UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 22

OCTOBER 18, 1967, TO OCTOBER 31, 1967

(PAGES 29209 TO 30688)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1967

J
11
.R
v.113
pt 22

DEPOSITED BY THE
ITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record
United States of America
PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, the baffling pressures and problems of the times in which our lives are set bring to our lips a cry of our inadequacy.

Who is sufficient for these things?

At this altar of prayer, set up so long ago by our fathers, we pause asking that Thy enabling might may undergird our weakness.

Show us the high adventure that awaits us in these days of destiny.

Reveal to us how vast are the issues and how great the enterprise committed now to our hands in the tangled affairs of our agitated world.

In a time that calls for heroism, make heroes of us all, rising with courage to the challenge of evil, putting on Thy armor to withstand the forces that war against the virtue and happiness of our race, Thy children.

We ask it in the name of Christ, our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and that the House insisted on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 to the bill.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 17, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Jerre S. Williams, of Texas, to be Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roger W. Tubby, of New York, to be representative of the United States to the European Office of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT AND FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1933

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third preference and sixth preference classifications for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Alaska State Legislature—HJR 3

"A joint resolution urging the support of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' request for supplemental funds needed to assist the natives throughout Alaska

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas the 1967 fishing season has been one of the poorest in the history of the state; and

"Whereas the effects of this devastating season will be felt not in a few areas but throughout the state; and

"Whereas the Tanana Valley flood of August 14, 1967, has caused great loss and hardship to the Natives of that area; and

"Whereas the burden of finding employment and subsistence for the Natives affected by both the fishing and flood disaster will fall upon the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Indian Affairs has found that its present appropriation is not sufficient to provide for the assistance needed;

"Be it resolved that the Alaska Legislature urges the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to consider the ramifications of the disastrous fishing season and the Tanana Valley flood on the Native population of the state and to recommend that a supplemental appropriation be made to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the purpose of providing for emergency relief to affected Alaska Natives.

"Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Carl Hayden, Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable George H. Mahon, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; the Honorable Charles L. Schultze, Director, Bureau of the Budget; and to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Howard W. Pollock, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the House October 1, 1967.

"William K. Boardman,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"Irene Cashen,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Passed by the Senate October 3, 1967

"John Butrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Emylou Lloyd,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"(Signed) Walter J. Hickel,
"*Governor of Alaska.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Alaska State Legislature—HJR 4

"A joint resolution requesting the Alaska Congressional Delegation to introduce legislation to cover Alaska shortfalls in revenue due to natural disaster of August 14, 1967

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas the flood disaster of August 14, 1967, has had a grave impact on state revenues and will continue to have an adverse effect for some time in the future; and

"Whereas it is of benefit to the entire nation that the Alaska economy once again gain a disposition of vitality with as little delay as possible; and

"Whereas it will take several years for the State of Alaska to make up for the shortfalls it has suffered in revenue and is sure to suffer in the future due to the magnitude of this natural disaster;

"Be it resolved that the Alaska delegation in Congress is respectfully requested to introduce without delay legislation which will have the effect of directly relieving the burden of the above mentioned shortfalls in revenue.

"Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the Senate and Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House; the Honorable George H. Mahon, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Howard W. Pollock, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the House October 1, 1967

"William K. Boardman,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"Irene Cashen,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Passed by the Senate October 3, 1967

"John Butrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Emylou Lloyd,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"(Signed) Walter J. Hickel,
"*Governor of Alaska.*"

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2072. A bill for the relief of Nestor S. Cueto (Rept. No. 643);

S. 2091. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Campuzano (Rept. No. 644);

S. 2168. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro Pina y Gil (Rept. No. 645);

S. 2175. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan Emilio Saignet y Crespo (Rept. No. 646);

S. 2191. A bill for the relief of Dr. Enrique Jose Suarez Diaz (Rept. No. 647);

S. 2193. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Jesus Gonzalez (Rept. No. 648);

S. 2256. A bill for the relief of Dr. Margarita Lorigados (Rept. No. 649);

S. 2285. A bill for the relief of Gordon Shih Gum Lee (Rept. No. 650);

H.R. 1948. An act for the relief of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran (Rept. No. 651);

H.R. 1960. An act for the relief of Angelique Kousoulas (Rept. No. 652);

H.R. 2464. An act for the relief of Yoo Young Hui and her daughter, Ok Young (Rept. No. 653);

H.R. 2978. An act for the relief of Yong Ok Espantoso (Rept. No. 654);

H.R. 3430. An act for the relief of Yim Mei Lam (Rept. No. 655);

H.R. 3497. An act for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta (Rept. No. 656);

H.R. 4534. An act for the relief of Mary Bernadette Linehan (Rept. No. 657); and

H.R. 5216. An act for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo (Rept. No. 658).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases (Rept. No. 667).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 866. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Pacino Biancarosso (Rept. No. 659);

S. 872. A bill for the relief of Francisco Renigio Fabre Solino (Frank R. S. Fabre) (Rept. No. 660);

S. 1129. A bill for relief of Demetera Lani Angelopoulos (Rept. No. 661);

S. 1180. A bill for the relief of Ana Jacaine (Rept. No. 662);

S. 1327. A bill for the relief of Dr. Samad Momtazee (Rept. No. 663);

S. 2120. A bill for the relief of Jose D. Neugart (Rept. No. 664); and

S. 2248. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Fuentes Roca (Rept. No. 665).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 107. A bill for the relief of Cita Rita Leola Ines (Rept. No. 666).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2548. A bill for the relief of Chan Ching Wo, Chan Shek Fai, Li Sui Chung, Ma Ah Yee, Man Kiu, Ng Bing Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2549. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2550. A bill to extend Letters Patent Numbered 2,322,210 and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 2551. A bill to impose annual quotas on the quantity of potassium chloride or muriate of potash which may be imported into the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Montoya when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 2552. A bill to provide for orderly trade in antifriction ball and roller bearings and parts thereof; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself and Mr. McGee):

S. 2553. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the operation and to reallocate the costs of the Kortes unit, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming, for fishery conservation; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hansen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Lausche and Mr. Scott):

S. 2554. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of flat glass imported into the United States by affording foreign supplying nations a fair share of the growth or change in the U.S. flat glass market; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2555. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress on the advisability of establishing a national park or other unit of the national park system in the central and northern parts of the Cascade Mountain region of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. Hartke):

S. 2556. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on certain watch movements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Moss, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Fong, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Smathers):

S.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution to provide that it be the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on Aging be called by the President of the United States in January 1970, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist the States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF PATENT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "To extend Letters Patent No. 2,322,210, and for other purposes."

In 1939 Mr. Bert N. Adams using his own ingenuity began experimenting in his home kitchen in Queens Village, Long Island, in the development of a new nonrechargeable, as opposed to a storage, electrical battery. He discovered that by the use of a magnesium positive electrode and a negative electrode comprising cuprous chloride fused with a carbon catalytic agent in a light container the battery would provide constant voltage and current for a long life without the use of acids, conventionally employed in storage batteries. It also did not generate dangerous fumes. The battery could be activated by plain or salt water.

The Adams battery is operable in temperatures from 65° below zero Fahrenheit to 200° Fahrenheit since the constant chemical reactions in the battery liberated large quantities of heat. When once activated by the addition of water, the battery continued to deliver electricity at a voltage which remained essentially constant regardless of the rate at which current was withdrawn in use. Since the battery was not activated until water was added, it could be stored indefinitely.

Adams applied in 1941 for letters patent which was issued as No. 2,322,210 in 1943. After the filing of his application Adams decided in 1942 that his invention had many potential military uses. He disclosed his invention, the benefits of his research, know-how and a number of his batteries to the U.S. Signal Corps, all at its request. Mr. Adams was promised that tests would be made and he would be advised of the results. He was not so advised.

The scientists of the Signal Corps and the Bureau of Standards were not convinced on the battery's performance. However, in November 1942, the Signal Corps changed its mind and concluded the battery was feasible. The Government then entered into contracts with various battery manufacturers for its procurement. Nevertheless, Mr. Adams was not advised of this change of decision nor of the procurement contracts.

The battery was found by the Government adaptable to many old and new purposes. In fact, in 1956 the Signal Corps Engineering Laboratories noted that the addition of water activated batteries "has brought about developments which would otherwise have been technically or economically impractical." The reference to "economically impractical" undoubtedly related to the fact that the cost of the Adams batteries were approximately one-fifth the cost of storage batteries using silver chloride and magnesium electrodes.

In spite of the Government's procurement of hundreds of thousands of batteries infringing the Adams' patent during the years since 1943 and saving many million dollars, as much as perhaps $39 million, it disregarded repeated requests and never informed Mr. Adams. The Supreme Court termed this conduct as "surprisingly" done.

It was not until 1955 that Mr. Adams found on examination of a battery produced for the Government by the Burgess Co. that the Government was using his invention. He promptly made demand for compensation. This was finally denied in 1960. His patent expired in June 1960.

In 1960 Adams filed a suit in the Court of Claims. The court found Adams' patent valid and infringed by the Government and ordered an accounting. The Government appealed to the Supreme Court on the issue of validity of the patent. On February 21, 1966, the Supreme Court in 383 U.S. 39 held the patent valid. The case is now in the Court of Claims for an accounting and determination of compensation due to Adams.

The question is why the bill, and what effect would it have. When his suit was filed in 1960, Mr. Adams could go back on his claim only to 1953 or 7 years. The statute of limitation is 6 years plus approximately 1 year in which his demand for payment was pending in the Department of Defense. Therefore, he is now barred by the statute from claiming for the 10 years from 1943 to 1953. He has been denied the benefits of his patent for that 10-year period through no fault of his but due to the wrongdoing of the Government. The bill would restore to him the enjoyment of his patent rights for 17 years by extending the patent life for 10 years commencing on June 22, 1960.

The bill would extend the statute of limitations to 6 years after the 10-year period or to June 22, 1976, for the bringing of suit against the United States. Both extensions would apply only as to the United States. This is explained by the fact that practically all of the use of Adams' battery has been by the Government and there has been little if any commercial use.

The extension of the patent period to 1970 is the only practical way to undo the injustice done to Mr. Adams by the Government since I am told that it would be impossible to obtain an accounting of purchases during the period from 1943 to 1953. In fact it appears that a great deal of difficulty is being experienced in obtaining a full accounting of purchases made from 1953 to 1960.

Mr. President, it seems very clear to me as it did to the Court that someone in the Government has been deliberately unmindful of the rights of this man. Simple justice needs to be done by Congress as it has done in the past when an inventor has lost the benefits of his invention through fault of someone in the Government. We have in many such cases extended the life of the patent. I hope the Congress will do so in this case.

Normally a private bill is introduced without explanation; the explanation is given the committee at a later and appropriate time. In this case, however, I believe it may be useful to recite the circumstances. Also I ask unanimous consent that articles from Life magazine, the Christian Science Monitor and the Wall Street Journal, each reporting on this matter, be made a part of the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the articles will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2550) to extend Letters Patent No. 2,322,210 and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hart, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The articles presented by Mr. Hart are as follows:

[From Time magazine, Mar. 4, 1966]

THE SUPREME COURT: HOW BERT BEAT THE BUREAUCRATS

No one believed Inventor Bert N. Adams in 1939 when he came out of his Queens Village, L.I., kitchen with a battery that seemed to revolutionize the original electrical "pile" devised by Alessandro Volta in 1796. Inventor Adams ultimately won a U.S. patent—and then the U.S. Government itself copied and repatented his battery without paying Adams a dime. Last week the Supreme Court not only agreed that Adams' battery met the U.S. patent test of being new, useful and "nonobvious"; by a vote of 7 to 1, the court also made clear that Adams' patent had been infringed during years of plain and fancy Government hornswoggling.

PRIMARY ACCIDENT

A lonely tinkerer in the style of the Edison era, Adams has supported his yen for inventing by toiling at a lengthy catalogue of jobs—cowboy, barber, auto mechanic, house painter, merchant seaman, research director for a vacuum cleaner company. His pre-war kitchen triumph was a primary (nonrechargeable) battery that delivered an even level of electricity over long periods of time. Until then familiar primary batteries delivered electricity at a declining rate until they wore out; their charge drained off even when not in use; and they rapidly deteriorated when subjected to extreme temperatures.

Adams' battery consisted of a lightweight container, one electrode made of magnesium and another of cuprous chloride. It could be stored indefinitely and activated by simply pouring in fresh or salt water. While cooking up some cuprous chloride on his wife's stove, Adams accidentally dropped cigarette ashes into the brew—and vastly improved it. Moreover, when his battery was connected to a load, a chemical reaction took place that produced heat. As a rèsult, the battery worked surprisingly well at temperatures as low as −65° F.

EXPERT ACCIDENT

In wartime 1942, Adams decided that his revolutionary battery had all sorts of potential military uses. When he offered it to the Army, though, every available expert rejected his idea as unvoltaic and unworkable. Indeed, no one yet knows exactly why the

Adams battery works. But without ever telling the inventor, the Government secretly confirmed his claims and ordered at least 1,000,000 similar batteries. One version is used in meteorological balloons operating at temperatures that would freeze conventional batteries. Another version, activated by salt water, powers signal lights in the survival gear of military aviators.

Adams got his patent in 1943; the Government got its own in 1953 based on the slight improvements of two army scientists. Adams finally got mad, and with the aid of an anonymous benefactor whom he credits with putting up $200,000 to fight the case, he went into the U.S. Court of Claims in 1960 and charged patent infringement. Fighting back, the Government cited older patents that used all of Adams' basic ingredients; an expert tried to build a battery according to the key (1880) patent, however, and the thing exploded. In the end, the court found that Adams was the first to create a workable, nonobvious battery out of the familiar ingredients. The Court of Claims ruled that the Government had clearly infringed Adams' patent.

SWEET VICTORY

When the Government appealed to the Supreme Court, Adams' New York lawyer, John Reilly, impressed the Justices during oral argument by pouring water into an Adams-rigged glass bowl while he went on talking. Electric lights connected to the battery popped on ten minutes later. When Justice Tom C. Clark read the decision last week, he fondly recalled that Lawyer Reilly "demonstrated it right here right in the courtroom."

For Adams, who is now 66 and lives in Yuma, Ariz., the next step is getting the Government to fork over damages—a complex legal process that may take months or years. No one yet knows how much he will collect; besides, he is ailing and may have little chance to spend it like the tycoon he might have been. Just his court victory over the bureaucrats, though, is mighty sweet to tinkerer Adams.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 26, 1966]

PATIENT INVENTOR WINS RECOGNITION AFTER 23 YEARS

(By Robert Cahn)

WASHINGTON.—"We affirm."

For Bert N. Adams, those two simple words by Associate Justice Tom C. Clark ended 23 years of disappointment and frustration.

Mr. Adams, an inventor, had won from the highest court in the land an admission that the United States had erred when Army Signal Corps scientists decided in 1943 that the battery he had invented was of no practical use.

To those listening in the Supreme Court chamber, the drama behind Case No. 55—the United States vs. Bert N. Adams—was not readily apparent.

The court already has denied patent-infringement claims in a related decision on three other cases. Now, as he summarized the court's 7–1 opinion on the Adams case, the Justice warmed to his subject. No doubt noting the block of visiting school children at the right of the chamber, he leaned across the bench to explain as simply as possible the Adams invention.

A FAMILY EFFORT

It is a nonrechargeable electrical battery, and not a dry-cell battery, the Justice said. The battery is made of two electrodes, one of magnesium and the other of chloride, which are placed in a container. When plain or salt water is added, the battery is activated within 30 minutes. It gives off a constant amount of electrical voltage, is efficient, and can operate at from 65 degrees below zero F. to 200 degrees F.

For several years prior to filing a patent application, Mr. Adams had worked in his home experimenting on the development of this battery, Mr. Justice Clark said.

What was left unsaid was that in those days, the late '30's, Mr. Adams was unemployed. To make ends meet, his wife worked in a candy factory and he repaired radios in their small, rented home in Long Island. He was self-taught in electrochemistry. He knew that others had tried to develop this type of battery and had failed. For two years he carried on experiments in his kitchen.

One night, he discovered accidentally that the addition of carbon into the cuprous chloride increased the current and provided a substantially level potential. It worked! On Dec. 16, 1941, he applied for a patent which was awarded to him two years later.

DECISION REVERSED

Less than a month after filing for his patent and with the war having started, Mr. Adams brought his discovery to the attention of the Army and Navy, Mr. Justice Clark continued. Arrangements were made for demonstrations before experts of the Army Signal Corps. The scientists who observed the demonstrations and who conducted further tests told Mr. Adams they did not believe the battery was workable.

Yet during 1942 and 1943, the Army provided hard-to-get magnesium for Mr. Adams to make batteries for them to test. He worked on the batteries in the bedroom at night, awakening often to see if their little lights were still getting electricity. "It was like trying to sleep with the Christmas tree on all night," says the inventor's wife.

Finally, in 1943, the Signal Corps experts said there were too many things wrong with the invention, and that they definitely couldn't use it.

Unknown to Mr. Adams, despite his repeated requests for information, the Signal Corps decided in November 1943, that the battery was feasible, Mr. Justice Clark said. The government contracted with various battery companies for its procurement. Several of the experts who had expressed disbelief in the Adams battery, later openly recognized its significance. One of the scientists for whom Mr. Adams had demonstrated the battery obtained a patent for the government in 1953 on the same idea.

• • • • •

PATENT INFRINGED

With the help of John A. Reilly of a prominent New York law firm, legal action was started in 1960. In 1964, the United States Court of Claims upheld that Mr. Adams' patent had been infringed. The Department of Justice then took the case to the Supreme Court.

Meanwhile, Mr. Adams, who had worked as an engineer and had developed inventions for several companies, left New York to go to Yuma, Ariz.

In explaining the court decision, Mr. Justice Clark noted that from the time of the Patent Act of 1793 until 14 years ago, the chief requirements for getting a patent had been that the invention was novel and useful. A 1952 act of Congress stated that in addition to novelty and utility, the subject matter to be patented should not be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

HE PUT IT TOGETHER

The government had argued that the use of magnesium and cuprous chloride were obvious to experts and were elements tired by earlier developers of batteries.

"The experts said it was obvious," Mr. Justice Clark remarked. "But he [Mr. Adams] put it together in a way that is would work . . . We conclude the Adams patent is valid."

The long legal battle is not yet over says the attorney for Mr. Adams. The case now must go back to the Court of Claims for an accounting of what is owed to the inventor.

Reached by telephone in Yuma, Mr. Adams said the money was not the important thing.

"I knew that justice always wins out," he said. "I had faith that it would. And it did."

• • • • •

The court's opinions on the four cases were the first rulings in 15 years on patentability. The effect of the decisions, even though in the Adams case the patent was upheld, is to reinforce the "unobvious" requirement of the 1952 law.

The court also was critical of the free rein exercised by patent examiners in their use of the concept of "invention." The court did not find any reason for relaxed standards.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 23, 1966]

PATENTS MAY BE MORE DIFFICULT TO OBTAIN IN WAKE OF HIGH COURT RULINGS IN FOUR CASES

WASHINGTON.—New patents may be more difficult to obtain, particularly for inventors who don't work in corporate laboratories, as a result of the Supreme Court's first searching reexamination of patent law in 15 years.

The High Court rejected arguments that 1952 Congressional amendments to the Patent Act of 1793 were intended to relax standards for new patent grants; the Justices said Congress was simply writing into law precedents the courts had set. Rather, it is the Patent Office that has relaxed standards, in the face of traditional court opposition to liberal standards for new patents, the Justices declared: "We have observed a notorious difference between the standards applied by the Patent Office and by the courts." If their words are heeded by the Patent Office, a unit of the Commerce Department, new patents won't be so easy for inventors to obtain.

A restrictive approach in the granting of new patents generally favors large corporations, according to some patent-law experts. Typically, large companies with extensive research facilities produce innovations substantially different in structure from products already on the market. On the other hand, individual inventors and small companies frequently come up with innovations that are little different structurally from already patented items, although some produce markedly different results.

In the fourth case, the Supreme Court upheld a lower court decision that a patent on an electric battery was valid.

Bert Adams of Hicksville, N.Y., was granted a patent in 1943 on a battery that was made of known materials but that, unlike a conventional battery, produced a constant, nondeclining output over its life span. The Defense Department has used the Adams battery since the early 1940s, but it refused to pay Mr. Adams anything, calling his patent invalid because the physical difference between his battery and known battery materials was too small. The Supreme Court said Mr. Adams' combination of materials was novel and his battery patentable. Now the Court of Claims is to decide how much the Government owes Mr. Adams.

POTASH IMPORT QUOTA BILL

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, there exists a situation in the State of New

Mexico that is bad now, and getting worse almost daily. I refer to the condition of the potash industry in my State, which is reeling from a series of body blows caused by unlimited dumping of foreign-produced potassium salts.

The human cost being paid by the citizens of New Mexico whose fate and future is bound up with our potash industry is appalling. This is an important enterprise that has long been most productive and essential to the well-being of the economy of our State, our Nation, and the lives of those who manned the industry.

It is heartrending to see mine closings come in dizzying succession, with each one striking at the lives and futures of hundreds of our people. These are hardworking, contributing citizens, American workers, who have been responsible for a substantial contribution over the years to the might of this Nation's economy. They have been a major segment of the economic backbone of New Mexico.

These men and women prefer to work rather than to complain. They do not ask for preferred treatment. Rather they ask that we give their honest complaints a fair hearing and decide on the merits what should be done.

I am sure you are all well aware of what has happened in other areas of the Nation and to other American industries. Competition is one thing, but ruinous dumping is another.

It behooves us to honestly stand up for American industry and the American worker. I am not advocating a narrow, isolationist type of protectionism that is akin to the policies of the gilded age of long ago. But I am speaking out in order to obtain for our people what foreign competitors are already practicing—enlightened self-interest on behalf of industries that produce goods and employ workers. The potash industry of New Mexico needs that help and needs it soon.

Mr. President, I, therefore, today introduce for reference to the Senate Finance Committee, a bill which would impose a much needed control on the ever-increasing and potentially disastrous imports of potassium chloride into the United States.

On June 23, 1967, I expressed my concern here on the Senate floor about the adverse effects excessive importation of potash is already having on our national production of potash. Over the last few years we have seen imports of potassium chloride rise from 9 percent of our domestic consumption in 1960 to over 38 percent in 1966. The frightening aspect is that indications are this trend will continue until our domestic potash industry is pushed out of existence.

An article in the Northern Miner on July 14, 1966, highlighted the threat to domestic production by our neighbor to the north, Canada. The article, entitled, "Potash Mining; Canada Leaps to World Leadership" brought home the point that plants now in production in Canada, or actively under development and construction, are estimated to have a capacity for production of potash by 1970 of 12.1 million tons of product or, in the parlance of the trade about 7.6 million tons of K_2O equivalent. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a "Box Score of Potash Operations" from that issue showing the Canadian operations.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOX SCORE OF POTASH OPERATIONS IN CANADA[1]

	Output (tons per year)	Capital cost	Production start	Shafts
Operating:				
International M. & C., K-1	2,000,000	$65,000,000	September 1962	1
Kalium Chemicals	600,000	50,000,000	September 1964	None
Potash Co. of America	600,000	45,000,000	April 1965	1
Total, operating	3,200,000	160,000,000		
Under construction:				
Allan Potash	1,500,000	70,000,000	Summer 1967	2
Alwinsal Potash	1,000,000	50,000,000	Early 1968	1
Cominco Potash	1,200,000	65,000,000	Late 1969	2
Duval Corp	1,000,000	63,000,000	Early 1969	2
International M. & C., K-2	1,500,000	60,000,000	Early 1967	1
Noranda Potash	1,200,000	73,000,000	Early 1969	2
Southwest Potash	1,500,000	60,000,000	Early 1970	2
Total, under construction	8,900,000	441,000,000		
Total	12,100,000	601,000,000		

[1] The Northern Miner, July 14, 1966.

Note: Potash Co. of America is planning a 2d shaft on which work is to commence early next year. International Minerals & Chemical Corp.'s K-1 and K-2 shafts connect underground. Alwinsal Potash expects to start sinking a 2d shaft shortly after production attained.

Mr. MONTOYA. This situation is of particular concern to me because of its immediate effect on a principal industry of New Mexico. The seven or eight major American suppliers of potash have for years mined this mineral in the area of Carlsbad, N. Mex. This industry has become so important to us that anything that would affect its prosperity, would also have serious impact on the economy of my State as a whole.

Recently the International Minerals & Chemical Corp. laid off 350 workers in Carlsbad. An even more crippling blow came yesterday when the U.S. Borax & Chemical Corp., which had originally scheduled to close down its operation by early 1968, throwing 900 more employees out of work, announced that it had revised its schedule and will now close down by early November of this year. That is, within the next few weeks or even days.

In an industry which employs a total of 4,000 workers, these layoffs are disastrous—they represent over 30 percent of the total working force employed in the mining of domestic potash. This is a circumstance which we cannot put up with, and unless this Congress acts, and acts quickly, we can expect this trend to continue. It is imperative that we act expediently.

I call attention to the following statistics which show the importance of this industry to the State of New Mexico specifically and to the United States in general:

POTASH TAXES PAID TO STATE OF NEW MEXICO IN 1966

Local and state taxes and royalties borne by the potash industry total more than 10 million dollars annually. For the calendar year 1966, the potash industry paid the following amounts:

Gross receipts tax (on sales)	$802,905
Sales tax (on purchases)	758,306
Compensating tax (on purchases)	143,862
Ad valorem tax	2,079,476
Royalties	5,066,891
Mineral lease	500,821
Occupation tax	25,842
State income tax	212,741
Severance tax	497,498
Total	10,088,842

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a series of tables which will portray graphically the serious crisis which our domestic potash industry confronts. These tables show the number of product tons of the mineral known as potassium chloride—KCl—and of its oxide content known as K_2O. Pure sylvite, or pure muriate of potash, contains 63.2 percent of oxide content—K_2O. Mining companies strive for a product containing a minimum of 95 percent sylvite—KCl—which then contains over 60 percent K_2O equivalent, the usual minimum standard.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—U.S. DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF POTASH

Year	Product (tons (KCl))[1]	K_2O (tons)[2]	Change over prior year (percent)
1960	----------	2,119,397	([3])
1961	3,911,896	2,054,097	−3.1
1962	4,248,931	2,342,876	+14.1
1963	4,293,141	2,645,040	+12.9
1964	4,820,741	2,935,989	+11.0
1965	4,692,760	3,141,856	+7.0
1966	4,931,686	3,810,531	+21.3
Total	26,898,155	19,049,786	----------

[1] Measured in terms of the mineral known as potassium chloride (KCl). Source for figures is the A.T. & S.F. RR.

[2] Measured in terms of the oxide content (K_2O). Pure sylvite, or pure muriate of potash, contains 63.2 percent of K_2O. Mining companies strive for a product containing a minimum of 95 percent sylvite (KCl) which then contains over 60 percent K_2O equivalent, the usual minimum standard. Source for figures is the American Potash Institute.

[3] Base year.

Note: Average increase per year over base year of 1960 averages 13 percent per year.

TABLE 2.—*U.S. domestic production capacity of potash* [1]

Year:	K_2O * *tons*
1960–64	2,800,000
1965	2,875,000
1966	3,400,000

[1] U.S.D.A. Publication "The Fertilizer Situation 1963–64, 1964–65, 1965–66" (Production Capacity for 1960 through 1963 assumed to be the same as 1964). The published figures have been reduced by 200,000 K_2O tons to reflect the net production capacity of K_2O as potassium chloride.

*Measured in terms of the oxide content (K_2O). Pure sylvite, or pure muriate of potash, contains 63.2% of K_2O. Mining companies strive for a product containing a minimum of 95% sylvite (KC1) which then contains over 60% K_2O equivalent, the usual minimum standard.

TABLE 3.—U.S. IMPORTS OF POTASH [1]

CANADA

Year	KCL (tons) [2]	K_2O (tons) [3]	Percent of domestic consumption
1960	6,717	4,030	(4)
1961	3	2	(4)
1962	76,395	45,819	2
1963	563,344	338,006	13
1964	837,357	502,414	17
1965	1,485,148	891,089	28
1966	2,015,838	1,209,503	32
OTHER IMPORTS			
1960	321,992	193,195	9
1961	331,901	199,141	10
1962	386,734	232,040	10
1963	313,192	187,915	7
1964	358,360	215,016	7
1965	295,133	177,080	6
1966	366,383	219,830	6
TOTAL IMPORTS			
1960	328,709	197,225	9
1961	331,904	199,143	10
1962	463,129	277,859	11
1963	876,536	525,921	20
1964	1,195,717	717,430	24
1965	1,780,281	1,068,169	34
1966	2,382,221	1,429,333	38
Total	7,358,497	4,415,080	[5] 23

[1] American Potash Institute.

[2] Measured in terms of the mineral known as potassium chloride (KCl).

[3] Measured in terms of the oxide content (K_2O). Pure sylvite, or pure muriate of potash, contains 63.2 percent of K_2O. Mining companies strive for a product containing a minimum of 95 percent sylvite (KCl) which then contains over 60 percent K_2O equivalent, the usual minimum standard.

[4] Less than 1 percent.

[5] Over the 7 years from 1960 to 1966, the total imports of K_2O into the United States averaged approximately 23 percent of our domestic consumption for those 7 years.

TABLE 4.—*Canadian consumption of potash* [1]

Year:	K_2O* *tons*
1960	100,880
1961	105,951
1962	105,282
1963	121,909
1964	154,663
1965	185,021
1966	197,062

[1] American Potash Institute.

*Measured in terms of the oxide content (K_2O). Pure sylvite, or pure muriate of potash, contains 63.2% of K_2O. Mining companies strive for a product containing a minimum of 95% sylvite (KCl) which then contains over 60% K_2O equivalent, the usual minimum standard.

TABLE 5.—WORLDWIDE POTASH PRODUCTION CAPABILITY VERSUS CONSUMPTION

Year	World production capability (including Carlsbad production) [1]	World consumption [1]	Excess capability over consumption [1]	Carlsbad production capability (estimated)
1960	8,500,000	8,500,000	None	4,200,000
1961	9,500,000	9,500,000	None	4,200,000
1962	10,000,000	10,000,000	None	4,200,000
1963	10,500,000	10,500,000	None	4,200,000
1964	12,000,000	12,000,000	None	4,200,000
1965	13,000,000	13,000,000	None	4,500,000
1966	15,000,000	14,000,000	1,000,000	5,100,000
1967	16,000,000	15,000,000	1,000,000	(2)
1968	17,000,000	15,000,000	1,800,000	(2)
1969	18,800,000	16,000,000	2,500,000	(2)
1970	20,500,000	17,000,000	3,500,000	(2)
1971	25,000,000	18,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000

[1] Chemical Week, July 2, 1966. Measured in terms of the mineral known as potassium chloride (KCl). Pure sylvite, or pure muriate of potash, contains 63.2 percent of K_2O the oxide content. Mining companies strive for a product containing a minimum of 95 percent sylvite (KCl) which then contains over 60 percent K_2O equivalent, the usual minimum standard.

[2] Not available.

Mr. MONTOYA. These tables show us at once the problems which our domestic potash industry is facing. In 1966, for example, our domestic consumption measured in K_2O tons was approximately 3.8 million tons. The domestic production capacity of K_2O was 3.4 million tons. Thus, there existed theoretically a gap of 0.4 million tons which our domestic industry could not support and which would have to be imported. However, our imports for 1966 in fact totaled not 0.4 million tons, but 1.4 million tons of K_2O; or measured in terms of product tons, 2.4 million tons.

Table No. 3 shows us the steady encroachment which imports have been making into our domestic market, and especially the Canadian imports. The Canadian imports have risen from less than 1 percent of domestic consumption in 1960 and 1961, to over 32 percent of domestic consumption in 1966. Total foreign imports have risen from 9 percent of domestic consumption in 1960 to over 38 percent in 1966. It is interesting to note further that imports from all countries other than Canada have remained relatively constant, totaling around 200,000 K_2O tons per year, while the Canadian imports have jumped from 2 K_2O tons in 1961 to 1,209,503 K_2O tons in 1966.

Why does Canada rely so much on the United States as an export source? First of all, as table 4 will verify, Canada's domestic consumption is running at less than 200,000 K_2O tons per year while its production potential, as I mentioned earlier, will soon be approximately 7.6 K_2O tons per year. Thus, Canada has little or no domestic market to speak of and must look elsewhere for its market. The United States is a prime target because these imports of potassium chloride into the United States are duty free.

Can not these problems be handled administratively? Mr. President, I sincerely wish that they could. However, I have called upon the U.S. Tariff Commission seeking relief for our domestic potash industry to no avail. The Tariff Commission replied to my appeal in these words:

> A careful consideration of the circumstances stated in your letter does not suggest any provision of law administered primarily by the Tariff Commission under which import restrictions could be imposed on the imports in question, and, of course, the Commission is not a rate-making agency.

The New Mexico delegation also called upon the U.S. Treasury Department, Bureau of Customs, to investigate possible violations of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended, of potassium chloride. After a summary investigation in this matter, the Bureau of Customs informed me on September 6, 1967, that the Bureau was instituting an antidumping proceeding to ascertain whether this merchandise is being imported at less than fair value within the purview of the act. We are still awaiting the results of this investigation.

I know that there will be a reluctance on the part of some because the United States, as a signatory of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT, has to abide by its commitment not to impose tariffs on duty-free imports. And imports of potash—in the form of potassium chloride and muriate of potash, TSUSA No. 48050—are duty free.

However, with the uncontroverted facts as detailed above, imports of low-cost potash are going to continue to increase at an injurious rate to our domestic industry if they remain unabetted. While a comprehensive study of the rate structure for shipments of potash within and to the United States has been available, a preliminary review indicates that the only three States in the United States where New Mexico potash can compete pricewise with Canadian imports are in the States of New Mexico itself, Texas, and Oklahoma. All the other 47 States can acquire their potash cheaper from Canadian sources.

It may be contended that exporters of potash will retaliate by instituting other barriers to our trade should we invoke a limited country quota on imports of potash. This is a problem, however, which we should be prepared to meet headon. We should by all means abide by our commitments, but we should not bury our heads in the sand while a domestic industry is destroyed by circumstances which were not prevalent when the United States entered into its commitment to allow duty-free imports of potassium chloride.

Who can say that we must remain blind to radically changed conditions, conditions which were certainly not contemplated in 1947 when Canada sought this duty-free concession on potash in GATT.

This Congress would be lax in exercising its duty should it turn its back on a struggling domestic industry which is struggling simply because of U.S. concessions to our foreign friends.

This Congress and the 89th Congress will be remembered for their efforts to stimulate economic development in this country. This is difficult to explain to the citizens of the Carlsbad, N. Mex., area, however. Because of our trade policies, hundreds of men have been laid off in the Carlsbad mines, hundreds of other have been affected because of the reduced purchasing power of these miners, and as a result, the Economic Development Administration on September 21, 1967, declared the Carlsbad area a redevelopment area.

Thus, we in New Mexico have witnessed economic development in reverse: a viable economy has now become a weak one, an economy struggling for survival, an economy which the Federal Government must now try to nourish back to health. But this assistance will not be necessary if we will but give our domestic industry a chance by enacting this quota legislation which I am introducing today.

In closing, I would like to point out to our foreign friends who have been relying on the United States for their potash market that this legislation has taken their needs into consideration and is an attempt to be fair. This legislation does not impose a stringent quota but instead imposes a very realistic quota.

If we look back to table No. 3 above we will see that the imports for the years 1960 to 1966 totaled to over 4.4 million K_2O tons. Table 1 shows us that our total domestic consumption for these 7 years amounted to roughly 19 million K_2O tons. Thus, for these 7 years, the percentage of imports to domestic consumption was an average of 23 percent. The bill which I introduce today would permit imports up to 25 percent of domestic consumption, a full 2 percent over the average for the last 7 years.

As I have said, taking all factors into consideration, I have tried to fashion a bill which would take into account the needs of our foreign exporters but at the same time a bill which would provide the protection which is most essential if we are not to see our national security threatened by having a vital domestic industry destroyed.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate Finance Committee and in the Senate to give this measure early and favorable consideration.

Mr. President, I ask that this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Thank you.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2551) to impose annual quotas on the quantity of potassium chloride or muriate of potash which may be imported into the United States, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2551

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the total quantity of potassium chloride which may be imported into the United States during the calendar year 1968 or any subsequent calendar year shall not exceed a quantity equal to 25 per centum of the estimated United States consumption of potassium chloride for such calendar year.

(b) For purposes of this Act, the term "potassium chloride" means potassium chloride or muriate of potash provided for in item 480.50 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall, before the beginning of the calendar year 1968 and each subsequent calendar year, estimate the United States consumption of potassium chloride for such calendar year. The Secretary may, from time to time during any calendar year, revise his estimate of United States consumption of potassium chloride for such year. The Secretary shall publish his estimate for each calendar year and any revised estimate for such year in the Federal Register.

(b) The President shall by proclamation limit the total quantity of potassium chloride which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the calendar year 1968 and each subsequent calendar year, to the quantity prescribed for such year under the first section of this Act based upon the estimates, or revised estimates, made by the Secretary of Agriculture for such year under subsection (a). In any case in which any revised estimate results in a quantity of potassium chloride which may be imported into the United States during a calendar year which is lower than the quantity resulting from the original estimate or a previous revised estimate for such year, the total quantity of potassium chloride which may be imported during such year shall not be less than the quantity actually imported on or before the date on which the Secretary of Agriculture publishes such revised estimate.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture shall allocate the total quantity of potassium chloride which may be imported into the United States during any calendar year among supplying countries on the basis of the shares such countries imported into the United States during a representative period selected by the Secretary, except that due account may be given to special factors which have affected or may affect trade in potassium chloride. The Secretary of Agriculture shall certify such allocations to the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue such regulations as he determines to be necessary to carry out, and to prevent circumvention of, the purposes of this Act.

(b) All determinations by the Secretary of Agriculture under this Act shall be final.

AUTHORIZATION TO MODIFY THE OPERATION AND TO REALLOCATE THE COSTS OF THE KORTES UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. MCGEE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the operation and to reallocate the costs of the Kortes unit, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming, for fishery conservation.

The Kortes Dam and powerplant is located between Seminoe Dam and Pathfinder Reservoir on the North Platte River. It was the first unit of the Missouri River Basin project, and the Kortes unit was authorized and constructed as a single-purpose project for power production.

The unit was built, however, before Congress recognized by law the allocation of fish and wildlife enhancement as project benefits. In 1961, at the request of the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, adjustments in the method of operation of the hydroelectric facility were made on an experimental basis to determine whether a worthwhile improvement could be made in the maintenance of a fishery below Kortes Dam. This operation has been done under close observation, and a proven fishery has been established on this reach of the river.

Reauthorization of the Kortes unit as a multiple-purpose project for power and fish and wildlife increases the benefit-cost ratio for the project. This project has been recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Wyoming Natural Resource Board, the State game and fish commission, and the Governor of Wyoming.

The legislation I introduce today was drafted through the courtesy of the Department of the Interior with slight technical amendments as proposed by the State engineer for Wyoming.

I ask that correspondence concerning this legislation be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the correspondence will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2553) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the operation and to reallocate the costs of the Kortes unit, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming, for fishery conservation, introduced by Mr. HANSEN (for himself and Mr. MCGEE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The correspondence presented by Mr. HANSEN is as follows:

WYOMING NATURAL RESOURCE BOARD,
Cheyenne, Wyo., January 25, 1967.

Hon. STANLEY K. HATHAWAY,
Governor of Wyoming, State Capitol Building, Cheyenne, Wyo.

DEAR GOVERNOR HATHAWAY: The staff of the Natural Resource Board has reviewed the Bureau of Reclamation *Cost Allocations Report on the Kortes Unit, Wyoming.* Comments on the report are included herewith. The Game and Fish Commission has expressed to us its interest in the operation of the Kortes Unit to provide a fishery in the North Platte River below Kortes Dam.

The Natural Resource Board acting in its capacity as the water resource planning and development agency of the State of Wyoming at its January 1967 meeting recommends to you:

1. That the Wyoming Congressional Delegation support legislation in Congress to reauthorize the Kortes Unit as a multiple-purpose project including power and fish and wildlife enhancement as purposes.

2. That the costs allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement be charged to the

project as nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

Copies of this letter and the comments on the Bureau report will be sent to the Congressional Delegation, the Game and Fish Commission, and the State Engineer.

Very truly yours,

Myron Goodson,
Chief of Water Development.

Memorandum on Reauthorization of Kortes Unit To Include Fish and Wildlife Benefits, January 25, 1967

To: Gov. Stanley K. Hathaway.
From: Frank J. Trelease, Water Resource Engineer, Natural Resource Board.

Kortes Dam and power plant is located between Seminoe Dam and Pathfinder Reservoir on the North Platte River. It was the first unit of the Missouri River Basin Project, and the Kortes Unit as authorized and constructed is a single purpose project for power production. The unit was built before Congress recognized by law the allocation of fish and wildlife enhancement as project benefits, and permitted the costs associated with these benefits to be charged off as nonreimbursable.

The Natural Resource Board received a copy of the Bureau of Reclamation *Cost Allocations Report on the Kortes Unit, Wyoming,* September 1966—Revised December 1966. The following is our review of the report:

1. The facility was operated until 1961 solely for the purpose of producing power. The operation of the power plant for peaking power practically eliminated the fishery in the ten-mile reach of the North Platte River between Kortes Dam and Pathfinder Reservoir. At the request of the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, the facility has been operated since 1961 to maintain minimum flows to support fishery in the River. This operation has been done under close observation, and a proven fishery has been established in this reach of the River. It is the desire of the Game and Fish Commission that this operation be continued.

2. The operation of Kortes power plant for the fishery reduces the power generation somewhat, but this can be made up in part from within the Western Division power system of the Missouri River Basin. The remainder of the effect can be made up from interchange energy from other Federal or private utility systems. The following figures indicate the magnitude of the effect:

[Millions of kilowatt hours]

	Without Kortes fish flows	With Kortes fish flows
Average annual—		
Net system generation	1,565.66	1,564.90
Nonfirm interchange out	25.88	32.70
Energy required interchange in	155.22	162.80

It is seen that the effect to the Western Division power system is small in magnitude. The Bureau computed an annual revenue loss due to the fish flows of $19,600.

3. Under existing law, the Kortes Unit can be reauthorized by Congress as a multiple-purpose project for power and fish and wildlife enhancement. The project cost of $14,751,657 would be reallocated as $8,685,799 for power and $6,065,850 for joint use for both power and fish and wildlife enhancement. The annual benefits would change from $815,375 for single-purpose power to $696,150 power and $150,000 fishery. The benefit-cost ratio would increase from 1.31 to 1.36.

4. The Bureau recommends the following: (1) the plan of operation including fish and wildlife enhancement as a second purpose of the Kortes Unit be approved, (2) the Kortes Unit be reauthorized as an integral feature of the Missouri Basin Project to provide for both power and fish and wildlife enhancement, and (3) the portion of the project costs and annual OM&R expenses allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

The effect of the reauthorization is to permit the continuation of the past five year's operation on a legal basis. If the recommendations of the Bureau of Reclamation are followed, the State of Wyoming will continue to enjoy the benefits of the operation without incurring any costs to the State.

March 6, 1967.

Mr. Floyd E. Dominy,
Commissioner of Reclamation, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

Subject: Cost Allocations Report on the Kortes Unit, Wyoming.
Re: 735.

Dear Commissioner Dominy: Herewith are Wyoming's comments on the report of the Regional Director concerning the Cost Allocations Report on the Kortes Unit, Wyoming.

We note from the report that the Kortes Dam and Reservoir was operated until 1961 as a single purpose power facility. In that year, at the request of the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission adjustments in the method of operation of the hydroelectric facility were made on an experimental basis to determine whether a worthwhile improvement could be made in the maintenance of a fishery below Kortes Dam. The result has been that a proven fishery has been established between Kortes Dam and Pathfinder Reservoir and what began as an experiment has resulted in a very worthwhile endeavor.

The report analyzes the effect that this change in operation of Kortes Power Plant has had on the western division power system of the Missouri River Basin. It further sets forth criteria for reauthorization of the Kortes Unit as a multiple purpose project for power and fish and wildlife enhancement and analyzes the economics of the Kortes Unit both before and after the proposed reauthorization. We are pleased to note that the proposed change results in a slight increase in the benefit-cost ratio for the project and that the Regional Director's recommendation is that steps be taken to permanently authorize the dual purpose operation.

We concur in the Regional Director's recommendations that:

1. The plan of operation presented in this report to include fish and wildlife enhancement as a second purpose of the Kortes Unit be approved.

2. The Kortes Unit be reauthorized as an integral feature of the Missouri River Basin Project to provide for both power and fish and wildlife enhancement.

3. The portion of project cost and annual O. M. & R. expenses allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

In addition, we are able to assure you that this proposal has the support of a wide range of interests in Wyoming. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this project and we will urge our Congressional Delegation to work closely with you in preparing whatever legislation is necessary to implement the change.

Sincerely yours,

Stanley K. Hathaway,
Governor.

State of Wyoming,
Game and Fish Commission,
Cheyenne, August 10, 1967.

Hon. Clifford P. Hansen,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hansen: This is to inform you that the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission strongly supports the proposed legislation which would establish the Kortes unit as a multiple-purpose reclamation project with fish and wildlife included as a secondary feature of the operation.

As you may know, we have conducted considerable biological work and reported on public benefits of this project in cooperation with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation has completed a cost allocation report which includes the recommendation that annual O. M. & R. expenses allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable. Governor Hathaway endorsed the Bureau's report in a letter to Commissioner Dominy dated March 6, 1967.

I understand draft legislation prepared by the Bureau is now under review in the Bureau of Budget. I would be happy to receive any information that you might have on the status of this legislation.

If you have any questions or if I can be of any assistance in expediting action on this legislation, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

James B. White,
State Game and Fish Commissioner.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C., September 8, 1967.

Hon. Clifford P. Hansen,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hansen: At your request we are enclosing a draft of a bill "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the operation and to reallocate the costs of the Kortes unit, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming, for fishery conservation."

This draft has been prepared as a service to you. Since it has not been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, you will understand, I am sure, that we can make no commitment at this time concerning the position of the Department on the measure.

Sincerely yours,

Max N. Edwards,
Assistant to the Secretary and Legislative Counsel.

State of Wyoming,
State Engineer's Office,
Cheyenne, September 25, 1967.

Hon. Clifford P. Hansen,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hansen: Thank you for your letter dated September 19 concerning the proposed legislation on the Kortes Unit of the Missouri River Basin Project in Wyoming. The copy of the bill which was attached to that letter appears to accomplish the desired result, and I would have suggestions for only a couple of minor revisions in the wording of that bill.

In Section 2 of the bill, starting on line 4 after the colon following Pathfinder Reservoir, I would suggest that the wording might be modified as follows:

"Provided, that *sufficient* water is available to maintain such minimum flow, *without a resultant adverse effect on other water users who have valid rights to the use of this water:* Provided further that when *sufficient water* is not available, *to operate in this manner,* water will be reserved for hydroelectric peaking power operations . . ."

These suggestions as shown by the italic sections above are minor in nature and my only thought would be that it should take preference in the event that there might be some adverse effect on the rights of valid water users resulting from this proposed revision in the manner of operation. I do not anticipate that such a set of circumstances will arise, but I do feel that it would be advisable to clarify the intent in the event such a situation does develop.

With these minor revisions, it would appear to me that the proposed bill will accomplish the desired result and will not harm anyone. This legislation would appear to be beneficial to Wyoming, and consequently I recommend its adoption.

Thank you again for sending me a copy of this bill. With best personal regards,

Sincerely,

FLOYD A. BISHOP,
State Engineer.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PARK OR OTHER UNIT OF NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM IN CASCADE MOUNTAIN REGION OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk, out of order, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress on the advisability of the establishment of a national park or other unit of the national park system in the central and northern parts of the Cascade Mountain region of the State of Oregon. I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2555) to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress on the advisability of establishing a national park or other unit of the national park system in the central and northern parts of the Cascade Mountain region of the State of Oregon, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2555

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of evaluating fully the potentiality for establishing therein a national park or other unit of the National Park System, the Secretary of the Interior shall make a comprehensive study of the scenic, scientific, recreational, educational, wildlife, and wilderness values of the central and northern portion of the Cascade Mountain Range in the State of Oregon, lying generally between the northern boundary of Crater Lake National Park and the Columbia River.

SEC. 2. Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress the results of such study and his recommendations concerning the advisability of establishing a national park or other unit of the national park system within the region generally described under the first section of this Act, and the lands desirable for inclusion therein.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which calls for a White House Conference on Aging be called in 1970, approximately one decade after the historic conference of January 1961.

If this Congress acts promptly on the resolution I offer today, it would follow approximately the same timetable required for the 1961 White House Conference which was preceded by almost 2 years of preparation and teamwork by Federal agencies, State officials, leaders in private organizations, and others.

To do the job effectively again, we should give ourselves no less time than we had then, and we should again insist on a high standard of excellence from beginning of planning to the final report to the President.

The late Representative John E. Fogarty—that great spokesman for programs of deep personal meaning for all Americans—put the case well for such a conference when he introduced his bill for that purpose on January 8, 1958. After vividly describing the major problems facing the elderly then, he said:

> It is eight years since the first conference on aging was held. Considerable experience has been gained in the interval, and many additional organizations and individuals have entered the field of aging. I am certain there would be great value in providing them opportunity to come together, first in their own states, and then in a national forum, to take stock of where we are and where we should be going. The first conference on aging stimulated a good deal of activity. A White House Conference would stimulate more, and it cannot come too quickly.

John Fogarty's words are equally true about the situation today. We have made great progress since January 1961, but in some cases that progress has simply given us more light to see with, if we are willing to look hard.

Since 1900 the number of persons in our Nation 65 and over has increased sixfold, from 3 million to over 19 million. In the next 15 to 20 years we will have over 25 million, an increase of 40 percent. By the year 2000 we will have over 28 million, an increase of 55 percent. And one out of every three Americans alive today, some 65 million people, will reach retirement age between now and the year 2000. This rapid increase in the number of older persons demands that the utmost in planning be accomplished now in order to accommodate them.

We now have medicare, and we are struggling to implement medicaid. But as we count the blessings these landmark programs have brought, we can also see more clearly that the elderly of our Nation still encounter formidable problems as they search for good health care, and our Senate is now about to consider the modest social security increases sought by President Johnson. I think we can see that we will soon have to do some hard thinking—not only about the future of social security—but about all sources of retirement income, including private pension plans. Meanwhile, too many of our elders still live in anxiety because they live barely above subsistence levels.

Thanks largely to the work of Senator Pat McNamara and John Fogarty, we now have an Older Americans Act and an Administration on Aging—as recommended at the 1961 White House Conference on Aging.

Job discrimination because of age still threatens any worker who must change employment status, even people in their thirties and forties. This problem persists largely because misinformation nourishes old-fashioned attitudes about the capabilities of so-called older workers.

As for housing, I sometimes think that—even with the heartening progress we have made in recent years—the needs of our elderly are growing greater, not diminishing.

Many more examples could be given, but I think that the best summary of the situation was made in powerful terms by President Lyndon Johnson in this year's message on older Americans when he said:

> One of the challenges of a great civilization is the compassion and respect shown to its elders. Too many of our senior citizens have been left behind by the progress they worked most of their lives to create. Too often the wisdom and experience of our senior citizens is lost or ignored. Many who are able and willing to work suffer the bitter rebuff of arbitrary and unjust job discrimination.
>
> In this busy and productive Nation, the elderly are too frequently destined to lead empty, neglected lives: 5.3 million older Americans have yearly incomes below the poverty level; only one out of five has a job, often at low wages; over 2 million elderly citizens are on welfare; nearly 40 per cent of our single older citizens have total assets of less than $1,000.
>
> Countless numbers dwell in city and rural slums, lonely and forgotten, isolated from the invigorating spirit of the American community. They suffer a disproportionate burden of bad housing, poor health facilities, inferior recreation and rehabilitation services.

The Senate Special Committee on Aging and its subcommittees are studying several of the problems mentioned by the President, and several others. As chairman of that committee, I will continue to do all I can to seek out facts, make recommendations, and urge the Congress to act on those recommendations.

It is because of my work on the committee, however, that I am deeply impressed by the magnitude of the problems facing the elderly and the extent of the Government's commitment to cope with those problems. We need to take a look at what we have done, and we need to come together for an organized discussion of what the 1970's may bring. In short, we should work now for a White House conference in 1970.

To begin that work, the resolution I offer today would:

First. Provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare plan and conduct the Conference with the cooperation and assistance of such other Federal departments and agencies as may be appropriate, and that a final report of the Conference be submitted to the President not later than 90 days following the date on which the Conference was called.

Second. Authorize each State, upon application to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, not more than $25,000 for use in planning and conducting a State conference on aging, for developing facts and recommendations and the preparation of reports, and for defraying costs incident to the State's delegates attending the White House Conference.

Third. Authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish an Advisory Committee to the Conference to advise and assist in planning and conducting the Conference.

The small investment of Federal funds necessary to implement this resolution becomes quite insignificant when compared with the many benefits to be derived from it. To enumerate a few, this resolution would:

First. Provide a sound basis for the development of future programs and improvement of present programs for the elderly.

Second. Provide a forum for the most qualified individuals in the field to engage in mutual exchanges and make recommendations.

Third. Enable each State to define its particular needs.

Fourth. Provide a strong incentive to States to give immediate and thorough consideration to present and potential problems.

Fifth. Enable the local communities, where much of the activity transpires, to make their needs known.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 117), to provide that it be the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on Aging be called by the President of the United States in January 1970; to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; to assist the States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging, and for related purposes, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 117

Whereas the primary responsibility for meeting the challenge and problems of aging is that of the States and communities, all levels of government are involved and must necessarily share responsibility; and it is therefore the policy of the Congress that the Federal Government shall work jointly with the States and their citizens, to develop recommendations and plans for action, consistent with the objectives of this joint resolution, which will serve the purposes of—

(1) assuring middle-aged and older persons equal opportunity with others to engage in gainful employment which they are capable of performing; and

(2) enabling retired persons to enjoy incomes sufficient for health and for participation in family and community life as self-respecting citizens; and

(3) providing housing suited to the needs of older persons and at prices they can afford to pay; and

(4) assisting middle-aged and older persons to make the preparation, develop skills and interests, and find social contacts which will make the gift of added years of life a period of reward and satisfaction; and

(5) stepping up research designed to relieve old age of its burdens of sickness, mental breakdown, and social ostracism; and

Whereas, it is essential that in all programs developed for the aging emphasis should be upon the right and obligation of older persons to free choice and self-help in planning their own futures: Now, Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized to call a White House Conference on Aging in January 1970 in order to develop recommendations for further research and action in the field of aging, which will further the policies set forth in the preamble of this joint resolution, shall be planned and conducted under the direction of the Secretary who shall have the cooperation and assistance of such other Federal departments and agencies as may be appropriate.

(a) For the purpose of arriving at facts and recommendations concerning the utilization of skills, experience, and energies and the improvement of the conditions of our older people, the conference shall bring together representatives of Federal, State, and local governments, professional and lay people who are working in the field of aging, and of the general public including older persons themselves.

(b) A final report of the White House Conference on Aging shall be submitted to the President not later than ninety days following the date on which the conference is called and the findings and recommendations included therein shall be immediately made available to the public.

GRANTS

Sec. 2(a). There is hereby authorized to be paid to each State which shall submit an application for funds for the exclusive use in planning and conducting a State conference on aging prior to and for the purpose of developing facts and recommendations and preparing a report of the findings for presentation to the White House Conference on Aging, and in defraying costs incident to the State's delegates attending the White House Conference on Aging, a sum to be determined by the Secretary, but not less than $5,000 nor more than $25,000; such sums to be paid only from funds specifically appropriated for this purpose.

(b) Payment shall be made by the Secretary to an officer designated by the Governor of the State to receive such payment and to assume responsibility for organizing and conducting the State conference.

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 3. In administering this joint resolution, the Secretary shall—

(a) Request the cooperation and assistance of such other Federal departments and agencies as may be appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution;

(b) Render all reasonable assistance to the States in enabling them to organize and conduct conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging;

(c) Prepare and make available background materials for the use of delegates to the White House Conference as he may deem necessary and shall prepare and distribute such a report or reports of the conference as may be indicated; and

(d) In carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, engage such additional personnel as may be necessary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive civil service, and without regard to chapter 57 and subchapter 111 of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and general schedule pay rates.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Sec. 4. The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish an Advisory Committee to the White House Conference on Aging composed of professional and public members, and, as necessary, to establish technical advisory committees to advise and assist in planning and conducting the Conference. Appointed members of such committees, while attending conferences or meetings of their committees or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized under section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

DEFINITION

Sec. 5. For the purposes of this joint resolution—

(1) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(2) the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress determines to be necessary for the administration of this joint resolution.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New Jersey for his leadership in legislation on problems of the aging, and I strongly support this resolution.

Mr. President, we are often told that our Nation is getting younger; that half of our citizens are under 25. Even with this emphasis on youth we cannot ignore either the problems or the potential of our senior citizens. They are a minority of our citizens, but it is a minority to which we all hope to belong.

And at a time when congressional as well as national attention is directed toward segments of our society who actively call attention to themselves through increasingly vocal means, we cannot turn our backs on the segment of our society that is in many ways the most helpless and the most hopeless, but which characteristically refuses to call attention to its plight.

The concept of the role of the elderly in our society has been one of declining years in which well-deserved relaxation is enjoyed. This stereotype ignores many facts: it suggests that we do not feel the aging can be of continuing use or service. It ignores the fact that a ruptured family structure may leave the elderly to lonely years with no continuing contact with society, and over half of those over 65 now live alone or with nonrelatives. It ignores the waste caused when those forced to retire still want to be productive. And it ignores the hardship faced by the poor who are forced to supplement their inadequate incomes in whatever ways they can find rather than relaxing. A White House Conference as proposed by this resolution could share with the Nation a new concept of the status and role of the older American.

Our new concept must admit some unpleasant facts. We have 19 million citizens over 65 and each day an additional 800 persons reach that age. At least one-third of this group is poor. This 9 percent of the population comprises 16 percent of those in poverty in our country. And the aging poor affect more than just their own numbers. Nearly one-half of them live with relatives. If they are not helped, their burden is added to the burdens of other poor persons. We must break the cycle of poverty not just by investing in the young, but by relieving the old.

Not all the elderly are on social security or any other type of retirement income, and even those on social security are not too secure. The average payment is less than $84 a month, and over a million of those on social security are also on the welfare roles. For these poor, the declining years of retirement can be years of hopelessness.

The proposed White House Conference could explore five dimensions of the problem of the aging poor—housing, health, consumer interests, income maintenance, and job discrimination.

The full extent of housing needs of the elderly are not known—but we do know that it is a critical problem. What could be more degrading to the spirit during one's latter years than the realization that an inadequate, unsafe, and unsanitary house would be your fate for the remainder of your life. Low-cost public housing for the elderly is needed.

Health problems affect older citizens more than any other segment of our society. They are often in poor health. Four out of five persons over 65 suffer from chronic ailments. Proper medical care has not been within the limits of their income, and endless years of medical inattention have resulted in deterioration of both body and spirit. Health maintenance services must be established to salvage the aged poor from crippling physical and mental deficiencies.

The aging are peculiarly susceptible to problems of consumer abuses. With fixed incomes for the remainder of their lives they are attracted by schemes which promise additions to their incomes or seem to permit purchasing of products which they would not otherwise think their income would allow. Any heavy obligation on their income as a result of fraud or malpractices can cripple them and make our other types of assistance ineffective. Legal remedies are virtually unexplored because the legal understanding of this group is as limited as any other segment of the poor. A White House Conference is an invaluable way to catalog these abuses and direct attention toward their solution.

The most effective way to combat these multiple problems is to establish a solid program of income maintenance for the elderly. At no level do social security benefits come near to meeting the requirements of the elderly. The average yearly benefit is $1,008—a sum shockingly incompatible with our most basic antipoverty goals.

Our social security system is the main instrument for income maintenance but income supplements can be developed through other programs. Our social welfare programs desperately need more workers, the elderly need more services, and they need more income. We can attack these three problems at once in a program employing the elderly to provide services for the elderly. In this way, today's inadequate income can be made to go further while the older Americans are aided in improving the quality of their lives.

The fifth problem to be examined would be employment discrimination because of age. Secretary of Labor Wirtz, testifying recently before a subcommittee of the Committee on Aging, gave eloquent expression to the waste that occurs when one is told he is of no more use simply because he has reached a certain age. He said:

> There are more long, cold winters in more people's lives than all the "long, hot summers" that have been the subject of so much recent concern. The plain facts are that there are more people discriminated against, so far as employment and opportunity are concerned, because their hair is white than because their skin is black. There isn't the bigotry here that has characterized racial discrimination, and probably not the same degree of bitter hurt. But the net abuse to what must be the human purpose, and life's more perfect design, is fully as great.

We must seek ways to prevent the wasteful and harmful effects of job discrimination.

Mr. President, I stated earlier that the White House Conference could give us a new concept of the elderly. Our new concept must also reflect a new type of senior citizen, for the group of aging increasingly represents a vast reservoir of talent and skills. Compulsory early retirement has created a new type of senior citizen—healthy, skilled, and eager to continue giving. Since many are retired in regard only to chronological age, each year tens of thousands are added to the retired group who the year before held responsible and productive positions.

This group wants to remain in the mainstream of life and needs society to indicate that it has further use for its services. Usefulness is the difference between life having meaning and no meaning. The White House Conference on the Aging held in 1961, listed as one of the rights of the aging citizen—the right to be useful. And we need these citizens to be useful. Even the richest nation in the world cannot afford to squander the talents, skills, and know-how of its older citizens. A conference could explore practical possibilities for participation in needed service activities.

Mr. President, I strongly support this resolution, for our aging require and deserve the attention and study that only a White House Conference can bring to bear, and I commend my distinguished colleague from New Jersey for recommending this course of action.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 403

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080, and ask that it be printed and referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. President, a physical therapist uses exercise, massage, heat, hydrobaths, and other means to develop and restore movement to crippled limbs. Physical therapists are particularly important in the care of patients who have suffered strokes or fractures.

To be qualified to treat medicare patients, a physical therapist must be licensed by the State in which he practices and must be a graduate of a program in physical therapy approved by the American Medical Association.

However, under medicare, physical therapy may only be provided through a hospital, a nursing home or a home health agency approved by Medicare officials. The therapist must be on the staff of the institution providing the service or he must have a formal arrangement or contract with the institution making it responsible for handling the therapist's bills.

Herein lies a problem. Formerly, physical therapists were used also in carrying out a physician's prescription for physical therapy in the patient's home or in a suitable location in the patient's home area. Now, with medicare, the service can only be provided through a contract with a home health agency or in a physician's office.

The majority of physicians do not employ physical therapists in their office and prefer to refer their patients—in need of physical therapy, with an appropriate prescription—to qualified physical therapists with whom they have developed professional relationships in the local area. Under the procedure set up by medicare, this method of providing a much needed service to persons over 65 is now often impossible.

In areas where there is no certified home health agency, or the agency is reluctant to negotiate contracts with several physical therapists, patients are denied the use of available qualified physical therapists.

The physical therapist, who is available after the normal workday or on weekends is providing a much needed service to patients in his home area. Without this service, patients must often go back to a hospital or nursing home some distance away for treatment. This represents a poor use of our available medical facilities, a disservice to the patient, and a greater expense to all.

I have therefore submitted an amendment which will provide a more effective utilization of facilities and medical resources within the scope of the existing program.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 403) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 60, strike out lines 1 through 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"INCLUSION UNDER PART B OF TITLE XVIII PHYSICAL THERAPY SERVICES FURNISHED TO OUTPATIENTS

"SEC. 133. (a) Section 1832(a)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting ', and other than physical therapy' immediately after 'hospital'.

"(b) Section 1861(m)(7) of such Act is amended by striking out 'or' before 'at a rehabilitation center' and inserting 'or at an office of a physical therapist' immediately after 'at a rehabilitation center'.

"(c)(1) Section 1861(s) of such Act is amended (A) by striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (8), (B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu of such period '; and', and (C) by adding immediately below paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

"'(10) physical therapy performed by a physical therapist who is legally authorized to practice physical therapy in the State in which he performs such function and who meets such standards as may be prescribed in regulations, provided such therapy is performed in accordance with the prescription of a physician who certifies (or recertifies, where such services are furnished over a period of time) that such services are or were medically required.'

"(2) Paragraphs (10) and (11) of such section 1861(s) are redesignated as paragraphs (11) and (12), respectively.

"(3) Paragraphs (12) and (13) of such section 1861(s) (as added by section 129(b) of this Act) are redesignated as paragraphs (13) and (14), respectively."

AMENDMENTS NOS. 404 THROUGH 410

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I send to the desk seven amendments to H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967, and ask that they be printed and referred to the appropriate committee.

These amendments would—

First, eliminate the limitation on the number of children with absent parents who may receive aid with Federal help through the aid to families with dependent children program;

Second, increase the funds authorized for day care services so that working mothers of low or modest income may have the benefit of licensed, supervised facilities for their children while they work;

Third, restore language in the existing law to assure that the placement of a parent on a work or training project is not inimical to the best interests of children in the family;

Fourth, require States to meet full need as reflected by their own standards;

Fifth, provide protective vendor payments to a relative or child undergoing counseling;

Sixth, increase the earned income exemption to $50 monthly plus one-half of additional earnings; and

Seventh, establish an optional new title combining old age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanent and totally disabled, and aid to families with dependent children.

Mr. President, the time has come for America and this Congress to face up to the problem of welfare.

The welfare system has few friends. To most Americans, welfare is a boondoggle—a handout to the unemployed too lazy to get work.

But most of the welfare recipients themselves do not like it. To be on relief is to lose in society's eyes the last vestige of pride and dignity. To be a welfare recipient is an admission that, in affluent America, you have failed to provide for yourself.

Yet no reasonable man would suggest that we abolish welfare overnight.

We have strong evidence that most Americans would rather be self-supporting than relief recipients—those able to work would rather have a job and the dignity, respect, and self-reliance that goes with it.

But in the past we failed to pay enough attention to the problem of breaking the cycle of welfare. We acted on the belief that we should feed those who were so poor they might otherwise starve. We concentrated on the "hand out"—instead of the hand up the ladder.

But we have found that poverty breeds poverty. As our world became more and more complex, the children of the poor—without proper food, housing, education, parental care, or medical care—were pushed even farther outside of the mainstream of American advancement than their parents. Later generations are even further behind.

In 1962, we began the necessary task of redirecting the public welfare program. The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, formulated during my period as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, were designed to give the Federal Government the tools to move recipients off the welfare rolls where possible, or to self-care where feasible. This year the programs established by the 1962 amendments were scheduled to expire. They have been extended for one additional year through legislation passed earlier this session. Now we have the opportunity and the responsibility to further improve welfare programs.

We must begin with an understanding of the true picture of welfare.

Today's welfare will include about 7.7 million Americans. Who are they?

One-third of welfare recipients, about 2.5 million, are aged, blind or disabled.

The remainder, over 5 million, receive assistance under the aid to families with dependent children—AFDC—program.

Of these 5 million, over 3.7 million AFDC recipients are children; about 1 million are mothers; over 180,000 are disabled fathers; 60,000 are other relatives of children not with their parents; 60,000 are unemployed fathers.

These statistics paint a pattern—a pattern which demonstrates that our first concern must be the children on the welfare rolls. It is the children who will form the next generation. It is the children's future that will determine whether we continue another cycle of dependency, despair and the dole—or whether we break the cycle of poverty.

The pattern of the statistics also indicates that we must provide more meaningful incentives for welfare recipients to work—more and better day care programs to allow mothers to gain employment—and additional work-training opportunities for those now unemployable.

The Social Security Amendments of 1967 are a fine beginning. They are directed toward breaking the welfare cycle, and their purpose is supported with over $800 million for work training programs, incentive payments for welfare recipients who work, day-care centers to free mothers for jobs, and similar services.

In other words, the 1967 welfare amendments now under consideration by the Finance Committee, are designed to help the welfare recipients back into our economy and society. But I believe the House bill can be improved.

The other body has rightfully expressed its concern with the growing number of welfare recipients. There is no question but that costs have been rising at a rapid rate.

We must work to reverse this trend—and the House amendments go a long way in this direction. The House bill says, in effect, "wherever it is appropriate, welfare recipients should receive training and help in getting jobs. There should be more day care centers, where unemployed mothers can have their children cared for while they are trained or while they work."

The bill would require States to do these things, to concern themselves more than they have about illegitimacy, to refer improper home situations to the courts, and to be more vigorous, in their efforts to secure a better life for children on AFDC. But the other body went a step further—a step further than necessary. The House amendments include a limitation on the number of children who can receive help with Federal assistance.

The House bill provides that no State shall receive Federal participation for a greater percentage of its child population receiving assistance because a parent is absent, than the percentage that such children receiving aid represented on January 1, 1967.

That is the technical explanation of the House amendment. But what does it mean in human terms? Who are the children covered by the bill?

They are children who never had a legal father. They are children whose fathers have deserted them, or have divorces, or been separated from their mothers—children whose fathers are in jail.

It is a sad fact of recent years that the number of such children who are in need has risen proportionately faster than the total child population. Nationally, the figure is about 3 percent. In individual States, they range from less than 1 percent to over 6 percent. It is almost certain that in the majority of States these percentages have been rising since January 1, 1967. I have little doubt that they will rise further before the programs contemplated in H.R. 12080 are fully effective.

The House bill requires that States provide training, work experience and day care for appropriate persons for AFDC recipients by July 1, 1969. But the limitation on the number of children who can receive Federal help takes effect far earlier—on January 1, 1968. We are therefore faced with a substantial period of time during which the States will be preparing their work-training, employment, and day-care programs—and a further period, even after July 1, 1969, when these programs will not yet be fully effective.

On January 1, 1968, the majority of States will almost certainly find themselves with more children with absent parents receiving aid than are eligible for Federal participation under the bill.

Furthermore, the limitation on the number of children eligible for Federal assistance will fall as an unequal burden among the States. States with urban and industrial centers are already bearing a large share of the national welfare cost as a result of the mass migration from rural areas to the cities.

The industrial States have traditionally established higher benefit levels of public assistance. They are not likely to react to the Federal limitation by reducing either benefit levels or the number of eligible children. But other States will. They will simply tighten their rules or establish arbitrary levels. So one result of the Federal limitation will be to encourage further migration from rural to urban areas.

The House bill establishes a strong effort to assure, in constructive ways, that

States move as far and as fast as they can to reduce the growing number of children on welfare. But the limitation provision creates as many problems as it solves. My first amendment would, therefore, eliminate this section of the bill.

My second amendment would expand the authorization for child welfare services. Since 1935, these services have been provided for children in their own homes, in foster homes, and elsewhere. When I was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, we inaugurated programs of day care and initially earmarked a portion of the appropriation for this purpose. Much progress has been made in the terms of standards, consultation, and licensing for day care. H.R. 12080 makes specific provision to increase the availability of day care for AFDC mothers while they are trained and go to work.

However, there are other mothers who need employment to stay off the welfare rolls—and who need decent care for their children while they work. In order to make additional day care facilities available to these mothers, my second amendment would increase the authorization for child welfare services from the figure of $100 million—which is contained in H.R. 12080 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969—to $125 million for that year. For fiscal year 1970, and thereafter, the authorization would be increased from $110 million to $160 million. These sums are a prudent investment in the prevention of much more costly dependency.

My third amendment deals with community work and training. I have always looked with pride on this program which was a part of the legislation that I advocated when I was in the executive branch. In the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, there was carefully worked out with the Congress language that says that as a condition of employment the State must make "provision for assuring appropriate arrangements for the care and protection of the child during the absence from the home of any such relative performing work under such programs, in order to assure that such absence and work are not inimical to the welfare of a child." Constructive work and training programs should, under no circumstances, be inimical to the welfare of a child. My third amendment would attempt to assure that they are not and restores this language to the bill.

Present law requires that eligibility to receive public assistance be based on State estimates of the minimum amounts needed for food, clothing, shelter, and other necessities of life. Federal law recognizes that conditions are different in different States and that it is up to each State to determine their own standard of need. Standards vary widely, as the cost of living varies from State to State.

But while eligibility for public assistance is based on minimum need, there is no requirement that the assistance payments meet the minimum standard set by the State itself. Thus, in the AFDC program, the lowest standard of eligibility set by any State for a family of four is $131. Most eligibility standards for a family of four range between $150 and $250. However, seven States place a ceiling of less than $100 a month on assistance payments. Twenty States pay less than $150 per month. One State pays only 23 percent of the standard of need as determined by the State itself.

When a family with children is forced to live on an amount of assistance substantially less than the minimum need, they must cut back on their food and clothing. Their children grow up without adequate food or medical care. Malnutrition, mental disorders, and physical handicaps become more common. Ultimately there is a greater cost to society than the cost of minimum assistance.

So my fourth amendment would require the States to meet full need as established by their own standards and review those standards periodically.

In cases where welfare recipients are irresponsible with money, the law provides for protective or vendor payments for food, clothing, and the well-being of the child. The cases are relatively rare. The payment can be made to someone else who will look after the child's best interest—a neighbor, a relative, a welfare or charitable agency. My fifth amendment would also allow vendor or protective payments to be made while a State agency is counseling a child or relative with regard to work or training.

The major thrust of the public assistance provisions in the social security amendments is to get people off welfare and back on their feet—to restore their financial independence and self-reliance. But many people on welfare are afraid of the first step—the first low-paying job. They may lose as much in welfare funds as they make on their new job, while facing additional expenses and the problem of care for their children. If they lose their new job, they may face a long delay or problem in getting assistance again.

The House-passed bill wisely requires States to allow AFDC recipients 16 and over an earned income exemption of the first $30 of monthly earnings plus one-third of additional earnings. My amendment would increase the exemption to $50 monthly, plus one-half of additional earnings. The amendment would also extend the same exemption to the aged and the permanently and totally disabled.

The purpose of my last amendment is simple. Its aim is to treat equitably and fairly all persons receiving Federally aided public assistance.

It would establish an optional title XX to the Social Security Act. States choosing to adopt the new title XX would be able to combine under one program those cash assistance programs now placed in four separate titles of the Social Security Act: old age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to families with dependent children.

The present complicated provisions of the Social Security Act reflect the historical growth of our public welfare programs. When the Congress enacted the Social Security Act in 1935, they included three public assistance programs, to aid the aged, the blind, and dependent children. In 1950, a new, separate program was added, to aid the permanently and totally disabled. In that year, the Congress also authorized vendor payments for medical care, which have been expanded and modified since. In 1960, medical assistance for the aged, known as the Kerr-Mills program, was added.

By this time, we had a hodgepodge of different formulas, different programs, with different degrees of support. As Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in 1962, I advocated and the Congress enacted a tentative step permitting States to combine their programs for the aged, blind, and disabled. Eighteen States have availed themselves of this opportunity. In 1965, the Congress consolidated all medical assistance programs under a new title XIX, known as medicaid. My amendment today would permit the States a similar kind of consolidation, for cash assistance payments.

As chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, I am quite aware of the wide range of programs in the Federal Government for children, the aged, blind, and disabled. It is time now for us to offer the States an opportunity to consolidate the various public assistance programs under a single equitable plan with comparable treatment for all needy persons under that plan. This is what my amendment would do.

The amendment incorporates all the progressive features already in the House bill pending before the Senate. The local welfare agency will have to carefully develop a comprehensive plan for each family with a dependent child receiving assistance. This plan will include an evaluation of the employment potential of the adults in the family, and it will set forth the steps needed to lead the family to independence through employment. My amendment, like the House bill, will require implementation of that plan by the State.

There are three key elements in this implementation. First, the State will have to offer assistance recipients work training. This is critical if the many assistance recipients with little or no work experience and without the skills needed in today's employment market are to be independent.

The second key element is day care. Over 90 percent of the adults receiving AFDC are mothers. Day care must be provided for their children if they are to be able to work regularly. I have also added in my amendment increased authorizations for child welfare services so that low income mothers who are no longer on AFDC or who never received assistance may also have an opportunity to use day care services.

The third key element is work incentive through earned income exemptions. Under present law, AFDC adults lose $1 in assistance for every $1 they earn. It is not surprising that many recipients feel no incentive to work. The House bill takes the very constructive step of requiring States to permit recipients to retain the first $30 they earn monthly plus one-third of additional amounts. In my amendment, I propose to allow them to keep $50 monthly plus one-half of the additional amount.

I have incorporated other features of the House bill in my proposed consolidated cash assistance program. My amendment provides substantially broadened Federal support for dependent children receiving foster care. It also requires protective payments in those unusual cases where a parent proves fiscally irresponsible. It requires a reasonable relationship between standards for cash assistance and standards for medical assistance.

In addition to increasing child welfare services funds substantially for day care services, my amendment provides for close coordination of child welfare services with services to dependent children receiving assistance.

Mr. President, my amendment will provide States an opportunity to achieve an administrative consolidation of cash assistance programs in a setting which treats all needy people equally, whether they are aged, blind, disabled or dependent children. Equal treatment will not increase the Federal commitment, nor will it require States to spend more or to spend less on assistance. But if they chose this option, States will treat all federally aided needy persons fairly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments (Nos. 404 through 410) submitted by Mr. RIBICOFF, were referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 404

On page 140, beginning on line 19, strike out all down through line 13, p. 141.

On page 141, line 16, strike out "209" and insert in lieu thereof "208".

AMENDMENT No. 405

On page 161, on line 2 strike out "$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$125,000,000"; and on line 3 strike out "$110,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$160,000,000".

AMENDMENT No. 406

On page 131, strike out line 3 and insert the following: "such program in order to assure that such absence and such work or training will not be inimical to the welfare of the child; and"

AMENDMENT No. 407

On page 142, insert the following after line 24:

"REQUIREMENT FOR MEETING FULL NEED

"SEC. 210. (a) Section 2(a)(10) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of subparagraphs (B) and (C) and by adding after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"'(D) provide (i), effective July 1, 1969, for meeting (in conjunction with other income that is not disregarded under the plan and other resources) all the need, as determined in accordance with the standards applicable under the plan for determining need, of eligible individuals (and such standards shall be no lower than the standards for determining need in effect on January 1, 1967), and (ii), effective July 1, 1968, for an annual review of such standards and (to the extent prescribed by the Secretary) for up-dating such standards to take into account changes in living costs;'

"(b)(1) Section 402(a) of such Act is amended by redesignating clauses (9) through (14) (as redesignated by section 202(a) of this Act) as clauses (10) through (15).

"(2) Section 402(a) of such Act is further amended by adding after clause (8) (as added by section 202(a) of this Act) the following new clause:

"'(9) provide (A), effective July 1, 1969, for meeting (in conjunction with other income that is not disregarded, or set aside for future needs, under the plan and other resources) all the need, as determined in accordance with standards applicable under the plan for determining need, of individuals eligible to receive aid to families with dependent children (and such standards shall be no lower than the standards for determining need in effect on January 1, 1967), and (B), effective July 1, 1968, for an annual review of such standards and (to the extent prescribed by the Secretary) for updating such standards to take into account changes in living costs;'.

"(c) Section 1002(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (12) and by inserting before the period at the thereof after clause (13) the following: '; and (14) provide (A), effective July 1, 1969, for meeting (in conjunction with other income that is not disregarded under the plan and other resources) all the need, as determined in accordance with standards applicable under the plan for determining need, of eligible individuals (and such standards shall be no lower than the standards for determining need in effect on January 1, 1967), and (B), effective July 1, 1968, for an annual review of such standards and (to the extent prescribed by the Secretary) for updating such standards to take into account changes in living costs'.

"(d) Section 1402(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (11) and by inserting before the period at the end thereof after clause (12) the following; '; and (13) provide (A), effective July 1, 1969, for meeting (in conjunction with other income that is not disregarded under the plan and other resources) all the need, as determined in accordance with standards applicable under the plan for determining need, of eligible individuals (and such standards shall be no lower than the standards for determining need in effect on January 1, 1967), and (B), effective July 1, 1968, for an annual review of such standards and (to the extent prescribed by the Secretary) for up-dating such standards to take into account changes in living costs'.

"(e) Section 1602(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (16), the period at the end of paragraph (17) and inserting '; and' in lieu thereof, and by adding after such paragraph (17) the following new paragraph:

"'(18) provide (A), effective July 1, 1969, for meeting (in conjunction with other income that is not disregarded under the plan and other resources) all the need, as determined in accordance with standards applicable under the plan for determining need, of eligible individuals (and such standards shall be no lower than the standards for determining need in effect on January 1, 1967) and (B), effective July 1, 1968, for an annual review of such standards and (to the extent prescribed by the Secretary) for updating such standards to take into account increases in living costs.'"

On page 107, line 7, strike out "(13)" and insert in lieu thereof "(14)".

On page 107, line 9, strike out "(14)" and insert in lieu thereof "(15)".

On page 107, line 10, strike out "(14)" and insert in lieu thereof "(15)".

On page 107, line 11, strike out "(14)" and insert in lieu thereof "(15)".

On page 107, line 12, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(16)".

On page 109, line 7, strike out "(16)" and insert in lieu thereof "(17)".

On page 109, line 13, strike out "(17)" and insert in lieu thereof "(18)".

On page 110, line 8, strike out "(18)" and insert in lieu thereof "(19)".

On page 110, line 11, strike out "(17)" and insert in lieu thereof "(18)".

On page 110, line 17, strike out "(13)" and insert in lieu thereof "(14)".

On page 110, line 18, insert "and 210 (b)(1)" after "202(a)".

On page 110, line 23, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(16)".

On page 111, line 6, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(16)".

On page 111, line 13, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(16)".

On page 112, line 5, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(16)".

On page 114, line 7, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(16)".

On page 115, line 17, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(16)".

On page 131, line 11, strike out "(19)" and insert in lieu thereof "(20)".

On page 131, line 18, strike out "(20)" and insert in lieu thereof "(21)".

On page 132, line 22, strike out "(21)" and insert in lieu thereof "(22)".

On page 135, line 17, strike out "(22)" and insert in lieu thereof "(23)".

On page 136, line 9, strike out "(23)" and insert in lieu thereof "(24)".

On page 140, line 12, strike out "(20)" and insert in lieu thereof "(21)".

On page 180, line 22, strike out "209" and insert in lieu thereof "211".

On page 180, line 24, strike out "1120" and insert thereof "1121".

AMENDMENT No. 408

On page 121, line 25, strike out "child or"

On page 122, line 1, insert after "subsection (a)" the following: "and for the denial of such aid to any child in any form other than payments of the type described in section 406 (b)(2) (which may be made in such a case without regard to clauses (A) through (E) thereof) or section 408".

On page 132, line 22, insert the following before the semicolon: ", except that the State agency may, for such period as the Secretary may prescribe, make payments of the type described in section 406(b)(2) (without regard to clauses (A) through (E) thereof) on behalf of any such child or relative who makes such refusal if during such period the State agency furnishes such child or relative counseling and other services aimed at persuading such child or relative to so register, to accept such employment, or to so participate or undergo training, as the case may be".

AMENDMENT No. 409

On page 115, strike out lines 20 through 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"EARNINGS EXEMPTION OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS

"SEC. 202. (a)(1) Effective April 1, 1968, clauses (8) through (15) of section 402(a) of the Social Security Act (as amended and added by section 201 of this Act) are redesignated as clauses (9) through (16), respectively."

On page 115, line 25, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

On page 117, line 4, strike out "$30" and insert in lieu thereof "$50".

On page 117, line 5, strike out "one-third" and insert in lieu thereof "one-half".

On page 118, line 16, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".

On page 118, after line 25, insert the following:

"(b)(1) Effective July 1, 1969—

"(A) Subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 2(a)(10) of such Act are redesignated as (C) and (D), respectively; and

"(B) Subparagraph (A) of such section 2(a)(10) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(A) except as may be otherwise provided in subparagraph (B), provide that the State agency shall, in determining need for such assistance, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income;

" '(B) provide that, in making the determination under subparagraph (A)—

" '(i) the State agency shall with respect to any month disregard the first $50 of the total of the earned income of such individual for such month plus one-half of the remainder of such income for such month; and

" '(ii) the State agency may before disregarding the amount referred to in clause (i), disregard not more than $5 per month of any income;

except that, with respect to any month, the State agency shall not disregard any earned income (other than income referred to in clause (ii)) of any such individual if—

" '(iii) he terminated his employment or reduced his earned income without good cause within such period (of not less than thirty days) preceding such month as may be prescribed by the Secretary, or

" '(iv) the income of such individual for such month was in excess of his need as determined by the State pursuant to subparagraph (A) (without regard to this subparagraph (B)), unless, for any one of the four months preceding such month, the needs of such individual were met by the furnishing of old-age assistance under the plan;'

"(2) A State whose plan under section 2 of the Social Security Act has been approved by the Secretary shall not be deemed to have failed to comply substantially with the requirements of section 2(a)(10)(A) of such Act (as in effect prior to July 1, 1969) for any period beginning after September 30, 1967, and ending prior to July 1, 1969, if for such period the State agency disregards earned income of the individual involved in accordance with the requirements specified in section 2(a)(10) (A) and (B) of such Act as amended by this section.

"(c)(1) Effective July 1, 1969—

"(A) Clauses (9) through (12) of section 1402(a) of such Act are redesignated as clause (10) through (13), respectively;

"(B) Section 1402(a) of such Act is amended by striking out clause (8) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(8) except as may be otherwise provided in clause (9), provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming aid to the permanently and totally disabled, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income; (9) provide that in making the determination under clause (8), the State agency—

" '(A) shall with respect to any month disregard the first $50 of the total of the earned income of such individual for such month plus one-half of the remainder of such income for such month; and

" '(B)(i) may, before disregarding the amount referred to in clause (A) disregard not more than $5 per month of any income, and (ii) may, for a period not in excess of 36 months, disregard such additional amounts of other income and resources, in the case of an individual who has a plan for achieving self-support approved by the State agency, as may be necessary for the fulfillment of such plan, but only with respect to the part or parts of such period during substantially all of which he is actually undergoing vocational rehabilitation;

except that, with respect to any month, the State agency shall not disregard any earned income (other than income referred to in subparagraph (B)) of any such individual if—

" '(C) he terminated his employment or reduced his earned income without good cause within such period (of not less than 30 days) preceding such month as may be prescribed by the Secretary, or

" '(D) the income of such individual for such month was in excess of his need as determined by the State pursuant to clause (8) (without regard to this clause (9)), unless, for any one of the four months preceding such months, the needs of such individual were met by furnishing of aid under the plan;'

"(2) A State whose plan under section 1402 of the Social Security Act has been approved by the Secretary shall not be deemed to have failed to comply substantially with the requirements of section 1402(a)(8) of such Act (as in effect prior to July 1, 1969) for any period beginning after September 30, 1967, and ending prior to July 1, 1969, if for such period the State agency disregards earned income of the individual involved in accordance with the requirements specified in section 1402(a)(8) and (9) of such Act as amended by this section.

"(d) (1) Clause (i) of section 1602(a) (14)(B) of such Act is amended to read as follows '(i) the State agency shall with respect to any month disregard the first $50 of the total of the earned income of such individual for such month plus one-half of the remainder of such income for such month, and'.

"(2) Subparagraph (B) of section 1602 (a)(14) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'and (iii) the State agency shall not, with respect to any month, disregard any earned income (other than income referred to in clause (ii) or subparagraph (D)) of any such individual if (I) he terminated his employment or reduced his earned income without good cause within such period (of not less than 30 days) preceding such month as may be prescribed by the Secretary, or (II) the income of such individual for such month was in excess of his need as determined by the State pursuant to this paragraph (without regard to clause (i)), unless, for any one of the four months preceding such month, the needs of such individual were met by furnishing aid under the plan,'.

"(3) Subparagraph (C) of section 1602(a) (14) of such Act is amended to read as follows: '(C) if such individual has attained age 65 and is neither blind nor permanently and totally disabled, (i) the State agency shall with respect to any month disregard the first $50 of the total of the earned income of such individual for such month plus one-half of the remainder of such income for such month, and (ii) the State agency shall not, with respect to any month, disregard any earned income (other than income referred to in subparagraph (D)) of any such individual if (I) he terminated his employment or reduced his earned income without good cause within such period (of not less than 30 days) preceding such month as may be prescribed by the Secretary, or (II) the income of such individual for such month was in excess of his need as determined by the State pursuant to this paragraph (without regard to clause (i)), unless, for any one of the four months preceding such months, the needs of such individual were met by furnishing aid under the plan, and'

"(4) A State whose plan under section 1602 of the Social Security Act has been approved by the Secretary shall not be deemed to have to comply substantially with the requirements of section 1602(a)(14) of such Act (as in effect prior to July 1, 1969) for any period beginning after September 30, 1967, and ending prior to July 1, 1969, if for such period the State agency disregards earned income of the individual involved in accordance with the requirements specified in clauses (i) and (iii) of section 1602(a)(14) (B) of such Act or subparagraph (C) of section 1602(a)(14) of such Act as amended by this section."

On page 119, strike out lines 1 through 10 and insert the following:

"(3) In determining the need of individuals claiming aid or assistance under a State plan approved under title I, XIV, or XVI or part A of title IV of the Social Security Act which provides for the determination of such need under the provisions of such title or such part as amended by this section, the State agency shall apply such provisions notwithstanding any provisions of law (other than such Act) requiring the State to disregard earned income of such individuals in determining need under such State plan."

Amendment No. 410

On page 160, strike out lines 10 through 12 and insert the following:

"Part 4—Family and Child Assistance and Service Program

"Sec. 236. (a) The Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following title:

" 'TITLE XX—FAMILY AND CHILD ASSISTANCE AND SERVICE PROGRAM—GRANTS TO STATES FOR AID AND SERVICES TO THE AGED, THE BLIND, THE DISABLED, AND NEEDY FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN, OR FOR SUCH AID AND SERVICES AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED, AND FOR CHILD-WELFARE SERVICES

" 'Part A—Grants to States for Aid and Services to the Aged, the Blind, the Disabled, and Needy Families With Children, or for Such Aid and Services and Medical Assistance for the Aged

" 'Appropriation

" 'Sec. 2001. For the purpose—

" '(a) of enabling each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to furnish financial assistance to needy individuals who are 65 years of age or over, are blind, or are 18 years of age or over and permanently and totally disabled,

" '(b) of enabling each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to furnish medical assistance on behalf of individuals who are 65 years of age or over and who are not recipients of aid, but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services,

" '(c) of encouraging each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to furnish rehabilitation and other services to help individuals referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) to attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care, and

" '(d) of enabling each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to furnish financial assistance to needy dependent children and the parents or relatives with whom they are living and to furnish family and child welfare services to such individuals to help maintain and strengthen family life and to reduce dependency,

there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this part. The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, State plans for aid and services to the aged, the blind, the disabled, and needy families with children, or for aid and services to the aged, the blind, the disabled, and needy families with children and medical assistance for the aged.

" 'STATE PLANS FOR AID AND SERVICES TO THE AGED, THE BLIND, THE DISABLED, AND NEEDY FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN, OR FOR SUCH AID AND SERVICES AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED

" 'Sec. 2002. (a) A State plan or aid and services to the aged, the blind, the disabled, and needy families with children, or for aid and services to the aged, the blind, the disabled, and needy families with children and medical assistance for the aged must—

"'(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and, if administered by them, be mandatory upon them;

"'(2) provide for financial participation by the State;

"'(3) either provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan, or provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to supervise the administration of the plan;

"'(4) provide for granting an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any individual whose claim for aid or assistance under the plan is denied or is not acted upon with reasonable promptness;

"'(5) provide such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;

"'(6) provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"'(7) provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the plan;

"'(8) provide that all individuals wishing to make application for aid or assistance under the plan shall have opportunity to do so, and that such aid or assistance shall be furnished with reasonable promptness to all eligible individuals;

"'(9) provide, if the plan includes aid or assistance to or on behalf of individuals in private or public institutions, for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards for such institutions;

"'(10) provide that no aid or assistance will be furnished any individual under the plan with respect to any period with respect to which he is receiving old-age assistance or medical assistance for the aged under the State plan approved under title I or aid under the State plan approved under title IV, X, XIV, or XVI;

"'(11) provide that, in determining whether an individual is blind, there shall be an examination by a physician skilled in the diseases of the eye or by an optometrist, whichever the individual may select;

"'(12) include reasonable standards, consistent with the objectives of this title, for determining eligibility for and the amount and extent of aid or assistance under the plan;

"'(13) except as may be otherwise provided in paragraph (14), provide that—

"'(A) the State agency shall, in determining need for aid, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming such aid, as well as expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income, and

"'(B) the State agency shall not consider such individual (or his family's) income (that is not disregarded, or set aside for future need, under the plan) a basis for finding that he is not in need, if such income is less than 66⅔ percent of the amount of income established for individuals (or their families) under subsection (f)(1) of section 1903 in determining whether payments pursuant to such section may be made for expenditures for medical assistance with respect to such individuals (or families) and for such purposes the provision of subsection (f)(3) of such section shall apply;

"'(14) provide that, in making the determination under paragraph (13), with respect to any individual—

"'(A) if such individual is blind, the State agency (i) shall disregard the first $85 per month of earned income plus one-half of earned income in excess of $85 per month, and (ii) shall, for a period not in excess of 12 months, and may, for a period not in excess of 36 months, disregard such additional amounts of other income and resources, in the case of any such individual who has a plan for achieving self-support approved by the State agency, as may be necessary for the fulfillment of such plan,

"'(B) if such individual is not blind but is permanently and totally disabled, (i) the State agency shall with respect to any month disregard the first $50 of the total of the earned income of such individual for such month plus one-half of the remainder of such income for such month, and (ii) the State agency may, for a period not in excess of 36 months, disregard such additional amounts of other income and resources, in the case of any such individual who has a plan for achieving self-support approved by the State agency, as may be necessary for the fulfillment of such plan, but only with respect to the part or parts of such period during substantially all of which he is actually undergoing vocational rehabilitation,

"'(C) if such individual has attained age 65 and is neither blind nor permanently and totally disabled, the State agency shall with respect to any month disregard the first $50 of the total of the earned income of such individual for such month plus one-half of the remainder of such income for such month; and

"'(D) if such individual is claiming or receiving aid with respect to a dependent child, the State agency—

"'(i) shall with respect to any month disregard—

"'(I) all of the earned income of such individual, if such individual is a child claiming or receiving such aid, for any month in which such child is under age 16 or for any month in which such child, if age 16 or over but under age 21, is (as determined by the State in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary) a full-time student attending a school, college, or university, or a course of vocational or technical training designed to fit him for gainful employment, and

"'(II) the first $50 of the total of the earned income of such individual for such month plus one-half of the remainder of such income for such month, if such individual is a child not included under subdivision (I) or a relative with whom any dependent child is living, and

"'(ii) shall disregard any training incentive of not more than $20 a week paid under a program of work and training maintained and operated either by the State agency as authorized under section 2009 or by the Secretary of Labor or his delegate as authorized under section 2010;

"'(iii) may, subject to the limitations prescribed by the Secretary, permit all or any portion of the earned or other income to be set aside for future identifiable needs of a child receiving such aid;

except that, with respect to any month, the State agency shall not disregard any earned income (other than income referred to in clause (iii) or subparagraph (E)) of—

"'(iv) any of the persons specified in subdivision (II) of clause (i) if such person—

"'(I) terminated his employment or reduced his earned income without good cause within such period (of not less than 30 days) preceding such month as may be prescribed by the Secretary; or

"'(II) refused without good cause, within such period preceding such month as may be prescribed by the Secretary, to accept employment in which he is able to engage which is offered through the public employment offices of the State, or is otherwise offered by an employer if the offer of such employer is determined by the State or local agency administering the State plan, after notification by him, to be a bona fide offer of employment; or

"'(v) any of such persons specified in subdivision (II) of clause (i) if with respect to such month the income of such persons was in excess of their need as determined by the State agency pursuant to paragraph (13) (without regard to this subparagraph), unless, for any one of the four months preceding such month, the needs of such persons were met by the furnishing of aid under the plan; and

"'(E) the State agency may, before disregarding the amounts referred to above in this paragraph (14), disregard not more than $5 of any income;

"'(15) provide in the case of aid with respect to a dependent child—

"'(A) for—

"'(i) the development of a comprehensive program for each relative and child receiving such aid with the objective of—

"'(I) maintaining and strengthening family life and assisting such relative and child to attain or retain capability for self-support or care, and

"'(II) assuring, to the maximum extent possible, that each appropriate relative and child will enter the labor force and accept employment so that they will become self-sufficient, and

"'(III) preventing or reducing the incidence of illegitimate births,

"'(ii) the implementation of such programs by—

"' (II) evaluating the employment potential of such relatives and children,

and their needs for training, education, rehabilitation, and medical services in order to secure and retain employment or to raise the level of their skills to secure advancement in their employment, and

"'(III) furnishing such individuals child-welfare services as defined in section 425, family services as defined in section 2005(e), and such other services as the Secretary may prescribe to accomplish the objectives of such comprehensive programs,

"'(iii) such review of each such program as may be necessary (as frequently as may be necessary, but at least once a year) to insure that it is being effectively implemented,

"'(iv) furnishing the Secretary with such reports as he may specify showing the results of such programs, and

"'(v) to the extent that such programs are developed and implemented by services furnished by the staff of the State agency or the local agency administering the State plan in each of the political subdivisions of the State, the establishment of a single organizational unit in such State or local agency, as the case may be, responsible for the furnishing of such services;

"'(B) that where the State agency has reason to believe that the home in which a relative and child receiving such aid reside is unsuitable for the child because of the neglect, abuse, or exploitation of such child it shall bring such condition to the attention of the appropriate court or law enforcement agencies in the State, providing such data with respect to the situation it may have;

"'(C) for—

"'(i) the development and implementation of a program under which the State agency will undertake—

"'(I) in the case of an illegitimate child receiving such aid, to establish the paternity of such child and secure support for him, and

"'(II) in the case of any child receiving such aid who has been deserted or abandoned by his parent, to secure support for such child from such parent (or from any other person legally liable for such support), utilizing any reciprocal arrangements adopted with other States to obtain or enforce court orders for support, and

"'(ii) the establishment of a single organizational unit in the State agency or local agency administering the State plan in each political subdivision which will be responsible for the administration of the program referred to in clause (i);

"'(D) for entering into cooperative arrangements with appropriate courts and law enforcement officials (i) to assist the State agency in administering the program referred to in clause (i) of subparagraph (C), including the entering into of financial arrangements with such courts and officials in order to assure optimum results under such program, and (ii) with respect to any other matters of common concern to such courts or officials and the State agency or local agency administering the State plan;

"'(E) for such aid (in appropriate cases) in the form of payments of the types prescribed in section 2005(b);

"'(F) for such aid in the form of foster care in accordance with section 2008;

"'(G) that—

"'(i) the State will enter into agreements with the Secretary of Labor, or such delegate as he may designate, for the referral of all appropriate individuals who have attained age 16 and are receiving aid with respect to dependent child to a work and training program established and maintained by the Secretary of Labor or his delegate under section 2010 in the geographical area in which such individuals live for purposes of preparing such individuals for, or restoring them to, employability,

"'(ii) such aid will not be denied by reason of such referral, or by reason of the refusal of such individual to perform any such work if he has good cause for such refusal, and

"'(iii) any additional expenses attributable to participation in such progress will be considered in determining the needs of such individuals,

"'(H) for—

"'(i) the establishment of a work and training program (which conforms to standards prescribed by the Secretary) for appropriate individuals who have attained age 16 and are receiving aid with respect to a dependent child with the objective that a maximum number of such individuals will be benefited through the conservation of their work skills and the development of new skills;

"'(ii) such a program to be in effect in those political subdivisions of the State in which there is a significant number (determined in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary) of individuals who have attained age 16 and are receiving aid with respect to a dependent child;

"'(iii) expenditures described in section 2009(a) in the form of payments to such individuals, and

"'(iv) meeting the requirements of such section 2009(a);

but only if the Secretary of Labor or his delegate does not maintain and operate any work and training program as authorized under section 2010 in the State, and has certified that it is not practicable for him to maintain and operate such a program anywhere in the State;

"'(16) if the State plan includes medical assistance for the aged—

"'(A) provide for inclusion of some institutional and some noninstitutional care and services;

"'(B) provide that no enrollment fee, premium, or similar charge will be imposed as a condition of any individual's eligibility for medical assistance for the aged under the plan;

"'(C) provide for inclusion, to the extent required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary, of provisions (conforming to such regulations) with respect to the furnishing of such assistance to individuals who are residents of the State but are absent therefrom; and

"'(D) provide that no lien may be imposed against the property of any individual prior to his death on account of medical assistance for the aged paid or to be paid on his behalf under the plan (except pursuant to the judgment of a court on account of benefits incorrectly paid on behalf of such individual), and that there shall be no adjustment or recovery (except, after the death of such individual and his surviving spouse, if any, from such individual's estate) of any medical assistance for the aged correctly paid on behalf of such individual under the plan;

"'(17) if the State plan includes aid or assistance to or in behalf of individuals 65 years of age or older who are patients in institutions for mental diseases—

"'(A) provide for having in effect such agreements or other arrangements with State authorities concerned with mental diseases, and, where appropriate, with such institutions, as may be necessary for carrying out the State plan, including arrangements for joint planning and for development of alternate methods of care, arrangements providing assurance of immediate readmittance to institutions where needed for individuals under alternate plans of care, and arrangements providing for access to patients and facilities, for furnishing information, and for making reports;

"'(B) provide for an individual plan for each such patient to assure that the institutional care provided to him is in his best interests, including to that end, assurances that there will be initial and periodic review of his medical and other needs, that he will be given appropriate medical treatment within the institution, and that there will be a periodic determination of his need for continued treatment in the institution;

"'(C) provide for the development of alternate plans of care, making maximum utilization of available resources, for recipients 65 years of age or older who would otherwise need care in such institutions, including appropriate medical treatment and other aid or assistance; for services referred to in section 2003(a)(4)(A) (i) and (ii) which are appropriate for such recipients and for such patients; and for methods of administration necessary to assure that the responsibilities of the State agency under the State plan with respect to such recipients and such patients will be effectively carried out; and

"'(D) provide methods of determining the reasonable cost of institutional care for such patients; and

"'(18) if the State plan includes aid or assistance to or in behalf of individuals 65 years of age or older who are patients in public institutions for mental diseases, show that the State is making satisfactory progress toward developing and implementing a comprehensive mental health program, including provision for utilization of community mental health centers, nursing homes, and other alternatives to care in public institutions for mental diseases.

Notwithstanding paragraph (3), if on the date on which a State submits its plan for approval under this part, the State agency which administered or supervised the administration of the plan of such State approved under title X or title XVI which relates to blind individuals was different from the State agency which administered or supervised the administration of the plan of such State approved under title I and the State agency which administered or supervised the administration of the plan of such State approved under title XIV, or the State agency which administered or supervised the administration of the plan under title XVI relating to individuals other than blind individuals, the State agency which administered or supervised the administration of such plan approved under title X may be designated to administer or supervise the administration of the portion of the State plan for aid and services to the aged, the blind, the disabled, and needy families with children (or for aid and services to the aged, the blind, the disabled, and needy families with children and medical assistance for the aged) which relates to blind individuals and a separate State agency may be established or designated to administer or supervise the administration of the rest of such plan; and in such case the part of the plan which each such agency administers, or the administration of which each such agency supervises, shall be regarded as a separate plan for purposes of this part.

"'(b) The Secretary shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), except that he shall not approve any plan which imposes, as a condition of eligibility for aid or assistance under the plan—

"'(1) an age requirement of more than sixty-five years; or

"'(2) any residence requirement which (A) in the case of applicants for aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) excludes any resident of the State who has resided therein five years during the nine years immediately preceding the application for such aid and has resided therein continuously for one year immediately preceding the application, (B) in the case of applicants for medical assistance for the aged, excludes any individual who resides in the State, and (C) in the case of applicants for aid with respect to a dependent child, denies such aid with respect to any child residing in the State (i) who has resided in the State for one year immediately preceding the application for such aid, or (ii) who was born within one year immediately preceding the application, if the parent or other relative with whom the child is living has resided in the State for one year immediately preceding the birth; or

"'(3) any citizenship requirement which excludes any citizen of the United States.

"'(c) Subject to the last sentence of subsection (a) nothing in this title shall be construed to permit a State to have in effect with respect to any period more than one State plan approved under this title.

"'(d) The Secretary shall, on the basis of his review of the reports received from the States as provided for under subparagraph (B)(iv) of subsection (a)(15) compile such data as he believes necessary and from time to time publish his findings as to the effectiveness of the programs developed and administered by the States under such subparagraph. The Secretary shall annually report to the Congress (and if the Secretary has approved the plan of a State under this part prior to July 1, 1970, with the first such report of such State being made on or before such date) on the programs developed and administered by each State under such subparagraph.

"'PAYMENTS TO STATES

"'SEC. 2003. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary shall pay to each State which has a plan approved under this part, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing January 1, 1968—

"'(1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during each month of such quarter as aid under the State plan (including expenditures for premiums under part B of title XVIII for individuals who are recipients of money payments under such plan and other insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof)—

"'(A) 31/37 of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to such month as exceeds the product of $37 multiplied by the total number of recipients of such aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (i) the number of individuals who received such aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) in the form of money payments for such month, plus (ii) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care); plus

"'(B) the larger of the following:

"'(i)(I) the Federal percentage (as defined in section 1101(a)(8)) of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the amount which may be counted under clause (A), not counting so much of such excess with respect to such month as exceeds the product of $38 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) for such month, plus (II) 15 per centum of the total expended during such month as aid (except with respect to a dependent child) under the State plan in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to such month as exceeds the product of $15 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) for such month, or

"'(ii)(I) the Federal medical percentage (as defined in section 6(c)) of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A), not counting so much of any expenditures with respect to such month as exceeds (a) the product of $52 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) for such month, or (b) if smaller, the total expended as aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care with respect to such month plus the product of $37 multiplied by such total number of such recipients, plus (II) the Federal percentage of the amount by which the total expended during such month as aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) under the State plan exceeds the amount which may be counted under clause (A) and the preceding provisions of this clause (B)(ii), not counting so much of such excess with respect to such month as exceeds the product of $38 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) for such month; plus

"'(C) five-sixths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $18 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid with respect to a dependent child for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (i) the number of individuals with respect to whom such aid in the form of money payments is paid for such month, plus (ii) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as aid with respect to a dependent child in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care); plus

"'(D) the Federal percentage of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under subparagraph (C), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds (I) the product of $32 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid with respect to a dependent child (other than such aid in the form of foster care) for such month, plus (II) the product of $100 multiplied by the total number of recipients of such aid in the form of foster care for such month;

"'(2) in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to—

"'(A) one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid under the State plan (including expenditures for premium under part B of title XVIII for individuals who are recipients of money payments under such plan and other insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds (i) $37.50 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) for such month and (ii) $18 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid with respect to a dependent child for such month; plus

"'(B) the larger of the following amounts: (i) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A)(i), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds (I) the product of $45 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) for such month, or (II) if smaller, the total expended as aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care with respect to such month plus the product of $37.50 multiplied by the total number of such recipients, or (ii) 15 per centum of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) under the State plan in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $7.50 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) for such month;

"'(3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to the Federal medical percentage (as defined in section 6(c)) of the total amounts expended during such quarter as medical assistance for the aged under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof);

"'(4) in the case of any State whose State plan approved under section 2002 meets the requirements of subsection (e)(1), an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan—

"'(A) 75 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for—

"'(i) services which are prescribed pursuant to subsection (a)(1) and are provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to applicants for or recipients of aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) or assistance under the plan to help them attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care, or

"'(ii) other services, specified by the Secretary as likely to prevent or reduce dependency, so provided to such applicants or recipients, or

"'(iii) any of the services prescribed pursuant to subsection (e)(1), and of the services specified as provided in clause (ii), which the Secretary may specify as appropriate for individuals who, within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe, have been or are likely to become applicants for or recipients of aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) or assistance under the plan, if such services are requested by such individuals and are provided to such individuals in accordance with the next sentence; plus

"'(B) 75 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for—

"'(i) services which are furnished pursuant to paragraph (15)(A) of section 2002 (a) and which are provided to any child or relative who is receiving aid with respect to a dependent child, or

"'(ii) any of the services described in paragraph (15)(A) of section 2002(a), which are provided to any child or relative who is applying for such aid or who, within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe, has been or is likely to become an applicant for or recipient of such aid; plus

"'(C) 75 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for the training of personnel employed or preparing for employment by the State agency or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision; plus

"'(D) 90 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for—

"'(i) training, supervision, materials, and such other items as are authorized by the Secretary, in connection with a work and training program described in section 2009, and

"'(ii) other services (not included in clause (i)), specified by the Secretary, which are related to the purposes of such a program and are provided to individuals who are participants in such a program,

"'(iii) incentive payments to any such participants of not more than $20 per week, unless the Secretary determines (including a determination for purposes of paragraph (5)(B)) that payments in excess of such 90 percentum are required to give full effect to the purposes of such section 2009; and in this regard non-Federal contributions may be in cash or kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services; plus

"'(E) one-half of the remainder of such expenditures;

"'(5) in the case of any State whose State plan approved under section 2002 does not meet the requirements of subsection (e)(1), an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts extended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan—

"'(A) 75 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for (i) services specified in paragraph (4)(B) which are furnished to the persons, and under the conditions, therein specified, and (ii) the training of the personnel specified in paragraph (4)(C) who will be utilized to provide the services specified in clause (i) of this subparagraph, plus

"'(B) 90 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for the items and services referred to in paragraph (4)(D); plus

"'(C) one-half of the remainder of such expenditures;

"'(6) in the case of any State, an amount equal to the sum of—

"'(A) 75 per centum of the total amount expended under the State plan during such quarter as emergency assistance to needy families with children in the form of payments or care specified in paragraph (1) of section 2005(f), and

"'(B) 75 per centum of the total amount expended under the State plan during such quarter as emergency assistance to needy families with children in the form of services specified in paragraph (2) of section 2005(f).

"'(b)(1) The services referred to in paragraph (4) (except subparagraphs (D) and (E)) and paragraph (5) (except subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (a) shall include only—

"'(A) services provided by the staff of the State agency, or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision: *Provided,* That no funds authorized under this part shall be available for services defined as vocational rehabilitation services under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (i) which are available to individuals in need of them under programs for their rehabilitation carried on under a State plan approved under such Act, or (ii) which the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under such Act are able and willing to provide if reimbursed for the cost thereof pursuant to agreement under subparagraph (B), if provided by such staff, and

"'(B) subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary, services which in the judgment of the State agency cannot be as economically or as effectively provided by the staff of such State or local agency and are not otherwise reasonably available to individuals in need of them, and which are provided, pursuant to agreement with the State agency, by the State health authority or the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act or by any other State agency which the Secretary may determine to be appropriate (whether provided by its staff or by contact with public (local) or nonprofit private agencies);

except that services described in clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) hereof may be provided only pursuant to agreement with such State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services so approved and except that, to the extent specified by the Secretary, child-welfare services and family services may be provided from sources other than those referred to in subparagarphs (A) and (B).

"'(2) Subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary, the services and items referred to in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (D) of subsection (a)(4) and subparagraph (B) of subsection (a)(5) may be furnished, pursuant to agreement entered into by the State or local agency administering the State plan, by employers, organizations, agencies, and institutions equipped to furnish such services and items.

"'(3) The number of individuals (specified in section 2005(b) (2) and (3)) with respect to whom payments described in such section 2005(b) are made for any month, who may be included as recipients of aid with respect to a dependent child for purposes of paragraph (1) or (2) may not exceed 10 per centum of the number of other recipients of such aid for such month.

"'(c) In determining the extent to which the amount expended for administration of the State plan was expended under paragraph (4) of subsection (a) or any of the subparagraphs thereof or under paragraph (5) of subsection (a) or any of the subparagraphs thereof, the State agency shall apply such methods and procedures as may be permitted by the Secretary.

"'(d)(1) Prior to the beginning of each quarter, the Secretary shall estimate the amount to which a State will be entitled under subsection (a) for such quarter, such estimates to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivision for such expenditures in such quarter, and if such amount is less than the State's proportionate share of the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived, and (B) such other investigation as the Secretary may find necessary.

"'(2) The Secretary shall then pay, in such installments as he may determine, to the State the amount so estimated, reduced or increased to the extent of any overpayment or underpayment which the Secretary determines was made under this section to such State for any prior quarter and with respect to which adjustment has not already been made under this subsection.

"'(3) The pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Secretary, of the net amount recovered during any quarter by the State or any political subdivision thereof with respect to aid or assistance furnished under the State plan, but excluding any amount of such aid or assistance recovered from the estate of a deceased recipient which is not in excess of the amount expended by the State or any political subdivision thereof for the funeral expenses of the deceased, shall be considered an overpayment to be adjusted under this subsection.

"'(4) Upon the making of any estimate by the Secretary under this subsection, any appropriations available for payments under this section shall be deemed obligated.

"'(e)(1) In order for a State to qualify for payments under paragraph (4)(A) of subsection (a), the State plan approved under section 2002 must provide that the State agency shall make available to applicants for or recipients of aid (except aid with respect to a dependent child) under such State plan at least those services to help them attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care, which are prescribed by the Secretary.

"'(2) In the case of any State whose State plan included a provision meeting the requirements of paragraph (1), but with respect to which the Secretary finds, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, administering or supervising the administration of such plan, that—

"'(A) the provision has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements of paragraph (1), or

"'(B) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such provision, the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State under paragraph (4) of subsection (a) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure to comply. Until the Secretary is so satisfied further payments with respect to the administration of such State plan shall not be made under paragraph (4) of subsection (a) but shall instead be made under paragraph (5) of such subsection.

"'(f) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, the amount determined under such provisions for any State for any quarter which is attributable to expenditures with respect to individuals 65 years of age or older who are patients in institutions for mental diseases shall be paid only to the extent that the State makes a showing satisfactory to the Secretary that total expenditures in the State from Federal, State, and local resources for mental health services (including payments to or in behalf of individuals with mental health problems) under State and local public health and public welfare programs for such quarter exceed the average of the total expenditures in the State from such sources for such services under such programs for each quarter of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. For purposes of this subsection, expenditures for such services for any quarter, in the case of any State shall be determined on the basis of the latest data, satisfactory to the Secretary, available to him at the time of the determination under this subsection for such State for such quarter; and determinations so made shall be conclusive for purposes of this subsection.

"'OPERATION OF STATE PLANS

"'Sec. 2004. (a) If the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under part A of this title, finds—

"'(1) that the plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 2002; or

"'(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision; the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments under part A of this title will not be made to the State (or, in his discretion, that payments will be limited to categories under or parts of the State plan not affected by such failure), until the Secretary is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied he shall make no further payments to such State under this part (or shall limit payments to categories under or parts of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"'(b) No payment to which a State is otherwise entitled under this part shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which requires that aid with respect to a dependent child be denied under the State plan approved under this part with respect to a child because of the conditions in the home in which the child resides if provision is otherwise made pursuant to a State statute for adequate care and assistance with respect to such child.

"'DEFINITIONS

"'Sec. 2005. For purposes of this part—

"'(a) The term "aid" (unless the context otherwise requires) means money payments to, or (if provided in or after the third month before the month in which the recipient makes application for aid) medical care in behalf of or any type of remedial care recognized under State law in behalf of—

"'(1) needy individuals who are 65 years of age or older,

"'(2) needy individuals who are blind,

"'(3) needy individuals who are 18 years of age or older and permanently and totally disabled,

"'(4) a dependent child or children, or

"'(5)(A) a needy relative with whom a dependent child is living and (B) the spouse of such relative if (i) such spouse is living with him, (ii) such relative is the child's parent, and (iii) such child is dependent child by reason of the physical or mental incapacity of a parent or pursuant to section 2007, except that, with respect to the individuals specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), such term does not include—

"'(6) any such payments to or care in behalf of any individual who is an inmate of a public institution (except as a patient in a medical institution); or

"'(7) any such payments to or care in behalf of any individual who has not attained 65 years of age and who is a patient in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases.

"'(b) The term "aid" also includes payments which are not included within the meaning of such term under subsection (a), but which would be included except that they are made on behalf of—

"'(1) a needy individual specified in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a),

"'(2) a dependent child, or

"'(3) a relative and such relative's spouse, specified in paragraph (5) of subsection (a) to another individual who (as determined in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary) is interested in or concerned with the welfare of such needy individual, child, or relative or, in the case of a child or relative specified in paragraph (2) or (3), directly to a person furnishing food, living accommodations, or other goods, services, or items to or for such child or relative, but only with respect to a State whose State plan approved under section 2002 includes provision for—

"'(4) determination by the State agency that such needy individual (by reason of his physical or mental condition) or such relative has such inability to manage funds that making payments to such needy individual or such relative would be contrary to the welfare of such needy individual or of the dependent child and, therefore, it is necessary to provide such aid through payments described in this subsection;

"'(5) undertaking and continuing special efforts (A) to protect the welfare of such needy individual and to improve, to the extent possible, his capacity for self-care and to manage funds, and (B) to develop greater ability on the part of the relative to manage funds in such manner as to protect the welfare of the family;

"'(6) periodic review by such State agency of the determination under paragraph (4) to ascertain whether conditions justifying such determination still exist, with provision for termination of such payments if they do not and for seeking judicial appointment of a guardian or other legal representative, as described in section 1111, if and when it appears that in the case of such needy individual such action will best serve the interests of such individual or in the case of aid with respect to a dependent child, the need for such aid is continuing, or is likely to continue, beyond a period specified by the Secretary; and

"'(7) opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency on the determination referred to in paragraph (4) for any individual with respect to whom it is made.

"'(c) The terms "medical assistance for the aged" and "assistance" (unless the context otherwise requires) means payment of part or all of the cost of care and services (if provided in or after the third month before the month in which the recipient makes application for assistance) for individuals who are sixty-five years of age or older and who are not recipients of aid (except, for any month, for recipients of aid who are admitted to or discharged from a medical institution during such month) but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet all of such costs of any medical care or remedial care recognized under State law; except that such term does not include any such payments with respect to care or services for any individual who is an inmate of a public institution (except as a patient in a medical institution).

"'(d) The term "dependent child" means a needy child (1) who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of the death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent, and who is living with his father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, brother, sister, stepfather, stepmother, stepbrother, stepsister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew, or niece, in a place of residence maintained by one or more of such relatives as his or their own home, and (2) who is (A) under the age of eighteen or (B) under the age of twenty-one and (as determined by the State in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary) a student regularly attending a school, college, or university, or regularly attending a course of vocational or technical training designed to fit him for gainful employment.

"'(e) The term "family services" means services to a family or any member thereof for the purpose of preserving, rehabilitating, reuniting, or strengthening the family, including family planning services, and such other services as will assist members of a family to attain or retain capability for the maximum self-support and personal independence.

"'(f) The term "emergency assistance to needy families with children" means any of the following, furnished for a period not in excess of 120 days in any 12-month period, in the case of a needy child under the age of 21 who is (or, within such period as may be specified by the Secretary, has been) living with any of the relatives specified in subsection (d)(1) in a place of residence maintained by one or more of such relatives as his or their own home, but only where such child is without available resources and the payments, care, or services involved are necessary to avoid destitution of such child or relative or to provide suitable living arrangements in the home in which such child is living—

"'(1) money payments, payments in kind, or such other payments as the Secretary may specify with respect to, or medical care or any other type of remedial care recognized under State law on behalf of, such child or any such relative (including the relative's spouse), and

"'(2) such services as may be specified by the Secretary;

but only with respect to a State whose State plan approved under section 2002 includes provision for such assistance.

"'(g) The term "aid with respect to a dependent child" means aid (as defined in subsections (a) and (b)) when the payments referred to therein are made to, or on behalf of, the individuals specified in paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (a).

"'(h) The term "relative with whom any dependent child is living" means the individual who is one of the relatives specified in subsection (d)(1) and with whom such child is living (within the meaning of such subsection) in a place of residence maintained by such individual (himself or together with any one or more of the other relatives so specified) as his (or their) own home.

"'USE OF PAYMENTS FOR BENEFIT OF CHILD

"'SEC. 2006. The provisions of section 406 are incorporated into this section and with appropriate redesignation of cross-references apply to this part.

"'DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF UNEMPLOYED FATHERS

"'SEC. 2007. The provisions of section 407 are incorporated into this section and with appropriate redesignation of cross-references apply to this part.

"'FEDERAL PAYMENTS FOR FOSTER HOME CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

"'SEC. 2008. The provisions of section 408 are incorporated into this section and with appropriate redesignation of cross-references apply to this part.

"'COMMUNITY WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"'SEC. 2009. The provisions of section 409 are incorporated into this section and with appropriate redesignation of cross-references apply to this part.

"'PART B—CHILD-WELFARE SERVICES

"'SEC. 2050. For the purpose of this part, the provisions of part B of title IV are applicable.'"

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply with respect to periods after December 31, 1967.

(c) No payment may be made to any State under title I, X, XIV, or XVI or part A of title IV for any period for which such State receives payments under part A of title XX or any period thereafter if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, pursuant to section 2002(b) of such Act, has approved a plan of the State which fulfills the requirements of section 2002(a) of such Act.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of—

(1) section 2003(a)(4)(B),

(2) section 2003(a)(4)(C) insofar as the personnel specified therein are or will be utilized to provide the services specified in section 2003(a)(4)(B),

(3) section 2003(a)(5)(A),

(4) section 2003(a)(4)(D),

(5) section 2003(a)(5)(B),

(as added to the Social Security Act by subsection (a) of this section) the percentage rate specified therein in the case of any State shall be 85 per centum (rather than 75 per centum) with respect to expenditures for the services specified therein made prior to July 1, 1969 under the plan approved under section 2002 of the Social Security Act.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 237. This part may be cited as the "Family and Child Assistance and Services Program Act of 1967".

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS FOR PART 3 AND PART 4

SEC. 238. (a) Section 228(d)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "IV," and by inserting after "XVI," the following: "or part A of title IV, or part A of title XX,".

On the following lines on page 173: 3, 6, 12, 16, 19, strike out "IV" and insert in lieu thereof "IV, or part A of title XX".

On the following lines on page 173: 9, 23, strike out "IV" and insert in lieu thereof "IV, and part A of title XX".

On the following lines on page 174: 2, 7, 13, 21, 24, strike out "IV" and insert in lieu thereof "IV, and part A of title XX".

On the following lines on page 174: 4, 17, strike out "IV" and insert in lieu thereof "IV, or part A of title XX".

On page 173, insert the following between lines 23 and 24: "(B) by striking out 'and 1903' each place it appears in subsection (a) and by inserting in lieu thereof '1903, and 2003'."

On page 173, line 24, strike out "(B)" and insert in lieu thereof "(C)".

On page 174, line 1, strike out "(C)" and insert in lieu thereof "(D)".

On page 174, line 3, strike out "(D)" and insert in lieu thereof "(E)".

On page 174, line 5, strike out "(7)" and insert in lieu thereof "(7)(A)".

On page 174, insert between lines 7 and 8 the following: "(B) by striking out 'and 1603(a)', and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: '1603(a), and 2003(a)'."

On page 174, line 11, strike out "(e)(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)(1)(A)".

On page 174, insert the following between lines 13 and 14:

"Section 1843(b) of such Act is further amended by inserting 'or' after paragraph (2), and by inserting after such paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"'(3) individuals receiving money payments under part A of title XX;'."

On page 174, between lines 21 and 22 insert the following:

"(C) by striking out 'or XIX' and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'XIX, or XX'."

On page 175, line 2, strike out "IV" and insert in lieu thereof "IV, or part A of title XX".

On page 175, strike out lines 3 through 5 and insert the following:

"(3) Section 1902(b)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out 'section 406(a)(2), be a dependent child under title IV; or' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'section 406(a)(2) or, if the State has a plan approved under part A of title XX, section 2005(d)(2), be a dependent child under part A of title IV or part A of title XX, as the case may be; or'."

On page 175, strike out lines 12 through 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(6) Section 1905(a)(ii) of such Act is amended—

"(A) by inserting after '406(b)(1)' the following: '406(b)(1) or, if the State has a plan approved under title XX, section 2005(d)(1)';

"(B) by inserting after '406(a)(2)' the following: '406(a)(2) or, if the State has a plan approved under title XX, section 2005(d)(2)';

"(C) by striking out 'IV' and inserting

in lieu thereof the following: 'part A of title IV or part A of title XX, as the case may be'."

On page 175, insert the following between lines 14 and 15:

"Section 121(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by striking out 'or XVI' and inserting in lieu thereof 'XVI, or part A of XX'."

On page 119, strike out lines 1 through 10 and insert the following:

"(d) In determining the need of individuals claiming aid or assistance under a State plan approved under titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XX of the Social Security Act which provides for the determination of such need under the provisions of such titles as amended by this section, the State shall apply such provisions notwithstanding any provisions of law (other than such Act) requiring the State to disregard earned income of such individuals in determining need under such State plans."

On page 134, line 24, strike out "part A of title IV of this Act" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Under part A of title IV of this Act or for aid with respect to a dependent child under a plan approved under part A of title XX of this Act".

On page 135, line 8, insert after "Act" the following: "or section 2002 of this Act".

On page 135, line 9, strike out "403(a)(3)(B) of this Act" and insert the following: "403(a)(3)(B) or section 2003(a)(4)(D) or section 2003(a)(5)(B) of this Act, as may be appropriate".

On page 141, strike out lines 23 and 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "assistance, other than medical assistance to the aged, under a State plan approved under title I, X, XIV, XVI, or part A of title IV, or part A of title XX, if—".

On page 142, line 18, strike out "or 1603(a)" and insert in lieu thereof "1603(a), or 2003(a)".

On page 147, strike out lines 20 and 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "State approved under titles I, X, XIV, and XVI, and part A of title IV, and part A of title XX,"

On page 148, strike out lines 20 through 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the State approved under titles I, X, XIV, XVI, and part A of title IV, and part A of title XX, and (ii) payments under section 523 and section 422,"

On page 150, line 15, strike out "or XVI" and insert in lieu thereof "XVI, or XX".

On page 150, line 18, strike out "and XVI" and insert in lieu thereof "XVI, and XX".

On page 159, line 22, strike out "IV" and insert in lieu thereof "IV, or part A of title XX".

On page 176, strike out "IV" and insert in lieu thereof "IV, and under part A of title XX".

On page 178, strike out lines 15 through 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "part A of title IV or part A of title XX, on account of family planning services and services and items referred to in section 403(a)(3)(B) or section 2003(a)(4)(D) or section 2003(a)(5)(B), as may be appropriate, with respect to any fiscal year—".

On page 179, line 20, strike out "the rate" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and notwithstanding section 2003(a)(4) (B) and (D) and section 2003(a)(5) (A) and (B), the rate".

On page 180, line 5, strike out "402" and insert in lieu thereof "2002".

On page 180, line 7, strike out "402(a)(7)" and insert in lieu thereof "2002(a)(13)".

On page 180, line 10, strike out "402(a)(8)" and insert in lieu thereof "2002(a)(14)".

On page 161, strike out lines 2 through 4 and insert in lieu thereof: "year ending June 30, 1969, $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $160,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $185,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and $210,000,000 for each fiscal year ending thereafter."

On page 162, line 3, strike out "title" and insert in lieu thereof "title, or the State plan approved under part A of title XX".

On page 170, line 11 strike out "402(a)(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "402(a)(3) or section 2002(a)(3) (after the State's plan under part A of title XX has been approved)".

On page 170, line 20, strike out "402(a)(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "402(a)(12) or 2002(a)(15)(A) (after the State's plan under part A of title XX has been approved)".

On page 175, line 15, strike out "4" and insert in lieu thereof "5".

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of amendment No. 402, intended to be proposed by Mr. NELSON to Senate bill 1125, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of amendments Nos. 400 and 401, intended to be proposed by Mr. HARRIS to H.R. 12080, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Friday, October 20, 1967, at 10 a.m., in room 1202, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

John Walter Hechinger, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1969.

Walter E. Fauntroy, of the District of Columbia, to be Vice Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1969.

To be members of the District of Columbia Council for the terms indicated:

Terms expiring February 1, 1968: Margaret A. Haywood, of the District of Columbia; J. C. Turner, of the District of Columbia; and Joseph P. Yeldell, of the District of Columbia.

Term expiring February 1, 1969: John A. Nevius, of the District of Columbia.

Terms expiring February 1, 1970: Stanley J. Anderson, of the District of Columbia; William S. Thompson, of the District of Columbia; and Polly Shackleton, of the District of Columbia.

At the indicated time and place, persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent.

STATE DEPARTMENT'S BERATING OF CRITICS UNBECOMING AND ILL ADVISED

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, in the morning newspapers appear articles concerning two top State Department officials berating Vietnam critics.

If we are to maintain the right of dissent, I assume it should apply to those who dissent from the dissenters.

Without doubt, the President has been under heavy attack. Without doubt, he does not like it. And without doubt, he has ordered the State Department to hit back.

What goes does this do? Does it serve the public good? Does it promote national unity? Do the troops in the field fight or do better? Does this not encourage Hanoi?

One would expect the administration to argue its cause—actually, one of the great problems involved in Vietnam may be that the administration has never made its case. But speeches by Mr. Rostow at the University of Kansas and by Mr. Katzenbach at Fairfield University in Connecticut, to my mind, serve no good purpose.

To characterize the dissent against Vietnam as a new Henry Wallace movement, as a new isolationism, as a position of foreign policy irresponsibility, or as liberals looking for a scapegoat because they cannot have an instant Great Society—as did Mr. Rostow—subtracts from rather than adds to the quality of legitimate debate on one of the greatest issues that face this country.

To characterize the dissent against Vietnam as existing because liberals find no easy alternatives, to claim that Vietnam is a logical and similar extension of Korea—as did Mr. Katzenbach—adds nothing to the intelligence of the American people or to the public understanding.

Mr. President, I have generally supported the administration position on Vietnam. To be sure, much of the dissent is without value. For the administration now to contribute more of the same is perhaps a matter of political expediency, but it will not add to the understanding of the people, or to the unity of the Nation, or to the explanation of our commitment in blood or treasury.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr.

Bartlett in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE AMERICAN CHINA POLICY STATEMENT BY DEAN RUSK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the Philadelphia Inquirer of this morning, under the heading "Washington Background," there was published a most perceptive column entitled "Rusk's China Dogma Is Just an Old Rerun," which was written by Joseph C. Goulden of the Inquirer Washington bureau.

Mr. Goulden is a fresh face in the Washington press corps, a young man of keen perception and a fine background. His comment is critical of Mr. Rusk, but I believe it is worthy of careful consideration by readers of the Congressional Record.

Mr. President, I have great affection for the Secretary of State as a human being and the greatest sympathy and admiration for him. However, I find myself quite unable to approve of his recent statements with respect to Communist China and the threat it poses to freedom in Southeast Asia or elsewhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article to which I have referred which was written by Joseph C. Goulden.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington Background: Rusk's China Dogma Is Just an Old Rerun

(By Joseph C. Goulden)

Washington.—The time has come for Dean Rusk to be marched to the barn and flailed with a birch rod until his stinging back signals his brain that new ideas are needed about dealing with the Chinese.

We are told we should be relieved now that the Secretary of State has finally avowed openly that our main purpose in Vietnam is to hold a billion Chinese at bay once they have nuclear arms.

We are assured that Rusk makes clear the stakes in Southeast Asia, and that further discussion is divisive, worthless and even harmful.

Nonsense. Rusk's statement must be read as a confession of failure of U.S. policy towards China under four Presidents and over 17 years.

Basically, nations hire diplomats to keep them out of war—and war is to the profession of statesmanship as a grounded boat is to a navigator.

All Rusk can tell us is that we can anticipate frightful amounts of Chinese trouble over the next decade, that we must be resolute, etc., and that the Asian nations "must brace themselves, get themselves set . . ."

One must ask, in anger as well as in pained frustration, why this has come to pass: Why the U.S., in almost two decades, has been unable to lure or scare the Chinese into peaceful coexistence; why our "relations" are at such a sorry depth that even the admission that nuclear war is possible is greeted as an important new turn of policy.

Assuredly, Dean Rusk doesn't deserve all the blame—but in this man we find focused the beginning, the presence, and the predicted future of American China policy.

In essence, this policy is that China doesn't exist. And Dean Rusk, as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, helped write it. On May 18, 1951, he said:

"We do not recognize the authorities in Peking for what they pretend to be. The Peking regime may be a colonial Russian government—a Slavic Manchukuo on a larger scale. It does not pass the first test. It is not Chinese."

Dogma should not be equated with truth—but the Rusk dogma survived after he left Washington during the Eisenhower Administration, and was still intact when he returned in 1961.

Which brings us to why Rusk deserves a birching rather than a sympathetic pat on the back for making a grossly inaccurate assessment of Peking—an error comparable to a prediction that Cecil Moore will be the next president of Philadelphia's Union League.

In December 1963, Roger Hilsman, the State Department's ranking official for Asian affairs, had the audacity to make a speech urging junking of the hidebound Rusk dogma (although he didn't phrase it that directly).

Hilsman suggested appealing to the "second echelon" Chinese leaders, who were dissatisfied then as now with the "rigid, primitive, and doctrinaire" policies of the Mao Tse-tung generation.

Hilsman said the U.S. should remain firm, but also "lay the groundwork for the kind of flexibility" that would take advantage of the passing of Mao.

Within a month Roger Hilsman was out of the Government—by his own choice, he avows, because of discontent over the bombing-solves-everything approach to the Vietnam war.

But Dean Rusk is bragging around town that he fired Hilsman because "he talked too much at Georgetown cocktail parties."

Hilsman's friends tell different stories from either of these. They say Hilsman's "sin" was that he questioned the inevitability of Rusk's dogma.

The troubling factor about all this is that Rusk is in a position to make his prophecy a self-fulfilling one.

VIETNAM—TONE OF CURRENT DEBATE ENCOURAGES ENEMY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, an editorial in the Washington Sunday Star of October 15 has a message of particular importance at this time.

The editorial writer pointed out that the moment Ho Chi Minh and his lieutenants become convinced that the administration opposition in next year's election is dedicated to a peace-for-any-price policy in Vietnam, they cannot logically do anything other than to wait for the outcome of the election and hope for the best.

The current debate on the war which suggests that the United States walk out on its commitments encourages the enemy.

There is a time and place for dissent. The right of free debate is an American tradition that we must preserve.

But the tone of the present debate is such that it no doubt misleads the enemy into believing that if they hold out long enough, they can wear us down and bleed us and South Vietnam into submission.

Whether we should be in Vietnam is not now a proper subject for debate. We passed that milestone when we responded to fire upon the American flag carried by an American soldier.

Never before in the history of this Nation have we stopped in the middle of a war to debate whether or not we should be, or whether or not we should see it through.

Prolonged discussions that suggest we go back on solemn commitments which we made as a nation have the effect of undermining the entire war effort that is, at best, a very difficult situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record the editorial which appeared in the Washington Star of October 15, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vietnam and the Republican Strategy

There is nothing surprising, distressing or improper about the fact that a major national debate is taking place over the administration's conduct of the Vietnam war.

There's nothing new, either, in the notion that the political leaders of the nation are answerable to the people and their elected representatives in time of war. The present debate, which has mounted in fury in direct proportion to United States involvement in the war, has its historical precedent in the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War and the Korean war. Only the two World Wars, with their total involvement of national effort, produced virtually total acquiescence.

The debate thus far has been drawn solely along the lines of personal conviction. In Congress, party politics have been conspicuously absent. The administration's chief defender in the Senate is the leader of the opposition party, Senator Dirksen. The loudest and most persistent critic is the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright. And the administration's official defense, now being presented with refreshing aggressiveness by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, also has been kept free from the petty confines of partisan politics.

But while it is the unquestioned right, if not the obligation, of every individual to search his mind and own conscience in order to determine what stand he should take on this nation's involvement in South Vietnam, it is not the duty nor the right of any political party to do so. Yet there have been increasing signs in recent weeks that the Republican party, as it moves toward the presidential election of 1968, is being tempted to make opposition to the administration's conduct of the war a matter of party policy and a major issue in the political debate to come.

Some of the leading Republican candidates, seeking out areas of vulnerability in the administration and in their opponents within the party, have abandoned previous positions to take up anti-war positions. Senator Percy calls for a greater emphasis on negotiations and less reliance on military achievement. Governor Romney proclaims that his earlier pro-administration stand was in error; that he was, in fact, brainwashed by the administration. Senator Morton, the former GOP national chairman, in an effort to protect Romney's image from a fearful beating, makes the remarkable assertion that President Johnson was himself brainwashed into submission by his generals and admirals. There are published reports that Rockefeller and Nixon are moving toward an anti-administration stand. There are rumors that Reagan may, before convention-time, join them there. Unattributed intelligence from the inner counsels of the Republican party report a move to bounce Senator Dirksen as head of the platform committee because of his unswerving support of administration policy.

The temptation for the Republican party to make political hay out of Vietnam is undoubtedly strong. But any such move would be divisive, dishonest and highly dangerous.

It has often been pointed out that any show of dissent from official policy by any prominent individual is damaging, to some extent, to the quest for peace in Southeast Asia. And it is quite true that such displays of indecision and confusion of purpose must inevitably encourage Hanoi in the hope that, if they can only hang on long enough, American determination will crumble and American troops will be withdrawn.

There is, however, an enormous difference between individual expressions of doubt and concern, and the adoption of an official, anti-war stand by a major political party. It is quite safe to assume that Ho Chi Minh is politically sophisticated enough to understand the difference between the convoluted soul-searching of a William Fulbright and the fixed, calculated, positive assertion of a party platform plank.

What would be the effect on the leadership in Hanoi and in the National Liberation Front if an official anti-war stand were adopted by the Republican party?

The moment that Ho and his lieutenants become convinced that the administration's opposition in next year's election is dedicated to a peace at any price policy in Vietnam, they cannot logically do anything other than to wait for the outcome of the election and hope for best.

If, on the other hand, Hanoi knows that the opposition candidate is dedicated to seeing the United States commitment through—or even if the attitude of the opposition party is uncertain—then the situation is reversed. Then, there would be considerable pressure on Ho to negotiate within the next 13 months, while the President still faces the election. It could be another four years before Johnson or his successor in office is again so strongly motivated to accept a compromise.

A decision by the Republican party to strike at the opposition's Vietnam policy will insure the continuation of the war for another year at least. It will divide the nation further in an area where dangerous division already exists. It will, in fact, be a cruel deception.

No Republican candidate, regardless of his campaign statements or the platform on which he runs, will in our opinion, actually be able to bring the Vietnam war to a quick end if he is elected. It is all very well to talk about negotiations; to negotiate is something else again. The unfortunate fact of the matter is that neither Hanoi nor the Viet Cong have, to this moment, shown any interest whatsoever in negotiating an end to the conflict, despite constant official and unofficial, public and private offers by the administration to stop shooting and start talking.

That leaves only one sure, quick way out of Vietnam for any future administration; Simply to pack up and leave. It is inconceivable that any President, faced with the realities of responsibility, would finally decide that it is in the national interest to scrap our treaty obligations and destroy our international credibility in one easy step. The President in 1969—regardless of what his name or party may be—most assuredly will be holding out for negotiations and an honorable peace before United States troops are withdrawn from Vietnam.

The Republican party must resist the temptation to play upon the nation's unformulated worries and dissatisfactions in the hope of a victory at the polls. There are, after all, legitimate and honest issues on which Lyndon Johnson can be attacked, and possibly defeated.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN COOPERATIVE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the cooperative has been and continues to be a very vital part of the American social and economic fabric.

Although many of us are used to associating the name "cooperative" with farm and rural problems, President Johnson has recently pointed out that the co-op is now also closely associated with cities as well as farms, with health and medicine as well as with feed and cattle.

In addressing the National Co-op Conference on October 4, the President described the cooperative as representing "American initiative at its most creative—groups of people joining together for a common goal, combining their labor to bring themselves a better life."

It is fitting that President Johnson should comment on the growth and importance of the cooperative effort in the United States. Under the President's party cooperatives have flourished throughout the country. Under the Democratic Party, farmers in the 1930's were protected from total economic collapse through price supports, and encouraged to join cooperatives, and under the Johnson administration the poor and disinherited of the cities are receiving new motivation to engage in community action to lift themselves out of poverty.

I am very pleased that again, as so often in recent days, the President has focused the eyes of the American people on some of the less spectacular, but no less important, accomplishments and milestones in American life.

I ask consent to insert in the Record the text of remarks by the President at the National Co-op Conference on October 4.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the office of the White House Press Secretary, Oct. 4, 1967]

Text of Remarks by the President at the National Co-op Conference

More than 100 years ago, a visitor to our young Nation commented on what he considered a remarkable American trait:

"The Americans make associations," wrote Tocqueville, "to give entertainments, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries . . . Wherever at the head of some new undertaking you see the government in France, or a man of rank in England, in the United States you will be sure to find an association."

Today, those associations have pervaded every facet of American life. Some of the best of them are called cooperatives, and they represent much of what is best about America.

They represent American initiative at its most creative—groups of people joining together for a common goal, combining their labor to bring themselves a better life.

They represent a deep belief in the potential of America as a land where no man need go hungry, or be driven off his land, or lack of medical care.

In the past three years alone, 133 cooperative credit unions have been organized by low-income families in depressed rural areas and city slums.

These credit unions are offering fair rates of interest. They are teaching people how to save, and are helping them take the first steps toward financial independence and responsibility.

In Clarksdale, Mississippi, for example, a young mother came to the credit union with a problem. She had bought a stove and had agreed to pay $17 a month for it—one-third of her income. Credit union officers showed her that she was paying 35 percent interest. The credit union loaned her the money to pay for the stove, and now she is making payments she can afford—at 12 percent interest.

Small farmers are banding together in cooperatives to market their crops, to get fair credit, and to buy supplies.

Near Sunset, Louisiana, a co-op was formed to market sweet potatoes. Year before last, the average net income was $2,300. Last season, the co-op got the farmer $900 more for his potatoes. That $900 pulled him across the poverty threshold into a more affluent American society.

These cooperatives are holding open the door of economic opportunity to the family farmer. They are making it possible for him to stay on the farm, rather than be forced to migrate to a distant and alien city.

In eastern Ohio, 120 farm families were ready to call it quits. Their hills were covered with brush—no fit pasture for livestock. As a last-ditch effort, they organized a co-op, borrowed money, bought two bulldozers, a heavy disk, and a seeder, and they seeded the land.

Now these families will be able to stick it out. They are on their way, I believe to a satisfying and rewarding life in rural America.

Cooperatives in cities are assuring more Americans proper medical attention. Members of the Seattle health co-op prepay their doctors, so they aren't reluctant to consult them early and often. As a result of this preventive medicine, co-op members spend less than half the number of days in the hospital as other Seattle residents.

Cooperatives are instilling a sense of belonging, of proprietorship, of responsibility in our citizens. During the riots in Detroit, two racially integrated housing cooperatives in the center of the burden area were patrolled by co-op members. Not a windowpane was shattered, not a building burned.

I am proud to participate with you in celebrating Co-op Month, 1967. Cooperatives play a vital part in building a better America.

"The highest and best form of efficiency," as Woodrow Wilson said, "is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

DEAN RUSK ON VIETNAM

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, few Secretaries of State have made such direct and forthright replies to their critics as did Secretary Rusk in his press conference last week.

His statement on Vietnam was articulate, clear, forceful, and based on compelling logic.

He placed the Vietnam conflict in the broader context of a world struggle.

He reminded his critics that this is not the first Communist war of liberation the United States has opposed.

He recalled that the United States—and almost the entire Senate—made a solemn international treaty commitment which obligates it to help South Vietnam resist aggression.

And he suggested that South Vietnam might not exist today had the American commitment not taken place.

To Secretary Rusk's words I might add the words of a recent article in the Washington Star.

We ought not to forget what happened in Korea in the early 1950's.

We must not forget that the same voices shouting "pullout" today were crying "warmonger" in those days.

Had the United States followed that course, there would be no South Korea today.

History has a way of proving those right who sense that a threat to a free nation 10,000 miles away may one day become a threat to the United States itself.

When our country was separated by oceans from its allies and its enemies, there was room for a benevolent kind of isolationism. Today we cannot afford not to be committed around the world.

The Vietnam conflict is costly. So was the war in Korea. So was the war against the Nazis and the Japanese. So was the American Revolution.

The only question which should be posed is: Were we right in getting into those wars? Are we right today in Vietnam? I am satisfied that we are, and that future events will prove it beyond any shadow of doubt.

I am proud that we have a standup Secretary of State who is not afraid of his critics and who defends his President's policies with such vigor.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Rusk's Explicit Reply to Critics," written by Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Evening Star of October 14, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 14, 1967]

RUSK'S EXPLICIT REPLY TO CRITICS

(By Gould Lincoln)

"And sometimes it gets tough; and sometimes we are tested and we find out what kind of people we are."

In these three phrases, in almost nut-like brevity, Secretary of State Dean Dusk stated the situation which the American people face in living up to this country's commitment in South Vietnam, and its commitments to our SEATO allies in Southeast Asia and the Pacific. Rusk was speaking at an almost hour-long press conference, in which he dealt with all the questions raised by the opponents of the conduct of the war and those whose main concern is to get out of Vietnam and end the war at any price.

When the history of this era is written in the not too distant future, the stature of the Secretary of State, committed to the honor and security of the United States, will loom large, and even larger in comparison to those whose criticisms and actions have encouraged serious divisions among the American people.

Rusk stated in clear and understandable terms that the security of the United States is involved, as well as the security of the people of South Vietnam and the millions of people in Southeast Asia in other countries not now controlled by the Communist Chinese. They have been threatened and are threatened by Red China's efforts to launch so-called "wars of liberation" within their borders. The United States, as he pointed out, is a "Pacific" nation as well an "Atlantic" nation, with Hawaii and Alaska, numbered among our fifty states. States which stretch far into Pacific waters, and are separated from the U.S. mainland.

Rusk revealed in their entirety the efforts of President Johnson and of the State Department to bring about peace in Vietnam; the efforts to obtain from Hanoi any assurance that it would agree to peace talks. He was caustic in his references to congressional critics of the administration's conduct of the war. He pointed out that virtually none of these gentlemen are advocating immediate withdrawal of our military forces without some kind of peace talks and agreement with Hanoi and the Viet Cong.

"The debate in which we are now involved (with these congressional critics)," said Rusk, "is essentially a debate about detail—this or that military move, this or that diplomatic step, this or that formulation of what is in fact a common middle position. If that be true, precision is important. People at least should make it clear whether they are arguing with Washington or with Hanoi."

Rusk said he was encouraged about prospects of peace in Vietnam. He was asked why. "There are many things," he replied. "Some reporter in Saigon invented the word 'stalemate.' Our military authorities do not believe there is a stalemate. Ambassador Bunker doesn't believe there is a stalemate." Rusk enumerated; defections from the Viet Cong doubling this year over last, and their recruitment falling off by half; improvement in the South Vietnam military forces; and our military forces and our allies getting on with the job. There is no standstill, he argued.

Discussing the demands that we halt the bombing of North Vietnam, Rusk said he had talked with a group of private citizens recently. "I said; 'All right, if we stop the bombing and Hanoi does not respond, will you then change your view?' They said, 'No, of course not.' " He might have asked these people with justice: "Whose side are you on any way?"

Rusk's belief that there is no "stalemate," and that the progress of the war in Vietnam is favorable to the United States and its allies, is solidly supported by Hanson W. Baldwin, Pulitzer prize-winning military editor of the New York Times, writing in the current issue of The Reporter. Baldwin's criticism of the conduct of the war is that it could have progressed to a greater degree if there had been less delay in widening the list of bombing targets in North Vietnam. He writes:

"It is clear, or ought to be, from any summary of the war situation that the ultimate outcome of the war in Vietnam does not have to be defeat. In 1950–51 exactly the same derogatory phrases now being applied to South Vietnam were tagged to South Korea. The South Koreans would not fight; they had corrupt and political generals; Sygman Rhee was an Oriental dictator and an American puppet. It has taken fifteen years and there are still U.S. troops in South Korea, but all these sour predictions have been proved false."

THE PROBLEM OF RIOTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as I stated before, the pending antiriot legislation making it unlawful to use interstate travel facilities to go somewhere to incite racial violence offers no solution to the problem of rioting in this country.

Individuals, whether they come from outside the State or from the community in which the violence erupts, do not and cannot cause riots. Conditions cause riots. Our task, then, is to eliminate the conditions of poverty, inequality, discrimination and abuse which lie at the core of the problem. It will do no good to keep attacking the surface while ignoring the causes which lie festering underneath.

Recent editorials in three Michigan daily newspapers, the Detroit News, the Pontiac Press and the Grand Rapids Press, clearly show the inability of this bill to prevent or even to curb rioting. The issues raised in these editorials are worth considering. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit News, July 21, 1967]

ANTIRIOT BILL SEEKS SCAPEGOATS: IT'S NO SOLUTION

If frustrated ghetto Negroes can vent their rage by insensate mob action, why shouldn't frustrated congressmen vent theirs by insensate legislative action?

Well, maybe more should be expected of congressmen than of mobs. But that appears to be a somewhat tattered notion. Then how about the next best reason, to wit: There's no point in it.

Maybe that's a forlorn notion to raise with congressmen, too.

But the fact remains that the antiriot bill which thundered through the House of Representatives 347 to 70 is the legislative equivalent of confronting a charging rhino with a peashooter.

There will always be those who seek to console themselves with the belief that these ghetto riots are primarily the work of "outside agitators." Stokely Carmichael is the favorite bogeyman, though no one has yet suggested how he managed to incite Newark Negroes to riot from New England, where he happened to be at the time.

Carmichael is a very trying, a very annoying man. He is also called a dangerous man, in that his calls to Negroes to "defend themselves against white aggression" are increasingly couched in violent terms, and add to the state of mind which can flare into riot.

But Carmichael will not be curbed by this riot bill, unless the meaning of its terms are badly twisted in the courts. "Incitement to riot" and similar terms have a very precise legal meaning, and well that they do; otherwise those in authority could use them to quash legitimate dissent or complaint.

If Carmichael or someone like him can be caught saying "Let's go down and burn out that place," antiriot laws will get him. Every state already has such laws. But he appears to know better.

And if he does not, if he disappears from the face of the earth tomorrow and with him a thousand like him, we would still have riots from time to time and place to place because the causes run deeper. If agitators can be prevented from crossing state lines (which is doubtful), the conditions which breed disorder would also breed some homegrown agitators to lead it. Agitators succeed where there's something to be agitated about.

No thoughtful person suggests that remedies for these conditions are easy or quick, or lie wholly in massive outlays of dollars. It may even be that they don't exist, though that grim conclusion would signal that our free society has failed.

But after the dreadful, necessary work of quelling these riots is done, we must surely find more plausible reasons for them than scapegoat "agitators," and more useful cures than symbolic hangings of Stokely Carmichael effigies.

[From the Pontiac (Mich.) Press,
[Sept. 1, 1967]

Antiriot Law Not Answer to Riots

"If anybody thinks that Detroit wouldn't have happened if we had had an antiriot bill, he just landed from the moon."

This was the reaction of Michigan's Democratic Sen. Philip A. Hart to pending antiriot legislation.

Michigan's Republican Sen. Robert P. Griffin concurred: "Any impression that this is going to actually stop riots would be a misleading impression."

We heartily agree with the senators from Michigan.

The Senate Judiciary Committee is holding hearings on the House-approved bill which would make it a federal crime to cross a state line with intent to incite a riot.

It is ridiculous to assume such action to make inciting a riot illegal will have any effect in preventing further outbreaks of violence around the Country. This is like saying that because there's a law, no one is going to break it. Michigan and other states already have antiriot laws to begin with.

Congress is wasting its time thinking of more ways to slap hands at a time when it should be attacking the conditions which breed riot and civil disorder.

The only effective antiriot legislation is that which will spur action at local levels to eradicate the sores of blight and poverty. The term "action" is the key ingredient.

This was brought home in Pontiac, when, after a night of civil disorder, a spokesman for potentially militant Negroes listed as one of their major grievances the lack of action to relocate people living in the Crystal Beach Housing Project.

Civil rights groups in Pontiac have been requesting action to clean up this slum project for years. Fortunately, the City had the foresight last February to appoint a citizens' committee to study local conditions and recommend methods to combat housing problems.

But all the study and legislative action in the world is useless unless it breeds action. Now, action appears imminent to relocate people from the Crystal Beach project.

Our City officials are one step ahead of Congress in antiriot action.

[From the Grand Rapids Press, July 21, 1967]

It's a State Problem

Encouraged by passage of the law to end the nationwide rail strike, sponsors of a House-passed bill to make it unlawful to use interstate travel facilities for the purpose of going somewhere to incite racial violence are pushing harder than ever for their measure.

In the Senate, which will consider the bill now, Senator Everett Dirksen observes, "I think the patience of both the country and the Congress is running out." Dirksen was referring, of course, to the outbreak of racial violence in Newark, N.J.

However, Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark and Gov. Richard Hughes of New Jersey agree there is no evidence that the Newark riots were triggered by outside agitators. In their view, the instigators of Newark's disturbances would be outside the proposed legislation.

"The real cause of the Newark riots," agreed Clark and Hughes in a mutual statement, "is the explosive frustration and impatience of those who suffer from slum housing, unemployment, inadequate education, insufficient training programs which would create equality of opportunity, and all the other deprivations so characteristic of the ghetto."

Critics of the proposed legislation, including the attorney general, say the language of the antiriot bill is so vague it will invite endless litigation. The bill would make it a crime punishable with up to a five-year prison sentence to travel in interstate commerce to facilitate, encourage or incite a violent civil disturbance.

But how far do "facilitate" and "encourage" really reach?

Each of the states has laws to prevent and control riots, and most of these laws are clearer and more enforceable than the federal legislation which hangs speech and motive on the thread of interstate commerce.

As the bill's critics have emphasized, even if enacted into law, the legislation would have minimal effect on urban riots. In his wide-ranging study of the sources of violence in cities of the North, Dr. Joseph Spiegel of Brandeis University contends that the cities blaming "outsiders" for racial unrest, "are, in truth, simply unwilling to admit or to do anything about their basic social ailments that lead to riots."

In the course of congressional debate it has become clear that the bill the House has passed is aimed at one man, Stokely Carmichael, spokesman and former head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. But suppose the bill does pass and become law; that Carmichael is arrested, and that the law is then challenged as unconstitutional and thrown out by the Supreme Court for its infringement on free speech. The attorney general already has cited that as a likelihood. If that happens, Carmichael will then become the liberated martyr, even in the view of those who never had contemplated rioting.

Most state laws are capable of dealing adequately with the riot instigators, whether they're Carmichael or anyone else. What is needed is the courage to enforce the valid state laws already on the books and the will to proceed with long-range cures for social illnesses.

MEETING OF GEORGIA ADVISORY COUNCIL OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Small Business Administration's Georgia Advisory Council held a productive meeting last Friday, October 13, at Stuckey's Carriage Inn, on Georgia's famed Jekyll Island.

Some of Georgia's leading businessmen and bankers were in attendance at the council's semiannual session. SBA was represented by its southeastern area administrator, Wiley S. Messick; the Atlanta regional director, John P. Latimer; and the Atlanta regional office's chief of financial assistance division, Robert Newman.

Harold S. Hammond, president of the Manufacturers National Bank at Newnan, Ga., who serves as Georgia's Advisory Council chairman, and William T. Maddox, president of the National City Bank, Rome, Ga., were active participants in panel discussions involving SBA's programs including the new lease guarantee program and the economic opportunity loan programs.

SBA State advisory councils are composed of individuals whose knowledge of and interest in the problems of small business enable them to make a substantial contribution in resolving the problems of the State's small business community. Members are appointed for 2-year terms by Robert C. Moot, SBA's able Administrator. Members include the owners of independent small businesses, bankers, and representatives from fields relating to small business such as educators, labor leaders, representatives of news media, chambers of commerce, and others.

Distinguished Georgians at the SBA council meeting included: E. D. Bigner, president of Fabrics, Inc. of Brunswick; Al J. Braxton, audit manager of Arthur Anderson & Co., Atlanta; Moses Coleman, president of the Coleman Co., Vidalia; John H. Davis, president of the Farmers Bank of Tifton, Tifton; Bev Henry Howard, Jr., president of the Howard Printing Co., Columbus; Robert H. Lassetter, small business coordinator of Lockheed Georgia Co., Marietta; Robert C. Martin, manager of the Kohlmeyer & Co., Columbus; and Mrs. Helen G. Serfling, a certified public accountant of Decatur.

DISTINGUISHED RECORD OF 164TH INFANTRY REGIMENT

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, North Dakotans are very proud of the long and distinguished record established by the 164th Infantry Regiment on many battlefields extending from the Philippine Islands in the Spanish American War, through France in World War I, and in the South Pacific during World War II. After World War II, although not fighting as a unit, its members also fought gallantly in Korea. This North Dakota National Guard unit established one of the greatest battle records of any military unit in World War II. It was the first U.S. Army unit to take the offensive during that war. This action took place on Guadalcanal.

One of the greatest casualties of the reorganization of the Armed Forces of the United States has been the abolishment of some military units which carried brilliant and proud records of service in many campaigns. This was such a unit. While these units may have been abolished, certainly their accomplishments will live on in the annals of our history.

The 164th Infantry Association is composed of former members of the 164th Infantry Regiment, not only from North Dakota, but from all over the United States. One of the most appreciated and treasured recognitions that has ever come to me was when the 164th Infantry Association made me an honorary member.

Mr. President, a very appropriate editorial about North Dakota's 164th Infantry, entitled "What Men Those Boys Were," was published in the Bismarck Tribune of October 16. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What Men Those Boys Were

"Jap Troops, Warships Launch Major Assault on Guadalcanal Base," read the banner headline in The Bismarck Tribune of Oct. 15, 1942.

By that time, the renewed battle there had been going on for two days, and many boys from Bismarck and other North Dakota communities were in the thick of it; but their folks back home couldn't know that.

Some time passed before anyone knew even that Army troops had joined in the Guadalcanal action, reinforcing the marines who had stormed ashore earlier and held onto prized Henderson airstrip with bulldog determination.

The men of North Dakota's 164th Infantry, reinforced in federal service by men from all over the country, waded ashore and got their baptism of fire that first night. The next day they moved into the Henderson field defensive perimeter and one of the bravest chapters in American military annals was started.

Later, the marines said they were so astounded at the way the 164th fought that they would be proud to claim it as part of the corps.

The soldiers from North Dakota, with their own high esprit de corps, returned the compliment. Marines, they felt, were good enough to be part of the 164th.

It wasn't quite accurate to say, as The Tribune did Friday, that the 164th was the first American army unit to go into battle in World War II. Others had beat them to that honor—but by fighting defensive actions.

Their distinction was to be the first American army unit to take offensive action in that war by helping to clear the Japanese out of Guadalcanal Island and start the long drive back to the Philippines and, eventually Japan.

Security was tight in those days. But eventually little facts, put together, led to the presumption that the 164th was on Guadalcanal.

Casualties, tardily reported, eventually made the presumption positive. The first to be reported was that of Lt. Frank G. Welch, a Bismarck boy who was an officer in Dickinson's company of the 164th. Then, one by one, came others, and eventually the list of those who died on that steaming jungle island was rich with the names of boys from North Dakota.

The 164th Infantry, North Dakota National Guard, is no more. A guard reorganization did away with it after decades of service including in the Philippines during the Spanish-American War and in France during World War I.

But the record of its service lives on, and no chapter in that record, or in any other military journal, can be brighter with bravery and victory than that which the 164th wrote on Guadalcanal. Twenty-five years later, the boys of 1942 are plump, balding, middle-aged men; but what men those boys—plucked from the high schools and the farms and the towns—were!

THE ABUSE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, nowadays we see all manner of actions perpetrated in the name of so-called civil disobedience or civil rights, or under the would-be protective cloak of the first amendment.

As a matter of fact, to some people's way of thinking, running into the streets, throwing Molotov cocktails, and destroying property are deemed ways to exercise freedom of expression or to petition the Government for a regress of grievances.

The illegal extremes to which these rights have been carried was very appropriately described in a tongue-in-cheek editorial published in the Wall Street Journal of October 16.

The editorial speaks for itself, and I believe accurately. I invite the attention of the Senate to it and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Precedent

The Supreme Court has agreed to review a lower court ruling that draft-card burning is a "symbolic act" protected as freedom of expression under the First Amendment. Should the ruling be upheld, it could prove precedent-setting. In fact, we can imagine:

Judge. John Doe, under charges filed July 17, 1987, you are accused of detonating dynamite to blow the right arm off the Statue of Liberty. Do you have anything to say for yourself?

Defendant. I was exercising my sacred right of dissent.

Judge. Well, this seems a little extreme to me.

Defendant. But I couldn't get anyone to pay attention to me any other way. Even after I picketed in Washington for 10 months, appeared on every national TV network, met with everyone in the Department of State and had three conferences with the President, they just wouldn't do as I say.

Judge. Even so, it just doesn't seem to me you you should go around dynamiting things.

Defendant. Freedom of Expression. Draft Card Ruling. First Amendment. Symbolic Act!

Judge. Er, Ah . . . case dismissed. Next case; Richard Roe, you are accused of arson in connection with the fire that destroyed the White House.

PREVIEWS OF TV PROGRAMS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission had occasion recently to endorse publicly the position of Jack Gould, the distinguished television critic of the New York Times, regarding a provocative policy: making available to his readers his assessment of television programs before they are broadcast. The occasion for Mr. Gould's experiment was the premiere program in the new and widely acclaimed "Bell Telephone Hour" series—"The Many Faces of Romeo and Juliet," on September 22.

Because such a procedure might contribute substantially to the size of audiences for programs of quality, this commendable experiment is worthy of extended study. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record both Mr. Gould's advance review and the report in a subsequent issue of the New York Times of Chairman Hyde's support of the television critic's position.

There being no objection, the review and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 22, 1967]

TV: A Soothing "Romeo and Juliet" Collage Opens "Bell Hour" Season on NBC Tonight

(By Jack Gould)

A soothing visual and aural collage of "Romeo and Juliet" in different artistic forms—stage readings, symphony compositions, opera, ballet and Broadway musical—will be the season's first "Bell Telephone Hour," to be presented over the network of the National Broadcasting Company tonight.

Many a viewer might eagerly settle for Claire Bloom alone as a radiant Juliet in a conventional stage version; her words have the wings of poetry and she exquisitely captures the poignancy of thwarted love in Verona. But that is not the form of "The Many Faces of Romeo and Juliet," and what will be offered this evening is nonetheless of interest on its own terms, a brisk illustration of how a classical theme can inspire contrasting craftsmen over many years.

The American Telephone and Telegraph Company, which last year adopted the attractive notion of bunching all commercials at a program's end to avoid intrusion in the continuity of the entertainment content, is trying this morning an older experiment that thus far has come to naught: allowing a critic to appraise a program before it goes on the air.

At the initiative of A.T.&T. this reviewer was invited to see a run-through of "The Many Faces of Romeo and Juliet" at a television screening at the utility's headquarters, 195 Broadway, on Wednesday with the express understanding that there would be no limitations on what subsequently might be written.

"The Many Faces of Romeo and Juliet" was not the first instance of a TV showing for advance reviewing. Many years ago the comedy "Harvey" was shown under such circumstances; Channel 13 tried the technique for almost a season and Channel 5 followed the procedure with isolated documentaries.

As someone else wrote earlier, the play is what matters, so the controversial intricacies of previewing can be momentarily deferred. "The Many Faces of Romeo and Juliet" to some extent reflects A.T.&T.'s traditional hopes that the "Bell Telephone Hour" can simultaneously appeal to a multiplicity of tastes, but in this instance a unifying theme takes the curse off such a fragmented format.

Miss Bloom and Jason Robards, who showed streaks of graying hair and a middle-aged rigidity that might contradict the popular image of Romeo, open the hour with a concert-style reading of the balcony scene to the background accompaniment of Berlioz's "Roméo et Juliet" Symphony and Tchaikovsky's "Romeo and Juliet Fantasy" Overture. The luminous face of Miss Bloom, with her subtle mastery of beguiling facial expressions, imparts enormous charm to Juliet's heart-rending soliloquies. In agonizingly brief close-ups she is captivating in her enduring youthfulness and understanding.

But her brief words turn out to be a bridge into the appearance of Erik Bruhn and Carla Fracci dancing with tender grace to the balcony scene to Prokofiev's "Romeo and Juliet" Scene 1. Thereafter Anna Moffo and Sandor Konya of the Metropolitan Opera sing the same scene in an excerpt from the Gounod opera. The closing sequence offers Carol Lawrence and Larry Kert in a repeat of their starring roles in "West Side Story," giving a modern version of the parting of lovers amid the environment of a tenement street. Against the preceding background of the other segments, Leonard Bernstein's "Tonight" acquires a haunting pertinency.

"The Many Faces of Romeo and Juliet," which was produced by Dan Lounsbery and directed by Clark Jones under the aegis of Henry Jaffe Enterprises, cannot be fairly divided into separate parts; it is the hour as a whole to which the viewer must surrender in restful and relaxed release from the noisy background of so much of today's TV.

Whatever a viewer's thoughts that one artistic concept in its entirety might have an edge over a compression of different formats, the "Telephone Hour" reflects a cultural approach of touching loveliness in compressing the program's various forms.

The reward is not so much a truly rounded production as an inventive suggestion of an enveloping mood that casts its own spell. The composite interpretation made its central point: that cross-fertilization of the arts goes on forever.

Apropos the experiment of reporting on programs the morning before their presentation, the American Broadcasting Company, the Columbia Broadcasting System and N.B.C., where one key executive made an authorized exception in the case of "The Bell Telephone Hour," reiterated yesterday their overall disapproval of such an arrangement.

The position of A.T. & T. is that a cultural undertaking needs the benefit of aroused audience curiosity if viewers are to tune in in the first place and be apprised of what not to miss. To know what to look for, the company says, could be a significant contribution to the long-range elevation of television.

The networks have a practical argument in rebuttal. A preview makes sense where reasonable judgment suggests the ensuing attention will be beneficial, but this does not diminish the larger risk. Critics for newspapers, press associations and weekly news magazines may turn thumbs down and thereby effect the size of the tune-in, a matter of overriding importance to sponsors eager to catch the mass audience.

Moreover, the networks argue, they lack the technical facilities to give TV critics across the country an equal opportunity to see shows for advance review, and the arrangement could also be an obstacle to last-minute changes or program pre-emptions. But basically the roadblock to advance reviewing is dollars and cents. The networks do not feel that they can have one policy for qualitative efforts and another for the potboilers in TV's schedule.

As a minimum journalistic service to readers, there is no gainsaying that advance reviews of TV shows, as in the instance of Broadway plays and books, would be helpful and constructive, but access to hits and not to flops clearly holds formidable perils, not to mention the massive expansion of personnel that would be required by both broadcasters and newspapers alike.

Presumably the day will come, if A.T. & T. is satisfied with its innovation and exerts an influence on other major corporate concerns. But last night the prospect of advance reviewing appeared as dark as ever.

The magnitude of TV makes critics of millions of set owners and separates the medium from Broadway, where a handful of aisle sitters can exert a life or death judgment. The superficial assumption that all media can be handled in the same manner is not substantiated in actual application.

The A.T. & T. experiment provided accommodations for a review by a single critic in an otherwise unoccupied room. The program was not projected on a misleading large screen with booming sound—it was shown on a conventional color TV receiver.

The restless viewer had the option of moving about without the hazard of disturbing others watching the show. The commercial announcements were included, a condition that does not always prevail under industry prescreening. Extraneous disturbances, if any, were less marked than might reasonably occur in a normal home, and the chairs were eminently comfortable.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 23, 1967]

TV Critic Previews Endorsed by FCC

The chairman of the Federal Communications Commission endorsed yesterday as a guide to public viewing the practice of allowing critics to write reviews of television programs prior to their broadcast.

The chairman, Rosel H. Hyde, commented on the practice at a news conference following his address to broadcasters at the year's opening luncheon of the International Radio and Television Society at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

His reference was to an experiment introduced earlier this week by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company that allowed TV critics to review in advance "The Many Faces of Romeo and Juliet." The program was televised last night on the National Broadcasting Company's "Bell Telephone Hour." Reviews of the program appeared prior to the telecast in yesterday's editions of The New York Times, The Washington Post and The Chicago Tribune.

The networks, despite the one exception, earlier reiterated their over-all disapproval of such an arrangement. They claimed the practice would limit their flexibility and asserted that the risk of unfavorable reviews would be too great.

SUPPORT EXPRESSED FOR JOB CORPS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, as a Senator from Minnesota, and as one who has had the opportunity and privilege of working closely on many programs of social importance with a longtime representative of Minnesota—the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States—I invite to the attention of Senators several items which are relevant to our discussion of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

These items include a series of letters received by the Vice President from a group of corporate executives who heartily endorse the Job Corps effort. Also included is a letter concerning the Job Corps program sent by Vice President Humphrey to the editor of the Minneapolis Tribune.

Mr. President, these letters represent excellent testimony to the widespread support which exists for the continuation of the Job Corps. I believe that Senators and other readers of the Record will find them both interesting and informative. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ann & Hope,
Cumberland, R.I., August 7, 1967.

Hon. Hubert Humphrey,
Vice President of the United States,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Vice President: I had the privilege of attending the meeting of the Mass Merchandising Research Foundation and the American Retail Federation with the Office of Economic Opportunity on July 26, 1967, and on the same day meeting with you and listening to your address concerning the Job Corps.

I learned a great deal that day. I must admit that previously I had many misconceptions regarding the Job Corps. I now know that the newspaper and magazine reports on the Job Corps I had previously read were not entirely accurate and, I am afraid, in some cases were deliberately misleading. Mr. Kelly, the Director of the Job Corps and his staff, and particularly the impressive young people who represented the membership of the Job Corps at this meeting helped me to see the Job Corps in an entirely new light. As a result, my feelings toward the Job Corps, previously rather luke warm, have completely changed. Now, individually, and as a member of the Mass Merchandising Research Foundation, I heartily endorse the Job Corps program. I sincerely believe that the Job Corps is a vital ingredient in the overall program to make useful and productive citizens of our disenfranchised Americans.

Again, may I express my personal appreciation to you for giving us of your valuable time and for your most inspiring message.

Respectfully yours,

Julius Blum,
General Manager.

Mammoth Mart, Inc.,
Brockton, Mass., August 2, 1967.

Hon. Hubert Humphrey,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Vice President: It was indeed a moving and thrilling experience for me to meet with you and Mr. Kelly in Washington on the 26th of this month, and may I thank you for the time that you gave to our retailing group.

I am sure that I share the views of all who were present when I say that we are in full support of the Job Corps Program, and in particular, we at Mammoth Mart will do our utmost to see that the program succeeds. Our employment roster runs in the neighborhood of 2,000 people and with the assistance of Mr. Kelly and Mr. Abe L. Marks, we will do whatever we can.

Once again, may I thank you for your time, as well as the memento of my visit to the office of the Vice President of the United States.

Sincerely,

Max Coffman, *President,*
Chairman of the Board.

Jamesway Corp.,
New York, N.Y., August 8, 1967.

The Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Vice President: As a representative of my Corporation, a chain of discount department stores, I was privileged to visit with you on Wednesday, July 26, 1967. This visit was with the Mass Merchandising Research Foundation Group concerning the Job Corps.

On behalf of myself and our organization, you can be certain that we fully support the efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity in relation to the Job Corps. I shall personally be happy to participate in a program designed to help place graduates of the Job Corps Centers in our industry.

Permit me again to express my thanks for your taking the time from your busy schedule to meet with our Group.

Respectfully yours,

Herbert Fisher,
President.

[From the Minneapolis Star, Aug. 22, 1967]

Humphrey on Job Corps

To the Editor:

The Minneapolis Star article of July 31 outlines the arduous process of "reach out" necessary to locate the hard core poverty girl. These are the disadvantaged, suspicious, rejected youth in whom must be engendered the motivation to help themselves by volunteering for the Job Corps. Their recruitment is not easy. But the situation is definitely improving.

The Women in Community Service (WICS) have pioneered a most difficult field of social endeavor. There is reason for them and all Americans who would serve our disadvantaged youth to be heartened. The Job Corps dropout rate is down: from 33 per cent who dropped out within 30 days in 1966 to 21 per cent in 1967. The dropout rate for girls who stayed less than 30 days is only 11 per cent in 1967. Job Corps youth are showing higher educational gains: 38 per cent completed senior and advanced training in 1966; 51 per cent in 1967. The WICS in following up the girls they recruit, have provided guidelines to improve Job Corps operation: permissiveness is out; a commitment executed by parents and youth for a 180-day stay at a center has been instituted to alleviate the initial homesick dropout lass.

The cost of $7,000 a full year at a Job Corps center compares favorably with the costs at a university like Harvard. These university costs stand over $10,000 when the contributions from endowment and alumni gifts are prorated per student for the 9-month academic year. Further, the Job Corps cost includes clothing; travel; pay and allowances for an enrollee's family; and the sometimes extensive medical and dental care these poverty youth require.

The struggles so graphically related in the Star are the growing pains of a new venture to provide in Job Corps centers what is probably a last chance for America's disadvantaged youth.

The Jobs Corps mission to recruit, train, and find employment for America's neglected youth will never be easy, but it is moving forward. The Job Corps centers are now successfully helping over 41,000 hard core poverty youth in 123 centers for men and women across the nation. The volunteer assistance of WICS in recruiting disadvantaged girls for the Women's Centers is appreciated.

WICS, representing 27,000,000 women across the country, not only screen and recruit, but also utilize community resources for girls who do not qualify or are unable to take the step to leave home. Because of the direct involvement of thousands of women in this work, communities all over the country are much more aware of the need to do something about young women in poverty. As leaders in their towns and cities, WICS have increased the awareness of others to this need and have sought to work out alternate solutions at the community level.

Every young woman contacted by the WICS benefits in some measure from their concern and interest.

Hubert H. Humphrey,
Vice-President.
Washington, D.C.

RABBI ABRAHAM J. FELDMAN

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, one of the leading rabbis of the Nation, Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, of Temple Beth Israel, West Hartford, Conn., has just announced his forthcoming retirement. Rabbi Feldman is a deeply religious man, a great spiritual and community leader. No worthwhile cause is beyond his active commitment. Not only his congregation, but the entire Connecticut community wishes him well in the years ahead. While he has earned his retirement, I know that he will always remain active for the good of mankind.

Personally, I wish Rabbi and Mrs. Feldman good health and happiness in the years ahead.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Hartford Times of October 16, 1967, and from the Hartford Courant of October 17, 1967, be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Hartford Times, Oct. 16, 1967]

Rabbi Feldman Retires

Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman works simultaneously at enough careers to keep a roomful of ordinary men busy full-time.

He is an editor, a teacher at two institutions of higher learning, chaplain of four organizations, a counsellor and lecturer, and a prolific author. He startled the congregation of Temple Beth Israel at a Yom Kippur service by announcing his decision to retire as its spiritual leader. "I've never had a day off," he said. "I want to observe the Sabbath as a member of the congregation."

Rabbi Feldman will of course continue to be—as he has always been—a stirrer of the pot in which things are cooking. He has been involved either immediately or more remotely in most of the progressive changes in the Greater Hartford community during his 43 years at Temple Beth Israel. His counsel is frequently sought and always valued by men and women on whom civic responsibility rests. His influence extends far beyond Connecticut, for his scholarship is widely recognized.

We wish Rabbi Feldman many happy and fruitful years. But retirement? Nonsense!

[From the Hartford Courant, Oct. 17, 1967]

Rabbi Feldman Plans for His Retirement

It hardly seems as if retirement were the word for what Rabbi Abraham Feldman has in mind. True, he has told his congregation at Temple Beth Israel that he would like to lay down the administrative duties he has borne there so notably for 43 years. And since in nearly four and a half decades he has never had a day off from them one way or another, one can understand that he will feel something of a load lifted from his shoulders when he steps down.

But retirement? Hardly. The Hartford community, Jewish and non-Jewish, knows there is too much dedication and vitality in the man for him to hide himself off somewhere and fold his hands in repose, however much it may be owing to him. Nor does the prospect that Rabbi Feldman has outlined for himself sound the least bit like retirement. He plans to continue preaching, lecturing, counseling. He has books to write. He still is a member of the board of every Jewish organization in Hartford. The Connecticut Jewish Ledger will still want its editor to continue in the post. He may step down from the pulpit, but he will also remain very helpful and actively in the community's midst.

Obviously the congregation at Temple Beth Israel is going to miss him acutely. In nearly a half century as its spiritual leader, Rabbi Feldman has witnessed the growth of the congregation from 225 to 1,500 member families. He has brought honor and distinction not only to himself but to the congregation for the outstanding role he has played both locally and in national Jewish life. He may rightfully observe that the intensification of religious and Jewish loyalties here has been most meaningful in his time. Thus the congregation of Temple Beth Israel may experience moments of melancholy at the thought of his relinquishing his longheld duties. But they, and the whole community of which he has been so wise, faithful and helpful a part, can take comfort in the fact he will not be far off when his counsel and effort are needed in the future. So, with cheerful as well as grateful hearts, Hartford may wish Rabbi Feldman joy in his richly-earned . . . u-h-h, what was that word again? Oh yes, retirement.

INSURANCE COMPANIES HELP IN GHETTO REHABILITATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the insurance giants of this country have offered America a most unusual tithe—the investment of $1 billion in housing located in the urban slums of our land. I ask permission to have inserted in the Record this editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune which addresses itself to the full meaning of this deeply patriotic decision.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Sept. 17, 1967]

Insurance Company Help Is a Welcome Ally

Decision by some of the country's 348 life insurance companies to pool one billion dollars of investment funds for use in ghetto rehabilitation illustrates again that government and private enterprise need not be deadly enemies. It particularly supplies moral support for the administration's most controversial antipoverty project, the 1967 rent supplement bill.

This is not the first time private business has operated alone or in partnership with federal and local government in solving public problems. It is one of the largest such joint undertakings in terms of funds dedicated to the task, however, and as such could signal a new U.S. trend in community awareness.

As reinforcement riding to rescue stricken rent supplements, the insurance company proposal should be doubly welcomed by President Johnson. The administration asked Congress this session for 40 million dollars to finance rent subsidies next fiscal year and the House of Representatives buried the item. Resurrection in the Senate was the last hope and things looked bleak until the insurance company plan appeared.

Although the one billion dollars is reportedly banked for other types of slum improvement and job-producing industrial loans, much is initially marked for projects creating federally-supplemented rental units. The rent subsidy has been attacked as an intrusion into the traditional home rental field. Except for welfare cases, taxpayers have never before been expected to help pay someone else's rent.

But, the insurance company offer accepts the rent supplement concept adding weight to support already given by the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

In going beyond mere acceptance of the proposition that American cities have problems requiring ambitious solutions, the insurance companies are offering to put their money up as well. The billion dollar contribution will neither obviate federal housing expenditures nor alleviate all ghetto conditions calling for Uncle Sam's aid. It will augment federal public housing funds, allowing them to stretch farther. As for other demands, there are currently two 10-year programs being advanced on Capitol Hill by urban congressmen, civil rights, labor and religious groups with price tags ranging from 185 to 300 billion dollars.

Obviously, appeals for funds to battle inadequate education, unemployment, poor health, crime and slum living will continue. It is at least heartening to see more of the private capital sector enlisting against the allies of civil unrest and disorder.

ONLY SENIOR STUDENTS SHOULD BE TAUGHT DRUG THERAPY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from an eminent physician in Milwaukee, Dr. Adolph L. Natenshon, who has corroborated several points made during the course of the investigation into prescription drug prices by the Senate Monopoly Subcommittee.

Dr. Natenshon, who has been in active practice for 28 years and has engaged in clinical investigation of new drugs for leading manufacturers, stated that when a student becomes a junior or senior in medical school, he has forgotten practically all he learned in his sophomore year about pharmacology, prescription writing, and materia medica.

As the result, the drug company detail man becomes the largest single source of knowledge for the doctor regarding therapy and drugs.

Dr. Natenshon makes the point that continuing education for the doctor is of utmost necessity. According to his statement:

> It is practically impossible for any physician to keep up with new drugs which have been appearing on the market at the rate of at least one new drug a day for the last ten years.

He suggests that the pharmaceutical manufacturers could contribute to a special fund to be used for special courses in therapeutics, prescription writing, and modern therapy.

Although I feel that a much greater effort would be needed, I think that Dr. Natenshon's statement should be called to the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Natenshon's article, which appeared in the April 1961 New Medical Materia, entitled "Only Senior Students Should Be Taught Drug Therapy," inserted in the Record at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Only Senior Students Should Be Taught Drug Therapy

(By Adolph L. Natenshon, M.D.)

In many medical schools today, students are taught pharmacology, prescription writing, and materia medica in the sophomore or second year. The result is that when they come in contact with actual patients in their junior and senior years—when they have occasion to use the information in a practical way—they have virtually forgotten it.

During internship and residency, drug therapy and prescription writing do not constitute too great a problem, because usually the young doctors go along with the drugs that are being used by the attending physicians.

However, when the new men go out into practice, whether as specialists or as general practitioners, the majority cannot write a simple prescription—and they are at a loss to treat such simple matters as nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, and many other common conditions which they did not have to contend with in hospital work. These common conditions make up a great part of the practice of any physician, involving patients seen either in the office or in the home.

As a result, much of what the doctor learns about therapy and drugs he must learn from the detail man.

At present, we are all very much interested in medical education and in the great need for scientists. We realize that most schools are going into the red, and require additional funds to operate. This problem can be solved rather easily. Pharmaceutical manufacturers could contribute to a special fund—to be used to hire physicians to teach courses in therapeutics, prescription writing, and modern therapy to senior students in all medical schools. These teachers should be physicians who are in actual practice, and are familiar with modern drug therapy.

THEY'D KNOW HOW TO WRITE

The result would be that, when the students went into practice, they would know how to write prescriptions. They would understand drugs, know when to use them, and would practice a much higher type of medicine.

This would be of great benefit to pharmaceutical manufacturers, as the doctors would make more use of drugs. It would save the manufacturers a great deal of money in the promotion and sale of new drugs, and there would be less incorrect usage of drugs. Moreover, it would help the general public, which would be receiving a much improved type of treatment and medical care.

The idea of manufacturer-financed courses could even be carried a step farther, into the field of postgraduate education. Short courses in modern drug therapy could be given at medical meetings, especially those attended by general practitioners.

In this manner, a physician could brush up on his drug therapy, and keep abreast of all of the new drug preparations. He would carry away with him from these meetings a great deal of practical knowledge about pharmaceuticals and pharmacology which he could use in his own practice.

At present, it is almost impossible for any physician to keep up with the new drugs which have been appearing on the market at the rate of at least one new drug a day for the last ten years. Moreover, the quantity of medical literature is so abundant that no busy physician can read more than a small portion of it, and in most cases he has to resort to abstracted material.

UNFAIR CRITICISM OF SECRETARY RUSK

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the enraged cries we have heard accusing Secretary Rusk of raising the "yellow peril" question in his news conference last Thursday do no service to Rusk, to our Nation's policies, to the truth or, for that matter, to those who counter the Secretary with such verbal abuse.

Secretary Rusk used no such words as "yellow peril" in his news conference. What he did do, however, was point out that it is Asia and the vast human resources it contains which is at stake today in Vietnam. These, he said, are worth fighting for. To a very real extent, our willingness to fight for them has made a considerable difference already, as has been eloquently testified to by Lee Kwan Yey, the Prime Minister of Singapore, by whose presence we are today graced.

The Wall Street Journal commented today upon what it called the "name-calling peril" which has arisen in the days following Secretary Rusk's news conference, observing:

> The peril the Secretary rightly or wrongly sees in Maoist China is essentially the same threat to American security posed by Hitler Germany or Stalinist Russia. Yellowness doesn't have anything inherent to do with it, and incidentally, Redness doesn't either.

Denying the peril, as Crosby Noyes wrote in last evening's Washington Star, "amounts to a bland denial of the fact that every country on the periphery of China—and a number of others besides—has felt the weight of Chinese militancy and political expansionism." The column of William S. White in this morning's Washington Post adds:

> Every colored nation which is under the gun in Southeast Asia—not to mention white Australia and New Zealand—very clearly sees a very real Red Chinese, and not a "yellow" peril to its safety.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal editorial and the columns by Mr. Noyes and Mr. White be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 18, 1967]

The Name-Calling Peril

"The Yellow Peril," snorts James Reston in response to Secretary of State Rusk. It's too bad the remark pretty much typifies the rebuttals to Mr. Rusk's argument that America fights in Vietnam to enhance its own security against an eventual threat from Communist China. For there are intelligent things to say on both sides of that proposition.

The peril the Secretary rightly or wrongly sees in Maoist China is essentially the same threat to American security posed by Hitler Germany or Stalinist Russia. Yellowness doesn't have anything inherent to do with it, and incidentally, Redness doesn't either.

The peril arises when any great nation—yellow or purple, Communist dictatorship or Druid theocracy—has convinced itself that it cannot tolerate the international status quo, and that it can rearrange matters to its own satisfaction through force. The peril is that such a state, unless it is disabused of the incendiary notion that force will succeed, will sooner or later precipitate a global war the U.S. will be unable to ignore.

Secretary Rusk's argument is that even though mainland China has no troops in South Vietnam, its ardor for expanding its ideology through insurgency would be damped somewhat by U.S. success there and would be encouraged dangerously by U.S. failure there. Other intended victims of Communist insurgency, moreover, will take or lose heart depending on the outcome of such insurgency in Vietnam. The issue has been put with enviable precision by J. R. Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post:

"The world is watching Vietnam to see if the rulers of one country, state sovereignty or territory, at an endurable risk and a bearable price, can impose a government and system of their choice on a neighboring people by inciting internal subversion, supporting indigenous insurrection, engaging in infiltration and intervening and invading as necessary. . . . The United States has intervened to make the price unbearable and the risk not endurable."

This line of reasoning can be opposed without resort to ridicule. Some experts on Asia, for instance, quite rationally argue that despite China's ranting about world revolution, its actual aims are limited and pose no threat to U.S. security even in the long run. But China's actual actions in foreign affairs can be called cautious only in comparison with its belligerent propaganda. Its actions in Korea, Tibet and India were hardly restrained by the standards of peaceful states. As it develops its nuclear arsenal, its leaders will probably feel in much better position to match deeds with words.

A more persuasive line of rebuttal, we think, would stress the limits not of China's intentions but of its capabilities. The recent capture and killing of Che Guevara provides one dramatic piece of evidence that exporting "wars of liberation" is after all not an easy task.

Insurgent war could be easily exported to South Vietnam because the Communists had captured the indigenous national sentiment during and just after World War II, because they had actually occupied the land during the war against the French and thus could leave behind arms and priceless trained cadre, because in South Vietnam an anti-Communist government had to be cut from whole cloth.

So how does it serve U.S. security to oppose Communist insurgency on this particular battlefield, the last spot on the globe where communism still rides the waves of World War II? By repairing to a more favorable line, would not it have been possible to check China's ideological expansionism with far less drain on world-wide arrangements for American security? Even today we must weigh the cost of the war; success in one theater is worth only so much.

That is the most persuasive rebuttal to Secretary Rusk we can think of, but it hardly leaves us without doubt. It is easier to cite the disadvantages of drawing a line in Vietnam than to defend the alternate choice of Thailand, India or the Philippines. And if the U.S. could have withdrawn from Vietnam without fatal cost in 1954 or 1963, by now its commitment is so unmistakable that the most graceful withdrawal could well strike a psychological blow that would make the next battlefield still more untenable.

The ambiguity of arguments on both sides of the security issue, one starts to sense, is why the Administration delayed so long in stressing it, and also why its critics now respond mostly with name-calling and other emotionalisms. Each side sees a different set of contingencies, but neither feels confident it can convince anyone the set it sees is the more likely one.

Yet there is no certainty this side of the grave, and someone must decide. The issue is an inconclusive one of probability, but that is no excuse for avoiding the relevant arguments.

The Administration has finally done its part to center the argument where it belongs, on national security. Its opponents will start to do their part when they concede that while Secretary Rusk's fears over that security may be mistaken, they are neither foolish nor fanciful.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 17, 1967]

War Critics Told Asia at Stake in Vietnam

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Criticism of Secretary of State Dean Rusk's recent strong statement on Vietnam is just about what might have been expected. The liberals—assuming the term applies—have taken refuge in their own private credibility gap. The reaction, in essence, is:

"This is all very well. We admire your eloquence and obvious conviction. But we simply don't believe you."

What the liberals disbelieve in particular is that there is any threat to American security in Asia, and especially in Vietnam, which justifies the price of the war there. Rusk has failed, they say, to prove his contention that China is bent on the conquest of Asia.

The liberals are equally unconvinced, apparently, by Rusk's argument that American power in Asia is an essential ingredient to the goal of establishing a stable peace in that part of the world.

This chronic disbelief is in itself incredible, in the face of the evidence. It amounts to a bland denial of the fact that every country on the periphery of China—and a number of others besides—has felt the weight of Chinese militancy and political expansionism. It simply ignores the fact that in most cases where direct pressures have been exerted, American power, directly or indirectly applied, has been the deciding factor of successful resistance.

This was true, certainly, in Korea in the early 1950's. It was true of the Communist threat aimed at Taiwan and the Philippines during the same period. It was true in Malaysia, where British power was ultimately successful in overcoming a Communist-inspired "war of national liberation." It was true in Indonesia, where a forceful Communist takeover would almost certainly not have been averted except for the American presence in Vietnam.

It is true today in Laos, Thailand and Burma—all of which have Communist-led insurrections on their hands. It is, in fact, highly improbable that there would be any non-Communist governments in Southeast Asia today if American security guarantees—backed by American power—had been withdrawn from the area a decade ago.

Nor is this purely a question of Chinese militancy, real as it is. The truth is that China is the preponderant military and political power in southern Asia.

Without the counterbalancing force of American commitments, there would be no need for direct military conquest. A leader like Singapore's Lee Kwan Yew—who is certainly no "client" of the United States—admits publicly that the sudden withdrawal of American power would leave him with no alternative to an accommodation with Peking—on Peking's terms.

Without firm security guarantees there is no assurance that any other country—including Japan—would feel very differently.

But even if all this were admitted, there is an impression that the liberals would still be unconvinced of the validity and the necessity of the American commitment to Asia. Where, they ask, is the threat to the United States whether Asia is dominated by communism or not?

Where indeed? The discussion has been considerably muddied by well-meaning but unconvincing talk of "strategic frontiers" and "front lines" of security that must not be breached.

In terms of global strategy, these concepts are hopelessly dated. The only thing which could pose a serious threat to the security of the United States today would be a drastic shift in the over-all balance of world power. Such a strategic shift in favor of a system essentially hostile to our own is something which this country cannot afford to permit, as long as it has the power to prevent it.

Power, furthermore, is not necessarily a matter of weapons or economic strength. It can be measured equally in terms of human resources, and these are what is at stake in Asia.

Many years ago, the United States decided that it could not afford to let the economic potential of Western Europe fall under Communist control. It has now decided that Asia's human resources—representing two-thirds of the human race—are equally well worth fighting for.

This, in essence, is what Rusk was saying last week. And whether the liberals believe it or not, this is what is really at stake in Vietnam.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1967]

Indonesia Seen as Dividend on Strong Policy in Vietnam

(By William S. White)

Indonesia, which only yesterday lay open to the shadow of Asian communism, has now effectively broken all relations with Red China.

Thus sealed beyond doubt is a counter-victory for the anti-Communist world so immense—since Indonesia is the sixth largest nation on this globe—as to be all but comparable to the tragic loss to that world of mainland China a generation ago.

This historic overturn, moreover, could not conceivably have been possible had not the United States persisted through three presidential administrations with its pledge not to let the cornerstone of Southeast Asia fall to Communist aggression in Vietnam.

Determined resistance in Vietnam demonstrably shored up those forces which have at last expelled the Chinese shadow from Indonesia. American weakness in Vietnam would, in equally undeniable truth, have strangled the anti-Communist counter-revolution in Indonesia.

But who can hear of Indonesia now amid the shrill clamors of a bitter minority which seeks at any cost to discredit that policy in Vietnam? The peaceniks, the soft-liners, have other things to speak of. And they have men, as well as policies, to destroy.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk recently tried to explain that a Chinese colossus publicly pledged to Asianwide and even worldwide aggression is a fearful fact of life which America really cannot ignore. And what is the consequence of this brazen effort to answer the endless attacks on the peacenik minority?

The reply is the most savage of the sneer-smear techniques, the huckster-slogans, yet hurled by men whose "right to dissent" is being so cruelly suppressed that even the draft-dodgers they encourage are sometimes actually arrested for attempting physically to obstruct the induction of other young men willing to fight for their country.

The new line is that Rusk, in exercising his elementary duty to explain the policy considerations of the Government, is raising the shabby banner of a "Yellow Peril" in Asia. This is sneer and smear, indeed. For, of course, the term "Yellow Peril" was disreputable a lifetime ago. The term was not remotely used by Rusk in the first place, nor is it remotely relevant to his case.

By innuendo, this man who under cruel beating from the left is attempting to save colored people in Asia from invasion and murder is himself made into an anti-yellow racist.

It does not matter to the peaceniks that every colored nation which is under the gun in Southeast Asia—not to mention white Australia and New Zealand—very clearly sees a very real Red Chinese, and not a "yellow," peril to its safety. It does not matter that Australia and New Zealand even now are thus increasing their troop commitments to Vietnam. It does not matter that the distinctly left-wing, and not right-wing, and undeniably dark, and not light, Prime Minister of Singapore is even now in Washington to testify that the Red Peril is Red indeed and present indeed.

No, it is not a Yellow Peril here; but it is something else. It is yellow journalism at its yellowest. It is to treat a somber exposition of world realities by the honorable official charged to conduct a foreign policy with a form of verbal abuse that lies on the intellectual level of a television commercial for mouth-wash.

CAMP FOGARTY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently it was my honor to be present at a ceremony renaming a Rhode Island Seabee base in honor of Rhode Island's distinguished late Congressman, John E. Fogarty. The naming of a Seabee camp in honor of Congressman Fogarty is particularly appropriate, as he was Rhode Island's best known and best loved Seabee.

Mr. President, while on the subject of the Seabees, I would like to point out that this year marks the 25th anniversary of the Seabees. Rhode Island takes particular pride in being the home State of this remarkable part of our military establishment. The Seabees have been active in every military engagement in which the United States has been involved since their creation in the Second World War. They are now actively involved in the present Vietnam conflict, where not only are they engaged in their traditional role of large building projects and supporting the Marines, but are also operating in small 14-man Seabee teams that work as completely independent units. As anyone who knows the Seabees would expect, this new development has been highly successful.

All in all, these Seabees are carrying on in the "can do" philosophy that is the Seabees motto and giving validity to the famous World War II Seabee expression, "The difficult we do immediately, the impossible takes a little longer."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission to insert two excellent recent articles, one on Camp Fogarty and one on the Seabees, from the Providence Journal into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal]

Name Becomes Camp Fogarty

The Sun Valley military training area on Route 2 in East Greenwich was renamed

Camp Fogarty yesterday in honor of the late Congressman John E. Fogarty.

More than 1,000 persons, including military and civilian officials, were present as Mrs. John E. Fogarty, the congressman's widow, unveiled a bronze plaque mounted in his memory on a 38-ton granite rock.

Rep. Robert L. F. Sikes, D-Fla. the principal speaker, and Rear Adm. Alexander C. Husband, USN, commander of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command in Washington, D.C., assisted Mrs. Fogarty in the ceremonies.

In his speech, Mr. Sikes said it is fitting this year, the Seabees' 25th anniversary, that a Seabee installation be named in honor of the member of "Rhode Island's best known and best liked Seabee veteran." Mr. Fogarty was a Seabee in World War II.

Admiral Husband, who represented the Secretary of the Navy, paid a brief tribute to the late congressman and ended by saying: "John E. Fogarty, we salute you."

Capt. John D. Burkey, commanding officer of the Construction Battalion Center at Davisville, said "it is most fitting that this new, enlarged military training area should be called Camp Fogarty in memory of the former Seabee who helped make it possible."

Others who spoke in tribute were Senators John O. Pastore and Claiborne Pell and Representatives Fernand J. St Germain and Robert O. Tiernan. Lt. Gov. Joseph H. O'Donnell Jr., representing Governor Chafee, also spoke.

The granite boulder rests in the center of a 50-foot circular area with light colored paving bricks and a two-foot red brick wall around it. The bricks were donated and laid by Local 1 of the Bricklayers and Masons Union. Mr. Fogarty always was proud of his start as bricklayer when a young man.

The memorial also includes a flagpole constructed by the Davisville Seabees, which flies a flag that has flown over the Capitol in Washington. Planters, containing native Rhode Island trees, line the entrance to the memorial. One of them has the name Guam, where the late congressman served with the Fifth Naval Construction Brigade.

At the ceremonies with Mrs. Fogarty was her daughter, Mary Louise. Other members of the family present were Dr. T. Francis Fogarty, Raymond Fogarty, William Fogarty and Charles Fogarty, the late congressman's brothers, and Miss Margaret A. Fogarty, his sister.

Among other officials present were U.S. Rep. Michael J. Kirwan, D-Ohio; Rear Adm. Frederick E. Janney, USN, of the office of the Chief of Naval Operations, and Maj. Gen. Leonard B. Holland, state adjutant general.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Sunday Journal, Sept. 3, 1967]

After 25 Years, It's Still "Can Do!"

(By Rudolph Hempe)

For 25 years, Seabees have been clearing, digging, planning, building and fighting—and they show no signs of tiring. What the aging and experienced can doers did on South Pacific Islands during World War II is being done now by their young and skilled successors in Vietnam.

And when the World War II and Vietnam Seabee veterans gather next Friday through Sunday for a Silver Anniversary reunion at Davisville, the inevitable exchange of war tales will no doubt have a marked similarity, many with only dates and places changed. For the Seabee today, despite the vast changes in peace and war over the last 25 years, is basically the same as his predecessor: a man with a rifle in one hand and a hammer in the other.

The Seabees were born in World War II out of desperate need. Before the war, the American military largely employed civilian workers under contract to build its bases outside the continental United States, especially on American-held Pacific islands.

But the ease with which the Japanese captured the islands pointed up the fact that civilian construction workers were not able to, nor could they be made to, defend the works they built. American military experts foresaw a long war characterized by extensive, specialized construction in dangerous combat areas. The need for construction workers in military units was apparent.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, the first contingent of 250 Seabees (whose name was derived subsequently from C.B. for Construction Battalion) was ordered trained. It wasn't long before whole-scale recruitment was underway.

There were "no brightly colored posters, no inspiring fanfares or magnetic slogans" to entice men to joint the Seabees, recalled one naval historian. Instead there was the almost certain promise of miserable climates, near-impossible projects and deadlines, and lots of hard work for low pay.

But they signed up: a sprinkling of young men but the vast majority experienced construction workers, some even with grandchildren.

The average age of Seabees in World War II was 35 and a popular Marine quip in the South Seas was "Don't insult a Seabee He's probably some Marine's father."

Small Seabee training camps mushroomed throughout the country and Rhode Island entered the picture in early 1942 when construction started on Camp Endicott. Camp Thomas, better known in those days as an Advance Base Depot, was constructed adjacent to it. The sites of both camps are now encompassed into what is known today as the Davisville Naval Construction Battalion Center.

Most of the first Seabees went into war areas with only a passing knowledge of how to use the small arms they carried. As a result, the Seabees came to rely heavily on protection provided by Marines, since the latter were usually first ashore, followed by Seabees on their equipment.

A firm bond grew between the two services. When a Seabee unit ordered supplies, often the order would be 10 percent in excess—for the Marines. The Seabees were thankful for the protection and the Marines were grateful for the roads, hospitals and galleys that made their miserable job a little easier.

The World War II Seabee was pictured as a grizzled, muscled, cigar-chomping miracle worker who could out-work any 10 men and out-curse an equal number of Marines. Nowhere in historical accounts, official or otherwise, is he pictured as an heroic soldier. He wasn't intended to be. In fact even Seabee veterans who are prone to amplify their deeds during the war, will not attempt to attribute any great measure of military proficiency to themselves.

"They sure used up a helluva lot of ammunition but I doubt they ever hit anything," commented one Pacific observer.

But when it came to building, no one would deny them credit. Within days after an initial assault, a South Seas island could be transformed into a strategic airfield. In many instances Seabees moved tons of crushed coral for surfacing runways while several hundreds yards away, Marines were fighting the enemy. Often while constructing facilities, Seabees would see enemy planes bomb and strafe their projects, destroying in minutes that which they built in hours.

Seabees also lent authenticity to the countless tales of American ingenuity that evolved out of the war. They showed how oil drums could be fashioned into everything from drainage pipes and shower facilities to washing machines and roofing material. While no official naval historians mention it, other observers recorded that the versatile oil drum also provided material for the essential components of some rather sophisticated stills.

Other stories are of how Seabees fashioned electrical condensers from the foil of cigarette packs, electrical insulators from beer bottles (empty of course) and radiators from ammunition boxes.

Perhaps most impressed, and at the same time perturbed, by Seabee ingenuity were new arrivals in war areas who paid goodly sums for "authentic" native grass skirts and jewelry and for Japanese battle souvenirs "just captured at the other end of the island"—when a close look would reveal some impressive Seabee manufacturing techniques.

In the postwar years, the Seabee force declined to about 2,000. The smaller camps were closed but the facility at Davisville, plus a few others, hung on.

The Korean War reversed the decline rate even though only one unit, an Amphibious Construction Battalion, saw action in the conflict.

After Korea, the Seabees grew slowly but it took a difficult and serious involvement in Vietnam to spur the real growth—a 600 per cent increase in force in the last two years to a total of 22,000 men.

Instead of small camps all over the country, the Seabees now have three training areas; Port Hueneme, California; Gulfport, Mississippi, and Davisville, which is the largest. Gulfport operates under the Atlantic Command, located at Davisville.

As in World War II, the increase in manpower needed for Vietnam prompted military officials to recruit pre-skilled men whenever possible. High ratings were offered to men with well-established civilian skills.

But the noticeable difference between today's Seabees and those of 25 years ago is the age. The majority entering Seabee ranks are about draft age and while the younger enlistees have perhaps less experience in construction than their World War II predecessors, the average Seabee has a higher achievement in education.

Another big change is the military proficiency of today's Seabees. Unhampered by the overnight emergency needs of World War II, Seabees today have more time for military training not only at Davisville and Sun Valley in East Greenwich but with the Marines as well.

Their equipment is the most modern available in construction work and there are even a surprising number who claim the food is good.

Their mission in Vietnam is essentially the same as it was in the South Pacific—support the Marines and build.

Near Danang, whole cities have sprung from the sand. Depots, airstrips, hospitals, water towers, electrical systems and other projects are on their list of accomplishments.

As in World War II, Seabees have had their casualties—one of them earning the Medal of Honor for his action.

And while battalions of Seabees (about 800 men in each battalion) are tackling the big jobs, small units, called Seabee teams, are performing the necessary small ones in Vietnamese hamlets and villages.

In fact, the Seabee teams are exemplary of the diversification now becoming apparent within the Seabee force.

Each team consists of 14 handpicked men including one officer. Team members have differing skills but are trained as a unit which is completely self-contained.

The teams are sent to outlying areas of Vietnam or Thailand to help unskilled and uneducated villagers to help themselves. If a village needs a well, the team builds it. At the same time, villagers are instructed in the procedure in the hope they will be able to help themselves next time. Instruction is given on simple hand tools rather than heavy machinery since there is no chance of a small village having use of a bulldozer.

In another kind of diversification, Construction Battalion 201, also at Davisville, specializes in Antarctic operations.

Each year the unit is deployed to the frozen continent to aid and support the continuing U.S. scientific effort there. To accomplish the difficult construction projects in the hostile terrain, the men are specially trained. While most of them spend the so-called Antarctic summer on the Ice when weather permits outdoor construction, a detachment usually "winters over" as well. Through the efforts of the unit, the earth's last frontier is finally being made more comfortable with the construction of modern buildings and utilities. But essentially the jobs that were done when the Seabees first made their mark in the Pacific are still being done today. And as far as most members are concerned, Seabees will be around for tomorrow's jobs as well—as long as they can say with pride and honesty, as they have for the first 25 years, "We do the difficult immediately. The impossible takes a little longer."

JOHN A. MAHAN, STAMFORD, CONN., PRINCIPAL, WRITES ON PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I recently received a very impressive paper on some basic problems of education from a constituent, Mr. John A. Mahan, assistant principal at Rogers Elementary and Junior High School in Stamford, Conn.

Mr. Rogers has also taught in schools in "disadvantaged areas" for 11 years and he is vitally concerned with the manner in which educational skills are taught. His paper, "Reflections on Possible Approaches to Learning Problems of Children," is imaginative and stimulating. It deserves widespread attention, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFLECTIONS ON POSSIBLE APPROACHES TO LEARNING PROBLEMS OF CHILDREN

(By John A. Mahan, February 14, 1967)

Educators nowadays speak frequently of educating the "whole child." However, this concept has been honored mainly in the breach. At several periods in the history of man, we have been much closer to the ideal—for example: in Ancient Greece, and Europe of the Renaissance. The age of the specialist is upon us, and we have a swarm of therapists and examiners scrutinizing the child. All too often, unfortunately, these people see the child solely in terms of their own discipline. Each of these disciplines can make a valuable contribution to the growth of a child with learning problems. However, it requires a broader view of the child and the basis of his problems to fit these aids into a program which might have a better chance of success.

Yet, oddly enough, despite the increasing numbers of highly skilled specialists, the classroom teacher encounters a depressingly large number of children who are achieving at a low level. Though we may make searching psychological evaluations and employ the efforts of remedial teachers, counselors, social workers, including psychiatric and psychological help, we still encounter children of normal intelligence who keep falling further behind each year in achievement in the basic skills. It is even more disheartening to scan a permanent record card and observe the steady drop in I.Q. score of a bright child—often as much as twenty to thirty points from Grade 2 to Grade 8. Why?

Several possibilities may exist. Are the schools failing the child? Are we dealing with a different type of child? Or can it be that we fail to recognize some of the problems which hinder learning? I feel that the latter alternative is the most likely and the one most responsive to improvement. It is often said that educational practice lags twenty-five years behind research and experimentation. Despite the vast improvement in mass communication, one comes to feel that the gap grows ever wider rather than smaller. Some of the information in these pages is already known, in some cases, for many years.

Let's look at what seems to be standard practice in most schools when a child is noticeably in difficulty in school. Usually a psychological evaluation is made, using various test instruments, and incorporating observations from his teachers. The resulting diagnosis gives a sharp and detailed picture of a troubled child. The weak point in current practice is the paucity of recommendations for coping with the problems enumerated.

Sometimes the recommendations seem inappropriate to the problem. Remedial helps, psychotherapy and counseling by social workers all have their place. But, too often they are recommended almost automatically. It seems almost as if the phrase "emotional block" has captured us so completely that we feel that all learning problems can be solved by psychiatric measures. In many cases, prolonged help of this type results in no appreciable benefit to the child. In the meantime, identifiable physical problems have gone unidentified and uncorrected. Let us, then, consider briefly several types of approach to recognizing and helping such children.

A. DEVELOPMENTAL STATUS OR READINESS

First, and possibly of paramount importance is the developmental status of the child. We wouldn't "send a boy to do a man's job", but we frequently impose tasks on children which are beyond their capacity. Furthermore, in our school entrance and placement policies, it would appear that we assume that all children entering school are at approximately the same level of development. Any parent, or anyone who deals with small children knows that this is not so. It is now generally accepted, for instance, that upon entering Kindergarten, boys are usually six months behind girls in development. Yet we make no provision for this difference in establishing school entry date.

Furthermore, each child develops according to his own timetable! We can intervene successfully only to a limited extent. Some children may need two, or even three, years of Kindergarten before being ready for Grade I, in spite of the fact that they may have a very high I.Q. This very concept of "readiness" is one which we bandy about a good deal, but in practice we do little to provide for it in the school set-up. Several school systems such as Cheshire, Conn., Visalia, Cal., Jefferson City, Mo., and Rutland, Vt., are making use of the research information bearing on this issue. Children entering Kindergarten are screened and grouped according to developmental, rather than chronological age. This has worked out very well. The Kindergarten teachers find it much easier to work with a class in which the behavioral level is more homogeneous, and the children themselves respond better with their own developmental age group. Such a program can be established with little expense.

Closely allied with this developmental attitude is a concern for the safe-guarding and improvement of a child's visual skills. Much more could be said on this topic alone. The author's experience has convinced him that many of the problems of children with learning difficulties are directly traceable to unresolved visual problems. In this simple statement there is a hard kernel of very bitter truth. Most visual examinations are at best, inadequate, while the Snellen eye-test used in schools is a snare and a delusion. A child may have what we describe as 20/20 vision—that is, he can see the letters on a chart 20 feet away, which he should see. But he does not read at 20 feet—he reads at no more than 20 inches and this is the area wherein the child often experiences trouble. A child with 20/20 vision at 20 feet, may have 20/40 or even 20/80 effective vision when he is working at a visual distance of less than 2 feet. The tragedy is that a routine eye examination often does not search out this area. An examination which does not go further than the 20/20 finding is valueless to such a child.

There are still subtler complications involving vision. In some instances children when tested show the proper visual acuity at near and far distances but can only focus for a short period of time on near materials. After 15 or 20 minutes they are unable to concentrate on the reading material. They become restless and fidgety. Parents, teachers and counselors describe them as lazy and unmotivated, when actually the child is blameless. Of quite another sort is the visual problems besetting the child who seems to have no biological reference point establishing left and right in his mind. He constantly gets his directionality mixed up. Games like "Simon Says" confuse him. He is forever reading things backwards, even seeing single letters reversed. Thus "b" is read as "d", or even "p". He reads *was* for *saw*, *no* for *on*. In arithmetic he is often scolded for "carelessness". When he reads numbers, 34 becomes 43. When he copies from the board or from his book he reverses—481 becomes 184.

Routine visual examinations will do little for the problems we have described. Fortunately there is a growing awareness of the contribution of such research centers as the Gesell Institute of Child Development in New Haven, Conn., the Optometric Center in New York City, and the Optometric Extension Group in Oklahoma. They give us a clearer insight into the visual problems of children as they affect the development of their minds and bodies, and as they affect their performance in school.

B. NEUROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION

A child's neuorological organization also can markedly affect his scholastic achievement. The problem of dyslexia belongs in this category. Sometimes it is called mixed dominance, or mixed laterality. While some children with this problem learn to read well and acquire language skills, many of them experience such difficulty as almost to appear retarded. Yet when tested with an individual I.Q. test, not dependent on reading, they prove to have normal, and sometimes superior intelligence.

The Sept. 27, 1962 issue of The New Yorker describes such a case in detail. The remedy described was *intensive remedial work in phonics* based on techniques evolved by Dr. Orton, Anna Gillingham and also Romalda Spaulding. This must be done on an individual basis for a period of 2 or 3 years. However, a relatively new approach worked out by Glenn Doman and Carl Delacato, when followed faithfully, can achieve results in a much shorter period of time. Their work originally began with brain-damaged children. In the course of this work they saw astonishing growth in the areas of language and reading. When these techniques were applied to children with reading problems, the same remarkable results were achieved, with children with mixed dominance. The Doman-Delacato techniques for improving reading ability are based on the premise that the stages of development are sequential. If anyone of them is skipped, the child's neurological organization will be adversely affected. Many skills and abilities will not emerge when they should, and to the level that they should. While some people may find it possible to disagree with the theoretical bases of this approach, it is very difficult indeed to dismiss the results they have achieved with children who have failed previously, time after time, in breaking the reading barrier.

One point of the Doman-Delacato method,

it appears to the author, has a special but almost unnoticed significance in the effort to aid the disadvantaged child. A key principle in the D-D system is that the young child must be given the freedom to move, to crawl, to creep and eventually to walk. In the crowded slum environment this is seldom possible. There is limited opportunity for such mobility, on top of much visual auditory and vocal deprivation. Before these children even reach kindergarten, they are already neurologically disadvantaged, as well as culturally, and the human deficit increases with each year of schooling. Applications of the Doman-Delacato principles and their approach to learning through the sequential steps of motor learning and neurological organization seem worth a serious trial to see what can be done. The techniques do not require elaborate equipment and so much could be done to assist these children at comparatively little expense per child. Surely, if children can be helped who have severe brain damage, then it seems that there is hope for those whom we describe as disadvantaged.

C. THE ROLE OF STRESS

There is still another problem confronting today's child and we pay far too little attention to it. It is the *stress* which we are placing on youngsters. Today there is an increasing emphasis on academic achievement beginning even in the very early years of school. Often, bright youngsters are pushed beyond their limits. Is it any wonder that they fall apart in junior or senior high school? It is said of the mule that he simply will not budge if he has been overloaded. A "good" child has no such helpful instinct and he will literally expend his resources completely in the effort to succeed.

An indication of the emphasis on early achievement is the current debate on whether or not children should be taught to read before they start going to school. The representatives of each point of view have marshalled their arguments well, and each presents a logical case. The author feels that the real question at issue is the child's readiness. Dr. Doman advocates early reading, but he also stresses the precautions which should be taken. No child, for example, should be confronted with a visual task for which he is neurologically not ready. Hence, all the materials are large in scale. Even the simple books, when this stage is reached, should be written in letters at least one-half inch high. Thus the element of visual stress will not place an undue burden on the child.

The work of Dr. Hans Kélye on stress is well known, and educators could profit much by what he has to say. The organism adversely affected by stress, *whatever the source,* reacts in a wide variety of ways. One of the conditions he describes is the "just plain sick syndrome", in which the patient cannot localize his complaint but just feels terrible. Many times doctors dismiss it as hypochondria, or refer the patient for psychotherapy. Isn't it like so many of our "school phobia" cases with the nausea, headaches, nervousness, fatigue, etc.? Dr. Kelye's approach to the problem is based on restoring an adequate adaptive capacity to the body, rather than the approach through psychiatry and counselling which we in education seem to favor. It involves a sound nutritional regimen, and restoring the delicate balance which should be maintained in the endocrine system. It is truly astonishing to see the effect that this approach, when followed faithfully, can have on children with learning problems.

Research shows, among other things, that children with certain thyroid dysfunctions cannot relate two or more ideas simultaneously. This, naturally, has an adverse effect on their performance in arithmetic computation and problem solving. It even has effects in such prosaic activities as carrying out a double or triple command. These children simply disintegrate into confusion in such situations. When the proper level of thyroid activity is restored, remarkable changes take place. The author has personally encountered several such instances in his work with children.

An interesting corollary of this work is the research done by Patricia Carrigan at the University of Michigan. It has given rise to what may be called the chemical theory of reading disability. In the reading clinic at the University children were encountered who seemed to resist the very best efforts at remedial instruction. Further screening was done, and auditory, visual, and even psychological problems were eliminated as factors. Then some rather subtle blood chemistry was done. These children seemed to have a high incidence of disturbed acetylcholine-cholinesterase balance on the one hand, or low production of these substances on the other. Acetylcholine seems essential if the synopses of the nerve cells are to establish new connections as they acquire a new learned response. The cholinesterase is necessary if the synopses are to release and become ready for acquisition of new learning. By use of appropriate metabolic stimulants and depressants, these children were enabled to make a start at overcoming their reading deficiencies. To the author, this seems to be an area of research which should be followed up vigorously, for it gets down to the fundamental bases of learning itself, and offers a breakthrough to particular problems which have baffled educators.

Besides the difficulties we have already mentioned, children who are reacting to stress show rigidity in posture, in movement, and in visual performance. They have literally tightened up to such a degree that the flexibility we associate with youth, is nearly gone. Pearl Rosborough of Belmont, Mass., in her study of some twenty remedial reading students, noted that not one could do a single front sit-up. The work of Kephart, Getman and others starts from physical activity, even play activities, and has an impact on the intellectual performance of the slow learner. It is imperative that the physical education program incorporate some of these activities, especially in the primary grades. The work of Jean Young of Pontiac, Michigan is noteworthy. She screens each child to determine where his difficulties are, and then builds a program adapted to the individual's needs. This program seems worthy of wider adoption. It takes into account the child's developmental status, and the wide variance in the physical potential of children, even though they be of the same age. However, the purpose of this discussion is not to treat each area exhaustively, but to indicate promising areas for exploration.

From the past several topics, we see again and again the influence of body on mind. The old Latin adage "Mens sana in corpore sano" (a sound mind in a sound body) seems truer than ever. Since the advent of Freud, we have attributed such primacy to the mind that, almost instinctively, we seek a psychological solution to children's problems in learning. The author respectfully submits that educators should thoroughly explore all these other avenues, which are primarily physical, before we subject a child to psychotherapy. It is evident that we are ignoring many techniques which are valuable, because we have forgotten that man is a psychophysical unit. While it is true that the mind can influence the body, the corollary is also true—the body can influence the mind.

D. THE ROLE OF NUTRITION

A few years ago the author came upon a most interesting book, "Body, Mind and Sugar", by Dr. Abrahamson and Pezet. Since then in various popular magazine articles and in medical journals, there has been growing discussion of hypoglycemia and relative hypoglycemia. If what we read is true, these conditions often pass unrecognized. Yet the symptoms can be severe enough to command attention. Doctors have reported that even the milder "relative hypoglycemia" can have the manifestations of many other illnesses, including mental illnesses and neuroses. The descriptions of what happens to memory, the ability to concentrate, and the ability to think clearly make an educator stop for some long thoughts.

What is the cause of low blood sugar, and what does one do about it. The condition seems to involve the inability of the body to maintain an adequate level of sugar in the bloodstream, for the oxidation of this sugar by the body is the source of our energy. To correct it, surprisingly, one does not consume more pure sugar. This only compounds the problem. The answer, seems to lie in observing a high protein diet, very little carbohydrate, and plenty of vegetables and fruit.

Now, think for a moment, of the diet of the typical teenager. Then just try to imagine the diet of the ghetto child. Home Economics teachers have surveyed the dietary habits of their pupils. Even in junior high school, only a few eat an adequate breakfast. The consumption of carbonated beverages, pastry, cakes, candy and other sweets will produce effects not only on the body, but also on the mind.

In Time magazine for April 22, 1966, the Joseph P. Kennedy Foundation reported the results of their study on the relationship between retardation and malnutrition. They point out that there are many kinds of malnutrition, but one that seems to have prolonged effects is a severe protein deficiency. Even if treated, a slower rate of mental development is observed in such children. Also observed in laboratory animals was the interference with the growth of myelin sheaths around nerve fibres. This brain damage cannot be fully repaired by normal feeding in later life. In this connection we might note the insistence of many obstetricians that expectant mothers stay within certain weight limits.

One would feel rather hopeless at this point, but much can be done if the advice of competent experts in nutrition is followed. We know fairly well what makes us sick, but we have rather scanty knowledge of what keeps us well. We might do well to give greater heed to experts in this field for the sake of happier, healthier and brighter children.

E. CONCLUSION AND PERSONAL COMMENTS

No teacher who is interested in his work lacks for descriptions and analyses of the problems he faces. I know. I worked for eleven years in a "deprived area" school. I looked constantly for answers to the question, "Why can't my kids read as they should?" I read all the textbooks. I found the diagnostic and descriptive sections marvelous. The practical solutions somehow didn't turn out the way they were supposed to. I tried the suggested procedures. Sometimes a slight gain would be achieved after much effort, only to evaporate after the summer vacation. I felt inadequate until I found that other teachers experienced the same thing.

Do these conditions afflict only children of the ghetto? From some of my previous comments one might erroneously gather this impression. To set the record straight, let me say that learning problems can affect a child from any economic level, even if he possesses an average or superior intelligence, and even though his home offer a warm and stimulating emotional climate. Poor neurological organization, to take only one factor by way of example, is found not only in the slums, but can occur even in the children of families who have every advantage. My own personal concern for the "culturally disadvantaged" causes me to speak of them with particular emphasis. But whether the child be rich or poor, it is a tragic waste of human potential to see these academic (but not intellectual) cripples.

If I were given the task to go ahead and work out a program for the "reality-bound child", to use Dr. Ilg's term, my first reaction would be one of fright. But I would make the effort anyhow. If I could establish my own conditions, my first request would be for time. Time to study the Doman-Delacato techniques, possibly as an intern in their training program. Then time to study the findings of the bio-chemical approach to reading difficulties. I have had much personal experience with the Gesell Institute. (My five children have had visual surveys there) and I have taken their workshop in developmental evaluation. I would definitely want any program in which I might be involved to have the benefit of the insight of these remarkable people.

What specific items would I incorporate into a remedial program? As a minimum, I would want to see the following:

a. A complete visual evaluation from the developmental point of view.

b. An evaluation of the child's developmental status.

c. An evaluation of his neurological organization.

d. Ideally, I would want a thorough physical evaluation, one which would consider possible endocrine dysfunctions.

In practice, however, I realize the difficulty of achieving this goal.

What methods of instruction would we use? Ah—there's the rub! What has been written so far has been a sketch or outline of some new procedures. They would have to be new, and almost of necessity a departure from the traditional methods which have failed so often. Even our so-called "special education" classes do little that is genuinely special or unique. Most of them essentially try to impart traditional materials in a watered-down way. It doesn't fool the children for a minute, and it doesn't really answer their needs. There is no existing manual of methods which one can pick up and apply at once. This may be an advantage, for we will be forced, as teachers, to really look at our children, analyze their problems and help them to solve them. "Education" comes from a fine old Latin word meaning to "lead out." The teacher serves as a guide, as a helper, but not as a source of ready-made answers. Rote learnings will not provide enough equipment for these children in their struggle with life.

The children of our "ghettoes" come to school with a variety of deficits and a poor self-image. Academic failure seems only to increase the deficits, and to impair still further the self-image. In my own limited experience, I have been able to point some children on the way to a greater measure of success. I would like to see the same opportunities offered to all children with learning problems. It seems worth the effort to me.

What I envision might be called a unitary approach to the child with problems. I know it might be statistically better to set up control groups, and study one or the other aspect of these approaches in isolation or in combination. The only trouble is that I would be deeply concerned about the control group kids. An unscientific attitude, it is true, but somehow I can't be cold-blooded about children with problems.

Why have I written all this? Mostly because of my conviction that this may lead to more effective help for children. I have been looking for answers to these problems for many years. In sum, I guess, what I am trying to find out now is whether anyone else is convinced enough to take such a program from the area of dreams to a concrete experimental situation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 43. An act for the relief of Mi Soon Oh;

S. 63. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Alberto Rojas-Vila;

S. 64. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Osvaldo Martinez-Farinas;

S. 221. An act for the relief of Dr. Armando Perez Simon;

S. 440. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Alejandro Solano;

S. 733. An act for the relief of Sabiene Elizabeth DeVore;

S. 741. An act for the relief of Rumiko Samanski;

S. 821. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Domingo Hernandez;

S. 975. An act for the relief of Mitsuo Blomstrom;

S. 1021. An act for the relief of Antonio Luis Navarro;

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Dr. David Castaneda;

S. 1110. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel Alpendre Seisdedos;

S. 1197. An act for the relief of Dr. Lucio Arsenio Travieso y Perez;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of Dr. Gonzalo G. Rodriguez;

S. 1279. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco Montes;

S. 1280. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Pereira;

S. 1458. An act for the relief of Lee Duk Hee;

S. 1471. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugo Gonzalez;

S. 1482. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernesto Nestor Prieto;

S. 1525. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario R. Garcini;

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos E. Garciga;

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria del Carmen Trabadelo de Arias;

S. 1678. An act for the relief of American Petrofina Co. of Texas, a Delaware corporation, and James W. Harris;

S. 1709. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Martin Ruiz del Castillo;

S. 1748. An act for the relief of Dr. Ramiro de la Riva Dominguez; and

S. 1938. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando Hipolito Maytin.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 159. An act to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2275. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Vallejo Samala;

H.R. 4985. An act for the relief of Mrs. Antonia Subias Val;

H.R. 7325. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain Federal lands for certain lands owned by Mr. Robert S. Latham, Albany, Oreg.;

H.R. 7427. An act for the relief of Maria Kolometroutsis; and

H.R. 11131. An act to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 159. An act to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 2275. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Vallejo Samala;

H.R. 4985. An act for the relief of Mrs. Antonia Subias Val;

H.R. 7427. An act for the relief of Maria Kolometroutsis; and

H.R. 11131. An act to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7325. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain Federal lands for certain lands owned by Mr. Robert S. Latham, Albany, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 498, S. 2171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, S. 2171, to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is proper that the pending bill, which attempts to breathe life into the moribund Subversive Activities Control Board, should be considered by the Senate during the Halloween season. This agency is a part of that debris of the witch hunts of the 1950's, the so-called period of McCarthyism, that still lingers with us. It is a part of that era in which a number of practices were adopted which seemed necessary for the national security, but which would have shocked our forefathers.

When the Constitution was first proclaimed, there was an uproar from liberty-loving Americans who had won the Revolutionary War. They forced down the throats of the reactionaries of that period the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. They made the adoption of these amendments a condition for the ratification of our Constitution. Throughout the years, we have affectionately termed those first 10 amendments to our Constitution the Bill of Rights.

So it is for us today to fight for the preservation of these rights. I believe it would be well for the people of the United States, our fellow citizens, to reread those first 10 amendments. I am certain that those lunatic fringe extremists, rightwing splinter groups such as the so-called Liberty Lobby, the Manion Forum, and the John Birch Society—or "Birchsaps" or "Sons of Birches," as our colleague the senior Senator from California, the assistant minority leader, has termed them—have never read or would like to forget those first 10 amendments.

Many of the nefarious laws of the McCarthy era were subsequently declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. I maintain that, from the standpoint of civil liberties, historians of the future will credit the Supreme Court of the United States with playing a major role in the preservation of our traditional concepts of individual liberty.

We have recovered somewhat from that era, which we would like to forget, of pointless suspicion, fear, character assassination, and ruined careers. The Subversive Activities Control Board, unfortunately, is still with us.

In order to circumvent the rulings of the Supreme Court which virtually nullified the powers of the Board, the pending legislative proposal would eliminate the power of the Board to require registration by the members of organizations of which it disapproves. However, it would continue the oppressive power of the Board to label voluntary associations of American citizens as "Communist action" or "Communist front" organizations. In short, this bill gives the five members of the Subversive Activities Control Board the power to smear any American organization. Furthermore, once it has attached an ugly label to a group it dislikes, the Board could require it to use that label in its communications with the public, whether by mail or by electronic broadcast. This comes very close to empowering a government agency in a democracy which has functioned largely through freedom of association to determine, in its own discretion, which associations may exist and which may not exist.

Mr. President, in the 17 years since its creation, the Subversive Activities Control Board has served no useful purpose and has not made a single contribution to the welfare or safety of the Nation. In fact, in the past 2 years it has not held a meeting. There are no cases pending before it. Apart from the five board members, only 13 employees remain. Their average salary is one of the highest in the entire Federal bureaucracy. These employees do nothing today but send messages to one another and expend energy once or twice a month to draw their salaries. This year this boondoggle is costing taxpayers more than $330,000—all completely wasted. The continued expenditure of taxpayers' money for this absurd boondoggle is unconscionable at a time when we are looking for ways to save taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, what is the urgency in attempting to revive this virtually dead agency? Are the youth of America imperiled? According to the party's own admission and the best estimates from reliable sources, there are only 500 members of the American Communist Party between the ages of 17 and 30—approximately 1 out of every 200,000.

Furthermore, according to J. Edgar Hoover, who should know, the Communist Party in the United States has lost 90 percent of its membership since reaching its numerical peak strength 23 years ago. The FBI report is that there were 80,000 Communists in the United States in 1944. The Soviet Red Army was crushing Hitler's "supermen" in Europe, and in America there was tolerance for home-grown Communists. At present, the FBI estimates the numerical strength of the Communist Party has nosedived and is between 8,000 and 10,000. In that total of 8,000 or 10,000, Mr. President, are included those FBI agents who have infiltrated in huge numbers and are masquerading as Communists. Even the ragtag secretary of the ragtag little party that may have 8,000 to 10,000 members says the Communist Party in the United States totals 10,000. That may be a boast on his part. He would not be minimizing the number.

At most, there is one Communist in the United States for every 21,000 non-Communists, the odds in favor of free institution being 21,000 to 1.

Last Sunday, more than 80,000 people crowded in the Cleveland stadium to watch the Cleveland Browns win a professional football game.

I am very sorry I was not there, because when I am in Cleveland I always attend the Cleveland Browns football games.

Now, taking FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's calculations—and I believe them—then all of three people in that entire crowd of 80,000 might be Communists. Do we need new legislation now to suppress those three out of 80,000 in our entire country? Should we be afraid that those few will harm the rest of us? Furthermore, we have on our side the brains and brawn of the city and State police, the FBI, the Army, Air Force, and Navy—never forgetting the Marines. Do we need the five men on the Subversive Activities Control Board and some 13 employees feeding at the public trough to the extent of $26,000 each per year for each Board member, and each employee drawing down an average salary of approximately $11,000 or more a year, to gallop to our aid? If it is claimed that we no longer are the land of the free, let us at least be the home of the brave.

In that connection, when I hear hysterical talk about Communists in the Protestant clergy, on the faculties of our universities, in the State Department, and even infiltrating PTA's and other neighborhood groups, I am reminded of a little couplet:

> Last night I saw upon the stair
> A little man who was not there.
> He was not there again today,
> Oh, how I wish he would go away.

Mr. President, our true shield against communism lies in the solid commonsense of citizens and in their loyalty to free institutions. That shield has kept America secure and free for more than 191 years; and it is just as strong and free now as it ever was.

Fascists—such as that group of colonels and generals who overthrew the constitutional regime in Greece, or the Fascists who have taken over in the Argentine Republic—and Communists, and others who seek to crush by force those who disagree with their opinions, are doing an evil. That was the method of the czars of Russia, the Bourbons of France, and of Adolf Hitler of Germany. They failed miserably. No one can exterminate ideas with clubs: they only scatter them. Combat wrong opinions with right opinions; combat fallacies with facts. There is no need to import into our country and to impose on a free people the techniques of communism, fascism, and other forms of totalitarianism, as we would be doing if the pending bill were agreed to.

Those supporting this proposed amendment claim that it would put the original Subversive Activities Control Act in line with recent Supreme Court decisions. This, of course, is facetious, for the powers of the Subversive Activities Control Board would remain unrestricted and vague. It is a blatant attempt to revise the SACB and give it even greater power. It bears the taint of McCarthyism and it gives a politically appointed Board the right to freely smear, libel, and slander any group or organization of Americans.

When the SACB was created in 1950, it was a bad idea. That was my opinion then; that is my opinion now. Nothing has happened to change my opinion. Instead, the evidence clearly and convincingly shows an effort to introduce totalitarian uniformity into political thinking. The existence of the Board continues to be a challenge to the basic principles of the democratic way of life of our Republic.

In 1950, when President Truman vetoed the McCarran-Walter Act which created this bureaucratic monstrosity, he said in his veto message:

> The provisions of the act are not merely ineffective and unworkable; they represent a clear and present danger to our institutions.

His warning has been validated in numerous Supreme Court decisions which have all but nullified the effectiveness of the legislation.

In that same message President Truman simply and concisely articulated the essence of freedom of speech in our society when he wrote:

> We can and we will prevent espionage, sabotage, or other actions endangering our national security. But we would betray our finest traditions if we attempted, as this bill would attempt, to curb the simple expression of opinion. This we should never do, no matter how distasteful the opinion may be to the vast majority of our people. The course proposed by this bill would delight the Communists, for it would make a mockery of the Bill of Rights and of our claim to stand for freedom in the world.
>
> And what kind of effect would these provisions have on the normal expression of political views? Obviously, if this law were on the statute books, the part of prudence would be to avoid saying anything that might be construed by someone as not deviating sufficiently from the current Communist propaganda line. And since no one could be sure in advance what views were safe to express, the inevitable tendency would be to express no views on controversial subjects.
>
> The result could only be to reduce the vigor and strength of our political life—an outcome that the Communists would happily welcome, but that free men should

abhor. . . . We need not fear the expression of ideas—we do need to fear their suppression.

I have joined with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] in introducing legislation which would abolish the SACB. This bill, S. 2146, is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. It would transfer to the Justice Department all Board activities and it would authorize the Attorney General to designate an independent officer or agency within the Department to handle these activities. Frankly, in my view, that is the legislative proposal we should be considering. May I commend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] on his leadership in making the public aware of this attempt to perpetuate and strengthen the SACB and in the effort to recommit the pending bill.

Mr. President, no hearings were held by the Committee on the Judiciary on this legislative proposal. The committee report contains no explanation of the bill's provisions, no section-by-section analysis, and no explanation of the changes that it would make in existing law. Neither the Justice Department nor any other executive agency was asked for its opinion of the bill. Any legislative proposal to strengthen or perpetuate the outmoded, un-American Subversive Activities Control Board should be the subject of thorough hearings before being brought before the Senate for debate and vote.

Mr. President, if the same energy that is being put behind the proposed amendment were devoted to the enactment of the administration's programs to alleviate poverty, to promote civil rights, and to provide for a better standard of living for all our citizens—instead of wasting our time arguing on this proposal—this country would be better served.

Communism feeds upon the tragic conditions of poverty, injustice, ignorance, and disease. The future safety of this country against the aggressions of communism lies with a patriotic, constructive, informed citizenry that holds to the idea that the best insurance against communism is the American family that is well housed, well fed, and with a reasonable prospect of security for the future.

Involuntary unemployment, as we well know, is a great moral wrong, and it should not be tolerated in a country like this. We should be spending our time in trying to overcome that problem.

The future safety of this country depends on citizens and leaders who realize that hunger, poverty, unemployment pave the way to communism. Those who have appropriated the issue of communism to serve their political ends are poor reeds to lean on in a fight against communism. These are the men who will be found continually voting on the side of the powerful special interests. They can always be depended upon to vote against all measures to make life better for more people and to insulate them against communism—protection against dependency in old age, unemployment, and occupational hazards, protection for their life savings, decent housing, medical care at a price they can afford to pay, farm programs based on the knowledge that a healthy agriculture is potent insurance against communism, the blessings of electricity on the farm, the right of labor to bargain for a fair share of the wealth it helps to create and the extension of educational opportunity.

Mr. President, I have spoken briefly on the sort of legislative proposals that have done so much good in the past. We should think about and work on amendments to such proposals at the present time, rather than waste time discussing a bill such as the pending legislative proposal.

Mr. President, let us at all times manifest the pioneering spirit of free and courageous men and women intent on maintaining our way of life and adhering to those sacred guarantees in our Constitution. Let us reaffirm the ideals and principles that have made our Nation the hope of the world. As one who despises Communists, communism, and Communist methods, I join with other Senators in urging that this scarecrow agency, the Subversive Activities Control Board, be discarded along with all vestiges of totalitarianism in our society. I strongly urge that the pending bill be recommitted.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 17, 1967, pp. 29030–29031, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I had notified the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], that the report would be taken up at 1 o'clock. He is detained on another official matter, from which he cannot excuse himself this time, I am advised that he has no objection to proceeding with the report. I know, also, that he has no strong exception to any of the action that resulted from the conference report.

Mr. President, in resolving the differences in H.R. 11456, the Department of Transportation appropriation bill for 1968, the conferees arrived at a total of $1,582 million. This is $139.4 million under 1967, $136.7 million under the 1968 estimates, and $69.5 million under the Senate version of the bill. It is $51.7 million over the House bill.

It might be helpful for the information of Senators if I summarize briefly the principal changes from the Senate version of the bill.

The funds provided for the Coast Guard for the construction of the oceanographic vessel were deleted and the conference report refers to its postponement "pending a comprehensive review of oceanographic research programs throughout the Government." The Senate conferees did not recede one bit in their interest in oceanographic vessels for the Coast Guard. However, there is a program of comprehensive review that we believe will be of value, and we receded for the time being.

The conferees on the part of the Senate were able to retain in conference approximately $36 million over the House bill of urgently needed funds for the Federal Aviation Agency for ensuring aviation safety by provision of additional manpower and electronic and other equipment. It is significant to note, too, that in the statement of the managers on the part of the House are included these words:

> The conferees are in agreement that the Congress should maintain a continuing surveillance over aviation safety and call on the Department of Transportation to present comprehensive plans for the continued maintenance of aviation safety standards.

The Senate conferees consider this a very grave matter, indeed, and believe that the bill does not carry enough funds for the urgent and demanding needs of aviation safety. The subcommittee intends to pursue this further and to urge early consideration of this matter. We will do that, of course, through channels; and the House is interested in the matter, also.

The funds for the grants-in-aid for airports for 1968 were compromised at $70 million, a split between the House and Senate versions, which were $65 million and $75 million, respectively.

In conclusion, the House conferees rejected the $2 million provided in the Senate version of the bill for the auto-on-train program.

Mr. President, the remainder of the picture is that the House has adopted the conference report. One matter—an item pertaining to the State of Montana, was rejected by the House on a rollcall vote on the floor. I understand that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] will address himself to that subject. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has some questions. I yield to the Senator from Montana so that he may make a statement at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would it not be appropriate to proceed to the approval of the conference report and then to consideration of the proposed amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. I have no objection. I believe we can call on matters as we see fit. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over the past months, Senator METCALF, Congressmen OLSEN and BATTIN, and I have been attempting to assist the people of Libby, Mont., in improving the airport facilities in that community.

The present Libby airport is federally owned and under the jurisdiction of the

U.S. Forest Service. The field is 2,700 feet in length with a sod-and-rock surface. At the northeast end of the field, there is a fence which amounts to an obstruction, and on the southwest end of the field is a large growth of pine and fir trees which comprise a considerable obstruction.

The construction of Libby Dam now in progress near Libby, at a cost of some $377 million, has brought about a considerable amount of heavy use of this antiquated airport by aircraft not normally suited for this type field. A number of twin-engine aircraft owned by the Federal Government and by the various construction companies involved with the dam are now utilizing this field which does not meet minimum Federal Aviation Agency standards. This is a hazardous procedure.

In February of this year, correspondence was received from Brig. Gen. H. G. Woodbury, Jr., Office of Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, in which he stated that:

> The air strip was originally located to serve light single-engine aircraft used by the Forest Service for fire patrol. It also served satisfactorily for local owners of light planes and was accepted as the Libby Airport.
>
> As such it has been used by contractors' airplanes and airplanes under contract to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as weather and ground conditions permitted. However, the length and surfacing of the runway, approach zones, and angle of approach are not adequate for twin-engine aircraft. Federal Aviation Agency representatives advise that the air strip does not conform to minimum Federal Aviation Agency standards for airports to serve small aircraft operating under visual flight rules. Because of adjacent terrain and developments, the air strip cannot be reoriented to meet the minimum standards. The Forest Service has requested the Federal Aviation Agency to place information in the Airmen's Guide to the effect that the Libby air strip is not recommended for use by airplanes with a gross wheel load over 12,500 pounds.
>
> With the start of Libby Project, larger planes have been using the airstrip in increasing numbers. This has created serious safety problems as the runway has deteriorated rapidly under increased use by heavier airplanes. The original limited capability of the facility is thus further aggravated by maintenance problems. In addition to these restrictions on the air strip, operations are severely limited by ground fog many days of the year.
>
> The policy of the Corps of Engineers requires that any airstrips generally available to the public which are constructed with project funds must conform to minimum Federal Aviation Agency standards. Since any rehabilitation of the existing airstrip would still not meet the minimum standards, the Corps of Engineers cannot participate in such a venture.
>
> Other more suitable sites for an airport exist in the vicinity of Libby Dam. Such sites are located on Forest Service lands. If the Forest Service will make lands available for an airport that will meet Federal Aviation Agency standards and Lincoln County and the City of Libby agree to the site, the Corps of Engineers will participate in such a project under the Federal Airport Act. The Division and District Engineers have been instructed to meet with representatives of the Forest Service and local interests with a view toward developing such a project.

Following this, the Montana Aeronautics Commission, in cooperation with the town of Libby and Lincoln County, took action to form a joint city-county airport board.

A request for aid was submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration during April, and sometime later, approval for aid in the amount of some 53.2 percent of construction costs of the airport was made.

The Corps of Engineers has available under its appropriation for Libby Dam $132,000 for construction of an airfield required to service Government-owned and contractor aircraft.

A survey was financed by the town of Libby and the State of Montana to determine the cost of an adequate airfield for Libby. It was originally estimated that $270,000 would be required. The Corps of Engineers later advised the State of Montana that, in their opinion, an additional $65,000 would be needed for a total cost estimate of $335,547. The Federal Aviation Administration is prepared to assist to the extent of $177,940, the Corps of Engineers is prepared to contribute $132,300, and the State of Montana has guaranteed an additional $32,000 as needed to insure completion of this airport.

I would point out, Mr. President, that the town of Libby is a community of some 2,800 people, located in the northwest corner of Montana in a mountainous area. It is 90 miles from Kalispell, the nearest community of any size. Air transportation to this town is vitally essential during the next few years while the dam is under construction, as well as to serve the Forest Service and the surrounding area in future years.

The need for the airport is now. Unopened bids are on hand at this time which will allow immediate initiation of construction, and all interested parties are willing to proceed with this very important project.

In the opinion of the Corps of Engineers, there was a doubt as to whether they had authority under the current law to proceed in this arrangement without additional language being enacted into law. With this in mind, and at the request of the Corps of Engineers, Senator METCALF and I proposed that the following language be added to the transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1968:

> *Provided*, That funds appropriated for the Libby Dam and Reservoir project in Montana may be used in the construction of an aircraft landing strip at Kelley Flats, Montana, in participation with local interests and other Federal agencies in a manner deemed appropriate by the Chief of Engineers.

This language would not have required the expenditure of any additional funds. The purpose was to permit construction of Libby Airport to proceed as soon as possible utilizing funds from the Corps of Army Engineers—who, I might add, are the principal users of the airport—the Federal Aviation Administration, which is the proper agency to enhance airport facilities throughout the Nation, and the local authorities who have been demonstrating their willingness to cooperate.

This airport is needed; it is vital to the construction of Libby Dam; it will replace a substandard, unsafe airport now being used, and in the long run will be economical.

If the Corps of Engineers proceeds to construct an airstrip, other than the proposed Kelley Flats project, at the cost of over $132,000, for using during dam construction, this airstrip will be abandoned in less than 7 years. There will be no residual value to the community, to the State, or to the Nation. I submit that this is false economy.

In view of the circumstances in connection with the vote in the House on yesterday, I am asking the chairman of the Senate conferees to recede from the Senate position on this matter. We will proceed at a later date to act in such a manner as to assure Libby an airport for the future.

Mr. President, I have just been provided with a statement expressing the views of the Chief of Engineers regarding this matter. I ask unanimous consent that it be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Libby Dam and Reservoir, a multiple-purpose project planned on the Kootenai River in northwestern Montana, is a key element of the comprehensive plan for development of the Columbia River Basin in the interest of flood control, power generation, recreation and related water uses. The estimated cost of this development is $377,000,000 with a benefit-cost ratio 1.6 to 1. The construction schedule is scheduled to meet the requirements of the Canada-United States Columbia River Treaty which requires full storage operations within seven years after start of the construction.

The transportation net in the Kootenai River and Fisher River Valleys is marginal at best. The only air facility of value in the area is located at Kalispel, Montana, which is connected to Libby by nearly 100 miles of secondary roads over mountainous terrain. The nearest city served by scheduled airlines is Spokane, Washington, which is approximately 150 miles by a secondary road network.

At all large isolated projects of this type, the Corps of Engineers usually constructs temporary, unsurfaced, minimal air strips in the vicinity of the Dam site to assist management control, expedite survey and inspection operations and for limited supply depot operations. These strips are without lights and control facilities and are not operational in bad weather and do not contain the air management safety repair facilities of FAA type airfields. Such a landing strip at Libby project would cost $132,300.

The Government can justify such an expenditure on the basis of savings of transportation to the Government employees and contractors on the project. This expenditure would provide the minimal strip which could be enlarged by participation with FAA and the Libby-Lincoln County Airport Board to provide a larger landing field built to FAA specification in the vicinity of Kelley Flats. The larger landing field will result in additional direct savings to the Federal Government and will provide a permanent airport instead of one which will be abandoned in 7 to 10 years. The larger field will not cost the Corps of Engineers any more money than will be spent without the Kelley Flats FAA Project. The current estimate cost of the larger landing field is $335,550; FAA would contribute 0.53% of the bid amount which based on this estimate is $177,940; the Corps of Engineers participation would be $132,300 leaving $25,000, to be supplied by Libby-Lincoln County Board. The Montana Aeronautics Commission has agreed to furnish up to

> $32,000 and their funds will be available in February 1968.
>
> Many specific benefits will accrue to the Government.
>
> 1. Maintenance of the strip will be responsibility of local interests.
>
> 2. Government will receive free use of facility for life of project—100 years.
>
> 3. The increased airstrip capacity will provide a local facility capable of:
>
> (*a*) Landing supply aircraft with equipment, maintenance goods and large volumes of critical supplies.
>
> (*b*) Providing a facility from which dependable scheduled air service can be provided thereby greatly reducing the charter costs and ground transportation costs for the 100 contractors and the Government agencies involved. This service alone would pay for the project.
>
> (*c*) Providing a reliable air medical evacuation facility which will reduce contractor insurance costs and Government costs.
>
> (*d*) Providing a basic helicopter and small aircraft center with maintenance facilities for the project area which will greatly reduce costs of air rental services presently provided from Spokane and Kalispell.
>
> These basic cost reduction features will reduce direct Government costs well in excess of the $310,000 FAA and Corps of Engineers estimated costs. In addition, each of the 100 contractors will be able to reduce his bid costs on Government contracts because of the reduced air freight costs, air lease costs, insurance costs, ground transportation costs, maintenance parts inventory costs, and improved management time.
>
> There is no need to elaborate on the host of service enterprises, subcontractors, salesmen, transporters, equipment installations, testing and maintenance personnel and secondary industries which will use this facility during the construction phase and after the project is completed. The return to the Government in taxes will pay for this airfield development many times during the 100-year life of the project.
>
> It is poor economy not to provide this authority for the Corps of Engineers to participate in the Kelley Flats Airport Project.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Mississippi, and I congratulate him, first, for having retained so much of the program voted by the Senate for aviation safety. I agree with the Senator that that is a matter of critical importance to the Nation.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. It was a team effort that kept the money.

Mr. HOLLAND. My comments, however, will be relative to the auto-on-train project, which was eliminated by the conference.

The House report considered the item for the high-speed ground transportation research and development and specifically denied $3,511,000 for the auto-on-train project. The report stated:

> The committee fails to understand why the Federal Government should finance a project of this nature during the period of high Federal deficit.

I believe Mr. W. Thomas Rice, president of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad, in his testimony before the Senate Department of Transportation Subcommittee on Appropriations, and which appears on page 646 of the hearing record, very clearly points up the reason why the railroad could not undertake such a project. The Office of High-Speed Ground Transportation in May 1966, had made the first contact with the railroad, at which time the Department advised that it was interested in contracting with a railroad company to perform such a demonstration project, and further advised that its analysis indicated that such service between the northeastern area of our country and Florida offered the greatest potential. Since the initial contact, the railroad has been working very closely with the Department of Transportation to develop feasibility studies which to date are most favorable.

I quote from Mr. Rice's testimony:

> The next question is why don't we do it ourselves, why don't we put up this money and try this train as an experiment. I will tell you why.
>
> We merged two railroads the first of July, the Seaboard and the Coastline. Putting these two railroads together in the next 5 years according to the engineers' estimate we are going to spend $66 million in fixed facilities to make two railroads into one by putting up the connecting tracks, the yards, and what-have-you to operate.
>
> "We will save money, yes, over a period of time but it will take a tremendous cash outlay to start with. Our long-term debt now is $401 million. Our fixed charges per year are $19.6 million. Our new equipment purchases this year, Mr. Chairman, and you will be interested in this, is better than $80 million. We are getting 2,150 boxcars between now and the end of the year. We have already gotten 600 covered hoppers. We have already gotten 16 locomotives. We just don't have gambling money. That is the very plain fact. You can't take the gross risk money and go to the horseraces with it. That is the reason we can't do this job. We think it has a reasonable chance of success but it would not be fair to the freight shipper needing the equipment he needs, and I hope continues to need, that we experiment in passenger service when we need to spend this money. And by the way, I must say in buying this equipment we don't have the necessary capital to make the downpayment on it.
>
> We are going into 100 percent financing or leasing it. I can't recommend that we take any money and gamble with it when we have to go into 100 percent financing of freight equipment to meet the needs of the public.

I think that was an excellent statement by Mr. Rice as to why the railroads could not undertake this themselves and why they were glad to go along on the initiative of the Federal Government in trying out this project.

As the Senator knows, the Senate committee and the Senate restored $2 million for the project which, unfortunately, was deleted in conference, although I understand that the Senate conferees fought very hard for retention of the $2 million.

Now, the estimated total cost of the project is $7.4 million, and I understand that the Department of Transportation has either committed or obligated some $3,884,000 previously appropriated. Thus, the additional funds requested for fiscal year 1968 would have completed the appropriations necessary for this project.

Of the committed or obligated funds previously authorized, some $2 million are already spend and nonrecoverable, and if the project is abandoned, this total amount will be lost. On the other hand, if it was the intent of the conference only to defer the project, it is possible that all but $800,000 will be recovered after the project is completed.

In order to clarify the record, I ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] if I correctly understand that the conferees merely deleted the appropriation for the auto-on-train project in view of the present difficult budgetary situation and the attitude of the other body, and that consideration may be given to the inclusion of these funds in future appropriations, either supplemental or regular.

I shall ask that question first and then later I shall ask another question.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator's question has to do with whether there are any restrictions?

Mr. HOLLAND. Whether there is any abandonment of the project.

Mr. STENNIS. There is no abandonment of the project as far as the Senate committee is concerned. The matter would be open to consideration for inclusion in future bills. We could not bind any future committee or Congress in any way. We did not learn any new facts about it that would cause us to change our minds about the project.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. That confirms my understanding.

My second question is: Do I correctly understand that there is no restriction placed upon the Department of Transportation as to the expenditure of these funds previously committed or obligated; that is, out of the appropriation made last year?

Mr. STENNIS. I refer to the amount, which the Senator has already stated, in round numbers of about $2 million spent from previously appropriated funds, and something in the neighborhood of $1.8 million that is not actually spent yet, although there may have been negotiations that more or less commit the funds. There is that much money in the pipeline, as that word is used.

No; we did not put any restriction on expenditures of previously appropriated funds. In fairness, it should be said that the Department will have to make a judgment, in my opinion, as to whether it is wise to spend that $1.8 million, in view of what happened here.

I think Congress should require them to make that judgment. I do not want to lessen that responsibility; but, there is no restriction.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I agree with him on his statement. The purpose of my colloquy was to bring out the points that have already been brought out by the questions and answers of the chairman, and further to accentuate the point that the whole program is based upon the initiative taken by the Federal Government in the effort to try out a program for the longer lines, in this instance, one from Washington to Jacksonville, as contrasted with the other program financed by the bill for the more heavily populated areas between Washington and New York, and between New York and Boston. I would not want it to appear at all as though this matter had been initiated by the railroad companies but, instead, that this is truly a Federal experiment in what it regards as worthwhile experimentation.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his kindness.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I yield now to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who is interested in this matter and concerned about it.

Mr. SMATHERS. I merely wish to associate myself with the remarks of my senior colleague in that which he has said, and particularly his concern about the future of this particular program. I, like him and others, think that this is a very meritorious program and hope there will be time to reactivate it in the future.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Now, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] wishes me to yield to him. He is interested in this bill. He has made a real contribution to putting it together, and I am glad to yield to him at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. My interest in this matter is essentially the same as that of the two Senators from Florida who have spoken to it. I think that what we want to be assured of is that while the conference report states, "and deletes all funds for the auto-on-train program," it does not say anything beyond that. I would assume, then, it means whatever unobligated funds they might have on hand may be spent under the authority which has been given to the Department of Transportation in previous situations.

I think the Senator has expressed himself on that, that the Department of Transportation should take and make a decision with respect to what they are going to do in view of the exclusion of the funds in the bill. Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. STENNIS. That is my idea about it. Those are my sentiments. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator very much because, particularly in the testimony, which the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] read from, of the president of one of the lines, there has lately—very lately—been some interest by outside people in perhaps contributing to this particular program. It might be possible that with what money is left or unobligated, we might be able to advance the program quite a way, when we consider the passenger train abandonments caused by the actions of the Post Office Department.

I think it is very important for Congress to look at this particular transportation situation with a great deal of concern.

Again I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want to thank the Senator from Colorado for his interest. I wish to emphasize the fact that the distance between Washington and Jacksonville was chosen, as I understand it, by the Federal Government as being the proper place for trying out this experiment, because Washington is a sort of funnel through which people can bring their cars from the entire Northeast, and Jacksonville is the gateway in Florida and is a sort of funnel into which cars can be delivered and then distributed as people may wish to drive into any part of the State of Florida, or into the nearby areas of Georgia or Alabama.

If this proves to be successful, it should open the door to similar programs along similar mileage lines. I think, for instance, of mileage from St. Louis, Mo., to Denver, Colo., or from Chicago, Ill., to Denver, where the population is not dense, as it is along the Atlantic seaboard from Washington to Boston, but where the distances are great and still people would want to take their automobiles along with them so that they could enjoy their sightseeing more, and to which they can look forward.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida for his very fine declarations on this matter.

Now I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is a member of the subcommittee, and a very valuable one, too, and who has worked hard on this bill and on preceding legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I shall be brief.

First of all, I suggest to the Senate, particularly for the RECORD, that this has been a difficult bill because the Department of Transportation is a new Department and it is therefore hard to evaluate and make comparisons.

I think the conference report came out with the best possible solution to some of the problems—and there are many evolving problems in the Department. There were some items the Senate would like to have had in the bill, but a conference is a conference—it is a compromise. When we talk about whether we should delete, postpone, or cut something out, it becomes a matter of policy. Sometimes, when the money is not given in an appropriation, the tendency is to say, "Well, Congress did not want it."

Sometimes that is not true at all. It is merely that it was postponed or temporarily stated, "Let it wait. This is something which can wait."

Among those in which I was deeply interested, of course, was the construction of an oceanographic vessel. I see in the report that it stated they sought a postponement of it, in effect, pending comprehensive review of research programs throughout the Government.

I want the RECORD to show that there is a review program. Congress passed the bill which created the President's Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources. I am a member of it, as is the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. They are making this review and expect to make a report to Congress no later than next April or thereabouts. We would have to take a comprehensive look at what we are going to do in this long-neglected field of oceanography. We are hopeful and rather sure that the report will recommend more oceanographic vessels. It takes a long time to build such a vessel, particularly when it is a custom-built job such as an oceanographic vessel is. We are hopeful—the Senator from Mississippi, myself, and the rest of us—that we might get started now and then it would be ready when the report would recommend it.

However, I want to ask the Senator from Mississippi now. I assume the conference actually to mean what it said, that this is a postponement; is that not correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I do not think there is any doubt what the sentiments of House and Senate conferees are for an oceanographic vessel. I think there will possibly be one or more of them for the Coast Guard; but there is a survey, as the Senator has said, in progress, and as I have stated, while the Senator from Washington was coming into the Chamber, we did not abandon our position there—that one was needed for the Coast Guard. Further, as the Senator says, the science of oceanography has long been neglected. Time has run out, and I hope we will push forward on it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] who is a member of the conference and the ranking minority member on the bill in its preparation.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator, my chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I have very little to add. The conferees on the part of the Senate were faithful in doing the best they could to present the viewpoint of the Senate.

Personally, I happen to be, from the beginning, one who believed and wanted to see the auto-on-train project continued without unnecessary delay, and brought to a final consummation. Very naturally I was one who, with the other conferees, made an earnest and honest effort—and I assure the Senate it was an earnest effort—to secure that result. In the case of the Senator from New Hampshire, he is particularly embarrassed about that situation, because we did retain funds, although we did not retain all of the funds by any manner of means, for the continued development of the northeast corridor.

I want to assure Senators, I want to assure my distinguished and beloved friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and all those interested that, as far as this Senator was concerned, he was not for one moment selling out the Florida route in order to save a northeast route.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one moment?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I just want to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from New Hampshire and to say to him that I gladly and enthusiastically supported the program for the speeding of transportation by rail from here to New York and from New York to Boston. I realize that that program relates to a completely different problem, because the populations are very great, but we certainly want to do everything we can to promote visitation to Florida, Georgia, Alabama, and other places for our friends who could drive their cars to Washington, put them on trains here and then, riding to Jacksonville, drive to such points as they may be interested in.

We appreciate the Senator's continued

support of that program, and will welcome his people whenever they come. As a matter of fact, we have gained a good many of them as permanent residents, and we wish we had more.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished Senator. I will add that this development, if it is successful—and I think it will be successful—means as much to my people as it does to the constituents of the distinguished Senator from Florida. I sometimes think, in the early winter and spring, when they go back and forth and stop to see me, that two-thirds of the population of my State go to Florida for the winter. They want to go. They want to take their cars and their families.

I am confident, for one, that this is not an abandonment of the program. There is an amount of approximately $1.9 million left over from unexpended funds to continue the program. The ultimate result, I am confident, will be that it will be finished, and then the Treasury will receive back a very substantial part of the approximate $1 million-plus of this expenditure when the railways take it over.

This is possibly a slight slowing up, but I am confident, as one member of the committee, I assure the distinguished Senator from Florida, the program is not being abandoned.

We saved everything we could in the conference. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is greatly to be commended for the battle he made for air safety, one of the most vital areas in this country today. I think it is second to none in importance. We were able, largely through the able leadership of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], to save a very substantial portion, almost all, of those funds.

I feel that this is a satisfactory conference committee report. I am thoroughly satisfied with it, with one or two slight exceptions, such as the one I have discussed; and I hope the Senate will confirm it.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I think that concludes the consideration of the matter now before the Senate, and I hope the Senate will adopt the report.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in connection with the Department of Transportation appropriation conference report which is before us today, I should like to call attention to an excellent editorial in the New York Times of Friday, October 13, entitled "New Vista for Transportation."

This editorial cites the valuable work being done by the Department in the field of high speed ground transportation, particularly as this work suggests alternatives to dangerous congestion in the airlanes and on many of our highways. And the editorial expresses regret at the final appropriation of $11.7 million for this program, as compared with the administration's request of $18.6 million and the Senate figure of $16.6 million. We only secured as much as we did because of the fine work of the Senate conferees, and here I extend my particular thanks to my senior colleague [Mr. PASTORE].

Of primary concern is the cut of nearly 40 percent in the $8 million requested for research and development in new modes of high-speed ground transportation. The blow was softened slightly by the conferees' allowance of $1.5 million for research and development in tracked air-cushioned vehicles. But the reduction in the balance of the research and development budget by nearly $3 million, I am advised, will curtail substantially work which had been contemplated in studying new kinds of propulsion systems, and curtail prematurely the range of possibilities which ought to be considered in planning efficient transportation systems of the future. What seems like a valid and necessary economy today may thus at some future date turn out to be a considerable diseconomy. For this reason, I would simply express the hope that this item may be given renewed consideration in supplemental appropriations, or as soon as the limitations imposed by the situation in Vietnam have been removed.

Finally, with regard to the proposed auto-train project which was disallowed by the conferees, I should like to make the point that the Senate has already expressed itself, in principle, in support of this project, by its 71-to-1 vote on October 5 to pass the Senate version of H.R. 11456, the bill before us today. The Senate Appropriations Committee's report of September 28 on that bill contained the following statement:

> The Committee recommends restoration of $2 million of the $3,511,000 reduction proposed in the House bill for the auto-train project. It is believed that the amount recommended, together with funds previously appropriated, will permit, on a limited basis, further developemnt of this service and utilization of information and plans already obtained through prior Federal expenditures.

This prior Senate action should provide a helpful indication of congressional intent to the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation, which can proceed to make the most of the work it has already done on this project, even though it has been denied the additional financing contemplated by the Senate. Specifically, I am advised that the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation can proceed to negotiate for the private construction and operation of the auto-train on a basis that will assure the Federal Government reimbursement for the investment it has already made in design and development of the project. I fully support this cooperative effort and hope that it comes to early fruition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we have another matter that is now coming up, an item that was rejected by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state Senate amendment No. 13.

The assistant legislative clerk read Senate amendment No. 13 as follows:

> SEC. 303. Funds heretofore appropriated to the Department of the Army for the Libby Dam and Reservoir project in Montana may be used in an amount not to exceed $140,000 in participation with local interests and the Federal Aviation Administration for the construction of an airport facility at Kelley Flats, Montana, in a manner deemed appropriate by the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senate conferees are sorry this matter did not prevail. The House conferees agreed to the item, but it was rejected on the floor of the House yesterday afternoon by a rollcall vote.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has already expressed himself on this matter, and does not choose to pursue it further now. The conferees on the part of the Senate therefore suggest and hope that the Senate will recede from its amendment.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to recede from amendment No. 13.

The motion to recede was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation on this bill reflecting the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1967, the budget estimates for each item for fiscal year 1968, the amounts agreed to in the House, the amounts agreed to in the Senate, and the final conference figure.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE BILL, H.R. 11456

Item	Appropriation, 1967	Budget estimate, 1968	Version of bill		Conference action
			House	Senate	
TITLE I—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses	[1] ($2,483,000)	$8,300,000	$6,985,100	$7,800,000	$7,400,000
Transportation research	3,000,000	[2] 8,100,000	5,950,000	6,200,000	5,950,000
Total, title I	3,000,000	16,400,000	12,935,100	14,000,000	13,350,000
TITLE II—COAST GUARD					
Operating expenses	326,434,000	368,972,000	339,992,500	344,429,500	342,651,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	[3] 103,000,000	107,014,000	107,014,000	121,514,000	107,014,000
Reserve training	24,497,000	([4])	24,300,000	24,300,000	24,300,000
Retired pay	44,750,000	48,260,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	45,000,000
Total, title II	498,681,000	524,246,000	519,306,500	538,243,500	521,965,000

See footnotes at end of table.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL, H.R. 11456—Continued

Item	Appropriation, 1967	Budget estimate, 1968	Version of bill		Conference action
			House	Senate	
TITLE III—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION					
Operations	$577,000,000	[5] $605,400,000	$593,326,000	$618,400,000	$605,400,000
Facilities and equipment	28,000,000	[6] 28,400,000	30,000,000	65,400,000	54,000,000
Research and development	28,500,000	27,500,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport	3,821,500			3,971,000	
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport	4,705,000			4,529,000	
Operation and maintenance, National Capital Airports		8,500,000	8,500,000		8,500,000
Construction, National Capital Airports		160,000	160,000		160,000
Construction, Dulles International Airport				160,000	
Grants-in-aid for airports:					
Fiscal year 1968	66,000,000				
Fiscal year 1969		75,000,000	65,000,000	75,000,000	70,000,000
Civil supersonic aircraft development	280,000,000	198,000,000	142,375,000	142,375,000	142,375,000
Total, title III	988,026,500	942,960,000	866,361,000	936,835,000	907,435,000
TITLE IV—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION					
Limitation on general expenses	(57,782,000)	(7)	(59,833,000)	(60,000,000)	(59,927,000)
Repayable advances to highway trust fund	65,000,000				
Federal-aid highways (trust fund)	(3,968,400,000)	(3,773,000,000)	(3,770,778,000)	(3,770,945,000)	(3,770,572,000)
Highway beautification	80,000,000	(7)	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Traffic and highway safety	10,000,000	(7)	21,034,000	21,034,000	21,034,000
Operating expenses:					
By appropriation		34,565,000			
By transfers		(65,875,000)			
Limitation on administrative expenses, National Highway Safety Bureau	(2,000,000)				
State and community highway safety (liquidation of contract authority)	10,000,000	100,000,000	20,000,000	40,000,000	25,000,000
Motor carrier safety	[1] (1,555,000)	(7)	1,670,000	1,780,000	1,780,000
Highway safety	210,000				
Forest highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	32,000,000	33,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	12,400,000	10,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Inter-American Highway		7,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Chamizal Memorial Highway		8,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Alaskan assistance			4,000,000	8,000,000	5,000,000
Repair and reconstruction of highways		15,097,772	15,097,772	15,097,772	15,097,772
General provision, sec. 401 limitation			(20,000,000)		
Total, title IV (general funds)	209,610,000	207,662,772	113,001,772	137,111,772	119,111,772
Highway trust fund	(3,968,400,000)	(3,773,000,000)	(3,770,778,000)	(3,770,945,000)	(3,770,872,000)
TITLE V—FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses		4,150,000			
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Administrator	[1] (60,000)	(8)	680,000	680,000	680,000
Bureau of Railroad Safety	[1] (834,500)	(8)	3,414,000	3,414,000	3,414,000
High-speed ground transportation research and development	22,000,000	[9] 18,600,000	10,300,000	16,632,000	11,750,000
Railroad research		300,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Total, title V	22,000,000	23,050,000	14,594,000	20,926,000	16,044,000
TITLE VI—OTHER ACTIVITIES					
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Limitation on administrative expenses	(515,000)	(515,000)	(514,000)	(514,000)	(514,000)
National Transportation Safety Board					
Salaries and expenses	[1] (3,589,000)	4,300,000	4,000,000	4,291,000	4,000,000
Total, title VI		4,300,000	4,000,000	4,291,000	4,000,000
Grand total, all titles:					
General fund	1,721,317,500	1,718,618,772	1,530,198,372	1,651,407,272	1,581,905,772
Highway trust fund	(3,968,400,000)	(3,773,000,000)	(3,770,778,000)	(3,770,945,000)	(3,770,872,000)

[1] Funding for activities transferred to the Department in 1967.

[2] Includes $2,300,000 requested under "Federal Railroad Administration, high-speed ground transportation research and development," for transportation information planning and excludes. $300,000 requested under this heading for railroad research.

[3] Excludes $1,245,000 transferred from Corps of Engineers in connection with alteration of bridges.

[4] Estimate of $24,535,000 carried under "Operating expenses."

[5] Original estimate increased $7,000,000 (S. Doc. 50).

[6] Original estimate decreased $7,000,000 (S. Doc. 50).

[7] Estimates carried under "Operating expenses."

[8] Estimates carried under "Salaries and expenses, Federal Railroad Administration."

[9] Excludes $2,300,000 for transportation information planning which is transferred to "Office of Secretary, transportation research."

INTEREST RATES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on August 16, 1960, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] made this statement:

> I swear Rip Van Winkle could have gone to sleep during any time in this century past and upon awakening could readily have determined which party was in control merely by asking "How high are the interest rates?"

I noticed in today's Wall Street Journal an article calling attention to the fact that interest rates today have reached the highest level since the 1870's. I refer to three articles, extracts of which I will have placed in the RECORD.

The first headline reads:

> Carolina P&L Bonds' Yield Believed Highest For Grade Since 1870s. But 6.375% Return on $40 Million Issue Is Not Expected To Bring Buyers Running on Reoffering.

The article reads:

> A $40-million block of Carolina Power & Light Co. 30-year bonds awarded at competitive bidding yesterday was to be publicly reoffered at yield considered the highest for comparably rated securities since the 1870's.
>
> Nevertheless bond-market analysts forecast a "slow" procession of potential customers to the issue.

In another column we find the headline:

> New York City Sells $119,140,000 of Bonds At 4.9121¢ Net Cost the Highest Since 1932.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 18, 1967]

TAX EXEMPTS: NEW YORK CITY SELLS $119,140,000 OF BONDS AT 4.9121 PERCENT NET COST, THE HIGHEST SINCE 1932

NEW YORK.—New York City accepted its highest annual net interest cost since 1932 in awarding $119,140,000 various purpose bonds to a group led by First National City Bank.

The group bid 100.005 for 4.90% and 5% coupons, setting an annual net interest cost of 4.9121%, highest since 1932 when the city paid 5½%, close to the current 5% limit set by the city.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Another article comments on the high yield of Government bond issues and in the headline states:

High Yield Is Resisted By Investors in Hopes of Still Further Rise. Secondary Market in Corporates Is Described as "Almost Nil"—Treasury Prices Decline Again.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 18, 1967]

BOND MARKETS: HIGH YIELD IS RESISTED BY INVESTORS IN HOPES OF STILL FURTHER RISE—SECONDARY MARKET IN CORPORATES IS DESCRIBED AS "ALMOST NIL"—TREASURY PRICES DECLINE AGAIN

NEW YORK.—Investors generally resisted the lure of the highest yields in nearly 100 years offered by yesterday's major new competitive corporate issue, apparently hoping that today's fresh offerings will carry even juicier rates.

The 6.375% yield set by underwriters on Carolina Power & Light Co.'s $40 million of double-A bonds far surpassed the previous 6.20% record level on comparable securities.

The 6.20% yield first reached in late August, was described by market specialists as the highest for a similar bond since the Reconstruction era.

* * * * *

"Lack of investor confidence and the poor performance of the corporate market" caused dealers in long-term U.S. Government securities once again to mark down prices to record lows, specialists said.

Losses in that sector ranged from 2-32 to 22-32 point on some dealer sheets. Among the Treasury issues marking the steepest declines were the key-indicator 4¼% bonds at 1987-92 which closed off 20-32 point at 84 8-32 bid, 84 24-32 asked. Yield at the latter price was 5.37%.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would like to read just two paragraphs from the article:

"Lack of investor confidence and the poor performance of the corporate market" caused dealers in long-term U.S. Government securities once again to mark down prices to record lows, specialists said.

Losses in that sector ranged from 2-32 to 22-32 point on some dealer sheets. Among the Treasury issues marking the steepest declines were the key-indicator 4¼% bonds at 1987-92, which closed off 20-32 point at 84 8-32 bid, 84 24-32 asked. Yield at the latter price was 5.37%.

Mr. President, I cannot help but wonder what Rip Van Winkle would think if he woke up today and found that interest rates today were the highest that they have been since 1870, and how he would reconcile that with the fact that the man now in the White House, just a few years ago, used to make almost daily in this Senate Chamber speeches bewailing what at that time he referred to as alarmingly high interest rates. Interest rates at that time averaged about 4¼ percent, or approximately 50 percent lower than they are today. I wonder if the President has forgotten his earlier speeches. I most respectfully suggest that he and many Senators on the other side of the aisle go back and refresh their memories on some of the great speeches they made in the 1950's about the alarming trend of high interest rates, which, I repeat, were at that time 50 percent lower than they are today.

A $90 MILLION BULB FOR LAST YEAR'S CHRISTMAS TREE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the closing days of the session last year Congress enacted H.R. 13103, the so-called Christmas tree bill.

In opposing that bill I called attention to one section which legalized and extended to June 30, 1967, a most glaring loophole. Ironically the Treasury Department, which had first denounced this proposal as an unwarranted multimillion-dollar tax loophole, later reversed its position and endorsed the bill with this provision intact.

This particular loophole was referred to as the tax-exempt swap arrangement for securities, real estate, and so forth.

Upon my request the Treasury Department has furnished a report showing the revenue loss that resulted from this proposal's being included as a part of the so-called Christmas tree bill. The Treasury Department's report shows that as the result of this legislation $420 million in securities were exchanged on a tax-free basis and that if the transferors had not had the benefit of this loophole, which gave them special tax exemption, the tax collected would have been about $90 million.

This was a $90 million bulb on last year's Christmas tree bill.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated June 16, 1967, signed by Mr. John A. Dudley, Associate Director of the Securities Exchange Commission, which includes a list of the exchange funds that received this tax-exempt treatment by virtue of the passage of H.R. 13103.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1967.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: We have now received and compiled the information you requested with respect to exchange funds which are tax-exempt by virtue of the passage of H.R. 13103. This information is presented in the enclosed table.

You will note that the registration statements of 11 of the 23 "swap" funds either did not become effective or were, or are to be, withdrawn. Of the remaining 12, 7 have not yet exchanged their shares for deposited securities. Under the provisions of H.R. 13103, the exchange must be completed by June 30, 1967. The experience of the other funds indicates that withdrawal of securities may substantially reduce the value of such deposits before the exchanges are consummated.

If you have any further questions with respect to this information, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. DUDLEY,
Associate Director.

(Enclosure.)

File No.	Name of fund	Effective date	Solicitation closed		Exchange completed	
			Date	Value of deposits	Date	Value of portfolio
2-25781	Diversified Life Fund, Inc.	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
2-25862	Exchange Growth-Income Fund, Inc.	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
2-25276	Exeter Second Fund, Inc.	Nov. 4, 1966	Feb. 3, 1967	$46,536,472	Mar. 8, 1967	$37,330,000
2-25710	Exeter Third Fund, Inc.	Feb. 6, 1967	Apr. 30, 1967	71,772,409	------------	(3)
2-25856	Federated Dual-Exchange Fund, Inc.	Apr. 19, 1967	Apr. 30, 1967	53,525,395	------------	(3)
2-25299	Fiduciary Exchange Fund, Inc.	Dec. 1, 1966	Feb. 15, 1967	76,984,971	Mar. 17, 1967	66,997,174
2-25268	5th Empire Fund, Inc.	Nov. 4, 1966	Feb. 7, 1967	23,573,659	Mar. 17, 1967	15,470,277
2-25688	Fifth Presidential Fund, Inc.	Dec. 28, 1967	Apr. 30, 1967	22,882,466	------------	(3)
2-24332	Fourth Empire Fund, Inc.	Mar. 10, 1966	Aug. 19, 1966	30,610,012	Mar. 30, 1967	21,931,466
2-24003	Independence Hall Exchange and Growth Fund, Inc.	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
2-22613	Industries Exchange Fund, Inc.	Nov. 9, 1966	Apr. 28, 1967	21,811,436	------------	(3)
2-25836	Institutional Exchange Fund, Inc.	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
2-24690	Life Stock Exchange Fund, Inc.	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
2-25258	Putman Exchange Fund, Inc.	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)
2-25869	Scudder Dual-Purpose Exchange Fund, Inc.	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)
2-25870	Scudder Duo-Vest Exchange Fund, Inc.	Apr. 19, 1967	May 24, 1967	51,871,956	------------	(3)
2-24584	The Second Federal Street Fund, Inc.	May 11, 1966	Nov. 15, 1966	82,622,416	Dec. 19, 1966	56,985,475
2-25838	Second Fiduciary Exchange Fund, Inc.	Feb. 14, 1967	May 1, 1967	116,367,419	------------	(3)
2-25857	Seventh Empire Fund, Inc.	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
2-25748	Sixth Empire Fund, Inc.	Feb. 9, 1967	Apr. 30, 1967	37,260,795	------------	(3)
2-25858	Sixth Presidential Fund, Inc.	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
2-25839	Third Fiduciary Exchange Fund, Inc.	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)
2-24353	Third Presidential Fund, Inc.	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)

[1] Became effective but did not solicit and will withdraw.
[2] Registered but did not become effective.
[3] Exchange not yet completed.
[4] Effective but will withdraw.
[5] Changed from an exchange fund to a conventional open-end fund.
[6] Withdrew registration.
[7] Withdrew its registration statement.
[8] Withdrew · merged into 4th Empire Fund.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letter of June 21, 1967, and the Treasury Department's reply thereto of September 21, confirming that the total value of the tax-free exchanges was approximately $420 million and that this tax-free exchange resulted in a special tax saving of $90 million.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1967.

Mr. Stanley S. Surrey,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Surrey: Under date of June 16, 1967, I received a report from Mr. John A. Dudley, Associate Director, Securities and Exchange Commission, with respect to the exchange funds which are tax-exempt by virtue of the passage of H.R. 13103. A copy of this report was forwarded to you.

In this connection will you please advise me the amount of the estimated loss in revenue to the United States Government as the result of this action. I would appreciate your including in this report an estimate of any additional loss that will result from additional securities being placed in these funds prior to the June 30, 1967, deadline.

Yours sincerely,
John J. Williams.

Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C., September 21, 1967.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: You have asked for information as to the estimated loss in revenue to the United States Government due to the organization of exchange funds which are tax exempt by virtue of the passage of H.R. 13103.

The report you received from the Securities and Exchange Commission indicates that 12 funds were completed after the effective date of the legislation. Final data which we have obtained from the Commission indicates that the total amount of transfers made tax free by the enactment of H.R. 13103 is approximately $420,000,000.

Statistics with respect to swap funds formed in the past indicate that the average cost of securities to the transferor is approximately 10 to 15 percent of value and it would appear that the average transferor would pay a capital gains tax at or close to the 25 percent maximum rate. Based on these assumptions, it could be said that if the transferors had made taxable exchanges, the tax due would have been about $90 million. Since there is no way to estimate how many of these securities would have been sold in taxable transactions in the absence of the swap alternative, it is impossible to say how much of this amount should be considered a revenue loss.

Thank you for your continuing interest in this important subject.

Sincerely yours,
Stanley S. Surrey,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, perhaps the Johnson administration and those Members of the Congress who supported this tax-free bonanza can reconcile their decisions with the more recent proposal to increase taxes by 10 percent.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on another subject, without regard to the question of germaneness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUR VIETNAM INVOLVEMENT—THE GREAT AMERICAN TRAGEDY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, from this morning's press reports, it is obvious that Secretary of State Rusk is now on the defensive regarding our tragic involvement in Vietnam. When Secretary Rusk and others who advocate our aggression in Vietnam defend our involvement in this civil insurrection and the sending in of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers and marines, they first make reference to alleged commitments made by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy to justify our intervention.

Those claims are readily demolished. The so-called commitment made by President Eisenhower was very "iffy," indeed. Here is what he stated, in 1957, in a letter to the president of South Vietnam:

> I am instructing the American Ambassador * * * to examine with you * * * how an intelligent program of American aid * * * can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial. The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. * * * The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government.

Then, regarding the claim that the late great President John F. Kennedy committed us to save the Saigon regime, even a cursory look at the statements of our late President refutes that claim. Here is what he said on September 3, 1963, shortly before his assassination:

> I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the government to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Viet Nam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last two months the government has gotten out of touch with the people.

Then, on another occasion, our late great President John F. Kennedy said:

> Transforming Vietnam into a Western redoubt is ridiculous.

This administration has made President Kennedy's "their" war into "our" war, despite the fact that President Johnson, in Akron, Ohio, in 1964, said:

> We are not about to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves.

Now, Mr. President, I read today that they are proposing to send 45,000 more American youngsters to fight an American war in Vietnam. Secretary of State Rusk could hardly have the effrontery to say that President Johnson made a commitment that we should gallop to the aid of South Vietnam under the present regime in Saigon. When they do not refer to the very "iffy" commitments made by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy to justify our involvement in the civil war in Vietnam, Secretary Rusk and other administration officials fall back on our so-called obligation under the SEATO Treaty.

Let us consider article IV of the SEATO Treaty. The text of article IV is as follows:

> 1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.
>
> 2. If, in the opinion of any of the Parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any Party in the treaty area or of any other State or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.
>
> 3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any State designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this Article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

Secretary of State Rusk has stated:

> It is this fundamental SEATO obligation that has from the outset guided our actions in South Vietnam. . . . If the United States determines that an armed attack has occured against any nation to whom the protection of the treaty applies, then it is obligated to "act to meet the common danger" without regard to the views or actions of any other treaty member.

However, the architect of the SEATO Treaty, the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, in trying to assuage congressional fears about the degree of commitment that the United States was making in the SEATO Treaty, said in 1955:

> If there is a revolutionary movement in Vietnam or Thailand, we (SEATO nations) would consult together as to what to do about it, because if there were a subversive movement that was in fact propagated by communism, it would be a very grave threat to us. But we have no undertaking to put it down; all we have is an undertaking to consult what to do about it.

The SEATO Treaty was agreed to by eight nations. Of these nations, the United Kingdom, Pakistan, and France have taken the sound position that there is no treaty obligation whatever involving their countries to send in combat soldiers to fight against the Vietcong in South Vietnam. They have definitely taken the position that there is no cause nor basis for them to assail North Vietnam with their armed forces.

De Gaulle is definitely hostile to the United States in our unilateral intervention in Vietnam. The party in power in Great Britain, the Labor Party, is opposed to our involvement. The United Kingdom, like France, has refused to send in even one combat soldier or one bomber to join us in fighting in Vietnam.

Likewise, the President of Pakistan has denounced our intervention in Vietnam in as vehement terms as President de Gaulle in France, and in as vehement terms as some leaders of the Labor Party in the United Kingdom. Pakistan with a large standing army and a large and powerful air force has not sent in one soldier nor one plane to assist in our aggression in Vietnam.

After President Johnson had given President Marcos of the Philippine Republic $150 million in additional foreign aid, in addition to that abundance of foreign aid theretofore granted to the Philippine Republic, and after President Marcos had his hot hands on an additional $150 million of American taxpayers' money, he then reluctantly agreed to send in 2,000 noncombat engineers. Not one combat soldier from the Philippine Republic and not one plane from its fine air force was committed to combat in Vietnam. President Johnson met with refusal and was rebuffed in all his efforts to secure combat aid from the Philippines. The noncombat engineers were transported by American ships and planes and have been clothed, equipped, paid, fed, and maintained by the United States at all times. Those noncombat engineers are the same sort of mercenaries as were the Hessians who fought with the Redcoats against the colonists in the American Revolution.

That leaves three other members of SEATO: Thailand, Australia, and New Zealand. We have poured billions of dollars of taxpayers' money into Thailand. We have built a great naval base south of Bangkok and we have established airbases throughout Thailand. The construction of our air and naval bases in Thailand is of a permanent character. I saw them when I visited in Southeast Asia, and I was in various places in Thailand at our airbases. Our planes have been using bases in Thailand for offensive operations in Vietnam for considerably more than 2 years. However, to date the Armed Forces of Thailand have not participated at all in fighting with us in Vietnam, nor has the Thai Navy of some 70 vessels participated at all in connection with the operations with our 1st and 7th Fleets off the coast of Vietnam.

At the present time, unfortunately, we Americans, in this insane policy of fighting in a land war in Southeast Asia, have committed our 1st and 7th Fleets, which comprises more than one-third of the entire U.S. Navy. We have committed approximately 42 percent of the air power of the United States in combat in Southeast Asia. We have committed more than one-third of our combat-ready soldiers and marines.

Despite strong opposition at home about 6,300 Australian servicemen have been serving in South Vietnam; and 376 men of the Armed Forces of New Zealand also have been landed there. Of course, additional grants of money have been made by President Johnson to both Australia and New Zealand.

Newspapers yesterday report that New Zealand will increase its contingent by 170 infantrymen and Australia by 1,700. Even at that, these are mere token forces hardly identifiable among the more than 500,000 young Americans now fighting in Vietnam.

These facts suffice to show that there is no truth and no validity to the claim made by Secretary Rusk. Furthermore, no official of any of the governments which signed the SEATO Treaty, other than Secretary Rusk—not one top official of the other seven countries—has claimed that there is any aggression against South Vietnam calling for members of the SEATO Treaty to report to the Security Council of the United Nations. Not one signatory to this treaty has communicated with the other parties to the treaty that they should consult on measures which should be taken for the defense of South Vietnam. Of course, as Senators are aware, Secretary of State Dean Rusk did not pull this argument out of his hat until we had been involved in Vietnam for more than 2 years. Apparently, it was an afterthought on his part that we had a commitment as a signatory to the SEATO Treaty.

It is interesting to note that the last sentence of section 1 of article IV states:

> Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.

In a publication issued by the Department of State in March 1966, entitled "The Legality of U.S. Participation in the Defense of Vietnam," the claim is made that our Government fulfilled this obligation in August 1964, when we asked the Council to consider the situation created by North Vietnamese attacks on the U.S. destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin; twice again, in February 1965, when the United States sent additional reports to the Security Council on the conflict in Vietnam and on the additional measures taken by the United States in the collective defense of South Vietnam; and in January 1966, when we formally submitted the Vietnam question to the Security Council for its consideration.

It is interesting to note that we did not take any step toward reporting our action in Vietnam to the Security Council until August 1964—after we had already committed many thousands of men and billions of dollars of equipment to the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. Apparently, it took officials of the State Department a long time to determine that we were in Vietnam because of the SEATO Treaty. In fact, it appears that this justification was made after it was finally realized that all the other timeworn excuses and loophole-ridden justifications claimed by officials of the executive department of our Government would not hold water.

Secretary of State Rusk has stated that he finds "no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Vietnam and abandon Southeast Asia to the fate which Asian Communists have planned for it." To begin with, the Secretary assumes that by withdrawing from Vietnam, we would be abandoning Southeast Asia to communism. Secretary Rusk disregards completely the fact that the war in Vietnam is a civil war which has been raging since 1940. There can be no argument about that.

When I was in Vietnam, General Westmoreland told me that the bulk of the VC were born and reared in South Vietnam. His second in command, Gen. Richard Stillwell, echoed that statement. General Stillwell stated to me that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting us in the Mekong Delta, in the southern part of Vietnam, were born and raised in the Mekong Delta.

To that I responded, "Well, we're involved in a civil war, then."

He said, "Well, it's a civil insurrection."

Secretary Rusk ignores the fact that this is a nationalist movement as well as a Communist movement—more nationalist than it is Communist. Vietnam is a small agrarian country. The ignorant peasants feel they know what freedom from colonial oppression is. They wish to breathe the air of liberty. They had been under the yoke of French colonialism for many, many years. They are liberty-seeking. It is questionable, indeed, whether many of these ignorant peasants are in fact Communists.

Apparently, Secretary Rusk cannot comprehend that we are fighting Vietnamese nationalism, which, far from opening the door to Communist Chinese conquest, really offers the best hope of erecting political and cultural barriers to such conquest.

The Vietnamese for years have feared the Chinese colossus to their north. Monuments commemorating victories of the past over Chinese aggression are evident throughout Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh himself was a prisoner in a Chinese dungeon in 1944.

Mr. President, talking about Ho Chi Minh, it is impossible to believe that he is a tool or could possibly be a mere tool or puppet of Mao Tse-tung, or of the Chinese Communists, for he himself was a prisoner in a Chinese dungeon for more than a year near the end of World War II.

The Secretary has created a scarecrow of invalid premises to frighten Americans into accepting his loophole-ridden justifications for our intervention in this civil war.

Just recently the Secretary—despite his disclaimers to the contrary—raised the specter of the yellow peril, menacing Americans and other peoples of the world. Let us consider this matter for a moment. Here is the nation of Communist China with perhaps 750 million people. It can maintain and does maintain a huge land army. It has no surface navy whatsoever, except some junks. It is true China has a nuclear capacity, but it will be a number of years before China will be able to fire any warheads at anyone. It has a very small and obsolescent air force, no surface navy whatsoever, and an antiquated and small submarine fleet far inferior to the fine air force and fine navy of Australia or of Japan, and far inferior to the air force and navy of the Republic of the Philippines.

Therefore, it is fantastic for Secretary Rusk to claim that there is a danger that Red China will go on a journey of conquest and that Saigon is an outpost defending Seattle or San Francisco.

Secretary Rusk's impassioned defense of his Vietnam policy evades the real issue facing us today. This is the urgency of stopping the bombing of north Vietnam and recognizing the Vietcong as a legitimate party to negotiations toward a cease-fire and an armistice. The unpleasant fact is that Secretary Rusk's policy, after nearly 3 years, has proven to be a dismal and tragic failure. Escalation has neither intimidated the Vietcong nor reduced their forces. On the contrary, these have tripled during the period of escalation. More young Americans are now being killed each week than were lost in the 3 years preceding the bombing of north Vietnam and the stepped-up ground warfare in the south that ensued.

The priceless lives of some 900 youngsters from communities throughout Ohio have been lost in combat. They have been listed as deaths due to combat by our Department of Defense. In addition thousands have been wounded and hundreds have died of hepatitis, plague, and other jungle diseases, or have been killed in a manner that the Department of Defense, to try to minimize our tremendous losses, terms accidents and incidents. Any veteran of a war, such as the present Presiding Officer (Mr. CLARK in the chair) and many Members of Senate, knows that those are in reality combat deaths.

It is a fact that in other States of the Nation equal suffering has been inflicted in every county and community.

Secretary of State Rusk alleges—and this is a false allegation—that we are saving Southeast Asia from communism. Why is it then that Asiatic nations such as Japan, Indonesia, and India have urged that we unconditionally cease the bombing of north Vietnam and then proceed toward ending this war? Practically all Asians outside of our client states and puppets have urged the same course of action.

It is becoming more and more obvious that it is not the so-called Chinese menace that has led the administration to this vast escalation of the war in Vietnam. Rather, it is the fact that the administration now must find some excuse, some objective, some scarecrow, that will seem dangerous enough to Americans to justify the commitment of more than 600,000 American soldiers and marines in Vietnam and Thailand, vast armadas of our ships and warplanes, and the expenditure of more than $2.5 billion every month in this civil war in a small nation 10,000 miles distant from our shores which is of no strategic or economic importance to the defense of the United States. It is not now and it never will be.

Mr. President, this is a particularly sad day for Americans, for we read in the newspapers today that only 41 miles from Saigon, our Armed Forces were engaged in a bitter, all-day battle with the Vietcong in regimental strength. Bear in mind, no members whatever of the South Vietnamese forces were engaged in that terrible battle—not one of them was there. They are busy furnishing so-called laundresses for American soldiers. They are busy selling American rations of cigarettes on the black market. They are indulging in graft and deserting from their armed forces—75,000 deserted during the first 10 months of this year. Those are the South Vietnamese forces—the so-called friendly forces. They are friendly forces, all right. They are friendly to everyone, including the Vietcong. They do not do any fighting.

Unfortunately, we read today that 58 Americans were killed and more than 61 wounded in this battle, fought almost within the suburbs of Saigon, only a little further distant from Saigon than Lorain, Ohio, is distant from my hometown of Cleveland.

Among the killed, I read with sorrow, were Maj. Don W. Holleder, former West Point football great, and Lt. Col. Terry Allen, Jr., whose father commanded the 1st Division in Tunisia and Sicily in World War II.

Those men were killed in combat just 40 miles from where the flamboyant Ky holds forth in Saigon.

From optimistic statements emanating from the White House, State Department, and Defense Department, Americans have reason to believe that this area so close to Saigon had been pacified and was under the complete control of American forces. The fact is that this fighting raged in a thick jungle on the edge of war zone D, the Vietcong's main base camp area only 40 miles above Saigon.

Mr. President, this was not sporadic guerrilla warfare but a pitched battle with Vietcong forces of regiment strength, reportedly 2,500 men. It was the biggest ground action since the siege of Conthien last month, and the bloodiest fighting in the area near Saigon for many, many months. This is further evidence of the fact that the escalation of the ground war in Vietnam has failed to disperse the Vietcong. The fact is that the Vietcong today control more hamlets and villages than they did 2 or 3 years ago, before our huge buildup of men and supplies.

As significant proof of the statement I have just made, about 2 years ago in Newsweek, Time magazine, and in the daily newspapers, we would see colored charts of the areas of South Vietnam which, it was claimed, were being held securely by the "friendly" forces of South Vietnam and by the Americans, and those areas being held by the Communists. It is significant that the Defense Department does not now permit the printing of such charts. They have not appeared in newspapers or weekly magazines for a long time.

This morning it was announced that we will be sending 45,000 more American soldiers to fight in the jungles and swamps in Vietnam. This, in addition to the more than 500,000 ground forces we have already committed to this civil war which we have made into an American air and ground war.

By this time it is crystal clear to most thoughtful Americans—and it should be crystal clear to Secretary of State Rusk and other administration officials—that if they are really intent on a military victory in Vietnam, it is going to require the participation of more than a million American soldiers and marines.

If they are going to continue seeking to destroy a nation and to kill off thousands and thousands of civilian men, women, and children, in addition to the 150,000 civilians we have already killed and maimed with our artillery and napalm bombing, then those in power in the Defense Department and the administration should tell the truth to the American people. They should tell them that it is going to require the participation of more than 1 million American soldiers and marines.

Let us hope that the Secretary of State comes to his senses before we become even further committed to such a tragic course of action.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think it goes without saying that every Member of this body vigorously opposes communism and supports every measure necessary to preserve the freedom of this great Republic.

For that very reason, I oppose Senate consideration of the pending bill, S. 2171, until hearings have been held upon it, and before an adequate and informative report has been prepared by the Judiciary Committee, which is responsible for it.

At the very least, I think the people of this country are entitled to a hearing on important legislation. The very nature of the work of this deliberative body demands it. It is impossible for every Senator to know every line or every facet of the 25,000 or more pieces of legislation introduced in every Congress.

Mr. President, I think that hearings and an adequate report are vital and essential for an intelligent, comprehensive Senate consideration of the bill, for at least the following four basic reasons:

First, we should not be considering on the floor of the Senate any legislation vitally affecting our national security without knowing exactly what the legislation is about and without hearings to ascertain the views of experts on national security and the threat of communism.

We should not be considering any such national security legislation without the testimony of the appropriate Government agencies responsible for the protection of the internal security of this Nation and other legal experts as to how the bill will actually work and how it might be improved.

I think the Senate is entitled to have the testimony of the responsible chiefs of the investigative agencies charged with the internal security of this country clearly on the record, with the pros and cons, before we make a judgment on the bill.

I have the greatest respect for the author of this bill and for those who have spoken in favor of it, but, with all deference to them, they are not charged with the responsibility of the internal security of this country. They are not intelligence agents. They do not have the day-to-day responsibility for investigation or prosecution of espionage. They do not know the problems that confront the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice.

From the beginning, it has seemed extremely strange to me why the sponsors of this legislation are afraid to have public hearings, why they are afraid to permit the responsible officers of the investigative agencies of this country to testify, why it is they bend over backward to prevent the Attorney General of the United States from testifying, why it is that they are absolutely adament in their refusal to agree to any type of public hearing on the merits or demerits of this legislation.

Could it be, Mr. President, that the demerits brought out by the testimony in open hearing might indicate that there is no valid security reason for this legislation? Could it be that the only reason for the adoption of the legislation is to keep a few political appointees in $26,000-a-year jobs?

I think the American people are entitled to know the answers. If this is a genuine internal security measure, as its principal sponsor says it is and protests it is, then why is he afraid to have the principal officers of the United States responsible for internal security testify? Why is he afraid to hold this bill up to the light of day? Why is it that he tried to suspend the rules of the U.S. Senate to consider the bill as part of an appropriations measure. Fortunately, his motion did not prevail. I think that any objective citizen who will study the record of debate on this matter and the history of this legislation, could not help but come to the conclusion that there is more to this than meets the eye.

Second, this bill was hastily drafted, and, as introduced and considered by the Judiciary Committee, contained at least technical defects, and in my view—and I am not on the subcommittee responsible for it—a massive loophole, about which I will have more to say later, which will allow some of the most dangerous Communist front organizations and action groups to escape any coverage under this legislation.

Of course, Mr. President, this is what happens when hastily drafted legislation is rushed through without any type of public hearing, without any type of study, without any type of scholarly examination. There are major loopholes, and there are possibilities of more.

Third, very serious questions have been raised about the qualifications of the most recent appointee to the 5-man Subversive Activities Control Board. Mr. Simon McHugh's principal qualification for the post seems to be that he married one of the secretaries of the President of the United States. Well, this $26,000-a-year job is not a bad job, particularly when the board has not examined a single case in the past year—and, indeed, has had little to do in the past 20 months. Indeed, they do nothing except sit, at taxpayers' expense, and expend $300,000 a year, day after day, week after week, month after month.

In light of the controversy about Mr. McHugh, the new Board member, I think the people of the United States are entitled to know what qualifications, if any, the members of the Subversive Activities Control Board possess other than friendship with influential people.

Fourth, this hastily drafted, unstudied bill deals with the most difficult questions of constitutional law, including citizens' rights under our own first 10 amendments and the rights of all citizens to protect themselves against internal subversion, the Communist variety or any other.

As you know, Mr. President, last week I joined with six other Senators in opposing the senior Senator from Illinois' request for suspension of the Senate rules to consider S. 2171 as an amendment to an appropriation bill. I did so because I agreed with the arguments propounded by that same Senator from Illinois only last January against suspending the rules to consider amending rule 22 of the United States Senate, the cloture rule. In January of this year Senator DIRKSEN said:

> If we are going to protect the Republic against wild schemes and fantasies and favorite legislative brainchildren, the thing to do is protect our rules.

I could not agree with the Senator more, and I think this argument is just as cogent in October as it was in January. It is just as cogent when the Senator from Illinois is on the other side of the argument as it was when we were on the same side of the argument. What Senator DIRKSEN said in January about suspending the rules of the Senate is equally true now about dispensing with hearings and an adequate report on this bill, S. 2171, the pending business of the U.S. Senate.

If ever there was a time when any legislation should have thoughtful hearings and a clear, thorough, precise report, it is on a bill affecting the national security of the citizenry of the United States. S. 2171 purports to be such a bill.

This bill deals directly with the major threat to the internal security of the United States in this century, the Communist conspiracy.

The bill would substantially alter and amend the basic law designed against that menace—the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. The proposal before the Senate purports to provide the legal tools needed to combat the Communist conspiracy, without infringing upon the constitutional rights of loyal Americans.

This bill deals with one of the most complex and controversial areas of the law of this Republic. President Truman vetoed the original act which S. 2171 would amend. Congress overrode that veto. Fifteen years of nearly constant litigation over the meaning and the constitutionality of that act's provisions followed. Court decisions have struck down major portions of that act because of their unconstitutionality. Still other parts of the act are even now being tested in court.

In short, Mr. President, S. 2171 amends one of the most significant, difficult, controversial, and critical areas of our law—the legal control of internal subversion in this country. Yet S. 2171 has never had an hour's or even a minute's hearing before any committee of the Senate, nor does the committee report upon it indicate the slightest notion of what that bill purports to do, what it provides, how it works, or even how it will change the existing law.

Mr. President, as I indicated last week, I shall oppose voting on this bill until hearings have been held upon it, and until an adequate report has been made upon it. It is a general and salutary practice in the Senate that every report on every important or controversial bill considered by the Senate shall contain an explanation of the bill, a section-by-section analysis and explanation of its provisions, together with an exact statement of how the bill would change the terminology of the existing law.

This practice exists for very sound reasons, and should be suspended only in the rarest of cases. The practice of writing complete and informative reports exists, first of all, to enable a Senator to understand what it is he is called upon to vote about, in general what the bill provides, its background, the need for it, an analysis of its sections, and a line-by-line statement of the changes the bill would make in the language of the existing law.

Each part of the report tells a Senator an essential part of what he needs to know about that bill, in order to cast an intelligent vote, in order to determine what the merits and demerits of a bill are, whether it should be amended to better serve the public interest, and whether it should be adopted or rejected.

Secondly, the report provides a basis for public understanding and legal interpretation of the provisions of the bill. When difficult questions of legal interpretations arise in court cases involving congressional legislation—and, indeed, this bill, by the very history and nature of the act it attempts to amend, will, if enacted, obviously be such legislation—the committee report on the bill provides a prime and essential part of the legislative history which is supposed to guide the courts in deciding what Congress meant when the words of an act are unclear, or are capable of more than one interpretation.

Indeed, Mr. President, there are many times, in committee deliberations and the markup of controversial pieces of legislation, when Senators taking opposing viewpoints on the committee will be able to agree on an amendment to or a deletion from the bill only because they have agreed on the language of the report. In some instances, the language of the report is debated as vigorously and strongly in a committee meeting or markup as the language of the bill itself.

There is a reason for that. Members of Congress realize that when a question arises before a court on the interpretation of an act, the report which is on the desk of the Senator when the bill is considered is indicative of the legislative intent, and is a binding part of the legislative history, together with the debate on the floors of Congress itself. In the absence of adequate legislative history, the court is free—in fact, it is forced—to guess what Congress meant, and to put the court's own interpretation on difficult areas of the law.

So Senate practice and sound legislative technique require a comprehensive report on every significant piece of legislation which this body adopts.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the author of the bill under consideration, S. 2171, seems to agree that the report on the bill is inadequate. At least last Wednesday, when S. 2171 became the pending business of the Senate in its own right, Senator DIRKSEN inserted at page 28533 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 11, 1967, a brief explanation of this 263-line, 11-page bill, in order, quoting his own words, "that Members of the Senate may have more detailed information on the contents of the measure."

That statement has now been reprinted as a separate document. On the cover of that document appear the words "Printed for the Use of the Committee on the Judiciary." But that document did not exist when the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, reported S. 2171 to the Senate, nor had I ever seen it—nor, to my knowledge, had any of my fellow committee members seen it, other than the Senator from Illinois—until it appeared on our desks in the Senate yesterday.

This piece of paper is entitled "Section-by-Section Analysis of S. 2171, a Bill To Amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as To Accord With Certain Decisions of the Courts." Counting that title as five lines, this so-called section-by-section analysis of the bill contains 74 lines. S. 2171 contains 263 lines. So this document provides only one line of explanation, including its five-line title, for every three and a half lines of the text of the bill.

Mr. President, we are not kidding anyone. This is not a comprehensive section-by-section analysis of the bill within the meaning, the need, and the tradition of section-by-section analyses in the Senate.

Obviously drafted in haste, printed nearly 2 months after S. 2171 was reported to the Senate, this document hardly deserves the title of section-by-section analysis, and certainly by no stretch of the imagination can it be considered a substitute for an adequate report on the bill.

I question the title that the section-by-section analysis has. It says: "A Bill To Amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as To Accord With Certain Decisions of the Courts." I wonder, if all the facts were brought before the view of the citizens of the United States and if we have full and open hearings in the course of which we permit those who might criticize the proposal to testify, whether the bill might not, as presently drafted, be reclassified as "a bill to permit the continuation of certain high-paid political appointees being compensated under an act entitled the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950."

I think the citizens of the United States are entitled to the facts which will enable them to reach a fair and an informed judgment on this bill.

And I think we, as Senators of the United States, are entitled to that same information.

Neither the so-called section-by-section analysis nor the original "report" on S. 2171 provides a satisfactory explanation of the bill either in form or in substance. Neither this analysis nor the original "report" includes a statement of the literal changes the bill would make in existing law.

In substance, the new "section-by-section analysis," like the original "report," adds little understanding to the otherwise total obscurity which now surrounds the provisions of S. 2171, in the absence of any hearings or an adequate report.

By producing this so-called summary of the bill's provisions at this the 12th hour, the bill's author has explicitly acknowledged the inadequacy of the original report on the bill. Unfortunately, the summary, too, is wholly uninformative as to what the bill actually provides.

Mr. President, what urgency is there about this bill? What is the acute national crisis after 20 months of SACB dormancy? What grave, imperative revelation justifies doing without hearings and without an adequate report on this bill?

Is the Federal Bureau of Investigation about to stop its activities in the area of internal security? Is the Central Intelligence Agency about to close its doors? Are any of the various Federal investigative agencies about to close shop? Is the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice about to go out of business?

The Subversive Activities Control Board has rarely met for 20 months. The Attorney General has referred no case to it in more than a year. It has been paralyzed for 15 years before that by lawsuits questioning the constitutionality of some of the provisions S. 2171 now seeks to cure.

If S. 2171 is so urgent now that the Senate must vote on it without even knowing what it provides, why was the bill not proposed last year or 2 years ago when the Supreme Court first held unconstitutional that part of the Board's activities that the pending bill was supposed to concern? Why was it not proposed then?

I think the people of the United States are entitled to hearings to bring out facts as to why it was not proposed. I think that the appointees to this board ought to be investigated. I think we ought to clear up once and for all whether we have a genuine "Subversive Activities Control Board," or whether it is just a nice, comfortable political pork barrel. And I think that the people of the United States are entitled to have hearings and to have the facts brought out.

In this great country, we generally can make a proper judgment when the facts reach the citizenry. And I am satisfied that we can make the proper judgment in this matter when the facts reach the citizenry.

Why the tremendous resistance, why the reluctance, why the complete obstinacy toward holding any public hearings on this matter, or even permitting the Attorney General of the United States to testify? Why is it that the sponsors are afraid to hold this matter up to the light of day? What is it that they want to keep hidden or unrevealed from the American people?

I think we are entitled to have public hearings. After 17 years, there is no special emergency today, other than the continuation of the $26,000-a-year sinecures which requires that the Senate act blindly, without hearings, and without a report on the bill.

It has been suggested that we will break faith with our men in Vietnam if we do not blindly approve the bill without knowing what it provides or even what job, if any, it is supposed to do. I say we do not break faith with our men in Vietnam by insisting upon our own basic, essential rules for the orderly and reasonable consideration of legislation, especially legislation dealing with our national security. I say we do not break faith with our men in Vietnam if we follow the historic rules of the Senate in dealing with important and significant pieces of proposed legislation.

But, Mr. President, we do break faith with our men in Vietnam if we carelessly, blindly, and unnecessarily dispense with the orderly processes of our liberty, which those men are fighting to protect—and I include among the orderly processes of our liberty the rules and practices of the Senate in the consideration of the Nation's laws.

I say we betray our fighting men if we substitute panic and political pressure for proper procedure, we betray them if we substitute needless expediency for time-honored, tested, and proved legislative procedure—procedure designed not to obstruct a bill's consideration or to prevent its passage, but designed rather to make certain that every bill passed, to the best of our ability, does what it is supposed to do, does it in the best way possible, and contains no time bombs or pitfalls to shatter our liberties.

What are we asking? We are asking that the bill be sent back to the Committee on the Judiciary, to enable the committee to hold at least 2 days of hearings and afford the Attorney General of the United States and perhaps four or five witnesses who have criticized the bill to testify. Then we are willing to have the bill reported to the Senate at a time certain and to have the Senate vote on the bill at a time certain. There is nothing obstructive about that.

We are merely asking for an opportunity to have the people of the United States become informed about exactly what the bill provides. If the sponsor has the votes, why is he afraid to have a public hearing on the bill, when he can have a vote in the Senate at a time certain?

I oppose the consideration of the bill by the Senate without hearings or an adequate report, not because I am against its provisions, for neither I nor practically any other Senator can know, with the puny record which is before us, what the bill specifically provides. I oppose a vote on this bill now because the procedure which has been followed—no hearings, an unintelligible report, and the suggested blind acceptance of its provisions—is as destructive of our system of liberty as any conspiracy needs to be to erode the foundations of our freedom. That is why I favor sending this bill back to committee for a designated, reasonably short period of time, to hold hearings and to draft an adequate, informative report on it.

What is the danger in holding hearings? Is there some part or provision of this bill which cannot bear the light of day? After 17 years of paralysis and 20 months of total inaction by the Subversive Activities Control Board, has the Communist menace become so acute in the last few days that we must act blindly this week rather than reasonably next month on this bill?

As I indicated, I am perfectly willing to agree to a binding consent agreement to limit debate on the bill once it is reported back to the Senate, and to agree on a specific date for that report, if the Senator from Illinois [Mr. **Dirksen**] is willing to hold hearings on the bill so that we can find out what it is all about, how it might be improved, and whether it can do the job that is claimed for it.

I believe that the Senate rules and practices for considering important legislation have a vital purpose in our Republic which should not be lightly overthrown. I see no reason to dispense with hearings or an adequate report in the case of this bill. In fact, in the case of this bill, in light of the importance of the subject, I believe such a hearing and such a report are absolutely vital.

Hearings on this bill, although not specifically required by the Senate rules, are an essential part of the legislative process recommended by practice, experience, the necessity for guidelines to the courts, and good commonsense.

We have had no expression whatever—other than a so-called mysterious letter, which has not yet been made public—of the views of the Department of Justice on this bill, even though the Justice Department will have primary responsibility for enforcing the bill. We do not even have any record of the views of members or staff of the Subversive Activities Control Board about the bill. We have no record at all on this bill.

At this point, Mr. President, let us lay to rest the assertion, made by those who favor passing this bill without hearings, that the testimony before the Appropriations Committee on this year's Subversive Activities Control Board budget provides a basis for enacting this bill. Those hearings were not on this bill, S. 2171, but were conducted as a part of the normal appropriations process and, also, in response to Senate Joint Resolution 145, which asked the Appropriations Committee to determine, in light of the controversial appointment of Mr. Simon McHugh to the Subversive Activities Control Board, whether:

First, the current and prospective volume of business of the Board warrants the continued exercise of its powers, and the continued performance of its functions and duties, by a separate agency of Government; and whether

Second, the powers, duties, functions, and property of the Board should be transferred to another agency of the Government in the interest of efficiency and economy in the conduct of Government operations.

Senate Joint Resolution 145, passed on July 25, 1967, is completely separate and apart from S. 2171, which was not introduced until two days later, on July 27 of this year. It was passed in response to the controversy about the continued usefulness of the Subversive Control Board in light of the appointment to it of an apparently completely unqualified person.

The hearings in question of the Committee on Appropriations are reprinted as part of the Senate hearings on State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriations, H.R. 10345, 90th Congress, first session, fiscal year 1968, on pages 1021 to 1071.

Two points about these hearings of the Committee on Appropriations suffice to answer the assertion that those hearings provide a basis for considering S. 2171.

First, the bill was not even before the Committee on Appropriations for consideration during those hearings and is barely mentioned by anyone during those hearings.

Second, those hearings not only were not available to the Committee on the Judiciary during its brief consideration of S. 2171, they were not even conducted until August 15, the very morning the Committee on the Judiciary took up and reported S. 2171 to the Senate, and were in fact going on simultaneously with the action of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Furthermore, the report of the Committee on Appropriations on the State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill not only did not endorse S. 2171, it did not even specifically mention it.

Mr. President, we have had no hearings on this bill, and we have no adequate report on it. We have, in fact, no record at all. Until we have such a record, I must continue to oppose a Senate vote on this bill.

My insistence on adequate consideration of this bill is not based solely on the belief, which I firmly hold, that every significant bill should be thoroughly considered in hearings and thoroughly explained in a report. My insistence in this case is also based on the fact that even a passing acquaintance with the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, which created the original Subversive Activities Control Board, and which S. 2171 would amend, and even a brief inspection of S. 2171 without the benefit of any hearings, shows that S. 2171 contains a massive loophole through which some of the most dedicated and dangerous Communists operating in the United States today and Communist-action organizations and Communist fronts will escape the exposure this amendment is supposed to provide.

It is common knowledge that the world Communist movement has, in the last decade, fragmented into at least two major ideological camps, the Soviet and the Chinese. Moscow, and the Communist Party throughout the world whose allegiance it commands, has somewhat tempered its belligerence toward the Western nations, while Peking has continued to pursue, in fact, to intensify the militantly hostile Stalinist line of world armed revolution.

Every informed high school senior knows that there is a vast difference between the operation of the world Communist group dominated by the Chinese and the world Communist group dominated by the Soviets. Indeed, their belligerence toward each other has been so pronounced it has come to national and international attention, particularly in the last several years.

I do not disagree with the commentators who note that, as toward our security, the divergence in Soviet and Chinese Communist doctrine is only a question of how they will prevail over our system rather than whether they should try. I believe we must continue to guard ourselves against attack from without and subversion from within by both the Soviet and the Chinese Communist Parties and programs.

But the fact is inescapable that whereas 15 years ago we may have faced only one Communist threat—the Stalinist Soviet—we now face at least two separate and distinct Communist threats which are at ideological war both with us and with one another. The ideological, strategic, and tactical split in the Communist world has split Communist Parties throughout the world into Soviet and Maoist camps, each pursuing a different approach and neither taking orders from the other. The split is so deep that the Soviet Union and the Chinese exchange not only verbal condemnation of one another, but also bullets at one another across the Chinese-Soviet border.

And that is precisely the Achilles' heel, one massive loophole, one fatal defect, in S. 2171 that even the most cursory hearing on the bill would have uncovered. If this bill is passed in its present form, it would apply only to Communists, Communist-action groups, and Communist fronts which take their direction from the Soviet Union. It will not apply to the more militant, more virulent, and I believe far more dangerous, Communist, Communist-action groups, and Communist fronts which take their lead from China, not from Moscow.

This glaring defect in S. 2171 arises from the fact that it simply amends the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, which, by its terms and by interpretation by the Subversive Activities Control Board and the Supreme Court, applies only to Communist groups, fronts, and individuals which are in the Moscow orbit, not to the groups, fronts, and individuals which take their direction from the Chinese Communist Party.

The 1950 act is thoroughly permeated with the theory that the internal Communist threat is directed by, and only by, the Soviet Union. This theory finds expression in many parts of the act, but especially in section 2, the congressional findings section, and section 13, the section detailing the proceedings of the Subversive Activities Control Board. As a result, the 1950 act authorizes the Subversive Activities Control Board to proceed in cases dealing with Moscow-oriented Communists, Communist-action organizations, and Communist-front organizations. But it is powerless to deal with Chinese-oriented Communists, Communist-action organizations, and Communist-front organizations. This is the position taken by the Subversive Activities Control Board itself, by the Supreme Court, and by the Department of Justice as recently as last Monday, October 9, in argument before the Supreme Court in the case of United States of America against Eugene Rovel, a case questioning the constitutionality of still another part of the Subversive Activities Control Act.

Lest there be any doubt that the 1950 act, which S. 2171 would amend, is restricted to dealing with the Communists, Communist-action agencies, and Communist-front organizations substantially influenced, dominated or controlled by China, I shall quote from the Supreme Court case of *Communist Party of the United States* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board*, 367 U.S. 1, 1961, the case which upheld the power of the Subversive Activities Control Board to hold the Moscow-oriented Communist Party of the United States to be a Communist-action organization required to register under the Subversive Activities Control Act. In that case, on page 112 and 113, the Court said:

> Under § 3 (3) of the Act, an organization may not be found to be a Communist-action organization unless it is shown to be, first, "substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 . . ." The only operative function of § 2 in this respect is to designate what Congress meant by "world Communist movement," "the foreign government," etc. The characteristics of the movement and the source of its control are not to be established by the Attorney General in proceedings before the Board, nor may they be disproved. But this is because they are merely defining terms whose truth, as such, is irrelevant to the issues in such proceedings. They are referents which identify "the foreign government" to which § 3(3) adverts. *The Board construing the statute, concluded that that foreign government was the Soviet Union. We affirm that construction. The statute, then, defines a Communist-action organization in terms of substantial direction, domination, or control by the Soviet Union.*

That interpretation of the act by the Subversive Activities Control Board, by the Supreme Court, and by the Justice Department is the law of the land today and would not be changed one iota by S. 2171.

To show what this defect in S. 2171 means, we need look no further than this morning's paper. The Washington Post, on page 22 of its October 18 edition, reports that Hanoi has announced the formation of a group called the South Vietnam People's Committee for Solidarity with the American People," whose purpose it is to unite and coordinate with the American people in demanding that the U.S. Government put an end to its aggressive war in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I assume that most of us would at least suspect or reasonably believe that this new South Vietnam People's Committee for Solidarity with the American People is a Communist-front organization. I do not believe that takes a great deal of acumen.

Yet, unless it could be proven that that organization is substantially directed, dominated or controlled by the Soviet Union, rather than by China, or is at least substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by another organization which itself is substantially directed, dominated or controlled by the Soviet Union, rather than by China, this new South Vietnam People's Committee for Solidarity with the American People could open an office across the street from the Capitol Building and could not be touched by the Subversive Activities Control Board.

So let no one be deluded that S. 2171 protects the United States from whatever threat Communist-inspired internal subversion poses to us. S. 2171 is, at best, a half-way measure which does not even reach those individuals and organizations which probably pose the greatest Communist threat to the United States—the Stalinist, virulent, violent, Chinese-oriented Communists, Communist-action agencies, and Communist-front organizations.

At least, Secretary of State Rusk seemed to feel so in his press conference last week. I refer to his fears of Communist China rather than of the Soviet Union.

Senate bill 2171, now before the Senate, does not even cover Communists, Communist-action organizations, or Communist-front organizations which are influenced by the Chinese Communist Party.

This is just one example of what happens when we do not follow proper legislative procedures in developing what a bill does, what it should do, and what it does not do. I do not know how many other loopholes an examination of the proposal would turn up, but my point is: Why the great resistance to a recommittal for a specific purpose, for a specific period of time, with directions for hearings, with a specific number of witnesses, including the Attorney General of the United States, with agreement to report back to the Senate on a date certain after the hearings for a vote at a time certain?

What possible result other than to benefit the people of this country could accrue from the proper legislative procedures which we request?

Here we are arguing on the floor of the Senate about whether this potently defective bill—covering only Soviet oriented Communists, Communist-action organizations, and Communist-front organizations, with no reference to or coverage of Chinese Communists or their organizations—should be passed without hearings or an adequate report.

Mr. President, I can only say that if the Communist conspiracy which has given rise to S. 2171 is organized in as haphazard a fashion as is our consideration of this slapdash bill, we have less to be worried about than I thought. I believe we do our national security a grave disservice in proceeding without hearings or adequate consideration of this bill.

If we are to be stampeded in the name of "anticommunism" into enacting a bill without adequate committee consideration, let it at least be a bill not so transparently defective as S. 2171, which does not even cover the agents and organizations of at least half or more of the world Communist movement.

Mr. President, I could and am prepared to speak for a much longer period on my concerns about the bill. I could, for example, renew my questioning of the Board's newest member whose principal qualification seems to be that he recently married one of the President's former secretaries. I could start questioning the qualifications of each of the other members, on the number of hours they have spent actually working while they were being paid $26,000 a year of the taxpayers' money.

I could discourse at much greater length on the need to update the 1950 act to make it workable in light of the radically changed circumstances in the Communist world and developments in our own domestic law. If we need a board to determine which organizations and individuals in America are subversive, let us make sure that we give that Board authority which will stand up in court. The constitutional defects in the original Subversive Activities Control Act, which this bill seeks to amend, led to 17 years of paralysis and defeat for the Board, because the defects prevented the act from ever being effective.

If we need a board of political appointees to expose subversion in the United States, then let us at least make certain that that Board has an opportunity to examine all areas of the internal security problem in the United States, those related to the extreme right as well as to the extreme left, those related to groups who advocate riot, assassination, and murder of public officials in the United States in our great cities, and others. If we are going to advocate a system of "exposure," then let us do it right and properly.

The constitutional defects in the original Subversive Activities Act, which the bill seeks to amend, I think have been pointed out sufficiently by the Federal courts of the United States at least to warrant, if we are going to amend the act, a detailed review on these various constitutional fallibilities in an effort to correct them.

Rather than blindly enacting a band-aid intended to cure some of these fatal defects in the 1950 act, I think it is only good commonsense to advocate that we should, instead, enact a thoughtful, thorough, timely, and effective bill which would cover all areas of internal security problems.

How do we know, without hearings or a comprehensive report on this bill, that it will not just aggravate the legal problems the Board faces? All we really do know about S. 2171 is that it can do, at best, half a job, not touching those who are probably, at present at least, potentially our most serious enemies—namely, those Communists, Communist-action organizations, and Communist-dominated groups oriented to or controlled by the Chinese Communist empire.

I am not going to speak at greater length this afternoon about these problems, because I hope what I and other Senators have put on the record makes clear the need to send this bill back to committee for thorough hearings and a comprehensive report. I have no wish to block a Senate vote on S. 2171 by extended debate. I do hope, however, that the points made here may convince Senators that the only wise vote on S. 2171 at this time is a vote to recommit it for proper and appropriate consideration in the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I would hope most sincerely that the patriotism of any Member of this body who happens to question the pending proposal, who has doubts about it, or who may vote and even argue against it would in no way be impugned or attached. I hope also that no Member will be colored or criticized or condemned for his action either for or against the pending measure.

I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from Maryland that opposition in any form to this measure does not mean that faith with our men in Vietnam has been broken. And I would hope that we would consider this proposal before us not on the basis of emotion, which can be charged quite easily, and sometimes have disastrous consequences—and I can speak on that personally—but on the basis of the merits—on the facts and practicalities as they exist at the moment.

A board exists—although it is barely operative—whose members are being paid, and will continue to be paid for the rest of this fiscal year, an annual rate of $26,000 or so. Now we can either do something through legislation to give these Board members something to do or we can, by our action of doing nothing, allow them to continue to draw their $26,000-a-year salaries without doing anything to earn them. It is just as simple as that, and every Member of this body knows it. We can permit them to do something to justify the salaries they are receiving, or allow them to go on as they are, getting $26,000-plus a year for doing nothing, or we can attempt to abolish the Board entirely.

Those are our choices and we ought to face up to this situation. I would hope that there would not be too much talk about lengthy debate or long-drawn educational discussions, because the issue is pretty clear and to the point. It should be faced up to regardless of how we feel on this particular proposal.

So I repeat, I simply think the Senate should be permitted to face up to the issue presented by the proposal now before us. S. 2171 amends the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 and in my opinion, poses no monumental policy decision. It does make an attempt to implement the Senate's decision of last week when it voted to appropriate funds for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Last week the Senate refused to delete from the State-Justice appropriation bill the funds for this Board. By retaining these funds in that bill, the Senate refused to back an effort to abolish the board this year.

As I understand it, the Supreme Court has ruled certain provisions of the original McCarran-Walter Act unconstitutional, and the present bill simply attempts to modify the Board's jurisdiction to comply with the Supreme Court's decisions and thus enable the Board to function. The Department of Justice, however, still must initiate any proceedings against any organization believed to be subversive.

There is no guarantee that the present bill, the Dirksen bill, will prove the effectiveness of the Board. But the Senate's decision last week demonstrates clearly that the Senate wishes the funds appropriated. This measure represents an effort to make certain that the funds will be expended in an appropriate manner. Without this legislation, the Board would exist with a stated congressional purpose, but without the license to function in furtherance of that purpose. Such a posture is, in my opinion, untenable.

It is true that the Board has lapsed into inaction. The recent decisions of the Supreme Court rendered unconstitutional the provisions of the 1950 law requiring individual registration of subversive organizations. This bill, as I understand it, does not attempt to overturn or interfere with those decisions.

It does, however, spell out the jurisdiction of the Board in accordance with those decisions, enabling the Board to hold hearings—which it cannot do now—to determine whether an organization, in reality, is bent on the destruction of our democratic processes.

Proceedings before the Board will be initiated upon the petition of the Attorney General, when he has reason to believe that an organization is so marked. The bill assures due process of law, including an open hearing before any final determination can be made. I believe that in the event action is to be taken against any organization, these due process safeguards should and must be afforded.

I am fully appreciative of the fact that the demands on this Board have diminished in recent years. I think that this speaks well for the vitality of our form of government and the diminished threat of communism internally in our country. However, since the Board does exist, and Congress has, as recently as last week, decided that it should not be abolished, S. 2171 makes a good deal of sense in updating the present jurisdiction of the Board.

There have been attempts, over the past several days, to reach an agreement to recommit the bill—and I have participated in those attempts—to the Committee on the Judiciary for a brief period of time, in order to hold hearings on this matter. However, these efforts have not been fruitful. In view of this, I would hope that the Senate now would be permitted to face up to the issue, and resolve it one way or another as soon as possible. If a motion is to be made to recommit, or to do otherwise, let it be made and disposed of by the Senate. If amendments are to be offered, let them be proposed and disposed of by the Senate. The issue, I think, is clear enough in each Senator's mind. I hope that the Senate will be permitted to work its will on this bill as early as possible. Whatever the Senate's decision is, I am prepared to accept it.

I now yield to the senior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader always speaks with great clarity and incisiveness, and leaves no doubt as to where he stands.

But is it not true that the big question is the question as to whether or not this bill would do anything, whether it would work, whether in fact, if we pass the bill, the Attorney General would or could take any action?

We have the word of the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], a former Attorney General, who worked with this law during the time he was Attorney General——

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. And an excellent one.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. And an excellent one, a man of great judgment, who said on the Senate floor yesterday that if he were Attorney General now he could not use the power that S. 2171 would provide. Senator KENNEDY made the case against S. 2171 effectively and persuasively. The former Attorney General presented three specific constitutional objections which would prohibit the enforcement of this legislation and would consequently still leave the Board with nothing to do.

In addition to the respected judgment of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], we have the word of several outstanding deans and professors of law schools in this country, who have stated authoritatively that S. 2171 has serious constitutional defects.

The question I would like to pose to the distinguished majority leader is this: In view of the fact that we have not had a single witness testify on this bill, that we have no statement whatsoever from the Attorney General, that we have a report which simply says, in effect, "Here it is, the Judiciary Committee approves it but makes no analysis," would it not be logical for the Senate to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, with the understanding, as the majority leader has stated so well, that they hold hearings for a brief period and then report the bill back for a decision by the Senate, but a decision with our eyes open?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr President, I believe the Senator's point has great validity. I am sure that he knows my position. I would vote against a motion to recommit, but I would not fight it. If the Senate decided that that was the best way to handle the matter, it would be fine with me; I would be more than happy to go along.

If I correctly read the collective mind of the Senate, however, it appears that there is not much hope that such a motion would carry; but I anticipate that one might well be made. Indeed, I hope one will be made, just to find out definitively what the sentiment of the Senate is.

If any Senators wish to offer amendments to strengthen the pending proposal, that action would be perfectly in order; or if some Senator wishes to move to abolish the Board altogether, that would be in order also. The basic point I am getting to is not the constitutional aspects of the question before us. I, frankly, am not qualified to discuss the constitutional aspects of a bill of this nature, because I do not feel that I have the requisite legal training. What we are confronted with is an issue based on action taken in this body over the past several days. Money has been appropriated in the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill. The same amount, I believe, was provided by both Houses.

If something is not done to give the Subversive Activities Control Board some additional powers, authorities, and responsibilities, it will mean, in effect, that for the remainder of this fiscal year the Board members and their staffs will be drawing salaries but will be doing very little in return.

I just do not like the idea of any Government agency such as this Board, with members drawing salaries in excess of $26,000 a year simply marking time, participating in "make work" projects—perhaps not even going to the office more than once or twice a month—and collecting their salaries. Because they will be paid. This Board has been set up under the law: the McCarran-Walter Act of 1950. So we have a choice: Either remove the impediments preventing its action, or face the possibility that for the remainder of this fiscal year there will be a board doing next to nothing and at the same time drawing a handsome salary. That prospect makes no sense at all.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I say to the distinguished majority leader that there is no indication, in my view, on the basis of the testimony of the former Attorney General of the United States and the opinions of outstanding experts, the only ones who have given us opinions on this bill, the deans of law schools and so forth, that the enactment of the measure would do anything to improve the situation.

Even if we do pass the bill, we will still most probably be faced with a Subversive Activities Control Board with nothing to do.

Because unless the Attorney General initiates cases before the Board, the Board will remain expensively idle, costing the American taxpayers another $300,000 a year at least.

It is true that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has a letter from the Attorney General. He has not told us what is in the letter. We have no way of knowing what is in the letter. We cannot read his mind, and we cannot read the mind of the Attorney General. Under the circumstances, since we do not know what is in the letter, it seems to me that we are in a position of having to do our best to develop the issues and develop the record on the floor of the Senate.

The distinguished majority leader believes that our chances of having the bill recommitted are not good. That seems to me to reaffirm the necessity of further consideration of a bill of this significance. The constitutional experts say the bill goes right to the heart of fundamental civil liberties questions. It is an important measure in terms of internal security. Under the circumstances, it would seem that we do have a perfect right—not only the right but the duty—to do our best to develop a thorough, comprehensive record on the floor of the Senate. The floor of the Senate should not be the place to do it; we ought to be before the appropriate tribunal, which is the Committee on the Judiciary, but we cannot do that unless the bill is before the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Wisconsin—and it is common knowledge—that this is the third different occasion I know of when he himself has taken the floor of the Senate to expound on this subject and to make his views known. The first time was some weeks ago, when the bill was called up briefly and was then set aside. The second time was last week, during the consideration of the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary appropriation bill. The third occasion is this week. In addition, the Senator appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations and made a very effective argument in favor of his position. He knows, of course, that other witnesses were present, representing the Board itself. One was John Mahan, of Helena, Mont., Chairman of the Board. Another was Assistant Attorney General Yeagley, who I thought represented the Attorney General, although about that the Senator from Wisconsin has raised some questions.

Also, as a result of that hearing, which was held—at least in part—as a consequence of the resolution submitted by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the committee made four recommendations. It is true that they did not mention S. 2171, but they did mention, if I recall correctly, strengthened or new legislation among the four proposals advanced.

So it appears to me that aside from the constitutional ground, as to which I do not feel I am qualified to comment, this proposal has been ventilated quite thoroughly, and I might say that the chief ventilator is the Senator from Wisconsin, with whom I am now holding a colloquy, because of his initial interest, his continuing interest, and his expertise in this particular subject.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The action of the Senate in rejecting the Williams amendment to the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill, thereby approving $295,000 for the Board, was action which, on the basis of the best information I could get, was pretty much forced.

As the Senator knows, when I appeared before the State, Justice, and Commerce Subcommittee, I indicated that I would like to knock out all the funds for the Board but that, on the basis of advice I had received, it was something that could not be done because the authorizing legislation was on the books. The commissioners were duly appointed and had been approved by the Senate and were occupying offices. There was an obligation to pay these salaries.

I was advised that in times past when Congress had tried to abolish agencies in the days of the New Deal and during World War II, it had been unsuccessful because the appropriations had been made for the agencies and the salaries had to be paid anyway.

I was perhaps misinformed. However, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] told me that the thing to do was to press for the outright abolition of the agency by means of a bill. I introduced a bill that is pending before the committee, and it has not had any hearings.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct in his interpretation of the salaries as they are applicable to officials of permanent agencies. But again, we get back to the basic, practical fact. The Board is in operation; at least, it is supposed to be. Its five members are doing little or nothing. If, in some way, they do not get additional authority and responsibility, they will keep on doing little or nothing and drawing $26,000 a year-plus in salary.

We should either give the Board something to do or abolish it. And if we do not want to give the Board something to do, then I would say, "Let us abolish it and do away with it." But we cannot abolish it now, because we have continued the funds for this fiscal year.

It is a simple question, as I see it, apart from the constitutional aspects. It is a case of either fish or cut bait. Give the Board something to do. Make them earn their money, or get rid of the agency and the jobs in that agency.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The distinguished Senator from Montana has indicated that he would oppose referring the bill back to committee for brief hearings. Would the Senator consider a possible amendment to the bill?

A number of people—the former Attorney General of the United States, the present junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], law school deans, and others—have raised the question that this will not work, that there exist serious constitutional defects which the Dirksen bill will not overcome so as to enable the Attorney General to bring an action before the Board.

Will the Senator consider an amendment which would permit the Dirksen bill to be passed and provide that, in the event the Attorney General is not able to act under the bill, and does not bring any cases before the Subversive Activities Control Board within the next 12 months, in that event the Board would be abolished, and the idle Board, which under those circumstances would have gone almost 3 years with nothing to do, would cease to exist?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would give consideration to any amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. As to whether I could approve such an amendment, I, of course, would be unable to say at this time. Nor do I think the Senator would expect me to, because we have to study these matters and determine their full ramifications. However, the proposal sounds as if it has possibilities.

If the Senator should offer such an amendment, I can assure him, as far as I am concerned—and I would assume the Senate as a whole would feel the same way—the amendment would receive every possible consideration. It would be one way of trying to arrive at a better position than we find ourselves in at the present time.

What worries me is that these people should have something to do in the meantime. They are being given their salaries.

Another thing that worries me, as I tried to indicate in the beginning of my remarks—and cannot emphasize enough—is that unfair connotations and criticisms and the like will be placed against some of those who are opposed to this legislation, those who raise questions about it.

That is something that I do not like and I do not approve. Everyone who is interested in this subject, regardless of what side he takes, is, in my opinion, a patriot of the highest order. The Senator who does what he thinks best in accord with his conscience, his understanding of the Constitution, and his responsibilities as a Senator, really demonstrates the highest degree of patriotism. So, these factors all enter into my thinking.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do think, on the basis of my own experience, as one who has taken a public position vehemently against the continuation of the Board under the present circumstances, that I should make my position known.

I can tell the Senator from Montana the reaction of the people in the State that elected Joe McCarthy and reelected him to the U.S. Senate.

I was at the Packers-Viking football game last Sunday and shook hands with 3,000 or 4,000 people. I spoke to many people. They all support my position. They are conservative people. They are most anti-Communist. However, they are emphatic in their feeling that this is a wasteful Board, constituting a waste of money and an extravagance that they would like to do away with.

The people know that the amount of money involved is very modest with relation to the entire budget. However, they realize that it is a very real example of how Washington can save money.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They are against it because the word is out that these members are doing nothing and drawing handsome salaries.

It is as simple as that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my position that the Dirksen proposal will not correct the situation. Valued opinions of respected constitutional experts and an excellent former Attorney General of the United States, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], emphasize that S. 2171 will not do the job.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think we should wait until the distinguished minority leader explains his position. I imagine he will be subjected to some pretty sharp questioning. The Senate should then be able to find out what his proposal specifically encompasses, what it offers in the way of increased responsibilities for the Board, and how it would affect the Albertson case and other matters which are of extreme importance in the consideration of the bill. In purpose and design, the proposal certainly is meritorious in seeking to establish a viable, operative Board. I support that objective whole heartedly.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his courtesy, and for raising the pertinent questions which he did.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE SECURITY COUNCIL SHOULD SEEK A PEACEFUL END TO THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to support the ideas that have been advanced by the singularly wise senior Senator from Montana, our distinguished majority leader; ideas supported by so many of my colleagues, urging that the Security Council take the initiative to try to seek a peaceful end to the war in Vietnam.

While there is no guarantee that the results would be successful, I believe the American national interest would greatly benefit by having us attempt to secure United Nations action.

Actually, I have urged this course of action for 2 years and particularly emphasized in a speech in Providence on November 8, 1965, that:

> To do so effectively we would have to agree, whether we liked it or not, to abide by the results of the United Nations collective judgment.

I reaffirm this view once again in strong support of the senior Senator from Montana and congratulate him on the initiatives he has taken in this regard.

FIFTH DELOS SYMPOSION—STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I recently had the very great privilege of attending and participating in the Fifth Delos Symposion, which brought together for a week of stimulating conferences an unusual group of scholars and public figures representing many different nationalities and professions. The conferences were held on board the motor vessel *Semiramis*, which stopped at several historic points in Greece and the Aegean Sea, including the island of Delos, offering us an opportunity to contemplate the historic origins of Western civilization.

This year's symposion, like the four which preceded it, was staged under the guiding genius of the celebrated Greek planner and urban scientist, Dr. Constantinos Doxiadis. And as in the preceding symposions, the general theme centered on the problems and challenges presented by the gargantuan spread of our urban environment.

The special theme for this year's discussions was "Strategy for Development," and one of the main conclusions reached was that while we have many admirable planning efforts in many different parts of the world, they are all inhibited by a distressing lack of scientific method, data and research. We noted enormous growth in GNP and corporate activity in the industrialized nations, but only a pittance of resources devoted to the systematic development of urban life. We recommended that there should be an annual pledge on the part of the technologically developed nations of 1 percent of GNP for world development. And we recognized the need for organizing resources and efforts to attack urban problems in a comprehensive and systematic way, according to the interdisciplinary concept of Ekistics, the science of human settlements.

Four years ago, following the conclusion of Delos I, I made a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD calling attention to that meeting and to the remarkable "Declaration of Delos," which was signed by the participants at that first meeting. Some of the words of that first declaration have a most prophetic ring to them, particularly when recalled against the background of events in some of our cities during recent months:

> What is not realized is that the failure to adapt human settlements to dynamic change may soon outstrip even disease and starvation as the gravest risk, short of war, facing the human species. A universal feature of the worldwide revolution is the movement of people into urban settlements at an ever faster rate. World population increases by 2 percent a year, urban population by over 4 percent . . . It is already evident that wrong projections of urban development produce inexcusable waste. The absence of any forecasts leads to chaos in the cities, to the undermining of civic order and the destruction of precious and diverse historic traditions. Thus the need for rational and dynamic planning of human settlements both now and in the foreseeable future is inherent in the urban situation today.

This year's symposion also produced a summary statement which I hope may prove to have as many valuable insights as the declaration issued by the first symposion in 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the "Final Report of the Fifth Delos Symposion," and a list of those who participated in this year's conference.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELOS 5: STRATEGY FOR HUMAN SETTLEMENTS—FINAL REPORT

1. In July, 1963, the first Delos Symposion was held, bringing together men and women from many different disciplines, nations and cultures to discuss the future of human settlements. Since that time, seminars, meetings for research and a steadily increasing participation by younger experts and students have been added to the yearly symposion. In July, 1967, it was announced that the experimental venture would be turned into a permanent programme.

2. The Fifth Symposion, held between July 22 and July 29, was once again drawn from a varied group of professions and nationalities. It drew on earlier symposia in which different aspects of urbanization—density, transport, regional systems—had been dis-

cussed, and attempted to bring them into a coherent Strategy for Human Settlements. A number of conclusions emerged as a result of these exchanges and the following paragraphs give, as is customary at the close of each symposion, a brief summary of the major points of agreement.

3. Until very recently, governments, scholars, economists and experts have, on the whole, neglected the importance or urbanization in national development. It is a result of development. It is often a burden on development. But it has yet to be made into an instrument of better development. It is this instrumental quality of urban growth that has not been sufficiently stressed. Transport and power, industrialization, capital formation, education are seen as major priorities. Agriculture has received a measure of attention. But the growth of the urban sector has tended to be seen as a consequence of other changes and to be left to look after itself.

4. Yet the urban sector is, by all odds, the most dynamic area of change. The number of people in cities grows twice as quickly as the population in metropolitan areas, three times as fast. Round each dynamic city, there is a widening gravitational field of economic and social forces which profoundly affect the patterns of living, even in what are supposedly still rural areas. And these changes presage the completion of the urban revolution in which most countries, by next century, will be predominantly urban and the more developed among them will have between 80 and 90 per cent of their people living in urban areas.

5. The consequences of the urban explosion might have continued to be ignored were it not for one increasingly obvious fact. The new urban environment, coming chaotically to life, is being challenged for better or worse in the developed countries but approaches a condition of crisis and revolution in many developing lands. The symptoms of breakdown are well known. Traffic patterns inhibit mobility. Pollution threatens the ecological environment. A host of problems spring from the highly uneven distribution of urban densities—at the centre, crowding of land and people, overloading, urban blight, rural migration into the most run-down areas; on the fringes, sprawl eating up the countryside, adding intolerably to the hours of commuting and limiting man's access to the natural world. All these facets on the urban problem have become better known and analysed over the last five years. Their appearance all round the world suggests a common response to similar pressures. In fact, the only real difference is that the developed nations command a modernized system of industry and agriculture which, if they so wished, could provide the resources needed to cope with the urban crisis. Elsewhere, the rise of the big city precedes full industrialization and its attractions may be impeding agriculture by a premature withdrawal of manpower or other resources. In this sense, faulty patterns of urbanization may be a factor in the world's growing shortage of food.

6. These pressures and changes are not self-correcting. On the contrary, they have all the makings of a downward spiral of disintegration. It follows that unless governments are prepared to insert a coherent strategy for urban development into their policies for national growth, they and their people will face a more and more dangerous and unworkable situation as the rising tide of population, both inside and outside the city, doubles and trebles over the next four or five decades.

7. A strategy for the development of human settlements thus lies at the core of successful general development. The symposion discussed various aspects of such a strategy, both in its theoretical form and its practical application. It was agreed that successful strategies are in theory likely to contain a number of elements which, together, make up a coherent and self-reinforcing system. At the beginning lies the delineation of the present situation (which itself can only be fully understood in relation to past trends and decisions). This situation is then projected into the future by the study, analysis and extrapolation of present trends. The process clarifies the consequences of present tendencies and, given the unsatisfactory nature of current urban development, convinces present opinion of imminent crisis unless changes are introduced. At this point, planning can introduce ideal concepts—not how the city will be but how it could and should be. Thus a vision of successful change becomes part of the present reality the basis for analysis and examination from which the planner derives authentic and realisable alternatives. Community acceptance turns them into actual, concrete changes. Successful change in turn becomes a new reality from which public reactions can be gauged and further extrapolations carried out. The whole dynamic process thus proceeds from the revelation of an unsatisfactory reality to the insertion of a practicable idea to the convincing of decision-makers (both leaders and community) to the realization of the project and to a new round of judgment, analysis, extrapolation and normative targets. In this process, realism provides the analysis, the cost-benefit ratios, the constraints which continue over time. But courage and vision are also needed "to invent the future" and to stay with the task of building it into reality.

8. At the level of concrete application, certain general principles also emerged. The vital point in starting a development strategy for cities is precisely to get it started. The process can begin at any number of points—pinpointing a specific problem, proposing a concrete plan. It can be started by any number of agencies, public or private, but the first need is always to set the process in motion. Another point is that targets, though specific, should be flexible enough to be changed in the course of implementation by a continuous process of trial and error. From this flows the need for a maximum public involvement and education through all possible media in the tasks of realizing and correcting the general strategy. This process in turn demands leadership sufficiently trained in the concept of urban development to give dynamic direction to public thinking. It also requires experts alert to all the opportunities of new technology. Political realities must be carefully assessed and the critical question asked whether the needed instruments of regional and local government are available. The scale of the task demands that every kind of agency—public and private—should be encouraged to exercise leadership with its corollary that all forces of investment—public and private—be drawn into the operation.

9. When the point of devising detailed strategies is reached, it must be said that the very variety of urban situations dictates as wide a variety of urban plans. Nevertheless, a number of concrete points emerged in the course of the discussions. At the primary level of the citizen and his family, the evidence suggests that in both developed and developing lands, more can often be done for poorer citizens by improving their social and educational environment than by simply rehousing them without regard for supporting services. For instance, in cities in the developing world where rural migration far exceeds any conceivable budget for housing, the best and quickest method of settling the new arrivals may be to set aside special settler—or "squatter"—locations, provide plots, lay out streets, lay on water and drainage, leave space for public use and services, link the area with the wider city and provide the settlers with the means, financial or otherwise, of building their own homes. This policy has the added advantage of simplifying the task of later redevelopment and it does not prejudice the issue whether or not the provision of urban housing is an expensive consumer item beyond the purse of poorer countries or a useful stimulant to dynamic growth. But the point was underlined that houses built with local materials can provide employment, mobilize local savings for home ownership, stimulate a wide range of subsidiary industries and do so without undue strain on the balance of payments.

10. At the level of the whole city, there was general agreement that the ultimate aim of strategy is to give citizens, within a context of recognizable social and physical order, access to the widest possible range of free choice, including the freedom to be consulted about their choices. This ideal implies mobility since choices cannot be indulged in if they are inaccessible, and this in concrete terms implies a transport system which ends the present combination of marooning for some and congestion for many, and uses all the means of movement, from the footpath to all forms of transport at the higher speeds, to give citizens access and time to enjoy the range of unimpeded choice which is the chief magnet drawing them to urban life.

11. But planning cannot encompass only the city. The fact that the great urban centers exercise their attraction over very large areas means that successful planning can only take place over the whole "field of force" surrounding the core city. For example, the Paris region, which will rise from 8 to 15 million citizens by the year 2000, might draw most of the growth of France into itself in wider and wider concentric rings if counterpoles of urbanism were not planned in other parts of the country, and its own growth encouraged to follow two specific lines of expansion through the basin of the Seine. The whole of the South East England is the planning region necessary to contain London's growth by providing alternative metropolitan areas. The Detroit Plan calls for an urban system which includes a second urban center at Lake Huron. An effective way of slowing down the Gadarene movement of peoples to the cities in developing lands could lie in building up a system of intermediate towns from which agriculture can still be practised but in which industry, educational institutions or other prestigious activities give people, short of the capital city, the kind of urban stimulus and opportunity they universally and irresistably desire. Comparative studies of these possibilities are not, however, available and the United Nations Social Commission has made no report as yet on its two year old proposal to initiate such a programme.

12. This delay is a reminder that all forms of urban strategy still operate under the severe disadvantage of a general lack of scientific method, data and research—a fact which also inhibits private citizens and institutions from evaluating the proposals put to them by governments or planners and contributing their own ideas to the process of inventing and building the urban future. The need has to be underlined for more research institutes in the urban field, more university programmes, more exchanges and experimentation on a national and international basis, more coordination of separate activities. And the institutions involved can in turn take on the task of expanding in a systematic way the lamentably small cadre of men and women trained in the ekistic skills of creative urbanism.

13. The emergence of people with sufficient knowledge and vision to give urban leadership will also largely determine the degree to which sufficient resources are made available for urban development. In the developed world, resources in themselves are not scarce. The combined Gross National Product of the wealthy powers is close to the $2,500,000 million mark. The United

States, Britain and Western Europe alone grow by not less than $60,000 million dollars a year (a figure equivalent to the entire Gross National Product of Latin America or twice that of Africa or India). In such countries the existing and expanding apparatus of wealth and technology is so great that within the time span needed to generate and deploy savings, build plant and train labour, a decision to undertake a project triggers the creation of the resources necessary to complete it. The difficulty lies in mobilising the vision and decision needed to allocate a larger share of these resources to the urban sector. What is needed is in fact an unleashing of the national imagination on a scale that compares with the effort and expenditure undertaken in national defence or the competition of the space race. Only then will citizens of developed societies be ready to dedicate to urban development the devices of modern technology, the public programming and public and private cooperation in investment which have emerged over the last decade as indispensable instruments for tasks of high national importance.

14. But this affluence is rarely to be found in the developing world. The entire annual inflow of public and private capital into Latin America, the entire annual investment of the World Bank and all the regional banks in developing lands are no more than the year's domestic and foreign investment of over a billion dollars made by a few large American corporations. Moreover, very little of this money has been devoted so far to urban development. Thus where the need is most radical, the means are least available and no amount of local saving can catch up speedily on an urban explosion which has outstripped its industrial and agricultural base.

15. At this point, the citizens of the rich countries confront a fundamental political and moral issue. Inside their cities, wealthier citizens can through taxation and investment pass on some of their surplus to the poorer neighborhoods. Inside the country, poorer regions can be helped in the same way. The moral obligations of citizenship and the political and administrative structures for such a transfer at least exists, even though they are not recognised and used on a sufficient scale. But in the world at large between wealthy nations and developing nations both the instruments and the obligations are largely lacking. Economic links are a fact. Instant communication is a fact. Supersonic flight may soon make all areas no more than two hours distant from each other. But brute physical proximity is not matched by moral neighborhood. Generosity and the sense of obligation all too often end at the frontier line. Until this changes, the transfers of wealth which are normal inside a community will not be made within the whole community of man. Given, therefore, the scale of the wealth of developed lands and the needs of the developing countries, the rich nations should fix their annual contribution to world development at the level of at least one per cent of Gross National Product—the percentage accepted in principle for the yearly transfer of financial resources at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in 1964.

16. At every level—in the city, in the region, in the nation, in the world at large among developed and developing peoples alike—the need is to bring the tasks and opportunities of the urban revolution to the center of public policy and private interest, to develop strategies of creative change and to mobilize the resources in capital and skills needed to turn man's dream of a better urban life into a daily reality. We can only repeat. For modern man the decision to act can be the means of creating and mobilizing the resources for action. Imagination, not resources, sets the limits of his activity. His survival in civic order and social peace depends therefore not only upon the realism of his plans and his vigor in pursuing them but also upon the courage with which he is ready to see visions and dream dreams.

PARTICIPANTS AT DELOS FIVE SYMPOSIUM

Mr. Charles Abrams, Mr. Preston Andrade, Mr. Edmund Bacon, Mr. David Bell, Mr. Francois Bloch-Laine', Professor Colin Buchanan, Mr. Emile Despres, Dr. Truman Douglass, Mr. Constantinos Doxiadis, Professor Louis Friedland.

Professor R. Buckminster Fuller, Mr. Roger Grégoire, Mr. Charles Haar, Dr. Edgar Harden, Mr. Harlan Hatcher, Mr. Felipe Herrera, Mr. M. Ionides, Lady Jackson (Barbara Ward), Mr. F. K. A. Jiagge, Dr. Reginald Lourie.

Professor Edward Mason, Sir Robert H. Matthew, Dr. Margaret Mead, Dr. Martin Meyerson, Mr. Jerome Monod, Mr. J. A. Munoz Rojas, Dean Peter Nash, Dr. Waldemar Nielsen, Mr. James F. Oates, Jr., Professor Hasan Ozbekhan.

Senator Claiborne Pell, Dean G. Holmes Perkins, Dr. James R. Perkins, Mr. John Robin, Representative James Scheuer, Mr. Don Shoemaker, Dr. Julius Stratton, Dr. Arnold Toynbee.

A NATIONAL POSSESSION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, recently this country lost a prized "national possession."

Woody Guthrie, a composer who wrote of America and against injustice, a singer who preferred to "sound like the ash cans of the early morning," died.

It was Clifton Fadiman who described Mr. Guthrie as "a national possession like Yellowstone and Yosemite." Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall called him a "poet of the American landscape."

His many songs, bred from his travels across a broad, diverse land he loved but chided for injustices and shame, would supply the stuff of which eloquent memorials are made.

However, Mr. Guthrie, the enemy of pretense that he was, probably would have preferred a more simple goodby. I can think of no better memorial than the title of one of his songs: "So Long, It's Been Good to Know You."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Guthrie's obituary, as published in the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the obituary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Woody Guthrie, the American folk singer and composer, died yesterday at Creedmoor State Hospital, Queens, following a 13-year illness. He was 55 years old.

Mr. Guthrie, who wrote more than 1,000 songs that echoed the glory and travail of American life, had been bedridden for the last nine years with Huntington's chorea, a rare hereditary disease that attacks the nervous system.

Harold Leventhal, the singer's agent and friend, said that in his last years Mr. Guthrie had been virtually immobile, unable to speak, read or use his hands.

"In the last few years we discouraged visits by his hundreds of friends," Mr. Leventhal said. "However, he did recognize members of his immediate family."

RASPY-VOICED HUMANIST

During his final illness, Mr. Guthrie was treated at several hospitals, including Brooklyn State Hospital and Greystone State Hospital in New Jersey.

For Woodrow Wilson Guthrie, his songs, his guitar and his humanism were his life. He was a wispy, raspy-voiced musical spokesman for the downtrodden who used his scarred guitar to sing out against injustice and sham.

He also sang of the beauty of his homeland—a beauty seen from the open doorway of a red-balling freight train or from the degradation of the migrant camps and Hoovervilles of the Depression years.

A small, weather-worn man with bushy hair, he was as simple and homespun as his songs. His grammar was often atrocious. But his vision of America was bursting with image upon image of verdant soil, towering mountains and the essential goodness and character of its people.

OF HIGHWAYS AND SKYWAYS

At a concert a few years ago in Connecticut, Odetta, the folk singer, told her audience that if she were in charge of things, one of Mr. Guthrie's songs, "This Land Is Your Land," would be the "national anthem."

The song, one of the balladeer's best known shows Guthrie at his best:

"I roamed and rambled, and I followed my footsteps,
To the sparkling sands for her diamond deserts,
All around me a voice was sounding,
This land was made for you and me.
When the sun come shining, then I was strolling,
And the wheat fields waving, and the dust clouds rolling,
A voice was chanting as the fog was lifting,
This land was made for you and me.
This land is your land, this land is my land,
From California to the New York Island,
From the redwood forest to the Gulfstream waters,
This land was made for you and me."

But Mr. Guthrie also stirred controversy with topical songs that were born in his radicalism and his impatience—songs deploring the Dust Bowl and the lot of its refugees, songs crying out against the misuse of migrant workers and extolling the virtues of labor unions. He also wrote talking blues, ballads and children's songs.

NO PATIENCE WITH PESSIMISTS

"I hate a song that makes you think that you're not any good," he once said. "I hate a song that makes you think that you are born to lose. Bound to lose. No good to nobody. No good for nothing. Because you are either too old or too young or too fat or too slim or too ugly or too this or too that. Songs that run you down or songs that poke fun at you on account of your bad luck or your hard traveling.

"I am out to fight those kinds of songs to my very last breath of air and my last drop of blood."

Woody Guthrie was born on July 14, 1912, in the Dust Bowl town of Okemah, Okla. His father, Charles Guthrie, was a professional guitarist and prize-fighter who made his living at several trades.

The five Guthrie children—Roy, Clara, Woody, George and Mary Jo—were reared on the old songs and ballads sung to them by their mother, and on the Indian square dances and Negro blues shouted by their father.

As a boy, young Guthrie sold newspapers, sang and danced in the streets for pennies, and fought it out in gang brawls. His formal schooling ended in the 10th grade.

A SERIES OF HARDSHIPS

Life went sour for the Guthrie family in Okemah. Charles Guthrie's land trading business went bankrupt, two of the family's houses were destroyed by fire, another by a cyclone. Young Guthrie's sister Clara was killed in an oil stove explosion. His mother developed Huntington's chorea and later died in a state asylum.

At the age of 15, he hit the road for Houston, working at odd jobs and playing the harmonica in barber shops and pool halls.

He returned to Okemah, then joined his father in the Texas Panhandle town of Pampa, where an uncle taught him to play the guitar. For the next few years he made up his own songs to sing at rodeos and carnivals.

As the dust storms and the Depression pressed in on the Southwest, the balladeer left home again, heading for the West Coast by freight train, singing in saloons to eat. In California, he appeared regularly on radio and his social conscience aroused by what he had seen on the road, sang at union halls, gave support to striking farm laborers and wrote articles for the radical People's World.

From this exposure to America's social and economic ills came such songs as "So Long It's Been Good to Know You," "Hard Traveling" "Blowing Down This Old Dusty Road," "Union Maid," "Pastures of Plenty," "Pretty Boy Floyd" and "Tom Joad."

A verse of "So Long It's Been Good to Know You," for example, graphically describes the dust storms:

"Well the dust storms came, it came like thunder
It dusted us over, it covered us under
It blocked out the traffic, it blocked out the sun.
And straight for home all the people did run."

His funds running low on the West Coast, Mr. Guthrie rambled to New York City, where he sang his songs in waterfront taverns and in hobo jungles; to the lost men on the Bowery, to the upper classes in Town Hall and to the workingmen in Madison Square Garden. He declined to sing in the Rainbow Room at Radio City Music Hall, however, because he said they wanted him to dress in a clown suit.

JOINED MERCHANT MARINE

Restless once again, he moved out once more for the South and the West. While in the Pacific Northwest, he composed 26 ballads for the Oregon Department of the Interior about Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, becoming a singing advocate of public power. His best-known songs of this period were "Roll on Columbia" and "Grand Coulee Dam."

Later, he joined Pete Seeger, Lee Hays, Millard Lampell and others in the Almanac Singers, a group that sang to unionists and to audiences of farm and factory workers across the country. During the early days of World War II, he toured Mexico with Mr. Seeger, making up songs supporting the Allied cause.

In 1943, he and his close friend, the late folk singer Cisco Houston, joined the merchant marine. Mr. Guthrie took part in three invasions and was twice on ships that were torpedoed. From the war years came songs like "Reuben James," "Round and Round Hitler's Grave" and "The Biggest Thing That Man Has Ever Done."

In 1943 he wrote "Bound For Glory," an odyssey of his life, a book that Orville Prescott, in The New York Times, said had "more triple-distilled essence of pure individual personality in it than any in years."

Following the war, he briefly renewed his association with the Almanac Singers and wrote a second book, "American Folksong," a collection of 30 songs and sketches. He was also associated for a time with Mr. Seeger and Mr. Hays in People's Song, which was described as a "new union of progressive songwriters."

AN INFLUENTIAL LIFE STYLE

Mr. Guthrie recorded many of his songs on the Stinson, Folkways and Victor labels, giving whole new generations who never had a chance to see him an opportunity to hear him. A result was that he had a profound influence on American folk singing, from the countless youngsters who sing out at Washington Square Park to such well-known performers as Bob Dylan, Tom Paxton, Logan English, Jack Elliott and Phil Ochs.

Realizing his voice did not sound "like dew dripping off the petals of the morning violet," Mr. Guthrie once said that "I had rather sound like the ashcans of the early morning, like the cab drivers cursing at one another, like the longshoremen yelling, like the cowhands whooping, and like the lone wolf barking."

Pete Seeger once described some of Mr. Guthrie's songs as being among those that "will probably last as long as people sing." And Clifton Fadiman, said the singer was "a national possession like Yellowstone and Yosemite, and part of the best stuff this country has to show the world."

Last year, when Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall presented Mr. Guthrie with an award by the United States Government for his lifelong effort to make the American people "aware of their heritage and the land," he described him as a "poet of the American landscape."

TRUST FUND ESTABLISHED

In 1956, several of Mr. Guthrie's friends established the Guthrie Children's Trust Fund, to provide for the singer's children and to collect, publish and safeguard the rights and interests of his works.

The balladeer married twice, first in the early nineen-thirties the former Mary Esta Jennings, and then in 1945 the former Marjorie Mazia Greenblatt. Both marriages ended in divorce.

Surviving are two daughters of his first marriage. Mrs. Gwendolyn Lackey of Los Angeles, and Mrs. Sue Garvin of Whittier, Calif.; two sons and a daughter of his second marriage, Arlo, a folk singer, Joady and Nora Lee, all of New York; a sister, Mrs. Hulett Edgmon of Seminole, Okla., and a brother, George, of Long Beach, Calif.

A private funeral service will be held today. A family spokesman said Mr. Guthrie's body would be cremated and his ashes scattered in the waters off Coney Island, where he once lived. A memorial tribute is planned by his family and friends within the next two months.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, for several days I have been following the debate on S. 2171, a bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. At this time, the discussion appears to be an apples-pears debate.

For example, in a very forceful statement made yesterday, the able senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] asked a series of questions in support of immediate passage of S. 2171.

His final question was:

> Do the people of the United States generally support and approve the idea that Congress should take legislative steps to protect our country against Communist activities on the home front?

The able senior Senator, a well-known and effective enemy of communism, answered his own question:

> I emphatically state that they do and I believe my good friend from Wisconsin is completely out of step with the times if he and those persons associated with him believe they do not.

The clear implication was that Senators associated with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] were opposed to legislative action in this area and did not appreciate the true threat of Communist activity on the homefront.

I hesitate to speak for other Senators, but as far as I am concerned the question was not to the point of the debate.

I will support a motion to recommit S. 2171 for hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee, with instructions that the bill be reported back on a particular date. I will not oppose a request for a unanimous-consent agreement to set a day and time for voting.

I will support such a motion not because I am irrevocably against legislative action on this subject, not because I do not appreciate the true threat of Communist activity on the homefront, but because if we are to have a bill of this type I want an effective bill, a bill which accomplishes what is intended without compromising the civil liberties which communism seeks to eliminate.

Frankly, I do not know if S. 2171 is a good or bad bill or if it will accomplish what is intended without sacrificing civil liberties.

The 1½-page report and the brief section-by-section analysis shed little or no light on the complex questions raised by this bill regarding constitutional rights.

The Senate Judiciary Committee has not held open hearings on this measure. I, for one, would like to have the thinking of the Attorney General on this bill, both as to its constitutionality and as to its effectiveness.

For example, are the definitions of Communist-action and Communist-infiltrated groups precise enough to be constitutional? If they are not, any action the board would take would go back into the courts for another protracted period during which the board would once again be, for all intents and purposes, powerless to act.

Does the bill meet all the objections raised by the Supreme Court about protection from self-incrimination?

And, does the Attorney General feel that the bill as written would create a useful tool in the fight against communism?

These are questions which should and could be explored if hearings were held. Then when we are asked to vote on the bill, we would have a better idea if we were just passing window dressing or a substantial, constitutional measure.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to take exception to the position that this legislation is an emergency measure. The Republic has survived a good many years without the benefit of any action by the Subversive Activities Control Board. It will survive a few more days or weeks while the Senate takes the time to give considered study to this legislation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the discussion of the bill offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, it has been the assumption on the part of many people, I believe, that this proposal would be supported wisely throughout the country, especially by the people in our society who have a conservative point of view politically. I indicated to the distinguished majority leader that the people in Wisconsin, on the basis of my association with them—and I try to be in as close association as possible—do not have that feeling at all. They oppose the continuation of this idle, outdated Subversive Activities Control Board.

I might simply add to my colloquy with the Senator from Montana that I have found that when I go out to my State, people are mighty frank. They do not hesitate to tell me when they think I am doing something with which they disagree, and they are very emphatic about it, and occasionally a little abusive about it. So I believe if there had been any substantial sentiment against this position, I would know about it.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate an opinion expressed in the current—the October—Nation's Business with respect to the Subversive Activities Control Board. Now, what is Nation's Business? The Nation's Business, published in Washington, D.C., is the official publication of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It is the national publication of organizations representing 4,750,000 companies and professional businessmen. I think it is both interesting and informative to read what Nation's Business, which speaks vigorously for the viewpoint of literally millions of American businessmen, says about the Subversive Activities Control Board. I should like to read a very brief excerpt from the October issue of the Nation's Business, on page 42, in the column "Trends: Right or Wrong."

> After all, in its 17-year life it has never controlled a subversive. It never has accomplished anything at all.
>
> This witch hunt had a fast start and a short life. The act of Congress establishing it was so full of fault, principally in its violations of the Constitution, that the board soon became inoperable.
>
> Instead of resigning and going about some more productive sort of work the five board members and their successors for 17 years have been drawing their pay rather quietly and doing practically nothing for it.
>
> Congress has appropriated an average of $300,000 a year to continue the farce, which so far has absorbed $5 million.

The article goes on to argue that in a country which has the biggest budget the world has ever seen, and faces the prospect of increased income taxes, one would think that one of the first things they would do would be to abolish a Subversive Activities Control Board which has done nothing.

As I have said, the foregoing statement is the point of view articulated by the principal publication of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

It would seem to me that this attitude so vigorously expressed by Nation's Business is something that Members of the Senate might want to ponder.

There seems to be an unfortunate tendency for us to return to the attitudes and ideas prevalent in the Senate in 1950 when my predecessor, Joe McCarthy, whose name was probably more widely known than the name of any other Senator of that day, was the dominant national voice on how the internal menace of communism should be repulsed.

I point out that any notion that there is a strong feeling that we must fight internal communism by this kind of board seems to have vanished. I think the American people, like the peoples of any country, have their strengths and weaknesses, but one very prominent characteristic of the American people is that we are pragmatic. The American people want results and we judge whether or not an agency is operating, whether a law is actually doing the job, and whether it gets results. If the law or agency gets results and we approve the objective, generally we support it. If the American people want an objective, a goal, or think something is worth seeking and the instrument designed to achieve that goal does not do the job, the American people generally oppose it. This makes sense to me.

As was stated in Nation's Business, this agency, in its 17-year life, has never controlled a subversive and it never has accomplished anything constructive. This is the issue on which most Americans who have any interest in this Board are assured: It is idle and it does nothing. In these circumstances it would seem that, if Congress is going to pass legislation affecting this dormant board, it should pass some legislation which Congress knows will work, which will do the job, and which will get results.

Mr. President, I submit on the basis of the record in the Senate, on the basis of no hearings, we do not know whether the pending legislation will work or not.

I think the majority leader was most fair when he said we should await an explanation from the distinguished minority leader to tell us how this law will work and tell us how this will solve the problem which the Albertson decision raised. As the majority leader said, there could then be whatever questioning Members of the Senate wished.

FISCAL ECONOMY IN TENNESSEE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a remarkable editorial which was published in the Wall Street Journal this morning and which discusses one of the most refreshing and astonishing Members of the U.S. Congress, a Member of the other body, Representative RICHARD HARMON FULTON, of Nashville, Tenn.

Mr. President, I have met Representative FULTON only once. He has done something which I think may shock some Members and disturb some Members, but I think it is a great contribution to economy and a most objective view of spending.

Representative FULTON has urged the Bureau of the Budget not to construct an annex to the Federal Courthouse in Nashville, Tenn., which is in his district. That request would cut an estimated $8 to $9 million and it apparently is in the budget and was about to be approved. Mr. FULTON, recognizing the need for economy at this time, wrote a letter to the Director of the Budget, Charles Schultze, and said:

> Do not spend money in my district on this project because I feel under the present circumstances we should wait until the economic situation in the country is improved and until the country can afford it.

I agree that this was a most remarkable action by the distinguished Representative from Nashville, Tenn., and I am delighted to see that the Wall Street Journal has commended him for taking this step.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial which was published in the Wall Street Journal today entitled "Mr. FULTON's Fiscal Footnote."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. FULTON'S FISCAL FOOTNOTE

According to the biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory, Rep. Richard Harmon Fulton of Nashville, Tenn., a Democrat, was born in 1927; was graduated from the Nashville public schools; attended the University of Tennessee; served in the Navy 1945–46; served as a state senator; is a real estate broker, 32d degree Mason, Shriner and a Methodist; is married and the father of five children; was elected to the 88th Congress in 1962 and re-elected to the 89th and 90th.

Now however distinguished Mr. Fulton's past achievements may have been, surely they must seem pale in the light of his latest. For the gentleman from Tennessee has done two remarkable things.

First, he changed his mind which many legislators find it extremely awkward to do. Last month he wrote a letter to the General Services Administration urging it to get going on the building of an annex to the overcrowded Federal Courthouse in Nashville, to cost an estimated $8 million or $9 million. Now, after concluding that in the absence of Congressional action on a 10% tax surcharge this year there is now "only one recourse by which the budget deficit can be kept down," he has reconsidered.

Second, he then wrote another letter, this one addressed to the Hon. Charles L. Schultze, Budget Bureau director, in which he said: "In the interest of economy and the economic health of the nation, I request that . . . the funding of the Federal Courthouse Annex be withheld until such time as the budgetary picture becomes clearer, and the demands on the Federal dollar are reduced . . ."

Mr. Schultze's reaction to this communication seems to have been, understandably, an amazed silence. There is almost no precedent for a legislator asking that funds be withheld from public works—that sacred Congressional institution, the pork barrel—particularly when located in the middle of the legislator's home Congressional district.

Perhaps Mr. Fulton's sacrificial gesture in behalf of restraining Federal expenditures will not help to get him re-elected. But even if it goes down as a footnote to Congressional annals as "Fulton's Fiscal Folly" it certainly ought to make him remembered as the man who put the nation's economic health ahead of a courthouse annex.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McCARTHY FOR HIS BOOK "THE LIMITS OF POWER"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, without question, one of the great figures in this Nation and in this body is the senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY. Senator MCCARTHY is a man of many and diverse talents. He is equally at home in the world of ideas and actions. He is an eloquent speaker, a wise and witty man. In addition to this, Senator McCarthy is an author of real distinction and has recently authored a book entitled "The Limits of Power: America's Role in the World."

This book has been reviewed very favorably by the New York Times which points out that the book substantially increases our insight into very serious problems this Nation faces in the world. The book is written by a Senator who has served on the Committee on Foreign Relations for many years, a man who has demonstrated before the Nation his grasp of the complex foreign policy that faces the Nation and who has demonstrated his courage in speaking his mind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the book review written by Charles Poore, which was published in the New York Times this morning, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

One Man's Policing Is Another Man's Liberating

(By Charles Poore)

E. B. White once suggested that perhaps it would take a vicious menace from another planet to unite our divided and pugnacious world.

I remember Mr. White's paragraph trope from The New Yorker when I face each season's clamor of serious books on rugged world affairs. They want peace but they can't quite produce it. And with each author doing his thing, the lot presents fresh divisiveness and printed pugnacity. Chances are that no two—let alone no two dozen—eminent authorities wholly agree on what we must do to be saved.

Yet all books add something to what we should know. The useful ones honor clarity. Great stuff may lie buried in jabberwocky prose, but it's tough to unearth it there. A happy medium lies in "The Limits of Power: America's Role in the World," by Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, a Minnesota Democrat. Agree with him or not, he's clear, quick, and readable.

Adlai E. Stevenson was Mr. McCarthy's ideal. If this book has a personal mark, it's the mark he thinks Mr. Stevenson would have made on America's foreign policy—"had his ideas and attitudes been translated into political reality."

ADVISE MORE, CONSENT LESS

Take the hypothesis and let the credit for it go. Here are some of Mr. McCarthy's elemental conclusions: First, the United States should work zealously through the best international agencies. Second, our great armament exports and the C.I.A. could use more Capitol Hill supervision. Third, the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee—on which Mr. McCarthy serves—might well do more advising and less consenting.

These principles seem generally Stevensonian, with the last a possible exception. At any rate, finding the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as well as the President and the State Department breathing harder down his neck at the United Nations would perhaps occasionally have troubled even Mr. Stevenson's urbane mind.

Now we're off to the all-too-human races. With Mr. McCarthy as our expert guide, we rush from the Middle East to the South Pacific, from South America to India.

The book's flow takes unpredictable courses, too. Not everyone would expect the dissertation on marketing the Dominican Republic's sugar crop, and little about the Soviet missile lunge in Cuba that included Mr. Stevenson's most famous hour of political reality.

Mr. McCarthy is as troubled as any of us by the Vietnamese tragedy. He's against the war, but he's not about to join either the victory-at-any price or the peace-at-any-price logicians.

In Mr. McCarthy's rear-view mirroring, the changing perspectives time gives past problems stand out instructively. Retroactively, he's not against America's entry to the last two world wars. In those days, however, eloquent voices were raised against our mixing into fights they called irrelevantly distant. Perhaps it was Thomas Jefferson who set a pattern for way out yonder ventures when he made the Mediterranean safe for Americans by fighting the Barbary pirates.

"A nation," Mr. McCarthy says, "has prestige according to its merits. America's contribution to world civilization must be more than a continuous performance demonstration that we can police the planet."

The rub, this book suggests, is that one man's policing is another man's blow for liberty. But we don't want E. B. White's parable of another planet policing us, or even liberating us, to come true.

THIEU-KY PROGRESS IN PACIFICATION ESSENTIAL IN VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, regardless of a Senator's position on our Vietnam policy it should be clear that we are not going to achieve our objective of peaceful negotiations unless a far greater effort is put into the so-called other war—social reform, economic development, land reform, educational achievement, improvement of health.

It is in these areas where the greatest progress for constructive resolution of this guerrilla contest must develop.

This morning's New York Times points out that the Thieu-Ky government has made extensive promises in these areas and that Ambassador Bunker is pressing hard for these commitments to be kept.

If we are ever to have any hope of ending this tragic war, the South Vietnamese Government must move ahead in this slow, painful, unspectacular area. Ambassador Bunker deserves credit for insisting on it.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial entitled, "Promises To Keep" be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Promises To Keep

The clearest thing about the Thieu-Ky regime in South Vietnam is the long list of commitments it has made to promote pacification, local security, social reform and economic development in that war-ravaged country. The pledges were made to the South Vietnamese people and to all of Saigon's war allies at the top-level conference at Honolulu, Manila and Guam. They were made again in the election campaign.

Now Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker is exercising pressure on the Saigon Government to make certain that these long-promised reforms are actually carried out. It is both appropriate and essential that this be done. The military effort, which is claiming a rising toll in American lives and resources, must fail unless the countryside can be pacified and public confidence established in the honesty and efficiency of the central Government.

These are tasks only Vietnamese can accomplish, and Saigon's performance to date has fallen far short of the generals' pledges. After a hard look at the situation in South Vietnam last summer, a Congressional watchdog committee reported:

"We are deeply concerned about the lack of meaningful progress and reform in the lagging and floundering pacification program; in dealing with the problem of refugees, inflation and land reform; in the conduct of the elections, and in the over-all administration with its entrenched and inefficient bureaucracy."

From the outset of American involvement the Washington-Saigon partnership has been based on mutual commitments. The United States has more than fulfilled its pledges. President-elect Thieu and Vice President-elect Ky have yet to do so.

HOW CONGRESS CAN CUT SPENDING RESPONSIBLY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when Congress is confronted with the need to reallocate or cut Federal spending, two alternative budget-paring mechanisms can be used. The traditional method is that of the meat ax; Congress cuts some specific amount from every spending request, and successful programs are slashed as much as less-productive projects. For example, poverty and education programs may be trimmed, but the need for these programs certainly does not diminish; short-term spending may be curtailed, yet the disastrous results from meat-ax reductions in these vital areas often means higher Government expenditures over the long run. In short, the meat-ax cure is worse than the illness.

The alternative to the meat ax is for Congress to establish a rational system of spending priorities. Budget requests can be ranked in terms of some payoff guidelines. When expenditures must be lowered, Congress can cut first the lower rated programs.

Tools for such a mechanism already exist. Many of them have been incorporated into the planning-programing-budgeting—PPB—system. Among these tools, cost-benefit analysis is perhaps the key instrument. In cost-benefit studies, total costs of a project are judged against the total benefits the project can provide, and the result is the present value of the proposal. If total costs exceed total benefits, the present value is negative; if total benefits surpass total costs, present value is positive.

Within cost-benefit analysis, all factors are discounted by a constant interest rate. The lower the interest rate utilized in such evaluations, the smaller the expected benefits needed. As the discount rate rises, there must be significantly greater returns in order to justify the project.

All investors—whether public or private—employ cost-benefit techniques in deciding where to employ funds. However, a major gap exists between the discount rate used for Government projects and the discount rate applied in the private sector. According to witnesses in recent Joint Economic Committee hearings on PPB systems, the private sector rate begins at around 10 percent and may be as high as 15 to 20 percent. But the Government rate for most long-range spending programs is around the 3-percent level, and depends upon the coupon rate at the date of issue of long-term Government bonds.

The witnesses emphasized that Government preferably should use the private-sector rate as the most relevant standard; but, in any case, that no discount rate below current Government security yields—around the 5-percent level—should be utilized.

In order to achieve a rational budget allocations system, projects should be evaluated against the possible alternative use of the same funds in the private sector. Justification of low-return public-works-type projects leads to transfer of resources from the private to the public sector, and creates inflationary pressures and lower economic growth.

Mr. President, Congress must utilize realistic decisionmaking tools. The meat ax must be dropped. Alternative discount rates must be used in cost-benefit analysis, and it is imperative that Congress encourage and employ these mechanisms if the goal of economy in Government is to be accomplished.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET COMMISSION ISSUES GOOD REPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning the President's Commission on Budget Concepts released its report containing recommendations directed toward creation of a truly modern and progressive budget presentation for the Federal Government. The report is a culmination of the work of these 16 distinguished Americans appointed to the Commission by the President last March to carry out the "thorough and objective review of budget concepts" which the President had announced in a budget message last January. The Commission assembled a very able staff headed by Mr. Robert P. Mayo, staff director, and Wilfred Lewis, Jr., director of research.

The Commission deserves the commendation of this Congress and everyone interested in improving the formulation of budget policies by the Federal Government. This outstanding report should contribute for years to come to improving the budget document and toward improving congressional and public understanding of this vital document.

As Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, I view the appearance of this report with a special interest because of the committee's longstanding interest in improving the budget document as one step in a larger program of improving the whole process of formulating Federal fiscal policy so as to promote increased effectiveness, efficiency, and economy in Government as well as to balance fiscal policies with the needs of our ever-changing and dynamic economy. The bold and ably formulated improvements suggested by the Commission deserve early and serious consideration with implementation as soon as practicable. I intend to take up with the members of the Joint Economic Committee the desirability of the committee promptly holding hearings on this report as well as on the question of what further improvements in the budget document, as well as in the whole budget process, would most contribute to improved efficiency and effectiveness of fiscal policy and Government administration.

Though I commend most highly the Commission for its work, I feel duty-bound to point out that this is but one step toward the improvements in budgeting procedures and practices which are so vitally needed. In fact, the Commission itself recognizes this fact. One illustration of the further steps needed can be drawn from the work of the Joint Economic Committee. The Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, of which I had the honor of being chairman, recommended in 1963 that—

> The budget for each year should be presented in the context of a broader, longer run set of budgetary projections. These projections should probably cover a 5-year period.

The President's Commission, while recommending making estimates which extend further into the future, suggested that this objective would best be served by encouraging private research organizations or a commission to make such long-term studies from time to time outside the regular budget processes. In a word, they did not recommend including such longer run budget projections as an integral part of the budget document and the budgeting process. In view of the longer run, multiyear character of most programs, it is clear that the President and the Congress must take a longer term look at budget programs if we wish to achieve effective control over the budget and to promote efficiency, economy, and maximum effectiveness in the execution of budget policies and programs.

I have had prepared a summary of the recommendations made by the President's Commission, together with two exhibits summarizing how they would influence the budget presentation. I ask unanimous consent that these documents be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION

1. The Commission's most important recommendation is that a unified summary budget statement be used to replace the present three or more competing concepts that are both confusing to the public and the Congress and deficient in certain essential characteristics.

2. The budget should be thought of as part of a broad financial plan, which incudes—in addition to budget appropriations, receipts, expenditures, and net lending—the means of financing the budget deficit (or use of a surplus) and information about borrowing and loan programs of the Government and its agencies.

3. More prominence should be given in the budget presentation to the actions requested of the Congress, including appropriations as well as revenue or other actions of a fiscal policy character.

4. Flowing from the definition of a budget as a basic part of a comprehensive financial plan, the budget should include all programs of the Federal Government and its agencies.

5. With respect to timing, the Commission recommends that budget expenditures and receipts be reported on an accural basis instead of the present cash basis.

6. A distinction between loans and other expenditures within the budget (and the calculation of the expenditure account surplus or deficit which excludes loans) is significant because of the fiscal policy aspects of the budget through its direct impact on employment and incomes.

7. Separate identification of the subsidies involved in Federal direct loan programs should be added to existing budget information to help promote the more efficient use of public resources.

8. Federal insurance or guarantee of private loans should continue to be reflected outside the budget totals, since they initially represent neither Federal expenditures nor Federal borrowing.

9. Sale by the Government of "participation certificates" in loans which it continues to own should be treated as a means of financing the deficit (or as an element in the disposition of the surplus) rather than as a deduction from expenditures in the derivation of the deficit.

10. The budget summary should include a "means of financing" section based on the budget deficit or surplus.

11. Those receipts of the Government other than taxes which are enterprise or market-oriented should be treated as offsets to expenditures to which they are related.

12. Communication of budget information to the Congress and the public should be (1) more frequent by providing within-year revisions of January estimates, (2) more detailed in terms of breaking down aggregate budget figures into quarterly or semi-annual units, and (3) more comprehensive by making estimates which extend further into the future.

13. The Commission strongly recommends *against* a "capital budget" which would provide separate financing of capital or investment expenditures on the one hand and current or operating expenditures on the other.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON BUDGET CONCEPTS

RECOMMENDED SUMMARY OF THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND FINANCIAL PLAN

I. Budget appropriations:
  Proposed action by the Congress.
  Not requiring action by the Congress.
    Total appropriations.
II. Budget receipts, expenditures, and lending:
  Receipt-expenditure account:
    Receipts.
    Expenditures (excluding net lending).
      Expenditure account surplus or deficit.
  Plus: Loan account:
    Loan disbursements.
    Loan repayments.
      Net lending.
  Equals: Total budget:
    Receipts.
    Expenditures and net lending.
      Budget surplus or deficit.
III. Means of financing:
  Borrowing from the public.
  Reduction of cash balances, etc.
    Total budget financing.
IV. Outstanding Federal securities and Federal loans, end of year:
  Federal securities:
    Gross amount outstanding.
    Held by the public.
  Federal credit programs:
    Direct loans outstanding.
    Guaranteed and insured loans outstanding.

TABLE 8.—HISTORICAL COMPARISON OF FOUR CONCEPTS OF BUDGET TOTALS, 1957–1968

[Fiscal years. In billions of dollars]

	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Administrative budget:												
Receipts	70.6	68.6	67.9	77.8	77.7	81.4	86.7	89.5	93.1	104.7	117.0	126.9
Expenditures	69.0	71.4	80.3	76.5	81.5	87.8	92.8	97.7	96.5	107.0	126.7	135.0
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	+1.6	−2.8	−12.4	+1.2	−3.9	−6.4	−8.3	−8.2	−3.4	−2.3	−9.7	−8.1
Receipts from and payments to the public (consolidated cash budget):												
Receipts	82.1	81.9	81.7	95.1	97.2	101.9	109.8	115.5	119.7	134.5	154.7	168.1
Payments	80.0	83.5	94.8	94.3	99.5	107.7	113.8	120.3	122.4	137.8	160.9	172.4
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	+2.1	−1.6	−13.1	+.8	−2.3	−5.8	−4.0	−4.8	−2.7	−3.3	−6.2	−4.3
Federal sector of national income accounts (NIA budget):												
Receipts	80.7	77.9	85.4	94.8	95.3	104.2	110.2	115.5	120.6	132.6	149.8	167.1
Expenditures	76.0	83.1	90.9	91.3	98.0	106.4	111.4	116.9	118.3	132.3	153.6	169.2
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	+4.7	−5.1	−5.5	+3.5	−2.7	−2.1	−1.2	−1.4	+2.3	+.3	−3.8	−2.1
Commission's recommended budget:												
Receipt-expenditure account:												
Receipts	80.1	77.5	84.6	94.0	94.3	100.2	109.1	114.5	118.9	131.1	147.7	165.2
Expenditures	77.4	82.8	91.6	91.0	98.3	107.0	113.6	118.4	119.0	135.7	155.5	171.1
Expenditure account surplus (+) or deficit (−)	+2.7	−5.3	−7.0	+3.0	−4.0	−4.7	−4.5	−4.0	−.1	−4.6	−7.8	−5.9
Net lending	1.3	1.5	2.8	1.9	1.2	2.1	−.2	.2	1.8	3.8	5.2	4.4
Total budget:												
Receipts	80.1	77.5	84.6	94.0	94.3	103.2	109.1	114.5	118.9	131.1	147.7	165.2
Expenditures	78.7	84.3	94.3	92.9	99.5	110.1	113.4	118.7	120.8	139.5	160.6	175.5
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	+1.4	−6.8	−9.7	+1.1	−5.2	−6.9	−4.2	−4.2	−1.9	−8.4	−12.9	−10.3

THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT STRONGLY ENDORSES SENATE RATIFICATION OF FORCED LABOR CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Forced Labor Convention which was adopted by the International Labor Organization at the strong initiative of the American labor movement has the full and enthusiastic backing of the AFL–CIO.

At the hearings before Senator Dodd's subcommittee last March, the legislative director of the AFL–CIO, Andrew J. Biemiller, made an especially strong case for Senate ratification of the Human Rights Convention on Forced Labor.

Because I am still mystified by the Foreign Relations Committee's decision not to report favorably the Convention on Forced Labor, and because I believe that Mr. Biemiller states very persuasively the case for Senate ratification of the Forced Labor Convention, I ask unanimous consent that his testimony before the ad hoc Subcommittee on Human Rights be included at this point in the Record:

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Andrew J. Biemiller, Director, Department of Legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew J. Biemiller. I am Director of the Department of Legislation of the AFL–CIO.

The AFL–CIO is extremely pleased to have this opportunity to testify before this subcommittee. It is our firm conviction that hearings—and appropriate Senate action—on these conventions are long overdue.

Because of the time limit, Mr. Chairman, as well as the large list of other witnesses scheduled to appear before this subcommittee, the AFL–CIO's testimony will deal specifically with our support for ratification of the Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor.

This is the Convention adopted by the International Labor Organization in Geneva, on June 25, 1957.

It requires ratifying states to suppress and not to make use of any form of forced or compulsory labor for certain specific purposes: namely, as a means of political coercion or education or as a punishment for holding or expressing particular social, economic, or political views; as a means of mobilizing labor for purposes of economic development; as a means of labor discipline; as punishment for having participated in strikes; or as a means of racial, social, national, or religious discrimination. Ratifying states are required to take effective measures to secure immediate and complete abolition of these proscribed uses of force or compulsory labor.

Organized labor's strong support for this Convention is based on its desire to protect and advance the freedom of labor both at home and abroad. It was, in fact, the American Federation of Labor—in 1947—that first requested the United Nations in conjunction with the ILO to conduct an investigation of forced labor wherever it may exist in the world.

It took two years of persuasion before the AFL accomplished its goal. In February 1949, despite the opposition of Russia and her satellites, the UN Economic and Social Council voted to request the ILO to make such an investigation.

An Ad Hoc UN–ILO committee was established to study the nature and extent of the forced labor problem, resulting in a report being issued in 1953 that found a systematic program of forced labor in all of the Soviet-controlled countries.

As a part of its report, the committee recommended: ". . . wherever necessary, international action be taken, either by framing new conventions or by amending existing conventions, so that they may be applicable to the position regarding forced labor conditions found to exist among the workers of fully self-governing countries."

On December 15, 1955, a second factual document was issued. The Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of the ILO reported to the Economic and Social Council of the UN on the use of widespread forced labor in Red China. This same report cornfimed the 1953 findings regarding forced labor in the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania.

Early in 1956, as the result of effective American leadership, the ILO established an Independent Committee to analyze material on forced labor received by the ILO and to submit conclusions to the governing body.

The Independent Committee issued its report shortly thereafter. It was this report that urged the ILO to adopt a new international instrument prohibiting the forced labor found to exist in a number of self-governing countries. It should be pointed out that an ILO Convention of 1930 imposed restrictions on forced labor in non-self-governing countries.

Although the United States, starting with the request of the AFL, had been largely responsible for the studies leading up to the ILO committee's proposal, it became apparent—in late 1955—that our State Department was not anxious to have the ILO adopt a forced labor convention.

When the ILO prepared to implement its findings by sending questionnaires among its member governments prior to proposing a new instrument or convention, the United States government refused to cooperate. Unlike the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and 41 other nations, our government failed to complete and return the questionnaire.

On April 25 and 27, 1956, the State Department's reasoning—or lack of reasoning—for this action became a matter of public record during hearings before the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

These hearings were conducted on S.J. Res. 117, introduced by our present Vice President, calling upon the United States to "exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes."

During the hearings a letter from the State Department to Senator Lister Hill was placed in the record. Basically, Secretary Dulles took the position that adoption of an ILO convention would not be an effective way of prohibiting forced labor since there would be no adequate enforcement machinery.

Instead, the State Department called for an ILO declaration to be coupled with continued efforts to expose and publicize forced labor practices wherever they exist.

In the letter written to Senator Hill by Assistant Secretary Robert C. Hill, the State Department attempted to support its position by poining out: "It is interesting to note . . . that the U.S.S.R. has embraced the idea of a convention and has called upon the International Labor Organization to 'adopt as broad and radical an instrument as is possible.' Endorsement of the convention form by the U.S.S.R. is indicative of what might be expected from the adoption of this (convention) form of action."

Testifying during the same 1956 hearings was AFL–CIO International Representative George P. Delaney. Mr. Delaney, who is now Special Assistant to the Secretary of State and Coordinator of International Affairs, correctly predicted that a majority of the participants at the June, 1957 ILO conference would support the adoption of the convention.

He told the subcommittee: "The failure of the United States Government vigorously to support the adoption of a convention on forced labor would place this nation in a position that would be ludicrous if its consequences were not so grave . . .

"I think that I can reasonably state that the overwhelming majority—in fact, all of the workers of the conference—except those who are controlled by governments—will certainly support the adoption of a convention. And I think I can say, with possibly the exception of the United States employer, that that will be true of the participants from the employer side of the International Labor Organization.

"The employer and worker representatives of the free nations of the world will consider anything less than vigorous leadership by the United States as an incomprehensible abandonment of its principles."

On June 25, 1957, the Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor was adopted by the ILO. As of January 1, 1967, 75 states have become parties to the convention. It is interesting to note that despite the prediction of the State Department in 1956, the Soviet Union has ratified the two other conventions being considered by this committee, but has refused to ratify the forced labor convention.

Unfortunately, neither has the United States. It was not until 1963 that the three conventions being considered by this subcommittee were submitted to the Senate. In asking for the Senate's constitutional consent to ratify, President Kennedy clearly stated the paramount issue when he declared: "The United States cannot afford to renounce responsibility for support of the very fundamentals which distinguish our concept of government from all forms of tyranny."

It is now two decades since the AFL first called for an investigation of forced labor and one decade since the ILO convention was adopted. Surely, it is time—at long last—for the Senate to give its advise and consent to this convention.

Legal and moral arguments strongly support this conclusion. As Ambassador Goldberg testified before this subcommittee on February 23, there is ample legal precedent for ratification. The moral reasons are just as compelling.

Our nation is now a party to two international human rights agreements. We ratified a convention on slavery during the administration of President Herbert Hoover and we ratified an agreement on the nationality of women during the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Further, there is nothing in the forced labor convention that does not coincide with the fundamental rights guaranteed under our Constitution. There is nothing in this convention that will alter the balance between the jurisdiction of the federal government and the jurisdiction of the states. There is nothing in this convention that is not already covered by federal constitutional protections. Finally, from a legal standpoint, approval of this convention would require no implementing legislation.

Ambassador Goldberg clearly spelled out the provisions of the convention dealing with labor strikes and labor discipline. We are in complete agreement with his explanation. As he testified, "The convention would have no application to criminal sanctions for violations of court orders—such as those commonly issued under the National Labor Relations Act. Nor would it cast any doubt on punishments for illegal activities; for example, assaults, in connection with a strike. Nor, finally, would the convention apply to sanctions imposed for having participated in an illegal strike or for other illegal activities."

It is, of course, just as clear that forced labor cannot be imposed in this country as a result of strikes or other labor activities that are legal.

The moral arguments supporting ratification of this convention are well known by members of the subcommittee. As the chairman pointed out in his opening statement on February 23, "We have made giant strides in our own country over the past decades in eliminating the inequities inherited from the past."

Ratification of this convention by our nation would emphasize—to the world—our commitment to the realization of human rights not only at home, but also abroad. For too long, the United States has supported the charter of the United Nations and its human rights principles without agreeing to give these principles real meaning and force.

Until our government ratifies this convention, the United States will continue to abdicate its moral leadership on an issue that goes to the heart of the struggle between democracy and communism. Our inaction refuses to recognize the effect this lack of leadership has on the uncommitted countries of the world just as it refuses to recognize the millions of persons still denied human dignity in the slave-labor camps that continue to exist behind the Iron Curtain and elsewhere.

WATERGATE COMPLEX

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is a controversy developing in the District of Columbia that interests many Senators. The controversy is referred to in an editorial which was published in the Washington Post on October 18 and an editorial which appeared the same day in the Washington Star.

This is a controversy that revolves around an attempt on the part of the Kennedy Center trustees to prevent the completion of the Watergate complex previously approved. A great many legal relationships have been established.

Mr. President, if the Kennedy Center trustees had their way, the matter would result in many litigious cases. I find not the slightest justificaticn for the position that the Kennedy Center trustees have taken. Therefore, I wish to read into the Record a letter I wrote to Mr. Scrivener, the Chairman of the Board of Zoning Adjustments of the District of Columbia today:

October 18, 1967.

Mr. Samuel Scrivener,
Chairman, Board of Zoning Adjustments,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Scrivener: As a member of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, I have followed with great concern the controversy that has developed between the Fine Arts Commission and the National Capital Planning Commission involving the Watergate Development Corporation.

In my opinion, the editorials in the Washington Post of October 13 and the Washington Star of October 13 are sound, both in their analysis and their conclusions that the attempt of the Kennedy Center trustees to force the Watergate Development Corporation to abandon the construction of the fourth major unit of its project is unsound and unjustified. To contend that building the fourth unit, as the Washington Post puts it, "a football field away from the Kennedy Center" would jeopardize the aesthetic values of the Kennedy Center, is absurd.

Basic legal rights have become vested in the Watergate Development Corporation in respect to completing the project, as originally designed and already approved by the appropriate government bureaus of the District of Columbia Government. For the National Capital Planning Commission or any other agency of the District of Columbia Government to attempt to reverse that approval with all the litigious issues that such a reversal would now stir up cannot be justified.

Therefore, I respectfully urge that the controversy be laid to rest once and for all by the National Capital Planning Commission denying the request of the Kennedy Center trustees in their attempt to prevent the completion of the Watergate Development Project, as originally planned and approved.

Yours respectfully,

Wayne Morse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter I wrote today to the Honorable Walter Tobriner, president of the Board of Commissioners, on this same subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

October 18, 1967.

Hon. Walter Tobriner,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Commissioner Tobriner: This morning, I have sent a hand-delivered letter, a copy of which is enclosed, to the Board of Zoning Adjustments in regard to the controversy over the attempt of the Kennedy Center trustees to prevent the building of the fourth unit of the Watergate Development Project.

I think the litigious controversy that would flow from the granting of the request of the Kennedy Center trustees would be very unfortunate and unjustified. I hope that such a mistake will not be committed.

With best wishes, always,

Cordially,

Wayne Morse.

RETIREMENT OF GEORGE A. ENGLAND, DIRECTOR, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, after more than 30 years of very distinguished service with the District of Columbia Government, Mr. George A. England, Director of the District of Columbia Department of Motor Vehicles, retired on August 31.

As a member of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, I worked very closely with Mr. England for many years on numerous District of Columbia problems. I know of very few public servants in the District of Columbia who brought more ability, integrity, initiative, and complete dedication to solving the problems of this city than did George England.

Mr. England's job as Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles was not an easy one. There were always tremendous pressures placed on him by employees of other District of Columbia departments and the public for special consideration. I have never known George England to yield the public interest on any matter.

I know that this man of great integrity and ability is and will continue to be sorely missed. I sincerely hope that Mr. England's deserved retirement will be a happy and productive one.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news release issued by the Public Affairs Office of the District of Columbia Government of August 21, 1967, announcing Mr. England's retirement.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

George A. England, Director of the District's Department of Motor Vehicles and a veteran of more than 30 years' service with the city government, will retire at the end of this month.

The post will be filled by William D. Heath, who is Executive Director of the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency.

Engineer Commissioner Robert E. Mathe, who announced the personnel changes today on behalf of the Board of Commissioners, said Mr. Heath will continue to supervise activities of the Parking Agency in his new job.

Mr. England, age 55, of 2416 Darrow Street, Silver Spring, who will retire August 31, is completing a career with the District Government that spans about 33 years. A native of Hyattsville and a lifelong resident of the Washington area, he started his District Government service in the Office of the Superintendent of Lorton Reformatory.

After several promotions in a number of jobs, Mr. England was named Special Assistant to the Engineer Commissioner in 1947. During the next 11 years, he served as Special Assistant to a total of five of the city's Engineer Commissioners.

In 1958, he moved up to head the newly established Department of Motor Vehicles.

In this post Mr. England has been associated with a broad range of highway safety programs, both local and national in scope. Included was service as President of the Eastern Conference of Motor Vehicle Administrators, and membership on the Executive Committee of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, the National Committee on Uniform Laws and Ordinances, and the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission.

New programs adopted by his department include requirements for reflectorized license tags, the retesting for driver's permits at age 65, eye vision examinations for permit renewals, color permit photographs, lengthened hours of service at inspection stations, and adoption of a computer system to keep a tighter check on the city's 450,000 licensed motorists.

The city's new Director of Motor Vehicles, Mr. Heath, will begin his new duties September 1, 1967. The appointment to the GS–15 post initially is on a temporary, 6-month basis.

A native of Washington, Mr. Heath, also 55, accepted his first job with the District in 1928 with a field crew in the Highway Department.

In 1942, he took the post of Superintendent of a production cost accounting section with the Bureau of Public Roads on the Alaska Highway Project.

After World War II Army service, during which he received a battlefield commission with the Army Transportation Corps, Mr. Heath returned to work for the District's Highway Department. His career included supervision in 1947 of the Highway Department's work in the development of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Study.

In 1958, after a 10-year stint as office engineer in the Highway Department, Mr. Heath was named to the post of Executive Director of the Parking Agency.

A registered professional engineer, he is a past president of the Washington Section of the Institute of Traffic Engineers, and currently is Vice President of the International Municipal Parking Congress.

His wife, Mrs. Lynn Heath, is a Special Assistant to the Director of the Highway Department. They reside at 1111 Army-Navy Drive, Arlington.

SALE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT TIMBER IN OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter dated September 11 from the Associate Director of Bureau of Land Management enclosing a sample of a letter sent to purchasers of BLM timber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this Bureau conducts a large timber sale business in Oregon. Its sale of timber exceeds 1 billion board feet a year with revenues approaching $50 million.

There is a great interest in the way this business is conducted. Therefore, I am pleased to call attention to the consultation procedure the Director of the Bureau of Land Management is using to keep people informed on pricing and sales policies.

In my opinion, Director Rasmussen's "open door" policy of explaining his agency's policies is a public interest course. On all the major issues he must meet—log exports, timber appraisals, allowable cuts, and grazing fees and use, he has made a responsible effort to keep the public informed. He has kept all of us in the Oregon delegation advised. In my view this is a wise and useful approach.

On my recent trips to Oregon a number of people had questions about the Bureau of Land Management's new timber appraisal system. Because of Mr. Rasmussen's earlier advice I could respond to those questions.

I hope that people concerned with public timber purchases in Oregon will take advantage of the invitation of the Bureau of Land Management when they have problems that call for consultation.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D.C., September 11, 1967.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: During the past several months the Bureau of Land Management has moved ahead on several matters regarding timber sale and appraisal policies and procedures. It is our objective to keep all interested parties informed on these important matters. To this end, we are planning to distribute the enclosed letter to potential purchasers and other interested parties whose names are contained on BLM timber sale mailing lists of western Oregon. This copy is being furnished for your information.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O. CROW,
Acting Director.

(Enclosure.)

A LETTER TO BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT TIMBER PURCHASES AND INTERESTED MEMBERS OF INDUSTRY REGARDING PROGRESS AND PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF A UNIFORM APPRAISAL SYSTEM AND OTHER MATTERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: In early April the Bureau of Land Management announced, jointly with the Forest Service, several proposed actions concerning timber sale and appraisal policies and procedures. You were made aware of these proposals through your various industry associations and meetings held by the Bureau. We wish to advise you of the progress which has been made.

The Bureau's interim timber appraisal system is in effect and it is reflected in September sales. Adjustments involve revised and updated appraisal data as well as a basic change in the appraisal formula. We are watching the results of these adjustments very closely and any problems which may develop will be evaluated as soon as they are apparent. The relation of bid prices to prices obtained using this interim system will be under constant scrutiny as one indicator of the appraisal adequacy.

The BLM and Forest Service have agreed on a plan for the development and testing of a uniform timber appraisal system. The objective of the system is to estimate fair market value for standing timber through an analytical appraisal method. Basically, both agencies use an analytical method now. Not all of the procedures for a uniform timber appraisal system have been worked out at this time. The sources of information needed to develop this plan and design the system will be many: operator's records, industry association records and publications, government publications, time studies, etc. Our development plan provides for continuous consultation with the industry which will be accomplished through a working committee of industry representatives. The committee will be expected to keep the industry fully informed.

We have joined with the Forest Service in conducting continuous profit studies. It is intended to obtain additional information in order to exercise informed judgment in estimating adequate profit opportunities for industry. This information is necessary for the uniform appraisal system development.

The long term development of a uniform timber measurement system is underway. The first part, a study of the adequacy of the existing log and tree measurement systems, is near completion. You may have been contacted by the Experiment Station as it conducted this study. The Bureau has completed a review of BLM cruising standards and procedures. We are vigorously moving ahead on the findings from the review.

There is little to report on bidding methods, except that a joint BLM-FS study is underway. We do not plan to take any action in this area until the study is completed which will be some time after January 1, 1968.

It is our intent to keep you fully informed on these matters and we will do our best to keep in touch when conditions warrant. You are encouraged to inform us of any questions or problems you may have in timber sale and appraisal policies and procedures.

Sincerely yours,

BOYD RASMUSSEN,
Director.

ALLOWABLE CUTS AND REPORT OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the first 14 pages of a report of the Oregon and California Lands Advisory Board on "Recommended Allowable Cut Policies for Managing BLM Forest Lands in Western Oregon," together with the cover letter dated August 29, 1967, from the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, the entire report covers 79 pages with tables and graphs. The portion that I am having printed includes the "Transmittal of Report, Acknowledgment, Committee Assignment, How the Committee Functioned, and the Summary of Findings and Recommendations."

This is a report of signal interest with tremendous long term impacts on Oregon's No. 1 industry—timber.

The Advisory Board has undertaken a broad and constructive effort to give general advice and counsel to the Bureau of Land Management—advice it sought. This represents a high level of citizen interest and participation.

In mid-1965, as I recall, the question of revision of BLM's Oregon allowable cut came up. Assistant Secretary of the Interior Anderson and the then BLM Director, Charles Stoddard, advised me that this matter would be given most careful review. At that time, there was considerable concern among some people in Oregon whether the Forest Service had suppressed a plan which it was alleged could dramatically raise its allowable cut if put into effect. This was a subject I gave considerable attention to by placing all the pertinent facts in the RECORD.

Both the national forests and BLM lands are of importance to Oregon for they are forest and range lands of great multiple uses.

This concept of a careful policy review has the support of Oregon's true conservationists.

Now the Bureau of Land Management has the benefit of its Advisory Board's views. BLM Director Rasmussen has given this work his considerable understanding. I know Oregonians will be pleased by his assurance that he will "be studying the report closely in developing Bureau policy on allowable cut matters."

Since this study was undertaken, the BLM forests in Oregon were hit in August 1967 by a tremendous fire that destroyed over half a billion board feet of timber. Data is not available on the number of board feet destroyed in Oregon and elsewhere in the West by forest fires this year. One estimate I have seen is that over one-third of a million acres were ravaged.

A great deal of care and study is required, not only on allowable cuts, but also on the steps needed to protect the allowable cuts and the great water resources that are linked so closely to our western forests.

EXHIBIT 1

JULY 25, 1967.

To: Charles A. Sprague, Chairman, O. & C. Advisory Board.

From: Dawn Peseau, Chairman, O. & C. Advisory Board's Committee on Allowable Cut Policies.

Subject: Recommended Allowable Cut Policies for Managing BLM Forest Lands in Western Oregon.

Pursuant to your instructions, this Committee submits herewith its report containing findings and recommendations for managing BLM forest lands in Western Oregon in accordance with the dictates of the O. & C. Sustained Yield-Multiple Use Act of August 28, 1937.

It is recommended that the Board approve this report and that it be forwarded to advise the Director, Bureau of Land Management and the Secretary, Department of the Interior.

By the committee:

DAWN PESEAU,
Chairman.
ERIC W. ALLEN, JR.,
Vice Chairman.
A. F. HARTUNG,
SIDNEY LEIKEN,
DAVID T. MASON,
RAY E. DOERNER,

BLM representative:

RODNEY O. FETY,
Cochairman.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The O. & C. Advisory Board Committee on Allowable Cut Policies deeply appreciates the splendid cooperation and participation of the many people who gave freely of their time and talent in assisting the Committee in arriving at this report.

It believes this is a noteworthy example of people working together on a common problem to arrive at solutions which reflect the best interest of the community and the Nation, now and in the future.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

At the May 3, 1966 meeting of the O & C Advisory Board, a motion was made and carried that a Committee of the Board be appointed to advise on O & C allowable cut policy issues and influences in Western Oregon.

Chairman Charles A. Sprague appointed Mrs. Dawn Peseau, Chairman, Mr. Eric W. Allen, Jr., Vice-Chairman, and Messrs. A. F. Hartung, Darrell Jones, Joseph W. McCracken, and David T. Mason, members of a committee to study the matter and report on its findings. At the end of calendar year 1966, new appointments to the Advisory Board resulted in Mr. Ray E. Doerner replacing Mr. Darrell Jones, and Mr. Sidney Leiken replacing Mr. Joseph W. McCracken on the Committee. Messrs. Jones and McCracken, however, were invited to attend and participate in Committee meetings as an aid in the transition of membership and to bring expert knowledge and views to bear on allowable cut questions. Mr. Rodney O. Fety was designated as Co-Chairman by State Director James F. Doyle to represent BLM and attend all meetings of the Committee.

HOW THE COMMITTEE FUNCTIONED

Under the chairmanship of Mrs. Dawn Peseau, subject matter research seminars were held by the Commitee on September 8, 1966, October 28, 1966, November 18, 1966, December 16, 1966, January 20, 1967, February 17, 1967 and March 17, 1967. Executive sessions were held on April 28, 1967, May 24, 1967 and July 25, 1967.

Outstanding authorities participated in a series of research seminars. They were deliberately selected to represent cross-sectional viewpoints in specific subject matter fields and the public and private sectors; for example, representatives from solid wood and wood fiber manufacturing, forest laboratory and experiment station, universities, federal agencies, state forestry organizations, forestry consultants, and industrial associations.

The Committee received written statements (See Appendix 3), oral presentations (See Appendix 4), and considered a number of references (See Appendix 5).

Specific assignments for preparing portions of a first draft of this report were given to Committee members by the Chairman. This draft was reviewed by Committee members and revised into this final report.

In considering allowable cut policy aspects, the Committee kept in mind the objectives for administering the O & C lands stated in the O & C Sustained Yield-Multiple Use Act of August 28, 1937.

Special consideration was given by the Committee to the fact that, as the owner of the major portion of the marketable timber in the Pacific Northwest, the United States Government does materially affect the economy of the Pacific Northwest by its allowable cut policies.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. CLARIFIED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The BLM has been intensifying forest land management practices as the feasibility and financing permitted and at the urging of the industry and the public. The Committee has learned that there are many opportunities for more intensive forestry practices, well known to land managers. The BLM needs the greatest possible motivation to adopt intensive forest land management practices.

The Committee recommends that the goals and objectives of the O & C land management need to be restated and clarified. The BLM is encouraged to communicate the problems and potentialities of the O & C lands as widely as possible.

II. FOREST INVENTORY

Complete, accurate, and up-to-date information on the forest land area, site class, topography, timber types, volumes, mortality, stocking, and growth are necessary as a basis for sound management of the O & C lands. The Committee learned that forest inventories are from five to eight years old. A reinventory of one of the oldest master unit inventories is now nearing completion; others are planned to commence during fiscal year 1968. The allowable cut was increased in 1962 without benefit of new inventory data. A major windstorm, a flood, a fire, and a serious insect infestation have occurred in Western Oregon since the last inventories.

The Committee recommends that reinventories of each master unit be made as rapidly as possible and that no changes be made in the allowable cut for a master unit until a reinventory of it is complete.

III. USE OF ECONOMIC CRITERIA

A high level of wood output is beneficial to the industry, employment, and the economic life of the community. However, seeking it through long rotations may tend to result in investment of funds in timber growing stock to the detriment of other activities, such as recreation and water developments, when the total available funds are limited. The Committee understands that there may be opportunities to utilize existing investments in over mature growing stock to finance intensive timber growing practices that will raise the long-run timber output significantly. One of the promising investments is in faster and more certain regeneration. Others include precommercial thinning, fertilization, genetics and the like. The BLM should be alert to evaluate the effectiveness of the application of new research developments and consider them in relation to the cost of their application. This will help assure that any increases in allowable cut made for these reasons are based on the practicality of attainment.

The need for a proper balance of investments in management intensification was obvious in the Committee discussions. Many more opportunities exist for increased allowable cuts by intensive management than there are funds to carry out these management efforts. Furthermore, some of the opportunities are much more favorable than others. The Committee is concerned that regular procedures be strengthened, and new ones established, for evaluating these public investment opportunities. This would serve to better guide Congress in making appropriations and guide the O & C counties in allocating the funds such as they have been directing for expenditure. It would also assist the O & C administration in carrying out the management activities by guiding them to the most promising opportunities first.

The Committee recommends that, aside from recreation, water, wildlife and other uses of the land, the BLM use economic criteria when determining the optimum amount of growing stock and other timber investments. Properly evaluated economic criteria will permit optimum wood yields, while placing reasonable limits on investments in growing stock and timber management activities in relation to the returns.

IV. OTHER FOREST LAND USES

Uses of the public lands for purposes other than timber production constitute a significant, increasing, and often beneficial segment of total demand on the public lands, including the O & C lands. This trend gives evidence of continuing. Providing for these uses, as well as for the increasing demands for timber, requires that the public land manager plan carefully in order to keep all reasonable options open insofar as possible. Land use programs must remain flexible.

The Committee recommends that a system of land classifications be developed and applied on the O & C lands to assure adequate provision for development and protection of other than commercial timber values and that such a system should not necessarily restrict the use to a single purpose, but provide for flexibility in the management for the various uses.

V. LONGER-RANGE BUDGETING

Additions to allowable cut now and in the long run often require dependable annual outlays. The present system of annual appropriations may not be certain enough to warrant those planned increases in allowable cut which are dependent upon continuing programs of intensive management.

The Committee recommends that a much improved long range system of planning, programming, appropriating, and allocating investment funds be developed. This system should begin at the local level to insure a realistic relationship between the need, the investment, and the local economy. The use of a portion of the O & C Land Grant Fund for these investment purposes is desirable and should be continued.

VI. STRONGER LOCAL PLANNING STAFF

Better procedures are needed at the State Office level of BLM for making decisions on factors used in allowable cut culculations and management planning. Several significant factors involve more than just technical forestry. Such things as kinds of products needed in future, evenflow of wood output, size of planning unit, and impact of and demand for other uses must be carefully evaluated as to their effect upon local communities and industries.

The Committee recommends that a stronger interdisciplinary planning staff drawing upon the skills of foresters, economists, sociologists, engineers, outdoor recreation specialists and others, be developed to evaluate alternatives as a basis for improved decision-making on allowable cut levels for the O & C lands.

VII. THINNING AND SALVAGE POLICIES

Two promising and desirable methods of increasing the currently available raw material are commercial thinnings and salvage of mortality. The Committee understands BLM proposes to offer about 140 million board feet of mortality salvage and thinnings during fiscal year 1968. It commends this start and hopes that this is to be a continuing and expanded program.

The Committee recommends that estimates of the total potential for thinning and mortality yields during the next ten years be refined, that the costs and returns, including employment and other benefits, of such a program be calculated, and that a proposed program to capture these opportunities be presented to the O & C Advisory Board.

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMPLETE TIMBER SALE PROGRAM

The wise and intensive management of O & C lands for timber results in production of many kinds and sizes of trees from several methods of harvest. Some trees are harvested as green mature timber, others as mortality, salvageable culls or suppressed trees in thinnings. Still other trees, such as some hardwoods, are only occasionally marketable. The industry and employment dependent upon timber as raw material need to know what and how much wood is available, now and for several years into the future.

The Committee recommends that all the timber determined to be available for cutting be included in the allowable cut, but that it be announced by the species, kinds, sizes to be offered for sale during the planned cutting period. This will require a system of control to prevent substitution of one kind of timber for another in the actual cutting program.

IX. ROAD DEVELOPMENT

A well-planned system of roads is essential to effective timber growing and marketing and to full use of the forest for other purposes, such as recreation. Timber harvest has provided income to the BLM and to the O & C counties for financing the major part of road developments thus far. Further study is required as to the allocation of construction and maintenance costs for the differing uses of general traffic roads. More intensive timber practices require certain roads specifically for these purposes, such as thinning and salvage, and these roads should be designed for that purpose.

The Committee recommends that the completion of the main road system serving all the uses of O & C lands be carefully planned, and be coordinated with the road programs on adjacent lands; and that the minor roads needed for intensive timber management be built to the reasonable minimum standards justified for that purpose.

X. RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION NEEDED

Although a great deal is already known about how to increase timber yields by more intensive management, still more remains to be learned or to be developed to the point of practical application. The Committee was also impressed with the need for better information about the effects on the local economy of changes in the output of timber or other uses of the O & C lands.

The Committee recommends that continued and increased support be given to the programs of research agencies and universities, and that the BLM should constantly apply promising new findings on a trial basis in order to determine their practicality for increasing timber production at reasonable cost. Furthermore, continued research and review of product objectives on the O & C lands should be conducted and program revisions made as warranted.

XI. ALLOWABLE CUT—A GENERAL STATEMENT

Great care must be taken to provide in perpetuity a productive O & C forest which is the base for much of our economy, as well as to satisfy the many other reasonable demands upon the limited forest land area. With respect to the allowable cut, it is easier to harvest timber than to grow it. Standing forests are an asset-in-being, but a newly harvested area is only potentially productive, one to four generations away from harvest.

The Committee recommends that land managers and foresters keep this ever in mind while applying technical formulae to the forest base to determine the allowable cut.

PROPOSED SALE OF AMERICAN SUPERSONIC BOMBERS TO PERU

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few moments ago, I noted on the ticker that the State Department has decided to sell supersonic bombers to Peru, and to several other countries of South America.

I shall discuss this matter at some depth on another day in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, but I want to make these brief remarks about it now. Approval of this sale is but another evidence of the surrender of our State Department and the Johnson administration to international political blackmail. It cannot be explained on any other basis.

Ah, we said to Peru, which has a per capita income for the masses of its people of $170 per year, "Why, we will sell you the bombers because if we do not, you are about to consummate the purchase of supersonic bombers from France. And, do not forget, we will supply you with foreign aid, too."

That is just what I say it is: Pure international blackmail.

Mr. President, do you know what we should have said to Peru? We should have said, "Go on and buy your bombers from France, and get your economic aid from them, too, and save our American taxpayers all of the losses they would otherwise have to suffer."

Mr. President, the sale of these bombers to Peru demonstrates once again the shocking foreign policy of the United States in Latin America time and time again.

It is a continuation of the policy that, when the chips of freedom are down in Latin America, the United States of America can be counted on to walk out on freedom. This support of military oligarchs, military mandarins, who have exploited for decades the poor people of Latin America, is once again being repeated. And we want to know what is happening to the U.S. image in Latin America.

I have said in past speeches, and repeat on the floor of the Senate today, that we create more Communists in Latin America than any other force in the world does, through our military aid to the military oligarchies that control too many Latin American countries.

Will anybody in the Senate get up on his feet and tell me why we ought to be providing any Latin American country with supersonic bombers, or destroyers, or submarines, or mile after mile of our largest tanks, or mile after mile of our heaviest field equipment? Let me hear him today or any other day. I challenge a Senator in this body to get up on the floor of the Senate to justify selling this kind of military equipment to any Latin American country, especially in competition with France.

There was a time when we feared that equipment might be sought in Russia and we felt that we did have to provide an alternative to Russian weapons.

But France—to hear the Pentagon and State Department talk, the United States is as afraid of French, British, and Swedish equipment in underdeveloped countries as it is afraid of Russian or Chinese equipment.

I cannot imagine how much closer we can get to international paranoia than to feel we must make planes available to Peru or Brazil because the alternative source is France.

I am in favor of certain military aid to Latin America. I am for military aid that will help keep down coups from the left and coups from the right. I am for supplying tear gas, rifles, pistols, small arms, the kind of military aid and equipment that is necessary to maintain internal order. How is internal order to be maintained with supersonic bombers that drop bombs? It is fantasy. How is internal order to be maintained with submarines or destroyers? Fantasy. More than that, it is deceit. It deceives the American taxpayer, which again the administration plays for a sucker. It seeks to maintain a military class so that the sons of the oligarchs will have military jobs and comprise the officer class of the Military Establishments in the military junta countries of Latin America.

Some years ago President Kennedy appointed me chairman of the American delegation to go to Peru for the inauguration of the President to whom it is now proposed to sell military aircraft and military fighter planes. I sat on the military review stand for about 3½ hours, along with the delegates and heads of the delegations of all the other countries of the world that attended the inauguration. I counted 40 or more Sherman tanks rumbling down that boulevard. I saw mile after mile of our military equipment rumble down that boulevard. I looked to see if what I had been told was true. I was warned in advance that I would not see a single Indian wearing an officer's uniform. Not only did I see that, but they were buck privates. I was also warned that I would see military generals in numbers out of all proportion. I saw them.

Well, this is not limited to Peru. The same thing is true in Argentina. The same thing is true in Brazil. The same thing is true in Ecuador. The same thing is true all through Latin America where the military rules in fact.

Of course, what that does is keep down political freedom. It victimizes the peasants, with their shocking, low standard of living. It victimizes them by making them easy prey to the vicious, lying propaganda of the Communists. They say, "You have nothing to lose by joining us." Do not forget that we are dealing with a peasantry. We are dealing with peons, a large percentage of whom—in most of the countries above 50 percent—are illiterate and ignorant.

The great vision of President Jack Kennedy was to export to them economic freedom and literacy. Let me say that if they can be made economically free and literate, they will develop their own system of political freedom. We cannot export it to them. They will never get it from the military oligarchs, for the record of military oligarchs is a record that supports not political freedom but political dictatorship.

I have worked in this field for many years in the Senate, and I am very proud of the record that my Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee has made. I have pleaded with the Senate year after year to eliminate from the foreign aid bill a large part of the millions of dollars that go into military aid. We have made some progress—not enough—only to have the House proceed to vote millions of dollars more than the Senate recommended. Then we get into conference and we have to compromise somewhere in between.

But this one is so wrong, this one is so completely unjustified, Mr. President, that I take these few moments again today on the floor of the Senate to warn the American people that the State Department is throwing away millions and millions of your dollars, not only wasting your money, but perpetuating a great wrong in Latin America by way of the type of military aid that we give to the military oligarchs.

I have been heard to say before that I not only am opposed to the materiel that we supply them. Does anyone think we are going to be paid back for these planes? Stop kidding yourselves.

It is remarkable, as the record shows, how small a percentage is ever paid back. The debt drags on, and after some years the military argue that what had been sold them before, or what had been given them before—much of our military aid to Latin America has been by gift—is now obsolete; they have to have new equipment. Then it is remarkable to see how debts can be forgotten or scaled down or adjusted.

Then the American taxpayer is stuck with it.

Mr. President, I shall not be a party now, as I have never been before, to fooling the American taxpayer or deceiving him. But we now learn that we are going to make fighters available under a so-called sales program. We will wait a long time to collect our money in payment.

We are going to pour in economic aid in addition, but chiefly on a government-to-government basis, instead of on a project-to-project basis. Starting with Peru, let us get ready for the lineup. If we do this for Peru, we shall have to do it for Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and the rest. It is a racket—just a racket. The American people ought to put a stop to it. The only way they can put a stop to it is to make perfectly clear to Members of Congress that if they continue to underwrite that kind of racket, they will be held to an accounting. I am very sorry to have to say that.

To the credit of the administration, I will say that we had a little preview of this plan the other day in the Commitee on Foreign Relations. The Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs discussed it with us and consulted with us. I highly approved of that. What surprises me is that, following that consultation, we now read on the news ticker that the administration plans to go through with the project.

If any Senator wants to know what took place in the consultation, a record was kept. It is not a public record, but it is available to any Member of the Senate who wishes to get it out of the safe of the Committee on Foreign Relations and read it. The record will show that the Assistant Secretary of State left the room with not the slightest doubt in his mind that he had run into a group of Senators who did not think the plan was a good idea.

I think there should be more consultation, but may I say that, of course, if the idea is just to have consultation as a matter of form, just to come up and raise the issue and listen to the objections, and then, within a few days thereafter—this was just a few days ago—go on and consummate the deal, irrespective of what Senators say when consulted, all I can do is sincerely advise my administration, "You are headed for more trouble." Further consultation and further consideration, including consultation with my committee, with a formal meeting with the Committee on Foreign Relations, would have been the proper way to do it.

Moreover, we are engaged in a companion military aid intervention program in Latin America; the administration will know what I mean when I say I am also opposed to sending a single American military man in military uniform—or in civilian uniform, for that matter, if the purpose would be the same with him in civilian clothes—to serve as a military adviser anywhere in Latin America.

That is the way new Vietnams start. That is the way the present Vietnam situation started, though Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy both rejected the thought of making this an American war in Vietnam.

When representatives of this administration cite President Eisenhower and President Kennedy as following a course that justifies the present course in Vietnam, they are completely wrong. That is one of the contributions to the credibility gap, when they release that kind of propaganda; for those two Presidents made very clear that they were not about to send large military ground forces over to South Vietnam to engage in combat.

I happened to think—and told him so—that President Kennedy made a mistake in even sending over advisers; but I am also satisfied that he was on his way to reversing even that policy at the time of his assassination. I have stated my reasons for that belief heretofore in several speeches on the floor of the Senate, before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and from platforms all across America. I shall not repeat them this afternoon. I close this comment this afternoon merely by saying that I am saddened by what the ticker story says. I think my Government is once again making a horrendous mistake in Latin America.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the acting majority leader—for, although I see the majority leader is present, it is the acting majority leader whose attention I seek to attract—the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] suggested that I not speak at any great length tonight on the pending business. I am willing to begin my speech at this point, but I say to the Presiding Officer that I join with him in his present countenance; I feel the same way. As the occupant of the Chair, he cannot speak but his smile speaks volumes.

I say now to my two leaders, the majority leader and the acting majority leader, that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] suggested that I speak until about 5 o'clock, and then finish my speech tomorrow. I did not have time to find out whether or not he had any understanding with the majority leader; I only wish to say I would be very happy to oblige him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield, whatever the Senator wishes to do in conjunction with the Senator from Wisconsin is perfectly acceptable.

Mr. MORSE. That is typical of the courtesy of the majority leader.

If the Senator from Montana feels that way, 15 minutes is not long; I would be perfectly willing to adjourn, and make my speech tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Whatever the Senator wishes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MINER SHORTAGE IN APPALACHIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I recently noted in the Morgantown, W. Va., Dominion-News of October 14, 1967, an article headlined: "Serious Miner Shortage Develops in Appalachia."

The article points out how the increased long-term demand for soft coal has created a demand for skilled employees which is as yet unfilled.

This has created an astounding paradox—unemployed miners, along with mining jobs that go unfilled. The reasons, the article points out, are first, that the new jobs require vastly different skills than the older miners possess and, second, that new young persons who might ordinarily be called upon to fill these new jobs are, in increasing numbers, leaving the area for other employment opportunities.

I believe this subject is worthy of further study to determine how the needs of this industry and this area can be better met. I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERIOUS MINER SHORTAGE DEVELOPS IN APPALACHIA

(By Ben A. Franklin)

> JENKINS, Ky.—A serious shortage of miners is developing in the remote, mountainous Appalachian coal fields, where years of chronic unemployment in the mines have left scars deeper than the pits themselves.
>
> For a generation, a shortage of miners in the eastern bituminous coal fields has been regarded as inconceivable. Bituminous mine employment has declined from a World War II high of 600,000 to about 113,000 men.
>
> Although the federal government has spent more than $6 billion in recent years to mitigate the impact of successive declines in coal employment, Appalachia has become synonomous with hard core, resistant poverty.
>
> Now a boom in coal, stimulated by the huge, long-range fuel demands of the electric utility industry, is producing paradoxes. Chief among them is that the new jobs now being advertised in the mines—estimates range from 30,000 to 100,000 new mining jobs in the next few years—apparently will do little or nothing to reduce the existing army of the unemployed. Men who have been unemployed or semiemployed for 10 years are regarded by the mine operators as too old or too set in the ways of welfare, officials said.
>
> The new jobs are for the young and for technicians.
>
> The reason is mechanization, which has been a boom to coal operators in this region for the two decades they have been replacing pick and shovel miners with machines. The move to machines began in the late 1940's, after the United Mineworkers Union, under John L. Lewis, won a $25 a day wage and a 40-cent a ton royalty payment from the operators to finance the union's welfare and pension fund.
>
> The fund was supposed to support all miners displaced by mechanization.
>
> The welfare fund, however, has retreated from total protection. Only 70,000 miners are now drawing pensions. And the mechanization encouraged by the U.M.W.'s 1946 mechanization contract has finally brought a crisis in skills in which the union apparently is playing only a small role.
>
> At a meeting of the mechanical mining committee of the American Mining Congress in Pittsburgh Thursday, Michael S. Widman, the U.M.W.'s director of research, angrily announced his resignation, effective immediately, from his own union's two-man national manpower training committee. He charged that the industry was making only scattered attempts to train new miners and to improve the image of the industry for recruiting purposes.
>
> The dearth of young, educated and trainable men for mining in Appalachia is directly traceable to decades of unemployment and economic depression.
>
> In the 1950's, 70,000 persons between the ages of 25 and 29 left the area. Of those remaining, many if not most apparently plan to leave.
>
> Work in the mines is not a popular vocation among the young, even when the labor is done by machines, and the coal companies now acknowledge this. The average age of working miners has now reached 47, according to union and industry spokesmen.
>
> The coal operators are trying to recruit young men in high schools and vocational schools, often signing them up before graduation with offers of high pay—the coal wage averages $146.57 a week—and sometimes "pirating" each other's trained employes.
>
> A few new "minecraft" training schools are opening under joint industry-government sponsorship in Kentucky, West Virginia, Virginia and Pennsylvania, in communities where nearly every unemployed middle-age man has some mining experience.
>
> One operator, the Eastern Associated Coal Company of Beckley, W. Va., broke ground last week at a miners' "New town," a subdivision of $12,000 houses which are to be financed and built by local homebuilders.
>
> "Not a company town," said Ben Romeo, the company's personnel director in Pittsburgh, "that's out, that's taboo." But he added that the company "is stressing that here, a miner can have suburban living, and not live in the shadow of the tipple (an apparatus for loading coal cars). That is what today's miner wants." The homes will be individually owned, some under Farmers Home Administration loans, without down payment.
>
> The mines need fewer machine operators who dig the coal than skilled craftsmen required to support the machines.
>
> At the Pike No. 26 mine of the Beth-Elkhorn Corp., which produces high-grade metallurgical coal with the most modern equipment in the country, according to its officers, the entire production operation is geared to maintenance. The machines operate only two shifts a day. The third shift, from 4 p.m. to midnight, is given over to machine maintenance.
>
> In the case of the continuous miner—a tract vehicle with revolving cutter heads and steel claws that stuff the broken coal into its loading conveyor—maintenance requires a knowledge of 440-volt electrical circuits, both alternating and direct current, hydraulics and the usual machinist's skills.
>
> With 1.6 trillion tons of coal in reserve—an 800-year supply at projected rates of consumption—and now with 10, 20 and 30-year contracts to supply fuel to steam electric plants, the coal industry is concerned about its image as an employer and as a neighbor.
>
> The biggest industry problem, however, is manpower, coal officials said. Samuel Pollack, a safety specialist with the United States Bureau of Mines, told the Pittsburgh Mining Man-Power conference Thursday, "I have three grandsons and I'm not sure I want them to go into the mining industry."
>
> The question industry officials must ask themselves, he said, "is would you want your own kids to go into the mines?" He got no answer.

INDONESIA BREAKS RELATIONS WITH RED CHINA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in today's Washington Post, there is published an article written by William S. White entitled "Indonesia Seen as Dividend on Strong Policy in Vietnam."

Mr. White states in part:

> Indonesia, which only yesterday lay open to the shadow of Asian communism, has now effectively broken all relations with Red China.
>
> Thus sealed beyond doubt is a counter-victory for the anti-Communist world so immense—since Indonesia is the sixth largest nation on this globe—as to be all but comparable to the tragic loss to that world of mainland China a generation ago.

Mr. White goes on to say:

> This historic overturn, moreover, could not conceivably have been possible had not the United States persisted through three presidential administrations with its pledge not to let the cornerstone of Southeast Asia fall to Communist aggression in Vietnam.
>
> Determined resistance in Vietnam demonstrably shored up those forces which have at last expelled the Chinese shadow from Indonesia. American weakness in Vietnam

would, in equally undeniable truth, have strangled the anti-Communist counter-revolution in Indonesia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record this very pertinent article, published in the Washington Post for Wednesday, October 18, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Indonesia Seen as Dividend on Strong Policy in Vietnam

Indonesia, which only yesterday lay open to the shadow of Asian communism, has now effectively broken all relations with Red China.

Thus sealed beyond doubt is a counter-victory for the anti-Communist world so immense—since Indonesia is the sixth largest nation on this globe—as to be all but comparable to the tragic loss to that world of mainland China a generation ago.

This historic overturn, moreover, could not conceivably have been possible had not the United States persisted through three presidential administrations with its pledge not to let the cornerstone of Southeast Asia fall to Communist aggression in Vietnam.

Determined resistance in Vietnam demonstrably shored up those forces which have at last expelled the Chinese shadow from Indonesia. American weakness in Vietnam would, in equally undeniable truth, have strangled the anti-Communist counter-revolution in Indonesia.

But who can hear of Indonesia now amid the shrill clamors of a bitter minority which seeks at any cost to discredit that policy in Vietnam? The peaceniks, the soft-liners, have other things to speak of. And they have men, as well as policies to destroy.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk recently tried to explain that a Chinese colossus publicly pledged to Asian-wide and even world-wide aggression is a fearful fact of life which America really cannot ignore. And what is the consequence of this brazen effort to answer the endless attacks of the peacenik minority?

The reply is the most savage of the sneer-smear techniques, the huckster-slogans, yet hurled by men whose "right to dissent" is being so cruelly suppressed that even the draft-dodgers they encourage are sometimes actually arrested for attempting physically to obstruct the induction of other young men willing to fight for their country.

The new line is that Rusk, in exercising his elementary duty to explain the policy considerations of the Government, is raising the shabby banner of a "Yellow Peril" in Asia. This is sneer and smear, indeed. For, of course, the term "Yellow Peril" was disreputable a lifetime ago. The term was not remotely used by Rusk in the first place, nor is it remotely relevant to his case.

By innuendo, this man who under cruel beating from the left is attempting to save colored peoples in Asia from invasion and murder is himself made into an anti-yellow racist.

It does not matter to the peaceniks that every colored nation which is under the gun in Southeast Asia—not to mention white Australia and New Zealand—very clearly sees a very real Red Chinese, and not a "yellow," peril to its safety. It does not matter that Australia and New Zealand even now are thus increasing their troop commitments to Vietnam. It does not matter that the distinctly left-wing, and not right-wing, and undeniably dark, and not light, Prime Minister of Singapore is even now in Washington to testify that the Red Peril is Red indeed and present indeed.

No, it is not a Yellow Peril here; but it is something else. It is yellow journalism at its yellowest. It is to treat a somber exposition of world realities by the honorable official charged to conduct a foreign policy with a form of verbal abuse that lies on the intellectual level of a television commercial for mouth-wash.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the transaction of morning business on tomorrow, I be permitted to speak for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 19, 1967, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, October 18, 1967:

In the Air Force

Lt. Gen. Richard L. Bohannon, FR19067 (major general, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth E. Pletcher, FR19136, Regular Air Force, Medical, for appointment as Surgeon General of the Air Force in the grade of lieutenant general for the period beginning from December 1, 1967, and ending on April 30, 1970. This nomination is made under the provisions of section 8036, title 10 of the United States Code.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 18, 1967:

Ambassadors

George J. Feldman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

Harrison M. Symmes, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

Hugh H. Smythe, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malta.

L. Dean Brown, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to The Gambia.

United Nations

Roger W. Tubby, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America to the European Office of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

In the Coast Guard

The nominations beginning William W. Peterman, to be lieutenant (jg.), and ending Marcus L. Lowe, to be lieutenant (jg.), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 16, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

When you pray, say, Our Father.—Luke 11: 2.

Eternal God, our Father, who has set eternity in our souls, the spirit of love in our hearts, and a song of praise on our lips, in the quiet hush of this moment we bow at the altar of prayer.

We come at the call of our President to pray and to pray for the people of our land. Pour out Thy spirit upon us and join us together in greater loyalty to our Nation, in greater justice to our fellow man, and in greater faith in Thee. Keep us faithful in the defense of freedom, and with courage and confidence may we preserve and promote the blessings of liberty everywhere.

Enlighten the minds of our people that we may work together to remove inequalities, to reduce friction, to renounce prejudice, and by the strength of Thy spirit may we foster an increasing good will in the hearts of all. Help us to take the law into our hearts and not into our hands and to respect the rights of all men. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution extending the time for filing report of Commission on Urban Problems.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1788) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments," with an amendment in which concurrence of the House is requested.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 889) entitled "An act to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 68-5.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 317]

Boggs
Bolton
Broomfield
Button
Culver
Dawson
Ford,
William D.
Fountain
Hébert
Herlong
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kazen
Laird
Landrum
Latta
Moorhead
Morton
Patman
Pool
Rarick
Rees
Sandman
St. Onge
Smith, N.Y.
Stephens
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 400 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SEIZURE OF FOREIGN VESSEL ILLEGALLY FISHING IN ALASKAN WATERS

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to advise my colleagues in the Congress that for the fourth time this year the U.S. Coast Guard has seized a foreign vessel in Alaskan waters fishing illegally.

This morning the U.S. Coast Guard cutter *Confidence* seized the 160-foot *Eitan Maru* No. 248, a 533-ton, longline fishing vessel. The *Eitan Maru* at the time of seizure had a cargo of 2½ tons of halibut, 4 tons of perch and 100 tons of black cod.

This is a case of first instance in that the Japanese vessel was not seized within the 3-mile or 12-mile limits of U.S. waters off the coast of Alaska, but was rather seized on the high seas, 60 miles southwest of Middleton Island because of violation of the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean.

The violation of international law concerned the catching of halibut in these waters. Apparently the vessel had many skates of longlines out, for the *Confidence* had to stand by for a period of 10 hours after seizure while the gear was retrieved and hoisted aboard.

Under terms of the International Convention, the seized vessel is to be taken to a port mutually agreed upon by the seizing nation and the nation of the violator, at which point the officers and crew under arrest and the seized vessel are turned over to authorities of the country whose flag the violating vessel was flying. In other words, the skipper and crew and the *Eitan Maru* No. 248 will be turned over to Japanese authorities for prosecution of both their internal and international law. It is estimated that the seized vessel will arrive in Kodiak, Alaska, sometime tomorrow morning.

It is obvious that these fishing violations are of a serious nature, there have now been two Russian violations and two Japanese violations. It is my feeling that the State Department should follow this matter closely to insure that the master of the vessel is severely fined and punished for this international violation.

ALASKA DAY

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in advising my colleagues in the House of Representatives that today is Alaska Day and the 100th anniversary of the occasion in Sitka when the flag of Imperial Russia was lowered and the American Stars and Stripes were raised gloriously over Alaska. By reason of the purchase agreement which was executed on March 30, 1867, Russian-America was turned over to the U.S. authorities on October 18 of that same year. The purchase price was $7.2 million, unquestionably one of the most significant real estate bargains in all of American history.

In contrast to the purchase price of $7.2 million, we have extracted untold wealth from the land and adjacent waters of Alaska. As an example, the value of gold taken from Alaskan soil for the period of 1880-1966 was $752 million, and since statehood in 1959, we have extracted $30 million of gold. The value of coal mined from 1880 to 1966 was $150 million, and $50 million of this figure has been since statehood. Oil and gas production since statehood totals $200 million. Timber harvested in the period 1950 to 1966 amounted to $560 million, $400 million of which has been since statehood. Agricultural products amounted to $66 million in the years 1953 to 1966, $45 million of which has been since statehood. And, finally and most impressive, fisheries resources between the years 1950 to 1966 have brought Alaska $1,760,000,000, a spectacular $1,000,000,000 of which has been since statehood.

At this historic centennial celebration of the changing of the colors, we should all remember the wisdom, the tenacity and the foresight of a truly great American, William H. Seward, the Secretary of State under Abraham Lincoln and President Andrew Johnson.

JET SALES TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the apparent decision on the part of the administration to sell supersonic jet fighter bombers to Latin American nations is indeed disturbing to all who are familiar with the economic needs of these countries.

It seems a shame that the aggressive arms sales policy of France has forced this policy shift, stemming from the announced decision on the part of Peru to purchase a dozen supersonic French Mirage V fighter bombers. Once again, the tragic drift of United States-French relations is further reducing our foreign policy to one of reaction and adaptation.

Nevertheless, we have made at least some progress. Were it not for the fact that a majority of the Members of the House and Senate have expressed themselves in opposition to past administration arms credit sales procedures, the changes are this significant decision to supply Northrop F-5's to Latin countries would not have been revealed until months after actual delivery of the aircraft. Judging from news reports and information I have been supplied, any supersonic jets supplied to Latin America are not likely to be facilitated by secret country X credit sales through the Export-Import Bank. The mere existence of public disclosure and debate over United States-Latin America arms sales policies resulting from French insistence to peddle sophisticated military aircraft to this hemisphere hopefully will create pressures aimed at resolving the problem before it gets out of control.

Mr. Speaker, more and more it appears that the avoidance of a dangerous Latin-American arms race depends upon hemispheric policies adopted on a voluntary basis by the Latin nations themselves. A hemispheric arms purchase quota must be placed high on the agenda for future diplomatic negotiations.

Without this, U.S. contributions to the Alliance for Progress and such other institutions as the Inter-American Development Bank will sustain deep cuts, if not termination. Such undesired consequences will not result from congressional or administration reaction as much as from the justified anger of U.S. taxpayers.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 949 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 949

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the minority side, to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third time that this matter of a continuing appropriation resolution has come up for consideration in this session of the House. It is a very complex and a very perplexing matter. On the previous occasion when this subject was before us, I addressed the House at some length on the necessity for some action to limit expenditures which had reached astronomical figures as the result of new programs and the policy of both butter and guns.

I shall not belabor the issue today. I can only express the hope that some meaningful action will be taken by this body today. It is one that is giving this House very much concern, and one which has given this particular humble Member of this House very much concern.

Mr. Speaker, when all is said and done, regardless of the many suggestions and approaches that have been made to the problem which confronts us, there is one thing we can all agree upon. I believe, which is that the time has arrived, as I said on previous occasions when a similar resolution was under consideration, for us to fish or cut bait.

The attitude of the country is reflected here in this House on both sides of the aisle. This group is representative of the people, as prescribed by the Founding Fathers. It is the group or the body of the Congress which is closer to the people, and the people are demanding some retrenchment, some cutbacks, some economy in the operation of the Government.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, provides for 2 hours of general debate. It provides an open rule. Unlike on previous occasions, any germane amendment can be offered, because the rule waives points of order.

I believe we might expect here in the consideration of this resolution and under the 5-minute rule that a number of approaches to this problem will be presented.

Frankly, I have no particular program on how this should be done. I am for it being done. I am no new advocate of economy and retrenchment in Government, as this House knows.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the House should dodge its responsibility or that the Congress should dodge its responsibility and delegate to the President the right or the duty of making these cuts. Badly as I want to see some economy and retrenchment, I still adhere to my former opinion that this is the responsibility of the Congress. The Congress of the United States is responsible for the condition we find ourselves in today and not the executive department, because, as I pointed out before, the President could not spend one dime if the Congress did not authorize it and appropriate the money. The responsibility is ours.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 318]

Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Boggs
Bolton
Broomfield
Button
Culver
Dawson
Diggs
Fountain
Grover
Halpern
Harvey
Hébert
Herlong
Ichord
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kazen
Kleppe
Laird
Landrum
Latta
Moorhead
Morton
Patman
Pirnie
Pool
Rarick
Rees
St. Onge
Stephens
Teague, Calif.
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 397 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. We have been up and down this mountain two or three times this year, taking a different trail each time. It looks as though we will take a different trail today to reach the top of the mountain on our resolution continuing appropriations.

You will remember that a couple of weeks ago a resolution was offered which would extend the date to October 10. That was about 1 week more in time as of the day we considered that particular resolution. Just prior thereto we had considered the so-called Bow amendment, the language in two sections which would place a ceiling on spending of some $131.5 billion. This would not have been germane to simply a continuing date. Those of us who supported the Bow amendment in the Rules Committee attempted to make a rule in order so that it could be considered, but we were not successful, with the result that it was offered on a motion to recommit. It failed by some eight votes at that particular time.

The particular resolution passed, went to the other body, the date was changed to October 23, which is next Monday, and it was accepted here in the House.

The resolution before us today, House Resolution 949, will permit the consideration of the continuing resolution, House Joint Resolution 888.

The resolution on the rule provides for 2 hours of debate. It is an open rule. Any amendments which are germane can be considered, and in my opinion the Bow amendment will be in order as an amendment to House Joint Resolution 888. As I understand, it will be offered and subsequent thereto, if unfortunately it loses, it will be the basis for the motion to recommit.

Points of order are waived in the rule. This was because the Ramseyer rule was not completely conformed with, and also this is legislation in an appropriation bill and the waiver is appropriate.

This particular resolution goes a little further than just dates. There is language in here which purportedly will reduce expenditures by about $1.5 billion.

The Appropriations Committee has prepared a summary of the various cuts. I do not know if it is available for distribution, but they very kindly presented it to the Rules Committee. I will not try to summarize those, because the gentlemen on the Appropriations Committee are much more qualified to do so, but it has to do with halting certain projects between now and November 23, Thanksgiving Day, which is the date of the extension of the resolution, with certain reductions in poverty programs, and certain other language therein having to do with absorbing some of the salary increases.

It is my personal opinion that this is a step in the right direction, but I do not think it will be very effective unless the Bow amendment is added to it, because otherwise there would be this cut today, and then would come more spending, and then we would have the supplemental appropriation to take care of the supplemental spending. So unless we have a ceiling, we will continue to go uphill, which we will have to face some time in the future.

The Bow amendment will be offered.

There are 2 hours of debate provided under this rule. It is a joint resolution. It will have to be passed by the other body, and eventually it will have to be signed by the President. I think it will be a very interesting experience between now and when final action is taken on this resolution.

I certainly hope that the date of November 23 does not mean we will be back here with a Christmas extension the next time. I hope maybe we can start winding up the year and get home by Thanksgiving this year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any requests for time and I know of no objection to the rule.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888), making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair designates the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. VANIK] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] to assume the chair temporarily.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888), with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The **CHAIRMAN** pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] will be recognized for 1 hour. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am intrigued by the number of the House joint resolution now before us—No. 888. This would indicate to me that in the House perhaps we are behind three "8" balls.

THE FISCAL PROBLEM

We have had some very serious problems and debates in regard to Government appropriations and spending in recent weeks, which is in my judgment very healthy, because I, for one, am for reducing appropriations. I am for reduced spending through reduction of appropriations wherever that can safely and reasonably be done.

I believe that since the January budget was presented and since action has been taken on many other bills, the worsening fiscal situation calls for the elimination of some Government spending which under more normal times would be highly desirable. We have to look at the fiscal picture in the light of October 1967, not in the light of January 1967.

In January 1967 the picture was not good, speaking from a fiscal standpoint, but since that time the picture has darkened. The President has announced that defense spending might go $4 billion higher than was anticipated at that time. There are indications that revenues will be less than then estimated. There is every indication that the President's announcement of considerable increased spending for the war is probably correct and to some extent spending is increasing otherwise.

It has been estimated that the Government may go in the red during the current fiscal year by as much as $29 billion, which would mean that the Government would have to go out and borrow $29 billion to cover the deficit. Such action would have a tremendous economic impact, a very unfavorable and perhaps to some extent disastrous impact.

In view of this, we need to cut appropriations as much as we reasonably can.

SUMMARY OF THE RESOLUTION

So we bring to the House today a continuing resolution, which includes some recisions, some further reductions. The further reductions in appropriations made by this resolution are estimated at approximately $1½ billion. This is what we estimate it would achieve.

If enacted, this would bring reductions in appropriations, by the House for fiscal year 1968, at this session of Congress, to about $7.5 billion. That would be the total in bills already acted on by the House and the estimated reduction in bills yet to be acted upon by the House.

So it seems to me we are reacting to the exigencies of the moment by undertaking to make further reductions.

Final action has not been taken on many of the major appropriation bills, so we could not bring in a line item recision bill of that type, because the amounts have not been finalized. We believe we have done the best we could under the circumstances.

As chairman of the Appropriations Committee I personally promised the House that I would undertake to bring in a recision bill last week or this week. We have kept our promise and we have brought in the bill. It is regrettable that we have been obliged to bring it in at this time. It would be more appropriate to bring in specific item recisions at the time we consider the final supplemental, but apparently the will of the House is that some form of reduction be considered now, so we will consider the matter now rather than at the time of the final supplemental.

What we have sought to do in this resolution is to give the House of Representatives an opportunity, a vehicle on which to work its will.

We have proposed additional reductions in civilian personnel, as shown in the report, which we estimate would save roughly $560 million.

We provide for absorption of the entire pay increase voted by the House last week in case a pay increase becomes law. That is $625 million, on the basis of the House passed pay bill, another very substantial savings.

We have provided for additional reductions in research and development areas, which we estimate would save roughly $325 million.

In appropriation bills thus far we estimate we have already cut research and development, in the areas affected by the resolution, by about a billion dollars. More than half of that was in the space program, because all of the space program is considered research and development.

This is a brief summary of the action proposed. The resolution is before the Members. The report is before the Members. I would hope that the Members would carefully read the joint resolution. It is a little technical in wording, but it is not too difficult upon a second or third reading. I believe the report is rather clear.

Frankly, I believe the Members will want to make some improvements in the pending measure. There will be some discussion of the problem confronting the Post Office and the problem confronting the Internal Revenue Service. We will want to discuss that. I am disturbed about it and I feel adjustments must be made. We want to do whatever is best for the United States of America as we proceed during the afternoon.

I should like to say, as to amendments which will be offered, after they have been discussed somewhat I shall move that the debate close, after we have had an opportunity for a reasonable amount of debate. We have been over this ground, much of it, several times in recent days.

I hope we can proceed with dispatch to the passage of this bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the able chairman, in respect to the cuts in research and development to which he averted, is any cut proposed for the research funds in the National Institutes of Health?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. It would apply to the National Institutes of Health as well as to other areas of research.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able gentleman, if he will yield further, recall what the cut is that is proposed in the NIH research funds?

Mr. MAHON. No. I do not have the figure as to what that reduction would be. There would be some flexibility in the assignment of these cuts within the department or service, for example.

Mr. PEPPER. And there would be half a billion dollar cut in the space program's research and development?

Mr. MAHON. We, in the House, have already approved a half-billion-dollar cut in NASA, in the regular bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able gentleman take into account in making that cut the announcement in the morning paper that the Russians just soft landed an instrument on Venus and we have not even gotten ours into the vicinity of Venus yet? Also one of the authorities of the space program said that we would not be able, if these cuts are made, to continue that area of exploration and development.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is familiar with this, but I might remind him that the reduction has already been made in the regular NASA appropriation bill.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I have listened with great interest to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations describing our continuing resolution today. I have read with great interest the committee report. I notice on page 5 of the report that reference is made to discussions within the Committee on Appropriations of the possibility of recisions. The distinguished chairman spoke in this Chamber on October 3 on the hopes he had of recisions and talked about the opportunity of making a recision today.

I also listened to the colloquy between the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas on the possibility of rescinding some of the research money for the National Institutes of Health. I have this question for the chairman: Does this continuing resolution offered today provide any recision of funds for the development of the civil supersonic transport aircraft?

Mr. MAHON. I was momentarily distracted. Will the gentleman rephrase that question as to the supersonic transport, please?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes. I understood the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in response to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to say that the resolution now before us could result in a cutback of research funds for the National Institutes of Health. My question is, Could the resolution before us provide any cutback in the development funds for the civil supersonic transport aircraft?

Mr. MAHON. These funds have been provided in previous years. No funds have been provided for fiscal year 1968 by this Congress, because the bill has not been fully enacted into law and approved by the President.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield further? I understand this body has passed in an appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation an appropriation of $142,375,000 for fiscal year 1968 for the development of the civil supersonic transport aircraft and further understand that the Senate passed and approved an identical figure. I understand, because I was here all during the debate on yesterday, that that amount was not in conference.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Because there was no disagreement between the House and Senate figures in the Department of Transportation appropriation bill, I understand that the conference committee has not yet reached agreement finally on the supersonic transport aircraft item in the Department of Transportation bill. I think I understand all that, Mr. Chairman, but what I am getting at is this: Do I understand that we have before this Committee today the possibility of cutting funds for research for the National Institutes of Health but that we have no possibility in the resolution before us of cutting the funds for the development of the civil supersonic transport aircraft? Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. In my opinion that is not correct. These funds——

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, wherein do we find in this continuing resolution any cutback of funds for the development of the civil supersonic transport airplane?

Mr. MAHON. We made a cut in research, Government-wide, and in all agencies. That cut would have to be applied agency by agency.

There is no specific cut here for the SST. But it could be cut as a result of the action which has been taken.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. VANIK). The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today for the first time, I can stand here and tell you that I believe we have a real chance to make substantial reductions in Federal spending in the coming year.

The fact that the majority on the Appropriations Committee has developed four spending curbs in this continuing resolution is very significant. It means that those of us who have stood here all year and argued for economy are receiving constructive support from the other side of the aisle. This is what I urged in private talks with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], my own chairman, over a month ago. It is gratifying to me and it will be glad news to the people of America to know that we are working together now to attack this problem.

My mail has been heavy with congratulatory letters from all over the country since our debate here September 27, when the House voted to recommit the October continuing resolution.

As all of us recall, that rejection of "spending as usual" followed an afternoon of debate on my resolution providing an absolute ceiling of $131.5 billion on 1968 spending, and rescinding to the Treasury $5 billion. The Associated Press, among others, interpreted that recommittal vote as a mandate to the committee and the House to cut spending at least $5 billion.

Most of my mail asks why we stop with $5 billion. The people of this country believe that we are spending far too much. Almost every citizen can cite evidences of wasteful Government spending. They see it in a local project or office, and they reason that it must be occurring in other areas, and they want economy in Government. The Harris poll this week shows 73 percent want cuts in Federal spending.

The debate since September 27 has been fruitful, as evidenced by the pending resolution. I continue to insist, however, that this resolution does not go far enough and I will offer again my overall expenditure limitation of $131.5 billion.

First, however, I wish to discuss the resolution and point out how far we have come since the economy debates in the spring, when my efforts to establish significant expenditure limitations were defeated time and again in the House.

In those debates the Bow expenditure limitation was hotly attacked by the majority as a meat-ax approach to economy and, except for the two instances mentioned, it was rejected out of hand.

Now we are in a much different atmosphere.

Section 2 of the resolution provides a 30-day moratorium on new obligations not essential to the Nation's defense or welfare. This offers a badly needed opportunity to review priorities. I pointed out some time ago that the administration was spending in July and August at an annual rate of $145 billion, $20 billion more than the 1967 rate. Perhaps this 30-day moratorium on new contracts and new hiring will give us a chance to stop our headlong dash into the biggest spending program in our history.

Section 3 applies to civilian personnel of the Government the spending limitation which was offered as the Bow amendment to six of the 12 appropriations bills thus far considered in the House. The Bow amendment said that the agency could spend only 95 percent of the money proposed to be spent in this fiscal year. The pending resolution would limit civilian personnel expenditures to 95 percent of the budget estimate.

Parenthetically, I may say that applying the 95 percent expenditure limitation to personnel expenditures only is much more difficult to administer than a general 95 percent limitation applied to all of the agency or department concerned. Under the language of the resolution, it will require major personnel reshuffling to accomplish the desired saving in the 9 months remaining in this fiscal year. A straight prohibition on new hiring, or a personnel ceiling to be accomplished through attrition, would accomplish the same purpose over a period of time without requiring reductions in force and thousands of personnel changes. Moreover, since the limitation is applied against the budget estimate, this procedure imposes a heavier burden on the agency that budgeted carefully with few requests for new jobs and a much lighter burden on the agency that asked for many new positions. However, since this is the method selected by the majority to accomplish a significant reduction, I will support it.

Section 4 requires that the Federal agencies absorb the cost of the pay increase which the House passed a few days ago. I voted against that pay increase because I considered it a reckless additional burden on an already overstrained economy. Absorption of the cost will help to alleviate that burden.

Section 5 of the resolution again employs the Bow amendment principle and requires a 10-percent reduction in expenditures for research not directly connected with our military effort. This is a prime area for economy. The cut here could be much larger, but we are pleased to have agreement on even a 10-percent reduction.

Having embraced the Bow limitation

in this resolution, I hope the majority will accept it if I offer it to the foreign aid bill later in this session.

The resolution would be complete if the committee had accepted as section 6 my amendment to provide an ironclad expenditure limitation on all Federal activities, except the purely military.

The provisions of the pending resolution leave the door ajar to the experts in budget juggling. All of us here should know how quickly any opening is exploited in the bureaucracy. We should slam the door shut and lock it by saying "you may spend this much and no more, and the savings go back into the Treasury." That is the only kind of limitation and the only kind of language that will be understood and will be effective in applying a realistic ceiling on this soaring budget.

Mr. Chairman, Sunday's newspaper column by Evans and Novak singled out the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], and the gentleman from Ohio, myself, as objects of special attention from President Johnson. According to these astute reporters, who seem to have ears at every keyhole, the President told 12 Democratic Senators that he was displeased with the notorious trio I have mentioned because we were interfering with his spending and taxing plans and he was going to get retribution by stopping Federal projects in our districts.

I am more than a little surprised by this report, for it does not sound like our President, whom I remember so well as the Senator from Texas when he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the State Department and we met many times in conference committee on the budgets for that Department and others. In those days the Senator from Texas, now President Johnson, had a sharp pencil and we agreed on many budget cuts. I can recall Senator Johnson telling us and telling the Senate that he was trying to help the President, General Eisenhower, practice economy. That is what we are trying to do now. We are trying to help President Johnson practice economy, for he has said he is for economy, and I find it hard to believe that his memory is so short or that circumstances are so changed as to create in his heart a desire for revenge against those of us who seek to help him practice economy.

With respect to the pending resolution, as I pointed out here a few days ago, Senator Johnson, now our President, suggested in 1957 that a "4-, 5-, or 6-percent cut" in each of the appropriation bills might be an appropriate economy device. The Record reveals that he discussed it with several of his colleagues and they agreed to try to work out a formula. I do not find that they ever did so, but I have done so and the House accepted the Bow 5-percent expenditure limit on the appropriations bills for State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary and for the Transportation Department. This is the formula that the committee has developed in section 3 of this resolution, with regard to civilian employment, and section 5 with regard to research.

Inasmuch as the President himself, when in the Senate, advanced this proposal for saving money, I do not understand why he would reject it nor why he would seek retribution against the Members who propose this economy.

In another debate in the 1957 economy drive, Senator Johnson, now our President, suggested that the Appropriations Committee should seriously consider a 5- or 10-percent decrease, leaving it to the President to determine where the cuts should be made.

We find Senator Johnson expressing the thought in these words:

> Perhaps the Appropriations Committee should seriously consider, when it deals with the appropriation for the Department of Defense—giving to the President and to the Secretaries what they have requested and then stating, "We direct you, as a part of the fiscal policy of the United States, for which we have a responsibility, to set up a system of priorities which will result in a saving or an economizing of a specific percentage"—perhaps 5 percent or 10 percent.

Again, this is what the Bow expenditure limitation, both on the bills on which I have offered it and on the overall budget, is trying to say to the President and to the Secretaries.

I do not believe that Lyndon B. Johnson, having endorsed the suggestion 10 years ago as a Senator earnestly trying to cut President Eisenhower's budget, would now oppose the same suggestion from Members of the House.

Senator Johnson, now our President, was greatly concerned about the growth of the budget and of the Federal payroll under President Eisenhower's administration. He noted that the number of Federal employees had jumped from 900,000 in 1939 to 1,900,000 in 1949 and that expenditures went up from $9 to $39 billion in that period. He pointed out that the 1958 budget proposed 2,400,000 employees and expenditures of $71,800,000. In all fairness, he also pointed out that the dollar did not buy as much in 1957 as it did in 1939, but he was, nonetheless, expressing alarm. I am certain that President Johnson will forgive us for expressing alarm when we see his budget proposing $136.5 billion with 2,800,000 employees.

He said:

> Like many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I shall apply myself to the task of scrutinizing each penny that we appropriate. I shall attempt to reduce items that I think should be reduced, and eliminate items that I think can be postponed, in the hope that Congress can still control the purse strings.

That, of course, is precisely what we have been trying to do here.

Like Senator Johnson 10 years ago, we must in all fairness point out that the dollar does not buy as much as it did in 1959. Things do cost more. But they do not cost twice as much, and President Johnson's agencies, I remind you again, were spending at an annual rate of $145 billion during the first 2 months of this fiscal year. That is over twice the spending that Senator Johnson was deploring in the Senate economy debate of 1957.

The actual increase in prices since the change of administrations in 1961 and apply this percentage allowance for inflation and add the cost of the Vietnam war, Federal expenditures this year should be about $125 billion. They are running at a rate of $20 billion more than that. I am suggesting that we limit expenditures to $131.5 billion, which is $6 billion more than any increase justified by both war and inflation and $6 billion more than we spent in the last fiscal year. No reasonable person could say that we were underspending in the last fiscal year. It would be reasonable to hold spending to that level. But we are not insisting on that, because it has appeared to be impractical and impossible to establish such a limitation. We are asking for $131.5 billion as a ceiling.

Going back again to the famous debates of 1957, the Senate majority leader who is now the President of this Nation told us that "this Government operated with stature and efficiency and it commanded the respect of the world with 900,000 employees in its highest peacetime year during the Roosevelt administration. We now have exactly a million and a half more employees than were required then." His statement appealed to me then and it does now. This Government operated with stature and efficiency and it commanded the respect of the world with about 2,000,000 employees in 1957. I think it can still do so today. Certainly we have added nothing to our efficiency and very little to our stature and we have lost respect in other parts of the world during the past few years when almost 2,500,000 civilian employees were on the Federal payroll.

The pending resolution will help us to reduce this swollen payroll. Any indication that we are making a serious effort to manage our spending will enhance the respect with which we are regarded, and I may say that it could be a very important contribution toward the future integrity of the dollar.

Now, let us review the situation.

As I said on the floor a few days ago, there are at least four ways to cut Government spending.

Approval of this resolution today will accomplish reductions or avoid expenditures of $1.4 billion.

Adoption of my amendment to place an absolute ceiling of $131.5 billion on spending will require the President to cut his spending plans by $5 billion.

The appropriations reductions recommended by the House to date are in the neighborhood of $4 billion and I am happy to see that our committee agrees in this report that we should end the session with total appropriation reductions of almost $6 billion. Allowing for some slippage in the bills reported by the other body, and on some of the bills this year the other body has been most cautious, we can expect to show savings in this fiscal year of $2 to $3 billion from the appropriations process.

Thus, we are approaching rapidly today the goal of $10 billion which many have mentioned as the desirable, maximum, feasible cut in Federal spending for the fiscal year.

The committee report points out that it is difficult at this time to consider recisions inasmuch as more than half of the appropriation bills are still in process. This means that the time has come for some cooperation from the White House.

In the debates to which I have referred in 1957, the Senator from Texas, who is now our President, made this reference to President Eisenhower:

> The President, at first, made statements which seemed to indicate sympathy for this attitude.

He was referring to the economy drive in Congress. He continued:

> He invited Congress to look into the budget and find out where it could be cut.
>
> It was only later . . . that the President came to the conclusion that big cuts could not be found.

History has repeated itself in that President Johnson has made many statements throughout the spring and summer in which he indicated sympathy for our economy efforts and pledged that his departments would seek out every possibility of saving. I am reluctant to believe that he has come to the conclusion that big cuts cannot be found. I am hopeful that we can rely on the many reports from usually reliable sources to the effect that the departments have given the White House memoranda showing where five and ten percent savings may be made. At this time, I call on the President to give this instruction and guidance to Congress. Help us to do what remains to be done in respect to the appropriations still not completed and the recisions we hope soon to undertake.

Here in the House during those same debates our distinguished Speaker called upon President Eisenhower to give Congress a list of priorities.

Everyone knows that there must be an order of priorities in Federal spending, just as there is in our own family spending. If the carpet is worn out and we are planning to replace it and about that time the refrigerator breaks down, how do we spend our limited funds for home improvements? We get a new refrigerator, of course. A refrigerator has higher priority than a carpet. Let us have from the President a list of projects, numbered one, two, three, four and so on down the line for each agency so that we can look at the priorities and defer or eliminate the nonessential or the less pressing items.

Rescisions are not a new idea to President Johnson. In 1959, as the Senate majority leader, he commented on the $10 billion unobligated carryover funds in the Eisenhower budget and he said:

> I also suggest, though I have not explored this carefully, that the Committee on Appropriations give consideration to the possibility of conducting inquiries into the unobligated balances, so that if it appears that certain recisions can be made, the committee can so recommend to the Congress CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 2, page 2009.

If Senator Johnson thought such a course was feasible and advisable when the administration showed a $10 billion carryover, surely he would be even more inclined to go along today when his administration has over $50 billion in its bank account, unobligated and ready to be spent.

If President Johnson refuses this assistance, I think the House might well consider as a last resort the policy suggested by Senator Johnson for the U.S. Information Agency in 1957 when that agency appropriation was the subject of bitter debate.

Senator Lyndon B. Johnson described his committee's recommendation as follows:

> Some suggestion were made that we should provide the amount of the House figure, $106 million. As chairman of the subcommittee, I asked the members to consider the fact that this administration had been in office 4 years, and that in 3 of those 4 years there had been appropriated for the USIA sums in the 70 millions, in the 80 millions, and in 1 year $113 million. The 4-year average was $90 million. I asked if any member of the committee could demonstrate from that record a justification which would permit a conscientious, informed Senator to say that this Agency was entitled, on its record, to more this year than it had received for the average of the 4 years.

Perhaps Congress should apply the same reasoning to 1968 expenditures.

If we average actual expenditures for the fiscal years 1964 through 1967, we get the figure of $106.7 billion.

Paraphrasing the Senator, I ask you if any of you can demonstrate from the record a justification, other than the increasing cost of the war in Vietnam, which would permit a conscientious, informed Representative to say that this administration is entitled, on its record, to more this year than it received for the average of the 4 years. I think you cannot.

That average includes 2 years of war, but even if we add war costs we do not exceed by $131.5 billion ceiling.

My remarks today are not intended to be critical of anyone, but only to point out what I believe is required of us if we are to discharge our responsibility as the keeper of the purse strings. Ten years ago President Johnson, then a Senator, made this comment:

> If I know Dwight Eisenhower, the President of the United States, and I think I do, I know he wants me to do my job as a United States Senator as my conscience dictates." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 5, page 6974.

As he said:

> The President can depend upon the Congress to meet him more than halfway, to cooperate with him wherever it feels he is right, and to oppose him only when it thinks he is wrong, and then to oppose him only on principle, and not on the basis of personalities. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 2, p. 2100.)

I say to you today that if I know Lyndon B. Johnson, and I think I do, I know he wants me to do my job as a Representative in Congress and as the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, and I know he understands that I may oppose him on principle, but in my remarks today I am not dealing in personalities, nor will I do so.

One more word, and one more reminder of the days when the President was the vigorous champion of congressional economy. Soon you will vote on my amendment to hold the spending ceiling at $131.5 billion, a savings of $5 billion. I say to you as Lyndon Johnson said to the Senators one late afternoon, 10 years ago:

> When the vote on the question is taken, every Member who wishes to vote for more money, for more jobs, for more Government-kept press services, for more assistants, can line up on one side and say, "here we are—the spenders, and proud of it." Those on the other side can line up and can say, "Here we are, the cutters, and we are proud of it." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 5, p. 6973.)

For the welfare of the people of this country, I earnestly hope that the cutters today will outnumber the spenders by a wide majority.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding and commend him for the long and hard fight he has made in behalf of fiscal sanity.

Earlier in the gentleman's remarks he spoke of the then Senator Lyndon Johnson's concern during the Eisenhower administration because of the increase in Federal employment. I checked only this morning with respect to present employment in the Federal Government. I found that during the regime of President Kennedy employment increased by approximately 100,000. I found that between June 30, 1963, and June 30, 1967, civilian employment in the Federal Government had increased, under President Johnson and his Great Society, by nearly 500,000.

Apparently President Lyndon Johnson is not as concerned about increased employment in the Federal Government as was Senator Lyndon Johnson during the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Can the gentleman tell me why the legislative and judicial branches are not subject to the same limitations under this resolution as the executive branch?

Mr. BOW. I say to the gentleman, I had hoped they would be. I am sure the gentleman knows that the committee considered this matter at great length. The gentleman from Florida was prepared to offer an amendment to the resolution at that time to include the legislative and judicial branches, which I would have supported, but this was a rather hurried session and it was found in the drafting at that time this could not be brought in.

I say to the gentleman also, I understand, on both sides of the aisle perhaps, there are amendments to be offered today to include the legislative and judicial branches. I shall support them, and I hope they will be included.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I should like to confirm what the distinguished gentleman has said. I do believe the legislative and judicial branches should be included, and I intend to offer an amendment to accomplish that.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. In the gentleman's remarks about Lyndon Johnson, when he was a Senator, he was referring to appropriation cuts and not to expenditure control.

I believe that is the basic issue here today; whether or not Congress is going to abdicate its responsibility and reduce this Chamber to a debating society, whether we are going to approach the subject in a proper way by having appropriation cuts.

I know that the gentleman here is not guilty of this, because I respect and admire him for what he is doing, but it seems to me actually what is being accomplished by this amendment is the creating of a condition here whereby the appropriations of this Government could go up to $500 billion, and every individual Member on the other side of the aisle would be able to vote for any appropriation he thought was beneficial to him politically, and after the appropriation was made the President then would be put in a straitjacket by saying that the expenditure control should be $131 billion. Then the individual Member on your side, if he is in favor of a program to build a hospital in his district or a flood control project, or any project, could come back there in a nice, smart political way and explain to the people of his district, "Well, Congress appropriated the money for this, but the President took it out."

Does the gentleman not believe we have a responsibility here to act on appropriations, as Senator Johnson acted in the Senate, and as he stated, as the gentleman read from the RECORD? Does the gentleman not believe we should act on appropriations and not abdicate our responsibility and reduce this Chamber to a debating society, sending resolutions to the White House saying that we favor this appropriation and that appropriation, but, on the other and, "We are going to put you into a financial straitjacket and these appropriations cannot be spent," to let the individual Member go back to his district and be an apostle of economy on one side and then in favor of projects in his district? Does the gentleman not believe this is abdicating our responsibility?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further at this time.

I appreciate the gentleman's expression, but I thought, before our time expired, I should like to reply to a part of it. If the gentleman needs more time, he can get it from his side.

The gentleman has raised a very interesting question. He has raised the question that we appropriate funds and then put the President in a straitjacket. He points over here and he says, "If the Republicans vote for these bills they can go back and claim them."

I believe my friend knows that sort of claiming is not just on one side of the aisle. I believe that on both sides of the aisle people have gone back to their districts at times and have said, "Look at what I have done. I have been able to get certain projects."

I believe, when we look it over, we will find a lot more on the Democratic side have gotten projects than Republicans. One just cannot point the finger over here.

The gentleman says we have to keep control and not put the President in a straitjacket.

Now, let me tell you he has that authority now to cut out programs—to freeze funds. We are not giving him anything new by putting this limitation on him. He already has it, and he has threatened to use it on me, or so the press says. I do not think he really did. I do not believe that. The President has this authority now. Let us see what will happen.

Let us get practical about the $131.5 billion we appropriated. We appropriated this money, and we have it in the RECORD that you have all your appropriations for 1967. Congress set them up. So we know that the Government went along pretty well there. There was no real problem at all about it. The Government got along real well in 1967. They had money to spend, and it was a big spending Government. We did a lot of things we had not done before with the funds in 1967. The actual 1967 spending was $125 billion. That is what he spent. We are not saying, "We are going to cut you down under what you had in 1967, Mr. President." In his January estimate he asked for $135 billion. What we are saying to him is, "Keep your spending down to $131.5 billion." That is $5.8 billion more than he spent in 1967, the fiscal year that just ended in June. So we are not hamstringing him. Just think of all the projects and things that were done in 1967. They operated all of the departments, the Post Office included, and the Internal Revenue Service and many others, and there would not be authorizations brought up that are going to eat up all that $5.8 billion in addition that we are giving him.

The gentleman knows that we have excluded the military from this. It seems to me that the gentleman put up some strawmen. We are not doing anything here that has not been done before or that the President himself, when he was the majority leader, did not ask for. He said, "Let us appropriate and let the President and the Secretary of Defense determine how they will spend the money."

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi in just 1 second. I owe the courtesy of yielding first to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. We all know that the President has the power to reduce these expenditures, but we have the responsibility here of making the appropriations. It is very unfair for us to send all kinds of spending bills down to the White House and have every individual Member protected politically voting for those projects that are favorable to his own district. That is what your amendment does. That is why the President differs with you and why I differ with you.

I was one of those who voted to table the tax bill. I voted that way because I felt through that tabling motion the Congress would live up to its responsibility, too. It is after we pass the appropriation bill that we would let the President cut what he wanted to under the power and authority that he has today, but why should we be able to vote for all kinds of appropriations and kite the appropriations bills up to astronomical heights and then say to the President, "Despite the fact that we voted for all these appropriations, we will only give you this much money to spend?"

Mr. BOW. May I again suggest that the gentleman get time from the gentleman from Texas to expand on that.

But let me simply say this: This is the one way we can actually reduce spending. If we put an expenditure limitation on it, we know——

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will not yield any further. I suggest the gentleman get his time from the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I thank my friend for yielding to me.

First again I want publicly and on the RECORD to say that I think the gentleman from Ohio has served a very splendid purpose in what he has done here.

However, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] made a statement a moment ago which is contrary to my understanding of the law and of the powers of the President of the United States. The thing that disturbs me about the gentleman's argument is that the President has this power—I believe my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE], said as much himself a moment ago, but what I would like to know is where the President gets that alleged power? I know of no place in the Constitution of the United States, although I do not set myself up as a great constitutional lawyer, nor do I know of any standard, law, device, or statute that provides or grants that power to the President of the United States.

Now, the fact that the President may use or usurp such power is one thing. But the question of his having that authority and that power is another thing.

Now, if my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] can straighten me out on that question, I shall greatly appreciate it.

Mr. BOW. All I can say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi is to repeat the Constitution to the gentleman which provides that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury of the United States, except in consequence of appropriations made by law, and so forth.

This is all that the Constitution says on that question.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may be correct to the effect that there is no authority in the Constitution requiring the President to expend the funds the Congress appropriates. However, I do not find anything, as I interpret the Constitution that represents a mandate that he must spend the money and that he has withheld it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to detain the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] too long——

Mr. BOW. I shall be delighted to yield further to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. However, I believe there is somewhere in the Constitution, although I have not looked at it recently—I know of no provision dealing directly with this question. However, somewhere in the Constitution there is a statement to the effect that the Chief Executive shall enforce the law. So, if the Congress authorizes and appropriates the money, perhaps the constitutional argument is on the other side—to the effect that the President should spend it

Now, Mr. Chairman, I repeat that this is the thing which disturbs me. I know that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] knows that I have not been partisan in this matter. My position is simply that the President does not have this power of the item veto and I am against the Congress giving it to him or sanctioning his use of it by legislative enactment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have consumed far too much time on this subject and I realize that my time is going very fast.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BOW. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

In my opinion we are here discussing the very meat of this entire situation. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] has pointed out, as well as I have heard it, just what the situation is here. By that I mean the responsibility of the Congress of the United States as contrasted with the responsibility of the Chief Executive. With respect to the question raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the only authority about which I know, that the President has to withhold expenditure of funds is that authority granted under the Antideficiency Act of 1950, which stated in substance that if conditions change following the providing of the funds to the executive branch, then in the light of the changing situations the Chief Executive can withhold the obligation or expenditure of funds.

Mr. Chairman, I shall obtain permission when we are back in the House to insert into the RECORD that portion of the law at this point in the RECORD.

The material referred to follows:

31 U.S.C. 665

(c) Apportionment of appropriations; reserves; distribution; review.

(1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the term "appropriation" means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available. Whenever it is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. The matter with which we are faced here—and it is my opinion that it has been very well pointed out here by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts—is to this effect: You see, heretofore Members have said, "Oh, well, I will vote for this; this is only an authorization, but the Committee on Appropriations will take care of that."

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have moved into Bow amendment era. We have the situation wherein we would appropriate in certain cases only and then say, "Why should we worry about that, because we will have an expenditure limitation and not let the President expend these funds."

Mr. Chairman, this is my problem, your problem, our problem.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I realize the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has many problems.

Mr. MAHON. That is an understatement of fact.

Mr. BOW. And, one of them is trying to protect the Treasury of the United States and the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. Chairman, there is a way to solve that problem. That is to say we are not going to spend any more than $131.5 billion in 1968. That is the primary problem of the gentleman from Texas, to save the taxpayers of this country from the dilemma of the budget, a budget that is entirely out of proportion.

I must say to the gentleman where did the President get his authority last November to delete $3 billion? If he is violating the law we have to take him to task.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOW. No, I cannot yield further at this time.

Mr. MAHON. I will yield the gentleman sufficient time, so he will not have a problem in yielding to his own side.

Mr. BOW. I have some Members who have asked for time.

Mr. MAHON. You are not losing any time, you are using my time.

The President last year used the provision of law, I assume, in the Antideficiency Act of 1960. As the gentleman knows, we had inflationary problems, and a changing condition following the time the appropriations were made, and I assume the President relied upon the portion of the law to which I have referred.

I believe that that was the basis of the decision then, and the President can do so again this year. But we have never given the President the statutory item veto. And that is the reason I so violently—if I may use that word—oppose the Bow amendment and other amendments of this type.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the President, in effect, used the item veto last year. Is the gentleman reading this through—"some change in situations"? Let us have Congress face up to the fact that there is a change in situations, there is a tremendous budget, a tremendous debt, a war in Vietnam and business as usual at home. It is time we began to tighten our belts and take the necessary steps if we are going to fight the war in Vietnam and escalate it. There ,are changes in conditions which the Congress should consider, and not leave it up to the President to decide whether he is going to decide to do it or not.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOW. I will yield further on the gentleman's time.

Mr. MAHON. I agree with the gentleman that there is a change in the situation, there is a great urgency for reductions, but I do not agree that it is the responsibility of the President. I agree that it is up to the Congress to reduce appropriations which in effect reduces spending. And that is the reason we have this bill before us which the gentleman from Ohio is supporting today. That is the crux of the whole matter. And in view of the changing conditions let us rescind, reduce, and otherwise limit the amount of money available to the President. But once we have provided the money to the President it is up to the President to spend it, or else, in view of changing conditions, to withhold it.

Mr. BOW. I must say to the gentleman we have not provided the money, there are about 11 bills still waiting to be brought in here. Let us put this reduction on spending, then when the gentleman and I go to conferences on the appropriation bills we can point out to the other body, as well as our own Members, that there is a limitation on spending, and we must reduce these appropriation bills to meet the ceiling which we have put on them.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Texas has just quoted the specific statutory authority by which the

President can refuse to spend the money appropriated that is made available by the Congress.

The gentleman from Texas very well remembers the invitation he and I and others had to go down to the President's ranch in Texas last December, and at that meeting the President asked if on some of the obligational authority that Congress had made available we would agree with him withholding the obligation during the fiscal year 1967. And if I recall correctly the gentleman from Texas and I and others on both sides of the aisle, and from both sides of the Capitol, agreed. The President should not approve the obligations and thereby reduce spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So there is no question that the President has the authority, and we have agreed in the past for the President to exercise that authority.

Now, the difference today is that today we seek to impose our will to cut expenditures rather than leaving it up to the President himself.

Mr. MAHON. I cannot yield more time. I will say to the gentleman that that is entirely in error.

The President indicated that in view of changing conditions he proposed certain holdbacks in obligations and expenditures, which was perfectly proper then. And it is perfectly proper now. It would be proper now for him to make such a decision. But the decision for us is to determine what we will provide him initially, by way of appropriations. That is the way we can save money and that is the only long-range way we can save money. The Bow amendment probably will save very little because the carryover money is available for expenditure next year, or the next year, and so on. The gentleman from Ohio does not rescind the money, he merely defers the expenditure of the funds through fiscal year 1968. Many of the funds are no-year funds.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman knows differently because the appropriation authority expires on June 30 and it will not be available for him to spend next year.

Mr. BOW. I just want to say to my friend, the gentleman from Texas, that I did not quite understand what he had to say about not saving any money. If the President said that he is going to spend up to $143 billion this year and we limit him to $131 billion—it looks to me like we are saving some money.

Mr. MAHON. I think it may be saving some money, but by no stretch of the imagination would it save $5 billion over the long pull, because the gentleman does not provide for a recision of those funds, but just says that the money cannot be spent in 1968 but it could be in 1969.

Mr. BOW. No; we limit him on what he is to spend for 1968, and then if the committee will have cut the appropriation for 1969, then we will have a chance.

It seems to me what we are doing here, Mr. Chairman, is simply this. We are saying, Go ahead with what we have in 1967. We are going to give you a $5 billion cushion. You can go above the amount in 1967. But then we are saying this year, this fiscal year, you are only going to spend $131.5 billion.

Then the Committee on Appropriations can report out the bills for next year and take that into consideration.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman's point is that the postponement of the $5 billion is a postponement for this year only. But the gentleman says in next year's appropriations, we would reduce the appropriation by $5 billion and, therefore, we are really accomplishing a saving. But that is a rather tenuous argument.

Mr. BOW. I will close with just this comment.

There was $125,700,000,000 last year, that is 1967, which was spent. This gives him $5,800,000,000 more than he spent last year. That was a pretty plush Government last year. They got along with what they had and did a good job. I think we ought to put this limitation on so as to assure us and the taxpayers.

Let me just say that the $3 billion that was frozen last November went into the deepfreeze in November, with the President putting it there. He put it in the deepfreeze and there were great headlines about the economy that the President was exercising. But when the thaw came—and it came awfully fast—and the money came back out and was spent, there were very little headlines about how much was spent. Never yet have we found out—and there is just a little bit that was actually saved. So there were big headlines when the money was going into the deepfreeze, but when the thaw came and the money came out and was used, there were no headlines. There is only one way that the money can be kept in the deepfreeze and that is with an expenditure limitation saying: That is all you can spend. This is the only way we can do it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a kind of proposition which is always a matter of controversy and will be as long as we have two parties and three branches of Government.

So there is nothing startling about the present arguments. But I would like to review with you a few issues and facts which I consider important.

One is that the President himself has said that the situation now is considerably different from what it was in January when the budget recommendations were made, and that we must cut back spending. We, the Congress, must cut back, not that we call on him to cut back. Certainly I think in the minds of the Members of this Congress, and apparently in the attitude on the part of the public, the situation is viewed with much more alarm and with much greater discomfort than back in January. I know we must act and act now to hold back.

With that predicate to begin with, I would like to say that what we are dealing with here is—if we agree that the situation has changed and we are faced, as a result of the war, and the war expenditures, with the necessity to hold back spending, the question is: What shall we do about it? We must tighten our belts.

But my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, did not state exactly what his amendment provides in the way of fair play or general application. He did not tell you he was leaving it up to the President as to where, while he only said how much. I would not say the gentleman did so intentionally because, as I said earlier, there is no finer gentleman or better Member of the House, than Frank Bow, of Ohio. It may be this is the only way he thought he could get his limitation on spending adopted.

Mr. Bow's amendment provides that the White House, the President—and, of course, if you want to take it down, the line, the Bureau of the Budget, which is a vague place where you do not really know who decides—at any rate, the President would be given a directive to cut over all expenditures by a total of $5 billion from the 1968 budget recommendations, without providing guidelines, without restrictions, without recommendations. I know that my friends on the left might believe that the President would cut out things that would affect their interest, or they might believe he would save them; I do not know what he would cut out. I sometimes have an idea, looking at Budget recomendations, that my area suffers more from the lack of understanding in the executive departments than do other areas. I suppose other Members from other areas feel the same way about their section. I presume actually the Bureau of the Budget and the President do the best they can. I am sure, however, each would want some guidance.

In any event, the Bow amendment provides that the President must strike $5 billion in spending from the 1968 budget without a word of advice, a word of restrictions, or a word of limitation as to what he may favor or as to what he should eliminate.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will yield in a moment. I should like to complete my statement.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman said that the Bow amendment would strike $5 billion. The Bow amendment might strike much more than that.

Mr. WHITTEN. A $5 billion cut in some places is bad enough, would be fine in others. I want to discuss that, that is why I do not want to yield until I complete my statement. At any rate, as I read the amendment, it would reduce spending under the proposals in the 1968 budget by $5 billion, with no protection, advice, or restriction as to where. But, as my colleague from Mississippi has said, the point is, you will find no law other than the limited provision mentioned by my chairman, the gentleman from Texas, which gives the executive department the right to withhold funds provided by Congress for projects, expenditures, and so forth as I say, when authorized and directed by the Congress. That is not to say he does not have the power.

I grant you that beginning, in view of the provisions of the Constitution he has the power to withhold projects because, the Executive being equal to the Congress, and the Congress being only equal, in the Constitution, to the President, we are powerless to do anything about it.

So the President has a power which he has exercised on occasion, and since we do not have the power to make him act differently, his action has the effect of right, so far as the result is concerned.

I believe we all recognize that a change has occurred and that the time has come for the President and the Congress to do something about it. We must, at least, with some exceptions, such as the war, hold back increases above 1967. And may I say with regard to the resolution before you offered by my chairman, Mr. Mahon, that I happened to be out of town for 2 days over the weekend, where I saw Ole Miss defeat Georgia, incidentally, and, fortunately, I thought, I was not here where I could go into his resolution in great detail with him, though I had been over the problem repeatedly earlier. I mention that fact because that which I did not approve, results perhaps partially because I was not able to present my arguments at the last minute.

Insofar as what I shall present to you at the moment, though I offered a similar proposal in the Committee yesterday, later withdrawing it, I did not have time to go over this proposal in detail with my chairman until last night after the resolution on behalf of the committee had been introduced in the House. But now if we be in agreement that we need to reduce expenditures below the present fiscal year's budget because of conditions, we ought to be sure that first we tie it to something that the Congress did and not to the Bureau of the Budget and its determinations.

So the provisions that I have prepared—would apply to the expenditures made, agency by agency and department by department, in 1967 as provided by the Congress. So our starting point is one fixed by the Congress, agency by agency and department by department—contrary to the Bow amendment which would invite the President to keep what he wanted, and cut out what we may believe essential.

Then the other thing my amendment would do is to reduce expenditures back to the 1967 level by department and by agency. The Congress will then be acting on a prior fixed position that we fixed and would not invite the President to apply such holdback to things that do not lend themselves to cuts.

Mr. Bow's amendment does not protect anything from the "asked for" action of the President. I do not want to be a party to reducing expenditures that go directly to supporting our men engaged in the war in Vietnam. But there is no provision in his amendment at the desk which would grant such protection. I do not want to hold the construction of highways so badly needed by my actions, when the funds were put in a trust account for that purpose only and my amendment protects such construction. Do you? I do not want to cut social security payments or the old age assistance payments, or medicare, or other retirement benefits to people who have become eligible since 1967, and I do not believe you do.

In other words, if we must cut back, let us cut back from prior experience where we fixed the amount and be sure we do not do needless injury to our outstanding obligations to people or to our country.

Let us see what shall be excepted from cuts by my amendment. First, let me read what I shall offer. I quote:

> Strike out all after the enabling clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "That the joint resolution of October 5, 1967 (Public Law 90–102) is hereby amended by striking out "October 23, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 23, 1967" and by adding the following language:
>
> "'*Provided further*, That for fiscal year 1968, unless hostilities in Vietnam and Southeast Asia should cease earlier, Federal spending of appropriated funds except the expenditure of trust funds by each Department and Agency of government, including the Legislative and Judicial branches, except for military expenditures of the Department of Defense directly related to our involvement in Southeast Asia, including pay of all military personnel, the payment of interest on the National Debt, payments under the Social Security Act, veterans and other retirement benefits, medicare and old age assistance payments, shall not exceed the amount expended during fiscal year 1967, except that the limitation on the Department of Transportation shall not be more than 95 percentum of the budgeted amount for 1968: *Provided further*, That where deemed necessary to maintain mail service, the President is authorized to exempt the Post Office Department from the provisions of this Act; and where it is deemed necessary to the collection of revenue, the President is authorized to exempt to the extent necessary the Internal Revenue and Customs Services from the provisions of this Act: *Provided further*, That such reduction of expenditures insofar as practical may be made by stretching out the time schedule of performance and payment on contracts so as not to require the elimination of new construction starts, and by each Department and Agency not filling vacancies.'"

There was no Department of Transportation in 1967, so I provided a restriction for that Department to the 1968 budget.

There are some things that are growing, such as mail service, and the number of people and collection of taxes, so I put these exceptions in here. The provision in my amendment might be said to be a freewill offering or a recommendation or what-have-you, but it is important to me, and I think it would be important to the Federal departments. This is the concluding paragraph, and this is back to the level they have been using all along:

> *Provided further*, That such reduction of expenditures insofar as practical may be made by stretching out the time schedule of performance and payment on contracts so as not to require the elimination of new construction starts, and by each Department and Agency not filling vacancies.

Let me review briefly the points in this. One, we start with 1967 actions of the Congress in fixing expenditures. We start there. Second, we call for the reduction or hold back to that level, but on those things where there should not be cuts and where in justice we could not afford to cut, I exempt those, such as old-age assistance and the rest. Then on the Department of Transportation I make an exception, tying it back to the Bureau of the Budget, because we had no prior history. Then I make it possible for the President on mail service and collection of revenue, where if in his opinion, it is required, he can waive the limitation as to internal revenue and post office as circumstances may demand.

Then I provide that in meeting this objective, to the extent possible, so as not to have to eliminate projects, to delay initiation of projects and drag out contracts and the rate of progress and rate of payments and not fill vacancies to the extent that those are practical.

I do not think we should just send any official, including the President, an unlimited directive to cut out $5 billion in expenditures where he might please, as the Bow amendment would do. I do not think the President would do it, but he could cut it all out of Republican districts. I say again, I am sure he would not. He could cut it out of what we believe in. He could just cut it out, period, without rhyme or reason or excuse.

Let me point out also, as I said, and we know it, the President of the United States has the power not to spend a dollar, and we are helpless to make him do it. But he does not have that right. If Congress sends the Bow amendment down there, then we have invited him to do it. He will then have the right to act as he wishes and say he is only carrying out the mandate of Congress. He will have complete freedom as to where to apply such reduction for we would then have placed the meat ax in his hands.

I do not want any part of it. I do not believe my friend from Ohio wants to go home having invited the President to apply that cut to these items which I have excepted in the amendment I shall offer. I do not believe he could live with it.

Really, I have used the word, President, where perhaps I should have said "the Executive."

My arguments are not directed to any individual but to you the Members of Congress. You or rather we, should live up to our responsibilities.

Remember, the President asked the Congress to hold back. It is my colleague from Ohio who wants to send the message back to the President: You cut—where you please—and I am sure wherever the President pleased would not suit Mr. Bow—and I feel sure it would not suit me.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. It has been said there will be a savings of around $5½ billion with the so-called Bow amendment. Could the gentleman tell us approximately the savings under his figures?

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend from Alabama for raising the question. I neglected to say one of the key parts here.

Actual spending in 1967 was $125.7 billion. The budgeted amount for spending in 1968 is $136.8 billion. The difference between actual spending in 1967 and the budgeted amount for 1968 is $10.8 billion.

When we take from that these things which I have felt we must except, the best I can figure the reduction under my amendment would be about $7 billion.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, my good friend and distinguished colleague, the chairman from Texas, started out by saying that this resolution was numbered 888 and, therefore, we were three times behind the eight ball. I have another interpretation of that. I feel it is very significant that it is 888, because under his proposal the Post Office Department would be behind the eight ball, the Treasury Department would be behind the eight ball, and the taxpayers would be behind the eight ball.

First, Mr. Chairman, let me say that if we are sincerely going to make cuts—and I am pleased to hear the gentleman from Florida is going to offer an amendment in regard to the legislative branch and the judiciary, which I will support—I hope we will start by cutting our own salaries by at least 5 percent. I hope we will go on to take some of the frills out of this House, such as cutting the salary of the House Postmaster. Here is a man who deals with 435 Congressmen and earns more money that the postmaster of Chicago. Do you realize how many millions of people live in the city of Chicago? And yet our own private Postmaster has a salary substantially larger than the postmaster of Chicago.

I also hope we can cut out about half of the Capitol Police force. Anyone who comes up our local streets in the morning and sees these fellows tripping all over each other, understands that this could be accomplished with no problem at all.

We could easily do away with some of the House of Representatives patronage by taking the elevator operators out of the many automatic elevators we have in the House of Representatives.

I certainly hope, on the other hand, that we will not make cuts here that will cripple the Post Office Department and the Treasury Department, and that would prevent the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service from collecting the revenues that we need to run this Government.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. This bill was brought out as a vehicle to let the House work its will. If the Members of the House do not feel there should be any reduction in personnel in the Post Office Department or in the Internal Revenue Service they have a right to work their will. We are providing a vehicle here. Perhaps the House will not agree with these provisions. I believe, myself, they are too stringent and I shall support adjustments.

Mr. CONTE. I admire the gentleman's effort here. I have supported every amendment brought forward recently to limit our Federal spending and I will do the same today, provided that those amendments are not going to cripple the vital services needed by the American public. But if the latter is going to be the result, I will not go along with it.

This would be killing the goose that lays the golden egg, and that has just never made much sense to me.

We are dealing here with revenue-producing agencies. Those are the ones who will be hurt when we cut down and say they must absorb the pay raise. The bulk of the employees are in the Post Office Department, more than 716,000.

Many of them are in the Internal Revenue Service. These are the agencies you will hit.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CONTE. After I am finished, I will be glad to yield. Let me tell you this: The Post Office Department came up before our committee last week on the basis of a hypothetical 5-percent cut in their expenditures which amounted to about $278 million. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas will amount to over $384 million in the Post Office Department. This will be about $100 million more of a cut for the Post Office than would result from applying a 5-percent cut, as is mentioned in the Bow amendment for all Government expenditures. These are the services that the Post Office Department would have to eliminate with a $278 million cut. They would have to eliminate Saturday delivery service on business routes. They would have to provide only one delivery per day on 5 days of the week on business routes. They would eliminate Saturday delivery on city residential routes. They would convert all rural delivery to 3 days a week. They will eliminate delivery on 1 additional day per week on city residential routes. They would forgo planned extension of rural routes. They would not convert presently eligible homes from curb to door delivery service. They would return to 1966 levels by reconverting converted door delivery service back to curb delivery.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I attended the hearing as well and I asked the witness whether the same kind of paralysis that existed in the Chicago post office for a period befor Christmas last year would continue again. He said it would not only continue in Chicago but in other major post offices throughout the country.

Mr. CONTE. Thank you. The cut would also mean a freeze on city delivery and they would undertake no new extensions. It would reduce parcel post delivery service to 5 days a week.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CONTE. It would close 1,000 post offices. It would close all the windows in first- and second-class post offices 1 day a week. It would restrict Saturday collection service to the Sunday schedule. They would have to schedule work force so as to gain a 2-percent increase in clerical productivity without regard to delays in mail. It would eliminate all postal work on Sunday and reduce overtime 50 percent. In the $17 million reduction in transportation, it would eliminate all the enroute distribution of mail, and shift mail from passenger-type trains to freight or truck, and eliminate all special dispatches by star route.

Now, if I may finish, that is based on a $274 million cut as opposed to over $384 million as proposed by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEED. In a recap of this I would like to tell my colleagues that the Department says the impact of this, instead of being $388 million, will actually be $452 million. So the situation is even worse than the gentleman is describing.

Mr. CONTE. I wish I had the time to go into what this would do to the Internal Revenue Service. It would mean the firing of 7,500 people concentrated in the collection and intelligence service of the Internal Revenue Department.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope when this bill gets into the amending stage that an amendment will be proposed—if one is not, I will propose one—to eliminate the Post Office Department and the Treasury from the Mahon resolution.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, it has been my understanding from the beginning that the difficulty in cutting expenditures as a means of controlling the budget is, of course, exemplified by the problems we have been having. Nobody wants to name the cuts, and if you do name the cuts, many people oppose those cuts. I would like to ask the proponent of each resolution this: Each of you has tried to save social security to make sure that the recipients of social security or any other trust fund would receive their payments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is that if we cut the personnel handling the trust funds we are going to delay the time it takes to get those social security checks to them.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, many Members on the other side of the aisle are not having any trouble in their respective districts with reference to this problem. However, anyone who is serviced by the social security office out of Chicago is having trouble.

Therefore, I would like to know what the proposed amendment which as proposed by each gentleman would do in the matter of personnel for all of these trust funds, first; and second, I would like to know what the effect would be, if you do not touch the personnel for each trust fund or the Post Office, what the cumulative effect upon the rate of all other expenditures will be? Then, I would like to make clear my own position.

I was one of those Members who voted to table the tax bill. I did this because I want to know where all of these cuts are going to be made. I am not for making any cut in any funds that come into the city of Detroit. And, if the rest of you want to cut something out of your district, I shall be glad to assist you in doing so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the distinguished gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask two or three questions.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at my request, has advised me of the possible impact of the enactment of this resolution. This is what he says:

In the field of general operating expenses it would cause "backlogs" of "substantial numbers by year end" in the field of compensation, pension, education and housing benefits. In addition, "contact service for returning Vietnam veterans would be curtailed." This would be particularly felt in the compensation and pension adjudication actions of Vietnam veterans as recently liberalized under the provisions of Public Law 90–77. Generally, the impact of the joint resolution on general operating expenses "would be a significant curtailment of services to returning Vietnam veterans."

In the field of medical administration:

> The reduction . . . would seriously jeopardize (the Veterans Administration's) ability to provide adequate leadership and guidance for on-going programs and for further implementation of new medical services, education and training, and medical research.

For medical care in the 164 Veterans' Administration hospitals the resolution would impose "a reduction in force in the magnitude of 15,618 employees and maintenance of an average employment level of 118,799, as contrasted with a September cumulative level of 134,417 and budget level of 134,948." The net effect of such a reduction in force, if it should occur, "would necessitate a substantial curtailment of personnel ratio to patient and closure of hospital wards." In addition, "it would eliminate implementation of new and expanded medical treatment programs planned for in the budget, and it would defer activation of new hospitals recently completed." An overall effect of such a reduction would be to "cause the quality of medical care provided to veterans to deteriorate and cause Veterans' Administration hospitals to fall behind in the progress that has been and is being achieved in the rest of the medical community."

In the field of medical research, the resolution "would require a reduction in force of over 700 employees" and would prevent the Veterans' Administration from activating "medical research programs in new hospitals coming into operation."

I would ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] if, in his opinion, that statement is correct?

Mr. MAHON. First, the resolution provides on page 3 that exceptions will be made so that no personnel cuts are required if they are involved in connection with the war in Southeast Asia and those involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.

So, I would assume that hospital employees are engaged in activities involving human life and thus I do not think they would be touched by this committee action.

As to new hospitals recently completed, I would say that they would perhaps be deferred.

In respect to medical research, I doubt if the Director of the Veterans' Administration knows exactly what would result on this point and, frankly, I do not know with such precision and assurance myself. But there is a reduction provided for, across the board, in research.

We have gone in research funds since World War II from the sum of $800 million a year to over $17 billion a year. There is some effort in this resolution to make some reduction. But if the work of these people involve the safety of life and protection of property, that could be excepted. That is a question of fact to be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss an amendment which I will offer later, which I am sure everybody will seize upon, because we all want to effect economies, and this is a do-it-yourself economy kit. It says this:

> Strike out everything after the first paragraph and add the following after the first paragraph:
>
> "The Bureau of the Budget shall within 60 days after the enactment of this resolution submit to each member of the House of Representatives a list of federal expenditures or obligations of expenditures in the Congressional district represented by each member of the House of Representatives for the 1968 fiscal year.
>
> "Such lists shall include salaries of federal employees, public contracts, public works, and grants or loans of federal monies whether given directly through the federal government or through an agency or department of a state, and all other sources of federal expenditure or obligation. Each member of the House of Representatives shall within 30 days after the receipt of such list submit to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee a list of recommended elimination or reduction of federal spending in the Congressional district represented by him or her, such list of recommendations of reduction or elimination not to be less than 5 percent of all federal spending or obligation of federal spending in such Congressional district for the fiscal year 1968."

My amendment does not make the President do the cutting, nor does it apply the congressional meat-ax approach. It allows each one of us to suggest savings in our own Congressional district.

And I will say further that I am not kidding, I am very serious about this amendment.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the gentleman from New Jersey has put forth this idea. Two months ago I protested the decision by the Department of Justice to grant some $52,000 to finance a local law enforcement project within a municipality in my district. I received considerable heat for doing this. I would be happy to comply with the provisions in the gentleman's amendment, since I have already taken a similar step, and look forward to the opportunity to do so again.

Mr. JOELSON. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I find this an interesting concept. However, how do we prorate the hundreds of thousands of bureaucrats that live here in Washington if we continue to hire them, as occurred in July of this year, at the rate of 33,000 a month, how do you plan to prorate them to the individual districts?

Mr. JOELSON. I would say that after we solve the difficulties at home we can then allow the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] to take the burden of the entire Nation on his shoulders. But, let us remember that economy—like charity—begins at home. In the words of John F. Kennedy, "let us begin."

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman would the gentleman include the Post Office and social security payments at his district level?

Mr. JOELSON. I would allow each Member to recommend to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Appropriations will then work its own will, but they will have every expert recommendations.

Mr. RESNICK. Would the gentleman also include veterans' hospitals and such as that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] for allowing me to take this time, inasmuch as I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, there has been discussion in the course of the debate this afternoon about a proposed amendment to save $142,375,000. That discussion centers about the appropriation for fiscal year 1968 for the civil supersonic transport aircraft. If recognized for that purpose, I will when we reach the amendment stage offer an amendment, which is now pending at the Clerk's desk, to effect this saving through recision.

Members of this House have heard me speak on the SST before. I have been endeavoring for a year and a half to provide an opportunity to substitute private financing for taxpayers' funds for this wholly commercial product. Not before in America's history have we taken hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to subsidize the development of a wholly commercial product.

The civil supersonic transport aircraft is a wholly commercial product. It has no military or defense purpose. Many people say to me, "Well, obviously, there is merit in your proposal, but America stands to lose its worldwide leadership because of the British-French Concorde and the TU-144 being developed by the Russians."

Let me respond to that. I am not proposing to kill the American supersonic transport. I am proposing to substitute for money from the general revenue fund of the Treasury, money from private investment sources to carry forward the supersonic transport development.

But I do not think anybody in this Chamber believes that the Russians are going to sell any supersonic transport aircraft on the world market. And you in this Chamber know that the British Government is in even worse financial trouble than we are. The British may well be about to pull out of the British-French Concorde development program.

The Concorde, even if built, has performance limitations which would not place it in competition with the American supersonic transport. Those of you who have studied these projects know that what I am saying is true.

Let me again emphasize that I am only seeking to save $142,375,000 in the SST development. I am not killing the program. We have $124.5 million in the SST pipeline—money that we have appropriated in previous years, including fiscal year 1967. There is $124.5 million that has not yet been spent. That money can be spent on the supersonic transport during the remainder of this year while we consider the alternative of private financing. There are many in this Chamber who have General Electric plants and Boeing plants in your districts. I do not criticize anybody in this Chamber for seeking to protect and fight for the economy of his district and the jobs of the people who live in his district.

America has some 135 GE plants. Both GE and Boeing have substantial order backlogs. You will not be hurting Boeing or General Electric if you adopt my amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I think we all realize what is involved in this particular matter this afternoon. What we need to do—in our responsibilities as members of the legislative and executive departments—is to acknowledge that we are in an expensive and difficult war. We should be willing to carry back to the people at home the fact that we too realize that there is a war and that we cannot have our cake and eat it—that we cannot live luxuriously and fight a hard war at the same time. What we should do now is win this war.

I would also suggest that this is a rather dangerous time in which to be playing partisan politics, and a great deal of partisan politics is wrapped up in what we are doing here today. Neither the Nation nor this body have the time for such partisan politics right now.

The resolution now being considered happens to affect an operation in which I am very much interested; and that is the Public Land Law Review Commission. We can live with it—and, if we have to, we shall live with it. However, it is not my opinion that this is the proper way to discharge the appropriation responsibilities of the Congress. The Congress is the appropriating body of our Government. Congress should accept that responsibility and be entirely honest with the people whom we represent. We should save money where it is possible to save. Where it is necessary to spend it we should spend it keeping in mind the needs of the day.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support any program that is honest in its attempt. But, it is only fair that I advise my colleagues now, just how the future activities of the Public Land Law Review Commission will be affected by the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Chairman, I bring to the attention of the Committee the effect that the nonselective, across-the-board reductions contained in House Joint Resolution 888 would have on one small unit of Government and probably on others.

As Members know, the Public Land Law Review Commission was established by the Congress as a temporary body to review all the public land laws of the United States and recommend modifications that may be necessary. Under a bill, H.R. 12121, that passed the House 2 months ago, the Commission's report must be submitted by June 30, 1970, but under existing law, the report must be submitted by December 31, 1968.

The act establishing the Commission also authorizes certain appropriations, and H.R. 12121 now pending in the other body would provide a new authorized ceiling on appropriations. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the limitation on appropriations that was approved by this body in H.R. 12121—namely, $7,390,000—is a realistic, conservative estimate of the cost of completing our job.

A reduction in expenditures this fiscal year will not in any way reduce the ultimate overall cost of the studies and could increase the cost by requiring a further extension of time if we are unable to accomplish as much as we have planned on an orderly progressive basis.

So that Members may be fully informed, I am including here a detailed analysis of the impact that House Joint Resolution 888 would have on the activities of the Public Land Law Review Commission.

Section 1: Not applicable; appropriations for the Public Land Law Review Commission are contained in Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of June 24, 1967, Public Law 90-28.

Section 2: Between date of enactment and November 23, 1967, our inability to enter into new contracts would not be critical; however, in view of the difficulty we have experienced in recruiting for some of our positions, our inability to hire additional personnel might be critical. Our fiscal year 1968 budget and appropriation were premised on a total of 48 personnel, but the inability to obtain properly skilled personnel has resulted in our current strength of 34, including four consultants.

Should we, in response to our previous recruiting efforts, "find" a proper person for one of the "vacant" slots, we would be unable to fill it. In a small organization with a highly skilled professional staff, this might be, even in a short range, critical. Should such restrictions be carried beyond the very temporary period such as proposed by House Joint Resolution 888, the impact would be severe.

Section 3 would result in a reduction of $37,350 of the $747,000 estimated for personnel compensation and benefits in fiscal year 1968. This would, based on our average salary of $14,000 per annum, require a reduction of approximately two or three personnel, depending upon category of employment, even if the prohibition on hiring contained in section 1 were lifted.

We have followed the policy of not hiring people just for the sake of filling positions. The director and I believe it better to have a position vacant rather than fill it with an unqualified person. In the professional fields, we have utilized the services of consultants intermittently for those skills not on the permanent staff.

The reduction required by section 3 might be critical in view of the fact that in a small organization there is very little flexibility where our estimate of required positions was very stringently drawn in the first instance.

Section 4 would require a reduction of $23,950 of the $747,000 estimated employee compensation and benefits in fiscal year 1968 after deducting the 5 percent cutback required by section 3 and deducting first-quarter fiscal year 1968 compensation. Based on our average salary, this would indicate a further reduction of two personnel—a professional and a clerk—even if the prohibition on hiring contained in section 1 were lifted.

The total reduction of $61,300 employee compensation, based on our average salary, would require a reduction of four personnel.

A combination of sections 3 and 4 would mean therefore a 10-percent reduction in our personnel target. Should we be able to recruit the hard-to-find personnel, our inability to hire either permanent employees or temporary consultants would be critical.

Section 5: Not applicable to this Commission.

Section 6: Not applicable to this Commission.

In addition to the above, the combination of sections 2, 3, and 4 would preclude the Public Land Law Review Commission from obtaining bids for the accomplishment of the study of the Outer Continental Shelf on a schedule required to fit the needs of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources. Pending receipt of additional funds for fiscal year 1968 to fulfill our contract program, the Director has taken the initial steps required for a temporary reprograming of personnel funds to make them available for the contracting of the Outer Continental Shelf study. The loss of these funds under sections 3 and 4 would leave us with insufficient funds for the estimated cost of the Outer Continental Shelf study. This could result in requiring the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources to separately duplicate some of the work we would be required to accomplish as part of this Commission's work.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the first clearcut opportunity the House has had to vote on a proposal to reduce overall Federal spending in the 90th Congress.

Virtually every expert witness to testify before the Ways and Means Committee—whether economist, businessman, financier, or Government official—has stated that a $29 billion Federal deficit would result in a heavy round of inflation and an even more costly version of the credit crunch that staggered the economy in 1966. Such an inflation would hit hardest in the low- and middle-income range and would be a heavy and indiscriminate tax on the American people.

Faced with such a crisis, I do not see how any Member of Congress could invite such serious consequences by inaction.

It does no good to grasp for easy solutions, to resort to sad cliches, or to orate about the many other serious problems that face this Nation. We do no service to the solution of those problems if we stand by and permit our economic strength to be sapped by inflation.

We should face up to the fact that two corollary actions are essential to a solution:

First, Federal expenditures must be reduced during the balance of fiscal 1968 and for at least the first half of fiscal 1969.

Second, there must be an increase in Federal revenues.

Both of these actions are essential, but it is abundantly clear that the Congress will not approve a tax increase unless there are ironclad assurances of expenditure reductions in the order of $5 billion.

It has been argued that Congress should reduce current appropriations by that amount—and I support such action—but this would not serve as a guarantee that total expenditures for the period would be reduced. Thirty billion dollars of unobligated funds are in the Treasury pipeline, and control of those funds is required.

Throughout the consideration of this problem, I have worked for an agreeable accommodation between the administration and the Congress, but the President has refused to make the necessary commitments. In my view, we must now seek another course to fulfill our responsibilities.

I am now satisfied that the only way we can be assured that the necessary restraint will be exercised is to impose a statutory spending limitation on the President.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, the Whitten amendment's approach to budget cutting is vastly superior to the Bow amendment. The Congress should take the responsibility for budget cutting and not leave it to the executive branch. I support the Whitten amendment and oppose the Bow amendment. There is no doubt that budget cuts are needed and should be spread over as many agencies and programs as possible without doing damage to our national interests.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the House Republican policy committee supports a reduction of at least $5 billion in governmental expenditures. Immediate action must be taken to reduce the anticipated administrative budget expenditures for fiscal year 1968 from $136,500,000,000 to $131,500,000,000. The President's adamant refusal to recommend or to institute meaningful cuts in spending has made it imperative that Congress impose a ceiling on expenditures. The disaster laden cycle of tax and spend, inflation, and ballooning deficits must be broken.

In fiscal year 1960 the nondefense spending by the Federal Government was $48.6 billion. The estimated nondefense spending for fiscal year 1968 is $95.6 billion. This is an increase of 97 percent. In the 5-year period of the Johnson-Humphrey administration, the Federal Government has spent $60.487 billion more than it has taken in. The interest alone on this deficit will cost the American taxpayer $2.8 billion a year for every year it remains unpaid.

The second and third installments on the grandiose Great Society program are now due. In 1965 and again in 1966, when the Republicans were outnumbered two to one, President Johnson and his rubberstamp Democratic majority in Congress hastily enacted a flood of new and extremely costly programs. This was at a time when the cost of the Vietnam war was continuing to escalate and it was completely foreseeable that it would soon reach its present rate of $2 billion a month. The combination of Great Society spending and increased defense expenditures has resulted in an inflationary spiral that has now reached an annual rate of 4.4 percent. Moreover, the cost of living has risen 12.6 percent since the Democrats took office in January of 1961.

Since 1961 the Democratic administrations have embraced the philosophy of unlimited Government spending and budget deficits. Despite repeated and ever more urgent danger signals, the Johnson-Humphrey administration has refused to put its fiscal house in order. It has consistently underestimated the cost of the war in Vietnam and the size of the budget deficit.

In January 1966, the Johnson-Humphrey administration submitted a $112.8 billion expenditure estimate that proposed defense expenditures of $60.5 billion. This was a totally unrealistic figure in view of the massive Federal spending. However, the administration continued to adhere to its original estimate. In fact, on September 8, 1966, the President not only reaffirmed the earlier estimate but assured the American people that total expenditures would be cut back by at least $3 billion. It was not until after the November elections that the American people finally learned the truth. In January 1967, the administration disclosed that fiscal 1967 expenditures would amount to $126.7 billion and not the $112.8 billion previously forecast.

Just last January the Johnson-Humphrey administration forecast a deficit of $8.7 billion for fiscal 1968. In June this figure was completely discredited when the administration was forced to obtain from Congress a borrowing authority that would accommodate a deficit of $29 billion. However, it was not until August 3, 1967, that the administration finally acknowledged the precarious state of the economy. On that date, the President forwarded a message to Congress wherein he urged the immediate enactment of a 10-percent surtax. In this message, it was stated that unless expenditures were tightly controlled and the tax increase imposed, the deficit for 1968 could be more than $28 billion.

The Republican Members of Congress have consistently called for a reduction in governmental expenditures and the immediate establishment of spending priorities. In March of this year, the House Republican policy committee urged the enactment of a resolution that would return the budget to the President and request that he indicate the places and amounts where he believes substantial reductions may be made. During the 85th Congress, President Eisenhower responded to a similar resolution by recommending reductions of $1.342 billion in a budget of $73.3 billion. The Democratic-controlled Congress has refused to grant this resolution any consideration whatsoever.

As the economic indicators have become more and more alarming, the Republican call for economy in Government and a reduction in expenditures has been echoed and reaffirmed in almost every quarter.

The Joint Economic Committee has called for a reduction or deferral of low priority and nonessential spending. This would, according to the committee, reduce the anticipated deficit and the Government's demand on the financial markets and leave more funds to private borrowers and would lower interest costs.

Almost without exception, those testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee regarding the President's request for a 10-percent surtax stated that governmental expenditures must be reduced. It also was noted that a reduction in expenditures has a far greater dampening effect on the inflationary fires than an increase in taxes.

The distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Representative WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, stated in an October 9, 1967, U.S. News & World Report interview:

> I think the first order of business, even though action on Appropriations bills hasn't been completed, is to relay to the Government departments instructions that they must reduce spending by a fixed amount.
>
> Now, I would feel much better about it if we could have some advice from downtown—from the Budget Bureau and the White House—with respect to where each individual program might be trimmed.

> The executive branch, in my opinion, has a lot better idea of where there may be excesses in the budget—excesses over what is really needed, or what somebody thinks is needed—than does Congress. If any of these excesses can be eliminated, we should be told.

Even President Johnson has joined those who are concerned by the present inflation. In a recent statement he acknowledged that:

> All taxes are burdensome but the cruelest tax of all is the inflation tax.

Most prophetically it was just 15 months ago that President Johnson also stated:

> When these folks start talking to you about inflation, you tell them that is something you only have to worry about in Democratic Administrations.

Real expenditure control must be achieved by examining and making basic changes in the mushrooming Great Society programs. To date, the Johnson-Humphrey administration has refused to consider this approach. It demands its tax increase in return for dubious promises of future frugality even though it is a fact that whatever funds are made available to this administration are always spent. According to the October 15, 1967, edition of the Washington Sunday Star, the President opposes the drive to force him to cut spending and is "concentrating now on escaping blame for the distress he expects to afflict the economy because Congress refuses to raise taxes."

One of the underlying reasons that this Congress is unwilling to grant a tax increase is the well founded doubt that the additional revenue would be used to reduce the deficit. If the President is really sincere about wanting a tax increase, he must take the first step toward reestablishing his fiscal credibility. He must at least cooperate in making a significant cut in the expenditure level of this Government.

There must be restraint in Federal spending and an immediate implementation of expenditure priorities if we are to avoid a runaway economy that may lead to governmental control of wages, prices and credit, as well as further increases in taxes. This can be achieved through the Republican proposed limitation on governmental expenditures. We urge its adoption.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, later on, at an appropriate time during the reading of the bill for amendments, I intend to offer an amendment to section 6 of the bill which will reduce the appropriations for the Office of Economic Opportunity from the amount of $1,400 million as provided in the bill, to an amount of $1,200 million.

The bill itself provides for a reduction of last year's expenditures from $1,687 million. My amendment will make a further reduction.

I realize that the main objections that many of my colleagues will have to this amendment is that it does not make enough of a cut in the appropriation for this agency. I agree with them. However, this amendment is offered as a compromise pending what I hope will be further reductions in the very near future.

I should like to point out that a reduction to $1.2 billion would, in effect, mean a reduction of $860 million in the President's budget in view of the fact that he had requested in his budget an appropriation of $2,060 million.

In my opinion the war on poverty has been one of the worst boondoggles in the history of our Nation. All of us are against poverty and want to prevent human suffering and despair. But this program, Mr. Chairman, has been a miserable failure and has not materially contributed to reducing poverty and human suffering. Its records are full of examples of waste and mismanagement. In fact, since the Office of Economic Opportunity was created in 1964, 75 percent of all of the agency's appropriations has been spent for administration and overhead.

Most of us agree that we must cut back on needless spending. In fact, that is the thrust of our debate today. Obviously there is no easy place to make the cuts, and obviously there is a great deal of buckpassing when it comes to determining who should "bell the cat." But, if we are going to make any cuts at all, we must cut the poverty program, because this is where the greatest amount of waste happens to be, and here is where we can specifically make clear our intention to cut back on this type of waste.

As a matter of fact, the House has on several occasions expressed its disappointment in the poverty program, and on two specific instances in recent weeks the House has by indirect action emphatically voiced its disapproval. The most recent instance was last week during the debate on the Federal employee pay bill when an amendment was adopted to preclude the employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity from receiving the increase. It was not the intention of the Members of the House to discriminate against the career civil service employees who happen to be working for the Office of Economic Opportunity, and I am confident that this discrimination will be corrected in the Senate or in conference. The effect of that amendment, however, was to let the RECORD show that the House of Representatives did disapprove of the waste in the agency caused by unnecessary hiring and too many high salaries as well as additional employees.

The second instance was when during the debate on the juvenile delinquency bill language was inserted specifically precluding the Office of Economic Opportunity from receiving any of the funds provided by the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this was indirect action. My amendment will be direct action. We will show emphatically that we want these errors to be corrected. We want improvement in the program. In effect, we want to clean up the mess.

My amendment will serve as a warning to the administrators of this program that unless they tighten their belts and eliminate waste the Congress may abandon their program entirely.

Frankly, I think they should.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, earlier in today's debate I said I intended to support the Whitten amendment. I carried out this intent on the teller vote which adopted the amendment in committee. I did this because I think it is essential for us to cut nonessential Federal spending. As I said before, of the various undesirable alternatives, I far prefer this cut to an unfair tax surcharge or to letting the national debt soar out of sight.

The addition of the Broyhill and Passman amendments to the Whitten amendment, however, makes it impossible for me to support the resulting package on final passage.

It just seems insane to be cutting $680 million from the Office of Economic Opportunity program at a time when the problems of poverty, urban and rural, are growing at such an alarming rate. Yet, this is what the Broyhill amendment would do.

With all its problems of administration, and there have been many, the OEO program has done a remarkable job of tackling the problems of poverty, getting resources devoted to resolution of these problems—both private and public resources, of State and local government as well as Federal—finding the answers to the complex problems of poverty, and trying out new approaches. A virtual revolution of knowledge has taken place in this field since this program, one of the proudest and best accomplishments of President Johnson, was started.

Sure, there have been administrative problems. The agency has been exploring uncharted waters. Sure, there have been false starts and errors made. Were it not for these errors, we could not learn the approaches that will produce results.

I think Sargent Shriver deserves great praise for his heroic work as Director of OEO. He certainly deserves kudos for sticking at the job and maintaining his enthusiasm and creativity in the face of all of its problems, challenges and the hard time given him by so many Congressmen, mayors, and private groups whose ox was somehow gored, justly or unjustly.

I cannot support this kind of wholesale destruction of the antipoverty program at a time of greatest need for it, when the poor are close to revolution because of their plight.

Do we want to see massive bloodshed in this country, a true revolt of the poor against our insensitivity? What hope can the poor derive from legal recourse to their Government when we turn the back of our hand to them in this way? Are we not just inviting trouble?

The cut made by the Broyhill amendment will be particularly serious as applied to ongoing programs, and some will certainly have to be cut. What do you think is going to be the result of tossing youngsters out of Headstart classes, of abruptly ending child medical care programs in midstream, of tossing dropouts out of Job Corps camps and vocational training courses? Not only is this a course of irrationality and cruelty, it is a course of danger.

The Broyhill amendment is not a cost-saver by any means, either. Do you really think it costs society less to rectify the damage of a delinquent, hire the police necessary to apprehend him, pay the freight to incarcerate and feed and guard him, than it is to educate or train him and enable him to avoid a life of crime? On the broader scale, you certainly can't think that the damage done to Detroit or Newark are economically worth the candle of the money saved.

And, what about the Passman amendment, cutting the heart out of our foreign programs? Did you never absorb the truth of the addage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure? Would you really prefer $2 billion a month military solutions to all our foreign relations problems?

Again, the foreign aid programs have many faults, and I have been among the first to criticize them and indicate ways in which I think they could be improved. I have spent most of my working life dealing with the problems of Latin America, participating in our aid and Peace Corps programs there. The solution certainly is not to end the programs but to improve them.

I, for one, should far prefer to spend $3 billion a year helping Latin American countries stand on their own feet in face of the threat of communism than spend $30 billion a year and countless lives of our youth battling to rectify Communist intrusion on the continent. I would far rather help build the Alliance for Progress into a better program for aiding the Latin nations to help themselves than have to repeat actions like that in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic there.

The Broyhill and Passman amendments bring us to the heart of the expense-cutting problem, the question of priorities. Certainly spending should be cut, and I have voted against better than $11 billion of it already in this session. But it is folly, economically, socially, and every other way, to cut the programs essential to our national health and safety while leaving in perfect tact the pork-barrel programs and the special interest subsidies. I just cannot go for that.

I therefore shall oppose the Whitten amendment as so sadly amended by Messrs. BROYHILL of Virginia and PASSMAN, and I fervently hope that you will do the same.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the record votes of the 89th and 90th Congresses show that the House of Representatives categorically opposes construction of the Dickey-Lincoln powerplant. It would provide no redeeming water resource development benefit to compensate for its enormous cost of over one-third of a billion taxpayer dollars, and its continuing annual tax loss of $3 to $5 million.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that I and others in southern New England oppose Dickey-Lincoln, sited in northern Maine, for the reason that it would provide the three southern New England States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut it would be built to serve, with high-cost power.

In 1975, the average wholesale cost of Dickey-Lincoln baseload and peaking power would be not less than 1.67 cents a kilowatt-hour, according to the findings of the House Appropriation Committee investigative staff.

In 1965, the average wholesale cost of power to the municipal utility systems of Massachusetts was 1.33 cents a kilowatt-hour. Due to wholesale rate reductions effected since then it is less today, and it is scheduled to go even lower by 1975, according to the FPC national power survey.

Mr. Chairman, it has been brought to my attention that—notwithstanding it would have a powerplant efficiency index of minus 60 percent—it has been asserted that Dickey-Lincoln could serve as a so-called yardstick for New England power costs. I must point out that, as shown by the recent decision of the Federal Power Commission presiding examiner in the western Massachusetts license proceedings, the cost of Dickey-Lincoln peaking power would exceed the cost of providing equivalent power by private industry's new, taxpaying facilities in New England by more than 34 percent. A powerplant that represents an annual overcharge of more than 34 percent is not southern New England's idea of a yardstick for its power costs.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of October 5, 1967 (Public Law 90–102), is hereby amended by striking out "October 23, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 23, 1967".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-five Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: Strike out everything after the first paragraph and add the following after the first paragraph:

"The Bureau of the Budget shall within 60 days after the enactment of this resolution submit to each Member of the House of Representatives a list of federal expenditures or obligations of expenditures in the congressional district represented by each Member of the House of Representatives for the 1968 fiscal year.

"Such lists shall include salaries of Federal employees, public contracts, public works, and grants or loans of Federal moneys whether given directly through the Federal Government or through an agency or department of a State, and all other sources of Federal expenditures or obligation. Each Member of the House of Representatives shall within 30 days after the receipt of such list submit to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee a list of recommended elimination or reduction of Federal spending in the congressional district represented by him or her, such list of recommendations of reduction or elimination not to be less than 5 percent of all Federal spending or obligation of Federal spending in such congressional district for the fiscal year 1968."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the joint resolution. It would impose additional duties on the Bureau of the Budget and would require reports of committees which are not now required. It calls for action which goes in the opposite direction to the joint resolution, which proposes to curtail rather than to expand Government activities. I insist upon my point.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes, I do wish to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey on the point of order.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is directed at the reduction of expenditures in each congressional district to the tune of 5 percent of the total expenditures in each district. As I understand the resolution under consideration, its purpose is to reduce spending by 5 percent. My amendment would merely establish a different way of accomplishing this purpose. Therefore, I submit that the amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Reading the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, in the opinion of the Chair the amendment includes a directive to the Bureau of the Budget and provides for an investigation by Members of the House and a review by the Committee on Appropriations. The Chair thinks the points made by the gentleman from Texas are well taken. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very disturbed and unhappy really that the amendment of my dear friend and colleague was not considered germane, because I thought it just about as effective and germane as the Bow amendment, which I understand is going to be coming up later for us to vote on.

If possible, I would like to draw the attention of my distinguished colleague and good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] and ask if he will answer a question for me. I was following the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts on the Post Office Department very carefully. Knowing him to be the expert he is, and the devoted and conscientious Congressman and legislator that he is, I heard him point out what would happen under the resolution.

I put to him this question: What would happen to the Post Office Department under the Bow amendment?

I presume amendments are going to be offered today to exempt the Post Office Department and the Internal Revenue Service and the Veterans' Administration and the Social Security Administration, and so on. The question I would put to my distinguished colleague and very good friend and neighbor is: What would happen under the Bow amendment?

Mr. CONTE. The Bow amendment has nothing to do with the argument I was directing against the Mahon amendment. The Mahon amendment specifically says all these agencies must absorb the pay raise. Therefore, I had something to work with. The Bow amendment cuts down expenditures by $5 billion, and it is up to the President of the United States as to where he will apply that limitation.

Mr. RESNICK. Will the gentleman answer this question?

Mr. CONTE. He has $5 billion more than he did last year.

Mr. RESNICK. Would the gentleman answer this question for me? I think the figure has been very well established that, after taking out the exempt features of the Bow amendment, we have basically $21 billion to work with.

Mr. CONTE. It is $31 billion.

Mr. RESNICK. No. After taking out the exemptions for the Defense Department and social security, and so on, I believe we have $21 billion. There is $9 billion of the $21 billion which is in Federal salaries. Perhaps the gentleman can enlighten me, because the author of the Bow amendment has not enlightened me, nor has anyone else, as far as I know. I would ask: Where is this $5 billion going to come from? If the gentleman from Massachusetts says it cannot come from the Post Office Department, and the distinguished gentleman from Texas says it cannot come from veterans affairs, and I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi does not want it to come from Agriculture, I would like to know where the $5 billion is going to be cut from?

Mr. CONTE. The President may cut it out of the space program or out of the agricultural program. We can save a lot of money in the Agriculture Department, where we have more employees than we have farmers in the United States, or there are many other programs where it could be taken out.

Mr. RESNICK. I have yet to hear one specific place where $5 billion is going to come from.

Mr. CONTE. I just gave the gentleman one.

Mr. RESNICK. I think the Republican Party is evading its responsibility. The Republicans say they want to cut $5 billion, but they will not say where. When a suggestion is made that we will take it out of the Post Office Department, everybody says no. It cannot come out of veterans affairs or public works. Maybe there is some part of the Government I do not know about. Surely the gentleman from Ohio must have some idea where this $5 billion is going to come from.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, when I directed my remarks to the gentleman from Texas, I did not disagree with him in regard to his argument on research and development, which I believe amounts to $1.7 billion.

Mr. RESNICK. If the gentleman will stick to the point, I am asking a very simple question. I say to my friend from Massachusetts, please tell me where $5 billion is going to come from?

Mr. CONTE. If the gentleman will give me the opportunity, I will. I say $1.7 billion on research and development, and maybe the rest out of Space and Agriculture, et cetera. Cut out all the subsidies. I realize that this may eliminate the gentleman on the Agriculture Committee, but it may be a godsend to him.

Mr. RESNICK. I am sure if the entire agricultural program was discontinued, my district would not lose a dime, because we do not get any subsidies in my district.

I say to the gentleman, in all honesty and sincerity, that never once has anybody on the Republican side said where the $5 billion is going to come from.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

"That the joint resolution of October 5, 1967 (Public Law 90–102), is hereby amended by striking out 'October 23, 1967' and inserting in lieu thereof 'November 23, 1967'."

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would present the House with a simple continuing resolution, extending the current resolution from the expiration date of October 23 until November 23, 1967. This, in my judgment, is what we should be doing in the House today. We should have before us only a continuing resolution for those agencies for which appropriation bills have not been signed into law.

I have been dismayed over the past month at the spectacle the House has been making. I am dismayed by the fact that we have before us this afternoon a resolution which would cut by 5 percent the cost of civilian personnel in all executive agencies, which would require the absorption of the 4½-percent pay raise, which would reduce research and development by 10 percent without any evaluation of priorities, and which would go to the very heart of the antipoverty program, which is the symbol of the Great Society, by cutting that program back to a rate that would be provided by an appropriation of $1.4 billion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has offered an amendment for a simple continuing resolution for 30 days. I am not authorized to speak for the Committee on Appropriations, but I would have no objection to the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RYAN. I am sure the distinguished chairman would not. I would hope that all Members of the House would put aside the debate in which we are engaged and vote in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge its adoption.

Before we vote, let me use the balance of my time. It appears as though the specter of a large deficit has impaired our sense of responsibility and liberated a primitive urge to destroy Federal programs and disrupt the processes of government. Our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], with whom I do not always agree, was quoted in this morning's New York Times as saying, "The House has lost its head."

If anything, this is an understatement. The resolution before us is the latest step in an alarming sequence of events which are slowly undoing the hard-fought legislative gains of the past 7 years. I wonder how many of us have given it the serious consideration it warrants.

Under section 3 agency payrolls are limited to 95 percent of the fiscal year 1968 budget estimates. Furthermore, under section 4 agencies are required to absorb the 4½-percent pay increase—6 percent for postal workers—internally by cutting back personnel. On the surface this looks like a total personnel cutback of 9½ percent, which would be damaging enough. However, according to Bureau of the Budget estimates, the consequences would be far more serious. Time is required to survey departments to determine where the cuts should be made.

In addition, employees must be given 30 days' notice, and payrolls must cover terminal leave and severance pay. It is anticipated that those terminated will be on the payroll until March 1. Therefore, the impact of the 5-percent reduction would occur in the last 4 months. The percentage payroll reduction would have to be prorated for all of fiscal year 1968 and telescoped in the last 4 months of the fiscal year. Thus, in order to absorb the effects of House Joint Resolution 888, an agency would have to reduce its payroll by 24 percent. This can hardly be met by not filling vacancies.

Let us look at a hypothetical case. Assume:

First. Payroll of $1,000,000 per month for 2,000 employees at average salary of $6,000 per annum;

Second. No change from 1967 to 1968; now at $1,000,000 per month level;

Third. Average terminal leave for employees who would be separated of 21 days;

Fourth. Severance pay equal to another month's pay;

Fifth. It takes 40 days from October 23 to determine who to fire and for RIF's;

Sixth. Thirty days' notice of termination;

Seventh. Employment severance actually begin January 1;

Eighth. Five-percent cut in personal service obligations; and

Ninth. Absorption of the 4.5-percent pay increase from October 1.

Then it would require 24-percent reduction in payroll or 480 employees to effect a reduction of $960,000, the amount of reduction required by sections 3 and 4.

The effects of a cutback of this magnitude are very damaging. For instance, a 5-percent cut in the Internal Revenue Service payroll, or $44 million, would result in reduced revenue collections of between $600 million and $1.3 billion, depending on the way personnel cuts are made.

A 5-percent cut in the Customs Bureau payroll amounting to $6.7 million will involve estimated revenue losses of $100 million to $250 million, not to mention such side effects as an unknown amount of increase in smuggling of drugs into the country.

The Post Office has reported that it may have to suspend second-, third-, and fourth-class deliveries and some first-class deliveries on Saturdays.

I do not point this out to suggest that the Post Office, Customs Bureau, and Internal Revenue Service be exempted from these provisions, but to illustrate how ill considered the entire resolution is. Undoubtedly, other agencies and public services would suffer as well.

The President has said repeatedly that we can afford both guns and butter. Now, the rising cost of war has raised the political price tag on vital domestic programs, and the House seems quite prepared to opt for guns without any serious debate on priorities. The threat of a $29 billion deficit is somehow seen as an eternal given, and few of us are pausing to consider how it got there. It is ironical that the President has structured the situation so that Congress sees it as a choice between a tax increase and cuts in domestic programs. As a result, the administration has set the stage for the gutting of its own domestic programs.

In adopting this resolution, we would be continuing the process of making grave decisions on national priorities by default. The Vietnam war bears principal responsibility for a deficit which may approach $29 billion. This may or not be detrimental to the economy. But, virtually without substantive debate, the House is deciding that the continued escalation of the war is worth the destruction of the critical domestic programs of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, that it is worth wreaking havoc on Federal agencies by compelling a 25-percent cut in payroll. The House is also apparently deciding that this course is preferable to a tax increase or tax reform.

The deficit has simply provided the excuse. The antipoverty program, the symbol of President Johnson's domestic program, has been the object of attack as a result of the balance of these political forces.

On September 26 the House adopted an amendment to the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act prohibiting the receipt of any funds by agencies administered or in any part funded or contracted by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Last week OEO was excluded from the civil service pay increase. And now, under House Joint Resolution 888, the poverty program is again singled out for special treatment. Its annual rate of expenditure would be limited to $1.4 billion for the interim period, or 15 percent below the fiscal year 1967 appropriation.

If this reduction were carried over into OEO's entire 1968 budget, it would result in the reduction of 55,000 summer jobs for needy youths, the reduction of in-school assistance to another 40,000 needy students, and the reduction of training programs for 15,000 school dropouts. Further, 95,700 poor adults would be denied job training. The Job Corps would be cut by 17,000 enrollees. Twenty-two thousand persons on the welfare rolls would be denied job training for productive employment. Headstart would be reduced by 18 percent; Upward Bound by 31 percent; local health by 42 percent; and legal services by 20 percent.

If reductions are to be made, decisions should not be reached without a full understanding of the substantive programs which will suffer, and not through ill-considered budget slashing.

The report which accompanies House Joint Resolution 888 points out that House floor action has already cut administration budget requests by some $3.8 billion, including $689 million in Housing and Urban Development, and $167 million from Health and Education. This is over and above administration reductions from fiscal year 1968 authorized levels totaling $4.45 billion, of which over 70 percent is in the critical domestic areas of Health, Education, Housing, and Urban Development.

In summary, we have already had budget reductions of over $8 billion.

Our cities, our education, our health needs have already been shortchanged. While these vital programs are meeting a slow death by strangulation, the military construction bill, which increased spending by $1.3 billion over last year's level, sailed through the House on October 3 by a vote of 377 to 33.

In the name of fiscal caution the entire fabric of enlightened congressional attitude toward Federal responsibilities in social legislation seems to be unraveling, with no end in sight. This, too, is appeasement. And the administration is the unhappy captive of its own ploy.

House Joint Resolution 888 would set extremely dangerous precedents for the destruction of hard-fought programs through the back door. It would impose drastic administrative burdens. It would cut out vital services.

A great deal more reflection and consideration of the substantive issues at hand, consideration of national priorities and the true national cost of the Vietnam war must precede such a drastic step.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I again urge the adoption of my amendment which provides a simple continuing resolution.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] in support of his amendment. I believe that some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle are springing into the mouth of defeat to avoid being gobbled up.

Of course, the amendment which I understand is to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] would destroy or seriously impair the progress that this Congress has made in meeting the problems of decay in our cities, of crime in the streets, of poverty, educational disadvantage, and discrimination, and of air and water pollution.

But, on the other hand, the limitations proposed by the Committee on Appropriations upon the extention of the joint resolution of October 5, 1967, Public Law 90–102, by House Joint Resolution 888 seems to me voluntarily to embrace defeat in anticipation of having the Bow amendment force defeat upon us.

I am for a frugal and efficient government, but I am not for our Government crippling itself to prove its frugality. Appropriations must be considered and recommended deliberately; and, when the House acts upon them, it should cut only with precision and intelligence.

I do not sense deliberation, precision, nor true economy in either House Joint Resolution 888, nor in the Bow amendment. Therefore, I would return to the previous deliberate, precise, and frugal action of the Appropriations Committee and of Congress. Such would be the effect of the Ryan amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The question was taken.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RYAN and Mr. BOW.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 107, noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. During the period beginning with the date of approval hereof and ending November 23, 1967, no executive department, agency, corporation, or other organizational unit shall make any obligation for any new construction, research, demonstration, training, service, or similar project or activity not directly related to the current military effort in Southeast Asia unless it is determined by the head of such department, agency, corporation, or other unit, under such overall guidelines as the President in his discretion may prescribe, that the project or activity requires obligations beyond administrative control, or involves the safety of human life or the protection of property, or involves the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law. No such department, agency, corporation, or unit shall make any obligation otherwise permissible for procurement of any goods or nonpersonal services that can, without impairing the national defense or welfare, be postponed during such period. No additional civilian personnel (or contract personnel in substitution therefor) shall be employed during such period unless it is determined by the head of any department, agency, corporation, or unit that it is necessary, within the limits of funds otherwise available, to do so in connection with the current military effort in Southeast Asia, the safety of human life, the protection of property, or for statutory positions the exact number of which is fixed by law.

SEC. 3. Funds available or becoming available to the several executive departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units for obligation for civilian personnel compensation and benefits for the fiscal year 1968 (other than those relating to retired personnel, those directly relating to the current military effort in Southeast Asia, those involving the safety of human life or the protection of property, or for statutory positions the exact number of which is fixed by law) shall not be available for such purposes beyond 95 per centum of the amounts estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15) as amended. Reductions pursuant to this section shall be applicable on an individual appropriation or fund basis to the greatest practicable extent without impairing essential functions, and such reductions shall not be offset by substitution of contract personnel. Amounts withheld from obligation pursuant to the provisions of this section are hereby rescinded and shall be covered into the Treasury, and amounts so withheld from obligation under corporate funds are hereby rescinded and shall revert to the source from which derived.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SIKES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 2, line 24, after "the", insert: "legislative (except items pertaining to the Senate) and judicial branches and the".

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the fact that I have four amendments which are interlocking and which apply to exactly the same subject, that the remaining three amendments be reported and that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 3, line 20, strike out "branch" and insert: ", legislative (except items pertaining to the Senate) and judicial branches".

On page 4, line 8, after "the", insert: "legislative (except pertaining to the Senate) and judicial branches and the".

And add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 7. The rate of pay of no individual employee shall be reduced by the operation of this resolution."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may have the attention of the Committee. I support the Mahon resolution. However, in addition—very simply and very briefly—I am seeking to say to the Nation that the House is willing to take the same medicine it wants to administer to other Government agencies. The perfecting amendments which I have offered are intended to subject the legislative and judicial branches to the same terms and conditions described for the executive, and for the same period of time. The amendments will do no more and no less. The amendments would include the House, the judiciary, Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and the Architect of the Capitol. Under the usual rule of comity items pertaining to the Senate are not included. They will have to sweep around their own door.

Under the resolution as introduced, Cabinet officers, agency heads, et cetera, are generally exempted by the language "or for statutory positions, the exact number of which is fixed by law." This existing phrase would protect Members of Congress and members of the judiciary.

Now, the new section 7 which I propose, should be clear on its face that it is primarily designed to accommodate individuals whose pay is provided by small line appropriations, such as the Speaker's Office, the Chaplain, et cetera.

As I intend the language to read, it would also insure that the rate of pay of no individual employee of a Member would be reduced by the operation of the resolution itself. In those cases where a Member is using the full amount of his clerk hire it is intended that it would not be necessary for him to take a reduction in the number of employees, or in the amount of clerk hire, provided someone in position, such as the Disbursing Clerk, would assess the reduction against the total appropriation, offsetting against the total reduction the savings resulting from unused clerk hire on the part of Members who do not utilize the full authorization.

This will not be popular in some quarters. I am simply leaning over backwards in an effort to be fair. I do not believe the House can in good grace exempt itself from the restrictions on spending that we propose for others, nor do I see any justification for exempting the judiciary.

I would call attention that there is a saving clause in the resolution itself, in the Mahon resolution, which I quote, on page 3, line 9:

> Reductions pursuant to this section shall be applicable on an individual appropriation or fund basis to the greatest practicable extent without impairing essential functions.

This would deal with emergency situations and I think provides the necessary protection.

I trust the amendments will be accepted.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I want to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment and I assure him that I am in full support of the amendment.

I will say further as chairman of the subcommittee for the legislative branch of the Government, I will do all in my power to see that our committee makes rescissions in line with the provisions of your amendment, if it prevails—and even if it does not prevail.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman, a member of the committee.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida. Certainly this is a most appropriate amendment to the resolution now before us.

As we have now recognized, there is a substantial need for a reduction in expenditures in all phases of Government as the resolution provides. It follows that certainly the legislative branch and the judicial branch ought to be subjected to the very same provisions.

This is really the minimum contribution that we, as a legislative body, can make in view of the demands that are placed upon the budget of this Nation. It would seem to me that it is the duty of the legislative branch to set the kind of an example that we expect other departments of Government to follow. It has already been stated that there are many frills that we could well do without.

Now is surely the time to let the Nation know, that the House of Representatives is ready and willing to tighten its belt in the best economic interest of the Nation and the taxpayers. American boys are making great sacrifices for the preservation of our way of life and it behooves us as a legislative body to make whatever economic contribution we can. I know that it is alarming to recognize that we no longer can afford all of the services that now exist, but that is what the budget situation demands. The spending spree is over and its time that the House should recognize it. It is the generous spending of Congress for both war and domestic programs that has led to the excessive deficit of $26 to $30 billion. We now ought to be just as anxious to practice prudence as we are demanding other departments of Government to do.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Florida some questions in an attempt to clarify this.

As I understand his amendment, if a person is using the full amount of their clerk hire, they will not be cut at all; is that right?

Mr. SIKES. This is my intention, but it is difficult to insure that this will be the case. As I pointed out in my statement, if someone in a position to do so, such as the Clerk of the House, will credit the clerk hire account with the unexpended funds in the accounts of those Members who do not use all of their clerk hire, it should not be necessary for any Member to take a reduction. If this were not done, it would be necessary for Members who use all their clerk hire to take a reduction in the number of employees or to cut salaries.

Mr. HAYS. But if everybody were using the full amount, there would have to be a cut; is that right?

Mr. SIKES. In that case it would be up to the Member himself whether he would cut salaries of individuals—or to cut the number of employees.

Mr. HAYS. Let me ask you this. In my case I have three fewer than I am allowed. So you are going to take the money that I am not using and apply it to somebody else so that somebody else can continue their full amount; is that it?

Mr. SIKES. We are assuming that each Member is using the number of employees that is required for the proper operation of his office.

Mr. HAYS. This whole thing is about as phoney as a Confederate $3 bill. If it passes, I am going to put three more people on the payroll in the morning—before the Senate acts and it can become law.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is his own judge of the requirements of his office.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

As the gentleman knows, I reserved on this in committee. I think almost everyone here is in agreement that the same principle that we seek to apply to the executive branch should apply to the legislative branch and the judicial branch as well.

The situation described in remarks just made relating to the clerk hire rule can be easily handled by the Clerk because the percentage limitation applies to the aggregate clerk-hire base for all 435 Members as a group. If enough Members have enough slack to equal 5 percent of the group figure no changes will be needed. Of course, if Members all fill their clerk-hire allowance before passage, then we will be subject to a 5-percent reduction the same as the executive branch.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the distinguished chairman of my committee.

Mr. MAHON. I want to make this statement in order to make some legislative history. Is it not true that the purpose of the Sikes amendment is to enable all Members who use all of their clerk-hire allowance to continue to use their clerk hire, if they need to do so, and Members who do not use all their clerk hire at the moment will not be restricted in using their clerk hire?

But if there are funds left in the account for the payment of clerk hire, I understand the Sikes amendment would provide a 5-percent reduction in those funds. I understand the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has offered the amendment in such a way as not to make a reduction in the pay of any employee on "the Hill," as we would not make any reduction in the pay of any other employee in the Government.

Mr. WYMAN. That is correct. If there is a 5-percent slack in the aggregate clerk-hire payrolls of Members at the time the amendment becomes applicable, due to the fact that Members have not used all of their payroll allowances, then the amendment would simply cut available base by 5 percent. For practical purposes this would have no tangible effect except as a limitation on the amount of base available for future commitment. This is the same as the resolution would apply to the executive branch and Government agencies.

However, if every Member goes out after this discussion today and employs up to his full allowance, the 5-percent reduction, according to the amendment, will of course then have to be applied by the Clerk across the board to all Members. I think it is important that this be understood in view of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it not a fact that if a Member does not use all of his clerk-hire funds, they go back to the Treasury anyhow?

Mr. WYMAN. That is correct. They are simply a credit unused for each monthly period.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I do not understand what you are trying to prove, since all the money goes back, not merely 5 percent. The whole sum you have not spent goes back to the Treasury at the end of the year.

Mr. WYMAN. At the end of each month. What is sought to be done, as I understand the pending amendment, is to in effect rescind or reduce the aggregate clerk hire available to members by 5 percent, but if this percentage is available at the time of enactment by virtue of unutilized clerk-hire base then nobody is adversely affected except in terms of ability to commit these funds in the future.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The thing I object to is that I have already tried not to use any more clerk hire funds than I need. I object to being made the goat by some Members who would like to get themselves on record but who in the meantime have been using all of their clerk-hire funds.

Mr. WYMAN. The gentleman is not being made the goat at all. The amendment would apply the same rule that the resolution would apply to the downtown agencies. You, individually, are not being made the goat at all. Should every Member proceed to commit all his clerk hire funds then the limitation would apply across the board. The fact that you have not seen fit to use all your individual funds, and some other Members have not used their funds, for you to say that since the cut will be made, therefore we should use all the money available, would not help, as I see it, because the cut would then have to be made across the board.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I am going to put them on because these fellows who are using all their funds ought to sacrifice a little bit, too, and do something besides talk.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of undertaking to clarify the situation confronting the House. I wish to make it clear that we would not tolerate and, as chairman of the committee, I would not tolerate any reduction in any Member's clerk-hire funds that the Member requires for the operation of his office, whether he is at the moment using all of his clerk-hire funds or not. If there are funds remaining after Members have used all the clerk hire they desire within the limit of what the law allows, the cut of 5 percent would be made from those funds.

The purpose of the Sikes amendment and its principal objects are the General Accounting Office, which has a budget of some $52 million, the Library of Congress, the Architect of the Capitol, and the other agencies in the legislative branch where there are more employees, and appropriations in larger sums, from which reductions can be made.

We would cut no one's pay and deny no Member the right to employ from funds he may not be presently using. I would hope that the House would accept this interpretation and let us get on with the issues before us.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Do not the funds that are not used by Members for clerk hire go back to the Treasury?

Mr. MAHON. They do.

Mr. ALBERT. What is the use of applying this amendment to the funds of Members of Congress?

Mr. MAHON. The amendment would also apply to the whole of the legislative branch, which includes the Library of Congress and the General Accounting Office.

Mr. ALBERT. If a Member is not using all of his funds—and I would say that a big percentage of the Members do not, or at least do not use them all the time—if you would cut them 5 percent, does that mean that next month when he puts on an employee that he can put on the full amount of his base or 5 percent less than the full amount?

Mr. MAHON. He could use the entire base. That would be my interpretation of the amendment. The purpose of the amendment is to cover the legislative branch as best it can be done.

Mr. ALBERT. It seems to me this needs some working on.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give a little illustration of how we are legislating in the dark. Does the gentleman have any figures as to how much has lapsed from the legislative branch already?

Mr. MAHON. We do not have those figures immediately available.

Mr. HAYS. We do not know. I have given back a great deal, and so have many other Members. It is probably 5 percent.

Does the gentleman know how this resolution will work on the State Department?

Mr. MAHON. On the State Department?

Mr. HAYS. They would have to lay off

800 employees, which they could probably do without, but at this time of the year it will cost more money to bring them home and give them annual leave, and so on, than we can save. I am going to vote against the resolution of the gentleman from Texas and the Bow amendment and all the rest.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would hope we would accept the Sikes amendment with the assurance that there is no provision that could be interpreted to withdraw from a Member the right to hire what the law now allows, or that it would cut the pay of the people in his office, which would be ridiculous and absurd. We are not reducing pay to individuals in the executive branch.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in an effort—I might say a very desperate effort—to understand it, particularly as it might relate to the General Accounting Office. Is it the intent of the gentleman that the funds for the General Accounting Office be reduced by 5 percent?

Mr. SIKES. I see no reason why any agency of the Government should be exempt from this general economy drive, and it would apply to personnel in the General Accounting Office. I trust the gentleman recognizes they should be just as careful about economy as any other agency.

Mr. MOSS. It is for the precise reason that the gentleman in the well is interested in real economy—in real economy—that he opposes reducing funds to the General Accounting Office. I know of few areas in this Government where we can invest dollars and produce more savings than in the General Accounting Office.

It is my opinion that it is utter foolishness to cut the funds for the auditing arm of the Congress at the very time when many programs are as yet not fully tried, as we expand the military activities, as we move all around the world involving this Nation's interests, that we cut off a part of the effective auditing arm of this Congress. I think it would be a tragic error, and if for no other reason—forgetting the legerdemain that goes on in this supposed reduction of our own forces—if for no other reason—than to preserve the forces in the General Accounting Office, I think this amendment merits a resounding defeat.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] if he would also like to apply this to the military employees, civilian and uniformed? If not, why not? I am not talking about the boys in Vietnam. I am talking about the boys in the plush chairs over in the Pentagon.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman wishes a response, will he yield to me?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like the gentleman to respond, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the language of the Mahon resolution applies to civilian employees in the Department of Defense, exempting only those who are directly associated with the conduct of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, how many of the military in the Pentagon are directly associated with the war in South Vietnam, and how many are not? Is there any way in the world of determining who are not directly involved?

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield, that information can not be definitely determined at this time, but I can assure the gentleman the great majority of civilian employees in the Department of Defense are not directly associated with the war in Vietnam.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But the gentleman's amendment does not include them.

Mr. SIKES. My amendment does not. They already are included in the Mahon resolution. Those civilians not directly associated with the war in Vietnam are limited in the Mahon resolution. They are not exempted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. How many Members are willing to take a 5-percent cut in their own salary today? We are getting so holy on the subject of economy.

I see about a dozen hands up. That is about par for the course.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman would get a better test if he were to offer an amendment for such a cut.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, for at least 15 minutes I was on the floor seeking recognition, and the Chair did not recognize me, and I do not like it.

Now I want to say this: for a number of years, and without any advertising it to gain acclaim and voter favor, I have saved money for the taxpayers by not using my entire clerk allowance, and I intend to continue in the ways that satisfy my conscience and doing it silently as a matter of course. I do not write to my constituents and say, "Other Congressmen may do this, but your Congressman does not." I credit my colleagues, all of them, with the same integrity with which I in my humble way approach the performance of my office.

But the proposal that I have heard today and that is embodied in the pending amendment is shocking beyond belief. It is the most brazen proposal ever made in a legislative body to my notion. It is as simple as that: If the gentleman from Ohio, WAYNE HAYS, and the gentleman from Illinois, BARRATT O'HARA, and others—I think a great majority of my colleagues—do not use all their clerk allowance, those who do use it all can benefit from the savings of their colleagues and still get credit in the sunshine of publicity for taking a nonexistent 5-percent cut.

What do we call that? It is phony economy. For the first time in the many years I have been a Member of this distinguished body I feel a sense of nausea and shame.

That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN].

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express warm affection for my good friend from Florida. I know he is sincere in offering this amendment, and I know it is his desire to save money. He is a valuable Member of this body, and I am proud to serve with him.

But I want to say that this amendment points up the evil of what we are doing today. This body has set up an Appropriations Committee. It is the biggest committee in this House of Representatives. Ostensibly it is one of the most powerful. It is one of the hardest working and busiest.

We are in an awful mess here because the Senate has not acted on the appropriation bills. Had they done so, we might be able to have a better idea of where the expenditures stand. We are desperately trying to retrieve control over appropriations, because of the fact that the Senate has not acted and of the fact that we have to continue the day-to-day expenditures of Government to keep the Government going.

The way this matter should be handled is to let the Senate finish acting, to continue the appropriations, to bring the matter back and then have another look, if the Appropriations Committee wishes so to do, to see where economy is to be made. This would be responsible government.

To legislate in this frantic, hasty, careless, irresponsible way, without having a full idea of the effects of the legislation before this body and the impact of the cuts upon the Government, is really the poorest kind of legislation.

I recall as a boy in the 80th Congress when they cut like this. They cut off a tremendous number of people who were Internal Revenue Service employees, with the result that Government tax revenues dropped right out of the bottom. The result of this was that the cuts which were supposedly economy cuts wound up costing the taxpayers far more, far more indeed, than the savings which were supposed to come from those personnel cuts. This is an example of what we are doing today.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIKES) there were—ayes 66, nays 134.

So the amendments were rejected.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. STEED

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. STEED: On page 3, line 6, immediately following the comma, insert the following: "those involving the protection of the revenues and essential postal services,"; and

On page 3, line 25, immediately following the comma, insert the following: "those involving the protection of the revenues and essential postal services,".

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that there is evidently a great deal of difference of opinion about what we are trying to do here today, surely we can all agree that in the great activities of our Federal Government there are some things we do that are just a lot more important than some other things we do. And, since the approach here today is an across-the-board approach, I have offered these amendments to exempt these two phases of our Federal activities, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that if the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union fully understood what this resolution, if adopted, would do to these agencies, and if it became law, no one of you would want it to apply to these particular agencies.

First, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that the subcommittee of which I am chairman which handles the budgets of these two agencies, has already held three meetings upon the question of recisions. In other words, we are in the process of determining which recisions can be made, and where they can be made.

Mr. Chairman, my desire is to give these agencies involved, and to give the House of Representatives an opportunity to work within the limits of the provisions of the proposed resolution.

However, in the meantime, I think all of the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union should remember this. This resolution, if adopted, will have a double impact upon these very important agencies due to the fact that if it is adopted it will cut back to the extent of 5 percent upon personnel in one section, and require the Post Office Department to absorb a 6-percent pay raise in the next section.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, this represents an 11-percent cutback which if this resolution is adopted would impose upon the Post Office Department.

Mr. Chairman, I remind the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that we have had our full budget recision hearings on the budget of the Post Office Department. They have gone through approximately 4 months of their fiscal year, as has the Treasury Department. Since this 11-percent cut would be applied to the remaining 8 months of their budget, it would have the actual effect of bringing about an 18-percent reduction in their activities.

Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department presently has 716,000 employees, which includes 31,600 which the Congress of the United States allowed them in their budget request this year. These people are already on board.

Therefore, if you apply this reduction to the Post Office Department, you are going to require them to absorb this 18-percent cut. In other words, they will have to discharge for the remainder of this year 132,000 postal employees. I can assure the members of the Committee that such action, if followed, will wreck the American postal system.

Mr. Chairman, I say this especially at this time. Are you going to do this right at the time when they are coming into the heaviest portion of their year—coming into the Christmas season of the year?

Mr. Chairman, if this is applied to the Internal Revenue Service they will lose 2,100 additional employees, and in addition to that they will have to absorb this 4.5-percent pay raise as well as the proposed 5-percent cutback, which is going to require a $44 million cut in their budget. During the remaining 8 months of their budget year, they will have to lay off 7,500 of their people.

Mr. Chairman, if they are compelled to do this, they will have to shut down activities that will cost this Government this fiscal year an estimated $1,295 million in collections and $270 million of this comes from interest alone.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a foolish thing to undertake to curtail the ability of a revenue agency to bring in some more money. In other words, it makes just about as much sense as a farmer would make if he ate his own seed corn. We would lose more money by this procedure than we are trying to save.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how any Member of this Congress would possibly want these two very, very important agencies of this Government to curtail their activities by creating a situation which this resolution would accomplish, if adopted.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Members of the House will take into account the funds involved for these particular agencies and realize that they are of great importance and of such great importance that we cannot afford these cutbacks that could better be applied to some other activities of the Government.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, if I thought the Senate would buy this and if I thought that this thing would pass, I would be delighted because if we had to cut back rural deliveries to 3 days a week and if we had to cut back city deliveries to 4 days a week, this would represent a different situation. You know, a lot of Members do not realize that the American people are not illiterate, and that they could read the record, would find out who did this and, boy when they realize this we would have a lot of new Members in the 91st Congress.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before commenting on the amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma, I would like to place in the RECORD explanatory material which appears in the report and which is of great importance in the consideration of the legislation before us.

I call attention to the following portions of the committee report:

SECTION 1—CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

This is the fourth continuing resolution of the session. Section 1 extends the current resolution expiration date of October 23 by 30 days, to November 23 (Thanksgiving Day). Otherwise in this respect, it is identical in emphasis and scope to the current resolution (Public Law 90–38, as amended by Public Laws 90–75 and 90–102, the general terms and conditions of which are explained in House Reports 374, 596, 708, and 724).

While the outside date in this fourth resolution is November 23, it is just that—an outside date. Like continuing resolutions of the past, the terms of Section 1 cease to apply to an agency or activity concurrent with approval by the President of the applicable appropriation bill in which provision for such agency or activity is made. Thus, the scope of this section constricts as each regular bill is enacted; and it becomes wholly inoperative after the last approval.

Five of the 15 appropriation bills for the current fiscal year 1968 have been enacted and cleared to the President. They are: Interior, Treasury-Post Office, Defense, Legislative, and the Agriculture bill not yet signed by the President.

The conference report on the Transportation bill is filed and now pending on the House Calendar.

Five additional bills have passed both Houses and are pending in conference. They are Labor-H.E.W., Independent Offices-H.U.D., the space program (NASA), Public Works, and State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary. Conferences have been held on several, and more are planned this week.

The District of Columbia bill is in committee of the other body.

Three bills are pending in the Committee on Appropriations where they have been awaiting legislative authorization; two of them still depend on authorization bills. They are: Military construction, which is to be reported shortly; Foreign assistance; and the closing supplemental in which will be considered, as a principal example, the antipoverty program. These three bills currently involve about $9 billion of appropriation requests.

DELAYS IN APPROPRIATION BILLS

The Committee's original reporting plan, released on April 10, was to bring all of the regular annual bills for fiscal 1968 to the House during the period March 20–June 30. The last one, for the new Department of Transportation, was scheduled to be reported on June 30.

The first 9 bills for 1968 were reported on schedule, but all the others were, or still are, either wholly or in significant part delayed for lack of more timely enactment of a number of related annual authorization bills.

As Members know the Committee on Appropriations cannot, within the rules, report appropriations for any purpose not previously authorized by separate law.

Following is a tabulation comparing the original committee reporting schedule with the status of the annual bills for 1968, three of which remain to be reported:

ANNUAL APPROPRIATION BILLS AS OF OCT. 16, 1967

Bill	Committee reporting schedule, Apr. 10, 1967	Reported to House	Passed House	Passed Senate	Final congressional action	Notes
Treasury-Post Office	Mar. 20	Mar. 20	Mar. 22	May 23	June 29	
District of Columbia	Apr. 14	Apr. 13	Apr. 18			
Interior	Apr. 21	Apr. 21	Apr. 27	May 18	June 12	Bill omitted provision for saline water program for lack of authorization bill (budget $13,482,000).
Independent offices-HUD	May 12	May 12	May 17	Sept. 21		Bill omitted NASA, budget $5,100,000,000, plus a couple of small items due to authorization bill delay.
Labor-HEW	May 22	May 22	May 25	Aug. 2		Bill omitted antipoverty program, budget $2,060,000,000, and 10 or a dozen other programs, budgets totaling some $261,840,100, due to lack of authorization bills.
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	May 26	May 25	May 31	Oct. 11		Bill omitted Appalachian item, budget $33,000,000 due to lack of authorization bill.
Legislative	do.	do.	June 1	July 10	July 24	
Agriculture	June 2	June 2	June 6	July 13	Oct. 10	Bill omitted an Appalachian item, budget $3,000,000, due to lack of authorization bill.
Defense	June 9	June 9	June 13	Aug. 22	Sept. 13	
Public Works	June 16	July 20	July 25	Oct. 10		Delay, awaiting AEC authorization bill, budget $2,646,100,000, plus 4 small items, budgets $15,385,000 not yet authorized.
Transportation	June 30	July 13	July 18	Oct. 5	(1)	Authorization bill for Coast Guard (budget $107,014,000) was delayed slightly.
NASA		Aug. 18	Aug. 22	Oct. 6		Not originally scheduled as a separate bill; annual authorization bill cleared Congress Aug. 8.
Military construction	June 16					Awaiting authorization bill, budget $2,937,000,000.
Foreign assistance	June 23					Awaiting authorization bill, budget $3,818,736,000.
Supplemental	(2)					Awaiting various authorizations and any last-minute supplements otherwise.

[1] Conference report filed.

[2] Supplemental bill for 1968, for which no reporting date was set, is not listed, but it is scheduled to carry, in addition to any necessary last-minute supplements, such major items as the antipoverty program.

SUMMARY OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

The House has considered, at this session, 14 general appropriation bills—2 supplemental bills for the fiscal year 1967 and 12 regular bills relating to fiscal 1968. It has reduced the budget requests for appropriations by $3,989,000,000, of which $3,816,000,000 relates to fiscal 1968 bills.

Some $9,040,000,000 of specific budget requests are *presently* involved in the 3 bills still pending in the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

The committee will continue its efforts to recommend further reductions in the three remaining bills. Opportunities exist for further significant reductions that will very probably bring the total reductions in the House, in the 15 bills for fiscal 1968, to something approaching $6,000,000,000, not all which of, however, will hold through the conference stages.

***Expenditure impact.*—Of course, not all of *such a $6,000,000,000* of House reduction against fiscal 1968 budget *appropriation* requests would translate into an *equal* reduction from the budget estimate of *expenditures* (disbursements) *during* the same fiscal year 1968, for the simple reason that, like the normal pattern of events, it was not expected, and thus not estimated that anywhere near the full amounts requested for appropriation for fiscal 1968 would actually also be paid out within the same (fiscal 1968) year. Carryover unexpended balances for expenditure in subsequent years are a normal thing. But, generally speaking, a reduction in appropriation is nonetheless a reduction in proposed spending—in either the same year, the year following, or beyond.**

A summary of the bill totals follows:

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION BILL TOTALS, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF OCT. 16, 1967

[Does not include any back-door type appropriations, or permanent appropriations[1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	All figures are rounded amounts		
	Bills for fiscal 1967	Bills for fiscal 1968	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered	$14,411,000,000	[2 3] $124,163,000,000	$138,574,000,000
2. Amounts in 14 bills passed by House	14,238,000,000	[2 3] 120,347,000,000	134,585,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−173,000,000	−3,816,000,000	−3,989,000,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered	14,533,000,000	[2 3] 124,234,000,000	138,767,000,000
2. Amounts in 13 bills passed by Senate	14,457,000,000	[2 3] 123,374,000,000	137,831,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−76,000,000	−860,000,000	−936,000,000
4. Compared with House amounts in these 13 bills	+219,000,000	+3,134,000,000	+3,353,000,000
C. Final actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered	14,533,000,000	[3] 85,955,000,000	100,488,000,000
2. Amounts approved in 7 bills enacted	14,394,000,000	[3] 84,094,000,000	98,488,000,000
3. Comparison—With corresponding budget requests	−139,000,000	−1,861,000,000	−2,000,000,000

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $15,212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968.

[2] Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget, $980,000,000; House bill, $925,000,000; Senate bill, $955,000,000) and for grants-in-aid for airports (budget, $75,000,000; House bill, $65,000,000; Senate bill, $75,000,000).

[3] And participation sales authorizations as follows: Total authorizations requested in budget, $4,300,000,000; total in House bills, $1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, $4,085,000,000; total enacted, $750,000,000.

SECTIONS 2 THROUGH 5 OF THE RESOLUTION

Sections 2 through 5 of the accompanying resolution present for the consideration of the House a number of selected economy proposals: a *temporary* general stop-order on new projects and activities and on deferrable procurement items; reductions in civilian personnel; absorption of increased civilian pay costs that would arise from the pay bill voted by the House last week; and reductions in research and development activities. These are submitted at this time especially in response to the desire manifested by a majority of the House when an earlier continuing resolution was debated and recommitted (without specific instructions) to the Committee on Appropriations on September 27, and the further debate had on October 3 when the substitute for the recommitted resolution was debated and adopted.

The committee report (No. 724, of September 28) on the substitute resolution stated:

"The committee will carefully review the appropriation actions of the session and determine whether or not it may, prior to adjournment, recommend recisions of appropriations previously made, giving consideration to the latest revenue outlook and other economic factors at that time."

In the subsequent House floor debate of October 3, various possible approaches, in response to the expressed desire for budgetary reductions beyond the multi-billion dollar reductions made and in prospect in the 15 appropriation bills, were discussed. The possibility of the rescission of funds previously appropriated was discussed. Postponements, deferrals, and stretchouts were mentioned. Expenditure ceilings were debated. It was stated also that consideration would be given to a more generalized approach as against line item rescissions, deferrals, or stretchouts.

Some committee meetings have been held in respect to those appropriations which have been enacted into law with the object of exploring specific rescissions and absorption possibilities. But with only 5 of the 15 appropriation bills cleared to the President it is not feasible to deal with the matter of rescissions on a line item basis even if it were otherwise determined upon. The amounts to be appropriated in the other 10 bills are not yet known; many of the items are still subject to conference adjustment, and some of course are not yet out of committee. A piecemeal or partial approach on a line item basis does not seem either logical or practical.

In the circumstances, then, what the Committee has done is submit some economy proposals on a general across-the-boards basis, but limited and pinpointed as to the objects involved except that in respect to Section 4 dealing with absorption of the civilian pay raise, wide latitude would be allowed to the Executive branch to make room for the absorption. This would comport with the practice of the past in connection with supplemental requests in the latter part of a fiscal year in which a general pay raise has been enacted in the sense that heavy emphasis is always put on absorptions, and provisions permitting transfers between appropriations to enable substantial absorptions within existing funds are commonplace in supplemental pay raise appropriation bills.

Approximate savings

There will be, of course, great interest in a dollar total of savings to be made under the terms of this resolution. Only a very rough approximation can be made, primarily because so many of the regular annual ap-

propriation bills are still awaiting final congressional action. Other contingencies and uncertainties are involved in any effort to arrive at precise numbers.

Briefly, the effect of section 2 is completely beyond reasonable estimation; section 3 should result in savings of roughly $560 million under the assumptions and caveats noted below; on the basis of H.R. 7977, as passed the House, section 4 would save $625 million; again with the assumptions and caveats noted below, section 5 would probably result in savings of $325 million. Thus, a very rough total, recognizing the uncertainties, would be on the order of $1,510 million after consideration of all other House action on appropriation bills to date, or $2,850 million disregarding reductions made to date.

The object and general dimensions and import of Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 are explained somewhat more fully in the paragraphs that follow.

SECTION 2—TEMPORARY SUSPENSIONS

Section 2 is in the nature of a temporary restraining order—during the 30-day period of the resolution—against making obligations for any *new* construction, research, demonstration, training, service or similar project or activity—with certain generally delineated areas of exception; against making any obligation for procurements that can be temporarily postponed without impairing the national defense or welfare; and against hiring any new civilian personnel—again, with certain stated areas of exception. The major thrust of Section 2 is a general foregoing—a general "stop-order"—on making contracts of various sorts until the appropriation bills and other fiscal actions, and the amounts thereof, are legislatively finalized and become applicable to the functions of Government.

To some extent, the provision dealing with *new* projects or activities is duplicative of a prohibition customarily carried in continuing resolutions—and carried in the one now in effect—that forbids initiation of new projects or activities until they are provided in a regular bill in due course. But Section 2 is more stringent with regard to the 10 bills still in Congress and it also has application to the 5 bills already enacted.

SECTION 3—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT

Estimated Federal executive branch civilian employment, projected as of the end of fiscal year 1968, is 2,881,500 as shown in the 1968 budget. Of this total, 2,615,000 are permanent full-time employees and 266,500 are other than permanent full-time employees. The total estimated pay and benefits for these Federal civilian employees, as reflected in the 1968 budget, is some $23,350,000,000.

There is a widespread and long-held belief among many Members and others that some further reduction in civilian personnel positions would be a good thing—and of course effect some economies. An across-the-board reduction of 5 percent, required by section 3 of the accompanying resolution, applied to the total estimated cost of personnel compensation and benefits would presumably save approximately $1,170,000,000. Actual savings, however, will be some lesser amount because of the exemptions from this reduction of employment relating directly to the military effort in Southeast Asia and of employment required for the protection of life and property, the impact of which cannot be readily determined. The best rough estimate which can be provided under the circumstances is that the saving could approximate $900,000,000 or perhaps slightly less. The reductions in numbers of employees, or more precisely, in number of positions, would probably be in the neighborhood of 110,000. Amounts withheld from obligation under this section are rescinded.

It must be noted that the reductions which the House has made in the 12 appropriation bills for fiscal 1968, passed thus far, directly related to civilian employment, amount to about $340,000,000 involving some 42,000 positions—very roughly calculated. In instances where reductions made in the regular bills have already, or will result in a cut of 5 percent in budgeted civilian personnel compensation and benefits, the general reduction levied by Section 3 of this resolution would not require a further reduction.

It should be possible to achieve a great deal of the reduction by failing to fill vacancies which occur in great numbers. The chairman of the Civil Service Commission told the Committee earlier this year that the turnover rate has increased sharply in the last couple of years. He said that the "new hires" rate for fiscal 1968 was figured at 21 percent, involving some 788,000 employees.

In distributing personnel reductions required by this section, it is the intent of the Committee to require first reductions in departmental administration. The fountainheads of the ever-increasing bureaucracy should sustain the first blow. In this context, departmental administration means those elements of cabinet offices (or offices of agency heads) and other subordinate offices which have responsibility for policy, planning, and general management of departmental (or agency) functions, i.e., that force which is engaged in general supervisory and administrative direction and control of the various field forces. In turn, field forces are those engaged either directly or indirectly in locally executing law or other delegated or assigned functions. This definition is somewhat more broad than the former "seat of the government", or current reporting on the basis of location within the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Significant headquarters organizations exist far from Washington, D.C., particularly, of course, Defense activities.

In making reductions in civilian employment, the section specifically provides that contract employment shall not be resorted to in substitution. Further, it is the intent of the Committee that military personnel are not to be assigned in substitution in the case of the Departments of Defense and Transportation.

SECTION 4—COST OF INCREASED PAY

Section 4 of the accompanying resolution simply provides for the absorption, by the Executive branch, of the added cost of such civilian pay increase as may be enacted. The bill pending before Congress (H.R. 7977), as voted by the House last week, is estimated to cost $625,000,000 in the fiscal year 1968. That bill carried an amendment requiring absorption of the cost of the pay bill in fiscal 1968 to the extent that it exceeded the President's cost estimate—an excess of some $78 million. Section 4 of the accompanying resolution merely extends the absorption feature to the whole cost. Thus it is the intent of this section that the absorption be within aggregate amounts of appropriations and spending authority otherwise available during fiscal year 1968.

SECTION 5—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

In recent years the Federal Government has poured billions of dollars into public and private institutions and organizations, including colleges and universities, to finance research of one kind or another. In 1940, the Government spent only $74 million for research and development. During World War II the research, development, and production cost of the atomic bomb was about two billion dollars over a period of about three years. We are now spending more than eight times that much in a given year. Since World War II, federal appropriations for research and development have gone up from about $800 million annually to about $17.5 billion.

The purpose of Section 5 of the resolution, the research and development provision, is to save some money and manpower at a time of fiscal crisis, force a reevaluation of research projects, the resetting of priorities, the deferral of projects not essential at this time, and the elimination of marginal projects. It provides a limitation on research and development activities of ninety percent of the budget estimates (as shown in Special Analysis I). Funds withheld from obligation under this section are rescinded.

The limitation is applied to budget estimates so as not to further reduce funds where appropriations have already been or will be reduced by ten percent or more. Reductions in specific programs and projects, made in the regular annual bills, are not to be restored in whole or in part in the reevaluation and resetting of priorities stemming from application of this section.

The impact of Section 5 on the Department of Defense is calculated to effect a total reduction of roughly $340 million, including the $164 million reduction already made by the Congress. The intention of the clause, excluding items "directly relating to the current military effort in Southeast Asia or directly relating to the development, test, and evaluation of specific weapons systems" is to exclude funds under "Operational Systems Development", "Engineering Development" and "Advanced Development". The phrase "Funds available to" means "Total obligational authority".

Specific savings to result from the application of this provision are dependent upon a number of factors including Congressional action yet to be completed on several appropriation bills. It can be assumed, with reasonable assurance, that as a result of the operation of this section additional obligational authority will be withheld to the extent of about $325,000,000. House or Congressional action to date on the appropriation bills reflect reductions of just over $1,000,000,000 in obligational authority in R. and D. areas. Thus, if House actions can be sustained, and this section is applied, total reductions in research and development will approximate $1,325,000,000.

SECTION 6—OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Section 6 provides that obligations incurred by the Office of Economic Opportunity under the authority of the continuing resolution may not exceed the rate that would be provided by an appropriation of $1,400 million for fiscal year 1968. Without this special limitation the rate could be as high as that provided for by an appropriation of $1,687,500,000, the sum appropriated for fiscal year 1967. The limitation related to $1,400 million will provide for a continuation of the program at a funding rate approximately the same as that which has actually prevailed for the first 3 months of this fiscal year.

COMMITTEE APPROXIMATION OF FISCAL YEAR 1968 DOLLAR VALUE OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION

Topic	Rough value (gross)	Credit cuts made in the regular bills—by House	Residual value computed
Section:			
3. Civilian personnel costs, 5 percent from the budget estimates (with exceptions)	$900,000,000	−$340,000,000	$560,000,000
Defense, excluding Southeast Asia	(300,000,000)	(−166,000,000)	(134,000,000)
Nondefense	(600,000,000)	(−174,000,000)	(426,000,000)
4. Cost of increased civilian pay, absorb all of it (House version)	625,000,000		625,000,000
5. Research and development 10 percent from the budget estimates (with limited exceptions)	1,325,000,000	−1,000,000,000	325,000,000
Defense	(340,000,000)	(−164,000,000)	(176,000,000)
Nondefense	(985,000,000)	(−836,000,000)	(149,000,000)
Total	2,850,000,000	−1,340,000,000	1,510,000,000

Mr. Chairman, the debate here this afternoon has revealed that it is easy to be for economy in the abstract but often difficult to be for economy in some specific items. The pending bill would reduce appropriations by about $1.5 billion yet it has provoked a strong protest. At the same time postponements in appropriations totaling $5 billion in the abstract and without specification of where the cuts may be made seem not to produce so much concern in the House. Passing the buck to the executive branch for making reductions seems to be not too offensive to Members but specifing exactly where reductions ought to be made seems to cause great consternation. As Representatives of the people, we are not sent here to perform easy tasks. We were sent here to grapple with the stern realities and make the hard decisions in respect to the spending of the taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma has moved that the reduction in personnel not be applied to the Post Office Department and to the collection of internal revenue. There is merit in his proposal. Please remember that the Committee on Appropriations was under mandate to bring in a bill to give the House an opportunity to practice economy and to make recisions. This we have done. The committee has provided the House with a vehicle.

The economy atmosphere of last week is somewhat altered when specific cuts came under scrutiny. The consequences of reductions are causing concern.

So here in this instance we have a very serious matter.

It is true, I believe, that some of the agencies are overstating the case, some of these "disaster" letters and fact sheets that are being passed around Congress are very impressive but somewhat misleading. That does not alter the fact that there is a great deal of merit in what Mr. Steed has said. I believe with Mr. Steed that some adjustments are in order. My object here is to try to put the whole problem in better perspective.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF NEW YORK TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. STEED

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rooney of New York to the amendments offered by Mr. Steed: Add the following: "law enforcement personnel and overseas personnel."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to the pending amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed] would further exempt all law enforcement personnel and overseas personnel. First, with regard to law enforcement personnel, we know what the situation is with regard to rampant crime in this country today. Are we going to ruin the efficiency of the FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Federal Prisons System, the Bureau of Narcotics, the Secret Service, the U.S. attorneys and marshals and all the agencies concerned with law enforcement?

Second, as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] remarked a while ago, when you bring back for firing the 800 Americans from overseas who are employed by the State Department, you will be committing financial suicide. When you discharge them you have to pay them for accrued annual leave, severance pay, and then pay all their expenses to come back with their families, their household equipment and automobile, which expenses will more than offset any savings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Miller of California yielded his time to Mr. Rooney of New York.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely thank the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] for yielding his time to me.

I have in my pocket a statement from the State Department indicating what this proposed legislation would do; not only would they have to institute a reduction in force of 800 Americans from overseas posts, but they would also have to fire 500 local employees, many of whom have been in the employ of the United States for a considerable number of years, and are highly valuable and trustworthy.

One of the compelling reasons for my offering of this amendment is to make it crystal clear that the pending resolution will not apply to the agencies I have mentioned. As an example, I set forth at this point a statement which I requested of the FBI indicating the consequences if House Joint Resolution 888 were to be applied against the FBI:

Effect of House Joint Resolution 888 on Its Funds Available Personnel and Programs

1. Sections 3 and 4 of the resolution pending before the House would mean an over-all reduction in funds pending before Congress of—$13,029,105.00. (5% cut in salaries and personnel benefits under Sec. 3 of $8,129,105 and pay raise cost absorption under Sec. 4 of $4,900,000).

2. This reduction in funds could only be effected by reducing its personnel, provided in its request pending before Congress, by 1,748 full-year employees (681 Special Agents and 1,067 Clerks).

"To accomplish this reduction in the eight months left in F.Y. 1968 would require (1) eliminating 2,643 planned appointments during the remainder of the F.Y. 1968 (175 Special Agents and 2,468 Clerks) and (2) removing from the rolls 11/1/67 a total of 1,688 employees (979 Special Agents and 709 Clerks)."

3. A savings of but $3,129,105 would be possible by the "not filling vacanies" approach—or 38.5% of the total required by resolution pending of $8,129,105. The remaining $5,000,000 or 61.5% would have to be effected through a reduction in force.

4. Such drastic cutbacks in personnel would require the FBI to sharply curtail or even eliminate its efforts in the organized crime, civil rights and general crime area of investigative activity. It would also have to cease or drastically curtail its service functions to other agencies and local law enforcement authorities such as fingerprint searches, name checking and scientific examinations. It would provide a "Hey Day" for Crime when the President and the citizenry are crying for crime control emphasis.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to General Release No. 153 that the Post Office Department put out today. It points out that business as usual is going on in the Post Office Department because a delegation of eight men headed by Assistant Postmaster General Dick Murphy is going to go to Bogotá to try to tell the Latin American nations how to speed up their mail.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that they stay home and speed up the mail here rather than going to Bogotá.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski].

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, sections 3 and 4 of House Joint Resolution 888 as reported strike at the very heart of our postal service. The impact on the postal service certainly could not have been understood when this language was written in the resolution.

Nearly $450 million the Post Office Department would have to absorb would come out of the pockets of the city letter carriers, the rural carriers, the clerks, the mail handlers, and the other postal employees. These employees are the key to the entire postal operation. Eighty percent of postal expenses are for employees' salaries and benefits.

If a meat-ax reduction is imposed, as this resolution would do, and applied directly to employment, it would simply mean the loss of 100,000 or more postal jobs.

The Postmaster General has both the authority and the responsibility to cut service under these circumstances. The Post Office Department has a monopoly on first-class mail, and must deliver this top priority mail. If he has only enough money to hire enough employees to handle first-class mail, he will have to cut off all other lower priority mail. He certainly could not accept the vast quantities of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail and store it.

I have heard statements that any major reduction in service of a Postmaster General is "blackmail." I would say that the shoe is on the other foot; an arbitrary cut of $450 million in funds for personal services would force the Postmaster General, against his will—and contrary to the responsibilities of his office—to reduce or eliminate services he is ready, willing, and able to provide the public if only he is given the wherewithal.

Mr. Chairman, these glaring oversights in House Joint Resolution 888 would be corrected by the amendments offered by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Appropriations, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed]. As chairman of the substantive committee, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I urge the adoption of those amendments.

I include the following statistical statement at this point:

Impact of House Joint Resolution 888 by Appropriation

1. *Administration and Regional Operation.*—Congress reduced the Fiscal Year 1968 personal service estimate by 5 percent. The reduction would have no additional impact on this area. However, the absorption of funding pay cost would require a cutback of 816 positions that were approved for this appropriation. A reduction in force would be required.

2. *Operations.*—The net impact on this appropriation for maintaining personal service costs at a 95 percent level would be a reduction of $218,166,000. This would require the elimination of 66,900 positions. The combined impact would be a reduction in funds available to maintain present level of service of $444,530,000 and elimination of 131,400 positions. This would require—

[Millions of dollars]

a. Embargo on 2d-, 3d-, and 4th-class mail	300.0
b. Eliminate Saturday delivery service on business routes	2.5
c. Provide only one delivery per day on five days of the week on business routes	1.7
d. Eliminate Saturday delivery on city residential routes	39.1
e. Convert all rural delivery to 3 days a week (language clarifying authority may be needed)	33.5
f. Eliminate delivery on 1 additional day per week on all city routes (residential and business)	28.0
g. Forgo planned extensions of rural routes	1.5
h. Do not convert presently eligible homes from curb to door delivery service	4.5
i. Return to 1966 levels by reconverting converted door delivery service back to curb	8.5
j. Freeze city delivery—undertake no extensions	13.0
k. Close 1,000 post offices and 50 percent of our contract stations	4.8
l. Close all windows at first- and second-class post offices 1 day a week	6.0
m. Restrict Saturday collection service to the Sunday schedule	1.3
Total	444.4

3. *Supplies and Services.*—The net impact on this appropriation for maintaining personal service costs at a 95 percent level would be a reduction of $556,000. This would require the elimination of 186 positions. The cost of absorption of the pending pay legislation would be $425,000 and the elimination of 142 positions. The combined impact would be a reduction in funds available of $981,000 and 328 positions. This would cause a reduction in force and the disruption of the postal supply service.

4. *Research, Development, and Engineering.*—The reduction in this account would be $2,314,000 for a flat 10 percent cut plus $206,000 and 34 positions to cover absorption of pending pay legislation. The total reduction in funds available would be $2,520,000. This cut would impede the Department's effort to modernize the postal service.

Summary of impact

	Million
5-percent personnel costs and benefits	$218.7
10-percent reduction in research	2.3
Pay costs absorption	231.0
Total	452.0

Note.—Impact on service has been calculated on a January 1, 1968, implementation date.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Robison].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the full committee—if he has time to answer—what will be the result of this amendment with respect to the recent hearings that the Steed subcommittee, on which I served, has had with respect to where savings could reasonably be made in the postal operation.

Does the chairman still hope that our subcommittee will continue on with that exercise?

Mr. MAHON. I am making no commitment at this time as to what the committee will do on rescissions or reductions in the future.

We have a bill before us now proposing certain reductions and we will await developments.

Here is an opportunity for Members to express their will on the vote for this amendment and on other amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Steed amendment. Mr. Chairman, just a few days ago the Members of this House followed our committee in adopting a new pay increase for Federal employees, including the postal employees.

You apparently believed us then when we told you about the tremendous problems that the Post Office Department is facing.

I submit to you that the worst kind of phony economy would be to cripple this very important Department of the Federal Government at a time when it is struggling with the heaviest burdens it has had in the history of this country. I guarantee you that the business community of this country is not going to thank this Congress if the mail service grinds to a screeching halt in the major business centers of this country and that is what could happen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Steed amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that there are 50 Members of this House who have not made a speech to postal organizations in the last few months telling them how much they loved them and how much they are in favor of comparability.

Yet, if this provision stands it will result in the immediate layoff of 130,000 postal employees. We will be saying to them, "Boys, we love you; to prove it, we gave you a raise last week—and now we are going to fire you." This amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Steed amendment.

I spoke at great length earlier today, in regard to what this amendment will do to the postal service and the Treasury Department and, therefore, I hope the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Steed amendment.

I would also like to offer an amendment to exempt air traffic controllers.

Not too long ago there was a terrible tragedy which resulted in 74 people being killed, including the Secretary of the Navy and his family.

I fly in and out of airports three times a week in a small plane and I know how essential air traffic control is. Are we going to cut back on that service and are we going to wait for the next crash for the sake of economy?

We held an investigation and everybody said that this is a terrible situation. Let us not cut back on air control and the people we need to keep these terrible, preventable accidents from occurring.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma exempting the Post Office Department from the provisions of the resolution now being considered by the House.

Not to exempt the postal service would have a very serious impact on the Department. The resolution as has been pointed out by our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman Steed, would in effect call for the reduction of $452 million in the budget of the Department. The budget for the fiscal year 1968 has already been worked on by the House Committee on Appropriations under the leadership of Congressman Steed, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte]. These two members and their fellow colleagues on their subcommittee are the best informed Members of the Congress on matters affecting the operation of the Post Office Department. We should listen and follow their advice.

To save the amount of the reduction of $452 million that this resolution would force on the Department would take some drastic and I believe undesired action. The Department indicates that it would cause the elimination of 132,578 positions. In the face of the mounting volume of mail, such a reduction in personnel would be disastrous in providing adequate mail service to the general public.

In the judgment of the Department, this reduction would place an embargo on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail until June 30, 1968. In addition, a delivery of first class and airmail would be reduced from the present 6 days a week to 4 days a week for both business and individuals. Additional curtailments in service would also be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, the imposition of an embargo is the only equitable way to effect the changes required. First class and airmail may be handled only by the Post Office Department. So, it clearly has the responsibility for maintaining those services. The users of these services pay in postage more than their cost. It is only reasonable that these services should be maintained to the fullest degree possible.

Several trillions of dollars worth of currency, checks, contracts, and valuable material of all kinds move as first-class mail. The maintenance of near normal first-class service would seem to be the highest priority in the public interest—for the well-being of the economy, of business and of the public generally.

The above arguments to exempt the Post Office Department from the provisions have been detailed by the Department. I believe it knows better than other sources what the resolution entails for its own Department. I am convinced by its position and the information developed by the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman STEED and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman CONTE. I join them in support of the pending amendment and trust that it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the House will work its will on these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 67, noes 90.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY of New York and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 102, noes 131.

So the amendment to the amendments was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 111, noes 72.

So the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is one of the tragedies of our procedure here that we could not get a record vote on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] because a great many of our Republican friends like to have their cake and eat it too. They want to talk about crime in the streets. I believe it is fair to point out that of the 121 people voting to cut the FBI about 100 were Republicans.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York. I think he wants to talk about the Farm Bureau.

Mr. RESNICK. I had only 30 seconds to go into the air-traffic problem. The gentleman from Ohio flies quite frequently, as I do, and as most Members of this House do.

Does the gentleman not believe this is certainly essential to life and limb?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, I certainly do. All those Republicans who voted that way had better hope that I never get killed in an airlines crash, because I will haunt the hell out of them.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman pointed out the effect of the defeat of the Rooney of New York amendment, as to the FBI.

I should like also to point out that we now will have to cut civilian activities in Vietnam. Even the military men have told us those are just as vital to our military involvement in Vietnam as our other programs.

Under this program there is to be an across-the-board cut. In my opinion, it will cut a very vital aid program in Vietnam, which means more to the ultimate war and peace in that nation than our military effort.

Mr. HAYS. I used the illustration a little while ago of a "Confederate $3 bill." That is no reflection on the Confederacy, but they are not worth very much except as curios.

I saw one of my dear friends from Chicago who voted the other way. As chairman of the State Department Subcommittee, I believe I ought to write a letter, to make sure he does not use any car and chauffeur on his next trip overseas. We can save a little money there.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I was pleased to join the gentleman in supporting the Rooney of New York amendment. It is noteworthy that the Rooney of New York amendment extended to law enforcement across the board, and it would have safeguarded the retention of personnel in the Narcotics Bureau, as an example, which covers a serious and most important nationwide problem.

A vote against the Rooney of New York amendment was a vote against effective narcotics control.

Mr. HAYS. In other words, those people were voting for more "hippies" and more "pot."

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I should like to ask any Member who is in a position to know whether or not the language in this resolution which excepts military spending in South Vietnam would also except such civilian programs as AID in South Vietnam. I believe this is vitally important for the RECORD.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. If our aid in South Vietnam is not directly related to the war in Southeast Asia I am unable to comprehend the language. There is no cut whatever in South Vietnam, either in military or civilian personnel, because it is directly related to the current war effort in Southeast Asia.

The military effort and the civil governmental effort and otherwise are all a part of the same tactics.

There is no intent, and no language, which would support a cut of any war effort in Southeast Asia.

Mr. JOELSON. Would the gentleman say that a school in South Vietnam or Thailand is directly related to our military effort in Southeast Asia?

Mr. MAHON. I do not know what kind of school that would be. This would be a matter of decision by the executive branch, under the language of the resolution.

I submit that this is too vital a subject to speculate on.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield.

Mr. RESNICK. Would the gentleman, being on the Committee on Appropriations, know, would this also affect the school lunch and school milk programs?

Mr. JOELSON. I am not dealing with those now. I think it would affect every program except those specifically exempted, and those are not exempted.

Mr. RESNICK. They would not come under the heading of protecting the public health and life?

Mr. JOELSON. I did not take the time to answer questions, but to ask them. I might say that I have received "questionable answers."

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PUCINSKI

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PUCINSKI: On page 3, line 8, after "those" strike out "directly relating to the current military effort in" and substitute "on active duty in".

Mr. PUCINSKI. What this amendment would do, Mr. Chairman, is simply provide that the same kind of cuts we are applying to all civilian personnel, including the personnel that the gentleman from Ohio was talking about so vehemently a moment ago, would also apply to civilian personnel in the Pentagon, the State Department, and the USIA and all of the other agencies except if they are on active duty in Southeast Asia.

I really do not know what the rationale is to blanketedly exclude at a time when we are trying to cut expenses here and trying to avoid a huge deficit—I do not know what the rationale is in blanketedly excepting and excluding from this legislation every civilian who happens to work at the Pentagon. You know as well as I do that if there is some way to tie themselves into Vietnam, they will find it. I do not know how many thousands of people work in the Pentagon and these related agencies, but I would guess and estimate that it involves probably 30,000 to 40,000 people. It seems to me there is just no logical explanation as to why the civilians working here in the United States, in the convenience and comfort of their homes and within the safety of the Pentagon should not bear the same brunt of helping to reduce Government expenses as everyone else.

It seems to me a perfectly logical amendment. It will not do any violence to our Vietnam effort. It will in no way adversely affect the war effort. It does not cover soldiers but only civilian personnel. It does not cover the civilian personnel, as the gentleman from New Jersey mentioned awhile ago, stationed in Thailand, Burma, Vietnam, and Southeast Asia. It only applies to civilian personnel serving here stateside. I just cannot see what the rationale is in exempting these people. I will be glad to yield to the chairman of the committee who can perhaps explain what the rationale is in blanketedly excluding these tens of thousands of people who are really not running any kind of risk in the war effort. I wonder if the chairman or some other member of the committee would be good enough to explain this to me.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois simply narrows the exemption which we have given. We have been most anxious not in any way to hinder the war effort.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We are not in any way hindering the war effort here. On the contrary my amendment will free more funds to expedite and increase the war effort.

Mr. MAHON. This bill restricts this and, in my judgment, applies it only to the people in Southeast Asia. There are people in Okinawa, in Guam, and the Philippines and other places——

Mr. PUCINSKI. How would we restrict the war effort by saying the civilians in the Pentagon will make the same contribution to a reduction in Government expenditures as every other Government employee across the board, including the security people that the gentleman from Ohio just talked about?

Mr. MAHON. There are people serving in many areas, such as Guam, Okinawa, and others related to the war effort. Our proposal is that we not restrict them in any way.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I will accept an amendment to include those territories, but I do not think the people in Washington here in the air-conditioned comfort of the Pentagon should be excluded merely because in some remote way they are related in a job that has something to do with Vietnam.

As the gentleman knows, I am one of the strongest supporters of the war effort in Vietnam and I shall continue to do everything possible to help us win this war against communism as quickly as possible. I firmly believe that reducing nonmilitary expenses is one way of helping make sure that our boys in Vietnam will have everything they possibly need to win the war. I hope the chairman will understand that we are in no way interfering with the war effort when we say that stateside civilians working outside the war zone should make the same contribution toward economy that we are asking all other American civilians to make.

I just do not believe that these people should be excluded. There was some discussion that not everyone has to be in the war zone to contribute to the war effort; that our boys need help from many quarters. I agree with this but all of those in supporting roles are well compensated in their jobs and I do not see how their effectiveness will be curtailed if we ask them to make the same contribution toward reducing the anticipated deficit for 1968 that we are asking all Americans to make. I do not know why these civilians should be given special treatment when their employment in no way places them in any danger as are our boys in Vietnam.

While I am on the subject of economy, Mr. Chairman, after the last debate on this matter, one of the Chicago newspapers said in its editorial that I said during debate that the wheels of Government would come to a grinding halt if Congress failed to reduce spending by $3.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I never said that. On the contrary, I have been calling for a reduction of $7 billion. What I did say the last time we debated this subject was that if Congress failed to extend the continuing resolution under which our Government is functioning until all appropriations bills are approved the wheels of Government would come to a grinding halt. Everyone here knows that if the continuing resolution is not approved before October 23, most agencies will not be able to expend any more money until their appropriations for 1968 are approved. I want the record to show I continue to support reduction in Government spending until the Vietnam war is brought to a successful conclusion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this limits the exemption too severely, in my judgment. It would tend to impair or embarrass the war effort in Southeast Asia and certainly would tend to impair our military readiness otherwise. Of course, Mr. Chairman, the rank and file of civilians, the great bulk of the employees in the Department of Defense in Washington are not exempt. Some Members have pointed out the fact, and our report states, that the departmental headquarters would be a good place at which to make reductions. However, in my opinion it would be most unwise for us to risk the application of any cuts to personnel engaged in the war effort.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment now close.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] for yielding to me at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out the fact that all of the people who are supporting the war effort are not located in the Pentagon. There are many thousands of people who are supporting this effort in the naval shipyards of the United States, making necessary repairs to our naval ships in order to keep these ships in service in Southeast Asia. There are people in the ammunition depots and many other vital war-supporting activities. In my opinion the kind of chance-taking language that is concocted by this amendment would certainly be the last thing that the Congress of the United States would want to approve and thereby risk withdrawing support to our fighting men which they need to protect their lives and safety.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I renew my motion that all debate now close on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, most of the discussion with respect to the proposal which has been presented to us by the Committee on Appropriations relates, it seems to me, primarily to sections 3 and 4—but, there are some exceptions that are contained in sections 3 and 4 that I think we now have lost sight of.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little amazed that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], does not defend his proposal with a little more diligence.

I say that, Mr. Chairman, because contention has been made that this would impose a restriction upon the number of people that could be employed, for instance, by the FAA in Air Controller groups. We have been given to understand that it is going to lead to a great deal more accidents if such a proposal is adopted.

However, Mr. Chairman, as I read both of these sections—and I think it is the intention of the chairman and the intention of the Committee on Appropriations—that position involving the safety of human life and the protection of property is exempt from the restriction. Mr. Chairman, am I right in that assumption?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Wisconsin is eminently correct in his last statement as to life and safety. But he is strictly in error and out of order in his criticism. This language appears at several places in the resolution which is pending before us. Of course, the air controllers would probably be considered as exempt as well as others whose positions relate to the safety of human life and to the protection of property.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And would not that also involve the law enforcement agencies? It seems to me that the basic reason that we have law enforcement is for the protection of the safety of individuals and for the protection of property.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I think, to some extent it does relate to law enforcement, particularly the people who are actually physically engaged in the business of law enforcement as contrasted to those people who, for example, are involved in the gathering of law enforcement statistics.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] talked about law enforcement officers and crime on the streets, and that this legislation was going to interfere, and there would be greater crime on the streets. I thought the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had taken precautions against that. All I want to know is whether I am right in interpreting what the committee is doing, or if the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], a member of the committee, is right in his interpretation? Who is right?

Mr. MAHON. I would say that the resolution itself, and the committee report, speak for the position of the committee, and make clear that people in occupations relating to the safety of human life and the protection of property are excluded. Many of the allegations of harmful effects of this resolution cannot be substantiated, but since we have freedom of speech generally I did not want to take the time of the House in repeating and repeating what is perfectly obvious.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I can only hope then that we make the RECORD clear so that the public understands that some of these references to what this bill will do are far from reality.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for making this point. There have been a number of instances this afternoon at which certain employees of the Department of Transportation, particularly employees of the Federal Aviation Administration, have been mentioned. I read section 3 as does the gentleman. It exempts those involved in the safety of human life, or the protection of property, and as I understand the intent that would exempt those FAA employees directly involved with aircraft traffic control, maintaining flight standards, and the safety of aircraft otherwise. It would also exempt those who are directly engaged in the safety of railroads and highways and automobiles. Also, most of the personnel of the National Transportation Safety Board would be excluded.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his comments and clarification of the provisions and intent of the proposal now before us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, listening to the colloquy a few moments ago I cannot think of anything more phony than the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has just agreed with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] that the language stated and restated in the resolution takes care of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other agencies dealing with law enforcement and public safety.

Moreover, I am interested in the fact that only last week the House approved a pay increase bill which carried as one of its provisions the absorption of a good deal of the increase in pay by the various departments and agencies of this Government.

Now, today, by the exemptions being written into this resolution, some of you are running away from the bill you voted for last week. If consistency is a virtue it is being abused here today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 3, after line 18, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 4. Funds available or becoming available to the United States Corps of Engineers shall not be available for the disposal, the discharge or the dumping into Lake Michigan of any polluted dredged material."

And renumber the following sections.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I enter this zone of contention with some trepidation.

This is a simple amendment. This is an amendment which will stop the further pollution of Lake Michigan by the Corps of Engineers. Realistically, my amendment should be directed to all of the Great Lakes. The Corps of Engineers ought to be prohibited from dumping polluted dredgings into any of the Great Lakes because the condition of the Great Lakes is becoming a national disgrace. The Corps of Engineers is adding to the contamination of the lakes by the dredgings they are dumping into them.

But I happen to know something about Lake Michigan and that is the reason I have limited my amendment to the lake upon which my city is located.

This amendment will stop the Corps of Army Engineers from continuing—and I use the word "continuing"—to dump polluted material into Lake Michigan, which the Engineers admit they are now doing.

In a hearing last week before the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, General Woodbury of the Corps admitted the Engineers were transferring polluted material—definitely polluted material—from Indiana Harbor out into Lake Michigan, dumping it into an area which is 8 miles off the coastline of Chicago and 4 miles from the cribs which are used as intakes for the drinking water for Chicago.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman would do better to get some other bill to add this amendment on because this is a pretty lame bill and in my opinion it should be defeated.

Mr. YATES. I share the gentleman's opinion about the bill, but it is the only vehicle at hand.

In the hearing last week it was admitted by the corps that their dredgings contained oil, pollution of all kinds, chemicals, detergents—all were being dumped into Lake Michigan.

The purpose of my amendment is to try to prevent the condition of Lake Michigan from deteriorating into the unhappy condition of Lake Erie. Did you know that Lake Erie is considered to be a dying lake? Do you know that it is suffocating from the incredible amounts of pollutants that are poured into it by industries and municipalities along its shores? There is a dead spot right in the center of Lake Erie where no fish live as a result of these pollutants. Lake Erie is becoming so foul that the area covering thousands of acres has no fish at all. Many of its bathing beaches are closed. And among the offenders who dump pollutants, chemicals, and all kinds of refuse into the lake is the Corps of Engineers through their dredgings.

My amendment would prohibit further pollution by the corps. I propose that they be prohibited from dumping polluted dredgings into the lake.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. If your amendment is adopted, will you join me in an effort to rescind the money for that Federal park that you are so strong for in my district that my people do not want?

Mr. YATES. I do not see how that bears on this question; but I hope the gentleman will join with me in preventing the further pollution of Lake Michigan along the dunes shore so that the people who use that area's bathing beaches can swim in clean water.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. What is the position of your Governor in Illinois on this matter that you are talking about of dumping this pollution?

Mr. YATES. I think the gentleman ought to address Governor Kerner directly. He would be glad to reply.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to something that the gentleman said facetiously, I am sure. He said that it was a simple amendment. It is also a very drastic amendment for it has the effect of stopping essential maintenance dredging required to maintain navigation in the numerous harbors and channels in the Lake Michigan area.

We spent $1 million in 1967 and we have $5 million in the bill this year for a pilot program by the Corps of Engineers to find out alternative ways of disposing of dredging materials without incurring prohibitive costs compared with the current program.

This pilot program is investigating all alternate disposal methods such as alongshore diked areas, disposal at some distance inland from the shore, and treatment methods and evaluating pollution abatement results.

Five localities have been selected for pilot programs including projects at Green Bay, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, and Great Sodus Bay. In the Chicago area, the use of on-shore disposal areas shows great promise and such areas are being actively explored in connection with the forthcoming maintenance dredging on the Calumet River.

As soon as an acceptable, alternate method of dredge disposal has been agreed upon, and at the earliest possible time, the corps plans to take appropriate budgetary action to secure the necessary funds.

Because of the high additional costs that would be involved in using alternate disposal methods, it is essential that the results of the pilot program be available before any drastic action is taken to disrupt and stop the current maintenance program of the corps. For example, it is tentatively estimated that just for the 15 Lake Erie harbors it would require an initial outlay of $110 million to provide along-shore diked areas to handle 10 years of dredging. The added cost of amortizing these diked areas, plus the added handling cost of placing material in them, would increase the present annual cost from $3.5 million to about $19.5 million. To extend such a program for providing alternate disposal areas to the 108 channel and harbor projects in the Great Lakes area could result in hundreds of millions of dollars in additional cost.

I would also like to state that the corps has been disposing of dredged material for decades by using selected dumping areas in the Great Lakes which have been selected in coordination with city and State authorities so that the dumping will not interfere with beaches or water intakes. And the corps claims that it has no evidence anywhere on the Great Lakes that the dumping has adversely affected either beaches or water intakes.

Certainly, until we can devise workable alternatives, we must maintain the navigation channels and, therefore, I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I join with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works in opposing this amendment. I thought this afternoon we were engaged in an economy wave here. But here is an amendment that will cost the Federal Government a great deal more, as has been pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. We have already appropriated $1 million to initiate a pilot program in 1967 in an effort to solve the problems of disposal of dredging materials in the Great Lakes area.

This amendment would have the drastic effect of stopping essential maintenance dredging planned this year on several harbors and channels in Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan. It would have a serious adverse effect on the navigation traffic in the Lake Michigan area.

As the gentleman has said, this year we have in the public works bill $5 million more to continue with the pilot program. This is where we will get the answers to the problems that are affecting the gentleman from Illinois and many more Members who are concerned with the Great Lakes. In the meantime we must continue to perform the essential maintenance dredging which would be prohibited by the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the arbitrary curtailment of time for debating my amendment is unfortunate.

My amendment was a direct statement against further pollution of Lake Michigan. The arguments against it by my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee will permit the pollution to continue. They point to an appropriation approved for the Corps of Engineers to engage in a study of alternate methods of dumping their dredged spoil which will take another year at least. They argue that the present practice of the Engineers in dumping polluted spoil into the lake should be continued in interim. "Let pollution continue," they contend, "until we have a feasible alternate."

Mr. Chairman, that is the same argument that has been made over the years and decades in an attempt to justify the increasing pollution of the lakes. When will it be stopped if not now? This is not a new threat. As a matter of fact, the Engineers received $1,000,000 from the Congress last year for their first study of alternate methods to dumping in the lakes. This year they have received $5,000,000 in this budget. Will the same study be continued for the next year—and the following year—and years thereafter while the same disgraceful dumping of pollutants continues? When would my colleagues stop the practice—if they would? I say the time is now, not some uncertain time years hence.

Lake Erie is pretty well contaminated already. Are the other Great Lakes to be subjected to the same slow death while the Engineers, who already must know what other methods are available, continue their various ruinous methods of disposing of dredgings.

The Great Lakes combined are the single greatest water resource in this Nation. We have been most profligate in our dealing with them. It is time we took determined and specific action to protect the lakes from the spoilers—including the Corps of Army Engineers.

I include the following at this point:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Oct. 3, 1967]

DEATH SENTENCE FOR LAKE DESPITE POLLUTION BATTLE—REPRIEVE 10 YEARS OFF

(By Henry DeZutter)

None of the states bordering Lake Michigan has promised to control algae-inducing pollutants for at least 10 years.

And it is algae-inducing pollutants that experts believe are killing the lake.

The fact that there are no commitments to control them has been discovered in an examination of pollution control programs submitted to the federal government by Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin and Michigan.

The state programs call for reducing most industrial and municipal wastes by 1972. But the key, algae-inducing pollutants—called nutrients—wouldn't be controlled until 1977.

Nutrients fertilize the growth of the stringy, green algae that are slowly choking Lake Michigan to death.

Vinton Bacon, superintendent of the Metropolitan Sanitary District—which keeps Chicago-area wastes out of the lake—says the 10-year deadline is "incredibly short-sighted."

"A lake lives but once," he said in an interview, "and this program could stamp the seal on the death warrant for Lake Michigan."

Water experts contend that continued algae fertilization would soon kill Lake Michigan, as it did Lake Erie.

The nutrients that feed lake-choking algae come mainly from detergents. They also are present in sewage, even after it is treated up to present standards, and some industrial waste.

Indiana's program, already approved by the U.S. Interior Sec. Stewart Udall and hailed as stringent, does not mention nutrient control for its Lake Michigan tributaries.

The three states that envision nutrient-control have written into their programs "escape" clauses permitting extensions of the 1977 deadline, if technology doesn't produce a financially feasible solution. Their plans still await federal approval.

Michigan's nutrient-control proposal filed with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration states:

"The long-term objective is to require that phosphates traceable to all industrial and municipal waste sources be controlled on or before June 1, 1977."

Wisconsin's promise is a little weaker:

"The department (Wisconsin Department of Resource Development) is vitally interested in the nutrient problem and hopes that a solution is available in the next 10 years but can make no commitments at this time."

The Illinois proposal, prepared by the Illinois Sanitary Water Board, says:

"The reduction of nutrients . . . should be accomplished, where deemed necessary, within the next 10 years, or as practical technical methods are developed."

Although experts have warned for years that the algae menace poses the greatest ultimate threat to Lake Michigan, it has been virtually neglected until recently.

Even the joint U.S.-Illinois-Indiana Conference on the pollution of southern Lake Michigan excluded the problem of nutrient pollution.

Public interest has escalated, though, as more and more of the stinking, slimy algae weeds have washed ashore—fouling beaches and interfering with swimming and boating.

More than an aesthetic nuisance, the algae also clog water intakes, increase water purification costs and choke off the oxygen supply from desirable fish life. When algae growth reaches a stage where desirable fish no longer survive, as in Lake Erie—a lake is said to be "dead."

Illinois is not exempted from the list of nutrient polluters.

Pollutants are discharged into the lake from largely inefficient waste-treatment plants run by the North Shore Sanitary District in Lake County.

These include large plants in Waukegan and Highland Park and smaller plants in Lake Forest and Lake Bluff. Two Lake County based U.S. military installations—Fort Sheridan and Great Lakes Naval Training Center—also flush nutrient-enriched wastes directly into the lake.

Albert C. Printz, water-quality standards officer for the Great Lakes region of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration defends the 10-year deadline for nutrient control.

"It's the best we can hope for given the sad state of technology in this field," he said. "I hope technological breakthroughs can speed the development of feasible nutrient control methods, but it's only a hope."

Sanitary District Supt. Bacon rejects this view as "short-sighted."

"The lake is a priceless asset. Nothing should be too expensive to save the lake," he said.

[From the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries, Ann Arbor, Mich., Oct. 19, 1961]

The Changing Ecology of Lake Erie

Erie is a rapidly changing lake and the progressive changes are threatening gravely its value to the public for all uses. The aging process of a lake is usually slow and subtle, and frequently goes unnoticed in a lifetime of man. When lakes are used for the disposal of industrial and human wastes the aging process can be greatly accelerated as has been thoroughly documented in Lake Zurich in Switzerland and Lake Washington near Seattle over the past 50 years. Never before, however, has such a dramatic process of premature aging been detected in a lake the size of Lake Erie with its 10,000 square miles of surface area.

Any thought that Lake Erie, because of its size, is an indestructible freshwater resource, has perished. Indeed recent evidence has shown that the lake is rapidly becoming useless for things and practices that once were traditional. The urbanization and industrialization of the area surrounding Lake Erie and the Detroit River created a pollution load that has resulted in vast changes in the physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of the lake. These changes once noticeable only in the bays and shore areas have spread throughout the lake, and now are a matter of grave concern to all who have an interest in, or who depend on this freshwater resource. Bathing beaches have become unusable; preferred species of fish are no longer abundant; contamination of domestic water supplies offers an ever-increasing problem; and shore and harbor areas are becoming more difficult to keep clear for boat traffic.

Lakes age physically, chemically, and biologically. Progress of physical and chemical changes may be inconspicuous, but they are cumulative. Over 2.6 million tons of silt enter Lake Erie in a year. Gradual filling makes the lake shallower and warmer. The use of lake water as a coolant in power plants can also contribute to warming. An estimated 1.9 trillion gallons of water from the Great Lakes was used by steam-electric-generating plants in 1959. In addition, several atomic-power stations are being built on the lakes because of their great requirement for water to cool the reactors. Practically nothing is known of the consequences of increased temperatures on thermal pollution. Some fish are attracted to the warm waters and large numbers die, and others are known to have very sensitive temperature requirements at critical life-history stages. Undoubtedly, as with other types of pollution in the lakes, the immediate effects of "thermal pollution" will be subtle, and difficult to measure.

Evidences of chemical pollution are clear-cut and impressive. Untreated and inadequately treated domestic waste of millions of people in communities bordering or near Lake Erie is entering the tributaries and marginal waters of the lake. In addition, the organic industrial waste load entering Lake Erie in 1953 was estimated to be equivalent to a population of about 900,000 by the U.S. Public Health Service. Inorganic industrial wastes, including toxic substances, have been reported in many analyses of tributary streams and lake waters. The concentrations of most dissolved chemicals have increased during the last 50 years. Calcium, magnesium, sodium, and sulfates show increases ranging from 1 to 10 ppm. Chlorides showed an increase of from 10 ppm in 1930 to 20 ppm in 1958. Total dissolved solids have increased steadily at an average rate of 1 ppm per year. Evidence exists that the concentrations of nitrogen and phosphorus compounds have doubled. Very low concentrations of dissolved oxygen in the central basin of Lake Erie have occurred during the summer in recent years—a positive indication of overenrichment resulting from the excessive introduction of organic pollutants. This condition has previously been unknown for a body of water the size of Lake Erie.

The biological consequences of increased physical and chemical pollution of Lake Erie have been spectacular. The mayfly nymph was once the most abundant fish-food organism inhabiting the bottom of Lake Erie. These clean-water organisms averaged about 400 per square meter of lake bottom for many years; today they average about 40 per square meter. The adult mayflies that once piled up under street lights and store windows are no longer evident. Pollution-tolerant worms have increased from 12 to 551 per square meter, and midge larvae (the type that can withstand low-oxygen conditions) from 56 to 299 per square meter since 1929. The bacterial load, at the outlet of the Detroit River increased threefold between 1913 and 1946–48. Major changes have also occurred in the fish populations. The once abundant cisco, whitefish, and blue pike that prefer clean water have all but disappeared. The lake is no longer an ideal habitat for the walleye and yellow perch. The less desired yet more tolerant species such as white bass, sheepshead, smelt, and carp are more abundant. Reports of fish kills are becoming increasingly common.

The status of Lake Erie as a useful freshwater resource has become uncertain. As impressive as the conpicuous changes have been, there may still be more dire consequences from slow and yet undetected accumulations of the common detergents and toxic chemicals that continually enter the lake. Lake Erie can be described accurately as a dying lake, and because of the subtle cumulative effects of sewage and industrial wastes, it may be dead even before we are aware of it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield no longer. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the amendment, and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth time this year we have had a continuing resolution on the floor of the House of Representatives. Frankly, if you were to pin me down and ask me what the resolution would do to the Government, I would have to tell you I do not know. It is very complex, very far-reaching, and I doubt that all its ramifications are known by anyone in this chamber.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a sad situation that we find ourselves for the fourth time in one year going through this exercise of voting on a continuing resolution. Certainly it must have come to the minds of others, as it has to mine, that there must be a better way to run a Congress than this.

I do not know why it is necessary to have these continuing resolutions come up. But here are the facts as I know them.

Some few years ago it became in vogue to have annual authorizations of certain matters which later became subjects of appropriations. We have annual authorizations for appropriations for NASA, for foreign aid, for military construction, for the Atomic Energy Commission, and other programs. Mr. Chairman, this takes time, and it should take time. The Members of the legislative committees involved in these very important matters should give them the legislative oversight which it is their duty to give. But the result is that the appropriation subcommittees get these matters so late in the fiscal year that it is absolutely impossible for them to complete their work before the end of the fiscal year.

So it becomes necessary to go through this exercise of adopting continuing resolutions time after time after time. Many of us remember the year when we actually had a continuing resolution in effect, until Christmas Eve.

I do not know exactly what the answer is, but I have introduced a little bill, and if this sounds like a commercial, so be it. I have been introducing it for some time. I think it might be of some help. The bill would provide that the fiscal year would be the calendar year. This measure would allow the legislative committees to do the proper job of legislative oversight, to come out with proper authorization legislation, and then it would enable the appropriations subcommittees to do a proper job of screening the expenditure requests and come up with a completed job of appropriations. Appropriation bills would be adopted before the end of the fiscal year, without the hasty actions we have taken under continuing resolutions.

I submit that under the present situation my own committee, of which I think very highly—and please do not construe this as any criticism of our fine chairman, or the able members of the Appropriations Committee—but we are not doing the job which this Congress and the people expect us to do.

We are not doing the job which the country expects us to do, and until we can change the system under which we are operating we will not be able to do it. We will be coming up year after year with continuing resolutions, with provisions in them which have been conceived in haste, and which many times, have meanings which are unclear and uncertain. Furthermore, the departments and agencies do not know the expenditure level at which they must operate until much of the fiscal year has passed. This certainly does not make for efficiency. I think it is up to the House to do something about cleaning up this resolution by adopting a motion to recommit. Certainly the gentleman from Ohio has a motion to recommit, which makes sense to me, because it sets a dollar limitation and then lets the administration decide where the cuts shall be. We have heard responsible Members of this Congress express grave doubts as to the effect this resolution would have on vital functions of this government. This situation could be mitigated if the power to allocate the expenditure cuts were given the President.

If the Members think this is giving power to the President he does not now have, I dispute that, because the President can reserve funds now, as we have seen.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would have to agree with the gentleman this does not give the President power which he does not now have, but it would give him a right which he does not now have, in my opinion.

Going further, I would like to say our Committee on Appropriations could proceed with its hearings and be ready to report a bill, and then advise the leadership that we are ready for authorization, by a legislative act or a rule. That is one way it might be handled.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I think to do that would be to take a very important function away from a legislative committee, and I would never want to do that.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not mean to say that. We would not report until authorized. There are two ways the Congress could authorize.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. What the gentleman suggests can and has been done. I would hope it would not have to be done in many instances. I would hope we would take a good long look at what this body ought to be doing in directing the fiscal operation of the Government. The Constitution charges Congress with the responsibility for appropriating funds. I submit to this body that we can carry out that responsibility better than we are now doing.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAYS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS: On page 3, after line 18, insert: "The Appropriations Committee is hereby abolished."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I supposed somebody would make a point of order against this, but since no one has, maybe we ought to get a vote on it.

Obviously I am not completely serious about this, but, on the other hand, I do not know that it would hurt very much. The Appropriations Committee has the House tied up pretty much in knots, and no two people in the committee can agree on what the resolution does.

We did not have an Appropriations Committee until the 1920's. The authorizing committee was the appropriating committee—I think it was until some time in the twenties—and if we are going to be tied up in situations like this, every year, year in and year out, as the gentleman said until Christmas Eve—maybe we ought to abolish the committee.

I am not so sure it is the fault of the authorizing committee, and, to be fair, I am not so sure it is the fault of the Appropriations Committee of the House. It seems to me the blame lies with the Appropriations Committee on the other side, but if we abolish ours, maybe they would have to abolish theirs, and it would not be too bad an idea.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the gentleman from Ohio offered this motion in a facetious mood. At least, I hope so.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which the gentleman is a member, has had since last winter to bring out a foreign aid authorization bill so we could get the appropriation bill on the floor. We do not yet have the authorization, and I do not know when we will have it, and we cannot adjourn until we get it. This is part of our problem.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I concede what the gentleman says is true, and we have been in conference, and on two occasions the Foreign Relations Committee in the other body has taken off—in one instance for 10 days and in another instance for about a week now. So please do not blame that on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not move to abolish the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HAYS. It might be a good idea.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I had not intended to make any comments regarding this resolution, but as I read it, I have several reservations about it.

If I read section 3 correctly, this would penalize the agencies which really have been squaring with the Congress and have been trying to hold expenditures down. It would penalize them.

If I read this correctly, it says:

Funds available or becoming available to the several executive departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units for obligation for civilian personnel compensation and benefits for the fiscal year 1968—

Then it has certain exclusions about South Vietnam, and says:

shall not be available for such purposes beyond 95 per centum of the amounts estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15) as amended.

I do not want to name agencies, because I would not want to exclude some. There are some fine agencies which have been holding the line. They squared with us on the Appropriations Committee and the legislative committees, so they get certain amounts in the budget. There is no increase or little increase in personnel in many instances.

Another agency might get an increase of 2,000 personnel or 3,000 personnel. Perhaps they need some of them but if I read this correctly, even if the Appropriations Committee concerned with that department cut the request from 2,000 personnel to 1,000, if they had requested 2,000 personnel in the 1968 budget, the 95 percent would apply to the 1968 budget and not to what the Appropriations Committee did.

That would be the case, unless I read it wrong. I would like to have someone correct me.

Am I correct in that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman's statement is a bit complicated.

Mr. CEDERBERG. It does not seem complicated to me.

Mr. MAHON. Please, what is the specific question?

Mr. CEDERBERG. As I read section 3, on page 3, it says that the funds "shall not be available for such purposes beyond 95 per centum of the amounts estimated therefor in the budget for 1968."

It does not say what is appropriated for 1968. It refers to what is in the budget.

If there were an agency which had no request for additional civilian personnel, that agency would get a cut of 5 percent. Do I understand that correctly?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If another agency had a request for 2,000 more personnel, and in the wisdom of the Appropriations Committee it was cut to 1,000 personnel, they would take the 5 percent not from the 1,000 added by the Appropriations Committee but from the 2,000 in the budget.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. There would be no cut in the agency that had requested 2,000 additional personnel, if they had already been cut by 5 percent or more in other bills this year.

Mr. CEDERBERG. No. If I read this correctly, if they had a request for 2,000 personnel and that was cut to 1,000, they could, under this, go up to 95 percent of what they asked for in the budget.

Mr. MAHON. No. This would cut them by 5 percent below the budget if Congress had not already cut them by that much or more.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I want to thank the gentleman, because he is making a terrific argument for my amendment to abolish the committee. He is showing how mixed up it is.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I am not so surprised by the proposal of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] to abolish the Appropriations Committee, because the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] which will come later, would turn everything over to the President and in effect abolish the Congress.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is where the gentleman is completely wrong. I believe that if we are going to have a sensible spending limitation we are going to have to adopt a total spending limitation to make any sense.

If you read this, gentlemen, you will find all kinds of exceptions we automatically give to the President. It refers to the President "in his discretion may prescribe" in many instances.

I see no effective way in which we can hold down spending except by adopting something like the Bow amendment, which I would hope would be a substitute.

What it does is it would hold spending to $131 billion, which is $5 billion less than anticipated but is still $6 billion over last year. It seems to me that is the most sensible approach.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is an amendment pending before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. There is.

Mr. MAHON. On that I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OTTINGER

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ottinger: On page 3 immediately after line 18, add the following:

"Sec. 4. Funds available or becoming available for obligation after the date of approval hereof for the development or construction of civil supersonic aircraft shall not be available for such purposes. Amounts withheld from obligation pursuant to the provisions of this section are hereby rescinded and shall be covered into the Treasury."

And renumber the other sections accordingly.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am wholly in accord with the efforts that are being made to cut nonessential expenditures within this body. I think it is something that badly needs doing. Faced by a $29 billion deficit or an inequitable 10-percent tax surcharge, cutting nonessential spending is by far the best alternative.

I think there is no more unnecessary expenditure than that which we have authorized and for which we have appropriated almost $700 million so far for the supersonic transport. This is so unnecessary and such an unsound venture that our great free enterprise system engaged in the manufacture of the aircraft is not willing to invest more than 10 percent of their own funds toward the accomplishment of this goal.

The SST, if it comes into being at all, is going to create a noise problem the likes of which we have never heard. Those of you who represent areas where people live near and around airports already have their constituents screaming with protest against the terrible noise problem they have. These protests are going to be redoubled if this plane comes into being. This will be a very serious hazard, I believe.

If the SST is really so good, I believe private enterprise would support it more than it is. There is no reason why we should get ourselves so involved in this effort which is eventually estimated to require some $5 billion in Federal funds. I think if we are going to cut nonessential spending, this is the area in which it is most propitious to begin. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MacGREGOR. As I indicated during general debate, I have had at the Clerk's desk and pending for some 3 hours an amendment to rescind this year's appropriation of $142,375,000 for the civilian supersonic aircraft development. According to the advice of counsel for the Committee on Appropriations, my amendment would not have been in order until after a complete reading of the bill since my amendment would have incorporated a new subsection 7. My purpose in asking the gentleman to yield to me at this point is to ask him whether or not the intent, purpose, and effect of his amendment would be the same as my amendment. The plain question that I wish to ask is this: Would the adoption of your amendment leave remaining for expenditure the $124.5 million now in the SST pipeline of funds appropriated by this Congress in previous years up to and including fiscal year 1967?

Mr. OTTINGER. It does. My amendment does exactly the same thing as the gentleman's and applies only to the funds available or becoming available for obligation after the date of approval thereof.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I think the amendment which has been proposed by the gentleman from New York and the text of my amendment do not fit into the same pattern.

Mr. OTTINGER. I have not seen the amendment which has been proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor]. I tried to locate him earlier.

Mr. MacGREGOR. The amendment has been pending at the Clerk's desk for some 2 or 3 hours.

Mr. OTTINGER. I am glad to join with the gentleman from Minnesota in our efforts to accomplish the same objective.

I am fully aware of the fact that the gentleman also has a bill, which I also sponsored, designed to accomplish this purpose, bills introduced as separate pieces of legislation.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I have been trying to do this for 1½ years.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] upon his efforts along similar lines.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota for his leadership and I am glad to join with the gentleman in this effort.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not plan to speak on the pending amendment, but I would like to comment on expenditures for the public works program which seems to be a very popular target these days when we are considering budget reductions.

Almost daily in connection with possible spending cuts some expert is quoted as stating that one area to make substantial reductions would be in the public works appropriation bill. Some suggest a nice round cut of $1 billion in public works. To the extent they are referring to the funding of rivers and harbors and irrigation projects, perhaps it is time we look at the facts for cuts of this magnitude are just not possible regardless of the merits of the question.

Let us analyze what makes up the $4.6 billion that is in the public works appropriation bill as it passed the House. First, 54 percent of this total, which the experts never mention, is for the expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission. These total $2.5 billion, which is $153.4 million less than requested in the budget. Except possibly for the $150 million included in the Atomic Energy budget for research and development of civilian power reactors, I think we all agree that the Atomic Energy Commission does not fall in the public works category. As to the possibility of still further cuts in the AEC program, it is now faced with absorbing sizable additional requirements for weapons development and production under the anti-ballistic-missile system for which provision was not made in the budget or the House bill.

It should also be noted that of the increase of $314.4 million in the bill over last year, $293.7 million, or 93 percent, is for the Atomic Energy Commission. These funds are required primarily to finance continuing activities funded last fiscal year with carryover unobligated balances and program revenues and to meet increased requirements of the weapons program. The net increase of only $20.7 million in the bill for all the other agencies includes an increase of $60.7 million for the water pollution control program largely offset by reductions in the other activities. All the other major programs in the bill have been decreased below the funding level for fiscal year 1967, including a reduction of $64.9 million, or about 5 percent, in the appropriations for construction of water resource projects.

Excluding AEC, the House public works bill total is $2.1 billion. Included in this is $293.8 million for the Federal water pollution control program which is being carried in the bill for the first time this year. For water pollution control research and development grants and the operating program, the House made a 10-percent reduction in the budget estimate. For construction grants for waste treatment works, the bill allows only the budget request of $203 million. This is less than half the authorization of $450 million for which there has been widespread public support.

Another $258.9 million in the bill is for the annual operation and maintenance requirements on completed projects of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the power agencies. The House bill has already reduced the budget request for these items by $10.4 million. Any significant additional reductions are not possible without neglecting essential maintenance items, resulting in more costly rehabilitation in future years.

Also carried in the bill is $40.5 million for the operation of the Canal Zone Government of the Panama Canal which is repaid to the U.S. Treasury out of revenues from the operation of the Panama Canal Company.

The bill also includes $21.2 million to cover the cost of interment in our national cemeteries, grave markers, and development and maintence of cemetery properties, including Arlington Cemetery. Certainly these programs are not "public works" that could be deleted or drastically curtailed.

The balance of $1.5 billion remaining in the bill is primarily for the activities of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the power agencies of the Federal Government. Excluding the investigations programs and necessary administrative expenses, $1.4 billion remains for the going construction programs of these agencies for flood control, water supply, irrigation, and power facilities. It is apparently in this area that the experts seem to think that wholesale cuts could be made. First, the experts don't seem to understand that the individual projects are funded in the bill not for the total cost, but only to the extent necessary to meet contractors' earnings during the year. In other words, a project costing $10 million is funded over a period of 4 to 5 years. Of the $1.2 billion included in the 1968 House bill for construction by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, only $13.6 million is to initiate construction on new starts. These include only 21 new starts under the corps and 2 for the Bureau of Reclamation. The balance of the appropriation—99 percent—is to finance the continuation of construction during the current year of projects previously approved by Congress. This involves over 300 projects.

For example, under the Corps of Engineers, about 75 percent of the appropriation of $935 million will be applied to 57 major projects, now under construction, in amounts of $5 million or more to meet contractors' earnings. About 70 percent of the funds are required to meet obligation commitments on continuing contracts and the remaining 30 percent is to provide for new contracts required to meet construction schedules on going projects. Many of these pending new contracts are essential to avoid project shutdowns and to prevent damage and loss to works already put in place under prior contracts. Even if we deferred indefinitely the balance of the pending contracts that might be postponed without project shutdown or damage to completed work, it is roughly estimated, pending completion of a detailed survey, that not more than $60 million would be saved this year in expenditures under the Corps of Engineers nor more than about $26 million under the Bureau of Reclamation program. Over one-third of these expenditure savings have already been reflected in the House bill reductions. Such further contract deferments would, of course, result in serious delay in the completion dates of these projects needed for flood control, water supply, power, pollution abatement, and so forth, and would in turn, result in higher completion costs due to the rising construction costs index.

I should also note that the allowance made in the bill for each construction appropriation item already reflects a general lump sum reduction, averaging 11 percent, to be applied to the individual amounts programed for the projects. In turn, the committee has taken full advantage of actual carryover funds available from last fiscal year and has reduced the new appropriation requests accordingly. In total, the committee, in its allowances for the construction programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, has made lump sum reductions totaling $171.9 million which will have to be met from carryover funds and through slippages, delays, and stretchout of contract awards, with the resulting reduction in expenditure requirements for fiscal year 1968.

The appropriations carried in the House bill for the construction programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are below both the appropriations for last fiscal year and the budget estimates for fiscal year 1968.

So, despite what the experts say, unless we are ready to cancel present contract commitments on projects now under construction, with the costly consequences now and in the years to come, it is just not possible to make any large-scale savings in appropriations or expenditures beyond those that have already been made in the bill.

I would like to insert in the RECORD for your review an analysis of the items in the bill and a statement as the basis on which the appropriation amounts for the construction items has been determined:

Analysis of items in public works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill, 1968

Budget estimate (as amended)	$4,864,613,000
House bill reduction	−244,891,000
House bill total	4,619,722,000
Deduct Atomic Energy Commission (54 percent)	−2,492,733,000
Balance, excluding AEC	2,126,989,000
Deduct (non-public-works construction items):	
1. Cemeterial expenses, Department of Army (development and maintenance of the national cemeteries)	−21,200,000
2. Operation and maintenance of Panama Canal Zone Government	−40,500,000
3. Annual operation and maintenance of completed water resource projects	−258,890,000
4. General investigations, Water Resources Council, and program administration	−109,344,000
Subtotal, non-public-works construction items	[1] −429,934,000
Deduct Federal Water Pollution Control Administration	−293,800,000
(Included under HEW bill in prior years. Includes $203 million for construction grants for waste treatment works compared with authorization of $450 million.)	
Balance in bill for planning and construction by Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and Tennessee Valley Authority	1,403,255,000
Deduct funds for new construction starts:	
Corps of Engineers (21 projects)	−6,113,000
Reclamation (two projects)	−7,500,000
Bonneville Power Administration (transmission facilities)	−$23,206,000
Irrigation Loans (three)	−1,185,000
Subtotal, appropriation for new starts	−38,004,000
Balance for funding continuation of construction on projects initiated by Congress in prior years	1,365,251,000
This latter total to finance construction ongoing projects consists of:	
Corps of Engineers:	
Construction, general	928,961,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	83,400,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
Construction and rehabilitation	165,200,000
Upper Colorado River storage project	41,000,000
Loan program	13,815,000
Bonneville Power Administration	87,294,000
Southwestern Power Administration	5,000,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	40,546,000

[1] House bill reduced budget estimates on these items by $23,818,000.

Further major cuts below the House bill in the above construction items are not feasible for the following reasons:

1. All projects in the bill are funded only on an annual basis; only the amounts required to finance contractors' earnings until July 1, 1968, are included;

2. Full credit has been taken for the availability of carryover balances in determining the new appropriation required;

3. Full credit has been taken for possible savings and delays on contracts during the year by making general, lump sum reductions, totaling $180.7 million and averaging 11 percent in the items in the bill, to be applied against the individual amounts programed for each project as listed in the report tables. Any further reduction would result, on an average, in projects being financed less than 89 percent of the amounts allocated to individual projects in the bill.

In summary, the bill now funds the above construction items, including the new starts, on the following basis:

Total amount programed for fiscal year 1968 for the individual projects as shown in the committee report tables	$1,583,957,000
Lump sum reductions made:	
For carryover balances	−39,035,000
For delays, slippages, and stretchouts	−141,667,000
Subtotal, reductions (−11 percent)	−180,702,000
Actual appropriations allowed	1,403,255,000

4. The 1968 appropriations allowed for these construction items are below the 1967 appropriation level and below the 1968 budget estimates.

5. The 1968 appropriation of $929 million for construction by the Corps of Engineers is typical of the other items:

(a) It is required to provide annual financing of contracts on going projects;

(b) About 70 percent of the funds are committed for contractors' earnings under existing contracts;

(c) The remaining 30 percent is for new contracts planned in 1968 to provide for orderly continuation of work on projects under construction;

(1) A portion of these contracts has already been let during the period July 1, 1967, to September 30, 1967, the heavy construction season;

(2) A portion of these pending contracts cannot be deferred indefinitely if loss or damage to work in place is to be avoided;

(3) The remaining pending contracts involve some segments of projects under construction which might be deferred without shutting down the project or incurring immediate loss to work in place, but with the resultant delay in project completion dates and the incurring of higher future completion costs;

It is especially in this latter category of contracts that the House bill has already reflected sizable reductions for delays, slippages, and stretchouts as outlined above.

Pending completion of a detailed analysis of the contracts in this category, it is roughly estimated that expenditure savings during the remainder of the fiscal year would not exceed $60 million, of which about half has already been reflected in the House bill reductions.

(4) The very restrictive policy on new starts reflected in the 1968 bill will result in a sharp reduction of $619.6 million in the level of the construction pipeline of the Corps of Engineers.

This year, if funds are allowed to meet contractors' earnings, completion is scheduled on 51 projects which have been financed annually over several years at a total cost of $735.5 million; the total cost of the 21 new starts in the bill, to be financed over the next 4 or 5 years, is only $115.9 million, the equivalent of only 6 weeks' construction at the current rate of expenditure.

The very limited number and total cost of the new starts in the 1968 bill (with a backlog of over 400 authorized projects) is in sharp contrast to the appropriation bills over the past 5 years which have averaged about 60 new starts annually with an average total cost of about $1 billion.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in 1966 I moved, during consideration of the appropriations bill for the SST program, to delete the 1967 fiscal year appropriation of $280 million.

On July 18 of this year I moved to delete the fiscal 1968 appropriation for the SST of $142,375,000. A week ago Thursday, in response to talk in this Chamber about recission bills, I offered a bill to rescind the amount of almost $143 million appropriated by Senate and House.

I am delighted that I have been supported in that effort by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger], and apparently by others in this Chamber.

I believe we have heard many times the arguments for and against the use of general revenue funds of the Treasury to subsidize the development of this commercial product. Let me summarize the arguments for adoption of the pending amendment:

First. There is in the pipeline $124.5 million for the civil supersonic transport aircraft from previous years' appropriations. This would still be available for expenditure. We would not cut off that flow for the support of this year's SST development.

Second. If we were to pass this amendment we would, however, give impetus to a consideration of the bills introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself, to provide private financing as a substitute for public financing of the SST.

Third. Never before, not last year, not on July 18, nor 2 weeks ago have we been faced with such a critical financial situation as we are faced with today—a $29 billion deficit—it may be somewhat less, it may be somewhat more. If we are going to find any areas to cut, if we are going to say we will not pass the buck to the President, let us show that the buck stops here in the House on this saving of $143 million.

Fourth. If we were to establish a list of priorities of public spending, surely everyone in this Chamber would put the SST financing down at the bottom of the priority list.

Fifth. There needs to be consideration—there needs to be most careful consideration of the sonic boom problem. We have studies pending in Oklahoma City, in Milwaukee, Minneapolis, and elsewhere, but we have not got the final reports on those studies. Let us get the facts so we can evaluate the economic feasibility of the SST and the likelihood of recovering the taxpayers' money.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at the arguments against the pending amendment.

First. We are not risking any money because we are going to recoup all of the funds. Yes you will, but only if the SST is an economic success, And only if after being an economic success the aircraft manufacturers sell more than 500 of the aircraft—a highly unlikely prospect in view of the 747, which will be flying high at that time.

Second. We must build the SST on a crash basis, and funnel these public funds into it, because America must maintain her supremacy in world commercial aviation. No one is going to buy the Russian TU-144 except a few countries behind the Iron Curtain.

The British Government, because of its financial plight, may soon be pulling out of the British-French Concorde aircraft project. But even if they continue, because of the many performance limitations of the Concorde, it will never be in competition with the American SST.

Third. That the American balance-of-payments problem will be aided by the public financing of this SST. Let me give you some interesting facts:

The U.S. Treasury Department, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Bureau of the Budget are the agencies of the U.S. Government most knowledgeable and most concerned about the balance-of-payments problem.

They are the agencies possessing the greatest expertise on this subject. But not one of these four agencies has published a single word in support of the contention frequently made that building the supersonic transport is necessary to help solve the American balance-of-payments problem.

I urge you in the name of commonsense and a decent regard for taxpayer opinion to adopt this amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has been up and down the hill on the whole supersonic transport matter. The effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would be to absolutely and immediately kill the program. That would not have been so with the amendment that had been suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota that would have rescinded only fiscal year 1968 funds.

I must decline to yield at this time to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger], because I think we ought to answer some of the arguments that he has made here.

This amendment would absolutely kill the program.

The gentleman from New York said in his arguments a moment ago that the SST program is going to cost the Federal Government and the taxpayers of this Nation $5 billion. That is not so.

We are financing only the development of the civil supersonic transport aircraft through the prototype phase, with the completion of two prototypes. The Federal Government is committed to spend $1.2 billion and no more. And if the program is successful, all of the $1.2 billion will be paid back. If more than 300 aircraft are sold, the Government will earn interest.

We have already appropriated, let me remind the House, through fiscal year 1967, $511 million. In the fiscal 1968 bill we carry $142.5 million for the SST program.

The issue is not whether or not to start the development of the SST. The program is underway. The program was initiated in 1959 and the first appropriations were made by the Congress in 1961.

The prototype aircraft are being built—and prototype Concorde aircraft are being built now by the British and the French and the TU-144 is being built by the Russians. The British and French Governments are putting $1.4 billion into their plane. This is $200 million more than we are putting into ours.

We have crossed this bridge on whether or not to develop a supersonic transport plane. It has been the judgment of three administrations to proceed.

President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson decided and recommended that we ought to go ahead with it.

What does this program mean to the economy of the United States? I have seen the gentleman from New York offer amendments to legislation on this floor that would have cost the Federal Government millions and millions of dollars. But he wants to kill this program which can help build up the economy of the country so that we might be able to afford such programs.

What does this program mean to the United States? Why do you have to stand up here at this time and defend it? Maybe it is not the best time, or the best year, to defend this program, but the point of the matter is that this is a program that is essential to the economic health of a large segment of the United States. It means 50,000 direct jobs. The employment and impact from those 50,000 direct jobs will probably be multiplied by four or five times throughout the United States.

We can help pay for some of the programs that the gentleman from New York was interested in—rat control, model cities, and rent supplements—with taxes that would be lost if the aircraft manufacturing industry of this country is not permitted to keep up with modern technology.

This is a program that improves the economic health of our country, and will enable this Nation to keep moving ahead.

I recall just about a week or 10 days ago when the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] rose on this floor and pointed to himself, and rightfully so, as being a very successful businessman. He indicated to this House that the reason for his success is that he was willing to pour back into his company money required to make his company successful, and he was delighted to do that. He pointed out that that is the reason we ought to be willing to invest in our own country and our own economy, and I think we should. I think that is the slide rule for the success of our private enterprise system in this Nation. Private business teaches us that investment is essential to progress.

If you are going to damage private enterprise by voting against a vital segment of our private economy, we are never going to be able to pay for any of the great programs in which most of us here are deeply and sincerely interested.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me say again that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would kill the program—absolutely and finally.

There is private financing in the program. Boeing and General Electric are committed to put in their own money. Boeing alone will put in $168 million of their cold, hard cash and we ought to tell them that we are going to support this program. They will put another $34 million of their cold, hard cash in facilities for the program. General Electric will put in $66 million of their cold, hard cash and $20 million in facilities. The airlines have put in $52 million in risk capital and are putting down $750,000 for each plane ordered. They are doing their part. We ought to do ours.

The gentleman from Minnesota talks of private financing but he uses the term quite loosely. Under one of the so-called private financing plans offered, and which I understand the gentleman supports, the Government would be called on to guarantee 100 percent of the value of a total of $2.5 billion in bonds. This is not private financing. This approach would give the Government all of the risk and none of the authority to protect its investment and would double the Government's liability over that now planned.

Under present plans, the production phase of the program will be completely financed with private capital.

To kill the SST now would be to waste at least $500 million and rob a vital segment of American industry of the opportunity of meeting world competition. This amendment ought to be defeated overwhelmingly.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the motion was adopted, the following Members were observed standing on their feet: Mr. Pelly of Washington, Mr. Meeds of Washington, Mr. Adams of Washington, Mr. Ottinger of New York, Mr. Taft of Ohio, Mr. MacGregor of Minnesota, Mr. Staggers of West Virginia, Mr. Dingell of Michigan, Mr. Boland of Massachusetts.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman from Minnesota has already spoken on this question. May he speak again?

The CHAIRMAN. He may speak in opposition to the pro forma motion.

At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not think it is good business for this Nation to start on a program such as the one we are discussing and then stop after we have spent many millions of dollars. The program makes us a leader in the world in the aviation field. We would now kill that program if we vote for this amendment. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] is recognized.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a Member of this House who has not taken pride in the fact that when it comes to civilian transport planes, American planes excel those of any other nation in the world. The buyers from other countries beat a path to buy our transport planes. There is no equal to them. There is only one reason for that achievement, and that is research. That is exactly what has produced the transport planes. If we are going to keep our position, we must put some money into the development of the SST. I urge Members not to veto, at this late date, the decision that was previously made by this House. I urge defeat of amendments to either curb or kill the SST.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. Adams] is recognized.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] at the end of the debate, and I will remain on my feet during the interim.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] is recognized.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Massachusetts said about me was 100 percent inaccurate. I have voted against more than $11 billion of spending proposals in this House this year.

I would say further to the gentleman, to show my sincerity in this matter, that I intend to support the Whitten amendment limiting expenditures to the 1967 level, with certain exceptions.

As for the argument that the SST will create jobs, I am all for the creation of jobs and the protection of jobs. But to continue on an uneconomic project which private industry itself is unwilling to finance just to protect jobs seems to me to be 100 percent wrong. I think we ought to get out of it. We have made a mistake and we ought to recognize it.

Several weeks ago, I voted against the Bow amendment and with the committee to give the committee a 10-day chance to come up with reductions it was promising. We have now seen its proposal and it is one with which I cannot agree.

The committee proposal limits the Office of Economic Opportunity to $1.4 billion while the problems of poverty mount alarmingly both in our urban slums and agricultural areas.

On the other hand, the committee proposal does not even touch the $4.6 billion public works pork-barrel or the multibillion-dollar agriculture and other special interest subsidies. It also fails to touch the SST.

I, therefore, must oppose the committee proposal and support the Whitten substitute, to accomplish exactly the economies which the gentleman from Massachusetts falsely accuses me of opposing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, while this amendment, I am sure, was offered in good faith, and I recognize the interest and opposition from the very beginning of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] and others to it, this is not the proper place to consider this amendment. I think the Members of this House should know, if they reflect on it in their consciences, that it is no more proper to consider this amendment here today, when the House has already debated and acted upon it, than it would have been to consider and vote favorably on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates] with regard to the pollution of Lake Michigan. We have had full debate on the project. The House has worked its will on it. In any event, there will be a 5-percent cut in this program under the resolution, if adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this is a very good example of acting in haste to save a few dollars and by that haste losing a great deal more money. I do not happen to approve of the way the SST contract was given. I expect to try to see it reviewed to assure that no windfall resulted. I think there is a strong possibility of an excessive amount of windfall inherent in that proposal to the developers of the SST. But the fact is if we happen to rescind the contract in such a high-handed fashion as this, the Federal Government will wind up with a loss of investment, loss in sales abroad, and a big deficit of payments from the project. In addition—and I think this is the worst thing of all—we will wind up with a situation where the Government will be liable in damages to the contractors for contract rescission.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] is recognized.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] is recognized.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAC GREGOR

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACGREGOR as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. OTTINGER: On page 3 after line 18 insert:

"SEC. 4. The unobligated balances remaining on the date of the enactment of this Act of the funds appropriated to the Department of Transportation for the Civil Supersonic Aircraft Development Program for fiscal year 1968 are hereby rescinded and shall be recovered into the Treasury."

And renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, this is my amendment to which I referred earlier during general debate and during the colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

This substitute amendment, I am now advised by members of the Appropriations Committee staff, will not have the same effect as the Ottinger amendment. The Ottinger amendment would stop the flow of SST money now in the pipeline. All my amendment would do, if adopted as a substitute, would be to save this year's appropriation. It would not cripple the ongoing SST program. It would not touch the $124 million waiting to be spent. It might slow down or stretch out the prototype development. Surely we can strike this modest blow for economy.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the MacGregor substitute to the pending Ottinger amendment.

The MacGregor proposal would rescind fiscal 1968 appropriations for the supersonic transport. The Ottinger amendment would repeal all funds for the SST, including those now ongoing.

One amendment would be slow strangulation. The other would be instant death.

Both amendments, I am sure, would cause delight and rejoicing on the other side of the Atlantic. The British and French with their Concorde are already 3½ years ahead of our supersonic transport. They expect to begin commercial service in 1971. The earliest timetable for the American aircraft is 1974.

The situation is very clear, Mr. Chairman. Delay of this program would seriously compromise American technical superiority. We would also strike a damaging blow to American jobs and profits.

Mr. Chairman, the cost to the Federal Government of developing this aircraft will be repaid when the company sells 300 of them. If 6-percent interest is charged, then the cost will be paid when 500 aircraft are sold. The market for the American SST is estimated at up to 1,100.

In short, then, we have to push ahead of or fall behind in the competition for technical superiority and for a sound balance-of-payments situation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota and, of course, I am violently opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

As I said, we have been up and down this road, and it has been the judgment of three administrations to start and to continue this program. We are now deeply in the program. We have appropriated $511 million in past years, and in this fiscal year have provided an additional $142 million.

All of the money the Federal Government puts in will be paid back if 300 planes are sold. The economics of the program have been studied, as I said before, by a very distinguished presidential advisory board. They are advised by competent authority that this is an economically feasible project and that the Federal Government will get back every dime it will have invested. They estimate that more than 300 planes will be sold.

After 300 planes have been sold, on the planes sold between 300 and 500, which we expect will be sold, there will be a return to the Government of 6 percent on its investment.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is a good program. I do not believe we can afford to let the British and the French put their plane on the market with uncertainty as to whether or not we will proceed, where it is evident there might very well be a stoppage of the American SST. Someone said the British will pull out of the Concorde program. With this kind of debate we are having on this floor, I am sure they will continue, because they will have the field in the free world to themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for defeat of both amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MACGREGOR and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 94, noes 102.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have just supported the continuation of the SST program, but it seems to me we have just observed a demonstration of what foolishness we have participated in here recently. It all depends on whose ox is being gored.

If we want to take this item by item and issue by issue we had just as well get started on some of these programs, for we will be voting here on Christmas Eve.

I think maybe that is the way to do it. I have asked for this time primarily to direct some questions to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW]. I believe I observed him a moment ago on the floor. I have some questions with reference to the Bow amendment, which we have heard a lot about.

We have just gone through a demonstration here, as I say, regarding a specific project. I happen to be in support of this project and voted for its authorization. I supported my good friends from Washington because I well understand the concern of the people who represent Boeing Aircraft and happen to believe that this program is good for America.

However, a question was raised here regarding the Bow amendment and its effect on this program. They said that it would take its proportionate cut. I am not at all sure that it will under the Bow amendment. That is why I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio a few questions about just what the Bow amendment means and what it will do. If I do not understand the Bow amendment, I hope the gentleman will correct me.

If the Congress adopts it, then we give the President the power to cut his budget or the total expenditures for fiscal year 1968 anywhere he desires at least up to or, in other words, a maximum expenditure of $131.5 billion. So he could cut out the entire expenditure for the SST program.

Mr. BOW. Which he can do now.

Mr. SISK. Is that correct or is it not?

Mr. BOW. That is right. He can do it now without the Bow amendment.

Mr. SISK. I well recognize that the President has certain rights to withhold funds, but I do want to make clear what we are doing and what people who support this are doing. I have great respect for the gentleman from Ohio. I am not questioning his sincerity, but I question him as to whether this is the way we want to handle the issue. We just had a demonstration here in which the Congress said we do not want to cut out the SST program. Does the gentleman want us to go ahead and attempt to try to adjust the budget in line with what we believe to be right rather than simply to say to the President, "You must come up with $5 billion of reduction in your budget" or what I understand from possible suggestions could be as much as $10 billion or $15 billion cut in expenditures and just leave it completely up to him?

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. Yes. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman pointed out the fact that the President could make these cuts in the areas he desires, which, as I have said many times, he already has the right to do. A great deal of concern has been had about the cutting down in different parts of the Government. Again I repeat that he would have $5.8 billion more than the expenditures in 1967 were. So this is not anything that will be a great catastrophe, because he will still have over $5 billion more than he had last year. The gentleman is right, though, but the point that does not seem to be getting across at all is that the President can do it now. He can cut the SST tomorrow or freeze the funds for it tomorrow. All we are doing is simply saying to him, "You must work within a certain expenditure limitation."

Mr. SISK. That is right. However, that response leads me to my next question, if I may do so and if I may direct it to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, I would ask with reference to the limitation and with reference to the exemptions which are contained under his proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Under the exemptions contained in the proposals which are now pending before us and the exemption which I understand the gentleman from Ohio has proposed, that we actually get down to a total expenditure budget of somewhere—and I have heard all kinds of figures ranging anywhere from $112 billion to $125 billion—and that is all he has to operate on? Is this true or is it not true? That is why I am asking the gentleman from Ohio as to just what his proposed amendment means.

Mr. BOW. That is correct. In other words, the President operated on a budget of about $125.7 billion during the 1967 fiscal year. He would still have the funds which he had for the 1967 fiscal year programs. Therefore, he has had plenty of funds with which to operate the Government in the last fiscal year. So, he is going to have the money with which to do so. He sent an expenditure budget up here to us originally in the amount of about $135 billion. This is where the credibility gap comes in and is why we have got to place a ceiling upon it. In other words, the President is spending at the rate of about $143 billion. So, unless Congress places some sort of ceiling upon expenditures, we do not know what they are going to do with the budget figures based upon the manner in which they have been juggling them.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I wish to remind the distinguished gentleman from Ohio of a specific provision of the gentleman's amendment with reference to expenditures in Vietnam over the amount of $22 billion. I do not believe the effect of this provision was made clear in the colloquy which was had between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk].

Mr. BOW. The gentleman understands that under my amendment, of course, that is correct.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, as I stated previously, I am only trying to find out just how much money actually the President is going to have left after we are through whittling? Yet, they say we cannot cut out the SST, a program which has been favored, as we demonstrated here earlier, but which carries a pretty good sum of money, or this, that or the other program.

Are we not cutting the amount of money which is available to the President for expenditure when we are finished whittling down—are we not cutting it down to a very small amount? Does it not resolve itself into a question as to whose ox is going to be gored?

Mr. BOW. I go back to the budget figure of $125.7 billion. He spent the money then, and that is a lot of money. He had a heyday at that time.

Mr. SISK. That included a portion of the Defense budget and the Vietnam war did it not?

Mr. BOW. But, may I say to the gentleman from California that insofar as the Vietnam war is concerned the amendment I am offering excepts those expenditures in excess of $22 billion that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia. Savings can be made in the Department of Defense as well as in some other areas not having to do with our military effort in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] raised these questions last week, to try to put the full amount in the Defense budget, one must remember that when one talks about defense one is talking about the Atomic Energy Commission and our program in outerspace.

So, there are the items involved. Therefore, it is not that limited amount.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I express my appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio in making himself available to answer these questions. But my questions have a broader bearing upon the operations of this Government, including the war in Vietnam.

For instance, when we get down to a few of the domestic programs here, as I said a moment ago, on the SST program, I am in favor of continuing that program. I am also, for example, in favor of continuing some of the antipoverty programs as well as some of the other domestic programs.

However, I am wondering whether or not when we say to the President, "You have got to reduce so many billions of dollars," we are not in essence saying, "You go ahead and cut the SST program as well as other programs" and, therefore, we ultimately leave it up to him and are asking for it, so to speak?

Mr. BOW. Does not the gentleman from California understand that the President did have funds for the poverty program in fiscal year 1967 and that he did have a part of the SST program funds available in 1967? Many of the Great Society programs were carried on under the figure of $125.7 billion. Now, we are propcsing to give him $5.8 billion in addition to that. We do not want him to go to $143 billion, which would be a runaway program unless we get into an additional situation in Vietnam.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, some conversation has been had here today about the war in Vietnam, but I believe that someone ought to make the main point about Vietnam. Had the United States not entered that conflict, this present financial impasse would not confront us. It is all the sadder when we perceive that the involvement in Vietnam may be a mistake, may be a wrong.

Is it not tragic for us here to engage in this immense financial problem posed by House Joint Resolution 888, when we may have created it needlessly.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend to this House that we address ourselves to the reduction of the war, and that will assure reduction of the Government costs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Appropriations and other funds available or becoming available to the executive branch for obligation during the fiscal year 1968 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits, and for other purposes (other than those relating to retired personnel, those directly relating to the current military effort in Southeast Asia, those involving the safety of human life or the protection of property, or for statutory positions the exact number of which is fixed by law), shall be apportioned for use over the fiscal year in such manner as to permit absorption, within the aggregate amounts available, of the additional costs (estimated at $625,000,000) during the fiscal year 1968 of H.R. 7977, the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967, or similar legislation if such is enacted into law.

SEC. 5. Funds available or becoming available to the several executive departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units for obligation for research and development for the fiscal year 1968, as defined in Special Analysis I accompanying the budget for fiscal year 1968 (other than those directly relating to the current military effort in Southeast Asia or directly relating to the development, test, and evaluation of specific weapons systems), shall not be available for such purposes beyond 90 per centum of the amounts estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15) as amended. Amounts withheld from obligation pursuant to the provisions of this section are hereby rescinded and shall be covered into the Treasury, and amounts so withheld from obligation under corporate funds are hereby rescinded and shall revert to the source from which derived.

SEC. 6. Appropriations made by Public Law 90–102, as amended, shall be available for activities budgeted under "Office of Economic Opportunity, Economic Opportunity Program" at a rate not in excess of that which would be provided for by an appropriation of $1,400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN; On page 5, after line 6, insert the following new section:

SEC. ——. Obligations during the period covered by section 1 hereof for activities to be authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 (S. 1872 or similar legislation) shall not exceed an annual rate of $2,000,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that I support the committee resolution. The amendment I am proposing merely places a limitation on the amount of money that can be obligated during the period of the continuing resolution, 30 days. It has no effect whatsoever on the amount of money that the AID agency may expect when their annual appropriation bill for fiscal 1968 is enacted.

There is a pipeline of approximately $6.7 billion for the mutual security program alone. That is just one spigot of the 16 spigots in the foreign aid bill.

I hope that the Members will approve this amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not authorized to speak for the committee, but I have no fault to find with this amendment and ask for a vote on it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROYHILL OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia: On page 5, line 5, after "of" strike out "$1,400,000,000" and insert "$1,200,000,000".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that we have already passed that section of the bill. I raise the point of order that the amendment is not in order since we have passed this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Yes, Mr. Chairman; the only thing this amendment does is to change the figure on line 5, page 5 of the bill from $1,400,000,000 to $1,200,000,000. It is just changing the amount authorized to be appropriated by this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Teaxs [Mr. MAHON] desire to be heard?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this portion of the bill had been read and approved and an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, which amendment was a separate section following it. So this is decidely untimely and out of order and I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. VANIK). It is the opinion of the Chair that since an amendment adding a new section to the bill was adopted following the section that the gentleman from Virginia seeks to amend now, the gentleman's amendment comes too late and the point of order is well taken.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 5 after line 6, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. —. Net aggregate administrative budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall not exceed $131,500,000,000, except by those expenditures in excess of $22 billion that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which puts a spending limitation on expenditures for the fiscal year 1968.

I see no reason to debate this further. We have debated it here for 4 or 5 days at different times. I think it is generally understood, but I want to point out one change that has been made in the language, and that is in accordance with the language in the resolution, and it excepts those expenditures in excess of $22 billion that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia.

You will recall that the previous amendment that I had read "military effort of the country."

This more specifically defines the $22 billion which it is estimated that the war will cost in South Vietnam and makes that exception that the President may determine more is necessary in Southeast Asia.

That is about the only change, my colleagues.

I simply want to repeat once more that the Government had plenty of funds in 1967 for a Roman holiday, and we are giving them $5,800,000,000 more this year to make the holiday even happier. There is no reason at all why they cannot easily continue their operations. The Congress has not authorized any new projects that are going to take any part of this $5,800,000,000 to any extent.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to have a vote, and I hope the House will support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL], a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my brilliant colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

My office, and I am sure the offices of nearly ever Member of this House, has been flooded this year with letters of protest from the taxpayers we represent who are increasingly incensed at the lavish spending we have witnessed under this administration. They are quite rightly concerned about the fiscal integrity of this country.

While I feel that the Appropriations Committee has done a commendable job in the joint resolution before us today, which limits expenses and places a freeze on new nonmilitary contracts and hiring, it is not, in my opinion, firm enough. Freezes by this administration have a tendency to thaw.

The resolution might be compared to locking the door of the Treasury, but hanging the key on the door. The Bow amendment locks the door and puts the key in the pocket of the Congress.

The amendment before us would place an absolute ceiling on all net aggregate administrative budget expenditures through June 30, 1968. Such expenditures could not exceed $131.5 billion, except for expenditures which may be in excess of $22 billion which the President might determine essential in behalf of the military effort in Southeast Asia.

In short, the Bow amendment would reduce the President's estimate of fiscal 1968 expenditures by $5 billion.

Both the Federal Establishment and the taxpayers can stand this reduction. You and I all know the sentiments of our constituents on the spend-and-tax issue. That was effectively illustrated in this House on September 27 when we voted 202 to 182 for the Bow recommital motion on the continuing appropriations resolution.

For 13 years I have fought for economy in Government on the floor of this House. During the past 8 it has too often been a losing battle. But the tide is turning, a national revolt against big government and wanton abuse of their hard-earned tax money has set in all across this Nation.

I urge that the House support the Bow amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the Bow amendment, in my opinion—and it is quite apparent on its face—would require and invite the President to use his power to reduce expenditures by $5 billion from that requested by the Bureau of the Budget, wherever he might wish to, except that there is a provision for South Vietnam. I certainly favor such reduction. The 1967 level of expenditure certainly should be ample under all present circumstances, except for the war and certain other obligations which my amendment provides.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Would not the gentleman agree that a reduction in expenditures is not a reduction in appropriations?

Mr. WHITTEN. It certainly is not, but, as the gentleman knows, since many estimates have been made in the process of getting action in both the House and the Senate, and in connection with which they tied the two figures together, when you bring it back to a spending limitation, you are in effect permitting the President to apply the cuts where he sees fit.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman, but I believe it is a misnomer to say that a ceiling on appropriations is a ceiling on expenditures.

Mr. WHITTEN. I hope the gentleman believes that his amendment would be a ceiling on expenditures. But if he does not feel that it would be, I shall not argue with him. The point is that while the power but not the right has existed in the executive department to freeze funds, the proposed action would be an invitation by the Congress for the President to turn "power" into "right." The average Member of Congress—and I am sure it is true of the American people as a whole—is for a reduction in expenditures.

In case the Bow amendment is adopted, it will cut expenditures back to the $131.5 billion level. I expect to offer a substitute for the entire bill, striking out all after the enacting clause, which would call, in my opinion, for larger reductions, though I would make the exceptions as I mentioned earlier, such as military expenditures in Southeast Asia, military personnel, payment of interest on the national debt, social security payments, veterans' retirement benefits, and all the rest of like kind. So in the event the Bow amendment is adopted fixing a ceiling on expenditures, I expect to offer as a substitute my own amendment, which would, I believe cut expenditures more, but would tie the limitations to the spending in 1967, when the Congress set the level. Where the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio has to do with the whole Federal Government, mine would tie the restriction down by departments and agencies.

In order to make my amendment applicable, it might be appropriate to take the Bow amendment, setting a limit, and then take mine, which will not tie the limitation down to the Budget Bureau figure but will tie it down to the 1967 spending, where Congress fixed the amount, and again I would make it applicable alike to each department and agency instead of permitting the President to apply the reduction where he wished, saving what he might prefer.

What I intend to offer would scale executive departments back to the 1967 level, and with few exceptions that is all they have been spending. They have been living only in the hopes of these increased appropriations.

The Bow amendment by itself, I would think, is wholly unsound, because it gives the President too much power. While I don't think he would, he could save his "butter" and cut our guns. I would tie the cuts to the 1967 spending. I think the provision I shall offer would carry out what we want to do. If the Bow amendment is offered, I will offer my substitute, setting up where the reduced expenditures, below this years' budget, must be applied.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I am doing my best to understand what the Bow amendment would do if it is passed. I understand it is an amendment to the resolution which would mean we would have two things, the committee resolution and the Bow amendment. Is there anyone here who can explain what the effect would be if these passed the House today together?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will say I would hope we would accept my substitute for it. My substitute would be to strike out all after the enacting clause and would tie cuts in budgeted spending for 1968 to the 1969 level, which is fixed by the Congress, with the exceptions which I have earlier spelled out.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bow amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabor this issue. We have debated it and debated it and debated it for weeks. I feel that the House of Representatives has done a good job in its efforts to reduce spending by its action on appropriation bills generally. We will certainly reduce the President's appropriation budget by as much as $6 billion. This will not be reflected in spending cuts to that extent in fiscal year 1968, but it will save $6 billion in total in the next 2 or 3 years. If we adopt the bill as submitted here today, the appropriation total reduction, we estimate, would go to $7.5 billion. The reduction in spending—in the first year, fiscal 1968—would probably be about $3 billion or $3.5 billion, the remainder would come in later years. It seems to me that this is the procedure to be followed if we wish to make our imprint on fiscal matters and preserve for the House of Representatives that cherished right of the power of the purse.

The gentleman from Ohio does not propose to "reduce" spending. He proposes to deny the expenditure of $5 billion—during the current fiscal year, that is. He does not rescind this money, because the $5 billion would remain available during the fiscal year 1969—if it were no-year money. So to some extent this would not be very much a money-saving amendment. It would reduce spending this year, but it would not save great amounts of money ultimately. The money, probably most of it, would still be available for expenditure in the hands of the executive branch.

The gentleman from Mississippi, who has worked very diligently in connection with these matters, has discussed with the Members an amendment which he may offer if the Bow amendment is adopted. He would substitute for the Bow amendment an amendment which would also reserve, for the fiscal year, about $5 to $7 billion, or more. No one knows just how much reduction in spending these amendments would bring about. But neither the Bow nor the Whitten amendments would reduce any of the obligational authority in the hands of the President.

I feel that we should not reduce ourselves to the puny position of a debating society and let the executive branch fully determine what shall be the expenditure pattern of this Government. We can remain in the driver's seat by controlling the amount of money we appropriate and make available to the executive branch for expenditure.

I believe we in Congress ought to do it by appropriations.

It is all right to say, "Mr. President, delay the spending of $5 billion or $7 billion." But we have seen here today the difficulty of even a modest reduction in appropriations. All this resolution provided was a relatively modest reduction in appropriations of about $1.5 billion, and we ran into all manner of trouble. It became apparent to one and all that the cut in appropriations of some $1.5 billion was very painful and difficult.

But this proposal would be turning over to the President the authority, and mandating him, without instructions from us, except that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] would say, "You have got to confine your slowdowns, your reserves, to each individual agency and department."

This is just too much power to give to any President. It is too much of an abdication on the part of Members of Congress.

This is no time to slow down the Government and to bring about a fiscal crisis. This proposal means we may well be hanging here in conference between the House and Senate for days and days with this issue.

We are in a war. This continuing resolution ought to pass. It can be worked out if we do not have in it the Bow amendment or the Whitten substitute.

I urge the House to vote down the Bow amendment and to approve the resolution which was brought here earlier in the afternoon by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill do now close.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman talking about the joint resolution?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that motion, and I move that all debate on the Bow amendment do now close.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman in that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Bow and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 177, noes 130.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the joint resolution of October 5, 1967 (Public Law 90–102) is hereby amended by striking out 'October 23, 1967' and inserting in lieu thereof 'November 23, 1967' and by adding the following language:

"'*Provided further*, That for fiscal year 1968, unless hostilities in Vietnam and Southeast Asia should cease earlier, Federal spending of appropriated funds except expenditures from trust funds by each department and agency of Government, including the legislative and judicial branches, except for military expenditures of the Department of Defense directly related to our involvement in Southeast Asia, including pay of all military personnel, the payment of interest on the national debt, payments under the Social Security Act, veterans and other retirement benefits, medicare and old-age assistance payments, shall not exceed the amount expended during fiscal year 1967, except that the limitation on the Department of Transportation shall not be more than 95 per centum of the budgeted amount for 1968: *Provided further*, That where deemed neces-

> sary to maintain mail service, the President is authorized to exempt the Post Office Department from the provisions of this Act: *Provided further,* That should the President deem it necessary for collection of revenue, he is authorized to exempt, to the extent necessary, the Internal Revenue and the Customs Services: *Provided further,* That such reduction of expenditures insofar as practical may be made by stretching out the time schedule of performance and payment on contracts so as not to require the elimination of new construction starts, and by each department and agency not filling vacancies.' "

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope I can have order and I think, perhaps, having discussed this earlier, the best thing I can do would be to read my amendment, if the members of the Committee will follow me. It is my opinion that the language of the substitute amendment speaks for itself better than I can add to it. So, skipping over the formal part which the members of the Committee heard read and which merely extends the time for the continuing resolution, the remainder is as follows:

> *Provided further,* That for fiscal year 1968, unless hostilities in Vietnam and Southeast Asia should cease earlier, Federal spending of appropriated funds except expenditures from trust funds by each department and agency of Government, including the legislative and judicial branches, except for military expenditures of the Department of Defense directly related to our involvement in Southeast Asia, including pay of all military personnel, the payment of interest on the national debt, payments under the Social Security Act, veterans and other retirement benefits, medicare and old-age assistance payments, shall not exceed the amount expended during fiscal year 1967, except that the limitation on the Department of Transportation shall not be more than 95 per centum of the budgeted amount for 1968: *Provided further,* That where deemed necessary to maintain mail service, the President is authorized to exempt the Post Office Department from the provisions of this Act: *And provided further,* should the President deem it necessary for collection of revenue, he is authorized to exempt, to the extent necessary, the Internal Revenue and the Customs Services: *Provided further,* That such reduction of expenditures insofar as practical may be made by stretching out the time schedule of performance and payment on contracts so as not to require the elimination of new construction starts, and by each department and agency not filling vacancies.

Mr. Chairman, there are several things that I believe I should again call to the attention of the Members. One is that fact that most of the departments in question have been operating at the 1967 level with few exceptions because they are required to do so by the continuing resolutions under which they have been operating, and those few exceptions have operated under 1968 appropriations for only a few weeks, so the reductions, to a tremendous degree, are reductions in proposed or authorized increased expenditures for the rest of this fiscal year. Where the Bow amendment as it stands would leave to the President the application of the reductions from the $136.5 billion contemplated in the budget to $131.5 billion, here we make the exceptions which the Members have heard, and we place the restrictions, department by department and agency by agency, on a fair and equitable basis.

Now, I realize that we are a growing country with more and more mail and more and more people, so I have provided that where the President determines that mail service requires it, he may make an exception to our restrictions. I do not know that I believe in the argument altogether about the Internal Revenue and Customs Service, but with an increasing workload and more and more people in our country, it stands to reason that they might require more people to collect more revenue. At any rate, should the President determine that either service does, he can make such determination and waive the requirements of my amendment for the Internal Revenue Service and the Customs Service to the extent necessary.

Now, we are all in a very practical business here. We cannot stop taking care of our country. You will recall I was the author of the successful motion some years ago to override the President's veto of public works necessary for the protection of our country. With my feeling, and I certainly believe it expresses the intent of the Congress, I provide that insofar as possible in holding these departments and agencies in cutting or holding back expenditures to the 1967 level, which is about all any of them have known, that insofar as practical it may be done by stretching out the time schedule of performance and payment on contracts so that we ourselves will not be hereby necessitating the elimination of new projects. We must not stop taking care of our country in a time of war unless it is absolutely forced upon us. All depends upon how strong we keep our country at home. And then I say to each department and agency, "Insofar as practical, try to live by your 1967 level by not filling vacancies."

Now, we do not say that you cannot hire, we just say "insofar as practical," and, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I do not know how to do this job facing us any better than this to meet the problems that we have, as my amendment attempts to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WHITTEN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. If I remember correctly, the gentleman stated earlier that his amendment would save approximately $7 billion or $7.5 billion, is that correct, based on the estimates the gentleman has had from the staff members of our committee?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, that is my judgment based on the best information I have. The spending budget or the money spent in fiscal year 1967 was $125.7 billion. The budgeted spending for 1968 was $136.5 billion making a difference of $10.8 billion between 1967 and the amount budgeted for spending in 1968.

The reduced expenditures from the 1968 budget called for by my amendment has varied from $5 billion to $7.5 billion. I am inclined to believe that the figure $7.5 billion is closer. There are a number of contingencies which cannot be firmly figured. But I would like to say at this point that under the Bow amendment which you just adopted, and for which I shall offer my substitute, you cut back only $5 billion. Under my amendment I believe we will cut more, but more important it is done by cutting all departments and agencies back, or holding them back, to their 1967 levels, with the exception, of course, of Vietnam needs. Nearly all of them are, or were, until a short time ago, operating under continuing resolutions at the 1967 level or less. The few departments that have had their appropriation bills finally enacted have had them for only a relatively few weeks, so you are really not cutting anything back much from where it is, but just keeping them from expanding and spending, from going on up, and we make exceptions for old-age assistance and other places where the number of people and the amount committed are something that we should not try to renege on at this time.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Under the provisions of your amendment, the cuts would be made by the Congress rather than by the President?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is. My amendment ties the limitation to the action of the Congress in providing money for 1967. That is one way. The other thing that this does as against the Bow amendment is that this makes it apply to each department and to each agency whereas the Bow amendment applies only to the whole Federal Government. The President could do anything so far as application of the $5 billion holdback is concerned. In fact the Bow amendment invites him to—I think we need to make the tiedown ourselves.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. In my opinion, the approach under the gentleman's amendment is much better than the approach under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] for the reason first that it would save more money and, secondly, that it is a more orderly way in which to impose reductions.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend and colleague from Alabama, who has contributed so much sound judgment to the Congress. Every department and agency knows what they spent last year so you have a solid starting point. So far as those agencies here that you might be interested in, we treat them all alike with exceptions in those areas where I think everybody here is willing to agree that we should have excepted. We cannot and would not want to cut people out of social security payments or old-age assistance when others no more qualified are receiving theirs. We may have many hundreds of thousands of more people entitled to certain benefits under the law in 1968 than in 1967. But I think that we, as Members of the Congress want to reserve the right to make these decisions. My amendment leaves the Congress where we have acted fairly, judiciously treating each department and agency alike and we have tried to have as a starting point 1967 where we, the Congress, set the figures. In this time of war what department or agency can rightly complain when we provide that they cannot go above at the 1967 spending level, which as I have said, is about all that any department has had. Of course, again I recognize the exception of the postal service where the workload may increase and the others provided in my amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Bow to the amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: At the end of the substitute resolution add the following:
>
> "*Provided further*, That net aggregate administrative budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 shall not exceed $131,500,000,000, except by those expenditures in excess of $22 billion that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I again will say that I am not going to take a great deal of the time of the Committee.

This is the Bow amendment which was just adopted to the regular bill and it now amends the substitute resolution.

If the substitute that has been offered by the gentleman from Mississippi does all the things that he says it does and there are some awfully good sounding words in it—let us top it off by putting a double lock on it and put on an expenditure limitation and have it the way he now has the House handling it, but let us be sure we have a lock on by putting a spending level in it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that if the language were modified to say "in no case to exceed $131,500,000,000," I would have no objection.

Mr. BOW. That is exactly what it says.

Mr. WHITTEN. But there seemed to be some other language in the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BOW. That is exactly what it says.

Mr. WHITTEN. I was interrupted. I am sorry. Will the gentleman repeat it?

Mr. BOW. The amendment states:

> At the end of the substitute resolution add the following:
>
> "*Provided further*, That net aggregate administrative budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall not exceed $131,500,000,000, except by those expenditures in excess of $22 billion that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia."

Mr. WHITTEN. I have to object to the last part of the amendment because the provision that I have stated, the $22 billion, might be taken as a limitation and I would not want to risk that. If the gentleman would agree to strike out the last part of the amendment and follow the language of my amendment, I would have no objection to it.

Mr. BOW. I am sorry. I have about 50 Members advising me and I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I said the amendment that I have offered would make an exception for all of the things that are directly related to our operations in South Vietnam. I am afraid that if the language having to do with the $22 billion for operations in South Vietnam were to remain, it would be accepted as something of a limitation. If the gentleman would put a period after the $131.5 billion——

Mr. BOW. I think the exception is there. If the President finds that they need money in excess of $22 billion, the President can determine it is necessary and can spend it.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would certainly not agree to language which would place a limitation on meeting the needs of our men in Vietnam.

Mr. BOW. I think unintentionally the gentleman is doing the same thing.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In examining the language of the Whitten amendment, and relating it to the particular provisions that are included in the Bow amendment, there is no conflict between the two——

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that, since I have not seen the language, I was trusting my memory, and now I observe the language "except those expenditures in excess of".

In view of that, I have no objection to the amendment though I believe it surplusage. My provision while reducing expenditures more ties the intent of the Congress down to department and agency rather than leaving the Executive the right to cut $5,000,000,000 where he might want to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bow amendment.

A somewhat confused situation exists. The Committee of the Whole House has approved a joint resolution making certain recisions, through debate and adoption, with some modification, of the first six sections of the joint resolution considered earlier this afternoon.

The gentleman from Mississippi has proposed to strike it out, and he has proposed a substitute amendment which is a modified form of the Bow amendment. It would eliminate the specific savings and reductions which were pinpointed in the original joint resolution. But it would make greater overall reductions—or, more precisely, deferrals of expenditures until 1969.

The gentleman from Ohio has now offered the Bow amendment, in its pure form, with all its chastity and attractiveness, to the Whitten substitute. It seems to me that we ought to preserve the work which we have done all afternoon and preserve the joint resolution which we have proposed.

Since Mr. WHITTEN's amendment would strike out the work of the House and give us one form of the Bow amendment, as I see it, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] would give us the real form of the Bow amendment, it would be better not to adopt the present Bow amendment and not to adopt the Whitten amendment and leave the joint resolution as it was. The House, in Committee of the Whole, acted. It exercised its will and adopted the original resolution which I had presented earlier in the afternoon, plus the Bow amendment.

As between the Bow amendment and the Whitten amendment, I would probably prefer the Whitten amendment, except that it strikes out all the other economy provisions which we have accepted during the afternoon. As the House knows, this resolution will go to the other body. It will not be approved, in my opinion, and we will be tied up here for I do not know how many days in connection with this matter, whichever way we go. I just wanted to outline the situation. The House, of course, is free to work its own will.

My best guess is that the Bow amendment, as a conservative estimate, will defer expenditures by $5 billion, and probably by a much greater sum because spending is going higher than was estimated in the budget. Mr. WHITTEN's amendment, I think, would cut even more deeply, and this may be what the House would like to do. But I do not think it would be wise for us to take this step. However, the House must work its will on this very important measure.

In my opinion the $7½ billion cut which we expect to make in appropriations requests is a wiser and more responsible course. The $7½ billion would be a genuine saving. The Bow and Whitten proposals involve deferrals to a very considerable extent, rather than reductions, and the funds become available for expenditure after the end of fiscal 1968 if they are "no-year" funds. A dollar not appropriated is a dollar that cannot be spent, but a dollar appropriated but not spent this year may—and to a very considerable extent would be—spent after the end of fiscal 1968.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman make the reference earlier to the fact that we would cut out the savings we had made earlier in the day. I saw the blackboard which the gentleman had and the savings under this substitute or the other—which are approximately twice as much as claimed by the gentleman.

May I say further—and I appreciate the gentleman yielding—that the gentleman's figures are tied to those of the Bureau of the Budget, which, of course, is an executive department, and I think it is much more sound to use as a starting point the actions of the Congress in 1967, and while our savings are twice those shown by the gentleman on the blackboard, it is done by pushing them back to the 1967 level, where most of them already are.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this point, that the continuing resolutions which we have had—and we have had four of them—have not been tied to expenditures. The continuing resolutions have been tied to appropriations. Funds provided in previous years have not been under the jurisdiction of the continuing resolutions. The continuing resolutions only referred to appropriations and not to spending. So I would trust that the proposals would be voted down.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on these amendments do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agree to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The question was taken.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Bow and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 192, noes 131.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROYHILL OF VIRGINIA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia to the amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: After the last proviso insert a new proviso to read:

"*Provided further*, That appropriations made by Public Law 90-102, as amended, shall be available for activities budgeted under 'Office of Economic Opportunity, Economic Opportunity Program' at a rate not in excess of that which would be provided for by an appropriation of $1,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this matter has already been approved by the House in a previous action. Therefore, I make a point of order against it.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the language of my amendment is the same amendment that I attempted to offer prior to the time of debate. It was ruled out of order because a new section has been added. The new section will strike out all after the enacting clause, and this is merely an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the ruling of the Chair that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia is an amendment to the Whitten amendment and is therefore in order at this point.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. My understanding is, Mr. Chairman, that the Chair has ruled that the gentleman from Virginia has no time to discuss his amendment. It seems to me, if my recollection is correct, that the time limitation offered by the gentleman from Texas and approved by the House was only to the Bow amendment to the substitute. If that is true, then it would seem to me that the gentleman from Virginia would not be precluded and would have the opportunity to discuss his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the opinion of the Chair that the motion that was made to close debate was to the pending Whitten amendment and amendments thereto. Therefore, there is no more time for debate on this matter.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I understand the Whitten amendment now reads that it would permit an expenditure by the Office of Economic Opportunity in this fiscal year of $1,687,000,000. Is my understanding correct on that?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The question was taken.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 167, noes 132.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] as amended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN to the amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: At the end thereof add the following:

"Obligations during the period by section 1 hereof for activities to be authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 (S. 1872 or similar legislation) shall not exceed an annual rate of $2,000,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, is it permissible to state to the Committee that this is the same amendment that was adopted earlier?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that is not a parliamentary inquiry, and the amendment is not debatable.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], as amended.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The Chair has stated the vote occurs now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. Is it not more accurate to say that this is a vote on the substitute by the gentleman from Mississippi, as amended by the Bow, Broyhill of Virginia, and Passman amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. This is the pending amendment on the Clerk's desk. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. VANIK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 949, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary inquiry is—is it possible to get a separate vote on any of the amendments to the Whitten amendment, including the amendments reducing the OEO program and the foreign aid program?

The SPEAKER. Not in the House at this time. There is one amendment that has been reported by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ALBERT. Then the only vote on those amendments would be on the Whitten amendment itself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, is this vote on the Whitten amendment, as amended?

The SPEAKER. The vote is on the Whitten amendment, as amended.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So a vote

"yea" is for the Whitten amendment, as amended, and a vote "nay" is obviously in opposition?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 164, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

YEAS—238

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Everett
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Galifianakis
Gardner
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Moore
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pettis
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Ullman
Utt
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—164

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kyros
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morse, Mass.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Whalen
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—30

Bell
Boggs
Bolton
Broomfield
Culver
Dawson
Edwards, Calif.
Fountain
Fuqua
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Landrum
Latta
Mathias, Calif.
Morgan
Patman
Pepper
Purcell
Rarick
Rees
St. Onge
Stephens
Tenzer
Tunney
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Boggs against.

Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Tenzer against.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Pepper against.

Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Latta for, with Mr. Holland against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Culver against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Edwards of California against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Purcell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. KUPFERMAN. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. KUPFERMAN moves to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 244, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

YEAS—158

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Barrett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kupferman
Kyros
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McFall
Madden
Mahon
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morse, Mass.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Whalen
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—244

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan

Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Everett
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Galifianakis
Gardner
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Moore
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Ullman
Utt
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—30

Bell
Boggs
Bolton
Broomfield
Culver
Dawson
Edwards, Calif.
Fountain
Fuqua
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Landrum
Latta
Lloyd
Mathias, Calif.
Morgan
Patman
Pepper
Purcell
Rarick
Rees
St. Onge
Stephens
Tenzer
Tunney
Williams, Miss.
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boggs for, with Mrs. Bolton against.

Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Latta against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Lloyd against.

Mr. Tenzer for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Culver for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.

Mr. Holland for, with Mr. Landrum against.

Mr. Tunney for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Mr. Rees for, with Mr. Fuqua against.

Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Bell.

Mr. HARDY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. BOLAND, GRAY, CHARLES H. WILSON, and EVANS of Colorado changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 254, nays 143, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

YEAS—254

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Moore
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Myers
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pettis
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—143

Addabbo
Albert
Annunzio
Barrett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Gallagher
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hays
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McFall
Madden
Mahon
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Whalen
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—35

Ashley
Bell
Boggs
Bolton
Broomfield
Culver
Dawson
Edwards, Calif.
Fountain
Fuqua
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Landrum
Latta
Lloyd
Mathias, Calif.
Morgan
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Patman
Pepper
Purcell
Rarick
Rees
St. Onge
Stephens
Tenzer
Tunney
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Boggs against.

Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Holland against.

Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Pepper against.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Culver against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Tenzer against.

Mr. Latta for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Mosher for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Edwards of California against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Rees against.

Mr. Lloyd for, with Mr. Tunney against.

Mr. Mathias of California for, with Mr. Willis against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. McCARTHY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed and that they be permitted to include certain brief and pertinent excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STAGGERS submitted conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes.

SLOW DOWN FLIGHT TO CITIES BY INCREASING RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the popular quiz games of a few years ago, a contestant was almost certain to be asked how much space each person would have if all the people in the world were placed in the State of Texas. The answer was something like 40 feet by 50 feet—not much of a spread but nevertheless surprisingly large quarters for 3 billion guests.

In view of the continuing growth of America's cities, perhaps it is time to put that question another way. Has any one of us ever driven through the countryside or traveled by airplane over our vast farmlands, forests, and mountains without thinking back to the crowded metropolitan areas with their teeming populations clustered in tenements, apartments, and mini-yards? And with not enough jobs and not enough playgrounds.

Yet with all this unseemly, unhealthy, and unrealistic crowding in our urban areas, the endless surge continues with each passing hour. Meanwhile, back at the ranch and over the hills and into the trees, there is room for everyone. Within 2 short months there will be some 200 million souls living in this country, and in continental United States alone there is enough land space to provide 9½ acres for every one of those men, women, and children. Unfortunately, unless sensible long-range planning is developed to encourage a reversal, the trend will endure indefinitely and we will have more people, more poverty, and more problems in the cities of America.

From 1950 through 1960, while the urban population of this country grew from 150 million to 179 million, the rural population actually declined—from 54,230,000 to 54,054,000. During this period the number of recipients of public assistance, according to figures published in the 1967 pocket data book prepared in the Statistical Reports Section of the Department of Commerce, rose from 5,613,000 to 6,340,000. For 1965, the number was 7,843,000.

The publication does not list a breakdown of rural and urban public assistance figures, but it is common knowledge that the major troubles lie in our cities. Unemployment plagues most large cities, and slum clearance is not keeping apace with slum creation.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman is quoted in the Washington Star of September 10 as saying that pressures on the cities were generated by a mass exodus from the countryside that has "literally forced 20 million rural people into our urban areas since 1950."

No one has been forced into our cities, Mr. Speaker. Economic conditions may have persuaded an endless number of families to retreat from their country homes, but proper planning on the part of the Federal Government would dissuade them from following the mirage that leads to distress and despair. Oases that come out of proper planning should long since have been provided far away from the stench of overpopulated cities.

In failing to take steps to discourage migrant families from retaining residence in rural areas, the Federal Government has in effect invited into large cities many hundreds of thousands of persons not in any way trained for the types of employment available in the economy and society of those cities. In consequence, many of the unfortunate who made the move are being subsidized by this same Government in areas of high rent and high prices; in smaller communities their stipends would go much further and their children would have less chance of falling into the caldrons of crime and immorality that have come to be associated with crowded city life.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the costs of the Nation's welfare and poverty programs can be reduced drastically if the administration will make a forthright effort to redirect the movement that is filling our cities with indigents at a time when useful rural land could be sown with economic opportunity to provide the environment that produces healthy, happy, law-abiding, useful citizens. Industry must be invited into our rural areas, with tax incentives where necessary and Government contracts where possible. With proper educational aid and job training, a vast number of those now dependent upon the dole will be able to look to the future with hope and a new dignity that is being denied them so long as they are captives of city slums.

The Nation has proceeded too long and too far down the road that has crammed seven-tenths of the people into one percent of the land, that has made public welfare a way of life for too many citizens who are able to work but denied the opportunity because of unwise relocation. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., Derrick. It follows:

A TEMPORARY PROGRAM?

Back in 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said: "The federal government must and shall quit this business of relief. . . . Continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration, fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit."

Today, with over 8 million receiving payments, this "business of relief" has become almost a profession on the part of many receiving it. Some of the recipients are beginning to make demands like other pressure groups. Some, we suspect, are making public welfare a way of life.

It's appropriate to recall that relief rolls today are higher than in the great depression. Which leads us to ask: If they are in the million during "boom" times, what would they be in another depression?

And if President Roosevelt were alive today we wonder what he would think about the status of relief which, according to him, was launched as a "temporary" program to help people until they could get back to work?

STEAMFITTER INQUIRY BREWS MURDER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a key figure in the St. Louis steamfitter union "inquiry" has been murdered, according to a story in the October 17 issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. Members will recall that after months of delay the Department of Justice agreed to my suggestion, that an investigation was merited by alleged violations of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

My request was based partly on the fact that no reports required by this act had been filed to reflect substantial political contributions by this union including a $50,000 contribution to the Lyndon Johnson campaign in 1964. The political intrigue was compounded by the Presidential pardon accorded head steamfitter Lawrence Callanan who had been serving a Federal sentence for racketeering.

The murder victim was identified by the Globe-Democrat as John O'Connell Hough, a St. Louis attorney with steamfitter connections and a previous witness on at least three occasions before a grand jury proceeding in South Bend, Ind. I do not know at this point how the death of Hough will affect the course of the grand jury proceeding in St. Louis, but it becomes more and more obvious that wherever the trail leads, a determined effort is being made by ruthless men to block it. The article follows:

KEY FIGURE IN STEAMFITTER INQUIRY BELIEVED MURDERED—BODY TENTATIVELY IDENTIFIED AS HOUGH'S FOUND IN MIAMI, FLA.

(By Al Delugach and Denny Walsh)

An apparent murder victim in Miami, Fla., was tentatively identified Monday by investigators as Clayton attorney John O'Connell Hough, The Globe-Democrat learned. Hough, 53, is a key figure in a federal inquiry into St. Louis Steamfitter Union pension insurance dealings.

The body of a man beaten and shot several times was found by two fishermen Sunday under a rubbish pile in a remote spot not far from a hotel where police were told he disappeared Aug. 12.

A missing persons report was given authorities Aug. 13 by a woman friend. She was quoted as saying Hough left a hotel in the Bal Harbour area just north of Miami Beach the previous day to meet two associates at the airport on a plane scheduled to arrive from St. Louis. As far as authorities know, it was the last time Hough was seen alive.

The condition of the body indicated the victim had been dead at least four weeks and probably longer.

Tentative identification, The Globe-Democrat was informed, was made from hair and clothing. A detailed description of Hough's clothing when last seen had been given authorities.

According to the description, Hough wore brown slacks, brown shoes, a yellow sport coat, light yellow shirt, brown tie and straw hat with a wide band.

The Dade County sheriff's office said Monday that, according to its policy, it could not release any information on the dead man's identity until positive identificaton could be made. It was learned that efforts were being made to obtain fingerprint samples and dental records for comparison.

Hough, a longtime associate of St. Louis Steamfitter Union officials, has had business ventures in the Dominican Republic for several years and was occasionally in Miami in connection with them.

STOCK BONANZA

In January, 1966, The Globe-Democrat revealed that Hough was one of several St. Louisans on record as having received a stock bonanza worth several hundred thousand dollars from First United Life Insurance Co. of Gary, Ind., in connection with sale of insurance to the steamfitter pension fund here.

Hough has been a witness three times since February, 1966, before a federal grand jury in South Bend, Ind.

Under direction of U.S. Justice Department criminal division attorneys, the grand jury has been seeking to learn if federal kickback laws were violated in the 1963 deal between the steamfitters and First United.

As revealed more than a year ago by The Globe-Democrat, Hough evidently had not filed federal income tax returns for several years past.

REPORTED MISSING

It is known that the Internal Revenue Service had built a promising tax evasion case against Hough, which conceivably could have been used to encourage his cooperation with the government in the pension insurance inquiry.

It was learned Monday that the Justice Department had known previously of the missing persons report on Hough. However, since he had been difficult to locate previously, federal authorities were not conducting an intensive search for him—just "looking for him in a casual way."

Hough, who lived in a palatial residence overlooking the Missouri River on Old Jamestown road near Florissant, had maintained offices in Clayton, both for law practice and for a now-defunct insurance agency representing First United.

Dade County authorities said the body was found at 9:55 a.m. Sunday in an uninhabited area west of Collins avenue and 172nd street. It was about five blocks from a motel area known as Sunny Isle Strip.

NO WEAPON FOUND

A spokesman said the fishermen were poking around in a rubbish pile alongside the Intercoastal-Waterway when they discovered the body. No weapon was found, he said. The immediate area is uninhabited.

The medical examiner was quoted as saying death was from several gunshot wounds from a large-caliber weapon. The sheriff's office confirmed that the missing person report on Hough was being investigated, but did not go into detail.

It was learned from other sources that Hough was reported to have left the Ivanhoe Hotel, 10175 Collins, and was to return for dinner at 6 p.m.

The woman friend—who is from St. Louis—identified herself falsely as "Mrs. Hough" when making the missing persons report to Bal Harbour police, The Globe-Democrat was told.

The woman, whose true identity was subsequently learned, remained in the Miami Beach area until Aug. 20, when she presumably returned to St. Louis, authorities said.

HEAVY GUARD

Two government witnesses have been under heavy security guard by federal marshals during past appearances before the South Bend grand jury. One of the witnesses from Miami had told officials he once was told if he did not keep his mouth shut he was a "dead man."

They had said they were involved with Hough in negotiations with the Indiana insurance firm in 1963 on a scheme involving sale of millions of dollars worth of insurance to Steamfitter Local 562's pension fund.

Hough who had handled large numbers of workmen's compensation cases for steamfitter members in past years, was city attorney for Florissant during the 1960–63 administration of then Mayor Henry Koch, a close steamfitter ally.

Frederick Ackerman, one of the government's witnesses, previously was quoted in The Globe-Democrat as having said he was present when the head of the Florissant City Council, Hugh Gorham, and the assistant police chief, Bernard Callanan, discussed "opening up" Florissant for gambling with Chicago hoodlums in 1963. Ackerman said the subject later was discussed with Hough.

Gorham is serving a federal prison term on conviction of perjury before the South Bend federal grand jury.

VIETNAM

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the recent announcement by Australia and New Zealand that they will increase their forces in Vietnam, for this is in tune with the recommendation I made to the House of Representatives on September 14, stating:

> The time has come to stop the increasing drain of American lives and national strength into South Vietnam by insisting that those in this area increase their effort.

Under the terms of the recent announcement Australia's present force of 6,300 servicemen in Vietnam would be raised to more than 8,000, the new units include a battalion group with helicopter support.

New Zealand will send a second company of infantry to Vietnam—the 170 infantrymen will join 376 New Zealand troops already there.

It is encouraging, also, to note that Narcisco Ramos, foreign secretary of the Philippines indicated a few days ago that the allies of the United States in Vietnam should seriously consider sending more troops. Presently the Philippine Government has a 2,000-man civic action unit in Vietnam, and this statement by Ramos gives us hope that more Philippine manpower—either military or civilian—will be assigned in this area.

Other countries with troops in the fighting area are Thailand and South Korea, and these forces should be expanded where possible.

The time has come when we should give serious thought to consolidating those gains we have made in Vietnam. Undoubtedly we have blunted the blade of communism in Southeast Asia. We have given Asians and others throughout the world cause to ponder that communism is not a desirable way of life for the future and that aggression always bears the bitter fruit of failure.

A major part of this task is for the United States to develop policies that will help the free Asian countries in the organization of peaceful and well-ordered societies. We must increasingly give thought to helping free Asians help themselves, and this can best be accomplished by methodically phasing Asians in and Americans out of the military and other operations in South Vietnam.

We must stand ready to help in this transition, for much remains to be done on the domestic front in South Vietnam, aside and apart from military operations.

Right now there are many Vietnamese roaming the rice paddies, displaced by the ravages of war. Every effort must be made to help these individuals reestablish themselves in their society, rather than to let them wander across the land, unbelonging and unproductive.

There are many civilians in this area who are in desperate need of medical attention, and our efforts should be accelerated in supplying skills and medicines for the afflicted. American doctors and health specialists increasingly should give attention to contributing their services in this area. In this I proudly refer to Dr. Robert Davis, of Boiling Spring, Pa., a resident of my congressional district who has already given freely of his medical skills through two volunteer tours to the Province of Tay Ninh in Vietnam.

Inflation is rampant in the economy of South Vietnam as it is here. Efforts should be initiated to introduce a note of stability. American economists and marketing specialists can contribute very valuable advice and services toward the end of bringing about a balanced economy and, in the process, provide some valuable economic lessons for those who handle the economy in South Vietnam.

If we persist in helping free Asians run their own show, the future will be secure for freedom in this area.

And another very important aspect would be this: The sacrifice of American lives and materials in this area will not have been in vain, for aggression will have been thwarted, and free people will have a free choice on their own way of life.

NEED FOR FEDERAL ATHLETIC COMMISSION

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, in recent years there has been increasing congressional interest in the national problems created by the great and growing power of groups involved in organized sports. This power has resulted from the tremendous American enthusiasm for organized sports of all kinds, particularly baseball, football, basketball, boxing, and racing. The spectator appeal of these and other sports has meant television and other media contracts with professional sports organizations worth many millions of dollars. In several cases it has caused intense competition between cities for team franchises, which in major sports are now worth millions of dollars.

As organized sports have grown, there has been a dramatic change in the character of athletic contests, with the local aspects of these contests decreasing in importance, and the national impact becoming greater. Thus, it was estimated that 40 million persons would watch the Red Sox-Cardinals series on television; but Fenway Park in Boston accommodates only 35,000 fans. Each autumn Sunday 20 to 30 million enthusiasts watch professional football games on television; only 55,000 can personally watch the Redskins play at District of Columbia Stadium.

Not only do most Americans watch organized sports over interstate television transmissions rather than in person at the stadium, but in most sports a large portion of the financial return from any contest is derived from sale of television, radio, or closed circuit television rights. In some sports, such as boxing, the gate receipts from any major event are a very small portion of the total receipts. For example, the second Patterson-Johannson fight had a reported gross of around $2,825,000; of this total, it is reported that over $2,000,000 came from theater television receipts. These figures merely bolster what in my judgment is an obvious conclusion: that organized sports depend very heavily upon the use of interstate facilities for their spectator appeal and for their financial success.

The recognition of this dependence upon the use of interstate facilities has caused numerous legislative proposals to render one or another aspect of organized sports amenable to Federal regulation. Many bills have been suggested which would have clarified the status of certain sports under the antitrust laws. In addition, the Members will recall that in the 89th Congress the House passed a bill which would, if it had become public law, established a Federal Boxing Commission.

This Federal agency would have been granted broad authority over professional boxing, including licensing, investigatory, and disclosure authority, the power to review contracts entered into between boxers, managers, and promoters, and also the power to prohibit the broadcasting or other interstate dissemination of contests in some circumstances.

This long and varied congressional interest in the regulation of organized sports has, in my judgment, resulted from two primary causes. First, as discussed above, it is now obvious that many aspects of sports are interstate activities, and have a substantial impact on interstate commerce. Second, it is equally obvious that the existing regulation of organized sports conducted by the 50 States is inadequate in some cases. Many States have rules respecting the conduct of sports which are less carefully drawn or less energetically enforced than is necessary for the protection of the public and the athletes. In addition, some elements involved in organized sports have become too powerful and too geographically dispersed to be regulated effectively by the States. Thus, private groups with great financial power can act in an environment in which they are accountable to no one for the way they exercise this power. They may act without restraint to affect directly the livelihood of the athletes; they may be able to dictate the terms upon which the athletes participate in the sport and even the terms upon which the sport is conducted. In some instances, it is probable that the combined appeal of this unregulated power and potential profit has attracted unsavory elements into organized sports.

As just one example of how a sports organization can act to affect the reputation and livelihood of an athlete, let me recall to the Members the recent controversy over the refusal of Muhammed Ali to be inducted into the Armed Forces, and the response to his refusal by the World Boxing Association. Let me be very clear before I proceed: The merits of Muhammed Ali's case are irrelevant to my discussion, and I do not intend my comments as any kind of judgment on these merits. What is important to my discussion is that within hours after Muhammed Ali refused to take the Armed Forces induction oath, the World Boxing Association stripped him of his heavyweight champion's crown. This action was taken by the World Boxing Association before any indictment had been returned against Muhammed Ali for his refusal to take the induction oath, and before he had been convicted of any crime for refusing to take this oath. The World Boxing Association by its action arrogated to itself the function of judge and jury of a cause which was not yet a case.

What were the consequences of this action? Leaving aside the personal humiliation it may have caused, it virtually destroyed Muhammed Ali's ability and right to pursue his chosen livelihood. This appears to me rather shabby treatment of a man who had earned the right to fight as heavyweight champion of the world. But whatever judgment one has of Muhammed Ali and the consequences which his actions merit, it does seem to me that this episode dramatically demonstrates two things: First, that actions of groups involved in organized sports can directly affect important rights of the athletes who participate in these sports, and second, that these groups can act in an atmosphere where their actions often are not subject to effective and responsible regulation.

Mr. Speaker, because of my conclusion that some aspects of professional sports should be subject to uniform and effective regulation, I intend soon to introduce legislation to create a Federal Athletic Commission. In the declaration of policy, it will be recited that the purpose of the bill is to create a Federal administrative agency which, in cooperation with appropriate State authorities, will be able to supply uniform regulation of organized sports where the public interest requires such regulation, but which will not impose regulation where none is needed.

The Commission proposed in this bill consists of five members, appointed by the President, serving a 5-year term. This Commission will be empowered to conduct investigations when it is determined that a question exists as to whether regulation of some aspect of any given sport is in the public interest. If the investigation indicates that some regulation is in the public interest, the Commission would be authorized to undertake such regulation to the extent of licensing participants and officials, prescribing minimum safety standards and minimum qualifications for officials, and publicly disclosing any information about the sport which is deemed to be in the public interest. The Commission would also be granted the power to enforce in appropriate ways the regulations which it issues. Lastly, the Commission would be required by the end of each calendar year to report to the President and the Congress on its activities, and is directed to include in its report such recommendations for legislative or other action as it deems appropriate.

It is my hope that the committee to which this bill is referred will hold early hearings on it. In my judgment, such hearings would establish beyond question that the national interest requires creation of a Federal commission to supply whatever regulation is needed in organized sports. Only a Federal agency can insure uniform regulation where needed in an industry which affects interstate commerce in such substantial ways, and which has spawned private groups with such great and unregulated power.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that no one attributes my interest in promoting the responsibility of groups involved in organized sports to any "antisports" animus on my part. Every society we know of enjoyed athletic contests, and our Nation is no exception. In addition to providing relaxation to millions of Americans, organized sports are the vehicle for many young men from poor backgrounds to get a college education. The sports pages of the newspapers are to most Americans welcome diversion from the confusing and uncertain news in the rest of the paper. And of course, no one could accurately determine the national value to our young people of a hero like Bob Gibson or Carl Yastrzemski.

In conclusion, it is my hope that the introduction of this legislation will promote thoughtful study of the status and activities of organized sports. I believe that establishing a Federal Athletic Commission is a necessary step toward insuring that organized sports continue to hold an honored place in our society.

IS COMPETITION DEAD?

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, here in the House we have watched a determined power company pressure group endanger New England's first Federal hydroelectric project—the Dickey-Lincoln School project in Maine.

A lot of arguments have been advanced against the project: it is less economic than nuclear power; it will kill the coal industry; its power will go begging. I reject these, Mr. Speaker, as efforts to obscure the real issues.

Consumers in the Northeast pay high electric rates; New England's industry is at an economic disadvantage; New England has suffered at least one major blackout and numerous smaller ones; its power system is not the most profitable in the Nation, despite high rates.

Utilities in the area have not yet got the message sent out by the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville Power Administration: keep rates low and increase the use of electricity by each consumer—then unit costs will go down and a prosperous cycle of low rates and high use will become established, to the benefit of all.

In the Northwest, Mr. Speaker, we take the view that electricity must be abundant, low in cost, available to all, for our industrial health and for our domestic comfort. Competition between the privately and publicly owned distributing utilities has benefited consumers and the utilities themselves.

Compare the economic strength of the New England utilities and those of the Northwest and I am sure you will find more vitality in the public and private systems of the Northwest.

The House will have an opportunity to vote again on the $1,676,000 appropriation for advanced engineering and design of the Dickey project. I hope that through this project we can open up to New England consumers and industry the prospect of a modern, integrated power system. And I hope we can jog the private utilities with competition. By this route, I believe, they may be persuaded to do what many other utilities are doing in their own self-interest—to adopt the mass-production philosophy of low cost and high use.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HOWARD W. POLLOCK OF ALASKA BEFORE THE CONGRESSIONAL PRAYER GROUP

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and distinguished colleague from Alaska [Mr. Pollock] addressed our traditional Thursday morning Congressional Prayer Breakfast Group here in the Capitol.

Because of the timeliness of his remarks and the highly enthusiastic manner in which his address was received, it is my belief that other Members may be interested in what he had to say. Having recently visited Alaska as the ranking Republican on the House Flood Control Subcommittee, I can certainly testify to the extraordinary compassion displayed by this dynamic and dedicated Congressman from Alaska. This great and forward-looking speech presented to a large gathering of our colleagues has drawn praise for its content from the Democratic and Republican Members in attendance.

Its depth of thought makes it worthwhile reading for every Member of Congress. Therefore, I submit the speech in full to record it permanently in our history-making Congressional Record:

Address by the Honorable Howard W. Pollock, Congressman for Alaska, Before the Congressional Prayer Breakfast Group, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C., October 12, 1967

Mister Chairman, my dear colleagues, and friends, this is a singular and cherished privilege and sincere honor for me to address this very unique group of my distinguished colleagues who regularly attend and participate in the weekly prayer breakfast of the U.S. House of Representatives. It was my privilege in Anchorage, Alaska, to regularly attend and participate in the weekly prayer breakfast which a group of us initiated some 4 years or more ago; and, I had heard of the congressional prayer breakfast group and the annual presidential prayer breakfast long before I came to the Congress. May I candidly tell you that among the joys I experienced in being elected to the United States Congress, no prospect was more exciting than that of joining you regularly at this weekly prayer breakfast. I honestly feel so humble among you and so very fortunate to be privileged each week to share this important time and experience with you.

Several months ago in Gastonia, North Carolina, the true ecumenical spirit prevailed. At a Jaycee award banquet, I was a Catholic Republican guest speaker in a Protestant church where a Jewish Democrat was honored as the "Young Man of the Year."

In the brief portion of your very busy day which has been allotted to me to address you in these next few moments, it seems singularly appropriate that we might together devote our attentions seriously to the topic of religion in our national life. We are beset with a problem before we even begin. Here in America, we have been so long cloaked in the warm robe of freedom and in the radiance of God's warmth and love—and in turn, America has so smiled on Christianity, that it is very easy for our faith to be lulled into forgetting the real difficulties, the sacrifices, that true Christianity demands.

If we who are "red-blooded all Americans" confuse Christianity and Americanism, then we do a disservice to and lose the true meaning of "the Word of God," the message that is truly universal. If we are to be thoughtful in our faith, we must look at the message of that faith and ask what it means to be a Christian. What sets us apart from men with other gods or no god?

We certainly always seek to be loyal and dedicated Americans: however, if we are also to proclaim a faith in Jesus Christ, we must realize that something more, something vastly more challenging, is asked of us. For this man, Jesus, did not prescribe a form of government or even a particular mode of life: he taught a basis on which to found all of life and all of the relationship among all men.

In a Nation which so thoroughly acknowledges and even supports our religious way of life, it is difficult to see what that religion really means. Our several forms of worship are so integrated into "the American way" that our view of the faith is often obscured by the patriotic and cultural accretions which become involved. A friend tells me that in her church the doxology and a stanza from "America" are sung as one song with scarcely a breath in between.

We are indeed fortunate to live in a Nation where our faith in God and our loyalty to country are completely compatible. This is not so in some of the countries behind the iron or bamboo curtains. But this compatibility of faith in God and loyalty to country is a mixed blessing if we forget that they are *compatible* and not *synonymous*—lest we follow one and thoughtlessly assume we are also serving the other. As the sun and an orchard: the first gives life and sustenance to the second, and the second bears fruit glorifying the first. Each is blessed by the other—But they are not the same. Although our Nation was conceived in accordance with our faith, neither has a monopoly over the other. We must never in arrogance claim that our democracy and our way of life have a unique claim on God or on his truth. We must clearly recognize that Christianity is much larger. We must clear our vision to recognize that the essence of man's faith transcends the forms of government around us.

Our course, all this is not to destroy the ties between God and country: It is to discover, separate and apart from all other considerations, just what it means to call oneself a Christian. It is to remember that it is so easy in America to forget—that to be a Christian is necessarily oftentimes to be courageously different.

Perhaps the mark of a Christian is that he is willing to love uphill, to love past the point where loving is easy, past the point where love is humanly rewarding, past the standard, outward forms or religious life. Christ's life is the beautiful, Lucid example of the imperative of uphill love.

In this ecumenical gathering it is easy to see that the active force in our world is not that which separates Christians from one another, but it is that love and fellowship which is the point, the focus of Christian unity. Our religious variety is a means of strengthening the essence in our lives. What must remain foremost is a faith in the power of love.

The world that we encounter today is weary with strife between groups of people. All too many are convinced that this great Nation stares into the face of decay and dissolution. Our very foundations are threatened, and we face the perilous danger of a nation unable to breach the gaps between groups of people with vastly different orientations. In my humble opinion, the leadership of the country has too often ignored the deep causes of the problems which confront us, and now many alienated groups, especially among our youth, see no more cause to support their leaders or to conform to established ethical precepts. Too frequently those who lead public thought have promoted an intellectual discourse which uses as its premise "Old standards are no longer relevant to our time. Throw out the old standards." And far too many unquestioning youth have wandered into a limbo that objects to and denies the restraints of the old standards without understanding the basis and the values from which they grew.

This is a strange time in America, when the great question that seeks solution in the conversations of people of all ages and backgrounds is this: "What does it all mean? What is the purpose of it all?" We are in a time of flux, a time of searching, a time when the search alienates large segments of the population from the established leadership that seeks to represent them. We search for the truth, but find it increasingly hard to find. I feel that you will clearly understand when I say that we often think one way in quiet moments, then act another under the pressures of our tasks and our times. For us, as believing Christians, the question of our responsibility and of our guilt is much more difficult and painful than it is for those who only move on the secular, or the economical or the political, or the cultural level.

We are caught in a moment of history so explosive, so potentially devastating, that few deny it is a precarious era. We feel weakness and experience anxiety about ourselves and about the whole world when we meet and start to think over our tasks on the debris of an old era and at the trembling foundations of new construction. We feel weakness when we set our vision upon the daily misery and the overhanging threats of our world. Our theological vision is not sufficiently penetrating: Our faith is without muscle: Our hearts do not beat with the joyous certainty of the wisdom of our generation—with the word of God. By our very life we have denied the potency of that joy.

The question that we now face is the role of the Christian leader. He is asked by his Lord to love all. Yet, he finds the world tortured by many whose philosophies and actions he cannot possibly condone. Perhaps it is particularly the youth who seem to disregard the standards and the values that uphold the structures of peace (although I am not sure this is so). And at the same time, those very youth are often crying out for peace at any price, condemning those of us who chose to work within the structures for a genuine peace among men. Yet, we are constrained by the love of God not to condemn, but somehow to have the courage to attempt the much more difficult task of understanding. The Christian leader is not free to judge and suppress the misguided in an attempt to forget them. The Christian leader has the monumental task of somehow understanding, without compromising principle. Our Lord taught us that love is reconciling and understanding, not dogmatic.

Only when we have come to understand the needs of the people we have chosen to serve can we truly be of service to them. Otherwise, we may be guilty of only carrying more water to the flood while we glory in what we deem to be our business for the Lord.

Although Christianity makes severe demands upon those who would follow, it is brilliantly simple, surprisingly clear. The confusion is only the result of men and women, like us, vainly seeking to reconcile our own desires, our own image-building, our own ambition for wealth or power, with the word of God.

It is greatly humbling to realize that I have surely failed to make a great impact on any of your lives at this juncture. It is even more humbling and greatly reassuring to realize that all I have said today can be easily contained in one phrase that has had great impact on all mankind. It is with this that I leave you, for nothing could be more lucid. We are left with the challenge to make these words of Jesus Christ relevant for our lives: "He who would be the greatest among you must be the servant of all."

Forgive me the length of this discourse. However, I cannot refrain in closing from sharing with you the impact of one short poem and one piece of prose that have been deeply meaningful to me in my life. The first was given to me by an inmate in San Quentin prison many years ago when we worked together developing an artificial hand. It reads as follows:

"I shall pass through this world but once; any good therefore that I can do, or any kindness that I can show to any human being, let me do it now. Let me not defer it nor neglect it, for I shall not pass this way again."

The meaningful poem which I desire to share with you is this:

"It is my joy in life to find
 At every turning of the road,
The strong arm of a comrade kind
 To help me onward with my load.
And since I have no gold to give,
 And love alone must make amends,
My only prayer is while I live,
 God make me worthy of my friends."

God love and keep you always.

THE POOR WILL SUFFER

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, by adopting, when we were in the Committee of the Whole, the Broyhill of Virginia amendment, 167 to 132, without any debate being permitted and without any way to obtain a record vote under the rules, the House has again turned its back on the poor of this Nation and on the cities of America, proving once more that the poor are not only fighting the war in Vietnam but also are paying for it.

This action also reflects the continued indifference on the part of so many of our colleagues to the urban crisis.

Apparently it is open season, Mr. Speaker, on the antipoverty program and on the Office of Economic Opportunity. We saw this in the amendment to the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act. We saw this last week when the OEO was deliberately singled out for exclusion from the pay increase.

Now today the Broyhill of Virginia amendment will reduce the program to a rate that would be provided by an appropriation of $1.2 billion. This will gut the poverty program. The effect of its impact will be felt in every city in the country and also in the rural areas.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, under House Joint Resolution 888 as submitted by the committee originally, the $1.4 billion rate, there would have been a minimum cut of 20 percent in all community action programs. There would have been no summer programs. In the neighborhood health program, there would have been a cut of 42 percent. The Headstart, the Follow-through program would have been drastically reduced, and there would have been an 18 percent reduction in the full year-round Headstart program.

With this further reduction in the antipoverty program, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the poor people of this country are going to suffer even more drastically.

KELLEY FLATS AIRPORT

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives witnessed a magnificently irresponsible—yet successful—effort in behalf of "false economy."

When I returned to Washington late last evening after spending 4 days on official leave of absence working to achieve a solution to the copper industry labor dispute in my State, I was flabbergasted to learn of the House action, spearheaded by our distinguished colleague from Iowa, to refuse authorization of a small airport which is so vital to the overall construction of Libby Dam.

Equipment and materials must be transported to the construction site. This is a simple fact. I have been assured by the Corps of Engineers that if this airport facility were not constructed the tools and materials would have to be flown to Kalispell and the resulting delay and surface transportation costs would more than offset the cost of the airport. To eliminate this facility would not be economy—it would be folly. Perhaps next we will hear a motion to replace bulldozers with shovels or to refuse the use of concrete in the construction of the dam.

But none of this is really central to this situation, because an airport will be constructed. Mind you, this was not an appropriations measure; it was an amendment added to the Senate version of this bill to authorize the expenditure of funds which have already been appropriated for a temporary airport for construction of a permanent airport which could continue to serve the area after the dam is completed. The Corps of Engineers has set aside $132,000 for construction of the temporary facility which, they know from experience, is an absolute necessity in this project.

In the only real economy move in this entire episode, my colleague, the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, introduced an amendment in the Senate version of the Department of Transportation appropriation bill authorizing the Corps of Engineers to expend funds—funds already appropriated and included in the Libby Dam project—for construction of an airport on a site which could continue to be used in future years rather than on a site which would eventually be flooded and useless.

The real waste was the waste of the time of the House by the ax-stroke approach to Government economy which now seems to be in vogue and the eventual waste of funds if the Corps of Engineers is forced to construct a temporary airport which will be flooded and useless in just a few years. A cursory examination of the facts in this matter could have eliminated this waste.

Throughout the West men of vision are doing their best to implement projects which will conserve our natural resources—projects to protect against devastating floods; to provide for irrigation and to make the best use of our water supply. In dollars and cents many of these projects appear to be expensive, but in the long run our experience has indicated that the benefits received and the protection provided against natural disasters will repay our citizens again and again for their investment.

Vision is needed today more than ever before—vision which will eliminate the threat of emergency appropriations in future years—emergency appropriations such as the $5½ million needed in our economy-minded colleague's home State of Iowa to repair flood damage in 1965. Surely I would support my colleague from Iowa or any other Member of this body in any project to provide flood control and guard against future threats to our Nation's economy in the form of huge, emergency disaster appropriations. We all know that a good insurance policy is good economy.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following project description of the proposed Kelley Flats Airport in the Record at this point:

Project Description of Kelley Flats Airport

Libby Dam and Reservoir, a multiple-purpose project planned on the Kootenai River in northwestern Montana, is a key element of the comprehensive plan for development of the Columbia River Basin in the interest of flood control, power generation, recreation and related water uses. The estimated cost of this development is $377,000,000 with a benefit-cost ratio 1.6 to 1. The construction schedule is scheduled to meet the requirements of the Canada-United States Columbia River Treaty which requires full storage operations within seven years after start of the construction.

The transportation net in the Kootenai River and Fisher River Valleys is marginal at best. The only air facility of value in the area is located at Kalispell, Montana, which is connected to Libby by about 100 miles of secondary roads over mountainous terrain. The nearest city served by scheduled airlines is Spokane, Washington, which is approximately 150 miles by a secondary road network.

At all large isolated projects of this type, the Corps of Engineers usually constructs temporary, unsurfaced, minimal air strips in the vicinity of the Dam site to assist management control, expedite survey and inspection operations and for limited supply depot operations. These strips are without lights and control facilities and are not operational in bad weather and do not contain the air management safety repair facilities of FAA type airfields. Such a landing strip at Libby project would cost $132,300.

The Government can justify such an expenditure on the bases of savings of transportation to the Government employees and contractors on the project. This expenditure would provide the minimal strip which could be enlarged by participation with FAA and the Libby-Lincoln County Airport Board to provide a much larger landing field built to FAA specification in the vicinity of Kelley Flats. The larger landing field will result in additional direct savings to the Federal Government and will provide a permanent airport instead of one which will be abandoned in 7 to 10 years. The larger field will not cost the Corps of Engineers any more money than will be spent without the Kelley Flats FAA Project. The current estimate cost of the larger landing field is $335,550; FAA would contribute 0.53% of the bid amount which based on this estimate is $177,940; the Corps of Engineers participation would be $132,300 leaving $25,000, to be supplied by Libby-Lincoln County Board. The Montana Aeronautics Commission has agreed to furnish up to $32,000 and their funds will be available in February 1968.

Many specific benefits will accrue to the Government.

1. Maintenance of the strip will be responsibility of local interests.

2. Government will receive free use of facility for life of project—100 years.

3. The increased airstrip capacity will provide a local facility capable of:

a. Landing supply aircraft with equipment, maintenance goods and large volumes of critical supplies.

b. Providing a facility from which dependable scheduled air service can be provided thereby greatly reducing the charter costs and ground transportation costs for the 100 contractors and the Government agencies involved. This service alone would pay for the project.

c. Providing a reliable air medical evacuation facility which will reduce contractor insurance costs and Government costs.

d. Providing a basic helicopter and small aircraft center with maintenance facilities for the project area which will greatly reduce costs of air rental services presently provided from Spokane and Kalispell.

These basic cost reduction features will reduce direct Government costs well in excess of the $310,000 FAA and Corps of Engineers estimated costs. In addition, each of the 100 contractors will be able to reduce his bid costs on Government contracts because of the reduced air freight costs, air lease costs, insurance costs, ground transportation costs, maintenance parts inventory costs, and improved management time.

I feel I need not elaborate on the host of service enterprises, subcontractors, salesmen, transporters, equipment installations, testing and maintenance personnel and secondary industries which will use this facility during the construction phase and after the project is completed. The return to the Government in taxes will pay for this airfield development many times during the 100-year life of the project.

It is poor economy not to provide this authority for the Corps of Engineers to participate in the Kelly Flats Airport Project.

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER, AND SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 5-minute special order I have been granted for today be vacated, and further unanimous consent that I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes today, after all other special orders and the close of all legislative business, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following report which I intend to make available to my constituents this week:

The Great Debate on Taxes, Inflation and Government-Spending has been going on for several months now and will likely continue for some time.

The Congress presently has turned deaf ears to LBJ's pleas for more taxes—telling him to slow down on spending first.

The President claims the Congress is responsible for spending and Congress claims the President is responsible. It should be made clear that the Executive Branch of the government headed by the President actually spends your tax money. True, Congress appropriates money, makes it available, grants "new obligational authority"; but the Administration actually spends the money. The President is not required to spend every cent made available to him. While the President is trying to place the blame on Congress for spending, keeping in mind that practically every time he sends a program up to the Congress for new spending authority and appropriations, he also sends his spokesmen up to lobby for them. The methods some of them employ are sometimes less than desirable. Furthermore, it is the President who requests funds from the Congress and he can hold down his requests. It is likewise true that Congress can reject or reduce these requests; and, to date, the Congress has reduced them by about $4 billion and will reduce them, in all probability, by at least another billion before the session is over. However, this solves only part of the problem. This year's budget requests by President Johnson contain pleas for new obligational authority exceeding $144 billion, and it is these new requests Congress is cutting back. But he also has available a pool of funds exceeding $125 billion, which have been previously appropriated, but are as yet unspent. Congress can't touch these funds except by putting a ceiling on federal spending or rescinding these previously appropriated funds. Therefore, in order to effectively curtail federal spending, both the new requests will have to be cut down and either a ceiling on total spending established or rescind part of the appropriations previously made.

The President argues that unless his tax increase is passed, we will have a deficit of around $30 billion and inflation. Of course, you are going to have inflation with a deficit of $30 billion—that is why it is imperative to cut spending. LBJ's tax increase would only reduce the deficit to around $23 billion; maybe, not even that low, depending upon when it is effective. But some Members of Congress feel a $23 billion deficit will create inflation also. With them, it is a matter of degree. A $23 billion deficit will create just about as much inflation as a $30 billion deficit.

Another Administration argument is that without the tax increase interest rates already high would move higher, because the Treasury would have to borrow the additional $7 billion. Thus, the government would be competing in the financial market for money and would drive up the interest rates and make money "tight". Some Members of Congress agree with this but think the better policy would be to reduce expenditures, so it isn't necessary to borrow more money, rather than increase taxes.

Another argument is that the housing industry would suffer a special burden, a recurrence of last years depression when money was "tight". Since other investments would look more attractive, institutions providing mortgage money would be reluctant to finance houses. This is probably true if the federal government has to borrow more money and compete with private enterprise and the individual in the money market. The answer here again seems to be to cut down on spending obviating the necessity of borrowing more.

The Administration spokesmen maintain it is Congress' responsibility to tell the President where to cut. Here are some suggested areas where additional cuts may be made without affecting the necessary services for the American people.

The military budget is not sacrosanct and there are a number of areas where waste could be curtailed, such as in the practice of purchasing items by negotiated contracts rather than by competitive bidding. The following are just examples, but the overall list runs into millions of dollars; here are just a few small examples:

1. The Pentagon spent $33,398.95 for 130 knobs which had a retail value of $210.60.

2. Thirty insulated couplings were purchased by the Pentagon for $2,025, compared to the retail price of $82.50.

3. Nine construction gears retailing at a total of $30.87 actually cost the Pentagon $1,748.70.

4. The Pentagon paid $511 for 20 small rods which normally retail for a total of $10.

5. The total retail value of the knobs, small rods, insulated couplings, and construction gears was $333.97. Yet the Pentagon paid $37,683.65 of your money!

Some Members of Congress claim the "TFX" incident has cost the taxpayers untold millions of dollars.

Furthermore, there is a $14 billion carryover of "unobligated" funds in the Department of Defense. The Congress approved defense appropriations of approximately $70 billion for this fiscal year. A cut of five percent would save $3.5 billion and not affect the Vietnam effort or our national security.

Another area where additional cuts can be made is in the Public Works Appropriations Bill. Although the Congress has already cut this figure beneath the President's total request, the figure is still in excess of $4.6 billion. While Public Works projects are dear to the hearts of Members of Congress and are, in most cases, very worthwhile and economically justified. Congress cannot have its cake and eat it too. Another cut of five percent in these programs would not materially affect their completion, but would have a decidedly favorable effect upon our deficit for this year.

The Administration has requested $70 million for Highway Beautification programs this year to cover the purchase of "rock outcroppings", scenic vistas, pastoral scenes or strips of timber or interesting natural shrubs. This money is to be used outside the right-of-way area of highways. This bill has already passed the Senate and has been reported out of the Public Works Committee, on strictly party lines. It would appear that, in this year of the "great deficit", we could at least delay the expenditure of this $70 million for these unnecessary frills.

Another area where considerable savings could be practiced would be Federal employment. Federal employment has increased over a year by roughly 250 thousand employees. The average salary of a Civil Service employee is approximately $7,000 and it takes almost $2,000 annually to provide office space, supplies and equipment for the employees. The increase in employment has added $1.8 billion to the Federal payroll.

Foreign aid has gotten completely out of hand. The following information was provided by Congressman Otto E. Passman, Democrat, Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations. Congressman Passman says, and I quote,

"New funds requested for foreign aid, all categories, first 7 months of 1967: *9 billion, 206 million, 154 thousand dollars*. This does not include *1 billion, 400 million dollars* previously carried in mutual security now in the Defense Department appropriation. Neither does it include a request for *4 billion dollars* to pay the interest on what we have already borrowed to give away.

"Unliquidated funds on hand on June 30 1967, from prior years' authorizations: *16 billion, 396 million, 781 thousand dollars*. If the Congress approves all new funds requested by the President this year, there will be on hand to be spent or obligated during the current fiscal year, the staggering total of *25 billion, 602 million, 935 thousand dollars*. Our country is committed to disburse funds during the current fiscal year in 100 nations and 5 territories of the world."

Obviously, a considerable cut could be made in foreign-aid programs. There is enough money in the so-called pipeline to continue this program without an additional dollar for at least two years. It would seem to many Members of Congress that it would only be fair to ask those foreign nations to tighten their belts a little and not expect so much from Uncle Sugar this year rather than to continually ask the American taxpayer to do without so that foreign governments could receive more of our largesse.

These are just some of the areas where both Congress and the Administration can reduce federal expenditures and still provide the necessary services for the people of America. And so the great debate goes on. In the few remaining weeks, there will be a great deal of maneuvering and let us hope that the American taxpayer wins this one fight at least.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE TAX RELIEF FOR CITY DWELLERS

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the cost of living in the United States climbs higher and higher each day. The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor just recently announced [1] that the cost of living rose four-tenths of 1 percent for the month of July alone, making for the greatest increase in 9 months. This means that for the 12th month in a row, a worker's paycheck bought less than in the previous year.[2] Today, to maintain the same purchasing power as one had in 1949, if you earned $5,000 then, you would have to earn 40 percent more in 1967.[3]

Nowhere is this trend of rising costs more severe than in the great cities of this Nation.[4] It may well be that paychecks are proportionately higher [5] in those urban areas that are suffering under the strain of increasing living costs, thus offsetting somewhat the disparity that exists between the higher living costs in urban areas as opposed to the lower costs in rural areas. However, while around the country salaries have tended to adjust in an attempt to minimize this disparity, our Federal tax rates, when applied to urban area taxpayers, do not take into consideration the fact that people living in these urban areas are forced both to earn more and spend more than their rural counterparts due to the nature of their environment. The graduated personal income tax imposes an increased tax burden on these city dwellers without recognizing that these people are forced to earn more than their country cousins, merely to maintain a comparable standard of living.

Under the graduated income tax, one's tax burden increases disproportionately to the increase in one's income.[6] If a person's taxable income doubles, his taxes as computed under a graduated income tax system are substantially more than double, and sometimes triple. Thus, merely for purposes of illustration, let us consider the case of the city dweller who may be forced to earn twice as much as one living in a rural area just to achieve the same standard of living. Although he is now earning twice as much, with graduated income taxes his taxes would not increase proportionately, but rather would more than double.[7]

Even without the graduated income tax feature, they have to run faster to maintain merely the same position, with the result that a higher tax bite on higher income means belt tightening. To use a simple illustration, a single person, in a small town, earning $2,000 at the bottom of the 20-percent bracket would pay $182, according to the tax computation chart.[8] At the top of the 20-percent bracket, earning $4,000 and without any graduated feature, the tax would be $545.[9] Yet that $4,000 per year would hardly suffice to maintain an equal standard of living in New York City, but still the Federal Government takes its bite in a far greater amount.

A statistical survey of consumer expenditures conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, documents the assertion that residents of urban areas tend to spend considerably more for the same basic living expenses incurred by rural residents.[10] Due to the unique characteristics of city life, the urbanite must spend 9 percent more than the rural person to run his household, 70 percent more for shoe repairs, 31 percent more for the dry cleaning and pressing of his clothes, 27 percent more for the general upkeep of his clothing, and 9 percent more for telephone services.[11]

---

[1] U.S. Department of Labor Release, August 25, 1967.

[2] AFL–CIO News, Sept. 2, 1967, p. 3, col. 1.

[3] Educational Services Division of the National Consumer Finance Ass'n, Aug., Finance Facts (1967).

[4] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index, March 1967.

[5] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Survey of Consumer Expenditures 1960–61, Consumer Expenditures and Income, Detail of Expenditures and Income Supp. 3—part A to BLS Report No. 237–93, at 114–127 (May 1966).

[6] Int. Rev. Code of 1954, § 1.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] Int. Rev. Code of 1954, § 3.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] Survey of Consumer Expenditures 1960–61 supra note 5.

The personal taxes of those people living in cities average about 12 percent higher than those living away from the cities.[12] As in 1965, per capita State and local tax burdens increased in every State and the District of Columbia, ranging downward from a high of $410 in New York.[13] According to the Census Bureau, city taxes throughout the United States during the period from 1965 to 1966 amounted to $84 per person, up from $80 per person 1 year earlier.[14] In 1966, the taxes levied by the city of New York on its residents had increased by 34 percent from its 1962 level.[15] In Los Angeles the increase for the same period was 25.5 percent, and in Detroit 25.4 percent.[16] The average increase in local taxes for all cities with a population of more than 1 million was 29.5 percent. On the other hand, the average increase for cities with a population of between 100,000 and 1 million was about 21 percent during the period of 1962 to 1966.[17]

There are some expenses that are especially severe only in large cities. An example of this is the high taxes one finds in New York City, which are the result of increasing urban problems in the field of welfare, housing, education, and health, that are not necessarily caused by New York City. New York City apartment dwellers in non-rent-controlled new buildings are suffering under rent increases of 20 percent and more. Detroit's residents are being saddled with price increases ranging from the price of haircuts to milk. People in Chicago are complaining about cigarettes, rent, food, and transportation cost increases. Residents of Los Angeles are faced with increased sales taxes.[18] These stories of increased urban costs are typical of the plight of the residents of large cities.

During this critical period of history, when the major cities of the United States are each day confronted with more and more crises, both social and financial, we should direct our efforts to helping the citizen who chooses to remain in the city and work toward its improvement rather than flee from its ills. Toward this end I have today introduced legislation that would go a long way toward correcting a serious inequity of our income tax system.

I have today introduced two bills, the first of which would exempt from payment of the 10-percent surtax proposed by the President, and now being considered by the House Committee on Ways and Means, those people living in cities having a population of 1 million or more. The second piece of legislation I have introduced would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a 10-percent credit against the income tax for individuals also living in cities with a population of more than 1 million. Thus, whether or not the proposed 10-percent surtax is enacted into law, the citizen-taxpayer of our large cities will be afforded some relief from the unfair position in which he finds himself under the Federal income tax system.

The article attached, from the New York Times of Wednesday, October 11, 1967, points up the plight of the city dweller on cost of living:

City Family's Moderate Budget Reportedly $9,000

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

Washington, October 10.—A new Government study of living standards and costs reportedly puts a city workers' family budget at about $9,000.

The Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics would not confirm that figure or any other. It acknowledged, however, that the study had been made and probably would be published next month.

Printing delays have been given as the reason for repeated postponement of publication, but informed persons believe that the Administration wants to avoid compounding problems of wage negotiations, particularly those in the automobile industry. Ford Motor Company employes are now in strike.

The budget that the bureau will unveil deals with "moderate living standards." It has nothing to do with the "minimum health and decency" budget that it used to publish.

The "moderate city budget" that the bureau published in 1959 ranged from $5,600 (for Houston) to $6,600 (for Chicago and Seattle).

The new figure will reflect more than price rises, which alone account for 14.5 per cent of the budget. It will reflect the changing concept of "standard of living."

There are many living standards, depending on one's income groupings. These standards have been changing since the United States became an industrialized country.

At one time, for example, the average factory worker rented his home. The changing concept of family stability now impels him to buy a house. Automobiles once were nonessentials. Today, many factory workers cannot travel between home and job, or between home and supermarket, without private transportation.

So the new budget will reflect ownership of homes and automobiles.

The "moderate" budget does not attempt to say what should be, but rather describes what already exists. The prototype family consists of a working father, age 38; a nonworking mother, a son, age 13, and a daughter, age 8.

The couple are in the middle stage of the life sycle, a well-defined stage in which they have acquired their basic durable goods and maintain a level of social health and well-being that is widely accepted.

The study examines every item that goes into their budget.

Economists of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organization in June, 1966, updated the bureau's "moderate" budget and put it at nearly $6,800. They said that the figure would be about $7,000 in 1967.

They arrived at this by adding price rises and taxes in 20 American cities, but their figure did not reflect the rising standard of living for the grouping that was studied.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics also will publish budgets reflecting a more comfortable level of living than the "moderate living standard"; a lower standard that may be called "minimum of adequacy," and the standard of a retired couple.

A "moderate standard" budget approaching $9,000 may have significant implications for the so-called poverty level budget of $3,200 for a city family of four. That figure was worked out by the Social Security Administration and has been accepted by the Government generally as a line defining the upper levels of poverty.

A labor economist, for instance, said that if the amenities were cut out of a $7,000 budget, it would drop to about $5,000 and make the $3,200 poverty definition look unrealistically low.

U.S. COAL EXPORTS LARGE, CAN GROW LARGER IF U.S. TRADE POLICY REMAINS CONSISTENT

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include tables and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the United States is the world's most efficient producer and largest exporter of coal. Preliminary 1966 data show that the United States exported $457.9 million of its bituminous—soft—coal, and $9.7 million of anthracite—hard—coal. In 1962 exports of bituminous coal were only $351.3 million, though anthracite exports were worth $24.6 million. Anthracite shipments have suffered partly because of lessened demand for anthracite as a home heating fuel.

Bituminous coal is used largely for industrial purposes—it is estimated that 60 percent of the exported coal is for metallurgical purposes, particularly steelmaking. Thus, it is worth pointing out that, although foreign steelmakers sell the United States about 12 percent of its total domestic consumptior of steel mill products, some of them use large amounts of American bituminous coal in producing that steel.

Though the United States is a large coal exporter and a very efficient coal producer, there is unquestionably room for greater export growth. An example is the long-term contract just negotiated with Japan. A consortium of three U.S. coal companies have signed long-term contracts to supply between 6 and 7 million tons of coal a year for the next 10 to 15 years. A spokesman for the organization that arranged the contracts foresees "the eventual benefit to the United States from these contracts alone as $1.5 billion worth of regularized trade."

The idea of regularity is important for the coal export business. According to an Interior Department official, before any company in the coal industry will invest millions of dollars in new mines and equipment, it must have a guaranteed market for a period of 10 to 20 years. The long-term contract promises this. The customer is assured of coal for the period of time he has contracted for, at a price previously agreed upon, within the limits of cost-escalation clauses. The only way for the customer to be protected over a long period of time is for him to sign the contract with the producer as well as the broker.

---

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] 28 CCH State Tax Review 35 at 1 (Aug. 15, 1967).

[14] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census City Government Finances in 1965–1966, at 8 (1967).

[15] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Compendium of City Government Finances in 1962, at 37 (1963); U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census City Government Finances in 1965–1966, at 38 (1967).

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Compendium of City Government Finances in 1962, at 6 (1963); U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census City Government Finances in 1965–1966, at 7 (1967).

[18] U.S. News & World Report, Tighter Squeeze Ahead On Middle Incomes, Aug. 28, 1967, p. 31.

With developments as large as these, the coal export picture looks very bright indeed. A report of the Robert Nathan consulting firm estimates that the foreign market for U.S. coal could reach an estimated "73 to 125 million metric tons in 1970," a substantial increase over 1966 U.S. bituminous exports of 49.2 million net tons.

Another important development is the participation of new geographic areas in the export of coal. The bulk of U.S. bituminous exports now come from western Pennsylvania, northern West Virginia, eastern Kentucky, and Tennessee. But there is now a consortium of three companies at work to develop a long-term contract to supply coal from Arkansas to foreign purchasers through the ports of Port Arthur or Galveston, Tex., which would mean substantial new port facilities and transportation, and associated benefits, for those ports.

In simple dollar terms the United States has a large stake in continued coal exports, and apparently has very bright prospects for increased exports in the near future.

This progress could be made even more substantial were the nontariff trade barriers of Western European countries to be reduced. An effort was made to do so in the recently completed Kennedy round, but was temporarily unsuccessful. I reported to the Congress on the problems of the Kennedy round negotiations on coal in the iron and steel sector report on May 1, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 11321 to 11335.

The effort to reduce nontariff barriers, such as quotas, on U.S. coal exports can continue and will be successful in future negotiation only if the United States is able to show by its own example that the quota device is an undesirable means of measuring differentials in international competitive forces. The current efforts in the Senate to impose mathematically rigid formulas to control imports of a very wide variety of foreign products would destroy any forward momentum we could expect in further reducing barriers to American exports. In fact, such U.S. quota devices would undoubtedly bring retaliation from those of our customers whose own exports to us were impaired.

The American Coal Exporters Association has prepared tables showing U.S. coal exports by destination. These tables will follow immediately. I also wish to submit for the RECORD an article titled "Coal Exports in the Spotlight" from the October 9 issue of the International Commerce magazine. This article describes the important new steps being taken on behalf of U.S. coal producers. These items follow immediately:

U.S. EXPORTS OF BITUMINOUS COAL AND VALUE

[Net tons]

Country of destination	1962		1963		1964		1965		1966 [3]	
	Tons [1]	Value [2]	Tons [1]	Value [2]	Tons [1]	Value [2]	Tons [1]	Value [2]	Tons [1]	Value
North and Central America:										
Bermuda	....	....	404	$3,992	....	....	....	....	90	$806
Canada	11,409,746	$98,089,184	13,762,062	116,968,517	14,187,335	$117,435,162	15,660,773	$133,140,587	15,828,528	129,646,103
Costa Rica	50	500	665	5,700	135	1,260	163	1,796	246	2,210
Dominican Republic	....	....	....	....	89	821	984	10,816	....	....
El Salvador	144	1,330	....	....	....	....	82	900	....	....
French West Indies	623	6,116	985	10,043	326	3,494	....	....	....	....
Greenland	506	4,194	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Guatemala	3,208	33,138	406	3,830	....	....	390	3,914	133	1,200
Honduras	439	3,715	255	2,207	450	4,153	302	3,328	122	1,200
Jamaica	68	462	....	....	30	280	23	256	....	....
Mexico	51,056	625,765	47,036	568,205	53,453	657,453	60,439	723,528	52,535	649,566
St. Pierre and Miquelon	4,759	47,283	5,004	51,694	3,415	34,981	2,832	31,556	5,028	53,758
Panama	162	1,346	2,938	20,468	62	560	51	560	67	600
Trinidad and Tobago	1,795	20,729	444	4,755	878	10,089	1,082	10,196	....	....
Other	3,057	27,942	28	276	28	256	125	1,378	236	2,642
Total	11,475,613	98,861,704	13,820,227	14,639,687	14,246,201	118,148,275	15,727,246	133,928,815	15,886,985	130,358,085
South America:										
Argentina	670,727	6,115,484	531,390	5,074,085	765,133	7,357,420	619,662	6,103,404	662,523	6,632,751
Brazil	1,316,150	12,893,756	1,155,806	11,134,652	1,101,308	10,637,844	1,210,517	11,864,546	1,739,113	17,206,580
Chile	114,126	1,077,650	180,650	1,705,056	183,783	1,745.943	126,194	1,251,528	156,182	1,571,139
Colombia	438	4,243	....	....	456	4,133	....	....	....	....
Peru	....	....	....	....	1,393	12,770	1,262	12,071	375	3,375
Uruguay	57,779	553,647	47,684	451,250	47,333	456,853	37,015	359,339	54,075	557,845
Venezuela	....	....	18,151	148,339	83	775	1,024	11,256	579	5,316
Other	....	....	....	....	....	....	44	486		
Total	2,159,220	20,644,780	1,933,224	18,513,382	2,099,489	20,215.738	1,995,718	19,602,630	2,612,847	25,977,006
Europe:										
Coal and Steel Community:										
Belgium and Luxembourg [1]	1,083,949	9,900,956	2,107,443	20,104,898	2,184,827	20,798,400	2,214,749	21,014,807	1,840,544	17,643,173
France	710,080	6,903,803	2,002,294	18,727,849	1,923,835	18,925,222	2,069,602	20,163,292	1,573,517	15,349,905
Germany (West) [4]	4,812,249	43,820,954	5,508,144	50,329,335	5,161,464	48,121,545	4,729,895	43,747,535	4,894,331	45,498,570
Italy	5,837,218	53,563,698	7,611,833	70,073,673	7,859,796	74,031,666	8,930,666	83,312,408	7,805,553	74,778,546
Netherlands [4]	3,186,593	29,034,131	4,170,478	37,837,416	3,985,711	36,498,030	3,371,223	31,238,594	3,165,221	29,656,460
Subtotal	15,630,089	143,223,542	21,400,192	197,109,171	21,115,633	198,374,258	21,416,135	199,476,636	19,279,166	182,926,654
Austria	251,949	2,256,619	44,790	439,879	30,979	286,726	....	....	....	....
Czechoslovakia	13,761	122,850	76,718	711,226	....	....	....	....	....	....
Denmark	37,570	330,592	40,483	358,214	17,505	174,568	5,833	52,536	1,855	16,978
Finland	568	4,989	6,726	61,247	7,532	71,285	....	....	....	....
Germany (East)	....	....	27,678	275,405	267,921	2,856,059	120,614	1,297,649	157,559	1,610,321
Greece	57,554	553,046	70,563	725,300	35,181	363,192	26,328	27,388	....	....
Hungary	....	....	24,569	213,880	....	....	....	....	....	....
Ireland (Eire)	241,011	2,103,556	464,269	4,169,271	325,290	3,096,940	313,115	2,852,147	355,516	3,341,358
Norway	17,453	170,589	16,688	159,925	93,116	938,832	164,663	1,624,650	220,484	2,200,502
Poland	....	....	....	....	10,070	93,517	....	....	....	....
Portugal	125,398	1,140,427	229,095	2,162,230	162,941	1,523,478	103,604	956,410	120,598	1,123,719
Rumania	....	....	44,224	397,328	134,248	1,235,320	56,244	520,527	83,553	795,816
Spain	766,095	6,769,847	1,405,748	13,368,946	1,406,607	13,576,102	1,376,609	13,447,985	1,193,662	11,980,909
Sweden	725,715	6,798,493	874,763	8,277,925	990,733	9,610,479	879,398	8,521,918	951,280	9,519,270
Switzerland	....	....	86,995	831,038	21,601	215,620	38,816	389,683	24,116	237,275
Yugoslavia	414,514	3,912,094	404,220	3,858,893	472,224	4,815,463	558,394	5,611,011	596,095	5,809,782
Other	1,996	17,369	50	630	....	....	5,917	55,224	3,271	22,605
Total	18,283,673	167,404,013	25,217,771	233,120,508	25,091,581	237,231,839	24,956,670	235,083,764	22,987,155	219,585,189
Asia:										
Indonesia	....	....	11,017	109,087	....	....	....	....	....	....
Israel	326	3,001	226	2,323	....	....	....	....	....	....
Japan	6,465,395	64,146,538	6,052,895	60,073,703	6,514,724	65,390,555	7,492,114	76,585,938	7,790,585	81,731,408
Philippines	1,139	11,392	....	....	....	....	....	....	231	2,083
Other	235	2,325	110	1,100	68	540	57	628	39	352
Total	6,467,095	64,163,256	6,064,302	60,186,213	6,514,792	65,391,095	7,491,171	76,586,566	7,790,855	81,733,843
Oceania: Australia	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	15,130	160,752

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. EXPORTS OF BITUMINOUS COAL AND VALUE—Continued

[Net tons]

Country of destination	1962		1963		1964		1965		1966 [3]	
	Tons [1]	Value [2]	Tons [1]	Value [2]	Tons [1]	Value [2]	Tons [1]	Value [2]	Tons [1]	Value [2]
Africa:										
Algeria			5,584	$48,857						
British West Indies			4,928	44,000						
Canary Islands							2,177	$18,553		
Congo (Kinshasa)					5,050	$47,599	4,157	40,097	3,379	$29,487
Egypt	11,362	$88,751	11,233	110,295	12,259	158,425				
Ethiopia			10,641	100,230						
Libya	16,408	156,623	10,405	99,182	51	23,253	310	3,413		
Nigeria							3,912	50,487	5,730	51,580
Other			120	1,427					309	2,782
Total	27,770	245,374	42,911	403,991	17,360	229,277	10,556	112,550	9,418	83,849
Total exports	38,413,371	351,319,127	47,078,435	429,863,781	47,969,423	441,216,224	50,181,361	465,314,325	49,302,390	457,898,724

U.S. EXPORTS OF ANTHRACITE AND VALUE

North and Central America:										
Canada	892,488	$14,165,660	794,585	$12,190,256	636,867	$9,042,930	642,657	$8,582,252	624,280	$7,915,873
Jamaica			122	1,254	46	613	95	1,400		
Mexico	5,325	85,675	7,319	108,268	7,712	104,176	8,921	122,854	23,418	245,920
Trinidad and Tobago	183	3,382	158	3,032	69	941	110	1,426	225	2,921
Other	322	5,538	148	1,807	113	1,521	729	9,672	903	11,708
Total	898,318	14,260,255	802,332	12,304,617	644,807	9,150,181	652,512	8,717,604	648,826	8,176,422
South America:										
Argentina	5,119	73,936			4,424	55,304	5,084	84,187	3,771	61,371
Brazil	10,370	125,598	5,336	71,318	1,701	22,609	2,089	44,999	6,005	99,104
Chile	257	4,751	529	7,134	387	9,695	397	8,229	717	13,598
Colombia	239	3,355	54	1,041	341	38,935	429	10,526	327	7,253
Peru			1,193	11,369	32	394				
Surinam							1,983	60,656	871	11,396
Venezuela	201	3,468	8,094	99,940	6,722	92,948	9,596	174,891	8,978	135,870
Other	29	480	38	664	36	474	45	580	31	1,029
Total	16,215	211,588	15,244	191,466	13,643	220,359	19,623	384,068	20,700	329,621
Europe:										
Coal and Steel Community:										
Belgium and Luxembourg [4]	205,008	2,572,753	543,874	6,751,100	140,486	1,909,146	30,816	391,392	374	4,848
France	140,703	1,373,430	723,964	7,374,115	291,796	3,647,802	29,883	266,152	8,861	82,500
Germany (West) [4]	244,011	2,286,129	52,163	660,828	679	8,808	92	1,187		
Italy	140,413	1,884,037	259,946	3,706,712	208,313	3,084,999	39,093	479,195	31,636	341,810
Netherlands [4]	133,183	1,579,722	829,118	11,065,015	201,071	2,827,104	3,040	51,221		
Subtotal ECSC	863,318	9,796,071	2,409,065	29,557,770	842,345	11,477,859	102,924	1,189,147	40,871	429,158
Denmark			50	538	54	715	83	1,216	103	1,327
Norway							72	684	2,205	16,427
Rumania									10,252	125,026
Spain			93,791	1,179,854	19,183	239,532	29,105	369,369	10,083	147,477
Yugoslavia			155	1,883					424	5,500
Other	65	899	430	5,984	439	5,859	1,483	19,205	899	11,867
Total	863,383	9,796,970	2,503,491	30,746,029	862,021	11,723,965	133,677	1,579,621	64,837	736,782
Asia:										
India	7,965	189,571	3,269	74,046	2,268	90,460	5,110	101,780	2,762	95,629
Indonesia					77	1,055	913	11,834	337	4,361
Israel	9,277	118,166	10,867	111,524	8,385	96,428	168	2,181	31	1,086
Japan			3,714	45,748	11,351	154,189			2,447	25,674
Philippines	85	1,255	277	3,790	120	2,037	818	20,191	559	10,384
Thailand							2,120	20,088	5,946	51,314
Vietnam (South)	5,605	53,443	14,583	197,010	29,385	535,500	30,185	486,122	16,806	241,649
Other	71	800	275	3,409	165	2,205	378	4,897	694	8,990
Total	23,003	363,235	32,985	435,527	51,751	881,874	39,692	647,093	29,582	439,087
Oceania:										
Australia	805	43,435	2,433	30,565	2,267	73,567	4,991	157,889	1,929	70,688
New Zealand			63	705			79	1,020		
Total	805	43,435	2,496	31,270	2,267	73,567	5,070	158,909	1,929	70,688
Africa:										
Kenya					565	9,595				
Tunisia			792	10,100			56	1,068		
Other					43	574			151	1,960
Total			792	10,100	608	10,169	56	1,068	151	1,960
Total exports	1,801,724	24,675,483	3,357,340	43,719,009	1,575,097	22,060,115	850,630	11,488,363	766,025	9,754,560

---

[1] Does not include shipments to U.S. military forces.

[2] Includes transportation charges (mines to ports).

[3] Preliminary figures.

[4] Shipments as indicated in vessel manifests upon departure U.S. ports, and includes tonnage for transshipment to undesignated destinations.

Source: U.S. customs data supplied by the Bureau of the Census.

Japan Sales Significant—Coal Exports in Spotlight—Promotion of Long-Term Contracts Seen Beneficial to U.S. Balance of Payments, Industry

(By Leslie J. Wilder)

A long-term contract under which U.S. coal is being exported to Japan is being viewed today with special attention. It is part of a pattern of worldwide distribution that can shape the future of a major U.S. industry. It can also help the U.S. balance-of-payments stance.

Describing the contract, Eli Goldston, chairman of the marketing organization that worked it out, said it represents "the culmination of several years of effort on our part, with the cooperation of the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo, to put the coal trade between West Virginia and Japan on a sound and long-term basis."

The export subsidiary of Goldston's company, Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, and two other U.S. coal firms, Consolidated Coal Co. and Island Creek Coal Co., have signed long-term contracts with Japanese steel and gas companies to supply 6–7 million gross tons per year for the next 10–15 years.

According to Goldston, "For a period in excess of a decade, there will be considerable assurance that each year coal of a worth of up to $50 million will be purchased at the mine mouth and an additional $30 million will be collected by U.S. railroads for the haulage from West Virginia to the tidewater ports."

Goldston foresees the eventual benefit to the United States from these contracts alone as $1,500,000,000 worth of regularized trade.

ITALIAN CONTRACT SIGNED

Eastern Gas and Fuel, through its export subsidiary Castner, Curran & Bullitt, Inc., also signed a long-term contract for a substantial tonnage with an Italian company a few years ago, and today is a leading U.S. coal supplier to that country. Italy generally holds off on long-term contracts because the country can get attractive terms in West Germany, which is selling below cost due to a surplus that is being stockpiled. The company recently signed a 10-year contract with the national steel company of Spain.

Goldston did much of his promoting of long-term contracts with the assistance of a 1963 report of Robert R. Nathan Assoc., Inc., for the U.S. Department of the Interior's Office of Coal Research, on the foreign market potential for U.S. coal. Another report which helped lay the groundwork for the sale was one on prospects for U.S. coking coal exports to Japan by Paul K. Stahnke, a former second secretary at the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo, now an economic officer at the Department of State.

The Japanese were especially concerned with stability of rail freight rates, Panama Canal tolls, and the general U.S. attitude toward trade with their country. The United States faces considerable competition from Australia, Canada, Poland, Russia and Communist China in exporting to the Orient. But with the Nathan Report in hand, Goldston said he was able to show the Japanese buyers "a concrete example of the U.S. Government interest in the continuation and improvement of the coal export trade between the United States and Japan."

Viewing this activity, George Fumich, director of Interior's Office of Coal Research, sees the long-term contract picture as a "three-legged stool." On the domestic scene, the coal industry, the railroads and the utilities each provide necessary support. Internationally, it is the customer, the producer/exporter and the broker who make up the base.

According to Fumich, "Before any company in the coal industry will invest billions of dollars in new mines and equipment, it must have a guaranteed market for a period of 10–20 years. The long-term contract promises this. The customer is assured of coal for the period of time he has contracted for, at a price previously agreed upon, within the limits of cost-escalation clauses. The only way for the customer to be protected over a long period of time is for him to sign the contract with the producer as well as the broker."

OTHER ENERGY SOURCES

Fumich describes a changing picture, with coal being converted into gas and even liquid (high octane gasoline). The petroleum industry is buying into the coal industry to guarantee its sources of supply. Fumich foresees eventually the growth of a natural resources or energy industry.

Presently, the need is to find a way of cracking coal from its solid state economically, thus broadening the energy base. Petroleum liquid hydrocarbons now account for 75% of U.S. energy consumption. Some 20 years ago coal represented more than 50% of this energy consumption. After World War II a new way of welding pipe was developed, that made it possible to use large-diameter, high-pressure pipelines for transporting natural gas across the country. Coal is now recapturing the same markets, in the form of electricity, and in the future expects even more in the form of synthetic gas.

Reporting to the annual meeting of the Coal Exporters Assn. in June, Mildred M. Loveless, executive secretary of the association, noted the slight decrease in U.S. European shipments in 1966. With respect to 1967 shipments, she said several factors should be considered in any estimate for total 1967 exports: "First, Europe is in the midst of a recession, and has had to shut down many of its own mines; second, competition is great from local sources; third, the use of oil and gas is increasing all the time."

Total bituminous coal exports in 1966 were 49.3 million tons, a 1.8% decrease under 1965 shipments. Canada's receipts of U.S. coal in 1966 rose slightly to 15.8 million net tons.

"In Japan," Mrs. Loveless continued, "increased industrial growth, particularly in the iron and steel industry, has increased imports of coking coal. Meanwhile, Brazil showed the largest increase in receipts of U.S. bituminous coal in 1966 to a single country—an increase of 533,000 tons, or 43.9%. The expansion of the iron and steel industry in Brazil and other Latin American countries will of necessity be based on imported coking coal. Most of it will probably come from the United States."

The European coal crisis and increased sales of oil and gas to the Netherlands, Belgium and France had contributed to the reduction in U.S. coal exports to those countries in 1966.

WEST GERMANY IS COMPETITOR

The sharp decline in U.S. coal shipments to Italy can be attributed in large part to a sharp rise in receipts of West German coal, and to a lesser extent to purchases from Eastern Bloc countries.

Assessing U.S. coal exports overseas, excluding Canada, in 1967, Mrs. Loveless forecasts an increase over 1966 shipments of only 500,000 tons. "I hope my estimate is conservative," she said. "In subsequent years, however, I foresee a more substantial rise. Certainly, projections of foreign demand for high-quality metallurgical coal would indicate a substantial long-term increase in imports of U.S. coal. But, of course, we still face the problem of existing non-tariff barriers."

Mrs. Loveless pointed out that "Coal contributes almost a half billion dollars annually to the U.S. balance of payments, and is the most important single non-agricultural raw material exported from the United States."

NATHAN REPORT CONCLUSIONS

The direction of coal exports has been influenced by the previously mentioned Nathan Report. The report reached the following conclusions, among others:

The foreign market for U.S. coal could reach an estimated 73 to 125 million metric tons in 1970, a 100 to 250% increase in U.S. coal exports over those of 1962. This increase would be dependent upon the extent to which the foreign countries relax their import controls and other protective measures.

U.S. bituminous coal is competitive with local coal in all the major markets of the world. U.S. mine prices and railroad rates have remained comparatively stable, and increased efficiency has reduced the cost of ocean transport. In contrast, production costs in foreign countries have been rising constantly to the point where they often exceed the price of U.S. coal delivered at foreign ports.

Seeing coal export as a vital means of contributing to the U.S. balance of payments, and to domestic employment in the coal-producing states, the Nathan Report also made the following recommendations:

That members of the coal industry make offers to major foreign consumers of long-term contracts at economic prices.

That the coal industry establish an association for the purpose of developing foreign coal markets.

That the U.S. government establish an Inter-Agency Coal Export Policy Committee and a Coal Export Advisory Council.

That the U.S. government, the coal industry and the coal-carrying railroads attempt to work out a reduction in rail rates on export coal.

OLD CONTRACTS FOR 1 OR 2 YEARS

It had been the practice in the U.S. that overseas contracts were negotiated and signed with brokers by the overseas consumer. These contracts were for only one or two years. From approximately the end of World War II to 1961, coal activity was down and the U.S. producers were accepting terms less than the most favorable. Therefore, they were agreeable to one or two year contracts. As the coal picture improved in the 1960's, however, the broker sometimes would be unsuccessful in his search for a U.S. producer, and unable to fill his commitment. U.S. producers did not want to enter contracts of such short duration when they could have longer ones with U.S. purchasers, such as the utility companies, which account for more than 50% of domestic sales.

In many countries national policy discourages the signing of long-term contracts. Belgium, for instance, is confident that the European Community will have established its common energy policy by 1970 and therefore will not make commitments. If this policy is not completed by 1970, presumably the picture will change.

France has relaxed its barriers to the import of coal in recent years, while some other European countries have tightened theirs. What the United States has lost in Europe, however, has been made up for by increased exports to Asia and South America.

Exports to France during the first six months of 1967 rose 45.2% over the same period of 1966 from 863 thousand tons to 1.25 million tons, while exports to Japan rose 61%, from 3.7 million tons during the first six months of 1966 to more than 6 million tons in the first half of 1967.

ARKANSAS IS NEW EXPORTER

Shipments to Japan may rise even further if current efforts to promote Arkansas coal exports are successful. Sumitomo, Garland Coal, and the Kansas City & Southern Railway are negotiating the formation of a new company to supply 11 million tons of coal to Japan over 13 years. Up to the present, Arkansas has not been a source of significant shipments to external markets.

Despite the competition, there will always be markets for U.S. coal because it is top quality. For example, Japan mixes U.S. coal with its own and that imported from Australia and other nations to obtain the grade needed.

High-quality, low-sulphur coal is becoming more in demand in the United States as laws are passed requiring the alleviation of air pollution. Low-grade, high-sulphur-content coal produces the largest amount of pollution. Utilities are now buying premium quality coal, because of its low sulphur content, for heating purposes. In considering the future availability of premium coal for export this increasing demand on the part of the utilities is a matter of concern. Residual oil from Venezuela doesn't meet the anti-pollution requirements. And oil from the Middle East, while it has a sulphur content of less than 1%, is dependent upon the political climate for its distribution, as has been dramatized in recent months.

A market for steam coal exists, but it is not a captive one like that for metallurgical coal. To expand sales, rates must be reduced and a method of delivering coal cheaply must be developed. Because transportation costs are the same regardless of the quality of the coal, the producer will mine, transport and export high-quality coal when he is able to.

The railroads have developed the "unit train," dedicated to a single mine, that can sometimes make a round trip in as little as 48 hours—a most economical operation.

The mine-to-port cost had previously been higher on export coal, because the railroads have not expected an increase in business if they adjusted rates, as they have for shipments of domestic coal. However, when the railroads recently felt it necessary to seek an increase on domestic coal rates, they did not request it for export bituminous coal.

Much of the U.S. supply of low-sulphur, low-priced coal is available in the Western states (No. and So. Dakota, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah) where transportation costs to East coast ports would be prohibitive.

TREND TO GIANT VESSELS

Ocean freight rates fluctuate widely. In the past five years large capacity vessels carrying more than 50,000 tons have been built. Frequently these are chartered by an overseas company that has a long-term contract. The present trend is toward even larger vessels up to 87,000 tons.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has said that "Coal from the United States, produced from the world's most abundant reserves by the world's most efficient methods, has won a solid place in foreign markets as a reliable supply to meet the expanding need for energy. Today, we are only beginning to realize its full export potential." He added that studies such as the Nathan Report "show possibilities for increasing coal exports to 80 million tons or more annually. The coal industry of the United States has both the reserves and the productive capacity to supply these needs while meeting an increasing domestic demand."

COAL FACTS

Here is the coal picture in outline:

Coal represents 70–80% of the U.S. fossil fuel reserve.

Coal represents only 22% of the country's final energy consumption.

Use of coal has declined over the past quarter century as diesel trains have replaced coal-burners, and gas, oil and electricity have become popular forms of heating energy.

Some 60% of exported coal is metallurgical, used in steelmaking.

Total dollar value of bituminous coal exported in 1966 was nearly a half billion dollars. $183 million worth went to the European Coal/Steel Community and $37 million to the rest of Europe. Canada imported nearly $130 million worth; Brazil, $17 million; and Japan, $82 million.

During the first six months of 1967, exports of U.S. coal were up 3% to 23.4 million tons—compared with 22.7 million tons during the same period of 1966.

During the first six months of 1967, 16.7 million tons were shipped overseas from Hampton Roads, Va., the leading U.S. port for coal export.

FORTUNE MAGAZINE EDITORIAL CALLS FOR CLEAR AND CONSISTENT ECONOMIC FOREIGN POLICY BASED ON MARKETPLACE COMPETITION

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an editorial in the Fortune magazine of September 15, 1967, titled "Toward 'One World' of Business." The point of the editorial is that slowly but surely there is developing "a world in which business will truly know no frontiers, in which the paramount rule governing the movement of goods and money will be the rule of the market."

Fortune identifies this inexorable movement as the true "economic miracle" of the past 20 years, and reminds us that it rests on four principles, which it is well worth restating here:

> First, that the marketplace should be the final arbiter of what and how much to produce; second, that profit is the most useful measure of business performance and the best incentive to improve it; third, that the most adaptable and most resourceful form of business organization is the professionally managed corporation that mobilizes its capital through broadly based stock ownership; and fourth, that it is generally better to go out and develop new and ever expanding markets than to defend old ones.

These are important reminders. They apply directly to some of the economic decisionmaking now being made by several major U.S. industries. Fortune itself recognizes the applicability of these principles to developments on the foreign trade scene. It says:

> Right now, when some of the world's leading economies are passing through a period of temporary slowdown, there is particular danger of a relapse into protectionism. As competition grows keener in lagging markets, U.S. business should be setting an example by resisting that powerful impulse to make things easier in the short run.

Fortune magazine identifies as cases in point the chemical, steel, and textile industries, though the argument applies to still other industries. In this context it is timely and proper that Fortune reminds us again of marketplace rules, all of which apply directly to these cases in point.

Finally, Fortune calls for "a foreign economic policy that is clear and consistent. Such a policy begins with the understanding that the interconnected world of business is man's best hope for stability, order, and constructive development. And a stable, orderly, constructive world provides the best hope for the United States."

Fortune magazine reminds us of these truths at a historic moment, when the main lines of U.S. trade policy as they have evolved over several decades are being strongly challenged by those very groups whose interests most fundamentally lie both in perpetuating competition along the lines of the above four principles, and in promoting the applicability of these principles throughout the world economy.

> ### TOWARD "ONE WORLD" OF BUSINESS
>
> Long after the notion became shopworn, people were in the habit of describing the astonishing economic upsurge around the world in the past decade as a succession of miracles. First there was the "German miracle," then the "Italian miracle," followed by the "Japanese miracle," and the cliché came up whenever the growth rate of this or that country showed signs of taking off. Two years ago, in an article written for this magazine, the late Henry R. Luce reminded us that "the greatest miracle of them all was the miracle of the American business-enterprise system . . . the inspiration and the source of all the rest." Luce's observation put the picture back into perspective. There is, of course, nothing supernatural about the U.S. business system. Its wondrous performance is the result of applying practical operating principles that evolved out of hard experience.
>
> These principles are so much taken for granted that it is worth while recalling what they are: first, that the marketplace should be the final arbiter of what and how much to produce; second, that profit is the most useful measure of business performance and the best incentive to improve it; third, that the most adaptable and most resourceful form of business organization is the professionally managed corporation that mobilizes its capital through broadly based stock ownership; and fourth, that it is generally better to go out and develop new and ever expanding markets than to defend old ones.
>
> It can be forcefully argued, to be sure, that the U.S. business system owes its success most of all to the special environment created by our unique historical and constitutional development, an environment that encouraged the free and creative expression of individual initiative. Nevertheless, there is now abundant evidence that the U.S. has no monopoly of the qualities that make a business system flourish. Behind the economic "miracles" abroad is a new awareness and understanding of precisely those principles that have been so long familiar to businessmen in this country. In nation after nation, the same process has been at work, casting off ideological blinders, breaking the bonds of traditionalism, parochialism, and narrow nationalism, and clearing the way for greater production and wider distribution of goods and services.
>
> In Western Europe, largely but by no means wholly because of the Common Market, business has emerged from its jealously guarded and once heavily protected local enclaves to compete in the free-for-all of the world market. Great family-owned enterprises such as Krupp, which stood like national monuments immobile in the face of change, have been transforming themselves into modern corporations owned by the public. As the article beginning on page 136 reports, there is growing acceptance of the idea that a company's sales and profit performance are everybody's business, and managements are discovering that they are deceiving themselves as well as their stockholders by not breaking out the figures. As for the Japanese, though they are still laggard about opening up their home market to outsiders, they have come a long way out of the closed society that confronted the world not very long ago. And who needs to be reminded of their nimbleness in adopting new technology and grappling for markets around the globe?
>
> In Latin America, Africa, and continental Asia, still only lightly brushed by the industrial revolution, the old suspicions and creeds die the hardest. But here too there has been an awakening, evident in the somewhat warmer welcome accorded foreign investment and the growing inclination to band together in regional economic units. And only recently, Mexico put in motion a giant policy shift, away from protecting inefficient local "import substitute" industries and toward encouraging production for export.
>
> Finally, even in the Communist countries (leaving aside China) the lessons of practical experience are beginning to penetrate and cast doubt upon established doctrine. Prodded by a rising group of reformers, the economic planners have reluctantly come to recognize that they cannot compel a complex economy to grow simply by issuing edicts and establishing quotas, that they need realistic prices and the yardstick of profit to tell them where to allocate resources. In the new "market socialism" (a phrase Lenin never coined), some plant bosses are even being encouraged to act like businessmen.

BREAKING DOWN THE BARRIERS

The cumulative effect of all these developments has been to make the world a better place to do business in than it has ever been before. The changes of attitude certainly contributed to the expansion of commerce. A further, more portentous consequence has been to break down the barriers, national and otherwise, that divide businessmen from one another, and to bring them together in a sense of common interest, common problems, and common objectives. The quiet proliferation of international consortia and corporate joint ventures, and the new vigor of organizations like the International Chamber of Commerce, are only surface manifestations of a great earth shifting underneath. So, in its way, is the more broad-minded, less resentful approach Europeans are beginning to take toward U.S. investment, an eventful transformation that is described in an article beginning on page 112. "Out of better acquaintance," the writer observes, "has come a healthy tendency to overcome emotions and grasp opportunities."

What is taking shape, slowly and tentatively but nevertheless unmistakably, is "one world" of business, a world in which business will truly know no frontiers, in which the paramount rule governing the movement of goods and money will be the rule of the market. This is a "one world" concept quite different from the kind Wendell Willkie envisioned a quarter of a century ago—the universal brotherhood of man that was supposed to materialize from the blood of World War II. It is a lamentable fact that the economic advance of the past decade has not brought real world peace, nor has it done much to lift the suppression of human freedom in many parts of the globe. But the emerging international community of business does contain the promise of establishing a solid framework of world order, and it will bring home to people everywhere that they can improve their well-being if they can overcome the obstructions posed by ideology and national rivalries. Once set in motion, genuine economic progress has a way of being self-reinforcing; it creates a powerful vested interest in further progress—and in the conditions which make that possible.

TEST OF LEADERSHIP

In the building of "one world" thus far, U.S. business has a proud and indisputable claim to leadership. At home, it has set an example by the unparalleled bounty it has produced, and its operations abroad have provided just the competitive shock treatment needed to stir foreign businessmen out of their complacency and parochialism. But from here on in, a lot more leadership—and of a different, more demanding sort—will be needed. The divisive forces of economic nationalism are still strong, and they have become more insidious, more difficult to fight.

Right now, when some of the world's leading economies are passing through a period of temporary slowdown, there is particular danger of a relapse into protectionism. As competition grows keener in lagging markets, U.S. business should be setting an example by resisting that powerful impulse to make things easier in the short run. Regrettably, however, when the Kennedy Round negotiators dotted the last i on the broadest and deepest worldwide tariff reduction in history, the groans from various sectors of U.S. business were more audible than the cheers. The chemical industry remains as adamant as ever about retaining the American Selling Price in levying import duties, a flagrant vestige of protection that many foreigners consider a test case of U.S. sincerity about free trade. And several other industries, notably steel and textiles, have pleaded that they need greater shelter against what they term "unfair" competition from abroad.

Of course, we needn't be naive about this. Many foreign governments do rig the rules of the competitive game by giving out subsidies, playing tricks with taxation, and imposing quotas on imports—all devices to give their exporters an advantage and throw a shield around their home markets. But the U.S. should be directing its efforts at getting this sort of rigging out on the table, instead of countering with its own retaliatory measures. In fact, it has been said that the next great round of trade negotiations should be devoted to getting rid of these shadowy so-called nontariff barriers. President Johnson ought to be taking the initiative in getting such negotiations under way as soon as possible.

Meanwhile, the U.S. itself stands guilty of perpetuating some more subtle kinds of interference with the free market. Practically all of our foreign aid is "tied" so that recipients must spend the funds in this country. Practically every purchase by a government agency is made under the "Buy American" rule. And then there are those indirect controls on the outflow of capital, the interest equalization tax and the guidelines for corporate investment abroad. Imposed as temporary expedients to cure the balance-of-payments deficits, they are taking on a disturbing air of permanence. Businessmen have rightly protested against the illogic of these restrictions and the long-range harm they will do. But it isn't just the self-interest of U.S. investors that is at stake; it's the whole concept of the free movement of capital. Nobody wants to see a world in which U.S. corporations own everything. One of the best ways to prove that isn't our intention is to assure foreign corporations an even break in obtaining access to our capital markets.

WORLD CITIZENS

The time is ripe for the U.S. to put forward an economic foreign policy that is clear and consistent. Such a policy begins with the understanding that the interconnected world of business is man's best hope for stability, order, and constructive development. And a stable, orderly, constructive world provides the best hope for the U.S.

This doesn't mean a revival of Manifest Destiny, with the Marines only one step behind the overseas investor. It does mean a refinement and projection of the same wisdom that produced the Marshall plan and our enlightened postwar aid to Japan, and more recently led us to encourage the formation of a Latin-American common market. The kind of policy we envision should address itself consistently to world development in all its aspects. It should lay out an economic and political strategy for bringing the backward nations eventually into full-fledged membership in the world market. It should promote efforts to eliminate instability and disorder in world economic life by fashioning a more workable international monetary system and the formulation of commercial world law to protect investment and provide for the arbitration of private contract disputes.

The glory of such an economic foreign policy is that a large part of the responsibility devolves on private corporations themselves. Some large U.S. companies have already become truly world corporations. Not only is the globe their market, but they set up their plants anywhere that it makes economic sense, and they employ workers of many nationalities to produce their goods. Not enough of them, however, conduct themselves like real citizens of the world, which means admitting foreign executives to their management ranks, putting foreign directors on their boards, and inviting foreign stockholders to share in their equity ownership.

But the one world of business is more than governments and more than multinational corporations. It is the seamless web of enterprise, big and little, foreign and domestic, which has been reshaping the global environment at a speed just short of revolutionary. That has been the most inspiring "miracle" of the last decade.

WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVES, BEWARE

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, an article in the New York Times of September 24, 1967, entitled, "Democrats Press Lobbyists To Aid Party Finances," would seem to indicate that when Washington representatives are invited to informal receptions by agencies of the administration they should leave their wallets at home—but bring their checkbooks.

The article from the Times by John Herbers recounts how various representatives of transportation industries received invitations to a reception in which "Secretary Boyd will discuss matters of interest to you and to this administration at this small, informal gathering."

Mr. John Criswell, the full-time fund raiser for the Democratic National Committee, explained that the affair was not for transportation people alone but included Democrats and Republicans who had contributed to the Democratic Party in the past. Mr. Criswell's explanation notwithstanding, the Transportation Secretary, Alan S. Boyd, did not deny that he had addressed representatives of the transportation industry. After which he promptly left.

Then Mr. Criswell talked about the party's financial troubles and suggested that those present buy tickets to the party's fundraising dinner and dance on October 7. The admission—$1,000 a couple.

How the transportation representatives felt about this bit of flim-flam, of course, I do not know. However, I would suggest that any representatives who are subject to such treatment in the future and resent it should get in touch with their newspaper friends, as was done in this case.

Representatives of Washington arise—you have nothing to lose but your shirts.

I include the article, "Democrats Press Lobbyists To Aid Party's Finances," by John Herbers, of the New York Times, in the RECORD at this point:

DEMOCRATS PRESS LOBBYISTS TO AID PARTY'S FINANCES—AT BOYD RECEPTION, SUPPORT FOR JOHNSON IS URGED AND $1,000 TICKETS PUSHED

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, September 23.—A number of lobbyists for Government-regulated transportation industries were invited by the Democratic National Committee to attend an informal reception for Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd last Monday night in a private club in Georgetown.

There they were urged by Mr. Boyd to support President Johnson for another term in office. Then after the Secretary left, they were asked by a committee official to buy $1,000-a-couple tickets to a party fundraising dinner and dance here on Oct. 7.

The black-tie affair, to be held in the Washington Hilton Hotel, has been billed as a President's Ball in honor of Mr. and Mrs.

Johnson and is to be attended by party contributors from throughout the nation.

The Georgetown reception was part of the drive that party leaders are conducting quietly in the private sector to assure a good turnout for the ball. At least part of the proceeds will go into next year's Presidential campaign.

MATTERS OF INTEREST

Invitations to the reception, which were sent out under the signature of John Criswell, acting treasurer of the committee, read:

"Secretary Boyd will discuss matters of interest to you and to this Administration at this small, informal gathering."

The reception was made known by someone in attendance who asked that his name not be used. He said it was his belief that the party had improperly used the office of the Transportation Secretary to seek political support for the President from a regulated industry.

He said the list of attendants was composed largely of representatives of shippers, truckers and airlines, most of whom lobby in Congress.

Mr. Boyd and Mr. Criswell said in interviews that there was nothing improper in the reception. Mr. Criswell said that the reception had not been arranged for representatives of the transportation industry but for a "cross-section" of people who had contributed to the party in the past, Democrats and Republicans.

He declined to provide a list of those who attended, saying he did not want to embarrass them.

HELD AT GEORGETOWN CLUB

The reception was held in the Georgetown Club at 1532 Wisconsin Avenue. The Georgetown section of Washington is a fashionable downtown neighborhood of expensive old homes and shops. The facilities of the club were made available to the party by one of the club's members.

About 40 persons were reported to have attended. Invitations were checked at the door. Mr. Boyd arrived after a cocktail party was under way, had one drink and chatted with a few people.

Then he gave a brief talk, saying that the country was well off and needed Mr. Johnson four more years. The source who attended said it had been his understanding that the speech would be framed for the transportation industry.

Mr. Boyd left immediately after the talk, almost abruptly, the source thought.

Mr. Criswell spoke next, describing the party's past financial troubles. He said that the financial picture was improving, but he was concerned that contributors might get the idea that no more problems remained.

Then he suggested that those present buy tickets to the dinner. The President not only would be at the dinner, the audience was told, he also would stay and dance.

The attendants were assured, according to the source, that arrangements would be handled in a way that none of you people will be embarrassed.

No attempt was made to sell tickets at the meeting. The source said that most of those attending could not afford to buy tickets themselves and were presumably expected to pass the information to their corporate offices. Under the Corrupt Practices Act, corporations are forbidden to make political contributions, but it is a common practice for businesses to do so through individuals.

NO TICKETS SOLD

At least two of those attending the reception, it was learned that Jack J. Valenti had solicited others in their companies in New York to buy tickets. Mr. Valenti, a former special assistant to the President, is president of the Motion Picture Association of America.

Mr. Boyd was appointed the first Secretary of the Department of Transportation last Nov. 6 after Congress agreed to consolidate under one department 34 agencies for air, rail and highway transportation.

These largely have policy, promotional, research and safety functions.

Economic regulatory functions are exercised outside the department by independent agencies such as the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Maritime Administration.

Members of these agencies, however, are appointed by the President, and the Administration has some advisory influence over rates and routes. International airline routes must be approved by the President.

A FEARLESS OFFICIAL

Mr. Boyd, a former member and chairman of the C.A.B., is known as a fearless official who cannot be swayed by political pressures. When he was informed that word of his appearance before industry representatives at the reception was to be published, he invited a reporter into his office and said that he would be glad to answer any questions.

"I am glad to do anything I can honestly and ethically do to help Lyndon Johnson," he said. "I know this speech was endorsed and encouraged by the Democratic National Committee. I was asked to talk about our program and urge support for the President."

He said he had been a Democrat all his life, but never in his Government career had he given anyone an advantage because of political affiliation or activity. He stressed that no plea for funds was made in his presence and that he expected never to know who at the meeting had made a party contribution and who had not.

The invitation to appear came to him through an assistant who had been reached by the committee, Mr. Boyd said.

Had the White House suggested that he make such appearances?

"Absolutely not, Mr. Boyd replied. "I bet Lyndon Johnson never had any idea that the meeting was being held."

At the end of the brief interview, Mr. Boyd said:

"If you find out about any other meetings I attend, come to me and I will tell you what I said."

The National Committee is, by tradition and practice, an instrument of the White House when the party is in power.

Mr. Criswell, a former newsman and press secretary to J. Howard Edmondson, former Oklahoma Governor and Senator, has been with the committee since 1964 and is the top full-time fund raiser in the party. He is young, affable and, like most staff members of the committee, answers questions in generalities.

CRISWELL WEARY

In an interview, Mr. Criswell seemed somewhat weary from long hours of work in preparation for the dinner. He explained in general terms the party's financial situation. The party ended the successful 1964 campaign more than $4-million in debt.

About half of this was retired in 1965, but little progress was made in 1966 because it was an election year.

The remainder of the debt was paid off earlier this year after fund-raising dinners in Austin, Los Angeles and New York. It is hoped that enough will be raised at the Washington dinner, Mr. Criswell said, to pay some current expenses and leave a substantial amount for next year's campaign.

Much of the money since 1964 has been raised by the President's Club, an innovation of President Kennedy that has been nurtured to maturity by President Johnson. Members pay $1,000 a year to belong, usually in the form of a ticket to one of the dinners.

In return they mingle with the President and attend seminars and other private meetings with Cabinet members.

The Washington dinner is being sponsored jointly by the President's Club and Citizens for Johnson-Humphrey committees. The committees were set up to raise funds in 1964.

Mr. Criswell said he did not know how many would attend but that he hoped for an overflow crowd. Reminded that the Washington Hilton Ballroom holds about 3,000, he said he thought that figure was a little high.

In any event, local Democratic committees across the country are out drumming up attendance and as a result the dinner is expected to be a truly national event, Mr. Criswell said.

He did not seem surprised when told that there had been a complaint about the Georgetown reception. When asked if such participation by a Cabinet member was common, Mr. Criswell said, "Absolutely standard."

A SELECTED LIST

The Georgetown reception, he said, was not set up for representatives of the transportation industry. He said that those invited had been selected by the committee staff from a list of those who had contributed to the party in the past and that a "cross-section" of interests had been on the list of those invited.

The source at the reception said that truckers, airlines and shipping interests had made up the majority of those attending and that major companies had been included. Informed of this statement, Mr. Criswell said that lawyers, bankers, manufacturers and other interests had been invited.

The names of those attending were not disclosed, either by Mr. Criswell or the source. However. Mr. Boyd did not deny that he had addressed representatives of the transportation industry. One lawyer reported to have attended is registered as a lobbyist for two transportation groups as well as other interests.

The fund-raising came at a time when Congress is considering reform legislation on campaign financing.

The Senate has passed a bill designed to plug loopholes in laws requiring the disclosure of contributions and has pending measure to finance Presidential and Congressional campaigns with tax money. Both are advocated by the Administration.

WASHINGTON, D.C., HAS NO "MAYOR"

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify a point and direct the clarification at both members of the press and members of the Johnson administration, especially the President.

The point is that the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., has no "mayor." There is no mayor. The position of mayor does not exist.

Through frequent repetitions by the President, the press has picked up the phrase that Mr. Walter Washington, newly chosen Commissioner of the District, I repeat, Commissioner, is the "mayor of Washington." He is not. An examination of the Reorganization Act will show that nowhere is there mentioned the word "mayor." While the phrase "mayor of Washington" might sound nice, it is misleading and a perversion of the law as enacted.

This is not a reflection on Mr. Washington, but I am questioning the sincerity of those who asked for and got congressional approval for a reorganized government which included the position of Commissioner, and who then attempt by Pavlovian repetition to end up with a mayor.

To show the extent to which this conditioning has been effected, the newspapers do not even take the time or effort to place the word "mayor" in quotation marks to indicate that this does not represent actual fact.

Such roundabout methods of achieving "change" in District government by the President and others does suggest the question: Was reorganization of the District designed to improve effectiveness and efficiency, or was there political motivation which is satisfied by creating a "mayor" where none exists?

WIDNALL APPLAUDS PRESIDENT'S BUDGET COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION ON PARTICIPATION SALES

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican position on the Participation Sales Act of 1965 has been vindicated by the 16-member President's Commission on Budget Concepts. The Commission has recommended that participation sales be treated in the budget in the same manner as regular Treasury securities.

Many of us who warned that PC sales would be the most expensive means of raising Government funds have been proven correct by recent experience, and would prefer outright appeal of the act. Nevertheless, other than the additional cost to the taxpayer, the most damaging aspect of this budgetary gimmick is that it hides from the Congress and the American people the true cost of Government. Such gimmickry, by seemingly reducing Government expenditures—thereby reducing Federal deficits—needlessly delays the application of fiscal restraints.

Those of us who have consistently taken this position will anxiously await Johnson administration actions implementing the Commission's recommendations.

POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I disclosed on the floor of the House that the main thrust of the poverty program in Atlanta is not to help poor people but for the creation of a political machine.

The needs of the poor have been and are being largely ignored, and many efforts of EOA are concentrated on organizing voters on a block-to-block basis.

Last night I received a telephone call from Atlanta relating to a statement by Rev. C. A. Samples, president of Northwest Community Civic Forum. I had not read this statement before I spoke yesterday although it was dated October 4 and does substantiate, in full, that the Office of Economic Opportunity in Atlanta is ignoring the needs of the poor and is giving preference to organizing a political machine. The poor in Atlanta deserve better. They are not getting the help from EOA they deserve.

Let us in Congress correct the faults of the poverty program. Let us insist that the poor actually be helped, and not that the hopes and aspirations of the poor be raised on high by people who want to use the poor for political purposes. For too long the poor have been used, in Atlanta, for political purposes. They have received promises and too little else in return for their vote. This must be stopped—the poor will not be fooled forever.

The taxpayers' dollars should not be used to create a political machine at the expense of the poor, as is now being done by EOA in Atlanta.

I submit the text of Reverend Sample's statement in full for inclusion in the RECORD:

NORTHWEST COMMUNITY CIVIC FORUM

(By Rev. C. A. Samples, president, Atlanta, Ga.)

To Whom It May Concern:

Congressman Fletcher Thompson of the 5th District has keyed in on 2 vital areas of concern to millions of underhoused, underemployed and ill fed Americans. Being critical of the implementation of existing poverty projects is healthy to clear the atmosphere, before adding new programs that would be the end result of the present ones, if properly administered.

As an example, why ACEP when the Evaluation Center was given an outright grant of 2 million to begin the same job. Another example is a study to evaluate the poverty program in Atlanta when it had only begun to staff itself, just 6 months prior, and had a number of so-called administrative positions open.

The concept of relieving poverty through the Community Action Program has many excellent points. To use professionals from related fields with no imagination and no previous claim to having done anything except punch a clock and file reports, write lengthy reports, attend meetings to be present, and after years of service of doing nothing in their respective fields come forward because of higher pay offered by the CAP to bog it down with their bureaucratic experience and degrees.

Examples are so numerous, space will not allow mention. Retirees find this a fertile field for re-employment. Job specifications are set so high that people who are underemployed could never hope to qualify while still at an employable age. This is done with deliberate malice aforethought and can be proved. Who wants the facts.

In the 5th Congressional District there are 7 Neighborhood Service Centers. Aides were trained to be the eyes and ears of the Centers. These Aides were then instructed by their professional teacher/advisors to enlighten the people about the programs offered from day care to immediate employment at higher rates of pay. The Aides did their jobs well. All roads led to the under-spaced, under staffed and under funded Centers.

The people came by the thousands, as the NSC records will show, to the promised land Centers. Here there hopes were dashed, faded and erased. The people responded, but the intake workers were overloaded, no jobs were available, social services and day care arrangements were still in the paper stage. Buck-passing began in earnest. The poor began to cry out. Millions were being spent, but no services available. No supplies or transportation available either.

The hogs were eating up everything in sight. All money was paying salaries, expanding and restaffing, also reorganizing. People didn't need any formal education to see the perpetuation of a grand scheme.

The Atlanta Grass Roots Crusade was organized in early 1966 to voice the discontent of the disadvantaged communities throughout Fulton County. A trip was made to Washington with documents presented to Mr. Sargent Shriver asking help from the dilemma. He still has them. We did get some relief.

The Crusade represented 35 Grass Roots Organizations throughout Atlanta and Fulton County. This group made its report to the people and set about a permanent organization now known as The Metropolitan Atlanta Grass Roots Council.

The Delegation to Washington, D.C., was composed of Benny T. Smith, C. A. Samples, Otis Cochran, Robert Baynes and Asbury Fears. They were selected to represent the Grass Roots Crusade Against Poverty.

The Grass Roots Council is presently in existence as a watchdog group in all areas of civic and political endeavor.

One point we brought to the attention of Mr. Louis Martin, a Vice-Chairman of the Democratic Party was that one John Calhoun, the NSC Co-ordinator, was attempting to get only people in the poverty areas jobs who would cooperate with him and his staff. This applied to volunteer as well as paid personnel. Community elections were rigged in the beginning. A guide book was issued, and then withheld, except only to certain so-called official people. Communications between the Center and the Community were suddenly stopped. No one could answer any questions while Mr. Calhoun worked his thing. He is quite a manipulator; in fact, he is a super-operator.

The Centers under his operation have all become voter registration headquarters. Receptionists have been sworn in. When you enter for service, you can register first, and business later. The Community Organizers are setting up block organizations with Block Chairmen. These CO's are paid with federal money and work night and day in the target communities. They are requested by their administrative superiors to work on Saturdays and Sundays. Of course they cooperate. If they don't, well they are phased out.

There are many volunteer civic groups who for years have encouraged voting. But they are pushed aside by this well-heeled CAP and the wheeling-dealing center coordinator Mr. Calhoun. Registering voters for the past 12 months has taken precedent over every other project Economic Opportunity Atlanta, Inc. has, to the detriment of her 1,000's of target area inhabitants. I sincerely believe voting is an inherent right.

But also it has no more business being financed with federal funds than the relationship of Church and State. If the CAP does not get out of the political business and down to the social action and education business that it was designed and funded for, then it needs to go out of business. The collision course we find ourselves headed for is not in the best interests of the target communities. Poor people are tired of being manipulated; they want to participate actively, implementing and making policy.

It must also be remembered that the pioneers whose sweat, both black and white who built America didn't have high school diplomas and college degrees. The innate ability to meet the challenges of life are still present if the change to participate presents itself. This goes to say it must be without the walls of color prejudice, greed and selfish interests.

The business barons and corporate interests know they have the answer. It has been advanced cautiously. No one wants to pioneer an established business in this adjustment experiment. Businesses would more participate if tax write offs would be allowed, if an unexpected decline might take place. This would be the businessman's insurance. All areas of business could take on the unskilled workers and let them receive on the job training for certain periods. Management would be expected to train sub-professionals.

Labor Unions if they expected to continue to operate would have to accept apprentices regardless of color. Open housing would have to be a reality.

Americans have the resources, both human and material to remake, reshape, revitalize, remould, rebuild, renew, restructure or regenerate our society to assure with dignity it's rightful place at the apex of world leadership.

Will we try to be good enough to do it; or will we continue on the mediocre road of self consideration and live under an illusion of false security through material achievements alone.

Time has given America the latter half of this 20th Century to prove to the world the worth of her existence on the time honored principles for the foundation.

A SPECIAL UNITED NATIONS REPORT

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the following is a special United Nations report I have sent to the residents of the 18th Congressional District of Michigan:

The alternative to peace is not war; it is annihilation—the American journalist Raymond Gram Swing observed. "Coexistence or no existence" is the way U.S. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg put it a few weeks ago.

It is that sober message, perhaps more than any other, that has brought the nations of the world to New York every fall for the past 22 years for the annual 3-month meeting of the United Nations General Assembly. Despite their differences, their disappointments and two major wars, they have continued to come, and so far, the world has averted that terrible alternative. This year I have the responsibility and the honor of serving as one of the five principal delegates representing the United States at the 22d General Assembly.

I am writing to you during United Nations week to explain what I am trying to accomplish as a member of the U.S. delegation, to provide a brief background of the U.N. and the major issues that confront it, and to invite your help and advice in this undertaking.

The issues that face the U.N. this fall are as diverse as the 122 nations that make up the General Assembly. They include the problems of Vietnam, the Middle East, Red China, Korea, a possible treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and a long list of other items ranging from control of the world's mineral-rich sea bottoms to the financing of the U.N. itself.

A brief summary of the major issues:

Vietnam: The war in Asia was a key topic in almost all of the opening speeches at the General Assembly. Although not formally on the agenda, Vietnam has been before the U.N.'s Security Council since 1966. Debate, although welcomed by the United States, has been blocked by the Soviets. The search for peace in Vietnam remains a matter of first priority and the U.N. under its charter, has a clear right and duty to concern itself with this problem. Our government is ready to stop air and naval bombardment of Vietnam when assured it will lead to productive discussion with Hanoi. The United States seeks a political solution which assures continued freedom for South Vietnam rather than a military victory.

Nuclear treaty: Russia and the United States have been close to signing a treaty to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear nations since August. The major unresolved question is which international agency will inspect atomic plants and enforce the pact. Accord could come near the end of the General Assembly session in December or early next year. Despite opposition from India, Germany, Sweden, Italy, and France, an agreement between the world's two greatest nuclear powers—the United States and Russia—might be the major achievement of the 22d General Assembly.

Middle East: The United States and Russia approached agreement on many of the complex issues stemming from the June Arab-Israeli war during the U.N.'s special summer session. But both Israel and the Arab States balked at specific settlement proposals. Since then, an Arab summit meeting was held at Khartoum and there have been signs of a change in attitude from some of the Arab States. The U.S. position calls for an end to the state of belligerency, the recognition of state sovereignty, justice for the refugee, free and innocent passage through international waterways, a limit to the arms race, multilateral agreement on the status of Jerusalem, and political independence and respect for the boundaries of all states involved. Israel has maintained its desire for direct negotiations with the Arab States. If direct negotiations prove impossible, the United States believes the U.N. can play a useful role as mediator. But the United States is convinced a peace cannot be imposed by outside powers.

Red China: What U.N. Secretary General U Thant has called China's "nervous breakdown" may scare away much of Peking's support for admission to the U.N. this year. Internal troubles coupled with attacks on such former supporters as India and Britain plus continued demands for the expulsion of Taiwan make it appear that the vote against admission may be even greater than the 56-to-46 margin which barred a seat last year.

Korea, a political battleground: Some of the tension usually attached to the Red China seating debate may be transferred to the annual Communist-bloc demand for U.S. withdrawal from South Korea. The matter comes under U.N. scrutiny because U.S. forces there continue to operate under the U.N. flag although they are not responsible to and do not report to the U.N. As the U.S. representative on the first committee, I will present the U.S. position on this item. Essentially, it is that the United States will agree to withdraw provided North Korea recognizes the U.N. mandate for rehabilitation and reunification of the country. The north has refused to do this in the past and another stalemate appears likely.

Financing the United Nations: The U.N. is a big business and the United States is its largest investor. As the U.S. representative on the U.N.'s fifth committee, comparable to Congress' Ways and Means Committee, I will be involved in reviewing the U.N. budget for fiscal 1968. It is estimated at $324 million, up $24 million from 1967. The figure includes $117 million for direct U.N. expenses, the remainder for the operation of its specialized agencies such as UNESCO. This year the U.S. pays about 32 percent. It has been proposed that our contribution be reduced to 31.91 percent in 1968. Russia, the next largest contributor, pays 14.92 percent.

A mirror of the world: In its 22d year, the United Nations is far from a "parliament of man." But it is a kind of mirror of the world, "warts and all." Despite the frustrations of the many stalemated issues it faces, it would be a mistake to conclude that they add up to failure of the UN concept. Some may indicate a breakdown in diplomacy between the great powers, others may point to the weakness of small power activism. Others reflect areas where only patience and time will cool the passions of conflict. But by its very act of coming together, by its debates and the opportunities it offers for quiet diplomacy off the Assembly floor, our world is made a marginally safer place.

How U.S. delegates are selected: When the U.N. was formed in 1946, Congress provided that two of the five U.S. delegates must always be chosen from its ranks. One-year delegates are selected from the Senate, the next from the House. One member is named from each party and traditionally both have come from the Foreign Affairs Committees. The gentleman from North Carolina, Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, was named with me this year. Other members of the U.S. delegation include Arthur J. Goldberg, William B. Buffum, Adrian S. Fisher, and five alternates. All delegates are entitled to rank of ambassador.

U.N.'s worldwide operation employ more than 35,000: Although the General Assembly meets for only 3 months each year—September to December—the U.N. is a year-round, worldwide operation. It employs more than 35,000 persons on a fulltime basis, about 5,000 of them at the U.N. headquarters in New York. A second major office complex in Geneva, Switzerland, houses many of the U.N. auxiliary agencies such as the World Health Organization—WHO. The U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO—is located in Paris. Other regional locations are Bangkok, Rome, and Chile. Included in the 35,000 fulltime workers are 11,000 employed on a parttime basis for the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East—UNRWA.

Commuter schedule: Responsibilities of the U.N. assignment require that I spend much of my time in New York. I am in daily contact with my offices in Royal Oak and Washington and commute as often as possible to keep up with congressional matters. During these 3 months, I will continue to give your requests and your correspondence prompt attention.

WHAT TROUBLES OUR TROUBLED YOUTH?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request to the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished president of the Menninger

Foundation of Topeka, Kans., was the featured speaker at the annual meeting of the American Humanics Foundation in Kansas City, Mo., on August 18, 1967. The topic for his remarks was "What Troubles Our Troubled Youth?" and I believe his remarks are must reading for all those who bear responsibility in the field of preparing our young men and women for positions of leadership in tomorrow's world.

I insert his remarks at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT TROUBLES OUR TROUBLED YOUTH?

(By Roy W. Menninger, M.D.)

To be asked to address the Annual Meeting of the American Humanics Foundation is an honor indeed, and has given me a welcome opportunity to think together with you about matters of concern to us both: Our youth. One cannot read the newspapers, the popular weekly magazines, watch television, or even travel about our larger cities without being made aware of our youth. Whether it is their numbers, their outlandish or provocative behavior, their fads or their economic influence, they are all about us. To be aware of their presence in all its forms is to become aware of something more: Much that they do is somehow troubling to us members of another generation, and even to those of us but a few years older than they.

Those of us who have occasion to see these youths professionally, as do we psychiatrists, become aware that the youths who trouble so many of us are themselves troubled people. It is no trick, of course, to decide that their troubles are their own—particular difficulties peculiar to the individual who seeks our help; youth who are troubled for having come from troubled families. It is not a much bigger step to decide that these special cases of trouble ought to be referred to a physician, a psychiatrist, a counselor or the like, or perhaps just treated with pills and otherwise disregarded.

To be sure, many of these troubled youths do come from troubled families, and do need psychiatric help. But what is often not considered by adults troubled by these troubled youth, or intentionally ignored if perceived, are some of the concerns about themselves and their place in the world which these troubled youths have in common; not only with each other, but with many of their peers who have not gone the route of becoming a patient. These concerns are not to be dismissed with a wave of our older and wiser hand, as we disdainfully comment on "the modern generation." These concerns which trouble our troubled youth require a hearing, and particularly a hearing from those of us who say, loudly and publicly, that we are concerned about our youth, that we are working to help our youth, that we are humanitarian in our interests. These people include you and me, so it is to us, as well as to many other adults who do not share our views, that I am speaking. I think we have failed our youth, by having failed to listen, or if to listen, failed to hear.

The evidences of their trouble are manifold. Statistics have a way of sounding cold and harsh, often failing to reveal the human tragedy they imply, but let me share a few of them with you. Did you know that one out of every six teen-agers becomes pregnant out of wedlock? Did you know that one-third to one-half of all teen-agers' marriages are prefaced by illegitimate pregnancy? Or that the number of unwed mothers under eighteen has doubled since 1940? Did you know that one teen-age marriage in every *two* ends in divorce within five years? And that forty per cent of all the women who walk down the aisle today are between the ages of fifteen and eighteen?

But it does not stop there. Three youngsters in every hundred between ten and seventeen will be adjudged delinquent this year. There are nearly half a million children hailed into juvenile court every year. There is a tremendous increase in the use of drugs—amphetamines, barbiturates, LSD. It is estimated that in Nassau County—there is no reason to think things are different here than they are there—one kid in every six has taken marijuana and LSD. Some estimate that up to fifty per cent of the kids on college campuses are experimenting with these drugs. The statistics go on, and they do not get better.

I do not know how you react to these figures. To me, they are dismaying, they are troubling; they certainly are a sign of troubled youth. If I were to take my own reactions as suggestive of what many, many other people must feel, I would know that one of the first reactions of an adult to these statistics and the tragedies that lie behind them is fear. So much evidence of disrupted living evokes apprehension within most of us. Will any of these things happen to my children? If they do, am I, the parent, to blame? These chilling statistics coupled with our own impressions of adolescence as a stormy and turbulent time contribute to a sense of apprehension about adolescence in general. "Clearly, they are unpredictable, stormy and potentially violent people," we think. The sudden sound of screeching tires on a nearby street in a quiet neighborhood brings an immediate reaction: "There goes a teen-ager," when of course we cannot know whether we are right or not. I walk down a city street and see a clustered group on the corner. For all I know, they are a bunch of happy, contented kids on the way home from a movie, but what do I feel? Fear. What do I think? They might attack me. So often is there this implication conveyed by the word "teen-ager:" An image of turbulence, conflict, explosiveness, unpleasantness, uncontrollability.

Not all of us are so consciously aware of this fear, but its workings are nonetheless evident in our reactions of contempt, disdain, disgust, or distaste that so many express in the wake of some teen-age act. This reaction or rejection is born perhaps of some conviction that adolescents are volatile combinations of sex and aggression barely under control. For most of us, it is a short and easy step to a reaction of indignant anger. Made anxious by the visible struggles of our teen-agers, we are quick to defend ourselves by righteous proclamations, usually emphasizing our adult wisdom, our greater experience, or some such; quick to point critically to these seriously troubled behaviors in ways that do not flatter us. Out of these anxious and angry feelings of ours come unreasonable constraints on our adolescents; vitriolic attacks on their behavior; ready capitulation to their demands; or perhaps what is worst of all, turning our backs on them, their concerns, and their needs, and ignoring them completely.

These adult reactions are problems for all sorts of reasons: They enable the adolescent to feel misunderstood (which he is); they allow us to think we have done something constructive, when we have done nothing of the kind; and even worse, they lead us to miss the whole point of this troubled behavior. In my view, so much of it speaks of the failure of society to deal with the real issues that adolescence poses for the adolescent, and for the society he lives in. By their very provocativeness, these behaviors draw our attention to the symptoms, obscuring completely the existence of a more serious problem that may underlie them.

For so many adolescents, their challenging behavior is a reaction of frustration to the failure of society to make a reasonable and sensible and appropriate place for them. To put it bluntly, our adult society tends to regard the adolescent as an unfortunate inconvenience, a sort of bad moment that we half wish would go away; a distraction or maybe a disruption that gets in the way of the real business of living for the rest of us, a kind of incidental way station in life which will surely pass if we wait long enough or hold our breath or look the other way. It is as if adult society regards adolescence as an unattractive extension of childhood that we must somehow put up with, until the magic of time has somehow transmuted that cute little baby of yesteryear into the adult of tomorrow. Most of us feel put upon by the very existence of the adolescent, annoyed with his presence, his unpredictability, his demands, his parasitic nature, and the like, as if we were somehow the victim and he the aggressor. And as with any victim, the roads of appeasement and bribery are natural recourses. So we give them a car when they ask, or a new electric guitar, or an increase in their allowance—"anything, just get off my back and out of my way."

More than this: We couple this anxious response of ours with words of moral uplift, sermonizing them about how things will have to change when they get out into that cold cruel world, how they must carry their end of the load, learn to be responsible, put their shoulder to the wheel, and so forth. Often in that vein we tax them with busywork which is meaningless to them and little more than our exploitation of their cheap and available labor.

So it is logical to suggest that our adolescents' provocative behavior may be their way of saying to us, "I object." They may be trying to tell us how they feel at our systematically segregating them from adult society. They may be trying to make us understand how grave is our failure to perceive their legitimate needs for participation, their legitimate needs for genuine challenge and genuine engagement in the real tasks of living.

How is it that adolescents are not greater participants in society? Partly, perhaps, because we look upon the job of the child and the adolescent as having a single, narrowly-focused task: completing his schooling. No matter how we define it, attending school is his task, and all else is secondary and generally classified under the rubric of play. By virtue of this commitment to schooling imposed by society, the child through late adolescence has no other significant social contribution to make. But beyond this, how can he, we ask? He is too immature, or too irresponsible or too inexperienced, or a drug on the labor market, or without enough social merit in the aggregate to permit anything more than the most token participation in any of the social processes characteristic of adult living. He is not ready for the privileges and responsibilities of this participation until some magical point has been reached—a particular age or an official change in status.

Without regard to their individual talents, their interests, their perceptiveness, their energy, their idealism, or their enthusiasm, we deny them a significant role in society at large. To be sure, there are exceptions, and some of us are proud to point them out, in much the manner of some of my bigoted acquaintances: "Some of my best friends are adolescents . . ." But for the aggregate, there is no social role but complaint attendance at school.

Nowhere is the starkness and meagerness of this social isolation more apparent than in the lot of the 15-year-old. Except for going to school, virtually nothing that he can do is legal. He can't quit school, he can't work, he can't drink, he can't smoke, he can't drive except to and from school, he can't marry, he can't vote, he can't enlist, he can't gamble. He cannot in fact participate in *any* of the adult virtues, vices, or activities.

But consider the consequences of this enforced sidelining of the adolescent. There he waits, champing at the bit, full of energy, drive and curiosity, intrigued and tempted by the publicly advertised advantages of adulthood, asked to forego pleasures that he sees the adults all around him engaging in freely and often to excess. Is it any surprise that he samples these experiences secretly, or in defiance, or inappropriately? And how does it prepare the adoescent for the world of adult responsibilities when he is given no opportunities to test, to try, to experience, to learn by doing? By what magic do we expect this growing adolescent, denied opportunities for the participation that teaches, suddenly to emerge on the stage of adulthood, full-fledged, capable, mature and responsible? Small wonder that so few are ready for these responsibilities when the time comes, when their predominate experience has been the frustration of waiting, impatiently, expected to forego, to postpone, to stand apart from the society which flows all around them.

How does this come to be? How is it that we view our adolescents as overgrown children, treat them as such, and then are perturbed by their acting that way? How is it that we are face to face with a social phenomenon of discontented adolescence which we can neither understand nor manage?

This is no place for an extended analysis, nor am I the person to undertake it if it were. But several factors of interest stand out in this connection that I would like to share with you. I am indebted to William Soskin, Leonard Duhl, and Robert Leopold for their persuasive analysis of these factors and implications, in a chapter on the "Sociocultural Dilemnas in the World of Adolescence and Youth," soon to be published.

One is the dramatic change in the economic status of the adolescent. The affluence of our society means, in effect, that the adolescent does not have to work, because the money he might earn is not as necessary for support of the family as it once was. Affluence provides him with the means for fantastic self-indulgence. It is estimated that last year the aggregate total for allowances and money earned by adolescents came to the staggering sum of fourteen billion dollars. This amount of money, plus a large amount of leisure time, plus a lack of significant involvement in the social fabric inevitably makes for a patterns of living with the character of endless play. This is a sharp swing of the pendulum to the opposite extreme from the days of child labor of fifty years ago.

The affluence in our society provides, moreover, a devastating contrast between the luxuries available to middle class youth and the continuing depriviations of the lower class, and particularly the Negro youth. And I suggest that this contrast is part of the inflammatory pressures that led to the riots that we have witnessed this summer.

This tremendous affluence means, of course, a tremendous consumer market which develops a self-sustaining and expanding dynamic of its own. And from the point of view of the adolescent, I would argue that this self-sustaining market tends to introduce more superficial, materialistic, spurious, shifting, status-centered values that push out the more solid virtues.

A second factor is the upward extension of schooling itself. Compulsory public education for all, initially limited to the elementary grades, gradually extended to secondary school education, as there was an expansion of knowledge that needed to be mastered and an increasing need for more and better training of people. But out of this virtue of compulsory public education came a few unexpected disadvantages. Among other things, it has meant an extended period in which the growing adolescent is dependent upon and controlled by adults. This spells further delay in permitting him to engage in some of the activities that will teach him how to deal with such ultimate life functions as work and the assumption of citizen and social responsibility. We have watched the age of legal responsibility creep upward from seven, where it used to be, to sixteen, eighteen, twenty-one—surely, for very good reasons, but with and not so happy consequences. Many years ago, a boy by the age of sixteen might well have been head of the household, or a soldier in the king's army. Even in our Civil War there were drummer boys and buglers at the age of fifteen.

What are some of these unhappy consequences? I think the most serious effect is the extent to which the adolescent is infantilized—childized" as Soskin, et al, have called it. He becomes more childish, with the room and the permission to stay that way. This state is a deterrent to healthy growth; it provokes and sustains our perceptions of him as inmature. It is a magnificent example of a self-fulfilling prophecy. We deny him some of the responsibilities of maturity, and when he responds with childish behavior, we say, "See, I told you all along you weren't ready." As we react by giving him still less responsibility and penning him up more, *he* reacts with still greater evidence of the immaturity that then justifies another round of adult control and demands for conformity.

I think this infantilizing of the adolescent does something more. I think it probably provokes adventure-seeking, thrill-seeking, serious risk-taking behavior, such as taking drugs, playing chicken on the highway, speeding at ninety miles an hour through the city, and so forth. I would suggest that this behavior not only expresses the sense of helplessness and frustration the adolescent feels at being so irrelevant to the adult society all around him, but conveys as well his anger and his resentment for being so disregarded and shoved aside by us adults.

Adolescents are action-oriented people; they are people seeking a cause and a reason for being. If we fail to supply tasks which are adequate to absorb these energies and relevant to their psycho-social needs they will do the only thing they can: seek their own outlets, and adults be damned. The fatal combination of their needs plus our indifference necessarily and inevitably leads to behaviors which will either embarrass or trouble us and risk being a danger to all. Our expectations and our presumptions about the adolescent as generally too immature to assume much responsibility embarrasses us further when he shows unexpected evidence of political or social maturity. Witness our astonishment at the success of the Peace Corps and our amazement at the conviction and effectiveness of the adolescent civil rights worker. We may not always agree with the sentiments they express and work for, but we cannot deny the strength and the effectiveness of their commitment when they are finally given the opportunity to make it.

One of the effects of these systematic social infantilization of the adolescent arises from the fact that we hang him between the horns of a serious dilemma. By its nature, adolescence forces gradual estrangement of the youth from the supports and the nurture that the family gave him as a child, yet does not provide the benefits and supports of adulthood. And there he hangs, able neither to retreat to the warmth and support of the family, nor advance into the companionship of adult society. This limbo in which the adolescent finds himself was filled in earlier years by the opportunity to serve as an apprentice, and by the availability of real work. With these no longer open to him, his world is an empty one, populated by church and youth groups and some commercial interests. As others have observed, the former are too selective and exclusive, failing to reach the very youth who may need it most, and the latter only exploits the chaos of adolescence for its own interests, with service neither to youth nor society.

Even more tragic, enforced schooling combined with enforced infantilization cemented by a systematic absence of real work and real participation in social process yields an unfortunate fruit. In spite of twelve years of education, the average high school graduate emerges from his educational cocoon with no place to go and nothing to be. He has no occupational identity, no skills worth selling, no systematic practice in the arts of living in a complex society, and not much of a clue about where to go to find what he does not yet have. The exception of course are the college-bound youths, though they, by that very token, are not average. Even here, though they may continue their schooling through various kinds of higher education, those older adolescents continue to feel isolated from society and are, in fact, excluded from much significant participation in social processes. Without voice or responsibility for the society that they are physically a part of, continuing to be aware of a pervasive sense of irrelevance to the larger adult community, they give vent to their distress and their resentment through overt external action—through acts of social protest, or town-grown riots, or vociferous support of unpopular causes, or through internal retreat with LSD or by becoming a hippie.

But these differences between the college adolescent and his drifting buddy who barely made it through high school are differences in degree, not kind. Each in his own way is struggling to come to terms with the failure of society to have prepared him better for the adult life it now expects him to lead. The symptoms of this failure, already expressed by the distressing statistics I recited earlier, are portrayed by unhappy premature marriages or excessive drinking or pursuit of crime. This is a message we cannot afford to miss. This is not simply a school problem; this is not a problem of better law enforcement; this is not a problem of stricter laws to prevent illegitimate pregnancies or teen-age marriages; this is not a problem to be solved by crying alarm or singling out some group for blame.

It is a problem for which all of us, all of us adults, are to blame. But our response to the problems of our adolescents cannot stop with the expression of a bit of guilt followed by some reassuring pablum. In fact, it must proceed to a new and more honest look at the adolescent and his relationship to the world around him. We must set aside this moralistic, holier-than-thou attitude of complacent superiority that we adults so often assume in front of our youngsters, and be willing instead to take a closer look at what it is the adolescent needs for his tasks of growth as he moves from childhood to adulthood, and what it is that we as the guardians of society are or are not providing to him to make that possible. I think we need to take a harder look at the extent to which our society has denied the adolescent the room he needs to experiment, to participate, to engage, and to involve himself in the fabric of real living. We need to consider how we can enable our youth to participate legitimately in the social issues of our time, struggle with the real problems of racial prejudice, social and economic deprivation, self-government, the development of conceptions of service to others. It means a recognition by us of our failure to give adolescents a chance to participate in meaningful, active, and effective ways in the social processes of our communities.

We deprive him of these opportunities at the very moment in his development when he needs the challenge of real situations and real problems to test himself against, to define his capabilities and his interests and to find out what he can do and who he is and what he is made of. We have sidelined him from the engagement with the vital concerns of our society at a time when he is motivated more powerfully by idealism and a sense of justice than he ever will be again. The adolescent is task oriented, he is eager, he has enormous energy and a willingness to invest this in useful and meaningful activities—but only if he has the opportunity and the permission to do so. If we fail, as I think we have failed, to provide these opportunities and permissions, we deprive an enormous proportion of our youth from engagement in the social and community activities which will give him the laboratory of learning he needs, and we deprive the community of the enormous contribution of vigor, spirit, energy, enthusiasm and capacity for change that could literally remake society.

What makes this failure of adult society so ironic is the fact that there are so many evidences of acute and immediate need in our communities for service, for assistance, for support, for rehabilitation. To see these needs on the one hand and the terrible waste in our eager, energetic but uninvolved youth is a tragedy of enormous proportions. The barest hint of what alchemy of change is possible when these psychologically needful youth are engaged in the tasks of community living are evident in the work of the Peace Corps and VISTA. It was impressive to note that perhaps the most single effective method for controlling the rioters in this summer past in Florida, where it was first tried and and belatedly in Newark, was the use of adolescents in the responsible role of roving carriers of the word, quieting the restless and resentful citizens and undoubtedly forestalling further riots. No one has yet recorded what this experience must have done for the youth involved, but there is no question about the value to the community of their unique participation.

There are surely ways in which a marriage of these socio-psychological needs of our adolescents and the human needs of our communities can be made, with inestimable profit for both. Perhaps this process can be begun by the many voluntary service organizations devoted to youth. I would hope so, but I am aware that this cannot occur without a simultaneous look—a hard look—at the artificiality and irrelevance, the busy work and triviality that all too many of our youth organizations put forth under the rubric of "character building." To be sure, some learning does take place, even from the fun-type avocational pursuits that most middle class oriented youth organizations put before their constituents. But too often, this learning is limited to promoting such selfish concerns as one's own advancement, indulgence or gratification.

Confrontation with the vastly greater needs of the segregated, ignored, deprived kids is rare. Engagement of our middle class youth is actually working with these less fortunate kids—the ones our youth organizations practically never reach—is even rarer, for it seems that it is the pattern of all too many youth groups to rest in the comfortable complacence of promoting good, solid, middle class values of achievement, progress, education, competition, and the like, and to ignore or silently avoid confrontation with, let alone engagement with, some of the critical concerns of our current society—racial and social justice, poverty, deprivation, delinquency, and the absence of individual dignity for so many.

Yet it is the work in these areas where the needs are so great that our hungry, identity-searching adolescents can stand to give so much and learn so much. By grappling with these real problems, engaged with real situations, they develop a truer sense of values than can ever occur from simply sitting passively and being told. They learn what so many of us have yet to learn well: the satisfactions and usefulness of service to others to produce a greater sense of community between both.

It's my hope that youth organizations can rise to this tremendous challenge, and offer some of the opportunities that both our adolescents and our community so badly need. I wish I knew of all the ways in which these glaring needs of adolescent youth for real participation could be met and joined together with the enormous needs of our communities and our society. I am sure there are many ways, and to the task of defining them, developing them, promoting them, and expanding them, we must all devote our energies.

But even this task, vital as it is, cannot begin until we have first begun to recognize the extent to which we have disenfranchised our adolescent youth from the social processes which engage so much attention of the rest of us. Without a doubt, voluntary organizations dedicated to youth have a crucial and significant role to play, so that our adolescents may again become a part of the main stream that flows on to adult maturity. This is a task well worth all the attention we can possibly find to give to it.

DANGEROUS LENGTHS

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Gardner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following article from the October 2, 1967, copy of Barron's so that it might be brought to the attention of my colleagues:

Dangerous Lengths: The Federal Crusade Against Smoking Has Gone Too Far

"Outdoor activity of an athletic nature, engaged in by youthful, fit and personable appearing models, serves as a positive backdrop to many cigarette advertisements. This activity also suggests that the smoking depicted in the foreground, if not conducive to rousingly good health, is certainly not incompatible with it. The most prevalent outdoor activity in current cigaret advertising is sailboating (Tareyton, Pall Mall, Parliament and Viceroy filters). To a lesser extent, fishing (Viceroy filters and Camel menthols), tennis (Chesterfield filters), hunting (Camel filters), golf and outdoor cooking (Viceroy filters), and bowling and 'sandbathing' (Winston filters) are all 'in.' . . .

"Some cigaret advertising transcends mere image association and projects its own separate and unique world. Examples include 'Salem Country,' a land in which romantic couples romp and preen through shifting, sylvan settings; the 'Night People,' whose post evening encounters can lead to smoking Parliament filters; and 'Marlboro Country,' where there daily unfolds the simple male heroic virtues of the 'Old West.' Worry over health has been banished from these Shangri-las."

While Barron's tends to disapprove of bureaucracy and all its works, the foregoing passages, taken from a recent Federal Trade Commission Report to Congress, unmistakably smack of talent. If the authors ever decide to seek gainful employment, we urge them to try Madison Avenue. Meanwhile, however, they and their fellow officials in the Federal Communications Commission and the National Interagency Council on Smoking and Health, along with kindred souls on Capitol Hill, are still doing business at the same old doctrinaire stand. Senator Robert F. Kennedy (D., N.Y.) is pushing a bill to tax cigarets according to their tar and nicotine content. The FCC has just reaffirmed a ruling which holds that in order to compete with the blandishments cited above, television broadcasters must give the foes of smoking air time free of charge if not exactly equal. FTC, in turn, relentlessly presses a campaign to force the industry to warn its customers: "Cigaret smoking is dangerous to health and may cause death from cancer and other diseases." Someday it aims to ban all cigaret adveristing.

What began a few years ago as a seemingly well-intentioned, if disturbing, effort to brainwash the citizenry into kicking the habit thus has spiraled into a crusade as menacing and ugly as Prohibition. At the time (Barron's, January 18, 1965), regarding the gross exaggerations of Emerson Foote, who headed the movement, we accused the Public Health Service of "placing the strident claims of the pitchman ahead of the unobtrusive quest for truth." Nothing that PHS has said or done since has changed our view. On the contrary, the anti-smoking forces, putting their worst foot forward, lately have sought to escalate from persuasion to coercion. As inveterate non-smokers, we freely concede that cigarets do one no good. As to the body, politic, however, the unchecked arrogance of bureaucracy is invariably fatal. When the choice lies between living dangerously or toeing the party line, we (like most Americans, evidently) would rather fight than switch.

Since publication in 1964 of "Smoking and Health," which, through a kind of guilt by statistical association, condemned the use of cigarets (but not cigars or pipes), officialdom has done its best to pick a fight. Armed with such dubious "proof," the Federal Trade Commission promptly sought to foist its own uncompromising slogans on the industry, a move which led a more tolerant Congress to pass the Federal Cigaret Labeling and Advertising Act. The law, which allowed manufacturers to put a milder warning on each pack of cigarets, has merely goaded the anti-smoking zealots to greater lengths. Thus, Senator Robert Kennedy, who yields to no man in his hot pursuit of demagoguery, has introduced a bill that would tax cigarets on the basis of their tar and nicotine content, as measured by the FTC in a laboratory newly equipped with a federal smoking machine. The FCC has gone much further. Last June, upon a complaint by a crusading young lawyer (strange how the breed has multiplied of late), the agency abruptly decided that the so-called fairness doctrine applied not only to the public debate of controversial issues but also to advertising. Specifically, it decreed that cigaret foes were entitled to free air time to criticize Winston's grammar, burn their Lark packs and otherwise lose their Kool. Two weeks ago, the agency unanimously reaffirmed its ruling.

"Oh what a tangled web we weave, when first we practice to deceive." From the outset, as a few bold scientific spirits insisted, "Smoking and Health" failed to prove that cigarets cause lung cancer or any other of the many ills to which the flesh is heir. With the passage of time, its findings have grown increasingly suspect. Last year Barron's cited the critique of Professor K. A. Brownlee of the University of Chicago, who faulted the Surgeon-General's Report for inadequate and possibly biased sampling methods, as well as for the arbitrary dismissal of conflicting views. This year the medicine men have undercut their own dogma. For, contrary to their previous findings, which exonerated nicotine as a health hazard, the witch doctors, in a remarkable if little-noted change of mind, are now pointing the finger of suspicion at it. Meanwhile, the Johnson Administration, which never gave the anti-smoking campaign its seal of approval, quietly continues to support the price of the filthy weed with taxpayers' money, and, for the benefit of foreigners, who presumably neither know better nor care, to extol the virtues of U.S. tobacco.

From a dubious premise, the Federal Communications Commission has proceeded grandly to an absurd conclusion. Since the licensee "is presenting commercials urging the consumption of a product whose normal use has been found by the government to represent a serious potential hazard to public health," the public interest requires him "to devote a significant amount of time to informing his listeners of the other side of the matter—that however enjoyable smoking may be, it represents a habit which may cause or contribute to the death of the user." In so ruling the FCC denied that it was setting a dangerous precedent. However, Commissioner Loevinger, the only member with any qualms whatever, offered effective rebuttal. "No matter what the Commission now says about the distinction between cigaret advertising and other types, it is establishing the principle that the Fairness Doctrine applies to commercial advertising, as distinguished from paid political broadcasting. The Commission will be hard pressed to find a rational basis for holding that cigarets differ from all other hazards to life and health."

The agency also doubtless will have trouble defending its stand in the courts (to which the broadcasting industry has appealed). On this score Mr. Loevinger again gives eloquent testimony. "Because the result seems to me to be socially and morally right," he averred, he was willing—albeit with "great doubt and reluctance"—to go along with the rest. However, he added significantly, "I have doubts that the action is procedurally and substantively consistent with controlling legal rules. I am reluctant because of concern that this action may represent a subjugation of judgment to sentiment." Mr. Loevinger may have his qualms, but for him, as well as for his colleagues, the end plainly justifies the means.

This is the classic rationale of tyranny, the perennial cry of the mob. The public interest, as we have said before, covers a multitude of sins, from the venial to the deadly. Smoking may be a minor issue, but contempt for due process of law looms large. Cigaret advertising, however disagreeable, constitutes an exercise in freedom of speech. Big Brother doesn't take over all at once, he closes in step by step. Here's a chance to draw the line.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wydler] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 11, 1967, on rollcall 307, I did not vote. This bill raised the pay rates of postal and other Federal employees. Unfortunately, I had been invited by the Governor of New York State to participate in an important oceanographic conference in the city of New York on that day. This commitment was of many months' standing. I had hoped to be able to return to Washington in time to vote on the bill but, unfortunately, the final vote came much earlier than was expected. I, of course, supported the pay raise for postal and Federal employees and would have voted in favor of the bill had I been able to be present. I was pleased that it passed the House of Representatives by a substantial majority.

RICE COUNCIL ADVERTISING IS UNFAIR TO POTATO PRODUCERS

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Kleppe] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the Federal Trade Commission to investigate a national advertising campaign by the Rice Council of America which, it seems to me, is unfair to the potato industry and both deceptive and misleading from the consumer point of view.

Although the U.S. Department of Agriculture says that rice actually contains more calories than potatoes, on a gram-for-gram basis, the main thrust of the Rice Council's advertising is that rice makes you slim, while potatoes make you fat. With potato producers receiving only 67 percent of parity—two-thirds of a fair price—for their crop, an advertising campaign designed to scare consumers away from potatoes could have further adverse price effects.

I submit for the Record my letter to the Federal Trade Commission:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., October 17, 1967.

Mr. Paul Rand Dixon,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commissicn, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I invite your attention to the attached brochure illustrating five advertisements running on a monthly basis in Life magazine under the sponsorship of the Rice Council of America, 3917 Richmond Avenue, Houston, Texas.

It seems to me that this advertising is both unfair and deceptive—unfair to the potato growers of America and deceptive insofar as the consumer is concerned.

As evidence, consider the July advertisement which displays what must be a cull potato, with the label "Ugh!" The message continues: "Just think. You never have to peel rice. All you need to make rice is hot water. Hot digity! Bury it in butter. Or add gobs of gravy! Rice fills you the long way . . . not the *round* way. Come on now—swear off mashing, beating, peeling, whipping. *Rice* is the reckless one!"

Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the Rice Council's advertising copywriter is the reckless one.

The unpeeled potato may not be the most beautiful vegetable in the world, but it compares favorably with a handful of rough rice. Forgetting aesthetics, however, it seems to me that the thrust of the Rice Council's advertising is that rice makes you slim and potatoes make you fat: "Rice fills you the long way . . . not the round way." The Council's September advertising asks, in boxcar type, "did you ever see a fat Chinese?"—this over a picture of a porterhouse steak with a pile of butter-laden rice alongside.

Although an obese Chinese may be a rarity in food-short Red China today, in happier times this was not true. No one ever confused Charlie Chan with The Thin Man.

If the Rice Council's advertising copywriter believes that "gobs of gravy" on rice is less fattening than on potatoes, let him consult his calory counter or, better yet, his family physician. Enclosed is a copy of a publication, 'Nutritive Value of Foods", which reports that a baked potato weighing 99 grams contains 90 calories, while a cup of cooked rice weighing 168 grams has 185 calories, while a cup of cooked rice weighing 168 grams has 185 calories. In other words, there is a little less than one calorie per gram in potatoes and a little more than one calorie per gram in rice. The report says both potatoes and rice contain only a trace" of fat.

Obviously the calorie count in butter or gobs of gravy" remains constant, whether applied to rice or potatoes.

Therefore, it seems to me that the Rice Council's advertising campaign is unfair to the potato industry, and both deceptive and misleading from the consumer point of view.

This matter was brought to my attention by Mr. Martin Kasperson, Executive Secretary of the Red River Potato Growers Association. I enclose a copy of his letter to me.

I wrote to Mr. L. O. Tiedt, Executive Vice President of the Rice Council in Houston, inviting his attention to Mr. Kasperson's complaint. In his reply to me, a copy of which is enclosed, Mr. Tiedt said, in part:

The industry's intent is to call attention to rice in a light, humorous manner in a campaign not unlike the widely-recognized Avis-Hertz efforts."

I believe this is a rather poor parallel. It wouldn't really be very humorous if Avis advertised that Hertz vehicles were unsafe, which is approximately what the Rice Council seems to be saying about potatoes to a cholesterol-conscious, diet-minded public.

The potato industry is a highly important segment of American agriculture. Potatoes are a major cash crop for many North Dakota farmers. North Dakota, with an average annual output of 14 million hundredweight, ranks third in the nation in potato production. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the average price received by farmers for potatoes on September 15, 1967 was $1.90 per hundredweight as compared with $2.07 a year earlier. This represents only 67 percent of parity, or two-thirds of what is considered a fair price.

With this depressed price, about the last thing potato growers need now is a national advertising campaign designed to scare consumers away from this highly palatable, nutritious food.

Potato growers are most sensitive about another point involved here. As Mr. Kasperson points out in his letter to me:

"Although no direct government subsidy monies are paid into the Rice Council promotion, it is very easily understood that were it not for their subsidy payments they could not afford to finance such an extensive campaign. Potato industry people feel strongly about this, as theirs is a nonsubsidized crop, and that indirectly the United States Government is assisting the rice growers in their attack on the potato industry."

According to the Commodity Credit Corporation's report of its operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, total commitments to the rice program, including inventory losses, export subsidies and sales under P. L. 480, were $175,862,724.00. Since there are only about 10,000 commercial rice growers in the United States, this means an outlay of about $17,500.00 per operator in a single year.

I believe the Rice Council's current advertising campaign should be investigated by the Federal Trade Commission.

Sincerely,

Tom Kleppe,
Member of Congress.

TAX INCREASE

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McDonald] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for several months we have been evaluating the President's request for a 10-percent surcharge on incomes to help cut his anticipated $29 billion deficit and stem inflation.

The administration has advanced many arguments, including the threat of greater inflation. I have considered these arguments and simply am unable to accept them. And so, for the following reasons, I cannot at this time support a tax increase:

First, the administration says a tax increase is needed to halt inflation, but has failed to demonstrate conclusively that a serious inflationary spiral is in prospect. The administration's contention, incidentally, is disputed by leading congressional economists in the President's own party.

Second, the administration admits it is faced with a $29 billion deficit, but has failed to make any meaningful reductions in nonessential spending or postpone new and untried programs not vital to the Nation's welfare.

Third, a tax increase would be frozen into law for 2 years and could aggravate an unforeseeable recession in 1968 or 1969. Budget cuts provide a more flexible economic weapon because they can be put into effect at once and allow for a more rapid reversal of policy.

Fourth, a tax increase would be an unnecessary additional burden on the public and especially on those citizens with fixed incomes.

FORT LAUDERDALE NEWS EDITORIAL SCORES PHONY ECONOMY TALK IN CONGRESS

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Burke] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale News on October 13, 1967, editor Jack W. Gore expressed the views of a great many Americans today with respect to H.R. 7977, the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act, which passed the House on October 11. As I was a strong advocate of the recommittal motion which failed by only 12 votes, I feel compelled to make this fine editorial a part of the Congressional Record. I therefore insert this editorial at this point in the Record:

House Economy Advocates Lack Guts To Stand Up When Chips Are Down

This past Wednesday, some 211 members of the House of Representatives provided another graphic illustration of just why the current economy talk in Congress can be given the tag of "all wind and no rain."

Up before the House members was a bill designed to boost postal rates by some $890 million. As originally drafted, the bill was aimed at using the proceeds of the postal rate hike to finance a 4.5 per cent pay increase for 715,000 postal workers.

But that was before the House spenders swung into action. By the time they got through amending what had been a limited pay hike bill, it had been converted into a giant catchall measure aimed at providing over 1,200,000 government employes with pay raises aggregating $2.6 billion.

Just about everybody in government service is included in this deal except 2,800 employes of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the war on poverty agency, which few in Congress seem to think much of these days.

The spend-happy Congressmen didn't even exclude themselves in passing out the pay raises. Stuck into the bill was a nifty little clause which will virtually guarantee a pay raise for Congressmen every four years without them even having to initiate the deal.

Under this clause the President, with advice from a citizens commission, will recommend at four year intervals salary scales for himself, the Congress and for the judicial branch. Unless either House disapproves the recommendations within 30 days after they are made, the new scales will automatically go into effect.

Under this clever little arrangement Congressmen will be spared the political embarrassment of hiking their own salaries. All they have to do is keep their mouths shut and more gravy will almost automatically be poured over their steak.

If one wonders why the lower House used a bill designed to hike postal rates and postal workers' salaries as the medium through which to give all government white collar workers not one but three separate pay raises between October first of this year and April 1 of 1969, the answer to that isn't hard to come by.

This was the spenders' way of trying to avert a presidential veto. President Johnson supposedly favors the idea of hiking postal rates which will continue the process of making the people pay more for increasingly poorer mail service, but he reportedly doesn't favor hiking the salaries of government workers anywhere near as much as this bill contemplates.

Thus, the House spenders sought to put Mr. Johnson on the spot by tying something he doesn't like, to something he does like.

And where were all the economy advocates while this fantastic $2.6 billion dish of gravy was being ladled out?

They were on hand and some of them, including Chairman Wilbur D. Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee, Rep. Gerald Ford, the Republican House leader, and Rep. H. R. Gross of Iowa, a long-time economy advocate, strongly urged that the bill be sent back to committee to chop down the size of the pay boosts and to eliminate the semiautomatic salary hikes for Congressmen.

But in the showdown vote, the economy advocates lost out by a 211–199 tally. So now the bill goes over to the Senate which, unfortunately enough, almost invariably increases rather than chops spending measures approved by the lower House.

This bill obviously makes a joke out of any Congressional claim that the lawmakers are the ones who want economy in government while it is the Johnson administration which wants to spend, spend and spend some more.

What kind of economy is it, we might ask, to pass a bill which increases government revenue only $890 million while increasing government expenditures by $2.6 billion? This is fiscal irresponsibility of the rankest sort, yet this didn't seem to bother the 211 members of the House who put their stamp of approval on this gravy train measure this past Wednesday.

Under the circumstances it is no wonder the federal government is head over heels in debt, and it is no wonder that no matter how much our people cough up in taxes each year it isn't enough.

The sad truth is that we have a Congress full of hypocrites who love to strike a public posture for economy in government but who, when the chips are down, don't have the guts to say enough is enough.

A LOOK AT THE ADMINISTRATION'S FISCAL POLICY—IS THIS ANY WAY TO RUN A BUSINESS?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Burke] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, much discussion of late has centered around the President's recent request for a 10-percent surcharge on income taxes. It seems to me that this proposal is tantamount to asking Congress to raise taxes so the administration can spend more money. This call for higher taxes has undoubtedly caused dire confusion in the Congress and, understandably, throughout the Nation as well.

According to the administration, higher taxes are necessary because of the growing demands of the war in Vietnam plus the admittedly high costs of maintaining the multitude of Federal programs characteristic of the Great Society. But for most of us the big question still remains unanswered: Is a tax hike really necessary?

Many years ago Chief Justice Marshall made the observation that the power to tax is the power to destroy. This leads us to the crucial question which the Congress must resolve. How much will, or can, the American people pay in taxes before they rise in rebellion against the wasteful and continual spending by their own administration? Of course, it is true that these same people are making more demands today than have been made in the history of our country. The trend in recent years has clearly been toward social reform and increased subsidies, all of which lead to a greater expansion of bureaucracy and governmental control.

Let us look at what this expansion has caused in the way of taxes. In 36 States—my own State of Florida not included—there are fixed-income taxes. Over 2,000 cities, counties, or other local governments have separate income taxes. Real estate taxes, as well as personal property and intangible taxes, exist in all 50 States at the city, county, or State level. General sales taxes exist in 42 States, not to mention State inheritance taxes, beer, wine, and cigarette taxes; gasoline, new car, and tire taxes. In addition, we find taxes on city income occupation licenses, stock transfers, mortgages, real estate conveyances, and even taxes for recording deeds of conveyance. People pay indirect taxes by way of auto tags, boat registrations, sewer and water charges, hunting fees, wedding fees; and there are often Federal, State, or local taxes for using public facilities such as parks and other recreational areas.

Only when we are fully aware of these numerous taxes required by the county and State can we truly see the enormity of the additional tax burden which the Federal Government is asking the American citizen to bear. To put it in perspective, the country is slowly being taxed to death. Higher taxes and inflation continue to negate salary increases and drastically reduce the purchasing power of those on fixed incomes, such as social security recipients. The greatest peril that the American people face today is the prospect of double taxation while trying to cope with the realities of inflation caused by excessive Government spending. It would seem to me that the American public is fully cognizant that the time has come when they should ask Congress and the administration whether such programs are really and truly necessary.

Many of my colleagues are as concerned as I am about the course our ship of state is taking today. For instance, we should be somewhat alarmed when we get statements from the executive branch such as we received when the President wanted an increase in the national debt limit last spring. At that time the public was told by the administration that unless the debt ceiling was raised, those on social security would not receive their benefits. Just recently we had another announcement from the administration in the form of a statement from Secretary Fowler that if Congress does not give the President a tax increase, the Congress of the United States would be required to assume the entire responsibility of the inflation which is sure to follow.

Make no mistake about it—there will be further inflation whether the President gets his tax increase or not. And the direct fault for such inflation lies directly on the shoulders of the President, who erroneously assumed that he could be all things to all people at all times, without destroying the economy and, indeed, the very foundation of this country.

I am convinced that far too much of our Government spending is simply nonessential at this time. Programs should be postponed until the Vietnam war is over and our finances are in better shape. Cuts can be made, and I believe that the American public should accept these cuts. This would apply to public works and other popular civil projects, as well as nonessential foreign aid expenditures which have become more of a habit than a sensible requirement of security.

In short, I do not believe that the administration has truly made a case for its tax increase proposal. In fact, I have joined with my colleagues in suggesting that the President submit new and accurate figures to Congress to indicate just how much the Federal Government is spending before we are asked to vote for a tax hike.

There may well be times when tax hikes are needed to forestall inflation. But even with a tax hike today, the President will have a deficit of $17 to $19 billion, and the country will have to borrow money to keep our Government operating.

I ask, Is this any way to run a business? And Government is our business. We are entitled to have the answers.

FEDERAL FUNDS AND ADVERTISING CAMPAIGNS

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have today written to the Federal Trade Commission asking that immediate action be taken on a complaint filed by the National Potato Council against the magazine advertising campaign being conducted by the Rice Council for Marketing Development, Houston, Tex.

As a Representative from the largest potato-producing State in the Nation, I have also written to the Department of Agriculture asking whether, directly or indirectly, Federal funds are paying for part of this campaign.

My letter to the FTC states:

> If the current advertising campaign of the Rice Council for Marketing Development is not, in actuality, illegal it is, at least, in excedingly poor taste in that it attempts to build one product by tearing down another.

In calling attention to a proposed ad which states in part, "The Idaho has got to go," I noted:

> It is my understanding that magazine publication of the ad has been stopped. But it is also my understanding that the Rice Council has been distributing a folder which plays on the same sentence. And, inasmuch as the word "Idaho" is copyrighted as pertaining to Idaho potatoes, would this not make the Rice Council subject to legal—and possibly punitive—action?

My letter to the Department of Agriculture observed that rice is among the most heavily subsidized of all agricultural commodities which certainly is not the case with potatoes. It said:

> I realize that the federal government, through the Department of Agriculture, would not directly subsidize an advertising program such as the one being conducted by the Rice Council. However, in view of the fact that the rice industry is so heavily subsidized can it not be assumed that some of the subsidy money is being forwarded to the Rice Council for this campaign—particularly in view of the fact that the money probably would not have been available had it not been for the subsidies?

VIEWS ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AGREEMENT—AFTER RIO MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the recent conclusion of the joint annual meeting of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in Rio de Janeiro climaxed developments of such great potential for the future of international economic relations that an evaluation of this progress seems to be in order. The United States was one of the originators and strongest supporters of the move toward international monetary reform; it thus would only be appropriate that we should, based on a clear understanding of the benefits which may result from the new plan, be among the very first nations to ratify the resolution on this issue, adopted by the delegates to the Rio conference. At this point it would be appropriate to note that this historic development represents a great tribute to the outstanding talents and unremitting efforts of our Treasury Secretary, Henry H. Fowler.

After nearly 4 years of arduous negotiations, the member nations of the International Monetary Fund have agreed upon a new system for the creation of international reserves, to facilitate the continuation and expansion of international economic intercourse. The search for such a system resulted from an increasing concern that the supply of international liquidity might not continue to be adequate to meet the needs of trade and finance: gold production was limited and independent of the requirements of the international financial community; U.S. dollars, the other major component of reserve assets, would become increasingly less available as the United States began effectively to cope with its balance-of-payments problem. And, while a supply of U.S. dollars would remain as international reserves so long as our deficit continued, the very existence of such a long-term imbalance in our international payments eroded world confidence in the stability of the hybrid gold exchange standard.

Thus, a new system of international reserve creation was sought, one which, in the words of Fund Director Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, would reflect "the principle that the international community should be able to control reserves, instead of reserves controlling the community." This principle is embodied in the new plan, adopted at the Rio meeting, which calls for the creation of special drawing rights to supplement the current gold-exchange system of international liquidity.

These special drawing rights, or SDR's, would be allocated to the member nations of the International Monetary Fund in proportion to their present Fund quotas. For example, out of each $1 billion of these SDR's created, the United States would receive an allocation of about $250 million SDR's.

When one nation was confronted with a deficit in its trade balance with another nation, these SDR's could be used to purchase the hard currencies needed to pay off the deficit. The SDR's would thus be accorded acceptability on a par with that of gold and the key currencies presently comprising our reserve assets; special drawing rights would supplement, rather than supplant, our current system of settling international transactions.

In response to fears that the new reserves might be used excessively and unwisely, there are various safeguards built into the SDR system. First, new drawing rights would be created only periodically and in limited amounts. The participating nations would, each time, be able to evaluate the need for reserve creation, and the wisdom of past use of the reserves. Furthermore, the plan stipulates that at the end of each base period, no nation may have used or acquired an amount of special drawing rights in excess of 70 percent of its initial allocation. Should a nation have exceeded this limit, it must use traditional reserve assets—gold or foreign exchange—to purchase or sell sufficient SDR's to return to the 70-percent limit. Moreover, when a base period ends and the time has come to vote on the creation of further SDR's, each nation's use of the drawing rights will influence the weighting of its vote, which will tend to restrain unwarranted use of these assets.

The initiation of a system of special drawing rights will in several ways be helpful to the United States in its international transactions. The addition to our supply of international liquidity will obviously provide us with an extra means of settling our international debts. Furthermore, the existence of a new type of reserve assets will help to alleviate the pressure on the U.S. dollar and the drain on our gold supply. As the SDR's come into expanded use and gain greater acceptability and respectability in the world economic community, the use of and demand for gold is likely to diminish proportionately.

In the realm of international relations, it would be rare indeed for a great innovation, regardless of its potential benefits to all parties concerned, to encounter no difficulties in obtaining unanimous acceptance; this new plan for monetary reform is, unfortunately, not one of those unique exceptions. Throughout the years of negotiation preceding adoption of the plans at the Rio meeting, one of the major stumbling blocks was the insistence of the European Common Market nations—particularly France—that settlement of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit was a prerequisite for acceptance of a new asset-creation system. The EEC had numerous political and economic objections to the continuation of the U.S. deficit; only by allocating the voting rights in the new drawing rights system so that the combined EEC countries could exercise veto power over reserve creation, was the agreement of the Common Market nations obtained on the initial outline plan. With this veto power, the EEC felt that it could exert pressure to obtain, among other goals, greater efforts by the United States to resolve its payments deficit.

At the recent annual meeting, the Common Market countries reiterated a further objective, the attainment of which they suggested they might also require before ratifying the reform plan. The veto power that they were granted applies only to the special drawing rights system; they have maintained, however, that they would also like to see changes in the voting rights and rules of the International Monetary Fund with respect to regular activities. Currently, the United States is the only member nation which has sufficient votes to exercise a veto over Fund procedures; the EEC wants to have the required voting majority raised so that their combined votes would be sufficient to exercise veto power.

At present it is difficult to predict to what extent the Common Market nations will insist on a change in the regular Fund rules as a precondition for ratification of the new system of special drawing rights. It goes without saying, however, that any such conflict which delays ratification of the monetary reform plan by all Fund members will be doing a disservice to the entire world economic community.

Mr. Speaker, the continued vitality and growth of international trade can bring in its wake greater economic prosperity and social and political benefits for all participating nations. The international monetary reform resolution adopted by the International Monetary Fund can make a great contribution toward insuring the attainment of these objectives. It is in the best interests of the United States that we strongly support this resolution and urge its ratification by all member nations of the Fund.

BALANCED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RUPPE] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, it is a high honor for me to reintroduce my balanced economic development bill on behalf of myself and 21 cosponsors. This legislation has been introduced in the other body by Senator KARL MUNDT and 20 cosponsors. The purpose of this legislation is to study the potential for a more orderly pattern of population growth on a national basis through which all sections of the country would benefit.

This legislation establishes a bipartisan Commission to undertake a thorough study and analysis of current geographic trends and economic development in the Nation. The pressing need for this Commission is obvious. The Census Bureau reports a population increase in metropolitan areas between 1960 and 1965 at a rate twice that outside metropolitan areas. About 63 percent of the people already reside in metropolitan areas. Moreover, 40 percent of the population reside in the 38 largest metropolitan areas of the country. The average rate of population increase in these 38 areas is about 2.06 percent per year—more than 20 percent in 10 years. Their median rate of increase is about 1.6 percent a year. This compares with the 0.7 percent average rate of increase outside metropolitan areas and the 1.9-percent average rate of increase for all the 224 metropolitan areas identified by the Census Bureau in 1965.

Thus, the already heavily populated areas continue to grow much more rapidly even in percentage terms than the more sparsely populated areas of the United States. The result of this economic imbalance in the cities has been substandard housing, polluted air, uncontrolled crime in the streets, congested highways, rundown schools, and growing discontent and upheaval among the already deprived minority groups. Economic imbalance in the countryside has resulted in declining economies, poverty-level incomes, limited job opportunities, and a forced exodus of the population into already congested areas.

The problems of the countryside and the urban areas are interrelated although they are often treated separately. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman was correct when he stated recently that urban problems need to be attacked in rural areas. In a recent editorial the Washington Post stated:

> The folly of making urban poor out of the rural poor is being more widely recognized. Instead of accepting the notion that rural emigration is inevitable—or even admirable—the idea is arising that megalopolis may not be the answer to all our social and economic and political problems.

The Federal Government, as well as State and local governments, organizations, institutions and foundations in the private sector are already attacking a variety of problems created by economic imbalance. However, we lack an overview. The problem needs to be approached in its totality. All sectors of society have a real mutuality of interest in understanding the interrelationships between economic development and demographic change. The flood of migrants is no better for the city than for the depopulated areas.

The public and private sectors of our economy could do much to encourage population shifts into more productive and progressive channels. Since we presently lack a national overview, the first step is the creation of a Commission on Balanced Economic Development. I feel a 20-member bipartisan Commission is particularly suitable and effective for this type of undertaking: a thorough analysis of geographic trends in the United States relating to economic development; the causative factors influencing trends; the implications in terms of distribution of population; the effect of governmental actions in shaping such trends; and the factors, both public and private, which influence the geographic location of industry and commerce.

A noted professor at the University of California at Berkeley expressed the need for this type of study when he appeared before the Government Operations Subcommittee exploring the Federal role in urban affairs. I feel that what he said is worth quoting:

> One of the weaknesses in current discussions of the problems of the city is the assumption that the crisis of the city is somehow unrelated to the crisis of our rural areas. It should be obvious that we cannot begin to deal effectively with the problems of the inter-city in education, housing, employment, health and welfare unless we also deal with the rotting and dying areas which are the sources of the apparently inevitable migration to the city. I do not see why this massive, unbalancing migration should be inevitable. I do not see why it is not possible for Federal and State governments, and the private sector, to do things which will encourage a change in the trend of our population movements.

This is in essence, the problem the United States must face and solve. The first step toward so doing is the passage of this bill to set up a commission to focus on this particular area, to make possible a unified effort of approach to a fast-encroaching national crisis. Piecemeal legislation has been tried and failed. This country needs a realistic approach to economic imbalance, and a detailed and particularized study before any positive action can be taken to correct the situation. The establishment of the Commission we advocate today is the logical first step forward.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place the text of the resolution in the RECORD at this point:

H.J. RES. 900

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds and declares that there is a need for more information and understanding concerning the means for achieving a better geographic balance in the economic development of the Nation. With a view to providing such information and understanding, it is the purpose of this joint resolution to establish a bipartisan commission to undertake a thorough study and analysis of current geographic trends in the economic development of the Nation, the causative factors influencing the same, the implications thereof in terms of the distribution of population, the effect of governmental actions in shaping such trends, and the factors (private and public) influencing the geographic location of industry and commerce as an aid in the formulation of policy at all levels of government.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Balanced Economic Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of twenty members to be appointed by the President as follows:

(1) Four members to be appointed from among residents of cities in the United States with a population of at least one million persons.

(2) Four members to be appointed from among residents of cities in the United States with a population of less than one million persons, but not less than one hundred thousand persons.

(3) Four members to be appointed from among residents of cities in the United States with a population of less than one hundred thousand persons, but not less than ten thousand persons.

(4) Four members to be appointed from among residents of towns, villages, and communities in the United States with a population of less than ten thousand persons.

(5) Four members to be appointed without regard to residence or political affiliation from among citizens of the United States who are specially qualified by training, experience, or knowledge in any field pertinent to the subject matter to be studied by the Commission.

(c) In the case of each class of four members described in clauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (b), not more than half shall be members of the same political party.

(d) For the purposes of clauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (b), the population of any city, town, village, or community in the United States shall be determined upon the basis of data contained in the current decennial census of population taken in the United States.

(e) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(f) Eleven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(g) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. The Commission shall undertake a thorough and objective study and investigation in furtherance of the purposes set forth in section 1. Such study and investigation shall include, without being limited to—

(1) an analysis and evaluation of the economic, social, and political factors which affect the geographic location of industry;

(2) an analysis and evaluation of the economic, social, and political factors which are necessary in order for industries to operate efficiently outside the large urban centers or to operate and expand within the large urban centers without the creation of new economic and social problems;

(3) a consideration of the ways and means whereby the Federal Government might effectively encourage a more balanced industrial and economic growth throughout the Nation;

(4) an analysis and evaluation of the limits imposed upon population density in order for municipalities, or other political subdivisions, to provide necessary public services in the most efficent and effective manner;

(5) an analysis and evaluation of the effect on governmental efficiency generally of differing patterns and intensities of population concentration;

(6) an analysis and evaluation of the extent to which a better geographic balance in the economic development of the Nation serves the public interest;

(7) an analysis and evaluation of the role which State and local governments can and should play in promoting geographic balance in the economic development of a State or region; and

(8) an analysis and evaluation of practicable ways in which Federal expenditures can and should be managed so as to encourage a greater geographic balance in the economic development of the Nation.

(b) The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress a report with respect to its findings and recommendations not later than two years after the effective date of this joint resolution.

POWERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission, subcommittee, or member deems advisable. Any member authorized by the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission, or any subcommittee or member thereof.

(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this joint resolution.

(c) The Commission may appoint such staff personnel as it deems necessary in accordance with the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall fix the compensation of such personnel in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(d) The Commission may procure such temporary and intermittent services as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $100 a day for individuals.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 5. (a) Any member of the Commission who is appointed from the executive or legislative branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in his regular employment, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission, other than those referred to in subsection (a), shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall cease to exist ninety days after the submission of its report.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation has a tremendous stake in achieving balanced economic development—agricultural and industrial growth and diversifications that spread their benefits across the countryside to cities, towns, hamlets, and farms. Unless balanced economic development can be achieved, the emerging picture for the Nation is indeed bleak. Poor and undereducated people are moving from the prairies, plains, and mountains more rapidly than the cities can assimilate them. There, for all too long an interval they cluster in worsening slums. The rioting and discontent that mark such communities reflect the bitter frustrations of people who have been shortchanged twice in a single lifetime—in their birthland and again in the urban meccas to which they flee in quest of a better life. In the ghettos of the central cities they find themselves relegated to substandard housing with inadequate police protection, insufficient or no parks and playgrounds, overcrowded schools and hospitals. All too often the ambition that brought them to the cities is stifled by a combination of low wages and welfarism. Most of the problems that torture our society in this era of vast productivity and technological process ooze from the Nation's failure to achieve balanced economic development. President Johnson's messages to Congress on civil rights, housing, air pollution, poverty, medical care and other subjects point up, at least by implication the need to start over and find ways to make the countryside prosperous so people may, with a reasonable measure of well-being, live there rather than swarm endlessly into cities that even now fall into chaos before their onrush. No thoroughgoing, overall study has been made of the interrelationships of the problems of rural America and the small towns, and the problems of the big cities. There have been many studies of isolated problems unrelated to others, but nothing in terms of a balanced economy. There is a pressing need now to find some answer to the problems of whether or not we have brought too many too soon into small areas. We have done it with too little thought as to whether people are going to be happy and content and fruitfully engaged when they go to those areas. Migration has bent in the direction of an assumed economic opportunity which must not exist any more from the standpoint of those people who in cold blood shoot down each other and wreck stores—the destructive manifestations of frustration. Before we can successfully fight a war on poverty, we have to have a picture of the whole problem across the country. We must be sure that we are striking at the causes rather than the symptoms. That is why I would think this kind of Commission would come up with a sort of white paper on developing a better balanced economical and educational opportunity in this country, to correct the problems in the city and in rural America which exist. I believe a study of the shifting of population certainly can help in that direction.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I see this resolution as one of importance to the entire Nation—to the cities and suburban areas, as well as the small towns and rural areas. The purpose of the resolution is to examine the causes and effects of the trend toward mass urbanization and whether Federal policies are really helping to solve the resultant problems. From a lack of proper prospective, many federal programs are limited in scope and are compounding present difficulties. Shifts in population such as the emigration from rural areas to metropolitan areas, and the middle-class flight from the cities have created grave social and economic problems. The older areas of the city are deteriorating and becoming unhealthy and unsafe. The newly established surburban areas have water, sewer, street, school, transportation, and tax problems that are creating new stresses. The rural areas are losing population and people remaining in the rural areas and small towns are experiencing financial difficulties; in some cases approaching those of the depression of the thirties. All of these developments add up to a national economic problem which cannot be ignored. They are producing needs which will quickly exhaust our Federal Treasury. New York City alone has estimated that in the next 10 years it will need $50 billion in Federal funds in addition to what it is presently spending from its own and the State and Federal sources to handle its problems.

I see this resolution as an instrument for studying the whole picture—the problems of New York City as well as the problems of the rural Midwest—in an attempt to bring about a better geographic balance in the Nation's economic development. I feel that solutions to the problems of economic imbalance will result in solutions to many of the sociological problems the Nation is facing as well. The less populated areas of the Nation offer many advantages to industry; such as plentiful water supply, and relief from the threat of air pollution. The urban transit problem which thus far has defied solution would be relieved to whatever extent industry disperses by locating in the less populated areas of the East, Midwest, and West. I believe this resolution offers the means to study the advantages and disadvantages of this type of dispersal. It offers a means to come to grips with the rising strife in the cities as well as the economic decline in other parts of the Nation.

It would certainly be wise to put an end to the industrial overloading of certain areas of our country and seek balanced economic development in the only way possible—a complete understanding of the social, economic and political factors influencing the location of our country's industries. This is the goal of the resolution placed before us—understanding of the system and the way it works so that we might better work with the system and make it and our Nation much better. We want to grow; we want to prosper; but we want to maintain and preserve that which is already ours. We want to insure quality of growth. The Nation needs a well-planned, carefully analyzed program. And such a program cannot be undertaken without a full and complete understanding of the process of economic development, the factors influencing such development, and what effect actions of our Government have upon this development. This resolution seeks to achieve this understanding.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, certainly I am in favor of any step that will assist and expedite the development of our smalltown and rural areas.

I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, for the introduction of his bill to establish a Presidential Commission that would define the problem of the urban and rural imbalance.

However, it is my feeling that the primary need is for action rather than study and while I certainly endorse and support the gentleman's bill, it is my belief that the emphasis should be placed on economic development—on improvement of public facilities—on opening up of access to our small towns in areas like Appalachia—on providing of circuit riding Federal teams to assist local communities in applying for Federal assistance—and on enactment of H.R. 9060 which I introduced last April 25 and which will provide tax incentives to induce business and industry to locate in small towns and rural areas. The response to this bill has been most favorable throughout the country.

James Russell Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post, said in a letter:

> It is good to know that not everyone in public life has cheerfully submitted to the notion that nothing can be done to keep our crowded cities from getting even more crowded.

In this connection my staff has compiled a sampling of news stories and editorial opinion on this bill which are of interest to my colleagues and to the Nation generally and which follow:

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Oct. 1, 1967]

ANTICONGESTION CAMPAIGN LURES EYES OF THE NATION

A campaign by Representative Joe L. Evins (D-Tenn.) to ease urban congestion by improving life in rural areas is attracting national attention.

An article by Evins on what Congress is doing for rural America is featured in the current issue of Grange Magazine, a quarterly publication of the National Grange.

A lifelong resident of the Middle Tennessee town of Smithville (population about 2,400), Evins has first-hand knowledge of small towns and rural areas.

From his own business and banking interests in Smithville and neighboring towns, he also has acquired information about the needs of rural communities.

This background obviously has been helpful to him as chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, which currently is looking into the economic problems of rural America. Solving these problems, Evins contends, will in the long run help solve some pressing urban problems.

"With some 70 per cent of our people now crowded into one per cent of our land, and with urban congestion growing worse every day," Evins wrote in the Grange Magazine article, "a comprehensive attack on the problem of pellmell urban population growth must include action to stimulate growth in non-urban area.

"From all sides comes mounting evidence that a full-scale economic revival in Small Town and Rural America is what is most needed to improve the prospect for all America, including major urban areas.

"From official Washington and the communities themselves, a steady flow of recommendations for positive measures to achieve such a resurgence is coming in. Indications multiply that we are at or near the threshold of an historic turning in our country's progressive development."

Evins has introduced a bill to give special tax concessions on investments in plants and machinery in communities outside the metropolitan areas, to stimulate the development of small industries and businesses in the rural areas.

He also has urged more assistance to small business, increased efforts to support the farm economy, more and better higher educational facilities in small towns and rural areas and continued improvement of highways.

Incidentally, Evins, now in his 21st year as a member of the House, has often been mentioned in recent years as a possible candidate for the Democratic nomination for governor. And he has sometimes displayed interest in becoming such a candidate.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 28, 1967]

Anyone that comes up with what purports to be a "no-cost" solution to any of the big, knotty problems of socio-economic origin is surely entitled to a hearing in these grabby days when "gimmie" is the password.

So here's a no-cost "solution" for furnishing private enterprise with incentives to shore-up jobless sore-spots, compliments of the National Federation of Independent Business Inc.

Offer an additional 7 per cent tax credit on the cost of machinery and equipment for enterprises which open up in job-short areas. It's the proposal of Congressman Joe Evins of Tennessee, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, and naturally he attaches strings to "guide" it.

The added credits would be given only to enterprises that employ at least 20 persons. They would not be available to a company that simply moved, cutting back in one location to benefit another.

Special tax provisions would also be provided for cost of plant and real estate, and tax allowances for training workers. But no tax money need be appropriated for the program.

In all, it's not unlike special incentives that have been and are being offered by some job-short, or depressed, countries. Proponents think, too, that proper application would take some of the pressure off metropolitan centers being overloaded with migrations of unskilled.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Sept. 30, 1967]

Evins Backed on Tax Credits

Washington.—A nationwide poll shows 63% of those responding favor Rep Joe Evins' bill providing special tax credits to new enterprises locating in rural areas.

The National Federation of Independent Business said the poll of its 240,000 members showed 29% to be in opposition to the Evins measure. Eight percent were undecided.

Poll results for Tennessee were quite similar to national results. There were 68% in support of the bill, 24% in opposition, and 8% undecided.

The measure would provide an additional 7% tax credit on the cost of machinery and equipment for enterprises which open in areas declared to be short of jobs. Such enterprises must employ at least 20 people, half of whom must be from the area.

To prevent an established firm from taking advantage of this, the bill also provides that incentives shall not be available to any enterprise that diminishes its operations or reduces employment in an already established location.

Special tax provisions over a five-year period are also provided for the cost of plant and real estate, and also there are tax allowances for training workers.

The bill is designed to cut down on migration and thereby reduce to the cities population pressures.

Emphasis

(Radio broadcast by Louise Evans of station KGNC in Amarillo, Tex., Oct. 4, 1967)

While big city mayors, perhaps understandingly so, and big city-oriented sociologists clamor for billions in Federal funds to solve every problem from rat extermination to jobs for idle teenagers, Congressman Joe Evins, Tennessee, Chairman of the House Small Business Committee, proposes a no-cost solution based on furnishing incentives to private enterprise.

It is this approach that the independent business men support. In a nationwide poll just concluded by the National Federation of Independent Business, the vote in favor of the Evins proposal is a majority of 63 per cent, with 29 per cent opposed, and 8 per cent undecided.

The heavily endorsed Evins bill, which has since been duplicated by similar bills introduced by other members of the House Small Business Committee, would encourage the economic development of rural and submetropolitan America by offering special tax incentives to new business enterprise.

After long study of the problem, the House Small Business Committee concluded that *not only* the present problem, but also a continually growing problem of the big cities is the migrations into these congested centers from the outlying areas by people who are unable to find employment in their home areas. The result is that the cities are overloaded with unskilled and semi-skilled unemployed, futilely seeking work in metropolitan areas that are becoming more and more technologically sophisticated.

The bill would give an additional 7 per cent tax credit on the cost of machinery and equipment for enterprises which open up in areas declared to be short of jobs, provided that such enterprises employ at least 20 persons, of whom at least half shall be from the area of location.

To prevent an established firm from taking advantage of this incentive, the bill also provides that the incentives shall not be available to any enterprise that diminishes its operations, or reduces employment in an already established location. In other words, the gain in new jobs must be a net gain.

Special tax provisions over a five-year period are also provided for the cost of plant and real estate and also tax allowances for training workers.

No appropriation of tax money is called for in the bill. Capital investment needed to provide jobs and reverse the migration to the big cities would be provided by private enterprise assured of partial tax forgiveness during the critical early years of getting an enterprise off to a sound start.

Although there has long been recognition that the national industry and commerce is too heavily concentrated in the big metropolitan areas, this is the first time that a no-cost solution to the problem of decentralizing the economic structure has been advanced.

Federation researchers are also inclined to believe that with a proper understanding, the measure will pick up support from farmers growing increasingly bitter over their returns in ratio to the prices consumers pay for their products.

They point out that as the costs of transportation and transportation labor increases, the costs of food distribution steadily climb, raising not only prices to the consumer, but also cutting down the farmers' share of the food dollar. More equitable distribution of job opportunities bringing people closer to the sources of food supply will shorten the distances from farm to consumer, and thus make reductions possible in the overall costs of food distribution.

[From the Columbia (Tenn.) Herald, Oct. 2, 1967]

Representative Evins' Tax Credits Bill Gains Businessmen's Support

Washington.—While big city mayors, perhaps understandingly so, and big city-oriented sociologists clamor for billions in Federal funds to solve every problem from rat extermination to jobs for idle teenagers, Congressman Joe Evins, Tennessee, Chairman of the House Small Business Committee proposes a no-cost solution based on furnishing private enterprise incentives.

It is this latter approach that the nation's independent business proprietors support. In a nationwide poll just concluded by the National Federation of Independent Business, the vote in favor of the Evins' proposal is a majority of 63 per cent, with 29 per cent opposed, and 8 per cent undecided.

In Tennessee the vote is 68 per cent in favor, 24 per cent opposed, with eight per cent undecided.

The heavily endorsed Evins bill, which has since been duplicated by similar bills introduced by other members of the House Small Business Committee would encourage the economic development of rural and submetropolitan America by offering special tax incentives to new business enterprise.

After long study of the problem, the House Small Business Committee concluded that not only the present problem, but also a continually growing problem of the big cities is the migrations into these congested centers from the outlying areas by people who are unable to find employment in their home areas. The result being that the cities are overloaded with unskilled and semi-skilled unemployed futilely seeking work in metropolitan areas that are becoming more and more technologically sophisticated.

The bill would give an additional 7 per cent tax credit on the cost of machinery and equipment for enterprises which open up in areas declared to be short of jobs, provided that such enterprises employ at least 20 persons, of whom at least half shall be from the area of location.

To prevent an established firm from taking advantage of this incentive, the bill also provides that the incentives shall not be available to any enterprise that diminishes its operations, or reduces employment in an already established location. In other words, the gain in new jobs must be a net gain.

Special tax provisions over a five-year period are also provided for the cost of plant and real estate and also tax allowances for training workers.

No appropriation of tax money is called for in the bill. Capital investment needed to provide jobs and reverse the migration to the big cities would be provided by private enterprise assured of partial tax forgiveness during the critical early years of getting an enterprise off to a sound start.

Although there has long been recognition that the national industry and commerce is too heavily concentrated in the big metropolitan areas, this is the first time that a no-cost solution to the problem of decentralizing the economic structure has been advanced.

Federation researchers are also inclined to believe that with a proper understanding the measure will pick up support from farmers growing increasingly bitter over their returns in ratio to the prices consumers pay for their products.

They point out that as the costs of transportation and transportation labor increases, the costs of food distribution steadily climb, raising not only prices to the consumer, but also cutting down the farmers' share of the food dollar.

[From the Lebanon (Tenn.) Democrat, Sept. 22, 1966]

Evins Says: Small-Town Development Holds Key to City Problem Solution

Small towns of America hold the key to a successful assault on the problems of the cities, Tennessee's Fourth District Congressman, Joe L. Evins, told the Congress last week.

In a floor speech with his remarks revised and extended into the Congressional Record, Evins said that the community concept is the backbone of this country.

He pointed to correspondence with President Lyndon B. Johnson in which he suggested a shift in emphasis from continuing to encourage urban growth to a new effort to develop small town potential.

The congressman referred to the president's statement at Dallastown, Pa., on Sept. 3, 1966, in which he said, "Modern industry and modern technology and modern transportation can bring jobs to the countryside rather than people to the cities."

Previously, Evins has charged that "too many federal programs ignore the small towns but have their emphasis on urban areas."

He has given warning to several government witnesses before congressional committees that he intends to wage a more determined campaign to see that small towns are not forgotten in various government programs.

Evins told the Congress that "It has been my contention for years that the community concept found in smalltown America is the backbone of our democratic society."

It is the weakening of that concept that has led to such tremendous problems in our cities, he pointed out.

"It has also been my contention that the direct assault on the problems of our cities will founder unless there is a second front assault made to divert population growth from our cities. This can only be done by a national campaign to sell smalltown America—a massive effort to create opportunities in smalltown rural America away from the great metropolitan complexes," he declared.

The text of Evins' proposal to the president follows:

1. Large metropolitan complexes are becoming unmanageable, unwieldly and ungovernable. They have far exceeded the cities' ability to provide adequate services. They are not single entities; they are conglomerations of unrelated communities that have grown like topsy. They breed slums, poverty, violence, suicide, discord, unhappiness. Cities have simply outgrown their original concept and their governments. They have exceeded in population and size the quantitative areas that can be governed effectively.

2. The community concept with all of its corollaries is basic to our American system. It is an effective unit. It embraces the psychological dimension that is missing in cities—the dimension of belonging, of being a part of a community, of being neighborly, of identifying with local government, of feeling significant.

3. This concept has been eroded as populations have migrated to our urban areas. Urban populations have been called "the lonely crowd." There is no identification, no feeling of belonging. There is distrust, lack of concern and compassion, lack of identification. Basic human values erode.

As you said in a speech on February 22 last, Mr. President, "The old, tried values of family and neighborhood and community are inperiled or eroded."

4. There are efforts to build whole new communities to retain the community concept and respect inherent in our forefathers' philosophy. But these are isolated efforts. What is needed is a concentrated effort to strengthen the small town base of America, to bring industry and business to small towns, to create towns that embody the best of the new technology and the best of the old philosophy.

5. I believe that people move to cities basically because that is where the greatest economic opportunities are found. You can see departures from this trend in small towns with progressive industry. The children think of staying, rather than leaving. And families who have lived in rural and small town areas prefer to move to a similar environment—but with greater opportunity to live the good life.

Your magnificent effort to build the Great Society is developing the nation in urban areas, rural areas and smaller communities. The new thrust that is needed—the new concept I suggest is a concentrated effort to develop the small town to its peak of perfection and to wage a national campaign to "sell" the small town to our new generation. This would ease urban problems by shifting growth to manageable divisions away from urban complexes.

The true values of our society are strongest in our small towns. We need to strengthen our society by inducing our younger people to live within the strong town structure and concept.

[From the Lebanon (Tenn.) Democrat, Aug. 24, 1967]

EVINS SEEKS REVERSAL TO MIGRATION TREND

(By Lawrence Fernsworth)

While Congressional committees are engaged in ferreting out the complex causes of riots in the cities, Tennessee's Rep. Joe Evins of the 4th district has been working at what he considers an important underlying factor of the problem, namely, reversing the trend of migrations from country towns and the farms to the big cities.

He believes that such efforts, through the improvement of opportunity in smalltown and rural America, and aid to small business has resulted in a slowdown in the rush to the cities.

Two years ago Evins wrote to President Johnson to say:

"Large metropolitan complexes are becoming unmanageable, unwieldy and ungovernable . . . They breed slums, poverty, violence . . . Cities have simply outgrown their original concept and their governments."

These forebodings of two years ago have in fact had what seems like prophetic response in the recent violence that has swept over the country.

But the tensions continued to be eased by a new situation which involves a slowdown of population growth in the big cities as smalltown America forges ahead.

Evins taking note of an article in Business Week reporting this new trend wrote to Director A. Ross Eckler of the Census Bureau for comment.

Mr. Eckler replied that while the populations of metropolitan areas continue to grow faster than in the nonmetropolitan areas, the growth is "at a somewhat reduced pace in the 1960's as compared with the 1950's" and that this "appears to be true for both the non-white and the white populations."

Census figures showed that in the 1950–1960 period about 8.6 million migrants were added to the metropolitan populations while other parts of the country lost about 6 million persons through out-migration.

By contrast there was a reverse trend in the 1960–65 period when metropolitan areas added about 2.5 million and non-metropolitan areas lost somewhat more than half a million through out-migration.

Evins, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business has been zealous in helping to improve the opportunities of smalltown America through making it possible for small enterprises to obtain advantageous loans, either directly through the Small Business administration, or by joint federal and local bank participation.

[From the LaFollette (Tenn.) Press, Oct. 13, 1966]

RURAL EMPHASIS

(By Bert Mills)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Small town America has few champions in high posts in Washington but one conspicuous exception is Rep. Joe L. Evins (D., Tenn.), Chairman of the House Small Business Committee and a ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee.

Rep. Evins is a 56-year-old lawyer and businessman from Smithville, Tenn., a town of about 2,000 people. The district that Evins has represented for two decades includes about 100 small towns and no big cities. Championing small town America comes naturally for Joe Evins.

For years, the Tennessee legislator has been trying to divert some of the increasing flow of Federal dollars to small communities, with some success. However, most votes are in the cities and most Great Society programs are urban oriented.

The Johnson Administration has even created a Department of Housing and Urban Development to try and meet the crushing problems facing cities. While some of its programs do benefit small communities, HUD focuses its major attention on metropolitan centers.

Rep. Evins has gone along with all the urban programs but at the same time has called for "a national program of economic development in small town and rural America." He has contended that the direct assault of the problems of cities "will founder unless there is a second front assault made to divert population growth from our cities."

More than a year ago, Rep. Evins wrote President Johnson to propose "concentrated effort to strengthen the small town base of America, to bring industry and business to small towns, to create towns that embody the best of the new technology and the best of the old philosophy."

L. B. J. WANTS RURAL FACTORIES

President Johnson has gone part way down the road charted by Rep. Evins but has stopped short of proposing the major program the Tennessean has advocated. In a September speech at Dallastown, Pa., LBJ enunciated his views on small towns.

He said that a poll had shown that half the U.S. population would prefer to live in a small town or on a farm, if they had a choice. The President, a small town boy himself, indicated that would also be his own preference.

Yet more and more Americans forsake the town for the city each year. The President said that if current trends continue, by 1985 as many people will be crowded into our cities as occupy the entire nation now. Enough people to make five more New Yorks or 25 Washingtons will be added to the ranks of city-dwellers a generation hence.

Many of these people, Johnson said, will move to the city against their will, because of better job and educational opportunities. He suggested this need not happen because "modern industry and modern technology and modern transportation can bring jobs to the countryside rather than people to the cities."

"I want to see more factories located in rural regions," Johnson explained. "I want more workers able to supplement their incomes by part-time farming and more farmers working part-time in industry. I want those who love the land to reap all the benefits of modern living."

The President went on to describe all his Administration has done for non-metropolitan areas—the public housing grants, the urban planning grants, the libraries and water systems made possible by U.S. aid.

GET ON WITH IT, EVINS SAYS

Rep. Evins applauded the Dallastown speech, and placed pertinent excerpts in the Congressional Record. He said: "I congratulate the President—and I say: 'Let us get on with it. Much has been done, but the real challenge lies ahead.' "

Evins reminded his colleagues that he has been contending for years that "the community concept found in small town America is the backbone of our democratic society." He argued that it is the weakening of this concept that has caused such tremendous problems in the cities.

The Congressman's proposal, not yet adopted at the White House, is for "a national campaign to sell small town America—and a massive effort to create opportunity away from the great metropolitan complexes."

[From the Columbia (Tenn.) Herald August 1967]

REPRESENTATIVE JOE EVINS PICKS UP REPUBLICAN SUPPORT FOR RURAL JOBS PLAN

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Joe L. Evins, D-Tenn., has gained unexpected top Republican support for his idea of providing more jobs and government services for rural and small town America.

It is far more than an idea for bringing more industry to the South. It is attracting attention as one possible answer to the overcrowding of fiscally strained cities in the North.

The Republican coordinating committee last week unveiled its five-point program for rebuilding "rural America" and for halting or possibly reversing, a nationwide migration to cities.

Evins promptly welcomed the Republicans aboard his bandwagon, which he started last April by introducing two bills offering tax incentives as inducement to industries to decentralize.

A native of Smithville, Tenn. (pop. 2,500), Evins has turned attention of his House Small Business subcommittee to small town problems. But he also has a hand in committee work on federal urban aid, which for fiscal 1964–68 is totaling $8.8 billion.

Recently Evins, after a look at urban riots this summer, said they "underlined the advantages of life in small town America." He said one result may be that some migrants will think seriously of returning.

In any event, he said, "the violence in big cities has dramatized the tremendous problems created by the concentrations of population in our metropolitan areas."

It has been estimated that urban problems could soak up $1 trillion in federal funds and still remain unsolved. Reserve migration as an alternate or partial solution has attracted increased attention.

President Johnson for months has recurringly looked toward the nation's open spaces on which only 30 per cent of the people occupy 99 per cent of the land.

"Modern industry and modern technology and modern transportation can bring jobs to the countryside rather than people to the cities," he said in an address a year ago.

Last week an assistant secretary of agriculture, John A. Baker, told the National Farmers Union meeting in Hot Springs, Ark., that government is less costly if people are scattered.

Baker in turn quoted the mayor of Kansas City as saying, "That is perfectly clear when you put it on a per capita basis, which is about $120 a year in Kansas City. In a city twice this size, the per capita cost would rise to more than $200 a person."

In one generation mechanization of farming, by destroying rural jobs, drove four million Southerners from the land. Baker said most of them went to just six states—California, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

He now sees a "flickering beginning" of awareness of the connection between the urban problems of racial tension, pollution and soaring tax costs and the rural problems of depopulation.

The Republican program calls on the government to give preferential services in rural areas that are low in job opportunities. This would include health, education, training and welfare programs.

The Republicans also called for economic inducements to bring in industries, construction of more rural vocational-technical schools and provision for city-style unemployment service in rural areas.

The Evins bills focus on inducing industry to shift plants from the burgeoning urban complexes to small towns and rural areas by providing tax incentives.

These bills are now before the House Ways and Means Committee. Evins is urging the committee start hearings as soon as possible.

[From the Nashville Tennessean,
Aug. 24, 1967]

Evins Greets Rural Aid Plan GOP Support

Washington.—U.S. Rep. Joe L. Evins, D-Tenn., said yesterday he welcomed GOP support of his plan to induce industry to locate in rural areas through a tax incentive system.

His remarks were prompted by the Republican Coordinating Committee's release of a similar plan to draw industry to small towns and rural areas.

"We are pleased that others are joining in this most important proposal to bring more industry and jobs to our small towns," said Evins, who introduced his bill last April.

The Tennessee lawmaker said his proposal grew from hearings before the House Small Business Committee—of which Evins is chairman—held earlier this year on problems and progress of small towns and rural areas.

The Evins bill, now before the Ways and Means Committee, provides an added 7% tax credit (in addition to the 7% investment tax credit which already exists) for machinery and equipment investment and accelerated tax amortization of investment in industrial facilities to firms locating new or branch plants in rural areas.

Evins had said his bill was designed to offer job opportunities in rural areas to avoid further migration to already congested and problem-filled major cities.

He said the purpose of the bill was to bring the benefits of an expanding economy to rural and small town America.

[From the Lebanon (Tenn.) Democrat,
Apr. 29, 1967]

Evins Acts To Improve Small-Town Life

(By Lawrence Fernsworth)

Washington.—Rep. Joe Evins of Tennessee's 4th district, who has become the recognized Congressional champion of the small towns of rural America has proposed a 7 per cent tax credit incentive to induce small industrial concerns and branch plants of larger concerns to locate in smaller communities.

His proposal, in the form of a bill called the Tax Incentive Development act is intended, as Evins told the House, to encourage young people "to channel their talent and their creativity into their own community rather than in major cities to compete with the residents of those cities for jobs."

The plan has grown out of evidence produced before the House Small Business committee of which Evins is chairman, and has the support of most if not all members of that committee as well as of other colleagues who have introduced companion bills.

It has particular application to a number of Tennessee counties that have seen their populations in various stages of depletion as their young people leave to hunt jobs in already overpopulated big cities.

Some of this evidence revealed that there are more Tennessee-registered voters in large cities outside the state than in their home counties. These people come back to vote and look forward to the day when they can go back to live in their home communities with assurance of jobs.

As the situation is now in many parts of the country the exodus of young people from rural communities to the larger cities is rapidly producing two nations, Evins told the House, "one a rural wasteland and the other urban slums."

The 7 per cent tax incentive proposed by Evins, would be in addition to the 7 per cent investment tax credit now in process of being restored—or a total of 14 per cent.

In Addition to the special credit the bill proposes an accelerated tax amortization of investment in industrial and commercial facilities, including land, over a sixty-month period.

There is a clause in the bill which prohibits the pirating of industry from another section.

[From the Nashville Tennessean]

Tax Bill Favors Rural Location of Business

(By Edmund Willingham)

Washington.—U.S. Rep. Joe Evins introduced yesterday a bill to provide tax breaks to businesses locating in small towns and rural areas.

The bill, an out-growth of House Small Business Committee hearings on the problems of small towns, would offer:

An additional 7% tax credit for machinery and equipment investment in smaller communities. This would be in addition to the 7% investment tax credit, now suspended, but expected to be restored by a bill that has passed the House and is now before the Senate.

Accelerated tax amortization of investment in industrial and commercial facilities, including land, over a 60-month period, to industry locating new or branch plants in small towns.

Evins, a small town champion, said the additional tax credit would not be allowed a concern unless 20 new jobs were created and the enterprise located in an area of high unemployment or underemployment, based on low family income.

The tax break also would be available for Indian reservations and areas affected by the closing of defense installations.

Evins emphasized that the aim of his bill is to bring the benefits of an "expanding" economy to small communities, and that it contains a clause prohibiting the pirating of industry.

"It is my hope that this bill will provide jobs and employment opportunities for our young people and others who want to live at home," he said. "A recent poll shows that 50% of our people want to live in rural America."

Evins quoted with approval a Washington Post editorial which said the nation "cannot accept as inevitable the further concentration of rural refugees in its large cities . . . the neglect of this problem is rapidly producing two nations—one a rural wasteland and the other an urban slum."

The 5th District congressman is chairman of the small business committee and during recent hearings held by a subcommittee Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman suggested the tax break for rural America. Evins responded to the idea immediately.

The thrust of the hearings was that urban areas cannot solve their problems until small town problems, including out-migration, are tackled. Evins' bill would try to provide more attractive opportunities in rural areas.

[From the Bristol (Tenn.) Herald Courier,
May 3, 1967]

Evins' Bill Could Alter Countryside

(By Elmer Roessner)

There is a modest little bill in Congress which probably will not be passed but which, if it is, will remake the face of America.

It is the tax-incentive development bill introduced by Rep. Joe L. Evins, D., Tenn., and sponsored by several other representatives.

The bill proposes tax advantages to businesses that are located in smaller communities. These are:

An added 7 percent tax credit, in addition to the suspended investment tax credit, for machinery and equipment investment in small cities.

Accelerated amortization of investment in industrial and commercial facilities, including land, over a 60-month period, to industries locating new or branch plants in small towns and rural areas.

TO THE HILLS!

Many corporations are already moving out of big cities to escape rising taxes, holdups, muggings, Mafia, air and water pollution, graft and other inconveniences.

Many states, counties and communities are offering tax advantages to businesses that settle in industrial parks. The most common is the construction of plants by the civic body by the sale of tax-exempt bonds, and the leasing of those facilities at rents that pay off the bonds. This sort of arrangement, in effect, gives the new business the advantage of tax-free rates on money needed for capital investment.

There is another great advantage in moving to small-town and rural communities: There are often abundant supplies of labor which is not organized and, because they do not have to pay big-city taxes and living costs, are happy to work for moderate wages.

MOUNTING ADVANTAGES

These advantages, plus the tax credits proposed by Joe Evins, would make moving to small-town or rural areas almost compulsory to a great number of businesses.

The 7 percent tax credit is no small item.

When Congress suspended the tax credit for machinery and equipment investment, the big corporations quite naturally postponed investments. This had the effects of a tax strike, and the administration and Congress were quick to call for an end to the suspension.

With two 7 per cent tax benefits available, scarcely a company in America could afford not to study the possibilities of moving to a rustic settlement.

If the Evins bill should be passed, the end of the cities would be hastened and smokestacks and plants would rise on what is now quiet countrysides.

[From the Sparta (Tenn.) Expositor, Aug. 31, 1967]

GUEST EDITORIAL: RECENT RIOTS UNDERLINE SMALL-TOWN IMPORTANCE

(By JOE L. EVINS, Fourth District Congressman)

The recent riots and violence in some of our major cities again have underlined the advantages of life in Small Town America—and the importance of programs of growth and progress that encourage our talented young men and women to invest their futures in their home communities. The violence in big cities has dramatized the tremendous problems created by the concentrations of population in our metropolitan areas.

Seventy percent of our people are jammed into one percent of the land area. Many of mankind's present day problems are magnified and aggravated by these heavy population concentrations. One result of the violence may well be that many of our people who have moved to our major cities and metropolitan areas may begin thinking seriously about returning to our smaller communities where life is more pleasant.

Many industries are decentralizing their operations and locating their plants in small towns and rural areas—providing jobs and opportunities to challenge our young people. In our District, we are seeing this occur—Douglas Aircraft, for example, has located five plants in our area at Carthage, Gainesboro, Monterey, Smithville and Sparta. Lockheed has located a plant in Shelbyville. Other industries are doing likewise. This is a national trend and should be encouraged.

It has been my privilege to join with those who have banded together in associations throughout our District to plan and carry out programs of growth and progress—programs to provide opportunities for our young people. The importance of broadening our population base and cutting and reducing the out-migration to our big cities has been declared a national policy by President Johnson. The Select Committee on Small Business is currently conducting hearings into the problems and progress of small town and rural areas. Leading officials of government have emphasized in testimony the importance of creating opportunities in smaller communities throughout America.

In this connection I have recently introduced a bill to provide tax incentives for businessmen and industrialists who locate plants in small town and rural communities. I have also recently recommended that the Federal Government establish circuit riding teams of Federal officials to travel throughout our rural areas, assisting our people in making applications for available, needed and essential programs of growth and development.

In our small towns people work together to achieve important goals and objectives. They love their communities—they have many friends throughout the community—they want to see their communities grow and prosper. This is the basic concept of a democracy—working together for the common good—and many experts tell us this concept has been eroded and lost in "the lonely crowd" of many of our metropolitan centers.

[From the Columbia (Tenn.) Herald, Sept. 23, 1967]

A WORD FOR SMALL TOWNS

How can the population pressures of the big cities be reduced?

By encouraging developments in small towns and rural areas, says Tennessee's Rep. Joe L. Evins.

Evins, whose House Select Committee on Small Business, has been holding public hearings on the erosion of small-town America, has an article in the September issue of Grange, a national farm publication. In the article he says:

"A comprehensive attack on the problem of pellmell urban population growth must include action to stimulate growth, in non-urban areas.

"Current conditions and increasing disorders in major cities around the country show clearly that urban overcrowding is producing a national crisis. The economic costs and the social costs of this population imbalance are growing more and more prohibitive."

Evins proposes two steps to help small-town and rural America and at the same time contribute toward making the urban centers "manageable and governable."

1. An additional 7% investment tax credit—plus 60-month depreciation allowances for new or expanded investment in job-creating plants and machinery in the non-urban areas.

2. Teams of federal agency representatives, with special training in explaining their services to rural leaders, to ride about the country in the manner of old fashioned circuit riding preachers.

Evins believes rural areas miss out on numerous federal programs because they do not understand them or do not have the facilities to file for them. Hence his idea of the circuit-riding information agents.

The congressman may have something. One thing is certain: if the movements of population from small towns to large ones continues throughout the remainder of this century, the prospect is that chaos is in store.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution introduced by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. RUPPE]. I am pleased to cosponsor this resolution calling for the establishment of a Commission to study the potential for balanced economic growth and development throughout the United States.

We are all aware of the urgent problems facing our cities. I do not believe we will have success in attacking these problems until we formulate a coordinated plan covering all the issues involved and employ all of the public and private means adequate to do the job.

A very necessary step in this effort is the important information which would come from the type of study proposed by this resolution. We need to know and understand fully the totality of economic imbalance in this country. We need to know the potential for a more orderly pattern of population growth on a national basis. With the continuous flood of Americans to the heavily congested urban areas, already difficult problems are quickly becoming critical. Public and private efforts are being made in one degree or another to attack the problems created by the existing economic imbalance, but we have insufficient understanding and an inadequate overall view of the imbalance itself. What are all of the pertinent factors in the relationship between economic growth and demographic shifts?

The result of economic imbalance is cities filled with more and more substandard housing, polluted air, crime, congested highways and overtaxed public transportation systems, rundown schools, and growing discontent among deprived minorities. The result in the nonurban areas is no better: declining incomes, limited job opportunities, and continued population exodus.

Surely the public and private sectors of our economy could do much to encourage population shifts into more productive channels. Surely, too, Federal programs and expenditures could be managed in such a way as to encourage greater geographic balance in the economic development of the country. But in order to organize and direct such programs wisely and effectively we need the kind of study proposed by this resolution. I urge my colleagues in the House to support it.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill which I am proposing today.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE PROPOSAL TO SELL SUPERSONIC JETS TO LATIN AMERICAN NATIONS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret deeply the reported decision of the State Department to withdraw American opposition to the acquisition of supersonic fighter aircraft by Latin American countries.

Assistant Secretary of State Covey T. Oliver informed me of the State Department's inclination toward such a decision last week. I expressed my opposition to him at that time. I repeat it today.

The United States was right in trying to persuade Latin American governments not to spend scarce foreign exchange on any supersonic fighters. The United States was correct in working against the purchase of French-built Mirage V aircraft by Peru and Brazil.

The reasons for this position were and are sound. These planes are obviously unsuited for use against guerrillas. For this purpose, slower, more maneuverable planes and helicopters would be more useful.

At the same time, it is evident that Latin American governments are not attempting to establish a system of continental air defense against an outside aggressor.

These planes, designed for tactical use in conventional warfare, are available for one primary purpose: conflict among the Latin American States themselves. They cause an arms race entail-ing expenditures far beyond what any of the countries can afford.

As one of the poor areas of the world, with a food deficit and a rapidly growing population, Latin America needs to devote its utmost effort to the development of its agriculture and industry and to the social programs which will make possible a better life for its people. In this, the Latin Americans need and deserve our aid.

Such a policy can build democracies and fight Castroism far better than all the guns and planes in our arsenal.

If, despite all our efforts, certain Latin American countries propose to buy aircraft from France, the United States should continue its opposition to the purchase both privately in diplomatic communications between the governments and publicly for all the world to see.

The United States should take the amounts spent by Latin American countries for armaments into account when determining the level or existence of American aid programs. I do not say that arms purchases, any more than any other single action which undercuts the self-help efforts which we have a right to expect of those countries, should result in a termination of aid. But arms purchases should be weighed heavily in determining U.S. aid.

What the United States above all should not do is sell out a fundamentally correct and moral position in order to gain some business as an arms supplier. What the French were about to do was outrageous. What we are about to do is contemptible. It is shameful as well as impolitic for the United States now to follow the bloody path of Sir Basil Zaharoff by purveying increasingly sophisticated weapons systems to poor countries. The military has been ruining these countries for years. We should stop playing their game.

Let us instead continue to refuse the sale of supersonic aircraft to Latin America, and to oppose any such transaction between the Latin Americans and the French or any others.

WATER FOR PEACE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, at various times considerable concern has been expressed about the ability of American companies to compete in world markets—especially against Japanese concerns and companies in countries of the European Common Market. I was most pleased, therefore, to note a recent press item reporting the success of one of our great domestic concerns, Westinghouse Electric Co., in underbidding companies from both of these areas in connection with the construction of a large water desalting plant in Saudi Arabia.

I have been especially interested in the water desalting program which our Government is carrying forward through the Department of the Interior. This is a program of worldwide implications, not only for our foreign policy objectives of promoting the peaceful development of the new and recently developing nations of the world but also for the development of the capabilities of our American companies to participate fully in the enormous market for goods and services which this awakening of the peoples of these nations portends. By providing an effective program of Federal promotion of these water desalting facilities, we enable our farsighted American companies to develop the capability to build these facilities and build them at costs competitive in the world market.

It recently was my privilege to visit one of these facilities in Key West, Fla., which is just south of my congressional district. This facility was built by Westinghouse Electric program and has proved highly effective in helping to meet the needs of Key West for more water than can be pumped to the island from the Florida mainland. The production of this facility is now about 2,600,000 gallons of water daily.

I was especially pleased therefore to learn that the Westinghouse Electric bid of $14,981,000 for the construction of the desalting and power facility in Saudi Arabia was below that of the competing Dutch and Japanese firms, as well as another U.S. competitor. This plant in Jidda will desalt 5 million gallons of water a day and produce 50,000 kilowatts of power. The Office of Saline Water, utilizing the knowledge which our program of Federal support far water desalting, is technical adviser to the Saudi Arabian Government for the project. I am pleased that the Office will have an opportunity, won on the basis of competitive bidding, to work with an American concern in developing this project and in developing the capacity of our country to be pioneer developers and manufacturers of this type facility.

COMMERCIAL BANKS SHOULD NOT HAVE THE POWER TO UNDERWRITE REVENUE BONDS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the debate on whether commercial banks should have the right to deal in revenue bonds has been thrashed out numerous times in the Congress since the passage of the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933.

Today it appears the Senate Banking and Currency Committee is looking favorably upon the banks' quest. Just last week the Financial Institution Subcommittee, of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, reported out a bill, S. 1306, recommending that the commercial banks have such authority.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the inherent dangers of reverting back to the abuses of the 1920's. It appears to me that commercial banks are engaging in many activities that are foreign to their true purpose. I read recently in a leading newspaper that one New York bank, in addition to selling lottery tickets, took 59 reservations for seats to the Jets professional football games. In many instances banks are engaging in services that they never dared to claim the authority to do before.

Many banks are now in the computer business. They rent out time on such equipment for nonbanking purposes. In many instances this service provides them with privileged information about other businesses leasing computer time.

A number of banks have set up full-fledged travel bureaus.

It is estimated that 1,400 banks across the country are promoting credit cards.

It is ironic that an industry which promotes fiscal integrity should be involved in one of the greatest fiascos of all time. Take, for example, the situation involving a number of Chicago banks who have taken a multimillion-dollar dunking on their foray into credit cards—though they are not saying so.

According to a newsletter published by the Research Institute of America, they reported as follows, and I quote:

> The race to capture the credit card market became a fiasco, earlier this year, when the banks mailed out unsolicited cards. Many of these went to newborn infants, "dummy" account names. Thousands of cards were stolen, retrieved from rubbish cans.

Another example of the bank interest in getting back into the investment banking business is the attempt by the First National City Bank of New York, which is the only bank in the country to sell interests in its own mutual fund. However, a Federal court in Washington recently voided the fund in a suit brought by the Investment Company Institute, a national organization of mutual funds. I noted in the October 12 issue of the Wall Street Journal that the banking industry is eyeing the mutual fund "reform bill," currently before Congress, as a vehicle for reestablishing a national bank's authority to operate mutual fund type accounts. Banking strategists in Washington are considering an appeal of the adverse lower court ruling issued earlier this year. This is another instance of the commercial banks attempting to circumvent the intent of the Glass-Steagall Act.

In St. Paul, a group of data processing centers are suing in Federal court to invalidate a ruling by the U.S. Comptroller of Currency that authorizes federally chartered "national banks" to perform such services.

In spreading its tenacles, the commercial banks are now roaring headlong into the mortgage banking business. Furthermore, where they are prevented by law from opening branch banks, they are forming a chain banking system. This is a practice whereby they purchase controlling interest in a number of independent banks.

With respect to S. 1306, which would permit banks to underwrite revenue bonds, is it not reasonable to assume that commercial banks, at some future date, will circumvent further the Glass-Steagall Act, and seek permission to underwrite corporate bonds? Now, when they achieve this goal, it will be natural to obtain permission to go back into the underwriting of other securities, thus doing away with the clear intent of the Glass-Steagall Act.

The Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. Camp, in a speech he delivered at the recent American Bankers Association Convention in New York said:

> Banks should not be excluded from any financial market which they may safely and prudently serve.

There are 40 law suits now pending against the Comptroller of the Currency to require him to enforce this law as Congress wrote it.

The threat to our American banking system through this concentration of power cannot be overemphasized. In the area of the general obligation bond business, the concentration of power lies in the hands of 10 of the Nation's largest banks, which were involved in the debacle of the 1920's.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE STUDY IS NEEDED

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the House Antitrust Subcommittee has now completed a staff report on the subject of automobile insurance, the result of a study undertaken at the request of the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative CAHILL, and myself on June 30. At that time, mounting evidence convinced me of the need for such a preliminary study, and the report just issued confirms my view that a full-scale investigation of the situation is not only warranted but essential. As the subcommittee report states:

> By any objective standard, the performance of the automobile insurance business in the United States is unsatisfactory. The system is slow and expensive, and the companies involved do a poor job.

Yet automobile insurance is certainly not a luxury, but a commodity required on a nationwide basis from an industry involving billions of dollars. It is, in my judgment, our responsibility to look into the problem to determine what steps must be taken if American citizens are to be assured of adequate automobile insurance at fair and reasonable rates. I include news articles from the Washington Star of October 17 and the Wall Street Journal of October 18 in the RECORD at this point, together with an analysis of the problem from Forbes magazine of October 15, 1967:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 17, 1967]

HOUSE REPORT CHARGES FIRMS DO POOR JOB—ANTITRUST UNIT STAFF ASKS INVESTIGATION OF INDUSTRY BY FTC

(By Robert Walters)

The nation's automobile insurance companies generally "do a poor job" in serving the public, and should be investigated, according to a secret report prepared by the staff of the House Judiciary Committee's antitrust subcommittee.

The report, based on a three-month study, was distributed yesterday to committee members with a "confidential" classification.

The staff study calls for a full-scale investigation of the auto insurance industry by the Federal Trade Commission.

"The information set forth in this report shows that, by any objective standard, the performance of the insurance business in the United States is unsatisfactory," the report said.

"The system is slow, incomplete and expensive, and the companies and organizations furnishing this service to the public, in many respects, do a poor job," it added.

The preliminary investigation was commissioned last July 25 by Rep. Emanuel Celler, D-N.Y., chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who acted on a request from Reps. Peter J. Rodino, D-N.J., and William T. Cahill, R-N.J.

In a letter accompanying the subcommittee report, Celler emphasized that the study represented only the views of the staff but said there had been "mounting criticism of business practices in the auto insurance industry field."

PUBLIC GRAVELY DISTURBED

The veteran congressman said complaints received by his committee indicated "that a broad cross-section of the American driving public is gravely disturbed by allegedly unfair and arbitrary insurance company actions."

In recent months there have been mounting charges that auto insurance firms seek rate increases without sufficient cause, cancel policies arbitrarily, refuse to insure some drivers with little reason and "black out" large areas of some cities to preclude the sale of insurance to low-income families.

The House study, prepared under the direction of Kenneth Harkins of the subcommittee staff, is not expected to be released to the public until the committee has met and considered the recommendations for future action.

In the Senate, two additional staff studies are under way—one by the Commerce Committee and another by the Judiciary Committee's antitrust subcommittee.

As a result of the broad-scale congressional interest, both public hearings and efforts to revise existing statutes governing the multibillion-dollar insurance industry are expected within the next few years.

Because the House study is the first to be released, insurance industry lobbyists have sought in recent weeks to convince committee members that it should not be made public. Both the American Insurance Association and the National Association of Independent Insurers have contacted committee members to present their case.

THREE POSSIBLE APPROACHES

The House subcommittee report said there were three possible approaches to conducting the full-scale investigation necessary prior to the drafting of any new legislation:

1. Establishment of a special subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee or a select House committee to conduct a one-year study. The report said such a committee would require $313,000 and the services of six attorneys, four economists, one actuary and four clerical assistants.

2. Establishment of a temporary governmental study commission of between 10 and 25 members, composed of both members of Congress and public representatives. Such an approach would require two to three years, the report said.

3. Congressional authorization for the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a "comprehensive investigation" over a period of two years.

CITES TURNOVER IN CONGRESS

Citing the problems of turnover within Congress and the lack of staff expertise on the subject in the House and Senate, the staff report recommended that the FTC conduct the probe. That proposal is subject to committee approval.

In a letter to Celler, FTC Chairman Paul Rand Dixon said the requested investigation would require an appropriation of $5 million if the entire insurance industry were to be the subject of the probe, and $1.5 million if the investigation were to concentrate only on the auto insurance industry.

Dixon estimated the services of 12 attorneys, 16 economists and accountants and 18 other staff members would be required for the study.

The committee report dealt only with auto insurance, but said that "it may be difficult to legislate fundamental changes in the system of regulation for the auto part of the insurance business without, at the same time, bringing about unforeseen and undesired results with respect to other types of the insurance business."

Despite that problem, the staff study said a further probe was necessary. It concluded that:

"The system that the auto insurance companies have developed in the United States to deal with accidental losses and injuries does not work well. For years there have been complaints that auto insurance company performance is unsatisfactory.

"The criticism extends from specific company practices, such as arbitrary and unfair cancellation and nonrenewal actions, to rejection of the basic premise, insurance against negligently caused losses, on which the present system of auto insurance has been erected."

The study said two policy decisions were involved, both posing "delicate questions that involve states' right and federal preemptive jurisdiction."

RESTRICTED APPLICATION

The first was whether there should be established a new system which would be "applicable to individuals who suffer economic losses and personal injury as a result of auto accidents."

The second was whether auto insurance firms should continue to enjoy protection from the federal antitrust laws. They secured such an exemption under the McCaren-Ferguson Act approved by Congress in 1945.

That law precluded all application of the antitrust laws to the insurance industry through June 1948 and provided that in succeeding years the federal statutes would be applicable only if the industry was not covered by state law.

Most insurance firms enjoy continued protection, but the House study found that state laws either are not enforced or are implemented only on a routine basis.

The report cited the "inadequacy of state regulation" and said a new investigation was justified because during congressional debate on the 1945 law it was agreed that "there should be a re-evaluation of insurance company supervision and activities in order to determine whether additional legislation was appropriate in the public interest."

[From Forbes magazine, Oct. 15, 1967]

THE GROWING STORM OVER AUTO LIABILITY

"Among the multitude of critics of our mores in America," Guy E. Mann, senior vice president of Aetna Life & Casualty, sighed recently, "many find it fashionable to criticize auto insurers." The fashion is not without foundation. In a motorized society, liability insurance is a must, a necessity, almost a utility. Yet it is getting more costly all the time—to a degree that inflation alone cannot account for the whole rise.

In Chicago a decade ago, it cost a family with an 18-year-old son who used their car only for pleasure $107 to buy a package of liability insurance: bodily injury, property damage and medical. Today the cost is $244—up 128%. In Los Angeles the cost was $116. Today it's $201—up 73%. In Buffalo the cost was $141. Today it's $216—up 53%.

Those are what the casualty companies call "preferred" rates, available for the most part only to "clean risks," accident- and conviction-free drivers between the ages of 25 and 65. For higher risks—especially those under 25—the tariff will often run nearly double. In addition, there are many who find it difficult to buy standard coverage at any price, among them: Negroes and other minority groups, enlisted men in the armed services and a long list of almost 50 other occupational categories, ranging from professional athletes, barbers, barmaids and beauticians to stevedores and warehousemen.

THE LORD PROVIDES

Even clergymen and doctors have been having their problems. The agency guide of one big automobile insurance group, for instance, warns that "clergy-medicine . . . driving records are among the poorest. Both appear to drive when preoccupied with problems. The clergymen may drive with the attitude that 'The Lord Will Provide.' With doctors there is the possibility of use of the car in emergencies."

To a degree, the writers of the insurance, the fire-&-casualty insurance companies, are simply making an effort to pass on the higher cost of doing business. This has led to a tendency on the part of the carriers to pass the buck for the public's complaints. Unfortunately, it is not so simple. Auto drivers are also voters; they are not an underprivileged minority. Not surprisingly, therefore, politicians are beginning to sniff an issue. Congressman Gene Snyder (Rep., Ky.) recently told the House of Representatives about a woman "domiciled in my home state" who, though "married to a drunk . . . had liability insurance at standard rates.

"I suppose being a rather sober character herself and being of the right color and coming from the right neighborhood and working at the right job," the legislator continued, "she was able to get standard rates." However, Snyder continued, "she divorced the drunk. And when she did that, they raised the rates because she was a 'recent divorcee,' The premise was," the legislator added, "that she 'might' be going out with a boyfriend who 'might' be driving the car and they did not know the driving propensity of the boyfriend. I would suggest that they had better reason to know the driving propensity of the drunk to whom she was earlier married." This is only one of the insurance atrocity stories beginning to flood the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

VOTERS AND CONSUMERS

The 90th Congress, more than any other in recent years, seems to have made the startling discovery that consumers are also voters. It has become aware that auto insurance has become a social problem of awesome proportions, encompassing $9.2 billion in annual premiums, 78 million cars, 98 million licensed drivers and $12.3 billion in accident losses. "You should see the mail I'm getting," says Congressman William T. Cahill (Rep., N.J.). "Why should a serviceman with a spotless driving record just returned from Vietnam have trouble getting insurance? This is a gut issue."

Other legislators see it the same way (FORBES, *Dec. 1, 1966*); so much so, in fact, that almost everyone is trying to get into the act. First it was the Dodd bill. The measure was prompted by a rash of 80 insolvencies among companies that wrote high-risk insurance and left, at most recent report, 300,000 injured individuals in at least a score of states on the hook for $600 million in largely uncollectible claims. The bill, still in committee, would establish a federal kitty, financed by insurance company contributions, to guarantee payment on claims against carriers that go broke. The research that went into the bill, says one Congressional investigator, "convinced a lot of people here that all we were seeing was the top of the iceberg. That's when the federal camel began itching to get its nose under the regulatory tent that until now has been almost the exclusive preserve of the States."

JOCKEY HILL

Galvanized by Congressman Cahill and Congressman William J. Green (Dem., Pa.), the House Judiciary Committee has cranked out a soon-to-be-published report, in part designed to establish its primacy (as against the House Commerce Committee's) to investigate state regulation of the auto carriers. The report will probably raise some questions about rate-fixing and the exemption from the antitrust laws granted to the insurance industry by the McCarran-Ferguson Act of 1945. The same kind of jockeying is going on in the Senate, where both the Commerce and Antitrust Committees have also shown intense interest in the industry. The Transportation Department, at the instance of Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Commerce Committee, has agreed to do a "pilot study" of the auto carriers. The Department was a bit slow in picking up the Magnuson option, a source says, because White House staff people suggested that auto insurance was a potential Great Society issue that Lyndon Johnson might want to preempt for himself next year when he will be running for reelection.

The industry itself is running scared, and rightly so. "Protecting insurance interests in the government arena is a complex and frustrating problem," says Aetna's Mann. "All predictions are that it will get worse." Auto insurance executives are deeply split over the question of whether there are any advantages to the legislative ground swell that may develop into broader federal regulation. But the problem goes even deeper than questions of regulation. Many experts today argue that the traditional system of negligence liability is so inherently wasteful that it ought to be junked.

COMMON DILEMMA

All of the pressure suggests that the auto insurers are caught on the horns of the same dilemma that impaled the auto producers and drug manufacturers. The former got hung up on the burning issues of air pollution and highway safety; the latter on high drug costs, most recently marked by the drive to make generic-name drugs available in place of costly branded items. The dilemma: either to move with social pressures, perhaps at the cost of the profit-and-loss statement; or to defend the status quo, usually at the cost of a blackened image—and ultimate capitulation.

"I can sympathize with them," says a Transportation Department official. "In this mixed economy of ours we expect them to act like businessmen and at the same time to respond with heightened social consciousness to people who can be pauperized by an auto accident. It's not an easy row for an insurance executive to hoe."

The insurance industry can defend rising rates with ample statistics. They boil down to two elements: inflation and the rising accident toll. The number of vehicles on the road has increased by about 45% in the last ten years, and, as State Farm Mutual Insurance President Edward Rust notes, "Frequency of accidents increases with the square of traffic density." Since 1957 deaths by accident have increased 36.9% to 53,000; injuries by 74% to 4.4 million. "Our average claim cost," says Rust, "is just going up 5% to 7% a year. You have to stop and figure the things that have to be paid for when there's an accident. Medical costs, of course, have snowballed. Repair costs have snowballed." Since 1958, according to the National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters, the average paid bodily injury claim cost jumped from $981 to $1,296, the average paid property damage claim cost from $151 to $221. Part of the repair cost stems from the more complex designs that car-makers push and buyers seem to prefer.

HANKEY-PANKEY

There is also the problem of outright fraud. Says a vice president of a west-coast insurance company, "There's too much hankey-pankey going on with injured individuals, attorneys and doctors." Further, he says, there is plenty of room for much tougher driver licensing requirements. "There are too many drivers on the road who are incompetent. We'd never give these people hunting licenses. We just had a case of a woman involved in an accident whose right leg was paralyzed," the vice president continues. "In order to stop, she had to take her hands off the steering wheel, take her foot off the accelerator, and press both hands on the right leg to slow the car down. She never divulged this to the insurance company or to the Department of Motor Vehicles."

The industry insists that "drivers make rates," and to some extent this is true. "As far as costs are concerned," says California Insurance Commissioner Richard S. L. Roddis, "it's the frequency of accidents rather than the amount of unusual awards that's really the significant problem from the rate standpoint. These million-dollar payoffs are dramatic, and they're probably bad things," he continues, "but it isn't the handful of big cases that really have the tremendous effect; it's the aggregate of all the dented fenders and broken windshields and bashed-in front ends and minor injuries that are the bread-and-butter rate."

The figures also show that the industry is not exactly coining money. Last year premium volume on all kinds of auto insurance topped $9.2 billion (compared with $6.4 billion in 1962) and that by any standard is sizable growth. Last year, however, was the first year since 1962 that the industry reported an underwriting profit—a slim 1% on premiums. Over the past decade, the Insurance Information Institute maintains, "insurers have suffered underwriting losses of more than $1.5 billion on auto liability insurance alone."

The situation is not, of course, as bad as these carefully segregated figures suggest. The companies also have investment income and an agreeable degree of tax shelter (*see table*). In a number of state rate proceedings, including Maryland, Virginia, Ohio and Pennsylvania, the question has been raised as to whether the statutory bookkeeping formulas designed by the states square with generally accepted accounting procedures. For one thing, these accepted formulas usually charge acquisition costs when incurred, even though the policy runs over a period of time. They also permit the companies to set up reserves for loss claims that have not been reported but which the companies think will be.

Most important of all is the question of investment income. Premiums are paid in advance. Thus the companies have use of the money. They also have the use of reserves. Both of these they invest and earn a return. All in all, in recent years investment income for the sixteen top companies has been running at an annual rate of about $1.7 billion—not only covering insurance losses but yielding a sizable profit for stockholders of most companies. In short, auto insurance is not quite as rough a business as most of the companies make it out to be.

THE TRUE VILLAIN?

The fact remains, however, that over-all profits are clearly not excessive, running on an adjusted basis to not much more than 6% on stockholders' equity. Why, then, have rates soared so? Some critics—and they are increasingly heard today—feel that the real villain is the negligence-claim system itself, a system so intrinsically wasteful, they maintain, as to be an albatross around the neck of policyholders, accident victims, investors and the casualty companies alike. What is needed is basic reform. "There is a strong, growing argument that a claims system based on fault is out of date and inherently defective as a means of reimbursing accident victims," says James R. MacKay, vice president of the Fireman's Fund American Insurance Companies.

Much of the argument has polarized around the proposals of Robert E. Keeton, a Harvard University law professor, and Jeffrey O'Connell, a University of Illinois law professor. Their position is that the whole system of insurance payments ought to be shifted to a workmen's compensation-like approach where anyone who has been injured by an auto should be reimbursed for medical costs and wage losses whether he was responsible for the accident or not.

The Keeton-O'Connell proposals contain many elements, it is true, that the industry has long discussed. But put into a package, and advanced at a time of such outcry about rates and cancellations, the proposals are getting serious attention today. Insurance Company of North America, for instance, in an advertisement in the *New York Times* last week, strongly recommended adoption of something along the lines of Keeton-O'Connell.

The first legislative test of the plan recently came into Massachusetts. A bill based on these proposals passed the House but was voted down in the Senate. At least three other states—California, Michigan and New York—are looking into the merits of Keeton-O'Connell or variations on it, and others are likely to follow suit.

In their book *Basic Protection for the Traffic Victim: A Blueprint for Reforming Automobile Insurance,* the law professors clearly state their case. It is that, given the complexities of memory and the blur of high-speed automobiles, it is almost impossible to fix the blame on any one person in many accidents. Theoretically, if there is no blame, there is no insurance payoff. That concept, however, goes against the grain of the overriding social need to make whole anyone who has been injured without bankrupting anyone who is putatively at fault.

The problem under the traditional fault system is that a good deal of high-cost legal effort goes into the business of trying to fix blame on the one hand, and to defend against those same efforts on the other. This is good for a class of lawyers but rough on the rate-paying public.

It is in the nature of the present relationship that the claimant will try to squeeze as much cash out of the situation as he can, and that the insurance company will try to pay as little as it can. The first consequence in many cases, says the vice president of a west-coast insurance company, is an inflated medical bill.

"Many doctors and attorneys," the executive says, "have a working relationship. Strangely enough, you'll always find a given attorney's clients are treated by the same doctor. If you go to a certain doctor first, you'll always wind up in a certain attorney's office."

The Keeton-O'Connell plan would exorcise what the former has called "powerful temptations to dishonesty" by vaporizing the "third-party" relationship: An accident victim would look to his own insurance company for the routine payment of whatever his direct losses are—up to a maximum of $10,000. He would have the right to go to court only for losses in excess of that amount.

One aim of the plan is to cut litigation costs on both sides by keeping all but the biggest claims out of the courts. "Most disputed cases, by far the great majority," according to Keeton, "involve injuries that are not severe, and in these small cases it often happens that more is spent in fighting than the claim is worth if valid. Added to this, of course, is a fortune in tax dollars used to maintain the courts whose time is consumed by these cases." Legal costs are one of the reasons why, Keeton adds, "less than 50 cents of the auto liability insurance dollar ever reaches the hands of any injured person."

Keeton and O'Connell maintain that other savings (deductibles for medical payments made on Blue Cross policies, for example) would enable the casualty companies to make substantial cuts in rates. They have got corroboration on that score from consulting actuary Frank Harwayne, who estimates that their "Basic Protection Plan" could pave the way for premium reductions of 15% to 25% in New York State, for example, and rollbacks of 19% to 25% in Michigan.

Harwayne's projections have been challenged as overly optimistic, and executives such as James S. Kemper Jr., president of the Kemper Insurance group, have raised a good many other objections. Among them:

The question of equity if the fault concept is dropped. "Is it equitable to pay benefits to the drunken driver, the convicted felon fleeing from his crime, the drag racer and the multiple accident repeater," asks Kemper, "and deny full recovery to innocent victims such as housewives and children whose *economic* loss will be limited mainly or entirely to medical bills?"

Doubt that claims payments would be speeded up, because the plan encompasses many variables, such as "collateral source payments, claimant income levels, extent of rehabilitation and recovery."

Interstate legal complications and competitive pressures on small companies.

Undoubtedly, there is a considerable vested interest in the present system: High rates mean high commissions for agents; even more, they mean high fees for a handiful of highly successful negligence lawyers. Significantly, the defeat of the bill in the Massachusetts Senate, Keeton says, "came after the public opposition of the personal injury lawyers."

But the insurance industry is being extremely shortsighted if it thinks that it can ignore growing public dissatisfaction with the present situation. As James MacKay of Fireman's Fund recently warned a group of insurance agents, "If there is a collision between our private interest in rates high enough to cover losses, and the public interest in higher loss payment without higher costs, then we must not be so naive as to assume the public interest will not prevail."

FIRE AND CASUALTY COMPANIES: A STATISTICAL PROFILE

[Listed below are the 16 largest publicly held casualty companies. Over the last 5 years, these companies[1] earned over $1,500,000,000 in investment income; incurred a statutory loss of some $500,000,000, but paid only $60,000,000 in taxes]

Company	Growth, 1966 over 1961 (percent)			Profitability, 5-year totals in millions				Stock data			
	Premiums written	Investment income	Capital and surplus	Premiums earned	Investment income	Statutory underwriting profit	Income taxes	Recent price	1966-67 price range	Indicated dividend	Yield (percent)
Continental Insurance	79.0	40.3	−3.3	$2,879	$269	−$49	$9	82½	89⅜—65⅛	$3.00	3.6
Insurance Co. of North America	51.0	56.4	14.4	2,575	222	−44	8	60¼	90½—59⅞	2.40	4.0
Hartford Fire Insurance Co	45.4	64.4	17.0	3,198	190	−41	2	25⅛	40¼—24¾	.92	3.6
Allstate Insurance Co	76.2	74.6	28.8	3,404	165	104	63	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
The Fund American Cos	120.0	111.5	49.2	2,490	140	−69	6	30⅝	39⅝—28	1.50	4.9
Continental Casualty	52.3	88.6	17.6	2,780	146	−90	6	56	58⅞—35	1.50	2.7
U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty	46.6	68.8	54.1	1,836	112	−15	2	54	68¼—50⅛	1.60	3.0
The Home Insurance Co	80.4	48.3	−11.5	1,823	118	−94	(3)	31¾	38⅝—29	1.40	4.4
St. Paul Fire & Marine	49.2	60.4	29.9	1,052	74	6	4	66½	82¼—61¾	1.68	2.5
Great American Insurance	40.2	41.4	2.4	994	80	−52	1	61⅛	66⅛—46¼	2.80	4.6
Reliance Insurance	52.5	87.2	70.4	987	58	−19	4	31¾	43—30½	1.60	5.0
Federal Insurance Co	53.6	42.3	15.8	528	43	13	7	46½	68½—45	1.50	3.2
General Reinsurance	84.3	80.6	32.7	511	36	2	5	262	300—205	2.00	.8
Glens Falls Insurance	40.0	62.0	−8.9	630	31	−39	(4)	42	55—31	1.00	2.4
American Re-Insurance	87.4	66.6	58.3	521	28	−19	1	44½	64—45¼	1.70	3.8
United States Fire Ins	53.1	54.2	−7.8	457	31	−21	4	40¼	46—27	1.60	4.0

[1] Excluding Allstate Insurance Co.

[2] Wholly owned by Sears, Roebuck & Co.

[3] None.

[4] Less than $500,000 paid.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 18, 1967]

AUTO INSURERS HIT IN STUDY BY HOUSE PANEL, WHICH THEN JUST CALLS FOR INQUIRY BY FTC

WASHINGTON.—The auto insurance industry took another round of verbal pummeling on Capitol Hill. But the prospects for any legislative follow-up to the political harangue remain distant and unfocused.

The staff of the House Judiciary Committee, after a two-month study ordered by its chairman, Rep. Celler (D., N.Y.), concluded that "by any objective standard, performance of the automoblie insurance business in the U.S. is unsatisfactory."

Current arrangements for compensating accident victims, certain sales practices, and instances of discrimination among prospective buyers on racial and occupational grounds were all singled out for criticism. Existing state-level regulation of auto insurance company rates and financial soundness was also found to be "inadequate" in many states.

As with the growing number of Congressmen who have leveled similar charges on their own, however, the Judiciary panel staff was in something of a quandary as to what should be done. After weighing several possible ways to proceed, the staff reportedly ended up calling for a further investigation by the Federal Trade Commission.

A further "substantial body of factual information should be collected" before any legislation is initiated, the committee staff report advised. The FTC was deemed the best agency to do the collecting because of its existing "machinery" to conduct economic studies.

If the FTC ever gets the assignment, however, it will be only after lengthy Congressional wrangling. The staff recommendation merely adds to a welter of investigative proposals already being promoted, both by key members of the House Judiciary unit and elsewhere on Capitol Hill. Reps. Rodino (D., N.J.) and Cahill (R., N.J.), who joined in urging Mr. Celler to order the staff study, both favor keeping any follow-up probe in the hands of a Congressional committee. Chairman Magnuson (D., Wash.) of the Senate Commerce Committee, on the other hand, has already prodded the Transportation Department into making preliminary inquiries with a view toward a full-dress study starting next June.

President Johnson according to some lawmakers who've been eyeing auto insurers critically, may well bring order out of the growing confusion by recommending his own study plan. The Transportation Department and the FTC would probably both be harnessed if the White House decided to seize the issue. But even if such an interagency plan for proceeding is developed, the guessing on Capitol Hill is that legislative recommendations are several years away.

"The actuarial work and regulatory analyses needed to lay a firm foundation for any major overhaul of auto insurance regulation represents a mammoth undertaking," said an aide to chairman Magnuson of the Senate commerce unit. The FTC, when queried by House judiciary staff members, figured it would need at least two years to do the job.

The only legislation considered to stand much chance of moving in the interim is a bill setting up a Federal reinsurance corporation to provide auto insurance holders the same sort of protection against insurer insolvency that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. offers bank depositors. All auto insurers operating in more than one state would be required to put money into the reinsurance pool under a bill that Mr. Magnuson intends to push in the Senate commerce unit next year. Rep. Moss (D., Cal.), chairman of a House subcommittee on finance, also is sponsoring the measure.

Acquisition by the press of the House judiciary staff study yesterday enraged Chairman Celler and other senior panelists. They had intended to keep it secret until the full committee could reach agreement on how to proceed. Confidential copies were distributed to the 33 panel members on Monday to permit private consultation on its contents with insurance companies and insurance commissioners in their home states. And it's by no means certain that a committee majority, following such consultations would have opted for taking any further action.

"The leak was clearly designed to pressure us into hasty action, and I for one don't like it," charged one Republican panel member.

STUDY RAISES QUESTIONS

The staff study, intended primarily for the members' guidance, deliberately raises a lot more questions than it squarely answers. The two most fundamental queries are:

—Should the broad exemptions from Federal regulation and application of the antitrust laws that the insurance industry currently enjoys be continued?

—Should insurance awards to victims of auto accidents continue to be based, as now, on legal determinations of liability for a collision, or should victims be compensated by their insurer without regard to who is at fault in an accident?

While the report's authors don't answer either question directly, they clearly lean toward Federal assumption of some regulatory role in the insurance field, and toward at least blending in, if not converting to, compensation of victims without regard to who is at fault.

The report lists numerous alleged industry practices that "need further investigation." Among them are: Reported efforts to tie the sale of auto insurance to the sale of other lines of insurance, and allegations of profiteering by insurance company sales agents who bill purchasers for more than the actual premium.

In evaluating the work of state insurance commissions, the staff study says "a number of factors point to the inadequacy of state insurance regulation. Many state insurance commissioners are ill-trained, have inadequate staffs and are far too dependent on the insurance industry for the data on "which they make rate and financial responsibility determinations."

LIFE CALLS FOR BOMBING PAUSE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Life magazine contains a thoughtful editorial calling for the United States to take the initiative in a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. In so doing, Life makes a perceptive analysis of the military and political ramifications of such a pause, acknowledging that it may offer some temporary benefit to North Vietnam and that a cessation of the bombing may not produce the negotiations which could end the war.

However, Life also points out that as long as a possibility exists that a bombing pause could result in deescalation of the war and meaningful negotiations, it should be attempted. The editorial notes:

> The fact that Hanoi will not promise anything in advance, in return for a bombing pause that hasn't happened yet, does not necessarily foreshadow their actual reaction to a pause that has gone on, say, for several weeks.

The editors of Life are to be commended for a well-balanced discussion of the issues we face in Vietnam and for advocating a policy which has been so stubbornly and vociferously resisted by the administration. I sincerely hope President Johnson and his advisers give the Life editorial their serious consideration; and I present it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD.

THE CASE FOR BOMBING PAUSE, NO. 7

Six times in 32 months of bombing North Vietnam, the U.S. has held its fire. Three times it was for a brief holiday respite. The three other bombing pauses were ordered to allow Hanoi to signal a willingness to talk peace. No clear signal came. Then, three weeks ago, President Johnson announced the U.S.'s willingness "to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussion." Hanoi came back with its standard reply: the U.S. must stop bombing "unconditionally," and North Vietnam will promise nothing in return.

Notwithstanding, we believe it would be worthwhile for the U.S. to take the initiative in another bombing pause. We think the U.S. should declare a respite in the attack against the areas north of the battle zones, confining bombing to the Ho Chi Minh Trail complex in Laos and to the southern provinces of North Vietnam, the immediate rear of the enemy forces pressing against the DMZ. There should be no publicly announced "conditions" that carry the whiff of an ultimatum. But this should not be a commitment to stop the bombing indefinitely. In taking this diplomatic and political initiative, the U.S. administration would have clearly in mind the kind of North Vietnamese response we would consider constructive, and how long we were willing to wait for it.

In advocating a bombing pause, with no advance promise of any reciprocal move by North Vietnam, we must acknowledge that almost all U.S. military opinion opposes such a course. The U.S. would be reducing pressure on the enemy, and that is not ordinarily the way to win a war. This, of course, is not an ordinary war. U.S. bombing is in a sense a reprisal against the North for the destruction and terrorism the Vietcong work in South Vietnam. Bombing damage and strain is an important price the North is forced to pay for continuing its support of Communist aggression in the South. The more direct military benefit for the U.S. and our allies is, of course, the interference with the flow of men and materiel from the North. There is much argument as to exactly how effective the bombing is, but in stopping most of it, we would unquestionably be giving up a weapon of some value.

Life believes, however, that the benefits of a bombing pause at this time outweigh the short-term military cost:

There is a remote possibility that a pause now could be the first step toward an acceptable diplomatic settlement of the war.

There is a strong probability that a bombing pause would improve the posture of the U.S. in Vietnam, in the eyes of many other nations and indeed of many Americans, and thus ultimately improve our chances of achieving our purposes in Vietnam.

As to the possibility of a pause leading to meaningful negotiations, Secretary Rusk tirelessly points out, "I have yet to hear anyone tell us that if we did stop the bombing they could definitely deliver Hanoi to the conference table. I have asked a number of governments, 'All right, if we stop the bombing, what can you deliver?' I get no response."

Hanoi itself has denounced past bombing pauses as U.S. "hoaxes." There is a danger that they would take a new bombing pause as a sign that the U.S. is caving in. There is considerable precedent in Communist diplomacy for *raising* your terms when the other side offers any concession.

Yet there do come times in wars when belligerents change policies and positions, sometimes shortly after swearing they never would. The fact that Hanoi will not promise anything in advance, in return for a bombing pause that hasn't happened yet, does not necessarily foreshadow their actual reaction to a pause that had gone on, say, for several weeks. Such a pause could stir up hopes all over the world, including the East European branches of Communism, and could put considerable diplomatic pressure on Hanoi. Probably Hanoi would say No again, to everybody—Canada, India, Denmark, U Thant, etc. But it is worth finding out.

The more weighty reason for a bombing pause is to recapture support for the U.S. presence and commitment in Vietnam. The bombing has isolated the U.S. from most of its friends and allies throughout the world (there are a few stout exceptions in Asia), and in this country the bombing is the focus and catalyst of most of the opposition to the war. There is the "bully" image—the most powerful nation on earth pouring World War

II-scale bomb loads onto a primitive little country. The U.S. has never been bombed; countries that have been tend to identify with the targets rather than with the bomber crews.

The fear that the bombing might bring China into the war, even bring on nuclear war, naturally increases as the U.S. goes after North Vietnam targets which are only 60 seconds' jet-time from the China border. It may be foolish of so many Japanese, Indians, Indonesians, etc., to worry about this. But they do.

In the U.N., over 30 non-Communist nations, among them several of our NATO allies, have now advocated stopping the bombing (with many variations of formula as to "conditions" or no-conditions). Perhaps the most thoughtful proposal was the Canadian suggestion of a bombing halt followed by restoration of the DMZ's neutralized status under international inspection. In later phases of the plan would come freezing of military "capabilities" throughout Vietnam and an eventual cease-fire.

Naively or not, many millions of ordinary citizens, and not a few ambassadors, foreign ministers and U.S. senators, think a bombing halt *could* lead to peace in Vietnam, and they are increasingly critical of the U.S. for not trying it again. If we did try it for a reasonable time, accompanied it with an energetic diplomatic probing, and then nothing came of it, the air would have been cleared. Support for a resumption of bombing, even for an escalation, would be stronger than for our present policy. But much would depend on what the Administration said about the new policy, and how it said it, not just to Hanoi but to the U.S. and the world.

Life believes that the U.S. is in Vietnam for honorable and sensible reasons. What the U.S. has undertaken there is obviously harder, longer, more complicated than the U.S. leadership foresaw. And in 1967 we are having another hard, complicated year out there. There is the encouraging fact of the Vietnamese elections, small blemishes and all; there is straight military progress; but there is the maddeningly slow work of translating these advances into pacification at the "rice-roots level." We are trying to defend not a fully born nation but a situation and a people from which an independent nation might emerge. We are also trying to maintain a highly important—but in the last analysis not absolutely imperative—strategic interest of the U.S. and the free world. This is a tough combination to ask young Americans to die for.

Home-front support for the war is eroding. One may discount some maneuvering among U.S. politicans as 1968 politics, but even the most patently partisan of these noises represents somebody's rather professional judgment of how the voters are feeling.

Life has more than once expressed its admiration for the Johnson administration's coolness and courage in its Vietnam policy. In action the President himself has shown a remarkable blend of resolution and restraint. But in articulation of the policy—which in the end is inseparable from policy itself—the President and his administration have become more and more glaringly unsuccessful.

The President is said to be subdued these days, inclined to "hunker down" and let the Vietnam criticism beat over him. Dean Rusk is infinitely patient and courteous in explaining to critics and questioners "Your quarrel is really with Hanoi." A confusing circumstance is that the other most influential Cabinet officer, Robert McNamara, clearly is less convinced of the efficacy of bombing the North than are the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or Rusk. Nothing inspiring or eloquent and not much that is simply informative is being said from Washington.

We believe the Administration very soon must act—and speak—to recapture domestic political and intellectual respect for its Vietnam policy and to rally more diplomatic and moral support abroad. We believe the initiation of a bombing pause is a gesture of forbearance and conciliation which might accomplish that. America has the strength to do it.

CITIZEN OF EL SALVADOR DESIRES ENLISTMENT IN U.S. ARMY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, a young citizen of El Salvador quit his job and traveled nearly 4,000 miles to my home in Houston with one burning ambition in mind.

Ernesto Beltran, 21, wants to repay the United States for its help to all of Latin America by enlisting in the U.S. Army and fighting our country's enemies.

Unfortunately, Mr. Beltran's hopes are strangled in redtape.

Here on a 30-day visitor's visa—the Army is precluded by law from accepting his application of enlistment. Reporters learned of the young man's efforts and wrote a heart-warming story of his hope to repay a debt of gratitude to our country. Many people rallied to the young man's side, and I was called on to help in slicing through the redtape.

After contacting sources here, I suggested to his friend and counselor in Houston, Mr. Mose Y. East, 6515 Hillcroft, whose wife is a native of El Salvador and both of whom knew Mr. Beltran personally, that the young man seek a 6-month extension of his visitor's visa and request the Houston draft board to induct him. The visa extension request, unfortunately, was denied.

Today, in a last effort to help, I have introduced a private immigration bill on behalf of Mr. Beltran, and I earnestly hope that it opens the door to his dream.

Here is a young man who worked and saved for years to make a dream come true. Here is a man, in my opinion, that any country would be proud to call citizen. And here is an example that the bearded beatniks of Oakland, Calif.—or the hundreds expected here to disrupt the Pentagon this weekend—could well heed and imitate. It is sad, indeed, that we cannot exchange a few of ours for a few more like Ernesto Beltran.

As Mr. East told news reporters, in describing Beltran as a young man of high ideals and strong character:

> I don't see how anybody could go wrong helping a kid with that much guts.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree.

FOOT DRAGGING IN WASHINGTON: THE UNFAIR HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of a number of our colleagues to bring about a greater degree of equal opportunity in the purchase of housing are recorded in a recent issue of Commonweal, a distinguished weekly publication devoted to reviewing public affairs, literature, and the arts.

This article by Jonathan Eisen describes in some detail the activities by certain Members of this House aimed at implementing effectively the Executive order issued by President Kennedy in 1962 which directed the Federal Housing Authority to "take all action necessary and appropriate to prevent discrimination because of race, color, creed or national origin."

The Commonweal article follows:

FOOT DRAGGING IN WASHINGTON: THE UNFAIR HOUSING AUTHORITY

Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi, interestingly, has become the latest sponsor of a fair housing bill. In an effort to assure that the relatively mild bill for the protection of civil rights workers which has passed the House would not become law, Eastland would have his Senate Judiciary Committee append a fair housing measure to it, thereby virtually guaranteeing its defeat.

That the inclusion of a fair housing provision is still enough of a kiss of death to appeal to Senator Eastland indicates the intractibility of the problem.

Fair housing is one area of the civil rights battle that has scarcely been touched by federal legislation or Supreme Court decisions. The Court did rule against the overt bigotry of restrictive covenants (Shelley v. Kramer); and Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act bans discrimination in federally-assisted programs. However, it specifically excludes insurance programs, which account for most government activity in housing.

Ironically, housing is probably the one area where a real degree of integration might be achieved almost overnight. Meaningful integration of local schools has been drawn out to a snail's pace, almost always contingent on agonizingly slow neighborhood integration. And, unlike education or employment, equality in housing does not require that the massive legacy of denied opportunity and deficient training first be overcome. More decent low and middle income housing, of course, is also a necessary condition, but the availability of existing housing on the basis of genuine equality of opportunity could do much to loosen the stranglehold on the ghetto Negro.

Several schemes to increase the number of low and middle income units have been offered to Congress this year. These range from measures to expand federal programs in public housing, to the Percy and Kennedy private incentive bills, to more money for rent supplements and urban renewal, to beefed-up FHA authority. President Johnson, moreover, has instructed the Department of Housing and Urban Development to produce its own private incentive bill.

One such effort, co-sponsored by three liberals on the House Subcommittee on Housing, includes an indirect fair housing provision. By prohibiting federally-insured banks from making mortgage loans to persons who fail to give legally enforceable nondiscriminatory pledges, the measure would reach over 70 percent of the housing market. The sponsors of the bill, Congressmen Reuss, Moorhead and Ashley, feel that this approach would resolve the constitutional objections raised by Senator Dirksen and others in connection with a blanket fair

housing law. The cutting edge of the bill is the authority of the federal government to impose conditions for its banking insurance. This provision would, in effect, extend President Kennedy's Executive Order of November, 1962, which prohibits discrimination in housing built with federal assistance. This was the famous "stroke of the pen," which Kennedy as candidate had challenged Eisenhower to enact (Kennedy was widely criticized in turn for waiting nearly two years before signing such an order himself.)

The Kennedy Order affects between 15 and 20 percent of the new housing market. It also applies to some 50,000 properties acquired by FHA annually through mortgage default, which are then sold for FHA through commercial brokers who are required by the Order to sell on a non-discriminatory basis.

Since 1962, the effect of the Order has been practically nil. FHA sees itself essentially as a business agency, and is extremely anxious to remain on cordial terms with its clients, the housing industry. FHA itself is an employer of former real estate men and insurance salesmen. Its first constituency is the industry, its second the white suburban buyer. As usual, the Negro comes last, if at all. Although it was conceived to help provide housing for those unable to afford conventional mortgages, FHA has been principally responsible for the postwar boom in suburban housing; it is not unusual to see advertisements for $30,000 houses offering FHA loans. Though now nominally under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, FHA in actuality continues to function almost autonomously.

Although the Order requires FHA to "take all action necessary and appropriate to prevent discrimination because of race, color, creed or national origin," FHA has interpreted this to mean only the provision of redress for buyers who encounter discrimination. Unfortunately, Negro buyers who have the sophistication and determination to press complaints in the face of repeated and humiliating efforts to dissuade purchase are a tiny minority of those discriminated against. At best, a case will end with an informal hearing and the admission by the builder that a "misunderstanding" occurred: FHA seldom invokes sanctions or even has follow-up spot checks.

To the extent that the Order is enforced at all, it is done through the efforts of voluntary fair housing groups. One such group, the American Friends Service Committee, recently released a comprehensive "Report to the President on Equal Opportunity in Housing," which has received little public notice. The report is a blistering and fully documented critique of FHA and the Veterans Administration, concluding that: "Executive Order 11063 is being widely and flagrantly violated by builders, brokers, and lenders . . . Implementation of the Order by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and the Veterans Administration (VA) has at best been ineffective and at worst subversive of the goal of equal opportunity in housing." Secretary Robert C. Weaver responded to the charges by citing a number of changes pending but in no way did he dispute the findings of the Report.

Happily the case apparently has not stopped with this confrontation and admission. Most recently FHA has come under growing criticism from a bipartisan group of House liberals, led by Manhattan Democrat William Fitts Ryan who called an informal hearing to deal with the enforcement of the Executive Order. Ryan himself had been central in the effort to pressure the Pentagon to declare off-limits certain off-base housing whose owners practiced discrimination against Negro G.I.'s. The conclusions drawn by Ryan's group correspond closely to the findings of the American Friends Report. It found that in fact the Order is "being enforced on a case by case method, and on the initiative of the complainant." Even the reform proposed, which would require the FHA to intercede on behalf of a minority buyer, "remains merely an embellishment on the case method."

Most important is the Ryan group's recommendation that FHA make non-discriminatory housing a matter of policy, as the Executive Order designated. The Congressmen's report recommended that "instead of merely requiring that proven discriminators take 'affirmative action' to get back into the FHA's good graces, FHA might well require that advertising of all housing provided with FHA assistance refer to the equal opportunity policy. On-site posters could also be required making the policy clear." FHA takes the position that this requirement would alienate the industry and damage FHA's position, which seems itself an acknowledgment that discrimination in housing is pervasive and that present FHA policies do not remedy the situation.

The likelihood of even an indirect fair-housing bill's being passed this year is remote. Rioters will not be rewarded, in the current argot of bigotry. Moreover, since FHA is unwilling or unable to enforce the existing Executive Order, whose mandate is clear, the fate of a blanket fair housing law would probably be similar.

Ryan's group has begun in a small but perhaps significant way to expose foot-dragging on the part of a government agency charged with a responsibility it refuses to carry out. The problem of the enforcement of non-discriminatory statutes which could thwart racist practices is immense, to some extent, no doubt, because of the evaporation of interested constituencies. Ryan in effect has begun what may become a Herculean effort to move a bureaucracy entrenched in practices which encourage further ghetto uprisings and which continue to make a mockery of our highest statements of policy.

JONATHAN EISEN.

INNOVATIONS IN LEARNING: BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, there is no greater tool for forging progress in the hands of our citizens than the possession of a good education. In a society so highly competitive as ours, to be without the benefits of a good education is to face a dismal future indeed. The correlation between lack of education and poverty is too plain to deny. Inadequate education, in most cases, means deprivation—poor nutrition, dilapidated housing, unhealthy environment, and lower-income status. And, as we well know, this tragic cycle can and does repeat itself all too often.

We must continue our efforts to break this vicious cycle of poverty and waste of human resources. One major way we can accomplish this, is to implement a program of bilingual educational instruction wherever it is applicable and desired in this country.

The focal point of my remarks here today is upon bilingual education, but I want to stress that we should be concerned primarily about the thrust toward a larger goal. I am speaking about the participation in and sharing by some 20 percent of our fellow citizens—the dispossessed and destitute—in the overabundance of America. Our immediate aim is to provide these disadvantaged Americans, through the use of such innovations as bilingual education, with the necessary tools to break their cycle of poverty and alienation from public affairs.

Who is in need of bilingual education and for what purpose?

Current estimates suggest there are over 3 million non-English-speaking elementary and secondary school children in the United States. An overwhelming majority of these children are the Spanish speaking of the Southwestern United States, Florida, and New York.

I make special reference to the "Spanish speaking" because these are precisely the type of persons this legislation is designed for. I will discuss the applicability of bilingual education to the Spanish-speaking community in greater detail later in my remarks.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, bilingual education is designed to facilitate learning by and for those students who find that they are better equipped to learn in another language. May I say that the key word, with respect to what I am saying, is "learn." I say this because, as I stated before, our chief aim is to facilitate learning.

Most of us have taken a good education for granted. We lose sight of the positive good that stems from our being exposed to the educational processes. We should realize that education has not reached all of America to the extent that it should. There are areas yet to be significantly affected. One of those areas of special need is within the communities that face a language barrier. To these citizens education means liberation. Who will deny that education can liberate a generation from the dregs of dismal failure to a bright and hopeful future? Education makes men more free; it helps lift up a man to his full potential.

Because we are desirous of a society wherein all men are afforded the opportunity and means to succeed, to advance their well-being, and to be respected, we welcome new innovations which seek to further these ends. This is the fundamental purpose of H.R. 8177, the bilingual education bill which I have introduced.

I grant you, there are some substantive and technical differences in the more than 30 bilingual education bills, but I am confident there is little disagreement over the fundamental principles and long-range purposes of this legislation.

There is one criticism or concern relating to this legislation which I want to dispel. It should be clearly understood by all that this legislation does not seek in any way or form to create divergent or isolated societies within the context of the larger society: Conversely, our aim is unity. We seek, instead, to foster understanding through education. Experience has taught us that education fosters understanding, and that understanding fosters tolerance. With tolerance comes acceptance of healthy competition, and the demise of ignorance and social frustration.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a pleasant feeling to observe someone struggling desperately to succeed and, yet, hopelessly cast upon a treadmill of stagnation and immobility. I want to share with the Members a letter I received last week from a young Mexican American girl who is representative of the present resurgence among the Spanish-speaking populace for self-identity, educational attainment, and community progress:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: Recently you spoke of the percentage of Mexican-American soldiers who have died in the Vietnam War, and the problems involved. I would like to personally thank you for bringing this subject up, because I feel you are one of the few statesmen interested in the problems facing the Mexican-American people.
>
> One of the problems, which you mentioned, is the lack of college facilities. Many of us Mexican-American students have a difficult time with the language barrier and a great difficulty in getting jobs to help us get through high school and college. The main problem, I feel, is the lack of jobs. Many of us need the jobs to help us with our financial problems, but not very many jobs are offered to us except agricultural work, and this is one job we do not want to have for the rest of our lives. We want a decent job, as everyone else, that pays well, where we can get experience from. Many employers will not hire us, because we are not experienced. Well I would like to know just how we can get experienced, when no one hires us and teaches us? I can not help but feel that some of them are prejudiced against us. I do not think that color, religion or what a person believes in should have anything to do with the way he or she works as long as the work is done.
>
> Because of these reasons, many of our young Mexican-Americans drop out of high school or discontinue further education after high school. I, myself, am facing these problems. We are nine in the family, and it is very difficult for my father to support six kids through high school and college, with the exception of my brother, who is in the Air Force. My two eldest sisters are going to college. They applied for jobs at the employment offices of many department stores, hospitals, state and government agencies, over the past two years and not one job was offered to them, because they lacked the experience. Just recently my oldest sister was offered a job in a hospital and the other is still looking. Last summer I applied for a job in the Youth Opportunity Center, but the only job they had to offer was agricultural work.
>
> So I took it. This summer I am looking for a decent job and I find it very difficult. Next year my sister and I will graduate from high school and I know that this will be the beginning of the long and hard struggle to continue our college education, which means a lot to us. My father has helped us a great deal by encouraging and helping us in any way he can with our financial problems, so that we might receive the education he lacked. I know that there are many young Mexican-Americans who face the same problem, and there are others who face more difficult problems.
>
> Organizations have been set up to help our young generation, but they have not progressed enough. I would appreciate it very much if you would please take these problems into consideration, and help us progress.
>
> Knowing that you are interested in helping the Mexican-American people, I decided to write to you even though I am not in your district. As you know, these problems do not only lie in your Los Angeles district but in all of California and in other states.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> HORTENCIA MORALES,
> *Sacramento, Calif.*

This young schoolgirl is not self-seeking. Her identification is with her immediate community. She is fully cognizant of the problems resulting from inadequate education. Her determination is outstanding and, indeed, enviable; because of this, she will likely succeed.

But, again, the central point of her letter is her concern for others. And, I regret to say, she has good cause for concern. Allow me to cite briefly, Mr. Speaker, a few facts relating to the educational problems of Spanish-surname persons in the Southwestern United States:

The differences between the adult Spanish-surname population and two reference populations are indeed enormous. In 1960, in the Southwest, adult Mexican Americans had, on the average, 7.1 years of schooling as against 12.1 for "Anglos" and 9 for nonwhites. If the "Anglo" record is taken as a norm, the gap was 5 years or 41 percent for Mexican Americans and 3.1 years or 26 percent for nonwhites. And the picture repeats itself in every State, though with some significant variations. The median attainment of the Spanish-surname group in 1960 ranged from 8.6 years in California to a dismal 4.8 years in Texas—the latter being barely above the level of 4 years which is generally considered the demarcation line for functional illiteracy.

In 1960 only 14 percent of the Mexican American people possessed a junior high school education, while less than 5 percent reached the college level. Fewer than 5 percent graduated from college.

I do not, of course, seek to affix the cause of this low educational attainment to the language problem alone. It is only one focal point of obstruction, there are many others—insufficient and inadequate jobs, poor environment which too often fosters a distorted sense or priority of values, inadequate health facilities, and dilapidated housing.

Who and where is the Mexican American? There is a population of over 5½ million Americans of Mexican descent in the Southwestern United States; the State of California is the home of over 1,700,000 persons of this background; over 750,000 Spanish-surname persons live in Los Angeles; and more than 175,000 Americans of Mexican descent reside in East Los Angeles alone.

I am proud to bring to the attention of this distinguished body, the fact that I am the congressional representative of the greater portion of the East Los Angeles community. Recently, many of my constituents appeared before a Senate committee in Los Angeles and spoke very favorably in support of bilingual education. I also had the great privilege of taking part in those California hearings, as did my esteemed colleague from California, the Honorable EDWARD ROYBAL.

The tendency for many researchers who conduct studies and expound upon this large community of people is to lump the whole group into one large stereotyped package—as Time magazine so disparagingly did in a recent issue—and to draw conclusions based upon this false premise. I caution against doing this—one could easily trend upon reality.

True, there are cultural, social, and language similarities within this ethnic group, but even the experts using scientific methods are confronted with vastly perplexing problems when conducting studies of Americans of Mexican descent. We must remember that this diverse people—the second largest minority in the United States—is spread from one end of the social, political, economic, and cultural spectrum to the other.

We will have to face squarely the fact that not every child with a Spanish surname is in need of the specialized instruction to be imparted through bilingual education. It is just not so. In discussing this, I am reminded of a statement made by Dr. Herschel T. Manuel, an educator from Texas, who affirmed:

> We must ever be mindful that we are dealing with an extremely varied population and with schools that differ widely. Like other children, these children vary in native ability from feebleminded to genius, in living standards from very low to superior culture, in economic status from extreme poverty to wealth. In language, some are comfortably bilingual when they enter school, many know Spanish only, some have a limited knowledge of English, and some know English only. "The Spanish-speaking child" turns out to be a number of different children.

However, there is a definite and immediate need for this legislation. As mentioned earlier, there are more than 3 million non-English-speaking elementary and secondary school children in the United States. For the most part, we are dealing with Spanish-speaking grade and high school students living mainly in the Southwestern States, New York, and Florida. Also affected would be French-speaking youngsters in Louisiana and along the Canadian border; children of oriental ancestry chiefly located on the west coast and in Hawaii; students of American-Indian descent; as well as other school-age children of non-English-speaking background residing in widely scattered sections of the country.

I want to impress upon the Members of the House that we in Los Angeles are aware of the need for specialized instruction, and anxious to assist these students. There are already successful pilot projects in operation, and many local citizens look hopefully upon the proceedings here in Washington and await our decisions and action. I hope we will not let them down.

The need for legislation such as that which I am discussing today becomes even more evident when we realize that—as an example—the Spanish-speaking population is not stagnant; that is to say, it varies in makeup and size. Consider, Mr. Speaker, that in fiscal year 1966, 45,163 persons from Mexico were admitted into the United States for permanent residence. Of this number, 26,582 gave, as their destination, the great State of California. Many of these new arrivals find themselves at home within the East Los Angeles community.

And please bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that these figures reflect only emigration from Mexico. In addition to Mexico, we welcome immigrants from 20 other Latin American republics each year. So, there is a constant replenishment of this resource. Why do I say resource?

I say this because I have long believed that one of the most valuable resources that this Nation possesses is the bilingual and bicultural abilities of its citizens. As we know, a sizable number of Americans are possessed of these wonderful attributes. The problem is that, heretofore, these abilities have been neglected and, even more distressing, discouraged. Our aim is to reverse this trend of unconcern and waste of human resources.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is reason for hope. Bilingual legislation has been introduced by more than 35 Members of this House. Moreover, continued hearings cannot but strengthen the content, as well as the chances for passage of this important legislation. I am encouraged, also, that the underlying purpose for this legislation has received proper focus. I reiterate: This legislation, in effect, seeks to preserve the best of our many languages and cultures, while, at the same time, it seeks to hasten the participation of all Americans in the grand scheme of America—individual fulfillment and community endeavor.

We have before us, Mr. Speaker, a great opportunity. I cannot overstress the inestimable good that will be imparted to those individuals who will become the recipients of this legislation—or the good that will be imparted to our own Nation, which becomes, as an end result, the grandest recipient of all.

J. E. GREINER CO. AND THE CHESAPEAKE BAY BRIDGE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in three addresses on the floor of Congress in the past 2 months, I have presented information concerning excessive fees, negligence, illegal spending of public money, and other questionable activities involving the J. E. Greiner Co., the consulting engineering firm which has recommended first priority to a bridge parallel to the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge, despite its rejection by the voters in statewide referendum last November. This firm is about to be awarded the contract to supervise the design and construction of that bridge, a contract which the chairman of the State roads commission has refused to make public, and which has been questioned as cost-plus, open end, and potentially expensive for the people of Maryland.

The main motive behind this drive to build a bridge next to a bridge is not the economic or engineering merits of the project, but the millions of dollars to be made from fees and land speculation. The Governor owns land on the approach to and near the proposed parallel span. He promised to sell this land last year, when his investment was discovered. It was only last week, however, after public prodding from me, that plans to sell this property were again announced. Eight business and political associates of the Governor, of course, still own the remainder of this land.

Moreover, the activities of the Greiner Co. in other States have been such as to forfeit the confidence of the people of this State.

For a number of weeks my detailed accounts of activities in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Florida have elicited only silence from the J. E. Greiner Co.

This silence was broken just recently when letters of E. J. Donnelly, a partner of the firm, and Mr. Jerome Wolff, chairman of the State roads commission, were entered in this RECORD. These letters berate me for "innuendo and character assassination." But careful examination of the letters and communications fails to bring out the slightest material rebuttal of my charges and in fact, they constitute a virtual plea of no defense.

Mr. Donnelly does not deny that the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission brought a $7.7 million civil negligence suit against the Greiner Co. in the U.S. District Court of Maryland.

Mr. Donnelly does not deny that the Greiner Co. paid the turnpike commission to settle this civil suit out of court.

Mr. Donnelly does not deny that the Manu-Mine Research & Development Co., whose drilling and slushing work was defended in a Greiner report signed by Donnelly, billed the turnpike commission $7.5 million for one part of the drilling and slushing work which the head of the Pennsylvania Department of Mines testified should only have cost $82,900.

Mr. Donnelly does not deny that the Greiner Co. recommended this mine drilling and slushing work despite its own testimony that none of its personnel had experience in mining engineering.

Mr. Donnelly does not deny that he had admitted on examination in court not visiting any of the mines the Manu-Mine Corp. was supposedly filling in before signing a report defending the corporation's work against State department of mines' criticism.

Mr. Donnelly does not deny the Greiner Co.'s shabby record in the Tampa Airport construction in Florida, which I described in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 21; or the Greiner Co.'s dealings with the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, which I described in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 28.

The Florida portion of that burden was assumed by Jerome B. Wolff, chairman of the Maryland State Roads Commission in a letter to the Baltimore News American dated October 1, which was reprinted in the RECORD as a companion to Mr. Donnelly's letter.

But Mr. Wolff does not deny that, after a Florida grand jury ruled that fees charged by the J. E. Greiner Co. for engineering and designs for the Tampa Airport were "unduly excessive" by $907,000, a new contract between the Greiner Co. and the aviation authority was negotiated which, a local newspaper reported, "could result in substantial savings."

Mr. Wolff does not deny that the grand jury findings were supported by an independent probe by the Consulting Engineers Council of Florida, which agreed that the Greiner Co.'s fees for the proposed airport were too high.

Mr. Wolff may be unaware that the State attorney of Tampa is considering a new investigation of Greiner's fee because estimated airport construction costs have doubled in recent months.

Still to be "defended" are Greiner's dealings with the commission which operates bridges between Pennsylvania and New Jersey. In 1956, the J. E. Greiner Co., as consulting engineers to the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, was found by a commission of legislative and law enforcement officials from both States to have authorized over a period of years illegal payments of $181,000 in public funds to commission members and employees. A re-formed Toll Bridge Commission later reduced Greiner's annual fee, from $40,000 to $12,000.

If the defense by Mr. Donnelly and Mr. Wolff of the Greiner Co.'s record in other States is less than complete, their defense of the decision to award first priority to the parallel bay bridge is equally insubstantial.

Mr. Donnelly defends a parallel bay bridge primarily with the claim that it will allegedly cost less to build and yield greater revenues when completed than a northern crossing of the Chesapeake Bay from Millers Island to Tolchester Crossing.

But Mr. Donnelly does not add that he was comparing the construction cost of a parallel bridge slated to have two lanes with a northern crossing scheduled to have four lanes. Nor does he add an important fact, revealed in Mr. Wolff's companion letter of October 1, that—

> There is the strong possibility it [the parallel bridge] will be three lanes instead of two—

Which, of course, means a commensurate rise in construction costs for the duplicate span.

Neither did Mr. Donnelly add that the cost estimate for the parallel bridge did not include the $50 million cost of constructing the Arundel Expressway to speed Baltimore area residents to the parallel bridge, while the cost estimate for the northern crossing did include the almost $30 million cost of approach roads to that bridge.

The estimates of how much revenue a parallel bridge would yield, which were cited with such confidence by Mr. Donnelly, were made by the traffic consulting firm of Coverdale & Colpitts.

Mr. Donnelly does not disclose the reliability record of these so-called traffic "experts." I have examined this record. I have disclosed eight major projects on which this firm made gross overestimations in traffic and revenue—including two bridges in Maryland, the Potomac River Bridge and the Susquehanna River Bridge. Coverdale & Colpitts overestimated 1966 traffic by 41 percent on the Potomac River Bridge and by 57 percent on the Susquehanna River Bridge.

The six other blunders include two bridges in Michigan and toll projects in Illinois, West Virginia, Massachusetts, and Kansas. Three of these projects are in default on interest payments to bond holders. A fourth is paying interest out of borrowed money. On the fifth and sixth projects, tolls had to be raised sharply in an attempt to make up for traffic deficiencies. Even with higher tolls, revenue is still below the firm's predictions.

Mr. Wolff attempts to defend Coverdale & Colpitts by citing statistics on the total number of successful projects they have undertaken. But even if we accept Mr. Wolff's figures, the failure record of Coverdale & Colpitts is 15 percent, since they blundered on projects with a value of three-quarters of a million dollars out of a total of $5 billion worth of projects—the figure Mr. Wolff quotes.

With the Greiner Co.'s cost and revenue estimates thus discredited, Mr. Donnelly's claim that a parallel bridge would not preclude construction of another bay bridge in this decade, while a northern crossing would, is equally lacking in substance.

Finally, can the Greiner Co. deny that the experience of building the first Chesapeake Bay Bridge at Sandy Point will be useful in the construction of a bridge parallel to the existing one?

I would like to make one final point regarding Mr. Wolff's defense of affirmative State legislative action on a proposal rejected by the Maryland voters in a referendum several months before.

Recently, I testified before a constitutional convention committee in Annapolis in support of a State constitutional amendment to bar passage by the State legislature—for at least the following 2 years—of any law rejected by the State's voters in a referendum. I pointed out at that time that the definition of a referendum is the "practice of referring measures passed upon or proposed by the legislative body to the electorate for approval or rejection."

If, after the voters have thus been heard and have rejected a particular piece of legislation, the State legislature can then ignore the voice of the people and immediately repass the same piece of legislation, the effect is the same as if the voters had not been heard at all. If the referendum is "a useful device of popular government that should be preserved in a new constitution," as the interim report of the Constitutional Convention Commission so described it, the effectiveness of this device should not be vitiated, nor its decisions overturned.

I have submitted the above facts to clarify the record on the bridges to be authorized by H.R. 11627. I hope this data will be of assistance to my colleagues.

THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION AND THE RIGHT TO PEACEFUL DISSENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many speeches in the Congress and throughout the country about how the Johnson administration allegedly equates dissent from its Vietnam policies with treason.

We hear charges that the Johnson administration would do anything to prevent its critics from having a public forum.

We have heard honorable, respected Americans allege that there is a police state in this country because people are afraid to speak up, and the President encourages that fear.

Well, today the public lie is given to all those irresponsible statements and charges.

In his column in today's New York Times, James Reston has given us a detailed report of how the Johnson administration is working with the leaders of this Saturday's Washington antiwar march to make certain that freedom is maintained and violence does not occur.

Mr. Reston—who cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called an apologist for the administration—reports how the Johnson administration is making ample provision for space and time for the marchers at the Lincoln Memorial and the Pentagon. The Government only insists that order be maintained and public buildings not be obstructed.

Now is this the picture of an administration suppressing dissent?

On the contrary. Here is a President of the United States who has been vilified on Vietnam beyond imagination, still giving public notice that any American has the right to dissent peacefully from any of his policies—and that Government will fully protect that right to dissent.

I pray that Mr. Reston's article will cut off the foolish and wild charges of suppression we have heard hurled against this administration.

Those charges are not true. And this Saturday's antiwar march is ample evidence of the fact that Lyndon Johnson supports the right to peaceful dissent, just as much as he supports the rightness of his own policies at home and abroad.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD Mr. Reston's article entitled "Washington: Johnson, the Court and the Peace Marchers."

WASHINGTON: JOHNSON, THE COURT AND THE PEACE MARCHERS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 17.—The capital of the United States is now preparing for what is advertised as the biggest antiwar rally in the history of the nation. The guess is that between 20,000 and 70,000 people will participate this weekend in a protest meeting at the Lincoln Memorial, a march to the Pentagon, and picketing and demonstrations there Saturday night and throughout Sunday.

In the emotional mood of the moment, the possibilities of some ugly scuffling and even bloodshed in these 48 hours are recognized both by Government officials and the organizers of the protest. The latter, representing all kinds of student, political, religious, racial, and pacifist organizations, have emphasized that "this is a peaceful demonstration . . . our purpose to protest the violence of the Administration's policies in Vietnam, not to contribute to more violence," but there are two important problems.

FREEDOM AND DISCIPLINE

First, The National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam is only a coordinating committee with no control over the members of many organizations who will attend the rally and march to the Pentagon.

Second, the leaders of the rally are not prepared to accept the principle on which permits for the rally are being granted: namely, that the Government has the right and duty to set reasonable limits on where the demonstrations can take place and for how long.

David Dellinger, chairman of the National Mobilization Committee, says he is willing to accept limits of space and time on the demonstrations, but that he is not prepared, and is obviously not able, to bind others to exercise their rights of speech and protest within limited periods and areas defined by the Government.

This is the difficult point. On Dellinger's own testimony, the Government has withdrawn from its original position that there could be no march or rally or provision for transporting such a vast crowd unless the committee repudiated any intention of civil disobedience. Beyond that, he agrees that the General Services Administration, which is representing the Government, has made ample provision in time and space for the use of the Lincoln Memorial, the mall, and the north parking lot at the Pentagon for the demonstrations, and the conveniences of the crowd.

There are elements coming here, however, that are not prepared to abide by the Government's limitations on the areas of protest, and some who are not even willing to follow Dellinger's view that "this is a peaceful demonstration."

THE UNPREDICTABLE CROWD

The Johnson Administration, however, has approached this awkward problem in a reasonable spirit. It regrets the whole thing. It knows that the photographs against the background of the Lincoln Memorial and the Pentagon will be used against its Vietnam policy all over the world. It is convinced that the Communists will exploit the rally and even that some of them have helped organize it—though it will not make available its evidence for this last point. But it has cooperated in the arrangements, within constitutional bounds, and though it has insisted on order and security, and will have 2,700 District of Columbia National Guardsmen on hand, it obviously has the sanction of the Supreme Court for these limitations.

Arthur Goldberg, who is probably the most persistent advocate for a generous Vietnam peace settlement in the Johnson Administration, stated the principle (Cox v. Louisiana) when he was a member of the Supreme Court of the United States.

THE MAJORITY OPINION

"The rights of free speech and assembly, while fundamental in our democratic society," he said in a majority opinion, "still do not mean that everyone with opinions or beliefs to express may address a group at any public place and at any time.

"The constitutional guarantee of liberty implies the existence of an organized society maintaining public order, without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of anarchy. The control of travel on the streets is a clear example of governmental responsibility to insure . . . order. . . ."

This is all the Administration has asked of the antiwar demonstrators. President Johnson himself has insisted, despite all the recent Vietnam criticism, that they have every right of dissent except the obstruction of public order or the security of public buildings. The question is whether the antiwar committees will be as restrained. Their purpose is to change the Vietnam policy, but if they attack the Pentagon instead of arguing their case, they will probably do precisely the opposite.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF BROADCASTERS—AN ADDRESS BY NEWTON N. MINOW TO THE 10TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF HOSO RENGO, THE JAPAN BROADCASTING FEDERATION, TOKYO, JAPAN, SEPTEMBER 7, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful and valuable citizens in our country is Newton N. Minow, of Illinois, who served with great distinction as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission by appointment of President John F. Kennedy.

Although now a lawyer in private life, Mr. Minow still serves the public good by participation in a wide variety of broadcasting activities, including service as a director both of the National Educational Television Network and the new foundation to create the Public Broadcasting Corporation as proposed to Congress by President Johnson.

An outstanding example of Mr. Minow's continuing concern with the public impact of radio and television is an address he delivered on September 7, 1967, in Tokyo, Japan, to the 10th annual convention of the Japan Broadcasting Federation.

This organization, which is called Hoso Rengo, is the national association of all Japanese commercial and noncommercial broadcasters.

Mr. Minow was the first American invited to address this group and his speech was later carried with questions and answers on Japanese television.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe Mr. Minow's perceptive address on this occasion, "Social Responsibilities of Broadcasters," will be of interest to many Members of Congress, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF BROADCASTERS

(By Newton N. Minow)

May I first express my appreciation to Hoso Rengo for inviting me to participate in its 10th Annual Conference in Tokyo. It is an extraordinary honor on my first visit to Japan, to be able to speak with so many distinguished leaders from both non-commercial and commercial broadcasting as well as to the many others in the audience who represent varied fields concerned with mass communication.

Also, may I express my appreciation to the Japan Broadcasting Corporation, which is videotaping this presentation for telecast throughout Japan.

I am told by my friends in Tokyo that some of you know my name in Japan because of an address I made several years ago to the American broadcasting industry in Washington at its annual convention. At that time I was serving as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission by appointment of President John F. Kennedy.

After I made that speech, one broadcaster came up to me on the platform and said, "Mr. Minow, I didn't think very much of your speech and didn't like it." I said thank you for your views. A few minutes later, he went back into the crowd and then he came back and said, "In thinking it over, your speech was terrible." Again, I said thank you for your opinion. Again, he disappeared into the crowd and returned and came back a third time and said, "Mr. Minow, that was undoubtedly the worst speech about broadcasting ever made by anyone in history." Governor LeRoy Collins, President of the National Association of Broadcasters was standing next to me and had heard all of this. Governor Collins put his arm around me and said: "Newt, don't let that man bother you. He has no views of his own; he just repeats everything he hears."

Today, I am no longer connected with the Government of the United States, but I still have deep interest in broadcasting. I am a Director of the National Educational Television network which has more than 100 affiliated stations throughout the United States. I am the Chairman of the Board of Directors of one of the largest educational stations in the United States, WTTW in Chicago, which operates on two channels, 11 and 20 to serve millions of people each day. I am a lawyer in private life representing a number of commercial broadcasters, including CBS network. And I am legal counsel representing all the six Chicago television stations in their plans for their new broadcasting antennas on top of a new 100 story building under construction in Chicago. And I am a Director of the new foundation leading the effort to create the Public Broadcasting Corporation in the United States as recommended to the Congress by President Johnson.

Wearing these many hats and roles of both commercial and non-commercial television (like Hoso Rengo) I am honored to be your guest.

Today I hope to share with you some thoughts on the subject suggested by Hoso Rengo: "The Social Responsibilities of Broadcasters." I would like also to learn your thoughts. Therefore, I will be brief in order to reserve time for an exchange of comment with you.

TO FLATTER EVERY PUBLIC WHIM AND PREJUDICE?

Before he became President, John F. Kennedy once told a group of American broadcasters that politicians and broadcasters had much in common. He said and I quote—"In the last analysis we are both dependent in large measure on the same factor—public approval. The broadcaster who offers shows that are not seen nor heard is not offering a public service no matter how high the quality of his show. The politician whose indifference to public opinion costs him his seat, will no longer be able to perform effective public service no matter how high principled his courage or independence might have seemed. The question facing us both," said President Kennedy, "is this—will the politician's desire for reelection and the broadcaster's desire for ratings, cause both to flatter every public whim and prejudice, to seek the lowest common denominator, to put public opinion at all times ahead of the public interest?" "For myself" said President Kennedy, "I reject that view of politics and I urge you to reject that view of broadcasting."

Because I deeply agreed with President Kennedy's analysis I was honored to accept his appointment to the Federal Communications Commission at the end of 1960. I had some strong convictions, not especially about the FCC, but about television; one of the industries which the FCC regulates; I believe that television is one of the most powerful instruments ever created to reach the minds and hearts of man. Nothing in the history of man approaches the potential of television for information, for misinformation, for sheer reach and impact.

TWIN RESPONSIBILITY OF BROADCASTERS

In speaking about the social responsibilities of broadcasters, let me say first that I view this in two frameworks . . . that of the individual nation's domestic situation . . . and that of the international situation. As each day passes, these two frameworks are being worked into one large structure. Unfortunately, however, many of us do not really understand the challenge imposed by the advance of technology in international communications.

Beginning with domestic considerations, television in the United States took a course quite different than in Japan. We started American television with strong commercial stations and networks which have grown and prospered and brought varied service to the people of America. We had only weak and struggling educational or non-commercial television.

In Japan, you created strong non-commercial service in the great and distinguished NHK. You then started commercial television which is growing and developing its service.

Starting in different ways, we both have learned the same lesson. That to serve the people of the nation well, we need both kinds of television to be strong and effective—both commercial and non-commercial television. Some things one can do better than the other—but our job as broadcasters is to provide choice and variety to the public. To accomplish this, we need both kinds of television.

I should like to tell you a little about our hopes for the Public Television Corporation in America.

REVOLUTIONARY PROPOSAL OF FORD FOUNDATION

On August 1, 1966, the new president of the Ford Foundation, McGeorge Bundy, and his television advisor, Fred W. Friendly (who not long before had resigned as president of CBS News), made their now famous domestic satellite proposal. They suggested the establishment of a non-profit corporation that would provide, through a series of fixed satellites, national interconnection for all of the nation's television networks. Satellite interconnection would cost less than the present system of land-lines interconnection; part of the saving would be passed on to the commercial networks and the rest of it would go to the support of ETV's national and regional program services.

The revolutionary proposal received wide national publicity and created a stir both inside and outside the world of communications.

The Ford Foundation also wanted to demonstrate to the American public what noncommercial television could contribute to the nation if it had adequate program funds and national interconnection, and in December of 1966 the Foundation appropriated $10,000,000 for this purpose. Most of that money will go to what has now become the Public Broadcast Laboratory of N.E.T. Beginning in October of 1967, P.B.L. will present, through the N.E.T. network, a live two-hour program on twenty-five consecutive Sunday evenings. The series is intended as both an experiment and a demonstration to provide a weekly review of cultural, sociological, scientific, economic, and political developments.

The P.B.L. project will be the first weekly series in the history of non-commercial television to be broadcast live across the country; the first live nationally interconnected ETV program was N.E.T.'s "State of the Union / '67," which was presented the evening of January 10, 1967.

Its first interconnection demonstration included two hours of commentary on President Johnson's State of the Union message, immediately after the President had spoken, by ten leading scholars and diplomats located in five cities around the nation. The response from critics was overwhelmingly favorable. Through the winter and spring N.E.T. continued its demonstrations with several timely programs and with coverage of two sets of Senate hearings. Then, on June 25, it brought to American audiences, by interconnection, the historic "Our World" telecast, which was produced by broadcasters from fourteen nations including Japan and seen by viewers on five continents.

CARNEGIE COMMISSION PLAN: PUBLIC TELEVISION CORPORATION

Meanwhile, in 1966, the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television was deep in its research and deliberations. The Commission consisted of fifteen distinguished persons from education, broadcasting, journalism, business, diplomacy, and the arts. Its chairman was James B. Killian, Jr., chairman of the corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who recently visited Japan to study and learn about your television system.

In mid-January of 1967, shortly after N.E.T.'s first interconnection demonstration, the Carnegie Commission issued its report to the American people. It called for "a well-financed and well-directed educational television system, substantially larger and far more pervasive and effective than that which now exists. . . ." The Commission urged the establishment, by Congress, of "a federally chartered, non-profit, non-governmental corporation, to be known as the 'Corporation for Public Television.'" This Corporation, the Commission said, "should be empowered to receive and disburse governmental and private funds in order to extend and improve Public Television programming." The Commission stressed the importance of having private funds available to the Corporation. Commercial broadcasters in the United States have supported this plan, and CBS has pledged $1,000,000 as a contribution. President Johnson has endorsed the plan, and its adoption is now pending in our Congress.

FIGHT IGNORANCE AND ITS DEVILS OF DESPAIR AND DESTITUTION

I have tried to summarize the domestic situation in the United States. In regard to your own domestic industry, I feel advised to limit myself to saying that I have read a great deal about broadcasting in Japan and respect it for its tremendous technical achievements and for its diversified and resourceful approach to providing both entertainment and education on a mass scale. Japanese television represents one of the world's most stimulating experiments and accomplishments in mass communication. I hope to learn more about your industry in the next few days.

In both your country and my country, however, I think you will agree that today we are faced with the urgent need and the technical opportunity to entertain, to inform, and to educate on a scale never before attempted. As our studies show that most people watch television to be entertained, I suggest that we do everything possible to increase the informational value of entertainment programs as well as reinforce the entertainment value of informational programs. What we must learn to do is to make our entertainment programs more educational and our educational programs more entertaining.

I hope that you will agree with me that in the healthy democratic society there is no reason and, indeed, no excuse for failing to utilize television to its utmost potential in enlightening our citizens. Anything else would be a waste of this electronic miracle and an abdication to ignorance and its devils of despair and destitution.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS REQUIRE NEW PHILOSOPHY

On the international level, the interested observer can discern encouraging developments on one hand . . . but frightening gaps on the other hand. The history of the 19th and 20th centuries is a story of mankind's failure to keep pace with its own technology. Today in communications, the world faces a repetition of this history. Too many of us greet the challenges of international communications in the 1970's with the vocabulary, the spirit, and the industry limitations of the 1950's. In a few years we will have the capability to send television signals from any spot on earth directly to any other spot, including individual homes. In a few years . . . so say the technical experts . . . we will have the skill to provide most homes in advanced industrial nations with their own personal communication centers offering newspapers and magazines by facsimile, video telephones, and perfect color television signals from ten . . . or ten-thousand miles . . . distance. The technical experts also tell us we will have the machinery to reach countless millions of the underfed and undereducated with lifesaving and soul-saving knowledge . . . knowledge that well might prevent worldwide waves of revolution by the desperate deprived. Ond yet, today, for the most part, we stand isolated in our individual nations facing our parochial problems with the philosophy of the earlier days when we began this experiment in mass communications.

There are important exceptions and encouraging developments, and in no way must we overlook the international news coverage by various television companies, the imaginative work of the Asian Broadcasting Union, the European Broadcasting Union, and Intelsat, and the efforts by individual broadcasting organizations to establish orderly and meaningful international operations. On the other hand, there are no signs of real urgency in our efforts to mobilize the talents and facilities of the various international broadcasters to meet the problems and the promises of the 1970's. Man long ago learned to lavish great and intense energy and skill on his tools of war. Today he must learn to generate the same energy and skill on developing and utilizing his tools of peace . . . such as international broadcasting.

IMMEDIATE GOAL: INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE

In order to conclude and allow time for an exchange of ideas, I would like to mention two personal thoughts, not for the 1970's or the year 2000, but but for the immediate future . . . for the very tomorrow of television.

First, may I urge each broadcaster present today to use the tools at hand for improving the exchange of cultural and educational television among those interested countries. One tool is the US-Japan Television Exchange program ably represented in Japan by Mr. Saburo Matsukata. There is a compelling need and opportunity for Japanese broadcasters to make available responsible and realistic public affairs programming for exchange with the United States. There is also a great need, I understand, for you to search your broadcast schedules and clear time for the telecasting of public affairs programs from the United States. For years we have enjoyed an excellent and fruitful exchange of businessmen, scholars, politicians, scientists, and other specialists. For years we have witnessed an adequate exchange of television entertainment. In striking contrast, there never has been more than a tantalizingly tiny exchange of public affairs television programming.

Finally, let me ask you leaders in broadcasting to turn your best efforts to expanding and dramatizing the two-way exchange of good television programming between our nations in any way your creativity directs. Would it be possible, for instance, for noncommercial and commercial broadcasters in Japan to pool their talents with their counterparts in the United States to provide periodic television festivals via satellite transmission, available to all those broadcasters who desire to participate? This might be done once a year or more, thus allowing our respective nationwide audiences to sample the arts, sciences, politics, and daily life of their Pacific partners. Hopefully, this type of program would encompass a period of several hours or several days and would cut across the traditional competitive lines of individual companies.

If such a concept proves unfeasible, at the very least let me urge you to explore with your American broadcasting partners ways and means to stimulate the exchange of public affairs programming. I do not believe that "business as usual" is good enough. International understanding and education must receive special attention. It is a matter of vision, and determination.

Speaking of television, a great American broadcaster, Ed Murrow, once said—"this instrument can teach; it can illuminate, yes, it can even inspire, but it can do so only to the extent that humans are determined to use it to those ends. Otherwise it is merely lights and wires in a box."

It is up to all of us, especially Japanese broadcasters and American broadcasters who together are so advanced in communications, to work together in unity so that television internationally does not become a vast wasteland. Each one of us must dedicate his talent to make sure that "television wa kōya de wa nai."

Thank you.

SLUM JOB PLAN SEEMS PROMISING

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Tennessean, an outstanding daily newspaper in my State and district, has long been noted for its support of programs to improve the lot of the disadvantaged and to help this nation meet its obligations.

One such significant undertaking is the joint industry-government job proposal upon which I commented here at the time President Johnson announced the program.

The Tennessean, in a recent editorial, has called attention to the President's new effort to erase the ugly blight of poverty from our rural and urban areas. This editorial lent its support to the new plan, underlining the Tennessean's belief in our ability to offer new hope and opportunity to those who are still condemned to poverty in this—the world's most affluent nation.

The Nashville Tennessean's editorial is further testimony to the value of this experiment. I ask that it be placed in the Record.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Oct. 4, 1967]

Slum Job Plan Seems Promising

President Johnson has announced a new pilot program designed to lure private industry into the fight against hardcore unemployment in urban and rural slums. It will be tried in five or six cities yet to be decided and in two rural areas.

Basically, the program is an attempt to induce businesses to create jobs and training opportunities in or near slum areas. At least $40 million in federal money will be made available for job training, as well as surplus federal property and equipment.

The program Mr. Johnson announced represents something of an administration end-run around a Congress which lately has been less than receptive to social programs.

Although the amount of money involved is small when compared to the scope of the problem, the project holds promise. Aerojet-General Corporation has been successful in setting up a project to help the unemployed in the Watts section of Los Angeles, and the former president of the firm will head the federal program.

It is encouraging, too, that rural areas, which have pockets of poverty and unemployment as grim as the ghettos, have not been forgotten.

The experiment offers responsible industry a chance for constructive cooperation with the government in the struggle against poverty, and the results will be watched with interest.

SLAP 'EM DOWN AGAIN, MAC

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Tiernan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great sense of pride and admiration to listen to your timely remarks 1 week ago when you brought to the attention of this House the inherent responsibility that all Americans bear when they seek to disagree with the aims and goals of our National Government.

No one in this Chamber can refute the wisdom and sagacity of your remarks. As a Representative in the Congress from the city of Boston—the birthplace of liberty and democracy—and as longtime majority leader in the House, you have long been in the forefront in the protection of individual rights and freedoms. Now, as our esteemed and honored Speaker, you have continued on in this same tradition.

It is my privilege and pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to place in the Record an editorial from the New York Daily News which is eloquent testimony to the timeliness of your remarks.

Slap 'em Down Again, Mac

Speaker of the House John W. McCormack (D-Mass.) is usually a calm man—some say much too calm—but he has his share of underlying volcanic fire out of Ireland.

The fire surfaced Wednesday, when Mr. McCormack got up in the House and cut loose on home-front objectors to the Johnson administration's Vietnam policies.

What aroused the McCormack anger was a reported remark by Red North Vietnam's Defense Minister Vo Nguyen Giap that dissent in the United States on the Johnson policies is "a valuable mark of sympathy" for our Communist enemies.

Said the Speaker:

"Nobody argues with the right to dissent. But if I had an opinion I thought would be adverse to the interests of my country, I would withhold it."

Many of the dissenters, roared McCormack, are giving aid and comfort to the enemy and gravely injuring our fighting men in Vietnam.

Some 100 House members got to their feet and cheered these remarks. Our hunch is that the great majority of Americans endorse both the remarks and the cheers. Certainly we do; and we hope Mr. McCormack will make variations of his Wednesday speech again, and again, and again.

OUTSTANDING REA REPAYMENT RECORD

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Johnson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during the first 8 months of 1967, rural electric and telephone systems financed by the Rural Electrification Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture made payments on their Government loans at the rate of almost $1 million every working day.

These payments, amounting to $203 million, brought to more than $3 billion the total amount paid by REA borrowers through August 31.

This includes $1.6 billion paid by electric borrowers on principal as due and $883 million in interest. In addition, they had paid $310 million on principal ahead of scheduled due dates.

REA's telephone borrowers, by August 31, had paid $145 million on principal as due and $125 million in interest. Payments ahead of schedule amounted to $14 million.

Losses in the 32-year-old rural electrification program amount to only $44,478. This is 8 ten-thousandths of 1 percent of the nearly $5.4 billion of loan funds advanced by REA for borrowers to invest in their local rural electric facilities.

The losses came about through foreclosures in the 1940's of loans to a power company in North Carolina and to a cooperative in New York.

There have been no losses in the 18-year-old rural telephone program, with $1.1 billion of Government funds already advanced to borrowers.

The repayment record of REA borrowers stands as a tribute to the fine manner in which rural people are making use of the Government funds entrusted to them. Some 25 million rural people—men, women, and children—now have the benefits of modern electric and telephone service. This was brought about by the dedicated efforts of REA borrowers, with financial assistance from the Federal Government. The continuing task is to make those services available to rural people under rates and conditions comparable to those in urban communities, and to do it on an area coverage basis.

Electric power and modern communications are essential to the economic development and future progress of rural America. The services provided by REA borrowers have a direct impact on the rural-urban balance required for future national welfare. When productive, respectable and adequately paid employment is available to people in their own local areas, there is little or no reason for them to seek these opportunities elsewhere—especially in already overcrowded cities. The task lies in boosting rural standards of living, both in terms of income and convenience, to match the attractions of urban living.

This is a challenge directly related to the leadership and initiative of REA borrowers in stimulating economic development in the areas which they serve. It is a challenge which rural electric and telephone systems accept. At the same time, they are retiring their financial obligations to the Government not only on time—but ahead of time, and with interest.

TRANSPORTATION AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Commerce Department has just announced completion of a study in depth of one of the pressing problems relating to our economy and our national life. The new study deals with the important area of the automobile, air pollution, and unconventional transportation vehicles. It was prepared by the Panel on Electrically Powered Vehicles and is titled "The Automobile and Air Pollution: A Program for Progress—Part I." The report offers a detailed analysis of the problem and makes a series of recommendations which the panel of outside advisers feels should be included in a national program for clean air. I want to congratulate the panel members and the Commerce Department as well as the other sponsoring Federal agencies for undertaking this important study.

It is clear that, in this increasingly complex age, we need to be continually vigilant in examining and analyzing the impact of our rapidly changing technology upon society and the economy. To properly carry out this difficult task, the Government needs enthusiastic cooperation from the universities and the industrial community so that all available knowledge may be brought to bear in finding the best solutions for the Nation. One of the more valuable mechanisms for bringing this about has been the Commerce Technical Advisory Board. Over the past 4 years, they have sponsored a number of important studies on matters involving technology and the economy. In this program they have involved our best technical talent in the process of suggesting public policy in many difficult areas. I trust that this excellent record will continue well into the future.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION IS PLAYING A VITAL ROLE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Nedzi] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when advanced technology and mass production are making it increasingly difficult for the small businessman to maintain a competitive position, the Small Business Administration is playing a vital role in our American free enterprise system. The impact SBA is making in the State of Michigan has accounted for a healthy increase in employment, the creation of new firms, and a valuable contribution of services and products essential to an expanding and diversified economy.

SBA, an excellent example of what President Lyndon B. Johnson calls "creative federalism," is a harmonious partnership of citizens and Government working together through financial and management assistance programs capitalizing on individual initiative and bold imagination of the struggling small businessman.

America's 4.8 million small businessmen have found an ally in President Johnson and SBA. The President has strongly supported in the past and continues to support today the efforts of the small business community. It was no surprise when he recognized and applauded the contributions made by the small business entrepreneurs in his Proclamation of Small Business Week, 1967. The President stated:

> Small business performs a service to the Nation beyond the supplying of goods. Operating in an open, competitive market, they stimulate the new ideas that create progress. They provide community leadership to aid economic development. They offer a wide and challenging variety of job opportunities to our people. We must insure that they will continue to hold a vital place in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I point with pride to the fact that Michigan, a State whose scenic beauty, recreational attractions, and industrial complex contributes billions of dollars each year to our gross national product, is achieving new and increased economic diversification. This diversification, aided greatly by long-term loans from SBA, is giving life to new firms as well as long established ones. These firms are in the ranks of the 95 percent of American businesses which are small and comprise the economic backbone of today's society.

During the fiscal year 1967, the Small Business Administration has made 326 long-term loans totaling $12,633,000 to develop and aid small business in the Wolverine State.

Included in the total are 153 SBA loans totaling $9.8 million to help small businessmen. Seven persons received $37,000 in disaster loans to repair or replace property damaged in natural disasters. Under the Agency's equal opportunity loan program 144 disadvantaged persons were provided with $1,559,000 in loans to aid in the establishment of a business or to improve an existing one. Twenty businesses that had been forced to relocate because of a highway or an urban renewal program were given long-term loans totaling $11,015,000. In addition, SBA has helped two local development companies with loans totaling $199,000.

An excellent example of how SBA assistance can make our economy grow is the Valente Dress Suit Co., in Detroit. In June 1954, Marco Valente, Jr., began a formal wear rental business with $10,000 and no employees. Working by himself for 1 year, Mr. Valente conducted operations from one store and generated only $6,000 in sales for the first 6 months. Having gained his experience in the business world as an employee of his father, who owned and operated a formal dress wear and laundry-cleaning service, Mr. Marco Valente expanded his operations from 1956 to 1962 to include the opening of two new formal dress wear stores and a dry cleaning and laundry plant.

Through these expansions, sales increased from $50,996 in 1959 to $71,492 in 1960, $71,732 in 1961, and $74,637 in 1962 with profits reported for all of these periods.

The need to expand facilities to handle the increase in volume and to be competitive prompted Mr. Valente to seek financial assistance. Although the business was making money, it was not sufficient to finance an expansion. On November 1, 1962, SBA approved a $50,000 loan to remodel, equip, and stock a new branch store.

The first year following the SBA loan, the business made a profit of $13,565 on sales of $173,389. Profits were $14,206 on sales of $240,786 in 1964 with profits of $55,206 and $36,483 on sales of $381,984 and $457,587 in 1965 and 1966, respectively. Operations continue to be conducted on a profitable basis for the current 6-month period with profits reported at $81,136 on sales of $339,766.

Since the SBA loan was made, four new locations have been added making a total of seven branches. The entire operation has increased its number of employees to 65 persons.

Mr. Speaker, this success story is but one of many which resulted from the initiative and bold imagination of a small business enterpreneur and the long-term lending program of SBA. Under the progressive leadership of the newly apopinted Administrator, Robert C. Moot, the Small Business Administration is providing the expertise in financial and management assistance called for by the Congress when it established the agency in 1953.

FARM BUREAU PRIVATELY JARRED BY RESNICK ATTACK ON TAX STATUS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the efforts of our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. Resnick] to shed light on the varied and farflung activities of the American Farm Bureau Federation. However, the results of his investigation and his accomplishments thus far are not widely enough known.

The New York Times of Sunday, October 15, 1967, described the Farm Bureau's insurance and other business activities. I was particularly disturbed to read about its rightwing activities and its attempts to influence our rural youth toward its narrow political beliefs.

The primary significance of the Times article is that it provides a totally independent documentation and confirmation of our distinguished colleague's charges. The reporter, Mr. Doug Kneeland, made his own investigation of the charges before he wrote the story. He spoke with the parties involved and at no time did they deny or refute any of the allegations made.

Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau is an extremely powerful force in the rural life of our country. Indeed, because of its business and lobbying activities, its power extends far beyond rural America. It seeks a national political role as well. It is an organization that lobbies before the Congress as a representative of the American farmer, but as the Times story indicates, it is apparently much more than this.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is important that we in the Congress know exactly to whom we are speaking when we are approached by this lobbying organization, and I believe that it is even more important for the American people to know the political role which this "farmers" organization seeks. Therefore, I insert this article in the Record at this point:

Tax Status Fight Jars Farm Group—Bureau Is Privately Shaken by Resnick's Attacks on It as Business Empire

(By Douglas E. Kneeland)

Kansas City, October 14.—Since last June, the American Farm Bureau Federation has been playing a quietly distainful Goliath to the belligerent David of Representative Joseph Y. Resnick.

Nevertheless, the top officials of the 1.7 million-member organization privately are displaying uneasiness over the four-month attack by the upstate New York Democrat.

He has charged repeatedly that the Farm Bureau has used its status as a tax-exempt organization ostensibly devoted to the welfare of farmers to build a "gigantic, interlocking nationwide combine of insurance companies and other businesses."

MILLIONAIRE IN CONGRESS

Furthermore, he insists, through its affiliates in 49 states (all but Alaska) and Puerto Rico, the farm bureau has become a channel for rightwing propaganda.

The farm bureau, for the most part, has publicly ignored Mr. Resnick, a stocky, cigar-smoking millionaire, who grew up on a farm in Ellenville, N.Y., and is chairman of the House Agriculture Committee's subcommittee on rural development.

An informal four-week inquiry shows that the farm bureau is, in many ways, all it claims to be.

Thousands of the country's best farmers are among its members. Farm bureau signs are tacked proudly to houses, barns and mailboxes along the straight gravel roads that part the corn and wheat fields of the Middle West.

They dot the byways through the vineyards of California, the cotton and tobacco country of the South and the rocky hills of New England.

But the American Farm Bureau Federation and its affiliates are more—much more—than an agricultural organization.

The bureau and its affiliates control an empire of 92 insurances companies, with assets of about $1.2-billion, and a vast network of other businesses.

These commercial interests sell to the farmer or buy from the farmer. Moreover, an impressive percentage of farm bureau members are not farmers at all, but simply customers who pay dues to purchase relatively cheap insurance.

Roger Fleming, who, as secretary-treasurer of the American Farm Bureau Federation, runs its Washington office, estimates that 75 per cent of the members have a substantial interest in farming.

Nonetheless, Mr. Fleming, a rugged 52-year-old who has nourished the flat accents and down-home talk of his native Iowa through 19 years in Washington, said in an interview recently that he had never been able to get an accurate breakdown from the states on their nonfarm membership.

Mr. Resnick and other critics have frequently charged that no more than half the organization's members are farmers.

Because of the vagueness about its membership and its constant attacks on government agricultural programs endorsed by the other major farm groups, opponents of the farm bureau are swift to anger when it flaunts its 1.7 milion members at Washington hearings and proclaims itself "the voice of agriculture in public affairs."

While the farm bureau operates openly as a lobby, its activities in the right-wing arena are not so generally known. Moreover, the national organization does not readily acknowledge these activities, remaining in the background while a growing number of its state affiliates openly promote the ideology of the far right.

State newsletters abound with editorials echoing the preaching of some right-wing conservatives and advertisements for the writing of others. The right-wing columnists get prominent display. Adult and youth "freedom forums" or "citizenship seminars" consistently feature ultra-conservative speakers.

Farm bureau members often receive unsolicited right-wing literature. Farm bureau women are urged through their own organizations to get anti-Communist books and conservative economic texts placed in school libraries.

Well known members of the John Birch Society and similar groups appear frequently on farm bureau platforms.

In several states, moreover, there is an increasing identity of interest and an apparent overlap in membership between the farm bureau and the Birch Society.

As long ago as 1964, Senator Milton R. Young, the North Dakota Republican, charged that the farm bureau in his state had been infiltrated by the John Birch Society.

In a recent interview, a leading North Dakota official said this was still so.

"They're the same people who are running the Taxpayers Republican ticket against the regular Republicans in next year's primary. It's the farm bureau and the Birchers," he said.

One late bit of news from Rosemary M. Landsberger, a Taxpayers Republican candidate, is that "the Communists everywhere are openly on the side of the liberal Democrats and the yes-men liberal Republicans."

In a telephone interview, Clark Robinson, president of the North Dakota farm bureau, said:

"I can tell you very little. I don't know which of our members belong to the John Birch Society. I don't think it's any of our business what a person belongs to.

SIMILARITY OF VIEWS

"We have, of course, something in common in philosophy with several organizations, including the John Birch Society.

"I haven't ever belonged, but I've read their Blue Book and some of the stands they take are the same as some of ours. Some of the methods they use, I'm quite sure we wouldn't use."

As for the Taxpayers Republican ticket, he said:

"I know a lot of folks who are running on the ticket. To my knowledge, none of them are in farm bureau leadership positions now, although they may have been."

A South Dakotan deeply involved in politics said that in his state "the farm bureau and the Birch Society are synonymous."

Thomas McNenny, president of the South Dakota farm bureau, denied this. Speaking by telephone from his home in Sturgis, he said:

"We're not associated with it in any way that I know anything about. As far as I know, none of the state leaders are members. Some of the county officers may be, but not that I know of."

The Johnson County farm bureau in Wyoming has adopted a resolution praising the Birch Society as "the most effective opposition to the advancement of Communism yet organized."

In Nebraska, Bernie Camp, the editor of the state farm bureau newspaper, who is a frequent advocate of right-wing doctrine, praised John A. Stromer's "None Dare Call It Treason," and then added:

"I suppose recommending this book labels me as a far-righter, but I've personally about reached the point in this loose use of descriptive phrases that such a term no longer bothers me."

In an interview, a former editor from a small town in Minnesota expressed concern over the farm bureau's right-wing indoctrination of youngsters.

"They send kids off to these Birch-type summer camps," he said, "and they come back really believing this stuff."

"We've even had some of them who were convinced that fluoridation was a Communist plot to weaken the country," he declared.

The youth meetings sponsored by the bureau usually last two to five days. At least six states—Kansas, Missouri, Michigan, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Texas—had them last summer.

A number of other state bureaus send students to seminars each summer on the campuses of Harding College in Searcy, Ark., and Oklahoma Christian College in Oklahoma City.

Harding, widely recognized as a right-wing institution is the home of the National Education Program, a fountainhead of conservative pamphlets, films and speeches. Dr. George S. Benson, director of the National Education Program, is president emeritus of Harding and chancellor of Oklahoma Christian.

A COLUMNIST, TOO

Dr. Benson writes a column that often appears in state farm bureau newspapers. He also speaks at most farm bureau youth forums.

The most recent youth forum was the fifth annual "Citizenship Seminar," sponsored by the Texas Farm Bureau.

A total of 377 high school juniors and seniors, whose tuition, room, board and transportation were paid by 138 county farm bureaus, attended the session on the Baylor University campus at Waco.

The students, who were "chosen on the basis of outstanding scholastic achievement and leadership ability," were expected to pass on their seminar experiences by speaking before groups in their own areas.

The five-day seminar was made up of "courses on citizenship responsibilities, the American heritage, and the threat of Communism."

Dr. Benson did not attend the Texas meeting, but several other professional right-wing speakers, who frequently participate in farm bureau forums, did.

They were:

Dr. Clifton L. Ganus Jr., president of Harding College; Dr. C. L. Kay, vice president of Lubbock Christian College; Melvin Munn, writer and commentator for the "Life Line" radio programs sponsored by H. L. Hunt, the Texas conservative; John Noble of Muncy, Pa., author of "I Was A Slave in Russia" and "I Found God in Soviet Russia," and W. Cleon Skousen, who is a former agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a former chief of police in Salt Lake City. Mr. Skousen wrote of police in Salt Lake City. Mr. Skousen wrote "The Naked Communist."

Another frequent tutor at farm bureau citizenship seminars is Dr. Nicholas Nyaradi. Dr. Nyaradi, director of the School of International Studies at Bradley University in Peoria, Ill., was Minister of Finance in Hungary before fleeing that country in 1948.

In July, Dr. Nyaradi and Mr. Skousen spoke in Boston at the New England Rally for God, Family and Country, which its sponsors called an "annual reunion for conservative Americans."

A few years ago, Dr. Benson wrote in his National Education Program Letter:

"Any American who loves freedom and is willing to work, work, to protect it can find intelligent direction and companionship in the John Birch Society groups."

The list of connections between farm bureau speakers and the right wing could go on, but they would be incomplete without mentioning Charles B. Schuman, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and his appearances on the Manion Forum radio programs.

On July 30, for instance, Dean Clarence Manion, the Birch Council member from South Bend, Ind., introduced Mr. Schuman on his program as "the freedom fighter of American agriculture."

Mr. Schuman and Mr. Fleming also have spoken at Harding College, but Mr. Fleming professes scant knowledge of the youth forums

RUN BY STATE UNITS

After declaring that he thought there were only two youth forums this summer, in Missouri and North Dakota, he said:

"Let me say I've not attended one of them and they are put on by the state farm bureaus. They don't have to get permission from us.

"These two forums I'm talking about, I've never seen their programs, but it would seem to me they have a patriotic tinge."

As for the consistently right wing character of the speakers, he said:

"Dr. Benson is a fine old gentleman. I've been on programs with Nyaradi and I'm happy to be identified with him. I suppose our program would be better balanced if we had some hippies on it, but our young people haven't taken that up."

The mainspring for the conservative activities of the state units appears to stem from the national organization's policy statement, to which members are expected to subscribe.

Under the heading "Farm Bureau Beliefs," it says:

"That the centralization of power and authority in the Federal Government, the movement to socialize America, the apathy of the American people toward this trend, and the apparent lack of responsibility on the part of individual citizens are among the greatest dangers threatening our Republic, and our system of competitive enterprise.

"That the trend toward increased centralization of power in the Federal Government has led us far into socialism, which is the stepping stone to communism.

"That such 'planned economy' concepts as socialism, fascism, communism, and other forms of totalitarianism should be opposed wherever and in whatever form they may be found."

THE CHAMIZAL SOLUTION A MORAL VICTORY FOR DEMOCRACY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, on October 28, President Lyndon B. Johnson, of the United States, and President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, of Mexico, will meet in my home city of El Paso and in the neighboring city of Juarez, Mexico, to formally transfer some long-disputed territory under the historic Chamizal Treaty. One strip of land will be transferred from the United States to Mexico, and another from Mexico to the United States.

These transfers, Mr. Speaker, stand as an example to all the world of the triumph of reason, of the mutual trust of good neighbors, and of faith that the troubles of the world can be settled at the conference table when both sides enter into negotiations in a spirit of mutual respect and trust.

As an outsanding example of the high respect in which the United States is held in our sister republic as the Chamizal Treaty is being consummated, I include in the RECORD an article from the special issue of the magazine Amigos, printed in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, commemorating the historic meeting of Presidents next week. This article was written for Amigos by a distinguished Mexican lady, Alma Carreño de Delgadillo.

Señora Delgadillo had served under the appointment of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos as a member of a Mexican committee to aid in the settlement of the Chamizal dispute. Because of a severe illness, she was unable to attend the meeting of Presidents Johnson and Lopez-Mateos at the border on September 25, 1964. Mr. Jorge Bate, editor of Amigos, informs me that the article here appended was written in the hospital during Señora Delgadillo's final illness. She died on May 30 this year. Her eloquent words, I am sure, reflect the feelings of millions of our friends and good neighbors in the Republic of Mexico.

The article follows:

The Chamizal Solution a Moral Victory for Democracy

(By Alma Carreño de Delgadillo)

In this troubled world of Berlin walls, guerrilla warfare, cold wars and distrust; where frontiers are not geographical delineations but fierce military installations, and in times when small nations play a game of mortal chess with international politics by setting a leading power against another, an oasis in peace is found in the solution of a century old problem that existed between the United States and Mexico.

Is there a victor? A loser? Yes, by all means! War, hate, misunderstanding lost an ace, when these two Countries gave the world a lesson of how barriers can be torn down in a truly civilized democracy.

The issue at stake was, in a material sense, small, in a moral one, a great one because it was not a matter for the President of Mexico to call on the President of the United States and with all good will make arrangements towards a just treaty. Many factors were involved. Time had passed to erase the exact point where the Rio Grande had begun its constant changes, some times towards the north and others towards the south.

People on both sides of the border who did not even know that the word "Chamizal" existed, much less had an idea where the territory was located, became instant experts in geography, engineering, international relations, treaties and accomplished accountants of every inch of ground involved. On one side of the border, the "Chamizal" was instantly located near the border of Canada, to the north; on the other side it was wished near Guatemala, to the south. There were things that contributed to more confusion, and in Mexico is was argued that the City of El Paso or some authority had a plaque on the walls of the White House Department Store that said: "On this spot then near the River . . . Juan Maria Ponce de Leon built his house." The date on the plaque: 1827. No one doubts that Ponce de Leon built his house there and the people who placed the marker must have proof of that but in the year 1827 Texas was part of the Republic of Mexico, so Ponce de Leon built his house on Mexican territory. The year . . . 1848 and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo is the important date to be kept in mind because it says that the Rio Grande was the boundary between the two Nations, at this part of Mexico and Texas. Sudden change in the River from then on would be subject to what international treaties specify on such cases; the land left to the north of the Rio Grande would continue to belong to Mexico as it would belong to the United States in case the River shifted suddenly to the contrary. Gradual erosion is another thing because the land then belongs to the part favored, as it is provided for in Articles I and II of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

The River changed many times causing severe floods and making it almost impossible to determine the "dividing line that shall forever be described" by the Treaty of 1848.

Mexico never ceased to claim and reclaim The Chamizal and in true justice, the United States never denied the right of its neighbor; no Federal projects were built, no legal titles to the land were given. In 1852 President Benito Juarez gave instructions to the mexican Ambassador to present a formal claim. Negotiations began, and in the year of 1889 the International Boundary Commission was formed with a representative of each Country. An attempt was made to settle the case and it was agreed to take it to international arbitration or what is called in this case "The Convention of 1910". Three persons would sit in judgement and the third, was Eugene Lafleur of Canada with Mexico and the States as the other two.

Lafleur gave his decision favorable to Mexico but the american representative did not accept. Here, it seems, the difference in the values or meaning of words was one of the motives for the american protest. "Slow and gradual" were the key words. Had the River changed gradually or slowly? The River refused an answer and perhaps gave both nations a few extra floods to keep them worried.

During the following years many attempts were made to find an answer that would satisfy all, according to the laws of both Countries. International Boundary Commissioners with their staff of experts, engineers and advisors kept a constant pace of investigations. The files of the respective offices have hundreds of documents to verify this. In some instances, it was censured, because the general public had no information regarding their findings but all was not published because it was necessary to do it in a confidential manner to give the real experts, tne ones that knew the case, a chance to work without pressure from the public or to keep it out of political issues. The ones that should know, the Presidents of the Republics and the Foreign Relations Offices were well informed of every step and every thing that was found either in favor or against.

History took a hand when an American President John Fitzgerald Kennedy admired and respected in the whole world made a visit to Mexico: he was welcomed by one of the most progressive Presidents of our Country, a man that has made peace a symbol of his life: Adolfo Lopez Mateos. Both agreed that words alone have no meaning so they translated them into action and an agreement was reached towards the Chamizal solution.

One hundred years of anxious waiting and all was settled! Or . . . was it? The tragedy that took the life of the Great American robbed the world of a champion and in Mexico the loss was felt deeply and sincerely. After the shock, a disturbing thought came into the minds of many: the successor to Mr. Kennedy is a texan. The Chamizal is on the Texas side of the border! Mexican people knew well Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson, the Seantor, the Vice President, but no one knew President Johnson. His speeches were closely followed and a clue was promptly found, because he had said once: "I am first, an American". And this American, born in Texas was the one that signed the Treaty returning the Chamizal to Mexico and now, indeed, one hundred years of problems had come to an end.

The City of El Paso, the one most near to the problem always took a stand on the matter that should be noted for posterity because pushing aside egoistic sentiments gave gracefully to justice an approving nod. The return of the Chamizal gave this City one more desire to better itself and plans are being carefully drawn to develop the area facing the Chamizal. Under the terms of the Convention of February 1st. . . . 1933 that deals with the rectification of the Rio Grande, for the prevention of floods, land in El Paso was exchanged for land from the northern section of Cordova Island. These plans, on the American side mean that, if approved, a Border Highway will be built along the rectified banks of the Rio Grande, connecting it with the National Highway System. This would improve traffic circulation within the City and provide an international route to Mexico.

A National Memorial Park that would beautify the area and would complement Mexican plans that will be made a reality in the Chamizal area. Among other things, the relocation of Bowie High School and Vocational School are being planned on 50 to 60 acres of land received in exchange.

Mexico has its program called "Programa Nacional Fronterizo" (National Frontier Program) and outstanding buildings of ultra modern architecture can now be seen. Many more are being built and once the actual return of the Chamizal is made, others shall come.

Ciudad Juarez in Mexico and El Paso in the United States are two cities that can be offered as an example of how freedom and democracy live side by side. There are no soldiers with guns guarding the border there are no barriers; a few Customs and Immigration men see that the law is obeyed in a simple way. They fight disease as a joint measure to protect the people: tuberculosis, rabies, mosquito control are the enemies they see. Young and old cross the border many times a week or many times a day. If an injustice is made, and always by some minor officer, it is at once corrected by higher officials. If a celebration is taking place civil and military authorities from both sides of the border are seen together. Newspapers in english are read widely in Ciudad Juarez and mexican newspapers are in hundreds of homes in El Paso. This proves that man does not need the same culture, the same background, the same history it only needs the moral and spiritual qualities, to live with dignity among other men.

NEED FOR AN INDEPENDENT FEDERAL MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have been one of 104 Members of the House of Representatives who sponsored legislation similar to that passed yesterday to give independent, agency status to the Maritime Administration.

The overwhelming approval of H.R. 159, which was passed by a vote of 324 to 44, demonstrates the importance of this measure and the realization by Members of the House, that this change is vital if we are to retain any semblance of a merchant marine.

We have discussed many statistics, figures, and facts in relation to this bill and the history of the merchant marine of the United States. I must commend the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for clearly and fulling stating its case and analyzing the problem. But of all the figures that bear on the problem, I think perhaps four numbers are most important. These numbers are 6, 8, 14, and 50.

No. 6. The United States which was once first in shipping in the world, is now sixth. It is no longer true that he who rules the seas, rules the world, and we have no wish to rule the world. But it is true that those nations that can compete vigorously in shipping, can compete in world trade and defend their interests. Nations which have maintained their shares in world shipping have continued to compete and hold their place in world markets without depending on military strength.

No. 8. Only 7 to 8 percent of our shipping trade is carried in our own American-flag vessels. This has meant virtual destruction of the American shipbuilding industry. Yards that were thriving 20 years ago have been closed down; men have lost jobs; and vital skills will disappear if the trend continues. We simply do not have enough of our own ships. We have had to revive ships that were destined to be scrapped in order to meet the needs of shipping for Vietnam. This is a deplorable situation and one that must be remedied. We cannot depend on foreign ships which depend on the highest bidder, which are restricted by other governments' policies. We must have a sufficient fleet at all times, to meet any emergency. At this time we have no margin of safety, no leeway. All of our ships are being used and we have no reserve in case of emergency.

No. 14. This follows immediately from the first two; the United States is 14th in shipbuilding. And let me repeat, the men who are skilled in this work will have to find other jobs in order to support their families; their skills will be lost and should we ever need them, we will be lost.

This also contributes to our problems with the balance of payments, as more and more money which is lost to American shipbuilders goes to foreign builders. A once thriving American industry will have disappeared if the trend of the reduction of the merchant marine continues.

This brings us to the fourth number, 50. I am really referring to 1950, for this is when the trend, the demise of the American merchant marine, began. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 created a five-man Maritime Commission, independent of all other executive agencies.

Because this commission was independent and autonomous, and because it had the dynamic and brilliant leadership of Joseph P. Kennedy, the merchant marine industry in this country developed, grew, and thrived. The growth of American shipyards during the period of the independent commission is well-known to Members of this body. The shipyard industry not only produced a competitive merchant marine, but it supplied our Nation with the ships it needed during the crisis of the Second World War.

In 1950 independent status ended as the commission became part of the larger Department of Commerce. And with this administrative change came the end of the era of the greatness of the American shipping industry.

We know the success and usefulness of independent agencies. Without their independent status, would the Atomic Energy Commission have been able to supply our Nation with the research and results in the field of atomic energy that it has, or would NASA have been able to develop the far-reaching and growing program we have today in space, or would the Tennessee Valley Authority been able to develop an entire region of our country that had been given up for lost 35 years ago? I think not. Independence means authority and interest, and we can be assured that an Independent Federal Maritime Administration would be more interested in the development of the maritime industry than would any larger agency or department.

I am very happy that this bill has passed the House. But I am more than happy; I am relieved. Because I firmly believe that without independent status, the Maritime Administration would languish in the pigeonholes of bureaucracy and the shipping industry, which has done so much for our country's economic and military strength, would slowly pass away.

PRESS SUPPORT FOR THE GONZALEZ BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD — FIFTH OF A SERIES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is actively involved at present in the problems of inflation and Government spending. I wish to relate these twin issues to the Renegotiation Board, which is charged by law to determine and eliminate excessive profits realized by contractors and subcontractors in the defense and space programs.

There are many contributors to inflation; the extent of wage increases and the extent of profit increases number among them. Although the various Presidential wage guidelines have been designed to restrain the spiral affect of excessive wage boosts on inflation, there are no similar restraints on excessive profit boosts. However, in the field of defense contracts, the recovery by the Renegotiation Board of unjustified profits surely has had a salutary effect upon inflation.

One certain way to reduce spending is to recover spending. Here again, the Renegotiation Board is directly involved. Recovering spending on defense and space contracts which have been determined to be excessive profits is in fact the sole purpose of the Board. In fiscal year 1966, the latest year for which figures are available, the Renegotiation Board issued determinations of excessive profits in the amount of $24.5 million. Although some of these determinations are being appealed to the U.S. Tax Court, experience shows that nearly all of the 24.5 million will be returned to the Treasury. In addition, in fiscal 1966, the proceedings of the Board resulted in the voluntary price reduction or voluntary refund of $23.2 million to the procurement agencies involved.

In this connection, I ask my colleagues to note the remarks of the gentlemen conducting this year's Senate and House appropriations hearings, respectively, into the Renegotiation Board's appropriation:

> Senator ALLOTT. I think this is probably the most profitable part of our Government as near as I can see. You have done a fine job.[1]

And—

> Mr. EVINS. From a strictly monetary point of view you spend about $2½ million a year, and you return to the Government about $47 million. That is about a $45 million profit operation. From that purely monetary viewpoint alone this is one agency (whose) returns to the Government are more than its expenditures.[2]

For every $1 we spend on operating the Renegotiation Board, the Federal Government is better off by about $18. This figure results from a comparison of the Board's determination of total expenses of the Board with the total amount of excess profits returned to the Treasury or to the Government procurement agencies as result of the Board's procedures from its inception in 1952 to June 30, 1966. The total expense figure is $47,797,000. The excess profits figure is $861 million, a sum of $361,132,710, which is the excess profits, after tax adjustments and credits, returned to the Treasury by the Board's determinations; and $500 million, an estimation of the after-tax-adjustment figure of the $1,269,802,673 in voluntary refunds and voluntary price reductions affected by the Board.

---

[1] Senate Hearings. Independent Offices and HUD Appropriations, 1968 (H.R. 9960), Part 1. Page 55. Hearings of June 6, 1967.

[2] Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, 1968. Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives. Part 1, page 110. Hearings of February 20, 1967.

Can anyone quarrel with recovering $18 of spending on defense contracts for $1 of spending on the Renegotiation Board? Is this not in effect a reduction in Federal spending? Is not this what we in Congress are after?

The Renegotiation Board is hamstrung. It should be reviewing many more contractors and subcontractors than it is presently authorized to do. There is no reason why the 18-to-1 ratio of savings should not remain constant. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 6792, which would restore the original effectiveness of the Board and thereby recover more Government spending.

Mr. Speaker, to date I have received no support for my legislation to strengthen the Renegotiation Board from any Member of either body. However, several newspapers have supported my bill, and I have permission to insert the fifth in a series of these comments:

[From the Dayton, Ohio, Daily News, Aug. 11, 1967]

WAR PROFITEERING

Congressmen are rightly anxious that no American shirk his duty to his country. But Capitol Hill ought to be just as concerned about corporations taking advantage of the war situation by raking in excessive profits on defense contracts.

During wars, supplies are needed fast; competition is sidestepped; cost analyses are difficult. This produces the business swamp in which war profiteering is bred. The check against such profiteering is the Renegotiation board, created in 1942. The board has the power to demand that a contractor make a refund on profits at the end of the fiscal year if they are deemed excessive.

During World War II, $11 billion was refunded to the Treasury. Many firms are anxious to cooperate and others make voluntary refunds. But others are reluctant to repay; some are probably not caught.

Since 1954, Congress has reduced the board's authority by amendments. Rep. Henry Gonzalez (D-Tex) points out that the board originally could investigate contractors whose prime contract awards amounted to at least $250,000 in a fiscal year; that floor has been raised to $1 million. Many categories have been exempted from the board's authority, and the board has only one-quarter of the manpower it had during the Korean war. Some congressmen have tried to eliminate the board.

Rep. Gonzalez' bill would restore the board's authority, as ought to be done in light of the intensified Vietnam fighting and enormous jump in defense contracts. And if Congress cares enough about war profiteering to make a deep probe, as Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has suggested, the shock might produce even tougher controls.

WASHINGTON POST ARGUES FOR THE DICKEY-LINCOLN PROJECT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to thank all who have cooperated with me and assisted me in my efforts for the Dickey project.

I am grateful to the colleagues who have loyally and steadfastly stood beside me, to the interested and concerned organizations that have joined me in opposing the powerful forces alined against the project, and to New England's press and other media for their fair interpretation of facts and editorial support.

The people of New England, the great majority of whom favor construction of the project, have helped immeasurably by voicing their interest and their sentiments.

I am especially grateful for the enlightened and unselfish support that has come from other areas of the Nation. An example of such support is the excellent editorial which appeared in the October 17 issue of the Washington Post. It argues persuasively for the Dickey project and I would like at this point to insert it in the RECORD.

DICKEY-LINCOLN

Further planning funds for the Dickey-Lincoln Dam on the St. John River in Maine now depend on the House-Senate conferees on the public works appropriation bill and it is to be hoped they will act favorably.

The Senate approved the Administration's request for $1,676,000; the House did not approve it. The conferees should follow the Senate's lead. If they do not do so, previous appropriations of $1.9 million for planning this hydro-electric project will be rendered sterile. The project has had trouble in Congress at each appearance, notwithstanding the thorough House study it got in 1965 when it was authorized.

Demand for the plant arose out of the power plight of New England where rates are the highest in the country. Since it was authorized there have been some downward revisions on the mere prospect of the plant. It will surely perform such a "yardstick" service when built. The rate structure has handicapped New England in the competition for new industry. The lower rates of the TVA have enticed into the South some old industries it might have held. Congress, in simple justice, owes New England one such plant.

It has been argued that conventional hydroelectric plants are outdated; but they continue to be essential power suppliers, with a national prospect that capacity of such plants will double in the next 25 years. Plants like Dickey-Lincoln are being built right now. Their usefulness as peak-load suppliers makes them efficient complements to steam or thermonuclear plants. Private interests now are planning a large thermonuclear plant at Wiscaset, Maine, but no one believes that it will be adequate to all future needs in the region. Some voices have been raised against its effect on recreational and wildlife values; but the foremost defenders of such resources support the project as vastly superior to an alternative site that would affect the wild-river program on the Allagash.

The project has been thoroughly studied. It contemplates the addition to the Nation's power resources of an efficient supply that will be available to private distributors, municipalities and cooperatives in a region where there is a deficit and where rates are high.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond to the statements made here on Monday of this week by my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO], statements made in a further attempt to cast doubt on the merits of the Dickey-Lincoln School project.

In his statement Mr. GIAIMO asserts that "in 1965 the cost of power delivered wholesale to purchaser systems in Connecticut was 0.88 cents per kilowatt-hour," and that power from Dickey-Lincoln School "would be not less than 1.7 cents per kilowatt-hour." These figures mislead and do not accurately represent the cost of power from either source.

These figures pegged as the price for power in Connecticut are misleading because they represent the cost for a mixture of firm and peaking power. Even the 1.7 cents per kilowatt-hour for mixed Dickey power is not right.

The only Dickey power to be marketed in Connecticut will be peaking power, and so these mixed-power cost figures are irrelevant.

Connecticut Light & Power charges 31.76 mills to users of 100,000 kilowatts or less for peaking power, whereas the cost to the same customers for Dickey peaking power would be 20.1 mills. This comparison is based on the latest offered rates for Connecticut Light & Power including all discounts. Both cost figures would apply only to wholesale customers.

To get some notion of the dimensions of the cost differential, based on current rates, between Dickey peaking power and the Connecticut utility's best offered rate, consider the comparative cost of 100,000 kilowatts from the two sources. The cost for this power from the private utility would be $2,782,496 annually compared to $1,762,800 for Dickey power. The difference of $1,019,696 represents the annual savings if the 100,000 kilowatt-hours of peaking power could be purchased from Dickey by Connecticut electric utilities.

This annual saving over the 50-year payout period of Dickey would amount to $50,983,800. Over the conservatively projected 100-year life of the project, the savings would amount to $101,969,600 on the sale of 100,000 kilowatt-hours peaking power or one-seventh of Dickey's output. This hardly supports Mr. GIAIMO's contention that Dickey will produce high-cost power. The opposite is most decidedly the case.

The Representative from Connecticut's suggestions that the Dickey project is too costly, and his hints that its construction would not be economically possible have been totally discredited.

In sending Dickey to the House in the Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriations bill earlier this year, our Appropriations Committee stated clearly that the project has been found to be feasible from an economic standpoint, and said it would return $1.90 for every dollar expended on it. No dissenting Dickey views were filed with the committee's report.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Tenzer, for October 18, 1967, from 4 p.m., and for balance of week, on account of observance of religious holiday (Succoth) Feast of Tabernacles.

Mr. Culver (at the request of Mr. Smith of Iowa), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Hanley, for 15 minutes, on October 26; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Esch) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Ruppe, for 45 minutes, today.

Mr. Findley, for 1 hour, on October 30, 1967.

Mr. Reuss (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Saylor.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Esch) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Pettis.

Mr. Gude.

Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Horton.

Mr. Lukens.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Kee.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 43. An act for the relief of Mi Soon Oh;

S. 63. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Alberto Rojas-Vila;

S. 64. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Osvaldo Martinez-Farinas;

S. 221. An act for the relief of Dr. Armando Perez Simon;

S. 440. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Alejandro Solano;

S. 733. An act for the relief of Sabiene Elizabeth DeVore;

S. 821. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Domingo Hernandez;

S. 975. An act for the relief of Mitsuo Blomstrom;

S. 1021. An act for the relief of Antonio Luis Navarro;

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Dr. David Castaneda;

S. 1110. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel Alpendre Seisdedos;

S. 1197. An act for the relief of Dr. Lucio Arsenio Travieso y Perez;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of Dr. Gonzalo Rodriquez;

S. 1279. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco Montes;

S. 1280. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Pereira;

S. 1458. An act for the relief of Lee Duk Hee;

S. 1471. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugo Gonzalez;

S. 1482. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernesto Nestor Prieto;

S. 1525. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario R. Garcini;

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos E. Garciga;

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria del Carmen Trabadelo de Arias;

S. 1678. An act for the relief of American Petrofina Co. of Texas, a Delaware corporation, and James W. Harris;

S. 1709. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Martin Ruiz del Castillo;

S. 1748. An act for the relief of Dr. Ramiro de la Riva Dominguez;

S. 1938. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando Hipolito Maytin; and

S.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution extending the time for filing report of Commission on Urban Problems.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 19, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1167. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1168. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the cost of medical and hospital care and treatment, funeral expenses, and salary payments furnished or paid by the District of Columbia to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the District of Columbia Fire Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 219. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 470. A bill to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 793). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of conference. S. 1160. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 794). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 13559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant to certain joint endeavors organized by hospitals the same tax exemptions as are accorded to the participating hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 13560. A bill to designate the Stratified Primitive Area as a part of the Washakie Wilderness, heretofore known as the South Absaroka Wilderness, Shoshone National Forest, in the State of Wyoming and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 13561. A bill to limit the quantity of baseball and softball gloves and mitts which may be imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 13562. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13563. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be included as income for the purposes of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 13564. A bill to provide that individuals living in large cities shall be exempt from any surtax or other income tax increase enacted during 1967; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 10-percent credit against the income tax for individuals living in large cities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS (for himself and Mr. Walker):

H.R. 13566. A bill to impose annual quotas of potassium chloride or muriate of potash which may be imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 13567. A bill to provide for a Federal Athletic Commission to regulate organized sports when and to the extent that such regulation is in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself and Mr. Battin):

H.R. 13568. A bill to create a human resources center to provide a location for various training centers and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 13569. A bill to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, to provide for a national program of flood insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself, Mr. BATTIN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. RHODES of Arizona, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.R. 13570. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BARING, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. OLSEN):

H.R. 13571. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 13572. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 13573. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit demonstrations at the Pentagon relating to the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 13574. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.J. Res. 895. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.J. Res. 896. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.J. Res. 897. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period September 15 through October 15 of each year as Youth Activities Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.J. Res. 898. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 899. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. RUPPE (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. POFF, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. BLACKBURN, and Mr. DOLE):

H.J. Res. 900. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TENZER:

H. Con. Res. 536. Concurrent resolution providing that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should submit a resolution to the United Nations for final and binding improvement of peace in Southeast Asia in accordance with the appropriate article of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 537. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should have one uniform nationwide fire reporting telephone number and one uniform nationwide police reporting telephone number; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H. Con. Res. 538. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should have one uniform nationwide fire reporting telephone number and one uniform nationwide police reporting telephone number; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 13575. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Cortagiani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 13576. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Othomaro Beltran Zepeda also known as Othomaro Beltran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 13577. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis Narciso Gonzalez y Fleites; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13578. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giuseppa Mangiamele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 13579. A bill for the relief of Alfio Margiotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 13580. A bill for the relief of Bruna Molinari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 13581. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Currado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 13582. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josefina F. Pilpil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 13583. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ewa Kraus Hann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

184. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city of Newport Beach, Calif., relative to Federal tax sharing, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

William F. Houck, National Adjutant of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GILBERT GUDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 18, 1967

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor Mr. William F. Houck, who today was named as national adjutant of the American Legion on the recommendation of the National Commander William E. Galbraith and with the concurrence of the Legion's National Executive Committee.

William Houck has been serving as acting national adjutant of the American Legion, the world's largest veterans organization, since the close of the 1967 national convention on August 31 of this year.

He is the ninth man to hold the position of chief administrative officer of the 2½-million member organization and he will be responsible for the direction and supervision of the Legion's national headquarters staff of 390 full-time employees located in Washington, D.C. and New York City.

Born in Holgate, Ohio, on March 17, 1917, he moved with his family to Garrett, Ind., at an early age. When World War II broke out he served his country as a lieutenant with the U.S. 28th Infantry and saw action in France, Germany, Luxembourg, and Belgium. Wounded by a landmine, he was returned to the United States in April 1945.

He was retired from active service on disability and returned to Indiana, where he became active in the American Legion. He was affiliated with the Aaron Scisinger Post 178 in Garrett, and was recently awarded a life membership by the post. In 1945 he was named assistant deputy adjutant of the American Legion of Indiana and 4 years later appointed to the position of deputy adjutant. In 1952 he joined the national headquarters staff of the American Legion and was named director of the Legion's Washington, D.C., office and he was serving as executive director of the Washington office at the time of his appointment as acting national adjutant.

I am proud to say that Mr. Houck resides in my congressional district, at 8517 Rayburn Road, Bethesda, Md., with his wife, the former Miss Meredith Ann Walter, of Garrett, Ind., and their daughter, Cecilia.

It is an honor for me to call attention to this outstanding American upon his achievement. I wish him the very best of luck in his new position with the Legion, and I am confident that he will continue to do an excellent job.

Double Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 18, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, there is a lesson for all in the career of Raymond

A. Gallagher, who has just retired after 41 years' service in a variety of capacities with Pennsylvania Electric Co. In addition to leaving an outstanding record in the utility industry, he has compiled a history of community contributions that should set an example not only for busy executives but for others in all types of employment.

A graduate of Pennsylvania State University in 1923, Mr. Gallagher was employed by the Erie Lighting Co., Alabama Power Co., and Duquesne Light Co. before joining Penelec in 1926. Through outstanding ability and devotion to duty, he became a member of the board of directors and vice president of the former Keystone Division of the company, with headquarters in Oil City, in 1942. Four years later he returned to Johnstown, where he had previously served as comptroller and chief accountant, as vice president in charge of industrial relations and rates. In 1954 Mr. Gallagher became vice president and assistant to the president. He was also chairman of the pension board and of the executive pension plan.

To achieve these positions in an important company in an important industry was obviously a full-time effort, but Mr. Gallagher was willing to expend reserve energies in behalf of his industry and his fellowmen. Several times a member of the executive of Pennsylvania Electric Association, he was vice president in 1950–51 and president in 1951–52. What is more, Mr. Gallagher was—

Director of the chamber of commerce and the Community Chest, and a member of the Rotary Club and the Boy Scout Council advisory board during his tenure in Oil City;

Director of the Greater Johnstown Chamber of Commerce, chairman of the American Cancer Society's 1951 fund drive in an eight-county central Pennsylvania area, and vice president and a member of the board of directors of the society's Cambria County unit, and

Division chairman for the campus completion campaign of the University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown.

Mr. Gallagher has also been serving as treasurer and a member of the executive committee of the Greater Johnstown Citizen's Safety Council and is a national associate of Boys Clubs of America.

Because so few individuals are gifted with the dedication, zeal, and stamina of Raymond A. Gallagher, his accomplishments stand out all the more. And we are all the better for them.

An Open Letter to the Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years the Post Office Department has been dedicated to the demise of the railway postal service, thus abandoning the time-honored and proven concept of enroute distribution of mail which throughout the years has facilitated the speedy delivery of mail upon arrival at its destination city or town or hamlet. I have tried my best to convince the postal officials that they were making a terrible mistake which they would some day have to pay for. Nevertheless, in spite of the counsel and warnings and urging by me and others who are genuinely interested in having the mail moved efficiently and expeditiously, the Department has gone ahead full speed in abandoning railway mail cars to the extent that soon there will be hardly an RPO car left anywhere in the country.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department has set its course and is not about to be deterred. During recent weeks I have received letter after letter from the Assistant Postmaster General for Transportation advising of discontinuance of railway post office service on yet another train. And each time I receive letters and telephone calls from the postal employees affected, some of whom have been riding the RPO cars for 20 years or more, pleading with me to try to reason with the Department.

The employees now know that the Department is not to be reasoned with on this subject and they have resigned themselves to their fate so far as their RPO jobs are concerned. All they are asking now, Mr. Speaker, is that the change in service be made in an orderly manner, permitting reassignment of the excess employees to other jobs without complete disruption to their lives and the lives of their families. These dedicated employees have established their homes at one end or the other of the line they have been working. They have bought houses, their children are in school, and they are part of the community in which they live. But they find that their long and faithful service entitles them to no consideration so far as the Post Office Department is concerned. They are told and I am told that "no regular postal employee will lose employment as a result of this action." This is true, of course, but the catch is they may have to sell their homes, take their children out of school, and move many miles away.

The most recent wave of RPO discontinuances will leave approximately 80 mobile clerks living in or in the immediate vicinity of my hometown of Omaha scrounging for other jobs. I have been advised that only 14 jobs have been made available for them in the Omaha post office, in spite of the fact that in recent weeks thousands of hours have been worked by temporary clerks and postal assistants who do not have career status. In addition, the attrition rate in the post office is high, requiring the continual hiring and training of new employees. It only makes sense, Mr. Speaker, that these excessed mobile employees should be placed in the local post office if there is work there for them to do, thus avoiding the expense, confusion, morale damage, and loss of efficiency in the postal operation resulting from relocation of employees to areas far from their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I have once again asked the Postmaster General to consider the welfare of these employees, as well as the postal service itself, and the pocketbooks of the taxpayers. A copy of my most recent letter to him follows, and I sincerely hope my plea will not fall on deaf ears.

OCTOBER 11, 1967.

Hon. LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LARRY: I find it necessary to contact you once again in behalf of the Mobile Postal Clerks who are being displaced and asked to disrupt their lives and the lives of their families, at great cost to themselves and the taxpayers, because of the wholesale abandonment of railway postal service.

I am particularly concerned, of course, for employees in the Omaha area. Information I have is that approximately 80 employees are affected by Mr. Hartigan's latest RPO slaughter. I understand that only 14 jobs in Omaha have been made available, even though officials of the Postal Clerks' union were assured some time ago by the Wichita Regional Office that jobs would be available in Omaha for the bulk of the excessed mobile clerks who wished to remain there.

There is little on this subject that I can add to what I have already said to you and other Department officials. I would only reiterate that I feel the Department has an obligation to these career employees, many of whom have more than 20 years of service, and I believe it would be in the best interests of all concerned if every effort were made to place them in the post offices nearest their homes, thus saving them the inconvenience, frustration, and expense of relocating in other areas, at the same time saving the Department and the taxpayers a considerable amount of money in relocation expenses.

Your further consideration of this urgent problem will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

Wall of Silence Surrounds U.S.S. "Liberty" Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on October 6 I wrote the following inquiry to the Secretary of State:

OCTOBER 6, 1967.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY: At the time of the Israeli attack on the U.S.S. *Liberty* it was stated that the Israeli Government would pay reparations to the United States for damage to the vessel and indemnification to injured United States personnel and survivors of United States personnel who were killed.

Would you kindly advise me in detail what, if anything, has been accomplished to date relative to these payments, the matter of apologies and all other developments concerning the matter.

Thank you for your courtesy in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

On the same date I wrote an identical letter to the Secretary of Defense.

Thus far I have heard nothing from the State Department and have received from Defense only a short acknowledgment under date of October 9, specifying that—

> This matter is receiving attention and you will be advised further as soon as possible.

Inasmuch as American lives were lost, American sailors were injured, and an American naval vessel was severely damaged by the attack on the U.S.S. *Liberty*, it seems to me that the U.S. Government by this time should be in a position to say something definitive about the whole affair and be in a position to give some assurances that the Israel Government is pursuing in good faith the matter of financial and other amends for the acts in this instance of members of its military establishment.

The Kee Report: Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this program is the Social Security System.

The report follows:

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee Report.

Your Congress is now engaged in what the experts describe as a routine revision of the Social Security system. While there has been controversy over a few amendments, the changes are too technical for review on a program of this nature.

In this time of alarm and excitement, a routine review of any Federal program is hardly likely to attract much public attention. I believe most of our citizens are deeply distressed at the growing wave of violence, both at home and abroad. However, in the midst of the world's bad news, perhaps this is the ideal time to review one of the most successful programs ever undertaken to aid those in need.

The Social Security system was launched a little more than 30 years ago, at a time when our national economy was slowly recovering from the great depression. The first and basic step was the establishment of a system of compulsory old-age insurance financed by the contributions of both employer and employee. Please bear in mind that in those days, the majority of retired workers had no fixed income and nothing to rely on except family support or public charity.

The insurance worked well from the beginning. But as late as the year 1950, only one quarter of our citizens over 65 years of age were receiving benefits under the Social Security system. The others were still outside its protection because for one reason or another, they failed to qualify. This group included self-employed persons, the employees of institutions or industries exempt from coverage, and women homemakers. Over the years since then, there has been a gradual expansion of social security coverage to help meet the financial needs of the majority of our senior citizens.

As a result, about 86 percent are now covered in one form or another. Perhaps the most satisfying feature is that the revised Social Security system attempts to make provision for those who need it most, the widows and orphans of deceased workers. The latest figures reveal that more than 14 million retired workers are now receiving monthly benefits, survivors benefits are going to more than 5 million widows and orphans, and benefits are also going to nearly 2 million disabled workers and their families.

A couple of years ago, during the last Congress, a further extension of the system was made when the medicare program was voted into law. This was adopted because experience had shown that the great majority of elderly Americans lacked the means for the medical costs of an extended illness. It is too early to evaluate the practical results of this program, but the urgency of the need is beyond question.

Social Security benefits, even for those who received the maximum amount, can hardly be called excessive. Yet, this monthly check represents the only income for 85 percent of those in the Social Security system.

Because of the current unrest, it is fashionable in some quarters to question the value of our Democratic institutions. Our system is not perfect. But it has brought more happiness to more people than any Government on earth.

Thank you for listening.

National Businesswomen's Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, October 15–21 has been designated as National Businesswomen's Week for 1967. The idea for observance of this week was first presented to the national convention of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs in 1928.

Its purpose is to publicize the achievements of business and professional women and to publicize the objectives and program of the National Federation. This week, a number of presidents of national organizations which serve career women are in the Nation's Capital for the Congress of Career Women. I understand that the focus of their meeting will be on the growing role of women in all phases of national life.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs was founded in 1919 as an outgrowth of the YWCA War Work Council of 1918.

Today there are more than 175,000 members of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs in more than 3,500 local groups. The membership represents some 700 occupations.

The objectives of the clubs are: to elevate the standards for women in business and in the professions; to promote the interests of business and professional women; to bring about a spirit of cooperation among business and professional women of the United States; and to extend opportunities to business and professional women through education along lines of industrial, scientific, and vocational activities.

Mr. Speaker, since 1923 the National Federation has sponsored awards and funds including a World Friendship Fund; the Lena Lake Forrest Fellowship Fund to finance research work in the problems of business and professional women; the U.N. fellowship which enables one of its members to study one of the agencies of the United Nations; the Sally Butler International Scholarship Fund; the Dr. Minnie L. Maffet Chinese Nurse's Memorial Fund; and the Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania Fund.

The federation also sponsors the Congress of American Women Leaders, participates in the International Federation of Business and Professional Women, and was instrumental in the creation of State commissions on the status of women.

Mr. Speaker, a tribute to the business and professional women of America is especially fitting in 1967 when one-third of the work force is made up of women, when more and more top Government positions are held by women, when women are heading brokerage firms and research teams, and when educated women whose children are grown are increasingly aware of the opportunities for career fulfillment which are available to them.

May I say that we welcome the ladies in Washington for the observance of National Businesswomen's Week, we commend them for the fine work they are doing, and we recognize them for their importance in every phase of the national life.

Congressman Horton Cites Team Sacrifices of Don Holleder—An "All America" Vietnam Victim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, Amerians were saddened this morning when they learned of the death in combat in Vietnam of a former all-America football hero, and an outstanding soldier, Maj. Don Holleder, of Webster, N.Y. I had the pleasure of knowing Don personally, and I would like to pay tribute to him today because his career typified the patriotic dedication which has been the bulwark of America's defense far more than any new developments in guns, planes, or rockets.

Mr. Speaker, Don Holleder was no ordinary man, any more than he was an ordinary soldier. Throughout his career, this young man showed unusual promise, unusual qualities of leadership, and an unusual sense of teamwork and consideration for the needs of others.

Don's consideration for and attention to his country's needs were almost too well demonstrated when he fell in combat yesterday in a strange and distant corner of the globe.

Don Holleder died in the flower of his manhood. Only God knows what contributions he would or could have made to his country and to mankind if he had survived the 1st Infantry's search-and-destroy mission in Vietnam yesterday. His untimely death compels us to look back on his short life to discern what sort of man he was:

The years between the moment when Don stepped forward to accept his diploma at Acquinas Institute in Rochester, N.Y., and the moment at 11:30 p.m. on the 17th of October when he was killed on a search-and-destroy mission in Binh Long Province, were years in which Don won championship on the gridiron and in his chosen military profession.

First, there was the distinction of a career at West Point where Don was an outstanding member of the football and basketball teams for 4 years.

The high point in his student days came in 1954 when he earned nationwide fame by being named an all-America end.

Don's unselfish devotion to the principle of team spirit showed itself the next year when the West Point team needed a quarterback. The coach asked Don to fill that position. Knowing that he would not be named an all-America as a beginning quarterback, but that he might win that honor again as an end, Don nevertheless sacrificed this chance for individual recognition for the benefit of the Army team. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, the parallel between Don's courageous personal sacrifice for the West Point football team, and his ultimate sacrifice in battle yesterday.

Don's military career after graduation from West Point showed a steady progression up the ladder of responsibility. From infantry school at Fort Benning he took aviation training and served in command positions. Don was assistant football coach at West Point, until last year, when he was given the assignment which showed that he had been marked for advancement in the Army—a year at the Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

Don completed that course in June of this year, and arrived in Vietnam last July as operations officer of the 1st Brigade of the 1st Infantry Division. It was in this important position, on a search-and-destroy mission, that Don was killed in action yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, Major Holleder's list of medals was impressive. He held the Air Medal, the Vietnam Campaign Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, and had earned the Combat Infantryman's Badge and the Ranger Tab.

But impressive as are his accomplishments in sports and in his professional career, I think Don typifies many young men today who dedicate themselves to the task of defending this Nation. It should serve as a reminder that too often we calculate the costs of war in terms of dollars, or planes. But the real cost is in the loss of fine young men like Maj. Don Holleder who must walk into the face of danger for the sake of the freedom of this Nation.

The occasion of the loss of this famed athlete and soldier is the proper occasion not only to mourn his loss, but to again firmly resolve that when our national policies require that we ask our young men to go into battle in the national interest, that the reasons be clear, and the need urgent.

There is no adequate consolation for Don Holleder's wife and family, and for his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Irving A. Cowles, of Lake Road, Webster, N.Y., in my congressional district, beyond knowing that we, and all Americans, feel his loss deeply and realize that the way of life we cherish is more secure because he was, for too short a time, among us.

ACYPL

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1967

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House another project recently sponsored by the American Council of Young Political Leaders—ACYPL—of which my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, LEE HAMILTON, and I are directors.

With the cooperation of the Department of State, the ACYPL on September 8 sent a delegation of 10 young American political leaders, five Young Republicans and five Young Democrats, on a 2-week study tour of four European countries. The purpose of this program was to familiarize these young American leaders with some of the attitudes current among young political leaders in Europe and to give the Europeans an idea of current thinking among young leaders here about the vital international and domestic issues that face us all. In addition, the young Americans had the opportunity to learn firsthand about politics in the countries they visited and obtained valuable experience in the give-and-take of international relations. Finally, the young Americans developed close personal ties with their European counterparts which will endure throughout their political careers.

The delegation was led by Kansas State Senator Tom Van Sickle, former national chairman of the Young Republicans, and Virgil Musser, national president of the Young Democrats. Included on the delegation were Republicans James Goetz, Lieutenant Governor of Minnesota; James Culbertson, chairman of the North Carolina Federation of Young Republicans; Richard Carling, member of the Utah House of Representatives; and B. B. McClendon, Jr., former general counsel of the Young Republican National Federation. The Democrats on the delegation were Alice McMahon, Young Democratic national committeewoman from Florida; Norman Cohen, Young Democratic president in New Jersey; Paul Pendergast, executive assistant to the Governor of Kansas; and Paul Lister, national treasurer of the Young Democrats.

The group was first briefed by the NATO international staff in Paris and by our Ambassador to NATO, Harlan Cleveland. After observing the Atlantic Treaty Association Assembly in Luxembourg and attending a meeting of the Atlantic Association of Young Political Leaders, the delegation visited Bonn and Berlin where they met with young German political leaders and received briefings from German Foreign Ministry officials. Last stop on the tour was London, where the group met with young British leaders and parliamentarians, discussed the British economy at the Treasury, and observed the recent by-election at Cambridge.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in Germany and England the U.S. delegation was accorded the official hospitality of the Government. Expenses for hotel, food, and domestic travel were borne in Germany by the Ring Politischer Jugend, which is an all-party youth organization heavily financed by the Federal and Lander governments. In England, the British Foreign Office, at the request of the British Atlantic Group of Young Politicians, provided the young American visitors with 4 days of first-class accommodation. Having participated in similar programs as a young political leader, I am fully aware of the value and educational impact of such exchanges among young political leaders from various European countries.

Mr. Speaker, our American equivalent of these organizations, the American Council of Young Political Leaders, is presently unable to host such a group of visiting delegations of foreign young political leaders. This fine organization, supported jointly by the Young Republican National Federation and the Young Democratic Clubs of America, the two official political youth organizations of the United States, has a current bank balance, according to a recent article in the Portland, Maine, Telegram, of $10.63. Should we not consider some way in which our politically active youth can carry on programs that our European allies and, indeed, other countries of the world find within their means?

Certainly, the international education and associations of our future political leadership and the future political leadership of other countries is vital and important enough to merit a larger bank account than $10.63. I am fully aware of existing programs operated by the Department of State and affiliated agencies to achieve these ends. Unfortunately, the bona fide politician, the person who has demonstrated his political ability by obtaining elective party or public office at an early age, is too often neglected in such programs. Of the dozens of foreign young political leaders I have met during my participation in young political leader activities, very few have had the opportunity to visit the United States under existing governmental and private programs. Most of these young political leaders from foreign countries are, or will be, in positions of great influence in their respective parties and governments.

Unlike existing programs, the ACYPL offers hospitality to young visiting political leaders that have shown sufficient interest in our free and democratic system to have raised transportation money to visit the United States from sources in their own countries. The fact that they have been able to find transportation funds from either party, governmental, or other sources in their own countries is a firm indication of approval from their own governments and support of their own political ability and future.

I believe we must find a mechanism to allow our young political leaders, operating through the ACYPL, to finance reciprocal treatment that is accorded them in foreign countries. In our modern world, where international understanding at the political level is so vital, we should expand programs such as those conducted by the American Council of Young Political Leaders as a partial solution to ever present and increasing problems of international scope.

Mining Seminar, Barstow, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1967

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nevada, Congressman WALTER S. BARING, and the gentleman from Utah, Congressman LAURENCE J. BURTON, and I attended a mining seminar last Saturday in Barstow, Calif., and I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the major events of this seminar. The purpose of the convention was to work out a cooperative spirit between Government and private industry with the object of revitalizing the mining industry in the West.

Mr. Speaker, by acclamation, the convention, attended by 750 registrants, endorsed the following four resolutions:

First. That Congress enact rules and regulations for the Department of Interior, to correct present unrealistic regulations. This resolution asks Congress to bring about an administration of mining law in the spirit and intent of Congress and the people.

Second. That State and county departments concerned with planning and approval of new mines and mills change attitudes and procedures for a better relationship with the mining industry.

Third. For many years the Government has paid subsidies to farmers, the merchant marine, and the aircraft industry, and has provided oil depletion allowances. Therefore, the President and the Congress should either subsidize the mining industry or eliminate subsidies and restrictions altogether and return to a free economy for all.

Fourth. That the seminar be annual, and its name changed from a county mining seminar to the Western States Seminar.

Mr. Speaker, the keynote addresses were delivered by my good friends and colleagues, Congressman WALTER S. BARING and Congressman LAURENCE J. BURTON, and it is a pleasure, therefore, for me to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD their remarks as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WALTER S. BARING, DEMOCRAT, OF NEVADA, BEFORE THE FIRST ANNUAL SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MINING SEMINAR, BARSTOW, CALIF.

Mayor Gilliam, Chairman Mikesell, my colleagues from the House of Representatives, distinguished guests, and members of the mining fraternity:

I always feel at home when I am in the midst of those who have the fortitude to explore for and develop the minerals that lie within the earth—mainly because even when they suffer economic setbacks they remain affable and confident in their future.

I am happy that this seminar has come into being and wish to compliment my good friend and colleague, Congressman Jerry Pettis for his vision and determination to bring about a constructive and public discussion of the problems of mining in San Bernardino County. I join with him in the hope that the views aired here and the suggestions made here will be given careful consideration by our mineral policy makers. I for one, look for positive action, not just promises or excuses from them.

Here we are in the nation's largest county with a history of mineral production highly helpful to the development of the West but where for the lack of sound policies the full potential of mineral development is not being realized. Is this potential to be denied realization and great producing properties of the past to become ghost areas and tourist attractions only? I cannot conclude that you would have it that way.

There are those, in this and past administrations both Democrats and Republicans with a different outlook than mine, who would have you believe that the mining industry of this country never had it so good. They point to high production and earnings and take credit for them. Have you ever heard them step forward with positive policies to aid our small miners, the very backbone of our mineral development in the past? Have you ever heard them announce, voluntarily, changes in onerous regulations or policies to encourage the search for and mining of our hidden ore bodies?

I say the record does not show concern over the plight or welfare of the miner. Rather it has been clouded with political soft soap, skillfully applied, with indifference and even callous disregard for those who risk their capital in pursuit of minerals in the ground. The record, too, is replete, with ever changing ground rules designed to make it more and more difficult to bring in new mines and develop them—particularly on the public lands.

Time will not permit me to cite but a few of the myriad of problems with which the mining industry has been beset and where solutions advanced by bureaucratic administration have discouraged rather than encouraged mineral progress. Let's take a look at the public lands area for a moment. Repeated efforts have been made by the bureaucrats to undermine our basic mining laws. Various regulations and rulings by Interior Department officials have attempted to erode the mining laws by holding that a mineral discovery on mining claims must be accompanied by a demonstration of "commercial value" of the product of the claim. They are still trying but, fortunately, the courts of the West have recently overturned the Departmental decision in this regard. What the final outcome will be in the higher courts, no one can say, but you may rest assured that the responsible mining industry will continue to challenge the action of the Department in denying location or patent on the grounds of lack of commercial marketability.

All of you here are probably familiar with the continuing efforts of the Interior Department to define "common varieties" of minerals under Public Law 167 in the narrowest sense. Patents have been denied and claims rules invalid in many instances where I believe that the minerals involved were certainly *not* of a "common variety." Although I have introduced a bill to clarify this situation, I am not sure that new legislation can specifically define "common varieties" better than existing law, without creating new problems unless the Department of the Interior is willing to cooperate by making reasonable interpretations of the laws passed by Congress. I do believe that reasonable administration, carefully evaluating each case on its own merits, can result in fair and equitable treatment of locations for minerals of an "uncommon variety" nature. Minerals, even though they are of common occurrence, may possess distinct and special values which properly qualify them for location under the mining laws. High type cement rock: special grade building stone; terrazzos of special grade and particular use, to my way of thinking, are *not* "common varieties." The only common thing about them is the uncommon treatment that has been accorded their claimants by the Department of the Interior. I do not believe that those administering the law today have carried out the intent of Congress but rather have sought to legislate by ruling and regulatory authority they did not receive in the enabling act.

Land withdrawal policies have certainly created havoc with mineral development. As you know, we have had numerous military withdrawals, too many of which have occurred in this country. Recently Congress has attempted to put some control over them by requiring that such withdrawals of 5,000 acres or more must have Congressional approval. This does not, however, provide for the lands returned to the public domain after they have served their usefulness, nor does it make sure that multiple use is placed in effect wherever it does not interfere with straightforward military activities. While there is this partial control over some defense withdrawals, there is no like control over other types of withdrawals, the majority of which prohibit operation of the mining laws. I have introduced legislation to correct this and to prevent future indiscriminate withdrawals harmful to adequate development of our mining industry. I hope we can secure its passage so that some curb may be placed on the bureaucrats.

Another type of land action that is causing great concern today, and particularly in my own state of Nevada, is the classification of public lands for specific purposes under provisions of Public Law 88–607 of 1964. That Act, passed as a temporary measure pending the report of the Public Land Law Review Commission's study of public land laws and their administration, provided for classification of public lands for disposal or interim management. The effect of such classification is to segregate the lands from settlement, location, sale, selection, entry, lease or other formal disposal under the public land laws, *including the mining and mineral leasing laws,* except to the extent that the proposed classification notice specifies that the land shall remain open for one or more forms of disposal under terms of existing land laws. This segregation was not intended to be kept in perpetuity, nor was it intended that every inch of public lands be classified prior to the Public Land Law Commission report. Were they all to be classified for specific uses, the work of the Commission might well be in vain. I submit that the Interior Department has sent its employees scurrying about the public land areas to classify as much land as possible in as short a time as possible and make it difficult for undoing such classification.

I am told that the Department is of the opinion that such classifications are of indefinite duration. This was not the intent of Congress. It is another example of assumption of authority beyond the intent of the legislation. I hope that Congress will exert its constitutional authority and reverse this move, thus reinstating the checks and balance between the legislative and executive branches of Government in land matters.

Before turning to a few other specific examples of unenlightened mineral policy, let me take this occasion to call your attention to the difficult and challenging task being undertaken by the Public Land Law Review Commission, of which Representative Larry Burton of Utah, and I have the honor of being members. Headed by my good friend, Chairman Wayne N. Aspinall of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Commission is forging ahead in its review of the more than 5,000 public land laws, the countless thousands of administrative regulations, rules and interpretations, and in the sifting of constructive suggestions from citizens in all parts of the country. I am sure the monumental job confronting it will result in a series of recommendations that will provide a guidepost for much needed revisions to remove inequities in law and administration and provide for maximum benefits to all of our people from our available public lands. This county should be proud of the fact that County Commissioner Nancy Smith is a member of the Commission and has participated in all of its work. Her awareness of your problems will certainly be of great help in arriving at solutions to mineral problems that will revitalize mining not only in this county, but throughout the United States.

Let us now take a look at other facets of mineral policies.

Minerals stockpiling is a good example of the destruction of confidence of the mining industry in the soundness of government policies. It was a firm, and I believe excellent, policy of the Government to create a national stockpile of strategic metals and minerals necessary to our defense. It proved its value in time of need. Pathetic today, however, are the views expressed by expert mining people years ago, when they said unless Congress securely retained the key to disposal of stockpile accumulations, materials in the stockpiles could be disposed of in an unbridled manner.

Their very existence would always have an unhealthy and repressive effect on the mining industry. How true these predictions of over 20 years ago have proved. You are all aware of the drive of two years ago and again last year to get rid of metals and minerals by public sale so as to reduce budget deficits. Mind you the concern was for obtaining funds. I maintain that this type of policy is depressive to our mining industry, is toying with possible defense requirements and supplies, and plays into the hands of those that believe we should keep our minerals in the ground and obtain our supplies from foreign sources. If you will review the history of our stockpile policies, I believe you can only arrive at the conclusion that the domestic mining industry was encouraged to build stockpiles and then thoroughly discouraged through a reversal of policy, adopted primarily to produce revenue or to hold prices at an unrealistic level. This is not the American way. We must not permit its continuance.

We have seen the sorry spectacles in the past of crash programs for mineral production and then their quick termination when they have served their needs—always with but little regard for the miner. The purchase programs for antimony, manganese, tungsten, mercury, etc., are good examples of this. The philosophy here was "get the miner to turn the spigot on, and we'll decide when to turn it off." Feast or famine, take your choice! What a policy!

We have seen efforts, year after year, to aid our domestic lead and zinc producers come to naught because of Executive Department opposition or outright threat of veto. It's been against tariff relief, quotas, purchase programs. It's been for a zero lead and zinc stockpile. What is it for—export of our lead and zinc job opportunities abroad?

We have seen our domestic uranium industry burgeon and deflate because of lack of long range policies. Again, miners turn the spigot on, "your Government will tell you when to turn it off."

We have seen our money cheapened through the downgrading of gold and silver in our monetary system. The prediction that many of us have made for a decade or more with respect to domestic supplies of these precious metals have been borne out. Throttled by Federal price control, unable to absorb more than tripled production costs, and denied the right to operate in a free market, domestic precious metal production could not and cannot meet demand.

The law of supply and demand has at last caught up with silver and the Government has had to admit that its supplies and its price control cannot now support industrial and coinage demands even with less silver being used in the coins. The operation of the law of supply and demand has brought a price increase accompanied by expanded exploration for new deposits (witness the Calico operations in this country) and increased production. Why did the Government continue to subsidize silver consumers at the expense of domestic miners when the supply-demand handwriting was on the wall? Do we always have to wait for emergency and crash programs?

(Perhaps the capable efforts of American Smelting and Refining Company and other forward looking mining companies may again result in a soundly based silver mining base here in San Bernardino.)

Gold, likewise, may respond to the law of supply and demand after having been shackled by Government fiat since 1934. As you know, I and many of my colleagues have urged for years that domestic gold mining be revitalized through various means—subsidies, bonus payments, free market, tax incentives, stockpiling and the like. Our plaintive marches to the White House and to the responsible Government Departments have met with sympathy but no substance in the form of assistance. Thus, I have again sponsored legislation to provide financial aid to gold mining. It has been approved by our committee and I hope that it may receive the green light for passage.

Internationalists and timid Government officials have practically written the destruction of our domestic gold miner. Substitution of paper money for gold backing of our currency practically removes gold from our monetary system. Why then does the Government persist in opposing a proper price, arrived at in the market place, for gold? It says Uncle feels it could bring about a loss in confidence in the dollar. How about the loss in confidence of those who would pan for gold, seek new gold supplies, and produce gold to meet the rising industrial demands if the price was right. Are not they entitled to a fair shake? How long do they have to continue as second class citizens?

How do we forge a minerals program to restore confidence in the miner? To do this, we must remove the fetters that shackle domestic mining. We must get the Executive Branch out of legislating through regulation and opinion. We must strengthen our mining industry, not mummify it.

I ask each of you to sound off to your elected officials and to the public at large, letting them know what policies are needed if mining is to develop in this country, in this State, and in this Nation. There is an old but appropriate saying "give the people light and they will find a way." I hope that you will aid all of us who are your friends in Congress by getting enough light on mining problems that the administrative branch will find a way to harness its lethal weapon labeled "veto" and find a way to strengthen the mining industry through sound policies that can be counted on not to be changed at the whim of bureaucrats. Given constructive guidelines, we in Congress can look forward to enacting the laws that will provide mining with the confidence to meet the challenge of the future.

REMARKS OF HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues from the House of Representatives, and members of the mining fraternity:

I have a deep interest in the maintenance of adequate stockpiles of strategic materials as a necessary supplement of our mineral production and other raw material programs. Such a program is vitally necessary to our national security and defense.

I did not, however, think that my research into latest stockpile policies would result in finding that our stockpile material experts place the things that dreams are made of above essential mineral commodities such as lead and zinc. But this, alas, is true. On January 6 of this year, the Office of Emergency Planning finally (after years of promises) announced nuclear war stockpile objectives and a comparison of them with conventional war objectives.

Here's but a sample of what our stockpile planners have arrived at:

1. *Opium*, which has a zero goal for a conventinal war, requires 143,000 pounds for a nuclear war!

2. *Feathers and down* should be stockpiled to the tune of 3 million pounds for both types of wars, conventional or nuclear.

3. We still need 558,000 pounds of *castor oil* in the event of a nuclear war, a drastic reduction from the 22 million pounds needed for a conventional war. (The use of nuclear bombs has obvious implications.)

4. Such important materials as aluminum, asbestos, certain types of bauxite, cadmium, copper, fluorspar, molybdenum, and lead and zinc are cut to a zero goal in event of a nuclear war!

Obviously, the establishment of the nuclear objectives and even of reduced conventional war objectives is going to have an impact upon the domestic mining industry. All of you are aware that the administration aims at realizing another billion dollars from stockpile sales of so-called excesses. The main value in this regard lies in the stockpile holdings of lead and zinc which have an approximate value of three quarters of a billion dollars.

Last year, with the leadership of Chairman Aspinall, the House Interior Committee held exhaustive hearings on the stockpile program and its relationship to domestic mining. These hearings resulted in a full and frank discussion of our stockpile policies, and I think raised some serious doubts as to the adequacy of even some of our conventional objectives. We did not then know what the nuclear objectives would be.

I would also point out to you that Congress has refused to transfer blanket stockpile disposal authority to the Executive Branch despite repeated efforts made in this direction. However, what the Executive Branch has not been able to obtain in one all-encompassing bill, it is getting piecemeal from Congress. Last year alone, it approved a large sheaf of bills calling for disposition of a broad range of mineral commodities. We have received notice from the Administration regarding the further disposal of stockpile minerals and metals. These will include proposals for disposition from both the national and supplemental stockpiles of 115,000 ounces of platinum, 1,200,000 pounds of bismuth, 60,000,000 pounds of nickel, 7,640 tons of rare earth materials, 15,000,000 pounds of molybdenum, 55,000 short tons of magnesium.

I know that all of you in the mining industry do not object to stockpile releases where complete justification has been made for them in the interest of national security, or even when really needed to meet the needs of our economy, but I am keenly aware of the criticism of the manner in which many releases are made. Such criticisms are justifiable, and I urge all of you to be sure that your views are made known to Congress when these measures are up for consideration by the Congress.

Undoubtedly, there is real justification for the stockpiling of opium, castor oil, and feathers and down; but there is equal justification for maintenance of a sound mining industry with essential minerals and metals in the stockpile. On the other hand, it is my personal opinion that the interests of the mining industry cannot be best served if the policy of any Administration is to consider the mining industry itself as a stockpile.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Gay Helen Barnett, managing editor of the Barstow Desert Dispatch, Barstow, Calif., appeared in the Desert Dispatch on Monday, October 16, 1967. I commend this feature story of the mining seminar to the attention of my colleagues and to the Government officials concerned with the problems of the mining industry:

RESOLUTIONS RECEIVED UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY MINING DELEGATES

(By Gay Helen Barnett)

Over 800 miners and those representing mining interests unanimously approved four resolutions at the conclusion of the first annual mining seminar held at Barstow College Saturday.

The resolutions came after the day long seminar heard directors of nine federal agencies involved in mining determinations explain the positions and policies and help available from the different agencies.

There was one fact that was made absolutely clear at Saturday's mining seminar at Barstow College, and that is the miners and the mining industry is extremely unhappy with the federal government.

The extent of the miners unhappiness with government policy was most clearly stated when Representative Jerry Pettis told a news conference that the federal directors of agencies involved in mining had "real guts" to even appear at the seminar.

The panel of government experts was not allowed to answer questions from the floor, but only those submitted in writing earlier for evaluation by the screening committee. This plan was undoubtedly felt necessary by the government to prevent department heads from obligating it to what could be termed indiscreet statements or promises.

As uncommitting and unadmitting as the panelists were, their stand was received goodnaturedly by the miners, a crusty and outspoken group at heart.

Government gobbledygook was received with chuckles and hearty laughs, despite the fact the industry has good reason for their complaints.

I call miners crusty and outspoken, and that's not an insult, it's a deep down truth. Anyone with enough fortitude to try making a living by digging an expensive hole in the ground in the hopes they'll strike paydirt has got to have real courage and, because government has forced them to be independent of anyone or anything, they are indeed outspoken about their livelihood.

Despite the shackles put on the federal panelists, a lot of good did come out of the seminar. The mining industry had a chance to hear what programs are available to assist them in their work, and what must have been the best news to those attending was the "hint" that indeed there may be discrepancies in the administering of mining laws.

I predict the only problem arising as the result of the mining seminar in Barstow will be the battle royal as to who will host the affair next year. For a program planned for a couple of hundred interested in mining, the turnout of about 800, all concerned with the same subject, can only be termed fantastic. There will be many a San Bernardino County city bidding for the seminar next year. Let's hope the steering committee will see to it that it stays right here in Barstow. It's a boom to our economy, not to mention our status.

The first resolution asked that those departments of state and county governments concerned with planning and approval of new mines and mills be urged to change their attitudes and procedures to facilitate a better relationship with the mining industry and promote that industry. The resolution cited the problems and bottlenecks that have impeded progress of the mining industry.

The second resolution cited the importance of the future of our country that we have a strong mining industry. It stated that mines and miners have met with problems in the past from various federal agencies involved in administering the mining laws which at times has been impeded by unrealistic regulations to the extent it is now almost impossible to patent a mining claim. The resolution urged that Congress enact rules and regulations for the Department of the Interior to administer the mining law in the spirit and intent of Congress and the people of the United States.

The last resolution received a round of hearty applause from those attending the seminar as the resolution complained of the many years of artificial monetary restriction on the prices paid for gold and silver by the U.S. Treasury that has resulted in thousands of idle mines and unemployed miners. The resolution stated that for many years the government has paid parity and other forms of subsidies to farmers, merchant marine and aircraft industry, and also oil depletion allowances. It resolved that the President and the Congress either subsidize the mining industry or eliminate subsidies and restrictions altogether and return to a free economy for all. The resolution was met with an ovation as the miners unanimously approved the resolution.

By general agreement of the seminar attendance the annual seminar will be renamed the Western States Mining Seminar, designating the inclusion of the eleven states concerned with mining in the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

You have need of patience, so that you may do the will of God and receive the promise.—Hebrews 10: 36.

Let us pray.

O God and Father of us all, in this quiet moment of prayer we come with humble and contrite hearts acknowledging our dependence upon Thee and praying that with Thee we may live through these critical days with courage and with faith. Give to us an inner greatness of spirit, an inner graciousness of heart, and an inner gentleness of mind that we may be more than a match for the challenge of this hour. Make us patient with each other and understanding, for we do not know the battles others are fighting nor the experiences they are facing.

We pray for the men and women defending our freedom with their lives. Grant unto them strength in need, help in danger, healing in body, and courage of mind and heart. May their sacrifice not be in vain. With them may we unite in proclaiming the life of liberty and the fruits of freedom now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11456) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 13 to the foregoing bill.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE—SUBPENA SERVED ON CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1967.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: By this letter I am transmitting to you a subpoena which was served upon me on October 17, 1967.

This subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, commands my appearance on Monday, October 23, 1967 at 2 p.m., to testify on behalf of the United States regarding an investigation being conducted for possible violations of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 101, and 1505.

The rules, practices, customs, and precedents of the House of Representatives require that no official, staff member, or employee of the House may, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena, testify regarding official functions, documents, or activities of the House without the consent of the House being first obtained.

The subpoena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Respectfully submitted.

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, the subpena will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The subpena referred to follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOTE.—Report to room No. 3825, third floor, U.S. District Court Building, Third and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

Spa ad Test—Court of Chief Judge Curran.

United States of America in re possible violations of title 18, United States Code, sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505.

The President of the United States to the Honorable W. Pat Jennings, Clerk, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, October 23, 1967 at 2:00 p.m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the U.S. Attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Edward M. Curran, Chief Judge of said court, this 11th day of October A.D., 1967.

ROBERT M. STEARNS,
Clerk.
By: DANIEL J. MENCOBONI,
Deputy Clerk.

(Edward J. Barnes, John Wall, Benton L. Becker, attorneys for United States.)

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE—SUBPENA SERVED ON MR. HOLLOWELL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1967.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEAR SIR: By this letter I am transmitting to you a subpoena which was served upon my legal advisor and administrative assistant, Mr. Hollowell, on October 18, 1967.

This subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, commands his appearance on Monday, October 23, 1967 at 2 p.m., to testify on behalf of the United States regarding an investigation being conducted for possible violations of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001, and 1501.

The rules, practices, customs, and precedents of the House of Representatives require that no official, staff member, or employee of the House may, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena, testify regarding official functions, documents, or activities of the House without the consent of the House being first obtained.

The subpoena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Respectfully submitted.

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the subpena will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The subpena referred to follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Report to U.S. District Court House, between Third Street and John Marshall Place and on Constitution Avenue NW., room 3812, Washington, D.C.

The United States in re possible violations of title 18, United States Code, sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505.

The President of the United States to Billie Gene Hollowell, legal advisor to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to attend before the grand jury of said court on Monday, the 23d day of October 1967, at 2:00 o'clock p.m. to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness: The Honorable Edward M. Curran, chief judge of said court, this 18th day of October 1967.

ROBERT M. STEARNS,
Clerk.
By: H. KLINE,
Deputy Clerk.

(Edward J. Barnes, John Wall, Benton L. Becker, attorneys for the United States.)

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—SUBPENA SERVED ON MR. McCORD

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Robert E. McCord, Chief Clerk of the Committee on Education and Labor, has received a Subpoena Ad Testificandum from the United States District Court dated October 17, 1967, to appear before a Grand Jury of said Court on Monday, October 23, 1967, at 2:00 p.m. in relation to possible violations of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505. The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicate that no official or employee of the House may either voluntarily or in obedience to a Subpoena Ad Testificandum appear without the consent of the House being first obtained.

The Subpoena Ad Testificandum is herewith attached and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the subpena will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The subpena referred to follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Report to U.S. District Court House, between 3d Street and John Marshall Place and on Constitution Avenue NW., room 3812, Washington, D.C.

The United States in re possible violations of title 18, United States Code, sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505.

The President of the United States to Robert McCord, clerk, House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to attend before the Grand Jury of said Court on Monday, the 23d day of October, 1967, at 2 o'clock p.m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the Court without leave of the Court or District Attorney.

Witness: The Honorable Edward M. Curran, chief judge of said court, this 17th day of October 1967.

ROBERT M. STEARNS,
Clerk.
By: H. KLINE,
Deputy Clerk.

(Edward J. Barnes, John Wall, Benton L. Becker, attorneys for the United States.)

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—SUBPENAS SERVED ON MRS. DARGANS, MR. BERENS, MRS. SHULER AND MR. WARREN

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Four additional employees of the Committee on Education and Labor have received Subpoenae Ad Testificandum from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, each dated October 10, 1967, to appear before a Grand Jury of said Court in relation to possible violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505.

These employees and the dates and times they have been commanded to attend the said Court are:

Mrs. Louise M. Dargans, Research Director on October 24, 1967, at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Donald F. Berens, Administrative Assistant on October 25, 1967, at 10:00 a.m.

Mrs. Mary L. Shuler, Stenographer-Clerk Typist on October 24, 1967, at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. John E. Warren, Office Clerk on October 25, 1967, at 10:00 a.m.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicate that no official or employee of the House may either voluntarily or in obedience to a Subpoena Ad Testificandum appear without the consent of the House being first obtained.

The Subpoenae Ad Testificandum are herewith attached and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the subpenas will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The subpenas referred to follow:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTICT OF COLUMBIA

Report to room No. 3825, third floor, U.S. District Court Building, Third and Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, D.C.

Spa ad Test—Court of Chief Judge Curran.

United States of America v. in re possible violations of title 18, United States Code, sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505.

The President of the United States to Mrs. Louise M. Dargans, 301 G Street, SW., Washington, D.C., or House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said Court on Tue. Oct. 24, 1967 at 10:00 a.m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the U.S. Attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Edward M. Curran, chief judge of said court, this 10th day of October AD., 1967

ROBERT M. STEARNS,
Clerk.
By: DANIEL J. MENCOBONI,
Deputy Clerk.

(Edward J. Barnes, John Wall, Benton L. Becker, attorneys for the United States.)

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Report to room No. 3825, third floor, U.S. District Court Building, Third and Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, D.C.

Spa ad Test—Court of Chief Judge Curran.

United States of America in re possible violations of title 18, United States Code, sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505.

The President of the United States to Donald F. Berens, 9863 Telegraph Road, Apartment 1, Lanham, Md., 20801 or House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said Court on Wednesday, October 25, 1967, at 10:00 a.m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the U.S. attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Edward M. Curran, Chief Judge of said court, this 10th day of October AD., 1967.

ROBERT M. STEARNS,
Clerk.
By: DANIEL J. MENCOBONI,
Deputy Clerk.

(Edward J. Barnes, John Wall, Benton L. Becker, attorneys for the United States.)

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Report to room No. 3825, third floor, U.S. District Court Building, Third and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Spa ad Test—Court of Chief Judge Curran.

United States of America in re possible violations of title 18, United States Code, sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505.

The President of the United States to Mrs. Mary L. Schuler, 6509 Piney Branch Road NW., Washington, D.C. or House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Tuesday, October 24, 1967, at 10:00 a.m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the U.S. attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Edward M. Curran, chief judge of said court, this 10th day of October AD., 1967.

ROBERT M. STEARNS,
Clerk.
By: DANIEL J. MENCOBONI,
Deputy Clerk.

(Edward J. Barnes, John Wall, Benton L. Becker, attorneys for the United States.)

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Report to room No. 3825, third floor, U.S. District Court Building, Third and Constitutional Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Spa ad Test—Court of Chief Judge Curran.

United States of America in re possible violations of title 18, United States Code, sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505.

The President of the United States to John E. Warren, 4065 Minnesota Avenue NE., Washington, D.C., or House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Wednesday, October 25, 1967, at 10:00 a.m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the United States attorney.

Witness, The Honorable Edward M. Curran, chief judge of said court, this 10th day of October AD., 1967.

ROBERT M. STEARNS,
Clerk.
By: DANIEL J. MENCOBONI,
Deputy Clerk.

(Edward J. Barnes, John Wall, Benton L. Becker, attorneys for the United States.)

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—SUBPENA SERVED ON MR. LANGSTON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on House Administration:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Julian P. Langston, Chief Clerk of the Committee on House Administration, has received a subpoena ad testificandum from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, dated October 23, 1967, to appear before a Grand Jury of said Court on Monday, October 23, 1967 at 2:00 p.m. in relation to possible violations of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505.

The rules and practices of the House of Representatives indicate that no official or employee of the House may either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena ad testificandum appear without the consent of the House.

The subpoena is attached herewith and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Sincerely yours,
OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the subpena will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The subpena referred to follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Report to room No. 3825—third floor, U.S. District Court Building, Third and Constitution Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.

Spa ad Test—Court of Chief Judge Curran.

United States of America v. in re Possible Violations of Title 18, United States Code, sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505.

The President of the United States to Julian P. Langston, Chief Clerk, Committee on House Administration, Room H 326, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.; and bring with you copies of: (1) H.R. 294 (88th Congress); (2) H.R. 7 (89th Congress); (3) Public Law 89–90 (89th Congress); H.R. 8775, enacted into law on July 27, 1965.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, October 23, 1967, at 2:00 p.m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the U.S. attorney.

Witness, The Honorable Edward M. Curran, chief judge of said court, this —— day of —— AD, 19—.

ROBERT M. STEARNS,
Clerk.
By ANNA M. KENNY,
Deputy Clerk.

(Edward J. Barnes, John Wall, Benton L. Becker, attorneys for the United States.)

AUTHORIZATION FOR HOUSE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES TO APPEAR AS WITNESSES BEFORE GRAND JURY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 950) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 950

Whereas in the investigation of possible violations of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 201, 287, 371, 641, 1001 and 1505, a subpena ad testificandum was issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and addressed to W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear before the grand jury of said court on October 23, 1967, to testify in connection with matters under investigation by the grand jury; and

Whereas other officers and staff employees of the House of Representatives have received, or may receive, subpenas ad testificandum to appear before the said grand jury in connection with the before-mentioned investigation; and

Whereas information secured by officers and staff employees of the House of Representatives pursuant to their official duties as such officers or employees may not be revealed without the consent of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House of Representatives, is authorized to appear in response to the subpena before-mentioned as a witness before the grand jury; and be it further

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives is authorized to permit any other officer or employee of the House who is in receipt of or shall receive a subpena ad testificandum in connection with the proceedings conducted by the grand jury before-mentioned to appear in response thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 889, DESIGNATING SAN RAFAEL WILDERNESS, LOS PADRES NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 889), to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BARING, JOHNSON of California, UDALL, SAYLOR, and REINECKE.

DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS TO CREDIT OF CHEYENNE-ARAPAHO TRIBES OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1933) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, with Senate amendments to the House amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments to the House amendment, as follows:

Page 4, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 6 to 11, inclusive.

Page 4, line 12, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "7." and insert "6."

Page 5, line 1, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "8." and insert "7."

The Senate amendments to the House amendment were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON APPROPRIATION BILL FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, October 20, 1967, to file a report on the bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT reserved all points of order on the bill.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORTS ON H.R. 9960, INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING APPROPRIATION BILL, AND H.R. 1274, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and on the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, may have until midnight Friday to file conference reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], the ranking minority member on this subcommittee, is ill. This is a very controversial bill, it involves large sums of money, and the conferees are still in conference. There are some 60 items of disagreement. There is some serious disagreement. It is a large bill, and requires thorough study. For these reasons I am constrained, on behalf of myself and others, to object.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], a valued member of our committee, has been ill for the past 2 weeks. I went out to see him at the hospital at Bethesda. He was on the floor yesterday afternoon and he said he would be at the conference meeting today. I have just spoken to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and he said that we must get on with this conference which has been too long delayed.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed on May 17. Of course, we are all sorry about the illness of our colleague, but I think we should move on with this matter so that the conference report may be filed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. I sympathize with our chairman's feelings. We are anxious to get on with this bill, too. But the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] is the ranking member of this committee on our side and he is ill. He asked me to object. For that reason I do object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

DEMONSTRATORS SHOULD BE DEALT WITH FIRMLY AND QUICKLY

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the draft dodgers at the University of Wisconsin and in Oakland, Calif., have given us a preview of what might happen here in Washington this Saturday. The demonstrators during the past several days have fought back at the police, hurling rocks, shoes, and other objects and have refused to disperse.

Even though the leaders profess to adhere to the policy of nonviolence, the word has gone out for militant violent protest by individuals during these demonstrations. To gain publicity they know that they must attack the police or armed soldiers who might be around to maintain order. The more violent they become, the more publicity they get.

And Saturday you can expect to hear the old Communist cry of police brutality.

I have asked the Attorney General to prosecute anyone who violates any laws during these demonstrations Saturday. The right to freedom of speech I certainly agree with, but the right to disrupt and destroy our Armed Forces certainly was never contemplated by our Founding Fathers under the protection given under the first amendment.

The bearded ones, the hippies, and the traitors will all be here on Saturday. The people of the United States expect them to be dealt with firmly and quickly if they attempt to stop the operation of the Pentagon.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, the conferees are considering the appropriation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The issues before these conferees include programs involving hundreds of millions of dollars. I hope that in their deliberations they will not overlook a small but important program. Last spring, HUD established the metropolitan expediter program on a pilot basis to acquaint local officials with the many Federal assistance programs available to them and to help them use these programs effectively. In May, the House denied funds for the program. Since then, the Senate has restored $350,000 so that the program can be reinstated on a small experimental basis.

One of the four areas to receive the services of an expediter was the Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton metropolitan area in my district. The program has been of great value to local officials throughout this area. Its greatest impact, according to Mayor Payrow, of Bethlehem, was on smaller communities in the area which felt that, for the first time, they too had a chance to participate in federally assisted programs. Other officials throughout this metropolitan area have strongly urged that the program be reinstated.

I have also been advised that continuance of this program is strongly supported by local officials in the Providence, St. Louis, and Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan areas where expediters had also been assigned.

By helping local officials use Federal assistance more effectively, this program can save millions of dollars. To bring about these savings and to keep this popular and promising program alive, I would hope that the conferees will be persuaded to agree to the small appropriation of $350,000 necessary to do so.

SOVIET SOFT LANDING ON VENUS

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] in pointing out to the House that indeed the Soviet Venus soft landing shot of yesterday was an outstanding technological achievement.

The fact of the matter is there is a good deal of newspaper speculation on the point that this puts the United States behind in this very important technological area by some 5 or 6 years. While I do not want to debate whether it is 5 or 6 years or whether it is 7 or 8 years, it is, of course, a fact that the United States is seriously behind in this very important area.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the only mission of comparable capability that we have is the mission that the Committee on Appropriations has already chosen to delete. If that action is sustained throughout the remainder of this session of Congress, then we are indeed behind the Soviet Union, and I would hesitate not at all to guess it is more like 7 or 8 years behind, rather than 5 or 6.

M–16 RIFLE DEFICIENCIES

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the report released last night by the Special Armed Services Subcommittee on the M–16 rifle program shows that the handling of the problem by the military borders on national scandal.

Every American owes a great debt of gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS; to the subcommittee chairman, Representative RICHARD ICHORD, of Missouri; and his committee members, Representative SPEEDY O. LONG, of Louisiana, and Repreresentative WILLIAM G. BRAY, of Indiana.

Were it not for the efforts of these Members of Congress, I cannot help but feel that many of the shocking facts uncovered by the special subcommittee would never have been made public to the American people.

While the ostrich-like approach taken by the military on this matter borders on national scandal, I hope we will quickly move ahead in the future to correct these deficiencies rather than spending all of our time trying to fix the blame.

I strongly endorse the subcommittee's recommendation for a new testing by an independent organization.

This recommendation should be quickly approved in view of the fact that the subcommittee feels there is still no proof that the modifications proposed will eliminate the malfunctions experienced with the M–16 rifle in Vietnam.

On May 22, 1967, I stood in this well and read excerpts from a letter by a combat Marine from the Asbury Park, N.J., area, which said in part:

> Particularly every one of our dead was found with his rifle torn down next to him where he had been trying to fix it.

The response from military officials to my letter said there were no known instances of excessive malfunctioning. The subcommittee report clearly shows that the response from the military was less than candid.

RUSSIAN LANDING ON VENUS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Communist Russia's soft landing of a spacecraft on Venus is of grave concern.

The Russian sputnik in 1957 shocked the United States out of some of its lethargy and alarmed the free world. The Russian soft landing on Venus indicates again the tremendous stride Russia has made in rocketry and space exploration. It is a manifestation of the importance Russia places on the race to the moon and to the planets.

The Venus landing represents huge expenditures by Russia. It proves beyond question the priority and importance that Communist Russia accords space and planet exploration.

The Russians are dead serious about becoming the first to land on the moon.

They are serious and determined to be No. 1 in space. It is true that we have a treaty with Russia regarding peaceful exploration of space, but it is equally true that with Russia in control of space with bases in space, they can and will be converted overnight to military blackmail and military conquest.

With Russia firmly established in space, military conquest of the free world might not be necessary. Russia could perhaps control the currents of the air and sea, seriously affecting weather in the Western World.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that with Russian superiority in space, neither military conquest nor control of the weather would be necessary for Communist ascendancy. With Russian spacemen on the moon and on planets, the neutral nations of the world would flock to the Russian banner. The socialist system would be accepted as superior and America, would be isolated. It would be only a question of time. Economic strangulation would then be the road to Red Russian victory.

Mr. Speaker, to me it is incredible that we do not accept this grave challenge, tighten our belts and spend whatever necessary to win the race to the moon, to the planets and for the conquest of space to secure our freedom. The destiny and future of our country hangs in the balance.

Make no mistake about it—if Russia controls space, it will be for war and conquest. If the United States is first in space, it will be for peace and freedom.

UNITED STATES AND SOVIET UNION INTERPLANETARY MISSIONS

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, we certainly cannot detract from the achievement of the Soviet Union in landing a mission on Venus. However, I do believe it is wise to point out that altogether the Soviet Union has launched 18 known planetary missions, 11 to Venus and seven to Mars, and only the last mission was successful.

In contrast, the United States has launched five and three of these have been successful.

I should like also to point out that it is not the landing on Venus which is important; it is not the information we get from Venus, nor the data. What is important is the vast storehouse of knowledge gained in reaching these objectives and the use of that knowledge for the benefit of mankind. And in this area the United States is far ahead.

REPUBLICAN WRECKING CREW

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues are in the process of compiling one of the most reactionary and destructive records in the long history of Congress.

One would have to go back, I think, to the New Deal or to the Truman era to find an appropriate comparison to the overwhelmingly negative voting record compiled by the Republicans in the House.

To date, the Republicans have voted overwhelmingly against every major domestic program of the Johnson administration—from the war on poverty to aid to education.

They have turned their backs on a tradition of bipartisan support for the President in foreign affairs during a crisis period.

They have offered nothing positive—no alternative programs worthy of consideration. Nothing has emanated from their ranks but the same woeful chorus of complaint and obstruction that has become the Republican hallmark in our national life.

They have even voted overwhelmingly—twice—against the rat bill.

This is the record, Mr. Speaker, and the opposition will have to live with it in 1968. I can assure them that the Democrats will not allow the American people to forget the members of the Republican wrecking crew who have turned their backs on every social and economic problem since 1960.

This is their record. And they will just have to face the consequences with the folks back home. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that in 1968 the wreckers will be wrecked.

The American people will deal in kind with those who have remained cruelly indifferent to their needs and aspirations.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2508, CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING, UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 2508.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the bill?

Mr. CELLER. That is the redistricting bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CALL FOR JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TO PROSECUTE ANY VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL LAW AT SO-CALLED ANTIWAR RALLY SATURDAY

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have requested the Justice Department to take legal action against any demonstrators who try to disrupt any Government functions Saturday during the so-called antiwar rally. I have also urged the Justice Department to look into those who have planned and financed this nationwide movement.

I have been led to believe that the ultimate object of the march and the demonstrations is to disrupt activity and work at the Pentagon. This on its face is seditious. I have requested the Justice Department to take action on the grounds of sedition against anyone involved with the interference of Government work.

In a reply to me, the Justice Department said it would take action against anyone who violated a Federal law. Sedition is a Federal law. If that law is broken Saturday, I expect to see arrests made by the Department.

The law is on the books. It must be enforced. We cannot long stand as a nation if this type of conduct develops.

I would also warn that the guise of antiwar that this demonstration is being conducted under is somewhat misleading.

People connected with the Communist Party have been the motivators of many of the demonstrations we are witnessing around the country this week. I expect there will be people in the Washington demonstration who have traveled to North Vietnam. In fact, I have heard that one who sat on the panel of the kangaroo court and condemned the United States is among the organizers of the march.

There may be many among the demonstrators who are simply objecting to the war. But these people have been led by others who seek more than to simply express their views on the war.

But regardless, their right of freedom of speech is another matter completely from disrupting Government or the confrontation with law enforcement agencies.

I trust the Justice Department will exert some leadership and live up to its promise to take action against those who attempt to disrupt the operations of the Government, no matter what the guise these demonstrators use.

PUBLIC STATEMENTS OF DR. JAMES L. GODDARD CRITICIZED

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, the wire services yesterday carried one of the most shocking statements I have ever seen attributed to a high Government official. A UPI story quoted Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration as saying he would not object any more to his college daughter smoking pot than he would to her drinking a cocktail. I believe Congress should demand the immediate resignation of Dr. Goddard.

Such a statement by the head of an important Federal department is completely irresponsible and, in my opinion, makes Dr. Goddard unfit to head a division which has control over the food and drug laws of the Nation. For a man in such a position to encourage the belief that there is little harm in using marihuana, which is illegal, in the face of all the evidence of the crime and misery caused by users of this drug, is absolutely inexcusable. If this is Dr. Goddard's attitude toward his own college-age children, I suppose there is little that can be done about it, but he certainly should be prevented from using the prestige of a high Federal office to encourage delinquency and the smoking of pot by youngsters outside his family.

Although I have no authority to summon Dr. Goddard before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on which I serve, I hope the occasion will arise soon that will bring him before the committee so that I may question him in detail concerning his beliefs regarding the use of illegal and harmful drugs by teenagers. In the meantime I urge his immediate resignation as Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration as a protection for the youth of this country against such sick and utterly intolerable advice.

The news release follows:

> MINNEAPOLIS.—Marijuana is no more dangerous than alcohol, Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, said yesterday.
>
> Goddard spoke to an audience of more than 200 students and faculty members at the University of Minnesota.
>
> He said he would not object any more to his college daughter smoking pot than he would to her drinking a cocktail.
>
> Goddard is the father of three college-age children.
>
> The long-term affects of marijuana may be more serious, he said, but "I don't think it is any more dangerous than alcohol."

PUBLIC STATEMENTS OF DR. JAMES L. GODDARD CRITICIZED

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I have read the New York Times report of Dr. James Goddard's remarks to which the gentleman from Tennessee has referred, and like him, I would like to express my dismay. When I served on the Public Health Committee of the New York State Senate I heard a great deal of testimony about the virtually irremediable disease of drug addiction. Many foolish young people have walked this one-way street only because they took their first steps under the illusion that marihuana is safe. Marihuana is the most valuable tool the narcotics pushers have. If its own affects are uncertain, where it leads is not.

It is appalling to me to hear the head of our FDA apparently condoning the increasing permissiveness with which society is viewing marihuana. This same bureaucrat, in his zeal to protect the public has delayed time and again the introduction of medicines designed to heal or treat disease by reputable business organizations. Despite our impatience, we have not criticized apparently arbitrary delays of this sort in the past, feeling that in this field caution is frequently sound public policy. But how are we to explain such loose and dangerous talk from this same cautious bureaucrat, particularly in the face of today's soaring illegal narcotics use? Mr. Speaker, I expect better judgment from a man whose job it is to protect the public.

PUBLIC STATEMENTS OF DR. JAMES L. GODDARD CRITICIZED

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a UPI release dated October 18 which quotes the Commissioner of the Federal Food and Drug Administration as saying before a university audience:

> He would not object any more to his college daughter smoking pot than he would to her drinking a cocktail.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that the Director of the Food and Drug Administration and a career physician with the U.S. Public Health Service would make a statement like this before a group of students at the University of Minnesota. Surely Dr. James Goddard realizes that marihuana is an addiction in the same sense that alcohol and cigarettes are, and even though it may have been his purpose to call attention to the dangers of alcohol, it is inconceivable to me that he would make such a statement in the context in which it has been reported. I can only regard it as a sheer act of momentary stupidity by a person who temporarily forgot his position and public trust. The article has been referred to and been inserted in the RECORD by my colleague from Tennessee.

PUBLIC STATEMENTS OF DR. JAMES L. GODDARD CRITICIZED

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in an expression of concern over the remarks of Dr. Goddard yesterday. I would like to suggest to the House that it is time for hearings on this difficult problem of narcotics use.

I have addressed the following letter to Dr. Goddard in regard to the article which appeared in the Washington Post, which I will also have printed in the RECORD along with the article:

> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
> *Washington, D.C., October 19, 1967.*
>
> Dr. JAMES L. GODDARD,
> *Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR DR. GODDARD: As elsewhere in the nation, some doctors and pharmacists in my District have been displeased from time to time by past decisions by you or your office.
>
> Because of the nature of your statement on marijuana as reported in the press earlier this week, I am sure I shall be receiving from highly respected people in these professions and in law enforcement in my District letters questioning the competence of the experimental work on which your conclusions were based. For this reason, would you be kind enough to send me a summary of this study.
>
> Because of the nature of your remarks, I am also sending the enclosed letter to the Chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee urging that you be called for a hearing to explore the studies FDA has made on drug use, abuse and dangers so that public information media or individuals will not interpret your remarks about marijuana improperly or as applicable to all narcotics or hallucenogenics.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> CLARENCE J. BROWN, Jr.,
> *Member of Congress,*
> *Seventh Ohio District.*

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1967]

FDA CHIEF MINIMIZES "POT" DANGER

MINNEAPOLIS, October 17.—The commissioner of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration said today he doubts marijuana is more dangerous than alcohol.

Dr. James L. Goddard spoke to an audience of more than 200 students and faculty members at the University of Minnesota and held a press conference.

The physician, who was appointed to the FDA in January 1966, said he would not object any more to his college-age daughter smoking marijuana than he would to her drinking a cocktail. He is the father of three college-age children.

Dr. Goddard said "the long-term effects of smoking marijuana may be more serious than the effects presently known" and he noted that both alcohol and marijuana distort the user's perception of reality.

"Society should be able to accept both alcohol and marijuana," Dr. Goddard said. He explained that they are unlike: alcohol depresses bodily functions while marijuana triggers hallucinations.

"I don't believe smoking marijuana leads to an addiction to stronger drugs," said the Food and Drug chief. "It is true most heroin users have smoked marijuana, but it is also true most heroin users have drunk milk. I have seen no proof there is any connection."

"Dr. Goddard said he thinks all law penalties for possession of marijuana should be removed, leaving penalties only for sale or distribution. He added that he does not favor "legalizing" the drug completely.

"We need more research on chronic use," he said, "and I think this research will start now."

Personal possession of marijuana carries too severe a penalty, Goddard said. "Marijuana is not as dangerous as LSD and yet the possession of LSD is not a felony," he said.

"Psychological dependence on marijuana is possible," said the first physician to head the Food and Drug Administration "but then a person can become psychologically dependent on any drug, including aspirin."

SST DEVELOPMENT VITAL TO U.S. ECONOMY

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time commend the Members of this body for the wisdom they displayed yesterday in rejecting efforts to curb or kill the supersonic transport program. I am gratified that a majority of my colleagues recognized the importance of moving ahead with this most promising venture which will benefit all Americans and the economy of our Nation.

The question as to whether this project should be pursued has been thoroughly explored, and it is well settled that development of a civil supersonic aircraft is eminently justified by its future favorable effect upon the economy of the United States.

To have delayed or scuttled the SST program would have been economy of the most illusory sort. It could have meant the waste of the approximately $500 million already put into the program and the anticipated beneficial effect on our balance of payments position, creation of jobs, and other economic boosts would have been lost.

It is most important to point out once again that the initial investment of the taxpayers in this unique development will be repaid. Unlike many other programs receiving government assistance, the SST program proposes to assure the return of the research and development expenditure, with interest.

I am pleased to bring to your attention once again, too, the fine work being done by the General Electric Co. on the design, development, and testing of the giant engine which will power the SST. These powerful turbojets are being developed and will ultimately be produced at the GE Flight Propulsion Division in Evendale, Ohio, which is located in the congressional district I represent. I am proud to note that design has met or exceeded original performance goals in all tests made so far, and I commend GE for its dedication to the success of this truly national project.

And once more, I wish to praise my colleagues for their vision in realizing that the SST program will not only keep the United States in the forefront of world aviation, but will result in many other benefits to the Nation as well.

THE M–16 RIFLE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] and his colleagues on the special Armed Services subcommittee on the M–16 report released today. It is excellent and provides a splendid foundation for remedial action. I am confident the subcommittee will press forward to clear up and correct the whole mess.

Immediate exhaustive tests of M–16 rifles and ammunition along the lines recommended by subcommittee must be ordered at once, and when these are completed the Congress must demand that production of the improved rifle and ammunition be pressed at the highest possible level until allied forces in Vietnam are fully supplied.

Meanwhile, the Department of Defense should limit in every practical way the combat employment of troops equipped with the M–16 rifle.

It makes no sense to increase troop strength in Vietnam until all allied forces are equipped with the best rifle protection of which our technology is capable.

The Ichord report underscores the shocking fact that rifle procurement for Vietnam is a major scandal and a shameful chapter without parallel in U.S. wartime history.

The report is excellent as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough.

The Congress must insist that testing and improvement of the M–16 be undertaken quickly, be done thoroughly and that improved weapons and proper ammunition be manufactured and shipped at the earliest possible date to our combat forces. Holiday shutdowns and strikes such as those tolerated last summer at Colt Industries, the sole manufacturing plant for M–16's, must not again be permitted.

The Congress must also fix responsibility precisely for the costly error on ammunition, for inadequate training of personnel in the use of the weapon, for the inadequate production schedules, for the authorization of the sale of 20,300 M–16's to Singapore when our own forces were not fully supplied, and for the failure of the executive branch to invoke Taft-Hartley to prevent a 3-week strike in July.

The Congress should also study the obvious need for legislation to meet conflict of interest problems such as that posed by the employment of retired Gen. Nelson M. Lynde by Colt Industries after he had participated earlier in contract negotiations for the weapon.

MOST AMERICANS ARE DISTURBED AT THE PUBLIC DEMONSTRATIONS IN PROTEST OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 mintue and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed, as I think most Americans are disturbed, at the public demonstrations being mounted at this time to protest the war in Vietnam. While each citizen has the right to express his or her views, I strongly believe that there is attached to that right a responsibility to insure that any expression of protest contribute to a better understanding of the issue at hand—and toward a constructive solution.

Furious protest that offers no direction, no clarity, no reasonable alternative, is actually destructive to the process of public problem solving.

Those of us who are searching for a new and better policy in Vietnam are hindered by massive demonstrations that only serve to heighten public emotion and multiply public confusion.

If our national direction in Vietnam or elsewhere is to change, it will finally change on the basis of the quietness of careful thought—the detailed examination of complex issues and relationships—and the soundness and rationality of the alternative policies suggested.

It is the sounder idea, not the loudest voice, that will finally prevail; the most thoughtful, factual inquiry, not the most enraged passion.

Mr. Speaker, those who choose to substitute violent protest for precise reason serve to undermine themselves, their country, and those in positions of public responsibility that are searching to find a better answer in Vietnam. Violent, directionless Vietnam protesters actually serve to delay the development of a new and sounder policy in Vietnam.

ADMINISTRATION DISPLAYS WEAKNESS IN DEALING WITH PLANNED DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am not as concerned about the planned demonstrations to be held in Washington and throughout this Nation as I am concerned about the display of weakness on the part of this administration which is reflected in its willingness to negotiate with those whose purpose it is to embarrass our Government and to divide our Nation at a time when the welfare and safety of our young men in Vietnam is at stake.

I am concerned about the weakness of an administration that has reacted to threats by closing the White House to visitors, while the officially declared excuse is that repairs are to be made no one can ignore the more obvious reason which is to prevent incidents, which would arise out of sit-ins during the demonstration.

Many law abiding citizens have saved their money for years to take a trip to Washington. Now they are denied their rights to visit the White House because of the threats of those who are planning the mass demonstration in Washington. Must the rights and conveniences of our responsible citizens give way to the irresponsible actions of those who believe they are above the law?

More important is the fact that the show of appeasement on the part of the administration amounts to surrender. Saturday it will be closing down the White House—a victory for those who show contempt for our Government. The next time the defense establishment. Later the legislative halls of Congress.

It is high time we repudiate Government by appeasement and strengthen the voice and power of the law abiding citizens who have a respect for law and order and are willing to make their voices heard in the ballot box instead of on the streets.

"JOIN THE FIGHT"—PROJECT OF BURLINGTON COUNTY TIMES

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives and to the country, a contribution being made by the Burlington County Times, a daily newspaper published in the district which I represent in Congress, to the servicemen serving in U.S. posts throughout the world. The Burlington County Times has been sponsoring a "join the fight" program throughout the entire area serviced by the paper.

The program urges the citizens of Burlington County to correspond with servicemen and to send them gifts. Each week, the newspaper publishes what has become a growing list of servicemen stationed in various parts of the world, particularly in Vietnam. The editors of the newspaper anticipate that a great number of Christmas gifts will be received by the men in Vietnam and in other areas of the world as a result of this program. I am happy to report that the "join the fight" program is receiving the enthusiastic support and commendation of people from all walks of life in the Burlington County area.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this type of activity is invaluable in maintaining the high morale of our troops. It is a clear indication of the thoughtfulness, the generosity and the support of the citizens back home. It is certainly a great antidote to some of the draft card burnings that our troops have heard about through other periodicals. I am also convinced that as a result of this correspondence, many new and lasting friendships will be developed. I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to commend publicly the Burlington County Times, its publisher, editor, and entire staff and to respectfully suggest to other similar periodicals throughout the country participation in a similar program.

ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATIONS ASSIST THE NORTH VIETNAMESE

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of anything that is more demoralizing to our troops in Vietnam than these anti-Vietnam war demonstrations in our country. And while I know that there are many people who are sincerely concerned about the war, and who are seriously and honestly looking for a solution, I wonder if those who have been urging that we cease the bombing of North Vietnam at this time have considered the fact that casualties among our American troops would increase seriously if such a bombing pause were ordered by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I have said here before—and I repeat it now—our best intelligence shows that our bombings of North Vietnam have successfully pinned down 175,000 North Vietnamese soldiers who are manning the anti-aircraft installations in North Vietnam. We have pinned down another 300,000 Communist soldiers in North Vietnam who are being used to supervise the repair of the damages that our bombers do. Women and children do the work but soldiers supervise them. That is a half million soldiers. If we were to end the bombing now with no assurances from the North Vietnamese that they are not going to move those troops into South Vietnam and use them against our soldiers, we would increase our casualties substantially. The President has said repeatedly, time and time again, that he is prepared to end the bombing the moment the Communists are willing to give us assurances that they will not move these one-half million North Vietnamese troops into South Vietnam and use them against our soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, those who have been urging this bombing pause should consider the consequences of their counsel if we were to release those half million Communist troops who are now pinned down in North Vietnam. I am sure it does not take any expert to realize that our casualties would mount, and who is willing to take the responsibility of seeing more American boys killed in South Vietnam?

So I hope that those who are going to participate in these anti-Vietnam war demonstrations will be cognizant of the fact that they in fact are prolonging the war, and that they in fact are contributing to the breakdown of morale among our troops, and they are in fact playing right into the hands of the Communists.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE TWO REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Fountain], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight Friday, October 20, to file two reports adopted today on food and drug administration procedures for the selection of laboratory sites and the administration of research grants in public health service. This request has the approval of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 322]

Abbitt
Ashley
Bell
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton
Brademas
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Cederberg
Conyers
Culver
Dawson
Diggs
Dwyer
Eilberg
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fuqua
Gettys
Hagan
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kazen
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
McEwen
Matsunaga
Morgan
O'Hara, Mich.
Patman
Pryor
Purcell
Rarick
Rees
Rumsfeld
Sandman
St. Onge
Sisk
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tuck
Tunney
Utt
Watts
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wright
Wyatt

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). On this rollcall, 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting television and radio; and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 794)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Public Broadcasting Act of 1967'.

"TITLE I—CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

"EXTENSION OF DURATION OF CONSTRUCTION GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING

"SEC. 101. (a) Section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 391) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: 'There are also authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of such section, $10,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.'

"(b) The last sentence of such section is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1968' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1971'.

"MAXIMUM ON GRANTS IN ANY STATE

"SEC. 102. Effective with respect to grants made from appropriations for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1967, subsection (b) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The total of the grants made under this part from the appropriation for any fiscal year for the construction of noncommercial educational television broadcasting facilities and noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities in any State may not exceed 8½ per centum of such appropriation.'

"NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL RADIO BROADCASTING FACILITIES

"SEC. 103. (a) Section 390 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 390) is amended by inserting 'noncommercial' before 'educational' and by inserting 'or radio' after 'television'.

"(b) Subsection (a) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392 (a)) is amended by—

"(1) inserting 'noncommercial' before 'educational' and by inserting 'or radio' after 'television' in so much thereof as precedes paragraph (1);

"(2) striking out clause (B) of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof '(B) in the case of a project for television facilities, the State noncommercial educational television agency or, in the case of a project for radio facilities, the State educational radio agency,';

"(3) inserting '(i) in the case of a project for television facilities,' after '(D)' and 'noncommercial' before 'educational' in paragraph (1)(D) and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such paragraph ', or (ii) in the case of a project for radio facilities, a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage noncommercial educational radio broadcasting and is eligible to receive a license from the Federal Communications Commission; or meets the requirements of clause (i) and is also organized to engage in or encourage such radio broadcasting and is eligible for such a license for such a radio station';

"(4) striking out 'or' immediately preceding '(D)' in paragraph (1), and by striking out the semicolon at the end of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ', or (E) a municipality which owns and operates a broadcasting facility transmitting only noncommercial programs;';

"(5) striking out 'television' in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of such subsection;

"(6) striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (3), striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof '; and', and inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"'(5) that, in the case of an application with respect to radio broadcasting facilities, there has been comprehensive planning for educational broadcasting facilities and services in the area the applicant proposes to serve and the applicant has participated in such planning, and the applicant will make the most efficient use of the frequency assignment.'

"(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by inserting '(1)' after '(c)' and 'noncommercial' before 'educational television broadcasting facilities', and by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(2) In order to assure proper coordination of construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities within each State which has established a State educational radio agency, each applicant for a grant under this section for a project for construction of such facilities in such State, other than such agency, shall notify such agency of each application for such a grant which is submitted by it to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall advise such agency with respect to the disposition of each such application.'

"(d) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by inserting 'noncommercial' before 'educational television' and inserting "or noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, as the case may be,' after 'educational television broadcasting facilities' in clauses (2) and (3).

"(e) Subsection (f) of such section is amended by inserting 'or radio' after 'television' in the part thereof which precedes paragraph (1), by inserting 'noncommercial' before 'educational television purposes' in paragraph (2) thereof, and by inserting 'or noncommercial educational radio purposes, as the case may be' after 'educational television purposes' in such paragraph (2).

"(f) (1) Paragraph (2) of section 394 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 394) is amended by inserting 'or educational radio broadcasting facilities' after 'educational television broadcasting facilities,' and by inserting 'or radio broadcasting, as the case may be' after 'necessary for television broadcasting'.

"(2) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by striking out 'The term "State educational television agency" means' and inserting in lieu thereof 'The terms "State educational television agency" and "State educational radio agency" mean, with respect to television broadcasting and radio broadcasting, respectively,' and by striking out 'educational television' in clauses (A) and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof 'such broadcasting'.

"(g) Section 397 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 397) is amended by inserting 'or radio' after 'television' in clause (2).

"FEDERAL SHARE OF COST OF CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 104. Subsection (e) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(e)) is amended to read as follows:

" '(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Secretary shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Secretary to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Secretary shall pay such amount from the sum available therefor, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.'

"INCLUSION OF TERRITORIES

"SEC. 105. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 394 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by striking out 'and' and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and by inserting before the period at the end thereof ', the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands'.

"(b) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by inserting 'and, in the case of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, means the High Commissioner thereof' before the period at the end thereof.

"INCLUSION OF COSTS OF PLANNING

"SEC. 106. Paragraph (2) of section 394 of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'In the case of apparatus the acquisition and installation of which is so included, such term also includes planning therefor.'

"TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION

"SEC. 201. Part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by—

"(1) inserting

" 'SUBPART A—GRANTS FOR FACILITIES'

immediately above the heading of section 390;

"(2) striking out 'part' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subpart' in sections 390, 393, 395, and 396;

"(3) redesignating section 397 as section 398, and redesignating section 394 as section 397 and inserting it before such section 398, and inserting immediately above its heading the following:

" 'SUBPART C—GENERAL'

"(4) redesignating section 396 as section 394 and inserting it immediately after section 393;

"(5) inserting after 'broadcasting' the first time it appears in clause (2) of the section of such part IV redesignated herein as section 398 ', or over the Corporation or any of its grantees or contractors, or over the charter or bylaws of the Corporation,'.

"(6) inserting in the section of such part IV herein redesignated as section 397 the following new paragraphs:

" '(6) The term "Corporation" means the Corporation authorized to be established by subpart B of this part.

" '(7) The term "noncommercial educational broadcast station" means a television or radio broadcast station, which (A) under the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in effect on the date of enactment of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, is eligible to be licensed or is licensed by the Commission as a noncommercial educational radio or television broadcast station and which is owned and operated by a public agency or nonprofit private foundation, corporation, or association or (B) is owned and operated by a municipality and which transmits only noncommercial programs for educational purposes.

" '(8) The term "interconnection" means the use of microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, communication space satellites, or other apparatus or equipment for the transmission and distribution of television or radio programs to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations.

" '(9) The term "educational television or radio programs" means programs which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes.'

"(7) striking out the heading of such part IV and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'PART IV—GRANTS FOR NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING FACILITIES; CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING'

"(8) inserting immediately after the section herein redesignated as section 398 the following:

" 'EDITORIALIZING AND SUPPORT OF POLITICAL CANDIDATES PROHIBITED

" 'SEC. 399. No noncommercial educational broadcasting station may engage in editorializing or may support or oppose any candidate for political office.'

"(9) inserting after section 395 the following new subpart:

" 'SUBPART B—CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

" '*Congressional declaration of policy*

" 'SEC. 396. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

" '(1) that it is in the public interest to encourage the growth and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, including the use of such media for instructional purposes;

" '(2) that expansion and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting and of diversity of its programing depend on freedom, imagination, and initiative on both the local and national levels;

" '(3) that the encouragement and support of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, while matters of importance for private and local development, are also of appropriate and important concern to the Federal Government;

" '(4) that it furthers the general welfare to encourage noncommercial educational radio and television broadcast programing which will be responsive to the interests of people both in particular localities and throughout the United States, and which will constitute an expression of diversity and excellence;

" '(5) that it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to complement, assist, and support a national policy that will most effectively make noncommercial educational radio and television service available to all the citizens of the United States;

" '(6) that a private corporation should be created to facilitate the development of educational radio and television broadcasting and to afford maximum protection to such broadcasting from extraneous interference and control.

" '*Corporation established*

" '(b) There is authorized to be established a nonprofit corporation, to be known as the "Corporation for Public Broadcasting," which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this section, and, to the extent consistent with this section, to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

" '*Board of Directors*

" '(c) (1) The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Board"), consisting of fifteen members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than eight members of the Board may be members of the same political party.

" '(2) The members of the Board (A) shall be selected from among citizens of the United States (not regular fulltime employees of the United States) who are eminent in such fields as education, cultural and civic affairs, or the arts, including radio and television; (B) shall be selected so as to provide as nearly as practicable a broad representation of various regions of the country, various professions and occupations, and various kinds of talent and experience appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the Corporation.

" '(3) The members of the initial Board of Directors shall serve as incorporators and shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish the Corporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

" '(4) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be six years except that (A) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (B) the terms of office of members first taking office shall begin on the date of incorporation and shall expire, as designated at the time of their appointment, five at the end of two years, five at the end of four years, and five at the end of six years. No members shall be eligible to serve in excess of two consecutive terms of six years each. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, a member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has qualified.

" '(5) Any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its power, put shall be filled in the maner in which the original appointments were made.

" '*Election of Chairman; compensation*

" '(d) (1) The President shall designate one of the members first appointed to the Board as Chairman; thereafter the members of the Board shall annually elect one of their number as Chairman. The members of the Board shall also elect one or more of them as a Vice Chairman or Vice Chairmen.

" '(2) The members of the Board shall not, by reason of such membership, be deemed to be employees of the United States. They shall, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties related to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this subpart be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $100 per day including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, equal to that authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

" '*Officers and employees*

" '(e) (1) The Corporation shall have a President, and such other officers as may be named and appointed by the Board for terms and at rates of compensation fixed by the Board. No individual other than a citizen of the United States may be an officer of the Corporation. No officer of the Corporation, other than the Chairman and any Vice Chairman, may receive any salary or other compensation from any source other than the Corporation during the period of his employment by the Corporation. All officers shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

"'(2) Except as provided in the second sentence of subsection (c)(1) of this section, no political test or qualification shall be used in selecting, appointing, promoting, or taking other personnel actions with respect to officers, agents, and employees of the Corporation.

"'Nonprofit and nonpolitical nature of the Corporation

"'(f)(1) The Corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

"'(2) No part of the income or assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any director, officer, employee, or any other individual except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

"'(3) The Corporation may not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

"'Purposes and activities of the Corporation

"'(g)(1) In order to achieve the objectives and to carry out the purposes of this subpart, as set out in subsection (a), the Corporation is authorized to—

"'(A) facilitate the full development of educational broadcasting in which programs of high quality, obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations, with strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature;

"'(B) assist in the establishment and development of one or more systems of interconnection to be used for the distribution of educational television or radio programs so that all noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations that wish to may broadcast the programs at times chosen by the stations;

"'(C) assist in the establishment and development of one or more systems of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations throughout the United States;

"'(D) carry out its purposes and functions and engage in its activities in ways that will most effectively assure the maximum freedom of the noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast systems and local stations from interference with or control of program content or other activities.

"'(2) Included in the activities of the Corporation authorized for accomplishment of the purposes set forth in subsection (a) of this section, are, among others not specifically named—

"'(A) to obtain grants from and to make contracts with individuals and with private, State, and Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions;

"'(B) to contract with or make grants to program production entities, individuals, and selected noncommercial educational broadcast stations for the production of, and otherwise to procure, educational television or radio programs for national or regional distribution to noncommercial educational broadcast stations:

"'(C) to make payments to existing and new noncommercial educational broadcast stations to aid in financing local educational television or radio programing costs of such stations, particularly innovative approaches thereto, and other costs of operation of such stations;

"'(D) to establish and maintain a library and archives of noncommercial educational television or radio programs and related materials and develop public awareness of and disseminate information about noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting by various means, including the publication of a journal;

"'(E) to arrange, by grant or contract with appropriate public or private agencies, organizations, or institutions, for interconnection facilities suitable for distribution and transmission of educational television or radio programs to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"'(F) to hire or accept the voluntary services of consultants, experts, advisory boards, and panels to aid the Corporation in carrying out the purposes of this section;

"'(G) to encourage the creation of new noncommercial educational broadcast stations in order to enhance such service on a local, State, regional, and national basis;

"'(H) conduct (directly or through grants or contracts) research, demonstrations, or training in matters related to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting.

"'(3) To carry out the foregoing purposes and engage in the foregoing activities, the Corporation shall have the usual powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, except that the Corporation may not own or operate any television or radio broadcast station, system, or network, community antenna television system, or interconnection or program production facility.

"'Authorization for free or reduced rate interconnection service

"'(h) Nothing in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, or in any other provision of law shall be construed to prevent United States communications common carriers from rendering free or reduced rate communications interconnection services for noncommercial educational television or radio services, subject to such rules and regulations as the Federal Communications Commission may prescribe.

"'Report to Congress

"'(i) The Corporation shall submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year ending June 30 to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before the 31st day of December of each year. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Corporation's operations, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this section and may include such recommendations as the Corporation deems appropriate.

"'Right to repeal, alter, or amend

"'(j) The right to repeal, alter, or amend this section at any time is expressly reserved.

"'Financing

"'(k)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $9,000,000, to remain available until expended.

"'(2) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, no grant or contract pursuant to this section may provide for payment from the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for any one project or to any one station of more than $250,000.

"'Records and audit

"'(l)(1)(A) The accounts of the Corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audits shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the Corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation and necessary to facilitate the audits shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audits; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

"'(B) The report of each such independent audit shall be included in the annual report required by subsection (i) of this section. The audit report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the Corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit, with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the Corporation's income and expenses during the year, and a statement of the sources and application of funds, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements.

"'(2)(A) The financial transactions of the Corporation for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of its operations may be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Corporation are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation pertaining to its financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers and property of the Corporation shall remain in possession and custody of the Corporation.

"'(B) A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress. The report to the Congress shall contain such comments and information as the Comptroller General may deem necessary to inform Congress of the financial operations and condition of the Corporation, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as he may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President, to the Secretary, and to the Corporation at the time submitted to the Congress.

"'(3)(A) Each recipient of assistance by grant or contract, other than a fixed price contract awarded pursuant to competitive bidding procedures, under this section shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"'(B) The Corporation or any of its duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this section. The Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall also have access thereto for such purpose during any fiscal year for which Federal funds are available to the Corporation.'

"TITLE III—STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL BROADCASTING

"STUDY AUTHORIZED

"**SEC. 301.** The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to conduct, directly or by contract, and in consultation with other interested Federal agencies, a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio (including broadcast, closed circuit, community antenna television, and instructional television fixed services and two-way communication of data links and computers) and their relationship to each other and to instructional materials such as videotapes, films, discs, computers, and other educational materials or devices, and such other aspects thereof as may be of assistance in determining whether and what Federal aid should be provided for instructional radio and television and the form that aid should take, and which may aid communities, institutions, or agencies in determining whether and to what extent such activities should be used.

"DURATION OF STUDY

"**SEC. 302.** The study authorized by this title shall be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before June 30, 1969.

"APPROPRIATION

"**SEC. 303.** There are authorized to be appropriated for the study authorized by this title such sums, not exceeding $500,000, as may be necessary."

And the House agree to the same.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
HORACE R. KORNEGAY,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
JAMES T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN PASTORE,
MIKE MONRONEY,
HUGH SCOTT,
JAMES B. PEARSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the conference substitute are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and minor and clarifying changes.

EDITORIALIZING

The House amendment contains provisions which would prohibit any noncommercial educational broadcast station from engaging in editorializing or supporting or opposing any candidate for political office. The Senate bill contains no comparable provisions.

The managers on the part of the Senate accepted the House provisions when it was explained that the prohibition against editorializing was limited to providing that no noncommercial educational broadcast station may broadcast editorials representing the opinion of the management of such station. It should be emphasized that these provisions are not intended to preclude balanced, fair, and objective presentations of controversial issues by noncommercial educational broadcast stations.

These provisions are consistent with the requirements of section 396(g)(1)(A) of the Communications Act of 1934 (which would be added by the conference substitute) which require that programs or series of programs of a controversial nature which are made available by the Public Broadcasting Corporation must adhere strictly to objectivity and balance.

DEFINITION OF "EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION OR RADIO PROGRAMS"

The House amendment defines "educational television or radio programs" to mean "programs which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes". The Senate bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference substitute includes a definition of the term which is the same as the House version but for the deletion of the words "and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes".

OBJECTIVITY AND BALANCE OF CORPORATION PROGRAMS

Under both the Senate bill and the House amendment the Public Broadcasting Corporation is authorized to "facilitate the full development of educational broadcasting in which programs of high quality, obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to noncommercial educational television and radio broadcast stations". The House amendment provides, in addition, that in the case of programs of a controversial nature there must be strict adherence to objectivity and balance. The conference substitute adopts these provisions of the House amendment with a modification so as to make the requirement more flexible. As so modified, each program in a series need not meet the test of objectivity and balance, but the series, when considered as a whole, must.

ARRANGEMENT BY CORPORATION FOR INTERCONNECTIONS

Under the Senate bill and the House amendment, the Public Broadcasting Corporation is authorized to "arrange, by grant or contract . . . for interconnection facilities suitable for distribution and transmission of educational television or radio programs to noncommercial educational broadcast stations". Under the House amendment, however, the Corporation could only make such arrangements with those appropriate private agencies, organizations, or institutions which were *nonprofit*. This would have required the Corporation to make arrangements for interconnection facilities through nonprofit intermediaries and would, consequently, have delayed and complicated the Corporation's operations. This requirement has been omitted in the conference substitute.

The managers on the part of the House feel that the Corporation needs this flexibility, not to establish a fixed-schedule network operation, but in order to take advantage of special or unusual opportunities that warrant the Corporation directly contracting for interconnection facilities. Even under these circumstances, however, it should be made clear that the decision to broadcast any program for which interconnection is provided by the Corporation remains entirely within the discretion of the local station. In addition, it should be pointed out that this change does not mean that others—such as a group of noncommercial educational broadcast stations or a noncommercial educational radio or television network—could not also arrange for interconnection and receive financial assistance for it in the form of a grant or contract from the Corporation. The conference substitute would permit this to be done.

Further, the conferees wish to make it clear that the limitation contained in proposed section 396(k)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 should not and is not intended to apply with respect to interconnection costs.

SYSTEMS OF INTERCONNECTION

The House amendment provides the Public Broadcasting Corporation with authority to assist in the establishment and development of *a system* of interconnection to be used for the distribution of educational television or radio programs. The Senate version authorized the Corporation to assist in the establishment and development of *one or more systems* of interconnection for the same purpose. The conference substitute is the same in this respect as the Senate version.

DEFINITION OF "INTERCONNECTION"

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contain definitions of the term "interconnection". The only difference in the two versions is that in the House amendment "airborne systems" were specifically included in the definition. The words "airborne systems" have been deleted from the definition in the conference substitute as unnecessary since "interconnection" is defined to include "other apparatus or equipment for the transmission and distribution of television or radio programs to noncommercial educational television or radio stations".

ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON THE CORPORATION

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment prohibit the Public Broadcasting Corporation from owning or operating any television or radio broadcast station, system, or network, or interconnection or program production facility. In addition, the Senate bill prohibits the Corporation from owning or operating any community antenna television system. The conference substitute is the same in this respect as the Senate bill.

RECORDS AND AUDIT

The House amendment contains provisions requiring an annual audit of the accounts of the Public Broadcasting Corporation by independent certified or licensed public accountants; and, for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of the Corporation's operations provides that "the financial transactions of the Corporation shall be subject to an audit by the General Accounting Office". The Senate bill contains no provisions with respect to records and audit.

The conference substitute is the same as the House version with two minor changes in order to make it clear that for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of the Corporation's operations the General Accounting Office is authorized, but not required, to audit the financial transactions of the Corporation. Thus, the following language from the House report on H.R. 6736 (the House companion bill to S. 1160) is an apt description of the provisions of the conference substitute relating to records and audit:

"Provision for a GAO audit was not originally included in H.R. 6736 because it was felt that such audits carry with them the power of the Comptroller General to settle and adjust the books being examined and that this authority would be contrary to the desired insulation of the Corporation from Government control. The Committee is also sensitive to the importance of having the Corporation free from Government control. However, the bill does not provide authority for the settlement of accounts. The provision is similar to that included in the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) with the exception that the audits are not required to be performed annually. It is expected that the GAO audits will be performed at such times as believed necessary by the Comptroller General or Congress in order to supplement the audits of the independent public accountants.

"The audits are to be performed in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and, in the case of GAO audits, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States."

STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL BROADCASTING

The House amendment authorizes a study of instructional television, including its relationship to educational television broadcasting and such other aspects thereof as may assist in determining *whether* Federal aid should be provided therefor and the form that such aid should take. Under the House version the study would be submitted to the President for transmission to the Congress on or before January 1, 1969.

The Senate bill authorizes a comprehensive study of instructional television *and radio* and their relationship to each other and to instructional materials, and to such other aspects thereof as may be of assistance in determining *what* Federal aid should be provided for instructional radio and television and the form that aid should take. Under the Senate bill the study would be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before June 30, 1969.

Both versions authorize not to exceed $500,000 for the study.

The conference substitute is the same in this respect as the Senate bill, except that the study must also be addressed to the question of *whether* Federal aid should be provided for instructional radio and television.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
HORACE R. KORNEGAY,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
JAMES T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to commend and to thank the Members who served on the conference committee, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL], the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD], and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY], for their diligence and their cooperation in getting this conference report out and in working with the other body.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the House conferees did a very good and a very fine job, because of the 15 points that were in difference—the 15 points that the House was in difference with the other body—all but four of these were resolved in favor of the position of the House of Representatives. Of those four upon which we did not get full and complete support of the position of the House, we only receded in part from our stand in the House.

Therefore, we feel that we came out with a bill almost identical with the one that passed the House some time ago.

I should like, briefly, to go over some of the points in order to demonstrate to the Members of the House what did take place. However, I would like first to reiterate what I said on the floor when this legislation was up for debate, and that is this: I feel that perhaps this could be one of the most important bills to come out of the 90th Congress. It was stated in a letter from the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges that his legislation had been compared in importance to the Morrill Act of 1862 with reference to its importance to education in the United States, I believe, and am of the firm opinion, that this legislation is that important or, perhaps, more so.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now outline the more important points that were in disagreement and on which we receded. I shall not take the time of the House to explain the others.

The version of the other body contains no definition with reference to the term "educational television or radio programs." The version of the House contained the following definition, "programs which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes."

The other body was adamant on striking out our definition. However, we were able to retain the main part which we feel is the positive side of it and not the negative side of the question by retaining the language, "which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes." We acceded to the deletion of the words "and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes."

By so doing, the basic House definition was retained and, at the same time, dispel any feeling that educational programs may not be entertaining or entertainment programs, educational.

This is one of the first changes that was made in the House version.

The next was a clarification of our requirement that there be strict adherence to objectivity and balance in the presentation of controversial programs. The conferees agreed unanimously that this section requiring strict adherence to objectivity and balance on all programs of a controversial nature should be clarified so that such adherence should be with respect to a series of programs. In other words, we wanted to make clear that if a program comes up at one time and one side is presented that we could not indict it because of that one program where there were to be two programs, or a series of programs. Balance and objectivity might not be achieved in any one program of a series, but the overall series wherein opposing viewpoints were presented would and should be a balanced and objective presentation.

To distribute programs produced for educational broadcasting, the Senate version provided for the establishment and development of one or more systems of interconnections. The House version only provided for a system of interconnection. Because of concern that the House version might preclude the establishment and development of statewide and regional systems of interconnection, this ambiguity was eliminated, by the House accepting the Senate version of this provision.

Another important provision considered by the conferees concerned the ability of the corporation to deal directly with communications common carriers, such as A.T. & T., in order to make arrangements for interconnection facilities. Under the House version the corporation was not authorized to deal directly with such carriers but, instead, could only make interconnection arrangements through "nonprofit" intermediaries, who in turn would deal with the carriers. To provide the corporation with more interconnection flexibility, the House accepted the Senate version of this provision, which did not contain the word "nonprofit," thereby authorizing the corporation to deal directly with communications common carriers.

The last question of any contention involved changing the Senate word "what" to "whether." In title III the Senate had authorized a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio to help determine "what" Federal aid should be provided, and the form such aid should take.

The House version provided that such a study should be addressed to the question of "whether" Federal aid should be provided. This provision is now provided for in the conference substitute, which is otherwise the same as the Senate bill. In this connection "radio" is now included in the study authorized by title III.

Now, these are the only major changes that were made in the bill which passed this House on September 21. The conferees, and I as one of the conferees, feel we did a very good job on behalf of the House in bringing back almost the identical bill that it passed. We had 15 points in contention, and the House did not recede completely on any of them. The four points that we partially receded I believe helped to make it a better bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] whatever time he may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from West Virginia has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the chairman has done a good job in explaining most of the provisions. There were two important parts of the bill when it was on the floor of the House which the House insisted on being in the original bill, and on which we maintained our position in the conference. One in which we said that the management of any one station or anyone speaking for them could not editorialize, and second, the station could not support or oppose any candidate for public office.

In the Senate version there was no such provision of any kind. The Senate receded with a slight change in the language, but no difference in the real meaning of the provision in the bill so that the provision against editorializing or supporting or opposing any candidate is retained.

The second change was the question on how this corporation board of directors was to be appointed. The House insisted—and this was a drastic change from the Senate version. The House version provided that no more than eight out of the 15-member board could be from one political party. We felt from the experience we had had with the various agencies in this town that it had worked well where an agency was made up of four of one party, and three of another, or five of one party and four of another, or six of one party and five of another. We felt this worked extremely well in that the minority kept constant check on the majority to insure that there was no corruption, or inefficiency.

So we did provide, and were able to retain, in the final conference report, that no more than eight of the fifteen members of the board shall be of one party.

I think the third one that you will probably want to know about is that in programs of a controversial nature there is a specific provision and many of you here in this body have talked with me about this provision. We tried to make it extremely clear, and I quote from the report:

> In addition to that, that in the case of programs of a controversial nature, there must be strict adherence to objectivity and balance.

We did have a difference with the Senate over interconnections. That is if these stations chose to hook up at certain times of the year, maybe a half dozen times I would guess, to present programs, how are you going to do this?

The Senate had a provision that did not make any difference between profit and nonprofit. In the House version we had nonprofit alone. We did change this to allow interconnection to be made in the discretion of the board as to whether or not it could be done through private enterprises or through nonprofit enterprise, feeling that if it were necessary they could go to nonprofit, but probably they would want to use the profit system as probably the most economical system that could be used for interconnection.

But we felt that it was best to leave to the board itself to determine which method they wanted to use.

The fourth provision that I think you will want to know about was that the House amendment provides the public corporation with authority to assist in the establishment and development of a system to be used for distribution of educational television or radio programs.

The Senate version authorized the corporation to assist in the establishment and development of one or more systems of interconnection.

On this question we adopted the Senate version and I believe there is good reason for that.

We did provide for a system of records and audits which were not provided for adequately, we felt, in the Senate version. I think finally we agreed on one important thing and that was to provide a study of instructional television including the relationship to educational television broadcasting and such other aspects thereof as may assist in determining how federal aid should be provided therefor. We provided $500,000 for this study.

We believe this will assist greatly in the portion of the spectrum having to do with educational and instructional television.

Those are in essence the changes that I think are of any substance. We agreed unanimously on those.

I would say on the number of changes that the House won approximately 70 percent and the Senate on 30 percent of the changes in the conference that resulted in the final version.

I recommend that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay] such time as he may require.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the chairman yielding to me.

I would like to commend the chairman of the committee and the minority leader of the committee, and those who have served on this conference committee, for what I see as a very fine job in bringing to the House a bill which was good when it left. In my opinion, it is even better now.

As has already been stated, we conceded slightly on only four of the 15 points which were in contention. This was a most amicable and productive conference.

I certainly rise in support of this bill and will say that in my opinion it is one of the finest pieces of legislation that has come from our committee in a good while.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Broyhill].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I consider this to have been a most productive conference. Although on some points the House conferees did recede, by and large we maintained the position of the House even on those points because we held up the intention of the House on what we had really wanted to do.

There was one point that I wanted to discuss briefly. We deleted one word, the word "nonprofit." Under the Senate bill the corporation would have been authorized to arrange by contract or by grant interconnecting facilities. They could then distribute programs to the various stations. Under the House bill the corporation would have been authorized to have made these contracts or grants only to nonprofit agencies.

The conferees felt there would be unusual occurrences or special occasions on which a program of nationwide interest should be distributed to those stations that wanted to carry such a program, and prohibiting the corporation from making these interconnection facilities themselves, and directly providing for those interconnection facilities would have been detrimental to the purposes of the act.

So the word "nonprofit" was deleted.

This action does not mean that the corporation is going to enter into any full-time networking arrangements. They will still be prohibited by the language in the bill from doing this. They will still not be able to do any broadcasting as such. They will only be taking advantage of this interconnection authority on special occasions whenever this may arise.

Also it is not only the intention of the managers, as is clear in the reports of both the House and the other body, but also as it is stated in the bill itself, where any interconnection is made, it will be within the discretion of the local stations to determine whether or not they want to receive or to carry a given program. That is one point I wished to emphasize.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] who has been a very strong supporter of this legislation, and who has spoken not only to me but to other members of the committee on several occasions expressing his strong support of this public broadcasting section.

Mr. CONTE. I would like to take this opportunity to compliment Congressman Staggers, the ranking minority member, Mr. Springer, my friend from North Carolina, Mr. Broyhill, and the other members of the committee for the fine job they did in bringing this bill to the floor of the House. It was unfortunate that I was unavoidably detained on September 21 when the bill originally came up, because I have had a long interest in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. I think the committee did a remarkable job in conference and with the overall bill. I strongly support the measure and hope it will pass today.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment to the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television; and for other purposes."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Staggers moves that the House recede from its amendment to the title.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by

which action was taken on the conference report on the motion to recede from the title amendment was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SAFETY OF CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 944 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 944

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13178) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the United States Capitol Buildings and the United States Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 13178, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2310) and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 13178 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the minority to the very able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is an open rule, which provides for 1 hour of general debate and, of course, for amendment under the 5-minute rule. This bill, simply and briefly, is a bill that would augment the present laws dealing with the protection of the U.S. Capitol, its grounds, and its buildings. To be perfectly frank about this bill, it is brought about because of the fact that there is another one of the numerous marches upon Washington anticipated here within the next few days.

This bill, as I said, would supplement existing legislation which goes back 100 years or more, under which the grounds of the Capitol were protected, but not the buildings of the Capitol.

Under the old law the grounds but not the buildings were protected, and the violations are misdemeanors with nominal fines provided.

This bill would cover the buildings themselves and would take care of such instances as we have had in the recent past.

Some Members will recall that only a few years ago there was a group of misguided Puerto Ricans who entered this Capitol Building itself and up there in the corner of the gallery they arose and began a holocaust of shooting and a general disturbance here in the Capitol itself. A number of the Members were shot.

Only a few weeks ago another group forced themselves into the Capitol. They forced the guards up against the walls, entered the gallery itself, and created a great disturbance in the deliberations of the Nation's business.

Not too long ago there was another group—which, incidentally, I believe was from my State; something rather unusual—who came into this Capitol and sat down outside of a committee room and refused to budge. This was the misnamed Freedom Democratic Party of Mississippi, an extreme leftist group.

So this proposed legislation would protect the Capitol, its grounds and its buildings, and its Members, from these misguided people who are bent on obstructing if not, in fact, destroying this, the world's most democratic form of government.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I am amazed to see what is going on, to pick up the papers each day, and to look at television, and see what is going on in this country in the subversive attacks upon this great haven of liberty, the United States of America and its institutions.

Now we are told that there will be possibly 250,000—I doubt if there will be anywhere near that number—who are going to march upon the Pentagon tomorrow or the next day. They are going to march upon this Capitol. They are going to protest, and they are going to protest violently about the war in Vietnam.

This is not a question of whether the war in Vietnam is a popular war, or even whether we should be there. The question is whether the institutions of this Government are to be attacked in any such manner.

We see these riots going on all over the country. People attack this institution which guarantees to them liberty and the pursuit of happiness—and, incidentally, now under the new concept, prosperity, because anyone who does not have better than $3,000 income is entitled to Government aid.

Yet they are never satisfied.

Sometimes I wonder if this is because we are too busy trying to appease these small minority groups. When I say "minority groups," Mr. Speaker, I do not have reference to the color of anybody's skin, either. I am talking about these groups who are continuously attacking our Government and its institutions.

Mr. Speaker, to illustrate: Here are a couple of, I do not know whether to call them circulars, brochures, or just leaflets, of propaganda. Some of this left-wing group saw fit to organize down in my State some few years ago a group known as the Freedom Democratic Party, whatever that is. They undertook to take over the government and they are still trying to take over the government of my State. I think anyone who is familiar with that situation is bound to be familiar with the fact that they are but a part of a nationwide conspiracy to bring about demoralization and the final overthrow of our Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to read all of this, but I just want to exhibit it to you here, to those who happen to be interested. Here is one. On the front page I draw your attention to this drawing with the instruction how to make a Molotov cocktail. I could do so, but I am not going to go into all of the details here as to what they propose to do.

Now I have to use the pigmentation of the skin, although I prefer not to, although this movement is not confined to Negroes. We have some ultra-left-wing white people who are also parties to it. They are advocating the accumulation of guns. They are advocating that for every Negro who happens to be killed that at least 10 white people be killed in retaliation. They are advocating that the election machinery and all the institutions of the State be taken over by this small, militant, misguided group. Incidentally, these are the same people I referred to a moment ago that came into this Capitol and sat down outside of a committee room in the hallway and refused to move. They stayed there, as I recall it, overnight.

Mr. Speaker, I say I am concerned not about the State of Mississippi alone, but I am concerned about all of the 50 States of this Union. I am concerned about how far we are going to permit this type of thing to go on.

How much appeasement is it going to take? How many billions of dollars must be fed out to them in order to bring about a cessation of their activities, if in fact, such can ever be done?

Mr. Speaker, I come back to the legislation. This is merely a bill that would increase the penalties, increase the jurisdiction of the authorities to prevent such things as I have just mentioned a moment ago, such as the shooting up of this Chamber by the Puerto Ricans and these other invasions.

Mr. Speaker, under the old law, what is the penalty now? A $10 fine. When these people moved into the gallery here just a few weeks ago, they were required to post a $10 bond. Then, of course, they never paid that. One of the great, good brothers, someone, whoever he is who finances these things, paid the bond or covered the forfeiture of such bond.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I

appreciate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules yielding to me at this time because I have a question to propound to the gentleman.

I would like to know if the chairman of the Committee on Rules understands the provisions of this bill in the same manner in which I feel I understand them?

I am a little bit disturbed about the language which appears on page 4 of the bill itself, that language which appears in lines 15 and 16, wherein the proposed legislation, if adopted, would make it a violation to parade, demonstrate, or picket within any of the Capitol buildings.

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry but I did not get the gentleman's citation.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. This language appears on page 4 of the bill, in lines 15 and 16.

Mr. COLMER. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. My question is this: If this bill becomes law, would it be a violation of the law to picket on the Capitol Grounds?

Mr. COLMER. To picket?

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. To picket on the Capitol Grounds. There is stated language which appears on page 4 at line 16 of the bill as follows: "to parade, demonstrate, or picket within any of the Capitol buildings."

Mr. COLMER. Yes. Perhaps, I should yield to the distinguished author of the bill since the gentleman from Maryland has made a far more thorough study of the facts involved and the language contained herein.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, in response to the interrogation of the gentleman from Georgia as propounded to the gentleman from Mississippi, "to parade, demonstrate, or picket within any of the Capitol buildings" is new language. However, to parade on the Capitol Grounds is now against the law.

We are merely adding this to the law. If this language is adopted it would prevent parades, demonstrations, or picketing within any of the Capitol buildings.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. On page 10 of the report, section 7 thereof, there is set out the following language:

> It is forbidden to parade, stand, or move in processions or assemblages in said U.S. Capitol Grounds.

And so forth.

That is now the law. This makes the penalty apply to similar actions within the buildings themselves.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Mississippi will yield further, it probably would not hurt to add to the clarity of the section and the language which appears at page 4, line 16 of the bill, to say "or Capitol Grounds"?

Mr. COLMER. If I understand the answer of the gentleman from Maryland and the response of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] correctly, that would be surplusage.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished chairman will yield, I notice that the language in the existing law in section 7, as it appears on page 10 of the report, does not use the word "picket," but the new language in the bill does use the word "picket," but it simply refers to the buildings.

I just wondered if it would do violence to the bill—however, I now see they also use in the new language in the bill itself the word "demonstrate" for the first time. The word "parade" is in the existing law.

The words are "to parade, stand, or move in processions or assemblages." That is in the existing law, but the new law as proposed would add the words "demonstrate and picket," but would leave out the word "grounds," and I just wondered if anybody would have an objection to adding the word "grounds" to the new language.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland for a further answer to that question.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In the present law it is forbidden to parade, stand, move in processions or assemblages, or to display flags, banners, or devices designed or adapted to bring into public notice any party, organization, or movement. So I do not see how one could picket with the language in the law the way it is at the present time, or demonstrate.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLMER. I yield further.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, but it was just a little unusual to me that they would use these words for the first time, and still leave out another very specific and significant word with reference to the grounds.

Mr. COLMER. May I suggest, in response to the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia, that this is an open rule, and when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule he may seek to further clarify it.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. I am disturbed, Mr. Speaker, by the gentleman's reference to and broad-scale attack on the Freedom Democratic Party in Mississippi. I believe that this party was clearly formed because of the refusal of the white power structure in the State of Mississippi to permit Negro citizens to vote and participate in the democratic process; and I take exception to the suggestion of the distinguished gentleman that the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party is bent upon a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States.

I believe that that is not a warranted conclusion to be made on the floor of this House.

I might point out that, insofar as I know, the Federal jury in the Chaney, Goodman, and Schwerner case has not come in, but it has taken over 3 years to bring to trial the accused murderers of three courageous young people who were brutally murdered on June 21, 1964, in the State of Mississippi, and that State judicial system failed to indict anyone for murder——

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentleman from New York for a question, and I do not want him to take all of my time because I may want to make some comments on his comments.

Mr. RYAN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, but I do believe that I should state my views for the RECORD on this matter.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RYAN. The gentleman has the floor.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman reply to my question? I will ask the gentleman from New York whether the gentleman takes this kind of a position—and we do not take this kind of a position in Mississippi—if the gentleman believes in and subscribes to any group of people, the Freedom Democratic Party in Mississippi, or any other group in New York, or whatever designation he wants to give to them, putting out literature showing people how to make Molotov cocktails to kill people with?

Does the gentleman from New York believe in that?

Mr. RYAN. Surely the gentleman would not suggest that any Member of this House would condone violence or would condone any effort on the part of any person to attempt to manufacture any weapons of violence.

Mr. COLMER. Then I take it the gentleman does not approve of that?

Mr. RYAN. I do not know what the paper, which the gentleman holds, says, but I stand on my statement. That is not the issue.

The issue that I wanted to respond to is the gentleman's blanket indictment of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman will permit, I indicted them for putting this literature out. The gentleman says he does not condone it.

Mr. RYAN. I do not concede that this organization put out the particular paper that the gentleman is holding in his hand.

Mr. COLMER. Let me just say this finally to the gentleman. The gentleman has been around this House now for about 4 or 5 years. It so happens, and I guess due to the fact that God and life have been good to me, that I have been around this House for 35 years. The House has witnessed the conduct of both of us, and I will leave it to the House to judge between our respective conduct and philosophy, and I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I think as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has already indicated in his remarks, in effect, the very fact that we have to bring to the floor of the House today a bill dealing with the safety of the

Capitol Building and the grounds that surround it—and incidentally, of course, the safety of the Members who work in those buildings—is a rather sad commentary on the fact that even here in the Nation's Capitol we seem to dwell in the very shadow of violence.

There were some 1-minute speeches that I listened to a few minutes ago referring to the fact that we may see a further manifestation of that directed not so much against the Congress apparently as against the Department of Defense and the Pentagon. But we may nevertheless see a further manifestation of that predisposition toward violence take place here in our Capitol on Saturday.

There was a day when men and women came to the Capitol to stand and to gaze in reverence and awe at the beauty of this building and at the Capitol dome; or to visit quietly with their Representatives in the office buildings and here on these grounds.

But if you have read the report, you will realize that one or two of the court of appeals cases that have led to this legislation involve the fact that there are those today who are not satisfied with the right to peaceably assemble and petition.

One of these cases involved some students who came to this very building not many feet from where I stand today and castigated the distinguished Speaker of the House and who were not satisfied with the fact that he courteously received them and listened to their petition, but they proceeded to make some impossible and preposterous demands which he had to reject and as a result they laid down upon the floor and began to kick and scream and carry on in a boisterous, disorderly, and disgraceful fashion.

It is because the Committee on Public Works felt that the general statutes of the District of Columbia and the 1946 act which deal with the Capitol Grounds are not sufficient to deal with incidents of this kind that they have brought this bill before the House today.

I think they should be commended, frankly, for undertaking this task because, of course, as they inform you in the report, the court of appeals itself, in one of those two cases, suggested to the Congress that a thoroughgoing review of these statutes is necessary because of the confusion that exists today in the law with reference to their enforcement.

The very fact that you can have the anomalous situation where for the crime of disorderly conduct, one can be punished by a fine of $250 or a jail sentence of up to 90 days, if it occurred anywhere else in the District or any other public building, but that one can commit disorderly conduct in the Capitol itself and be fined no more than $50 indicates very clearly, I think, the confusion of the present state of the law and the fact that some changes and amendments are necessary.

That is all, I think, this bill undertakes to do. It does it by making clear that the 1946 act relates not only to the Capitol Grounds but also to acts committed within the Capitol Building itself as well as other buildings located on the Capitol Grounds. It further goes on and spells out in section 6 of the act of 1946, as revised, that it is a felony for anyone to come upon the Capitol Grounds with firearms, explosives, or death-dealing weapons of any kind.

Then it makes a misdemeanor of another category of offenses and penalizes them as such. If people come, either to this Chamber, or to the committee rooms of the Capitol, or to the Rayburn Building, or to the Marble Room of the Senate, and so on, in an effort willfully to obstruct business or otherwise interfere with activities going on there they are guilty of committing a misdemeanor.

It should be pointed out that there are some minority views that are attached to the committee report. They reflect concern on the part of at least one Member of this body that the language used in the bill was not perhaps as artful as might be the case; that there is some vagueness, which, of course, is normally to be avoided in drawing penal statutes, the point is raised that in confiding to the Capitol Police Board, which is the body made up of the Architect of the Capitol, the Sergeant at Arms of this body and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the authority to issue regulations to exempt Members of Congress or members of the armed services, the Secret Service or the FBI—people who might necessarily, either in the discharge of their duties have to come upon the Capitol Grounds or enter these buildings with side arms or firearms, we have introduced an unconstitutional element.

We had one Member of this body appear before the Rules Committee and confess some alarms that he might, unless exempted, be subject to penalties under this act merely for having an 18th century dueling pistol as part of a collection of weapons which he kept in his office. I suppose, in an effort to meet that situation, there is that provision in the bill that the Capitol Police Board can exempt from the application of this statute Members of Congress and others who might have a legitimate reason to come upon the grounds or to enter these buildings with firearms.

I, myself, think that perhaps the language of the statute itself might have better specifically set forth those specific exemptions from the law, rather than confiding that jurisdiction to a police board to issue regulations. Frankly, if an amendment is offered to that effect, I would very gladly support it. But I think on the whole the committee has performed a useful and a necessary service in bringing this bill to us today under an open rule where it can be discussed and, if need be, amended to further assure the safety of the Members of this House and the other body and to insure the maintenance of decorum and order in the Capitol Building.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13178) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol Buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 13178, with Mr. STEED in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I feel the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] did a splendid job in explaining just exactly what effect this bill will have.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 13178, which is before this body today, is needed legislation. Recent incidents within the Capitol Building itself and on the Capitol Grounds indicate quite clearly why this bill should be passed today. Visitors from all over the United States coming to the Nation's Capital every year as well as the Members and employees of the Congress are entitled to go about their pursuits without any undue disturbance from those who would attempt to disrupt the orderly business of the Nation's Capital by such actions as we have seen in recent weeks. The Committee on Public Works believes this legislation, which strengthens existing law regarding the use of and the safety and order within the Capitol Buildings and Grounds, will provide the proper vehicle to prevent future disturbances such as we have seen in the recent past. The legislation specifically would prohibit certain dangerous, disorderly, and disruptive conduct within the Capitol Buildings. It further, and necessarily so, increases the penalties for engaging in such dangerous and disorderly conduct.

The bill, in essence, would amend existing law in the following manner. It places in the category of a felony the carrying, discharge, or transportation of weapons and explosives on the Capitol Grounds or in the Capitol Buildings and knowingly and with force and violence entering and remaining upon the floor of either House of Congress. In the category of a misdemeanor would be a wide range of disruptive or disorderly conduct. The penalty for felonious activities would subject the perpetrator to a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. The penalty for engaging in any of the other prohibited acts would be a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both.

The responsibility for prosecuting the violations under H.R. 13178 would rest with the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia. He strongly supports the enactment of this legislation. In addition, several recent court decisions affecting these problems within the District of Columbia pointed out that the general statutes applying to disorderly conduct in the District did not apply to the Capitol Buildings or Grounds. It further brought to light the need for legislation such as this which is before us today.

Let me say further that the legislation specifically gives to the Capitol Police Board, which is composed of the Architect of the Capitol and the Sergeants at Arms of the House and Senate, the authority to issue such regulations as it deems necessary for the proper control of order within the Capitol Buildings and Grounds. The committee pointed out in its report in answer to several questions raised by Members during the hearings on the legislation that, and I quote directly from the report:

> The committee expects that the Capitol Police Board in the exercise of this regulatory authority will, to the extent appropriate, exempt Members of Congress from these provisions, as well as officers and members of the Armed Forces, National Guard, Secret Service, FBI, and other police officers engaged in the performance of their official duties.

This language in the report plus the record we are making here today indicate quite clearly what the committee and I believe the Congress will intend by the legislation. I am certain the Capitol Police Board will follow what we have written into the committee report.

Let me conclude by saying, as I said initially, H.R. 13178 is needed legislation. I strongly recommend its passage.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. As the gentleman is well aware, there are several Members of Congress who are collectors of guns, rifles, and so forth. If they were to keep these weapons in their offices or someplace on the Capitol Grounds, it is not the intent that they would be in violation of the law, is it?

Mr. FALLON. I believe the report and the legislative history we make today will show that the police board can exempt them from the prohibited acts of this law.

Mr. HALEY. It is not the intent of this legislation to prohibit that?

Mr. FALLON. It is not the intent to prohibit any Member from having a gun collection or making whatever use he may wish to make of them.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this to be essential legislation. Some reasons for it have been discussed, such as the uncertainty at the present time as to under what statute those who are responsible for disorder on Capitol Hill would be prosecuted, what the fine would be, or who would do the prosecuting. This was very ably described by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 22, 1967, which explained in detail the need for this legislation.

The need for this legislation also is stated, and there is an invitation for Congress to act, in the case cited at the end of the report, the Smith case, as it appears on page 26. In that case the court stated:

> What we said in *Feely, supra*, applies here. These appellants were entitled to know with certainty the offense with which they were charged and the possible penalty threatened. Under the circumstances they were entitled to a definite reference to the law which they had allegedly violated. In view of the confusion apparent in the enforcement of these and related statutes we commend to executive and legislative authorities a review of this entire area of the law.

This is precisely what the legislation intends to accomplish.

Mr. Chairman, I have been in this Chamber at a time when up in one of the galleries a member of the Nazi Party handcuffed himself to one of the railings, after he threw a swastika in this House Chamber. It could have been a Molotov cocktail.

I was also in this Chamber when right out of the door to my left there appeared a complete stranger in a white sheet, spewing hatred, who came right here in the well of this House spewing his hatred. He was not a Member and not an employee, not entitled to be on the floor. He was obviously attempting to disrupt and obstruct the operation of this legislative body, which I personally believe to be the most important and effective legislative body in the entire world.

I understand also that fellow under that sheet was a member of the Nazi Party, and I have heard rumors that he was the one who shot George Lincoln Rockwell. It is a good thing he did not have shooting in mind the day he appeared on the House floor.

I also have in mind the Puerto Ricans, who were here in 1953 and who did actually shoot a number of Members—one of whom was our respected chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

I also have in mind those who sat in the gallery of the other body in recent days and tried to disrupt their business.

It is my opinion, it is essential that Congress act as it relates to Capitol Hill, just as much as I felt it essential for Congress to act as it related to the antiriot bill and violent civil disturbances throughout this Nation.

I am glad to see the bill here. It passed the Senate without any substantial disagreement or votes against it whatsoever. I believe it is time that we on Capitol Hill provide the necessary deterrent and do away with the loopholes which now exist in some instances and which no penalty other than a $10 forfeiture for those who are guilty of civil disturbance on Capitol Hill.

We should make certain that disorderly conduct within buildings is punished, and we should serve notice at this time to those "peaceniks" who are invading Washington, reportedly this weekend, that on Capitol Hill the Government's business as it relates to the legislative branch—and, yes, in all buildings, public buildings, as well—these buildings are off limits, and the business of governing the people of America must go on, and no one in the name of any objective will be permitted to stop that Government business.

I would like to say as an aside that I am deeply disappointed as well, that there is not on the lawbooks at the moment as a reception for those coming to Washington to demonstrate this weekend, H.R. 421, the antiriot bill, which I introduced and which passed this House by a vote of about 5 to 1, 349 to 70. I am sorry that so far it is bottled up in the Committee on the Judiciary of the other body. If that law were on the books, and if in fact civil disturbance results, then they would be subject to the necessary and stiff penalties of that bill. Unfortunately, there is no similar protection in the District of Columbia. I think it is a crying shame that that bill is not law at the present time. I sincerely hope and pray that there will be no violent civil disturbance this weekend, but I think on Capitol Hill we have a duty to pass this bill so as to serve notice that Capitol Hill is off limits.

I do not need to remind my colleagues of these disgraceful episodes. I might say no one more strongly supports than I do the constitutional right of American citizens to freedom of speech, to petition of Government, redress of grievances, to demonstrate peacefully in opposition to or in favor of Government actions. I support these, but I insist that there must be reasonable limitations on the manner in which these rights can be exercised. Individuals and groups must be afforded the freedom to express views but not in such a way as to obstruct or impede the orderly procedures of governing nearly 200 million Americans. We must have a balance between the interests of our citizens and our Government, protecting the Government on the one hand and the individual right to freedom of expression on the other hand.

This bill accomplishes that. It has been very carefully drafted. Our distinguished chairman has discussed basically what it attempts to accomplish. I want to debunk some of the bunk, if I can, that is being said, and possibly will be discussed in the markup of the bill in just a few moments. I would like to do so in advance. Here are some questions that have been raised.

Is prohibition of parading, demonstrating or picketing as provided in the bill unconstitutional? My answer is "No." Section 7 of the act approved July 1, 1946, already prohibits these activities on the Capitol Grounds. The constitutionality of section 7 of the act approved July 31, 1946, 40 U.S.C. 193g, was upheld by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals in the case of Dianne Feeley against District of Columbia decided on June 17, 1966. In that case, the court stated,

> The Capitol Grounds statute has for its obvious purposes the noninterference with the work of the legislature, the maintenance of free and undisturbed movement of tour-

> ists and visitors into and around the seat of our nation's government, and the protection of the landscape. It is clear and nondiscriminatory on its face and prohibits any and all groups from parading or assembling in a certain defined area. As such, we feel it is a permissible exercise of congressional power.

This bill, H.R. 13178, simply extends this prohibition to Capitol buildings. Aside from the constitutionality of prohibiting these activities on the grounds, it seems such prohibition within the buildings where the legislative processes take place is clearly and unquestionably constitutional.

The second question is, Would the bill impede Members and staff members from carrying out their official duties? The answer is "No." Subsection (c), section 6 of the 1946 act, as it would be amended by H.R. 13178 expressly provides that "Nothing contained in this section shall forbid any act of any Member of the Congress, or any employee of a Member of Congress, any officer or employee of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, or any officer or employee of either House of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof which is performed in the lawful discharge of his official duties." Also, this is pursuant to the rules of the House as it appears on page 8 of the report.

The next question is: Would H.R. 13178 prevent Members of Congress from transporting firearms to their offices, or retaining them there, whether for the purpose of display, protection, or sporting use?

Answer: No, possession or transportation of firearms is unlawful except as authorized by regulations which shall be promulgated by the Capitol Police Board. The House report on the bill—House Report No. 745—at page 7 expresses the intent that Members of Congress and others be exempted to an appropriate extent, from this provision.

Next we come to the question of whether delegation of authority to allow exemptions from prohibitions of criminal laws is invalid.

Answer: No, the general authority of the Congress to delegate authority is too well established to require citations. A few examples of precedents for the delegation of authority to allow exemptions from the prohibitions of criminal statutes will suffice:

Exemptions by Secretary of the Treasury against transportation of firearms or communication, in favor of banks, public carriers, and so forth—49 U.S.C. 1472, misdemeanor.

Exemption from hunting, fishing and trapping laws by Secretary of the Interior—18 U.S.C. 41 et seq., misdemeanor.

Exemptions by Postmaster General from prohibition against mailing firearms—18 U.S.C. 1715, felony.

Exemption by Commissioner of Narcotics on importation of narcotic drugs and coca laws—21 U.S.C. 173, felony.

The next question is, Could congressional staff members and visitors to the Capitol innocently subject themselves to a criminal prosecution, without intent to violate the rules, or disrupt the Congress or its deliberations?

Answer: No, it has been said that reasonable discretion by the prosecutors will solve this problem. I believe this is a partial solution. But a more acceptable solution is the adoption of workable and meaningful rules by the two Houses of the Congress. It is on the assumption that such rules will be adopted that I favor this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear in my opinion that legislative action is needed, and needed soon, in order to control disruptive activities on the Capitol Grounds. It is my opinion that H.R. 13178 meets this clear need. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I cosponsored and shall vote for the bill, and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Chairman, there is much in H.R. 13178 that is reasonable and implicit in the right of the Congress to take necessary steps to enable it to carry out its constitutional function. Nevertheless, I must rise to urge that it be recommitted to the Committee on Public Works so that an issue of vital importance which this committee has failed to deal with can be afforded the airing it is entitled to.

We are told by the committee that it has given full recognition to the need to provide every legitimate opportunity for the public expression of dissenting views in a reasonable and proper fashion while giving equal attention to the need to provide and maintain necessary safeguards for protecting the conduct of public business in the Federal Legislature.

The committee has assured us that it has sought to accommodate both of these values. It is my strong conviction that the bill, as reported out by the committee and which is before the House, has failed to accommodate these values, to the detriment of the basic right of the people to assemble peaceably and petition their government.

Under existing law, the people are flatly banned from any demonstrations on the Capitol Grounds, however peaceful, however dignified those demonstrations may be. This ban was enacted in 1946 as section 7 of the Capitol Buildings and Grounds Act (40 U.S.C. 193(g)). It presently provides:

> It is forbidden to *parade, stand,* or *move in processions* or *assemblages* in said United States Capitol Grounds, or to display therein any flag, banner, or device designed or adapted to bring into public notice any party, organization, or movement, except as hereinafter provided in sections 11 and 12 of this Act. (Emphasis added.)

The enactment of H.R. 13178 as before us today would leave intact this unconstitutional and unconscionable restriction.

The committee's failure to act to repeal section 193(g) is the most convincing demonstration that it has not given full recognition to the need to provide every legitimate opportunity for the public expression of dissenting views in a reasonable and proper fashion.

The 1946 Congress acted unwisely, in my opinion, when it enacted section 193 (g). Yet it can be said for that Congress, in mitigation, if not in excuse, that it did not have the benefit of the declaration of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Edwards* v. *South Carolina*, 372 U.S. 220 (1963).

In that case, the Court recognized that a peaceful demonstration on the grounds of the South Carolina Statehouse was protected by the first amendment. Speaking for an almost unanimous court, Justice Stewart said:

> The circumstances in this case reflect an exercise of these basic constitutional rights in their most pristine and classic form. The petitioners felt aggrieved by laws of South Carolina. . . . They peaceably assembled at the site of the State Government and there peaceably expressed their grievances "to the citizens of South Carolina, along with the Legislative Bodies of South Carolina."

It appears clear to me that the thrust of this holding applies with equal force to a petition to the U.S. Congress. The committee tells us in its report that it exercised great caution and gave careful attention to the need for legislative constraint in this matter. It admirably declares:

> The nature of the legislative process, and the problems which now confront us as a Nation, are such that people with strong feelings must be assured of the rights of freedom of expression and of assembly and the right to petition their Government, but under no circumstances should the guarantee of these rights be extended to a license for a minority to delay, impede, or otherwise disrupt the orderly processes of the legislature which represents all Americans.

I agree that the Congress of the United States must not have its work interfered with or unduly disturbed. I agree that it can prohibit any dangerous, disorderly, or disruptive conduct. Therefore, Congress can and should prohibit demonstrations within the Capitol Buildings themselves, but that does not mean that Congress has the right to prohibit peaceful demonstrations on the Capitol Grounds. Even if picketers or demonstrators carry signs urging Congressmen and Senators how to vote on particular measures, this is no more than the right they now have by mail or personal visits.

I can only assume that the committee, in its failure to repeal section 193 (g), proceeded on the tourtured and dangerous presumption that any and all demonstrations on the Capitol Grounds would delay, impede, or otherwise disrupt the orderly processes of the legislature.

I recognize that a demonstration, however peaceful and however orderly its participants intend it to be, might indeed cause some inconvenience to the Capitol Police, might require the police to place more men on duty. Nevertheless, to continue this flat prohibition on this ground is to diminish the cherished first amendment right to the stature of a nuisance.

I do not say that a narrowly drawn regulatory statute evincing a judgment that certain specific conduct on the Capitol Grounds be regulated is not permissible. We could reasonably limit the periods during which the Capitol Grounds are open to the public, and place controls on where demonstrators could march, so they would not unduly burden traffic or block access or egress to and from the Capitol. However, such regulation is a far cry from the present flat ban on demonstrators or picketing. As the Washington Post put it so eloquently in its editorial on October 17:

> Demonstrators must be peaceable to come under the First Amendment's protection. But they ought not to be discouraged or frustrated out of a fear that they will become disorderly. Only a clear and present danger of disorder can justify repression of the right to assembly and petition. That right, indeed, ought to be jealously guarded by Americans, for it constitutes one of the keys to national security. It is time enough to repress protest when it actually threatens public safety. Until then, it is an asset, not a liability.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Public Works, and in the event the motion fails, I would urge a "no" vote on final passage.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds so that I may answer the gentleman because I do not want his statement to be unanswered when it has nothing to do with the bill before us.

He is talking about the law that is presently in existence. This bill does not change the law that is presently in existence, which relates to the Capitol Grounds. This bill sets rules that relate to the Capitol buildings. So we are leaving the law basically as it is insofar as it relates to the grounds. His argument has no place in the discussion of this bill relating to the Capitol buildings. That is the typical red herring that is constantly dragged in with relation to the antiriot bill and other matters, and has no place in the discussion of this legislation.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE].

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise with some trepidation as a junior majority member of the committee. I am the only one who expressed a dissenting view to the particular bill before us. I do so not because I disagree with the objectives of the bill because I happen to concur wholeheartedly with the objectives of the bill. I disagree primarily because I believe the bill is aimed at one weekend—the weekend coming up—whereas the bill will be on the statute books from here on.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was hoping that no one would make that statement. But since the gentleman has made that statement, I want to assure him that this bill and the history behind this bill have no connection with the statement that the gentleman just made.

This bill was filed in the other body by the majority and minority leaders some few weeks ago. I can assure the gentleman that the introduction of this bill, and the reporting of the the bill by the committee, and the consideration of the bill in the House today is not because of any proposed or possible plans of certain groups or individuals in relation to next Saturday. I am sure the gentleman will accept my word for that.

Mr. WALDIE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do accept it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It might be just a coincidence, but there is no intention with respect to that nor is there any relationship to that.

This bill was introduced and it passed the other body and was reported out of our committee. A rule was obtained for its consideration and it is on the legislative program at this time for consideration—but not because of any plans of any group of groups in connection with the coming weekend.

Mr. WALDIE. I thank the distinguished Speaker. I accept his assurances completely and I apologize if I have misconstrued the facts, as I apparently have done.

Nevertheless, my objections to the bill have nothing to do with the objectives because I think the objectives of the bill are proper.

My objections to the bill stem from the fact that I think it is poorly drafted, and if I may point out some ambiguities, I think perhaps my objections to the bill might be better understood.

First, let me point out, as I understood the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] to state earlier, that a refutation can be made to the assertion of any objections by stating they will be clarified when the regulations are adopted.

It probably can be stated with some certainty with reference to any objection that I make to this bill that the reply can be made, "Well that objection will be cleared up when regulations are adopted." But I do not know what those regulations are today and I will not have any part in the formulation of those regulations nor will the people I represent have any part in the formulation of those regulations.

All that I can pass on today is what is now in the provisions of this bill. There are these ambiguities that I want to point out that are in this bill that is before us today.

When we create acts that constitute a felony, we do not require a person who commits that felony to have knowledge that he is committing a felony or a crime. Whereas strangely enough, when the person commits a misdemeanor, we do require that the person should have knowledge.

I call your attention to line 7 on page 2 where in the introduction to the felony section, it says:

> It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons—

Then it defines the acts.

When we are dealing with misdemeanors, however, it says:

> It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons willfully and knowingly—

It seems to me if we are going to qualify their conduct in committing a misdemeanor as being willful and with knowledge, then their conduct in committing a felony should equally be so qualified, that is, that it should be done willfully and with knowledge.

Further, if you consider the section dealing only with felonies, as this bill is written—putting aside for the moment the adoption of any future regulations—if a Member of the Congress or his staff or a guest in Washington, D.C., believes because of conditions that he has been led to believe do here exist, and in my view perhaps their understanding may be incorrect—but if they believe that for their self protection it is desirable to carry a weapon, then they have committed a felony if they carry that weapon on Capitol Grounds.

If a constituent of mine from Contra Costa County, Calif., visits Washington in a camper—and many of them do—and he has the right for his protection to carry a weapon in that camper as he travels across the country—if that person parks his camper on the Capitol Grounds, he has committed a felony. He has not intended to do anything wrong but under the very wording and language of this bill, he has committed a felony, by mere possession of his rifle or gun. At a later date I shall offer an amendment in an attempt to correct that discrepancy.

Further on in the misdemeanor sections, if a man enters the floor of the House with force and violence, he still has to do it with knowledge. Line 24 states: "knowingly, with force and violence, to enter or to remain upon the floor of either House of the Congress." That seems to me to be absurd to require that he have knowledge when he enters the House with force and violence that he is doing so, and yet if he just enters the Rayburn Room, if he and his family are passing by the Rayburn Room, there is no door on that room, and there is no guard at that room; it is an inviting room. If they walk in that room and sit down to rest, they have knowingly entered that room. They have willfully entered that room, and they have committed a misdemeanor.

I know the argument can be answered, as the gentleman from Florida did, that there are two protections for this unfortunate family: First, there would be no prosecution, obviously, resulting from that act. I know there would not. But the mere fact that they are subjected to the indignity of having committed a misdemeanor and the insulting determination that no prosecution will result seems to me indicates that the bill is poorly drafted.

The second protection to this family stems from the argument that we can draft regulations which would prevent this from occurring to these people. But we should not be required to depend upon this independent body that is going to draft these regulations.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would add just one phrase on page 3, line 4, after the misdemeanor recitation:

> It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons willfully and knowingly with intent to impede, disrupt, or disturb the orderly conduct of official business.

Then if they are entering these places with that intent, they have committed a misdemeanor and should be arrested.

We have provided that qualification in two of the seven proscribed acts. We say that if he enters a committee room "willfully and knowingly" he can be arrested only if he entered that room "with intent to impede or obstruct the business of the Congress." If he enters the gallery as our guests do up here, if there is no man on the door and they enter the gallery, even when the Congress is not in session, you do not have to prove that they entered that gallery with intent to impede, obstruct, or disturb the Congress. They have committed a misdemeanor.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY].

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DENNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think the gentleman from California ought to be answered and this is the time to do it. Therefore, I have asked the gentleman from Nebraska to yield to me for a moment.

I understand the gentleman from California has raised the question of whether we should have the act require an intent to impede or disrupt as an element of the crime relating to the House floor and the House gallery.

Specifically, in committee we added the word—and it was on my recommendation—"knowingly," and already contained in the bill was the word "willfully."

Let us see what definition the legal dictionaries give to the word "willfully." "Willfully" is defined in case after case. One case states that the word "willfully" means not merely voluntarily but with a bad purpose. "Willfully" means with a bad purpose.

Further, it is defined time and again as to require the element of evil intent.

Here are a few of the cases. There is *State* v. *Bowers*, 228 N.W. 164, 165; 178 Minn. 589, a Minnesota case, in which it is stated:

> "Willfully" means with an evil intent or a bad purpose.

Here is another one, a Wisconsin case, *Humbird* v. *Fristad* (Wis.) 242 N.W. 158, 161: " 'Willfully' involves evil intent."

Here is one in Wisconsin: In criminal law, "willful" involves evil intent or malice. There is case after case. In *People* v. *Jewell*, 101 N.W. 835, 836; 138 Mich. 620 in Michigan:

> The term "willful" implies evil intent without justifiable excuse.

That completely answers the gentleman in his concern relating to a person innocently coming into the House Chamber or into the gallery. There has to be an evil intent in order for a violation to be committed. I think that completely answers the gentleman's objections.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a reply?

Mr. DENNEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the author of the bill, the gentleman from Florida, if that be so, why in the actions proscribed under sections 3 and 4 of the same subsection (b) to which we have made reference, is the qualification "with intent to disrupt the orderly conduct of official business"?

Mr. CRAMER. That is a good question, and there is a simple answer. I think the rule ought to be more strict under paragraphs (1) and (2), relating to the House floor, where we carry on our business, and where no one but Members and staff members are permitted. There should be a stricter rule as it relates to the floor than to the places listed under (3) and (4) and (5) and (6).

Mr. WALDIE. Further, is the gentleman suggesting the addition on line 4 of the wording "with intent to impede or disrupt orderly business" and not striking the word "willfully" lessens the impact and makes it less strict?

Mr. CRAMER. It makes it much less strict. It makes it less strict on the floor of the House, where the law should be more strict. The amendment of the gentleman, in my opinion, guts this section.

Mr. WALDIE. My amendment to add the words "with intent to disrupt or disturb the orderly conduct of business" guts the section?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. That is my opinion. The gentleman asked me the question, and I have given the gentleman my answer.

May I add, to reply further to the gentleman, one reason is that under the proposed amendment there has to be proof of those specific elements, which is not necessary as it is presently worded.

Mr. WALDIE. With the use of the word "willfully" why would we have to prove evil intent and have to prove specific elements of intent?

Mr. CRAMER. We could carry this on indefinitely.

Mr. WALDIE. I am willing to do so.

Mr. CRAMER. The actions, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment, would be applied to disrupting and disorderly conduct.

Mr. WALDIE. Or to the actions which the gentleman is proscribing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about several aspects of this bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE] has raised a number of very significant questions concerning the draftsmanship. He has questioned the loose language of the bill and whether or not this bill would stand up constitutionally on the point of vagueness or inconsistency. I think his discussion was enlightening, and also I feel his minority views as contained in the report are helpful in considering this legislation.

Beyond the question of the draftsmanship of this bill, however, I would suggest that there is another aspect, and that is the civil liberties question, the question of infringement on the Bill of Rights' guarantees.

This bill continues a dangerous trend toward the erosion of the rights peaceably to assemble and to petition for a redress of grievances which are guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, and which are subject, at this time of intense national emotion and concern over the war in Vietnam, to the temptation to restrict them. We should resist this temptation wherever we see its shadow.

I would point out that the Washington Post in an editorial of October 17 stressed the issue of the right of peaceful assembly. The Washington Post also expressed regret over recent administrative regulations restricting the right of peaceful assembly in the area of the White House.

This raises the question, to what extent will the effect of this proposed legislation, in conjunction with the basic act which it amends limit the visibility of dissent in this country?

The gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] pointed out that since 1946, when section 7 of the act of July 31, 1946, was enacted, the Supreme Court, in 372 U.S. 229, Edwards et al. against South Carolina, has struck down South Carolina convictions for demonstrating on the capitol grounds at the State capitol of South Carolina.

These questions are pertinent this afternoon. The present statute seems defective on first amendment grounds, and the committee might have seen fit to amend section 7 of the present law.

No one questions the need to protect both Houses of Congress from those who would willfully disrupt their performance of legislative functions. But I am concerned, first by a vaguely drafted piece of legislation, especially when it relates to first amendment guarantees and provides criminal penalties. Secondly, I view this as one more step in a series of bills brought before this House which will slowly compromise basic free speech guarantees. This tendency is a byproduct of the war which is increasingly being questioned by the American people, and the temptation to suppress dissent must be resisted.

Let us look at this legislation in the context of the national climate today.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 13178, which, while purporting to provide for the safety of the buildings and grounds of the Capitol, will in practice interfere with the freedoms of many Americans who visit the Capitol to either sightsee or to present their grievances to the Congress.

I am well aware of the need to insure that Congress—both in its committee rooms and on the floor of the House and Senate—be able to carry out all its duties without fear of violence or any other kind of disruption which would interfere with the orderly conduct of its business.

On the other hand, I am deeply concerned about the broad scope, vague language, and possible interference with first amendment rights of the bill before us today. It was so hastily conceived and reported out of committee that no official views of the Justice Department or the District government were available. Moreover, there seems to be no disposition on the part of the bill's supporters to accept clarifying amendments such as those offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE] which would remedy some of the most glaring defects, such as the lack of specific intent in the felony provisions.

Finally, I am most concerned about the general frame of mind and attitude of Congress reflected in such legislation. We have many, many thousands of quiet, orderly, visitors in the Capitol each year. We have a small number who, sometimes with an excess of zeal are passionately concerned about presenting their grievances to their constitutional representatives. Are we to overreact to the newspaper headlines occasioned by the latter few by passing legislation which flatly prohibits all demonstrations and which may, by its broadly restrictive terms, limit the rights of those wishing to make their case to Congress? This seems to be a case of using a shotgun to eliminate a gnat.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13178

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes", approved July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193a; D.C. Code 9–118), is amended by—

(1) inserting therein, immediately after the words "book 127, page 8,", the words "including all additions added thereto by law subsequent to June 25, 1946,"; and

(2) striking out the words "as defined on the aforementioned map".

(b) Section 6 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193f; D.C. Code 9–123) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons—

"(1) Except as authorized by regulations which shall be promulgated by the Capitol Police Board:

"(A) to carry on or have readily accessible to the person of any individual upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings any firearm, dangerous weapon, explosive, or incendiary device; or

"(B) to discharge any firearm or explosive, to use any dangerous weapon, or to ignite any incendiary device, upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings; or

"(C) to transport by any means upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings any explosive or incendiary device; or

"(2) Knowingly, with force and violence, to enter or to remain upon the floor of either House of the Congress.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons willfully—

"(1) to enter or to remain upon the floor of either House of the Congress, to enter or to remain in any cloakroom or lobby adjacent to such floor, or to enter or to remain in the Rayburn Room of the House or the Marble Room of the Senate, unless such person is authorized, pursuant to rules adopted by that House or pursuant to authorization given by that House, to enter or to remain upon such floor or in such cloakroom, lobby, or room;

"(2) to enter or to remain in the gallery of either House of the Congress in violation of rules governing admission to such gallery adopted by that House or pursuant to authorization given by that House;

"(3) to enter or to remain in any room within any of the Capitol Buildings set aside or designated for the use of either House of the Congress or any Member, committee, subcommittee, officer, or employee of the Congress or either House thereof with intent to disrupt the orderly conduct of official business;

"(4) to utter loud, threatening, or abusive language, or to engage in any disorderly or disruptive conduct, at any place upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings with intent to impede, disrupt, or disturb the orderly conduct of any session of the Congress or either House thereof, or the orderly conduct within any such building of any hearing before, or any deliberations of, any committee or subcommittee of the Congress or either House thereof;

"(5) to obstruct, or to impede passage through or within, the United States Capitol Grounds or any of the Capitol Buildings; or

"(6) to engage in any act of physical violence upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings; or

"(7) to parade, demonstrate, or picket within any of the Capitol Buildings."

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall forbid any act of any Member of the Congress, or any employee of a Member of the Congress, any officer or employee of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, or any officer or employee of either House of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, which is performed in the lawful discharge of his official duties."

(c) Section 8 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193h; D.C. Code 9–125) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. (a) Any violation of section 6(a) of this Act, and any attempt to commit any such violation, shall be a felony punishable by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or imprisonment not exceeding five years, or both.

"(b) Any violation of section 2, 3, 4, 5, 6(b), or (7) of this Act, and any attempt to commit any such violation, shall be a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding $500, or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

"(c) Violations of this Act, including attempts or conspiracies to commit such violations, shall be prosecuted by the United States attorney or his assistants in the name of the United States. None of the general laws of the United States and none of the laws of the District of Columbia shall be superseded by any provision of this Act. Where the conduct violating this Act also violates the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia, both violations may be joined in a single prosecution. Prosecution for any violation of section 6(a) or for conduct which constitutes a felony under the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia shall be in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. All other prosecutions for violations of this Act shall be in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions. Whenever any person is convicted of a violation of this Act and of the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia, in a prosecution under this subsection, the penalty which may be imposed for such violation is the highest penalty authorized by any of the laws for violation of which the defendant is convicted."

(d) The proviso contained in section 12 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193k) is repealed.

(e) Section 16(a) of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193m; D.C. Code 9–132) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 16 (a) As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'Capitol Building' shall be construed to include all buildings situated upon the United States Capitol Grounds and all subways and enclosed passages connecting two or more of those buildings.

"(2) The term 'firearm' shall have the same meaning as when used in section 1(3) of the Federal Firearms Act (52 Stat. 1252, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 901 (3)).

"(3) The term 'dangerous weapon' includes all articles enumerated in section 14(a) of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 654, as amended; D.C. Code 22–3214(a)) and also daggers, dirks, stilettoes, and knives having blades over three inches in length.

"(4) The term 'explosive' shall have the same meaning as when used in section 1(1) of the Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385, as amended; 50 U.S.C. 121).

"(5) The term 'act of physical violence' means any act involving (1) an assault or any other infliction or threat of infliction of death or bodily harm upon any individual, or (2) damage to or destruction of any real property or personal property."

Sec. 2. Section 15 of the Act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; 40 U.S.C. 101; D.C. Code 4–120, 22–3111), is amended by deleting "shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50.", and inserting in lieu thereof: "shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

Sec. 3. Prosecutions for violations of the Act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193a et seq.; D.C. Code 9–118 et seq.) and of section 15 of the Act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; D.C. Code 4–120, 22–3111), occurring prior to the enactment of these amendments shall not be affected by these amendments or abated by reason thereof. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to violations occurring after its enactment.

Mr. FALLON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 2, immediately after "willfully" insert "and knowingly".

On page 5, line 18, strike out "shall" and insert in lieu thereof "may".

On page 6, strike out lines 1 and 2.

On page 6, line 3, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FALLON

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I offer four technical and clarifying amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Fallon: On page 4, line 11, strike out "or".

On page 4, line 16, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 5, line 5, strike out "(7)" and insert in lieu thereof "7".

On page 6, strike out lines 11 through 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The term 'Capitol Buildings' means the United States Capitol, the Senate and House Office Buildings and garages, the Capitol power plant, all subways and enclosed passages connecting two or more of such structures, and the real property underlying and enclosed by any such structure."

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, these are technical amendments, merely to clarify the language.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on

the amendments offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POFF

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POFF: On page 6, line 22, insert the following after the word "also": "any device designed to expel or hurl a projectile capable of causing injury to persons or property,".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. I have seen the gentleman's amendment. I believe it strengthens the bill. We will accept it on this side.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I believe the gentleman has a sound amendment. It is needed. I agree with the amendment.

I referred to the gentleman earlier in my remarks, in the debate on the bill. I want to express to him my personal appreciation for the very fine research work he did relating to the confused state of the present law on this subject matter, as has appeared previously in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was a great deal of help to us in the committee and in the consideration of the bill, and in calling attention to the need for the bill.

The gentleman, one of the finest lawyers in the House, is to be congratulated for that service.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, in response to that most generous statement, may I say first of all thank you, and then, in order to be utterly honest, let me pause to pay tribute to the member of the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, Mr. Don Santarelli, who did the basic background research work which made the memorandum which appeared in the RECORD possible.

Mr. Chairman, just briefly, by way of explanation, this amendment is simply designed to include in the weapons which would be prohibited in the Capitol of the United States not only firearms but those guns which are discharged by use of compressed air or carbon dioxide or a spring mechanism or the zip-type gun or the so-called sling-type gun.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] for accepting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALDIE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALDIE: On page 2, line 8, insert after the word "persons," the word "knowingly."

On page 2, line 15, insert after the word "device" the following: "with intent to injure any person or property."

On page 2, line 23, insert after the word "device" the following: "with intent to injure any person or property."

On page 3, line 4, insert after the word, "knowingly," the following: "with intent to impede, disrupt, or disturb the orderly conduct of official business."

On page 3, line 22, beginning with the word "with," strike out all through "business," on line 23.

On page 4, line 3, beginning with the word "with," strike out all through "thereof" on line 8.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, the strike-out portions of the amendment merely reflect the fact that the qualification "with intent to disrupt the orderly conduct of official business" will no longer be required if my amendment is adopted, in items 3 and 4 on pages 3 and 4, because we repeat that phrase at the beginning of that section and require that specific intent for every one of the proscribed acts, in other words, that there be found "an intent to impede or disrupt or disturb the orderly conduct of official business."

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, these are the things we are seeking to prevent by this bill; namely, to prevent an impeding, disrupting, or disturbing of the orderly conduct of official business. I believe our use of the Capitol is restricted to the orderly conduct of official business and our right to control those visitors who visit our Capitol should similarly be limited to the fact of preventing them from impeding, disrupting, or disturbing the orderly conduct of our official business. This act goes much further than that. The actions of our visitors which are not intended to impede, disrupt, or disturb the orderly conduct of official business can be prohibited under the present bill. It seems that the Capitol belongs to the people of the United States as well as the Representatives of the United States.

The other amendment deals only with a section relative to a felony.

We use the word "willfully"—and as the gentleman from Florida explained—when described in terms of a misdemeanor, it carries with it the connotation of an evil intent being found. We do not demand that in terms of actions which are designed to constitute a felony. We do not even demand that they know they are committing a felony. All we say is if they know they have committed these specific acts, then they come under the definitions which constitute a felony. We should make this delineation so that no one makes a mistake when they do walk onto the Capitol Grounds, and should be sure that they know in having done so that they have committed a felony if engaged in the activities covered under the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, but in the language which is contained in the report we are undertaking to set up dual standards by exempting Members of Congress from carrying firearms even into their offices, or here.

Also, it seems to be anomalous that here we are rushing to get this thing through in order to protect ourselves. But, there is no such rush coincident with this to protect the public.

Mr. Chairman, by passing the administration's firearms bill to protect the public, we would be accomplishing something in their behalf. However, we are certainly hurrying to protect ourselves.

Mr. WALDIE. I think that the remedy would be insured with the adoption of these amendments relative to the use of guns. The present law reads that if you discharge any gun within this area that constitutes a felony, no matter what the intent is and I believe that to be proper. But, with my amendment, if you are carrying or if you are transporting a gun you have to be found guilty of the charge that you are carrying it or transporting it with the intent to injure a person or property.

Mr. Chairman, all that this amendment is designed to do is to insure that every single action described as being evil in this legislation is, in fact, evil. It it to prevent innocent people from becoming ensnared in this situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, in relation to one of the amendments which has been offered by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE], the words "willfully and knowingly" appear.

However, if someone should walk through that door there or come in through the door here—if they should do so—and if no one were at the door and they walked on in, there is nothing "willfully" or "knowingly" inherent in that. I am talking about while the House is not in session.

As Speaker, I have allowed and have followed the practice of permitting Members to bring their friends and groups into the House Chamber. In my opinion this represents a wonderful and certainly stimulating and interesting experience. However, I can assure the gentleman from California, based upon my own knowledge of the law—having been before I came to Congress very active in trial cases, particularly criminal cases—the Government has to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt as to the elements of "knowingly and willfully." And, if some individual or if some little family happened to stroll into this Chamber and if there is no one at the door to tell them that it is against the regulations and you cannot do this, that would not constitute a violation.

But, if it were someone who came through that door as happened a year or so ago and who rushed right into this Chamber, that would be a violation, of course. I have given considerable thought to this matter. Suppose he had a gun in his pocket; suppose he had a bomb on him? Who knows the instrumentalities of potential death which one carries with him?

Mr. Chairman, in connection with that amendment, I can assure the gentleman from California—at least I will join with the gentleman in the statement that no one would undertake to prosecute someone who walked in here under totally innocent circumstances. However, if someone walked in here with a gun in their pocket, I am sure that the gentleman would agree that would represent a different situation?

Mr. WALDIE. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this would be true even if the House were not in session.

However, I see groups out here and individuals from all parts of the country whom I am so glad to see. I upon occasion say to them, "Well, have you been in the House Chamber?" I give them permission to go in and upon occasion I come in with them. I think it is stimulating, especially when there are children involved. I say, "Well, I hope you will sit in the Speaker's chair; some of you youngsters might have the good fortune to be here some day." In my opinion that is productive of good results. I say, however, "When you sit there, remember it is not an electric chair, but sometimes there is an awful lot of electricity around it." Of course, I say this in a joking way and in making conservation with these people.

Mr. Chairman, the term "willfully and knowingly" would not cover anyone who happened to stray into the Chamber, if there were no guard or if there were no assistant doorkeeper or policeman at either one of these doors to prevent them from doing so.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to receive the assurances you have given me, but let me tell the Speaker what prompted my concern. I asked that question of the representative from the Department of Justice before the committee, I posed the very hypothetical question the Speaker posed to me about the family that walked into the Rayburn Room.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WALDIE was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Speaker for his courtesy in yielding me this time.

As I started to say, I posed that very hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker, to the representative of the Department of Justice before the committee. I said to him "What would happen to this family that visits me from Contra Costa County that accidently wanders into the Rayburn Room, assuming, No. 1, they intend to walk into the Rayburn Room and, No. 2, they knew it was the Rayburn Room." I said "Have they committed a crime?" and he said "Yes, they would have committed a crime, but no one would ever prosecute the people."

And I acknowledge that they would not prosecute them, but my objection is that those people would have been subjected to this insulting determination.

I am more inclined to accept the Speaker's version on what is criminal law than that of the Department of Justice, but my concern is that the Department of Justice apparently is not as certain as the Speaker is that "willfully" constitutes a situation that is not covered by the hypothetical question I posed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman asked the question if they willfully and knowingly walked into the Rayburn Room——

Mr. WALDIE. No. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. In violation of the law, but not if they happen to walk into the Rayburn Room.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the very question I posed to the Department of Justice representative during the committee hearing—and if the report were before the Speaker he could see that I was talking about this family from Contra Costa County with one child who wandered down the hall, and there is no guard or policeman in the Rayburn Room, and it is an inviting room, and they walk into it. They knowingly walk in, and it is willful, they know it is the Rayburn Room. The representative of the Department of Justice said that under the wording of this bill they would have committed, of course, a crime, but he said "Do not worry. We would not prosecute them."

Mr. McCORMACK. If it is a willful matter——

Mr. WALDIE. They were tired.

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe the Rayburn Room is designed for the benefit of the Members, primarily. Is that correct?

Mr. WALDIE. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right. Rather than having your constituents out in the corridor, when the east wing was built the room was built so as to have Members meet their constituents under an atmosphere of respectability, and it is not only for meeting constituents and friends, but they have conferences in there.

Now, there is a corridor down the east side of the building, and my district offices are there. I come along that corridor and every once in a while I see a sign saying that the public is barred. I take that sign and put it inside the Rayburn Room, because it belongs inside the Rayburn Room, not out in the corridor. So I just move the sign back because I do not like to see a sign there saying to the public that they cannot walk down that corridor. That corridor goes over to the Senate side, and the sign properly should be in the Rayburn Room, geographically it should be in the Rayburn Room, so I move it back when I see it.

But if someone walked in there accidently, there is nothing willful or knowing about it. I can see them walking down that corridor, and they might step into the Rayburn Room, but there is nothing knowing or willful about that.

Mr. WALDIE. I accept the views of the Speaker, but the Department of Justice——

Mr. McCORMACK. With all due regard to the Department of Justice, they have not always been right.

Mr. WALDIE. I absolutely agree. I could not concur more. That was the reason why I thought if we included this phrase then the interpretation of the Speaker would be unmistakably correct.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Is it not the point of the gentleman that knowing and willful can be interpreted without what the criminal courts say is an inference that there is more or less an evil intent that is coupled with knowing and willful?

Mr. WALDIE. I certainly believe that to be so.

The gentleman from Florida in his research has determined that the inclusion of the word "willful" in a criminal statute requires a feeling of evil intent. My only reason for including this is to clarify the wording with the intent to impede and obstruct the business of the Congress; that is the only thing we are trying to prevent. So, whatever the evil intent was, if they prove these facts it does not matter how evil it was, these are easily provable, and it is a lot more difficult to prove it without this standard. Under the criteria the gentleman from Florida set up on his definition of "willful," then you have to prove some mystique, something very mysterious, some evil intent. And it seemed to me that this proposed amendment strengthens the act.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman has performed a very useful service in the colloquy that he has had with the Speaker. I say to the gentleman that I have some sympathy with his purposes and his objectives in connection with this language, but I do believe in light of the legislative history that has been written, with the very strong statement as to the requirement for the definition of "willful" and "knowingly" supported on both the majority and the minority sides of the House, that the need for the limitation which the gentleman seeks to add has been eliminated, and I believe we can proceed to adopt this bill without the dangers the gentleman fears.

Mr. WALDIE. That colloquy dealt only with the "misdemeanor" portion of the bill, but it sheds no light on the ambiguities contained in the felony section.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as the proposed amendments to page 2, it would seem to me that the mere possession of a firearm irrespective of what the person may have in his own mind should be sufficient to make it a misdemeanor. Hence, I am sorry but I must disagree with the proposed amendment.

As has been stated by the gentleman from Oklahoma and also with relation to the colloquy that took place, I think that rather clearly explains the intent of the Congress, to the effect that before there can be any conviction there is the presupposed fact that the language, as contained in the bill, so far as willfully and knowingly, as concerend it is required that the person must be shown to have intended to impede and disrupt official business.

As I said earlier, I think the gentleman is wrong so far as the mere possession of the weapon is concerned.

In the State of New York, we have what is known as the Sullivan law. Under that law the mere possession of a weapon, a dangerous weapon, is a crime. It is a misdemeanor unless the person has a license. I think the gentleman should take that into consideration, although I am in complete accord with the clarification that he seeks to make in connection with this legislation.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALDIE. I think there is a misunderstanding on the gentleman's part. Under the present wording, without the amendment, the mere possession of firearms is a felony and not a misdemeanor. The mere possession of a firearm with no intent to use it for any improper purpose is a felony.

A family that goes through the Capitol grounds in a camper or trailer with a weapon in that camper and accessible to them has committed a felony under the wording of this act.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. It would seem to me, may I say in answer to the gentleman, that the onus is upon the individual who carries the weapon. If there is anybody who has to be careful and cautious about a possible violation of law, it is the one who carries the weapon.

Mr. WALDIE. The only reply that I would make to the gentleman is that there is no defense possible. The person could say that he carries the weapon because he has a permit to carry it and is carrying it across the country for the defense of his family. But that is no defense because the mere possession is a felony. There is no prescribed intent in the bill as it is written. The amendment I propose would give them a defense.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I would be satisfied to go along with an amendment to make it a misdemeanor and to say that no intent is necessary. But I do believe that the mere possession of a dangerous weapon should be treated as a crime. As I said earlier, any explanation or any onus should be upon the one who carries the gun. We should not be compelled to prove that he was carrying it for any purpose other than an ulterior purpose.

So, as I said earlier, I think if there is to be any amendment, it might be in the sense that mere possession of a dangerous weapon should be a crime although it may well be a misdemeanor.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the language offered by the gentleman from California is necessary. In fact, it would have a tendency to weaken the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I merely wish to cite for the Record the Supreme Court case of *Felton* v. *United States*, 96 U.S. 702, in which the Court discussed the meaning of the word "willfully" and its construction saying that it implies evil intent. There is no question about it. The State courts overwhelmingly have taken the same position. "Willfully" clearly includes bad intent. So what the gentleman is attempting to accomplish is already accomplished in the bill by the word "willfully." But it does not limit it to actually disrupting the House, as it appears in the bill. The gentleman's amendment would limit it to actually intentionally disrupting the Chamber. If some comes in and steals that dictionary or cuts up the paintings on the wall, they are not necessarily intentionally disrupting the conduct of business, but they are doing something with an evil intent. They come in here with an evil intent.

So as the bill is written, it is much broader, and the Supreme Court has stated time and again that principle as have the State courts. I think the amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Steed, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13178) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 944, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 336, nays 20, answered "present" 1, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

YEAS—336

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Bevill
Biester
Blanton
Boland
Bow
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carter
Casey
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Ruppe
St Germain
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Ullman
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—20

Bingham
Bolling
Burton, Calif.
Cohelan
Curtis
Eckhardt

Edwards, Calif.
Gallagher
Gilbert
Hawkins
Kastenmeier
McFall
Nix
Ottinger
Reid, N.Y.
Roybal
Ryan
Scheuer
Teague, Calif.
Waldie

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Van Deerlin

NOT VOTING—75

Abbitt
Ashley
Bell
Betts
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton
Brademas
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Conyers
Culver
Daddario
Dawson
Dwyer
Edwards, La.
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gettys
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Hull
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
Kornegay
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Macdonald, Mass.
Matsunaga
Michel
Moorhead
Morgan
Moss
Patman
Pickle
Pryor
Purcell
Railsback
Rarick
Rees
Rhodes, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Sandman
St. Onge
Sisk
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tuck
Udall
Utt
Vander Jagt
Watts
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pickle for, with Mr. Van Deerlin against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Rees against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Rosenthal against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carey with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Button.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Vander Jagt.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Moss.

Mr. Pryor with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. Gettys with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Hanley with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Tuck with Mr. Wright.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Udall.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Ashley.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. HAWKINS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ECKHARDT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE]. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 944, I call up from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the bill S. 2310.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FALLON

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. FALLON: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2310, to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the United States Capitol Buildings and the United States Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 13178, as passed, as follows:

"That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes", approved July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193a; D.C. Code 9–118), is amended by—

"(1) inserting therein, immediately after the words 'book 127, page 8,', the words 'including all additions added thereto by law subsequent to June 25, 1946,'; and

"(2) striking out the words 'as defined on the aforementioned map'.

"(b) Section 6 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193f; D.C. Code 9–123) is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 6. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons—

" '(1) Except as authorized by regulations which shall be promulgated by the Capitol Police Board:

" '(A) to carry on or have readily accessible to the person of any individual upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings any firearm, dangerous weapon, explosive, or incendiary device; or.

" '(B) to discharge any firearm or explosive, to use any dangerous weapon, or to ignite any incendiary device, upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings; or

" '(C) to transport by any means upon the United tSates Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings any explosive or incendiary device; or

" '(2) Knowingly, with force and violence, to enter or to remain upon the floor of either House of the Congress.

" '(b) It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons willfully and knowingly—

" '(1) to enter or to remain upon the floor of either House of the Congress, to enter or to remain in any cloakroom or lobby adjacent to such floor, or to enter or to remain in the Rayburn Room of the House or the Marble Room of the Senate, unless such person is authorized, pursuant to rules adopted by that House or pursuant to authorization given by that House, to enter or to remain upon such floor or in such cloakroom, lobby, or room;

" '(2) to enter or to remain in the gallery of either House of the Congress in violation of rules governing admission to such gallery adopted by that House or pursuant to authorization given by that House;

" '(3) to enter or to remain in any room within any of the Capitol Buildings set aside or designated for the use of either House of the Congress or any Member, committee, subcommittee, officer, or employee of the Congress or either House thereof with intent to disrupt the orderly conduct of official business;

" '(4) to utter loud, threatening, or abusive language, or to engage in any disorderly or disruptive conduct, at any place upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings with intent to impede, disrupt, or disturb the orderly conduct of any session of the Congress or either House thereof, or the orderly conduct within any such building of any hearing before, or any deliberations of, any committee or subcommittee of the Congress or either House thereof;

" '(5) to obstruct, or to impede passage through or within, the United States Capitol Grounds or any of the Capitol Buildings;

" '(6) to engage in any act of physical violence upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings; or

" '(7) to parade, demonstrate, or picket within any of the Capitol Buildings.

" '(c) Nothing contained in this section shall forbid any act of any Member of the Congress, or any employee of a Member of the Congress, any officer or employee of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, or any officer or employee of either House of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, which is performed in the lawful discharge of his official duties.'

"(c) Section 8 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193h; D.C. Code 9–125) is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 8. (a) Any violation of section 6(a) of this Act, and any attempt to commit any such violation, shall be a felony punishable by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or imprisonment not exceeding five years, or both.

" '(b) Any violation of section 2, 3, 4, 5, 6(b), or 7 of this Act, and any attempt to commit any such violation, shall be a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding $500, or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

" '(c) Violations of this Act, including attempts or conspiracies to commit such violations, shall be prosecuted by the United States attorney or his assistants in the name of the United States. None of the general laws of the United States and none of the laws of the District of Columbia shall be superseded by any provision of this Act. Where the conduct violating this Act also violates the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia, both violations may be joined in a single prosecution. Prosecution for any violation of section 6(a) or for conduct which constitutes a felony under the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia shall be in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. All other prosecutions for violations of this Act *may* be in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions. Whenever any person is convicted of a violation of this Act and of the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia, in a prosecution under this subsection, the penalty which may be imposed for such violation is the highest penalty authorized by any of the laws for violation of which the defendant is convicted.'

"(d) Section 16(a) of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193m; D.C. Code 9–132) is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 16. (a) As used in this Act—

" '(1) The term "Capitol Buildings" means the United States Capitol, the Senate and House Office Buildings and garages, the Capitol Power Plant, all subways and enclosed passages connecting two or more of such structures, and the real property underlying and enclosed by any such structure.

" '(2) The term "firearm" shall have the same meaning as when used in section 1(3) of the Federal Firearms Act (52 Stat. 1252, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 901(3)).

"'(3) The term "dangerous weapon" includes all articles enumerated in section 14 (a) of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 654, as amended; D.C. Code 22–3214(a)) and also any device designed to expel or hurl a projectile capable of causing injury to persons or property, daggers, dirks, stilettoes, and knives having blades over three inches in length.

"'(4) The term "explosive" shall have the same meaning as when used in section 1(1) of the Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385, as amended; 50 U.S.C. 121).

"'(5) The term "act of physical violence" means any act involving (1) an assault or any other infliction or threat of infliction of death or bodily harm upon any individual, or (2) damage to or destruction of any real property or personal property.'

"Sec. 2. Section 15 of the Act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; 40 U.S.C. 101; D.C. Code 4–120, 22–3111), is amended by deleting 'shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50.', and inserting in lieu thereof: 'shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.'

"Sec. 3. Prosecutions for violations of the Act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193a et seq.; D.C. Code 9–118 et seq.) and of section 15 of the Act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; D.C. Code 4–120, 22–3111), occurring prior to the enactment of these amendments shall not be affected by these amendments or abated by reason thereof. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to violations occurring after its enactment."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon].

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 13178) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

OBSTRUCTION OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 676) to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 676, with Mr. Steed in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code—relating to obstruction of the administration of justice—by adding a new section prohibiting the obstruction of Federal criminal investigations.

Sections 1503 and 1505 of chapter 73, title 18, presently prohibit attempts to influence, intimidate, impede, or injure a witness or juror in a judicial proceeding, a proceeding before a Federal agency, or an inquiry or investigation by either House of the Congress or a congessional committee. However, attempts to obstruct a criminal investigation or inquiry before a proceeding has been initiated are not within the proscription of those sections.

The proposed legislation would remedy that deficiency by providing severe penalties for attempting to obstruct the communication to a Federal criminal investigator of information relating to a violation of a Federal criminal law, thus extending to informants and potential witnesses the protections now afforded witnesses and jurors in judicial, administrative, and congressional proceedings.

Subsection (a) of the bill would amend chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, by adding a new section, section 1510, at the end thereof.

Subsection (a) of the new section 1510 would prohibit willful attempts, by means of bribery, misrepresentation, intimidation, or force or threats of force, to obstruct, delay, or prevent the communication to a Federal criminal investigator of information relating to a violation of a Federal criminal law. The subsection would also prohibit injuring any person in his person or property on account of his communicating such information to a criminal investigator or on account of such communication of information by any other person—a relative or friend, for example. Both proscriptions would apply to protect the communication of information to a Federal criminal investigator at any time from the commission of a criminal violation or conspiracy until the institution of judicial proceedings within the meaning of sections 1503 and 1505. The penalty provided for a violation of the section is a fine of up to $5,000 or imprisonment for up to 5 years, or both.

Subsection (b) of the new section 1510 defines "criminal investigator" to include any person authorized by a department, agency, or armed force of the United States to investigate or prosecute violations of Federal criminal laws. This includes Federal prosecuting attorneys, as well as Federal criminal investigators, within the group of persons to whom the communication of information is protected.

Subsection (b) of the bill would make the necessary technical amendment to the chapter analysis of chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 676, a bill to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers], has ably described the provisions of the bill. I do not wish to repeat what he has already said, but I do wish to underscore the importance of this legislation, particularly in view of the rising tide of crime.

The President's Crime Commission focused nationwide attention, as did recent issues of Life magazine, on the sinister and ever-growing power of organized crime. We are all aware of the great obstacles which confront prosecutors in the successful prosecution of organized criminals. The code of silence that shields participants in organized criminal activity is notorious. Bribery, intimidation, and the use of force are also employed by the crime syndicate to thwart criminal investigations and prosecutions. The successful utilization of the code of silence, bribery, and force virtually precludes prosecution and conviction of organized criminals.

But it is not only in organized criminal activity that the harassment, intimidation, or bribery of potential witnesses occurs. The problem permeates every phase of illegal or unlawful activity—prosecution and conviction is almost impossible to obtain when witnesses are subject to such pressures, and law enforcement officials are powerless to prevent the application of such pressures.

This bill would provide Federal law enforcement officials with the effective and long-overdue tool to control and prevent persons who willfully endeavor by means of bribery, misrepresentation, intimidation, or force, or threats thereof, to obstruct, delay, or prevent the communication of information relating to Federal criminal laws by any person to a Federal criminal investigator.

There has been raised some objection to this bill by the argument that the legislation could be used by criminal investigators to harass or threaten an actual witness. The report by the Committee on the Judiciary in both the House and the Senate makes very clear that such could not occur. It is the unequivocal contention of the members of both committees that the prohibitions in this bill would be applicable only to persons who procure another person by the means listed in the act to obstruct, delay, or prevent the communication of information. It is only the procurer that we seek to prosecute and not the actual witness.

The legislation has been strongly supported by the President's Crime Commission, the Department of Justice, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and law enforcement officials throughout the country. It is my hope that we may act promptly on this part of the war on crime.

Let me add that witnesses who testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee included Charles Siragusa, executive director of the Illinois Crime Commission; the Special Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, David C. Acheson; the Attorney General; and other witnesses; all of whom supported this legislation.

Let us provide law enforcement officials with this greatly needed weapon. I urge every Member's support of S. 676.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure all of us are equally concerned about crime and are willing to do what we can to combat the crime situation which confronts the Nation today.

This bill has a very worthwhile purpose, and I find myself in support of the purpose of the legislation, but I do believe it should be amended.

In the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which originally considered this legislation and which conducted the hearing, a majority of the subcommittee members voted to delete the word "misrepresentation" which appears on line 8 of page 1. When the bill came before the full committee the word was reinserted into the bill.

A few days ago, when the legislation came to the floor of the House, I suggested that I would offer the amendment to strike the word "misrepresentation," whereupon the chairman of the full Judiciary Committee said in open session that he was agreeable to accepting this amendment.

I am now advised that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee cannot be with us today, but that the gentleman handling the bill is not agreeable to accepting the amendment.

If Members have had the opportunity to look at the report, they have found that there is a very fine argument made for the proposition that there should be Federal legislation to prohibit attempts to influence, intimidate, impede, or injure a witness or a juror, or to prevent such conduct where a crime is under investigation.

It is said on page 2 of the report that the need for this legislation was to plug a loophole in the protection that the Government can now provide to its own witnesses and informants. This loophole results from the fact that presently it is not a Federal crime to harass, intimidate, or assault a witness who may communicate information to Federal investigators prior to the case reaching the court.

Well, we are in sympathy with that, and certainly we should have a loophole plugged.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, in view of the importance of what the gentleman is saying, that a quorum is not present. I think the Committee ought to hear what he is saying:

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Seventy-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 324]

Abbitt
Ashley
Bell
Betts
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton
Brademas
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Cederberg
Celler
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Dawson
Diggs
Dingell
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards, La.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gettys
Hansen, Wash.
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Hull
Hungate
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Long, La.
Martin
Matsunaga
Moorhead
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Nedzi
Patman
Pickle
Pool
Pryor
Purcell
Rarick
Rees
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rumsfeld
Sandman
St. Onge
Sisk
Stephens
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tuck
Udall
Utt
Vander Jagt
Watts
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wright
Wyatt

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STEED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 676, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 356 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from North Carolina had 7 minutes remaining. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying prior to the quorum call, it seems to me this bill would be much improved by the deletion of the word "misrepresentation" on page 1, line 8. The committee report language is rather interesting in several respects, and I would ask that we might read on page 3, the last paragraph before the analysis of the bill. Also, prior to that, the committee says:

> This committee wishes to make it abundantly clear that this legislation cannot be used by a Federal investigator to intimidate or harass a potential witness or informant by reason of his giving false or misleading information about a criminal violation.

I do not quite follow that language in the committee report.

Then the committee goes on to the other paragraph to which I referred, and I have been trying to understand this one for several weeks. It says:

> Your committee wishes to make abundantly clear the meaning of the term "misrepresentation" as used in this act. It is our intention that the actual procurement by a party of another party's misrepresentation or silence to a Federal investigator would be covered even though such procurement was not achieved by any misrepresentation. At the same time, it is also our intention that procurement of a witness' communication or silence to a Federal investigator by means of a misrepresentation on the part of the procurer is also covered under the act.

If a court looks at that explanation by the committee as to what it means, and understands that, it will be endowed with that degree of wisdom which many courts seem to hold they have already. I personally do not understand that explanation.

In a case in Nebraska—and there are many cases dealing with this, and I just happened to pull this one out of a reference in the library, Corpus Juris, in a Nebraska court, in Pasko against Trela—they said this:

> "Misrepresentation" means any manifestation by words or other conduct by one person to another that under the circumstances amounts to an assertion not in accordance with fact.

I do not know about that; misrepresentation by words or other conduct." It seems to me this gets us into a little problem here.

Then, in Webster's Third New International Dictionary, on page 1,445, the word "misrepresent" is defined as follows:

> Misrepresent: to represent incorrectly.

I can see, under the language of this bill, that a Federal investigator—and that includes all Federal investigators, practically—could go into a man's office under the guise of a general investigation. Perhaps it would be revenue, or food and drug, or many other types of things which may be either civil or criminal investigations. But at the time this investigator comes in, so far as this bill is concerned, he does not have to say, "Well, now, we have information that you have committed a crime and we are investigating that crime."

He could come in as a Federal investigator under the definition here of a criminal investigator, being "any individual duly authorized by a department, agency, or armed force of the United States to conduct or engage in investigations of or prosecutions for violations of the criminal laws of the United States."

So this man may come there as one of the types of investigators I have mentioned. He could be a wages-and-hours investigator coming in very quietly, just to make a friendly investigation, doing his job. In the course of the thing the individual might make a statement which is later shown to be incorrect, or might cause some employee to make one that was incorrect. When the trial came on for the main offense, a jury might well acquit the man, but the Federal prosecutor could then come back with this bill, if it becomes the law, and say, "You were acquitted on the principal offense we were investigating, but you caused one of your employees to make a misrepresentation of fact when we were investigating, and it made our investigation harder to accomplish. It obstructed and delayed us in our investigation. So you may think you are smart because the jury turned you loose, but we are going to indict you under this law and you could get up to a $5,000 fine or 5 years in prison."

My friends, I do not believe any of us want to do that.

I know there are a lot of arguments here by lawyers that this does not do what I say it does. But I want to say that over a period of 11 years it was my responsibility to send bills of indictment to the grand juries regularly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, if I had had a defendant for whom I had to send in a bill of indictment to the grand jury under this proposed law, under the term "misrepresentation," I would have said that "on or about a certain date the said John Doe did willfully endeavor by means of misrepresentation to obstruct, delay, or prevent the communication of information relating to the violation of a Federal criminal statute" and I would name the statute, "to a criminal investigator, one Richard Roe, an agent of the Department of Labor," or "of the Food and Drug Administration."

That would be the indictment one would send under this.

I say to my colleagues that we should not make every mother who might tell an investigating officer that her son is not hiding in the closet or that her son is out of town when she knows he is around the corner subject to imprisonment for 5 years.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of economy of time, I shall not make a formal speech which would be appropriate in response to the point which has been so eloquently registered by the gentleman from North Carolina, but, rather, I will reserve my comments to the 5-minute rule when his amendment is offered.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, the obstruction-of-investigation bill is related to the obstruction-of-justice statute which has been on the law books for many years. That is the statute which makes it a crime to corrupt or injure a witness or a juror before a court, executive agency, or a congressional committee.

It might be thought that this statute is sufficient to protect those who potentially may become witnesses; namely, those who supply information to investigators. However, the courts have ruled that since criminal statutes must be strictly construed, the obstruction-of-justice statute applies only after the judicial proceeding has commenced and not during the period of investigation. The Department of Justice has recommended this legislation. The President's Crime Commission has endorsed it. And the President himself in his February 6, 1967, message on crime urged its adoption.

Simply stated, this bill would make it a crime to corrupt or injure a potential witness or informant who desires to communicate information to a criminal investigator. It not only protects the informant himself but members of his family and others close to him who might be the target of unlawful influence or injury.

It should also be understood that this bill applies only to the investigation of violations of Federal criminal statutes and to Federal criminal investigators.

Some dispute has arisen with respect to the thrust of subsection (a). The dispute is bottomed upon conflicting interpretations of the language. And in this particular, I concede that the syntax of the sentence is awkward. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] fears that this subsection would make a wife who makes a misstatement concerning the whereabouts of her husband a criminal.

This fear arises only if the clause "by any person" is taken to modify the clause "violation of any criminal statute." Because the sentence structure is misarranged, such an interpretation is possible. However, a reading of the subsection as a whole demonstrates clearly that the intent is that the clause "by any person" be taken to modify the clause "communication of information." Accordingly, the proper interpretation of subsection (a) might be paraphrased as follows: "Whoever endeavors by certain means to obstruct the communication of certain information by another person to a criminal investigator is guilty of a crime."

To appreciate fully what subsection (a) does, it must be understood that the new statute envisions three central actors—the investigator, the informant, and the obstructor. The first two, the investigator and the informant, might be called "supporting players." The third, the obstructor, is the principal player. The sanctions of the new statute apply only to the conduct of the principal player. The purpose of the new statute is only to penalize the person who attempts to frustrate the cause of justice by preventing the communication of information by informants to investigators. It does not penalize the informant. Thus, in the hypothetical case posed by the gentleman from North Carolina, the wife who misrepresents the whereabouts of her husband is not guilty of a violation of this statute.

Obviously, there are many ways in which the obstructer can prevent the communication of information by the informant to the investigator. He might use force or threats of force. He might resort to other forms of intimidation. He might attempt bribery. In addition to all of these, the obstructor can successfully prevent the communication of information by misrepresenting material facts to the informant. He may also successfully accomplish his evil purpose by persuading or forcing the informant to misrepresent the facts when he talks with the investigator. In either case, the obstructor obstructs the investigation and society's right to protection and vindication is denied. In neither case is the informant guilty of a criminal purpose. He is either the innocent victim or the frightened victim of the obstructor. This statute does not intend to penalize the victim.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 676, and wish to commend the Committee on the Judiciary for their prompt and favorable consideration of this legislation.

S. 676 is similar in objective to my own bill, H.R. 6387, which I introduced early in this session. I sponsored this measure because, to me, any frustration or obstruction of criminal investigations is inimical to our system of justice—and when this happens, all of our citizens are injured.

Organized crime is reported to be a flourishing business today; and it affects every individual, whether it is the innocent victim who is ruthlessly exploited or the ordinary citizen who must bear the tax burden of the growing cost of law enforcement. It is evident to me, and I believe to a great majority of those I have the privilege to represent in the Congress, that more realistic laws to deal with crime are necessary—and S. 676 is an essential step in that direction.

The greatest impact of this legislation will be felt where it is most urgently needed—in the prosecution of cases involving organized crime and racketeering. As the committee has pointed out in its report, it is in this area of investigation that witnesses most often refuse to cooperate with the prosecution because of threats or other kinds of intimidations directed at them or their families. This bill strikes at the very source of the power of racketeers, which is the ability of organized crime to impose silence on its members and thereby protect both the leaders and the membership in its organization.

Under the present law, it is not a Federal crime to harass, intimidate, or assault a witness who may pass information to Federal investigators prior to the prosecution stage. Experience has shown that potential witnesses or their families are often intimidated, threatened, and even injured during the investigative preliminaries to a criminal prosecution.

This bill, however, will provide protection for such witnesses by prescribing Federal penalties for any willful attempt by means of bribery, misrepresentation, intimidation, force, or threat of force, to obstruct, delay, or prevent the communication to a Federal criminal investigator of information relating to a violation of a Federal criminal law. I would hope, however, that the House could further clarify the terms "misrepresentation" and "criminal investigator" in order that there be no misunderstanding as to the intent of the Congress so that these terms would not be interpreted too broadly by the courts.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill which is now before us is identical in purpose to ones which I have sponsored in both this Congress and the 89th Congress. I am pleased to rise in support of this bill. As I am sure most of our colleagues realize, the present Federal law protecting jurors and witnesses in Federal judicial proceedings and congressional investigations has been narrowly construed by the courts. It has been interpreted to extend its protection only after the initiation of a formal proceeding. The result is that the Federal Government is frequently unable to effectively protect its own witnesses.

The measure before us would make it a Federal criminal offense for anyone to obstruct, delay or prevent the communication of information concerning a Federal crime to a Federal investigator by means of bribery, misrepresentation, intimidation or force. This measure would allow the Federal Government to better protect its witnesses and prosecute those who attempt to silence such witnesses.

Organized crime in particular benefits from the present law, for organized crime typically resorts to the most brutal methods, including murder, to prevent the success of investigations which threaten its existence. In his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee Mr. Katzenbach referred to "dozens of cases of witnesses beaten with baseball bats and tortured with acetylene torches." He observed further that "for every identifiable case of intimidation or attack, there are many more cases of sudden, unexplained silence" on the part of witnesses or potential witnesses.

The recent report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice talks about the difficulties faced by law enforcement agencies in getting people to testify against organized crime. "Even the true victims of organized crime," the report reads, "such as those succumbing to extortion, are too afraid to inform law enforcement officials." If law enforcement officials are able to develop informants, despite this fear, members of the criminal organization use "torture and murder to destroy the particular prosecution at hand and to deter others from cooperating with police agencies. Informants who do furnish intelligence to the police often wish to remain anonymous and are unwilling to testify publicly."

It would not be hard to continue with evidence of organized crime's willingness to employ drastic measures to obstruct justice. What concerns me is that gangsters and other criminals are actually being protected from punishment by our Federal law, because there is no statute to prohibit them from threatening or harming witnesses in order to prevent the initiation of court proceedings. There is no doubt in my mind that, as Attorney General Clark observes, "This frustration of criminal investigations is inimical to our system of justice. And when justice is frustrated, all of our citizens are injured."

This much needed legislation has already been approved by the Senate and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it today.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, S. 676, aimed at the obstruction of federal criminal investigations, is obviously needed legislation for the reasons pointed out in the committee report and in the debate.

I regret that the word "misrepresentation" was not omitted as proposed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] and I would have supported a motion to recommit to achieve this improvement in the bill. However, in the vote on final passage, I am constrained to vote in favor of the bill, rather than to have no bill at all.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 676

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1510. Obstruction of criminal investigations

"(a) Whoever willfully endeavors by means of bribery, misrepresentation, intimidation, or force or threats thereof to obstruct, delay, or prevent the communication of information relating to a violation of any criminal statute of the United States by any person to a criminal investigator; or

"Whoever injures any person in his person or property on account of the giving by such person or by any other person of any such information to any criminal investigator—

"Shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'criminal investigator' means any individual duly authorized by a department, agency, or armed force of the United States to conduct or engage in investigations of or prosecutions for violations of the criminal laws of the United States."

(b) The chapter analysis of chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1510. Obstruction of criminal investigations."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Whitener: On page 1, line 8, strike the word "misrepresentation."

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to take any further time. I have already tried to outline my position. There is one other statement that perhaps I should have made. That is, that under existing law one who perjures himself under oath on the witness stand is subject to prosecution and punishment now. I do not think you ought to create an offense today which you might refer to as extra-judicial perjury, as this bill would do.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman is trying to get at here is the real crooks, as I understand it, who, by bribery, threats or intimidation, or bodily injury, and so forth, keep from investigators and others from the courts information for the proper prosecution of criminals. When you get into the realm of misrepresentation, I think that the gentleman in the well has pointed out that there is a lot of room for abuse of this particular thing. Also, when you get into misrepresentation with intent, if there is any doubt in someone's mind then you subpena them under oath and then prosecute them for perjury.

I think that the gentleman has a good amendment and it should be adopted, because it will make this a good bill.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from Texas, who was a distinguished and able judge in the courts of Texas for many years before coming to this Congress.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. It is not often I find myself in agreement with the gentleman from North Carolina, so I hasten to say I think he has made a very persuasive case.

Mr. WHITENER. I hope the gentleman will not shake my faith in my amendment. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first let me pay sincere tribute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina. It has been my privilege to serve in this body with him now since he first came here, and I have nothing but the highest personal esteem and professional regard for the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, the point which the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina makes, he makes in all sincerity, and he does so most persuasively.

However, I most respectfully take exception to the position which the distinguished gentleman has assumed.

Mr. Chairman, the dispute which arises, I think, has to do with differing interpretations of the same language. In this particular I can say that the syntax of the first sentence of subsection (a) is awkward. The gentleman from North Carolina senses, in essence, that this subsection would make a wife, when interrogated concerning the whereabouts of her husband, subject to the provisions thereof. The theory arises, Mr. Chairman, only if—and I invite your particular attention to the bill—the clause "by any person" is taken to modify the clause "violation of any criminal statute." I say this, Mr. Chairman, because the sentence structure here is inartfully drawn.

It is possible, by a stretch of interpretation to reach the conclusion which has been postulated by the gentleman from North Carolina, and yet I suggest that the proper interpretation of this language is to assume that the clause "by any person" modifies, rather, the clause "communication of information." This is how it was intended. Therefore, if it is so interpreted, it is impossible to draw the interpretation which the gentleman from North Carolina has drawn.

This intent is made abundantly clear in the committee report. This intent is made abundantly clear in the committee report of the other body. This intent is made abundantly clear by the witnesses who testified in support of the bill, including the witnesses from the Department of Justice—and, parenthetically, in that context, permit me, Mr. Chairman, to remind the members of the Committee that this legislation has the wholehearted support of the President of the United States, the Department of Justice, the Judicial Conference of the United

States, and the President's Commission on Crime.

I think it is important that we deal with this legislation, if possible, without adopting any definitive amendment, in order that we may move expeditiously to lay this bill on the President's desk.

If the amendment now pending should prevail and if a conference should be called for, I say that the delay which would ensue would not serve the best interest of the investigative branch of the executive establishment of this Government.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be unfortunate to allow the RECORD which we are writing today to stand without a refutation of the interpretation which the gentleman has offered

It has been said that judges sometimes do not read the legislative committee reports and judges sometimes are not influenced by the legislative history which is written in the course of debate on the floor of the House and upon the floor of the other body.

Mr. Chairman, if this is criticism, then it is a sad commentary upon the judicial system, and I do not choose to assume that those who hold in their hands the power to decide the liberty or the imprisonment, the life or the death, of the American people are so careless in reaching their conclusions in law. Rather, I think they are careful. I think Mr. Chairman, it would be a mistake to linger over this amendment.

Accordingly, I respectfully urge that this body reject the amendment. I say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], that he should not be too disturbed that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has withdrawn the acceptance which he registered, tentatively, when his acceptance was so registered.

I suggest that if the gentleman will rethink the matter and discuss it with the officials of the Department of Justice, the gentleman will find why the chairman withdrew his acceptance. I commend him for his openminded posture which permitted him to do so.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. Very briefly, I would like to direct a question to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia which I was trying to do when the time of the gentleman ran out. The question I would like to direct to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia is that, having introduced this bill back in 1961, and again in this session, I am very much interested in seeing it become law. My interest is strong because I believe it is essential in fighting organized crime, as I understand it, to include in this legislation the word "misrepresentation." That word was put in for several specific and important purposes, and these have to do with the fact that one of the basic problems is that in the Mafia and the Cosa Nostra, the membership in those organizations alone would not be sufficient——

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I would say to the gentleman that I would prefer that he let me finish. I have not even finished my question.

As I say, membership in those criminal organizations alone could not necessarily be the basis of proof of participating in intimidation or threats of force and coercion, and, additionally, those are not usually the reasons for failure to obtain testimony. That failure is too often due only to a code of silence or loyalty. That is why "misrepresentation" was put in, specifically, intentionally, and purposely, to make certain that those situations where a member of the Mafia or Cosa Nostra is involved as a witness or a procurer of a witness will be covered. And that is why "misrepresentation" is included.

Is that not correct?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. It is entirely correct.

May I pause parenthetically to say that the President's Crime Commission, when it endorsed this concept, gave specific reference to the bill that was introduced by the gentleman from Florida several years ago. If any tribute is due any individual for this legislation, it is due primarily to the gentleman from Florida. I commend him and congratulate him on the work he has done in this matter.

Mr. CRAMER. That was not the answer I was seeking, but I thank the gentleman.

But I do not want to see the Cosa Nostra and Mafia members, by striking "misrepresentation," excluded from this legislation, and therefore I oppose strongly the language in the amendment.

Mr. POFF. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. POFF. May I say I believe the gentleman is entirely correct, and I believe it should be understood, in order to understand the full impact of what the gentleman says, that this legislation deals primarily with three actors, first the investigator, second the informant, and third, the obstructor, in the conveyance of information to the investigator, and this legislation applies in its criminal sanction only to the obstructor and never to the informer.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been impressed with the position of the gentleman from North Carolina of the misrepresentation aspect of this bill. I find it difficult to believe that the law enforcement agencies of our land have no other way to deal with the Cosa Nostra—if there be such, and I assume there may well be—than to pass this legislation that affects every single American. Including "misrepresentation" in this bill, coupled with the very broad definition of "investigator" gives me cause for grave concern about the constitutional liberties issues involved in this proposal—in its present form.

Now, if the investigators were limited to the FBI I suspect my concern would not be so broad, but this permits just about anyone in the Federal Establishment, presumably under the cloak of authority, to just go on a fishing expedition, prying into the lives and conduct of the American people. And because of the very broad definition of "investigator" there is all the more reason to be very cautious in terms of what we are going to include as a definition of what I understand to be felonious conduct if this legislation becomes law.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I might point out to the gentleman on page 2, line 9: "agency, or armed force of the United States to conduct or engage in investigations of or prosecutions for violations of the criminal laws of the United States."

Those persons who have given that authority under the statutes are the ones who are covered.

I have a complete list of them and I would be happy to include them in the RECORD.

Mr. BURTON of California. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would be so kind as to have them detailed at this point in the debate.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will do that. They are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Immigration and Naturalization Service.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Internal Revenue Service: Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division; Intelligence Division.

Bureau of Customs.

Bureau of Narcotics.

Secret Service.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Office of Chief Inspector.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration.

Social Security Administration.

LABOR DEPARTMENT

Office of Labor Management and Welfare Pension Reports.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Air Force: Office of Special Investigations.

Army: Criminal Investigations Division; Counterintelligence Corps.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Navy: Navy Intelligence; Navy Inspector General and Provost Marshal.

Mr. BURTON of California. If I may interrupt the gentleman, I have so little time left and the list is so long. But I do want to thank the gentleman for making my point. I hope that the gentleman will complete his listing of the rather awesome number of Federal agencies that are now going to be, in effect, cloaked with this additional authority. I would hope that the gentleman would at this point seek unanimous consent that they may all be entered into the RECORD.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will have to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to the gentleman's motion and include this as part of my remarks.

Under unanimous consent, I insert at this point the list of the Government departments authorized to conduct criminal investigations and the statutes under which such investigations are conducted and the fields covered by same.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal Bureau of Investigation: All criminal statutes not otherwise specifically assigned.

Immigration and Naturalization Service: Immigration and naturalization matters.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Internal Revenue Service:

Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division: Liquor law violations; national firearms acts; tobacco tax.

Intelligence Division: Income tax and withholding tax violations.

Bureau of Customs: Customs violations.

Bureau of Narcotics: Narcotic laws.

Secret Service: Counterfeiting, threats against the President.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Office of Chief Inspector: Mail fraud and other postal violations including burglary, robbery of post offices, embezzlement of mail, lotteries, obscene material sent through mail.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration: Drug laws.

Social Security Administration: False claims.

LABOR DEPARTMENT

Office of Labor Management and Welfare Pension Reports: Investigates violations of Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, and Labor Management and Disclosure Act.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard: Explosives shipment by water, navigation and shipping violations, security and safety of harbors and water fronts.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Air Force, Office of Special Investigations: Criminal investigations.

Army:

Criminal Investigations Division: Criminal investigations.

Counterintelligence Corps: Intelligence.

Corps of Engineers: Water pollution.

Navy:

Navy Intelligence: Intelligence matters.

Navy Inspector General and Provost Marshal: Criminal investigations.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Federal Petroleum Board: Connolly "Hot Oil" act.

Fish and Wildlife Service: Fish, game, and bird acts.

Bureau of Land Management: Grazing Act, trespass on public lands, timber depredations.

Branch of Investigation, Division of Inspections: Irregularities of employees in performance of duties.

Mr. **BURTON** of California. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time that I have left, I would like to state that the gentleman from Colorado has effectively buttressed one of the points I was trying to make, to wit, that this bill contains a very broad definition of an "investigator" and we ought to proceed therefore with the utmost caution.

For this reason, I intend to resolve the benefits of any doubt that I have in this regard in favor of proceeding more slowly rather than precipitously. Therefore, I intend to support the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is true we find some strange bedfellows so to speak on this particular legislation. But I must say that the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Colorado and the committee are deeply concerned, and rightfully so, about a hard-core segment of the criminal element of this country. But bear in mind that it is a minority of the people of this country. Let us not sacrifice the freedom, rights and privileges of the vast majority of the people of this country by placing this power in the hands of all of the agents in the list that the gentleman read—and he did not even get to finish the list—under this penalty.

You have a good bill in my opinion except for this one world, misrepresentation. You are placing too much authority in the hands of these agents.

Mind you, everyone of these agents or investigators is a human being. They get mad. They get their toes stepped on. They sometimes get over inflated about their work and they are inclined when they are not fully cooperated with, in their opinion, to file charges. Let us not give them that authority. You have a good bill except for this one word. When it comes to "misrepresentation"—if you have any idea that someone is giving you the runaround—if you have a major crime or there is a major investigation, you can certainly bring him in, put him under oath, and if he lies to you, put him away for perjury.

But let us not sacrifice all the rights and freedoms of the people of this country and put this country under a police state with this one word. I refer to the Agriculture Department. You listed them. You had a long list. When you mentioned those words as to the departments you were talking about, you knew that there are thousands of investigators in every one of those departments. The gentleman knows my position on guns. Some people want to penalize every law-abiding citizen who owns a gun in order to get at the criminal element. You are going to do the same thing in this bill. Do not do it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. Certainly I yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I do not think the gun bill has anything to do with it.

Mr. CASEY. It is the same principle. There are those who want to penalize all the law-abiding citizens. They want to put them under a police state to get at the hard-core criminal element.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman's statement of my position may be inaccurate, but I want to point out that in regard to the statement you made about calling people in and putting them under oath, an investigator does not have that authority in every instance.

Mr. CASEY. No; and let us not permit him to get that authority. He is just an ordinary investigator.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I say to the gentleman that we are not giving him that authority in this bill. The only thing we are doing here——

Mr. CASEY. I will not yield any further. You may not be giving him the authority to interrogate under oath, but if someone gives him some information that he thinks—and I emphasize, he thinks—is misinformation, he can file a charge. All right. It may be fruitless. It may be innocent. But he has the authority to make everyone in this country to whom he talks, if he has any idea that they are giving him misinformation, the object of a charge which he might file against him. Do not shake your head, because he would have that authority. He would have the right to file a charge.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. He would not have the authority to file a charge if he knows in fact that the man is innocent.

Mr. CASEY. He has the right to file a charge.

Mr. POFF. If he has some doubt——

Mr. CASEY. If you give him the proposed authority, there will be more charges filed than you think.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. If he files a charge without proof that the information is misinformation, he makes himself vulnerable to a suit.

Mr. CASEY. I did not understand what the gentleman said.

Mr. POFF. He makes himself liable for a charge of false arrest or false prosecution.

Mr. CASEY. Do not give me that stuff. They do that all the time. How many false arrest charges have you seen filed recently?

Mr. POFF. I say again that unless the prosecutor or the investigator has information that is convincing to him that the information imparted by the informant is misinformation, he would never make the charge.

Mr. CASEY. You are ascribing to the investigators a great deal of intelligence that they do not have, and you know it. You have lived in this world long enough to know some of these investigators. The gentleman has a good amendment, and we ought to knock out that word for the benefit of the majority of the people.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I wish to point out that this legislation supplements the obstruction-of-justice legislation which is already on the books. The obstruction-of-justice law provides that whoever corruptly endeavors "to influence" witnesses, jurors, or officers shall be subjected to punishment. The present legislation does not go any further than the obstruction-of-justice statute when it seeks to get at the procurer of a person who misrepresents, the procurer of a misrepresentation.

Since this measure is aimed at organized crime, the syndicate, or Cosa Nostra, we must recognize that such criminal elements do not always use the tools of bribery or threats. Sometimes they use the code of the syndicate in which they procure testimony or silence, and such thwarting of an investigation does not necessarily follow a threat or a bribe.

Nevertheless, it does procure a misrepresentation which thwarts a criminal investigation.

I also want to point out that this measure relates to a criminal investigation which may extend over a long period of time. That is another reason for the need of this legislation. In such situations, there is no pending proceeding to which a person can apply for relief, but there is only an investigation going on, with all its ramifications with regard to organized crime. Such an investigation may extend over a long period of time. That is the thing we are trying to get at. We must not lose sight of the objective. Let us not release the organized criminals involved in this great network because of some technical arguments that may be made here, especially when the committee has made itself clear, not once but many times, and on the floor of the House we have made ourselves clear, too.

We are not trying to get at the person who makes a misstatement. We are trying only to get at the criminal who procures the misstatement. That is eminently clear in this report and in the debate on the House floor. I think it should be clear to everyone.

I would just like to point out that all the testimony, including all the witnesses who appeared before the Senate committee in support of this legislation, were aiming their attack at organized crime. That is what this is intended to get at. So let us give this weapon to the Attorney General in the fight against crime. Let us not preclude him from having it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the gentleman a situation that happens virtually every day from California to the Gulf of Mexico. The border patrolman or the Immigration Department people come to a home and ask, "Do you have an alien working here who does not have a proper passport?" Of course, they do not follow through with an explanation. They ask, "Do you have a 'wetback' living here?" And the employer says, "No, I do not." It could be at a home, a business, or on a farm. When the person says, "No, I do not," does he not come under this law and become subject to 5-year imprisonment or a $5,000 fine?

Mr. McCLORY. No, that would not be involved. In the case you have described the witness himself is making a misstatement or misrepresentation of fact. S. 676 covers only the criminal suspect who "procures" a misrepresentation.

Mr. WHITE. Why would they not be involved? It is a criminal offense to illegally cross the border.

Mr. McCLORY. This is aimed at the procurer of the testimony. It is not aimed at the person making the misstatement, even though it is willful. It might be a crime under another statute, but it is not under this.

Mr. WHITE. This is a criminal violation. They had come across the border. The investigator goes to the person who is employing the one involved. The investigator asks, "Do you have a person working for you illegally?"

Mr. McCLORY. What the gentleman is referring to is a person involved in making a misstatement in a pending criminal case or a criminal who may be asserting rights under the fifth amendment. But that is not involved in this bill. The example the gentleman is giving is not an example which relates to this legislation. It is probably an example relating to the fifth amendment, and we are not discussing this amendment today.

Mr. WHITE. I cannot see where it does not apply, sir.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to understand the response of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory] to the question posed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. White.]. This bill very clearly states in section 1510(a), "Whoever * * * by * * * misrepresentation"—on the face of it, this would apply to anyone who endeavors by misrepresentation to obstruct, delay, or prevent the communication of information relating to a violation of any criminal statute. So the example just cited would seem to fall within the statute.

Furthermore, I would make two other points. If the objective of this legislation is to reach organized crime, then I come back to the issue raised by the gentleman from California [Mr. Burton]: Why is it necessary to extend the scope of the bill to a broad range of criminal investigators? It would seem to me, if the objective is to reach organized crime, sufficient to limit its application to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Internal Revenue Service, the Treasury Department Narcotics Bureau, and similar law-enforcement agencies, and not include every department and agency of Government, which may authorize individuals to act as "criminal investigators." The bill does not require that the person designated as a criminal investigator be a regular employee.

My final point briefly is this. This act would make criminal and punishable by a fine of $5,000 or 5 years imprisonment, or both, not a completed act, not an attempt as understood in criminal jurisprudence, but an "endeavor." The report on page 3 states that the word endeavor has been selected to avoid the "technical difficulties" involved in proving an attempt to commit a crime. I have yet to hear the justification for departing from well-established concepts of criminal law to create a brandnew form of felony.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed the amendment proposed to strike the word "misrepresentation." There is no need for this amendment. Both a careful reading of the bill and the committee report will show beyond question of a doubt that the intent is perfectly clear. I call your attention to the paragraph in House Report No. 658, on page 3 the following:

> This committee wishes to make it abundantly clear that this legislation cannot be used by a Federal investigator to intimidate or harass a potential witness or informant by reason of his giving false or misleading information about a criminal violation. The sole purpose of the act is to protect informants and witnesses against intimidation or injury by third parties with the purpose of preventing or discouraging the informants or witnesses from supplying or communicating information to the Federal investigator. The informants or witnesses cannot themselves be subject to prosecution under this act on account of any information they may furnish to the investigator.

There is no need to tamper with the language which has been studied by the subcommittee and the full committee. We must have this weapon against organized crime.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Whitener) there were—ayes 36, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Albert) having assumed the chair, Mr. Steed, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 676) to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States, pursuant to House Resolution 933, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 276, nays 47, not voting 109, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

YEAS—276

Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill

Carey
Carter
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hunt
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Moore
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Ruppe
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Walker
Wampler
Whalen
Whalley
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—47

Abernethy
Andrews, Ala.
Bevill
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burton, Calif.
Cabell
Casey
Clark
Cohelan
Colmer
Conte
Davis, Ga.
Downing
Edwards, Calif.
Farbstein
Ford, William D.
Galifianakis
Gardner
Hagan
Hawkins
Hays
Jonas
Karsten
Lennon
McClure
McMillan
Mink
Montgomery
Morris, N. Mex.
Nichols
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neal, Ga.
Roberts
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
Smith, Iowa
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tunney
Waggonner
Waldie
Watson
White
Whitener
Whitten

NOT VOTING—109

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Barrett
Bell
Betts
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Cederberg
Celler
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Culver
Dawson
Diggs
Dingell
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards, La.
Eshleman
Fallon
Feighan
Fino
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gettys
Gray
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Long, La.
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Matsunaga
Michel
Mize
Moorhead
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Nedzi
Nix
Olsen
Patman
Pickle
Pollock
Pryor
Purcell
Railsback
Rarick
Rees
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Sandman
St. Onge
Sikes
Sisk
Stephens
Taft
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tuck
Udall
Utt
Vander Jagt
Watkins
Watts
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt
Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Nix against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Kornegay against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Tiernan for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.

Mr. Tenzer for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Rees against.

Mr. Dulski for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Patman with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Kluczynski with Cederberg.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Willis with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Pryor with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Button.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Mize.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Vander Jagt.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Tuck.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hungate.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sisk.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. Hanley with Mr. Pickle.

Mr. Olsen with Mr. Udall.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. POAGE and Mr. BINGHAM changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include therewith extraneous matter on the bill S. 676, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1788, AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO ENGAGE IN FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATIONS OF CERTAIN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1788) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JOHNSON of California, HALEY, EDMONDSON, HOSMER, and REINECKE.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1967

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he will kindly advise us as to the program for tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished acting minority leader bringing this matter up, because I do want to take this means of advising the House there will be a session tomorrow. We are adding to the program two bills:

H.R. 10442, to facilitate exchanges of Forest Service lands for public school use, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate; and

House Resolution 241, to transfer jurisdiction over military and national cemeteries from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I might add for the information of the gentlemen here, these bills are not controversial, as I understand.

Does the gentleman have any information he can give us about next week, or would he prefer to wait until tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. I plan to announce the program for next week tomorrow. However, I advise Members that there will be considerable business next week. We will have conference reports and original bills also.

I believe right now we might expect a conference report on an appropriation bill on Monday.

Mr. ARENDS. On Monday. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Have these bills been tried under unanimous consent? I have an idea that the bills scheduled for tomorrow would pass under unanimous consent.

Mr. ALBERT. So far as I know they have not been.

WHY WE NEED HIGHER THIRD-CLASS POSTAL RATES

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the debates in the House yesterday underline the critical nature of the fiscal and economic situation confronted by the Nation today. I believe that many Members now see the importance of further raising the postal rates on third-class mail. Some extremely persuasive testimony was presented within the past few days to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee by the Postmaster General and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Because this subject matter is so pertinent to the budgetary discussions which are now going on, I include the texts of these statements, as well as the text of testimony which I presented yesterday to the same committee:

STATEMENT BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN BEFORE THE SENATE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, OCTOBER 16, 1967

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I'm pleased to have this opportunity to speak to you about several matters that are of vital concern to the Post Office and to our Nation as a whole.

The fiscal facts that prompted the postal rate legislation now before this Committee are known to all of you. In brief, our deficit reached an all-time high in fiscal 1967, exceeding $1.1 billion. This year—even before we record the effects of possible salary increases—our loss will be more than $1.2 billion. The pay bill enacted by the House would add another $231 million to our deficit this fiscal year.

These burdensome deficits are reason enough to ask the Congress for a general rate increase. In fact, I would be neglecting my duties if I did not urge a rate increase to meet the requirements of the Postal Policy Act. The Postal Policy Act says that "postal rates and fees *shall* be adjusted from time to time as may be required" to make postal revenues approximately equal to operating costs, excluding the cost of the Department's public service responsibilities.

As my first chart shows, our operating deficit this year is about twice the level of public service costs authorized by the Postal Policy Act. In other words, the taxpayer is footing the bill for about $645 million of postal costs that should be paid by users of the mails.

Mr. Chairman, while these are indeed oppressive facts, I must emphasize that my request for a general rate increase was not prompted solely by parochial budget balancing aims. I have a much deeper concern. Unless we face up to the need for quick and far-reaching changes, our postal service may collapse under the weight of the fast growing demands heaped upon it.

Our postal system serves six per cent of the world's population, yet it sags under the weight of half the world's mail. (Chart No. 2.) Our system cannot take on three to four *billion* more pieces of mail each year without facing repeated threats of service breakdown.

Each day brings new and disturbing evidence that we have long insulated the postal service from the technological progress that has permeated nearly every other segment of our economy. The gravity of the problem we face calls for a massive modernization effort, an effort that will require average capital outlays of $1 billion *each* year over the next five years.

Facing facts realistically, we cannot expect the Congress to appropriate $1 billion per year for capital programs on top of more than $1 billion, each year, to meet our current operating deficits.

Most mail sorting today is still a peek-and-poke operation. Lines of pigeon-hole cases occupy most of the working space in archaic postal buildings. Over the next few years, we must catch up with a modernization lag that has left most of our postal operations and facilities 30 years behind current technology. As shown in Chart Number 3, of all the federally owned space we occupy, about 90 per cent was built in the 1930's or earlier.

Unless we modernize thoroughly and effectively, we cannot provide adequate service for a booming mail volume. If the rate of growth of the past 10 years is repeated, mail volume will top 100 billion pieces in 1976. And even this enormous figure may prove to be conservative, since the per capita use of the mail is increasing, as shown in Chart Number 4.

We now require more than 700,000 employees to do the job. In the near future, we will be well beyond the point where adding another army of postal workers can cope with our towering workload.

ZIP Code is bringing us to the threshold of the technological barrier we must crack. To pass across that threshold, our largest post offices and sectional centers must have a coordinated array of modern mail handling instruments: optical scanners, electronic sorting machines, and new materials handling equipment. Further, we must have buildings designed for streamlined postal operations, not buildings fitted merely for miles of pigeon-hole sorting cases.

Unless we modernize, I can see no way to slow the upward rise in postal costs and rates. Personnel costs account for more than 80 percent of our budget and even under the most improved operation our employees will remain our major cost as well as our most important resource. But with more capital equipment to share the work that men do today, staff growth will be slowed and future pay raises will be justified more by productivity gains than by increases in living costs.

Mr. Chairman, the House Postal Rates Subcommittee completed 21 days of public hearings on the Administration's rate bill. My staff provided me with a full account of each day's proceedings, all of which left me with one dominant impression: No one denied that the postal service is operating under the most burdensome deficit in its long history; yet, few mail-user groups conceded they contributed to that deficit in any significant way.

We have no illusory deficit. It is real and massive. And it must be ascribed to all patrons, despite the efforts of many who deprecate or brush aside the Department's cost figures.

Postal service is the most widely shared of all Federal services, but it is not shared equally by all taxpayers. Business generates about 80 per cent of all mail. (Chart Number 5.) Yet, while postal service is largely a business service, we ask all taxpayers to pay for postal deficits. It would be much fairer to ask those who use postal service to pay in proportion to their demands for such service.

In 1966 we delivered more than twice the volume of mail we delivered 20 years ago. There is evidence that unrealistically low postage rates were a factor in this rise.

Mail has its counterparts in other modes of communication, delivery, and advertising. Therefore, when postal rates are low in relation to other prices, mail volume rises rapidly. And when such growth adds to postal deficits, I believe we have a greater responsibility to charge them to mail users rather than to the taxpaying public.

Mr. Chairman, five months have passed since the House began its review of the rate proposals submitted by the President. Although I regret the need to postpone effective dates, these months were well spent. I am deeply grateful to the 26 members of the House Committee for their penetrating analysis of a massive volume of testimony. I trust their prodigious efforts, culminating in a comprehensive report and recommendations on all key issues, will lighten the burdens of this Committee.

We proposed rate increases yielding about $825 million, based on projected mail volume for fiscal 1968. The bill approved by the House carries a price tag of $890 million. Consequently, every week of delay means that about $17 million of postage costs that could and should be paid by users of the mail are being financed, instead, from general Treasury funds. Revenue from the House bill would exceed our proposal by about $35 million annually on single piece third-class mail, $30 million on air mail, $5.5 million on mass circulation commercial publications, and $4 million on nonprofit second-class publications.

Of the total additional revenue, some $568 million would flow from increases in letter postage. The remainder would be generated by increases ranging roughly from 20 to 30 per cent in other classes of mail.

Mr. Chairman, in discussing our rate proposals I feel little would be gained by retracing issues that are wrapped in controversies over the merits of out-of-pocket costs versus fully allocated costs. Therefore I will make no reference to cost coverage for the various classes of mail. Instead, I will discuss costs and rates about which there can be no dispute.

Certainly no one can dispute the statement that about 80 per cent of our expenditures are labor costs—and that each minute of productive labor time costs very nearly

7 cents per employee. Now, contrast that, if you will, with the fact that 94 per cent of our first-class letters are delivered for only one nickel. I challenge anyone to cite any commodity or service of comparable value that can be purchased at that low price.

Mr. Chairman, our first-class postal rates can honestly be described as a bargain. As Chart Number 6 shows, the average American worker now earns the price of a letter stamp in about one minute. It takes the average Canadian worker more than 1.3 minutes to earn the money for a stamp. It takes the British worker 2.5 minutes, the West German worker 4 minutes, and the average French worker must put in almost six minutes on the job to buy a stamp.

Let's go on with our contrasts. For most newspapers, our average postage is 1¼ cents; for magazines, 2½ cents; for advertising circulars, 2⅞ cents. And these are among our highest rates, except for parcels. To complete the contrasts, I would have to talk about the *one penny* we receive to deliver 8 rural newspapers or 8 publications of nonprofit organizations. I would also have to tell you about the nickel we get to make cross-country deliveries of as many as 4 circulars mailed by nonprofit organizations.

At nearly 7 cents per minute for postal clerks and carriers, can there be any reasonable doubt that all our rates are too low?

Since the Postal Policy Act states clearly that first-class mail must pay all its allocated costs, plus an additional amount representing the fair value of all extraordinary and preferential services, facilities, and factors relating to it, we are proposing a one-cent increase in first-class mail rates, including letters and post cards.

Compared with first-class rates, second- and third-class rates should be and are lower because mailers using these classes do much sorting and other pre-mailing work at their own expense and these classes do not receive the priority service of first-class mail. However, in view of the size and nature of the postal deficit I feel equity demands that the increases for these classes should be at least as large as for first-class mail.

During past debates over proposed rate increases, when doubts arose over the ability of second- and third-class mailers to pay higher rates they were usually resolved in favor of more moderate rate increases. In 1961, for example, warnings that the magazine industry was "in a precarious financial position" had a significant effect on the decision to enact a moderate postal rate increase phased over a 3-year period. According to magazine industry spokesmen, however, their financial situation has since changed from insecure to solid.

In view of the many reports of the health of the publishing industry, in sharp contrast with deepening postal deficits, we asked the Congress to approve an average 23 per cent increase—phased over three years—for regular-rate, outside-the-county mailings of second-class publications.

Of all rate issues, the one that has generated the most heat and controversy is third-class bulk mail. I will speak frankly on that issue. My reading of public sentiment indicates there is a widely held belief that bulk mail rates should be well above present levels, even higher than those we proposed to the Congress. I am also firmly convinced that the general public is willing to pay its fair share of higher postal costs. But the public is adamantly opposed to higher rates for letters unless bulk rate matter pays substantially more than its present postage.

I believe our proposal on bulk mail rates strikes a fair balance between the interests of the public and the mailers. It would substantially reduce the deficit attributable to the delivery of third-class mail, but it would not crush third-class mailers under an intolerable financial burden.

Yet, the severest reaction to our rate proposals has come from third-class mailers who protest they are being treated unfairly. Objections have been raised to the amount of the increase and to the fact that it isn't phased, as is the proposed raise for second-class mail.

Let's take up rate levels first. Second-class rates have always been much lower than rates for any other class of mail. Low rates for publications are rooted in the long-standing tradition of promoting the widest possible distribution of newsworthy and educational reading matter. Third-class rates, on the other hand, are higher because that service is primarily for advertising matter in direct competition with numerous other advertising media.

Our proposed rate increases average 31 per cent for bulk third-class and 23 per cent for regular rate second-class. The higher increase for third-class would compensate for the more favorable treatment it received in the 1962 rate law, when second-class was raised 25 per cent and bulk third-class only 15 per cent.

As to phasing, we can expect both second- and third-class mailers to pass on most, if not all, of their postage increases to their customers. But this cannot be done as quickly for newspapers and magazines as for direct-mail advertising. For much of their revenue, publishers depend on subscriptions which often run over periods of two to three years and longer. The three-year phasing would permit publishers to absorb higher rates gradually and to recoup their costs on new subscriptions as old ones expire.

Bulk rate third-class mail has been the most rapidly growing of all major mail services. From 1947 to 1966 its volume increased more than 250 per cent, compared to 80 per cent for all other mail. Even from 1953 to 1966, when most rate increases were effective, bulk mail rose 73 per cent. (Chart Number 7.)

There is no doubt that low postage rates have contributed to the extraordinary growth of direct mail. There also is abundant evidence that past rate increases have not disadvantaged either the direct-mail industry or the users of that advertising service. Since 1950, bulk mail volume—commercial and nonprofit combined—has grown faster than our economy. And direct-mail has held its 15 per cent share of the nation's advertising dollar despite higher postage costs and hard driving competition from television radio, and magazine advertising. (Chart Number 8.)

I found of considerable interest a published article highly favorable to direct-mail. It appeared in the January issue of *Postal Record,* the official publication of the National Association of Letter Carriers. That article reported:

"If there were no third class mail, the Post Office Department could eliminate about one-quarter of its clerical employees, and about one-fifth of its letter carriers."

Well, the cost of keeping that number of employees on our payrolls is about $780 million annually. In contrast, total revenue from third-class mail is only $682 million. So, right off, we have an out-of-pocket loss of nearly $100 million in just two personnel categories, to say nothing of the added costs for other personnel, transportation, space and equipment.

We do not object to the rapid growth of third-class mail. We recognize it as a sign of economic growth. However, we *do* object when that growth adds considerably more to our costs than to postal revenues and thus adds to the burdens of other mail users and taxpayers who must pay the costs of rapidly mounting postal deficits.

I want to stress that we appreciate the efforts of second- and third-class mailers to comply with ZIP Code pre-sort regulations. And we understand their desire for information on our savings from ZIP Code. But we could not calculate savings from a system still in its infancy. Even now, we hesitate to make premature estimates. But in view of the intense interest I will present our latest estimates, subject to revision in light of more complete data and experience.

Recent studies indicate ZIP Code pre-sort savings are averaging two-tenths of a cent per piece. Applied to our projected 1968 volume this would mean total annual savings of about $35 million for bulk rate third-class and $18 million for publishers' second-class mail. In other words, were it not for pre-sorted second- and third-class mail we estimate our expenses in 1968 would be $53 million higher.

Mr. Chairman, our proposals also call for increases in the rates paid by nonprofit organizations. On a percentage basis, these increases are steeper than other increases, but only because past rate adjustments for this category of mail have been unrealistically low. Even with the proposed increases, such organizations would still enjoy large and valuable postage preferences. Currently, the public service cost of handling nonprofit mail exceeds $200 million yearly—nearly 40 per cent of all public service costs. (Chart Number 9.)

Minimum rates for nonprofit organizations were not raised in 1962 when all other rates were raised.

Mr. Chairman, the bill approved by the House differs in some respects from the proposals submitted by the Department. I will discuss each difference where I feel major issues are involved.

My keenest disappointment stems from the omission of all references to surcharges for mail of hard-to-handle sizes and shapes. It is the will of the House that this subject be explored more fully before standards or surcharges become effective.

Accordingly, in the very near future the Department will have ready for submission to the Congress a new legislative proposal on this matter. We will recommend that the Congress set surcharges for lightweight pieces of first-class and air mail that cannot be processed readily by postal machinery and that the Department be directed to conduct a comprehensive study to determine the size standards on which the surcharge should be based. The surcharges would not become effective until two years after the size standards developed as a result of the Department's study have been published in the Federal Register. The mailing public would be given ample opportunity to comment on the size standards proposed by the Department before they are published in the Register.

We will not propose surcharges for third-class mail. However, I am taking this opportunity to advise the Congress and mailers of our intention to issue regulations governing pieces of odd size and shape. Our aim is to exclude from bulk mail all pieces that cannot be tied into bundles by letter carriers in the normal manner. These regulations will be issued, initially, as proposals with adequate opportunity for mailers to react and to adjust to final decisions.

There are a few other House departures from our own proposals that I believe merit some comment:

Air mail. We recommended a one-cent increase in the rates for air mail letters and postal cards. The House bill calls for a two-cent increase. In the interests of equity and the maintenance of a proper balance among the charges for the various levels of postal service, we feel a one-cent increase in the rates for air mail letters and postal cards should be enacted.

Second-class rates for non-profit organizations.—Our proposal called for a new postage principle of charging nonprofit publications slightly higher rates for advertising than for editorial content. The House accepted the principle and decided to raise nonprofit postal rates for advertising content—over a six-year period—to almost the same level as rates for advertising in commercial publications. The House bill makes nonprofit and commercial rates identical up to the sixth zone, but for the sixth zone and beyond nonprofit rates would be 12 cents, while commercial rates would go up to 17 cents per pound for Zone 8. We do not object to equal rates for advertising content. If Congress favors this approach, we feel nonprofits should pay the commercial rates for all zones, not just the first five.

Air second-class.—The House bill would authorize air mail for second-class publications upon request on a space available basis, with the mailer paying the additional cost of the air transportation. To give us time to clear up the space problems this new service would create, we ask that it not start until six months after the effective date of the new second-class rates. Also, we recommend a minimum charge of four cents per copy for air second-class to discourage diversion from first-class mail. Without a minimum, some mail now being sent first-class could be shifted to air second-class and receive similar service at a rate that would result in a loss for the Post Office. The basic rate for second-class mail does not come close to covering the Post Office's cost in delivering it. Even if the full additional cost of providing air transportation is added to the basic charge, the rates for air second-class will still be below the break-even point for the Department. Unless a minimum charge is set, newsletters, for example, could shift from first-class to air second-class with a resulting drop in postal revenue from six cents per piece to as little as two cents.

Surcharge on mass-circulation publications.—As you know the House added a charge of three-tenths of a cent per piece on regular second-class publications that mail out more than 500,000 copies per issue. This provision was not in the Administration's recommendations. I am certain the Committee will be hearing the views of the magazine industry on what effect this provision would have on publications distributed through the mail.

Bulk third-class nonprofit rates.—Our proposal called for returning to the formula of setting bulk third-class rates for nonprofit organizations at half the commercial rate. The House adopted the principle but seriously weakened it by exempting from the increase mailings of groups with charitable, religious, or general health purposes or *any* nonprofit mailings consisting entirely of fund solicitations for these purposes. We estimate the exemptions may comprise 60 per cent of all third-class nonprofit bulk mail. We see no reason why a selected few of the eight types of groups which qualify for special low rates should be singled out for additional preferential treatment. We believe all nonprofit groups should pay a 1.9 cent minimum rate.

I have not tried to cite all the details of this far-reaching postal rate bill. Undeniably, the legislation before you encompasses a difficult set of problems. Nevertheless, we believe action must be taken soon so Congress may concern itself primarily with postal modernization and service improvement rather than operating deficits.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, the rate increases we proposed are the very least we need to maintain a viable, progressive mail service.

The American people are entitled to the finest mail service in the world. I believe that the intensified effort to move ahead through research, and through mechanization and modernization, will bring us to the threshold of a new era in our postal history. My goal for the postal service of the future is one that I am sure I share with every member of this Committee; a postal service that operates at minimum cost and maximum efficiency; a postal service of which we can all be proud. I believe this new rate structure is a significant element in the attainment of that goal.

Statement of Representative Ken Hechler, Democrat of West Virginia, to Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, October 18, 1967

Mr. Hechler of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, but have attended most of the House and Senate hearings on postal rates and have read all the testimony before both the committees. For seven years, I have tried to familiarize myself with third-class postal rates and have had numerous discussions with Post Office Department officials, private industry representatives, and have carried on a wide-ranging correspondence with interested senders and receivers of third-class mail.

In 1962, I sponsored an amendment to the postal rate bill to raise the bulk third-class rate from 2½ cents to 3½ cents, which carried in the House of Representatives but was mangled in the conference committee and phased down to the current rate of 2⅞ cents. Had the House rate of 3½ cents prevailed in 1962, I feel that the postal service and the budget would both be in better condition today.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be in the best interest of the postal service, the American people served by it, and our national economy if the third-class bulk mail commercial rate were set at 4.5 cents, instead of 3.8 cents as contained in the House bill. I commend this committee for its breadth of interest in calling the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to testify, as he did yesterday, because postal rates are and should be related to the entire fiscal and economic situation. We are in an entirely new economic ball-game from early this year when the President proposed the 3.8-cent rate on third class bulk regular mail. Budget Director Schultze clearly pointed out in his testimony yesterday that serious consequences would flow from continuing to run up a mounting postal deficit, at a time when the Nation is already threatened with inflationary pressures and high interest rates.

All you have to do is to take the arguments advanced by both the Budget Director and the Postmaster General, and you have an excellent case for the 4.5 cents rate on bulk third class commercial mail. Even though they would not depart from the President's recommendation, the facts they presented are conclusive support for the 4.5 cent rate. For example, Postmaster General O'Brien stated on Monday: "When postal rates are low in relation to other prices, mail volume rises rapidly. And when such growth adds to postal deficits, I believe we have a greater responsibility to charge them to mail users rather than to the taxpaying public." And Budget Director Schultze underlined yesterday "the importance of maintaining the basic principle that Federal activities which provide business-like services should cover the cost of those services in the rates they charge, and not throw the cost on to the shoulders of the general taxpayer."

I was further impressed by Budget Director Schultze's statement that "the general taxpayer not be asked to subsidize those parts of the postal operation—and they are by far the largest part—which simply provide business-like services to industries and individuals."

The current rate bill will produce, when its rates become fully effective in 1970, a total of $890 million in additional income. Postal pay rises in the House-passed legislation will eat up $711 million of this amount. This means that after raising rates all along the line, the net effect of this House-passed bill will be to reduce the annual postal deficit by $179 million.

When you subtract public service costs from the net annual postal deficit of $1.2 billion, we find, as pointed out by the Postmaster General on Monday, that "the taxpayer is footing the bill for about $645 million of postal costs that should be paid by users of the mails." Now, with a net operating annual deficit of $645 million, it stands to reason that if you bring in a rate and salary bill which only cuts the deficit by $179 million, this still leaves us $466 million a year in the hole.

Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, I believe it is the duty of the Congress to raise the rates further on second and third class mail. The third class mailers are frequently criticizing the fact that I concentrate on the need for raising third class rates, whereas the cost coverage of second class rates is lower. I would point out that an amendment which I sponsored was adopted by the House, placing a surcharge on second-class publications, about which I shall say more later. Also, I sincerely believe that some attention should be given by this committee to making a slight and additional increase across the board on all second-class publications. I think this should be done to produce a balanced rate structure. I will not mention a specific figure for adjusting the second class rates upward, because I feel I can produce some more substantiating testimony on the subject of third class rates, which I have analyzed more thoroughly.

Third class mail volume now accounts for 27% of the total mail volume, but produces only 16% of the total postal revenue. Over one out of every four pieces of mail is now third class mail, whereas 20 years ago one out of six pieces of mail was third class. From 1947 to 1966, the volume of bulk rate third class mail increased more than 250% while all other classes of mail were increasing in volume only 80%. The testimony of Postmaster General O'Brien before this committee has shown that (1) the low third class rates have contributed to the vast growth of the volume of third class mail; (2) past rate increases have not hurt the direct mail industry or the users of that service; (3) since 1950, the bulk mail volume has grown faster than our economy; and (4) direct mail has maintained its share of the advertising dollar.

Mr. Chairman, the House-passed bill will bring in a total of $234 million of additional annual revenue from third-class mail. If the Senate sets the bulk third-class rate at 4.5 cents for commercial mail, instead of 3.8 cents as contained in the House bill, and if comparable increases are made in other categories of third-class mail, there will be produced $370 million of additional annual income from third-class mail alone. What this means is that my proposal will bring in $136 million of additional annual revenue above and beyond the House-passed rates on third class mail.

For the record, here are the specific comparisons between the House-passed bill and the third-class rates which I propose:

[In cents]

	H.R. 7977 as passed by House		Hechler proposal	
	Mailed prior to Jan. 7, 1968	Mailed after Jan. 7, 1968	Mailed prior to Jan. 7, 1968	Mailed after Jan. 7, 1968
Individual piece	6	6	6	6
Additional ounce	2	2	2	2
Books, catalogs, etc	12	16	12	18
Other matter	18	22	18	24
Bulk rate, regular	2⅞	3.8	2⅞	4.5
Nonprofit	1.25	[1] 1,3	1.25	2.25

[1] For religious, health, charitable organizations and for fund-raising; all other nonprofit, 1.9 cents.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss cost coverage for third-class mail. Assistant Postmaster General Ralph Nicholson has supplied me with an analysis which is based on the volume for the fiscal year 1968, and is adjusted to include two factors:

(1) the ZIP code savings to the Post Office Department as a result of ZIP coding by the third class mail users; and (2) the cost coverage adjustments after taking into consideration the pay increases included in the House-passed bill. Factoring in the features, the House-passed bill provides 82 percent cost coverage for all third class mail, while my proposals would result in a cost coverage of 91 percent. This figure includes a public service allowance for non-profit third class mail.

NONPROFIT RATES

During the House debate, there are several effective measures which were taken to defeat the raise in third class rates which I proposed on the floor. First, there was some heavy administration lobbying on behalf of the original rates proposed by the administration, and several of those who told me they would support the 4.5-cent rate were changed over to back the 3.8-cent rate. Second, there was some effective lobbying by the third-class mail organizations, many of whom got their local permit holders to wire and phone in at the last minute. There was no organized counter-pressure on behalf of the recipients of third-class mail. Finally, there was some effective last-minute pressure and deep concern expressed in the closing minutes of the debate on the effect of my third class rate rise proposal on non-profit organizations.

I share the concern of the Postmaster General and the Director of the Budget that the third class non-profit rates are split in the House-passed bill, in such a way as to give preferential treatment to religious, charitable and health organizations and those concerned with fund-raising. It seems to me that equity and postal policy both dictate that these third-class rates should be maintained at a level 50 percent of the commercial rates, a time-honored principle which was established by the Congress as part of the Postal Policy Act of 1958.

The splitting of the non-profit third class rates means that there would be only a token increase in that category of non-profit third class mail which constitutes 60 percent of the total volume. There would be only a nominal increase in the classifications of religious, charitable and health, plus fund-raising, of from 1.25 cents a piece to 1.3 cents. This represents little more than rounding off the figures so that they come to one decimal point rather than two.

Mr. Chairman, it is high time that the Congress face up squarely and unemotionally to the problem of rates for third-class mail mailed by non-profit organizations. It is high time that Congress should take a cold, hard look at the facts.

Since third-class mail was established as a special category in 1928, when Calvin Coolidge was President, the rates for bulk third class mailings by non-profit organizations have increased exactly one-fourth cent from 1 cent which they were in 1928 to 1¼ cents which they are now. In sharp contrast, over the same 39-year period, first class rates have shot up from 2 cents to 6 cents as now proposed. So first-class rates will be increasing by 200 percent in a period when non-profit rates are rising only 25 percent.

Contrast this with the cost of other items. In 1928, you could buy a pound loaf of bread for 9 cents; today, the cost is about 22 cents. In 1928, you could have a quart of milk delivered to your home for 14 cents, today, the price has doubled to about 28 cents.

VOLUME INCREASES IN THIRD-CLASS MAIL

As the postal rates for non-profit organizations remained extremely low, more and more non-profit organizations began to take advantage of the situation through larger mailings. These organizations now account for 17 percent of all bulk-rate third-class mail, as compared with only 8 percent in 1952. In the same period, the volume of non-profit third class mail has shot up 250 percent—from slightly over 800 million pieces to nearly 2.9 billion pieces of bulk-rate non-profit third class mail. Now let's contrast that with other third-class mail. During the same period since 1952, commercial bulk-rate third class mail increased 58 percent, while the total mail volume was going up 52 percent over the same period.

In addition to the volume increase in third-class mail, many new organizations appear to be getting in under the "non-profit" umbrella. The law defines a "qualified non-profit organization" as "religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans or fraternal organizations or associations not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual."

Many non-profit organizations are now mailing neckties, pins, souvenirs, and other items for which they are seeking monetary contributions. A number of these items are unsolicited. The increased volume of such unsolicited items slows the delivery of mail, and also competes with private enterprise firms forced to pay higher postal rates.

NONPROFIT RATES SHOULD BE 50 PERCENT OF COMMERCIAL RATES

When the commercial third-class bulk rate was raised from 2 to 2½ cents on July 1, 1960, the rate for other non-profit organizations went up from 1 to 1¼ cents.

But in 1962, when the rates for commercial mailings were raised in stages to their current bulk rate level of 2⅞ cents, the bulk rates for non-profit third class mailings remained frozen at 1¼ cents. In addition, the 1962 legislation actually *reduced* the non-profit bulk pound rates by about 40 percent. This was accomplished by reducing the pound rate on circulars mailed by non-profit organizations from 16 cents to 9 cents, and on non-profit books and catalogs from 10 cents a pound to 6 cents a pound.

I feel strongly that we ought to return to the policy established in the Postal Policy Act of 1958—that rates for non-profit organizations should be 50 percent of the rates for commercial mailings. That is why my proposal calls for a bulk rate of 2¼ cents a piece for non-profit organizations, and 4½ cents a piece for commercial bulk mailings.

Several critics have pointed out that percentage wise the rate increases for non-profit organizations are steeper than for commercial organizations. But that is only because these rates are initially so low. As Postmaster General O'Brien very fairly pointed out in his testimony on May 9 before the House Postal Rates Subcommittee: "Even with the proposed increases such organizations would still maintain large and valuable postal preferences. Currently, the public service cost of handling nonprofit mail exceeds $200 million yearly, nearly 40 percent of all public service costs."

ADVISORY PANEL ON POSTAL RATES

In 1965, the Advisory Panel on Postal Rates, headed by former Representative Robert Ramspeck of Georgia, made some very pertinent observations on postal rates for non-profit organizations:

"We question whether these subsidies should be intermingled with postal rates. If there is merit in these subsidies, they should be identified and included as direct payments from the budgets on the Federal agencies charged with overseeing public welfare activities. Since rate policy and subsidies are now commingled, the Postmaster General is in a position that compels him to propose rates based on extraordinary welfare considerations as well as on conventional value-of-service and cost criteria. . . . Funds for subsidies should be provided by direct appropriations, to the agency overseeing the welfare activity, rather than as a hidden cost in the postal budget."

Philosophically, the increasing subsidy to the non-profit organizations has disturbed thoughtful students. What it means is that the general taxpayer is forced to pay to make up the postal deficit due to causes in which he may not believe. "Why should I be taxed to subsidize someone else's religion?" pertinently asked a writer from Pittsburgh. The question well might be raised also whether the Post Office Department, with the prime responsibility of delivering the mail on time—which it increasingly finds difficult to accomplish efficiently and speedily—should also be burdened with extending assistance to all sorts of causes.

Many non-profit organizations send through the mail articles of merchandise and ask for a contribution. Mr. T. A. Hamilton of Louisville, Ky., probably spoke for a great many people when he wrote: "I have nothing against charitable organizations. However, I believe that our giving to such organizations should come from the heart, and should not be placed under the pressure of modern-day merchandising."

Under the current rates, it is really fantastic what and how much a non-profit organization can mail. Up to eight publications can be mailed by these organizations under the non-profit second-class rates for as little as one penny. Furthermore, there is no extra charge for long hauls. For one penny, the post office will take these eight publications mailed in New York and deliver them in Hawaii.

If a non-profit organization wishes to make a fund solicitation through third-class mail, the post office will deliver four fund solicitation letters for only a nickel. These rates have been the same since 1962, although other postal rates were raised in that year.

The postal deficit which is caused by third-class mail sent by non-profit organizations has been rising. The difference between fully allocated costs and the revenues received from non-profit third-class mailings was $58 million in fiscal year 1963. These costs rose almost 62 percent in three years for a total of $94 million is fiscal 1966, and are now estimated to be running at a rate of about $100 million a year. The deficit caused by second-class non-profit mailings has risen to about $110 million per year. This means that the annual deficit of second and third class non-profit mailings runs over $200 million annually.

I trust that the Congress will face up to this problem directly and raise the rates on non-profit mailings.

I have long been disturbed by the fact that our postal rate bills are fashioned with an eye to the mailers of third-class mail, instead of the recipients of third-class mail. There has been much comment about whether or not people like to receive third class mail. The direct mailers tell you that little old ladies would be lonely if they didn't receive such mail. I received one letter from a dear old lady who vigorously protested because she could not get her husband off the mailing list of several organizations despite the fact he had been dead for eighteen years. The lady lives in State College, Pa. She sent me a copy of the form letter she had received when she sent several requests to take her husband off the list. Her name and address were typed in at the top of the form letter, which stated that they had received her request and if she received future mailings would she kindly ignore these mailings.

Mr. Chairman, the impudence of these direct-mail organizations not only makes them a nuisance in their utter refusal to drop names from their mailing lists, but it further infuriates the taxpayer when he realizes that part of his taxes go to subsidize low third class rates. Also, the average user of the first class and air mail letter bitterly resents the fact that the first class mail user helps carry the third class mailer on his back.

There have been many statements about public opinion on this issue. One of the best was made before this committee on Monday when Postmaster General O'Brien noted: "My reading of public sentiment indicates there is a widely-held belief that bulk mail rates should be well above present levels, even higher than those we proposed to the Congress. I am also firmly convinced that the general public is willing to pay its fair share of higher postal costs. But the public is adamantly opposed to higher rates for letters unless bulk rate matter pays substantially more than its present postage."

The National Federation of Independent Business completed a nationwide poll in June of this year, specifically directed at my proposal to raise third class rates to 4.5 cents. A total of 82 percent supported my proposal, 15 percent were opposed and 3 percent were undecided. In its press release announcing these results, the National Federation of Independent business made this comment:

"It has long been held that third-class mail is the mainstay of the advertising activities of smaller business firms, thus the heavy support for raising the rates on this class is considered to be somewhat of a surprise."

There have, of course, been many statements and charges made that the rates which I propose would drive people out of work, close up and bankrupt businesses, etc. There is a full-page ad in Roll Call, April 13, 1967, entitled, "The Big Lie Technique", which states "Congressman Ken Hechler is leading the newspaper fight to price third-class mail out of the postal service. . . . By using Herman Goering's big-lie approach, certain publishers hope to convince the American people that direct mail advertising is not selling $40 billion worth of goods and services annually. They refuse to report the fact that the 275,000 third-class permit holders in the fifty states help keep from three to four million Americans profitably employed."

First, I would like to state that if this is indeed a $40 billion a year business, showing substantial profits, it should not expect to continue to receive subsidies from the taxpayers. Second, so far as the employees of the direct mail industry are concerned, I do not believe we should turn our postal service into a welfare agency whose function is to keep people employed; the function of the postal service should be concentrated on quick and efficient delivery of the mail. Third, so far as pricing third class mail out of the postal service, the record is replete with examples of how the dire predictions of the past failed to materialize. In 1958, before this very committee of the Senate, Harry Maginnis, head of the Associated Third Class Mail Users, predicted that if a rate of 2½ cents a piece went into effect "the annual volume of third class mail would not remain at 16 billion pieces. . . . It is my firm opinion that third-class mail volume would drop to 10 billion pieces under the impact of the $25 per thousand rate." The rate was hiked to 2½ cents, and third class mail volume, contrary to Mr. Maginnis' dire predictions, rose to 16.9 billion pieces in 1959, and 17.9 billion in 1960, and is now well over 20 billion pieces annually despite an even higher rate. Finally, I feel that we ought to measure well our words when we talk about concerns going out of business. What business in the world could survive the annual deficits being suffered by the Post Office Department, excluding its public services? Why should the taxpayers keep picking up the tab to keep the Post Office budget balanced, when tax dollars are really going into the coffers of the direct mailers? We ought to be more worried about the Post Office Department itself going out of business when it practices the outrageous economics forced on it by the direct mailers.

THIRD-CLASS MAIL AS VIEWED BY POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Senator Boggs raised some interesting questions yesterday concerning the impact of third class mail in smaller post offices. Not long ago, I asked a number of postmasters, clerks and carriers throughout West Virginia to write me their thoughts on how third class mail was handled. Out of approximately 250 replies, only three felt that the current rates and manner of handling third class mail were adequate, and a huge majority expressed themselves quite emphatically on the subject.

Fred T. Newbrough, Postmaster at Berkeley Springs, W. Va., writes: "I will soon start my thirty-fifth year in the postal service, which has included clerk, assistant postmaster, postal inspector and postmaster. . . . The delivery of third class mail does disrupt the service and I have not found a rural carrier who likes it. Furthermore, it is a cause of annoyance to about half or more of our patrons. Some request us to do what we cannot do: throw it in the wastebasket and not deliver it. Those who get mail through lock boxes stand in the lobby and sort out the circulars and throw them in the wastebasket. This is another time we handle it—at the incinerator."

Francis A. Atkins, Postmaster at Sutton, W. Va., writes: "To say that third class never interferes with or slows the delivery of first class is not correct. As a former postal clerk and mail dispatcher, I can personally say that I would much prefer to handle classes of mail I felt people wanted. To deliver a letter from a soldier in some faraway place to see the happiness in the eyes of a grandparent when they get a note from that grandchild who is just learning to write, that is personal satisfaction to postal people. In discussions with my clerks and carriers, I find that they feel they are not really serving the public and giving of themselves when working third class."

Donald M. Foley, rural carrier at Waverly, W. Va., writes: "I have been a rural carrier for 25 years. In more than 25 years, I have not heard a postal worker, other than one inspector who said there was no such thing as junk mail, say anything in favor of this class of mail. I am much in favor of letting the mailers pay the full cost of handling the mail. I mentioned this to one lady, who said she thought they should have to pay the full cost of handling the junk, and then pay her a little something for carrying it from her box and burning it."

A. A. Farmer, Postmaster at Bolt, W. Va., writes: "Today was a typical day of 'junk mail', so your letter of interest was very much appreciated. I would estimate that I worked 80 percent longer distributing the circulars to the various boxholders, then 15 minutes later the majority of the junk mail was deposited in trash cans for my disposal. The patrons appreciated my efforts so much that they let me burn their trash."

M. V. Finney, Postmaster at Dixie, W. Va., writes: "We have not learned to like such mailings, and find that extra time is consumed when we have to fold off-size pieces of bulk mailing before casing them."

Helen V. Horton, Postmaster at Slab Fork, W. Va., writes: "Third class mail requires as much and sometimes even more time than first class mail."

Donald O. Lewis, Rural Carrier on a Huntington, W. Va., route, writes: "Box-holder mail is, I guess, the worst kind of mail sent. I have received several letters from people on my route asking me to leave no more JUNK of this type in their box. Wish I could comply. Some in the extreme rural areas have asked me not to leave the slick kind; it doesn't wipe well. I have 600 boxes on my route, and am allowed only 24 minutes extra to deliver 'box-holder' mail. Sometimes I get disgusted the next day when I see these advertisements scattered along the highway."

Ray H. Maxwell, rural carrier, Friendly, W. Va., writes: "There are too many mailers who abuse the right to send third class mail, and there is no question that at least 50 to 75% of this class mail is never opened. All one has to do is look in the wastebaskets at the various post offices."

Cecil B. Niswander, Postmaster at Lesage, W. Va., writes: "Lesage is a country post office, and we have a good number of our patrons who come in every morning, and while they wait for their mail they talk. This is a subject that comes up daily for discussion. I am of the opinion that if the mailers of the advertising material could listen in on these discussions of their mail, there would be much less junk mail . . . I doubt that as much as 10 percent of this mail is read by these patrons. I notice that when we burn the trash most of it is still sealed . . . This mail does cause delay in the delivery of first class mail. The rural carrier could case all the first class mail that we receive here within an hour of receipt, but the third class mail takes more time than all the other classes combined. There is a lot of complaining from the carriers over the ever-increasing volume of junk mail."

SURCHARGE ON LARGE-CIRCULATION MAGAZINES

I would like to add a few words on the amendment which I sponsored and which passed the House to place a surcharge of 3 per copy on all magazines whose circulations reach 500,000. This surcharge starts with the 500,001st copy, and does not apply to nonprofit publications. Also, all copies at additional entry points would pay the surcharge. A calculation of the exemption will be made only at the post office of original entry. Thus if a magazine publisher deposits 1 million copies at the point of or final entry, he gets an exemption for 500,000 copies and pays a surcharge on the remainder. If his total mailing through all entry points is 1 million copies, but he mailed only 400,000 copies at the original entry point, the only exemption he gets is for the 400,000 copies at the original entry point.

The reason for this procedure is to avoid the administrative complexity of consolidating information from all entry points before assessing postage.

Statement of Charles L. Schultze, Director of the Bureau of the Budget Before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the U.S. Senate, on Postal Rate Increases

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to participate in your consideration of an increase in postal rates. In his Budget Message last January, the President stated: "To provide improved services, to cover proposed pay increases for postal workers and largely offset the remaining postal deficit, a postal rate increase is both necessary and desirable." Subsequent economic and fiscal developments lend even more urgency to that recommendation for rate increases than it had in January.

I do not profess to be an expert on postal rates, and therefore I will leave a discussion of the specific structure of the rate increases to the Postmaster General and his staff. My major concerns are two-fold:

First, the general economic consequences of continuing to run a very sizable postal deficit in a period when the Nation is already threatened with inflationary pressures and rising interest rates; and

Second, the importance of maintaining the basic principle that Federal activities which provide business-like services should cover the cost of those services in the rates they charge, and not throw the cost on to the shoulders of the general taxpayer.

CURRENT ECONOMIC AND BUDGET SITUATION

As I pointed out to the Committee earlier this month, when I testified on the Pay Bill, the fiscal situation has become much more difficult since the budget was transmitted last January, with the Federal deficit substantially larger than originally estimated. At the same time, the economy is moving ahead sharply, and the signs indicate that its advance is accelerating, as we had originally projected.

The level of personal income has been rising rapidly in recent months. So, too, has the index of industrial production. Employment has been increasing and recently the workweek has been lengthening. Retail sales have been advancing at a healthy clip, and numerous other signs of an accelerating economy can be cited. Figures released last week showed that even with the Ford strike, the Nation's gross national product rose quite sharply in the third quarter of this calendar year, resuming a rapid upward advance after two quarters of much more modest increase.

The combination of a sizeable budgetary deficit and a rapidly advancing, fully-employed economy presents an inflationary potential that we clearly should not allow to become a reality. Rising prices, soaring interest rates, and a deteriorating balance of payments situation would place far heavier burdens upon the American people than will the measures needed to prevent their occurrence. These threats to the economic health of the Nation call for continuing expenditure restraint and control on the part of both the Administration and the Congress, coupled with the tax surcharge the President has proposed.

The continuation of a large postal deficit would contribute to the general economic problem facing the Nation in two ways:

1. By adding to the overall Federal deficit in a period of high-level and sharply rising economic activity, the postal deficit contributes toward an overheating of the economy, and consequently toward the building up of excessive wage and price increases.

2. By swelling the amount which the Treasury has to borrow from the public—at a time when private borrowing is itself very large—the postal deficit contributes toward tight money and rising interest rates. In turn, when credit tightens and interest rates on short- and intermediate-term securities increase, funds which would otherwise flow into savings institutions serving the housing market tend to be diverted to other uses. Home-building, as we witnessed last year, is especially vulnerable to rising interest rates. On the basis of last year's experience, it is entirely possible that a continued rise in interest rates could easily reduce the building of new homes by one-half a million units.

This is not a time for the Government to be running a large postal deficit when there is a reasonable alternative.

POSTAL RATES AND THE EFFICIENT OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT

The Post Office plays a dual role in affairs of our Nation. *First,* it is one of the Nation's most important business activities, providing a vital and irreplaceable Nation-wide communications network for both industry and individual consumers. With annual sales now approaching $6 billion, it ranks in size with the very largest corporate giants. *Second,* the Post Office has also been a means by which the Nation has subsidized the costs of certain educational, non-profit, and other activities, by providing its services at below-cost rates to designated groups.

Although the postal establishment performs certain public service functions (roughly 10 percent of total operations in terms of costs), it is also a giant business whose operations are completely interwoven with operations of our whole national economy. It is difficult to conceive of any activity in our economy that does not find the services of the Post Office essential. Its relationship to the operation of the national economy is indicated by the fact that 80 percent of the mail is generated by businesses or institutions.

The Postal Policy Act recognizes the dual public service-business role of the Post Office by providing, on the one hand, for contributions from general tax revenues in support of specifically designated public service activities, and, on the other hand, for postal rates, collectively, which will produce revenue approximately equal to the remaining costs of postal operations.

It is possible for reasonable men to disagree with particular aspects of the Postal Policy Act and the manner in which the Act should be implemented—for example, the particular designations of public services, the amount of public service subsidy, the distributions of rate burden, etc. However, I believe that the general concepts stated in the Postal Policy Act are sound, and should be strongly supported.

Where the Congress has decided that specific subsidies to particular users of postal services are in the broad national interest, then it is indeed perfectly proper that the deficit in postal operations on account of such subsidies should be borne out of general Treasury funds, and shouldered by the general taxpayer—exactly on a par with subsidies or assistance of other kinds which the Congress has enacted.

At the same time, it is equally important that the general taxpayer not be asked to subsidize those parts of the postal operation—and they are by far the largest part—which simply provide business-like services to industries and individuals. The heart of our free enterprise system is the market price mechanism.

It is generally the most efficient means society has yet devised to regulate the production and distribution of goods and services. We often find it desirable to modify this mechanism for sound national purposes—for example, by providing low-interest-rate loans for rural electrification, or food for the poor through the Food Stamp Program. But it is neither efficient nor equitable to require the taxpayer to underwrite below-cost services in *general*—we do not provide a general subsidy for everyone's electric bill, or food bill, or his haircuts and shoe-shines. In short, the principle of charging full cost for *general,* business-like services, and providing subsidies for *specific,* carefully designated public objectives is an eminently sound one. It is consistent with both a progressive social policy and a sound, business-like economy. Continuation of a large, general subsidy to mail users violates this principle and introduces serious distortions into the use of economic resources.

Failure of the postal rate structure to cover its non-public service costs not only distorts economic efficiency in the short run; it is also a heavy deterrent to long-run improvements in postal service. A losing business is seldom the most attractive place to invest one's money. And the general taxpayer ought not to be asked to do so.

As an essential and integral part of our business and institutional activity, it is imperative that the Post Office perform its mission as efficiently and effectively as possible. There is no denying the fact that the Post Office today is not operating at optimum efficiency. In large part, this is due to a lag in accommodating postal operations to modern technology and in providing adequate facilities for the processing of mail. Certainly, no one recognizes the defects in the postal system more clearly than the Postmaster General, and he is initiating energetic and imaginative action to correct these defects.

However, correction of postal deficiencies will require major infusions of capital for research, equipment, and facilities, which can be provided only through appropriations from general tax revenues. The Postal Policy Act contemplates that capital investment in the postal system will be recovered through annual depreciation charges included in the costs upon which rates are based. If rates are not set at levels which provide revenues sufficient to cover costs, as defined in the Act, the Post Office Department is in the difficult position of asking for large appropriations for capital investment at the same time an appropriation must be made to cover a postal deficit.

In view of the many demands upon our tax resources, and the clear commitment to recover postal costs from mail users, the existence of a large postal deficit can only have an adverse effect upon the level of appropriations for capital investment, and make it more difficult to overcome the deficiencies in the postal service.

When postal rates are not sufficient to cover costs, we are asking the general taxpayer to invest his tax money with the certain guarantee that he will take a loss. I see no more reason for him to be willing to do this than he would want to invest in a steel mill, a telephone company, or a trucking firm whose prices were set below cost.

In brief, long-run improvement of the postal system—both the quality of its service and the efficiency of its operations—requires capital investment. Establishment of rates sufficient to cover costs should significantly improve the chances of securing the needed investment funds. In turn, these funds can contribute toward an increase in postal efficiency, and thereby reduce the magnitude of rate adjustments in the future.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, I believe the current situation calls for strong efforts to dampen inflationary trends—the "inflation tax" which the President has called "the cruelest tax of all." As part of these efforts, we must have responsible fiscal action to avoid an excessive budget deficit. Enactment of the proposed postal rate bill will contribute importantly to this end.

From the standpoint of the postal service itself, failure to charge rates sufficient in the aggregate to cover non-public service costs can only lead to a distortion of sound economic principles and a misallocation of scarce national resources. Equally as important, the continuation of large postal deficits makes it exceedingly difficult to provide for improvements in postal service and efficiency. By this route, failure to cover today's postal deficit helps to create still further deficits tomorrow.

I hope the Members of the Committee will act promptly and favorably on the postal rate legislation before you.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise to deplore the omissions I find in the conference report on appropriations requested by the Department of Transportation. I am particularly concerned that we find ourselves where we were every year in the past when it comes to allocating funds for development of a workable transportation system.

The bill is heavily weighted in terms of development of air and highway travel. I do not object to the Federal involvement in air and highway transportation, but I do protest the tremendous inequity that is present in this conference report.

We are near the billion-dollar mark in annual expenditures to fill the air with jets and the countryside with jetports. Another $142 million is in this bill for the development of a supersonic transport.

On the highways we are spending nearly $150 million annually, not counting the nearly $4 billion in highway trust funds pumped into the roadbuilding program every year.

Yes, I agree most of this is necessary in a country that is still experiencing fantastic growth. But, I raise the question, "Are we right in overfilling airspace and jamming the countryside with roads and highways, while we ignore the mass movement of passengers by rail?" I know we are looking into mass transit facilities for urban areas, but there is also the problem in the intercity area which is going largely unnoticed.

This is clearly evident in the report of the conference committee. In 1965, under the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act, we embarked on a major program to revitalize and restore ground transportation, including the railroads, to a point where the public would patronize the service. The goal, as I recall, was to move forward in transportation on all three modes—air and highway, which we do with expensive regularity, and by ground transportation, which until 1965, was left to survive on its own.

Most of you know railroad passenger service is not surviving. Withdrawal of most first-class mail from passenger trains has set off a new round of train discontinuance cases. If your mail is like mine, you are well aware of the problem. I might say that it is a problem that this Congress must be prepared to face and soon.

My attention today is directed toward the deletion of all funds from the Department of Transportation's development of an auto-on-train service in the Office of High-Speed Ground Transportation.

Very briefly, the auto-on-train project involves the carrying of autos and passengers on specially constructed rail cars. Passengers ride in the automobiles or in special entertainment or dining cars in the train. Cost of the movement of a family of at least four and their cars would be $100 from Washington to Jacksonville, Fla. We have already invested $2 million in the project, but the Office of High-Speed Ground Transportation will have to hold off on any further planning and development.

I personally hope that this same issue is presented to us again next year. I see in it a positive approach to solving the passenger train problem, and to me it makes a lot of sense. A family of four or more could go to Florida, California, the Northwest, and maybe even to Colorado, if they had the advantage of low-cost rail travel and use of their own car at their destination. Thousands of people and hundreds of cars would be on trains and off the highways.

The $3.5 million requested for the program by the Railroad Administration would pave less than 2 miles of interstate highway or build part of a jet runway. It is indeed a tragedy that we cannot spend a few dollars to upgrade railroad passenger service—to give it a new look and new interest to the traveling public. To do so would make every dime we spend on highways and airports that much more meaningful, because highways and airports would then be able to handle the number of cars or people they were designed for. I ask that you keep an open mind on the question of improving ground transportation so that when we next consider the problem—and I am sure it will be an issue before us—you will remember that there are immediate answers to the upgrading of rail service. My last concern is that we—in not acting today to keep the auto-on-train program alive—may be too late when another 50 or 100 passenger trains are no longer in operation.

SOVIET EXPLORATION OF SPACE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the news was flashed across the world that the Soviet Union has successfully soft-landed a spacecraft on the surface of the planet Venus.

Following close behind is our own Mariner Venus capsule, guided to pass today within approximately 2,500 miles of the planet, then to go into solar orbit.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the Members of the House as forcibly as I can that the Soviet Union has accomplished a feat in the exploration of space which is truly a demonstration of great technological capability.

That event should dispel any notion in the mind of any Member that the Soviet Union is retarding the tempo of its program of space research.

This achievement makes it unquestionably clear that we are still in a contest of scientific research and applied technology with Russia in which we enjoy no permanent advantage.

The Soviet engineers were able to launch a 2,438-pound spacecraft that traveled for 4 months through space and traversed over 213 million miles.

They were able to pinpoint a target 43 million miles away with a diameter of less than 8,000 miles, and then land the payload gently on the surface.

That nation has obviously developed the components and the electronics that are able to furnish and transmit data in a very hot environment.

The Soviet Union is processing data on the planet this Nation has not yet been able to obtain, and which is revolutionizing the knowledge of Venus and the solar system.

With a gross national product of approximately half of this Nation, that country is spending about the same amount of money on space exploration we are.

This is a measure of the importance that nation attaches to space research and the development of space technology.

In commenting on the outstanding Soviet achievement, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, James E. Webb, said:

> The Soviet announcement that they have made a soft-landing on the planet Venus represents an accomplishment any nation can be proud of.
>
> To go from Sputnik I to Venus IV in 10 years illustrates the powerful base of technology being developed in the Soviet Union.
>
> The fact that this has been accomplished in connection with the 50th anniversary of the Communist revolution is intended to encourage those in and out of the Soviet Union who believe the use of rocket technology to master and use the newly opened environment of space can become a major factor in the balance of technological power among nations.
>
> In my view, this accomplishment will convey the intended message.

I feel it most important, most urgent to remind this House that scientific research in space demands the development and creation of unprecedented capabilities in areas of major technologies.

I also want to point out to the House that the changes of political climates, that a reduction of Soviet truculence toward the Western World has not altered one iota their principal aim—the destruction of democracy and the elimination of the capitalistic system.

We cannot, to our peril, allow our arch competitor to enjoy an advantage in a field of major technology that we cannot match or counter.

We must not, through default or because of transitory, shortsighted judgments, fail to support adequately our programs of space exploration.

I leave these thoughts with you to think over in the months to come.

Budget considerations for the coming fiscal year are not very far away.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will think long and hard with regard to our national stake in our space program and its vital importance to our future in this deadly competition.

There are no consolation prizes for the loser.

AMBASSADOR EDWARD A. CLARK

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, at no time in the history of Australian-American relations have the ties between our two countries been closer.

American and Australian servicemen in Vietnam are fighting a common peril and threat to the free world at large.

In commerce and industry, in agriculture and exploraton of natural resources, in the relations between the Governments and the peoples themselves—never before have two nations been closer than ours for their mutual profit, prosperity, advancement, and, indeed, survival.

There is no doubt in my mind that the prime architect of this significant intensification of collaboration between the United States and Australia at this time has been my fellow Texan U.S. Ambassador Edward A. Clark.

It was most pleasing, therefore, to read in the Sunday New York Times Magazine a recap of Ambassador Clark's diplomatic mission since he was appointed to the post.

This excellent article was written by Harry Gordon, assistant editor of the Melbourne Sun, and graphically details the hard work Ambassador Clark has poured into his responsibility.

I insert the article at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

WHEN A TEXAS-STYLE DIPLOMAT HITS AUSTRALIA

(By Harry Gordon)

CANBERRA.—The bus pulled up outside the large red-brick Georgian building, and the driver called out, "Okay, then. Everybody out for the American Embassy." The tourists spilled across the sidewalk and into the marble-floored entrance, between framed replicas of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. They emerged on the other side of the hall, trooped across a formal garden and reached another front door. A rich Texan voice boomed: "Well, howdy, folks. I'm the Ambassador, and this here is Missus Clark. Just take your time looking around, and ask me anything you want. It'd make me very happy if you'd all accept a Texas yellow rose and some literature about my home state."

The Hon. Edward Clark, Ambassador for the United States of America in the Australian capital city of Canberra, was wearing a yachting jacket that day, with a yellow rose in the lapel and watch chain that carried a golden miniature map of Texas; when he lifted his arms wide or pointed to his treasures—"That there's a Pic-cass-ee-oh, and here's a chart showing all the oldest houses in San Augustine, Texas," he revealed bright blue, three-inch-wide braces, decorated with reindeer.

Afterwards, the tourists marched back to the bus, loaded with little yellow roses, bundles of booklets and a mild air of bewilderment. They had just been hit by Hurricane Ed, and this can be an overwhelming experience. He had kissed babies, posed for snapshots beside his elm tree ("Miz Eleanor Roosevelt planted that") and extracted sincere, puzzled promises from a bunch of Indonesian students that they would visit his home in San Augustine. Other passengers had been treated to a series of jokes ("So President Lincoln said, 'If you-all think General Grant's drinking too much, I just wish you'd find out what brand he's drinking . . . he's the only one we got who's winning' "), and still others now possessed recipes for mixing drinks from bourbon, a potion not easily available in Australia.

The next stop on the bus tour was at the Japanese Embassy, and the disembarking tourists were disappointed to find that nobody was waiting at the front door to greet them. "Where the heck's the Ambassador?" asked several passengers of a butler who had obviously been told to keep an eye on the silverware and the ashtrays, but the butler remained silent and inscrutable. Nor were the tourists howdied at the British, the French and the German Embassies. At the Soviet mission's building, the bus did not even stop.

The bus jaunt around Canberra's embassies that day in 1965 had been organized to raise money for the Red Cross, and it was quite successful. But it did not endear Ed Clark, the newly appointed United States Ambassador, to all members of the resident diplomatic corps. What was the man trying to do, some of them asked, turn the place into some kind of fairground stall? Did he think he was running for office? Today Clark grins proudly as he recalls that the man who was then Prime Minister of Australia, Sir Robert Menzies, took him gently aside and told him: "You keep that stuff up, Ed, and they'll throw you out of the ambassadors' union."

In fact, Ed Clark has kept up the practice of meeting tourist coaches; he is, of course, the only ambassador in Canberra to do so. He shook hands with nearly 2,000 on that first strenuous, memorable Red Cross day, and his personal howdy-total (after two years in the job) is something over 14,000. So far, nobody has tried to throw him out of the ambassadors' union; indeed, most of his fellow diplomats have come to regard him with deep affection—although he is still apt to make the more pukka of them wince when he calls a greeting like "Howya, Charlie, y'ole hossfly," at a cocktail party.

Clark, at 61, is one of the United States Foreign Service's most unusual exports, and he is undoubtedly the leading character in the Australian national capital. Canberra (pop. 100,000) is a beautifully laid-out, rather staid city, which possesses a well-defined Establishment whose members come from the Australian National University, the diplomatic corps, the civil service and the Houses of Parliament. The pattern of living inside this Establishment is quite formal; with the bulky exception of Ed Clark, it has included only two really colorful ambassadorial characters in recent years. One was a Malaysian who disappeared mysteriously last year for nine days after striking up a friendship with a King's Cross (Sydney) stripper; the other was an Indonesian who insisted on performing somersaults in his garden each morning, clad only in a sarong. Both have now returned to their homelands, leaving Clark undisputed as the most refreshing personality in the rather pompous protol-conscious diplomatic round.

Clark is a large, 200-pound extrovert who rambles at formal functions through an apparently endless supply of folksy, cracker-barrel, Texas-flavored stories. He has been branded a clown by some critics, and "Mister Ed" (after TV's talking horse) by others. He has certainly talked a lot, often in Texan superlatives, and he has a formidable reputation as a backslapper; he has dropped a few diplomatic clangers, is reputed to own the loudest (and thus least diplomatic) whisper in Canberra, and has shown an almost pathological determination to view the world through yellow-rose-colored glasses. His obsession with that Texas bloom asserts itself in many ways; at a conservative estimate, he has handed out some 50,000 of them; he rarely is without one in his buttonhole; there is, in fact, a rumor that he wears a yellow rose in his dressing gown lapel. He has 850 yellow rose bushes in his 10-acre gardens at the embassy, and when these are out of season he goes to extraordinary lengths to keep up the supply—he has even had them flown, packed in ice, from Texas.

This past Aug. 26 he sponsored Australia's first Texas race meeting in Canberra. Events included the election of a Yellow Rose Maiden, the Lone Star Flying Handicap, the Texas Handicap, the San Augustine Improvers' Race and the Austin Progressive Handicap. The Ambassador and his Chinese butler Huong dispensed bourbon and yellow roses to special guests under a flagpole from which fluttered the flag of the Lone Star State. The winning jockey in the Texas Handicap received a decanter full of bourbon and the lucky horse a garland of 300 yellow roses flown specially from Texas. Some of them, it ate.

It would be wrong to describe Clark as a discreet conversationalist at cocktail parties. He has been heard to say of one nationality, "They're not like Australians . . . they put their hand out to you, but it's not for shaking." And again, "Y'know, if you were on fire, those guys wouldn't even bother to extinguish you." (In truth, he expressed this sentiment a little more bawdily.) He prefaces many remarks with "Shoot, man," says "you-all," refers to himself as "Ah" and shortens the word "mister" to "mist" or "mizzuh."

In a quiet way, he has managed to match his wardrobe admirably to his personality and his vocabulary. Not long ago he astonished natives in a New Guinea marketplace by arriving in a Stetson—and when he adjusts his bowler at a jaunty angle, low over one eye, he immediately takes on the look of an aging but enthusiastic vaudeville comic. He is not a wild dresser; but in striped pants, cutaway, silk topper and other formal gear, he always gives a mischievous, Groucho Marx impression of someone who has been playing at dressing up.

All of these things would seem to make Ed Clark rather unlikely ambassadorial material—and there is no doubt, frankly, that he is. He has been the target of a good deal of unsympathetic criticism. It is significant, though, that most of the criticism occurred soon after the Ambassador's arrival, when the general impression was that this was a noisy, over-jovial extrovert who had blundered, by reason of a close friendship with President Johnson, into diplomacy. Some of his most vehement early critics are now quite fervent admirers.

The most blistering early attack came from Douglas Brass, editorial director of Australia's only national newspaper, The Australian, and a columnist for that paper. A month after Clark presented his credentials in Canberra, Brass wrote: "He obviously has a heart of gold, but there's no disguising that the new American Ambassador to Australia is something of a disappointment. The general impression in the capital is that if Mr. Edward Clark has any talents to match the significance of his post, he does his genial best to conceal them. It is grossly undiplomatic to say these things—but diplomacy is no more my business than Mr. Clark's; and I think it tragic that the United States Administration should have so little regard for us as to send a folksy gladhander to Canberra at a time of mutual delicacy, in war, investment and trade. . . ."

Exactly six months later, Douglas Brass wrote about Ed Clark again. He recalled his charges that the Ambassador was a folksy gladhander with no talens for what should be an important job, and then he went on: "I eat my words now. Mr. Clark, though he still loves to clown in public, has endeared himself to Canberra as a very shrewd operator and genuine friend of this country. I can do no more than acknowledge it, and nobody has asked me to do it."

In the past couple of years, many revised their first unflattering opinions of Ed Clark, and it is no exaggeration to say that he is now regarded as the most successful Ambassador the United States has ever sent to Australia. The Premier of the state of Victoria, Sir Henry Bolte, says candidly: "No other American representative has attempted to learn about the country and know the people the way Ed Clark has. Never before has the U.S. been so well represented—and with our alliance in Vietnam, our closer trade ties and the growing U.S. investment in Australia, that representation has to be good."

How has Clark, the clown in the Stetson, done it? By displaying a massive appetite for work and a determination to see every one of Australia's 3-million square miles, by being totally sincere, by being closer to his head of state than any ambassador in the country. He has surrendered none of his flamboyance, and his extravagant behavior still causes a few shudders among the professional diplomats; but his overall performance has been so impressive that a member of his staff was recently moved to remark, "If this guy's not a professional, I just hope he never loses his amateur status."

It is hard, of course, to estimate the quality of an ambassador's work. His basic jobs are to feed information back to his government and to build goodwill between the two countries concerned. While there is no reliable gauge available to assess the quality of Clark's reports, it is known that last year, when President Johnson asked his ambassadors to poll the governments to which they were assigned on whether the U.S. should bomb Hanoi and mine the North Vietnamese port of Haiphong, Clark's reply was reported to be on the President's desk 10 days before the next reply was received.

In the field of goodwill, there is no doubt that the man has been immeasurably successful. Along with all the homilies, the platitudes and the Texas hokum that he dispenses comes a great deal of genuine warmth—and Australians, who normally distrust wordiness have reacted well to him. They know that he has become a potent salesman in America for Australian trade, travel and investment.

"I asked the President just before I came out here what I was supposed to do," says Clark. "The President, he says, 'I want you to spread yourself around, Ed. Don't get stuck in no martini belt. Don't confine yourself to the striped pants circuit. I want you to go out and meet these people. And I want you to tell us everything about Australia . . . what they're thinking, what they're doing, how stable they are, how friendly they are.' "

That Clark has followed the President's advice can be little doubt. He may indeed have followed it too well, from the Australian point of view. Washington columnist Leslie Carpenter, whose wife Liz is press secretary to Mrs. Johnson, recently speculated that Clark may soon be named a White House "trouble-shooter"—the latest in a spate of speculations that he will shortly be moving on, now that he has served a two-year stint in Canberra.

But Clark professes to be astonished by the report. He will be in Washington this week, but the visit, he says, "was my idea, not with the Departments of State, Defense, Intheirs. I have a number of matters to discuss terior and Agriculture on matters concerning Australia—but I'm not looking for any trouble to shoot. If the President has any plans for me, I just don't know about them." He adds that he intends to be back in Australia in time for the Melbourne Cup, the nation's most famous horse race, which will be held Nov. 2. "I've picked the last two winners," he remarks, "and I intend to keep picking 'em."

An example of Clark's thoroughness in following the President's counsel has been his unprecedented record in going out and meeting the people. He has really "spread himself around." He flew 154,000 miles in 1966 and has flown another 110,000 miles this year—crisscrossing every Australian state, visiting as far north as New Guinea and as far south as Australia's Antarctic base. He has talked all the way, averaging a formal speech every five days, working a circuit that embraces churches, schools, Rotary and Lions clubs and all sorts of professional and trade organizations; his aides say that he has made far more speeches than any ambassador from any country, in the capital.

More important Americans have visited Australia during Clark's term of office than ever before; mostly they are personal friends, and they seem to respect his judgment entirely. He is credited by many Canberra observers with having been responsible for the visit last year by President Johnson—the first to Australia by any American President-in-office. He has worked hard to promote American investment in Australia.

Clark is known to have intervened on Australia's behalf when U.S. Government authorities were discussing capital outflow restraints and possible restrictions on American investments overseas; several U.S. corporations were being questioned about programs involving the investment in Australia of sums of between $15-million and $250-million. "That's when I got into the act," Clark confesses. "The authorities who were doing the questioning backed off . . . maybe just to get rid of me." He induced a 14-man Texas business delegation (most of them wearing cowboy hats) to tour Australia in July, and recently persuaded leaders of two New York banks and representatives of the oil, steel and aluminum industries to offer to put up the money for the establishment of what may be Australia's first postgraduate school of business administration. He has worked hard this year at getting the U.S. Armed Forces to buy supplies for American troops in Vietnam and the Pacific in Australia.

Undoubtedly, Clark's great advantage over all other ambassadors in Canberra is his ability to communicate immediately without recourse to formal diplomatic channels, with his President. He has done this quite often. One such instance came before Vice President Humphrey visited Australia and Asia last year; when his itinerary arrived from the State Department, it showed that Humphrey was due to have a half-day in Canberra, then two days in Manila, two in Bangkok and longer periods in other Asian capitals. Other ambassadors would have had no option but to accept the itinerary, even though the shortness of the Australian stay might have been construed as a small snub to the Australian Prime Minister; Clark was counseled by his own professionals not to take any official action.

According to Canberra newsmen, Clark ignored the advice. He telephoned the President and told him, "It's not good enough, Mr. President. You can't wipe these people off like that . . . it's an insult! If half a day is the best you can do, I suggest the Vice President doesn't call here at all." The itinerary was changed, and Humphrey stayed in Canberra for two days. The Australian Prime Minister, Harold Holt, who had been in office only a short time, was extremely grateful to Clark.

Ed Clark's direct route to the President has been the cause of some embarrassment. One veteran Canberra newspaperman met the Ambassador recently in a crowded lounge at the city's airport. "Waal, fancy meetin' you," Clark called. Then Clark lowered his voice to a gentle roar: "Y'know, I was talkin' 'smorning' to the President, and . . ." Suddenly the lounge was hushed; 500 people craned forward to hear what the President of the United States had been thinking. "Whatever it was, it was pretty insignificant," says the reporter. "But when Mister Ed decides to drop a name, he does it from a great height."

The Mister Ed label was first applied maliciously, but now it is used with total affection. Sometimes it appears in newspaper headlines, and reporters who attend conferences at the American Embassy have christened the cocktail he serves them—an old-fashioned with a bourbon base—"Mister Ed's drink." His relationship with local newspapermen has been particularly affectionate ever since he played host at a press conference for Pierre Salinger, the late President Kennedy's press secretary. After the formal questioning had ended, Clark said to Salinger, who is an excellent pianist: "Hey, Pierre, what about you play a few tunes for the boys?" Salinger obliged, and somehow the affair developed into a singsong, with newspapermen, Clark and embassy aides grouped around the piano singing tunes like "Chicago" and "Give My Regards to Broadway."

Clark's nature is so aggressively jolly and his desire to be loved so obvious that it would be easy to underrate the man. But even while he's telling Texas jokes, indulging in Texas reminiscences and generally behaving like a Texas caricature, the eyes behind his rimless glasses are operating independently. They are cool, level, calculating—the eyes of a very shrewd man. Just how shrewd might be gauged from the fact that he has built up, from a stake of $150 in 1932, a personal fortune in the region of $10-million. When he left Texas for Australia, he was chairman of the Capital National Bank and a board member of Texas Southern University; his law firm of Clark, Thomas, Harris, Denius and Winters has handled the affairs of the Lyndon Johnson family for many years. He has been active in Democratic party politics since the early thirties, and has been an active supporter of L.B.J. since the pair met in 1934. In 1937 Johnson stood for Congress, and his campaign was handled by Clark; then, in 1949, Johnson was elected to the Senate in a close and disputed contest.

In the legal wrangle which followed—there were charges of vote rigging and claims that Johnson had no right to stand for Senate office while he was still a Congressman—Clark acted as Johnson's senior legal counsel. "A lot of people think Ed owes a great deal, including this job, to L.B.J.," says one friend of the Clark family. "In fact, the truth is probably the opposite. Lyndon owes more to Clark than he could ever pay back." Whatever the case, there can be no doubt that the two men are very close; President Johnson is godfather to one of Clark's four grandchildren—three girls and a boy, all children of his daughter, Leila. (Clark is fiercely proud of the fact that these grandchildren are sixth-generation Texans: "My family arrived in 1842, when Texas was still a republic.")

In mid-1965, Australia had been without a United States Ambassador for exactly a year; the job was being held down very well by a charge d'affaires, but there were many Australians who regarded the absence of an ambassador as a considerable slight. Sir Robert Menzies, who was then Australia's Prime Minister, visited Washington.

"Sir Robert knows how to talk tough," says Clark. "He went to Washington and told President Johnson that Australia had waited long enough for an ambassador. The two countries had a lot of ties, and the Prime Minister made it obvious that he was getting ready to be offended. To be fair, the President had had a lot of things on his mind, and he simply hadn't gotten around to picking the right man.

" 'All right,' says the President. 'What kind of man you got in mind?'

" 'I want you to appoint a close friend,' says Menzies. 'Someone you've got confidence in . . . somebody who can ring you on the telephone and get straight through to you.'

" 'How would you feel about a Texan?' the President asks, and the Prime Minister says, 'I think that would be great . . . as long as he's a Texan who knows you very well.'

" 'Mist' Prime Minister,' says the President. 'I think I got your man.' "

On that summer day in 1965, Ed Clark and his wife Anne were driving from Washington to Austin, Tex. They arrived home to find a message asking Clark to ring the President immediately. "Ed," said the President, "I want you to come right back here and bring Anne with you."

"What's it for?" asked Clark. The President answered, "I can't tell you, Ed, but it's pretty important." That night Johnson introduced the Clarks to Menzies, and told him, "I think I've got your ambassador."

"We stayed at the White House that night and talked a lot more about the job at breakfast next morning," Clark recalls. "Then my wife and I went upstairs to talk it over. That Sir Robert was a very eloquent, persuasive man, but I had a lot of reservations. I kept telling my wife I was as busy as a bee with the law practice and the bank. I told her I felt I ought to keep working, and I said something about saving for a rainy day. 'As far as you're concerned, Ed Clark,' she said, 'it's raining right now. If you don't take this, you'll just keep on doing what you've been doing for the past 40 years.' I told her we'd better get on down, because we'd kept those two important men waiting a long time."

The couple went downstairs and had a cup of coffee; and suddenly Ed Clark, native son of Texas, banker, attorney, hamburger connoisseur and amateur breeder of bulls, was Ambassador-designate to Australia. "It all happened faster than a bull's blink," he says.

Recently, shambling amiably around his dining room, living room, "Texas Room" and garden, pausing often to point out the attractions (Steuben glass penguins, paintings, a husky-sled harness he brought back from the Antarctic, tennis courts—"Charlton Heston played there"—and a Texas pecan tree), Clark admitted frankly that he had been very nervous when he arrived in Australia. Interviewing the man is like standing under a waterfall: the torrent of words cascades all around, and it is utterly impossible to divert the flow. But when he talks about himself, Clark's honesty can be quite touching.

"I knew all the guys at the embassy here were professionals, and I was a rank amateur," he said. "I knew they'd look upon me as a political appointee, and I felt they would resent me. Yet I needed them so much. I didn't know a thing about diplomacy—I had no reason to. I didn't even know anyone in the Foreign Service. I knew it was important to have good manners, to be kind and considerate to people, but I didn't know when I was supposed to wear a cutaway or a silk hat. If I was due to call at some formal function, say an embassy party, I didn't know how long I was supposed to stay or who I was supposed to talk to or what I was supposed to talk about. I didn't know the rules of the game, and if they had wanted to make me look a fool, those professionals at the embassy could easily have done that. They turned out to be wonderfully loyal and cooperative, and they advised me well."

The loyalty has worked both ways. Ed Clark has 112 people on his embassy staff, and he has made some sort of history by entertaining all of them at barbecues and small lunch and dinner parties. He discusses every speech he makes and conference he attends with senior counselors, and is usually guided by their advice.

Mrs. Clark is a small, gray-blond woman whose gentle, rather shy and wry manner makes her an ideal foil for the gregarious Ambassador. She pretends to disapprove of Clark's almost belligerently friendly invitations—in back-country towns like Wagga Wagga and Coonabarabran he has been known to announce, "If you folks ever find yourselves in Canberra suffering from frostbite or snake-bite, just call in on Miz Clark and me for our bourbon cure." She chides him often about "talking too big," and tells him to remember that he is a foreigner in Australia. But they have been married for 39 years; she is intensely devoted and proud.

Mrs. Clark's gardening, church (they are Episcopalians) and needlework activities, plus a very catholic taste in books and magazines, give her a breadth of interests outside the embassy; Ed Clark has very few. A nongardener and nongolfer, he spends just about all his waking time in some form of embassy work, though he does keep in close touch with his Texas banking and legal interests, even to the point of staying abreast of all staff salary adjustments. Both send frequent tape recordings to their daughter and her family in Greenville, Mo.; they often show home movies (most of which happen to be about Texas) and entertain at barbecues which range from the intimate to the congested. One of the latter type was thrown on a cattle ranch owned by a friend during the Johnson visit; it was attended by 400 guests and a group of friendly kangaroos.

A couple of weeks ago, on a visit to Sydney to address the Institute of Engineers, Clark heard there were two American destroyers in town, fresh from Vietnam. He visited the ships, shook hands with everyone on board and asked his perennial question: "Anyone here from Texas?" There is always somebody there from Texas. This month Americans serving in Vietnam will begin taking short furloughs in Australia, and Ed Clark will be waiting to meet each planeload, watching specially for the inevitable Texan.

"People say to me, 'You're not the Ambassador for the United States; you're the Ambassador for Texas,'" says Clark. "I say, That reminds me of the guy who threw a rock at a cat and hit his mother-in-law. It ain't so bad after all."

How much longer Ed Clark will remain the Ambassador for the United States (and for Texas) is, as indicated, open to some doubt. "Just before I came out," he said recently, "I asked Senator Fulbright how long an ambassador usually stayed, and he said a man usually had the job during the pleasure of the President. Other people have said that about two years is the normal term." Clark's two years were up on Aug. 15; it is known that the State Department has offered him three other ambassadorships, but so far he has chosen to remain in Canberra. "I wouldn't take another diplomatic job just for the honor of it," he said, "but if the President told me that I might lighten his burden in some small way by accepting an appointment, I'd take it."

At this point his large face quarried itself into a broad grin. "I used to say that I didn't want to go any place where there was a language barrier," he said. "But my wife, a little unkindly, said, 'Let's face it, honey, wherever you go with that Southern accent, you gonna wind up with a language barrier.'" He dug his audience in the ribs, chuckled at some length and said good-by. Ed Clark is a trouper, and like all good troupers, he likes to leave 'em laughing.

TAX INCREASE AND SACRIFICES IN ORDER TO CUT SPENDING

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have received a most thoughtful letter from a constituent who is an old friend, even though a dedicated Republican and a conservative. He is Harold W. Gloyde, president of the United Mutual Savings Bank, of Tacoma, Wash., a man with broad experience in financial matters and community affairs, and a highly responsible citizen.

It will be noted that unlike most of the letters many of us get from our people who want spending reduced, but in places other than at home, he is fully aware that such reductions must come at home if they are to come elsewhere, in areas that directly affect him as well as areas that affect someone somewhere else, and he is prepared to make the sacrifices that all must make when spending is to be cut. This, I regard as a high degree of responsibility.

He writes as follows:

Mr. Floyd Hicks,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Floyd: I didn't think the time would come when I would write my Congressman urging that there should be a tax increase. However, I see that most of the mail is in opposition so here is my comment, for whatever it is worth.

In my view, this 10 percent surtax should, in fact, must be enacted into law. If it is not passed by Congress the effect will be, as the President has stated, "strangling tight money and a mortgage crisis." Of this, there is no doubt. Further, as stated by Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve, if the tax increase does not pass, interest rates will, indeed, be a great deal higher than they are now.

Of course, the tax increase should properly be accompanied by a substantial reduction in spending. And that, in my view, means a cut in just about everything. Highway construction, foreign aid to everybody including Boeing customers, Housing and Urban Development including [some local projects are mentioned here], everything should be cut. Maybe it is time to find out if we can exist without federal aid for a while.

Concluding, this tax increase just has to be passed. And if space programs, military spending, and a few more things have to be pruned, it suits me just fine.

Yours truly,
Harold W. Gloyde.

ROLE OF ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEES IN MARITIME POLICY

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an address by the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, during the debate this week on H.R. 159, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee pointed out the justification for this legislation. At that time I was reminded that he had recently addressed the convention of the Propeller Club of the United States on the same subject. Having been privileged to read his excellent address, I think it is appropriate that it be shared with Members of Congress and the public.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following address by the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers at this point in the Record:

Address by Hon. L. Mendel Rivers, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, to the Convention of the Propeller Club of the United States, Honolulu, Hawaii, October 12, 1967

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I was highly honored when Ed Hood and Ralph Dewey asked me to speak to this illustrious organization, the Propeller Club of the United States, on the increasing role of the Armed Services Committees of the Congress in the formulation of maritime policy.

Since it seems to me that American sea power and our maritime policy are mutually dependent upon each other, I can certainly appreciate the implication.

Nevertheless, I was complimented by his suggestion that the Committees on Armed Services of both the House and Senate enjoy an ever-increasing role in maritime policy. But in acknowledging the possibility that this could be true, I don't want to deprecate in any way the outstanding efforts and accomplishments of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House.

Let me put the situation a little more bluntly. Our maritime industry is so badly off, it certainly can't do any harm for two committees of the House to take an immediate interest in your plight, and it might do some good.

Do you remember as a child, and I can remember this even in Charleston, making a snowman after a heavy snowfall and watching it melt as the sun rose high in the heavens?

A melting snowman is a somewhat pathetic but, paradoxically, a brave looking spectacle.

Usually, the broom in the snowman's hand is the first object to fall, and then parts of the face. The snowman continues to dwindle in size and usually, the melting continues until eventually there is just a puddle of water, two black stones that represent the eyes, a piece of wood for the mouth, the broomstick, and, of course, someone's old hat.

Well, that's about the situation that is going to face our merchant marine industry if we don't do something about it. In other words, you are going to be left holding your hat.

Eighty percent of the American merchant marine fleet is more than 20 years old. That's not bad for human beings, but it's catastrophic for the shipping industry.

It always concerns me when I recall that as we slide down the scale in merchant marine tonnage, the Soviet Union tonnage goes up.

Between 1951 and 1965, the merchant marine of the Soviet Union grew from less than 600 ships of 2.6 million dead weight tons to more than 1,250 ships of 9 million tons.

During this 14 year period, which saw America's gross national product increase almost arithmetically, the active U.S. maritime fleet dwindled from 1,950 ships, with over 22 million tons, to 1,000 ships of 15½ million tons.

I am told that since 1958, the Soviet Union has advanced from 21st to seventh place among the maritime nations. As a result, a good part of their shipping is modern and efficient.

I am further told that as of last year the Soviet Union was building or had on order 585 merchant ships, totaling almost 5,700,000 dead weight tons. At the same time, we had on order 39 merchant ships, totaling less than 550,000 dead weight tons.

By 1980, the Soviet Union will have a merchant marine twice the size of the United States, and long before that date, Mussolini's Mare Norstrum will become the Soviet's Nashe Morye (our sea).

If anyone doubts that the Soviets move into a vacuum—watch what happens in the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean and the eastern reaches of the Mediterranean.

Now, I am sure that there are some computers, or at least there are people who use computers in the pentagon, who will tell you that as our merchant marine gets older, and as our U.S.-owned tonnage decreases, our status as a maritime nation improves. Fortunately, I learned a different brand of arithmetic, so I don't understand this theory of strength through weakness. And I wouldn't believe it if I did understand it.

This nation of ours is one of the few in the world bounded by two vast oceans.

Whether we like it or not, we were destined, from the day Columbus landed at San Salvador, or the Irish landed in Newfoundland, to become a maritime nation.

In every war in which we have been engaged, including the war between the States, control of the seas has been the deciding factor. Just recall Yorktown and deGrasse's fleet; the battle of Lake Erie; Vera Cruz; the Northern Blockade; Manila Bay; two world wars; Korea, and now Vietnam.

Even though the aviation industry has made tremendous advances and the skies today are becoming crowded with aircraft, nevertheless 98% of all the cargo going to our troops in Vietnam is carried by ships.

But the day is not far off when we are going to be dependent upon other countries to carry this kind of cargo unless we decide to do something about it now.

This may sound strange coming from me, since I had a little something to do with our improved military airlift, like procuring the C–130's, the C–141s, and the C–5A—and let there be no mistake, I'm all for airlift—but a hand is worthless without a heart to sustain the body.

Now, before I continue this pessimistic appraisal of our maritime industry, let me compliment those of the industry who have ventured their own capital, some with and some without government subsidy, to build modern ships. I have particular reference to the *Sea Barge*, the *Seatrain* concept, fully containerized ships, and variations of the *Lash* program.

These companies have gambled on the future of the maritime industry in the hope that America will awaken to the need for a vastly improved merchant marine.

Now, while I would like to compliment industry for its efforts to build up our merchant marine, I want to also say that subsidization in its present form may require some extensive changes.

I don't profess to know enough about the technicalities of rate-making to make an intelligent suggestion, but I hate to see somebody pour ground glass in a good cup of coffee and that is just about what some of the labor unions are trying to do to our merchant marine. The only difficulty with that is that some of you have become so accustomed to that kind of treatment that you have learned to digest ground glass.

The only restriction, as I understand it, on passing wage increases on to the customer is the Maritime Administration, and they may or may not approve a wage scale after it is negotiated and a contract has been signed. I suppose industry gets stuck every once in a while, but it seems to me to be a strange way to run a shipping industry.

It occurs to me that there are some people in this nation, and perhaps some important people, who would like to nationalize the entire merchant marine. Perhaps that is one solution. It would probably stop all progress, but we wouldn't read about the problems quite as much.

I would prefer to think that there are enough intelligent people in this country who can sit down and analyze where we stand and come up with a solution. And it is not going to be an easy solution or an easy compromise.

There are going to have to be concessions made by lots of groups and lots of special interests, and there must be one concession in common from all who participate in such a discussion—an agreement that the security of this nation comes first.

Each group, whether it is labor, industry or government, is going to have to put its best and most patriotic minds to work or we are going to wake up some day and find ourselves completely dependent on foreign shipping. When that day happens, when we go from being the top dog in world affairs to an underdog, believe me there are going to be nations standing in line—nations who have been some of our most expensive dependents—waiting to kick us.

A partial answer to this problem is special purpose shipping.

I am not going to spend a great deal of time talking to you about the fast deployment logistic ship that was proposed by the department of defense this year.

Our committee and the Congress, as you know, did not approve the 30-ship program, and I think it safe to say that we still are not enamored of the total production package nor the strategic concept that accompanied the proposal.

But, I don't think anyone should conclude that our committee is opposed to the development of a fast deployment logistic ship. It does not necessarily have to be a ship owned and operated by the United States Navy, or the United States Army. It does not necessarily have to even be a ship built to a design paid for with Government funds.

It could be a ship now underway, or a ship already in existence, or it could be a combination of several ships.

What I personally would like to see is the construction of four or five prototype FDLs, not necessarily all built in the same yard. I'd like to think that improvements could be made as they are being constructed, from lessons learned from the ships that are being built by private industry for the privately-owned steamship companies.

It is quite possible that the sea barge and lash concepts may have marked advantages over the FDL, since they may be more cost effective than the FDL. These could be chartered to do much of the cargo hauling jobs for our overseas forces.

I strongly supported the announcement of a design winner for the FDL because I did not want to see more than $17,000,000 in Government funds—and perhaps another 8 to 10 million in private funds—wasted.

I'm confident that each of the studies submitted on the FDL were good. These have been paid for and should be available to everyone.

We should build four or five government-funded FDL's, compare those with the vastly improved ships now underway for private industry, and come up with a ship that will be flexible, multi-purpose, fast, efficient, and capable of meeting world competition through the use of improved operating techniques.

But, before our committee approves *any* FDL's, the Department of Defense must present to us, as we said in our report, an approved program for:

(a) The modernization of Navy shipyards.

(b) A strong new American merchant marine.

(c) The continued ironclad non-revocable assurance that none of the FDL's will be used in competition with what's left of our merchant marine.

And believe me, I am not kidding—which a lot of people have found out—the hard way!

I am interested in better Navy and private shipyards because they are vital to our security.

I am also interested in seeing us build new, modern, fast-moving cargo carrying ships capable of easy on-and-off loading, preferably by barges, as shallow draft as possible, and capable of long cruising range. They do not have to be pre-positioned in anticipated trouble spots of the world. There probably aren't enough ships in the world to meet that contingency.

This is the role of the navy's amphibious forces.

But, of course, some of the ships can be pre-loaded, others should have a fast unloading and reloading time, and be immediately available when called upon.

The merchant marine industry of this Nation must attain improved automation, faster speeds, and quicker turn-around capability to become cost competitive in order to regain our posture as a leading maritime nation of the world.

I have referred earlier to the need for closer partnership between the military and the private sector in the design and construction of vessels adaptable both to commerce and defense.

Of equal importance, is the need for long term plans and priorities for the allocation of defense cargoes to all segments of the merchant marine.

The continued pace of private investments in ships in many of our essential trade routes depends squarely upon some form of programmed cargo volume for each stage of an emergency. We could very well lose our present U.S. flag position in cargo liner competition if the parcel lots of military cargo fluctuates widely back and forth from a period of feast to famine.

Procurement practices in military cargo must be regularized and the ground rules re-established, in order to insure continued availability of cargoliners when emergencies arise.

At the same time, and I say this with considerable conviction, the carriers who enjoy regular patronage of military cargoes in nonemergency periods, especially those who get subsidies, must respond with all possible ships and space in such emergencies.

The "respond" proposal, or some equivalent priority agreement, must be implemented without delay.

We must take advantage of those things we know best—mass production techniques—progressive standardization—and nuclear power. We must look at undersea towing possibilities, air cushion techniques, and polar routes. Air cushioned vehicles, for example, are practical and exist today. They should be explored further. The outstanding commercial advantages of the nuclear powered SS *Savannah* should be exploited and carefully analyzed by all who are engaged in the shipping industry.

And, above all, the Nation must be told over and over again that sea power is vital to our safety, vital to our existence, vital to our future, and is not a problem limited to the States that border the oceans.

A fast-moving merchant marine fleet is just as important to the State of Iowa as it is to the State of California.

A fast-moving merchant marine fleet is as much a part of sea power as our indispensable, incomparable aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines.

I have said in the past that we are not going to authorize any new major surface combatant vessels that do not have nuclear propulsion. This, of course, always raises the question as to what is a major surface combatant vessel.

Certainly, there will be no additional carriers authorized by our committee unless they are nuclear powered. What I will insist upon, and I am confident my committee will support me, is that we develop all-nuclear powered task forces.

It seems to me the height of absurdity to have nuclear carriers and not have nuclear powered guided missile frigates making up the task force.

At the same time, I know there is a crying need for additional destroyers, particularly general purpose destroyers.

If cost and, even more important, the availability of nuclear propulsion plants precludes the construction of a substantial number of nuclear powered general purpose destroyers, then of course we must authorize conventionally powered ships of this class in order to put on line the fire power necessary for the type of wars I can envision in the years ahead.

I think it is time that the Committee on Armed Services and the Department of Defense work out an acceptable formula for the proper mix of nuclear powered and conventionally powered ships.

The Congress has overwhelmingly approved the strong stand our committee has taken on nuclear propulsion for our major surface warships. This year we authorized construction of two nuclear powered guided-missile frigates in lieu of two conventional guided-missile ships requested by the Department of Defense. The Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 90–22) states:

"The contracts for the construction of the two nuclear powered guided-missile frigates shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the congress that their construction is not in the national interest."

The Department of Defense can expect similar action to be taken in the future, if they continue to recommend that we build warships with obsolete propulsion systems.

It took a long time for some people to accept the fact that steam was better than sail.

As far as the House Armed Services Committee is concerned, it is not going to take the same amount of time to convince equally stubborn persons that nuclear power must replace conventional power. We have an advantage, and we must exploit it.

I think you all know one of the greatest living advocates of sea power—Admiral John Sidney McCain, Jr. He has given his lecture on sea power to our committee so many times that I think I can repeat a great deal of it. But he always impresses me when he says that, on any given day, there are about 2100 ships in the North and mid-Atlantic ocean.

I don't know what the figure is now in the Pacific, but it must be pretty substantial because we have a lot of ships carrying supplies to South Vietnam and the Communists have an awful lot of ships carrying supplies into Haiphong Harbor—supplies to be used against us. A pretty silly way to fight a war, I might add.

If someone really wants to test the importance of sea power, all they would have to do is measure the effect of a blockade of North Vietnam upon the economy and war-making ability of North Vietnam.

Of course, we might engender a little adverse world opinion with such a blockade.

Personally, I don't care what any other nation says. I'm not an isolationist, but I'm getting tired of being told that "world opinion" isn't with us. I prefer those words of Luke, Chapter 11:23—"He that is not with me, is against me."

We've learned, the hard way, that some of our most expensive dependents—like De Gaulle—certainly aren't with us.

There are all too few countries we can depend upon, with any real certainty, in a time of true crisis. And that's all the more reason why we must move quickly to shore up our merchant marine.

If we don't, we may one day become a have-not nation. It's that simple.

And yet, would you believe that at no time since I have been chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has the Department of Defense ever expressed grave concern about the decline of our merchant marine.

It is inconceivable to me that the people in the executive branch of government charged with the responsibility for the defense of our Nation have not come forth with a firm proposal to solve this problem. It is even more inconceivable to me that they have not consulted with the legislative experts in the Congress in this field, in this vital area.

Apparently, the Department of Defense will continue to adhere to its childish concept that the Congress cannot make any original contributions to the problems that confront our merchant marine in our national security.

What has happened to the old days when the Congress and the executive branch of government used to sit down together and work out solutions to the problems that confront the Nation?

And certainly there cannot be a greater problem than that which confronts our merchant marine, and the problems confronting us in the Far East.

I'm told that 98% of the trade of the Orient goes through the straits of Malacca, and that on any one day, 200 ships pass through those straits.

I'm told that 12,000 ships a year anchor in Singapore, and 10,000 in Indonesia.

I don't know how many belong to us, but I do know that tin, oil, rubber, tungsten, platinum, and many other vital raw materials are carried on these ships.

Our survival depends upon sea trade, sea lift, and sea power.

If our committee is playing an increasing role in the formulation of maritime policy—and I hope we are—it is because American sea power and our maritime policy are inseparable.

Thank you for inviting me here to speak before an audience that knows and loves the sea, in a beautiful state that is surrounded by the sea.

THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, for some time now the Federal Housing Administration has been subject to attacks from all sides.

It has been criticized for going too fast. It has been criticized for going too slow.

It has been depicted as the darling of the suburbs, and the culprit in the deterioration of our inner cities. It is either too conservative, or too liberal, depending on the identity of the last speaker.

Whatever the housing problem, the FHA at once becomes a culpable party in the eyes of some.

The continuing barrage is neither warranted nor justified.

The FHA has made mistakes in the past, in individual cases, and I would be surprised if there were none in the future. But its overall influence has been for the good, and it is now making the necessary transition to make it an influence for good in our specialized and socially pressing housing problems of today.

One of the principal aims of recent housing legislation has been to develop a public-private partnership to serve low-income families by coupling the resources of the Government with the initiative and imagination of private enterprise. It is only natural that the Federal Housing Administration, with its long experience in dealing with the private sector of the housing market, should be given responsibility for carrying out these programs.

With the tools that we in the Congress have given it, the FHA can be and is responsive to today's needs. This does reflect a change in policy and thrust, this does require change on the part of FHA personnel. These, however, are obstacles which have been overcome, and for those who would continue to overemphasize FHA's role in the suburbs, I can only admonish them to take a look at what has happened and what is happening.

In 1934, when the Federal Housing Administration was first established, its primary purpose was to restore public confidence in the homebuilding and home financing industries in an effort to bring that part of the economy out of the doldrums of a severe economic depression.

This was accomplished and in the process, a whole new industry was formed. Homebuilding and mortgage lending on a large scale became possible. It was just as well, for FHA's big role was to accommodate the housing needs of returning World War II veterans.

This was a tremendous undertaking, one of great magnitude, and the FHA response was magnificent. Coupled with the outstandingly successful GI loan program of the Veterans' Administration, our veterans got their homes at terms they could afford, and our country was transformed into a nation of homeowners.

Today, nearly two of every three families own or are purchasing their homes, and a great deal of this is attributable either directly to FHA or to the influence FHA exerts on the mortgage market.

In the process of succeeding, however, the FHA earned for itself a reputation of being the midwife to suburbia.

Originally, that was a factual portrayal of the agency.

But the FHA has made a change and is adapting itself to the needs of today.

We in the Congress and in the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, a subcommittee it is my honor and privilege to chair, have provided the FHA with new tools and programs to attune it to today's needs. We have given it programs to help those of greatest need—the low- and moderate-income housing program, the rent supplement program, a program for home ownership for low income families. It is to this stimulus the FHA is now responding.

The metamorphosis is not complete, and more change is needed. But an all-out effort is being made to have the FHA participate to the fullest extent possible in housing the poor and near poor families of our country.

For instance, Commissioner P. N. Brownstein recently told me the FHA was giving a broad interpretation to a 1966 legislative amendment which made possible mortgage insurance in riot or riot-threatened areas. As a result of this, in the past 2 months, the FHA committed on over 1,200 mortgages for homes in these areas.

This is a far cry from the false image painted of an FHA addicted to a well-ordered suburbia, and I believe it is time that we acknowledged this activity in improving housing within our Nation's cities. We desperately need a free flow of mortgage money into our central cities.

To go one step further, Commissioner Brownstein also told me that much of FHA's insurance business is in the inner city with much emphasis being given to rehabilitation.

In addition, the FHA also is showing an increase in business in the rural areas.

So we have a situation in which more home mortgage insurance is being written on either side of the suburb than in the suburb itself.

The housing in which some of our people are living is not good. It is totally inadequate by American standards and something should be done to correct this situation.

While I am certain each of us would like to see housing removed from the list of social problems, I believe it ill becomes any of us to criticize the FHA as the culprit responsible for this condition.

Let us face the facts on the root causes and not concentrate as some have done on finding a convenient whipping boy. We then can get on with the business of trying to find workable solutions, and I have the faith and confidence in the FHA to know it will be in the vanguard of those acting responsibly.

This is not to say the FHA is perfect, nor that some criticisms are not deserved. However, I know the dedication that Commissioner Brownstein has to the correction of program deficiencies and in carrying out the programs in the manner contemplated by the Congress.

The FHA has been extremely useful to the American people in the past. It has done an excellent job in expanding the building industry, and in providing homes for our returning servicemen. The task ahead, that of rebuilding our inner cities, and making good standard housing available to all, is probably the most complex of all the housing tasks faced by any organization.

I believe the FHA will be equal to its role in that task and will help us to do the job that we in Congress want done.

PASSPORT RESTRICTION BILL

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, within our concept of ordered liberty there exists the constitutional protection against the deprivation of life, liberty or property without due process of law.

This protection extends by implication to a citizen's right to travel abroad. Any arbitrary or capricious restraint on such travel is not consistent with our concept of a free society, and would be a deprivation of liberty without due process.

This right to travel, however, is not absolute, but rather must be balanced against other provisions of the Constitution governing the conduct of the United States in her relations with other nations.

It is crucial to our foreign policy and because of the changeable and explosive nature of contemporary international relations, it is imperative that the executive department, and especially the Department of State, be given stronger measures by which travel to foreign countries may be regulated when such travel is not in the best interest of the United States.

The bill I am introducing today will make it a crime for anyone to travel without a passport to, in or through a country for which a passport is not valid, or for refusal to surrender his passport upon proper demand.

This bill will fill a gap in the existing law which now permits a person to obtain renewal of his passport merely by declaring that he will not again go into a country for which his passport has not been validated.

The law as it exists now provides no penalty for travel to unauthorized countries except forfeiture of the passport or, in the case of "willful use" of the passport in violation of travel bans, 5 years in prison and/or $2,000 fine. It is almost impossible to prove use because passports are not stamped by the Governments of North Vietnam and Cuba.

Thus, a person who violates travel restrictions imposed by the State Department only has to offer a promise of "good faith" that he will not again violate the ban and his passport will be renewed.

Just 2 weeks ago six persons received new passports by promising that they would not again go to a country not named in the passport.

One of those six individuals is David Dellinger, editor of the leftist publication Liberation magazine. He is also national chairman for the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam and is currently planning a march on the Pentagon this Saturday, October 21.

Dellinger has been convicted for violation of the selective service law and traveled to North Vietnam in 1966 as an alleged member of an "investigating team" for the so-called Bertram Russell War Crimes Tribunal.

His passport was revoked on January 5, 1967, but just 2 weeks ago he was issued a new passport on his sworn promise that he would not again violate the restrictions. His new passport has been validated by the State Department for travel to Cuba as a "journalist."

Others who have just been issued new passports are: Herbert Aptheker, an admitted Communist and director of the American Institute for Marxist studies; Lena Greene, American-born wife of British journalist Felix Greene; John Christopher Kock, New York radio announcer; Harold Supriano, an unemployed California social worker; and John Gerassi, not otherwise identified.

We are now asked to believe that they will not violate the passport restrictions. Such promises have in the past been "illusory."

If these people do go to a restricted country, the only existing punishment is loss of their passports, only again to have them renewed upon a promise of "good faith."

The laws of this country should be accorded more respect, and if the laws of this country are not sufficient to deal with the problem, then they should be amended and made stronger. This is my intention in introducing this bill.

"TIGER" TEAGUE—NEW GOALS IN SPACE

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Russian soft landing on Venus emphasizes the urgent need for new goals and more money in our own space program.

We can point with pride to the leadership of GEORGE MILLER, "TIGER" TEAGUE, and, the members of the Committee on Science and Aeronautics here in this House for their outstanding leadership and foresight in this field. They urgently need the backing and support of every Member of the Congress in facing this new challenge from Russia.

The General Electric Forum recently conducted an interview with our distinguished and beloved colleague, OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Manned Spaceflight.

I commend this interview with Mr. TEAGUE to the attention of my colleagues and to the people of our country:

MEETING PUBLIC NEEDS

(By Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, Chairman, House Subcommittee on Manned Spaceflight)

Question. Congressman Teague, you are recognized as one of the most knowledgeable space experts in the Congress. What do you see as the Nation's over-all direction in space exploration?

Answer. There can be three major areas of emphasis in our efforts to explore space and to utilize it for the benefit of mankind. These were outlined in a report entitled "Future National Space Objectives," which was prepared in 1966 by the House Subcommittee on NASA Oversight, which I chair.

The first area is near-earth orbital operations for scientific experiments and commercial utilization. For example, it has been estimated that by placing a telescope outside the earth's atmosphere, more information about the universe can be obtained in one year than has been previously accumulated in all of recorded history.

The commercial side, the use of weather and communications satellites shows great promise, and we can look for an extension of these programs in the years to come.

The second area is lunar operations. Merely landing on the moon is *not* our end objective. The real goal is to examine the moon to discover more about the origin of our own planet and to determine if the lunar surface may be made more habitable for extended astronomical observations and other scientific activities.

In the near future, a manned lunar laboratory program should be pursued, as well as an earth-orbital laboratory program. These programs will provide the basis for extending our manned lunar effort into the third area of emphasis—interplanetary activities—in the period beyond 1975. This extension, of course, requires the use of unmanned probes at first to gain sufficient information on deep space to allow man to venture forth into this relatively unknown and hostile environment.

One thing which intrigues me about probing deeper into the solar system, both in manned and unmanned vehicles, is the possibility that we will be able to understand better how nature functions here on earth, and what some of the mechanisms are which control our solar system and the many star systems of the universe. For instance, only a few years ago, we knew nothing about the Van Allen radiation belts around the earth, and relatively little about how activity on the sun affected the earth. Information from several space probes has greatly broadened our understanding of these important areas.

Question. When should we begin to work actively toward new goals in space beyond the Apollo lunar landing?

Answer. Right now. I say this with full awareness of recent (and current) Congressional concerns over the size of our national space budget. The House Subcommittee's report recommended that future major goals be set at the earliest possible time to assure our scientific and technological preeminence in the 1970's, and to provide a focal point for an orderly national space program.

If we don't start working toward new goals now, the sophisticated aerospace team built up for the Apollo moon program will begin to shrink away. NASA has estimated that by the end of this year, about 200,000 people—50 per cent less than at the peak—will be at work on the Apollo program. By the end of 1968, this figure will be down to about 100,000, and by the end of 1969, if the program is successful and going as it should, its employment will be nearing an end.

Question. In light of this year's close Congressional look at the space budget, what is the general mood of the 90th Congress toward space exploration beyond the Apollo man-on-the-moon program?

Answer. It is my view that Congress will continue to support the Apollo lunar landing program while continuing to take a hard look at new programs proposed by NASA.

Considering the fact that there are many pressures and possible alternative allocations of the resources available in the Federal government, including Vietnam, it is incumbent upon NASA to continue to make clear the value of these new programs in terms of economic advantage, technological progress, national security and scientific discovery. Within budget limitations, I personally believe that these new space programs should be pursued vigorously—if not this year, actively advanced when national budget conditions permit.

Question. What role does Congress play in overseeing the space program?

Answer. Primarily we represent the public voice in the amount of money spent and in the direction of the activities. It certainly isn't the job of Congress to run the day-to-day operations of the space program, but rather to examine periodically how well the work is being done and what return we are gaining in new knowledge and practical utility from the space program.

In addition to the annual authorization hearings where past performance and future planning are reviewed, our subcommittees travel to NASA centers and plants of the major industrial contractors to review their projects each year. We supplement these activities by conducting studies each year into those areas which appear to be most critical, such as our report on "Future National Space Objectives," mentioned earlier.

Congress must examine any new program not only on its own merits, but also on its relationship to other national goals. Each decision we make in the area of science and technology involves the setting of a relative order of priorities for the use of the Nation's resources for science and technology.

Given the feasibility and desirability of a particular program, it is the ultimate responsibility of Congress to determine when the program should start, when it should end, and at what funding level it should be pursued. Here are a few of the questions Congress asks about each space project:

Is the objective compatible with other national goals?

Is there a reasonable expectation of achieving the objective?

What will be the effect of the program on the welfare of the general public?

Are there desirable or undesirable international implications?

Are new concepts of science or technology required?

What will the program cost each year, and what will be the total cost?

Are the cost estimates realistic?

Can any portion of the program be modified to reduce costs and still realize the end objective?

What effect will the commitment of that sum of money have on other Federal activities?

Question. As you assess the public mood at this time, how much support is there for the space program?

Answer. I think there is general public support. Recently a public survey firm made available to me a set of questionnaires discussing public interest in the space programs, which indicated general support for it. Another barometer is the mail we receive on the subject. Less than one per cent of the mail I receive on a daily basis is unfavorable to the space program.

One of the problem areas we are facing is the need to keep the public informed. Here, I think both NASA and industry need to do a better job. There is a great deal of communication within the space industry on a daily basis, and through periodic meetings, and this is certainly important. But sometimes I think we lose sight of the fact that it is equally important to make this information available and understandable to the general public.

For example, I think it is important for leaders in the space industry to talk to local civic organizations, schools, and nonspace-related industries, and to distribute to these groups whatever information is necessary to allow them to make an intelligent and informed assessment of the space program on their own.

Question. What are the possibilities for improved international cooperation in space?

Answer. I'm convinced that in the years ahead international cooperation in space will increase. There is great potential in the use of space for human betterment, in such areas as earth-orbital agricultural surveys, international communications, and oceanographic surveys.

More than 60 per cent of the world's people, for instance, are protein-deficient today. If, by earth orbital surveys, in cooperation with the less-developed countries, we can improve that situation, our entire space program will have paid for itself many times over.

The problem in international cooperation, of course, is in finding the right mechanism. There is a major element of national security wrapped up in the development of advanced technology, so all nations are understandably cautious. But the gains can be so great if we can only find the mechanical means for cooperation.

Question. From your viewpoint as a representative of the people, why is it so important for the United States as a nation to set ambitious goals in space?

Answer. If we expect to continue the rapid progress made to date in this country, to compete in the world marketplace in the years to come, and to help other peoples improve their standards of living, we will need still more technological progress. And this is what the space program is providing us—technology on a scale so vast and varied that we can barely keep up with it. There is hardly a single field of scientific endeavor that is not touched by the space program.

Even more important is the stimulation that our ambitious goals in space bring to the young people of our nation, and to our educational system. This stimulation is hard to measure, but I am convinced that without the examples of the attainments of the many highly skilled people in the space program and of the astronauts, our young people might well set lower goals for their own accomplishments.

> If I could sum up these reasons, I would say that the national space program is an integral part of our national well-being, not only for today, but for the future as well—intellectually, materially, and spiritually.

A MORATORIUM ON VIETNAM CRITICISM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the mass demonstrations against the war in Vietnam planned for Washington and other cities this weekend seems sure to be exploited by the Communists and others throughout the world who oppose our policy there. With the likely excesses of emotion and oratory, some step to avoid international misinterpretation is needed. For this reason, when the shouting and the drama has passed and our treasured right of dissent has been exercised by those who wish to exercise it, I suggest that all Americans follow the demonstrations with a self-imposed 30-day moratorium on criticism on our policy in Vietnam. You might call this a halt in verbal bombing.

Such a procedure could accomplish a number of purposes within acceptable limitations.

First, it might do far more than the protestations to create a climate favorable to negotiation. The wide range of criticism in our country during the past few months has surely demonstrated to the world the existence of free expression in our society. Now to avoid misrepresentation and misunderstanding, the depth of commitments of most Americans in their loyalty to the Nation could be demonstrated most vividly by the announcement and observance of such a period of voluntary restraint.

Secondly, such a pause would provide a period for thoughtful consideration by those charged with the heavy responsibility of making decisions. The weight of daily choices in the war and in international policy is a heavy one and can hardly have been helped by the current barrages of criticism that tempts direct reply and reaction.

A third and equal benefit of such a lenten period would be the opportunity it would offer every American for reflection upon our responsibilities to ourselves, our Nation and the world for the views we espouse and the course we take in Vietnam and other troubled spots in the world.

With these goals in mind, I suggest that the President, leaders of both parties in the Congress and all who hold responsibility for commenting on the course of events, ask all Americans to pledge themselves to a moratorium on criticism and demagoguery relating to U.S. involvement in Vietnam to run 30 days commencing October 23 through Thanksgiving, November 23. This would and should be no gag-rule. The facts and the news we must have. It would not be a blackout, but rather it might mean progress through new light to show us the way toward the best course.

I do not suppose it will happen, but if it did, it would be inspiring and might be helpful.

TIME TO TEMPER OUR DISAPPROVAL OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am gravely concerned about recent reports from Vietnam, including captured Vietcong and North Vietnamese documents, that indicate Communist refusal to enter negotiations may hinge on mounting antiwar sentiment here in America.

These reports indicate that leaders in Hanoi may be "holding out just a little while longer" in the hope that public opinion in this country may force a U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam thereby negating any need to negotiate.

If this be the case, then it appears that the demonstrators, themselves, may be prolonging this war and causing increased and needless casualties among U.S. fightingmen in Vietnam.

Responsible voices in our Nation, fearing this may be the case, have long warned that freedom of speech and the right to dissent, in this regard, should be accompanied by responsible restraint. With freedom of speech, goes the responsibility each of us has for those young Americans in Vietnam who are really paying the price of this war.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time for serious reflection by all Americans—a time to ask ourselves if we have, in fact, given aid and comfort to the enemy by burning flags and draft cards, attempting to shut down induction centers and other public buildings, and berating our Nation as "immoral" and "indecent." Such irresponsible actions and words are being misread in foreign capitals and I think its time we temper our disapproval in favor of those men that this administration has committed to the war in Vietnam.

Even though a substantial number of Americans, including many in Congress, oppose administration policy in Vietnam, it is also true, in this instance, that those who take to the streets to express their opposition, may be doing more harm than good when it aids and abets the enemy.

Quite frankly, I feel we must now face up to a new and awesome reality. To prolong this war one more day or cause the death of one more American in Vietnam, now becomes the solemn responsibility of each and every citizen of this country.

My principal purpose in raising this question today is to bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues in the hope that we can measure up to this challenge before it is too late. In my judgment, we are entering an explosive and dangerous period in our country and in our history that could well destroy our national fiber unless we are aware of this threat and ready to meet it.

DESIGNATING THE ROSE AS AMERICA'S NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 896, which names the rose as America's national flower. This, of course, is not a new proposal, but rather a renewal of a much needed piece of legislation. The United States stands alone as the only major country in the world which does not have a national floral emblem. For this and other compelling reasons, I am sponsoring this resolution.

The rose really needs no champion, for its beauty and popularity are well documented. Time after time, in a series of national polls conducted by periodicals and floral organizations, the rose has emerged as the Nation's choice to be named our country's official flower. This Week magazine was so sure of the rose's popularity that it conducted a poll to determine which color of the lovely bloom would be the national flower. Stated this magazine uncategorically:

> The rose is America's favorite flower.

Coincidentally, the red rose was the overwhelming choice. But no matter the color. The rose is the thing, be it red, yellow, white or whatever color. There are hundreds of varieties in various hues, and they are all lovely.

Another important factor is the widespread pleasure this flower gives. The rose is grown for fun and profit throughout this great Nation. From housewives in Portland, Maine, to commercial producers in California, everyone is growing roses. It is a relatively easy bush to cultivate in most climates and is known for its hardiness. It is my pleasure to represent Tyler, Tex., known as the city of roses. Tyler is the center of an agricultural complex that produces more than half of all the field-grown rose bushes produced in the United States. America is the leading rose nation in the world, with annual production of more than 30 million bushes.

But roses are not the property of Texas alone, nor do we claim them for ourselves solely. Indeed, the rose is revered across the land. From the Pasadena Rose Festival on New Year's Day to Tyler's own Texas Rose Festival held each October to the celebration of National Rose Week, Americans honor the role of the roses in our lives.

The rose has a long and proud history. Archeological findings in Oregon indicate that prehistoric man encountered the rose as far back as 5 million years ago, probably making the rose the oldest flower known to man. Through the centuries the rose has been adopted as a symbol for many things: courage, beauty, honor, truth, fidelity, grace, and on and on. Even today, at almost any function where flowers are given as a token of admiration and esteem, the choice is the rose. First Ladies receive roses, prima ballerinas get them by the basketful and teary-eyed actresses walk off stages with armloads on opening night. Miss America is crowned each year holding a bouquet of roses.

Finally, why do we need a national flower? There are a number of good reasons, it would be helpful to have an official flower for use at State functions, whether in the White House or for other Government officials. In greeting visiting dignitaries, presenting our national flower would be a fitting welcome. But there is one most compelling motive, and it is a simple and an obvious one: The rose, in the hearts and minds of Americans, already is the national flower. It is only left to the Congress to make it official.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE OBSERVANCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR: PROGRESS REPORT NO. 2

Mr. **FASCELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FASCELL**. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1963 and again in 1965, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolutions designating the year 1968 as the International Human Rights Year and calling on all member states to join in observing the 20th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In the fall of 1966, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on legislation proposing the establishing of a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for the observance, by and in the United States, of the International Human Rights Year. Although the subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair, reported the legislation favorably, we did not manage to obtain House concurrence to that proposal prior to the adjournment of the 89th Congress.

At the beginning of the current year, a special committee was appointed by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO to plan and prepare for the observance of the International Human Rights Year. Under the able chairmanship of Mr. Bruno V. Bitker, of Milwaukee, Wis., that committee has done an impressive amount of work in stimulating interest in the forthcoming International Human Rights Year among American educational institutions as well as among a multitude of private, voluntary organizations.

On June 21, I reported in the Congressional Record on the initial accomplishments of Mr. Bitker's committee.

Today, I should like to include in the Congressional Record a further status report received from Mr. Bitker.

Before I do this, however, I should like to call to the attention of the membership of the House the proclamation on the Human Rights Year, 1968 issued last week by President Johnson.

President Johnson strongly reaffirmed America's belief in human dignity and equality in his stirring proclamation celebrating the anniversary of the Human Rights Declaration of 1948.

The President marked the historical importance of this declaration of freedom by naming December 10 to 17 Human Rights Week and 1968 Human Rights Year.

This document joined in common voice the nations of the world to express, in the President's words:

> Man's deepest beliefs about the rights that every human being is born with, and that no government is entitled to deny.

In a world beset with tyranny, America must continue to set a shining example for freedom-loving people everywhere to follow. On a globe hot with conflict, we must reassert our abiding conviction that nations and ideologies which deny basic human rights will crumble.

This has been our faith. It will always remain our faith.

The renewal of this basic belief is the real meaning of President Johnson's eloquent proclamation celebrating the Universal Human Rights Declaration.

Under unanimous consent I place this proclamation in the Record.

The text of that proclamation, promulgated on Otcober 11, 1967, the birthday of the late Eleanor Roosevelt, reads as follows:

"HUMAN RIGHTS WEEK AND HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR"—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The year 1968 will mark the twentieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations—an historic document of freedom that expresses man's deepest beliefs about the rights that every human being is born with, and that no government is entitled to deny.

The United Nations has designated 1968 as International Human Rights Year. It has invited its members to intensify their domestic efforts to realize the aims of the Declaration.

Every American should remember, with pride and gratitude, that much of the leadership in the drafting and adoption of the Declaration came from a great American, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. She was our first representative on the UN Commission on Human Rights.

Today, October 11, would have been her 83rd birthday. With the inspiration of her humanitarian concern still before us, I call the attention of our people to the Declaration she helped to author.

To Americans, the rights embodied in the Declaration are familiar, but to many other people, in other lands, they are rights never enjoyed and only recently even aspired to.

The adoption of the Declaration by the United Nations established a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations. These principles were incorporated into Human Rights Conventions, to be ratified by the individual nations.

American ratification of these Conventions is long overdue. The principles they embody are part of our own national heritage. The rights and freedoms they proclaim are those which America has defended—and fights to defend—around the world.

It is my continuing hope that the United States Senate will ratify these conventions. This would present the world with another testament to our Nation's abiding belief in the inherent dignity and worth of the individual person. It would speak again of the highest ideals of America.

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, in honor of the ratification of the American Bill of Rights, December 15, 1791, and in honor of the adoption by the General Assembly of the United Nations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, December 10, 1948, do hereby proclaim the week of December 10 through 17, 1967, to be Human Rights Week and the year 1968 to be Human Rights Year. In so doing, I call upon all Americans and upon all Government agencies—federal, state and local—to use this occasion to deepen our commitment to the defense of human rights and to strengthen our efforts for their full and effective realization both among our own people and among all the peoples of the United Nations.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eleventh day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred sixty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-second.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record the second progress report on the activities and accomplishments of the special committee of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, submitted to me by Mr. Bruno Bitker.

The report follows:

THE U.S. NATIONAL
COMMISSION FOR UNESCO,
Milwaukee, Wis., October 12, 1967.

Hon. DANTE F. FASCELL,
Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: Your continued interest in the observance of International Human Rights Year—1968 is most heartening. As you noted in your report to the 89th Congress, the 1965 White House Conference on International Cooperation urged that the United States plan in advance for the observance. In your statement to the House on June 21, 1967, you commented on the preparations that had then been undertaken by the U.S. National Commission for Unesco, and the help received from Assistant Secretary of State Charles Frankel through the appointment of Mrs. Margaret H. Williams to assist in the planning.

On October 11th, President Johnson issued a Proclamation designating 1968 as Human Rights Year. The date, incidentally, is the birthday of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt who did so much to bring about the adoption by the United Nations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Declaration is, as the President proclaimed, "an historic document of freedom that expresses man's deepest beliefs about the rights that every human being is born with and that no government is entitled to deny".

The President called "upon all American and upon all government agencies—federal, state and local—to use this occasion to deepen our commitment to the defense of human rights and . . . for their full and effective realization both among our own people and among all the peoples of the United Nations".

The committee of the U.S. National Commission for Unesco will do what it can to implement the President's Proclamation. In our preparations over the past months, we have considered it of especial importance to bring to the attention of the American public the relationship of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to World Peace. We constantly emphasize the roots of the Declaration in American history and American basic documents such as our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution. We do this not as chauvinists but because the ideas expressed, even the language used, in our national documents had such an influence in the preparation of the Universal Declaration.

To this end we are enlisting the active support of the educational world on all levels. We have met with representatives of organizations in the educational world such as the National Educational Association and its affiliates, the American Council on Education and others of equal status and influence.

The activities of the National Council for the Social Studies is of special significance because of its professional standing among social science teachers throughout the country. It has created a special committee to work on a publication on the Universal Declaration which would be a teaching guide for the social science teachers as well as those of other classrooms.

We have also been in communication with universities around the country. We hope to encourage institutions of higher learning to conduct seminars and institutes and conferences. It is our expectation that four of these seminars will be of major dimensions, conducted in four geographical areas of the country (the east coast, the mid-west, the south, and the west coast) and that those seminars would have the direct cooperation of departments of the federal government including the State Department's Bureau of Cultural and Educational Affairs, through its International Cultural Exchange Program. An example of a seminar undertaken on the university level is one scheduled for the current year at the University of Iowa (a copy of its agenda is enclosed). The Georgetown Law Center, Harvard Law School and Howard Law School are among those who will hold seminars.

The National Unesco Commission membership includes members of the Congress as well as representatives of recognized national organizations interested in matters of this nature. We have circularized these organizations as well as the Commission's members, past and present, urging that their organizations participate in the 1968 observance in several ways: by adopting appropriate resolutions at their respective national conventions; by devoting a session thereat to the Universal Declaration on Human Rights; by publishing appropriate articles in their journals; by distributing material to their members; by supporting the ratification of the four human rights treaties now pending in the Senate.

Questionnaires (copy attached) have been sent to these same organizations and individuals soliciting information as to the extent of their activities. It is too soon to evaluate the returns but early responses indicate that there will be considerable activity in the private sector during 1968. A summary (Aug. 3, 1967) of programs by some of these organizations is attached.

In cooperation with the United Nations Association and with the support of many other voluntary organizations, the U.S. Unesco National Commission is sponsoring a guidebook for use by local community leaders and organizations. It is entitled: "You in Human Rights". An initial printing of 20,000 copies has been authorized. The guidebook will be of practical value to local civic, educational, religious and other groups in planning local or state-wide observances of IHRY. The actual publication date is December 10, 1967, Human Rights Day. I served as the chairman of the Editorial Committee and am confident it will contribute materially to grass roots recognition of the significance of the Universal Declaration.

Many private organizations will be publishing material for distribution to their own members and local affiliates, as well as for general public use. The Association Press (the publication arm of the Y.M.C.A.) is publishing a paper-back book entitled "Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in Your Community" edited by Dr. Stanley I. Stuber. It is scheduled for release in January 1968, and is to be popularly priced. We have been informed that a printing in excess of 100,000 copies is contemplated.

Prior to the President's Proclamation calling on federal agencies to strengthen their efforts in this field, there existed an interdepartmental committee on foreign policy relating to human rights. We have been meeting with members of that committee from time to time and will now re-emphasize our efforts through it.

In the meantime we have secured approval of the Post Office Department for a special cancellation which will read: "IYHR: 1968 International Year For Human Rights."

Dies must be purchased. The U.S. National Commission for Unesco will acquire a half dozen. But through the Commission's membership as well as through the United Nations Association it is planned and hoped that dies will be purchased by local groups throughout the country for use in their respective post offices by applying to their own postmasters.

A formal request has been made by the Secretary of State to the Postmaster General for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp. This request is being processed through the usual channels and we believe it will be acted on favorably in time for use early in 1968.

The U.S. Office of Education, through Dr. Harold Howe, a member of the Unesco National Commission, has indicated its interest and its willingness to help. Its first assist is through a special feature article in *American Education*. It will review the manner in which human rights is taught at one institution, reprints of which will be available for wide distribution, and thus serve as a pattern for others.

The Department of State and the Unesco National Commission have issued a number of publications in the past. Some of these will now be revised and reissued in quantities. It is expected that the State Department will include appropriate pieces in its Bulletin (circulation of 9000) and in its Briefs, which has a mailing list of 20,000 (mostly schools). The Unesco Commission will continue to furnish material to its affiliated organizations and to the public to the extent of its available supply of publications.

The General Assembly resolution on I.H.R.Y. urged the ratification by all member nations of conventions on human rights. The President's Proclamation also refers to these conventions. Four are now pending before the U.S. Senate (Genocide, Slavery, Forced Labor, and Political Rights of Women). A Senate sub-committee held hearings early this year on three of the treaties (other than Genocide) and the full Senate Foreign Relations Committee heard witnesses in September. I testified in support of ratification, and also recorded the approval of the Human Rights Committee of the White House Conference on International Cooperation as well as of the U.S. National Commission for Unesco. The full Foreign Relations Committee on October 11th, in executive session, reported out one of these conventions—on slavery—but failed to report out the other two.

The activities at United Nations are, of course, on the international level. But the programs planned and the material being issued are of great interest and assistance to us in planning the American observance.

The UN Office of Public Information is publishing a news letter. It has in preparation a special 100 page booklet. "The United Nations and Human Rights", which will be printed in English, French, Spanish and Russian. It will be available before Dec. 10, 1967. The UN is also issuing a 16 page pamphlet, "Questions and Answers on Human Rights". Considerable attention is being directed by the UN to the International Conference on Human Rights to be held in Teheran from April 22 to May 12, 1968. Mr. Curtis Campaigne has been named by the Division of Human Rights of the United Nations as a special assistant to coordinate the U.N.'s activities for the observance year. We have met with him on a number of occasions and are continuing to cooperate wherever appropriate.

Many of the specialized agencies of the UN are preparing for the observance year. Unesco was specifically referred to in the General Assembly resolution and "urged to mobilize the finest resources of culture and art in order to lend the . . . year . . . a truly universal character"

Unesco is honoring the General Assembly recommendations and is undertaking a number of projects. These will encompass: the publication of a booklet, in cooperation with the UN, "Teaching Human Rights", for teachers; a "Report on the Effects of Apartheid"; a re-appraisal of Unesco's previous Statement on Race; a unique project on "Human Rights and the Identification of Universal Human Values" which will consist of a collection of texts originating from the most diverse of the world's cultures which bear a connection with human rights.

The American contributor on this project is the distinguished historian Dr. Henry Commager. Publication is scheduled for the spring of 1968. It is hoped that out of the comparative analysis of these texts relating to human rights in the different religions, ideologies, laws and cultures may come a basis for determining whether there exists a universal conception of human rights.

Unesco intends to publish a special issue of its magazine *Courier* which has a wide international distribution especially among educators.

In Geneva I attended a meeting in July of the special I.H.R.Y. Committee of Non Governmental Organizations in Consultative Status with the United Nations Economic-Social Council. A non-governmental group in England (organized through the United Nation Association of the United Kingdom) seemed the most active of the private organizations around the world, other than those in the United States. We have, however, probably done as much or more than most nations in our preliminary planning. The World Conference of Lawyers on Peace Through Law met in Geneva at the same time. Many American jurists and lawyers participated. It adopted my resolution supporting the observance of I.H.R.Y. by lawyers throughout the world.

As you can see from the foregoing we have been as active as our resources and manpower permit. We have no fully assigned staff or budget. The help from the staff of the U.S. National Commission for Unesco, particularly the valiant service of Mr. William Marvin, its Deputy Executive Secretary, and from Mrs. Williams of the Department of State has been most valuable. But it is an additional heavy assignment for them, since it is added to the load of their regular work which they must continue to carry.

We have, nevertheless, managed to interest a great many responsible organizations, both public and private, particularly in the educational world, in undertaking appropriate projects for the observance year. We have started the ball rolling and can only hope it continues to pick up speed.

Sincerely,

BRUNO V. BITKER.

ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES PLANNED FOR INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR AS REPORTED IN RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRES, AUGUST 3, 1967

MEETINGS

(1) B'nai B'rith—session to be devoted to Human Rights at Triennial Convention, Washington, D.C. September 7–12, 1968.

(2) African Studies Association—likely that 1968 program will include discussion panel relating to Human Rights and Africa.

(3) American Anthropological Assn—sessions at 1968 convention might be arranged.

(4) AFL–CIO—preparatory discussions being held concerning resolution on Human Rights for 1968 convention.

(5) American Jewish Committee—planning sessions for 1968 convention and cooperating in the planning of the World Assembly for Human Rights to be held in Montreal.

(6) American Psychological Association—Symposium on Human Rights planned for 76th Annual Meeting in San Francisco August 30 to September 3, 1968.

(7) American Sociological Association—1968 annual meeting—Presidential address will refer to International Human Rights Year and it may be possible to have a special session on the subject.

(8) Associated Countrywomen of the World—Triennial Conference in East Lansing, Michigan on the University Campus September 3–10, 1968. Evening session will be devoted to UN activities which will include discussion of Universal Declaration as well as another session with a speaker on the subject. 5000 women will attend; 1000 from other countries.

(9) Church Women United—Seminar on Human Rights, March 1968.

(10) National Assn for the Advancement of Colored People—sessions at 1968 convention may be possible.

(11) National Congress of Parents and Teachers—planning a World PTA meeting to follow May 1968 National Convention in San Diego, California. Program will probably be based on U.S. Bill of Rights, Universal Declaration, Declaration of Rights of the Child and Bill of Rights of the Family.

(12) National Council of Catholic Women—session at 1968 Convention.

(13) National Council of Negro Women—session at 1968 convention.

(14) National Council of Women—session at October 1968 convention.

(15) YMCA—15th annual YMCA Seminar on the UN and World Affairs Education November 12–17, 1967 will have Human Rights Year as its theme.

(16) American Society of International Law—session at annual meeting in April 1968.

(17) Experiment in International Living—Experimenters Assn (alumni body of Experiment—24,000 members in U.S.) will feature Human Rights Year as theme of 1968 annual meeting

QUESTIONNAIRE

(Please fill in and return to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520.)

PROGRAMS

For Human Rights Year 1968 are you planning:
Special meetings? ------------------------
Commemorative ceremonies marking the anniversary date, Dec. 10? ------------
Commemorative ceremonies marking the anniversary week, Dec. 10–17? ----------
Sessions at your 1968 convention? --------
(Please describe) ------------------------
Are you planning these activities with other organizations? ----------------
Please indicate organization --------------
Human Rights Conventions:
Is your organization supporting the Human Rights Conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor, the Political Rights of Women, and Genocide now before the Senate? ------------------------

PUBLICATIONS, OTHER PRINTED MATERIALS, AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS

Have you published or issued any materials (including audiovisuals) within the past 5 years relating to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or on the Bill of Rights? ------------------------
(If in affirmative, please list and enclose copies when returning the questionnaire, indicating costs and where they might be obtained) ------------------------ ------------------------------------ ------------------------------------
Are you planning to issue materials within the near future on the theme stated above? ------------------------
(Please provide description) ------------ ------------------------------------ ------------------------------------
Suggestions would be welcome relating to any means by which public or private institutions, or local or national organizations can further an understanding of the Declaration. ------------------------ ------------------------------------ ------------------------------------
Please return to address at top questionnaire. ------------------------
Title:
Organization:

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA,
Iowa City, Iowa, September 25, 1967.

Mr. BRUNO V. BITKER,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. BITKER: You will recall me as a recent member of the U.N. National Commission for UNESCO. I shall be representing the Association of American Geographers at the forthcoming meeting in Hartford, and shall no doubt see you there.

I have not neglected your correspondence of June 30 concerning the resolution of the National Commission urging all national organizations and individuals to join together to promote observances of the international Year for Human Rights.

You may be interested in what we are planning to do here in the University of Iowa. I am enclosing, therefore, a memorandum concerning a seminar which is to be offered during the first semester of the current academic year on international and comparative human rights. The first meeting is scheduled for this coming Tuesday evening, September 26.

Note that I am scheduled for the session on January 9, and will speak on Human Rights and the work of UNESCO. Needless to say, if you have any materials or thoughts that might help me develop that lecture, I would be quite happy to have them.

We are hoping that the seminar will be a satisfying one for both students and leaders.

Again, let me say that I shall look forward to seeing you in Hartford.

Cordially,

CLYDE F. KOHN,
Chairman.

MEMORANDUM, SEPTEMBER 1967

Re Description of and Agenda for *Interdisciplinary Seminar: Dynamics of International and Comparative Human Rights* [Business Administration (6B: 288); Journalism (16: 280); Law (91: 680); Religion (32:280); Sociology and Anthropology (34S & 34A:280); others to be added.]

To: Graduate Students and Interested Faculty.

From: Prof. Burns H. Weston (College of Law).

Beginning with the 1967 Fall-Winter semester, a new interdisciplinary graduate level seminar on international and comparative human rights will be offered. Students not taking the seminar for credit, and interested faculty as well, are urged to attend. The seminar, whose title is set forth above, is generally and officially described as follows:

"Main currents of thought and action as regards human rights in a transnational context. An interdisciplinary analysis of human rights problems and developments on the international and comparative planes, with emphasis on individual research and writing. No prerequisites. Graduate students and interested faculty only. (Credit: 2 s.h.)"

Subject to last minute change, all sessions will meet for three (3) hours each Tuesday evening in the Board Room of Old Capitol, commencing at 7:15 P.M. Each session will be divided roughly half-and-half between lecture and discussion, in that order.

In addition to certain required and recommended readings (a list of which will be distributed at the first meeting of the seminar), students will be expected to read by no later than the second meeting (October 3) the symposium "Human Rights in Perspective," 18 International Social Science Journal, No. 1 (1966) (SS.65/I. 71/A), available at Iowa Book and Supply.

Meeting: September 26, 1967. Lecturer: Professor Phillip D. Cummins (Philosophy). Topic: "What Are 'Human Rights'?"

Meeting: October 3, 1967. Lecturer: Professor David H. Andrews (Anthropology). Topic: "Human Rights and the Search for Cultural Universals."

Meeting: October 10, 1967. Lecturer: Professor Lawrence E. Gelfand (History). Topic: "The Quest for Human Rights in the World Community: A Pre-1945 Historical Dimension."

Meeting: October 17, 1967. Lecturer: Professor Willard L. Boyd (Law). Topic: "Are Human Rights Legal Rights?"

Meeting: October 24, 1967. Lecturer: Professor Hugh Dingle (Zoology). Topic: "Why *Human* Rights?"

Meeting: October 31, 1967. Lecturer: Professor William E. Connor (Medicine). Topic: "The Right to Life as a Human Right: Situation Ethics vs. Medical Ethics."

Meeting: November 7, 1967. Lecturer: Professor Howard J. Ehrlich (Sociology). Topic: "Human Rights and Human Prejudice."

Meeting: November 14, 1967. Lecturer: Professor Robert D. Baird (Religion). Topic: "Religions Obstacles to Human Rights."

Meeting: November 21, 1967. Lecturer: Professor Irving Kovarsky (Business Administration). Topic: "The Right to Work as a Human Right."

Meeting: November 28, 1967. Lecturer: Professor James W. Markham (Journalism). Topic: "The Right to Give and Take Information as a Human Right."

Meeting: December 5, 1967. Lecturer: Professor John Schmidhauser (Political Science). Topic: "The Right to Dissent as a Human Right."

Meeting: December 12, 1967. Lecturer: Professor David Hayman (English). Topic: "Human Rights and World Literature."

Meeting: January 2, 1968. Lecturer: Professor Willard L. Boyd (Law). Topic: "Whither the Law of Human Rights?"

Meeting: January 9, 1968. Lecturer: Professor Clyde F. Kohn (Geography). Topic: "Human Rights and the Work of UNESCO."

Meeting: January 16, 1968. Lecturer: Professor Alvin H. Scaff (Associate Dean, Graduate College). Topic: "Human Rights and Higher Education."

FINNISH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, Finland is a free and independent state. She achieved her freedom at the time of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution. Since that time she has had to fight Russia twice to preserve her territorial integrity.

It is only fitting that we honor her on this 50th anniversary of her independence as a nation. There are a large number of people of Finnish descent residing in Oregon's First Congressional District, as well as throughout the rest of this Nation. To them I say on this occasion, "you have a right to be proud of your heritage."

I also would like to present at this time an editorial from the Oregon newspaper the Daily Astorian, which extends further congratulations to the Finns and their descendents on this celebrated occasion:

FINNISH ANNIVERSARY

Finland has been one of the US's best friends in Europe, and for many years was the only European nation to pay its World War I debts to this country.

It is fitting and proper therefore that we issue a special commemorative postage stamp honoring the 50th anniversary of Finnish independence.

Finland is a mere youngster among the family of nations, for 50 years is a short national existence, even though the Finns have an ancient culture and civilization of their own.

Bigger neighbors for centuries had political dominance over Finland—for a long time the Swedes, then the Russians.

Finnish independence was one of the fruits of World War II and the Russian Bolshevik revolution, which gave this small satellite nation the chance to shake off Russian control.

Independence was not won easily—Finland had its own bitter civil war between the reds and the white before it achieved national stability. Twice since then, during World War II, Finland had to fight the Russians to preserve freedom. It won once, was licked once, and had to give up some territory, but stubbornly maintained precious independence at a time when other small central European nations all became Soviet satellites, controlled by grim communist puppets of Russia.

Finland has a right to be proud of its 50 years of independence, and is entitled to the honors we give her on the occasion.

M–16 RIFLE

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that the just-released report of the Special Armed Services Subcommittee chaired by the able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD], and fully supported by the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], reviewing the performance of the M–16 rifle in Vietnam, addresses itself to the problem of gun lubrication which I have been concerned about for the past year or so.

For months, the Army insisted there was no problem—and that the lubricant many soldiers were mail ordering from home was no good—even though the Marine Corps later tested and approved it for Vietnam. Then last May the Army announced they were issuing another lubricant that they claimed to be superior—and that had been in the inventory since 1959. They also revealed that their lubricating instructions have been improper. Subsequently, the Marine Corps announced it was adopting the new Army lubricant even though its own tests raised doubts about its claimed superiority.

In the face of this confused, mishandled situation the committee recommends that comprehensive independent tests be made to insure that our troops get the very best lubricant. I fully agree—for such a simple thing as a can of oil can be mighty important to a soldier whose life depends on his rifle. It will be interesting to see whether the Pentagon will act on this recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, on July 19, 1967, I discussed the matter of rifle lubrication problems in Vietnam at some length together with providing a documentary history of this controversy. Consequently at this time in order that the RECORD may be complete I insert the section of the subcommittee report dealing with the question of lubrication, appearing on pages 5362 to 5363, at this point in the RECORD:

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE M–16 RIFLE PROGRAM OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

LUBRICANTS

With respect to the question of the possible connection between rifle malfunctions and proper lubrication, the subcommittee views with concern the following facts:

1. After months of unequivocally defending the authorized rifle and small arms lubricant (known as VV–L–800 or PL Special) being issued in Vietnam, the Army has acknowledged in its report dated June 1967, that a better lubricant for the difficult environmental conditions of Vietnam has existed in the inventory since 1959, and since late May has been rushing it out to the troops.

2. The special qualities of this purportedly superior lubricant (known as MIL–L–46000A) became known to the Army, according to its own account, as the result of tests designed specifically to weigh the claims of a commercial, molybdenum disulfide base lubricant (known as Dri-Slide), which has won considerable acclaim from many of the troops in Vietnam who have procured it by mail order at their own expense and inconvenience. Without such outside stimulus there is no indication as to when the Army would have reviewed the lubricating qualities of MIL–L–46000A and considered making it available for use in Vietnam.

3. As a further result of this special Army test it was discovered that the official rifle maintenance instructions were improper in that the lubricant was required to be sparingly applied to certain parts of the M–16; and revised instruction prescribing liberal lubrication have been issued as of June 2, 1967.

4. In 1966 the Marine Corps tested, approved, and procured approximately 100,000 units of Dri-Slide as a supplemental lubricant for use in Vietnam along with the authorized lubricant (VV–1–800). According to testimony before the subcommittee on May 16, Marine Corps spokesmen reported that the troop response to Dri-Slide was "very enthusiastic" and that they were in the process of reordering this type of lubricant. It was also stated that a test was being made of the new Army lubricant MIL–L–46000A. In a memorandum dated July 24, 1967, the Commandant of the Marine Corps announced, in releasing the final report of this test that:

a. MIL–L–46000A would replace VV–L–800 as the "standard general purpose lubricant for all small arms."

b. Contrary to the findings of the test and the recommendation of the testing facility, the supplemental lubricant (Dri-Slide) would not be retained in the supply system.

In testimony before the subcommittee on August 8–9, this test, which was identical in scope to the one conducted in 1966, was acknowledged by Marine Corps representatives to have shown that Dri-Slide was "significantly more effective" under dry, sandy conditions and "equally effective" as MIL–L–46000A on the M–16 and M–16A1 rifles under muddy water conditions. However, when questioned as to why the Marine Corps did not accept the results of its own test, the witness disclosed that certain test findings were subsequently rejected on the basis of a further analysis ordered by the Marine Corps. Upon request a copy of this analysis was submitted for the record and the document bears the date of June 30, 1967. Since the final test report dated July 24, 1967, contains no reference to such an analysis or any suggestion that the test was invalid in any way, the subcommittee can only conclude that it was misled by the witness when told that further analysis had caused the Marine Corps to reject the results of its own test. To compound matters, this same Marine Corps analysis, it was learned after study, raised questions about the 1967 Army lubricant test as well.

Therefore, in view of the confused, uncoordinated, crisis-oriented, self-protective manner which has characterized all too much the handling of the matter of rifle lubrication, so vital to the welfare of the foot soldier in the field, the subcommittee recommends that:

The Secretary of Defense—

a. Authorize an independent research facility to conduct a thorough analysis of the tests procedures of the various services to ascertain their reliability; and to conduct such additional tests of such lubricants as are found necessary to clearly establish their effectiveness as lubricants under various conditions.

b. Initiate efforts to improve coordination among the services to insure an orderly, continuous research and development program in the field of weapons lubricants; and to report to the committee the steps he has undertaken to accomplish this.

HIGHWAY, MAIL SERVICE CUTBACKS ARE PHONY THREATS

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration's threat to drastically curtail mail service if Congress cuts spending is as phony and unnecessary as its threat to harpoon highway construction.

The administration is trying to get its tax measure passed by conning the public into thinking essential Government services will be curtailed if Government spending is reduced.

The administration is protecting its pet political programs from cutbacks by threatening needed Government services and that is all this fuss amounts to. It would have us believe the whole Government would fall if we cut its programs by so much as a nickel. Such a political line is pure hogwash. If we cannot make reasonable reductions in questionable programs at such a serious time for the Nation, we really are in bad shape.

The administration's threat to cut back Federal highway aid by as much as 50 percent as an anti-inflationary move will not reduce the budget deficit whatsoever. The highway trust fund, established by Congress in 1956, is a pay-as-you-build program. It is paid for by highway users through various taxes and the administration has no right to take away from the people what they have already paid for.

It is shamefully misleading to suggest that we can resolve the current financial mess and reduce the extraordinary budget deficit we face by hacking up the highway aid program. The highway trust funds are not a part of the swollen Federal budget.

Cutting our Federal highway program would result in drastic economic consequences, as my mail indicates. I include certain correspondence I have received on the highway matter at this point in my remarks:

State of Minnesota,
House of Representatives,
October 11, 1967.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ancher: As Chairman of the Minnesota House Highways Committee for years, I have spent countless hours and tremendous effort to develop our highway system. The Legislature this past winter recognized that we were way behind in our highway building program, with many dangerous and unsafe highways, and passed legislation to enable our Highway Department to accelerate its program.

I attended hearings of the Joint House and Senate Public Works Committees in Washington last winter and talked to most of our Congressmen and Senators. At that time we were assured by our delegation that no stone would be left unturned in the restoration of the Thanksgiving Day cutback in Federal highway user funds.

The construction of new and safer highways is the most basic part of the economy of Minnesota. We cannot allow any cutback at all in our Federal highway building program. A cutback would definitely postpone completion of the Interstate System and result in a slowdown of our accelerated highway building program, thereby causing more lives to be lost, less jobs for our people, a slowdown in tourism, and the continued congestion of our metropolitan areas.

I urge you to exert all efforts in every way possible to stop the political maneuvering with our dedicated highway funds.

Very sincerely yours,
August B. Mueller,
Chairman, Minnesota House Highways Committee.

Associated General Contractors of
Minnesota, Inc.
Minneapolis, Minn., October 10, 1967.

Representative Ancher Nelsen,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ancher: Yesterday Governor Harold LeVander of Minnesota received a telegram from Transportation Secretary Boyd alerting the Governor to a possible "drastic reduction" in federal highway funds because of congressional discussions in federal expenditures.

It seems we only finished the dispute on this subject which was begun last fall by a cut-back . . . and which was finally restored.

Please keep in mind that federal highway funds are trust funds, derived from taxes paid by motorists and is NOT a part of the federal budget. Any cutback in federal funds on highway can be deterimental in employment of our people and to our state's economy—and frankly shouldn't be even under consideration by the Executive branch.

We would appreciate you again doing your best to encourage that no cutback be made in the vital, well-planned, long-range highway program—not only because of the economics involved, but also because the funds were paid in for highways specifically . . . and because many lives are saved each year by good highways.

Will you use your influence to help us? Thanks.

Constructively yours,
William H. Gary,
Manager.

Concrete Paving Association of
Minnesota,
St. Louis Park, Minn., October 13, 1967.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Nelsen: The Board of Directors of the Concrete Paving Association of Minnesota passed a resolution October 11 instructing the Executive Director to forward letters to the Congress of the United States stating its opposition to the proposed cutback in Federal Highway Funds.

This Association will appreciate your support in opposing the proposed cutback because of the economics involved. A cutback will surely slow the highway building program which is so vital to our Minnesota economy.

We, in the Minnesota Highway Industry are working hard to economically build safe highways for our citizens and for those who visit our state. A cutback of highway funds will certainly be detrimental to Minnesota.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
L. P. Pederson,
Executive Director.

Minnesota Asphalt Pavement
Association, Inc.,
St. Paul, Minn., October 10, 1967.

To All Congressmen, Representatives, and Senators of Minnesota:

We urge that you oppose a proposed Federal cutback in highway funds. This Federal aid to our state highway program is not a handout. It has been derived from taxes imposed on highway users. Congress has appropriated these funds and a cutback by the administration will be contrary to the studied judgment of Congress. Highways require long-term planning, designing, engineering, construction personnel and equipment. This cannot be turned off and on like a water faucet. It has taken years to develop the skills and efficiency to carry on this vast program. Thousands of people are directly affected by a cutback, and the misery of the countless skilled union equipment operators and other labor employed in this effort throughout the nation will have a good reason to ask why the Federal Government has hurt them. A Federal cutback means a breach of good faith and a breaking of the promises to the states and counties who have their programs planned and budgeted far ahead. This is necessary to have an orderly program. Last Thanksgiving Day, we had a serious blow in a similar cutback. Then last winter, part of this was restored. A few weeks ago, our Federal aid for this fiscal year was announced and things looked pretty steady. Now, another cutback is being threatened and everything is going to be shaky again. It seems that everytime there is a crisis of some kind, that the highway program becomes a target for some purpose or other. Our national and state highway program is too important to be turned off and on like a water faucet. Your efforts to impress this upon the powers that be will be appreciated by many.

John V. Hoene,
Executive Vice President.

Minnesota Good Roads, Inc.,
Minneapolis, Minn., October 11, 1967.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ancher: We of Minnesota Good Roads, Inc. are greatly disturbed by the telegram received by Governor Harold LeVander on Monday, October 9th, from Secretary of Transportation Boyd.

The monies collected by the Federal Highway Users Fund from gasoline tax and other items is money that should be spent directly on the highways of our country.

A cutback in these funds will do great harm to the economy of Minnesota. It will slow the accelerated highway building program that the Minnesota Highway Department has been geared to due to the additional funds appropriated in the last legislative session. But, most important of all, the lives of many Minnesotans will be lost because the safe highways were not built on time.

We would appreciate any help you can give the people of Minnesota in forestalling any such drastic cutback in Federal highway funds.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Robert M. Johnson,
Executive Director.

Hall Equipment Inc.,
Minneapolis, Minn., October 12, 1967.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: This letter refers to the suggested cut-back in the Federal Highway Funds, and we strongly urge you to do all possible to combat such a measure and to propose the completion of the present Highway Building Program as scheduled. Our Highway network in Minnesota is presently very inadequate.

This Highway Program should be expanded and accelerated, not cut back.

A cut-back would definitely be a great economic loss to our State.

Your efforts to prevent such a curtailment in this Program is requested.

Yours very truly,
W. F. Hall,
President.

Minneapolis, Minn.,
October 11, 1967.

Congressman Ancher Nelsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Re contemplated cutback highways funds. No cutback should be effected to further postpone completion of Federal Highway system. Postponement will result in continued congested metropolitan areas, less jobs for workers, more lives lost. Federal highways are a vital portion of national defense. Vote no for any cutback.

S. J. Groves & Sons Co.

CITY OF ANCHORAGE URBAN BEAUTIFICATION

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Pollock] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, the city of Anchorage is doing its utmost to correct the misconception the many residents of the lower "48" have that Alaska is the deepfreeze State.

In 1966, the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce awarded the highest honor, the Gold Pan Award, to the parks and recreation department for their city beautification program. This is the first time such a city department has been so honored. In 1967, the chamber again recognized the efforts of the department and awarded the "oak leaf cluster." Again this action made history, as no organization or individual had ever been so honored on 2 successive years.

On October 18, 1967, the city of Anchorage received the Certificate of Merit Award from the American Association of Nurserymen. This was the result of the Anchorage entry in the public building beautification category of the association's beautification contest. Anchorage was one of 34 cities so honored out of a total of 80 entries.

The Federation of Garden Clubs recently held their conference in Anchorage and the national president publicly stated she had never witnessed floral displays with such intense color and profusion of bloom. Nineteen hundred and sixty-seven is Alaska's centennial year and an expanded beautification program was undertaken by the parks and recreation department and the results were highly gratifying. A large floral Alaska centennial seal drew much favorable comment as did new street planters in the downtown business area. These planters are a modification of the Washington, D.C., trash containers used by the National Park Service.

Anchorage continues to astound the thousands of summer visitors who come to the largest State. They return with the full realization that they have visited an amazing land whose colorful summers are a large factor in disproving the old cry of Alaska being Seward's folly.

GODDARD'S JUDGMENT GONE TO POT

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, while I am trying to convince my three daughters that they should not smoke, my urgings are blasted by an alleged expert who says that marihuana is not any more objectionable than a cocktail.

I must agree with Dr. Robert W. Baird that this alledged expert, Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, resign.

Dr. Goddard apparently lacks the facts and good judgment. He has stated that the effects of marihuana, presumably the long-range effects, are unknown. And evidently from this position he concluded that there was nothing wrong with its use until the final effects become known.

This is as absurd as saying that we do not know the final effects of atomic radiation so do not be upset if your children carry around a bit of U–238 as a pocket piece.

In addition, as Dr. Baird points out:

> He ought to realize that 97 other nations who signed the Narcotics Convention of 1965, of which we were a part, can't be all wrong in realizing that marijuana is detrimental.

I submit for the Record an article from the Washington Evening Star, and one from the New York Times, both dated October 19, 1967.

What Dr. Goddard does within the limits of his home and family is his business, but statements such as these, made by a public official in that capacity and supposedly as an expert, are the business of the public which he is hired to serve. I hope their calls for his dismissal are loud and clear.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 19, 1967]

Goddard Urged To Quit for Marijuana Views

New York.—Dr. Robert W. Baird, director of a Harlem narcotics clinic, demanded today that Dr. James L. Goddard resign as commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration "for equating marijuana on the same plane as alcohol."

Goddard told a news conference in Minneapolis, Minn., earlier in the week he doubted whether smoking marijuana was more dangerous than drinking alcoholic beverages but that both distorted perception of reality. He cautioned that long-term effects of smoking marijuana may be more serious than now is known.

"I don't believe smoking marijuana leads to an addiction to stronger drugs," said the food and drug chief. "It is true most heroin users have smoked marijuana, but it is also true most heroin users have drunk milk. I have seen no proof there is any connection."

(He said he would not object any more to his college daughter smoking pot than he would to her drinking a cocktail, United Press International reported.)

Baird said Goddard's comments had done "irreparable damage across the college campuses as well as in the high schools." Baird is chairman of the Suffolk County, Long Island, Narcotics Control Commission and director of the Haven Narcotics Clinic in Harlem.

In Washington, Goddard issued a statement saying he did not dismiss the difference between smoking marijuana and having a cocktail.

"We do know physical and mental penalties that the alcoholic must pay; these are well documented. For the user of marijuana, the threat is of the unknown effects which science must yet determine," Goddard said.

He noted that possession and use of marijuana carried very severe legal penalties but the use of alcohol did not. In Minneapolis, he said he thought penalties for marijuana should be limited to sale or distribution—not possession. He added he did not favor legalizing marijuana completely because of the need for more research on its effects.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 19, 1967]

Peril of Marijuana and That of Alcohol Equated by Goddard

Minneapolis, October 18.—Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, said yesterday "whether or not marijuana is a more dangerous drug than alcohol is debatable—I don't happen to think it is."

Dr. Goddard said that he favored removing all penalties for the possession of marijuana, leaving penalties only for its sale or distribution.

"We don't know what its long-term effects are," he said. "For example, we don't know whether or not it may alter the chromosomes, as LSD may do. I wouldn't want young women who haven't been married and had children yet to be affected.

"It distorts your perception of reality so it's dangerous if you are driving a vehicle or operating heavy equipment."

Dr. Goddard was asked if he would object to his son or daughter using marijuana. He has a son, Bruce, 19 years old, and two daughters, Margaret, 21, and Patricia Ann, 18, in college.

"We've discussed this at home," he said, adding:

"I would object in terms of the law today and any possible long-term effects."

He said that he did not favor "legalizing" the drug completely but favored the removal of all penalties for simple possession.

"We need more research on chronic use," he said, "and I think this research will start now."

Dr. Goddard's comment on marijuana came after a lecture on business responsibility to an assembly at the University of Minnesota. He told that group that he would answer questions on any subject except marijuana.

But the first question at a news conference that followed was on marijuana. It was then that he gave his views on the subject.

VIEWS ARE ASSAILED

Dr. Robert W. Baird, a campaigner against marijuana and other narcotics, assailed Dr. Goddard's comments last night and demanded his resignation as head of the Food and Drug Administration.

Dr. Baird said that Dr. Goddard's comments had done "irreparable damage across the college campuses as well as in the high schools."

"This man's knowledge of narcotics is notoriously poor," Dr. Baird said. "Before he makes comments off the cuff, he ought to realize that 97 other nations who signed the Narcotics Convention of 1965, of which we were a part, can't all be wrong in realizing that marijuana is detrimental.

"I am surprised at him as a doctor. I am really mortified."

Dr. Baird, who is the director of the Haven narcotics clinic in Harlem and the chairman of the Suffolk County Narcotics Control Commission, said that he was "unequivocally" demanding Dr. Goddard's resignation "for equating marijuana on the same plane as alcohol."

A symposium on narcotics will be conducted by Dr. Baird today at the New York Hilton. About 1,000 college and high school students are expected to attend.

Dr. Baird said in a telephone interview that he would produce a dozen youngsters who had become involved in accidents of one kind or another after smoking a marijuana cigarette.

TARGET: LABOR

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in June

1966, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee released a statement by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, concerning the 18th National Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A.

Concerning labor unions, Mr. Hoover stated:

> We can anticipate that the party, using the slogan "labor is a key force," will make every effort to increase its recruitment of industrial workers. This objective was brought out during the trade union report which placed emphasis on the need for industrial concentration in the Midwestern areas. Specifically mentioned were such cities as Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, St. Louis and Pittsburgh. This helps to explain why 18 members of the party's new 80-member national committee were elected though relatively unknown except that they were labor unionists.

In his statement Mr. Hoover also stated that George Meyers, Baltimore Communist Party leader, admitted that weaknesses existed in the area of labor. It might well be that the Communist Party in the United States has never fully recovered from the rough treatment given to them by the labor movement some years ago when a number of unions were kicked out of the CIO for Communist domination. However, if a statement by British Labor Minister Ray Gunter is any criterion, it would behoove us to be on our guard here in the United States.

He charged that Communists had entered into an unholly alliance with elements of the Trotskyist party, to foment strife in British labor relations.

I include the article, "Strikes Peril Our Recovery, Wilson Warns," from the Chicago Tribune of October 19 at this point in the RECORD:

STRIKES PERIL OUR RECOVERY, WILSON WARNS—GUNTER BLASTS RED INVOLVEMENT

(By Joseph Cerutti)

LONDON, October 18.—Prime Minister Harold Wilson and Labor Minister Ray Gunter today warned that the labor troubles now afflicting industry threatened Britain's economic recovery.

Gunter accused the Communist party of fomenting discontent and "plotting to make this a winter of disruption."

Wilson delayed a visit to Scotland to confer with Gunter and Frank Cousins, head of the Transport and General Worker's union, who returned to Britain today after cutting short a visit to the United States and Mexico.

SOME 127 SHIPS IDLED

The hour-long discussion centered mainly on the strike in London and Liverpool docks which has tied up 300 million dollars worth of exports. More than 14,000 stevedores and 127 ships were idled today in the two ports. So far there is no indication that the government plans emergency measures, such as calling in troops, to move the goods choking warehouses.

Another wildcat strike has crippled a major development project in the heart of London and strikes are also threatened on the railroads, provincial bus services, and in electrical and printing industries.

Wilson told luncheon guests here today that he was shocked by the holdup of exports. He warned that failure to deliver on time might endanger repeat orders.

CANNOT AFFORD LUXURY

"We cannot afford the luxury of industrial action which chokes the pipelines thru which our exports are flowing," Wilson said.

Speaking at Gillingham, 35 miles east of London, Gunter criticized union leaders for having lost control over members in some areas.

"The official leadership is met with derision and contempt and only too typical communistic tactics are employed to prevent them from getting a hearing at meetings," he said. "There is a viciousness about some of the thugs most active in leading unofficial action that is alien to our traditions."

CHARGES UNHOLY ALLIANCE

Gunter charged the Communists had "entered into unholy alliance with elements of the Trotskyist party."

"They aim," he said, "to destroy our hopes of economic recovery and thereby they hope to bring ruin to the social democratic movement."

The minister warned union leaders that they must demonstrate their ability to carry responsibility. If they failed, he hinted, the government might step in to restore order.

THE MEANING OF RESPONSIBLE PROTEST

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BURKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my distinguished colleagues have noticed in past months the vehement antidraft movement and the sharp turn it is currently taking. This turn is exhibited by a mass movement of protest to our draft system and to the war in Vietnam. The dissenters have been building steam for months, and this week it appears that the antidraft effort is ready to explode in ugly demonstrations across the Nation.

I am not one to stifle protest or curb dissent, as I dearly value our basic freedoms. But I truly wonder if these long-haired hippies really know the meaning of responsible protest.

We all know our country was founded by fervent believers in free expression. Throughout our history there have been protests and dissents for one cause or another. But these protests in our Nation's past were to build and develop a better America—they were not cast to disparage our own country, to cast a low morale key, or to aid and abet the enemy.

Our system of the draft, whether it be perfect or not, is a system established by law. And the law must be obeyed or we have anarchy on our hands. I believe the momentum being developed by these current antidraft protestors is leading to more and more anarchy in this country. I believe this open protest flaring in several cities by these long-haired, unbathed creatures of our times has reached a point of real danger. Just this week the Vietcong openly announced that they will cultivate these protest groups to further encourage antidraft movements in the United States and even encourage desertion within the ranks of our own military men in Vietnam.

Let us look at these protestors. Some of these cardburners have been using the excuse of school exemption to avoid their military obligation. According to recent reports, some of these so-called students have entered college and do not even bother to attend classes. They have used their entrance into college as a means to avoid the draft. To me and, I am sure, to a number of you and to all in America, this entire matter is disgusting.

It is one thing to have constructive protests, to encourage free speech. But it is quite another thing to give aid and comfort to the enemy during wartime conditions in which American lives are at stake. The administration and the Congress must get tough and rectify this most dangerous situation before our Nation's morale reaches a far more critical point, and we find ourselves puppets at the hands of smiling Communist puppeteers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest two measures which may help curb these disgraces. I would hope, first of all, that the proper authorities would exercise some initiative and immediately round up these hippies, have orders processed for them, and turn them over to some rugged military basic training center for some good training. If they qualify, following their 8 weeks of basic training at Parris Island, Fort Benning, Fort Hood, or any of the many other fine military training centers in the United States, they can then fulfill their 2-year obligation to their country. That is, if they qualify. A good stiff dose of basic training may be all these people need to bring them back to the realities of this world.

Second, I would recommend that those young men of draft age status who flee to another country to avoid the draft should be given the opportunity to return to this country. But if in due time this is not done, action should be taken to remove his citizenship.

These may be drastic actions, Mr. Speaker, but these are drastic times. If these long-haired protestors want to remain citizens of America like several million others, they must start facing the responsibility this citizenship requires. And this responsibility does not mean a pipefilled dream world of flowers.

DR. GODDARD'S POSITION ON MARIHUANA

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, owes Congress an immediate "yes or no" answer on whether or not he advocates removal of all legal penalties for possession of marihuana.

If the answer is "Yes," then I intend to ask him to resign so that we can remove any possibility that American youth may conclude that the U.S. Government condones the use of marihuana.

It may be argued that Dr. Goddard's opinions do not constitute a position by the U.S. Government itself. While in a narrow sense this is true, I doubt that those who ply the marihuana trade—particularly among our youth—will make that distinction when quoting the doctor.

Most of my colleagues are aware of what Dr. Goddard is reported to have said yesterday at a press conference at Minneapolis, Minn. His comments were widely quoted by the Nation's news media. But I will summarize briefly for those who may not be familiar with Dr. Goddard's purported position.

According to a story which appeared on page 1 of the New York Times today, Dr. Goddard said he favored removing all penalties for the possession of marihuana. His grounds for this position, according to the Times, is personal doubt that marihuana is a more dangerous drug than alcohol.

It should be noted that Dr. Goddard did not, as quoted by the Times, go so far as to give dope pushers carte blanche, for he indicated that penalties for sale or distribution should continue to exist.

However, the great harm which has been done is not modified in the slightest by this shading. There can be little doubt that Dr. Goddard's apparently permissive attitude regarding marihuana possession will encourage the young to engage in what may be dangerous practices—and embolden those who would corrupt the young.

I cannot prove that marihuana can cause personality or genetic damage, but on the other hand, Dr. Goddard, by his own admission, cannot prove that it does not—and in fact indicates that the question is serious enough that researchers are today trying to pinpoint the truth. In view of this, it would seem unconscionable to tamper with the possession laws.

However, the harm which may or may not be done by marihuana itself is not, in my opinion, the main issue here. I am far more concerned by the theory held by many—myself included—that marihuana is a tall half-step toward the use of demonstrably harmful drugs such as heroin.

During my service as a U.S. attorney, I had many opportunities, unfortunately, to observe the victims of drug addiction—and the vicious men who led them down the primrose path of supposedly harmless thrills.

With these people in mind, I say that Dr. Goddard should set the record straight if he does not advocate the removal of penalties for possession of marihuana—or otherwise resign.

THE RIGHT TO DISSENT?

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I read a dissertation entitled "The Johnson Administration and the Right to Peaceful Dissent."

This afternoon, I had the opportunity to read the plans and program for the march on Washington, October 21 and 22, 1967, which is designed as a demonstration to end the war in Vietnam.

I believe Members of the House will find the following plans, program, and instructions, as issued to the prospective demonstrators, quite interesting:

GOVERNMENT WITHDRAWS ULTIMATUM—PERMITS EXPECTED FOR MARCH AND RALLIES

(By Dave Dellinger, chairman, national mobilization committee)

Latest indications are that the permits for Saturday's march and two rallies will be in our hands by the first of the week. This is a reversal of the government's ultimatum of October 6 that there would be no march, no rally, and no provision for the discharge and pickup of bus passengers, unless the committee publicly repudiated the civil disobedience portion of its program.

We were greatly aided in winning this important victory by the unanimous vote of the Mobilization Administrative Committee to reject the government's ultimatum and by the widespread support for the Committee's position that came in by mail and telephone from all over the country. On Friday, we had warned the government to expect a larger and more militant crowd in response to its attempted suppression. When we met with them again, in two lengthy sessions this week, we were able to cite concrete evidence to back up our warning. Among other things, we informed them that speakers who had not committed themselves to civil disobedience at the Pentagon—men like Julian Bond, Dr. Benjamin Spock, Rev. William Sloane Coffin, Jr., and Don Duncan—had indicated their determination to speak at the rally, *with or without a permit*. We were able to tell them that a wide variety of groups, including Women Strike for Peace, Veterans for Peace, Students for a Democratic Society, and the Committee for Independent Political Action, had responded to the government's threat by announcing that they expected to double the number of participants coming from their organizations. We told them of the formation of a panel of prestigious lawyers to fight for our first amendment rights, both in and out of the courts. This panel is being organized by the Law Center for Constitutional Rights (William Kunstler, Arthur Kinoy, Morton Stavis and others), the American Civil Liberties Union, the Emergency Civil Liberties Union, and the Washington Lawyers Committee for October 21st, headed by Edward De Grazia.

Naturally we made no request for "permits" for the civil disobedience part of our activities at the Pentagon. What kind of civil disobedience would that be? But we pressed the case for permits and all necessary accommodations and facilities for a massive rally at the Lincoln Memorial, for a massive march to the Pentagon, and for a rally, picketing and vigiling at the Pentagon. For whatever reasons, we found the government's representatives ready to work out the details of permits and other necessary arrangements.

Because of the size of the crowd expected and the resulting "traffic jam" of marchers, the time for the speeches at Lincoln Memorial has been advanced to 11:30 AM and step-off time for the march to the Pentagon to 1:30 PM. Musicians and other artists will perform from 10:00 to 11:30 AM and again from 1:30 PM until the Lincoln Memorial has been emptied. A second rally will take place at the Pentagon, beginning at 3:30 PM and continuing until about 5 PM. The exact location of the Pentagon rally is one of the last items being negotiated.

The government has set aside an area near the Mall Entrance to the Pentagon where "administratively allowed" picketing and vigiling can take place. Plans for direct action—for blocking entrances or for substitute actions if we cannot get close to the entrances—are being worked out by the Direct Action committee. There will be special marshals for the civil disobedience action.

The civil disobedience will begin at the Pentagon about 4 PM. Naturally there will be thousands who take part in the march and rallies but who for a variety of reasons will not take part in the direct action. We have provided maximum geographical separation between the other activities and the civil disobedience so that no one will be drawn by accident into the civil disobedience activity or any arrests or conflicts that might result. Personally, I hope that thousands of persons will feel the urgency of taking part in nonviolent civil disobedience in addition to the traditional march and rally, so that we can move impressively into a new period of determined resistance.

If all goes well, the hippies will have a concert featuring the Jefferson Airplane, the Fugs, and other rock bands in a grassy area in the vicinity of the Lincoln Memorial but far enough from the speeches so that the sounds of the two events will not conflict. The hippies also plan an "exercism."

We expect thousands of persons to stream into Washington on October 21, representing a diversity of viewpoints and temperaments. Whatever our differences—our disagreements even—let us remember that we are united in the overriding goal of ending the war in Vietnam, to save the lives of Americans and Vietnamese slaughtered daily, and to make it possible for the Vietnamese to enjoy the independence they have sought for so long.

REVISED CONFRONTATION SCHEDULE

Saturday, Oct. 21: 10:00 a.m., *Assemble.* 11:30 a.m., *Rally* at Lincoln Memorial. 1:30 p.m., *March* to Pentagon begins. 3:30 p.m., *Rally* at Pentagon. 4:00 p.m., *Direct Action:* peaceful sit-in for those thousands who wish to participate *Supporting pickets and vigil. Rally* continues. 9:00 p.m., *Mass meeting* (location to be announced at rally).

Sunday, Oct. 22: Confrontation continues with direct action and supporting pickets and vigils.

Important: Please communicate the information in this bulletin to your constituencies immediately. Take it on the bus too.

THE RALLY

Contingents will assemble in the following groupings:

A Notables, including representatives of veterans and draft resistors. B Religious groups. C Veterans' groups. D Pacifists. E We Won't Go groups & The Resistance. F Students & Youth. G Vietnamese contingent. H Nationalities. I Black Nation's Viet Conference. J Professional groups (medical & health workers should be in front of group). K Midwest contingent. L Middle Atlantic & Southern. M Washington, D.C. contingent. N Political groups. O Community groups. P Community groups. P New England. Q Organized labor. R Adult peace groups. S N.Y. State. T Womens groups. U Artists & Entertainers.

Speakers will include: Dave Dellinger and Julian Bond (co-chairmen); Dr. Benjamin Spock; Lincoln Lynch (CORE); Clive Jenkins, (British Labour Party); Mrs. Dagmar Wilson (Women Strike for Peace); Donald Duncan (former Master Sgt., Green Berets); Rev. William Sloane Coffin; Juan Mari Bras (Puerto Rican independence movement); John Wilson (SNCC); Father Charles Owen Rice; and Rabbi Abraham Feinberg. Barbara

Dane, Phil Ochs, the Jefferson Airplane and the Fugs will be among the entertainers.

HOUSING

The housing center in Washington is at 1607 Corcoran NW: follow New York Ave. to 16th St.; turn right up 16th; Corcoran is one block past Q St. There isn't a phone there yet, but there will be by the 21st, so call 536-4375 in Arlington for referral to the housing center phone.

All efforts will be made to place everyone requesting housing, but it is impossible to take care of everyone. *Those within a 350 mile radius of Washington* are urged not to request overnight accommodations unless they have specific commitment for Sunday.

Host families have not been requested to provide meals; breakfast will probably be served. Those staying in churches will not have cooking facilities or bedding. Bring all available sleeping bags and blankets.

Housing volunteers will meet the buses as they arrive to give further information. They will also hand out a list of available hotels. Hotel rates now available are:

Minimum $3.50 per person—3/room.
Minimum $7.00 per person—2/room.

Food: Everyone is urged to bring as much food as he thinks he will need and can comfortably carry.

Money: We don't have any either. Please try to send as much as you can to help pay for sound equipment.

TRANSPORTATION

Arrangements have been made for buses to discharge passengers on Independence Ave., directly south of the Lincoln Memorial reflecting pool. Buses will then receive instructions on where to park for the duration of their stay. It will be in the vicinity of the Pentagon North Parking Lot. If there are people who do not want to march to the Pentagon, shuttle buses will be available at the end of the Lincoln Memorial rally to transport them to their bus site.

Note for those traveling on New Jersey Pike on chartered buses: The rest stop will be Mile Post #71 between interchanges 8 and 8A.

MARSHALLS

Every bus/train/plane/car caravan should have at least one marshall: they will be responsible for getting their contingent to the right part of the assembly area; for information; order; lost children; first aid; calming demonstrators, and calming counter-demonstrators. All marshalls should equip themselves with light blue armbands: a limited number of these are being prepared for New York City and for last minute distribution, but please try to get your own. Marshalls should seek out marshall captains at the rally for further instructions. Very important marshalls meeting in Washington, Fri., Oct. 20 at 9 PM for all those who can make it (if you can, call Mobilization office in DC for location). Address further questions about marshalls to: Brad Lyttle, Wash. Mob., 2719 Ontario NW, 387-3626. Norma Becker, 5th Ave. Vietnam Peace Comm., 17 E 17 St. NYC, 255-1075.

MEDICAL INFORMATION

Complete medical facilities will be made available at the Lincoln Memorial by the DC Dept. of Health. The Medical Committee for Human Rights has offered its services to join in legal-medical teams which will observe and assist throughout the demonstration. They will also be cooperating with authorities to establish first aid centers on Pentagon grounds. Medical team center is located at 2719 Ontario Rd. NW; phone: 483-2150 and 483-2153.

A WORD TO THE WISE

Permits for the rallies, the march, the picketing and vigiling on the mall of the Pentagon have been assured us. Problems may arise, but serious trouble is unlikely, especially for those not committing civil disobedience. This is a peaceful demonstration. Be militant but don't be provoked or sidetracked. Our purpose is to protest the violence of the administration, not to contribute to it. Before coming to the demonstration, participants should think through their actions in different situations. People will always have different responses, but in general the following policies are good: Attempt to remain calm. Be firm but not provocative. Violent situations are made worse by violent responses or frightened retreat. Make it your responsibility, also, to calm others. In most situations, it is better not to run. If you run *from* the police, you may encourage them to be bullies. If you run *at* them, you may cause them to panic and act irrationally. Remember: the police are often scared when dealing with a crowd. If you can act toward them in a way that makes them less so, they are much less apt to behave irrationally. And of course: follow the directions of marshalls. Don't accept or spread rumors. Check with the marshalls for accurate information.

SLOGANS FOR OCTOBER 21 DEMONSTRATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Mobilization suggests the following slogans to be used on Oct. 21. Those marked with asterisks will be printed in mass quantities by the Committee. The remaining slogans will be hand painted in smaller quantities. All groups and individuals are encouraged to bring their own placards, utilizing these slogans or slogans of their own choice. The slogans represent a range of views and not all the participants will necessarily agree with all of them.

"Confront the Warmakers"

"Support Our Men in Vietnam—Bring Them Home Now . . . Alive!"

"Self-Determination for Black America and Vietnam"

"Immediate Withdrawal of all U.S. Troops: Vietnam for the Vietnamese"

"End Armed Occupation of Black American Communities"

"No Taxes for the War Machine"

"End the Draft—Support the Men Who Say No"

"Children Are Not for Burning, Stop the Bombing of Vietnam"

"Free the Fort Hood Three; Free All Anti-War GIs in Jail"

"No Puerto Ricans to Vietnam—Ningun Puertorriqueno a Vietnam"

"Stop Persecution of H. Rap Brown and All Anti-war Militants"

"Big Firms Get Rich—GIs Die"

"Support Muhammad Ali and All Those Who Resist the Draft"

"Black People: 23% of the GI Dead; 2% of the U.S. Bread—WHY?"

"Negotiate with the National Liberation Front"

"No Vietnamese Ever Called Me a Nigger"

"Americans Support Vietnamese People, Not U.S. Puppets"

"Make America Safe for Stokely Carmichael and All Anti-War Fighters"

"U.S. Violates U.N. Charter"

"End All U.S. Interventions Against National Liberation Movements"

"Wipe Out Poverty, Not People"

"Black Men: Fight White Racism—Not Vietnamese"

"They Are Our Brothers Whom We Kill—Dump Johnson"

(at the bottom of each sign: Stop the War Now)

LEGAL DEFENSE

We have a team of 38 D.C. lawyers and 110 law students who have researched the legal aspects of the demonstration and will handle any legal involvements. Some will be on the scene and others will manage the legal center at 2719 Ontario Rd NW, telephone 483-2150 and 483-2153. They will be where all the action takes place and will undertake to represent any arrested demonstrator from the moment of arrest.

The Mobilization Committee is not in a position to raise all bail and people planning to participate in civil disobedience are urged to make their own provisions; this would mean bringing at least $50, or if it is possible, $100, with them.

Some individuals and groups will adhere to a jail/no bail policy because they feel that paying bail impoverishes the peace movement and enriches the government. Attempts are also being made to raise bail for emergency purposes and for those who just don't have it.

IMPORTANT PHONE NUMBERS

National Mobilization office in Washington: 2719 Ontario Rd NW, 387-3626.

Legal and Medical Information: 2719 Ontario Rd NW, 483-2150; 483-2153.

Housing; Lost and Found: 1607 Corcoran NW, 536-4375 (Arlington)—will refer you to correct number.

MESSAGE TO BLACK PEOPLE

Black people across the nation disagree with the Mobilization's concentrated emphasis on the Pentagon. Therefore, all Black people are urged in the interests of Black American unity to gather at the Lincoln Memorial rally under the banner "Black Nation's Viet Conference" where we will then go to the Black community of Washington to discuss the issue of Vietnam and its meaning to Black America and Black American survival. Black marshalls will be guides to the conference; speakers will include Leroi Jones, H. Rap Brown, Ivanhoe Donaldson, Larry Neal, John Wilson, Adaylabu Adeigbol, and Omar Pasha Abu Ahmed. Omar Pasha Abu Ahmed, Political Bureau Black American People's Liberation Movement.

FOR THOSE PLANNING TO PARTICIPATE IN CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

If the march to the Pentagon proceeds according to plan, direct action will begin at 4:00 pm, following an announcement by Dave Dellinger. A small committee will have surveyed the situation, and, depending on the nature of police preparations, will have instructed Dave to announce one of three alternatives:

1) We will enter the Pentagon and sit down in offices, in meeting rooms, and across hallways.

2) If this seems impossible, we will block doorways and entrances.

3) If police and armed forces make this impossible, we will clog service roads, preventing deliveries and obstructing vehicles.

Trained marshalls will guide people to the spots where they will be most effective. We are urging local groups to organize orientation sessions so that potential participants may understand the nature of the action.

In case of attack, we should attempt to remain as calm and unaggressive as possible. Violent situations are invariably made worse by violent responses. Our purpose in Washington is to confront the violence of the administration, not contribute to it. Various self-protective techniques have been developed to blunt the force of physical attack. It is strongly recommended that local groups hold orientation meetings prior to the march to familiarize the participants with these techniques. In any event, listen to the instructions of the marshalls, attempt to control your natural anger or fear, and remain calm.

If police start making arrests, one technique is to impede their progress by going limp, *i.e.,* making the police carry you to the paddy wagon, rather than walking. Going limp is considered a form of resisting arrest in Virginia, but not in DC. Its advantage is that done *en masse,* it prolongs the action for hours, sometimes days.

Other suggestions:

1) *Listen to marshalls.*

2) Don't answer back to counter-demonstrators.

3) Those who are engaged in a sit-down should *keep seated*. If we begin to mill around, police are more likely to panic and initiate violence.

4) Remember that running and sudden motions also worry and panic the police.

5) Wear comfortable clothes: closed shoes, long sleeves if possible, no jewelry. Remove pins and other sharp items.

6) It is remotely possible that police will use tear gas, in which case it would be useful to have a wet cloth or handkerchief to cover your mouth and nose (the cloth is easy to carry in a plastic bag).

7) In case of tear gas or anything similar, remain calm, listen for instructions from marshalls, retreat calmly to a safe spot, and *always remain with a group*.

8) Make it your own responsibility to keep the situation cool and to calm panicky people. *Remember: police themselves are often scared when dealing with a crowd. If you can act toward them in a way that makes them less frightened, they are much less apt to behave brutally.*

We do not intend to rush police lines, or to attempt to enter the Pentagon by force. Nevertheless, we will persist in a determined effort to impede its operations, and to stand our ground for as long as this is feasible—at least until Monday noon, Oct. 23.

We hope that people in your group can contribute other suggestions. Be sure to have a meeting, before you set out for Washington, to discuss nonviolent tactics.

A CALL TO CREATIVE DISRUPTION OF THE WARMAKERS, OCTOBER 21–22 (FOR ALL THOSE PLANNING TO PARTICIPATE IN CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE)

(By Maris Cakars, Barbara Deming, Marjorie Heins of the Direct Action Committee)

How many miles have we walked in protest?
How many signs and letters written?
How high and how often have we raised our
    voices? How many words?
Hardened to the bloody slaughter in Vietnam,
    deaf to the cries of grief and agony,
    and cynical of freedom and independence, this nation's leaders choose not
    to see or hear us.
War is not a peaceful demonstration. Its
    makers are killers, not marchers.
Who then will deny it—that now is the time
    for direct action?
For the speeches and placards and marches
    fall short of the mark.
Fall short of the centers of power.
Now is the time to confront the warmakers!
Now is the time to disrupt and resist!
We call on all Americans to peaceful and
    direct action at the Pentagon.
Sit in; lie down; stand firm.
In every way, let our bodies block the machinery of war.
And this will be a signal to all across the
    land:
Resist the warmakers,
Disrupt the juggernaut,
Close down the war machine,
Now, before it is too late.

BOW EXPENDITURE LIMITATION

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, this summary of the economy debate of the past 4 weeks might well be called an "open letter to taxpayers." Our work in the House during that period has given American taxpayers the first real reason to hope that spending can be checked and tax increases may be avoided and inflation can be brought under control.

The action of the House yesterday, if sustained by the other body, must save American taxpayers at least $5 billion. It may save $10 billion. This saving is guaranteed by the Bow expenditure limitation which says that the President may not spend more than $131.5 billion in the fiscal year, except for essential and unforeseen expenses of the war in Vietnam. Inasmuch as he has estimated his spending at $136.5 billion, we are assured the $5-billion saving. And, since his agencies were spending in July and August at an annual rate of $145 billion, we may be saving twice that amount.

The first intimation that the House was ready to cut expenditures came September 27 when we sent back to the Appropriations Committee its 30-day "spending as usual" resolution. We did so on a rollcall vote of 202 to 181. The Bow expenditure limitation had been ruled out of order, but the debate that day was centered on that amendment and many people, including the Associated Press, interpreted the action of the House as a "mandate" to the Appropriations Committee to cut spending.

Then followed the debate of October 3 when, once again, the Bow amendment was ruled out of order. But, progress had been made. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] told the House that our committee would make every effort to find means of cutting back appropriations already recommended. The House voted to allow until October 10, for that effort. The Senate extended the date until October 23. Yesterday's debate was occasioned by that approaching deadline.

The resolution presented yesterday by the Democrat majority illustrated a remarkable and commendable change of direction, as a result of the previous debates. It would have saved at least $1.5 billion by placing a 30-day moratorium on new hiring and contracts, by limiting civilian payroll expenses to 95 percent of the budget estimate, by limiting research to 90 percent of the budget estimate, and by requiring that agencies absorb all of the cost of the civilian pay increase.

In this action the majority embraced the Bow expenditure limitation which had been offered on six of the regular appropriations bills. Bitterly opposed by the majority last spring, it was adopted on only two of the bills. This Bow amendment limited all the expenses of an agency to 95 percent of its estimated expenditures and it would have saved $778 million had it been accepted on these bills.

Although the Mahon resolution was a great step forward, Republicans insisted that it did not go far enough. I offered, and the House accepted, the Bow expenditure limitation of $131.5 billion.

The House then substituted the Whitten amendment, with the Bow limitation. The resulting bill provides that spending may not exceed the level of the previous year except for the necessary military expenses in Vietnam, the Post Office and Internal Revenue services, veterans' and social security payments, and a few other items.

The final rollcall vote was 253 for and 143 against.

This is a resounding victory for the taxpayers.

It is a gratifying vindication for the Republican leaders who have been urging economy since the first days of this session.

In the early days of the session, Republicans had little support for these efforts and our victories were few and far between.

Yesterday that situation was changed, and the welcome support of many Members from the majority party gave us the margin of victory that we have lacked throughout the year.

Summing up our activities to date, we have cut the appropriations bills considered in the House by about $4 billion. We may be able to raise that figure to $6 billion before the session ends. Since not all of the money authorized in these bills is to be spent this year, the savings cannot be estimated precisely. They should reach $3 billion to $4 billion.

Two amendments by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], who is second ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, cut participation certificate sales by nearly $2.5 billion.

The Bow limitation on the Whitten amendment would hold spending to $131.5 billion.

These are solid accomplishments, but I should like to point out that savings of an additional $2 billion might have been made if over 40 other individual Republican amendments to appropriations bills had been accepted by the House.

Members of the House can expect to be subjected to heavy pressure in the next days and weeks from all of those who have a special interest in Federal spending. The White House can be expected to lead the attack on our economy drive. Taxpayers will be threatened with reductions in Government services, towns and cities will be threatened with curtailment of various programs, and every effort will be made by the bureaucracy, with its vested interest in spending, to bring pressure on us to restore spending cuts and reverse our position. I hope Members will stand firm, for the vast majority of Americans, struggling under the heaviest burden of taxation in history and fighting the most vicious inflationary spiral in many, many years, are supporting us and they need our help.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING—CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of October 18 the committee of conference on the bill H.R. 2508, the congressional redistricting bill, finally reached agreement. That agree-

ment was not unanimous. Among the House conferees the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers] and I did not sign the conference report and did not agree to the compromise reached. Among the Senate conferees, the Senator from Massachusetts, Ted Kennedy, did not agree.

The text of the conference agreement of yesterday reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled "An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives" (46 Stat. 26), as amended, is amended as follows:

Subsection (c) is amended by striking out all of the language in that subsection and inserting in place thereof the following:

"(c) In each State entitled in the Ninety-first Congress and the Ninety-second Congress to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled "An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives" (46 Stat. 26), as amended, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative (except that the States of Hawaii and New Mexico may continue to elect their Representatives at Large). *No State shall be required to redistrict prior to the 19th Federal decennial census unless the results of a special Federal census conducted pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1954, as amended (71 Stat. 481; 13 U.S.C. 8), are available for use therein. Nor shall any State prior to such census be required to elect its Representatives at Large.*"

As will readily be seen, the committee of conference quite unexpectedly abandoned the bulk of the agreement which had been reached in June of this year. The contents of that agreement are to be found in report No. 435, a document entitled "Congressional Redistricting," filed on June 27, 1967, and ordered to be printed. No satisfactory explanation was given in the committee of conference as to why we had abandoned section 1 of the bill as passed by the House, section 1 of the bill as passed earlier this year by the Senate or, more importantly, section 1 of the conference report heretofore agreed upon by the conferees and filed, as I have indicated, in late June.

The essence of the material abandoned was the "permanent standards" section of the congressional redistricting bill. The conferees in June agreed in substance to accept, and to recommend for acceptance to their respective bodies, the language of section 1 of the House bill. When this passed the House, section 1 provided standards for State legislatures to follow in congressional districting for the 93d and subsequent Congresses. These standards were, as follows, and I now quote from report No. 435, dated June 27, which was the initial agreement of the conferees:

First. When a State is entitled to more than one Representative, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of authorized Representatives.

Second. Representatives shall be elected only from such districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative. Existing provisions for a Representative at Large are eliminated.

Third. Each district shall be composed of contiguous territory, in as reasonably a compact form as the State finds practicable.

Fourth. The district with the largest population shall not exceed by more than 10 percent the district with the smallest population in number of persons, excluding Indians not taxed.

Fifth. Population shall be based on the then most recent decennial census, but if a State redistricts more than 2 years after a decennial census, the population figures to be used must be those of a statewide Federal special census conducted pursuant to the provisions of the act of August 26, 1954 (71 Stat. 481; 13 U.S.C. 8), and said census must be less than 2 years old at the time of the next election following the redistricting.

Sixth. Unless the particular State constitution requires otherwise, there shall not be more than one redistricting following the decennial census.

Mr. Speaker, I point out again that these "permanent" provisions were agreed to by the conferees, that they did constitute a very fine set of standards to be used in congressional districting following the 1970 census.

The conference report which was filed on June 27, adopted this section in the form as passed by the House of Representatives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I see no justification for throwing aside months and months of effort by both the House Committee on the Judiciary and the work which was done in this Chamber, as well as the work which was performed by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the work performed by the other body, to establish reasonable and widely accepted permanent standards for congressional redistricting. Yesterday's developments were particularly surprising since the conferees had heretofore agreed upon the language that we would recommend be enacted into law.

There surely is no justification for having to replow this ground all over again. But, if the conference report is to be adopted, this current conference report which is nothing more than a very sketchy outline of certain prohibitions regarding the establishment of congressional districts for the next two Congresses, we will indeed have wasted a great deal of time and effort.

On tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce a bill which will incorporate the provisions of the October 18 conference report, and which will include the provisions of the conference report of June 27 insofar as those provisions apply to permanent legislation dealing with congressional redistricting after we have up-to-date figures following the 1970 census.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Minnesota yielding to me at this point. I do not wish to take much of the time of the gentleman and of the House since I am not particularly qualified to undertake a thorough and searching study of this subject. However, my State, the great State of Missouri, is one of the States that is having to undergo a test of its legislative redistricting action and, indeed, there are other such States, as I have learned in the last 24 hours, which have indicated a deep interest in this matter.

And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman in the well, who brings to us for our consideration such a timely subject, would comment upon the efforts which are now being made in the Congress as represented by the efforts of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress, and which legislation is now pending before the Committee on Rules, having passed the other body by an overwhelming vote, if this recommendation of the joint committee were adopted, we would have the right to present minority views in conference reports which is, in essence, what the distinguished gentleman is so appropriately doing as he stands in the well of the House today.

However, I hope that the gentleman will go one step further. If this situation is as bad as the gentleman indicates, I would hope that we would take the necessary action against the conference report, since the gentleman does not see fit to sign it. However, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman what effect the adoption of this conference report would in his opinion have upon the various statutes that are now under consideration for judicial determination pending actions of the various legislatures as, for example, the great "Golden Bear State," the State of California, which cannot come to a decision on this matter? In other words, would it or would it not be unfair to adopt this conference report which, of course, is legislative instruction with reference to the law and to the courts of the land?

Mr. MacGREGOR. In my opinion the answer varies. It varies with the individual three-judge court. But I believe the majority of the conferees would give the gentleman a different answer. Other conferees might tell you that this new language, if adopted by Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States, will constitute a mandatory restraint upon the Federal judges. I do not think so. I think that any particular judicial action or reaction will depend upon the individual attitudes of the judges named to the three-judge panel.

Mr. HALL. A decision to be reached which would involve the separation of powers of the three branches of the Government?

Mr. MacGREGOR. That is my opinion, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Casey). The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MacGregor was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MacGREGOR. I did not respond to the comments of the gentleman with respect to my intentions to act further.

In addition to introducing a new bill tomorrow which will incorporate what is now adjudged to be the joint opinion of the majority of the conferees, I will incorporate the earlier provision in the conference report dealing with permanent standards, and I see no reason why we should not accomplish this. I believe this would produce a much better legislative product. And I would hope that when this body considers the question of adopting the conference report we might send it back to conference with instructions to incorporate the provisions of the bill that I will introduce tomorrow.

I believe we will then have made a satisfactory attempt to deal with this subject not only for the interim period preceding the 1970 census, but also in the post-1970 census period.

Mr. HALL. Again I compliment the gentleman, and I certainly will join him in this effort.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the gentleman very much.

THE IRS AND A RECENT MAGAZINE ARTICLE: A REBUTTAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, an article published by the Reader's Digest has been a cause of deep concern to many of my constituents. I refer to "Tyranny in the Internal Revenue Service," written by John Barron.

The article, citing 16 specific cases, accused the Internal Revenue Service of using gross methods of intimidation and pressure against taxpayers, and of misusing its powers to tyrannize innocent and conscientious taxpayers.

If all of the facts stated in the 16 cases are true, then it is creditable that they were assembled and made public. There can be no harm in bringing errors and misdeeds of public employees to the attention of the public. It is the best way I know of assuring the American people that such things will not happen again.

But there is an important element of unfairness in the article's approach, which is worthy of the closest scrutiny by the Members of the Congress. I refer to the clear implication that these 16 cases are typical of IRS methods in performing the important duty of collecting taxes.

This is an unfair implication, and its unfairness was quite clearly shown by the testimony of Sheldon R. Cohen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of this House.

Mr. Cohen is an outstanding public servant, a dedicated and conscientious Commissioner, whose task it is to carry out one of the most complicated laws in the world, collecting each year the $148 billion which pays for all the services and all the functions of the U.S. Government.

Mr. Cohen's thousands of employees deal with 100 million taxpayers, who file 70 million income tax returns each year. The IRS, under his administration, operates so fairly and so efficiently that 48 million refunds put $7.5 billion back into the pockets of taxpayers each year, with most of the refunds made within 45 days from the date the return is filed.

In a statement replying to the article in the Reader's Digest, the IRS recalled that the magazine said its writer, in his determination to seek the truth, spent 6 months in research, traveled 5,800 miles, and held 280 interviews.

> This massive enterprise resulted in 16 instances of alleged wrongdoing by IRS, considered worthy of inclusion in the article—

The Revenue Service pointed out.

Certainly, this observation needs little additional comment. Surely, 16 cases out of millions hardly add up to "tyranny."

The IRS cited the fact that the Reader's Digest article admitted that most IRS agents "want to be just and reasonable," but laid the so-called "tyranny" at the door of "the system."

> While in the course of a year, 3.5 million taxpayers are called in to substantiate their deductions and claims—

The IRS said—

> some 25 million are given help and information as to their obligation and their rights, as part of this "system."

The article referred several times to "unrefuted sworn testimony" on which it based its charges. This, said the IRS, was testimony before a congressional subcommittee at hearings, not statements made during trial in a court of law. The IRS statement went on:

> Americans who have seen court trials know that "sworn testimony" does not always produce the complete truth, unless there is cross-examination by the defense attorney and testimony of other witnesses to bring out the whole story. In the subcommittee hearings, there was no cross-examination of witnesses.

Certainly, nobody concerned with the rights of the vast majority of American taxpayers can take any issue with efforts to recover taxes which are owed and unpaid. It must be clear that when one taxpayer does not pay his taxes, all the rest of us must make up for his share.

The article concerned itself mainly with the 1.9 million taxpayers whose returns were found to be in error, and who paid additional taxes, but it did not tell what happened to the remainder of the 3.5 million returns that were selected for examination during the year.

The IRS said:

> Of those 3.5 million, over 1.3 million taxpayers were notified that their returns were accepted without change and 300,000 other taxpayers received $154 million in refunds, because examination showed they had made errors which caused them to overpay their tax.
>
> These figures were not used in the article, presumably because they would not jibe with the statements that IRS agents are judged by the "alleged errors" they find and "how often they bring in more dough."
>
> Obviously, thousands of IRS agents and auditors, who found errors in some returns but also reported "no change" in 1.3 million returns or gave refunds in 300,000 cases, were trying to do their job in line with IRS policy to determine the correct tax—no more, no less.
>
> In addition, the article did not point out that IRS refunded $82 million to 1.4 million other taxpayers who made mistakes in arithmetic and overpaid their taxes—further evidence that IRS seeks only the correct tax.

To the article's charge that high IRS officials tried to "cover up and withhold data," the Revenue Service made this reply:

> The facts are that in addition to more than a hundred letters and reports submitted to the Senate Subcommittee by IRS, some 50 officials and employees were instructed by Mr. Cohen to testify fully and frankly. These included, besides Mr. Cohen himself, an assistant commissioner, regional commissioners, division directors, district directors, branch chiefs and supervisors.
>
> The only data withheld from being spread on the public record by the subcommittee was information which cannot be disclosed because of specific provisions of the law or which identified innocent third parties.

The IRS statement pointed up a basic fault of the article, when it characterized as a "gross oversimplification" the idea that the Revenue Service, "at its whim, can seize a taxpayer's assets."

> Collection of taxes from those who will not pay voluntarily is a necessary procedure in extreme cases, in fairness to those who do pay.
>
> However, only when there is an overt action on the part of a delinquent taxpayer to purposely dissipate his assets or to take them out of the country will the IRS seize assets without warning.
>
> In every other case, a person who owes taxes is given ample opportunity to pay voluntarily. He is given several written notices, afforded conferences and, if warranted by his financial condition, part payment agreements are worked out. Enforced collection is made only as a last resort.

Most important of all, I feel, in the IRS statement, is the assurance that the door is never closed between the taxpayer and the higher echelons of the Service:

> Through the years, IRS has invited taxpayers to write to their District Director or to the Commissioner in Washington, D.C., when they think a mistake has been made or they have received unfair treatment. This invitation continues in effect with assurance that IRS will consider every valid complaint and will take corrective action wherever warranted.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, only 16 cases of the many millions handled by the IRS were cited, and even if every word of every statement about these 16 cases were true, it would certainly not add up to "tyranny," or anything approaching it.

And yet, even in those 16 cases, there remain doubts and questions of interpretation. It is unfortunate, from the standpoint of equity, that the Reader's Digest, as the vast and popular magazine it is, has a much more certain forum for getting its own interpretations to the people than does the IRS, which must depend upon the limited space available in the daily press for its channel of communication.

However, even the specific cases mentioned in the article must be considered with understanding. It may be that there have been a few isolated instances of unscrupulous procedure by a few of the thousands of the employees in the Internal Revenue Service. But I challenge any agency, of any government, to prove that among the armies of people who work for the public, at least a few do not show up as less perfect and less just than their fellows.

We are all familiar with the great efforts made by private industry to retain the services of skilled people. It is surely all the more important in Government, which frequently has difficulty in competing with industry for the abler people in its employ.

Let us not, then, make the job more difficult by using an all-too-ready tarbrush to splatter the thousands of the good and honest and conscientious with the misdeeds of the few. Let us rather be thankful that in this free, democratic society, the misdeeds can be brought to light fairly and the errors—whether of omission or commission—can be speedily eradicated.

Let us be as prompt to praise the efficiency, ability, and conscientiousness of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the legions of good people who work in his agency, as we are to criticize the few who do not meet the high IRS standards.

AIR QUALITY ACT ESSENTIAL

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, air pollution has been a subject of growing national concern for more than a decade.

It has been studied and analyzed, graphed and charted, and talked about, but it has not been removed. It still hangs over our cities, threatens our health, and destroys our property.

Every community with over 50,000 people has an air pollution problem. This represents more than two-thirds of our population.

Air pollution causes economic losses estimated at $11 billion a year. Even more important is the overwhelming evidence that air pollution is a factor in the development and worsening of such chronic respiratory diseases as asthma, bronchitis, emphysema, and lung cancer.

The problem is real and it is getting worse.

In January of this year, the President reminded us that air pollution worsens in direct proportion to the Nation's economic growth, increases in urban population, rising demands for heat and energy, and upward trends in the use of motor vehicles, production of refuse, and production and consumption of manufactured goods.

Clearly, it will not be long before air pollution reaches truly critical proportions in many parts of the country. What happened last Thanksgiving in New York, where severe air pollution cost more than 160 lives, was not an isolated occurrence; it was an omen of things to come.

As President Johnson has suggested, we must strengthen both our research efforts and our regulatory activities if we are to succeed in dealing with the menace of air pollution. The bill reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would help the Nation do both.

It provides for the acceleration of research needed to advance our knowledge of control methods, and it calls for standard-setting on a regional basis, which is a logical way to attack the problem.

I am endorsing the proposed Air Quality Act because I believe that it is a logical and essential step in the Federal Government's efforts to mount a truly comprehensive national attack on air pollution.

Every provision of this legislation will help bring us closer to the day when all Americans can enjoy their surroundings without fear or danger.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD BACK POLICY ON AIRCRAFT ARRESTING GEAR

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have called to my colleagues' attention a number of areas in which the Federal Government could be moving to promote aviation safety. One of these is the development and use of aircraft arresting gear which could save lives and prevent the destruction of multimillion-dollar aircraft in the event of runway overruns and aborted takeoffs. While this equipment is by no means a total answer and should not be represented as an alternative to longer runways where those are possible, aircraft arresting gear can make a critical difference at airports where runways cannot be lengthened.

It is unfortunate, in my view, that the attitude of the Federal Aviation Administration toward aircraft arresting gear has been negative. The fifth Aerial Navigation Conference of the International Civil Aviation Organization will be held in Montreal next month. One of the items on the agenda concerns the establishment of an international policy with respect to aircraft arresting equipment. There are indications the United States will oppose the establishment of any affirmative policy on the issue, although as far back as 1962 the FAA conducted a successful series of tests to establish the feasibility of such gear.

Members of the House and Senate should be aware of this. I urge my colleagues to express their support for a positive, meaningful air safety program by joining me in urging the responsible officials to insist that the U.S. policy on the aircraft arresting gear question be an affirmative one.

For the information of my colleagues, I present for inclusion in the RECORD the text of a letter I have today sent to the Secretary of Transportation:

OCTOBER 19, 1967.

Hon. ALAN S. BOYD,
Secretary of Transportation,
Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ALAN: The fifth Aerial Navigation Conference of the International Civil Aviation Organization will be held at Montreal, Canada, commencing November 14. As in past years, the United States will be represented at the conference.

Question 3 on the agenda calls for an examination of recent progress in the development of aircraft arresting gear and a study of the possibility of adopting a standardized gear in the event that international airports will be equipped with them. This is a matter of serious concern to me. The development of aircraft arresting devices was a matter I emphasized in proposing to the Federal Aviation Administration last month a twenty-point air safety program. In my view, FAA's delay in completing the testing and certification of aircraft arresting gear and its failure to require such equipment at major airports is deplorable. It raises serious questions regarding the FAA's willingness and ability to establish and implement a safety program that will meet the demands of aviation's rapid growth in this country.

It is my understanding that an inter-governmental committee on which are represented the Department of Transportation, FAA, Civil Aeronautics Board, Department of Defense and Department of State is in the process of developing a U.S. policy paper on this and other items on the ICAO agenda. I have also learned that the FAA is strongly resisting a policy statement in favor of aircraft arresting equipment. On the other hand, I am reliably informed that the Governments of France and Great Britain have adopted policies favoring such equipment and are dismayed at the intransigence of the United States in this regard.

From our discussions, Alan, I know you are vitally concerned that the Government meet the challenges of aviation growth, not only in regard to safety, but in other areas as well. As a pilot, you are well aware that the Armed Forces have been using aircraft arresting equipment successfully for years, for land-based as well as carrier-based aircraft. The Air Force credits the hook and cable gear it has used since 1951 on its land bases with saving some 250 aircraft every year. The FAA completed a successful series of tests at its Atlantic City research center in November 1962. It subsequently continued to "study the situation" with representatives of the airline industry and even went so far as to promise a decision by January, 1965. As far as anyone can determine, they are still "studying the situation."

In 1964, officials of the FAA gave some indication that they favored arresting gear as an added safety factor but were not willing to force the airline industry to accept it. Unfortunately, this has all too often been the FAA's attitude toward air safety, regardless of the fact that the urgency of the need for and the feasibility of a particular program has been established.

In one 12-hour period in April 1964, three commercial aircraft—two Boeing 707 jets and a prop-jet Electra—overran runways at New York airports. Fortunately, there were no fatalities. But there were deaths and injuries, not to mention substantial economic losses, in the more than 40 reported overshoots in the period 1954–1964. And you will recall the tragic loss of 130 lives in the aborted take-off of an Air France jet from Orly field in Paris in June, 1962.

It is significant that some airline officials share my view that the new generation of jetliners, with their vastly increased weight and higher landing speeds make even more urgent the need for increasing the safety factor in the event of a miscalculation or malfunction during take-off or landing.

Also, the phenomenon of aquaplaning—the loss of tire friction on wet pavement—continues to plague the airline industry. When today's heavy aircraft hit a film of water on a runway they frequently keep going despite braking efforts and the engines' reverse thrust. I am informed that when an aircraft wheel aquaplanes, it comes to a complete stop and if this condition lasts more than three seconds on a jet, the anti-skid system is automatically deactivated. Yet, FAA officials continue to emphasize improving reverse thrust capability and advocate grooving runways to increase braking power (although these groves would tend to ice up in cold, damp weather).

As you know, a number of companies have developed aircraft arresting gear capable of halting today's largest jets. I hold no particular brief for any of these firms, but in view of the fact that the state of the art has progressed to this point, I simply cannot understand the refusal of the FAA to require this equipment where it is needed. I am aware that the gear would not be inexpensive; estimates run between $300,000 and $1 million per runway. But we must keep in mind that this equipment is designed to prevent the destruction of aircraft costing millions of dollars, not to mention the lives involved.

I hope that you Alan, will recognize the urgent need for the United States to take the lead in promoting aviation safety and the ICAO conference offers a unique opportunity. I respectfully request that you take all necessary steps to see that our government adopts a favorable policy with respect to the conference agenda question on aircraft arresting equipment and moves ahead to require such equipment at the larger civilian airports.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN COLOMBIA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, having been privileged to participate in the planning and development of the Peace Corps, I am always pleased to bring to our colleagues' attention another one of the Corps' successful programs. I am particularly happy when it involves one of my constituents and, even more so, in a program which I helped to initiate.

For the past 2 years, Mr. Davis Loretan, of Valhalla, N.Y., has been serving as a Peace Corps volunteer in a community development program in Colombia. This type of program basically involves helping other people help themselves. A volunteer will enter a community and assist the residents in organizing and deciding upon needed and worthwhile projects which they would like to undertake as a community. The volunteer will then help the residents to execute the project and obtain such outside assistance as may be necessary. The goal of community development programs has been accurately described as bringing people together toward a common goal.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Loretan for his dedication and exemplary service and congratulate him for being awarded the Order of the Saman by the people of Colombia. I believe his work is another example of the fine work being done by the Peace Corps overseas and I am delighted to insert herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, the following article:

[From the Reporter Dispatch, White Plains, N.Y., Sept. 22, 1967]

HE HELPS COLOMBIAN PEASANTS HELP THEMSELVES TO BETTER LIFE

(By Lorretta Lynde)

VALHALLA.—Feudalism exists today, even in the Western hemisphere, and it is the goal of David Loretan, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Loretan of 337 Columbus Ave., to try to do something about it.

Mr. Loretan returned today to Oiba, Santander, Colombia, in South America. The community has been his assignment in the Peace Corps for two years and he is now beginning a third year, an extension of the usual term.

The people of Oiba seem to have recognized and appreciated what Mr. Loretan has done for them. Before he left to come home, he became the first North American to receive "The Order of the Saman," a silver medal with a gold tree on it. The tree represents one growing in the town of Oiba and is symbolic of the community spirit there. It was presented to Mr. Loretan for the "effect he had had on the community."

STEPINAC GRADUATES

Mr. Loretan, a 1961 graduate of Stepinac High School, holds a political science degree from St. Michael's College in Winooski, Vt. He joined the Peace Corps in 1965 and went to Colombia in September of that year.

Assigned to Oiba as a community developer, Mr. Loretan had a variety of duties, most of which involved organizing the communities and the peasants who lived in them. The peasants, accustomed to having the government contribute to projects sporadically, had trouble imagining themselves actually asking for what they needed. In communities like Oiba, such funds are handled by regional capitals (in this case, Bacaramanga) which are one equivalent to state capitals here.

The most difficult people to reach, Mr. Loretan observed, are the peasants of the veredas, small communities located on the large farms which surround communities like Oiba. These people have a difficult time making ends meet with their meager coffee crops and small salaries from large farms.

VERY RICH, VERY POOR

The peasants represent one end of the balance of two classes, prominent in most South American countries—that of the very rich and the very poor. Though some of the rich do contribute to improvement projects for the peasants, not all of them do, and the overall contribution does not amount to much.

Peace Corpsmen like Mr. Loretan visit the veredas and attempt to build interest and community spirit so that these people can accomplish improvements within their communities. With the help of the Peace Corps, the Federation of Coffee Growers has begun to aid these communities of peasants. The federation buys the coffee and returns the profits in the form of partial expenses to build the schools and improvements.

Mr. Loretan says it is best if the people contribute part of the funds and effort themselves so that they gain a sense of involvement in their school. "In schools that the government itself built, the people tend to think of the school as belonging to the government," stated Mr. Loretan.

SEEK NATURAL LEADERS

"When we go into a community like this," says Mr. Loretan, "it is best for us to try to find the natural leaders of the community. These people are best to help us organize the projects to earn funds and work on various projects."

The peasants in Mr. Loretan's assigned community raised money with such projects as bazaars including lunches, dancing and games, and with such activities as taking down old unrepairable buildings and selling the materials. The proceeds of these efforts were used to match the money given by the Coffee Growers and the government.

Schools are the major project for workers like Mr. Loretan. One school has been finished since he arrived in Oiba and he expects another to be finished when he returns. "The length of time it takes to complete a school in these towns depends on the community and upon its leaders," he says.

When Mr. Loretan returns, he will work for a time in the same community and will later go to the regional capital to aid new and current Peace Corpsmen in an administrative capacity.

"These people are wonderful," Mr. Loretan smiles, "and I'm delighted to be able to go back."

NATIONAL FOUNDATION OF LAW

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the American legal system is undergoing extraordinary strains in an effort to meet the rapidly mounting demands upon it. We all have heard of the "law explosion" that has led the massive backlogs on the civil dockets of courts throughout the Nation. And never, of course, have the demands on our system of criminal justice been as heavy or as complex.

These new strains, reflecting both the rapid population growth and our ever more complex way of life, are further complicated by vastly expanded efforts at bringing the full protection and benefits of the law to the poorest segments of our population, and by vital new efforts at making the law and legal institutions more responsive to developing public needs and expectations.

The legal profession and the law schools have made valiant efforts to keep pace with these new demands. But each limited step forward has revealed a dozen more that should be taken. Their experience has made it clear that the law, the framework for all our social and economic processes, is the poorest of stepchildern when it comes to allocation of resources, both public and private, for research and education. And there is little reason to believe this imbalance, resulting in a serious lag in legal research and training, will be changed under present policies of the funding agencies and organizations.

It is against this background, Mr. Speaker, that I introduce today a bill to create a National Law Foundation to promote improvement in the administration of justice and in legal education and research.

This bill has been in preparation for many months in cooperation with the American Bar Association, the Association of American Law Schools, and the American Association of Law Librarians. Each group approves the bill as drawn.

The new Law Foundation, with the overall charge of improving the administration of justice, also would pursue programs designed to upgrade the quality of legal services and to make the law and its institutions more responsive to public needs. It would support legal education through grants to individuals, law schools, nonprofit organizations for continuing legal education, law libraries and other facilities for legal training. It also would initiate and support programs of research, in cooperation whenever appropriate, with Federal, State, and local agencies as well as private educational and research institutions including law schools and bar associations. It further would provide support to improve the Nation's law schools through scholarship and fellowship programs and grants to institutions.

The proposed Law Foundation, under direction of men expert in the practice of law as well as legal education and research, would focus attention directly on many of the most critical problems of our time.

It would, in short, provide for the vital and expanding field of law the great coordinating and supporting services available to the sciences through the National Science Foundation and to medicine through the National Institutes of Health. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that comparable support is needed if our legal processes and institutions are to continue to provide the framework necessary for ordered progress in all aspects of our national life.

JOHN B. TURNER IS MR. MIAMI

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, few men have contributed of themselves to their community to the extent to which John B. Turner has in Miami.

The Miamian magazine has recently honored him by selecting him as Mr. Miami, and this recognition is richly deserved.

Mr. Turner's activities in behalf of the community have been most numerous, but one of his outstanding contributions has been his service as chairman of the Dade County Community Task Force which was established in cooperation with the Federal Government to cope with the problem of thousands of Cuban refugees who have poured into the area in the last few years.

I commend to my colleagues the Miamian article which describes but a few of Mr. Turner's many efforts to make Dade County a better place to live for all:

PLAN FOR THE NEXT GENERATION

Everything being done today, should be done for the people and the city that will be here 50 years from now, according to John B. Turner.

Turner, one of Miami's civic leaders, looks at the community as he believes it will be in the future.

"I always at least try to look ahead. Never go back, and never look back except to learn and benefit from experiences and history," he said.

In his 17 years in the Greater Miami community, Turner has guided the helm of most every major community effort.

He has been president of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce, the United Fund, Operation Amigo, South Florida Boy Scout Council, Downtown Kiwanis Club and chairman of the board of the Economic Society of South Florida, to mention only a few.

One of the most recent major involvements was as chairman of the board and executive committee of the Dade County Community Task Force, and organization stated at the expressed wishes of the President of the United States to insure that there be no adverse economic effect on the Greater Miami area from the Cuban Refugee Airlift inaugurated nearly two years ago.

"The Task Force was an unusual organization. We had to go looking for problems to solve. We found plenty of them, and found solutions to some such as assisting in obtaining more adequate federal funds for the education of the Cuban children in the Dade School System, helping work out the problems of the Cuban dentists, and other similar problems," Turner said.

Turner had also been a member and vice chairman of the Dade County Community Relations Board.

"If there is one group that could do more in less time, it would be an organization composed of a community relations board and a task force. With connections and influences both within the community and in Washington, such a group could be effective in obtaining federal funds to help build Miami-Dade Junior College, the proposed state university, and in obtaining funding for Aerojet-General, and other projects which the federal government could participate in which would stimulate the economy and aid industry," Turner believes.

But without such a group, the momentum must come from within the community to accomplish overall goals.

"People are coming to Florida, and business goes where people are," Turner said. "The population trends show over two million people by the 1980's and they are probably right. We must prepare ourselves for the next 50 years. We can't simply plan for the next few years or even few decades.

"The major problems of this area stem from the people who settled here 50 years ago. They lacked vision. They didn't build for a population of a million persons.

"We are still in a pioneer era. There are still the opportunities here that there were 20, 30, or 50 years ago. Sure, Miami Beach has already been developed, but the same kind of opportunities exist if you look for them."

Turner believes that it is the duty of each generation to provide the necessities, such as school, for the next generation.

"On this point," he said, "Dade County has an excellent reputation. Our schools are excellent for what we had to work with. But here again, taxes are going to have to be raised, or bonded indebtedness incurred, so that we can continue to grow, expand and build more schools, housing, sewers and all the other things that a society needs and will be needing in the coming years."

Part of the planning ahead is looking for new job opportunities for the growing population.

"Miami must encourage new industry to move in, new industry which will provide jobs for the population which in turn will need housing, education and other products and services.

"I don't mean just big industry. Big companies would be nice, but don't forget the smaller plants. They're even more important if you have enough of them," Turner emphasized.

Turner believes that it is the duty of the entire community to help encourage a good business climate, and the organization to work through is the chamber of commerce.

"The value of the chamber of commerce to this community can only be limited by the time and the interest that's put into it by the business and professional people," Turner emphasized.

Initial steps, he believes, have been taken to start Miami on the road to further progress. Review of the state and local government, a strong look at taxation and problems of the future, the new Doxiadis plans for redevelopment of downtown, are all a step ahead.

"But we must take action if we want the problems to be solved. I am all for private enterprise implementing these things, but not if it takes another 25 years. We have been struggling and struggling, and nothing gets done. Let's accept it and implement it, either in whole or in part, or reject the whole thing.

"Maybe the only way we can get the plan finished is for some government group to go in and get it done. Otherwise, the Doxiadis plan will be just another report."

Turner, a retired vice president of Cities Service Oil Co., has helped to implement many ideas and plans in this community. As president of the Community Television Foundation of South Florida, Inc., he was instrumental in obtaining a more progressive programming policy for the station.

In other areas, he serves as an elder of the Miami Shores Presbyterian Church, trustee of the Florida Presbyterian College, on the executive committee of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, and a director of the Dade National Bank of Miami.

Prior, he had been on the regional board and dinner chairman for the National Conference of Christians and Jews, active for over 20 years in the American Red Cross and chairman of the Dade County chapter.

To top them all, however, was the American Red Cross' 1967 award to him as "Man of the Century."

CERTIFICATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE MECHANICS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a program for the voluntary certification of motor vehicle mechanics by the Secretary of Transportation and to assist the States in establishing programs for the compulsory licensing of auto mechanics.

I have been concerned for some time, Mr. Speaker, that the auto owner is not receiving adequate service from many auto mechanics. Once the owner of a car discovers that something is wrong, he is at the mercy of the auto mechanic.

A recent survey taken by the New York based Citizens Committee for Metropolitan Affairs reported that 60 percent of the garages to which a malfunctioning automobile was brought turned in completely false diagnoses. We are all aware that these practices go on in every area of the country and are due either to untrained mechanics or to outright fraud.

The purpose of my bill is the voluntary licensing of auto mechanics who meet certain standards as prescribed by the Secretary of Transportation. The mechanic who meets such standards and receives certification would be able to hold himself out to the public as a reputable skilled craftsman. The individual car owner would then be able to determine whether he is going to a good mechanic or, like the 600, is riding blindly into the valley.

The certification of good mechanics by the Department would also serve as a lever to encourage the less skilled either to upgrade their skills or to get out of the business.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, would also provide grants to those States which enact compulsory programs of licensing and would include the cost of apprenticeship or training programs for mechanics.

I want to emphasize that I have introduced this bill in order to generate study and discussion of this very real problem. It is in no way a final solution to the situation but rather a beginning.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a newspaper article from the New York Times and a Columbia Broadcasting Co. editorial which bear upon this problem:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 27, 1967]

GARAGES HERE FAIL A SPOT REPAIR TEST

A study of 19 automobile repair garages here has shown that only five accurately diagnosed a minor engine defect and that the repair cost estimates ranged from no charge to $40.

"Eleven garages—60 per cent of those surveyed—turned in completely false diagnoses," the Citizens Committee for Metropolitan Affairs reported yesterday.

Speaking at a press conference, William F. Haddad, president of the committee, said that its survey had shown "a shocking scarcity of well-trained mechanics" and "a desperate need for fair-price guidelines in automotive repairs."

The committee is a nonprofit civic organization formed in 1964 and composed of approximately 700 members. In the words of Mr. Haddad, they are "young professionals, Wall Street types."

Participation in the group, which is financed by assessments on the members and the 18-man board of directors, is strictly voluntary, and members are assigned to serve on one or more of its 18 subcommittees. In keeping with its policy of serving the public as an "aggressive ombudsman," the committee recently investigated Surrogate Court patronage practices and drug prices in New York State.

The automotive survey was conducted by volunteers headed by Thomas Boyd, a returned Peace Corpsman who taught mechanics in India. Nineteen independent service areas were selected with standard market sampling techniques that correlate neighborhood income with population density. This selection method, according to the committee, gave a cross-section of garages that was "representative" of automotive repair centers for the entire state of New York.

A 1966 Oldsmobile Vistacruiser station wagon, with 27,000 miles on the speedometer, was selected as the test vehicle. Members of the test team were taught how to measure the distributor point setting and how to alter this setting from the manufacturer's recommended specification of 30 degrees.

Before entering each service station, a member of the survey would adjust the point setting to 42 degrees; otherwise the car was said to be in "excellent condition."

The point setting regulates the firing of the spark plugs in the engine.

According to Mr. Haddad, this particular alteration was selected because the type of engine malfunction it produces—a very rough engine, with loss of power and difficulty in starting—should be recognized by "a kid in high school mechanics class" as being caused by an improper point setting.

The survey reported, however, that most of the 19 mechanics consulted were inclined to recommend a full tune-up—at prices ranging from $14 to $40.

In one instance the mechanic listened to a description of the car's performance and, without leaving his desk to inspect the car, suggested: "Probably needs a tune-up—$22.05."

At another midtown garage on the East Side of Manhattan, a man who did not claim to be a mechanic but said he was "familiar" with the car, said:

"Sounds like it needs a tune-up. If it hasn't been tuned within 10,000 miles, you should have it done."

Cost: $35.

Other mechanics were apparently baffled by the problem. One, who worked at a lower East Side gas station checked the spark plug wires, changed the fuel mixture settings on the carburetor, readjusted them to nearly the same position said: "Must have been some dirt in the carburetor."

Only one mechanic of the five who correctly diagnosed the trouble correctly identified the problem immediately. He readjusted the points without charge.

On the basis of these investigations, the report concluded that "except for the few cases of satisfactory service, the mechanics were not willing to waste their time on a $2 or $3 adjustment."

The report contended that mechanics were content to use a "cover-all diagnosis" of a tune-up even though, "in all but a couple of stops, the car's engine was running so badly that an experienced man could not have failed to suspect improper ignition timing, which could have been corrected by a simple adjustment."

The report recommended that "the City of New York promulgate fair-price guidelines for automotive repairs and that procedures be established that will lead to certification and licensing of automotive mechanics in the New York City area."

Approaches have already been made to state legislators and the offices of the Mayor and the Governor to discuss the possibility of legislation requiring the licensing of mechanics.

Commenting at the press conference, Mr. Haddad said:

"I think it [the mechanic's alleged incompetence] has become a form of acceptable corruption. The public has been made to feel that it is normal to do business in this manner.

"However, I'm sure something is going to be done about it this time."

TEXT OF WCBS (NEW YORK) EDITORIAL

Subject: Auto repair abuses.

Broadcast: September 29, 1967, 12:20 p.m., 4:20 p.m.; September 30, 1967, 8:20 a.m.

A committee of public spirited New Yorkers has made a valuable contribution to automobile safety and consumer protection. By conducting a survey of Manhattan garages, the group has exposed the auto repair business for the indifferent, incompetent racket it too often is.

The committee's findings, of course, are nothing new. They'll have the ring of unhappy truth to any car owner who's ever nursed a leaking head gasket or clogged fuel line. Most owners would be hard put to tell the differences between these maladies, and repair shops, through incompetence or fraud, are often quick to capitalize on the public's ignorance.

In its survey, the Citizens Committee for Metropolitan Affairs used a recent-model car with a common but minor engine defect. The committee's survey team drove the car to nineteen garages for diagnosis and repair. The committee found that cost estimates varied from "no charge" all the way up to $40. Of the nineteen garages surveyed, only five accurately spotted the defect using the proper techniques. Three others found the trouble after trial and error. Eleven of the nineteen—that's 58 per cent of the sample—incorrectly identified the problem.

The committee summed up the service it received as "careless," coupled with "intent to defraud." Widespread incompetence "has become a form of acceptable corruption," said one official, "and the public has been made to feel it's normal to do business in this manner."

Now regardless of what the public feels—negligence, poor training and outright larceny are scarcely ingredients of normal business practice. Next to a home, a car is the most costly piece of property you're likely to buy. And there's no reason why the motorist should not expect and receive the same standard of competence from mechanics that he does from a dentist or piano tuner. Maybe the answer is that pride in the craft is gone. If that's the case, it's time for government to step in. You can't legislate pride. But you can mandate state licensing for mechanics and the repair shops they work in. Loss of license means loss of work. And this is probably the quickest way we know to clean up those abuses of trust and confidence that too often characterize what should be a skilled, fairly-priced service.

MILITARY RULE IN GREECE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perceptive and best informed writers on the military regime in Greece is Maurice Goldbloom. Mr. Goldbloom, a freelance writer, was labor information officer for the U.S. economic mission to Greece in 1950–51. He has since returned to the country many times and has numerous sources of information that give authority to his articles on recent Greek developments. Following is an article that appeared in the September 24 New York Times magazine:

AFTER THE ARRESTS: HOW THE MILITARY RULES 8 MILLION GREEKS

The military junta which seized power in Greece last April 21 is still nervous, but with each passing day it is less and less vulnerable. By now, neither a decision by King Constantine to break with it, nor a decision by the United States to cut off military aid would automatically topple it, though either would undoubtedly weaken it.

The attitude of most Greeks toward the King's role is summed up in a mot that has been going the rounds in Athens: "In the process of seduction, there is a point at which a girl must decide whether she is going to remain a virgin. The King has passed that point with the junta." In his recent appearances in the United States—in Washington with the President, in Newport for the America's Cup races—Constantine has apparently been acting as the regime's envoy. For its part, the United States, through its initial acquiescence, has given the junta the time it needed to dig in.

In other words, the junta, though not noticeably more popular, does seem to be more solidly entrenched. The coup was staged by no more than 200 to 400 officers—out of some 10,000 in the Greek Army. The ability of such a small group to seize power without significant opposition was largely the result of mistaken identity. Greeks had long been expecting—and right-wing Greeks had been hoping for—a coup by a large, nominally secret, but in fact well-known, organization dominated by senior officers known as IDEA. But over the years a small, rival organization of junior officers, called EENA, had been growing up almost unnoticed. At the time of the coup its leadership included only one general—Stylianos Patakos, now Minister of the Interior—and he had been made a brigadier only three months before. The group's most important leader was Col. George Papadopoulos—who happened also to be the man assigned by IDEA to transmit the orders for its coup to its followers throughout the army.

It was EENA that struck, but when Papadopoulos gave the signal its recipients thought they were obeying IDEA. Because there was no organized democratic group in the army, there was no military resistance. Because civilian political groups—including the weak and demoralized Communists—were prepared only for lectoral activity, there was no popular resistance.

Once in, the junta lost no time in broadening its base of military support. Increasing the officer corps by approximately 10 per cent has enabled it to win the support of perhaps twice that many officers through promotions and new appointments. Key officers on whose loyalty it could not count were forced to retire. In the army, this purge for the most part took place immediately after the coup; in the navy, where the coup had received almost no support, the junta moved more slowly. Still, by mid-August more than 60 naval officers, mostly of high rank, were said to have been removed, and 11 to have been arrested.

Arrests, indeed, have been the junta's most conspicuous activity. The cases of former Premier George Papandreou of the Center Union, his son, Andreas Papandreou, and Mikis Theodorakis, composer of the score for "Zorba the Greek," have attracted worldwide attention, but there are thousands more, and the arrests show no signs of abating.

The original wave of arrests was based largely on an army list of suspects prepared nearly 20 years ago; the conspirators had been afraid to ask for more recent lists for fear of tipping their hand. Thus, many of those arrested in the first sweep were people who, whatever they might have been in the turbulent nineteen-forties, had long since ceased to be politically active.

Later arrests—which by now certainly outnumber those of the first wave—have been more selective. They affect all sections of the political spectrum, including parliamentary deputies, former Government ministers and several of the country's leading journalists. They also include a man who criticized the King in a telephone conversation with his sister, a bus driver who objected to letting a soldier ride free and numerous persons accused of such offenses as having five or more guests in their home or possessing a mimeograph and not registering it with the police.

Of those arrested at the time of the coup, more than 6,000 were sent to a hastily opened concentration camp on the island of Yiaros. (Some 1,500, most of whom had been arrested because of their official positions rather than for their politics, were soon released, though many remained under house arrest.) The Government has now announced the opening of a second major concentration camp on the island of Leros, to which prisoners are being transferred from Yiaros. This should be an improvement.

Yiaros is a completely waterless and barren island, swept by high winds. Before the coup it had an old and unused prison, with cells for a few hundred persons. When the detainees were dumped on the island, the prison was used to house some of the women. The other prisoners were housed in tents, 25 to a tent, grouped in three camps.

Some weeks later, at a time when the Government claimed to have released about a third of the prisoners originally there, it announced plans to construct reservoirs on the island which would make it possible for each prisoner to receive 15 liters (a little less than 4 gallons) of water a day. Clearly, the water supply during the first several weeks must have been barely enough for drinking, let alone sanitation.

Later, other ameliorations were promised. These included an improvement in the diet, which was said to have consisted mainly of beans, and the opening of a canteen at which prisoners could purchase additional food and other small necessities. Some of these improvements may have taken place. It at least appears reasonably certain that the canteen was opened—since underground channels reported a few weeks later that it had been closed again.

There are inevitable gaps and time lags in information on conditions in the various places of detention, since Yiaros and most of the others have been barred to journalists and foreigners. A representative of the International Red Cross has, to be sure, been permitted to visit them. But in accordance with the normal practice of that organization, his report was submitted only to the Greek Government, which never made it public.

The Government did, however, release a letter in which the Red Cross representatives asked on humanitarian grounds that the 250 women confined in the old prison on Yiaros be transferred elsewhere, to accommodations more appropriate to their sex. (The circumstances of this release were such that one is impelled to wonder if the Government really desired to give it wide publicity. In the Greek Government press office, official releases are normally laid out on tables, arranged in the order of the numbers which they bear. They are available in Greek, English and French. This release had no number, it was not with the others, and it was available only in Greek.) I have seen no report indicating that such a transfer has in fact taken place, although the women may be among those now being moved to Leros.

If conditions on Yiaros have improved in some elementary physical respects, it appears that they have recently become worse in other ways. Some 250 of the "most dangerous" prisoners are said to have been segregated from the others, and to be confined to their quarters 20 hours a day. During the four hours in which they are allowed out, the other prisoners are confined, in order to prevent any contact between the two groups. And the three camps on the island are kept isolated from one another.

These changes probably result from the regime's disappointment at the failure of the prisoners to break down under its pressure. A condition for release is that the detainee sign a pledge to refrain from "antinational and anti-Governmental activity." Few politically significant prisoners have been willing to sign, regarding it as dishonorable.

Interior Minister Patakos complained to me: "Some of them are getting more hardened instead of reforming. They have organized by tents; a leader for each tent, and a group leader for each 8 or 10 tents. They have a president for each of the camps, and a general commander for the whole island. They have collected 250,000 drachmas [a little more than $8,000] among themselves, for what purpose I do not know, but I am sure it is not a good one."

As one of the "Communist" leaders of the hardened prisoners, Patakos mentioned Dimitrios Stratis. When I remarked that the 78-year-old Stratis, a veteran trade-union leader and left-wing parliamentary deputy whom I know well, was not a Communist, Patakos replied: "He calls himself a Socialist, but he is a Communist. In Greece, we have right people and wrong people. All those who are against the country are Communists. Stratis is a Communist in his heart and his works. They are all liars."

Yiaros and the courts-martial which hand out sentences of five years for writing slogans on walls and eight years for *lèse-majesté* are not the Government's only instruments of intimidation. Some Greeks beyond the borders have had their citizenship revoked—most notably, the actress Melina Mercouri, who seems to have come out ahead on the exchange.

Many persons regarded as potential troublemakers have been taken to police stations and badly beaten, as a warning, without being formally arrested; this treatment has been most often used on students and other young people. The security police have visited private employers with lists of "unreliable" individuals who are to be discharged. Many people have had their telephones removed because of their political views; all have been discouraged from talking politics on the phone or writing about it to friends by the knowledge that phones are likely to be tapped and letters opened.

But the junta has not relied on terror alone to consolidate its position. Rather, it has systematically endeavored to entrench itself in every aspect of Greek life. On the national level, despite the existence of a nominally civilian Government, an army officer plays a key role in every ministry—in some cases as minister, in others as secretary general, in still others as a political commissar without official title.

The tenure of civil servants has been abolished; many have been removed for their ideas, and all have been ordered to pledge their loyalty to the regime on pain of dismissal. The purge has not been confined to such politically sensitive departments as the police, where 118 high-ranking officials and police doctors were dismissed in mid-August. (Others had been ousted previously, individually or in smaller batches.) It has even affected the director of the Byzantine Museum, an internationally known scholar.

Locally, the regime has destroyed the system of nonpolitical nomarchs or district administrators, whose establishment American advisers once regarded as one of their major achievements. More than half the nomarchs have been removed; most of their replacements are army officers. While asserting its belief in the decentralization of authority, the Government has removed large numbers of elected mayors and local councils and replaced them with appointees chosen in Athens.

Nor has it confined itself to the governmental sphere. It has seized control of the Orthodox Church. It has dissolved hundreds of private organizations and removed the officers of numerous others, including bar associations, agricultural cooperatives and the Jewish community.

The United States Embassy in Athens clearly does not like the regime, though most Greeks regard it as responsible for the coup—an opinion the junta assiduously encourages. (A skeptical friend remarked to me, after seeing one of the coup leaders in action, "Now I believe what you say about the Americans not being behind the coup; they'd never have chosen *these* people!") But the Embassy also regards the present Government as a lesser evil than a revolt against it, and has therefore placed its hope in persuading the junta to practice self-denial and restore democracy voluntarily. Its influence is limited, since the junta now feels certain that the United States will continue military aid whatever happens. (Some weeks after the coup, the U.S. did cut off certain items, estimated by the Defense Department at 10 per cent of the total.)

Nevertheless, the Embassy and State Department see great cause for optimism in the appointment of a committee of jurists to draw up a revised Constitution by the end of the year for submission to a plebiscite. This is supposed to lead to a speedy and orderly restoration of constitutional government.

This assessment appears to contain a large measure of wishful thinking. The group named to draw up the new Constitution included a few persons of some distinction, several conservative nonentities and a few with rather unpleasant reputations. But the members were not consulted before their appointments were announced, and some of the best-known have refused to serve.

The Government's influence on the deliberations of the committee is not likely to be cast on the side of democratic institutions While Premier Constantine V. Kollias has said the new Constitution will be only slightly changed from the present one, journalists close to the junta have called for much more drastic alterations. Among the suggestions offered are a ban on political activity by anyone who has ever cooperated with the extreme left, a requirement that all candidates have loyalty certificates from the security police, and the exclusion from office of anyone who has ever held foreign citizenship.

The first of these provisions would not only bar all those in the United Democratic Left (EDA), a party which contains some hard-core Communists but also a wide range of non-Communists. It would also ban most members of Papandreou's Center Union and a number of people now on the right—including some ex-Communists who hold office under the junta or are among its advisers. (For example, Theophylaktos Papaconstantinou, whom the Government has placed in charge of the press, is a former Communist theoretician. So is the editor of Eleftheros Kosmos, the newspaper widely regarded as closest to the junta.)

The significance of the second is shown by a story told by a friend who had served as an officer attached to the general staff. One of his duties was to investigate the qualifications of officer candidates. In the dossier of one he found a report from the Security Police: "A. is a dangerous subversive, being closely associated with the politician Constantine Rendis." At the time of the report, Rendis, who belonged to the right-center, was Minister of Public Order and the superior of the police official who wrote it.

The third proposal is aimed primarily at Andreas Papandreou, a former American citizen and the man on whom millions of Greeks rest their hopes for their country's future.

When I asked Patakos what constitutional changes the Government would propose to the committee, he mentioned none of these specific points, although he referred in a general ways to changes in the qualifications of deputies. In response to a question, he added that the Premier named by the King would still have to receive the support of a majority in Parliament. He added that these ideas were merely being considered very tentatively; the one point on which the Government was determined was that the new Constitution must cure all the faults of the existing system. Apprised of this statement, one diplomat remarked: "That's easy; all he has to do is change eight million Greeks."

Whatever kind of Constitution may emerge from the committee, the problem of implementation will still remain. The embassy appears to rely on the King and Patakos—the member of the junta who is regarded as most susceptible to the influence of the palace—to promote the restoration of a constitutional regime. Patakos, however, does not seem to have any such intention. He told me: "We are not interested in elections; if we were, we wouldn't have made a revolution. This system we have now is the best system, because what we have now we have achieved with the people's support, so there is no need for elections. We have more serious problems than elections. What we have done we did in order to achieve certain aims, and when we have achieved these aims, then we will have time for elections. . . . We are frank people. We are not liars and we do not want to make false elections, the way they do in Russia with 98 per cent; therefore there will be no elections."

But even if Patakos could be introduced to support a prompt return to constitutionality, it is unlikely that he could accomplish it. Unlike Colonel Papadopoulos, who organized the coup, Patakos appears to have little talent for conspiracy or political infighting. He seems a basically decent if insensitive man, whose political naiveté is almost incredible. (He is responsible for most of the pronouncements which have brought ridicule on the junta—the bans on miniskirts, beards, long hair, etc.) A soldier of peasant origin (a brother is said to be still working on the roads in Crete), he rose slowly through the ranks for 37 years, becoming a brigadier general and commander of the tank school three months before the coup. Only then does he seems to have been brought into the conspiracy—because the tanks he controlled were necessary to its success. One suspects that he joined partly because of resentment at the establishment—civil and military—on which he blamed his slow promotion (he talks with obvious bitterness of the 10 years he lingered as a lieutenant colonel), and partly because he really believes the moralistic slogans to which others in the Government pay lip service.

In any showdown between Patakos and Papadopoulos, the latter seems far more likely to be the victor. Indeed, the other members of the junta may in any case drop Patakos when they feel strong enough to do so. He might even end up on Yiaros. If he should, I would not expect him to sign a declaration in order to obtain his release.

But if the junta does not seem likely to give up power voluntarily, there are factors which may eventually lead to its downfall. One is the difficulty of getting competent personnel to work for it. The population of Greece is about the same as that of New York City, and the proportion of trained personnel is much lower. If one eliminates a majority of the population—and a much larger majority of the well educated—on political grounds, it becomes difficult to find competent people for important positions. Moreover, many whom the junta might be willing to appoint do not want to serve under present conditions; in one instance, it has had to draft a retired official into the army in order to make him assume a top post in a ministry.

This difficulty may explain some of the peculiar appointments the Government has made. One, particularly strange for a regime which talks in terms of moral regeneration, is that of Constantine Thanos as Secretary General of the Ministry of Coordination and Alternate Governor of the World Bank, two of the most important economic posts it had to fill. Mr. Thanos was, a few years back, rejected for a teaching post at the University of Athens because it was discovered that the thesis he submitted in support of his application was a verbatim plagiarism from a memorandum by Prof. Benjamin Beckhart of Columbia. The incident is not the only one of its type in Mr. Thanos's career.

But the Government may well feel that it cannot look too closely into the moral credentials of anyone who can help it solve its economic problems, for these are very great, and almost certain to increase. At the beginning of June, Greece had short-term debts of about $20-million more than its official gold and foreign-exchange reserves. (Some $100-million in gold sovereigns, the purchase and sale of which were used to stabilize the currency internally, did not appear in the official reserves. The exact amount in this fund was secret.) And Greece's three principal sources of foreign exchange—emigrant remittances (about one Greek worker in five is employed abroad), tourism and shipping—all seem likely to drop sharply this year, as does foreign investment.

In addition, it is almost certain that a loan of about $100-million which had been promised by the European Economic Community will now be postponed, if not canceled. Nor have the financial prospects been improved by the resignation of the internationally known economists Xenophon Zolotas and Michael Pesmazoglou as Governor and First Deputy Governor of the Bank of Greece.

No wonder that a former minister says of Col. Nicholas Makarezos, who as Minister of Coordination is in charge of economic policy: "He's the only one of them who thinks seriously about problems; that's why he always looks worried." The colonel's worries seem likely to come to a head within the next six months. By that time, the Government is widely expected to run out of cash. (It is already asking for U.S. economic aid.) It may be able to renew credits as they come due, simply because creditors will prefer to keep their loans on the books instead of pushing them into default. But without new credits, which seem unlikely, there will have to be drastic import restrictions and currency controls; there may be a devaluation of the drachma and a sharp reduction in the standard of living.

The political repercussions of such a development are unpredictable. It may be that the opposition will still be too disorganized to take advantage of the situation, and that the Government will be able to ride out the crisis. But it is also possible that students—who are difficult to control because their leadership is always being renewed—and workers returning from northern Europe, where many of them have already organized against the junta, will by then form the basis of an effective resistance movement. And if the regime is not able to keep up the standard of living of the armed forces—particularly the officer corps—trouble could come from that quarter.

Such a situation could conceivably result in a countercoup. Or the junta might turn to a foreign adventure, particularly in Cyprus. This past summer, there were sounds from Athens of a new drive for *enosis*, the union of Cyprus with Greece. (They produced no sympathetic echoes among Greek Cypriotes.)

Or the regime might seek to rally popular support by swinging in a Peronist or National Bolshevist direction. There are already some signs that it is considering this option. One is a decree prohibiting any Greek, including employes of foreign companies and international organizations in Greece, from getting more in salaries, allowance and pensions than the Premier receives—about $18,000 a year. The junta issued a decree raising the salaries of Cabinet ministers substantially, but forbade the press to mention it. Some days later another decree was issued reducing the salaries—but to a point well above their previous levels. The reduction was then publicized, without mentioning the previous raise.) It has also raised pensions for peasants by about two-thirds. And Agriculture Minister Alexander Matthaiou's first radio address was not only filled with leftist phrases, but was couched in a form of the *Demotiki* (the popular language, traditionally championed by the left as against the *Katherevousa* or "pure" language backed by the right) so extreme that it is regarded as the trademark of the Communist party and shunned by everybody else. A move in this direction might also take on an antimonarchical aspect; not all the members of the junta regard the King as indispensable.

It might seem strange for a rightist government to move in this direction. But the junta does not represent the traditional Greek right, rooted largely in property and birth. Its leaders are men of lower and middle-class background. They may hate the left, but they have no love for the conservative establishment.

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to urge the Members of the House to give their full support to the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967. Approval of this legislation would be of benefit to virtually every American and would help to safeguard the health and welfare of generations to come.

Three times since 1963, the Congress has taken steps to accelerate the Nation's movement toward cleaner air. Under the legislation enacted by the Congress, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has helped in the creation and strengthening of State and local air pollution programs, instituted Federal action to abate interstate pollution in nine areas of the United States, established national standards for control of motor vehicle pollution, and intensified research on ways of controlling the major air pollutants.

Yet, each day the air pollution problem is worsening. With a renewed sense of urgency, the States, the cities, and the Federal Government must commit themselves more fully and effectively to America's struggle against poisoned air. Federal action alone cannot overcome the problem. The measures proposed in the new legislation before us will directly help State and local governments in their efforts to prevent and control air pollution arising within their jurisdictions.

I am convinced that by putting the stamp of approval on the legislation before us, we are forging another link in the chain of Federal-State partnership that is so vital to the restoration of the quality of our atmosphere.

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make a few comments about the problem of air pollution which has become, unfortunately, a major environmental concern in many parts of our country. This House will soon consider the Air Quality Act of 1967, which has been recently reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and this fact prompts my present remarks.

In recommending last January that the Congress adopt the Air Quality Act, President Johnson expressed the Nation's resolve to eliminate air pollution. This feeling by our citizens is not just a fad; it is based on an increasing comprehension of the enormous price we have been paying—and continue to pay this very day—for neglecting our air supplies. There was a time when a plume of smoke from a factory stack was emblematic of progress and productivity, but our society has reached the stage when we are able to have the benefits of industrialization without attendant detriments. Air pollution is a health hazard, air pollution damages property, air pollution decreases visibility, and air pollution depresses the human spirit. The Air Quality Act is a step toward mitigating these undesirable byproducts of our affluent society.

While the new legislation has several meritorious features, I should like to discuss one major provision today. I am referring to the bill's provisions for the establishment by the States of air quality standards and implementation and enforcement plans, with the assistance and guidance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. After the Secretary has designated air quality control regions and has published criteria and control technology information for a given pollutant, the States will be obliged to establish standards and implementing plans for the regions. Presently, the States are not under such an obligation, and while some of them have done admirable work in this regard others have been unwilling or unable to confront the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of this House to give thoughtful consideration to this legislation when it is presented to us for our approval, and I hope that they will join me in voting for its enactment.

IN DEFENSE OF CONGRESSIONAL INTERNSHIPS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently a Sunday supplement of the Washington Post, the Potomac magazine, carried an article relating the reactions of a number of young people to their experiences while serving as congressional interns on Capitol Hill.

The tenor of many of the reactions was of disillusionment, disappointment, and disgust that they were given seemingly petty assignments during their brief employment in congressional offices.

During the spring semester, a student at American University's Wesley Seminary here in Washington volunteered his services in my office. His objective was to gain experience both in the functions of our National Government and in service to the public. He felt experience of this kind would be of substantial help to him in his future work as a clergyman.

Ths young man, now the Reverend David G. Henritzy, pastor of Pomeroy Methodist Church, in Pomeroy, Pa., read the Potomac magazine article and then sent his reactions to the editor.

I am pleased to be able to bring his letter to the attention of my colleagues as concrete evidence of how valuable our internship program can be, if the individuals selected have the personal initiative to gain from their experiences:

POMEROY METHODIST CHURCH,
Pomeroy, Pa., October 16, 1967.

The EDITOR, POTOMAC MAGAZINE,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was interested to read your recent article, in the October 1, 1967 issue of *Potomac* concerning congressional interns. I also have served as a congressional intern and would like to write in defense of the program.

Many of the complaints of the interns you interviewed seem to have arisen from the fact that the interns did not find the intern program to be what they expected. I served my internship with Rep. Fred B. Rooney (D-Pa.) and began it with the assumption that I was going to learn as much as possible about the workings of Congress and a congressional office. I too, spent a large part of my time working a roba-type machine, or addressing letters, or even clipping newspaper articles. However, I felt that this was not only a way of learning what really goes on in a congressional office, but also as a very real means of assisting an already heavily-loaded staff and thus freeing the professionally trained staff members to do the really important jobs.

Because my attitude may have been somewhat more responsible than that of some of the interns you interviewed, I was eventually given more of the responsibility which all the interns craved. I did not expect, nor did I, make policy decisions, but I was given such responsibilities as speech writing, preparing briefs for the congressman on important topics, and handling many private cases completely on my own.

I left my internship with a much heightened respect for the duties and responsibilities of a congressman, plus a good understanding of how our political system works on a day-to-day basis. I felt that this was what I went there to learn and could not have been more pleased with my experience. Working in congress is an extremely responsible position which requires a high degree of professional training. Perhaps if the other interns realized this they would not only find their internships to be of more value, but would also be a greater service to their country.

Sincerely,

DAVID G. HENRITZY.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VIGORITO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, in a message to the Congress last January 30, President Johnson warned us that unless vigorous action is taken, and taken quickly, our cities will become totally engulfed in a pall of polluted air. The President said:

> The pollution problem is getting worse. We are not even controlling today's level of pollution. Ten years from now, when industrial production and waste disposal have increased and the number of automobiles on our streets and highways exceeds 110 million, we shall have lost the battle for clean air—unless we strengthen our regulatory and research efforts now.

The President went on to recommend adoption of the Air Quality Act of 1967.

Mr. Speaker, the record clearly shows that the administration has led the way in supporting and strengthening the national air pollution control effort. The proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 is a logical and timely response to the experience we have gained under the Clean Air Act, which the President signed into law in 1963. To my way of thinking, the proposed legislation is perhaps the most important measure to come before the Congress this session. There is mounting evidence that air pollution presents a potentially serious health hazard especially to people who work or live in or near our urban and metropolitan centers. There is an urgent need to continue and expand our efforts to halt the deterioration of our atmosphere. Almost daily the problem grows more acute.

I agree completely with the President's assessment of the problem, and I urge that the bill reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee be passed by the House.

AIR QUALITY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us realize that one of the most precious substances on this planet is the air we breathe. But I wonder how often it crosses our minds that for the first time in the history of mankind we have begun to slowly but relentlessly change the composition of the air. The air is no longer the pure mixture of natural gases that our high school science texts described; it is these gases plus tiny but significant amounts of contaminants that not only do not support life they threaten life.

These contaminants are byproducts of America's industrial progress. But they are not necessary byproducts. As President Johnson said in his message to the Congress on air pollution last January:

> This situation does not exist because it was inevitable, nor because it cannot be controlled. Air pollution is the inevitable consequence of neglect. It can be controlled when that neglect is no longer tolerated.
>
> It will be controlled when the people of America, through their elected representatives, demand the right to air that they and their children can breathe without fear.

Mr. Speaker, soon we will have before us the Air Quality Act of 1967 originally proposed by the President last January. This act recognizes that air pollution is truly a national problem and calls for a national approach. Its provisions will strengthen and accelerate the efforts begun with the Clean Air Act of 1963.

The bill has had the support of many distinguished witnesses. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, William H. Stewart, in endorsing this bill, made clear that the problem of air pollution is a health challenge of the first magnitude confronting the American people today. He added that "We can, and we must, proceed now."

I believe that we in Congress have a responsibility to see that our dedication to the protection of every American's right to live, work, and enjoy the fruits of prosperity includes the right to breathe clean healthful air. The bill which will soon be before us is an affirmation of that right. And the time to act is now. This is not a problem to be put off for tomorrow.

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE RADIO NETWORK

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, last August 17, on the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, the Partners of the Alliance sponsored an amateur radio operators program originating in Lima, Peru. Two-way radio contact was made not only with most of the hemisphere, but a total of 38 countries throughout the world responded to the special Partners of the Alliance signal of station OA4SIX. The anniversary broadcast also coincided with the meeting in Lima of the Inter-American Coordinating Committee of the Partners of the Alliance.

The worldwide attention this program created is indeed significant. The Partners of the Alliance program is the partnership effort of the citizens of the Americas to raise the social and economic standards of all peoples and assist in reaching the objectives of the Alliance for Progress. It helps to involve people of the hemisphere in the development process. Today, 32 U.S. States and the District of Columbia are in partnership activities with a similar number of areas in 15 Latin American countries. The State of North Carolina is paired with Cochabamba in central Bolivia and the citizens of both areas are taking an active role in educational, medical, and agricultural projects.

The idea of the Partners network was sparked by a constituent in my district, Mr. David A. Rawley, Jr., of High Point. An article on his role in the project appeared in the recent newsletter published by the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance in Washington, D.C. I place the article in the RECORD for the interest of Members of the House:

WORLD RESPONDS TO HAM RADIO

An international network of amateur radio operators marked the sixth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress last August 17 and was first to tell the world that the Third Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance will be in Lima, Peru, March 31 through April 3.

A permanent Partners radio network to broadcast every Saturday from 7 to 9 a.m. is in the planning stage and may become a reality within weeks.

During the five days of the anniversary week that the network operated, 500 two-way radio contacts were made with 35 U.S. states and 38 foreign countries, including England, France, Belgium, Australia, Israel, Cuba and Russia.

The network's activities overshadowed the official business of the Inter-American Coordinating Committee of the Partners of the Alliance, meeting in Lima to make arrangements for and set the date of the annual Partners' conference in Lima next Spring. A total of 300 delegates from North and South America are expected to attend.

BORN LIKE HURRICANE

The unique network a "first" in Partner's history, was born as suddenly as a hurricane. At last year's Rio Conference of the Partners, the Committee on Human Relations emphasized the essentially private nature of the Partners program, based on participation of individual citizens, groups and organizations in the Partner countries.

The idea of a network occurred to David Rawley, Jr., of High Point, North Carolina, and the Partners adopted it.

The Government of Peru granted special call letters—OA4SIX—and that became the official Partners Station in Peru with a radio ham contact set up with Peru's Texas Partner. All other Partners were alerted to tune in on 14.340 kilocycles. They did, with enthusiasm.

In radio ham jargon, the "OA" of the call letters was instantly recognized as Peru, the "4" as Lima. The "SIX" was a nod to the Sixth Anniversary of the Alliance for Progress.

FROM SHACK TO WORLD

Rawley said credit for the permission to operate and the special call letters goes to Peruvian Partners Ricardo Palma and Eduardo Dibos. The official station operated from the ham radio "shack" in Palma's home in the Miraflores section of Lima. Rawley supplemented Palma's equipment with a transmitter, receiver and amplifier he brought from High Point, representing an extra air freight charge for 70 pounds he cheerfully paid.

Edward Marcus, vice president of Neiman-Marcus in Dallas and president of the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance, sent the first official words flashing world-wide from Palma's antenna in Lima.

Joining him from Lima were James H. Boren, director of AID Partners' programs; Warren Huff, executive director of the N.A.P.A.; Dr. Nelson M. Robinson, University of Tennessee Department of Political Science, and Dr. Will Pirkey, Denver physician, chairman of the Colorado Partners, and, with Dr. Walfrido Prado Guimaraes, Sao Paulo, Brazil, co-chairman of the forthcoming annual Partners Conference.

Also heard from Lima were Dr. Roberto Rendon, Guatemala; Marco Algara, El Salvador; Eduardo Dibos, Peru; and Doctors Edgard Barbosa Ribas and Jayme Messeder, both of Brazil.

GOVERNOR'S GREETINGS

The Governors of Maryland and Rio exchanged greetings. David Leon in Kentucky and Ricardo Leon in Ecuador said "Hello." Banks Miller in Austin traded information with fellow Texans Marcus and Boren in Lima.

Rawley, possessor of a radio ham license since age 12, said more than 200 "QSL" cards were received in the first week after the broadcasts, asking for information about the Partners.

(Radio hams send each other "QSL" postcards as proof of their contacts and to comment on how the signal came in. For the Lima broadcasts, a special blue-and-white "QSL" postcard is being mailed to all radio contacts to forever adorn the walls of the recipient radio ham's shack. It carries the Lima call letters, the Alliance for Progress seal and information on the Partners.)

Rawley said questions from all corners of the globe expressed great curiosity about the Alliance and the Partners and then enthusiasm for the whole concept.

Besides the 35 U.S. states, Rawley said Peruvian Partners Station OA4SIX made two-way contacts with radio hams in:

Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay, Puerto Rico, Surinam, Uruguay.

Also, Canada, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Russia.

Also, Chad, Kenya, the Channel Islands, Ellsmere Island and Sardinia.

DRUG RECALL PROCEDURES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Eilberg] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I sought to bring to the attention of the House the event of what I then called a narrowly averted disaster. You will remember it involved a recall of the drug "Coumadin."

I mentioned at that time that in addition to asking that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee be charged with the task of investigating drug recall procedures and making recommendations that would avert similar near catastrophes in the future, I was writing to Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration. In my leter to him I asked both for a report on what had happened and for strengthened procedures within FDA itself.

I am pleased at this time to offer for the Record the text of Dr. Goddard's reply to me. I also offer at this time a letter I subsequently received from the executive secretary of the Philadelphia Association of Retail Druggists. Included in the contents of this communication from Morris E. Blatman is a proposal which I would like to call to the further attention, and to the attention of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

That proposal would establish a code to be used in drug recalls. That is, in each applicable case the necessity for a recall would be identified by a letter or some other designation by which physicians and pharmacists would immediately know that:

First. This code would signify a vital emergency. It would mandate notification to distribution centers and news media within 24 hours and would be detailed.

Second. This designation might be used to notify distributors of drugs, including physicians and pharmacists that further distribtution of items so marked is prohibited.

Third. This designation would signify merely that routine replacement of the quantity of drugs in question was being made in cases where labeling, advertising, therapeutic claims or package inserts may be misleading. I would suggest a reasonable amount of time be permitted for changes under this designation.

I am indebted, and I think the health science professions and all the people of the greater Philadelphia area should be indebted, both to Morris E. Blatman, executive secretary of the Philadelphia Association of Retail Druggists, and to Joseph Cantor, chairman of that association's professional relations committee. They did yeoman work last week in helping to avert a possible disaster. I am sure that similarly dedicated men also acted in a similar manner in drug distribution centers troughout the Nation.

The material referred to follows:

PHILADELPHIA ASSOCIATION OF
RETAIL DRUGGISTS,
Philadelphia, Pa., October 16, 1967.

Hon. JOSHUA EILBERG,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EILBERG: I am aware of your interest in the problems of Pharmacy and the public health and I am presuming upon our personal relationship to make a few observations in regard to a recent event in which you were interested enough to make your views known.

I refer to the recall of a drug "Coumadin" which took place over the last week-end. There are now sufficient facts available to make this a most important subject for study because it points up the glaring errors that are possible in a bureaucratic system of government when there are no checks and balances.

The drug Coumadin is a trade-marked brand of sodium warfarin. The patent for the drug is held by the University of Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation. Three companies are licensed to manufacture it and distribute it in the United States: Abbott Laboratories (Chicago), Endo Laboratories (New York) and Purdue-Frederick (New York).

Present information now exists that in early August the New York office of FDA and Endo officials discussed various small discrepancies in assaying various batches of Coumadin. Assays are done by comparing the product with standard reference material furnished by the United States Pharmacopoeia. Methods of testing were questioned and discussed.

I have no intention of discussing this very highly technical phase of the problem. Suffice it to say that there is recognized differentiation in methodology and in interpretation.

On or about October 12, 1967, Endo Laboratories agreed to recall seventeen batches of the drug manufactured during the last three years. One batch was limited to distribution to military installations and does not concern the public for the moment.

This drug recall could have been accomplished quickly and safely without arousing the emotions of several million cardiac patients. When one translates the fact that each concerned cardiac involved someone in his family, his physician and his pharmacist, then we end up with many thousands of additional people aroused by newspaper, radio, TV and word of mouth reports about a "dangerous drug recalled that could kill everyone who takes it".

You and I and Dr. Goddard may know this to be untrue but we would have one difficult job to convince that cardiac patient that it isn't true. It will take months of patient and calm reasoning to convince these people that Coumadin was safe to take and continues to be safe.

But more importantly for you and I, is the realization that the handling of drug recalls should receive a prompt and intense study as to how it should best be accomplished without endangering the health of the public. Obviously, there are times when recalls should be made promptly and without any delay. But certainly there are other considerations.

To point up the stupidity of the entire incident few people are aware that the other two companies involved (Abbott and Purdu-Frederick) also issued drug recalls but it made no newsworthy impression.

But even more disturbing to me is the fact that just a day or so before the Coumadin incident there was a quiet drug recall for a cough syrup because some batches contained broken glass, (Copy enclosed). How does one correlate these two incidents as to whether or not they were properly handled.

It seems to me that the Coumadin incident could have been done very quietly and discreetly but someone pushed a panic button that resulted in a great deal of unnecessary publicity; a lot of unnecessary anguish and a lot of explaining, counter-explaining and lots of elevated blood pressure.

The pharmaceutical industry and the government have talked about drug recalls for several years but because it is a touchy problem with many facets as to the responsibilities of each professional discipline that is involved, very little of a definite nature has been established. So while there is a list of recalls printed each week by FDA there is little beyond that. Sometimes we see letters from the big manufacturers concerning items that are being recalled; rarely do we see recall letters from small companies or distributors even in our own Delaware Valley area.

Some manufacturers prefer to handle the letters and recalls themselves issuing credits, cash or other merchandise. Other manufacturers prefer to have the retailer send the merchandise back to the wholesaler. The wholesaler claims that this is a costly operation and has suggested that they be paid by the manufacturer. This sets up a long drawn out chain of events and payments. But this, too, is not an immediate problem.

I have given some thought to the question of drug recalls and at the present time, I can only suggest that each notice of a drug recall by the government and the manufacturer should be rated as follows:

A—Vital emergency. All news media and distribution centers must be notified within 24 hours with all pertinent details including lot numbers to be withheld from further distribution.

B—All avenues of distribution must be

notified by letter from the manufacturer or distributor that further distribution of the affected items is prohibited.

C—Routine replacement. This category of recall should be received for those items where the labeling, advertising, therapeutic claims or package inserts must have printing changes. A reasonable amount of time should be permitted for this change to take place.

While I grant that these categories may not be sharply defined as outlined above, perhaps they should be explored for possible changes in contrast with the present system or lack of system.

I hope that this long letter will give you some idea of the problems that may become involved in a drug recall.

We in Pharmacy will be most appreciative of your continued interest and help.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS E. BLATMAN,
Executive Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1967.

Hon. JOSHUA EILBERG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EILBERG: Dr. Goddard has asked me to reply to your inquiry of October 16 concerning the procedure followed in reporting the Coumadin recall.

If the established procedure had been followed, there would have been no release to the lay press or the public concerning the recall. However, as a result of a deviation from the procedure in our New York District Office, the lay press and the public were inadvertently advised of this recall.

The press conference called by Dr. Goddard was for the purpose of advising the public to continue with their medication and not to be alarmed. A copy of Dr. Goddard's statement is enclosed.

Our Assistant Commissioner for Education and Information visited the New York District Office the morning of Friday, October 13 to determine why this information was released by that Office in contravention of existing established procedures. He learned that the release was the result of a staff member's misunderstanding of the District Director's instructions. Corrective action was begun at 7:30 a.m. on Friday.

We agree with the views of Pharmacist Cantor. FDA does not recall prescription drugs by use of the lay press unless the product is so dangerous that death would result if it were taken. Our procedure does provide for the recall information being provided pharmacists and physicians by the manufacturer of the product involved. We provide a "Weekly Recall List" that is on a controlled distribution list to the medical and industrial press. (A copy is enclosed.)

As a former practicing pharmacist, I am in complete sympathy with Mr. Cantor. You can assure him that we have taken every possible step to prevent further errors of this type.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. PUMPIAN,
Director, Office of Legislative and Governmental Services.

THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Air Quality Act of 1967 represents an important step forward in the struggle against air pollution.

Surely at this time there is no need to convince anyone of the dangers of air pollution. To quote recent testimony presented to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by Surgeon General William H. Stewart:

> Air pollution is a problem of many dimensions. It has an adverse effect on the national economy and on the individual economy of families in virtually every city and town. It impedes the growth of cities and the growth of cattle and crops. It impoverishes the quality of living of millions of our people.

Or, as President Johnson succinctly stated the problem in his message to Congress regarding air pollution in January of this year:

> Polluted air corrodes machinery. It defaces buildings. It may shorten the life of whatever it touches—and it touches everything.

As the air around us has grown more and more polluted, the Congress has sought new ways in which the Federal Government might oppose air pollution on a nationwide scale. Under the Clean Air Act of 1963 and its amendments of 1965 and 1966 we have accomplished much, but air pollution continues to grow worse. I believe that the Air Quality Act of 1967 will prove to be the start of a new era in air pollution control.

The act requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to designate air quality control regions, to publish criteria on the effects of various pollutants in the air, and to issue information on available control techniques for these pollutants. The Governors of the States then have the responsibility of setting air quality standards for the control regions and for establishing programs to implement the standards. Taken together, the criteria on the effects of pollutants and the information on available controls will give direction to our research efforts.

In all, the provisions of this legislation are a logical and timely response to a growing national problem.

PRESS SUPPORT FOR THE GONZALEZ BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD—SIXTH OF A SERIES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed myself for days now to the role of the Renegotiation Board in recovering excess profits on space and defense contracts. I have warned of the increased war profiteering which is inherent in the great jump in defense contracts due to the Vietnam war. I have pointed out the anti-inflation tendencies of the Board's work, and how it reduces Government spending.

I have drafted and introduced legislation to restore the Renegotiation Board to the effectiveness that the current level of defense spending demands. My bill is H.R. 6792, introduced on March 8, 1967. I wish to present at this time an analysis of the six sections of H.R. 6792.

Section 1 contains the short title, the "Renegotiation Amendments Act of 1967."

Section 2 would establish the Renegotiation Board as a permanent agency. The life of the Board has been extended for 2-year periods since 1962.

Section 3 is a technical amendment.

Section 4 would again place the Tennessee Valley Authority under the review of the Renegotiation Board. TVA had been brought under the Board by Executive order in 1951, but was eliminated by amendment in 1956 at the close of the Korean war.

Section 5 would return to $250,000 the "floor" of total space or defense sales each year by a single contractor or subcontractor above which it is mandatory to file with the Board. The floor had been increased to $500,000 in 1954 and to $1,000,000 in 1956.

Section 6 would eliminate various of the main exceptions added by amendments to the original Renegotiation Act of 1951. Section 6(a) eliminates the partial exemption on competitively bid construction contracts. Section 6(b) eliminates the amendment of 1956 to the partial mandatory exemption for durable productive equipment which had broadened the definition of that equipment. Section 6(c) eliminates the mandatory exemption from renegotiation for standard commercial articles and services, presently defined as those articles and services of which 35 percent or more sold to nongovernment buyers. Section 6(d) provides that the above eliminations would be effective on June 30, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, to date I have received no support for my legislation to strengthen the Renegotiation Board from any Member of either body. However, several newspapers have supported H.R. 6792, and I have permission to insert the sixth in a series of these comments:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Aug. 13, 1967]

THE FLIES AND THE HONEY

"For the flies will come to the open honey,
And if war and hell have the same dimensions
Both have been paved with the best intentions,
And both are as full of profiteers."

—STEPHEN VINCENT BENET,
In "John Brown's Body."

With the cost of the war in Vietnam about to reach $26 billion a year, and with the Defense Department currently spending an annual average of $1600 for each American family, what is being done to curb war profiteering? Apparently, precious little.

Back during World War II, a Man from Missouri named Harry S. Truman got national headlines for his Senate investigations of war profiteering and, largely as the result of it, was picked for the Vice Presidency, whence in 1945 he reached the White House.

Also as a result of his work, and that of the War Contracts Price Adjustments Board which stemmed from it, the Federal government recovered more than $11 billion in "excess profits" from private contractors who did business with it during World War II.

Then in 1951, with the Korean War on, Congress established the Renegotiation Board as an independent agency with the sole mission of recovering any "excess profits" from contractors doing business with the government. As a result, more than $800 million was recovered during and after the Korean War.

The Renegotiation Board is still in existence, and trying hard with limited resources, but that is about all that can be said of it. Coincidentally, it is listed in the Washington telephone directory after "Referee in Bankruptcy" and "Registrar of Wills."

According to its last annual report, in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966, it brought about the return to the U.S. government by private contractors of only $24.5 million in excess profits. Another $23.2 million was returned through "voluntary refunds" and "voluntary price reductions" in connection with renegotiation proceedings.

This is a pretty small amount compared with the $11 billion from World War II and the $800 million from the Korean War. And it is not the fault of the Renegotiation Board, which has been doing all it can.

The whole sad story is set forth, in an article that is as hot as a tamale, in the August issue of The Progressive magazine by Cong. Henry B. Gonzalez, the "New Frontier" Democrat from San Antonio, Texas.

The reason so little is being done, and despite the fact that prime contract awards this year will probably total $45 billion—the highest for any year since World War II—is that ever since 1954, Congress has been reducing the Board's ability to do its job.

Its personnel has been cut to less than a fourth of what it was during the Korean War (it stood at 742 in 1953, and was down to 179 in 1966). Its regional offices have been cut from six in 1954, including one in Boston, to two (one in Washington and one in Los Angeles).

All this is bad enough, but by amendments and exemptions Congress has been removing more and more private contracts from the purview of the Board. The floor for contract awards subject to renegotiation has been raised gradually from $250,000 to $1 million. And contracts involving standard commercial articles have been exempted—a pretty large open barn door for any loophole seeker.

There was even an attempt last year to abolish the Renegotiation Board altogether. It came from the Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., in a letter to the House Ways and Means Committee saying that letting the law expire "would not harm the nation's defense effort and would not increase the cost of procurement."

Fortunately it failed, but the Renegotiation Act comes up again next year. Instead of killing it, Congress ought to strengthen the Board, and do so immediately. It can do so by passing Cong. Gonzalez' bill, H.R. 6792, which would restore the $250,000 floor for contracts subject to renegotiation and otherwise strengthen the Board's powers to what they were when the Korean War broke out.

In his Farewell Address of 1960, President Eisenhower warned against the "military-industrial complex." That warning, instead of being heeded, has been forgotten by a Congress and a society too mindful of prosperity in a war economy and too oblivious to the needs of our ghettos.

Says Cong. Gonzalez: "Our history has been one of rampant war profiteering, and I am convinced, as even the limited annual reports of the Renegotiation Board reveal, that profiteering is going on now, is increasing, and will continue to increase unless something more realistic is done to stop it."

He is right. For as Benet said, the flies will come to the open honey, and so far Congress hasn't even seemed to be interested in old-fashioned fly-paper.

OLD MENTY IS GONE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, Frank William Keaney, longtime track, baseball, football, and basketball mentor and athletic director at the University of Rhode Island, died in Wakefield, R.I., after a long illness.

Frank Keaney was an unusual and rare individual. He was a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Bates College, a professor of chemistry, physics and math, and a one-man physical education department. He coached baseball for 28 years, football for 21 years, and basketball for 26 years. In addition to these activities, he was a noted collector of old American glass, an inveterate reader of Greek and Latin classics, and a former professional ballplayer with the Chicago White Sox.

A real guy this Frank Keaney—known affectionately to all Rhode Islanders as "Old Menty." He revolutionized the game of basketball from a slow methodical dribble to the fast-break, razzle-dazzle, firehorse game that it is today. He was advised by many skeptics and critics that this innovative style of basketball had little future. Frank's reply was typical—"We don't say we're right, but you've got to stop us."

His colorful and fast-talking manner made Frank Keaney an extremely sought after favorite in sports circles all over the country.

"Old Menty" believed in wasting no time on the floor—the more shooting there was, the more baskets you made was his attitude. He sought to instill in his boys a fighting spirit that held no brief for quitters. His Rhode Island teams achieved national fame for their consistent 100 point games and there can be no doubt that Frank Keaney was truly the father of the first "point a minute" team.

At a New York luncheon for coaches from all parts of the country some years ago, "Old Menty" summed up his remarks by a few words which seemed to be his basketball philosophy:

> Give the crowds action. If some coach puts up a screwy defense, use a screwier offense. Then, if you lose, pivot, and go home.

Although Frank Keaney retired 11 years ago, until recently, he was still in evidence on the campus, particularly on the floor of Keaney Gymnasium watching one of his protegés—Ernie Calverley—leading another Rhode Island team to victory. He was a true friend to all his boys—a man of great warmth, kindness, and enthusiasm. We in Rhode Island will miss this great and wonderful friend.

To his lovely wife and two sons, Warner and Frank, Jr., Mrs. Tiernan and I wish to extend our sincere sympathy on the loss of their husband and father—a man who now rests among the great in Rhode Island history.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to place in the RECORD four newspaper articles and an editorial on the passing of Frank William Keaney:

[From the Providence Evening Bulletin, Oct. 11, 1967]

FRANK W. KEANEY—HE BRIGHTENED HIS CORNER

The "Old Menty" is gone. The endearing term was coined by Ram athletes because to them their coach was first a teacher.

He taught boys the rules in the game of life, and they became men through their association with him and the lessons he taught through the medium of collegiate athletics.

A graduate of Bates College, he was a Phi Beta Kappa and a master of psychology. He did not smoke, drink or swear, but his colorful and expressive vocabulary could put mere profanity to shame. He disdained the "efforts of the big lugs" and gave every consideration to "the kids who came to play."

He changed basketball from a slow, methodical exhibition into the speedy, high-scoring game that is played today from high school through the pros. He installed the fast break, the floor length pass and the all-court press. He conditioned his players so that any team daring to play the Rams type of game with them would be run into the ground. They were trained by practicing with 15-inch hoops (18-inch is standard) and with smudge pots smoldering to assimilate game conditions of smoke-filled arenas.

When his Rams first appeared in Madison Square Garden and blitzed St. Francis with a record-breaking first-half scoring splurge, New York fans went ga-ga. Droves of them left the arena as Long Island University and Creighton put on a traditional exhibition in the "big game" of the night.

Frank said baseball was his game and advocated playing high school and college schedules in the autumn because the players were in better condition after a summer of outdoor activity and because weather conditions were at their best in this area.

He earned many honors for his accomplishments, and he also earned the admiration, respect and friendship of all who knew him well. His was a warm, friendly, outgoing and effervescent personality. He shared his enthusiasm and love of so many things with everyone.

He was my friend and I shall miss him.

[From the Providence Evening Bulletin, Oct. 10, 1967]

FRANK WILLIAM KEANEY

It is being said of Frank W. Keaney today that he was an innovator in sports, making over collegiate basketball in his own image, that he was a mentor in the classic sense of that word, that he was warmly gregarious, a colorful conversationalist, a man who won a memorable place in the whole range of the sports he loved so well.

All the things being said of Mr. Keaney, who died yesterday, are true. He was Mr. Basketball, and the records at the University of Rhode Island attest to a competence in coaching that made him and his university bywords on the sports pages of the nation's newspapers. On the campus, a great gymnasium is a towering memorial to his achievements.

But he was more than all these things. He had that elusive, that rare skill in leadership which can inspire others to do better than they thought they could do, better than they could have done under a less able man. It was his ability to inspire and lead that gave full meaning to all his other qualities and made Frank William Keaney the great man he was.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 11, 1967]

Frank W. Keaney, Retired Coach, 81—Rhode Island's Basketball Mentor Until 1948 Dies

Wakefield, R.I., October 10.—Frank W. Keaney, former athletic director at the University of Rhode Island and the coach who quickened the pace of college basketball by developing the fast break, died today in South County Hospital. He was 81 years old.

Mr. Keaney, the apostle of fire-horse play, also coached baseball, football, basketball and track. But his national reputation was made in basketball, where his teams compiled a record of 402 wins and 124 losses in 28 years.

Rhode Island played in the National Invitational Tournament in Madison Square Garden in 1941, 1942, 1945 and 1946. The highlight of the Rams' appearances there was the final game in 1946 when Rhode Island lost to the University of Kentucky by one point.

In the same tournament, Ernie Calverley, now the basketball coach at the university, fired the "shot heard 'round the world"—the ball traveling 55 feet to slip through the hoop and gain a victory for the Rams as the buzzer sounded.

Mr. Keaney was a member of Phi Beta Kappa at Bates College, where he earned a bachelor's degree in 1911. He taught at high schools in Connecticut, Massachusetts and Rhode Island before becoming the one-man physical education staff at the university, then Rhode Island State College.

He was named to the Basketball Hall of Fame at Springfield College several years ago.

Mr. Keaney retired from coaching in 1948 and became athletic director of Rhode Island. In 1956, he retired as professor emeritus of physical education.

[From the Narragansett Times, Oct. 13, 1967]

Keaney, URI "Fire Horse," Dies at 81

Prof. Frank W. Keaney, recognized as the apostle of "fire-horse basketball," died yesterday afternoon at South County Hospital after a long illness.

Born June 5, 1886, in Boston, Mass., Mr. Keaney was appointed to the University of Rhode Island faculty in June, 1920. He retired June 30, 1956.

A pioneer in developing high-scoring basketball teams, Coach Keaney's system was the forerunner of the "razzle-dazzle" style of play now used in professional basketball as well as in intercollegiate circles.

A graduate of Bates College in 1911, Mr. Keaney taught at Putnam, Conn. High School in 1911–12, at Woonsocket, R.I. High School in 1912–17, and at Everett, Mass. High School in 1917–20.

At URI he coached all sports, and was director of athletics when he retired.

Survivors are his widow, Winifred McKee Keaney of Peace Dale, and two sons, Frank W. Keaney Jr. and Warner M. Keaney.

When Mr. Keaney came to URI in 1920 as coach of all sports, athletic director, and "instructor of chemistry, physics, mathematics or bacteriology," his first move, in the fall of that year, was to burn all of URI's athletic equipment: a dozen football shoes and fourteen pairs of boxing gloves.

He demanded that President Howard Edwards buy three dozen new football uniforms and began a 36-year career marked by the spectacular, particularly in basketball, where he instituted the fast break. His "fire-horse" type of play revolutionized the game and set the pace for today's high scoring games. His team gained national recognition as it began scoring over 100 points per game with consistency, and its trips to Madison Square Garden were the signal for some of the hottest contests ever to beset Manhattan.

In basketball, Keaney's record was 401 wins and 124 losses. In baseball it was 197 victories and 97 setbacks. In football it was 70 wins to 84 losses with 13 ties. His cross country record was marked with eight triumphs and not a loss and his track record was seven of eleven in the winner's circle. In all, his teams engaged in 1,006 contests.

The URI gymnasium named after him was dedicated Dec. 1, 1953.

Keaney attended Roberts Grammar School and Cambridge Latin School, both in Cambridge. He played on the Cambridge Latin football, basketball, and baseball teams. On weekends he indulged in gruelling cross-country runs, sandlot football or baseball, and swimming. He ran three miles a day.

He went to Bates College in 1911 and first taught in ungraded rooms for three years. On the Bates baseball team Keaney was known as "pepper box" with a .480 batting average and 38 stolen bases. After graduating he joined the Chicago White Sox of the American Baseball League, but within two weeks he was sent to the Des Moines minor league team and after a summer left professional ball. He could hit and run, but his arm was never strong enough for the big league, Keaney explained.

"But I got my fair chance at the big time," he said.

In 1914 he married Winifred McKee, a former classmate at Bates. Mrs. Keaney took charge of the URI's coed physical education program while her husband was setting records with the men's team.

In six years, the basketball Rams took four trips to the National Invitational Tournament and in their final tournament defeated a heavily favored Bowling Green team. A 55-foot shot by Ernie Calverley, present Ram hoop coach, sent the game into overtime. They topped Muhlenberg in the semi-finals and were eked out by Kentucky 46–45, in the finals.

Keaney collected old American glass and fine china, and had a cellar full of classical books in Greek and Latin which he read for relaxation.

Keaney never drove a car and one of his major complaints was aimed at students who had "automobile knees." He walked 12 miles a day and wore a meter to make sure he filled his quota. Alcohol and tobacco were definitely out.

He described his greatest thrill when his Rams came from behind, 26 to 8, to pull out ahead of Temple at Convention Hall in Philadelphia on January 31, 1941. "That was real fighting spirit," he said, "the kind I like my boys to show. I have no use for quitters and those lads proved they weren't."

Funeral services were held this afternoon at 2 p.m. at the Kingston Congregational Church with the Rev. John Hall, Episcopal chaplain to URI, officiating. Burial was in New Fernwood Cemetery, Kingston.

Honorary bearers were William Mokray, Marcus Greenstein, Dr. Carl Woodward, Paul Cieurzo, Hugo Mainelli, Jesse DeFrance, Thomas Doherty, Dr. Harold Browning, and Dr. A. A. Savastano. Active bearers were Robert Lepper, James D. Wright, Ernest Calverley, Louis Abruzzi, Robert Mudge, and William Rutledge.

[From the Providence Evening Bulletin, Oct. 10, 1967]

Frank Keaney, Former Coach at URI, Dies

Frank William Keaney, nationally famous for developing the fast break with his University of Rhode Island basketball teams, died yesterday at South County Hospital in Wakefield. He was 81 and had been ill since spring.

The apostle of "firehorse" play was a notable coach in baseball, football, basketball and track at URI, then Rhode Island State College, but his national reputation was made in basketball, where his record comprised 402 wins and 124 losses in 28 years.

His Ram teams went to the National Invitational Tournament in Madison Square Garden in 1941, 1942, 1945 and 1946. New York fans loved his run-and-shoot basketball. But the highlight of URI appearances there was the final tournament game in 1946 when the Rams lost to Kentucky by one point in a thriller.

That was the same tourney in which Ernie Calverley, now the URI basketball coach, fired the "shot heard around the world"—the ball traveling 55 feet to slip through the hoop and tie the game against Bowling Green as the buzzer sounded. The Rams won in overtime.

Mr. Keaney, who had been an athletic star at Bates College, was an unusual coach. He was a great innovator. This coupled with his fast-talking colorful manner made him a great favorite in sports circles throughout the nation.

His basketball teams reflected his personality, fast-moving and high-scoring with no time wasted. Mr. Keaney always felt that if you did more shooting and made more baskets, you were likely to win. He was credited with producing the first "point a minute" team.

He was the husband of Winifred (McKee) Keaney, whom he married in 1914. They made their home at 23 Beech Hill Rd., Peace Dale.

A son of the late Frank W. and Nellie (Cotter) Keaney, he was born in Boston June 5, 1886.

A Phi Beta Kappa at Bates, where he got his B.A. degree in 1911, Mr. Keaney taught at high schools in Putnam, Conn., Woonsocket and Everett, Mass., before he became the one-man physical education staff at then Rhode Island State College.

He retired from coaching in 1948 and became athletic director of URI. On June 30, 1956, he retired as professor emeritus of physical education.

The Frank W. Keaney Gymnasium was dedicated in his name on June 6, 1955.

The honors showered upon him were many. He was presented the award of the Boston Basketball Writers in 1952. That same year he was presented the Frank Lanning Annual Award by Words Unlimited.

He was the first man inducted into the URI Hall of Fame on Feb. 9, 1960. Shortly thereafter he was one of three coaches and seven players named to the Basketball Hall of Fame at Springfield College. Mr. Keaney also was inducted into the Rhode Island Heritage Hall of Fame on May 24, 1966.

He won the Walter Brown Memorial Trophy at the New England Basketball Writers annual dinner in Newton, Mass., on April 3 of this year. His son, Warner M. Keaney, accepted the prize on his behalf. Warner, a 265-pound giant, had played for his dad and handled the backboards the way the coach visualized the game should be played.

Warner lives in Wakefield and is football and baseball coach at South Kingstown High School.

Another son, Frank W. Keaney Jr., who lives in East Windsor, Conn., also played for the "grand old man" and has also been a coach.

The stories about Mr. Keaney were more numerous than the points his teams scored. He was an avid collector of glass spoon holders. Mr. Keaney scoured antique shops with the same zeal with which he fired his teams and collected about 600 holders.

He was so wrapped up in sports there were some things he never got around to do. Friends said he was too absent-minded and absorbed in other matters to learn how to drive a car.

Mr. Keaney taught chemistry at URI for many years. He coached football from 1920 to 1941 and baseball from 1921 to 1949.

In other sports, as well as basketball, he believed in mobility. His 1941 baseball team stole 58 bases.

When Mr. Keaney first turned to speed on the basketball court, his critics held little hope for the future of his style of play. But Mr. Keaney replied, "We don't say we're right, but you've got to stop us."

Once he told a group of coaches from all parts of the country at a New York luncheon: "Give the crowds action. If some coach puts up a screwy defense use a screwier offense. Then if you lose, pivot and go home."

An imaginative coach, Mr. Keaney prepared his teams for the New York garden by keeping smudge pots burning during practice sessions at Rodman Hall. It was to ready the Rams for cigarette smoke during the championship games.

Another of his tricks was having his players practice with smaller rims on the baskets. The practice rims measured 15 inches in diameter and were inserted inside the regular 18 inch hoops.

Mr. Keaney made a motion picture, "How Not to Play Basketball," that gained wide circulation. Hollywood later came to the Kingston campus and made a film entitled "Basketball Wizards" demonstrating the Keaney methods.

Upon his retirement, Dr. James P. Adams, chairman of the board of trustees, spoke of "his significant service to the university over a long span of years."

In addition to his sons, Mr. Keaney is survived by his wife, a sister, Mrs. Charles Plummer of Needham, Mass. and four grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held tomorrow at 2 p.m. at the Kingston Congregational Church. Burial will be in New Fernwood Cemetery, West Kingston.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BUTTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. SANDMAN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of personal matter.

Mr. ASPINALL, from October 23 to November 6, 1967, on account of official business.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. FALLON), for today, on acount of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By uanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MACGREGOR, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho), for 30 minutes, on October 24; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DORN and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUBSER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RIVERS.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. BRASCO in three instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11456. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 741. An act for the relief of Rumiko Samanski.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11456. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 20, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1169. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period January 1 to June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 79-520; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1170. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for judicial review of orders of the Commission and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee of Conference. H.R. 2508. An act to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 795). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 951. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 12601, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 relating to the registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 796). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 952. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 13510, a bill to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 797). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 953. Resolution for consideration of S. 1985, an act to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, to provide for a national program of flood insurance, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 798). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SIKES: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 13606. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 799). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 13584. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to establish the National Foundation of Law to promote improvement in the administration of justice in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 13585. A bill to amend section 103 of title 23, United States Code, to authorize additional mileage for the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 13586. A bill to raise additional revenue by tax reforms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 13587. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to further limit political activity on the part of workers in poverty programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 13588. A bill to establish a program for the voluntary certification of motor vehicle mechanics by the Secretary of Transportation; to assist the States in establishing programs for the compulsory licensing of motor vehicle mechanics; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 13589. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13590. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on honey and honey products and to impose import limitations on honey and honey products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13591. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. SISK, MR. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 13592. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 13593. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the number of congressional alternates authorized to be nominated for each vacancy at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 13594. A bill to provide criminal penalties for certain travel under a U.S. passport in violation of certain passport restrictions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13595. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13596. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 13597. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide pensions for children of Mexican War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 13598. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals; and for others purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13599. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H.R. 13600. A bill to prohibit federally insured banks from making unsolicited commitments to extend credit, and to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 13601. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to contract for the construction of certain parking facilities on federally owned property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida (for himself and Mr. BATES):

H.R. 13602. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 13603. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize comprehensive pilot programs in lake pollution prevention and control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 13604. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13605. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 13606. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DORN:

H.J. Res. 901. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.J. Res. 902. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.J. Res. 903. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 13607. A bill for the relief of James E. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13608. A bill for the relief of Stella Kostoglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 13609. A bill for the relief of Menashe Menashe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 13610. A bill for the relief of Janina Szmyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13611. A bill for the relief of Soo Pu Hwang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13612. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Badala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13613. A bill for the relief of Vito Conigliaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 13614. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gustavo Leon-Lemus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13615. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raul Agustin Pereira-Valdes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

185. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Gardena, Calif., relative to enactment of S. 1306; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

186. Also, petition of the city of San Jose, Calif., relative to Governmental tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by Hon. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who dwellest, not in temples made by hands, but in reverent hearts of those who truly seek Thee—with the refreshing dew of Thy strengthening grace upon us, may we go forth on our way, attended by the vision splendid, as we lift up our hearts with the grateful te deum, "He restoreth my soul."

With Thy benediction, may we face the toil of this day with honest dealing and clear thinking, with hatred of all hypocrisy, deceit, and sham, in the knowledge that all great and noble service in this world is based on gentleness and patience and truth.

Let us put into the fugitive fragments of every day such quality of work as shall make us unashamed when the day is over and all the days are done.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MONTOYA thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 18, 1967, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 985) for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 445) for the relief of Rosemarie Gauch Neth, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1108) for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol and wife, Lucia J. Caballol, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 43. An act for the relief of Mi Soon Oh;

S. 63. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Alberto Rojas-Vila;

S. 64. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Osvalo Martinez-Farinas;

S. 221. An act for the relief of Dr. Armando Perez Simon;

S. 440. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Alejandro Solano;

S. 733. An act for the relief of Sabiene Elizabeth DeVore;

S. 741. An act for the relief of Rumiko Samanski;

S. 821. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Domingo Hernandez;

S. 975. An act for the relief of Mitsuo Blomstrom;

S. 1021. An act for the relief of Antonio Luis Navarro;

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Dr. David Castaneda;

S. 1110. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel Alpendre Seisdedos;

S. 1197. An act for the relief of Dr. Lucio Arsenio Travieso y Perez;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of Dr. Gonzalo Rodriquez;

S. 1279. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco Montes;

S. 1280. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Pereira;

S. 1458. An act for the relief of Lee Duk Hee;

S. 1471. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugo Gonzalez;

S. 1482. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernesto Nestor Prieto;

S. 1525. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario R. Garcini;

S.1557. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos E. Garciga;

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria del Carmen Trabadelo de Arias;

S. 1678. An act for the relief of American Petrofina Co. of Texas, a Delaware corporation, and James W. Harris;

S. 1709. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Martin Ruiz del Castillo;

S. 1748. An act for the relief of Dr. Ramiro de la Riva Dominguez;

S. 1938. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando Hipolito Maytin;

H.R. 11456. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution extending the time for filing report of Commission on Urban Problems.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968 and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 18, 1967, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of K. Edwin Applegate, of Bloomington, Ind., to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Indiana, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of seven flag officers, and ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Vice Adm. Charles B. Martell, and Vice Adm. Charles E. Weakley, U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral;

Rear Adm. Paul Masterton, and Rear Adm. Turner F. Caldwell, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving;

Vice Adm. John J. Hyland, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving;

Rear Adm. William F. Bringle, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving; and

Adm. Roy L. Johnson, U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade of admiral.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably promotions and appointments of 815 officers in the Navy in the grade of captain and below and 50 appointments in the Marine Corps in the grade of major and below; also 1249 promotions to 1st lieutenant in the Army. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

James E. Allen, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the U.S. Navy;

Peter E. Benet, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps; and

Robert B. Aasen, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jerry S. Williams, of Texas, to be Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 626 and the succeeding measures in sequence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 878) to amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange property which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 481(c)), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In acquiring personal property, any executive agency, under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator of General

Services, may exchange or sell similar items and may apply the exchange allowance or proceeds of sale in such cases in whole or in part payment of the property acquired. Before any such exchange or sale is made, such property shall be offered for utilization by Federal agencies under section 202(a) of this Act and if not transferred under that section such property thereafter shall be made available for at least thirty days for donation under section 203(j) of this Act, except that in the discretion of the Administrator passenger carrying vehicles in motor pools of the General Services Administration, and automatic data processing equipment and systems may be sold or exchanged without making such vehicles, equipment, or systems available for donation under section 203(j) of this Act. Any exchange or sale transaction carried out under the authority of this subsection shall be evidenced in writing."

(b) The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the third month beginning after the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 642), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 878, as amended, is to require that before property can be disposed of by exchange or sale under section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, it be made available (1) for transfer to other Federal agencies, and (2) for donation for health, education, or civil defense purposes. The bill would continue agency authority to exchange or sell equipment, machinery, fixtures and other items of personal property and apply the proceeds of sale or exchange against the purchase of new equipment. The amended bill would also continue existing statutory requirements that items sold or exchanged be similar to the ones procured and that each transaction be evidenced in writing. As originally introduced, S. 878 would have required the agencies to submit detailed reports to the Committees on Government Operations of all property exchanged or sold. This reporting provision was deemed too burdensome by the General Services Administration and thus it has been deleted from the substitute bill.

To protect the financial integrity of the Government-wide motor vehicle pools, and to provide a more flexible method for the disposal of automatic data processing equipment and systems, the bill, as amended, would give the Administrator of General Services discretionary authority over the disposal of passenger-carrying vehicles in motor pools operated by the GSA, and the disposal of automatic data processing equipment and systems maintained and operated by that agency.

BACKGROUND AND USE OF SECTION 201(C)

S. 878, as amended, would establish by law a procedure for handling property in the exchange/sales category similar to the method followed by the Department of Defense until this year.

Except for the special provision for the disposal of passenger-carrying vehicles and automatic data processing equipment, the substitute bill is identical to S. 2610 which was unanimously approved by the committee and passed the Senate on July 11, 1966.

Section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 authorizes agencies to exchange or sell personal property and apply the trade-in allowance or proceeds of sale for property acquired as follows:

"In acquiring personal property, an executive agency, under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, may exchange or sell similar items and may apply the exchange allowance or proceeds of sale in such cases in whole or in part payment for the property acquired: *Provided*, That any transaction carried out under the authority of this subsection shall be evidenced in writing."

This part of the Property Act was designed to supersede 21 statutes or provisions of laws which were repealed by section 602 of the act. The original statutes authorized the heads of some of the departments and agencies to trade in used equipment and apply the trade-in allowance against the price of the new equipment. Those statutes were enacted during the period 1912–41 at which time it was common practice to trade in motor vehicles, typewriters, adding machines, and other office equipment and apply the allowance against the cost of new equipment.

Initially this authority was limited to a few items; however, during the postwar period the number of items that could be exchanged or sold, and the proceeds applied to new procurement, steadily increased throughout the Federal service.

During the past few years the committee has received a number of communications from representatives of the State agencies for surplus property, and other local officials, complaining about the sale of Government property which is usable and needed for educational purposes. Most of these complaints have centered around the growing tendency of the Government to sell more and more property under section 201(c) which, in turn, diminishes both the quality and quantity of property available for donation to the States authorized by section 203 of the Property Act.

The State agencies for surplus property are responsible for locating, screening, warehousing, and distributing surplus property for donation to schools, colleges, and medical institutions, and are, therefore, vitally concerned with the operation of the Government's surplus property program. These local officials further contend that section 201(c) is not being used with discretion, as intended, but as a means of augmenting the annual appropriations of Federal agencies.

There is obviously a close relationship between the exchange/sales program and the property donation program, in that as more property is turned in for new equipment, less property becomes surplus and thus available for donation purposes.

Section 203(j) of the Property Act permits the Administrator of General Services discretionary authority in the donation of surplus personal property as follows:

"Under such regulation as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion, to donate without cost (except for costs of care and handling) for use in any State for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose, any equipment, materials. books, or other supplies (including those capitalized in a working capital or similar fund) under the control of any executive agency which shall have been determined to be surplus property and which shall have been determined under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection to be usable and necessary for any such purpose."

The donation of surplus personal property to schools, colleges, and other educational institutions has contributed much to improve the skill and knowledge of students and adults on a national level with very little cost to the Government.

HEARINGS

No specific hearings were held on S. 878. However, the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures held extensive hearings on a number of related bills during the first session of the 89th Congress. The hearings revealed that an increasing amount of Government property is being sold to the public, or traded in under the exchange sales provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, with the result that a great deal of property is diverted from the regular channels of disposal to health, education, and civil defense activities. This bill emanated from those hearings and is intended to reassert and clarify congressional policy with regard to the disposal of unneeded personal property.

The committee noted that section 201(c) of the Property Act has been used as the legal authority for selling Government property under a spot bid, or the open competitive bid method for moving property out of the supply system. The legislative history and background of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act does not support this interpretation of the law. Selling property under this authority further reduces the volume of surplus property which would otherwise be available to schools and colleges through the donation program.

Many of the items currently being sold under section 201(c) could be used in the classrooms, laboratories, and vocational schools but can be obtained now only by such schools by bidding against the surplus property dealers. Some of the items offered for sale under the exchange/sale procedure consist of cafeteria equipment, battery charges, gasoline pumps, aircraft jacks, machine tools, household ranges, sterilizers, conveyors, bathroom fixtures, drinking fountains, sinks, and hand drills which are seldom, if ever, exchanged by private concerns.

Officials of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property testified that the sale of property under section 201(c) denies the schools and colleges of much needed property, and noted that some of the school administrators are at a loss to understand why the Government was selling the same property which the schools and colleges need.

The president of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property testified in part as follows:

"Our association has become greatly alarmed through the past few years at the amount of property being sold through the provisions of section 201(c). All agencies of the Federal Government have been using this provision with the exception of the Department of Defense whose regulations issued on August 7, 1962, permit exchange/sale of property only after it has been made available for further Federal utilization and donation.

"Within the past month we have learned the Department of Defense has circulated a proposed revision to these regulations whereby the 69 categories of property eligible for exchange/sale will no longer be made available for donation and further Federal utilization, outside of the Department of Defense, will be possible only on a reimbursable basis.

"Since the implementation of exchange/sale by civilian agencies, the great majority of property received by our eligible donees has been generated by the Department of Defense. The proposed revision by DOD, therefore, would deny the schools, hospitals, and civil defense organizations most of the property they have been receiving. The 69 categories involved in the provision include nearly all classes of equipment and supplies most vitally required by the donees. We sincerely believe the implementation by DOD, and the continued use of exchange/sale by the civilian agencies will result in the termination of the donation program as authorized under section 203(j) of the act."

On March 26, 1966, the Administrator of General Services issued a revision to the

Federal Property Management Regulations, which became effective on July 1, 1966. Under these regulations GSA discontinued the practice of soliciting trade-in bids or proposals from manufacturers when it begins negotiating for the purchase of new motor vehicles. Instead, the GSA now sells its used vehicles and uses the proceeds to help pay for the new vehicles. Part 101-46 of the GSA personal property regulations were also revised to reduce from 69 to 41 the number of items which may be exchanged or sold by Federal departments and agencies under sec. 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

After GSA issued its new regulations the Department of Defense revised its procedures to conform with the GSA. In view of the vast amount of property within the Department of Defense and its prior practice of offering exchange/sale property for donation before disposal, this change in DOD policy will have an adverse effect on the property donation program. It has been contended by the State agencies that if DOD is allowed to pursue the practice of exchanging or selling property before screening for donation purposes it will cripple the donation program.

In view of this contention, the chairman on August 30, 1966, wrote the Secretary of Defense, pointing out the effect this change in procedures would have on the donation program, and requested the Secretary to delay implementing the GSA regulations until the end of the 89th Congress, or until the Congress had an opportunity to consider the bill (S. 2610) which had then passed the Senate and was pending in the House of Representatives. The Secretary responded on September 22, 1966, and reported that DOD had revised its personal property regulations to conform with the new procedures promulgated by the GSA. He further indicated that of the total amount of property generated by DOD last year, a very small amount could be classified under the exchange/sale category. The Secretary assured the committee that the new regulations would not impair the donation program, and agreed to withhold implementation of any other changes in the disposal procedures until the end of the 89th Congress.

The House of Representatives failed to act on S. 2610. In February 1967, Senator John L. McClellan introduced S. 878 and requested the Department of Defense to submit its views and recommendations thereon for early consideration. By letter dated June 7, 1967, Mr. Paul C. Warnke, General Counsel of the Department of Defense, submitted the following reply:

"In connection with the cost reduction program currently underway within the executive branch, and our continuing, overall efforts to curtail Defense expenditures wherever possible, the Department of Defense *exchange/sale policy has been reevaluated recently* as one of many areas where additional potential economies are believed to exist. Accordingly, it has been determined prudent for the Department of Defense *to discontinue the offering of exchange/sale personal property to other Federal agencies and eligible donees* prior to attempting the recoupment of funds or the establishment of credit by use of the exchange/sale authority." [Emphasis supplied.]

Thus DOD property formerly made available for use by other Federal agencies and eligible donees, is now being diverted from these channels of disposal. If the trend is allowed to continue, the donation program for health, education, and civil defense will be destroyed.

The committee has been informed by representatives of the GSA and other Government officials that the volume of property available for donation by the State agencies has been decreasing continuously during the past year, and this downward trend is expected to continue in the future.

The committee is convinced that the original intent of section 201(c) authorizing limited sale or exchange of property was sound but that so much property is now being sold under its provisions that the effectiveness of the surplus property donation program is being seriously diluted.

The Congress has repeatedly endorsed and supported the donation program, which has contributed much to the health, education, and civil defense of the State and local communities, and this committee does not intend to have the program crippled by administrative action.

NESTOR S. CUETO

The bill (S. 2072) for the relief of Nestor S. Cueto was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2072

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nestor S. Cueto shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 26, 1960.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 643), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. EDUARDO CAMPUZANO

The bill (S. 2091) for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Campuzano was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2091

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Eduardo Campuzano shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 11, 1960.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 644), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. PEDRO PINA Y GIL

The bill (S. 2168) for the relief of Dr. Pedro Pina y Gil was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2168

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Pedro Pina y Gil shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 28, 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 645), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. JUAN EMILIO CAIGNET Y CRESPO

The bill (S. 2175) for the relief of Dr. Juan Emilio Caignet y Crespo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2175

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Juan Emilio Caignet y Crespo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 30, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 646), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ENRIQUE JOSE SUAREZ DIAZ

The bill (S. 2191) for the relief of Dr. Enrique Jose Suarez Diaz was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2191

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Enrique Jose Suarez Diaz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 7, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 647), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ALFREDO JESUS GONZALEZ

The bill (S. 2193) for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Jesus Gonzalez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2193

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Alfredo Jesus Gonzalez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 12, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 648), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt as ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. MARGARITA LORIGADOS

The bill (S. 2256) for the relief of Dr. Margarita Lorigados was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2256

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Margarita Lorigados shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 10, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 649), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

GORDON SHIH GUM LEE

The bill (S. 2285) for the relief of Gordon Shih Gum Lee was considered, ordered to be engrosesd for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2285

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gordon Shih Gum Lee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 19, 1953, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 650), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States as of June 19, 1953, thus enabling him to file a petition for naturalization. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

LIM AI RAN AND LIM SOO RAN

The bill (H.R. 1948) for the relief of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 651), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States of two alien orphan children to be adopted by citizens of the United States who have previously filed the maximum number of petitions which may be approved for one petitioner.

ANGELIQUE KOUSOULAS

The bill (H.R. 1960) for the relief of Angelique Kousoulas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 652), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in an immediate relative status of the minor child adopted by citizens of the United States.

YOO YOUNG HUI AND OK YOUNG

The bill (H.R. 2464) for the relief of Yoo Young Hui, and her daughter, Ok Young was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 653), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Yoo Young Hui and her daughter, Ok Young, to enter the United States so that the adult beneficiary may marry her U.S. citizen fiance.

YONG OK ESPANTOSO

The bill (H.R. 2978) for the relief of Yong Ok Espantoso was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 654), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to preserve immediate relative status in behalf of the widow of a U.S. citizen member of our Armed Forces.

YIM MEI LAM

The bill (H.R. 3430) for the relief of Yim Mei Lam was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 655), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of the minor child adopted by citizens of the United States.

RAMIRO VELASQUEZ HUERTA

The bill (H.R. 3497) for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 656), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to an alien who has assisted other aliens to enter the United States in violation of the law in behalf of the husband of a citizen of the United States.

MARY BERNADETTE LINEHAN

The bill (H.R. 4534) for the relief of Mary Bernadette Linehan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 657), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide that the U.S. citizen father of Mary Bernadette Linehan shall have resided in the United States for a sufficient period of time after the age of 14 years in order to transmit U.S. citizenship to her under the provisions of section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

ROBERTO MARTIN DEL CAMPO

The bill (H.R. 5216) for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 658), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to an alien who has assisted other aliens to enter the United States in violation of the law in behalf of Roberto Martin Del Campo.

GUISEPPE PACINO BIANCAROSSO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 866) for the relief of Guiseppe Pacino Biancarosso which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guiseppe Pacino Biancarosso may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of such Act, and a petition may be filed in his behalf by Olga Biancarosso Carmeci, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of such Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read for the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 659), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of the adopted son of a citizen of the United States. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

FRANCISCO RENIGIO FABRE SOLINO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 872) for the relief of Francisco Renigio Fabre Solino which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "of" strike out "April 13, 1960" and insert "November 5, 1960"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Francisco Renigio Fabre Solino (Frank R. S. Fabre) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 5, 1960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 660), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended to reflect the date upon which he was last admitted as a visitor.

DEMETRA LANI ANGELOPOULOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1129) for the relief of Demetra Lani Angelopoulos which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 8, after the word "Act" strike out "subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 1129

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Demetra Lani Angelopoulos may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. Constantine Angelopoulos, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 661), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of the adopted daughter of a citizen of the United States. The amendment is technical in nature.

ANA JACALNE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1180) for the relief of Ana Jacalne which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, at the beginning of line 7, strike out "Steven Jacalne, a citizen" and insert "Mr. and Mrs. Steven Jacalne, citizens"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ana Jacalne may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of such Act, and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Ana Jacalne by Mr. and Mrs. Steven Jacalne, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of such Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 662), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of the adopted daughter of a citizen of the United States. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

DR. SAMAD MOMTAZEE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1327) for the relief of Dr. Samad Momtazee which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after word "of" where it appears the first time, strike out "June 1962, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available." and insert "July 4, 1962"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 1327

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Samad Momtazee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 4, 1962.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 663), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

JOSE D. NEUGART

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2120) for the relief of Jose D. Neugart which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 6, after the word "of" strike out "November 6, 1960" and insert "November 5, 1960"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2120

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose D. Neugart shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 5, 1960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 664), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. This bill has been amended to reflect the proper date upon which the beneficiary first entered the United States.

DR. JOSE FUENTES ROCA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2248) for the relief of Dr. Jose Fuentes Roca which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "of" strike out "August 5, 1961" and insert "September 5, 1961"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2248

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Jose Fuentes Roca shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 5, 1961.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 665), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended to reflect the proper date upon which he entered the United States.

CITA RITA LEOLA INES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 107) for the relief of Cita Rita Leola Ines which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 3, after the word "sections" strike out "101(a)(27)(A)" and insert "203(a)(2)"; and in line 7 after the word "States" strike out the period, insert a colon and "*Provided,* That no natural parent or step-parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."; so as to make the bill read:

S. 107

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of sections 203(a)(2) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cita Rita Leola Ines shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Carolina Ines Campomanes, a lawful permanent resident of the United States: *Provided,* That no natural parent or step-parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 666), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to qualify for second preference status as the unmarried daughter of a permanent resident of the United States. The bill has been amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations.

COPYRIGHT PROTECTION

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 114) extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. Res. 114

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in any case in which the renewal term of copyright subsisting in any work on the date of approval of this resolution, or the term thereof as extended by Public Law 87–668, or by Public Law 89–142 (or by either or both of said laws), would expire prior to December 31, 1968, such term is hereby continued until December 31, 1968.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 667), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this legislation is to continue until December 31, 1968, the renewal term of any copyright subsisting on the date of approval of this resolution, or the term as extended by Public Law 87–668 or by Public Law 89–442 (or by either or both of said laws) where such term would otherwise expire prior to December 31, 1968. The joint resolution would provide an interim extension of the renewal term of copyrights pending the enactment by the Congress of a general revision of the copyright laws, including a proposed increase in the length of the copyright term. This resolution would be the third such interim extension of copyright. The second extension (Public Law 89–142) will expire on December 31, 1967.

This legislation merely provides for the prolongation of the renewal term of copyright and does not involve creation of a new term of copyright.

STATEMENT

This legislation arises from a study of the U.S. copyright system authorized by the Congress in 1955. After extensive preparatory work, copyright revision bills were introduced in both Houses during the 88th Congress and again in the 89th Congress. In the latter Congress, hearings were commenced on this legislation. At the start of the current Congress, copyright revision bills (S. 597 and H.R. 2512) were again introduced. The House of Representatives on April 11, 1967, passed an amended version of H.R. 2512. This committee's Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights has held 17 days of hearings on copyright law revision. These hearings were concluded earlier in this session. Both the bill passed by the House of Representatives and S. 597 would increase the copyright term of new works from 28 years, renewable for a second period of 28 years, to a term for the life of the author and for 50 years thereafter. They also provide for a substantial extension of the term of subsisting copyrights.

Because of difficulties which have arisen concerning certain provisions of the revision bill (not relating to the increase in copyright term), it is apparent that action on the revision bill cannot be completed before the expiration on December 31, 1967, of the temporary extension of copyright term. In these circumstances, it seems desirable that the terms of expiring copyrights should be extended so that the copyright holders may enjoy the benefit of any increase in term that may be enacted by the Congress. It is the view of the committee that the same considerations that led to the enactment of Public Law 87–668 and Public Law 89–142 warrant the approval of this joint resolution.

After a study of the joint resolution, the committee recommends that the legislation be favorably considered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with H.R. 2516, the so-called civil rights bill, the Senate on August 25, 1967, ordered that the bill be returned to the Committee on the Judiciary with a direction that it be reported to the Senate within 60 days.

The committee met on yesterday and took action on a motion which provides that on Wednesday next, the committee will consider this bill at 10 o'clock; that the committee will proceed to vote at 11, and that it will continue to vote until it has finally disposed of the bill at or before 5 o'clock on Wednesday next.

That motion also contains a provision that the committee rule which entitles a member to have a bill go over for a week be set aside, and it also contains a provision that the bill not be physically reported to the calendar until the following Monday, to enable the committee staff and individual members to prepare reports to accompany the bill.

Now, in order to do that, it will go beyond October 24. I ask unanimous consent that the order entered by the Senate on August 25, 1967, be modified to direct that on October 30, the bill be reported in conformity with the Senate request and direction.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JACKSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the time allotted to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], be recognized for up to 20 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Office of the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 17 OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act as amended to provide for judicial review of orders of the Commission, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITION

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Newport Beach, Calif., favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. **JORDAN** of North Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 2068. A bill to repeal certain acts relating to containers for fruits and vegetables; exportations of tobacco plants and seed; naval stores; and wool; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 668).

By Mr. **HOLLAND**, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 2179. A bill to extend for 3 years the special milk programs for the Armed Forces and veterans hospitals (Rept. No. 669).

By Mrs. **SMITH**, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 108. A bill to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the State of Maine (Rept. No. 670).

By Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif. (Rept. No. 671).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **RIBICOFF** (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 2557. A bill to establish within the Department of Justice a Division for Investigation of Missing Persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. RIBICOFF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **MORSE**:

S. 2558. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte V. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **HOLLAND**:

S. 2559. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael Luis Bejar Arias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **RIBICOFF**:

S. 2560. A bill to provide for orderly trade in stainless steel table flatware; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION

AMENDMENT OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. **CLARK** submitted a resolution (S. Res. 179) amending the Standing Rules of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF A DIVISION FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF MISSING PERSONS

Mr. **RIBICOFF.** Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to establish within the Department of Justice, a Division for the Investigation of Missing Persons. The division would, upon request of the police of a community, county, or State, conduct investigations for the purpose of locating any person missing for 72 hours or longer, or missing under circumstances which give rise to the belief that such person may be victim of a criminal offense.

Mr. President, each year approximately a quarter million people in the United States disappear. Approximately 95 percent of these people reappear or are found, but there are an estimated 5,000 to 10,000 persons per year who disappear permanently. Some of these people intend to disappear and this, taken alone, is not a criminal offense. But often there are serious and tragic consequences which result when a person drops out of sight. Relatives spend great effort, time, and expense to determine whether the person has been injured or kidnaped, or is dead. In the case of one of my constituents, over 2 months elapsed before his college-age son was found dead, and the family's long agony will never be forgotten by those who know them.

A great many difficulties beset any attempt to organize and sustain a search for a missing person. When someone disappears in the United States, he vanishes into any one of 50 States and thousands of communities, each of which has its own separate police force. There is no focal point or clearinghouse to which citizens and policemen may turn for information or reports on missing persons. Nor is there any such bureau to which policemen can send descriptions of persons whom they suspect might be missing from some other unidentified community. The missing persons problem is instead handled by an unsystematic, informal, and often ineffective exchange of information.

Where no Federal laws appear to have been violated, the FBI does not have jurisdiction and thus cannot enter actively into investigative efforts. Thus the local police in a great many cases have no one to whom they can refer cases, and their own staff capabilities are usually limited. Nor is it difficult to understand why local police, overburdened as they often are, tend sometimes not to move very quickly in search of missing persons—since so many reappear of their own accord. Except for the dramatic search posse which sometimes comb an area for lost children, organized systematic location efforts directed by local police are rarely undertaken.

What I hope we can accomplish here is the creation of a highly skilled, resourceful investigative group with an excellent and coordinated data-exchange and communications system. Upon request of local police, the agency established under this bill would assist in investigation and in exchange of information across the Nation. It would fill the quite considerable gap which now exists between the point at which local police usually reach the limits of their authority and competence, and the narrowly defined group of cases which the FBI may enter—those in which there is some evidence of kidnaping, or those in which foul play is suspected, both of which call for FBI involvement after 24 hours.

There is a need for a centralized and computerized national center where information on missing persons is readily available for local police departments throughout the Nation.

Consider, for example, the missing persons problem created by the growing number of misguided youngsters who run away from home to live as "hippies."

The East Village in New York and Haight-Ashbury district in San Francisco have become meccas for hippies and other youthful dropouts from society.

The New York Police Department and the San Francisco Police Department each receive hundreds of missing persons reports a week from distraught parents all over America who suspect their missing children are living in the "hippie" havens.

In New York City alone, some 11,000 persons were reported missing in the city last year. Eighty-five percent of these were youths under 18.

But the East Village and Haight-Ashbury, while the best known, are actually only two of many areas in the larger cities where youngsters congregate.

Teenagers adrift, away from home and with no visible means of support are picked up by police not only in New York and San Francisco, but in cities all over the Nation.

And, chances are, somewhere in America a parent has filed a missing persons report on every one of these youngsters.

A computerized records system at the Justice Department would be an important aid for local policemen as they search for these youngsters.

It would also assist police in quickly identifying those youngsters they pick up or detain.

Finally, it would be some consolation, however small, to the parents of missing children. These parents would at least know that the very best and most efficient communications network is at work on their behalf in finding their children.

Mr. President, I ask that this bill be given careful consideration by the appropriate committee so that some means may be developed to deal with this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 2557) to establish within the Department of Justice a Division for Investigation of Missing Persons, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Ribicoff, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2557

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established within the Department of Justice a Division for Investigation of Missing Persons. Such Division shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for officers of Level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The Director shall discharge his duties under the supervision and direction of the Attorney General.

(b) The principal office of the Division shall be situated within the District of Columbia. The Director shall establish such other offices of the Division as he shall determine to be required for the performance of its duties. Subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, the Director may appoint and fix the compensation of such other personnel of the Division as he may determine to be required for the performance of its duties.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of the division to—

(1) conduct appropriate investigation, upon request duly made by any police or investigative organization of any State, any political subdivision of a State, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, for the purpose of locating any person who is reported by any such organization to have been missing for 72 hours or longer or to be missing under circumstances which give rise to belief that such person may be the victim of a criminal offense;

(2) transmit appropriate reports of the results of any such investigation to the organization which requested that such investigation be made; and

(3) in the case of any investigation so requested in aid of actual or prospective civil or criminal proceedings against the missing person sought, furnish to such organization all evidence obtained by the Division in the course of its investigation which is pertinent to such proceedings.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I just heard the Senator from Connecticut explain his bill to establish within the Department of Justice a division for the investigation of missing persons. The bill seems most appropriate and timely.

I ask unanimous consent that my name may be listed as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS TO MEDICAID

AMENDMENTS NOS. 411 AND 412

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, two amendments to H.R. 12080, the omnibus social security welfare bill now pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

These documents relate to title XIX, medicaid. Their purpose is to lower the enormous costs of that beneficial program without injuring the millions of Americans who are deservedly aided by it. They will help to alleviate two of the most serious problems that have arisen with medicaid, particularly in my State of New York.

The first contemplates variations in the income levels of eligibility within a State based on differences in shelter costs within a State. Studies have shown that shelter costs are the most significant variable in the cost of living as between urban and rural areas. The cost of rent and home purchase in rural areas is far less than in the cities. An income of $5,000 a year therefore buys far more in rural areas than it does in the city. As a result, there is no real need that eligibility levels for medicaid be as high in the rural areas of New York State as they are in its large cities, and my amendment would require the States to take variations in shelter costs into account when they determine eligibility levels. I believe this is an important and constructive step forward, and would help us significantly in the State of New York.

This amendment would alleviate what has become a near-crisis situation in New York State. In some of our rural counties 75 to 80 percent of the population is eligible for medicaid under the income eligibility levels which the State established. In these counties, welfare costs have skyrocketed over the past 18 months. Increases of 50 and 60 percent in the cost of welfare are common, and 90 percent or more of the increases are due to the cost of medicaid. One county executive wrote to me that welfare costs in his county are up almost 60 percent—over $8 million—in just 1 year. He pointed out that this will cause local taxes to double in short order, with the prospect ahead in the near future of a tax rate triple the current level. Many counties have been forced to borrow to meet the obligations which medicaid has imposed.

It is no accident that the counties which have faced these difficulties are, by and large, counties where living costs, and particularly shelter costs, are lower than they are in some of the most heavily urban areas. The fact is, consequently, that in these areas medicaid is available to some who simply do not need it. Not surprisingly, these are the areas in which the greatest opposition to the program has been expressed. Under my amendment, the State would objectively determine differences in shelter costs around the State, and would accordingly establish differences in eligibility levels. The result would be decreases of as much as 20 percent in eligibility levels in some of the counties which are the hardest pressed at the present time. A further result would be that medicaid would come closer to being a program which in fact serves only those who need it.

The second amendment would allow far more stringent regulation of the costs of hospital care and physician services than exists at the present time. Medical costs have risen greatly in the past year and a half, and it is no accident that this has occurred since medicare and medicaid have been in effect. Many of these costs are unavoidable, of course, as nurses and other personnel finally begin to receive a living wage for their work. And the costs of materials and supplies have risen. But in some areas of our country, unfortunately, there are some physicians who and some institutions which have literally reaped bonanzas from these programs. A newspaper report recently, for example, indicated that in California 1,200 physicians have received $83 million in the last 18 months in reimbursement under medi-Cal, that State's title XIX program, an average of $70,000 for each physician.

In New York State, the physicians' fees paid under medicaid have increased substantially over the past year. Fees for office visits to general practitioners and specialists have more than doubled. If these fees, as well as the reimbursement to hospitals and nursing homes, were regulated under my amendment, the fiscal pinch which many counties in New York have felt as a result of medicaid would be substantially alleviated.

The amendment would operate as follows: for inpatient care, it would limit payments to hospitals and nursing homes to the amount paid for comparable services by either the Blue Cross Plan in the area or title XVIII, whichever is less. At the same time, it would provide incentive payments for the efficient operation of hospitals and nursing homes based upon their demonstrated ability to develop new management procedures and discharge patients promptly. For outpatient care, the amendment directs that an outpatient visit be defined and that it must include seeing a physician, and it limits payments to a hospital for an outpatient visit to a ceiling of 18 percent of the per diem payment for inpatient care. For payments for the services of physicians and other professionals, the amendment directs that fee schedules shall be based upon the average level of fees charged in the county or metropolitan area over the 10 years previous to the adoption of the plan. The amendment would allow the development of special reimbursement methods for group practice plans.

These are by no means the only problems which beset medicaid. Medicaid was a program with great promise. Its purpose was to make medical care available to millions of Americans for whom routine medical attention was previously an unattainable luxury and catastrophic illness a bankrupting disaster. Yet in New York State, and here in Congress, it is apparent that public confidence in the program has been badly shaken. I believe that adoption of the two amendments I have proposed today would help to restore that shaken confidence, but I think other steps need to be taken as well. I therefore call on Governor Rockefeller to establish a blue-ribbon commission composed of medical experts, fiscal experts, Government officials, consumers of the medical care which medicaid provides, and other relevant persons, to look into all of the issues which have been raised and to make recommendations for the future. The commission could investigate all of the components of the cost of medicaid—the extent to which the surprisingly high cost of the program is a result of abuse by individual physicians and other professionals and by inefficient hospitals and nursing homes which have had no incentive to reduce management and administrative costs, and the justification for the suddenly increased fee schedules for services of physicians and other professionals that are now in effect around the State. The commission could look into the fiscal burdens on local government around the State and recommend steps to ease those budens. Governor Rockefeller has already stated that he will ask the legislature to act to have the State take over some or all of the local share of the costs, and I support that proposal.

The commission could also look into the quality of care which is being provided under medicaid around the State, and make recommendations for new laws and new procedures to assure that the quality of care is maintained at the highest level possible. The commission, in summary, would determine just what the taxpayer's dollar is buying with medicaid, and could take us a long way toward understanding what new forms of delivering health services must be developed and how we are going to develop them if the provision of health care to those of our citizens who need it is not going to bankrupt us.

There is one other matter of importance at the Federal level. The House of Representatives imposed a limitation on Federal participation in programs under title XIX which is wholly unreasonable and unworkable. It will be an unwarranted intrusion in New York State, but it will be nothing short of disastrous elsewhere. The 150-percent ceiling which the administration originally proposed earlier this year was based on each State's public assistance definition of minimum need. The 133-percent provision in the House bill is based on the amount which the State actually pays to its public assistance recipients, which in many cases is a vastly smaller amount that its definition of minimum need. The original intention of title XIX was that medical indigency be defined at a level substantially in excess of a State's public assistance definition of minimum need. The House bill will in many States have the opposite effect, and is therefore totally unrealistic.

For example, Mississippi, according to HEW figures, was paying 22.8 percent of minimum need to its ADC children in January of this year. When the 133⅓-percent limitation in the House bill goes into effect, the ceiling for medical assistance in Mississippi will be approximately 30 percent of its own definition of minimum need. The State of Ohio is another good example. In January 1966 its definition of minimum need was $224 a month for a family of four. However, the ADC payments were actually $170 a month for a family of that size. When the 133⅓-percent limitation goes into effect, the ceiling on medical assistance for a family of four in Ohio will, therefore, be approximately $227 a month—an unacceptably low figure.

What is really involved even in the 150-percent limitation originally proposed is a failure of insight about the connection between ill health and dependency, a failure to realize that the provision of adequate health care to the poor depends upon an infusion of funds of the magnitude which title XIX as originally enacted was intended to supply. Thus, if we cut into title XIX, we cut into the possibilities of better health care for the poor.

Nevertheless, I think we must realistically face up to the fact that some ceiling is likely to be imposed. If the bill as it emerges from the Senate Finance Committee contains a ceiling lower than what the administration proposed, I intend to join Senator Javits in seeking on the Senate floor to raise the ceiling to the 150-percent level. That is the least we can do.

Medicaid, as I have said, was a program of great promise. It was a new hope for millions of Americans to receive health services never before available to them. That hope has now been tarnished. I believe, however, that if the amendments I propose are enacted, we will have taken the first steps toward instituting the kind of regulation that can make medicaid a viable program for the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the Record.

The amendments (Nos. 411 and 412) submitted by Mr. Kennedy of New York, were referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Amendment No. 411

On page 160, insert the following between lines 6 and 7:

"DIFFERENCES IN STANDARDS WITH RESPECT TO INCOME ELIGIBILITY UNDER TITLE XIX

"Sec. 232. Effective July 1, 1969, section 1902(a)(17) of the Social Security Act is amended by—

"(a) striking out '(17)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(17) (A)';

"(b) redesignating clauses (A), (B), (C), and (D) as clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively;

"(c) striking out '; and provide' and inserting in lieu thereof ', and (B) provide';

"(d) striking out 'income by' and inserting in lieu thereof 'income (i) by'; and

"(e) adding at the end thereof before the semicolon the following: ', and (ii) by establishing, in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary, differences in income levels (but only in the case of applicants or recipients of assistance under the plan who are not receiving aid or assistance under the State's plan approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI, or part A of title IV) which take into account the variations in shelter costs as between such costs in urban areas and such costs in rural areas'."

Amendment No. 412

On page 160, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"UTILIZATION OF AND REASONABLE CHANGES FOR CARE AND SERVICES FURNISHED UNDER TITLE XIX

"Sec. 233. (a) Effective April 1, 1968, section 1902(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (25) (added by section 229 of this Act) the following new paragraphs:

"'(26) provide such methods and procedures relating to the utilization of care and services available under the plan as may be necessary to safeguard against unnecessary utilization of such care and services;

"'(27) provide methods and procedures for payment for the care and services available under the plan as follows—

"'(A) in the case of in-patient care, a definition of and formula for determining reasonable cost shall be included in the plan, which formula shall provide—

"'(i) payments to any hospital, nursing home, or other institution in which inpatient care is provided, may not exceed the amount paid for comparable services by either the Blue Cross Plan in the area or title XVIII, whichever is less, unless adequate justification based upon hardship to a hospital can be supported by financial data,

"'(ii) that any hospital which provides complete medical services for inpatients as part of a per diem cost may, in the discretion of the state agency, be paid per diem rates proportionately higher than Blue Cross or title XVIII,

"'(iii) special ceilings on per diem payments to hospitals, nursing homes, and other institutions in situations in which occupancy rates average less than 80 per centum.

"'(iv) provisions for negotiated rates with hospitals, nursing homes, and other institutions if the State chooses to use some basis of payment which reimburses on a basis less than cost, as defined above, and

"'(v) provisions for incentive payments for efficient operation of hospitals, nursing homes, or other institutions based upon the demonstrated ability of an institutions to discharge patients promptly or upon other measurable factors;

"'(B) in the case of outpatient care—

"'(i) an outpatent visit shall be defined in the plan and the minimum services for such a visit, which shall include seeing a physician, shall be described,

"'(ii) payments for an outpatient visit may be negotiated or cost-based, but if negotiated, shall not result in payments higher than cost,

"'(iii) payments to a hospital for an outpatient visit may be no higher than 18 per centum of the per diem payment for inpatient care, and

"'(vi) the plan shall include provisions per capita payments to hospital-based group practice plans;

"'(C) in the case of payments to physicians, dentists and allied professions—

"'(i) fee-for-service payments to physicians, dentists and allied professions shall be based open a fee schedule established by the State,

"'(ii) the fee schedules shall reflect geography and qualifications of physicians as established by the Board Certification Program of the American Medical Association,

"'(iii) the fee schedules shall be based upon the average level of fees charged in the county or metropolitan area over the ten years previous to the adoption of the plan, and

"'(iv) the plan may establish appropriate payment methods for group practice units.'

"(b) Section 1902(a)(13) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out clause (B) thereof."

AMENDMENT TO MEDICAID

AMENDMENT NO. 413

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk for printing an amendment to H.R. 12080 which would allow the individual States the greatest flexibility in devising their programs of medical assistance, under title XIX of the Social Security Act.

There has been a good deal of criticism of the medicaid program. In particular, the plan of my own State of New York has been quite controversial—both in the State and nationally. I think it fair to say that the income eligibility standards established by the State of New York for medical assistance had a great deal to do with the fact that H.R. 12080 contains a ceiling on the income level for eligibility to medicaid, for which Federal matching funds would be available. The New York plan is large—and it has been expensive. However, one reason for the large size of the New York program is the fact that present Federal law has kept it from being more exactly shaped to the needs to be met.

In 1966 I introduced amendments to title XIX which would have given the States greater flexibility. In light of the strong support for some sort of ceiling on Federal participation, I believe there is even stronger need for this flexibility now. In particular, a State should not be required to set the same eligibility standard for all its geographic parts. The present New York standard cannot be seriously questioned as applied to the large cities. For example, a four-member family earning $6,000 a year in New York City needs medical assistance. However, in the rural upstate counties, this figure may well represent an income too high for eligibility and may well lead to so many eligible recipients that the county cannot meet its share of the financial burden. Nevertheless, present law inhibits New York, for example, from setting different income standards for different parts of the State, depending upon various average income levels, different costs of living, and, a different scale of health costs in geographic regions of the same State. I believe that the State should be allowed to make such distinctions where necessary and practical. Such a change in the law would permit the development of programs more relevant to the real needs of a State—and less expensive.

Another Federal requirement which unnecessarily adds cost to a State program is that which prohibits a deductible feature for hospital bills. Such a deductible is acceptable as far as medical costs are concerned; it should not be prohibited for hospital bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 413) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 414

Mr. MANSFIELD proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts, which was ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2552) to provide for orderly trade in antifriction ball and roller bearings and parts thereof.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2467) to amend the Social Security Act to permit an individual to become entitled to hospital insurance benefits under title XVIII of such act, if he is otherwise qualified therefor, without filing application for benefits under title II of such act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 19, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 43. An act for the relief of Mi Soon Oh;

S. 63. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Alberto Rojas-Vila;

S. 64. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Osvaldo Martinez-Farinas;

S. 221. An act for the relief of Dr. Armando Perez Simon;

S. 440. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Alejandro Solano;

S. 733. An act for the relief of Sabiene Elizabeth DeVore;

S. 741. An act for the relief of Rumiko Samanski;

S. 821. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Domingo Hernandez;

S. 975. An act for the relief of Mitsuo Blomstrom;

S. 1021. An act for the relief of Antonio Luis Navarro;

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Dr. David Castaneda;

S. 1110. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel Alpendre Seisdedos;

S. 1197. An act for the relief of Dr. Lucio Arsenio Travisso y Perez;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of Dr. Gonzalo Rodriquez;

S. 1279. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco Montes;

S. 1280. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Pereira;

S. 1458. An act for the relief of Lee Duk Hee;

S. 1471. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugo Gonzalez;

S. 1482. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernesto Nestor Prieto;

S. 1525. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario R. Garcini;

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos E. Garciga;

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria del Carmen Trabadelo de Arias;

S. 1678. An act for the relief of American Petrofina Co. of Texas, a Delaware corporation, and James W. Harris;

S. 1709. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Martin Ruiz del Castillo;

S. 1748. An act for the relief of Dr. Ramiro de la Riva Dominguez;

S. 1938. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando Hipolito Maytin; and

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution extending the time for filing report of Commission on Urban Problems.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments shall hold hearings on November 8 and 9, 1967, on Senate Joint Resolutions 31 and 80. These resolutions are proposed constitutional amendments designed to provide for the citizens of the District of Columbia representation in the Congress.

The hearings shall begin at 10 a.m. each day in room 318 of the Senate Office Building. Persons interested in these hearings should contact the subcommittee staff in room 419 of the Senate Office Building or on extension 3018.

SECRETARY GARDNER COMMENDED FOR SPEECH AT UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, John W. Gardner, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, delivered a thoughtful and perceptive speech last week on our domestic problems, and about the general mood of the Nation. Mr. Gardner very ably observed that the first duty of responsible citizens today is to bind together rather than tear apart, and that the fissures in our society are dangerously deep from dissent and divisiveness. He delivered his address at a great Southern educational institution, the University of North Carolina, at Chapel Hill. Mr. President, I have not always agreed with the policies and programs of the agency he heads, but I commend Mr. Gardner's message to the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Gardner's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE[1]

My present job gives me a close-up view of the domestic problems of this Nation. I'd like to talk about those problems, and about the mood of the nation.

In the early years of this Republic, our people had wonderfully high hopes for the new nation. It was to be a model for all mankind, a city on a hill, a haven of liberty and reason and justice.

Today we are unrivaled in wealth and power. We have all the outward trappings of success. What of the dream?

---

[1] As delivered at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, Thursday, October 12, 1967.

I don't think anyone would deny that we are uneasy in our affluence. Do I need to recite the list of anxieties—racial strife, poverty in the midst of plenty, urban decay, crime, and so on and on?

The Bible says "Thou shalt grope at noonday, as the blind gropeth in darkness." One feels occasionally that for us it is that kind of noonday.

But it isn't.

There is a kind of comfort in thinking that our troubles are more distressing than ever before. But a close reading of history denies us that comfort. The truth is that our blessings are greater than ever before. Our troubles are no worse. They are different.

It was an error to suppose, as so many once supposed, that we could fashion a society free of problems. The problems will never cease. They will only change their character.

What is the character of the problems we face in this Nation today? How shall we cope with them?

The problems themselves are easily identified. Among them I would list the search for an enduring peace, the eradication of poverty, renewal of the cities, the requirement that we do justice to Negro Americans, the improvement of education, population control, the preservation of our natural environment, the reshaping of governmental processes, and economic growth.

But we could discuss those items exhaustively without ever getting to the sources of uneasiness for many Americans today, an uneasiness that stems not from any one problem but from all, an uneasiness that goes directly to the question of where we are headed, of our health and soundness as a society, and of the relationship between the individual and society.

Ours is a vast and complex society. It's hard to know where you fit in—if indeed you do fit in. It's hard to identify anything you can call your community. It's hard to say who your leaders are—if there are any leaders in an intricately organized society. It's hard to feel any responsibility for what happens, or to feel any pride if things happen well, or to know what to do about it when they don't.

We don't want an impersonal society in which everyone is anonymous, in which no one has a sense of belonging, in which individuality is smothered by organization, in which rootlessness is the universal condition and irresponsibility the universal affliction.

But how are we to avoid those hazards?

One thing we are going to have to do is to restore a sense of community and participation at the local level, which is the only level that will have immediate meaning for large numbers of Americans.

Everything about modern life seems to conspire against a sense of community—and as a result we have lost something that most of us need very much.

We need the assurance of identity that a healthy community offers. We need the mutual obligations of community life. Above all, perhaps, we need the sense of participation—and the experience of participation—that is possible in a coherent community.

All that we know about the individual and society, and much that we know about the learning process suggest that the individual actively participating is better than the individual insert or passive—a better learner, a better citizen, a more complete person, a more self-respecting individual.

The non-participant individual, without roots, without a sense of identity or belonging is a hazard to everyone including himself. He is a ready recruit to strange causes. He is always liable to lash out in desperate efforts to find meaning and purpose. We have too long pretended that people can live their lives without those ingredients. They cannot. And if they cannot find socially worthy meanings and purposes they will cast about desperately and seize upon whatever comes to hand—extremist philosophies, nihilist politics, bizarre religions, far-out protest movements.

Individuals actively participating in a community where they can see their problems face to face, know their leaders personally, sense the social structure of which they are a part—such individuals are the best possible guaranty that the intricately organized society we are heading into will not also be a dehumanized, depersonalized machine. They are also the best hope for curing the local apathy, corruption and slovenliness that make a mockery of self-government in so many localities.

Responsibility is the best of medicines. When people feel that important consequences (for themselves and others) hang on their acts, they are apt to act more wisely. It is not always easy to have that sense of responsibility toward a distant Federal Government. It helps if the ground on which responsibility is tested is at one's doorstep. Every man should be able to feel that there is a role for him in shaping his local institutions and local community.

To achieve that goal, as President Johnson has so often emphasized, we are going to have to have far greater concern for the vitality of State and local government. We shall need vigorous local leadership in and out of government. A great many of our best people are going to have to roll up their sleeves and pitch in to help make this society work.

To eradicate poverty, rebuild our central cities, lift our schools to a new level of quality and accomplish the other formidable tasks before us will require a great surge of citizen dedication. Everyone will have to lend a hand. Industry, labor, minority groups. State and local government, the universities, the churches, farm groups, the press—all will have to pitch in.

If we imagine that the Federal Government alone, or Federal, State and local governments alone can solve those problems, and that everyone else can stand by and play sidewalk superintendent, we are deceiving ourselves. It won't work. The renewal of our cities, the rebuilding of our society will require a barn-raising spirit of mutual endeavor.

If that isn't clear to you, then perhaps you haven't grasped the dimensions of the tasks facing this Nation. The problems won't solve themselves, and they won't be advanced toward solution by bombast or hand wringing or cynicism or rage or self-pity on the part of any of us. They will yield only to unremitting effort by people who have the resilience of spirit and steadiness of purpose to do the work of the day as it has always been done—against odds.

We can dream great dreams and talk brilliantly of what is now bad that should be better. But when the time for doing comes—and it's long past—we must recognize that as President Johnson put it, the kind of society we want is going to have to be built brick by brick in the heat of the day, by people who have taken the trouble to learn how the society runs and how it can be changed.

The problems are real. It doesn't require the instincts of a reformer or the eye of a muckraker to detect social evils in this land today. All it requires is the ability to follow the newspapers, to scan the data of infant mortality among the poor, to read the crime statistics, to see the manifold signs of urban disintegration, to observe the bitterness of racial conflict.

I imagine that for most of us gathered here today life is reasonably comfortable. It is easy to suppose that we are safely insulated from the problems that beset this land, that they are someone else's problems, not ours.

But they are grimly and irrevocably the problems of our generation, and none of us can escape. There isn't any place to hide. The consequences of poverty, racial conflict, environmental pollution, urban decay, and other problems will affect the quality of life for everyone here today, and for everyone in this land, the comfortable and the uncomfortable. It won't be a decent life for any of us until it is for all of us.

Consider the recent turn toward violence. Where will it lead? Where *can* it lead? There are bitter and vindictive people on both sides who hope for the worst. But you and I have to believe that a saner path is possible.

Despair in the ghettoes cannot be cured by savagery in the streets. Violence begets violence. It is time to speak out against those on either side who through words or actions contribute to conflagrations of bitterness and rage. They wreak more havoc than they know. They may create ruinous cleavages and paralyzing hatreds that will make it virtually impossible for us to function as a society.

This is a day of dissent and divisiveness. Everyone speaks with unbridled anger in behalf of his point of view or his party or his people. More and more, hostility and venom are the hallmark of any conversation on the affairs of the nation.

There used to be only a few chronically angry people in our national life. Today all seem caught up in mutual recriminations—Negro and white, rich and poor, conservative and liberal, hawk and dove, Democrat and Republican, labor and management, North and South, young and old.

I've listened to them all, and at this moment I'd like to say a word not for or against any of them but in behalf of a troubled nation.

Today the first duty of responsible citizens is to bind together rather than tear apart. The fissures in our society are already dangerously deep. We need greater emphasis on the values that hold us together.

We need a greater common allegiance to the goals and binding values of the national community. A society or a nation is more than just a lot of people. A lot of people are a crowd or a population. To merit the term *society* or *nation* they have to have some shared attitudes and beliefs, and a shared allegiance. If the nation is to have any future, people have to care quite a lot about the common enterprise.

We know that many are willing to die for their country. We also have to care enough to live for it. Enough to live less comfortably than one might in order to serve it. Enough to work with patience and fortitude to cure its afflictions. Enough to forego the joys of hating one another. Enough to make our most cherished common purposes prevail.

Today extremists of the right and the left work with purposeful enthusiasm to deepen our suspicion and fear of one another and to loosen the bonds that hold the society together. The trouble, of course, is that they may succeed in pulling the society apart. And will anyone really know how to put it together again?

The cohesiveness of a society, the commitment of large numbers of people to live together, is a fairly mysterious thing. We don't know what makes it happen. If it breaks down we don't know how one might go about repairing it.

Back of every great civilization, behind all the panoply of power and wealth is something as powerful as it is insubstantial, a set of ideas, attitudes and convictions—and the confidence that those ideas and convictions are viable.

No nation can achieve greatness unless it believes in something—and unless that something has the moral dimensions to sustain a great civilization.

If the light of belief flickers out, then all the productive capacity and all the know-how and all the power of the nation will be as nothing, and the darkness will gather.

If enough people doubt themselves and their society, the whole venture falls apart. We must never let anger or indignation or political partisanship blur our vision on that point.

In Guatemala and Southern Mexico one can observe the Indians who are without doubt the lineal descendants of those who created the Mayan civilization. Today they are a humble people, not asking much of themselves or the world, and not getting much. A light went out.

The geography and natural resources are virtually unchanged; the genetic make-up of the people is no doubt much the same. They were once a great people. Now they do not even remember their greatness. What happened?

I suspect that in the case of the Mayans, the ruling ideas were too primitive to sustain a great civilization for long.

What about our own ideas? Can they sustain a great civilization?

The answer depends on what ideas we are talking about. Americans have valued and sought and believed in many different things—freedom, power, money, equality, justice, technology, bigness, success, comfort, speed, peace, war, discipline, freedom from discipline and so on.

I like to believe that most Americans would agree on which of those values might serve as the animating ideas for a great civilization.

In my present job, I deal with a side of American society in which the existence of certain ruling ideals is visible and inescapable. I see children being taught, the sick healed, the aged cared for, the crippled rehabilitated, the talented nurtured and developed, the mentally ill treated, the weak strengthened.

Those tasks are not done by unbelieving people. Those tasks are carried forward by people who have at heart what I like to call the American Commitment.

I believe that when we are being most true to ourselves as Americans we are seeking a society in which every young person has the opportunity to grow to his full stature; a society in which every older person can live out his years in dignity; a society in which no one is irreparably damaged by circumstances that can be prevented.

All too often we have been grievously unfaithful to those ideas. And that infidelity can be cured only by deeds. Such ideas cannot be said to be alive unless they live in the acts of men, unless they are embedded in our laws, our social institutions, our educational practices, our political habits, our ways of dealing with one another. We must act in the service of our beliefs.

Every individual is of value.

The release of human potential, the enhancement of individual dignity, the liberation of the human spirit—those are the deepest and truest goals to be conceived by the hearts and minds of the American people.

And those are ideas that can sustain and strengthen a great civilization. But we must be honest about them. We must live by them. And we must have the stamina to hold to our purposes through times of confusion and controversy.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHARLES O. FINLEY—THE ALL-AMERICAN DISGRACE TO SPORT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at long last the people of Kansas City and the Midwest have rid themselves of one of the most disreputable characters ever to enter the American sports scene.

The American League owners have pledged, have given an irrevocable covenant, to the mayor of Kansas City, to the presiding judge of Jackson County, to the president of the Kansas City Sports Complex, to the president of the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, to me personally and above all to the fans of Kansas City, that Kansas City will have an American League franchise by March 1, 1968, at the latest and will be ready to play at the opening of the 1969 season.

This means that despite the unprecedented effort of Kansas City to maintain major league baseball, and its superb record of attendance in the face of the obstacles Mr. Finley imposed, the fans will have no baseball for 1 year, 1968.

But this loss is more than recompensed for by the pleasure resulting from our getting rid of Mr. Finley.

Nevertheless, and based on the record, we were surprised the American League owners did not kick Mr. Finley out of organized baseball.

Our only regret is that Mr. Finley has now been foisted on our good friend, former Senator Bill Knowland. Knowing Bill as we do, and knowing Mr. Finley, it will be interesting to see how long this works out.

Later we will present to the Senate a few of the actions, and methods, Mr. Finley used in his efforts to wreck the hopes of his players, and the fans of Kansas City and this Midwest area.

JUNIOR COLLEGE ELIGIBILITY UNDER THE IMPACTED-AID PROGRAM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, last year, as my colleagues may recall, I opposed the administration's efforts to eliminate the eligibility of junior colleges under the so-called impacted-aid program, Public Law 81-815 and title I, Public Law 81-874.

Because of the importance of this issue, I appeared on April 5, 1966, before the Education Subcommittee and strongly urged the subcommittee to reject the administration's recommendation and accept my amendment, which continued junior college eligibility. The subcommittee, and later the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee, agreed with me, and as a result, the Senate adopted the Murphy amendment continuing junior college eligibility. Congressman BELL of California led this fight on the House side.

Again this year it appeared that the loss of funds was threatened. Recently, the California State Legislature passed, and the Governor signed into law, legislation establishing a new 15-member Board of Governors of California Community Colleges, which will be the new governing body for the State's junior colleges. The new board will succeed to the responsibilities previously exercised by the State board of education, the director of education, and the department of education.

As a result of this administrative change, I heard disturbing reports that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was about to render a ruling making California junior colleges no longer eligible for the impacted-aid assistance.

With the Elementary and Secondary Education Act presently being considered in executive session by the Subcommittee on Education, I was determined not to allow this "vehicle" to clear the Congress and then to hear the Department had ruled California junior colleges ineligible.

To prevent the loss of funds, I prepared an amendment which I planned to offer, if necessary, to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and which, incidentally, I am confident would have been accepted by the subcommittee. I also pressed the Department to render an immediate decision on this matter and provided them with a copy of the California State law.

I was pleased, Mr. President, to have received late yesterday a letter from Mr. James F. Hortin, Acting Director, Office of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, ruling that California would remain eligible. I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE MURPHY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you for the copy of the California State Law, Chapter 1549, approved by the Governor on August 20, 1967, relative to junior colleges (grades 13 and 14) which you sent to our office yesterday.

The provisions of the new Act have been reviewed by our Counsel and the Commissioner has determined that those junior colleges in California which were considered to be legal "local educational agencies" for purposes of Public Law 81–815 and Title I, Public Law 81–874, under the terms of the previous California law are not precluded from the same classification under the new Act.

Should you have need for further information relative to this matter we will be glad to oblige.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. HORTIN,
Acting Director, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am extremely proud of the educational system in the State of California. In my judgment, it is unparalleled in the Nation. The junior colleges are an important part of this great educational system. At this very moment in California 84 out of every 100 college freshmen and sophomores are in our junior college system. This statistic in itself underscores their importance.

California has been the pioneer in the junior college movement which has spread throughout the Nation. As of October of last year, there were 78 junior colleges in the State, and there may be more now for they are growing so fast that I have trouble keeping track of them. By early 1970, it is expected there will be 100. Had a ruling been made that the California junior colleges were ineligible, a heavy blow would have been inflicted upon some of these colleges.

Since California has been the leader in the junior college movement, I believe that any decision harmful to the California system might have national repercussions. And, Mr. President, the junior colleges continue to grow nationally. I am advised that there were approximately 850 junior colleges in the country last year, and 67 new ones will open this year. These junior colleges were attended by 1.5 million last year and an additional 250,000 students will be enrolled this school year.

I, of course, am delighted over the ruling of the Department. I am pleased no amendment will be necessary. This ruling of the Department will be applauded by educators, citizens, and particularly the junior college students.

I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the language of the California act creating the new governing board for the junior colleges be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the text of the act was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Approved by Governor August 30, 1967. Filed with Secretary of State August 30, 1967.]

SENATE BILL 669

An act to amend section 22700 of, and to add chapter 1.5 (commencing with section 185) to division 2 of, the Education Code, relating to higher education, and making an appropriation therefor

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Chapter 1.5 (commencing with Section 185) is added to Division 2 of the Education Code, to read:

"CHAPTER 1.5. THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

"185. There is in the state government a Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, consisting of 15 members, who are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate.

"The first members of the board shall be appointed by the Governor on or before January 15, 1968, and the Governor shall designate the date of the first meeting of the board. At least seven of the initial members shall have served as members of local junior college governing boards in this state prior to their appointment to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Any such member must resign from the local junior college governing board before his appointment if he is serving on a local junior college governing board at the time of his appointment.

"186. The terms of office of the members of the board shall commence on January 15, 1968, and the members shall enter upon their duties on that date and shall classify their terms of office by lot so that four of the terms of such appointive members shall expire on January 15, 1969, four of the terms of such appointive members shall expire on January 15, 1970, four of the terms of such appointive members shall expire on January 15, 1971, and three of the terms of such appointive members shall expire on January 15, 1972. Thereafter, the terms of office of the members of the board shall be four years.

"At the first meeting of the board, and annually thereafter, the members shall select two of their members to serve as chairman, and vice chairman, respectively.

"187. Members of the board shall be selected from outstanding lay citizens of California who have a strong interest in the further development and improvement of the public junior colleges.

"188. Any vacancy on the board shall be filled by appointment by the Governor, subject to confirmation by two-thirds of the Senate. The appointee to fill a vacancy shall hold office only for the balance of the unexpired term.

"189. Members of the board shall serve without pay. They shall receive their actual and necessary traveling expenses while on official business. The headquarters of the board and the chief executive officer shall be in Sacramento.

"190. The board shall appoint a chief executive officer, designate his title, and fix his salary.

"191. The chief executive officer shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing power. He shall execute such duties and responsibilities as may be delegated to him by the board.

"192. The chief executive officer shall employ and fix the compensation, in accordance with law, of such assistants, clerical, and other employees as he may deem necessary for the effective conduct of the work of the board and the chief executive officer.

"193. The board shall have the power to adopt such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, as are necessary for its own government and to enable the board to carry out all powers and responsibilities vested in it by law.

"194. All official acts of the board shall require the affirmative vote of at least eight members. The vote of all members shall be recorded.

"195. All meetings of the board shall be open and public except as otherwise provided.

"The board may hold executive sessions closed to the public to consider the employment of any person, or the dismissal or other form of disciplinary action to be taken against any officer or employee under the jurisdiction of the board, except where such person, officer, or employee requests a public hearing. The board may exclude from any such meeting, whether public or closed to the public, during the examination of a witness, any or all other witnesses in the matter being investigated.

"196. It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall provide leadership and direction in the continuing development of junior colleges as an integral and effective element in the structure of public higher education in the state. The work of the board shall at all times be directed to maintaining and continuing, to the maximum degree permissible, local autonomy and control in the administration of the junior colleges.

"197. Commencing on July 1, 1968, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall succeed to the duties, powers, purposes, responsibilities, and jurisdiction heretofore vested in the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, and the Director of Education with respect to the management, administration, and control of the junior colleges. Whenever in any law relating to the management, administration and control of the junior colleges reference is made to the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, or the Director of Education, such reference shall be deemed to mean the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

"198. The State Board of Education is designed as the state educational agency to carry out the purposes and provisions of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress, and is vested with all necessary power and authority to perform all acts necessary to receive the benefits and to allocate, upon the advice and recommendations of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the funds provided by such acts of Congress to public junior colleges."

SEC. 2. Section 22700 of the Education Code is amended to read:

"22700. There is hereby created an advisory body, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, to be composed of three representatives each of the University of California, the California State Colleges, the public junior colleges, the private colleges and universities in the state, and six representatives of the general public. The university shall be represented by the president and two regents appointed by the regents. The California State Colleges shall be represented by the chancellor and two trustees appointed by the trustees. Public junior colleges shall be represented by a member of the State Board of Education or its chief executive officer as the board may from time to time determine, and a member of a local public junior college governing board and a public junior college administrator. The junior college governing board member shall be selected by the State Board of Education from a list or lists of five names submitted for its consideration by any association or associations of statewide coverage which represent junior college governing boards. The public junior college administrator shall be selected by the State Board of Education from a list of five names submitted for its consideration by the California Junior College Association. The private colleges and universities shall be represented by three persons, each of whom shall be affiliated with a private institution of higher education as a governing board member or as a staff member, in an academic or administrative capacity and shall be appointed by the Governor after consultation with an association or associations of such private institutions and subject to confirmation by the Senate. The general public shall be represented by six members appointed by the Governor subject to confirmation by the Senate. The terms of the appointments made pursuant to this section shall be as follows:

"(a) The representatives appointed by the regents shall serve one-year terms.

"(b) The representatives appointed by the trustees shall serve one-year terms.

"(c) The member of the State Board of Education or its chief executive officer who represents the public junior colleges shall serve until the first meeting of the board in the next succeeding calendar year following his appointment.

"(d) Except as otherwise provided in this subdivision, the term of office of all of the other members of the council appointed pursuant to this section is four years, and they shall hold office until the appointment of their successors.

"The terms of such members in office on November 1, 1965, shall expire as follows:

"(1) The term of the member who, as a member of a local public junior college governing board, is representing the public junior colleges, the term of one of the members representing the private colleges and universities, and the term of one of the members representing the public shall expire on November 1, 1965.

"(2) The term of one of the members representing the private colleges and universities, and the term of one of the members representing the public shall expire on November 1, 1966.

"(3) The term of the member who, as a public junior college administrator, is representing the public junior colleges and the term of one of the members representing the public shall expire on November 1, 1967.

"(4) The term of the other member representing the private colleges and universities, and the term of one of the members representing the public shall expire on November 1, 1968.

"(5) The terms of the other two members representing the public shall expire on November 1, 1969.

"On or before November 1, 1965, the Governor shall designate the order in which the terms of his appointees expire pursuant to this subdivision.

"(e) Any person appointed pursuant to

this section may be reappointed to serve additional terms.

"No appointing authority specified in this section shall appoint any person to alternate membership on the council with the following exceptions who shall be appointed by the appropriate appointing authority; two alternates for the president and the two representatives of the regents; two alternates for the chancellor and the two representatives of the trustees, and one alernate for the one representative of the State Board of Education. Each alternate shall be a member of the appropriate appointing authority and shall be appointed for an annual term.

"No person appointed pursuant to this section shall, with respect to any matter before the council, vote for or on behalf of, or in any way exercise the vote of, any other member of the council.

"Commencing on February 1, 1968, the public junior colleges shall, notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, be represented exclusively by two members of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges chosen annually by the board, and the chief executive officer of the California Community Colleges; provided that, the member of the State Board of Education or the board's executive officer, the member of the local junior college governing board, and the public junior college administrator (to be replaced by the chief executive officer of the California Community Colleges) shall continue to serve until the successors are designated and qualify to serve. The representatives of the public junior colleges shall serve for one-year terms. One alternate member may be designated by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges."

SEC. 3. The Co-ordinating Council for Higher Education, as soon as this act becomes effective, shall undertake a study of all of the duties, powers, responsibilities, and jurisdiction in the management, administration, and control of the junior colleges and shall report to the Governor and to the Legislature on or before December 1, 1968, on the appropriate functions which should be performed (a) by local school boards maintaining junior colleges and (b) by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

SEC. 4. There is hereby appropriated from the General Fund for the support of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000), or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended for expenses incurred by the board pursuant to Chapter 1.5 (commencing with Section 175) of Division 2 of the Education Code, including planning for the uninterrupted performance of the functions and duties transferred to the board.

ARMY OF SOUTH VIETNAM BEARS ITS SHARE OF WAR BURDEN

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to recent remarks made on the Senate floor suggesting that the South Vietnamese are not bearing their share of the burden in resisting Communist efforts to take over their country.

The facts of the case do not support this impression. There are presently over 700,000 men in the regular and paramilitary forces of the Republic of Vietnam. Thus, of approximately 4.5 million adult males throughout the country nearly one in six is in armed service. A comparable figure for the United States would be approximately 8 million men in the Armed Forces. These forces have almost constantly borne heavier killed-in-action losses than United States and free world allied forces. Reliable figures for combat deaths since January 1965, when the big U.S. military buildup began, through August 1967, show 27,738 South Vietnamese combat deaths compared with 12,592 Americans killed in action during the same period.

On April 24, 1967, General Westmoreland said this in evaluating the performance of the Vietnamese Armed Forces:

> I have worked with the Vietnamese military for more than three years, and I have learned to understand and admire them. A look at their record in combat, as well as in political administration, reveals an exceptional performance, when all is considered. . . . In my book, the Republic of Viet-Nam Armed Forces have conducted themselves with credit. As I tour the country several times each week, I am encouraged by the obvious improvement in the morale, proficiency and quality of their fighting forces.

Moreover, the South Vietnamese have borne a heavy load of civilian casualties resulting from Vietcong terrorism. These civilian losses are part of the price the Vietnamese people pay while resisting aggression. These are also casualties suffered in the common cause.

For example, there were 816 South Vietnamese either killed, wounded, or kidnaped in the Vietcong antielection campaign in the weeks immediately prior to the presidential elections on September 3. Since 1960 the Vietcong have assassinated more than 12,000 civilian village and hamlet officials and kidnaped 41,000 others.

The Vietnamese have been fighting for over 25 years against the Japanese, the French, and now against the Communists. While there are no accurate figures for the total casualties they have suffered during this struggle for freedom and self-determination, it has been estimated that close to a half million South Vietnamese have died because of the war since 1959.

In our natural impatience at the length and cost of our involvement in Southeast Asia, it would be unwise to disregard the political, social, and economic achievements of the last few years. Examples are:

First, the drafting and promulgation of a new constitution by a body of representatives of the people, the election of the executives and legislators provided for in the constitution, and the beginning of the development of a loyal opposition to the officials newly elected to power. For the first time in its history, South Vietnam has meaningful parliamentary institutions. The fact that these institutions were produced in time of war by free elections is indeed an accomplishment of which any free world government might well be proud. One might note in passing that during World War II, neither Great Britain nor France, countries with long parliamentary traditions, conducted nationwide elections.

Second, the village and hamlet elections of April to June of this year which have brought representative government to 1,037 villages and 4,616 hamlets in secure parts of the country;

Third, the encouraging initiatives of the South Vietnamese Ministry of Revolutionary Development in the fields of agricultural reform, self-help, and the rapid development of effective revolutionary development cadre to work in the pacification of rural Vietnam;

Fourth, the imaginative and courageous economic policies of the South Vietnamese Government which have held inflation, inevitable in any wartime situation, within manageable limits; and

Fifth, the striking progress made toward the resolution of the important highlander minorities problem through the recent passage of a minorities bill of rights and land tenure law, and the fulfillment of longstanding promises in the fields of education, social welfare and justice. The Government of the Republic of South Vietnam is now well advanced in the progress of reintegrating the Montagnard rebels into the government structure. One former rebel leader is now a senator.

The assertion that the Vietcong is "way ahead" of the Saigon Government in terms of effective political organization in the countryside is inaccurate and unwarranted. It would be acceptable only to those who confuse the working of naked terrorism with the art of government. It loses sight of the fact that confiscatory, externally directed and supported guerrilla type of administrative efficiency, which deals in no economic or social programs but only in promises and propaganda, is an activity far different from the massive responsibilities of the GVN, youthful and ill trained as it may at times seem to be. The Vietcong do not have to maintain roads and bridges—they blow them up. They have no educational program, unless it is that of terrorizing schoolteachers into preaching their political line. They have no health program, no seed or fertilizer improvement programs, no irrigation programs. They make refugees, whereas the national government tries, with remarkable success, to care for them. The Vietcong do have a land reform program of a sort. It is unique in its simplicity. It consists of a simple declaration that all land belongs to the people they are propagandizing at the moment. They have a very simple taxation system: taking everything that impressed porters can carry; and they have a most effective military conscription program beginning with 14-year-olds.

The late Prof. Bernard Fall, a noted historian and authority on the 20th century struggles of the Vietnamese people, preached that the side which will win the present struggle in Vietnam will be the side that outadministers the other; but he clearly recognized and emphasized the massive handicap of the side that has to defend and improve a society compared to the side which can concentrate exclusively on tearing it down.

When the progress of the South Vietnamese Government and people is viewed as having been achieved despite these handicaps, myths about the popular appeal of the Vietcong and despair over the slow rate of progress of the GVN both tend to disappear.

DANGER OF RETURN TO LOGROLLING IN WORLD TRADE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the current import quota hearings of the Senate Finance Committee have engendered nationwide, even worldwide interest. During the committee's 3 days of hearings the pros or cons of existing U.S. trade policy have been and will be debated. The hearings which started out to consider four or five quota proposals have become a much more important battleground—between those supporting our current trade policies which have been enormously beneficial to this country and those who would have us believe that a policy of retaliation and counterretaliation would be more profitable.

I testified before the Senate Finance Committee this morning because I wished to reaffirm my position, that on balance, the interests of New York and the country lie in the continuation of existing U.S. trade policy.

In view of the loud protestations of those who are demanding quotas, I think the Senate and the country should be aware of the fact that there are major domestic corporations who are greatly concerned about these proposed quotas as well as the Committee for National Trade Policy and various importer groups.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my testimony as well as a series of wires sent to me today by these corporations and groups be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items requested were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE ON PROPOSED IMPORT QUOTA LEGISLATION, OCTOBER 19, 1967

Mr. Chairman, I am very appreciative of the opportunity to appear before the committee this morning in opposition to measures proposing quotas on various items of imports into the U.S. There is grave suspicion in the world that the bills now pending before this Committee, signal a new wave of protectionist sentiment in the U.S., reversing our Post War trade policy in favor of a species of log rolling and favor swapping that the world thought had gone out thirty years ago.

Personally, I am persuaded that should these quota bills be enacted into law, they *would* undermine the basis of our postwar policy of trade liberalization and that this, in turn, could return us to the international trade wars of the 1930's and a continuous round of retaliation and counter-retaliation until the economic health of the world economy itself would be imperiled.

These quotas pose other dangers to the United States economy:

1. They would result in higher prices for millions of U.S. consumers and thereby contribute to inflation;

2. They would endanger billions of dollars worth of U.S. exports and thereby worsen our balance of payments position, contribute to unemployment and loss of profits;

3. They threaten individual enterprise and would impose even more government controls and bureaucracy on U.S. industry than at present.

They would create new difficulties for the industries they are ostensibly protecting—if past experience with quotas is a good guide to the future—because they are inflexible.

I am also strongly opposed to these bills because I consider the well-publicized plan of the sponsors to append them to the Social Security bill very damaging to the hopes of a large segment of the American people, our senior citizens. In the end this may not be done—particularly if the counsel of many leaders on both sides of the aisle is followed. But if it is attempted, it should be clear that they would jeopardize a well-earned social security "raise" for those Americans who spent their life in hard work and deserve more decent retirement incomes.

In recent months there has been much said in the Senate about the usurpation by the Executive Branch of the powers of Congress in the field of foreign trade. *It seems to me the new protectionist drive for import quotas in turn represents an excessive use of Congressional power on behalf of certain industries at the expense of the public at large and the nation.*

As a legislator, I have an obligation—as have other members of Congress—to concern myself with the problems of my constituents resulting from strong foreign competition. For these and other reasons I have supported measures coming before the Senate which contributed to their economic health, such as the 1964 tax cut, the 7% investment tax credit, small business loans and the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

But, I also believe that members of Congress have an obligation to assure that the solutions they support to help their constituents are based on objective evidence; (the Tariff Commission was created by Congress expressly for that purpose) are tailored specifically to help sectors of industry claiming serious import injury; and are consistent with the over-all national interest. *I do not believe that across-the-board quotas covering an entire industry or import limitations achieved by allegedly "voluntary" international or bilateral agreements reached with supplying nations is the way of going about helping injured industries and displaced workers.*

My own prescription for sectors of industry hurt by imports consists of: 1) adjustment assistance in line with Title III of the Trade Expansion Act, but substantially liberalized by making a favorable finding for this purpose easier than at present and by providing more liberal loans, tax benefits and retraining programs for workers in the injured firms or sectors of industry. This avenue has by no means been exhausted; 2) a Federally-supported program to attack the basic causes of obsolescence, either directly through a modernization fund or by guarantees or subsidies to commercial banks and private investors which undertake significant modernization programs in industries threatened by obsolescence which cannot otherwise help themselves; and 3) the elimination of government policies, such as "two-price cotton" which contribute to difficulties of certain industries facing foreign competition.

Lest I am accused of being entirely altruistic, I wish to give another reason—a very practical reason—for my opposition to these quotas. If enacted, they would on balance seriously undermine the foundation of my own state of New York's welfare and economy—our commerce with the rest of the world. As far as New York is concerned, this commerce consists of an estimated $1.5 billion in manufactured exports originating in the state in addition to more than $75 million in agricultural exports originating in the state; substantial imports of raw materials and parts needed for products manufactured in the state; $15.9 billion of foreign commerce shipped through the Port of New York for destinations all over the U.S. According to a study made by the First National City Bank recently, an estimated 375,000 jobs are involved in loading, unloading, trucking and producing these goods in the Port of New York area. Millions of dollars in income for the steamship lines, airlines, railways, truck carriers, banks, insurance companies, freight forwarders, customs brokers and tax revenues for the local, state and federal governments are also involved. It can be seen clearly how gravely restrictions on U.S. foreign commerce could hurt New York's economy as well as that of the nation.

I do not wish to go over the ground covered very effectively by representatives of the Executive Branch yesterday. But I would like to identify several key points in the debate.

The appearance of temporary relief for certain U.S. industries from import competition by mandatory quotas should not be confused with permanent improvement in the U.S. trade position. On the contrary, these quotas will very likely worsen our trade position.

The value of imports involved in those quota proposals already introduced—namely for steel, lead and zinc, meat, textiles, footwear, electronic products, hardwood plywood, ground fish, strawberries and honey—totaled $3.6 billion in 1966. Quota proposals involving a tightening up of already existing quotas—namely cotton textiles, petroleum, and dairy products—involved another $2.7 billion in imports, with the two categories covering an estimated $6.3 billion of our 1966 imports or 25% of our total import of merchandise that year. This does not mean that this amount of imports would be eliminated. This only indicates that this much of our imports would be exposed to drastic cuts. It must also be emphasized that for every restriction we impose on certain imports, an equivalent limitation on our exports can be expected to be imposed by other countries on some U.S. industry, unless we give concessions of equal value in other areas. Now, which industry shall be selected to pay for higher protection on steel, oil, textiles and so forth?

Let us consider, for example, the steel industry's case for increased protection. By every measure I have seen, the steel industry is in pretty healthy condition. Shipments of steel mill products for example have increased from 71 million tons in 1962 to 90 million tons in 1966. Employment has increased from 521,000 in 1962 to an estimated 576,000 in 1966. Total dividends paid by the steel industry have increased from $445 million in 1963 to $484 million in 1966 according to the American Iron and Steel Institute, and according to the same source, profits per each dollar of revenue have stayed at 6% in 1965 and 1966. It is true that imports during the past two years have totalled close to 11% of domestic consumption of steel. However, it seems to me that an industry which has 89% of a market is doing pretty well indeed.

It is also true that in the past three or four years steel exports have declined. However, if the millions of tons of steel purchased each year in the United States for manufactured products destined for eventual export is included in steel export data, the industry's export position appears in a better light. The import-export equation for steel mill products changes considerably if this factor is taken into account. Such data for two industry classifications, machinery and transport equipment, show a net export surplus of between two to two and a half million tons of steel a year! The industry's capital expenditures in 1966 were $2 billion and now are projected around $2½ billion this year. With increased utilization of the oxygen process of steel making and more efficient and competitive distribution facilities, this industry is in an excellent position to face competition from abroad more effectively. As Secretary Trowbridge pointed out in his testimony yesterday, the reason for increased imports in the last four or five years has been the heavy demand for steel accompanied by more diverse purchasing by some large users who, fearing a domestic shortage, are looking for price advantages, meet their needs by buying both foreign and domestic steel.

In other words, one of the major reasons for higher steel imports are domestic steel shortages resulting from strikes and other reasons. In the absence of such imports serious bottlenecks and price increases could result in significant damage to important steel users in this country. The quotas could also result in higher steel prices which would inevitably lead to increase in use of competing materials such as plastics, copper, aluminum, concrete and paper.

In this connection, I would urge this Committee to consider the claim made by the American Institute for Imported Steel that it is automation in the steel industry rather than imports that has been the principal contributor to the loss of jobs. They cite the closing last year by the U.S. Steel Corporation of its last remaining mill in Donora, Pennsylvania, and by Jones and Laughlin Company which in March of 1966 shut down a nail plant at Aliquippa, Pennsylvania as another factor for loss of jobs in the industry. They also claim that an ever smaller number of production workers are required to produce an increasingly quantity of steel again contributing to jobs losses.

I would also suggest that the Committee consider the recent evidence put forth by Congressman Thomas Curtis of Missouri who has claimed that between 4 to 10% of steel imports in 1966 were by American steel producers themselves, who needed imports to break production bottlenecks in a year of exceedingly strong demand for steel.

In conclusion, I cannot emphasize strongly enough that quotas, while ostensibly assisting an industry in trouble, result in increased government controls over industry, increase the need for more bureaucracy and inject new inflexibilities into an industry. The administration of quotas requires a tremendous amount of paper work with questions arising daily over the specific application of the quota such as clearing commodities for withdrawal, determining when a quota has been filled, collection of fees and other charges, payments of refunds, and the administration of specific provisions of the quota including country or origin markings, chemical analyses, port of entry charges, immediate delivery of perishable goods, dock strikes, etc. One of the big problems with the lead and zinc quotas, for example, was that smelters were unable to acquire sufficient quantities of ore of the grades necessary for their smelting operations. The surplus lead and zinc situation which was a problem that lasted for over 15 years changed to one of shortage. Italy, for example, which had an allocation under the original quota proclamation, chose not to fill it. Since there was no provision for reallocating unused quotas, the total supply for the domestic market was decreased while other supplying countries were prevented from increasing their exports to the United States. I could cite other examples of licensing difficulties, of problems involving evasion of quotas which underline the short-sightedness of these quota proposals.

I hope that the pressures now put on Congress for quotas will serve one useful purpose—as a warning to the Administration that substantial segments of U.S. business are dissatisfied with present world trade patterns and the non-tariff barriers they face abroad. Except for the anti-dumping code the Kennedy Round scarcely touched the vital area of non-tariff barriers. Yet these are the real inhibitors of expanded and liberalized world trade.

New quotas are not the way to reduce or eliminate non-tariff barriers abroad. They would only compound the problem. But we should take heed that unless and until U.S. trade negotiators go up against their foreign counterparts to hammer out agreements to open up protected European and Japanese home markets pressure for U.S. quota legislation will continue to plague us.

U.S. trade officials know well the variety of subtle and tacit devices by which the foreign industrialized nations exclude or restrict U.S. products from their home markets, all the while demanding free and open access to American markets.

The urgent need for U.S. trade policy is to work on behalf of expanded U.S. exports into protected foreign markets. Non-tariff barriers must be the prime target of this policy.

Both this nation and our trading partners must recognize that this is an age of interdependence between the economies of dozens of nations. As the leading industrial nation of the world, the U.S.—in its own self interest—must do all it can to contribute to the freer competition in world trade, not to lead the way in erecting trade barriers that will, in any event, be no more effective than the original Wall of China.

PEORIA, ILL.,
October 18, 1967.

Hon. Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Caterpillar strongly opposes import quota bills currently under consideration by Senate Finance Committee. Believe they would be catastrophic for U.S. foreign trade and undo many of gains of Kennedy Round and other trade negotiations which have encouraged export expansion during last thirty years. They would be a serious and ill advised step backward.

WILLIAM BLACKIE,
Chairman, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
October 18, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge you to use all of your persuasiveness with your colleagues in the Senate to defeat current efforts to place import quotas on textiles and allied products. Such quotas would waste the work of the Kennedy Round negotiators before the nation has had an opportunity to judge the results of their agreements. It would be much more prudent to gain more experience under the new agreements rather than destroy them prematurely with import quotas. We fear the result of precipitative action would be higher prices and more limited selections of consumer merchandise.

FRED LAZARUS, Jr.,
Chairman, Executive Committee,
Federated Department Stores, Inc.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
October 18, 1967.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I wish, by this wire to express the strongest possible opposition to the series of individual quota bills now pending before the Senate Finance Committee. These bills collectively would vitiate the hard won agreements obtained in the Kennedy round negotiations. Moreover any quotas at this time would reflect not only a lack of good faith with our negotiating partners in the Kennedy round but also a more basic lack of faith in the operations of a free enterprise economy for which we are the leading spokesman throughout the world. Freer world trade is an extension of the free competitive market which we have domestically and have espoused throughout the world. The facts testify to the effectiveness of this system. As we have progressively lowered our tariff and other trade barriers since 1933, our markets throughout the world have expanded manyfold. Our economy has grown in part through sales to foreign nations. Many U.S. industries and substantial U.S. employment depend upon sales in foreign markets which are only supported through sales by foreigners to U.S. from foreign countries. It is misrepresentation to argue that a minor quota here or a minor quota there will not significantly influence our economic posture in the world. The adoption of any quotas at this point in time will antagonize foreign sellers and lead to retaliation that will hurt U.S. industry. Moreover the adoption of any one quota encourages proliferation to many other quotas. There is no line which can be adequately drawn between safe quotas and unsafe quotas. The adoption of any single quota limitation on imports at this time will be publicized throughout the world as a reflection of attitude. Even industries most directly and apparently adversely affected by tariff reduction should recognize that the benefits to the U.S. economy from increased sales abroad will expand all domestic markets including those of firms with overseas competitors. It is difficult for anyone to document a single case where a past reduction of tariff has specifically hurt a particular industry, but our economic record of the past thirty years gives testimony to the incalculable benefits of broadening markets for American industry.

HOWARD C. PETERSEN,
Chairman of the Board, the Fidelity Bank.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
October 18, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your telegram notifying me of your impending testimony concerning the import quota bills now under consideration by the Senate Finance Committee. As a member of the Executive Committee of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, I have cosigned with the other council members a telegram which opposes this import quota legislation. This telegram is being sent today by James A. Linen, chairman of the United States Council of the ICC, to Senator Russell Long, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. A copy of Mr. Linen's telegram is being sent to your office.

My best regards,

ARTHUR K. WATSON,
President, IBM World Trade Corp.

BOSTON, MASS.,
October 18, 1967.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We feel a change in the basic trade policy of desiring freer trade throughout the free world would be a mistake despite current monetary problems and urge your opposition to rigid import quotas which would surely induce retaliation abroad.

THOMAS D. CABOT,
Chairman, Cabot Corp.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
October 18, 1967.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.:

I commend you on your forthcoming appearance before the Senate Finance Committee in behalf of enlightened and liberal American foreign trade program on the basis of my experience in international business and my continued interest in U.S. trade policy toward both developed and underdeveloped countries I believe that at no time in our history is it more important to exert strong leadership in liberalizing trade and tariffs for two reasons our role of responsible leadership demonstrated in the Kennedy Round must be sustained both in good faith and in effective economic relations, and secondly realistic self enlightenment suggest that we should not invite reciprocal adverse reaction from our trading partners damaging our overseas markets and export trade the Kennedy Round would be irrevocably harmed in my opinion by untimely and counterproductive import quota bills and other restrictive trade actions I urge you to do all possible to offset these proposed measures both in the interest of our own nation and in the interest of constructive world relations. Best wishes.

H. J. Heinz II,
Chairman, H. J. Heinz Co.

Stamford, Conn.,
October 19, 1967.

Hon. Jacob Javits,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Deplore efforts establish import quota. Would be calamitous step backward undoing years of work by countries' far-sighted leaders to bring about better promise world peace and order and would short sightedly damage countries' prosperity. The best for majority must govern, not gain for a few.

W. H. Wheeler, Jr.,
Chairman, Pitney-Bowes Corp.

New York, N.Y.,
October 18, 1967.

Hon. Jacob K. Javits,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Regret unable comment meaningfully on proposed import legislation without having studied the bills. My own views on trade policy were sent out last July 20 before joint subcommittee on foreign economic policy where I said, "The great promise of the Kennedy round is the effective increase in export opportunities brought about by the reciprocal reductions in foreign tariffs. I feel strongly U.S. businessmen should approach the results in this affirmative manner."

Regards,

David Rockefeller,
Chase-Manhattan Bank.

New York, N.Y.,
October 18, 1967.

Senator Jacob K. Javits,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to exert every effort against the possible passage of bills to impose import quotas. For too long the monkey on our economic back has been the false notion that trade restrictions insure our markets. Nothing could be more destructive to our postwar policy of an Atlantic trade partnership that has been supported by both parties. Nothing could be more harmful to the shared economic progress of the western world.

For most of the industrial countries, rapid economic growth has come to depend in large part on rapid expansion of international trade. This is why participants in the Kennedy round worked so hard for success. Rapidly growing exports of manufactures make a rapid growth of output possible.

This is why trade in manufactured products among the industrial countries in the post-war period has been growing even faster than industrial output, which is unprecedented.

The notion that national economies are neatly divided into domestic and international business is simply without substance. The fact is that every economy benefits from a growth in trade and is hurt by a contraction in trade. Efficient business managements can understand and deal with new competition arising from tariff reduction and can take advantage of the new export opportunities. But there is no way to cope with retaliatory tariff and other trade restrictions arising out of protectionism.

The sustained downward trend of industrial tariff rates in the post-war period has helped to create a favorable trade climate among the industrial countries. Failure of the Kennedy round would have been serious, not so much because tariffs would have remained uncut, but because business confidence in the future course of trade policy would have been seriously disturbed. Such confidence is now being disturbed by the moves toward protectionism in our country. These moves seem to contradict the whole principle of the Kennedy round which we initiated.

Post-war prosperity was largely built upon the dismantling of barriers to the movement of trade. This has proved to be a sound course and should not now be reversed.

Walter B. Wriston,
President, First National City Bank.

Buffalo, N.Y.,
October 18, 1967.

Hon. Jacob K. Javits,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our authority supports in principle unencumbered free trade and believe that no action should be taken to interfere with the free flow of international traffic.

Niagara Frontier Port Authority.

Washington, D.C.,
October 18, 1967.

Senator Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As executive director of Committee for a National Trade Policy non-partisan organization devoted to liberalization of world trade in U.S. national interest congratulate you on what we know your testimony October 18th before Senate Finance Committee will be. You are one of very few Senators who are unqualified supporters liberal U.S. trade policy without departure in deference to special interest groups. Yesterday we sponsored meeting of representatives of some 100 national organizations and corporations favoring freer trade. They represented millions of people in the U.S. and we are convinced that the same broad consensus for freer trade still exists in this country as it did in 1962. Import restriction bills being considered by Finance Committee are the worst way for Government to respond to problems of foreign competition. They are inconsistent with enterprise system and would go far to reverse the trade policy this country has followed since 1934. They lead to a cartel system. Retaliation from our trading partners should be expected against our exports amounting to several billion dollars in trade coverage. These bills are irresponsible legislation and if enacted would make impossible the kind of world trade cooperation developed over the last 30 years.

John W. Hight,
Executive Director, Committee for a National Trade Policy.

Washington, D.C.,
October 19, 1967.

Hon. Jacob K. Javits,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge that you, as a Senator representing hundreds of importers in New York State, oppose the quota bills during the Senate Finance Committee hearing this week.

These quota bills affect a wide variety of products and enactments by the Congress. Would be a complete reversal of a United States liberal trade policy since 1934. A return to protectionism could not fail to cause retaliation by other countries against American exports.

Quotas are one of the most unfair and discriminatory methods of regulating imports. Quotas are difficult to administer and impose even more Government control over an economy which claims to be based on free enterprise. Quotas create an artificial economic environment and once enacted survive long beyond the circumstances they were intended to alleviate.

Gerald O'Brian,
Executive Vice President, American Importers Association.

New York, N.Y.,
October 18, 1967.

Senator Jacob Javits,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The members of our organization are the leading importers of nonferrous metals. While only lead and zinc are specifically included in the pending legislative proposals for import quotas, we must record our conviction that the adoption of import quotas of any kind is destructive to our Nation, these proposals violate the very spirit of the recently concluded Kennedy round. Not only would the prestige of the United States suffer throughout the world but the entire competitive business system of our Nation will inevitably be transformed into a system of cartels and monopolies. Those of us who have lived through the depression cannot forget the economic disintegration and despair which high tariffs helped create. We urge you to oppose vigorously all import quotas and to present our views to the Senate Finance Committee at its curent hearings on quotas.

Aubrey Moss,
President, American Metal Importers Association, Inc.

New York, N.Y.,
October 18, 1967.

Senator Jacob Javits,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The American Institute for Imported Steel, Inc., opposes all import quota legislation for all commodities unless clearly required for U.S. defense needs. There is no need for steel import quotas except to enable domestic steel industry to raise their uniform prices charged to consumers. The current protectionist drive endangers not only the achievements of the Kennedy round but the entire structure of international trade among the nations of the free world. The destruction or serious impairment of that trade would be catastrophic, and destroying ours and our trading partners' prosperity and leading to a depression. You, of course, have my authorization to present our views to the Senate Finance Committee. With highest esteem and personal regards.

Kurt Orban,
President, American Institute for Imported Steel, Inc.

Washington, D.C.,
October 18, 1967.

Senator Jacob K. Javits,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Import quota bills under consideration by Senate Finance Committee would affect at least 43 per cent of U.S. imports from Japan in 1966 or 1.3 billion dollars enactment of these bills would jeopardize U.S. exports to Japan valued at 2.3 billion dollars in 1966 because Japan would have right to retaliate under GATT. It would undermine essential economic partnership between U.S. and Japan and thus endanger basis of our Pacific alliance. Defeat of these import quota bills and similar restrictive legislation is imperative in the U.S. national interest. Earnestly urge strong support of our position.

Nelson A. Stitt,
Director, United States-Japan Trade Council.

Washington, D.C.,
October 18, 1967.

Hon. Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As counsel for the American Fur Merchants Association, Inc., 224 West 30th Street, New York, leading fur dealers association in the United States, I wish to state emphatically that the association is strongly opposed to all types of import quota legislation now being considered by Senate Finance Committee before which you are appearing this week. As regards our particular product, mink fur skins, President Johnson has ordered Tariff Commission to ascertain all facts on mink fur industry including impact of imports on the U.S. market. To even consider imposing an import quota on mink before Tariff Commission study even starts is unthinkable. My association feels strongly that a three day hearing on the imposition of import quotas on a wide variety of products is at the least unfair bordering on the side of autocracy. More power to your good right arm in your fight for a continuance of the liberal international trade policy which the United States has followed for the past thirty odd years.

JAMES R. SHARP.

GEORGIA'S EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION NETWORK

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Senate an excellent article that appeared in the October issue of Broadcast Management/Engineering on the State of Georgia's educational television network.

As this very fine article points out, educational television in the United States is more than 10 years old, and Georgia has become a national leader in this field in just 2 years. A survey last spring showed that almost a million students in Georgia benefited from education courses telecast over the 10-station network.

Georgians are rightfully very proud of the progress that has been made in education in recent years, and this is another outstanding example of such advancement in my State.

I certainly want to commend everyone concerned with Georgia's excellent television educational network, and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGIA'S SECRET IN BECOMING AN ETV LEADER? PLANNING, STANDARDIZATION, QUALITY

(NOTE.—Lou Peneguy, director of information of the Georgia Educational Television Network, immodestly claims the Georgia ETV network is No. 1 in the nation. No. 1, 2, or even 10, it's certainly a leader, as this material on engineering aspects, requested by BM/E, indicates.)

The question frequently posed to Georgia ETV officials lately is, "Since ETV in the U.S. is over ten years old, how has Georgia become a national leader in statewide ETV operation in two years?"

Within the past 24 months the Georgia Department of Education has dedicated five ETV stations. These were added to the service of its Warm Springs and Savannah stations. Another, WDCO, channel 15, Macon-Cochran should be broadcasting by the time this issue is circulated. In September, 1965, its Educational Television Services Executive Director, Lee Franks, contracted to have the stations interconnected.

Through a cooperative effort, WGTV, the University of Georgia station, and WETV, the Atlanta City Schools station, are affiliates of the 10-station network. This means Georgia has a rare combination of a state department of education, a university and a public school system harmoniously working together to originate daily programs on all educational levels.

A survey this spring reveals there were 920,215 student viewers of educational telecourses within the state of Georgia. Of Georgia's four-million population, 92 percent are within an ETV signal (98 percent with the addition of WDCO).

Behind the technical development of the Georgia ETV Network is Harvey J. Aderhold. Holder of U.S. Department of Commerce (pre-FCC) Radio Operator's License No. 414 since December 27, 1929, he began contract work for the Georgia Department of Education in 1958. He joined the Department as its Broadcast Engineer in May, 1962. Now the Network Director of Engineering, Aderhold regulates the daily activities of fifty-six members of his technical staff, who operate the Department's licensed stations.

With the assistance of national broadcast consultant, Earl Cullum, Aderhold created "a paper network" for the State Board of Education. It demonstrated how 18 TV stations would give a quality picture in every Georgia public school classroom. Instead of a plunge into the construction of the proposed paper network, the Board authorized the establishment of one station as an experiment. This was done by erecting WXGA-TV. Its first transmission was in December, 1961.

Through numerous tests in schools, within the WXGA-TV coverage, Aderhold decided by mounting all future Georgia ETV antennas on 1000 foot or higher towers, the entire state could be covered by ten stations.

The State Superintendent of Schools endorsed Aderhold's recommendation that all equipment installed for Georgia ETV programming would be first quality, new equipment. In agreement with the proposal, the State Superintendent said "Today's children have TV as commonplace at home. They enjoy it; they believe what it presents. In the same manner they learn to sing commercial jingles, they can be educated if the TV presentation is aired as good as, or better than commercial programming."

The second money-saving idea advanced by Aderhold was to have the interior of all Georgia TV transmitter buildings identically designed. With the same 2,230-square-foot interior floor plan, the architect's fees were less. Purposefully, the exteriors would be different.

Another practical advantage of identical floor plans is that new transmitter engineers can be trained in one station, and be transferred to another one without any on-the-job confusion. (A particular tool in the station repair shop where he is trained can be located in the same position on the bench as is a similar tool in the other transmitters.)

In each case, the transmitter room is located in the center of the building, with no outside windows. This is to keep the heart of the operation clean, easier to air condition, and to prevent outside distraction.

Included in the transmitter control room is a film and slide chain, and facilities to run audio tape or to make local announcements via microphone. Each station has am/fm radio receiving facilities to enable it to function on behalf of Civil Defense, if necessary.

Each station has all of the test equipment needed for normal, routine checks, and has an adequate electrical workshop to handle its own maintenance or repairs.

Each transmitter building is air conditioned by a central unit with motorized louvers. The louvers aid to retain the same year around operating temperature.

The transmitters, themselves, are fed air through roll-a-matic filters to eliminate dust. A thermostat in the line between the transmitter and the heat exchanger is set to hold a continuous 130-degree water flow to the klystron. This has extended the life of the klystrons, and has stabilized the transmission.

For the comfort of the staff, each transmitter building is equipped with a completely furnished kitchen, lounge, large bedroom, and bathroom with shower.

For economy, too, all but one of the towers have elevators. (One station atop a high mountain, has its antenna on a short, self-supporting tower.) This makes it possible for the station personnel to maintain its tower . . . (i.e., changing the lights, re-touching rust spots, checking the line).

Again, to be thrifty, Aderhold has built most of the Department's stations on one acre of land. He obtained easements for the guy wires.

Each transmitter is staffed with three assistant engineers and a full-time utility man. The latter is necessary to keep the lawns trimmed, shrubs clipped, and flower gardens weeded.

Director Aderhold keeps in contact with his crew from his office adjoining the Georgia Educational Television Network Control Center on Atlanta's Peachtree Street. He telephones each station's chief engineer twice daily to keep a constant flow of intrastaff communications.

The network interconnection by common carrier rather than by State owned microwave network was Aderhold's recommendation after he had investigated other statewide ETV interconnected systems. It is his attitude that commercial firms are specialized to service the 844 miles of microwave needed to tie together the Georgia ETV stations. His records prove his original theory was correct. From June, 1966 to June, 1967, on the overall network operation, there has been 99.7 percent of microwave efficiency. To check this efficiency, a Tekonixscope with a Polaroid camera affixed is housed in each station. Three test patterns (multiburst, stairstep, and widow window) are regularly sent down the line from Network Control to be photographed. At the same second the transmitters are photographing the test signals, so is Network Control. The photographs are mailed to the Control Center where they are compared to determine if there is any network line deterioration. If there is, the common carrier firm serving the transmitter where trouble appeared, is immediately notified.

As a double check, a multiburst test is super-imposed over network programming at all times. This impulse interlacing is done by a vertical internal keyer, and is seen at the stations on the scope. It is not observed by the average viewer.

Because the current Georgia Department of Education theory is that all in-school and teacher-refresher telecourses should be flawless, the 35-people at the Department's studio produce all of the programs on videotape.

Network Control, 6 miles from the studio, is equipped with dual equipment: two switchers, two audio boards, and four standard broadcast videotape playback machines. Two are available as a backup.

The Control Center can originate film or videotape color, it passes color, fed into the system by National Educational Television, or from the University of Georgia studio in Athens. All of the facilities are adapted to pass color.

Although all of the Network Control equipment has been wired so a single operator can handle all film, slides, remote feeds, and videotape playbacks without leaving the control panel, Aderhold insists that two men be on duty at it whenever the network is broadcasting. The effectiveness of his staff schedule has been rewarding. Network Control made only one error during its past year of performance.

Besides Network Engineering Director, Aderhold, the Network Control staff includes a Network Supervisor who coordinates the Center personnel. The staff does its own maintenance, its own testing, does videotape recording for other ETV stations (i.e., for

N.E.T. stations yet to be interconnected in the southeast). Occasionally it feeds a program to one of the Georgia Network affiliate stations when the latter operates on a different schedule than the rest of the network. Each of the network stations can break away to air a telecast of all interest.

At Control there is an Assistant Network Engineering Director who coordinates the engineering of the Control Center and the studio; a Project Engineer who handles the FCC licensing and regulations on the Georgia Department of Education stations and its three translators.

Under Aderhold's jurisdiction, too, is the technical operation of the remote bus. This is "old hat" to him, as he used to handle remotes regularly when employed by a commercial TV network.

When the Utilization wing inquired how it could show telecourse excerpts during its teacher and PTA meetings, Engineer Aderhold bought a small delivery van, and equipped it with a standard videotape playback unit which feeds TV receiver monitors placed in a school library, auditorium, etc., and assigned an engineer to it. The van has become such a practical asset that he has added a second one.

To survey the signal strength of any of the transmitters at any school, Aderhold established a Field Service staff. He maintains this staff has been an excellent public relations benefit between the Georgia Network and schools. It has saved some schools as much as $1000 by its advice to administrators.

An example of the results of the Field Services is reflected in a June memo from Aderhold to Mr. Franks which reads, "Our Department made the following reception check in 120 counties and 1129 schools:

Excellent reception in 879 schools
Good reception in 142 schools
Fair reception in 59 schools
Poor reception in 49 schools

With adaptation of suggestions previously made, we should have excellent reception in 99 percent of all schools in the state."

In nearly every situation, the school administrators listen to what is suggested by the Field Service engineer in regard to ETV reception as the network staffer is recognized as a qualified professional who is on their state level.

Network Engineering Head, Aderhold, reports that ¾ of his personnel has been selected from applications from commercial TV broadcast engineers; the other ¼ are enlisted from electronics trade schools.

Besides overseeing the station construction and day-to-day network technical operation, Aderhold is very involved in the Department's erection of a multimillion dollar TV studio, 4 miles South of the Capitol.

FORWARD THINKING IN ALL AREAS

This spring with William Smith, director, Mississippi ETV Authority, Mr. Franks coplanned the organization of a southeastern ETV network. Fourteen states are assisting in its development. It is scheduled to have its regional headquarters in Atlanta.

Within the past two years, Georgia ETV Network Utilization Administrator, O. Max Wilson, has built the nation's largest ETV Utilization division. A former teacher, he believes in extensive personal contact with school administrators and classroom teachers. His group held 142 meetings with over 10,000 adults across the state between June, 1966 and May, 1967; 68 of the meetings were expressly for 6674 Georgia classroom teachers. A vast number of the sessions relied on a videotape van, which will be described later in this article.

Georgia's recent fireballing into ETV by its Department of Education caused the U.S. Department of Education to request that Georgia Superintendent of Schools, Jack P. Nix, host the first National Conference for State Department of Education Personnel on Educational Television. One hundred twenty-five top state officials from 41 states attended the Atlanta meeting.

VICE PRESIDENT SPEAKS TO NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on October 10, 1967, Vice President Hubert Humphrey gave a moving, challenging speech to the National Conference of Catholic Charities in San Francisco, Calif. He talked about the problems of our cities, the human problems there. He called upon all of us—not only the Catholic Church, but other churches, all levels of government, private industry, labor, and voluntary organizations—to put our best efforts into solving these problems that are on our very doorstep.

I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's remarks be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, National Conference of Catholic Charities, San Francisco, Calif., October 10, 1967

In these days, time moves swiftly and rarely allows us the privilege of looking back. But this morning I will insist on this privilege—at least to think back over the three years since we last met.

As Sister Mary mentioned, it was in 1964 that I last talked from this platform, only three years ago. Yet, when one considers all that has happened, does it not seem an eternity?

Perhaps the more so for me because, three years ago, I was called to new responsibilities and began to see the sweep of events from a vantage point with a broader view. From where I sit, the scene is tumultuous.

But so it is, I'm sure, for all of us—for all men and for all their institutions. And nowhere has change been more dramatic than in the world of Catholicism.

I stand in awe at the new wave of ferment and vitality you have loosed upon an admiring world. Ecumenicism is the order of the day. What a prodigious dialogue you are carrying on, among yourselves as well as with the rest of mankind.

As never before, Catholics, Protestants and Jews are attending each other's services, joining each other's organizations, cooperating in each other's projects, marching together in social action. And these are not formal, meaningless gestures.

They are, I believe, the natural outgrowth of a renewed brotherhood, of a deeper mutual understanding of a spirit of openness which men ardently seek.

It is a tribute, may I say, to the everlasting validity, the continued freshness of the teachings of history's greatest rebel, Jesus Christ.

During these troubled years, the response of Catholicism—indeed of all churches—a response characterized by flexibility but rooted in the eternal, stands out as a dynamo of hope against the forces that would fragment the human race.

For me personally, one of the most memorable episodes of the last three years was my visit with Pope Paul in the Vatican. I pray for his good health and continued vigor.

Three years ago we were feeling the impact of two historic Encyclicals, Pacem in Terris and Mater et Magestra.

To these great letters from his predecessors, Pope Paul has now added his masterful Encyclical "On the Development of Peoples," a document remarkable for both the breadth of its humanity and the precision of its detail.

One of my most cherished possessions is a signed copy of this Encyclical which its illustrious author gave me this April. Its powerful opening phrases can serve as my challenging text for today and for many tomorrows:

"Freedom from misery, the greater assurance of finding subsistence, health and fixed employment; an increased share of responsibility without oppression of any kind and in security from situations that do violence to their dignity as men; better education—in brief, to seek to do more, know more and have more in order to be more: that is what men aspire to now when a greater number of them are condemned to live in conditions that make this lawful desire illusory."

That desire for an equal opportunity to achieve one's highest humanity is lawful in the highest sense within the Judeo-Christian tradition: it is equally lawful under the Constitution of the United States.

And to say that the desire for equal opportunity is illusory for a large minority of American citizens today, either because of racial discrimination or poverty, is no overstatement.

What have we done, and what can we do, to fulfill that lawful desire for the millions who live in our cities? That is the subject for our meeting today; and since we are looking back over the events of the last three years, let me simply state that I think the federal government, for its part, has been responsive to the need to the extent that its resources would permit.

We have not always been sure that what we were doing was the best course of action. But we, both in the Administration and in the Congress, operated on the assumption that doing something was better than doing nothing.

Our course has involved trial and error, and some political risk as well; but we have been ready to accept the results with our eyes open. For we knew that the poor and the city dwellers could only lose by inaction and delay.

The achievements we have made in the last three years have been achievements not for one Administration or one Congress, but for the American people as a whole—Medicare . . . the Elementary and Secondary Education Act . . . the Model Cities Program . . . rent supplements . . . the Job Corps . . . Head Start . . . Upward Bound . . . Neighborhood Youth Centers . . . Community Action centers. There is more on the way, including a vitally important Safe Streets and Crime Control bill.

I will not volunteer any detailed evaluation of these programs. I am, after all, speaking to a roomful of men and women whose life's work is ministering to the needy. You are uniquely qualified to judge these efforts, and your verdicts, I assure you, will be eagerly scrutinized in Washington.

I will point out, however, that we have made an important breakthrough in our notion about what we as a society are trying to achieve and how we should go about it.

We have, once and for all, laid to rest the idea that poverty and blighted opportunity can be adequately treated with charity or, in more modern parlance, "welfare."

We have decided to seek basic and lasting solutions, rather than contenting ourselves with palliatives.

We have decided that we are going to do whatever is necessary to throw open the door of American opportunity to every resident of this nation.

This broader task is one that the federal government cannot and must not undertake alone. We in Washington can dispense "welfare," but we cannot manage the intricate task of social growth that the permanent elimination of poverty and blight will require.

As Thomas Jefferson said, "were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

This is a job for governments at all levels, particularly in the cities and neighborhoods themselves. That is where the people themselves have the greatest influence over their own destiny, and that is where they can make their particular needs known most effectively.

And it is a job which requires the full resources of private enterprise and private non-profit organizations.

The federal government can provide resources but the initiative, the drive, and the creative management that is going to get the job done will have to come from the communities themselves. That concept—federal support for local initiative—has been built into every piece of poverty and urban development legislation passed during the last three years.

Will this formula work? I think we already know that the answer is yes.

Federal dollars invested under the Model Cities Program can and will stimulate greater public effort and private investment in scores of cities.

Job Corps camps all over the country are being successfully run by private firms under government contract.

Industries have undertaken major on-the-job training programs for the hard-core unemployed, either with or without federal support . . . and they have found that it pays economic as well as social dividends.

Just two weeks ago President Johnson announced a 40 million dollar test program designed to support an intensive assault by the private sector on joblessness.

The life insurance companies of America recently pledged a billion dollars to finance low cost housing in slums and to provide employment opportunities in high unemployment areas.

Voluntary agencies—church groups, neighborhood committees, corporations set up by ghetto residents themselves—are building housing and providing community services with grants from governments at all levels.

There is Plans for Progress, a volunteer effort by American corporate business to assure employment on the basis of merit—only another example of private effort to right old wrongs and inequities.

The point is that all our institutional resources—governmental, voluntary, business and labor—are beginning to mesh in a cooperative national effort to build the "Cities of Hope" you have been discussing. What we are seeing is the development of a new American Ecumenicism—an ecumenicism which recognizes that all of us suffer if the few are left behind, together.

I know that the National Conference of Catholic Charities is part of this picture. To say that you shared in the growth of the ecumenical spirit would be an unforgiveable understatement. In your work you were ecumenical long before Vatican II. For ten years anyway you have been working harmoniously with a widening circle of non-Catholic agencies.

We have seen the steady growth of your concerns and your perspective. You have gone from a natural concentration on your own toward an inevitable involvement with the needs of the total community, from helping the poor to eliminating poverty.

Your spokesmen are heard with deep respect in Washington and I want to take this occasion to express the gratitude of the Administration for the intelligent and informed critical support they have given to social legislation.

I know that there has been a lot of theoretical discussion of "relevance" among Catholics. As a friend, let me just say that I think the Catholic Church and the Catholic charities are relevant in the United States today as never before, precisely as an instrument for creating a better life in the cities.

In a very practical sense, you are in an excellent position to help coordinate public and private efforts because your organization transcends the boundaries of separate communities and cities; because your mandate is not limited to people of a single ethnic or racial group. Moreover, your churches, schools and community centers are often in the very ghetto areas where the opportunities they afford are needed most.

But your role extends beyond the practical sphere. No mixture of money and material will, by itself, rekindle the hope that has flickered out for many residents of urban and rural America today—and I do not mean just the poor ones.

Our cities today are suffering from more than a lack of physical amenities. There is in them, and in many of the people who live in them, a sickness of the soul, an emptiness of the spirit. Men are deadened, frustrated, alienated and finally unhinged.

This is the poverty that is most difficult to overcome. It is poverty of the spirit far more than poverty of the purse, that challenges this rich nation.

How do we put men together again?

How do we re-arouse the desire to care, to hope, to act?

The Church, with its abiding concern for the whole man, with the inner man as well as the shell, can help us find the answer.

The measure of our success, as Christians and Americans, will be our ability to make real to men the lawful desire—in the words, again, of Pope Paul—

"to seek to do more, know more and have more in order to be more," and the greatest of these is "to be more."

SENATOR HRUSKA MAKES COMPELLING CASE FOR MEAT IMPORT LEGISLATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, earlier today, my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] testified before the Committee on Finance in behalf of his meat import bill, S. 1588, of which I have the privilege, along with 38 other Senators, to be a cosponsor.

Senator Hruska's thoughtful, well-reasoned discussion of the impact of meat imports on the Nation's agricultural economy and the need for corrective legislation deserves the attention of all of us who are concerned about the worsening situation on America's farms.

My colleague has long furnished valuable and expert leadership on behalf of the Nation's farmers and ranchers. His testimony today was in sharp contrast to the arguments advanced yesterday by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and other members of the President's Cabinet who are uncompromisingly opposed to this legislation, just as they were 3 years ago when the Congress approved the present statutory authority for the imposition of quotas on imports of foreign meat.

It is Secretary Freeman's position that imports are not harmful to the American cattle industry, singing the same offkey tune he used in 1964 when the bottom dropped out of the cattle market and drove countless cattlemen out of business.

The Secretary seems far more concerned with the problems of foreign importers than with those of American farmers and ranchers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record Senator Hruska's splendid statement before the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Roman L. Hruska in Support of S. 1588, Before the Senate Finance Committee, October 19, 1967

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, a little more than three years ago this Committee played a leading role in the enactment of Public Law 88–482, the present statutory authority for the imposition of quotas on the importation of foreign meat into this country.

Public Law 88–482 was the first in our history which granted such authority, so far as I know. It was enacted in 1964 to protect our domestic livestock industry against an overwhelming danger which had suddenly arisen to threaten it.

I refer, of course, to the extraordinary expansion in the volume of foreign beef which was flooding into our market at that time.

Appendix I shows U.S. imports of cattle, calves, beef and veal compared with U.S. production (all in carcass weight equivalent) compared with production, by year, from 1954 to 1966.

In 1956, it is noted, these total imports were 254 million pounds, or 1.6 percent of U.S. production for that year.

In 1966, the corresponding figure for imports was 1,455 million pounds, about 600 percent greater than ten years earlier. The figure for 1966 is the third highest in recent years, having been exceeded only in 1962 and 1963.

Indications are that 1967 imports will exceed 1966 volume.

The impact of these large-scale imports on our domestic livestock markets was direct and severe. Cattle prices held up through most of 1962 but declined near the end of the year, slumped badly early in 1963, dropped further later in the year, then during the first part of 1964 really scraped bottom. Altogether the average monthly Chicago price for choice slaughter steers fell from $30.13 in November of 1962 to $20.52 in May of 1964, 32 percent in eighteen months. It was too much of a reversal for any industry to withstand without disaster; in 1964, the cattlemen had to ask their government for at least partial protection from the weight of imports.

At the time, Secretary Freeman contended that domestic production was primarily responsible for the price collapse, rather than imports. I do not intend to go all over that argument again. Fluctuations in domestic production were an old story. The new factor in the situation was the mountainous amounts of foreign beef crossing our borders. It is simply not credible to deny that the imports were a major causative factor.

Public Law 88–482, which was finally enacted in August of 1964, like most legislation, was a compromise. Regardless of its provisions, the very fact of its enactment was of tremendous importance. For the first time there was written into law the principle that quotas on imports to protect the domestic industry should be imposed, and the law contained the spelled-out formula of how that quota was to be calculated. Those were tremendous gains. This Committee deserves a vote of thanks from the entire livestock industry of this country for nailing those principles into the law.

However, at the time those of us who had fought for the legislation said very candidly that the bill fell short of what we believed should be done. We reserved the right to come back to the legislative process for changes, and also the right to judge the legislation in the light of our experience with it.

Furthermore, the recent sharp upward

surge in meat imports must give us pause. Attention already has been called to the fact that 1966 imports shown in Appendix I are the highest in recent years. Indications are that 1966 imports will be exceeded by 1967. Imports of the meats covered by Public Law 88–482 during July of this year amounted to 88.7 million pounds, and imports in August, according to preliminary figures secured by telephone, were 92.2 million pounds. For the two-month period the level of imports represented an increase of 21.8 percent compared with the same two months of the preceding year. If imports during the remainder of this year should continue at the July-August rate, the total for the year would amount to 920 million pounds. That would be far the highest level of imports for any year since the year of disaster, 1963.

For that reason this may be a particularly good time to reexamine the statute and how it operates.

How well has Public Law 88–482 worked to date? The answer is that on the basis of our experience thus far it has been found to be seriously defective. It has not provided the protection it was supposed to give to the cattle industry and to agriculture generally. As a matter of fact, the law has been so little help that as yet we have not even been able actually to impose any quotas under its provisions.

We have had an opportunity to experience its weaknesses, and to observe the potential loopholes left open for foreign meat to be pushed through.

THE PRESENT LAW

How is the present law supposed to work? The law starts out by establishing a quota or limit as to the quantities of certain specified types of foreign meat—specifically, fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, and mutton—which may be imported from abroad. That is the base quota, which the law sets at 725,400,000 pounds, the annual average, approximately, of imports of those meats during the years 1959 to 1963.

But this figure is adjusted upward in two ways before a quota can be imposed. First, imports are permitted to increase from year to year at the same rate as domestic production. As of now this growth has amounted to 179,200,000 pounds, thus resulting in an adjusted base quota of 904,600,000 pounds for 1967. The law provides secondly that quotas not be imposed except when imports are expected to amount to 110 percent of this adjusted base quota. This "trigger point," as it is called, amounts to 995 million pounds for 1967.

But finally, the quotas are imposed on the basis of an advance estimate by the Secretary of Agriculture as to the level that he expects imports will reach for the year. The statute now provides that at the beginning of each year, and quarterly thereafter, the Secretary of Agriculture is to estimate the quantities of the specified types of meat that will come in during the year. The quota will be imposed only if his estimate of expected imports is a larger figure than the trigger point calculated for that year in the manner previously described.

The secretarial estimate is of course a forecast before the event, and subject to all the errors and hazards that afflict any effort by humans to foretell the future.

EXPERIENCES TO DATE

Our experience with the law this year has already revealed some of the weaknesses in it.

To begin with, there was a period earlier this year when it seemed likely that the provision for a 10 percent overrun would turn out to be the most important part of the law. As noted above, for 1967 the adjusted base quota would be 904.6 million pounds, and the trigger point would be 995 million pounds. Earlier this year it was expected that imports might amount to 960 million pounds—more than the figure for the adjusted base quota but less than the trigger point. In other words, with imports at the 960 million level—within the 10 percent zone—this 10 percent overrun provision would prevent the quota limitation from being invoked.

Clearly this 10 percent overrun is a useless and burdensome provision which tends to defeat the purpose of the law, and should be gotten rid of.

Next, there is the question of the secretarial estimates. The whole mechanism of the law is brought into play by the estimates of the Secretary of Agriculture, and the effectiveness of the quota system is dependent on the accuracy of those estimates.

On the basis of our experience with the law to date, it has to be said that the secretarial estimates are not terrifically accurate, or at least that is the case with respect to those made at the beginning of the year. For 1965 the Secretary at the beginning of the year estimated that total imports would amount to 733 million pounds. As we moved through the year his estimates declined progressively, and his estimate for the full year made in September was 630 million. Actual imports during all of 1965 came to 614 million pounds, more than 100 million less than his estimate for the beginning of the year.

For 1966 his beginning estimate the previous December was set at 700 million pounds, while total imports finally came to 823 million pounds. For 1967 his beginning estimate was 960 million, but already he has revised that downward to a figure of 860 million. Thus, each of the three years it has appeared that his initial estimate was 100 millions pounds or more away from the mark. I do not intend to sound too critical; it may be that in the field of economic forecasting that is fairly accurate, but the whole machinery of estimating imports is not really necessary anyhow. In any revision of the law, it can be dispensed with.

Thirdly, and foremost, I am convinced that the base quota in present law is unfairly high to begin with. This quota was set at a level equal to average imports during a particular base period, 1959–63. That base period was carefully selected indeed—it was the highest five year period that could possibly have been chosen. It included the two exceptionally high years of 1962 and 1963, when more than 10.5 percent of U.S. production was imported.

Let me say that it is difficult to understand the psychology which, first, permits imports for a time to run absolutely wild, to build up a tremendously high volume for a period, and then, when quotas are imposed, uses that short period of high volume imports as the basis for settling how high the quota must be. Prior to 1962 imports of these meats had never exceeded 614 million pounds; yet Public Law 88–482 set 725 million as the base quota and through the operation of the growth factor the adjusted quota for 1967 is pushed up above 900 million pounds.

That is simply too much foreign meat for our livestock economy to be legitimately asked to absorb.

PROVISIONS OF BILL

Let me summarize briefly the provision of S. 1588.

First of all, it would wipe out the provision for a 10 percent overrun in permissible imports, over and above the quantity specified as being in line with the policy set by Congress. That 10 percent overrun should never have been in the law in the first place.

Secondly, the bill would abolish the role of the Secretary of Agriculture in making forecasts of the quantity of imports to be expected. Instead, by this bill the quota would be imposed by the law itself, and would not be dependent upon the Secretary's estimate.

Third, the bill would change the base period upon which the quota is calculated. The base quota in the present law, for total imports of fresh, chilled, and frozen beef, veal, and mutton, is set at 725,400,000 pounds, which was approximately the average annual importation of those products during the 5-year period 1959–63. In S. 1588 that base is set at 585,500,000 pounds, the average annual volume of imports during the years 1958–62, a much more representative base period.

Those are the three most important changes proposed in the bill. There are several other changes which are more in the nature of housekeeping or technical amendments, needed to make the administration of the system work more effectively but not changing its fundamentals. It is hoped that these changes may be accepted as noncontroversial.

The first of these changes is to place the quota system on a quarterly instead of an annual basis. At times there is a surprisingly wide fluctuation in the volume of meat imported from one quarter to another. For example, during July-August of this year, imports were running at the rate of 270 million pounds per quarter, whereas during the previous quarter they amounted to less than 180 million pounds. There is no reason to permit such fluctuations which are unsettling to our market here, and which can be prevented by dividing the annual quota up into four quarterly quotas.

Next, S. 1588 would provide that any offshore procurements of foreign meat by the military for use overseas would be charged against the appropriate import quota. Last spring the Defense Department arranged for the purchase of 10,000,000 pounds of lamb from Australia and New Zealand for use in the feeding of our troops in Vietnam and elsewhere overseas. If purchases of this type must be permitted, it seems only right that the equivalent quantities be deducted from any quotas governing importation into this country. This quantity—10,000,000 pounds—is quite a lot of lamb. Actually, since there is no quota on lamb at the present time anyhow, this provision would be inapplicable for the time being, but it has been included in the bill so that when and if an offshore procurement of a type of meat subject to quota should be made, the provision would come into play. It is hoped that the military will not object to this amendment, which would not hamper or really affect the conduct of military operations in Vietnam in the slightest.

Finally, the bill also provides discretionary authority to the President to impose quotas if necessary on other types of meat not already covered by existing law, that is, such meats as lamb, pork products, and canned or prepared and preserved beef. We have had trouble with imports of some of these meats in the past year. Last year imports of lamb were higher than in any recent year except 1963. Imports of pork and also imports of prepared and preserved beef were higher than in any year for certainly many years. Appendix II sets out product weight of U.S. imports, by year, 1958–66.

Not only that, but this authority to impose quotas on other types of meat may be essential to prevent evasion of the quota on the fresh, chilled, and frozen product. It is conceivable that if the quota on fresh, chilled, and frozen beef is filled, foreign producers might turn to the canning or preserving of additional beef for shipment to the United States, in order to get around the U.S. quota. We know that essentially that means was used to avoid the quota restrictions on dairy products. Elementary prudence requires that we arm ourselves against such a potentiality.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, S. 1588 is a fair and reasonable bill, a bill designed to stabilize the role of imports in our meat supply, to protect our domestic industry without doing harm to our foreign suppliers.

It gets rid of the 10 percent overrun feature in the present law which should never have been in there in the first place. It also changes the base period to 1958–62, a reasonable base which is much more representative of the historic position of imports than the base in the present law, 1959–63, which yields an exaggerated figure as a quota base.

The bill simplifies the administration of the program by abolishing the complex system of secretarial estimates of future imports. It smoothes out the flow of imports by substituting quarterly quotas for one annual quota.

Please note that imports will not only continue in line with their historic contribution to our meat supply, but we allow the import quota generous growth factor. The bill permits imports to be increased at the same percentage rate as domestic production. The bill would stabilize our domestic markets without harming the importer or the foreign producer.

It is good that the Finance Committee has chosen this time to look again into the problems of the livestock industry, and the impact of imports on our own economy in this country. The cattle industry is the most widespread of all our farm industries in this country, and also the largest in terms of value of output. There are thirty-four states having more than one million head of cattle and calves. Total cash realized from sale of cattle and calves during 1966 amounted to $10.4 billion, which was 24.2 percent of the total cash receipts from farm marketings during 1966. That was far, far greater than cash receipts realized from any other branch of agriculture in 1966—nearly double the figure for cash receipts from dairying, which was the next largest branch of agriculture in terms of gross revenue.

The prosperity of the cattle industry is also of fundamental importance to the continued well-being of producers of feed crops for sale, of course.

I hope this Committee will approach this problem recognizing the historic role of agriculture in this country, the new problems that beset the farmer in this era, and the pressures which have made it most difficult to preserve a healthy rural economy and society.

In these last few years of extraordinary prosperity, it has seemed that every segment of our economy has thrived and prospered—except the farmer. For the farmer, however, the prosperous sixties have been a period of rising costs and lagging prices for farm products, a neverending race in the squirrel cage to keep up with his mounting expenses. Last month—September of 1967—the index of prices received by farmers declined by four percentage points, and the parity ratio fell again—to only 73, lower than the annual average parity ratio for any year since 1933. The parity ratio for beef cattle for September was only 81, slightly above the average for all farm products but certainly not high enough to give us any comfort. In 1967 the total number of farms in the entire United States had dwindled to the figure of 3,176,000, less than half the figure for 1935, which was 6,813,000. It is a trend which is not pleasant to think about or talk about, but which must be faced and dealt with as one of the central problems of the times in which we live.

To stem this unhealthy tide of migration away from the farms, to give the livestock man at least a small assist in his effort to maintain the healthy rural economy and rural society of the past, we ask that the Finance Committee help strengthen the import quota system in the manner proposed by S. 1588.

Mr. Chairman, 20 years ago, in 1947, the average price for choice slaughter steers in Chicago, per hundred pounds, was $26.22. Last year, in 1966, the average price was almost identically the same—$26.29. All through the intervening period it was a struggle to keep the price up to that 1947 level. The price fluctuated as high as $35, as low as $22 a hundred; it held at $26 or better in ten of the 18 intervening years, and averaged below $26 in eight of the 18.

So it might be said the price of cattle at least has not gotten worse.

But what has happened to the value of our dollar in the meantime? First of all, look at the great gains of our factory labor. The average hourly wage in manufacturing industries in this country was $1.22 in 1947. That figure increased *every single year* during the intervening years and in 1966 it was $2.71—more than twice what it was in 1947.

What about the cost of living? Taking 1947 as the base year and therefore making it equal to 100, the consumer price index by 1966 had climbed to 145.4—45 percent above the cost of living of 20 years earlier. That is a measure of how the value has gone out of the dollar.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the relief provided in this bill is reasonable and long overdue. I trust the Committee will act favorably on this measure and not add to the difficulties of an already overburdened segment of American agriculture.

APPENDIX I

U.S. IMPORTS OF CATTLE AND BEEF, COMPARED WITH U.S. PRODUCTION, BY YEAR, 1954–66 (CATTLE AND CALVES AND BEEF AND VEAL)

Year	Imports: Live animals: Number (thousand head)	Imports: Live animals: Meat equivalent[1] (million pounds)	Imports: Meat (million pounds)	Imports: Total (million pounds)	U.S. beef and veal production[2] (million pounds)	Imports as a percentage of production (percent)
1954	71	35	232	267	14,610	1.8
1955	296	93	229	322	15,147	2.1
1956	141	43	211	254	16,094	1.6
1957	703	221	395	616	15,728	3.9
1958	1,126	340	909	1,249	14,516	8.6
1959	688	191	1,063	1,254	14,588	8.6
1960	645	163	775	938	15,835	5.9
1961	1,023	250	1,037	1,287	16,344	7.9
1962	1,232	280	1,440	1,720	16,313	10.5
1963	834	180	1,678	1,858	17,357	10.7
1964	529	113	1,085	1,198	19,442	6.2
1965	1,111	265	942	1,208	19,719	6.1
1966[3]	1,081	241	1,204	1,445	20,604	7.0

[1] Estimated at 53 percent of the live weight of all dutiable imports of cattle.

[2] Total production (including an estimate of farm slaughter).

[3] Data are preliminary.

Source: Livestock and Meat Situation, May 1964, published by USDA, p. 37, brought up to date by special tabulation by the Department of Agriculture.

Note: Canned and other processed meats have been converted to their carcass weight equivalent. For earlier year data see the source.

APPENDIX II

U.S. IMPORTS, 1958–66

[In millions of pounds]

Commodity	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Imports:[1]									
Beef and veal:									
Fresh, frozen, chilled	358.2	524.5	413.8	569.0	860.0	985.3	705.6	583.9	762.9
Canned	113.4	94.7	76.5	95.2	83.7	113.4	83.6	92.8	93.6
Other[2]	147.6	103.2	22.3	24.9	23.7	23.7	11.2	24.4	36.8
Mutton and goat: Fresh, frozen, chilled	17.2	47.3	37.3	44.9	65.0	62.9	34.3	30.0	60.5
Lamb: Fresh, frozen, chilled	6.8	9.5	12.4	10.9	13.1	18.9	10.4	12.5	14.9
Pork, total	182.8	174.9	171.3	173.7	203.8	210.5	210.6	262.3	298.3

[1] Product weight.

[2] Prepared and preserved.

EFFECT OF IMPORTS ON CATTLE PRICES

(Supplement to statement of Senator ROMAN HRUSKA, of Nebraska, Senate Finance Committee, October 19, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, in his testimony yesterday the Secretary of Agriculture made a number of statements about the beef import situation which require comment.

In his discussion of the background of the 1964 law, he pointed out that the European Economic Community, the United Kingdom, and Japan have increasingly been erecting barriers against imports, with the result that world beef surpluses were pouring into our market. It is good to see that he now appears to recognize that these beef imports were and are a problem, and that our action in enacting Public Law 88–482 was a defensive measure forced upon us by the policies of other countries.

It is all the more disappointing, therefore, to note that he still will not recognize the impact of these imports on price.

In his prepared statement he says:

"If the most restrictive features of the legislation presently before Congress were implemented, it is our estimate that the price rise on domestic cutter and canner cows would be less than 2 percent, and on fed cattle, less than 1 percent."

Those of us who went through this meat import struggle before, in 1964, will recall that between November of 1962 and May of 1964 the price of choice steers in Chicago fell over $9 a hundred, more than 32 percent. I do not contend that the entire 32 percent was due to imports, but some substantial part of it was. Certainly it seems absurd for the Secretary to talk in terms of one and two percent.

But putting the argument on a more technical level, it happens that in 1963 staff experts of the Department of Agriculture carried out an analytical study of precisely this point—the effect of imports on the U.S. price. Putting the findings of that study in lay language, the conclusion at that time was that for each increase in imports amounting to 180 million pounds of beef (carcass weight equivalent, including live cattle) the domestic price on choice steers would be knocked down about 30 cents a hundred. On the basis of this formula, total beef imports last year of 1,445 million pounds would have had a total impact on our prices of about $2.40. Any cutback in that volume resulting from a tighter application of quotas would have had an effect in proportion to the size of the cutback.

This matter was dealt with in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 2, page 2442, where there is reprinted an extract from the November, 1963, issue of the Livestock and Meat Situation, a publication of the Department of Agriculture, together with a letter from an official of the Department correcting an error and explaining the study.

SIGNIFICANCE OF EXPORTS TO THE CATTLE INDUSTRY

Whenever any effort is made to provide reasonable protection against imports for the U.S. cattle industry, invariably we are met with the cry of alarm that nothing must be done, because it might endanger our export markets. In essence, that was the theme of the cabinet officers who appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on October 18.

Insofar as agriculture is concerned, it is certainly true that export markets for wheat, soybeans, corn, and certain other products are of the highest importance. If the Trade Expansion Act or other efforts under the trade agreement program had shown any capacity to protect and expand exports for those products, this argument would be worthy of attention. But the short fact is that the Kennedy Round was a lamentable failure with respect to protecting our foreign markets for these surplus farm products. During the 1964 hearings Secretary Freeman told this Committee of his repeated trips to Europe in an effort to get rid of the variable fee system employed by the EEC. Yet the sad fact is that now with the Kennedy Round concluded, the variable fee system remains in effect without the slightest limitation or mitigation of its terms.

During the 1964 hearings Secretary Freeman also spoke glowingly of his hopes to expand U.S. exports for beef. He said:

"We estimate there is a need for 100,000 to 150,000 tons of beef in the Western European markets for the remainder of this year . . . We believe we can sell . . . We have invited delegations of buyers from Western Europe to visit this country to look at our beef and cattle. Representatives of Italy and France are here now on buying missions . . ."

Did we sell that 100,000 to 150,000 tons (equal to 200 to 300 million pounds) of beef to Western Europe in 1964? Or any other time? We did not.

Total exports of beef and veal to *all* foreign countries in recent years have been as follows:

[In millions of pounds]

Year:	
1963	33
1964	65
1965	54
1966	39

Meanwhile, let us not forget that imports in 1966 of beef and veal (carcass weight equivalent, all types except live animals) were 1,204 million pounds, 30 times the volume of exports.

Certainly all of us interested in the welfare of the cattle industry must applaud these efforts to expand foreign markets for our beef. Certainly we are glad to sell some of it abroad if we can. But let us be realistic. American beef is a premium product, delectable to the taste but not cheap to the pocketbook. Europeans generally, to their misfortune, have never acquired much of a taste for it. If they had, doubtless some of them would be regular purchasers in spite of the price, but generally speaking we cannot compete, price-wise, with Australian or Argentine beef in the foreign markets of the world. Since Secretary Freeman made those optimistic statements, our volume of exports has gone down, not up, and it was not very great to begin with.

The home market has been good to us. The foreign market has not. Let us not sacrifice the basis of our prosperity while chasing a will-o'-the-wisp.

MEAT IMPORTS AS A PERCENT OF PRODUCTION

In his statement, Secretary Freeman said: "The limit on imports under the law would be approximately 6.7 percent of domestic production. Actually, imports in 1966 were 5.6 percent of production, and we expect them not to exceed 5.8 percent this year. By contrast, imports amounted to 8.6 percent of production in 1963."

By contrast, in my prepared statement there is a reference to "the two exceptionally high years of 1962 and 1963, when more than 10.5 percent of U.S. production was imported."

My figure is taken from an appendix attached to my statement; the figures therein are copied from a publication of the Department of Agriculture, or supplied directly by the Department.

It appears that Secretary Freeman's figure for 1963—8.5 percent—is obtained by leaving out of the calculation the carcass weight equivalent of the live animals imported. Omitting this category of imports also permits him to say that 1966 imports amount to only 5.6 percent of production; if the live animals are included the correct figure for 1966 is 7.0 percent, and 1967 will doubtless be higher.

To secure an accurate picture of the share of our market held by the foreigner, it would seem necessary to take into account all imports of foreign beef and veal in all forms—fresh, chilled, or frozen; canned; prepared and preserved; and on the hoof.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, October 15–21 marks the 1967 observance of National Business Women's Week. Sponsored by the National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., National Business Women's Week honors the more than 27 million women in the Nation's labor force and focuses attention on the important role played by women generally in bettering the world in which we live. First observed in 1928, National Business Women's Week offers the National Federation's 178,000 members an opportunity to spotlight the outstanding contributions of all business and professional women in all phases of economic, social, and cultural life. Through 3,800 local clubs, the National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., salutes the business and professional women of America for their achievements in their communities, their States, and the Nation.

For many years, both before and during my years of public life, I have had the good fortune of dealing with the Business and Professional Women's Club in North Dakota. I have always been impressed by the uniformly effective work accomplished by these clubs, whose members include many of my State's most talented and competent leaders. The great strides they have made in establishing principles such as equal employment opportunity for women have resulted from years of devoted effort.

I congratulate Business and Professional Women's Clubs for their present achievements and extend my very best wishes for a highly successful, gratifying future.

MERGER OF AFM WASHINGTON LOCALS MARKS ANOTHER MILESTONE IN THE AFM'S PROGRAM TO ELIMINATE SEPARATE NEGRO AND WHITE LOCALS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for the past 2½ years the American Federation of Musicians, under the able leadership of President Herman D. Kenin, has been engaged in a vigorous program designed to eliminate, once and for all, its few remaining separate Negro and white locals serving the same area.

The program has actually been administered by former AFM President James C. Petrillo, who was called out of retirement in 1964 especially for this job. In the short time the program has been in existence, 20 out of the 38 dual AFM locals have been merged, and arrangements for several other mergers are nearing completion.

Just recently, AFM Locals 161 and 710, in the Washington, D.C., area, merged, marking another milestone in the AFM program. President Kenin and Mr. Petrillo detailed the success of the program so far, and pointed out that the problem of dual locals was not one which the AFM had created, but one which it had inherited and wished to be disinherited of as soon as possible. President Kenin also noted that the basic problems which the AFM had encountered in persuading dual locals to merge stemmed not from discrimination, but from the need to protect the interests of the smaller locals, Negro or white, from being swallowed because of the merger.

Mr. President, there is no excuse for dual locals in this day and age, and that is why I take this opportunity to commend the leadership of the AFM for instituting and successfully implementing its program to eliminate the vestiges of an old and discredited system.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about the recent merger of the Washington locals, published in the AFL–CIO News, and President Kenin's eloquent remarks on that occasion be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MERGER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LOCALS HIGHLIGHTS AFM DRIVE

Two separate Washington, D.C., locals of the American Federation of Musicians became one in real show biz fashion. The once separated Negro and white Locals 161 and 710 merged at a meeting attended by such notables as Washington's new "mayor" and the current and former heads of their international union.

AFM Pres. Herman Kenin hailed the merger in the nation's capital and noted that five more voluntary mergers will come before the end of the year. At present there are 18 cities that still have separate locals, including large northern centers like Boston, Bridgeport, Conn., Buffalo, and Philadelphia.

"After Jan. 1, 1968," said Kenin, there will be an "executive order" issued by the international to end any remaining separation.

The 2.5-year-old program to combine locals that were set up separately early in the history of the union has been headed by former AFM Pres. James C. Petrillo who now heads the union's Civil Rights Dept. Petrillo told a press conference that the progress made to date in merging some 20 once-separate locals was done by "persuasion that it's the right thing to do."

Kenin told the first membership meeting of the new Local 161–710 that the end to all separate musicians' locals "cannot come too soon for us."

"We do not want dual locals in the American Federation of Musicians," he declared. "This is a situation which we in the federation inherited. We want to be disinherited as quickly as it is humanly possible to do so."

Also present at the merger meeting was A. Philip Randolph, AFL–CIO vice president and president of the Sleeping Car Porters. Randolph congratulated the new local officers and called the mergers "trade union victories." It will strengthen the union, he noted.

Walter Washington, the District of Columbia's newly-appointed mayor, greeted the union officials warmly and related some of his experiences working in New York City's ghettos last summer.

"Hundreds and thousands of kids looked up at Negro and white musicians and it made no difference to them what color they were. All they said was, 'I like it, because I dig it, because he plays good stuff.'" Washington referred to the Jazzmobile concerts that toured New York City sponsored in part by the Musicians. He asked the new local for its help in establishing a similar program in Washington. "We need to jazz this city up," he said, "I'm going to ask you for your assistance."

Officers of the new local will be Pres. Sam Jack Kaufman, Sec. J. Martin (Marty) Emerson, Administrative Vice Pres. Louis H. Aikens, former president of Local 710.

REMARKS BY HERMAN D. KENIN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS, FIRST COMBINED MEMBERSHIP MEETING OF LOCALS 161 AND 710, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 8, 1967

In our jobs all of us have certain activities and projects in which we take a special interest, and, if they progress satisfactorily, real pride.

This integration program of the Federation happens to be one in which I take a special interest, as well as pleasure in its rapid progress.

That is why I can truly tell you what a pleasure it is for me to be here with you—and I want to thank Sam Jack Kaufman, Marty Emerson, Lou Aikens, Otis Ducker—and indeed all of you—for making me your guest.

Naturally, the merger here in Washington of Locals 161 and 710 has a special significance, far beyond its importance within the community.

For it has taken place in the nation's Capital, where the eyes of the world are focused on what we are doing in this field.

Further, the first meeting of the merged Local in Washington comes at a time when I can report to you that since December, 1964—when the Federation persuaded Jimmy Petrillo to come out of retirement and head up our Civil Rights Department—Federation Locals have been successfully merged in some twenty different cities—out of a total of thirty-eight jurisdictions where dual locals formerly existed.

Furthermore, I expect to see the merger of a number of others very shortly.

Jimmy Petrillo has headed this program for us with his typical zip and gusto, and I think it won't be long at all before we can announce that the integration of dual Unions in the A. F. of M. is one hundred per cent complete.

I speak for myself, I speak for Jimmy, and I speak for the Federation when I say that this cannot come too soon for us. We do not want dual Locals in the American Federation of Musicians. This is a situation which we in the Federation inherited. *We want to be disinherited as quickly as it is humanly possible to do so.*

Our steady progress in unification stems from a number of factors. On the Federation's side, we have operated on the basis that there is no vested interest in past practices, or past philosophies.

We do not accept, as a reason for inactivity or unreasonable delay, the worn-out excuses or rationales that "This is the way we have always done it; this is the way it has always been." The past has its place and should be respected in some areas—but not in the area we're talking about here. We must not become the victims of tyranny of the status quo.

Instead I prefer Carl Sandburg's lines: "Yesterday is a wind gone down. The past is a bucket of ashes. Tomorrow is the day."

Also, from the merging Locals themselves, the contributions to unification have been tremendous. Indeed, without these contributions, we could not have made much progress.

Basically, these contributions amount to one special thing, which I would like to call *respect for the human spirit.*

When you deal with the merger of two Unions, you are also in a sense merging human beings. And that is a lot different from merging corporations. In a corporate merger your main concern is protecting the market value of a stock or bond, and coming out on the right side of a profit and loss column.

But when two Unions are merging, you are affecting human lives, human sensitivities, and human ambitions.

As I need hardly point out to you, each of two merging Locals comes to the unification process with its own assets and liabilities, its own officials, and its own methods of operation. The problems involved in creating one Local out of two are never easy, and in many instances they seem at first glance almost unsolvable. But we solve them.

One of the most delicate of all factors in a merger, is the protection of the rights of the "minority".

I should like to point out here that this is not necessarily a matter of race. In fact in most cases it is a matter of numbers—because members of the smaller of two merging Locals must not be swallowed up by the other.

Finally, the merger, if it is to have practical meaning and result, requires the abolition of duplicating functions, the unification of others, and often the relinquishing of cherished positions long and ably filled by dedicated trade unionists in both Unions.

I should like to pay tribute here to all of the officials and officers of merging Unions—here in Local 161–710 and in other cities as well, for the spirit in which they have responded to this need.

Those who have been affected should know that it is not a sign of weakness or of defeat, when one gives up a position or accepts a change under these circumstances.

On the contrary, to do this requires a special strength and a real dedication to a worthwhile cause.

The merger of two Unions accomplishes one more thing. It can prove that sometimes a new whole is even greater than its old parts.

It creates a new, a broader, a revitalized base of operations for the merged Union.

It consolidates within its area of operations the combined efforts of all professional musicians, united in the American Federation of Musicians and devoted in the fullness of their integrated strength to the maintenance and advancement of the cause of professional musicianship in America.

In my book, this is a partnership of unionism and professionalism of the highest order. I salute you for your dedication to this cause.

RHODESIA-BRITAIN-VIETNAM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Wednesday edition of the Washington Daily News an excellent editorial which I believe goes to the heart of a very serious deficiency of one aspect of U.S. foreign policy.

In short, we have the U.S. Government joining Great Britain in economic sanctions against Rhodesia, and at the same time Great Britian gives us little more than lipservice—and not very much of that—in applying the same kind of pressure against war-mongering North Vietnam.

This does not make one iota of sense to me.

The Daily News sums up the situation very well:

> If we can't get any help from Britain and others on this point, we at least could call off our anti-Rhodesia campaign, especially since the Rhodesians haven't done anything to us anyway.

I call this splendid editorial to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FRIENDS AND TRADERS

At a recent session of a joint House-Senate committee to resolve differences between the two branches of Congress over foreign aid, the committee deleted a provision previously voted by the House to ban sales of U.S. military equipment and supplies to countries trading with communist North Vietnam.

This was done on a plea from the State Department and the Defense Department that this would cause all kinds of problems with our "friendly" allies.

About the same time in the Senate an amendment was adopted to the State Department appropriation bill demanding that the Johnson Administration press the United Nations for the same type of economic sanctions against North Vietnam as are being applied to Rhodesia.

This amendment, sponsored by Sen. Harry Byrd, Jr. of Virginia, surprisingly was adopted 74 to 15.

On that point, Congress seems to be operating in opposite directions. So is the Administration.

The Administration vigorously supported the UN sanctions against Rhodesia which, as Sen. Byrd said, is not a threat to peace. Yet it has not even asked the United Nations to impose sanctions against North Vietnam, which at the moment is the most aggressive threat to world peace.

We have no real business messing in Rhodesia's affairs. This African country has declared its independence of Britain—"illegally," the British say—and its only quarrel is with Britain. But out of friendship with the British government, the U.S. joined in the UN action and has broken diplomatic relations with Rhodesia.

What would be wrong with the British, out of reciprocal friendship, giving the United States a hand in putting the economic (and military supply) squeeze on war-making North Vietnam?

As Sen. Byrd said, as long as we have troops fighting the war against North Vietnam we should "use every diplomatic and financial pressure available to us to bring this war to a speedy and honorable conclusion."

If we can't get any help from Britain and others on this point, we at least could call off our anti-Rhodesia campaign especially since the Rhodesians haven't done anything to us anyway.

THE ATHLETICS MOVE TO OAKLAND

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, in the 19th century, Kansas City was the jumping-off place for Americans heading West. Thousands of pioneers rendezvoused in Missouri before setting out on the trail for California and the other States west of the Mississippi. I am happy to report that the movement continues to this day.

As we all know, that city of Oakland has been successful in its bid to obtain a franchise in the American League. The Kansas City Athletics will play in Oakland next year, giving my State its fourth major league ball club. I rejoice in the fortunate choice of Oakland as the site of the Athletics' new home.

California waited many years for major league baseball to arrive. The tremendous growth of my State, and the avid interest of Californians in sports, finally convinced baseball owners of the State's potential. Indeed, they are well convinced. With pardonable pride, I point out that California's four major league baseball teams exceed the number in any other State, including New York in its heyday. The success of the Los Angeles Dodgers, the San Francisco Giants, and the California Angels at Anaheim paved the way for Oakland's feat in landing the new team.

The citizens of Oakland, Alameda County, and all others in California welcome Mr. Charles O. Finley and the Athletics. May the team prosper and may the blue skies, warm sun, and friendly spectators in California bring success to Mr. Finley and his team. I congratulate Oakland for a successful end of its effort to bring major league baseball to the city.

MARYLAND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ENDORSES COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF CRIMINAL ACTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carried encouraging news for Americans discouraged by the rising rates of crime in our country, and the cost of that crime to its victims. In an article "Aid Backed for Victims of Crime," the Post announced the endorsement by Maryland's Legislative Council of legislation providing that the State compensate victims of criminal acts, or the victims' survivors, for injuries or death. I commend the council on this progressive and humane action, which is much needed in order to protect Americans against the disaster of crime, which is as mindless and arbitrary as the elements.

On January 25, 1967, I introduced in the Senate a bill (S. 646) which I had also sponsored in the 89th Congress, to provide for such compensation for victims in those areas in which the Federal Government exercises general police power. Such consideration is already given to the sufferers of criminal injuries in England, and in the States of California and New York. Free legal aid has long been available to the criminal, as well as full maintenance if he is jailed, including medical aid. It is time the victims received as much consideration as the criminal.

For too long, the victim of criminal acts has been ignored in this country. On our streets, people are attacked and in case after case passersby fail to come to the aid of the victim. The Congress must not join in this massive indifference, but must lead the Nation away from its stance of unconcern. I urge the Congress to pass this legislation, for the benefit of every American, rich and poor—for every American is liable to the injury of criminal violence.

The concern of America is expressed in such actions as that of the Maryland Legislative Council in its recommendations to the legislature. I am very glad to see that concern spreading across America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Aid Backed for Victims of Crime," in October 19, 1967, Washington Post, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AID BACKED FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME

ANNAPOLIS, October 18.—Maryland's Legislative Council endorsed "good samaritan" legislation today under which victims of criminals or their survivors would be compensated by the State for injuries or death.

The Council, the General Assembly's between-sessions study arm, also recommended enactment of a bill providing for emergency commitment of suspected mental cases who may do harm to others.

Both measures stirred controversy when proposed in the past. The revised versions approved today contain safeguards intended to meet such criticism.

The "good samaritan" bill, patterned after one that went into effect early this year in New York State, would create a three-man Criminal Injuries Compensation Board to pass upon cash awards to victims of criminals or survivors of the victims.

Awards would also be granted for those injured or killed while trying to prevent a crime or helping a policeman apprehend a suspected criminal.

The legislation specifically exempts payments for automobile injuries or injuries caused by family disputes. It provides criminal charges for making false claims.

The legislation contains no scale of benefits, but ties them to sums paid for injuries under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Current payments range from $25 a week for a permanent disability to a death benefit of $27,500.

The emergency commitment bill was drafted by a subcommittee headed by Sen. Steny G. Hoyer (D-Prince Georges). It is intended to give authorities a legal way to deal with potentially dangerous mental cases who cannot now be legally apprehended. They must either be charged with some crime—often, critics say, as a subterfuge—or put through the cumbersome and time-consuming commitment procedure.

Past efforts to prepare a law have been attacked on grounds that it might lead to commitment of sane persons by others who merely are angry with them or want to get them out of the way. Much criticism has come from right-wing groups.

The proposed bill, while providing a short cut from the regular commitment procedure, is insulated with safeguards. After a suspected mental case is taken into custody on a simple petition prepared by a relative or other complainant, he must be examined within 36 hours by a psychiatrist or, if none is available, a physician.

If the individual is found to be unlikely to harm himself or others, he must be immediately freed. Otherwise he would go to a State mental hospital for up to two weeks for examination. Meantime, if appropriate, normal commitment procedures could be followed.

The bill provides that the suspected mental case must be represented by a lawyer at all times.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS S. 1—PRESIDENT'S GUN CONTROL BILL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from Mr. Earl F. Morris, president of the American Bar Association, strongly urging congressional enactment of S. 1, the State Firearms Control Assistance Act, which has been favorably reported to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by its Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

In his letter, Mr. Morris outlined the ABA's longstanding support for Federal legislation to control interstate shipment of firearms. He recalled that in 1965 the ABA's criminal law section recommended support for Federal legislation even stronger than S. 1 and that the ABA's House of Delegates voted 184 to 26 to approve this recommendation. Mr. Morris also pointed out that—

> In 1966, the House of Delegates again overwhelmingly voiced its support for strong legislation to restrict the interstate shipment of firearms, stating the need for this legislation is critical and of the utmost importance in the control of crime and violence.

Mr. Morris urges prompt Judiciary Committee action on S. 1. So do I. The soaring crime rate, and particularly the events of this summer, uncontrovertably demonstrate the urgency for action by the Federal Government to help the States keep guns out of the hands of criminals, lunatics, and juveniles. That is the sole purpose of S. 1. It should be enacted in this session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Morris'

letter, and the Gallup and Harris polls to which it refers, be reprinted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

American Bar Association,
Washington, D.C., September 29, 1967.

Re S. 1.
Senator Joseph D. Tydings,
Senate Judiciary Committee,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Tydings: Surely the time has come when the federal government must act to control the interstate shipment of firearms. The continuing increase in all categories of crime, together with the alarming possibility of further rioting in our city streets, makes this always sensible step a new imperative. It is clear that even the best of state laws cannot alone provide the controls needed. There is no clearer need for use of federal regulation in the control of crime. And, the American people, as reported in Gallup and Harris poll findings (Congressional Record, September 21, 1967, p. 26324), understand this need.

The American Bar Association strongly supports federal legislation to restrict the interstate shipment of firearms. After careful study of the various proposals to amend the Federal Firearms Act, the Criminal Law Section of the American Bar Association, in 1965, recommended support for legislation which was even stronger than S. 1, now pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee. The House of Delegates of the American Bar Association voted 184 to 26 to approve the recommendations of the Criminal Law Section. This vote was taken after the members of the House heard a debate between the executive vice president of the National Rifle Association and a sponsor of the 1965 legislation.

Again in 1966, the House of Delegates, composed of leading lawyers from every state, overwhelmingly voiced its support for strong legislation to restrict the interstate shipment of firearms, stating that the need for this legislation is critical and of utmost importance in the control of crime and violence. These resolutions are enclosed.

Since there have been extensive hearings by the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency and this matter has been thoroughly studied, it is hoped that the full Judiciary Committee will act favorably on S. 1 as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Earl F. Morris.

American Bar Association Policy

FIREARMS ACT, 1965

Resolved, That the American Bar Association urges the Congress of the United States to enact S. 1592, 89th Congress, or similar legislation which would amend the Federal Firearms Act to prohibit the shipment of firearms in interstate commerce except between federally licensed manufacturers, dealers and importers; to prohibit sales by federally licensed dealers of shotguns and rifles to persons under 18 years of age, and of all other types of firearms to persons under 21 years of age; to prohibit felons, fugitives and persons under indictment of felonies from shipping or receiving firearms in interstate commerce, and to control commerce in large caliber weapons; to restrict the sale of handguns to residents of the state where purchased; and to limit the unrestricted volume of imported weapons.

Be it further resolved, That the Section of Criminal Law be authorized to present the views of the American Bar Association to the appropriate committees of Congress on such proposed legislation.

FIREARMS CONTROL BILL, 1966

Whereas, the House of Delegates in August 1965, by an overwhelming majority, approved federal legislation restricting the indiscriminate sale and transportation in Interstate Commerce of certain firearms; and

Whereas, no action has been taken on this bill by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas, the need for this legislation is critical and of the utmost importance in the control of crime and violence; and

Whereas, the President of the United States has urged the Congress to expedite action on this bill;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the American Bar Association reiterates its approval, in principle, of the pending firearms control bill and urges the Congress to act upon this legislation at its present session.

The Harris Survey

(By Louis Harris)

A national survey indicates that 27 million white Americans, representing 54% of the nation's homes, own guns. A majority of gun owners say they would use their weapons to "shoot other people in case of a riot." Large numbers of white people in this country have apparently given serious thought to self-protection, and one person in every three believes that his own home or neighborhood might be affected by a riot.

It would be a mistake, however, to conclude from this evidence that most whites welcome the idea of unrestricted arms. To the contrary, by a decisive 66-to-28% margin, white gun owners favor passage of a law in Congress which would require that all persons "register all gun purchases no matter where they buy them."

Gun ownership shows wide variants by regions of the country:

Gun ownership among whites

[In percent]

	Own	*Don't own*
Nationwide	54	46
	—	—
By region:		
East	33	67
Midwest	63	37
South	67	33
West	59	41

Gun ownership is concentrated more in the South and the Midwest than in other parts of the country. The East, where the fewest own guns, is also the area where gun owners would be least willing (46%) to use their firearms against fellow citizens.

The cross section of white gun owners was asked:

"Would you use your gun to shoot other people in case of a riot?"

Use gun to shoot people in riot

[In percent]

	Gun owners	
	Would use	*Not use*
Nationwide	55	45
By region:		
East	46	54
Midwest	54	46
South	58	42
West	59	41

The willingness to use guns against other people seems to be related to white gun owners' attitudes toward a national firearms control law. Although a majority in the South and West favor such legislation, the percentages in favor are less than in the East and Midwest.

The cross section of white gun owners was asked:

"Do you favor or oppose federal laws which would control the sale of guns such as making all persons register all gun purchases no matter where they buy them?"

REGISTRATION OF ALL GUNS

	Favor	Percent opposed	Not sure
All white gun owners	66	28	6
By region:			
East	70	21	9
Midwest	70	25	5
South	62	27	11
West	56	40	4

Clearly, the spate of civil disorders over the past summer has raised people's fears for their safety. This was evident in the replies of the special cross section of whites to this question:

"Do you fear that in a riot your own home or neighborhood might be affected?"

MIGHT BE AFFECTED BY RIOT

	Percent		
	Might be	Not be	Not sure
Total whites	34	58	8
By income:			
Under $5,000	41	49	10
$5,000 to $9,999	33	60	7
$10,000 and over	32	62	6

Low-income whites, many of whom live in fringe neighborhoods alongside Negroes, are most apprehensive.

It should be pointed out, however, that earlier Harris Surveys reported that when both Negroes and whites were asked how they feel about their personal safety on the streets, Negroes were far more anxious than whites. Fear of violence does not seem to show any color line.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1966]

The Gallup Poll: Gun Owners Themselves Favor Curbs

Princeton, N.J., September 13.—Few issues spark such heated reactions as gun controls, and few issues are so widely misunderstood.

Some of the opposition to the registration of guns comes from those who think that this would mean banning all guns. Actually, the law proposed would not prohibit a person from owning a gun—either for sport or protection—but would require that a record be made of the name of the gun purchaser. The purpose of such a law would be to keep guns out of the hands of persons with a criminal record, the mentally disturbed and others unqualified to handle weapons.

The mood of the public for nearly three decades has been to impose controls on the sale and possession of weapons.

The survey questions and findings:

"Would you favor or oppose a law which would require a person to obtain a police permit before he or she could buy a gun?"

[Percentage]

	All persons	*Gun owners*
Yes	68	56
No	29	41
No opinion	3	3

Those who favor such a law:

1. Too many people get guns who are irresponsible, mentally ill, retarded, trigger happy, criminals.
2. It would save lives.
3. It's too easy to get guns.
4. It would be a help to the police.
5. It would keep guns out of the hands of teenagers.

Reasons of those who oppose such a law:

1. Such a law would take away the individual's rights.
2. Such a law wouldn't work—people would still get guns if they wanted to.

3. People need guns for protection.

"Which of those three plans would you prefer for the use of guns by persons under the age of 18—forbid their use completely, put restrictions on their use, or continue as at present with few regulations?"

[Percentage]

	All persons	*Gun owners*
Forbid use	27	17
Restrictions on use	55	59
Continue as at present	15	22
No opinion	3	2

ADDRESS BY GOV. RONALD REAGAN BEFORE CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, it is well known how proud I am of the magnificent record which has been compiled by California's great Governor, Ronald Reagan, during his first 9 months in office. On October 12, Governor Reagan spoke before the California Federation of Republican Women in San Francisco. His remarks on that occasion contain a succinct explanation of some of the actions by his administration which have been the subject of much public discussion, not only in California but across the Nation. I believe it would be very helpful for all Americans to have the opportunity to read excerpts from that speech, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOV. RONALD REAGAN AT THE CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN BANQUET, SAN FRANCISCO, OCTOBER 12, 1967

There were some who reacted with shocked horror when we proceeded to do the things we promised we would in the campaign, even though they seemingly approved them at that time.

We learned the savage anger with which some in government can fight back and actually sabotage efforts to reduce the size and power of government.

And as they got their propaganda mill grinding, I'm sure you must have been confused, and found you lacked answers, particularly when our opponents challenged you for an answer.

Let me tell you, sometimes I'm confused when I read what I'm supposedly doing. For the most part the press has been very fair and objective. But a few publications let ideology get in the way of their objectivity. I can read what they say I'm doing and get so mad at myself I go out and sign a recall petition.

There's only one way to avoid controversy and that is to do nothing.

There was and is, for example, tuition. Now I have no quarrel with those who choose to disagree with me either on philosophical grounds or the practical virtues or lack of same. I do suggest there has been considerable distortion of what we advocated and a great deal of silence about the details of the program offered.

And frankly, I'm fed up with hearing a debate on the relative merits of free education versus the other kind. The debate properly is: since education is very costly, who should pay and what's a fair share for those getting the benefit.

And since no one in the academic community has seen fit to mention the plan we proposed and the reasons back of it I would like to do so briefly here and now.

Our great university system offers a premium education to those who rate in the top 12½ percent scholastically of their high school class. Since little effort is made to make this education available to those from lower income groups, those attending the university come from families of comparable means to those attending our private and independent schools such as Stanford and USC.

Problem No. 1 then is providing an education for children of the lower income families. Problem No. 2 is the high dropout rate in our university. Problem No. 3 is the dissatisfaction of students with so many professors engaged in research rather than teaching. Problem No. 4 is that in our rapid expansion to match our growth there are never enough state funds so that new courses have to be delayed.

We suggested a tuition only one-sixth of that charged at Southern California and actually less than one-tenth of the cost of educating a student. If accepted it would provide a combination of grants and loans to needy students. With the grant getting larger and the loan smaller each year to encourage the student to go on and get his diploma. The loans of course to be paid back after graduation.

In addition, this tuition would also provide for 250 new teaching chairs with $25,000 salaries for professors who would teach. And it would leave several million dollars for capital building projects each year to help keep pace with our growth.

Now apparently all these suggestions prove I am against youth, education and intellectualism.

Let me add something I'm for and all Republicans should be. Legislation now hung up in congressional committees which would grant full tax credits to parents paying tuition to educate their sons and daughters.

I'm sure that many of you are disturbed by charges that this administration is practicing economy at the expense of the mentally ill. Several days ago in L.A. I read a melodramatic account of deteriorating care for the mental patients and even how one might have been saved from suicide if more care had been available.

The writer very carefully refrained from making it clear the suicide occurred the year before I took office. Now very simply what we've done is to continue the policy that put California out in front of the nation in mental health care. From 1960 to July, 1966 the number of patients in our mental hospitals declined by more than 10,000. The number of employees increased by more than 1,000.

While maintaining the ratio of patient and employee of July, 1966, in the hospital. We are seeking at the same time to upgrade the program of local care for patients which has already proven successful and which has reduced the patient population in the hospital.

A few days ago the National Association of State Mental Health groups revealed our increased support for these local programs is the largest in history and where a year ago there was $13.38 per diem spending for each mental patient, this is now $15 per patient.

(NOTE.—Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes there may be additions to, or changes in the above. However, Governor Reagan will stand by the above quotes.)

PENTAGON YIELDS: ORDERS AUDITS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the announcement by officials of the Department of Defense setting forth new rules to be followed by firms seeking defense contracts to assure compliance with the Truth in Negotiating Act was a victory for taxpayers. Failure in the past to enforce this act caused overpricing of defense contracts and resulted in taxpayers being overcharged millions of dollars. The exact amount has not—and probably cannot—be measured. However, we do know that the Comptroller General, after minimal spot checking, reported there had been overpricing of more than $130 million during a 10-year period.

Enforcement provisions recently announced by Defense Department officials will, if properly executed, bring an end to this waste of taxpayers' money. Much of the credit for this change of policy belongs to the Plain Dealer, a great newspaper in Cleveland, Ohio, whose Washington bureau reporter, Sanford Watzman, first focused national attention on this gross mismanagement of contracting procedures in the Defense Department. Both the Plain Dealer and Mr. Watzman are to be commended on their efforts to help bring about economy in Government. It was these articles, which I subsequently had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that prompted me to investigate this problem and to call for an investigation of Defense Department contracting procedures, especially those relating to the Truth in Negotiating Act.

I also commend the chairman of the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], whose work in bringing to light this scandalous situation resulted in the corrective action which has recently been taken.

Mr. President, on October 3 and 4, respectively, the Plain Dealer published an article entitled "Plain Dealer Stories Got Action" and an editorial entitled "New Strength for Truth Act," reporting and commenting on the decision by Defense Department officials to enforce the Truth in Negotiating Act. I commend them to Senators and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Oct. 3, 1967]

PLAIN DEALER STORIES GOT ACTION

WASHINGTON.—The new Pentagon policy on auditing of defense contracts is the third positive response by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara to articles in The Plain Dealer, beginning last April.

The newspaper brought to light hitherto obscure reports of the General Accounting Office, a congressional agency, which charged McNamara with weak enforcement of the 1962 Truth in Negotiating act.

Last May, the Defense Department, under fire from Congress' Joint Economic Committee because of The Plain Dealer disclosures, announced proposals for new regulations requiring documentation of the "truth" certificates.

Contractors have been given an opportunity to comment. A final draft of the new code is expected later this year.

A second major criticism was lack of teamwork by Defense Department personnel in implementing the four-year-old law and apparent misconceptions about its provisions.

The response was organizing of truth-in-negotiating "seminars" for defense procurement personnel across the country. A conference on the issue for Pentagon officials is scheduled for Oct. 30 at Hershey, Pa.

The new edict on auditing will serve an additional check by detecting overcharges after contracts are completed.

GAO has uncovered overpricing at the rate of $13 million a year.

This has resulted from minimal spot-checking by GAO, which has a relatively small auditing force. With its own vastly superior army of auditors, the Pentagon will be able to check systematically a far larger number of contracts.

Assistant Defense Secretary Morris suggested to aides of Minshall and Proxmire that the lawmakers might now choose not to push their bills—so the Pentagon will have an opportunity to test the effectiveness of the order. Both Minshall and Proxmire were away when Morris called.

The five-paragraph edict was dated last Friday. It was in the form of a memorandum, under the letterhead of the secretary of defense. It was signed by deputy secretary Paul H. Nitze, No. 2 man at the Pentagon.

A defense spokesman explained that Nitze had acted for McNamara, who was at a NATO conference in Turkey last week. The memo is addressed to Morris and other ranking defense officials, including the secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force.

John M. Malloy, Morris' deputy, told The Plain Dealer it will take about 30 days before the order reaches all defense procurement offices and is put into effect.

Purchasing officials are commanded to include in future contracts a provision granting defense department auditors the right to examine corporate records after a contract is completed. This would be a condition of the contract.

The purpose is to determine whether the contractor had acted in good faith at the time of negotiations—that is, whether he had supplied to the government accurate, current and complete information in figuring his costs.

The estimate of material and labor costs is one of the chief elements involved when corporations and the Pentagon agree on the price to be paid for military hardware. Profit allowed the contractor is based on this estimate.

The order covers the so-called firm fixed price (FFP) contracts used in most major procurements. More and more such contracts have been signed since McNamara became defense secretary in 1961.

Once the price is agreed on, the contractor assumes all the risks. He may end up making money or losing money. If his own efficiency entitles him to greater profits than anticipated, he is entitled to keep the extra money—providing he is not found to have deliberately overstated his probable costs.

McNamara favors FFP over an older form of contract, known as the cost-plus-fixed-fee (CPFF). Under the latter, the contractor is guaranteed a profit no matter how inefficient he may have been in regulating overhead costs.

Because GAO found cases where contractors had not been entirely frank with the government, it urged the Pentagon to follow the GAO lead and to begin a comprehensive audit program.

The recommendation was made two years ago. After considerable delay, McNamara agreed to go along—but excluded the FFPs from his new audit program, reserving his decision on the multi-million-dollar contracts.

McNamara's advisers split on the GAO recommendation as it pertained to the FFPs. His auditors urged him to accept the proposal and aggressively to implement it.

But the secretary's procurement people warned McNamara that this might damage relations with many contractors on whom the government is dependent for materiel.

The procurement men argued that an audit after a fixed price is "second guessing" the contractor, thereby undermining the incentive principle of FFP.

McNamara's long-awaited decision came in the face of mounting criticism in Congress. Another congressional panel, the subcommittee for special investigations of the House Armed Services Committee, opened hearings last week.

Members of that group accused the Pentagon of stalling. At that point the Defense Department had not yet filed its comments on the June 6 Proxmire-Minshall legislation.

GAO spokesmen told The Plain Dealer they were gratified by the decision. But they quickly added it is now up to the Pentagon to prove by its enforcement actions that new legislation really is not needed.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Oct. 4, 1967]

NEW STRENGTH FOR TRUTH ACT

A 21-gun salute to the United States Department of Defense.

It has, at long last, decided to do its duty, to audit the multibillion dollar business it does with defense contractors. It has, in effect, decided to put new meaning and strength behind provisions of the 1962 Truth in Negotiating Act.

This is a victory for the American taxpayer who has paid a bill for all too many millions of dollars in overpriced government purchases.

It is a victory for an agency of Congress, the General Accounting Office, which in only minimal spot-checking by a limited staff discovered overcharging by defense contractors at the rate of $13 million a year for the past 10 years.

Also, it is a victory for The Plain Dealer, whose Washington Bureau reporter Sanford Watzman first focused national attention on this gross mismanagement of defense business.

And it is a victory for such concerned members of Congress as Rep. William E. Minshall, R-Cleveland; Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., and Sen. Stephen M. Young, D-Ohio. Young read Watzman's stories into the Congressional Record. Proxmire and Minshall investigated, held hearings and introduced legislation to compel Defense Department auditing of contracts.

The department felt the lash of criticism from all these sources following the start of publication of Watzman's stories in April. The department responded by proposing new rules to be followed by those who seek defense contracts. The contractors, in addition to submitting required "truth" declarations that prices are based on accurate, complete and current information, also would be required to substantiate the statement with data and documentation.

Later the department announced it had set up truth-in-negotiating briefings for its procurement personnel across the country. In cheering the move, this newspaper at that time said the department had still more to do "if the public is to be convinced that the Truth in Negotiating Act is being fully enforced." The Plain Dealer suggested that the Pentagon "begin by finding on its own some of the costly errors which in the past have been found only by the General Accounting Office."

Now the way is open for this to be done. The Defense Department's latest announcement declares that future procurement contracts will contain a provision granting department auditors the right to examine contractor records after work is performed.

This acknowledgment by the Pentagon of major responsibility for detecting overpricing and taking action to secure refunds is long overdue but nonetheless welcome.

Whether performance lives up to promise in this area of duty will be noted carefully by The Plain Dealer and others in time to come.

THE HARD POLITICAL ROAD TO PEACE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recently an experienced and knowledgeable foe of communism wrote an article for the Los Angeles Times conveying some of his observations with regard to the Vietnam war. I refer to Isaac Don Levine and his piece published in the October 6, 1967, issue of the Times.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Isaac Don Levine, who now resides in the Washington environs, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARD POLITICAL ROAD TO PEACE

(By Isaac Don Levine)

The end of the soft political road to peace in Vietnam has been brought within sight by the double-barrelled rejection of the olive branch offered by Ambassador Goldberg from the rostrum of the United Nations.

But before we find our way to the hard political road of achieving peace in Vietnam—and there is such a road, as we shall see—it may be necessary to take a short last step on the old track to dispel whatever illusions still linger in our midst.

There can be little doubt that the prompt rejection, first by the Kremlin's mouthpiece, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, of the American appeasement call for "meaningful" negotiations in return for a stoppage of the bombing, had been formulated in anticipation of Goldberg's move. This is evidenced by the timing of the immediately made announcement from Moscow of greatly increased future military aid, including missiles and planes, to North Vietnam.

The second rejection followed from Hanoi within three days. The official Communist Party organ *Nhan Dan*, reiterating numerous statements made since the beginning of the year by Ho Chi Minh and his top ministers, called for the unconditional stoppage by the United States of bombing and *all other acts of war* as a prerequisite to peace negotiations.

This at least has the merit, thanks to Ambassador Goldberg's very belated proposal, of bringing out in bold type for the benefit of Sen. Fulbright and his many vocal followers, the fine print in the ultimatum which Hanoi has been serving on Washington all along.

Like Hitler in "Mein Kampf," Ho Chi Minh has been spelling out for us his terms in unmistakable language. Every truly authoritative declaration issued from Hanoi and echoed from Moscow has advanced the formula "stop the bombing and all other acts of war." But like the proverbial ostrich with his head buried in the sand, the articulate pacifist and so-called liberal leadership of American public opinion has preferred to overlook and suppress the heart of the formula which is imbedded in the phrase "and all other acts of war."

Even as I write these lines, there lies before me a published analysis of the Vietnam impasse by the international commentator of one of our greatest newspapers in which he writes: "Hanoi has said that it is not going to talk until President Johnson calls off the bombing."

But what has Hanoi really said to us? "We will enter into negotiations if and when you stop all military operations in Vietnam," is what Hanoi has been dinning into our deaf ears for many long months. There is and there can be no other interpretation of Hanoi's position than its demand for a one-sided cease-fire by the United States in the air, on land and at sea as a precondition to a vague Red promise to come to a peace conference.

But if there are still those amongst us who refuse to read Hanoi's clear handwriting, there is just one more one-inch step from Ambassador Goldberg's move which the United States can take on the soft diplomatic road. After President Johnson's latest offer to stop immediately aerial and naval bombardment when this will promptly lead to productive discussion, Washington can formally present to Hanoi a proposal which would leave room only for an absolutely unequivocal reply, to wit:

"The United States will stop the bombing at a fixed date the moment Hanoi announces its readiness to go to the conference table on that date."

This is how the World War I armistice was set, at 11 a.m., on Nov. 11, 1918.

Hanoi would, of course, reject again our final appeasement call, but the air at home would be completely cleared of any illusions as to Ho Chi Minh's intentions. With the exception of a lunatic fringe, the nation would be reunited in the quest for an honorable political peace along a new, though much harder, road.

This road also runs through Moscow, but it touches its very nerve-center, Soviet national security, which decisively overshadows and outweighs any ideological considerations, in the eyes of the present Kremlin leadership.

Since Moscow supplies 70% of all the sinews of war to North Vietnam, it is manifest that it holds the key to a political settlement of the conflict. If the Kremlin were to suspend all aid to Ho Chi Minh, his militant policy would quickly give way to a mood of compromise.

It has often been demonstrated since Lenin's abject Brest-Litovsk peace with the Kaiser's Germany in 1918 and his similar peace with Pilsudski's Poland signed in Riga in 1921 that Communist states in their international relations can leap overnight from a stance of flamboyant aggressiveness to a posture of peace-at-any-price.

The United States holds several diplomatic aces strong enough to induce the Kremlin for the sake of its vital national interests to force Hanoi to the conference table. Here we can only suggest three possible ways of enlisting the Kremlin as peace-mediator in Vietnam in return for high stakes of national security.

The key to all three potential moves is the mortal Soviet fear of a resurgent armed Germany.

First, we still maintain a ring of strategic air bases which we built around the Soviet Union during Stalin's era of aggression and which Moscow regards even now as threatening its lifelines. Many of these bases are growing obsolescent in the age of long-range missiles, and will be dispensable before long. But they still give us a powerful trading position.

Second, there is the issue of a future nuclear Germany and of her access to our nuclear armory. This is a transcendent matter of life or death to Russia. A pact which for 99 years would bar Germany from developing and using atomic weapons might prove a mighty card to play in the quest for a durable peace in Southeast Asia.

Third, West Germany does an annual trade of some $800 million with the Soviet Union and its Communist satellites. This trade is of critical importance to the Communist bloc's efforts to build up its industrial plant. If Bonn were confronted with the prospect of a total withdrawal of all U.S. armed forces in Germany to give us the necessary trained manpower for the war in Vietnam, it might very well decide to sever all trade relations and business contracts with the Communist bloc. This, in turn, would bring Moscow to its senses. Indeed, why should West Germany provide the Communist powers with the tools which in turn furnish weapons and war supplies to Hanoi? Our pressure on Bonn could make Moscow exert pressure on Hanoi to give up its intransigence.

To play any one of these aces prudently and firmly, however, would require a sweeping housecleaning in Washington, where the political progeny of Harry Hopkins and the carriers-on of the spirit of Teheran and Yalta remain deeply ensconced in the policymaking bureaucracy.

NORMAN COUSINS ON VIETNAM'S "TRAGIC TRAP"

Mr. **HARTKE**. Mr. President, the current issue of the Saturday Review has received considerable attention because of the article it contains by Theodore Sorenson, who speaks out there for the first time on his view of Vietnam. That article has already appeared in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as inserted by both House and Senate Members.

But the issue is noteworthy for another statement on Vietnam as well. That is the editorial signed by the magazine's distinguished editor, Norman Cousins. It discusses the objections of the Department of State to the positions presented in a previous editorial and in doing so it exposes some of the reasons which so often subject official positions to the charge of maintaining technical accuracy while achieving practical distortion.

Linked to the magazine's reply to State's rebuttal, the editorial perceives, and I believe correctly, that a major reason for growing opposition to the war in this country is "the increasing awareness of a gap between our announced aims and the policies being carried out in the name of these aims." Further, although we are constantly encouraged to believe we are taking every effort toward peace, Mr. Cousins questions whether we are not now actually committed "to achieve a military solution" as our "dominant policy in Vietnam."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Tragic Trap" may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRAGIC TRAP

A spokesman for the United States Department of State has politely called our attention to what the Department regards as misleading statements in SR's editorial, "Is the National Honor Being Bombed?" [SR, Sept. 9]. These were the three statements to which the State Department took principal exception:

1) The editorial made it appear that the United States only recently made a calculated decision to send military planes over Communist China. Actually, the State Department spokesman said, there is nothing new about such flights; United States military planes have been flying authorized missions over Communist China for several years.

2) The editorial stated that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara has said the bombing operations over North Vietnam have had little military value and were being carried out because they help boost morale in South Vietnam. The State Department objected to this paraphrase as having gone beyond the actual position of the Secretary. True, Mr. McNamara did not agree with those who held exaggerated ideas about the military efficacy of the bombings, but neither did he suggest that the value of the bombing was as slight as the editorial made it appear.

3) The editorial referred to missed or spurned opportunities to negotiate one of which occurred in December, 1966 when United States Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge in Saigon took the initiative in asking a neutral third party to urge Hanoi to come to the negotiating table. As a result, the editorial said, approaches to Hanoi were made and the initial response was guarded but affirmative. Exploratory meetings were arranged for Warsaw in the middle of December but were called off when the United States bombed the city of Hanoi just before the talks were to start. The State Department spokesman declared it was not Ambassador Lodge but the neutral third party who took the initiative in seeking negotiations. He also said the projected meetings were less definite than the editorial indicated. Moreover, it was difficult for the State Department to believe that Hanoi, if it genuinely wished to negotiate, would allow the bombings to stand in the way.

SR's editor welcomes the direct and amicable expression of concern by the State Department over information and viewpoints conveyed in this magazine. An editorial page is first of all an exercise in responsibility. Criticism of the nation's foreign policy, especially in a matter as critical as the Vietnam war, must rest on a body of supportable fact. It is against this background that we offer the following points:

1) We accept without question the State Department's statement that the authorization for military flights over Communist China is not new. However, far from being reassured by this statement, we find it profoundly disquieting. The fact that violations of Chinese airspace have been taking place over a period of time does little to offset the apprehension that the Government has been engaged in provocative actions that could jeopardize the national security. Both President Dwight D. Eisenhower and President John F. Kennedy have recognized the folly of involving the United States in a major land war on the mainland of Asia. Also, almost all responsible statesmen have recognized that miscalculation or accident could touch off nuclear holocaust. When we put these views before the State Department spokesman, he replied that Communist China has had full knowledge and understanding of our military flights over her territory and does not regard them as provocative. We are puzzled by this reply. If Communist China "understands" the reason for the overflights, why did it recently shoot down two U.S. planes—which, incidentally, were officially described by the U.S. Government as having "mistakenly wandered off course"? Is it unreasonable to point out that either the flights are authorized or are accidental, but cannot be both? On one hand, the State Department declares that the flights are deliberate and that China knows all about them, the implication being that the Chinese do not consider them an act of war; and on the other hand the Government declares that these airspace intrusions are the result of an accident. Is it unreasonable to ask what our own attitude would be toward violations of American airspace by Russian or Chinese planes? How would we react to statements that we are not likely to find such actions provocative, and that, indeed, we "know all about them"?

2) We regret any imprecision in reporting Secretary McNamara's position on the bombing of Vietnam. We note, however, that he said nothing to encourage those who believe the bombing can bring about decisive military gains. The main point made in the editorial, it may be recalled, was that one of the major reasons for the bombing of North Vietnam was that it was said to contribute to

the morale of the South Vietnam Government. If it is true that the bombing is less effective militarily than is generally supposed and if reports are true of substantial numbers of civilians being killed or maimed by the bombing, then the conception of bombing as a morale booster continues to strike us as a warped and morally indefensible policy.

3) The point that it was not Ambassador Lodge but a neutral third party who took the initiative in seeking negotiations calls for correction, although our information had been corroborated by prime sources we had no reason to question. Here, too, however, the main issue is not who took the initiative but the fact that the United States bombed the city of Hanoi just before the exploratory talks with North Vietnam were scheduled to begin in Warsaw, the result being the collapse of the projected meeting. The State Department believes that arrangements for the talks were far less definite than the editorial indicated; even so, it is a fact that the U.S. Ambassador to Poland was brought home hurriedly for the purpose of briefing him on the American position. It is also a fact that after the State Department announced that the bombings had been carried out in error (at first, the Department denied the bombings), the President sought to reschedule talks by assuring North Vietnam that we would refrain from bombing actions within a fixed distance from the city. As for the Government's argument that it was unlikely that the bombing of Hanoi was the specific cause of the cancellation of the talks, the fact remains that the talks were about to begin, the bombings were carried out, and the preparations for the talks abruptly ceased.

One of the main reasons for the growing opposition within the United States to the war in Vietnam is the increasing awareness of a gap between our announced aims and the policies being carried out in the name of these aims. The Government says it wants to negotiate but that it has no one to negotiate with. That situation is certainly true today, as Hanoi's recent statements make clear; but it is far less clear that this has been the case all along. There have been at least four specific instances, one of them involving U.N. Secretary General U Thant, in which approaches to Hanoi produced affirmative responses, only to have the efforts thwarted or blasted by inexplicable military or political moves.

The President has been far more moderate in his policies than the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as Congressional testimony makes clear. But the question arises nonetheless whether, step by step, the aim of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to achieve a military solution may not now in effect be dominant policy in Vietnam. No man has advanced stronger arguments against a military solution than the President, but the American military has evidently not accepted that conclusion. Actions in the field seem to indicate that the argument has been swinging in the military direction.

Vietnam is one of the most tragic traps in history, and we are all caught in it, the Americans no less than the Vietnamese. We may not be able to find a way out, as Theodore Sorensen says in his article in this issue, unless we begin to do these things that are consistent with the ends we seek.

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in New York on Saturday, October 21, the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Parliament will commemorate the 11th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution. It will be a time of sadness, for the revolt succeeded only for a few days. More important, it will be a time of rededication, for the spirit of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters could not be snuffed out by the tanks which crushed their movement.

Indeed, that spirit can never be snuffed out. Men long to be free, and freedom cannot be suppressed indefinitely in any land.

The sacrifices of the Freedom Fighters will not be forgotten by free men. Their cause will not be forgotten. They will not be forgotten. As they rededicate themselves to freedom, let us all rededicate ourselves to the proposition that all men everywhere deserve the opportunity to govern themselves in peace.

THE MINK RANCHING INDUSTRY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on October 18, Mr. Richard E. Westwood, president of the EMBA Mink Breeders Association and first vice president of the National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on hearings we are holding on import quota legislation. Mr. Westwood testified in behalf of the mink industry which is being severely hurt by cheap foreign imports coming into the United States from the Scandanavian countries.

I am the sponsor of S. 1897, the mink import bill, and some 21 other Senators have cosponsored this legislation. I am very hopeful that the Finance Committee will report an omnibus quota import bill at an early date and that the mink industry will be helped by this legislation.

Mr. President, I would like to insert at this point in the Record my preliminary statement made at the Finance Committee hearing on October 18, and also the statement made by Mr. Westwood.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Preliminary Statement

October 17, 1967.

I am very pleased that the Chairman has seen fit to conduct these hearings.

The serious problems caused by foreign imports must be solved. I'm sure that the Administration will tell its story very well. There are, of course, two sides to every problem, and the real service that is being rendered here is the opportunity for the injured industries and parties to be heard.

There will be a great deal said here about free trade. It will have the support of the Administration, the academic world and the nations and foreign industries that benefit from it at the expense of American farmers and industry. But throughout this land there are farmers and businessmen who, in spite of very efficient operations, are finding it most difficult, and in some cases impossible, to compete with foreign imports. For once someone must listen to their story, and it must be understood if a workable solution can be found.

I think it is very important in dealing with this whole problem that we understand that the several industries, particularly those in agriculture, are not asking that foreign imports be excluded. Those parties who will testify for some type of quota system realize that the United States must import if we hope to export. They realize that most countries produce many products cheaper than the United States. They are only asking that import practices be examined and where necessary brought into proper balance.

It is unfortunate that the parity ratio is only 73 at the present time. Many dairy, cattle and mink farmers are being driven off their farms through no fault of their own. I know what the free traders would say about that situation. However, these independent businessmen face the prospect of losing a major investment, and in some cases their life's savings.

Our mink people are only asking that import quotas be pegged at 40 percent of domestic consumption. To me that appears to be very generous, particularly when one considers that the American market was and continues to be developed almost solely by the American mink industry.

Our dairy and cattle people are only asking that loopholes and evasive practices which have seriously injured their operations be closed.

Our mink, dairy and meat producers have found no long-term remedy to the import problem. They are forced to live with yearly fluctuations, market changes and cheap imports to the extent that mink farming, dairy farming and cattle production has become a hazardous economic venture.

Our lead and zinc producers only ask for a fair share of the American market. The same can be said for the domestic oil industry.

Mr. Chairman, again I want to thank you for scheduling these hearings.

The Mink Ranching Industry Fights for Its Very Survival

(Statement before the Senate Finance Committee on October 18, 1967)

(Note.—Your Statement on behalf of the National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis., by Mr. Richard E. Westwood, West Jordan, Utah, First Vice President. Mr. Westwood is also President of EMBA Mink Breeders Association of Racine, Wisconsin. Mr. Westwood's testimony is directed toward the problems created for the domestic mink ranching industry by having mink skins bound on the "free list" of imported agricultural commodities.)

Chairman Long, and Distinguished Members of the Committee, my name is Richard E. Westwood of West Jordan, Utah, First Vice President of the National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Inc., a nation-wide trade association devoted to the domestic mink ranching industry. This organization represents over 95% of the mink ranchers of the United States, and its fifty-one constituent member associations represent virtually all mink ranching association activity in the United States. I also speak in the capacity of President of EMBA Mink Breeders Association.

It is my sad privilege to speak to you today on behalf of a group of proud and otherwise self-reliant agricultural producers, the mink ranchers of the United States, who are fighting for their very lives. Imports, riding "piggy-back" on a new and unique industry, and sheltered by duty-free entry, have reached the proportions of a tidal wave which inundates our markets and paralyzes our sales.

Unlike most of the industries scheduled to speak at these hearings, the mink ranching industry is not merely concerned with its rate of profit, but with its right to survival. It's last crop of mink pelts, some nine million, a quantity far below the total annual consumption in the United States, has now been marketed, with great difficulty, far below cost of production. As a result, its producers face immiment disaster, since, like many other agricultural producers, the sales proceeds of one crop must provide the financial resources for re-seeding and propagating a succeeding one.

In producing the 1965 crop, over a billion pounds of agricultural and marine byproducts were utilized by mink ranchers who spread their $69 million worth of feed purchases over grains, packing house and poultry offal fish, and nutritional fortification materials.

It is out of sheer desperation that we have turned to the Congress of the United States as a last resort, hoping that its power and wisdom will find a way for us to retain our farms, and our skills, and our life's savings.

Mink ranching, as a profession, is just as American as movies and jazz and mass-production. And like other American genius that has spawned endless enriching industries for the benefit of mankind, its roots lie deep in native ingenuity and self-reliance. Mink is peculiarly native to North America only, and the idea of converting its forest beauty into an agricultural product for the benefit of the fashion-conscious women of the world was a North American idea. In the span of about forty years the mink rancher has brought this difficult little animal from an esoteric forest oddity to its present rank—by far the most popular of all furs in the fashion world.

After 1940, American mink farmers, having solved some of their cagey breeding and production problems, formed marketing groups, and it was their genius to recognize from the start that funds must be provided from their own sales to build consumer demand and to set quality standards for the protection of the consumer. Further foresight and genetic skill enriched the product of providing, in rather rapid succession, a range of natural mutation colors giving it endless adaptability. No other livestock industry can match the rapid scientific breeding progress developed by American mink ranchers. For more than a generation, its associations have insisted on (a) quality control and consumer protection, (b) product enrichment from new color and texture, (c) self generating programs to build consumer demand through promotion and advertising.

All of these cardinal points of self-help took money which might otherwise have been taken as profit by less progressive producers. The ranchers' association efforts since the early 1940's have been able to double the consumption of mink in the United States every ten years and they have spent an aggregate of about $20 million in doing this. In the last (1965) crop year for which records are complete, the ranchers produced 8¼ million mink pelts, then worth $160 million.

But little profit. In fact, during the past five seasons, 40 percent of our producers have been forced out of business and currently the survivors are facing disaster. Why?

No rich and promising market such as that created and built by the American mink ranchers can escape the hungry gaze of enterprising foreign producers—especially while that market remains exposed mercilessly to invasion, from the binding of mink to the free entry list, a classification, by the way, which was erected without consulting the mink rancher who created the product.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the rancher long ago became conscious of an unfair foreign competition, slowly stealing his market away, riding "piggy-back" on his promotions, producing at a lower cost and expanding exports into the rich American happy hunting grounds which lay ahead, wide open, without an iota of import regulation.

After import quantities began to back up at trade levels in the American market in 1959, the ranchers, through their legislative arm, the National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Inc., asked for government relief through the Escape Clause, but the Tariff Commission, after a study of the industry, ruled that imports were not the injury claimed. As predicted by the ranchers indigestion of increased quantities of mink, particularly from Scandinavia, sent the world market crashing. Prices fell from $21.48 to $16.41, a 23% drop, establishing a valuation base from which we have never really recovered. Since that time we have lost over 40% of our producers, forced out of business from a price structure that obviously allowed little or no profit.

Other avenues of government relief were earnestly searched for, with none promising. Since the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 established rigid policy lines for freer world trade, we have lived in a kind of terror, on the one hand respectful of ennobling government efforts to upgrade world prosperity, and on the other hand fearing the inevitable catastrophe from foreign competition which believed that the American woman would consume an endless number of mink pelts, without the logical financial assistance to build new consumer demand.

And the inevitable descended upon us. In the past marketing season prices fell from $19.48 to well below $14.00, probably a 30% break when all the figures are in. What industry can take such dislocations as this? What respect for free world trade can be generated from competition that demoralizes and displaces a unique and valuable contribution to our agricultural and national economy?

In 1966 total imports increased 16% and in the case of the four Scandinavian countries over 23%. As examples of unreasonable expansion, Denmark increased her imports to U.S.A. 28% and Norway over 38%. In the corresponding period growth of production on American ranches remained at a mild and cautious 9%.

Why cautious? Still mindful of the crash of 1960. Still trying to find money to build new consumer demand. And still hardly able to make a profit from the price structure of the sixties, from which 40% of the producers gave up.

The price structure of the 1960's, however, did not impede our foreign friends. Imports grew from 2¾ million, the total at the time of the 1959 Tariff Commission Escape Clause failure, to 5,675,000 in 1966, more than doubling in that short span of years.

In 1956 imports claimed 30% of the American market, in 1959 we were concerned that they claimed nearly 35% of consumption, but in 1966 their probable share will be 42%. Where will they stop?

Apparently there is no limit to the ability of imports to swallow up the domestic market. American producers, facing this stealthy encroachment of their own rightful domain, are only too conscious of the advantages handed out by government to foreign mink ranchers through duty-free entry. For the foreign rancher works from a lower cost of living, produces with noticeably lower labor costs, and makes little financial contribution to the building of consumer demand.

And, forgive us, to point out here that he pays no taxes to the United States community, maintains no schools here, carries no local civic responsibilities, and elects no public officials. Forgive us, too, if, borrowing a term from railroading, we use the term "piggybacking" in a loose manner.

As an example of the kind of competition we face, the last three or four years have resulted in a total of 15–20 thousand Scandinavian producers, each of whom, it is said, average about 450 pelts per annum. Such insignificant average ranch production is hardly more than moonlighting and obviously does not constitute the producers principal source of income. By contrast American ranches average over 2,250 pelts per annum, a quantity which requires serious full-time engagement.

Under the moonlighting conditions of the average Scandinavian producer, labor is provided largely by a member of the family in spare hours and payroll demands such as face American ranchers are hardly a major production factor.

An exception to this frightening picture of foreign competition is Canada, our neighbor and co-inventor of mink ranching. Canada, in the years before 1959, assisted financially in building a mink market in the United States. Her ranchers share similar cost-of-production demands with us and, understandably, her growth rate, like our own, in recent years, remains halting and cautious. Once the principal source of imports, Canada now ranks in fourth place and shipments to us are slowly declining.

Other foreign competition remains relatively static. But Scandinavia, which two decades ago was of little consequence, now exceeds the United States as the world's major producer of mink. That it achieved such status in the year of world market disaster is, we think, significant. Though Scandinavian rancher associations have spent some money in the American market, it has been largely used at trade levels in pirating our own trade customers and trade relationships—but hardly to the building of new consumer demand. Though total export figures on mink pelts do not tell the whole story, there has been a steady increase in the percentage of ranch-raised mink pelts going abroad. Last year exports totalled well over a million and brought home $22 million in gold. Ranchers pelts accounted for more than ¾ of this billion and the total will steadily increase. By contrast, imports cost us in 1966 over $73 million in gold.

Analyzing the statistics in the case is very interesting, and our brief to the Committee Staff will certainly contain a tight documentation of our case, but our reason for being here today transcends the theory and practice of free or reciprocal trade. It is—very simply—a case of survival. Competition with foreign producers, as they are presently aided by duty-free entry, has brought us to the brink of disaster. Having exhausted all hope of administrative relief, we have laid our cause before Congress, where in the last months we have found many Congressmen and Senators who have given us courage and encouragement. To date over 75 companion bills or co-sponsorships have been introduced on our behalf, patterned after the pilot H.R. 6694, introduced by Congressman James Burke of Massachusetts.

In this action we have requested Congress to grant a simple device—that is, to freeze the status quo as to the sharing of the American market with imports. The bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the domestic consumption of mink in one year and to establish a quota limiting imports to 40% in the next.

What more free trade can there be? What American industry, protected or not by tariffs, is willing to guarantee it's foreign competition that share of it's domestic market?

What more liberal attitude is to be found among American industries who are willing to share future growth to that etxent? Some of our congressional friends say that this is too liberal and that a freeze of status quo will but perpetuate the elements of disaster already so apparent.

Your indulgence in our case to hear the complaint and to carry it to careful staff investigation is appreciated by all of the mink ranchers of the United States. Without government intercession at this point their proud and resourceful industry will certainly vanish. Without some reasonable economic device that will assure stability in future years, their ability to accumulate funds for product and market promotion will quickly evaporate. Without the mink rancher, the fur industry itself will find it hard put to promote and vitalize its own consumer demand, something it has never been able to do for itself.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, in behalf of the domestic mink ranching industry, I wish to thank you for the fine consideration you have given us in permitting us to present our case to you.

As an industry, we are in a state of crisis and it is our hope you can give us expeditious and remedial relief. Again thank you for your consideration.

ONE MAN'S VALUES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last Wednesday, October 11, a great testimonial dinner, sponsored by ACA—Americans for Constitutional Action—was held at the Washington-Hilton Hotel in our Capital City on the occasion of the 75th birthday of the chairman of ACA, Adm. Ben Moreell, CEC, USN, retired. It was an event long to be remembered and many Members of the House and Senate were among those present.

It was my pleasure to deliver a banquet address devoted to the life, achievements, and philosphies of Ben Moreell, and to the activities of ACA which he so ably has served for many years. In response to my remarks, Admiral Moreell delivered a magnificent and inspiring address entitled "One Man's Values." I ask unanimous consent that the address by this distinguished American be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S VALUES

(By Adm. Ben Moreell, CEC, USN (Retired), Washington, D.C., October 11, 1967)

Governor Edison, General Lane, Senator Mundt, the Reverend Mr. Ingram, Mr. Pew, my charming wife, esteemed hosts, honored friends and dear relatives:

I am awed by this munificence; your presence here; the generosity of our hosts; the inspiring prayer of Mr. Ingram; the eloquent tribute of Senator Mundt and General Lane's expertise as Toastmaster General! I am profoundly grateful for all.

Vanity induces the thought that all this is fulfillment of the poet's plea:

"Oh, wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursels as others see us."

But prudence cautions me to read on:

"It would frae monie a blunder free us
An' foolish notion!"

It is clear that Master Burns had other circumstances in mind when he penned those lines!

As I recall my many errors of commission and omission over the years, I conclude that a more fitting role for me would be to follow the example of Sam Goldwyn, notorious disciple of Mrs. Malaprop. He was taking a golf lesson, and in superbly inexpert manner, he was spraying the landscape with wild shots. Suddenly he drove a long ball straight down the middle! Astounded by his feat, he turned quickly to his instructor and asked, plaintively, "What did I do right?"

I am indebted to Senator Mundt for having so generously reported some of my "shots" wherein I, too, appear to have done some things right!

It is fitting that I acknowledge, also, my debts to those whose willing hearts and minds and hands helped me on my way. Many of you are among them. I am thankful for and honored by your presence. I have been favored by a kindly Providence in my family, my friends, my able and devoted teachers, and my many loyal co-workers. Because of your help, and that of others, I have accumulated a debit balance so large that I can never pay it off!

No small part of that balance is a debt all of us share, a debt owed to that band of patriots who blazed a trail from tyranny to freedom, through government oppression, to establish our free Republic.

They raised "a standard to which the wise and honest can repair," a standard which retains its integrity because it is rooted deeply in spiritual faith and in eternal principles of truth and justice.

I will define those principles, and the values derived therefrom, as I see them. I do so with caution, fully aware that, in light of the infinite variability of human beings, honest conclusions drawn from a given set of circumstances by a number of people may cover a wide range of opinion.

THE LAW OF HUMAN VARIATION

Each of us begins life with certain inherited physical, mental and moral characteristics, some of which are as unique as one's finger-prints. As we grow older, the variations at birth are expanded by differences in environment, education, training, associations, and experiences, and by the influence of our studies, meditations and such Divine guidance as we are able to invoke. These diversities bring about differences in material possessions and in the status achieved in the professions, the arts and other areas of human endeavor.

All this is the natural resultant of the law of human variation, a law of such transcendent importance to the progress and well-being of mankind that it must surely be Divinely authored! "The God Who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time," Jefferson observed. I would presume to add, "And He made us all different, each one from every other one."

With such a powerful force acting to induce diverse judgments, it is truly remarkable that we can achieve pragmatic working agreement on most of the crucial issues which confront our Nation. We do so only as we develop a broad tolerance for the opinions of others, a tolerance essential for arriving at workable solutions which attract the support of public opinion.

Alexander Hamilton advanced this thought in a plea for ratification of the Constitution. He wrote, in the first Federalist Paper, "So numerous, indeed, and so powerful are the causes which serve to give a false bias to the judgment, that we see . . . wise and good men on the wrong as well as on the right side of questions of the first magnitude to society. This circumstance, if duly attended to, would furnish a lesson of moderation to those who are ever so much persuaded of their being in the right in any controversy."

It is in light of the foregoing that, over the years, I have tried earnestly, but not always with success, to avoid impugning the motives, the patriotism or the integrity of those with whom I have differed on important questions. I trust that the views I present here tonight will be received with tolerance and understanding.

PRINCIPLES OF THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

The essential elements of the principles which set the pattern for the American way of life are:

First: Man receives, directly from the Creator, his rights to life, liberty, and to sustain his life by the fruits of his own labor. The latter entails his right to possess, protect, utilize and freely dispose of his honestly acquired property. These rights are inherent and inalienable. They are not mere privileges conferred by government, or the President, or the Congress, or the Supreme Court, or any other human agency, to be withdrawn at the whim of that agency when politically expedient.

Second: To make those rights secure, our forebears organized a common agency, which they called "government," to which was granted a monopoly of force with which to defend the peoples' rights; to define a system of laws; to invoke a common justice; and to keep the records incident thereto. Government would not be empowered to administer the affairs of men; rather it would dispense justice amongst men, who would be free to manage their own affairs.

Because government is force, controlled by fallible human beings, its powers were to be strictly limited and clearly defined in a written constitution to keep it from going off on a career of its own, like a cancer, consuming the very rights it was organized to defend.

Third: In order that each person might have full scope for the development and use of his talents, he must have maximum freedom of choice which should be limited only by the requirement that he may not thereby impair the freedoms of any other person. This requires a free market for goods, services and ideas, into which government would intrude only to perform the functions allocated to it specifically by the Constitution.

Under this system, each person may use his dollars as ballots to promote those goods and services which satisfy his wants best. This is the essence of the world's most productive economy, our own free market system, which offers incentives to venture, rewards for success and penalties for failure, all commensurate with the values delivered to the market-place as these are determined by willing buyers and willing sellers.

Fourth: To deprive a person of his rights is to violate a natural law. This will call forth its own penalties, as does defiance of any natural law, moral or physical. If I jump from a high building I am defying the law of gravity; and I am penalized. In like manner, when we defy the law of human variation by trying to equalize the social, economic or cultural status of individuals by resort to the coercive force of government, thus restricting free choice and impeding creative energies, we suffer the penalties.

A corollary is that there is no moral sanction for any man to impair the rights of his posterity. Just as he may not sell them into slavery, so may he not deprive them of their economic or political freedom. Jefferson held that the act of deferring payment on the public debt, thus imposing this burden on future generations, is tantamount to enslaving them.

Fifth: Every God-given right entails a responsibility to exercise that right within the limitations fixed by such stern admonitions as The Ten Commandments, The Sermon on the Mount and The Golden Rule. A man's right to the free use of his faculties makes him responsible for the manner in which he uses them. His right to life demands that he be responsible for caring for himself and his own. He is responsible for fulfilling the contracts which he enters into freely. And he has a responsibility to protect the framework of the social order which permits him to use his faculties for his own ends and to discharge his obligations as he may choose.

And, finally, there is a realm of moral obligations and duties which is a matter for religion, a matter for individual conscience, a matter for a man and his intimate relationship to his God. It is presumptuous for human beings to legislate about such matters. If such obligations and duties are imposed by force of law they lose their moral content for the individual, because, when coercion is introduced, he no longer has freedom of choice.

SQUANDERING OUR LEGACY

On this solid foundation our people built a Nation dedicated to human freedom; a Nation which was a haven of refuge for the oppressed and a beacon of hope for those who could not escape to our shores; a Nation where there was always compassion and abundant help for the needy but where opportunity for self-help was held to be far more important and was made available in generous measure; a Nation where, within the limitations of human error and frailty, there was a generally prevailing respect for the personal dignity and the natural rights of all, without regard to race, creed, color or national origin.

What have we done with this rich heritage? My generation has squandered its legacy. We have failed to preserve the integrity of this citadel of freedom. We have permitted its super-structure to be eroded and its foundations weakened to the point where there is grave danger of collapse.

All of us share the blame. We are reaping where we have sown. Over the past half-century we have propagated a mis-placed faith in the ability of the Central Government in Washington to achieve any kind of material, economic, social or moral purpose. Implementing this faith we have abdicated our personal responsibilities to God and to our neighbor in favor of an impersonal government, upon which we have thrust enormous powers. Or, we have stood by meekly and permitted government to seize more and more authority, centralizing it in Washington, far removed from the scrutiny of those from whom it was taken.

Thus, local communities are deprived of the means of solving their own problems by the use of realistic measures, suited to local conditions. Instead, they must resort to ineffective or harmful solutions devised by Washington experts in philosophical abstractions, who ride rough-shod over local customs, practices, procedures and prejudices.

Professor Daniel Moynihan, prominent modern liberal, recently remarked, "The Federal Government is good at collecting revenues and rather bad at disbursing services."

Our current policies ignore the great hazard of concentration of economic or political power in government. Lord Acton warned us, "All power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely."

It has been said that the people never give up their liberties except under some delusion. We have been surrendering our liberties under the delusion that government has some supreme competence in the realm of economics, some magic multiplier of wealth, some easy access to a vast store of economic goods which may be had without working for them, merely by voting for them!

INNER RESTRAINTS—LAW AND ORDER

In 1776, George Mason wrote this statement into the Virginia Declaration of Rights:

"No free government or the blessings of liberty can be preserved to any people but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

What principles did he have in mind? They were, broadly speaking, religious principles; not the doctrines and creeds which set off one group from another but rather the belief in a just and merciful God which they share. It was a basic American principle to separate Church and State, not because of any hostility to religion; quite the contrary. The State was to be secular in order that religion might be free to teach our people the inner restraints of self-discipline. The latter, in turn, would reduce or eliminate those infringements on individual rights which so often accompany forceful measures taken by government to establish and maintain public order.

Edmund Burke said:

"Society cannot exist unless a controlling power on the will and appetite is placed somewhere; and the less there is within the more there must be of it without."

The American tradition holds that a free society is possible only if it consists, predominantly, of spiritually conscious, self-disciplined individuals. This is evident in both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The framers of those documents believed they were transcribing "the laws of Nature and of Nature's God." The supremacy of the Constitution was believed to stem from its correspondence to a law superior to the will of human rulers.

In recent decades we have veered away from that design for a great and devout Nation, whose basic tenet was an economically independent citizenry, supporting and controlling a government which is the servant of the people, not their master! Instead, we have moved sharply toward the seductive idea of a socialist "utopia," which reverses the American pattern, enslaving the people by having the government support them! This is the same false "utopia" from which many of our people, or their forebears, escaped in order to seek freedom and opportunity in America!

To know the ailment is the first step toward finding the cure. We can escape from our current confusion; but it will not be by political legerdemain. Rather, it will be by a rehabilitation of those spiritual and moral values which made our Nation great!

AMERICA AND MORAL LEADERSHIP

I am no prophet of doom. While I hold that disaster lies ahead unless we change course, I believe that the world is now on the threshold of what could be such a dynamic expansion of spiritual understanding and material productivity as to tax the capacities of all mankind! The world looks to America for moral leadership. The great French philosopher, Jacques Maritain, said:

"What the world expects from America is that she keep alive, in human history, a fraternal recognition of the dignity of man . . . the terrestrial hope of men in the Gospel!"

We can provide that moral leadership if each of us will dedicate himself to "justice, moderation, temperance, frugality and virtue, and frequent recurrence to fundamental principles." This task must be undertaken by each one, acting individually. Our success will then be evidenced by the wise actions of our elected law-makers—and by those who execute the laws they enact. This is the way we can make our liberty secure!

The great Irish patriot, John Philpot Curran, said:

"It is the common fate of the indolent to see their rights become a prey to the active. The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

Freedom is never free. It's security requires tireless dedication and unceasing toil. Once lost, it can be regained only by paying a very high price in blood, sweat and tears.

We live in an era of crisis. In such times, the genius of our people is to rise above their differences and to unite their strengths to serve the common good.

Let us face the future with determination, confidence and, above all, faith in God and in each other. We will not fail; for we shall know the truth, and the truth shall make us free!

THE MANY CAREERS OF HAROLD TITUS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, last week the conservation world lost one of its strongest and most effective spokesmen when death took Harold Titus of Traverse City, Mich.

Active until the end, Mr. Titus had built a nationally prominent reputation for his work on behalf of conservation.

To borrow a fitting expression from the Traverse City Record-Eagle, Harold Titus had many careers.

After graduating from the University of Michigan in 1911, Mr. Titus became a fruit grower in Grand Traverse County. Later he joined the U.S. Army during World War I.

For a time Mr. Titus served as reporter for the Record-Eagle. He took an early interest in fiction writing as well, and during his lifetime, which spanned 79 years, he completed nearly a dozen novels. These included "I Conquered," published in 1916, and the equally popular "Black Feathers," published in 1936.

Mr. Titus contributed numerous articles to such well-known national publications as Collier's, Red Book, and Ladies' Home Journal.

After helping to organize the Izaak Walton League of America in 1922, Harold Titus became a prime mover behind the formation of the Forest Service. From 1927 until 1935, he served on the Michigan Conservation Commission.

A recipient of many distinguished conservation awards, Mr. Titus was designated winner of the 1951 Wildlife Society's Leopold Medal.

He served as conservation editor of Field and Stream magazine until his death.

Mr. Titus was born into an era that did not know air and water pollution. To his generation, highway beautification meant keeping the status quo. The horseless carriage was just a dream.

But as he grew to adulthood, Harold Titus grasped that our ever-mounting population and industrial expansion could eventually spell the ruination of nature's gift to America.

Harold Titus dedicated his life to preserving the country's natural beauty and our rich heritage. We are the ultimate benefactors of his untiring efforts. Americans of all generations will continue to owe him a lasting debt of gratitude.

LABOR RIGHT TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST STRIKEBREAKING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, every Member of this body should be alerted to a proposal, set forth by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina on October 12, which, if adopted, would cripple the cherished right of organized labor to wage a strike for improved working conditions. I refer to the Ervin substitute for H.R. 2516, the civil rights bill passed by the House in August.

The Ervin substitute provides in section 104 that the National Labor Relations Act be amended to prohibit union imposition or judicial enforcement of any fine, and "any disciplinary action whatever," against a union member who engages in strikebreaking. Thus, for the first time in our history, labor unions are singled out from among all associations and organizations for a prohibition against any discipline of their own members—even members who violate the first duty of union allegiance by assisting the employer against the common cause of their fellow unionists in a strike for better working conditions.

This unprecedented and punitive provision would negate union majority rule and would cripple the cherished right to strike which Congress has so many times upheld as the legitimate weapon of organized labor for the improvement of the worker's lot.

The Ervin proposal would negate a long record of congressional protection of the right to strike. In 1932, the historic Norris-LaGuardia Act sought to free labor's right to strike from oppressive interference by judicial injunctions. Then in 1935 Congress expressly provided that nothing in the new Federal labor law would impair the right to strike. In 1947—in the Taft-Hartley amendments—we once more resisted efforts to impair this cherished right of the workingman. Even Senator Taft in the last analysis recognized the legitimate privilege of workingmen to improve their conditions by concerted work refusal. As the Senator put it during the floor debate on the issue of the labor strike:

> We have not forbidden it, because we believe that the right to strike for hours, wages and working conditions in the ultimate analysis is essential to the maintenance of freedom in the United States . . . our freedom depends upon maintaining the free right to strike (93 Cong. Rec. 7537).

In 1959 in the Landrum-Griffin law, which I again resisted in its unwarranted curtailment of labor union rights, Congress once more refused to impair in any way labor's resort to the strike. Indeed, the power to discipline strikebreaking members was at least inferentially recognized where we provided that nothing in the 1959 law should be deemed to "impair the right of a labor organization to adopt and enforce reasonable rules as to the responsibility of every member toward the organization." Now, in contrast to that provision, Senator Ervin's proposal would bar unions from enforcing the most reasonable union rule of all—the rule requiring membership allegiance to the common cause in a union strike to improve the lot of every employee and member of the union.

Senator Ervin's proposal would enact a rule of organizational anarchy for labor unions alone among all organizations and associations in our society. It would bring Congress to the aid of antilabor employers seeking to blunt labor's rights and freedom of self-protection. This harsh and restrictive proposal deserves to be rejected by every Member of this body.

PROPOSED TREATIES CONCERNING PANAMA CANAL

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on September 2, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] spoke before the Young Americans for Freedom in Pittsburgh, Pa.

His remarks on that occasion make a thoughtful contribution to the current discussion of proposed treaties concerning the Panama Canal. I believe all Americans should have an opportunity to read Senator Thurmond's warnings concerning the possible abbrogation of our rights and interests regarding the Panama Canal.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Communist Plans for the Panama Canal

(Address by Senator Strom Thurmond, Republican, of South Carolina, before Young Americans for Freedom national convention, Pittsburgh, Pa., September 2, 1967)

The most recent dispatches from Panama have been telling a perplexing story. Last June President Johnson and President Marco Robles announced that the two countries of the United States and the Republic of Panama had completed negotiations on three *new* treaties regarding the Panama Canal. Although the official texts of these treaties have never been released, the details are fully known.

From the American point of view, there is only one word to describe their contents. These treaties are the *greatest* give-away since God gave man the world for his dominion. They give away United States jurisdiction and sovereignty. They give away United States land and property. They give away United States operating facilities and engineering works. In short, they give away the entire U.S. Canal—and indeed any new canal that the United States might build in Panama—to a dubious operating authority whose sole strength is the slender reed of promises by the Republic of Panama. Let me take just a moment to describe the batch of three treaties. The first and most important treaty is the basic re-negotiated Panama Canal Treaty. This treaty sets up an *organization* described as "International Juridical Entity" which would be the administrative agency for operating the Canal. All of the property that *now* belongs to the United States Government would be turned over *free* of charge to the operating agency. The present Canal Zone would be diminished from the 10-mile wide strip to an area approximately 1 mile wide. The Canal Administration would operate its own *court* system and its own *police* forces in the Canal area.

So you can see that it will be very crucial for the *safety* of the Canal to make sure that the United States has *control*. Ultimate control of the Canal is in a governing board of 9 men. The United States has a 1-man majority on this board. But I want to point out that Congress will relinquish *all* control over the appointment of these men and has *no* recourse if even *one* of them should turn out to be incompetent or acts against the best interests of the country.

Furthermore, the *executive* control is in the hands of a Director General and his deputy. The terms of office of these men alternate between United States citizens and Panamanian citizens. At the present time, the President of the United States can assume direct control *instantaneously* if dangerous conditions are warranted. Under the five-four board, *control* would be so *diluted* that it would be impossible to be sure that effective action could be taken in time.

I would like to mention one other aspect of this important treaty. The formula for *payments* are strongly biased against the United States. Panama's share is based on $0.17 per long ton going up to $0.22 per long ton, year by year. After these payments are made to Panama, estimated to be about $20 million per year, then all other expenses of the Canal are to be paid, including overhead, capital improvement, and operating funds. The last priority is held out for the United States payment which is only $0.08 per long ton and going up to $0.10 per long ton. The effect of these increased payments will undoubtedly result in increased tolls which could easily be as high as 25%.

The second treaty is the proposed status of forces treaty which defines the rights and privileges of our territory forces stationed to defend the Canal. One of the most serious drawbacks of this treaty is that it provides for a committee to confer when any special action is necessary to defend outbreaks of insurrection or enemy attack. The treaty stipulates that in the event that the committee fails to come to agreement on *what* measure can be taken that the controversy will be directed toward the respective governments through proper channels. This is an extremely cumbersome arrangement, and is another example of civilians dictating a no-win military policy without any consideration for the experience and professional judgment of the military experts.

Another feature of this treaty is a provision that the Panamanian Flag shall fly over *all* United States bases on Panamanian soil. The United States Flag *cannot* fly unless Panama gives *special* permission. No other base agreement that we have anywhere in the world stoops so low as to strike the American Flag.

The third treaty gives us an option to build a so-called sea level canal somewhere in Panama. At this point we do *not* know whether a sea level canal is technically or economically feasible. Congress currently has authorized a study which will take at least three years to complete. It is insane to propose a treaty for building a sea level canal when we don't even know that *such* a canal *can* be built. At the very least, these treaties should be held up until the sea level study is complete. Furthermore, if a sea level canal is built, the control structure will be virtually identical to the proposal in the new treaties with one exception: The door is held open to internationalization in the construction and financing of a sea level canal. *This* would dilute our control *even* more.

But in spite of this give-away, the most recent dispatches from Panama are indeed perplexing. These dispatches report that there is tremendous opposition growing within the ranks of Panamanian politics to approval of the treaties. We hear that President Marco Robles is being attacked on all sides. The plans for the formal ceremony of signing the treaties, which according to informed sources was scheduled for three weeks ago in Washington, have been put off *indefinitely*. President Robles sought to make these treaties his political triumph, but it now appears that the treaties will cause him nothing but tribulation.

These reports have caused great concern and puzzlement throughout many quarters in the United States. Many men thought that the generous give-away attitude reflected in these treaties would appease Panamanian nationalism. When the treaty negotiators sat down two years ago, the United States held almost all the cards.

We had, first of all, *sovereignty*—operating sovereignty in the Canal Zone. Secondly, we had won *independence* for Panama and furnished Panama with the main source of development and support. Thirdly, we have had a history of generous concessions and easy relations with Panama since the first treaty was signed in 1903.

The only card that Panama held was the somewhat dubious power of *blackmail*, a power growing out of *extreme* Nationalist activities. There was absolutely no reason why a strong powerful nation like the United States should give in to the petty blackmail on the fluctuating Panamanian political scene.

Yet when the negotiation game was over, Panama got up with the whole pot. We played as though we *wanted* to lose. Many of our United States liberals, particularly those who are most liberal with the taxpayers' investments, have been genuinely puzzled by the ominous turn which events have taken in recent days, with the stirring up of opposition to the treaties.

However, those who have been watching the Panamanian scene closely for some time were *not* surprised. Early in July soon after the treaties were announced, I made a short speech before the Senate pointing out what the *long-term* aspirations of the Panamanian Nationalist sentiments were in regard to the Canal.

From statements in the Spanish language press, it was clear that the Nationalists were prepared to urge extreme measures. Among their objectives were: First, that Panama aspires to have the *same* relation to the Panama Canal that Egypt has to the Suez Canal and proposes to nationalize it. Second, that Panama repudiates the idea of *internationalization*. Third, that Panama is determined to have *complete* sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Fourth, that Panama is considering closing territorial waters around the Canal Zone—a jurisdiction not recognized by the United States—as a *trap* to get its demands.

From these and other objectives, it was soon to be clear that the contents of the proposed treaties would not satisfy the demands of Panamanian politics. Insofar as the United States maintained *any* kind of indirect control at all, or retained *any* power, however bridled, to *protect* the Canal and its installations—to *that* extent the Panamanian Nationalists would remain dissatisfied.

The latest word is that even the most responsible of the forces opposing the treaty for principal objections are demanding that President Robles re-negotiate *four* principal items in the treaty which give minimum safeguards for the extensive U.S. interests in the Canal. These four objections are: First, that the provisions in the treaties for special *courts* in the area of the Canal would result in courts that would be outside Panamanian juridical control. Second, the special *police* force in the Canal area would have exclusive authority and not be under the direct control of Panama. Third, the *governing body* of the Canal administration would be weighed with 5 to 4 in favor of the United States; the Nationalists would prefer the other way around. Fourth, the provision for the use of Panamanian territory by U.S. armed forces defending the Canal is regarded as an imposition upon Panamanian sovereignty.

Now, as a matter of fact, the *actual* U.S. control exerted through these four points is so weak as to be extremely dangerous to our interests. The special Canal courts would be employing a new body of law which would not necessarily have the same protection as U.S. law. The police force would be under the control of a weak authority which would have difficulty coping with unexpected or large disturbances. The 5 to 4 margin on the governing body of the administration depends entirely upon the character and ability and inclination of the men who are appointed to the United States seats by the United States President.

Finally, the provisions for the United States defense bases in Panama are weakened by the giving of priority to Panamanian uses. Although the Panamanians want more than this, these protections are ridiculously weak when compared to the *firm* position which we *now* enjoy and seem intent upon abandoning. The question *then* is, *why* is Panamanian Nationalism intent upon rejecting the United States give-away?

The *answer* is that in terms of political action, Panamanian *Nationalism* is nearly impossible to distinguish from *Communism*. Now I grant that the *motives* of many Nationalists may be quite different from those of the Communists. I grant that many Panamanian politicians are not looking beyond their shores. On the other hand, the Communists have had their eye on the Panama Canal from the very first days when Communism seized power in the Soviet Union. In the famous memoirs of John Reed *Ten Days That Shook the World*, this American observer of the Bolshevik Revolution reported that the Soviet representative to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, Comrade Skobelev, was instructed by the Soviet Executive Committee to demand that "all straits opening into inland seas as well as the Suez and Panama Canals be neutralized." This grand strategy of the Communists has endured down to the most recent days when, during the Suez crises in June, the Soviets once more demanded that *all* great waterways be internationalized.

It is easy to see *why* the Soviets have their eye on the Panama Canal. This is, of course, an important waterway in world trade. But it is even more important as a *vital* artery to *American* trade. Two-thirds of *all* cargo going through the Panama Canal is either bound to an American port or is coming from an American port. Those who wish to *bury* the United States must begin by blocking the Panama Canal.

But in time of war the Canal takes on an entirely *new* significance.

During the Second World War, 5,300 combat vessels used the Canal and 8,500 other ships carried troops or military cargo through it. For reasons of safety, no Axis ships could be permitted to go through. Of course, none would have dared come within hailing distance of the entrance to the Canal. Similarly, during the Korean war, over 1,000 U.S. Government vessels transited the Panama Canal to carry troops, supplies, and war materiel to U.S. troops in Korea.

Despite the fact that those who say that the Canal is outmoded in an age of nuclear warfare, it continues to be an import supply line to Vietnam. U.S. Government and U.S. Government chartered vessels transiting the Canal increased in number from 394 to 725 in the period of fiscal year 1965–66. The cargo carried jumped from 1.9 million to 3.2 million long tons. Although these figures are the most recent available, they are for the year ending June 30, 1966, in the period before escalation really began in the buildup of military supplies in Southeast Asia.

Nuclear warfare *could* destroy the Panama Canal—or indeed any canal, even a *sea level* canal. However, we must presume that wars will continue to be fought as at present, to wit, in non-nuclear engagements. In that case, the Canal provides the Navy and supporting Merchant Marine with interior lines of sea communications, far shorter than the routes around Cape Horn or Cape Good Hope. If the Canal were blocked, a large part of the U.S. railroad capacity would have to be used to shuttle troops and supplies from Atlantic to Pacific.

Even if the Canal were closed in peace time, the cost to the United States would be great. Millions of dollars would be added to U.S. shipping costs, and as much as two weeks time in ocean shipments. Japan, one of the largest buyers of U.S. coal, would probably have to seek other sources of supply. California and other West Coast states would begin to feel an almost instantaneous blight. Steel shortages would quickly begin to affect almost all West Coast manufacturing. On the East Coast, many of the canned foods which we take for granted, such as pears and pineapples, would become very expensive.

Hunt Foods and Industries, one of the big West Coast fruit and vegetable packers, has estimated that it alone would need 75 to 80 more railroad cars in the next 60 days if the Canal were closed. I think that no one would disagree that the closing of the Panama Canal, or its take-over by a hostile nation, would be disastrous for the U.S. economy. It is no wonder, then, that the Communists have given it the No. 1 long-range priority.

Americans sometimes have difficulty in imagining how a fiercely Nationalist country like Panama, could become the tool of Communist policy. A recent publication of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I am a member, recently chose Panama as a hypothetical case in the study of Soviet propaganda techniques. Allow me to quote:

"On the day the government of Panama falls under the control of some Popular-National-Progressive Anti-imperialist Front of Liberation, the United States could be maneuvered into relinquishment of the Panama Canal without using a single missile from its billion dollar armament. This is a very real and possible imminent development. The Front might consist of 500 students, 60 Sergeants, 50 professors, 40 journalists, 30 lawyers, and 20 longshoremen, gathered from the back rooms of a dozen cafes, and united around 10 Soviet agents at a cost to Moscow of some half million dollars."

Those who have not studied Communist history and Communist techniques cannot possibly imagine the tremendous leverage that even 10 Soviet agents who might appear to be Panamanian Nationalists can have in such a case.

Now let us turn from the hypothetical study made by a U.S. Senate Subcommittee to another study published in a theoretical periodical, the *World Marxist Review*, which is, of course, a public organ of the international Communist conspiracy. The *World Marxist Review* has already laid forth the Communist strategy for the take-over of Panama. Now it must be remembered that I am not quoting from some musty document born out of the Stalinism of the '30's. This article was published in March, 1965, almost contemporaneous with the beginning of the negotiation of the present Panama treaties that have been proposed by the Johnson and Robles administrations. Let me quote:

"The People's Party of Panama (the Communist Party) has charted the road along which revolution can be carried out. The only solution seen at present is the transfer of the power to the people—workers, peasants, forward-looking intellectuals in the middle sections, and groups of the bourgeoisie who want radical reforms. Considering the realities of the present situation, it is doubtful if these reforms can be achieved the parliamentary way.

"In the opinion of our party, the national liberation revolution in Panama will pass through *two* stages. In the first stage, the task will be to set up a national, democratic, peoples-government which will consistently carry out an agrarian reform, pursue an independent foreign policy, do away with corruption, take vigorous steps to develop the national industry, and embark on deep-going economic and social reforms."

At this point, I would like to break away from the text to emphasize the importance of the next statement which appears in the *World Marxist Review*. Let me quote:

"It is extremely important in the first stage to pursue a policy of unity, an alliance with all the forces interested in these changes (irrespective of their ideology). The party resolutions state that only a revolutionary peoples government, uniting all segments of the nation opposed to the oligarchy will be able in the second stage of the revolution to combat the U.S. and its monopolies, to remove the imperialist ulcer and pave the way to nationalization of the Canal.

"The immediate aim of this struggle is to deflate the oligarchy, compel it to show itself in its true colors as the direct agent of U.S. imperialism, and thus shorten its days. The ultimate aim is to achieve the *complete* liberation of the country. To this end, the Communists will use all forms of activity."

This article from the *World Marxist Review* explains clearly why the Nationalist agitation in Panama has grown so intense. According to the rules of Communist strategy, President Robles represents the so-called "oligarchy." Therefore, the Communists are attacking him and his treaty. They will demand an independent foreign policy. They will demand that the alleged corruption of the oligarchy be done away with. In the first stage of the Communist plan, it is clear that they will ally themselves with the Nationalists so closely that it will be impossible to distinguish one from the other. Insofar as we assist the plans of the Nationalists, we are advancing the first stage of the Communist strategy.

It is my belief that the present treaties play into the hands of this Communist strategy. For example, one of the most significant sections of the proposed treaty turns over all the auxiliary enterprises connected with the Canal to "private enterprise." The terms of the treaty make it clear that only those favored by the Panamanian Government will be allowed to bid on the operation of these enterprises. Moreover, the treaty makes it plain that if competitive bidding is unsatisfactory, the contracts will be awarded by negotiation.

In the first place, this arrangement makes it appear as though well-established and going businesses are being turned over to the Panamanian oligarchy to fatten their pockets. This provision makes it appear as though the bidding will provide a ready field for all kinds of corruption and kick-backs.

It does not matter whether this situation will come to pass or not. The treaty terms are framed in such a way as to give the Communists their rallying point. They will press for a government, to quote the *World Marxist Review*, "uniting all segments of the nation opposed to the oligarchy." This means the downfall of the Robles regime according to the Communist plan.

This is the stage we are witnessing now in the vicious attacks against the treaties in the Robles government. We must not forget that the second stage of the plan is "to combat the U.S. and its monopolies . . . and pave the way to nationalization of the Canal."

In view of the fact that the treaties seem tailor-made to fit Communist propaganda, it is interesting to note that one of the chief negotiators for President Robles is a self-avowed Marxist intellectual, Diogenes de la Rosa. Senor de la Rosa has a history that the liberal journals like to describe as "a very colorful past." It is well known in Panama that for years the sympathies of Diogenes de la Rosa have lain with the Trotskyite Communists. I would like to quote to you a sarcastic comment which the columnist in the Spanish newspaper "El Mundo" made on August 17. The columnist who writes under the by-line of Picando commented that Diogenes de la Rosa is now labelling those who oppose the new treaties as "Communists and traitors." Picando's sarcastic comment was "How times have changed for Comrade de la Rosa."

The impossibility of distinguished true Nationalist aims from issues which the Communists can use to agitate their two-part plan should make us wary of any arrangement in the Canal Zone which would weaken our control. Despite so-called safeguards written into the Treaty, we will no longer have the direct physical control of the territory in security of the Canal area which we now have.

If we *accept* these treaties in the hope of solidifying a fairly moderate government in Panama, the only thing we will accomplish is to make that government the target of increasingly strong Communist pressures. By throwing upon a small nation a responsibility which it doesn't have the capability to exercise, we are endangering the freedom and independence of that government.

I do not believe that any arrangement under which the United States gives up its effective sovereignty can be made to work for the benefit of the United States. There cannot possibly be any *better* way of protecting the Canal than to protect it *ourselves*.

We have the *sovereignty* and *jurisdiction* over the Canal by treaty. We *own* the land by separate purchase. We are twice owners of the Canal by *treaty* and *purchase*. There is no compelling reason to turn over its administration to a complicated *international* administration, under the direct sovereignty of a weak country.

If we accept the blackmail of Panamanian politics, then we will be following a policy which accurately complements the two-stage Communist plan outlined in the *World Marxist Review*. We see that plan already operating in the daily headlines of our newspapers today. If we are to avoid a stunning defeat, we must immediately change course.

Ladies and gentlemen, for the sake of the *national security* of the United States, these treaties *should* not and *must* not be confirmed. To prevent their confirmation, public opinion must crystallize and make itself known so that the Senate will realize the importance of the Canal to this nation. *You* can have a vital part in energizing public opinion and alerting our public officials. Write to the President, write to your two Senators, and have others write. I have been getting hundreds of letters on the Canal question, and I know what effect letters can have.

We must *not* jeopardize the security of our nation by allowing the confirmation of these proposed treaties with Panama.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order previously entered, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is recognized.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 498, S. 2171.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

THE MARCH ON THE PENTAGON: LIBERTY UNDER THE LAW OR POLITICAL WARFARE?—NATIONAL MOBILIZATION AND THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 16–21

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—NMC—is a nationwide movement which includes some sincere pacifists, some honest searchers for peace, and some innocent dupes. But it also includes a mixed bag of anarchists, Socialists, black power extremists, and Communists of both the Moscow and Peking variety. Ray Cromley, a skilled newspaper analyst, has written of the leadership in the following way:

> Jerry Rubin, a self-styled socialist who wants to close down the banks and the universities as "institutions that use and destroy human beings and values" is known primarily for his part in the University of California riots, for his 1964 trip to Castro's Cuba and for his support of "black power."
>
> David Dellinger is known for his openly-expressed support of Cuba's Fidel Castro and his regime. James Bevel and Ralph Abernathy are from Martin Luther King's civil rights movement. Lincoln Lynch has been a high official in the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE).
>
> Arnold Johnson, active in getting the march idea started, is better known for his work as National Public Relations Director of the Communist Party, USA.[1]

And Mr. Cromley goes on to point out that these large protest movements seem to be controlled by interlocking boards of directors and that they shift from one political warfare campaign to another, "Vietnam one week, Cuba the next, then to black power, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic" and that "these men and women were professional organizers. They're experts in publicity, whipping up crowds. Some have had special training in these fields."[2]

Also represented in NMC is the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC—headed by black power extremist H. Rap Brown. Brown is at present free on bail on a charge of inciting a riot in Cambridge, Md. Brown appeared at the Overseas Press Club in New York on August 28 along with Dick Gregory, the Negro comedian, the Right Reverend Monsignor Charles Owen Rice of Pittsburgh, Father Thomas Lee Hayes, executive director of the Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Gary Rader, the former Green Beret reservist who reportedly burned his draft card, and Abbie Hoffman, a leader of New York's hippie community.[3] He endorsed the march on the Pentagon, but did not answer in response to a question as to whether his followers would practice nonviolence.[4]

Perhaps Rap Brown did not want to answer the question about nonviolence since, despite the name, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, SNCC is actually embarked on a course of violence and has striven to tie the agitation over the Vietnam war to the black power thirst for violence. For example, Rap Brown gave an interview to the French political weekly Nouvel Observateur in which he said:

> We have chosen guerrilla warfare as a solution which the situation imposes on us. We will concentrate on strategic points in the country—in the factories, the fields and homes of whites. . . . We will carry on bloody sabotage operations. We are studying the techniques of modern guerrilla warfare. Our black brothers who are fighting in Viet Nam for white America are getting good lessons in guerrilla warfare.[5]

These words of Rap Brown indicate that he will do what he can to make the march on the Pentagon produce violence so that this may become a pilot operation in what Rap Brown envisions as a future pattern for guerrilla operations in the great cities of America. In this he faithfully reflects the calls to violence of his predecessor and associate in SNCC, Stokely Carmichael. Carmichael was a leading figure at the Latin American Solidarity Conference—LASO—held in Havana, Cuba, in August 1967, a meeting for the promotion of revolutionary activity in both North and South America. Carmichael has been quoted as saying:

---

[1] Ray Cromley, "The Oct. 21 March," *Washington News*, October 11, 1967.

[2] *Washington News*, ibid.

[3] *Vietnam Public Opinion*, August 29, 1967; New York *News*, August 30, 1967; the New York *Times*, August 29, 1967, also reported that representatives of the National Conference for New Politics attended the Overseas Press Club conference as participants.

[4] *Vietnam Public Opinion*, ibid.

[5] *Nouvel Observateur as quoted by Human Events*, issue dated October 21, 1967, p. 4, released October 16.

> Armed struggle is today the only means of struggle by the North American Negro. Our movement is progressing toward an urban guerrilla war within the United States itself.

Carmichael also stressed solidarity with the North Vietnamese Communists,[6] and this same theme of linking the war in Vietnam with the black power movement in the United States is sounded by Rap Brown.

The role of SNCC in the march on the Pentagon should be thoroughly investigated to determine if funds are being transmitted to SNCC from Cuba for this or for other forms of political warfare and whether it is also possible that funds from Communist Cuba or other Communist countries might also be employed to aid some of the other participating organizations in the demonstrations during the week of October 16–21.

Such an investigation might be most revealing as to the real source of the attacks on President Johnson and the attempt—through propaganda, incitation to violence, and other forms of political warfare—to blackmail U.S. foreign policy. This is suggested by a thought-provoking report by columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. They have pointed out that secret links between SNCC and Communist Cuba go back as far as 1964. They have written that—

> The flamboyant Carmichael is merely the outward manifestation of the SNCC-Cuban alliance, not its cause. The principal responsibility for moving SNCC violently to the left must go to two men who, unlike Carmichael, seldom appear on television or the front page. One is James Forman, who today holds no formal office in SNCC but is still believed to be its most important internal force. When SNCC was spawned in the Southern sit-in movement in February 1960, by idealistic Negro college students, Forman was already a hardened radical and an associate of Negro terrorist Robert Williams. . . . The other man is even less familiar to the public than Forman. He is Jack Minnis, a white intellectual radical who, as an instructor at Tulane University in 1961, was a leader in pro-Castro activities in the New Orleans area. With Forman in absolute control of the SNCC apparatus, Minnis was named to its central committee. . . .[7]

Evans and Novak went on to say that the clearest evidence of the SNCC-Cuban tie-in came in 1966 when SNCC leader Julian Bond was not—at first—seated by the Georgia House of Representatives. Bond's case was in the hands of "white lawyer Charles Morgan of the Atlanta office of the American Civil Liberties Union—ACLU. Morgan is a civil libertarian but no radical."

Then—

Stated Evans and Novak—

> things were suddenly changed and Victor Rabinowitz,' [appeared] a Manhattan lawyer long associated with far left causes and a leader in the National Lawyers Guild and the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, organizations specializing in defending Communists Rabinowitz served as legal counsel in the United States for the Castro government and had intimate contacts in Havana. Forman insisted that Rabinowitz supplant Morgan as Bond's attorney. In accordance with standard American Civil Liberties Union practice of deferring to other attorneys, Morgan stepped aside.

Most interesting of all, however, Evans and Novak state that—

> At about the same time Rabinowitz took over in the case, *"SNCC's treasury—empty since the disaffection of white liberal contributors—suddenly began to fill again. It is believed by many close to SNCC that the new money came from Cuba.*[8]

The mention of the Julian Bond case is interesting since The New York Times has subsequently reported that Julian Bond has been named cochairman—along with David Dellinger, publisher of the extreme left magazine Liberation—of the march on the Pentagon. The Times said that Bond called the march "an important step because it will give all Americans cause for the thought about what is being done in our names—against our wills."[9]

Whatever the motives of Julian Bond may be, he and others participating in the so-called October Week should be well aware that Rap Brown—and some of the other Pentagon march planners—not only openly advocates violence, but also has not hesitated to keep abuse on the President of the United States in such a way as to incite violence against the President. Thus, at a news conference in Washington, D.C., July 27—it was more aptly an agitation conference—Rap Brown said:

> Johnson is a wild, mad dog—an outlaw from Texas.[10]

Can it be doubted that the Communist newspaper, the Worker, which so often pours out its vituperation on the President, would write:

> The most influential and militant sections of the Negro freedom movement are now aligned against the Vietnam war. It is of historic significance that the two great protest movements of our time are now being joined . . . .[11]

While Rap Brown openly advocates violence, he, at least, does not hide his aims in Aesopian language. What is one to think of language that is an invitation to violence, but thinly concealed? Thus the Mobilizer of the National Mobilization Committee in its September 26 issue calls on page 1 for "From dissent to resistance" and on the second page states:

> Direct action is planned for those who are prepared to close down the Pentagon war machine.[12]

And the leftist extremist newspaper National Guardian in its October 14 issue wrote of some of the groups planning to take part in the October 16–21 demonstrations that subsequently the emphasis would be on "visibility and disruption."[13] And on the editorial page of the same issue the Guardian reprinted anarchist Peter Kropotkin's view of violence:

> Our action must be permanent rebellion, by word, by writing, by dagger, gun or dynamite, sometimes even by ballot when it is a case of voting for an ineligible candidate . . . . We are consistent and we shall use every weapon which can be used for rebellion. Everything is right for us which is not legal.[14]

OCTOBER WEEK AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL WARFARE

While it will be made to appear that the march on the Pentagon is a purely domestic affair, the Communists have actually given themselves away and revealed the international apparatus seeking to exploit the American demonstrations. Thus the Worker for October 1 states:

> U.S. Embassies and consulates in virtually every major city of the world will witness solidarity demonstrations October 21–22. Supporting demonstrations are planned for Rome and Bologna, Italy; Oslo, Norway; Amsterdam, Holland; Aberdeen, Scotland; London, England; Paris, France and other cities throughout the nation, Copenhagen, Denmark, Winnipeg, Canada, in West Germany, Belgium, Japan, Australia and New Zealand among others.[15]

And the extent of the revolutionary forces at work in the world today and the efforts of the Communists in trying to tie their own movement to revolutionary black extremists is shown by an October 7 report from London. The London Daily Telegraph stated that a Mr. Kingsley Tweed "from Harlem, New York" told a black power rally in London:

> To hell with one man, one vote. Every black man better get himself a gun, a submachine-gun, a hand grenade and shoot everyone that is White. He must do it now.

The Daily Telegraph went on to report that the chairman of the meeting said, "We love the English the way the Vietcong love the Americans" and urged the need for "revolution."[16]

The leftist Student Mobilizer also carried accounts of international activities in support of the October Week in the United States. The September 1 issue stated:

> On October 21, the Canadian antiwar movement will demonstrate . . . international solidarity with the Vietnamese people and the American people.

It also stated that—

> A Frankfort, Germany meeting of the International Conference of Vanguard Youth Organizations in July voted to work for solidarity demonstrations against the Vietnam war throughout Europe on October 21.

---

[6] As quoted by *Havana Radio*, August 1, 1967; Carmichael said that "after the Watts rebellion the question of nonviolence was discarded. It was clear to everyone that the path is the path of arms."

[7] Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, "Inside Report," *The Washington Post*, August 3, 1967.

[8] *Washington Post*, ibid. Emphasis supplied.

[9] The New York *Times*, October 8, 1967.

[10] *U.S. News & World Report*, August 7, 1967, p. 8; Brown concluded the conference by saying "go get your guns."

[11] *The Worker*, March 16, 1967.

[12] *Mobilizer*, Vol. 2, No. 2, September 26, 1967, pp. 1–2.

[13] *National Guardian*, October 14, 1967.

[14] Ibid.

[15] *The Worker*, October 1, 1967.

[16] The London *Daily Telegraph*, October 7, 1967.

> The organization was formed last March to coordinate anti-Vietnam-war activities among socialist youth organizations in Europe. Participants include groups in Belgium, France, Italy, England, Germany, Netherlands, Ireland, Scandinavia, and Spain.[17]

A leading scholar in the field of defense studies, Prof. J. D. Atkinson, of Georgetown University and the Georgetown Center for Strategic Studies, has written in a recent book on political warfare:

> The Communists always seek to take the offensive. This is a sound military principle. It has an equally decisive advantage in psychological operations. Many hear the first charges; few hear the disclaimer. The importance of the offensive in the psychological and political struggles in today's peace that is not peace and war that is not war is exemplified by the unceasing activities of the Communist fronts at the international, national, and local levels.[18]

This appears to be what the march on the Pentagon is intended to do, to take the offensive on the home front and to win the Vietnam war in Washington, for the evidence is mounting that the Vietnamese Communists are beginning to lose the war in Vietnam. Only last week—October 14—Radio Hanoi admitted that the situation in the DMZ had become "extremely serious" for them.[19] The tragedy, of course, is that some very high-minded people, some honest pacifists, some very-well-meaning citizens, and even some innocent dupes will be deceived into taking part in what is chiefly a political warfare enterprise of extremist leftists, black power revolutionaries, and Communists of both Moscow and Peking orientation.

THE PENTAGON AS A SYMBOL, PRESIDENT JOHNSON, OUR COMMANDER IN CHIEF, AS THE TARGET OF POLITICAL WARFARE

The march on Washington on October 21 has been referred to many times as a "march on the Pentagon." But the Pentagon is being used as a symbol, the political warfare target is our Commander in Chief, President Johnson. This is made clear, for example, by the Student Mobilizer's "Call to October 21" in which it is stated:

> On October 21 we are going to go directly to Johnson and the government.[20]

And at the previously cited meeting at the Overseas Press Club in New York of representatives of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam it was reported that William Pepper, executive secretary of the Conference of New Politics said:

> It is only a question of time for a sweeping repudiation of Lyndon Johnson and his administration.[21]

The American people are a great and an understanding people. Unless their past history is a living lie, there is every indication that they never flinch before the truth. That truth needs to be laid on the line to the American people now. It is that, despite the innocent involvement of some Americans, the October march on Washington and the Pentagon is chiefly the work of a highly organized smearbund of Communists, fellow travelers, and leftist extremists. The purpose of this political-warfare exercise is to attempt to discredit and defeat the efforts of a courageous President to do his duty as he sees it under that great common law of us all, the U.S. Constitution. As Chief Executive, as Commander in Chief, and as having the major powers in the field of foreign policy vested in him by that Constitution, President Johnson has sought earnestly to safeguard America, not only now in 1967 but also into the future. He has had to face the hard, the very hard, choices, not of the moment, but of choices affecting the lives of all of us into and beyond the next decade. This he clearly spelled out as long ago as his state of the Union message in 1965. In answering the question of why the United States was in Vietnam, the President said:

> We are there, first, because a friendly nation has asked us to help against Communist aggression. Ten years ago our President pledged our help. Three Presidents have supported that pledge. We will not break it. Second, our own security is tied to the peace of Asia. Twice in one generation we have had to fight against aggression in the Far East. To ignore aggression now would only increase the danger of a larger war.

A little over a hundred years ago a President had to make hard decisions while faced with such dissidents as the Knights of the Golden Circle and the Copperheads. Abraham Lincoln then said the "the enemy behind us is more dangerous to the country than the enemy before us."

Are we today faced with a similar time of troubles as internal dissension and demonstration attempts to stay the hand of the President and as noisy agitators slur him with slanderous remarks and even suggest violence by inference?

In our system of government there is, of course, always a place for honest criticism of policies of the President, of the Congress, and, indeed, of the Judiciary. I, too, have been critical of the President in some matters, and probably will be again. This is as it should be. But the march on the Pentagon of October 21 and the terms of reference, the guidelines, the bitter propaganda attending and surrounding it must raise the question as to whether this is an exercise in liberty under law, or whether it is an exercise in political warfare, a naked power play to interfere with, to control, and, in the words of one slogan for the demonstrations, "to bring to a halt" the policy of the Government of the United States. If, indeed, it is this latter, and I believe it is, do we not then—all of us—have a duty to hold up the power and purpose of the President of the United States in this present struggle and to say with the prophet Isaiah:

> Strengthen ye the feeble hands, and confirm the weak knees. Say to the fainthearted: Take courage, and fear not.

I believe such a duty is clearly ours, and, as one Senator, I shall continue, in this matter, to stand by the President—the Commander in Chief, and our country's leader.

NAVY VERSION OF TFX PROGRESSING WELL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have followed with interest the debate which has been carried on, both in the press and here on the Senate floor, regarding the TFX aircraft. Lately, particular attention has been focused on the F–111B, which is the Navy version of this revolutionary new plane—so important to our defense when operational.

On October 17, 1967, the Honorable Robert A. Frosch, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, in a speech before the Electronics and Aerospace Systems Technical Convention, gave an authoritative, dispassionate and thorough evaluation of the F–111B. As such, Mr. Frosch's speech is an important contribution to the public understanding of this complicated subject. He deserves our gratitude for rendering a service to those who want to know the facts and to make up their minds on the basis of the merits of the case.

At the conclusion of his speech, Mr. Frosch says:

> We gave the contractor (and he accepted) a very tough requirement to meet.

Then he goes on to say:

> We are convinced that in its primary air defense interceptor role the F–111B . . . represents the finest fleet air defense system available in the immediate future.

Mr. President, the testimony of Mr. Frosch deserves much weight, he is in charge of Research and Development for the U.S. Navy. His conclusion that the F–111B is, in fact, progressing well is gratifying—though not surprising—news to me. The Grumman Aircraft Corp. of Long Island, N.Y., is a principal contractor of the F–111B program. Grumman has had a superb record in building Navy planes for more than 25 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Frosch's address be printed in the RECORD, so that it will be available to all Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

F–111B DEVELOPMENT

(Address by the Honorable Robert A. Frosch, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, to the 1967 Electronics and Aerospace Systems Technical Convention and Exposition (EASTCON, IEEE), Washington, D.C., October 17, 1967)

Today I will discuss the technical status of the F–111B and in particular some aspects of its development during the past few years. In order to clarify its current status, I will begin with an account of Navy aircraft test procedures as they relate to development philosophy.

---

[17] *Student Mobilizer*, Vol. 1, No. 5, September 1, 1967, p. 1, and p. 3. On p. 4 it was stated that the president of the University of Hartford chapter of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) said they hoped to send two busloads to the demonstration and "we hope to be able to offer all the students on our campus, who are so inclined, free tickets on the buses." WHERE DO THEY GET THE MONEY?

[18] James D. Atkinson, The Politics of Struggle: the Communist Front and Political Warfare, Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1966, p. viii.

[19] *Radio Hanoi* report of October 14 as cited in the Washington *Sunday Star*, October 15, 1967.

[20] *Student Mobilizer*, August 15, 1967, p. 1 and p. 3.

[21] As reported in *The Worker*, September 3, 1967; *Exclusive*, September 6, 1967, p. 4 stated that at the press conference also were "Amy Swerdlow of Women Strike for Peace, and Fred Halstead, the Socialist Workers Party (Trotskyite-Communist).

In order to be certain that difficulties in the development of an aircraft are identified for correction as soon as is possible in the development cycle and to assess the basic aeronautical qualities of the airplane, the Navy has its own test pilots fly a sequence of tests called "Navy Preliminary Evaluations" (NPE). Five such flight series are normally flown. These are not, in any sense, acceptance tests, but rather are intended to identify problems and potential problems very early in development so that they may be corrected. The test pilots try to find all the problems they can regardless of how minor they might be. They comment only on the plane *actually flown;* it is not their responsibility to, and they do not try to, identify ways of correcting the problems they find nor do they usually speculate on the prospects for doing so.

The test articles that are used for acceptance of the aircraft at the *end* of development are flown in a sequence of trials run by the Navy Board of Inspection and Survey. It is only these BIS trials that can be described as acceptance tests.

The Navy test pilots who fly preliminary evaluations are an extremely competent, professional, and dedicated group of men. We are proud of them and delighted with their hard-nosed attitude, which, by early identification of problems, has saved the Navy a tremendous amount of trouble.

The NPE report is intended for the test agency, procuring agency, and contractor. The professional airplane developers in each of those organizations recognize the special nature of the report for its intended use as a management tool to expedite corrective action if considered necessary by the procuring agencies. The procuring agencies are aware that the test agency writes the report based on the test article at the test time without regard for corrective action which may already be approved, but has not yet resulted in hardware changes. It is the responsibility of the procuring activity and the contractor, not the test activity, to initiate corrective action or to determine, as often happens, that none is required. The report is not generally intended for public or Congressional use and is written for professional use, without the explanations and qualifications which are understood by the aeronuatical professionals, but should be added if it were intended for a wider audience.

Recently there has been considerable hubbub in the press and Congress over comments extracted from a recent F–111B Phase I NPE. Various newspapers, in articles and editorials, have commented on these Phase I NPE results. Remember that a Phase I NPE is purposely placed as early in development as the airplane can be flown in order to provide for early detection of difficulties.

To convey to you the "flavor" of such a Phase I NPE report, I would like to quote from such a report. The following are excerpts from a list of deficiencies characterized as 'correction mandatory':

"Inadequate lateral control effectiveness in configuration Power Approach (the configuration of the aircraft during carrier landings) at normal approach airspeeds.

"General airframe buffet in configuration Power Approach."

"Unreliability of afterburner light-offs with JP–5 fuel above 35,000 ft."

"Windshield distortion in the vicinity of the 'stress strap' and the resultant restriction to forward field of view."

"The excessive distance between the pilot and the control stick."

"Slow longitudinal trim rate."

"Inadequate damping of residual directional oscillations."

"Inadequate stall warning in configuration Power Approach."

"Nosewheel shimmy."

"Random engine exit nozzle opening and closing when modulating at minimum afterburning."

"Location of the speed brake and microphone switches."

Quoting from the same report, in the section relating to prospects of meeting contractual guarantees, "... the following guarantees will probably not be met or their attainment is questionable:"

"Time to accelerate from maximum velocity at military rated thrust to 1.2 IMN at 35,000 ft."

"The specific range at 40,300 ft."

"Subsonic combat rated thrust combat ceiling."

"Maximum velocity at military rated thrust at 35,000 ft."

"Time to climb to 35,000 ft. using combat rated thrust."

These quotes add up to an airplane which, unless modified, would give pilots at least considerable difficulty in carrier landings, if they could be made, and an aircraft with some real problems in combat flight. The quotes I have just read to you are *not* from the recent F–111B NPE, they are, in fact, from a Phase I NPE of the F–4 fighter plane conducted in the Fall of 1958. There were also a number of complimentary remarks about the aircraft and its other flight properties. After those remarks were made, the F–4 proceeded through the other phases of development, passed its BIS trials, and was introduced into the Fleet in December 1960. It has performed well there, is recognized as the best fighter available in the free world today, and the basic design has been applied to Air Force variations, which are today being purchased in greater numbers than Navy versions. We, therefore, have a clear example of the flavor of a Phase I NPE which, if quoted out of context, could indicate a bleak future for the F–4. With hindsight, it is evident that the F–4 future was considerably better than the quotations above would indicate because the NPE comments assisted in the achievement of this successful weapons system.

Relative to the F–111B, the general concept of commonality itself was not really a new or foreign thought. We have proven in the F–4 program that Air Force and Navy airplanes with similar mission requirements can be successfully used by both services. We have recognized within the Navy the desirability of commonality and have pursued it in such programs as the A–1 Skyraider. It was produced in attack versions, airborne early warning versions, electronic warfare versions and utility versions. We have demonstrated economies in the S–2 and C–1 and E–1 airplane family by common engines, common subsystems and nearly common airframes for different missions. We are today pursuing that logical course of action utilizing the basic A–6A design to create the EA–6A, and with further variations, the EA–6B. We are considering a tanker variation of the same airplane called the KA–6D. All of these examples are given to emphasize that the basic concept of airframe, engine and avionic commonality leading to variations of the same airplane with different uses has long been recognized and understood within the Navy.

The design of the F–111B was challenging, but the variable sweep wing and afterburning turbo-fan engine made it appear possible to incorporate in the same design characteristics necessary to meet both Air Force and Navy requirements. This was a somewhat more radical approach to commonality than had previously been tried, and one which put rather more severe problems on the shoulders of the *initial* design engineer. The Contractor analyzed designs for *each* small element that were essentially three designs: one to meet only the Navy requirements, one to meet only the Air Force requirements, and the third as the best way of satisfying both requirements. Because of the magnitude of the development and the everpresent publicity attendant in this program, the Contractor designed so as to insure that each new feature would indeed perform as planned and that neither service would find its requirements neglected.

Confronted during manufacture of the first three aircraft with the inescapable conclusion that the aircraft would be heavier than desired, the Contractor initiated a massive redesign effort which has been described as the Super Weight Improvement Program (SWIP). This redesign, effective at F–111B No. 4, was instituted before the first Navy aircraft was delivered. The first three aircraft were in fact overweight, and much heavier than number four, approximately 3,000 pounds heavier. It is useful to ask whether the first three F–111B aircraft (which were known to be unrepresentative at the time of their acceptance) were a waste of money. As a matter of fact F–111B's No. 1 through 3 are in active use today as avionics and Phoenix test beds. All of these tests are required and all of the aircraft are usefully occupied. Accepting no F–111B aircraft until the first SWIP version was available would merely have delayed the avionic and Phoenix testing without improving the program. The weight of the aircraft is of little importance for this testing, but other basic properties and shapes are important to it.

The redesign effort produced the weight improved or so called SWIP airplanes, F–111B's #4 and #5. We immediately utilized Navy #4 as the demonstration airplane to validate, with Contractor pilots, flutter and structural qualities of the SWIP design. While #4 F–111B opened the permissible flight envelope, #5 was prepared for a Phase I Navy Preliminary Evaluation essentially as if it were a new aircraft. Before this NPE there were many known F–111B characteristics and problems based on the flight testing of the pre-SWIP airplanes. In spite of the SWIP effort, prior to the NPE date, we had determined that higher thrust engines and other configuration changes would, in all probability, be necessary. However, the Navy desired a new and independent evaluation of the airplane which was much more representative of the expected end product of the R&D effort. The NPE was conducted, as always, on the hardware available. Improvements required and designed for later airplanes but which were not yet incorporated in the test aircraft were not considered.

Examples of deficiencies that were found in that F–111B NPE and which were termed "correction mandatory" are quoted as follows:

"Unsatisfactory lateral-directional handling qualities in the high-lift configuration with Adverse Yaw Compensation which degrade the night shipboard recovery capability."

"Repeated occurrence of afterburner blowout and unsuccessful afterburner selection at conditions well within the NPE operating envelope."

"Inadequate pilot's external field of view at the guaranteed minimum usable approach speed."

"Unacceptable feedback of the Stability Augmentation System in the primary flight controls."

"Unsatisfactory characteristics associated with extended speed brake operation."

"Inadequate taxi turning capability for carrier operations."

"Low excess thrust for acceleration from loiter flight conditions with maximum afterburner."

"Unsatisfactory airplane tip-back characteristics."

"Inaccessible location of the Control System switch which incorporates standby gain provisions."

"Lack of fire extinguisher in the crew module."

"Suspectibility of the crew module escape system to damage by personnel stepping on the wing glove area of the module. (The approved walkway areas are not adequately delineated. Existing 'No Step' markings are sporadically placed and confusing.)"

From the same report the following recommendations and conclusions apply:

"Extensive simulator evaluation of the F-111B cockpit with the complete weapons systems displays and pilot's primary flight displays is essential to determine the suitability of the cockpit design concepts."

"Supplementary solutions to eliminate multiple images in addition to increasing windshield incidence should be investigated."

"The windshield 'critical area' should be redefined in accordance with carrier visibility requirements vice Air Force optical gunsight requirements."

If you recall the list of F-4 NPE problems I went through earlier, you will find some of these familiar:

Within the same report, as in the case of the F-4 report quoted above, estimates of the probability of meeting contractual guarantees indicated some would probably not be met. Because of the timeliness and classification involved, I prefer not to discuss the exact details.

The question which immediately comes to mind is, "How serious are these comments?" Analysis of them indicates that they range from easily corrected minor problems to limitations that may persist to some degree despite our best efforts.

The problems we face in deciding exactly how much correction is enough are more complex than might appear at first look. For example, we all agree that the pilot should have a good view over the nose of the airplane in order to effect a carrier landing. (This has been a perpetual problem; some aircraft used to approach the carrier almost sideways for this reason. The F-4U or Corsair I was a classic example of this.) In the F-111B we found problems with the industry standards in defining precisely where the eye of the 5 to 95 percentile pilot should be in order to insure adequate vision. In order to define a satisfactory "fix" for this problem we had to discard the industry standard, which was misleading, and substitute a more stringent one.

Another example is the standard geometric description of the tip-back tendency which relates the airplane center of gravity to the deck contact point of the main wheels. We find that variations in braking ability and aircraft inertia characteristics in actual practice require us to modify the simple geometric definition of what is a usable tip-back configuration.

Our experience with the F-111B is giving us new insights into the writing of specifications for aircraft. It must be remembered that, at best, a specification is only a capsule description of what we want; some numbers extracted from a vast mass of qualitative and quantitative desires.

At this time, we have the following corrections which will be in succeeding Navy F-111B's in engineering design.

a. An improved engine to provide additional thrust throughout the flight envelope. This engine is designated the TF-30-P-12 and will be in F-111B No. 6 and subsequent.

b. A visibility improvement package which raises the pilot's seat, modifies the windshield angle, and increases the flap deflection; all three working in concert to improve over the nose visibility during landing. The flap fixes will be incorporated at Navy #6 with the cockpit changes introduced at Navy #8 and retrofitted to Navy #6.

c. A redistribution of weight and a movement of the landing gear aft which will improve the present tip-back properties of the aircraft. An extended nose will be in all aircraft after Navy #6. The landing gear modification will be effective in Navy #8 with simple retrofit to Navy #6.

d. The extended nose referred to above and introduced to improve weight distribution will be used to house the Phoenix airborne missile control system in a more accessible location. At the same time, the volume previously occupied by the Phoenix and other avionics has become available and permitted installation of an additional 2000 lbs of fuel. This change will be effective in Navy #6. The additional fuel provides increased loiter time.

The point most often raised in Congress and most media releases is whether the aircraft is indeed carrier suitable. Carrier suitability could be defined as the appropriateness of the vehicle to exist in the carrier environment. Obvious questions such as adequate deck strength have been considered, and there is no problem in the supercarriers from which we expect to operate the F-111B. The elevators in the Forrestal and subsequent carriers are updated as all aircraft loads increase and are expected to create no problem at Fleet introduction with the weights anticipated. The updating of elevators in these carriers was undertaken and is being carried out for reasons that are fundamentally independent of the F-111B. A program of catapult improvements in Kitty Hawk and subsequent carriers has been carried out to improve their capability to handle all aircraft at lower catapult wind-over-deck. These improved catapults will constitute the majority aboard the intended carriers at Fleet introduction of the F-111B. The capacity of the remaining catapults cited in the original F-111B specification will also be adequate to handle the aircraft.

The previous properties cited have been carrier characteristics necessary to match airplane characteristics. Directly associated with them are the airplane characteristics to match the carrier. The variable sweep wing has its most obvious advantage in landing and take off, and is an important innovation in the F-111B. Because the energy requirements to catapult or arrest are concerned with kinetic energy, in which of course the velocity enters as the square while the mass enters linearly, the low-speed landing and take off characteristics of the F-111B, due to the high lift in the wing-forward configuration, more than adequately compensate for the increased mass. Comparable weight carrier aircraft such as the RA-5C and A-3B do not benefit from this feature and, thus, impose higher loads on the carrier when operating at equivalent mass to the F-111B. The F-111B is expected to land and take off at speeds about 15 to 20 knots less than the F-4 and RA-5C.

Curiously, the success of this high lift feature has created a problem; the airplane has sufficiently high lift and low drag and speed in the landing configuration that on the glide slope the engines have had to run very near idle, with the result that the response of the aircraft in this state is too sluggish. A few minor changes appear to be sufficient to correct this happy problem.

We are preparing to take F-111B #5 aboard an aircraft carrier sometime during the spring of 1968. While we are aware of shortcomings in that specific aircraft which will be corrected in succeeding airplanes, we believe it is necessary to test the F-111B in its intended environment as soon as possible. There is no substitute for appropriate full-scale testing in any development program. This testing will not commence until laboratory structural tests (now scheduled on a test article in November), and land-based tests using catapults and arresting gear installed at Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, and Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River are complete. The latter testing is scheduled to start in January 1968. Thus we are building up to initial carrier trials in our usual straightforward and careful manner.

About a year later than the initial trials with F-111B No. 5 a production representative aircraft with all the fixes I have previously enumerated will conduct more involved and complete carrier tests.

As I discuss the F-111B airplane today, we are more than two years away from the Board of Inspection and Survey trials which I referred to earlier as the true acceptance trials. We have many engineering changes to be incorporated, many development steps to be taken, and much more quantitative flight testing to be performed to perfect the configuration. There will be other NPE's embracing a larger flight envelope and more internal components of the complete weapon system. Of course, the testing to date has established a high probability of acceptability of the basic aerodynamic qualities. After the Contractor demonstrations and NPE's are complete as prerequisites to BIS trials, some four or five uninstrumented production airplanes will be designated as BIS aircraft. They will be tested at the Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River and the Naval Missile Center at Point Mugu. At about the time those trials are in progress, another set of production-representative aircraft will be assigned to the Operational Test and Evaluation Force. The OPTEVFOR airplanes will be used to develop and refine the tactics the Fleet will use when operating the F-111B/Phoenix weapon system.

At the end of BIS trials, delivery to the Fleet will begin with initial deliveries to a Replacement Training Squadron. From that squadron in due course will come the trained personnel to man the first deployable Fleet squadron.

The Fleet introduction described above will take place within the year following BIS in the configuration established during development and proven acceptable in the BIS trials.

Having discussed the suitability of the aircraft, and its state of development, I will address its mission capability. The Navy mission capability for the F-111B has always centered around the long range missile carrying and multiple missile firing capability of the airplane/missile combination. The Navy requirements, as they were conveyed in specification form to the Contractor, detailed five design missions. The first of these was the fleet air defense mission, which is still our primary mission. The second of these employed the Phoenix in a distant air superiority role, such as over a beachhead. The third, fourth and fifth missions capitalized on the long range performance of the airplane to deliver nuclear and conventional bombs. We expect the aircraft to be capable of performing the fleet air defense mission as defined; and capable of performing flight to a distant beachhead area, where supported by appropriate Marine Tactical Data Systems or Airborne Tactical Data Systems it will provide an effective distant air superiority capability.

While the remaining missions which deliver nuclear and conventional bombs can be performed by the F-111B, they have become less important Navy requirements for the F-111B.

With regard to the fighter role, we must begin by considering what a fighter is. This is a current problem; the concept varies from Snoopy and the Red Baron (with white scarf trailing out behind, as in the Peanuts comic strip) through something in order of the YF-12 Mach 3 fighter proposed for continental air defense. The letter F in the military airplane designation simply means fighter, and we use that designation for fighter bombers, fighter interceptors, and general purpose fighters, some of which are intended for traditional dogfights, and some not.

Limited range fighters, such as the F-5A and extremely long range fighters, such as the F-111A, have considerably different characteristics. The F–111B was designed to fill the fleet air defense role, which is essentially the fighter interceptor role. In such a role, it is supported by systems such as the Airborne Tactical Data System (currently carried in the E–2A), the Naval Tactical Data System, and the Marine Tactical Data System when near a beachhead. Assisted by these tactical data systems it performs more nearly a function corresponding to that of the fighter interceptor in the continental Air Defense Command, which operate under guidance of numerous control nets.

In 1966 the Chief of Naval Operations convened a study of the F–111B in its primary fleet air defense role as an interceptor. The aerodynamic characteristics of the assumed fleet F–111B aircraft were purposely viewed in a pessimistic manner compared with both Contractor supplied characteristics and the original specifications. The F–111B/PHOENIX was compared with the PHOENIX system carried in subsonic aircraft, with other fighters with other missile systems now visualized for the appropriate future era, and with variations of those other fighters which showed promise. The study employed the latest in dynamic simulator techniques, and used a base of knowledge about this aircraft and competing systems which we have established over many years.

It was the finding of this elaborate formal examination of the problem, and the judgment of the Naval officers who ran it, that the F–111B/PHOENIX system, on a deck-space and cost-effectiveness basis, was a better system for the fleet air defense role than any comparable system which could be introduced in the same time frame. We feel confident that this study has indeed shown, as well as anything but operating experience can, that this airplane, equipped with its PHOENIX missile system, will provide effective fleet air defense, and will meet the *military requirements* that led to its development, even if it does not meet all of the specifications that were the Contractor's guaranteed estimates of what the aircraft would do. The relative cost effectiveness advantage of F–111B/PHOENIX over competing systems is greatest for the more serious threats to the fleet. For lesser threats, the requirement for a complex fleet air defense is smaller and the other systems become more competitive. However, we find it necessary today, as in the past, to plan for the threats which the potential enemy is capable of launching, and this must include the serious and sophisticated threats.

We have treated this CNO study to sensitivity analyses for possible degradations in aircraft performance and modifications in cost. When all the elements of predicted ten-year operating costs, deck-space allocation, and effectiveness against threat, (including variations up to the highest threat that we believe could be mounted) are considered, we find that it meets our fleet air defense requirements better than any competing system available for study.

It now appears inappropriate to consider the F–111B as competing directly with the subsonic A–7 carrying conventional bombs. We are examining instead the possible employment of the F–111B as a missile platform in attacking with air-to-surface missiles with large stand-off ranges. In this role, its potential as a well equipped avionic platform with excellent performance, and its ability to return and land with unexpended expensive missiles, provides advantages that none of our other aircraft can match. We have not yet completely defined this new secondary role for the aircraft, which, in any case, would require the airplane to use stand-off missiles which have not yet completed development nor reached the Fleet.

In summary, we gave the contractor (and he accepted) a very tough requirement to meet, if he was to provide all the performance desired by the Navy and by the Air Force in the designs he initiated. As we examine the situation some years later we find that the aircraft will probably not meet all of the initial specifications and the contractor will have to accept some responsibility for this lack. It is, of course, not unusual for a military aircraft that uses advanced state-of-the-art to fail to meet some of the specifications, the real question is whether it meets military needs. We have examined whether the F–111B continues to meet the original primary military mission requirements, and we are convinced that in its primary air defense interceptor role the F–111B, equipped with the PHOENIX airborne missile control system, and firing multiple shots of the long range PHOENIX air-to-air missile, represents the finest fleet air defense system available in the immediate future.

The F–111B is now in the state of development where we are satisfied that the basic problems have been solved and that we have identified other design problems and we have solutions in progress. The overall success of an airplane is not determined by these initial technical problems, but is determined over the long run by how the system meets a solid military requirement. We are heartened by the fact that the Air Force now appears to be bringing its version of the F–111 into the operational inventory in a highly successful manner.

We base our expectation that the F–111B will be a satisfactory, carrier-suitable aircraft for its mission partly on the fact that corrections for the deficiencies discovered in the first serious flying of its development have been identified and designed, and partly on a historical record that tells us that mandatory deficiencies (frequently of a major kind) are normal in development aircraft emerging from Phase I NPE. In past development these have been corrected, with the result that we fly highly satisfactory aircraft in the Fleet.

NEW YORK CITY'S VEST POCKET HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to New York City's proposed vest pocket housing program, the first in the Nation. It is a program which incorporates modern techniques of planning in one coordinated effort aimed at the problems and desires of individual neighborhoods. It works toward the rebuilding of each community on the basis of its unique history and character to meet the present needs and desires of its people. New York City has launched its own model cities program with a commitment of $15 million, most of which will go toward the vest pocket housing program.

This first step in New York's own model cities program was the subject of a searching inquiry when Jason R. Nathan, administrator of the Housing and Developing Administration of New York City recently appeared as a guest on the public affairs television program, "Youth Wants To Know."

I ask unanimous consent that highlights from the transcript of the "Youth Wants To Know" program, produced by Theodore Granik, a discussion by Mr. Nathan and a panel of interested students from Anacostia High School in Washington, D.C., Walt Whitman High School in Maryland, and Fairfax and George Marshall High Schools in Virginia, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the transcript were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Youth Wants To Know

(Note.—Made available through a grant from Mrs. Allie S. Freed, president, Buckingham and Claremont communities; created and produced by Theodore Granik; associate producer, Jay B. Cutler; assistant to the Producer, Susan Gallagher.)

Youth Wants To Know presents Mr. Jason Nathan, Administrator of New York City's Housing and Development Administration.

Announcer. Youth Wants To Know, the penetrating and provocative questions of America's young people, created and produced by Theodore Granik.

Mr. Granik. Welcome to Youth Wants To Know. Our Guest is Jason R. Nathan, Administrator of New York City's Housing and Development Administration, in proving the quality of urban life, America's most critical domestic problem, may very well find its prototype in New York City, symbolizes the grandeur and despair in life. Under the leadership and guidance of Jason Nathan, who has had a distinguished career in urban development, the City of New York has launched a penetrating attack on the root causes of the program, initiated a vest pocket housing plan, an action program which lays the foundation in the future of model's City's planning. What the program will encompass, how it will involve the community and what will be the design innovations are but a few of the areas about which Youth Wants To Know. Let's begin our questioning by a panel of high school students with you, David.

Question. Mr. Nathan, do you feel that the vest pocket program will be an answer to some of the problems of the ghettos of raising the economic standing of low income families and things like this?

Mr. Nathan. Well David, I think it's one of a whole bushelfull of tools or answers to this problem. The old houses of ten or fifteen years ago, they used to think that the answer to all of these problems was a one shot affair—build housing but that isn't the answer, it's one of them. That's why we think so strongly about getting this new vest pocket program off the ground.

Question. How can you be sure that the people involved in this program will be happy with your results?

Mr. Nathan. Well I think that what we are trying to achieve here and the way we are trying to achieve it Debbie is the best way I can express it. Everybody in this country has heard for years about urban renewal and public housing and the fact that the people in the neighborhoods object to them, negro removal, plans made back in city halls someplace and nobody knows what's going on, the essence to my mind for vest pocket program is that people in the communities have had a hand in developing the plan. We had since last Fall over 120 meetings in the vest pocket housing areas in New York of Harlem, Central Brooklyn and the South Bronx, and these programs in large part come out of these meetings with the communities.

Mr. Granik. It certainly takes in that East New York section where I was born.

Mr. Nathan. Right, Bedford, Stuyvesant, Brownsville and East New York are included in the Central Brooklyn area.

Question. Mr. Nathan, what are some of the wide-spread criticisms you get of this program from the people involved?

Mr. Nathan. Well so far I am sort of nervous because the criticism has not been widespread. I think the thing that was exciting a few weeks ago was that when a public hearing was held on the vest pocket program before the New York City planning commission the community groups were actually out in force supporting the program because they said its our program and it was a very heartening thing to me.

Question. Well sir, the militant negroes, on the community action you talked about the vest pocket housing program, they do represent a segment of the negro community, are they in on the community action too?

Mr. Nathan. I believe so to a very great degree. I had a session in my office just yesterday, a group of militant leadership from one of the areas. We talked about plans, we talked about jobs, we talked about the negro housing and militant or not, the interesting thing to me is that we were all talking about precisely the same needs and we weren't sitting on opposite sides of the fence from each other but we were in basic agreement on objectives. The question that we have to try to resolve is how to get there fast now, not five years from now. The problem of delay has been one of the root problems of the Cities—how do we get moving now?

Question: Sir, you said you want to move fast. I can see you want to start fast. But aren't you being a little unrealistic, I mean besides building houses you have to educate the people and this certainly can't come over night and this I think is one of the problems of the militant Negroes. Do you agree that you can move quickly?

Mr. Nathan. Well, lots of people say I'm crazy when I say we should work toward doubling housing production for low and moderate income people in New York and my response to that is that I had better not be crazy because we have 450 thousand substandard housing units in New York and when we double it we have to go on to triple it. The housing problem, as I had in the beginning, is not going to solve all of the root problems but it does deal with a major element of environment in which people live. We can provide better education and we must but at the same time where people live has got to be worked on. That's why I say that we have to work on all of them at the same time. We can't wait to get better education before we start.

Question: Mr. Nathan, part of your program provides for bringing middle class families into the ghettos, providing housing for middle class families. How do you plan to attract these middle class families? What do you think will bring them back?

Mr. Nathan. I don't think that the process of bringing back middle class families will come by housing alone. Let me answer it negatively to start with. I think that if we ever intend to work toward the day when Harlem is not a ghetto, then we must put something in Harlem besides low rent public housing. Because there are thousands of units of low rent public housing there and it contributes to being a ghetto. There has to be different kinds, different ranges, different economic levels of housing so there are choices and opportunities for people for residents of Harlem, Puerto Ricans, for anyone in Harlem to have a choice of low rent public housing. Or if his income has risen to have his choice of good, new middle income housing or moderate income housing but beyond that the problem of bringing middle income families there relates to making more than just a bedroom, more than just a closet out of the ghettos. Harlem has every physical attribute of a desirable community. The transportation is terrific, the location is terrific but if you have no reason to go there, except to sleep there, nobody else goes to Harlem. You have to bring other things except housing like community schools, like city wide facilities so other people including white people will go there.

Question: Sir, how do you account for the fact that more slums eventually regenerate into more slums and the cycle just goes over and over again as happened in many of the public housing instances.

Mr. Nathan. Well I think this is one of the old, old problems. In fact out-dated problems that people have talked about for years. Why rebuild slums when they are just going to turn back into slums. The answer is number one we have to build, we have to provide decent housing facilities. Number two we have to manage them better. There are public housing projects throughout the country which are probably models of mismanagement and at the same time we have to provide more than just a house. We have to provide social services. We have to provide help to the families who have family problems—a reason for helping them out of anti-social behaviour—recreational facilities, job opportunities.

Question: Mr. Nathan, New York has had some of the strongest open housing legislation on the books for many years now. What has this done to stop the public housing areas from being ghettos?

Mr. Nathan. I don't think it is in frankness, its done far too little, just scratched the surface. The open housing legislation has given you legal means through laborious court processes to enforce open housing but in too many cases it has been out of families reach, it has dealt with prejudices of people and it hasn't done the job.

Question: And yet in so many areas in the country everybody is in an uproar about getting open housing legislation on the books. Do you think that this is the first thing that we should be worrying about?

Mr. Nathan. I think as I said before there are so many tools we have to be concerned about. The open housing legislation is important because it provides a legal framework for action but it is by no means an answer. It's one of the many tools.

Question: Mr. Nathan, in your vest pocket housing program, Mayor Lindsay said that federal funds would be needed eventually to complete the program. Well, if the funds don't come through will the whole housing program in New York fail?

Mr. Nathan. No, not by any means. We are not jumping off on the vest pocket housing program and not knowing whether there is any water in the pool. We have the commitments of federal funds for the first stage vest pocket program of 8,000 units in these areas that we started on and the City of New York is going ahead with the seed money to start it, without waiting for the seed money from Washington. We are going ahead with a head-start program in housing and the federal funds have been committed for that.

Question: Mr. Nathan, you have recently voiced the crying need for private enterprise to come into the City. You said in fact that we are going to bribe them in. Is this necessary to vest pocket housing?

Mr. Nathan. I guess I'll never live down that statement. But I think what I was trying to say in a joking fashion to whoever wrote the article in the newspaper that it is impossible to expect private enterprise which is by far the biggest and most resourceful part of our whole industry, of our whole economy. It's impossible to expect private enterprise to make major investments in the slums for the purposes of charity. Their stockholders are stockholders because they expect to make a profit on it. It seems to me that if we are going to bring the innovation and the "dynamism" and the drive of private enterprise into helping the Federal, state and local government do what they have failed so miserably to do which is to deal with the slum problem so that we have to provide financial incentive to bring them in.

Question: Mr. Nathan, when private enterprise builds a building on one of your lands for urban renewal do you have any control over the land charge?

Mr. Nathan. This depends on the kind of situation we are talking about. If the property is sold to private enterprise for so called fully tax paid housing for example then there is no limitation. It depends on what kind of controls you seek to put on it. What kind of housing to build. If you are attempting to achieve middle income housing, then we would sell it to a private non profit sponsor who would build housing under an agreement to serve certain income levels and certain rentals. If it's for low rent public housing it would be specifically regulated to deal with that level.

Question: The units which you are building for the vest pocket, are they also going to be cooperative? Are they also going to be owned?

Mr. Nathan. If there is anything the community has said to us that they want to mix. Our present plans based on the way the communities came out with it in this vest pocket housing program that the Mayor announced two weeks ago is for 8,000 units in the first stage, 8,000 units of housing of which 6,000 will be new, 2,000 will be rehabilitated, and of that 8,000 approximately fifty fifty, 4,000 will be low rent public housing and 4,000 will be moderate income housing. Some of it rental, some of it co-op.

Question: Mr. Nathan, then would you support proposals by Senator Percy and Senator Kennedy to provide for home ownership?

Mr. Nathan. Well, I think the concept of home ownership is very, very important. I have serious questions as to whether or not the tremendous number of proposals for home ownership really spearheaded by Senator Percy whether or not these proposals are getting down to the low income group. I think that most of them are dealing with families in the $5,000.00 to $10,000.00 bracket and it really isn't relative to the low income families, at least the proposals I have seen in New York.

Question: Mr. Nathan, getting realistic, how are you going to attract middle and high income suburbanites to live in the city. What incentives are there?

Mr. Nathan. Well let me state two very strong convictions. Everybody talks theory. The rich man and the poor man. You can't mix water and oil. It's funny, you drive along third avenue in New York which has been completely rebuilt with badly designed luxury apartments since World War II. And right around the corner from those high rise luxury buildings on third avenue right around the corner are five story old tenements some of them still under rent control with low income people and there doesn't seem to be a bit of a problem. We make more of a problem in theory than it is in fact. And the second thing is if we provide good housing buys, the pocket-book nerve is going to be a very effective part of the picture.

Question: But isn't the matter of education, the matter of facilities, the matter of people in suburban homes, who would rather be there?

Mr. Nathan. Well, I think Philadelphia, among other cities has proven something and that is the attractiveness of living in the center of the city. I wouldn't, if my life depended on it, live out in the suburbs, but I happen to be prejudiced about living in the center of town. I think a lot of people feel the same way. Coming in from that postage stamp of grass that you are wedded to I think has lots of advantages.

Question: Mr. Nathan, in this case we are talking about mixing low and high income groups but I think you will have to admit that there is a very deep racial problem also. How are you going to convince white middle class people to move into the lower Negro areas.

Mr. Nathan. Probably the only way we can even deal with this is the process of time and contact. Ignorance and wild assumptions are a difficult thing to overcome. But right now as I said before we had 35,000 units of middle income housing scattered around New York and in many, many of those projects, many, many whites and negroes are living together and no one thinks a thing about it. The discouraging thing that all of us recognize is that we always hear the bad stories but we don't hear the heartening stories about people living together in peace and friendship.

Question: What are you going to do though about the middle class person who is already in the suburbs, who has firmly established in his mind the idea that Harlem is what it is now. How are you going to convince him to move to Harlem with all the connotations that it now has?

Mr. NATHAN. I don't expect to. Maybe next week I will be a magician. I don't expect to remake people's minds. I would hope that as they get less emotional and as they recognize that they cannot wall off themselves from the rest of the city's problems. This is not a matter of asking people to move to Harlem. It's a matter of living and let live. It's a matter of giving other people opportunities or not standing in the way of other opportunities.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. COURT OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday, I had planned to testify before the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary on S. 176, a bill for the settling of labor disputes that affect the vital interests of the public. It was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

I had prepared my testimony for that hearing, and expected to be able to testify at 2 p.m. before the subcommittee; but the Senator from Florida became involved in other matters that necessitated a postponement of the hearing, which I fully understand and appreciate, and it is perfectly satisfactory to me. However, I, too, have a great many other responsibilities that are taking me away from the Senate from time to time these days, and I do not know how soon it will be possible for me to appear before the subcommittee; and I desire to have my views a matter of public record. Therefore, I intend to present a summary of my testimony at this time on the floor of the Senate. I shall be available to testify—in fact, I am requesting that I have the privilege of testifying—before the subcommittee at an early date, when the chairman reconvenes the hearings on S. 176. I will then be subject to examination by the subcommittee with respect to my views in regard to how I believe emergency labor disputes that imperil the health, safety, and security of the country should be handled.

At this time, I wish to make this statement for the record.

Yesterday, I sent to the press a mimeographed copy of the testimony I would have given before the subcommittee, and I shall use that statement as the framework of my comments at this time.

The hearings that have been underway before the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary deal with a bill introduced by Senator SMATHERS, S. 176, to establish a U.S. Court of Labor-Management Relations, referred to generally in the press as a court of compulsory arbitration. Generally, the hearings appear to date to be directed toward a solution of the problem presented by labor disputes that would adversely affect the public interest of the Nation. The bill is not—and it is my understanding that the hearings generally are not—intended to deal with any area of labor-management relations except for such disputes.

I feel qualified to appear before the subcommittee and to make the speech today on this subject matter. I wish to point out, however, that I believe the subject matter is appropriate for the consideration of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, not the Committee on the Judiciary. The mere fact that the words "labor court" are used in the bill does not, ipso facto, automatically bring it within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

The bill deserves to be considered by the Labor Committee because, from time immemorial, the Labor Committee has had jurisdiction over legislation that deals with the regulation of labor disputes.

In any event, I believe that the bill, after it is considered by the Judiciary Committee, should be referred to the Labor Committee for the consideration of the Labor Committee, before the bill comes to the calendar of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have had in mind testifying on this bill for labor courts because it seems to me to be a monumental, historic departure from the concept of collective bargaining that we have spent decades building up. It seeks to shortcut the process with which we have been struggling to deal with strikes which tend to tie up the Nation in an important segment of industry, such as railroads, airlines, and similar strikes, with which we have dealt in the Labor Committee.

I should like to join the Senator from Oregon in taking a stand against such a bill. The best that can be said for the bill is that it is very premature. But what is more important is that here is a totally new collateral attack on the collective bargaining system, with which we are having enough trouble as it is; and the bill will tend to divert energies toward contending with it, when it is really not apposite to the situation, under anything we can see in the present and look forward to in the future.

We would be much better advised to do what the Senator and I have urged—to consider the range of alternatives available to Congress, the President, and the country for dealing with these so-called national emergency strikes which have frustrated us. In the case of this bill, we are sort of going off into Alice in Wonderland. We are talking about labor courts when the country is not remotely ready for it. It is a different situation from the basic social and economic structure of the country which is based on collective bargaining and trade unionism as it exists today.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the intervention of the Senator from New York, and I agree with him.

I have been on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for many years, and measures always have been referred to the Labor Committee when they deal with any proposal that would regulate by legislation labor disputes in this country.

It is self-evident that the purpose of S. 176 is not to establish or change judicial procedure, but to deal with big strikes.

This is labor legislation. As such, it should have the review and consideration of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

In the meantime, this hearing record should show some of the basic objections to this particular means of coping with national emergency disputes.

The present title II of the Taft-Hartley Act was passed by Congress in 1947. It was the result of the rash of strikes which followed the return of our country to a peacetime economy and the lifting of the wage-price controls which had been present during World War II. During that period there had been a voluntary agreement not to strike or lock out and the War Labor Board had adjudicated all requests for increases in wages. That was a wartime measure instituted to control the inflationary tendencies of a war economy. As a former member of that Board, I can say it worked and worked well.

It worked because it was based on a voluntary agreement entered into between labor and management that for the duration of the war they would suspend their right to strike and their right to lock out. It worked during the war period when all of us were willing to give up a portion of the usual freedoms we enjoyed.

Peacetime is quite different. In peacetime we traditionally do not want the Government to tell us what price to sell our merchandise at or exactly what the labor conditions of our employees should be. However, when the strikes during 1945, 1946, and 1947 appeared to disrupt our Nation's economy, legislation was passed in an attempt to solve the problem.

The 1947 legislation was not good legislation and very shortly thereafter Congress, or at least the Senate, attempted to devise some amendments to title II of Taft-Hartley in order to perfect the emergency dispute provisions of our labor laws. In 1952 the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported by bill S. 2999 of the 82d Congress. The report on that bill, which was recently reprinted in the committee print, "Federal Legislation To End Strikes: A Documentary History," published by the Labor Subcommittee during the recent railroad shopcraft dispute, clearly sets forth the various possible avenues of legislative action. It concluded that only minor revisions of the provisions of title II were possible; however, in the rush to adjournment that year the bill was never acted upon.

In 1952, the Labor Committee rejected

the thought of instituting a system of compulsory arbitration for the settlement of emergency labor disputes. Since that time I have not seen any reason to change my judgment that the committee was correct in this conclusion.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IS BASIS OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The American system of labor-management relations is called collective bargaining. It proceeds upon the premise that given the time, management and labor have the ability to solve their own problems by sitting down across the table from one another and talking out their differences. Sometimes, and this is relatively infrequently, bargaining breaks down and resort is made to some sort of self-help to further the objectives of one side or the other and it also takes the form of lockouts or strikes. But this self-help is only for a limited period, because its only purpose is to induce the other side to agree at the bargaining table to the earlier demands which led to the use of self-help. The basic premise of the system is that the parties will be able to solve their differences between themselves without resort to outside interference or help. This means that neither side wants Government intervention because when the Government intervenes the parties lose control over the bargaining. They also lose control over the outcome. Of course the claim is made that weak industries are unable to hold their own against their workers and they need the counterbalance of the Government to stand against the might of unions that wish to drain all of the profits of the company to its workers, so it is alleged. Everyone knows that this is hypocrisy. Every union wants to continue a business which keeps its members' jobs healthy, for without a healthy business there are no jobs.

Moreover, the kind of dispute this bill would affect is hardly likely to be one involving small, weak companies or industries. There are those, however, who believe that the system which we have developed has developed middle-age spread. They believe that the strikes which occur causing inconvenience to the public should be eliminated. They therefore propose some sort of mechanism which they believe will deal fairly with both sides but will eliminate strikes. They seldom mention lockouts, but, of course, lockouts would be included. They propose a decisionmaking body of one sort or anothor which will settle the disputes which cause the strikes.

One commonly heard argument in support of the labor court concept is that it is used in other countries of the world. There are two fallacies contained in that argument. First is the conclusion that it has worked well, but the subjective conclusion that it has worked well is not justified, since our system has never been tried in those countries. Collective bargaining is desired by many of the labor experts of Australia and New Zealand.

Second, and much more important, is that while a system may be perfectly viable in a country with a population of 11,335,000, we have almost 200 million people in the United States and a regular work force of almost six times the entire population of Australia. We all know that the democracy as practiced in ancient Greece on a city-State level is not possible in our country today. It cannot be assumed that what is done in small, largely agricultural countries with small labor forces will work well for the greatest industrial nation in the world which is almost 15 times as large.

These things are seldom as simple as they appear at first glance. Of course, if a court or an arbitrator decides the matter in dispute, that dispute is gone and there will be no strike or lockout. But there will also be no collective bargaining because one side or the other will know that he can do better appealing to the independent third party than he can by means of bargaining. So he will sit tight and not bargain. So more and more the parties will just turn to that wonderful third party to tell them what to do.

When the Government tells you what to do, that is Government regulation. And when the Government can tell you what wages to pay your workers it is only one short step for the Government to tell businesses what prices they can charge and what profits they can make. Economic freedom, as we know it under our private enterprise system, goes out the window. Sure, it is much nicer and simpler not to have strikes, but how many of us want arbitrators, the courts, or the President of the United States to tell the country what wages the workers shall get, what profits the businessmen of the country shall make, and, of course, as we are so well aware right now, what the level of taxation of our citizens shall be?

Any solution to what can and must be described as basically a minor convenience should not destroy one of the things that has made this country's economic system so productive and so profitable—free collective bargaining.

You may ask, what about situations such as the recent railroad shopcraft dispute where you stated that the national welfare was being endangered? The Congress of the United States has done well to deal with each problem as it arises. We cannot use an atom bomb to kill one fly. No element in our entire private enterprise system is more basic to the system than is collective bargaining. I see no reason for Congress to shun its responsibility to protect the public interest through the commerce clause, by delegating this responsibility to another Government agency, on blanket terms to be applied to all disputes that meet the definition.

True, we have strikes of national impact from time to time. Where necessary, Congress has provided the machinery for terminating them. There is no evidence whatever that these disputes have unduly burdened the Congress, for this is one of the things we are here for.

I have been heard to say in past debates on this subject matter in the Senate that so long as the interstate commerce clause is in the Constitution, the Congress of the United States cannot and should not escape its responsibility to deal with an industrial dispute that reaches such a proportion that great jeopardy is placed upon the public interest. It is the Congress which has jurisdiction over interstate commerce, and the sole jurisdiction of Congress in the field of industrial relations stems from the interstate commerce clause. Oh, I know serious labor disputes are hot political potatoes. I understand politicians, I think, pretty well. They would rather not burn their fingers on them. But they were elected to office to carry out their responsibilities to every section of the Constitution of the United States, including the interstate commerce clause.

Let me say to the voters of this country, "Do not let your Congress ever duck its responsibilities in regard to great national emergency labor disputes. You elected them to protect you when you had a special situation that calls upon Congress for congressional action."

Now, they are few and far between, but that does not justify Congress seeking to pass a compulsory arbitration law and calling it under the very interesting label of "court of labor relations," and turning over the economic welfare of millions of workers and hundreds and thousands of employers to so-called judges who do not have the slightest background, training, or basis for handling questions of wages, prices, taxes, and profits.

We cannot separate those questions from the question of determining major labor disputes on a compulsory basis in this country. That is why I never have and never shall vote for a compulsory arbitration law. That is why I shall always be proud to have my record show that I was one of two Senators who voted against the only compulsory arbitration law ever passed by the Senate.

Thus, as one who has worked in this field for 32 years—for I arbitrated my first case 32 years ago and have been involved in many, many, in fact several hundred, major labor disputes in this country in the past 32 years—I shall never be a party to supporting compulsory arbitration legislation which seeks to substitute for that precious freedom, the freedom of employers and workers to iron out at the collective bargaining table their differences over wages, hours, and conditions of employment, the judgment of whatever number of men are placed on a so-called labor court to settle issues which are not judicial at all.

That is one of the basic fallacies in this whole approach to compulsory arbitration. We are not dealing with judicial issues. We are not dealing with litigious legal concepts. We are dealing with the basic economic rights of men and women among labor and among employers as to what their economic relations shall be in respect to the employer-employee relationship. That is why this proposal would establish a kind of statism in the American economy, a kind of collectivism in the American economy, a governmental dictation of the working relationships which are to prevail in a so-called democratic society between employers and employees. When we do that, we are not dealing with questions of legal rights. We are not dealing with questions of judicial problems. We are dealing with the economic relations between supposedly free employers and those free men and women who are the employees.

I will never cast a vote to enslave American employers and American workers under the arbitrary discretion of a so-called labor court. Because, when we do, we destroy the freedom of collective bargaining in this country.

Oh, the argument is made that I do go along with the exceptional cases. I shall cover those situations. They do not destroy free collective bargaining. We merely recognize that under our constitutional system that there is no absolute right to strike or lockout. It is a relative right. But it is a superior right in most instances, and becomes a subordinate right in few. When we get a great labor dispute which imperils—note my language—which imperils the health, safety, and security of the American people, then the superior right of the American people to governmental intervention subordinates the very precious right of management to lockout and workers to strike.

That is not the Smathers bill. The Smathers bill seeks to give jurisdiction to the court in a case in which they find it involves public interest.

What case does not? But they are altogether different from the emergency disputes which imperil the health and safety of the Republic under the Taft-Hartley law. How many such disputes have there been? Twenty-eight. Listening to some of my colleagues, we would think that a great strike peril was confronting us 24 hours a day because, from time to time, free men and women who are employees and free men and women who are employers exercise that precious freedom of the right to strike and lockout.

Well, let me say to those who are inconvenienced by strikes and lockouts, do not forget that the price of freedom comes high. But, it is worth it. It is worth all the inconveniences one has to suffer in the case of a strike or lockout, when that strike or lockout does not involve an imperilment of the health, safety, and welfare of the American people.

What does the Smathers bill propose to do? It proposes to take any labor case before an arbitration tribunal into a court for a compulsory decision, if it is alleged or a complaint is filed which claims the public interest is substantially involved. The public interest is involved in every labor dispute. That does not justify having the Government come in and dictate the terms of the economic life for the people involved in a good faith labor dispute.

If we do not understand that deep philosophical concept of the meaning of economic freedom for American workers and American employers, then we have not grasped the real meaning of the great strife which has occurred and developed in this country over the years for the rights of free men and women to bargain for the hours, wages, and conditions of employment in their relationships with employers.

We have fashioned specific machinery for specific disputes, in specific situations. By so doing, we have left collective bargaining as intact as it can be left after a national work stoppage. We have left the responsibility for wages and working conditions where it belongs—in the hands of union and management.

Once remove that responsibility from private hands—once put it in a permanent public agency—and we will have moved a long way toward the substitution of government fiat for private decisionmaking throughout our whole economic system.

Management has more to lose from this procedure than anyone else. Wages are one of its major costs, if not the major cost. Once this part of its business enterprise is turned over to a government agency for determination, management's operation of the enterprise is severely reduced. And that government agency is not going to be guided solely by what is good for management, but by its own charge to the public interest. Statism, collectivism, in labor-management relations is not going to benefit either party in the long run.

Congress, in short, is not too busy to deal with a national labor dispute of the proportions covered by this bill. Better that we should continue doing so on an ad hoc basis than turn over to a new bureaucracy so important a part of our economic life.

BILL IMPOSES NARROW SOLUTION ON ALL DISPUTES

Let me turn now to the terms of S. 176. I sympathize with what Senator SMATHERS is trying to do. He wishes to establish a course which would solve all emergency disputes. His bill has, however, only the most superficial relationship to the means provided under Public Law 90–54 which settled the railroad shopcraft dispute.

I do not agree with the principle of S. 176 that a court which must decide each case upon the record of evidence made before it is the best means of solving all national emergency disputes. Our recent rail board had no such constriction. Ours was not an arbitration board, as this court would be. Ours was a mediation board, empowered finally to propose a settlement within the bargaining history. That was our guideline; not the evidence subject to court rules, which so often can mean that the side with the best lawyers and best economists makes the best record. The arbitrator has no choice, then, but to make his award on that basis.

The arbitrator is bound by the record. The arbitrator is bound by the preponderance of the evidence. The arbitrator is subject to reversal if his decision cannot be documented and the transcript of the record applied to the burden of proof and the preponderance-of-evidence rule. A mediator is not so bound. The mediator seeks only to bring the parties to a conscionable compromise of their differences irrespective of the evidence.

A mediator takes into account the economic position of the parties. In the railroad case, we took into account, for example, the fact that for every day of strike the railroad companies would have lost $12 million-plus per day in expense losses alone, plus every dollar, amounting to millions more, of income from the railroads.

We took into account the fact that the public, in time of war, if a railroad strike brought the economy of the country to its knees in the midst of a national crisis, would lose hundreds of millions of dollars a day. We took into account what, in the long run, the workers and their families would lose in dollars and in public good will. That was what the mediators took into account along with such factors as were presented. We took into account what was fair for the workers today by way of a concession to them here and to the carriers there. We considered what would be a fair, commonsense, equitable solution of their differences.

It is an entirely different process from arbitration. It is not understood, I know. It is not understood by many in the labor ranks in this country. How well I know. I have taken their criticisms. But their criticisms never have the slightest effect on me so far as fulfilling my responsibilities is concerned when I am in charge of a labor case. We protected the legitimate rights of the carriers and the workers in that case by holding within the framework, as Congress provided for in the statute it passed, through a mediation process, not an arbitration process.

What is more, we protected collective bargaining as an institution, in this and in all other industries.

Mr. President, should industrial relations be subjected permanently and by compulsion to the straitjacket of compulsory arbitration? Are wages and working conditions really an appropriate subject for the rules of courtroom law? I think not, as a general rule. How many other business contracts, mergers, and so forth, would businessmen care to see arranged exclusively under such rules?

Each dispute in the labor field is unique. A permanent court of five men will not necessarily make available the men who may be best qualified in a particular dispute, especially since those who serve on it would have very few cases to handle. Ad hoc procedures, on the other hand, allow the use of the individuals best qualified to contribute their talents to the given case. The type of court proposed in S. 176 would exclude some of the Nation's best qualified laymen in industrial relations from contributing to the solution of labor disputes.

BILL EXPANDS DEFINITION OF EMERGENCY DISPUTES

I have already noted that the bill changes the definition of emergency disputes under Taft-Hartley from disputes which "imperil the national health or safety" to those which would "adversely affect the public interest of the Nation." Under the Taft-Hartley definition, there have been roughly 28 disputes since 1947 which could have gone to the court provided for in the Smathers bill.

That is an average of 1.4 disputes a year. During 4 of those years, there were no emergency disputes at all.

On the basis of the Taft-Hartley definition, one must conclude that this five-man, permanent court would have almost nothing to do. But under the definition of the bill, it would appear that most disputes would come under its jurisdiction and would be settled by pure and simple compulsory arbitration.

So we have to ask ourselves, is not economic freedom worth something? Is it not worth inconvenience, is it not worth sacrifice; yes, is it not worth some of what S. 176 calls an adverse effect?

Remember that the dispute which "imperils the national health or safety" is a dispute so far reaching, so comprehensive, so vital that the national health and safety must come ahead of the interests of the parties. That was the situation we had in the recent rail dispute.

But the definition which changes "imperils" to "adversely affects" and changes "the national health or safety" to "the public interest" is going to turn over to compulsory arbitration the general, run-of-the-mill labor disputes anywhere in the country. The adoption of this bill would encourage one side or the other not to participate in good-faith collective bargaining, because they will sit down and see if they can gain more with the compulsory arbitration court. The Smathers bill would be an inducement to the breakdown of the precious right of freedom called free collective bargaining.

We still live in an economic and political democracy. There are no guarantees in a democracy; there are no guarantees of high wages or profits or success in the free enterprise system. We have thought the price of occasional inconvenience, of occasional loss of profits, of occasional loss of wages and family income was worth paying for the precious right of economic liberty.

ARSENAL OF WEAPONS APPROACH

Finally, I would elaborate on a point which I have already touched upon. I do not think there is one single solution which should be applied to all difficult labor-management disputes. That only complicates the situation. Everyone knows before the bargaining even begins how it will end if the parties do not make their own contract. The only permanent legislation in this area I have ever thought sound was the one that called for the so-called arsenal of weapons, which provided alternative solutions that could be applied depending upon the circumstances.

I think Public Law 90-54 was a sound solution for the recent rail dispute.

But who knows whether it would be appropriate for the next national emergency? It may not be. Certainly I would hope it will have the effect of discouraging both parties to rail bargaining from seeking a publicly imposed solution again.

In labor relations, nothing is more important than that the options be kept open. Congress should keep its options open, too. I know the groans and moans that go up in this body when a major dispute appears to be headed for legislation. The cry is heard that we should rid ourselves of labor issues, because they bring political repercussions no matter what a Member of Congress does. Many bills are based upon the desire for a politically painless solution to labor disputes. There just are none.

LABOR NEGOTIATIONS WILL BECOME MORE POLITICAL, NOT LESS

No one knows better than I that legislation in this area can be politically painful. But no one should be deluded that labor relations can be removed from politics. I would serve notice upon every Member of Congress that you turn over to a public body the job of writing wage contracts, and you will plunge Congress into a political pit that will make you wish for the good old days when you only had to worry about one dispute at a time.

You will bring into politics the whole spectrum of wages and working conditions. The members of the court will have to be appointed and confirmed; the guidelines any such body applies will be subject to amendment. You will have Congress lobbied so hard from all sides that wage levels will become a major and direct political problem for every candidate for Congress.

We in Congress are in charge of establishing wages for postal workers and civil servants. What this bill, and others like it do, in effect, is not to remove Congress from the labor field, but to put the whole massive set of private labor negotiations right in our laps, along with civil service and postal wage scales.

Do you think the Mine Workers and the Auto Workers and the Longshoremen—to name just three unions—will leave us alone, once we assign contract writing to a labor court? To the contrary, they will hold us responsible for the men on the court, for each of their decisions, and they will seek to improve their economic position by further legislation.

General compulsory arbitration, as provided by S. 176, will, in my opinion, do more harm than good to industrial relations, and I do not believe Congress should turn to it.

Oh, I made this plea in 1963, when I pleaded against that compulsory arbitration bill which came out of the Commerce Committee urging compulsory arbitration for the settlement of the railroad dispute in 1963. I was one of two Senators who voted against it. If one will read the RECORD, he will find that, looking up at the front row of the gallery, where there were sitting some of those who had brought the pressure and the lobbying techniques to bear upon the Senate to pass that law, I said to them, pointing my finger at them, "You will rue the day that you brought the pressure on the Senate to pass this compulsory arbitration law, for you leaders will have to assume the responsibility of passing the first compulsory arbitration law ever passed by the Congress of the United States."

I want to say, in complete fairness to them, that many of them have told me since how right they considered I was in 1963 and how much they appreciated the position I took. Well, I have had some difficulty with some of them since, as I have participated in the solution of some labor disputes, including two east coast dock cases, the airlines case, and recently the railroad case. When I am put on a board that is in the middle and called upon to settle a labor dispute, I never permit my obligations to that board to ever mix with my political views.

But today I am discussing what I think are major tenets of our economic and political philosophy that ought to be considered by Members of the Senate before they vote on the Smathers bill, if it ever comes to a vote. In my judgment a vote for the Smathers bill will be as great a mistake as the Senate made in 1963, when it voted for the first compulsory arbitration law in the history of the Republic. I hope such a vote will never be cast again, because it is most important that we see to it that workers and employers in America remain completely free to participate in collective bargaining between themselves for the determination of their wages, hours, and conditions of employment, and that no restriction ever be placed upon that freedom except in those rare and novel cases where a course of economic action on the part of workers and employers in a dispute imperils the health, safety, and security of the Republic. Even then, the Congress should assure that in protecting such a major, superior public interest, it does the least possible to interfere with collective bargaining.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE CLEDWYN HUGHES, M.P., SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WALES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to bring to the floor of the Senate a very distinguished visitor, who is the Secretary of State for Wales, and who was appointed for that purpose in April 1966. He is also a Privy Counselor who served as a member of the Cabinet in Britain, and he is one of the foremost spokesmen for the Labor Party. He is a stanch Welshman. I have often expressed my high regard for Wales. I remember when I first encountered the middle name of John Llewellyn Lewis. I became curious and found out that he was a Welshman.

Subsequently, when I was a college student, I was assigned to sell books to farmers in an area of South Dakota, variously populated with Welsh people. I was a master at doubletalk, as it were, and almost got to the point where I could talk in Welsh.

Our visitor is a distinguished person who has served Her Majesty's Government so nobly. It is my privilege to introduce the Right Honorable Cledwyn Hughes, Secretary of State for Wales. I trust Senators can take a moment, after applause, to shake hands with our distinguished visitor. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. President, it has been my pleasure, shared by other Senators this day, to meet and greet a distinguished visitor to this country and to this body—the Right Honorable Cledwyn Hughes, a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council, a member of the Cabinet, a member in Parliament from Anglesey in Wales, and Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Wales.

This is an office in the British Cabinet recently created to fill a long-felt need—one hoped for, aspired to, fought for, and desired by countless generations of Welshmen loyal to the concept of the United Kingdom.

Mr. President, in no way do I desire to intrude on this floor on matters that properly belong to our British friends. But I am moved to say, Mr. President, that I rejoice with my fellow Americans of Welsh blood in not only the creation of this important Cabinet position, but in the dignity and ability that is being demonstrated by the present holder of this office.

I am moved to speak as did John Milton, a one-time Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when Britain was a Commonwealth—who said of another who then held the responsibility of moving forward the affairs of the principality in the United Kingdom:

> And all this tract that fronts the falling sun,
> A noble peer of mickle trust,
> And power has in his charge, with tempered
> awe to guide
> An old and haughty Nation proud in arms.
>
> —John Milton (1608–74).

Thus spake Milton, and in this context I can only say that the right honorable gentleman, the Secretary of State for Wales, has already brought to pass through the British Parliament an act that for the first time in over 700 years grants the ancient and honorable tongue of Wales full legal status in the courts of law within the ancient realm of British princes. This is a meet and goodly thing, but of equal importance is the guidance that is being given this "old and haughty nation" in making further contributions to the industrial Western World.

Welsh is the language of poets and hearthstone, but English, of course, is the language of commerce and all Welshmen today speak English, as many of them speak Welsh. We look back with admiration at this little nation that has so long contributed to the cause of freedom. We recall that it is said Thomas Jefferson and 16 of the other signers of our own Declaration of Independence were of Welsh blood and that a Welsh prince of Wales was signatory to the Magna Carta. We honor the leadership given by her sons and daughters both at home and abroad in war and peace, in labor and in commerce and agriculture, and especially wherever tyranny is to be denied.

May I add, Mr. President, that I am especially glad to welcome to this, our Capital City, a member of the British Cabinet charged with furthering the affairs of this small, but vitally important part of the islands of Britain—who together with her sister nations in the United Kingdom have for so many decades been our stanch allies in the cause of peace, freedom, and human dignity.

While men of Welsh blood look back with affection and pride to their long and tempestuous history, it is now obvious that, as demonstrated by Mr. Hughes' visit to the United States, the future holds bright promise for the people of Wales as they, with their skills and determination, diversify and expand their industrial contribution to their nation and the world.

Further, Mr. President, it may interest Senators to know that one of the few remaining Welsh churches in the United States is in the city of Chicago where services are held in the ancient British tongue—a reminder of how many Americans in my State and in others have their roots in this lovely little corner of Britain.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the speech which Secretary Hughes delivered at noon today to the Interparliamentary Union group at a luncheon here.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech of Hon. Cledwyn Hughes, Secretary of State for Wales, to the Interparliamentary Union, U.S. Group, at a Luncheon on October 19, 1967

It is a great privilege for me to be your guest today and it is particularly pleasing to me that this luncheon in my honour should have been arranged by the Interparliamentary Union—U.S. Group. I have been a member of the United Kingdom Group of the I.P.U. for 17 years and throughout that time I have taken a keen interest in the work of the Union. The Union's record is an enviable one and I believe that the Union will continue to make a massive contribution to better understanding between all those of us who are proud to be members of it.

My Department of State, the Welsh Office, is a very young Department; it is not yet 3 years old. The office which I hold—Secretary of State for Wales—carries with it membership of the British Cabinet. My particular job is to represent the needs and aspirations of Wales and of the people of Wales in the Cabinet—that is, in the most important forum in our system of government.

As Secretary of State I am the Minister of the Crown who is directly responsible for a wide range of executive functions for Wales—housing, local government, roads, environmental planning, economic planning and so on. But, of course, as a member of the Cabinet I share with my colleagues the collective responsibility for all my Government's policies and decisions.

The main purpose of my visit to the United States is to meet industrialists, bankers, businessmen and a host of others to talk about the exciting prospects for those Americans who are prepared to undertake industrial investment in the United Kingdom. I am not here to "bang the drum" for Wales alone, but as every perceptive investor will know the most fertile fields awaiting cultivation in the United Kingdom are found in Wales! The Welsh people are noted for being completely fair and unbiased in these matters!

My most lasting memory of this visit will be of the extraordinarily friendly welcome I have received. I have met a large number of members of Welsh societies and organizations—people who are first class citizens of this great country but who nevertheless cherish their links with the land of their fathers, grandfathers—and even farther back in history. Back in fact to 1170—which as every good Welshman knows is the year that the son of one of our Princes discovered America, long, long before anyone else thought of it!

The strength of the links was brought home to me very forcibly yesterday I had a long talk in the Welsh language with a Washington lady whose forebears came to this country in 1834 and who herself has never set foot in Wales. And it was brought home to me very movingly last Sunday when the children of a church which I attended at Wilkesbarre sang a hymn in Welsh.

For generations—indeed, for centuries, the Welsh people have greatly influenced and contributed to the growth of this country. And of course people from other parts of the United Kingdom have also played their part.

At home in Britain there is a lively debate going on—largely in the columns of the press—about the question of relations between the United States and the United Kingdom. Mr. Alfred Friendly drew attention to this in a recent article in the Washington Post and referred particularly to some remarks made by Lord Chalfont in an interview with an Italian newspaper and subsequently on television. Lord Chalfont, as you may know, is the Foreign Office Minister charged specifically with conducting the continued day-to-day handling of our application to join the E.E.C. and he has recently established himself in Brussels for this purpose. The London Times in its report on Lord Chalfont's recent statements used a rather sensational and certainly quite misleading headline—"Britian breaks special link with U.S." It is this as much as anything which has led to so much public discussion of what has so often been referred to as the "special relationship" between our two countries.

I should just like if I may to make one or two comments on this question, since I feel sure that headlines such as that used by The Times are liable to mislead the many friends of Britain in this country.

The basic trouble is that people in Britain tend to talk about a "special relationship" without really thinking deeply enough about what they mean. There are I believe two aspects of our relations which have to be looked at separately.

The first is what I might best describe perhaps as the "human" links between our two peoples. What I have in mind here is our common heritage of language and all that that implies in the cultural field, as well as our very similar conceptions of law, government, democracy and so on. These things are organic. They were not created by any act of government policy and equally cannot be and will not be abolished by any act of government policy. As Mr. Friendly put it, "this relationship persists whether anyone wants it to or not". My own experience during this visit is ample proof that Mr. Friendly is absolutely right. And the sympathy and understanding which flow from these human links is important, significant, and enduring.

The other aspect of our relationship, and this is the one of which Lord Chalfont was speaking, is the working relationship between our two Governments. This of course benefits from the other communtiy of feeling to which I have already referred, but it is not governed by it. Both our Governments have the duty of pursuing the interests of our two countries as they judge and assess them. It is by definition a feature of governments in the free and democratic world that the pursuant of self-interest is enlightened and should not be at the expense of others if this can possibly be avoided. This is not to say that we are always in full and perfect harmony—life would be rather dull if we were—but your country and mine both believe, with considerable justice in my view, that we are on the side of the angels.

Against this background, our handling of day to day problems inevitably goes on through periods of ups and downs. Many of you will not have been happy with the decisions we have found it right and necessary to take in the field of defense policy East of Suez. We have not enjoyed taking these decisions nor have we enjoyed the fact that you find them unpalatable. But the fact is that if we are to have any meaningful foreign policy at all, with continuing validity over the years, we must cut our coat to fit the cloth available and must create a stable economic base.

Part of this process is reflected in our application to join the European community. You will I am sure all have been struck by the extent of the conviction which exists in Britain today that this is a necessary step. As part of the process, we must demonstrate that we mean to be good Europeans in all aspects, and that we are not seeking simply the economic benefits of membership while trying at the same time to preserve some kind of special and exclusive relationship with the United States such as existed as a fact of life during World War II. The Atlantic Alliance will continue to be—as it is for the countries of continental Europe—the basis of Britain's security.

I should perhaps also say that in the economic, commercial and technological fields there is a natural and legitimate concern in Europe, including Britain, at the growing need to preserve our separate identity in face of existing and growing American predominance. There is in this no desire whatever to do down the United States, and I have no doubt that you listening to me today will understand and sympathise with our motives.

The truth is that all this is a reflection of our fundamental economic problem and I would like to say a few words to you about our economy—a subject which has been the subject of lively discussion in recent months.

As you well know, the Government introduced stringent measures of restraint in July last year in order to correct our balance of payments difficulties and eliminate inflationary pressures. These measures are now bearing fruit and Britain's external position has been substantially strengthened. On the home front prices have been virtually stable over the past twelve months and wages have risen only slightly—which means, of course, that our relative cost position vis-a-vis the rest of the world has shown a real improvement. There has been a rise in unemployment as a result of these measures, but it should not be overlooked that a part of this increase reflects a marked improvement in the productive performance of industry. This improvement will continue. Let me give you one example from Wales: in two or three years' time one of our giant steelworks employing close on 20,000 men will be able to produce even more steel than at present but with about 40 per cent fewer men. There is clear evidence to hand that industry is tackling the structural difficulties that lie at the heart of Britain's economic problems.

The measures we have taken were, and are, unpopular in Britain and they involved politically difficult decisions. But the fact that we took these measures—and that we are standing by them—is proof of our unswerving determination to set the economy on the right course. And quite frankly I would rather be a member of an unpopular government of a solvent Britain than of a popular government of a bankrupt Britain.

During the year ending 30 June, 1967, we ran a favourable balance on our external accounts. This surplus was achieved by eliminating deficits on both the current and capital accounts. However, it is unfortunately the fact that during the first half of this year there has been some deterioration in our trading position which has set off periodic waves of adverse confidence in the pound sterling. But some deterioration was inevitable as a result of removing the import surcharge last November and eliminating the E.F.T.A. tariffs on 1 January. Unhappily, this upward movement in imports coincided with a dramatic slowing down in the growth of world trade, which affected our export performance. For instance, the U.S. economy showed little increase in total G.N.P. in the first half of 1967 and imports into this country remained virtually flat. Then again, Germany slipped into its most severe post-war recession, and the French economy ceased expanding. Given such a combination of factors, it is not surprising that our trading position suffered. Nevertheless, even in the face of this slowdown in world trade, Britain's exports in the first half of 1967 were up 5% over the 1966 level.

Looking to the future, we confidently expect that our exports will show a significant further expansion alongside a renewed growth in world trade. I would add, however, that these hopes are based on the assumption that the impetus towards liberal trading arising from the successful conclusion of the Kennedy Round will continue.

The world in which we live is a troubled world. You have enormous problems and responsibilities; so have we. Your resources are great; ours are less—but they are still considerable. In this troubled world the respect which our peoples have for those things that really matter—the freedom of the individual under the rule of law and for our great Parliamentary institutions—affords the best hope for the future of mankind.

U.S. POLICIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at his press conference on October 12, Secretary of State Dean Rusk made a careful and thoughtful exposition of our policies in Vietnam, of the difficulties of bringing Hanoi to the conference room, and of our national interests in Asia. The Secretary's remarks, if fairly heard, should help Congress and the American people to get a better perspective on the problem of achieving a compromise settlement with an adversary who does not yet wish to compromise and to focus attention on the issues at stake in Vietnam.

Some people, I was surprised to discover, think that the Secretary was suddenly introducing a new and radical justification of our efforts in Vietnam by relating the war to the problem of China. It was the danger lurking in Chinese power and ambitions that we in the Senate had in mind when we ratified the SEATO Treaty more than a decade ago. It was this danger that President Eisenhower had in mind in April 1954 when he said that the loss of Indochina could have incalculably serious consequences for the free world and dramatized, perhaps too vividly, the process of disintegration that would follow in terms of the "falling domino" principle.

President Kennedy's decision to step up sharply the scale of our military assistance to the Vietnamese Republic was made not in terms of Vietnam alone but of the threat which, he said, China clearly posed to the security of independent countries of South and Southeast Asia.

It has fallen to President Johnson to persist without wavering on the course begun by his predecessors—a line of policy, furthermore, that has deep roots in our longstanding recognition that the domination of Asia by any one power is inconsistent with the vital interests of the United States. I wonder how many Americans today remember that the breakdown of our talks with Japan in the fateful summer of 1941 was caused by Japan's seizure of Indochina?

The importance of the American effort in Vietnam can be understood only in the context of Asia as a whole, and of the hegemonic aspirations of Red China. In Asia we and our allies are trying—and with far greater prospects of success than is recognized by those who cannot see beyond Vietnam—to create a reliable balance of forces. If we succeed, as we shall, the benefits will accrue not only to the non-Communist countries of Asia but also to ourselves and to our European allies.

Will any of those who, whether intentionally or unintentionally, are urging policies that lead toward an American withdrawal or a humiliating compromise argue that such a course would not open the doors to a vast extension of Chinese influence in Asia? As this became clear, would our Asian commitments decline, or would we feel compelled to extend and deepen them to many other areas, from Thailand to the Indian Ocean and to the Philippines? To me the answers are clear, just as it is clear that our stand in Vietnam has already strengthened hopeful tendencies in Indonesia—the fifth most populous country in the world—and elsewhere in non-Communist Asia.

It is hardly necessary to say, I hope, that the concern that has led to our involvement in Vietnam has nothing to do with a racist interpretation of history in terms of a yellow peril. It has to do with the tendency of great powers that possess, and are possessed by, a militant and expansionist ideology to dominate their neighbors unless they are checked by countervailing power.

In its lead editorial yesterday, the Washington Post correctly observed that "there is nothing mutually exclusive about the several reasons we fight this war." We are fighting at once to defend South Vietnam's right to an independent existence, to fulfill our commitments, to check aggression, to block Chinese expansion, and to reduce the danger of a later, greater war by fighting a limited war.

If anyone has a constructive suggestion to make on Vietnam, he should put it forward, so that it can be looked at hard and thoughtfully in an effort to understand its pitfalls as well as its possibilities. But all too often of late the criticisms have been negative, reflecting, I believe, the very frustrations the Communist adversary has hoped to arouse by protracting the conflict. Wishful thinking will not persuade Ho Chi Minh to accompany us down the path to negotiation and a peaceful settlement.

Obviously, no one who holds my point of view can prove beyond peradventure of doubt that his analysis is correct. I do not have, no one has, the gift of prophecy. I can only say that I can find nothing in history in general or in the history of Asia in particular to encourage me to believe that a great power that describes its purposes as China describes hers will refrain from exploiting the weakness of its neighbors—unless it has reason to fear the consequences.

We are not alone in our concern for the role China expects to play in Asia. Nehru once thought we were wrong, but in the fall of 1962 Nehru was obliged by events to revise his view of China. With good reason India today looks apprehensively at the giant beyond the Himalayas. The Indonesians took great pains to cultivate their relations with China; they paid a heavy price for the lesson Peking provided. Burma, Thailand, Malaya, and even Cambodia have learned through bitter experiences that inoffensiveness provides no security. On his current visit to this country, Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew, of Singapore, is cautioning us to be patient and prudent in our policies in Asia, to stand firmly by our commitments, and to remember that Southeast

Asia needs strong friends if it is to maintain its independence.

Were we wrong here in the Senate to ratify the SEATO Treaty? Were Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy wrong in their assessments of our national interest in defending the independence of Southeast Asia? Are China's neighbors wrong to fear China's expansionism? Are China's leaders lying when they proclaim their intention to foster and support so-called wars of national liberation? Were all of us who supported the Korean war wrong to think that the cause of peace requires the strong and peaceloving to oppose aggression by the strong and peaceupsetting?

This does not imply, as should be obvious, that the United States must take responsibility for every uprising or revolt anywhere in the world. We should not, if we could, for as we know better than most, revolution is not always a dirty word. No prudent person has ever thought that we should become the policeman of the world. We can do a lot, but our resources and capabilities are limited and our power must be rationed in accordance with a responsible ordering of our national interests.

I have been moved to speak today because I fear that our frustrations are showing. We are in for serious trouble indeed if our tempers become frayed and our understandable unhappiness with a long and difficult and costly war leads us to impugn one another's motives and to make charges that, if true, could only mean that our leaders do not merit our confidence as men of integrity and dedication to the national interest.

This weekend the streets and public gathering places here in the Nation's Capital will be filled with self-proclaimed apostles of protest—some prideful and some arrogant—confronting young Americans in uniform with such morale-building slogans as "Hell no, we won't go." We can and will survive such contributions to our national dialogue, but I am not sure that we could survive the debasement of our debates in Congress and in the national political campaign which looms just ahead to the level of this weekend's demonstrations.

I find it particularly disheartening that some who have long been identified with liberal policies and programs at home and who strongly supported the condemnation of aggression in the Charter of the United Nations, even when this involved a costly struggle against aggression in Korea, no longer seem able to bear the burden of staying the long hard course on which the world's chances for a peaceful future depend. Do they think we can build a better America in a world in which the bars to aggression by the strong against the weak are lowered?

We are facing a most serious test of our national character and democratic processes—a debate over our policies and purposes in the midst of a war and a national election campaign. We are, or ought to be, engaged in reasoning together, not in cutting each other up. The war in Vietnam cannot be brought to an end by attacking each other here at home, but it can be lost, rather, it will be lost, if we destroy our confidence in each other. It is my great hope that the Senate, with its great traditions, can set an example for the nation of how reasonable men reasoning together may find unity through honest and vigorous but temperate debate.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I commend the Senator from Washington for this very straightforward plea and forthright analysis of the nature of the American commitment in Asia; because, like the Senator from Washington, I have been very deeply concerned about the rather reckless kinds of assaults that have been contrived in the last few days, aimed in particular, and seemingly personally, at the Secretary of State in some cases and cloaked behind careful phrases and cliches.

Heaven knows, the whole question of Asia and what its future may be is difficult at best; and I know of no Senator with the ultimate wisdom to say with certainty what that future may be. That is all the more reason why I believe the Senator from Washington is correct in saying that this is no time for that kind of emotionalism, that kind of haranguing, or that kind of personal vindictiveness; that if we ever needed clear minds, clear spirits, and very levelheaded dialog, it is at this very moment.

For that reason, I believe the Senator has rendered a service here. I feel very deeply on this issue myself, as the Senator knows. I often think of a rather appropriate comment attributed to the late Adlai Stevenson, when he warned his fellow Americans that we have to be realists as well as dreamers.

As Stevenson said:

> We have to begin where we are.

What I believe he was trying to tell us is that we cannot begin where we should have been; we cannot begin where we might have been if things had somehow been different; and we cannot begin where we may some day be. Those are wishful thinking; but we have to start where we are.

Where we are is in the midst of a world that, in a national sense, is a lawless world. We do not have a world under law; and the only substitute, still, that civilized man has come up with for world war is stability through balance of the existing forces.

As Mr. Stevenson warned us, unless we are willing to start at that point, we are not going to be able to realize a stronger United Nations, a world under law, or stable international economic development.

That is what I think the Senator from Washington is suggesting to us, that it is that kind of realism that must mark our beginning. I would hope, as a sometime historian, that we might learn from history. A very wise philosopher reminded us that those who forget history are condemned to repeat it.

Mr. JACKSON. George Santayana, I believe.

Mr. McGEE. Yes. And there are elements of history that I think are very useful, and should not be forgotten. Certainly one of those, in terms of our experiences in World War II, was the lesson of how not to come to grips with open aggression. We learned that one important thing to avoid is giving somebody else's territory away to the aggressor, in the hope that somehow that will appease his ravenous appetite. We were taught that lesson the hard way, and I hope we learned it. Will the Senator agree that that lesson certainly is valid, in terms of our searching for guidelines for our conduct in Asia?

Mr. JACKSON. I agree with the Senator. And, Mr. President, I take this opportunity not only to compliment, but to commend the Senator from Wyoming for the able way in which he has articulated, on the floor of the Senate and throughout the country, our policy with reference to Vietnam. I believe the country owes him a great debt of gratitude for the clarity with which he has expressed our position. I deeply appreciate his comments and observations in connection with the situation as we find it today in Asia.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to add, if I may, that the lessons we learned so dearly and at such heavy cost in Europe we now have a chance to profit from in Asia. I would be the first to urge caution in that respect; I am sure that not everything that happened to work out in Europe would necessarily work out in Asia. The two areas of the world are quite different in many respects.

But one ingredient they have in common, and that is that they are made up of independent nation-states, each of which is sovereign unto itself, and they are free to run amok if they wish. I think the basis of American foreign policy since World War II has been the same in Europe and in Asia—that is, that it is in our national interest to see to it, if we can, if we have the wisdom and the will to do so, that no one nation ever again dominates either Europe or Asia.

We used to think of that principle only in European terms; but we did more than any other single force in the world to shove Asia directly front and center into the balance-of-power calculations of the whole globe, and thus establish, it seems to me, the inescapable truth that the world, indeed, is round. It is that role in which we now find ourselves.

There are some who say it is none of our business; but we did it. The Russians did not do it in Asia, the French did not not do it, the Dutch did not do it. We did it ourselves. The war in Asia was won almost unilaterally by America. We destroyed the warmaking potential of Japan. We were the ones who contributed most largely to the withdrawal of the French from Indochina and the Dutch from Indonesia. The shambles that remained at the end of the war was a feasting ground for aggressors and for those if you will, who would seek to exploit devastation, unless the devastation were cleaned up and some of the shattered pieces put back together again, as a starting point.

I think we were compelled, as a nation with a conscience and as a people who really generally mean it when we say that we aspire to a more stable world, to try to take some responsibility for achieving a new sense of balance in Asia. For that reason I say that whenever the critics have a better case that they can make—and they have not come up with it yet—they will have to learn from the lessons that we learned so dearly from Hitler and Tojo and Mussolini. We, of course, must apply those lessons in Asia with caution and restraint, but with the keen insight that we have acquired because of the very dear experience we have had. I think the history in Asia since the end of World War II bears that out. It seems to me the record is already very clear. We have already made a difference in that part of the world.

The balance of Asia some day, I am sure, will be maintained by Asians themselves, perhaps one leg of it resting in Indonesia—as the Senator from Washington describes it, the fifth largest nation in the world—one leg in Japan, another one in mainland China, and another in India. We cannot say for certain where the structure will repose; but the Asians themselves would like to have that chance. One of the consequences of what we are trying to do in Asia now, I think, is to help to win the time that will preserve for them that sort of chance.

I am a little put out by those who set up their own straw men so that they can knock them down, or who drag across the floor of the Senate some kind of dead horse, if we may use another figure of speech, and then beat it as though they had nothing better to do. But when they talk about the yellow peril in Asia, when they talk about not taking part in land wars in Asia, when they talk in fetish terms or as if from some fountain of wisdom, I think they are not contributing to our national interest.

The issue is not the yellow peril; the issue is the balance of Asia. There are billions of Asians, and there will soon be more Asians. They would like a chance to say something.

Mr. JACKSON. I wonder what the position of some persons would be if the current thrust was against India instead of against South Vietnam.

Mr. McGEE. I think that some of them would have to readjust the verbiage they have been employing lately. The trouble, it seems to me, is that they are so far bogged down in thinking about the minutia of Vietnam that they cannot deal with Asia as a whole. Asia is the big issue; Vietnam happens to be where the war is taking place. It could have happened in a dozen other places in Asia. Would not the Senator agree?

Mr. JACKSON. I agree that the American stand in Vietnam can only be understood in the context of Asia. That is why it is interesting to raise the question as to what the attitude of some persons would be if some other Southeast Asian country were involved.

I recall that when the Chinese started to move into India in 1962, many of the great liberals of this country were highly exercised about it and wanted immediately to give military support to India. Some of our liberal friends are not very logical about all this.

As you say, a reliable balance of forces in Asia is the issue. That is the reason we are in Vietnam. That is the reason we are making this great effort.

I must say that I was shocked by the reaction of some people to the remarks made by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk. What the Secretary of State said at his press conference is exactly what has been on the minds of millions of Americans and, yes, of friends around the world. Our friends and our thoughtful people at home have been thinking about this problem in terms of Asia and an expansionist Red China.

When the Secretary made his statement, some people claimed it was a wholly new approach to the problem. But, as I pointed out in my main remarks, it has been the policy of our Government since World War II with President Eisenhower, to see Vietnam in the context of Asia. President Eisenhower in 1954 viewed the situation in Indochina in the context of Asia. And President Kennedy followed through on the policies initially undertaken by President Eisenhower recognizing that the future of Southeast Asia is a matter that concerns the vital national interests of the United States.

Mr. McGEE. And the history of our country is replete with evidence to substantiate the conclusion of the Senator there.

The balance of Asia does make a difference to us. We are a great Pacific Ocean nation for better or for worse. The future of the world lies in the Pacific. That is where most of the human race is. That is the direction in which the whole world is moving.

Mr. JACKSON. Japan is the third largest industrial nation in the world.

Mr. McGEE. Thanks to the kind of policy the United States has been pursuing in Asia.

Mr. JACKSON. We know that the leaders in Japan and in the other non-Communist countries of Asia look to the United States for leadership. We have given them new hope. They have new confidence. They have a new determination to withstand the threat and maintain their independence. And I think this stems directly from the effort we are making in Vietnam.

Mr. McGEE. Would it be a fair summary then to say that, first of all, in the hindsight of history there is relevant history to guide us here? Historians even now speculate as to what would have happened if we had listened in 1931 to those who said: "Let's stop Japan in Manchuria before she gets bigger."

They speculate as to what would have happened in Europe with respect to Adolf Hitler. Some people advocated in 1936, before he broke into Western Europe, that he should be stopped then.

These are questions that face us in the hindsight of history. And I think most people would agree that in view of that hindsight it would have meant an entirely different course of events if we had acted sooner rather than later.

We have the word from Peking that we should look to the future. We have the word of Mr. Mao and Lin Piau and the rest of the men in Peking concerning how they do not really mean these things but just want to hear each other talk.

I can remember how people used to talk about the paperhanger from Austria, Adolf Schickelgruber. His book "Mein Kampf" was a very revealing book.

I do not think in the light of historical experience that we can be quite so indifferent as some of our critics seem to be when they profess that these people will not implement what they say they can.

That does not mean at all that we have to take on China any more than anybody else. We only ask that mainland China not resort to force to try to impress its will on others. If they persuade somebody by talk, more power to them. If they have a better idea than the next nation, great. However, let us make sure that we do not let them nibble away at the little ring of independent countries around them, because then that would make a difference not only to those small countries, but also to the United States.

It is not without great point that they talk with great confidence about being the wave of the future. They have already tried to put that into effect in Indochina through the Communist Party there. They almost succeeded. They flagrantly said that the Philippines were soon to be the target.

They began to press against India. I think it is of interest to note the double standards under which the critics operate, as the Senator has pointed out, in regard to India.

I talked to Mr. Nehru who had made a study on this very important subject. We discussed India's attitude on the use of force from the outside.

I will never forget what he said. He said:

> I have read American history. I remember that it took an attack by Japan on your territory to shock your country into divesting yourself of your isolationism.

He then said:

> I will give you a parallel. Something like this may have to happen to India before we are shocked into a more realistic attitude.

It was only 3 years after that that India indeed experienced her first assault from mainland China. Her attitude changed overnight in regard to China. Today, India has one-half million troops in the Himalayan Range.

Changes are taking place. There is this restless change that is already taking place. What we cannot know for sure is how far China intends to go. Nobody can know this.

Those who suggest that China is so convulsed that she cannot go anywhere ignore the fact that one reason for China's internal difficulty is that the United States stood, and that contributed to the erosion of the magical image that the Chinese sought to spread, that they were the wave of the future. And because we stood, China did not move in and take it all over.

Japan has been able to prosper only because China did not do that. She did not take Taiwan where there are roots and where they are a very strong, independent, economic entity, whatever else history may call it.

China did not take over Indonesia, and

they did not take it over almost entirely because of the American presence in Vietnam.

The Indians have stood against China because the United States responded with military help at a time when she needed it.

It is interesting to note that one of the great liberal voices of our country today that criticizes our policy in Asia was the first voice raised asking for American planes to help India, because that liberal voice came from the Ambassador to India in those days.

It makes a difference, then, when you have to take the consequences for what you say, and many of our critics are enjoying the luxury of irresponsibility.

The very last point I wish to make is simply to remind us that not only is history raising a warning finger to us not to make the same mistakes again, if we can avoid it, not only is the conduct of China even now open to serious question—our hope is that we can dissuade them from moving wildly and irresponsibly by making clear our position earlier rather than later—but also, the Asians, who have to live with the situation, next to China, are very strong in their concern about China's future plans. They make no bones about it.

I returned a few months ago from a trip around the rim of China, and they all mentioned this. This is their central fear. This is not something invented by Mr. Rusk, by the President, or by anybody else. This is no joke. These are the hard facts of power politics lines, and it has nothing to do with the green people, purple people, brown people, or yellow people. It has to do with the naked attributes of national power. That is what makes up the world today, until we can make it a better place, somehow.

This is what is at stake in Asia, and I believe we stand a much better chance in the tides of history if we can dissuade a nation from resort to those extreme points or if we can persuade those who are not as strong to stand together in an attempt to try to preserve the chance in Asia for the continent of Asia to proceed with some semblance of balance and freedom from force. It is the force that redounds to the advantage of the aggressor.

That is all we ask. We do not want the American image. We do not want to make little Democrats out of them. We do not want little of anything. We just want them to have the chance.

When you array the billion independent Asians alongside the approaching billion in China, you are not talking about a yellow peril. You are talking about a problem in Asia, an area in which we have learned that it makes a difference to our security, as Japan taught us very dearly; and the shape of this new balance in Asia makes a difference to the security of our country.

That is why I join with the Senator in applauding the Secretary of State for his hard-hitting, forthright, and direct approach to the basic question at stake in Vietnam. It has little or nothing to do with Vietnam. It has everything to do with this most important and potentially most powerful part of the world. I compliment the Senator.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I must say that the Senate is indebted to the able senior Senator from Wyoming for his very helpful remarks.

In short, what we are trying to do is to help create in Asia a reliable balance of forces. As the able Senator has pointed out, the non-Communist Asian leaders understand Communist China. They report that to know Communist China is to fear Communist China. I am glad that the Senator emphasized that point, because I believe it needs to be reemphasized over and over again.

I am happy to yield to the distinguished and very able member of the Committee on Armed Services, the senior Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Washington, for his very timely and forthright statement.

Recently, I was privileged to meet a very able and articulate Asian leader, a neutralist, who made a profound statement which I should like to share with my colleagues. He stated that all Asians know that Americans have great firepower, but most Asians are now wondering if Americans have staying power. This statement was made in reference to Vietnam.

If Americans do not have staying power, this Asian leader remarked, we are lost. This Asian leader felt that if we can convince Asians that we do have staying power, that we have the will, the perseverance, and the patience, this long and miserable war will be concluded.

I believe it is well for us to recall a speach that was delivered by President Johnson not long ago, in which he commenced by saying, "This is a time for testing." Yes, Mr. President, this is a time for testing of the will, patience, and perseverance of the people of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the able Senator from Hawaii certainly put his finger on the crucial point here. Our adversaries are hoping that our people will not have the will to stay the course. Our adversaries hope to be able to win this conflict in the American political arena. They know they cannot win it on the battlefield. They won it in Paris in 1954, and they hope the situation will develop in this country so that they will be able to repeat that maneuver.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the able Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington has made a very able and thoughtful presentation, as indeed he always does. I was particularly interested in the last sentence of his remarks, in which he said:

> It is my great hope that the Senate, with its great traditions, can set an example for the Nation of how reasonable men reasoning together may find unity through honest and vigorous but temperature debate.

Mr. President, I believe it is very important, in the most important subject facing the American people today—the war in Vietnam—that there be full debate; and, as the able Senator from Washington has said, that there be vigorous debate but temperate debate.

I have long felt that one of the great failures of our Government in regard to Vietnam has been its inability to obtain effective support from other nations—or, perhaps, even its unwillingness to seek additional support from other nations. With that thought in mind, the late news from Bangkok is that Thailand has agreed to increase troop commitments to South Vietnam from 2,000 men to a full division. The news report did not indicate how many men that would provide, but a Thai division normally is considered to number roughly 20,000, as I recall.

Although I have been critical for over a year of our Government's lack of activity in this regard, I wish today to commend the President and our Government for focusing additional attention on the need for Asians themselves to participate to a greater extent in this struggle in Southeast Asia.

I commend, too, the Government of Thailand for its decision to send additional troops to Vietnam, and call attention to the recent action of Australia and New Zealand for doing likewise.

Again, I wish to commend the very able Senator from Washington for the remarks he made this afternoon.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I thank my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, for his comments. I fully agree with him on the need to get more Asians involved in the struggle for the defense of non-Communist Asia. I believe that the first order of business of the new Government in South Vietnam should be to build up more effectively their armed forces. They must in due time carry the brunt of the effort in Vietnam. I would hope that this would become the No. 1 priority item on the agenda of the new Government.

I commend the able Senator from Virginia for bringing up this point because it needs to be emphasized and reemphasized over and over again.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am privileged to serve under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Washington on the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations. I have watched him in both open and closed meetings as he has probed the issues which affect the vital national interests of this country. I have watched him as he, with real commonsense, has made constructive suggestions about the national security of this country.

Mr. President, I think that is what he has done here today. He has injected a much-needed measure of commonsense into the debate on Vietnam. If we are to have the kind of meaningful debate and national dialog that the Senator from Washington suggested we should have, it is important that the real issues be joined. We cannot do that if we resort to a questioning of motives, as has, unfortunately, been done in this country in recent days in regard to the President of the United States, particularly. I do not think there is any way the real issues can be joined by questioning motives.

I do not believe the real issues can be joined on Vietnam by ascribing to one's opponent in the argument some ridiculous and superficial position, and then proceeding to knock it down. For example, one might charge that an opponent believes in a monolithic view of communism, and then argue the opponent is wrong because that view is outdated, when nobody really believes in a monolithic view of communism in the world today.

Mr. JACKSON. We all know that the Communist movement has never been monolithic.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the kind of thing we have had. Then, there is the yellow peril matter. It is a terribly helpful thing to one's own side of the argument if he can make the argument for the other side as well, and that is what has been attempted too much in this country in recent days.

The other thing that is necessary if the issues are to be joined is that we face up to the real fact of the fear for their own future which is in the minds of those in many countries in Asia.

I have recently had conversations with heads of states or persons who were very near heads of states in some five countries of Asia. What they have to say about their own future being very much bound up with what is going on in Vietnam cannot be denied. The issues on Vietnam cannot be joined unless that fact is met unless we discuss what we are going to say to those people if we do not continue what we are attempting to do there in assuring for the people of South Vietnam their right of self-determination without outside interference and aggression.

That seems to me to be the crux of what the Senator has said. We have to argue on the real issues and join debate on the real issues. We cannot do that with some of the kinds of arguments that have been put forth in the country in recent days.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator for his speech and helping to keep the debate on the real issues involved.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the able junior Senator from Oklahoma for his most effective remarks in connection with this critical problem in Asia. Mr. President, I yield to the able junior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank my colleague on the Committee on Armed Services for yielding. I shall take only a moment because I do not wish to infringe on the time of the very patient and agreeable senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who yielded to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

The Senator from Washington has made a knowledgeable, thoughtful, thorough, and thought-provoking speech, and he has performed a great service. I share the viewpoint he has expressed, and I congratulate him on making this statement today. It is a timely speech and needed to be made.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, I was scheduled late yesterday afternoon to make a speech that I have prepared, setting forth my views on the proposal to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950. The RECORD of yesterday will show that because of the lateness of the hour, I agreed to make the speech today. It is not too long. I shall proceed with it without interruption, leaving such time as I can before my plane departs for questions after I finish; but I have not only a very important obligation here, but important obligations of political self-interest out in the great State of Oregon, and I am about to fly out there again to protect those political self-interests with a series of speeches during the next few days.

However, I should not want to go without at least leaving for the RECORD my views on this subject. I say that most respectfully to my beloved friend the Senator from Illinois. I wish to leave this message for him to consider, not that I have much hope of persuading him, as he often persuades me—though I think he will not dispute that sometimes, perhaps surprisingly, he finds himself in agreement with me.

However, on this issue, we have a good-natured friendly difference of opinion, and I want him to know that I am going to leave my position on the RECORD, and then I hope that my good friend from West Virginia, the acting assistant majority leader, will find it possible to arrange a live pair for me, if I am unable to get back in time. It may be that even my good friend from Illinois might be overcome by a feeling of charity for me, and give me a pair; but if not, perhaps my majority leader or my acting assistant majority leader can help me.

I do not know how long the debate will last. I am relatively certain, though, that the matter will be voted upon before I return; and, therefore, I hope that either the acting assistant majority leader, the majority leader, or my good friend the minority leader will be able to accommodate me. My friend the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair), gave me a pair when I was absent on a recent trip, but I do not like to return to the same fountain twice in so short a time.

With that nonsense out of the way, I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to make sure that the Senator catches his plane, he could send me a postcard, and just put his speech in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I am watching the clock. I will catch the plane, I think, as long as I hold, after I have this pleasant visit with the Senator from Illinois, to my intention not to yield further, I shall have plenty of time to get the plane.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say to my friend, in respect to a pair, that if the vote is substantially in our favor, probably I could be induced to give the distinguished Senator a pair.

Mr. MORSE. Being the great political economist that he is, I know that the Senator from Illinois knows that would be sound political economy; but I want a pair where the man pairing with me might be really giving me something of great value. Therefore, I want my majority leader to try to get me a pair even if the vote is close; and, in deference to the Senator from Illinois, I hope at least it will be close.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In order to speed this discussion, I wish to assure the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon that everything will be done to get him a live pair if necessary; and if I can afford to do so, I will give it to him.

Mr. MORSE. The majority leader has always been gracious to me in that respect, and I cannot begin to state how much I appreciate not only his many courtesies but those of the minority leader as well. I am now completely serious. Innumerable courtesies have been extended to me by both the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to discuss S. 2171, the measure introduced by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, in an effort to resuscitate the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Someone once observed, I believe it was the French philosopher Voltaire, that the lesson history teaches is that we refuse to learn the lessons history teaches us. Certainly this is true about this legislation. Like Banquo's ghost, it comes to haunt us. It revives memories of a period we had hoped was over—and that should be over. It is, I think, a symptom of the increasingly strident tone with which the war in Vietnam is discussed by its proponents. It reflects a war mentality—nationalistic, self-serving, moralistic. It vents pent up indignation and frustration—"If we cannot locate and destroy the enemy in Vietnam, we will do it right here at home."

This bill is utterly pointless, unnecessary and dangerous. The most intelligent thing ever said about the Internal Security Act of 1950 was President Truman's statement when he vetoed it. It is clear, I think, that he possessed greater wisdom and presence of mind than the majority of those of us at this end of Pennsylvania Avenue in 1950. Now some among us wish to revive this pathetic effort at congressionally sanctioned witch-hunting. It carries the stamp and bears the stench of the McCarthy era. It would promote all the most insidious aspects of that tragic period in our history.

We are on notice regarding this legislation. The red flag is up. The effort made here only a few days ago to railroad this bill through the Senate should have raised questions in the mind of every Member of this body as to what there is in S. 2171 that is so obvious it need not be studied—so elementary it does not require analysis. The procedure attempted here the other day to hurry this bill on its way was shocking. My position and my thought regarding this whole business were ably stated by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. His remarks brilliantly exposed the dangers rampant in such hasty disposal of the bill. I applaud him for his efforts.

Of course, we all recognize why it would be desirable to consider this bill in a hurry. The only way in the world the Senate would allow this effort at legalized character assassination would be in haste. Because it will not stand up to the light of day. This bill should not be examined because it will not stand up under examination. The theory of this legislation is quickly murdered by the facts. That is why the Senate was asked to approve it in a hurry. The Subversive Activities Control Board has done absolutely nothing for at least 20 months, and of course the truth is that it has not done anything since its inception.

But now there is some compelling reason why the Senate needs its own Un-American Activities Committee. And what is even worse, there are those who equate this gesture with patriotism. Senator DIRKSEN, on the Senate floor last Thursday, October 10, urged passage of this legislation to boost the morale of the boys in Vietnam.

There they are—

He said—

> fighting the Reds—and what is the Senate doing? What are they going to think of us?

I am sorry to hear such an appeal. It is tragically out of keeping with our responsibility. It is an obvious appeal to emotion and bad judgment. What is more to the point, it simply ignores the facts. I wonder how the boys in Vietnam would feel if they fully realized that the U.S. Senate was seriously considering legislation which would create an instrumentality perfectly capable of depriving those boys of the very principles for which they are fighting. Not once did the Senator from Illinois mention the rights of those who would become the objects of the insidious techniques of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Why is it that there are always those in this country who, the minute the going gets a little rough, want to junk all the great protections of our rule of law in an effort to ferret out our enemies, both real and imagined? They never stop to consider the irreparable damage which will ensue to our system of government. What is it precisely we seek to protect? I believe it is the preservation of individual dignity by a rule of law and not of men. The only thing that protects each of our citizens from the arbitrary action of those who govern, is the rule of law. And the only thing in this world that distinguishes our system from the Communists is our dedication to that rule of law. Is it so difficult to see that if we use the same techniques as our opponents, we vitiate the whole reason for opposition?

What is there that is patriotic about depriving a man of his right against self-incrimination? What is there that is patriotic about giving a committee carte blanche authority to smear and attack the character of any of our citizens? What is there that is patriotic about discarding the normal function of our courts to set up this alegal agency to move over the landscape and spew its invective wherever it pleases? Would creation of such a monster make the boys on the front feel better? Is this what they are fighting for? Of course not.

I was very interested in the comments made last Wednesday by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] regarding the retaliation which will probably be experienced by those who oppose this measure. Despite the fact that the Senator from Maine supports this bill, I thought her remarks regarding reaction by the extreme right to the Senate's refusal to suspend the rules in consideration of this bill were very apropos. The same hue and cry will be raised in response to the speeches of those of us who oppose this bill. The superpatriots and the hate merchants are never very happy when we describe this kind of legislation for exactly what it is. But then if it comes to the point where we are afraid to express our views in deference to the noisy right, we should all pack up and go home.

S. 2171 is nothing more than an effort to circumvent the thrust of Supreme Court decisions which gutted the Internal Security Act of 1950—and rightly so. This is a new effort to avoid—actually to ignore—the decisions of the Court.

We ought to go back and read Marbury against Madison. We ought to go back and read what that great Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court pointed out—the importance of maintaining a government by law, vesting, as the constitutional fathers did, in the Supreme Court the determination of whether a given proposal is constitutional or unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court nullified the whole point of the 1950 act by finding the registration requirement unconstitutional in the case of *Albertson* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board*, 382 U.S. 70 (1965). Said the Court:

> It follows that the requirement to accomplish registration by completing and filing Form IS-53a is inconsistent with the protection of the Self-Incrimination Clause.

The Attorney General in that case was seeking individual party members to register after failure of the organization as a whole to do so. Justice Black, in 1961, had in a dissenting opinion stated persuasively why he felt the entire Internal Security Act was unconstitutional. Senator PROXMIRE very correctly referred to that statement in his speech of October 16, and it appears in the RECORD for that date. The danger that the act merely seeks to compel self-incrimination was voiced by the Attorney General in 1950, later Supreme Court Justice, Tom Clark as early as 1948 in testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], speaking here yesterday on this bill, very ably pointed out serious legal objections to this legislation. Here is a 13-page amendment to a law 50 pages long, reported out of committee without a report, without the advice of one legal scholar or any other witnesses for that matter, and we are told that we should simply proceed to approve it because it obviously is sound. Nonsense.

The opposite is true. Here is an effort to flush Communist action and Communist infiltrated groups into the open, and yet we are not given the slightest guideline as to what activity defines such an organization. The use of those phrases lays this bill wide open to legal objection—"void for vagueness." How long would it take the courts to strike down this obvious effort to sanction such power to smear? I should think the Members of the Senate would want to take a long hard look at this and have the opinion of our best legal minds before sending such legislation on its way. We all know that, if passed, this law goes from the Senate to the President to the courtroom. In light of Supreme Court decisions rendering the 1950 act useless, I should think we would be very concerned about what reception this law would receive in the courts. Do the proponents of this bill care what happens to it once passed? Do they really seek effective legislation to control Communists, or do they simply desire the grandstand play, a "charade," as Senator KENNEDY so aptly put it yesterday. I think the efforts to rush this bill through without examination answer those questions.

There are those who say this bill merely seeks to expose. Embracing the procedure suggested, that is bad enough, but it is not the whole truth. This bill punishes—as clearly and as effectively as a provision in our criminal code. It sanctions control over organizations branded—they are denied tax deductions; they must stamp their mail as from a Communist organization and identify themselves in broadcast communications. It does not require that we stamp their foreheads, though perhaps that is merely an oversight of its authors.

Then there is the very interesting question posed by Senator KENNEDY: What happens if a witness refuses to testify before the Board? What happens if the witness says to the Board, "My political beliefs are none of your business." Then what? Is there anyone in this room who believes there is a court in this land that would sanction forcing an individual to tell such a Board what his political beliefs are? And looking beyond the attractive idea of forcing Communists to squirm in their chairs, consider, if you will, the possibilities of similar legislation to investigate other groups. There are less than 10,000 Communists in America, and Mr. DIRKSEN wants to flush them out. But there are certainly other organizations holding views contrary to and perhaps as dangerous to America. Why not flush them out? Where does this kind of nonsense stop?

This is the reason why we have courtrooms and criminal procedures—to protect our basic constitutional rights, to protect against the whole witch-hunting business. We should have learned by now. Give a group such vague, open-ended authority as would rest with the Board, and we erode the basic legal principles upon which our system rests. A kangaroo court offends the whole tradition of American jurisprudence. The McCarren Act and these proposed amendments are built on sand—quicksand, for all of us.

Supreme Court decisions on freedom of assembly portend nothing but complete emasculation for this bill should it pass. Senator Kennedy discussed some of those decisions. He discussed the matter with a brilliant legal background. He discussed it as the former Attorney General of the United States.

In my own State as far back as 1937, in *De Jonge* v. *Oregon* (299 U.S. 353), defendant was convicted under an Oregon criminal syndicalism law of assisting in the conduct of a meeting called under the auspices of the Communist Party. The Supreme Court reversed the conviction, holding that participation in a public meeting, otherwise lawful, but held under the auspices of the Communist Party, violates freedom of speech and assembly guaranteed by the due process clause of the 14th amendment. In *Herndon* v. *Lowry,* 301 U.S. 242 (1937), Herndon was convicted by a Georgia court of attempting to incite insurrection by calling and attending public meetings and making speeches to organize the Communist Party of Atlanta to resist and overthrow the authority of the State. The Supreme Court reversed the conviction, holding that the statute did not furnish a sufficiently ascertainable standard of guilt. I have no idea what the ascertainable standard of guilt is under the legislation we are considering. In *Bridges* v. *Wixon,* 326 U.S. 135 (1945), detention of Harry Bridges under a warrant for deportation on the ground of affiliation with the Communist Party was held unlawful on the ground that the hearing on the question of his membership had been unfair. The court held that more cooperation with a Communist organization in connection with its lawful activities was not sufficient to show "affiliation." In *United States* v. *Lovett,* 328 U.S. 303 (1946), a statute forbidding payment of compensation to three named employees of the Government who had been charged with being members of Communist-front organizations was held invalid as a bill of attainder. In *United States* v. *Rosen,* 338 U.S. 851 (1949), Rosen was convicted of contempt of court for refusing to obey an order directing him to answer certain questions he had been asked before a grand jury concerning alleged criminal conspiracy by Communists. The court of appeals reversed his conviction, and the U.S. Supreme Court denied certiorari. In 1961, the Supreme Court struck down a Florida statue requiring all public employees on pain of dismissal to sign an affidavit stating, in part, that they would not aid or support the Communist Party. The opinion of the Court, delivered by Mr. Justice Stewart, held that the statute was so vague and ambiguous as to deprive the plaintiff of liberty without due proces of law. *Cramp* v. *Board of Public Instruction,* 368 U.S. 278 (1961). You will recall that Washington State's teacher's oath recently received similar treatment and was struck down for vagueness. In a concurring opinion in a 1963 case, *Gibson* v. *Florida Legislative Commission,* 372 U.S. 539 (1963), Mr. Justice Douglas pointed out:

> Government is not only powerless to legislate with respect to membership in a lawful organization; it is also precluded from probing the intimacies . . . of such groups . . . regardless of the legislative purpose sought to be served.

I say, most respectfully, that I pray to God that the Senate of the United States has not become a star chamber yet. Yet, this bill really causes one to think back to star-chamber procedures, which, do not forget, constituted one of the great causes for the revolution against the British Crown.

It bothers me, knowing our constitutional history—with which knowledge we should be able to charge every Senator—that we should be seriously considering in the Senate today a bill so obviously in violation of one constitutional guarantee after another. Do not take my word for it. Just read the decision by the Supreme Court to which I have alluded. The Supreme Court is the great citadel and guardian of the constitutional liberties of a free people. And I want to keep them free. I want to keep them free of legislation such as this, that infringes upon their freedom.

I cite these opinions and discuss these decisions—there are many more—only in an attempt to focus the attention of the Senate on the problems this legislation has already run into and the legal difficulties it would face if passed now.

The fact is, of course, that the McCarren Act has already been devastated by judicial opinion. As has been repeatedly said here, that is the reason the Board has done nothing for 2 years. It has done nothing because there is nothing for it to do. It is not just wounded—it is dead. Christ could be resurrected, but this Board cannot be, so far as ever giving it constitutional life is concerned. This Board is dead. So far as any legislation on which its operations are based today, it should remain that way.

No one has yet suggested one good reason why the act should be patched together. There is no evidence to justify its activity in the first place, nor is there any assurance that these amendments correct the legal failings of the original legislation. In fact, there is considerable evidence they would not. I was very interested in Senator Kennedy's remarks that if there was any part of the original legislation that was valuable, it was perhaps the registration information supplied, and, of course, that was struck down and is not in these amendments at all. If there was any justification for this bill in the first place, it is removed. It is a pointless, idle gesture to send it back out into our judicial system to be struck down again.

In this connection, I wish to emphasize the importance of remarks made here October 18, yesterday, regarding another loophole in the original legislation not corrected by these amendments. I refer to the speech by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], wherein he pointed out that the McCarren Act applies only to Communism of the Soviet variety, relying on interpretations of the act by the SACB itself, the Supreme Court, and the Justice Department. What effect would this legislation have on Communist front organizations or Communist action groups directed from Peking and Hanoi? It is apparent that, even if we accept the minority leader's assumptions as to the need and practicability of these amendments, they are a halfway measure. It is plainly possible that the SACB might well have no authority to investigate organizations supported by the most militant Communist capitals in the world.

It is of considerable interest that much of the rhetoric here the past few days in support of S. 2171 has referred to the war in Vietnam as the most obvious symptom of a need for this legislation. Yet, ironically, it now appears this bill would not ever permit investigation of organizations in the country supported from Hanoi. All of which, I submit, reinforces my statement that this bill is but a gesture.

In light of recent Supreme Court decisions reemphasizing the necessity for protection of the individual's constitutional rights, I shudder to think of the Court's reaction to this legislation. I have no idea, nor have the proponents of this bill made any effort to explain, how this amendment could be squared with recent opinions of the Court. Here is a bill whose stated purpose is the exposure of communism by flushing them into the open. In a period of increased consciousness of the individual's right to privacy, the very idea of indicting a group of individuals by "exposure" cannot be justified. It is an anachronism. Criminal defendants have been assured, in the Escobedo and Miranda decisions, of their right to be fully informed of their constitutional rights and furthermore, the State bears the burden to show that those rights have been fully understood. These protections are rooted deeply in our history and reinforce the priority we place on individual liberty. How can this attitude be reconciled with efforts to accuse by association and punish by innuendo?

The answer is that they cannot. And they should not be. For the truth is that the laws now on our books are more than adequate to protect us from those who seek to overthrow our government by force. If not, let us consider new legislation which notifies those we would accuse of precisely the crime they committed and extend to them the guarantees of the procedure already firmly established in our court system. That is what courts are for. Not committees with the power to ruin reputation and character by whim. We do not need to resort to this kind of thing to protect ourselves from the Communists. We have an efficient law enforcement system fully prepared and capable of that job. Is not indictment and trial in a court of law sufficient "exposure?" Is it not effective to get the Communist into the open? The fact is that the proponents of this bill have not suggested one way in which it would assist in the struggle against internal communism. They have not pointed to one loophole in our present law enforcement procedure that this bill would plug.

This bill is a gesture, and an empty one at that. It seeks to satisfy those for whom the ordinary processes of due process are too slow—those who cannot or would not wait for anything as patient as a trial by jury. No, vesting power in this committee to seek out and destroy is much swifter—much more efficient. This bill has war fever written all over it—it seeks to satisfy those frustrated by pursuit of an illusive enemy in a pointless, illegal, unjustified, immoral war.

What is there about the history of the SACB which its proponents believe portends such a bright future? Since 1950, the committee has spent a lot of the taxpayer's money and generated considerable heat but no light. As has been stated here before, it has managed to produce a raft of judicial opinions gutting it and spreading mistrust and suspicion of our entire legal process. There is not one shred of evidence that the professionals whose job is internal security—those in the Justice Department and the FBI and related agencies—cannot do the job. There is nothing to indicate that the Attorney General requests this legislation—nor that Mr. Hoover favors it. It would be interesting to have some hearings and to call them as witnesses, which we have a right to do, and that is what we should do. There is only some shrouded reference to the fact that the President wants this bill, though for what reason he evidently does not care to say.

I have great admiration for him, but he is no lawyer. If I wanted to learn about constitutional law I would not go to my President. I would be glad to listen to his lawyer, the Attorney General of the United States. But we have a duty to the President in this case. Those of us who are opposing this bill are really performing a great act of loyalty to our President when we are arguing in an attempt to save him from the horrendous mistake he would make if he signed such a bill. That is why we are pleading to get this matter back into committee and get the constitutional authorities before the committee and make a record. Then, I want to submit that record to my President because I predict to the Senate this afternoon that if you are willing to recommit this bill and conduct the hearings you should insist on, that record would show the shocking constitutional inadequacies of this bill; and although my President is not a lawyer, he is a reader, and I am satisfied that when the President finished reading that record, this talk that he wants the bill would then be open to serious question.

Those who support this bill refer us to recent hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee for documentation of their case. The most striking thing about those hearings was that this bill was not under consideration, but that, I suppose, is a minor point. At any rate, the testimony makes interesting reading.

Principal spokesman before the committee in reference to the Control Board was Mr. J. W. Yeagley, Assistant Attorney General from the Department of Justice. Mr. Yeagley testified regarding some of the background of the Subversive Control Committee. In the course of his remarks, he stated that the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, compiled in response to the 1950 act, has not been changed or added to since 1955, over 10 years ago. Mr. Yeagley testified that the most important reason for that fact was because of constitutional questions inherent in the program of the Control Board. He also indicated that the Justice Department has had difficulty preparing cases because of the burden of proof they must carry. It was interesting that when asked whether the Justice Department would be interested in assuming the functions of the Board, Mr. Yeagley stated that he did not think the Justice Department would want the job of trying to be prosecutor, jury and judge. If that is true, and I am sure it is, one wonders why a congressional committee wishes to assume the role of that particular trinity. Any lawyer knows the importance of separation of functions in a courtroom—why is that separation less important before the Board?

The fact is, of course, that the Board cannot, within its inherent structure, hope to afford the objects of its inquiry procedural due process. As I used to tell my law students some years ago, if procedural due process is denied an individual, it makes not one whit of difference what substantive rights he may have.

Mr. Yeagley's testimony also helps to explode the suggestion that the need for the Board has increased. As he pointed out, membership in the Communist Party is now estimated at somewhere between 8,000 to 10,000 people. This is considerably less than the estimated membership of 80,000 estimated at the end of World War II. But in response to these 10,000-odd fanatics, already subject to criminal prosecution, we are asked to assign $300,000 plus vague and undefined powers to the Subversive Activities Control Board for an excursion into the problems of internal security and an unlimited opportunity to experiment with the precious liberties of our citizens. I believe this amendment is totally ill advised.

As Senators know, I have called attention to this from time to time in the past, and now make only a sweeping, broad brush stroke reference to it this afternoon. It was in 1954 that the Senator from Massachusetts, Jack Kennedy, came to me and talked to me about an amendment that he was thinking about offering which sought to outlaw the Communist Party in this country. I discussed it with him. He was very careful in the amendment to protect due process and the procedures essential to its maintenance. I agreed with him. He and I went to another colleague in the Senate, the then Senator from Minnesota, now Vice President of the United States, Mr. HUMPHREY, and we explained our viewpoints to him in regard to the proposed amendment. The Senator from Minnesota agreed with us. Thus, the Kennedy-Morse-Humphrey amendment was offered, outlawing the Communist Party in this country with, as I said, all due process and procedural rights protected. It is the law of the land today.

I want to say that I remember that record and treat without very much seriousness the abuse and castigation which has been heaped upon me from time to time by those who do not know my record. Sometimes, they are uncharitable enough to question my patriotism. However, I stand on that record. I stand on my constitutional conservatism because, let me point out, if there is the slightest weakening, giving away, or violating of the precious constitutional guarantees given to the American people, to the extent that Congress does it, it will make the American people just that much less free.

We are talking today about preserving freedom in this Republic when, under the leadership of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], we are fighting this bill. For this bill cannot be reconciled with the preservation of the constitutional freedoms of the people of this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from an editorial on this subject, which was published in the Washington Post yesterday. It is a great editorial I commend the editors of the Washington Post for their journalistic insight into the great questions which make the pending bill, really, unacceptable, if Senators will only study all the aspects of its constitutional implications.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> In order to get around the rulings of the Supreme Court, the Dirksen proposal would slough off the powers of the Board to require registration by the members of organization of which it disapproves. But it would continue the unseemly and oppressive power of the Board to label voluntary associations of American citizens "Communist-action" or "Communist-front" organizations.
>
> What this comes down to, in simple terms, is an unlimited power to smear. And once it has attached an ugly label to a group it dislikes, the SACB can require it to use that label in its communications with the public, whether by mail or by electronic broadcast. It comes very close to empowering a Government agency to determine, in its own discretion, which associations may exist and which may not exist in a democracy which has functioned largely through freedom of association.
>
> The statute under which the SACB would operate provides standards of a sort to guide its determinations. But they are so vague as to be without content or meaning. And in simple fact, as President Truman said when he vetoed the original act creating this monstrosity, they confer on Government officials "vast powers to harass all of our citizens in the exercise of their rights of free speech."
>
> In the 17 years since its creation, the SACB has served no useful purpose and has made not a single contribution to the control of communism. The true American shield against communism lies in the solid common sense of the American people and in their free loyalty to democratic institutions. That shield has kept America secure and free. There is no need to import into this land and to impose on a free people the techniques of totalitarianism. In the name of genuine Americanism, the Senate ought to cast this scarecrow agency into the discard.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the avowed purpose of the bill is to brand individuals and organizations as "Communist" after a proceeding of dubious validity and for no other purpose than to hold the individuals so named up to public ridicule. We seek to publish the names of our enemies in the forum so that they may be made the objects of our scorn. I ask my colleagues of the Senate whether this is the manner in which a free society protects itself. I ask you to remember the mischief created by this type of activity. If we have learned from our experienced, we should, almost by reflex, avoid this Pandora's box.

This amendment repeals sections 7 and 8 of the 1950 act—those providing for registration of Communist organizations, and substitutes for those requirements, imposition of duty upon the Board to determine whether or not an organization is Communist and serve a copy of its finding upon the organization and upon individual members so accused. Notice of that determination would then appear in the Federal Register.

Obviously, there is no recourse for the individual so accused. The damage is done. Allowance for individual weaknesses or mistakes is not made. "Guilt by association" assumes physical form. The imputation of guilt is complete. The accused is not allowed to confront his accusers or subpena witnesses. I suppose the advocates of this bill relish the thought that such public notice gives avowed Communists just what they deserve. Perhaps—if the imputation of guilt is that obvious and the reasons for such association are so clear. But I am sure that they are not. I believe we found out in the fifties that motives are sometimes not so easy to discern and the reasons for an individual's conduct are not so readily learned in a crowded committee room. I make no excuse for dedicated Communists who seek the overthrow of this Republic. That is why I was one of the authors of the amendment which is now the law of the land which makes their party illegal in this Republic. But if in our effort to net them, we accuse and smear and attack those whose guilt is not so clear, we violate the basic guarantees of fairness and equity which we serve. We should know all this—we have been around this track many times.

I should also like to call the attention of Senators to the remarks made on the floor of the Senate by my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] particularly regarding the cost of the Subversive Activities Control Board. The President is now asking us to pass a surtax to help finance the disaster in Vietnam. I had the occasion to speak in the Senate, just a few days ago, and record my views on that subject. I stated then, and I state again that I shall refuse to support any such increase until the Administration evidences a real desire to cut unnecessary spending. Expenditures for the Control Board almost define the word unnecessary.

Since 1965, it has cost our taxpayers $2 million to finance this Board while it did absolutely nothing. The Board's 18 employees average $11,000 a year, which is certainly an adequate amount to pay 18 people to keep track of each other. It will cost us over $330,000 this year alone. If the President wants to cut expenditures to indicate his good faith to the American people, he could begin by naming this expense the complete waste of money it so obviously is.

In this connection, I wish to indicate my support for the bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], S. 2146, which would transfer all Board activities to the Justice Department, where they belong in the first place. Such a transfer would represent sound policy and sound economics.

In light of all the objections to the bill voiced in the Senate during the past few days, and in view of the overwhelming legal difficulties in store for such legislation, I suggest that it is imperative that the bill be referred back to committee for discussion and the taking of testimony. The distinguished minority leader suggests that there is nothing to investigate. I can make several suggestions to him.

I would suggest that the committee call as its first witness the Attorney General of the United States. His opinion seems to me to be essential to any intelligent consideration of the bill. This is particularly true in light of the comments made in the Senate on Tuesday by a distinguished former Attorney General of the United States, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], that when he was Attorney General, his office did not receive one piece of information from the Subversive Activities Control Board in connection with communism in the United States that had not been uncovered in other ways. It was also his statement that if he were asked to testify before a congressional committee, he would have to say that to continue the existence of the Board would be a waste of the Government's money.

Those are strong statements. And they emanate from a man who ought to know. If Senator KENNEDY found the SACB to be useless while he was Attorney General, it appears to me that Mr. Clark's opinion as to his present evaluation of the work of the Board would be indispensible. I think the present Attorney General has a clear obligation to make his views known and I believe we have the right to hear them.

The American people have that right. The Senate has no right to deny that right to the American people. After all, we are but the agents of the American people. We have no right to sit here and take action on a bill that is subject to grave constitutional shortcomings without hearing the Attorney General and without hearing a series of top constitutional authorities in the Republic.

We keep hearing from the minority leader that he has a letter from Mr. Clark on this subject. Well, let Mr. DIRKSEN stand up and read the letter. But let me say that I do not care what is in the letter. I want the Attorney General put on the stand. I want to hear his case-in-chief. I want to hear his answers to the questions that will be put to him in an examination at a public hearing on a bill that so deeply concerns itself with the precious rights and the constitutional liberties of the American people.

The minority leader said he is content with the contents of that missive. That is wonderful. If the rest of us knew what it says, maybe we would be. Perhaps the Attorney General's opinion is being kept a secret for some reason known only to Senator DIRKSEN. Why are we not being allowed to inquire into the position of the Nation's top law officer? We also keep hearing veiled comments to the effect that the President supports this legislation. That is the statement of the Republican leader. I do not know of anything the President has said publicly.

I would suggest that there are at least 37 other excellent witnesses available to the Congress whose opinions would be of considerable relevance in considering this bill. I refer to the 37 prominent law professors around this Nation who have urged the Attorney General to oppose it. It seems to me a matter of no small moment when opposition to legislation is voiced by such distinguished legal scholars as Profs. Louise Jaffe and Clark Byse of the Harvard Law School and Walter Gellhorn of Columbia and many of their most outstanding colleagues.

These great constitutional scholars warn us about the dangers of this bill. Their analysis of the problems involved and the expression of their opinions would add considerably to our ability to make a good, well-reasoned determination. What good reason can the proponents of this bill give us for not hearing the testimony of these distinguished Americans? Are we in such a hurry we have no time for explanation of such complex legislation?

I think a very serious question arises in regard to this bill whether our committee system has been used in good faith in this matter. There is no explanation for why this bill was reported out without any report or analysis. It is clear on its face that it is not so elementary as to warrant such summary treatment.

The committee process and the taking of testimony and evaluation of legislation in an orderly manner are great procedural safeguards, belonging not to the Senate, but to the American people. This process of orderly legislative procedure has been developed over the years in order to protect the substantive legislative rights of the American people. The deliberations and reports of the Judiciary Committee would be of vital importance to us now. I do not understand why the committee conducted itself in the manner it did in relation to this bill. The committee heard not one witness. Not one page of testimony was taken. Not one scintilla of evidence was received relating to this, one of the most controversial issues facing our Nation.

I must respectfully submit, Mr. President, that the handling of this bill does not coincide with my idea of orderly legislative process. I can only assume that this effort to circumvent the normal committee process and the refusal of the bill's proponents to refer it back to committee stem from a fear of what a thorough investigation would reveal. I believe we seriously endanger the substantive rights of our citizens and the orderly processes of this great body when such an effort is made to push legislation through the Senate under a cloud.

Senator MUNDT stated yesterday that further hearings on this bill are not necessary because of the exhaustive hearings regarding the original legislation. It would appear that, like the Bourbons, we have learned nothing and forgotten nothing. It seems incredible to me that anyone could live through the McCarthy era with its smear tactics, methodical character assassination, and hours upon hours of pointless, meaningless testimony and not remember it. The pathetic spectacle—the constant vision of Senator McCarthy's effort to implicate every decent American who opposed him—the lies, the retributions, the broken careers and constant harangues—do we want to repeat them? I am appalled. I would have hoped that no one here—particularly here in the Senate—would want to revive the spectacle of that 14th-century witch hunt. The techniques used during that period made a mockery of judicial procedure and reduced the procedural and substantive rights of our citizens to ashes. For many, it poisoned forever their ability to respect and trust our form of government. I am sure these infamous hearings of the midfifties did more to spread communism in this Nation than any other single action in our history. The constant vision of men ignorant of their own history and indifferent to their future does not quell communism; it promotes it. And that is precisely the door now sought to be reopened.

Senator MUNDT's statement here yesterday in support of these amendments clearly set forth the essential reasoning of its proponents. The Senator expressed his fear of communism and stated that the need to protect our people from the Communists is obvious.

I am sure it is. We all oppose the Communist movement and would do anything possible to check its growth, within a government by law. Anything possible, that is, that did not force us to compromise our own convictions and sacrifice constitutional guarantees.

It is not the fear Senator MUNDT and Senator DIRKSEN and others have expressed, which is unreasonable. It is their response. They seek a worthwhile goal, but refuse to examine the methods they propose to reach it. In 1964, this philosophy that the end justifies the means ran for the White House. The American people listened, and watched, and voted. You know the result.

I say in all seriousness, if we come to the place in this Nation where we are willing to use any means at our disposal to spy upon our own citizens, invade their right of privacy and assembly, and in other ways ignore the constitutional principles upon which this Republic is based, in an effort to upbraid a handfull among us who do not belong, then I say to you, we prostitute our history and make sewage out of our system of jurisprudence.

The guiding principle which serves this Republic is our refusal to use totalitarian methods to preserve our society. We have never found it necessary to use authoritarian techniques to save ourselves. There is certainly no such need now.

Our history vomits up this effort to ignore our government of laws, not a government of men. Our reason is repelled by it. Our conscience is offended by it.

I oppose S. 2171 in all particulars that I have mentioned here today and others that I have not taken the time to mention. Therefore, I shall join in the motion to return this bill to committee for consideration, death, and burial.

Mr. President, before I yield the floor, to carry out a commitment I made to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I suggest the absence of a quorum——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before doing that?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate has just had an opportunity to hear a man who I think is, without question, the outstanding constitutional authority in the U.S. Senate. I believe the Senator from Oregon was the youngest law school dean in the Nation when he became dean of a great law school. He has studied the Constitution throughout his life. He has contributed repeatedly on the floor of this body the most invaluable kind of constitutional advice. Many Senators who disagree with the Senator from Oregon on particular issues before the Senate have been repeatedly swayed by his constitutional knowledge, because they know he speaks as a real scholar, as one who knows the Constitution thoroughly, and as one who is devoted to its principles.

There is one other point I would like to make in connection with the speech the Senator from Oregon has just made. I have always been impressed, in the 10 years that I have been in the Senate, with the insistence of the Senator from Oregon that we should have a record on legislation before it comes on the floor. Again and again, even as to legislation which he wholeheartedly approves and wants to get through the Senate in a hurry, he has insisted that we have hearings on it and establish a record, because, as the Senator from Oregon has said, this is the very heart of legislation, and unless we have hearings, we vote on legislation with our eyes closed.

As to the argument the Senator from Oregon has so ably and eloquently made this afternoon, it seems to me that it is in the best traditions of this body; and I hope that every Senator will read his speech in the RECORD. If Senators do not do so, we shall do our best to refer them to it at a subsequent time, because I think this issue is absolutely vital, and, as the Senator from Oregon has said, one that goes to the very heart of freedom in this country: constitutional liberties. On such a subject especially, we should all be concerned to have pertinent information fully developed at a hearing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his overgenerous comments. He is, of course, a biased friend, and biased friends are very precious jewels. I appreciate his friendship. I wish to tell him that it was a pleasure for me to follow his leadership on this bill, and that in my opinion great thanks are due to the Senator from Wisconsin for his courage in making it perfectly clear to the Senate that he would see to it that there was full and adequate debate on the bill before it came to a vote. I commend him for his position and his courage, and thank him for his leadership. It was a pleasure to serve as a private in the ranks over which he has acted as general, as he marshaled this bill through the course of debate in the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Oregon for his statement on this serious matter.

Mr. President, it is my view that the history of the Subversive Activities Control Act provides conclusive evidence that any attempt to amend it should be subject to extensive hearings.

This is the normal procedure for any legislation, but in this case the record indicates need for special caution.

The House of Representatives in 1950 passed the Subversive Activities Control and Communist Registration Act by a vote of 354 to 20 and the Senate approved the bill by 70 to 7. President Truman vetoed the measure and the Congress passed it over his veto, by a vote of 286 to 48 in the House and 57 to 10 in the Senate.

Nearly everyone is familiar with what followed. It is not enough to have an overwhelming vote by Congress or for Congress to assert its power to override the President's veto. There are also constitutional questions, and the court decisions invalidating some of the statutory provisions have made the law ineffective to the point where in recent months the Board has been practically unemployed.

Now it is proposed by S. 2171 to amend the law, remove certain provisions, and continue the Board as an investigatory institution. But we are asked to do this without public hearings and without the careful examination of the constitutional questions.

Yesterday the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] who, as Attorney General had responsibility for several years for enforcement of the law, presented a summary of the Court decisions and of the constitutional questions which, in his judgment, still remain under the amended version now before the Senate.

As Senator KENNEDY stated, court decisions to the present have relied upon the privilege against self-incrimination but the right of association under the first amendment is also relevant, and this constitutional right as a result of court decisions over the past 17 years is clearer and more explicit than it was when the original measure was enacted.

In his statement yesterday the former Attorney General listed three additional constitutional questions which remain unanswered.

He stated:

> First. The definitions of "Communist action" and "communist-infiltrated" groups are the same as they were in 1950—these definitions raise serious questions—they are vague about what groups are included and what groups are not. The Supreme Court's loyalty oath decisions have strongly suggested that vague definitions of "subversive" groups are not constitutionally permissible, because such lack of clarity discourages people from associating with legitimate groups. Yet section 782 of the act—which would not be affected by S. 2171—uses language of the most general sort.
>
> Second. Although the Board's activities would be investigatory, there are a number of severe restrictions on members of suspect organizations which would apply once the

Board made its determination of "Communist-action" or "Communist-infiltration." The groups themselves are denied tax deductions—their mail must be stamped—their activities are subject to heavy supervision. Thus, the Board still has functions which are inherently punitive—and which may well be a violation of the privileges against self-incrimination.

In addition, the increased protection given political associations by the Supreme Court in recent years makes this kind of government supervision open to serious doubt under the first amendment.

Finally, the self-incrimination problem may be greater under this bill than under the existing act. What happens if an individual refused to answer political questions before the Board? Can he be punished for contempt? Is failure to testify evidence of subversive activity? If the Board's final determination results in severe restrictions on groups, is this not a use of investigatory power to punish?

Mr. President, this list of questions deserves careful consideration in hearings. It is not my view that the Congress should be awed by constitutional lawyers or that we should always refrain from action on their recommendations, but in an area involving constitutional rights so directly as this proposal does, we should hear what they have to say before taking action. We should not proceed to approve this bill until they have been carefully considered in hearings.

Apart from the constitutional questions there is a practical aspect which deserves reflection.

Members of the Senate recall the urgency with which the act of 1950 was pressed and the warnings of what would happen to the Nation if we failed to enact it. It is now 17 years later and for all practical purposes it has been ineffective; at least there have been no convictions under the law. Has the United States been endangered as a result? Have students in schools or citizens been subverted? Is communism stronger in the United States today? Has our freedom been endangered?

I believe the American people are better informed about the Communist challenge than 17 years ago. I believe they are better aware of the limitations and weaknesses of Communist nations than in 1950. Their judgment is a result principally of the events of history, of the evidence of inadequacies and failures of Communist parties as they have attempted to exercise political power in various nations, of the de-Stalinization revelations in the U.S.S.R. itself, of the Sino-Soviet split and the tension between Communist nations, of the Communist setbacks in Africa and Indonesia, and many other events.

On the positive side—and more important—the success of the Marshall plan in rebuilding Europe and the strength of Western European nations and the United States in moving forward under democratic governments have answered some of the questions and doubts of 1950. I do not believe we would routinely amend and extend a law dealing with subversive activities adopted in the spirit of 1950. Some old problems have been reduced and some new tensions have arisen. We should explore carefully whether we are establishing effective safeguards, or the most effective safeguards, for 1967 and the years ahead.

Of course, no nation can be unconcerned about subversive activities within its borders. The question is about the means to restrain them, and I believe this requires more thought and attention than has been given in reporting out S. 2171. In the meantime, I believe we can continue to have confidence in the FBI and the Department of Justice as to immediate dangers of subversive activities.

I am hopeful this measure will be sent back to committee and the entire question reviewed, adequate hearing held, and better procedures recommended to the Senate for debate and decision.

THE LETTER IN FACT AND FANCY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Tuesday the distinguished minority leader dramatically waved in his hand a letter from the Attorney General of the United States, reportedly containing the opinion of the Attorney General on the pending legislation, S. 2171.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as is his privilege, preferred not to reveal the contents of that letter Tuesday.

I do not pretend to know the contents of Senator DIRKSEN's letter from the Attorney General. It is altogether possible that it could be one of the most important letters in United States' history. I, myself, cannot judge any letter's significance until I have had a chance to read it.

Perhaps it ranks with some of the great letters of history; with Disraeli's "Letters of Runnymede" or Gladstone's "Letters to Lord Aberdeen."

Perhaps this mysterious letter will be remembered by future generations along with the Federalist Papers which had their humble origin as mere letters.

But in the hope of setting the record straight, I want to inform the Senate that the distinguished minority leader is not the only Member of this body who receives correspondence from the Attorney General.

I checked my own files and discovered quite a number of epistles from Attorneys General.

Here is one from my early days in the Senate, just after my election. I had in mind a bill which I was convinced would settle many of the Nation's problems if it were constitutional. So I wrote to the Attorney General, at that time, and asked his opinion of my bill. His answer was not very encouraging. Although I had better not read the exact words, I will paraphrase his response. It went like this: "If your bill is enacted by the Congress, the Department of Justice will enforce it consistent with the Constitution and the standards of the act."

The Attorney General, at that time, was a very kind and tactful man. He let me down gently. I could hardly characterize his letter to me as a ringing endorsement of my bill.

So my imaginative proposal, which coincidentally had been the subject of no hearings and no reports from any executive agencies, did not save the Republic. But even without my bill's enactment, the Republic survived.

I also found in my files, after admittedly a cursory inspection, another letter from another Attorney General. But perhaps I had better not disclose the contents of this letter either, because it was written after the passage by the Senate of a major piece of domestic legislation during the Johnson administration.

The letter thanked me for my small part in Senate passage of that landmark measure. But I had best be careful because the letter went on to praise the distinguished minority leader for his unstinting dedication to the cause of civil liberties.

Perhaps it would be wiser not to read that letter at this particular time.

A third letter which I received from the Attorney General's office concerned a Federal judgeship in Wisconsin. But I better wait until the third reading of a bill from Senator TYDINGS' subcommittee to divulge that letter's contents.

I merely cite these examples to emphasize that the senior Senator from Wisconsin also receives letters from Attorneys General. I am sure that all Senators receive equally informative and interesting letters from the Attorney General from time to time.

But I do hope that no Senator will ever receive a letter from any Attorney General in response to an inquiry about a pet bill which states:

> If the bill is enacted, the Department of Justice will enforce it consistent with the Constitution and the standards of the act.

That would be too cruel a jolt. I confess to my colleagues that receiving such a letter from the highest legal officer in our Nation really shook my confidence. I do not wish the same experience for any Senator.

When I received that discouraging word from the Justice Department, I was reminded of the passage from Corinthians:

> Not of the letter but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.

Indeed the letter can "killeth."

Or maybe the Attorney General who had authored that deflating passage had, himself, heeded the advice of Thackeray, who wrote:

> The best way is to make your letters safe. I never wrote a letter in all my life that would commit me.

All the senior Senator from Wisconsin seeks on this bill is really quite simple. We want to hear the Attorney General, the head of the Department which will initiate any action under this bill. I want to hear what he has to say: whether he agrees with his distinguished predecessor, the very able Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] who opposes the proposed legislation and says the bill will not, cannot, work or whether he supports this legislation.

I think Sir Francis Bacon summed up my position on the question of hearings on S. 2171 when he said:

> It is generally better to deal by speech than by letter.

Let us hear the Attorney General speak.

I yield the floor.

AUTHORITY FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills presented to him today, even following the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on yesterday I had a colloquy with the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, as shown by the RECORD on page 29259.

In that colloquy the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] made the following suggestion with respect to the pending Dirksen bill:

> Will the Senator consider an amendment which would permit the Dirksen bill to be passed and provide that, in the event the Attorney General is not able to act under the bill, and does not bring any cases before the Subversive Activities Control Board within the next 12 months, in that event the Board would be abolished, and the idle Board, which under those circumstances would have gone almost 3 years with nothing to do, would cease to exist?

I replied to the proposal in the following manner:

> Mr. MANSFIELD. I would give consideration to any amendment offered by the distinguish Senator from Wisconsin. As to whether I could approve such an amendment, I, of course, would be unable to say at this time. Nor do I think the Senator would expect me to, because we have to study these matters and determine their full ramifications. However, the proposal sounds as if it has possibilities.
>
> If the Senator should offer such an amendment, I can assure him, as far as I am concerned—and I would assume the Senate as a whole would feel the same way—the amendment would receive every possible consideration. It would be one way of trying to arrive at a better position than we find ourselves in at the present time.

AMENDMENT NO. 414

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 12, after line 17, insert the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 12. Section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act (50 U.S.C. 791) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:
>
> " '(i) The Board shall cease to exist on June 30, 1969, unless in the period beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection and ending on December 31, 1968, proceedings under this Act shall have been instituted before the Board and hearings under this Act shall have been conducted by the Board. On January 1, 1969 the Attorney General shall determine whether such proceedings have been so instituted, and such hearings have been so conducted, within that period. The determination so made by the Attorney General shall be published in the Federal Register.' "

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after considering the matter thoroughly this amendment, I believe, is largely in line with the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] on yesterday.

As originally drafted, line 3 of the amendment under (i) contained the words "one or more" before the word "proceedings," and also on line 5, the words "one or more" appeared before the word "hearings."

Those words were struck out because I, at least, felt that if it were a matter of a single hearing or a single proceeding, that would be insufficient and therefore those terms appear in their plural context.

I wanted to explain that to indicate that we are trying to make this as tight and as reasonable as possible.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I say to the distinguished majority leader that I very deeply appreciate this. Frankly, I had intended at a later date to introduce an amendment of this kind. It is far better coming from the majority leader. I think it accomplishes a great deal of what we are interested in accomplishing.

Frankly, the amendment of the Senator was made available to me by the majority leader. I checked the amendment with my staff and they seem to think that it fulfills the kind of proposal I made yesterday.

I would greatly appreciate it if the Senator from Montana would permit me to discuss it for a short time with other people who have shared the position I take on the floor. But I think that we should be able, under this proposal, to arrive at a determination on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, of course. Anything the Senator desires is his for the asking.

Frankly, I did not know whether the Senator intended to offer an amendment of this kind. I thought the proposal deserved consideration; it was considered and the amendment was drawn. So I will refer to this as the Proxmire amendment from now on, because the idea was generated in the course of the colloquy between us on yesterday.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If there is to be a vote on it, I hope it is referred to as the Mansfield amendment. It would do a lot better.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let us not quibble about it. I do not intend to push it today. But I did want the Senator to have a copy of the amendment as proposed so as to find out if in his view it agreed with what the Senator said yesterday. And hopefully we can perhaps get a vote on the amendment tomorrow, all matters being considered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That would be agreeable.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 889) to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BARING, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. REINECKE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House concurred in the amendments of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1933) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS COMPOSED OF CONTIGUOUS AND COMPACT TERRITORY FOR THE ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on June 8, the Senate passed by a convincing margin, 55 to 28, legislation that would set definite legislative standards implementing and fully consistent with the Federal Constitution's strict requirement that each man's vote count as much as another man's vote in the election of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

That legislation would have prohibited the gerrymandering of congressional districts and would have permitted a population variance of only 10 percent between the smallest and largest districts in a State beginning with the 1968 elections.

The House-passed version of this legislation, H.R. 2508, left the question of gerrymandering to the States and would have permitted a population variance of 30 percent between the largest and smallest districts in a State until the 1972 elections.

Because of the differences between the Senate and House versions, there was a conference.

The appointed conferees met several times and reportedly were deadlocked over both the gerrymandering provisions and the question of what the acceptable temporary population variance between districts should be.

I am informed that today the conference has filed an agreement that avoids both of these issues. The agreement, first, makes illegal "at large" elections for House Members, except in Hawaii and New Mexico, beginning with the 1968 elections.

Second, the conference decided that no State shall be required to redistrict until after the 1970 census unless an earlier special census, paid for by the State, is available, with the further provision again that prior to such special census, no State shall be required to elect its Representatives at large.

Mr. President, the desirability of Congress' acting definitively and in this manner regarding the prohibition of at-large elections is clear. No one doubts that

Congress may properly enact such a provision pursuant to its constitutional power under article I, section 4, to alter regulations governing the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives.

However, I respectfully submit that the unconstitutionality and undesirability of the second section of the conference agreement—that courts cannot require States to realine congressional districts until a special Federal census is available—is equally clear.

My objections to this latter provision are briefly these:

First. If this proposal is saying to the courts, "You cannot order a State to redistrict unless that State voluntarily agrees to pay for and provide a special Federal census," then the legislation is clearly unconstitutional. This is so because in *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 8 (1964), the Supreme Court declared that the Federal Constitution's plain objective is that "as nearly as is practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's." To permit any State the option of declining to redistrict by refusing to authorize and pay for a special Federal census is to permit the State unconstitutionally to withdraw from the Federal court's established jurisdiction over implementation of the one-man, one-vote principle.

Second. If the conference proposal were deemed constitutional, its immediate effect would be to delay until the 1972 elections Federal court enforcement of fair districting in 18 States which include 259 Congressmen, or more than half the Members of the House of Representatives.

Third. Not only would this proposal bring to a grinding halt court enforcement of redistricting, it would turn back the clock by permitting the 33 States which either have completed or begun redistricting since the *Wesberry* decision on February 17, 1964, to redraw their lines with no constitutional limitations on what the population variance between the largest and smallest districts might be.

Fourth. The proposal is inconsistent because it seems to permit States voluntarily to redistrict without a special Federal census, but provides that States which are ordered to redistrict by courts must pay for a special Federal census.

Fifth. The expense of a special Federal census will be an unwelcome financial burden to the financially hard-pressed States. There are 18 States with congressional districts which have been declared unconstitutional by the courts, or which have been challenged in the courts, or which are vulnerable to challenge under the most recent Supreme Court decision. In the two largest of these States, New York and California, the cost to the State of a special Federal census would be more than $6 million. If, as is conceivable, the courts order all 18 to conduct special census and redistrict before the decennial census in 1970, the total cost to this group of States would be approximately $35,273,000.

Thus, one might say that in this time of financial crisis Congress is considering a $35 million redistricting bill and sending the tab to the hard-pressed States.

Sixth. Under present procedures, it would be 1970 before the Census Bureau could complete the required special censuses if the courts ordered as many as 10 or 15 States to redistrict. Probably, the Supreme Court would not tolerate such a delay, and would require that the census be done immediately. That would considerably raise the cost of the surveys to the States so as to simply make such surveys impossible.

Seventh. There has been no adequate justification demonstrated for making a special Federal census a condition precedent to a court-ordered redistricting. Of course, because of population shifts, the 1960 census figures are not precisely accurate. Nevertheless, no one has proved that the distortion in fair representation caused by inaccurate census figures is anywhere nearly as bad as the distortion caused in the 18 States which are currently electing 259 Congressmen upon the basis of lines that are clearly unconstitutional.

Notwithstanding the argument that the 1960 census is old by 7 years, and not therefore current, it seems infinitely preferable, by appropriate legislation, to require redistricting on the basis of the best available and newest figures and to require the States to redistrict on the basis of what they should have done 7 years ago. The Supreme Court has never accepted this argument as a justification for waiting until 1972 to implement the one-man, one-vote decision. And, too, population estimates can be used, where available, to minimize whatever distortion has been caused by population shifts since the 1960 decennial census.

Eighth. Finally, this legislation actually increases, rather than lessens, the probability that at least the 174 Members of the House from California, Indiana, New Jersey, Texas, Missouri, Ohio, New York, and Florida might be forced by the courts to run at large for election to Congress in 1968.

Because of the wide-ranging effect this last provision may have on so many Members of the House, I should like to discuss it in detail.

To begin with, it is my reluctant but firm conclusion that, if enacted, the legislation contained in the report filed today by the distinguished conference committee will be rather swiftly declared unconstitutional by the Federal courts. In the earlier debate in May and June on this legislation, I elaborated my views on why I believe that the Federal courts will tolerate no Federal legislation that attempts to modify or circumvent its rulings which during the last 2 years have directed or encouraged fair redistricting in 33 States. I refer to the RECORD, pages 14016–14018, 14784. Suffice it to say that, while I favor prompt congressional action in establishing more definite standards within the constitutional limits set by the Court, there is no doubt that congressional action which attempts to circumvent or modify the Supreme Court's interpretation of the one-man, one-vote rule will be regarded by the Court as unconstitutional.

The provision which states that the courts cannot require a State to redistrict unless the State first voluntarily orders and pays for a special Federal census is unconstitutional because it permits the State to unilaterally withdraw from the Court's jurisdiction over redistricting.

Even if the legislation is read to authorize the court to order a special census before it orders a State to redistrict, I still believe the courts will regard the census provision as an unjustified delaying tactic and still hold the legislation unconstitutional.

I say this because it appears that, if a number of States descended upon the Census Bureau with court-ordered requests for a special survey, the Bureau could not complete any in time for the 1968 elections. Under the Bureau's present procedures, if 10 to 15 of the vulnerable 18 States requested special censuses it would take 8 months to provide the information for the smaller States and up to 15 or 16 months to provide the information for the largest States, New York and California.

It could be that the Census Bureau with additional personnel could conduct a number of surveys in time for the 1968 elections, but it is not likely at this late date. Thus, I conclude that by the time the courts consider this legislation, if enacted, they will decide that enough delay is enough and declare the entire act unconstitutional.

And what will be the result, if I am correct in my analysis, when the courts declare that the legislation is unconstitutional? Given the usual delays in both the legislative and judicial process, this ruling might not occur until late next spring. During that time, the legislatures in California, Indiana, and New Jersey—which are under court order to redistrict—would likely wait to see whether the Federal law might prove valid and therefore shield them from the court's redistricting order. Probably, the courts which are considering the cases in Texas, Missouri, Ohio, New York, and Florida would wait for a definitive decision on the question from the Supreme Court. Perhaps by that time suits will be filed in the remaining 10 States where the congressional lines are vulnerable to attack under constitutional standards—Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Iowa, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Washington, and West Virginia—and those cases will also be stalled, waiting for definitive Supreme Court action on this enacted legislation.

Then, assuming that the Supreme Court declares the law unconstitutional next spring, what will happen in the States where the legislatures and the courts have delayed their decision? The courts could immediately prepare their own redistricting plans for the 1968 elections. Most likely, some would order the legislatures to redistrict immediately in time for the 1968 elections. Too, it is entirely possible that the legislatures in several States, some of which may have adjourned, will not be able to meet or, if they meet, to agree upon a redistricting plan. It is likely that the courts then will, because of the recalcitrance of the legislatures and the shortness of time before the elections, order that all the Congressmen in those States run at large. Needless to say, at-large elections for the House would have important political consequences, especially in a presidential election year.

I should note that it is of no avail to argue that a court might uphold the prohibition of at-large elections even though it declared unconstitutional the special census provision. There is no severability clause in the conference report. If the Court rules any of the law unconstitutional, it will rule it all unconstitutional.

In conclusion, I should say that I am not happy with the prospect of opposing the report of the distinguished conference committee. I had hoped that even if the conference could not agree on the gerrymandering provisions that there might be some agreement on definite temporary and permanent standards for permissible population variance between the largest and the smallest districts in a State. Failing that, I had hoped that the conference might simply report a bill that eliminated at-large elections, except in Hawaii and in New Mexico. I am disappointed that, because the census provision both attempts to delay redistricting and raises the possibility that many Congressmen will be forced to run at large, I cannot support this conference report.

Because of the merit in eliminating at-large elections and because the report's effort to do so is jeopardized by the apparent unconstitutionality of the remainder of the conference report, I am considering introducing to the pending business in the Senate or to the next pending business an amendment that would eliminate at-large elections. I feel confident the Senate would support such a measure and that with that issue out of the way, the vote whether to accept the conference report could concentrate mainly upon the issue of whether it is constitutional and desirable to provide that no State may be required to redistrict unless a special Federal census is conducted and paid for by the State.

SECURITY CLEARANCE OF WALT WHITMAN ROSTOW

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, press reports over the weekend state that Walt Whitman Rostow, special assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, denies that he was refused a security clearance three times under the Eisenhower administration.

I believe that Mr. Rostow is being less than candid. Both the Washington Post and the Evening Star quote him as follows:

> From 1951 onward, I had continuous security clearance from various agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, this reply is not responsive to the allegations presented by Mr. Otto Otepka in his brief filed recently before a State Department hearing officer on his long and complicated case. The specific issue is whether Rostow was initially rejected for a high-level clearance by the Department of the Air Force; and again in 1955 by Herbert Hoover, Jr., then Under Secretary of State; and again in 1957 by Roderick O'Connor, then Administrator of the State Department Bureau of Security. Rostow has not denied these allegations because he knows he cannot truthfully do so.

When Rostow says that he has had security clearance from various agencies since 1951, he is trying to obscure the issue. Anyone who knows anything about security clearances knows they are granted for various degrees of accessability and by various agencies. The standards of each agency may be, and frequently are, entirely different; and they may be bypassed completely by high-level command.

While Rostow's statement that he has had continuous security clearance from 1951 onward is possibly true, it does not offer any refutation to the original allegation. Whatever level of clearance he may have had, the fact is that he has been denied strict high-level clearance on the three occasions mentioned. For example: under the Hoover action of 1955, Rostow was disapproved to attend meetings of a psychological warfare panel of the Operations Coordinating Board—OCB—which operates directly under the jurisdiction of the National Security Council. This is, of course, a very high level, critical clearance.

The fact that Rostow was denied high-level clearance three times indicates that the security factors involved were not taken lightly.

State Department security standards are spelled out in law and regulation. It is a fact that Rostow did not meet those standards. Today Rostow is special assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. The fact that he now presumably has a high-level clearance—that is permission to have access to sensitive data—shows clearly that the security standards in our top echelons have been lowered.

There is widespread public confusion about the exact meaning of the word "clearance." It has nothing to do with the commonly accepted meaning in legal parlance that a person is "cleared" of charges filed against him, for lack of evidence. A security check is not a judicial proceeding. To be "cleared" simply means that a person has received permission to have access to information of a certain level of sensitivity.

The reasons for denying a clearance do not necessarily imply that a person has engaged in subversive activities. The subject may be open to blackmail for some unfortunate incident in the past, or because he may have relatives behind the Iron Curtain. Past incidents may have shown carelessness in handling classified data, or friendships that could lead to unintentional transmission of data to the enemy. The denial of a security clearance does not necessarily imply disloyalty.

However, denial does imply that high risk is involved because of a subject's background. Intentionally or unintentionally, the subject presents some weak spot which could be exploited by the enemy. Subsequent clearance does not mean that evidence of weak spots has been disproved; more likely it means that a subjective judgment has been made to take the risk despite the evidence. Ultimately, the Soviet Ambassador himself could be given a security clearance if the President decided it was in the national interest.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon completion of the transaction of routine morning business tomorrow, I be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPENDING CEILINGS ARE NOT THE BEST WAY TO CONTROL EXPENDITURES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on yesterday, I warned the Senate of dangers inherent in meatax spending cuts as compared to a rational system of budgeting priorities. Action by the House yesterday points out even more clearly the desperate need for Congress to have before it some means of judging which programs are contributing the most to national welfare.

Across-the-board budget slashes help no one. While the objective of economy in Government remains paramount, moves to trim all programs indiscriminately tend over the long run to create demands for higher spending in order to remedy dislocations suffered in vital programs which suddenly are left without funds.

The term "economy in government" is not tantamount to advocating equal reductions in all programs. Instead, when we aim for economy in government, the target is that of realistic spending priorities. With such priorities, Congress would be able to selectively pare expenditures by starting to cut first from the lowest ranked programs.

A current example is quite relevant. If Congress had insisted that the administration use alternative discount rates in cost-benefit analysis of public works programs, significant savings could have been achieved. Alternative interest rates, for instance, the current yield on Government securities and/or the estimated discount rate employed in the private sector, would have shown zero or negative present value of many expensive public works projects.

In hearings last month by the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, testimony revealed that present Government discount rates, based on historical coupon rates of long-term Government bonds, lead to inaccurate budget decisions which ultimately cause increased inflationary pressures and lower economic growth. Witnesses said that the extremely low discount rate now applied by the Government creates serious misallocations, and they called upon Congress to change current policies so that such misallocations could be minimized.

Mr. President, across-the-board reductions are simple expedients; they will not solve the problem of budget priorities. Congress must act to establish and encourage techniques which will lead to better spending decisions.

BETTER DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS CAN HELP SOLVE RURAL-URBAN PROBLEMS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, much attention has focused recently on the wisdom of tackling our urban problems in the rural areas. While this idea may sound paradoxical on the surface, it makes a good deal of sense, because it recognizes the connection between our rural and urban problems. This approach raises the idea that megalopolis may not be the only answer to economic progress; that, in fact, there is no reason to make urban poor out of the rural poor. In other words, this approach suggests that we could go a long way toward solving our urban crisis if we stopped emigration of the rural poor to the cities.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I have been impressed by the logic of this approach, and have introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 33 directing the Joint Economic Committee to study the relationship of population movements to economic growth and development. Although such a study and the guidelines it could supply for public policy are prospective, we can and should begin to evaluate Federal programs and expenditures in light of their impact on our urban/rural problems.

Federal expenditures for research and development—R. & D.—are an obvious example of an area in which the Federal government can influence economic development. We know that Federal funds have a significant influence on the development of strong scientific departments in our academic institutions; and that in turn universities with superior scientific capability attract to the area new business firms which have a need for research facilities and talent. Thus, it is apparent that the distribution of Federal funds for research and development can and does affect the pattern of economic development in the country. For example, it is a well known fact that the growth of the electronics industry in the Boston area was due to a large extent to the proximity of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University.

But despite the impact the Federal Government could have in directing economic change through research and development expenditures, this factor has been given little if any emphasis in determining the distribution of these funds. Instead of attempting to change current development patterns, we have, in effect, contributed to their growth by giving the bulk of our funds to institutions already most advanced and by spending most of our funds in the very areas which are growing so rapidly. The figures are illustrative.

In fiscal year 1965—the last year for which we have a breakdown by States—the Federal Government spent about $14.4 billion on research and development. During this year 31.7 percent of these funds went to one State alone—California, and this actually represented a decline from fiscal year 1964 when California's percentage was 34.6. New York was second with 9 percent, Maryland third with 6.1 percent, Massachusetts fourth with 5.1 percent, and Texas fifth with 5.1 percent. Thirty-one States received less than 1 percent—Wisconsin included—and nine of these States had less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

Yet this distribution of funds has little relationship to population distribution. Whereas the Federal Government spent $287 on research and development for every person in California, it only spent $31 per person in Wisconsin. And although Wisconsin ranked 14th in population among the States in the 1960 census, it ranked 23d in 1965 in the amount of Federal research and development funds received. And this rank marked a rise from the previous year when Wisconsin was 26th.

I cite the example of Wisconsin, because it is, of course, the instance with which I am most familiar. However, the discrepancy between population and research and development funds received would apply equally to many other States—especially States with a large rural population.

Mr. President, I think this evidence provides a dramatic example of our failure to take into account national objectives and problems in the distribution of funds for special Federal programs. It is clear to me that we would better serve our national goals by spending a larger portion of our research and development funds in the less urbanized States. Such a policy would contribute a powerful impetus to the economic development of these States and would ultimately lessen some of the pressures on our urban States and large cities.

TAX INCREASE NOT THE ANSWER TO INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal recently spelled out in an editorial why the tax increase proposal of the administration will not solve the serious and developing inflation problem that faces the country.

In selling the increase to the country, the President has repeatedly put his prime emphasis on its desirability in holding down prices.

The trouble, Mr. President, is that the inflation we are now suffering—in retail food prices, in the prices for steel, autos, chemicals, and medical services, will not be restrained by a tax increase.

The answer in food is well known. A tax increase that omits—as this proposal properly does—people with incomes below $5,000 will have no restraining effect on the demand for food.

In steel, autos, chemicals, and many other lines, demand has diminished below last year and far, far below capacity.

Thus, a tax increase to restrain demand further is not the answer. Prices in these areas are rising because of a cost push. A tax increase will simply push those prices up further.

In the rapidly rising service area, in medical services, for example, the shortage of doctors, hospital nurses is so acute that any lessening of demand by a tax increase will have little substantial effect.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Milwaukee Journal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

L. B. J. UNCONVINCING

President Johnson's warning that a refusal to raise taxes will cost Americans twice as much in the form of higher prices is a scare tactic.

The president predicts that an overheated economy will force the cost of living up 4 to 5% next year unless there is a surtax, in which case he says the increase will be held to only 2.5%.

While the cost of living index is a key indicator, the president is fudging when he treats it as a single indivisible force. The Green Bay Packers are a team, but they also are individuals of varying ability to influence the outcome of a game. Similarly, the cost of living index has its internal components. When these are examined it is plain that some items—notably medical services—have risen much faster than others in the last 10 years. Indeed, commodities—especially new cars and household appliances—have been slow risers.

Thus, even if galloping inflation were an imminent danger, which many experts aren't ready to concede, it is doubtful that a tax increase is necessarily the best remedy. To slow down inflation, a tax increase must draw money that would otherwise be spent on things that contribute heavily to inflation. This would not likely be the case with medical care and many other services—from dry cleaning to haircuts—which have been a strong cause of higher living costs.

On the contrary, the brunt of the tax hike probably would be felt by producers of durable goods—cars, dishwashers and TV sets—who have done tolerably well in restraining prices since 1957.

Moreover, there is no guarantee that a tax increase would have much impact on federal spending, a key factor in any threat of overheating. The tendency of new expenditures to absorb new revenue is well known.

The economy, now in its 80th month of expansion, is beset by diverse forces. Signs of inflationary surge mix with omens of economic sag. However, if hyperinflation does occur, a reduction in nonwar, nonpoverty spending should be the first resort. The moon can wait, as can the supersonic transport and plenty of pork barrel projects.

Congress might even muster enough fortitude to close shameful income tax loopholes that permit too many rich men to pay far less than a fair share.

COMPREHENSIVE REVISION OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution embodying a comprehensive revision of the Standing Rules of the Senate. With the exception of certain minor changes necessitated by the passage of time, this resolution is identical with a resolution originally introduced by me in the second session of the 88th Congress, on September 23, 1963, as Senate Resolution 372, and subsequently reintroduced in the 89th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution, together with an explanatory memorandum, which first appeared in the Record on September 23, 1964, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, for the benefit of those who may choose to pursue the matter in detail, I point out that the Record of September 23, 1964, also contained a comparative side-by-side print of this resolution and the existing standing rules of the Senate. However, because of the length and complexity of this material, I do not ask that it be placed in the Record again. I would hope that serious students of our obsolete, outmoded rules would refer back to the Record for September 23, 1964, in order that the details of this comprehensive rewrite of the rules may become apparent to them.

I would hope, if there are serious students of rules reform—and I am sure there are—that I will receive some constructive suggestions with respect to the very detailed and comprehensive changes which the draft I have just submitted makes in our present rules.

Although this matter has been pending before the Senate since 1964, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, to which it has been referred, has not held 1 day of hearings on this revision.

During the debate earlier this year on the Monroney-Madden legislative reorganization bill, I sought to obtain Senate approval of a number of the more significant reforms contained in this resolution.

My efforts, except in a few instances, were unavailing. And since it now appears that the other body is unlikely to act at this session on the legislative reorganization bill, and possibly not next year, either, even those few exceptions may go down the legislative drain.

One of the arguments made against my proposed amendments to the Monroney-Madden bill was that the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress lacked jurisdiction over matters relating to the Standing Rules of the Senate. Although the argument, in my judgment, is irrelevant in the context in which it was raised, I do not doubt that several of my colleagues were persuaded by it and voted against reforms which they support on the merits because of the manner in which they were brought to the floor.

There is another aspect to this question which I desire to note briefly. At the time of the debate on the Monroney-Madden bill, and again when the so-called clean elections bill was before the Senate, I offered three amendments which I called the "Bobby Baker" amendments. These amendments undertook to require financial disclosure of income, assets, and liabilities of Members and of those of their staffs who were receiving salaries in excess of $10,000 a year. The "Bobby Baker" amendments also hit at other abuses which were brought to light during the extensive inquiry into Mr. Baker's affairs which was held—I note the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Baker] has come to the floor, and I wish to make it abundantly clear that I am not talking about him.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have no doubts in that respect.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

These "Bobby Baker" amendments did receive substantial support on rollcall votes in the Senate. I think one reason why that support was not sufficient to pass them was that we had a commitment from my friend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] that, as chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics, he would bring forward at this session, in time for it to be debated and disposed of at this session, a comprehensive code of ethics.

I realize that the members of that select committee have been busy with a wide variety of other matters, including military authorizations and appropriations. I realize further that pending before the select committee is the consideration of the behavior of one of our colleagues. But we do have a definite commitment that a proposed code of ethics will be forthcoming in time for the Senate to vote on it at this session. I hope that that commitment will be kept. It is now Thursday, October 19. Who knows how much longer we shall vegetate in Washington? I would suggest that if the commitment is to be kept, it is about time we saw some action.

I make these comments not in derogation of the ability or the zeal or the industry of the members of the select committee. I merely point out that a commitment is a commitment. I hope very much that it will be met.

Returning to the subject of the rules, there can be no question of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which I serve, to consider and report the resolution which I am submitting today, either in its entirety or seriatim. Let the committee pick those changes in the rules that it believes are desirable and reject those that are not. Let us have some hearings. Let us call some experts. Let us have some debate. Let us have a committee report and, if necessary, minority or supplemental or concurring views.

But let us not sweep this vexed problem of a badly needed revision of the Rules of the Senate under the rug. Let us not go on, as we have for so many years, with rules which are totally inadequate to the needs of the 20th century—and the third third of the 20th century, at that.

I say to my friend from Wisconsin, whom, I am candid to say, I am assisting in his effort to get a free, full, and complete debate on the subversive activities control bill, let us get some rules which will make a long-winded filibuster impossible, so that when a majority of the Senate is ready for action, it will be able to act.

I should like to deny categorically that any of us who are assisting the Senator from Wisconsin in attempting to bring out into the open the many deficiencies in the substance of this bill and in the procedure by which the present bill was brought to the floor of the Senate, and is attempted to be jammed down our throats without adequate hearings, without any effort to write the kind of report which would be intelligible, are seeking to conduct a filibuster. But we ought to be able, under our rules, to stop that sort of menace. I am sure that the Senator from Wisconsin would agree with me, as he has in the past, that we do need some drastic reform of our present procedure of conducting unlimited debate until such time as two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present and voting are prepared to impose cloture.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wholeheartedly agree with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. As the Senator knows, I have always voted for majority cloture and supported those who have advocated majority cloture. It seems logical and proper to me that a majority of Senators should be able to bring a matter to a vote whenever they wish to act.

On this particular point, I think it is mandatory that when you have no record, when you have no hearings, when you have no testimony, then you are forced into the position where you have to debate the matter at length on the floor, particularly if it is a controversial matter, one that does concern our Constitution and our most vital liberties. This is certainly true if it is a matter which the most distinguished law experts of our country have told us has serious constitutional defects; or which, as the Senator from Oregon said of this proposal earlier today, goes to the heart of freedom in this country; or which, as the former Attorney General of the United States, the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], has said, is unworkable, specifying the particular constitutional defects in it.

Under such circumstances, it seems to me it would be negligent on the part of Senators if they voted on the matter after a brief debate, without full, comprehensive discussion of the issues of the case, such as the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from New York, and some of the other outstanding Members of the Senate have given this matter.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with my friend from Wisconsin, and I thank him for his helpful intervention.

I say in all good humor to our mutual and dearly beloved friend from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]—whose absence from the floor I deeply regret, since this is a matter of great interest to him—that he has tried to impose cloture upon us with regard to this problem. He tried it just the other day, when he wanted, by a two-thirds waiver of the rules, to tack this iniquitous measure onto an appropriation bill.

He failed.

I am sure the Senator from Illinois feels very strongly that the public interest requires the passage of this bill. I make these comments hoping that he, or some member of his staff, will pick them up from the RECORD, and that by this very action he may be persuaded to join the Senator from Wisconsin and me in attempting to change our rules so as to obtain majority cloture when the issue shall again come before the Senate.

Mr. President, in view of the continuing and, to my mind, highly justifiable outcry about the need for reform in the Senate, both procedural and ethical, I hope that the Committee on Rules and Administration will show more interest in the matters raised in this resolution than it has in the past.

I point out that a year or two ago the Committee on Rules and Administration, on motion of our beloved President pro tempore [Mr. HAYDEN], was given the authority to spend a substantial amount of money on an investigation of the rules of the Senate. They obtained another authorization for that purpose early this year. But so far as I know, the Committee on Rules and Administration, except for hiring a quite competent and able young man to look into the matter, has not done anything with respect to the study of the rules for which the money was appropriated. I do hope, perhaps as a result of this gentle reminder, that they will decide to have a good, hard look at this suggestion for proposed revision of the rules, which I now send to the desk and ask to have appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 179) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 179

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended to read as follows:

"RULE I

"ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE AND SELECTION OF OFFICERS

"At the commencement of each Congress, the Senate shall elect a President pro tempore and shall choose its officers, the Secretary, the Sergeant at Arms, the Chaplain, the Secretary to the Majority, the Secretary to the Minority.

"RULE II

"APPOINTMENT OF A SENATOR TO THE CHAIR

"1. The President pro tempore shall perform the duties of the Chair in the absence of the Vice President or vacancy in the office of Vice President.

"2. In the absence of the Vice President, and pending the election of a President pro tempore, a Senator designated by the majority leader, with the concurrence of the minority leader, shall perform the duties of the Chair.

"3. The President pro tempore shall have the right to name in open Senate, or, if absent, in writing, a Senator to perform the duties of the Chair. In the absence of such designation by the President pro tempore, the majority leader, with the concurrence of the minority leader, shall designate a Senator or Senators to perform the duties of the Chair; but in neither instance shall such substitution extend beyond an adjournment, except by unanimous consent.

"4. Whenever any Senator shall be designated to perform the duties of the Chair during the temporary absence of the President pro tempore, such Senator shall be empowered to sign, as acting President pro tempore, the enrolled bills and joint resolutions coming from the House of Representatives for presentation to the President of the United States.

"RULE III

"PRESENTATION OF CREDENTIALS

"1. The presentation of credentials of Senators-elect and other questions of privilege shall always be in order, except while a question of order or a motion to adjourn is pending, or while the Senate is dividing; and all questions and motions arising or made upon the presentation of such credentials shall be proceeded with until disposed of.

"2. The Secretary shall keep a record of the certificates of election of Senators by entering in a well-bound book kept for that purpose the date of the election, the name of the person elected and the vote given at the election, the date of the certificate, the name of the governor and the secretary of state signing and countersigning the same, and the State from which such Senator is elected.

"RULE IV

"OATHS, ETC.

"The oaths or affirmations required by the Constitution and prescribed by law shall be taken and subscribed by each Senator, in open Senate, before entering upon his duties.

"RULE V

"COMMENCEMENT OF DAILY SESSIONS

"The Presiding Officer having taken the Chair, and a quorum being present, motions to correct any mistakes made in the entries of the Senate Journal of the preceding day shall be in order and proceeded with until disposed of, unless objected to. If objection is made, the Senator moving to correct the Senate Journal and the Senator objecting may file at the Clerk's desk briefs in support of their positions. Such briefs shall be printed in the Senate Journal for the calendar day on which the motion to correct was made, together with a notice that a vote on the motion will take place on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session at a time certain to be set by the Presiding Officer. At the designated time, the motion to correct shall be submitted to the Senate and decided without debate.

"2. Unless a motion to read the Senate Journal of the preceding day, which shall be nondebatable, is made and passed by majority vote, the Senate Journal shall be deemed to have been read without actual recitation and approved.

"3. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn.

"RULE VI

"SENATE JOURNAL

"1. The proceedings of the Senate shall be accurately stated in the Senate Journal which shall be the Senate section of the Congressional Record. Messages of the President in full; titles of bills and joint resolutions, and such parts as shall be affected by proposed amendments; every vote, and a brief statement of the contents of each petition, memorial, or paper presented to the Senate; the legislative proceedings; and, the executive proceedings in open executive sessions, shall be entered.

"2. The executive proceedings in closed session, the confidential legislative proceedings, and the proceedings when sitting as a Court of Impeachment, shall each be recorded by the Journal Clerk in a separate book.

"RULE VII

"QUORUM—ABSENT SENATORS MAY BE SENT FOR

"1. No Senator shall absent himself from the service of the Senate without leave.

"2. If, at any time during the daily sessions of the Senate, a question shall be raised by the Majority Leader or the Minority Leader, or, in their absence, by the Acting Majority Leader or the Acting Minority Leader, as to the presence of a quorum, the Presiding Officer shall forthwith direct the Secretary to call the roll and shall announce the result, and these proceedings shall be without debate.

"3. Any Senator may raise the question as to the presence of a quorum but only for the purpose of seeking recognition and calling for a vote on the pending business once the presence of a quorum has been ascertained; and, declaration of such intention shall be made by such Senator immediately prior to his raising the question as to the presence of a quorum. Immediately upon the statement of such intention and the raising of such question by any Senator, the Presiding Officer shall forthwith direct the Secretary to call the roll and proceed as above provided.

"4. Whenever, during any quorum call as provided for in paragraphs 2 and 3, the Presiding Officer ascertains that a majority of the Senators are present in the Chamber, he shall direct that the quorum call be halted.

"5. Whenever upon such rollcall it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present, a majority of the Senators present may direct the Sergeant at Arms to request, and when necessary, to compel the attendance of the absent Senators, which order shall be determined without debate; and pending its execution, and until a quorum shall be present, no debate nor motion, except to adjourn, shall be in order.

"RULE VIII

"ORDER OF RECOGNITION

"When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized; and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him, except that he shall first give recognition to the following Senators in the order prescribed if any of them shall also seek recognition:

"(1) The Majority Leader, or, in his absence, any Senator designated as Acting Majority Leader by the Majority Leader, and occupying the Majority Leader's desk.

"(2) The Minority Leader, or, in his absence, any Senator designated as Acting Minority Leader by the Minority Leader, and occupying the Minority Leader's desk.

"RULE IX

"DEBATE

"1. No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer; *Provided, however,* that such consent shall not be required where any Senator shall raise a germane point of order that the Senator in possession of the floor has transgressed the rules of the Senate. Unless submitted to the Senate, the germane point of order shall be decided by the Presiding Officer subject to an appeal to the Senate as provided in Rule X. Any Senator against whom a germane point of order shall have been raised and any Senator raising such point of order may appeal from the ruling of the Presiding Officer, which appeal shall be open to debate. If the Presiding Officer shall sustain the germane point of order and no appeal is taken, or if upon appeal the Senate shall sustain the germane point of order, the Senator against whom it has been made shall take his seat; otherwise he shall retain possession of the floor.

"A germane point of order may be raised in respect to enforcement of paragraphs 3 and 5 of this Rule.

"2. It shall not be in order to interrupt a Senator having the floor for the purpose of introducing any petition, memorial, report of a committee, resolution, or bill. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to enforce this Rule without any point of order hereunder being made by a Senator.

"3. No Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same legislative day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate.

"4. Upon the request of any Senator who has been recognized, his remarks upon any subject may be delivered in writing, and if so delivered shall be printed in the Senate Journal in the same manner, and in the same size print, as if those remarks had been delivered orally. The Senate Journal shall contain a notation that the material was submitted but not delivered orally.

"5. Whenever a Senator has held the floor for three consecutive hours, he shall be required to yield the floor upon objection and any Senator may raise a point of order at any time thereafter that such Senator yield the floor.

"6. No Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly, by any form of words, impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator, or refer offensively to any State of the Union.

"7. If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, in the opinion of the Presiding Officer transgresses the rules of the Senate by impugning the motives or integrity of another Senator, the Presiding Officer shall, either on his own motion or at the request of any other Senator, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall take his seat, and may not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate. Any Senator directed by the Presiding Officer to take his seat, and any Senator requesting the Presiding Officer to require a Senator to take his seat, may appeal from the ruling of the Chair, which appeal shall be open to debate.

"8. If a Senator be called to order for words spoken in debate, then, upon the demand of the Senator or of any other Senator, the exceptionable words shall be read by the Official Reporter for the information of the Senate.

"9. Whenever confusion arises in the Chamber or the galleries, or demonstrations of approval or disapproval are indulged in by the occupants of the galleries, it shall be the duty of the Chair to enforce order on his own initiative and without any point of order being made by a Senator.

"10. No Senator shall introduce to or bring to the attention of the Senate during its sessions any occupant in the galleries of the Senate. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor may the Presiding Officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent.

"11. During the consideration of any measure, motion, or other matter, any Senator may move that all further debate under the order for pending business shall be germane to the subject matter before the Senate. If such a motion, which shall be nondebatable, is approved by the Senate, all further debate under the said order shall be germane to the subject matter before the Senate, and all questions of germaneness under this rule, when raised, including appeals, shall be decided by the Senate without debate.

"12. When the reading of a paper is called for, and objected to, it shall be determined by a vote of the Senate, without debate.

"13. No dilatory motion shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer. A Senator whose motion has been determined by the Presiding Officer to be dilatory may appeal from the decision of the Chair, which appeal shall be decided by the Senate without debate.

"14. Former Presidents of the United States shall be entitled to address the Senate upon appropriate notice to the Presiding Officer who shall thereupon make the necessary arrangements.

"RULE X

"QUESTIONS OF ORDER

"1. Subject to the limitations in Rule IX, a question of order may be raised at any stage of the proceedings, except when the Senate is dividing, and, unless submitted to the Senate, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate. When an appeal is taken, any subsequent question of order which may arise before the decision of such appeal shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate; and every appeal therefrom shall be decided at once, and without debate; and any appeal may be laid on the table without prejudice to the pending proposition, and thereupon shall be held as affirming the decision of the Presiding Officer.

"2. The Presiding Officer may submit any question of order for the decision of the Senate.

"3. When a question of order has been submitted to the Senate, or a debatable appeal has been taken on a decision of the Presiding Officer as provided herein, debate on such submission or appeal shall be limited, in all, to one hour, unless the Senate shall otherwise direct.

"RULE XI

"MORNING BUSINESS

"1. One hour, if that much time be needed, shall be set aside for the transaction of morning business as set forth in Rule XI, paragraph 2, on each legislative day at the opening of proceedings unless the Senate shall otherwise order by unanimous consent. The period for morning business may be extended for up to one additional hour, upon motion, which shall be nondebatable, approved by majority action.

"2. The Presiding Officer shall, during the period for morning business, lay before the Senate messages from the President, reports and communications from the heads of Departments, and other communications addressed to the Senate, and such bills, joint resolutions, and other messages from the House of Representatives as may remain upon his table from any previous day's session undisposed of. The Presiding Officer shall then call for:

"The presentation of petitions and memorials.

"Reports of standing and select committees.

"The introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

"Concurrent and other resolutions.

"Statements or comments not to exceed three minutes which may include requests for unanimous consent to insert articles and other printed matter in the Senate Journal and to submit statements.

"3. Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the Chair, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the Calendar shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer, unless by unanimous consent; and if such consent be given, the motion shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be decided without debate upon the merits of the subject proposed to be taken up.

"RULE XII

"PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

"1. Every petition or memorial shall be signed by the petitioner or memorialist and have indorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, and shall be presented and referred to the appropriate committee without debate. But no petition or memorial or other paper signed by citizens or subjects of a foreign power shall be received, unless the same be transmitted to the Senate by the President.

"2. Every petition or memorial shall be referred, without putting the question, unless objection to such reference is made; in which case all motions for the reception or reference of such petition, memorial, or other paper shall be put in the order in which the same shall be made, and shall not be open to amendment, except to add instructions.

"3. Only a brief statement of the contents of such communications as are presented under the order of business 'Presentation of petitions and memorials' shall be printed in the Senate Journal; and no other portion of such communications shall be inserted in the Senate Journal unless specifically so ordered by the Senate, as provided for in Rule XL, paragraph 1; except that communications from the legislatures or conventions, lawfully called, of the respective States and insular possessions shall be printed in full in the Senate Journal whenever presented, and the original copies of such communications shall be retained in the files of the Secretary of the Senate.

"4. Senators having petitions, memorials, or private bills to present after the conclusion of the morning business may deliver them to the Secretary of the Senate, indorsing upon them their names. Said petitions, memorials, or bills shall, with the approval of the Presiding Officer, be entered on the Senate Journal with the names of the Senators presenting them as having been read twice and referred to the appropriate committees.

"RULE XIII

"CALENDAR MONDAY

"1. At the conclusion of the morning business on each Monday, unless upon motion decided without debate the Senate shall otherwise order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Calendar of Bills and Resolutions, and bills and resolutions that are not objected to shall be taken up in their order. An objection may be interposed at any stage of the proceedings, but upon motion the Senate may continue such consideration; and this order shall commence immediately after the conclusion of morning business, and shall take precedence of the unfinished business and other special orders.

"RULE XIV

"MOTIONS TO CONSIDER

"1. All motions to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be debatable, unless otherwise provided in these Rules; *Provided, however,* that when any Senator shall file, at the desk of the Clerk, a notice of intention to move to consider any matter on the Senate Calendar on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session, such motion for consideration when made by such Senator shall be decided without debate. The notice of intent shall be printed in the Senate Journal.

"RULE XV

"SPECIAL ORDERS

"1. Any subject may, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present, be made a special order; and when the time so fixed for its consideration arrives the Presiding Officer shall lay it before the Senate, unless there be unfinished business of the preceding day, and if it is not finally disposed of on that day it shall take its place on the Calendar of Special Orders in the order of time in which it was made special, unless it shall become by adjournment the unfinished business.

"2. When two or more special orders have been made for the same time, they shall have precedence according to the order in which they were severally assigned, and that order shall only be changed by direction of the Senate.

"And all motions to make a subject a special order, or to change such order, or to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"RULE XVI

"BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND RESOLUTIONS

"1. Every bill and joint resolution shall receive three readings previous to its passage. The first reading and the second reading may be on the same calendar day, if the Senate by majority vote without debate, shall so direct; but the third reading must be on a different calendar day. The Presiding Officer shall give notice at each reading whether it be the first, second, or third. The first or second reading of each bill, or both, may be by title only, unless the Senate by majority vote without debate shall otherwise order.

"2. Every bill or joint resolution shall immediately after second reading be referred by the Presiding Officer to the appropriate committee. Appeals from rulings of the Presiding Officer referring bills and joint resolutions to committee shall be decided by the Senate without debate. A motion to place a bill or joint resolution on the Senate Calendar immediately and not refer it to committee may be made by any Senator after such bill or joint resolution has been read twice but before it has been referred to committee, and such motion shall be decided by majority vote of the Senate after debate not to exceed a period of one hour.

"3. Every bill and joint resolution having been read twice and referred to a committee, shall, upon being reported by the committee, immediately be placed on the Calendar. Every bill and joint resolution originating in a committee shall, upon being reported by the committee, be read twice and then placed on the Calendar.

"4. The Secretary of the Senate shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and shall examine all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.

"5. All resoluions shall lie over one calendar day for consideration unless the Senate shall by majority vote otherwise direct.

"RULE XVII

"REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND MOTIONS TO DISCHARGE

"TO LIE OVER

"All reports of Committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of a subject, and all subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over one calendar day for consideration, unless the Senate, without debate, by a majority vote shall otherwise direct, or unless otherwise provided in these Rules.

"RULE XVIII

"REFERENCE TO COMMITTEES—AMENDMENTS

"When motions are made for reference of a subject to a select committee or a standing committee, the question of reference to a standing committee shall be put first; and a motion simply to refer shall not be open to amendment, except to add instructions.

"RULE XIX

"AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS

"1. All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law.

"2. The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any such restriction, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

"3. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received.

"4. No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill; nor shall any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law be received if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency.

"5. No amendment, the object of which is to provide for a private claim, shall be received to any general appropriation bill, unless it be to carry out the provisions of an existing law or a treaty stipulation, which shall be cited on the fact of the amendment.

"6. (a) Three members of the following-named committees, to be selected by their respective committees, shall be ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations, to serve on said committee when the annual appropriation bill making appropriations for the purposes specified in the following table opposite the name of the committee is being considered by the Committee on Appropriations:

"Name of committee	*Purpose of appropriation*
Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.	For the Department of Agriculture.
Committee on Armed Services.	For the Department of Defense.
Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.	For aeronautical and space activities and matters relating to the scientific aspects thereof, except those peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.
Committee on Commerce.	For the Department of Commerce and related activities.
Committee on the District of Columbia.	For the District of Columbia.
Committee on Finance, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.	For the Departments of the Treasury and the Post Office.
Committee on Foreign Relations.	For the Department of State and related agencies, and for the foreign assistance programs.
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.	For the Department of the Interior and related agencies.
Committee on the Judiciary.	For the Department of Justice and for the Judiciary.
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.	For the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Committee on Public Works.	For Public Works.
Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (to be selected by said members).	For the development and utilization of atomic energy.

"(b) At least one member of each committee enumerated in subparagraph (a), to be selected by his or their respective committees, shall be a member of any conference committee appointed to confer with the House upon the annual appropriation bill making appropriations for the purposes specified in the foregoing table opposite the name of his or their respective committee.

"7. When a point of order is made against any restriction on the expenditure of funds appropriated in a general appropriation bill on the ground that the restriction violates this rule, the rule shall be construed strictly and, in case of doubt, in favor of the point of order.

"RULE XX

"AMENDMENTS—GERMANENESS

"No amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in a bill under consideration shall be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; and all questions of relevancy of amendments, when raised, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer, subject to appeal to the Senate to be decided without debate.

"RULE XXI

"AMENDMENT MAY BE LAID ON THE TABLE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE BILL

"When an amendment proposed to any pending measure is laid on the table, it shall not carry with it, or prejudice, such measure.

"RULE XXII

"AMENDMENTS—DIVISION OF A QUESTION

"If the question in debate contains several propositions, any Senator may have the same divided, except a motion to strike out and insert, which shall not be divided; but the rejection of a motion to strike out and insert one proposition shall not prevent a motion to strike out and insert a different proposition; nor shall it prevent a motion simply to strike out; nor shall the rejection of a motion to strike out prevent a motion to strike out and insert. But pending a motion to strike out and insert, the part to be stricken out and the part to be inserted shall each be regarded for the purpose of amendment as a question; and motions to amend the part to be stricken out shall have precedence.

"RULE XXIII

"AMENDMENTS AFTER THIRD READING—RECOMMITMENT

"When a bill or resolution shall have been ordered to be read a third time, it shall not be in order to propose amendments, unless by unanimous consent, but it shall be in order at any time before the passage of any bill or resolution to move its commitment; and when the bill or resolution shall again be reported from the committee it shall be placed on the Calendar unless the Senate by majority vote shall otherwise direct.

"RULE XXIV

"MOTIONS

"1. All motions shall be reduced to writing, if desired by the Presiding Officer or by any Senator, and shall be read before the same shall be debated.

"2. Any motion or resolution may be withdrawn or modified by the mover at any time before a decision, amendment, or ordering of the yeas and nays, except a motion to reconsider, which shall not be withdrawn without leave.

"RULE XXV

"PRECEDENCE OF MOTIONS—PREVIOUS QUESTION

"1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

"To adjourn.

"To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

"To take a recess.

"To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

"To lay on the table.

"For the previous question.

"To postpone indefinitely.

"To postpone to a day certain.

"To commit.

"To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged, except that after the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution, no motion to lay on the table shall be in order; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, for the previous question, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate.

"2. (a) Whenever any motion or amendment to a measure pending before the Senate has received consideration for a total of not less than fifteen hours, during a total of not less than three calendar days, any Senator may move the previous question with respect to such motion or amendment.

"(b) Whenever any measure pending before the Senate, together with any motions or amendments relating to it, has received consideration for a total of not exceeding fifteen calendar days, any Senator may move the previous question with respect to such measure and any or all motions or amendments relating to it.

"(c) When such a motion is made and a quorum is ascertained to be present, it shall be submitted immediately to the Senate by the Presiding Officer, without debate and shall be determined by a "yea" and "nay" vote, a majority prevailing. A previous question may be asked and ordered with respect to one or more measures, motions, amendments, or matters, and may embrace one or more amendments to any pending measure, motion or matter described therein, and the passage or rejection of the pending bill or resolution; Provided, however, that any or all motions or amendments not so embraced by the motion for the previous question shall be deemed rejected. If the previous question is so ordered as to any measure, motion, amendment, or matter, that measure, motion, amendment, or matter shall be presented immediately to the Senate for determination. One hour of debate, equally divided between opponents and proponents, shall be allowed on any motion, amendment, or matter, other than the passage or rejection of the measure, bill, or resolution on which the previous question has been ordered; and, four hours of debate, divided in the same manner, shall be allowed on the passage or rejection of the measure, bill, or resolution covered by such order.

"All incidental questions of order arising after a motion is made for the previous question, and pending such motion, shall be decided, whether on appeal, or otherwise, without debate.

"RULE XXVI

"PREAMBLES

"When a bill or resolution is accompanied by a preamble, the question shall first be put on the bill or resolution and then on the preamble, which may be withdrawn by a mover before an amendment of the same, or ordering of the yeas and nays; or it may be laid on the table without prejudice to the bill or resolution, and shall be a final disposition of such preamble.

"RULE XXVII

"VOTING, ETC.

"1. A demand for the yeas and nays, when seconded by eleven Senators, shall be sufficient to require a rollcall vote. When the yeas and nays are ordered, the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically; and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question unless excused by the Senate. Senators entering the chamber after their names have been called may obtain recognition from the Presiding Officer and have their votes recorded prior to the announcement of the vote; but no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the Presiding Officer, except that a Senator may, for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the Presiding Officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent.

"2. When a Senator declines a vote on call of his name, he shall be required to assign his reasons therefor, and having assigned them, the Presiding Officer shall submit the question to the Senate: 'Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?', which question shall be decided without debate; and these proceedings shall be had after the rollcall and before the result is announced; and any further proceedings in reference hereto shall be after such announcement.

"3. No request by a Senator for unanimous consent for the taking of a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution shall be submitted to the Senate for agreement thereto until, upon a rollcall ordered for the purpose by the Presiding Officer, it shall be discovered that a quorum of the Senate is present; and when a unanimous consent is thus given, the same shall operate as the order of the Senate, but any unanimous consent may be revoked by another unanimous consent granted in the manner prescribed above upon one day's notice.

"RULE XXVIII

"RECONSIDERATION

"1. When a question has been decided by the Senate, any Senator voting with the prevailing side or who has not voted may, on the same day or on either of the next two days of actual session thereafter, move a reconsideration; and if the Senate shall refuse to reconsider, or upon reconsideration shall affirm its first decision, no further motion to reconsider shall be in order unless by unanimous consent. Every motion to reconsider shall be decided by a majority vote, and may be laid on the table without affecting the question in reference to which the same is made, which shall be a final disposition of the motion.

"2. When a bill, resolution, report, amendment, order, or message, upon which a vote has been taken, shall have gone out of the possession of the Senate and been communicated to the House of Representatives, the motion to reconsider shall be accompanied by a motion to request the House to return the same; which last motion shall be acted upon immediately and without debate, and if determined in the negative shall be a final disposition of the motion to reconsider.

"RULE XXIX

"APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

"1. At the beginning of each Congress the Senate shall proceed by ballot to appoint the members of each standing committee, and unless otherwise ordered, of each other committee of the Senate. All members of each such committee so appointed shall be appointed by one ballot. A plurality of the votes cast shall be required for the appointment of the members of each such committee.

"In the event a vacancy occurs for any reason in the membership of a standing committee and of any other committee of the Senate during a session of Congress, the Senate shall proceed by ballot to fill the vacancy. A plurality of the votes cast shall be required in the filling of a vacancy.

"2. Upon the appointment of the members of each such committee at the beginning of a Congress pursuant to paragraph 1, the majority Members thereof shall elect by secret ballot of the majority members of the committee one member of that committee to be chairman thereof. Such member shall be of the majority party of the Senate. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be required for the election of a chairman of any such committee.

"No Senator shall be elected or shall continue to serve as chairman of a standing committee after he has attained the age of seventy years.

"When a permanent vacancy occurs for any reason in the chairmanship of a standing committee and of any other committee of the Senate, the vacancy in the membership shall first be filled (if necessary) as provided in paragraph 1 hereof, and a successor chairman thereafter elected as hereinabove provided.

"No Senator shall be chairman of more than one standing committee nor of more than one subcommittee of each committee of which he may be a member.

"RULE XXX

"STANDING COMMITTEES

"1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

"(a) (1) Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, to consist of sixteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating primarily to the following subjects:

"(A) Aeronautical and space activities, as that term is defined in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, except those which are peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

"(B) Matters relating generally to the scientific aspects of such aeronautical and space activities, except those which are peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

"(C) National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"(2) Such committee also shall have jurisdiction to survey and review, and to prepare studies and reports upon, aeronautical and space activities of all agencies of the United States, including such activities which are peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

"(b) Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of fifteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Agriculture generally.

"2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.

"3. Animal industry and diseases of animals.

"4. Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.

"5. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

"6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

"7. Agricultural economies and research.

"8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.

"9. Dairy industry.

"10. Entomology and plant quarantine.

"11. Human nutrition and home economics.

"12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

"13. Agricultural educational extension services.

"14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.

"15. Rural electrification.

"16. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.

"17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.

"(c) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of twenty-six Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

"(d) Committee on Armed Services, to consist of eighteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Common defense generally.

"2. The Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally.

"3. Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

"4. Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the armed forces.

"5. Selective service.

"6. Size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

"7. Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards.

"8. Ammunition depots.

"9. Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone.

"10. Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

"11. Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

"12. Aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

"(e) Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of fourteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitioners, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Banking and currency generally.

"2. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

"3. Deposit insurance.

"4. Public and private housing.

"5. Federal Reserve System.

"6. Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.

"7. Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.

"8. Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

"9. Control of prices of commodities, rents, or services.

"10. Bonded debt of the United States.

"11. Deposit of moneys.

"(f) Committee on Commerce, to consist of eighteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

"2. Regulation of interstate railroads, busses, trucks, and pipe lines.

"3. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television.

"4. Civil aeronautics, except aeronautical and space activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"5. Merchant marine generally.

"6. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.

"7. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.

"8. Rules and international agreements to prevent collisions at sea.

"9. Merchant marine officers and seaman.

"10. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, lifesaving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.

"11. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

"12. The Coast Guard, including lifesaving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.

"13. The United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.

"14. Weather Bureau.

"15. Except as provided in paragraph (d), the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally.

"16. Inland waterways.

"17. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

"18. Bureau of Standards, including standardization of weights and measures and the metric system.

"19. Transportation of dutiable goods.

"(g) Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of eight Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. All measures relating to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general, other than appropriations therefor, including—

"2. Public health and safety, sanitation, and quarantine regulations.

"3. Regulation of sale of intoxicating liquors.

"4. Adulteration of food and drugs.

"5. Taxes and tax sales.

"6. Insurance, executors, administrators, wills, and divorce.

"7. Municipal and juvenile courts.

"8. Incorporation and organization of societies.

"9. Municipal code and amendments to the criminal and corporation laws.

"(h) Committee on Finance, to consist of seventeen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Revenue measures generally.

"2. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.

"3. Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions.

"4. Veterans' measures generally.

"5. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"6. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the armed forces.

"7. Compensation of veterans.

"(i) Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of nineteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

"2. Treaties.

"3. Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.

"4. Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation.

"5. Neutrality.

"6. International conferences and congresses.

"7. The American National Red Cross.

"8. Intervention abroad and declarations of war.

"9. Measures relating to the diplomatic service.

"10. Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries.

"11. Measures to foster commercial and cultural intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.

"12. United Nations Organization and international financial and monetary organizations.

"13. Foreign loans and grants.

"14. Reciprocal trade agreements.

"15. Tariffs and import quotas and matters related thereto.

"(j)(1) Committee on Government Operations, to consist of fifteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

"(B) Reorganization in the executive branch of the Government.

"(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

"(A) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;

"(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

"(C) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;

"(D) studying the intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities.

"(k) Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to consist of seventeen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.

"2. Mineral resources of the public lands.

"3. Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.

"4. Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.

"5. Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.

"6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.

"7. Measures relating generally to the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations.

"8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.

"9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

"10. Mining interests generally.

"11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.

"12. Geological survey.

"13. Mining schools and experimental stations.

"14. Petroleum conservation and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.

"15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.

"16. Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

"(l) Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of sixteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.

"2. Constitutional amendments.

"3. Federal courts and judges.

"4. Local courts in the Territories and possessions.

"5. Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

"6. National penitentiaries.

"7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.

"8. Holidays and celebrations.

"9. Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.

"10. State and Territorial boundary lines.

"11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.

"12. Civil liberties.

"13. Patents, copyrights, and trademarks.

"14. Patent Office.

"15. Immigration and naturalization.

"16. Apportionment of Representatives.

"17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.

"18. Interstate compacts generally.

"(m) Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to consist of sixteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Measures relating to health, education, labor, or public welfare generally.

"2. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

"3. Wages and hours of labor.

"4. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.

"5. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract, and migratory labor generally.

"6. Child labor.

"7. Labor statistics.

"8. Labor standards.

"9. School-lunch program.

"10. Vocational rehabilitation.

"11. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.

"12. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

"13. Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and St. Elizabeths Hospital.

"14. Welfare of miners.

"15. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"16. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.

"17. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"18. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.

"19. National social security.

"20. Employment, unemployment and the utilization of manpower.

"(n) Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to consist of twelve Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. The Federal civil service generally.

"2. The status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement.

"3. The postal service generally, including the railway mail service, and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic-tube service; but excluding post roads.

"4. Postal-savings banks.

"5. Census and the collection of statistics generally.

"6. The National Archives.

"(o) Committee on Public Works, to consist of sixteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

"2. Public works for the benefit of navigation, and bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).

"3. Water power.

"4. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

"5. Public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally.

"6. Measures relating to the purchase of sites and construction of post offices, customhouses, Federal courthouses, and Government buildings within the District of Columbia.

"7. Measures relating to the Capitol building and the Senate and House Office Buildings.

"8. Measures relating to the construction or reconstruction, maintenance, and care of the buildings and grounds of the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution.

"9. Public reservations and parks within the District of Columbia, including Rock Creek Park and the Zoological Park.

"10. Measures relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads.

"(p) (1) Committee on Rules and Administration, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"(A) Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same; except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

"(B) Except as provided in paragraph (o)8, matters relating to the Library of Congress and the Senate Library; statuary and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.

"(C) Except as provided in paragraph (o)8, matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.

"(D) Matters relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; Presidential succession.

"(E) Matters relating to parliamentary rules; floor and gallery rules; Senate Restaurant; administration of the Senate Office Buildings and the Senate wing of the Capitol; assignment of office space; and services to the Senate.

"(F) Matters relating to printing and correction of the Congressional Record.

"(2) Such committee shall also have the duty of assigning office space in the Senate wing of the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings.

"(3) Such committee shall have jurisdiction to investigate every alleged violation of the rules of the Senate, and to make appropriate findings of fact and conclusions with respect thereto after according to any individual concerned due notice and opportunity for hearing. In any case in which the committee determines that any such violation has occurred, it shall be the duty of the committee to recommend to the Senate appropriate disciplinary action, including reprimand, censure, suspension from office or employment, or expulsion from office or employment.

"2. The said committees shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed.

"3. (a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this subsection, each standing committee, and each subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by said committee, subject to the provisions of section 133(d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

"(b) Each standing committee, and each subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to fix a lesser number than one-third of its entire membership who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

"4. Each Senator shall serve on two and no more of the following standing committees: Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; Committee on Appropriations; Committee on Armed Services; Committee on Banking and Currency; Committee on Commerce; Committee on Finance; Committee on Foreign Relations; Committee on Government Operations; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and the Committee on Public Works. No Senator shall serve on more than one of the following standing committees: Committee on the District of Columbia; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and the Committee on Rules and Administration. Each Senator shall serve on no more than two of the subcommittees of any standing committee of which he may be a member, except that he may serve on more than two subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be effective during any period when there are more than forty-six Senators of the minority party.

"5. No standing committee shall sit without special leave while the Senate is in session. A motion for leave for a standing committee to sit while the Senate is in session shall be a privileged motion and shall not be debatable.

"RULE XXXI

"COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

"1. Each standing committee shall meet at such time as it may prescribe by rule in accordance with provisions of section 133(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, upon the call of the chairman thereof, and at such other time as may be fixed by written notice signed by a majority of the members of the committee and filed with the committee clerk.

"2. The business to be considered at any meeting of a standing committee shall be determined in accordance with its rules. Any measure, motion, or matter within the jurisdiction of the committee which a majority of the members of the committee indicate their desire to consider by votes or by presentation or written notice filed with the committee clerk, shall be considered at such meeting.

"Action for the initiation, conduct, and termination of hearings by a standing committee upon any measure or matter within-its jurisdiction shall be determined by majority vote of the members of the committee.

"3. Whenever any measure, motion, or other matter pending before a standing committee has received consideration in executive session or sessions of the committee for a total of not less than five hours, any Senator may move the previous question with respect thereto. When such a motion is made and seconded, or a petition signed by a majority of the committee is presented to the chairman, and a quorum as prescribed by committee rules pursuant to paragarph 3 of Rule XXX is present, it shall be submitted immediately to the committee by the chairman, and shall be determined without debate by yea-and-nay vote. A motion for the previous question shall be decided by a majority vote of the Senators voting. A previous question may be asked and ordered with respect to one or more pending measures, motions, or matters, and may embrace one or more pending amendments to any pending measure, motion, or matter described there in and final action by the committee on the pending bill or resolution. If the previous question is so ordered as to any measure, motion, or matter, that measure, motion, or matter shall be presented immediately to the committee for determination. Each member of the committee desiring to be heard on one or more of the measures, motions, or other matters on which the previous question has been ordered shall be allowed to speak thereon for a total of thirty minutes.

"4. The provisions of paragraph 1 herein, where applicable, and of paragraphs 2 and 3 herein shall be applicable to meetings and procedure thereat at any meeting of any subcommittee of any standing committee.

"RULE XXXII

"INSTRUCTIONS TO REPORT ON MAJOR LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

"1. It shall be in order at any time after the concusion of morning business for any Senator to make a motion to denominate any measure then pending in any committee or subcommittee of the Senate as a 'major legislative matter,' and such motion shall be a privileged matter and subject to immediate consideration, provided that a notice of intention to make such a motion shall have been presented on the previous calendar day on which the Senate was in session, and printed in the Senate Journal.

"2. Debate upon such motion shall be limited to eight hours, the time to be evenly divided between the opponents and proponents of the motion.

"3. Such motion, when agreed to, shall constitute an instruction to the committee to which the measure denominated a 'major legislative matter' has been referred to report such measure to the Senate within 30 calendar days, by poll or otherwise, with the recommendation (a) that it be passed, or (b) that it not be passed, or (c) that it be passed with such amendments as shall be recommended.

"RULE XXXIII

"SESSION WITH CLOSED DOORS

"On motion made and carried by a vote of a majority of Senators present and voting to close the doors of the Senate on the discussion of any business which may, in the opinion of a Senator, require secrecy, the Presiding Officer shall direct the galleries to be cleared; and during the discussion of such motion the doors shall remain closed.

"RULE XXXIV

"EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

"1. When the President of the United States shall meet the Senate in the Senate Chamber for the consideration of Executive business, he shall have a seat on the right of the Presiding Officer. When the Senate shall be convened by the President of the United States to any other place, the Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Senators shall attend at the place appointed, with the necessary officers of the Senate.

"2. All business in the Senate shall be transacted in open session, unless the Senate in closed session by a majority vote shall determine that a particular nomination, treaty, or other matter shall be considered in closed executive session, in which case all subsequent proceedings with respect to said nomination, treaty, or other matter shall be kept secret; *Provided*, That the injunction of secrecy as to the whole or any part of proceedings in closed executive session may be removed on motion adopted by a majority vote of the Senate in closed executive session; *Provided, further*, That Rule XXXIII shall apply to open executive session; *And provided further*, That any Senator may make public his vote in closed executive session.

'3. When the Senate is acting in closed executive session, the Senate Chamber shall be cleared of all persons except the Secretary, the Chief Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Parliamentarian, and such other officers as the Presiding Officer shall think necessary; and all such officers shall be sworn to secrecy.

"4. All confidential communications made by the President of the United States to the Senate shall be by the Senators and the officers of the Senate kept secret until the Senate shall, by resolution, take off the injunction of secrecy, or unless the same shall be considered in open executive session.

"5. Any Senator or officer of the Senate who shall disclose the secret or confidential business or proceedings of the Senate (except for the disclosure by a Senator of his vote in closed executive session) shall be liable, if a Senator, to suffer expulsion from the body; and if an officer, to dismissal from the service of the Senate, and to punishment for contempt.

"6. Whenever, by the request of the Senate or any committee thereof, any documents or papers shall be communicated to the Senate by the President or the head of any Department relating to any matter pending in the Senate, the proceedings in regard to which are secret or confidential under the rules, said documents and papers shall be considered as confidential, and shall not be disclosed without leave of the Senate.

"RULE XXXV

"EXECUTIVE SESSIONS—PROCEEDINGS ON TREATIES

"1. When a treaty shall be laid before the Senate for ratification, it shall be read a first time; and no motion in respect to it shall be in order except to refer it to a committee, or to consider it in open executive session.

"When a treaty is reported from a committee with or without amendment, it shall, unless the Senate shall otherwise direct, lie one day for consideration; after which it may be read a second time and considered as in Committee of the Whole, when it shall be proceeded with by articles, and the amendments reported by the committee shall be first acted upon, after which other amendments may be proposed; and when through with, the proceedings had as in Committee of the Whole shall be reported to the Senate, when the question shall be, if the treaty be amended, 'Will the Senate concur in the amendments made in Committee of the Whole?' And the amendments may be taken separately or in gross, if no Senator shall object; after which new amendments may be proposed.

"The decisions thus made shall be reduced to the form of a resolution of ratification, with or without amendments, as the case may be, which shall be proposed on a subsequent day, unless the Senate shall otherwise determine; at which stage no amendment shall be received unless by unanimous consent.

"On the final question to advise and consent to the ratification in the form agreed to, the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present shall be necessary to determine it in the affirmative; but all other motions and questions upon a treaty shall be decided by a majority vote, except a motion to postpone indefinitely, which shall be decided by a vote of two-thirds.

"2. Treaties transmitted by the President to the Senate for ratification shall be resumed at the second or any subsequent session of the same Congress at the stage in which they were left at the final adjournment of the session at which they were transmitted; but all proceedings on treaties shall terminate with the Congress, and they shall be resumed at the commencement of the next Congress as if no proceedings had previously been had thereon.

"RULE XXXVI

"EXECUTIVE SESSION—PROCEEDINGS ON NOMINATIONS

"1. When nominations shall be made by the President of the United States to the Senate, they shall, unless otherwise ordered, be referred to appropriate committees; and the final question on every nomination shall be, 'Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?', which question shall not be put on the same day on which the nomination is received, nor on the day on which it may be reported by a committee, unless the Senate, by majority vote, should so direct.

"2. When a nomination is confirmed or rejected, any Senator voting in the majority may move for a reconsideration on the same day on which the vote was taken, or on either of the next two days of actual executive session of the Senate; but if a notification of the confirmation or rejection on a nomination shall have been sent to the President before the expiration of the time within which a motion to reconsider may be made, the motion to reconsider shall be accompanied by a motion to request the President to return such notification to the Senate. Any motion to reconsider the vote on a nomination may be laid on the table without prejudice to the nomination, and shall be a final disposition of such motion.

"3. Nominations confirmed or rejected by the Senate shall not be returned by the Secretary to the President until the expiration of the time limited for making a motion to reconsider the same, or while a motion to reconsider is pending, unless otherwise ordered by the Senate.

"4. When the Senate shall adjourn or take a recess for more than thirty days, all motions to reconsider a vote upon a nomination which has been confirmed or rejected by the Senate, which shall be pending at the time of taking such adjournment or recess, shall fall; and the Secretary shall return all such nominations to the President as confirmed or rejected by the Senate, as the case may be.

"5. Nominations neither confirmed nor rejected during the session at which they are made shall not be acted upon at any succeeding session without being again made to the Senate by the President; and if the Senate shall adjourn or take a recess for more than thirty days, all nominations pending and not finally acted upon at the time of taking such adjournment or recess shall be returned by the Secretary to the President, and shall not again be considered unless they shall again be made to the Senate by the President.

"RULE XXXVII

"THE PRESIDENT FURNISHED WITH COPIES OF RECORDS OF EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

"The President of the United States shall, from time to time, be furnished with an authenticated transcript of the executive records of the Senate, but no further extract from the Executive Journal shall be furnished by the Secretary, except by special order of the Senate; and no paper, except original treaties transmitted to the Senate by the President of the United States, and finally acted upon by the Senate, shall be delivered from the office of the Secretary without an order of the Senate for that purpose.

"RULE XXXVIII

"CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

"1. A majority of the Senate members of a committee of conference shall have indicated by their votes their sympathy with the bill as passed and their concurrence in the prevailing opinion of the Senate on the matters in disagreement with the House of Representatives which occasion the appointment of the committee.

"2. The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order except if a question of order or a motion to adjourn is pending, or which the Senate is dividing; and when received, the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put, and shall be determined without debate.

"3. Conferees shall not insert in their report matter not committed to them by either House, nor shall they strike from the bill matter agreed to by both Houses. If new matter is inserted in the report, or if matter which was agreed to by both Houses is stricken from the bill, a point of order may be made against the report, and if the point of order is sustained, the report shall be recommitted to the committee of conference.

"4. Every report of a committee of conference shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the Senate conferees sufficiently explicit to inform the Senate what effect such amendments or propositions as the conference shall have agreed to will have upon the measures to which they relate. The statement shall be in writing and shall be signed by at least a majority of the Senate conferees.

"5. (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

"(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order.

"RULE XXXIX

"MESSAGES; MATTER FROM THE PRESIDENT AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"1. Messages from the President of the United States or from the House of Representatives may be received at any stage of proceedings, except while the Senate is dividing, or while a question of order or a motion to adjourn is pending.

"2. Messages shall be sent to the House of Representatives by the Secretary, who shall previously certify the determination of the Senate upon all bills, joint resolutions, and other resolutions which may be communicated to the House, or in which its concurrence may be requested; and the Secretary shall also certify and deliver to the President of the United States all resolutions and other communications which may be directed to him by the Senate.

"3. The Presiding Officer may at any time lay, and it shall be in order at any time for a Senator to move to lay, before the Senate, any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Represenatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose. Any motion so made shall be determined without debate.

"RULE XL

"PRINTING OF PAPERS, ETC.

"1. Every motion to print documents, reports, and other matter transmitted by any of the executive departments, or to print memorials, petitions, accompanying documents, or any other paper, except bills of the Senate or House of Representatives, resolutions submitted by a Senator, communications from the legislatures or conventions, lawfully called, of the respective States, and motions to print by order of the standing or select committees of the Senate, shall, unless the Senate shall otherwise order, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. When a motion is made to commit with instructions, it shall be in order to add thereto a motion to print.

"2. Motions to print additional numbers shall also be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and when the committee shall report favorably, the report shall be accompanied by an estimate of the probable cost thereof; and when the cost of printing such additional numbers shall exceed the sum of twelve hundred dollars, the concurrence of the House of Representatives shall be necessary for an order to print the same.

"3. Every bill and joint resoluiton introduced on leave or reported from a committee, and all bills and joint resolutions received from the House of Representatives, and all reports of committees, shall be printed, unless, for the dispatch of the business of the Senate, such printing may be dispensed with.

"4. Whenever a committee reports a bill or a joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof it shall make a report thereon and shall include in such report or in an accompanying document (to be prepared by the staff of such committee) (a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee. The subsection shall not apply to any such report in which it is stated that, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with the requirements of the subsection to expedite the business of the Senate.

"RULE XLI

"WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS

"1. No memorial or other paper presented to the Senate, except original treaties finally acted upon, shall be withdrawn from its files except by order of the Senate. But when an act may pass for the settlement of any private claim, the Secretary is authorized to transmit to the officer charged with the settlement the papers on file relating to the claim.

"2. No memorial or other paper upon which an adverse report has been made shall be withdrawn from the files of the Senate unless copies thereof shall be left in the office of the Secretary.

"RULE XLII

"REFERENCE OF CLAIMS CASES AND OF CLAIMS ADVERSELY REPORTED

"1. Whenever a private bill is under consideration, it shall be in order to move, as a substitute for it, a resolution of the Senate referring the case to the Court of Claims, under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, as amended.

"2. Whenever a committee of the Senate, to whom any claim has been referred, reports adversely, and the report is agreed to, it shall not be in order to move to take the papers from the files for the purpose of referring them at a subsequent session, unless the claimant shall present a petition therefor, stating that new evidence has been discovered since the report, and setting forth the substance of such new evidence. But when there has been no adverse report, it shall be the duty of the Secretary to transmit all such papers to the committee in which such claims are pending.

"RULE XLIII

"BUSINESS CONTINUED FROM SESSION TO SESSION

"1. At the second or any subsequent session of a Congress, the legislative business of the Senate which remained undetermined at the close of the next preceding session of that Congress shall be resumed and proceeded with in the same manner as if no adjournment of the Senate had taken place.

"2. The rules of the Senate shall be adopted at the beginning of each Congress on a yea and nay vote, a quorum being present. A majority of the Senators voting and present shall prevail. They may be changed at any time as provided in these rules.

"RULE XLIV

"PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

"No person shall be admitted to the floor of the Senate while in session, except as follows:

"The President of the United States and his private secretary.

"The President elect and Vice President elect of the United States.

"Ex-Presidents and ex-Vice Presidents of the United States.

"Judges of the Supreme Court.

"Ex-Senators and Senators elect.

"The officers and employees of the Senate in the discharge of their official duties.

"Ex-Secretaries and ex-Sergeants at Arms of the Senate.

"Members of the House of Representatives and Members-elect.

"Ex-Speakers of the House of Representatives.

"The Sergeant at Arms of the House and his chief deputy and the Clerk of the House and his deputy.

"Heads of the Executive Departments.

"Ambassadors and Ministers of the United States.

"Governors of States and Territories.

"Members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"Members of National Legislatures of foreign countries.

"Judges of the Court of Claims.

"Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"The Librarian of Congress and the Assistant Librarian in charge of the Law Library.

"The Architect of the Capitol.

"The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

"Clerks to Senate committees and clerks to Senators when in the actual discharge of their official duties. Clerks to Senators, to be admitted to the floor, must be regularly appointed and borne upon the rolls of the Secretary of the Senate as such.

"RULE XLV

"REGULATION OF THE SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL

"1. The Senate Chamber shall not be granted for any other purpose than for the use of the Senate; no smoking shall be permitted at any time on the floor of the Senate, or lighted cigars be brought into the Chamber.

"2. It shall be the duty of the Committee on Rules and Administration to make all rules and regulations respecting such parts of the Capitol, its passages and galleries, including the restaurant and the Senate Office Building, as are or may be set apart for the use of the Senate and its officers, to be enforced under the direction of the Presiding Officer. They shall make such regulations respecting the reporters' galleries of the Senate, together with the adjoining rooms and facilities, as will confine their occupancy and use to bona fide reporters for daily newspapers and periodicals, to bona fide reporters of news or press associations requiring telegraph service to their membership, and to bona fide reporters for daily news dissemination through radio, television, wire, wireless, and similar media of transmission. These regulations shall so provide for the use of such space and facilities as fairly to distribute their use to all such media of news dissemination.

"RULE XLVI

"SUSPENSION AND AMENDMENT OF THE RULES

"No motion to suspend, modify, or amend any rule, or any part thereof, shall be in order, except on one day's notice in writing, specifying precisely the rule or part proposed to be suspended, modified, or amended, and the purpose thereof. These rules may be amended by a majority vote, but a two-thirds vote of the Senators present, a quorum being present, is required for their suspension. Any rule may be suspended without notice by the unanimous consent of the Senate, except as otherwise provided in clause 1, Rule XXVII.

"RULE XLVII

"DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

"1. Each individual who at any time during any calendar year serves as a Member of the Senate, or as an officer or employee of the Senate compensated at a gross rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, shall file with the Secretary of the Senate for that calendar year a written report containing the following information:

"(a) The fair market value of each asset having a fair market value of $5,000 or more held by him or by his spouse or by him and his spouse jointly, exclusively of any dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family, at the end of that calendar year;

"(b) The amount of each liability in excess of $5,000 owed by him or by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly at the end of that calendar year;

"(c) The total amount of all capital gains realized, and the source and amount of each capital gain realized in any amount exceeding $5,000, during that calendar year by him or by his spouse, by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on behalf or pursuant to the direction of him or his spouse, or him and his spouse jointly, as a result of any transaction or series of related transactions in securities or commodities, or any purchase or sale of real property or any interest therein other than a dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family;

"(d) The source and amount of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from any relative or his spouse) received by or accruing to him, his spouse, or from him and his spouse jointly from any source other than the United States during that calendar year, which exceeds $100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, or other facilities received by him in kind;

"(e) The name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States in which he has a financial interest; and the name, address, and a brief description of the principal business of any client of such firm for whom any services involving representation before any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States which were performed during that calendar year, together with a brief description of the services performed, and the total fees received or receivable by the firm as compensation for such services;

"(f) The name, address, and nature of the principal business or activity of each business or financial entity or enterprise with which he was associated at any time during that calendar year as an officer, director, or partner, or in any other managerial capacity.

"2. Each asset consisting of an interest in a business or financial entity or enterprise which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name of such entity or enterprise, the location of its principal office, and the nature of the business or activity in which it is principally engaged or with which it is principally concerned, except that an asset which is a security traded on any securities exchange subject to supervision by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States may be identified by a full and complete description of the security and the name of the issuer thereof. Each liability which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name and the address of the creditor to whom the obligation of such liability is owed.

"3. Except as otherwise hereinafter provided, each individual who is required by paragraph 1 to file a report for any calendar year shall file such report with the Secretary of the Senate not later than January 31 of the next following calendar year. No such report shall be required to be made for any calendar year beginning before January 1, 1968. The requirements of this rule shall apply only with respect to individuals who are Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate on or after the date of adoption of this rule. Any individual who ceases to serve as a Member of the Senate or as an officer or employee of the Senate, before the close of any calendar year shall file such report on the last day of such service, or on such date not more than three months thereafter as the Secretary of the Senate may prescribe, and the report so made shall be made for that portion of that calendar year during which such individual so served. Whenever there is on file with the Secretary of the Senate a report made by any individual in compliance with paragraph 1 for any calendar year, the Secretary may accept from that individual for any succeeding calendar year, in lieu of the report required by paragraph 1, a certificate containing an accurate recitation of the changes in such report which are required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year, or a statement to the effect that no change in such report is required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year.

"4. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be made upon forms which shall be prepared and provided by the Secretary of the Senate, and shall be made in such manner and detail as he shall prescribe. The Secretary may provide for the grouping within such reports and certificate of items which are required by paragraph 1 to be disclosed whenever he determines that separate itemization thereof is not feasible or is not required for accurate disclosure with respect to such items. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be retained by the Secretary as public records for not less than six years after the close of the calendar year for which they are made, and while so retained shall be available for inspection by members of the public under such reasonable regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe.

"5. As used in this rule—

"(a) the term 'asset' includes any beneficial interest held or possessed directly or indirectly in any business or financial entity or enterprise, or in any security or evidence of indebtedness, but does not include any interest in any organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

"(b) the term 'liability' includes any liability of any trust in which a beneficial interest is held or possessed directly or indirectly.

"(c) the term 'income' means gross income as defined by section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(d) the term 'security' means any security as defined by section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b).

"(e) the term 'commodity' means any commodity as defined by section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2).

"(f) the term 'dealing in securities or commodities' means any acquisition, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

"(g) the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means (1) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate, (2) an employee of the Senate or any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, (3) the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and employees of his office, (4) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties, (5) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (6) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (7) an employee of a Member of the Senate if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and (8) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

"RULE XLVIII

"PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES

"1. No Member of the Senate or any officer or employee of the Senate may engage or participate in any business or financial venture, enterprise, combination, or transaction with any person, firm, or corporation which is—

"(a) engaged in any lobbying activity;

"(b) engaged for compensation in the practice of rendering advisory or public relations services relating to the securing of contracts with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof; or

"(c) engaged in, or seeking to become engaged in, the performance of any construction, manufacturing, research, development, or service contract with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof.

"2. No Member of the Senate or any officer or employee of the Senate may accept—

"(a) at any time from any individual, entity, or enterprise which is engaged in lobbying activity any gift of money, property, entertainment, travel, or any other valuable consideration in an amount or having a value in excess of $100; or

"(b) within any calendar year from any such individual, entity, or enterprise such gifts in an aggregate amount or having an aggregate value in excess of $100.

"3. No officer or employee of the Senate may be vested with or exercise any authority or responsibility for, or participate in any way in any consideration of or determination with respect to, the allocation among Members of the Senate of any funds available for use to defray expenses incurred or to be incurred by any individual for or in connection with any campaign for the nomination or election of any individual to be a Member of the Senate.

"4. As used in this rule—

"(a) the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' has the meaning given thereto by rule XLVII; and

"(b) the term 'lobbying activity' means any activity undertaken by any person other than a Member of the Congress to influence directly or indirectly the introduction, passage, defeat, amendment, or modification of any legislative measure in either House of the Congress.

"RULE XLIX

"TESTIMONY OF MEMBERS OF THE SENATE BEFORE COMMITTEES

"Whenever any standing, special, or select committee of the Senate or any joint committee of the Congress, which is engaged in any investigation within its jurisdiction, has reason to believe that the testimony of any Member of the Senate may be pertinent to such investigation, such committee, with the approval of a majority of its members (including at least one member of the minority party), by written communication may request such Member of the Senate to appear before the committee to give testimony concerning the subject matter under investigation. Such Member of the Senate shall appear before such committee in obedience to such request unless within ten days after receipt thereof he delivers to the chairman of such committee a written statement, duly signed by such Member of the Senate, stating that he is without knowledge of the subject matter under investigation.

"RULE L

"OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT

"1. No officer or employee of the Senate shall engage in any business, financial, or professional activity or employment for compensation or gain unless—

"(a) such activity or employment is not inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his official duties; and

"(b) express permission has been granted by the Members of the Senate charged with supervision of such officer or employee by this rule;

Provided, however, That in no event shall any officer or full-time employee of the Senate, without special leave of the Senate—

"(a) serve in any managerial capacity in any business or financial enterprise; or

"(b) engage in any regular professional or consulting practice, or maintain an association with any professional or consulting firm.

"2. For the purposes of this rule—

"(a) each Member of the Senate shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees;

"(b) each Member of the Senate who is the chairman of a Senate or joint committee or subcommittee shall be charged with the supervision of each employee of such committee or subcommittee;

"(c) the majority leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the majority, and the minority leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the minority;

"(d) the Vice President shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees; and

"(e) the President pro tempore shall be charged with the supervision of all other officers and employees of the Senate.

"3. As used in this rule, the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' has the meaning given thereto by rule XLVII.

"RULE LI

"The Presiding Officer shall construe these rules so as to give effect to their plain meaning. Precedents and rulings in force prior to the adoption of these rules shall not be binding in the construction of these rules."

The explanatory statement is as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN COMPREHENSIVE REVISION OF SENATE RULES PROPOSED BY SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK

"1. Journal: The Senate Journal is nothing more than a quaint anachronism which is never looked at by anyone and is read only for purposes of delay. Its place has been taken, for practical purposes by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The revision recognizes this fact, and satisfies article I, section 5, clause 3, of the Constitution, which requires each House to keep a journal of its proceedings, by stating that the Senate section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be the Senate Journal.

Since the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is printed and available to Senators each morning following a session, there is no need to have it read aloud, and the right to require that is abolished. Presumably any errors in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be corrected informally, or by unanimous consent, as they are today. But a procedure for correcting mistakes by motion, without debate, is provided for those cases in which unanimous consent cannot be obtained. Under this procedure, the Senator seeking to make the correction, and the Senator objecting to the correction may file written briefs in support of their positions for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in advance of the vote.

2. Quorums: The unrestricted right of any Senator to call for a quorum has frequently been the source of great harassment and delay. The revision circumscribes this right by requiring a Senator to declare his intention to call for a vote on the pending business once the presence of a quorum has been ascertained. Only on this condition could an individual Senator suggest the absence of a quorum. However the majority or minority leaders, or in their absence, the acting majority or minority leaders, could call for a quorum at any time. The Presiding Officer would have the duty to halt the quorum call once he ascertains the presence of a quorum in the Chamber.

3. Order of recognition: This provision codifies and elaborates the unwritten rule that the Chair will always give preference in recognition to the majority and minority leaders. In the absence of the leaders, it gives equivalent rights to any Senator designated to act in that capacity and occupying the leader's desk.

4. Germane points of order: The revision seeks to clear up the confusing situation which presently exists with regard to the right to interrupt a Senator who has the floor for the purpose of raising a point of order. It provides that a Senator may be interrupted without his consent for the purpose of raising a point of order that the Senator in possession of the floor has committed a transgression of the rules of the Senate germane to his possession of the floor.

5. Submission of speeches without delivery: Upon request, a Senator would be permitted to have his written remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in normal size print without the requirement of full oral delivery. However, the RECORD would contain a notation to the effect that the material was submitted but not delivered orally.

6. Three-hour rule: Whenever a Senator has held the floor for more than 3 consecutive hours, an objection to his continued possession of the floor, if made by any Senator, would compel him to yield the floor.

7. Germaneness of debate: The present rule, which provides for a daily 3-hour period of germane debate, would be made more flexible by the adoption of a procedure whereby a majority of the Senate, by nondebatable motion, could require further debate on the pending business to be germane to the subject matter before the Senate until the business was disposed of.

8. Points of order: This new provision would limit debate on questions of order submitted to the Senate, and debatable appeals from rulings of the Chair, to 1 hour, in all, unless the Senate orders otherwise.

9. Morning business: The morning hour rule has been revised extensively to abolish the confusing distinction between morning hour and morning business, and to dispense with the need for unanimous consent to make statements or comments of not more than 3 minutes' duration. There would be a daily period of 1 hour, if that much time should be needed, set aside at the opening of each new legislative day for the conduct of morning business. The Senate, by majority vote without debate, could extend the period for up to 1 additional hour. During this period, under the regular order of business, Senators would have the privilege of making 3-minute statements and could seek unanimous consent to have printed matter inserted in the RECORD.

10. Motions to take up: This revision would provide a means by which a Senator could convert a motion to proceed to the consideration of any measure on the Senate Calendar, which would ordinarily be debatable, into a nondebatable motion. This could be done by filing at the desk of the clerk a notice of intention to make such a motion on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session. The notice of intention would be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. Procedure for bills, joint resolutions and resolutions: This rule has been extensively rewritten both to clarify its operation, and to reduce the potential for disruption of normal legislative procedures by the objection of a single Senator. The provision by which any Senator can prevent a bill from being referred to committee, and have it placed directly on the calendar after second reading, has been eliminated. However, this may be done on motion by a majority of the Senate after 1 hour of debate, equally divided between opponents and proponents. The section permitting any Senator to force a postponement of the introduction of any bill or joint resolution for 1 day has also been eliminated.

12. Ex officio members of appropriation committee: The Senate rules presently provide for the selection of three ex officio members of the Appropriations Committee from each of eight legislative committees. These ex officio members serve on the Appropriations Committee for the limited purpose of considering annual appropriations for programs within the jurisdiction of their particular legislative committee. The revision of this rule adds five more legislative committees to this list, on the ground that they have equally valid claims to participate in appropriations decisions affecting matters within their jurisdiction. These five additional committees are: Commerce, Finance, Interior and Insular Affairs, Judiciary and Labor and Public Welfare.

13. Germaneness of amendments: This provision, which is similar to the present practice of the House of Representatives, incorporates a general prohibition against nongermane amendments. Questions of germaneness are to be decided by the Presiding Officer subject to appeal to the Senate without debate.

14. Previous question: The cumbersome and unwieldy cloture provisions of rule XXII would be deleted by this revision. In their place would be substituted a split-level motion for the previous question, by which a majority of Senators present and voting could terminate debate: (1) on any motion or amendment to a measure pending before the Senate after that motion or amendment has received 15 hours of consideration on not less than 3 calendar days; or (2) on the measure itself, together with any motions or amendments relating to it, after the measure plus all related motions and amendments has received consideration for 15 calendar days.

If the previous question is ordered, 1 hour of debate equally divided between opponents and proponents, would be allowed as to any motion or amendment encompassed by the motion for the previous question, and 4 hours, divided in the same manner, would be allowed on final passage. Unlike the cloture procedure under which Senators may call up for a vote after cloture any germane amendment which has previously been presented and read, this procedure would limit consideration after the previous question had been ordered to amendments embraced by the motion. All other amendments would be deemed rejected.

15. Voting: Two additions have been made to the existing rule, both for the purpose of codifying existing practice: (1) A demand for the yeas and nays, when seconded by 11 Senators, shall be sufficient to require a roll-call vote; and (2) Senators entering the Chamber after their names have been called may obtain recognition from the Presiding

Officer and have their votes recorded prior to the announcement of the vote.

16. Selection and retirement of committee chairmen: Chairmen of standing committees would be chosen by secret ballot of the majority members of the committee at the beginning of each new Congress. In addition, no Senator would be permitted to serve as chairman of a standing committee after he has attained the age of 70.

17. Jurisdiction of committees: The jurisdiction of the Senate Committees on Finance, Banking and Currency, Foreign Relations, Commerce, and Labor and Public Welfare would be shifted to provide a more logical and equitable division of responsibility. In addition, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration would be enlarged in accordance with Senate Resolution 338, to include violations of the rules of the Senate. The Rules Committee would also be given the power to recommend appropriate disciplinary action, including reprimand, censure, suspension or expulsion from office or employment after making findings of fact and conclusions and after according notice and an opportunity for a hearing to any individual concerned.

18. Limit on committee memberships: The present rule which limits Senators to membership on not more than two major and one minor committee contains a grandfather clause making an exception for members of the Government Operations and Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committees. As a result, some Senators serve on as many as four major and one minor committee. This revision would strike the exception, and make up the difference by reducing slightly committee memberships. The Appropriations Committee would be reduced from 27 to 24 members. Of the remaining major committees, 10 would be cut back from 17 to 15 members, and two would be cut back from 15 to 13 members.

19. Committee meetings during Senate sessions: Although standing committees may now sit without special leave during the period while morning business is conducted, a single Senator still has the power to prevent every standing committee and every subcommittee of a standing committee from meeting while the Senate is in session after the close of morning business. The sole purpose of this revision is to implement the intention of the drafters of the Legislative Reorganization Act by stating that a committee may obtain leave to sit while the Senate is in session by a privileged, nondebatable motion.

20. Committee bill of rights: A majority of the members of each standing committee would be authorized, in addition to the procedures now provided in individual committee rules, to convene meetings; to direct the initiation, conduct, and termination of hearings; to call up bills for consideration; and to terminate debate in committee after a measure has received committee consideration in executive session for a total of 5 hours.

21. Instructions to report on major legislative matters: Although it is axiomatic that the committees of the Senate are its creatures and agents, no procedures presently exist by which the Senate can exercise its authority in a fair, orderly, and effective manner.

The rules do presently provide for a motion to discharge a committee from further consideration of a measure. But this motion cannot be used to secure committee consideration of a subject, nor does it provide a device for obtaining a committee's recommendations. Moreover, such a motion can be filibustered, since it is debatable.

This proposal remedies these defects by creating a privileged motion to denominate any measure pending in committee or subcommittee as a "major legislative matter." This motion would be nondebatable, provided that a notice of intention to make such a motion had been presented on the previous calendar day, and printed in the Congressional Record.

Debate on the motion would be limited to 8 hours, the time to be divided equally between opponents and proponents. Such motion, if carried by a majority of Senators present and voting, would constitute an instruction to the committee in which the measure was then pending to report it to the Senate within 30 calendar days, by poll or otherwise, with the recommendation (a) that it be passed, or (b) that it not be passed, or (c) that it be passed with amendments, stating the recommended amendments.

22. Selection of conferees and explanatory statement: A majority of the Senate members of a conference committee would have to be chosen from those who indicated by their votes their concurrence with the prevailing view in the Senate on matters in disagreement with the House. Senate conferees would be required to prepare a statement explaining the action of the conference, just as the managers on the part of the House are required to do under the House rules.

23. Adoption of rules for each Congress: The provision continuing the rules of the Senate from one Congress to the next Congress would be deleted, and a majority of Senators present and voting would be empowered to adopt rules at the beginning of each Congress.

24. Disclosure of financial interests: This new rule, which was offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the disclosure resolution favorably reported by the Rules Committee earlier in the year, would require every Senator and every Senate officer or employee compensated at a gross rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, to file a financial report each year. The report would contain the following kinds of information:

a. Assets: The identity and fair market value of any asset having a fair market value of $5,000 or more.

b. Liabilities: The amount of each liability in excess of $5,000, and the name and address of the creditor.

c. Capital gains: Source and amount of all capital gains realized in the preceding calendar year in excess of $5,000.

d. Income: Source and amount of every item of income for the calendar year in excess of $100, including gifts other than gifts from a relative.

e. Assets belonging to a trust; assets, liabilities, capital gains, and income of a spouse; and capital gains earned through a strawman are all covered. Family homes and tax-exempt charitable entities are exempted.

f. Association with a professional firm which practices before Federal Government agencies.

g. Service as director, officer, or manager in a business enterprise.

25. Relations with lobbyists: This is another new rule which was offered as an amendment to the Rules Committee proposals. It prohibits Senators, and Senate officers and employees from engaging in joint ventures with lobbyists, and from accepting gifts worth more than $100 from lobbyists.

26. Testimony of Senators before committees: This new rule, also offered as an amendment to the Rules Committee conflict-of-interest resolution, would grant authority to any duly authorized committee of the Senate to request any Senator to come before it and give any pertinent testimony it has reason to believe he can give on the subject matter under investigation. A Senator receiving such a request would be required to appear and give testimony, unless within 10 days he delivers to the chairman of the committee a signed statement to the effect that he is without knowledge of the subject matter under investigation.

The Rules Committee would have the power to investigate breaches of this rule, and to recommend appropriate disciplinary action, including reprimand, censure, suspension, or expulsion.

27. Moonlighting by Senate employees: This rule was also a part of the omnibus substitute amendment offered to the Rules Committee resolution. It would prohibit officers and full-time employees of the Senate from serving in any managerial capacity in any business or financial enterprise, or engaging in any regular professional or consulting practice, or maintaining an association with any professional or consulting firm without special leave of the Senate. In addition, it would permit moonlighting only if two conditions are met: (1) the activity or employment must not be inconsistent with the conscientious performance of the officer or employee's official duties; and (2) express permission must have been given by the Member of the Senate charged with the supervision of the officer or employee. For the purposes of this rule, each Senator would be responsible for supervising his own staff; chairmen of committees would supervise committee staffs; the majority and minority leaders and the Vice President would supervise their own employees; and the President pro tempore would be charged with the supervision of all other officers and employees of the Senate.

PROPOSALS REQUIRING CONCURRENT ACTION OF BOTH HOUSES

1. Appropriations Committee procedures: House and Senate Appropriations Committees would be authorized to hold joint hearings and half of the appropriations bills each year would originated in each Chamber to expedite congressional business. (S. Con. Res. 28, introduced by Senator Clark on March 7, 1963, and pending in Rules Committee.)

2. Separate session for appropriations: (S. 2198, introduced by Senator Magnuson, and cosponsored by Senators Clark, Neuberger, and Hart; pending in Rules Committee.) This bill would divide the annual session of Congress into two parts: a "legislative session" which would begin on January 3 of each year and end not later than the first Monday in November; and a "fiscal session" beginning on the second Monday in November and ending not later than December 31. Under the proposed procedure, Congress would devote the early session to substantive legislation including authorizations. It could then recess for the summer and come back in November to deal with appropriations. The bill also changes the fiscal year to make it correspond with the calendar year, so that all appropriations bills will be enacted before the beginning of the fiscal year to which they pertain.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, recent developments in the House of Representatives with respect to the war on poverty and legislative authorizations, and indeed appropriations, for that most necessary war, have indicated an opinion on the part of some of our colleagues in the House of Representatives that the war on poverty has not been a success; that it is vulnerable in terms of support by the constituents of the Members of the House of Representatives; and that, therefore, a political field day can be had at the expense of the war cn poverty by chopping it to pieces, refusing to permit the employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity to receive the pay raise which the House has joyously voted for all other Federal employees, and cutting back, as it did yesterday, the appropriations for the poverty war to a far greater extent than other appropriations—indeed, as I understand it, chopping an additional $500 million out of those appropriations for the current fiscal year, reducing the appropriations which were eventually passed from a figure of around $1,650,000,000 to $1,200,000,000 or less.

My purpose in raising this question on the floor of the Senate today, before we take up the drastic action of the House of Representatives in the cutting of domestic expenditures at an extraordinary session last night, is to give tongue, if you will, to my view that our friends in the other body vastly underestimate the strong public support, all over the country, for the war on poverty.

If I am right, our colleagues will come to regret the precipitate action taken last night.

VISTA WORKS QUIETLY FOR A BETTER AMERICA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the past summer was not the best of summers for Americans who are happy to serve their country and their fellow men in quiet, unobtrusive ways. The headlines have gone to those who set whole neighborhoods ablaze with incendiary words and incendiary Molotov cocktails. Television has seemed preoccupied with the handful of individuals who denounced their country and preached sedition from Communist havens in Cuba and Hanoi.

But for all their sound and fury they actually do amount to only a handful of demagogs who are already repudiated by the vast majority of Americans of all races, creeds, and national origins.

But while this treacherous handful was ranting and rabble rousing, many Americans this summer were quietly, peacefully and devotedly building better towns and cities, a better Nation. They were, in fact, building a more encompassing and more enduring American brotherhood.

I speak particularly, Mr. President, of the self-sacrificing and self-effacing men and women, and boys and girls, who are the warriors in our country's war on poverty. Their unsung accomplishments are creating a better world for all of us, a world of pervading social and economic justice. Among these antipoverty warriors, I would like to single out today the VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America.

The story of what the VISTA volunteers have done and are doing at Maple Lodge, the former resort home of the world-famous philosopher John Dewey near Pittsburgh, deserves the widest possible audience. And the VISTA young people, themselves, deserve our praise and heartfelt thanks for what they are doing in this instance and other instances.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record an article in VISTA and the Maple Lodge Camp, which appeared in a recent issue of the Pittsburgh Point, a weekly newspaper, which comments from time to time on matters of importance to the greater Pittsburgh metropolitan area, and is a splendid weekly, always containing perceptive and stimulating articles.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Maple Lodge Camp: A Success Story

(By Carl Gershman)

Just a little over a month ago a short article appeared in this newspaper describing a place called Maple Lodge. Some VISTA workers in Pittsburgh were trying to get a camp under way there, and a request was made for financial assistance. At the time the project seemed to many people like another good idea that was doomed to falter on the traditional stumbling blocks of insufficient funds and talent. But to the pleasant surprise of everybody, Maple Lodge Camp is now a going concern, complete with children, adults, horses, dogs, a chicken that lays an egg a day, and a sheep named Beeswing.

In days past Maple Lodge was the resort home of the famous American philosopher and educator John Dewey and his wife. Situated on a beautiful 45-acre estate, the lodge was an ideal place where Dewey could study and write. There also the Dewey's entertained some of Western Pennsylvania's most eminent citizens. Since Dewey died, in 1952, the lodge has had only limited use, although its history is remembered with pride by the residents of the small neighboring town of Slickville, who still talk of the beautiful flowers and the "fine people."

About two years ago Mrs. Dewey offered to lease Maple Lodge for a dollar a year to the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources. It was her understanding that the Mayor's Committee, the administrative body of the poverty program in Pittsburgh, would both pay the $1300 annual insurance fee for the property and develop a program that would enable some of the city's less privileged children to take advantage of her former home. In 1965 The Mayor's Committee was able to satisfy the first criterion with a federal grant, but somehow it never accomplished the more demanding task of developing a program. With the 1966 cutback in federal funds, the grant for the insurance was lost; and as the lodge had not been used in the past, it was decided not to raise the money privately but to give up the property.

In February of this year, some two months before the lease was to run out, a VISTA from Homewood-Brushton took a group of ten children out to the estate. That Saturday was one of the coldest days of the year, but the children didn't seem to mind. According to the kids, the Dewey property was one of the "baddest" places they had ever been to, and they were all for coming back again on the following Saturday.

Each Saturday new VISTAs organized car pools to make the 30-mile trek out to Maple Lodge. As the weather got warmer, the kids started playing in the small creek that runs by the house. One VISTA even brought two large families out, and it is still uncertain whether or not the parents enjoyed the outing more than the kids. The Dewey property was never referred to as such back in the neighborhoods. Some called it "the farm," others "East Pittsburgh," but to most it was simply "the country," and soon the VISTAs were not able to satisfy all the requests to go there.

When the VISTAs learned of the Mayor's Committee's decision to give up the property, they were surprised as well as disappointed. Many parents and children suggested that the $1300 needed to keep the property be raised through car-washes and bake-sales. One thing was clear to everybody—that under no circumstances should the property be lost.

In April several of the VISTAs got together to draw up a proposal for the use of the property, with the objective that if presented to the Board of Directors of the Mayor's Committee, they would not simply change their vote but also assist in raising the funds. The proposal outlined an eight-week-VISTA-supervised summer camp for children—one week for each of the eight poverty neighborhoods—as well as weekends devoted to leadership seminars for teenagers, classes for un-wed mothers, and short vacations for the elderly. When it was presented to the Board there was some grumbling about alleged VISTA immorality in New Mexico, and lack of proper supervision, but in the end the Board gave its unanimous approval for the idea, on the understanding that the VISTAs would raise the money.

Things started slowly, as it was hoped the money might be coming from a local foundation. When no money did come, a candy-sale was organized in which the children and the VISTAs, with the help of some friends from the middle-class neighborhoods, raised $1000. Mrs. Dewey sent a contribution of $450, and a group of junior high school kids from Squirrel hill netted another $100 with a picnic. The Point article also brought in some money, and soon the whole project was underway.

Chuck Koloms, chairman of the VISTA Council, contacted Jean Vondracek, who has had considerable experience with camps as well as with the Summerhill School. After seeing the estate she volunteered to run the camp, while Koloms was to take care of all matters concerning money, transportation, and enrollment. Much fixing up was needed at the property, and during the month of June an enormous amount of labor was devoted to that purpose. The grass was cut, the garage was transformed into an arts and crafts center, and the main house was thoroughly cleaned, as were the creek and the fields, to make certain that there were no dangerous objects lying about. Virgil Walters, a neighboring farmer who said he's for "any place for kids to play," brought his tractor down and cut the grass on the fields that for years had been left untouched. On one Saturday, through Bob Pease of the Urban Redevelopment Authority, 15 teenagers from the URA came out to help. Pease also arranged for Richard Mellon to donate a tractor.

While all this was going on the Mayor's Committee submitted a request to Washington for OEO summer funds and for government surplus food. The camp was to begin on July 3, and it was not until June 30 that the money came in from Washington—not $5000, as requested, but $7000. This was in addition to some money that the Mayor's Committee had already allotted the project. And so the camp did begin as planned, as 12 girls from Homewood-Brushton, aged 11–14, accompanied by two VISTAs, arrived at Maple Lodge on the morning of July 3.

Judy Nelson and Linnea Hendrickson, the two VISTAs, realized that to adhere rigidly to program they had planned would be phony. The activities were determined by the children after they had felt out the place and adjusted to its mood of freedom and peacefulness. At any time during the day some children would be painting or making candles at the arts and crafts center, others might be catching minnows down at the creek or fooling around in the water, and still others might be riding horses or playing with Beeswing. If somebody wanted to do nothing that was all right also.

Everything is very personal at Maple Lodge. The number of children is small (Mrs. Vondracek's four children stay there in addition to the kids brought by the VISTAs), and they know each other, as well as the VISTAs, before coming. The experience is one of individuals living in community. Mrs. Vondracek described this as letting "each one do as he pleases" without ever violating the rights of others. For example, the first night some children wanted to listen to the radio while others wanted to sleep. The solution was simply to play the radio quietly. Acting as the devil's advocate, I asked Mrs. Vondracek:

if the group decided to do a certain thing and one person did not care to participate, would not this be a case of lack of adjustment? She replied, "Adjustment to what?"

It would be wrong to imply that anarchy reigns at Maple Lodge. The children asked that they be trusted with responsibility and not merely be ordered to do things as they are at home and at school. The trust was given and they were remarkably responsible. They abided by all the health and safety rules and imposed discipline on themselves. The work required of them was divided into four chores which were assigned on a rotating basis to four groups of four children each. As the kids regarded Maple Lodge as their own home as well as somebody else's, they were very thorough in doing their chores. One girl called the place "a home away from home."

The group activities that were planned were attended by everybody. There were cook-outs, movies, and story-telling. One night Becky Coker, a detached youth-worker from the Y on the Northside, came out to show a film on human reproduction. A box for write-in questions was set aside so that the children could ask impersonally about things they might otherwise have been embarrassed to mention. There was little giggling during the discussion after the film. On the contrary, the children participated in a mature discussion of a very serious subject. One girl wrote in, "I have no question but thank you for taking the trouble to come out and speak to us."

There are many things planned for Maple Lodge. The camp is still only in experimental stages, but as its founders are learning, there is joy in discovery. One still pressing need is someone to help with the cooking so that some of the pressure can be taken off Mrs Vondracek. (If anyone is interested in giving this assistance, contact Curt Roemele at the Mayor's Committee, 261–5191.) On the last weekend in July there will be a teenage leadership workshop. About 20 teenagers will come out for a weekend of seminars with community leaders from Pittsburgh on such subjects as "The New Face of Politics in America," "Civil Rights and the Law," and "Careers." Hopefully these workshops can become a regular program.

It is, of course, still too early to assess the success of Maple Lodge Camp in terms of its effect on the children or as an experiment in communal living. Judging by the quiet satisfaction of those who have worked to make it a reality, as well as by the sometimes not-so-quiet reaction of the children who have attended it, it would seem that the prospects for success are considerable. All of the children at the camp come from poverty areas, many from Pittsburgh's crowded ghettoes. Out at the camp, however, the burden of poverty and distinction of race seem irrelevant. They are forgotten, if only temporarily, in the solitude of the surroundings and in the uncompromised individuality of community life. It's a safe bet that if John Dewey were alive, he would approve of the use being given his former home.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2310) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol Buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PRESERVATION OF SAFETY WITHIN THE U.S. CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2310.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2310) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes", approved July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193a; D.C. Code 9–118), is amended by—

(1) inserting therein, immediately after the words "book 127, page 8,", the words "including all additions added thereto by law subsequent to June 25, 1946,"; and

(2) striking out the words "as defined on the aforementioned map".

(b) Section 6 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193f; D.C. Code 9–123) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons—

"(1) Except as authorized by regulations which shall be promulgated by the Capitol Police Board:

"(A) to carry on or have readily accessible to the person of any individual upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings any firearm, dangerous weapon, explosive, or incendiary device; or

"(B) to discharge any firearm or explosive, to use any dangerous weapon, or to ignite any incendiary device, upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings; or

"(C) to transport by any means upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings any explosive or incendiary device; or

"(2) Knowingly, with force and violence, to enter or to remain upon the floor of either House of the Congress.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons willfully and knowingly—

"(1) to enter or to remain upon the floor of either House of the Congress, to enter or to remain in any cloakroom or lobby adjacent to such floor, or to enter or to remain in the Rayburn Room of the House or the Marble Room of the Senate, unless such person is authorized, pursuant to rules adopted by that House or pursuant to authorization given by that House, to enter or to remain upon such floor or in such cloakroom, lobby, or room;

"(2) to enter or to remain in the gallery of either House of the Congress in violation of rules governing admission to such gallery adopted by that House or pursuant to authorization given by that House;

"(3) to enter or to remain in any room within any of the Capitol Buildings set aside or designated for the use of either House of the Congress or any Member, committee, subcommittee, officer, or employee of the Congress or either House thereof with intent to disrupt the orderly conduct of official business;

"(4) to utter loud, threatening, or abusive language, or to engage in any disorderly or disruptive conduct, at any place upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings with intent to impede, disrupt, or disturb the orderly conduct of any session of the Congress or either House thereof, or the orderly conduct within any such building of any hearing before, or any deliberations of, any committee or subcommittee of the Congress or either House thereof;

"(5) to obstruct, or to impede passage through or within, the United States Capitol Grounds or any of the Capitol Buildings;

"(6) to engage in any act of physical violence upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings; or

"(7) to parade, demonstrate, or picket within any of the Capitol Buildings.

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall forbid any act of any Member of the Congress, or any employee of a Member of the Congress, any officer or employee of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, or any officer or employee of either House of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, which is performed in the lawful discharge of his official duties."

(c) Section 8 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193h; D.C. Code 9–125) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. (a) Any violation of section 6(a) of this Act, and any attempt to commit any such violation, shall be a felony punishable by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or imprisonment not exceeding five years, or both.

"(b) Any violation of sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6(b), or 7 of this Act, and any attempt to commit any such violation, shall be a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding $500, or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

"(c) Violations of this Act, including attempts or conspiracies to commit such violations, shall be prosecuted by the United States attorney or his assistants in the name of the United States. None of the general laws of the United States and none of the laws of the District of Columbia shall be superseded by any provision of this Act. Where the conduct violating this Act also violates the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia, both violations may be joined in a single prosecution. Prosecution for any violation of section 6(a) or for conduct which constitutes a felony under the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia shall be in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. All other prosecutions for violations of the Act may be in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions. Whenever any person is convicted of a violation of this Act and of the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia, in a prosecution under this subsection, the penalty which may be imposed for such violation is the highest penalty authorized by any of the laws for violation of which the defendant is convicted."

(d) Section 16(a) of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193m; D.C. Code 9–132) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 16. (a) As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'Capitol Buildings' means the United States Capitol, the Senate and House Office Buildings and garages, the Capitol power plant, all subways and enclosed passages connecting two or more of such structures, and the real property underlying and enclosed by any such structure.

"(2) The term 'firearm' shall have the same meaning as when used in section 1(3) of the Federal Firearms Act (52 Stat. 1252, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 901(3)).

"(3) The term 'dangerous weapon' includes all articles enumerated in section 14(a) of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 654, as amended; D.C. Code 22–3214(a)) and also any device designed to expel or hurl a projectile capable of causing injury to persons or property, daggers, dirks, stilettoes, and knives having blades over three inches in length.

"(4) The term 'explosive' shall have the same meaning as when used in section 1(1) of the Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat 385, as amended; 50 U.S.C. 121).

"(5) The term 'act of physical violence' means any act involving (1) an assault or any other infliction or threat of infliction of death or bodily harm upon any individual, or (2) damage to or destruction of any real property or personal property."

Sec. 2. Section 15 of the Act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; 40 U.S.C. 101; D.C. Code 4–120, 22–3111), is amended by deleting "shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50.", and inserting in lieu thereof: "shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

Sec. 3. Prosecutions for violations of the Act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193a et seq., D.C. Code 9–118 et seq.) and of section 15 of the Act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; D.C. Code 4–120, 22–3111), occurring prior to the enactment of these amendments shall not be affected by these amendments or abated by reason thereof. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to violations occurring after its enactment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 20, 1967, at 12 noon.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 19, 1967:

U.S. Attorney

K. Edwin Applegate, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years, vice Richard P. Stein, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 19, 1967:

Administrative Conference of the United States

Jerre S. Williams, of Texas, to be Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States for a term of 5 years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Our Friend Sam Davenport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, though Sam Davenport is no longer officially associated with the Congress, we often think of him and his splendid service to the membership. Most of us perhaps will always remember Sam as connected with the Office of the Coordinator of Information. We know how faithful and dedicated he was to duty. While here he answered thousands of our questions and inquiries annually. He often answered the phone himself and would often bring a reply in person so as to explain more fully.

He was devoted to the House as a great American institution. He loved the House and respected it as the most direct representation the people have in our democracy. Sam Davenport was well aware that a Congressman not only had to legislate, but he has to perform tasks for his individual constituents. He realized that a Congressman was no more effective than his political strength back home.

While serving us here Sam was courteous, sympathetic, and kind. He is a true gentleman.

I first knew Sam not as one to provide the answer to our difficult questions, but as an unofficial member of the House Christian Breakfast Group. In the old 80th Congress Sam was there every Thursday morning and this is where I first learned to know, respect, and admire him. He is a Christian soldier who fervently believes that Christianity is the answer to our complex modern-day problems. He is truly one of the finest men it has ever been my privilege to know.

While Sam is no longer officially associated with the Congress, he will continue to be of service to his country and to his fellow man.

Mrs. Dorn and my staff join with me in wishing for Sam and his family the very best always.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, 188 years ago, the cause of freedom lost an outstanding general in Casimir Pulaski.

After a courageous, but unsuccessful struggle against Russian control of his own beloved Poland, this great Polish patriot learned of the American Revolutionary War, and immediately volunteered his services in our fight for independence.

The dedication with which he performed his self-imposed duty to defend our right to freedom and democracy inspired troops at Brandywine, Germantown, Valley Forge, and finally at Savannah, where he gave his life for the most important cause in the world—freedom.

For his courage, his dedication, and his adherence to principle against all odds, America shall never forget General Pulaski, nor the significant contribution he made toward our struggle for democracy.

Treatment of Prisoners of War in North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, recent releases of news concerning American military personnel held captive in North Vietnam starkly point out some facts which should be spread before the American public and the peoples of the entire world.

The conditions under which our young men exist as prisoners appear to be adequate by North Vietnamese standards and on that basis Hanoi claims that it is giving the prisoners humane treatment.

Humane treatment covers more than getting barely enough to eat and having a leaky roof over one's head. These men have families and they are naturally concerned for their families' welfare.

Hanoi has consistently refused to announce the names of the prisoners it is holding. Out of the more than 200 American prisoners the Department of Defense believes to be held in North Vietnam, Hanoi has released the identity of less than 100. By no stretch of the imagination can this be called humane treatment.

Some of the correspondents who have visited North Vietnam have been told that the prisoners are free to write to their families. This is a gross misstatement. I am informed that less than 75 prisoners have been permitted to send letters and post cards to their families, and these only very infrequently.

It is certainly not a very humane captor who will keep from the families of the prisoners knowledge of their fate and condition, especially since this knowledge can have no conceivable effect on the course of the fighting.

Those who oppose the U.S. presence in Vietnam and who are apologists for Hanoi should ponder whether their support of and sympathy for the North Vietnamese position is really merited in view of this kind of treatment being meted out to those of our men who have fallen into the hands of these Communist sadists.

FMC Corp. Contributes Another Advance for Our Military Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am especially interested in new developments of equipment and materiel to be used by the Armed Forces of the United States. I am pleased to say that a firm in my district, the Ordnance Division of FMC Corp., has earned the reputation for producing tracked vehicles which have constantly improved in efficiency and which have been produced at lower proportionate costs to the Department of Defense.

A ceremony is being held today in San Jose, Calif., commemorating acceptance of the first prototype of a new assault amphibian for the Marine Corps. This new tracked vehicle is designated LVTPX-12. Designed to be launched from offshore ships, it travels through rough seas and plunging surf, and continues over-the-beach and inland, carrying 25 combat-ready troops or 10,000 pounds of cargo, at speeds in excess of 8 miles per hour on water and 40 miles per hour on land.

The amphibian is the result of coordinated effort by the Marine Corps, the Naval Ship Systems Command, and FMC Corp., to develop a family of landing vehicles to replace the current LVTP5 family of amphibians developed during the early 1950's.

Acceptance of the initial prototype marks a major milestone in the development program. This prototype is the first of 15 being built for testing and evaluation in order to demonstrate the ability of the design to meet the stringent requirements of the Marine Corps in all extremes of climate, terrain, and operational service.

The FMC Corp. of San Jose, Calif., was awarded the development contract, on the basis of competitive bidding, by the Naval Ship Systems Command.

Water jet propulsion is a new feature in the LVTPX-12. Tests show an impressive improvement in water speed and maneuverability. Tests to date indicate the LVTPX-12 will have the reliability and low maintenance requirements so essential in combat and will have the lowest operational cost of any vehicle for its size and weight.

FMC has extensive experience in the military amphibian field. The Marine Corps first landing vehicle was developed by FMC in 1941. This was followed by a construction program in which the company built over 11,000 LVT's in several different models during World War II. Since then, FMC has made many significant contributions which have provided effective, low-cost military vehicles for our Armed Forces.

The M-113 vehicle family used so extensively by the U.S. Army in Vietnam was developed and is being produced by FMC at a cost lower than any previous personnel carrier. Deadline time on the M-113 in Vietnam has proven to be lower than any other wheeled or tracked vehicle being used in that war.

If past experience is repeated we have reason to hope that the LVTPX-12 will soon be furnishing the same low cost service to the Marine Corps that is now provided by the M-113 family of vehicles.

The engineers, executives, and all personnel of FMC are to be congratulated for providing the Nation's fighting forces with another significant step forward.

Bernard Marson: A Brilliant Architect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is undergoing a major transformation as block after block of new construction—new buildings of all types rise to provide a far better environment for all of our people.

This reshaping of our urban areas is a vital part of the lives of each and every one of us. If the city planning is done intelligently and with imagination, we can all point to far better lives.

One of the young architects who is certainly making a striking impression in this field is Bernard Marson. A brilliant designer with great imagination, Mr. Marson has designed industrial, residential, commercial, and medical buildings.

He has the courage of his convictions; namely, that architects have a major responsibility to society. They must not only plan structures that are economically feasible and practical, but must strive to improve the esthetics of the community. They must plan with vision and with a sense of creation. They must attempt to bring beauty into the lives of the community, while not losing the essential functional aspect of their structure.

Mr. Marson, whose work has been singled out repeatedly by the New York Times, is typical of the young, capable architects who our Nation must encourage. For in their hands rests much of the future of our country and its growth.

Pulaski: The American Freedom Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join in hailing the 188th anniversary of the passing of the great Polish leader and patriot, Casimir Pulaski, who gave his life for this country in our early battle for independence and freedom.

This great fighter for personal liberty was born in Poland in the year 1748. At a very early age, under the leadership of his father, he fought in the Polish uprising against Russian control of his own country after the partition had been decreed by Germany, Russia, and Austria.

Fighting against organized tyranny at great odds, Pulaski and his noble compatriots were defeated and crushed by the Russians but this misfortune did not dim his resolution to fight for human freedom.

His father and brother had been lost in the battle for Poland but Pulaski was resolute. Visiting the great Benjamin Franklin in Paris and learning of the urgent need for trained leaders and soldiers in the American Revolutionary War, this great lover of freedom traveled to the United States and contacted General Washington and immediately took up the fight for American independence.

He fought gallantly in the Battle of Brandywine, was commissioned a brigadier general by Congress and given command of the entire American cavalry.

For 2 years this intrepid Polish hero and freedom fighter furnished superb leadership to the cavalry and struggled and fought gallantly against the enemy.

Finally, during the siege of Savannah, he was seriously wounded and within a few days he died, a martyr for the cause of freedom, while still in the bloom of youth at the age of 31.

He was hailed by all the leaders of the American Revolution who regarded him truly as one of their own and throughout the years he was paid high tributes of gratitude, honor and affection, by the American Government and people.

Hailed and saluted as a hero who gave his life for his country, many memorials and monuments were constructed throughout the Nation in his honor and his name is inscribed in the rolls of the martyred dead who gave up their lives in the bloody struggle to institute American liberty, human rights and freedom, under God, in this country.

It is a curious irony that the homeland of the great Pulaski is still crushed and held in the iron grip of tyranny and oppression against which he struggled in his early years.

After all these years, gallant Poland and its noble people have been in the vanguard of almost every struggle for freedom, yet they are still unliberated and held in bondage by Russian imperialist oppressors.

Even now, during our bitter struggles in Vietnam, Russian imperialism is giving comfort and aid to the aggressive designs and activities of Communist governments that are opposing the liberation of oppressed peoples in Asia.

The Communists profess peace but give it only lipservice. If they would stop sending Mig aircraft, large guns of all kinds, and even missile systems of various kinds and military materiel, supplies, and equipment of almost every kind in support of the North Vietnamese, the present conflict could not be carried on for 2 weeks and would collapse of its own weight.

Let there be no misunderstanding on the part of the American people or anyone else that it is only because of the support of Russia that this bloody war is being continued and I hope and pray that the Russian Government will accede to the pleas of this Nation and all humanity for peace, based on collective security in the world.

The great Pulaski will always be gratefully remembered by the American people of every generation. His spirit still lives and always will live because it is the spirit of freedom and dignity of man, the spirit breathed into the soul of every human being when he or she comes into this world, implanted in the breast not only of Americans but of all peoples, the spirit that does not recognize the oppression and exploitation of others, the spirit that seeks freedom and justice for all.

This was the spirit of Casimir Pulaski who gave his life for American independence and freedom for all.

As we again turn our thoughts with gratitude and deep appreciation to recollections of this great Polish hero's supreme sacrifice for this Nation and for freedom, let us resolve that his sacrifice and that of so many millions of boys throughout the world who died to defend and to enthrone freedom for all, shall not be in vain.

As we honor the great Pulaski, let us renew our determination to hold firm to the ideals and truths for which he gave his life, to preserve our own freedoms and to help other nations to preserve theirs and to stand resolutely with those who seek liberation for them and peace in the world in the name of Pulaski and let us all be reinspired by Pulaski's supreme sacrifice for our country to continue to hold out the hand of encouragement and assistance to his homeland of Poland that the time may come and not be too far distant, when this great nation may be freed from servitude and bondage and take its place once again in the ranks of the free independent nations of the earth.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, 475 years have passed since the prosperous "land of opportunity" we now inhabit was discovered.

The courage and gallantry of the young man who made this discovery have been recorded in history books for centuries, but we, as a Nation, have yet to pay tribute befitting the magnitude of Christopher Columbus' accomplishment.

As Americans, we can boast of wealth, strength, and freedom, and for the pride with which we cherish America, Columbus is one to whom we owe a national debt of gratitude. This, in my opinion, can best be expressed by declaring October 12 a national holiday.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Rev. Tally Hanna, pastor, Oak Hill Methodist Church, Oak Hill, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God in Whom we live, and on Whom our hopes are built, we turn to Thee before acting upon the business of this day asking not for an easy time or an easy way out. We know that the good things of life are only won by hard work and cooperation.

Help us, Father, to love one another and when our minds clash against each other in opposition, grant us the wisdom of disagreeing without getting mad. Help us to realize that he that is slow to anger is better than the mighty and he that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city. Keep us calm and our minds open to Thy ways. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 19, 1967, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BENNETT ON MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the transaction of morning business, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] be recognized for up to 45 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

DEATH OF FORMER PRIME MINISTER SHIGERU YOSHIDA, OF JAPAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was with great regret and sorrow that I learned of the passing of former Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida, of Japan.

Mr. Yoshida—a man of honesty and integrity—was responsible for much of the initiative in leading postwar Japan toward democracy and friendship with the United States, a friendship which has lasted and has been enhanced down to the present day.

Mr. Yoshida headed Japan's Government for 7 years between 1946 and 1954, and they were difficult years because they marked the period of the occupation. He signed the San Francisco Peace Treaty on April 28, 1952, which restored Japan to the status of an independent nation.

In many ways, Mr. Yoshida has been responsible for a renewed and continuing understanding between Japan and the United States, and he has been called most aptly the architect of the Japanese-American friendship which is in existence at this time.

May I express the sense of sorrow which the Senate feels on the passing of this great Japanese who did so much to restore Japan, to lead her back into the family of nations, and to cement the relations between our two great countries. His contributions were many, and they will form an enduring monument to the accomplishments which have marked his life.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I remember with great interest a long visit I had with Prime Minister Yoshida in Tokyo some years ago. He was certainly an interesting personality, and a very strong personality, coming at a time when Japan, in her troubles and problems, needed a firm hand. I think he came on the scene at an opportune moment and exercised a tremendous influence on Japan, and its relations with other countries, and brought it out of difficulties.

So I share with and identify myself with the observations of the distinguished majority leader in expressing our sympathy and, generally speaking, our concern about the passing of a great man in another country with which we now have a very pleasant and cooperative relationship.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, October 20, 1967, he signed the enrolled bill (S. 2310) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 676) to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 1933. An act to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; and

S. 2310. An act to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 2561. A bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax deduction for expenses incurred in the construction of residential fallout shelters of approved type and design; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAKER:

S. 2563. A bill to regulate imports of ferroalloys and related products into the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. BAKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

THE FERROALLOYS AND RELATED PRODUCTS IMPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1967

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, for the last few days the Committee on Finance has been considering several bills which would limit the importation into this country of various goods. It is my understanding that these proposals will be considered individually and in the aggregate, both as to the needs of domestic industries as well as potential impact on the international economic and diplomatic picture.

Among the commodities important to the economy of my State are ferroalloys and related products. There is evidence that rising imports of these products do constitute an unreasonable threat to the health and future of these industries in the United States.

So that ferroalloys and related products may be included in the deliberations of the Committee on Finance, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to regulate imports of ferroalloys and related products into the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2563) to regulate imports of ferroalloys and related products into the United States, introduced by Mr. BAKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO DELAY HIGH UINTA WILDERNESS AREA

Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48); which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 48

Whereas the full development for beneficial use of Utah's limited water resources is fundamental to the future development and prosperity of the State; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation is presently engaged in water resource investigations in the Uinta Mountains in Utah in connection with the Ute Indian project of the ultimate phase of the central Utah project, with a reconnaissance report due in 1969; and

Whereas these investigations will determine the most feasible sites for the location of the necessary dams and other works of the project; and

Whereas drilling is also underway in the same area for oil and gas; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture is required under the provision of Public Law 88–577, the National Wilderness Preservation Act, to submit to Congress in September 1967, designated boundaries for twelve wilderness areas, and has chosen the High Uinta Wilderness Area as one of them; and

Whereas the designation of this area as a wilderness area will preclude the location of any reclamation works within it: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that congressional action be delayed on the designation of the High Uinta Wilderness Area in Utah until the reconnaissance report on the Ute Indian project of the ultimate phase of the central Utah project is completed in 1969, and until results of current testing for oil and gas in the area are known, but not later than December 31, 1969.

AMENDMENT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 415

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PROXMIRE) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts, which was ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

AMENDMENT NO. 416

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to H.J. Res. 888, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added at its next printing to S. 2551, a bill to impose annual quotas on the imports of potassium chloride into the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] be added as a cosponsor of my amendment No. 265. This is an amendment to H.R. 12080, the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1967, to provide coverage of certain drugs under medicare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS NOS. 400 AND 401—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on last Monday I submitted certain amendments intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080, the social security amendments bill now pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

The first amendment would require States to provide for the recruitment, training, and effective use of community service aids and social service volunteers in administering welfare programs.

The second amendment would direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study and make recommendations for accomplishing better service, advice, and assistance in according welfare recipients their full protection and use of laws and programs.

I am pleased to report, Mr. President, that these two amendments are gaining significant approval and support, both from within and without the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of these amendments, amendments Nos. 400 and 401, intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080, the names of Senators TYDINGS and CLARK be added as additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, these names added to those who have already become cosponsors of the amendments, Senators KENNEDY of New York, HART, MONDALE, BROOKE, HATFIELD, and NELSON, brings to nine the number of Senate cosponsors.

Further, I recently received a letter from Mr. Rudolph T. Danstedt, ACSW, Washington director of the National Association of Social Workers, Inc., concerning these two amendments, as well as other matters, supporting the aims of both amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of that letter having to do with the two amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1967.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: I read with considerable interest the two amendments which you proposed to H.R. 12080—the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

Your amendment number 400 will, I am sure, strike a very responsive chord among a great many social workers to whom the problem of securing manpower for appropriate phases of our public welfare program is of very considerable concern. Over a year ago, a Task Force on Poverty of our Association, in response to a request we received from Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, indicated that we need to face up to some kind of staff system in the social services which recognizes three levels of personnel—the graduate social worker, the social work aide, who would have an undergraduate degree, and the subprofessional, who in your amendment is called a "community service aide".

We certainly support efforts to recruit and train welfare recipients for such community service aide positions, a practice now being followed by many OEO Community Action agencies.

I was impressed also by your amendment number 401 under which the HEW Secretary is asked to determine how staffs of public welfare agencies may move toward assuming some kind of an advocacy role with respect to the rights of assistance recipients for public assistance and other governmental programs.

Very importantly, your two amendments serve to give a badly needed positive emphasis to the welfare section of H.R. 12080, while your remarks are a most welcome offset to the repressive tone that seems to characterize the bill.

Sincerely yours,

RUDOLPH T. DANSTEDT,
ACSW, Director.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 20, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2310) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

K. Edwin Applegate, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years, vice Richard P. Stein, resigned.

Asher E. Schroeder, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Iowa, for the term of 4 years, vice Donald E. O'Brien, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, October 27, 1967, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 44

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that the committee has scheduled hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, expressing the sense of the Congress that the Vietnam conflict should be submitted to the United Nations. These hearings will be held on Thursday, October 26, and Friday, October 27, in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building. They will begin at 10 a.m. on each day.

Persons wishing to testify on the resolution should communicate with Mr. Arthur M. Kuhl, the chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LABELING OF POTATOES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, four days ago, on October 17, 1967, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] took the floor to denounce S. 562, a bill now pending before the Senate Commerce Committee, the proposed National Potato Labeling Act.

Senator LAUSCHE contends that this bill will "serve one or two States to the disadvantage of the other States in the Nation." By this, he means Idaho and Maine, two famous potato-growing States.

The facts are, however, that support for this bill is not, in the least, confined to Idaho and Maine. Last year, the National Potato Council, the organization of commercial potato growers from throughout the country, voted 91 to 1 in favor of potato labeling by State of origin.

In giving its endorsement, the National Potato Council implicitly recognized that the American housewife associates potato quality with the area from which they come. This is not true of most other farm products. But potatoes are of differing varieties, sizes and taste; they possess differing qualities of mealiness, some better for one form of preparation than another. Each major area of potato production has become known, by the nature and quality of its yield, to millions of consumers in the grocery stores of the country.

Again let me stress, these well-known potato-growing areas are not restricted to Idaho or Maine. There are many others, the Red River Valley of North Dakota and Minnesota, the Klamath Basin of Oregon and California, the Eastern Shore of Virginia and Maryland, the Connecticut River Valley of Massachusetts and Connecticut, to mention a few.

For this reason, the proposed National Potato Labeling Act has enjoyed widespread support from commercial potato growers in all parts of the country. They are striving to protect the identity of their product in the marketplace.

If potatoes were all alike, differing in no important way, regardless of where grown, or if their quality could be readily determined by outward appearance, or by the common tests of smell or feel, there would be no justification for S. 562. There would be neither need nor reason for labeling potatoes by State of origin. If such were the case, Senator Lausche would be right in asking why this special labeling requirement should be applied to potatoes, but not to other agricultural products.

Potatoes, however, are not all alike. They have different qualities, depending on where grown, which are often undetectable by outward appearance or by application of any of the other common tests. This is why the Department of Agriculture, departing from customary practice, has given its support to the principle of special labeling requirements, by area of origin, where potatoes are concerned. And this is why, in judgment, the distinguished Senator from Ohio is in error when he charges, as he did on Tuesday, that the labeling requirements in this bill would impose a burden on the potato industry that "it ought not to have to bear."

The Senator also misconstrues the nature of the labeling called for by the bill. He alleges:

> An Ohio potato would have to be labeled "Ohio Potato." A Wisconsin potato would have to be labeled "Wisconsin Potato." Minnesota, which grows a great number of potatoes, likewise would have to label them "Minnesota potatoes."

This is simply not so. In the first place, there is no requirement whatever in the bill for labeling individual potatoes; the labeling provision applies only to containers, to the package in which the potatoes are sold. Furthermore, nothing in the bill precludes or impairs the use of established brand names, nor is there any requirement whatever that the brand name selected must incorporate the name of the State in which the potatoes were grown. Packaged Ohio potatoes would not have to be sold as "Ohio potatoes," as the Senator implies.

Actually, the labeling requirement, in line with good truth-in-packaging practices, is purely factual in character. The bill provides that the container in which the potatoes are packed shall bear a label "which clearly indicates, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary, the State of origin of the potatoes, and the name and address of the packer or repacker." The purpose is to give factual information to the ultimate consumer, to which every interested housewife ought to be entitled.

Senator Lausche, as we all know, is opposed to false advertising and deceptive marketing practices. He takes the position, in this case, that present laws are adequate to protect both the potato grower and consumer. If this were so, Mr. President, S. 562 would never have been introduced. The very fact that the National Potato Council calls for the enactment of this bill, and support for it comes from every corner of the country, should be evidence enough that present laws have proved inadequate.

I, for one, can testify to the failure of present laws to put a stop to the recurrent sale of large quantities of potatoes as Idaho potatoes, which are grown in other States. My efforts, over the past 5 years, to end this misrepresentation in the marketplace have proved unavailing. Senator Lausche says existing laws are "very distinct and precise." Well, perhaps they are to the Senator from Ohio, who would not condone the deception I have just described. But the Federal Trade Commission, despite many proddings, refuses to take action, apparently unable to decide whether or not it is charged with responsibility. As for the Food and Drug Administration, it has furnished no relief, no investigation, and no prosecution under any existing law.

Does the Senator from Ohio really think these avenues have not been fully explored? We come here to plead for a remedy to right a wrong. The proposed National Potato Labeling Act is necessary if deceptive and fraudulent practices in the marketing of potatoes are to be abated. Bringing to an end the misrepresentation of potatoes through a State-of-origin labeling requirement will not, as the Senator has charged, impose a burden on industry which it ought not to bear; rather, the requirement will lift from the consumer a burden he ought not to bear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point four statements which were presented in testimony before the Committee on Commerce when hearings were held on the bill, which develop in full the case for S. 562.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Testimony of Doyle Burns, Executive Director, National Potato Council

My name is Doyle Burns. I am Executive Director of the National Potato Council. This is a non-profit, voluntary organization whose membership is made up of all commercial potato growers from throughout the United States. I am authorized to testify here on behalf of the National Potato Council.

During the most recent Eighteenth Annual Meeting of this organization, held November 14–15, 1966, in Phoenix, Arizona, several resolutions were adopted, of which Resolution No. 3 reads as follows: Resolved, that the National Potato Council request and support legislation requiring that all potatoes packed or shipped, with the exception of potatoes for processing, be labeled as to the State of Origin.

Potatoes are a rather unusual crop in many respects. There are no government controls or restrictions on the acreage which can be planted or the amount which may be marketed. As a result, potato plantings are influenced by the allotments allowed on certain other crops. This oftentimes works to the disadvantage of potatoes by creating a huge surplus of supplies for which there is no market. It has also been established that the demand for potatoes is fairly static. We do not eat more potatoes just because we have more available or when they are selling at a lower price.

Generally speaking, when there is an excess of potatoes available to the market, the market becomes more selective and only the better qualities of potatoes will be shipped with the poorer qualities finding their way into salvage outlets such as livestock feed or starch. During periods of scarcity the market will accept some potatoes of a poorer quality in order to meet its needs. Thus the quality of any given lot of potatoes becomes an important factor in its marketability.

Many production areas have become quite conscious of the importance of marketing *only* quality potatoes regardless of the available supply and have restricted themselves to selling or offering for sale only the better qualities. As a result of this practice (and it is to be highly commended in the public interest), some areas have developed an enviable reputation. This reputation is on rather shaky ground so long as unscrupulous operators in other areas of production can prepare potatoes for shipment and represent them as being the product of a quality marketing area. This is being done and has been a common practice on the part of some dealers in some areas for years.

There is a second group of offenders, however, who contribute to this practice and probably make up a greater volume of business than those mentioned above. These are the people who buy potatoes from many areas of the country, bring them together at a central location and proceed to regrade the entire lot and place them in consumer packs without bothering to identify the origin of any of the lots; or, declaring on the consumer container that the potatoes therein are from some particular state when in actuality only part of the pack, or in some cases, none of the potatoes come from the state or area declared on the container.

Finally, there is the retailer who does not bother to remove identification on or about the potato bin which states that the potatoes on display are from a certain specific area. This law would not prohibit him from leaving such signs on his potato bin but, if the state of origin is on the container, the customer will soon learn to read the label and disregard such misleading signs.

These are the three principal types of offenders. The next question is: "Who is hurt by this practice?"

This Bill has been offered in the interest of the general public. If the consumer wants to buy potatoes from some particular state, regardless of her reasons, she is entitled to some assurance that those potatoes are accurately labeled. It is misleading and false advertising to continue such practices.

Secondly, the potato industry must strive vigorously to make sure that high quality, usable potatoes will be found in the retail stores in order to defend ourselves against the inroads of competing food products. One of the few ways that such quality can be assured is to encourage areas of production to develop their identity by putting out only the very best pack possible. It is important that each area develop a pride in its own product. This Bill, S. 562, will afford the area a reasonable protection and some guarantee that its efforts to deliver to the consumer a full measure of value have not been thwarted by someone whose only goal is a fast, easy dollar.

I respectfully urge that this Bill be favorably received and reported out at the earliest possible date.

Statement of A. E. Mercker, Executive Secretary, on Behalf of the Vegetable Growers Association of America (VGAA)

Mr. Chairman, my name is Albert E. Mercker. I am Executive Secretary of the Vegetable Growers Association of America which was established in 1908. The address is 815 17th Street, N.W., Room 226, Washington, D.C. 20006. The organization in general is comprised largely of small and medium sized family-operated vegetable and potato farms, including the small market gardeners that surround the large Eastern municipalities and the larger commercial family-operated farms of the Southeast and Midwest.

Our Association favors this bill and urges its adoption.

There is a certain amount of misrepresentation of potatoes and vegetables in the market place, sometimes brought about by deliberate mislabeling, or the failure of the repacker, or retailer, to place any label on the potatoes or labeling them under areas of production that have a good to excellent reputation. An increasing proportion of fresh potatoes, in my judgment about 75 percent, are sold at retail in consumer size packages and often lose their identity as to their State of origin.

We firmly believe that potatoes should be marked so that at the time of purchase the purchaser of fresh potatoes, be he a consumer or purchaser for a restaurant, or other public eating places, may, by knowing where the goods were produced, be able to buy or refuse to buy them, if such markings should influence his will.

Any grower, shipper, or repacker, who has confidence in the grade, quality, and pack of his potatoes has nothing to fear from this legislation. This bill would help to place the potato industry on a merchandising basis. Individual brands, or area brands of quality potatoes, would obtain premiums over other packs and encourage the packing of a higher quality pack with a minimum of defects. In this way the per capita consumption of fresh potatoes would be increased.

Consumers have a record high take home pay and are constantly looking for better quality merchandise. When consumers ree a labeled package of potatoes as to grade and State of origin, they are more likely to purchase the labeled potatoes or vegetables. This decision, multiplied many times over each day, would add significantly to the income of potato or vegetable producers.

This bill, if enacted into law, would enable every State to protect its fair name within and without its borders. It would also be beneficial to the entire potato industry.

I thank the Committee for the opportunity and privilege of appearing before you on behalf of the Vegetable Growers Association of America.

Statement of Edd Moore, Executive Manager, Idaho Grower Shippers Association, Inc., Idaho Falls, Idaho

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is Edd Moore. I am the Executive Manager of the Idaho Grower Shippers Association, Inc. This is a non-profit voluntary association, with headquarters at 357 "C" Street, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401, whose members are engaged in growing, packing, and shipping of Idaho potatoes. In the aggregate, they handle approximately 90 percent of the State's tonnage of fresh potatoes.

The importance of potatoes as a staple food has increased through the ages until today the annual world production exceeds 8 billion bushels—which now exceeds the production of wheat. Their annual value is greater than all the gold and silver produced. On a national basis, potatoes rate sixth in cash receipts exceeded only in value by cotton, wheat, soybeans, corn and tobacco—which incidentally are government supported.

Potatoes are the number one basic food in America and account for nearly 25 percent of all fresh fruits and vegetables purchased at retail. The per capita consumption is now reported to be 120 pounds.

Potatoes are produced in all 50 states and somewhere among these states potatoes are being planted and harvested every month in the year. In 1965 they were the most important cash crop in Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Idaho and Alaska. Production amounts to about 1½ million acres annually and is valued at retail in excess of 1½ billion dollars.

Presently, Idaho leads the United States in potato acreage, production and processing. Economically, potatoes are the "Main Spring of Idaho—the largest industry dollarwise." We have been producing and shipping potatoes for approximately 60 years and during that period of time have shipped over 1,815,000 carloads of potatoes from Idaho.

One of the most popular varieties produced in this country is the Russet Burbank. Idaho produces approximately one-half of this variety, the balance being grown in Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Texas, Nebraska, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, New York and Maine. In the past several years Idaho's production of potatoes equals about 30 percent of the U.S. late production.

In recent years increased agricultural technology has resulted in many thousands of dollars being spent annually by the Federal Government, as well as the various states, for research at the production level, to improve the quality of potatoes for growers and consumers alike. Quality in potatoes is often based on the adaptability of a given variety to weather and soil conditions in a given locality. This, of course, leads to the phenomena of increased locality identification.

We wholeheartedly support S. 562. Enactment of this "National Potato Labeling Act" will afford the necessary protection to potato growers in their respective states who assess themselves for the purpose of promoting their potatoes. Most of the major potato producing states today are engaged in various types of promotional programs. To substantiate this fact we offer you copies of advertisements taken at random during the past year from "The Packer", a fresh fruit and vegetable publication. From these ads you will note that each state is promoting its own potatoes.

According to USDA, acreage harvested this past year from these 14 states, was in excess of 1,000,000 acres, or slightly over two-thirds of the total U.S. production. Potato growers are not subsidized by the Federal Government. Promotion is strictly a self-help program.

Congress has passed legislation directed to truth in labeling. Enacted over 25 years ago was the Federal Seed Act, which includes seed potatoes shipped across state lines. This act specifically provides for, among other things, identification of the state of origin of the seed potatoes and the name and address of the shipper on all seed offered for sale. It is submitted that one of the principal reasons this legislation was enacted was to give to the growers who were buying seed protection as to the identity of the growing region, of the type of seed he desired to purchase and the type of seed that would best serve his needs.

The Perishable Agriculture Commodities Act was passed in 1930, which was sponsored by the late Senator Borah of Idaho. This Act specifically applies to trading rules and regulations governing the fresh fruit and vegetable industry, which were sorely needed to correct unethical trading practices. Under the existing provisions of the PAC Act, misbranding *only* occurs when the contents of a container do not correspond with the markings on the container. There are no specific provisions requiring identification of grade, variety, state of origin, shipper, packer or repacker. Here is a typical container extensively used throughout the country, which is completely void of the aforementioned identifications, yet in complete compliance with the PAC Act.

Again, please bear in mind that misrepresentation *only* occurs when the contents of a container do not correspond with the markings on the container. The positive need for enactment of the "National Potato Labeling Act" is to correct the many abuses of this unidentified container by word, act or deeds. For example: Visualize, if you please, a display of Russet Burbank potatoes in this unidentified container in a supermarket. Over or nearby this display is placed Point of Purchase material (such as we use in Idaho, and is available from some 15 other major Russet producing states) which is suggestive, appealing and positive in its identification. The adverse and improper result of this unethical practice is sale by association or inference. The innocent housewife is duped into thinking that the potatoes she buys in the unidentified package are potatoes coming from the state shown on the Point of Purchase material. This situation would be equally true for any variety from any area. Further, it would be equally true on a display of bulk potatoes. This devious sale technique is not a violation of the act.

In addition, the use of containers without representations of any sort lend themselves very readily to misrepresentation either by inference, or by word, act or deed, in the merchandising and sale of potatoes. In addition to this problem the failure to place any identification also makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to trace potatoes for the purpose of procuring enforcement of the PAC Act.

By contrast, here is a container that factually identifies the producer and state of origin. Certainly this type of container identifies the product so that a given consumer, having purchased the product, can then go back and repurchase the product knowing she will be getting the same product she previously purchased.

In addition, Congress passed the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, which is administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This act prohibits the shipment in interstate commerce of a food if its labeling is false or misleading in any particular. The main difference between the two acts is that the Food & Drug law deems a food to be misbranded, if in package form, unless it bears a label containing the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor. We have been informed on several occasions by officials of the Food & Drug Administration that the origin of the food product is not required to be shown on the container. Nor does the manufacturer, packer, or distributor need to be located at the point of origin of the product shipped. Therefore, a packer or distributor of potatoes could be located anywhere and ship his otherwise unidentified containers into any state and sell them into any market to his advantage and be within the Federal laws.

The very fact that potatoes can be legally sold without the identification of origin creates a very favorable atmosphere for those unscrupulous operators who practice the art of deception by inference, or otherwise. Sales by deceptive means or oral representation are practically impossible to enforce.

Following is an example as to the manner in which this type of deception works.

Let us say a packer or repacker, licensed under the PAC Act, is located in Chicago, Illinois, and is packaging potatoes for retail outlets. Further, that he is packing the Russet Burbank variety on a specified order for Washington Russets. Assume for the sake of discussion that the f.o.b. price of Russets in Wisconsin was about the same as in Washington. The freight differential between Washington and Wisconsin is approximately $1.00 per hundredweight, or about $500.00

per car. Through the use of the unidentified container as to point of origin, the retail buyer has absolutely no way of knowing where his potatoes originated. All the buyer can do is accept the oral word of the seller that he received Washington Russets. You can rest assured that the delivered price was based from Washington, and that the grower in Wisconsin was not compensated accordingly. Both the retailer and the consumer has paid an exorbitant price as a result of these trading practices. This same example could be used on red potatoes from Wisconsin and Red River Valley. An operator in New York City could purportedly be selling Maine potatoes but substituting locally grown potatoes. The same tactic could be performed in most of the major markets. This is vicious competition! With this excessive profit, this unethical operator can always undersell the legitimate operator. Results: either the legitimate operator is forced out of business or joins the club of quickbuck artists. Passage of S. 562 is urgently needed to correct these flagrant abuses.

The purpose of this bill is simple. It provides for the labeling of all fresh potatoes so that the ultimate consumers and buyers may know with certainty the state of origin of the potatoes purchased. Also, it will provide positive protection for the growers who are willing to invest their dollars to promote the sale of their potatoes.

It is our observation that labeling will improve product quality by identification of the packer, if for no other reason than pride of label. Packer identification will enhance the enforcement at the terminal or retail level when misbranding exists.

Enactment of the "National Potato Labeling Act" will materially assist the Food & Drug Administration in identifying the origin and packer when contaminated potatoes are shipped.

The fresh potato industry needs only true and accurate branding of state of origin, and the name and address of the packer, repacker or seller on every package or lot of fresh potatoes offered for sale.

The provisions of this Bill will equally protect the grower and consumer. Presently, the buying public is left entirely unprotected where specific identifications are lacking. To assure that the best practice of the marketplace become common practice against the selfish minority who defraud and deceive the public, charge unfair prices, or engage in other sharp practices, there exists an unquestionable need for passage of this vital legislation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, we very much appreciate the opportunity afforded us to present our views on this bill. We respectfully request favorable action on this "National Potato Labeling Act" to afford the consumers an honest product selection, as well as to protect the growers and merchandisers of potatoes.

Testimony of Harold E. Bryant To Be Presented to the Senate Commerce Committee, Relative to S. 562

My name is Harold E. Bryant. I am executive Vice President of the Maine Potato Council, and Consultant to the Maine Potato Commission, both offices being located in Presque Isle, Maine.

The Maine Potato Council is a trade association of growers, shippers and allied industries associated with the production and marketing of Maine potatoes. We have as members all potato growers in the State of Maine.

I also represent the Maine Potato Commission. Since 1936 potato growers in the State of Maine have had a self-imposed tax whereby they tax themselves two cents a barrel (a barrel weighs 165 pounds) for all potatoes produced in Maine being used for human consumption. These funds are used for research, advertising and the promotion of Maine potatoes.

At the present time Maine is the second largest producer of potatoes in the United States, being second to the State of Idaho. Maine has been recognized over a period of many years as one of the leading producers of quality potatoes in the United States. Being located in the extreme northeastern part of the United States our natural sales and distribution territory for Maine potatoes is that area east of the Mississippi River.

Our potatoes are harvested in September and October and marketed throughout the winter months. In the marketing of our crop we compete with most of the other states who harvest their crop in the fall of the year and market during the winter months. This would include Idaho, N. Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan and all of the eastern states north of Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

Like some, but not all, of our competing states our growers are continually trying to upgrade the quality of our product and improve the image of Maine potatoes in the market place. In addition to trying to deliver quality merchandise we, like Idaho and some other states, spend large sums of money promoting our potatoes in the market place. We believe we have an excellent quality product and we want the housewife to be able to identify that product and ask for it if she believes it to be the most desirable for her purposes. Regardless of the fact that we are spending a great deal of money promoting and advertising our potatoes we find that in many cases our efforts are being nullified and the housewife finds it impossible to identify our product or the product of any other quality-minded potato producing states because in too many cases potatoes may be advertised in the retail stores as coming from one state when actually they were grown in some other state.

In addition to this a practice has been developed in the retail stores whereby a broad area of identification will be used such as having signs saying "Eastern Potatoes". This is a very common practice in the markets along the eastern seaboard. "Eastern" potatoes could mean potatoes coming from anywhere in the east; they may come from excellent potato producing areas or may be extremely poor quality. If they are and the housewife is dissatisfied, far too often she will cease to buy potatoes of any kind, so that those states who are trying and do a good job of production and marketing are penalized along with those areas who do not put out the effort necessary to deliver quality merchandise.

Idaho for illustration is a strong competitor of Maine. We are willing to compete with Idaho or any other quality-minded potato producing state, and let the housewife and the consuming public be a judge of the merits of our product compared to competitors. If we are unable to meet competition we must suffer the consequences.

However, we do believe that both consumers and growers are entitled to have the product they buy, and in the case of growers the product they sell, identified so that everyone knows what they are buying and may be able to reward or penalize the producers on the basis of the quality merchandise they are delivering.

Representing the potato industry in the State of Maine we urge this committee to support S. 562.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge the presence in the Chamber this morning of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], who has joined with me in the cosponsorship of this measure, along with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I concur fully with the remarks of my distinguished colleague [Mr. Church].

The production of quality potatoes is big business in my State, just as it is in other States. In Idaho we are justly proud of the quality of our potatoes. Our bill, S. 562, gives the consumer protection by insuring that the label on the potatoes the housewife buys does not misrepresent the product.

Idaho potato farmers and shippers have come to Washington in unanimous support of the bill, as have persons from other parts of the Nation. All we ask is that the bill be reported out of committee so that all Senators may have the opportunity to make up their own minds as to its merits.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 652, S. 2068; Calendar No. 653, S. 2179; Calendar No. 654, S. 108; and Calendar No. 655, H.R. 11767.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AN ACT TO FIX STANDARDS FOR HAMPERS, ROUND STAVE BASKETS, AND SPLINT BASKETS FOR FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

The bill (S. 2068) to repeal certain acts relating to containers for fruits and vegetables; exportation of tobacco plants and seed; naval stores; and wool; and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2068

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Acts of Congress listed below are hereby repealed:

(a) The Act of August 31, 1916, entitled "An Act to fix standards for climax baskets for grapes and other fruits and vegetables, and to fix standards for baskets and other containers for small fruits, berries, and vegetables, and for other purposes" (39 Stat. 673, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 251–256);

(b) The Act of May 21, 1928, entitled "An Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 685, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 257–257i);

(c) The Act of June 5, 1940, entitled "An Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes" (54 Stat. 231; 7 U.S.C. 516–517);

(d) The Naval Stores Act approved March 3, 1923 (42 Stat. 1435; 7 U.S.C. 91–99);

(e) The Act of May 17, 1928, entitled "An Act to authorize the appropriation for use by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain funds for wool standards, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 593; 7 U.S.C. 415b–415d).

SEC. 2. Section 10(b) (3) of the Act of November 3, 1966 (80 Stat. 1302; 15 U.S.C. 1459 (b) (3)), is amended to read as follows:

"(3) containers subject to the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1912 (37 Stat. 250, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 231–233), or the Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1186, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 234–236)."

SEC. 3. This Act shall become effective sixty days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 668), explaining the purposes of this bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill, which was requested by the Department of Agriculture, would repeal the Standard Container Acts of 1916 and 1928, Tobacco Seed and Plant Exportation Act of 1940, Naval Stores Act of 1923, and Wool Standards Act of 1928.

The Standard Container Acts prescribe standard sizes and capacities for certain types of baskets and hampers used in shipping fresh fruits and vegetables. The Department advises that shipping methods have so changed since the acts were enacted, that now less than 10 percent of fresh fruits and vegetables are marketed in the regulated baskets and hampers. With repeal of these acts, the bill would bring the containers regulated by them under the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, approved last year. The Tobacco Seed and Plant Exportation Act prohibits exportation of tobacco seed in order to protect American growers, and is no longer useful since tobacco production is now well established outside the United States. The Naval Stores Act provides for the establishment of standards and grading and prohibits false or misleading practices, and the Wool Standards Act provides for the development of standards. The standards and grading work now done under the latter two acts can be done under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, and the Department advises that there is no need for special legislation covering these two commodities. With the repeal of such legislation the Department advises that it could reduce its standards and inspection work on naval stores and its standards work on wool to a level commensurate with the need therefor.

The Department estimates that enactment of the bill will result in an annual reduction of $116,000 in Federal expenditures.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS FOR ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS HOSPITALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2179) to extend for 3 years the special milk programs for the Armed Forces and veterans hospitals which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment in line 6, after "31," strike out "1970.'" and insert "1970'."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1446a), is amended by striking in subsections (a) and (b) the words "December 31, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 669), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill would extend the Armed Forces and veterans' hospital milk programs for 3 years, until December 31, 1970. These programs authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make dairy products acquired under the price support program available to veterans' hospitals, the Armed Forces, Department of Defense hospitals, and the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The committee amendment would correct the punctuation.

CONVEYANCE OF RIGHT, TITLE, AND INTEREST IN CERTAIN LANDS CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF MAINE

The bill (S. 108) to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the State of Maine, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 108

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Maine, without consideration, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained by it in the tract of land which was conveyed to the State of Maine pursuant to the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey the Kennebec Arsenal property, situated in Augusta, Maine, to the State of Maine for public purposes", approved March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1270), by a deed from the United States dated April 2, 1905.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 670), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the State of Maine, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States as reserved in a conveyance to the State of the Kennebec Arsenal property pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1270).

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The property in question has been used continuously since 1905 as part of the Maine Insane Hospital. This authority is now sought to permit the State to use a portion of this property for a fire department and other public purposes, but is precluded from doing so by the conditions of the original conveyance. The bill, S. 108 would, if enacted, authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to release these conditions.

BACKGROUND

The Kennebec Arsenal was originally established by the War Department in 1836 comprising 40 acres of land located on the east side of the Kennebec River in Augusta, Maine. The arsenal was abolished by order of the Secretary of War, May 1, 1901. Subsequently, under an act of Congress approved March 3, 1905, the Secretary of War, by deed dated April 12, 1905, conveyed the entire property to the State of Maine for use in connection with the Maine Insane Hospital. Both the act and the deed contained provisions which (1) restricted the property to be used only in connection with the insane hospital; and (2) authorized the President of the United States, in his discretion, to repossess the property if needed for uses of the United States.

Since this property has not been under military control for many years, the records of the Department of the Army contain very little information with respect to the former installation. An investigation discloses that the property has been used continuously since 1905 as part of the Maine Insane Hospital. The State has indicated that it now desires to use a portion of this property for a fire department and other public purposes, but is precluded from such use by the conditions of the conveyance. This bill would, in effect, authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to release these conditions.

The Department of the Army no longer has any direct interest in this property, and there are no foreseeable future defense requirements for its use. Consequently, the release of the deed restrictions is not objectionable to the Department of the Army.

Since the General Services Administration is the primary disposal agency for the United States, their views were solicited since one of the conditions to the release is the right of the President to recapture possession of the property at any time for the needs of the United States. This agency has advised that it is their understanding that the State intends to continue to use the remainder of the 40 acres and other adjoining lands belonging to the State for the purpose of the mental hospital, and that the fire department will be used primarily for the protection of the hospital; that while GSA is generally opposed to legislative proposals of this type, under the circumstances of this case, they have no objection to the enactment of S. 108.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this bill will have no effect on the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

U.S. NAVAL STATION, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

The bill (H.R. 11767) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 671), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this legislation is to permit the Secretary of the Navy to retrocede to the State of California all, or such portion as he may deem desirable for retrocession, of the jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States over any lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This authority is sought particularly to permit the State of California, acting through local civil authorities, to furnish regular police protection to the 391 families residing in two Navy housing projects constructed on separate parcels (88.77 acres and 58.86 acres) of land which now comprise parts of the Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif. The retrocession would be accomplished by filing written notice thereof with the Governor of California, to be effective upon its acceptance by the State in such manner as its laws may prescribe.

BACKGROUND

This legislation was submitted as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 90th Congress. The purpose is to permit the Secretary of the Navy to retrocede to the State of California certain lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif. This authority is sought particularly to permit the State of California, acting through local civil authorities, to furnish regular police protection to the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

The U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif., comprises a total of 1,503.63 acres of land and submerged lands. The main site of the naval station encompasses 1,102.46 acres acquired by separate condemnation actions in 1940, 1942, and 1963. The remaining 401.17 acres of land, acquired by condemnation and transfer, are the sites of seven separate off-station Navy housing projects.

Over most of the naval station and five of the off-station housing projects, the Government jurisdiction is proprietorial only. However, over a 243.46-acre portion of the main site (including 219.58 acres in which the Government interest is only a leasehold until August 9, 1970), the Government presently has partial legislative jurisdiction, subject only to State reserved powers of taxation and service of civil and criminal process. Such jurisdiction is vested by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution, section 255 of title 40, United States Code, an act of the California Legislature of March 12, 1872, as amended by chapter 710 of the statutes of 1939 (California Political Code, sec. 34), and Secretary of the Navy letter of April 5, 1943, accepting jurisdiction, acknowledged by California State Lands Commission letter of April 10, 1943.

The same Federal constitutional provision and statute, the same substantive California law, recodified as California Government Code, section 111, by chapter 134, California Statutes of 1943 Secretary of the Navy letter of November 12, 1943, accepting jurisdiction and California State Lands Commission acknowledgment letter of November 12, 1943, operated to vest the Government with similar jurisdiction over 485 acres acquired in 1942 for use in connection with the U.S. Naval Fuel Depot, San Pedro, Calif. Two portions of this 485-acre tract, measuring 58.86 and 88.77 acres, were subsequently transferred from the Naval Fuel Depot, San Pedro, to the Naval Station, Long Beach. Their development and use as Palos Verdes public quarters and the San Pedro fund housing project, respectively, has given rise to a significant problem in the furnishing of adequate police protection to the 391 families residing in the housing projects. The Government's existing legislative jurisdiction over the entire 485 acres leaves local police authorities with no jurisdiction over these projects for performance of their ordinary functions of law enforcement and protection of persons and property on behalf of the residents. The Navy shore patrol, the only Government police agency readily available, cannot effectively police these residential areas since it has no general authority over persons other than members of the Armed Forces. Under section 13 of title 18, United States Code, the criminal laws of the State would be enforceable in the project areas notwithstanding the lack of State jurisdiction, but only as Federal law and only by such other Government police officers as may be provided. The forum for enforcement of such laws would be the U.S. district court.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

The law enforcement agencies of the city of Los Angeles and of the county of Los Angeles, presently rendering police services in the general localities of Palos Verdes public quarters and the San Pedro fund housing project, have both indicated willingness to furnish these housing projects with their regular services if the impediment of lack of jurisdiction is removed. Government retrocession of legislative jurisdiction over these projects as soon as possible is considered highly desirable to relieve the existing unhappy situation. This will make regular police services of the city of Los Angeles and the county of Los Angeles available to occupants of portions of the housing project under their respective jurisdictions. Advising that State acceptance of retrocession of Government jurisdiction will require an act of the California Legislature, the California State Lands Commission has prepared proposed general legislation to effect State consent to Government retrocession of jurisdiction under certain conditions of procedure. Such proposed legislation will be submitted to the legislature in its 1967 session.

This proposal is consistent with similar special legislation previously enacted, and the draft legislation is flexible. Neither limited to nor describing specific installation areas or ends to be attained, it is designed to vest the Secretary of the Navy with authority to make such adjustment in legislative jurisdiction over the lands of the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif., as he deems desirable. Exercise of this authority with regard to the two housing projects will permit local police authorities to furnish to their occupants the same protection of person and property which they presently furnish to the naval station's five other housing projects and to the community in general.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this legislative proposal would not result in an increase in budgetary requirements.

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

This bill incorporates a legislative proposal submitted to the Congress by the Department of Defense as part of its legislative program for the 90th Congress, as is evidenced by a letter addressed to President of the Senate, dated July 3, 1967, which is set out below and made a part of this report.

PEOPLE PEOPLE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the dialog that has continued these many months in the Senate concerning U.S. policy in Asia and Vietnam, it has become rather fashionable for the critics of present policy periodically to launch attacks on a certain aspect of policy or utterance by public officials; address their criticism to that point for as many days as it can command a headline; and then lay back until another issue comes along. It now seems that if no new issue becomes readily available, the critics then proceed to invent one.

For the past few days, for example, the Vietnam critics have addressed themselves to the contrived allegation that Secretary of State Rusk has resurrected—for political reasons—the old "yellow peril" fears, and they have attempted to persuade public opinion that the Secretary, for sinister reasons, has unfairly preyed on a public fear about the yellow masses of Asia inundating the world.

This, of course, is sheer poppycock, and the tactics of the critics in attempting to characterize Secretary Rusk's remarks in such a context are obvious attempts to create another "straw man."

The issue at stake in Asia, Mr. President, is not yellow people—nor green people, nor purple people, nor brown people. The issue is people people. There are millions of Chinese. But there are also millions of other Asians in the adjacent Asian countries, and it is the opportunity to win the chance for these Asian people to determine their own destinies that is really at stake in the world today. The billion non-Chinese in Asia surely have as deep a personal stake in the future shape and form of the Asian Continent as do the billion Chinese. The issue has no connection with the color of people's skins but everything to do with the people themselves.

Needless to say, an Asiatic continent brought into balance among the competing interests of all Asians serves best our own national interest as well. Since World War II, the foreign policy of the United States has wisely had as a part of its underpinnings the principle of preventing any one nation from dominating the continent of Europe and, by the same token, has pursued the goal of preventing any one power from dominating the Far East. By restraining the expansive and threatening flutterings of a China in convulsions now, we can best hope to win time for the other nations of Asia to restructure their own balance of forces and to maintain their own stability. The goal of peaceful change rather than bloody and violent change creates a far better climate for progress in Asia.

FORMER CONGRESSMAN HASKELL PROPOSES EDUCATION PLAN TO HELP CHILDREN OF POVERTY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, former Representative Harry G. Haskell, Jr., of Delaware, has proposed an imaginative plan of intensive education to help rescue children who are now likely to continue in their present pattern of poverty and despair.

In a speech last night in Wilmington to members of the committee of 39, a nonpartisan civic organization, Mr. Haskell suggested an intensive program of education aimed at children in the critical learning period from 4 to 8 years of age. He calls his idea catch-up education, and suggests that a Wilmington school where 50 percent or more of the children are in the poverty category be selected for a demonstration project.

This imaginative plan advanced by Mr. Haskell is in keeping with his long record of personal interest and action in the affairs of his city and State.

In the interests of bringing his plan to the attention of a wider audience, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech last night be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE OF OUR CITY DEMAND THE LONG-RANGE SOLUTION

(An address by Harry G. Haskell, Jr., to the Committee of 39 on Thursday, October 19, 1967)

Let us for a moment imagine the case of a child born into an environment of poverty and despair in Wilmington.

Growing up in a household where the father is out of work and receiving welfare—if in fact there is a father there at all—and in which the mother is working long hours for little pay—if she is working at all—the child is on his own. He plays in the streets, in rat-infested back alleys and in filth. Where else is there to play? He attends school, but his background is so deprived that even the most basic concepts in the Dick-and-Jane reader are beyond his comprehension. The teacher has no time to give him the special help he needs, for he is one of 30 or 40 children in her class. He falls further and further behind academically and consequently he loses interest.

At the same time he sometimes watches television. He sees how other people live, and he wants it. The idea of having some money in his pocket to buy a car and play a little grows more and more attractive. The benefits of education seem more and more obscure. He drops out of school and soon finds he cannot get a job, or if he can that it pays him very little.

One muggy August evening he is standing around when suddenly some one tosses a brick. He tosses one too. He gets away with it. But not long after he gets in trouble with the law, for the temptations of crime prove too much for him, and he spends more and more time in a state-supported correctional institution. Soon he, like his father, is on welfare, again being carried by the taxpayers. He fathers a number of children, children who like himself are destined to require public help in any number of ways during their lives. Once again, society has lost. More important, a human being has lost.

This example can be multiplied by thousands right here in our city. This is not only Harlem or Watts. It is Wilmington. It is one example of the urban problem, the problem of the cities, a problem of poverty, inequality, lack of opportunity—all of which leads to frustration.

We have seen this year more dramatically and more destructively than ever what the consequences of this unbroken cycle are. This in spite of the fact that many efforts have been made in our city and elsewhere.

It has gotten to the point where many people, including some dedicated to solving these problems, throw up their hands and say there is no answer. I say: there *has* to be an answer.

It is true that much is being done and much more has been anticipated to combat urban problems. In two of the three fundamental areas—namely housing and employment—there is hope that we are reaching toward meaningful levels of accomplishment. Programs for low-cost housing, increased job opportunities, and recreational sites, plus legislation in the civil rights field, will help. But while such good works are essential, and require expansion and improvement, they are basically firefighting operations rather than long-range solutions.

What is the long-range solution? What is the thing that could do the most effective job of solving the problems of our cities? I submit it lies in the early development of the child through special and effective educational programs that really emphasize individual attention to the child.

In his Chicago studies, Bloom found that intelligence patterns are 50 per cent established by age 4 and 80 per cent established by age 8. Obviously, then, this is the area in which we must work the hardest. We must compensate for environmental deficiencies by providing a total education not simply academic in nature.

Communication is the key. As Dr. Earl Jackson of Wilmington's Bancroft School says: "We learn to read in grades one through three, then we read to learn."

We need a program that includes strong emphasis on health, basic living tools, language arts, and broadened experiences. The fact of the matter is we have to concentrate our efforts on these four to eight-year-olds.

Such a program requires large amounts of additional money. It makes financial sense because it will cost far less to solve the problem now than later. These are kids who above all deserve a chance in this life. These are people, not statistics. To fail to take this opportunity now, is to mass-produce children who will be problems for society their entire lives, and the problem snowballs as population grows.

What is being done in this field today? What has been learned that we can apply here in Wilmington?

One national pioneer effort has been Operation Headstart, one of the few successful efforts in the "War on Poverty." Headstart, as you know, began on a summer basis with pre-school youngsters, attempting to prepare them for school. Generally, it involves children between three and five years old. The summer programs now serve about 500,000 children, the full-year programs about 200,000.

Mr. Jule Sugarman, director of Headstart, testified before a U.S. Senate committee last June on this program and had the following to say about its success:

". . . in general, the research says the child who comes into Headstart is substantially below the advantaged child in his development. If you use a scale of 100, he is down somewhere around 80 or 85. After he has been in Headstart, he is up to the 90 to 95 range. He is below the average child, but still significantly better than when he came into the program."

Mr. Sugarman also noted that ". . . it is particularly true that the child who was the worst off when he started is one who gains the most in the program. . ."

But let us consider what Mr. Sugarman had to say next for this is important in terms of the long-range solution.

"After the child has been out of Headstart for a few months or a year he tends to lose some of the gains he has achieved during the Headstart program, a fact which we attribute largely to the kind of program into which he goes in the school system, whether it be kindergarten or first grade. He does not slip back to his original level, but he does not maintain the level of gain that he first achieved in the program."

A little later in his testimony, Mr. Sugarman says that his office anticipates this kind of assistance is necessary through the third grade, although not as many children may need this much.

Further evidence comes from Jeanne S. Park, an information officer in HEW's Office of Education, writing in the American School Board Journal last August. She wrote:

"Research has demonstrated that the gains which children make in Head Start classes often are lost in the transition to classroom work in regular schools, unless the schools also provide special attention."

So Headstart by itself will just not answer the problem.

Recognizing this, the Office of Economic Opportunity is working on a new program called Follow Through, designed to pick up where Headstart leaves off. It has begun this fall in a limited version in 30 communities, involving some 3,000 children and costing 3 million federal dollars. It begins in a major way next fall when it will involve 190,000 children and 120 million federal dollars. Communities will be encouraged to experiment. None of these pilot programs is operating in Delaware.

Another way in which the federal government participates in this kind of work is through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Title I of that act deals with education of children of low-income families.

Perhaps the most interesting, and most controversial, program of all is operating in 21 schools in New York City, where it began three years ago. It is called the More Effective Schools, or MES, program.

It is a total program from pre-kindergarten through the entire elementary school. Its key concept is individual attention and total education. In pre-kindergarten, there are no more than 15 pupils per class. There are three teachers per class. In kindergarten, there are no more than 20 pupils per class. There are two teachers per class. In grades one through six, there are no more than 22 pupils per class. There are four teachers for three classes.

Also, there is a full-time health counselor, three full-time guidance counselors, one full-time psychologist, one part-time psychiatrist, junior guidance classes, and a full-time social worker. There also are teaching specialists in reading, math, art, audio-visual work, science, music, and English language available to all children.

I noted that this program is controversial. This is so because of serious differences of opinion over its effectiveness. There is no question that it has brought many benefits. Teachers like to teach in this program. Parents are happier too. Discipline problems are fewer. Absenteeism is lower. There is an improved atmosphere. But this is a program that costs twice as much per student as the regular program, and such expenditure requires proof of academic achievement also. Here is where the controversy exists.

One report was in a recent Wall Street Journal article on MES, where it noted that "in standard tests given last April, second and third grade pupils in the 21 MES schools displayed reading ability at the national norm or above. . . . In 240 other slum-area schools in New York, by contrast, second-graders were five to six months behind norms in reading developments, while third-graders lagged even more."

But on the other side we cannot ignore a study released last week by the Center for Urban Education, a federally-financed researched and education agency. This study said that while there are many side benefits of the MES program—a better atmosphere, better discipline, et cetera—the children do not test significantly higher. The problem, according to those who made this study, is that teachers need special training to teach in such a program. With imaginative training, the people who made the study feel such a program would have a real chance of success.

Many cities have begun a campaign for MES-type education. The McCone Commission, in its Watts report, said that this was the only type of program that could succeed there.

California, according to a June report in the Chistian Science Monitor, is involved in this so-called compensatory education. Here is a comment by Dr. Wilson C. Riles, who heads that program:

"We didn't expect any gains in so short a time. The amazing thing to me is that we made some. Youngsters in the first semester made one month's gain for every month of the program.

"That may not sound like anything special. But before, those same kids were making only $\frac{1}{10}$ of a month's gain for each month in school. That means they were falling steadily behind everybody else month by month. By the time some of them got to high school, they were three or four years behind.

"Our program so far hasn't closed that gap. But it shows we could stop the backward drift. It prevented them from falling still further behind."

In Pittsburgh, they are using lower pupil-teacher ratios, team teaching, preprimary education to prepare slum children for early grades, and a 4½ day week 11 months of the year.

With all this as background, I'd now like to return to Wilmington and discuss a possible program for this city.

I propose that the Wilmington schools take on a project in this area that we might call catch-up education. I would propose that one school be selected, a school where 50 per cent or more of the children are in the poverty or disadvantaged category. Let's take the children between four and eight years of age, which means adding a new grade level for the four-year-olds. Let's make kindergarten a full instead of half-day program, which means doubling the program for five-year-olds. Let's reduce class sizes in the first three grades to about half of what they are now; namely, one professional working with 15 youngsters rather than 30 or 35. Let's extend the school year for these children to 11 months, which means adding six weeks to the present school year. Let us keep in the back of our minds, as another possibility, the idea of extending the school day from 8 a.m. until 5 p.m. And let us try to involve the parents of these children as much as possible.

Then, let us do what the gentlemen who made the New York study recommended to me: provide special and imaginative training for the teachers in this program so as to reach maximum effectiveness in the small classes, individual instruction, etc.

Let us see whether this works, on a demonstration basis. I believe it would be a national first. And, if necessary, I feel that federal demonstration project funds might be available to help us out.

It might range from $150,000 to $450,000 depending upon the school selected. It would certainly be worthwhile to see if we can make this work here.

If catch-up does work after a year's operation, then we had better be prepared to take the bull by the horns and find the funds to do the job in the whole city of Wilmington.

What are we talking about in terms of a full-fledged program? If we consider Wilmington elementary schools where at least 50 per cent of the children at a poverty or disadvantaged level, we are talking about eight schools and 5,000 children between ages four and eight. To provide smaller classes and an extended school year I am told, would mean about $450 per pupil over and above the current cost of about $560. This does not include additional building space.

Total cost would be slightly over $2 million.—This does not include special teacher training or added physical plant.

It is noteworthy that the Delaware committee studying causes of civil unrest, in its recent report on education, recommended establishment of state-supported kindergartens, that Headstart be made a permanent federally-financed program for a full school day and all year around, and that additional teachers be allotted to schools with children having special needs. Thus, this committee recognized the need and has gone part of the way.

I think it is obvious that Wilmington cannot alone undertake the financing of such a large program. The federal government, and the state government, will have to participate.

We shall also need the support—and I mean the full and energetic support—of all the leadership available to us. This will be crucial if it is to come to pass.

We obviously need support also from civic and community groups, such as your Committee of 39, and elected officials at all levels.

And finally, it must be done on an absolutely nonpartisan basis.

Let us try this out on a demonstration basis. For we need this kind of program here. We must determine soon whether this will work. If it does, we must have the courage, intelligence and boldness to part with a sizeable piece of our national and local treasure in order to preserve that treasure later on. That treasure obviously is both economic and human.

We should do it for humanitarian reasons because it is the right thing to do. We should do it for financial reasons, because it will save us money in the long run. If we want to live together successfully in this city and nation, we had best get on with the job.

We live in a time when men talk of going to the moon. We must apply the same energy, talent and resources to a more critical program, that of improving the lives and opportunities of all Americans.

Among all cities, Wilmington should have the capacity to solve its problems. If we here can't do it, and I know we can, then it is difficult to conceive of this nation as a whole doing it—Thank you.

PRESERVATION OF WILDLIFE GAINS NEW FRIEND: NBC NEWS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during the last few decades there has been a rapid increase of interest on the part of all Americans in the preservation of endangered species such as the disappearing American bison and the spectacular whooping crane. It was front-page news recently that at Patuxent Wildlife Research Center a number of whooping crane eggs have been artificially hatched, providing new hopes and possibilities for the continuation of this greatly endangered species.

This interest and concern are, in part, a result of long-term dedicated work by such great conservationists as former President Theodore Roosevelt and his helper, Gov. Gifford Pinchot, of Pennsylvania; and by John Muir and cartoonist "Ding" Darling. But, even more, this public concern is the result of an increasing attention being paid to conservation and wildlife preservation by concerned American news media.

I take this occasion to thank heartily those news writers and news reporters who have played so essential and commendable a part in bringing into the public eye the dangers which are faced by our American wildlife and endangered species throughout the world. Especially I wish to thank the managers and writers of NBC News Service, which on Friday, September 29, 1967, presented to the American public a report on American wildlife which will live in the minds of its viewers for months to come.

In "American Profile: Our Endangered Wildlife," Ed Cobb, whose "Mark Twain" series has educated the American public in the wonders of our natural world, narrated the story of our present battle in this country to save endangered species in the face of great industrial growth and change.

Included in this documentary are the vital, and frightening, needs for greater protection of the dainty Florida key deer, the disappearing timber wolf, and the recently rediscovered ivory bill woodpecker of the Big Thicket areas of Texas. I have mentioned on the floor of the Senate this great event in the annals of wildlife research, the recent reported sighting of this species which has long been thought extinct, and I have expressed my great concern for the adequate protection of this bird. I repeat on this occasion that this and like endangered species must be preserved for future generations of Americans, as well as for ourselves.

In this excellent documentary on American species, NBC notes in the words of one of Conservation's great men, Dr. Aldo Leopold, of the University of California at Berkeley, that:

> For one species to mourn the death of another is a new thing under the sun. We who have lost our (passenger) pigeons mourn the loss. Had the funeral been ours, the pigeon would hardly have mourned us. In this fact, rather than in nylons or atomic bombs, lies evidence of our superiority over the beasts.

In this statement lies the essential quality of the conservation movement: It demands the inspiration of its followers with an esteem for the natural world of which we are a part. Without this inspiration of which only man is capable, conservationists would go begging; there would be no American bison, no whooping crane, there would remain no more bald eagle, the symbol of our Nation. But this has not happened, greatly to the credit of all Americans, and greatly to the credit of a concerned and involved American news service. For with the appearance of such a program as this by NBC News, Americans are again advised of the progress, and the remaining needs, of their efforts to preserve their fellow species; and by this report they again receive the appeal to notice, and to care about, the wildlife which they encounter seldom in the midst of urbanized modern living.

I have sponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 41 for the purpose of convening a World Conference on the Conservation of Wildlife; I encourage the passage in the near future of my Big Thicket National Park bill, S. 4, which would preserve the habitat of the greatly endangered ivory bill woodpecker.

It is by such legislation as this that we in Congress can work toward the preservation of the natural world in which we live, and can show our esteem for the works of creation.

My Correspondence from Texas and across the Nation convinces me that this is a cause very dear to the hearts of Americans everywhere. And such reports as NBC's "Our Endangered Wildlife" encourage my belief that this situation and this need are recognized by the most important forces, the most essential register, of our Nation's outlook on the world, and her concern for the world of the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the NBC program "Our Endangered Wildlife" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcription was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PROFILE: "OUR ENDANGERED WILDLIFE"

(Transcription from tape of an NBC News documentary which appeared Friday, September 29, 1967)

VOICE. "American Profile," the first of a series of documentary glimpses of the continent on which we live; brought to you by American Iron and Steel Institute. Look for the steel mark on things you buy. Today and tomorrow steel makes things better for you; and by New York Life Insurance Company. The New York Life agent in your community is a good man to know.

[Commercial.]

VOICE. Now to narrate this special NBC News Report on "Our Endangered Wildlife," here is artist and conservationist Ed Dodd, creator of "Mark Trail."

Mr. ED DODD. I'd like to show you a book. It hasn't been published, and it won't be. The title is "Rare and Endangered Fish and Wildlife in the United States." Its cover is red, denoting danger. Inside are reports on 323 wildlife creatures: mammals on salmon pink; birds on green; reptiles and amphibians on yellow; and fishes on blue.

More than 300 individuals and organizations, all specializing in wildlife studies, were consulted to prepare that preliminary report; and from it has been distilled a master list of seventy-eight species threatened with extinction. This is a frightening number, in light of our past record. In what we might call modern times, we have seen the passing—to mention only a few—we have seen the passing of the Great Auk, the Heath Hen, the Sea Mink, the Carolina Parakeet, the Labrador Duck, Steller's Sea Cow, the Mamo, and, to mention the classic example of destruction, the Passenger Pigeon.

In the early 1800's there were billions of passenger pigeons in the United States, perhaps 5 billion. The passenger pigeon was edible and available, and vast flocks were slaughtered indiscriminately.

On September 1st, 1914, the last of the passenger pigeons died at the Cincinnati Zoological Gardens. The bird was a female named Martha. There is much dispute about her age, and what caused her death. All that is really of little value. The point is that she was the last of a species. She stands mummified now at the Smithsonian Institution, mute in death, yet speaking volumes on the foolishness of man.

And we did nearly the same thing with the buffalo—the American bison—and in the same time period. At the end of the Civil War in 1865 four massive herds of buffalo covered the Plains, from the Canadian border to deep into Texas. There were tens of millions of them. Then two great transcontinental railroads were pushed across the nation, followed by settlers and cities and vast expansion. Between 1865 and 1883, in the short period of eighteen years, these herds were reduced from millions to only 740.

The first real wildlife conservation program in the United States was started then, and the buffalo was snatched from the brink of extinction. It had been close, and we had learned a lesson.

But the growth of the United States has been inexorable. And with that growth, other wildlife creatures have been placed in danger of extinction. Seventy-eight in all. Last February, following the passage of the Endangered Species Preservation Act by Congress, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall released the first list: fourteen mammals, thirty-six birds, six reptiles and amphibians, and twenty-two fishes.

The powerful grizzly bear is on that list. So is the black-footed ferret, who must feed on the rapidly vanishing prairie dog. So is the ivory-billed woodpecker. It's so rare it was feared extinct, until just recently when three pair were sighted in the big thicket country of eastern Texas. On the list also is the Ne-Ne Goose, the state bird of Hawaii. It is a tragic fact that half of the thirty-six birds on the list are Hawaiian birds. And on the list, too, is the diminutive Key Deer of Florida.

These are the Florida Keys. They're strung together like pearls from the southern tip of the nation. They are the home of the Key Deer, the smallest member of the deer family.

The Key Deer is only about 30 inches high at the shoulders. It's a hardy animal. It can live on harsh, salty vegetation. It can drink brackish water most other animals would refuse. It can swim the waters of the Atlantic from island to island. It can endure the fury of hurricanes.

But the Key Deer has had trouble adapting itself to man. Speeding cars ran it down. Hunters with dogs and jacklights cornered it and shot it. Poachers in boats took advantage of its helplessness while swimming and clubbed it to death. Home builders destroyed its vegetation.

Twenty years ago the Key Deer had diminished almost to the vanishing point. The alarm was sounded. Conservationists and wildlife organizations joined with the Federal Government to establish a natural refuge. The location is Monroe County in the Florida Keys. With that help the Key Deer is coming back. But it still could be wiped out.

Refuge Manager Jack Watson, who can safely be described as a "tough cookie," is the Key Deer's resident protector.

Mr. JACK WATSON. This is the reason the Key Deer Refuge was started, to protect this specimen of white-tailed deer. We first made the original survey to see what the deer population was in '48; and at that time, we came up with an estimated fifty deer, on five islands. Today, we have approximately 400 deer, and they're on eighteen islands.

The deer have come up due to protection more than anything. They have plenty of food on the islands, and plenty of fresh water. All they needed was protection. We have lost on the average of thirty deer a year to automobiles. And we know that we lose a few to the hunters, the poachers. We keep both a boat patrol, a plane, and road patrols going for near twenty-four hours a day, although they still keep trying.

We have no predators other than man and automobile on these deer. There are no big cats in this area. So, we don't have to worry about that. Man and automobile is all we have to worry about.

Mr. DODD. All we have to worry about: man and automobiles. In truth, Jack Watson puts it somewhat less delicately in private conversation. He protects the Key Deer day in and day out with a fierce determination. As he drives through the Key Deer National Refuge, he knows the battle is a never-ending one.

Mr. WATSON. This area over in here used to be deer habitat, but now it's turned into this big development here. Pretty near every piece of property they've got in there has been sold. There have been quite a number of houses built down in this section of it.

This privately owned land here is under lease to the government, and the owner receives fire protection and against people stealing palms and palmettos out of the area. This land on both sides of the road here is owned by the National Audubon Society, and they have leased it to the government for ten years.

This is another subdivision that covers about 800 acres, and this is a typical house that you will find springing up in these subdivision areas. And these will eventually take over all the deer space, and therefore we're going to have to acquire some of the outer islands for the deer to move out to when this transition takes place on all this building.

Mr. DODD. And so Jack Watson goes about his job of protecting the Key Deer. He belies his native toughness in his tender care of "Bucky" and "Bubbles," two deer badly injured by automobiles and nursed back to health.

The most urgent measure needed to preserve the Key Deer is federal acquisition of natural habitat. This must be done while land can still be acquired. Some of this is being done, but slowly.

It seems possible that the development and occupation of the Florida Keys by man may eventually drive the Key Deer out. Already some conservationists have suggested that the Key Deer be transplanted. They are hardy and could possibly do well in almost any place. But that would take them out of their natural habitat, and that's a move always fraught with danger.

Actually, great progress has been made in less than twenty years in building up the herd. But the tiny Key Deer still faces the danger of extinction. Some men still poach. Some men still drive too fast through the refuge. But others, like Jack Watson, protect. And it's those men who are determined to prevail.

[Commercial.]

Mr. DODD. This is the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center at Laurel, Maryland. It's a facility of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of the Interior. It's also the headquarters of the endangered wildlife research program. Among other things, the scientists here are trying to save the whooping crane, a classic case in conservation circles.

The more plentiful sandhill crane, grey instead of white, was used as a stand-in. In six years of preliminary study, a breeding stock of sandhills was established. It was felt that those successful experiments pointed the way to saving the whooper; and that was to restock the whooping crane in the wild, just as we do with quail and pheasant.

Dr. Ray Erickson, seen here in the coat, is the director of this research, and all endangered species research. His assistant is Glen Smart. Together with colleagues in Canada, they are writing the latest chapter in the dramatic Whooping Crane story.

But first, the background. The whooping crane is the tallest of American birds. Some say it is the most majestic. Certainly it's spectacular in flight. At last count, there were forty-three in the wild and nine in captivity. That's a total of fifty-two. It's hoped that another survey later in the year will find several more young birds in the Canadian breeding grounds.

The whooping crane winters in the United States on the 47,000 acre Aransas National Wildlife Refuge. It's located about seventy-five miles north of Corpus Christi, Texas. In the spring the giant birds migrate north, flying 2,000 miles to Wood Buffalo National Park in the Canadian Northwest Territories.

On both ends of the map, the protection vigil is unending. In Aransas, wardens pay constant attention to the welfare of the whooping cranes. Without this care, there is little doubt that the giant bird would pass from our wildlife scene.

In 1945, as the whooping crane captured the public conscience, the National Audubon Society joined forces with the federal government in what was called a cooperative whooping crane project. That seemed to be the turning point. The joint project called forth the Society's research director, Robert Porter Allen. He was one of those dedicated men who seem to people every major conservation program. Although there were many others who helped, it was Allen who was the catalyst for action.

It was the persistence of Allen that led to the discovery of the whooping crane's breeding grounds in Canada. That was in June of 1955, and it was a major breakthrough in the research.

Allen is gone now. He died of a heart attack in 1963. But if the whooping crane survives, that survival will be a monument to Robert Porter Allen. The responsibility has passed to other hands now; to Dr. Ray Erickson and his associates on both sides of the Canadian border. This year they took a major step forward. Dr. Erickson explains.

Dr. Ray Erickson. We picked up six eggs in Wood Buffalo National Park in Northwest Territories, Canada. In the incubator at Patuxent, we had them tied down with rubber bands to hold them in place because an incubator is not built for whooping crane eggs. It was built for much smaller eggs, such as domestic poultry. And we had to do this because the cylinder of trays would turn 90 degrees in each direction, and there was danger that they might fall out.

The first visual indication of hatching came when they pipped, the first one on the ninth of June; and this is a little erruption from inside the egg in which the egg shell is cracked out in one place. The bird then proceeds over a period of about twelve hours to continue the job, until finally they emerge when the larger end of the egg shell is broken or pushed out.

As they began pipping, we moved them down to a lower compartment in the incubator called the hatching compartment; and there the youngsters struggled out of their egg shells. The birds were allowed to remain in the hatching compartment for about twenty-four to thirty-six hours. And as soon as they were fluffy and ready to leave this compartment, we put them into 4x2-foot compartments with a heat lamp, and where they were able to walk around and exercise.

The birds remained in these compartments almost another day before they were given their first meal. At this time, of course, they were living on the egg yolk sac, with which birds are born, and which tides them over until they can adapt to food that is available.

We fed them a turkey starter mash, fortified with vitamins, minerals; and they also particularly enjoyed the meal worm supplement. These are live meal worms.

We had these birds locked away from any intrusion other than by the people who were taking care of them. Therefore these shrouds to camouflage the human form, to prevent the birds from becoming imprinted or given an early impression of the human form as opposed to the form of their mother, which they would have seen in the wild. It may have been important to prevent a fixation on humans so that later on when they paired, they would not reproduce in captivity.

They remained indoors for about three weeks. After that we moved them out of doors and they were able to get more sunshine and catch insects and get much more exercise. We feel we have been extremely fortunate the first year. However, we have left room for improvement in subsequent years, if it is decided to go ahead with additional egg pick ups. We hope to develop a flock of ten or twelve breeding pairs which will produce youngsters that can be returned to the wild to bolster the wild population, or possibly to start new breeding populations, in Canada.

However, a much deeper issue is at stake, a moral one. I think we're fortunate to be living in a period when man is reducting his destruction of habitat and of these species and stopping awhile to say that it's about time we try to save rather than exploit.

Mr. Dodd. These baby whooping cranes point up the importance of the work at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center. But the Interior Department must go to Congress for funding. In the budget for fiscal 1968, the President asked for $694,000 for endangered specie research. When the appropriations bill was finally enacted, that figure had been cut by $150,000.

Another item in the President's budget was lost entirely. That was $750,000 for acquisition of additional land in Maryland for wildlife research. Thus, current funding for endangered species research totals $544,000. It means simply that certain phases of the study will have to be postponed.

For some of the seventy-eight wildlife creatures, time may have already run out.

[Commercial.]

Mr. Dodd. Concern for the wildlife creatures around us is not a new thing. There were laws in 1623 in the Plymouth Colony dealing with hunting and fishing rights. Other laws providing a certain amount of protection for deer go back almost as far. Yet we must understand that it wasn't until this century that the wildlife conservation movement was born.

In the year 1901, the National Audubon Society came into being as a strong private voice for conservation. The same year saw Theodore Roosevelt become President of the United States, and the President and the Society joined hands.

Roosevelt established the first wildlife refuge. He took the lead in removing our natural resources—timberland, waterways, mineral deposits, and game animals—from the control of private speculators.

Under the guidance of forester Gifford Pinchot, later to become the Governor of Pennsylvania, the chief executive established the Inland Waterways Commission and the National Conservation Commission. And under Roosevelt and Pinchot the national forest system was established. Today it consists of over 180 million acres.

It wasn't until the year of 1916 that the National Park Service was established. And it wasn't until the 1930's that "Ding" Darling, the Pulitzer prize-winning cartoonist, came onto the conservation scene. He was chief of what was then called the Bureau of Biological Survey; and he pioneered in the conservation of game birds. He set aside more than 3 million acres of public land as wildlife refuges; and it was "Ding" Darling who helped found what is now the National Wildlife Federation, another powerful citizens' voice in wildlife preservation. Indeed, it has only been since World War II that there has been wide acceptance of the new science called "wildlife management."

It was only in the latter part of 1966 that President Johnson instructed the Interior Department to take action to protect wildlife species in danger of extinction. The action is cooperative, of course. The Interior Department could never do it alone, and doesn't.

The story of the Kirtland's Warbler provides an example of that cooperation. This tiny song bird is in danger of extinction. Its numbers are less than 1,000. It has become, in a management sense, the responsibility of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

In 1963, the Forest Service set aside a Kirtland's Warbler Management Area in the Huron National Forest, 4,000 acres near Mio, Michigan. Management is necessary because the scientists have learned that the Kirtland's Warbler cannot survive unless it has young pack-pine trees for shade and shelter.

So, when the warbler migrates to its winter quarters in the Bahama Islands, the Forest Service rangers set fire to the management area. Forest fires are usually tragic things, but here control fire is used for good.

The rangers set a "fire in a box," and they watch it carefully from the ground and from the air. Research has shown that this burning brings renewed life to the jack-pine. The tree needs the heat of fire to open its cones; to spill out its seed; to grow new trees, young trees that are absolutely vital to the survival of the Kirtland's Warbler.

Out of the fire comes new life, new life for the jack-pine, and new life for the little warbler.

The protection and management of the Kirtland's Warbler is not complete. Much study is needed of the wintering areas in the Bahamas; and it is obvious that authorities in the Bahamas must give the tiny bird the same protection that it now has in the United States. The Florida Audubon Society is working on that.

That's one look at wildlife management. It is a science that has been pioneered by Dr. Aldo Leopold, professor of zoology at the University of California at Berkeley. Last July he was appointed chief scientist of the National Park Service, and charged with advising the Park Service on programs for management of resources.

It was a fortunate appointment in that Dr. Leopold is not a pessimist about man's relationship with the animals. He knows that our wildlife heritage can be saved, saved by intelligent men. Some years back, in commenting on the extinction of the passenger pigeon, Aldo Leopold wrote:

"For one species to mourn the death of another is a new thing under the sun. We who have lost our pigeons mourn the loss. Had the funeral been ours, the pigeon would hardly have mourned us. In this fact, rather than in nylons or atomic bombs, lies evidence of our superiority over the beasts."

[Commercial.]

Mr. Dodd. This is Isle Royale, Michigan, forty-five miles long, nine miles wide, 210 square miles of almost total wilderness in northwestern Lake Superior.

Since 1940, it has been a national park. It is seventy miles from upper Michigan's copper country, and eighteen miles from the nearest point in Minnesota. The Canadian shores loom on the horizon. There are no telephones on the island, no roads, no automobiles, no television. It's a remote area of great beauty, and of considerable importance to the endangered species research.

Here, in what is a natural wildlife laboratory, there is a big moose herd, some 700 strong. The moose in themselves are not endangered; but they are the catalyst for the research.

In the 1930's, the herd had grown to perhaps 3,000. They over-browsed the island; literally ate themselves into starvation, and hundreds died. About 1948, as the plants on which the moose fed were making another recovery, the timberwolf was introduced into the environment. That set up the circumstances for important research on predator-prey relationships. The research is important too because the timber wolf is an endangered species. Less than 1,000 of them are known to exist in the Chippewa and Superior National Forest in Minnesota. The encroachment of civilization drove the timber wolf into these tiny pockets of wilderness. Heavy hunting and trapping pressure for bounties almost finished the job of extinction. The pressure, as we shall see, is not yet ended.

The research on the wolf and its prey on Isle Royale started in 1958, on a cooperative agreement between Purdue University and the National Park Service. The bulk of the study is done during the winter, when there are no visitors on the island, and when it is easy to spot the wolves against the white mantle of snow. Surveys are taken from the air, and flights are made every day that the weather allows.

And when a moose kill is spotted the plane is landed nearby and the researcher snowshoes to the spot to get a close look at the remains.

The wolf is an efficient predator, and very little evidence of its kill is left behind to study.

The director of the research project is Dr. Durward Allen, professor of Wildlife Ecology at Purdue University. He talked to producer Chet Hagan.

Prof. Durward Allen. Since our studies began in June of '58 there appears to have been a—quite a nice relationship—you could call it a balance if you want to, though it's not a strict balance—between the wolf population and the moose herd and the vegetation. As of mid-winter our moose herd probably is between 600 and 700 animals, and it's stayed that way. The wolf population is about twenty-five, give or take two or three or four each year. And so we have apparently a moose herd that is being held at this level by a population of wolves that runs about one per ten square miles—and that's a lot of wolves; and they're living on moose, and some beaver; and they are protecting the vegetation of the island from being overbrowsed by another big build-up of moose; which means they're keeping the moose in business. Otherwise the moose would undoubtedly go through this same over-population and reduction that we saw earlier.

Mr. Chet Hagan. Now, this is done naturally. There is no man hunting in that——

Professor Allen. No.

Mr. Hagan [continuing]. . . . national park at all?

Professor Allen. In national parks we don't meddle with such things, and this is a natural condition, and we have followed it now summer and winter, over the past ten years. The killing of moose is not a random thing at all. It's—these wolves try about a dozen moose, or they'll investigate about a dozen moose, before they find one that they obviously can sense is vulnerable. The adult moose that are killed are nearly all over five, and most of them over six years old; mostly around ten years old, in fact, on the average. Many of them show conditions of disability; lumpy jaw, or lungs loaded up with tapeworms, cysts, or something like this.

Mr. Hagan. Is there really a balance of nature?

Professor Allen. I like to think that there is because in all communities, all communities tend toward a condition of stability. Unless a wild community is stable, something happens to it. It's destroyed. So that things come together, and they go through a stage of trial and error, and the animals that have a function, that permit them to survive there, will survive, and others won't. If you want to call that a balance of nature it's all right, but I don't use the term because so many people misinterpret it. They give it some strange Mother Goose connotation that over-simplifies our entire picture of the natural world, and there has been so much of this done that I like to talk about the stability of natural communities. Even that is only a relative thing, because animal populations vary from here to here, and still they'll trend back toward the intermediate condition, and the community will stay there and not be destroyed.

Mr. Dodd. One of Dr. Allen's researchers on Isle Royale has been Dr. David Mech, who lives now in the suburbs of Minneapolis with wife, children, and two young wolves named "Thunder" and "Lightning". The presence of the wolves in the Mech backyard is symbolic perhaps of his insistence that the wolf is harmless to humans, and must be saved from extinction.

In Minnesota he has had a chance to fight for that point of view, because it is in Minnesota which has the only sizable population of wolves left in the United States that the bounty battle is fought with regularity and much heat. Northern Minnesota legislators want the bounty reimposed. Mech was asked whether the bounty is valid.

Dr. David Mech. No, in general the bounty doesn't even accomplish what it is supposed to; that is, it doesn't even help reduce or exterminate the species on which it is imposed. But with the timber wolf, I am afraid that it might be successful; and that's because the timber wolf occurs in such low densities—remember, not more than one wolf per ten square miles. And that fact, coupled with the modern technological advances in killing animals, like the use of the aircraft, snowmobiles, snares, and things like this—possibly even poisons—well, these coupled with a high bounty perhaps could exterminate the timber wolf in Minnesota.

Mr. Hagan. Let me be the devil's advocate for a moment. Don't the wolves here in Minnesota kill pretty many deer, and leave fewer deer for the hunger?

Dr. Mech. Well, that's what people think; a certain segment of the public thinks this. However, people don't realize that whether or not there are wolves around a deer herd, every deer herd has a very high annual mortality, and in places where there are timber wolves it appears that the wolves are just taking the place of other mortality factors.

Now, I checked the five major timber wolf counties in Minnesota, and found that the hunter success rate for each of those counties averaged higher than the statewide average. The statewide average was 44 per cent; that is, 44 per cent of the hunters filled out their licenses. Whereas in the five major timber wolf counties an average of 51 per cent of the hunters filled out their licenses. It certainly doesn't look to me like this is any indication that the wolves are hurting the deer hunting.

Mr. Hagan. Might it indicate exactly the opposite?

Dr. Mech. Possibly, and for this reason: We have found from other studies that in places where the timber wolves are harvesting a fair amount of the deer—of a prey population; for instance, on Isle Royale—there has been a corresponding increase in the reproductive rate of the prey population. So, to go back to Isle Royale for a moment, before there were wolves, it was very rare to find any twin calves in the moose herds. However, now that there are wolves on Isle Royale, in the summer we have found as high as 38 per cent of the cows that had calves had twins; and it appears to us that this is probably a result of the timber wolves culling out the older, less productive animals, and therefore stimulating the reproduction.

Mr. Dodd. In the north country of Minnesota the views on wolves are totally different. In Bemidji, State Representative Leonard Dickinson is an outspoken advocate for the bounty on predators. He says his constituents are angered by the defeat of his bounty bill in the Legislature.

Representative Leonard Dickinson. They were unhappy—when I say "they" I mean I'm speaking for 90 per cent of the people who live in this northern area; not in just this particular area, but all the northern cut-over area. Well, for instance, I talked to a Watkins man the other day, and he's already printed some little placards: "No bounty, no hunting," and he's selling these things like mad to all these farmers and these—even with his orders, they're putting them up saying "No bounty, no hunting," and they mean business. You don't have to—I don't——

Mr. Hagan. In other words, they're posting their land.

Mr. Dickinson. They really are. They just feel—figure that someone has stepped on their toes, and not knowing the whole picture. There are two sides to this thing. It bothers them.

Mr. Hagan. Well, on the other side of the coin, Mr. Dickinson, the conservationists contend that the wolf takes only the very young or the very old in the deer herd, sort of leaving the survival of the fittest. What do you think about that?

Mr. Dickinson. Well, they should know better. That just definitely will not hold water. It just will not hold water. I wouldn't say they wouldn't pick a sick deer or a wounded deer or a very young deer, but you've got to remember that most of the big deer kill is in the deep snow. When your crust comes on the snow, a deer cannot possibly get away from a timber wolf, or a flock of wolves. It's impossible. I have good people who have testified before our Game and Fish Committee that they find as many as twenty carcasses within just a small area of where timber wolves have taken that many, and they'll take the last one. They're killers. They kill by instinct. And I don't think people understand that. These people who are talking of preserving the timber wolf as a hereditary thing don't know the past history of the timber wolf. They're just blank. I hate to say that. They fail to face up to reality.

Mr. Dodd. And so the controversy over the timber wolf continues in Minnesota. It's a perfect illustration of the difficulties inherent in wild life conservation. In this case, the endangered species is not a pretty bird, nor a tiny deer, but a timber wolf; and our childhood fairy-tale training about the big bad wolf dies hard.

[Commercial.]

Mr. Dodd. The bald eagle has been the symbol of the United States since the nation's earliest days, but has not been universally loved. Benjamin Franklin, who wanted the wild turkey as the national symbol, complained that the bald eagle was a bird of "bad moral character, generally poor and often very lousy."

Franklin's views were not accepted, however, and as the United States grew in esteem, so did the fierce-eyed majestic bald eagle.

Today, it's an endangered species. In truth, it's the Southern bald eagle in danger of extinction. Actually, it differs from the Northern bald eagle only in size, being slightly smaller. There are only 1,500 of the Southern bald eagles south of the Canadian border.

We might have been years delayed in our realization of the plight of the bald eagle if it had not been for the late Charles L. Broley. He was a retired banker from Canada who started research on the bald eagle at the age of 58. He began his studies in 1939, for the National Audubon Society. He turned in—to use his own words—"enthusiastic reports about eagles nesting successfully everywhere along the Florida west coast, from Tampa to Fort Myers." By 1946, he was banding 150 young eagles a season. Then he began to note a decline, and by 1950, he was able to band only twenty-four young birds.

Broley sounded the alarm and continued his work. He made all his own tree-climbing equipment, including the slingshot apparatus that enabled him to fire a four-ounce weight attached to a strong fish-line up into the tall eagle trees.

Then, to the end of the line, he attached a strong rope to haul up a ladder. When the ladder was in place, the dangling end of the rope was tied securely around the base of the tree.

Then came the climb. Broley was seventy-four years old when these superb pictures were made by Bayard Read of the Department of Orthinology at Cornell University. Broley was called the "eagle man" by all who knew him. And he would keep himself in condition for these climbs by chinning himself fifteen times every day on a car in his car shed.

Not every nest could be reached from the first ladder. Sometimes the bottoms of the bigger nests effectively blocked Broley. So he would throw a rope over the nest, and haul up a smaller ladder, which would swing free high above the ground. But it enabled him to reach his goal.

The goal was always the same for Charles Broley. An eaglet to band. And once it was banded, other eagle-watchers would begin to get new knowledge on the extent of the eagle's life.

In his twenty years of work, Charles Broley banded more than 1,200 eaglets, more than all other ornithologists put together. His banding revealed that bald eagles are migrating birds, an important change in eagle knowledge.

Broley also charged that many eagles had been made sterile by pesticides, and research into what Broley started is still going on today.

In 1960, in the year after Broley's death, the Audubon Society began its continental Bald Eagle Project, to continue Broley's work. It's a cooperative project, involving the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the U.S. Forest Service, and the various state game and fish commissions. The current research director is Alexander Sprunt, IV, and Sandy Sprunt knows the battle to save the Bald Eagle is not yet won.

Mr. ALEXANDER SPRUNT, IV. Originally, bald eagles occurred pretty much all over the North American Continent, north of Mexico. Unfortunately, this is not the case today. I might say that the most healthy eagle population that we have in North America is located from here northwestward through the coast of British Columbia, Southeastern Alaska, and out the Aleutian chain. This is a very healthy eagle population which, as far as we can tell, is living under almost primeval conditions.

I wish we could say the same about most of the eagles in the rest of the United States, but unfortunately we cannot. In the yellow areas, which cover quite a bit of territory, the eagle population is undergoing a slow decline. This decline is about on the order of that which has been going on for many, many years in the United States ever since the white man reached our shores and began to fill up the environment; and this decline would parallel that of many species of wildlife which have taken the same road.

Now the red areas, which are largely coastal and around the Great Lakes, present a different picture altogether. In these areas, there has been a catastrophic decline in the last twenty years, primarily since World War II. It is here that the reproduction of eagles has dropped sharply, and the population is undergoing a rapid decline. Just as an example, in this little section of the west coast of Florida here, where Broley did his work, and where the decline of eagles was spectacular, the rise in the human population during the same period that Broley was working was approximately 300 per cent. This is based on the 1960 population figures, and it is undoubtedly greater than that today.

Direct shooting also has been a factor in the decline of eagles. Although it has been against the law to shoot bald eagles—against federal law, in the United States, to shoot bald eagles, since 1940, shooting still is a factor. Most eagles are killed during the first four years of their lives, when they are in an all-brown plumage—that is, they lack the white head and tail of the adult bird.

During the time they are in this plumage, many people do not recognize that they are eagles. They shoot them because they think they're large hawks, or vultures. Of course, in many states—in most states, really, the shooting of large hawks and vultures is also illegal, but this doesn't stop the trophy hunter and the careless shooter from killing eagles and all other large birds as prey.

So, in this immature plumage particularly, the eagles are still being lost to the gun.

Mr. DODD. The young eagle trying his wings for the first time is symbolic of the current efforts in the United States toward the preservation of our endangered species of wildlife. We are only trying our wings. We are not yet flying. There is much we do not know about the animals, birds and fishes now in danger of extinction. We need greater research, establishment of more refuges, as well as improved position in the priority of things for the wildlife community. The United States, like any complex society, has many problems. This is one of them, this possible loss of some key members of the natural environment. It remains to be seen whether the priority assigned to this one problem will be high enough to lead to solutions.

Extinction is a harsh reality of Nature. Actually, no man knows how many species of life have been on this Earth. To say there have been millions, even billions, is probably not an exaggeration. Any life that has outgrown its environment, or has failed to adapt to changes in it, dies. It becomes extinct. The huge dinosaurs that once roamed this planet are a classic example of this truth.

Yet, extinction in the hands of Nature is a gradual and a necessary process. Extinction in the hands of Man is comparatively sudden. It is often unfeeling, almost always violent, and without question unnecessary.

That's what we've been trying to say in this hour. The preservation of the seventy-eight wildlife creatures now threatened with extinction cannot be left entirely in the hands of the scientists. There must be some conscious, positive effort by the motorist in Florida who might run down a Key Deer, by the hunter in the field who might mistake an immature Bald Eagle for another bird; by any man or company of men who might burn a forest or drain a swamp or pollute a stream. To put it another way, the time has come for the realization that man endangers an animal simply because he's there.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD AT THE THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE POTOMAC HIGHLAND OF WEST VIRGINIA, CACAPON STATE PARK, BERKELEY SPRINGS, W. VA., OCTOBER 16, 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on October 16, 1967, I addressed the third annual meeting of the Potomac Highland of West Virginia, which was held at Cacapon State Park, Berkeley Springs, W. Va. I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POTENTIAL OF THE POTOMAC HIGHLAND

I am delighted to have the opportunity to address this meeting dealing with the recreational development of Eastern West Virginia.

This is a most favored area. Its potential, in my judgment, is virtually unlimited. Eastern West Virginia comes as close as any place I can think of to having almost everything it needs for full-scale recreational development.

You who are here tonight know the details concerning these assets better than I. But let me, as one who comes from another part of West Virginia, give you my impressions about this area.

These ten counties, that Potomac Highland, Inc., is promoting, have the widest range of scenic beauty in West Virginia. To say that does not disparage any other part of our state—for most all of West Virginia is richly endowed with natural beauty and resources for recreational development.

But where else can one find within a few hours driving time from Washington and other large urban centers such a contrast as that between the rolling blue grass horse country of the Eastern Panhandle and the Allegheny Mountain peaks towering nearly five thousand feet into the clouds around Spruce Knob?

It is, indeed, an area blessed—an historic section of our state, with tremendous possibilities for the future, only a few hours away from the teeming megalopolis of the Eastern Seaboard.

Yes, I think the potential is great, and I congratulate you who are attending this conference for the work you are doing and for your enthusiasm and your effective efforts to make your dreams come true.

I share those dreams. I am proud of my state, as you are proud of it, and I like the slogan you have put on the front of your Potomac Highland brochure, "The Nation's Eastern Playground." I want to see you turn those words into the fullest reality—and I want to help you do it.

To that end, the Potomac Highlands already have much to offer the visitor. It is a truism of the travel promotion business that scenery and climate alone are not enough to hold the traveler. There must also be interesting things for the family or the couple on vacation to see and do, if they are to tarry long in one place.

At this time of year, visitors to the mountains of this area can enjoy a pageant of color that is unmatched. If they love the outdoors, as I do, they can ride, or hike the mountain trails, or hunt. In the winter they can ski. All year long they can fish.

If they enjoy "improving the breed of the horses," as the saying goes, they can visit two fine race tracks. Soon they will be able to play golf on the new championship course at Canaan Valley and enjoy other activities there at the really fabulous resort that is now in the making, and for which, I am informed, the main contracts are to be let this winter.

The visitor to the Potomac Highlands can go down into the Smoke Hole and Seneca Caverns to see the wonders of nature underground, or he can ride the Cass Railway to get the breathtaking view of the Alleghenies at Bald Knob. He can picnic, he can camp on some of the most interesting sites in the East, he can relax in wilderness areas, or in plush park facilities such as these.

He can have a farm vacation, or take a mineral bath, or go water skiing. He can come face-to-face with history at places like Harpers Ferry and Berkeley Springs.

I am happy to be able to say that I have had a part in the new developments that are under way in the Potomac Highland—developments that can mean so much to West Virginia as we look toward the future.

One of which I am particularly proud, as I am sure you are, is the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area. I feel that the potential for this area is even greater than we thought at first, I say this because such areas of unspoiled natural beauty are becoming fewer and fewer in our bumper-to-bumper metropolitan world.

That portion of the Monongahela National Forest can enrich the lives of all who visit it. I believe the hundred thousand acres that Congress has set aside for the public domain will become a mecca for all who love the outdoors among the more than 30 million people who live within less than half a day's drive of it.

I think it would not be too much to say that the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation area may well become the "Wilderness Jewel" of the Eastern United States. I am extremely grateful that I had the privilege of sponsoring the legislation that created this Potomac Highland asset. I am glad to be able to report to you, too, that the observation tower on Spruce Knob, for which I was able to help secure the funds, is now nearing completion. It should be finished in November, and when it is the magnificent view from "the top of West Virginia" will become more accessible to all.

As for the "development" of the area itself, that will be up to the U.S. Forest Service, but, in contrast to highly developed or sophisticated recreation facilities, substantial portions of Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks will be left in the primitive state. The northern portion of the Smoke Hole section will be known as a "pioneer zone." This means that it will be managed so as to maintain the environment of a primitive forest similar to that found by the first pioneers when they crossed the Blue Ridge to the Alleghenies. This zone will afford a unique opportunity for the growing number of our people who, because of the pressures of city life, want to "get away from it all."

As for the over-all potential "draw" of visitors, Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks is expected by the Forest Service to attract a million visitors a year by 1970. This, the Forest Service says, will increase to an expected three to five million by the year 2000.

Another major project of great interest to the Potomac Highland area is the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park and the National Park Service's Interpretive Facilities Center that is to be built in the coming year. This center, which will bring together the information specialists of the Park Service and allow them to work under one roof, will in itself be a tourist attraction.

A beautifully-designed, yet modern and functional, building will be erected on the hillside above the Shenandoah River near where John Brown's "fort" now stands, the historic old building that figured in the pre-Civil War raid, which is, itself a tourist attraction.

The Park Service Center, when it is completed, will house the designers, artists, and writers and so on who produce the Park Service's descriptive literature and audio-visual materials. This is a splendid new facility to come into West Virginia's Potomac Highlands and I am gratified that I had a part in obtaining it.

Each year the Park Service produces some 16 million pamphlets and other publications dealing with the National Parks, along with innumerable films, tapes and slides to help the millions who visit the parks to enjoy and appreciate them more. These aids are now produced at scattered locations throughout the country. West Virginia thus gets another welcome Federal activity that will add to the state's economic growth.

Harpers Ferry was a logical site for this new facility because of the location there of the Park Service's Stephen T. Mather Training Center, which is the principal school for training Park Service rangers in interpretive methods. The two centers will complement and supplement each other. Anticipating that the Interpretive Center—and I think correctly—will in itself draw visitors, the Park Service is providing in it an exhibit lobby where visitors to Harpers Ferry and the Historical Park can see how the Park Service explanatory material is produced. A total of $1.2 million has been appropriated by Congress for construction of the building and equipping it.

Other current projects in this 10-county area that I think are of interest to you include the new Cranberry Mountain Information Center in Pocahontas County, the Eagle Lake Dam in the Monongahela National Forest (also in Pocahontas County), and the Trout Pond Recreation Area in Hardy County, all three of which were initiated with moneys I was able to add to the budget of the U.S. Forest Service. In addition there is the Leetown National Fish Hatchery in Jefferson County for the improvement of which I obtained funds, and the Sugar Grove Naval Radio Receiving Station in Pendleton County, for which I obtained authorization and also was able to obtain funds.

The Forest Service expects to spend $1.7 million for the work on the Trout Pond project, of which $675,000 has been appropriated to date. A 64-foot high dam is now under construction which will create an impoundment of about 13 acres, around which the new recreation area's camping and picnic sites will be provided. The new lake is to be known as Trout Lake.

Plans for the Eagle Lake Dam should be completed this fall. This will be a considerably larger impoundment of some 47 acres. It will eventually have 250 campsites designed to accommodate 1,300 persons at a time. There will be picnic facilities and a beach for swimming. The estimated cost of this project is $780,000.

About four and a half miles away is the Cranberry Mountain Visitors Information Center, which I recently had the pleasure of dedicating, bringing this project to completion. I believe that that part of the Monongahela Forest will become another mecca for visitors in the area which Potomac Highlands Inc., is promoting.

The work at Leetown is being completed and the facility will be dedicated this coming Saturday in a ceremony at which I will speak. This fish hatchery is the headquarters for one of the foremost fish disease laboratories in the world. The two new buildings include a Visitor's Center, and the expectation of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is that it will draw an increasing number of tourists.

As for Sugar Grove, the Navy is hopeful that its radio receiving center there may be operational by the end of 1968.

A basic ingredient of any tourist development, of course, is roads. Access to the recreational facilities and other attractions must be provided.

Improvement is in the making in this regard, too. Depending upon the availability of funds, the Allegheny Parkway, which I originally proposed and on which I have been working for several years, will give easy access into the heart of the Potomac Highland. It would serve the Potomac Highland area as a new north-south scenic artery, much as the Skyline Drive and Blue Ridge Parkways do along the crest of the Blue Ridge in Virginia. It would enter West Virginia about halfway between Berkeley Springs and Harpers Ferry, with a spur extending to Harpers Ferry. It would pass near Romney to a point in the vicinity of Keyser, and thence south along the high elevations of the Alleghenies, traversing the entire north-south length of the Potomac Highland area.

In my judgment this parkway could be one of the greatest boons of all to the full development of this whole region. The National Park Service is now completing its master plan for the parkway, and we should have those plans perhaps in the next few days. The field studies have been completed, the route determined, and once the plans are all wrapped up, they will be submitted to Congress. I have introduced the bill pending before the Senate Committee on the Interior that would create the parkway. The nation's fiscal picture at present, of course, is such as to make any immediate start on construction doubtful. But I hope Congress will authorize the project. It is well for us to bear in mind, however, that proposals for other scenic parkways are also before the administration and Congress. I shall continue to push as vigorously as I can to bring about the realization of this dream.

The Highland Scenic Highway, sponsored by Senator Randolph, is already under construction in its initial segments between Gormania and Richwood, and it, too, will add to the Potomac Highland potential.

It has been a pleasure for me to discuss these projects and developments with you. I commend you for the work you are doing, for it will benefit all of our state, not just the Eastern portion. But it is the Eastern portion that you are most interested in, and I say to you in closing, as I said at the outset of these remarks, that I think the potential of the beautiful Potomac Highland area is great. You have got a lot going for you. Thank you.

CHAMPIONSHIP NAVY BEAN SOUP

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, next Friday, as we all know, the Nation celebrates Navy Day. Aside from appropriating funds for 10 new aircraft carriers, I can think of few ways in which the Senate could more significantly or frugally mark this auspicious occasion than by having the championship Navy bean soup included in the Senate restaurant menus that day.

In no way, of course, would this signify any disrespect for—or falling from favor of—the Senate's own famous bean soup. Without Senate bean soup to support this body during the long winter sessions, I shudder to think where the Nation might be today. But I would hope that for at least this 1 day there would be room on the menu for two bean soups.

Now, in all candor, let me add that I have never actually tried the championship Navy bean soup. One can only assume that with the entire Department of the Navy behind it, it is not going to give the Senate collective indigestion.

Mr. President, I requested and have now received from the Department a copy of the winning recipe. The fact is that despite 3 years in the Navy in World War II, I had never even heard of the Navy bean soup competition—which goes to show how uninformed one man can be. I am confident, however, that the rivalry was spirited. One pictures Navy men sending in exotic recipes from all over the world. Perhaps the finalists squared off with ladles in the Pentagon kitchen. In any case, I am sure the championship Navy bean soup is worthy of the name. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to share the Navy recipe with other Senators and their wives by having it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the recipe was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Recipe: Navy Bean Soup

1 Cup Navy Beans.
4 Cups Water.
1 Pound Ham Bone, cut in sections.
½ Cup Onions, chopped.
2 Carrots, fresh, medium, sliced thin.
2 Ribs of Celery, fresh, chopped.
⅛ Teaspoon Prepared Mustard.
⅛ Cup Green Peppers, fresh, minced.
½ Cup Tomato Puree.
1 Whole Clove.
2 Peppercorns.

Pick over and wash beans thoroughly, soak for 12 hours. Drain, place all ingredients in container. Season with salt and pepper to taste. Cook slowly over low flame approximately 4 hours, stirring occasionally to keep from scorching; add liquid if necessary. Remove ham bones, serve with a sprig of parsley and crisp saltines.

Smooth Sailing.

A SERGEANT VIEWS THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Powell Tribune, a semiweekly newspaper in Park County, Wyo., has been carrying a lively exchange of views on the subject of the war in Vietnam, giving voice to its readers in an admirable attempt to encourage public concern and public thought. Among the recent letters, and published on October 13, was one from Sgt. Richard R. Martin, of the 4th battalion, 47th Infantry, telling why he is in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that Sergeant Martin's letter to the editor of the Powell Tribune be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

If We Have Wars We'll Need Men With Courage

Dear Editor: I have been reading the Tribune articles concerning the "Dumbell War" and as an active participant in the topic under discussion I thought I might express my views.

I am 23 years old and a 1962 graduate of PHS. I was married in November of 1965, drafted in May of 1966, and I came to Vietnam with my unit in January of 1967. I am with and always have been with Co. B, 4th Bn., 47th Inf. In effect, I'm a mud stomping, bug swatting GI who is darn proud of it! Back in training I could have given less than my best and possibly I would never be where I am now, but I don't think I would have been able to live with myself for any length of time.

Our outfit is basically a "strike force." We go places where the VC dominate and as such we see a little more of what this war is all about than most people do. We see the women and children doing what little work gets done in the fields. We notice the complete absence of able bodied men and women in the many typically poor villages. We are appalled at the lack of decent food and clothing for the vast majority of the people.

We take Vietnamese interpreters with our company to talk for us when we enter the villages and "homes" of the pillaged Delta. They tell us the old farmer in Long An Province is glad to see us. He says the V.C. have slacked off considerably since Allied Forces started routing them out in early 1966. They still come through his area and demand meals, but they no longer haul off his rice in large bagfuls. The old farmer offered us a few scrounged citrus fruits. The interpreter said the old man wished he had more to offer, but long ago the V.C. took away the able bodied workers and it was hard for him to produce more.

The interpreters also tell us that the husbands and fathers of the lonely women and love starved children are away fighting in the war. Naturally they all say they are on the allied side. Some are without a doubt fighting for the V.C. That doesn't keep the women and children from being lonely and without love.

As we see villagers and workers it is part of our job to check their papers and billfolds for proper ID cards. We also check all enemy papers and billfolds. The only person I have ever known to have over 500 piasters ($5 U.S.) in his possession was a man who was traveling with a squad of armed V.C. In his papers we found enough piasters to equal well over $150 U.S. He also had papers indicating he had been out collecting "taxes."

The only religious building I have ever seen that was in useable condition was in a particularly heavily populated area. It was a Buddhist temple and it had five elderly Monks in it. The temple also housed the only school I have seen in my eight months over here.

Now, some of you reading this letter are saying that these problems could be resolved by pulling the U.S. troops out of Vietnam and in effect ending the war. Do you really believe the communists will open schools? After all, an ignorant person is easier to control, and how much intelligence does it take to follow a water buffalo and a plow through a rice paddy? And after the rice is harvested do you really believe they will let the ignorant farmers keep it when Red China is starving? Of course, if the war was over they would let many of the people go home, but they would keep many more people in the military for "necessary" projects. They would have to keep a strong army in case the "US Imperialists" ever struck again. Also, people will be needed to go into other countries and convince them of the right (and mighty) ways of communism.

If we were to pull out of Vietnam what would become of Thailand and other small, gallant nations of Southeast Asia? As far as that goes, how long would it be before the "Red Tide" engulfed North America in its subtle but sure ways?

I realize this letter may not encompass the deeper and more controversial aspects of this war, but it basically states the reason why I (and hundreds of others) are risking life and limb in this "Dumbell War." We are doing it so that we can live with our families in a free society and so that we can help others live under conditions resembling ours as much as possible.

I respect the thoughts of the people who wrote the previous articles, even though I cannot agree with them. From the appearance of the news we get from the states many of the people that use freedom of speech to any extent are developing thoughts more and more along this line. I only hope enough people stay alert enough to insure that this type of free speech does not lull the nation so far that it brings an end to our freedom of speech.

In conclusion, I would like to borrow a part of Mr. Wickstrom's letter to the Tribune where he wrote "We hope soon there will be no Powell boys, Wyoming boys, or any other kind of boys fighting wars like this." I hope so too, but as long as there are wars like this to fight, I hope there will always be men with courage and conviction enough to fight them.

Sincerely yours,

Sgt. Richard R. Martin.

WILDERNESS AREAS IN THE NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Moab, Utah, Times Independent of October 12 has published a lead editorial entitled "Why All the Fuss?" The editorial comments that the National Park Service is presently considering areas within the national parks and monuments that might be set aside as wilderness and points out that it is completely illogical to go through this practice.

I agree wholeheartedly with the viewpoint of the editorial.

Since its creation, the National Park Service has been entrusted with the management and preservation of the scenic wonders in our national parks and monuments, and I believe it has done a very fine job. Why must we now have the Service set aside parts of the areas as wilderness within the national parks?

The policy to date has always been to preserve areas of wilderness in the parks, and there is no reason to believe that that objective will change with the change of administrations or for any other cause. I think it peculiar that we should tell the Park Service to tie its own hands so far as future planning and management are concerned. I recognize, of course, that the wilderness bill calls for a procedure of this sort, but I would hope that we will not have great areas of our parks frozen in the wilderness and therefore unavailable for consideration by the planning staff of the Park Service at a later date.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why All the Fuss?

We are sure that given time, we will be able to find adequate rationalization in the well-prepared folder submitted this week, to justify the trouble and expense now being put forth, to place certain land within the present boundaries of some Utah parks and monuments (including Arches), into the wilderness category.

The withdrawal from an already-withdrawn federal preserve doesn't make much sense to us. It would appear that Park Service planners and wilderness advocates don't trust themselves in future years when it comes to further development work. So to insure perpetuity of wilderness status, a formal super-withdrawal is now being sought.

We are sure that to primarily eastern advocates of the wilderness concept, the idea is more appealing than it is to those of us who have had more than our share of near-wilderness and lack of development over the years.

But to force even the conservation-conscious National Park Service to conform in certain areas to pure wilderness preservation, when they alone have carried the preservation ball for so many years, seems to be going from the sublime to the ridiculous.

We doubt that there will be much reaction to the public hearing scheduled in Moab in December. NPS has just about developed Arches all it intends to develop it, and with respect to the rest of the monument, who cares? For all practical purpose, it is, and will be, kept in a wilderness state—regardless of the outcome of the present efforts.

NATIONAL VFW OPPOSES WARTIME TRADE WITH COMMUNIST RUSSIA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I placed in the Record a resolution adopted at the national convention of the American Legion opposing President Johnson's policy of expanding trade with Communist-bloc nations which are supplying North Vietnam with its warmaking weapons.

It has now been brought to my attention that another great veterans' organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at their annual convention in New Orleans last August, adopted a similar resolution. I believe that the VFW resolution hits the nail right on the head in its discussion of what is a strategic item when we are dealing with Communist countries.

I also invite to the attention of the Senate the emphasis placed on the conversion of the moneys derived from these imports into the "munitions, trucks, and weapons that are being sent to North Vietnam to be used against the U.S. Armed Forces and their allies fighting for freedom in Vietnam."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 264 Opposing All Forms of Trade, Commerce, and Financial Assistance to Communist or Communist-Controlled Nations

Whereas, any aid to a Communist country, be it nonstrategic or wheat or a "loan" of American dollars, strengthens the Communist masters and further enslaves the peoples of these countries; and

Whereas, monies derived from these various imports are being converted into munitions, trucks and weapons that are being sent to North Vietnam to be used against the United States Armed Forces and their Allies fighting for Freedom in Vietnam; and

Whereas, in paragraph 7, of Resolution No. 14 (1966 Convention) entitled "Resisting Communism and Assisting Our Loyal Allies in Restoring Freedom" it reads: "Oppose all forms of trade, commerce, and financial assistance that will strengthen the Communist nations, thus adhering to a policy of not strengthening the forces of Communism which have as their prime objective destruction of the United States and freedom throughout the world." This Resolution being unanimously passed by the Delegates in session at the 67th National Convention in New York; and

Whereas, in a news release dated Thursday, December 22, 1966, Commander-in-Chief Fry commends Rep. Paul Findley (R-Ill.) for his amendment in opposition of Sale of Surplus Food to Communist Nations, and in the third paragraph says "This is bad enough (referring to 4-million dollars in credit subsidies) but Yugoslavia and other Communist nations are continually trading with Communist aggressors of North Vietnam. Their goods and materials are aiding in the death of American fighting men every day."; and

Whereas, Commander-in-Chief Fry in the last paragraph of his news release of December 22, 1966 says "We must not allow food, clothing, fuel and arms to be put into the hands of the aggressors like North Vietnam so they might drag that war for Freedom to eternity. The sooner our government stands straighter and stops listening to those who supposedly 'build bridges' with our enemies, the sooner our men can come home where they belong."; now therefore

Be it resolved, by the 68th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that we emphatically go on record demanding that the importing of Communist products be stopped immediately; and that a campaign be begun by every post, county council, district and department urging their families, friends and the citizens of their respective communities to cease purchasing these Communist imports.

Adopted at the 68th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held at New Orleans, La., August 20 through 25, 1967.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the September 1967 crime report for the District of Columbia as prepared by the Metropolitan Police Department.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, SEPTEMBER 1967

During September 1967, a total of 3,393 Crime Index Offenses were reported in the District, an increase of 565 offenses or 20.0% from September 1966.

During the month increases occurred in the classifications of Homicide, up 4 offenses or 57.1%; Rape, up 11 offenses or 157.1%; Robbery, up 118 offenses or 32.8%; Housebreaking, up 214 offenses or 21.8%; Larceny ($50 & Over), up 139 offenses or 27.4%; and Auto Theft, up 101 offenses or 15.6%.

A decrease occurred in the classification of Aggravated Assault, down 22 offenses or 6.9%.

The increases for this month brought the trend of Crime Index Offenses (total offenses for the past twelve months) to 36,497, an increase of 9,239 offenses or 33.9% from the trend of September 1966, and an increase of 269.8% from the low point of April 1957.

Clearance of Crime Index Offenses for the twelve month period ending with September 1967, were down to 25.0% as compared with 27.7% for the twelve month period ending with September 1966.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT
CRIME INDEX OFFENSES, SEPTEMBER 1967

Classification	September 1966	September 1967	Change Amount	Change Percent	Cumulative to date Fiscal year 1967	Cumulative to date Fiscal year 1968	Percent change	Total, 12 months ending September 1967
Criminal homicide	7	11	+4	+57.1	33	40	+21.2	164
Rape	7	18	+11	+157.1	37	46	+24.3	159
Robbery	360	478	+118	+32.8	1,018	1,425	+40.0	5310
Aggravated assault	317	295	−22	−6.9	947	891	−5.9	3181
Burglary	981	1,195	+214	+21.8	2,860	3,468	+21.2	13,397
Larceny ($50 and over)	507	646	+139	+27.4	1,419	1,811	+27.6	6,320
Auto theft	649	750	+101	+15.6	1,960	2,310	+17.9	7,944
Total	2,828	3,393	+565	+20.0	8,274	9,991	+20.7	36,475

Precinct	September 1966	September 1967	Change Amount	Change Percent
1	247	221	−26	−10.5
2	263	351	+88	+33.5
3	275	316	+41	+14.9
4	57	63	+6	+10.5
5	205	165	−40	−19.5
6	126	155	+29	+23.0
7	49	81	+32	+65.3
8	59	94	+35	+59.3
9	303	359	+56	+18.5
10	326	410	+84	+25.8
11	253	439	+186	+73.5
12	170	147	−23	−13.5
13	314	332	+18	+5.7
14	181	260	+79	+43.6
Harbor	----	----	----	----
Total	2,828	3,393	+565	+20.0

Precinct	Total	Criminal homicide	Rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Housebreaking	Larceny, $50 and over	Auto theft
1	221	1	----	51	14	36	78	41
2	351	1	2	84	48	92	62	62
3	316	----	1	25	8	94	150	38
4	63	----	----	5	3	26	17	12
5	165	1	----	31	22	63	17	31
6	155	----	3	14	5	75	20	38
7	81	----	----	4	3	29	31	14
8	94	----	----	7	1	37	36	13
9	359	3	2	55	42	162	33	62
10	410	----	3	60	53	140	53	101
11	439	----	5	66	25	153	48	142
12	147	2	----	9	14	55	28	39
13	332	3	----	44	43	128	56	58
14	260	----	2	23	14	105	17	99
Harbor precinct	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Total	3,393	11	18	478	295	1,195	646	750

DISTRICTING CONFERENCE REPORT SHOULD BE OPPOSED

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, yesterday in a speech on the Senate floor I outlined eight objections to the report of the Senate-House conference on congressional redistricting which was filed in the House yesterday.

Today the Washington Post, in an excellent editorial, urges the defeat of the conference report.

While there are several objections to the report, I think that two major considerations deserve the main attention in the Senate's vote on whether to accept the conference report.

First, the legislation proposed by the report is unconstitutional. By providing that no States shall be required to redistrict unless a special Federal census is provided by the State, the conference is permitting States unconstitutionally to withdraw from the court's jurisdiction over redistricting.

Or if the legislation is read to authorize the courts to order a State, first, to pay for a State census, and second, to redistrict, the courts will hold the legislation to be a delaying tactic that unconstitutionally slows down the process of redistricting. I do not expect a Supreme Court which has presided over the fair redistricting of 33 States since its landmark decision in Westberry against Sanders only 2½ years ago to permit this conference-proposed legislation to completely halt redistricting for 5 years.

The second major point of discussion should be this: If the special census provision is ruled unconstitutional—and I am convinced it will be—the prohibition of at-large elections for Representatives contained in the conference proposal also will be unconstitutional. There is no severability clause.

Thus, there is a good possibility that many of the 164 Representatives from California, New Jersey, Indiana, Texas, Missouri, Ohio, New York, and Florida will be forced to run at large in the 1968 elections. That is so because it may be the spring of 1968 before the Supreme Court could announce a definitive decision on the constitutionality of the legislation. At that late date, Federal courts in States having unconstitutional districtings might be required to dispose of pending cases by requiring the House Members to run at large.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in this morning's Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICTING FIASCO

The conferees' report on the districting bill is a severe disappointment. Congress set out to create new standards that all the states would have to meet so as to assure fair and equal representation in the House. Bills for this purpose cleared both houses, and the Senate bill was admirable. But the quarreling conferees have ripped both bills to pieces and brought forth a substitute that is virtually worthless.

The heart of both bills was a provision requiring the states to permit no more than 10 per cent variation between their largest and smallest districts after the 1970 census. This has been completely deleted. Indeed, the conferees abandoned all efforts to set up permanent districting standards for the states because they could not agree upon an anti-gerrymandering provision and a temporary population variation rule for the next two elections. The result is to scuttle a vital principle that had been strongly approved by both houses.

What remains is merely a ban on court-imposed elections at large and a shabby declaration that no state will be required to redistrict before the 1970 census unless the results of a special census are available. It is easy to understand the lack of enthusiasm for any major redistricting drive on the basis of 1960 census figures, which are no longer an accurate measure of population in any state. If this attempt to suspend the districting process temporarily had been coupled with a strong set of standards to take hold after 1970 it would have won substantial sympathy. But in its present form it is merely a pesky bit of obstructionism.

The best course for both the Senate and the House, in our view, would be to reject the conference report and to instruct the conferees to bring in a bill embracing at least the standards approved by both houses. These conferees have shamefully disregarded the will of their parent bodies, and they should not be permitted to get away with it.

EFFECT OF MARIHUANA ON THE HUMAN SYSTEM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a most unfortunate and ill-considered statement has been made by Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner of the Federal Food and Drug Administration, about the use of marihuana and its effect on the human system.

I am sure that if he had it to do again, Dr. Goddard would temper his remarks in light of the body of scientific evidence, pro and con, that exists on this subject.

It is not my purpose to reprimand Dr. Goddard, who sits in judgment on the regulation of the use and labeling of all types of drugs in the United States, and who generally has the reputation of being far stricter in his application of the laws and regulations to unusual drugs than he was in his own comments on the use of marihuana.

I do want to point out that a great number of people who are experts in the science of drugs and law enforcement do not share his liberal views on marihuana.

I wish to point out first that scientists of the caliber of Dr. Dana L. Farnsworth, director of Harvard University Department of Health Services; and Dr. Curtis Prout, chief of medicine at Harvard, made a significant statement about the marihuana problem in the Bulletin of the San Francisco Medical Society, and this statement was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 11, 1967, just a few days before Dr. Goddard spoke, by the Honorable JERRY L. PETTIS, a Member of the House of Representatives from California.

Dr. Farnsworth and Dr. Prout declare in the statement that marihuana has a chemical effect on ordinary consciousness causing ideas to come forth in a "rapid, disconnected, and uncontrollable manner." They said dangerous effects include a slowing of reflexes, a distortion of reality, including loss of the sense of time, and conditions causing automobile accidents.

It is most unfortunate and discouraging to law-enforcement agencies throughout the Nation that so high an official as Dr. Goddard should make the comments he did. At the very time he was speaking, in fact, State and local law-enforcement personnel from across the Nation were gathering in Washington for a special school conducted by the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control of the Food and Drug Administration on the subject of the enforcement of our narcotics laws, including the law making it a crime to possess or use marihuana. Two very fine officers from the Nebraska State Safety Patrol who specialize in this type of law enforcement are attending this school—Sgt. Wayne Rowe and Investigator James Dibbert. They have obtained for me a copy of a resolution adopted recently by the International Criminal Police Organization, commonly known as Interpol, representing 100 member countries.

In view of Dr. Goddard's statement that there is nothing wrong with marihuana except that there is a law against it, and that except for the law against it he would not object to his college daughter smoking marihuana any more than he would object to her drinking a cocktail, I think it is urgent to point out and to place in the RECORD the resolution adopted by Interpol in Japan earlier this month.

It appears that the resolution was based on conclusions of the finest scientific minds of the world on drug abuse and dependence-producing drugs. I refer to the World Health Organization and its expert committee, which has determined that cannabis, the dried flowering spikes of the pistillate plants of the hemp contained in marihuana, is capable of producing drug dependence.

Quite obviously, Dr. Goddard, who personally has the responsibility of protecting the health and welfare of our citizens, is misinformed or not completely informed about a subject which could have far-reaching damage to susceptible individuals and to our society.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution of the International Criminal Police Organization on this subject.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1: NARCOTIC DRUGS

(International Criminal Police Organization, 36th general assembly session, Kyoto, September 27 to October 4, 1967)

Whereas the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, obligates signatories to place cannabis under a system of rigid control;

Whereas many members of Interpol are from countries which have ratified or acceded to the Single Convention;

Whereas the WHO Expert Committee on Dependence-Producing Drugs has determined that cannabis is capable of producing drug dependence and that harm to society is caused by abuse of cannabis;

Recognizing the need for checking any possible tendency to minimize the harmful aspects of cannabis or to bring about legalization of this drug;

Recognizing that inadequate control of illicit cannabis traffic breeds drug dependence, creates enforcement problems and injures the national welfare;

Keeping in view the resolutions adopted in General Assembly sessions in Rio de Janeiro and in Berne in 1965 and 1966 respectively, and having considered the developments since then;

The I.C.P.O.-Interpol General Assembly, meeting in Kyoto from 27th September to 4th October 1967 at its 36th session:

Recommends that all Interpol members urge on their governments the necessity of providing adequate and prompt measures to ensure that illicit cannabis traffickers are severely dealt with, and that possession of cannabis be restricted to legitimate medical, scientific and industrial use.

(Adopted unanimously.)

MODEST MIRACLE IN BOONE COUNTY, MO.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, until a few years ago, for all people in rural areas to ever expect to have plenty of pure, safe running water in their homes and barns was thought impractical.

Because of the low density of population and the considerable distances between farms, most people in rural areas had resigned themselves to the belief that it would cost far too much to be supplied water from a central system.

Mr. President, today every resident in Boone County, Mo., both rural and urban, has signed up for piped water to their homes and farms—and this includes some 2,700 farms in that county.

When all the systems are completed, Boone County expects to be the first rural county in the Nation to be completely served by central water systems.

How was it accomplished? It was accomplished by a combination of hard work by local people and the full cooperation of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Farmers Home Administration with its rural community water and sewer facilities loan and grant program. This same program is helping to revitalize thousands of rural areas in this Nation.

The history of this modest miracle in Boone County was reported in detail by Lew Hudson in the Worthington, Minn., Globe, on September 29.

Because this article should serve to encourage and inform other rural residents on how to do the same thing as the residents of Boone County have done, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PIPED-IN WATER FOR FARMS? HERE'S ONE PLAN—SYSTEM TRIED OUT IN MISSOURI—IT'S MORE EFFICIENT, SAFER, MAY COST LESS MONEY.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Problems urban areas are having with maintaining adequate water supplies have been the subject of much attention in recent years. Equally as important, but perhaps not as well known, are the problems farm people have with water systems. Today and tomorrow, the Globe discusses the rural aspects. This first report tells of a dramatic experiment in Boone county, Missouri while tomorrow's will discuss the extent of rural water problems in Nobles county, Minnesota.)

(By Lew Hudson)

COLUMBIA, MO. (Special).—"Water, water everywhere but not one drop to drink."

So went the plaint of the Ancient Mariner. Around these parts, thanks to the efforts of hard working citizens, that familiar phrase has been changed about. For residents of Boone county, Missouri, it now is quite literally "water everywhere and every drop good to drink."

Boone county is the first and only county in the nation to offer every citizen, both urban and rural, with water service piped directly to their homes.

It is likely that most people have never really thought about laying water mains to farm homes, and those who have probably have considered it "totally impractical" as was the case with electrical service four decades ago.

Still, Boone county has achieved this modest miracle. Now, farmers in that area no longer have to depend on their own wells. When they want water, they do the same thing town people do—they turn the faucet on.

The county is a fairly normal one. Its farms are from small to medium size by southwest Minnesota standards. The countryside is sharply rolling with large expanses of timber on the steeper slopes and along the streams.

The Missouri river forms the southwestern border. In the center of the county is the city of Columbia, a community of more than 30,000 persons not counting the student body of the University of Missouri which has its main campus there.

Water is not a major problem here although it is sometimes costly to obtain. For livestock watering, most farmers throw a dam across a nearby ravine and build a pond. For drinking water, it is necessary to drill a well.

The area is underlaid by a deposit of coal, and wells must penetrate that to get at water which is potable.

In all, there are 2,700 farms in the county and most of the operators have signed up for piped in water. Almost all the county already has water systems in operation although laying of mains is still in progress in a few remaining sections.

Rural water systems have a long history in Missouri although it was not until the last few years that things really got moving. Back in 1935, the state legislature passed a law allowing groups of private citizens to band together to form non-profit corporations to sell water to their members. The idea at the time was to make it possible for growing suburban areas around major cities to install water systems. It was not particularly designed to be of use to strictly rural areas.

From 1935 until 1962, 12 water districts were organized around St. Louis and Kansas City. Then, in 1962 a major breakthrough came when the Federal Home Administration was authorized to help in financing of such developments.

FHA was given the power to underwrite bonds sold on the open market or to make direct loans where other financing was not available.

It was soon after that Boone county started building water mains to rural people. The first water district was formed in the fall of 1963.

A formal procedure was laid down, based upon experiences of the first district. It has since been refined.

First requirement was that a proposed water district must be laid out in order to average five users per mile of line. Anything less than this makes it unfeasible since construction costs are greater than can be paid by reasonable usage charges.

Charles Baldwin, FHA representative for the county and perhaps the key man in the entire Boone county water situation, explained the procedures to be followed.

"It all starts with an expression of local interest on the part of the citizens," he said. A mass meeting is then held to discuss the matter. If sufficient interest appears to be present, a steering committee is elected.

The test of sincere interest comes early. Each person at the mass meeting is asked to pay a $10 fee. This is used by the steering committee to hire an engineer to make a feasibility study of the project and to draw a preliminary plan.

When this is done and if everything looks favorable, the steering committee then contacts every person within the proposed district asking them to sign a tentative agreement to hook onto the water system.

At this point, the preliminary plan is submitted to the Missouri Board of Health. The FHA then draws up a summary of the plans and submits it to the state FHA office for its approval.

When these steps have been completed, an attorney is retained to describe the legal boundaries of the proposed district and to prepare the necessary notices of hearings.

Under Missouri law, a petition, containing at least 50 signatures of land owners in the district, must be signed to call a court hearing on the proposal. At this hearing, all persons are invited to testify. Baldwin says to date, in 10 district proceedings, not one objector has appeared.

Each water district is governed by a board of directors. Initially, the board is appointed by the court with each member representing a geographical portion of the district. Later, board members are elected on a staggered basis.

When court approval is received and a board appointed, the directors then go back to the people to have them sign firm user agreements. A fee of $25 is collected at this time from each.

By this time, each prospective user has invested $35 in the project. His first $10 is his meter deposit. The last $25 is used as a connection fee and helps to build the system.

Financing of the well drilling and laying of mains is accomplished by issuance of revenue bonds. These are sold after a revenue bond election is held. Final engineering plans are drawn and the district is then ready to move into construction.

FHA can loan money to districts at four per cent interest but funds available from the government are severely limited at this time. An alternative is to sell the revenue bonds on the normal bond market to private investors.

The board of directors sets the rates to be charged. Baldwin said the districts try to keep the total construction costs at about $1,000 per connection or less. Minimum charges are set at a level high enough to meet the bond payments. Charges for consumption over the minimum bring in necessary money to keep the system in operation and to make any repairs which might be necessary.

Boone county's districts charge an average of $6 per month as a minimum rate. This is for the first 2,500 gallons. The next 15,000 gallons is at 75 cents per thousand, and all over that at 50 cents per thousand gallons.

Districts also have a commercial rate for such things as trailer courts, manufacturing enterprises and large cattle feeders. It provides a $12 minimum for the first 5,000 gallons with the next 15,000 gallons at 75 cents per thousand, the next 15,000 gallons at 50 cents per thousand, and all over 35,000 gallons at 35 cents per thousand.

A self reading system is used under which residents send in cards monthly with their meter readings. Once a year or so, the district sends a meter reader around to double check the accuracy of the reading.

At present, each district elects a clerk who prepares the billings. Discussions are now underway as to the possibility of setting up a central maintenance crew and billing office to serve all districts and supported by all.

The rate structure is such that virtually all farmers sign up for the service. However the prices are too high to permit irrigation use. Districts could not supply enough water for general irrigation.

The districts have found that while most farmers are happy to hook onto the system, they still depend on ponds for their livestock water supplies and use the pressure system for house use. In other areas, where farm ponds are more difficult to build, farmers might find it to their advantage to use the piped water for livestock as well as house use.

Wells supplying the districts in Boone county average 1,000 feet in depth. Mains are 160-pound per square inch plastic pipe laid 42 inches below the surface. Depending on needs, mains vary from four to six inches in diameter.

Mains go only to the property line closest to the house. Installation of connecting lines is the responsibility of the farmer.

To date, Boone county has a total investment in rural water mains and wells of more than $6,000,000. In return, it has provided every rural citizen with a safe and ample supply of water, piped to his door at a price comparable to that paid by urban citizens. No longer is it necessary to have water hauled out from town during drought periods, to suffer the inconvenience of break-down of private pumps, or to forego the modern conveniences of automatic washers, dishwashers, or adequate plumbing.

It is an accomplishment fully as significant as the extension of electric service by the REA's of the nation. It is one sure to be emulated by other counties in years to come.

RE PENN-CENTRAL MERGER

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, all of us from the Northeast have been greatly heartened by the action of the U.S. district court in New York yesterday which clears the way for the consummation of the merger of the New York Central, Pennsylvania, and New Haven Railroads.

The decision was notable for its promptness and also for its clear acknowledgment of the relationship between this merger and the very survival of rail service to the New England area. The court acknowledged that even a temporary cessation of the New Haven's operations would bring "devastating hardship" to the area involved, and made it clear that, since other objections had been disposed of, the merger should proceed as fast as possible.

The district court, in fact, set a 15-day limit within which its decision could be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. As the district court noted, no one can determine whether the Supreme Court will be willing to hear an appeal on an expedited basis that would permit a decision before December 31 of this year. The processes of justice are and should be deliberate, of course, but speaking for myself and as I see the interests of New England, I can only express the hope that the very special economic circumstances in this case will be taken into consideration by the High Court should an appeal be made.

The district court itself spelled out those special circumstances in its decision yesterday as follows:

> No one has contested the forecast of the New Haven Trustees that their cash will run out at the end of 1967; no one has indicated any probable source of funds for the beleaguered property other than the merged Penn-Central.

Mr. President, the U.S. district court in New York has taken a major step toward bringing this important matter to an equitable conclusion. And it has demonstrated in the process that the judicial branch does not stand blind or aloof from reality. We can only hope that any remaining issues will be dealt with as promptly and as fairly and that the Penn-Central merger may come to pass before it is too late to realize the full economic benefit that should flow from it.

ADMIRAL TRUE ON VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Rear Adm. Arnold E. True, USN, retired, served for many years in the U.S. Navy after his graduation from the Naval Academy until his retirement some years ago. Since that time he has been associate professor of meteorology at San Jose State College in California, following his last naval service as chief meteorologist for the Atlantic Fleet.

During World War II Admiral True was commander of the U.S.S. *Hammond*, which played a vital role in the turning point of the Pacific war in the Battle of Midway where she was finally sunk in battle. Admiral True holds the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, Bronze Star, and other decorations.

Therefore his is a voice which deserves to be heard on the subject of Vietnam. He has taken a strong position in opposition to our policies, as have several other military figures who during their careers attained high status and now in retirement are free to speak their minds. This Admiral True has been doing in a series of speeches made in Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and other places. Recently he and I were together on a television program in Chicago.

I have received from him the text of his basic views presented in his speeches, under the title "Vietnam: Dead End in Asia." In it he examines some of the slogans and myths with which the American people have been bombarded as to our Vietnam operations. He finds that our military effort is not, in fact, achieving the goal of combating communism but rather is turning Vietnamese against us that we must "turn this country around" so that we become "leaders, not obstructionists, in an evolving world."

Mr. President, the words of Admiral True deserve heed and I hope his audiences, and those who may read his views, will listen. I ask unanimous consent that this address may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM: DEAD END IN ASIA

(By Rear Adm. Arnold E. True, USN, retired)

(NOTE.—The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not reflect the views of the Navy Department.)

We are here to discuss a war that our country is fighting with a small, technologically undeveloped nation in Asia 10,000 miles away. Historian Arnold Toynbee says that the destinies of the whole world are involved in Vietnam. So much of the world's attention has been focused on it, that this small nation has become the most important country in the world. There is such a divergence between public pronouncements and facts that our people are divided and confused. Alan Paton says, "Man is capable of creating tremendous noble slogans and shouting them aloud while doing ignoble deeds—and the more ignoble the deeds, the louder the slogans are shouted."

In this age of television and radio, we are bombarded with a stream of conflicting opinions, propaganda, statements, misstatements, and slogans so that it is not surprising that we are confused.

Slogans are the refuge of the unthinking. Adolph Hitler knew this when he proposed that the big lie, repeated loud enough and often enough, would be believed by the people. Sometimes the liar himself comes to believe it. I am not suggesting that we have any Adolph Hitlers in this country.

The public relations barrage that reaches the American people runs like this: our objective in Vietnam is self-determination for the Vietnamese people. We have made sacred commitments. Our intervention is in support of the SEATO Treaty. We are supporting the free world. Our national honor is at stake. The key to our involvement is our own national security. We must stop communism. If we don't fight them there we'll have to fight them here. This war will prevent a bigger war in the future. We must support our boys in Vietnam. We are winning the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people. It is a simple case of aggression by North Vietnam against a neighboring country whose freedom we are defending. Wars of liberation must not be permitted to succeed. We will not grow tired. We will not be defeated. These are noble sounding slogans. They are designed to appeal to our best instincts and our highest moral values. They are heard so often that many Americans believe they mean what they say.

Let us examine some of the slogans and the facts or lack of facts that lie behind them:

We are most frequently told that our objective in Vietnam is "self determination" for the Vietnamese people. A careful reading of the 1954 Geneva Accords indicates that they offered exactly that. After a cooling off period for the departure of the French, a free election under supervision of the International Control Commission was to be held in 1956, to decide if South Vietnam would reunite with North Vietnam or remain an independent country. That election was never held because Ngo Dinh Diem who had been installed as premier by the United States, with our encouragement, refused to hold them. President Eisenhower said that if they had been held, 80% of the people would have voted for Ho Chi Minh. South Vietnam has had a series of dictatorships for thirteen years that were unpopular with the people. General Ky holds power by virtue of the support of U.S. tanks, aircraft, and troops. The recently elected general assembly consisted of a carefully screened group of mandarins and wealthy landowners who have dominated Vietnam for a thousand years. Students and Buddhists protest that the recent Presidential elections were a fraud. It has been said that the elections were very like those in the U.S., but we don't let the army vote twice and we don't prohibit all Republicans from voting. Many unbiased observers think that Ho Chi Minh would still get 80% of the votes if a truly free election were possible. Under present circumstances it is not possible. A news dispatch a few days ago reported that 240,000 leaflets were dropped on a Vietnamese village which said that the village would be bombed again and again and advised the villagers to defect to the Saigon government if they wished to live. This does not sound like self-determination.

The Administration says repetitiously that we have made commitments to the government of South Vietnam that must be kept. According to the U.S. Constitution, foreign policy shall be conducted by the executive with the advice and consent of the Senate. I can find no record of the Senate having advised or consented to any commitments to the government of South Vietnam. I do find record of their having consented to and ratified the charter of the United Nations, and our actions in Vietnam are in direct violation of that charter. It is claimed that our intervention is in support of the SEATO treaty. A group of eminent international lawyers state that it is a violation of the SEATO treaty. India, Pakistan, and Britain are members of SEATO and they are not fighting in Vietnam.

Another slogan is that we are supporting the "free world". Our "free world" has some poor examples in the military dictatorships in Greece, in Taiwan, in Haiti, and a dozen other countries, not to mention that of General Ky in South Vietnam. It would be a little closer to the truth to say that we are supporting any government anywhere that is anti-communist, regardless of the wishes or the freedom of the people.

It is said that our National honor is at stake. Norman Cousins in an editorial in the Saturday Review says, "The President is indeed right that our national honor is at stake in Vienam. The national honor is at stake because things are being done in Vietnam that are dishonorable and inconsistent with the meaning of American history."

In a recent speech in Texas, the President said the key to our involvement in Vietnam is our own national security. He did not explain how tiny Vietnam could threaten the security of the United States. There seems to be little danger of the Vietnamese Navy capturing San Francisco or landing an invasion force. It is true that our national security is threatened but not in or by Vietnam. We are now spending more than 70 billion dollars a year for national security and supporting a military force of over 3 million men and we have less security than at any time in our history.

Another slogan is that we must stop communism. Three years ago the Defense Department reported that there were about 95,000 active communists in South Vietnam. Some authorities say that a large proportion of these were non-communist nationalists. Today the official reports indicate that about 300,000 active communists are in South Vietnam and we have killed 200,000. If we are stopping communism, how do their numbers grow at such a rate? A Vietnamese teacher watching the bombing of a Vietnamese village said "Today we make many communists". There is a way to combat communism, but it is not military. We can best defeat communism by building a better society for the people than the communists can build. We might start at home.

The Secretary of State says that we are fighting now in Vietnam to prevent a bigger war in the future. The news reports indicate that this is a good-sized war now, and it has dire prospects of growing directly into the bigger war that we are trying to prevent. Russia has promised that for every escalation by the U.S., she will increase her aid to Vietnam. That aid has been increasing. We need to remember that Russia has a more valid commitment to support North Vietnam than we have to support South Vietnam, and the probabilities are that she will keep that commitment. China has promised that she will not see Vietnam defeated. Most Chinese scholars and experts believe that China will keep that promise. We would certainly go all out if China or Russia were attacking Canada or Mexico on our borders.

Congressmen voting funds for the Vietnam war say "We must support our boys in Vietnam". I dare say that if you took a poll of the boys in Vietnam, you would find an enormous preference for being supported at home. We certainly don't support them by pushing more and more of them into the jungles and mud of a country 10,000 miles away in a war that they don't understand and for which they have little enthusiasm. If the Chinese suddenly pour a million troops into Vietnam, our boys will face a massacre far worse than Korea. Is that the support we offer?

"We must win the hearts and minds of the people". This is really a strange one. When we sacrifice our blood and our treasure to save these people from the slavery of communism and lead them to freedom and democracy, it seems that this in itself would win the hearts and minds of the people. But we have to pacify them by keeping a large part of the army in the villages to reinforce their desire for the blessings of American democracy. The only ones we don't have to pacify are those who are selling PX goods on the black market in Saigon. Our military personnel report that the NLF soldiers and the North Vietnamese soldiers are the best fighters that they have ever seen. At the same time they report that the Saigon army is not interested in fighting—that the soldiers are unreliable—that they desert by the thousands. These Saigon soldiers are of the same blood and nationality as the NLF. What could be the explanation of this? Is it possible that the common people and the Saigon Government's soldiers do not believe in or support the government for which they are forced to fight?

"It is a simple case of aggression by North Vietnam against a neighboring country". There is no historical foundation for the statement that N. and S. Vietnam are two countries. The Geneva Accords state plainly that the 17th parallel is a temporary line made originally to separate the armies of the French and the Viet Minh. General Ky was born in Hanoi. If there are *two* countries, we have a paradoxical situation in that the dictator and 'elected' vice President of S. Veitnam is a foreigner from the enemy country that is doing the aggressing.

"Wars of national liberation must not be permitted to succeed". If this statement is true, the status quo is frozen in the entire world by edict from America. No peoples dissatisfied with their government, no matter how autocratic or dictatorial may be permitted to change that government. This seems inconsistent with the history of America, since our country was founded by men who fought a war of national liberation.

Today we are fighting two wars; one against Vietnam and one against poverty, hunger, despair and discrimination in the United States. One of these wars is supposed to be a limited war. Which one? Our cities are slums. Our transportation systems are obsolete. The subways of Moscow and Leningrad, the railroad trains of Japan and the streets of Paris make the U.S. look like a backward country. Our crime rate is rising. It is not safe to walk in the streets and parks at night. What are our priorities? If the peoples of a developing country look at us and read our newspapers, do they see a society that they wish to emulate? They many envy our wealth but not our sense of values.

For fifty years the American public has been brain-washed into an anti-communist paranoia. For twenty years our wealth and our energies have been poured into an armaments race with the Soviet Union under the myth of the existence of a monolithic communism. We cling to this idea in spite of the obvious changes that are taking place in the communist world. If we have any cause to fear communism, it does not lie in threats from the jungles of Vietnam. It lies in the neglect of our own society while we pour billions into the war machine.

How do we get out of the mess we are in? General Gavin, in a speech at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, in offering a solution, said "Let's turn this country *around.*" Pursuing a wrong direction saves neither face nor dignity. The United States is without question the wealthiest and most powerful country in the world. We are rapidly becoming the most hated country in the world. We have the capacity to exercise worldwide leadership through economic and cultural achievements—not through a genocidal war against a little country in Southeast Asia.

Sometime ago, we asked the Secretary General of the United Nations to use all of his efforts to bring the Vietnam war to an end. He proposed a logical and practical course of action. We ignored it. We wanted to "win."

The Vietnam war is only one symptom of a disease in our foreign policy which may be fatal if left untreated. If we don't "turn this country around" there will be more Vietnams in Southeast Asia, in South America, and in Africa. We are trying to stem a tide of revolution among the hungry and underprivileged peoples of the world. We are trying to maintain the status quo in a world where the fundamental law is change. It can't be done and our attempts will result in our own disintegration and destruction. The alternative is to become leaders, not obstructionists, in an evolving world.

In the last half century, the world has shrunk to a size where it can be circled in 90 minutes instead of 90 days. A narrow nationalism is as obsolete today as a narrow tribalism was a half century ago. Technology has given to us and to others the means to destroy mankind in a matter of minutes. If we want to survive we must control this technology. The only solution is an international organization to settle disputes without war. The United Nations is an attempt in this direction. It is ineffective in preventing war because it does not have the full support of the two power giants of the world—the United States and the Soviet Union. A third giant, China, is now appearing. The key to international peace lies in co-existence and cooperation among these three while a more effective international organization is being built. U Thant has said that the membership and voting weight of the present U.N. must be made more realistic before it can become a really effective organization. A logical and constructive move by the United States would be to take the lead in building the United Nations into a workable and more effective entity. If our present leaders cannot do the job, let's find some who can and will!

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 498, S. 2171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 415

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modified amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, after line 17, insert the following new section:

SEC. 12. Section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act (30 U.S.C. 791) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) The Board shall cease to exist on June 30, 1969, unless in the period beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection and ending on December 31, 1968, proceedings under this Act shall have been instituted before the Board and hearings under this Act shall have been conducted by the Board. On or before January 10, 1969, the Attorney General shall determine whether such proceedings have been so instituted, and such hearings have been so conducted, within that period. The determination so made by the Attorney General shall be published in the Federal Register."

Nothing in the Act shall be construed to impair the power of Congress to provide for an instrumentality to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I want to say, with respect to this amendment that we have presented, it allows 1 year for the Board normally to operate under the 1950 act.

As everyone knows from the basic language, it depends upon the Attorney General making a finding, when he has reason to do so, with respect to a Communist-front organization or any other alleged tainted organization, then to file a petition and serve it on such organization and also serve it on the Board, and the Board then can institute hearings and summon witnesses.

Incidentally, under the rest of the language of the amendment that is offered to the 1950 act, the Board could enter an order but it does not call for compulsory self-registration which the Court found to be in violation of the fifth amendment.

I do not quarrel with the decision of the Court in that respect. The act had to be cured, as was suggested in the amendment that was offered in the first instance. Here, however, under this additional language, there will be 1 year; and, obviously, if nothing happened, I cannot imagine that either Congress or the Board would want to sustain a board for a considerable period of time without any functions and in the meanwhile drawing pay.

I have discussed this with one member of the Board certainly, and he agrees with that concept.

Now there is, in addition, one sentence to the effect that nothing in the amendment shall impair or interdict the right of Congress to create an instrumentality to carry out the objectives and purposes of the 1950 act.

I asked the majority leader to concur in that language for a reason. Actually, it is not necessary, but I would not want someone, at some future day, to charge that we were acting in bad faith and that we had virtually—implicitly or otherwise—agreed that the Board, or anything like a board, should go completely out of business without having some substitute agency or instrumentality to carry out the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Therefore, under the circumstances, I think that just about concludes any controversy with respect to the pending bill.

For myself, I think that on Monday next, I shall want to make a few amplified remarks and submit a few additional things for the RECORD.

I do want to take issue with the very distinguished former Attorney General of the United States on some of his statements made on this floor.

Likewise, I want to indicate from the record how much time was actually devoted to this matter before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. It will be just as well to have a complete record.

Then I want to take judicial notice of the fact that question was raised about the Attorney General not coming before the committee.

For that purpose, I shall want to submit a letter to the Attorney General by the chairman of the committee inviting him to come and appear with respect to the matter in hand.

SO-CALLED DEMONSTRATIONS FOR PEACE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, during the past few days we have been treated to the sickening spectacle of young men all across America, many in dirty clothing with long hair and long beards, burning their draft cards and participating in so-called demonstrations for peace. Many others, we read in the press, are preparing to "turn in their cards" and to refuse to serve their country. These disorders, we understand, are to culminate on tomorrow of this week with a massive demonstration in Washington and a march on the Pentagon designed to "shut it down."

The draft card burners and the demonstrators oppose the war in Vietnam. They have expressed the intent to create such disorders and such chaos, if they can, that the normal operations of the Department of Defense will be disrupted and the conduct of the war impeded. This, of course, they cannot do. At least, it is my belief that we have not yet reached the point at which these people will be permitted to undertake actions that could lead to any such result.

And in this connection, I wish to read a paragraph from the lead editorial in today's Washington Post:

> It is a purile form of anarchy to talk about closing down the Pentagon. These marchers had better acquaint themselves with the facts of life: they are not going to be allowed to close down the Pentagon "war machine" or any other kind of United States Government machine.

This does not mean that our Nation should remain complacent in the face of threats such as the misguided and irresponsible demonstration leaders and would-be draft dodgers have made. I am not complacent, for it is my belief, based on the most reliable information that I can gather, that their objective is to create a situation, if they can, in which lawbreaking and violence will result. They cannot stop the war, but they can do, and they are doing, and they have done, and they will continue to do, untold mischief and damage to this Nation, both at home and abroad.

Mr. President, instead of bringing the peace nearer, the "peace demonstrators" are making the prolonging of the war inevitable. The immaturity and the irresponsibility of the "peaceniks" can cause the deaths of many more American boys. The blood of U.S. soldiers and sailors, of U.S. marines and airmen will be on their hands. The demonstrators for peace, Mr. President, are in reality agents of death, for they encourage our enemies to hold out against American fighting men in Vietnam in the mistaken belief that the hippies and the flower children and the draft-card burners—as well as those who encourage them—represent the real America. Thank God, they do not.

I think a review of recent events that have led up to the impending demonstration will be useful, since the plans for Saturday are an outgrowth of previous demonstrations—supported by divergent groups and persons, but all united toward the goal of creating a crisis in Government.

The apparent chief sponsor of the events which have been occurring in other places and which are to be climaxed here in the Nation's Capital is the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, formerly known as the Spring Mobilization Committee. It is described as a "coordinating group," which welcomes the affiliation of any and all organizations protesting the war and opposing U.S. policy in Southeast Asia.

Its chairman is David Dellinger, editor of a publication called Liberation, a leftist magazine published in Greenwich Village in New York. Dellinger has been widely identified with the radical left. In one of the earliest statements announcing the plans for the march here, he was quoted as saying:

> We do not intend to express the kind of dissent that can be ignored.

The aim of the demonstration is to "obstruct the war machine," and he said that those who take part are prepared to be arrested—New York Times, August 18, 1967.

Dellinger was further quoted the next day, August 19, as saying that the demonstration may involve "new techniques" of civil disobedience, but he declined to say what they would be—UPI, Washington Post, August 19, 1967.

A second individual, described as "coordinator" for the demonstration, is Jerry Rubin, whom the Washington Evening Star on September 27 described as "a 29-year-old confirmed radical," the organizer of the Vietnam Day Committee on the Berkeley campus of the University of California. Rubin was quoted by the Star on that date as saying:

> Mass civil disobedience will send the message across the country.

Rubin was born in Cincinnati in July 1938. In 1964 he traveled to Havana, Cuba, under sponsorship of the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba, in open defiance of the State Department's ban on Cuban travel. He has been active in anti-Vietnam movements and, in June 1965, reportedly said:

> We must consider treason—deliberate sabotage of the war machine.

He openly describes himself as a "revolutionary," and last summer, after making an uninvited appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in which he wore a Revolutionary War uniform, he was fined $45 for disorderly conduct. He was quoted in the Washington Star article as saying:

> If white America wakes up, it won't be because of conscience, but because they're afraid the whole house is going to come down.

David Dellinger, to go back to him for a moment, was born in Wakefield, Mass., August 15, 1915. He has been prominently associated with the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a pacifist group. He has expressed approval of the Castro regime in Cuba and sympathy for the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico.

In other statements to the press, Rubin has stated:

> The peace movement is no longer one of merely protest and demonstration. We are now in the business of wholesale and widespread resistance and dislocation of the American society.
>
> We, the American people, are going to have to close down the Pentagon, the universities, the banks—all the institutions that use and destroy human beings and values.

I pause here, Mr. President, only long enough to say that that is revolution, pure and simple.

Mr. President, the genesis of the demonstration planned for Saturday occurred last May 20 and 21, when the Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam held an antiwar rally and conference here in Washington at the Hawthorne School. The stated purpose of the conference was threefold: First, an evaluation of the April 15, 1967, demonstrations in New York City and San Francisco; second, coordination of various aspects of the so-called peace movement; and third, the exchange of ideas on future programs. Several workshops were set up, and the workshop on mass demonstrations brought in a recommendation for staging a massive demonstration in the form of a march on Washington, which is planned for tomorrow. Reportedly the national public relations director of the Communist Party, USA, Arnold Johnson, was one of the persons attending the conference and approving the recommendation for Saturday's demonstration.

The conference, which was attended by some 700 individuals, included other Communist Party members, for example, James Jackson, Archie Brown, and Bettina Aptheker, all members of the Communist Party National Committee.

Also present were members of the Socialist Workers Party and its youth group, the Young Socialist Alliance. Peace groups attending included the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, Women's Strike for Peace, and the Committee for Nonviolent Action. After the May meeting, the committee changed its name to the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, or NMCEWV.

On August 29, 1967, a rally attended by approximately 2,000 to 3,000 persons was held by the NMCEWV and other anti-Vietnam war organizations in New York City. H. Rap Brown, leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, SNCC, was one of the speakers. He reportedly told the rally:

> We helped build this country, and we will burn it down.

He called President Johnson "Hitler's illegitimate son and a gangster." Among other individuals on the speakers' platform were Henry Winston, national chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and other Communist Party members.

At a news conference held on August 29, the Reverend Thomas Lee Hayes, the executive director of the Episcopal Peace Fellowship, and a spokesman for NMCEWV, stated that demonstrators were then expected to come here from across the Nation for a confrontation that would "shut down the Pentagon." He said:

> We will fill the hallways and block the entrances and thousands of people will disrupt the American war machine.

H. Rap Brown also attended that press conference. He announced that SNCC would support the demonstration in Washington, and said that he himself would attend it.

During the period August 31–September 4, 1967, the National Conference for New Politics convention was held in Chicago. There, a resolution was unanimously accepted endorsing the confrontation with "the warmakers in Washington, D.C." The resolution urged all groups represented at the convention to participate in the demonstration.

Concurrent with these developments, as one considers the background for this week's events, groups throughout the country held meetings to publicize the plans for the march and the demonstration. These included the Student Mobilization Committee in Philadelphia, a group reportedly controlled by Young Socialist Alliance members.

Others were the Minnesota Committee To End the War in Vietnam, which recently held a meeting in Minneapolis to mobilize for the demonstration. Other groups, including the Communist Party, were requested to join with the Minnesota Committee in supporting the demonstration.

In Cleveland, the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council issued a letter urging participation in the Washington march to "involve thousands of persons across the country in a massive display of determination through forms of protest and direct action."

The 1967 National Convention of the Students for a Democratic Society has urged its chapters to support the demonstration, which was reportedly announced as the culmination of various local antiwar projects during the summer and fall. The Hartford, Conn., chapter of SDS reportedly has made great efforts toward bringing people here tomorrow.

In addition to the groups I have already cited as supporting the march, the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, cited as a Communist front, has also reportedly chartered two buses to leave New York City for Washington. In all, I understand that transportation has been arranged—as of the latest date for which I was able to obtain information—for 49,700 persons. There may be reason to doubt that that many persons will take part; on the other hand, it is possible that more may take part.

The demonstration is not a spontaneous one. It has an international aspect, too. Plans have been announced by various groups that concurrent with the demonstration here in the District of Columbia, other demonstrations will be held in Copenhagen, Edinburgh, Paris, Rome, London, and some Canadian cities.

In this connection, the arrival in Washington of a "peace torch" is planned as a part of the demonstration. This torch was ignited in Japan, carried to San Francisco and is now being carried through various cities in the United States. The torch is said to be symbolic of opposition to American policy in Vietnam. It is being transported in a Volkswagen bus.

Mr. President, I have stated several times in recent weeks in this Chamber that it is my belief that there is a concerted effort on the part of radical individuals and groups to create a crisis in our American Government. This is true in the fields of welfare and civil rights, and I believe it includes the Vietnam war as well. The tactics in all the demonstrations are similar, and the participants are often the same.

My belief that there is a pattern in these occurrences, that they are part of an overall plan of provocation, is borne out and strengthened by statements that have been called to my attention in the October 14 edition of Washington's so-called underground newspaper, the Washington Free Press.

On page 3, in this underground newspaper, in an article headlined "Anti-War Escalation," the paper reported in connection with the march on Washington:

> The opening round was fired on Sept. 11 when 5 young people showered the Senate with leaflets. "To all U.S. Congressmen," the leaflets read, "Your first order of business this session should be a general declaration of peace, followed by immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, an end to conscription, and an end to the suppression of Black Americans. Until you meet these emergencies there will be sustained disruptions of the government apparatus."

The Selective Service, this underground newspaper, the Washington Free Press, continued, was the next target, beginning on September 14, with the demonstration by the Woman's Strike for Peace following on September 20.

Furthermore, the paper said on page 4, in connection with the events of this so-called antidraft week:

> October 16 is regarded as a beginning, not an ending . . . it is the offspring of the April 15 draft card burning in New York. Should the non-cooperators be indicted for violation of the Military Selective Service Act or called for induction, their cases will provide . . . a rallying point for other young men who are being urged to take part in the resistance.
>
> Our job—

The paper said in still another article on page 5 under a headline so obscene that I will not repeat it on the Senate floor—

> is to demoralize the army.

Mr. President, it has been stated by those planning Saturday's demonstration that it will be peaceful and nonviolent. Perhaps it will be, I hope that it will be. We have had enough of riots and unrest and bloodshed and violence.

But, Mr. President, I am also very reliably told that those who are planning this march and this demonstration reject the view that their aims—whatever they may be—can be achieved peacefully or without violence. That is why I said at the outset of my remarks that it is my belief, based on the most reliable information that I can gather, that the objective is to create a situation in which lawbreaking becomes inevitable and in which violence and arrests and a display of military power will occur.

What, may I ask, is "civil disobedience" but the breaking of the law? That is what we are promised for tomorrow, Saturday—civil disobedience. The viewpoint of the agitators, if I have gaged it correctly, is that only by civil disobedience, only by breaking the laws and creating incidents, can they get the attention they want.

We have had criticism of the war in Vietnam aplenty right here in this Chamber—most of it reasonable, intelligent, responsible dissent. That is the democratic way. But it is not enough for the irresponsible, the beatniks, the fellow travelers, the revolutionaries, the Communists, the anarchists, who apparently will not be satisfied until blood runs in the streets.

Mr. President, I do not know what will happen Saturday. But I want to commend the various agencies of Government that have been preparing for any eventuality. In this connection, the Washington Post editorial this morning to which I have already referred said:

> The Government has manifested, as it should, genuine tolerance for, if not hospitality to, a demonstration against itself; and the General Counsel of the General Services Administration, Mr. Harry R. Van Cleve Jr., has accorded full recognition to the civil liberties issues involved.

So I commend these people in the Government and the agencies that have been preparing for any eventuality and that have been discussing with the purported leaders of the march concerning the planning of the march, attempting, as best these Government leaders can, to keep the march and the demonstration within controllable bounds. Many agencies are involved—the General Services Administration, the National Park Service, the Justice Department and the FBI, the Selective Service, the Department of Defense, the Metropolitan Police, the Arlington County police, and others.

Representatives of these agencies and groups have attempted to draw up ground rules and an agreement with the leaders of the demonstration to insure that it will be peaceful and that violence will not occur. I hope that sensible rules will prevail. The representatives of Government have bent over backward in their efforts to guarantee that the rights of peaceable assembly and free speech are not abridged. There has been the greatest regard for constitutional rights—even for those who do not reciprocate with the same sense of responsibility regarding their own actions.

In this respect the Washington Post editorial of this morning states:

> Not all of the March leaders have responded in kind. These leaders are diverse in background, interest and aim. Their organization appears unstructured. And while some have been genuinely concerned to keep the protest peaceable, others have talked quite irresponsibly about civil disobedience and even violence.

The officials of Government have shown great restraint in dealing with the threat this demonstration poses.

In the case of the draft card burners, I think far too much restraint has been shown. It is true that litigation is now pending in the courts regarding the legality or illegality of such acts. But the Selective Service Act requires that a man in draft status have his card in his possession at all times, and it would seem that the destruction of the card would be prima facie evidence of violation of the law—to say nothing of the insult to flag and country that is so repugnant to all who love this land. I think that far too much leniency has been accorded, and that a crackdown at the outset would have spared us much of the shame that we all must feel at the actions of those who hold their country and their Government in such low esteem.

Mr. President, I hope that all who are curiosity seekers or thrill seekers, that all who have no business in the area of the demonstration on Saturday, will be urged by responsible authorities to stay away from the scene—and that, if it is possible, the police keep the tourists and the merely curious and the passersby away from the area. I say this in the interest of preserving the peace and for the safety of the public in general.

What we have witnessed this week and what we will yet witness is a sign of the times—another manifestation of the breakdown of respect for authority, for government, for religion, for morality, and for country. These virtues are not as old fashioned or as out of date as some in this day profess to believe.

The demonstrators tomorrow, whether it is their aim or not, will be serving the cause of America's enemies. If the demonstrators do not know this, they are incredibly naive or unbelievably stupid. I believe that many or most of them are not only fully aware of this but are also intent upon serving such cause.

Mr. President, the evidence suggests that, if the Communists have not actually organized this demonstration, they are taking full advantage of it. It is an effort to stimulate confusion and division among our own citizens. In my opinion, it is an effort calculated to demean the President of the United States and the Presidency, an effort designed to weaken this country's position throughout the world, and especially in Vietnam, because it is indubitably the hope of the Communists in our own country and elsewhere that the resolution of the American people will be eroded and that the history of the French failure will be repeated by an American failure and that the war will be lost at home.

The most despicable aspect of all, to me, is the below-the-belt blow it deals our men in uniform in Southeast Asia. They have, time and time again, displayed courage above and beyond the call of duty in their fight against the Communists. They have withstood the best the Communists can throw at them militarily. But, Mr. President, against the insidious tactics of the so-called peace demonstrators, which sap the morale of our fighting men and undermine them at home, Americans in Vietnam are defenseless. The aid and comfort given to our enemies by the demonstrators can only mean that the war will be prolonged and that the casualty list of American boys will grow.

Mr. President, before I conclude these remarks, I want to make it unmistakably clear that my words here are aimed at the irresponsible demonstrators and draft card burners and the Communist-inspired leaders who manipulate them. Nothing that I have said is intended to reflect in any way on the sincerity and the integrity of responsible critics of the conduct of the war in Vietnam, especially those in this Chamber, among whom may be counted some of the most highly regarded, highly respected Members of this body.

As I have said so many times in this Chamber, the rights of constructive and responsible dissent, of legitimate free speech and free assembly in the United States of America, are unquestioned. But draft card burnings and attempts to impede and harass the operations of Government and to intimidate its officials are distortions of those principles—distortions that have already been tolerated far too long. I hope that reasonable minds will prevail and that the wishes of those individuals and groups who may try to incite violence will be thwarted this weekend. Perhaps, hopefully, the numbers converging upon Washington will be fewer than has been anticipated. In any event, it is a time for cool heads, not hot heads. But it is also a time for order, and it is the responsibility of government at all levels to secure and to preserve that order, and to deal firmly, swiftly, and adequately with any and all persons who may attempt to disrupt the normal operations of the Capital City and its environs.

Once again I refer to the Washington Post editorial of this morning which states:

> The world will observe what happens in Washington tomorrow and will judge America accordingly. Feelings run very high about the war in Vietnam. But emotional tension cannot justify lawlessness or violence. The right of peaceable assembly is a right to appeal to the reason and conscience of the country. It is not a right to induce anarchy.
>
> The duty of the local, state and Federal law-enforcement authorities in this situation is quite clear. They have a responsibility to let the march and the subsequent planned demonstration run their course—so long as they remain orderly and confine themselves to the routes and locations assigned to them; and they have a corollary responsibility to protect the marchers from any violent interference or disruption by citizens who disagree with them. But it is equally clear, of course, that the law-enforcement authorities have a responsibility to protect the public safety and to prevent any disruption of governmental activity.

There are those who say that we cannot afford to enforce our laws for fear of becoming a police state. I say that we have already moved much too far in the direction of a state of "anything goes"—a permissiveness and disrespect for order which can even more quickly destroy us. Citizens lose respect for a government, and for a nation, that does not have enough "guts" to enforce its laws, that lacks the will to brand as traitors those who betray it.

It is ironic, indeed, that the site the demonstrators have chosen for their antiwar spectacle is the hallowed ground on which stand the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln Memorial, the shrines that the Nation has erected to two of its most illustrious leaders—Presidents who led us in other wars. The presence of draft card burners and those who preach anarchy, and treason in such surroundings desecrates and defiles our American heritage.

Mr. President, it is the heroes—not the beatniks or the hippies—who have made this Nation great. And it is the heroes, not the hippies, who will keep it great as they preserve freedom in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the editorial from today's Washington Post to which I have alluded; an article from today's Washington Post entitled "5,000 GI's To Help Control Rally Here"; an article from the Washington Post entitled "Leaders Divided on Aims of March"; an editorial from the Wheeling, W. Va., News Register of October 18, 1967, entitled "The Protesters and the Law"; and an article from the Reader's Digest of November, entitled "What Is at Stake in Vietnam: An Asian View."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News Register, Oct. 18, 1967]

The Protesters and the Law

Although we are opposed to U.S. involvement in Vietnam we would not think of condoning the civil disobedience and disorder accompanying the current mass demonstrations against the Vietnam war.

Burning draft cards and blockading induction centers are violations of the law and must be dealt with as such. Our existence as a free people is dependent upon a healthy respect for law and order. Whether they be civil rights demonstrators or anti-war protestors, once the law has been broken the guilty parties should be arrested and prosecuted to the limits of the statutes.

Where law ends, tyranny begins.

[From the Reader's Digest, November 1967]

What Is at Stake in Vietnam: An Asian View

(An interview of Tan Sri Ong Yoke-Lin, Malaysian Ambassador to the United States, by Carl T. Rowan)

(Note.—Tan Sri Ong Yoke-Lin was a top political leader in Malaya when it was still a British protectorate and a member of the mission to London that won Malaysian independence in 1957. Still a member of the Cabinet in Malaysia, he has also served as his nation's ambassador to the United States since 1962.)

(Carl T. Rowan, director of the U.S. Information Agency 1964–65, is today a widely syndicated columnist, also a radio and TV commentator.)

Question. Mr. Ambassador, the United States has almost 500,000 troops in Vietnam. We have suffered 13,000 killed and 80,000 wounded there. Is Vietnam becoming too much an American war?

Answer. No. The South Vietnamese have over 700,000 troops and have suffered more that 70,000 military and civilian dead since 1961. Many nations are aiding them. South Korea has sent some 45,000 troops. The Philippines, Australia, New Zealand and Thailand have all contributed troops. Other countries have supplied specialized training and material support. All of us in Asia have a lot at stake there.

Question. Critics hold that, except for the Korean troops, Asian contributions have been of a token nature—that we are fighting for a group of nations that won't fight for themselves. Why, for example, hasn't your country sent troops?

Answer. Because of our own serious problem of communist subversion. Though we won the 12-year war against them seven years ago, some 1500 armed, fanatical, hard-core communists still lurk along our northern border with Thailand and in the jungles of Sarawak. These terrorists, many of them trained in Indonesia during Sukarno's "Crush Malaysia" campaign, now get their orders from Communist China. Our small armed force is barely sufficient for our own defense.

Question. Malaysia, then, can provide only moral support?

Answer. We have given considerably more than moral support. As early as 1958, our prime minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman, saw that the communists would try to take South Vietnam through terrorism just as they were trying to take Malaysia, and he called upon the free world to help South Vietnam. Though hardpressed ourselves, we began to train South Vietnamese in counter-insurgency techniques we had found successful. Several thousand officers have now completed this continuing program. And when we won our victory over the communists, in 1960, we gave most of our military equipment to South Vietnam.

Question. You won your war against the communists yourselves. Why can't the South Vietnamese?

Answer. There has been a far more massive infiltration of communist men and material into South Vietnam than there was in Malaysia. The South Vietnamese need more help.

Question. You believe that U.S. involvement is vital, then?

Answer. You recall the political manifesto which Lin Piao, the Communist Chinese Vice Premier and Minister of National Defense, expounded in 1965—that Asia, Africa and Latin America are the rural areas of the world, and that if you take the rural areas the cities eventually will fall. U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam under present circumstances would put Communist China well on the way to achieving Phase 1 of Lin Piao's master plan: domination of Asia. We in Malaysia, for example, would be in deep trouble. Not only would the armed bands of communists be encouraged, but the underground subversives would re-emerge.

Let's face it. Your country carries a terrible burden today because no other country in the world has the will and the power to stop Red China's expansionist march. Your stand has achieved more than most Americans seem to realize. You have given confidence and hope to millions of Asians who would otherwise have submitted to the communist juggernaut. In Indonesia, which Sukarno had all but delivered to Peking, the army and the people rose up and crushed the communist coup attempt of 1965, later ousting Sukarno. I doubt they would have moved so confidently if your strong stand in Vietnam had not made it clear that you are not going to abandon Asia to communist tyranny.

Beyond this, Asians have been inspired toward economic and social cooperation as never before. They have formed the Asian Development Bank, created ASPAC (Asian and Pacific Council), reactivated the Association of Southeast Asia. All this has been made possible by the stabilizing presence—the security shield—the U.S. military.

Question. Some Americans say that we have no vital interests so far from home, that we have no right to be there.

Answer. The United States has *every right* to be there, helping South Vietnam to repel aggression and meet the needs of her people. You also have a "selfish" interest. Red China has openly and brazenly declared her aggressive intentions. If you don't make a stand in Vietnam, you risk a much bigger war in years to come.

No fair-minded Asian believes that the United States has any ulterior economic or territorial motives. We are aware that, instead of keeping territories that you occupied in World War II, you returned them and spent vast amounts of money to rebuild them. You helped Japan to become one of the most prosperous countries of the world. You sent your young men to save Korea from communist domination. You willingly gave independence to the Philippines. This is a record that no amount of propaganda can distort.

Question. But some eminent critics say that in Vietnam the United States is opposing nationalism, not communism—that we are warring against the same kind of revolution that gained us our independence.

Answer. I know that it wasn't "nationalism" that caused communist terrorists to kill Malaysians for 12 years. It was an international communist conspiracy. A fanatical wing of these same conspirators is operating in Vietnam today.

Question. Critics have said that the United States will be hated in Asia for generations because it has sent soldiers to kill young Asians. What are the racial implications of this war?

Answer. In my country, the communist terrorists were mainly of Chinese origin—but so were 90 percent of the innocent and helpless Malaysians they assassinated. It was no race war; it was a conflict between murderers and a people who wished only to live in peace. Likewise in Vietnam. Asians recognize that this is just another of the many struggles of freedom against tyranny and coercion. Asian nations have themselves sent troops to Vietnam, remember. Race is not a factor.

Question. Some critics say that the Saigon government is a dictatorship, unworthy of support under a pretense of defending freedom and democracy . . .

Answer. You cannot ignore the fact that, for years, South Vietnam has been under vicious attack. What the South Vietnamese have is a war government. Even in a democratic country, the government necessarily takes on extra power during periods of national emergency. Some of your President's powers during World War II might be considered "dictatorial" when viewed from peacetime. South Vietnam must move toward democracy, but first it must have a period of peace—of freedom from aggression.

One more point about this: Don't forget that the Hanoi regime in North Vietnam is a dictatorship *beyond any doubt*. It is easy to criticize the harassed leaders in Saigon, but does any critic maintain that the group in Hanoi is preferable?

Question. Do you think a negotiated settlement in Vietnam is possible?

Answer. We should be very wary about any such proposal. The communists will come to the conference table only when they think that by doing so they can still take over South Vietnam. We have seen the work of the communists who went to Geneva to negotiate. Before the ink was dry on the agreement they signed in 1962, they started a campaign to subvert and take over the government of Laos from the neutralist premier Souvanna Phouma—one of the things they had pledged not to do.

In my country, when we had thoroughly whipped the communists both militarily and politically, there were no negotiations. Our government simply declared an end to "the emergency." It could well be that, if the American people show determination to last out the struggle in Vietnam, there will be a quiet, unannounced de-escalation, and eventually the war will fizzle out—but only after the communists are convinced that they have no hope of gaining their objectives.

Question. Mr. Ambassador, many Americans and some Asians fear that Communist China will enter the war and involve all Asia in a brutal conflict. Do you share this fear?

Answer. Before the United States bombed North Vietnam in 1965, the fear was widely expressed that such action would bring on Red Chinese intervention. But this has not happened. The Red Chinese leaders have been quite cautious.

Question. To sum up, just what is at stake in Vietnam?

Answer. The independence of more than 200 million people in Southeast Asia; the rice bowl of the world; vast supplies of rubber, tin and oil; strategic control of critical sea lanes; the possibility of a wider war; and the integrity of a great nation, the United States—all are at stake. And much more—not the least of which is the simple desire of small, weak countries like mine to live free of harassment and aggression by the great powers, free of foreign coercion and subversion. That is what is at stake.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 20, 1967]

Five Thousand GI's To Help Control Rally

Up to 5,000 Army troops are being flown into Washington to help control the anti-war demonstration scheduled here Saturday.

The first planeloads, bearing troopers of the 82d Airborne Division and Army military police, arrived at Andrews Air Force Base yesterday afternoon. The paratroopers were flown from Ft. Bragg, N.C.

The military police detachment consisted of about 300 members of the 518th Military Police Detachment at Ft. Hood, Tex. The Pentagon clamped a tight lid on information about the paratroopers and military police, but it was learned the Army and the Air Force are prepared to airlift more than 6,000 troops, if it is believed necessary.

A massive security plan has been drawn up, with the possibility of 40,000 to 100,000 demonstrators, as predicted by the sponsors, and a fragmented leadership. Apparently there is no direct, overall control by any single group.

Government officials reportedly fear the lack of direction could lead to incidents requiring extensive police supervision.

Possibly 10,000 men will be involved in the police and patrol operation in the District and at the Pentagon. These would include the paratroopers, military policemen, 1500 Metropolitan Police, 2500 D.C. National Guardsmen, U.S. marshals, Government security guards and Park, White House and Capitol Police.

The job of the paratroopers will be to keep order at the Pentagon rally. They are to make no arrests. Federal marshals from the Justice Department will be on hand outside the Pentagon if arrests are needed. A special booth is being set up for that purpose.

Yesterday the General Services Administration issued a permit for the rally.

The permit allows a march across the Potomac River, after the rally at the Lincoln Memorial, and two separate demonstrations outside the Pentagon.

The permit has been in negotiation for two weeks.

The issuance of the permit does not settle the question of which route the marchers will take across the River. The permit refers only to "the most direct route."

Under the permit, the marchers must cross by Memorial Bridge. What is still in doubt is what route they will then take to the Pentagon.

Harry Van Cleve, general counsel of GSA, said yesterday that the permit would be revoked if law violations occurred "resulting in substantial danger to the people or property or in serious disorder."

"Mobilization (the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam) has represented to me that while there may be those who wish to break the law, that number will not be great," Van Cleve said.

March leader David Dellinger said there would be acts of "civil disobedience" at the Pentagon. He said he would specify at a news conference today what those acts would be.

The terms of the permit rule out an attempt by a self-styled group of hippies to link arms and form a circle around the Pentagon in an effort to "exorcise the evil spirits of the Pentagon."

Metropolitan Police Chief John B. Layton has released a detailed, 17-page memo on police activity, spelling out the deployment of 1503 policemen and 1847 National Guardsmen. (600 Guardsmen will be held in reserve for use in "critical areas," when needed. This reserve force is augmented by the city's 222-man Civil Disturbance Unit and Canine Corps.)

About 200 reserves of the Metropolitan Police Department were sworn in last night to serve from 12:01 a.m. Saturday until 8 a.m. Sunday. The men, to be assigned to precincts, will be unarmed.

Special details of police—at the railroad station, the bus terminals and other spots—will handle a wide assortment of problems.

Routine policing of the city will be carried on as usual. This is made possible through the cancellation of days off, changes in shifts and use of the Guardsmen for the demonstration areas in the District.

Layton made a strong pitch for courtesy and patience on the part of the police. "Members of the force, in handling the many unusual circumstances, shall be patient, discreet and courteous . . . during the demonstration," he ordered.

He ordered further that "arrests for minor infractions shall be held to a minimum."

He concluded: "This is one of the most important occasions that the Metropolitan Police Department has ever faced. It is imperative that every man and every official do his utmost to see that these orders are carried out, to the end that, when the demonstrations are over and the participants have dispersed, they may look back on this day with pleasure and that there will linger in their hearts a genuine esteem for our Department."

The Police-Community Relations Unit, headed by Insp. Vernon H. Culpepper, will be in full operation, reporting directly to Chief Layton

National Guardsmen will not be on duty at the Pentagon, since that is outside the D.C. National Guard's jurisdiction. A two-day drill was scheduled by the Guard so its men would be available for the weekend.

Most of the troops were billeted at Ft. Myer, Va.

It is unlikely the Army troops would carry anything so menacing as fixed bayonets for the demonstrations.

Police plans, too, call for no rifles or bayonets, but only regular equipment. Police will wear plastic helmets with plexiglass fronts. They will also carry chemical spray.

About 200 marshals will be brought into the area to augment the staff of 100 marshals under the U.S. Marshals here.

Six U.S. District Court judges and their staffs will be in the courthouse Saturday, ready to conduct a working court. The U.S. Commissioner also will be present. The District Court judges will work only if there is an overflow from the Court of General Sessions, which will have first crack at all demonstrators arrested. The U.S. Attorney's office will have from 30 to 40 assistant U.S. attorneys on hand to prosecute cases. A group of lawyers have volunteered their services to act as defense counsel for demonstrators arrested.

The day of demonstration will get under way at 11:30 a.m. with speeches and music at the Lincoln Memorial. The march across the Potomac begins at 1:30 p.m.

Demonstrators at the Pentagon will be limited, under the permit, to two areas. One demonstration will begin at 3 p.m. in the North parking lot, a ten-minute walk from the building.

Van Cleve of GSA said "a very large number" of demonstrators, but not all, will be allowed to assemble on a triangular grassy area in front of the Mall entrance at 4 p.m.

This demonstration, Van Cleve said, will consist of "picketing and vigiling." According to Mobilization leaders, it will also include civil disobedience, such as attempts to block the entrance of the Pentagon.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 20, 1967]

Leaders Divided on Aims of March

The anti-war march on the Pentagon on Saturday will be on open-ended, come-one-come-all affair that will draw participants from a wide spectrum of American society.

It will include suburban housewives and radicals of the New Left; students and Trotskyites; black nationalists and hippies.

The diversity is intentional because sponsors want the biggest turnout possible. But it is also the source of a long conflict that has plagued the march from its inception here last spring.

It has become a divisive issue within the American peace movement and specifically within the sponsoring National Mobilizing Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

Radicals wanted an exercise in mass civil disobedience and virtual occupation of the Pentagon. Others wanted only a massive show of discontent—a symbolic "confrontation with the warmakers," not an invasion that might produce violent retaliation.

"It always works out the same way—the only thing we agree on is that we are against the war," observed a New York staff member of the Mobilization. "The rest of the time we're at each other's throats. It's like a scenario."

Mobilization's leadership—those who somehow gave it direction—reflect the diversity. They are professors who organized the first anti-war teach-ins; union leaders of moderate persuasion; civil rights veterans of the Southern protests; long-time pacifists.

Among them, these are most prominent:

David Dellinger, chairman and leading organizer of the National Mobilization Committee; editor of Liberation, an antiwar magazine; once imprisoned for three years for refusing to register for the draft; he has made two trips to North Vietnam to talk with leadership of that country and the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front.

Professor Robert Greenblatt, national coordinator of the Mobilization; professor at Cornell University; a native of Hungary, he was imprisoned in a Nazi concentration camp; an early founder of the campus anti-war "teach-ins" and a vice president of their sponsoring organization, the Inter-University Committee for Debate on Foreign Policy.

John Wilson, a national leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee; major spokesman for Negroes participating in the march; recently met, along with other Americans, with representatives of North Vietnam and the NLF in Czechoslovakia.

Sidney M. Peck, cochairman of Mobilization; associate professor of sociology at Case-Western Reserve University in Cleveland; author of a book on the American labor movement; veteran of the "teach-ins," currently chairman of the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council.

Jerry Rubin, project co-director for the march; nationally known for his leadership in antiwar campaigns in Berkeley, Calif.; led protests designed to block troop trains; appeared for House Committee on Un-American Activities hearing in an American Revolutionary War uniform; leader in Progressive Labor Party, a Peking-oriented faction of the Communist movement.

The Rev. James Bevel, a militant aide to the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.; veteran of many civil rights drives in the South during the early 1960s; one of the most important organizers of first Mobilization march last April in New York; helped organize Saturday's march, but is said not to be participating because of illness.

Omar Tasha Abu Ahmed, a Black nationalist and leader of New York's East River Congress of Racial Equality; veteran of the early civil rights movement and an organizer of the 1963 civil rights march on Washington; a former lieutenant of Malcolm X in the Organization of Afro-American Unity; vice chairman of the recent Black Power Conference in Newark, and a leader of the "Black People's" contingent at the National Conference of New Politics in Chicago.

Dagmar Wilson, a cochairman of the Mobilization and founder of Women Strike for Peace.

Among the more prominent names now associated with the march are the Rev. William Sloane Coffin, Jr., chaplain at Yale University; Dr. Benjamin Spock, eminent child physician and until three weeks ago the national cochairman of Committee for A Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE); and the American poet, Robert Lowell.

The march has received legal assistance from two prominent civil rights lawyers, William Kunster and Arthur Kinoy. The Washington Lawyers' Committee, which will aid any demonstrators jailed, is headed by Edward DeGrazia.

From time to time, according to members of the Mobilization's large administrative committee, the list of active organizers has included Chicago labor leader Sidney Lens; Fred Halstead, head of the Socialists Workers Party in New York, and Ralph DiGia of the War Resisters' League, a pacifist organization.

The Pentagon march was planned as a follow-up to the large Mobilization march in New York last April. Its genesis was a meeting in Washington's Hawthorne School, 501 G st. sw., on May 20 and 21. There were veterans of the New York march, headed by its chief organizer, Mr. Bevel, and representatives of many peace groups, SNCC, Students for a Democratic Society, Socialist splinter parties, and a couple of Communists.

The march plans lagged during the summer months and many feared it would flop. By late summer, Rubin had been chosen to revive it with the detailed organization work in Washington, and he arrived with his Berkeley-style radicalism and flair intact.

"We are now in the business of wholesale and widespread resistance and dislocation of American society," he told the press. Mobilization's national chairman Dellinger was on record as predicting the marchers would "shut down the Pentagon" and leave no Government building "unattacked."

Such radicalism, echoed by some on Mobilization in New York, promptly dismayed many moderates from well-established peace groups. A symbolic showdown occurred over an issue of The Mobilizer, the committee's publication.

Edited by one of the Berkeley group, it spoke of America's "murderous military machine" and promised that during the march: "We will fill hallways and block the entrances (of the Pentagon). Thousands of people will disrupt the center of the American war machine. In the name of humanity we will call the warmakers to task."

An ad hoc committee of Mobilization leaders attending the New Left conference in Chicago became alarmed. Such groups as Veterans For Peace, SANE, and Trade Unionists For Peace feared the radical overtones would keep them from participating.

That issue of The Mobilizer was scrapped, editors were changed, and the paper reappeared with a less militant explanation of the march from Peck, the Cleveland professor.

For example, Peck emphasized that any civil disobedience at the Pentagon was up to the individual marcher. It "is planned only for those who are prepared to risk arrest, if that is necessary, to disrupt the war machine," he said. No one knows how much civil disobedience—bursting into the Pentagon—there will be, but one march leader estimated that 2,000 to 10,000 would try it.

The march's official tone—if anything about it can be called "official"—now stresses the symbolic confrontation. The leaders argue that the march will lend "national visibility" to the antiwar protests, in contrast to the sporadic and isolated instances of draft-card surrenders and door-to-door political canvassing.

Besides moderating its tone, Mobilization also brought into its top-level organization John Wilson, the slender SNCC staffer now running its New York office. He was named codirector of the project, it is said, to give Negroes equal representation in line with black-power demands at the Chicago New Left conference.

Whether and how Negroes will participate are unanswered questions. The Mobilization staff expects the Negro contingent to join the rally at the Lincoln Memorial, then break off for separate meetings in Negro neighborhoods of Washington.

The Washington Committee for Black Power refused to participate on any grounds, declaring: "The day is over when black people jump up and march like puppets when their white puppetmasters pull the strings."

Codirector Wilson retorted: "I'm far from being a puppet. The march is particularly relevant to black people, but I wouldn't get into a hassle with anyone who doesn't want to attend."

A major mystery of the march has been the absence of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, whose presence at the April demonstration in New York gave the peace movement a substantial lift.

Dr. King has said he regrets being unable to participate in the march. He has a fund-raising benefit scheduled in Cleveland. His spokesmen have denied persistent rumors that Dr. King is staying away because of the possibility of large-scale disobedience.

Dr. King's aide, Mr. Bevel, also is not active in the march preparations now, although he was the chief organizer of the April demonstration. His friends said he is ill in Chicago. Another close associate of Dr. King, the Rev. Ralph Abernathy, is a Mobilization cochairman, but he has not actively assisted in the march preparations.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 20, 1967]

AN APPEAL TO REASON

The Americans who plan to march tomorrow from the Lincoln Memorial to the Pentagon in protest against the war in Vietnam have an indubitable right to do so. This form of expressing dissent from a policy of their own Government is honored by tradition and protected by the Constitution. It bears witness to a freedom which is at once a source of strength to America and an essential element of American life. When all this has been said, however, it is vital for the marchers to remember that the constitutional right which they exercise is a right to assemble *peaceably* and that it must be exercised in good order and in conformity with valid laws.

Leaders of the March have conferred with Government representatives, and reasonable rules have been formulated as to routes, permits and appropriate places for demonstration. The Government has manifested, as it should, a genuine tolerance for, if not hospitality to, a demonstration against itself; and the General Counsel of the General Services Administration, Mr. Harry R. Van Cleve Jr., has accorded full recognition to the civil liberties issues involved.

Not all of the March leaders have responded in kind. These leaders are diverse in background, interest and aim. Their organization appears unstructured. And while some have been genuinely concerned to keep the protest peaceable, others have talked quite irresponsibly about civil disobedience and even violence. There may be a few, indeed, who seek disorder for its own sake—or for the sake of concealed interests not primarily concerned with peace and justice.

There are confused appeals to the marchers, some of them couched in the language of incitement. One publication of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam declares, for example: "Direct action is planned for those who are prepared to close down the Pentagon war machine . . . The general plan is for persons to enter the Pentagon and to block the staircases, hallways, and doorways by the traditional nonviolent sit-in techniques; in doing this we will disrupt the war machine's normal functioning."

The duty of the local, state and Federal law-enforcement authorities in this situation is quite clear. They have a responsibility to let the march and the subsequent planned demonstration run their course—so long as they remain orderly and confine themselves to the routes and locations assigned to them; and they have a corollary responsibility to protect the marchers from any violent interference or disruption by citizens who disagree with them. But it is equally clear, of course, that the law-enforcement authorities have a responsibility to protect the public safety and to prevent any disruption of governmental activity.

It is a puerile form of anarchy to talk about closing down the Pentagon. These marchers had better acquaint themselves with the facts of life: they are not going to be allowed to close down the Pentagon "war machine" or any other kind of United States Government machine.

The police ought to use as much force as may be necessary—as much and no more—to maintain order and prevent law-breaking. Persons who interfere with the normal functioning of government or otherwise break the law should be arrested and taken as promptly as possible to a court; there will be a number of judges on hand to deal with them according to law. No resort to clubs and disabling gases can be justified save by absolute necessity to stop mob action. The essential task of the police in this difficult situation will be to contain violence, not to punish it or to become engulfed in it.

The world will observe what happens in Washington tomorrow and will judge America accordingly. Feelings run very high about the war in Vietnam. But emotional tension cannot justify lawlessness or violence. The right of peaceable assembly is a right to appeal to the reason and conscience of the country. It is not a right to induce anarchy.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the statement of the Senator from West Virginia with respect to the proposed demonstration tomorrow.

In this connection, it is proper to recall that the first amendment to the Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

It is obvious that there is no better place in the United States to petition the Government than at the seat of the government.

The courts have protected the constitutional rights of free speech, petition, and assembly which have been interpreted to comprehend demonstrations. The States and their instrumentalities—such as a municipality—and the Federal Government have authority, through their police powers—and when I say "police power," I refer to their general police powers rather than to the police as an agency—to regulate demonstrations as to number of participants, time, and place. But regulations cannot be so used as to prevent the exercise of constitutional rights. I have received letters recently about certain individuals of whom we have heard much lately concerning the statements they make about our Government, advocating its overthrow, advocating insurrection, advocating riots.

But again, the Supreme Court—and it is not just the present members for the Supreme Court continues—the Court has held that speech, reprehensible as it may be, cannot be punished unless it is such that is reasonably calculated to bring about presently the act which is advocated. It is difficult to define, but that is generally the constitutional situation.

But I affirm strongly, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has correctly said, that the first amendment is not a license for the violation of law. It is not a license for the obstruction of the processes of government. It is not a license for anarchy.

I do not know what is intended or what will happen tomorrow, but I hope very much that the law will be obeyed and, if not, that it will be enforced. The protections of the first amendment are far reaching, even to protect the advocacy of the overthrow of the very government which protects the one who speaks. But there is no right to violate the law and to obstruct with force the processes of the Government of the United States.

The very essence of our Government is that it is based upon law and respect for the processes of the law. It is based upon the consent of the people. But that consent is to be determined through the processes of the Government itself, by the choice of the people in the selection of their officials through the influence the people bring to bear upon legislation and policy in many ways, including free speech, but not through violation of law.

For a second element in our system is the enforcement of the law.

As the Senator from West Virginia has said, there are Members of this body who have not agreed with every aspect of policy in Vietnam, as I have not, as I have said in speeches for over 2 years, and I shall continue to do so. But I know of none—and I include myself among them—who has suggested that he would not support our Government once its decision was made, or who would advocate disobedience to law.

In every war there have been those who have objected to military service for conscientious reasons, and they have been protected. Others have been deferred and passed over for compassionate reasons. I do not suppose that anyone, no matter how brave he may be, looks forward to engagement in war. But thousands have served in every war, as a duty to their country, under that obligation and substantive truth of our governmental system that it is a system based upon law.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his helpful remarks.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], at my suggestion, offered an amendment that would force the Subversive Activities Control Board either to go to work or get out of business. The amendment which I proposed to the majority leader on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday, which he drafted and introduced, provides a good resolution to the SACB problem.

My opposition to the Dirksen proposal as to the continued appropriation of funds for the SACB was based on the fact that for 20 months it has been an idle, do-nothing Board that has been wasting the taxpayers' money at a rate of $300,000 per year.

I frankly wished to abolish the Board and to transfer its functions, such as they were, to the Department of Justice. The Mansfield-Proxmire amendment will achieve this unless the Board, at long last, goes to work.

I vigorously opposed the Dirksen proposal because it would not provide the Board with anything to do. It continued to rely on the Attorney General to initiate action, and the Attorney General seemed most unlikely to take any action.

The Dirksen bill did not meet certain clear constitutional objections. Of course, Senator DIRKSEN disagrees. He contends that the Attorney General would act under his amendment and the Board would make a contribution to the struggle against domestic communism.

The Mansfield-Proxmire amendment resolves this difference. If the Attorney General does not initiate action before the Board in the next year, the Board is abolished.

If the Attorney General does initiate action and the Board is put to work, the $26,000 per year Commissioners will be performing at least some function. The taxpayer will at least be getting something for his money.

My position throughout debate on the bill has been that the Attorney General will not use the Dirksen proposal because of constitutional defects. Consequently, it is my belief that the Mansfield-Proxmire amendment will result in the death of the Board. At the heart of this whole issue is personal freedom in America and the sacred safeguards to the individual of the Bill of Rights. In my view, the death of this Board will contribute to freedom in America.

But in either event, the taxpayer will win. The Mansfield-Proxmire amendment will provide that either the Board is abolished and the $300,000 per year is saved, or the Board is put to work to earn the $300,000 per year the taxpayer is spending on it.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished minority leader supports this amendment, too, and, as a matter of fact, will cosponsor the amendment, which would make it pretty unanimous. I am delighted at that. I think this is completely consistent with the position he has taken and completely consistent with his sincere belief that his proposal would result in an active Board.

It seems to me that this is a good resolution of the matter, and I most heartily welcome it.

CONFUSION, NOT ECONOMY, RESULTS FROM HAPHAZARD BUDGET CUTTING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the absence of a budgeting priority system continues to create a shambles within the Government. Everyone wants economy in Government, but the methods now being pursued can only lead to disastrous conditions and overall higher costs.

In this morning's Washington Post, Federal Diary columnist, Mike Causey, reports on the confusion running rampant throughout Washington after the House adopted its meat-ax budget-cutting approach. As Causey says:

> If any Federal Agency has figured out the actual impact of the House's $5 billion-plus spending cut, the House Appropriations Committee would appreciate a call. More than 200 House members voted for the economy plan but nobody seems to know what it would do.

Mr. President, that "nobody seems to know what it would do" is not surprising to me; as long as Congress cannot relate the merits of one program as compared to those of other proposals, there just is no rational way to implement budget cuts. Unsophisticated across-the-board reductions are dangerous as well as being chaotic; the successful program is sliced as much as the marginal program, but the needs which make programs vital do not diminish, and, in the end, Congress spends more to bring these important programs back into effective operation.

Once again I emphasize that the alternative exists to this terrible helter-skelter budgeting approach. The alternative is a logical system of budget decisionmaking, a system which clearly points out advantages and costs of proposed spending plans. Last month the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee held hearings on one set of these new systems, the planning-programing-budgeting—PPB—techniques.

One powerful conclusion came out of those hearings: Government discount rate policies now cause serious economic dislocations. The Government has been employing very low interest rates in cost-benefit studies, and this has meant that many vastly expensively projects with minimal, and even negative, returns are justified. According to witnesses in the PPB hearings, the Government should apply alternative discount rates which better reflect opportunity costs of Government investment.

As a matter of fact, they testified that the entire economic profession, all economists who work in that area, unanimously support that position.

If Congress wants to avoid future turmoil, budgeting systems must be adopted which show such alternative uses of funds. That is the realistic path to true economy in government.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Effect of Spending Cut Is Unclear to Everyone," from the October 20, 1967, Washington Post be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF SPENDING CUT IS UNCLEAR TO EVERYONE

(By Mike Causey)

If any Federal agency has figured out the actual impact of the House's $5-billion-plus spending cut, the House Appropriations Committee would appreciate a call. More than 200 House members voted for the economy plan but nobody seems to know what it would do.

Down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, Federal agencies are equally in the dark. Many of them haven't had this year's budgets approved and they've already been directed to cut back on them.

Here's a sample of non-opinions gathered yesterday from a wide variety of sources:

An Appropriations Committee member: "I don't have the foggiest notion what we did. The action taken (Wednesday night) created a completely different animal from the cut we had planned."

An agency official whose budget (he thinks) has been seriously hurt by the House: "If we didn't have any people on the payroll, not a single employe, we still couldn't completely comply with this resolution. Many of our spending obligations were incurred a year or two ago."

An agency official whose budget (he thinks) is untouched by the economy edict: "I think we are okay. We did most of our hiring early in the year and have people ready to replace those who leave, with the result that we really don't have vacancies. We will have to be selective in our future hiring of clerical employes, but I think we are safe from any personnel cuts."

Budget Director Charles L. Schultze: He told the Senate Appropriations Committee yesterday that if the House action stands some agencies would have to cut their personnel by 10 to 20 per cent. Schultze said the resulting severance payments would require agencies to make even greater economy savings to pay the people they laid off.

Finally, from a Capitol Hill expert who has been watching appropriations battles and Federal agencies for 30 years: "A hell of a lot of people are going to be hurt before this thing is over."

Put them all together and you will find that nobody really knows what is going on. The only sure thing is that many agencies would be forced to lay off at least some workers and that promotions would be harder to get.

Sidelights: The House exempted the Internal Revenue Service, the Customs Bureau, the FBI, Post Office and Defense agencies dealing with the Vietnam war from the economy drive. But two agencies—the General Services Administration and the Coast Guard—with substantial Vietnam programs were not included in the exemption. They would have to come up with a combined total of $22 million in savings.

Midnight Magic: As if they didn't have enough worries, departments such as Labor, Agriculture, Health, Education and Welfare and a score of smaller agencies will soon be broke again.

The continuing resolution permits agencies whose budgets haven't been approved to carry on operations. It expires at midnight Monday. The Senate is expected to agree to an extension—the second or third such this year—to let the Government operate until budgets are approved.

If the continuing resolution should not be approved for some reason, those agencies would be technically broke. They could meet the next employe payroll because they would be paying for work performed two weeks ago. But after that . . .

CAPACITY UTILIZATION DROPS SHARPLY IN THIRD QUARTER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Federal Reserve Board has just reported a significant drop in manufacturing capacity utilization for the third quarter of 1968. This means that, obviously, the country does not need a slowdown because there is a slowdown. During the July–September period, plants on the average used only 83.8 percent of their capacity. This figure was down from 84.8 percent in the second quarter and from 87 percent in the first quarter of the year. Although strikes in the automobile, copper, rubber, and steel-hauling industries were all in process at some time during the quarter, the Federal Reserve Board stated that they had accounted for no more than one-half of the decline in the index.

Mr. President, capacity utilization does not decline in an overheated economy or at a time when demand is advancing rapidly. The fact is that productive capacity has grown tremendously in this country over the past few years. I have continually argued that there is sufficient economic capacity to support a much more rapid economic expansion than anything in prospect today.

This news of the second quarterly decline in a row in capacity utilization—and it is really the third—is especially meaningful, coming as it does on the heels of other bearish economic news. Last week it was reported that unemployment rose in September from 3.8 percent to 4.1 percent of the labor force—the highest level since late 1965. Then on Monday the Federal Reserve Board announced that its index of industrial production fell from 157.8 percent of the 1957–59 average in August to 156.3 in September. The index is now below the level it had reached a year ago when it was 157.7.

Mr. President, it must be remembered that this is a growing country with the work force increasing at a rate of 1.5 million a year and with our capacity to produce increasing greatly. Under these circumstances, when production goes down we are not suffering in demand.

These most recent economic indicators clearly support the view that the administration's call for a tax increase is premature.

It would be sheer folly to impose new taxes with the outlook so uncertain.

All they could do would be to contribute to the slowdown and sluggishness in the economy which is moving too slowly and not too rapidly.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times, entitled "Factory Use Fell in Third Quarter," be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTORY USE FELL IN THIRD QUARTER—SIGNIFICANT DROP FOR SECOND 3-MONTH PERIOD HURTS JOHNSON TAX CASE—STRIKES NOT MAIN CAUSE—FIGURE OF 83.8-PERCENT UTILIZATION OF CAPACITY IS A DIP FROM PREVIOUS 84.8 AND 87 PERCENT

WASHINGTON, October 18.—The portion of their total capacity that manufacturers had in actual use in the third quarter of this year dropped significantly for the second straight quarter, the Federal Reserve Board reported today.

The decline, which Reserve officials said was by no means entirely a result of strikes, weakens the Administration's case for a tax increase. That case has been based, in part, on the argument that the expanding economy would produce pressure on manufacturing capacity and thus threaten to create the classic type of inflation caused by an excess of demand over supply.

The third-quarter figure, which is still subject to revision, showed that manufacturing industry used, on the average, 83.8 per cent of its capacity in the July-September quarter. The second-quarter figure had been 84.8 per cent and the first-quarter figure 87.0 per cent.

PREFERRED RATE

The primary processing industries, whose capacity utilization rates tend to shift around more rapidly than those for all of manufacturing, fell to 82.1 per cent from 82.8 per cent in the second quarter and 85.9 per cent in the first.

Industry in general prefers to operate at about 91 or 92 per cent of capacity, the experts agree. Any higher rate tends to impair efficiency and increase costs.

Industrial capacity has been increasing in recent years as a result of a sharp rise in business capital spending.

In testimony on the proposed tax increase, Administration officials and economists who favored the tax increase, argued that capacity could—and presumably would—rise very quickly to inefficient and inflationary levels from the rate of about 85 per cent that existed in the second quarter. The second-quarter figures were the latest available at the time of the hearings by the House Ways and Means Committee on the tax bill in August.

The third-quarter capacity utilization rate of just under 84 per cent brought that rate back to the average level that prevailed over the 10 years beginning in 1956. Reserve officials pointed out this fact as a means of demonstrating that the third-quarter rate was not particularly low.

The 1956–66 period used for the long-term comparison was, however, a period that encompassed two recessions and a long period of subnormal business activity, dating roughly from 1961 through early 1964.

Strikes in the automobile, copper, rubber and steel-hauling business all were in progress at some point in the third quarter. Reserve officials said, however that they believed these strikes accounted for less than half of the third-quarter decline in capacity utilization.

They noted also, however, that the slowdown in business activity that occurred in the first half of this year had extended into July—the first month of the third quarter. Industrial production, which is the base on which capacity utilization is figured, actually hit its low point for the year in July.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TOMORROW'S ANTIWAR MARCH ON WASHINGTON A SHAMEFUL DISPLAY OF ANTI-AMERICANISM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, tomorrow, thousands upon thousands of demonstrators are expected to descend on Washington with the avowed purpose of disrupting the Pentagon.

I cannot help regarding these demonstrations as a shameful display of anti-Americanism. Certainly, they have the effect of giving aid and comfort to the enemy and prolonging the war in Vietnam, and were there a formal declaration of war, their conduct would be treasonous.

Perhaps some comfort can be found in the fact that these people do not speak for or represent the American people, and I hope the Hanoi regime and our Communist enemies realize this.

The Washington Evening Star, last night, published a very fine editorial about this demonstration. The editorial called for enforcement of the law and that the demonstrators be arrested, tried, and sent to jail if they are found guilty of violating the law in their so-called efforts to disrupt the Pentagon.

I think this is a splendid editorial which puts the matter in its proper perspective, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO AMERICAN BOYS

What is wrong with America? What is right?

A photo layout on the front-page of the late editions of Tuesday's Star gives at least a partial answer.

One picture showed a weary young Marine taking cover in a trench at Con Thien while writing a letter, possibly the last letter he will ever write. The other was a photograph of a young man burning his draft card in Philadelphia, with the outlines of Independence Hall in the background.

One should try not to be bitter about such contrasting portraits of two American boys. Both, we suppose, can be credited with a certain sense of dedication. The Marine in all probability had volunteered to fight for his country, to fight where and when he was ordered to fight. The draft-card burner not only is unwilling to fight in this war; he hopes to persuade others to follow his example.

There is something wrong when hundreds of young Americans burn their draft cards in public while other young Americans responding to the draft have to struggle across the bodies of anti-war demonstrators to get to their buses, as was the case in Oakland, California, on Monday. But, within reason, there is also something right about this.

None of us should forget that the men who assembled in Independence Hall on July 4, 1776, to sign the Declaration of Independence, the men who mutually pledged to each other "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honour," were rebels in their own right.

True enough, they were men of the stripe of the young Marine at Con Thien. Had it been otherwise the American Revolution would have died in its infancy. Still, those signers of the Declaration believed in the right of dissent, in the right of petition, in the right of peaceable assembly for the redress of grievances. But the emphasis, we think, must be on "peaceable."

Our own city now faces a threat of a march this Saturday by 40,000 to 100,000 protesters against the war in Vietnam. Leaders of the group say that the objective "is to force a confrontation and to disrupt the Pentagon."

We say that it will be a national disgrace if anything of the sort is tolerated. This is not the freedom that the signers had in mind in 1776. It is not the kind of freedom that our troops are fighting and dying for today in Vietnam.

If the draft-card burners and their related peaceniks really try to "disrupt the Pentagon" in an illegal demonstration they should be arrested, tried and sent to jail—and made to stay there for a while. In short, they should be treated as John Hancock and his colleagues would have treated any Tories who might have tried illegally to subvert the American Revolution.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMUNIST SUPPORT OF PENTAGON DEMONSTRATION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have reliable information and reports that establish beyond doubt that key organizers and leaders of the march on the Pentagon tomorrow are members of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

These reports and information further establish that the march is heavily supported by the Hanoi government as an extension within the continental United States of the war in South Vietnam.

Well-known and active functionaries of the Communist Party were present at the meetings in which the march was planned. Very reliable information indicates the head of a pro-Chinese Communist group intends to participate in the march and break his group away from the main demonstration to go through the ghettos of Washington to recruit demonstrators and encourage protest.

Some of the demonstration leaders have been in recent contact with representatives of the National Liberation Front—the Vietcong—and some of the very key leaders have been to Hanoi more than once.

It is clear from the evidence that this is part of a move by the Communists, especially of the North Vietnamese Government, to divide the American people, disrupt our war effort, and to discredit our Government before the world.

The leaders of North Vietnam consider the march on the Pentagon tomorrow as much of their war effort as the guerrilla warfare in South Vietnam and the North Vietnamese Army assault on our troops on the battlefield.

Those who participate in the demonstrations tomorrow will be, in effect, cooperating with and assisting the enemy. Some will participate without knowledge of what they are doing, but the damage to the Nation will not be lessened because of their ignorance.

Every person who plans to participate should be aware that this is not just another protest. It is a valuable service to our enemy.

Knowingly or not, those who demonstrate here in these movements are discouraging our fighting men, and giving our enemy hope that after all, if they push us hard enough and bleed us long enough, that we will be persuaded to give in to them.

We are now at the dividing line. If the enemy should be able to create enough sentiment in this country for us to turn our backs on our commitments in South Vietnam, I have no doubt but that we will be inviting trouble all over the world.

This is a time for national solidarity, for unity, and dedication to our national purpose. The right to dissent to the policy of our Government is one thing; but to actively assist the enemy is wholly another thing.

The evidence is clear that the demonstration scheduled tomorrow is a tool of and a product of a Communist effort to defeat the United States in South Vietnam.

We must beware of this event—and all other events of like kind.

This one has the curse of communism on it, and is a direct arm of the enemy with which our men are engaged in mortal combat in the jungles of South Vietnam at this very hour and will be while the demonstration is going on.

The time has come to call a spade a spade.

The demonstration planned for this weekend in Washington is clearly and undeniably a Communist enterprise.

Its key organizers throughout the country have been the cadres of the Communist Party.

It is part of an orchestration of hate toward America which the Communists have scheduled in virtually every major nation in the world.

I am prepared to be specific on this; and, in addition to what I have said, I call special attention to the following items:

In France, Communist Humanité advertised demonstrations to take place October 19–22 in Paris and in 20 departments of France. It said:

Hundreds of thousands of Frenchmen will consider it an honor to participate in the Saturday marches. Under our coordinated blows, the aggression will finally be extinguished and freedom will flourish in the land of Vietnam.

The Saturday that is mentioned is tomorrow.

Second, in Italy, Communist papers reported that "thousands" tried to reach the U.S. Embassy in Rome in order to demonstrate; announced that anti-U.S. demonstrations would be held October 20–22 in 12 areas; and played up U.S. antiwar activities.

Notice that included in the dates mentioned is the day following today.

Third, in Finland, Communist Kansan Uutiset reported that 21 organizations would be represented at a demonstration on October 21 in support of demonstrators in the United States.

Again, the date mentioned is the day following today.

Fourth, in Belgium "sympathy" demonstrations have been announced in five cities for the period October 20–25. In Brussels, a rally to be held by the newly formed Vietnam Coordinating Committee on October 21 was to include a "debate" on the war.

The same date there as to the Saturday.

Fifth, in India, Bombay papers first reported that a march on the American Consulate-General would be held October 21 to coincide with the Washington march, and then carried a new date of October 19.

Sixth, in Brazil, nationalistic Correio da Manha of Rio reported that the National Student Union was coordinating a nationwide Vietnam week October 16–21, and that students at Belo Horizonte would conduct a mock trial of President Johnson on October 19.

Seventh, in Chile, Communist Siglo announced that Uruguayan, Colombian, and Panamanian delegations would take part in a "continental youth solidarity meeting on Vietnam" in Santiago, October 26–29.

These are only a few examples of the most effective Communist propaganda operation since the "germ warfare" symphony during the Korean war.

The Vietcong have, of course, been given their role:

On October 16, Hanoi radio announced:

> A South Vietnam Peoples Committee for Solidarity with the American People has been founded in South Vietnam. The committee's formation appears to be an outgrowth of the September 6 through 12 Bratislava Conference which brought together North Vietnam, Front, and American Peace Group representatives to "further develop the antiwar movement."
>
> The new commitee is headed by Ho Thu, Deputy Secretary General of the Front's Central Committee, and includes such well known NLF personalities as Madame Nguyen Thi Bia (who headed the Front delegation to Bratislava).
>
> Hanoi radio quotes Ho Thu as saying that: "The struggle of the Vietnamese people for liberation and that of the American people against the Johnson government's policy of aggression and the struggle of the world people against U.S. imperialism to defend peace are closely linked together." Ho added that the committee was founded with the view to "consolidating and developing the close relation and the solidarity and friendship between the Vietnamese and American people, and promoting the coordinated struggle for the interests of the two peoples and for peace and security in the world."
>
> The committee immediately sent messages to two American groups, the National Mobilization Committee and the Students Mobilization Committee, supporting their October 16 through 21 peace drive.
>
> In a related move the North Vietnamese Women's Union sent a message to American women "hailing their courageous and sustained struggle against Johnson's war of aggression in Vietnam." The letter also approved the October 21 drive.

Now all of us here know that most of the "peace mobilizers" are not Communists. The overwhelming majority are youngsters who have grievances against a society which has given them time and money enough to indulge the luxury of self-pity.

But the fact that they are not Communists is irrelevant—they are acting out a scenario written and staged by Moscow.

The Bill of Rights protects their freedom to be dupes of Moscow, provided, of course, they remain within the law.

At the same time, those of us for whom history did not begin with the war in Vietnam have the duty to tell them, and the American people, that what we are witnessing is not a great "spontaneous upsurge of dissent."

We are witnessing a classic demonstration of Communist "agit prop." A hard core of cadres has gone into operation, seized the theme of "peace," and created a front largely composed of innocents.

The same technique was used in the 1930's with the American League Against War and Fascism; in the 1940's with the Progressive Party; in the 1950's with the Stockholm Peace Movement.

That sincere Americans allow themselves to be manipulated in this cynical fashion by the Moscow puppeteers can be explained only by ignorance or by stupidity.

After the evidence I have introduced today the excuse of ignorance can hardly be further accepted.

Mr. President, these tragic happenings are just as plain as the noses on our faces—well documented and proved by unimpeachable sources. I had the word. Again I warn the American people, the people of this great, fine city and the people throughout our Nation, to beware of movements of this kind, that originate in this way, that have a purpose directly contrary to our purposes here in America, and, in fact, not only contradictory but, as I have read, the long arm and an adjunct of the fighting war itself against our people and against our Government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion of morning business on Monday, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] be recognized for a period of 45 minutes, and that following that time, until not later than 3:30 o'clock, the time be equally divided between the distinguished minority leader and the majority leader, or whomever they may designate, and that not later than 3:30, there be a quorum call, and then a vote on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, later reduced to writing, is as follows:

> *Ordered,* That on Monday, October 23, 1967, at not later than 3:30 p.m., there be a quorum call to be followed by a vote on amendment No. 415, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.
>
> *Ordered further,* That all time for debate on the amendment following the speech by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, or their designees.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 23, 1967, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 20, 1967:

U.S. NAVY

Vice Adm. John J. Hyland, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of admiral.

Rear Adm. William F. Bringle, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral.

Adm. Roy L. Johnson, U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade of admiral pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Rear Adm. Paul Masterton, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. Turner F. Caldwell, Jr., U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

The following-named officers when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. Charles B. Martell, U.S. Navy.
Vice Adm. Charles E. Weakley, U.S. Navy.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Robert B. Aasen, to be first lieutenant, and ending Richard N. Zweig, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 4, 1967.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nomination beginning James E. Allen, to be lieutenant (jg.) in the Navy, and ending James A. Addison, to be captain in the Navy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 3, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength.—Isaiah 40: 31.

We are thankful, our Father, for Thy strength, available for us. Having reached a place of power with Thy help, keep us from the sin of complacency. Deliver us from indifference in the presence of evil, complacency in the presence of human suffering, and smug satisfaction with our own achievements. May we never be at ease so long, our Lord, as large areas of our national and social life are not in harmony with Thee. Stir us to constant struggle against evil and for righteousness.

Now may the strength of God pilot us, the power of God preserve us, the wisdom of God instruct us, the hand of God protect us, and the shield of God defend us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1948. An act for the relief of Lim Al Ran and Lim Soo Ran;

H.R. 1960. An act for the relief of Angelique Kousoulas;

H.R. 2464. An act for the relief of Yoo Young Hui and her daughter, Ok Young;

H.R. 2978. An act for the relief of Yong Ok Espantoso;

H.R. 3430. An act for the relief of Yim Mei Lam;

H.R. 3497. An act for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta;

H.R. 4534. An act for the relief of Mary Bernadette Linehan; and

H.R. 5216. An act for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2310. An act to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 107. An act for the relief of Cita Rita Leola Ines;

S. 866. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Pacino Biancarosso;

S. 872. An act for the relief of Francisco Renigio Fabre Solino (Frank R. S. Fabre);

S. 878. An act to amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange sale property;

S. 1129. An act for the relief of Demetra Lani Angelopoulos;

S. 1180. An act for the relief of Ana Jacalne;

S. 1327. An act for the relief of Dr. Samad Momtazee;

S. 2072. An act for the relief of Nestor S. Cueto;

S. 2091. An act for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Campuzano;

S. 2120. An act for the relief of Jose D. Neugart;

S. 2168. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Pina y Gil;

S. 2175. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Emilio Caignet y Crespo;

S. 2191. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Jose Suarez Diaz;

S. 2193. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Jesus Gonzalez;

S. 2248. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Fuentes Roca;

S. 2256. An act for the relief of Dr. Margarita Lorigados;

S. 2285. An act for the relief of Gordon Shih Gum Lee; and

S.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS FOR JOINT MEETING ON FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, TO RECEIVE PRESIDENT OF UNITED MEXICAN STATES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Friday, October 27, 1967, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the President of the United Mexican States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take it this request is for the sole purpose of the joint meeting?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ABUSE OF HOSPITALITY BY ARAB STUDENTS

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention a series of resolutions enacted by a group known as the Organization of Arab Students in the U.S.A. This organization is evidently composed of students from Arab nations who are pursuing their studies in the United States. They held a convention recently in Cambridge, Mass.

One of the products of this convention was a resolution about Vietnam. This resolution termed the hostilities in Vietnam as a "brutal, imperialistic war" and called for "the immediate stoppage of Arab oil supply to the American Military Establishment in Vietnam, Thailand, and Southeast Asia in general."

I think that it is impertinent for these Arab students to abuse the hospitality of the United States as they have done. It would have been more in order if they had urged the dictators of several Arab States to cease rattling their bent and tarnished sabres and to try to do something for the benefit of the ignorant poor people whom they now exploit.

THE COPYRIGHT PROTECTION—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON OCTOBER 26

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the other body passed Senate Joint Resolution 114 which would extend the duration of the copyright protection in certain cases. This was apparently made necessary by the failure of the other body to act on the copyright revision bill passed earlier this year by this body.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore announce that next Thursday, October 26, Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Judiciary Committee will have hearings on this matter. Those Members and other parties desiring to communicate their views on the subject may do so by contacting Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Judiciary Committee before that time.

AUTHORITIES SHOULD MEET RESPONSIBILITY OF MAINTAINING LAW WITH FAIRNESS AND FIRMNESS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, with these demonstrations taking place here in Washington, I hope the same mistake made in Detroit will not be made here tomorrow. General Throckmorton, the overall commander in Detroit issued the order, "Unload your weapons and put the ammunition in your pockets and don't load them until an officer tells you to load." Who ever heard of restoring peace without being fully armed?

There is not much difference in my opinion in rioters and demonstrators, when the demonstrators are trying to undermine the security of this country.

This is a big country and a great country, but I do not know how many more riots and mass demonstrations it can take, especially when civil disobedience and willful disregard for the law are taking the place of the ballot box and the speaker's platform.

If I were the commander tomorrow, I would instruct my personnel to have their weapons loaded and locked. It would be clearly understood that they have the authority to take all necessary actions to maintain order in the Nation's Capital.

I sincerely hope that no one is injured tomorrow. However, I trust that the authorities will meet their responsibility of maintaining the law with fairness and firmness.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe this is the start of a sad and shameful weekend in our Nation's Capital.

NOT SO CLEAN, PERHAPS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, explosive charges have been hurled from the Republican side of the notorious, seagoing Governors' conference ship concerning the advisory telegram reputed to have been sent to the *Independence* by the White House.

Gov. George Romney, the "Mr. Clean" of the Republican Party, has taken a characteristic attitude on the problem and has given it as his infallible opinion that Governor Reagan, in disclosing the telegram, was more moral than its sender.

I am not going to delve into the competing morality of the two positions. It seems to me that this is not a matter of assessing moral blame, but it is a legal matter, since on the question of disclosure the Congress has already spoken.

Section 605 of title 47 of the United States Code sets forth criminal penalties for the unauthorized divulgence of a telegraph message by a person who is not the agent of the sender.

Clearly, the Reagan divulgence comes within the terms of this statute and, therefore, is subject to prosecution under the criminal laws of the United States.

IDENTIFICATION OF LEADERS OF THE DEMONSTRATION SCHEDULED FOR TOMORROW

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, in case anyone might be misled by the type of demonstration that is scheduled in front of the Pentagon tomorrow, I wish to identify some of the leaders of this draft-dodging movement that is converging on Washington.

Jerry Rubin is the project codirector, who is better known for his leadership in trying to block troop trains in California and for giving assistance to those who would collect funds for our enemies, the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

Dagmar Wilson, a cochairman and founder of the Women Strike for Peace, who has refused to answer questions under oath before a House committee.

John Wilson, a national leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, who has just recently returned from Communist Czechoslovakia where he met with representatives of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

And let us not overlook William Kunstler and Arthur Kinoy. These lawyers were among the counsel who represented Morton Sobel, coconspirator in the case of the Rosenbergs, who gave the atom bomb secret to Russia.

I hope all loyal patriotic Americans will realize what kind of demonstration this will be with this type leadership. This is not a protest or an exercise in freedom of speech. This is a militant, overt conspiracy to destroy our Armed Forces and to try to mislead world opinion into thinking that Americans are not behind our boys who are fighting in Vietnam.

Already several groups have withdrawn from the demonstration plans after learning the true nature. I am sure that other groups will withdraw before tomorrow.

PUNISHMENT FOR PROSPECTIVE DEMONSTRATORS AT THE PENTAGON

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, in World War II some French women performed in houses of commercial affection for the benefit of the German invaders. When they were identified as traitors, as they most assuredly were, they were branded by being shorn of their hair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to suggest this type of treatment in this country, because many loyal Americans have lost cranial coverage through natural means. However, Mr. Speaker, these people who plan to demonstrate against the Pentagon tomorrow and thus give encouragement and support to the terrorists of North Vietnam should be required to bear some identifying symbol so that they would be recognized for what they are.

COMPETITION FOR LOW-NUMBERED LICENSE PLATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for good, clean fun it will be difficult to top the scramble that is now going on by the pubahs of Washington, D.C.'s new city government for low-numbered license plates for their limousines.

It appears that the new mayor, Walter Washington, got the No. 1 license plate without too much of a struggle. But then the numbers game heated up—would Deputy Mayor Thomas Fletcher get No. 2 or would it go to the Chairman of the City Council, John Hechinger?

At that point, according to the newspapers, the White House, sorely beset by the war in Vietnam, a $29 billion deficit, inflation, and an economy-minded Congress, laid aside these minor problems of state and intervened to assign No. 2 license plate to Hechinger and No. 3 to Fletcher.

Going on down the list in this numbers game, it is still uncertain whether our own beloved and distinguished Speaker of the House, Mr. McCORMACK, is going to be able to retain his No. 18.

We await with bated breath the further intervention of the White House in an effort to resolve this new and stupendous problem that afflicts our Government.

THE QUESTION OF LICENSE PLATE NUMBERS ISSUED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with surprise and I cannot bring myself to believe that our beloved Speaker is No. 8 on the list of anyone.

Mr. GROSS. No. 18.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It well may be that in some strange manner the Speaker's automobile drew No. 18 but the Speaker himself is No. 1 in the hearts of the Members of this House.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the program for the balance of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we shall continue with the program previously announced for today. Then we shall ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

Mr. Speaker, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day. However, there are no District bills scheduled for consideration.

Also for Monday there is scheduled for consideration H.R. 11627, authorizing certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

I understand the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], is here, and we will probably have the conference report on the appropriations for the space agency on Monday, and possibly the independent offices on Tuesday. We will also probably have the conference report on the redistricting bill, and there will be other conference reports during the week.

I make this announcement now so as to advise the Members of the business on Monday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Am I clear that on Monday the conference report from the Committee on Appropriations on the space agency will be brought in?

Mr. ALBERT. It is expected to be brought in.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And the conference report from the Committee on the Judiciary on the redistricting bill also will be presented on Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. Monday or Tuesday. I have not been specifically advised as to which day it will be.

On Tuesday, H.R. 13606, the military construction appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968.

Wednesday, H.R. 10915, reduction of extra-long staple cotton quota, with an open rule, 1 hour of debate.

Thursday, H.R. 13510, Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967, with an open rule and 2 hours of debate.

On Friday we will have a joint meeting of the two Houses, with an address by the President of the Republic of Mexico.

This announcement of course is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to advise all Members that it may be necessary for the Chair to declare a recess at some time during the day.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is my understanding accurate that it may invlove the continuing resolution, so that we should stand by for any action on that?

Mr. ALBERT. I believe that the gentleman is correct; yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that that is so.

The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AMENDING HOUSE RULES TO TRANSFER JURISDICTION OVER MILITARY AND NATIONAL CEMETERIES FROM COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 241 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 241

Resolved, That clause 10 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out paragraph (h) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(h) Military parks and battlefields."

SEC. 2. Clause 19 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(h) Cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad."

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 326]

Abbitt
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Barrett
Belcher
Bell
Betts
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Buchanan
Button
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gettys
Gilbert
Goodell
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gurney
Hagan
Hall
Halleck
Hanley
Harsha
Hébert
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kazen
Keith
Kelly
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Minish
Mize
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Pepper
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reifel
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Robison
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
St. Onge
Sandman
Schadeberg
Schwengel
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Staggers
Stephens
Stuckey
Taft
Taylor
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Waggonner
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyman
Yates
Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 234 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING HOUSE RULES TO TRANSFER JURISDICTION OVER MILITARY AND NATIONAL CEMETERIES FROM COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, strike out line 4, and insert "(h) Military parks and battlefields; national cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior."

On page 1, line 8, strike out "at the end thereof the following:" and insert "a new subsection (b), as follows:"

On page 1, line 10, strike out "(h)" and insert "(b)".

On page 1, line 12, strike out "abroad." and insert the following: "abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior", and by redesignating subsections "(b)" through "(g)" as subsections "(c)" through "(h)".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution to the best of my knowledge is entirely unanimous. It proposes to transfer the jurisdiction of certain cemeteries of the

United States in which veterans of certain wars are buried, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

It retains within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, through the amendments just adopted, military parks and battlefields as well as national cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

As I said earlier, to the best of my knowledge every conflict that existed has been stricken out of this bill and this bill has been unanimously reported and should be unanimously supported.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. What is the reason for this legislation? I have heard no reason stated for this transfer of jurisdiction from the Interior Committee to the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Would the gentleman briefly state the reason or reasons for this?

Mr. BOLLING. I would prefer to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a response to the gentleman's interrogation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is just an attempt to consolidate all national cemetery programs. The Department of the Interior has jurisdiction over some of them, the Veterans' Administration has jurisdiction over some of them, and the Department of the Army has jurisdiction over some of them. This legislation merely represents an attempt to consolidate all of them in one committee insofar as organization is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Missouri will yield further, then there is a division of authority existing today?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield; yes.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, this would bring all of them together?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I would say further to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], that this is a matter which has been under consideration for a very considerable period of time by members of the several committees involved. This final agreement was reached in my opinion very wisely and it is not my opinion that anything which has been done in this connection has been done on the spur of the moment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as one who served on the very first Veterans' Bureau when it was organized in 1920, it is my personal knowledge that they tried to bring these things together, But, historically, certain of these cemeteries were under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army while others were brought under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior as well as the Veterans' Administration. Therefore, we have them scattered throughout the Government.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this represents a very constructive step toward bringing all of them together.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the present administration policy has been and probably still is against the expansion of national cemeteries except the one in Arlington. Can the gentleman shed any light on whether or not the transfer of jurisdiction to the new committee will result in any expansion of the national cemetery system?

Mr. BOLLING. I will yield further to the gentleman from Texas to reply to that question.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey, who has taken a great interest in the cemeteries for a number of years, that I would expect our committee to immediately hold hearings, and first attempt to define a national cemetery policy for our country.

As I understand the present situation, the executive branch wants to close out the cemeteries, do away with them. In talking with other members of our committee I believe our committee would take a rather moderate approach toward continuing some national cemeteries.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest in answer to the question propounded by the gentleman from New Jersey that it is not only the policy of this administration but it has been the policy of every administration since I have been in Congress to oppose the creation of any new national cemeteries except the extension of the cemetery in Arlington.

There are 68 cemetery bills in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Some 5 years ago we made one of the most extensive studies of what is involved in this matter that has ever been made by a committee. We were unable to get anyplace.

I believe that the opposition of the administration, regardless of what party is in power, will continue as far as the overall program of authorizing new cemeteries or extending existing cemeteries.

On the other hand, we did authorize a veterans' cemetery, in the 89th Congress, in the last Congress. It was authorized as a veterans' cemetery near a veterans' facility. It is thought that maybe this is the way that we will be able to open up programs where we can have at least regional areas served by new cemeteries located near veterans' facilities.

Mr. CAHILL. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. I would like to say to the distinguished chairman, as the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has indicated, largely because I have a national cemetery in the district that I represent, I have evidenced great personal interest in this matter. I believe that most of the Members of the Congress were persuaded that the administration policy opposed further expansion of existing cemeteries, but I believe, certainly as far as the speaker is concerned, that the decision that really upset us all was the decision to establish a new cemetery in Texas.

Now, I understand how it was done, and I am sure that most Members did not approve of it being done that way. But here we have an administration telling us that there will be no further national cemeteries, there will be no further veterans' cemeteries, there will be no further expansion of existing cemeteries, and then we find out that a new one is established. That is the thing that disturbs me.

And I agree with the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I, too, believe it is about time that we had hearings. I believe it is about time that we had some national policy on this, and I believe, as the gentleman believes, that it should be a reasonable one.

I recognize that we cannot put the cemeteries everywhere in the United States where veterans' organizations want them, but I believe there can be a reasonable policy established. I certainly hope that the gentleman from Texas who has been very interested in doing something along these lines, will have the opportunity to hold hearings so that we will establish a policy which will be followed by all committees.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the distinguished gentleman who just spoke that in 1962 we held hearings on March 5, 6, and 7, and I believe the gentleman who just spoke appeared before our committee.

Mr. CAHILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALEY. He spoke in support of an expansion of the program, if I might put it that way.

Mr. CAHILL. That is correct.

Mr. HALEY. Certainly we believe that, as a result of these hearings, the best thing to do and the sensible thing to do is to try to get these cemeteries handled by one committee of the House so that additional hearings may be held, and proper action taken.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling] has ably stated, House Resolution 241 as amended and reported by the Committee on Rules attempts to achieve a more orderly jurisdictional division in the matter of national cemeteries. At the present time there is a bit of a problem because the Rules of the House basically divide the jurisdiction between the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Additionally the Committee on Foreign Affairs has some interest in overseas cemeteries. For some time it has been clear to members of the interested committees that the problem could be broken down into two rather clearly distinguished types of cemeteries; those which are being actively used as national cemeteries in which our military veterans are being buried, and those which are not active cemeteries. This latter group of cemeteries primarily associated with major battlefields of the Civil War is, as a general rule closed to present and future burials. They have become, along with these battlefield sites, military parks of an historical significance, regularly bringing Americans from all over the country to view and visit them.

This second group of cemeteries has long been administered by the Secretary of the Interior. Those cemeteries still open and available for the burial of our service men ought uniformly to be under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This committee is charged with the overall direction and formulation of our national policy with regard to our service veterans. The committee also deals on a regular and day to day basis with the Veterans' Administration, the agency which handles the matter of veteran burials.

House Resolution 241 has been before the Committee on Rules for some 6 months. Hearings were held earlier in the year at which time it was clear to the committee that the resolution as introduced did not clearly differentiate between the types of national cemeteries I have mentioned. Discussions were held with the interested committees and amendments adopted which achieve the desired results. If the resolution is adopted and the rules amended, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will retain jurisdiction over "national cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior"—in other words, those cemeteries which are part of military parks and battlefield monuments. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs will have jurisdiction over national cemeteries "in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior."

As I have indicated, all interested committees have been consulted and agree with the resolution. The intention of the Committee on Rules is to assist these committees by adjusting the jurisdictional lines to more accurately reflect the interests of the committees and protect our veterans.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a change in the haphazard, unplanned establishment and expansion of our veterans' cemeteries is long overdue.

The measure before us today, which is similar to my own House Resolution 377, would provide a start toward such a change, by transferring to the Veterans' Affairs Committee responsibility for national cemeteries in which American veterans are buried. Let us make this start without delay.

We have heard much this year about the crisis in our national cemeteries. We have seen orders limiting veterans' burials at Arlington Cemetery, and there are indications that similar limitations may soon be necessary in others.

Though these steps always seem to come as a surprise, there is really nothing new about them. For years, we have been frequently warned of the need for a workable, long-term plan to establish adequate gravesites for our veterans. I have taken this floor on a number of occasions over the years to urge the need for such planning.

All legislation toward this end has been repeatedly buried in committee. We can wait no longer to act, lest the Arlington crisis grows into a nationwide impasse.

For example, all New York veterans groups have often expressed to me their concern over Pinelawn National Cemetery on Long Island. When Pinelawn was established in 1937, it was estimated that it would provide gravesites for veterans until 1975. In recent years, it has become evident that this estimate was overoptimistic. Today, we face the prospect of a close-out date almost upon us.

We are now told that without expansion, Pinelawn is likely to have reached almost full capacity by 1970—a little more than 2 years from now. That is close enough to mean that the Pinelawn crisis is already here.

There are many other veterans' burial grounds throughout the United States whose future should be outlined in a practical, well-defined plan. We cannot afford to wait for cliff-hanging solutions each time a cemetery comes close to closing.

The rules of this House now require that all legislation affecting the National cemeteries be referred to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It would certainly be far more desirable for such legislation to be considered by the Veterans' Affairs Committee, whose daily work makes it far more familiar with the needs of veterans.

As a member of that committee, I can assure you that we are in constant communication with spokesmen for the veterans of the Nation, and we are familiar with the changes in those needs as the years go by.

By amending clause 10, rule XI today, we can make certain that the close cooperation between American veterans and the Veterans' Affairs Committee can be put to practical use in the administration of the national cemeteries.

As I said, this is a first step, leading to an essential second step—the establishment of a national veterans' cemetery system, in which can be buried the veterans of all the wars of this Nation, declared and undeclared.

A number of Members of this House have introduced legislation for the establishment of such a system. It would provide for the future planning which is the only way to eliminate the recurring crises in the national cemeteries. One of the bills for this purpose is H.R. 13457, which I have introduced.

Like so much other legislation of great importance to the veterans of America, this measure is gathering dust in a committee pigeonhole. It should be brought out for speedy action. This is only part of our debt to those who have fought for us, and who have helped to preserve our freedoms and our way of life.

But today's start is a necessary one. By transferring to the Veterans' Affairs Committee jurisdiction for the national cemeteries in which we bury our veterans, we can bring closer the day when planning, not crisis, will determine our solutions to this most important national problem.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution. It is essential that we provide adequate cemetery facilities for our veterans. In New Jersey, the veterans' cemetery at Beverly can no longer fulfill its function.

It is my hope that the action provided by this resolution will be a first step toward resolving a problem which has been too long ignored.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Resolution 241. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is, I believe, the proper committee to consider the future of our national cemetery system.

Both the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague] are to be commended for their statesmanship in formulating this proposal to resolve the jurisdictional problems that have surrounded the cemetery issue.

If House Resolution 241 is approved, as I am sure it will be, I intend to introduce legislation to establish a National Cemeteries Site Selection Advisory Board, with a membership drawn from both the Federal Government and the major veterans' organizations.

The cemetery problem is particularly acute in my own San Diego area. After the only national cemetery there, Fort Rosecrans, was closed to new applications a year ago, literally hundreds of requests for burial space had to be denied.

The Board I will propose would be charged with recommending the creation of new cemeteries and the expansion of existing ones. It would also address itself to the question of eligibility standards for burial at public expense. The Secretary of the Army could accept or reject the Board's recommendations. But any rejection would be subject to review and possible reversal by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

I strongly believe that a broad approach to the cemetery problem will be the most effective way to tackle the problem, for shortage of burial space in our hallowed national grounds is truly a national concern. Any proposal to assist only one area or region to acquire additional cemetery space is not likely to win much support in a Congress whose Members speak for all parts of the Nation.

We Californians are painfully aware of the inherent injustices in the National cemetery system as it now exists.

Today, there are only two national cemeteries open throughout the entire West—and those are distantly located in Oregon and Montana.

In contrast, Virginia boasts 17 national cemeteries, including five in the Richmond area alone. The concentration of the cemeteries in States like Virginia was dictated by considerations during and immediately after the Civil War, when the system was established.

California and the West have never caught up with the East and South.

A total of only five national cemeteries have been assigned to the seven westernmost States. And of the five, three have reached their capacity and shut down, or will shortly.

The system is badly in need of a major overhaul.

It is all too clear that over the years the responsible authorities have made no consistent effort to provide cemeteries to match the growth of the veteran population in the West.

I feel an unbiased Site Selection Advisory Board, such as I will propose, could do more than any other agency to redress the wrongs that have been committed over a century.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for House Resolution 241, to transfer the jurisdiction over military and national cemeteries from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The effect of this resolution is to remove from the Department of the Army the responsibility of administering our national cemetery system and switch it to the Veterans' Administration. This responsibility properly belongs to the Veterans' Administration which already handles most other veterans' matters.

Since the Civil War one of the benefits available to our men who have served in the Armed Forces has been the honor of being buried in a national cemetery. However, many servicemen are now being denied this honor because of lack of space in existing national cemeteries and the policy of the Department of the Army not to expand present national cemeteries or construct new ones. I feel this policy should be reversed and I believe the passage of this resolution will facilitate such a change in policy.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 241. This resolution will amend the rules of the House of Representatives to remove from the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs jurisdiction over legislation relating to national cemeteries except for those national cemeteries which are administered by the Secretary of the Interior. The rules of the House of Representatives would be further amended to add to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs the responsibility for legislation relating to cemeteries of the United States in which veterans are buried except for those cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

As the senior Republican on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which will receive this added responsibility, I want to express my support for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of our committee. The vesting of responsibility for legislation relating to national cemeteries in a single committee appears to be a sound move. It appears to be even more logical to charge the committee that deals with veterans' benefits and services with that responsibility. At the present time, legislative jurisdiction over cemeteries in which veterans are buried is divided among three committees in the House of Representatives.

Under this resolution the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will assume legislative jurisdiction over all national cemeteries except 13 which are now administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a part of the national park system. Seven of these cemeteries are closed to further burials. These cemeteries are located in national historical parks and battlefields. They are administered by the National Park Service because their significance as national monuments overshadows their importance as places of current burial. Therefore, it seems appropriate that legislative jurisdiction over this small group of national cemeteries should remain with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution and urge that it be passed.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose House Resolution 241 by any means because I know that there has been a need for all of our cemeteries and national monuments to come under the same administration and oversight committee, and I know that under the able guidance of Chairman TEAGUE, of Texas, such administration and oversight will be superior.

For the record, however, I would like to admonish all concerned against a broad expansion of our national cemeteries without careful consideration of all factors involved. Certainly all necessary facilities must be provided for those veterans who need appropriate burial grounds that are conveniently situated and well maintained.

However, there are great numbers of privately operated, perpetual care burial parks throughout the Nation who can in most cases, provide the needed facilities and who have voluntarily made such facilities available at vastly reduced and, often, no cost to the survivors.

These operators should be given every consideration as well as the survivors of the veteran involved who, in many cases, wish interment to be alongside predeceased and surviving members of the family.

I am sure that the committee, in its wisdom, will consider carefully these factors and will provide ample opportunity for private operators to be heard in hearings prior to any program of expansion.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and one who is vitally interested in legislation dealing with national cemeteries, I wish to express my support for this resolution.

I have been deeply concerned over the fact that the entire future of federally operated cemeteries seems to be buried in a quagmire of indecision and indirection. The sooner that jurisdiction is settled over this subject, the sooner we can get on with solving the national cemetery problem.

I believe that a full study of the national cemetery situation is necessary to explore means of fulfilling the national obligation of this country to those who have fallen in its battles. And to avoid the pitfalls of putting the Federal Government into direct competition with the private and religious cemetery administrators. We must seek to avoid unnecessary costs in land purchase, maintenance, and administration of national cemeteries. And at the same time, we must do something to meet the increasing requirements for veteran burial sites.

During this session of the Congress, I have introduced and strongly supported three bills dealing with national cemeteries. On January 19, 1967, I sponsored H.R. 3159, to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery on Federal property in Los Angeles County, Calif. It seems incredible to me that with the large number of retired military people and veterans in this area that some effort has not been made before to establish a national cemetery nearby.

One of the major obstacles to expansion of the military cemetery system has been the extraordinary rise in land cost near metropolitan areas. My bill, H.R. 3159, however, would authorize the use of land already belonging to the Federal Government. This is land in the Angeles National Forest, land which otherwise would never be used for anything. The area is secluded and suitable for a national cemetery, yet close to the population of Los Angeles. However, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee could take no action on this much needed legislation because of the jurisdictional matter.

On February 21, 1967, I introduced another related piece of legislation. This bill, H.R. 5891, will streamline the administration of the national cemetery. As you know, at the present time national cemeteries come under three separate Government agencies—the Army, the Interior Department, and the Veterans' Administration. This is clearly an unnecessary duplication of effort. It is inefficient and careless. I have proposed in my bill, H.R. 5891, that all cemeteries be administered by one agency—the Veterans' Administration.

On June 28, 1967, I introduced H.R. 11229, to liberalize the burial allowance now payable by the Veterans' Administration in behalf of eligible veterans. This bill would raise from $250 to $300, the VA contribution toward the actual funeral expenses of a veteran, and in addition would provide up to $100 for the purchase of a burial site. Because of the lack of space in many areas of the country, more and more veterans are being buried in private cemeteries, and for them the site allowance is a compensating factor.

In just a few years, many of our national cemeteries will not have space left for burial places. It is imperative that we act now to alleviate this situation and I urge everyone of you here today to wholeheartedly support this resolution.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 241. As I see it this is a measure which deserves the support of every Member of this House. For too long a time our veterans cemeteries have been administered by a whole host of Federal agencies to the detriment of the veteran generally. Further, this measure would place jurisdiction over veterans' cemeteries with the great Committee on Veterans' Affairs where it could receive the top priority treatment that it deserves.

For some time I have criticized what I consider to be shortsighted policies dealing with the question of veterans cemeteries. I think that if we approve this bill today we may have taken a long step in the right direction.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this time, first, to commend the Rules Committee for bringing this resolution to the House for its consideration. Their action indicates that they are cognizant of some inconsistencies which exist at the present time in the rules of the House of Representatives and they are willing, when the matters can be worked out by the respective committees, to change the rules.

Second, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. ASPINALL], the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee [Mr. MORGAN], and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RIVERS] because the jurisdiction that is involved at the present time is fragmented among those three committees. I commend these three distinguished gentlemen for their cooperation and sense of responsibility in working out this difficult problem concerning the legislative jurisdiction over our national cemeteries. This is an effort to solve this problem, which affects over 24 million Americans. In the 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which has jurisdiction concerning national cemeteries held hearings on the subject of national cemeteries in an attempt to formulate a national cemetery policy.

The Honorable J. T. Rutherford, who was a Member of Congress during that time, presided at the hearings and attempted to resolve some of the difficulties. I commend Mr. Rutherford for the excellent manner in which he conducted the hearing and the important information and statistics which have resulted from the hearings. Because of the administration's position of opposing the expansion of existing national cemeteries and the creation or establishment of any new national cemeteries—and this is in both the Democratic and Republican past administrations—it was impossible to bring order out of the chaos that exists.

House Resolution 241, will transfer to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs the jurisdiction over national cemeteries, except those cemeteries involved in national military parks administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the National Park Service. They are: Antietam National Cemetery in Maryland, Battleground National Cemetery in the District of Columbia, Fort Donelson National Cemetery in Tennessee, Fredericksburg National Cemetery in Virginia, Gettysburg National Cemetery in Pennsylvania, Poplar Grove National Cemetery in Virginia, Shiloh National Cemetery in Tennessee, Vicksburg National Cemetery in Mississippi, Yorktown National Cemetery in Virginia, plus some small areas in Andrew Johnson National Historic Site in Tennessee, the Custer Battlefield National Monument in Montana, and Chalmette National Historic Park, Louisiana.

I would also point out to my colleagues that there are two independent agencies also involved in this area of responsibility and they are: the American Battle Monuments Commission, and the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. These two commissions are concerned with the erection of suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American Armed Forces in foreign countries. Their specified responsibilities are as follows:

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission was established by the act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 366; 36 U.S.C. 426), as amended.

The Commission is composed of nine members appointed by the President; three Members of the Senate, three Members of the House, three other citizens of the United States who serve for a term of 4 years and without salary.

The purpose of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission is to construct, with the cooperation of the Government of the Philippines, on Corregidor Island in Manila Bay, a memorial to the memory of all who fought and died under the American flag in the Pacific area during World War II. Plans for the memorial include a battlefield park with historical mementos of the war in the Pacific and a building for use as a tourist center and auditorium.

In 1963, Public Law 88-240 authorized to be appropriated to the Veterans' Administration without fiscal year limitation, such sums of money, but not to exceed $1,500,000, as may be necessary for the erection of the memorial, tourist center and auditorium, the battlefield park, and preparation of a documentary film commemorating the story of Bataan and Corregidor, and other appropriate films of the Pacific phase of World War II.

Public Law 88-240 provides that the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission shall cease to exist upon completion of the construction authorized by the act, or on May 6, 1967, whichever shall first occur.

H.R. 3399, a bill to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission to November 6, 1968, or upon completion of construction authorized by Public Law 88-240, whichever shall occur first, was introduced in this session of the 90th Congress and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3399 passed the House on April 24, 1967, and passed the Senate on May 4, 1967.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

The American Battle Monuments Commission was created by the act of March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1509; 36 U.S.C. 121).

The Commission is composed of 11 members by the President as follows: a chairman, vice chairman, nine commissioners, and a secretary. Members of the Commission serve without compensation except the secretary, and at the pleasure of the President.

The purposes of the American Battle Monuments Commission are:

First, to erect and maintain memorials at suitable sites—except in national cemeteries—commemorating the services of the American Armed Forces since April 6, 1917;

Second, to design, construct, and maintain American military cemeteries and memorials therein to World War I and subsequent wars located outside the United States and its possessions, and to maintain the national cemetery in Mexico City;

Third, to maintain rosters of burials and recorded missing at the overseas cemeteries;

Fourth, to provide regulations for the erection of American war memorials by other sponsors in such countries as may so authorize the Commission;

Fifth, to furnish next of kin of those buried or memorialized at the overseas cemeteries with photographs of the headstones or engraved names; and

Sixth, to erect a memorial in Washington, D.C., to General of the Armies John J. Pershing.

Jurisdiction of matters pertaining to the American Battle Monuments Commission was originally a function of the War Department. By Executive Order No. 6614 of February 26, 1934, matters pertaining to national cemeteries and memorials located in foreign countries were transferred to the American Battle Monuments Commission as an independent agency. Legislative matters pertaining to the American Battle Monuments Commission are now referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I am satisfied, after discussing the matter with the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, that hearings will be held and that the Members who have introduced almost 68 bills which are now before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be given an opportunity to present their views, and the administration will be given an opportunity to present its view. The Veterans' Committee will then present, I hope, to the House a position on national cemeteries and let the House and the people who serve on the other side of the Capitol work their will. If that is done, it will be a tremendous step forward.

By placing all activities under one independent agency, the Veterans' Administration, which does have jurisdiction over all members of the armed services after their discharge from the service, including responsibility for attending to the final burial rites and the payment of sums of money to the family, will be a tremendous step in the right direction. I urge that the resolution be adopted.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I wish to commend the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and all who have made this resolution possible.

Mr. Speaker, for several years I have been urging a change in the national policy relating to veterans' cemeteries. I have appeared before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House and have testified in favor of the expansion of our national cemetery system. I have always been advised that the executive branch of the Government was opposed to this expansion. I have disagreed with the policy established by the executive believing that the families of veterans should be given the privilege of burying the deceased in a national cemetery. I have been particularly concerned when veterans who died as the result of battle injuries were precluded from burial in national cemeteries.

While I am aware that veterans cemeteries cannot be established in all areas, I am convinced that appropriate hearings would disclose where the need actually exists and therefore provision could be made for suitable burial plots in convenient locations throughout the country.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has always recognized the problem and has tried to the very best of his ability to be helpful. I wish to commend him for relinquishing to the Veterans' Affairs Committee of this House jurisdiction over veterans' cemeteries. It is my understanding that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has also been cooperative and helpful and I am convinced, based upon my knowledge of the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague], that full hearings will be held and appropriate action will be taken as soon as possible.

I think this is a step in the right direction. Mr. Speaker, today more than ever, with men dying on the field of battle in Vietnam, we must establish a national policy for the burial of our veterans and I am convinced that the Veterans' Affairs Committee is the appropriate forum for this decision. I heartily endorse the resolution and urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Don H. Clausen].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I also wish to associate myself with the very fine remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania complimenting the efforts of the various committee chairmen in attempting to resolve this problem.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express my concern that the remaining space available in our national cemeteries is insufficient to give the distinction of burial in a national cemetery to all deserving veterans and their wives.

If we do not now begin to look ahead we will find ourselves in the unfortunate position of having to refuse burial in national cemeteries to those who are among the most responsible for the freedoms and liberties which this Nation enjoys today.

This year, the Secretary of the Army issued new regulations which severely restricted those eligible for burial in our national cemeteries. The regulations were made necessary because the administration has consistently opposed the expansion of our national cemetery system. The new regulations were a slap in the face of our veterans who have defended our country with great courage in time of great need.

I trust that the action we are taking here today will result in a more realistic policy in this area and break up the legislative logjam which has resulted from the administration's refusal to support additions to the national cemetery system.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Price of Illinois). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Missouri has yielded to me. I doubt if any committee in recent years has yielded up as much jurisdiction as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is willing to yield up at this particular time. But may I say to my colleagues that in the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, which has jurisdiction over these cemetery bills, that we have over 400 bills before that committee at the present time. We are busy enough without trying to overcome the opposition we have had in the various administrations, at least for the past 20 years, with regard to the establishment or even the enlargement of one of our veterans' cemeteries.

I think everyone should be advised as to the cemeteries that are left under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, and I shall read them at the present time:

Antietam, Md., which is already closed to burial;

Battleground, D.C., which is closed to burial;

Fort Donelson, Tenn., which is still open to burial;

Fredricksburg, Va., which is closed to burial;

Gettysburg, Pa., which is open to burial;

Poplar Grove, Petersburg, Va., which is closed to burial;

Shiloh, Tenn., which is open to burial;

Stones River, Tenn., which is open to burial;

Vicksburg, Miss., which is closed to burial;

Yorktown, Va., which is closed to burial;

Andrew Johnson National Historic Site, which is open to burial;

Custer Battlefield National Monument, which is open to burial; and Chalmette National Historical Park, La., which is closed to burial.

This leaves 13 of the national parks or national historic site cemeteries still under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. All other cemeteries and all bills having to do with other proposed cemeteries would go, by this resolution, to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is desirous that this change of jurisdiction be taken at this time.

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Taylor] such time as he may consume.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks which have been made by Chairman [Mr. Aspinall], and by the ranking minority member [Mr. Saylor].

I am familiar with the efforts both of them have been making down through the years to get a national policy on cemeteries established. I believe this is a sound change in House rules. I believe the cemeteries operated by the Secretary of the Interior should be under the jurisdiction of and rest with the House Interior Committee, and that other cemeteries should be under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks after the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Quillen] on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors,

the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 0, not voting 206, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

YEAS—226

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Andrews, Ala.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Bennett
Berry
Bevill
Biester
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Casey
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Cowger
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dole
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Fisher
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Gardner
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hunt
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kuykendall
Kyros
Langen
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Mink
Minshall
Montgomery
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nichols
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Pike
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roth
Roudebush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Whalen
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wylie
Young
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—206

Abbitt
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Barrett
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Betts
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Buchanan
Button
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gettys
Gilbert
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gurney
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Harsha
Hébert
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Keith
Kelly
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Latta
Long, La.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Mailliard
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Minish
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Pepper
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reifel
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Robison
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Rosenthal
Roush
Rumsfeld
Sandman
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schwengel
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stuckey
Taft
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waggonner
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyman
Yates
Zablocki

So the resolution as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Minish with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Morgan with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Tenzer with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Rostenowski with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Button.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Machen with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Watson of South Carolina.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Pryor with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Mayne.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Meskill.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Flood with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Moss.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Murphy of New York.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Fuqua.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Watts.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Tuck.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Monagan.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Mailliard.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT, INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

REREFERENCE OF CERTAIN BILLS FROM COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the following bills and that they be rereferred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs: H.R. 235, H.R. 236, H.R. 278, H.R. 306, H.R. 322, H.R. 345, H.R. 346, H.R. 347, H.R. 403, H.R. 640, H.R. 648, H.R. 890, H.R. 1042, H.R. 1168, H.R. 1306, H.R. 1407, H.R. 2062, H.R. 2125, H.R. 2135, H.R. 2136, H.R. 2291, H.R. 2292, HR. 2545, H.R. 3118, H.R. 3159, H.R. 3294, H.R. 3304, H.R. 3315, H.R. 3316, H.R. 3744, H.R. 3801, H.R. 3818, H.R. 5270, H.R. 5279, H.R. 5440, H.R. 5473, H.R. 5620, H.R. 5649, H.R. 5657, H.R. 5798, H.R. 5891, H.R. 6009, H.R. 6065, H.R. 6237, H.R. 6282, H.R. 6395, H.R. 6396, H.R. 6627, H.R. 7226, H.R. 7268, H.R. 7287, H.R. 7333, H.R. 8044, H.R. 8190, H.R. 8290, H.R. 8782, H.R. 9166, H.R. 10438, H.R. 10795, H.R. 10810, H.R. 12224, H.R. 12352, H.R. 12556, H.R. 12801, H.R. 12822, H.R. 13457, House Joint Resolution 53, and House Resolution 660.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman suggest that a file cabinet goes along with the bills.

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman will yield to me, I may say that the action will relieve my file cabinets very materially.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 23

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the vote was taken on House Resolution 241 I was momentarily delayed and was not able to be present to vote. Had I been present I would have voted in the affirmative.

FACILITATE LAND EXCHANGES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 947 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 947

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10442) to facilitate exchanges of land under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), for use for public schools, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Quillen] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, those who listened to a reading of the resolution will know the purpose not only of the resolution but also of the bill it makes in order. I know of absolutely no controversy on either the rule or the bill. I therefore reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling] has stated, House Resolution 947 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 10442.

The purpose of H.R. 10442 is to remove a specific problem which faces many school districts throughout the country.

In areas where lands are owned by the Forest Service, it is common for school districts to locate their schools on these publicly owned lands. This practice has given rise to some problems: First, the difficulty of obtaining the necessary financing for improvements upon lands the school district does not own; and second, the problems faced by school districts in obtaining title to such lands.

Current law requires an exchange of land of equal value. Private owners can pick up their prices; frequently there is no suitable land available. The bill resolves the problem by creating a new method school districts can use to acquire title to the public lands on which they have constructed schools.

Funds may be deposited with the Secretary of Agriculture in the amount of the appraised value; after this the Secretary is authorized to convey title to the Forest Service lands to the school district. The funds so deposited are held available for the Secretary to purchase equivalent land for inclusion into the Forest Service's lands.

Limitations are placed on the use of this procedure to insure no abuses occur. The lands conveyed to any school district cannot exceed 80 acres. Funds received by the Secretary can be used only to purchase equivalent land, and such land must be in the same State and appropriate for inclusion into our national forests. A committee amendment will require a separate appropriation by Congress for the Secretary to remove any of the moneys from the Treasury to purchase any land.

No additional cost is anticipated by the Department of Agriculture, which supports the bill. There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely appreciate this opportunity to speak in behalf of H.R. 10442, which I introduced in an effort to provide a fair and equitable solution for one of the serious problems confronting school districts operating in national forest areas. In some cases, the best interests of the children and the district can be served through school sites centrally located, which may be on national forest land. In some instances these schools are operated under special permits with title to the land remaining in the national forest. These school districts experience financing problems and other uncertainties arising from the limited tenure allowed by permits, the lack of assurance in regard to fees, and the problem of financing buildings and other facilities on lands not owned by the district.

Under present law, as an alternative, school districts may endeavor to acquire title to school sites by exchanging the land for other non-Federal land of equal value, which the Forest Service is willing to accept. The great difficulty which arises is that in some areas it is almost impossible for a district to acquire acceptable exchange lands now in private ownership, because owners of these lands frequently demand purchase prices far higher than the appraised value fixed by the Forest Service. In other instances, there are simply no acceptable private holdings in the immediate area which would be available for purchase negotiations by the school district.

H.R. 10442 is, I believe, a simple direct solution to this problem. It would provide the school sites needed, and at the same time preserve the integrity of our national forests. The bill would permit a school district to deposit an amount equal to the appraised value of the school site land with the Secretary of Agriculture, who would be authorized to convey the land to the district. The money so deposited would be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for acquisition of equivalent land in the same State to be added to the national forest.

The bill also provides that such exchanges could be made on the basis of exchange land offered by the school district, and partially by deposit. The bill limits the exchange to any one public school district to no more than 80 acres.

Also, the committee adopted an amendment suggested by the Department of Agriculture which would establish a special fund in the Treasury for deposits received by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to this legislation. This amendment, therefore, would insure that this fund was separate and be subject to the appropriations process specifically for the purpose of acquiring new land for the Forest Service to replace that conveyed to the public school districts under this legislation.

As many of my colleagues know, there have been numerous private bills offered in the past to enable specific school districts to acquire sites on forest lands. These bills were denied favorable action. In some instances they involved donation of the site, and in other cases, some measure of payment would have been required. I think Congress has rejected these private bills, because they would create what might turn out to be undesirable precedent and all of them tended to diminish the national forest holdings, contrary to our general policy.

The bill now before you was worked out through numerous conferences with national forest people and as you are no doubt aware has the strong endorsement of the Department of Agriculture.

This legislation has the virtue of setting up the general public policy and avoids the necessity of dealing with individual district problems on a piecemeal basis. In my opinion it also preserves both the integrity of our forest lands, and requires the equivalent of payment at full appraisal value, thus insuring against discrimination, either for or against school districts operating in national forest areas, in comparison with those outside forest areas.

The legislation would not involve a large number of districts, although it is of great importance to those affected. I have made a preliminary survey of the districts possibly affected in California. In our State approximately 50 percent of all the land in the State is in Federal Government ownership. Much of this land is interspersed with private holdings, on which families reside and where educational facilities must be provided. My survey discloses that this legislation would be of significance in at least five of California's 58 counties. These counties and perhaps others have school districts in national forest areas which are facing school site problems. I am sure that an equivalent situation exists in other States in which national forests are located.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust and hope that my colleagues will find this approach to this problem acceptable and in the best interest of the Federal Government and the concerned school districts, and that H.R. 10442 will be worthy of enactment today.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 1, not voting 210, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

YEAS—221

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Bennett
Berry
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Bolling
Bow
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Casey
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Cowger
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dole
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Fisher
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Gardner
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hunt
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kuykendall
Kyros
Langen
Leggett
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Mink
Minshall
Montgomery
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nichols
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
Saylor
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Whalen
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wylie
Young
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—1

Pike

NOT VOTING—210

Abbitt
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Barrett
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Betts
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Buchanan
Burleson
Button
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Colmer
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gettys
Gilbert
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hébert
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Keith
Kelly
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Mailliard
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Minish
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Pepper
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Robison
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
St. Onge
Sandman
Schadeberg
Schwengel
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stuckey
Taft
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Waggonner
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyman
Yates
Zablocki

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Schadeberg.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Minish with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Morgan with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Kyle.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Tenzer with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Price of Texas.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Batten.

Mr. Rarick with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Button.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Kupferman.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Eilberg with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. McClure.

Mr. Hanley with Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Wampler.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Machen with Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Watson.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Winn.

Mr. Pryor with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Mayne.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Meskill.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Feighan.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Olsen with Mr. Pepper.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Randall.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Griffiths.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Moss.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Murphy of New York.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Reuss.

Mr. Roush with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Wright.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Fascell with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Watts.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Tuck.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Boland.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Gettys with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Monagan.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Roudebush.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10442) to facilitate exchanges of land under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), for use for public schools, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 10442, with Mr. ST GERMAIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, in an effort to try to help the House expedite the business and get to a prompt adjournment this afternoon, I think we might well accept the explanation already made by the gentleman from Tennessee as covering the items of this bill.

There was no objection made to the bill in the committee, nor do I know of any objection since then, other than a suggested amendment which has just now been presented to me.

So, Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I must, with some reluctance, rise in opposition to the amendment which is to be offered by my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

The amendment the gentleman proposes has merit in substance, but is defective in form.

I share the gentleman's concern over a proliferation of special accounts in the treasury, but the gentleman's amendment would go beyond the removal of the bill's authority to establish a special fund. It would also delete the limitation on the Secretary to confine his acquisition of other land to real property in the same State.

The effect of the amendment would therefore leave all the collected funds in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than the Treasury Department. It would also establish, in effect, an outright land sales program by the Forest Service. For these reasons I must oppose the amendment and any like motion to recommit while urging passage of the bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10442

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever an exchange of land is proposed by a public school district or other public school authority under the Act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), as amended (16 U.S.C. 485, 486), or other authority under which the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to exchange national forest lands or other lands administered by the Forest Service, if the public school authority proposing the exchange has insufficient land to offer, the exchange may be completed upon deposit with the Secretary of Agriculture of a portion or all of the value of the selected land. Any amount so deposited shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the acquisition of lands in the same State as the selected lands and which are determined by him to be suitable for the same purposes as the selected lands. Lands so acquired shall have the same status and shall be subject to the same laws, regulations, and rules as the selected land.

The provisions of this Act shall not be applicable to the conveyance in exchange of more than eighty acres to any one public school district or other public school authority.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 3, strike the words "available to" and insert in lieu thereof the words "covered into a special fund in the Treasury which when appropriated shall be available until expended by".

AMENDMENT TO COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER to the committee amendment:

On page 2, line 2, after the period, strike out the remainder of line 2 and following down through line 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I know that the House is anxious to work its will today so I will be brief in explaining what this amendment does.

By the terms of this bill when less than 80 acres of land are exchanged to a school district—and that is all the bill applies to, less than 80 acres—a school district instead of providing land to the Forest Service, in whole or in part can provide cash representing the value of the land it is going to get from the Forest Service.

The way the bill is written, and sought to be amended by the committee, this cash that is so received would go into a special fund in the Department of Agriculture, out of which some later Congress might appropriate money to buy similar lands in the same State to take the place of lands given to the school district by the Forest Service.

In theory that is a commendable idea. But as a matter of practical application, it is not.

These transactions with the school districts throughout the 50 States and the territories are not large in number, the amount of land is not large, and its value is not great.

So we will have that separate fund of a minimal amount lying over in the Agriculture Department. It will cost money to administer—not much, but it will probably cost more money than is in the fund to appropriate it out again for the purchase of land.

So such a small amount is involved, what my amendment would do would be merely to strike out this procedure, and when the school districts deposit money to get some of their land from the Forest Service to build a school, that money will simply go into the Treasury, where it can be put into the general fund, and thereby we will save ourselves all of this complicated accounting and going through a useless act. I certainly ask the support of the House on this amendment to clean up the bill as it should be.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If I understand the gentleman from California correctly, his amendment would result in any funds which would be paid for land by school districts under this bill being received into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. HOSMER. That is correct. We all know the Treasury needs the money and we all know that we do not need another account in some back pocket somewhere.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As an Arizonan, I find it very agreeable to be agreeing with the gentleman from California on this subject.

Mr. HOSMER. This is a very rare occasion. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I would not want to find fault with the gentleman's objective in trying to save administrative cost, but it seems to me that to accept his amendment would be to approve a policy in connection with the administration of public lands which I doubt the majority of the House would want to approve, although personally I have been one of those who have felt that we probably ought to dispose of a large part of these public lands. But I have not thought that the forest lands were the place to begin, and certainly not on a bill like this.

What this amendment would do would be to diminish the amount of forest land. Because there are only rather infinitesimal amounts of land involved here, it is true that the cost of administration of this fund would unquestionably be inordinately high in relation to the amount of money involved. But I would be a little reluctant to accept the philosophy that we should simply sell these lands and pocket the money.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Would not the gentleman agree with me that the amount of land involved is highly unlikely ever to exceed 400 or 500 acres a year, and probably much less?

Mr. POAGE. I do agree with the gentleman. I doubt that it will go even as high as the gentleman suggests. On the other hand, I do feel that it sets a rather dangerous precedent that we probably do not want to set.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Will the gentleman agree with me further that it is highly unlikely that this would amount to as much as $10,000 a year in any year, and, therefore, would amount to so small a sum that it would almost buy nothing?

Mr. POAGE. I have already agreed with the gentleman on that, but I think the gentleman must likewise agree with me that it does open the door, that it does set a precedent, that it probably will be followed by opening the door a little further, and, while I do not get terribly excited about that, I think there are a good many Members of the House who would.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I wish to ask my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, if, in his opinion, under the law as it now stands the Forest Service would have authority to buy lands in the States of the Union?

Mr. POAGE. No; the law as it now stands authorizes the school district that is so located on forest lands to have an appraisal of its property, just as this provides, and to deed to the Forest Service or to the Department of Agriculture land of like value which meets the requirements of the Forest Service. All in the world this bill does is to shorten the process and make it unnecessary for the school district to go out and solicit lands over the State. That is the only effect of the bill. I doubt that this is a proper vehicle to make so far reaching a change in policy.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I agree with the gentleman. I think the bill is perfectly fine. But I was wondering about the amendment of the gentleman from California.

Is the language in the bill on page 2 necessary to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reacquire lands to take the place of lands which have been sold?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It was my opinion the law, as it is now, would authorize the Secretary to do that.

Mr. POAGE. As I understand the existing law authorizes transfer of lands, not the taking of money and investment of the money. If the law presently allowed investment in lands, there would not be any purpose to this bill whatever.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say, as the author of the amendment, the sum is so small in amount of land and money that insofar as any precedent is concerned for violation of public land, it would not be so under the legal maxim of de minimis non curat lex, which means something that is this small would never be a precedent for violation of public lands and national forests. Therefore, I again urge we do the sensible course of things here, cover this money into the Treasury and not establish an expensive fund.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with this very important piece of legislation, I think it might be interesting to point out that some of the freshmen Members, who acquired a great deal of knowledge about how to run this House in a very short length of time, sent a letter to the Speaker the other day sort of derogating the leadership for not having sessions on Mondays and Fridays.

Actually, I think we have been having sessions pretty regularly on Mondays, with quite a number of bills handled, and rollcalls.

In any case, these people with quite a bit of knowledge about how to run the House suggested we should have meetings every Friday. It is interesting to note that the first Friday after they sent the letter, about half of them were absent, and today on the first rollcall about one-third are absent, to wit: Messrs. Brown of Michigan, McClure, Mayne, Price of Texas, Railsback, Sandman, and Winn.

Since they know so much about running the House, and they are so free with advice, my only suggestion is they ought to take their own advice and stick around on Friday.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the question first falls on the perfecting amendment, and subsequently on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer], which was in effect a motion to strike.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hosmer) there were—ayes 39, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having resumed the chair, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10442) to facilitate exchanges of land under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), for use for public schools, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 947, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOSMER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. HOSMER moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 10442) to the House Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On line 2, page 2, after the period, strike out the remainder of line 2 and all down through line 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 30, nays 191, not voting 211, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

YEAS—30

Ashbrook
Berry
Broyhill, Va.
Clawson, Del
Conable
Duncan
Ford, Gerald R.
Gross
Gude
Hamilton
Holifield
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Kuykendall
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
MacGregor
Martin
Rhodes, Ariz.
Smith, N.Y.
Talcott
Thomson, Wis.
Van Deerlin
Wiggins
Zion

NAYS—191

Abernathy
Adair
Adams
Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Bennett
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Casey
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Cowger
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dole
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Edmondson
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Fisher
Foley
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Hunt
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
King, Calif.
Kleppe
Kyros
Langen
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McFall
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
May
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Mink
Monagan
Montgomery
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nichols
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Pike
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Quie
Quillen
Reid, N.Y.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Skubitz
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Whalen
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wylie
Young
Zwach

NOT VOTING—211

Abbitt
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Barrett
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Betts
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Button
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gilbert
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gurney
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hébert
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Keith
Kelly
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McDade
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Pepper
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Robison
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Sandman
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schwengel
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stuckey
Taft
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Waggonner
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyman
Yates
Zablocki

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Minish with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Morgan with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Tenzer with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Button.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Machen with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Pryor with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Mayne.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Meskill.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Flood with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Moss.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Murphy of New York.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Fuqua.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Watts.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Tuck.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Minshall.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Howard with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Findley.

Messrs. POOL, PELLY, MAILLIARD, BIESTER, and PETTIS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

POSTPONING FURTHER PROCEEDINGS UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on this bill be put over until Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed 2 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding earlier this afternoon my name was mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] as not being present. I hope that this is not an indication of the accuracy of other statements he may have made. I am here and I was recorded as being here at the first quorum call. A little more investigation would have revealed that I was present. I believe there was another gentleman, Congressman GUY VANDER JAGT, who was also reported absent.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. In the interest of accuracy I wish the RECORD to show that I was and I am present today.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the House that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLACKBURN] came up and introduced himself to me and told me he was present, and I corrected my remarks to show that. As a matter of fact, another fellow came up and introduced himself as Mr. BLACKBURN. I do not know whether I was being taken for a ride or how many Mr. Blackburns we had, but I had not met the gentleman before and I had not really bothered because I did not think he would be here in the next Congress, anyway.

HEARINGS ARE SET ON LAKE FEE REPEAL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Public Works will begin hearings November 2 on bills sponsored by 30 members to terminate entrance fees on our Army Engineer lakes and reservoirs.

Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my constituents certain facts about revenue collections under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. I said that revenue collections for the Golden Eagle permits, and entrance and user fees had lagged behind estimates made in 1963 by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of Interior.

I stated that the 4-year total collections of $21,532,269 were less than the Bureau estimated it would receive every year from these sources.

This evaluation fell considerably short of complete accuracy, and I want to apologize to the House of Representatives for not giving the complete and accurate picture.

To have been absolutely correct, I should have told the House the precise degree to which collections have fallen behind estimates. The sum actually taken in from all of these fee collections during the fiscal years 1965, 1966, and 1967 was only 18 percent of the $105,000,000 the Bureau said it could expect in this period. These statistics—provided by the Bureau itself—clearly demonstrate the complete failure of these sources as revenue producers.

This percentage figure gets no better when we view fiscal 1968 figures. The estimate for this coming year was $59,000,000, and the July and August collections have been only $5,239,704. Since these 2 summer months should contribute from 40 to 50 percent of the total collections for the year, it is easy to calculate that proportionate increases will not bring the fiscal year 1968 total anywhere near the offical estimate.

In short, collections are not merely low, as I formerly stated—they are shockingly low. What promised to be a major contributor to the Land and Water Conservation Fund has proven to be little more than a source of irritation to the people, and a black eye for the Congress.

These fees are adding little to the fund and I propose that they be eliminated altogether. My current bill on the subject—H.R. 11236—would prohibit all entrance and admission fees at recreation areas under the administration of the Army Engineers—limiting charges to those user fees levied on fully developed facilities. It would also bar recently imposed fees on private docks and swimming floats on these reservoirs, which constitute an obvious violation of the congressional prohibition of charges by government for the use of waters.

If this bill were extended to completely eliminate the Golden Eagle and all entrance and admission fees at all national parks and other recreational areas, the fund would remain both healthy and strong, with much more enthusiastic public and congressional support.

It has come to my attention that certain high officials in the administration have realized that these admission fees are of little value and have been studying the possibility of discontinuing them. Some officials who promulgated these fees are questioning their value.

I think that it is clear that these fees have not served their purpose. By removing them, we will again make outdoor recreation areas open to all Americans—no matter their station in life or ability to pay an entrance fee.

WAGING THE WAR AT TWO FRONTS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on my writing table to the left of my desk, leaning against the wall and reaching almost to the ceiling, is a 4- by 8-foot piece of plaster board with a map of Vietnam pasted on it. The map came in two pieces and we carefully put it together and glued it on the plaster board in order that I might constantly be aware of the blood of our blood and the flesh of our flesh in that land; also, in order to be reminded daily of the geographical positions of our friends and of our enemies.

Behind my desk, Mr. Speaker, there is a window which opens onto the roof adjacent to the seventh floor offices of the Longworth Building. Tomorrow, from that vantage point, with a pair of binoculars, I may monitor the activities of our friends and of our enemies; not from the map of Vietnam, but just across the Potomac at the Pentagon.

The anti-Vietnam-war march with its stated objective to "close down the Pentagon war machine" by those who, "don't mind being arrested for breaking the law," is the march of a North Vietnamese ally, American VC, with U.S. soldiers necessitated to defend against the invasion. Let us dare to call it by its proper name, anarchy, ill-disguised as dissent. And that precious right of peaceful expression guaranteed by our Constitution must be no shield for treason. Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as minor treason.

Let our purpose and resolve be clear; where words have failed let us meet force with superior force. Tear gas will be an excellent first-round repellant to these human insects who march to the beat of the Hanoi drummer. These are not neutral, peace-loving people, but enemies who aid the cause of our adversary and who are accessories to the wielding of the sword which has inflicted the grievous wounds evidenced by our marines at Bethesda Hospital.

Our Nation, Mr. Speaker, wages war at two fronts. One I can monitor from my map. The other from my window.

SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN BOYS IN VIETNAM

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed, as I know most of our colleagues and most Americans are, about the mass demonstrations planned here in Washington tomorrow. I am disturbed because, first, it will be played up big by the world press, and cannot help but have an effect on the morale of our boys in Vietnam. The Vietcong and the North Vietnamese and our other enemies will conclude that these demonstrations are indicative of the feeling toward the war in our country. We know this is not so. We know these demonstrators represent a very small minority of Americans. Many of us may not agree entirely with our policies in Vietnam, but we do agree that we should give our wholehearted support to our fighting men.

Mr. Speaker, I am further disturbed at the reports I hear that the leaders of this demonstration plan to turn it into massive civil disobedience with the hopes of creating violence and injuring both those participating in the demonstration and the soldiers and others on hand to help control the demonstration. This would substantially increase the publicity that the protesters will get in the headline-conscious world press.

Our Government has already spent thousands of dollars to prepare for this demonstration, and the total cost could run into considerably more. The cost of flying in 5,000 paratroopers, feeding and sheltering them is tremendous. Here in the Congress we are economy minded, yet our Government is being forced to spend money that could well be used elsewhere to control a demonstration against our Government. That could happen nowhere but in America. How long would such a demonstration last in North Vietnam, or Red China, or even Russia? It is ironic to me that these people are demonstrating against the very freedoms that give them the right to demonstrate.

The Governor of my State of Alabama, the Honorable Lurleen B. Wallace, has issued a proclamation calling on the people of our State to show their gratitude to our fighting men this weekend. She has asked all vehicles to burn their lights on Saturday and Sunday, and all homes to turn on outside lights Saturday night as a show of visual support to the boys in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that every American would join with Governor Wallace and the people of Alabama in demonstrating support for, and not against, American boys in Vietnam this weekend.

M-16 RIFLE MESS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as one of the House Members who asked for the M-16 rifle investigation, I take this time to commend the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] and particularly the subcommittee, chaired by our able colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Ichord], on the matter of the mess of the M-16. This subcommittee was critical and particularly so of the procurement of the M-16 and the fact that one producer was a sole source procurement for the M-16. The report was critical of the labor problems and strike that plagued the producer. The committee was severely critical of the escalated cost of the M-16 and critical of the profits that have been realized by the sole source producer.

Mr. Speaker, these were precisely the questions we raised against the closing of the Springfield Armory. This decision to close the Springfield Armory has deprived the Nation and its taxpayers of one of the most effective means of exercising quality and cost control, and tests and evaluations of small arms, and small arms parts, and their production.

In the light of this M-16 rifle program report, many of the well-documented arguments that were used by all of us, the Massachusetts congressional delegation and the Springfield Armory Technical Committee, to reverse the decision to close the Springfield Armory, have been sustained.

Mr. Speaker, the decision of November 19, 1964, to close the Springfield Armory was incredible.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Record an editorial, on the M-16 report, which appeared in today's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The M-16 Report

If the New Left were to set out to compose an insider's indictment of the "military-industrial complex," it could hardly match the report which a congressional committee has submitted on the M-16 rifle. The House Armed Services Subcommittee report on the M-16, the basic combat weapon in Vietnam, is a devastating document which demands the most serious concern.

Despite battlefield complaints of jamming, Army officials did not react until these complaints reached the press, the Subcommittee stated. It found the Army's performance then to be characterized by delay, carelessness, buckpassing, and internal politics and jealousies. The Subcommittee declared that the Army's failure to correct a critical ammunition flaw "borders on criminal negligence."

The Subcommittee was deeply disturbed that a general who negotiated the M-14 contract with Colt retired to take a job with Colt. It learned that Colt "enjoyed negotiated fixed-price contracts on a 10 per cent profit rate basis" but in fact made M-16 profits as high as 19.6 per cent. It was led to ask if the 26 year "sole source" position for M-14-type ammunition held by Olin Mathieson "may have influenced" the Army's buyers.

At the very least, the Army is guilty of failing to satisfy legitimate public inquiries about the reliability of the M-16. Now that it is accused of other such shocking practices, it will surely want to reply, with complete candor. The public insists on no less.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING BILL

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a new congressional redistricting bill. This action is necessitated by the disappointment which many of us feel as to the inadequate work-product of the committee of conference on congressional redistricting the day before yesterday. The bill that I have introduced today incorporates the temporary provisions from the conference committee's report of October 19. It also incorporates the permanent provisions that our committee of conference agreed upon in late June of this year. Reaching agreement on those permanent standards was a very important part of the task which our conference committee had. Although I was a conferee, I have been unable to find a satisfactory reason for the abandonment of the permanent standards. The permanent standards agreed upon by the conferees June 27 were the same permanent standards in the bill that passed this House this spring. They dealt very wisely with the question of permissive population disparity between districts and also dealt effectively with the compactness and contiguity requirements for the post-1970 census period.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that others might study the bill I have introduced today and might give me some support when I seek to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to combine the temporary provisions of congressional redistricting we conferees agreed to the day before yesterday and the permanent provisions agreed to and printed in Report No. 435 of the House, June 27, 1967, entitled "Conference Report on Congressional Redistricting."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 20, 1967]

DISTRICTING FIASCO

The conferees' report on the districting bill is a severe disappointment. Congress set out to create new standards that all the states would have to meet so as to assure fair and equal representation in the House. Bills for this purpose cleared both houses, and the Senate bill was admirable. But the quarreling conferees have ripped both bills to pieces and brought forth a substitute that is virtually worthless.

The heart of both bills was a provision requiring the states to permit no more than 10 per cent variation between their largest and smallest districts after the 1970 census. This has been completely deleted. Indeed, the conferees abandoned all efforts to set up permanent districting standards for the states because they could not agree upon an antigerrymandering provision and a temporary population variation rule for the next two elections. The result is to scuttle a vital principle that had been strongly approved by both houses.

What remains is merely a ban on court-imposed elections at large and a shabby declaration that no state will be required to redistrict before the 1970 census unless the results of a special census are available. It is easy to understand the lack of enthusiasm for any major redistricting drive on the basis of 1960 census figures, which are no longer an accurate measure of population in any state. If this attempt to suspend the districting process temporarily had been coupled with a strong set of standards to take hold after 1970 it would have won substantial sympathy. But in its present form it is merely a pesky bit of obstructionism.

The best course for both the Senate and the House, in our view, would be to reject the conference report and to instruct the conferees to bring a bill embracing at least the standards approved by both houses. These conferees have shamefully disregarded the will of their parent bodies, and they should not be permitted to get away with it.

CEILING ON FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. **LLOYD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. **LLOYD**. Mr. Speaker, action taken by the House of Representatives on Wednesday, October 18 in placing a ceiling on Federal spending for the 1967 fiscal year except for specified exemptions is an act of responsibility in the conduct of the Nation's fiscal policy, which if substantially supported by the U.S. Senate, will make it possible to go on to further responsible consideration of measures to establish fiscal soundness in this country. Specifically, it will allow dispassionate consideration of the proposal to levy a surtax as requested by the Johnson administration.

This is not to imply that this surtax will be or should be supported but in my opinion, it does open the door to rational and reasoned debate.

It does raise the hope that we may discharge a duty to the American people to harness the root causes of runaway increases in living costs.

In the absence of proof that there will be appropriate and substantial cuts in domestic spending in time of war, the great majority of the people in my district, and I believe the majority of the people throughout the country, might rightfully consider a tax increase to be intolerable.

In the absence of a substantial and essential cut in domestic spending, who could blame the taxpayers of America for believing that increased taxes would merely encourage and accelerate waste and profligacy in domestic spending and, with such a belief, who could reasonably maintain that such a tax increase should not be opposed in the national interest.

Responsible officials of the Treasury Department have told me that a deficit above the $12 to $14 billion level would create serious disruption and unreasonably increase the cost of money in the money market when the Treasury competes with private financial institutions for the Nation's savings. Of course, there are many who will maintain that even this deficit is unreasonably excessive, but we are in war time and in the cause of national defense a deficit may be expected.

It is acknowledged that in the absence of a spending cut the deficit may reach $30 billion. With the spending limitation imposed by this House on October 18, if substantially approved by the Senate, it, therefore, becomes possible to analyze the need for the surtax in a new perspective.

By this action of ours on Wednesday of this week, we discharged a responsibility to the American people. By this action of ours, it is now possible to go on with a dispassionate, and hopefully nonpartisan analysis of further steps which should be taken in our vital national interest in time of war to attempt to establish and maintain sound fiscal policy.

SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL

Mr. **DORN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DORN**. Mr. Speaker, each day millions of parents send their children off to school knowing they will be well cared for along the way. Their assurance is based upon the fact that today there are over 900,000 School Safety Patrol members protecting some 19,000,000 children at road crossings on their way to school.

In order to help these youngsters receive the recognition which, I believe, they deserve, I have introduced a House joint resolution designating the second week of each May as "National School Safety Patrol Week."

The effectiveness of these young men and women is not to be denied. Since school patrols were first initiated in 1922 on a nationwide basis, the traffic death rate of school-age children has dropped nearly one-half while the death rate of all other age groups has doubled.

In recognition of their work each year representative groups from around the country participate in a parade down Constitution Avenue in the Nation's Capital. This year groups from 22 States including South Carolina participated. The parade, sponsored by the American Automobile Association in conjunction with schools and police, is part of a 3-day program.

One of the highlights each year is the presentation by the AAA of Gold Life Saver Medals to those young patrol heroes who have actually saved the life of a schoolmate in traffic danger.

These coveted medals are presented by a top U.S. official. Among those who have made the presentations in past years are Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman, Vice President Nixon, Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY, and Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who has also presented these medals, has said that he feels the patrol members "are playing a great part in civic work and have been very instrumental in the protection of their schoolmates from the hazards of the highway. They are making a grand contribution to law enforcement and I join in the tribute that is rightfully theirs."

Since more than 14,000,000 children are transported by 180,000 buses to 45,000 schools, the work of the School Safety Patrol has expanded into this area by providing the busdriver with assistance in giving the children a safe and enjoyable ride.

They see that the children enter the bus in an orderly manner and take their seats. They also see that the students remain in their seats while the bus is in motion and keep the aisles clear at all times, so the driver can concentrate on his important task. The patrol member also sees that the students remain quiet, orderly and courteous.

These youngsters give of their time to protect their fellow students. They are learning the benefits of assisting others and at the same time acquiring leadership experience which will help them throughout life.

Since the lifesaving efforts of the school safety patrol plays an increasingly important role in the nationwide campaign and concern for the reduction of traffic accidents, this program should receive public attention and citizen support.

WHAT PRICE COMMUNISM? A 50-YEAR REVIEW

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in various daily newspapers, in anticipation of the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution of 1917, series of articles are appearing reviewing the record of the Soviet Union over the past 50 years. While much more material will be forthcoming on this subject in the next few weeks, some of it factual and some distorted propaganda, it would be well to establish a guideline upon which to judge the truth of the Soviet record. The primary basis for judgment must be, of course, the benefit to the individual person in his search for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The rights stressed by our Founding Fathers are no less inalienable to the peoples of the Soviet Union, the captive European states, China, Cuba, North Vietnam. Simply put, the common denominator upon which to evaluate the benefits of the Bolshevik revolution in all Communist-dominated areas is the God-given rights of the human being. Present advances in Soviet architecture are reduced to insignificance if the peoples of the Soviet Union cannot freely worship their Divine Creator how and when they please. Soviet technological gains are less than nothing to those in Soviet-consigned graves.

As I have indicated before, an excellent book for reading during the upcoming celebration is "Workers' Paradise Lost," by Eugene Lyons. Mr. Lyons, presently a senior editor of the Reader's Digest and formerly editor of the American Mercury, began his career as a journalist sympathetic to the Bolshevik revolution. Six years as a Moscow correspondent for the United Press shattered his illusions. His celebrated "Assignment in Utopia," published in 1937, reflected that disenchantment. His many years of study and experience concerning the Soviet Union served as the basis for other books in this area: "Stalin: Czar of All the Russias," "The Red Decade," and "Our Secret Allies: the Peoples of Russia."

The greater part of "Workers' Paradise Lost" is devoted to destroying 21 myths concerning the U.S.S.R. which have become prevalent in some circles. In addition, one chapter entitled "What Price Communism?" reviews briefly the record of communism as it pertains to the costs of life, the costs in terror, the costs in thought control, the political costs, the costs to the world, and the costs in moral values.

For an objective analysis of the Soviet 50-year record, this book should be required reading.

As a sample of the wealth of information contained in Lyons' latest effort, I am inserting the chapter "What Price Communism?" in the RECORD at this point:

WHAT PRICE COMMUNISM?

(NOTE.—An assessment of the Soviet half-century, as has been underscored in preceding sections of the book, cannot evade consideration of the exorbitant price paid by the Russian peoples and the world. Many of the costs have been put on record in examining the principal myths with which the subject is encrusted. But a summation is in order, to complete the balance sheet. This unavoidably involves some repetition; and the six groupings under which the costs are organized of necessity overlap and intermesh.)

1. THE COSTS IN LIFE

A British journalist, D. G. Stewart-Smith, in his book *Defeat of Communism,* attempted an estimate. International communism from 1917 to 1964, he found, was directly responsible for eighty-three million deaths—more than the deaths in the two World Wars. This did not include the loss of life in the second of these holocausts, although Moscow's role in the triumph of Hitlerism and in unleashing the war cannot be underestimated. Of the eighty-three million, according to his analysis, more than forty-five million were in Soviet Russia proper, through civil war, famines, "liquidation of the *kulaks,*" purge executions, the high mortality rates in concentration camps, and so on.

Such figures, any figures in this grim context, are open to challenge in both directions. He puts the dead in the man-made famine of 1932–1933, for instance, at six million—I would scale it down to four million. (Yet a British historian, J. N. Westwood, in his recent book, *Russia 1917–1964* writes: "About 10 to 15 million people died in the 1932–34 famine and its attendant epidemics"; possibly he had in mind also the toll of life in the deportations of those years.) Deaths in forced-labor areas and prison "isolators," Mr. Steward-Smith reckons at eleven million—most estimates are substantially higher. At Yalta, Winston Churchill was voicing sympathy for the high Russian casualties in the war. Stalin shrugged. Collectivization, he told his guest, had cost the USSR more lives than the war. If he was right, Mr. Stewart-Smith's total in that column is probably too small.

In his monumental study *The Growth of Industrial Production in the Soviet Union,* released in 1962, Professor G. Warren Nutter aligned Soviet statistics revealing "a deficit of some 40 million people between 1941 and 1945." Since the highest estimate of loss of life in the war is 20 million, at least that many more had been lost through other causes. In 1913 the population within the present boundaries of the Soviet Union was more than 60 per cent higher than that of the United States, but by 1962 it was only 20 per cent higher. In this Soviet shrinkage demographers see evidence of the tens of millions of lives destroyed.

A young Yugoslav educator, Mihajlo Mihajlov, returning from a long summer sojourn in Russia in 1964, was jailed for publishing an uninhibited account of his experience and findings. Apparently Tito had acted under pressures from Moscow: the main charge was giving offence to a friendly foreign government. Tito himself, of course, had said things a thousand times more devastating about the USSR. Speaking in Zagreb on November 3, 1952, for instance, he exclaimed: "Millions of Soviet citizens languish in *death* and forced-labor camps." It was no secret that what Moscow found most distressing in Mihajlov's account was his revelation that the Soviets early in their career had operated extermination camps, thus canceling out another "first" in the Nazi obscenities.

"The Soviet press is writing less and less about fascist and Nazi camps, to avoid comparisons with the Soviet camps," Dr. Mihajlov wrote. "This is quite understandable. The first 'death camps' were not founded by the Germans, but by the Soviets. In 1921, near Arkhangelsk, they set up Kolgomor camp for the sole purpose of physically destroying the prisoners. It operated successfully for many years and swallowed up many of the Bolsheviks' former allies—members of the non-Bolshevik revolutionary parties."

But one blushes at the quibblings about figures and comparative sadisms. It is like insisting that only five million Jews perished in Nazi gas chambers, not six million as commonly believed. What are a few million corpses more or less in the statistics of the Caligulas and Genghis Khans, the Hitlers and Stalins of history?

Millions of the victims, in the torture chambers and in the slave camps, were denied the solace of a quick and easy death; they died slowly, excruciatingly from physical abuse, overwork, undernourishment and exposure. The Soviet killings of individuals and of groups "as a class" were not committed in a frenzy of anger or panic. For the most part they were carried out in cold blood, deliberately: calculated destruction not only of enemies but of potential enemies, or simply to be rid of the superfluous and unwanted.

2. THE COSTS IN TERROR

It is even more difficult, actually impossible, to reckon the costs of half a century of terror generally, spanning as it does the spectrum from harassments to executions, from purges to mass deportations. No one was exempted, not even devoted communists and heroes.

The vastness of the Soviet state's machinery for internal spying and repression is in itself an index to the extent and ubiquity of terror. Never before, not even in a world that included German Nazism and Italian fascism, has a regime spawned such gigantic organs of surveillance, denunciation, punishment, consorship, and intimidation. No government in modern times, except perhaps Communist China, has invented so many "crimes against the state" or applied the death penalty so extensively. In former revolutions, terror and brutality subsided with victory. In Soviet Russia, uniquely in the history of revolutions, persecution and punishment grew in scope and ferocity after the safety and power of the new masters was assured.

As a matter of course, the authorities read the citizen's mail and listen in on his phone. The secret police maintain branch offices on the premises of the larger factories, mines, farms, universities, libraries, hotels, railroad stations. Little agents inform on bigger agents, like vermin on vermin. Every functionary important enough to rate a secretary or chauffeur takes it for granted that they are reporting not only his conduct, contacts and opinions, but his "political mood" for evaluation by the police. Not even the topmost leaders are exempt from this round-the-clock attention.

Every janitor reports on the tenants and every tenant is encouraged to watch and report on his neighbors, his fellow employees, local officials. Children are taught to report on their parents. In the years since Stalin, especially in Khrushchev's time, millions of young people have been organized in local vigilante brigades to check on the personal and political morals of their neighborhoods. Under beguiling names like *Druzhiny* (state guards), these youngsters, mostly teen-agers, may invade private homes, stage "trials" and hand out punishments. In some ways they resemble the Red Guards unloosed by Mao Tse-tung in China in 1966.

Victor Kravchenko, a Soviet defector, wrote in his celebrated book, *I Chose Freedom* (1946): "Multiple webs of espionage by the party and of the party, by the GPU and of the GPU, pooling information at some points, competing at other points, covered Soviet life from top to bottom. We lived in a world swarming with invisible eyes and ears." He was depicting the 1930's, but basically this system still prevails.

On January 11, 1918, Lenin, commenting on the blood-letting already under way, added: "We are still far from *real* terror, because for the time being we are stronger than they are." They—the foes of his regime—must have grown stronger with every month and year, since the "real" terror was applied on an ever larger scale.

Estimates of the number of slave laborers, by former camp inmates and scholarly researchers, range from ten to twenty-five million. Brooks Atkinson, in 1946, after his return from a six-year assignment in the USSR for the New York *Times*, put it between ten and fifteen million. A conscientious study made for a Commission of Inquiry into Forced Labor, published in 1951 as a book (*The Soviet Slave Empire*, by Albert Konrad Herling) said: "There is no doubt that in the last decade the prison camps and forced-labor camps had a minimum of eight million workers, and at various times a maximum of twenty million."

Some 90 per cent of this humanity being men of working age—only about 10 per cent of the victims were women—this represents about 15 to 30 per cent of the country's total male working population. But when we take into account the large turnover in the camps and exile regions—the mortality rate in the worst camps has been estimated as high as 30 per cent a year—it is a fair guess that no fewer than fifty million Soviet citizens in the aggregate experienced the Gehenna of the slave-labor system for periods of a year (for those lucky enough to die quickly) to twenty-five years.

After all discounts are made, it is clear that almost every family in the vast Soviet empire gave at least one member to the insatiable beast. During and after the war, of course, millions of non-Soviet prisoners—Germans, Balts, Poles, and other East Europeans, as well as Japanese and many Americans—swelled these legions of the damned. Statistics do not begin to suggest the sufferings involved for the direct victims and their broken families. It would take the genius of a Dante to describe the purgatory and the hell in which men, women, and even children lived like so many animals, in filth and vermin, worked literally to death, chronically starved, abused and insulted.[1]

A German woman, Elinor Lipper, came close to conveying the horror in her book, *Eleven years in Soviet Prison Camps*, published in 1951. "A Soviet camp," she wrote, "is an incubator for all the vilest human instincts. Its name, 'correction labor camp,' is a mockery. . . . Not only does the camp provide no educational work; it gives the criminal the finest opportunity to practice his profession. The thief steals, the speculator speculates, the prostitute sells herself. The normal person is perverted, the honest man becomes a hypocrite, the brave man a coward, and all have their spirits and bodies broken." The fact that political offenders, the vast majority, are herded together with ordinary criminals is one of the worst afflictions of camp life; the "politicals" are literally at the mercy of killers and perverts, who wield more power than the official warders and guards.

Contrary to widespread misconceptions deliberately spread by the Kremlin and its friends abroad, the camp system has not been abolished since the passing of Stalin. Its dimensions have been reduced, although current vctims must still be counted by the hundreds of thousands—by millions, according to some estimates. The treatment of inmates has become more lenient. But the institution itself is intact, and additional "crimes" punishable by exile to "corrective labor colonies"—in many cases the old camps *renamed* for easier swallowing—have been announced by the authorities from time to time.

Then there was the malignant process of collectivization. According to the pro-Soviet Sidney and Beatrice Webb, British Fabian Socialists, one million peasant families were liquidated. This is the most moderate estimate. At least five million human beings, that is, from babies in arms to the aged, were stripped of all possessions and transported in cattle cars to the Siberian *taiga*, the Arctic tundra, and Central Asian deserts, to live or die. Three or four times as many fled from the unfolding horrors in their ancestral villages, abandoning their homes and goods; most of them found work at new construction and industrial sites, the rest ended up in slave camps and exile regions.

Their ordeal was only part of the incalculable agonies of the entire peasantry—at that time more than three-fourths of the population—most of them despoiled of their earthly goods and herded by raw force into the hatred *kilkhozes*. Ever since, they have been subjected to a new species of serfdom, tied to the land, exploited without mercy in the interests of the state, their fate even bleaker by far than that of the so-called proletariat in factories, mines, and offices.

The testimony of Isaac Deutscher, a British writer, is pertinent because he has been consistently pro-Soviet, excusing the most obscene crimes in terms of historical necessity. In his book *What Next?* (1953), he wrote about collectivization: "The terror matched the resistance which those policies encountered. Only with scorpions could tens of millions be driven into collective farms, multitudes be shifted to new industrial sites, and the vast majority of people forced to toil in misery and suppress in silence the fury evoked by the privileges of a minority."

After a brief relaxation of pressures in the mid-thirties, the terror zoomed to new peaks in the time of the blood-purges, from 1936 to the coming of the war. The world to this day has not realized the real magnitude of that great carnage. It could know directly only the publicized butchering of leading communists, military men, professors, writers. The melodramatic Moscow treason trials in the foreground tended to shut off the view of the all-embracing purges behind them. Actually the whole population was affected.

In the ruling party, 1,800,000 members and candidates for membership were expelled, more than half the total, and that meant for them anything from concentration camp to shooting. At least eight million more, non-communists, were subjected to liquidation, implying anything from loss of their jobs and homes to loss of their lives. Executions and suicides have been estimated by Soviet defectors involved in the holocaust as high as two millions, and one million would probably be a moderate guess of the total. The late Moshe Pijade, one of the three of four leading communists in Yugoslavia, raised the ante in his polemic anti-Stalin zeal. "In 1936, 1937, and 1938," he said "over three million people disappeared from the earth's surface in the Soviet Union."

A purge of some ten million men and women staggers the imagination. Including their families and friends, whose lives were shaken up and often wrecked, we come close to a quarter of the whole population! And in truth no one escaped the tragedy, living amidst the thunderous fears of the time. Millions not actually involved in the purge remained psychologically crippled by the sheer waiting and dreading.

During the war, the inhabitants of entire "autonomous republics" were torn up by the roots from their ancestral soil, deported and dispersed, like the supposed *kulaks* a decade earlier. These victims included the Volga Germans, the Crimean Tartars, the Buddhist Kalmyks, Chechen-Ingush, Balkars, and Karachias. Millions of Ukrainians received the same treatment; Khrushchev himself, one of the top engineers of this mass exile, would explain in 1956: "The Ukrainians escaped this fate only because there were too many of them and because there was no place to exile them to." The peoples deported in mass—not even members of the Communist Party and the *Komsomols* were spared—were not "rehabilitated" until 1957. By that time, their ancient homes had been preempted by Russians and others, so that the belated right to return was largely meaningless.

The nationwide purges were resumed after the war, in the so-called Zhdanov period (named for Stalin's ideological inquisitor, Andrei Zhdanov). In scale, duration, and malevolence, they matched the abominations of the 1930's. Those subjected to the greatest pressures were then the educated classes: scientists, writers, artists, and intellectuals generally.

---

[1] For those interested to delve more deeply into the grim facts about Soviet concentration camps, there is a rich literature in many languages. Here, arranged chronologically, are a few of the books available in English:

Letters from Russian Prisons, edited by Roger N. Baldwin. Albert & Charles Boni, 1925.

Escape from the Soviets, by Tatiana Tchernavin, Dutton, 1935.

I Speak for the Silent, by Vladimir V. Tchernavin. Hale, Cushman & Flint, 1935.

Prisoner of the OGPU, by George Kitchin. Longmans Green, 1935.

Escape from Russian Chains, by Ivan Solonevich. Williams and Norgate, 1937.

The Women Who Could Not Die, by Julia de Beausobre. Viking, 1938.

Forced Labor in Soviet Russia, by David Dallin and Boris Nicolaevsky. Yale University Press, 1947.

The Dark Side of the Moon, preface by T. S. Eliot. Scribner's, 1947.

Tell the West! by Jerzy Gliksman, Gresham Press, 1948.

Soviet Gold: My Life as a Slave Laborer, by Vladimir Petrov. Farrar, Straus, 1949.

Slave Labor in Russia. Presented by the American Federation of Labor to the United Nations, 1949.

Under Two Dictators, by Margaret Buber. Gollancz, 1950.

The Soviet Slave Empire, by Albert Herling. Wilfred Funk, 1951.

Eleven Years in Soviet Prison Camps, by Elinor Lipper. Regnery, 1951.

Stalin's Slave Camps: An Indictment of Modern Slavery. Confederation of Free Trade Unions, Brussels, 1951.

As Far As My Feet Will Carry Me, by Josef M. Bauer. Random House, 1957.

I Was a Slave in Russia, by John H. Noble. Devin-Adair, 1958.

Years of My Life: The Memoirs of a General of the Soviet Army, by A. V. Gorbatov. Norton, 1965.

Having touched on the most conspicuous episodes, we must again make clear that these, and others like them, do not encompass the whole terror in its myriad dimensions. There was the premium put on hypocrisy and lying, the shattering of family life by sudden arrests and by the ravages of denunciation. There was, and remains, the systematic persecution of religious faith and practice, the most sacred beliefs and holy objects of the greater part of the population—Christians, Moslems, Jews—mocked and mangled. Like people trapped on battlegrounds in war, everyone in Soviet Russia, from the lowliest to the highest, lived in an atmosphere of unremitting fear, blood, sudden evacuation and sudden death, but with refinements of danger and dread unknown in mere military wars.

Every student of the Soviet times has his own little list of what he considers the worst or most revealing elements in the terror. Dr. Lin Yutang, for example, cites his three "favorites": (1) making children of twelve subject to capital punishment; (2) sending women to work in under-surface coal mines; (3) harassing workers in their lunch recess with threats of prison for lateness in returning to work.

The overwhelming majority of Soviet citizens now alive were born into an all-pervasive atmosphere of terror, grew up in it, absorbing its nerve-wracking hates and poisons. They have lived under the constant surveillance of a colossal secret-police organization, with its own specialized army for internal repressions, supported by great contingents of professional and volunteer informers—an establishment for detection of heresy and swift punishment second in size only to the regular armed forces.

They have known the panic of the after-midnight knock on the door; the anguish of denunciation by close friends and relatives, including one's adored children; the awareness that their most innocent conversations, their mail and phones might be monitored and bring disaster. Arbitrary terror encompasses more humiliations, persecutions, punishments without crime, than language can convey. This was the haunting memory that moved Yevgeny Yevtushenko to recall the loss of "twenty million in war, and millions in the war on the people."

The defense of the horrors has become standard in communist apologetics. It is to the effect that capitalist industrialization in the nineteenth century, marked by sweatshops and child labor, was also cruel. The argument is both specious and stupid. Private entrepreneurs did not deliberately and arbitrarily, as a matter of state policy, murder millions and condemn tens of millions to slave labor in hideous concentration camps. Moreover, in Western Europe and the United States, under relatively democratic systems, the evils could be exposed, opposed, and ultimately eliminated.

Let no one suppose that terror on this scale over such a protracted period can be canceled out in the national memory and from the national conscience by a few years of moderation. Its scars are on every mind and heart. Although they have never been published, the heartbreak songs of camp and prison, the haunting laments of the homeless children, are sung by the new generation, secretly among themselves or defiantly in schools and at demonstrations. The wounds are unstitched, unhealed—gangrenous with guilt among the mighty, a festering fury among the humble.

3. THE COSTS IN THOUGHT CONTROL

Having sealed the country as hermetically as they could against foreign printed matter and radio, the oligarchy rationed information stingily through absolute control of the flow of news and ideas. The content of everything in print and on the airwaves was limited to authorized "truths," which is another name for official lies. Multiple censorships guarded against the leakage of forbidden thoughts through the press, books, scientific papers; on the stage and screen and on the air; in schoolrooms and lecture halls. Folk songs and fairy tales were examined for dangerous overtones. Not even the Holy Writ of Marx, Engels and Lenin was exempt from censorial editing and suppressions.

Textbooks, from kindergarten up, were crammed with half-truths and full lies. Every discipline, from economics to agronomy, from biology to philosophy, was narrowed and mangled to conform with dicta from Marx and Lenin and the propaganda line of the masters. Areas as seemingly remote from Kremlin interests as astronomy and psychiatry were sown with booby-traps for careless practitioners. The marauders were especially ruthless in the fields of history. Everything that did not fit into their arbitrary mythology was thrown into what has been called the Memory Hole. Past events were revised or blotted out. Historical "facts" and biographical data were simply invented, then deleted or restored periodically as the party "line" changed.

Reflecting the occupational hazards of callings involving the mind, the proportion of professors and students, scientists, historians and such was especially high, in relation to their numbers, among the "liquidated" and the inmates of slave camps. In literature and all the other arts, music included, the creative urge became the shortest road to economic penury or physical extinction. At the same time the treasure-houses of Russian poetry, prose, music, philosophy were "purged" insofar as censors could do it with so great and vast national heritage.

Lord Bertrand Russell, the British philosopher, though he was at the time sympathetic to the Russian Revolution, wrote in a book on Bolshevism in 1920: "If a more just economic system were only attainable by closing men's minds against free inquiry, and plunging them back into the intellectual prison of the Middle Ages, *I should consider the price too high.*" The exorbitant price was paid but it did not buy the more just economic system. Said André Gide, after his journey through the USSR which cured him of his illusions about communism: "I doubt that in any country of the world, even Hitler's Germany, is thought less free, more bowed down, more terrorized."

Those who have read George Orwell's fantasy-novel, 1984, have some idea of what it means to have your every thought and gesture and facial expression watched by Big Brother. Some parts of his prevision of thought-control carried to its extreme were chillingly close to what was actually happening in Stalin's empire.

The other side of suppression and censorship has been large-scale and systematic indoctrination. Veritable armies of lectures have been engaged in molding two hundred million minds to conform to preconceived patterns. Enormous funds and manpower—a million full-time and part-time indoctrinators, it has been estimated—were assigned to this job of "brainwashing." William Benton, publisher of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, after a study of the subject in Russia, wrote in 1956:

"Throughout the Soviet Union, there are about six thousand special schools maintained by the party and devoted exclusively to training professionals propagandists. . . . Above these schools are 177 regional 'propaganda colleges' to train 'alumni' of the local schools. And above the regional schools are a dozen high institutions giving 'graduate training' to several thousand advanced students."

Never before in history has there been such a stupendous enterprise in shaping the thought of a nation—in "selling" a regime on a twenty-four-hour schedule to its captive subjects. The pressures of nagging, hectoring slogans, clichés, exhortations, boasts, and threats are so relentless that they have amounted to a form of psychological torture. Some people have cracked under the strain, most have bowed meekly. Yet amazingly, unauthorized thoughts and feelings, memories and intuitions, somehow did survive in the underground of minds and hearts and now, more than ever before in the fifty years, rise to the surface to taunt and frighten the rulers.

4. THE POLITICAL COSTS

These are inherent in the formula of "dictatorship of the proletariat." The self-anointed and self-perpetuating dictators, a few hundred or a few thousand, have exercised absolute power over the small ruling party and through it over the rest of the citizenry. The rank-and-file communist has various privileges and opportunities but no more political rights than his non-party neighbors. The tight oligarchy operates through appointed proconsuls and agents of all degrees. The authority each of them wields is strictly delegated from the top and he is accountable only to his superiors in the pyramid, never to the people under his tutelage.

Soviet communism has stamped out free speech, press, and assembly, even in the restricted measure that they existed under the monarchy. The reader need only think of the political rights he enjoys—no matter how inadequate he may consider them—and realize that he would not have them if he were a Soviet citizen. "Elections" are limited to a single list of names, drawn up by the party or by organizations under party control. The whole process of "voting" is a compulsory totalitarian charade, implying not the slightest degree of popular participation in government. It does not differ from elections under Mussolini and Hitler, who in fact merely copied the Soviet model.

As a practical matter, it is unimportant how the Soviets or "legislatures" are "elected" and who "represents" the constituency, since these bodies have no governing function whatsoever. They meet so rarely and so briefly that the very pretense of a role in running the nation is farcical. The Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the national parliament, meets only once or twice a year *for a few days, a week at most*. Only mentally retarded children could believe the fairy tale that it disposes of the law-making business of a great and complex empire in this time. The "parliament" does not even have the time to rubberstamp all the decrees and plans theoretically submitted for its approval. It has never rejected any law or plan submitted by the bosses or approved it by less than unanimous vote. From the ballot box to the gala annual speech-making marathon in the Kremlin, the exercise is spurious.

Despite the beating of drums around so-called de-Stalinization, the country still lives under the Stalin constitution—not that it makes any difference, since it is ignored in practice insofar as political and civil rights are concerned. That extraordinary document was modestly presented in 1936 as "the most democratic constitution in the world" and duly hailed abroad at the time as evidence of Stalin's "new liberalism." It added insult to injury by listing on paper the fundamental civil guarantees denied in actuality, then and now. It assigned autonomous functions to an array of social and governmental organizations, with the mere proviso that all of them must remain under control of the Communist Party.

From time to time, as at present, there has been a supposed "return to legality." But it appeared soon enough that there can be no real rule of law under a regime that is itself lawless that extracts "confessions" to invented crimes by torture, violates its own constitution, disposes of its enemies by secret administrative action, issue decrees affecting the entire citizenry by arbitrary decision of the uppermost clique.

Where political sins are involved—and nearly everything is "political" in the totalitarian world—the judicial system is a travesty of justice. The accused has no right to defense counsel until after the police and investigatory machine has prepared him for trial. Even then, the defense lawyer, unless he has an urge to political suicide, can do nothing to embarrass the prosecution or expose its deceptions. In the infamous demonstration trials, in particular, the supposed defenders sometimes outdid the prosecutors in zeal to destroy their "clients."

Exoneration of citizens brought to trial under "political" statutes is exceedingly rare; to be accused by the all-knowing, all-seeing states is proof enough of guilt. Failure to denounce others who may harbor sinful views, whether relatives or strangers, is a punishable crime. Wives are obliged to testify against husbands, husbands against wives, and of course no one is exempted from testifying against himself.

Everyone knows that in Soviet Russia there is no *habeas corpus*. Few outside the country know that there is not even *habeas cadaver*. No non-official witnesses can confirm an execution and the body of the executed is not returned to the family for burial. The suspicion that a relative or friend whose death has been officially announced may in fact be alive, rotting in some isolator or concentration hell, adds mortifying uncertainty to the tragedy. Instances of "executed" persons who years later turned up alive are not unknown in the Soviet Union.

The individual has no semblance of any role in government, in law-making and decision-making, and most important, no protection against the will and whims of an arbitrary, all-powerful state. A differing value is placed on political and civil freedoms in different civilizations, but no matter how low the price-tag, their total denial to more than 200 million people for five decades is a decisive element in the balance sheet.

5. THE COSTS TO THE WORLD

Directly and through its international apparatus and extensions, the damage Soviet communism has done to the world is incalculable.

There is hardly a major crisis anywhere on this globe—from Southeast Asia to the Caribbean, from Africa to the Middle East—in which the territorial and ideological ambitions of Moscow are not deeply involved. The turbid tides of anti-Western and anti-American demonstrations, riots, arson—even in America and the West—are almost always communist-instigated, communist-led or, at the least, exploited by the communists.

And this has been true ever since Bolshevism seized a base of operations in Russia, along with the country's colossal material and human resources. The world since 1917 has been in a continuous turmoil of bloody conflicts, ferocious civil wars, competing propagandas, nearly all of them fomented or encouraged by communism. At bottom the history of these fifty years has been a struggle between free nations and those aspiring to freedom on one side, and a dehumanized totalitarianism on the other. Directly or by its example, as already observed, communism has spawned other types of totalitarianism, while itself enduring as the strongest and most menacing.

It happens that I was present, as a very young free-lance reporter, in late 1920 at the Livorno (Leghorn) congress of the Italian Socialist party. I watched how the communist faction, with Moscow agents present openly directing the strategy of demolition, split that powerful organization and its trade unions. It was this split that opened wide the road to Mussolini and his castor-oil brigades. In the same fashion, more moderate Marxist and other Leftist forces in the rest of the world were splintered from within on Kremlin orders. The parties which local adherents of the Moscow faith could not take over, they systematically destroyed.

The most disastrous consequences of this effort—disastrous, it turned out, for Russia too—was the triumph of National Socialism in Germany. In the climactic years of Hitler's rise, Stalin and his Communist International identified the moderate socialists and liberal reformers as "social fascists" and "the main enemy." Against them even collaboration with the Hitlerites was certified as smart tactics. In 1931, on Kremlin instructions, the German Communist party joined the Nazis on certain issues to defeat the noncommunist Left. Thus the opposition, which might have headed off the obscenity, was fragmented and the Nazi movement had the unimpeded right of way.

The Kremlin stuck to its blunder even after Hitler was enthroned and slaughtering German communists. As late as April, 1934, the Communist International still declared solemnly that Nazism "by destroying all the democratic illusions of the masses and liberating them from the influence of Social Democracy, accelerates the rate of Germany's development toward proletarian revolution."

Earlier that year the communist chieftain in the United States, Earl Browder, ridiculed those who feared Hitlerism. Fascism, he explains, "destroys the moral base for capitalist rule, discrediting bourgeois law in the eyes of the masses; it hastens the exposure of all demagogic supporters of capitalism, especially its main support among the workers—the socialist trade-union leaders. It hastens the revolutionization of the workers, destroys their democratic illusions and prepares the masses for the revolutionary struggle for power."

The Stalin-Hitler pact that unleashed World War II astonished only those who had forgotten the Kremlin's ambivalence on Nazism. The two dictatorships had plenty in common. It was easier for communists willing to serve Hitler to join his party than for most other Germans. After the war, Ulbricht in East Germany repaid the compliment by enlisting thousands of ex-Nazis in his communist apparatus.

The evil went deeper. Communist ideology, by disorienting the minds of several generations of men, contributed to a world-wide erosion of traditional intellectual and ethical standards, the decay of idealism and democratic preferences. It provided a rationale for inhumane practices under "revolutionary" labels. Red intrusion and subversion weakened or destroyed progressive and radical movements, trade-unions, democratizing trends.

Starting with one hundred and sixty million subjects in one country, communism has spread to take in a third of the human race. Because it was unloosed in Russia, its extension propagated and financed by Lenin's Third or Communist International, the sufferings in all other Red nations, from China to Cuba, may justly be charged against Soviet communism.

The conquest of unwilling peoples was begun by the Lenin-Trotsky regime with the re-imposition of Russian imperial dominion over racial-national minorities that had broken away in the civil-war period. Gruzia (Georgia), the Ukraine, various Central Asian areas that had set up their own governments were brutally beaten into submission. Then, in due time, Lenin's successors went on to crush one neighboring nation after another: Outer Mongolia before the Second World War, Central and Eastern European nations during and after the war. And the end, as Soviet propaganda and official programs make clear, is not yet.

In an era when old-style colonialism has been virtually ended, Red imperialism has emerged as the largest colonial system extant. It is today the only dynamic, *expanding* imperialism on this planet. Korea, Vietnam, the horrifying toll of death in averting a communist take-over in Indonesia, are merely episodes in the permanent totalitarian offensive against the rest of the world.

As the Second World War was drawing to its end, Winston Churchill, in a burst of optimism he was to regret, said: "I know of no government which stands to its obligation, even in its own despite, more solidly than the Soviet Union." President Truman matched this faith in "good old Joe." But the echoes of the last battles had barely died away when Moscow returned with renewed energy to its systematic assaults on free societies.

Again Stalin was denouncing the Allies without whom he could not have saved his regime from obliteration. One after another the Kremlin's solemn undertakings for post-war occupation and normalization of the defeated lands were broken. One after another the hopes that Soviet Russia would cooperate for a peaceful world, nurtured by President Roosevelt's and Prime Minister Churchill's reassurances, were punctured. While the West hurriedly demobilized, the Soviets held their military strength at wartime levels and used it to intimidate neighbors and yesterday's allies. In brief, everything was back to abnormal.

In Bulgaria, Poland, Berlin, the Soviet Zone of Occupation in Germany, the three- and four-nation interim authorities were displaced by all-Soviet controls. Finally a Red puppet regime was nailed down on Czechoslovakia. Through the United Nations, Washington offered one of the most generous gifts in history: an equal share for the USSR in a multi-nation control of the nuclear power that was still an American monopoly. Stalin turned it down. Similarly he turned down a part in the Marshall Plan and stopped his new colonies from participating in it. Then came Soviet-made crises in Berlin and the sudden invasion of South Korea.

Muscovite obstruction and aggression were back on history's agenda. Hesitantly, reluctantly, the United States, Britain, France, Turkey had begun to rearm and to build NATO and other regional defensive alliances. By the deliberate, world-revolutionary choice of the Soviet hierarchs a debilitating armaments race was forced upon a world struggling to repair the devastations of the war. Moscow was fishing in troubled waters in Africa, the Middle East, Latin America—and diligently troubling waters that were still calm.

Soviet contempt for treaties and its own pledged word are a matter of public record. In 1955, a fully documented analysis of nearly one thousand Soviet treaties made public by a U.S. Senate committee showed that the USSR "had broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise." Subsequently a special committee of the American Bar Association found that in twenty-five postwar years the United States had 3,400 meetings with communists, and that "all this talk led to fifty-two major agreements and Soviet Russia had broken fifty of them." The strength and the prestige of the United Nations have been undermined by more than a hundred Soviet vetoes, and by refusal, when it suited Kremlin purposes, to abide by U.N. decisions.

The Red blight is everywhere. Every nation and colonial region, from the most advanced to the most backward, has its legal or underground communist contingents—usually both brands—working to disrupt the existing or emerging order. Every major social or religious organization, every vital labor and peasant movement, every national-independence movement, is already infiltrated by communists or in the process of penetration.

Because it is consciously at war, international communism endlessly prepares the necessary leaders and experts in the use of all political, psychological, economic, and revolutionary weapons. The campaigns are planned and manned by professionals, painstakingly trained for their jobs. According to NATO intelligence files, Henry J. Taylor reported in the American press in September, 1966, the Soviet regime "runs African-Asian communist indoctrination programs in about 177 colleges and six thousand secondary schools in Iron Curtain countries, a trade-union institute for Africans in Budapest, and terrorist training centers in Prague, Warsaw and in East Germany."

If anything, these NATO intelligence figures understate the magnitude of the "educational" networks for preparing guerrilla leaders, propaganda specialists, social sappers, terror cadres from all continents, then deploying them in their native lands to explode legal governments, to capture or ruin non-communist revolutionary movements. Other such training centers operate in Red China and Cuba.

None of this is recent or accidental. Years before 1917 Lenin set up study centers for followers in Bologna and Capri in Italy, and a third near Paris. Schools for communist revolution were established in Russia and non-communist countries soon after the Bolshevik *coup d'etat* and multiplied steadily thereafter. Textbooks for the trainees in treason cover a wide range of skills. Typical subjects include "Preparation for Armed Insurrection," "Ideological Penetration of Armed Services," "The Tactic of the United Front."

In the half-century, the schools have graduated scores of thousands of agents, masters of the arts of softening free peoples and sapping their self-confidence, setting class against class and race against race. The fact that there are today more such schools than ever before should give pause to those who would like to believe that the cold war is over. Revolutionary cadres on such a scale are not being trained for the fun of it.

The communist blight, I repeat, is everywhere. The havoc it works has not been limited to governments and institutions. Its poisonous effects have been even wider and deeper on the minds of men the world over. Sincere progressives in all countries, as I have already pointed out, have been disoriented and corrupted by support of, or flirtation with communist doctrines and practices. Men and women of intellectual and moral stature—among them educators and religious leaders who influence young minds—not to mention the millionfold Lumpen-intelligentsia in the non-communist world, found themselves defending slave labor, glorying in the Big Lie, shouting "Hoorah for murder!" when the killers were communists.

Communist propaganda generated the kind of cynicism that could applaud Kremlin blood-purges and genocide; that could side with the enemy against one's own country in Korea or Vietnam; that could argue self-righteously, "What if a few more million die"—in Russia, that is, or China, not in their own country. Unlimited violence and crime were a down-payment on the utopia of their fantasy world; though the advance payments already come to more than eighty million lives, a usurious fanaticism can take more and yet more in its stride.

6. THE COSTS IN MORAL VALUES

A deep immoralism has marked the Soviet years from the start. It turned the person into an object, a bloodless statistic, and shrank respect for the living to the vanishing point. In pursuit of its purposes, it has demeaned or outlawed truth, honor, kindness, personal loyalty, and other such "petty bourgeois prejudices." No appraisal of the Soviet half-century makes sense if it evades these staggering costs in moral terms.

History, of course, is replete with evil governments and cruel individual tyrants, but usually they gave lip-service to some code of ethics even while violating it. The USSR was the first totally immoral state, so proclaimed by its founders, so maintained by their successors. It has treated immoralism as a positive virtue, derided ethical scruples, boasted of its capacity for what others call evil, acknowledging no limits on action beyond its own will and expediency.

Communists, one Martin Milligan instructed readers in the January, 1965, issue of *Marxism Today*, "must regard themselves as free, indeed morally obliged, to violate *the principles of truthfulness, respect for life,* etc. when it is absolutely clear that a great deal more harm would be done by adhering to such principles than by violating them." The killer thus sets himself up as the sole judge of when he is "morally obliged" to kill! This has been a continuous, inviolate principle. Forty-four years earlier a certain I. Duzcinski explained:

"Communist ethics makes it the highest duty to accept the necessity of acting wickedly. This was the greatest sacrifice the revolution asked of us. The conviction of the true communists is that evil transforms itself into bliss through the dialectics of historical evolution."

With continued indulgence, however, acting wickedly ceased to be a sacrifice and became itself a source of bliss—the psychotic thrill of power to inflict pain and death with complete impunity. The willingness to hurt or kill for the cause was hailed in the communist incantations as "Bolshevik firmness" and "Leninist courage." By that perverted logic, the firmness and courage proved by slaying a million were multiplied tenfold in slaying ten million. The very categories of Good and Evil were outlawed as sentimental weakness. Vyacheslav Molotov was entirely in Soviet character when he said off-handedly, while the Germans were raining death on Poland, that one's opinion of Nazism was just "a matter of taste."

A hostage system made the whole family punishable for the political crimes of any relative. The arrest and conviction of a man almost always brought some punishment, at the least exile, to his wife and grown children; invariably they were dispersed to different prisons and camps in different parts of the country.

Other regimes may have induced young children to spy on their parents—it remained for the Soviets to erect a monument to Pavlik Morozov, a little monster who informed on his father and mother and got them executed. The Pavlik episode occurred in the 1930's in a village in the Sverdlovsk area. Peasant neighbors were so infuriated by his action that they killed the boy, thus creating a martyr memorialized in metal in that village and held up as a model for all good little communists.

Other tyrants may have robbed their citizens—it remained for the Soviet secret police to round up tens of thousands suspected of hiding a few dollars, jewels or other *valuta*, and to subject them to medieval tortures for weeks and months until they handed it over. The police in every district had a production quota to fulfill in this "gold-mining in torture chambers"—those victims who did have something to hand over were the lucky ones.

Jean Jacques Rousseau who warned that "nothing on this earth is worth buying at the price of human blood," could never have made the grade as a Bolshevik. Lenin and his brethren laughed at such sentimental nonsense as "bourgeois liberalism." For Good and Evil they substituted expediency. Thus released from the moral restraints on normal men, they could compound any monstrosity not merely in good conscience but in pride.

Lenin, it is important to recall, had found Sergei Nechayev, the apostle of absolute immoralism, even before he found Marx. In 1868, Nechayev wrote his celebrated *Catechism of a Revolutionist,* in which he renounced all norms of civilized behavior and prescribed every imaginable depravity in the pursuit of the "ideal." It is as fanatic, hate-packed a document as the human brain has ever produced. The revolutionist, he wrote, "knows only one science, the science of destruction," which does not stop at lying, robbery, betrayal and torture of friends, murder of his own family. His central dictum, that "everything that contributes to the triumph of the revolution" is moral, has been echoed by Lenin and his disciples to this day and, indeed, figures in every communist pronouncement on morality.

"Thus before he became a Marxist," Max Eastman has summed it up, "Lenin had arrived by an emotional road at the rejection of moral standards which Marx deduced from a pretended science of history. The confluence of these two streams of thought [Nechayev and Marx] is one of the greatest disasters that ever befell mankind."

It was pure Nechayevism, in almost the master's original language, when Lenin wrote: "Morality is that which serves the destruction of the old exploiters' society. We do not believe in eternal morality and expose the deceit of all legends about morality." This precept was in due time enshrined in the *Soviet Encyclopaedia:* "The only scientific criterion of morality is the defense of the victory of communism." Thus the wisdom of time and the genius of moral philosophers through the millennia were discarded in the name of a distant vision of the perfect society.

Let no one suppose from his reference to deceit that Lenin ever opposed it in principle. On the contrary, deception was a matter of tactics, a primary tool for rule, when practised by "the vanguard of the proletariat," meaning himself and his henchmen. He chose hate, arrogance, mass murder, in the boundless ego-mania of men possessed by the conviction that they are destined saviors of Humanity, the destined instruments of History.

Now that Soviet communism has vaulted over a quarter-century of Stalin dominance to rest its claim to legitimate succession on Lenin alone, there is a tendency to romanticize his character. It is argued, even by some opponents of communism, that he was humane, idealistic, and so on. Yet there is little that Stalin did, except in its scale, that was not done first by Lenin. Stalin simply carried to insane extremes the crimes first sanctified by Lenin.

It was Lenin, it should not be forgotten, who devised the first terror machine, the Cheka, and put a sanctimonious sadist, Felix Djerzhinski, at its head. It was Lenin who ordered the murder of thousands of innocent "hostages"; disposed the first and only democratically elected legislative body after the Bolshevik seizure of power, the Constituent Assembly, crushed the Kronstadt revolt of his own Red sailors; raised lies and falsification to prime virtues in his system.

Messianic delusion as an alibi for immoralism is an old, old story. In *The Blithedale Romance,* a novel about the communist experiment in Brook Farm in the 1840's, Nathaniel Hawthorne depicted its leaders, men obsessed by a vision of perfection:

"They have no heart, no sympathy, no reason, no conscience. They will keep no friend, unless he makes himself the mirror of their purpose; they will smite and slay you, and trample your dead corpse under foot, all the more readily, if you take the first step with them and cannot take the second and the third, and every other step in their terribly strait path."

Whatever brand of beatitude those in the grip of such obsession may be pushing, they wind up in utter depravity. Dazzled by hallucinations of some golden future, convinced that they and they alone can bring it into being, and means seems to them haloed by the envisioned end.

The dilemma of ends and means is central to an assessment of communism. After all, both a highway robber and an honest workman have the same objective: to acquire money. The difference is in the means each uses to attain that end. Brutal means invariably brutalizes those who use them as well as those who are its victims. Milovan Djilas, the Yugoslav ex-communist, in his celebrated book, *The New Class*, was right, of course, when he wrote:

"Throughout history there have been no ideal ends which were attained with non-ideal means, just as there has been no free society which was built by slaves. Nothing so well reveals the reality and greatness of ends as the methods used to attain them."

Another writer, Professor W. W. Kulski, in 1957 posed one of the basic questions in his book, *The Soviet Regime: Communism in Practice:* "Is it worthwhile to inflict death and untold suffering on individual human beings for a dream of future happiness of mankind?" People who live by the accumulated wisdom of the ages and the sages, he believes, cannot hesitate in giving their answer:

"No end and no dream of future happiness could make them feel free to use any and all means. Soviet experience proves that means may become ends in themselves, while the millennium of future happiness recedes beyond human vision and reach."

Yet their profession of noble intentions leading ultimately to a perfect society has been the only argument advanced by communists for their savage terror. Five hundred years ago, in 1441, the nominal Bishop of Verden. Dietrich von Nieheim, set down a statement which helps explain the excesses of the Inquisition. "When its existence is threatened," he wrote, "the Church is freed of moral edicts. Unity as an aim blesses all means: perfidy, treachery, tyranny, imony, prisons and death." The words sound as if they had been uttered by a zealous communist today in defense of *his* "church." False confessions extracted by torture, mass homicide, universal spying, man-made famine, genocide—everything goes, until the very memory of decency, love, justice fades out.

That in the Soviet Union the means have all but expunged the professed ends is all too clear. The ends were the creation of a just society of equals. Industrialization—which Marx had taken for granted as a heritage from the displaced capitalism—in Russia became the unavoidable means. And inevitably that evolved into a supreme end in itself so compelling that it was used to explain and justify the most vicious means. The initial ends continued to be recalled in ritualistic oratory, but they lost relevance to real life, dominated by the regime's obsession with the new end of industrialization at any cost. What is more, the seizure and retention of power, which was at first regarded as a transitory means for the attainment of communism, also turned into a supreme end in itself.

Thus in the name of humanity, the Soviets have cheapened and insulted human life. They have "scientifically" sacrificed the living generations for the supposed benefit of generations yet unborn, inflicted real horrors today for highly problematical happiness in some far-off tomorrow.

That, too, violates our ingrained moral intuitions. Anyone who decided to torture and murder one man or woman for the good of the victim's unborn great-grandchildren would be adjudged insane. Is he any less insane when he decides to torture and exterminate millions of men and women for the good of their unborn posterity? Have only the unborn a right to happiness, so that the anguish of the living is a trifling investment for their great-grandchildren?

A thousand accidents may snatch the theoretical happiness from the coming generations; they may even have a different concept of happiness than the group now brandishing "the sword of history" in their behalf. Only the torment of the living is real and indubitable. If it is morally permissible to wipe out a sector of Humanity for the sake of History, then there is no sensible reason for drawing the line at five million or five hundred million. Drown them all, comrades, leaving only a he-Stalin and a she-Stalin in their monolithic ark to start things over again from scratch!

By 1934, when I departed from Russia, nothing was left of the high mood of dedication, traces of which I had still found among communists six years earlier. The very vocabulary of idealism had been outlawed. "Equality" was lampooned as bourgeois romanticism. Excessive concern for the needs and sensibilities of ordinary people was punished as "rotten liberalism." Terror was no longer explained away as a sad necessity. It was used starkly and glorified as "human engineering." Means had blotted out ends and have held this priority ever since.

The Marxist theory of permanent class struggle rules out compromise, reform, truce, common humanity, mutual respect, family loyalties. "Marx's great crime" Eugene Methvin writes in an as yet unpublished book, "was that he dethroned man's civilizing emotion—love and the spirit of cooperation—for his more primitive, monstrous emotion, hate. In man's ambivalent Jekyll-Hyde nature as the civilized savage, Marxism is a throwback philosophy, anti-civilization and anti-*homo sapiens*."

Any doubts on this score have been removed by Marxism as practised under Soviet communism. Philip Spratt a former British-Indian communist leader, stated: "The communist movement runs on hate—the leading theorists are quite frank about it—and hate is a potent fuel." Hate not merely of capitalism as an abstraction, but of capitalists as people; hate of entire nations is preached in school books for Soviet children. The American poet, e.e. cummings, after a sojourn in Soviet Russia, wrote in his quaint style: "every kumrad is a bit of quite unmitigated hate."

In the Congo in 1965 hopped-up Simbas, armed and inspired by Moscow and Peking, went on a murderous spree that shocked the world. Witnesses testified that they attended scenes in which men and women were dismembered, disembowled, and their hearts used for ritual food. Far from apologizing for its established complicity in such barbaric cruelties, spokesmen for the Kremlin in the United Nations demanded that the United States be condemned for rescuing some of the trapped victims, black and white, from this fate.

As a practical matter, on its own terms of expediency, the official rejection of ethical standards has taken a heavy toll from the Soviet regime itself. Lacking a moral compass, the Soviets have written a record of blunders and depravities paid for in economic losses, destruction of irreplaceable brains and skills, loss of popular respect, loathing for the system on the part of the new generations.

A corrupt autocracy, both by example and from the need to escape its exactions, has bred corruption in the people. By falsifying statistics, concealing and lying about simple facts, it has taught its subjects to lie and falsify. Hence the shocking dimensions of theft of state property, bribery, faked bookkeeping, disregard of law: matters that are constantly exposed and bewailed by the Kremlin's own press. Hence political and moral decay within the ruling party, likewise admitted and inveighed against in this press. Day after day the leaders plead for discipline and dedication among their followers, attacking (to quote a recent Soviet document) the "schizophrenics, hypocrites, self-servers, windbags, eye-washers, demagogues" in the party concerned only with "their own personal well-being."

In a time of ferocious purges, Maxim Gorki was implored to intercede with the Kremlin, where his influence was enormous, for literary friends dying in dungeons or awaiting execution. Not only did he refuse but he used the occasion to express publicly his sympathy for the prison wardens and executioners. "People whose historical duty it is to kill some beings in order to save others," he wrote, "are *martyrs*, and my conscience will never allow me to condemn them." It was a degrading affair: the champion of the denizens of the "lower depths" championing the police and firing squads! If the once warm-hearted humanitarian could be so corrupted in the climate of immoralism, what did it do to lesser men?

Indeed it is proof of the underlying moral potential of the Russian peoples that, in the fifth decade of life under Nechayev-Leninist oppression, they still harbored "old-fashioned" human feelings. As soon as the Stalin terror subsided a little, after the despot's death, we saw it in the writings of young poets and in the eagerness with which the new soul-searching was taken up by youth generally. The instincts for decency had not atrophied; they were thawing out. In endless ways the more articulate and more daring showed, and continue to show, that they have hearts attuned to love and charity and respect for life.

Inevitably the reign of immoralism in one country, its rationale for "acting wickedly," spilled over into the surrounding world. Once they accepted communism in theory, men and women managed to accept and even defend its excesses in practice. This was true not only of outright party members but of a broad periphery of sympathizers, those whom Stalin called his "useful idiots" abroad.

And that, too, must be listed, along with the orgies of savagery in the name of good causes in so many places. Communism has fed and fattened and spurred on "the monster of violence that stalks the unhappy twentieth century," as Allen Drury calls it in his latest novel.

Such are the appalling costs of fifty years of Soviet dictatorship—a sketchy and inadequate summary, yet sufficient to underline the folly of evaluating supposed "progress" without considering the price paid by the Russian peoples and all mankind.

The new "moderation" has been so blown up by wishful hoping that it has induced waves of euphoria in some quarters. There is loose talk of "liberalization," though the Kremlin mocks the word and dreads the idea. In truth the Soviet Union remains a closed and maximally policed society. Not a dent has been made in the regime's monopoly of political power.

The dictatorship itself, eager to establish the continuity of its reign from Lenin to date, does not rest its claims of "miraculous success" on the post-Stalin or post-Khrushchev period, but on the entire half-century. The judgment of history, similarly, will be based on everything that has transpired in these fifty years.

DOES THE ADMINISTRATION BELIEVE THERE IS A CRISIS IN THE CITIES?

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today on the domestic scene we hear day after day the emphasis, the dialog and the controversy over the two crucial and vital issues facing our Nation. First, Vietnam and second, the fast deteriorating situation in our cities.

How serious is this administration in coming to grips with the explosive problems of the cities, when it talks constantly of the urgent, immediate and vital needs that must be met at once and at the same time conducts a delaying action for rather obvious political purposes?

In the last housing bill as a preliminary to the execution of the demonstration—model—cities program, a planning fund was set up. The administration asked for $12 million and was, by authorization and appropriation, granted $11 million.

How credible are administration statements as to urgency when with over a year expiring since the $11 million has been available not one area has been selected for a model cities program, although over a hundred have indicated their interest. HUD said this week:

> There is no list. It's in the hands of the Secretary, and he hasn't made any decision.

At the same time HUD denied it had drawn up a "top secret list" of 19 cities which were to share in the $11 million planning fund.

To repeat, HUD has had and held $11 million appropriated out of $12 million requested for planning over one year. This means a needless delay of at least a year on the regular program.

Some crisis. Some urgency.

FDA HEAD DOUBTS POT IS WORSE THAN ALCOHOL

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There is no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the news that our Food and Drug Administrator, Dr. James Goddard, favors a society that permits the use of marihuana, as freely as it allows the consumption of alcohol is most disheartening. It is disheartening because I wonder how we legislators who are trying vainly to tackle the multitude of problems that confront our Nation can hope to obtain reasoned opinions from our top Government officials, when the Administrator of Food and Drugs is so unconcerned about the effect of drugs upon our Nation's youngsters.

Dr. Goddard says he would not object any more to his college-age daughter smoking marihuana than he would to her drinking a cocktail. Yet, those of us who have read in the New York Times the tragic account of Linda Fitzpatrick's death or have read the accounts of police investigators on drug addiction cannot help but be shocked with such a cavalier attitude. Linda Fitzpatrick, according to acquaintances, graduated quickly from marihuana to LSD. And so do almost all the hippies, draft-card burners, and the great unwashed who feel compelled to "turn off" decency and "turn on" the dangerous thrills of drug addiction.

I am not a physician and cannot argue medical or scientific facts with a doctor. But, the corrupting influence of drugs upon our society, the resulting decay, cannot be dismissed lightly. And such flippant remarks by Commissioner Goddard are indefensible. They give official sanction to those who seek to undermine the moral fiber of our Nation's youth.

The Times noted in its article:

> The forces at work on young people like Linda are the source of puzzlement for many other parents and of studies by social psychiatrists as they seek to understand the thousands of youths who are leaving middle-class homes throughout the country for the "mind expanding drug" scene like Greenwich Village.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the problems generated by drug addiction are among the most potent facing our country today. And I further submit that Dr. Goddard's attitude is not helping us to overcome these problems. For the benefit of my colleagues who may have missed the news dispatch concerning Dr. Goddard's speech in Minneapolis, I place the following article from the Washington Post of October 18, 1967, in the Record:

FDA Head Doubts Pot Is Worse Than Alcohol

Minneapolis, October 17.—The commissioner of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration said today he doubts marijuana is more dangerous than alcohol.

Dr. James L. Goddard spoke to an audience of more than 200 students and faculty members at the University of Minnesota and held a press conference.

The physician, who was appointed to the FDA in January 1966, said he would not object any more to his college-age daughter smoking marijuana than he would to her drinking a cocktail. He is the father of three college-age children.

Dr. Goddard said "the long-term effects of smoking marijuana may be more serious than the effects presently known" and he noted that both alcohol and marijuana distort the user's perception of reality.

"Society should be able to accept both alcohol and marijuana," Dr. Goddard said. He explained that they are unlike: alcohol depresses bodily functions while marijuana triggers hallucinations.

"I don't believe smoking marijuana leads to an addiction to stronger drugs," said the Food and Drug chief. "It is true most heroin users have smoked marijuana, but it is also true most heroin users have drunk milk. I have seen no proof there is any connection."

"Dr. Goddard said he thinks all law penalties for possession of marijuana should be removed, leaving penalties only for sale or distribution. He added that he does not favor "legalizing" the drug completely.

"We need more research on chronic use," he said, "and I think this research will start now."

Personal possession of marijuana carries too severe a penalty, Goddard said. "Marijuana is not as dangerous as LSD and yet the possessson of LSD is not a felony," he said.

"Psychological dependence on marijuana is possible," said the first physician to head the Food and Drug Administration "but then a person can become psychologically dependent on any drug, including aspirin."

LATIN AMERICAN PURCHASE OF AMERICAN SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, both the New York Times and the Washington Post of this morning editorially pointed out the futility of the State Department's approval of the sale of U.S. F-5 fighters to Peru in order to forestall her purchase of French jets. This can only encourage a new round of arms competition in Latin America.

The Washington Post recommends, "American aid to a country buying French jets should be cut by the sum spent for the purchase of these aircraft."

Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that it was a matter of U.S. policy that expenditures by Latin American countries on expensive supersonic military aircraft are indefensible upon economic and political grounds.

My consistent support of foreign economic aid has not been for the purpose of encouraging an arms race among economically underdeveloped countries, which in my opinion would retard the economic development which our aid is supposed to promote and encourage militarism and international instability.

If indeed it has become a matter of policy that foreign aid funds to underdeveloped Latin American countries can be used to release funds for the purchase of expensive American military hardware, then the basis for our support of foreign aid has radically altered, and it needs to be reevaluated.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post of October 20 as follows:

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 20, 1967]

Latin-American Arms Race?

The grim coup scored by the French aircraft industry with its $20-million sale of Mirage V fighter-bombers to Peru—the first supersonic jets to go to Latin America—has had its dismally predictable effect in Washington. The effort to keep competition among the Latin military at the subsonic level at least until the turn of the decade has now broken down.

The United States has decided to sell its own supersonic specialty for the underdeveloped countries, the F–5 Freedom fighter, to Argentina and Brazil and Venezuela if they want it (which they apparently do)—and to Peru too if, as some in Washington apparently hope, the French deal can still be unhinged.

The quest for these expensive prestige symbols, irrelevant to defense against internal Castro-type subversion—the one clear menace to the hemisphere—will now climb to a new level. Programs of economic and social reform that are the surest defense against present or potential guerrilla threats will suffer from further diversion of scarce resources.

All this is part of a cycle that begun in 1966 with the sale of 25 American Skyhawk attack bombers to Argentina. Chile reacted by buying 20 Hunter fighters from Britain. Venezuela bought 74 F–86K Sabres from West Germany. Peru, denied supersonic planes by Washington, got what she wanted from France.

Back of this cycle, however, there is a longer history that makes it easier to deplore the squandering of $1.5 million on a Mirage, in a country whose direst need is roads for farm produce, than to find a remedy. Latin-American ground and air forces, traditionally small but modern, have been growing obsolescent compared even with the forces of underdeveloped countries in the Middle East and Asia. What is under way now is a new round of re-equipment spurred by the prestige demands of the military.

Faced with the alternative of yielding to the Latin requests for supersonic planes or seeing the business—and the long-term relationships that theoretically accompany it—go to France or other countries, Washington has yielded. The least that it can do now is to make sure that the weight of the United States in this often wasteful and questionable traffic is always on the side of moderation and restraint.

Filling the minimal military requirements of the Latin governments through regular commercial channels is one thing, as they will be filled—if not by the United States, then by someone else—anyway. Promoting arms sales through foreign aid channels, as has been done in the past, is another. Latin America must be ruled out of bounds to high-pressure salesmanship. It will be disastrous for the countries concerned, including the United States if "re-equipment" is permitted to escalate into another dismal arms race.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 20, 1967]

Latin Bargain

The Administration has gotten itself into a bad fix over the sale of supersonic fighters in Latin America. Previously it opposed Latin purchase of these jets on the ground that they represented a dangerous and unnecessary diversion of scarce development funds. But now that the French threaten to sell Mirages, the United States takes the position that it is the lesser of the evil to block the Mirages and let the Latins buy American F–5s instead.

If French jets are bad for Latin America, how can American jets be good for Latin America? Both would siphon off development funds. Both would stimulate a purchaser's rivals and enviers to follow suit. Both would represent a shift rightward in the internal political balance, toward the military and away from public needs. Both would increase tension among the countries of the continent.

The arguments in favor of selling F–5s are, to us, unpersuasive. That F–5s are cheaper than Mirages and involve a link with Washington rather than Paris are considerations which do not touch the main point: that Latin America has no security need for supersonic jets. That the sale of F–5s can be postponed to 1969–70, or so the United States hopes, underlines the lack of rationale for them.

If some Latin air forces have old equipment, that does not prove they need 1000-mile-an-hour attack planes. And if the military in some Latin countries is a stable pro-America element deserving of cultivation, that does not automatically justify its every hardware demand.

We continue to believe that Amercan aid to a country buying French jets should be cut by the sum spent on those aircraft. Further, the United States should not allow its own supersonic jets to be sold to Latin countries unless there is a demonstrable military need. When the United States joined its Latin neighbors in the Alliance for Progress, it struck a bargain with them: help for self-help. It is the sovereign right of any Latin country to back out of that bargain. It is the duty of the United States to stick scrupulously to its terms.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that upon rechecking the Record, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Blackburn] who made the fuss about the Members who did not respond to the quorum call, I do not know where the gentleman was. However, I have here now the Record in regard thereto which I have checked and have rechecked, and the Record shows that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Blackburn] was not present at the time of the call of the quorum. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the gentleman's indignation is misleading.

THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, early this year when the President proposed the Air Quality Act of 1967 he emphasized that air pollution is a national problem with economic costs running into the billions of dollars each year and health costs which are incalculable. The President also noted that the problem was worsening. Urban growth, industrial expansion, increasing demands for energy, increasing use of vehicles, all threaten to engulf us in a rising tide of air pollution. We must redouble the efforts begun with the Clean Air Act of 1963. We must control those sources we know how to control, and we must launch a crash program to develop technology for those sources we do not now know how to control.

The Air Quality Act of 1967 is an important step in this direction. While it continues the programs previously established, it provides some new tools with which to attack air pollution.

The act requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to designate air quality control regions throughout the country, and to publish criteria on the effects of pollutants and information on techniques for controlling these pollutants. The States then have the responsibility of setting air quality standards for the control regions and for establishing programs to implement the standards. Taken together, the criteria on the effects of pollutants and the information on available controls will give direction to our research efforts. I can do no more than strongly urge each of my fellow Congressmen to vote for this bill as evidence that we are continuing and, in fact, reinforcing our effort to obtain clean air for all Americans.

AMERICAN LEGION, FIRST DIVISION, COOK COUNTY COUNCIL, ENDORSES CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO'S BILL TO DESIGNATE NUCLEAR PLANT AT WESTON, ILL., AS "THE ENRICO FERMI NUCLEAR ACCELERATOR"

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the Congressional Record today a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Illinois, First Division, Cook County Council.

The resolution urges the Congress to enact into law as soon as possible legislation which would designate the nuclear plant to be constructed at Weston, Ill., as "The Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator."

As all of us know, in December of 1967, the atomic age will be 25 years old. By enacting this legislation into law to conclude with the 25th anniversary of the atomic age we would be paying a fitting tribute to an immigrant who arrived in America, became a naturalized citizen, and produced the first nuclear chain reaction in the grandstands of Chicago University on December 2, 1942.

All of us are familiar with the vast destruction that nuclear energy can inflict upon a whole nation, or upon the whole world for that matter. All of us must work together to make sure that nuclear energy is used instead to make a better life for nations and people all over the globe. This energy can be harnessed for the benefit of all people—it can be used to create more food, more industrial plants, more housing, more clothing—so that the gap between the "haves" and the "have nots" will be narrowed. Only in this way can we insure world peace.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in this effort. On July 25, 1967, I introduced H.R. 11726 to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., be named "The Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi. I shall appreciate the help and the assistance of my colleagues on both sides of the isle to insure that this year on the 25th anniversary of the atomic age we will appropriately honor the memory of the man who made all of this possible—Dr. Enrico Fermi, the architect of the atomic age.

The resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Illinois, First Division, Cook County Council, follows:

Resolution 3

Resolution requesting the naming of the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., "The Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator"

Whereas, The American Legion in its recent issue of the National American Legion Magazine, dated September, 1967, and appearing on Pages six (6) and seven (7), features Mr. Enrico Fermi in its review of "How the Atom is Changing the World"; and

Whereas, on Page six (6) in the second paragraph, further singles out Enrico Fermi, who directed the United States Manhattan Project twenty-five (25) years ago, on December 2, 1942, that the first nuclear reactor produced a chain reaction with controlled fission of enriched uranium–235, under the grandstands of the U. of Chicago's Stagg Field; and

Whereas, Enrico Fermi has been singled out by the entire world, as a great American who through his development with that event, nuclear science, which began in 1896, ushered in the "atomic age", was only the beginning of the invention of Enrico Fermi Manhattan Project that would further change the entire world for the benefit of mankind; and

Whereas, the United States Government has awarded the State of Illinois with the construction of the Weston nuclear accelerator location; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Enrico Fermi Post #1266, located within the Fifth District, First Division, Department of Illinois, does hereby urge the adoption of this resolution in recognition of Dr. Enrico Fermi, Nobel Prize Winner in physics in 1939, directing the first atomic program under the stands of the U. of Chicago stadium, support the legislation which has now been introduced in Congress, recommending the Weston, Illinois, nuclear accelerator be named "The Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of this great American; and be it further

Resolved, that this resolution be adopted by the Fifth District and the First Division Cook County Council, the Department of Illinois and further that a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the First Division, Cook County Council, to the twenty-four (24) Congressman from Illinois and the two (2) United States Senators, urging their support in accomplishing the objectives and intent of this resolution.

SALVATORE D. SULL,
Post Adjutant.
THOMAS CRIVELLONE,
Post Commander.

This resolution was adopted by the Fifth District Council in regular meeting on this 21st day of September, in the year 1967.

R. B. GALLMAN,
District Adjutant.
BERNARD SANDOWSKI,
District Commander.

This resolution was adopted by the First Division Council in regular meeting on this 4th day of October, in the year 1967.

JAMES V. KISSNER,
Division Adjutant.
EDWARD A. SCHALK,
Division Commander.

PUBLIC TELEVISION: WHAT LIES AHEAD?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the House this week approved the conference report on the landmark public television legislation. It is expected that final Senate approval will come shortly. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have been proud to participate in the deliberations which resulted in legislation which clearly is one of the most important bills to pass the Congress in recent years.

However, Congress can only pass legislation. It cannot legislate public acceptance and enthusiasm for a concept or a program. The future of the public television program is perceptively analyzed in today's New York Times by the noted columnist James Reston. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and present it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON: PUBLIC TELEVISION AND PUBLIC APATHY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 19.—The House of Representatives approved this week the creation of a noncommercial television network. The bill went through unnoticed in the shuffle, like the bill in Mr. Lincoln's time to create the land grant universities of America, and if the people pay any attention to it, which they aren't at the moment, it could be almost as important an educational force in the future as our great state universities have been in the past.

The purpose of this bill is to create a Public Television Network, free of commercial compulsions and Government control, which will concentrate on what is important and enduring in American life, rather than what is commercially successful.

THE PROBLEM

It is an effort, in short, to grapple with a practical problem: to portray the fundamental and not merely the dramatic or commercially useful aspects of American life; not to replace but to supplement commercial television; to fill the gap between what commercial television cannot do because it must reach the widest mass audience, and what noncommercial television cannot do now because it simply does not have the money, the facilities or the personnel to do it.

The need for creating a noncommercial network, free of advertising and political control, has been recognized by a remarkable company of Americans. Frank Stanton of the Columbia Broadcasting System has not only approved the experiment but committed a million dollars to get it started. That remarkable man John Gardner, former head of the Carnegie Corporation of New York and now Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington, originally arranged to put up the funds to study the problem. McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, persuaded his organization to finance a Public Broadcasting Laboratory under National Educational Television to demonstrate the possibilities of a television network while the Congress was debating Government support of the project.

A DREAM NETWORK

Meanwhile this concept or dream of a network free to deal with what endures rather than merely what sells, mobilized the energies of men like James B. Conant, former president of Harvard; Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina, and James R. Killian Jr., former president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. But there are now problems of the most fundamental nature.

President Johnson has done a magnificent job of leadership on this whole project. He has seen the prospects and the problems. He and his staff, headed by Douglas Cater in the White House have elbowed the legislation through the committees, concentrating on the principle and the authorization of a noncommercial network rather than the appropriations.

But now there is a problem. The Senate will approve the bill within a few days. The President and Senator Magnuson of Washington, who heads the Senate committee concerned, will see to that. There will be the signing of the bill in the Rose Garden, with pens distributed to all the people concerned. Public reaction to all this, however, will then be important, and could be decisive.

If there is no, or little, public support for this whole idea of serious noncommercial reporting of public affairs, of weekly reviews of the news, and good children's programs, the whole project could languish and be lost in the present preoccupation with the cost of Vietnam and economy on everything else, and this raises an interesting public question.

The most common complaint heard these days is that thoughtful people feel helpless to relieve the things that trouble them. On this, the squares and the hippies, gran'ma and junior agree. They scratch but the itch goes on. They are anxious about the war and the cities, and they are irritated about a lot of other things, but their main frustration seems to be that they can't do anything about it.

THE PUBLIC QUESTION

The public television bill in Washington, however, gives them a chance for effective action. It touches their lives. It is tangible. The generations may be divided on everything else, but they are all grumbling about television and newspapers and singing commercials, and now they have a real opportunity to create a new network even if in the end they don't watch it. The project has now gone about as far as it can here, thanks to an unusual consensus between the President and the intellectuals. The question now is whether the public shows some interest in supporting it politically and financially.

PRESS SUPPORT FOR THE GONZALEZ BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD—SEVENTH OF A SERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on the M–16 Rifle Program reported yesterday that the Army's management of the M–16 rifle procurement was "unbelievable." This special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee stated that the Army handling of the ammunition problem for the M–16 "borders on criminal negligence." It is indeed hard to believe that the Army could be so lax in supplying good weapons to our fighting men in Vietnam. The M–16 hardly qualifies as "the soldier's best friend," at least not loaded with the ball propellant supplied by the Army.

One of this subcommittee's findings in particular touched on my concern with war profiteering. The subcommittee suggested that the profits of Colt's, Inc., were excessive on the M–16 contract. A 10-percent profit rate had been negotiated on all production contracts, but the subcommittee found that the rate of profit averaged 16.8 percent from 1965.

Considering that 1,400,000 M–16 rifles have been ordered from Colt's, this represents a healthy mismanagement, if not an illegal misuse, of the taxpayer's dollar.

In connection with the excessive profits finding, the subcommittee recommended that the General Accounting Office audit Colt's military contracts to determine the true profit rates experienced, the adequacy of their accounting system, and whether Public Law 87–653, the Truth in Contract Negotiating Act, was circumvented.

This is well and good. I certainly feel that the facts uncovered by this subcommittee, as well as by other committees and other colleagues, warrant a tightening of the Defense Department's procurement procedure and their audit capabilities.

However, there is another line of defense against war profiteering, one which is, inexplicably, being ignored. This deterrent to war profiteering is the Renegotiation Board, whose sole responsibility is to determine and recover excessive profits of contractors or subcontractors who have been awarded space or defense contracts.

Whether any defense contractor, like Colt's Inc., is subject to renegotiation is an "iffy" proposition. There are many escape clauses to the jurisdiction of the Renegotiation Board. These statutory exemptions to renegotiation would excuse a contractor who had less than $1 million in Government business considered "renegotiable," any contract for standard commercial articles or services, certain construction contracts competitively bid, certain new durable productive equipment, et cetera.

On the other hand, the flexible nature of the criteria by which the Renegotiation Board determines "excessive" profits—including the efficiency of the contractor, reasonableness of costs and profits, net worth and capital employed, extent of contribution to the defense effort, and character of business—permits the review of not only fixed-price and cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts but incentive contracts as well.

Undoubtedly, the contract of Colt's for the M–16 rifle would be subject to renegotiation, since Colt's has over $1 million in defense sales, and due to the nature of the M–16 contract.

However, the Renegotiation Board must look at Colt's profits not on a contract-by-contract basis, but for the period of the contractor's fiscal year. Whether Colt's excessive profits on the M-16 contract as represented by the Renegotiation Board depends upon the Colt's total profit picture in the years under review. Balanced against possible losses on other contracts, excessive profits on a single contract might not be considered excessive for the fiscal year review period.

In any event, this example is another indication of the increasing profiteering on war contracts resulting from our growing commitment in Vietnam. The record of the Renegotiation Board, which has returned to the Treasury $936,455,823 in excess profits from 1952 to June 30, 1966, speaks a loud volume for elimination of the exemptions to the renegotiation process.

Mr. Speaker, to date I have received no support for my bill, H.R. 6792, to strengthen the Renegotiation Board from any Member of either body. However, several newspapers have supported my bill, and I have permission to insert the seventh in a series of these comments:

[From the Boston Globe, Sept. 15, 1967]

Flies Still at the Honey

When Cong. Henry B. Gonzalez (D-Tex.) demanded on Thursday that his colleagues in the House of Representatives "get up off the seat of their pants" and do something about recovering perhaps billions of dollars in excess profits on war, defense and space contracts, he wasn't fooling.

Rep. Gonzalez' patience is about ended, as the nation's should be, too. It is now more than six months since Mr. Gonzalez introduced a bill to amend and strengthen the war contracts Renegotiation Act. The House Ways and Means Committee has kept it bottled up ever since, denying the hearings while it goes through the calculatedly slow motions of an alleged study while waiting for the act quietly to expire next June.

There can be no accurate estimate of the excess profits which an emasculated Renegotiation Act has funneled into the pockets of some of the holders of well over $100 billion in prime war contracts let on a noncompetitive bid basis in the last three years. And there never will be if current efforts to strangle the Renegotiation Board succeed. But more than $11 billion in excess profits was recovered through renegotiation of World War II contracts, and it may be assumed that the amount to be recovered now is something proportional.

Congress, however, has been whittling away at both the board's authority and personnel (The Globe, Aug. 13). Personnel has been cut to less than a fourth of what it was during the Korean War, two-thirds of the regional offices have been shut down and the floor of contracts subject to renegotiation has been raised gradually from $250,000 to $1 million. Mr. Gonzalez asks only that the floor be restored to $250,000 and that the board's renegotiation authority be restored to what it was when the Korean War broke out.

That does not seem too much to ask, especially in view of the escalated dollar value of the contracts under question: $27.9 billion in 1965, $38.2 billion in 1966 and $44.6 billion this year.

Rep. Gonzalez has been ignored in his demands for reports from most of the contract-letting agencies. Some have merely acknowledged his request. The Defense Department has ignored him completely.

"Both the administration and the Congress are guilty of negligence," Rep. Gonzales charges. "It is time for Congress to wake up."

That it is, especially in the light of the administration's request for a 10 percent surcharge on income taxes to finance the war.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Nichols] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world are on the Pentagon this weekend where thousands of people are expected to demonstrate against our position in Vietnam. Most of the headlines will play this up as being indicative of the feeling of Americans. Again I say we know this is not true. As evidence of this, I would like to point out that WBRC–TV and radio in Birmingham, Ala., will again, for the third straight year, film interviews with service families and forward them to the husbands, sons, and brothers in Vietnam. There, the men can borrow a projector and can at least see and hear their families' personal Christmas greeting to their loved ones. It is most gratifying to me that our news media are publicly exhibiting their interest in the welfare of our fighting men in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record today's WBRC editorial which announces their public service project:

Films for Vietnam, 1967

As a personal service to Birmingham area fighting men now on duty in Vietnam, WBRC television and radio are proud to announce the third year of participation in a project that has captured the imagination of the entire Taft Broadcasting Company.

During the first two weeks in November, at the studios of WBRC television channel six photographers will be available for the filming of brief interviews with service families for forwarding to their husband, son, or brother in Vietnam.

We have been informed that almost every service man has available to him, usually for the asking, a projector for showing these films.

If you or if a friend of yours has a close relative who would like to receive such a film, the number to call for an appointment is 322–4701. That's WBRC Television, 322-4701. Once again, the days set aside for the filming sessions will be during the first two weeks in November.

Films for Vietnam is a public service project for this station and the Taft Broadcasting Company.

LATEST EFFORT TO DISSOLVE SBA SHOULD BE REJECTED BY THE CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it appears that another effort is being made to dismember the Small Business Administration and transfer its functions to the big-business-oriented Department of Commerce.

It seems that there are those who are determined to wipe out the SBA as a one-stop shop for the small businessman in his relations with the Federal Government. This marks the third time within 2 years that the effort has been made.

This particular effort is contained in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 which—as passed by the Senate—includes in section 406 the provision that the Secretary of Commerce will control the small business poverty loan program by being empowered to provide financial assistance without limitation for—

Planning and research, including market research, in connection with the making of the antipoverty business loans.

The identification and development of new business opportunities.

The furnishing of centralized services with regard to public services and Government programs, including the antipoverty loan program.

The establishment and strengthening of business service agencies, including trade associations and cooperatives.

The encouragement of the placement of subcontracts by major businesses with small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals.

The furnishing of business counseling, management training and legal and other related services, with special emphasis on management training programs.

In addition the Secretary of Commerce would be empowered to set up its own small busines procurement operation to assist small business in obtaining Government contracts and Government business.

In other words this "sleeper" in the Economic Opportunity Amendments would establish a small business section of the Department of Commerce, duplicating and competing with the same operations and functions in the Small Business Administration.

The Department of Commerce under this provision would be permited to move into the business loan, management assistance, procurement assistance, and antipoverty programs of the Small Business Administration.

This is obviously an effort to achieve through the backdoor what has been rejected previously by the Congress. In 1966 there were those who advocated the elimination of SBA as an independent agency and the transfer of its functions to the Department of Commerce.

Later there was an announcement of a proposed new Department of Commerce and Labor—and SBA reportedly was to be eliminated as an independent agency and made a small bureau in this giant Department. This effort has also foundered.

Many of my colleagues were opposed to both of these efforts. Congress has made it clear on many occasions that the approximately 5 million small businessmen throughout the Nation need and deserve an independent agency to represent their interests.

To bury the SBA in a giant Department would be to turn the clock back 15 years to the time when small business assistance functions were scattered throughout Government and when the small business section was a stepchild in the Department of Commerce.

This latest effort reflects the determination of certain interests in and outside of the Federal Goverment to diminish the influence of our small businessmen in the Nation and in the Capital—and Congress must not tolerate it.

In addition to this provision, section 404 of the economic opportunity amendments would again create divided authority in the matter of the determination of the eligibility for SBA antipoverty loans.

Here again, history is repeating itself. After exhaustive hearings before the House Small Business Committee last year, it was determined that the divided authority in the administration of antipoverty loans was inefficient, wasteful, cumbersome, and impractical.

As a result, the House amended the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966 to give SBA the sole authority in the making of these loans.

Section 404 of the proposed new act would empower the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to again share with the administration of SBA the authority to determine the eligibility of loan applicants.

This arrangement would be just as inefficient today as it was last year—and this provision should be stricken.

I strongly urge that sections 404 and 406 be stricken and defeated.

The small business loan program is one of the soundest programs in the antipoverty program because it is keyed to the premise that the basic solution to poverty and unemployment is the creation of jobs in our free enterprise system.

This program is working—to introduce another round of duplication and inefficiency following the elimination of this problem a year ago makes no sense—it should be defeated.

I therefore strongly urge that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, members of the committee, and others, give careful consideration to these matters and that these sections 404 and 406 be deleted from the bill—or amended in such a way that the integrity of SBA is preserved—and its functions retained without duplication by the Department of Commerce.

Let us not return to inefficiency and divided authority in the small business assistance program.

IMPENDING SALE OF SUPERSONIC JETS TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post today editorially denounced the impending sale of U.S. supersonic jets to Latin America. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I have long felt that if the Latin Americans can squander their money on military luxuries, they certainly do not need our money for economic necessities.

The Latin American Presidents were reportedly ready to forego "new generation" weapons such as jets at their summit conference in Uruguay last April, but were forced to back down by military pressure. It would be a sad spectacle if the American Government and Congress were to back down under Latin American military pressure, too.

Even the Defense Department admits that helicopters, communications equipment, and small arms are the chief weapons against guerrillas—not jets. Latin American nations only need jets to get one step ahead in the arms race.

The Washington Post believes—

> American aid to a country buying French jets should be cut by the sum spent on those aircraft. Further, the United States should not allow its own supersonic jets to be sold to Latin countries unless there is a demonstrable military need.

I agree, and would take it a step further: I think a strong case can be made for total withdrawal of aid—both economic and military—from any Latin American country that buys these military glamor weapons.

I commend the Washington Post editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

LATIN BARGAIN

> The Administration has gotten itself into a bad fix over the sale of supersonic fighters in Latin America. Previously it opposed Latin purchase of these jets on the ground that they represented a dangerous and unnecessary diversion of scarce development funds. But now that the French threaten to sell Mirages, the United States takes the position that it is the lesser evil to block the Mirages and let the Latins buy American F–5s instead.
>
> If French jets are bad for Latin America, how can American jets be good for Latin America? Both would siphon off development funds. Both would stimulate a purchaser's rivals and enviers to follow suit. Both would represent a shift rightward in the internal political balance, toward the military and away from public needs. Both would increase tension among the countries of the continent.
>
> The arguments in favor of selling F–5s are, to us, unpersuasive. That F–5s are cheaper than Mirages and involve a link with Washington rather than Paris are considerations which do not touch the main point: that Latin America has no security need for supersonic jets. That the sale of F–5s can be postponed to 1969–70, or so the United States hopes, underlines the lack of rationale for them.
>
> If some Latin air forces have old equipment, that does not prove they need 1000-mile-an-hour attack planes. And if the military in some Latin countries is a stable pro-American element deserving of cultivation, that does not automatically justify its every hardware demand.
>
> We continue to believe that American aid to a country buying French jets should be cut by the sum spent on those aircraft. Further, the United States should not allow its own supersonic jets to be sold to Latin countries unless there is a demonstrable military need. When the United States joined its Latin neighbors in the Alliance for Progress, it struck a bargain with them: help for self-help. It is the sovereign right of any Latin country to back out of that bargain. It is the duty of the United States to stick scrupulously to its terms.

CLEAN AIR ACT PROGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, in a message to the Congress last January 30, President Johnson presented some cogent arguments for the adoption of the Air Quality Act of 1967. In assessing the progress we have made under the Clean Air Act, the President said, in part:

> We have proposed and the Congress has enacted three laws since 1963, each representing some forward movement toward cleaner air.
>
> Under these laws, we are spending more than $25 million this year in matching grants to cities and States, and in research and other efforts:
>
> We have helped to create 80 local air pollution programs, and to strengthen 40 others.

We are working in nine areas of the United States—including the New York-New Jersey area—to abate pollution that passes across State lines and is beyond the reach of any single State or city.

We have established a system of national standards for motor vehicles, that will become effective with the 1968 models.

We have begun by Executive order to control the sources of air pollution on Federal installations throughout the country.

We have intensified our research work on sulfur oxide pollution from coal and oil burning, and on pollution from motor vehicles.

Yet the pollution problem is getting worse. We are not even controlling today's level of pollution. Ten years from now, when industrial production and waste disposal have increased and the number of automobiles on our streets and highways exceeds 110 million, we shall have lost the battle for clean air—unless we strengthen our regulatory and research efforts now.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my unequivocal support of the Air Quality Act of 1967.

Under the act, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would be required to delineate the broad atmospheric areas of the Nation relying principally on those meteorological and topographical factors which influence the diffusion and transport of pollutants in the air. Then, after consultation with State and local governments, the Department would be empowered to designate air quality control regions. Such regions could include portions of two or more States, or could lie entirely within a single State; in either case, each region would include a group of communities affected by a common air pollution problem.

The Department would continue to develop and publish air quality criteria reflecting the best available scientific data on the adverse effects of air pollutants, and would publish information on the adequacy and cost of techniques for controlling these pollutants, as well as cost-effectiveness analyses of alternative methods.

The publication of air quality criteria and emission control data would be the signal for States to begin developing air quality standards and plans for implementing the standards in air quality control regions designated by the Department.

To me, these provisions of the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 dramatically illustrate what the bill sets out to do. Taken as a whole, I sincerely believe that this act will enable the Nation to take a giant step along the road leading to more rational and scientific control of the ever-increasing desecration of our atmosphere.

FARM BUREAU CO-OP UNDERSELLS ITS MEMBERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, during a Senate investigation of the Farm Bureau in 1926, Senator George Norris—the great crusader from the Nebraska cornfields—exclaimed that "the time will come when the rank and file of American farmers will realize by whom they are being deceived."

Until recently the Farm Bureau had such a stranglehold on rural America that they were able to effectively squelch all attempts to expose them. However, during the last few months, the American farmer has begun to wake up. He has begun to realize the extent to which the Farm Bureau is indeed deceiving him. He is beginning to see that the Farm Bureau represents him in just about the same way that General Motors represents the automobile worker.

Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer describes how the Tuscarawas County Farm Bureau Cooperative Association not only set up an egg producing business which undersold its own members, but used money withheld from them to underwrite the competition, besides.

It is just one more variation of the old Farm Bureau game of "farming the American farmer." Under unanimous consent, I respectfully request that this article be inserted in the Record.

Farm Bureau Egg Co-Op Undersold Members

(By Richard C. Bixler)

New Philadelphia.—The Tuscarawas County Farm Bureau Cooperative Association set up an egg producing business here that undersold its own members, using money withheld from them to underwrite the competition.

A young farmer, Paul E. Ladrach, then living near Stone Creek here in Tuscarawas County, questioned the logic and financial soundness of what the co-op was doing with money belonging to members who were given paper dividends instead of cash.

Ladrach charged that mass production of eggs from the business set up by the co-op was flooding the local market, reducing wholesale prices to less than it cost other farmers to produce eggs.

Ladrach paid for a newspaper advertisement asking directors of the co-op why the money of members was being used to compete directly with them.

He stirred considerable efforts among other members of the co-op to force cancellation of the egg-production contract. After the Dover Daily Reporter publicized Ladrach's efforts, the local co-op store (Landmark) canceled its advertising in the newspaper, Harry Yockery, editor, said.

The farm bureau entered the egg-producing contract in the early 1960s with Earl C. Miller, a farmer on County Road 52 west of here.

It was an arrangement known by farmers as "vertical integration." In effect, it means contract farming, with a farm being little more than a leased operation and the farmer its operator.

A contract usually provides that a co-op or company furnishes all raw materials, while the farmer delivers a product at a specified unit price.

With the contract, Miller built a completely automated chicken house with a capacity of 12,000 birds. The chicken house and equipment reportedly cost about $40,000. Miller was to receive 8 cents a chicken, each month.

Ladrach contended the contract should have been based on egg production—say at 5 cents a dozen—rather than on an 8-cent rate for chickens.

With a contract based on production, the farmer has an additional incentive to give the best possible care to the chickens, Ladrach said, in order to earn the highest profit.

When a contract provides payment based on the number of birds, Ladrach said, the farmer has a guaranteed income even if many of the chickens die and if egg production is under par.

When his objections to directors of the co-op brought no results, Ladrach obtained the names and addresses of persons holding Class A voting stock. He presented his views in a letter to them. He asked that they elect directors opposed to the "chicken contract." He told them the co-op had lost a considerable amount of money in its first year with the contract and urged that it be cancelled at once.

About 30 members agreed with Ladrach's views at the co-op's annual meeting for 1964. They managed to elect two directors to the co-op's seven-member board. The two directors could not prevail on the others to terminate the contract and it remained in effect.

The members were told by a lawyer from the Ohio Farm Bureau Cooperative Association in Columbus that only a co-op board had the right to enter or cancel a contract. The members could act only in an advisory capacity, the legal counsel said.

A year later Ladrach again was unsuccessful in an attempt to win support from the directors.

John Ridenour, now president of the co-op board, who was a director when the "chicken contract" was signed, told The Plain Dealer recently:

"It's true we lost quite a bit of money the first year and maybe made a little after that. I don't know how we've made out this year so far. If we renewed the contract, we'd have to renegotiate for a better price, based on today's figures. But I don't know yet if we'll renew it or not. We'll have to completely analyze it over the last five years first."

Ridenour said the board has "made some mistakes."

He explained:

"There was a lot of interest in contracts like this among our members nine or 10 years ago. They wanted us to get into it like private feed companies were doing, so we decided to set this one up as 'an experiment,' no more than that.

"Now the interest seems to have died down and I'm not sure we'd even consider another such contract."

Ladrach, who at the time helped his father operate a large farm, has since quit farming and works in a steel mill. He said:

"Dad retired from farming and after three years of trying to get my neighbors to see what was happening to them and getting nowhere, I decided to get out of farming and working 16 hours a day, seven days a week.

"Let them fight their own battles. I had my first paid vacation of my whole life this year, with two weeks of nothing to do and a paycheck coming in, and I really enjoyed it."

HOW MEAT INSPECTORS SAVED LIVES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the incalculable value of Federal meat inspection is well illustrated in an October 8, 1967, article by Mr. Nick Kotz in the Des

Moines Register and Tribune. Without the meticulous care of U.S. Department of Agriculture meat inspectors, scores of people in Philadelphia, Pa., might have been infected with anthrax. Inadequate State or local inspection systems would not have located the potential source of this virulent disease.

Mr. Kotz' helpful report also points out the potential dissension within the meat-industry management where many executives hesitate to advocate the extension of Federal meat inspection out of fear of retaliation.

Mr. Kotz also asks why some of the Nation's very largest firms, part of whose operations are not federally inspected, are in the forefront of opposition to the extension of the coverage of the Federal meat inspection law.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Kotz' article in the Record at this point:

How Meat Inspectors Saved Lives: Averted Outbreak of Anthrax

(By Nick Kotz)

Washington, D.C.—Only the alertness and ability of federal meat inspectors prevented a potential disaster from deadly anthrax, a former packing company official has told The Sunday Register.

"I dread to think what might have happened to scores of persons in Philadelphia, Pa., if it hadn't been for federal inspection," related Francis E. Buckman, formerly an executive of John J. Felin & Co. in Philadelphia.

Buckman strongly favors a proposal by Representatives Neal Smith (Dem., Ia.) and Thomas Foley (Dem., Wash.) to expand federal meat inspection to cover large plants now exempt from inspection. At present, federal inspection exists only in plants that sell across state lines.

Buckman's views are significant because many packing company executives who favor the Smith-Foley bill have been either reluctant to come forward for fear retaliation by competitors in the industry.

IOWA BACKING

For example, the president of a large federally-inspected firm in Iowa has told Foley that he strongly favors expanded federal inspection.

Yet, he acknowledged in an interview that he does not want to state his views publicly because he is concerned that the giant firms of the industry might try to damage his business.

This meat firm executive believes that principal opposition to the legislation comes not only from non-federally-inspected plants but from the very largest firms, which have plants that are federally inspected and others that are not.

Swift & Co., the nation's largest firm, operates both federally inspected plants and plants that very carefully do not sell in interstate commerce and thus are not under federal inspection. Swift officials refuse to disclose the number of these plants.

Former meat firm official Buckman said his own experience in the industry has convinced him that only federal inspection guarantees complete protection for the public.

Buckman is now staff director of the United Fund in Philadelphia. Previously, he was an industrial engineer for John Morrell & Co. at Ottumwa, Ia., and for Felin and later was advertising and sales promotion manager for the Felin firm. Felin has since been purchased by Morrell.

One day in 1952 Buckman was startled when the Felin production line which processes 444 hogs per hour suddenly stopped.

Federal inspectors on the line informed him they had never personally seen anthrax, but suspected it in six hogs being processed. The inspectors carefully examined the lymph glands of each hog, and noticed that in six cases the glands were salmon-colored, instead of putty-colored as they should be in healthy hogs.

Inspectors from the regional office were called in and the existence of anthrax was confirmed. The hogs were condemned and Felin employes spent the remainder of the day scouring the entire plant to make certain that no deadly anthrax spores were present.

Because of Felin's excellent record keeping procedures, USDA officials quickly were able to pinpoint the exact farm in Ohio from which the hogs had come.

USDA officials have confirmed Buckman's story and agreed that the virulent anthrax germs in the diseased hogs might have been spread through hundreds of packages of sausage or other processed pork procedures.

USDA officials said humans exposed to anthrax can develop malignant carbuncles, can contract fatal pneumonia from inhalation of anthrax spores, or can develop fatal septicemia from eating contaminated meat.

According to USDA officials, the disease is still rather widespread in cattle, horses, and hogs in South Dakota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Texas, Louisiana and California. It also exists in parts of Vermont, New Jersey, Delaware, Wisconsin, Utah, Nevada, and Oregon.

The Public Health Service notes that there have been 153 reported cases of anthrax in humans during the last 10 years. But officials caution that there are possibly many cases which were not reported.

Buckman said he seriously doubts whether a plant with state or local inspection or with no inspection would have caught the anthrax.

"Those were six of the healthiest looking hogs I have ever seen," he commented. "Without proper federal inspection, those beautiful carcasses would have been made into fresh meat and manufactured goods."

"In a non-inspected house, those goods would have gone into commercial channels out of pure ignorance."

Concerning state and local inspection in Pennsylvania, Buckman said: "It's completely meaningless. Most of this inspection is periodic. It's not constant. In many cases, inspectors are not qualified."

"As long as a plant is operating where one pound of meat can be processed without inspection, you don't have protection."

Pennsylvania is one of 13 states providing for voluntary inspection. Eight states, including Minnesota, have no state inspection system.

ELECTRIC RATE REDUCTION IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hathaway] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, recently, statements have been made concerning the cost of electricity in New England which indicate that the consumers of the region are realizing savings in their electric bills because the private utilities are taking steps to reduce rates.

These statements are intended to illustrate that there is no need for construction of the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power project to bring about rate reductions and that the private companies are at long last taking steps necessary to reduce these high costs. The facts do not support these statements, however, so I am taking this opportunity to review them for my colleagues in the House.

The most recent compilation of power costs appears in a report bearing the title "Typical Electric Bills" for 1966, which was published by the Federal Power Commission on January 12, 1967. A press release announcing publication of the report stated that—

> The highest average bills in the Continental United States were reported in the Middle Atlantic Region where for 500 kilowatt-hours the average bill was $11.71. New England's bill was almost as high—$11.65 for 500 kilowatt-hours.

Mr. Speaker, those who have dedicated themselves to destroying the Dickey project, of course, saw in this statement a welcome opportunity to distort fact, and to create the false impression that New England consumers had lost the dubious distinction of paying the highest electric bills in the Nation. This, unfortunately, is not the case, and New England homeowners, businessmen, and industries continue to bear the brunt of unnecessarily high electric bills.

It is true that during 1966 bills to the consumers of 500 kilowatt-hours in the Middle Atlantic region received bills for 6 cents more than did New England consumers. However, in all other categories of residential use, New Englanders continued to receive the highest bills in the Nation. The average New England household, which uses 250 kilowatt-hours of electricity each month, pays $8.55 or nearly 16½ percent above the national average.

Permit me to offer further evidence of New England's unenviable position at the bottom of the electric power cost scale in the Nation by citing its unfavorable ranking among the States. Among consumers of 250 kilowatt-hours, Maine ranked 50th, Massachusetts 48th, New Hampshire 47th, Rhode Island 46th, Connecticut 38th, and Vermont 26th.

Among consumers of 500 kilowatt-hours Maine ranks 48th, Massachusetts 46th, New Hampshire 42d, Rhode Island 40th, Connecticut 38th, and Vermont 34th.

Among consumers of 750 kilowatt-hours Massachusetts ranks 48th, Maine 47th, New Hampshire 45th, Rhode Island 43d, Connecticut 39th, and Vermont 35th.

New England consumers of 1,000 kilowatt-hours fare equally badly with Massachusetts ranking 48th, Maine 47th, Rhode Island 46th, New Hampshire 45th, Connecticut 41st, and Vermont 39th.

Other figures compiled by the Federal Power Commission demonstrate that New England consumers of all types—residential, commercial, and industrial—are paying bills which are far in excess of the national average.

Residential bills per kilowatt-hour of energy used in the six New England States exceed the national average by 35.6 percent in Massachusetts, 28.5 percent in New Hampshire, 27.6 percent in Rhode Island, 26.8 percent in Maine, 10.9

percent in Connecticut, and 4.6 percent in Vermont.

Commercial consumer bills per kilowatt-hour exceed the national average even more: by 50.9 percent in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, 43.1 percent in Rhode Island, 42.7 percent in Maine, 15.1 percent in Connecticut, and 14.7 percent in Vermont.

Illustrative of the power-rate factor which has inhibited industrial development in New England are the high rates per kilowatt-hour charged to industrial consumers. Rhode Island industry pays 63 percent more than the national average for power, Massachusetts 61 percent, Connecticut and New Hampshire 41 percent, Vermont 40 percent, and Maine 16 percent.

The foregoing comparisons are drawn from information made available by the private utilities and published in the FPC publication "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Privately Owned, 1965."

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that it will surprise no one in this Chamber when I say that the FPC report, "Typical Electric Bills," which I quoted earlier also states:

> Rates tend to be lowest in areas where Federally operated generating plants are located.

A recent publication by the Tennessee Valley Authority demonstrates that not only do consumers benefit from Federal projects such as Dickey, but private power companies also experience increased earnings as a result of the injection of a competitive influence in an otherwise monopolistic industry.

The TVA study shows that the closer private companies are to TVA, the higher their average use and, as a result, the earnings of utilities bordering the TVA area have increased at a greater rate than the average of all large utilities in the Nation—a 1,200-percent gain between 1937 and 1963 as compared to a 500-percent increase in earnings for large private power companies nationwide.

Despite these facts, which argue persuasively for their cooperation with efforts to make the project a reality, the private power companies in New England have blindly persisted in their attempts to defeat the Dickey-Lincoln School project. The basis of their opposition has been the contention that they are planning to meet the electric power needs of New England by their own methods. I shall show that such planning is actually nonexistent.

In the course of their intensive study of the Dickey project early this year, the investigative staff of the House Appropriations Committee asked the Electric Coordinating Council of New England to produce evidence of the planning by these companies to provide reliable and low-cost power to their customers. No such evidence was produced, and to this day their plans are supported only by a full-page newspaper advertisement on their so-called Big Eleven power loop which they claim to be the cure-all for power needs in New England. The staff study report states:

> Although representatives of the Council advised that they have planned to meet the problems of supplying the power needs of New England on a central coordinated basis, they have not produced any document supporting this central planning with the exception of an advertisement that appeared in the public press in January, 1966.

It was on this phony premise that the Electric Coordinating Committee, in an elaborately bound folder of material mailed to Members of the House Appropriations Committee under date of June 23, 1967, arrogantly chose to challenge the findings of the committee's investigative staff and to substitute their own conclusions—conclusions which touted the so-far unsupported Big Eleven loop as a gigantic regional step forward.

The private utilities have loudly claimed that the Dickey project, which has been under study for many years, has yet not been studied enough. At the same time, they have offered a hastily conceived and totally unplanned and unresearched alternative for Dickey. They have completely failed to satisfy the need for regional planning on a central, coordinated basis. They have gambled on the hope that by promising to construct a large number of powerplants, they would satisfy the public and the Members of Congress that the Dickey project is unnecessary. Once Dickey is defeated, they know that there will be plenty of time to research and to alter their announced plans. They are old hands at procrastination.

The private utilities will point to the fact that some of the 11 promised powerplants are already under construction. While this is conveniently true, the fact, as they have themselves been protesting, is that construction without proper engineering and planning is meaningless. It provides no guarantee that the loop will meet the need efficiently, reliably, and in such a way as to reduce consumer bills.

I say to my respected colleagues that as one who has long sympathized with the plight of Maine and New England people I welcome the promise being offered by the private utilities and earnestly hope that the Big Eleven powerloop will live up to the promise being made for it. I am prepared, in a spirit of cooperation and fair play, to work with the private utilities to achieve what best serves the people of New England.

In return I ask only for a reciprocal willingness to cooperate, and to be dealt with fairly. The Dickey project is of proven value and merit. No amount of ranting against it and no deluge of misrepresentations can alter this fact.

Dickey is a justified and wise investment of Federal funds. It is a fully repayable investment and will return $1.90 for every $1 of tax money used to build and operate it.

It will serve the Nation's interest, it will serve New England's interest, and it will serve the people of that region well. I make this statement confident in the knowledge that years of study and engineering research have proven it to be true beyond any doubt.

To the private utilities of New England, I pledge my cooperation in meeting the region's future proven needs in the manner best calculated to serve the people. In return, I ask only that they consider Dickey's merits objectively and with open mind.

To my respected colleagues in this House, I pledge my sympathetic consideration of the needs of their States and their people. I shall not permit parochial consideration to blind me to the needs of other areas. In return, I ask only for fair and thoughful consideration of my arguments in behalf of the Dickey project.

Above all, I earnestly request full and fair consideration for the people of New England, who have long awaited the day when they too may enjoy the benefits of low-cost electric power.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON OFFERS EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO WOMEN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is to be congratulated on extending to women the benefits of the Executive order on equal employment opportunity.

By offering women equal employment opportunity in Government and Government-contract jobs, the President has continued his policy of opening the door of opportunity to women in both public and private fields.

This Executive order requires employers to follow the President's own policy of choosing the most qualified person for a job—regardless of their color, religion, or sex.

The day is surely not far away when women will share with men the full equality of citizenship and opportunity our laws promise.

Lyndon B. Johnson has brought that day immeasurably closer.

I insert into the RECORD the President's remarks upon extending the Executive order on equal employment opportunity to women.

EXECUTIVE ORDER AMENDING EXCUTIVE ORDER No. 11246, RELATING TO EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

It is the policy of the United States Government to provide equal opportunity in Federal employment and in employment by Federal contractors on the basis of merit and without discrimination because of race, color, religions, sex or national origin.

The Congress, by enacting Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, enunciated a national policy of equal employment opportunity in private employment, without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

Executive Order No. 11246 of September 24, 1965, carried forward a program of equal employment opportunity in Government employment, employment by Federal contractors and subcontractors and employment under Federally assisted construction contracts regardless of race, creed, color or national origin.

It is desirable that the equal employment opportunity programs provided for in Executive Order No. 11246 expressly embrace discrimination on account of sex.

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, it is ordered that Executive Order No. 11246 of September 24, 1965, be amended as follows:

(1) Section 101 of Part I, concerning nondiscrimination in Government employment, is revised to read as follows:

"SECTION 101. It is the policy of the Government of the United States to provide equal opportunity in Federal employment for all qualified persons, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program in each executive department and agency. The policy of equal opportunity applies to every aspect of Federal employment policy and practice."

(2) Section 104 of Part I is revised to read as follows:

"SECTION 104. The Civil Service Commission shall provide for the prompt, fair, and impartial consideration of all complaints of discrimination in Federal employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. Procedures for the consideration of complaints shall include at least one impartial review within the executive department or agency and shall provide for appeal to the Civil Service Commission."

(3) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of the quoted required contract provisions in section 202 of Part II, concerning nondiscrimination in employment by Government contractors and subcontractors, are revised to read as follows:

"(1) The contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The contractor will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex or national origin. Such action shall include, but not be limited to the following: employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. The contractor agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notices to be provided by the contracting officer setting forth the provisions of this nondiscrimination clause.

"(2) The contractor will, in all solicitations or advertisements for employees placed by or on behalf of the contractor, state that all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex or national origin."

(4) Section 203(d) of Part II is revised to read as follows:

"(d) The contracting agency or the Secretary of Labor may direct that any bidder or prospective contractor or subcontractor shall submit, as part of his Compliance Report, a statement in writing, signed by an authorized officer or agent on behalf of any labor union or any agency referring workers or providing or supervising apprenticeship or other training, with which the bidder or prospective contractor deals, with supporting information, to the effect that the signer's practices and policies do not discriminate on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, and that the signer either will affirmatively cooperate in the implementation of the policy and provisions of this order or that it consents and agrees that recruitment, employment, and the terms and conditions of employment under the proposed contract shall be in accordance with the purposes and provisions of the order. In the event that the union, or the agency shall refuse to execute such a statement, the Compliance Report shall so certify and set forth what efforts have been made to secure such a statement and such additional factual material as the contracting agency or the Secretary of Labor may require."

The amendments to Part I shall be effective 30 days after the date of this order. The amendments to Part II shall be effective one year after the date of this order.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 13, 1967*.

PRIVACY AND THE NATIONAL DATA CENTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine recently sent me a copy of the keynote address given by my good friend and colleague, Representative CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, to the Spring Joint Computer Conference in Atlantic City, N.J.

As all of us know, Congressman GALLAGHER is chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy. His work as subcommittee chairman in protecting our individual privacy has been widely recognized in the press and in Government circles, and his accomplishments have generated wide and favorable comment from the academic and legal community.

I feel that this speech that Congressman GALLAGHER gave last April 18 has as much value and, perhaps, more pertinence today. I submit it at this point for the consideration of our colleagues:

PRIVACY AND THE NATIONAL DATA CENTER

(Text of a speech delivered by Representative CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, before the Spring Joint Computer Conference in Atlantic City, N.J., on April 18, 1967)

Eleven months ago our Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy held a series of hearings on a proposal that was advanced under the banner of economy and efficiency in Government by the Bureau of the Budget. The proposal was for the Federal Government to consolidate into a giant computer system all the information now collected and published by some 20 agencies of the Federal Government. The proposal was called the National Data Center.

Upon learning of the National Data Center, my mind recalled a speech that I made three or four years earlier about the possibilities of the age of the Computerized Man. At that time, I spoke of the dangerous possibilities inherent in the unregulated and poorly understood development of Total Informational Systems within the Federal Government. Since that time, our work has involved studies and investigations into the high yield of information about individuals that was becoming the new game, not only in Washington, but throughout the country, not only in the public sector, but also in the private.

We found that the Information Explosion resulted from the proliferation of information gathering devices and from the increased ability to store this information economically though for some unspecified and undefined purpose. Broadly speaking our work covered eavesdropping and wiretapping devices, lie detectors or polygraph examinations, personality testing, mail stops, garbage snooping and an assorted variety of other bugging, peeping and listening tools.

One wondered why all this information was necessary and how it could possibly be used? The National Data Center proposal provided the answer. In the future, all of this information could be stored and could be used if it were only centralized and made uniform. The only question that remained seemed to be, does the Government want to spend the money to construct the Center?

The perplexing aspect was that no matter what our officials said, the Computer experts insisted that the National Data Center could, if properly designed, be converted into a National Intelligence Center or what in one of my nastier days I referred to as a National Dossier Bank.

Perhaps I was overly alarmed initially; but to me a ten-year projection of a National Dossier Bank was no small threat to our society, our freedom and our Republic—especially in view of the minor alarms that were going off at various echelons of government and which were apparently unheard. And finally, what adds threat to the potential danger is the absolute obsession that is now in vogue to include the social security number on every form and in every human transaction.

What this is leading us to, and what the most disturbing aspect of all this is, is the undemocratic process which begins at such an early age to make people believe that they cannot say *no* to those who consider them fair game for any kind of quiz show, and the perpetuation of their answers to these questions which would follow them for all times—frozen in time and the computer.

However, rather than merely opposing what was not fully understood, my colleagues and I set out to create a climate of concern among not only Government officials and computer experts, but also to include the various disciplines which could contribute toward a better understanding not only of the National Data Center, but also of the broader implications of the Computer and its effect on the future.

That climate of concern is now a fact; an accepted state of affairs.

During the past eleven months we who have followed this issue through its circuitous evolution have witnessed a phenomenon which demonstrates the vitality and creativity of our society. We have seen many interested people coming together to try to help each other in an attempt to alter the course of human evolution.

I personally am very pleased by this development. I enjoyed very much meeting people from the computer industry, and I have learned a great deal from you. Together, we have tackled what is to my mind the most difficult of human problems. We have set out to take necessity out of history, and we have done a pretty good job so far.

Our job is not, has not been, and will not be an easy one; but, as Justice Brandeis said, "the only way to make historical inevitability become real, is through our own effort."

I would like also to assure you that, to paraphrase Marc Antony, "I come not to bury the computer, but to praise it." I say this so that we shall understand, from the beginning, that I have not and I do not attack the computer as a technological innovation. By any and all counts, it is a most beneficial addition to our means of coping with the environment we live in.

The only statement I would like to make to you is, in this content, that we cannot underestimate the potentialities of this tool—the computer—especially when that tool has so many qualititative dimensions of its own which are not yet fully realized, and in particular insofar as the computers expansion seems directly tied to the increasing limitation on the traditional idea of man in society.

The problem I see for us now is a problem

of wholly new dimensions for human society. In order to realize the full nature of this problem we perhaps exaggerated one aspect or manifestation of it—the National Data Center—and thereby threw light on the real problem we face.

The problem modern man confronts in the twilight of the 20th Century is that he has the unique opportunity and capability of being able to search out a predictable future for his society. This is a characteristic unique to our era, and it is due, essentially, to the fact that we in America have rationalized our economic and political life so thoroughly that a change or innovation made now will have for us certain predictable ramifications in the near future. Thus, though man has sought to construct a predictable rational order since the beginning of his being, only now have we reached the stage when the realization of this goal is a possibility.

We might also say that 20th Century man has brought forth his own particular version of hell—that is, the possibility of a computerized, undimensional society, inhibited by no law or moral consideration in the exercise of its power, recognizing no private refuge for the individual in its effort to penetrate every sphere of life and to make every subject serve its purpose.

We now realize that the technological revolution has brought about many changes and innovations. The computer is one of these. The use of the computer affects man in a particular and peculiar way; a way no other invention has affected him. Other inventions in other technological revolutions have altered the way man lives—his mode of existence—the computer, alternatively, alters who man is, what man is, and who he sees himself. The use of the computer has two characteristics unique unto itself: first, it can do the thinking of a man, and second, it can remember things about man that even he himself cannot *or does not choose* to remember.

The technological revolution centered around the computer can potentially serve man in a way no other innovation has ever served him. Its development and use has helped doctors diagnose illness, teachers to instruct their pupils, mathematicians to solve problems, economists to understand the economy and in many more ways. Additionally, the computer should also help us to eliminate duplicity and waste in record keeping and reporting. It will enable government agencies whose job it is to help people to be better equipped to perform their services.

Simultaneously, however, this technological revolution poses an immediate threat to the individual as a person. It also poses a threat to liberty and freedom.

The reality of this threat was, until recently, very much obscured by the same benefits which gave rise to the threat. For the very same benefits which accrued to the individual's betterment, leisure and affluence, encroached on his basic and undeniable private existence. This Pythian observation is at the heart of the problem of finding a balance between technological change and the democratic process—a process at whose heart is the acceptance and maintenance of the right of the individual to his personal privacy.

The privacy of the individual is inviolate. Its nature and dimensions must be assured against any and all incursions. The reason for this is simple. The Right of Privacy stands as the last dimension of man's true freedom. Its existence separates him from the totalitarianism of the overt manipulation of his personality, and its reality is the cornerstone and basis for his uniqueness and individuality.

The possibility that the Right of Privacy will be dissolved, the idea that man as an individual will become identified with his reified past and that he will lose his personal integrity, the thought that men will be treated as facts not persons, is an eventuality which the advancements of science and technology alone have made relevant to our society.

In our time, man's desire to create a predictable and rational environment has come to include the demand for democratic control over economic life and equality of economic opportunity. It is obvious that these changes in popular beliefs and accepted institutions have been necessitated by the changes in the social structure of our Western civilization brought about by spontaneous economic growth, by the spread of universal literacy, and by the new problems posed by capitalist industry. It is equally obvious that they are changes within a country of fundamental values.

But there is no guarantee that the necessary technological and ethical changes required to keep up with technological change will always be made in good time. For it is implied in the definition of a free society that there is no single center responsible for these adjustments—that its overall development is not planned.

In our age of electronic inevitability, however, we can do something that we were never able to do before. We can use the technology—with depth of perception and increased insight—to work with man, for man and by man.

At the present time, the proposals for a National Data Center have been vague and have done little else than to suggest an institution in which to house a statistical compilation of facts and figures from existing Government records on an aggregate basis. The Bureau of the Budget announced, through a series of reports, that there was a need and a use for this kind of Center.

Though at this time I will not argue the question of need, I would like to indicate that the Bureau has never "statistically" demonstrated to me how great this need is and how much better the National Data Center would be to meet this need. In any event, we will hypothesize a need.

The real problem arose when we began to think not of the proposal, but of the reality of the Center.

When one recognizes the enormous amount of information on individuals in the hands of the government, when one realizes that all this information when combined with a social security number is readily identifiable, when we observe that the development of a comprehensive computer dossier on an individual basis is both technologically feasible and may prove to be logical and economic, we realize that even the most innocuous of centers *could* become the heart of an individualized computer based Federal record-keeping system.

What is more, we on the Subcommittee realized, when looking back over the technological developments of the past years, that even if all this weren't presently possible, we could not help asking ourselves: "How soon will it be possible?" The techniques and technology of the information revolution are evolving at such a rapid rate that any denial of this possibility may, some time soon, prove erroneous.

Also, since we must run hard just to keep pace with the developments of new computer technology, it follows that we might have to run twice as hard to insure that the technical safeguards we built into the system kept pace with technology itself.

Thus, confronted with these possibilities, we called for our hearings to slow down and/or halt all further progress toward the establishment of the Center.

Again, we were not at that time and we are not now "Ban the Computer" advocates. We were not saboteurs of government economy and efficiency.

We called for a breathing period during which a balance could be drawn between these technological changes and the traditional values and laws we cherish. We saw a vision of our laws becoming so irrelevant to the technological state of the art as to render them impotent and valueless.

In my opinion, the particular effect of the collection and correlation of all this information in one place signifies a radically new kind of threat to the Right of Privacy, and consequently a new threat to man's last dimension of freedom and dignity.

With the complexity of our society, and the dependence of individuals upon one another for service and support, there is an increasing need for people to live in the presence of others. Yet, the fundamental human claim to personal freedom and dignity remains. Privacy is the right to live one's own life in one's own way, to formulate and hold one's own beliefs, and to express thoughts and share feelings without fear of observation or publicity beyond that which one seeks or acquiesces in.

The claim to privacy is fragile, but persistent; it is as subtle and powerful as the need for personal dignity; it is a fundamental aspect of individual freedom and worth.

It is the right of each individual to determine for himself in each particular setting or compartment of his life how much of his many-faceted beliefs, attitudes and behavior he chooses to disclose. The Right to Privacy includes the freedom to live in every different role without having one's aspirations in one context placed in another without permission or freezing a moment in life and using it out of context.

To an individual this information is more than mere statistics. It is the data of judgement, not the biblical last judgement, but something equally dreadful. The instantaneous last judgement on earth as to employment, promotion, school, acceptance in the community and service to the Country.

With all the information in the files of the Federal Government collated and collected, unified and made interchangeable, the fragile nature of the individual's personality and privacy is sacrificed.

No longer will the individual be able to maintain a discontinuous autobiography. Somewhere, somehow the government—through its many forms and files—will be able to locate and identify you. This is for the innocent individual, a limitation on his Right to Privacy. You are defined, like it or not. Past evaluations and past histories have become recordable, and they form the basis for any future applications or recommendations the individual will seek. To me, this is no less than the identification of every American as a potential criminal. Are we not criminalizing our population when each man knows his number could be up?

At one time in the history of the United States, we might not have worried about this, because the frontier was open and the state of nature was just beyond the Mississippi River. There, no government agent would or could follow you. There, one could live, act, think and die as one liked. Now, alternatively, we can no more use this last physical refuge to maintain our individuality and uniqueness.

However, one can say that these threats were inherent already in our society, and the computerization of information is therefore not to blame. It could be demonstrated that the very computerization of data itself is a security precaution, and that by its very nature it *ups* the price of the intruder.

In fact, prior to the computer revolution all you really needed was a well placed individual with access to file folders to get information on a particular individual. Now the situation is much different and the operation much more complex and costly. In order to "break" the Data Center you would need:

(a) a machine
(b) a code book

(c) a set of instructions, and
(d) a technician.

What is more, we could integrate into the data system technical controls and checks which would make "bugging" or misusing the computers more difficult.

But *this* kind of technical solution overlooks and underestimates the profound effect the computer is having on our concept of society and man's view of himself. This is to be seen in two broad categories representing particularly dangerous threats posed by a computerized data center.

First, a National Data Center such as we have described creates a relationship of the individual recorded with certain other individuals who he does not know and with whom he cannot check information held about himself. Implicit in this evaluation is the eventuality that the social outlook of a given individual will and must be altered to meet the possibility that everything he does is recorded and remembered, without, necessarily, an understanding of the contextual or historical evolution of the action or event.

The individual person cannot be quantified and calculated without adapting his personality structure to this change in his relation to society. Moreover, the change that occurs *must* radically affect that aspect of man's existence which is most dynamic to his personality. This aspect can be characterized as the *concept of redemption*.

It seems to me beyond a reasonable doubt that if all of one's actions are recorded, and if all of one's mistakes are indelibly pegged to one's personal history, and if one is always potentially accountable—*out of context*—for actions of impulse or misfortune, then the very idea that an individual can start anew is rendered impotent.

It has always been my belief that with or without a physical frontier, America was the one country where man could redeem himself from his past errors and/or that he could radically alter his life's direction without being intimidated for it.

What is more, it has always been my belief that America was the one place where revolution could not take place, where radicalism was irrelevant because here an individual could change his surroundings, his environment at will.

Also, America has always represented for me a place where an individual could change his mind, his beliefs, and outlook on life, and still be able to live as a free and valuable component of our society.

The America I have described cannot be the same America after a centralized computer system, a system which neither forgives nor forgets, is introduced.

If we have learned nothing else from previous technological revolutions, we must have learned that these revolutions have changed man's outlook on society and man's concept of himself. It seems to me absolutely undeniable that the computerized data and information systems will have the effect—if permitted—of rendering insignificant the concept of redemption, and thereby sap man's dynamic and creative energy of real meaning.

The crystallization of one's life and one's mistakes into "machine readable form" denies man the freedom to forget. This denial flattens his existence to the point of limiting his future-possible actions.

All the great religions are based on the concept of renewal. Man can only be efficient when he has the chance to start over, to get up when he falls. Man cannot be efficient if there is not a second chance. He cannot be efficient if he has lost hope.

The second broad category of threats posed by the computerized data center consists of potential danger in the collection of information and the way it is used. This brings us to the power of information and the nature of its accuracy.

The information explosion is the product of a general increase in our desire to know, to predict and to regulate. This is, perhaps, a function of the tremendous impact that science has had on us in the last fifty years. Governments believe that they must be responsible for the safety and affluence of their people. This entails predictability and requires an enormous amount of information on the very people it governs. The justification of all this information is found in the Government's desire to draw on an increased and broadened stock of knowledge of the factors and variables with which it must deal.

In order to create more benefits, Governments think they need to know more about their people. In this press for knowledge, the sectors of private life diminish. The more the Government knows the less the individual has left of himself which is his own. The more the Government accumulates data on the individual, the more the Government feels it needs to know. The more it intrudes on the individual by accumulating and correlating information, the less the individual has to decide for himself.

The advances made in automatic data processing systems have undoubtedly accelerated the evolution of this explosion. The desire to know while insatiable by its nature has been increasingly and more easily satiated by the introduction of faster and better systems of centralization and collation.

Thus, one consequence and one reason for the proposed National Data Center is that many Federal Agencies will go beyond current levels of inquiry and begin to ask more complex and probing questions. Not only have we become more adept at using the information presently collected, but we now have greater facilities for searching out new information.

One has only to look at the one-in-four sample of the Bureau of the Census to find proof positive of this evolution.

Additionally, the information becomes qualitatively more probing as it becomes quantitatively greater. Questions of affiliation, loyalties, medical histories and attitudes are becoming increasingly more relevant as information becomes more refined. It is the old principle of the more you know, the more you need to know, and the better will become your methods of finding this information.

The risks inherent in this increased quantification of knowledge are diverse and great. Some of these risks are:

(1) errors in reporting, recording and correlating;

(2) distortion of information caused by machine malfunction;

(3) misuse of information by persons working with the data;

(4) misuse by people who are at a distance from the data but who have access to it through remote consoles;

(5) violation of an individual's understanding that information furnished a particular Federal agency or official would not be disclosed to others.

The point to be made and understood here is not only that the quantity and quality of information accumulated presents an inherent limitation on the individual's ability to act freely and choose among random alternatives, but that the information recorded—whether accurate or not—acquires a dignity by its very insertion into the computer. Unrelated events become facts, and facts are not disputable.

An event, an action, a legal proceeding gain unqualified and unconditional status as realities. As "dossier" information accumulated, it requires a "reliability" by quantity as opposed to veracity. Moreover, since computers are just machines, and since machines cannot lie, information contained within them becomes "accurate" independent of evaluation.

In the area of the nature of the information itself, there are two particularly real hazards. *First,* the individual may be ignorant of the collection and use of the information acquired. And *second,* the people responsible for the translation, gathering and processing of the information may be neither cautious nor qualified to handle and select the information to be stored.

The very fact that someone will have to decide who is included in a particular class or description of people is a potential threat to the unsuspecting individual. How and who can decide the nature of the classification "security risk", "loyalty-in-doubt", "criminal" or "associate of criminals"?

It is obvious that there is a value judgement to be made here, the question is who can we trust to make it, and how can we control the information once so classified.

If we are going to be able to punch out groups of people, how can we control the quality and security of the information both at the point of input and the point of output?

What classifications are necessary and which classifications present an undue invasion of privacy?

What value is there in maintaining a group labelled "mental health patients" when and if these patients' records are dubiously accurate or potentially dangerous to the *continued* health of a particular individual?

How can we denote an evaluation or an opinion or an unsubstantiated observation in a computer so that it does not acquire the status of "fact?"

Finally, we come to the area of greatest threat of all. This danger though neither overtly nor covertly present with us, is inherent in the nature of our free, pluralistic society. This danger is, of course, the possibility that all this information once collected will fall into the hands of people either duly elected or not, who through design or overzealousness, use the information for ends not wholly justifiable. What I am getting at are the "efficient bureaucrats" or the "irresponsible public officials" who, once in positions of power, will use the highly dubious information collected in this system for malicious purposes.

This threat exists both in a real sense as a probability, and in a theoretical sense as it affects man's perception of his freedom and privacy.

In the real sense, the ramifications would be disastrous, but in the theoretical sense the result would be subtle, pervasive and corrosive to our form of government and concept of society.

Can we imagine a society where the individual fears the government's knowledge of his actions, can we envision a people whose privacy is non-existent because the government in omnipresent, and can we picture a society whose actions are pre-determined on the basis of information surrepitiously or legally acquired?

I can. It is the picture of a totalitarian society in Europe in the 1930's and 1940's, A society where information was given freely and used maliciously, a society where "aggregate statistics" became "dossiers" and "dossiers" became death warrants.

Some of you will doubt the analysis I have just presented, and others will scoff at me. However, let us look at our problem from a different perspective. Let us transport ourselves to the 27th Century.

If we transport ourselves to the 27th Century, and look back to 1967, taking into consideration all that will have taken place during the interim, we might re-read this speech and say, "what in the world was he talking about." It is my hope that, in fact, my efforts in this regard are unwarranted, that my fears are unrealistic and that my imagination is fantastic.

However, if this is not the case, then it is my hope that all of us together will take a bold step in the direction of equity and reason now. I would hope that you in the computer industry would work among yourselves and together with members of the legal profession to begin to redress the balance between democracy and technology.

I have pointed out so far that we have a new and different technological revolution confronting us, that this revolution effects both our society and the individual, that while we can make technical adjustments in order to insure a degree of privacy we may not, or at least have not re-established the balance, and that along with the technical security precautions required, we must question the very basis for the technological rationalization of our society.

I am not, I must mention in passing, neglecting to assign a strong and meaningful role for the Congress. For if we do not realize our role, Congress too could be programmed, and later perhaps voting could be properly programmed or eliminated. We, for our part, must create stringent regulations and laws governing the type of information, the quality of information, the accessibility of information and the storing of information. We must also act to define the way in which information can be used within the Federal Government and dessiminated beyond it.

Moreover, to insure the accuracy of dossier information which can be stored in a centralized computer data center, we must formulate a method by which the individual can check the accuracy and relevance of the information maintained on him. Along with this, the individual must be assured by Act of Congress his right to protest the accuracy and relevancy of his file.

All these and many more are procedural steps which, prior to the construction of a National Data Center, must be assured to the individual.

The major threat to the National Data Center is not, however, a problem for lawmakers, but rather it is one for computer experts and computer technicians. This is so for two reasons.

First, it will and must be the obligation and responsibility of people such as yourselves to build data processing systems which are secure from the kinds of threats which are or could be manifested. There is only so much that can be written into law, the rest must be covered by the technical design of the system.

Second, in the long run, it will be computer experts and technicians who design the programs and control the daily use of automatic data processing systems.

If we think of the Data Center in terms of a form and content dichotomy, then we can deal with the formal structure of the Center separate from the accuracy and integrity of the data. Carrying this further, if the Right of Privacy (containing within it the right of consent and the right of non-disclosure) is the key value to be protected, then the safeguards needed will fall into the broad groupings of:

(1) accuracy and accessibility of the data; and

(2) integrity and responsibility of the organizational structure of the center, its mode and manner of dissemination of information.

To say this differently, where shall we place the responsibility for the future privacy of the individual, and in whom shall we place this responsibility?

Shall we regard the computer as sufficiently sophisticated in its present or its future forms to regulate and "govern" itself?

Ought we to make computer operators responsible for the misuse of the computer?

What kind of governing agency shall we put in charge of all data collection, since in a short time all data will be kept in such a form as to make it interchangeable within and without the government agencies and departments?

As I have pointed out, one of the most important "soft ware" aspects of the National Data Center will be how a program is written into the computer, how it is interpreted and in what form the raw data is kept.

In addition, if a program is wrongly classified or if the data mistakenly appears out of the computer, or if certain data is programmed incorrectly, there is only the possibility of punitive action after the damage is done.

In meeting the problems we confront in these two categories, we must accept two entirely different kinds of solutions.

First, the only way of imploring computer manufacturers to devise safer, more secure systems is to continuously remind them of the dangers inherent if these type of computers are not designed. And also, to remind them that they too may suffer from a weak or inadequate system.

The second category of technical adequacy involves something more rigorous and stringent. To my mind, the only way of meeting the problem of responsibility of computer technicians in their use of the computer and their role of maintainers of stored data involves some form of licensing. The most pertinent analogy that comes to mind is that of the Certified Public Accountant.

Perhaps in the future we shall have to create a class of people called *Certified Public Computer Accountants*. Under this appellation would fall all the people involved with the use of the computer and the storage of information. This would apply in the public sector as well as in the private spheres, and would involve regulations and punitive action according to the degree of the wrong committed.

My hope would be that as the technology of computer science grew more sophisticated, the less of a need we would have for great punitive action. But we cannot rely solely on this hope.

At the present juncture, we have begun work in these two areas. Computer users and manufacturers have begun to identify the loci of computer weaknesses. At this very meeting we will hear the presentation of several papers on computer design and security control. This is an encouraging beginning as long as it is followed up by the computer manufacturers.

In addition, we who deal with the legislative and legal aspects of data processing information systems have begun to give serious and concentrated thought to the necessary legal regulations which will govern the functioning of the data center.

Thus, taking the progress we are making in the two above mentioned areas in conjunction with the re-thinking that is being done in the Bureau of the Budget on the proposed National Data Center, it would seem that we have come a long way.

Nonetheless, there is much, much more to be done. Today I have tried to indicate to you where we are going and how I think we should get there. It is a long road with many obstacles, but it is one which we will and must travel.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Arizona), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. CORMAN, for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. OLSEN (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of California), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. STUCKEY (at the request of Mr. JOELSON), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. JOELSON), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CULVER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 107. An act for the relief of Cita Rita Leola Ines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 866. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Pacino Biancarosso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 872. An act for the relief of Francisco Renigo Fabre Solino (Frank R. S. Fabre); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 878. An act to amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange sale property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1129. An act for the relief of Demetra Lani Angelopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1180. An act for the relief of Ana Jacaine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1327. An act for the relief of Dr. Samad Momtazee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2072. An act for the relief of Nestor S. Cueto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2091. An act for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Campuzano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2120. An act for the relief of Jose D. Neugart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2168. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Pina y Gil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2175. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Emilio Caignet y Crespo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2191. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Jose Suarez Diáz to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2193. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Jesus Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2248. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Puentes Roca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2256. An act for the relief of Dr. Margarita Lorigados; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2285. An act for the relief of Gordon Shih Gum Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1948. An act for the relief of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran;

H.R. 1960. An act for the relief of Angelique Kousoulas;

H.R. 2978. An act for the relief of Young Ok Espantoso;

H.R. 3430. An act for the relief of Yim Mei Lam;

H.R. 3497. An act for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta;

H.R. 4534. An act for the relief of Mary Bernadette Lineham; and

H.R. 5216. An act for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The **SPEAKER** announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1933. An act to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; and

S. 2310. An act to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol Buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **ALBERT.** Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 23, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "The Administration of Research Grants in the Public Health Service" (ninth report by the committee) (Rept. No. 800). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "Food and Drug Administration Procedures for the Selection of Laboratory Sites" (10th report by the committee) (Rept. No. 801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1136. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 702), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 581h), relating to surveys of timber and other forest resources of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Committee of conference. H.R. 9960. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 803). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Committee of conference. H.R. 12474. An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 804). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. BATES):

H.R. 13616. A bill to provide for orderly trade in leather footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 13617. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 13618. A bill to require the establishment, on the basis of the 19th and subsequent decennial census, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 13619. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 904. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 13620. A bill for the relief of Emma Exconde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13621. A bill for the relief of Agata Carmen Smith, also known as Tina Scala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Jesus said, "I am the light of the world; he that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."—John 8: 12.

Our Father God, in the darkness of our day we turn to Thee who art the light of the world and the light our world needs this present hour. Amid the discontent and dissatisfaction of this age we come to Thee for guidance and direction.

Lead, kindly light, amid the encircling gloom, lead Thou us on. Keep Thou our feet; we do not ask to see the distant scene; one step enough for us. Help us to see it and to have the courage to take it—that step by step we may move in the direction of more harmonious relationships among our people, greater cooperation among the nations of the world, and an ever increasing good will in the hearts of all men. In the name of Him who is the light of the world we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 20, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 108. An act to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the State of Maine;

S. 2068. An act to repeal certain acts relating to containers for fruits and vegetables; exportation of tobacco plants and seed; naval stores; and wool; and for other purposes; and

S. 2179. An act to extend for 3 years the special milk programs for the Armed Forces and veterans hospitals.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD SET EXAMPLE OF COURAGEOUS LEADERSHIP

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives was under security Saturday more stringent than during World War II. Doors were locked and services to Members were suspended. Apparently we were supposed to fear violence which might come by reason of the visit to Washington of thousands of marchers demonstrating and protesting against U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia.

Since when, Mr. Speaker, should the normal functions of this great body be disrupted at the whim of peaceniks and demonstrators? Are we afraid to confront those who are not in accord with the official policies of the United States? Shall we have for ourselves at home peace at any price and yet demand of Americans courageous sacrifice on a foreign battlefield?

Who shall dictate the locking up of our shop next? We speak of responsibility. Responsibility to whom, Mr. Speaker? To the vast majority of the American people who expect some display of courageous leadership from their elected Representatives, or should we in the House be quiveringly responsive to the demands of the irresponsible minority who would govern by demonstrations, marches, and civil disobedience?

If we are symbolic of what America stands for, Mr. Speaker, the House was a poor example on Saturday past to the soldiers, airmen, seamen, and marines fighting for our freedoms in Southeast Asia; to the parents, wives, and children whose loved ones represent us on the battlefield.

We should stand tall for our fighting men overseas instead of catering to those that demonstrate in a manner repugnant and disgusting to the vast majority of the American people.

Shame on our House, Mr. Speaker. Shame on our House.

VIOLENCE DISCREDITS MASS PROTEST

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, every American citizen has strong convictions concerning the war in Vietnam. However, regardless of how they feel, I am sure all Americans are thankful that when some 50,000 persons decided to express their opposition to the war at the steps of the Pentagon this past weekend, that no one in authority abridged their constitutional right to assemble peaceably.

At the same time, those who resorted to violence and attempted to force their way into the Pentagon brought shame on their fellow protestors as well as themselves and discredit on those who lawfully protested the war. The majority of the demonstrators, exercising their constitutional right to protest in a lawful manner, lost because of a minority of militants who attempted anarchy. The militants lost because their lawlessness caused sensible Americans to discredit their movement. The end result was confusion and shame.

Mr. Speaker, any person who exhibits violence or lack of respect for law and order, or burns draft cards and money, or shows contempt for the courts or the flag, or flaunts individual rights above the rights of society, should not receive either comfort or compassion.

As a Member of Congress, I can assure those who peacefully demonstrate, I will do everything I can to protect and preserve our heritage of laws and freedom, including their right to dissent.

But, on the other hand, I have nothing but indignation for those who resort to violence and choose to defy the laws of our great Nation.

ATTACKS UPON OUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, by now the filth and debris left by the rabble that infested Washington over the past weekend has been removed from sight, but the scar on the honor of our country will remain for all to see.

Has there been any other time in world history when the chief executive of a country overruled his advisers and gave permission for what turned into an all-out attack against the nerve center of his country's defense system?

Can any other example be cited where a powerful government dealt with persons who admittedly recognize no limits and obey no laws other than those they choose?

Where else in a country's history has official consent and tacit blessing been given to those who openly planned to engage in civil disobedience and invite arrest?

Why was it necessary to subject U.S. soldiers to what the newspapers called "face-to-face taunts and incredible obscenities" and "ugly and vulgar provocation—the most vicious personal slander"?

Did we have to hand over to our country's enemies some remarkable propaganda in the form of films showing thousands, against the backdrop of our Capital City's shrines, in what appears to be open revolt?

And did we have to allow to be inflicted on our country as a whole the deep feeling of shame, when our citizens see their own Government seemingly helpless against those who would destroy it?

This disgraceful matter, condoned by the administration, means the beginning of more and increasingly vicious insults to and attacks upon our Government.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE THIS AFTERNOON

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

REGULAR FRIDAY SESSIONS FOR THE HOUSE

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members who requested regular Friday sessions almost a month ago, I want to commend the Democratic leadership for arranging a somewhat impromptu session last Friday. I realize how difficult it is to accept any constructive suggestion to speed the work of the House, and particularly one which comes from first-term Republicans. But now that we have made this historic breakthrough, I urge the leadership to take a further step by announcing today that the House will sit regularly each Friday for the rest of the session. It should not tax the planning capacity of the leadership to give Members much more notice of Friday sessions than was done last week. When the announcement did not come until late Thursday afternoon, I for one did not feel I should cancel speaking engagements made for Friday in my district.

It is, of course, embarrassing that only 21 out of 28 Republicans who requested Friday sessions were present. This was an attendance mark of 75 percent compared with 60 percent for all Republicans and only 47 percent for the Democratic Members of the House. Actually this was the high-water mark for the Democrats, who had only 45½ percent present on the final vote. One hundred and thirty-four Democrats were absent and only 112 present out of a total of 246. If you will just give us a little more notice, Mr. Speaker, we Republican first-termers will make every effort to beat Democratic attendance by a greater margin than last Friday's 75 percent to 45 percent.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAYNE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the gentleman that, when the program is announced, it is announced for the full week. Members are always on notice that we may meet on Friday. There is no announcement as to whether or not we will meet on Friday, but if we do not finish our business we may well meet on Friday. Would the gentleman expect us to meet on Friday if there is no business?

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would expect, on the basis of only 10 months' experience, that the distinguished majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, should be able to let us know more in advance than was done last week. In all seriousness—and I think the other Members of this group of 28 Republicans would agree—and in all good faith we hope we can meet regularly on Fridays for the rest of this session. There is obviously much business still to be done, and we do not want to have to be here until Christmas if it can be avoided.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the legislative week runs through Saturday, and we can only adjourn over by unanimous consent. We would never make the attempt if there was business still to be done for the week.

Mr. MAYNE. May I ask the distinguished majority leader if, other than the joint meeting which is planned for Friday, there is any plan to have legislative business on this Friday?

Mr. ALBERT. It all depends on whether we have any business ready for floor action and consideration on Friday.

ATTENDANCE AT HOUSE SESSIONS ON FRIDAYS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled to make an observation, brought forth by the complaint of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MAYNE], a member of the junior advisory board to the Speaker, who, one might say, figuratively speaking, was caught last Friday with his legislative trousers at half-mast.

My grandfather, who was a livestock dealer—I said this a year ago, and I repeat it for the gentleman's benefit—used to say, "They hardly ever squeal until you stick them pretty good."

FRIDAY ATTENDANCE AND ABSENTEEISM

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I had a little bit of amusement already this week listening to the gentleman from Iowa. He told us he was a freshman, but really that was not necessary, because it is very obvious he is inexperienced. Now, I would give him a little free advice. If you are embarrassed by criticizing the leadership for not meeting on a Friday and then not being here on Friday yourself, instead of highlighting it or spotlighting it, when you make a blunder like that, I think the best thing for you to do would be to ignore it.

Now, on my part, I had planned to go home last Friday and I had not issued any pious statements about how diligent I am, but when there was a session announced I had a very remarkable idea. I just called up home canceling my appointment, and I was here, and I missed the gentleman from Iowa.

THE RECENT DEMONSTRATION AT THE PENTAGON

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, of course the disgraceful performance, or whatever one chooses to call it—of that motley crowd which assaulted the Pentagon—is a chapter in our history which is not good to behold, but is not all bad. Because from this demonstration we have learned this morning that the Selective Service System has taken all of these cards that were turned in—those they could get their hands on—and these cards will be sent back to the local draft boards with instruction that the names of these cardholders and their status with the Selective Service System be reappraised in order to find out what classification they have.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the Selective Service System is going throughout the country in the determination of these cases and is going to undertake to prosecute those cases that have not been prosecuted heretofore for violations of the Draft Act.

And, Mr. Speaker, to my great satisfaction, the Department of Justice has finally agreed to start moving upon the prosecution of some of these cases.

The Committee on Armed Services, as the Members will recall, wrote the Draft Card Burning Act, the act which makes it a felony to burn a draft card. However, the Department of Justice has been sitting on dead center on this. Now they have agreed to prosecute these cases. So, all is not bad.

Further, the Selective Service plans to send into the various States a staff to support the local boards in preparing the prosecutions, so something good might come out of this after all.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman be receptive to a bill which I would like to introduce providing that when one destroys a draft card, they automatically induct him into the service?

Mr. RIVERS. Why, of course, I am. I am receptive to anything which my distinguished friend from Ohio suggests.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 330]

Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bell
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Button
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Corman
Davis, Wis.
Dent
Diggs
Donohue
Dwyer
Farbstein
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gibbons
Goodell
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Holifield
Horton
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Long, La.
Macdonald, Mass.
Mathias, Md.
Mosher
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Philbin
Pickle
Pool
Purcell
Rarick
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schwengel
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Stephens
Udall
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wright
Wydler
Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 358 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MERGER MARKS MILESTONE IN MAJOR HEALTH FIELD

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, recently the voluntary battle against epilepsy was strengthened by the merger of the Epilepsy Foundation and Epilepsy Association of America in to the Epilepsy Foundation of America. The merger represents a previously unrealized opportunity to provide important and necessary services to the nearly 2 million Americans who are afflicted with epilepsy. It is a welcome step.

The legal and medical problems of epilepsy first came to my attention when I served in the Ohio General Assembly. At that time we succeeded in enacting legislation governing driver permits, workmen's compensation coverage, and marriage licenses for persons with epilepsy. Unfortunately, laws governing the activities of persons with epilepsy are too often based on an obsolete conception of epilepsy. Actually, more than half of all persons with epilepsy can become seizure-free when given competent medical treatment, while an additional 30 percent can enjoy substantial relief from seizures.

There is still much progress possible, however. I am hopeful that the new Epilepsy Foundation of America will continue to help to make great strides.

FACILITATE LAND EXCHANGES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the question on the passage of the bill H.R. 10442, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NASA APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 804)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) "making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3; and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1 and 2.

Joe L. Evins,
Edward P. Boland,
George E. Shipley,
Robert N. Giaimo,
John O. Marsh, Jr.,
David Pryor,
George Mahon,
Charles R. Jonas,
William E. Minshall,
Louis C. Wyman,
Burt L. Talcott,
Frank T. Bow,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Warren G. Magnuson,
Allen J. Ellender,
Richard B. Russell,
Spessard L. Holland
(except amendments
Nos. 1 and 2),
John O. Pastore,
Clinton P. Anderson
(except amendments
Nos. 1 and 2),
Gordon Allott
(except amendments
Nos. 1 and 2),
Margaret Chase Smith
(except amendments
Nos. 1 and 2),
Roman L. Hruska,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 1: Reported in disagreement.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $628,000,000 for "Administrative Operations" as proposed by the Senate instead of $648,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Joe L. Evins,
Edward P. Boland,
George E. Shipley,
Robert N. Giaimo,
John O. Marsh, Jr.,
David Pryor,
George Mahon,
Charles R. Jonas,
William E. Minshall,
Louis C. Wyman,
Burt L. Talcott,
Frank T. Bow,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Mills). The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we bring you today the conference report for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1968. Since the authorizing legislation passed the House and the appropriate bill for NASA has passed we have had extended sessions among the conferees. We have agreed on two items and have been unable to agree on two others. At the outset I would say that the House won in the conference in holding down the overall appropriations. We have made reductions of more than half a billion dollars, specifically we have cut $526,600,000 below the budget.

Mr. Speaker, basically there are three amendments to consider in this conference report. First is research and development; second is construction; third is administrative operations.

The Senate reduced the amount for administrative operations by $20,000,000. When the conferees met we accepted this reduction of $20 million in administrative operations below the House figures.

The two amendments in disagreement on which we have been unable to agree are in research and development and construction. There are some 20 items in research and development in the bill overall. We have reduced the items in disagreement to about two or three items. The original budget recommended for NASA was $5,050,000,000. Subsequently an amendment was submitted by the Bureau of the Budget for $50 million additional for the NERVA nuclear rocket research program. This brought the overall budget for NASA for next year to $5.1 billion. The House has cut this amount to $4,583,400,000, or a reduction of $516.6 million. We have thus cut the funding for NASA by more than half a billion dollars.

In the research and development program, the Apollo and the Apollo applications programs will continue. The manned flights programs have been rescheduled following the tragedy. The Apollo applications program is planned and will be continued with various industries throughout the country.

There will be no delay or stopping the Apollo and the Apollo applications programs. A viable space program will continue to move forward.

The House has cut two new items of research—which are the Voyager and the NERVA II programs. We reduced Voyager by $36 million—and we reduced the nuclear rockets program by $29.5 million.

So, we have made reductions in new programs beyond the Apollo program. I repeat, we have made reductions in the Voyager and the nuclear program which involve space exploration beyond the lunar landing.

The other body feels that the Voyager program which is involved in research with interplanetary space, flights to Venus and Mars is important, and we agree it is important. However, we feel these programs can be deferred at this time. The ongoing projects of NASA will continue.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact when the House passed the appropriations bill earlier, the President of the United States commended the House upon the one-half billion dollar cut which we made. He stated that conditions had changed since the 1968 budget was prepared almost a year ago and since the budget was submitted to the Congress.

I would like to read briefly to the Members of the House again from the President's statement. The President in signing the authorization bill for NASA took the unusual position of commending the House for its cuts in appropriations for the space program. The President said that ordinarily he would be opposed to such a large reduction but that conditions have changed greatly since January. He pointed out the fact that the Nation now faces increased expenditures, reduced revenues, a potentially large deficit and the need for a 10-percent tax surcharge.

Mr. Speaker, against this background President Johnson said that "some hard choices must be made to distinguish between the necessary and the desirable."

Mr. Speaker, we have made these decisions on that which we think is necessary and desirable.

We agree that the Voyager program is important—interplanetary research in space to Venus and Mars is important, but we feel that these cuts are necessary.

While these programs are desirable they are not necessary. We feel they can be deferred at this time.

In further explanation of the action of the conferees, Mr. Speaker, we have agreed to an increase of $10,000,000 over the amount originally provided by the House for tracking facilities. NASA has a nationwide and worldwide system of tracking and communications. We have contracts with various governments around the world and with various countries. We are under agreement and contract to meet certain monetary commitments for these tracking facilities.

In addition to this there is the fact that these tracking facilities are very vital to the safety of our astronauts. So, we have allowed this increase in the tracking facilities item as the conferees have agreed.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the other body has reduced the item of "Administrative operations" by $20 million. The House conferees have agreed to a $10 million increase in the tracking facilities. So, the net result is a reduction of $526.6 million below the budget. The total amount which is carried in this conference report is $4,573,400,000.

We certainly think this sum will provide for an ongoing and a viable space program and ask that the conference report be adopted.

I include in my remarks a chronological history of this bill:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968, COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION

[Reflects recommendations of House conferees on items reported in disagreement]

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriation, 1967	Budget estimate, 1968	Passed House, 1968	Passed Senate, 1968	Conference action, 1968	Conference compared with—			
						Appropriation, 1967	Budget, 1968	House, 1968	Senate, 1968
Research and development	4,245,000	4,352,000	3,899,500	3,995,500	3,909,500	−335,500	−442,500	+10,000	−86,000
Construction of facilities	83,000	76,700	35,900	55,400	35,900	−47,100	−40,800		−19,500
Administrative operations	640,000	671,300	648,000	628,000	628,000	−12,000	−43,300	−20,000	
Total	4,968,000	5,100,000	4,583,400	4,678,900	4,573,400	−394,600	−526,600	−10,000	−105,500

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins], the chairman of the subcommittee, for yielding time to me. However, I shall use only a minute or two of the time of the House during which to say that that I concur in the views expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Let me review briefly what has happened with respect to this bill so that Members will know exactly what is involved.

The budget request—revised—was for $5,100,000,000. The House-passed bill contained $4,583,400,000—a reduction of $516,000,000 under the budget. The Senate-passed bill contained $4,678,900,000, which was an increase of $95,500,000 above the House bill. So we went to conference to resolve the differences in the two bills.

The result of that conference is before the House today in the form of a conference report and a statement of the House managers.

If the conference report is adopted and the motions that will be made by the gentleman from Tennessee are approved, the result will be a net reduction of $85.5 million in the Senate-passed bill and a net increase of $10 million in the House-passed bill.

This will still be $506,000,000 below the budget.

We feel that the committee position is a sound one and that the House should sustain it by adopting the conference report and approving the motions that will be made by the gentleman from Tennessee.

I therefore join my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, in urging the House to adopt the conference report and approve his subsequent motions. I would point out, and I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee will concur in this, that there is reprograming authority in the law. If the administration feels in its wisdom that there should be some reprograming as between the several research and development programs as detailed in the reports, they have the right to come up here and present their reprograming proposals to the appropriate committees of the Congress. I for one would like to assure the administration that any reprograming proposals will receive fair consideration.

I would like to request the gentleman from Tennessee to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], and then to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton], as they have requested me to get them some time on the conference report.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa, but before doing so let me say that I certainly agree with the gentleman from North Carolina that NASA under Administrator Webb has authority to submit reprograming changes and transfer funds for that which he considers to be in the best interest of the United States. We have cut the funds down, but if the Administrator feels certain programs are of greater importance than others, or of higher priority than some of the other programs, then he can submit such proposals to the Space Committees of the House and the Senate, and to the Appropriations Committees within the confines of the budget.

Mr. JONAS. That gives a degree of flexibility to this program, and yet it keeps the final control in the hands of the Congress as to the amount of money that will be spent.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I certainly thank the gentleman from North Carolina for bringing out this point because there is some concern about the NERVA II program. If reprograming is requested and supported by the Administrator, it can be considered by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Mr. JONAS. Now, if the gentleman will yield briefly to the gentleman from Iowa, and then to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I have in hand a newspaper insert published by North American Aviation, the apparent producers of the Apollo. It is very interesting.

As I understand it, North American Aviation is financed approximately 100 percent by the Federal Government. In other words, the taxpayers' money is being used to put out this sort of thing.

I cannot give the Members the exact number of copies, but it was circulated in certain newspapers of Sunday, October 8, to some 10 million people. In other words, 10 million purchasers of the newspapers selected, and there were 18 of them. I am interested in this from the standpoint of the use of the taxpayers' money for this sort of thing.

I tried to find out how this was paid for. North American Aviation says it was paid for "out of corporate profits."

But the corporation is not prepared to talk about the money involved. Mr. William Hines, science editor of the Washington Star, says an expert newspaper estimator informed him the cost was between $400,000 and $600,000 for this newspaper insert, or approximately a half million dollars.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. I think the gentleman should be commended for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I, myself, asked NASA questions about this expenditure for extravagant advertising by North American Aviation for the purpose of building up its public image. After all of the revelations about North American I should think that it would try to improve its own internal management rather than indulging in external publicity. It is important that we know how this is being paid for. Clearly the American taxpayers are paying, for they pay the bills for the Apollo program. In addition, it's fair to assume that North American will claim a tax deduction for the corporate advertising with reference to this program.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I would say again, as I have said before, that the director of the NASA program, Mr. James Webb, ought to have been fired after the Apollo disaster that cost the lives of three astronauts last January. More than ever does it become evident, when you see this sort of expenditure by North American Aviation, the prime contractor for Apollo, that the time is long past due for the elimination of James E. Webb.

There is something seriously wrong when an outfit such as North American Aviation, approximately 100-percent financed by the Federal Government, and with contracts running into the hundreds of millions of dollars, spends $500,000 on a one-shot "prestige" advertising deal in 18 newspapers of this country. This simply means to me that the contracts the Government has with this firm are entirely too lush.

This, in my opinion, is a contribution to the fantastic cost of getting to the moon. It is an extravagance that the taxpayers of this country cannot afford, and I urge the House Appropriations Committee to conduct a thorough investigation of it.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the question as to who is paying for the advertising insert of North American Aviation. This advertising of North American Aviation is paid for by the stockholders of that company out of the profits of the corporation.

I have never heard the gentleman question any of the oil companies or the telephone companies, which are regulated businesses and put on some very fine television programs, or any of those people who are big advertisers. I have never heard the gentleman question their rights to use their profits as they see fit. I think they have a right to do it.

If the gentleman will go back, he will remember that this was thrashed out some years ago in the Committee on Armed Services when the aerospace companies were forbidden to charge against their operating expenses any money that they spent for prestige advertising. There was a fine line drawn at that time as to the aerospace industry in that advertising that they had to do to attract people to them, that is, ads they put in the paper for engineers and scientists, were a legitimate charge against their operations. All other advertising comes out of their profits.

I am sure the gentleman would not want some farmer who works pretty hard in Iowa being told how he can spend the profits that he makes on his farm.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me very briefly to make a statement?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In response to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], let me say I know of no oil company in this country that is financed almost 100 percent by the taxpayers of this country through Government contracts. There is a great difference in this case between oil companies and North American Aviation.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I do not have control of the time to yield to the gentleman from California. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has yielded to me.

I would say to the gentleman from California that this newspaper insert does not concern employment. There is not one word in it directed to the recruitment of engineers or any other kind of technician by North American Aviation. This is a promotion piece for North American Aviation paid for at the American taxpayers' expense.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa, that as usual he got a little bit confused. When I told him that some years ago we made that distinction between advertising that contributed to their business, such as advertising for engineers, that was allowable. But as to prestige advertising, it was not allowable—and this is prestige advertising.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I want to thank the gentleman for the time he has yielded to me. I would like to say to the House that this is a serious turning point, a critical crossroads in our U.S. space program.

Every Member should be very interested in what is being proposed on the funding of future programs with necessary long leadtimes to see what the U.S. directions are going to be for the future 8 to 10 years. Ours is now not merely a decision having to do with tomorrow. This is a time of basic decision on these important space programs. The first decision is, Shall we in the United States remain and compete in the space race with Russia, not only to the moon, but likewise in planetary exploration?

The world has a new competitor in the space age research and development, as well as in atomic and nuclear propulsion. China is now proceeding with the development of a rocket with nuclear propulsion. It has early become evident to Peking scientists that in order to operate successfully in space, big booster power, high energy fuels, and nuclear propulsion are necessary.

The Chinese nuclear rocket program is based upon a nuclear reactor through which passes liquid hydrogen that is stored in the rocket. This same fuel, liquid hydrogen, in circulation is also used as a coolant for the nozzle of the rocket.

The Chinese research and development programs are broad in their scope. They are proceeding with the development of a sounding rocket called Caditi for the purpose of exploring the high atmosphere for weather determination purposes. Likewise, work is being carried on in China in the province of Kwangsi not far from Vietnam on telecommunications satellites. The University of Nanking in the southern part of China is conducting training courses in various applications of rocket programs.

The Chinese space research center of Sinkiang now has programs in the study of materials necessary for space experiments. Intensive training is being given at the rocket institute in this center—Balon Roditi. Chinese research and development scientists are working on the development of rockets for long distance use in the Pacific area. Of course, there is talk of work on "far out" rocket purposes such as the rocket Kueidite, a proposed postal rocket.

The nations of the West, including Russia, should not underestimate Chinese competence in these matters and the pace of their research and development programs. Dr. Fan The Ngoc was trained at Moscow before the Chinese-Russian division. Dr. Chin San Chang directs the work of the Nuclear Institute of Peking. The director of the Institute of Physics of Peking is Dr. Wang Kan Chang. It can be seen that each of these people is of doctoral level under any world standards.

It is my belief and prediction that the Chinese will orbit the first Chinese satellite by January 1968, which will amaze many people, but not surprise me in the least. In addition, it should be seriously considered that the Chinese rocket institute—Balon Roditi—is interested in the development of rockets "for all purposes." This, of course, includes military as well as peaceful uses. Peking is not a signatory to the recent peace treaty for the peaceful uses of outer space.

The U.S. Government and the American people must be alerted to the swift progress of the Red Chinese nation in space research and development, high energy propulsion, and large boosters. Especially, the U.S. Government and the American people must realize the tremendous advances being made in the Red Chinese nuclear research field.

Under these circumstances, it is tragic to me and an ominous omen for the future that the Chinese nation is going ahead with studies and work around the clock in these fields while the United States is slowing its effort, easing up on its progress, and settling down to what has been recently called a space program crawling on its hands and knees. To longtime supporters of U.S. eminence in space, this is a tragedy of no small proportions.

The U.S.S.R., with the tremendous competence in its recent soft landing of scientific instruments on Venus, has awakened the world to see more clearly the outstanding competence of the U.S.S.R. The eyes of the world have not been opened to the strong advance of the Chinese in research and development in all fields and especially the space field and nuclear rocket propulsion, and the amazing advance in nuclear weapons that has already been made public. My warning to America is to expect these developments soon in research and development in the space programs as well as the nuclear propulsion field.

The U.S. Congress has the important decision to make whether the United States will remain in the space race for lunar and planetary exploration.

The House Science and Astronautics Committee has decided that we will remain in the race. For the Apollo program there are adequate funds in this appropriation bill for the United States to make the three-man landing on the Moon, in my estimation as the ranking Republican member of the Science and Astronautics Committee. Our committee has worked on this long and hard.

I would like to say likewise that there are adequate funds, and to me more than adequate funds, for the Apollo applications program which follows the Apollo program. Likewise I believe there are adequate funds in most of the various other NASA research and development categories.

However, I do feel that, with the Russians having just softlanded an instrument package on Venus with their Venus V program, we in the United States are tremendously behind the Russians on planetary exploration. In order to have any program at all for the United States for planetary exploration in the 1970's, NASA must now begin on what is called the Voyager program. The original NASA request was for $71.5 million. In the authorization conference with the Senate, I succeeded in getting agreement at the $42 million level for Voyager. In my House motion to recommit on June 28, 1967, I had asked for $50 million for the Voyager program and the House adopted my recommendation by a large majority.

The $36 million proposed by the Senate appropriations action is, in my opinion, the absolute minimum with which our country can even start a program for an unmanned lander to Mars by 1975. Under this very low level of funding, the originally proposed 1973 Voyager flight, according to Mr. James Webb, the Administrator of NASA, cannot be accomplished.

I strongly urge the House to reconsider before the United States is forced out of the field of planetary exploration during the 1970's. We need and must have this $36 million appropriation.

As Congress can see, unless NASA goes ahead, the United States is going to run into a blank wall in U.S. programs 3 or 4 or 5 years from now. The Members have heard me recommend valid cuts in the NASA budget, and I appreciate the House approval of so many of these cuts. It was my motion to recommit and my amendment, as amended, that deferred $201.4 million from this program, where I felt it could be cut. But I have maintained throughout that NASA should not lay up a lot of these tremendous vehicles that cannot be used before 1972, 1973, and 1974.

I believe that the House conferees shoud agree in the conference to the Senate proposal to restore $36 million for the Voyager program, $10 million for the NERVA nuclear rocket research program and $9.5 million for initial funding of the construction of nuclear rocket test stands in Nevada.

As I have consistently maintained, the future of our space program lies not in manufacturing large numbers of our present vehicles and spacecraft but rather in constantly developing newer and more efficient vehicles and craft such as the Voyager and NERVA II engine.

The Saturn V booster, as presently constituted, is based on a design which will be at least 8 to 10 years old when the vehicle is put into use. We need better fuels, more efficient engines, space storable fuels and, most importantly, very high specific impulse and long-life rocket engines. This last feature, to the best of my knowledge, can only be obtained through the nuclear propulsion route. NASA must not sacrifice tomorrow's goals by adhering to yesterday's technology. NASA must pursue the development of the NERVA II nuclear engines.

I recommend that the House conferees should not accede to the Senate request for adding $35 million to the Apollo applications program as approved by the House. You will recall the House reduced the NASA request for this program from $454 million to $300 million. This figure is more than adequate and can be maintained at the $300 level without materially affecting our total space program and, more importantly, our research and development effort for newer and better equipment.

The Apollo applications program currently calls for the use of the uprated Saturn I vehicle for its initial missions in 1969, 1970, and 1971. The original uprated Saturn I program called for the production of 12 vehicles. In addition, NASA has already initiated the procurement of long lead items for four more vehicles. I ask why are these four needed? Of the original 12 vehicles, three have been launched, one is at Cape Kennedy ready for launching, six are in storage, and the other two are in the final stages of checkout and assembly. If the Saturn V program is successful, as everyone believes it will be after all these years of development and testing, NASA will have at least seven uprated Saturn I vehicles for use on the Apollo applications program. Why then does NASA need four more? These additional four will not be delivered until calendar year 1970 and 1971, over 3 years from now. All this time, NASA will have seven Saturn I vehicles already produced and in mothballs waiting for approved missions.

I am also concerned over the NASA plan to produce uprated Saturn I vehicles which will be placed in storage for lack of timely missions. Many of the uprated Saturn I vehicles now in storage will not be used for several years after their assembly. This will most certainly cause a critical problem in reliability, in the training of launch crews with widely scattered launches, in the refurbishment of engines, seals, gaskets, and other such parts which deteriorate rapidly in storage, as well as less well understood causes of deterioration. Why is NASA continuing the production line when the end product goes to storage? Why does not NASA store the production line itself until the items are needed?

The same situation will hold true for Saturn V vehicles and spacecraft to be used in the Apollo application program. NASA will have, I assure you, as many as five to seven surplus Saturn V vehicles and Apollo spacecraft from the Apollo lunar landing program which can be used without producing a single additional vehicle or spacecraft.

NASA, in its original request for Apollo applications, included over $267 million for launch vehicles and spacecraft in its total request of $454 million. The House reduction of $154 million still left, at the very minimum, over $110 million for vehicles and spacecraft even if the entire House reduction was taken in this one area.

I would also like to point out to the House that the Apollo applications program, as presently constituted, is developing more and more into a "blue sky" science program. Where the Congress was told initially that this program would be primarily earth oriented in inventorying and identifying earth resources, it now develops that the currently planned Apollo applications missions are primarily oriented toward launching an orbital workshop and a solar telescope. In these critical times of financial deficits, I find it difficult to see how the Congress can agree to the addition of funds to the Apollo applications program to carry out missions which could well be deferred a year or more without any damage to our space effort.

I consider the nuclear rocket program to be the most important propulsion effort that the United States has initiated since the start of the Saturn V rocket program. It is necessary that Congress provide funds to develop the NERVA II nuclear rocket at 200,000 pounds of thrust, rather than reduce the program to where NASA can proceed only with the smaller NERVA I system. If the funding level is held to the House figures, NASA will develop an engine of only one-third of the required thrust cabability.

The Senate approved $56.6 million for research and development for this item and that is the figure that I recommend that the House agree to. The reasons are simple. The space program is committed now to using the Saturn V as the basic boost vehicle. Its original capability for lifting a lunar capsule was 95,000 pounds. It has been uprated to the point where it can now lift 100,000 pounds, which is about the limit that can be obtained from product improvement. Any additional mission capability must come from the upper stages.

Additionally, in the Apollo manned capsules there has been an increase in weight of 8,500 pounds since the design was firmed up in 1964. There has been a 3,000-pound increase since the Apollo fire. NASA is now at the limit of its capability for the current configuration and the total payload is approaching the 100,000-pound limit which will leave no margin of safety. I use this bit of history to show what the weight increases are likely to do in future space work. Why, then, limit the United States to a costly development of the smaller NERVA I engine which takes about the same time period to develop and at only slightly lower total cost, when a much larger thrust requirement is almost certain to develop in the near future? To develop an item that is known to be inadequate for future needs is shortsighted waste. I strongly feel that the United States should never again be caught with inadequate boost capability.

I have always strongly supported research and development. I suggest that NASA apply the moneys saved from the Saturn I production and apply it to this work. The NERVA II rocket which doubles the payload capability of the Saturn V also provides a maneuver capability, a start-stop capability and later recovery of the engine for subsequent use. I recommend that the House conferees accept the more progressive and forward looking position by accepting the Senate figure for nuclear engine research and development.

The nuclear test stands in Nevada will then require funds for their construction. NASA's original request was for $22.5 million of which $3 million was for designing the facility. This $3 million is provided in the facility planning and design line item.

The Senate figure is the total amount, $19.5 million required for construction only. I recommend that these construction funds be reduced $10 million agreeing to an appropriation of $9.5 million. This amount is all that NASA can utilize this year since these test stands have not yet been designed.

As I have stated before, the Voyager program represents the only major planetary program this Nation will have in the 1970's. In view of the recent spectacular success of the Russians with the Venus 4 lander, I find it difficult to understand any reluctance to provide at least a minimum level of funding to keep the Voyager program alive. The President's Science Advisory Committee's report on the "Space Program in the Post-Apollo Period" gave unequivocal endorsement and the highest priority to planetary exploration after the lunar landing and strongly recommended an expanded commitment to the Voyager project in fiscal year 1968.

The Soviet Union has launched planetary spacecraft to Venus and Mars at virtually every opportunity since 1960. We must not place this country in the position of relinquishing its position in this important area.

NASA originally requested $71.5 million to fund the initial portions of the Voyager program in this fiscal year. When Mr. Webb, the Administrator of NASA, was asked as to what could he do with a level of $40 million, he replied that he would have to forgo a launch in 1973 to Mars and prepare, at a rock-bottom effort, for a landing in 1975. This less than desirable level inherent in the $36 million proposed by the Senate will still permit NASA to proceed with investigating critical areas of technology such as propulsion, fuel tankage, data storage and transmission systems, life and cycle tests on power systems, science photographic systems, and other areas.

In summary, I oppose the addition at this time of further funds for the Apollo applications program for the reasons I have just given. This Apollo applications program which has many vehicles in storage without approved missions and which does not intend to fly missions until the 1970's should certainly be able to more than get along with the $300 million the House appropriated at this time.

I strongly recommend that there be continued research and development on the nuclear engine by approving addition of $10 million for nuclear rockets and $9.5 million for the nuclear rocket test stand construction. And, finally, I feel that it is imperative that Congress live up to its full responsibility for U.S. planetary research by the U.S. Congress including $36 million for the Voyager program.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it seems to be an appropriate time to review the status of the authorization and appropriation of funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1968. Detailed hearings have been held by the Committee on Science and Astronautics in the House of Representatives and its counterpart in the other body. The views of the Members of the House and the other body have been thoroughly aired in discussion of the authorization legislation. The House Appropriations Committee has reported on the floor of this House and this House has accepted the bill proposed by our Appropriations Committee.

The appropriations conference has met and reached agreement only on the administrative operations portion of this bill and will now return to the Senate for addtional conferences. Over half a billion dollars has been cut from the NASA budget request for fiscal year 1968. It is now time that we reach an agreement on the NASA appropriation. One-third of the fiscal year 1968 is already behind us. For NASA to conduct an orderly program, it is necessary that we reach an agreement at the earliest possible time.

The Apollo program, to land and safely return a man from the moon in this decade, is already regaining momentum from the tragic accident of this past January. The Apollo Applications program, to gain a maximum return on the investment which we are making in the space program, has now reached the point of hardware development. The Voyager program, to maintain an orderly and forward looking unmanned planetary exploration program, has been proposed by NASA. This is further supported by the NASA proposal to undertake the development of NERVA II, a nuclear rocket stage, to assure us of the propulsion capability for manned and unmanned capabilities in the 1970's.

NASA will be hard pressed to achieve a lunar landing in this decade. In fact, it is my assessment that NASA likely has less than a 50-50 chance of achieving a manned lunar landing and return in this decade. For the fiscal situation for 1968 to continue in the way that it stands today is a disservice to NASA and to the Nation. It is time that we stopped dragging our feet.

Both the Voyager and NERVA II programs have been deleted by the House in this year's budget. The Apollo applications program has been reduced by over $150,000,000 by the House. Today, by actions on the floor, an additional cut of $20,000,000 in administrative operations as proposed by the other body has been accepted in the House. All of these actions pose major management problems to NASA. The sooner final action can be taken on this bill, the sooner the final shape and form of our national space effort for the ensuing several years can be established.

I must remind my colleagues that today just as in previous years we still remain in competition as a world power with the Soviet bloc. Their achievement of less than a week ago of a soft landing of a vehicle on the surface of Venus only strengthens my conviction that this is not only a competition for scientific achievement, but also a competition involving our national security. The actions which have occurred in the Congress since January of this year with respect to Apollo applications, planetary programs, and development of manned applications as well as new propulsion capability, have been weakened. We must look with concern to our future position in space. To some extent, this represents an insufficient effort on the part of NASA and industry to acquaint the general public with the full import of our national space program. I have spoken out on this issue before and have been critical of both NASA and the industry in not bringing the story of the national space program to our general public.

I must commend North American Aviation for their recent publication in several of the leading newspapers of the United States in bringing the Apollo program to the direct attention of the general public. The supplemental section which North American Aviation published in several of these newspapers, at their own expense, represents an excellent example of the fact that the story of this complex and important program, Apollo, can be brought to the general public.

However, if the story of the national space program is adequately presented to the American public, I am convinced that it will receive the support that is necessary to assure that we will be second to none in space. As I have said before, space is much like the high seas. If we wish to maintain this sphere of activity for the use of all people it will be necessary for us to develop and maintain our capability in space utilization and exploration. I call upon all of the Members of the House to consider not only this year but also in the years immediately ahead when the space program will require courageous support to assure that adequate funds are provided to gain the return on the large investment which we have already made that awaits us in the space program. This we must do for the good of our country.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I am, as is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], distressed to hear that funds for Voyager have been eliminated from this appropriations bill. It is my understanding that $36 million was proposed by the Senate and not agreed to by the House.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNING. So there is no funding for Voyager?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in this particular set up we have in the House, we will give no funds at all for Voyager and cancel all planetary exploration in 1973 and 1975 to Venus and Mars.

Mr. DOWNING. That means we will have no on-going program in outer space.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is the end of the interplanetary programs for America. We are dropping out of the space race.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. Certainly with more than $4.5 billion we are not discontinuing the space program.

Mr. Speaker, we have not reached the moon and we have not safely returned a man to earth yet with the Apollo program. The Apollo program is being continued. The Apollo applications program is being continued. Some feel there is too much money provided for these programs and that there is some cushion in funds that may be available for other purposes.

As the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out, there is authority for the administrator to transfer funds in research from one program to another as the Administrator may in his judgment feel is in the best interests of the United States. If he feels that Voyager is of sufficient importance and of high priority he can ask for reprograming of research funds for this purpose.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the gentleman to say the Administrator can do that. He can transfer funds?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. If he shows that to the Congress that it is desirable to do so, yes. He can determine which is of the highest priority and importance and of the greatest interest to the United States. The reprograming procedure is available.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my distinguished friend the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Virginia, that it has been made clear on the floor today that insofar as this committee is concerned, any reprograming effort on the part of the administration will be very carefully considered. I think because of the cushion we think is in here already and because of that reprograming authority, they can take care of all needs within the limits of the appropriations that will be available if the action proposed today is approved.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, that whereas this is not a new program, the plans were laid long ago, and the NASA facilities in charge of it, have manned the program accordingly. It means that many people may have to be discharged from their present positions. Certainly none of us wishes this to happen if it can be prevented. If this cut persists I hope the administration will consider transfering sufficient funds to keep this program going.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The Voyager program is at least 6 years away, and it would cost an estimated $2.3 billion. The gentleman is speaking about a new program with expenditures in excess of $2 billion for a beyond-the-moon program. Confronted with a budgetary situation as we are, it was the feeling of our committee that this new and costly program could be deferred and delayed.

I want to say that I do not personally oppose the Voyager program, or the nuclear programs. I am impressed with the possibilities that these programs may offer and perhaps sometime in the future a more modest funding for them can get underway.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time because I should like to pose a question to the chairman of the subcommittee, and the same question to the ranking minority member.

In his opening remarks the chairman of the subcommittee said that there were desirable projects and there were essential projects; that they were cutting out those projects they felt were not essential. That does not mean they are prejudiced against the desirable projects, if and when we can afford them?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Not at all. Many members of the committee feel that the Voyager program would develop scientific information of great value to the country.

It relates to exploration flights to Venus and Mars which possibly will be of great scientific value to the country in the future. We are not prejudiced against these programs. We just do not believe they are of the highest priority and essential at this time.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. To make the legislative history, then, if NASA—within these funds which the Appropriations Committee members who were on the conference committee from the House, on both sides have provided—can go ahead, we would like for NASA to go ahead with the Voyager programs, to keep us in the planetary exploration field; and, second, we would like for them to go ahead with the NERVA II nuclear engine program; and, third, we would like for them to go ahead with the ordering of four more Saturn 1–B's so that the lines will not close down on the making of the Saturn 1–B's. That would mean, within these funds, we would like these programs which have been proposed by the President to go ahead. If they can, as the gentleman has said, by the transfer of funds get that fine result, all well and good; we are for it; is that right?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The conferees cannot commit the authorizing committees of the House and Senate as to what they may do by way of reprograming. No action can be taken on funds until reprograming is considered.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed that Project Voyager has been deleted from the fiscal year 1968 NASA appropriations bill, as reported back by the conference committee. Earlier the House Appropriations Committee had eliminated funding for the Voyager program, but I had been hopeful that the conference report would restore at least some life to this extremely important interplanetary exploration effort.

Only last week the Soviet Union demonstrated, with her soft landing of an instrumentation package on Venus, that she is proceeding massively with Voyager-type programs.

In my mind the Nation, is today, setting the stage for another expensive catch-up effort, because I cannot believe that we are willing, as a nation, to give up the exploration of the next great frontier, interplanetary space, by default.

Voyager gave us the opportunity to proceed on a cost-effective basis, but I am afraid that this opportunity may now be lost.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, NASA funding this year has been a long and complicated process. Various actions have been taken with varying degrees of soundness. I am on record as having favored reductions in NASA's budget which I believed to be desirable. As the months have worn on, many Members, not previously disposed to limit NASA's appropriations, have chosen to support cuts on the basis of the attitude of economy with which all budget questions are now being faced. Unfortunately, this has led to some cuts which are less fortuitous than others. I refer, in particular, to the attitude which has emerged toward cutting new programs because they are new and leaving on-going programs alone because they are on-going. This might seem reasonable in a vacuum, but it does not work out or mean precisely what it is expected to mean when careful consideration is given to NASA's program.

For example, the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences deleted the Voyager program on this basis, and the House Appropriations Committee followed suit. The Senate Appropriations Committee has now recommended that $36 million be restored of the $71.5 million requested in order to get this program under way. Although I am in favor of reducing NASA's budget where reasonable, Voyager is not really a good place to do it. Whereas the Voyager program may appear to be new, it is announced with a new title and new procurement plans, unmanned space exploration is not at all new to our space program. Voyager, which is the plan to conduct unmanned interplanetary space probes, is simply carrying out what has perhaps been the most beneficial portion of our space program to date. Unmanned space flight is far less costly than manned space flight since there is no requirement to put astronaut safety before scientific experiment and does not, therefore, need the advanced life-support systems or extensive safety measures necessary when men are an integral part of the mission. The bulk of the scientific benefits received so far from our efforts in space has been in unmanned missions, such as the discovery of the Van Allen radiation belt—a discovery of tremendous importance—which was made on a mission estimated to have cost in the neighborhood of $1 million.

It is my belief that greater emphasis at this time should be placed on unmanned space exploration, with an insistence that direct scientific experimentation be the primary aim in order to derive the greatest benefits for America and for all of mankind. The more glamorous manned space flight should be pursued in a more orderly fashion than it has to date. At the least, a good mix should be sought in which scientific experiments are the primary aim, and men are included only when their presence is deemed to contribute significantly to the scientific goals of the mission. The President's Science Advisory Committee recognized this problem very well in their report of February 1967 and stated as follows:

> The Nation can choose any one of several different levels of space effort. The program can be extremely ambitious and press rapidly forward with manned exploration of the planets, or can be less expensive and emphasize a larger proportion of unmanned missions in near earth space; the choice must depend on evaluation of the direct and indirect benefits . . . we believe that man should be used in space flight only when his presence contributes in an important way to the exploratory and scientific objectives.

At another point the report stated:

> We recomend a. That a far more intensive effort be carried out to examine the applicability of satelite technology to the missions of all the Federal agencies. Such studies should take into account not only technological possibilities but the benefits, economic and others which might be derived from satellite technology as compared with other methods. For many purposes, it would appear that unmanned satellites are the preferred way to meet such possible requirements.
>
> b. That, whether the proposed space application systems are manned or unmanned, a reasonably clear case of potential utility must be made, which includes an assessment of potential economic benefit, before significant development costs are assumed. . . . We must emphasize that a great deal of space technology has passed the point where the demonstration of mere feasibility of a particular space application has any technological or prestige significance.
>
> c. That, before a manned earth resources survey is included in the Apollo Applications Program, detailed cost-benefit studies be completed which treat manned versus unmanned methods for accomplishing these tasks.

I think the President's Science Advisory Committee spoke extremely wisely when it made these recommendations, and Congress in its effort to limit Federal spending should profit from these informed opinions. In the long run an investment in Voyager may save a great deal of money, whereas the Apollo applications program—while billed as an "on-going program," is an effort to keep the Apollo manned space flight program alive by devising new ways to make use of Apollo hardware. As the PSAC has pointed out, and as I and others have pointed out during recent months, the Apollo applications program is, as yet, largely a concept about how to continue the present emphasis on manned space flight—regardless of the cost—and has yet to be presented in the kind of detail—with mission schedules, expected accomplishments and benefits, and long-range cost projections that should be an absolute requirement before Congress votes to invest enormous funds in boosters and other long lead-time items of hardware which will commit us to the program by the sheer amount of money spent. Therefore, it should be clear that the House recommendation that the Apollo applications program be limited to $300 million should be held fast. My own recommendation has been that the appropriation for Apollo applications be limited even further until such time as NASA presents a clear cost-benefit picture as a basis for congressional decisionmaking. But at the least the House-recommended $300 million should stand firm, and no more funds should be added for this program at this time.

Another, and perhaps the most important item under consideration, is the Senate recommendation that $10 million be added to the appropriation for the NERVA II nuclear rocket program and that $19.5 million be added for construction of test stands at the nuclear rocket development station, which is for the purpose of flight testing the NERVA II nuclear rocket engine. These are two halves of the same question and should be jointly considered. I have gone into this issue in great detail in recent months and will only try to summarize the situation today. If we consider the premise that Congress should seek proper evaluation of the costs and benefits of manned space flight, it will be clear why NERVA is such an important item from the point of view of limiting NASA's appropriation. The NERVA II nuclear engine is proposed by NASA for one sole purpose—even though it is not yet technically proven that this engine is necessary for the intended purpose—to place an astronaut on the planet Mars. The House has deleted a far less costly unmanned probe of Mars in the proposed Voyager program, and should insist upon its disagreement to the recommendation of the Senate to restore funds for a manned Mars mission—which has not been agreed to as a national goal—and is conservatively estimated to cost upward of $200 billion in a mere 18 years.

The NERVA engine program has been going on for a number of years, and technology studies have been nearing completion. Thus the program was phasing down. NASA's original budget request of $46.5 million was intended to continue the phasing down of these technology studies. This knowledge will not disappear, and will be available should we decide to pursue it. However, NASA, prior to congressional consideration of the budget, submitted an amended budget proposal asking for additional funds to initiate no further studies, but the development of actual flight hardware so that the NERVA II engine could be built and put into use. This is a long-term project which is estimated to cost upward of $2 billion in the next 8 years. There is no doubt that after $2 billion is spent in building this engine and testing it on the test stands at the Nuclear Rocket Development Station for which the $19.5 million of construction funds is proposed by the Senate, there will be tremendous pressure to go ahead and justify the expense by using the engine. Needless to say, other developments are taking place so rapidly that many experts expect that the NERVA II engine may be obsolete by the time its proposed date of use comes around. These experts point out that it is also not yet clear that the engine will have all the benefits expected.

But NASA is anxious to get this program underway before serious questions are raised about it so that another major manned space goal will become a reality and NASA may be assured of maximum funds with which to operate. Although I can appreciate this desire on the part of NASA, my concern for the welfare of this Nation, the finiteness of our budget, the need for a careful examination of national priorities and, in particular, the need for rational long-range planning and a sensible allocation of resources within the space program lead me to feel this would be an unwise decision for Congress to make at this time. It is a luxury which we can ill-afford when an unmanned mission is a reasonable alternative and would, as far as we know, benefit us as much or more. I believe we can well defer this item.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note that the Senate recommended, and the House will be asked to concur, a reduction in the funds for Administrative Operations by $20 million. I have argued extensively that administrative operations funds must in the future be presented to Congress in such a way that it will be possible for Congress to determine the allocation of these funds to the various programs they are intended to support. This has not been done to date and is one of the reasons why Congress has not been able to determine the actual cost of a given program in NASA's budget. I argued further that in line with this principal administrative operations funds could and should be cut by an amount roughly equivalent to cuts in research and development programs in order to carry out and insist upon the relationship which exists between the two and which ought to be spelled out for Congress as it funds programs and makes decisions about the distribution of resources. Since research funds have been reduced from the original request, it is reasonable that administrative funds be reduced as well. I commend the conferees for this action.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted and that I be permitted to extend my own remarks and to include in the RECORD a table reflecting the appropriations for the NASA program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 1: On Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out "$3,890,500,000" and insert "$3,995,500,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$3,909,500,000".

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this relates to the increase in appropriations for research and development.

Within the overall amount of $3,909,500,000—I repeat, $3,909,500,000 for research and development—consideration can be given to the Voyager program or to any other research program in which the administrator is interested, provided reprograming is approved by the appopiate committees of the Congress.

We believe that with the more than $4.5 billion provided in this conference report, a viable space program can and will be maintained and continued.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY], a member of the Space Committee, who is interested in the Voyager program, since we are considering research and development under the Voyager program.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is making a great mistake in this conference report on the appropriations for NASA, when it cuts out the moneys for the Voyager, interplanetary flight to Mars. At a time when our chief competitors in space, the Soviet Union, is making spectacular advances in its interplanetary exploration program, the House of Representatives proposes to ax completely the similar planetary programs of the United States.

It has occurred to many of us who are interested in space, that the very spectacular achievement of the Soviet Union in its soft landing recently on Venus should have convinced the House Appropriations Committee members to have at least partially funded the Voyager program.

The Soviet Union is putting a great deal more emphasis and more money in its planetary programs than we are. In fact, from the action of the House today, we have insured that the Soviets will leave us far behind in this very important program. At a time when they are pressing ahead, we are cutting back. We are leaving Russia as the sole occupant of interplanetary space.

It is inconceivable to me how House Members can forget the enormous worldwide impact of Sputnik I. Russia got into space ahead of us, both in unmanned and manned space flights. It took years and years of enormous spending and crash programs to catch up with the Russians and to convince the people of the world that we were not a second rate scientific nation, at least in the field of space.

In this action of the House on this conference report, we are repeating all over again the mistakes of yesteryear. Under the guise of economy, we are letting Russia forge ahead of us in space efforts. This is false economy. Again, I predict that in the 1970's when Russia makes flights to Mars and we have no programs at all going to that planet, that Members of this House will take the floor and blame whoever is in charge at that time for their shortsightedness and for not going ahead with these planetary missions. However, those who are in the House today and who will be in the House in the 1970's and seek to point fingers at people for shortsightedness will have only themselves to point at.

Here today, we are cutting out completely, the interplanetary flight programs for the 1970's. We will have no planetary missions in the decade ahead.

A great scientific nation cannot afford to fail to meet the competition in interplanetary space flight. I sincerely hope the House of Representatives will reconsider this ill-advised action next year.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader of the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I should like the gentleman from Tennessee to clarify the parliamentary situation we are now facing.

Do I understand by his motion that we are insisting on the House figure?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct, with the exception of the $10 million increase in research and development. This is brought about by reason of the testimony on the tracking facilities. It was said that because of our commitments and our contracts around the world we did not have enough funds to pay for tracking. Also, when the big booster shots are fired and the astronauts are in space, for reasons of safety we may need more money for tracking. We are standing firm in our reductions in research except for the $10,000,000 increase for tracking. The House yields to the Senate position for this amount.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. But in any case the total amount is less than the budgeted figure in the first instance?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. That is correct. We are over one-half billion dollars below the budget.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask one other question? Under this amendment we would be going along with an additional $10 million over and above the House figure for tracking. How much below the Senate figure does the amendment provide for research and development and what is the amount in the amendment for research and development overall?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The Senate increased the House figure for research and development by $96,000,000. We have agreed only to the $10,000,000 increase for tracking. We are recommending a cut and reduction of $86,000,000 in the R and D item.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And the House would be restoring $10 million of that remainder for the tracking if we stand firm?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. When we were considering this research and development fund, I would like to emphasize for the House, it is better for the future of the space program that we emphasize very hard research and development. If we do not, we are freezing the state of the art in space right now where we are. We will have the astronauts flying vehicles that have been in storage for 5 to 8 years on old designs. Therefore we must look into things like the solid fuel prime booster for the Saturn V and Apollo programs. Also on the second stage we should have liquid and high-energy fuel research on boron and fluorine and these caustic liquids.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We are not freezing research, I will say to the gentleman, or the space program. We are recommending an appropriation of $4,573,400,000 which includes $3,909,500,000 for research in space alone. If this conference report is adopted there will be $4,573,400,000 for the space program for 1968, so we are not freezing the research program on the space program at all, I will assure the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. May I add one more point?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman has made his point clear.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I have challenged NASA on the floor of the House for wasting $400 million because of poor scheduling. I have had no reply to that, nor has any Member challenged the statement that on Saturn V, by going down to two in a year's production in the years 1971 and 1972, they will cost over $120 million apiece, while if they will make them at the rate of four a year, their cost will be $93 million apiece. If they make six on Saturn V's, they will cost only $63 million apiece. NASA, by its scheduling, is wasting money at the rate of $400 million overall on the Saturn V program. Again I challenge them and ask them to revise their scheduling. Again I ask for them to revise their scheduling so as to save this money.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 2: On page 2, line 12, strike "$35,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$55,400,000".

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, with reference to this amendment we are urging that the House insist on its position with request to construction. If the research and development funds are not provided for phase II of the NERVA program, funds for construction of the test stands will not be required. Construction appropriations have been reduced corresponding to appropriations for research. We feel that NASA can sustain those reductions and continue with ongoing and important space research and exploration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman from Tennessee has a motion to offer.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL TUNNELS AND BRIDGES IN MARYLAND

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 948 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 948

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11627) to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple resolution, making in order what I understand to be a very simple bill. To the best of my knowledge there is no opposition except one opponent to the bill or the resolution. However, in the interest of time and, actually, on behalf of the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] who was to have handled the rule, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, during the legislative progress of H.R. 11627 through this House—first in the Public Works Committee, then in the Rules Committee—I have spoken out in opposition to one of the bridges authorized by this legislation; the bridge parallel to the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge. I have sought to delete the authorization for this bridge from the bill.

I would now like to present the case against the parallel bay bridge on the floor of this House. I realize that I have no chance to win on the issue of deleting the parallel bay bridge from this bill. The dean of the Maryland delegation is chief sponsor of H.R. 11627, and he is also chairman of the powerful Public Works Committee. All of us who know the political facts of life know what I am up against.

My purpose in taking my fight against the parallel bay bridge to the floor is to bring out certain facts about the bridge for the benefit of my colleagues in this House; for the benefit of the Senators who will soon consider this bill; and for the benefit of the voters of Maryland who decisively rejected the parallel bay bridge in a referendum only last November.

The necessity for congressional action on a bill authorizing the construction of bridges and tunnels in Maryland, according to the Public Works Committee report, stems from two technical requirements:

First. Because the bridges in this group were partly authorized by an act preceding the General Bridge Act of 1946, in which Congress delegated to the States the power to permit construction of bridges over navigable waters; and

Second. Because new structures authorized by this bill will participate in the financial pooling of revenue established by the original act.

However, Maryland officials are interpreting congressional endorsement of this legislation, which includes the parallel bay bridge, not as the technicality which is its only justification, but as ringing approval of their own insistence on a project that the people who voted them into office had rejected.

Therefore I urge my colleagues to look beyond technicalities before deciding on the value of H.R. 11627. Because the implications and significance of the parallel bay bridge are not mere technicalities—not to the people of Maryland who will use these bridges and who rejected the parallel bay bridge—not to the Maryland State officials who have so assiduously pushed the parallel bay bridge, and not to the Federal Government, which may have to finance the approach roads to the bridge. Construction of the parallel bay bridge will determine State and Federal expenditures for highways in Maryland for years to come.

If the parallel bay bridge is built, at least $50 million will be needed for an Arundel Expressway to speed Baltimore area residents to the parallel bay bridge. Millions more will be needed for a new Kent Narrows Bridge, which is a small drawbridge on the approach road to the Chesapeake Bay Bridge that is lifted up to 50 times daily on busy summer weekends; and for a new Choptank River Bridge, another narrow bridge on the vacation route to the parallel bay bridge.

I would also like to call my colleagues' attention to actual traffic figures for the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge, and economic and financial data about the projected parallel bridge.

The existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge is now carrying only half its rated capacity of 8.5 million cars a year.

Traffic on the existing bridge failed to make any real gains between 1963 and 1965 because of the opening of other toll facilities.

The existing bay bridge is congested on only a few summer weekends during the year.

Simple and inexpensive methods of easing such infrequent congestion—for example, increasing toll booth facilities, and eliminating approach-road bottlenecks—have yet to be introduced by the State roads commission. In fact, I believe it is fair to say that they want all the congestion they can get so they can make a case for another parallel bridge. Each time they get a little congestion there they have photographers swarming all over the place trying to get pictures of it.

If a bridge were built in the Baltimore area first, it would provide better service to the 60 percent of the Maryland population living in the metropolitan area. It would expand the port frontage, attract new industry and population, and build up the economy of Maryland generally.

These bonuses cannot be claimed for a bridge alongside of a bridge which can give greater convenience on only a few summer weekends, and mostly to out-of-State motorists.

Contrary to the claims of the Maryland State Roads Commission, the parallel bridge will not be paid for by tolls of the people who cross it. Interest and amortization on the second bridge will cost $4 million to $5 million a year, and at a $1 toll will require an extra 4 to 5 million cars annually.

Yet the State roads commission figures show that the extra traffic using this second bridge will still be far below this figure, even by 1985. The parallel bay bridge will therefore have to be paid for by the people who use other toll facilities—the Susquehanna Bridge, the Potomac Bridge, and the Harbor Tunnel.

That is why they have to come to the Congress because they have to have the revenue from these other toll facilities, including the existing bridge and the Potomac River Bridge which is across interstate waters. This requires them to come from congressional authorization.

If they were just content to let that bridge be paid for by the people who cross it, they would not have to come to the Congress for money at all—at least that is their claim.

If the parallel bridge—and a second harbor tunnel—were not built, and it is very interesting to note that this has been overlooked at all times in all of the arguments, if these are not built, all of these toll facilities in the State would become free to motorists in 3½ years under the State law automatically.

Maryland voters have been told again and again that the advice of experts should determine which bridge should be built first, and where, and that the advice of these experts should supersede the wishes of the votes as expresesd in referendum.

The records of these so-called experts give some index to measure the value of their advice.

Estimates of traffic and revenue on the proposed parallel bay bridge were made by the traffic consulting firm of

Coverdale & Colpitts. I have discovered eight major projects on which this firm made gross overestimations in traffic and revenue—including two bridges in Maryland, the Potomac River Bridge and the Susquehanna River Bridge. These eight projects have a total value of three-quarters of a billion dollars, or 15 percent of Coverdale & Colpitts' entire business.

In addition to the Maryland bridges, this firm's six other blunders include two bridges in Michigan; and toll projects in Illinois, West Virginia, Massachusetts, and Kansas. Three of the projects are in default on interest payments to bondholders. A fourth is paying interest out of borrowed money. In the fifth and sixth projects, tolls had to be raised sharply in an attempt to make up for traffic deficiencies. Even with higher tolls, revenue is still below the firm's predictions.

The main motive behind this drive for a parallel bridge is not the economic merits of the project but the millions of dollars to be made from fees and land speculation.

The Governor—and now listen to this—along with eight business and political associates, owns land on the approach to and very near the proposed parallel span. Last year, when his ownership was discovered, he promised in a rather emotional statement to sell his share and give any profits to charity. Repeated public prodding has only just now succeeded in getting a definite action to sell this property. Whatever happens to the profits of his share though, and keep this in mind, eight business and political associates of the Governor, of course, still own the remainder of this land and still stand to profit from this parallel bridge.

More questionable than the record of Coverdale and Colpitts is that of the J. E. Greiner Co., the consulting engineers who recommended the parallel bridge and have just been given a cost-plus contract—although I thought those things went out with World War II—under which the higher the costs, the higher the profits, to design and supervise construction of this bridge—a bridge duplicative of the present bridge, which was designed by this same firm.

This same firm can draw on the designs which they originally used to build the bridge and which ought to be of some value in building the parallel bridge.

In Pennsylvania, in 1957, after two Greiner officials were indicted on a charge of conspiracy to defraud the turnpike commission of millions of dollars, the commission dismissed the Greiner Co. as consulting engineers and brought a $7.7 million civil negligence suit against the firm. The Greiner Co. had recommended a program, of drilling and filling minefields, for which the State was billed over $7 million, but which—State mine officials testified—should have cost only $82,900, or 1 percent. Five State officials, including the chairman of the turnpike commission, went to jail. The two indicted Greiner officials escaped conviction, but the Greiner Co. paid the turnpike commission to settle the civil suit out of court.

In Florida in 1965, a grand jury ruled that fees charged by the J.E. Greiner Co. for engineering and design of the Tampa Airport were "unduly excessive" by $907,000, or 37 percent.

In Pennsylvania and New Jersey, in 1956, the J. E. Greiner Co., as consulting engineers to the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, was found to have authorized illegal payments of $181,000 in public funds to commission members and employees. In addition, Greiner officials authorized additional payments of public money for extravagant parties and pleasure trips to Las Vegas and other cities.

For example, a $4,000 set of china which was made by the same firm with which the chairman of the commission was connected was bought from that firm for entertaining, and a gal was hired and put on the rolls for secretarial services, though she was simply a nightclub entertainer known as TNT From Gay Paree.

So doubtful was the chairman of the Maryland State Roads Commission that his contract with Greiner for the parallel bridge could withstand public scrutiny that he long delayed making this document available. I had one heck of a time getting hold of it. I have just been able to obtain a copy, but only after the contract was signed and delivered, and even then only after one of my assistants prodded the chairman's office for 3 days running.

This cost-plus contract gives Greiner every incentive to squander public money because the firm will not only be reimbursed for all of its payroll expenses on this project but will receive in addition an amount equal to 101 percent of these expenses.

In summary, the building of a parallel bay bridge would be a tremendous economic and financial mistake for Maryland and its people, who would be paying for this blunder through extra tolls for years to come. I have briefly described the history of miscalculation, negligence, land speculation, and plain incompetence surrounding this bridge and the consultants and the Governor who recommended it. The need for a parallel bridge is far from proven, and the black marks against it so many and varied, that the House would be wise not to authorize its construction at this time. During the reading of H.R. 11627 for amendments, therefore, I shall offer an amendment to strike the parallel bay bridge authorization from this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In his previous remarks, the gentleman made some reference to the interest of the taxpayers' or the people of the Nation generally in this matter. Is this proposed bridge going to cost the Federal taxpayers, the taxpayers of all the country, any money now or in the future?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Not directly, but indirectly. In the first place, it will cost the toll taxpayer. They are merely taxpayers who are paying sums out of a different pocket, anywhere from $70 million to $100 million, depending on its cost. But in addition, there will be scores of millions of dollars worth of approach roads and bridges which will have to be built to service this road which would not necessarily otherwise have to be built if a bridge were built in another area.

So this is of great significance to the Federal taxpayer.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. In connection with the matter of approach roads. Approach roads would have to be built regardless of where the bridge is built; is that not correct?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Not necessarily.

Mr. MORTON. In Kent County there are no road systems that would now handle or support any reasonable amount of traffic across the proposed bridge?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I agree with the gentleman entirely. If a bridge is built in another area, roads would have to be built. The Governor and the State road commission have consistently maintained that only the northern approach would require approach roads. Now it turns out that already a $60 million Arundel Expressway is being projected for the parallel bridge, if the parallel bridge goes through.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 331]

Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bell
Blatnik
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Clark
Conyers
Corman
Davis, Wis.
Dent
Diggs
Donohue
Dwyer
Edwards, Calif.
Farbstein
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gibbons
Goodell
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Horton
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Long, La.
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Martin
Mathias, Md.
Mosher
Multer
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Pepper
Philbin
Pickle
Pool
Purcell
Rarick
Resnick
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Schwengel
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stephens
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Utt
Watson
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wright
Wydler
Zablocki

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling] has ably stated, House Resolution 948 provides for the consideration of H.R. 11627 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 11627 is to allow the State of Maryland to construct and operate four bridges or tunnels across the Chesapeake Bay, a navigable waterway.

In 1938 and 1948 Federal legislation was enacted to provide for construction of the current bridges and tunnels. Since a navigable waterway is involved, Federal approval must be obtained by the State. Present and future needs require additional crossings.

No Federal cost is anticipated. Costs will be borne by the State, which will recover its costs through tolls.

The Maryland General Assembly, in its recently completed session, approved the four crossings covered by this legislation. Maryland is ready to go to work. No Federal agency, the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of the Budget, or the Department of Transportation has any objections, though Transportation takes no position on two of the proposed crossings, saying it has not had enough time to study them. There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule. I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11627) to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 11627, with Mr. Joelson in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 11627 would authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland. The purpose of the bill is to allow the State of Maryland to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge parallel to the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge from a point in Anne Arundel County at or near Sandy Point to a point in Queen Annes County at or near Kent Island; a bridge across or a tunnel under the Chesapeake Bay from a point in Baltimore County at or near Millers Island to a point in Kent County, or a combined bridge and tunnel at such locaton; a bridge across or a tunnel under the Chesapeake Bay from a point in Calvert County to a point in Dorchester County, or a combined bridge and tunnel at such location; and an additional tunnel under or a bridge across the Patapsco River from a point at or near Hawkins Point in the city of Baltimore to a point at or near Sparrows Point in Baltimore County.

This legislation was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works. It is needed and necessary legislation and is purely technical in nature, allowing the State of Maryland to build these additional structures.

I might point out to the Members that there is no cost to the Federal Government involved in the enactment of H.R. 11627. The entire total financial obligation will be borne by the State.

The Maryland Legislature in its last session enacted into law the authorizing legislation for the additional bridge structures and the tunnel contemplated under the terms of the bill we are considering today. The approval for these additional bridges and tunnel by the Maryland Legislature was overwhelming in both houses.

This is purely and simply a State matter insofar as the actual construction, location, and determination of the bridges and tunnel are concerned. I might point out that under the Federal-aid highway program, which came into being in 1956, the question of the actual location and the site for highway construction must be initiated and approved by the States before there can be any Federal participation in the highway program. Thus, under our great highway program we gave to the States the initiative as far as location and construction of roads and bridges are concerned, and this is completely similar to the legislation we have before us today and the authority the State of Maryland would have under this bill.

In 1938 the Congress approved an act—52 Stat. 205—which authorized the State of Maryland to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River within the State of Maryland and a bridge across the Potomac River from a point in Charles County, Md., to a point approximately opposite in the State of Virginia. The first mentioned bridge is entirely within the confines of the State of Maryland. The bridge across the Potomac River connects Maryland with Virginia and is an interstate bridge.

In 1946 Congress enacted the General Bridge Act which gave congressional consent, subject to certain Federal agency approval, to bridges and tunnels across navigable waters within the States. This general approval did not, however, include interstate bridges such as the Potomac River Bridge.

In 1948 the Congress passed an act—Public Law 654, 80th Congress—which supplemented the 1938 Maryland act. Under the provisions of this act, the State of Maryland was authorized to construct a bridge across or a tunnel under the Chesapeake Bay from a point in Anne Arundel County to a point approximately opposite on Kent Island—the Chesapeake Bay Bridge—and also a bridge or a tunnel under the Patapsco River in the city of Baltimore—the Baltimore Harbor Tunnel. The act permitted the State to fix and charge tolls in accordance with the laws of the State and to unite or group for financing purposes either or both of the existing bridges with either or both of the new structures authorized by the bill.

Under the laws of the State of Maryland the revenues from the Potomac River Bridge, the Susquehanna River Bridge, the Chesapeake Bay Bridge, and the Baltimore Harbor Tunnel are grouped together for financing purposes. The Potomac River Bridge is an interstate bridge connecting Maryland with Virginia. The other three structures are all within the State of Maryland and are intrastate in character.

The Maryland law authorizing the commission to construct additional toll structures across the Chesapeake Bay and additional crossing of the Baltimore Harbor authorizes the grouping of the toll proceeds of all of the existing structures in connection with the financing of the proposed new structures. It is contemplated by the State roads commission, acting pursuant to an act of the Maryland legislature, that the toll revenues from the existing Potomac River Bridge will be grouped or combined with the revenues from the other bridges and tunnel in connection with and to make possible the financing of the new structures. Congressional approval, therefore, is necessary.

If it were not for the pooling or grouping of the revenues from the Potomac River Bridge, an interstate bridge, for financing purposes the State of Maryland would have the authority to construct all of the projects enumerated in H.R. 11627 under the authority of the General Bridge Act of 1946.

Let me conclude by reiterating the following points. This is basically a State matter. The need for the legislation today is purely technical in nature. There is no Federal cost involved.

I urge approval of the legislation.

Before closing my statement, I should like to answer the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Long]. He criticized the integrity of the Governor of Maryland, the highway director, and he also made certain charges against the Greiner Co., who would do the engineering on the bridge to be built under this bill and who did the engineering on the present bridge that is now serving traffic over the Chesapeake Bay. Further, as one package, they will do the preliminary engineering on all of these projects. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Long] said that they were accused of certain malfeasance, or whatever he charged them with, in Pennsylvania in 1954.

I might say to the gentleman that the best vindication that could be given to this engineering firm is that they have supervised and engineered $150 million worth of work in the State of Pennsylvania since that time.

Also the gentleman accused the Greiner Co. of charging exorbitant fees with regard to a Florida contract here on the floor of the House. That same Greiner organization is still working in Florida under the same contracts.

I do not know what better vindication could be given to an engineering firm than that.

I might say in closing that neither I as chairman, our Committee on Public Works, nor even the Congress has ever told a State highway department where to locate a bridge, a tunnel, or a highway, even when we were paying 90 percent of the cost. So I do not believe the Congress should do so in this present instance.

I do not believe the Congress should amend the law of a State legislature until the State legislature and the Governor ask Congress. It is through a technicality that we have to pass this law. I do not believe we should attempt to change the laws passed by the legislature and signed by the Governor of that State.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be very brief, and then I want to yield to the principal sponsor of this legislation on our side, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON], and also the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GUDE] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

I briefly want to say I think everyone knows I am not a toll road proponent and never have been. This is a matter the State legislature acted upon, a legislature that was elected at the same time the bond issue, that was mentioned, was voted upon. That legislature, elected by the people of Maryland, as I understand it, voted, four-fifths of them, for the enabling legislation passed, with respect to which we are legislating at the present time.

This is a fight in Maryland and not a fight involving Florida, and this is why I want to say we outside of Maryland should not get Congress in the middle of it. As far as I am concerned, the best way to get Congress in the middle of it is to accept the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] to strike the parallel Chesapeake Bay Bridge from the bill. That would violate what the State legislature has acted upon.

I do not think Congress ought to be in the business of deciding what bridges the State can or cannot build to the exclusion of other bridges. This bill lets the State do what it see fit to do as to all the bridges or tunnels—all four of them—and the State decides the priorities; it is not Congress dictating to the State that it can decide on three but not on the fourth, when it is quite obvious on the record that the fourth, the parallel Chesapeake Bay Bridge, is the one needed the most.

As far as I am concerned, I do not intend to get into the problems of the Maryland delegation.

I know that all but one of the Maryland Congressmen support it. One Maryland Congressman does not support it because he wants it in his district. But I do not think Congress ought to get into that kind of fight when the legislature itself says we should let the State make the decision. That is what this bill does. There is no Federal money involved.

This bill permits the State to do what it sees fit as to all the bridges, based on priorities—that is, four bridges or tunnels in total. As far as I am concerned, the legislation has merit and should be supported. I think the best way for Congress to stay out of any problems relating to deciding priorities, which has always been a State determination, is to vote for this bill as it came out of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if there is no Federal money invloved, then it is up to the people of the State of Maryland to finance this bridge. Is that not correct?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct, through tolls—which is the proposal, and it is the proposal the Maryland Legislature has acted on.

Mr. GROSS. Through bond issues or tolls or however they want to finance it?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Someone has spoken of a referendum. If the referendum was adverse to this bridge, then the Maryland Legislature has authority to take care of that situation by not providing the construction money.

Mr. CRAMER. The legislature acted subsequent to the referendum, which resulted in a four-fifths vote in support of the legislation that is presently before us. That is their responsibility.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida has said that Congress should not be in the middle of it, but, of course, Congress is in the middle of it.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman, in my opinion, is trying to put Congress in the middle of it, and as far as I am concerned, this bill keeps Congress out of an issue that should be decided by the State of Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. If the Congress is not in the middle of this, why is this bill before Congress?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the gentleman does not appreciate this, of course.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I believe I do appreciate it.

Mr. CRAMER. I will be glad to indicate it is necessary for this bill to be before Congress because of the inclusion of the Potomac River Bridge, an interstate bridge on U.S. 301, which was authorized by a 1938 act of Congress, in the "pooled" financing arrangement for four existing toll facilities and the four new toll facilities involved in this bill.

The gentleman is familiar with previous legislation that makes this bill necessary. That is why the bill is before us.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. If the gentleman will yield further, he pointed out that the Federal Government does not have to pay anything about the cost of these bridges. Would not the gentleman agree that a bridge like this is going to require a tremendous number of approach roads, which the Federal Government will be asked to pay for in future years, including the $60 million Arundel expressway?

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman knows full well that if the bridge were built in his district it would require approaches as well. The gentleman likewise knows that if money is going to be spent for an approach, or if approaches are constructed, it will require 50 percent State participation. The State first will have to put up its own money. It makes the decision supposedly on the merits. I suggest to the gentleman, I do not want to see Congress get in the middle of a purely State controversy by following the gentleman's recommendation.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. If the gentleman will yield further, I am glad he said "supposedly on the merits."

I might point out that not only is the parallel bridge going to require tremendous numbers of subsidiary roads, for which the Federal Government will have to help pay, but the tunnel around the city is also going to raise a real question as to whether the Federal Government should be committed to an East-West expressway through the city, which will cost a great many scores of millions of dollars, when they propose to put a tunnel around the city.

The Federal Government is right in the middle of these projects, whether it likes it or not.

Mr. CRAMER. I say to the gentleman, I believe he has evidenced by his discussion some of the problems that now exist or will exist in the future into which the Federal Government would inject itself if it should say, "No, you cannot build the parallel Chesapeake Bay Parallel Bridge."

That is a decision for the State. I do not think the gentleman or any other Member of the House should suggest that Congress dictate to the State what should be done in this instance. This bill would let the State do as it sees fit, based upon its own determination of needs.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON], who is a cosponsor of the bill, 5 minutes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First I should like to take this opportunity to thank the very distinguished chairman of the great Committee on Public Works, my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], for the work he has done on this legislation.

Here we have an argument going on, and it is in the wrong forum. The question as to where Maryland should build its bridges and where it should build its highways and tunnels, and questions as to the pattern of the highway network of Maryland, certainly, are questions which should be determined and answered within the State itself. Therefore, it is with an apology I come before the House and my colleagues to discuss this matter.

I am not going to respond in any way to the allegation which has been put forth that there are inefficiencies, inequities, or even bad practices within the State agencies involved in the responsibility for highway planning, construction, and administration. Several administrations have been involved in this proposition. I am not here to criticize the administration in my own State, past or present, be it Democrat or Republican. I do that at home and I do it constructively.

I hope the Congress will pass this bill because it is necessary. Navigable waters are involved. Areas which concern our national defense are involved. Other legislation preceding this makes it necessary that we have permissive legislation to go about our business of selecting a site and building bridges to serve the public of Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, this bill now being considered is of vital importance to the State of Maryland and the motorists from other States who travel through my State. This latter class includes millions every year.

The bill will authorize the State Roads Commission of Maryland to construct four additional toll structures.

One is the second crossing of the Baltimore Harbor; one is another crossing of the Chesapeake Bay parallel to the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge; one is a northern crossing of the Chesapeake Bay; and the other is a southern crossing of the Chesapeake Bay connecting southern Maryland with the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

All of these crossings are entirely within the State of Maryland and none are on or directly connected with the Federal Interstate System of Highways.

Being a resident of the State of Maryland and living in Baltimore city, I personally know that a second crossing of the Baltimore Harbor is necessary and urgent. Traffic using the existing Baltimore Harbor Tunnel backs up and causes delays practically every weekend of the year.

I also know from personal knowledge that traffic delays occur every weekend during the summer months on the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge.

These traffic jams cause hundreds of motorists to wait in line up to 2 hours in order to use the existing bridge.

On the eastern shore side of the existing bay bridge there are four traffic lanes to accommodate traffic and on the western shore side of the bridge there is also a four-lane highway.

The present bridge is only a 2-lane bridge and the proposed new bridge will be, in effect, an enlargement and improvement of the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge.

Both the proposed northern and the proposed southern crossings of the Chesapeake Bay are included in the State roads commission's proposed highway program and will become necessary in the future.

This bill merely authorizes the State roads commission to finance and construct these crossings in conjunction with certain existing toll crossings already in use.

The General Assembly of Maryland, which has been reapportioned in accordance with the ruling of the Supreme Court, has passed legislation authorizing the construction of these four crossings.

This legislation was passed at the 1967 session of the general assembly by four-fifths or more of the members of both houses of the Maryland Legislature.

The Governor of Maryland is on record publicly supporting this bill.

The Maryland State Roads Commission unanimously endorsed this legislation and the chairman of that commission is on record by letter to the Public Works Committee of this House of Representatives endorsing this legislation.

The Board of Public Works of Maryland, which includes the Governor, the treasurer of the State of Maryland, and the comptroller of Maryland, has unanimously approved preliminary engineering contracts for certain of the projects included in this bill.

And, in addition, seven of the eight Members of Congress from Maryland joined in sponsoring this legislation now before this House.

It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that for this Congress not to enact this legislation or to amend this legislation would have the effect of the Congress attempting to dictate the location and the construction priority of bridges and tunnels located entirely within the State of Maryland.

This, I submit, is not a proper function for the Congress.

In addition, I point out that if this bill now being considered becomes law, it will not cost 1 cent of Federal Government money.

Delays have already cost the motorists desiring to use these structures untold inconvenience and the delays have cost the State of Maryland millions of dollars in additional construction costs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge favorable consideration of the bill now pending, in order that the State of Maryland may proceed with the construction of these projects without further delay.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. First I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman in the well, my colleague from Maryland, for his help and support in this bill.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] for his statement and to urge support of this legislation. Of course, I associate myself with the remarks which the gentleman has made.

Mr. Chairman, I am honored and pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 11627 with the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee and with five of my Maryland colleagues.

The legislation before you today is an authorization bill, the enactment of which is a prerequisite to the construction of additional crossings of the Chesapeake Bay and the Baltimore Harbor. This legislation is very farsighted because it would authorize a number of bay and harbor crossings, enough in my mind to meet our needs for decades. Enactment of this bill would allow the State of Maryland to proceed with construction of each additional bay and harbor crossing on a priority basis as the State sees fit without the necessity of coming back to the Congress for additional legislative authorization each time an additional project is needed.

As many of you are aware, there has been some controversy about which additional bay crossing should be constructed first. This legislation does not settle that controversy, nor is it intended to. But it will, if enacted, allow the State to assign and implement its construction priorities on each additional crossing without further congressional action.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this bill and urge its enactment, because additional bay and harbor crossings are badly needed to serve the people of our State and those who travel through it. Additional bay crossings in particular can mean closer economic and social ties within our State with a resultant strengthening of our economy and growth. We have already seen this to a significant degree as a result of the building of the first Chesapeake Bay Bridge. What followed on the Eastern Shore was nothing less than dramatic. We should, through enactment of this omnibus authorization bill, assist southern Maryland, the southern and northern portions of the Eastern Shore, in achieving similar economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this legislation does not provide for the expenditure of any Federal funds. It does not place any additional financial obligation on the Federal Government. It is merely congressional authorization for the State of Maryland to undertake the construction of these various additional crossings under its own priority system and under its own system of financing.

I strongly urge the Committee to pass this bill.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Fifty-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 332]

Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bell
Blatnik

Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Clark
Conyers
Corman
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Donohue
Dwyer
Edwards, Calif.
Farbstein
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Goodell
Halleck
Halpern
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Horton
Howard
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Long, La.
McCulloch
Macdonald, Mass.
Mathias, Md.
Mosher
Multer
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Philbin
Pickle
Pool
Purcell
Rarick
Resnick
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Schwengel
Smith, N.Y.
Stephens
Udall
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wright
Wydler
Zablocki

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLS) having resumed the chair, Mr. JOELSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11627, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 356 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the requst of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the unique feature of the Federal highway program is that it is locally controlled. Local initiative determines a State's participation in the program. States define their highway needs, determine the location of highways and bridges, secure the land, and otherwise implement their plans for the achievement of their goals.

This is a fundamental principle—and the principle is the same whether it applies to California, New York, or Maryland. If we begin today to dictate at the Federal level where a bridge should or should not be built we violate that principle and interject Federal controls into an area where they do not belong.

Any parliamentary maneuver to defeat this principle of local initiative should itself be defeated.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GUDE].

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], for the work which he has done on this legislation and for making it possible to improve the transportation system in our State.

I strongly urge passage of H.R. 11627, which will authorize construction by the Maryland State Roads Commission of a parallel Chesapeake Bay Bridge, among other toll facilities of the State of Maryland.

Many Members of the House, I know, have had the opportunity to enjoy our Maryland and Delaware beaches and have had an opportunity to use this toll facility.

I hope they have not been too inconvenienced by the hardships that have been incurred on them by lack of a proper facility.

This is a positive step to relieve choking congestion which hampers the safety and comfort of Maryland citizens who travel between the eastern and western shores, whether on vacations or in commerce.

I have long been interested in developing solutions to problems of traffic congestion on the Chesapeake Bay Bridge. Thousands of residents of Montgomery, Howard, and Anne Arundel Counties, Md., as well as great numbers from other points in metropolitan areas of Washington and Baltimore, use this bridge to reach the recreational facilities offered by the Delmarva Peninsula. The two-lane span carrying this tourist volume as well as the growing commerce carried by highways U.S. 50 and 301 has achieved a point of intolerable congestion during much of the year.

During the year 1967 a condition known by traffic engineers as "choking congestion" existed on the bridge in excess of 300 hours. This is six times the amount of tolerate "choking congestion" for which bridges are normally designed.

The total stopping of traffic, during which traffic is held to one way, for periods of over an hour, occurred 70 times during this year.

During 1967, there were 30 days when this two-lane bridge carried between 25,000 and 30,000 vehicles, which doubled the average daily volume. The 1967 total volume of vehicle trips should exceed 4.6 million.

Two different, independent traffic studies conducted for the Maryland State Roads Commission during two different and successive administrations have produced convincing testimony for the need of this facility. Also a reapportioned legislature this year instructed the State roads commission to proceed with this program according to the priorities established by their studies.

Passage of H.R. 11627 is basic to the efficient development of a safe and adequate highway system for the State of Maryland, and I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11627.

I am going to be very brief in my remarks. This is a noncontroversial bill similar to one which passed the House in the last Congress by unanimous consent. This is a bill that should not take up too much of our valuable time today. The construction involved in this bill has been authorized by the State Legislature of Maryland, which told the Governor and the State roads commission to pick the best sites. This might be a site which my colleague, who is opposed to the bill, would approve himself. This could be any of three bridges or tunnels. I am not an expert on selections of sites. I leave it to the experts who will know where any bridges or tunnels should go. All this bill does is authorize the State of Maryland to construct, maintain, and operate the necessary bridges or tunnels.

It does not cost the Government a penny.

Only State money is involved.

I commend my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, for expediting action on this legislation, of which I am a cosponsor. I urge all my colleagues to support this bill and I certainly hope it passes so our State can get on with construction of these much-needed bridges and tunnels.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11627. I do so with the greatest of respect for the dissenting member of the Maryland delegation in the House who has appeared before our committee and testified against this bill. He appeared before the Committee on Rules and testified against the rule and now has brought to the floor of the House an argument which in my opinion the Committee on Public Works concluded was primarily an argument to be settled in the State of Maryland by the people of Maryland.

Now, Mr. Chairman, out of all the due respect in the world for our dissenting friend, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], I cannot avoid the conclusion that this is a matter on which an overwhelming showing from the State of Maryland would appear to support the passage of this legislation.

For instance, if the Members of the Committee will take a look at this bill, they will see that the bill is not only sponsored in this House by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, but also by six other members of the Maryland delegation in this House of Representatives. It is not a Democratic sponsorship exclusively or a Republican sponsorship. It is a bipartisan sponsorship.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has the support of the Governor of Maryland, who is a member of the Republican Party. It has the endorsement of the chairman of the State Highway Commission of the State of Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Not at this point. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Furthermore, I am impressed by the fact that the various departments of the Federal Government involved which have been asked to present their views with reference to this particular bill have not supplied to our committee nor to this House any solid reason for denying the State of Maryland the consent that has routinely been given to any other State which has requested this type of consent for the construction of a bridge over a navigable stream.

Mr. Chairman, in the absence of a direct Federal contribution to the cost of this project—and this bill authorizes not one dime as a Federal contribution to the cost of these structures—and in the absence of any type of an adverse report from either the Department of Transportation or the Department of the Army, personally, I cannot see any solid reason for this House to enter into the question or the judgment decision as to where these bridges and as to where these tunnels should be built.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that we have made a record which indicates to us that this is a matter that the State should handle and that should properly be left to the State, in this instance to the State of Maryland.

The overwhelming majority of the Maryland delegation supports the bill. It does have the support of the people who have the primary responsibility for roadbuilding in the State of Maryland.

With that type of showing and with that type of record, it seems to me it would be completely out of line with the precedents in this House for this body to vote against this bill which has been unanimously reported out of the Committee on Public Works.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] wishes me to yield to him at this point I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The gentleman from Oklahoma said that the Governor of Maryland supports this bill. I wonder if the gentleman from Oklahoma realizes the fact that the Governor of Maryland owns land right next to the bridge in question, with six or eight other persons—business and political associates? I wonder further if the gentleman realizes that last year when this fact was disclosed, he in a public announcement said that he was going to sell the land and give the proceeds received therefor to charity? This has not been done. But, evidently, after prodding, he has agreed to do it. However, what profit he might make from the sale thereof, he still has an obligation to his six or eight other very close political associates who still own in conjunction with him the land in question. Therefore, in my opinion, there is a real conflict of interest on the part of the Governor of the State of Maryland. Further, I do not think that the Governor's recommendation should be taken in any authoritative sense.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Without passing in any way upon the merits of that point, it is my opinion that whether or not the Governor does have an interest in this particular construction project is a matter that apparently has not been persuasive with many of the colleagues of the gentleman from Maryland, and that includes members of both parties. It is also a matter of record that the people directly concerned with roadbuilding, including the legislature itself of the State of Maryland, have endorsed this project and have given it their support.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma yielding to me at this point. With reference to the question of real estate ownership, I think it is proper that I disclose the fact that I do live on the Eastern Shore, and that my house is located fairly near the end of the present Bay Bridge. I think my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], also has property which would be very close to the end of the bridge.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I will be glad to bet the gentleman $5,000 if he can demonstrate that I own any land within 20 miles of any bridge location that is now proposed.

Mr. MORTON. My house is within 20 miles, and I feel that is pretty close.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Oklahoma 1 additional minute.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GARMATZ. My friend, the gentleman from Maryland, to my left, I wish he would pay attention, if he would, please. The gentleman says he does not own any land near a bay bridge proposed location. It may be true that there is a little animosity going on between the gentleman from Maryland and the Governor of the State of Maryland. But may I ask the gentleman: Does he own any land near one of the military bases in his district where it is expected that they will be doing some building? And as a member of the Construction Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, I would ask the gentleman from Maryland if that is correct or not?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I might point out that the Governor made this charge in desperation, and I would say that I have owned a farm which is completely on the opposite side of the city of Aberdeen, a good 3 miles. It is being used for farming. And I have a quotation which I am going to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from my opponent in the last election who said he had absolutely no ground on which to charge me with any conflict of interest in the ownership of my farm, and that was my opponent Paul McHenry in the last campaign.

Mr. GARMATZ. The gentleman has not answered my question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. GARMATZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. GARMATZ. About owning property near a military installation. The gentleman calls it a farm.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I call it a farm, and it is far from being near any military reservation; it is separated by an entire city from the military reservation.

Mr. GARMATZ. What city is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The city of Aberdeen.

Mr. GARMATZ. That is a city of four gasoline stations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I had originally been promised 5 minutes by the chairman, but I will try to make it in 3 minutes.

I have already pointed out that the voters rejected the parallel bay bridge project by an overwhelming vote in the last election; then the legislature repassed it.

I might point out also that our new Governor, who has a conflict of interest, has enormous patronage power. It is well known that a new Governor in Maryland can get just about anything he wants from the legislature if he wants to give out enough patronage for doing so. And this case is no exception. These are the facts of political life in my State of Maryland.

I have gone into a lot of the background on the experts who recommended the parallel bridge, and I have found out that Coverdale & Colpitts, the traffic consultants, has goofed on eight different projects in other States, representing nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars in projects that are in default of interest, are being paid out of borrowed money, or have had to raise tolls to escape default. Those are the qualifications of the experts. One-sixth of all of the projects of Coverdale & Colpitts, using the figures of the State roads commission, are in trouble throughout the country.

Why should we take the word of these experts when, by the overwhelming vote of the people of Maryland, the project was rejected? I believe the people of Maryland have a right to say that they do not want the parallel bridge. They said so decisively.

We are told that this vote here today is merely a technicality, but that is not what it means to the Baltimore area. In the Baltimore area, congressional approval means approval of this project. That is the thinking, as interpreted by the Governor and the head of the State roads commission.

While Federal money is not involved here, the Federal Government is involved in two ways.

In the first place, $70 or $100 million worth of toll money is going to be used up to pay for the parallel bridge. This will divert money away from projects which the people of Maryland might build with toll revenue and thereby reduce future demands on the Federal taxpayer and Federal road funds.

The indirect burden is thus very great. Furthermore, I might point out that this is a duplicative facility. Remember that all over this country we have a tremendous need for roads and bridges. In this case, we are being asked to put a bridge right next to a bridge when in the whole expanse of the Chesapeake Bay of nearly 200 miles there is only one crossing. And then they will come to the Federal Government for the money for access roads.

Sixty million dollars is already being projected for an Arundel Expressway to lead to the bridge. They are also going to need money for a Kent Narrows Bridge which is going to take millions of dollars, and for a Choptank Bridge.

All this money is to go to feed into a bridge which is a wholly duplicative facility and which adds nothing to the economy of Maryland.

I think it is of vast concern to the Congress when money is being wasted anywhere and when sooner or later the Congress is going to be asked to pick up the tab.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, a bill similar to the one that is before the House today was passed by unanimous consent some 3 or 4 years ago. It went over to the other body and they failed to act on it. It is similar to the bill which was passed by the House by unanimous consent.

As I said before, when it comes to the selection and location, when we are putting up 90 percent of the money, under the 1956 act, the State highway director selects the location whether it be a bridge or a highway. In this case not one dollar is being put up by the Federal Government and all that the State legislator and the Governor of the State of Maryland and the State highway director are asking for is for permissive legislation so that they may build these projects when and where they want to.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 463, Public Law 654, Eightieth Congress) is amended by striking out "and (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(2)" and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "(3) a bridge parallel to the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge in the State of Maryland from a point in Anne Arundel County at or near Sandy Point to a point in Queen Annes County at or near Kent Island, and approaches, including connecting highways, thereto, (4) a bridge across or a tunnel under the Chesapeake Bay in the State of Maryland from a point in Baltimore County at or near Millers Island to a point in Kent County, or a combined bridge and tunnel at such location, and approaches, including connecting highways, thereto, (5) a bridge across or a tunnel under the Chesapeake Bay in the State of Maryland from a point in Calvert County to a point in Dorchester County, or a combined bridge and tunnel at such location, and approaches, including connecting highways, thereto, and (6) an additional tunnel under or a bridge across the Patapsco River from a point at or near Hawkins Point in the city of Baltimore to a point at or near Sparrows Point in Baltimore County, and approaches, including connecting highways, thereto."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 3 of such Act of June 16, 1948, is amended by striking out "either or both" at each of the two places where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place "any one or more".

Mr. CRAMER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LONG OF MARYLAND

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONG of Maryland: On the first page strike out line 8 and all that follows down through and including "(4) a" on line 4 of page 2.

On page 2, line 9, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)".

On page 2, line 13, strike out "(6)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out the parallel bridge portion of this three bridge-tunnel package.

As you probably know by now, this bill proposes to let the State of Maryland build three bridges. One of them would be parallel to the present bridge, would cost between $70 and $100 million, and would involve an annual interest and amortization cost of $4 or $5 million. It would also require more traffic to pay for it than is projected by the State roads commission through the rest of this century. That is the first item.

The second is a bridge in southern Maryland. The third is a bridge from Baltimore over to Kent County, which I have favored if a bridge is needed at all, about which there is considerable question and the fourth is a tunnel under the Baltimore Harbor which would be parallel to the present tunnel. I might point out that it probably will not be needed once the projected East-West Expressway gets through. But I am not proposing that at the present time. I am asking the Committee to throw out the parallel bridge from this bill. This was the bridge which was rejected by the voters of Maryland overwhelmingly in one of the largest voter turnouts we have had in the history of voter referendums in Maryland. The voters turned the proposal down in the district of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] overwhelmingly, and in the district of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] overwhelmingly, and in the district of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] overwhelmingly, and, of course, in my district overwhelmingly.

I bring this amendment before the House because this bridge is not needed. It is congested for only a few summer weekends a year, and I do not believe you can ever build enough facilities in this country so that they will not be congested some of the time. What congestion there is could be relieved by building more toll booths and by manning some of the toll booths that are not open at busy times.

On Labor Day I went across the bridge and one of the toll booths was closed down because the toll collector was out to lunch. Traffic was limping across the bridge.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the State roads commission wants congestion. They are doing everything they can to build a case to build this parallel bridge. That is the main reason that this bill has been brought before you. The other three projects, except possibly the harbor tunnel, were put in the State legislature's package bridge bill to get votes. This bill was gotten through the State legislature by the process of misrepresentation. The legislators were made to believe there was enough money for three bridges and a tunnel.

I say to you that there is not enough money for more than the parallel bridge and a harbor tunnel. These two projects together will bond the taxpayers of the State until the year 2000, and there will never be any chance in the rest of this century to build a bridge in northern or southern Maryland.

The parallel bridge and the harbor tunnel are both duplicative facilities. These facilities together will also require the Federal Government sooner or later to dig into its pocket to build all sorts of other roads. This is very much a practical matter before you because, as I have maintained, when you waste money on a project of this sort, you create a demand that the Federal taxpayer solve the problems you have created. The proposed project will create great demands in the future for Federal roads to feed into this duplicative facility which will do nothing for the State of Maryland.

I hope very much that the Committee will support my amendment.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. FRIEDEL. You mentioned that a parallel bay bridge would cost $70 million to build.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. That was the estimated cost 3 or 4 years ago, according to the State report. Now it would probably be much more than that. It might well go to $100 million.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Can the gentleman tell us what a bridge in the northern bay or a bridge in the southern bay would cost?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I think a northern bridge would cost somewhat more than that amount, not a great deal more. What I maintain is that if any bridge is needed at all—and I am not sure that any is at the present time or in some years to come—we should put it in another location. While another bridge in the northern part of the bay would cost more, it would do something for the people of the State. It would build up the economy of the State. It would give the people of the State another way of getting across the bay. The proposed parallel bridge would merely provide a duplicative facility which would help only a few people on a few weekends a year.

It is about as close to pure waste as anything you could imagine.

I might say also that these bridges are getting more expensive all the time. When the present bridge was built, the cost of borrowed money was 2.9 percent. They will probably have trouble getting the necessary money for the proposed bridge for interest rates approaching 6 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. The gentleman has taken a lot of time of the Congress today. The amendment he is offering does nothing more than amend a law of the State of Maryland. That is exactly what it does.

This bill was passed by the legislature overwhelmingly and signed by the Governor, which made it a law of the State. The gentleman is coming to the Congress and asking us to amend a law of the State legislature. I do not think we have any right to do it. I do not think we should do it, because we will get ourselves into a lot of trouble if we start this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I believe what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] is trying to tell other Members of this body is that everybody is out of step but him. Certain Members of Congress are out of step, the State legislature is out of step, the State senate is out of step, the Governor of Maryland is out of step, and the board of public works, which consists of the controller of the State of Maryland and the treasurer of the State of Maryland—everybody is out of step but the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I think, rather than belabor this, it is simply a question of whether this Legislature, this Congress, wants to tell the Legislature of the State of Maryland where to build its bridges. If we accept the amendment before the Congress, we are actually making a site selection for a bridge without any information, without figures, without traffic studies, without anything.

The bill is permissive and it has taken all the sites which are logical for the bridges across the bay and for the tunnel under the Baltimore Harbor. This problem then will have to be resolved through all the mechanisms that are available for such resolution, in the State organization, in its legislative and executive branches.

Therefore, I am opposed to the amendment. I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOELSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11627) to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland, pursuant to House Resolution 948, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MICHEL. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MICHEL moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 11627) to the Committee on Public Works.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 344, nays 9, answered "present" 1, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

YEAS—344

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill ,Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
MacGreogr
Machen
Madden
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—0

Hays
Long, Md.
Mahon
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Ryan
Vigorito
Wolff

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Michel

NOT VOTING—78

Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bell
Blatnik
Boggs
Bow
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Carey

Celler
Chamberlain
Conyers
Corman
Daddario
Davis, Wis.
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Donohue
Dwyer
Edwards, Calif.
Farbstein
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Halleck
Halpern
Hawkins
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Horton
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Long, La.
Macdonald, Mass.
Mathias, Md.
Miller, Calif.
Mosher
Multer
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Purcell
Rarick
Resnick
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ruppe
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Slack
Smith, N.Y.
Stephens
Udall
Utt
Watson
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wright
Wydler
Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mathias of Maryland for, with Mr. Michel against.

Until further notice:

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Aspinall with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Corman with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Button.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Roush.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Poage with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Pickle.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Rogers of Florida.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS]. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 12603, NATIONAL VISITORS CENTER ACT OF 1967

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 12603, the National Visitors Center Act of 1967.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I understand that the report is in the process of being prepared, and it is understood that the minority will have an opportunity to review it prior to its being filed.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We shall, as we have in the past, consult with the minority before the report is filed before midnight.

Mr. CRAMER. With that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

JEWISH UNIT SAYS TWO GROUPS SPREAD ARAB HATE

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of Congress to an article that appeared in this morning's edition—October 23, 1967—of the New York Times.

This news story clearly indicates how hate organizations become captives of and prey to propaganda designed to build up ill will, opposition, and hate against individuals, nationalities, and nations. This is accomplished by simply parroting reams of false and misleading charges that constantly bombard the public and the press.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has effectively and persuasively exposed this activity. This organization and its national director of the league, Mr. Benjamin R. Epstein deserve the commendation of all fair minded people for performing this most useful service.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place the article at this point in the RECORD.

JEWISH UNIT SAYS TWO GROUPS SPREAD ARAB HATE—ANTI-DEFAMATION BODY ASSERTS SNCC AND STATES RIGHTS PARTY ARE BOTH RACIST

(By Irving Spiege)

HOUSTON, October 22.—The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith today accused two racist groups, one antiwhite and the other antinegro, of disseminating Arab-sponsored, "gutter level propaganda" in this country aganst Jews and Israel.

Benjamin R. Epstein, national director of the league, who made public a study containing the charges, named the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the National States Rights party as the groups in question.

Mr. Epstein described the student committee as a "black racist and left-wing revolutionary organization" and its "polar opposite, N.S.R.P.," as "neo-Nazi white racist."

The study declared that the two groups were circulating propaganda materials produced by the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestine Arab Delegation.

The Arab groups, the league said, are registered with the United States Government as agents for foreign powers, under regulations of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

THREE-DAY MEETING ENDS

The report highlighted the closing session at the Warwick Hotel of a three-day meeting of the league's national executive committee, the policy-making body of the organization. The league seeks to safeguard the civil and religious rights of Jews here and abroad, and also plays a strong role in the civil rights movement.

Mr. Epstein charged that the S.N.C.C. newsletter and the states rights party's publication, Thunderbolt, showed almost "word-for-word dependence" on Arab propaganda material against Jews, Zionism and the State of Israel.

He said that S.N.C.C.'s newsletter "parroted whole sections of a 1966 Palestine liberation organization diatribe produced in Beirut, Lebanon," while the Thunderbolt reproduced whole paragraphs from a Palestine Arab delegation polemic issued last July 14.

Mr. Epstein exhibited pages of printed material that both American groups had culled from Arab propaganda publications.

For instance, the Palestine Liberation organization asserted that "the Jewish state [Israel] was planted at the point of intersection of Asia and Africa without the free approval of any Middle Eastern, Asian or African country, except the Union of South Africa, itself ruled by an alien minority."

SAME SENTENCE USED

In the S.N.C.C. newsletter, the same sentence appears.

The Thunderbolt quoted almost verbatim from the Palestine Arab pamphlet, which charged Jews with war crimes and genocide.

The league study described the Palestine liberation organization as a "notorious and extremist Arab propaganda apparatus, masterminded by Ahmed Shukairy, a long-time Arab spokesman who has engaged in anti-Jewish tirades on the floor of the United Nations and elsewhere."

The Palestine delegation, the league said, is the group headed by Haj Amin El-Husseini, the former grand mufti in Jerusalem who supported Hitler during World War II.

The study said that the Palestine liberation organization had offices in New York City and operated "on a million-dollar-a-year budget provided by the Arab League."

The study said the group was under the direction of Izzat Tannous, a Palestinian Arab who has acted as a spokesman for Arab refugees at the United Nations.

Mr. Epstein said that the use of Arab materials placed S.N.C.C. "at the disposal of Arab propagandists as an overeager handmaiden."

He also charged that the National States Rights Party was a "notorious, anti-Jewish and anti-Negro group."

Mr. Epstein said that the party was organized in Knoxville, Tenn., in 1958 and now operated out of Savannah, Ga. Its philosophy, he said, is "neo-Nazi."

REPORT ON ANTI-VIETNAM WAR DEMONSTRATION AT PENTAGON

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 21, for a period of approximately 3 hours, I observed firsthand the antiwar demonstrators at the Pentagon. Because of your interest in this demonstration, I would like to relay to you my observations.

At about 3:45 p.m. the crowds began to build up and were pushing toward the line of military police. Members of the 503d MP Battalion plus U.S. marshals were holding the crowd back. At 4:15 p.m. several demonstrators broke through military police and confronted several marshals who properly and quickly used their nightsticks to control the demonstrators. The U.S. marshals handled themselves very well: However, they seemed rougher than the soldiers. Around 5 p.m. a platoon marched out of the Mall entrance of the Pentagon as reinforcements. The show of new strength caused the crowd to yell and holler. I noticed that no soldier had his weapon loaded but did have ammunition available on his belt. Considering the crowd and demonstrators involved, this, in my opinion, was the proper procedure of handling the ammunition. I would estimate about 40,000 people present at the most: possible 5,000 were actually hardcore antiwar demonstrators, another 5,000 were lukewarm protestors, and the other 30,000 were there for entertainment. Some had even brought a football and were playing touch football during the lull.

Around 5:30 p.m., possibly 70 or 80 demonstrators broke through a line of U.S. marshals and did enter the building but were quickly thrown out by marshals and soldiers. Between 5:30 and 6 about 2,000 demonstrators started walking toward the Pentagon. A platoon of the 503d MP Battalion was brought out of the buliding and moved toward the crowd. The platoon had to crawl through manmade rope fences and became somewhat disorganized after going through the fences. One squad of the platoon was as much as 75 yards in front of the rest and were quickly surrounded by the demonstrators.

The protesters pushed and shoved these MP's and then for some unknown reason the squad leader marched the squad back past the platoon and into another group of demonstrators rather than back into platoon position. There heavy scuffling started. On two different occasions the peaceniks had a soldier on the ground and were beating them. The demonstrators were pulled off by other soldiers and other protesters. In all fairness, this was not a vicious crowd, or they could have possibly stomped some of the MP's to death if they had wanted to. On the overall operation, the military and marshals did a splendid job, and I noticed especially the individual bravery of the soldiers in the trapped platoon. But, in, my opinion, more riot training is needed by this unit.

The thoughts that were going through my mind during the 3 hours I observed the demonstration were what effect this would have on our gallant soldiers now fighting in Vietnam, what kind of image this would help to create in the eyes of the rest of the world, and what the cost to the taxpayers would be for all the elaborate preparations made at the Pentagon to repel the demonstration.

I hope that our Government will not permit this cheap show to come to town again.

USE OF SOVIET SURFACE-TO-SURFACE GUIDED MISSILE TO SINK ISRAEL SHIP

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there are very serious implications for the United States in the use of a Soviet surface-to-surface guided missile to sink an Israel ship. This is the first time in history that a Russian radar-controlled missile has been used to sink a ship of any flag. If the Soviets are prepared to equip and assist the Egyptians to blow up an Israel destroyer in international waters during a United Nations cease-fire agreement, for which Soviet Russia voted, may we not consider that similar naval missiles will be provided to North Vietnam for use against the ships of the U.S. Navy?

It will be too late to issue warnings if a Soviet-built "Komar" or "Ossa" missile boat appears off Haiphong or the DMZ and sinks a U.S. aircraft carrier with thousands of American sailors. This would be intolerable. The issue would no longer rest on whether or not Soviet Red naval personnel actually pushed the button.

Admiral Moorer, the U.S. Navy Chief of Operations, has stated that it was obvious that Soviet sophisticated weaponry was used in the sinking of the Israel destroyer *Elath*.

The attack took place almost simultaneously with the arrival in Cairo of the Soviet Deputy Minister of Defense and a large military delegation from Moscow including naval, air force, and army officers. An estimated 8,000 Soviet military advisers and technicians were already in Egypt. Among them were Red navy personnel advising the Egyptian crews on board the Soviet naval ships and submarines provided to the Nasser regime.

The Israel Government seems to have suffered even more provocation than the North Vietnamese naval attack on our destroyers in the summer of 1964 that led to our Gulf of Tonkin resolution Here we have the case of an extreme escalation in which the Soviet Union has provided and possibly actually fired a surface-to-surface naval missile to sink a ship. It was an attack involving the highest degree of electronic and missile skills as well as a very new and sophisticated Soviet missile.

Moscow may well be testing to determine the U.S. attitude toward use by Soviet satellites of naval missiles. They chose the Arab-Israel area to make this test because of a belief that the United States would seek to avoid a confrontation because of the administration's ambiguous and vague commitments to Israel. Moscow knows that our policymakers are eager to restore relations with the Arabs. The Communists know that they have been able to resupply the Arabs with even more modern weapons than those lost in the June war—without the United States keeping its commitment to sell a limited number of military jets to Israel.

The lack of American firmness in the Middle East may cause that region to erupt again into a war less easy to stop than the 6-day conflict. The presence of Russian men and ships could cause the conflict to escalate in a manner disadvantageous to both Israel and the United States.

The Port Said base in Egypt, now used by the Russians, was the source of the guided missile attack on the Israel ship.

It seems as if the Russians are going to make Port Said into a second Haiphong for a test case to see whether they can establish a privileged sanctuary in the Mediterranean. If they win this show of strength, the lesson will not be lost on the Arabs and the Mediterranean peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Soviet Union is taking advantage of our preoccupation in Vietnam and rifts in NATO to make a long end run into the eastern Mediterranean aimed at that region in addition to the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean. The strategic factors are obvious. More than oil is at stake.

We must immediately make known to the Russians that they should not miscalculate on our intentions. Last spring the Russians ordered the U.S. 6th Fleet to leave the Mediterranean. They then incited and armed the Arabs, to use the Arab states as a proxy force, to turn the Mediterranean into a virtual Russian lake. Thanks to the Israeli military victory, the Russians suffered a setback.

Moscow immediately embarked on a propaganda campaign at the United Nations and a massive military training and resupply operation in the Arab world. The administration's response was confined to a belief that only Vietnam and China were a real threat to our security.

Before it is too late, we must serve notice on the Russians that there are limits to their manipulations and escalations in the Middle East. The very least we must do is to supply the Israelis with effective weapons to counter the new Soviet-Arab offensive buildup.

SECOND HEADQUARTERS LABORATORY FOR FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to House Report No. 801 which was filed on Friday after being reported out by the

House Committee on Government Operations.

This report deals specifically with the procedures, or lack of them, of the Food and Drug Administration in selecting an alternate site for construction of its second headquarters laboratory. While contending that it wanted to build on property it owns and adjacent to existing facilities in Beltsville, Md., the FDA buckled and said if it could not build in Beltsville, Md., it would build the proposed $17 million laboratory in Madison, Wis. This decision was made despite the fact that an FDA study in 1966 for the House Appropriations Committee showed that it would cost the taxpayers $5.4 million more to build in the Midwest.

Contrary to a report last Friday, October 20, 1967, in the Washington Daily News, the Maryland and Virginia Congressmen were not out to lunch when the House approved a rider that would force the laboratory to be built in Madison, Wis. At the time that the appropriation bill for the FDA was being considered, I offered an amendment to strike the rider that would force construction of the laboratory to a site outside a 50-mile radius of Washington, D.C. This is the rider that was proposed in committee by the ranking minority member of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, a man whose reputation for economy is well known in this body.

However, this reputation does not transcend public works projects such as the second headquarters laboratory for the FDA. The 50-mile rider which was left in the bill after my amendment to delete it was defeated could cost the taxpayers approximately $135,000 a word, as I pointed out during the deabte on my amendment. If this is a demonstration of the type of economy that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are sponsoring then I fear we will need a 25-percent tax surcharge to make up the deficit in the budget that they would have us incur.

It is typical of the Republican Party, as so clearly demonstrated with the 50-mile rider for the added $5.4 million in cost to the taxpayers, that economy and efficiency in government are fine as long as it does not cost them anything, such as this laboratory.

I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, for his thorough public hearing, research and report on the way the alternative site for this laboratory was selected. Congressman FOUNTAIN has performed a real public service in this exposure of bureaucratic bumbling and I believe very deeply that his report vindicates the position I have taken, the position that Senator TYDINGS and Senator BREWSTER have taken and the position of my Washington-area colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GUDE], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] in opposition to this 50-mile rider in behalf of the taxpayers.

The Fountain report on the site selection for this laboratory also points out that the contention of the appropriations subcommittee that decentralization is a factor in recommending this laboratory be built outside of the Washington area is simply not valid. Indeed, it is obvious that had the decentralization policy, as stated in section 3(a) of the Bureau of the Budget, Circular A-60 of July 18, 1963, been applied to this project, it undoubtedly would have been funded for Beltsville, Md., not Madison, Wis.

There is little doubt that the next step to take is that recommended by the Fountain report. That is that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare require the FDA to conduct a "thorough, objective, and careful study to select the most desirable site for Headquarters Laboratory No. 2. The Department should take appropriate steps to insure that the study is carried out in strict compliance with HEW regulations and with due regard for economy and efficiency."

I do believe that such a study will show that the most economic and efficient location for the laboratory is in Beltsville. Perhaps then, those of the other side of the aisle who preach economy but practice "I'm for me first" public spending will realize that at one time or another someone, either the public or a congressional committee, will see through their fallacy and do the right thing.

THE SHAMEFUL DEMONSTRATIONS PROVE UGLINESS OF THE SELF-STYLED MILITANTS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most shameful chapters of American history was written here in Washington over the weekend. It demonstrated the full ugliness of the self-styled militants against our position in Vietnam and it showed their full contempt for the principles of human dignity which our soldiers in Vietnam are defending today.

Scotty Reston and Jimmy Breslin and some of the other reporters around the country said this morning in their analyses that no one won in this exercise over the weekend. I do not agree, I think that the Nation had an opportunity to see firsthand how an irresponsible group of so-called militants, gathered, I am sure, by those who want to destroy our effort to win in Vietnam, could bring shame and disgrace on the whole country. I do not know anything that was more shameful than to see these people spitting in the faces of our American soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is to the everlasting glory of our American troops that they were able to retain their self-control. I think this fanatic demonstration over the weekend by those who oppose Vietnam shows that our boys are really winning this battle in Vietnam. The Communists are doing everything they can all over the world to try to disrupt our efforts there. They cannot win in Vietnam because of the overwhelming effort of our American troops so they are trying to score victories in Washington and other capitals of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I say this demonstration was misdirected. If these people are really sincere in trying to bring this war to a halt, they should have marched on the Soviet embassy in Washington, because that is where the blame lies. This great President of ours, President Johnson, had tried and tried and tried to bring this whole conflict before the United Nations. Our great Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg, has used every resource at his command to bring this conflict to the United Nations. It has been the Soviet Union with its veto that has blocked every effort to resolve this conflict in an orderly way.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say this weekend has taught us much. It gave the American people a chance to see the full ugliness of the self-styled militants who tear up everything that is sacred and decent in this country.

I have asked the selective service people to look at every one of these people who have been arrested and find out what their selective service status is and how many of these people are enjoying the privilege of not serving in the service because they are going on to higher education. They have a right to come here and protest against their Government, but they do not have a right to stay out of military service. That is a privilege bestowed on them by their local selective service boards. I think the time has come when we ought to take a look at these militants. What are they learning? What are they teaching them, when they come over here and spit in the face of an American soldier?

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that this has been a shameful demonstration. I think that the American people see who is behind it. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, it should serve as a compelling disgrace on those who participated to learn that Hanoi has stated Saturday's demonstration gives the Communists new courage to continue killing our American soldiers. I say the demonstration on Saturday was an act of treason against our Nation. It made a mockery of our constitutional right to dissent and weakened the most sacred institutions of our Republic.

WE NEED TO MAKE THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I, along with more than 100 other Members of the House, have joined in sponsoring the legislation recently adopted by the House aimed at establishing maritime independence. My own concern for this legislation is based on two important premises:

First. I know that the maritime industry, both shipping and shipbuilding, contributes significantly to our domestic economy, and to helping to correct the balance of payments.

Second. I know that the maritime industry has an important role to play as the Nation's fourth arm of defense—backstopping our military forces in times of crisis, as it is doing today in carrying 98 percent of the war materiel and two-thirds of the fighting men who are manning freedom's frontier in Vietnam.

For far too many years, administration after administration has been timid when it should have been bold in its approach to our maritime problems. The Federal Government has been parsimonious in its financing of ship construction and operation, even though these Federal funds are vital if our shipping and shipbuilding industries are to compete in the world market with their low-wage foreign competition.

While we have been reluctant to move as a nation, other countries have lavishly underwritten their maritime programs with public funds. The result is that we have fallen from our position of predominance—fallen from first to sixth in terms of shipping, and fallen from first to 15th among the major maritime powers in terms of shipbuilding. Even tiny Finland is now ahead of us in ship construction. Today, although our economy and our defense posture demand that we have as large, as fast, and as modern a fleet as possible, we can scarcely call ourselves a maritime power.

Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd has suggested that the provision of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which requires American construction of all U.S.-flag vessels be repealed, and that we embark on a program of obtaining a significant share of our new ships abroad.

This poses a serious economic threat to America. It will endanger the jobs, not only of skilled craftsmen in American shipyards, but also of the people in scores of different occupations who contribute the products that go into American-built ships.

This also poses another threat. In time of crisis, we may not be able to depend on the shipyards of other nations to produce the vessels we need in abundance—as we needed whole fleets of vessels when we entered into World Wars I and II. If we have in the meantime bled our own shipyards white in terms of skilled technicians, we will be faced with a crisis of major proportions.

Many of us in Congress have been working for some time to effect a long-range program for the growth of our merchant fleet, so that we can carry the commercial and defense cargoes of our Nation efficiently and effectively.

This recent action—to reconstitute the Maritime Administration as an independent agency—is an important part of these endeavors. This agency can be responsive to the needs of our merchant fleet only if it is free of the artificial restraints under which it now operates as a ward of a Cabinet-level department.

PROFILE IN COURAGE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent in our country that those individuals who have the responsibility of providing affirmative, constructive action are invariably subjected to criticism. It is also a truism that the more difficult the decision and the more responsible that executive might be, the wilder and more irresponsible the attacks become. President Johnson is no exception to these attacks by self-appointed experts.

A realistic, lifetime politician, like President Johnson, is well aware of the difficulties that he will face whenever he determines a course of action. In spite of the hue and cry that is raised by some, he can be certain that he has the confidence and approval of the American public. While many of the decisions that he must make daily are difficult, only time can decide how wisely and judiciously he has performed his duties. I am confident that our present Chief Executive will fare well when the history books are written.

As we have just this past weekend witnessed a comglomeration of those poorly informed but highly vocal and irresponsible critics here in Washington, I think my colleagues might be interested in the views stated in a newsletter put out by the M. E. Green Co., Inc., a commodity brokerage firm. The comments entitled "Profile in Courage" follow.

PROFILE IN COURAGE

Every day appears to be a good day to criticize the man in the White House. Recently, even a leading magazine took time out to participate in the contest of disparaging epithets directed against the 36th President of the United States. We do not propose today to take a stand for or against the issues so vividly and irresponsibly discussed by so many, but we will try to analyze Lyndon Baines Johnson's motives for action.

Usually good actors are poor playwrights, and good playwrights do not perform well on the stage. John F. Kennedy was an excellent actor, his personal appearances were inspiring, his press conferences were literary events, and the brilliancy of his on-stage performance made up for the mistakes of judgment. A tragic event left the promise of youth unfulfilled, created a myth and put the subsequent President at a disadvantage. This problem was compounded when the intellectuals who played first violin in the JFK Orchestra, unwilling to play second violin in the LBJ Band, decided apparently in unisono to unload their frustration on the new conductor. The Schlesingers, Goodwins & Company must be forgetting that the greatness of America lies in its unsophistication, not in intellectual snobism. American democracy is horizontal, unlike Western Europe's, where it is vertical, and where political power, money and education are represented usually by a single person or combined in one family or club.

The man from Texas, who replaced the man from Boston and Hyannis Port, and who does not have the same aura of "savoir-faire" and "savoir-vivre" as his predecessor, recently stated what every thinking American should have known all along, i.e., that if he were concerned only with his own popularity, he would not have been going about things the way he has and would not suggest higher taxes or more war or similar unpopular actions. And that is the crux of the matter: LBJ is putting his own political future in jeopardy for the sake of his belief that he is doing the right thing for the United States.

We all know that even Johnson's enemies do not consider him incapable, not smart, or a political amateur; obviously, he has the opposite qualities and certainly weighs carefully the pros and cons of all his decisions, particularly those that concern the future of America and/or his own. The record shows that in this context he always chose America. Now whether or not President Johnson's judgment is right, only history will tell. But one thing is sure, that in pursuing his policy in a most unselfish way he has proven to be a better American than his critics. LBJ has stuck to his guns even at the cost of alienating large segments of the U.S. population; few political figures would do it. This courage and self-denial—not egotism as others claim—have brought the President nothing but abuse. Another "despised" man, in a letter to his sister written 200 years ago, made timeless and pertinent remarks about such slanderous assaults:

"As to the abuses I meet with . . . I number them among my honours. One cannot behave so as to obtain the esteem of the wise and good, without drawing on one's self at the same time the envy and malice of the foolish and wicked, and the latter is a testimony of the former. The best men have always had their share of this treatment, and the more of it is in proportion to their different and greater degrees of merit. A man has therefore some reason to be ashamed of himself when he meets with none of it. And the world is not to be condemned in the lump because some bad people live in it. . . ."

Not only adults—senators, teachers, taxi drivers, barmen and the like—abuse the presidency, but so do teenagers and college students, and there appears to be some sort of a race going on in the United States for the No. 1 spot in irresponsibility, blindness and vulgarity. American political life has always been full of it, yet reason ultimately prevailed in spite of the fact that those who had the least to say always yelled the loudest, as, for instance, students of some American universities who have an excellent record of wrong political judgment. In 1946, when an honorary degree was bestowed by Columbia University on one of the greatest men of this century, the then students demonstrated violently against him.

The "despised" man who 200 years ago wrote the letter quoted above was Benjamin Franklin; the man abused in New York 21 years ago was Winston Churchill. To the loneliest man in the nation, Lyndon Baines Johnson, today's target of vicious irresponsible attacks, our sympathy and respect.

INDUSTRIAL BOOM IN ZAMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it always is a matter of prideful satisfaction to me, who is firm in my faith in the future of the new nations of Africa, to announce achievements in the forward economic drive in Africa. Things indeed

are happening in Zambia, as the following article from the Zambia Mail of September 29 indicates:

INDECO BRINGS IN NEW PROJECTS WORTH £68M

(By John Leech)

Industrial projects with a total value exceeding £68,000,000 are being established in Zambia as a result of the efforts of the Industrial Development Corporation which is spearheading the country's drive to set up income-producing enterprises as part of the four-year national development plan. Another £22,000,000 worth is now under consideration.

The rate of private foreign capital investment in Zambia has taken an upward swing in the first six months of this year and is now regarded as "encouraging".

The more such capital that is attracted, the more employment there will be, the more skills Zambians will learn and the more the economy will expand and be diversified away from its present almost total reliance on copper.

Up to now, Indeco has concentrated on bringing to Zambia, with government participation, basic infrastructural industries designed to meet Zambia's fundamental raw material needs which had hitherto been imported. These include oil, cement, tyres, steel products, textiles, explosives and fertilisers.

NEW PHASE

It is now moving into the second phase of its long-term operational objective, to introduce industries with an export potential making use of the country's own natural resources such as timber, fish and grain as well as copper, the present mainstay of the economy.

A progress report on projects which Indeco already has under way makes impressive reading.

Zarn-Tan Road Services, the £5,000,000 road freight operation between the Copperbelt and Dar es Salaam operated in conjunction with intersomer and the Tanzanian Government, is expected to announce shortly that it completed its first year with a profit.

The exact amount will depend to some extent on the method of depreciation favoured by the company's auditors, but however small it may turn out to be, it will exceed initial expectations.

The company's fleet reached its projected peak of 430 heavy duty Fiat trucks before the end of the first year instead of after four years as planned.

And although turn-around times are not yet anywhere near up to expectations, the company is now carrying between 15 and 20 per cent of the country's copper exports and bringing in large quantities of general goods as well as all the heavy furnace oil for the Mufulira smelter. En route depots are now under construction.

The Tazama pipeline, being built by Snam Progetti for the company formed by the Zambian and Tanzanian Governments and Italy's ENI, is ahead of schedule despite a late start due to the Suez crisis and may well finish before the due date of September next year.

Some 105 miles have already been completed and tested and another 239 miles are well under construction. Unexpectedly, welding operations have far outstripped digging, which has been held up to some extent by mechanical breakdowns.

Chilanga Cement's third kiln was fired at Lusaka last month and the new factory at Ndola is up to schedule despite delays in material supply due to the Suez closure. When it is completed in late 1968 or early 1969 Zambia will be completely self-sufficient in cement which now has to be imported to supplement local supplies.

STATE'S PLANS

Zambia Sugar Company, a subsidiary of Tate and Lyle, recently opened its first major irrigation scheme at the Nakambala site in Southern Province. This project will supply all Zambia's sugar needs by next year with an annual estimated output of £1,700,000.

At Kafue, ten miles south of Lusaka, three of the biggest State-participating enterprise will be sited. The Greek firm, Doxiades and Co., who drew up the master-plan for development of this small town for an influx of 20,000 workers and their families, will go out to tender before the year's end for the £6,000,000 development needed for the first stage including 1,100 houses. They have been engaged by Indeco as consulting engineers for the scheme. The work is being done for Kafue Estates, Ltd., a wholly-owned Indeco subsidiary.

Zambia Steel and Building Supplies, another wholly-owned Indeco subsidiary, is now doing £1,000,000 worth of business a year and is expanding with two new depots in Ndola and Lusaka. This organisation will be a major factor in providing assistance to small Zambian contractors who are being encouraged.

The Zambia Wholesale Corporation, designed to provide the only country-wide wholesaling organisation for consumer goods, is now trading briskly. Its main warehouse is in Lusaka but it is having problems recruiting managerial staff for the eight rural depots planned. Its prices are described as "competitive", which they must remain if it is to carry out its primary function of improving business in the rural areas.

FERTILISERS

Another major project which will shortly go out to tender is the construction of the £7,000,000 fertiliser plant for which the contract has now been signed with Kobe Steel of Japan. This, like the £3,700,000 textile plant and the projected iron and steel industry, will be sited at Kafue. The construction of the textile plant is now going ahead and machinery is being shipped (£2,250,000 worth) from Platts of Manchester.

A complete survey of the iron deposits at Sanje near Lusaka has now been completed by the Yugoslav firm of Geozavod. A British firm of consultants has now been engaged to re-examine this £12,000,000 project in light of revelations that deposits are phosphoric and for the use of Siankandobo coal which is of better quality than Nkandabwe which had originally been projected for use.

The iron deposits are said to be sufficient for 30 to 40 years at 55–60 per cent iron content but there is unlikely to be any question of Zambian exports of this commodity.

Covenant Industries of Britain, a subsidiary of ICI, have now been brought into the £3,000,000 Kafironda Explosives plant project. Indeco will hold one third of the shares in this, with Covenant taking 44 per cent and African Explosives and Chemical Industries the remaining 22 per cent.

RANCHING

The £3,000,000 Dunlop tyre factory for Ndola is due to go out to tender very shortly.

Meanwhile, Indeco is making its first tentative investigations into agricultural projects.

A suggestion that an Agricultural Development Corporation should be formed to foster the long-term large enterprises now in the Ministry of Agriculture has, however, not entirely found favour.

As a result, Indeco has been asked to take more interest in some of them. A World Bank organisation, the Agricultural Development Service, which is also doing work in East Africa, is now investigating Zambia's 12 state cattle and dairy ranch plans with a view to them being run on commercial lines. Indeco is also looking at a major Virginia tobacco scheme north-east of Broken Hill.

Indeco's issued capital has now been increased to £6,500,000 (£3,800,000 at the end of 1966) and if the graph of utilisation of funds published in the last annual report were now extended it would go right off the page.

GUILTY VERDICT IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is important to take note of the action of an all-white jury in the State of Mississippi in convicting seven white men for the Federal crime of conspiracy to deprive three courageous young Americans—James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner—of their civil rights by cold-blooded murder. The jurors were brave in reaching their verdict. They refused to accept the shameful double standard of justice which emboldened the perpetrators of this dastardly crime. Let us hope that these convictions will serve as a deterrent to future racial violence in Mississippi.

In July 1964, after a firsthand visit to Philadelphia, Neshoba County, Miss., where I looked into the murders of my constituent, Andrew Goodman, and James Chaney and Michael Schwerner, I reported that Mississippi was in a state of lawlessness where white vigilantes did as they pleased and the police not only did not enforce the law, but were involved in its violation. At that time I advised the President and the Attorney General that I was convinced that local law enforcement officers were involved in the murders, and I urged a relentless effort by the Department of Justice to ascertain the facts.

The Department of Justice is to be commended for the thoroughness with which the case has been handled. Assistant Attorney General John Doar, who prepared and argued the Government's case with skill and precision, is especially to be congratulated.

No doubt the case received extensive publicity because two of the victims were white. Nevertheless, it is important that the world know that attitudes may be changing in the South.

Until now the State of Mississippi has refused to indict anyone for the murders. It remains to be seen if the State will now prosecute for murder and signal the beginning of the end of the reign of Klan terror. This again illustrates the need for a Federal antiracial violence statute, which is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to the families of the three young civil rights workers who have lived constantly with this horrible crime ever since June 21, 1964. They instilled in their sons a sense of values and a belief in an America where true equality of opportunity should exist. Having sacrificed their lives so others could enjoy freedom, their sons belong to an honor roll of martyrs in the cause of liberty. Now the parents may see a glimmer of hope that the sacrifice was not in vain.

I include at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of October 22, an editorial from the

Washington Post of October 22, an article by Val Adams from the New York Times of October 21, and an article from the New York Post of October 21:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 22, 1967]

Guilty Verdict in Mississippi

The conviction of seven white men by an all-white jury in Mississippi for conspiring to murder three young civil rights workers would have been unthinkable when the crime was committed three years ago. The jury's verdict was a measure of the quiet revolution that is taking place in Southern attitudes—a slow, still faltering but inexorable conversion to the concept that a single standard of justice must cover whites and Negroes alike.

It would be an exaggeration to pretend that acceptance of this concept is approaching universality in either South or North, but the finding of guilt in Meridian suggests that Mississippi's citizens may be in advance of its politicians in their willingness to face the realities of the nation's commitment to the equal application of law. The state would do honor to itself if it now moved in its own courts to press murder charges against those whom evidence links to the killing of the three youths.

The Federal conspiracy statute that provided the legal foundation for the present decision is no adequate safeguard against racial barbarism of the kind these slayings so starkly reflected. Until the authorities in Mississippi and other Southern states demonstrates that they will not default on their duty to prosecute such murders, there will be a need for the bill recommended by President Johnson and already passed by the House under which the murderers could be tried in the Federal courts for the crime they actually committed.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 22, 1967]

Mississippi Justice

The entire Nation can be proud of the verdict returned Friday in the Federal District Court in Meridian, Miss. A jury of 12 white Mississippians found seven other white Mississippians guilty of conspiring to deprive three civil rights workers of their civil rights by the simple expedient of killing them. But more important than the verdict is the message the action of the jury carries. For the believers in violence in that Deep South state, as well as for the rest of America which has held Mississippi justice in contempt, the message is clear: Law-abiding citizens there will tolerate a great deal of nonsense and criminal activity directed toward civil rights workers and Negroes, but they will not tolerate murder.

This may seem like a mini-step forward to those who believe that the color of a man's skin makes no difference to the law or to God and should make no difference to other men. But it is a major step for Mississippi to take. The conduct of Mississippi judges and juries in the past had led the thugs and wild men there to believe that any action to preserve segregation would go unpunished. The first jury to warn otherwise was the one in Jackson that refused to acquit Byron de la Beckwith of the murder of Medgar Evers. This jury in Meridian has made the warning crystal clear.

But the verdict should not delude those who believe in civil rights into thinking that Mississippians have changed their views on segregation. This was a Federal Court, where the charge had to be conspiracy to deprive men of their constitutional rights, and not a state court, where the proper charge of murder could have been brought. Judge Cox, who apparently presided over this trial with fairness and sternness, is no less a segregationist now than he was a year ago. But he, and this jury, have demonstrated that they believe no one should be deprived of his life because of his belief in civil rights. We trust that in pronouncing sentence, Judge Cox will remember the horror of the crime—a deliberate and carefully executed plot to kill three men and to bury their bodies in a dam, conceived by the Ku Klux Klan and carried out with the help of a man sworn to uphold justice and the law.

Besides the 12 brave men and women who served on this jury, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Assistant Attorney General John Doar deserve the Nation's thanks. Their painstaking investigation and careful prosecution now enables the country to raise its shoulders a bit from the yoke of shame placed there on that terrible night in 1964 in Neshoba County.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 1967]

Verdict Pleases a Victim's Family—Parents of Goodman Rejoice at Landmark Decision

(By Val Adams)

"A landmark decision. This reflects the changes that have occurred in the South."

The words were spoken here yesterday by Mrs. Robert W. Goodman soon after she and her husband learned that a jury in Meridian, Miss., had convicted seven defendants for conspiracy in the slaying of three young civil rights workers in 1964. Andrew Goodman, their son, was among those killed.

In meeting with reporters in their apartment at 161 West 86th Street, both parents agreed that the Mississippi verdict was a turning point in bringing about equal justice for all.

"We both feel that this decision and conviction on the part of the jury is of historical significance for the whole country," Mr. Goodman said. "The South is moving away from its hardened position and like all things in history, there will be a matter of time before all vestiges are eliminated."

Mr. Goodman, an engineer who is president of Grow Construction Company, 313 West 53d Street, said it was encouraging that "people in the South, in a civil rights case, sat in judgment of their own actions and decided they would not tolerate violation of law and order."

Both parents also commended the Justice Department for pressing the case and praised the court for insisting on a fair trial without farce.

When asked about the jury decision, Mrs. Fannie Lee Chaney, mother of James E. Chaney, another of the civil rights workers killed, said:

"They did better than I thought they would."

Mrs. Chaney, formerly of Mississippi, moved here in 1965 and now works as a nurse's aide in a nursing home.

Nathan H. Schwerner of Pelham, N.Y., father of Michael H. Schwerner, the other murder victim, said he was "grateful to the members of the jury for doing their duty as Americans despite fears of Klan reprisals."

"It remains to be seen," Mr. Schwerner added, "whether the state of Mississippi, the only organism which can prosecute for murder, will bring murder charges against the proven killers and their associates."

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People called the jury verdict "a history-making development" in Mississippi.

The American Jewish Congress said Americans of "all races and religions" would welcome the verdict.

[From the New York Post, Oct. 21, 1967]

The Man Behind the Verdict in Mississippi

Meridian, Miss.—As John Michael Doar, a boyish-looking government attorney from Wisconsin, argued the Neshoba lynching case to an all-white Mississippi jury, a friend of one of the defendants whispered, "He's winning his case with his argument."

No one can really say how much the lawyer's argument influenced the verdict, but many observers here believe that Doar's quiet, logical argument against lynch law loomed large in the guilty verdicts returned against seven Klansmen.

He began his summation almost apologetically, telling the jurors he hoped they would understand that he came from Washington to prosecute the case only because of "your national government's concern for local law enforcement."

PREVENTED RIOT

He first gained national attention on June 15, 1963, in Jackson when he single-handedly prevented violence between police and a crowd of Negroes who paraded after the funeral of slain civil rights leader Medgar Evers.

With the afternoon temperature soaring to 103 degrees, a crowd of 500 Negroes filled a narrow Jackson street and began throwing rocks and bottles at police. It was unprecedented for Mississippi Negroes, and officers, one of them vowing to "wipe them out," began preparing to open fire.

Doar, shortsleeves rolled up, coat in hand, calmly walked toward the Negroes as missiles sailed overhead.

"You can't win in the streets," he shouted. "You can't win with bricks and bottles." The Negroes finally dispersed.

President Kennedy personally congratulated Doar for preventing a riot.

WENT TO PRINCETON

Doar, born in 1921, in Minneapolis, grew up in New Richmond. He was graduated from Princeton and after service in the Air Force as a lieutenant earned a law degree at the University of California.

He practiced law with his father in New Richmond for 10 years. A Republican, he gave up the lucrative law practice to join the Justice Dept.'s Civil Rights Division toward the end of the Eisenhower administration.

Doar, No. 2 man under Civil Rights Division director Burke Marshall during the Kennedy administration was appointed head of the division by President Johnson on Dec. 18, 1964, after Marshall resigned.

Even after the appointment, Doar refused to remain deskbound in Washington, preferring instead to work in the field, preparing cases to end Klan terrorism, encouraging Negroes to exercise their civil rights, and moving to punish segregationists who violated their rights.

ACCUSING FINGER

He calmly and deliberately recided the evidence of an elaborate Klan lynching plot, dramatically pointed an accusing finger at the chief conspirators, and told the jury acquittals for the defendants would "declare the law of Neshoba County the law of the state of Mississippi."

Doar, 46, was castigated by defense attorneys who told the jury he was an "outsider" and an integrationist, who had come to Mississippi to force the federal government's will on the state.

But his bitterest enemies would be hard-pressed to criticize Doar's courage and determination.

In 1963, he and two other Justice Dept. officials led James Meredith, the first known Negro to enter the University of Mississippi, through a boisterous mob that later turned the campus into a bloody riot area.

In 1965, after a state jury in Hayneville, Ala., acquitted three Klansmen who killed Viola Liuzzo following the Selma-to-Montgomery march, Doar doggedly accumulated a conspiracy case similar to the one he prosecuted here. An all-white federal jury in Montgomery convicted the Klansmen and they were given maximum 10-year sentences.

HERO'S LAST LETTER CAPTURES TRUE GREATNESS OF AMERICA

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my

remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam is a source of much frustration to all of us. Our Nation is engaged in a different kind of war and we face a different kind of enemy. At times we experience situations for which our past experience has left us unprepared and our sense of futility seems almost overpowering.

Those of us who know first hand of the carnage and destruction of previous wars can imagine how much more difficult is the lot of those brave men who now face the enemy. Death is a daily companion as they search out an evasive enemy in the mud and mire of the steamy jungles of Southeast Asia.

One such courageous man, 1st Lt. William B. Kiser, a native of Sheffield, Ala., in the district I represent, has provided an inspiring insight into our Nation's actions there.

In a few short paragraphs of a letter to his mother, this brave young man has provided us with the very essence of the greatness which is America. His words are so touching, I must share them with you.

This will be the last letter Lieutenant Kiser will ever write his mother. He was killed in action 3 days after it was written.

Although his words were in answer to a concerned mother's question, Lieutenant Kiser's straightforward comments have a message for us all. After mentioning his anticipation of an approaching rest trip, Lieutenant Kiser turned to his mother's question and wrote:

> You wanted to know how it is over here. Well, we have definitely made progress and we are definitely winning the war. For instance, just the year I've been here, there are places you couldn't go to at all without getting into a fight, now in the same areas there isn't a Vietcong in sight. The success of the election proved we are swinging the people onto our side. The bad thing is there are still so many Vietnamese that are completely indifferent to the war.
>
> And then at times when you see Americans killed it all seems so futile. For instance we received a letter tonight from the father of a Sgt. who was killed about three weeks ago. He isn't raising hell about the war, what he wants to know is how his son was killed and if he was a good soldier. He gave his son a military funeral.
>
> In my opinion if the U.S. pulls out of Vietnam without gaining a victory then this Sgt.'s life and 30 or 40 others that I have personally seen die and thousands like them will have all given their lives for nothing. It will all have been a big waste.
>
> I get quite disturbed when I read about the protesters and draft dodgers. But then I think about it and I realize this is what makes our country great. We are fighting and our men are giving their lives protecting the right of these people to protest. I don't like it over here, very few people do, but not one of them will say he is sorry he is here. I am proud to be able to say "I fought in Vietnam." I just hope America does not give up before victory is assured. I guess that is enough of that.
>
> Only 58 days until I'll be on the big bird home. Be good and write when you can.
>
> Love,
>
> Bill.

Many will never know the great personal loss suffered by the family of Lieutenant Kiser. But in a significant sense his death was a severe loss to the future of the entire Nation.

He was the very epitome of all that is right and good in our land. He lived an active and eager life. He had been an officer in the Order of DeMolay in Phoenix, Ariz., where his family moved when he was 7 years old.

He earned his way through 3½ years at Arizona State University by working as a brakeman for the Southern Pacific Railroad.

He enlisted in the Army in 1964 and was sent to officer candidate school.

Shortly after arriving in Vietnam he was decorated with the Bronze Star Medal for heroism. The citation stated:

> For heroism in action performed against a hostile force in the Republic of Vietnam: Second Lieutenant Kiser distinguished himself by valorous actions when he came to the rescue of a friendly force under heavy attack near Rach Kien, Vietnam, on 18 February 1967. When notified that an infantry unit had been pinned down by hostile fire, he immediately ran several hundred meters in order to render his assistance. Leaving the protection of an adjacent treeline, Lieutenant Kiser moved through a waist-deep rice paddy in order to join forward elements of the beleagured unit. The completely exposed terrain offered no cover, but Lieutenant Kiser continued to advance, disregarding the hail of insurgent fire. When he reached the forward element, he began to receive vocal instructions from a fellow officer, and then immediately called them in to a 106 millimeter recoillless rifle crew. Nearly 50 rounds were called in upon the enemy position, breaking the Viet Cong attack and preventing further casualties among the infantry unit. Second Lieutenant Kiser's courage under fire and devotion to duty are in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, the 9th Infantry Division, and the United States Army.

Beyond his wonderful record his last letter is a monument to that which should survive. His clear thinking and beautiful understanding of what makes our country great are qualities which could be imitated by many others to the true enhancement of our country's future.

Lieutenant Kiser's earlier citation for heroism indicated his "courage under fire and devotion to duty" are in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, the 9th Infantry Division, and the U.S. Army.

I would enlarge upon that citation.

Lieutenant Kiser exhibited patriotism and love for his country to a degree exceeded by no man. He gave his very life that others might enjoy the greatness that is America. He did so without regard for the merits of those who stay behind or their appreciation of his sacrifice. He did so not by choice but because he saw his duty.

For Lieutenant Kiser and thousands like him who have given their all, we must carry on so that they have not died in vain.

As he concluded his last letter to his mother: "I just hope America does not give up before victory is assured."

"MAYOR": A CASE OF FALSE PACKAGING

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I recently commented on the fact that Mr. Walter Washington, Commissioner of the District, is not the "mayor" of Washington. I also remarked that attempts to name the position "mayor" had political overtones which emanated from the White House.

Within days after I commented on use of the title "Mayor," the Washington Evening Star contained an editorial which attempted to justify this title from various angles, I was pleased that the editorial, "Mr. Mayor," contained these sentences, to which I alluded in the earlier remarks:

> There is no mystery about how it started, or why. The President began using the term, rather pointedly, at Washington's oath of office ceremony three weeks ago. He has taken every opportunity to use it since. He obviously wants it to take hold.

I believe it is also obvious that the President wants to totally replace the concept of "Commissioner" with the concept of "mayor." It would doubtless be immeasurably helpful when he asks Congress to legally change the position, which he is sure to do. If Mr. Washington, or a successor, were "mayor" in name, it would merely be a slight technicality, to estimate the words of the President, for Congress to make him this in fact.

I usually appreciate the Star for its editorial positions but in this instance I must take exception. The Star points out a flaw in the use of the term. I quote:

> "Mayor" makes the District sound more like other cities. It implies that through the Johnson reorganization plan the new District head has been vested with powers which would be quite impossible if he were merely a "commissioner."
>
> None of which is really true, and no one, of course, should be taken in by this political ploy. So why are we being taken in?

The Star, then lists these reasons: Mr. Washington fits the dictionary definition, "chief executive officer of a municipal corporation."

I must say that the implication that the District or the position of Commissioner is parallel to others across the Nation is strong; but the District is unique, there is no place like it, even if the President does want to "make it sound more like other cities."

The Star adds that in some cities mayors are appointed. Fine, but in the District the Commissioner is appointed, the law does not mention "mayor" and one must assume that in "other cities" appointed mayors are persons serving offices created by law containing the word "mayor."

The Star's personal reasons for using "mayor" total up to convenience. It is easier to fit "mayor" into a headline. Not accurate, but easier. As an editor and publisher myself, I can sympathize, but not much.

Also the Star says that Mr. Washington "needs all the prestige just now that he can muster by any means." I can say that things must be in bad shape if the President, Mr. Washington, and the District as a whole need the prestige mustered by false packaging.

But, anyway, the Star asks:

> So long as no one is deceived, what's the harm?

This is by now rather obvious. But what is not obvious to the Star is that the President must not believe that no one is deceived or he would stop publicly calling Mr. Washington by the wrong title.

I agree with the Star that this is a political ploy and the long-range value of it should be evident to anyone who has ever learned anything by repetition. Unfortunately, the fourth estate has taken the easy way out.

Here is the full text of the editorial:

MR. MAYOR

> In a letter the other day one of our readers asked a good question: Why, all of a sudden, is everyone going along with this business of calling Walter Washington the new mayor when his real title is District Commissioner?
>
> There is no mystery about how it started, or why. The President began using the term, rather pointedly, at Washington's oath of office ceremony three weeks ago. He has taken every opportunity to use it since. He obviously wants it to take hold. And the reason is that "mayor" makes the District sound more like other cities. It implies that through the Johnson reorganization plan the new District head has been vested with powers which would be quite impossible if he were merely a "commissioner."
>
> None of which is really true, and no one, of course, should be taken in by this political ploy. So why are we being taken in?
>
> Well, we might, weaving and dodging, note that Webster does define "mayor" as the "chief executive officer of a municipal corporation," which Walter Washington certainly is. Or that mayors, in some cities, are in fact appointed rather than elected. Or even that Walter Washington, after all, needs all the prestige just now that he can muster by any means.
>
> But the simple truth is that we are persuaded by a consideration of purely personal convenience: The word "commissioner," to put it bluntly, just doesn't fit in headlines. "Mayor" fits fine.
>
> It used to be that we got around this dilemma by using names such as Tobriner, Duncan or Mathe. But "Washington," let's face it, counts nearly as long in the copy book as "commissioner." Besides, the person is apt to be confused with the city. And we've never been one of those that calls people FDR or LBJ—so WW is out.
>
> Mayor, it is. Our copy readers are overjoyed. You should get better headlines. And so long as no one is deceived, what's the harm?

CENTENNIAL OF WESTERN MARYLAND COLLEGE

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on October 21 it was my privilege to take part in the centennial convocation marking the 100th anniversary of Western Maryland College, one of the indispensable, independent liberal arts colleges in the Nation. On this occasion, the administrators, faculty, students, alumni, and friends of this fine institution paused to look back over the college's proud history, and forward to a second century of growth and accomplishment.

Established in 1867, Western Maryland was the first coeducational college south of the Mason-Dixon Line. The college was the dream of Fayette R. Buell, who operated a private school in beautiful Westminster, Md., and started constructing the first college building in 1866 on a hill at the western end of Westminster which had been used at times for public meetings and as a Federal artillery emplacement during the Civil War. Chartered in 1868 by the former Methodist Protestant Church, Western Maryland is now a church-related college of the Methodist church.

Since the administration of its first president, Dr. J. T. Ward, Western Maryland has been led by four succeeding presidents to its present position as an effective, highly esteemed institution. Its leaders have built the college from a 6-acre campus with one building to a complex of more than 160 acres with facilities valued at $10 million. The student body has grown from the 70 enrolled that first year to over 800 today. As part of its centennial celebration, the college is engaged in a vigorous expansion program which will provide sufficient facilities for an enlarged student body of 1,200.

The theme for the college's year-long celebration is "The Liberal Arts College: Continuity and Change." In taking a keen, constructive look at the role of liberal arts colleges in education today, Western Maryland is both analyzing her own role and future, and providing leadership for other independent liberal arts institutions in our changing educational structure.

The president of Western Maryland College, Dr. Lowell S. Ensor, the officers and members of the board of trustees, the college's entire administrative staff and faculty, and its alumni and students deserve our warm congratulations for their achievements to date and the soundly based confidence with which they face the future. The record of Western Maryland College in her first century has been one of great accomplishment, written in the contributions of the institution's many distinguished graduates, in the growth and prominence which the college has brought to the community of Westminster, to Carroll County, and to Maryland, and in the leadership which Western Maryland has exerted in the cause of quality education. I have every confidence that the school's record during the next 100 years will be equally proud.

For the information of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD at this point the following summary of the college's history and objectives:

WESTERN MARYLAND COLLEGE

BACKGROUND

The dream of one man the selfless labor of another account for the beginnings of Western Maryland College. Fayette R. Buell, operator of a Westminster private school, had a dream which he followed until construction actually started in 1866 on the first College building. The late J. T. Ward, who became associated with Mr. Buell while his plan was being formulated, went on to see the College through a difficult beginning period, serving as its president for 19 years.

Western Maryland opened in 1867 and was chartered in 1868 under the auspices of the former Methodist Protestant Church. It is now one of the church-related colleges of the Methodist Church. The College is coeducational; in fact it was the first institution south of the Mason and Dixon line to open its doors to both young men and young women.

At the retirement of J. T. Ward from the presidency of the College, Thomas Hamilton Lewis became Western Maryland's second president. During his administration, the College developed financial stability and intellectual firmness. Promotion of its physical growth and a vision for the future were the College's inheritance from the presidency of Albert Norman Ward. President Fred G. Holloway brought Western Maryland safely through the depression and the difficult times of World War II. Under the present incumbent, Lowell S. Ensor, the College has become an up-to-date and outstandingly effective institution.

That first building, started by Mr. Buell with borrowed money, was located at the western end of Westminster on a hill which had been used at times for public meetings and as a federal artillery emplacement during the Civil War. There were just six acres and one building in the original campus. Since that time the College has acquired surrounding farm lands and other properties to achieve a campus of more than 130 acres with facilities valued at 9½ million dollars. There were 70 students enrolled when the College began; now enrollment tops 800. The curricular approach has broadened, also, from a narrow classicism to the full scope of liberal arts.

In those early days, Western Maryland, one College historian has remarked, had both "the ultra-Victorian provincialism of the environment and the conservative influence of denominational sponsorship"—this, despite its radical adoption of coeducation. Both the nation's and the College's approach to higher education have progressed from that era.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

As a liberal arts college, Western Maryland presents an educational program which equips graduates with qualities of leadership and a sense of responsibility for personal development and the advancement of society.

Students at a liberal arts college receive an education which enables them to meet the vagaries of life with discrimination, understanding, and a fund of useful knowledge. Students can acquire a comprehension of humanity in terms of social environment and natural law. They are taught to search for the basic issues of any specific problem or conflict and discover what human values are involved. Liberal education attempts to inspire that range of interest, depth of appreciation, and facility of thought and action needed for effective living in a democratic society.

Western Maryland, along with many distinguished undergraduate institutions, is interested in a well-stocked and well-disciplined mind, but educates for more: insight, which goes beyond facts and skills. The program at Western Maryland is aimed at fostering an enlightened and responsible citizen—enlightened in the sense of understanding rather than merely possessing a fund of facts, and responsible to the degree of being involved personally in what engages the mind. At the same time, the College encourages students to develop a sense of aesthetic and spiritual values and to feel inspired to create. Such interests are not merely supplementary to the business of life; by adding value to leisure hours, they make it full. Western Maryland also realizes that professional proficiency is essential. Certain career choices require special abilities which the student is helped to acquire. The College provides an education which is basic to nearly all professions as well as specialization in some areas. Typical of this chance to specialize is the opportunity for French students to take their third year of study in France.

Western Maryland is accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and by the University Senate of the Methodist Church. It holds membership in the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the National Association of Schools of Music and has the approval of that Association for a Bachelor of Arts degree in applied music and in music history and literature. The College is on the approved list of the American Association of University Women.

Education is self-enrichment. The liberal arts philosophy concentrates on informed individualism, and Western Maryland offers a program which enhances development toward individual breadth and maturity.

"THE GREAT DOLLAR THROWAWAY"—NEW PROOF OF NEED FOR FEDERAL REFORMS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, our current debates over Federal expenditures and immediate spending cuts have reemphasized the need for long range, thorough reforms in Federal operations to hold costs to manageable levels and insure that American taxpayers receive a dollar's worth of services for every tax dollar.

Dramatic new evidence of the problems which have developed in the executive branch is being published this week by the Baltimore News-American in a provocative series "The Great Dollar Throwaway," by News-American reporter Jerry Cartledge. Mr. Cartledge's thoughtful articles are based on more than 3 months of study and investigation, review of countless massive Federal documents, and interviews with many individuals in the Congress, in the executive branch, and in non-Federal agencies which utilize Federal assistance. Interest in my bill—H.R. 69—to establish a new Hoover-type commission to review and reform Federal operations attracted Mr. Cartledge's attention and his work promises to alert countless Americans to the importance of beginning such an effort without further delay.

I feel that Mr. Cartledge's articles will be of immense interest to the Congress, and may point out some problem areas which individual Members have not had the opportunity to explore. I would therefore like to place his first two articles, from October 22 and 23, in the RECORD today, and will include the rest of the series as it is published:

THE GREAT DOLLAR THROWAWAY

(By Jerry Cartledge)

The federal government expects to spend a minimum of $169.2 billion this year—at least $135 billion in the executive branch bureaucracy—to conduct its business. The President says that if Congress will impose an immediate 10 percent surcharge on all personal and corporate income taxes, the 1968 fiscal spending binge will amount to only $14 to $18 billion more than the government can expect to take in from taxes and other sources this year.

On Aug. 3, when President Johnson sent his special tax request to the Congress, he warned that if he did not get his 10 percent tax boost, deficit spending would spiral to more than $28 billion.

According to statistics given to the House of Representatives prior to the President's tax increase plan, the average American will work —— hours and 25 minutes of every working day of the year to earn the money he will need to pay his 1967 federal taxes. The estimate, which by many is considered extremely modest by many experts and was made by the Tax Foundation Inc.

According to statistics given to the Congress by Rep. Theodore R. Kupferman of New York, "it costs $4.481 to run the federal government every second of every day in the year."

A large portion of the spending stampede has resulted from the agencies, departments, bureaus, offices, etc., which have been created since the last bipartisan and public review of executive branch spending and policy which was completed by the Second Hoover Commission 12 years ago.

In an attempt to restore some sanity to government spending, a Maryland congressman, Charles McC. Mathias Jr., has been trying for the past three years to establish a public watchdog group, comprised of federal and state leaders and experts from private enterprise, to find out exactly what is happening to American taxpayer dollars and to make wise suggestions to the Congress on how we can cut spending, or at least get a dollar's worth for a dollar spent.

Today, the federal government plans to spend $36.9 billion more than in 1966 and about $15.6 billion more than it spent last year.

A large portion of this money will be spent to pay the salaries of Congressmen and their staffs and the more than 3 million people on the payroll in the Executive Branch of government.

Most of the remainder will be spent to carry out the programs of a spiderweb of departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments and instrumentalities of the executive branch.

A total of $76 billion in the 1968 budget is earmarked for "major military programs," with the present war in Vietnam making ever greater demands for money.

The President early this year asked for a green light from Congress to increase deficit spending up to $8 billion dollars to finance the cost of our military activities in Vietnam. Congress reluctantly agreed to $7 billion.

Budget analysts have allocated $16.7 billion for "grants-in-aid to state and local governments." But this is by no means the limit of taxpayer dollars that will be spent on domestic programs that are increasing at what many federal legislators term "an alarming rate."

Following the laws of inertia, programs once set in motion tend to remain in motion. Defying the laws, programs at rest do not tend to remain at rest. By their very nature, federal programs—particularly those dealing with domestic problems—have built into them the capacity for continuation, reproduction, expansion and proliferation.

Today there are more than 220 separate programs through which the federal government assists states and localities financially. These programs require at least 20 different agencies with more than 400 regional offices and 150 Washington offices to administer, by a most conservative estimate.

However, Maryland Congressman Charles McC. Mathias Jr. says the figures are much higher.

"The Department of Health, Education and Welfare alone," Mathias says, "participates in 175 to 180 programs costing about $8 billion. There are about 57 vocational education programs, and 33 agencies engaged in 296 consumer protection activities."

Paperwork alone cost $9.5 billion, or 7 percent of the 1967 budget, and the figure will rise again this year.

The number of federal employees in the Washington area needed to cope with mammoth government increases by 6,000 each year. There is no accurate estimate of the increased payrolls at the government's regional establishments across the nation.

Actually, when things get down to the regional and local levels, they often get lost, statistically and otherwise.

In a special study, the Library of Congress has stated that, "The federal government now spends nearly $4 billion annually on research and development in its own laboratories, but it does not know exactly how many laboratories it has, where they are, what kinds of people work in them or what they are doing."

What duplication, overlapping, completion and general inefficiency exist in the giant multiplicity of programs conducted by the federal government at the local level can only be guessed at.

But some indication may be gotten from testimony of Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz before Congress when he noted that: "There are 15 to 30 separate manpower programs administered by public and private agencies, all supported by federal funds, in each major U.S. metropolitan area."

To add to the confusion, Connecticut's Democratic Sen. Abraham Ribicoff recently told the Senate: "Manpower programs alone have increased eightfold since 1961, but they are administered by 10 separate organizational units in three independent departments."

Some of the foregoing examples and many of those to follow might seem mildly humorous to the average person—until he stops to realize that he is paying and will continue to pay for it at a shocking rate.

Hardly anyone speaks of economists in this capital city of the greatest nation ever known to civilization. Members of Congress know that the word "economy" is a dirty word in Washington, and those who still remember pledges of economy to the people back home realizes that the only way to broach the subject is to speak of "efficiency."

A smart Congressman does not question the wisdom or economy of a particular program of the federal government. Rather, he respectfully inquires as to whether the program involved is being administered efficiently. Via this route, he can sometimes find out whether a program is actually accomplishing anything "tangible."

"Art for art's sake" might well be the slogan of many of the federal government's program architects, especially those dealing with research. The program is often the only excuse for its own existence, and anyone who tries to measure the value of the program expenditure in terms of dollars and cents, improved living standards or service rendered is left dismayed.

For instance, Uncle Sam, through the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities, is spending $5,000 for studies aimed at finding out who has written what that happens to be critical of the writings of Edgar Allen Poe. Among other things, the federal government is also using taxpayers' money for a $12,650 study entitled "Literary Investigation of American Popular Culture," and $18,000 to find out whether Edmund Burke actually wrote "18th Century Journal."

At a time when the nation is erupting with racial violence and Negro leaders are either demanding or pleading for more economic assistance from the federal government to alleviate the disastrous conditions of urban ghetto life, it is a bitter fact that, through some flaw in research, the U.S. has wasted $3.5 million to create a modern ghost town in Brazil.

The money was spent by the U.S. to provide 19,000 homes for the impoverished people of the shantytowns and ghettos outside Rio de Janeiro. Only, one or more of our programmers goofed, and the homes were built 30 miles away from the city of Rio where the shantytown dwellers must find work. In order to live in these bright new homes, the workers would have to spend almost a third of their near-starvation wages to commute to and from work.

New York's Republican Congressman Charles Goodell made an inspection tour of Brazil and recently reported to the Congress that the Rio workers are still living in their favelas (shantytowns).

"When it is understood what $3.5 million could have accomplished in developing resource-backed community action within the favelas themselves, the enormity of this kind of waste is galling," he noted.

Goodell also got a good look at U.S.-financed school construction in Brazil, another glaring example of fairy godmother programming, botched planning and hasty spending.

Many of the schools were poorly constructed, Goodell reported, and there was immediate danger that some of the roofs or walls were collapsing. Contracts had been awarded to unregistered firms on a noncompetitive basis, with later changes permitting contractors to double the award price. Additionally, the schools were deteriorating because there had been no provision made for upkeep.

But wasteful spending abroad is only a small portion of an ever-growing problem which has caused many members of Congress to take a long, hard second look at the program bonanza and spending spree that has become the order of the day in the sprawling Washington bureaucracy.

Several members of both houses of Congress have introduced legislation aimed at reorganization of the Executive Branch in an effort to curb runaway government handouts. All target inefficiency, duplication, overlapping procedures and resulting administrative costs of "over-kill proportions."

In the Senate, Ribicoff has called for a partisan commission of nine persons from government and private life, appointed by the President, to help find some solutions to the problem. The preamble to his bill (S. 2116) states:

"The Congress finds that there are more than 150 departments, agencies, boards, commissions, bureaus and other organizations in the Executive Branch engaged in performing the functions of government; that such a proliferation of governmental units tends to produce a lack of coordination between them and overlapping, conflict and duplication of effort among them; that the President and Congress need additional tools and procedures to exercise better supervision and direction . . . and that improved organizational structure and managerial techniques would permit the President to carry out more effectively the Constitutional mandate that he coordinate and manage the Executive Branch in accordance with the laws enacted by Congress."

Members of the Ribicoff Commission appointed from private life would receive $100 per day, plus expenses, for their planned 18 months of study.

Another Senate measure, by Kansas Republican James B. Pearson, calls for 10-member bi-partisan commission . . . with two appointed by the President, four by the president of the Senate (two Senators and two private citizens), and four by the Speaker of the House (two Representatives and two private citizens).

Private citizens would be paid $75 per day, plus expenses, during the two-year life of the Pearson Commission.

Both bills gives the commission power to issue subpoenas for witnesses and documents and to hire "consultants and experts" for $75 per day under the Ribicoff proposal and $50 a day under Pearson's plan. Both bills provide for open-end salaries for commission staffs.

In the House of Representatives there have been several bills submitted by members interested in "streamlining government operations," for much the same reasons as those expressed in the Senate.

But the most comprehensive measure to date, and one which has won the most support, is the bill calling for the establishment of another "Hoover Commission" by Maryland's Congressman Mathias.

The bill (H.R. 69) would establish a commission along the same lines as the two others which accomplished so much to put government back on the tracks after years of unbridled spending during World War II.

The new study group would be officially titled "The Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," as were its two predecessors, but probably would be commonly called the Third Hoover Commission.

Mathias' bill calls for a commission of 14 bi-partisan members as follows:

Six appointed by the President, two from the Executive Branch, two from among the 50 U.S. governors and two from private life.

Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two Senators and two from private life.

Four appointed by the Speaker of the House, two Representatives and two from private life.

Private-citizen members of the two-year commission would receive $75 per day, plus expenses, and could hire "temporary and intermittent services . . . at rates not to exceed $50 a day for individuals." The commission would have the power to "apppoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems necessary."

While the pay for commission members seems attractive, the duties involved are staggering enough to assure that only those with a dedication to public service will be willing to tackle the job.

The Mathias bill stresses the obligation of the commission to "promote economy, efficiency and improved service" in the government by:

Defining responsibilities of officials, and functions, services and activities of departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments and instrumentalities of the Executive Branch . . .

Recommending methods and procedures for reducing expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions . . .

Eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities and functions . . .

Consolidating services, activities and functions of a similar nature . . .

Abolishing services, activities and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of government . . .

Recommending means . . . to expedite coordination of programs and policies in areas such as, but not limited to, urban affairs, natural resources and transportation . . .

Recommending means to increase and improve liaison and communication, including the sharing of information, within the Executive Branch, between the executive and legislative branches of the federal government, and between the federal government and appropriate state and local governments and public entities.

Under the Mathias proposal, the commission would have subpoena powers to probe into every nook and cranny of the federal bureaucracy.

The members would have the tools to cut through any amount of red tape or peer into the highest ivory towers of entrenched political favoritism and protection.

HOOVER COMMISSIONS SAVED BILLIONS

(By Jerry Cartledge)

Twenty years ago, in the immediate aftermath of World War II, when the Federal government was still at the apex of an unbridled spending spree and a bureaucracy spreading like cancer, a Senate committee on expenditures in the Executive Departments reported:

"The time is ripe for a general overhauling, for going through the government with a fine-tooth comb and for casting some light into all the many dark places."

As a result of this committee and others within a deeply concerned and worried Congress, the first Hoover Commission, was born officially created by the stroke of President Truman's pen on July 7, 1947.

According to Maryland Congressmen Charles McC. Mathias Jr., who is leading a legislative drive for a similar commission, the 1947 body was created at a time of rapid change, when the Federal government had become unwieldly, inefficient and obviously unable to respond to new conditions and new responsibilities.

The first commission, formed to conduct a systematic, objective review of Federal operations, ultimately made more than 100 major recommendations which when implemented, shaped the government into a far more effective instrument public service.

The cost of operating the commission for its 18 months duration was about $2 million. A survey by the Library of Congress, completed early in 1960, showed that the commission had resulted in savings "of at least $7 billion . . . based on the official reports of the Federal agencies themselves."

In its final report, in 1949, the commission described the magnitude of the problems it had faced by noting that in less than 20 years civil employes of the government had increased from 570,000 to more than 2 million . . . bureaus, sections and units increased four-fold to more than 1,800, and that annual expenditures had spiraled from $3 billion to more than $39 billion for administrative purposes alone.

The commission concluded, "Such rapid growth could not take place without creating serious problems of organization and management. Methods, procedures and controls effective two decades ago cannot cope with the management needs of today."

Echoing the above statement, Mathias recently noted that over the last 20 years the federal budget for administrative purposes alone has grown from $33.7 billion in fiscal 1948 to $135 billion in fiscal 1968, which started July 1.

During that same 20 years, Mathias said, the non-defense budget increased from $22 billion to $59.5 billion, a jump of 170 percent.

Mathias told the House of Representatives last June: "We now have more than 220 major federal grant-in-aid programs and innumerable minor ones, contained in more than 400 separate authorizations, and administered by at least 21 federal agencies with more than 150 major bureaus and offices in Washington and more than 400 regional and area offices in the field."

For the above reasons, and a volume more that have been enumerated by congressmen from all parts of the nation in support of the Maryland congressman's bill (H.R. 69), Mathias is imploring Congress to act now to begin another sweeping review of big government, aimed at cutting waste and increasing efficiency, savings and services.

In this light, it is important to review the accomplishments of the first Hoover Commission, and its successor, which served in 1953–55 under the administration of President Eisenhower.

One of the key recommendations of the first commission led to the Reorganization Act of 1949, under which the President may submit reorganization plans to Congress, and the plans become law unless rejected within 60 days by a majority of either House or Senate. This permits the President to control the purse strings and coordinate or eliminate activities within the agencies with which he is most vitally concerned.

In addition to the Reorganization Act which, incidentally, is currently being used by President Johnson to seek a compromise solution to the problem of home rule in the District of Columbia, the most significant results of the first Hoover Commission's report were eight in number:

1—The Military Unification Act of 1949. Even though this left our defense establishment far short of complete unification, it was an enormous stride toward that goal. Fortunately, it came just in time to produce unprecedented teamwork among the Armed Services in the critical early days of the Korean War.

2—Creation of the General Services Agency (GSA), by combining four previous agencies for more efficient government housekeeping—through modernized purchasing, inventory control, storage, and records management in the civilian agencies.

3—Complete reorganization of the State Department to clarify responsibilities, expedite communications and eliminate artificial staff barriers.

4—Consolidation of a multiplicity of functions within a Labor Department of full Cabinet stature.

5—The end of political appointments in the corrupation-ridden Bureau of Internal Revenue, which now operates under the merit system.

6—Reclassification and regrouping of welfare activities and the creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. While this agency currently is the object of much criticism in Congress because of its proliferation of programs and varying policies, its creation eliminated an unbelievable fragmentation of public services which were almost impossible to evaluate.

7—Elimination of much delay, waste and duplication in the Post Office. Many of the recommendations in this regard were to be taken up by the next Hoover Commission, with extremely successful results in savings and service.

8—Separation of "hidden subsidies" from payments by the federal government for the transportation of airline mail.

A Citizens Committee which evaluated the commission's work reported the resulting savings of "at least $7 billion," but carefully noted that the complete, overall savings from these and other measures "became hard to trace in the budget upsurge created by the Korean War."

The second Hoover Commission report scored major accomplishments in the areas of national safety and government cost, and resulted in five basic changes in government functions and several particularized improvements.

1—Defense Unification, now Public Law 599, strongly reinforced the constitutional principle of civilian control of the military.

The authority of the Secretary of Defense was greatly clarified concerning transfer, reassignment, consolidation and abolition of functions. The effectiveness of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a planning unit was strengthened. The number of Assistant Secretaries was sharply reduced and many of the resulting causes of inter-service bickering and delay were eliminated or, at least, diminished.

Bearing virtually on the safety of the nation and the lives of its people, the measure provided for unified combat commands.

A citizens Committee concerned with this aspect of the commission's work found that "frightening evidence of confusion and dissention in the frontal sectors of our defense bastions were brought out" by both Hoover Commissions and by expert witnesses called to the hearings on the subsequent unification bill.

An amendment to the unification measure, to correct what the commission termed "one of the most grievous cases of waste in the whole far-flung defense establishment," authorized the unified procurement and management—under civilian control—of common-use defense supplies such as food, clothing and fuel.

While this section of the law was "permissive" rather than "mandatory," it gave the Defense Secretary a chance to effect enormous economies.

Modernized Budgeting System, adopted via Public Law 759, was the result of a commission finding that the government was operating under an obsolete system. Prior to the new law, Congress made lump sum appropriations for long-term projects and rarely got a second look at the expenditures in succeeding years.

Huge carryovers in unexpended funds, estimated by the commission at near $70 billion in 1955, "were flowing over the dam beyond further congressional review."

As a result, the Congress finally adopted "annual accrued expenditures budgeting," which means that the government pays, in a given year, only for the goods and services received in that year.

However, recent investigation reveals that this measure is being ignored to varying degrees by deferred spending in government agencies, particularly the military.

A poignant example of the inefficiency and apparent waste involved in certain aspects of deferred spending was turned up this year by Maryland Democratic Congressman Clarence D. Long.

It seems that the Navy in 1964 requested $1.2 million to build new barracks for the WAVEs stationed at Bainbridge, Md. The appropriation was subsequently approved, but the barracks were not built until this year—long after the women had been shipped to a new permanent station in Orlando, Fla.

3—Reduction of government competition with private business, a key recommendation of the commission, has been to a varying degree accomplished by several minor laws and direct action by the Executive Branch.

For example, in 1955 the commission found some 2,500 business-type government establishments "engaged in useless and costly competition with nearby private businesses, usually small businesses, in the Defense Department alone."

These included bakeries, laundries, and factories making paint, rope, ice cream and scores of other civilian products. By 1960, about 700 had been closed or were in the process of being shut down or curtailed.

4—An improved federal career service, recommended by the commission, has come into being, more through executive action then legislation. The commission placed heavy emphasis on the need for attracting and holding competent administrative, managerial and scientific personnel in federal service.

A Career Executive Board has since been set up along the lines suggested by the commission.

5—Recommended coordination and expedition of federal research—an area of crying neglect today—was to some degree achieved by the defense unification law. The law, based on a fundamental commission proposal, amounts to a congressional mandate to the Defense Department to eliminate duplication and delay in overlapping and confused research programs.

The law also established a Departmental Director of Defense Research and Engineering, with broad powers not only to centralize and coordinate Armed Services research projects, but to initiate research programs on his own wherever he sees a gap or lag.

The Citizens Committee reviewing this action emphasized, "The importance of this development can hardly be overstated. Recent studies (in 1958) have shown alarming contrasts in the time required for U.S. missile and other projects to move from the 'idea' stage to the drawing board and then into production, as compared with the record of the Russians."

Other accomplishments of the second Hoover Commission were:

Liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corp. This not only put an end to government loans to snake farms and juke box operators, it returned $474 million in capital funds to the Treasury.

Improved and simplified government paperwork. The commission in 1955 found that paperwork cost the government $4 billion a year, almost equal to the entire federal budget of 1930. (Last year, government paperwork cost $9.5 billion, but this resulted from many factors—such as population explosion and inefficiency produced in an ever-growing bureaucracy.)

The government-wide system of better records management and simplification suggested by the Hoover Commission did have some tangible effect however. As an example, the 1,040 largest Post Offices in the nation now use 600 standardized forms in place of 22,000 local forms, prior to 1960.

Coordination of military hospitals, with one branch of the service handling medical care for all military personnel in a given region . . . rejecting the costly theory that soldiers must go to Army hospitals and Sailors to Navy hospitals, even though it meant overfilled hospitals in some areas and half-full hospitals in others.

Not all of the commission's recommendations were followed, however, and certain of them might well be implemented today with many beneficial results.

Some of the suggestions forgotten by subsequent administrations and Congresses include establishment of a coordinating Federal Advisory Council and Health . . . reorganization of federal legal services . . . establishment of a joint committee on intelligence matters . . . improving the efficiency of government lending agencies and making them self-supporting . . . reorganization of federal water resources and power facilities, and restriction of federal activity in areas where private industry cannot operate.

The second Hoover Commission was given $2,848,543 by Congress for its 18 months of work. It spent $2,768,562 and returned $83,527 to the Treasury. A commission task force estimated savings in federal expenditures as a result of its recommendations of more than $8.5 billion.

RUSSIAN VEGETABLE OIL TO DOCK AT NEW ORLEANS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I sent this telegram to Hunt-Wesson Foods:

> Customs officials have notified me that the Norwegian merchant ship *Prometheus* is expected to dock any day now at New Orleans bringing ashore 20 million pounds of vegetable oil your firm has purchased from the Soviet Union. Texas Transport & Terminal in New Orleans is U.S. agent for the ship.
>
> This of course is part of the 40 million pound purchase you are making from Moscow and which constitutes the first import of vegetable oil from the Soviet Union in at least a 25 year period.
>
> Because I am deeply concerned for the safety of our men who daily face Soviet weapons and for soybean and cotton farmers who are gripped in the worst cost-price squeeze in years. I resent this unprecedented import.
>
> Under these regrettable circumstances I consider it only fair to acquaint you in advance with the course of action I will take once this third and largest Soviet cargo is unloaded on American soil.
>
> At that time, I will:
>
> 1. inform fully each of my colleagues in the Congress in regard to details of the import,
> 2. remind them of the depressed price levels which have prevailed in the U.S. vegetable oil market throughout the period during which the import occurred,
> 3. supply them with the text of your telegram to me dated September 12, 1967, in which you frankly admitted your firm bought from Moscow in order to keep U.S. prices down. To refresh your memory, here are your very words:
>
> "To attempt to buy domestic cottonseed oil for export use in competition with our own, and other domestic consumer needs, could put an extreme inflationary pressure on the price of domestic vegetable oils."
>
> 4. remind them that the Soviet Union is supplying most of the sophisticated weapons which are causing such heavy U.S. casualties in Vietnam,
> 5. notify them that Wesson Oil purchased henceforth in U.S. stores may be made from Soviet vegetable oil.
> 6. inform them that Wesson is the only U.S. firm using Soviet vegetable oil, and finally,
> 7. urge each of them—especially those representing soybean and cotton growers—to pass this information on to all of their constituents.
>
> If I receive the cooperation I anticipate, a substantial number of U.S. consumers will thus be forewarned about the origin of Wesson Oil and the callous indifference of the firm's management to the economic plight of farmers and the military plight of their sons in Vietnam. I am sure many of them will decide to join the Findleys in boycotting Wesson Oil.
>
> I had hoped that your firm, out of respect for our men in Vietnam, would cancel this contemptible purchase. Today, with the docking of the *Prometheus* expected momentarily at New Orleans, my hopes have vanished.

THE 11TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, October 23 marks the 11th anniversary of the beginning of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956.

What began as a peaceful student demonstration turned into a total uprising comprised of the workers, farmers, artisans, schoolteachers, and members of the Hungarian Armed Forces. Representatives of the entire Hungarian population, from teenagers to grandmothers, joined in the revolt against the tyranny of communism. These oppressed Hungarians disproved the claim that national communism can be a substitute for freedom. They disproved the claim by risking their families, homes, work, and future—all sacrificed to throw off the yoke of their oppressors and to establish a free new government.

The Hungarian freedom fighters believed it was better to struggle against oppression than to live a life of slavery. Their cry of defiance and of faith in the rights of man was heard everywhere in the world.

One of the darkest pages of history records the savagery of the Communists in suppressing this uprising. Hungary became a veritable bloodbath in which the Soviets waged a campaign without mercy, killing more than 24,000 fighters for freedom. Countless thousands were jailed or deported.

Hungary is still one of those nations under the domination of the Communists and we deeply sympathize with her serious plight. By marking this 11th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution we focus the attention of the world on the danger of Communist tyranny. That is the reason I speak on behalf of the brave Hungarian people, so that no one will ever forget what happens to a nation once it is so unfortunate as to be under the Red tyrant's heel.

The Hungarian freedom fighters are remembered in the hearts of every free man across this earth as the true embodiment of the spirit that keeps liberty the thriving and real force that it is. We mourn the dead, we pity the wounded and we embrace the imprisoned participants of that revolt 11 years ago. But most of all, we respect the deep and powerful commitment to freedom that is an integral part of the heritage of the Hungarian nation.

On this 11th anniversary of the 1956 uprising, we ardently hope and pray that soon a bright new day will dawn for Hungary when she will once again become a member of the family of free and independent nations.

THE 11TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 11th anniversary of the uprising of the Hungarian freedom fighters against the Soviet-imposed Hungarian Communist government.

This heroic effort to achieve freedom for the Hungarian people was put down in a ruthless fashion by the armed forces of the Soviet Union.

As years go by the great attempt by the Hungarian people to obtain independence is forgotten and the tyranny which exists by the Communists in Eastern Europe is tragically accepted as a political fact of life.

I do not believe that it should be accepted in this fashion. I believe that the spirit, dedication, and aspirations of the people of Hungary and other captives of communism will eventually result in supreme freedom and that Moscow imposed totalitarianism will ultimately be overcome.

We must note the historic fact that the turmoil in the Middle East, parts of Africa, and guerrilla warfare in Latin America, are all extenuations of Communist efforts to achieve world control.

The center of the stage at the moment is Vietnam, where our Armed Forces are in action repelling the Communist attack on the freedom of South Vietnam.

It is obvious that there will not be true peace and freedom in the world until such day as communism is totally vanquished or if, in an unforeseen development, the Communists abandon their efforts for world control.

The Hungarian freedom fighters remain a symbol of man's legitimate desire for independence. We today respect the heroic episode that they wrote on the pages of history, and encourage Hungarians and other peoples whose native lands are controlled by communism to persevere in their faith and to continue their efforts so that legitimate government and true freedom can be restored to their homeland.

TURNPIKE: TREMENDOUS IMPACT ON BOULDER

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district in which the spirit of independence and initiative which won the West still is very much alive. My constituents are people who would rather not sit back and wait for the Government to decide what they need and when they need it—particularly when nonpublic resources could do it sooner and more efficiently.

Last month a ceremony held near Broomfield, Colo., marked the ending of toll-road status of the 17.3-mile-long Boulder-Denver Turnpike—and it was the final chapter of a story which, I believe, typifies this spirit of independence and initiative.

There had been those who predicted that the turnpike would not pay for itself—and, in fact, there were provisions in the enabling legislation for State assumption of part of the costs of retiring the 30-year bond issue which financed the project. Remarkably, the turnpike not only cost the general taxpaying public in Colorado nothing, but it even produced so much revenue that the four-lane, high-speed route became part of the State public highway system nearly 15 years ahead of schedule.

That was what the ceremony at Broomfield was all about. Excerpts from a special section of an outstanding newspaper in my district, the Boulder Daily Camera, telling some of the high points of this remarkable success story, follow:

TURNPIKE: TREMENDOUS IMPACT ON BOULDER

(By Dick Walberg)

"This Boulder toll road proposition is nothing in the world but a special interest deal to make more soft jobs at the expense of the hard working taxpayers."

So wrote a business consultant and announced gubernatorial candidate of the turnpike in 1949 before legislation was passed making the four-lane, limited-access highway possible.

His remarks were representative of the emotional antagonism aroused by the Boulder-inspired proposal to build a thoroughfare linking Boulder directly with the state capital. Because those were tax-lean years, the proposal called for the construction to be financed by bond to be retired with tolls collected from the users. To make the bond issue attractive to big lenders, a clause in the enabling legislation provided the State Highway Department, if tolls were insufficient, would pay up to 30 per cent of the annual cost of retiring the bonds.

It was this clause that made the far-sighted dream of Prof. Roderick Downing, "father of the turnpike," a reality and it was this clause that gave license to opponents to open a broadside attack against the proposition. But now, 18 years later, the ironic fact is that the Boulder-Denver turnpike is the only major traffic facility in the state built at no cost to the general taxpaying public.

Since it was opened on Jan. 19, 1952, the entire cost of the turnpike has been paid by the dimes and quarters of motorists using the highway. Over the years more than 44 million vehicles have plied the 17.3-mile high-speed highway and the clink of silver has totaled more than $10.5 million.

Thursday marks an end to the tolls.

An 11 a.m. ceremony will commemorate the turnpike's unique new status of being the nation's only toll road that is a part of a public roads system to be paid off and become toll-free.

The occasion will bring Charles Brady, head of the American Auto Association, from his Washington office. James F. Ellis, chairman of the State Highway Commission, will serve as head of the celebration. Members of the 35th and 37th General Assemblies will be invited, with special recognition to be accorded William L. Paddock and Leslie R. Steele, the Boulder representatives, and Frank L. Gill, Hillrose senator, who sponsored the turnpike legislation back in 1947 and 1949.

For two Boulder Chamber of Commerce officials, leaders in the fight for the turnpike from the start, the commemoration will be especially rewarding. One is Frank Henderson, chairman of the chamber's highway advisory committee, and the other, Francis W. Reich, the chamber's veteran manager.

These men, together with A. A. Paddock and Frank Jamison and a handful of others, campaigned tirelessly for the proposed traffic facility. Theirs was the hard sell, pitched like today's TV commercial for a laundry detergent.

Their claims:

Boulder would receive $44 million in benefits from the turnpike during the anticipated 30 years of tolls believed required to pay off the construction bonds.

The facility would be a boon to all segments of the Boulder economy and would revolutionize Boulder's way of life.

Travel between Boulder and Denver would increase 30 per cent.

200 lives would be saved in 30 years by driving "Tomorrow's Highway — Today" rather than the narrow, hazardous U.S. 87–287 north out of Denver and State Highway 7 west into Boulder.

Motorists using the superhighway would actually save money because the turnpike would cut off 7 miles on the trip to Denver, and at a nickel a mile for operating a car the net saving would be 15 cents.

These were some of the more brash claims; now nearly two decades later, how do they stack up?

Assessable property in Boulder has jumped from $14 million in 1950 to $101 million, better than a seven-fold increase. County property assessments increased five-fold to $240 million.

City building permit valuations rose from $3½ million to $20 million. Retail sales climbed from $22 million to $135 million. Bank resources from $20 million to $100 million. Population went up from 20,000 to 56,000.

Travel on the turnpike the first year more than doubled the projected average daily count of 2,200 and by last year had reached 13,774.

31 fatalities have occurred on the turnpike since it opened or about 3.9 per 100 million miles of travel. The national average for traffic fatalities is 5.67 per 100 million miles.

And, while the toll has remained unchanged at a dime and a quarter, the cost of operating a motor vehicle has more than doubled so that the net saving per trip is even greater than projected.

Actually no yardstick can measure the impact of the turnpike on Boulder, for who can isolate its effect on the community from the welter of other influences? But there is no denying the impact has been tremendous. Reich, who has had his thumb on the pulse of Boulder for 31 years as manager of the chamber, weighs the turnpike along with the University as the two things most influential in shaping Boulder.

"Without the turnpike," he said, "we simply would not have the facilities and development we now have. Before it was constructed Boulder was at the stub end of a side road; the advent of the highway gave Boulder direct access to Denver's suppliers, transportation terminals and other facilities needed to attract desirable industries to the area.

JIM EVANS, PATRIOTIC BROADCASTER

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, while a few thousand malcontents did their best to disrupt the Nation's Capital and the Pentagon on Saturday, there was one courageous voice speaking out for America. Jim Evans, whose program is broadcast over radio station WMAL from 10 to 2 every day, used the time on Saturday to remind Americans of the glories of this great country of ours and of the rich heritage which has been bought for this generation by the sacrifices of our fearless and dedicated forefathers.

While those gathered at the Lincoln Memorial and the Pentagon displayed the enemy flags of the Vietcong and called for the defeat of our troops who are fighting aggression and tyranny, Evans played some of the stirring patriotic melodies which lift up the hearts of those who sincerely believe in freedom and justice.

I just want to take this moment to pay tribute to Jim Evans and applaud the many fine statements he made Saturday in support of the American dream. His effort was a far greater contribution toward world peace and justice for all men than the hate-filled slogans chanted by those anti-Americans taking part in the disgraceful display at the Pentagon.

EGYPTIAN ATTACK ON ISRAEL DESTROYER

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the outrageous attack upon, and the sinking of the Israel destroyer *Elath* by Egypt is the most flagrant violation of the cease-fire in the Middle East. The Israeli ship was 13½ miles out in international waters. As Israel Foreign Minister Abba Eban said, Egypt should be condemned by world public opinion.

This incident illustrates more clearly than ever the need for true peace in the Middle East which must be achieved through direct negotiations.

As long as there is only a cease-fire or a temporary armistice, there are likely to be other incidents with further tragic losses. The way to prevent recurrences is to have a final peace settlement in the Middle East arrived at by the nations involved through direct negotiations on all issues.

The United States, other peace-loving nations, and the United Nations must make every effort to secure such a peace settlement as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the sinking was accomplished by the use of sea-to-sea missiles supplied by the Soviet Union and fired from one of Egypt's 15 PT-type boats. The accuracy was such that it raises a serious question as to whether Soviet experts were overseeing and supervising the actual operations.

The Soviet Union's role in providing armaments to Egypt since the end of the war is a most dangerous one. The introduction of increasingly sophisticated weapons by the Soviet Union into the explosive Middle East only compounds the difficulty of achieving a peace settlement and increases the risk of nuclear warfare.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend

my distinguished and able colleague from New York for an able and timely statement to the House.

Mr. RYAN. I appreciate the gentleman's expression of support.

THE UNDECLARED WAR ON J. P. STEVENS & CO.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received, as I assume other Members did, a copy of a statement by Mr. Robert T. Stevens, delivered before a subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee. I read it. The testimony given by the president of J. P. Stevens & Co. contained some shocking revelations. It revealed a 4-year undeclared war that has been waged against the Stevens Co. by the Textile Workers Union of America, aided and abetted by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO. By documentation the statement leaves no doubt that the National Labor Relations Board has, without reason, thrown its weight against the textile firm. This presents a formidable array of power against one employer.

A few days earlier I received, as I am sure others did, a copy of a pamphlet entitled "The Hollow Promise," which apparently was designed to give the union's side in the war I have referred to. I also read it. Unfortunately it contains many generalities and emotional appeals, and is quite lacking in factual data to support charges and assumptions that it contains. It depicts much thunder but little lightning.

The war against the Stevens Co. began in 1963. Since then the news media have carried many stories about the persistent efforts to unionize the plants. Scores of insertions have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding various aspects of the struggle. In addition, one committee hearing has been conducted.

Mr. Speaker, since the attempt to unionize Stevens is unique in many respects, characterized by some rather unbelievable techniques, I have undertaken to examine all the evidence available on the subject and have attempted to compose an objective report on the case. The impact of the ultimate outcome of this effort to unionize employees of the Stevens Co. will be felt by both workers and employers throughout the country.

To begin with, the right of collective bargaining is basic. It is a cherished privilege that is accorded to workers and employers, and the right must be properly observed and protected. But collective bargaining is inherently a voluntary privilege, not a mandate in any sense of the word. It has been said, and correctly so, that when workers voluntarily join a labor union the workers control the union; but if their joining is compulsory, then the union controls the workers.

STEVENS WORKERS OPPOSE BEING UNIONIZED

The J. P. Stevens Co. operates 71 plants and employs some 44,000 workers. It is an old, well-established, and efficiently operated concern, which has provided a market for natural fibers and employment for a vast number of people in the manufacture of textiles. It appears that a larger majority of the workers do not want to join the union. In fact, the union's effort to organize them in some 25 plants has been defeated in elections held at every plant selected by the union for tests. Yet, despite this repeated expression on the part of the workers, the union continues to demand unionization, and in pursuing this course has resorted to some highly questionable tactics.

This effort by the Textile Workers Union of America has been underway since 1963. Four cases charging unfair labor practices have been filed against the company. In each instance, the NLRB found the company guilty. Moreover, the second circuit court of appeals not long ago upheld the verdict against the company in the first case, initiated in 1964.

UNFAIR PUBLICITY

As a result of the suits and the verdicts against it, the Stevens Co. has received much unfavorable publicity. The ruling of each trial examiner has been widely reported. So were the NLRB rulings and the decision by the second circuit. The company has really taken some heavy punches.

In addition, the Stevens firm appears to have been roundly assailed during hearings before a congressional committee. Even the special counsel of the committee, Prof. Dan Pollitt, of the University of North Carolina, has gone far beyond the call of duty to publicly take Stevens to task.

In many letters received by Members of Congress, and in the news media, union members have also denounced Stevens. William Pollock, President of the Textile Workers Union, in his testimony before the committee, pulled out all the stoppers in a castigation of the company and for good measure gratuitously included almost the entire southern textile industry because the majority of the southern textile workers are not organized. Pollock made it quite clear that was what he was mad about. Indeed the union leader blamed most of the economic ills of the South—going back to the Civil War period—on the nonunion status of the textile industry and other southern industries. He made it quite clear that he does not believe in voluntary unionism.

The company has been smeared and must have been injured, along with the entire southern textile industry, few of whose workers have chosen to join unions. An objective observer would, I believe, conclude that it has been a ruthless and rather vicious war that has been waged against this concern.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY HARD PRESSED

Staying in business and making a success in the textile business has certainly been no bed of roses in recent years. Many have not survived. Much of this trouble has been due to excessive imports. The textile business is a major industry and employs nearly a million people, but seems a stepchild insofar as the Federal Government is concerned. A rather large number of us in the Congress, representing districts where mills are located and where the natural fibers are grown, have been quite active in recent years in efforts to keep this industry from going under. We have encountered formidable resistance in the State Department. The so-called Kennedy round of trade agreements lowered textile duties, and did harm to the stability of our domestic industry. And on top of all this, labor problems have been aggravated by Government agencies which have actively helped the unions in their efforts to unionize textile workers even when they do not want to be organized.

It naturally follows that Stevens officials have been forced to take much of their valuable time, at great expense, to deal with these attempts. And Government activities have added to this burden. Federal power can be awesome, and when combined with the union powerhouse the struggle becomes very unfair and lopsided.

In meeting this combination the Stevens Co. has shown remarkable courage. It has tenaciously stood by its employees. The firm is reported to have told its employees that they had a right to join a union if they wished to, but also told them it did not believe they would be benefited if they did join. This was in keeping with the finest traditions of industry-employee relationship in a free society. But, amazingly, in the eyes of the union officials and of the NLRB, such expressions constitute a major sin.

STEVENS WORKERS ARE HAPPY AND SATISFIED

It should be pointed out that Stevens enjoys a reputation as a progressive company. It commands the respect and gratitude of its employees. Since 1963 the workers at eight plants have voted down the union. One rerun election was held, with the same result.

When one takes into account the circumstances under which the elections were held, the results become very significant. The union had the choice of locations; that is, it could select the plants where there seemed to be the best prospects for victory. The Textile Workers Union has at its command major resources, and can draw upon the tremendous wealth and other resources of the AFL–CIO. The press reported that George Meany, president of AFL–CIO, went to the White House to urge the President to take punitive action against Stevens by canceling all the company's Government contracts. So determined is the union that it would resort to measures designed to weaken the company economically, and jeopardize the jobs of thousands of workers, in order to gain a victory to the liking of the union leaders. And it must be kept in mind that throughout this entire struggle the union has had the benefit of a powerful agency, the NLRB, in efforts to unionize.

NLRB EXAMINERS BIASED

Let us take a look at what the NLRB has done in this war. I have said that all three NLRB trial examiners ruled against Stevens after hearing many witnesses and after lengthy deliberation. Despite the time employed, the examiners reached their conclusions by a fantastic process of reasoning which made a farce of what was supposed to be a deliberate and objective proceeding. What did the trial examiners come up with? Believe it or not, they decided that the company witnesses were lying and that the union witnesses were telling the truth.

A sizable majority of the 450 witnesses

heard by the trial examiners were company witnesses. As was admitted by one of the trial examiners, Boyd Leedom, former Chairman of the NLRB, the company witnesses, on the whole, were honorable men with good reputations. Yet it was no problem for the examiner to find that virtually all of those witnesses had falsified. I have examined his explanation, a masterpiece of obfuscation and circumlocution. In brief, what he said is that the finding that the witnesses for the company were to lie under oath was made by Stevens officials. A search of the record reveals no evidence whatever to sustain this amazing conclusion.

Obviously, a decision which would persuade more than 250 witnesses to falsify unblushingly is most extraordinary and requires a lot of explanation. And Mr. Leedom's explanation is indeed extraordinary. What a fertile imagination the examiner is possessed of. He said that opposition to unionization, in the Stevens case, became in the nature of a crusade, in which the company witnesses were freed of a sense of individual guilt. Listen to his rationalizing:

> And so either believing or rationalizing that their position 's just, they (the witnesses) engage in the common error of fighting real or pretended "evil" with evil. A dual standard of conduct—that is, one standard for the individual and another for an organized effort—has been recognized and applied throughout the history of mankind. War, out of which national heroes are born and are greatly honored by us all, is the prime example.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen a lot of tortured reasoning in my time, but this one takes the cake. Just imagine a paid Government official indulging in such fantastic thinking as a basis for a ruling deeply affecting the legal rights of a taxpaying enterprise. Boiled down, it simply serves to reveal his emotional bias against the company. It furnishes a good example of the extent to which he and other NLRB officials will go in their role of helping organize employees, and trying to force them to join unions. In my considered judgment, it is a deliberate insult to intelligence to conclude that the Stevens Co., or any other employer, could persuade more than 250 reputable persons to falsify under oath.

The simple fact is that neither Mr. Leedom, nor the other trial examiners, nor the members of the NLRB, believe for one moment that the witnesses conspired to perjure themselves. Otherwise the NLRB would have charged the Stevens' witnesses with perjury, as was its duty, and would have sought the punishment such perjury deserves.

There is indeed much more evidence to sustain the charge that the Textile Workers Union and the NLRB conspired to build a case against Stevens than there is that the company entered into a conspiracy with its witnesses. For example, over 2 years elapsed in the first Stevens case between the first alleged law violation and the examiner's decision. This served to allow an accumulation of other alleged violations and the results were used to sustain the Board's conclusion that Stevens has been guilty of "massive and deliberate" unfair labor practices. Overall, the workers fired, according to the union, for alleged antiunion activity, constituted only a tiny fraction of the entire labor turnover. Moreover, invoking the Leedom method of arriving at conclusions, the decision could be reached that the employees involved in the unfair labor practice charges deliberately conducted themselves in such a way that they would be fired. By doing so the union could build a case, and it was hard pressed for any semblance of a case.

I make no charge that there was any conspiracy between the union, the NLRB and certain prounion workers. Yet, there is circumstantial evidence to bolster such a conclusion.

As I have said, there is not one single bit of evidence to support the Leedom fictional theory that the Stevens Co. conspired with more than 250 witnesses so that the latter would lie under oath in order to forestall unionization. Yet, the NLRB accepts without question this ridiculous theory. Moreover, the findings that all the company witnesses lied, and that the union witnesses told the truth, has been accepted by one Federal court and probably will be accepted by others. The Federal courts do not go behind the NLRB findings of fact if the latter are supported by substantial evidence. In practice, this means that NLRB findings as to credibility are not reviewed.

EVIDENCE OF BIAS BY COURT

It is interesting to note that the second circuit court of appeals must have had some qualms about the finding that the company witnesses gave false testimony. A considerable portion of the opinion by Justice Feinberg discusses some of the discharges involved and decided that they substantiated the finding that the company witnesses perjured themselves, while the testimony by the union witnesses constituted the soul of truth. But it becomes quite apparent that Justice Feinberg carefully selected the discharges to be mentioned and picked out only those which tended to support his conclusions. The judge, for example, did not mention the case of one Jack Ross, who was fired, according to the company, after several written reprimands about his work. Nor did Justice Feinberg choose to go into the case of Garvis Powers who, his employer said, quit after he was discharged for operating a lottery in the warehouse. And he ignored other discharges where, it seems to me, the company witnesses made out a superior case.

Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that the Congress tolerates this sort of travesty—that of having a worker engage in misconduct which would require any responsible employer to take drastic action, and have that incident used as an excuse for the filing of an unfair labor practice. The Congress should correct this inexcusable loophole. It perpetuates a travesty and condones a racket.

There is in the Stevens case evidence of manipulation by union lawyers in order to get a more friendly court to hear them. The first of the Stevens cases in 1964 was transferred, at the request of the union, from the fourth circuit of appeals. I understand it is well known among lawyers that the second circuit is regarded as more liberal than the fourth circuit—that is, more inclined to go along with the union point of view.

That attitude is not unusual, however, for Federal Judges these days. And it is well known in legal history that a liberal judge will in nearly every instance lean over backward to favor a labor union. Indeed the Supreme Court, now stacked heavily with liberals, is notorious for being prounion.

ALLIS-CHALMERS CASE

Here is an example of what I mean: In NLRB against Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., et al., the high court in a 5-to-4 decision upheld a NLRB ruling that it was not an unfair labor practice for a union to fine a member who continues to work during a strike called by that union. In a devastating dissent Mr. Justice Black very properly pointed out that the decision placed the right of a union to control its members ahead of the statutory protection of the rights of individual workers in all cases.

Even the liberal Washington Post could not stomach his travesty by the Supreme Court. Commenting on the case, the Post editorial said:

> The answer of the dissenters . . . is pointed and severe: "The real reason for the Court's decision is its policy judgment that unions, especially weak ones, need the power to impose fines on strikebreakers and to enforce these fines in court." The dissenters go on to say that the Court has written this "new proviso" into the law despite a strong and clear purpose of Congress "to leave workers wholly free to determine in what concerted labor activities they will engage or decline to engage."

SUPREME COURT LIBERALS

Thus we find a senior Justice on that tribunal citing the fact that the five majority members had in effect written a "new proviso" into the law. Such outlandish decisions can be expected from the extreme liberals who are appointed by Presidents to serve on the Supreme Court. And incidentally, the last two appointments on that Court—one appointed this year and one last year—are well known as liberals. Yet, with no right of appeal or review of an action by that tribunal, the American people find themselves in a straitjacket—victims of virtual dictatorship.

Now, the Congress can, of course, do something about this. It can correct the blooper committed by the Court in the Allis-Chalmers case, and it can limit the High Court's jurisdiction. It can also submit amendments to the Constitution—which, however, requires two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate. But unfortunately those of us who feel that way simply do not have the votes to make the courts conform with the written law and the Constitution. And, even so, there is always the danger of the veto in case of changes in the law.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned the courts in order to further confirm the difficulties confronted by the Stevens Co. and hundreds of others in their struggle for fair play and survival. Their first obstacle is, of course, the NLRB, which has been described as an adjunct of the AFL–CIO. That agency's trial examiners had to strain themselves to the extreme in order to find Stevens guilty of conspiring to violate labor laws.

I spoke of Mr. Leedom's dream which he ingeniously converted into a legal premise. But he at least did try to tell why he believed the union witnesses and disbelieved those for Stevens. One examiner, Thomas Ricci, frankly said there had been no evidence given him to support the union's contentions. This did not faze him. He simply said Stevens had been found guilty of violation in the past, therefore it must be guilty in the case which he was hearing—a veritable masterpiece of logic.

JUDGE ROY BEAN—LAW WEST OF THE PECOS

Mr. Speaker, on the walls in my office there is an enlargement from an actual photograph of a court scene presided over by one Roy Bean. A trial of some horse thieves was in progress, and the scene is on the front porch of a ramshackle frontier building, with the judge hearing witnesses. Signs on the structure read: "Judge Roy Bean, Notary Public," "Law West of the Pecos," and "Justice of the Peace."

That old building remains today, just west of the Pecos on the Rio Grande, located at Langtry, Tex., in the district I represent. It is preserved and maintained as a sort of landmark by the State highway department. In frontier days before the turn of the century, when few counties in the area had been organized, Bean assumed authority, and served as judge, jury, and prosecutor simultaneously. He was often so firm and positive in the exercise of his authority that for years no one undertook to question his right to operate as he did. He performed marriages, granted divorces, and assumed jurisdiction over any case from murder to malicious mischief. I have personally talked with people who knew him and saw him in action.

Now, today we may poke fun at Roy Bean's operation. We may ridicule his arrogance and his distortion of justice. But in reality the "Law West of the Pecos" is being reenacted today, only more dressed up, more prestigious, and more sophisticated.

Some of the judge's maneuvering could be cited proudly as precedent today in decisions of the NLRB and some of its trial examiners. And by the Supreme Court as well. Roy Bean assumed authority he did not have as a matter of law; so does the NLRB and its examiners. And so does the Supreme Court. Judge Bean made laws and made policy, without regard to legislative direction; so does the NLRB and its examiners. And so does the Supreme Court. Judge Roy Bean's decisions rankled with bias and prejudice, irrespective of propriety and merit; so it is with the NLRB and its examiners. And so goes the U.S. Supreme Court.

Judge Roy Bean was ahead of his time.

STRANGE NLRB ORDER

But as was typical of Judge Roy Bean's practice, absence of law or precedent was of no concern to the NLRB in the Stevens case. And, as might be expected, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals went supinely along with the Board. Although admitting that the Board "went beyond the conventional," the court was content to treat the orders as a way to deal with "a major campaign of illegal antiunion activity, spearheaded by retaliatory discharges."

Accordingly, the court upheld the NLRB orders that the company post the decision against it in all 43 of the North and South Carolina plants. The requirement that the company assemble its employees during working hours and have someone read the decision to them was slightly modified. The court decided the orders were to be read only at the 20 plants where unfair labor practices were found and that Board officials, instead of Stevens employees, might read them.

Stevens, of course, had no option but to appeal to the Supreme Court and take its medicine, whatever it may be. Still another case, in which the decision is directly opposite to that of the second circuit, is reported to be on its way to the Supreme Court.

In this instance the NLRB ordered that the employees of a company, Scotts, Inc., of Holland, Mich., be assembled to hear an order against Scotts read. The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia reversed the order. Justice Tamm hit the nail on the head when he said:

> The ignominy of a forced public reading, and a "confession of sins" by any employer, any employee, or any union representative makes such a remedy incompatible with the democratic principles of the dignity of man.

If the Roy Bean-type orders by the NLRB in the Stevens case are finally upheld, these would apply in other instances where companies balk at helping organize their workers. In another Stevens case, the NLRB ordered the company to furnish the union the names and addresses of all its employees in the Carolinas. Clearly, this was designed to help the union in its work of organization. Yet the NLRB was created by the Congress to be strictly a neutral agency, beholden to neither management or labor.

Within recent years the courts have shown keen awareness of individual rights, and in that respect have on occasions gone to the extreme in the case of hardened criminals. Many confessions have been thrown out because the courts said they were made under duress. Now, in disposing of the Stevens appeal it will be interesting to see if the Supreme Court applies a double standard in that respect, where a company has been ordered by the NLRB to confess its guilt.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

There is one other aspect of the Stevens case I should like to mention. It relates to freedom of speech. Stevens posted a notice giving the company's views about the organizing drive. Among other comments one stated:

> (1) This matter is, of course, one of concern to the Company. It is also, however, a matter of serious concern to you and our sincere belief is that if this Union were to get in here it would not work to your benefit, but, in the long run, would itself operate to your serious harm.

The company went on to advise that it would not be necessary for any employee to join a union in order to work, that union membership would grant no preferred treatment by the company, and concluded:

> (2) If anybody causes you any trouble at your work or put you under any sort of pressure to join the Union, you should let the Company know, and we will undertake to see that this is stopped.
>
> (3) No person will be allowed to carry on Union organizing activities on the job. Anybody who does so and who thereby neglects his own work or interferes with the work of others will be subject to discharge.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this land of free speech, what is wrong with that advice? Has our system of government degenerated to the point where an employer—those who invest and risk capital and create jobs and pay taxes—cannot communicate their honest views to those whom they employ, with respect to what they deem advantageous to those workers? Yet, the NLRB said the notice constituted a violation of the law and was upheld by the second circuit. The court upheld the Board's conclusion that the prediction of "serious harm," to the workers from unionization constituted coercion.

It is well known that the advantages or disadvantages of unionization in plants are the subject of honest disagreement. In some cases unionization works well; in others it creates far more problems than it solves, generates internal conflicts, loss of work from strikes, and so forth. In fact, there are today 18 States which prohibit compulsory union membership in order to work. This serves to confirm a widespread viewpoint that unionization is not necessarily desirable. In other words, honest people entertain honest views both for and against the question of advantage of unionization. Some honestly think that in a particular situation "serious harm" may result from this—and admittedly they may be right; while others disagree.

In its petition to the Supreme Court for review of the second circuit decision, the Stevens Co., raises the following question:

> May the Board prohibit the employer from expressing to his employees his "sincere belief" that the Union would not work out to their "benefit", but "in the long run would itself operate" to their "serious harm"?

For many years agitators have gone up and down the land, preaching lawlessness, race hatred, race war, and violence and destruction. Yet, in most instances the authorities have stood by and the Justice Department insists nothing can be done to interfere with the constitutional right of free speech. But when a company tells its workers, to whom it owes an obligation by virtue of the employer-employee relationship, that in its considered judgment unionization would harm their interests, the NLRB and a Federal Court rules that this constitutes an unfair labor practice. Are we in this country operating under a double standard with respect to the exercise of freedom of speech?

MORE PROUNION NLRB ACTIVITY

An amazing development during the war against Stevens has been the demand by the union that Government contracts with Stevens be canceled because of the trumped up unfair labor practices upheld by the NLRB. The Comptroller General ruled last year that this does not warrant cancellation of such contracts. Yet, the union persists in its demand, and certain irresponsible politicians join in the clamor.

This tirade against Stevens has, however, paid off for the union. The Labor Department did cancel a contract with Stevens for training employees on the job. This occurred on May 1, 1967. The $50,000 contract was summarily canceled at the behest of Mr. Pollock, head of the Textile Workers Union and the Department of Labor has revealed no reasons for its action. Who suffers from this cancellation? Only the workers affected?

Mr. Speaker, I am personally deeply concerned about the NLRB's conduct in the area of labor-management relations. Its repeated abuse and misuse of power has been documented in scores of cases. Only recently I have cited and documented several instances of this kind, and have put them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I cited, for example, the cases in my own district of the Patio Foods, Inc., of San Antonio; the B. & W. Engineering Co. of San Angelo, Tex., Stevens Sash & Door Co.; and the Lone Star Textiles, Inc. In each of those cases there is not even the shadow of doubt as to the extremely prounion bias employed by agents of the NLRB.

The Stevens case illustrates the desperation of the unions and the NLRB over the state of the union movement, which lags far behind the growth in the work force. It bespeaks a growing lack of labor statesmanship in the labor movement. Resort to subterfuges, compulsion, and even violence in order to add dues payers to union rolls, have become a common practice in the past of mercenary and power-hungry union leaders. The exposing rays of the midday sun should be focused on these practices. And the NLRB has become particeps criminis to this tragic development.

NLRB HITS STEVENS AGAIN

Throughout the proceedings against Stevens runs the concern of the NLRB and union officials that ordinary remedies which the Board applies in the average unfair labor practice case will not force the company to capitulate. Unusual remedies were employed. Saying that the firm had engaged in "massive and deliberate" unfair labor practices, the Board ordered Stevens to—

First. Mail copies of the required notices to all employees of the J. P. Stevens plants in North and South Carolina.

Second. Grant the union, for 1 year, reasonable access to bulletin boards and all places where notices to employees are customarily posted.

Third. Convene, during working hours, all employees and read the contents of the notice.

Under the circumstances these remedies were novel and went far beyond the recommendations of the trial examiner. It is known that in many cases where many more employees were found by the NLRB to have been wrongfully terminated, the Board issued no such orders. Then why Stevens?

Quite obviously the Board was determined to put the Stevens Co. in a bad light in the eyes of its employees. The company complained that the notice the NLRB ordered Stevens to sign and post and mail and read was nothing short of a confession of guilt. The NLRB's notice spoke repeatedly of the company's "discrimination" against employees in terminating them and of Stevens' "discriminatorily" withholding work from them.

This very procedure drummed up by the NLRB is an undisguised confession of guilt by that Board—guilt of its prounion bias and its anti-Stevens prejudice. It was an unvarnished Roy Bean concoction because there is nothing in our labor laws which authorizes the three extraordinary steps trumped up by the Board.

NLRB MUST BE REPLACED

Most of the eminent authorities on this subject agree with me. Let me cite one. Kenneth C. McGuiness, former general counsel of the NLRB and now a Washington attorney specializing in labor law, summed up the attitude of that agency in a book. He had this to say:

> Irrespective of one's philosophy or predilections, and regardless of the objectivity of any analysis, the new Board's divided opinions provide an impressive basis for the conclusion that the Kennedy majority is undermining the purpose of the statute, frustrating the intent of Congress, and demoralizing major areas of labor-management relations. These are strong words but, once more, the cases speak for themselves.

He added:

> The new Board has persistently undercut employee freedom of choice and protection whenever in conflict with the growth of labor unions. The organizations whose rights are derivative have been favored over the source of those rights.

Frankly, I am afraid that agency is beyond reform, so deeply imbedded as it is with prounion bias. A study of the war on Stevens will confirm that fact, when viewed objectively. And scores and scores of other cases could be cited. We have reached the point where a change in the system is simply imperative. Accordingly, I have introduced a bill to replace the NLRB with a labor court, geared to the times, with built-in protection against willful miscarriage of justice as applied to the employer and the employee alike.

In conclusion, let me repeat: In the Stevens case the union's effort to organize in some 25 plants has been defeated in free elections held at every plant selected by the union for tests. Despite the fact that the vast majority of the Stevens workers do not want to join the union, a war of major proportions has for 4 long years been unleashed against this employer, aided and abetted by the NLRB.

The conduct of the Stevens Co., at great expense in time and money, in resisting this arrogant attempt to rule or ruin, should serve as an inspiration to all Americans who adhere to the practice of freedom and fair play within the framework of our cherished free enterprise system.

The Roy Bean system of justice should be laid to rest.

THE RECENT HURRICANE IN TEXAS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, approximately 1 month ago, one of the most devastating hurricanes in the history of the United States hit my congressional district in my area of south Texas with great devastation. I would like to make a report to the Members of the House concerning this hurricane and the work that was done by the people of my area, by the State agencies, and by the Federal agencies, concerned in affording relief to the people of the stricken area.

Even before the hurricane struck, Mr. Speaker, I was constantly kept advised here in Washington by the Weather Bureau of the path of the storm. I can never offer enough commendation for the wonderful work the people of the Weather Bureau did from their New Orleans office and from their base, also, in Brownsville, Tex. They maintained constant track of the storm throughout the path it took to come to our area. I was being informed hourly of its progress as it was heading toward our area in south Texas.

As Members of the House know, the Weather Bureau now has a great scientific hurricane hunting setup, in which they use planes and radar and satellites, which help them track a storm. This was of great benefit to the people of our area, because all the necessary precautions were taken to see that there was no loss of life.

To the credit of the people of the area who performed the work, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to the advance warning which the U.S. Weather Bureau gave, there was no loss of life whatsoever during the devastating winds and the flood afterward. Also, I commend the MARS system—that is the Military Affiliate Radio System—which cooperated with me throughout the day and the night of the hurricane. As the winds were hitting our areas, telephone wires and electrical wires were coming down as the fury of the winds increased.

Mr. Speaker, here in Washington, I had no way to keep in touch with my people in the area except through the MARS system, in which they use what we commonly call the "ham" operators. These operators were able, sitting here in Washington, to speak by radio to a ham operator somewhere in my district, who would attach his instrument to a telephone and let me speak to the different officials throughout the area of concern during the fury of the hurricane. I cannot commend these operators enough for allowing me to stay in touch with my constituents.

I might just give an example of how the operation works, and the wonderful job that these civilian ham volunteer operators do. Mr. Speaker, at one time during the night I was trying to get in touch with the disaster center at the department of public safety in Austin, Tex., which was coordinating all of the information from the stricken area.

We were able to make a contact by radio with a lady in Tyler, Tex., who from Tyler, Tex., placed a long distance telephone call to the center at Austin, Tex. Therefore, even though we were not able to directly communicate by telephone or even by radio at that precise moment into my area, we were able to get through to the Texas Department of Public Safety at Austin, where they did have radio contact with their units in the south Texas area. In that way we were able to keep in constant communication.

Just over a month ago, immediately after the hurricane subsided, Mr. Speaker, I left here, not knowing that the great floods which were to follow were on the way. I might say that in trying to fly into the area, I finally got as far as San Antonio, Tex., when all flights into the area were canceled. The roads were flooded, and there was no way to get in, other than for the valiant determination of one unknown man, because I yet do not know his name, a Trailways bus driver who took a group of people in, myself included. It was the last bus to get into my area in those few days. This was the way I was finally able to arrive in the area.

Upon getting to the area, Mr. Speaker, of course I found there was great devastation from the winds. Really, I do not wish for any of my colleagues in the House to have to go through the ordeal of having to see a virtual paradise, such as we claim the lower area of south Texas is, in such devastation as I saw there.

To the great commendation of the people of that area, of the Federal and State governments and the local governments, they were already in the process of coming back from the blow that had been struck them.

I saw the Red Cross set up refugee centers there. In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, they took care of some 400,000 to 500,000 people. They afforded them shelter from the winds. After the winds subsided, they afforded them shelter from the floods. They fed them. They got clothing for them. They got medicine for them. They got volunteer workers to cooperate with the Red Cross in affording to the people the relief which they needed at that time.

Also, Mr. Speaker, in this time of great turmoil throughout the world, in which we see countries divided by barbed wire, such as in Europe and the Middle East, and in which we see neighbors fighting other neighbors, in this day of strife and turmoil in our area there was no border between the United States and Mexico. By declaration of both Presidents there were no formalities for crossing the border. Each one was to go as he saw fit on either side of the Rio Grande, to receive whatever aid or help he needed.

In an area of Mexico close to one of their dams which was at the time being flooded there were some 15,000 people, whose only high ground to go to was on the American side of the river. They came into the small town of Rio Grande City, and Roma, Tex., where they were received. They were housed in the churches, in school gymnasiums, and in private homes. No question was asked, "Where do you come from? What is your nationality? What is the responsibility of your government?"

Our Government, our volunteer agencies, and all the people in the area opened their hearts and their homes, and shared their food, water, and clothing with all those people.

This should be an example to the other peoples of the world, Mr. Speaker, of two great neighbors doing what they can in the hour of need by helping each other as best the situation would allow.

The Governor of the State of Texas, Gov. John Connally, arrived in our area shortly after I did. I had the privilege of inspecting the area with him, from one end to the other. It was a very gratifying situation to be able to go into the refugee centers, not knowing whether those people were U.S. citizens or Mexican citizens, but having the Governor of our great State of Texas come in and ask, "Are you being fed? Are you being taken care of? What can we do to make your life a little bit easier under the circumstances?"

I might add that not much later the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, also came to our area. I had the honor and the privilege of escorting him through the stricken area. He also had the same concerns, namely, are these people being fed and do they have sufficient clothing. He went so far as in a few words of Spanish to ask a woman from Mexico how many children she had and were they getting enough milk. This shows the concern of our Government, Mr. Speaker.

I know we have difficulties and we have fiscal problems, and I know we have many more important things to do in achieving leadership in the world, but when the President of the United States and when the Governor of one of our sovereign States takes the time to come and visit a stricken area to see that the lowliest person is receiving all of the aid possible, it makes you feel proud of your country and of its leadership.

I could not commend more sincerely the President of the United States and the Governor of the State who came there in their position of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, in the legislative field I might also add that both Senators from Texas, JOHN TOWER and RALPH YARBOROUGH, came into our area on their own, and then again when the President came down there. From our side of the Capital, a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works came at my invitation to inspect the area. Mr. Speaker, let me digress just a moment because I have spoken of the Red Cross here. There was a magnificent job done by the Salvation Army. I think I will never pass one of the ladies with the tambourines of the Salvation Army without feeling greater respect and admiration for this organization because they came as volunteers, as did the people of the Red Cross, from throughout the United States. They brought gifts and fed the people in the refugee shelters and in the schools and in the streets, and they brought all of the aid that was available to them. I felt good in knowing that these private agencies were there.

As to the Federal agencies, which we have more direct dealing with, Mr. Speaker, beginning with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, they provided food for the Salvation Army and for the Red Cross to distribute. They provided staples for all of the refugee shelters, and they were down there shortly before the storm hit, stayed throughout the storm and afterwards, providing all of the surplus commodities and everything else that was at their disposal.

Then, of course, comes the time for reconstruction. After the presidential declaration of a disaster area, the Office of Emergency Planning came in. Of course, they were already there in preparation for this, knowing that the declaration would come forthwith after the disaster. They were there, and they are still there cooperating with our cities and counties and providing that help which Public Law 875 allows in this type of a declaration of a disaster area.

The Small Business Administration is there, also, facilitating loans to all those who might need them.

I would like to state that the first application for a loan from the SBA immediately after the storm on September 22 was granted. On October 2 the first checks were distributed to some of the borrowers in Brownsville, Tex.

The Farmers' Home Administration was also there offering aid to those in the agricultural field.

I might add here, Mr. Speaker, that, of course, there is very little experience in this type of disaster. And, there is very little precedence for the things that needed to be done. So many of the requirements of the area could not be met at that particular time by these agencies. However, they have been most cooperative with me in the days after in trying to solve the specific requirements of our area.

Mr. Speaker, daily, the Small Business Administration or the Farmers Home Administration makes a further declaration of policy that is available to our area but which was not immediately available when they first went down there. Loans to the farmers whose crops were destroyed, loans to the citrus growers whose citrus products were virtually blown off the trees—and instances in which most of the crop was lost, help and assistance was extended to them as well as to the shippers who sell or package these products after they are harvested.

So, Mr. Speaker, they are cooperating with us. Slowly, as I run into an area where there is no precedent or regulation, we are continuously striving to meet this requirement or the requirements as they arise in the area.

Also, I would like to add here, Mr. Speaker, the fact about the great help that was performed and extended to our people by the military. This in my estimation was aside from the international commitment of our armed services. This was the greatest cooperative effort of the armed services in peacetime about which I have ever known.

Mr. Speaker, the Civil Air Patrol, an organization about which all of us know, was already on the ground setting up a communications network and flying as spotters for marooned people in the flood areas.

Mr. Speaker, the first group to come in was the Coast Guard with helicopters. Immediately after that the Army organized a task force known as "Bravo." They came in with helicopters, they came in with mobile kitchens, they came in with medical supplies, they brought in various elements of the Air Force which were needed to evacuate people, they brought in staples forwarded to the area by the Department of Agriculture in Air Force transports. They performed one of the most beautiful jobs that the military could possibly perform in peacetime. The helicopter pilots, Mr. Speaker—and I flew with a great number of them—took no rest for the greater part of the days during which they were there. They had very little food. It seemed as if they were thinking that "these are my people and this is my home," because they assisted in trying to bring out everyone from the tiniest baby that needed to be flown from a refuge shelter to a hospital. They took the largest load of which they were capable of transporting in one of those big Chinook helicopters.

Mr. Speaker, these people of the helicopter service came in there and took no time for rest. I might add that the machines gave out before the fliers did. The general in command told me that he practically had to force the pilots to take a rest but that the machines just can perform for so many hours they have to be checked and before they require inspection. The Corps of Engineers deserves special recognition for their participation also.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride in the armed services of the United States that we should note the fact that the mechanical equipment gave out before the men did, and of this I am very proud and very thankful that these men should extend themselves to this point in this great crisis.

Mr. Speaker, in many instances this service was performed at great danger to the people involved who came in to help the people of our area. All of the other Federal agencies, Mr. Speaker, including the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Public Health Service, General Services Administration, the Department of Labor, HEW, the Immigration and Customs Services, the Food and Drug Administration, and even the Internal Revenue Service, have come into the area and have held seminars informing the people as to where they may claim a tax deduction for some of the losses which the people sustained during this most severe hurricane. We had people from all of the areas of the United States coming in attempting to be of service to us.

Then, we had our local people themselves. The National Guard was activated and served with a most distinguished manner in our area. I know that the National Guard was a great stabilizing effect in holding the situation down and in preventing any type of mass law violations. Of course, we have the type of people who are not known for their violence. I might add that some of the representatives of the news media kept asking the question, "What about looting?"

What about looting? In the areas where there was devastation and great destruction there was no single instance of looting that I know of throughout the area except one that they mentioned, and I dare say he might have been in need of it, someone had broken into a liquor store and taken one bottle. Otherwise there was no looting that I knew of, or that anyone was aware of.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I want to commend the gentleman on this very timely subject in relating his experiences in connection with the terrible hurricane in his district. I have also had some experience, having been in the National Guard back in the 1940's in Mississippi, and I was down on the Gulf Coast when there was a major disaster caused by a hurricane at that time. I was comparing my experiences with what the gentleman has said, particularly in regard to the number of various agencies and organizations that come to the aid of people when they are in trouble.

However, one thing has amazed me that the gentleman mentioned, and that is the lack of looting in Texas and in Mexico, that occurred during this disaster. It has been my experience all over the country, and also through participation in these disasters, that there is a fair amount of looting. People will come from all over the country to see if they can pick up goods of value from stores, and even going into the homes of the people, and I am really surprised to hear the gentleman say that there was really very little looting that took place.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I say very proudly that so far as I know there was only the mention of one case of looting, and I do not know if that one was verified.

Of course, as the gentleman has mentioned, there are people who will come from the outside to take advantage of a situation like this, and who do come in and possibly do loot, but not the local people of the area, because I cannot see how anyone who has gone through the terrible dangers of a hurricane, and who has experienced the flooding that occurs afterwards, would have the time or even the inclination to take something from his neighbor who has suffered along with him.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I would also like to commend the gentleman for going down into Texas when he knew a hurricane was developing, and one that possibly could strike in his district. I also might say that I saw the gentleman on national television, so I certainly know the gentleman was in his district.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman for his statement. There always is, in a situation such as this, the question of whether one should go or not go, and I had to resolve that question in favor of going because I have been taught since I was a very young child that when your neighbor is in need, even if they are such as me, that one should go and say "Here I am for whatever I can do, and for whatever little contribution I might make." I felt it was ncessary to let my neighbors know that I was there in their hour of need. And really they are not my neighbors, they are my people, and I am one of them, and that is why the decision was made that I should go and be there with them.

Then, Mr. Speaker, after I had gone there and thought the worst was over, it was yet to come because of the terrific rains.

We have an internal floodway system which discharges water from the Rio Grande, and from there into the Gulf of Mexico. The International Boundary and Water Commission has jurisdiction of this internal floodway. I might add that under the circumstances the floodway contained as much water as was possible. I actually understand it was designed to carry some 140,000 cubic feet of water per second, and at one time it was carrying almost 200,000 cubic feet of water per second, so you can see that the floodway system was taking a much greater burden of water than was planned for it, but it did contain most of the flooding.

Had we not had the floodway system, my area would be no more. I can say that our International Water Boundary Commission did a beautiful job under the circumstances in providing the needed equipment to fix the levees where they might have breaks.

Afterward we had flooding in the city of Harlingen, and the city of McAllen, and several of the other cities and rural areas, either from the river or from the lack of adequate drainage in some areas, or just because of low ground.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take all of my time except to say that I am speaking without notes and that if I missed naming any one, it is not because they did not participate but because I could not think of them at this time. But everyone who was asked to, did cooperate and everyone came and everyone helped with their resources and helped beyond the limit and availability of their resources. They came and they helped unselfishly.

I cannot say any more. There is no beginning and there is no end of those who helped. Let me talk about the young people. You talk about the younger generation. You talk about the young people in high schools and in colleges and you see how they are publicized in what they are doing. But you should have seen the young people in my district. They were filling sandbags. They were helping in the refuge shelters. They were acting as interpreters when there were people from Mexico. They were acting as runners for the civil defense organization and for the volunteer agencies such as the Red Cross and the Salvation Army. I do not have any question about the future of those young people in my district. Oh, they might publicize someone who gets out of line now and then. But I think if we all look back, we were out of line now and then. I cannot do anything but commend the young people of that area because really I think we learned a lot from them. They brought the whole high school football teams and the coaches and teachers and worked as a team on the football field. That is how they filled the sandbags—when one more sandbag meant the difference between whether a city would be under water or not.

The young people were there—the Boy Scouts and the football teams and the bands and every organized unit in our high schools and colleges in that area were there.

So I think they publicize too much what the young people may do that is wrong. I am here to say that I saw what they did there and what they did was right and, by golly, they did a lot of things that were right.

There is no beginning and no end to the number of civic clubs, the churches and the teachers. I think this would be of interest, Mr. Speaker. When a school was opened up for the refugees to come in, the teachers who taught in that school would work in the school or the center and would help with the problems of the refugees. A nurse in that school became the nurse in that refuge. The principal became the organizer. I think the schools and the administration of the schools and the schoolteachers did a fabulous job in this respect throughout the area.

The churches opened their halls and their meeting centers. In the city of Rio Grande the Catholic church itself was opened for the refugees to come in. It was a great thing to see the priests and the nuns and in the other churches to see the preachers and ministers and the lay leaders of the churches working to see that the people were fed and to see that they had a dry place to stay.

I must also offer great commendation to the private sector. All of us know that communications is very, very important. The telephone companies that, of course, are private industry, brought in people from throughout the South to open up lines of communication as rapidly as possible.

The people in the electric industry, the private sector that provides electricity, brought in people from throughout the area. They pooled their resources.

The different telephone companies and the different power companies pooled their resources and brought in people immediately into the area and even before the winds had subsided they were there setting up powerlines and setting up telephone systems.

The REA in our area, the electrical and telephone systems, also did fabulous work. They cooperated all together. Those who did not have trouble in the outer area sent their work crews to work in our area.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like, in behalf of the people of the 15th Congressional District of the State of Texas thank all of the agencies of the Federal Government who cooperated and helped us and who participated with us and who are now participating in this good work.

I commend all State agencies that participated during the crisis and that are now participating. I commend all the private sector, industry and citizens alike. I commend all of those from the outside who came to our aid in our hour of need.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old hymn that, if I remember correctly, has a chorus that goes something like this:

> Oh, Beulah Land, sweet Beulah Land,
> Upon its highest mount I stand
> And look away across the sea
> Where mansions are prepared for me.
> Praise God I am living
> On a mountain
> In Beulah Land.

There was no mountain in the Texas gulf coast area where Hurricane Beulah struck in the third week of September 1967. But south Texans have built their own mountain—a mountain of faith and determination—and with the help of the good Lord and of their government and of their own determination in this time of dire need, they will bring their land back to a position of enduring economic strength. I know they will and for this I am proud of them, terribly proud, for these are my people.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) entitled "An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 1; further insists on its amendment No. 2, disagreed to by the House; and requests a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. HRUSKA as conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON PUTS VIETNAM IN PROPER PERSPECTIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today President Johnson delivered an historic speech when he vowed that the United States would continue to fight for its goals in Vietnam and would not be swayed by frustration, impatience, or willingness to stay the course.

United Press reported his speech as saying:

> Peace and stability will come to Asia only when the aggressors know that they cannot take other people's land by force.

Speaking at a convention of the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical, and Technical Employees at the Shoreham Hotel, President Johnson said further:

> In every way we can, we search for peace in Vietnam. But we appear to be searching alone. Those who began the war are not willing to explore ways to end it. They cling stubbornly to the belief that their aggressions will be rewarded by our frustrations, our impatience, and our unwillingness to stay the course.
>
> It will not be so.
>
> The Asian allies fighting with the United States shared this position.

President Johnson perhaps put the finger on the whole basis of the war in Vietnam when he quoted a leading public figure in a free Asian country who, recently talking with the President about the United States, said:

> This is perhaps the first time in history that a world power has consciously used its strength and wealth to promote the interests of weak and poor nations.

The President said:

> I believe that tribute is well deserved.

President Johnson expressed a conviction that out of the present conflict "a concept of world order is quietly emerging which offers the world its best chance for a constructive change."

He described this concept as a "new concept of community."

The logic of this idea first became evident in Europe, the President said, adding "the European Common Market was the result of this thinking."

The President went on to say:

> In Latin America economic integration is clearly seen as the key which can unlock strength dreamed of for centuries.
>
> In Asia the same idea has now begun—for the first time—to persuade separate nations of their common purpose.

"Africa, too, is feeling the stirrings of a regional spirit," he added.

President Johnson said that only in the Middle East "ancient rivalries and frustrations" seem to inhibit the prospect of cooperation.

And the President added:

> But in our search for new solutions to old challenges, there is hope even here that men will look together at problems they share.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the President's speech is a historic speech.

I hope it will be widely reported and widely reprinted, because indeed in the one statement of his speech, President Johnson, has put this whole conflict in Vietnam in proper focus, when he quoted the Asian as saying:

> This is perhaps the first time in history that a world power has consciously used its strength and wealth to promote the interests of weak and poor nations.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, if we stand with the President in this firm belief, when Vietnam returns to peace—as it shall—we will see a long, long era of peace.

The President placed in proper perspective the overall hopes and long-range aspirations of the United States in driving for victory in Vietnam. These hopes get lost in the day-to-day reports of casualties and debate on Vietnam.

The fact of the matter is that this country is in Vietnam today in a continuing effort to help small nations in distress against Communist aggression. What we are witnessing in Vietnam today really started 20 years ago in 1947, in Greece, when America came to the aid of Greece—beleaguered by the Communists' frightful drive to destroy Greece; take her over and then have clear sailing through the Mediterranean into Africa and the Middle East and Southeast Asia. What we are witnessing in Vietnam today is a continuation of a vast struggle against communism.

I submit what we are seeing in Vietnam today may very well be the showdown between the aggressive designs for world conquest by international communism and the peaceful designs of the United States and her allies.

I say the President's emphasis on this point, that we are for the first time using our strength and wealth to promote the interests of the weak and poor nations, will have widespread ramifications as this historic speech penetrates the nations of the world.

The other day, Mr. Speaker, we observed United Nations Day. I think it is interesting to point out that when the United Nations was founded, it had 51 nations in its membership. Today it has 127. Most of these are small nations. Many of them are smaller than some of our large States in the United States, but each one of these newly emerged nations reflects the great revolution that has taken place in the last two decades—the revolution which gave living expression to man's historic yearning to be free, the revolution against colonialism and all other forms of subjugation.

I think the President's speech today is one of the most historic announcements that has come from the White House, because his speech today assures these small, newly emerged nations that the United States intends to establish an order of peaceful relations in this world and to renounce once and for all man's desire to resolve his conflicts on the battlefield. The President's assurances today are that this Nation is ready and willing to stand in defense of small nations that want to belong to the community of free nations.

This speech is important because it serves notice on those who would want to escalate this war, not to make the mistake of miscalculating our intentions. A study of man's conflicts shows that all of history's big wars have been started by miscalculation. The most colossal miscalculation in the history of civilization was perpetrated by Hilter, who believed, according to records we have since captured in Berlin, that the United States would not respond to his aggression. This was a colossal miscalculation which brought the world to World War II.

The President's firm statement today enunciating our principles and our determination, in my judgment, serves to clear the air and will avoid any miscalculation of our intentions.

I believe that in the day to day debate about Vietnam we lose track of the fact that we are winning this war in Vietnam. It is not a stalemate.

It is not the kind of stalemate that we witnessed in Korea 14 years ago, where to this day, week in and week out, our mission meets at Panmunjom trying to get the Communists to work out some sort of peace treaty there, so that we can release our troops now stationed in Korea. The Communists have violated every single point of the 1953 truce agreement in Korea. The Communists have turned North Korea into one of the most formidable military bastions in the world today, contrary to their pledge made in 1953 at the time of the truce.

We do not want another stalemate like Korea. What we are driving for now in Vietnam is victory.

I believe there are straws in the wind which clearly indicate that we are on the right track toward that victory. While I believe that war is much too important to arouse false hopes of early victory, and I believe the President has shown tremendous self control in resisting the temptation to mislead the American people, to have them believe that somehow this may be an easy victory, we should study the various straws in the wind which give us some hope for ending the conflict.

The President has leaned over backward. His own popularity has suffered deeply because of it, but he has wanted to be totally and completely honest with the American people. He would rather remain silent than to paint a rosy picture and have the people believe that somehow or other, tomorrow or the day after tomorrow, this war will come to an end.

But I do believe that within the framework of this very great caution on the part of the President, we should not overlook certain indications that are in the wind. I am in no position today to estimate their full value or their full impact, but I believe we should not overlook these facts: First, when we capture Vietcong prisoners of war, our best intelligence reports indicate there is developing a very serious ammunition shortage in South Vietnam. Certainly our soldiers have been destroying great stores of Communist ammunition. They have been cutting off their supply lines. They have been bombing their depots in North Vietnam. The results of this activity are now beginning to penetrate through to our intelligence sources, and we are told the Vietnamese will have difficulty retaliating.

I am sure we all received with great reassurance today reports from American intelligence sources that there is building up an ammunition shortage in South Vietnam.

Second, we know also from captured prisoners of war, who are questioned not by American troops but under contract by the Rand Corp., that these prisoners of war are telling our people who question them that their food supplies and medical supplies either are diminishing or are nonexistent. Some prisoners of war have stated they get a pocket full of rice to last them a whole week. Other prisoners of war have told our intelligence people, of the Rand Corp., that they are unable to get any kind of medical supplies, because the routes for medical supplies have been cut off.

This creates mounting difficulty for the Communists in South Vietnam.

Third, we also have reliable intelligence information that the Vietcong are experiencing greater and greater difficulty in replacing their losses in South Vietnam.

We have said here before on this floor that our best intelligence clearly indicates that a continuation of the bombing of North Vietnam has tied up 175,000 Communist troops of North Vietnam. These 175,000 are tied down manning the antiaircraft installations. Another 300,000 are supervising the repair of damage done by our bombers. We know that men, women, and children do the repairs, but they are not capable of managing the repairs of the damage we have inflicted. So we have successfully tied down a half million Communist troops. These are, in many instances, the best troops the Communists have in North Vietnam. We have tied them down with continued bombing.

We have reports that this continued bombing has seriously impaired the morale of the North Vietnamese.

Contrary to those who would have you believe that they have no effect when we shut off these cities from each other, when we destroy bridges and cut off communications and interfere with supply lines, it now starts to look as though it has a very serious and devastating effect on the morale of North Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh through his propaganda machine would have you believe that he has complete control over his people, but our best intelligence clearly indicates that he is having mounting domestic troubles in North Vietnam.

Fourth, our own big buildup of troops has proved most effective there. The average American is not aware of the fact that 24 months ago we had only 20,000 troops in Vietnam; there were allied ships trapped in Saigon Bay and Saigon harbor for 5 months. We were not able to get to them to unload them. Since then, our troops have built Camranh Bay; several heliport pads and airports, and roads and lines of communication. We stopped the Communist infiltration during the day, and now we are stopping it by night. We have developed flares and airplanes that literally turn night into day with huge lights and airplanes specially designed to fly over the infiltration routes of the Communists and stop them in the dead of night.

Our troops have done a magnificent job in the last 24 months. It is only reasonable to expect that our troops needed 24 months in order to crank up and gear up for stopping the Communist aggression. Those 24 months of careful planning are now paying off.

Fifth, our own help from our allies is growing. I am sure that we all saw with great reassurance the announcement from Thailand that she is increasing her commitment in troops to South Vietnam from 2,000 to 20,000 soldiers. Korea has 50,000 there, and Australia is thinking of sending more, also.

These nations were not deterred by those who stormed the Pentagon this weekend and tried to create the impression that this country is divided in our cause in Vietnam. For those who doubt the position in Vietnam the best answer is the aid that we are starting to get from our allies in Southeast Asia.

Sixth, Mr. Speaker, finally, I believe that the statement made by President-elect Thieu that when he is sworn in on the 31st of October, he himself, in the name of his government and of the people of South Vietnam, will try to work out some solution with North Vietnam, also holds promise. This is an important development.

I list all of these things only to point out how foolish we would be if we were to follow the counsel of those who stormed the Pentagon over the weekend.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, will go down in history as the stubborn architect of hope and freedom who refused to compromise with expediency.

Here is the former schoolteacher from Texas who, while many others urge him to seek meaningless compromises, firmly believes in his responsibility to future generations not only of his country but of the world.

Oh, there is no question but that Mr. Johnson could improve his standing in the popularity ratings overnight. All he has to do is make a few side deals as has been done through all the pages of history. But this great President knows that this would be only something which would lead to further aggression.

As this unnamed Asian spokesman said this is perhaps the first time in history that a world power has consciously used its wealth and strength to promote the interests of the weak and the poor nations.

Mr. Johnson is the architect of this policy.

God grant that those well-meaning Americans who today counsel peace at any price will see the light of truth. We hope they will understand that the Communists have no intention of stopping.

All of the emphasis is being placed on the President of the United States here. What about the Soviet Union? All that Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Kosygin have to do is pick up the telephone and tell their ambassador in the United Nations not to use the Soviet veto, and this whole Vietnam conflict will be before the United Nations in 15 minutes. Time and time again President Johnson has said he is willing to take this conflict to the United Nations where it belongs. Our great ambassador, Arthur Goldberg has used every device at his command to get this whole issue before the United Nations.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union, which continues its design for ultimate conquest of the world in one way or the other, has frustrated these efforts.

And, so, Mr. Speaker, I say that the President of the United States today has delivered an historic speech, one which I hope every American will read and see how he has placed into perspective our role in Vietnam.

More important, Mr. Speaker, the President has spelled out, with the help of the Congress, how we in our day can establish an order among nations which will help them resolve their problems as free men at a conference table instead of as soldiers engaged on the battlefields of the world.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Johnson has spelled out a formula for lasting peace. I hope that those who understand the pride and yearning of 127 nations that want to be free, those who stormed the Pentagon upon last Saturday—these misguided professors who too often lead these youngsters further toward a lack of full understanding of the issues involved in Vietnam—I hope all of them will read the President's remarks and say, "Here is an honest man, dedicated to lasting peace in our time."

ITALIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA SUPPORTS LEGISLATION TO MAKE COLUMBUS DAY A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, as you know, observances were held last week in many States, as well as in our Nation's Capital, marking the discovery of this great Nation and the American Continents by Christopher Columbus. Almost coincidentally, a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary conducted hearings earlier this month on legislation to establish Columbus Day as a national holiday.

In that connection I was particularly pleased, in view of my own interest and work of many years toward that goal, to have read the statement of John N. LaCorte, who appeared before the committee in support of that bill. In it, Mr. LaCorte, who is founder and director of the Italian Historical Society of America, emphasized the truly national character of such an observance by reminding us that the discovery of Columbus represented the combined efforts of many peoples and therefore should be observed by all Americans throughout the Nation.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, since 1956 the Italian Historical Society of America has been in the forefront of the efforts to have Columbus Day declared a national holiday. Under the dynamic leadership of Mr. LaCorte, the society has been responsible for according Columbus proper recognition in New York City, where its headquarters are located, by instituting the annual Columbus Day ceremony in Brooklyn and by the naming of a section of its Civic Center as Columbus Plaza.

Mr. LaCorte's statement is an excellent plea for the observance of Columbus Day as a truly patriotic holiday for all Americans. I commend it for reading by all of our colleagues and therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, wish to include Mr. LaCorte's statement at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF JOHN N. LACORTE, DIRECTOR, ITALIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2372 DECLARING OCTOBER 12 TO BE A LEGAL HOLIDAY

My name is John N. LaCorte. I am Founder and Director of the Italian Historical Society of America, with headquarters at 113 Columbia Heights, Brooklyn, New York.

The Italian Historical Society enthusiastically supports H.R. 2372, which would declare October 12—Columbus Day—to be a legal holiday observed throughout the nation by all Americans. It does so not only because a native son of Italy discovered the land in which we are privileged to enjoy our American heritage, but because the discovery of Columbus was truly symbolic.

The discovery of Columbus has special significance for all of us because all Americans trace their origins to explorers who have come to this great land over the last five centuries. It is to Columbus, that first immigrant, that Americans are indebted for the great influence that migration has asserted upon our nation—an influence which brought about a new concept in modern civilization and made possible the America of today.

In addition to lighting a torch of hope for all the others who have come to our shore, the discovery of Columbus, like our American heritage which it has made possible, also represents the combined efforts of many peoples. We need only to be reminded of the fact that although Columbus was an Italian, his voyage and historic discovery were made possible by Spanish funds. Seamen of many lands composed the crews.

As the fruits of Columbus' discovery have been harvested by all Americans, of all races, color and creed, all Americans should welcome a national holiday commemorating that event. It will thus be a holiday with a distinctively American character.

Out of deference, therefore, not to Americans of Italian extraction, but for the significance of that discovery, the Italian Historical Society urges the passage of H.R. 2372. This bill would demonstrate in a positive and permanent way the significance of the discovery of the New World by establishing October 12, Columbus Day, as a national and legal holiday.

Support for this measure is not confined to one geographic area or to one ethnic group. Members of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States, representing every part of America and Americans of every race, color and creed, have introduced similar legislation. As President Lyndon Johnson aptly noted in his Columbus Day message of 1966, "there is something of Columbus in every American." All America and all Americans should have the opportunity to celebrate this significant event in a special way.

In 1934, the Congress passed a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 12 as Columbus Day in observance of the anniversary of the discovery of America. Several States have made Columbus Day an official holiday. Schools and civic associations throughout our land present programs in honor of Columbus. Yet Congress, despite overwhelming support for this legislation, has never seen fit to take the next logical step and elevate Columbus Day to the status of a national legal holiday. H.R. 2372 would accomplish this purpose.

The Italian Historical Society of America enthusiastically endorses this bill and urges favorable recommendation by this committee and prompt passage by the Congress of the United States.

UNITED NATIONS WEEK

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Americans all over the country are observing United Nations Week. The value and importance of the U.N. are being discussed at thousands of meetings.

One such meeting was held Sunday night by the foreign affairs interest group of Washington Street Methodist Church in Alexandria, Va. The speaker was Steven E. Beasley, a science writer and member of the United Nations Association. In his short talk, Mr. Beasley discussed a few of the programs being carried on in the underdeveloped world by U.N. agencies. The text follows:

United Nations Week is a time for careful thought about the importance of the world organization to us all.

At a time when international problems seem to be more complex than ever before in man's history, the United Nations plays a meaningful role in alleviating much of the tension between men and nations. When we consider the possible consequences of not getting together to solve our problems in a cooperative manner, we can readily see the grave implications. At stake are two critical hopes: world peace, and the full realization of man's individual potentials.

Both of these hopes are served by the U.N. Disputes among states can be aired before their peers in an atmosphere of order and respect. The U.N. can act as a disinterested third party, drawing upon the wisdom of the best minds available to resolve differences amicably.

Equally as important to peace is cooperation among member nations of the U.N. to achieve their major aspirations of good health for all, broad public education, and economic advancement. The specialized agencies of the U.N. serve as vehicles for this cooperation. These agencies include, among others, the World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

I would like to talk to you tonight about the importance of the work of these three agencies to the achievement of major development goals in the low-income countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

The campaign by WHO to achieve the highest possible level of health in the broad sense of complete physical, mental, and social well-being is a vital part of the broader development effort for social progress and economic advancement. This overall program will hopefully achieve a more stable and peaceful world.

In the low-income countries, there are 800 million children and young people, most of whom know poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease as inescapable facts of life. More than 300 million of these children live in areas with diets low in protein and calories. These are the young adults of 20 years from now.

A growing body of scientific evidence indicates that protein intake, in the early years of life, is essential to mental development. A diet that lacks the eight essential amino acids, or the nitrogen needed to enable the body to make the other 12 amino acids, may permanently damage the ability of the child to learn.

To raise protein levels in native diets, the Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama (INCAP) has developed a low-cost food for children called Incaparina. INCAP is an agency administered by the WHO regional branch, the Pan American Health Organization. Other substitutes now used include Fortifex in Brazil and Pronutro in South Africa. These compounds are made from plentiful food materials which are not now in the native diets: maize, sorghum, cottonseed, soybeans, and peanuts.

FAO programs provide additional hope that the severe protein-deficiency diets will be improved. The World Food Program provides a storehouse of surplus food from the wealthy nations, ready to use in disasters, to improve the diet of people who are underfed, and to promote improved agriculture through erosion control and irrigation of dry areas.

All the developing countries pay a high price for the lack of adequate health and nutrition, in terms not only of very high death rates, but also of reduced capacity for a full output of work, low rates of production, diminished energy, and a general lowering of the body's resistance to disease. The need, then, is for medical services: clinics, health centers, hospitals; doctors, nurses, and laboratory technicians to man these facilities. WHO assists member nations in developing physical facilities and training medical staff personnel to man them.

High disease incidence also results from the lack of sanitation, the presence of insects which carry and transmit disease, and poor facilities for disposal of waste. Through these neglected sources, parasitic diseases and infections are spread. WHO has intensive programs of sanitation, disease control, and education of the people as to the proper measures to take to maintain healthful living conditions.

An example of the effectiveness of this program is the increased productivity and decreased mortality resulting from the WHO world-wide malaria eradication program begun in 1955. The Inter-American Development Bank, a U.N. agency, reports that in Mexico during the period 1950–1962, as the mortality rate due to malaria decreased from 85 per 100,000 inhabitants to 2, the gross domestic product per gainfully employed person rose from $647 to $1080 a year. Even more spectacular are the 1950–1963 figures from Nicaragua, where the gross domestic product per worker rose from $424 to $1,000 while the malaria mortality rate dropped from 278 per 100,000 to 23.

Eighty per cent of the children in Southeast Asia suffer from worms. Now, WHO-supported scientists have achieved a major break-through in the eradication of one form of worm infestation, filariasis. Using a genetically-altered form of the carrier of this worm, the *Culex fatigans* mosquito, WHO scientists bred the altered male mosquito with the fertile females in Okpo, Burma. The female mosquitoes were "fooled," in that they bore no offspring. One hundred per cent of the eggs found in the area around the village did not hatch, effectively halting the spread of filariasis in that area. Further expansion of this technqiue to other countries gives hope to millions that they will never suffer from filariasis.

Medical research into the various forms of cancer is another of the important WHO programs. Cancer of the liver accounts for more than half the cancer deaths among the Bantu tribesmen of Africa, while cancer of the breast is much rarer in Japan than in most countries. These examples illustrate areas where a co-ordinated international approach is clearly indicated to provide epidemiological information from a large region. WHO administers twelve international reference centers for the mapping of various kinds of cancer and standardizing the classification of tissue changes. This approach will help scientists to understand better the causative mechanism involved and eventually to find methods of prevention and cure.

An important service of WHO is the Epidemiological Intelligence Service in Geneva. The aim of this agency is to ensure maximum protection from the spread of infectious disease with the least possible interference with trade and travel. Information on cases of cholera, plague, relapsing fever, typhus, smallpox, and yellow fever is beamed throughout the world by telegraph.

International scientific cooperation and the advancement of educational and cultural activities through meetings and exchange of students, touring folk groups, and aid to planners of educational programs, are some of the important activities of UNESCO. Both in improving the educational level of developing nations and in bringing together scientists of the world, UNESCO provides vital needs. Improved understanding between peoples is the end result.

As you celebrate UN Week, think about these important contributions of the UN specialized agencies. They serve the people of the world in a very personal way. They work tirelessly to end poverty, ignorance, hunger, and disease. They prevent war, to the extent that war is caused by these severe deprivations.

WASHINGTON: PUBLIC TELEVISION AND PUBLIC APATHY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, the House approved the conference report on S. 1160, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. It is hoped that the Senate will speedily approve this conference report clearing the way for the President to sign this legislation into law. I have been a longtime supporter of this legislation and I was the leadoff witness before both House and Senate committees when hearings were held on this legislation. I am proud to be associated with such a measure that will have great impact on the lives of our future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time, insert an article by Mr. James Reston, associate editor of the New York Times, of October 20, who hails the passage of this legislation as one of the great milestones in quality education in this country. I insert Mr. Reston's article following my remarks in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: PUBLIC TELEVISION AND PUBLIC APATHY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 19.—The House of Representatives approved this week the creation of a noncommerical television network. The bill went through unnoticed in the shuffle, like the bill in Mr. Lincoln's time to create the land grant universities of America, and if the people pay any attention to it, which they aren't at the moment, it could be almost as important an educational force in the future as our great state universities have been in the past.

The purpose of this bill is to create a Public Television Network, free of commercial compulsions and Government control, which will concentrate on what is important and enduring in American life, rather than what is commercially successful.

THE PROBLEM

It is an effort, in short, to grapple with a practical problem: to portray the fundamental and not merely the dramatic or commercially useful aspects of American life; not to replace but to supplement commercial television; to fill the gap between what commercial television cannot do because it must reach the widest mass audience, and what noncommercial television cannot do now because it simply does not have the money, the facilities or the personnel to do it.

The need for creating a noncommercial network, free of advertising and political control, has been recognized by a remarkable company of Americans. Frank Stanton of the Columbia Broadcasting System has not only approved the experiment but committed a million dollars to get it started. That remarkable man John Gardner, former head of the Carnegie Corporation of New York and now Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington, originally arranged to put up the funds to study the problem. McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, persuaded his organization to finance a Public Broadcasting Laboratory under National Educational Television to demonstrate the possibilities of a television network while the Congress was debating Government support of the project.

A DREAM NETWORK

Meanwhile this concept or dream of a network free to deal with what endures rather than merely what sells, mobilized the energies of men like James B. Conant, former president of Harvard; Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina, and James R. Killian Jr., former president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. But there are now problems of the most fundamental nature.

President Johnson has done a magnificent job of leadership on this whole project. He has seen the prospects and the problems. He and his staff, headed by Douglas Cater in the White House have elbowed the legislation through the committees, concentrating on the principle and the authorization of a noncommercial network rather than the appropriations.

But now there is a problem. The Senate will approve the bill within a few days. The President and Senator Magnuson of Washington, who heads the Senate committee concerned, will see to that. There will be the signing of the bill in the Rose Garden, with pens distributed to all the people concerned. Public reaction to all this, however, will then be important, and could be decisive.

If there is no, or little, public support for this whole idea of serious noncommercial reporting of public affairs, of weekly reviews of the news, and good children's programs, the whole project could languish and be lost in the present preoccupation with the cost of Vietnam and economy on everything else, and this raises an interesting public question.

The most common complaint heard these days is that thoughtful people feel helpless to relieve the things that trouble them. On this, the squares and the hippies, gran'ma and junior agree. They scratch but the itch goes on. They are anxious about the war and the cities, and they are irritated about a lot of other things, but their main frustration seems to be that they can't do anything about it.

THE PUBLIC QUESTION

The public television bill in Washington, however, gives them a chance for effective action. It touches their lives. It is tangible. The generations may be divided on everything else, but they are all grumbling about television and newspapers and singing commercials, and now they have a real opportunity to create a new network even if in the end they don't watch it. The project has now gone about as far as it can here, thanks to an unusual consensus, between the President and the intellectuals. The question now is whether the public shows some interest in supporting it politically and financially.

MOVIES MADE IN MIAMI

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district, the 11th District of Florida, has been growing rapidly in many respects—in population, in industry, and in its already great capacity to accommodate millions of tourists each year. But a little-known aspect of our growth has been the development of the Miami area as a center for the production of motion picture films for television and movie theaters.

A report of our progress in the motion picture field by Mr. Don Shoemaker appeared in the current issue of the Miamian, the official magazine of our Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Shoemaker is the distinguished editor of the Miami Herald and is chairman of the motion picture committees of both the Florida Council of 100 and the Miami-Dade Chamber's Committee of 21.

I wish to call this article to the attention of my colleagues and insert it in the Record at this point:

Made in Miami Movies

(By Don Shoemaker)

Forty-five years ago a young man soon to become known famously as Ramon Navarro swaggered before the cameras in a movie called "Where the Pavement Ends."

The site of this Rex Ingraham-Alice Terry film was more prophetic than the career of its fledging star. The picture was produced by Miami Studios on a 40-acre plot in Hialeah.

More than a generation later movie production in the Greater Miami area is enjoying a sort of comeback—sort of, because its great promise of a couple of years ago is now in an "iffy" stage.

Films do not necessarily mean the silver screen. Most of Miami's local production today is for television sequences and advertisements, or commercials. And most of the producers work on a small scale.

Greater Miami's share of the national market probably is only 2 per cent, far back of New York (with perhaps 8 per cent) and farther still from Hollywood, the aging but still chief locus of the industry.

A generation after Ramon Navarro, Greater Miami pursues the industry with as splendid a passion at the Great Lover sought the rustic beauty or the refugee from the desert harem.

The motion picture and television committee of the Committee of 21, working in collaboration with its likeness in the Florida Council of 100, is a principal suitor of an industry which is institutionally fickle.

The reason is rather simple.

In the old days of Hollywood a film company was rooted to a studio. There it made its pictures, with an occasional junket "on location." These ventures included the filming of a Louisiana bayou feature on a river in Western North Carolina or a Biblical extravaganza in the canyons of New Mexico.

Realism is where you want to find it. And perhaps this is where Florida fits in.

The State Development Commission has prepared a brochure listing dozens of sites in the Sunshine State which recapitulate any natural setting save a howling blizzard.

Under the leadership of the Florida Council of 100, Florida's child labor, education and tax laws were interpreted officially in such a manner as to encourage, even to entice, California producers to this state.

Facilities here, of course, are substantial. Ivan Tors, who is reputed to have plunked $4 million into a North Miami studio complex, is the major producer of the area.

Tors has recently started two full length feature films and has added 14 feature pictures and three teevee series to his schedule for South Florida's immediate future. His current sequence is "Gentle Ben."

Studio City, which bills itself as the largest motion picture complex in the East, has 30 acres of sound stages, laboratories and set construction buildings in North Miami.

With $3.5 million invested in two major sound stages, a production building where offices, dressing rooms and rehearsal stages adjoin wardrobe and makeup, Studio City has opened an office in New York to lure Eastern producers to South Florida.

Recently Pathe News signed a contract to move into Studio City, where it will produce educational films and audio-visual aids. It will house here its library of 27 million feet of on-the-spot news coverage. This will be edited, with updated narration, into historical documentaries.

Capital Films of Washington and Reela Films, a division of Wometco Enterprises, are equipped to process any quantity of films made by local producers or those on location in Florida on a service basis unmatched by Hollywood.

Other producers in Greater Miami are small but important. They include Rainbow Pictures of Coral Gables, South Florida's pioneer specializing in animated films and in industrial and documentary productions; Colodzin Productions, Continental Cinema Corp., International Video Productions, Van Praag Productions, and several others.

One of Florida's most critical problems in attracting a film industry is squelching those who would repel it. Fly-by-night producers and peddlers of film pornography assail the conscience of the industry as they concern laymen who are beguiled by its potential.

To control the bad guys as well as to promote the good ones a group of producers headed by John Hugh of Orlando has set up the Florida Motion Picture and Television Producers Association.

With a grant from the Florida Council of 100 and assistance from the Development Commission the FMPTVPA has prepared a 35 mm. film promoting the organization and serving the center piece of a Florida Motion Picture Week which will be observed later this month statewide.

Nothing has given the industry a stronger boost in recent years, however, than the advent of Jack Gleason.

The teevee star, who employs 265 people and who has built his own rehearsal complex and started a scenery company, produces millions of dollars worth of publicity for Miami Beach and Florida.

Each Gleason production is a major economic investment running well into six figures. The weekly tab for stagehands alone is $7,500. He has been spending $5,000 a week for scenery, plus costumes. A single one-minute commercial on the show, which now enjoys top-ranking, costs $60,000.

Last year Stanley Colbert of Columbia Pictures said in an interview with Variety that Miami would vault to second place in the movie industry. "It is easier," he explained, "to bring key New York actors to Miami than to California. Cost is lower, time is shorter, and the actors are more receptive to shooting anywhere than in California."

Actor empathy, however, is only a part of the answer. Ramon Navarro evidently liked South Florida. So, for "Tony Rome," did Frank Sinatra.

If it is to grow, the industry greatly needs local financing. If this is ever forthcoming in the manner that Wall Street at one time and the Bank of America at another gave Hollywood its wad, great things can be expected of Florida cinema.

Equally important is the labor requirement. Trained production crews are few outside of Hollywood. While the average age of production workers is 57 there and sweetheart unions pass jobs down from father to son, the California industry is waking up and training younger people.

The Committee of 21 and the Florida Council have an understanding with Lindsey Hopkins School which may lead to significant adult training courses for movie technicians. Without an ample supply of skilled "grips" and other workers, a domiciled movie industry for South Florida is pleasant talk, and nothing else.

With these trained people and with a consortium of capital, such a development amid countless locations, modern facilities and a matchless, smog-free climate, is a mine of pure gold.

BUSINESS COMMUNITY GIVES ITS SUPPORT TO PRESIDENT'S NEW JOB PROGRAM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, telegrams are pouring in from enthusiastic businessmen throughout the Nation, supporting President Johnson's new job program for the hard-core unemployed.

These farsighted businessmen realize, along with the President, that this Nation must not forget its rural and urban poor. They recognize the need of inducing private enterprise to invest its genius in our slums. They support the President's efforts to harness the energies of business and Government in a cooperative venture to bring jobs to the jobless, hope to the neglected, dignity to the oppressed.

The President's new program presents the business community with both a challenge and an opportunity—a challenge to its ingenuity, and an opportunity for public betterment along with private benefit. As the executive director of the National Rehabilitation Association put it:

> American business large and small has been a willing and effective partner in assuring employment for the [physically and mentally] handicapped. This Association has confidence in the capacity of business to respond equally to this new challenge.

In offering their assistance to the President, private enterprise is vindicating their confidence President Johnson and this Nation have placed in their desire to improve life in our ghettos.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the Record a cross section of these telegrams to evidence the enthusiasm of the business community for the President's new job program:

The President,
The White House:

The National Rehabilitation Association expresses its appreciation for your proposal to bring the tremendous resources and initiative of the private enterprise system more directly into the national effort to master the problems of disadvantaged and otherwise handicapped people. We are convinced that the successful experience of public and private programs for the physically and mentally handicapped can be, extended to reach and help those with other types of equally serious handicaps. Throughout the 47-year history of the vocational rehabilitation program American business large and small has been a willing and effective partner in assuring employment for the handicapped. This association has confidence in the capacity of business to respond equally to this new challenge. Let us add also our thanks for your splendid statement yesterday when you signed the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967.

E. B. Whitten,
Executive Director,
National Rehabilitation Association.

The President,
The White House:

Strongly support your business cooperative action program to promote training and jobs for hard core unemployed. Cooperation by Government with the private sector is essential in meeting this problem squarely. I stand ready to offer whatever assistance I can to assure success of this most important project.

Cronin Gartland Co.,
Arthur D. Cronin.

The President,
The White House:

Strongly support your big and small business cooperative action program to provide training and jobs for hard core unemployed. Cooperation between public and private sectors absolute necessity in meeting this problem squarely and quickly. I stand ready to offer what assistance I can.

Charles E. Baxter,
President, Baxter Woolen Co., Inc.

The President,
The White House:

The Society of American Florists, representing 211 affiliated grower, wholesaler and retailer florists associations throughout the country, supports fully the Small Business Administration's hard core employment program. We believe that cooperation of private and public groups is absolutely necessary to provide qualified workers for industries such as ours. Your support will be greatly appreciated.

John H. Walker,
Executive Director.

NEED FOR FURTHER IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions—both in this House and in talks with my constituents—I have noted that, while the reforms initiated in the Immigration Act of 1965—Public Law 89-236—removed many of the inequities in our heretofore archaic and discriminatory immigration laws, the present law still contains loopholes and shortcomings which must be corrected.

Numerous barriers still must be overcome by persons desiring to emigrate to our country or to adjust their status while already in the United States; families are still needlessly separated with little hope of being reunited in the near future; aliens serving with our Armed Forces in Vietnam must still cope with lengthy naturalization procedures. A wide variety of other additional inequities in our immigration policy are remnants of earlier, harsher measures.

I have already introduced legislation to alleviate the desperate situation of persons presently registered under the fifth-preference position of worldwide quotas, particularly those persons under the fifth preference of the Italian quota.

Today I am introducing a bill aimed at accomplishing a series of sweeping reforms—reforms which are urgently needed to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals.

At present, if an alien's application for an immigrant visa is not approved, he has no other legal recourse than to reapply at a later date or have a sympathetic Congressman request that the original application be reviewed. My bill will establish a Board of Visa Appeals, in the Department of State, which will be responsible for reviewing the denial of an immigrant visa to a relative of an American citizen or permanent resident alien, upon the petition of such citizen or alien.

Refugees are presently registered under the seventh-preference position of worldwide quotas and the number is not to exceed 6 percent of the overall annual limitation of 170,000. My bill establishes a new policy of granting asylum to refugees, removes them from seventh-preference status, and provides 12,000 immigrant visas annually to qualified refugees from all over the world.

My bill provides additional means to reunite families which have been separated. For example, parents of permanent resident aliens would enjoy second-preference status, rather than no particular status, as is presently the case.

These are just a very few of the many features of my bill which is aimed at facilitating and assisting persons to emigrate to our country rather than to make it almost impossible in some instances. I believe this legislation is long overdue. Aliens seeking to enter our shores have been humiliated and made to suffer indignities long enough.

I commend our distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. Celler] and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] for taking the lead in sponsoring this much-needed legislation, and I am pleased to join them in this effort.

While this measure is directed toward instituting a vast number of needed reforms, there is one important area not covered—the question of the labor certification. Although the hope has been expressed that this subject will be considered during the course of hearings on the bill, it contains no specific language to this effect.

Under the provisions of the 1965 Immigration Act, all intending immigrants without preference must first secure approval, or a labor certification, from the Secretary of Labor, stating that their admission will not adversely affect American citizens similarly employed, before their applications for immigrant visas will even receive some initial consideration. Governmental studies have shown that the quality of immigration results in the creation of more jobs than the immigrants themselves take and, in many cases, the immigrants are highly skilled and can make major contributions to American science, technology, and industry.

Prior to December 1, 1965, the effective date of Public Law 89-236, the burden of proof rested with the Secretary of Labor, and an alien could enter the United States unless the Labor Secretary specifically said "No." At present, however, the labor certification requirement for third, sixth, and nonpreference immigrants stipulates that the Secretary grant specific approval that an alien's employment in this country will not adversely affect the domestic labor force.

This procedure results in prolonged, often detailed, and generally unnecessary additional paperwork and administration of the alien employment certification program.

In a recent report, the Department of State informed me that—

> This requirement [labor certification requirement] has made it more difficult for persons of all nationalities to obtain visas when they have no relatives in the United States who can confer on them a relative preference status which would exempt them from the labor certification requirement or when they cannot qualify to fill a job in a profession or occupation for which workers in the United States are in short supply.

This labor certification requirement has hit prospective Irish immigrants particularly hard. Statistics prove that section 212(a) (14) of the 1965 Immigration Act has caused a definite decrease in Irish immigration to the United States. For example, only 860 visas were issued to applicants to whom this section applied from December 1, 1965, through March 31, 1967. Of the over 6,000 Irishmen who made application for visas during the same period of time, only a little over 2,000, or one-third, actually received visas.

I cannot see why the Irish should be discriminated against, particularly when one considers the many outstanding contributions made to American science, religion, arts, and humanities, government, and politics, industry, and technology by many Irish immigrants and their descendents. However, although the Irish have long been one of our largest groups of immigrants, they are now severely restricted as the great majority of those wishing to come to our country must apply for a labor certification in order to obtain permission to enter.

Unfortunately, we did not foresee this difficulty when we passed the 1965 Immigration Act in the 89th Congress, and I am sure our colleagues will agree, Mr. Speaker, that this inequity can and should be corrected with the greatest dispatch. Therefore, I am also introducing today a bill which amends section 212(a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The effect of this amendment will be to restore more flexibility to the current law's definition of "skilled workers" and restore the former labor provisions of the immigration laws prior to 1965. In addition, I have added a section to the Celler-Kennedy bill which calls upon the Department of Labor, in cooperation with the Departments of State and Justice, to conduct a thorough study of the operation and effect of the labor certification procedure and to report to the Congress on or before 6 months of the date of the bill's enactment.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we must realistically examine our immigration policies, and remove from our laws discriminatory practices and procedures of selecting immigrants, which amount to nothing more than a standing affront to millions of our citizens and our friends overseas. Public Law 89–236 went a long way but not far enough. Further legislative action is required to demonstrate to the world our dedication to equal and just treatment of immigrants, and I urge that my two bills receive expeditious and favorable consideration.

HOW THE MILITARY RULES 8 MILLION GREEKS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is appalling to me that in all the time since democracy has been suspended in Greece and the Government in the hands of a military dictatorship, this country has lodged no formal complaint and, in fact, continues to send military aid under an agreement concluded with the now-deposed democratic regime.

The junta which took over in April has abolished any signs of democratic government and seems in no great hurry to restore any rights. Concentration camps have been activated, arrests have run into the thousands, and no area of personal or economic life remains free from surveillance.

I would like at this time to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the September 24, 1967, New York Times on the facts of "life" in Greece today.

AFTER THE ARRESTS: HOW THE MILITARY RULES 8 MILLION GREEKS

(By Maurice Goldbloom)

The military junta which seized power in Greece last April 21 is still nervous, but with each passing day it is less and less vulnerable. By now, neither a decision by King Constantine to break with it, nor a decision by the United States to cut off military aid would automatically topple it, though either would undoubtedly weaken it.

The attitude of most Greeks toward the King's role is summed up in a mot that has been going the rounds in Athens: "In the process of seduction, there is a point at which a girl must decide whether she is going to remain a virgin. The King has passed that point with the junta." In his recent appearances in the United States—in Washington with the President, in Newport for the America's Cup races—Constantine has apparently been acting as the regime's envoy. For its part, the United States, through its initial acquiescence, has given the junta the time it needed to dig in.

In other words, the junta, though not noticeably more popular, does seem to be more solidly entrenched. The coup was staged by no more than 200 to 400 officers—out of some 10,000 in the Greek Army. The ability of such a small group to seize power without significant opposition was largely the result of mistaken identity. Greeks had long been expecting—and right-wing Greeks had been hoping for—a coup by a large, nominally secret, but in fact well-known, organization dominated by senior officers known as IDEA. But over the years a small, rival organization of junior officers, called EENA, had been growing up almost unnoticed. At the time of the coup its leadership included only one general—Stylianos Patakos, now Minister of the Interior—and he had been made a brigadier only three months before. The group's most important leader was Col. George Papadopoulos—who happened also to be the man assigned by IDEA to transmit the orders for its coup to its followers throughout the army.

It was EENA that struck, but when Papadopoulos gave the signal its recipients thought they were obeying IDEA. Because there was no organized democratic group in the army, there was no military resistance. Because civilian political groups—including the weak and demoralized Communists—were prepared only for electoral activity, there was no popular resistance.

Once in, the junta lost no time in broadening its base of military support. Increasing the officer corps by approximately 10 per cent has enabled it to win the support of perhaps twice that many officers through promotions and new appointments. Key officers on whose loyalty it could not count were forced to retire. In the army, this purge for the most part took place immediately after the coup; in the navy, where the coup had received almost no support, the junta moved more slowly. Still, by mid-August more than 60 naval officers, mostly of high rank, were said to have been removed, and 11 to have been arrested.

Arrests, indeed, have been the junta's most conspicuous activity. The cases of former Premier George Papandreou of the Center Union, his son, Andreas Papandreou, and Mikis Theodorakis, composer of the score for "Zorba the Greek," have attracted worldwide attention, but there are thousands more, and the arrests show no signs of abating.

The original wave of arrests was based largely on an army list of suspects prepared nearly 20 years ago; the conspirators had been afraid to ask for more recent lists for fear of tipping their hand. Thus, many of those arrested in the first sweep were people who, whatever they might have been in the turbulent nineteen-forties, had long since ceased to be politically active.

Later arrests—which by now certainly outnumber those of the first wave—have been more selective. They affect all sections of the political spectrum, including parliamentary deputies, former Government ministers and several of the country's leading journalists. They also include a man who criticized the King in a telephone conversation with his sister, a bus driver who objected to letting a soldier ride free and numerous persons accused of such offenses as having five or more guests in their home or possessing a mimeograph and not registering it with the police.

Of those arrested at the time of the coup, more than 6,000 were sent to a hastily opened concentration camp on the island of Yiaros. (Some 1,500, most of whom had been arrested because of their official position rather than for their politics, were soon released, though many remained under house arrest.) The Government has now announced the opening of a second major concentration camp on the island of Leros, to which prisoners are being transferred from Yiaros. This should be an improvement.

Yiaros is a completely waterless and barren island, swept by high winds. Before the coup it had an old and unused prison, with cells for a few hundred persons. When the detainees were dumped on the island, the prison was used to house some of the women. The other prisoners were housed in tents, 25 to a tent, grouped in three camps.

Some weeks later, at a time when the Government claimed to have released about a third of the prisoners originally there, it announced plans to construct reservoirs on the island which would make it possible for each prisoner to receive 15 liters (a little less than 4 gallons) of water a day. Clearly, the water supply during the first several weeks must have been barely enough for drinking, let alone sanitation.

Later, other ameliorations were promised. These included an improvement in the diet, which was said to have consisted mainly of beans, and the opening of a canteen at which prisoners could purchase additional food and other small necessities. Some of these improvements may have taken place. It at least appears reasonably certain that the canteen was opened—since underground channels reported a few weeks later that it had been closed again.

There are inevitable gaps and time lags in information on conditions in the various places of detention, since Yiaros and most of the others have been barred to journalists and foreigners. A representative of the International Red Cross has, to be sure, been permitted to visit them. But in accordance with the normal practice of that organization, his report was submitted only to the Greek Government, which never made it public.

The Government did, however, release a letter in which the Red Cross representative asked on humanitarian grounds that the 250 women confined in the old prison on Yiaros be transferred elsewhere, to accommodations more appropriate to their sex. (The circumstances of this release were such that one is impelled to wonder if the Government really desired to give it wide publicity. In the Greek Government press office, official releases are normally laid out on tables, arranged in the order of the numbers which they bear. They are available in Greek, English and French. This release had no number, it was not with the others, and it was available only in Greek.) I have seen no report indicating that such a transfer has in fact taken place, although the women may be among those now being moved to Leros.

If conditions on Yiaros have improved in some elementary physical respects, it appears that they have recently become worse in other ways. Some 250 of the "most dangerous" prisoners are said to have been segregated from the others, and to be confined to their quarters 20 hours a day. During the four hours in which they are allowed out, the other prisoners are confined, in order to prevent any contact between the two groups. And the three camps on the island are kept isolated from one another.

These changes probably result from the regime's disappointment at the failure of the prisoners to break down under its pressure. A condition for release is that the detainee sign a pledge to refrain from "antinational and anti-Governmental activity." Few politically significant prisoners have been willing to sign, regarding it as dishonorable.

Interior Minister Patakos complained to me: "Some of them are getting more hardened instead of reforming. They have organized by tents; a leader for each tent, and a group leader for each 8 or 10 tents. They have a president for each of the camps, and a general commander for the whole island. They have collected 250,000 drachms [a little more than $8,000] among themselves, for what purpose I do not know, but I am sure it is not a good one."

As one of the "Communist" leaders of the hardened prisoners, Patakos mentioned Dimitrios Stratis. When I remarked that the 78-year-old Stratis, a veteran trade-union leader and left-wing parliamentary deputy whom I know well, was not a Communist, Patakos replied: "He calls himself a Socialist, but he is a Communist. In Greece, we have right people and wrong people. All those who are against the country are Communists. Stratis is a Communist in his heart and his works. They are all liars."

Yiaros and the courts-martial which hand out sentences of five years for writing slogans on walls and eight years for *lese-majesté* are not the Government's only instruments of intimidation. Some Greeks beyond the borders have had their citizenship revoked—most notably, the actress Melina Mercouri, who seems to have come out ahead on the exchange.

Many persons regarded as potential troublemakers have been taken to police stations and badly beaten, as a warning, without being formally arrested; this treatment has been most often used on students and other young people. The security police have visited private employers with lists of "unreliable" individuals who are to be discharged. Many people have had their telephones removed because of their political views; all have been discouraged from talking politics on the phone or writing about it to friends by the knowledge that phones are likely to be tapped and letters opened.

But the junta has not relied on terror alone to consolidate its position. Rather, it has systematically endeavored to entrench itself in every aspect of Greek life. On the national level, despite the existence of a nominally civilian Government, an army officer plays a key role in every ministry—in some cases as minister, in others as secretary general, in still others as a political commissar without official title.

The tenure of civil servants has been abolished; many have been removed for their ideas, and all have been ordered to pledge their loyalty to the regime on pain of dismissal. The purge has not been confined to such politically sensitive departments as the police, where 118 high-ranking officials and police doctors were dismissed in mid-August. (Others had been ousted previously, individually or in smaller batches.) It has even affected the director of the Byzantine Museum, an internationally known scholar.

Locally, the regime has destroyed the system of nonpolitical nomarchs or district administrators, whose establishment American advisers once regarded as one of their major achievements. More than half the nomarchs have been removed; most of their replacements are army officers. While asserting its belief in the decentralization of authority, the Government has removed large numbers of elected mayors and local councils and replaced them with appointees chosen in Athens.

Nor has it confined itself to the governmental sphere. It has seized control of the Orthodox Church. It has dissolved hundreds of private organizations and removed the officers of numerous others, including bar associations, agricultural cooperatives and the Jewish community.

The United States Embassy in Athens clearly does not like the regime, though most Greeks regard it as responsible for the coup—an opinion the junta assiduously encourages. (A skeptical friend remarked to me, after seeing one of the coup leaders in action, "Now I believe what you say about the Americans not being behind the coup; they'd never have chosen *these* people!") But the Embassy also regards the present Government as a lesser evil than a revolt against it, and has therefore placed its hope in persuading the junta to practice self-denial and restore democracy voluntarily. Its influence is limited, since the junta now feels certain that the United States will continue military aid whatever happens. (Some weeks after the coup, the U.S. did cut off certain items, estimated by the Defense Department at 10 per cent of the total.)

Nevertheless, the Embassy and State Department see great cause for optimism in the appointment of a committee of jurists to draw up a revised Constitution by the end of the year for submission to a plebiscite. This is supposed to lead to a speedy and orderly restoration of constitutional government.

This assessment appears to contain a large measure of wishful thinking. The group named to draw up the new Constitution included a few persons of some distinction, several conservative nonentities and a few with rather unpleasant reputations. But the members were not consulted before their appointments were announced, and some of the best-known have refused to serve.

The Goverment's influence on the deliberations of the committee is not likely to be cast on the side of democratic institutions. While Premier Constantine V. Kollias has said the new Constitution will be only slightly changed from the present one, journalists close to the junta have called for much more drastic alterations. Among the suggestions offered are a ban on political activity by anyone who has ever cooperated with the extreme left, a requirement that all candidates have loyalty certificates from the security police, and the exclusion from office of anyone who has ever held foreign citizenship.

The first of these provisions would not only bar all those in the United Democratic Left (EDA), a party which contains some hard-core Communists but also a wide range of non-Communists. It would also ban most members of Papandreou's Center Union and a number of people now on the right—including some ex-Communists who hold office under the junta or are among its advisers. (For example, Theophylaktos Papaconstantinou, whom the Government has placed in charge of the press, is a former Communist theoretician. So is the editor of Eleftheros Kosmos, the newspaper widely regarded as closest to the junta.)

The significance of the second is shown by a story told by a friend who had served as an officer attached to the general staff. One of his duties was to investigate the qualifications of officer candidates. In the dossier of one he found a report from the Security Police: "A. is a dangerous subversive, being closely associated with the politician Constantine Rendis." At the time of the report, Rendis, who belonged to the right-center, was Minister of Public Order and the superior of the police official who wrote it.

The third proposal is aimed primarily at Andreas Papandreou, a former American citizen and the man on whom millions of Greeks rest their hopes for their country's future.

When I asked Patakos what constitutional changes the Government would propose to the committee, he mentioned none of these specific points, although he referred in a general way to changes in the qualifications of deputies. In response to a question, he added that the Premier named by the King would still have to receive the support of a majority in Parliament. He added that these ideas were merely being considered very tentatively; the one point on which the Government was determined was that the new Constitution must cure all the faults of the existing system. Apprised of this statement, one diplomat remarked: "That's easy; all he has to do is change eight million Greeks."

Whatever kind of Constitution may emerge from the committee, the problem of implementation will still remain. The embassy appears to rely on the King and Patakos—the member of the junta who is regarded as most susceptible to the influence of the palace—to promote the restoration of a constitutional regime. Patakos, however, does not seem to have any such intention. He told me: "We are not interested in elections; if we were, we wouldn't have made a revolution. This system we have now is the best system, because what we have now we have achieved with the people's support, so there is no need for elections. We have more serious problems than elections. What we have done we did in order to achieve certain aims, and when we have achieved these aims, then we will have time for elections. . . . We are frank people. We are not liars and we do not want to make false elections, the way they do in Russia with 98 per cent; therefore there will be no elections."

But even if Patakos could be induced to support a prompt return to constitutionality, it is unlikely that he could accomplish it. Unlike Colonel Papadopoulos, who organized the coup, Patakos appears to have little talent for conspiracy or political infighting. He seems a basically decent if insensitive man, whose political naiveté is almost incredible. (He is responsible for most of the pronouncements which have brought ridicule on the junta—the bans on miniskirts, beards, long hair, etc.) A soldier of peasant origin (a brother is said to be still working on the roads in Crete), he rose slowly through the ranks for 37 years, becoming a brigadier general and commander of the tank school three months before the coup. Only then does he seem to have been brought into the conspiracy—because the tanks he controlled were necessary to its success. One suspects that he joined partly because of resentment at the establishment—civil and military—on which he blamed his slow promotion (he talks with obvious bitterness of the 10 years he lingered as a lieutenant colonel), and partly because he really believes the moralistic slogans to which others in the Government pay lip service.

In any showdown between Patakos and Papadopoulos, the latter seems far more likely to be the victor. Indeed, the other members of the junta may in any case drop Patakos when they feel strong enough to do so. He might even end up on Yiaros. If he should, I would not expect him to sign a declaration in order to obtain his release.

But if the junta does not seem likely to give up power voluntarily, there are factors which may eventually lead to its downfall. One is the difficulty of getting competent personnel to work for it. The population of Greece is about the same as that of New York City, and the proportion of trained personnel is much lower. If one eliminates a majority of the population—and a much larger majority of the well educated—on political grounds, it becomes difficult to find competent people for important positions. Moreover, many whom the junta might be willing to appoint do not want to serve under present conditions; in one instance, it has had to draft a retired official into the army in order to make him assume a top post in a ministry.

This difficulty may explain some of the peculiar appointments the Government has made. One, particularly strange for a regime which talks in terms of moral regeneration, is that of Constantine Thanos as Secretary General of the Ministry of Coordination and Alternate Governor of the World Bank, two of the most important economic posts it had to fill. Mr. Thanos was, a few years back, rejected for a teaching post at the University of Athens because it was discovered that the thesis he submitted in support of his application was a verbatim plagiarism from a memorandum by Prof. Benjamin Beckhart of Columbia. The incident is not the only one of its type in Mr. Thanos's career.

But the Government may well feel that it cannot look too closely into the moral credentials of anyone who can help it solve its economic problems, for these are very great, and almost certain to increase. At the beginning of June, Greece had shortterm debts of about $20-million more than its official gold and foreign-exchange reserves. (Some $100-million in gold sovereigns, the purchase and sale of which were used to stabilize the currency internally, did not appear in the official reserves. The exact amount in this fund was secret.) And Greece's three principal sources of foreign exchange—emigrant remittances (about one Greek worker in five is employed abroad), tourism and shipping—all seem likely to drop sharply this year, as does foreign investment.

In addition, it is almost certain that a loan of about $100-million which has been promised by the European Economic Community will now be postponed, if not canceled. Nor have the financial prospects been improved by the resignation of the internationally known economists Xenophon Zolotas and Michael Pesmazoglou as Governor and First Deputy Governor of the Bank of Greece.

No wonder that a former minister says of Col. Nicholas Makarezos, who as Minister of Coordination is in charge of economic policy: "He's the only one of them who thinks seriously about problems; that's why he always looks worried." The colonel's worries seem likely to come to a head within the next six months. By that time, the Government is widely expected to run out of cash. (It is already asking for U.S. economic aid.) It may be able to renew credits as they come due, simply because creditors will prefer to keep their loans on the books instead of pushing them into default. But without new credits, which seem unlikely, there will have to be drastic import restrictions and currency controls, there may be a devaluation of the drachma and a sharp reduction in the standard of living.

The political repercussions of such a development are unpredictable. It may be that the opposition will still be too disorganized to take advantage of the situation, and that the Government will be able to ride out the crisis. But it is also possible that students—who are difficult to control because their leadership is always being renewed—and workers returning from northern Europe, where many of them have already organized against the junta, will by then form the basis of an effective resistance movement. And if the regime is not able to keep up the standard of living of the armed forces—particularly the officer corps—trouble could come from that quarter.

Such a situation could conceivably result in a countercoup. Or the junta might turn to a foreign adventure, particularly in Cyprus. This past summer, there were sounds from Athens of a new drive for *enosis,* the union of Cyprus with Greece. (They produced no sympathetic echoes among Greek Cypriots.)

Or the regime might seek to rally popular support by swinging in a Peronist or National Bolshevist direction. There are already some signs that it is considering this option. One is a decree prohibiting any Greek, including employes of foreign companies and international organizations in Greece, from getting more in salaries, allowance and pensions than the Premier receives—about $18,000 a year. (The junta issued a decree raising the salaries of Cabinet ministers substantially, but forbade the press to mention it. Some days later another decree was issued reducing the salaries—but to a point well above their previous levels. The reduction was then publicized without mentioning the previous raise.) It has also raised pensions for peasants by about two-thirds. And Agriculture Minister Alexander Matthaiou's first radio address was not only filled with leftist phrases, but was couched in a form of the *Demotiki* (the popular language, traditionally championed by the left as against the *Katherevouse* or "pure" language backed by the right) so extreme that it is regarded as the trademark of the Communist party and shunned by everybody else. A move in this direction might also take on an antimonarchical aspect; not all the members of the junta regard the King as indispensable.

It might seem strange for a rightist government to move in this direction. But the junta does not represent the traditional Greek right, rooted largely in property and birth. Its leaders are men of lower and middleclass background. They may hate the left, but they have no love for the conservative establishment.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the conference agreements reached on the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. In general, I supported the purposes of this act throughout its legislative history, and, in fact, spoke on this floor in support of improved public television back when the bill was first introduced.

There has been very little argument that something is needed to supplement the programing of the commercial stations. Without noncommercial television, we have an inflexibile situation by which a certain segment of the viewing public is deprived of its choice of television. Certainly we cannot cater to every taste, but when the kind of program being squeezed out is so valuable, then I think it is time we reevaluated the system. The Public Broadcasting Act does this, and I think it is a good step toward the goal of good, noncommercial programing.

With the Federal Government already involved in this field, and with it becoming even more involved by virtue of this act, I think it is important that safeguards be erected to prevent the law from being used for something not intended. I think it should be clear that the programs envisioned by the act are not to compete with the type of broadcasting usually seen on commercial stations today. We have got to be careful to insure that the noncommercial broadcasts do not threaten the welfare of other stations, especially those on UHF channels, and to insure that political promotions are removed from the sphere of Government-supported activities.

To my way of thinking, it is sound legislative policy to define as clearly as possible the congressional intent. In a project this wide sweeping, we should assure that Government participation is carefully limited.

It was for this reason that I sponsored in committee an amendment to the bill defining the term "educational television or radio programs." My definition, as approved by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and by the full House, was that the types of programs to be promoted by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting were to be "programs which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes." The conference report, on the insistence of the conference members from the other body, omits the prohibitive aspects of the definition, saying only that the term means "programs which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes."

This language is better than nothing, but I still believe the Congress could do better in defining and delimiting the type of program to be promoted under this bill. I see nothing wrong in defining these terms as precisely and completely as we can. The definition I proposed contained both the permissive and the prohibitive aspects; the conference definition contains only what is permissive. I regret that this omission was made, for, as one of my constituents recently said, there is nothing wrong with insuring that Federal dollars do not go to support western or comedy television programs.

THE HUNGARIAN UPRISING IN OCTOBER 1956

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in their long and turbulent history, the Hungarian people have always struggled for their national independence and political freedom. For centuries they fought against more numerous and powerful foes, and they have generally succeeded in defending their national integrity. In the mid-19th century, their country became part of the Austro-Hungarian empire. But at the end of the First World War, when the Austro-Hungarian empire was dissolved, Hungarians once more regained full freedom and national independence.

The years between World War I and World War II proved a period of trial for the Hungarian nation. Political unrest and economic instability were accentuated by social disturbances. In the early 1920's, their free existence was threatened by communism, then rampant in certain parts of Eastern Europe. Fortunately Hungary, strengthened by some outside aid, rid itself of these dangerous elements and again became master of its own destiny. After the outbreak of the last world war, however, fate once more placed Hungary's destiny in the hands of others.

Even before the end of World War II, the Soviet Union had designs on Hungary. The Kremlin wanted to install a "friendly" regime in Budapest, which of course meant a Communist takeover in Hungary. This was accomplished much against the protests of the leaders in the free world. By 1948 the forces for democracy and freedom were eliminated and crushed, and with the aid of the Red Army, Communist totalitarianism was firmly established in Hungary.

Life became intolerable, almost unbearable under communism, and this state of affairs continued for 8 years. But the Hungarian people became impatient with the Communist dictatorship. By 1956, they were determined to take their stand against their oppressors and to challenge their Communist rulers to an open fight, which eventually led to the bloody events of the Hungarian uprising in October of 1956. On October 23 the students at Budapest University staged a demonstration demanding full national independence. Immediately, this movement spread to other parts of the city and to the countryside, taking both the Communist government and the Soviet forces by surprise. The students tore down all the Soviet emblems and destroyed Stalin's huge statue in Budapest.

The Hungarian Army joined in this uprising and in a few days it seemed that the revolt would achieve its goal. At first, the Soviets seemed very conciliatory, and in this the Hungarians were sadly deceived. While the Hungarians were jubilant with their success, the might of the Soviet Union was being marshaled against them. Even more tragic is the fact that the friends of the Hungarian nation in the West were not in a position to give them any effective aid.

The events of succeeding days constituted one of the saddest episodes in the history of the Hungarian people. In the course of a week the country was enveloped by Soviet forces and completely sealed off from the free world. Fighting raged for several days and in the ensuing human carnage thousands of innocent brave Hungarians gave their lives for freedom.

Early in November, when so-called peace and order were restored in Hungary, the people were more oppressed than ever before in their history. Today, 11 years after that heroic uprising and tragic ending, they still suffer under Communist totalitarian tyranny. The uprising of October 1956 remains a memorable event in Hungarian history and in the Hungarian people's struggle for freedom and independence, which we pray will come to them soon.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the 20th-century American is a health conscious American. The picture of a well groomed, radiant couple entertaining other well groomed radiant couples is perpetuated in every form of American advertising. The modern American housewife prides herself on her spotless children. The American husband values his shiny car and his dapper appearance.

Contrast this American self-portrait with the more realistic picture of American society choked and poisoned by air pollution. Paint corrodes on the spotless homes, vegetation dies, and the shiny cars which clog the highways discharge fumes which sicken their drivers. Americans who flee to the suburbs are dismayed to learn that air pollution respects no boundaries. They are appalled to see their once beautiful communities being enshrouded in a mass of poisons.

Mr. Speaker, the effects of air pollution on the economy and on the health of our citizens are well known. Air pollution is not only unsightly; it seriously endangers the health of our citizens. Our citizens are rapidly losing faith in the image of a spotless America and are asking us to halt the poisonous spread of air pollution. A recent Harris poll showed that there is more public support for expanded Federal pollution control than for any other single domestic program.

The President laid the groundwork for the enactment of just such a program in his message to the Congress last January 30, in which he proposed adoption of the Air Quality Act of 1967. I firmly believe that the bill reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee provides a truly effective solution to this critical problem.

This legislation includes a program for combating the problem of air pollution now, by requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to publish criteria of the effects of various air pollutants and information on the technology for controlling these pollutants. The States must then set control standards for their own areas based on this information. The bill strengthens the existing program of motor vehicle pollutant control by calling for the development of State inspection systems, to insure continuing effectiveness of motor vehicle controls.

This legislation also adds another major dimension to controlling air pollution by increasing funds for further research in all aspects of this problem.

Mr. Speaker, our President and our citizens are asking us to make the dream of a healthy, radiant America a reality. I believe that the 1967 Air Quality Act is equipped to help do this and I strongly urge its enactment.

ADDRESS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL LARRY O'BRIEN

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, Vermont Democrats had the good fortune recently to get the benefit of the wisdom and wit of Postmaster General O'Brien. The topic was politics and important national issues. When Larry O'Brien talks politics, it is both a joy and an education to hear him. I'm sure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will find the Postmaster General's Vermont remarks interesting.

I include the text of the Postmaster General's speech in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE VERMONT DEMOCRATIC PARTY DINNER, ALLIOT HALL, ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE, BURLINGTON, VT., OCTOBER 13, 1967

I am delighted to join you tonight and to bring you a personal message from the President.

President Johnson asked me to tell you that he shares your view that you have one of the outstanding Governors in the nation in Phil Hoff, and that at a time when the nation is dealing with complex national and international problems America needs such men in the Governor's chair, and in the Halls of Congress. And then the President added, "When it comes to assessing the sources of America's power, it is not our national resources nor our ability to produce military or consumer goods that generates that power. Rather, it is a tradition, a tradition in which exceptional men are willing to devote themselves to the public good through public service. And Phil Hoff is an excellent example of this tradition working in behalf of better government."

Certainly, all who know Phil Hoff share the President's views. Your Governor's voice is listened to with respect in Washington. And if Vermont has a single need or requirement that he hasn't told us about in Washington, I can't imagine what it might be.

Actually, I am not really sure why you

asked me here tonight, since I was informed that this was a partisan dinner.

Such partisanship is in direct conflict with my intense effort to prevent the injection of politics into the Post Office Department.

On my flight here today, I overheard an interesting conversation across the aisle. There were two very prosperous and self-satisfied looking gentlemen, and another, not so well dressed or sure of himself. But this man made up in friendliness for his obvious lack of worldly goods.

He tried several times to strike up a conversation with these overstuffed fellows.

Finally, one said, stiffly. "Name is Scrooge; Republican, retired, married, two sons: doctors." The other followed suit: "Name is Clinkscales, Republican, retired, married, two sons: lawyers."

The little man looked abashed for a moment and then said slowly and subtly: "Name is Smith; Democrat, still working, never married, two sons—both Republicans."

Actually, some of my best friends are Republicans. And, to quote a famous general you all know: if you give me some time I may be able to recall their names.

Fellow Democrats, in these trying times, in this age of recurring crisis and swift change, in a time when guns sound in Southeast Asia, and in the Middle East, when Africa is alight with fires of ancient tribal hatreds, when there are vast convulsions in the Communist world, we need leadership and vision. The Democratic Party has demonstrated again and again through action, constructive legislation, commitment and compassion, that it possesses leadership in abundance.

The other political party by and large is too often a party afflicted by astigmatism, the compulsion to reach for a fifth of old sloganeer at every crisis, and the substitution of attractively packaged candidates for fresh thought.

As for those candidates, on election day the people will see behind that man-tan, those flashing teeth, and that little spit curl in the middle of the forehead. "Come out from behind that smile, Ronald Percy, we know you!"

One of the most interesting pastimes in Washington is discovering quickly which politician is a Democrat and which is a Republican.

How do we political bird watchers tell a Democratic eagle from a Republican whooping crane?

It's easy.

Fishing is a good way. Democrats eat the fish they catch. Republicans hang them on the wall.

TV is another good way. Democrats watch westerns that make them clench their fists and become red in the face. Republicans get the same effect from watching Democrats.

Economics is another excellent way. Democrats look at the hopeful side. A typical Republican reaction to the nation's greatest economic boom in history is that we are now in the depths of prosperity.

Fighting, though bad, very bad, is another touchstone.

Republicans fight after elections. Democrats fight all the time. This exemplifies Will Rogers' statement, "I am not a member of any organized political party. I am a Democrat."

The Republicans on the other hand have plenty of organizers.

This evening I want to discuss one of them.

My first choice was the Governor of California, the man who has made many actors think twice about taking on villain roles for fear it may harm their political futures, the man I like to think of as the Nineteenth Century Fox.

But, I have decided to discuss another man, one who is coming up to Vermont in a few weeks.

He's the Governor of Michigan. You remember. He's the one that Americanized the compact car. And his views since then have been truly in the mainline of Republican tradition: think small. And shift for yourself.

His positions on public issues remind me of a traffic sign I once saw. The sign warns: Don't park on both sides of the street.

The Michigan Governor once said he was courting the Presidency. Well, I am happy to tell him, it's already engaged.

He recently claimed he was—and I use his very words—brainwashed.

Perhaps in the rarified air of this beautiful State he may be able to clear his mind.

So, my first question is: Governor, how did you learn you were brainwashed?

Where does the Governor of Michigan *really* stand on Vietnam? Through the fog we see something for everybody. He supported President Johnson in a speech in Hartford. Then he said the war is a "tragic mistake." He also favored Republican Congressman Ford's call to expand the bombing, and he backed the doves who feel that we should negotiate at all costs.

Do you really *know* where you stand on Vietnam, Governor Romney?

And when you arrive here in Vermont could you tell the good people about it in clear sentences, sentences you won't have to retract later?

Now, I don't want anyone in this room to get the impression that I am not taking the Governor of Michigan seriously.

He is a very energetic and curious gentleman.

Recently, you may note, he had an interesting dialogue with some of the Hippies in San Francisco, one of whom asked the good Governor to vote for *him*. I don't know whether he will heed that Hippie's plea, although he did say that he agreed with much of their philosophy. But agree or not, I want him to know that he is one of my favorite "flower people."

You know, it is easy right now, very easy, for members of the opposition to swing around the country, advocating first this position and then that position.

It is easy, I almost said simple, because the opposition does not bear the responsibility for the course this nation is to take, for the safety and security of our people.

In Vietnam the President is following the road of responsibility.

It is not an easy road.

But the President is convinced that is the road that leads to a free Asia; the road that leads to a freer and a happier and a more secure America.

As he said less than a week ago, "I believe the American people will follow its course—not blithely, not cheerfully—for they all lament the waste of war; but they will follow it with a firm determination, now that we have begun it, to see it through all the way."

That is how our President feels.

And I believe the vast majority of us share that determination.

I know that John Fitzgerald Kennedy saw that his country would need determination. In 1960 he said, "Now that the age of consolidation is over . . . once again the age of change and challenge has come upon us."

The result, he said, is that . . .

"The next year, the next decade, in all likelihood the next generation, will require more bravery and wisdom on our part than any period in our history. We will be face to face, every day, in every part of our lives and times, with the real issue of our age—the issue of survival."

That is precisely what we face today.

And survival demands hard decisions, responsible decisions.

It demands hard choices, not temporary expedients.

President Johnson, a man who has spent his lifetime in the public service, certainly treasures public support. And there are many who suggest ways by which that support could be increased—*temporarily*—

—by softening or renouncing the struggle in Vietnam, or escalating it to the red line of danger

—by giving in and retreating on the tax proposal

—by abandoning the fight against discrimination—the fight for the poor—here at home.

There might be some short term political gains from this course of expediency.

But what about next year . . . or five years from now?

What would that course mean, not for Lyndon Johnson, not for the Democratic Party—but for the United States of America?

I tell you what the President thinks it would mean. His words are straight from the shoulder. "It would mean," he said, "greatly increasing the chances of a major war—not this year, but in the years immediately ahead.

"It would mean imposing a far more onerous tax, a tax of inflation, on all of our people—and the poorest among us—not just this year, but next year.

"It would mean dooming our cities to angry strife and squalor—in every year yet to come."

And then he added, "So we do have a choice.

"We can take the easy road tonight, denying our responsibilities, hoping that a rise in our polls will compensate for what we ought to have done for our country.

"Or we can take the harder road of responsibility. We can do what we believe is right for our children's future, though it may mean a great deal of present pain.

"I have made my choice. And I pray that I—and we—will have enough of that bravery, unselfishness and wisdom that Jack Kennedy said we would need—to see it through, all the way."

That is the President's choice. The choice of responsibility.

What is *your* choice?

Ladies and gentlemen, no matter who the Republican choice may be, the foggy voice from Michigan, the Nineteenth Century Fox, or Barry Goldwater's favorite Nelson Rockefeller—no matter who he may be, we cannot expect to prevail by merely sitting back and watching the candidate slipping his tongue or washing his brain. We have got to work and we have got to organize.

We must organize to win elections, and we must organize to tell the voters of the issues, to get them interested in our programs, our goals, our positive platform and the Republican's do-nothing program.

In a manual I produced some years back, there are many tried and true rules about organizing to win elections.

But manuals must be brought to life by the touch of willing hands.

We Democrats possess in abundance leadership, accomplishment and aspiration.

But the record of past elections clearly shows that leadership, accomplishment and aspiration are simply not enough.

We have got to get out, roll up our sleeves and get to work.

I can tell you here tonight at this moment that our national leaders will be working, and working *together!*

Lyndon Johnson, Hubert Humphrey, and Robert Kennedy and the other leaders of our party will be marching shoulder to shoulder leading our party toward victory in 1968.

I can assure you of that. But what about our leadership on the local level, right here in Vermont?

I ask no more of you than will be given by our Party leadership. I ask of you no less than the kind of cooperation that existed between John P. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

You know that in the best American tradition these two men fought valiantly for the

Democratic Presidential nomination. When the decision was made, neither man permitted the past to cloud his judgment. John F. Kennedy wanted the most able man he could find for his Vice President. That's why he picked Lyndon B. Johnson. He knew the problems we faced were too vast, the course of human life too uncertain to have anyone but the very best in the Vice President's chair. And Lyndon Johnson made the same judgment when he chose Hubert Humphrey in 1964.

My friends, the sense of mutual responsibility, the ability to forget past differences, paid dividends for our country in those terrible days of November, 1963. The result was continuity of leadership, and continuity in the constructive work of the Democratic Party.

That continuity began with cooperation in 1960. Let us restore and let us strengthen that spirit and we will again assure continuity in the great unfinished tasks that face this nation.

Let us continue—but in the final analysis, you—the Democratic leaders of this State and leaders in every State—must show the way to victory in 1968.

My friends, the decision is in your hands.

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Kyros] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to add my voice to the many who have spoken in support of the Air Quality Act of 1967, which President Johnson proposed to us last January 30.

I am much impressed by the evidence linking air pollution to such increasing health problems as lung cancer, emphysema, and chronic bronchitis. I recognize that the arguments linking air pollution to human health damages have not been conclusive, but they are certainly very persuasive. It seems clear to me that human health and perhaps life itself may be at stake and that we cannot wait for the long-term results of medical and epidemiological research to prove irrefutably that such harm is being done.

I have listened patiently to those who say we must research the problem further, and I conclude that they are right. There are many sources of air pollution, like the coal burning powerplant, for which we do not yet have an economically feasible means of control that can be applied uniformly throughout the country. But, on the other hand, I am impatient with the fact that we have not applied in anything like adequate measure the controls which have been available for many years. I am told for example that controls are available which will reduce particulate emissions by 95 percent. Presently it is estimated that we are reducing particulate emissions by 30 to 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the administration's leadership in attacking the problem of air pollution, and I urge all here today to respond affirmatively to the President's call for support of the Air Quality Act of 1967.

A SEASONAL AMENDMENT FOR RETAILING

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Ashmore] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems confronting America today involves the current and demanding job market and the unskilled worker looking for employment. While this problem is serious, it is rather ironic at the same time, for in too many instances, the prospective employer and the potential unskilled worker are not getting together. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that I have at least a partial solution to this national problem and I would respectfully urge my House colleagues to give favorable consideration to the proposal I am about to introduce.

One of the largest employers in the Nation is the retail industry. Traditionally, general merchandise stores have, in the past, hired several hundred thousand so-called seasonal employees to help them during the Christmas season. I would like to point out that retailing emphasizes the Christmas season period because it is this period of October, November, and December which provides department stores with some 36 percent of their annual sales. In other words, these 3 months carry the heavy burden for the entire selling year.

To meet this peak retail selling period, more temporary seasonal employees are hired. Department of Labor statistics reveal that in 1965 for the months of October, November, and December, the average number of paid employees is 22.6 percent greater than the previous 9 months in the year. December employment was 27 percent greater than for the monthly average for October and November. So it is quite clear that these stores possess a great potential market for seasonal employment.

But this is only part of the picture. The thousands that are employed each year—in 1965, it was 1,990,800 during the Christmas season—are seasonal employees. They are hired for only this period. The overwhelming majority are untrained in that they have had no experience in retail stores. They are needed however, and they anxiously seek such employment, primarily to supplement family income. These seasonal workers are generally secondary wage earners, such as students, housewives, retired people, and others. These workers have been employed at a lower rate than the experienced workers. Even in those large stores which are unionized and which have a negotiated minimum wage, these seasonal employees are hired at a lower rate than that stipulated in the union contract for regular employees.

The situation I have described thus far existed before the Fair Labor Standards Act was amended in 1966—and the minimum rate was increased to $1.40 an hour. The 1966 amendments, I am afraid, have discouraged many employers from hiring because of the new higher rates now required under the Fair Labor Standards Act. In recent days, the pages of the Congressional Record have taken note of several surveys showing the impact of the 1966 amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I am today, offering an amendment to that act, which I sincerely believe will be, if it is approved, a boon both to the many thousands looking for seasonal work and to the employers.

My amendment, Mr. Speaker, would permit retailers to hire seasonal workers only during the last 3 months of the year at a rate 90 percent of the legal minimum. I have been assured by retailers, both in my own district and throughout the country that if this amendment is adopted, jobs will be available to many thousands of people who otherwise will not be able to secure employment.

Mr. Speaker, as I view this amendment, it will open up employment for untrained and unskilled people. It will provide jobs for young and older people who either have not entered the labor market yet, or who have retired and need to supplement their incomes. It will permit housewives to take part-time jobs and earn additional money for the Christmas season. On the other side of the coin, it will provide additional help for retail stores permitting them to serve their customers in a manner that they otherwise would not be able to do.

Mr. Speaker, there is strong justification for the proposed 10-percent wage differential. Since the minimum rate has risen to $1.40 an hour, these untrained, seasonal workers simply cannot be hired because employers do not feel it is economical to hire at the higher rates. There is also a problem that would be accelerated between the permanent staff of the stores and the seasonal workers if this 10-percent wage differential is not permitted.

I sincerely believe that the adoption of this proposed amendment will produce only good results. It will mean more jobs for those who in a major degree cannot find employment suitable to their own individual liking and individual schedules. It will aid the stores in solving a most serious problem. Moreover Mr. Speaker, and I would like to stress this point—most stores would hope to use this avenue to find capable, permanent full-time employees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of the proposed amendment.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS URGES DEFEAT OF PROPOSED DINGELL AMENDMENT TO CLEAN AIR ACT—CHARGES POLITICAL INFLUENCE OF AUTO INDUSTRY RESPONSIBLE FOR FRUSTRATING SMOG-CONTROL EFFORTS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Roybal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, with the 1967 amendments to the Clean Air Act expected to be on the calendar for House consideration within the next week or so, I believe it is vital for all Members to understand the critical damage that will be done to the cause of effective air pollution control in America's urban metropolitan centers by the adoption of the auto industry-sponsored Dingell amendment to this measure.

The Dingell amendment would not only eliminate the Senate-passed provision of the bill that permits the State of California to pursue its aggressive smog control program—and, incidentally, continue to provide urgently needed national leadership in this vital field—but it would substitute language backed by the Automobile Manufacturer's Association that would have the effect of prohibiting any State from applying more stringent motor vehicle emissions standards it felt necessary to protect the health and welfare of its citizens.

This blatant attempt by the auto lobby to sabotage California's pace-setting, and so far successful air pollution control program is deeply resented by our nearly 20 million residents.

As further evidence of this far-reaching concern, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the resolution recently adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors calling for defeat of the Dingell amendment, as well as an excellent editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Times on this subject, entitled "A Setback for Strong Smog Controls":

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
October 2, 1967.

All Members of the California Congressional Delegation.

GENTLEMEN: As its meeting on September 28, 1967, the Board of Supervisors adopted an order supporting the attached statement of Supervisor Warren M. Dorn regarding air pollution legislation.

At the same time, the Board directed me to send you a copy of an editorial, "A Setback for Strong Smog Controls," which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on September 28, 1967.

Very truly yours,

JAMES S. MIZE.

MOTION BY SUPERVISOR WARREN M. DORN, SEPTEMBER 28, 1967

I move that the board support the following statement and that all members of the California delegation in Congress be so notified:

The auto industry once again has frustrated the people of Los Angeles County in their struggle to eliminate the smog caused by motor vehicles. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce yesterday deleted from S. 780, the Air Quality Act of 1967, a provision which would have permitted California on its own initiative to establish more stringent motor vehicle control requirements than those set for the rest of the country.

The provision was put into the Senate version of the bill by California's Senator George Murphy, and approved by the Senate 88–0. It was removed in the House Committee by amendment of Michigan Representative John Dingell, whose district includes the City of Detroit.

This means that Los Angeles County, which has the worst photochemical smog problem in the country due to the emissions from motor vehicles, can have no stricter requirements for control than some rural area on a wind-swept prairie, unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare approves. This puts the arena in which decisions will be made 3,000 miles away from the people who have the need, and much closer to the political influence of the auto industry.

Representative Lionel Van Deerlin of San Diego is to be commended for his effort to defeat the Dingell amendment. Members of the California Congressional delegation should rally to support him in correcting this when S. 780 comes before the House.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 28, 1967]

A SETBACK FOR STRONG SMOG CONTROLS

The people of California have lost the latest round of the congressional fight over tougher air pollution legislation.

At the urging of its member from Detroit, the House Commerce Committee refused to give California the right to make its auto emission standards any more stringent than the federal limitations, even if they are inadequate for this state.

Committee members knew, of course, that the federal emission standards, which go into effect on all 1967 cars, are the same that California has required since 1966—and has found unsatisfactory. Our present limitation of 275 parts per million (ppm) of hydrocarbons is scheduled to be reduced to 180 ppm by the State Department of Public Health in 1970.

The Senate recognized the plight of California and its pioneering efforts to force the auto makers to develop effective smog control devices. As unanimously passed, the Senate version of the new clean air bill would exclude California completely from the federal pre-emption.

All urban states will be the losers if the House does not restore the Senate exclusion, for the primary reason all new cars have control devices is that California made them mandatory two years ago.

"The results thus far could not have been achieved had the State of California not issued an ultimatum to manufacturers of motor vehicles: 'Either control your product or you don't sell it in California,'" said Eric Grant, executive officer of the State Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board.

Even with the threat of losing their No. 1 state market, the auto industry came up with control systems that were "marginal in their performance," according to Grant, who believes it essential that California reduce its emission standards below the new minimums scheduled for 1970.

The chances of improvement, therefore, were definitely weakened by the House committee action. Although HEW Secretary John Gardner has been a leader in the fight for clean air, a future secretary may not be so interested in stronger controls of the pollutants produced by motor vehicles.

Ironically, the author of the amendment backed by the auto industry, Rep. John D. Dingell (D-Detroit) has won a number of awards for his contributions to conservation, including the promotion and preservation of clean air.

The California delegation in the House should waste no time in mounting a campaign to assure that this state is not crippled in the enacting of even stronger laws against air pollution.

THE AMERICAN SOKOL

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, 1967, the American Sokol Organization of Little Ferry, N.J., held its 70th anniversary of existence.

This auspicious occasion was celebrated with a banquet at the organization hall, Main and Garden Streets. Mr. Charles Kuss was the master of ceremonies; and assisting him as cochairmen were: Charles Kubicek and Charles Iverson. The anniversary committee consisted of Charles Kuss, William Zabransky, Jr., Eugene Zabransky, Emil Tuma, Henry Vesely, George Monett, Jack DeStories, Larry Halak, Arthur Hirtler, Henry Mayer, George Janakis, Leo Kubicek, Miss Blanche Kubat, Mrs. Joan Zabransky, Mrs. Marge Hall, Mrs. Anna Funk, Mrs. Mary Killian, and Mrs. Malcolm Hill.

The featured speakers were Eugene Zabransky, president of the men's division; Mrs. Blanche Kubat, president of the women's division; Mayor Fred Heinige of Little Ferry; and myself.

The word "Sokol" translated means "falcon" and the organizational motto is "Freedom, Friendship, Faith, and Longevity." The Sokols teach moderation in all things, a healthy body and a healthy spirit.

Many of the members are active gymnasts who have participated in gymnastic competition throughout the world, having won high honors.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to include the text of the speech which I made at the banquet of this wonderful organization, which is a very active group in my congressional district.

The speech follows:

THE AMERICAN SOKOL

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. I wish to express to you my deepest appreciation for inviting me to be with you today because I know that I am among people who are dedicated to a love of country and liberty—to physical exercise and mental and moral development.

As active participants in the American Sokol movement, you need not be reminded of the history of your patriotic and progressive organization. However, I would like to dwell upon it for a moment or two.

Founded on February 16, 1862, just over 105 years ago, in Prague, Czechoslovakia, the first Sokol, Educational and Physical Culture Organization had a profound effect on history. It was brought to life by a group of public-spirited men to whom liberty and democracy were a cherished ideal. These men, well versed in the history and philosophy of the past, wanted freedom and liberty for their people.

They realized that only a nation which is willing to prepare for and retain independence must maintain it by constant vigilance. They stressed, realized, and fought for the development of the entire individual—physical, mental, moral, and spiritual. The founders of this organization created a terminology for calisthenics, apparatus exercises, and games that is so precise that units thousands of miles apart can practice the assigned drills, then meet at the great Sokol exhibitions and after only one general rehearsal, perform as if they had trained together for months.

Dr. Miroslav Tyrs, one of the co-founders of the Sokol movement, believed that the entire nation—men, women, and children—

should consistently exercise from the early childhood past their maturity. All of this for neither profit or glory, all of this as a dedication to their nation, and enlightened member of a family of nations, conscious of their rights, and their duties and obligations.

The Sokols are respected in every land that is free. They are hated and feared by every form of dictatorship. They were the first organization to be dissolved by the Nazis and Communists wherever these two usurped power. The Sokol leaders were the first to be imprisoned and liquidated. The Second World War saw 90 percent of the Sokol leaders liquidated in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. The great mass of the powerful Sokol organizations are far from being exterminated or completely managed. The great spirit of freedom, liberty, and human justice instilled in them by courageous men and women for over a century is still very much alive and is transferred to each group of new children. We know that those who have once known freedom and liberty as we know it will never forget it.

These Sokol trained people have faith in the inexorable destiny of mankind. The Sokols in America have produced their own great leaders and thinkers. Men and women in all walks of life have felt that their greatest contribution to this great land would be to devotedly serve in the Sokol ranks, to constantly train the young in that physical, mental, moral, and spiritual strength that is the bulwark of a nation.

I wish to extend to you my most sincere congratulations upon your observance of the 70th anniversary of the American Sokol Organization of Little Ferry. Your organization has done outstanding constructive work during the past seventy years of your existence. You have played a most effective role in coping with the problems of our youth. Through your program of gymnastics, calisthenics, and games, you have contributed much to combat juvenile delinquency. You have built character and good life into countless members of youth during these past seventy years. There is no finer work than any group of men or women, or organization can be dedicated to than this.

A new generation is not born with traits of responsibility, a sense of patriotism, selflessness and dedication to principle. This is only gained by learning from others, and you have given this to our youth.

Your fine organization, knowing that youth is the future, has devoted these seventy years to providing guidance which leads toward the development of the strong and responsible citizen.

I am proud of the fact that one of the oldest units of the American Sokol Organization is located in my Congressional District here, in Little Ferry, you have a fine auditorium and spirit of the old American Sokol should continue to live in our community. You know the goals of the Sokol movement. It is up to you as an organization to fulfill these goals, and if I am able to add something to achieve these goals, I am always at your beck and call.

Do we, in Little Ferry, want to move backward by standing still—in the pride of future accomplishment?

I believe that we do not and I am confident that you agree.

In the seventy years since the Sokols were organized here in Little Ferry they have contributed to the building of good character in our youth more than any other organization of like magnitude.

Let us carry on to preserve this nation and carry on these lofty ideals.

In conclusion, I wish to remind you that you have a national heritage which you must pass on to your young men and women. And, as Americans, we also have a responsibility to our adopted country. You must not fail in your endeavors to promote the ideals for which the Sokol Organization was founded.

Let me congratulate you, again, upon your past successes and wish you well in all your future endeavors.

IRRESPONSIBLE HOUSE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard a great deal about economy in government these past few weeks. Much of what has occurred on the floor of the House has been for public consumption. Therefore, I think it entirely fitting to place before you two editorials from highly respected newspapers in my home city of Trenton commenting upon the so-called economy drive.

It is perfectly clear that the public is not being fooled by what has transpired here. I would suggest that it is time that we address ourselves to our duties and act without further delay on the pending appropriations bills. As we do so, I earnestly commend to the attention of my colleagues the editorial "Ashamed of This House" which appeared in the October 20 edition of the Trentonian; and that entitled "Irresponsible House" which appeared in the Sunday Times Advertiser of October 22. The editorials read as follows:

[From the Trentonian, Oct. 20, 1967]

CONGRESS DISGRACES ITSELF—ASHAMED OF THIS HOUSE

As debate on proposals to order the President to cut back federal spending reached a fine flower of idiocy in the House of Representatives on Thursday night, Rep. Barratt O'Hara (D., Ill.) sadly observed: "For the first time in all the years I've been here, I'm ashamed of this House."

Considering the number of years that Mr. Barratt (who is 85 and the only Spanish War veteran in the Congress) has served, and what has happened on various occasions during that period, that is a rather forceful statement of disgust.

Nor was the gentleman from Illinois in error. The whole episode, which resulted in a directive that the President reduce spending by from $5 to $7 billion (nobody is quite sure which, in view of the confused compilation of amendments which the House finally passed; but what's a couple of billion dollars these days?) was a howling disgrace.

The same House which is now ordering the President to cut back spending is the one which last week voted federal pay increases. How are the affected federal agencies to absorb the increases while at the same time holding down their spending? By layoffs, perhaps, as Rep. Morris Udall (D., Ariz.) noted when he observed: "We're saying to the boys (employes): 'We gave you a raise last week and now we're going to fire you.'" An odd situation.

Well, not quite "we"—since the whole rationale of the House action was to put the onus of economy measures upon the President while allowing the congressmen to pose merely as champions of "economy" in general.

New Jersey's Rep. Charles Joelson underlined this by saying that the House could make specific proposals if every member would offer some suggestions for cutting spending on federal projects in his own district. "I'm not kidding," he added. "I'm very serious." It's nice to know that there are some people in the House who take their job seriously.

This whole disgraceful exhibition of legislative irresponsibility is the handiwork of the so-called Republican-Dixiecrat coalition, whose prime motive is to give President Johnson a hard time. This objective they seem to be by way of achieving.

That they are at the same time making themselves, the Congress and the entire government of the United States ridiculous in the eyes of the people and of the entire world seems not to occur to them—or, if it does, not to bother them. It is to be hoped that their disgraceful opportunism and reckless irresponsibility will catch up with them at the next general election. Hoped, but not expected; for the public shows an amazing tolerance for such "economy" humbug.

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Sunday Times-Advertiser, Oct. 22, 1967]

IRRESPONSIBLE HOUSE

The House, with the Dixie-Republican coalition firmly in control, has ordered President Johnson to slash from $5 to $10 billion—nobody is precisely sure how much—from this year's federal spending program.

If the order is sustained by the Senate, the cuts will have to come in a handful of domestic programs where the federal response was already both little and late.

The poverty program would be hard hit. So would school aid. Rent supplements. Model cities. The teacher corps. Transportation. Public health.

Precisely the areas where the need for action is so compelling in this urbanized, poverty-plagued, air-and-water polluted, traffic-jammed decade.

The House fastened its meat-ax measure to a routine financing bill that must be passed in order to keep many government agencies in business at their present spending levels until their appropriations bills can be cleared.

And therein lies the problem. The Senate can, and must, undo the damage done by the House. But the House is in a position to hold out in conference for large-scale cuts—and this could lead to a stalemate in which the routine bill would be sidetracked and the agencies depending on it would run out of money to meet their payrolls.

This would be an invitation to chaos; but it is not at all certain at this point that the House conservative coalition, in its zeal to embarrass President Johnson and its obsession with "economy," would not be capable of this mischief too.

Nevertheless, it is urgent that the Senate move decisively to reverse the House action. The domestic needs of this country won't wait until next decade to be met. They need the government's full attention and commitment now.

UTILITIES OUT TO KILL NEW ENGLAND DAM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Lardner, a staff writer for the

Washington Post, in today's edition of that newspaper takes an impartial and objective view of the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project.

I believe this article, because of its insight and objectivity, should be read by all who may be called upon shortly to vote on continuing appropriations for this project. I therefore enter it in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 23, 1967]

UTILITIES OUT TO KILL NEW ENGLAND DAM

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

Shortly after the Great Blackout of 1965, New England's private power companies began brushing up their image with singing commercials and full-page ads featuring "Reddy Kilowatt."

The theme, sung to a catchy tune on TV screens: "Plenty of Low-Cost Power Coming Your Way."

The electric companies of New England, the public was told, were launching a big, billion-dollar building program to put up 11 new generating plants, five of them nuclear.

There was, public power advocates maintain, another motive to the advertising campaign: Dickey-Lincoln.

AUTHORIZED IN 1965

The first Federal hydroelectric project ever authorized for New England, Dickey-Lincoln would consist of two dams generating 794,000 kilowatts of public power from northern Maine's St. John River. It would cost $312 million, including a transmission system and interest charges during construction.

Authorized in 1965 after a bitter fight, Dickey-Lincoln would be the first Government "yardstick" for power costs in a region where consumers pay the highest electric bills in the continental United States.

A potent lobby is working hard to kill it. It may very well succeed.

"Nobody should underestimate the political strength of the private utilities in the New England area," Vermont Gov. Philip H. Hoff, who has been burned by power plays in his own state, said in a speech last month.

"They have an amount of political persuasion and control that far exceeds their actual contribution to New England society."

OTHERS IN OPPOSITION

Aligned with the private utilities—the 19 biggest banded together in the Electric Coordinating Council of New England—are conservationists offended by the 88,000-acre lake Dickey-Lincoln would create, and coal interests offended by the thought of anything that might reduce the consumption of coal.

The controversy has made a modest $1.6 million appropriation to complete planning for Dickey-Lincoln perhaps the biggest issue in the $4.7 billion appropriations bill now in a Senate-House conference.

The Senate voted the money. The House, on a 233-to-169 roll call, did not. Carrying the ball for the private utilities in the House debate was Rep. Robert N. Giaimo (D-Conn.).

The essence of the utilities' attack is short and simple. The "Big 11 Powerloop" of their aids, they say, can do the job better than Dickey-Lincoln. Contends Ulbert A. Cree, chairman of the Coordinating Council and head of the Central Vermont Public Service Corp.; "The whole damn thing is a waste of the taxpayers' money."

UTILITIES RESPOND

A wide array of Government reports, statistics, statements and memos says otherwise. They conclude that Dickey-Lincoln is a sound investment and could provide not only substantial reductions in power costs for round-the-clock customers in Maine, but also cheaper peaking power for utilities outside the state such as small co-ops and municipal systems.

Undismayed, the utilities have responded with mass mailings to members of Congress, turning the Government reports upside down with statistics "adjusted" to prove that private power is cheapest and best.

"They've been deceiving the public and they've been trying to deceive members of Congress," charged Rep. William D. Hathaway (D-Maine). "They've really piled on the distortions."

An exhaustive staff study ordered last year by members of a confused House Appropriations subcommittee is a case in point. The staff reported to the subcommittee last March that "the privately financed alternates (to Dickey-Lincoln) cannot compete costwise with the Federal Government in providing identical facilities for power supply, whether it be conventional steam, nuclear steam or a pumped-storage hydrodevelopment."

Two months later, Rep. Giaimo sent fellow members of the full Appropriations Committee an "analysis" showing, he said, that private industry can do "a more economical and efficient" job than Dickey-Lincoln.

The analysis began with the heading: "House Appropriations Committee Staff Report Reveals Dickey-Lincoln Project Economically Inefficient, Economically Unfeasible."

PREPARED BY FIRM

It was prepared by Northeast Utilities, a holding company that includes Connecticut Power & Light, Hartford Electric Light and Western Massachusetts Electric. Northeast has also had two men assigned to shuttle between Connecticut and Washington as lobbyists on Dickey-Lincoln.

Asked about the "analysis," Giaimo at first said, "I'm not working with Northeast Utilities on this," but he subsequently acknowledged that he had asked Northeast to work up the report for him.

The House Appropriations Committee recommended Dickey-Lincoln funds anyway, stating in a July 20 report to the House:

SAME TACK IN SENATE

"The executive investigation conducted by the Committee staff has confirmed that the project is economically feasible, with a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1, and would provide efficient hydroelectric power at reasonable rates for peaking purposes as well as firm power to the preference customers in Maine."

Five days later, the House voted to kill Dickey-Lincoln on Giaimo's motion. "A careful study of the Committee's (staff) report," he assured his colleagues on the floor, would show that the project "is not justified."

The utilities have taken the same tack in the Senate and with the Senate-House conferees.

In a Coordinating Council mailing to all Senators Sept. 30, Cree contended that a Federal Power Commission study—when "adjusted" for a $70 million "discrepancy"—showed the rightness of the private power companies' cause.

In an Oct. 11 letter to the Senate-House conferees, Giaimo charged that the Corps of Engineers had made Dickey-Lincoln look good by assuming its cost would be repaid over 100 years instead of the "required" 50 years.

The next day, Cree followed up by sending the conferees a study headlined: "Federal Power Commission Review Confirms Dickey-Lincoln Project Economically Inefficient, Single-Purpose Power Plant." It, too, complained of a "pay-out period of 100 years" and suggested with a touch of indignation that this "should not be done."

FINDINGS DENIED

The "payout period" the Corps of Engineers calculated for Dickey-Lincoln is 50 years, although the dams are expected to last much longer than that.

As for the Federal Power Commission, Chairman Lee C. White wrote Sen. Margaret Chase Smith (R-Maine), a Dickey-Lincoln supporter on the Conference committee, that "the Commission has not made any of the . . . findings" attributed to it by the private power companies' little headlines.

Cree denies that the utility companies have been playing with figures unfairly.

Meanwhile, conservation groups have been jumping into the campaign to kill the Federal power project. This month, the Wilderness Society, whose governing board happened to hold its annual meeting in Maine, and reportedly the Sierra Club decided to oppose Dickey-Lincoln.

The conservationists generally disavow any solicitations by private power interests. But the Wilderness Society has been picking up some "economic" background from the private power lobby's National Association of Electric Companies.

Dickey-Lincoln's location would protect Maine's Allagash as a wild river, but the conservationists say they want to keep the Upper St. John as a wild river, too.

ONE STRUGGLE ASPECT

The Dickey-Lincoln fight is just one aspect of the New England power struggle. While the big private power companies say they will refuse to buy Dickey-Lincoln power, the small co-ops and municipal systems—tired of the high wholesale costs they pay the big companies—have already agreed to take most of Dickey-Lincoln's output.

At the same time, the Massachusetts municipals are trying to get a piece of some of the nuclear power that the bigger, private companies will control. They have also raised antitrust objections involving Northeast Utilities and the Coordinating Council in proceedings before the FPC.

Ostensibly a planning group, the Council excludes publicly owned utilities from joining it to plot out New England's future power needs.

In light of frustrations such as these, the municipals charged in a brief filed with the FPC this month, the opposition to Dickey-Lincoln "cannot be dismissed as mere lobbying."

INDIANA'S NINTH DISTRICT HOSPITAL OFFICIALS CITE PROBLEMS AND PROGRESS OF MEDICARE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, through a series of local meetings, I have been making a continuing assessment of the needs of the residents of the Ninth Congressional District of Indiana and the effectiveness of Federal programs in helping to meet those needs.

One of these sessions was with hospital administrators to discuss health care in the Ninth District, and more particularly, to gage the effectiveness of medicare in meeting the health needs of the elderly.

A short time prior to the meeting, a staff assistant from my office toured the 17-county Ninth District, discussing with hospital administrators the problems and progress of medicare. His report showed that medicare is working well and that there has been a significant improvement in health care for the elderly. However, the report showed, too, that there are some substantial problems in the implementation of the medicare program.

My followup meeting with hospital administrators was an informal and candid session in which they expressed concern about these problem areas and suggested changes in the implementation of the program.

First, may I say that I appreciate very much the work these hospital officials are doing in meeting the influx of elderly patients created by medicare. Although they have been faced with exploding costs in meeting new demands, they have been making every effort to keep health care costs down.

An initial verdict on medicare is clear. The program has improved the quality of health care for the elderly in the Ninth District. It has, however, taxed the district's 12 hospitals to accommodate the increased numbers of elderly patients.

The 17-county Ninth District is rural in makeup. There are no great metropolitan centers to attract and support extensive health centers. Nor are there the tax resources to establish and maintain such centers.

Yet hospitals in the Ninth District have been moving ahead in recent years—even before the advent of medicare—to improve their services. Federal assistance for hospital and nursing home construction, expansion and modernization has increased 10 times in the last 2 years.

A recent report by the Public Health Service shows that more than $2 million in hospital expansion and modernization work has been authorized for six facilities in the Ninth District to date this year.

Federal assistance has been obligated for the following hospitals in the district in the last 2 years:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE OBLIGATIONS FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES, 9TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, INDIANA

Year and county	City	Name of facility	Federal share	Category	Beds provided
1966:					
Bartholomew	Columbus	Bartholomew Community Hospital	$52, 125	Diagnostic or treatment center	0
Jackson	Seymour	Lutheran Community Home	182, 000	Long-term care facility	54
Total 1966 (2 facilities)			234, 125		54
1967:					
Bartholomew	Columbus	Bartholomew Community Hospital	171, 621	Diagnostic or treatment center	0
Clark	Jeffersonville	Clark County Memorial Hospital	1, 012, 500	General hospital and public health center	44
Jackson	Seymour	Jackson County Schneck Memorial Hospital	526, 393	General hospital	108
Do	do	do	130, 767	Long-term care facility	32
Lawrence	Bedford	Dunn Memorial Hospital	293, 000	General hospital	92
Orange	Paoli	Orange County Hospital	180, 431	Long-term care facility	30
Total 1967 (6 facilities)			2, 314, 712		306

The most substantial form of Federal assistance to Ninth District hospitals has been the money allocated through the Hill-Burton program. In Indiana, hospital and nursing home improvements are financed with one-third Hill-Burton funds and two-thirds local funds.

Since the Hill-Burton program was initiated by the Public Health Service in 1946, more than $9.2 million in Hill-Burton funds have been expended or have been allocated and now await payment for construction work on 12 hospitals and one nursing home in the Ninth District.

Following is a breakdown of those Hill-Burton funds allocations in the district:

Hospitals	Federal grants	Funds allocated but not paid
Dunn Memorial Hospital, Bedford, Ind	$183, 629. 06	$293, 000. 00
Bartholomew County Hospital, Columbus, Ind	837, 925. 26	171, 621. 00
	269, 447. 76	
Fayette Memorial Hospital, Connersville, Ind. (and a $380,000 Indiana public works grant)	105, 730. 95	
	500, 000. 00	
Decatur County Memorial Hospital, Greensburg, Ind	410, 000. 00	
Clark County Memorial Hospital, Jeffersonville, Ind	11, 243. 94	1, 012, 500. 00
	436, 000. 00	
Southeastern Indiana Rehabilitation Center	39, 901. 63	
Dearborn County Hospital, Lawrenceburg, Ind	$415, 420. 00	
	223, 288. 27	
King Daughters' Hospital, Madison, Ind	325, 648. 66	
	202, 333. 00	
Orange County Hospital, Paoli, Ind	315, 002. 11	$180, 430. 84
Washington County Memorial Hospital, Salem, Ind	179, 176. 56	
	55, 381. 67	
Scott County Memorial Hospital, Scottsburg, Ind	214, 233. 56	
Jackson County Schneck Memorial Hospital, Seymour, Ind	85, 000. 00	657, 160. 00
Lutheran Nursing Home		199, 700. 00
William S. Major Hospital, Shelbyville, Ind	450, 000. 00	

Priority for Hill-Burton funds is given to rural areas. The act directs State agencies to give priority to "hospitals serving rural communities and areas with relatively small financial resources."

In Indiana, fiscal 1968 State allocations under the Hill-Burton Act are as follows:

	Total	Modernization	Hospitals and public health centers	Long-term care facilities	Diagnostic and treatment centers	Rehabilitation facilities
State	$6, 621, 681	$1, 382, 235	$2, 980, 368	$1, 592, 282	$444, 531	$222, 265
United States	280, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	130, 000, 000	70, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	10, 000, 000

With this kind of assistance, however, the State still reports 3,670 new hospital beds needed and 8,140 beds which need modernization. Across the country, 66,365 new beds are needed and 271,770 beds need modernization.

Hospitals in the Ninth District have had to make substantial adjustments to meet the heavy demands for health and medical services for the elderly. It is a tribute to their adaptability that the necessary adjustments have been made and are continuing to be made and the demands are being met.

The Social Security Administration reports that as of October 17, this year, the Blue Cross Hospital Service of Indiana—the prinicpal medicare fiscal intermediary in Indiana—has paid $3,813,019.94 in medicare benefits to hospitals in the Ninth District.

However, the review of medicare with hospital administrators indicates that there is much more to be done.

Medicare has accentuated a serious shortage of nursing homes in the Ninth District. Few communities have adequate facilities for long-term nursing home care.

As a result, as much as 45 percent of the bed space in some Ninth District hospitals is being taken up by medicare patients. Hospital administrators are concerned about this high rate of bed utilization by the elderly, but add that these patients do need this kind of medical care.

They point out that many of these patients could be cared for at far less expense, but with no compromise in the quality of their care, in adequate nursing homes and through effective home care programs.

Under the present provisions of medicare, those who need nursing home care must first be admitted to a hospital for 3 days to qualify for this kind of care. In the Ninth District, they are being admitted to hospitals on this basis, but they are not being discharged because there are no nursing homes to accept them.

COMPLAINTS

Hospital administrators voiced concern about several aspects of the medicare program. Their complaints centered on the following areas: First, the reimbursement formula: Hospital administrators were unanimous in saying that the 2-percent allowance for provider costs is inadequate for hospital construction, modernization and expansion costs.

Medicare's allocation of only 2 percent

above hospital costs is not enough to contribute materially to hospital modernization and expansion, which is needed without exception in the Ninth District, administrators contend.

One administrator said his kind of return on the investment—more than $2 million—in his health care facility was "ridiculous." He suggested that the cost plus 2-percent formula be eliminated and hospitals be allowed to charge a flat fee with an added cost factor large enough to help finance future construction and modernization.

The administrator also complained that medicare regulations prohibited him from listing donated services of volunteer help as part of the hospital's cost of operations. Although the services are not directly related to patient care in some instances, they would have to be paid for by the hospital if they were not donated, he said.

Current payments to hospitals also came under fire from the administrators. One said his hospital had received a recomputed quarterly payment of $24,000, was asked to return $4,000, and then received word that the hospital would receive $6,000 more. He said he felt the quarterly reviews and payments were too frequent and prevented hospitals from committing the money for fear medicare officials will request that part or all of it be returned within that quarter.

Second, the depreciation schedule: Several administrators said hospital depreciation regulations called for by medicare regulations are too strict.

They said they do not have the invoices and bills substantiating costs going back 10 years, required by the auditors to support their depreciation schedules. Some could not verify authorizations for purchase and construction, thus requiring appraisals and additional costs.

Third, administrative redtape: One of the most nagging problems in the original medicare program has been the cumbersome certfication and billing procedures.

Prior to medicare, a physician had to certify that there was medical necessity for a patient's entering the hospital. The process was repeated during the third week of hospitalization and again at the end of the seventh week, if necessary.

The purpose of this paperwork was laudable. Overcrowded hospitals should be used only by those in genuine medical need. Medicare, however, requires hospitals to also establish a utilization committee to achieve this same goal. With this additional certification procedure, however, physicians and administrators are understandably irritated.

Another major problem for hospital managers has been the discrepancy between medicare and standard billing procedures. Normally, the patient receives one itemized bill for services. But under medicare, not only is billing indirect, it requires separate arrangements for diagnostic and all other hospital services.

Problems have cropped up, too, in billing procedures for radiological and pathological services. Some specialists in these medical areas insist upon billing patients directly, rather than working under contract to the hospital.

Administrators say the confusion over billings procedures has been a major complaint.

The requirement for repeated outpatient certifications also was a major complaint of administrators.

The processing and payment of outpatient claims is delayed many times by an apparent inability of the Social Security Administration to process the claims quickly, they said. Another source of delay in the administration of these claims is the patients' inability to provide adequate proof that they paid out $50 in doctor's bills that year, as required under medicare, part B.

Fourth, lack of construction funds for both hospitals and nursing homes: Administrators are concerned about the lack of an effective, realistic funding program to assist in hospital and nursing home construction, particularly in those counties with low tax bases where matching funds are difficult—if not impossible—to realize.

Through the Hill-Burton program in Indiana, the State administers Federal funds on the basis of one-third the total cost. Local tax revenues must account for the remainder of the cost.

Although Hill-Burton funds have accounted for more than $9 million worth of construction in the 17-county Ninth District, there have been complaints that the program acts as a sort of "broken crutch" for health needs.

One administrator said Hill-Burton funds are allocated on a "bed space" standard and not on the basis of total health needs in each community.

In Indiana, he said, it takes 3 years to get Hill-Burton funds, a delay which all but cancels the worth of the Federal assistance. He said construction costs have been increasing at the rate of about 10 percent annually, resulting in a 30-percent loss over 3 years' time and negating the worth of Hill-Burton grants in Indiana.

Fifth, nurse shortage: There is growing concern among hospital administrators about the critical shortage of nurses.

Some administrators say that a 3-year nurses' training program is needed, despite the demands of nursing groups for the continuation of a 4-year program with a degree.

Sixth, bad debt losses: Several administrators point out that medicare has not cut the bad debt losses at their hospitals, despite the assertions that medicare would all but eliminate these losses.

Seventh, a lack of understanding: I would add here a complaint on the part of many medicare recipients. My mail and my conversations with these constituents indicate many have difficulty in understanding what is covered and what they must pay.

They also have difficulty in keeping the papers needed to establish the $50 deductible requirement.

PROPOSED CHANGES FOR MEDICARE

Congress is aware of the problem areas of medicare, and is trying to make improvements.

This concern is reflected by the amendments in the medicare provisions of the Social Security Act which was passed by the House last August. The bill H.R. 12080 contains provisions to improve and simplify the administration of medicare. These provisions include:

1. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

(A) METHOD OF PAYMENT FOR PHYSICIANS' SERVICES

The bill would make available a new procedure for requesting payment for services for which payment under the medical insurance program is made on the basis of reasonable charges which would serve as an alternative to the assignment and receipted bill payment procedures provided for under present law. The new procedure would permit physicians—and others who furnish services for which payment under the medical insurance program is made on the basis of reasonable charges—to receive medical insurance payments on the basis of an itemized bill without having to agree, as under the assignment method, to accept the program's allowable charges as payment in full if the bill is submitted in an acceptable manner and if the total charges do not, in fact, exceed the program's allowable charges. Where these conditions are not met or where the physician requests that the benefits be paid to the patient, payment would be made to the beneficiary on the basis of an acceptable itemized bill.

(B) ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN PHYSICIAN CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The bill would restrict the hospital insurance program requirement that there be a physician's certification of medical necessity with respect to each admission to a hospital so that the requirement would apply only to admissions to psychiatric and tuberculosis institutions. The requirement for a physician's certification for outpatient hospital services would also be eliminated. The requirement in present law that there be a physician certification with respect to stays of extended duration in all participating hospitals would be retained.

(C) ADDITIONAL DAYS OF HOSPITAL CARE

The bill provides for an additional 30 days of coverage of inpatient hospital services in a spell of illness—up to 120 days in total—with a coinsurance amount equal to one-half the inpatient hospital deductible—$20 initially—applicable to each of such 30 days.

(D) SIMPLIFICATION OF REIMBURSEMENT TO HOSPITALS FOR CERTAIN SERVICES

The bill would—

First, provide that the full reasonable charges—no deductible or coinsurance—will be paid under the medical insurance program for covered radiological and pathological services furnished by physicians to hospital inpatients;

Second, consolidate all coverage of outpatient hospital services under the medical insurance program by transferring coverage of outpatient hospital diagnostic services from the hospital insurance program to that program; and

Third, allow hospitals to bill medicare patients directly for small outpatient charges—subject to final settlement in accordance with present cost-reimbursement provisions. These changes would simplify beneficiary understanding and facilitate hospital and intermediary handling of medicare claims by bringing the requirements of the medicare program more closely into line with the usual billing practices of hospitals and the payment methods of private insurance organizations.

(E) INCLUSION OF PODIATRISTS' SERVICES

The bill would cover the nonroutine services of doctors of podiatry or surgical chiropody under the medical insurance program. In addition, the bill would exclude routine foot care from coverage whether performed by a podiatrist or a medical doctor.

Perhaps just as important as the proposed amendments are the comments of the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, in reporting H.R. 12080 for a vote of the House.

He said the committee has asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to check the effect of the medicare program on hospital finances as the hospital accounting years close. He said:

> During the next year, we will receive reports on the experience and if problems appear, we will recommend appropriate steps to correct them.

2. CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS AND NURSING HOMES

Financially hard-pressed communities in the Ninth Congressional District need more realistic funding programs for construction of hospitals and nursing homes.

This shortage of facilities has been accentuated by the initial inflex of medicare patients. The proposed extension of hospital time for medicare patients could aggravate these conditions of overcrowding.

The great lack of nursing homes has created an excessively high rate of space utilization by the elderly. Hospitals often are forced to overcrowd wards or move patients into halls, all of which reduces the hospital's capacity for diagnosis and treatment of inpatients.

It is apparent there is a need at all levels of government—local, State and Federal—to make a careful assessment of the health care problems which have been pointed up by the first months of medicare.

Such an assessment should lead to a program or series of programs to meet hospital needs, nursing home shortages, and the establishment of total health care centers.

Counties with low tax bases and high concentrations of medicare recipients must be given special consideration in any such improvement program.

3. REIMBURSEMENT FORMULA

Administrators have a legitimate complaint that medicare is creating hardships. However, it must be remembered that medicare was not created to be a subsidy to support hospital expansion programs, many of which are unrelated to the care of elderly patients.

Congress may have been too conservative in setting formulas to prevent this. We did not intend that medicare patients subsidize other patients, nor did we intend that other patients subsidize medicare patients.

The reimbursement controversy is one of a larger debate about the adequacy of hospitals in general. The problem is to mesh medicare payments, hospital construction funding programs, charities, and private investments into a program to guarantee the development and expansion of high-quality medical services.

Out of a study, encompassing all of these alternatives, I am hopeful we will find practical ways to increase incentives for hospitals to operate efficiently. A consideration of the reimbursement formula alone will not solve the problems facing us.

These, then, are some of the questions that must be answered in any review of medicare.

At this point, it would appear that medicare has not been in operation long enough for anyone to draw any hard and fast conclusions about its total impact upon hospital finance.

Only now are hospitals beginning to have an audit on the first year's experience with the program. In Indiana, the Ernst & Ernst accounting firm is supervising this process in all of the hospitals, specifically looking at the problem of reimbursement.

Once this lengthy procedure is completed in Indiana and elsewhere, the Ways and Means Committee is on record that if substantial complaints are valid, the medicare formula will be liberalized.

This evaluation should take into account the controversy over depreciation and billing procedures, which represent very real problems to Ninth District hospital administrators.

CONCLUSIONS

Across the country, medicare has enrolled 19.1 million elderly Americans under part A of the insurance plan, and in that number 17.3 million are enrolled in part B of the plan.

It has shown Congress that two requirements are still to be met if the medicare program is going to function effectively and efficiently:

First, better communications: Many of the recipients of medicare are confused about the benefits or about the procedures in acquiring those benefits.

As there was a concerted effort to enroll these people in medicare, perhaps there should be a similiar campaign to advise them of the benefits available to them and the means by which to achieve those benefits.

There is a need for communication between the Federal Government, State government, local government and officials of hospitals to fully utilize the program.

And there is a need for communication between doctors and hospital staffs to plan and work together efficiently in carrying out the medicare program in a way to provide the greatest benefits to those in need of care.

Second, constant oversight: We in Congress must exercise our responsibility of oversight and continually assess the medicare program.

Medicare was a far-reaching piece of legislation. Putting it into practice has created many problems, to be sure. But they are not insurmountable problems.

We must see that medicare functions as it is intended to function. But we must be ever watchful to see that from it comes the greatest possible benefit to the doctors, the hospitals, and to the recipients of hospital insurance.

VFW SUPPORTS FREE MAILING FOR MILITARY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Members of this House are well aware, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States as an organization has always been a leader in protecting the interests of members of our Armed Forces. I would like at this time to call attention to another, and recent, example of alert and timely efforts by the VFW in behalf of our fighting men.

On October 6, 1967, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Joseph A. Scerra, of Gardner, Mass., wrote me in support of pending legislation to grant free mailing privileges to all U.S. servicemen overseas, at sea, or hospitalized in the United States or overseas. Provisions for the purpose are contained in section 116 of H.R. 7977, the postal rate and Federal employees' pay measure passed by the House on October 11.

Commander in Chief Scerra, in unmistakable language, placed the VFW and its 1,400,000 overseas combat veteran members squarely in support of our House-passed provisions. The VFW commander also issued a national press release, including the full text of his letter to me, and it is a privilege for me to insert the release in the RECORD:

NEWS RELEASE BY VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 6, 1967.—The National Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Joseph A. Scerra, of Gardner, Mass., today urged Congress to promptly pass legislation providing for free mailing by all U.S. military personnel outside the United States.

The V.F.W.'s support of free mail for hospitalized and overseas personnel was set forth in a letter from V.F.W. National Commander Scerra to The Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski, Chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars was one of the original supporters of free mail for military personnel in Vietnam and actively worked for the passage of that legislation. In his letter to Chairman Dulski, Commander Scerra pointed out that the V.F.W. has long believed that free mail privileges should be extended, also, to all U.S. military personnel on foreign station, at sea, or hospitalized.

The text of V.F.W. Commander-in-Chief Scerra's letter to Chairman Dulski follows:

"The Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. DULSKI: The purpose of this letter is to express the continued support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for legislation, now pending before the House of Representatives, to provide for free mailing by all U.S. military personnel hospitalized or overseas.

"By way of background, I would like to point out that the Veterans of Foreign Wars actively sponsored and supported the legislation which provided free mail for our military personnel in Vietnam. The V.F.W. appreciates the action of Congress in extending that long overdue and fully justified free mailing privileges to our troops in Vietnam.

"However, the V.F.W. stated at that time it was also our belief that free mailing should be authorized for all of our overseas military personnel.

"On the basis of my extended travel overseas, in the course of which I have visited our armed forces personnel in numerous overseas locations, as well as those serving with the fleet, it is my firm belief that authorizing such free mailing privileges for all our military personnel outside the United States would increase morale, contribute to military efficiency, and in the long run would prove to be an economical procedure.

"We also urge that such free mailing be provided for hospitalized military personnel.

"In view of the gallant services being so ably performed by our military personnel throughout the world, I respectfully urge, on behalf of the 1,400,000, overseas combat veterans comprising the membership of the V.F.W., the prompt passage of legislation to provide for free mailing privileges for all of our overseas and hospitalized military personnel.

"Sincerely,

"JOSEPH A. SCERRA,
"Commander in Chief"

WHILE THE FARMERS TILL THE SOIL THE FARM BUREAU TILLS DOLLARS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, Ted Pearson, a reporter for the Birmingham, Ala., News, has just completed a series of articles about the Alabama Farm Bureau. It is significant to note the overall title that he gave to this series, after thoroughly investigating the Farm Bureau, "Farm Bureau: Tilling Dollars."

Although the writer appears to be basically sympathetic to the Farm Bureau, he must be commended for an extremely fine, thorough job of research and investigation, in producing a no-holds-barred story of all the aspects of Farm Bureau activity in that State. His articles confirm many of the charges that have been made recently about the Farm Bureau's subversion of the farmers' interest, and serve as a scorching indictment of the farflung business activities of this commercial and financial empire. After reading about the Farm Bureau's shopping centers, hotels, automobile tire business, stock and bond business, and insurance companies and real estate speculations—and then looking at the tax-exempt status that the Farm Bureau enjoys because supposedly it is a farm organization—one might well stand back in amazement and ask himself, as I have done, "What in the world does all this have to do with solving the problems of the American farmer?"

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I respectfully include the second article of Mr. Pearson's series in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Oct. 9, 1967]

WEALTHY FARM BUREAU IS LARGE OWNER OF PROPERTY AND SECURITIES IN ALABAMA

(By Ted Pearson)

You can go to several Farm Bureau-owned shopping centers in Alabama and buy a loaf of bread or a mink coat.

Or you can stay in a Farm Bureau-owned hotel.

Or, if you have a Farm Bureau membership card (you don't have to be a farmer to join), you can go to one of 110 dealers and buy a set of premium tires with the Farm Bureau private label.

All this points up the extensive interest, both direct and indirect, that Alabama's Farm Bureau has in the field of merchandising—and its enviable status as an owner of real estate and wealthy landlord.

It is a role that Farm Bureau has assumed through its highly successful insurance companies and a merchandising arm established primarily to put needed products into the farmer's hands at a saving.

Property holdings of Farm Bureau's insurance companies are big. So is their portfolio of stocks and bonds.

Farm Bureau's title of ownership is on several shopping centers, including two of the largest in Birmingham and Alabama—Five Points West, purchased in 1966, and Eastwood Mall, acquired this year. Other shopping centers under Farm Bureau ownership are in Dothan, Brewton, Demopolis, Montgomery and Clanton.

Of these, the best income producer in 1966 was the huge, 52-store Five Points West shopping complex. It was, in fact, the biggest moneymaker among Farm Bureau properties.

For the Alabama Farm Bureau Mutual Casualty Insurance Co., Five Points West produced a 1966 gross of $473,155. Taxes, repairs and expenses took a $301,993 cut out of that, leaving a net of $171,162.

The listed purchase price for the shopping center was in excess of $6.5 million, but through an intricate arrangement of mortgages, loans and leases, the actual cash put up by the Farm Bureau company was far less than that—somewhat in excess of a half million. Thus, the net income for the first year was about 20 per cent of the actual cash outlay for the purchase.

Farm Bureau insurance companies as yet have no income figures in for the recently acquired Eastwood Mall, but the profits probably will exceed those of Five Points West.

The Farm Bureau companies own hotels, including the famous but antiquated Exchange Hotel on Court Square in Montgomery. They own office buildings, choice subdivisions and other high-priced residential property, and a substantial amount of open land for future development or speculative purposes. Their portfolios of stocks and bonds are filled with blue chips.

They are constantly looking around for more real estate to pour their surplus capital into, and for more securities to build up their portfolios.

The bulk of the investment property is held by the Alabama Farm Bureau Mutual Casualty Insurance Co. At the end of 1966, it held title to 54 separate pieces of investment property, 15 of which it purchased during 1966. The book value of this property was pegged at $12.4 million.

From its investments, this Farm Bureau company realized a gross income of $878,806 in 1966. But taxes, repairs and expenses amounting to $527,723 cut net income to $351,000.

In addition to Montgomery's Exchange Hotel, acquired in 1962 at a listed purchase price of $780,000, the Farm Bureau companies own the Guest House in Birmingham, purchased in 1965 and 1966 for $1.4 million.

Farm Bureau's managers are astute at turning a profit on buying and selling investment property for their insurance operations.

During 1966, one of the companies sold off $934,521 in real estate, a total of 12 transactions on which it realized a net profit of $86,546.

Among these transactions was this one: Four years ago, the company bought a tract of Montgomery property called "the Hill lands" for $510,587.68. Last year, a part of this property, 32 lots representing $96,624 of the original purchase price, was sold for $154,850—or a profit of $58,225.

There are several subdivisions and tracts of development land in the Farm Bureau companies' property investment folders, including choice areas in Montgomery, Jefferson County, Selma, Auburn and Tuscaloosa.

The portfolio of stocks and bonds owned by these companies has grown rich, too. At the end of 1966, the Farm Bureau companies owned more than $12 million worth of corporate stock, both preferred and common, and more than $9 million in bonds, mostly tax-exempt bonds issued by governmental bodies and other public agencies—more than $21 million altogether.

The list of corporate stocks owned by the Farm Bureau companies includes some of the top-notch blue chips in American industry—General Motors, Chrysler, American Airlines, Gulf Oil, Royal Dutch-Shell, Westinghouse, Kaiser Aluminum, and many others.

The Farm Bureau companies hold substantial stock interest in other insurance companies, in public utilities, in banks. Stock ownership is held in 13 banks and 32 insurance companies, including the No. 1 and No. 2 Alabama-based life companies, Liberty National and Protective Life.

Aside from the three companies under its exclusive domain, Alabama's Farm Bureau has a vital stake in the investment portfolio of the Southern Farm Bureau Life Insurance Co. of Jackson, Miss., of which Alabama Farm Bureau is co-founder and one-fifth owner.

That company, as of the end of 1966, had $39.2 million invested in bonds of various kinds, $7.9 million in high-grade preferred and common stocks, and $65.3 million in mortgage loans. It had comparatively little invested in real estate, however.

Collecting property, and buying up large blocks of stocks and bonds, has been a matter of necessity as well as choice, of course. When you own and operate insurance companies, as the Farm Bureau does, you are required by policyholder-protecting status and by ordinary laws of business survival to invest large sums in income-paying properties. Profits from investments go into reserves as growth capital, and to policyholders as dividends.

That's why—through its insurance company investments—Farm Bureau has become a little-recognized but rather large owner of property and securities in Alabama. As such, it has an indirect interest in the field of general merchandising as a rent-collecting landlord from tenants of its shopping centers.

It also has a direct interest in speciality merchandising, and the specialty is notably tires for automobiles, trucks and other vehicles. It handles its merchandising operations for tires and certain other items, including auto batteries, through a separate company called Alabama Farm Bureau Service Co.

They're sold through 110 independent dealers throughout the state—service station operators, garagemen, local storeowners—under percentage-of-sales contracts. Farm Bureau members, whether active or associate, simply go to their local dealer, show their membership cards, and purchase the items they want, at prices usually lower than those of competing products.

Thus, Farm Bureau merchandising is not limited to farmers, although three-fourths of the 100,000-plus members are either directly engaged in farming or have a direct interest in farms and therefore are active members. A non-farmer may become an associate member simply by applying, paying the $12 annual dues, and getting cleared by his local county Farm Bureau.

Tires carry Farm Bureau's private label—"Safemark." They're manufactured for Farm Bureau by General Tire Co. Tires and tubes accounted for $984,076 of the merchandising company's total sales of $1.1 million for the year ended last June 30. Sales of batteries, carrying a private Farm Bureau label of "Weathermaster," brought in $83,433.

Other items sold through Farm Bureau Service included fertilizer, baler twine, cottonseed meal, certain chemicals, light bulbs and coal.

The merchandising company's net profit on sales is extremely low, reflecting one of the major reasons Farm Bureau offers the products it sells at prices lower than competitors. Profit margin is not a factor. The company's net operating income was only $6,075 for the past year, in spite of more than $1 million in sales. Whatever profits are made, however small, go to build up the service company's book assets.

Farm Bureau's leaders periodically look over the merchandising field with an eye to adding new products and services.

"What we do in Farm Bureau service," says the president, J. D. Hays, "is geared wholly to the wants and needs of our farmer members. If we see an opportunity to provide a needed product or service at a lower cost, and without loss in our handling it, we will do it."

One new area Farm Bureau is happily moving into is selling feed grain to farmers. In June, it established an elevator and handling facility at Maplesville in Chilton County to sell feed corn to farmers at reduced costs. Prospects for rapid expansion of feed grain merchandising to farmers are good. Alabama farmers need far more feed grain than they produce, the majority aren't large enough to buy in cost-saving carload lots, and the Farm Bureau can.

As for tires, Farm Bureau managers say they're selling premium tires to members at a saving of at least $8 per tire under comparable products of other sellers. For a set of four, that's a saving of $32, quite an attraction to cost-conscious farmers.

Merchandising—or "economic and business services" as it is called by Farm Bureau—is another example of Farm Bureau's steady rise to the levels of big business.

The way things are going, Farm Bureau in Alabama is going to get bigger in that field.

MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS COST $110 MILLION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF GLEN CANYON DAM IN ARIZONA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Department of the Interior, on October 22, 1967, issued a news release in which the widely dispersed economic benefits derived from construction of the Glen Canyon Dam are described in detail.

These benefits, as indicated in the release, were felt in virtually every State in the Nation as materials, equipment, manufactured goods and transportation services were required to complete the project.

Construction of the Dickey Lincoln School hydroelectric project in northern Maine will provide similar economic benefits to all parts of the country. As was the case with Glen Canyon, the largest portion of the materials for Dickey will be purchased outside Maine and New England.

Glen Canyon was built at a cost to the Federal Government of $243 million. The Dickey project will cost $212.1 million, so its direct economic benefits will be commensurately less, but still a huge amount.

In order that colleagues throughout the Nation may fully appreciate the direct interest which industry and workers in their own States have in Dickey's construction, I include the Interior Department release in the RECORD:

MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS COST $110 MILLION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF GLEN CANYON DAM IN ARIZONA

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall reported today that manufactured products costing $110 million were purchased and shipped from virtually every State in the Nation for use in constructing Glen Canyon Dam and Powerplant on the Colorado River in Arizona, according to a recently completed economic study by the Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

Construction of Glen Canyon Dam started in 1957 and final completion of all work occurred in 1966.

An additional $10 million was required for freight by train, truck, and airplane from all off-site locations to the desert construction area.

More than $70 million of the total money for manufactured materials, equipment and freight, which were used for Glen Canyon Dam itself as well as the powerplant and housing needs of construction men, were spent in geographic regions beyond the borders of the Southwest region where the structure was built. Purchases came to $50 million in the dam's home region. (See attached chart).

Reclamation Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy said that bringing together such great quantities of supplies and so many skilled men in constructing multipurpose water resources projects results in economic benefits to all parts of the country. "It is significant to every part of the Nation that nearly 60 percent of the shipments of the permanent materials and equipment for this dam were from regions outside the area where the dam was built," Dominy said.

The 710-foot high concrete dam is the major water storage and power generating structure of the Colorado River Storage Project, and is widely known for its impoundment of scenic Lake Powell, which has been called the world's most beautiful manmade lake. The dam itself was awarded the Outstanding Engineering Achievement Award in 1964.

The following table shows the quantity and cost of materials and equipment used in constructing Glen Canyon Dam and Powerplant:

	Tons (thousands)	Amount (millions)
Materials:		
Steel and other metals	60.7	$27.9
Building materials	20.3	10.5
Concrete products	807.2	10.3
Repair parts, fuel, etc.	125.1	10.1
Miscellaneous materials	60.5	2.6
Explosives and chemicals	24.2	1.6
Subtotal	1,098.0	63.0
Equipment:		
Electrical	6.3	19.0
Hoists, pumps, etc.	1.1	16.3
Concrete	2.1	4.4
Motorized	5.9	4.1
Office and engineering	.3	1.2
Building	.9	1.1
Miscellaneous tools	1.1	1.1
Asphalt	.1	.4
Subtotal	17.8	47.6
Total materials and equipment	1,115.8	110.6

The above table does not include the preponderant weight of the dam—the sand, aggregates and water used in the concrete mix.

Salaries to all contractor construction employees paid during the 10-year construction period were nearly $79 million, while expenditures for land and government administrative costs came to $43 million. Construction of the giant dam generated a total of 50 million man-hours of direct on-site and indirect off-site employment—an equivalent of 100 employees working 250 years each.

Employees in actual construction efforts accounted for 5 million man-hours, or nearly 20 percent of the total on-site labor. Machine operators and carpenters were about equal with 2.8 million and 2.6 million man-hours each. Others doing considerable direct on-site work were truck drivers, iron workers, electricians, plumbers and cement masons.

Some 24 million man-hours of all employment—an equivalent of 12,000 man-years—occurred off-site, or in various industries at locations other than the dam. These were mining, manufacturing, transportation, wholesale and retail trade, agriculture and such industries. This included 13 million man-hours of primary employment in the final stages of manufacturing the materials and equipment, and 11 million man-hours of secondary interindustry employment in processing semifinished and finished materials and delivering them to the manufacturer.

As a project of the Reclamation program, the total Federal construction cost of Glen Canyon Dam—amounting to $243 million by the end of 1966—is largely repayable over the years from the sale of commercial power produced in its 900,000-kilowatt capacity powerplant. Project power revenues also will contribute to other water resource development in the five-State Upper Colorado River Basin.

Mr. Speaker, accompanying the Interior Department release was a map indicating expenditures by areas for direct construction material, equipment, and freight requirements supplied by all regions of the Nation. These economic benefits were distributed as follows:

Far Western States	$19,888,000
Rocky Mountain States	16,227,000
Plains States	2,036,000
Southwest States	49,568,000
Southeast States	2,459,000
Great Lakes States	6,343,000
Mideast States	20,497,000
New England States	630,000

An additional $3,358,000 was expended abroad.

POSTAL LIFE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, response to the new Post Office Department magazine has left little doubt that there has been a great need for such a publication.

Postal Life is winning praise from career postal workers throughout the Nation. The magazine provides them with much needed means of keeping in touch with new developments and matters which concern themselves and their careers.

For example, the September-October issue told employees about the creation of the postal uniform and the effort that goes into maintaining quality. The original issue carried a most interesting story on mail service to our men in Vetnam.

Since mail to Vietnam will be heavy this Christmas, I think it is important that we know just how those important letters and parcels are going to make their way from the United States to Southeast Asia. I am therefore inserting into the RECORD the very thorough, very readable story which appeared in the first issue of Postal Life. I am also inserting five letters from career employees in my home State of New Jersey who like the magazine very much.

The material referred to follows:

MAIL FOR OUR MEN IN VIETNAM

In a place called Long Binh, the Army has a replacement depot. It is a military base which processes servicemen moving in and out of Viet Nam, and its atmosphere is one of haste and transience. A man isn't likely to find anyone there he knows.

Mail service is general delivery. The call window tempts every soldier who passes through, and even if he is newly arrived overseas, the clerk may very well have a letter or two for him.

Often, the mail will beat him from the United States to Vietnam. American troops are receiving the finest mail service ever; General William C. Westmoreland himself has said so.

The chief of Viet Nam military operations places mail in importance with bullets, bandages and beans. He says that a letter from home is one of the most significant contributions to men in the field.

First class mail is getting three to five day delivery from posting stateside. Small parcels sent space available (SAM) are delivered in about 10 days. Mail from Viet Nam to the USA gets the same service.

The flow of mail to that embattled nation has risen to a flood, and the task of getting it delivered is a mighty team effort in which all postal employees in America play a part. In cooperation with commercial carriers and the Department of Defense, postal employees are helping to make the military mail operation a not-so-small miracle.

More than 55 million pounds went to Viet Nam last year.

The mail originates, of course, in the great cities and a thousand towns and villages which have contributed their sons to the Vietnam conflict. It is processed in thousands of post offices and dispatched as quickly as possible to west coast concentration centers.

Sometimes two million pounds a week arrive at San Francisco; half will go to Viet Nam, the remainder to Japan and other points in the Far East. Seattle, open barely three months, handles a lesser amount.

Postal employees sort the mail by APO, and military mail clerks help with the arduous researching of incomplete addresses. That task is particularly important because the men and their units may be continually on the move in the shifting land war, and delivery under combat conditions is hard enough as it is.

Forwarding has been developed to a fine art in Viet Nam. Military locator specialists keep track of transfers and troop movements. Almost all of the time, the mail catches up.

The responsibility has been the military's ever since the pouches left the great jumping off points, traveling as armed forces mail bound for the Far East. The larger, heavier parcels go by ship. They will spend 21 days on the water and possibly weeks more awaiting unloading. Average age of the delivered surface parcel is about 45 days.

The trip by air takes about 30 hours. Spacious cargo planes transport the mail in white fiberglass containers called "igloos," each of which holds about 80 pouches and sacks. Last Christmas, more than nine million pounds of mail was bundled into igloos and packed off for Viet Nam.

The large airstrips in Viet Nam are among the busiest in the world. The noise and activity go on around the clock. The jet whine never ceases. Inevitably, the mail plane descends from the calm of 30,000 feet into a maelstrom.

As always, time and the oppressive heat close in. It is near midnight. The temperature is 97 degrees. At Tan Son Nhut airfield outside Saigon, or Da Nang up country or Cam Ranh Bay, the men come running to unload the mail.

Their job is similar to those of thousands of mail handlers and clerks in hundreds of sectional centres throughout the United States.

Get hands on the mail. Get it broken down. Get it to transportation and get it on its way. Fast.

The mail must be off by dawn. Some goes to temporary offices up the road. Some to base housing. Much of it will go inland, to the field. Or to hospitals.

Through the night, the mail is moved up to the flight line. It is gathered from the Military Air Command Charters, from the Pan American commercial flights, from the ships in the bay. Long lines of artificial igloos looking out of place in the tropics stand waiting.

Most mail moves inland by air, and at sunrise the first wave of mail planes, the pony express of the sky, takes off. CV-2 Caribous and the ubiquitous helicopters bear the greatest load.

It is 7:00 A.M. Aloft is a Caribou assigned to carry mail to two brigades of the 1st Infantry Division at Phouc Vint and Lai Khe, about 45 miles north of Saigon. Aboard are 3,500 pounds of letters and parcels, two PFC replacements, medical supplies and parts for the division's vehicles.

The trip is uneventful. The gunfire is distant. Overhead a squadron of jet fighters streaks toward the horizon. No one is giving notice to the mail plane.

The pilots makes casual remarks about the gunfire, saying that mail planes are a favorite target of the Viet Cong but that he knows of no loss of mail. He dips a wing, puts down toward the brigade's airstrip. He sounds an airborn mail call, honking the plane's raucous horn three times.

A mud-splattered truck bursts from the shelter of the trees and races out to meet the plane.

The driver dismounts and begins to load the truck, flinging mail sacks with the same easy motion he used to pitch hay in Iowa. He checks his manifest and pulls off, down the bumpy road toward his APO, a quonset hut in which the temperature will rise to 111 degrees by noon.

The structure is his duty post for at least 12 hours a day, for as many as 10 weeks without a day off. He is the corporal, and he has seven men to help him open the sacks and sort the mail by units.

"It could be worse," he says. "Five months ago we were in a tent. Now at least we have electric lights when the generator isn't too tired."

In a few hours a radio call summons unit mail clerks. They arrive in Jeeps, bringing letters and packages to be mailed, and they collect the incoming pouches for their outfits.

The quonset is located at the edge of the town. Across the street is a little market whose sign is done in the eloquent squiggles that mean whole thoughts to the Vietnamese. Under it ads for Pepsi and Coke vie for attention.

Women, lovely in the flowing ao dai, pass the APO. Kids are shouting to each other. Soldiers arrrive in a steady stream, calling at the APO for mail. There are lock boxes along one wall.

It is hot and sweaty. A man must handle his mail gingerly or the washable blue will come off on his fingers.

A popular item in packets from home is Kool-aid. A mail clerk says that everyone is drinking it now that ice is available. A small thing to be grateful for.

It is only morning, but the corporal is tired. He is perspiring, and his eyes are red. But he won't take off.

"Twelve hours a day is a long day, day after day," he says. He is making out money orders, trying not to smudge the ink. "But the guys really need that mail."

The corporal is proud of his job. "I'm really doing something worth while here. I wonder if those guys working our mail in the States think about their jobs like this. It's something special, you know."

He goes on about the fantastic money order business in Viet Nam. Already a legend is the Air Postal Clerk at APO 96307 who wrote $105,000 worth in one day and had only a 40 cent error in his report . . . and a sore hand. It is not unusual for an APO to issue $2 million in money orders in one month. Hip pocket bank, the GI's call it.

This is to be expected. Money orders were born of similar circumstances during the Civil War when soldiers needed a safe and convenient method of sending money home to their families.

In Viet Nam money orders are most important on pay day. But the mail is important every day. At Da Nang it never stops.

It is 10:00 P.M. A Pan Am 707 touches down, brakes its engines with a shattering scream and taxis to the apron. A couple of Air Force sergeants with stripes to their elbows volunteer to help unload mail. Nine of the 13 "igloos" are to come off. About 45,000 pounds of mail for Da Nang.

It's eerie. The VC's have tried to infiltrate the base again. Rifle fire echoes in the distance. White flares light the skies and linger for endless seconds, perishing reluctantly. A sentry dog barks sharply as if he has someone. Night sounds.

The ten man crew unloads the mail swiftly. There is no pause for the noises from the darkness. One of the noncoms, a hulking fellow from the Bronx who repairs jet engines 12 hours a day talks about the VC killed a few nights before at Tan Son Nhut. He had been a shoe shine boy who worked for the Americans during the day.

The other sergeant is a tall Southerner dubbed the "Dixie Hot Shot" because he maintains machineguns on fighter planes, and he doesn't make life any more settled. Without emotion, he describes the mortar raid on 25th Division APO which killed one clerk and wounded seven.

Hot Shot's low, unhurried monologue is interrupted by an urgent blast from the sirens. The men pause and look into the distance.

"I wonder if Eddie pulled guard tonight," Hot Shot says.

The cargo section is closed and already the plane is warming its engines for the last leg of the trip. Saigon.

The mail igloos have been loaded aboard large flat bed trucks which will haul them to a nearby postal operations area.

The fog is about to come in and the plane hurries to take off position. After the fog, rain will come. Again.

This means that the wounded aboard the hospital ship Repose in Da Nang Harbor will get their mail by boat, not helicopter. In good weather the chopper makes two mail trips a day to the ship.

A sweating PFC begins to complain. He doesn't know whether it is worse to work in the warm rain of Da Nang or to spend the dry season in the searing, sand blown heat at Saigon airport. He has handled mail at both.

Some of the mail at Saigon's Tan Son Nhut is worked inside under huge inflatable rubber shelters. The air is stifling. But that, they say, is a big improvement from last year when they were working mail in the open and in the rain.

From the great, bustling military centers where the igloos are broken down by divisions and units, the mail goes into the jungle by Jeeps and helicopters and often times on a mail clerk's back. It is carried into the central highlands and the plains and the rice paddies in the Mekong delta; it goes to the Marines at lonely outposts, to the Green Berets wherever they are encamped, to American servicemen, soldiers fighting in a distant land. Mail for the kids from back home.

PATERSON, N.J.

EDITOR, POSTAL LIFE,
Washington, D.C.:

I do enjoy your Postal Life magazine. It's a pleasure in reading it. Also, it makes you feel like working.

MICHAEL D. FIORILLO.

EDITOR, POSTAL LIFE:

Your first issue of Postal Life deserves a tremendous amount of praise for a job well done. All articles were very informative and interesting as well as educational. Mailing directly to all postal employees will give us the feeling of one big family working for the same goals and sharing in the "profits" of service to our Government.

We all can learn first-hand information from our employer, the coming improvements, what the future has in store for career employees and many benefits to attract career personnel.

I wish to comment again and say I hope that this new Postal Life will always be part of our postal career and that future editions continue to be as fruitful as the first!

Congratulations!

DANIEL J. DE VENIO,
Secretary, Hackensack (N.J.) Postal Union.

JERSEY CITY, N.J.

EDITOR, POSTAL LIFE,
Washington, D.C.:

I believe every man has a need to take pride in the work he does. The fact that he supplies the public with good postal service is no longer enough.

Our new magazine is like a ray of sunshine on a cloudy day. There has been a basic need for communication between all crafts of career employees for some time. The problems it will solve and the truths it will disseminate will prove its worth alone.

In closing, I would like to say thank you for a most interesting and informative publication, but it was only a drop of water to a thirsty man. Let's have more.

WILLIAM CORCORAN.

PATERSON, N.J.

EDITOR, POSTAL LIFE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on the fine format of the original issue of Postal Life.

I believe that Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien is thinking in the right direction for better relations.

Best of success and a long life of journalistic service.

JAMES R. LEE,

ENGLEWOOD, N.J.

EDITOR, POSTAL LIFE,
Washington, D.C.:

I reiterate just about all the praises already listed on pages 2–3, Vol. 1, #2.

Having carried a rural route out in Essex County, I certainly enjoyed your article on "Ike Budrey." It brought back fond memories of my befuddlement with the three adjacent Smith farms in Cedar Grove, N.J.—W. A. Smith, W. E. Smith and L. E. Smith—no relation either. There were at least a dozen in each house.

Come Christmas time, we had to take all "Smith mail," split it into three equal bundles and hope they were on speaking terms!

Best regards on this new venture on Postal Life. We, out in the field, like to be reminded that somebody in "the home office" has a high opinion of postal work and workers, that we're not just a drain on the Treasury Department, not just an added tax burden. We work and endeavor to get an impossible job done as quickly as possible, as economically as practicable.

H. G. KAST.

MEAT FOR THE TABLE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, America's consumers rightfully expect that the food they buy is wholesome and fit for human consumption. And most of them believe that the meat and meat products they buy for themselves and their families has been inspected and found to meet the rigorous standards of the Federal meat inspection law. But the fact is that a substantial portion of meat and meat products is not federally inspected. The lead editorial of a recent issue of the AFL–CIO News points out that consumers have been "deluded into a feeling of false security" regarding the safety and wholesomeness of meat and meat products. I include that editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

MEAT FOR THE TABLE

The assurance of a safe and healthful meat supply is one of the key elements in the AFL–CIO's drive to protect American consumers against the unscrupulous practices of the marketplace.

Some of these practices are better known than others. Meat inspection falls into the too-little-known category with most consumers convinced that the meat and meat products they buy have been inspected by the federal government.

The reality is that they are not fully protected and that they are in a real sense being deluded into a feeling of false security. Actually, some 15 percent of all meat slaughtered and some 25 percent of all meat products processed are not federally inspected.

Some of this production is inspected at the state level, but even the best of the state programs, where they exist, leave a great deal to be desired.

The federal meat inspection act, in addition, is 60 years old and badly in need of modernization and overhaul.

Meat inspection is a direct and immediate issue for consumers. Serious illness can be caused by unwholesome and unclean meat.

Consumers have in a number of cases paid normal prices for meat that came from sick animals or from animals that died from causes other than slaughter. Potentially dangerous situations concerning insecticide residues in meat have developed in the past few years.

The consumer has a right to get the full protection of meat inspection which he believes he now has. He has the right to expect that the government will assure the health and safety of his family in this matter.

The simple answer is a federal meat inspection law to cover all plants which are in or affect interstate commerce. But the meatpacking industry and the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture are raising the discredited cry of "states' rights" and are urging further weakening of an already weak bill.

These proposals would in effect be a hoax on the consumer by further compounding confusions and illusions about meat protection.

Urging the states to pass good inspection laws, the basic approach of the committee bill, does not face up to the problem and fails completely to assure the American public that it is really protected from the health hazards of unwholesome and unclean meat.

The answer lies with a measure that would place nearly all meat plants under the interstate commerce provisions used as a guide in other existing legislation and thus bring their products under federal inspection.

The meat inspection issue involves the health of the American people and cannot be subjected to bargain basement approaches or gimmicks that would prevent full and complete inspection.

The House of Representatives has the responsibility not to short-change the American consumer on this vital issue and to vote for strong, effective legislation that can be accepted without question as the fullest possible protection.

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 represents a significant legislative step in the continuing battle for clean air. Under the Clean Air Act of 1963 and the amendments adopted in 1965 and 1966, the Nation has made significant progress in this crucial battle, but we still have a long way to go. Despite increased governmental and private efforts in this area, air pollution continues to grow and to threaten the health and well-being of millions of Americans.

Today, the threat of a contaminated

atmosphere is one of our most serious problems. Polluted air damages or destroys virtually everything it touches. In economic losses alone, air pollution costs the country billions of dollars a year through injury to vegetables and livestock, corrosion and soiling of materials and structures, depression of property values, and interference with ground and air transportation.

Of even greater significance are the adverse effects on human health. Air pollution is associated with the occurrence and worsening of such respiratory diseases as asthma, bronchitis, emphysema, and lung cancer. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service has said that air pollution is unquestionably a factor in the development of many diseases affecting millions of people.

Moreover, the problem is steadily worsening. The President reminded us last January that unless the Nation comes to grips with this problem now, it will reach truly critical proportions within the next decade.

The bill that is before the House—the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967—would, if enacted, provide new opportunities for effective action at all levels of government. This legislation would broaden air pollution control programs at all levels of government in an effort to protect and enhance the quality of the environment.

But the proposed act also recognizes that government alone cannot eliminate the threat of air pollution. The ultimate solution to this problem depends very heavily on collaboration between government and industry. The President has said that the time to begin forging such a cooperative effort is now. The proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 would enable the Federal Government to take important steps in this direction. This legislation must be passed; action to protect the Nation against the mounting dangers of air pollution cannot be delayed.

THE RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM IS AN AID TO LESS FORTUNATE AMERICANS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the rent supplement program can provide the necessary motivation for a family to improve its economic standing. It provides the way for low-income families to live in decent surroundings without the label of the poor neighbor.

By giving them a new start in life, the program is offering a chance for these people to set their sights on higher goals in jobs, education, and a better standard of living.

A man with meager means who is given the chance to live in clean surroundings, rather than in the slums of America's back streets, has more of a chance to rise out of membership in society's economic backwash.

The economic barrier that stood in the way of this man in providing good surroundings for the bringing up of his children can be broken with the aid of rent supplements. He can focus his attention on improving his way of life and that of his children.

The rent supplement program is an aid to less fortunate Americans in their quest for a better way of life.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FISHER, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. DE LA GARZA, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, today, for 30 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RAILSBACK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. DINGELL.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 108. An act to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the State of Maine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2068. An act to repeal certain acts relating to containers for fruits and vegetables; exportation of tobacco plants and seed; naval stores; and wool; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

S. 2179. An act to extend for 3 years the special milk programs for the Armed Forces and veterans hospitals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2464. An act for the relief of Yoo Young Hui, and her daughter, Ok Young.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 676. An act to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1948. An act for the relief of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran;

H.R. 1960. An act for the relief of Angelique Kousoulas;

H.R. 2464. An act for the relief of Yoo Young Hui, and her daughter, Ok Young;

H.R. 2978. An act for the relief of Yong Ok Espantoso;

H.R. 3430. An act for the relief of Yim Mei Lam;

H.R. 3497. An act for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta;

H.R. 4534. An act for the relief of Mary Bernadette Linehan; and

H.R. 5216. An act for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 24, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1171. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a certification that the relevant portion of the Inner Loop Freeway and the substructure of the Labor Department building are coordinated in design and will be constructed as a unit, pursuant to the provisions of 80 Stat. 671; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1172. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of an additional facility project proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 13054. A bill relative to age discrimination in employment (Rept. No. 805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11161. A bill to extend for 3 years the special milk programs for the Armed Forces and veterans hospitals (Rept. No. 806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Af-

fairs. S. 1031. An act to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended (Rept. No. 807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3982. A bill to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, relating to the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services; with amendment (Rept. No. 808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 1341. A bill to amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize additional accumulation of leave in certain foreign areas; with amendment (Rept. No. 809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAY: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 12603. A bill to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 13622. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 13623. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for a minimum wage for certain seasonal retail employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 13624. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant to certain joint endeavors organized by hospitals the same tax exemptions as are accorded to the participating hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 13625. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize certain common carriers to furnish transportation to students at reduced rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 13626. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States and other nations in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 13627. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head-of-household benefits to any individual who may not make a joint return but maintains his own household as his home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13628. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13629. A bill to amend section 212(a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13630. A bill to remove certain limitations on ocean cruises; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 13631. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of flat glass imported into the United States by affording foreign supplying nations a fair share of the growth or change in the U.S. flat-glass market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 13632. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 13633. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 13634. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 13635. A bill to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 13636. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 13637. A bill to amend section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 13638. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to authorize a program of research and demonstration for the control of pollution in lakes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 539. Concurrent resolution providing that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should submit a resolution to the United Nations for final and binding improvement of peace in Southeast Asia in accordance with the appropriate article of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

291. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, relative to the enactment of S. 2457, which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 13639. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Belesiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 13640. A bill for the relief of John Fotopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 13641. A bill for the relief of Mr. Eduardo C. Robreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 13642. A bill for the relief of Jesus J. Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13643. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Bonavolonta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13644. A bill for the relief of Michelangelo Petralito and Giuseppa Petralito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13645. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Musa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 13646. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luisa Cangiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 13647. A bill for the relief of Miss Louisa Rota-Sperti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 13648. A bill for the relief of Michael T. Mouzas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 13649. A bill for the relief of Rafael Espitia Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 13650. A bill for the relief of Aydee Cordero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13651. A bill for the relief of Rosina Parisi, Donato Parisi, and Gerardo Parisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13652. A bill for the relief of Alberto Aiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H. Res. 954. Resolution referring the bill (H.R. 13642) to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

187. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the publishing of a certain document; to the Committee on Rules.

188. Also, petition of the city of Maderia, Calif., relative to governmental tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

189. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the appointment of a Treasurer of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

Monday, October 23, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Father Baan Vietz, pastor, Holy Trinity Catholic Church, Barberton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, we pray You today, to listen to the supplication of Your children for Jesus' sake.

We offer the prayers of our hearts this morning for the heroes of the 1956 Hungarian revolution. On this day they fell on the streets of Budapest in the fight for freedom. The torch of liberty from the hands of the fallen Hungarian freedom fighter was picked up by the American soldier, our sons who are fighting so fiercely in Vietnam. Lord, source of all human dignity, bless our fallen heroes with eternal happiness in heaven and with the fulfillment of their ideals here on earth. We urge You, O Lord, through the words of Your prophets: How long, O, Lord, how long will You tolerate Your saints being ridiculed? When are You going to revenge the blood of Your holy ones?

Jesus, the Saviour, taught us that You are our Father and we are Your children. In the Senate of the United States, Your sons are praying for their little brother, the mutilated, the martyred Hungary.

And in behalf of Your little ones I beg of You, my God, bless Your sons in this Chamber with wisdom, perseverance, and unity in pursuing Your will. Pour Your blessing on those who carry the burden and take the blows of the enemy today.

God bless America! God bless Hungary! Lord God, bless the whole world with justice and peace. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1788) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Haley, Mr. Edmondson, Mr. Hosmer, and Mr. Reinecke were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 676. An act to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States;

H.R. 1948. An act for the relief of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran;

H.R. 1960. An act for the relief of Angelique Kousoulas;

H.R. 2464. An act for the relief of Yoo Young Hui, and her daughter, Ok Young;

H.R. 2978. An act for the relief of Yong Ok Espantoso;

H.R. 3430. An act for the relief of Yim Mei Lam;

H.R. 3497. An act for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta;

H.R. 4534. An act for the relief of Mary Bernadette Linehan; and

H.R. 5216. An act for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 20, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT ORDAZ, OF MEXICO, TO ADDRESS JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with the greatest of personal pleasure that I announce to the Senate, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] and myself, that the distinguished President of Mexico, the Honorable Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, will address a joint session of Congress. The address will take place at 12:30 p.m. on Friday, October 27, in the Hall of the House.

It is our sincere wish that as many Members as possible will be on hand for this important occasion. The President of Mexico—indeed the entire Republic of Mexico—has something to say to the hemisphere and the world. His is a message of a proud people who have achieved, within a democratic framework, great progress against incredible odds.

Under the guidance of such outstanding statesmen as President Diaz Ordaz, Mexico is setting an example which all nations would do well to emulate. As neighbors in the hemisphere and as partners in the Alliance for Progress, our friends to the south are doing more than simply paying lipservice to the ideals of the Alliance.

For example, Mexico is devoting 26 percent of its direct Federal budget to education, approximately three times the amount spent on the military establishment. Mexico's longstanding program of land reform and redistribution has been speeded up in recent years. Mexico is demonstrating daily through its growing industrial base the success of its self-help philosophy.

In short, Mr. President, Mexico, in pursuing the goals of its own revolution, serves as a model of stable, progressive government. President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, like Adolfo Lopez Mateos and others before him, has played a very great role in this development. As such, they have earned the plaudits of mankind.

We are delighted that the President of Mexico will honor us with his presence. We are looking forward to his message.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, 2 years ago, when the President of the United States journeyed to Mexico to dedicate the Lincoln Square in honor of the great emancipator, the majority leader and I were privileged to make that journey at the same time. On that occasion, we had an opportunity to visit intimately and at length with the President of Mexico and also the members of the Mexican Congress. It was, to say the least, a very fruitful and constructive visit, and I came away deeply impressed.

I am delighted that he comes now to honor us and to address a joint session of Congress, and I share the sentiments uttered by the distinguished majority leader.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 16, 1967,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably, with amendments, on October 19, 1967, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 672) thereon, which was printed.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, October 23, 1967, the Vice President signed the enrolled bill (S. 1933) to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Certification by the Administrator, General Services Administration

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., certifying, pursuant to law, that the relevant portion of the inner loop freeway and the substructure of the Labor Department building are coordinated in design and will be constructed as a unit; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Facility Project for the Army National Guard

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on a proposed additional facility project proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard, at Kaneohe, Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Proposed Amendment to Concession Contract in Yosemite National Park, Calif.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to a concession contract in Yosemite National Park, Calif. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Title II of Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966

A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report of Postmaster General

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967 (with accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the appointment by the President of the United States of Hon. Mary A. Varallo as Treasurer of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the City Councils of the City of Madera, and the City of Livingston, both in the State of California, favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code (Rept. No. 673).

By Mr. INOUYE, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands (Rept. No. 674).

By Mr. MUNDT, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development (Rept. No. 675).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service. Since these names have already appeared in the Congressional Record, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

John F. L. Ghiardi, of Michigan, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service; and

J. Wesley Adams, Jr., of Illinois, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of New York):

S. 2564. A bill to insure a reasonable opportunity for all electrical utilities to participate in the benefits of nuclear power; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. Aiken when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2565. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2566. A bill for the relief of Melinda Batista Pachengo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 2567. A bill for the relief of Fung Yut Ma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2568. A bill for the relief of Mr. Leonel E. Enriquez; and

S. 2569. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Luisa Marrero de Enriquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2570. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax deduction for certain expenses of meals and lodging when a taxpayer's residence has been damaged or destroyed by fire or other casualty; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 2571. A bill for the relief of Mary Tai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Percy, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Scott, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 2572. A bill to establish a Domestic Development Bank to assist in the development of employment and business opportunities in certain urban and rural areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Allott, Mr. Baker, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Percy, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Scott, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 2573. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to charter an Economic Opportunity Corporation to encourage the participation of private enterprise in the effort to rebuild urban slums and eliminate poverty in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, under present Internal Revenue Service regulations, as I understand it, a taxpayer's loss of residence by fire, storm, flood, or other casualty is limited to actual physical damage. No credit is allowed for extra living expenses incurred while the taxpayer's house is being rebuilt or repaired, or while the taxpayer seeks another permanent residence.

The cost of living in a hotel or motel and the cost of eating out means, of course, more expense for the taxpayer, and at a time when he is already burdened with unexpected expenses.

The bill I introduce, and urge speedy passage of, would, under the above-described conditions, simply let the taxpayer deduct from his tax bill expenses paid and incurred for meals and lodging for himself and members of his household during a period not to exceed 3 months, and only to the extent these expenses exceed an amount which the taxpayer would have paid for himself and family if his residence had not been destroyed or damaged.

Mr. President, as a result of Hurricane Beulah, many of my fellow Texans have incurred much expense. This proposed measure would help ease somewhat their burden.

I would point out a similar situation nearly always arises as a result of hurricanes, tornadoes, and floods, in whatever part of the Nation they might occur. Our action in approving this measure, for both this year and in future years, will help some of our fellow Americans when help is most needed.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2570) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax deduction for certain expenses of meals and lodging when a taxpayer's residence has been damaged or destroyed by fire or other casualty, introduced by Mr. Tower, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2570

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 218 as 219, and by inserting after section 217 the following new section:

"Sec. 218. Certain extraordinary living expenses.

"(a) Allowance of Deduction.—There shall be allowed as a deduction the extraordinary living expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year as a result of damage to, or destruction of, the taxpayer's residence by fire, storm, or other casualty.

"(b) Extraordinary Living Expenses Defined.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'extraordinary living expenses' means the expenses which are paid or incurred by the taxpayer for meals and lodging for himself and members of his household (to the extent such expenses are not lavish or extravagant), and which are paid or incurred—

"(1) during the period (not exceeding 3 months) while the taxpayer's residence may not be occupied, or may not be used for the preparation and serving of meals, as a result of damage or destruction by fire, storm, or other casualty (or as a result of repairs being made on account of such damage), or

"(2) during the period (not exceeding 3 months) while the taxpayer is securing a new residence after damage to or destruction of his residence by fire, storm, or other casualty,

but only to the extent such expenses exceed the expenses which the taxpayer would have paid or incurred in providing meals and lodging for himself and members of his household if his residence had not been damaged or destroyed.

"(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 218. Certain extraordinary living expenses.

"Sec. 219. Cross references.

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 172 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 417

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague Mr. PROXMIRE, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us to my bill, S. 2262, to amend section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The bill was offered to aid American Motors, which has suffered substantial losses in the recent past, yet has continued to make heavy investments in plant and equipment.

Bill S. 2262 will give American Motors the help needed to continue as a substantial, independent competitive force in the automotive industry.

In the bill American Motors would be permitted to apply losses from current operations more effectively against income on which the company paid taxes in prior years by extending the present 3-year period over which business losses can be carried back to 5 years, while reducing the loss carryforward period from 5 years to 3 years.

The total carryback-carryforward period would still remain at 8 years.

This change would enable American Motors to apply for a $20 million tax refund, and it would not cost the taxpayers a nickel.

If American Motors operates at a profit for the next 2 years, the firm can still claim the tax refund. On the other hand, if the firm is acquired by another company, the acquiring company could write off all of AMC's losses against its own tax liabilities.

In either case, the U.S. Treasury gives up the $20 million.

I believe the Federal Government should do all it possibly can to help maintain American Motors as an effective automobile producing firm. Our failure to do so can result in irreparable damage to the welfare of thousands of people and to the automobile business itself.

The amendment I offer today clears up the obscurity in the language of the bill as to the meaning of gross receipts in one of the four qualifying conditions. The effect of the relief given to American Motors is not changed one bit. Neither the profits nor the losses of the company is affected.

I hope the Senate will act quickly and favorably on the bill as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 417) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS JOINT RESOLUTION, 1968—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 418

Mr. HOLLAND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. HOLLAND, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 419

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House Joint Resolution 888, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. MUNDT, which appears under a separate heading.)

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, last week on behalf of my colleague [Mr. MCGEE] and myself, I introduced S. 2553, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the operation and to reallocate the costs of the Kortes unit, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming, for fishery conservation.

The purpose of this legislation is to reallocate the costs to take advantage of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act enacted in the 89th Congress. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has jurisdiction over the reauthorization and authorization of Missouri Basin projects and also multipurpose water resource projects in the West generally. The legislation was mistakenly referred to the Committee on Public Works and I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be re-referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1897) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 276) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 513) to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title X thereto which will establish a program to protect adult health by providing assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease, by providing assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers, and by providing assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1217, a bill I have introduced to provide for uniform annual observances of certain legal public holidays on Mondays, the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors: Senators BARTLETT, CANNON, CLARK, DIRKSEN, FONG, INOUYE, MILLER, MORTON, NELSON, PEARSON, PELL, PERCY, SMITH, and YOUNG of Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 117) to provide that it be the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on Aging be called by the President of the United States in January 1970 to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist the States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging, and for related purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 23, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 676. An act to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States; and

S. 1933. An act to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds now on deposit

to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, I would like to announce that hearings will be conducted Thursday, October 26, on S. 2255 and H.R. 12121, two bills to extend the Public Land Law Review Commission.

The act of September 19, 1964, provides that the Commission shall submit its report and recommendations to the Congress and the President by December 31, 1968, and cease to exist 6 months after submission of its report or on June 30, 1969, whichever is earlier. The proposed legislation would extend both dates by 18 months.

The requested extension is asked because the Commission's study program has become greater than had been anticipated.

The hearings will be open and public, and will start at 10 a.m. in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building. Those interested in testifying or submitting statements for the record should inform the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, room 3106, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

NOTICE OF TRADE EXPANSION HEARINGS IN MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Select Committee on Small Business will hold hearings on expansion of foreign trade opportunities for midwest industries. I will chair the 2 days proceedings in Milwaukee, Wis., on December 1 and 2 at the U.S. post office and courthouse.

The goal of the hearings is to explore the export potential for the next 5 to 10 years for all the industries and businesses in the region. Only four cities have been selected as locations for regional hearings. I am gratified that Milwaukee is one of them.

The committee has sent invitations to many leaders from industry, governmental units, trade associations, business organizations, and institutions of higher learning. The response has been very favorable. I look forward to a very informative 2 days of discussion with several dozen people who are the most knowledgeable and the most interested in the field.

Milwaukee is a major port on the St. Lawrence Seaway, America's fourth seacoast.

The heartland of the Nation relies to a great extent on Milwaukee to handle its exports and imports. Every year shows a record amount of tonnage handled.

The port's harbor and dock system can handle additional loading with ease. The region is anxious to move ahead in the export field. Wisconsin now ranks 12th in the country in value of manufactured exports; Illinois is second, Michigan sixth.

During 1966 in Wisconsin, over 68,000 individuals depended on foreign trade for jobs.

Wisconsin's 1966 share of the export business totaled almost $630 million.

The product groups break down into $328 million for machinery excluding electrical; $53.6 million for electrical machinery; $73.6 million in transportation equipment; $31.5 million for fabricated metal products; $39.7 million for food and dairy products; $7.6 million for lumber products; $7.9 million for paper and allied products; and miscellaneous products including ordnance, printing and publishing, and chemicals totaling $37 million.

The midwest region can look forward to many years of prosperity. But it will have to step up its pursuit of the markets of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America if it is to maintain and improve its position in trade leadership.

It is a fact that the Nation's trade surplus is at its lowest level since 1959. In that year, trade surplus stood at $6.7 billion while it fell to $3.7 billion last year. The country's dwindling gold reserves are a cause of mounting concern.

The question is, can the Midwest help its own economy and that of the Nation through a concerted effort to increase its own export business?

Some of the greatest opportunities available for expansion of the field lie with small business. About 90 percent of all 290,000 U.S. manufacturers are classified as small business. All farmers are small businessmen. Unfortunately, most of the time we are myopic to opportunity. The average person thinks only in terms of the companies in the "Fortune 500." Yet the expertise these large companies possess can be relied on to help guide the way for the newcomer.

The hearings are designed to receive the views of the trade community. In time we will build a record from each of the major regions of the country. We hope that this inquiry will help in great measure to give encouragement and direction to expansion efforts where they are needed. In light of the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee [Mr. Smathers] on September 14, that a Secretary of Commerce has been appointed and the Small Business Administration has reestablished its long-dormant export program, I feel that this exploration has already accomplished a great deal.

I hope that testimony at our Milwaukee hearings will define the practical problems of the region's industries, and that witnesses will explore the long-term potentials and problems of trade in the region's products.

We will ask business and industry representatives to describe what they believe should be the role of the Federal Government, of State and local government, and of private organizations—all of whom will have to work together to develop overseas markets.

The role of the U.S. Commerce Department will have to be explored in great detail in any proposed trade-expansion programs. For example, what should the Department be doing specifically regarding immediate market needs? What should its role in the long-range picture be?

Where should the Government assist business in developing new and better marketing techniques? How much attention should be paid to the new or smaller exporters as opposed to the major firms who determine in large measure the U.S. balance-of-payments position? What are some of the barriers the Government can lower?

The eventual publication of these hearings will provide a valuable source of information not only for the Congress and the public but it will also do much to demonstrate to our foreign trading partners that our economy is basically composed of small, independent firms; that there is increasing interest in mutually profitable commercial trade.

Holding hearings in the field will enable the committee to hear the practical suggestions—always the best—of those who are now, those who want to be, and those who should be connected with the export field.

The committee will have to rely on the experts to provide the answers. I am sure the Milwaukee hearings will help point the way to some of the needed solutions.

The committee will be happy to hear all views. Those having an interest in the subject matter are invited to contact the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Testimony by him before Maryland Constitutional Convention concerning younger voting age and judicial and legislative reform in Maryland.

VIETNAM—HOW NOT TO UTILIZE AIRPOWER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a year ago last December, when in Vietnam, I became deeply impressed with the knowledge—no surprise because of his vast experience—of one of the finest men it has ever been my privilege to know, Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, U.S. Air Force, retired.

I ask unanimous consent that this experience in the form of his record, be printed at this point in this Record.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Department of the Air Force, Office of Information, Public Information Division]

Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers

Brig. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers assumed command of the 836th Air Division, MacDill Air Force Base, on 1 April 1963. Prior to his assignment here, he had commanded the 354th Tactical Fighter Wing, Myrtle Beach AFB, S.C., since 3 October 1960. Before that, he was commander of the 4530th Combat Crew Training Wing at Williams AFB, Arizona.

A veteran of more than 27 years service with the Air Corps and Air Force, he is a graduate of the Canadian National Defense College at Kinston, Ontario; the Air War College at Maxwell AFB, Ala.; and the Armed Forces Staff College at Norfolk, Va.

General Meyers entered military service in July 1936 at Fort Snelling, Minn. He attended pilot training at Randolph and Kelly Fields, Texas, from July 1937 to June 1938. His first assignment after completing pilot training was with the Eighth Pursuit Group at Langley Field, Va.

During the early part of World War II he accepted the first P-47 Thunderbolt fighter for use by the Army Air Corps. Later he had the job of familiarizing General John K. Cannon, the man for whom Cannon AFB was named, with the aircraft's flying characteristics.

Serving with the 368th Fighter Group, his was the first Air Force unit to land in France after Normandy. After the German surrender, General Meyers served with the Fifth Air Force in the Far East and landed at Tachikawa Air Base, Japan, only days after the unofficial Japanese surrender.

In 1946 he assumed command of the First Fighter Group when it was the first jet fighter unit in the Air Force. In 1948 he was assigned to Williams AFB for a year and a half where he served as Commander of the primary training group and as Deputy Wing Commander. In 1950 he went to Korea for two years as Fifth Air Force Director of Operations during the Korean Conflict.

His other post-war assignments include: Deputy Chief of Staff of Operations, Headquarters TAC, Langley AFB, Va.; Vice Commander of the Ninth Air Force, Pope AFB, N.C.; and Deputy Director for Requirements, Headquarters USAF; and Commander of the 27th Tactical Fighter Wing at Cannon AFB, N.M.

Among the awards and decorations he has received are the Distinguished Service Medal, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal with seven Oak Leaf Clusters, Bronze Star and the Croix de Guerre from France, Luxembourg and Belgium.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Recently, General Meyers testified before the Senate Military Preparedness Subcommittee; and anyone who wants to leave, for a minute, the conclusions of the armchair strategists in favor of the opinion of one in the field who directed this air war under all these rules, restrictions, regulations, and other instructions, will be interested in his short, concise, and entirely extemporaneous statement as presented to the subcommittee. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his statement be inserted at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Yarborough in the chair). Without objection, the statement will be printed at this point in the Record.

The statement is as follows:

Testimony of Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, U.S. Air Force, Retired, Former Deputy Commander of the 7th Air Force in Vietnam

Senator Stennis. Do you have a prepared statement?

General Meyers. I do not, sir, but I would like to make some opening remarks.

Senator Stennis. Whether or not they are prepared in writing, you certainly may make some opening remarks and I hope you do.

General Meyers. First I would like to say that I am very pleased to have an opportunity to talk with you gentlemen. You are obviously dealing with a subject which has been very close to my heart. Having spent about 16 months in Vietnam, naturally I am extremely interested in what is going on over there to this day.

I think that in any review or look at the Vietnam war, first you must look at the strategy or the policy which is being pursued over there, and my understanding, of course, is that we have three stated objectives. These objectives I think have been given to the committee many times, and in the interests of saving time, I will not repeat them.

I do not think that any military man that I have ever talked to has any quarrel with the objectives as presented. They are very straightforward, and easily understood, and I think capable of achievement.

I think where the great difference of opinion occurs is how these objectives are being carried out; specifically, how airpower is being used in North Vietnam to implement these objectives.

Associated with the objectives, there is another policy that does not come out as loud and clear as the three stated objectives. If you look at the way airpower has been employed in Vietnam, it is very obvious that this policy exists. This policy is the application of the air effort on a graduated controlled response basis. Initially, as we went into this war conflict, our targets were just across the DMZ. We were trying to create pressure on the enemy, and hopefully by doing so he would come to a decision that he could not win the war, and would agree to some sort of negotiated settlement.

GRADUATED PRESSURE GIVES ENEMY TIME

This policy of graduated pressure has a lot to do with how the air is being employed and the effectiveness of the air campaign in Vietnam. It gives the enemy time to take corrective action on many of the targets that we have struck and nullify the results of our attacks.

For example, consider the interdiction program against bridge targets on his lines of communications. It became obvious to him of course that this was a target complex that we were going to destroy. But because we did it piecemeal over a long period of time, he was able to put the material that he needed to repair the bridges in place, so that when the bridge was destroyed, he would cut down the time that the bridge was out of use.

In addition to that, he put cables across the rivers and the inlets so that he would have a means of crossing. Ferryboats were put into position so that they could be utilized immediately. By giving him this opportunity to organize his resources, he could cut down the effect of the destruction of a given target.

HIT POWER FACILITIES ON PIECEMEAL BASIS

Another specific along the same line. Our attack against the power facilities in North Vietnam. Again this was done on a piecemeal basis. It has been said that there are about 2,000 portable generators that have been brought into Vietnam to replace the loss of these permanent facilities.

Obviously, these generators did not exist initially, but because of the long period of time we spent destroying them, these replacement items were provided, so the impact of the destruction of these facilities was lost.

This graduated application of airpower I think has a major impact on the effectiveness of the airstrikes in the north. That is the point that I would like to get across to the committee, and I do not think it has been emphasized, at least in the press reports that I have read.

The targeting, of course, in North Vietnam is also very pertinent to the effectiveness of our air efforts up there. The target systems that we have gone after in the past have been limited in scope because of this graduated pressure policy that we were pursuing, and many of the good, more lucrative targets in the north were not attacked.

HAIPHONG NO. 1 TO MILITARY MAN

I understand that additional targets have now been released. Of course to the military man, the No. 1 target in North Vietnam is the port of Haiphong. This port represents to North Vietnam what the industrial capacity of Germany and Japan represented to them during the World War II time period.

North Vietnam is basically an agrarian country. They do not have the industrial capacity to produce the wherewithal to fight a war. As a result of this, they must import these necessities. A great deal must of necessity come through the port at Haiphong. It has been estimated to be somewhere between 75 and 85 percent of the total North Vietnam imports enter through this port. The remaining percent enters through the northeast railroad and road nets from China.

DOESN'T MAKE SENSE

It just does not make sense to me that we would put thousands of sorties into North Vietnam on armed reconnaissance when the material we are trying to destroy is located in a very vulnerable position as it is offloaded from the ships in the port of Haiphong. Why do we leave the equipment unmolested in these ports, and then attempt to relocate and destroy it as it moves down hundreds of miles of jungle trails? This is a very difficult thing obviously for our pilots to accomplish. Obviously a port is a very vulnerable facility, because the material has to be distributed after it is unloaded and stored. It is a very lucrative military target, and that is the point in time to bring your airpower to prevail against the material, not after it has been scattered all over the country of North Vietnam.

DEMONSTRATION AT THE PENTAGON

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the agencies and representatives of Government who dealt with the demonstrators against the war in Vietnam at the Pentagon are due credit and praise, in my opinion, for the manner in which they discharged their responsibilities.

The troops and their officers, the U.S. marshals and all who faced the protesters displayed admirable firmness as well as restraint in their enforcement of the regulations drawn up to govern the demonstration. Theirs was a difficult and delicate task, indeed. Great bloodshed could have occurred. That it did not is a tribute to the careful planning that preceded the demonstration and the effective way the plans were carried out.

I compliment the Department of Defense, the Justice Department, the General Services Administration, the police, and all who had a part in handling this unusual situation. The constitutional rights of the demonstrators were protected, and at the same time those who broke the law or violated the regulations were dealt with quickly, firmly, and I think justly.

It is reassuring to all citizens to see their Government respond as efficiently and as responsibly as it did. There is no question that the firm determination exhibited by all the agencies involved has served notice that efforts to disrupt the operations of Government will not be tolerated.

Hanoi's comments on the demonstration are proof enough that the Communists welcomed it. I stated last week that they had a hand in fomenting it. It is certain the demonstration served their ends. Hanoi will never negotiate, nor make any move toward peace, as long as it believes that dissatisfaction with the war may eventually cause America to withdraw. Saturday's demonstration could have no other effect than to reenforce that belief.

It was ridiculous of Hanoi, however, to say that repressive tactics could not prevent the demonstration. The demonstrators, as everyone knows, were given official permission by their Government to stage the protest. Repressive tactics were used only when they violated the rules or broke the law.

PERSONALITY: DR. ARMAND HAMMER

Mr. MANSFIELD. The New York Times of Sunday, October 22, contains a personality story about one of the most successful businessmen in the Nation. I refer to Dr. Armand Hammer, who has engaged in his lifetime in a number of ventures but, at the same time, has been able to retain a continuing and firsthand interest in the works of the old master of western painting and sculpture, Charles Marion Russell.

In a sense, we look upon Dr. Hammer as a Montanan because of the personal interest he has developed in the works of Charlie Russell in all his fields of artistic endeavor. The finest bronze sculpture Russell ever made has been presented as a gift to the White House by Dr. Hammer and, therefore, to the American people. Within the next several weeks a formal acceptance ceremony will take place at the White House, and it is my hope at that time to join with Dr. Hammer and the President and his wife when the official presentation is made. It will be good to have a bit of Montana in the President's House to serve as a reminder to the Nation of this great Montanan's contribution to the art and the history of the Republic.

We of Montana will be deeply indebted to Dr. Armand Hammer for his sense of history in presenting this remarkable work of Charlie Russell's to the First Family in the White House and, thereby, to the Nation as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article and an article entitled "Russell Bronze Given to White House," relating to the Russell sculpture "Meat for Wild Men," written by Betty Beale, and published in the Washington Evening Star of August 25, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 22, 1967]

PERSONALITY: DR. ARMAND HAMMER

(By William D. Smith)

At one time or another in his 69 years, Armand Hammer has made money on Aberdeen Angus cattle, asbestos, bourbon, barrel staves, caviar, chloroform, furs, gas, hides, jade, jeweled Easter eggs, mouthwash, oil wells, paintings, pencils, a radio network, shampoo, sheep's intestines, tractors, vodka and wheat.

Dr. Hammer is also a fully qualified physician, but he has never made a penny as a doctor. Medicine, in fact, is one of the few things that he has not turned into a profit-making venture.

He is now the president of the Occidental Petroleum Corporation, a company whose corporate personality has taken on the success, excitement and eclectic nature of its present chief executive.

When Dr. Hammer first became involved in Occidental in 1956, the company's stock sold for 18 cents a share and had a net worth of less than $50,000. On Friday, the company's stock closed at 88⅜ on the New York Stock Exchange and Occidental had assets of more than a billion dollars.

The resurrection of Occidental, a company that was ready to declare bankruptcy only 11 years ago, came about by pure chance. Dr. Hammer moved to California in 1955 to retire in the sun with the $6.5-million he had received from Schenley Industries for his J. W. Dant & Co., the manufacturer of the nation's No. 1 bottled-in-bond bourbon.

He soon became bored with the sun, sand and do-nothing routine. A friend approached him and asked him to finance two wildcat wells in Bakersfield, Calif., for $120,000. "I looked at the company, which was then selling at 20 cents a share, and told my friend it was not worth even the 20 cents a share," Dr. Hammer commented.

The friend told Dr. Hammer of the tax advantages in oil and the retired millionaire decided to take a fling. Both wells came in "much to my surprise," the doctor says.

The management of Occidental next asked Dr. Hammer for $1 million to obtain 11 oil leases in Los Angeles.

In 1957, Occidental asked Dr. Hammer to be president of the company. "My first thought was, well, I don't know anything about the oil business so I had better start hiring the people who do," he explained.

Dr. Hammer contends in his low-keyed but dynamic voice that this is the first principle of good business management: "Get the people who best know how to do the job and you can't go wrong."

He explained:

"I didn't even know who knew the oil business so I asked my bank, the Chase Manhattan, to give me the name of the person they thought was the most knowledgeable oil consultant. They told me about N. Van Wingen, a professor at the University of Southern California.

"I put him on the board and then asked him to pick the best oil man on the coast. He named Eugene C. Reed. Occidental didn't have enough money to hire Reed for a salary so I offered him opportunity through stock options instead."

This is Dr. Hammer's second principle of business management: Give people opportunity through incentives such as stock options and they will produce.

"I told Gene Reed this was a chance to make a million and he said, 'well, I always wanted to make a million,' and accepted." Mr. Reed, who recently retired as executive vice president, made his million many times over.

This formula of offering a prospective employe a chance at big money rather than a large salary attracted many other top oil people to the rapidly expanding company. "They left security to take the big chance," he observed.

Occidental's army of experts led by Mr. Reed and spurred by Dr. Hammer found gas and oil with amazing regularity in the California area. In 1960, the company went into the fertilizer business with the purchase of the Best Fertilizer Company.

In 1961, Occidental made what would prove to be one of the most important moves in the recent history of the oil industry. Dr. Hammer and his team went to Libya and asked for oil concessions. The Libyan Government said it would give the concessions if Occidental would also built a fertilizer plant.

Dr. Hammer approached the International Ore and Fertilizer Company, a worldwide agricultural chemical marketing operation, in an effort to make a deal on Libya's request. During the negotiations, Dr. Hammer decided to acquire the company.

In 1965, Libya opened its land area to competitive bidding by the oil companies. Much to the surprise of the major international oil giants, Occidental was awarded choice sites at a price considerably lower than some of the competing bids. Occidental's offer, of course, had included plans for a fertilizer plant.

Since 1965, Occidental's Libyan concessions have proved to be one of the world's major oil deposits, exceeding even the most optimistic estimates. In the words of a Wall Street analyst, "With one fell swoop, it placed Occidental in the class of the major petroleum giants."

While Dr. Hammer was making his way in the oil business, he was also spreading Occidental's wings to cover petrochemicals, sulphur, minerals and homebuilding. Most of the diversification came through acquisitions and almost every venture has proven profitable.

How does this jack of many businesses and master of what would seem all describe himself? "I am first and foremost a catalyst—I bring people and situations together."

Dr. Hammer organized his first million-dollar business, a wholesale chemical concern, while still a student at Columbia University's School of Medicine.

While waiting to begin his internship, Dr. Hammer heard about the famine in Russia following World War I. With some of the money he earned while a student, he bought a surplus field hospital and took it to the famine area.

Seeing that the people needed food, not medicine, he told Soviet officials: "I will bring over ships filled with grain if you will fill them with products I can sell in America." The Russian officials agreed. He became something of a hero in Russia and at the same time established a very profitable export-import business representing 38 leading American manufacturing companies. He obtained the first concession awarded by the Soviet Government, an asbestos mine in the Ural Mountains.

Why is Dr. Hammer still working 16 hours a day seven days a week when he has achieved both fame and fortune? "Believe me, I would pay Occidental to let me work" is the way he puts it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 25, 1967]

"MEAT FOR WILDMEN": RUSSELL BRONZE GIVEN TO WHITE HOUSE

(By Betty Beale)

The White House has acquired a bronze by the famous cowboy artist of Montana, Charles Russell. It is entitled "Meat for Wildmen" and called by the donor the finest bronze Russell ever created.

The sculpture was rushed to Washington from New York yesterday to arrive on the day of the dinner commemorating Montana Sen. Mike Mansfield's 25 years in the Congress. The majority leader called the President to tell him of the offer of the gift by Armand Hammer, president of the Occidental Petroleum Co., and President Johnson expressed his pleasure in receiving it.

It all came about because the White House dinner for the Shah of Iran. Both Mansfield and Hammer were at that party and admired the western bronze by Remington that is spotlighted in the downstairs corridor.

Hammer reports the senator remarked somewhat longingly, "Wouldn't it be marvelous if someone would present to the White House a Russell bronze as a match for the Remington?"

Mansfield knew that Hammer had the largest collection of Russell sculpture in the world because he bought the whole contents of the artist's house. Hammer took the hint and called his brother Victor, of the Hammer

Galleries in New York; to ship the bronze down at once, and it arrived yesterday.

Mrs. Johnson told him at the dinner honoring Mansfield last night that she had walked around it, admiring it, and was so happy it was in the White House. She also told him she was going to put it where the 1.8 million persons who come to the White House every year could see it.

The sculpture, resting on a revolving stand five feet in height, is three feet long, two feet wide and one foot high, said Hammer. Only 10 bronzes were cast from the original wax model which is in Montana's Historical Museum.

It depicts Indians on horseback attacking a buffalo.

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION OF 1956

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, today is recognized as the 11th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1956.

It is, therefore, fitting that we look back to that heroic event and recall the historic happenings which, for a period of several days, held the world spellbound.

Eleven years ago Hungarians rose up against the Soviet-imposed Communist regime. What we were then witnessing was a spontaneous, popular outburst of protest against an alien, Communist dictatorship.

A new and free government was installed at the capital of Budapest. With human courage and the simplest, manmade instruments of battle, Hungarians had succeeded in throwing off the yoke of Soviet imperialism.

Mr. President, no event since then has quite equaled the drama of those days. The high, unambiguous aspirations of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters will live forever as a testament to man's never-ending search for liberty and dignity.

The struggle of that day carries great meaning for all Americans. For we were once again reminded that the ideals and rights enjoyed in this country are truly universal in scope.

The proud history of the Hungarian revolution will live as long as men are possessed of the natural instinct to be free.

Together with thousands of Americans and native Hungarians living in the United States, I pay tribute to the brave patriots who in 1956 raised the banner of freedom to its zenith.

VIEWS OF GEN. MAXWELL TAYLOR ON CONTINUED BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, U.S. bombing of North Vietnam, as Gen. Maxwell Taylor has written, "is accomplishing the purposes for which it was begun, not perfectly but in such measures to represent an indispensable element of our overall strategy."

General Taylor, in a forceful article defending continued bombing, points out anew that the purpose of this most controversial aspect of the war in Vietnam is to convince our adversary of the futility of his attempt to impose a Communist regime on the people of South Vietnam.

General Taylor's credentials to comment both upon the military and political aspects of the war, and of the bombing, are of the highest order. He does, in this article, which I have taken from the Sunday Star of October 22, 1967, recount the history of the bombing strategy, the reasons for it, and the results. I commend it to everyone's attention and, further, want to commend the Washington Star for publishing the article. The Star is among the newspapers which have editorially called for a cessation of the bombing attacks against North Vietnam, we may recall. So it is a matter of editorial fairness by its editors that has led the Star to publish General Taylor's article in rebuttal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Gen. Maxwell Taylor's article citing the reasons for continued bombing of North Vietnam be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR CONTINUED BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

(By Maxwell Taylor)

The basic case for the bombing of North Vietnam is the need to do everything possible by all available means to create a situation for the leaders in Hanoi such that, from considerations of self-interest, they will change their ways and cease the aggression against the South. Since air power is a unique asset on our side (just as guerrilla power is uniquely theirs), it is only commonsense for us to exploit this weapon to the maximum consistent with the unusual context of the Vietnam conflict. I would stress that the context is unusual, a fact which accounts for the departure from what many would call the normal use of air power as demonstrated in past conflicts.

The decision to attack the military target system in North Vietnam was taken in February, 1965, only after long debate and much heart-searching within our leadership which had lasted literally for years. I became personally involved in the issue on the occasion of a visit to Vietnam in October, 1961, as a member of a mission sent by President Kennedy to review the deteriorating situation which had resulted from the effects of the "War of Liberation" declared in 1959 by Hanoi against South Vietnam. By the evidence, we became deeply impressed with the growing threat to the Diem government and, indeed, to the security of the entire country posed by the accelerated guerrilla campaign. Reflecting upon the significance of the events which we were witnessing, we included in our report to President Kennedy the following remarks:

"While we feel that the program recommended represents those measures which should be taken in our present knowledge of the situation in Southeast Asia, I would not suggest that it is the final word. Future needs beyond this program will depend upon the kind of settlement we obtain in Laos and the manner in which Hanoi decides to adjust its conduct to that settlement. If the Hanoi decision is to continue the irregular war declared on South Vietnam in 1959 with continued infiltration and covert support of guerrilla bands in the territory of our ally, we will then have to decide whether to accept as legitimate the continued guidance, training and support of a guerrilla war across an international boundary, while the attacked react only inside their borders. Can we admit the establishment of the common law that the party attacked and his friends are denied the right to strike the source of aggression, after the fact of external aggression is clearly established? It is our view that our government should undertake with the Vietnamese the measures outlined herein, but should then consider and face the broader question beyond." We did not decide at the time of our report to recommend the use of air power "to strike the sources of aggression" but many of us had the possibility very much in mind as we watched the evolving situation in the following years.

A CRITICAL PERIOD

I arrived in Saigon as Ambassador in July, 1964, and inherited the political consequences of the overthrow of the Diem government in the previous November. How historians will eventuality appraise the significance of this event I do not know, but its immediate result was a period of critical political instability with coup following coup as governments were overturned by the unresisted pressure of power seeking minority groups.

To the Communist leadership in Hanoi and the Viet Cong, the disappearance of their principal enemy, President Diem, was a boon which offered them unexpected opportunities which they were quick to realize. From their point of view, the entire year of 1964 was a period of exploitation of the fall of Diem during which they tried to score dramatic military or political successes, hoping to clinch the victory which they now felt to be within their reach. On our side, we worked feverishly to shore up the government in Saigon and to increase the South Vietnamese forces—military, paramilitary and police—still hoping to be able to cope with the growing guerrilla threat with indigenous resources. We lived dangerously in this period, never sure from night to night when a new coup might overthrow another feeble government or when we might lose some important provincial town to a surprise attack or a military base to mortar fire.

Toward the end of 1964, the enemy began to take as prime targets the American bases and billets throughout the country and inflicted serious losses in the mortar attack upon the Bien Hoa airfield in November, the bombing of the American-occupied Brinh Hotel in Saigon on Christmas Eve and the mortaring of the airfield at Pleiku in February, 1965. In all, we were faced with a generally deteriorating situation characterized by continued political turmoil, minority conflicts both within the population and within the Armed Forces, mounting terrorism against U.S. personnel and deepening discouragement throughout South Vietnam. These adverse trends led me to conclude in late 1964 that the time had come when we must employ the unused resource represented by our preponderant air power to carry the war to the North and "to strike the source of aggression" four years after we had first seriously considered it.

THREE CLEAR PURPOSES

When, after the attack on Pleiku, the decision was taken to initiate the air campaign, it was done for the clear purposes which seemed valid at the time and which, in my judgment, remain valid today to justify the continuation of the bombing. The first was to encourage the people of South Vietnam by the knowledge that, at long last, the homeland of the enemy was being attacked in some small compensation for the heavy losses indicted upon South Vietnam through the long years of the guerrilla aggression.

The second purpose was to use air power insofar as air power could be effective to limit and make more difficult the infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. I would emphasize that no one involved in this decision thought then or thinks now that air power alone can stop the infiltration from the North. Our experience in World War II and in Korea has indicated clearly that there are limits to the effectiveness of air attacks in keeping determined men from moving supplies and equipment on the ground under air attack.

However, that same experience also indicated that air power can indeed set limits on the size of forces which can be maintained in combat and can restrict the tempo of that combat when the enemy lines of communication are under constant air attack.

The third purpose was political and psychological in nature—the need to remind the leadership in Hanoi that henceforth they no longer operated in a sanctuary free from attack and that, as time went on, their homeland would pay an increasing price for the continuation of the aggression against the South.

Those being the purposes of the air campaign, we may appropriately inquire to what extent they have been fulfilled. Secretary McNamara has answered that question with minimum words, saying: "Weighted against its stated objectives, the bombing campaign has been successful." It was clearly successful in 1965 in raising the morale of the South Vietnamese who were overjoyed when they first received the news of the initiation of the air attacks. One must add, however, that this kind of lift is transitory and today the bombing attacks on the North are so commonplace that they occur without much comment or reaction in the South. However, we should remind ourselves that if, for no good reason and in exchange for no clear reciprocal advantage, these attacks were significantly curtailed or stopped, there would be a most serious negative reaction throughout South Vietnam that could have serious effects upon the willingness of this long-suffering people to continue a struggle which, beginning as political subversion in 1954, is now in its 13th year.

INTERDICTION EFFECT

With regard to the interdiction effect of the bombing campaign, I would concede at once that, as expected, it has not succeeded in stopping infiltration from North to South. Although I have no particular confidence in the accuracy of our estimate of the daily tonnage required to support the enemy forces in South Vietnam, which the growing use of artillery and heavy rockets is greatly increasing, I would also concede that the bombing in itself is never likely to reduce the flow of men and supplies below the absolute minimum required to keep the present forces alive and operating at the currently low level of combat activity. On this point of combat activity, our information indicates that an enemy battalion does not average in combat much more than one day per month, a level of activity which contrasts sharply with the four to six days per week of activity of maneuver battalions on our side. So if the bombing has not stopped the infiltration, there is much evidence to indicate that it has succeeded in making the movement of men and supplies to the combat zone slow, difficult and costly. It substantially increases the number of men and tons which must be dispatched from the North to get one man or one ton into South Vietnam.

At the time of the Tet bombing pause in February of this year, we had photographic evidence of the eagerness of the enemy to take advantage of any suspension of the bombing to move men and supplies with impunity in maximum numbers with maximum speed. When the preannounced hour for the Tet suspension arrived, the North Vietnamese logistic system moved immediately into high gear, speeding ships, trucks, trains and aircraft from North to South with maximum tonnage to take advantage of a sky clear of bombers. It is estimated that the cargo moved in this period was at a rate 15 to 20 times greater than that normal under conditions of bombing. It was an impressive demonstration of the capacity and efficiency of the logistic system of the North and a reminder of the war-sustaining capability there which is held in restraint by our bombing.

A SECOND FRONT

With regard to the third purpose, that of imposing a heavy price on North Vietnam for the conduct of the aggression in the South, the most eloquent testimonial of effectiveness has been the concerted propaganda campaign waged from every Communist capital to force the U.S. to give up the bombing campaign. Knowing our longstanding desire for peace negotiations, the Communists have set as a price for discussions the prior cessation of the bombing, obviously the one action above all others which they would wish us to take. I shall not lengthen this article by repeating the widely published tabulations of bomb damage to communications, power, petroleum, and the supply system of North Vietnam which constitute the statistical evidence of the effectiveness of the bombing in reducing the war-making and war-sustaining capability of North Vietnam and imposing a heavy burden on the fragile economy. It has, in effect, opened up a second combat front which the North Vietnamese must defend at great cost. We estimate that over 500,000 people have been diverted from military or civil pursuits to contribute to air defense and to repair the damage caused by the bombing. This is an important diversion of manpower already greatly taxed to replace the heavy battlefield losses in South Vietnam. This second front opened and maintained by our bombers offsets to some degree the guerrilla battle front in the rear areas of South Vietnam. Both employ the bomb as a primary weapon, ours delivered by aircraft, theirs delivered by guerrilla terrorists. This analogy should be borne in mind when one considers the reciprocity which we should require in exchange for any suspension or cessation of the bombing.

One may observe that if, in relation to its purposes, the bombing campaign is so successful, it is odd that so many people are urging our government to end or to modify it. There is no doubt that the air campaign is by far the most controversial element of our entire strategy and there is certainly some grounds to think that there must be something wrong with it if it causes so much domestic and international criticism.

As I understand them, the critics fall into two classes—those who say the bombing campaign does too little and should be stepped up and those on the other flank of the argument who say the bombing campaign does too much and should be stepped down or stopped.

CASE FOR "HAWKS"

The case for the "hawks" who say we should bomb more targets and bomb them harder rests upon a question of judgment, namely, how fast and how far should we apply the pressure represented by our air capabilities. At the outset, our leaders deliberately decided to apply this pressure slowly and gradually in order to give ample time to the Hanoi leaders to reflect and to adjust their behavior. This gradualism in the use of military force was dictated by a number of concerns all of which would seem understandable and indeed commendable. In a world of high tension politics and nuclear arsenals, any responsible government should go slow in taking actions which might conceivably result in misunderstandings or over-reaction leading to the outbreak of major hostilities. In the particular case of North Vietnam, there has been the added reason that we wished to bring Hanoi to its senses in time and in condition to exert influence upon the terminal settlement in South Vietnam. We are often reminded that even if Hanoi ceased to exist tonight, there would still be over 100,000 armed men in South Vietnam who might continue the conflict almost indefinitely if left to their own hopeless devices. We can find many examples among the Japanese forces by-passed in our Pacific campaign of units which maintained themselves in the field for years without communication or assistance from the homeland. Such conditions, if reproduced in South Vietnam, would present a formidable long-term problem for the South Vietnamese and indirectly for us. Hence the preservation of Hanoi as a government in being, potentially capable of joining with us at some time in resolving the entire Vietnamese problem, would seem a clear advantage—at least as of now.

If one accepts this point of view, then the rate of increase of air pressure becomes a matter of judgment and those who criticize the slowness of the increase cannot prove their case any more than can those who defend the current tempo. Is it more effective to move rapidly through the target system to the point where little remains except Hanoi itself or rather slowly so that the enemy always has something of value to salvage if he will mend his ways? My own feeling is that the rate has been about right and that the important thing is not so much a further expansion of the target system as is the relentlessness with which we continue day after day to maintain the pressure on North Vietnam with a constancy enforcing the impression of the inexorability of ultimate defeat.

For those who would end or sharply curtail the bombing of the North, I would point to the serious consequences of such action. If the morale of South Vietnam rose upon the initiation of the bombing, it could fall disastrously low if, for no valid reason, we ended it. There would be a similar reaction among our own troops who at present are fighting magnificently in seeming oblivion to the doubts and misgivings which bedevil some Americans at home. Our leaders would find it very difficult to explain to them, or for that matter to their families, why they were being deprived of the protection represented by the bombing attacks on the logistic system of North Vietnam. Under such conditions, I would expect a wave of violent criticism in the U.S. which would far exceed the complaints which we are hearing now.

EFFECTS ON HANOI

The effect upon the Hanoi leadership would also be adverse to our interest. Ho and his colleagues would be overjoyed at a success which they would attribute to the international and domestic pressures generated by their propaganda and the weakness of the American Government. If the latter could be compelled to give up so clear an asset as the bombing, the Communist leaders would expect to be able to win any contested point if they were tough and patient enough about it. If they came to a negotiation table following such a concession, we could be sure of encountering nothing but hard-nosed, uncompromising positions. They would have no incentive to expedite negotiations and every reason to fall into the Panmunjom pattern of foot-dragging and stalling while we continued to suffer casualties inflicted by the guerrillas in South Vietnam. Having given up the important "blue chip" represented by our air campaign, we would be hard put to leave the negotiation table with an agreement even minimally satisfactory to our side.

One may object that these consequences would apply only to a complete and final cessation of the bombing but not to another pause which many think would be reasonably sure to result in negotiations. Even if one is skeptical about this possibility after the experience of the six previous bombing pauses, isn't it worth taking the limited risks involved and trying a pause for another reasonable period?

In replying, one is in the realm of opinion as always when undertaking to evaluate the consequences of some future event. However, to me at least, the disadvantages of another pause are quite clear and reasonably certain whereas the advantages are contingent upon highly unlikely events. Even if the enemy did not exploit the pause to gain important military advantages, even if he opened discussions or negotiations during the pause, our act of having yielded to pressure in accepting the pause could create the effect on Hanoi described above and would make it harder ever to get a reasonable settlement at the peace table. Also in the present atmosphere at home and abroad, it would be much more difficult than formerly to resume the bombing if the pause produced no meaningful results and it would be very easy to drift from a suspension of the bombing into a de facto cessation with all the consequences forecast in our earlier discussion.

RECIPROCAL ACTION

Even if we gave up our bombing in exchange for some reciprocal action by Hanoi, we should be very careful with regard to the nature of this reciprocity. One often hears the suggestion that we should stop our bombing for the agreement of the other side to stop infiltration. This to me is a very dangerous bargain, since it will be most difficult to verify the fact of the cessation of infiltration except over a prolonged period of time. If, as seems likely, a cease-fire, total or partial, were in effect in the period, verification would be almost impossible since we depend largely upon captured prisoners and documents to give us hard evidence of infiltration. If under these conditions we would stop our bombing, we would never be sure whether we were getting value promised by the other side.

In this connection, I have often thought that a better reciprocal action in exchange for a progressive cessation of the bombing would be a simultaneous and parallel reduction of guerrilla incidents in South Vietnam. These incidents are known and recorded so that it would be quite possible to relate the sortie rate flown by our aircraft against North Vietnam to the number of guerrilla incidents in South Vietnam. Thus, we would have two scales of activity which could be moved up and down in relation to one another. This would have a certain logic since, as I mentioned at the outset, there is an analogy between the two campaigns being waged against the rear areas of North and South Vietnam—the one by our bombers, the other by their guerrillas.

The conclusion which I have derived from the foregoing considerations is that the bombing campaign against North Vietnam is accomplishing the purposes for which it was begun, not perfectly but in such measures to represent an indispensable element of our overall strategy. That strategy, we must remind ourselves, is for the purpose of changing the will of the adversary and bringing him to accept the impossibility of imposing a Communist regime on South Vietnam. If that strategy fails, we fail in our objective of an independent Vietnam free from aggression and able to choose its own government. To give up the element of our strategy represented by the bombing of North Vietnam without a countervailing quid pro quo would be a deliberate act of self-denial which could weaken our side at a time when it should be strengthened. Such an act would dismay our Vietnamese and Free World allies, would needlessly expose our troops and would stiffen the will of Hanoi to hold out for unacceptable conditions and to hang on until we give up. Thus, it would be a course of action contrary to our national interest and to the interests of all others desiring a prompt settlement leading to an enduring peace.

INFLATION PROBLEM: RISING COSTS, TAX INCREASE, THE WRONG MEDICINE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, prices are rising too rapidly and they are likely to continue to go up too fast.

But a tax increase is exactly the wrong way to fight the kind of inflation we face.

The New York Times yesterday published an excellent analysis of the nature of the current inflation that is plaguing us. The analysis shows that it is rising costs, not excessive demand that is the prime culprit for increasing prices.

There are few shortages—no general shortages of factory capacity to produce all the goods we want, no overall manpower shortage, but there is, indeed, a shortage of skilled workers in some lines.

Most of the price increases that have plagued the economy have come from the rise in the price of food. This is true in both the Consumer Price Index and the wholesale price picture.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, what assistance would a tax increase give us in fighting inflation. It will not keep down food prices. No one contends that it will.

It will not significantly assist in solving the acute problem we are suffering in some areas from the shortage of skilled workers. In the general areas of overall manpower and productive facilities, where a tax increase could, indeed, ease demand pressures, there is no shortage. There is, in fact, a surplus.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article in the New York Times printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Prices of Goods and Services Responding to Rising Costs—But Is It Inflation?

(By Douglas W. Cray)

A ranking economic villain, inflation, is back on page one again.

Almost daily one is confronted with the word that such and such an item is, henceforth, going to cost the purchaser more money.

And almost daily one is also confronted with a kind of strained hand-wringing from someone in Washington or elsewhere who keeps an eye on such things to the effect that these price increases are a threat; a threat that brings the specter of inflation a step or two closer.

As the respected Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis capsuled it in its latest monthly economic review:

"Although strengthening of total demand has been accompanied by additional real output, prices have also increased. Price increases have reflected the rising costs associated with excessive demands for total product a year ago. Consumer prices increased at a 4 per cent annual rate from April to August after rising at a 2 per cent rate during the previous eight months. The recent acceleration was primarily in food prices. Prices of all consumer items except food have increased at a 3 per cent annual rate since April, virtually the same as the rate of the previous eight months."

There has been a similar flurry of activity on the wholesale price front. As the same bank put it: "Wholesale prices, reflecting in considerable measure developments in agricultural products and processed foods, have increased at a 2.3 per cent annual rate from April to August. This index had fallen at a 2 per cent rate from last August to April. Wholesale prices of finished industrial goods have risen at a 1.5 per cent rate since April, about the same as in the previous eight months."

That's the backdrop for the uneven price picture that has been drawing increasing attention in recent months from economists in Washington and elsewhere.

In addition to the more familiar indicators such as the consumer price index and the wholesale price index, economists also pay close attention to another key measure of the impact of upward price movements on the whole economy. This one is known formally as the "implicit price deflator for total gross national product." In ordinary consumer terms, this means simply an index of the price changes occurring in all the goods and services that go into the G.N.P.

In the third quarter of this year, this index stood at 117.7 up 3.3 points from its level in the quarter a year ago.

This plainly reflects the creeping up of prices. But whether it qualifies as "inflation" is another question.

There are a host of price-front examples—evidence that economists everywhere are putting into their data books or, as some put it, "cranking" into their computers. The input includes, to pick some current and completely random entries, the following:

Late last week Revere Copper and Brass, Inc., announced it was raising prices of all its copper products by 2 cents a pound, and all copper alloy products 1 cent a pound.

Owens-Illinois, Inc., on the same day announced that it would raise prices of most of its glass containers.

Last month, the Freeport Sulphur Company, raised sulphur prices. A few days later, the Allied Chemical Company increased its price for sulphuric acid.

In mid-September, the Rexall Drug and Chemical Company raised the price of polyethylene resins. The Union Carbide Corporation followed suit a short time later. This month, the Ethyl Corporation increased its price for polyethylene packaging film.

Six weeks ago, International Nickel, which produces 60 per cent of the Western world's nickel, raised its price for the metal by 8¾ cents a pound to 94 cents. Stainless steel companies followed and companies that produce nickel-bearing copper and brass alloys moved next.

General Motors raised prices on its 1968 models an average of $124 a car, or about 4 per cent. Chrysler and Ford also decided to charge more, although Chrysler subsequently announced a partial rollback, bringing it more into line with the others.

Generally all the companies' formal announcements have cited the pressure of increased costs.

In many of the above instances, "production" and "labor costs" have been fingered as the culprits; the reason why product prices were being raised.

Citizen X, raising the price of product Y, always has a reason why Consumer Z is going to have to pay more money for it. That reason, currently at least, inevitably seems to come to rest on "increased costs."

This, in turn, suggests that somebody else, back there up the line a bit, raised his prices too . . . ahead of Citizen X. That somebody could be either a producer of a raw material, that is, wheat, corn, copper, coal or whatever; or it could be the men who work the fields or mines, that is, labor.

It confronts one in the mid-inflation maze with the age old question of which came first, increased costs or increased prices?

The question endures as does the maze. Talks last week with the economists in Washington who keep closest track of price movements and the patterns that create elicited no definitive answers to this one, quite possible because none really exist.

But talk of such things as the behavior of the basic yardsticks—the Consumer Price Index and the Wholesale Price Index—did shed light on what's going on and where.

The talks also elicited skepticism that wage and price controls are just around the corner.

Some businessmen, wary of the risks to the economy from the continuing war in Vietnam, have deemed it prudent or sound management to raise posted, or catalogue, prices now in order to be prepared for a freeze when, and if, it should come.

Government officials who would be most intimately involved in any such undertaking indicated there was not a shred of evidence at this point to warrant such fears.

These same officials did, however, call attention to a cost-push that exists now and promises to be much in evidence as 1968 gets under way. This cost-push is the shortage, in some sectors, of skilled labor.

Shortages, whether it be manpower or material, inexorably lead to increases, in economic terms, at least. Manufacturers, for example, actively seeking manpower to fill gaps in production lines are fully prepared to recruit (one cost) and train (another cost) the needed bodies. They are also prepared, as production continues apace, to pay (still another cost) whatever terms are finally agreed upon in labor contracts.

Thus the most widely known price indicator, the Consumers Price Index, stood at 116.9 in August, up 2.7 percent from last year. September figures are due next week from this market basket sampling of some 400 separate items that John Q. Public buys or might buy from his grocer's, automobile dealer's or haberdasher's stock.

One may skim through the assorted ingredients of this composite and come up with a shelf-full of inklings. Apparel prices, for example, are significantly higher this year than last year, reflecting among other things increased wages in the industry and, looking ahead, a short cotton crop. There has also been a perceptible widening of margins in the apparel industry at both the retail and wholesale level.

Also in the non-durable sector of the CPI one notes that footwear prices are, again, significantly above last year's levels—up 4.7 percent as of August, 1967, from August, 1966.

Here again there is a reflection of such things as increased prices for hides and skins.

REASONS FOR RISES VARY

Moving on to such other basics as gasoline, one also finds increases from last year, some of them vaguely tied by the marketers to the Suez Canal shutdown. In the view of some of the most seasoned economists in Washington, a more meaningful explanation for the bulge now being registered in gasoline prices is the absence this year of the retail "price wars" that have marked the gasoline station scene in recent years on both coasts.

As for the durable goods corner of the CPI, one readily notes the jump—2.7 per cent in August—shown this year in used car prices. Here there is, in the view of top Government officials, a "market situation"; a "situation" that includes such factors as the increase in the number of teenage drivers and the scarcity of late model used cars.

When one comes to "services" one encounters some even larger jumps, including medical costs—up 8.9 per cent in August from the same month a year ago. Medical costs are presently the subject of some Congressional scrutiny, especially in the area of drug prices.

But transportation services are up too, with local transit sharply higher along with automobile repairs, registration and license fees. The jump in automobile insurance, also a part of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' CPI "services" category has, to date, been much less this year than in 1965 and 1966.

Finally, in this increasingly affluent era, that CPI shows an increase of 3.8 per cent so far this year in men's haircuts. This, it is felt outside of barbershops, reflects the growing popularity of "styling," a more expensive way of saying, and obtaining, a haircut.

Matters are much the same on the wholesale price index, up 0.3 per cent in August and perhaps another 0.2 per cent in September. But the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and others, are hopeful of getting the necessary funds to refine its data on the wholesale price front.

It is well recognized, for example, that posted or list prices at wholesale market levels do not necessarily reflect actual selling prices. Discounts are commonplace, especially in aluminum at this point. As it stands now, the BLS wholesale price index measures only posted prices, not actual marketplace prices.

It has been suggested in some quarters that another reason businessmen have been publicly edging up their posted prices at the same time that they are not-so-publicly doing business at former prices is for the possible stock market-public relations value therein. Investors, it is felt by some, are likely to be attracted to the corporation that is, fashionably perhaps, in step on the price front, not lagging behind out of step.

Still, it is certainly true, that one hears fewer official and sturdy blasts these days from Washington about all of these individual steps in the price-rise picture. It appears to some observers that the Council of Economic Advisers has accepted, perhaps reluctantly, the creep-up to the extent that it hovers near the 3 per cent level and saves its full arsenal for those major breakthroughs beyond, say, the 3 per cent range.

All of which leaves one tracking "inflation" right back where one started from: with more questions than answers.

But as one knowledgeable Washington economist put it a bit wistfully last week: "The climate, insofar as prices are concerned, has clearly changed" . . . seasonally adjusted, of course.

ALSOP REPORT ON ALLIED PROGRESS IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, one of America's most perceptive columnists, Joseph Alsop, has written a series of articles from Vietnam vividly describing the marked allied progress in that war-torn land.

His article showing the allied successes in II Corps is exemplary of the entire series.

II Corps covers about one-half of the strategically vital and fertile central region of Vietnam. Because of its geography the course of the war here is considered predictive of the progress in other corps areas.

Once large units of North Vietnamese troops roamed almost at will, strongly reinforcing the Vietcong's iron hold over the population.

According to firsthand reports by Mr. Alsop, this has all changed drastically.

The crack 3d and 5th North Vietnamese Divisions have all but crumbled into ruin and the 95th Regiment, desperately called in for replacement, has been caught, punished, and driven back to its hungry mountain refuge.

With the breakdown of the large North Vietnamese units Alsop notes that Vietcong control of the countryside has withered. Captured documents show the Vietcong has desperately called for reinforcements—which the Allies continually drive back. As Alsop vividly puts it, "the VC here are in a dreadful, probably irreparable mess."

The thrust of this and his other articles is that the conflict is being won on all fronts. His knowledgable report evidences that the only stalemate in Vietnam is in the total lack of progress by the enemy.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's article, published in the Washington Post, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vietcong in a Dreadful Mess in Region Held by II Corps

Nha Trang, Vietnam.—"Pray God the United States never, never gets into this kind of a stalemate!"

The young intelligence colonel gave the shortest and most vivid possible summary of the situation here in II Corps, which constitutes about half of the strategically vital central region of South Vietnam.

Six months ago, when I was last in II Corps, the VC were already in a mess here—and a mess that was all the more interesting because it seemed to predict the course of the war in other corps areas. II Corps is still predictive, and now it is fair to say that the VC here are in a dreadful, probably irreparable mess.

II Corps is predictive because of its very special geography of its corps areas, to the west are the tumbled mountains of the Annamite chain and the wide savannahs of the high plateaus. Here are few people and resources. Along the seacoast on the east are fertile, alluvial rice plains, each embayed in mountain masses, and here, in these rice plains are just about all the population and resources.

It can be seen, then, that the enemy's big units—the North Vietnamese divisions and the supporting VC "main force" and provincial battalions—are bound to have a very thin time in II Corps whenever they lose effective access to the coastal rice plains. And this has made the costal big units specially vulnerable.

Hence the North Vietnamese regiments of the so-called B-3 front, in their Cambodian sanctuary beyond the western frontier, have merely been contained by the American 4th Division, which guards the high plateaus. Meanwhile, the lion's share of II Corps resources—the air cavalry, the Koreans, and other Allied units, as well as some good South Vietnamese outfits—have been employed to harry the enemy's big units out of the rice plains. The results are dramatic by now.

In Binhdinh Province, as already reported, what used to be the best North Vietnamese division in the South, the 3d, has all but crumbled into ruin. In Phuyen and Khanhhoa, the two regiments of the 5th North Vietnamese Division are in no better shape. And in the provinces farther to the south, although more limited resources have been available, the combined rollback and erosion of the enemy big units is also proceeding apace.

What is interesting about this process is not the fate of the big units. What is interesting rather is the effect on the VC control of the population and the VC base in the countryside, once the big units have been driven into hungry, ineffectual refuge in the mountains, where these "big brothers" can no longer give real support to their little brothers in the plains below. This could be foreseen six months ago, when there was documentary evidence that the 18th North Vietnamese Regiment was retained in Binhdinh because of pleas by the province party committee. The committee warned that the whole VC structure would be endangered if this wretched regiment, then down to 600 men, went north to safer territory to refit and pick up replacements.

What was then merely foreseeable has now begun to come to pass in deadly earnest, however. Take Phuyen Province, once the domain of the 95th Regiment of the 5th North Vietnamese Division, plus the tough 30th VC main force battalion. Soon after the Koreans pushed down into Phuyen (where the VC used to hold everything up to the suburbs of the province capital) the 95th Regiment was so badly mauled that it fled into the high mountains to lick its wounds.

That was last December. By May, captured documents show leading members of the local party network were grimly complaining that VC control had been lost in whole districts of the vital rice plain; that dire damage had been done to the VC base in the countryside by defection, capture and loss in battle of great numbers of essential cadres; and that, in short, the situation in the rice plain was near-desperate.

For this very reason, beyond doubt, the 95th Regiment got a good many hundred replacements during the spring. The coastal big units in II Corps now enjoy almost absolute replacement-priority, it noted. And what then happened to the 95th in turn indicates the kind of result this priority has thus far everywhere produced.

In brief, when brought up to strength, the regiment was ordered to descend again into the rice plain, with the prime mission of staying there permanently to aid the local VC and the secondary mission of collecting rice for its own hungry requirements. It did so, preparing a strongly fortified position in the northwest corner of the main plain. It also did some damage that could probably have been avoided by more rapid response to the intelligence. Reinforcements came, but fairly late.

Even before the reinforcements arrived, however, the Koreans and the local South Vietnamese army units had caught up with the 95th; had punished it cruelly; had driven it out of its new fortifications; and had chased it back into mountain-refuge again. In the process, a Korean regiment also trapped the 30th VC main force battalion. And in prisoners and killed, including the battalion political officer and the second in command, the Koreans destroyed just over half this veteran battalion's total strength of about 300 men.

Driven by necessity, small elements to the 95th Regiment are still trying to return to the plain in search of rice, of which they are desperately short. The fight is not over. The damage recently done is only beginning to be repaired. But the essential fact to note is that the big units were called to the rescue by the VC party apparatus in the populous areas of Phuyen, and this rescue party ignominiously failed. If rescue was so badly needed, and there is no real hope of rescue, what will be the future of the apparatus?

ELEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, 11 years ago the free world was stunned as a brave people, struggling to secure the rights of free men, was ruthlessly and cruelly crushed under the heel of communism. In the years since the Hungarian revolt untold suffering has been endured by millions of people under the weight of the Communist system, but nowhere has the suppression, the elimination of freedom and the lack of justice been more complete than was experienced in Hungary.

Last month delegates from 18 American and European countries attended the Fifth World Congress of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation in Ottawa, Canada. At that meeting the Freedom Fighters reaffirmed their position on several issues and I think we would all do well to examine those issues carefully and let them be a constant reminder of how precious our freedom is.

Two of those points bear repeating today. The Freedom Fighters stated that, despite misleading tactical changes, Hungary is still a colony of Moscow. It is significant that on November 7 the Soviet Union will observe the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution. Within that period of half a century the spider web of the Communist ideology has reached out to ensnare nearly one-third of mankind. Yet the Soviet propaganda mill asserts that the Western Powers are colonialists seeking to ever increase their sphere of influence. This indeed is an incredible assertion and a thin coverup for what has been the most ambitious effort to extend a political system ever witnessed.

The Freedom Fighters also pointed out that the policy of "building bridges" is a one-way road. A unidirectional funneling in which goods and goodwill are utilized by the Communist government with no benefit or change in life of the millions of oppressed Hungarians.

Mr. President, I have made many speeches in the past stressing this same point, and I again call attention to the fallacy of attempting to build bridges of trade to Communist nations without demanding concessions in return which would be helpful to the advancement of freedom throughout the world. In return for our trade I believe we should demand a religious freedom, or allowing American newsmen into Communist countries, or any number of other actions which would bring some small measure of freedom and hope to people such as the Hungarians.

Mr. President, on the 11th anniversary of the Hungarian revolt, I call on all free men to reassert their belief in the cause of freedom and once again pledge their support to the Hungarian people. Eleven years after the heroic effort of the Hungarians our admiration has not dimmed for those who did not fear death.

THE COMMITTEE PRINT ON SMALL BUSINESS CRIME PROTECTION INSURANCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on April 11 of this year, I introduced S. 1484, to provide a program of Federal assistance to small businessmen in obtaining insurance protection against criminal activity. At that time, I was convinced that such a program was necessary in order to supplement the insurance then available from the insurance industry.

As a result of the testimony at the hearings held by the Committee on Small Business and the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I have become even more convinced of the urgent need for a Federal program to help provide crime protection insurance for small businesses.

I am happy to report that the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, under the able leadership of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] has been working steadily on this problem since the hearings held by it in mid-September. This has resulted in the publication by the Small Business Subcommittee of a committee print of a bill which would make crime protection insurance available to small businesses under a Federal program which emphasizes maximum participation by the private insurance industry.

I am gratified that the committee print, while adhering closely to the principles enunciated in my bill, S. 1484, would make the administrative implementation of a federally aided insurance program for small businesses even more expeditious. I am confident that the 31 cosponsors of S. 1484 will join me in commending the efforts of Senator McIntyre's subcommittee.

It is my hope that all Senators concerned with the plight of small businessmen who are trying to earn a living in our high crime rate urban areas will join me in urging an early consideration of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee print and a memorandum outlining its provisions, together with a list of the cosponsors of S. 1484, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cosponsors of S. 1484

Senators Bartlett, Bayh, Bible, Brewster, Byrd of West Virginia, Case, Clark, Cooper, Fannin, Gruening, Hart, Inouye, Jordan of North Carolina, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Long of Missouri, Mondale, Monroney, Montoya, Morse, Moss, Nelson, Pell, Proxmire, Randolph, Scott, Smith, Sparkman, Tydings, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, and Young of North Dakota.

S. —

A bill to assure small business concerns of the availability of insurance against property losses resulting from criminal activity

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Small Business Crime Protection Insurance Act of 1967".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds that criminal activity has caused acute hardship and serious economic loss to small business concerns in many areas of the Nation; that such hardship and loss threaten the continued vitality and existence of small business enterprise in such areas; and that there is an immediate need to assure small businesmen of the opportunity of obtaining insurance against property losses resulting from criminal activity to complement vigorous programs of crime prevention activities at all levels of government and society.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act (1) to authorize the institution of a small business crime protection insurance program through the cooperative efforts of the Federal Government and the private insurance industry; (2) to assure that the Federal assistance authorized in connection with such program will be provided only to the extent, and for so long as, it is necessary to enable small business concerns to obtain such protection on reasonable terms and conditions; and (3) to encourage small business concerns and State and local governments to improve and modernize their standards of crime deterrence and protection.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(2) The term "small business concern" has the same meaning as when used in section 7(a) of the Small Business Act.

(3) The term "criminal activity" means robbery, burglary, arson, vandalism, and such other crimes as the Administrator may by regulation prescribe.

AUTHORITY TO INSURE AND REINSURE

Sec. 4. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Administrator is authorized to provide, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, insurance and reinsurance against property losses by small business concerns resulting from criminal activity.

(b) The authority conferred by this section shall be subject to the following conditions and limitations:

(1) No insurance or reinsurance shall be provided under this Act covering risks against which adequate coverage is available from other public or private sources on reasonable terms and conditions.

(2) No insurance shall be provided under this Act, if the protection sought to be provided by such insurance can be achieved through the reinsurance authority conferred by this Act.

(3) No insurance or reinsurance shall be provided under this Act to protect small business concerns from property losses due to criminal activity, unless such concerns conform to such minimum standards with respect to crime deterrence and protection as the Administrator shall by regulation prescribe.

(4) No insurance or reinsurance shall be provided under this Act to protect small business concerns in any locality from property losses due to criminal activity, unless the Administrator determines that there is being carried out in the locality a program (conforming to standards and criteria established by the Administrator) to reduce the incidence of, and provide increased protection against, criminal activity.

(c) In the exercise of the authority conferred by this Act, the Administrator shall make continuing surveys of areas in which small business concerns are receiving the benefits of insurance or reinsurance under this Act with a view to determining whether in any such area, as the result of the institution of effective crime deterrence and protection programs or otherwise, adequate insurance coverage is available to such concerns without the assistance authorized under this Act. If, as the result of any such survey, the Administrator ascertains that the incidence of crime in any such area has dropped, he shall take whatever steps he deems practicable to increase the insurance industry participation in the program being carried out in that area under this Act, and decrease the participation of the Small Business Administration. If the Administrator ascertains that adequate insurance coverage is available in the area to small business concerns on a reasonable basis without the assistance authorized under this Act, he shall no longer make such assistance available in that area.

PROPERTY AND LOSS LIMITS; RISK CLASSIFICATION

SEC. 5. The Administrator, after consultation with the advisory committee established under section 12, shall provide for the determination of types and location of property of small business concerns with respect to which insurance or reinsurance shall be made available under this Act, and the nature and limits of loss or damage in any area which may be covered by such insurance or reinsurance. The Administrator, after consultation with such advisory committee, may, from time to time, issue appropriate regulations regarding the classification, limitation, and rejection of risks assumed under this Act.

DIRECT PRIVATE INSURANCE

SEC. 6. The Administrator shall use his best efforts to encourage private insurance companies to undertake the issuance of insurance policies covering property losses by small business concerns resulting from criminal activity. In this regard, the Administrator shall exercise a liberal loan policy in extending loans to small business concerns for the purpose of improving their standards of crime deterrence and protection if, as a result thereof, the small business concern shall then become eligible for such insurance coverage on a reasonable basis with no additional assistance under this Act, or shall thereby meet the minimum standards as prescribed by section 4(b)(3) of this Act.

REINSURANCE AUTHORITY

SEC. 7. (a) The Administrator shall, whenever he determines such action to be in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, provide reinsurance to private insurance companies to cover excessive losses under policies issued by them insuring small business concerns against property losses resulting from criminal activity. The premium rates and terms and conditions applicable to such policies shall be subject to approval by the Administrator having due regard for the purposes of this Act. The Administrator shall provide a method of ascertaining that portion of a loss paid by an insurance company which is to be deemed excessive for the purpose of reinsurance under this Act. In this regard, the Administrator shall be entitled to review all claims paid by the insurance company under policies issued by it under the program authorized by this Act.

(b) The Administrator shall negotiate with insurance companies for the purpose of establishing fees for reinsurance offered to such companies under this Act. Such fees shall be based on a consideration of the risks involved and shall, insofar as practicable having regard for the purposes of this Act, be adequate in the judgment of the Administrator to produce sufficient proceeds over a reasonable period of years to pay all claims for losses.

INSURANCE AUTHORITY

SEC. 8. (a) The Administrator shall provide insurance against property losses by small business concerns due to criminal activity whenever he determines that adequate coverage at reasonable rates is not otherwise available to such concerns.

(b) The Administrator shall, from time to time, establish a schedule of premium fees for insurance policies issued under this section. Such fees shall be based on a consideration of the risks involved and shall, insofar as practicable having regard for the purposes of this Act, be adequate in the judgment of the Administrator to produce sufficient proceeds over a reasonable period of years to pay all claims for losses. All fees so established shall be uniform for similar risk within a given area.

POLICY AND PROGRAM LIMITS

SEC. 9. The aggregate amount of insurance policies and reinsurance agreements outstanding at any one time under this Act shall not exceed $

FUNDS

SEC. 10. (a) There are hereby established in the Treasury two revolving funds as follows: (1) an insurance fund which shall be available for the payment of proved and approved claims for losses under, and other nonadministrative expenses arising in connection with, insurance issued by the Administrator under this Act; and (2) a reinsurance fund which shall be available for the payment of proved and approved claims for losses under, and other nonadministrative expenses arising in connection with, reinsurance issued by the Administrator under this Act.

(b) Fees collected by the Administrator for insurance issued under this Act shall be paid into the insurance fund. Fees collected by the Administrator for reinsurance issued under this Act shall be paid into the reinsurance fund. In addition, appropriations are hereby authorized to be made to such funds, as capital thereof, in such amounts as may, from time to time, be necessary or appropriate, which appropriations shall remain available until expended.

(c) Business-type budgets for each of the funds established by subsection (a) shall be prepared, transmitted to the Congress, considered, and enacted in the manner prescribed by law (sections 102–104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 847–849)) for wholly owned Government corporations.

CLAIMS PAYMENT AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 11. (a) Under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, he shall arrange for prompt adjustment and payment of valid claims for losses covered by insurance or reinsurance under this Act.

(b) Upon disallowance of any claim against the Administrator under color of any insurance or reinsurance made available under this Act, or upon refusal of the claimant to accept the amount allowed upon any such claim, the claimant may institute an action against the Administrator on such claim in the United States district court in which a major portion (in terms of value) of the insured property of a business concern is located. Any such action must be begun within one year after the date upon which the claimant receives from the Administrator written notice of disallowance or partial disallowance of the claim. For the purposes of this section, the Administrator may be sued and he shall appoint one or more agents within the jurisdiction of each United States district court upon whom service of process can be made in any action instituted under this section. Exclusive jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon United States district courts to hear and determine such actions without regard to the amount in controversy.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 12. (a) The Administrator shall appoint an advisory committee without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, which shall consist of not more than fifteen persons selected from among representatives of the insurance industry, State insurance officials, and from among members of the public. The advisory committee shall advise the Administrator in the preparation of any regulations prescribed in accordance with this Act, with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this Act, and shall perform such other duties as the Administrator may, from time to time, assign to such committee.

(b) Members of the advisory committee shall, while attending conferences or meetings thereof, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Administrator, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

POWERS

SEC. 13. In the administration of this Act the Administrator may exercise any of the powers conferred upon him by sections 5 and 6 of the Small Business Act.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 14. The Administrator shall include in his annual report to the Congress a comprehensive statement concerning the operation of the insurance and reinsurance programs authorized by this Act, together with such recommendations for legislation to improve the operation of such programs as he deems necessary or desirable.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate for the carrying out of the provisions of this Act other than those for which appropriations to the revolving funds are authorized by section 10(b).

MEMORANDUM ON COMMITTEE PRINT: SMALL BUSINESS CRIME PROTECTION INSURANCE

Under this Committee Print the Administrator of SBA is authorized to provide insurance and reinsurance against property losses by small businesses resulting from criminal activity, when such insurance or reinsurance is not available from private or other public sources at reasonable rates. The direct insurance would be offered by SBA only if the protection cannot be obtained through the reinsurance provisions of the Act. Insurance or reinsurance would be provided if the small business concern conforms to certain crime protection measures as SBA shall prescribe and would be provided in those areas in which there is being carried out an SBA approved program to reduce criminal activity.

The Committee Print provides that SBA shall make continuing surveys of areas covered by the Act to determine if conditions are such that adequate insurance can be obtained from private sources. If such insurance is available, he shall no longer make assistance available under this Act in the area.

SBA is authorized under the Committee Print to provide for the determination of types and locations of property for which insurance or reinsurance can be obtained under this program and the nature and limits of loss or damage in any area which may be covered by such insurance or reinsurance.

The Committee Print directs the SBA to institute a liberal loan policy for loans to small businesses for improving their crime deterrence and protection.

The Committee Print authorizes SBA to provide reinsurance to private insurance companies with respect to policies issued by them under this program. Rates and terms applicable to such policies shall be subject to SBA approval. Fees for reinsurance shall be negotiated by SBA and the private insurance companies. Such fees should be adequate, insofar as practicable, to produce sufficient proceeds over a number of years to pay all claims for losses. The SBA is empowered to review all claims paid by insurance companies under this Act.

SBA is also authorized under the Committee Print to provide insurance to small business concerns when it is unavailable from private sources at reasonable rates. SBA shall establish a schedule of rates and fees to be charged for insurance it issues under the Act. Such fees shall be adequate, insofar as practicable, to produce sufficient proceeds over a reasonable number of years to pay all claims for losses.

The Committee Print establishes the amount of insurance and reinsurance which may be outstanding at any one time under the Act. It establishes an insurance fund and a reinsurance fund at the Treasury and provides authorization for appropriations needed for these funds. It provides for claims payments and judicial review for the disallowance of any claim under the Act. It establishes an advisory committee of 15 members to advise the SBA in the preparation of regulations and policy under the Act.

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from California, who is necessarily absent today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURPHY

In Vietnam today, young Americans are engaged in combat with an enemy seeking to impose its form of government by force upon the people of another nation. Eleven years ago on this October 23, young Hungarians fought to break the domination of their country by the same kind of enemy. The uniforms are different, the scene of battle is different, but the foe in Hungary in 1956 and the enemy in Vietnam in 1967 are of the same stripe. Americans fight in Vietnam to assist the people of South Vietnam from being overrun by Communists, Hungarians fought in Budapest 11 years ago to throw off the Communist yoke.

The Hungarian revolution of 1956 electrified the world. It shattered once and for all time the myth that the peoples of Eastern Europe were satisfied with the stifling domination of the Soviet Union that had been their lot since the close of World War II. It showed in dramatic fashion that freedom dies hard within the hearts of people, and it demonstrated that an enslaved nation will explode when squeezed too hard by Communism's straitjacket.

The passage of time has dimmed the memories of Hungary's short-lived attempt to attain the status of a free nation, but one thing has not been forgotten. This is the bravery of Hungarians who fought with the crudest of weapons against the mighty army of the Soviet Union.

It is pertinent, Mr. President, to briefly recount the events of October 23–November 4, 1956, in Hungary. Those were proud days, not only for Hungarians but for freedom-loving people everywhere. We should not forget that during this period there existed a free Hungarian government, one that withdrew from the Warsaw Pact, attempted to negotiate for the removal of Soviet troops from Hungary and sought United Nations' recognition of its status. During this period, thousands of Hungarians were freed from political imprisonment, including Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty.

Beginning with demonstrations by factory workers and students in Budapest, the revolt enjoyed quick success. Then Russia clamped down, crushing the fight for freedom on November 4 with attacks in strength on Budapest and other large Hungarian cities. The valiant freedom fighters were unable to stand up to the might of Soviet armies and the light of freedom that had been lit on the streets of Budapest was extinguished.

It is to the credit of the United States, Canada and other Free World nations that immigration gates were opened for the admission and resettlement of more than 150,000 Hungarian freedom fighters who fled across the border to Austria. The Hungarian refugees who settled in the United States have become useful, productive and patriotic citizens. These refugees understand completely the evils of Communism, demonstrated by their unswerving support of the American effort in Vietnam.

The Fifth World Congress of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation was held in Ottawa, Canada, from August 31 to September 4, 1967. The organization by resolution declared that Hungary at present "is still a colony of Moscow, in spite of misleading tactical changes." It reaffirmed its demands that Russian occupationary forces be removed from Hungary and that Hungary be given the right of self-determination through free elections. I support the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation in those views.

JOHNSON-LEE DISCUSSIONS A MARKED SUCCESS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the bonds of friendship and mutual respect between Singapore and the United States have been strengthened by the useful discussions this week between Prime Minister Lee and President Johnson.

President Johnson's concern for the problems of all nations in Asia—large and small—led to a development of close personal rapport between these two champions of a free Asia.

Prime Minister Lee expressed agreement with the fundamental precepts underlying our entire Southeast Asian policy: Regional cooperation in an area which has known dissension and discord; the right of every nation in Asia to choose its own way of life free from outside interference—an ideal being defended there today; an honorable settlement in Vietnam which, in the words of their joint statement, will "enhance the prospects of peace and security for the rest of South and Southeast Asia."

President Johnson thus has enlisted the continued support of a trusted ally in his efforts to help Asia break the chains forged by generations of oppression.

The spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding which marked their dialog is the keystone to a vibrant, free Asia.

Regional cooperation, not rival competition; mutual accord, not rank discord: These are the building blocks of a prosperous Asia.

Their agreement to work toward implementation of these principles marks the Johnson-Lee talks with success.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BALTIC DECLARATIONS OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, 1968 will mark the 50th anniversary of the declarations of independence by the three Baltic nations of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. When the revolution freed the Russian nation from the fetters of czarist rule, these Baltic States fulfilled their national dreams of self-government and declared independence from Russia. It is this act, of hope and determination, which we in the U.S. Congress call attention to.

In the brief time before the start of World War II the peoples of these nations formed their own democratic governments, rebuilt their war-shattered lands, and fostered the national customs and freedoms which they held so precious. Unfortunately Soviet Russia stepped in to interrupt liberty and peace, under the umbrella of shameful agreement with the Nazi aggressors. The Russian invasion and occupation in 1940 marked the end of independent progress in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and ushered in deportation, starvation, and tyranny.

Mr. President, it is important that we draw attention to this half century mark since the Baltic States proclaimed independence, especially when the last quarter of this time has been endured without this independence. It is our sincere hope that one day soon these three nations will again have the independence and freedom they proclaimed in 1918 and which they so justly deserve.

THE COPPER STRIKE'S 100 DAYS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, yesterday the State of Utah celebrated an unenviable and very damaging milestone. One hundred days ago Sunday the employees of the Kennecott Copper Corp. went out on strike.

Today on the 101st day of the strike I shall not attempt to discuss the merits of the relative positions of management and labor. That is not my function as U.S. Senator. I do believe, however, that I should call to the attention of this body and of the parties involved, that there is a very significant public interest here which has been ignored and which to date has been damaged severely. The impact of the strike on the economy of my State is tremendous.

To date, Utah's economy has lost $37,673,000 and in a population of a million people, this kind of economic injury is severely felt. The average employee has lost $1,968 in wages in the 101 days since the strike began. Furthermore, based upon the initial offer of the company an employee will have to work 18.92 years to make up the lost wages. If an additional 10 cents per hour could be negotiated over the initial offer, an employee would still have to work nearly 9.5 years to make up the difference.

These figures, Mr. President, point up the futility of the strike and the fact that thousands of copper employees in my State and throughout the Nation, are no longer benefiting from the strike nor do they have any prospect of real eventual economic improvement.

It is my understanding that contract talks which have been conducted on a sporadic basis during the past several weeks were called off over the weekend and the differences between the unions and management are such that a settlement at this time is very remote indeed.

Seldom in the history of my State has a situation existed where the invocation of section 208 of the Taft-Hartley law was more justified. I with five of my colleagues, have sponsored a Senate resolution designed to inform the President of the United States that it is the sense of the Senate that the Taft-Hartley law be invoked and this crippling strike now affecting the entire Nation be ended at least temporarily.

In light of the present improbability of a settlement, I think that hearings on my resolution are now mandatory. The time has come when the standoff between management and labor should give way first, to the views of the strikers themselves and secondly, to the public interest. In a recent poll published Sunday, October 22, in the Salt Lake Tribune, 70 percent of the copper workers expressed a desire to return to work while negotiations continue. Many of these people are on welfare and any nest egg which they may have accumulated is now gone. The copperworkers are ready to go back to work and I do not believe they should be prevented from doing so.

It is time that the union leaders in Pittsburgh and the management officials who are negotiating this contract realize that the primary interest to be met at this moment is that of the employees and the communities wherein they work. By this, I am not saying that either side must make concessions. What I am saying, Mr. President, is that we must have the Taft-Hartley law now.

There are several reasons why the copper workers must get back to the mines, smelters and refineries. They must again start earning a wage to sustain their families and wives and children. The use of the Taft-Hartley law by the President would hopefully spur negotiations between labor and management.

Another critical reason is that our copper supply is being rapidly exhausted.

I am told that domestic firms including those supplying war material have had to turn to purchasing copper from overseas companies, thereby easing the pinch in their manufacturing or in keeping orders current. However, at the same time they and we as taxpayers are paying a premium price, often as much as 33 percent more, for the copper, than would be required under the last domestic price.

In other words, not only are 45,000 persons out on strike, many perhaps wondering where their next rent money is going to come from, but the cost of copper-made products is certainly going to reach inflationary levels which will eventually deal these same strikers and the users of coppers a double economic blow.

Surely, Mr. President, we have reached a point where strategic factors dictate the use of the Taft-Hartley law by the President of the United States. The Salt Lake Tribune published an editorial on Sunday, October 22, which greatly illuminates the entire matter. I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why Not Negotiate While Men Work?

As long as contract talks between the Kennecott Copper Corporation and the United Steelworkers of America were underway the hope existed; futile though it may prove to be, that a settlement might be reached. But when the talks were broken off last week, it became obvious that no progress had been made and that the two sides might be even further apart than when the joint sessions began.

So the strike, now in its 100th day, will continue until meaningful negotiations become possible.

Kennecott accuses the union of blocking such negotiations by insisting on company-wide bargaining. The Union, while professing a willingness to bargain locally, demands a "satisfactory and simultaneous" agreement covering all Kennecott workers. And that is just another way of saying "company-wide bargaining."

Now Kennecott has taken the issue to the National Labor Relations Board by filing a charge of unfair labor practices against the union on the grounds it introduced an extraneous issue ("satisfactory and simultaneous" agreement) which does not involve wages, hours and other terms of employment.

The Union, in reply, said it welcomed the opportunity to submit "all the facts" to an impartial government agency.

The NLRB's findings might clear the air, but they are not likely to speed settlement of the strike. These hearings take time and the damaging effects of the nationwide copper strike may well bring direct Federal intervention, perhaps in the form of a Taft-Hartley injunction, long before the NLRB can hand down a decision.

It is sometimes said that things have to get worse before they get better.

But how much worse can the effects of the copper strike become?

Utahans are painfully aware of the damage the strike has done to the economy of their state. Tax revenues are falling. Welfare costs are rising. Business is being curtailed. And with each passing day, the economic picture becomes gloomier and gloomier.

Nationally, the story is the same. For all practical purposes, the copper industry is shut down. Factories using copper in their products are badly squeezed. The war in Viet Nam makes heavy demands on the copper supply. How long can this process of deterioration continue before the Federal government intervenes?

A Presidential decision to invoke the Taft-Hartley Law on the grounds the strike threatens the nation's health and safety would send the strikers back tc work for 80 days. That would not of itself bring a settlement, but it would certainly clear the way for meaningful negotiations. And the history of Taft-Hartley indicates that, with few exceptions, an injunction is followed by a settlement.

However, if the union and company so decide, no injunction would be necessary to send the strikers back to work and permit the resumption of copper production. The mood of Kennecott employees, as revealed in a survey by Bardsley and Haslacher, Inc., points in this direction. Seventy percent of the rank-and-file employees favor returning to work while negotiations are carried on the research firm reports. It is also significant that fifty percent of those interviewed called the strike and its settlement their most important family problem.

We urge the union leadership to study these findings carefully. After 100 days of stalemate, the leadership would do well to consider a new approach. A gesture of good will, like a back-to-work decision, might be just what is needed to break the impasse. It certainly would be welcome by the people of the community.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL SUPPORTS NEW FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, change is always difficult, even when the case for change, in the public interest, is clear and compelling.

In the case of changing the basis for reporting the Government's financial plan and program through its budget, that change will be especially difficult.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal editorialized that to most Americans the Federal budget system "annually produces little more than a mountain of paper thickly shrouded by fiscal fog."

Frankly, Mr. President, I think that the same impression is held by many Members of Congress. Of course, we have a principal responsibility to act on that budget.

Recently, a Presidential Commission has proposed some interesting and useful changes that would provide a single budget that would be highly useful to the public and to Congress in evaluating and directing the enormous Federal Government.

All of us in Congress have a duty to study this recommendation. It could greatly enhance our performance for the benefit of the taxpayer and all Americans.

The Milwaukee Journal recently discussed the new budget proposal in a highly competent editorial that concisely suggests some of the reasons it deserves consideration by Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Oct. 22, 1967]

BUDGET THAT MAKES SENSE

To most Americans, the federal budget system annually produces little more than a mountain of paper thickly shrouded by fiscal fog. One reason is that the government actually operates with three budgets, none of which provides a truly revealing picture of income and outgo.

There is great merit, therefore, in the proposal of a presidential commission to replace the three with one comprehensive document that would give taxpayers, and probably many congressmen, a much clearer notion of what they are buying, how they are paying for it and what the overall impact will be on the economy.

The administrative budget, the one most commonly referred to each year, is an antiquated accounting concept dating to President Garfield. It ignores nearly one-fourth of receipts. It excludes, for instance, the massive trust funds for social security and highways, which take in more money than they pay out.

The inevitable result is confusion, as federal expenditures and receipts are greatly underestimated and deficits are heavily exaggerated. If businessmen followed this horse and buggy method of accounting many would appear bankrupt. Furthermore, public fascination with the administrative budget encourages every president to use bookkeeping tricks to make him appear as prudent as possible. This merely piles deception atop distortion.

The two other budgets—consolidated cash budget and national income accounts budget—tend to give a more complete picture, but each has shortcomings. The special commission proposes to combine the most illuminating features of all three budgets.

The major question is one of timing. President Johnson may hesitate to install a new system in an election year and provoke fresh charges of "gimmickry." Further, realistic budgeting could show a deficit larger than currently anticipated under existing methods of projection. This, too, is a deterrent to a changeover in 1968.

Nevertheless, the traditional way of figuring the budget is a conspicuous failure of popular government that the nation should not tolerate much longer.

IN PRAISE OF MORGAN DUBROW—FATHER OF DICKEY-LINCOLN PROJECT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, since the first proposal for the development of the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in Maine, Mr. Morgan Dubrow of the Interior Department has been an invaluable friend to New England.

Mr. Dubrow's expertise on multipurpose water conservation projects was crucially important to the Maine congressional delegation in our work to gain congressional authorization of Dickey.

Without his enthusiasm for the project, and his convictions on its value, Dickey may never have reached President Johnson's desk or the Congress.

His analyses of Dickey's benefits and feasibility have withstood the stiffest campaign against a Federal power project ever raised by the private power industry. His findings have been substantiated by the only special House study of a Federal power project in memory. His conclusions have been justified by the Bureau of the Budget, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, and every other agency which has reviewed Dickey's merits.

In short, no Federal project has ever received as much preconstruction study as has Dickey, and the fact that Mr. Dubrow's analyses have stood up against this unprecedented review demonstrate both his professional skills and the value of the project itself.

In a recent article published in the Portland Sunday Telegram, Washington correspondent Donald R. Larrabee reviews Mr. Dubrow's work for Dickey and recognizes his contribution to the project, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Sunday Telegram, Oct. 8, 1967]

DUBROW: FATHER OF DICKEY

(By Don Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—The name of Morgan Dubrow probably doesn't mean much to anyone in Maine, even the most ardent supporters of the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power development for which he has labored a great deal during the past six years.

But it is doubtless true that without Dubrow's personal and professional involvement in the Upper St. John River project, the Dickey plan would not have moved to its present advanced state of approval in Congress.

Dubrow has been the Interior Department's chief engineering adviser on Dickey from the beginning. He has been through every major private vs. public power controversy in the past quarter-century, having been associated with the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

As Interior's top man in engineering and hydrology, he was asked in 1961 to head up an evaluation study that led to the Dickey-Lincoln School proposal. At the time, the Maine Congressional Delegation's long battle for Federally-assisted water resource development had received a setback from the International Joint Commission which questioned the feasibility of the Passamaquoddy Tidal Power project.

Sen. Edmund Muskie prevailed on President Kennedy to order a review of the Commission's report by the Interior Department. Secretary Udall handed the job to a team headed by Dubrow. Out of this study two years later came a package deal which substituted Dickey and Lincoln School sites on the St. John river for the old Rankin Rapids site. For years, Rankin Rapids was regarded as the ideal power site because it would have used the full flow of the Allagash.

It was this decision that made it possible for the Interior Department to work out its partnership plan with Maine to preserve the superb recreational areas of the Allagash from flooding.

Looking back on this history, the mild-mannered Dubrow fairly erupts these days when he hears outcrys from those who say the Government has not considered conservation aspects in its pell-mell rush to build New England's first Federal power dams.

"Why," Dubrow said, "we could have produced about $3,500,000 a year more in power from Rankin Rapids but we would never have been able to preserve the Allagash as a free-flowing stream for recreational use. Secretary Udall made an absolute decision that we were going to protect it.

"One of the first things we did was to look at the conservation question. At the original meeting, the Secretary made it crystal clear to me that despite substantial additional power benefits from Rankin Rapids, he considered himself the keeper of the Nation's wild rivers and the Government official most responsible for conservation. The Secretary laid down the ground rules that we were to come up with a reasonable substitute that would preserve the Allagash."

It is often overlooked but the Interior Department, rather than the Corps of Army Engineers, has carried the ball for Dickey in the Johnson Administration. This is the agency that handles transmission of public power but it is also the Department most involved in preserving our natural resources and environment. And it is headed by an ardent conservationist, Udall, who has seen the Allagash and the St. John River and believes in the proposal now awaiting final planning money from Congress.

Congressman William Hathaway is surprised by the recent surge of conservationist opposition to the Dickey project. When the matter was before Congress for authorization two years ago, there wasn't a witness against it from such groups as the National Parks Association, the Sierra Club, the Izaak Walton League or the Wilderness Society. These organizations are vigilant, active and vocal in their opposition to hydroelectric projects which threaten recreational and scenic resources.

"I'm flabbergasted," Dubrow remarked a few days ago. "For anyone to say we haven't paid attention to conservation is sheer madness." He said the Fish and Wildlife Service has made basic studies on the fisheries and protective language will be written into the treaty agreement with Canada which is now in the final drafting stages.

As soon as the Army Engineers receive the first construction funds, a comprehensive recreation plan for the Dickey and Lincoln Reservoirs will be developed, according to Dubrow. The project is expected to flood some 135 square miles or 86,000 acres of timberland. In its stead, there will be a huge lake for fishing and other forms of recreation.

The Agriculture Department, in a separate report on the Dickey project two years ago, foresaw one additional benefit for Maine farmers deriving from the flood control aspects of the project. Assistant Secretary John Baker noted that the plains along the St. John River between St. Francis and Van Buren were so prone to flooding that several thousand acres of high quality farm land had been abandoned by owners.

The Dickey project is expected to give a high degree of flood protection to the whole river plain and this should make it possible to develop and improve the flood plain land for more intensive agricultural use.

LYNDA BIRD CHOOSES WEST VIRGINIA GLASS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have recently noted in the press that the President's daughter, Miss Lynda Bird Johnson, who is soon to be married to Marine Capt. Chuck Robb, has chosen as her crystal, glass produced in my own State of West Virginia.

This crystal, called "President's House," is manufactured by the Morgantown Glassware Guild, Inc., of Morgantown, W. Va.

West Virginia is the home of a number of fine glass producers as well as several of the Nation's largest sheet glassmakers. However, it is the fine, handblown glass to which I refer today.

This product is a link with the past, for the art of blowing glass and crystal has changed little over the centuries.

Strong men with strong arms and lungs are as needed today as hundreds of years ago to give molten glass its initial shape. Similarly, no machine can replace the skill and precision of the human hand and human eye at knowing the precise curve to give a glass goblet or vase so that it becomes a work of art—functional, yet beautiful.

I am proud that Miss Johnson has chosen a West Virginia crystal, and I hope that it serves her well through many happy years of marriage.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled, "But What Will She Wear?" published in the New York Times of October 18, 1967, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 18, 1967]

But What Will She Wear?

(By Enid Nemy)

The fashion guessing game, apparently a favored White House amusement, is once again at a peak. This time, it is occasioned by the forthcoming marriage of Lynda Bird Johnson to Capt. Charles S. Robb of the Marine Corps.

The President's elder daughter, who has revealed some intimate details of her romance and engagement in an article in McCall's magazine to be released next week, is reluctant to discuss less personal subjects. The designer of the bridal gown for the Dec. 9 ceremony, and the trousseau plans, are shrouded in secrecy.

The White House policy of silence, which has resulted over the years in rumors, ensuing denials from press secretaries and a merry round of sleuthing more normally associated with mysteries than with first families, is confined primarily to anything connected with the world of fashion. It does not apply to the accouterments that will grace the table of the newlyweds.

A White House announcement yesterday confirmed that Miss Johnson had selected Chantilly flatware by Gorham for her silver pattern ($41.50 for a four-piece table setting of knife, fork, teaspoon and salad fork). The Louis XV design was originally introduced by Gorham in 1895 and, according to a company spokesman, "is ornate but restrained and has been the most popular pattern we've had in the last 30 years." It is the pattern her mother uses.

JEWELER REFUSES TO TALK

The announcement added that Miss Johnson had chosen the Tuxedo pattern by Lenox for her china and The President's House pattern by the Morgantown Glassware Guild of West Virginia for her crystal.

The Tuxedo pattern, an all-white service with a narrow gold rim, and another circle of gold near the rim, is $37.95 for a five-piece place setting of dinner, salad, bread and butter plates and cup and saucer.

The President's House, an unadorned tulip-shaped crystal originally selected by Mrs. John F. Kennedy and still used in the White House, is $1.60 a glass.

There was no information forthcoming on any part of the wardrobe planned for the wedding. "Lynda wants, as every bride does, her dress to be a surprise to the groom," said Mrs. Marta Ross, a White House press spokesman.

However, there is reason to believe that some serious approaches have been made regarding her wedding dress. One of the companies said to be in the forefront of the bridal sweepstakes is the House of Bianchi in Boston. The family-operated concern, founded in 1949, is the closest approach to a custom wholesale house. Bridal gowns sell for $175 to $800 (average price is $325) in stores across the country.

Phyllis Bianchi (Mrs. Bernard Lange), president, head designer and daughter of the founder, refused any comment when told of the report. But other sources insisted the concern had been at least asked to submit sketches for consideration.

Miss Bianchi, whose spring and summer collection is now being shown in New York, currently favors high stovepipe necklines, an easy line with a suggestion of fit under the bust and fabrics like silk and wool that have some body. She prefers ivory to white and often designs a dress and coat costume to wear during the ceremony. The coat, which is fashioned to look like part of the dress, can then be removed for the reception.

Although Miss Johnson obligingly posed last month displaying her engagement ring, the White House has not disclosed where the yellow gold band with three diamonds was purchased.

PATTERNS OF CHINA AND CRYSTAL

Harry Winston, the New York jeweler who is said to have been commissioned to do both the engagement ring and the wedding band, would neither confirm nor deny the reports. "Any announcement will have to come from the White House," he said.

Miss Johnson, a slim (size 8 or 10), tall (5 feet 9 inches) brunette partial to somewhat more make-up and hair than are currently fashionable, is no stranger to the manufacturing edifices on Seventh Avenue.

She is as fond of clothes as most 23-year-olds and more able to indulge herself than most. A recent shopping expedition during which she spent $4,000 for 25 fall and winter outfits was not unusual, according to manufacturers.

"She's in and out of here all the time," one of them reported.

"She gets one, two or three outfits here each season," said another, who added that her visits had been more frequent since she joined the staff of McCalls magazine last year at a salary reported to be less than $10,000 a year.

The eight middle-priced houses chosen by Miss Johnson on her last shopping safari here (she returned for one day of fittings after her recent Acapulco vacation) were unanimous in their opinion that the clothes she bought then were not for her trousseau.

"They were all wool or a similar fabric," said Pat Sandler, the designer for Highlight, where she bought two outfits ($300). "Unless she's going North, she certainly wouldn't use them for a honeymoon."

The dress to be worn by Mrs. Johnson at her daughter's wedding is also the subject of speculation. Two of her favored designers—Adele Simpson and George Stavropoulos—said they had not as yet been approached and Mollie Parnis, a third, said, "I can't discuss whether I've been approached."

A RESPECTFUL REPLY TO CRITICS BY ALLAN GERDAU

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times contains an advertisement written and paid for by Mr. Allan Gerdau which is, as he himself puts it, "a respectful reply to critics."

Mr. Gerdau has great faith in our American system and in our present leadership, as his letter indicates.

He has written:

> Opponents abroad and—to a lesser, but even sadder and more dangerous extent—dissidents at home not only do not state truthfully and simply the objectives of our country and our leaders that we elected to fulfill them, but they misrepresent and distort.

This statement is no denunciation of those who disagree. It is, indeed, a respectful answer in which a private citizen has stated his belief and has pointed out some of the distortions and misrepresentations which he feels are lessening allegiance to our Nation and are serving to encourage our opponents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gerdau's advertisement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 19, 1967]

Deep Thanks for the Friendly Letters, Including a Remittance, Helping This Respectful Reply to Critics

(Re my letter New York Times, Sept. 28, 1967)

A nation, or individual, that does not take a stand, is not worth a damn!

Our country has taken a stand.

Nobody knows if our chosen position is the infallibly perfect one.

Nor must it be inevitably wrong, as some would have us believe.

No longer is it the time for us civilians to decide whether we should fight on this or that hill, or fight at all. The fact is, that we ARE fighting. A policy decision to stand has been made. Our four last Presidents have supported this stand.

Knowing the seriousness of military decisions and the disasters that might ensue from military defeat, our founders wisely gave to our elected leaders the responsibility—first, to gather all information and facts possible regarding any danger to our freedom. Then, if they found the danger critical, in deliberation with their aides, to act decisively and promptly to prevent the danger from overwhelming us.

It is one thing to dispute, to vacillate, and to make mistakes in peaceful times. Then, generally, we can correct errors when discovered. Defeat, when we are fighting, may not give us a second chance. That is why our system gives so much authority to leaders who are responsible for our protection.

When our leaders debate military matters in public there is a grave danger that we civilians will take our relatively meager knowledge too seriously. Emotions are beginning to influence many of us into behaving as if *we* had the understanding, the noble intentions and love of peace and that our leaders have less or none of these.

One ex-boy-scout leader wrote me that any boy scout leader would make a better general than Westmoreland and that we should remove him.

Our citizens may not give this opinion their support, but do not let us fool ourselves. A terrifying number of citizens who may not even have a boy scout's training, are recommending the removal of our leaders. The immobilization of our leaders and lack of united effort that our opponents so urgently seek, *we* may bring about by permitting the nonprofessional to usurp the function of leadership.

It is one thing, for the bleacher buffs in baseball to know who should pitch, how to pitch, and how to run. They make baseball more fun. They add to the zest. They do little, if any, harm. God bless them! Actually, however, they do not really want to make the decisions themselves. They prefer to leave decisions to professionals and then have the pleasure of roaring.

Not so with the bleachers in our national life. Not only can they harm us, they can bring us defeat. Military decisions are best left to the military under the Commander-in-Chief. The protection of our nation has been bought with their valor. They will not betray us. Our defeat is far more likely to come from our lack of proper support to our leaders, than from our leaders' lack of ability or willingness to defend us.

"Dilettantism," said Carlyle, hypothesis, speculation, and a kind of amateur search for Truth; toying and coquetting with Truth—this is the sorest sin."

During our past crises, by luck or voting intelligence, we have provided ourselves with able leaders. Our present leaders are possibly one of the best-informed and effective teams we have ever had in the field to protect our safety. To undermine our own professional strength in the midst of a fight is not reasonable conduct.

In times of stress, we have always had protestants and dissenters, which endangered our country. As one man wrote me: "Washington had his Tories; Lincoln, his Copperheads; Wilson, his Firstists; Roosevelt, his Fascist. Never, never were they right—no never."

The conquest of a free and friendly nation by outside military force, is a deadly threat to us, even without considerations of honor. Just because our friend seems miles away seems to make it easier for us to be more indifferent than if he were in Staten Island. In today's world he is only seconds away from us. And if we were to demonstrate that distance cools our loyalty and our pledges our smaller friends must accept enslavement.

Many believe if their friendly neighbor is murdered or attacked, it is no concern of theirs, even regardless of a pledge—"pull down the shades, to hell with the neighbor. Just fortify your own house. When the next neighbor is attacked, again pull down the shades; again strengthen your own house."

To desert your friends at such a time, even miserably to dishonor your pledge deviously or candidly, might not be so bad materially for the moment. But, our national neighbors are not just murdered. They are forced to join the attack against us. By force the number against us is increased. Worse yet, they may no longer communicate with us or the free world. Imprisoned. To climb the prison wall means death.

Our aims and policies are so genuinely friendly, and even kindly to mankind, that our opponents do not dare announce them to their people simply and truthfully. They do not dare announce that we wish all nations to have their own customs and own forms of government; they do not dare announce that we hate war almost above all else, with only one exception—we hate loss of freedom for ourselves and our allies more; they do not dare announce that we fight only when external force is used against us, or an ally.

Opponents abroad and—to a lesser, but even sadder and more dangerous extent—dissidents at home not only do not state truthfully and simply the objectives of our country and our leaders that we elected to fulfill them, but they misrepresent and distort.

Distortions and misleading statements have been important factors in bringing about many wars. Distortions also injure our internal unity.

Subsequently I shall illustrate by example some distortions of the present.

In the past we wished to grow peacefully and in good-fellowship with the Germans. Their leaders preferred to misrepresent our policies and aims. Only thereby could they induce their citizens to fight us. They even misrepresented *their* intentions and methods.

We did not fight to enslave the Germans, nor to force our methods or government upon them. Victory enabled us to prove our friendly intentions. Former opponents have become our friends.

The same happened in Japan. Again we have become friends. Again they have retained their own customs and own government.

Many believe that the two world wars could have been prevented, had we, a united people, simply, clearly and convincingly stated that our nation would fight as one, together with all freedom loving nations against conquest by foreign military force. Our present leaders have not made this mistake. Clearly they have announced their determination to resist any armed aggression against our nation or against a friendly ally. Our present leaders are proving to the world that we mean what we say. This is very important. While our leaders are protecting our honor and safety we, as a nation, have to prove that once our nation decides to fight, we fight as one.

It is well known that the Communists expected us, long ago, to break up through riots and civil rebellions. They have been surprised, mightily, that this did not happen among free men. They almost gave up hope. Now, suddenly, they have become encouraged by our dissensions—while our armies are fighting.

About the surest way to bring attack from a bully is to let him know or hope that you will not stand. Or, if there are several, that they can divide their intended victims. Among the surest ways to defeat an army is to kill its spirit. One of the best ways to kill its spirit, is to have it believe that its cause is considered only a minor one at home and to receive half-hearted support.

Another method of undermining is to confuse the issues or pretend that we fight for any other cause than an urgent need to protect our nation.

When our professional look-outs spot an approaching army, it is dangerous for those who are not on the lookout to deny the fact. In our present struggle, the facts are even more simple. Attack, and invasion—from the outside against a friendly nation—were begun.

Our leaders do not ask for surrender. *We* shall not surrender.

Our commanders hate war at least as much as the rest of us. They plead and plead for a friendly exchange between our opponents and ourselves. All we seek, is safety from outside attack against us, or against a friendly ally. Our opponents decline to discuss matters in a friendly atmosphere. Instead they demand unconditional surrender of part of our armament. History has given us the right answer for that one—General McAuliffe's "Nuts" to the Germans. To be fair to our opponents, they do not demand that we turn over part of our forces to them. They only ask that we tie one arm behind our back, while they attack the other. "Nuts"!

Our nation believes in reciprocity. To get nothing in return, is not reciprocity. Our belly is full with hopeful but unrealistic concessions. If there *is* reciprocity, let our present opponents spell it out.

It almost seems that there is a diabolical and cunning influence from some source over our opponents. There seems to be an intentional demand which they know in advance is a military stupidity. Their demands seem to be so one-sided, that they can have only one purpose—the increasing of debate and dissension in our land.

I shall now refer to present distortions and misrepresentations that tend to lessen allegiance to our leaders and encourage our opponents:

1. "Our nation is hated." Of course our nation is hated. Every nation is hated by someone. Even the spiritual leaders of the world's great religions have been hated. But, what a distortion of truth! No other nation has more respect and more good will from the outside world than ours.

(*I have been around the world many times, to Australia and the Far East about nineteen times. I have lived abroad for many years. Since my international merchant training commenced in 1916, I have known no nation to grow more in the respect and devotion it receives from the world at large.*)

2. "We are hated in Viet Nam." While dictating this reply, I received an unexpected visitor from South Vietnam. He called to thank me for my reply to Mr. Roth. The visitor added, that we must not be surprised if we are hated by North Vietnam, and even by many in South Vietnam. To them, we look like the French. He explained that it is a totally new experience for an Asiatic nation that was colonialized to have a powerful Western nation fight for the welfare and freedom of the Asiatic nation. That we wish them to have the same benefits from freedom as we wish for ourselves is hard for them to believe.

3. "We wish to force our customs and government on the South Vietnamese." How often do we hear this among our own people even though it is not in the minds of our leaders. History disproves the charge.

4. "The English fought harder, because bombed." There is no more courageous or better fighter, in my opinion, than the Englishman. But did they not also fight harder because they monthly became stronger—or hoped so to become? They knew to yield meant conquest by the foe. The German is not considered a cowardly fighter—but was his fighting capacity improved by bombing, by the destruction of his war-making machines?

5. "Civilians are killed." Of course, the lives of civilians are endangered, when living close to military targets. Of course, when new inventions enable a larger range to reach arsenals and targets far beyond former capacities—more civilians are endangered. Would more lives be spared, if these military targets increased their production of destructive armaments? Furthermore, I doubt if any commanders have ever tried in battle to protect civilians more than ours in this war. We have been slow to apply our power, and increased our own deaths thereby.

6. "Doves and Hawks." Nice, playful names for games—but mischievously misleading in our troubled times. We all long for peace—we are all a peace loving nation—we wish to give and receive friendship. We all want to defend our homes. We are not Doves nor Hawks—our bird is the Eagle.

Cheers to our leaders who know the facts and dedicate their lives to protect us. Deep thanks that they are not dismayed when we are slow to give them the support that loyal citizens owe in battle.

Many wanted to remove Washington, Franklin was accused of theft, Lincoln was almost impeached, Grant was slandered. But their devotion to our country did not falter. May the burden of our present leaders be similarly bearable, while we rally to their support.

We can select victory. We can select defeat. We cannot have half victory, or half defeat.

Nor will the world judge us half victorious or half defeated.

Our preference is to join with our opponents in full victory for mankind, but defeat we shall not accept.

ALLAN GERDAU,
President, Tontine Emporium, Inc.,
82 Wall St., New York.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND CUTBACK

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, on October 8, 1967, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation sent a telegram to the Governor of the State of Idaho indicating a cutback on Federal aid highway trust funds for fiscal 1968. It is my understanding that similar telegrams were sent to the Governors of each of our States.

The reason for considering such cutbacks, according to Secretary Boyd was due to congressional discussions on substantial reductions in Federal expenditures.

This proposal, understandably, caused our Governor, Hon. Don Samuelson, great concern. Less than a year ago, action similar to that now under consideration was taken by this administration. The confidence that a participating State and those who are paying for the funding of such programs through gas taxes and other taxes is being taken.

How can we plan in advance, Mr. President? How can contractors who have hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in specialized equipment and trained personnel prepare bids and enter into contracts for surveys and construction of highways with such threats as this being used twice in 1 year?

These funds are trust funds set aside for a specific purpose. They are not in the same category as the usual appropriated funds. It may well be that a delay in the program is temporarily deflationary, but the end result will be more inflation. Where men and equipment must seek other contracts, it will cost more money to have them return to half completed work.

I have been advised by personnel in the Department of Transportation that no decision on this matter has been made yet. I, for one, believe the decision should be made at once, that this whole proposal should be dropped and that we proceed without further delays and interruptions on this highway program which is so essential to our economy and our safety.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Secretary Boyd's telegram to Governor Samuelson on August 8, Governor Samuelson's reply, and a copy of my letter to Secretary Boyd be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. Don Samuelson,
Governor, State of Idaho,
Statehouse, Boise, Idaho.

Dear Governor: In view of recent Congressional discussion on substantial reductions in Federal expenditures, it may become necessary to impose ceilings on the Federal-aid highway program in the immediate future. If this action becomes necessary, I would propose to establish quarterly ceilings on the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds effective November 1, 1967.

Under consideration are three alternative levels of reduction in your authority to obligate Federal-aid highway funds for new projects for the next 12 months. The alternative levels of reduction nationally and for your State are: $2.2 billion, $1.0 billion, and $600 million.

Procedurally, each State would receive a quarterly ceiling which would be 25 percent of its annual apportionment of Interstate and ABC (primary, secondary and urban) apportionments (at a $4.4 billion national rate) less a quarter of its share of the total reduction. Any reduction would be prorated among the States in the same ratio as the apportionment of Interstate and ABC funds.

Under this procedure, your State could submit new Federal-aid projects for approval up to the obligational ceiling for each quarter. Within the ceiling, projects could be submitted for (1) preliminary engineering, (2) acquisition of rights-of-way, and (3) advertising for bids for construction.

Existing unobligated balances would not be a factor because the quarterly ceiling on obligations would be 25 percent of your annual apportionment of funds less your share of a selected reduction.

It is my desire to receive from you as rapidly as possible your comments as to the impact this will have upon the programs of your state as well as on your economy. I also would like to receive your comments and/or suggestions on the above proposed procedure for carrying out a reduction in the Federal-aid highway program in the event it is necessary. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Alan S. Boyd,
Secretary of Transportation.

Boise, Idaho,
October 10, 1967.

Alan S. Boyd,
Secretary, Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.:

Reurtel 8 October 1967 concerning possible imposition of ceilings on F. A. highway program for fiscal '68. Direct response to two questions asked as follows: (1) Obligation authority ceilings set forth in alternate proposals would reduce Idaho highway program for remaining portion of fiscal '68 by (A) 80 percent: (B) 39 percent: and (C) 31 percent. (2) Should any reduction in the F. A. highway program be undertaken at any time, reduced apportionments should be directly proportional to full apportionments. Existing unobligated balances from prior releases should remain available for use.

Any of these proposals would have an extremely serious impact on the economy of Idaho. It would create chaos in the construction industry where highway program represents twenty five percent of Idaho heavy construction work and accounts for about thirty percent of heavy construction employment. Supporting heavy equipment, materials, bond, insurance and financing institutions would incur commensurate loss of business. Professional and technical personnel will leave highway field for more stable employment. Schedules and commitments for utility relocation: local government agreements and related work: and, the orderly relocation of business and residential properties would be seriously disrupted. Your testimony before Joint Senate and House Public Works Committee on 27 February 1967 stated that "a full annual program level of 4.4 billion will be put into effect with the start of the new fiscal year on July 1". As late as 20 June 1967 a wire to the Department of Highways from E. H. Swick for F. C. Turner, director of public roads, stated that "The 4.4 billion rate of fund availability suggested by Secretary Boyd in his testimony of February 27 before the House and Senate Public Works Committees will be realized."

This wire further stated that "trust fund balances are estimated to be adequate to sustain the release of rates indicated herein." Based on these assurances, a special session of the Idaho Legislature increased the State tax on gasoline and diesel fuel, to become effective 1 January 1968, so as to be in a position to utilize all Federal aid funds available to Idaho. Action as suggested by your wire of 8 October is not consistent with earlier commitments and cannot be considered to be in good faith. A substantial portion of highway user taxes is already diverted from the Federal aid highway trust fund to other purposes at the Federal level. There can be no valid reason for considering a holdback on that portion which does go to the trust fund where it is held "in trust" for a program so vital to the safety, economy, and stability of our country. The matter should be dropped immediately.

Don Samuelson,
Governor of Idaho.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1967.

Hon. Alan S. Boyd,
Secretary, Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: You recently sent a wire to Governor Don Samuelson of Idaho advising that consideration is being given to a possible holdback or cutback of federal aid highway trust funds for fiscal year 1968. You asked about the possible impact on the state if certain alternatives were to be placed in effect.

On October 11th, Governor Samuelson replied to your inquiry indicating clearly the serious impact such action by your Department would have not only on our highway program in Idaho, but on the total economy of our state. I fully agree with Governor Samuelson. These are funds "held in trust" for the furtherance of a vital program which goes to the very heart of our national safety. A cutback of such funds is not justified and if carried out could only lead to further inflation when and if this essential program is continued.

The states, as well as those who pay gasoline and other taxes to make this program possible will lose faith in the federal participation if actions such as now contemplated are paraded before us as threats each time a reduction in federal spending is proposed by Congress.

I hope this proposal will be dropped immediately so our highway program can proceed without further interruption.

Sincerely yours,

Len B. Jordan,
U.S. Senator.

A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO RESTORE THE POWER OF THE POLICE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in the recently published report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," a supplemental statement by seven of the Commission members set out certain goals for reform in the enforcement and administration of the law in the United States.

This statement shows a clear and desirable need for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 22, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the voluntary admission or confession of the accused in a criminal prosecution shall be admissible against him in any court sitting anywhere in the United States, and that the ruling of a trial judge admitting an admission or confession as voluntarily made shall not be reversed or otherwise disturbed by the Supreme Court or any inferior court established by Congress or under its authority if such ruling is supported by competent evidence. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. President, an adequate opportunity must be provided the police for interrogation at the scene of the crime, during the investigation and at the station house, with appropriate safeguards to prevent abuse.

The achievement of the proper balance between the rights of the individual and those of the society as a whole is admittedly a tremendously difficult task. In the initial stages, at least, the law-enforcement officers of this Nation are charged with the maintenance of this balance. It is the policeman who is first on the scene of a crime; it is the policeman who must attempt to piece together the often incoherent or contradictory statements of witnesses in an attempt to get at the facts; it is the policeman who must sometimes face the open hostility of the crowd of onlookers, and it is the policeman who must detain the suspected offender. All of these activities are carried on in the world which is familiar to those who enforce the law—be it the dimly lit alley in a city, the streetcorners of the town, or the highways which span this country. The law-enforcement officer, then, does not have the serenity of the judicial chamber as a place in which to determine the proper course of action, nor is he allowed the restrospective view of a carefully reconstructed series of events as an aid in formulating a constitutionally correct course of conduct. He must enforce the law in the present tense and make his decisions in seconds, and not after months of reflection. How can the law-enforcement officer carry out his duties in such a way as to achieve the results which justify his existence—compliance with the law by the individual members of the society which has made itself subject to that law?

Certainly one of the key factors in successful enforcement of the law is the right of the policeman to interrogate a suspected offender on the street, or at the scene of the crime or at the station house. Often the investigators of a recently perpetrated offense have little or no substantive information with which to begin their quest for the truth. Crimes such as kidnaping necessitate immediate action in the form of interrogation if the victim is to be safely returned. In many instances, interrogation benefits the innocent as much as the guilty, because potential suspects are quickly exonerated. For all of these reasons, it may be said that the right to question suspects is an essential part of law enforcement.

On the other hand, there must be for the individual suspect safeguards against the abuses of the right of interrogation. These protections have existed since the formation of this Nation in the Constitution of the United States. The fifth amendment, which provides protection against self-incrimination, and the sixth amendment, with its assurance of counsel, afford the individual rights which are as essential to the individual as the right of interrogation is to the policeman.

In the final analysis, the determination of the relative rights of the individual and society through its law-enforcement officers is made by the judiciary, and particularly through the U.S. Supreme Court. The current disposition of the Court toward the balance of rights can best be seen in the case of *Miranda* v. *Arizona* (384 U.S. 436 (1966) which sets out the following standard relative to the questioning of suspects:

A suspect must not only be warned of his rights to remain silent and that any statement made by him may be used against him at trial, but also that he has the right to request the assistance of counsel which must be provided to him before he can be asked any questions at the scene of the crime or elsewhere. These rights may be waived by the suspect if done "voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently," but the suspect may later indicate that he wishes to remain silent or have the assistance of counsel, in which event the questioning must immediately cease.

In the light of the circumstances under which a policeman must attempt to carry out his duties, a standard such as that in Miranda effectively precludes the use of interrogation by law enforcement officers, except in the exceedingly rare case in which a suspect would waive the protection so readily extended to him by the Supreme Court. What we have seen as a result of these Court actions is a sacrifice of the rights of society in favor of those of the individual. When a suspect requests the assistance of counsel, how many could be expected to then undergo interrogation when, as Mr. Justice Jackson has so aptly put it:

> Any lawyer worth his salt will tell the suspect in no uncertain terms to make no statements to police under any circumstances.

The proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution, while taking into account the inviolable rights of the individual, would also guarantee the basic right of security to our society by removing the present barriers to the right of the representative of that society to question those suspected of a crime.

Mr. President, the legitimate place of voluntary confessions in law enforcement must be reestablished and their use made dependent upon meeting due process standards of voluntariness. Prior to the overextension of constitutional guarantees to the individual by the Supreme Court, the standard for the admissibility of a confession was whether or not it was made voluntarily by the suspect.

Obviously, the confession made under circumstances of intimidation or coercion was not to be admitted since it clearly violated the right of the individual to avoid self-incrimination. Barring such violations, however, the generally accepted view that voluntary confessions were a desirable part of the criminal process certainly seemed justified in view of the difficulties inherent in the enforcement of law.

With the advent of Miranda, it became obvious that where there could be little expectation of interrogation, it would be reasonable to expect that confessions would be done away with altogether. The dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice White in Miranda itself points out that—

> [T]he result [of the majority holding] adds up to a judicial judgment that evidence from the accused should not be used against him in any way, whether compelled or not (*Miranda* v. *Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 538 (1966)).

There can be little doubt that the standard imposed upon the law enforcement officer by virtue of the Miranda case results in the virtual elimination of the use of confessions as one of the indispensable elements of the functioning of our legal system. In the relatively short time since this case was decided, there have been numerous examples of the effects of such a standard. Criminals of the most despicable sort have been set free to endanger our society.

For example, two defendants with long criminal records won dismissal of murder charges because they had not been informed of their rights to counsel before they confessed. The State supreme court justice, noting that for the second time in a 10-day period he was forced to dismiss a murder charge because of a Supreme Court decision, stated:

> These defendants have records for robbery, assaults and drugs, as well as other crimes. In the very near future I expect to see the defendants back again in this court. I hope it won't be for murder. As I see the smirks on their faces, I know that they are getting away with murder.

A Federal judge made this statement after releasing a man tried for murder:

> On three separate occasions, this man voluntarily confessed foully killing his wife and throwing her body on a dump . . . he led police there. Yet the U.S. Court of Appeals has seen fit to throw the confessions out . . . tonight felons will sleep better.

In another case, a man who admitted slaying his wife and five children walked out of a courtroom a free man because the only available evidence against him was his own confession.

It is interesting to note that some of the strongest criticism of the Miranda doctrine has come from judges themselves. These men, who must administer the judicial system in this country, see what the majority of the members of the U.S. Supreme Court cannot or will not see—that to proscribe the use of the voluntary confession constitutes the most extreme example of the intentional aberration of our system of criminal law and procedure in the history of this Nation.

The amendment (S.J. Res. 22) would reinstitute the test of voluntariness as the criterion for the admission or rejection of confessions in criminal cases.

The vital question which has been raised by the combination of the recent trend of Supreme Court decisions and the ever-increasing rate of crime—the latter having the propensity to increase in relation to the continuing incomprehensibility of the former—is whether the law enforcement agencies of this Nation can effectively discharge their responsibilities without a change in the existing constitutional provisions. Unfortunately, at a time in our Nation's history when the need for law enforcement has heightened, we cannot turn to the courts for guidance. Therefore, we must for the good of our society, bring about a resurgence of police powers which can only accrue to the benefit of the Nation as a whole. The responsibility for this undertaking must be assumed by Congress and the States, through ratification of the proposed amendment (S.J. Res. 22) to the U.S. Constitution.

COMMUNITY SERVICE AIDS AND SOCIAL SERVICE VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

Mr. **HARRIS**. Mr. President, the National Association of Counties has endorsed my amendment No. 400, cosponsored by several other Senators, intended to be proposed to H.R. 12080. I am grateful for this support, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me from Mr. C. D. Ward, general counsel of that distinguished organization, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter

was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

National Association of Counties,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1967.
Senator Fred R. Harris,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention: Mr. Leslie R. Kreps.)

Dear Senator Harris: I appreciated the opportunity of discussing with Mr. Kreps our support of Senator Long's foster care proposal, S. 2470. I was also pleased to have Mr. Kreps bring to my attention your amendment relating to community service aids and social service volunteer programs.

In December of last year, the National Association of Counties held its first welfare conference, and I feel you would be interested in knowing that one of the specific recommendations directly relates to your own proposal. The recommendation was titled "New Welfare Employment Criteria" and reads as follows:

"Whereas the present federal and state classification and qualification staffing requirements for welfare and social workers often result in the wasteful application of professional talent to sub-professional tasks and often precludes the employment of competent persons to perform many welfare tasks, the National Association of Counties urges and recommends that the federal government foster and encourage the states to experiment in the use of sub-professional classifications.

"Whereas it is difficult to obtain necessary caseworkers under the present mandated classifications and qualifications, we recommend in the interest of home rule and greater efficiency that the fixing of such classifications and qualifications be vested in the local unit of government administering such relief, consistent with Civil Service as established in each State."

On behalf of the National Association of Counties, I should like to express our support for your amendment and to advise you that this letter may be utilized for such purpose.

Very truly yours,

C. D. Ward,
General Counsel.

TRIBUTE TO AN INDUSTRIOUS REPORTER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Department of Defense earlier this month moved to plug a gaping hole in its procurement procedures by ordering that a clause be included henceforth in all firm fixed price contracts involving certified costs or pricing data giving the Pentagon explicit right of access to the contractor's actual performance records in order to provide assurance that defective cost or pricing data had not been submitted prior to consummation of the contract.

If the postaudit authority established by this recent administrative action is exercised effectively, it could mean a savings to the taxpayers of millions of dollars a year because it would go a long way toward ending the enormous losses to the Government in overcharges on defense contracts.

A healthy share of the credit for the Pentagon's recent action must be given, I believe, to an able and industrious reporter for the Cleveland, Ohio, Plain Dealer, Mr. Sanford Watzman, who in a superlative series of articles last spring put the spotlight on the Pentagon's failure to enforce the 1962 Truth in Negotiations Act, which requires that contracting officers obtain current, accurate, and complete cost data from contractors. This law is the taxpayer's only defense against the establishment of unreasonably high cost levels in negotiated contracts.

Mr. Watzman's articles, which drew on obscure, almost-forgotten reports by the Comptroller General of the United States, prompted the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chairman, to probe into this area during hearings last May on Federal procurement procedures. The testimony of the Comptroller General was both instructive and shocking. He disclosed at the hearings that the loss to the taxpayer because of overcharges on defense contracts ran into the millions just on the very small sampling of contracts audited by his agency, the General Accounting Office. This would indicate that the actual loss on all contracts could conceivably be in the billions of dollars.

Following the hearings, I introduced a bill (S. 1913) to provide the Pentagon with explicit postaudit authority—a move first suggested by Mr. Watzman. The purpose of this bill was to establish a policy that the Comptroller General contended could be established independently by the Pentagon simply by amending the Armed Services procurement regulations. The Comptroller General recommended this course to the Defense Department some time ago but no action was taken on the recommendation. Postaward audits of the actual records of performance, the Comptroller General concluded, often provided the best means of verifying that the data submitted prior to the award was accurate, current, and complete.

The memorandum issued last month by Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul H. Nitze appears to establish through administrative action just the authority recommended by the Comptroller General and the authority my bill would establish in law. If Secretary Nitze's order is effectively and fully implemented, there will be no need for passage of my bill. But the Defense Department's record of enforcement in the procurement area, either of administrative regulations or of statutes such as the Truth in Negotiations Act, does not encourage optimism. To the extent that my bill can be credited with bringing about the Nitze order, Sanford Watzman deserves a large share of the credit. And he will deserve credit, too, for the ultimate savings to the taxpayer, if the Nitze order is effectively implemented.

REPORT OF PANEL ON ELECTRICALLY POWERED VEHICLES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have just received the report of the Panel on Electrically Powered Vehicles which was set up by the Department of Commerce early this year in a joint-sponsorship agreement with several other executive branch departments and agencies. The panel has studied the critical problem of automotive air pollution and its control with particular emphasis on the development and use of new low-polluting propulsion systems.

I am happy to report that I find the results of the study, published in the report entitled "The Automobile and Air Pollution—A Program for Progress—Part I," a thoughtful and significant addition to our discussion of methods to insure that the benefits of advancing technology will be used for the good of the entire Nation.

The panel, of which Richard S. Morse, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is the chairman, is composed of a group of eminent industrial, academic, and technical experts who have generously contributed their time and energy to collect and review the latest available information and to offer their conclusions and recommendations for desirable public action. The Nation is fortunate to have at its call such dedicated citizens who willingly come together in a voluntary effort to help formulate important matters of public policy. These men whose names I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, deserve our congratulations for their fine effort.

The report contains many important conclusions and recommendations which should be given serious consideration by both the executive and legislative branches. Of particular interest to me is the recommendation that the Federal Government use its procurement policy to stimulate the development and use of devices and vehicles which will lower pollution, for I have urged on several occasions that such a creative approach in Federal purchasing can be an important instrument in achieving this objective. I am pleased that the panel has highlighted this area for consideration. An extension of this recommendation to create a program which will assure that private industry will rapidly strive to develop and use the latest systems for the control of pollution should also be an important part of any Federal activity designed to reduce air pollution and encourage the creation of new and more effective means of transport.

I also note that the report recommends that the Federal Government should increase its support for research, development, and demonstration in mass transportation programs. I have long been an advocate of policies which will help this Nation create the advanced transportation systems which are urgently required by our citizens in crowded urban areas. There is no doubt that our urban population will continue to increase, and it is therefore essential that we take every reasonable step to study, test, and develop the most effective means of transportation for both goods and people.

The panel report also contains a recommendation that the Federal Government initiate a 5-year, $60 million, program to seek information from which to develop future emission standards and to support additional research. The areas singled out by the panel as deserving particular attention include the examination of alternative energy sources for vehicles, and the development of new vehicular propulsion systems, emission control devices, and special purpose urban cars. A program of this type may be essential to enable the Government to find the most effective means for counteracting the polluting side effects of our present personal transportation systems, so I believe it is important that we give it our careful consideration. For it already is becoming unpleasantly clear that in the future we shall need vehicles, particularly in our urban areas, which are virtually nonpolluting.

In summary, Mr. President, I think this report should provide the basis for some new and meaningful steps by the Federal Government in its attempt to control pollution and develop new transportation systems. The Department of Commerce and the other supporting agencies deserve our congratulations for preparing, so promptly, this excellent analysis. I urge that it be given serious and detailed consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PANEL ON ELECTRICALLY POWERED VEHICLES

Richard S. Morse, Chairman, Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Manfred Altman, Director, Institute for Direct Energy Conversion, University of Pennsylvania.

Edward H. Blum, Princeton University. (Now with Rand Corporation).

Rolf Eliassen, Professor of Environmental Engineering, Stanford University.

James W. Ford, Director, Economics Office, Ford Motor Company.

Everett Gorin, Manager, Process Research, Research Division, Consolidation Coal Company.

Carl E. Heath, Section Head, Government Research Laboratory, Esso Research and Engineering Company.

Seymour W. Herwald, Group Vice President, Westinghouse Electric Corporation.

Edward O. Johnson, Manager, Engineering-Technical Programs, R.C.A. Electronic Components and Devices.

Peter Kyropoulos, Technical Director, Styling Staff, General Motors Technical Center.

Alan G. Loofbourrow, Vice President, Quality and Reliability, Chrysler Corporation.

David V. Ragone, General Atomic Division, General Dynamics Corporation (Now Professor of Metallurgy and Material Science, Carnegie-Mellon University).

Robert C. Shair, Vice President, Research and Development, Gulton Industries, Inc.

Philip Sporn, Retired President, Director, American Electric Power Company.

Charles W. Tobias, Chairman, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of California, Berkeley.

Myron Tribus, Dean, Thayer School of Engineering, Dartmouth College.

Paul T. O'Day, Executive Secretary, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology, U. S. Department of Commerce.

ELEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, 11 years ago today the Hungarian people reacted against Soviet political and military occupation of their country. Soviet troops ignited the flames of revolution when they fired on defenseless students who were peacefully demonstrating on October 23, 1956. Hungarians—young and old, workers and intellectuals—rallied to the students' cause, risking their lives for freedom. After years of oppression and subjugation by the Soviets, Hungarians wanted the right to determine what men should govern their country through general, free, and secret elections with the participation of several political parties; the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungarian soil; investigation and correction of all political and economic trials; complete freedom of speech; and vast improvement of the economy of the country—all privileges which we in the United States enjoy as ordinary rights of citizenship and freedom.

By the end of October peace had returned to Budapest as Hungarian freedom fighters achieved their goals. Imre Nagy was named Premier and installed a new cabinet in which the power of the Stalinists was greatly reduced. Nagy announced that Soviet troops would soon leave Budapest, and Soviet representatives returned from Moscow with a declaration complying with most of the demands made by the revolutionaries.

On November 4, 4 days after evacuation of Soviet troops from Hungary had apparently begun, these forces reentered Budapest—10 armored divisions, reenforced by aerial attacks by Mig fighters. All over Hungary, patriots hurried to protect the newly won freedom against such an onslaught of military might. Radio appeals to the free nations of the West and to the United Nations went unheeded as diplomacy bogged down in the redtape of words and vetoes. Hungarian freedom, however, with its dwindling store of rifles, ammunition, grenades, Molotov cocktails, sticks, and stones could not for long protect itself against the endless stream of Red tanks and automatic weapons. Soviet forces crushed this Hungarian revolt but not the people and the spirit which fostered it.

Mr. President, on this 11th anniversary of the start of the Hungarian revolution it is appropriate that we pause to pay homage to the brave men and women who died in Hungary for the cause of freedom. It is appropriate that we join with those Hungarians who were able to flee their country and find friends and comfort here in America and with those who are still in Hungary in a silent prayer that one day soon, Hungarians will realize that freedom which was so dearly won and lost in 1956.

ARMS SALES POLICIES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, C. L. Sulzberger, writing from Brasilia, took a look at American arms sales and the policies which govern them, particularly as these apply to our neighbors in Latin America. In the New York Times for October 18, Sulzberger makes a number of points, but his chief one is that we cannot, by refusing arms, hope to prevent their acquisition. Other nations, notably France, are willing and able to provide them, and in the field of aircraft will, in fact, sell faster, larger aircraft.

The implications are many, both short and long term, as Sulzberger points out. His column should be read by those whose intentions are good but whose realism is clouded when it comes to this question. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: ANOTHER POKE IN THE EYE

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

BRASILIA, BRAZIL.—U.S. arms policy in South America is about to get another poke in the eye with a blunt stick, this time in Brazil. We have only to thank our own befuddled approach to the question of selling weapons to friends.

Bruised by Congress on numerous issues, the Defense Department thinks it can avoid an arms race on this continent by withholding modern equipment from our friends, above all jet aircraft. Our friends, however, don't share this pleasant belief. They listen to our advice, make their own decisions and buy elsewhere.

WHERE BUT PARIS?

The obvious place to buy is France. French arms merchants are energetic, backed by their Government, and prepared to extend generous credit. Furthermore, the Israeli Air Force was French-equipped and, since it chewed up the best Soviet matérial the Arabs had, South American generals were favorably impressed.

When Washington refused to sell Peru our F-5 fighters, Lima bought a batch of France's Mirage-V supersonic jets. Simultaneously, Argentina purchased fifty French tanks, compounding our frustration because, quite apart from trying to discourage a hemispheric armaments race, the U.S. doesn't relish losing markets to de Gaulle.

Now an even worse disappointment is shaping up. Brazil the greatest South American nation and our most active ally here, wants to purchase about twenty U.S. F-5's. These aren't really supersonic and, indeed, were conceived as counterinsurgency planes for developing nations. Nevertheless, Washington refuses approval.

For months Brazil's President, Marshal Costa e Silva, has argued his case, even in personal correspondence with President Johnson, but Secretary McNamara, who fears Congressional resentment, maintains a virtual veto. Meanwhile France pushes its aircraft as an obvious alternative.

Last August Brazil was ready to take Mirages, which are more expensive than F-5's and virtually twice as fast. Paris offers excellent terms, including willingness to construct an aviation factory here and promise of earlier delivery than we could offer if we were ready to do business.

Costa e Silva is under pressure from his officers. This regime was first installed by army coup three years ago, and its main dynamic remains military. There is nothing even remotely Nasserist about it. but the rationale is similar. Nasser told me in 1955 that he had to buy arms from Russia when we refused them because his only organized backing came from officers and, if he refused them materiel, they might withdraw support.

Here read "France" for "Russia." The military establishment, which is pro-American and mildly liberal, looks to Costa e Silva for new weapons. The air force has only three serviceable but outmoded jet fighters and fifteen jet trainers. It complains that training crews on obsolete equipment makes them unfit to cooperate with the U.S.A. in an emergency.

The political implications to a largely military regime are clear. Costa e Silva has shown patience with our position, but is being urged to give an answer before Aviation Day next week. Meanwhile, a new French sales mission is awaited as Paris pushes further into the market.

Our basic arms policy has been unrealistic, if nobly motivated. By withholding modern weapons we hope to discourage armaments races and to encourage the spending of defense funds on development. But, while philosophically sound, this simply won't work without a monopoly—which we don't have.

We refused to sell aircraft to Israel and South Africa because we didn't want to offend the Arabs and the new Negro republics. France sold to both and nevertheless became more popular with the Arabs and many African states. Meanwhile Israeli prowess with French equipment spurred French arms sales.

WEAPONS WANTED

Many South Americans resent our restrictions and question what the U.S. alliance is worth if it doesn't allow access to weapons. And the diplomatic implications are obvious. Long-term spare parts and training commitments are involved. Furthermore, in some countries on this content the military is the real political power, while in all it lurks behind the scenes.

Our intentions are good, but in practice they are self-defeating. Congress doesn't want lands we help to waste funds on weapons, but, after all, those aren't our colonies and make up their own minds. It is good that Washington has reversed itself on Brazil in time, for elsewhere in South America U.S. diplomacy was banging barn doors on horses already grazing in France.

ALF LANDON PROPOSES NEW APPROACH TO LABOR-MANAGEMENT DISPUTES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, in a recent tribute to Alf M. Landon on his 80th birthday, I took note of his continuing active participation in public life and ever fresh and cogent discussion and analysis of the great public and political issues of the day.

Today, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Landon's latest contribution, a proposed new approach to handling labor-management disputes which affect the national interest.

Mr. Landon originally unveiled an outline of his new approach to the difficult problem of emergency strike legislation last July. This idea has now become a fully developed proposal which merits serious consideration.

He suggests first that the research facilities of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service be greatly strengthened. When, on the basis of this research, the Director of the Service certified that a bargaining impasse existed in a given industry, a three-man arbitration panel would come into being roughly 6 months before the expiration of the existing contract and would attempt to mediate the dispute before it assumed crisis proportions.

The panel would also be empowered to make nonbinding recommendations which the disputants would have 30 days to consider. If they did not accept its recommendations, they would suffer the loss of the protection of current labor laws and the right to receive Government contracts. Thus, while they would have the option of refusing to settle their differences, they would pay a heavy price for their intransigence.

Mr. Landon would also give the parties the right of immediate appeal of the board's decision through the Federal court system.

Mr. President, this proposal was outlined in a speech by Mr. Landon before the Kansas State Federation of Labor at Topeka October 19, 1967, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR, MANAGEMENT, THE PUBLIC—ALL IN THE SAME BOAT

These are indeed troubled times. Trouble in Asia and Africa—trouble in the old world—and trouble in the new world.

Mankind is seeking new solutions to age-old and unsolved problems—and new problems created by automation—electronic energy and power—and the space age.

Growing industrialization has changed the agrarian economy in America into an industrial economy in my lifetime.

I can remember when the advocates of reducing the twelve-hour day to the ten-hour days were called radicals.

Then came the eight-hour day. I remember talking to a superintendent of a blast furnace about that. He said the eight-hour day might be all right for other industries. It can't work in the steel industry.

Steel was the last big industry to hold out against that. President Warren G. Harding persuaded big steel to adopt the eight-hour day.

A year later, I was talking to this same man. He said he wouldn't go back to the ten-hour day if he could.

Then came the Wagner Act—which I supported. However, it has not been the hopeful solution of our industrial relations problems which rank close to our complex international relations crying for solutions.

The Wagner Act begat the Taft-Hartley Act. The Taft-Hartley Act begat the Landrum-Griffin Act.

The Eisenhower board was busy reversing the decisions of the Roosevelt-Truman board. The Kennedy-Johnson board is now busy reversing the decisions of the Eisenhower board.

The reason for that is the social and economic thinking of the appointees to those agencies. Appointees change with the administration in power—state or national. While the legislation does not change—the interpretation of it does. That creates chaos for management, labor, and the public.

For ten years or more, we have been diverted from arriving at a workable, fair and equitable solution of our complex industrial relations problems by an organized campaign for so-called right-to-work legislation.

It has been adopted in 20 states and is still a pending issue in others.

I opposed this purely negative legislation when it was pending in the Kansas legislature. I opposed it when it was submitted as a Constitutional amendment in 1958.

Now a new trend is developing that is a great threat to collective bargaining as a corollary of democratic processes—that I have always believed in—and that is compulsory arbitration by President Johnson.

Let us take a look at how that has been developing—step by step. In 1963, President Kennedy asked Congress for legislation providing for compulsory arbitration by a board either appointed by the president—or selected by the Congress—or to final decision by the I.C.C.—to settle the railroad firemen and enginemen's threatened strike. At the request of their union, I made a statement at that time which it used—that I was opposed to compulsory arbitration either by a president—or by Congress. As between the two, I would take the Congress.

The board was established. It made its findings. They are still awaiting final court decisions interpreting that board's decisions as to how many men a railroad train crew should consist of—after some four years.

This litigation has cost the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen at least a half million dollars in legal fees and court costs alone—and it is far from settled yet. The Circuit Court of Appeals two months ago remanded the case back to a Federal District Court Judge of the District of Columbia for correction of his former decisions that he had taken three years to make. Within the last few weeks, the railroad attorneys filed pleadings in that Circuit Court of Appeals that involve further delays. Eventually this arbitration board's decision will reach the Supreme Court of the United States.

Then President Johnson personally postponed the threatened railroad strike in 1964. He claimed credit for its settlement.

Up to this very day, the questions involved in the threatened strike by all of the operating railroad brotherhoods are still unsettled and still pose a more explosive situation in the nation's railroad transportation system.

In his State of the Union message to the Congress in January, 1966, President Johnson said he would send to the Congress a recommendation for the permanent solution of industrial-labor problems. He failed to do that.

The President also did not even mention that most highly critical one of all our problems in his State of the Union message in 1967. When questioned by reporters later why he had omitted any reference to labor-management problems and their solution in that message, the President said he would send a special message on it later.

Well, it is late—and growing later with the passage of time—and we have had only piecemeal recommendations from the President to the Congress on that most important and crucial question before the country—or piecemeal use of the awesome power of a president to personally force the settlement of major industrial disputes.

President Johnson personally settled the threatened steel strike in 1964—and the airlines strike in 1966. He settled the second steel strike in 1965 by locking the representatives of labor and management in a room—sending them their meals—telling them not to come out until they had reached an agreement settling the strike.

In August, 1967, President Johnson allowed the questions involved in the railroad machinists' dispute to continue to develop with increased emotions, bitterness and bad feelings—until the deadline was finally reached when he could—in the role of meeting a national emergency—once again ask the Congress for compulsory arbitration.

Thus the President took another step in the direction of establishing compulsory arbitration by a president when that was all the choice he gave the Congress. The Secretary of Labor had the gall to insult the intelligence of the American people by saying that policy of President Johnson was not compulsory arbitration.

Mr. Wirtz called it a "decision in finality." He is right. There is no right of appeal by either side. Neither was there any right of appeal by either side in the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen's case, except for interpretation of the meaning of the board's language.

This was pure naked settlement by the awesome power of a president. It is eroding the principle of collective bargaining—and democratic processes, to boot.

Former Governor Henry J. Allen once told me of his interviewing Mussolini. The Fascist dictator handed him a book on the Kansas Industrial Court Act of 1919, saying, "Here is where I got my industrial policies." There was one highly important difference. Mussolini did not permit any right of appeal.

There have been five major labor dispute decisions made in the last four years either by direct presidential power or by compulsory arbitration legislation initiated by the President.

I agree with Mr. H. E. Gilbert, President of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen—and with Mr. George Meany, President of the AFL–CIO—that if compulsory arbitration or a "decision in finality" is to become the way of settling our industrial disputes, nationalization of big corporations can well come about.

Therefore, it is high time to be thinking of alternatives.

Last July—in a National Educational Television Network interview—in response to a statement that compulsory arbitration was the only solution of our complex industrial problems, I disagreed. In reply to the question of what were the alternatives, I said I've got one in mind that I am willing to try out. At least, it's something to think about.

1. I'd create a Court of Equity on top of our present Labor Board. Leave the present Labor Board as it is to do the paperwork, the administrative work, and so forth. This Court of Equity could be five or seven—bipartisan—with the most rigid conflict of interests tag.

2. There must be a right of appeal from that Board's decision, and I'd make it direct to the Circuit Court of Appeals Three Judge Court, and then to a jury of laymen.

Now, the right of appeal is a precious one that we've got to maintain intact, but eliminate the costly—often deliberately created—delays.

That proposal stimulated discussion of this critical national problem—which I hoped it would.

For the purpose of further discussion, I think well of a simple solution of this pressing problem that was suggested to me.

First, a federal statute providing that six months or so before the expiration of a union contract—where no agreement on its extension has been reached—an arbitration board of three be named—one by each side to the dispute.

The key man—the chairman—either to be selected from the heads of state universities by drawing his name from a hat—or, as a suggestion to think about, why not name the National Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service? He already has an existing staff and a fund of research with experience. The board, once organized, could select such additional research staff as it desired.

Congress could give the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service the power and funds appropriate and, in broad outline, the mechanics would be:

1. a) Collate in each region the economic and other data pertinent to the problem which other government agencies are collecting; b) Collate any private studies in line with (a) above.

2. Upon an impasse, the Regional Director certifies to the National Director, who then forms an arbitration board consisting of himself and representatives from management and labor.

If there are more cases for this arbitration board than can be handled promptly by the National Director, he then could draw the name of the head of one of the state universities as a substitute.

Second, this board to have all the powers of subpeona of any court for all the records involved in its decision.

Third, when the decision is reached, it is not "a decision in finality." It can be appealed by either side direct to a Three Judge Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. Then to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Fourth, in order to further eliminate costly delay, a statutory requirement that this arbitration board's decision is placed immediately on the top of the court's calendar—to be heard and decided forthwith.

Fifth, that any moneys or fringe benefits that are due the employees or their heirs under the board's decision dating back to the expiration of the contract be put in escrow and be payable with six percent interest added when the judicial proceedings—if any—are terminated.

Sixth, because the public interest as a whole is involved—the cost of the arbitration board's proceedings to be paid by the national government—when federal questions are involved. When purely local questions are involved, the state government should assume this responsibility.

Seventh, language that required interpretation to be referred back to the arbitration board—not the courts.

Eighth, and finally, I come to a very critical question. If there is no settlement and no acceptance of the board's findings within thirty days, this new arbitration board could have the authority to enforce its decisions by the same provision now existing in our Civil Rights statutes—to-wit:

If a party and/or parties fail to accept voluntarily this method of settling labor-management problems, then they could be deprived of the use, benefit and services of existing labor laws and the right to receive contracts from the government. Or, if either party does not choose to accept this method of arbitration, they should not be forced to do so. If they prefer direct action, then they inevitably will face the growing trend for compulsory arbitration with "decisions in finality."

Labor is confronted with an unfriendly public when that public is inconvenienced.

I first suggested starting six months ahead of the expiration of an unrenewed contract with the thought

(a) that this would be helpful before feelings and emotions were aroused,

(b) that it would give all parties—including the public—the opportunity to become familiar with the problems of that particular industry, and

(c) it might be worth considering that either labor or management could participate in this proposed arbitration board's hearings with the right to withdraw at the end of ninety days.

After that, neither party can withdraw until the hearings are completed and the board's decision is made and announced.

Then, as I have previously listed, either party should have the right to appeal direct to the Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States—or to face inevitable further congressional legislation.

If this plan was in effect, it would eliminate pooling subsidizing of one line of industry by other lines of the same industry where the one shut down by a strike receives financial help from all. That will help settle major strikes.

Some eighty years ago, Edward Bellamy published a fascinating book called Looking Backward. The book was a best-seller for several years, although today it is virtually forgotten outside of our colleges. Nevertheless, the book still influences thinking.

Bellamy's hero went to sleep in 1887 and awoke in the year 2000 to find that the economic squabbles of his day had led to the development in the 20th century of three big trusts—labor, industry and government. Because labor and business could not settle their differences and because the American people were getting squeezed in between, the government finally stepped in to eliminate business and labor. In other words, nationalization of big business.

Unfortunately, not being a witness to the results of the concentration of power in the hands of government in the 20th century, Bellamy was not aware that totalitarianism tends to destroy rather than preserve.

I tell you this story because it is quite relevant to what has been happening in the United States in industrial-labor disputes—that is coming to a head faster than is realized

This proposal I have just discussed with you is not a "decision in finality" on my part. I simply throw it out for discussion and consideration with the hope that labor will realize this is no time to continue a negative position of sitting on their hands. Undoubtedly other provisions will occur that should be included in the legislation to make it constitutionally realistic—workable—and fair and equitable to all three parties involved—unions—corporations—and the public.

We now have a hodge-podge of legislation governing labor-management relations so that it is a field day for the lawyers, with their hands in the pockets of both labor and management.

At least, I am proposing guidelines for a national board of arbitration by statute, where there are none now. It should expire at the end of five years to see how, in the light of trial and error, it works out in practice.

It is high time we face up to the real tests we are having now.

Arbitration—except for these recent incidents of compulsory arbitration with no actual right of appeal—has not been used heretofore except for interpretation of disagreements over the meaning of the language of a contract.

Both sides have got to realistically approach a fair and equitable solution—or compulsory arbitration with no right of appeal is here.

Under this plan, all parties must put their cards on the table at the start, instead of at the end, as is the case now. If that was established, there would be fewer cases pursued to the point of arbitration.

The arbitration board I am talking about would deal with major industrial disputes with guidelines where there are none now. Its membership could constantly change with each case. The only permanent officer would be a secretary to organize the proceedings—when, as and if required. It makes use of experience with the present arbitration procedures provided by contracts over grievances at the local level, in the light of trial and error experience. It makes use of experience with that machinery.

Now both sides' strategy is not to put all their cards on the table—at least to start with. When they know that will be the case before the expiration of the contract, that may well stimulate more negotiated settlements of major industrial disputes.

In the last four years—prior to the present disputes—every major labor-management dispute settlement has been forced either by the President personally—or by compulsory arbitration set up by him.

More and more, it is becoming evident that there is urgent need that we start thinking about some more positive solutions in the design of democratic processes to our complex industrial problems than this purely negative right-to-work legislation—and—even worse and more destructive of collective bargaining—compulsory arbitration—based on Fascist "decisions in finality"—that is the very antithesis of our precious democratic processes.

FEDERAL MULTIPURPOSE WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a Senator, has been an articulate advocate of Federal multipurpose water conservation programs, in his region and across the country. His book, "Overcharge," underscores the inadequacies of the private power industry and the resulting cost to the consumer. It also demonstrates his expertise in the field of power generation.

Senator METCALF recently spoke in Portland, Maine, where he discussed the importance to New England of the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project on Maine's St. John River.

His remarks are especially significant now when Senate-House conferees are considering Dickey's future. I ask unanimous consent that Senator METCALF'S talk to the Maine Oil & Heating Equipment Dealers Association appear in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR LEE METCALF BEFORE MAINE OIL & HEATING EQUIPMENT DEALERS ASSOCIATION, PORTLAND, MAINE, OCTOBER 11, 1967

I had the opportunity to become acquainted with an important resource issue in this region when I served with your Senator Ed Muskie on the Public Works Committee. That is the committee which authorizes projects built by the Corps of Engineers, such as the Dickey-Lincoln project.

As I listened to the testimony, read the Record and noted the votes on Dickey-Lincoln, I was reminded of a similar situation in the Nineteen Fifties. I was on the House Interior Committee then, and the big multi-purpose dam proposed in that era was Hells Canyon, on the Snake River which forms the boundary between Idaho and Oregon.

The real issue there was not public power versus private power. The issue was full development—maximum use of the river for power, flood control, pollution abatement and other beneficial uses of water—versus partial power development through low dams which would forever preclude maximum use of the river's potential.

The private power companies were for the partial development, by themselves, of this great river. And they won, through the kind of saturating, nationwide lobbying that is a hallmark of the power companies, which constitute the largest industry in this country.

The tactics they used were similar to those being used against Dickey-Lincoln. The arguments are much the same. In fact, I think somebody went through those old Congressional Records of the Nineteen Fifties, struck out the words "Hells Canyon," inserted "Dickey-Lincoln" and passed them around.

Senator Muskie, who is the leading authority in Congress on air and water pollution abatement, tells about the new ways to recycle water, to use it over and over again. Well, we can both tell you that some of those power company speeches have been recycled time after time. Their pollution content by now is rather high.

Thanks to the leadership in the Congress of both Senators Muskie and Smith, Dickey-Lincoln was authorized, and planning money for the project was included by the Senate in the public works appropriation bill.

There will be a tremendous effort by the utility lobby to get the Senate-House conference to delete these funds, or get Dickey-Lincoln voted on separately and killed in the House. Your Congressional delegation—Senators Muskie and Smith and Congressmen Hathaway and Kyros—strongly supported by Governor Curtis, have done a magnificent job for Dickey-Lincoln. But they need all the help you can muster for them, in view of the formidable opposition.

Just a few days ago I received a letter and packet of material from Albert Cree, head of Central Vermont Public Service Corporation and Chairman of the Electric Coordinating Council of New England. It consists of leaders of the New England power companies, which are fighting Dickey-Lincoln because they want to keep their tight, high-cost monopoly as it is.

I told him that I supported Dickey-Lincoln, because I believed it was in the interests of both the consumers and the power suppliers, the investor-owned utilities as well as the municipal and cooperative systems. I cited the example in my region, where the power companies have fought public power projects for decades, yet benefit substantially from them. They buy large blocks of power from these projects, at the same rates charged the municipals and co-ops.

These natural sites for multi-purpose dams—and Dickey-Lincoln is one of the few good ones left—provide substantial additional public benefits, for pollution abatement, recreation, and municipal and industrial water.

Let me tell you how these multi-purpose Federal dams help business. When Yellowtail Dam in Montana was completed in Nineteen Sixty-Six none of us realized how quickly that water would be desired by industry. One major industry has already applied for a substantial quantity of water for development of a new industry nearby. More applications are expected. In addition, last winter that dam prevented millions of dollars in flood damage following devastating cloudbursts of the type that occur only once in a century.

The main reason the big power companies want to kill Dickey-Lincoln is that they want to kill off the small city-owned and rural electric cooperative power systems. They don't like those little yardsticks of comparison.

Public power systems have a preference for purchase of power from Federal dams. In actual practice, however, private industry and private utilities buy one-third of the output of the Federal power plants. They obtain almost three times as much of the Federally produced power as all the rural electric cooperatives together. Remember that, the next time you see a power company advertisement complaining about the Federal power program and the allegedly unfair advantages it provides for preference customers.

In one of the most arrogant maneuvers I have seen during more than thirty years in public office, power companies around the country are now trying to keep city and cooperative power systems from participating in the big nuclear generation and long-distance transmission systems. The public paid, through taxes, more than two billion dollars for development of practical nuclear power. Now the private companies want to have it all to themselves.

And in the forefront of this group of subsidy-seeking investor-owned utilities is the Electric Coordinating Council of New England, which includes the three principal I.O.U.s in this State—Central Maine Power, Bangor Hydro-Electric and Maine Public Service.

I do want to mention two developments in Washington which will be of particular interest to you, as a group of businessmen who are often subjected to unfair competition from utility companies. One is the study underway by Congressman John Dingell and his House Small Business Subcommittee. He has sent out detailed questionnaires on utility subsidies. Hearings on this subject are scheduled to get underway in January. They will provide an excellent forum for small businessmen such as yourselves.

The other study was initiated by Senator Muskie, as Chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I am a member. Last year he invited each of the state utility commissions to answer a questionnaire dealing with its make-up, staff, budget, policies and jurisdiction. The tabulation and summary were printed last month as a committee print. It is entitled "State Utility Commissions."

It has been well-received as a valuable reference for legislators, regulators, teachers and business, as have previous studies prepared by Senator Muskie's subcommittee.

This is largely a statistical study. There is no comment from the subcommittee. It is a factual account, from the commissions themselves.

I have great sympathy for these state commissions, many of them overburdened with work and short on staff and funds. Let me tell you some of the things which they reported to Senator Muskie.

These commissions are responsible for regulating hundreds of huge monopoly utility corporations, plus thousands of smaller companies. In transportation you have quite a bit of competition. The customer does not have a choice, though, as to where he gets his electricity, or his telephone. His interest is supposedly protected by these commissions. Yet some of them don't even have an attorney, or an engineer, or an accountant, or perhaps but one or two persons in those categories. Salaries are low. In many cases all these commissions can do is ratify the proposals put before them by the utilities. Thus, the rate-paying public is regulated by the utilities, although the unending utility advertisements, whose cost is passed on to the customers, try to make you believe that the utilities are strictly regulated.

So what happens when a relatively small industry, such as oil heat, goes before a commission to air its grievances about sharp practices by the giant utilities? These commissions don't have enough resources to do the jobs already assigned them, let alone take on new investigations.

The public probably has less accurate information about utilities and regulation than any other area of government. The Muskie and Dingell subcommittee studies have helped fill an unmet need, and laid the groundwork for better government and more equitable treatment of minority members of the energy industry.

THE HUNGARIAN UPRISING

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, today marks the 11th year since the courageous uprising against the ruthless Communist regime in Hungary. On October 23, 1956, and the 12 days which followed, the world watched as the Hungarian people fought for and seemingly obtained control of their country and the right of self-determination only to have their hopes for freedom crushed by an incredible use of Soviet military might.

Although Communist tyranny added more than 20,000 lives to its growing list of atrocities, the Hungarian men, women, and children demonstrated by fighting and dying that subjugation will never destroy the spirit nor the desire of men to be free.

On this, the 11th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, we express our admiration for the courage and determination of the Hungarian people.

TIMELY WARNING ON DANGERS OF LAND PURCHASES IN BRAZIL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, during hearings on the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act, which would regulate the sales of undeveloped land, evidence was presented which indicated that many unsuspecting Americans were being duped into buying tracts of land in Brazil. At that time we were told by the Department of State that it was extremely difficult for a foreigner to obtain clear title to land in Brazil, and that in some instances foreign ownership was illegal under Brazilian law.

Unfortunately the sale of Brazilian land to Americans continues. A story in the October 11, 1967, issue of Times of the Americas, a weekly paper devoted to news of Latin America, describes the efforts of the Brazilian Government to stop these illicit sales. I ask unanimous consent that this useful story by Francis L. McCarthy, UPI Latin American editor, be printed in the RECORD.

This story is certainly clear evidence of the need for legislation to regulate the sale of undeveloped land in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG LAND SWINDLE IS UNCOVERED IN BRAZIL

(By Francis L. McCarthy)

A massive land swindle has been unearthed in Brazil with hundreds of Americans in the Midwest, Southwest and West the victims of unscrupulous salesmen to the tune of millions of dollars.

Complaints from American citizens in Texas, Indiana and Utah, among other states, are pouring into the U.S. Embassy in Rio de Janeiro and the federal government in Brasilia. They range from charges of fraud and irregularities in registrations and transfers to outright absence of any title to lands bought.

The scandal has reached such proportions that the government has ordered a military inquiry and the American Embassy officially urged "caution and prudence" in the further purchase of lands in the Brazilian interior.

The Ministry of Justice said last week that the background of all persons engaged in selling land in the interior to Americans is being carefully studied and the guilty face legal punishment and expulsion from the country.

Governments of Bahia and Goiás states are searching out the addresses of all Americans who have bought land in the interior. The purpose is to call upon them to appear in person to prove ownership.

Hundreds of thousands of acres have been sold to American citizens in these two states alone, according to authorities.

A federal police spokesman in Brasilia told UPI that dozens of cases of irregularities in registration and transfer have been uncovered in Bahia and adjoining Goiás alone.

"Dead men and non-existent persons have been used to facilitate the transfer of lands from speculators to American buyers," he said.

He listed these irregularities in sales of land to Americans which made the transactions illegal: Little if any formal compliance with the legal formality of properly surveying properties and getting sale approval from Brazil's Agrarian Reform Council; sales by squatters of lands not properly registered and the need to show they have been compensated before being dispossessed; sale of Indian lands owned by the federal government as trustees for the indigenous tribes without prior government approval.

In many cases Americans have paid $3.15 an acre for land the speculator bought for $.50 cents. The land was unimproved and had, at best, cloudy title, the spokesman said.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION BOYD BEFORE VIRGINIA CONFERENCE ON WORLD TRADE

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I had the pleasure of accompanying Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd to Norfolk last week to attend the Virginia Conference on World Trade.

Secretary Boyd delivered a most interesting address, highlighting the various duties and programs of his new agency. I believe his speech would be of interest to every Member of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO THE VIRGINIA CONFERENCE ON WORLD TRADE, AT THE GOLDEN TRIANGLE MOTEL, NORFOLK, VA., OCTOBER 19, 1967

I am flattered to be in Norfolk at a meeting on international trade, but I approach this task tonight with some misgivings. After all, inviting someone to come from Washington to Tidewater Virginia to talk about world trade is not unlike sending someone from Washington to St. Louis to describe baseball. You are the experts, and the best we in Washington can hope to do is play a satisfactory supporting role.

I am happy also tonight to be in the home country of Bill Spong, a fellow who we're proud to have in Washington. I don't know whether Senator Spong still admits it or not, but I like to remember that we were schoolmates together—law school students on the grounds of the University of Virginia.

Back in July, Mr. Bowditch[1] wrote me a letter inviting me to this meeting. The letter began—and I quote—"Dear Secretary Boyd: Being a native Virginian, you are aware of the efforts our Commonwealth has made to strengthen its position in foreign trade in recent months." I am really a native of Florida, but I came anyway in the hope that a degree from Charlottesville and a friend named Spong will ward off any charges of misrepresentation.

I said a moment ago that you are the experts in international trade. I can document that. From the beginning—from the establishment of that first permanent British colony in the New World early in the 17th Century—Tidewater Virginia's very existence has been world trade. You sent Pocahontas to England—she may have been the first touring Miss America, or at least the first Tobacco Queen—and by sending her you convinced the Court of St. James, through Pocahontas' charms, that the New World was something more than a land of savages. You sent Mr. Jefferson to Paris and he sent back the plans for the Maison Caree, which became also the plans for your State Capitol. All the while, you were shipping tobacco and lumber and naval stores—the list goes on—and today it includes sophisticated as well as basic products—food products, textiles, metal products, machinery, and literally mountains of coal. Governor Godwin has said, "We are shipping lenses and pharmaceuticals to Germany, soy beans and textiles to Japan, and poultry and eggs to South America." It would not surprise me if Virginia were, in fact, carrying coal to Newcastle.

Recently you've also been sending out teams of Virginia saleaman, led by Governor Godwin, to tell the world about Virginia's products. Your energy has paid off, as I'm sure it will continue to do. The planners and the economists in the Department of Transportation tell me that within the next eight or nine years the international trade of the United States, in annual tonnage, will more than double. That's a healthy increase. From what I hear, dynamic, sales-conscious Virginia is going to seize its fair share of the increased profits.

And so one of the first things I want to do tonight is commend you—indeed, to thank you on behalf of the nation—for your achievements in international trade. Your motives, as you seek foreign markets, are largely concerned with the economic life of Virginia—with the expansion of industries and with attracting new industries; with utilizing your ports; in the end, with improving the lot of your citizens.

Yet when you go out in search of markets, even if you go primarily as Virginians, the advances you make are advances for the entire nation. You are serving a national goal. You are contributing to the national wealth. And your contribution is more than economic. In any marketplace at least in the long view, the most productive relationship between buyer and seller is a relationship of mutual respect and mutual understanding. When you, as Virginians and as Americans, establish new trading ties with Europeans, or with Africans, or Latin Americans or Orientals, you have established new lines of understanding and respect between the United States and the rest of the world.

For a long time now, I've been going about the country talking about a Department of Transportation. I did it first as an advocate of an idea—the idea that the country needed a Department of Transportation. That was before Congress, last year, authorized the establishment of the Department.

In the days before the Department was born, I made many promises. One was that if a Department of Transportation were established, and if it were given the tools to work with, the expenditure would be the greatest investment this country has ever made.

Well, the Department is now six and a half months old. And I stand by my promise. I think that with your help, we're going to effect substantial savings of money for shippers, for transporters and for the Federal Government. And in the meantime—again with your help—I think we're all going to get out of the bargain a better transportation system.

What is the Department of Transportation?

The Department is a recognition by Congress and by the President that transportation needs to be regarded in the 1960's not as railroads here, and highways there; airplanes up there, and ships out there; but as a coordinated system for the safe, efficient and the economical movement of people and goods. Our job at the Department level is to coordinate the various transportation agencies—to help them work together, and in harmony with others, to serve national purposes.

We are not in business for the purpose of providing pat answers to every problem. We look to the cities and states for guidance, and to groups of states which are willing to work together to solve regional problems. We will ask local governments to make their own decisions about transportation problems. And we are hoping that industry, more and more, will offer answers to the transportation questions that the cities, the states and the Federal Government identify. And as a matter of fact, especially where international trade is concerned, we in the Department of Transportation expect quite often to be pulling back the long arm of the Federal Government. If you will pardon the expression, transportation is on the move in this country; and there will be times when the most important contribution we can make will be to get the Federal Government out of the way.

What do we mean, in the Department of Transportation, when we talk about coordinating transportation: Coordination is a murky word open to all sorts of interpretation. But let me try a definition: Coordinating transportation means bringing the various kinds of transportation together in a single, functional whole—what engineers call a system. It means looking at the various modes of transportation without pre-judging them. If a product moves first by conveyor belt in the factory and then by truck and then by rail and then by steamship, we are willing to look at the conveyor belt and the truck and the railway car and the ship as equals—as partners, if you will, in a transportation system. There are differences between the vehicles. But they are all vital to the mission involved, and that mission is getting merchandise from one place to another. We think there's a certain timeliness about our willingness to regard the various modes of transportation as equals.

---

[1] W. H. Bowditch, President of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce.

Our transportation landscape today has four major categories of vehicles—water carriers, trains, motor carrier and airplanes. The ships and barges are, of course, the grandfathers of the lot. Then came the railroads. In the last century the nation bent over backwards to accommodate itself to the railroads and speed their development. As a reward for its efforts, the railroads helped unify the nation and gave us cheaper, speedier transportation than we had ever known.

Then, early in this century, came the trucks. We were wise enough and foresighted enough to tailor many of our regulatory policies and our public spending policies to the development of the automotive industry, and again we have been rewarded. Later, the airplanes came along, at first barely capable of hauling a few bags of mail, now tough, reliable cargo carriers. The nation again modified its laws and its promotional powers sufficiently to allow for the growth of the airplane. What we have today, therefore, is a strong inventory of transportation choices—vehicles ready to take your produce and your products to customers around the world.

In the Department of Transportation, we're going to try to be as modern as any of the most advanced cargo-carrying brothers and sisters in this transportation arsenal. Modern, that is, in the sense that we approach transportation with no pre-conceptions about which mode is best; and modern in the sense that we're unflustered by the probability of change. None of our transportation industries is fledgling any longer. None of them needs to be coddled. What they do need is whatever assistance we can give them in working together to give the nation point-to-point, door-to-door, *coordinated* transportation service. They need an environment which will allow them, with as little government meddling as possible, to do the kind of job which you as traders and travelers need from them.

The people who built the ports of Virginia knew what we mean now when we talk about coordinating transportation. Your Hampton Roads complex did not become a major port simply because it was a handy outlet for nearby manufacturers and mine operators. Your ports became important nationally only when you coordinated your capability for ocean shipping with other modes of transportation—that is, when your ports gained access by highways and rail lines to the manufacturing and mining centers to the west. Today, you have the biggest port complex in the nation which does not have at its doorstep a manufacturing cluster.

But the fact that most of your cargoes originate at points hundreds of miles inland represents a challenge as well as an accomplishment. For the farmers of Virginia, and the manufacturers of Virginia, the potential for profitable international trade is all the more attractive because of the convenience of Virginia's ports.

And now I'd like to talk to you about facilitation. Facilitation is a word we toss around quite a bit in the transportation business, but like that other word we use—coordination—facilitation doesn't mean much until you put it to some use. We want to put facilitation to use on behalf of world trade, and we think it can mean a great deal.

In the field of transportation, this word facilitation means exactly what it seems to mean. It means making transportation more facile, making travel easier and the movement of cargo more efficient by eliminating whatever impediments stand in the way. It means knifing through redtape. It means eliminating unnecessary paperwork. It means reducing the amount of time that passengers have to stand in line at an airport or the amount of time that a valuable shipment has to lie on the dock. Facilitation means accommodating our legal requirements and our regulatory habits to improved transportation technology such as the technology of containerization. It means, in short, making transportation easier and less expensive

I'm particularly interested in a phase of the facilitation effort which I like to think of as the paperwork rebellion. In our Department, we have an Office of Facilitation which is devoting a lot of energy to the job of reducing the amount of paperwork required in international trading. But I am happy to say that the government is by no means carrying the entire load. Just a few months ago a group of private companies which are concerned with the problem of excessive paperwork established a new organization known as NCITD—the National Committee for International Trade Documentation. The committee will have a professional staff. It has the whole-hearted support of international shippers and domestic and international carriers. We in government are gearing up to cooperate effectively with the committee and with any other groups which share with us a concern about the impediments to free international trade.

I'll give you some examples of the problem of documentation—a problem which President Johnson has characterized by saying that our international trade is conducted on a sea of redtape. The problem is that a manufacturer who wants to ship his products abroad must complete literally yards of forms—some of which are remarkably complex, others of which duplicate each other. The problem is that because of our legal structure, carriers are unable to quote single-factor rates for shipping goods from, say, an inland American city to an inland city in Europe. The problem is that a ship entering an American harbor must file nine separate forms and a ship leaving a harbor must file an additional five forms.

We think those 14 forms required for entering and clearing a harbor can be reduced to one. The international treaties which permit it have been ratified, and we're now working on that single form. We think the time has come for carriers to be able to quote through-rates for international, intermodal shipments. We think the number of forms that a shipper must file can be reduced substantially. We think industry and the government can devise a uniform commodity code that could be understood by truckers and railroads and ocean carriers; and most of all, perhaps, through government-industry cooperation, with a willingness on both sides to see just how much can be done.

If we can reduce the paperwork involved in international trade, the level of exports should rise accordingly. Paperwork is expensive. Too many American manufacturers, large and small, limit their export business simply because of the cost of the paperwork made necessary by our quaint shipping habits and our antiquated laws.

Let's take a look, for example, at the small Virginia manufacturer exploring a potential market abroad. He makes an inquiry about shipping costs, and he's likely to be asked right away whether he wants to be charged by cubic feet, by the hundred weight, the long ton, the short ton or the metric ton.

All he wants to do is ship his goods at the lowest cost possible, and he hasn't the time or the wherewithal to make himself, in the process, an expert on the complicated shipping business. We believe it is the job of industry to give the shipper the most economical, uncomplicated service possible, and the job of government to help create a transportation environment in which this can be done.

I'd like to mention two other programs we've begun in the Department of Transportation. The first of them is being carried out by a small organization which we call the Office of International Industrial Cooperation. Its job is to learn, by all available means, what transportation technology developed in other nations would be of value to the United States. And its job is to work out the agreements which we believe can lead to significant economies of both time and money as we in this nation seek to solve our transportation problems. This office is now working through established international organizations, and with individual ministries of transport in Western Europe and Japan, with an eye toward putting into effect an information exchange program for all kinds of transportation technology. We have found the Europeans and Japanese to be enthusiastic about our ideas for cooperation—and understandably. In all the developed nations of the world, millions of dollars are spent each year for transportation research and development. If we can pool some of your resources, every nation involved can profit.

The other new program which I want to mention has to do more directly with internation trade. I'm sure many of you have recognized that the developing nations of the world are becoming customers for your exports. The ability of these nations to buy our products is tied closely to the success of the technical assistance programs which the United States and other more prosperous nations are conducting. The Agency for International Development in the State Department administers the technical assistance programs of the United States. It is a surprise to many people that the agency spends about a third of a billion dollars a year on transportation projects abroad.

We of the Department of Transportation intend to become the advisor to the Agency for International Development on transportation matters. We hope to bring to those technical assistance programs which involve transportation the same broad, coordinated approach to transportation planning that we intend to apply to federally assisted public transportation programs in the United States. The result, we feel, will be not only savings of money in our assistance programs, but also a more orderly growth of transportaton systems in the developing nations of the world.

A MOST LOYAL UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING FOOTBALL FAN

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as Senators whose States are represented in the Western Athletic Conference know, the University of Wyoming football team is undefeated and is steadily making ground in the weekly ratings of major teams by the news services. This, of course, is of immense interest to me and to those who work in my office. We had, in fact, considered ourselves as being among the most loyal Cowboy fans anywhere in the United States.

But we have been put in the shade, it seems, by George Ferris, of Memphis, Tenn. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD an

Associated Press dispatch taken from last Friday's Evening Star which details the lengths of Mr. Ferris's loyalty to the Wyoming Cowboys.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Phone Call Costs Football Fan $55

Rawlins, Wyo.—George Ferris of Memphis, Tenn., is a University of Wyoming football fan.

Ferris was unable to attend last week's Wyoming game with Utah in Salt Lake City so he telephoned his sister, Mrs. Nancy Vroman of Rawlins. He asked her to tune in radio station KRAL broadcasting the game, turn up the volume and place the radio near the telephone receiver.

Ferris listened to the game—won by Wyoming 28–0—for about 3½ hours.

Telephone company officials estimate the call cost him about $55.

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF LYME CONGREGATIONAL UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST, BELLEVUE, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Lyme Congregational United Church of Christ, of Bellevue, Ohio, of which the Reverend Will Cook is pastor, in this year of 1967 will be celebrating its 150th anniversary.

The church had its beginning on July 17, 1817, with 10 members. It is located in Huron County, which constituted a part of the Firelands. The episode of the Firelands is more richly colored than any other historical development in the State of Ohio.

The western portion of the reserve of Connecticut, 25 miles wide, was known as the Firelands. Though it was a part of New Connecticut, it was from the outset quite distinct from the tract bought and sold by the Connecticut Land Co. In 1792 the general assembly set aside and quitclaimed this half million acres to the citizens of the Connecticut shore towns who had suffered property losses at the hands of British troops during the Revolutionary War. The Firelands, therefore, have their own story and have retained an individuality separate from the rest of the reserve.

No region in the State of Ohio, perhaps, is more richly colored by its past history than Erie and Huron Counties. It was known in Connecticut as the Sufferers Lands, in Ohio as the Firelands, and in the official documents of the incorporation of the Sufferers as "the half million acres of land lying south of Lake Erie."

To live in that area in the early years of the 19th century required ruggedness, stamina, work, faith, and belief in one's country. It was a land of trees, swamps, and wildlife. The forests had to be cleared, the lands drained, cabins built, wells drilled, and labor pursued.

After these pioneers first established their homes, they immediately proceeded to establish their institutions of government, of learning, and of worship.

The Lyme Congregational United Church of Christ, established in 1817, has had a substantially continuous existence for 150 years. Its Sunday school is the oldest in Ohio with a continuous organization.

Mr. President, we should find inspiration in the manifest stability of the people living in that area who through all of the changes—good and bad—of 150 years have persevered in keeping the Lyme Congregational United Church of Christ active and cultivating high level moral conduct, fidelity to government, and faith in the Lord.

THE LATE MOST REVEREND CELESTINE J. DAMIANO, ARCHBISHOP-BISHOP OF CAMDEN, N.J.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to pay profound tribute to the Most Reverend Celestine J. Damiano, archbishop-bishop of Camden, N.J., whose untimely death occurred on October 4.

Archbishop Damiano had a distinguished career of service to the Roman Catholic Church before he came to New Jersey. He served as a Vatican observer to the United Nations and was apostolic delegate to South Africa before taking over as the spiritual leader of Roman Catholics in the Camden area.

During his tenure, 30 new churches were begun and three major high schools were established. The Camden area contains many living memorials to Archbishop Damiano, but he was best known to me not for the churches and schools which were erected during his time in Camden, but for his concern for the people of his diocese. Under his direction, the neighborhood apostolate, aimed at combating poverty, was begun. He launched the House of Charity program, which ministers to the sick and the infirm of body and mind.

My own personal experience with Archbishop Damiano was in his firm and unswerving support for measures to better the lives of migratory farmworkers, often against opposition. He initiated social programs and supported legislative measures to provide economic opportunities and better living conditions for farmworkers and their children.

Archbishop Damiano's death came at the age of 55, a relatively young age. But he had already accomplished more than most men who live out the full span of their years. At his passing, we share the grief of his family, his friends, and those whose spiritual leader he was.

PROPOSED PANAMA CANAL TREATIES

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the Nashville Banner, in a recent editorial, made some very pertinent observations about the proposed Panama Canal treaties. The Banner editorial is based on comments on the proposed treaties by Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs for Veterans of Foreign Wars. General Hittle's qualifications to speak out on this subject are apparent. James Stahlman, the distinguished president and publisher of the Banner, has himself had a long and deep interest in the affairs of this hemisphere and his newspaper is an important voice in matters affecting our hemispheric relations. I feel that the opinions expressed by the Banner and General Hittle merit careful notice by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the Banner editorial of September 18, 1967, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Panama Canal Treaty a Threat to Hemisphere

Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC, (Ret.) recently spotlighted the inherent dangers involved in abandoning U.S. control over the Panama Canal through negotiation of a new treaty.

The general, director of National Security and Foreign Affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, made two points:

Fidel Castro is counting on U.S. relinquishment of the Canal Zone as a basis for scuttling the deal whereby Cuba now is bound to recognize this nation's right to maintain its naval base at Guantanamo.

A pull-out from Panama would be the first step by which the Russians hope to attain control of the Caribbean.

Gen. Hittle's warning is not idle speculation. It is grounded in fact. Havana Radio (Castro's mouthpiece) more than a year ago bluntly stated that "the standards of modern times apply everywhere, and Guantanamo—just as Panama—is an anachronistic survival of colonialism."

It now is evident that Premier Alexei Kosygin and Castro are covertly working to promote the pending Panama Canal Treaty as a prelude to demands that we also get our military forces off that Cuban base. With a Panama pull-out as a precedent, they can be expected to renew their tirades for that.

Gen. Hittle's apprehension is shared by other able military leaders who agree that control of the Caribbean by Russia would pose an intolerable threat to Western Hemisphere defenses.

As Gen. Hittle put it: "Once we agree to relinquishing control over it (the Canal) we have lost our freedom of action in protecting our strategic lifeline and the whole hemisphere."

One thing Congress should bear in mind in the consideration of any one of the several Panama Canal treaties before it for action is that success of the Red scheme to nose us out of the Caribbean hinges on U.S. ratification. With that trophy tucked under their belt, Kosygin and Castro could then proceed to put Operation No. 2 into action—an effort to boot us out of Cuba.

It should be quite clear that ratification of the proposed Panama Canal Zone treaty would move the world closer to the day when Russian submarines would be able to prowl Caribbean waters in comparative safety.

It is a canny Communist trap to avoid.

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the anti-Communist demonstrations led by students in Budapest on October 23, 1956, marked the beginning of a revolution that has had a profound effect on the Hungarian nation, the Communist bloc, and on free men throughout the world. From those relatively innocent beginnings, there has grown a new national feeling among the Hungarian people, and a new awareness of the real meaning of democracy among all the peoples of the world.

When the Hungarian puppet regime called in the troops and began to fire into the crowd that October day, the first faint soundings of the death knell of communism were heard. Admittedly, there have been no monumental changes in Communist dominance over the subject people behind the Iron Curtain, but there has been established a definite precedent for the expression of dissatisfaction with the Communist dictatorship.

By the morning of the 24th of October, the revolt was in full swing and spreading to the countryside. The world quickly realized that this was not just a bunch of rambunctious students demonstrating, but was a real rejection of Communist bondage. Within 2 days, the revolt had gripped the entire nation of Hungary and was implanted in the hearts and souls of the Hungarian people. For a few short days, there appeared to be some chance that a free Hungarian nation might rise from the ruins of the brief but courageous revolt, but Russian tanks and troops reentered the nation on November 2 and restored the Communist equivalent of peace and order.

There have been subtle changes made as a result of the revolt of 1956. The lot of the peasants has improved. There is more economic freedom. The Hungarians sent to Siberia have been, for the most part, returned, and there has been a relaxation of some of the press and speech laws. But there are also those demands that were never met: the demand for free elections, an end to Russian occupation, restoration of the Hungarian national symbols, and the end of a Russian dominated secret police that monitors the actions of every Hungarian. The Hungarian Revolution has not ended as long as there are unfinished tasks in the liberation of the people of Hungary and the other captive peoples of Eastern Europe.

Freedom and liberty are not strangers in Hungary. The Hungarians have fought for freedom and have stood against tyranny before. The events of 1848 and the resultant drive for independence are proof enough that this nation cherishes its liberty. The heroic stance of the freedom fighters against the Russian tanks in 1956 have amply demonstrated to anyone who doubted the Hungarian thirst for freedom that the Hungarian people have kept alive their desire to be free.

On this anniversary of the revolt of the Hungarian people against their Russian overlords, let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom and to those who now languish behind the Iron Curtain.

The Hungarian revolt was not in vain and it serves as a constant reminder of the cost of freedom and of the value of liberty.

CAN WE STICK IT OUT IN VIETNAM?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew, of Singapore, who visited in Washington, D.C., last week, presents us with a good picture of how we Americans are viewed in Asia. As Chalmers Roberts wrote in this morning's Washington Post, Lee came to Washington with his purpose rather bluntly stated. He wants to know whether the United States has the will to stick it out in Vietnam. He wants to know if the Americans are, to use his terms, going to stay on the bus to the end of the road, as he thinks we must.

This, of course, is a major concern in all Asia, for the developing nations there realize that their well-being is inextricably tied to our determination to see it through.

I ask unanimous consent that Chalmers Roberts' column entitled "Washington Probe by Lee Kuan Yew" and the lead editorial of the Sunday Star of October 22, 1967, which assesses the "we cannot win" attitude of some administration critics but arrives at the dominating truth that the United States has a vital role to prove that the road to Communist domination will not be found in so-called wars of liberation, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 22, 1967]

Washington Probe by Lee Kuan Yew

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

Not within living memory has a visiting head of government made so bluntly evident the purpose of his mission to Washington as did Singapore's Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew last week. From President to press Lee let Washington know he had come to find out whether the United States has the will to stick it out in Vietnam.

He left the impression on departure that he has considerable doubts. He found the President introspective, complaining about Congress and critics, taxes and budgets, rather than lifting his eyes to the horizon Lee seeks to perceive.

Lee made it evident, despite pleas from such persons as Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.) that Asian nations do more to help with the war, that there will be no Singapore participation until and unless, if then, the United States has convinced him of its will. And that, he said, candidly, will be after he sees how the presidential election is fought and how it comes out next year.

The effervescent Lee, just turned 44, is a Cambridge-educated lawyer and Socialist who admires British diplomatic skill despite Britain's past sins in Asia. By contrast, he said two years ago that, while Americans are "a highly intelligent, well-meaning people," the Johnson Administration "lacks the depth and judgment and wisdom which comes out of an accumulation of knowledge over a long period."

Despite that statement President Johnson has been touting Lee because he has also said that "if Vietnam goes, the rest goes" in Asia. Some officials here last week were foolish enough to mistake such sentiments as meaning that Lee is "with us all the way." Nothing could be further from the truth.

Lee's view boils down to this: Singapore is one of many small states in Asia which feel the massive psychological weight of China. In the past, European powers, the British, French and Dutch, offered a counterweight to China in Asia. But the European powers are going or gone from Asia and the only possible substitute is the United States.

After World War II the United States had an opportunity to provide that counterweight, but it paid little attention to Asia, so Eurocentric is the American attitude. And so China was lost whereas Western Europe was saved. Then in a belated effort to contain Communist China the United States stumbled into the Vietnam war.

The United States could have gotten off the bus, to use his metaphor, in 1958 or 1961 or as late as 1963 after Diem's fall by coming to an accommodation with the Vietcong. But since it did not, choosing instead what has become a major war, the fate of all the small and large nations alike in Asia are now deeply involved in the outcome.

Given the mess the United States has let itself get into, as Lee sees it, it must stick it out. Ho Chi Minh so distrusts and dislikes President Johnson he certainly is not going to arrange a peace conference which would help the President's election campaign. So there is nothing for the Americans to do but show they are determined to stay on the bus to the end of the road. Then, and only then, will Hanoi talk settlement.

Lee constantly refers to himself as an ethnic Chinese, which he is though he did not learn Chinese until he became an adult. While he says that the Peking regime hates him for making a success of his Socialist regime, he feels that China is bound to be a great nation. Anyway, why shouldn't the Chinese be great?

Furthermore, he adds, the Chinese are clever. Hence they are not going to march into Southeast Asia with their armies. Rather they will work through local Communist parties (the first cell was set up in Singapore the year he was born, 1923, notes Lee). A Vietcong-North Vietnamese victory would massively increase the influence of these parties, in Lee's view.

The "critical" question—"critical" is a favorite word—thus is whether the United States will be clever about Asia, backing those leaders who want to modernize their nations and creating a more sophisticated policy than simple containment of China. Central to this question, as Lee sees it, is whether the United States has gotten over its Eurocentrism. He is not at all sure.

Lee Kuan Yew, or "Harry" Lee as he is popularly known at home, is a man of the future. He sees his fate tied to America's role in Asia but he has plenty of complaints about how we play that role. He is far from "with us all the way" but the United States could do with a dozen more Lees.

[From the Washington Star, Oct, 22, 1967]

Is U.S. "Victory" Impossible in Vietnam?

The statement that it is "impossible" for us to win a "military victory" in Vietnam is being repeated by so many people that it is beginning to assume some of the aspects of a truism. But it isn't necessarily true. And it is a contention that should not be unthinkingly accepted.

Even in the literal sense, a military victory is not impossible. For we have the military power that would be required to destroy the enemy. But for a variety of reasons, including the danger of touching off World War III, we have no intention of trying for a military victory as that term was used in the second World War. So it becomes a matter of definition. If the meaning of military victory is a victory which will permit us to achieve our aims, or our principal aims, in Vietnam, then such an outcome is by no means an impossibility. In fact, there is considerable evidence that, however slowly and painfully, we are in the process of winning that kind of military victory now.

For one thing, our military commanders are confident of allied ability to handle anything that the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese can throw into the fight. The enemy has not won an important victory in a long, long time. His main force units have been pulled back or cut to pieces. He is having increasing difficulty in bringing in replacements to rebuild those units. If the North Vietnamese were hoping for a spectacular, even though localized, success against the Marines in the First Corps area, that hope has faded away. For the Marines, engaged in a kind of fight to which they are not accustomed, dug in at Con Thien, took everything the enemy could hurl at them, and, at least in the belief of the Americans in

Saigon, inflicted very heavy casualties on the attackers. Now, with the monsoon season under way, there is scant likelihood that the Communists will or can resume that assault. In fact, the expectation among our military leaders is that the enemy in the future will rely on guerrilla warfare waged by small units. This can be a very tough and nasty business. But it is also something that can be dealt with. And if it comes to this, it will surely signify that we, not the Communists, are winning the war.

There are a few other straws floating around. A recent dispatch from Saigon quoted a "senior" American official as saying that "striking" progress has been made in the pacification program and that further gains can be expected. We hope this is right, for the pacification program is the companion piece to the military phase of the war. Success in the former is as essential as success in the latter, and we have a long way to go. But if pacification progress is being made, that, too, is an indication that we are indeed winning the kind of military victory we set out to win.

Another hint may be found in a report from Hong Kong which appeared last week in the Washington Post. The gist of it was that the Viet Cong's political arm, the NLF, has set up a group to unite Americans calling for an end to the U.S. "aggressive war in Vietnam," and also to encourage American troops in Vietnam to desert. A small thing, perhaps, but also something that quite conceivably could be the reaction of a combatant who knows that the actual fighting is going against him.

As opposed to all of this, we suppose the people who say that a military victory is impossible might cite the attitude of Hanoi. Just last week, after Secretary of State Rusk had repeated our own government's desire to negotiate a settlement and had expressed his bafflement at Hanoi's continuing refusal, the North Vietnamese official newspaper came out with another rejection. Nhan Dan said all U.S. peace offers are "sheer deceptions," and restated Hanoi's minimum demand for peace talks—recognition of the Viet Cong and withdrawal of all American troops from Vietnam.

Does this adamant refusal to negotiate mean that Hanoi thinks it is winning the war? Maybe so; probably not. But it is, or at least it appears to be a fact, and it cannot be brushed aside—especially by the we-can't-win people. For if we can't win in a military sense, and if Hanoi won't negotiate, what do they propose that the United States should do?

They do not say. But the answer seems obvious enough. We simply must stay in this war and "win" it—win in the sense and to the extent that the purposes for which we have been fighting are finally achieved.

Some of the things Dean Rusk said at his press conference last week resulted in a great fluttering of wings in the dovecote. He was accused of switching his ground, or conjuring up a brand new justification for our fight in Vietnam in the form of an imaginary "yellow peril." Dean Rusk of course did not speak of or even hint at a "yellow peril." That racist phrase was put in his mouth by his critics. What he did say was this: "Within the next decade or two, there will be a billion Chinese on the mainland, armed with nuclear weapons, with no certainty about what their attitude toward the rest of Asia will be."

This is unquestionably true. And it is simply nonsense for anyone to charge that the secretary, in mentioning this fact, was inventing some new excuse or justification for what we are trying to do in Vietnam.

The fact is that Communist China, judged on the basis of its own statements, is a threat to peace in Asia and in the Pacific. Mr. Rusk did not invent this threat last week. It was clearly recognized during the Eisenhower administration, when the SEATO treaty was negotiated and ratified by the Senate. It was a basic reason for our decision, again with approval by Congress, to defend Formosa. It certainly was at least one consideration in President Kennedy's move to step up our assistance to South Vietnam. And it has been a very large factor in the subsequent decisions taken by the Johnson administration.

It is true that other reasons have been given for going to the aid of the South Vietnamese. Among these are treaty obligations as well as commitments—commitments bearing upon the reliability our our government's word. The President has said and rightly so, that we will not accept a dishonorable settlement in Vietnam. But there is nothing inconsistent between justifications of this nature and Dean Rusk's allusion to the threat posed by a nuclear-armed China. All of them are valid reasons, and all of them have been in the picture for a long time.

Of course, if one believes that we must begin now the adjustments of attitude which will be necessary if we are to reduce or liquidate our commitments in Asia, as has been suggested, then there is no need to be concerned with winning in Vietnam.

We do not accept this. Like it or not, the United States has and will continue to have a real and vital national interest in a peaceful Asia. And an essential first step in protecting that interest is to prove now, in Vietnam, that the road to Communist domination will not be found in so-called wars of liberation.

MILWAUKEE DESERVES A NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL FRANCHISE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Milwaukee's claim to a major league baseball franchise is unquestionably the best of any city in the country.

This is true not only because Milwaukee built a beautiful and spacious stadium expressly to accommodate a professional team and that the team was removed from the city after 13 years—to leave it the only city that had ever been left wholly without a baseball franchise, until Kansas City lost one for just 1 year—1968, but also because Milwaukee deserves a team for another reason.

This city has proved that it will support baseball, and with great enthusiasm. Its record of support for 13 years was superlative—more than 1,500,000 people for those years.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to one of the most persuasive statements of the merits of Milwaukee's claim made recently by Editor Lloyd Larsen of the Milwaukee Sentinel in an article entitled "Big Chance for National League To Help Itself and All of Baseball."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG CHANCE FOR NATIONAL LEAGUE TO HELP ITSELF AND ALL OF BASEBALL

(By Lloyd Larson)

When National league owners get together to pick two expansion cities, they will be reminded of some facts favorable to Milwaukee. Among them: Milwaukee averaged more than 1,500,000 in attendance for 13 years . . . four times went over 2,000,000, something only New York (Yankees) and Cleveland had done before . . . the all-time high here was approximately triple the city's population . . . Milwaukee's attendance record, from the standpoint of percentage or stadium capacity, probably will stand forever in baseball.

To people in this city and state, those are powerful arguments that should convince National Leaguers beyond all question of doubt that this territory is a logical choice.

All that has to do with local self interest, of course. But there is another, much more important reason why Milwaukee should be welcomed back into the fold. For in doing so, the National league would be performing a great service to baseball in general and the older of the big leagues in particular. That's right—a great service to the sport as well as the league. A much needed service, too.

PREDICTION CAME TRUE

I told National League owners three years ago at their historic meeting in New York that baseball would create new enemies and feed ammunition to old ones by such acts as pulling the rug on Milwaukee.

That's exactly what happened. The Nationals and all of baseball did take a beating because of what they did to the "miracle" city. And they are still getting their ears pinned back for the things going on in baseball. If anything, the pace is being stepped up again because of what writers throughout the country concluded was a badly bungled expansion job by the American league.

So here's a grand opportunity for the Nationals to counteract the critical blasts by admitting, like big men do, that they made a mistake in the case of Milwaukee and telling the world that they are not interested in recriminations, but want only to let bygones be bygones and get off to a new start.

WHY NOT REDUCE ROSTERS?

A vital consideration, too, is the never ending threat to baseball at the congressional level because of the controversial reserve clause. Giving Milwaukee its due could ease that threat—perhaps even eliminate it.

Certainly, a new franchise will mean much to this city and state. But, to repeat, a remarriage will benefit the National League and baseball will benefit just as much or more.

Talent shortage—an age old problem—naturally comes up when they get into expansion. But this need not be as serious as alleged. In fact, in seeking the solution, some adjustments loom up that may prove helpful in the long run.

Say that the player limit is reduced from 25 to 22—or perhaps even 21. That would make 60 or 80 of the present regular squad members available for expansion club development.

Some managers naturally will scream and insist they can't get along with 21 or 22. But there are others that say it can be done. Why not give it a whirl?

So what if it would mean the end of using three or four pitchers in one inning and seeing a string of pinch hitters and pinch runners on the other side? The baseball played would be just as good. And it might even be more interesting and the time of a game might be reduced by 10 or 15 minutes. That in itself isn't a bad idea.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SOVIET JEWS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with those who have made such appropriate and pertinent observations condemning the discrimination against Soviet Jews.

I am deeply proud to be a citizen of a nation where there is not such despicable discrimination.

HOUSE COMMITTEE SEVERELY CRITICAL OF FDA PROCEDURES ON SITE SELECTION FOR HEADQUARTERS LABORATORY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on October 20, the House Committee on Government Operations severely critized the Food and Drug Administration for "a serious lack of concern for economy and efficiency in selecting sites for laboratory facilities." The House committee report confirms the case I have been making concerning FDA collaboration in efforts to locate in Madison, Wis., the new FDA laboratory which, for reasons of economy and efficient administration, belongs in the Washington metropolitan area.

As Senators know, this facility was originally to be placed in Beltsville, Md., and the FDA maintained that that location was the most desirable from the standpoint of economy and efficiency. The Senate Appropriations Committee confirmed that the facility should be in the Washington area. The FDA, moreover, said that the location of the facility outside Washington would result in substantial added costs.

Despite this evidence, Commissioner Goddard later told a congressional committee that location of the facility outside Washington would be acceptable.

The report of the House committee cites this inconsistency in FDA recommendations and its failure to rely upon adequate studies and to comply with HEW site selection regulations.

In addition, the committee states that the original FDA cost study, which that construction in Beltsville would be $5.4 million less costly to the taxpayers, was revised to show a lesser differential on the basis of a study—and I quote the report—"of poor quality and doubtful validity."

The committee reports that FDA officials not only disregarded HEW site selection regulations, but also were not even aware of the existence of other regulations bearing on site selection.

The House Government Operations Committee points out that final selection of the alternative site by FDA was made without a single site visit to any institution by qualified inspectors. The committee report states that the alternative site was selected in a "hasty manner" with "an almost total absence of documentary support."

Among its recommendations, the committee "strongly" asks that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare require the FDA to conduct a thorough, objective, and careful study to select the most desirable site for Headquarters Laboratory No. 2, and that this study be carried out in strict compliance with HEW regulations, with due regard for economy and efficiency.

Mr. President, I strongly agree with these recommendations and findings. I wish to express my wholehearted commendation to the House Committee on Government Operations, to the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee and to the subcommittee chairman, Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Findings and Conclusions" and "Recommendations" from pages 13 to 15 of this 10th report of the Committee on Government Operations, House Report No. 801, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The Food and Drug Administration has demonstrated a serious lack of concern for economy and efficiency in selecting sites for laboratory facilities.

In one of the two situations it examined in detail, the committee found that FDA has a substantial part of its laboratory activities—which might better be located outside downtown Washington—housed in a costly new building (Federal Building No. 8) near the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at the foot of Capitol Hill. At the same time, administrative and regulatory personnel, who have frequent dealings with HEW officials and the Congress, are located in rented quarters in Arlington, Va.

In the other situation, the committee found that FDA had selected an alternative site for its Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 without an adequate study and without complying with HEW site selection regulations.

The circumstances leading to location of FDA laboratories in Federal Building No. 8 date back a number of years, and it was not always possible to determine exactly what happened. However, it appears that lack of foresight on the part of FDA and failure of the agency to adjust its plans promptly to meet changes in its overall responsibilities and workload is at least partially responsible for the present situation.

2. During hearings on FDA's appropriation for fiscal year 1968, FDA witnesses did not mention the disadvantages the agency had previously stated would result from location of Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 in the Midwest. In fact, the attitude expressed by FDA was completely inconsistent with its previously stated position. In reports, letters, and statements, FDA has maintained that Beltsville is the most desirable location from the standpoint of economy and efficiency. It has taken the position that location of this facility outside Washington (except in the Southeastern United States) would result in substantial added costs and could present additional problems resulting in decreased efficiency.

Yet, when Commissioner Goddard was asked in his appearance before the House Appropriations Subcommittee what his reaction would be to a limitation requiring Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 to be located outside the Washington area, he replied, "It wouldn't bother me" and proceeded to suggest an alternative site. No mention was made of FDA's own estimate that the alternative site would substantially increase initial and operating costs.

The committee wishes to emphasize that it is citing FDA's cost estimate only to illustrate the inconsistency of FDA's position and its apparent lack of concern for economy and efficiency. In so doing, the committee is not endorsing the accuracy of the estimate. In fact, since the subcommittee's hearings, FDA has changed its original estimate and now maintains that the initial cost differential between Beltsville and the alternative site at Madison, Wis., would be about $1 million rather than $5,400,000. However, for the reasons previously cited in this report, the committee finds no basis for placing any more reliance on the second estimate than on the first.

3. The committee's study has shown that both the original FDA cost study which showed a $5,400,000 differential in favor of a Washington location, and a recent revision of it, reducing the differential to $1 million, are of poor quality and doubtful validity.

4. The committee found that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not have adequate administrative practices to insure that its constituent agencies are complying with the Department's site selection regulations including those relating to decentralization of activities.

HEW's site selection regulations, which appear to be reasonably adequate, were not followed in the selection of the alternative site for Headquarters Laboratory No. 2.

The regulations require establishment and utilization of a site selection board or team for major projects, but this was not done.

The regulations also require preparation of a report reflecting sites considered, the points considered in the evaluation or comparison, the reasons for the choice made, and other pertinent items. No such report was prepared.

Testimony at subcommittee hearings disclosed that FDA officials not only disregarded the above departmental regulations, but were not even aware of the existence of others bearing on site selection policies.

5. The committee found that procedures used by FDA in selecting an alternative site for Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 were completely inadequate. An adequate and properly conducted study might or might not arrive at the same conclusion. However, the inadequacy of the study that was made is shown by the following:

The list of 47 institutions supposedly meeting FDA's basic criteria—and therefore regarded as eligible for consideration—was incomplete.

The list of 47 institutions supposedly under consideration was reduced to six on the basis of the personal opinions of one individual, who made no record of the basis for his actions and did not visit any of the 47 institutions.

Final selection of an alternative site was made by FDA without a single site visit to any institution by anyone possessing the necessary scientific qualifications to evaluate the potential contributions each institution might make to FDA's research program.

Because of the hasty manner in which an alternative site was selected, an adequate evaluation of all potentially desirable sites was impossible.

There was an almost total absence of documentary support for the selection made.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The committee recommends that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare take prompt and effective steps to insure that the Food and Drug Administration complies with HEW site selection regulations and the Government-wide policies for decentralization and real property utilization set forth in Bureau of the Budget Circulars A-60 and A-2 revised.

2. The committee strongly recommends that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare require the Food and Drug Administration to conduct a thorough, objective, and careful study to select the most desirable site for Headquarters Laboratory No. 2. The Department should take appropriate steps to insure that the study is carried out in strict compliance with HEW regulations and with due regard for economy and efficiency.

The committee wishes to emphasize again that it is taking no position as to where Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 should be located; its concern is solely that the location be determined in a proper manner and that there be adequate documentation justifying both the selection and the manner in which it is made.

3. The committee recommends that the Bureau of the Budget review the practices being followed by Federal departments and agencies with a view to determining whether they have appropriate site selection regulations and whether such regulations are being carried out effectively.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER FOR RECESS ON FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1967, TO HEAR THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO ADDRESS JOINT MEETING OF CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess on Friday, October 27, 1967, beginning at 12:15 p.m., subject to the call of the Chair, to hear the Honorable Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, the President of the United Mexican States, address Congress in a joint meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

WORLD WAR III—COMMUNIST STYLE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the need to get at the true meaning of the war in South Vietnam grows more imperative with every passing day. There are those who claim it is based solely on American imperative cupidity—or stupidity. These have become bolder to the point of hysterical mass civic disobedience which reached its latest climax this last weekend. Others hoping for the end of the fighting, seek in vain for signs that Ho Chi Minh and his North Vietnamese Communists are willing to negotiate. Still others believe that only by driving through with our overwhelming air and naval superiority can we ever hope for an early and acceptable end to the conflict.

Mr. President, it is as though all of us are lost in a dense fog made thick by undependable information. All of what we are told is piecemeal and inadequate, and much of it is slanted to support preconceived conditions, philosophies, or prejudices. As we grope in this darkness, we are pulled this way and that by the many strident voices of political spokesmen, military experts, editorial pundits, and foreign kibitzers.

I think most of the confusion grows out of amateur attempts to second guess the generals and diplomats, with respect to the daily conduct of the war. I am not going to do that. Instead, for what it may be worth, I shall present my conception of how this conflict fits into the framework of 20th century history.

I begin with a word that has already been worked to death, the word "escalation." Ordinarily, it is used to describe the calculated steady increase in our commitment of money and war material in South Vietnam. But there are those who use it to express their fear that if the present buildup continues, it will inevitably lead to world war III.

Mr. President, each new war produces its own new vocabulary and this one has already overworked the word "escalation," used to refer to the calculated, steady increase in our commitment of men, money, and war material in the war in South Vietnam.

Those who use this word are understandably vague as to where they think this new war will be fought, though the usual inference is that it will be a natural extension of the present conflict that will begin by expanding across the Chinese border, bringing first China and then Russia in against us. They see the United States facing the massed power of more than a billion people and a fearful nuclear holocaust.

I am emboldened to speak out now because I have come to believe this concept is basically false and is based on a misreading of history since World War II. To me the present war in Vietnam cannot possibly escalate into world war III because world war III has already been going on for more than 20 years.

In my opinion, the battle in South Vietnam may turn out to be as decisive in the third world war, as the Battle of the Bulge and the Battle of Midway were in World War II.

If my interpretation is right, why has not this been clear to everybody from the beginning? To me there are several reasons. First, our definition of a world war is based on the patterns of the other two World Wars which were essentially the same. Second, from the beginning this has been an undeclared war and our enemy has carefully spaced his activities in the hope that we would never recognize its significance or its scope. Third, the other World Wars were over in less than 10 years. They expect this one to last several decades.

There is time only for a very brief expansion of this concept. To begin with let us look briefly at the pattern of the two previous World Wars. Their patterns, having become history, are very clear. Both were generated by the overreaching personal ambitions of paranoic European rulers. Both began with swift and sudden military drives at full power strength. Both began in Europe and the Atlantic, although Japan and Communist Russia later became involved in the second, and for this reason that conflict also raged over the Pacific and through the countries on the east coast of Asia. Japan's goal was the same kind of mastry over Asia that Hitler sought for the Germans over Europe. In fact, Japan had already invaded Manchuria and other parts of China before the big war began and during the war itself had successfully overrun most of the other nations in Southeast Asia.

If Japan had been the victor in World War II, China would have been surrounded and Japan would have been the master of the whole Far East. We did not allow this to happen then and we cannot allow it to happen now. Because our own west coast fronts on the Pacific, the United States must always have a deep concern about the fate of the nations of Asia. That concern has been put into words many times, such as President Johnson did when he said about a year ago, "no single nation can or should be permitted to dominate the Pacific region."

In World War II Japan made the attempt to do just this and failed. But this is world war III and now it is China and Russia whose mastery of Asia we must prevent. However, I should also point out that in taking this position, I am not in anyway advocating American domination of Asia. I believe our past history and record in Asia supports my position.

While both earlier World Wars started without our being involved, we did eventually get into both and when forced to intervene we supplied the margin of power that tipped the scales against the would-be world conquerers and when we intervened in the Asiatic half of World War II, we carried practically the whole battle and now we have had to intervene in this one.

There is another fundamental reason why this world war is different from the other wars both in its inception and its pattern. The other wars began when the would-be imperialists thought they had strength enough to conquer Europe and the world. They were defeated, but the holocaust left all of Europe and much of Asia almost completely destitute, both of productive capacity and military might. This created a near-vacuum into which the Communists could start the new and vastly different type of world war for which they had long planned.

The weakness of their own postwar exhaustion would not permit them to undertake any massive attack against any free nation or any combination of which the United States was a part. It is clear that they felt, however, that they could move immediately against countries whose impoverished economies appeared to be fertile soil for Communist ideology. Instead of open warfare, they proceeded to foster internal revolutions in these nations, begun with subversion and pursued through the use of native Communist guerrilla forces.

WARS OF NATIONAL LIBERATION

This time the world was not to be swallowed whole but chewed up in little bites. This time they hoped to consume many key areas without arousing the sleeping giant which is the United States. This time they even hoped not only to conceal the relationship of these wars to their worldwide objectives but also at the same time to give them a noble purpose by calling them deceptively, wars of national liberation.

But like all would-be conquerors, they talked too much and eventually gave the whole evil plan away. In December 1965, Premier Kosygin told James Reston:

> We believe that National Liberation wars are just wars and they will continue as long as there is national oppression by imperialist powers.

I trust that discriminating people quickly recognize the propaganda contained in Kosygin's statement.

In September 1965, the Red Chinese Minister of Defense in a long policy statement announced that Mao expected to use wars of liberation to expand communism to Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

A statement along this line by General Giap, the commander in chief of the North Vietnamese forces in this war is of greatest significance. He said:

> South Viet Nam is the model of the national liberation movement of our time. If the special warfare that the United States imperialists are testing in South Viet Nam is overcome then it can be defeated anywhere in the world.

So, although we may not see it now as a critical turning point in history, the Communists do.

The list of countries against which the Communists have already used subversive warfare and direct attacks is longer than most Americans realize. All in all we can count 19—Yugoslavia, Greece, Malaya, Philippines, Cuba, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia, Korea, Guatemala, Venezuela, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Bolivia, Nicaragua, Cambodia, Burma, and India.

The method succeeded in Yugoslavia, in China, in Cuba, and in North Vietnam. It is currently underway in embryonic form in South America, in Bolivia, Venezuela, Colombia, Guatemala, and Nicaragua. And in Southeast Asia in Thailand, Cambodia, and the rest of Laos.

But sometimes it has failed, particularly when the United States has moved in to provide help to the legitimate government. The first major failure was in Greece immediately after World War II. Other Communist failures have been in the Philippines, in Burma, Indonesia, in Guatemala, and in Malaya, and these are encouraging. But, the biggest test of all is still facing us in South Vietnam.

Looking at this conflict as another in the series of local wars which although widely separated in time and place together make up world war III, we can easily see how the Communists hope to succeed by exploiting weakness, where the Germans and Japanese failed by exerted strength. In that framework, I shall ask and try to answer four questions.

One, in what way does this Communist pattern produce a type of warfare which differs from or resembles that which took place in the earlier world wars?

Two, why are we in this war?

Three, up to this time has our intervention been good or bad for South Vietnam and the world?

Four, what is the best way to end the conflict?

Turning to the first question, it is easy to see why South Vietnam was selected by the Communists as a promising battleground in their wars to exploit weakness. Their capacity to govern themselves had almost been eroded away by more than a century of French colonial rule, which seems to have been particularly repressive and marked by calculated corruption.

It is no wonder that the Vietnamese people finally rebelled. But, in light of what is happening now, 13 years later, it is unfortunate that the hero of that fight for freedom, Ho Chi Minh, was a Communist, and that even today his communism is more important to him than the freedom for which he fought the French.

The fact that the south once followed his leadership made it possible for him to organize the Vietcong and leave them behind in the south, like time bombs, to explode after the Treaty of 1954. Between then and now, they have literally dug themselves in—both into the earth itself—and into the village life.

From these two points of strength, they have carried on a grisly program of subversion and murder for the purpose of wiping out all free local government by destroying its leaders. Moreover, because as Communists they have no religion themselves, they have sought to create and exploit unholy political tensions among the various Buddhist sects and against the Catholics. In short, to use religious differences to help them create anarchy and chaos.

I think the fact that the love of freedom has survived is eloquent testimony to the dedication and determination of the South Vietnamese. The fact that they twice turned out to vote in unexpectedly large numbers underscores the depth of that feeling. I should have said three times, because there has been another vote over the weekend.

I am sure they know that voting is a privilege Ho does not allow his subjects north of the 17th parallel.

Another political liability is that they do not have full faith in their leaders. Some of them are still corrupt, and after 13 years, their government is still weak from the constant pressure of the Vietcong. But even the illiterate peasants prefer their government to the communism of the north, and are still willing to fight for it.

When we look at the military aspects of this war, it is easy to see how different it is from the other wars we have fought in Asia—far different from the island hopping of World War II, and even from the mass-movements combat in Korea. This war is confined to an area that, while small, includes a topography that varies from rice swamps to densely wooded mountains. The actual fighting is usually between small units, involved in hit-and-run engagements of very short duration. And the ability of the South Vietnamese people to fight has been worn away by the 20 years of continuing warfare that has raged back and forth across their land and taken its toll of their young manhood, and their resources.

The war's most significant feature is the enemy's use of the pattern of guerrilla combat. That this has been the basic pattern for what the Communists call wars of national liberation had already been demonstrated earlier in other countries. Looking back, we see that this was the pattern used by Tito's partisans in Yugoslavia, and it was used again in the attempt to take over in Greece. It has been tried and has failed in Malaya, the Philippines, and the Dominican Republic, and is still continuing in Thailand.

Of course, for us the most vivid and embarrassing example was Castro's takeover of Cuba with a handful of men. But Mao's success in China may have overbalanced all these lesser failures, because it gave the Communists a second great population and power base.

For many reasons it has been difficult, even impractical, for our American soldiers to adapt to this type of warfare. Because the Communist guerrillas fight without identifying uniforms, we cannot tell the Viet Cong from the South Vietnamese; and we have never been able to discover, let alone cope with, all the enemy's unorthodox tunnels and hiding places.

But we have learned that to offset their guerrilla tactics, we must increase our air superiority. We have done this by adding fighting helicopters and the dense fire power of the slow, old C-47, now rearmed, called "Puff, the Magic Dragon" to the power of our conventional fighters and bombers.

To counter this they have loosed a flood of propaganda both here in America and throughout the world, hoping to create a wave of public opinion that would force us not to use our full air capability and thus give up our greatest tactical advantage. If they could require us to fight the war entirely on the ground, they would have every hope of victory.

I recognize that there are many other features of this war that create special problems for us that I shall not mention because I want to maintain a long-range perspective on its place in the framework of world war III—Communist style.

So, I will move on to my second question—why are we in it?

It is clear to me that in all these little wars, the United States has been reacting in accordance with its traditional policies. In other words, it has been "doing what comes naturally." I say "what comes naturally" because, contrary to belief of some, we have not been improvising our foreign policy in Vietnam. We have been pursuing there the same objectives that we held in Europe when we opposed the Kaiser, Hitler, and Stalin, and in Asia when we opposed Japan. We will not allow one nation, either directly or through proxies like North Vietnam, to dominate whole regions of the globe.

Today, the task is harder because the current threat uses the cutting edge of communism, and for a while at least that has an appeal to people who have been impoverished and held down under a colonialist's thumb. But the principles for which we stand and our objectives are the same. Any changes you detect in our attitude then and now are simply those made necessary by differences in time, circumstances, and tactics.

BASIC AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

At least four American principles stand out, and in every war of this century we have sacrificed much blood and treasure rather than give them up. Let me list them:

First. Devotion to the principle of personal freedom as a fundamental concept of government.

Second. Our belief that all other peoples who desire to live with these same freedoms should have the right to do so, and that when we protect their freedom, we are always protecting our own.

Third. A willingness to help other peoples improve their economic conditions, even to the extent of opening our own markets and sharing our own wealth if necessary.

Fourth. A determination never to be an aggressor or to embark on a policy of colonialism.

In listing these, it should go without saying that we believe such a policy will always be in our own national self-interest, and result in long term benefits to ourselves as well as to our friends. I am sure that in this present contest with communism there is no essential conflict between our own goals and the hopes of those we seek to help.

Of course, the application of these four principles has varied with the changing circumstances of our expanding history. Its first major expression was for the protection of the infant Latin American Republics when early in the 19th century they began to throw off the yoke of European colonialism. Because this happened during the Presidency of James Monroe, the principle has been known since as the Monroe Doctrine. Our commitment to this principle led us into our war with Spain in the Philippines at the end of the 19th century and this in turn brought us for the first time into Southeast Asia. That experience, now two-thirds of a century behind us, set the precedent for our more recent intervention in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, the south seas, and now South Vietnam.

Since this has been the latest of many confrontations between our foreign policy and that of the Communists, perhaps we should pause to look at Vietnam in terms of these principles. When we do, it is obvious that first, there has been a challenge to a people seeking to establish freedom as the basis for their own self-government; second, we have come to the aid of a nation so challenged; and third, we have been generous with our economic aid.

I want to dwell a little longer on my analysis of the fourth aspect of our foreign policy, that we have never been the aggressor nor succumbed to the temptation of neocolonialism.

If ever a nation was in a perfect position to take advantage of a world situation, that nation was the United States after World War II. During the troubled years since, we could easily have become the world's greatest neocolonial power, a label which now very obviously fits the great Communist nations. We could easily have turned our economic aid programs into international mortgages and foreclosed them to gain territorial control in many parts of the world.

When the war ended, all of Europe was broken and prostrate and Japan was helpless. If the Communists had been in our place, all these countries would have been dragged behind the Iron Curtain long since. But our devotion to the moral values in self-government has been stronger among us than the urge to dominate other people.

We could have conquered and held Japan; instead, we chose to rebuild it as an independent democracy. Our success in Japan holds promise for what we can do for the people in Vietnam. The successful growth of free government in Japan is proof that Buddhism is not incompatible with the essential concepts from which democracy must grow.

The same spirit shines through our record in Taiwan. By supplying military protection and foreign aid, we have helped make that once-backward nation economically independent, and its example stands as a beacon of hope to the other peoples of Southeast Asia.

As I have tried to demonstrate, our presence in Vietnam is in keeping with our longtime foreign policies. We are there to protect ourselves and our own interests by protecting the existence and interest of still another small nation. We are doing this: First, because our own security requires that Red China not be allowed to become the dominant nation in Asia; second, because we cherish freedom; and, third, because we believe such help rather than territorial acquisition or colonial control is better for us and the world.

Having indicated my belief that we are in this war as a logical expression of our long-established foreign policy based essentially on self-interest, I am lead naturally to ask my third question—has our intervention already created benefits for Vietnam and for those other countries in Southeast Asia who love freedom? I think the answer is a resounding "Yes."

I think there is great value in the fact that South Vietnam is still a free country, free enough at least to adopt a new constitution and elect the new officers it provided for, both by popular vote. But of greater worldwide significance is the indirect effect of our intervention in preserving the freedom of other countries in Southeast Asia. Before we put our military power in South Vietnam, several had already been set up for Communist takeover, and all would probably have gone down like dominoes—hence, the phrase "the domino theory."

THE DOMINO THEORY

Of course, this theory may seem to be an oversimplification. The loss of South Vietnam might not mean the immediate collapse of other states in Southeast Asia, but it would undoubtedly set off a new series of guerrilla wars. If South Vietnam were to fall, the Communists would have a new power base from which to infiltrate and eventually overcome Cambodia and the rest of Laos.

Once these countries were under Chinese control, Thailand would be completely surrounded on the east by Communists, and if it stood alone, it would be comparatively easy to choke it into submission. In fact, Communist guerrillas controlled from Hanoi and Peking, and operating from Cambodia, are already active in northeast Thailand. Troops from North Vietnam have actively supported the Pathet Lao in gaining control of nearly half of Laos.

Similar Communist activities in Malaya, Burma, and Indonesia indicate that the Russians and the Chinese believe in the truth of the domino theory, whether we do or not, and are using it wherever and whenever they think the situation is propitious.

To me, the best proof of the accuracy of the domino theory is that it has actually worked in reverse. By standing firm in South Vietnam, we have given these other nations time to prepare to protect themselves, and have furnished them a shield behind which they can strengthen their own political institutions and their own national economies.

The best evidence of this is the change that has occurred in Southeast Asia since 1965 when we first made it absolutely clear that we would stand firm in Vietnam. In 1966, nine free Asian nations formed the Asian and Pacific Council. Japan is in that group, along with our Australian and New Zealand friends, and they are all determined to remain free of China. Then, only a few weeks ago, five Southeast Asian nations formed the Association of Southeast Asia.

Former neutrals such as Indonesia, as well as stanch anti-Communist nations like Thailand, are determined that through their own regional cooperation, they can help preserve their freedom.

But the most significant event to me was the establishment last year of the Asian Development Bank, to whose capital Asian and non-Asian nations—including the United States but not China or Russia—have subscribed. The Bank's resources will be devoted to building and rebuilding the economy of this area which the Communists now threaten.

But for the most dramatic proof of the success of the domino-theory-in-reverse, look at Indonesia after Sukarno's downfall. Indonesian leaders have told us how close their country came to a Communist takeover. The loss of Indonesia to the free world would have been very tragic, because this little-known Asiatic country is the fifth most populous nation on the globe and the third richest in terms of natural resources. The Communists probably regard it as the most precious prize in Asia, and they almost had it in their hands. Yes, I am sure our presence in Vietnam has already helped the whole free world.

I am ready now to move on to my final question, which leads naturally from the previous one. What would happen now if the United States withdrew before the situation in South Vietnam is stabilized?

Most experts recognize the Vietnam confrontation as crucial. It has been building up for nearly 15 years now, and if we should allow the Communists to prevail, storm warnings would immediately rise around the world.

Our premature withdrawal would demonstrate that the Communists have at last found the key to victory in a world war—the war of national liberation. If we allow this to happen, all free nations, particularly the small ones, would be justified in believing that we are unworthy to be trusted as the leader of the free world. Those other countries to which we have given promises of support would properly doubt whether our help would be forthcoming when they needed it, especially when the going got tough.

In other words, our friends would lose faith in us, and we would deserve it.

If we ever lose the right to lead the free world, Communist power would be unchallenged, and communism might eventually become the wave of the future. One by one, the smaller free countries would have to bow under its yoke, and the day could come when we stood isolated and alone.

Mr. President, it is very interesting to me that the people who represent the antiwar group in the United States are becoming more and more clearly revealed as great isolationists. They do not want us to get involved anywhere else in the world. Obviously, we must not risk that great tragedy by trying to isolate ourselves from freedom's problems now.

The war will end someday. All wars do. Then we will move to the conference table to fashion the post war pattern for the hoped-for peace. Many people are calling for negotiation now. It is my firm belief, however, that we should not go into any negotiations with anyone until we can be sure that at the end of the negotiations South Vietnam will still be free and independent.

If the Communists hold the trump cards at the conference, they will play them with great and ruthless skill because they have always regarded such negotiations as a continuation of war in a different form.

Our premature withdrawal or resort to premature negotiations might have another dangerous result. It could allow China, or Russia, or both of them—if the present split can be healed—to acquire effective control over all of Asia. If that happened, it would create a tremendous economic and military power base from which Communist nations could move against the rest of the world.

Our capitulation would put all the free nations now along the Pacific coast of Asia into great and immediate jeopardy, including the giant Japan, the now stable Formosa, and the still struggling Korea.

Because we know that communism hates Christianity, we could soon expect that religion to disappear in Asia—first the Philippines, then in Australia, and New Zealand—as those countries were outflanked and overrun.

Am I seeing nightmares? The Japanese almost did all this less than 30 years ago from a much weaker power base. But do not take my word for this risk. Listen to what the leaders of these threatened countries have to say.

The statement of the Foreign Minister of Malaysia, Prince Abdul Rahman very effectively destroyed the "civil war" concept when he said:

> The power vacuum left over from the retreat of western colonial rule . . . has not been filled by the growth and consolidation of indigenous power. On the contrary, taking advantage of the situation, a giant outside power, the People's Republic of China, seems bent on a long-range program of expanding its power and influence through its proxies in Southeast Asia. It is not South Viet Nam which seeks to annex North Viet Nam, but vice versa. This has been officially admitted by Hanoi, and Peking is giving Hanoi every encouragement. Peking's and Hanoi's involvement in the Communist offensive in Laos is also well known. And since early last year, Peking has repeatedly threatened Thailand, Malaysia and Singapore with so-called People's Wars to be launched by local Communist movements against these three countries.

I have other quotations. One from the Thai Government clearly underscores the source of the danger:

> Decent nations the world over already know that aggression in Southeast Asia, either against the Kingdom of Laos, the Republic of Viet Nam, or Thailand, was started many years ago by none other than the Communist regime of North Viet Nam, in collaboration with certain Communist countries.

Another by the Prime Minister of Australia, who has explained what American involvement means to his country:

> No region today contains greater dangers for world peace and security than Asia. Southeast Asia has been singled out by the Communists as a critical area of challenge. They believe that if their technique of so-called "Wars of National Liberation" can succeed in South Viet Nam, it can be employed with similar success in many other countries.

Finally, Singapore's Prime Minister, Lee Kuan Yew, who has been in Washington within the last 10 days, said:

> I feel the fate of Asia—South and Southeast Asia—will be decided in the next few years by what happens in Viet Nam. If the Americans decide to pack it up because the position is untenable in South Viet Nam, then what happens to the 500 armed Communists wandering around the borders of Thailand and Malaysia is very pertinent. And if Malaysia cannot be held, then Singapore must make adjustments accordingly.

Which means Singapore goes back to the Communists.

But the prospect for peace and freedom in all of Southeast Asia will be very bright indeed if we stay until the situation is truly stabilized. Japan, which has now developed firmly rooted traditions of freedom, would undoubtedly emerge as the great economic leader of the people of Asia. Our Anglo-Saxon counterparts in Australia and New Zealand would be able to carry out their supendous programs for the development of their heretofore undeveloped natural resources. There would be hope that in time, the tides of freedom, which have already begun to flow north from Indonesia, could flow into and across China, thus weakening and eventually removing this potentially dangerous threat.

THE END OF THE WAR

We come at last to the final question—the one on everybody's minds. How can we end this? When can we get out?

I have taken all this time to get to this point because I believe we can only find the right answer if we understand how and why we got in.

The actual process of disengagement is similar after every war. A cease-fire is agreed upon, followed by an armistice. This leads to a conference, at which the pattern of the future relations between the two combatants is worked out, including the conditions for the final disposition of the military forces. Only then can we have hope that peace can be achieved.

So far, none of these steps have been taken in Vietnam. Several times we have unilaterally tried temporary cease-fire periods, and bombing pauses, but the enemy not only has not responded in kind but has used the time to strengthen his position.

Can we get a promise of negotiations first before the fighting stops? We have tried that too, both through direct contacts and through intermediaries, both openly and secretly. Others have tried also, including officials such as U Thant, the Secretary General of the United Nations, and private citizens acting on their own. All have been rebuffed.

Why can we not just stop fighting one day and wait to settle our problems with the Communists at the negotiation table? There are several reasons why this is impossible.

The first grows out of the difference in attitudes that we and they have toward negotiations. To us, it is a process by which decisions are reached through mutual concessions. To the Communists it is merely an extension of the conflict on a different level, on which they continue to fight for their own basic goals. Rather than to compromise, they will "negotiate" interminably, as witness the negotiations still going on in Korea after 15 years and the many years of fruitless peace conferences in Geneva. When our spirit of compromise meets their intransigent attitude, who usually loses? The answer is obvious and has been written into history many times, from Yalta on.

The second reason is equally fundamental. The outcome of any conference is determined mainly by the relative power, strength, and influence which the two opponents bring to the bargaining table at any war's end. This obviously reflects the relative military strength of the two. If we began negotiations today, would the strength of our present military position enable us to overcome the Communists' traditional intransigence?

There is still a third reason, and, to me, it is the most important of all. Have we accomplished what we went in to do? Can we be sure that after any negotiation undertaken without a military decision that the people and Government of South Vietnam can be assured of freedom from the continuing Communist pressures of subversion, terror as well as from actual military invasion? Until we can, any withdrawal on lesser terms will mean tragedy for the South Vietnamese—a faith-destroying defeat for us, and a great encouragement for the Communists to make the next local war a much bigger one.

Am I an incurable pessimist? Far from it. I think we are winning this third world war, and at an increasingly rapid rate. Of the 19 little wars the Communists started, they have really only won four: Yugoslavia, North Vietnam, China, and Cuba, and internal conditions in these latter countries, one a giant, the other a pigmy, are now rapidly going from bad to worse.

But even so, I do not think the Communists are ready yet to give up their grand plan for world conquest or subversion through these so-called wars of national liberation. Therefore, I believe that if hostilities end in Vietnam on an inconclusive note, they will soon begin somewhere else and continue into the future. If this happens, will we have to intervene again? I am sure we will, but I am also sure that if we win this one, the next one will be easier. If we lose it, the next one could be catastrophic.

Will world war III end like the others—with a victory for freedom? To me there has always been only one answer. The spirit of freedom in man personified by the eagle can be crushed but never be destroyed. It has survived great periods of oppression in the past and is stronger today than ever before.

This same spirit of freedom has already opened up cracks in the existing Communist monolith. The European satellites are becoming increasingly more independent of Moscow and every new taste of freedom creates a greater appetite for more. Even in Russia itself the once all-powerful party is being forced to shift more and more of its economic investments away from heavy industry geared to the production of military hardware in order to supply consumer items increasingly demanded by the Russian people, who are coming to realize that life is easier in the free world. Moreover, every time the men at the top in Russia change, the new leader, or leaders, have to make more concessions to the individual citizens in order to get a broader political base, and this always increases the power of the people.

What about the Russian ability and willingness to come to the aid of their local pawns in a limited war when things go bad? The recent Israeli-Arab debacle has just exposed this as a false hope and a myth. When the multibillion-dollar war machine they supplied to their Arab friends was shattered in 6 days by a tiny Israeli force, the Russians did not move in with troops to help. Their only aid was a series of angry, frustrated, self-serving speeches at the U.N. On the other hand, when the South Vietnamese war reached a point at which the free people were being defeated, we sent in combat forces.

SUMMARY

As I close, let me repeat my basic assumption and my four questions and answers. To me, the war in South Vietnam is a part of world war III, Communist style; another in the series of little wars the Communists thought they could win easily, by which they hoped eventually to extinguish all political, economic, and personal freedom in all the world.

First. How is this war different? Every war is both different and similar as controlled by the conditions under which it is fought, and this one was planned by the Communists to make our air and naval power ineffective. Fortunately, we have learned how to adjust our use of airpower to offset enemy guerrilla tactics and by now have regained the military superiority.

Second. Why are we in this war? We are in it for the very same reason we went into the earlier world wars because in the interest of U.S. security, we cannot allow a hostile power to gain control of Asia. We have always been willing to fight to maintain freedom, both in our own interests and to help others to maintain their freedom. I question if we can allow communism to slowly peck away at the institutions of freedom around the world and still preserve this precious possession for our own posterity.

Third. Up to this time, has our intervention been bad or good for Vietnam and the rest of Southeast Asia? Definitely and dramatically good. Behind the shield of our power, the Vietnamese people have begun to construct a free government, and in the rest of Southeast Asia, the domino theory has begun to operate in reverse.

Fourth. And finally, when and how can we bring this tragedy to an end? This can only be done by making militarily sure that the South Vietnamese people can be assured of a future free from internal terror and external force. To withdraw sooner would not only reward Communist aggression, and confirm the effectiveness of their so-called wars of liberation, but would inevitably encourage further Communist military adventures elsewhere, just at a time when, in fact, their essential weaknesses are beginning to show and they are going downhill.

I have taken this much time to pose these questions and give my answers to them, because I think both the doves and the hawks among us tend too often to interpret the Vietnam problem largely in terms of each day's headlines instead of considering the overall long-term, worldwide values involved.

For my final sentence, I turn to the book of Luke in the New Testament. Here I find what, to me, is the ultimate summary of my thesis, and the only key to lasting peace in Vietnam:

> And Jesus said unto him, no man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Utah for his very instructive and sound presentation today. The Senator courageously takes a position which, for the moment, may be unpopular.

I was especially struck by the fact that early in his talk he discussed the subject of aggression, atrocities committed upon innocent men, women, and children, and the purpose of imposing colonial domination. It is tragic that in our country, especially as manifested in the last 2 days here in Washington, the charges of aggression, seeking to impose colonial domination, and committing atrocities have been heaped upon the United States instead of upon the Communists of North Vietnam, Peking, and Moscow, where they belong.

Yesterday's demonstrations, which were discussed by the Senator from Utah, were advertised by the Communists in fullpage advertisements, calling upon citizens of the United States to come to Washington. Why were the Communists so deeply interested? Why did they want thousands of visitors to come to Washington and participate in the demonstration?

There has been talk about infiltration and subversion in Latin America and in other countries. We have it in the United States. Infiltrators and subversives were present on the Capitol Grounds yesterday. Their attitude, whether intended or inadvertent, was friendship to communism and hostility to the United States.

I commend the Senator from Utah for an excellent, sound, courageous presentation of the problem.

Mr. BENNETT. I certainly appreciate the comments of my friend the Senator from Ohio. I value his opinion and his knowledge very highly, as I do his friendship.

I have tried to present as clearly as I could my conception of what the fight in Vietnam is about. I realize that others disagree with my conception. The final determination will be known only when it becomes history.

I should like to repeat that I am coming to believe very strongly that we are in world war III, that we have been in it for 20 years. The enemy is obvious; his goals are obvious; and we are in it for the same reason that we went into the others.

On this note, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] under the time limitation. I understand that the distinguished minority leader, Mr. DIRKSEN, will yield 10 minutes, under the bill, to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the vote on the pending amendment, there be a limitation of a half hour on the amendment to be offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the time to be equally divided between the majority leader and the minority leader or whomever they may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARTICIPATION IN THE BENEFITS OF NUCLEAR POWER BY ALL ELECTRICAL UTILITIES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to insure a reasonable opportunity for all electrical utilities to participate in the benefits of nuclear power and ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Atomic energy has now been developed as a source of electric power to the point where Government subsidies for the construction of new plants is no longer considered necessary.

It is now deemed competitive with fossil fuels and in many cases with water power.

The result of the years of research and the nearly $1½ billion of public expenditure has, however, brought with it many new problems.

With the surge of applications for licenses to construct new plants with capacities running far into billions of kilowatt power, it is essential that guidelines for the granting of these licenses be established.

Under the present uncoordinated system, with Federal licenses still being granted only on a research basis and with various State licenses being required—frequently on a conflicting basis—there will soon be a shortage of power in some areas unless Congress fixes the responsibility and lays down guidelines for the licensing of nuclear powerplants.

The purposes of the bill I am offering are:

First. To protect the public health.

Second. To protect and conserve natural resources particularly river systems and water supplies.

Third. To prevent monopoly in the field of electric generation and distribution.

Fourth. To insure an adequate supply of electricity in areas threatened by shortages.

The manner by which these purposes would be achieved are made apparent in the bill which I ask to have printed at the end of my remarks.

Witnesses for electric utilities have made it clear before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that they are happy with the present law as it is. It serves their purpose well.

Witnesses for the fossil fuels have indicated that they wish nuclear production of electric energy would go away.

The fact remains, however, that with the accelerated use of electricity in the United States we must have an enormously increased supply and that we must not let the desires of special interests block or delay the needs of the Nation.

Therefore, I hope for early action on this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received; and without objection, the bill will be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2564) to insure a reasonable opportunity for all electrical utilities to participate in the benefits of nuclear power, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of New York), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 10 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 111. (a) No person shall be issued a license under this chapter to construct and operate a utilization or production facility to produce electric energy for ultimate sale to the public unless the Commission finds that—

"(1) the applicant has granted to all other interested persons, including Government agencies and public, private, and cooperative bodies, engaged in the distribution, transmission, or production of electric energy an opportunity to participate to a fair and reasonable extent, as determined by the Commission, in the ownership of the facility for which the license is requested;

"(2) the proposed facility will be best adapted to a comprehensive regional plan for the use and development of the power, water, and related land resources for the region to be served by such facility;

"(3) the applicant agrees to make the output of electric energy from the facility available, during the life of such facility, for sale on fair and nondiscriminatory terms to all persons, including Government agencies and public, private, and cooperative bodies, engaged in the distribution, transmission, or sale of electric energy;

"(4) the proposed facility is financially and technically feasible;

"(5) the proposed facility will have sufficient capacity to meet reasonable demands for electric energy within the region to be served by such facility, including the demands of public, private, and cooperative electric utilities;

"(6) adequate transmission capacity is or will be made available to provide reasonable service to all owner-participants and purchasers of electric energy;

"(7) the applicant has provided for reasonable representation by all owner-participants in the operation of the proposed facility; and

"(8) the applicant otherwise meets the requirements of this chapter.

"(b) Before determining whether or not a license shall be issued under this chapter to any person to construct and operate such a utilization or production facility the Commission shall—

"(1) request the advice of the Federal Power Commission with respect to—

"(A) whether the proposed facility is consistent with the most efficient development of the power resources in the region in which such proposed facility is to be constructed; and

"(2) request the advice of the Water Resources Council, established under title I of the Water Resources Planning Act (79 Stat. 244; 42 U.S.C. 1982a), regarding the compatability of the proposed facility with any comprehensive, coordinated joint plan for water and related land resources development which has been approved for the region, river basin, or group of river basins in which such facility is to be located; and

"(3) request the advice of the Attorney General of the United States with respect to whether or not the operation of the proposed facility by the applicant would be inconsistent with the antitrust laws of the United States.

The chairman of the Federal Power Commission, the chairman of the Water Resources Council, and the Attorney General respectively, shall advise the Commission with respect to the matters referred to in this subsection whenever requested by the Commission to do so; and the Commission shall give due consideration to such advice in determining whether or not to approve an application for a license under this chapter.

"(c) the Commission shall refuse a license under this chapter to any such applicant if such applicant fails to meet any of the conditions stated in subsection (a), or if such applicant refuses to agree to meet such conditions.

"(d) The Commission shall have the express authority to revoke, after notice and opportunity for hearing, any license issued under this chapter in any case in which any such applicant fails to comply with conditions specified in subsection (a) and to which the applicant previously agreed."

STATEMENT ON CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the conference committee on the congressional redistricting bill (H.R. 2508) has reported a bill containing the following provisions:

First. All States entitled to more than one Representative during the 91st and 92d Congresses are required to establish single-member districts—except that the States of Hawaii and New Mexico may continue to elect Representatives on an at-large basis.

Second. No State is required to redistrict prior to the 1970 decennial census, unless there is conducted a special Federal census, and no State is required to elect its Representatives at-large prior to that 1970 census.

Mr. President, I am extremely disappointed with this conference agreement.

Although authorities on constitutional law agree that the Congress may properly establish standards for State legislatures to follow in the creation of congressional districts—under article I, section 4 of the Constitution—I respectfully submit that the conference agreement will very likely be declared unconstitutional on two grounds.

First, I believe the second section of the conference agreement may well be unconstitutional.

It would permit any State not to redistrict by not having a special Federal census before the 1970 Federal census is taken. This would permit the States to withdraw unilaterally from the Court's jurisdiction over congressional redistricting.

This, I am convinced, the Congress may not do, for there appears to be no constitutional basis for this delegation of authority.

Moreover, the conference agreement would have the effect of delaying until the 1972 elections any Federal judicial enforcement of its one-man, one-vote ruling in congressional redistricting. Aside from the large number of States affected—18 States represented by 259 Congressmen, more than half the membership of the House of Representatives—or the enormous cost involved which the 18 States must pay—one estimate is that it would cost these States some $35 million for special Federal censuses—it is highly dubious that the Federal courts would tolerate such a delay in compliance with the Supreme Court's ruling on fair congressional districting.

The second ground on which I believe the conference agreement to be unconstitutional is that a State may not elect its Members of the House of Representatives on an at-large basis. Therefore, I believe that the exemption of the States of Hawaii and New Mexico from the requirement to elect Representatives on a single-district basis is clearly unconstitutional.

The principle of electing Representatives by single-member districts is firmly established in our constitutional traditions.

The question of representation of the House of Representatives was debated at great length during the Constitutional

Convention of 1787. As part of the great compromise, article I, section 2 of the Constitution provided that members of the House should be chosen "by the people of the several States" and should be "apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers."

The delegates to the Convention, concerned that State legislatures might apportion House seats unequally and unfairly, provided in article I, section 4, that while the "times, places, and manner of holding elections" may be left to the States, the Federal Government was to have the last word:

> The Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.

The first exercise of Federal authority came in 1842, when Congress sought to end the practice of some States of electing Congressmen-at-large rather than from single-member districts—and in the Apportionment Act of June 25, 1842 (5 Stat. 491), Congress established the principle that Congressmen be elected one from each district of contiguous territory.

In 1872 Congress added a requirement that districts should contain "as nearly as practicable" equal numbers of inhabitants. In 1901 the requirement that districts be composed of "compact territory" was added, and all three requirements were restated in 1911. The 1929 legislation did not include these provisions, however, and they have been lacking in apportionment acts ever since.

For more than 87 years, each State having more than one Representative was required to elect them from single-member districts.

The principle of electing Representatives by single-member districts, therefore, was established more than a century ago in our constitutional law.

The provision of the conference bill exempting Hawaii appears to me to fly in the face of well-established constitutional law.

I consider the Hawaii exemption particularly unreasonable, unfair, indefensible, and unconstitutional. The conference agreement is therefore quite unacceptable to me.

I have steadfastly opposed such an exemption—during the Judiciary Committee's consideration of H.R. 2508, and during the Senate debate on the bill earlier this year.

Although the committee agreed with me and adopted my amendment to strike the Hawaii exemption, and the bill as passed by the Senate on June 8 did not contain the Hawaii exemption, I regret and deplore its inclusion in the conference bill.

From my study of the debate which took place in the House when the bill was considered on April 27, it is clear to me that the Hawaii exemption provision was approved hastily and only after perfunctory debate.

Full consideration of all the factors involved plainly shows that the Hawaii exemption should not have been included in the conference bill.

I strongly believe, Mr. President, that what is applicable to 48 other States of the Union should be equally applicable to Hawaii.

It is my understanding that the purposes of H.R. 2508 are first, to require that States establish districts for the election of Representatives in Congress; and second, to provide that congressional redistricting be based on the 1970 census or an up-to-date special Federal census, and thus implement the one-man, one-vote doctrine of *Wesberry* v. *Sanders* (376 U.S. 1, 18 (1964)).

If these are the reasons for the enactment of this bill, then why not have them applicable to all States? Why did the House exempt Hawaii?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The 10 minutes allotted to the Senator have expired.

Mr. **FONG**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for another 5 minutes.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I take the liberty of yielding to the Senator 5 minutes out of the time of the distinguished minority leader.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. **FONG**. Mr. President, one reason advanced during the House debate on the Hawaii exemption was that the geography of the State of Hawaii renders it difficult to draw district lines.

This is absolutely untrue.

Ever since Hawaii's annexation to the United States in 1898 and the election of the first Territorial Legislation in 1900, Territorial Senators and Representatives were elected to the bicameral legislature according to senatorial and representative districts—Hawaii Organic Act of April 30, 1900.

In fact we have only recently reapportioned both houses of our State legislature—so that district lines had to be redrawn for both the senate, in 1966, with eight senatorial districts, and for the house, in 1959, with 18 Representative districts.

Having this long history and experience in drawing district lines among the eight major islands of the Hawaiian archipelago, there is no reason to believe that congressional district lines could not also be drawn, in conformity with the requirements of H.R. 2508.

Another reason cited during House debate on the Hawaii exemption and, I understand, during the conference committee's deliberations, is that never in the history of the State have congressional district lines been drawn. This is true. But we became a State only in 1959.

Hawaii's population at the time she entered the Union in 1959 was determined on the basis of the decennial census of 1950. At that time, in 1950, Hawaii's population was 499,794, which entitled the State to only one Congressman.

The 1960 decennial census, however, showed that Hawaii's population rose to 632,722. This new figure entitled Hawaii to a second seat in the House.

Thus, only since 1960 has Hawaii elected her Representatives to the National House on an at-large basis

One apparent purpose of the conference bill's provision that no State is required to elect its Representatives at-large for the 91st and 92d Congresses was to afford a transition period to some 22 States which have not yet reapportioned their legislatures.

The State of Hawaii, however, has already reapportioned its legislature.

In accordance with a decision of the Hawaii Federal District Court of March 9, 1965, and the U.S. Supreme Court case of Burns against Richardson handed down April 25, 1966, the Hawaii Legislature reapportioned the State senate. Elections under this new apportionment were held in November 1966, and the legislature, including the newly apportioned senate, has completed its 1967 session.

Hawaii, then, does not require a transition period provided by the conference bill. Having already gone to court, and, under court order, having reapportioned the legislature, Hawaii is now prepared to proceed to implement the Wesberry ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court and draw congressional district lines. And this can be done when the State legislature meets for its 1968 session next February.

Another apparent purpose of the conference bill's provision, that no State is required to elect its Representatives at-large for the next two Congresses, was to afford relief to the State of Indiana, which is the only State now under court order to elect all of its 11 Representatives on an at-large basis.

Why, Mr. President, should a ban on at-large elections be enacted to benefit especially and only one State of the Union? Why should the ban be made applicable only to 48 States, and not to all 50? Why should at-large elections be permitted in only two States of the Union, and not in the other 48?

Is it not a fact that the conferees felt that by exempting the State of Hawaii from mandatorily drawing congressional district lines, this would insure the continuation of the present political complexion of our congressional delegation?

Is it not also a fact that by banning at-large elections in the other 48 States which would force the State of Indiana to redistrict, this would insure benefits to a certain political party?

Is it reasonable to conclude that party politics was a motivating factor in exempting Hawaii and in banning at-large elections in 48 States?

Mr. President, in terms of size of population, Hawaii ranks 40th among the 50 States, 11th from the bottom, according to the Census Bureau's 1965 estimates.

Of the 10 States with smaller populations than that of Hawaii, five States are entitled to two seats in the House of Representatives. These five States are Idaho, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

If Hawaii is to be exempted from the provisions of section 2 of the bill, it is only fair that these five States also be exempted.

There appear to be absolutely no grounds on which the exemption of Hawaii from the requirement of single-member districts may be justified: not in terms of geography, not because of any long-standing tradition, not because of the necessity for a transition period or for relief from a court order, not in terms of population size.

Indeed, the exemption seems to me to be clearly unconstitutional.

I therefore say, Mr. President, that any State electing its Congressmen at-large is doing so unconstitutionally.

For this reason, I will urge an early court test of the constitutionality of this bill if the conference report is approved by the Senate. I am very hopeful that the courts will sustain my view and strike down the exemption provision as unconstitutional.

Mr. President, because the conference report contains a proposal which I strongly believe to be unconstitutional, unfair, and unreasonable, I will vote against its approval.

For all the reasons I have cited, I urge my colleagues to reject the conference report.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally against both sides.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my staff has prepared a section-by-section summary of S. 2171 as it amends the Internal Security Act of 1950.

I had intended to present this summary on the floor during the debate on S. 2171, last week. But because both the high quality and considerable volume of the statements of my colleagues who joined me in opposition to S. 2171 so captured my attention that I did not complete this summary.

Because I believe this comparative study of S. 2171 and the Internal Security Act of 1950 offers valuable information which should be made a part of the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the summary be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(15) The terms "totalitarian dictatorship" and "totalitarianism" mean and refer to systems of government not representative in fact, characterized by (A) the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial basis, with so close an identity between such party and its policies and the governmental policies of the country in which it exists, that the party and the government constitute an indistinguishable unit, and (B) the forcible suppression of opposition to such party.

(16) The term "doctrine" includes, but is not limited to, policies, practices, purposes, aims, or procedures.

(17) The giving, loaning, or promising of support or of money or any other thing of value for any purpose to any organization shall be conclusively presumed to constitute affiliation therewith; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as an exclusive definition of affiliation.

(18) "Advocating the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism" means advocating the establishment of a totalitarian Communist dictatorship in any or all of the countries of the world through the medium of an internationally coordinated Communist movement.

(19) "Advocating the economic and governmental doctrines of any other form of totalitarianism" means advocating the establishment of totalitarianism (other than world communism) and includes, but is not limited to, advocating the economic and governmental doctrines of fascism and nazism.

Once again we are reminded of the degree to which the monolithic world Communist movement has changed since this legislation was passed back in 1950. The definition language refers in subsection (3) (a) of section three to an organization "substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title." This organization, it is pretty generally known, is the Communist Party of the United States of America. But I think even those who unconditionally support this legislation will admit that this Soviet arm of the Communist movement may well have considerably less influence than the Communist Chinese brand of Communism on the direction of the Communist apparatus in the Western Hemisphere. The type of wars of liberation that we may face in South America—certainly the guerrilla actions there—have a distinctively Chinese Communist stamp. In fact if any evidence is uncovered to indicate the Communist movement or ideology is involved in ghetto riots I would be quite surprised if it had its roots in the Soviet rather than the Chinese brand of Communism.

Section 4 of the 1950 Act defines certain prohibited acts, such as the communication of classified information or receipt of classified information by a member of a communist front, communist action or communist infiltrated organization. It also prescribes a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for 10 years for a violation of the section. The section reads as follows:

"CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTS

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to combine, conspire, or agree with any other person to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, as defined in paragraph (15) of section 3 of this title, the direction and control of which is to be vested in, or exercised by or under the domination or control of, any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual: *Provided, however*, That this subsection shall not apply to the proposal of a constitutional amendment.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, or of any corporation the stock of which is owned in whole or in major part by the United States or any department or agency thereof, to communicate in any manner or by any means, to any other person whom such officer or employee knows or has reason to believe to be an agent or representative of any foreign government or an officer or member of any Communist organization as defined in paragraph (5) of section 3 of this title, any information of a kind which shall have been classified by the President (or by the head of any such department, agency, or corporation with the approval of the President) as affecting the security of the United States, knowing or having reason to know that such information has been so classified, unless such officer or employees shall have been specifically authorized by the President, or by the head of the department, agency, or corporation by which this officer or employee is employed, to make such disclosure of such information.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any agent or representative of any foreign government, or any officer or member of any Communist organization as defined in paragraph (5) of section 3 of this title, knowingly to obtain or receive, or attempt to obtain or receive, directly or indirectly, from any officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof or of any corporation the stock of which is owned in whole or in major part by the United States or any department or agency thereof, any information of a kind which shall have been classified by the President (or by the head of any such department, agency, or corporation with the approval of the President) as affecting the security of the United States, unless special authorization for such communication shall first have been obtained from the head of the department, agency, or corporation having custody of or control over such information.

"(d) Any person who violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than ten years, or by both such fine and such imprisonment, and shall, moreover, be thereafter ineligible to hold any office, or place of honor, profit, or trust created by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

"(e) Any person may be prosecuted, tried, and punished for any violation of this section at any time within ten years after the commission of such offense, notwithstanding the provisions of any other statute of limitations: *Provided*, That if at the time of the commission of the offense such person is an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, or of any corporation the stock of which is owned in whole or in major part by the United States or any department or agency thereof, such person may be prosecuted, tried, and punished for any violation of this section at any time within ten years after such person has ceased to be employed as such officer or employee.

"(f) Neither the holding of office nor membership in any Communist organizaton by any person shall constitute per se a violation of subsection (a) or subsection (c) of this section or of any other criminal statute. The fact of the registration of any person under section 7 or section 8 of this title as an officer or member of any Communist organization shall not be received in evidence against such person in any prosecution for any alleged violation of subsection (a) or subsection (c) of this section or for any alleged violation of any other criminal statute."

The Dirksen bill retains this language—an entirely appropriate decision in my estimation. However, the Dirksen proposal fails to strike language in subsection (f) stating that the fact of registration under sections 7 or 8 of this title shall not be received in evidence against a person. What need have we for this language when sections 7 and 8 are explicitly stricken from the 1950 Act by the Dirksen bill? What need have we for this language when no individual or organization has been registered in the history of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, when the courts have specifically ruled that registration would violate the fifth amendment right against self-incrimination, and when the very purpose of the Dirksen bill, S. 2171, is to replace the elimination requirement with a disclosure requirement? The answer is quite simple—it is an oversight of the kind that is only natural when a bill has been as hastily put together and considered as this one has been.

Section 5 of the bill concerns itself with Federal employment of members of communist front, communist action or communist infiltrated organizations. The Dirksen proposal correctly strikes the following language in section 5 (a):

"EMPLOYMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 5. (a) When a Communist organization, as defined in paragraph (5) of section 3 of this title, is registered or there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register, it shall be unlawful—"

In so doing the Dirksen bill recognizes the fact that registration is unconstitutional. It replaces this language with language indicating, as it was indicated in the statement of purpose, that the new method of listing communist action, communist front and communist infiltrated organizations and individuals is to be by Subversive Activity Control Board determination rather than registration. Thus the new wording reads:

"(a) *When there is in effect a final order of the Board determining any organization to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, it shall be unlawful—*"

Similar correcting language is made in section 5 (a) (1), which did read:

"[(1) For any member of such organization, with knowledge or notice that such organization is so registered or that such order has become final—]

"*(1) For any member of such organization, with knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—*"

We then revert to the language of the 1950 Act prohibiting the holding of certain jobs by members of groups which would be determined by the Subversive Activities Control Board to have Communist connections under the new legislation. To be more specific, the language of the Act reads:

"(A) in seeking, accepting, or holding any nonelective office or employment under the United States, to conceal or fail to disclose the fact that he is a member of such organization; or

"(B) to hold any nonelective office or employment under the United States; or

"(C) in seeking, accepting, or holding employment in any defense facility, to conceal or fail to disclose the fact that he is a member of such organization; or

"(D) if such organization is a Communist-action organization, to engage in any employment in any defense facility.

"(E) to hold office or employment with any labor organization, as that term is defined in section 2 (5) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended (29 U. S. C. 152), or to represent any employer in any matter or proceeding arising or pending under that Act."

The Dirksen bill goes on to strike language in section 5(a)(2) of the Act which again makes registration rather than determination a criteria for prohibiting contributions to a subversive group or conspiracy to violate section 5(a)(1). The registration language, which is stricken, reads:

"[(2) For any officer or employee of the United States or of any defense facility, with knowledge or notice that such organization is so registered or that such order has become final—]"

It is replaced with the following language replacing the registration criteria with final board determination as follows:

"*(2) For any officer or employee of the United States or of any defense facility, with knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—*"

The language of the original 1950 legislation is then retained, enumerating the prohibited actions in connection with a communist front, communist action, or communist infiltrated organization. The prohibited actions are:

"(A) to contribute funds or services to such organization; or

"(B) to advise, counsel or urge any person, with knowledge or notice that such person is a member of such organization, to perform, or to omit to perform, any act if such act or omission would constitute a violation of any provision of subparagraph (1) of this subsection."

We then go on to subsection (b) which reads:

"(b) The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to designate facilities, as defined in paragraph (7) of section 3 of this title, with respect to the operation of which he finds and determines that the security of the United States requires the application of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary shall promptly notify the management of any facility so designated, whereupon such management shall immediately post conspicuously notice of such designation in such form and in such place or places as to give notice thereof to all employees of, and to all applicants for employment in, such facility. Such posting shall be sufficient to give notice of such designation to any person subject thereto or affected thereby. Upon the request of the Secretary, the management of any facility so designated shall require each employee of the facility, or any part thereof, to sign a statement that he knows that the facility has, for the purposes of this title, been designated by the Secretary under this subsection."

This subsection in effect states that the Scretary of Defense is to determine what is a defense facility for the purposes of the above mentioned prohibition against certain actions by officers or employees of the Federal government and defense facilities. In that connection, I wonder if the floor manager of the bill could tell me whether or not any such defense facilities have been designated by Secretary McNamara or are presently considered as falling under the terms of this section?

I think it is relevant to note here that the Dirksen bill fails to change some inconsistencies in the first part of section 5. For example the section apparently would not prohibit outright employment in a defense facility for members of Communist front organizations while it places a complete prohibition on employment with a labor organization. Here again the act itself might well have profited from a more thorough evaluation of its existing provisions.

I want to make it clear that I am not advocating that union employees should be allowed to be members of subversive organizations However if we feel that union employees occupy such key positions that they should, under no conditions, be members of a subversive organization should we not apply the same standard to those employed in a defense facility rather than permitting members of subversive groups to be employed in such facilities as long as they disclose their membership, as the 1950 Act does?

Section 6 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is not affected by S. 2171, the Dirksen bill. The section prohibits the use of passports by a member of a communist front, communist action, or communist infiltrated organization. Section 6 states:

"DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) When a Communist organization as defined in paragraph (5) of section 3 of this title is registered, or there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization, with knowledge or notice that such organization is so registered or that such order has become final—

"(1) to make application for a passport, or the renewal of a passport, to be issued or renewed by or under the authority of the United States; or

"(2) to use or attempt to use any such passport.

"(b) When an organization is registered, or there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register, as a Communist-action organization, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to issue a passport to, or renew the passport of, any individual knowing or having reason to believe that such individual is a member of such organization."

I know that many civil libertarians object to this sort of restriction on freedom of movement. I think they should be given a chance to testify when the Judiciary Committee was considering the bill, for this is another controversial area that could easily have been examined, and should have.

Section 7 is stricken by the Dirksen bill. It requires that Communist action and Communist front organizations register. It also enumerates the type of information that the registration statement shall contain. Here are its provisions:

"REGISTRATION AND ANNUAL REPORTS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 7. (a) Each Communist-action organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Board, to register as a Communist-action organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist-action organization.

"(b) Each Communist-front organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Board, to register as a Communist front organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist-front organization.

"(c) The registration required by subsection (a) or (b) shall be made—

"(1) in the case of an organization which is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization on the date of the enactment of this title, within thirty days after such date;

"(2) in the case of an organization becoming a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization after the date of the enactment of this title, within thirty days after such organization becomes a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be; and

"(3) in the case of an organization which by a final order of the Board is required to register, within thirty days after such order becomes final.

"(d) The registration made under subsection (a) or (b) shall be accompanied by a registration statement, to be prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the following information:

"(1) The name of the organization and the address of its principal office.

"(2) The name and last-known address of each individual who is at the time of filing of such registration statement, and of each individual who was at any time during the period of twelve full calendar months next preceding the filing of such statement, an officer of the organization, with the designation or title of the office so held, and with a brief statement of the duties and functions of such individual as such officer.

"(3) An accounting, in such form and detail as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, of all moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and the purposes which expended) by the organization during the period of twelve full calendar months next preceding the filing of such statement.

"(4) In the case of a Communist-action organization, the name and last-known address of each individual who was a member of the organization at any time during the period of twelve full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement.

"(5) In the case of any officer or member whose name is required to be shown in such statement, and who uses or has used or who is or has been known by more than one name, each name which such officer or member uses or has used or by which he is known or has been known.

"(6) A listing, in such form and detail as the Attorney General shall by regulation prescribe, of all printing presses and machines including but not limited to rotary presses, flatbed cylinder presses, platen presses, lithographs, offsets, photo-offsets, mimeograph machines, multigraph machines, multilith machines, duplicating machines, ditto machines, linotype machines, intertype machines, monotype machines, and all other types of printing presses, typesetting machines or any mechanical devices used or intended to be used, or capable of being used to produce or publish printed matter or material, which are in the possession, custody, ownership, or control of the Communist-action or Communist-front organization or its officers, members, affiliates, associates, group, or groups in which the Communist-action or Communist-front organization, its officers or members have an interest.

"(e) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to file with the Attorney General on or before February 1 of the year following the year in which it registers, and on or before February 1 of each succeeding year, an annual report, prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the same information which by subsection (d) is required to be included in a registration statement, except that the information required with respect to the twelve-month period referred to in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of such subsection shall, in such annual report, be given with respect to the calendar year preceding the February 1 on or before which such annual report must be filed.

"(f)(1) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, accurate records and accounts of moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and purposes for which expended) by such organization.

"(2) It shall be the duty of each Communist-action organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, accurate records of the names and addresses of the members of such organization and of persons who actively participate in the activities of such organization.

"(g) It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to send to each individual listed in any registration statement or annual report, filed under this section, as an officer or member of the organization in respect of which such registration statement or annual report was filed, a notification in writing that such individual is so listed; and such notification shall be sent at the earliest practicable time after the filing of such registration statement or annual report. Upon written request of any individual so notified who denies that he holds any office or membership (as the case may be) in such organization, the Attorney General shall forthwith initiate and conclude at the earliest practicable time an appropriate investigation to determine the truth or falsity of such denial, and, if the Attorney General shall be satisfied that such denial is correct, he shall thereupon strike from such registration statement or annual report the name of such individual. If the Attorney General shall decline or fail to strike the name of such individual from such registration statement or annual report within five months after receipt of such written request, such individual may file with the Board a petition for relief pursuant to section 13 (b) of this title.

"(h) In the case of failure on the part of any organization to register or to file any registration statement or annual report as required by this section, it shall be the duty of the executive officer (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of an executive officer) and of the secretary (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of a secretary) of such organization, and of such officer or officers of such organization as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, to register for such organization, to file such registration statement, or to file such annual report, as the case may be."

By striking this regulation requirement it is quite obvious that the Dirksen bill is attempting to comply with recent Supreme Court and circuit court decisions. However it is also quite evident that a great deal of information that would have been required in a registration statement is no longer required under the proposed legislation. This includes names and addresses of members, records of moneys received and expended, a listing of printing presses or machines, etc. This disclosure provision would seem to be at the heart of the registration requirement. Anyone today can find out from the Attorney General's list which are and which are not Communist front organizations. If the way in which the list is compiled has to be updated to conform with recent court decisions, then so be it. Is it essential, however, to have a five man board paid $130,000 a year simply to tell us that groups such as the Communist Party of the United States are subversive without gleaning any of the additional information that would have been required in a registration statement as to membership, printing facilities, etc.? I certainly am not disagreeing with the court's decision that it would be unconstitutional to require registration. But in the absence of this convenient way for getting information the Congress felt in 1950 was vital, is it worth perpetuating the Board just to tell us facts that the government in all cases and the people in most cases already know?

Section 8 of the act, requiring registration by individuals who are members of Communist action organizations is also deleted in accordance with court decisions by the Dirksen bill. It reads as follows:

"REGISTRATION OF MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST-ACTION ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 8. (a) Any individual who is or becomes a member of any organization concerning which (1) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7 (a) of this title as a Communist-action organization, (2) more than thirty days have elapsed since such order has become final, and (3) such organization is not registered under section 7 of this title as a Communist-action organization, shall within sixty days after said order has become final, or within thirty days after becoming a member of such organization, whichever is later, register with the Attorney General as a member of such organization.

"(b) Each individual who is or becomes a member of any organization which he knows to be registered as a Communist-action organization under section 7 (a) of this title, but to have failed to include his name upon the list of members thereof filed with the Attorney General, pursuant to the provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 7 of this title, shall, within sixty days after he shall have obtained such knowledge, register with the Attorney General as a member of such organization.

"(c) The registration made by any individual under subsection (a) or (b) of this section shall be accompanied by a registration statement to be prepared and filed in such manner and form, and containing such information, as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe."

As I indicated earlier, though these sections have been deleted, the remaining sections have most definitely not been renumbered. I hope that the Senior Senator from Illinois will be able to correct this oversight, before we reach a final decision on the bill.

The Title of Section 9—Keeping of Registers; Reports to President and Congress—has been deleted by the Dirksen bill and replaced by—Records of Final Orders of the Board; Public Inspection; Reports to President and Congress. I think this suffices to give a pretty good idea of the changes made in section 9. The present section 9 has to do with the keeping of registers of Communist action and Communist front organizations and reads as follows:

"SEC. 9. (a) The Attorney General shall keep and maintain separately in the Department of Justice—

"(1) a 'Register of Communist-Action Organizations', which shall include (A) the names and addresses of all Communist-action organizations registered under section 7, (B) the registration statements and annual reports filed by such organizations thereunder, and (C) the registration statements filed by individuals under section 8; and

"(2) a 'Register of Communist-Front Organizations', which shall include (A) the names and addresses of all Communist-front organizations registered under section 7, and (B) the registration statements and annual reports filed by such organizations thereunder.

"(b) Such registers shall be kept and maintained in such manner as to be open for public inspection: *Provided*, That the Attorney General shall not make public the name of any individual listed in either such register as an officer or member of any Communist organization until sixty days shall have elapsed after the transmittal of the notification required by section 7(g) to be sent to such individual, and if prior to the end of such period such individual shall make written request to the Attorney General for the removal of his name from any such list, the Attorney General shall not make public the name of such individual until six months shall have elapsed after receipt of such request by the Attorney General, or until thirty days shall have elapsed after the Attorney General shall have denied such request and shall have transmitted to such individual notice of such denial, whichever is earlier.

"(c) The Attorney General shall submit to the President and to the Congress on or before June 1 of each year (and at any other time when requested by either House by resolution) a report with respect to the carrying out of the provisions of this title, including the names and addresses of the organizations listed in such registers and (except to the extent prohibited by subsection (b) of this section) the names and addresses of the individuals listed as members of such organizations.

"(d) Upon the registration of each Communist organization under the provisions of this title, the Attorney General shall publish in the Federal Register the fact that such organization has registered as a Communist-action organization, or as a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, and the publication thereof shall constitute notice to all members of such organization that such organization has so registered."

Since the Dirksen bill replaces the entire section 9, I would like to know if any consideration has been given to retaining the requirement that sixty days shall elapse between registration (which, of course, under the present bill, would be board determination), and the availability of the information to the public. The 1950 Act language also states that if an individual petitions to have his name removed from the list his name shall not be made public for six months. The Dirksen language providing for dissemination of this information provides no such safeguards as the following language makes clear:

"Sec. 9. (a) The Board shall keep and maintain records, which shall be open to public inspection, giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and individuals as to whom, there are in effect final orders of the Board issued pursuant to any of the provisions of subsections (g) through (j), inclusive, of section 13, or subsection (f) of section 13A.

"(b) *Copies of the reports and orders of the Board so issued shall be furnished by the Board to any person upon request and upon the payment of the reasonable costs thereof as then currently fixed by the Board.*

"(c) *The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress on or before June 1 of each year (and at any other time when requested by either House by resolution) a report giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and all individuals as to whom, there are in effect such final orders of the Board."*

Thus the Dirksen bill seems to take away one very important procedural safeguard.

Section 10 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 has to do with the use of the mails or radio and television to distribute communist front or communist action material. Here again the Dirksen bill changes the section to make it conform to the new Board determination procedure. Whereas the old section 10 read:

"USE OF THE MAILS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

"Sec. 10. It shall be unlawful for any organization which is registered under section 7, or for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring it to register under section 7 or determining that it is a Communist-infiltration organization, or for any person acting for or on behalf of any such organization—"

The new section 10 reads:

"Sec. 10. It shall be unlawful for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization—"

Subsection (1) of section 10 is retained almost in its entirety as follows:

"(1) to transmit or cause to be transmitted, through the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, any publication which is intended to be, or which it is reasonable to believe is intended to be, circulated or disseminated among two or more persons, unless such publication, and any envelope, wrapper, or other container in which it is mailed or otherwise circulated or transmitted, bears the following, printed in such manner as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, with the name of the organization appearing in lieu of the blank."

However the printed caveat has been changed by the Dirksen bill from "Disseminated by ———, a Communist organization"; to "Disseminated by ———, an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist ——— organization." Frankly I am a bit mystified by this change. Since the phrase includes no reference to registration I don't quite understand why it was replaced. I hope we can get an explanation on this matter.

Subsection (2) of section 10 raises the same problem. The subsection again is retained practically in toto:

"Or (2) to broadcast or cause to be broadcast any matter over any radio or television station in the United States, unless such matter is preceded by the following statement, with the name of the organization being stated in place of the blank."

Yet the required announcement is changed from "The following program is sponsored by ———, a Communist organization" to "The following program is sponsored by ——— an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist——— organization."

Section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 denies tax deductions and exemptions to communist front and communist action organizations. The first part of subsection (a) is not affected by the Dirksen amendment. It reads:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no deduction for Federal income-tax purposes shall be allowed in the case of a contribution to or for the use of any organization if at the time of the making of such contribution"—and here is where the language is changed. The old Act reads "(1) such organization is registered under section 7, or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7 or determining that it is a Communist infiltrated organization," while the Dirksen bill reads "there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action or a Communist-front organization."

The same types of changes are made in subsection (b). That section currently reads "No organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax, under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code, for any taxable year if at any time during such taxable year," and here, again, is the language stricken by the Dirksen bill," (1) such organization is registered under section 7, or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7 or determining that it is a Communist-infiltrated organization." The Dirksen bill replaces this language with the phrase: "there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action or Communist-front organization."

As is quite evident, the Dirksen bill simply and properly conforms this section to the determination powers it seeks to give the Board by changing the registration references to determination references.

Section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 in effect sets up the Board. The unchanged part of this section reads:

"SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

"Sec. 12. (a) There is hereby established a board, to be known as the Subversive Activities Control Board, which shall be composed of five members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three members of the Board shall be members of the same political party.

"The terms of office of the members of the Board in office on the date of enactment of the Subversive Activities Control Board Tenure Act shall expire at the time they would have expired if such Act had not been enacted. The term of office of each member of the Board appointed after the date of enactment of the Subversive Activities Control Board Tenure Act shall be for five years from the date of expiration of the term of his predecessor, except that (1) the term of office of that member of the Board who is designated by the President and is appointed to succeed one of the two members of the Board whose terms expire on August 9, 1955, shall be for four years from the date of expiration of the term of his predecessor, and (2) the term of office of any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be for the remainder of the term of his predecessor. Upon the expiration of his term of office a member of the Board shall continue to serve until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have qualified.

"The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board shall be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

"(b) A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, and three members of the Board shall, at all times, constitute a quorum. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"(c) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

"(d) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $26,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment."

This last phrase is especially interesting. In view of the complete lack of Board activity it must be mighty tempting for Board members to engage in another "business, vocation or employment." It is indeed fortunate that the word "avocation" does not appear. Eight hours a day of doing absolutely nothing could be very hard on a person's mental health.

Subsection (e) of Section 12 has been modified to once again recognize that the Board determines Communist front and Communist action groups but does not require their registration. Subsection (e)(1) has not been changed. It reads:

"(e) It shall be the duty of the Board—

"(1) upon application made by the Attorney General under section 13(a) of this title, or by any organization under section 13(b) curate stenographic record shall be taken of ganization is a 'Communist-action organization' within the meaning of paragraph (3) of section 3 of this title, or a 'Communist-front-organization' within the meaning of paragraph (4) of section 3 of this title; and

"However Subsection 12(e) (2) which under the 1950 Act states:

"(2) upon application made by the Attorney General under section 13(a) of this title, or by any individual under section 13(b) of this title, to determine whether any individual is a member of any Communist-action organization registered or by final order of the Board required to be registered, under section 7(a) of this title."

Has been modified to read:

"(2) upon application made by the Attorney General under section 13(a) of this title, or by any individual under section 13(b) of this title, to determine whether any individual is a member of any organization as to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action organization."

I think it is very important to note what section 13 will also make very, very clear and that is that even under the new proposal the

Attorney General must apply to the Board for positive action before the Board can take one step. In the absence of a recommendation on the Dirksen bill by the Attorney General we have absolutely no way of knowing whether or not the Justice Department will ask the Board to act. That is why we really have a duty to withhold action until we hear from the Attorney General that he is going to use this legislation without any qualifications—without any if, ands or buts.

The remainder of section 12 speaks for itself:

"(3) upon any application made under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 13A of this title, to determine whether any organization is a Communist-infiltrated organization.

"(f) Subject to the civil-service laws and Classification Act of 1949, the Board may appoint and fix the compensation of a chief clerk and such examiners and other personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

"(g) The Board may make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, as may be necessary for the performance of its duties.

"(h) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board such sums as may be necessary to carry out its functions."

Section 13 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 deals with proceedings before the Board. Here the truly substantial change made by the Dirksen bill is most evident. The old section 13(a) dealt with registration in this way:

"REGISTRATION PROCEEDINGS BEFORE BOARD

"SEC. 13. (a) Whenever the Attorney General shall have reason to believe that any organization which has not registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this title is in fact an organization of a kind required to be registered under such subsection, or that any individual who has not registered under section 8 of this title is in fact required to register under such section, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization or individual a petition for an order requiring such organization or individual to register pursuant to such subsection or section, as the case may be. Each such petition shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts upon which the Attorney General relies in support of his prayer for the issuance of such order."

The new section 13(a) shifts from the registration approach to the Board determination approach as follows:

"(a) (I) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization a petition for a determination that such organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be.

"(II) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any individual is a member of an organization which has been finally determined under this section to be a Communist-action organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such individual a petition for a determination that such individual is a member of such organization. Each petition under part (I) or part (II) of this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts upon which the Attorney General relies in support of his prayer for the issuance of such order."

Here it is made crystal clear that the Attorney General must move if the Board is to be effective. And whether or not the Attorney General intends to move under the proposed legislation is a question that remains unanswered.

Incidentally, for some reason the two subsections I just read are headed Roman numeral I and Roman numeral II instead of the arabic numerals 1 and 2 used throughout the rest of the bill. Hopefully this technical problem can be provided for if we reach a point of taking final action on the legislation.

Subsection (b) of section 13 also is completely amended by the Dirksen bill. It deals with registration cancellation, or, in the case of the Dirksen bill, a change in the Board's determination that an organization or an individual has Communist connections. The old section 13(b) reads:

"(b) Any organization registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this title, and any individual registered under section 8 of this title, may, not oftener than once in each calendar year, make application to the Attorney General for the cancellation of such registration and (in the case of such organization) for relief from obligation to make further annual reports. Within sixty days after the denial of any such application by the Attorney General, the organization or individual concerned may file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for an order requiring the cancellation of such registration and (in the case of such organization) relieving such organization of obligation to make further annual reports. Any individual authorized by section 7 (g) of this title to file a petition for relief may file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for an order requiring the Attorney General to strike his name from the registration statement or annual report upon which it appears."

This is replaced by the following language:

"(b) Any organization as to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist organization, and any individual as to whom there is in effect a final order of the Board determining him to be a member of a Communist-*action* organization may, not more often than once in each calender year, file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for a determination that such organization no longer is a Communist organization (in the case of an organization which has been determined under subsection (a) of this section to be one of the types of Communist organizations) or that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization, as the case may be. Each petition filed under and pursuant to this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts relied upon in support thereof. Upon the filing of any such petition, the Board shall serve upon each party to such proceeding a notice specifying the time and place for hearing upon such petition. No such hearing shall be conducted within twenty days after the service of such notice."

Although this section provides an important procedural safeguard for the unjustly branded man or woman I doubt very seriously that it will ever be used, because, in my estimation the Attorney General will not even ask the Board to make an initial determination. Thus there will be no determination to appeal from.

Subsections (c) and (d)(1) of Section 13 of the 1950 Act remain intact. These subsections outline the hearing procedures in the following fashion:

"(c) Upon the filing of any petition pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (b) of this section, the Board (or any member thereof or any examiner designated thereby) may hold hearings, administer oaths and affirmations, may examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States, and may require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, and other records deemed relevant, to the matter under inquiry. Subpenas may be signed and issued by any member of the Board or any duly authorized examiner. Subpenas shall be issued on behalf of the organization or the individual who is a party to the proceeding upon request and upon a statement or showing of general relevance and reasonable scope of the evidence sought. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. In case of disobedience to a subpena, the Board may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. Any of the district courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce documentary evidence if so ordered) and give evidence relating to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found. No person shall be held liable in any action in any court, State or Federal, for any damages resulting from (1) his production of any documentary evidence in any proceeding before the Board if he is required, by a subpena issued under this subsection, to produce the evidence; or (2) any statement under oath he makes in answer to a question he is asked while testifying before the Board in response to a subpena issued under this subsection, if the statement is pertinent to the question.

"(d) (1) All hearings conducted under this section shall be public. Each party to such proceeding shall have the right to present its case with the assistance of counsel, to offer oral or documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. An accurate stenographic record shall be taken of the testimony of each witness, and a transcript of such testimony shall be filed in the office of the Board."

Subsection 13 (d) (2) of the 1950 Act is changed by the Dirksen bill. The change, in my estimation, is for the better because it liberalizes the procedural safeguards contained in the original legislation. Subsection (d) (2) now reads:

"(2) here an organization or individual declines or fails to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization or individual by the Board pursuant to this section, the Board may, without further proceedings and without the introduction of any evidence, enter an order requiring such organization or individual to register or denying the application of such organization or individual, as the case may be."

In other words, under the 1950 Act, failure to appear indicated guilt, a summary judgement could be made without the presentation of a case, and the injured organization or individual would have to go through a lengthy and expensive appeal process to amend the Board's order. The new language of the Dirksen proposal requires the Board to try the case even in the absence of the accused. The language states:

"(2) here an organization or individual declines or fails to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization or individual by the Board in proceedings under subsection (a) *of this section, the Board shall, nevertheless, proceed to receive evidence, make a determination of the issues, and enter such order as shall be just and appropriate. Upon failure of an organization or individual to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization or*

individual in proceedings under subsection (b) of this section the Board may forthwith and without further proceedings enter an order dismissing the petition of such organization or individual."

The remainder of Section 13 up to subsection (g) has not been changed by the Dirksen bill. However it has some very interesting things to say about what the Board shall consider in deciding whether an organization is a Communist action or Communist front organization:

"Where in the course of any hearing before the Board or any examiner thereof a party or counsel is guilty of misbehavior which obstructs the hearing, such party or counsel may be excluded from further participation in the hearing.

"(e) In determining whether any organization is a "Communist-action organization", the Board shall take into consideration—

"(1) the extent to which its policies are formulated and carried out and its activities performed, pursuant to directives or to effectuate the policies of the foreign government or foreign organization in which is vested, or under the domination or control of which is exercised the direction and control of the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title; and

"(2) the extent to which its views and policies do not deviate from those of such foreign government or foreign organization; and

"(3) the extent to which it receives financial or other aid, directly or indirectly, from or at the direction of such foreign government or foreign organization; and

"(4) the extent to which it sends members or representatives to any foreign country for instruction for training in the principles, policies, strategy, or tactics of such world Communist movement; and

"(5) the extent to which it reports to such foreign government or foreign organization or to its representatives; and

"(6) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members are subject to or recognize the disciplinary power of such foreign government or foreign organization or its representatives; and

"(7) the extent to which, for the purpose of concealing foreign direction, domination, or control, or of expediting or promoting its objectives, (i) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, its membership (by keeping membership lists in code, by instructing members to refuse to acknowledge membership, or by any other method); (ii) its members refuse to acknowledge membership therein; (iii) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, records other than membership lists; (iv) its meetings are secret; and (v) it otherwise operates on a secret basis; and

"(8) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their obligations to such foreign government or foreign organization.

"(f) In determining whether any organization is a 'Communist-front organization', the Board shall take into consideration—

"(1) the extent to which persons who are active in its management, direction, or supervision, whether or not holding office therein, are active in the management, direction, or supervision of, or as representatives of, any Communist-action organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2; and

"(2) the extent to which its support, financial or otherwise, is derived from any Communist-action organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2; and

"(3) the extent to which its funds, resources, or personnel are used to further or promote the objectives of any Communist-action organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2; and

"(4) the extent to which the positions taken or advanced by it from time to time on matters of policy do not deviate from those of any Communist-action organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2."

Once again we have references to that monolithic world communist movement dominated by a single foreign government that seem highly naive in view of the state of the Communist world today. I suppose many of us wish the world were that simple. However, it just isn't. I think the Judiciary Committee should have recognized the changes that have taken place in drafting this legislation. I would hope the bill could be re-referred to the Committee so that it could come forth with a bill that takes account of the realities.

Subsection (g) of Section 13 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 provided for Communist-front and Communist-action organizations as well as individual members of Communist-action organizations to receive notification that they were required to register after the Board had made a determination:

"(g) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 7 of this title; or

"(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist-action organization (including an organization required by final order of the Board to register under section 7(a)), it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such individual an order requiring him to register as such under section 8 of this title."

Now that the courts have decided that it violates the constitution to require groups and individuals to register, the Dirksen bill simply requires the organization or individual to be notified that a determination has been made. The language reads:

"(g) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines —

"(1) that an organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order determining the organization to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization as the case may be;

"(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such individual an order determining such individual to be a member of a Communist-action organization."

The bill itself makes this service sound quite omnious. However it really is nothing more than notification. Although the term "order" is used in referring to the notification the individual or organization is not ordered to do anything or not to do anything.

Subsection 13(h) of the 1950 Act is deleted by the Dirksen bill and replaced by a new subsection 13(h). The change is intended to replace references to registration with references to determination. The old section 13(h) now requires the Board to deny the Attorney General's petition for registration in certain instances in the following words:

"(h) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization is not a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts; issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying his petition for an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 7 of this title; and send a copy of such order to such organization; or

"(2) that an individual is not a member of any Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts; issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying his petition for an order requiring such individual to register as such member under section 8 of this title; and send a copy of such order to such individual."

The new section 13(h) makes the following change:

"(h) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization is not a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying the determination sought by his petition, and shall send a copy of such order to such organization;

"(2) that the individual is not a member of any Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying the determination sought by his petition, and shall send a copy of such order to such individal."

Subsection 13(i) is quite similar to 13(h) but deals with a redetermination of a group or individual's purity rather than an initial determination that they are not involved in Communist activities. Subsection 13(i) as contained in the original act refers to registration procedures as we can see by its language:

"(i) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization is not a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts; issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order requiring him to cancel the registration of such organization and relieve it from the requirement of further annual reports; and send a copy of such order to such organization; or

"(2) that an individual is not a member of any Communist-action organization, or (in the case of an individual listed as an officer of a Communist-front organization) that an individual is not an officer of a Communist-front organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts; issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order requiring him to (A) strike the name of such individual from the registration statement or annual report upon which it appears or (B) cancel the registration of such individual under section 8, as may be appropriate; and send a copy of such order to such individual."

The new language, referring to determination rather than registration states:

"(i) If, after hearing upon a petition filed

under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General and such organization an order determining that the organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or Communist-front organization as the case may be;

"(2) that an individual no longer is a member of any Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General and such individual an order determining that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization."

Subsection 13 (j) deals with a determination that an organization or an individual continues to be Communist tainted even after a rehearing. Here again the Dirksen bill replaces the 1950 language with new language reflecting the change from registration to determination. The old language reads:

"(j) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order denying its petition for the cancellation of its registration and for relief from the requirement of further annual reports; or

"(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist-action organization, or (in the case of an individual listed as an officer of a Communist-front organization) that an individual is an officer of a Communist-front organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such individual an order denying his petition for an order requiring the Attorney General (A) to strike his name from any registration statement or annual report on which it appears or (B) to cancel the registration of such individual under section 8, as the case may be."

The replacement language states:

"(j) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order denying its petition for a determination that the organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization as the case may be.

"(2) that an individual is a member of a communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon such an individual an order denying his petition for a determination that the individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization."

The final subsection of section 13, subsection k, provides for Federal Register notice of the Board's actions. Since the Board would issue an order based on a determination under the Dirksen proposal rather than require registration, the language of the Act is changed from:

"(k) When any order of the Board requiring registration of a Communist organization becomes final under the provisions of section 14(b) of this title, the Board shall publish in the Federal Register the fact that such order has become final, and publication thereof shall constitute notice to all members of such organization that such order has become final."

To the following:

"(k) When any order of the Board issued under subsection (g), (h), (i), or (j), of this section becomes final under the provisions of section 14(b) of this title, the Board shall publish in the Federal Register the fact that such order has become final, and publication thereof shall constitute notice to all persons that such order has become final."

Section 13A of the 1950 Act was added in 1954 to deal with Communist-infiltrated organizations—especially labor unions. Since it is not relevant to the bill under consideration today, I don't propose to go into it.

Section 14 of the 1950 Act has to do with judicial review. It in fact is the section under which the courts asserted jurisdiction over the cases deciding the Board did not have the power to compel registration. The old act and the proposed bill read the same under up to the seventh sentence of the section.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 14. (a) The party aggrieved by any order entered by the Board under subsection (g), (h), (i), or (j) of section 13 or subsection (f) of section 13A, may obtain a review of such order by filing in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, within sixty days from the date of service upon it of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Board be set aside.

"A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Board, and thereupon the Board shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and shall have power to affirm or set aside the order of the Board; but the court may in its discretion and upon its own motion transfer any action so commenced to the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit wherein the petitioner resides."

At that point the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 reads:

"If the court shall set aside an order issued under subsection (j) of Section 13 it may, in the case of an organization, enter a judgment canceling the registration of such organization and relieving it from the requirement of further annual reports, or in the case of an individual, enter a judgment requiring the Attorney General (A) to strike the name of such individual from the registration statement or annual report on which it appears, or (B) cancel the registration of such individual under section 8, as may be appropriate."

As the language indicates a court decision to set aside an order would result in the cancellation of the registration and the lifting of the requirement that the organization make annual reports.

The Dirksen language would simply result in a redetermination:

"If the court shall set aside an order issued under subsection (j) of section 13, it may, in the case of an organization, enter a judgment requiring the Board to issue an order determining that such organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or Communist-front organization, as the case may be, or in the case of an individual, enter a judgment requiring the Board to issue an order determining that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization."

In contrasting these two sections it is easy to see how mild the reworked language is compared to the original wording. It is very difficult to have any sort of leverage against a Communist group in the absence of a requirement that it take a positive step of some kind. This raises once again the question of whether or not we should keep the Board in existence merely to point the finger of guilt at groups we already know are guilty of violating the kind of standards set forth in the Act before the Board makes a determination.

The rest of the language in section 14 remains the same:

"The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(b) Any order of the Board issued under section 13A shall become final—

"(1) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for review, if no such petition has been duly filed within such time; or

"(2) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Board has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by a United States Court of Appeals, and no petition for certiorari has been duly fined; or

"(3) upon the denial of a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Board has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by a United States Court of Appeals; or

"(4) upon the expiration of ten days from the date of issuance of the mandate of the Supreme Court, if such Court directs that the order of the Board be affirmed or the petition for review dismissed."

Section 15 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 is a penal section. It puts teeth into the Act by requiring groups and individuals who fail to register in accordance with the Act to pay a fine. It also permits an individual to be imprisoned for up to five years. Of course this section had to be stricken by the Dirksen bill since its operativeness is based completely on a failure to register and the courts have declared registration illegal. This is how the old section reads:

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 15. (a) If there is in effect with respect to any organization or individual a final order of the Board requiring registration under section 7 or section 8 of this title—

"(1) such organization shall, upon conviction of failure to register, to file any registration statement or annual report, or to keep records as required by section 7, be punished for each such offense by a fine of not more than $10,000, and

"(2) each individual having a duty under subsection (h) of section 7 to register or to file any registration statement or annual report on behalf of such organization, and each individual having a duty to register under section 8, shall, upon conviction of failure to so register or to file any such registration statement or annual report, be punished for each such offense by a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than five years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

For the purposes of this subsection, each day of failure to register, whether on the part of the organization or any individual, shall constitute a separate offense.

"(b) Any individual who, in a registration statement or annual report filed under section 7 or section 8, willfully makes any false statement or willfully omits to state any fact which is required to be stated, or which is necessary to make the statements made or information given not misleading, shall upon conviction thereof be punished for each such offense by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or by both such fine and imprisonment. For the purposes of this subsection—

"(1) each false statement willfully made, and each willful omission to state any fact which is required to be stated, or which is necessary to make the statements made or information given not misleading, shall constitute a separate offense; and

"(2) each listing of the name or address of any one individual shall be deemed to be a separate statement.

"(c) Any organization which violates any provision of section 10 of this title shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not more than $10,000. Any individual who violates any provision of section 5, 6, or 10 of this title shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

The new section 15 as envisioned by Senator Dirksen and contained in his bill amending the 1950 Act saves the Board some work by making it clear that it does not have to start all over again to make determinations in the case of individuals or groups that have already been ordered to register but can simply change the order to register to an order stating that a determination has been made. Thus we can breath a sigh of relief in the knowledge that the five Board members now making $26,000 a year won't have to go to work until the Attorney General tells them to do so by petitioning the Board for a determination—a very unlikely eventuality. Subsection 15(b) holds out some hope, but very little indeed that the Board members will have work to do by preserving the pendency of cases now before the Board. The section reads:

"Sec. 15. (*a*) *In the case of any organization which by proceedings under section 13*(*a*) *prior to the date of enactment hereof has been finally determined by the Board in carrying out its duties under subsection* (*c*) *of section 12, to be a 'Communist-action organization' or a 'Communist-front organization', and as a result of such determination has been ordered to register, the Board shall forthwith modify its previously issued registration order as may be necessary to conform such order to the provisions of section 13*(*g*) *hereof, and shall forthwith include such organization on the record maintained under section 9: Provided, however, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed so as to prevent any such organization from filing a petition as provided in subsection* (b) *of section 13.*

"(*b*) *In the case of any proceeding pending before the Board on the effective date of this enactment the Board and the Attorney General are authorized to proceed in accordance with the provisions of this Act as herein amended. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced prior to this enactment in any court of the United States shall abate by reason of this enactment. The court in any such case may allow such motion or supplemental pleadings as may be necessary to conform the litigation to the provisions of this Act as amended.*"

Mr. PROXMIRE. I might say, Mr. President, that I think this is particularly important since there were no hearings on the bill, and since this is, I think, quite a complex change in an elaborate statute. I believe the summary will serve a worthwhile purpose. I have talked to some news reporters and others who have said they would like to have that kind of comprehensive analysis, to know precisely what the bill would do; and that is the reason for my request.

Mr. President, I am happy both to cosponsor and to support the amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Mansfield].

With characteristic modesty, the majority leader when he introduced this amendment on last Thursday referred to it as the Proxmire amendment, because the idea for this amendment had been first suggested by me in a colloquy with the majority leader, the day before. I thank the majority leader for his designation of the pending amendment as the Proxmire amendment. But I am always happy to take second billing behind my majority leader and will refer to the amendment as the Mansfield-Proxmire amendment with his permission.

I have opposed the continuation of the Subversive Activities Control Board for some time. On July 21 of this year I introduced a bill, S. 2146, to abolish the Board and transfer its remaining duties, if any, to the Department of Justice. Six days later the minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] introduced the pending bill, S. 2171, which was reported favorably from the Judiciary Committee on August 15 with no hearings and no opinions from the Department of Justice.

I have fought S. 2171 because I believe in such an important and sensitive question involving basic constitutional guarantees, privileges and immunities, the Senate should proceed responsibly and intelligently.

In order for the Senate to proceed intelligently and responsibly on S. 2171, the Senate should have the detailed testimony of the Attorney General, who, under this bill, will be charged with its enforcement.

We have had no word from the Department of Justice on S. 2171. We do not have the considered opinion of a single legal expert on S. 2171. I must say we have had emphatic opinions from some of the leading law school deans and constitutional experts in the universities. And the opinions that I have seen, coming in the scores, have been emphatically against the bill and against the Subversive Activities Control Board.

In fact, the only record on S. 2171 has been made on the floor of the Senate. The distinguished Senator from New York and former Attorney General of the United States [Mr. Kennedy] made a most persuasive argument against S. 2171, stating that if he were Attorney General he could not use any of the authority conferred on him by the enactment of S. 2171.

We also heard from one of the greatest constitutional authorities ever to grace this body, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. He opposed the enactment of S. 2171 a bill that had no hearings, no opinion of the Department of Justice, and represented a total circumvention of the committee system.

The Senate also heard, this past week, from the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings]. With precision and insight, he pointed out the pitfalls and loopholes of S. 2171 as it was written and reported. He pointed out a very important omission in the bill which would, as he said so well, result in the fact that those who represent the position of Communist China in this country in trying to subvert this country would not be brought under the control of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], in his own inimitable and convincing style, made a strong case against Senate enactment of S. 2171.

In addition these opponents of Senate passage of S. 2171 were joined by other respected Members of the Senate: the able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] and the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

I am grateful for all these contributions to the discussion of S. 2171. The people of the country likewise should be grateful. Without their thoughtful contributions, we would have had no record, no statements, no information on the pending legislation.

My own position throughout debate on the bill has been that the Attorney General will not use the Dirksen proposal because of constitutional defects. Consequently, I believe that the adoption of the Mansfield-Proxmire amendment will lead inexorably to the abolition of the Board.

At the heart of this whole issue is personal freedom in the United States and every individual's sacred safeguards guaranteed by our Bill of Rights. In my view, the death of this Board will contribute significantly to the preservation and enlargement of freedom in the United States.

Some good friends have expressed misgivings about the amendments serving to encourage the initiation of sham proceedings before the Board in order to comply with the language of the amendment.

I do not share that fear. I have confidence in Attorney General Ramsey Clark, the highest legal officer of the U.S. Government, and his dedication to our traditional freedom and cherished personal liberties.

The Attorney General of the United States will not be party to a hoax or a sham. I am confident that he will not use any of the powers conferred by S. 2171 to initiate patently unconstitutional cases before the Board.

I say that because, at least in my view, these cases are patently unconstitutional, in any event, and the restraints of the Constitution and constitutional considerations are likely to restrain the Attorney General on the basis of his demonstrated belief in civil liberties.

I am confident that the Board will receive its death sentence today from the Senate by adoption of the Mansfield-Proxmire amendment to S. 2171. I am likewise confident, or I could not in good conscience cosponsor the Mansfield-Proxmire amendment, that the Attorney General will not commute that death sentence, but rather will enforce it.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first I should like to read into the Record the letter I received from the Attorney General under date of October 16, 1967.

It reads:

> Dear Senator Dirksen: You have asked me what course of action the Department of Justice will follow in enforcing S. 2171 should it become law.
>
> The bill provides the Attorney General "shall file . . ." proceedings with the Subversive Activities Control Board under the

> standards set forth. If it becomes law, S. 2171 will be enforced. Proceedings will be initiated with the Board as evidence warrants, consistent with the Constitution and the standards of the Act.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> RAMSEY CLARK.

Mr. President, I asked the Attorney General for a letter, and that is the letter that he sent. And I think it is fully adequate to my purpose and fully adequate so far as the matter of the Subversive Activities Control Board is concerned.

If one goes to the trouble to read the Internal Security Act of 1950, he will discover that there is no mandate on the time picture is and how much time I The language of the act is very plain. It says, "if the Attorney General has reason to believe." Of course, he can file or not file a petition. He may never have reason to so believe. That, of course, under the act, is his privilege and his right. I have an idea that that discretionary power is going to be taken care of also before we get through.

Mr. President, perhaps I should inquire of the Chair as to exactly what the time picture is and how much time I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time under the control of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois is 44 minutes as of now, and the time under the control of the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, is 49 minutes as of now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Chair. We have had comment on the many statements that have been made on the floor concerning whether communism as such is an imminent, clear danger in this country. And those who have the rather naive idea that it is not cite membership figures. However, those membership figures do not include fellow travelers and that other horde of hangers-on that share these ideological views.

I point out also that the membership of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union was just a handful compared to the population of the country. But by brutality, deception, deceit, and by the use of power they subjugated the rest of the people and imposed their will upon them. They then extended their authority into other countries until perhaps 1.5 billion people today are in some way directly or indirectly connected with this ideological wave that has gone into so many corners of the earth.

If I needed to do anything to make it clear, I need only cite what happened in Germany last week when a lieutenant colonel became a defector from the Soviet Union, and there was thereby uncovered several spy rings that eventuated in the self-hanging by a woman who was a member of this spy ring.

It happens not only over there, but also in the United States of America. So, this is a dangerous force in this country. And I am determined, for myself, that there is going to be an instrumentality of Government that is going to deal with it.

I wish Senators would take a flashback to 1933 and examine that exchange of memorandums between Franklin Roosevelt and Maxim Litvinov, the Soviet Commissar after the agreement was signed with all Communist assurances that they would never infiltrate or try to subvert or penetrate our institutions. There was not anything that they were not willing to agree to over their signature.

Why, Mr. President, the ink on that memorandum in November of 1933 was scarcely dry before they began this subversive operation. And it was a little while later that in the House of Representatives we had to set up an instrument to try to deal with it. It has been going on ever since. These are the miners and sappers who are working at American institutions, and there is something about them that is absolutely relentless and unforgiving.

It took 27 years after that time to put the Internal Security Act on the books. It came in 1950, when the late Pat McCarran, of Nevada, was chairman of the Judiciary Committee. That is when it happened. It was in that act that the Subversive Activities Control Board was established. It had one clearcut purpose. It was not designed particularly to put people in jail. It was designed to expose them and to bring them into the light of day, so that their neighbors could see. And when they go around with the tin cup and try to collect money for this purpose, for the advancement of the Communist Party in this country, here, at least, is an exposure that lets people know who they are and what they are trying to do.

That was made abundantly clear by Mr. Philbrick, who became an informant for the FBI after long association with and after long membership in the Communist Party. His testimony is there for anybody who wants to read it.

In the scheme of things and in point of time, comes the Supreme Court and the U.S. circuit court of appeals, in two cases. There it is alleged—and I do not quarrel with the decision—that compulsory self-incrimination is in violation of the Constitution. I will not quarrel with the essence of that decision, nor with the decision of the U.S. circuit court of appeals dealing with individuals. In one case it was an organization; in other cases there were alleged individual Communists. You cannot have them incriminate themselves, under the Constitution. Any student of that document knows that quite well.

But after the Board languished more or less helpless, not because of any laches or negligence on its own part, but because of this court decision, here come proposals, first, to resist curing the act and bringing it in line with the court decisions; second, by a bill introduced to abolish the Board, and, third, by a sustained effort to deny money to the Board.

That is what we had to deal with in the introduction of S. 2171, which I introduced. The bill was designed and is designed to cure the damage done by the Supreme Court.

Now, Mr. President, let us examine what I call the rather picayunish and frivolous arguments of those who have been in opposition to this bill.

First, there is the question of hearings, and it has been alluded to only in the last little while. Well, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, who is also chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, had this to say in remarks that otherwise he would have presented to the Senate. He had been out of town, but now that we are coming to grips with it, there was no particular point in making a speech. But I have it here, and I read from his remarks. There were hearings before the Internal Security Subcommittee. He says:

> In this series of hearings the subcommittee held public hearing sessions June 23, 24, 27, and 29, 1966, and on May 2, May 9, May 10, and May 24, 1967. The subcommittee also sent questionnaires to many legal scholars throughout the country and received numerous replies which have been placed in the committee's hearing records.
>
> The subcommittee staff has made various studies and analyses of both internal security laws and court decisions with respect to such laws.

Well, there are hearings, about 10 days of hearings, before the Internal Security Subcommittee.

Now let me refer a little further to the remarks of the chairman. He said:

> Accordingly, the Internal Security Subcommittee acted as speedily as possible after the court decisions to bring this situation to the attention of the full committee. The legislation now before the Senate was reported to the full committee as an original subcommittee bill before the end of March—that is, within a few weeks after the decision of the Court of Appeals in the Communist Party U.S.A. case.

The chairman goes further. He says:

> This legislation did not receive a bill number until it was introduced by Senator Dirksen as S. 2171. However, the legislation was before the full committee and on full committee agenda from April of this year until it was reported to the Senate.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the committee print of the bill, because I have it here, and I want all the world to see that there was a committee print—obviously undated—but for the purposes of the subcommittee and the full committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Without objection, the bill will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The bill is as follows:

> [Confidential committee print, Mar. 20, 1967]
>
> S. —
>
> A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Act of 1950 so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts
>
> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 2 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is hereby amended by adding immediately following paragraph (15), a new paragraph, as follows:
>
> "(16) The findings of fact contained in paragraphs (1) through (15) of this section are reiterated. Recent court decisions involving the registration provisions of this Act make it necessary to enact legislation to accomplish the purposes of such Act without the requirements of registration. Disclosure of Communist organizations and of the members of Communist-action organizations as provided herein is essential to the protection of the national welfare."
>
> SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows:
>
> (a) By changing that part of subsection (a) thereof beginning with the first word of the subsection and continuing down to subparagraph (1) thereof, so as to read:

"(a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board determining any organization to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, it shall be unlawful—"

(b) By changing that part of subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) thereof which precedes (A) so as to read:

"(1) For any member of such organization, with knowledge of notice of such final order of the Board—".

(c) By changing that part of subparagraph (2) of subsection (a) thereof which precedes (A) so as to read:

"(2) For any officer or employee of the United States or of any defense facility, with knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—".

Sec. 3. Sections 7 and 8 of the Subversive Activities Control Act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 4. The caption to section 9 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read: "RECORDS OF FINAL ORDERS OF THE BOARD; PUBLIC INSPECTION; REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS."; and

Section 9 of such Act is amended so as to read:

"Sec. 9. (a) The Board shall keep and maintain records, which shall be open to public inspection, giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and individuals as to whom, there are in effect final orders of the Board issued pursuant to any of the provisions of subsections (g) through (j), inclusive, of section 13, or subsection (f) of section 13A.

"(b) Copies of the reports and orders of the Board so issued shall be furnished by the Board to any person upon request and upon the payment of the reasonable costs thereof as then currently fixed by the Board.

"(c) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress on or before June 1 of each year (and at any other time when requested by either House by resolution) a report giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and all individuals as to whom, there are in effect such final orders of the Board."

Sec. 5. Section 10 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows: the first sentence thereof preceding subparagraph (1) is amended so as to read:

"Sec. 10. (a) It shall be unlawful for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization—".

(b) The phrase following the colon at the end of subparagraph (1) thereof is amended to read: "Disseminated by , an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist- organization;".

(c) The phrase following the colon at the end of subparagraph (2) thereof is amended to read: "The following program is sponsored by an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist-organization."

Sec. 6. Beginning with (j), all that of subsection (a) of section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act down to and including the end thereof is amended so as to read: "there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action or a Communist-front organization."

Sec. 7. Beginning with (j), all that of subsection (b) of section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act down to and including the end thereof is amended so as to read: "there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action or a Communist-front organization."

Sec. 8. Paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read:

"(2) upon application made by the Attorney General under section 13(a) of this title, or by any individual under section 13(b) of this title, to determine whether any individual is a member of any organization as to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action organization."

Sec. 9. Section 13 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows:

(a) By amending subsection (a) thereof so as to read:

"(a)(I) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization a petition for a determination that such organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be.

"(II) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any individual is a member of an organization which has been finally determined under this section to be a Communist-action organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such individual a petition for a determination that such individual is a member of such organization. Each petition under part (I) or part (II) of this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts upon which the Attorney General relies in support of his prayer for the issuance of such order."

(b) By amending subsection (b) thereof so as to read:

"(b) Any organization as to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist organization, and any individual as to whom there is in effect a final order of the Board determining him to be a member of a Communist-action organization may, not more often than once in each calendar year, file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for a determination that such organization no longer is a Communist organization (in the case of organization which has been determined under subsection (a) of this section to be one of the types of Communist organizations) or that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization, as the case may be. Each petition filed under and pursuant to this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts relied upon in support thereof. Upon the filing of any such petition, the Board shall serve upon each party to such proceeding a notice specifying the time and place for hearing upon such petition. No such hearing shall be conducted within twenty days after the service of such notice."

(c) By amending that portion of paragraph (2) of subsection (d) thereof which precedes the last sentence thereof so as to read:

"(2) Where an organization or individual declines or fails to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization or individual by the Board in proceedings under subsection (a) of this section, the Board shall, nevertheless, proceed to receive evidence, make a determination of the issues, and enter such order as shall be just and appropriate. Upon failure of an organization or individual to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization or individual in proceedings under subsection (b) of this section the Board may forthwith and without further proceedings enter an order dismissing the petition of such organization or individual."

(d) By amending subsection (g) thereof so as to read:

"(g) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order determining the organization to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization as the case may be;

"(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such individual an order determining such individual to be a member of a Communist-action organization."

(e) By amending subsection (h) thereof so as to read:

"(h) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization is not a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying the determination sought by his petition, and shall send a copy of such order to such organization;

"(2) that an individual is not a member of any Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying the determination sought by his petition, and shall send a copy of such order to such individual."

(f) By amending subsection (i) thereof so as to read:

"(i) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General and such organization an order determining that the organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or Communist-front organization as the case may be;

"(2) that an individual no longer is a member of any Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General and such individual an order determining that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization."

(g) By amending subsection (j) thereof so as to read:

"(j) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order denying its petition for a determination that the organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization as the case may be.

"(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon such an individual an order denying his petition for a determination that the individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization."

(h) By amending subsection (k) thereof so as to read:

"(k) When any order of the Board issued under subsection (g), (h), (i), or (j) of this section becomes final under the provisions of section 14(b) of this title, the Board shall publish in the Federal Register the fact that such order has become final, and publication thereof shall constitute notice to all persons that such order has become final."

SEC. 10. The seventh sentence of subsection (a) of section 14 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read: "If the court shall set aside an order issued under subsection (j) of section 13, it may, in the case of an organization, enter a judgment requiring the Board to issue an order determining that such organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or Communist-front organization, as the case may be, or in the case of an individual, enter a judgment requiring the Board to issue an order determining that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization."

SEC. 11. Section 15 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read:

"SEC. 15. (a) In the case of any organization which by proceedings under section 13(a) prior to the date of enactment hereof has been finally determined by the Board in carrying out its duties under subsection (e) of section 12, to be a 'Communist-action organization' or a 'Communist-front organization', and as a result of such determination has been ordered to register, the Board shall forthwith modify its previously issued registration order as may be necessary to conform such order to the provisions of section 13(g) hereof, and shall forthwith include such organization on the record maintained under section 9: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this subsection shall be construed so as to prevent any such organization from filing a petition as provided in subsection (b) of section 13.

"(b) In the case of any proceeding pending before the Board on the effective date of this enactment the Board and the Attorney General are authorized to proceed in accordance with the provisions of this Act as herein amended. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced prior to this enactment in any court of the United States shall abate by reason of this enactment. The court in any such case may allow such motion or supplemental pleadings as may be necessary to conform the litigation to the provisions of this Act as amended."

Mr. DIRKSEN. So there were hearings, plenty of hearings, before the Internal Security Subcommittee, and a committee print from which to work, and then it went to the full committee, and there it had to take its chances.

In connection with this measure, a resolution was adopted by the subcommittee, and it is signed by every one of the 10 members. I read it into the RECORD:

Resolved by the Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security laws, That the attached original bill be reported favorably to the Committee on the Judiciary with a recommendation that such bill, together with the proposed report attached thereto, be reported favorably to the Senate.

Who signed that resolution? Senator EASTLAND, Senator DODD, Senator MCCLELLAN, Senator ERVIN, Senator BAYH, Senator SMATHERS, Senator HRUSKA, Senator DIRKSEN, Senator SCOTT, and Senator STROM THURMOND.

So, you see, the bill is very honestly and very properly here. I wanted that noted for the RECORD.

I go further, Mr. President. There has been much talk that the Attorney General has not appeared before the committee. Well, let us see whether or not the Attorney General was summoned to come before the committee. I think I have his letter here somewhere, if I can find it among these papers. But there was a letter addressed to the Attorney General of the United States, dated April 13, 1967. This is it:

Hon. RAMSEY CLARK,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Enclosed is an original bill reported to the Committee on the Judiciary from its Internal Security Subcommittee, together with a Confidential Committee Print of a proposed report approved by the Subcommittee and recommended for transmission by the full Committee to the Senate.

At its meeting today the Judiciary Committee voted to call upon the Department of Justice to advise the Committee, in time for consideration by the Committee at its meeting next week, whether the department objects to the enactment of this proposed legislation.

Because of the time factor, it is requested that the department's report be expedited and submitted to the Committee not later than Tuesday, April 18th.

Best personal regards and all good wishes,
Sincerely,

JAMES O. EASTLAND.

Mr. President, what more do you have to do today to get an Attorney General to come before a Senate committee? He did not come. We told him time was of the essence and we said we wanted the matter expedited. We did not hear from the Attorney General. He did not see fit to come before a Senate committee. That is his business, not mine, but at least the country will know he was asked to come up and he decided he would not do so.

So I guess that should dispose of the business of the Attorney General and his being summoned to come before the committee.

Now, among other things, I see that the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] had a good deal to say in the course of the debate on October 18. Senator TYDINGS contended that the bill "contains a massive loophole through which some of the most dedicated and dangerous Communists today will escape the exposure this amendment is supposed to provide."

Mr. President, I did not know that he had such solicitude, and it astonishes me not a little. According to him this loophole arises from his belief that the world Communist movement has changed and that it is no longer directed by the Soviet Union.

It may well be that the time will come when Congress can investigate the need for further amendments so as not to bring within the provisions of the statute other but as yet undefined categories of organizations. However, this does not mean that there is not a continuing and most grave danger from the groups operating in this country under the direction of the Soviet Union. This whole matter was thoroughly gone into by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Security Subdivision in the Department of Justice, in a memorandum written on behalf of the then Acting Attorney General, the Hon. Ramsey Clark, that was filed in the U.S. District Court in the matter of *W. E. B. Dubois Clubs of America, and others,* v. *Ramsey Clark, and others,* civil action 1087-66.

I could read, I suppose, pertinent items into the RECORD from this memorandum but instead of that I shall submit the entire memorandum and let it speak for itself. At this point, in connection with my comment on what the distinguished Senator from Maryland had to say, I submit and ask to have printed in the RECORD this action filed in the District Court in the District of Columbia entitled *W. E. B. Dubois Clubs of America, and others, plaintiffs,* v. *Ramsey Clark, and others, defendants,* Civil Action No. 1087-66.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA W.E.B. DUBOIS CLUBS OF AMERICA, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS, v. RAMSEY CLARK, ET AL., DEFENDANTS—CIVIL ACTION No. 1087-66

REPLY MEMORANDUM FOR THE DEFENDANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

This memorandum is submitted in reply to the Supplemental Memorandum for plaintiffs submitted pursuant to leave granted by the Court at the hearing on January 27, 1967.

Plaintiffs' Supplemental Memorandum appears to be devoted to the proposition that the "world Communist movement" referred to in Section 2 of the Act is no longer "monolithic" and that, for that reason (apparently that single reason) the Act is no longer constitutionally valid. For this plaintiffs cite the opinions of a number of public figures.

Of course, Section 2 does not use the term "monolithic". It does say (Sec. 2(4)), "The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country". Nor do "direction and control" necessarily imply exclusive direction and control and Sections 2(4), (5), and (6) clearly do imply that there is and will be in the future more than one "Communist dictatorship".

In the language of Sections 2 Congress recognized that the facts it described, and on the basis of which it acted, would change from time to time, perhaps even from year to year. Not all the facts recited in the Section are equally significant or equally related to the purpose of the legislation. That purpose was the protection of the United States against the evils sought to be brought about by the Communist movement. It would be far-fetched to an extreme to assume that, if and when, another nation than Russia, became a leader of a dissident group of Communist nations, that that fact should invalidate the Act, even when the ties and relationship between the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the Soviet Union remain the same. Changes in descriptive or background facts and details should not be held to nullify an Act of Congress.

The significant fact is that appellants make no attempt even to claim that the relationship between the Communist Party, U.S.A. and the Soviet Union and the Party in the U.S.S.R. have changed at all. That relationship was the motivating factor for the Act.

If the question as to the nature or control of the world Communist movement "is at least debatable" the decision is clearly one for Congress. "The inquiry must be restricted to the issue whether any state of facts either known or which could reasonably be assumed affords support" for the legislation. *United States* v. *Carolene Products Co.,* 304 U.S. 144, 154.

A similar argument, with respect to the same legislative findings of fact, now made by plaintiffs, was made to a three-judge district court in this District in 1963 in the case of *Flynn* v. *Rusk*, 219 F. Supp. 709. The Court there quoted the Supreme Court's language in *Communist Party* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board*, 367 U.S. 1, at 94–95:

"It is not for the courts to re-examine the validity of these legislative findings and reject them. See *Harisiades* v. *Shaughnessy*, 342 U.S. 580, 590. They are the product of extensive investigation by Committees of Congress over more than a decade and a half. Cf. *Nebbia* v. *New York*, 291 U.S. 502, 516, 530. We certainly cannot dismiss them as unfounded or irrational imaginings. See *Galvan* v. *Press*, 347 U.S. 522, 529; *American Communications Assn.* v. *Douds*, 339 U.S. 382, 388–389."

The three-judge court in *Flynn* went on to state the rule as enunciated by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in *Communist Party* v. *S.A.C.B.*, 93 U.S. App. D.C. 66, 223 F.2d 531, 565 (1954): "The rule as we understand it, is that, if it appears Congress has power over the subject matter of a statute and if the findings of fact are not baseless but are based upon extensive investigation, the courts are to adopt those findings."

The Act under immediate consideration was passed in 1950 based on the legislative findings of Congress promulgated after years of receiving evidence as to the nature of the international Communist movement, its characteristics, methods of operation, and objectives. Since that time this country has been engaged in two wars, first, in Korea and now currently in Viet Nam, both for the purpose of stemming the tide of international Communism. In 1962 we experienced the Cuban missile crisis, brought on by the efforts of the Soviet Union to establish a missile capability within 100 miles of the United States.

Ever since the passage of the Act in 1950, Congress has had the standing committee, the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, charged with the responsibility of gathering information on a continuing basis to keep the Congress apprised of the extent and nature of Communist activities generally. These committees, of course, have made and continue to make numerous reports which discuss the continuing threat of Communism. See, for example, the Annual Report for the Year 1965 of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, House Report No. 1926, 89th Congress, Second Session. And see also Senate Committee print entitled "The Tricontinental Conference of African, Asian, and Latin American Peoples", a staff study prepared for the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.

The Senate staff report just referred to concerns itself with a conference which took place in Havana, Cuba on January 3, 1966, which is characterized by the report as "probably the most powerful gathering of pro-Communist, anti-American forces in the history of the Western Hemisphere." The report points out that the Soviet delegation, consisting of forty delegates, was the largest at the conference. "Asian countries were represented by 197 delegates while African countries had 150, and the 27 Latin American groups comprised 165 delegates".

Pages one and two of the Senate staff report state the following:

"Salient aspects of the Conference are evidenced as follows:

"The public posture of international communism since the fictitious burial of the Communist International has been that it does not engage in subversion or violence. At the Havana Conference, all pretense of nonintervention in the affairs of other nations was dropped, and the delegates, under Moscow leadership, openly committed themselves to the overthrow by violence of all those governments which do not meet with their approval.

"The Conference established a Communist-dominated general headquarters to support, direct, intensify, and coordinate guerrilla operations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

"Gave communism a subversive leverage surpassing anything it has heretofore possessed. Bringing into the Conference fold militant leftist and nationalist movements from many countries (which, while themselves not Communist, share the antipathy of the Communists towards the West and towards the United States, and support the Communist-backed "wars of national liberation").

"Havana was selected as the headquarters for international subversion and guerrilla operations, thus making a de facto situation de jure in international Communist circles.

"Immediately following the Conference, the Latin American delegations met and, after reviewing the problems of 'revolutionary tactics and strategy,' unanimously voted to establish a parallel regional organization, to be known as the Latin American Solidarity Organization (OLAS), with its permanent headquarters in Havana.

"Moscow elbowed the Chinese Communists out of the No. 1 position to emerge as the undisputed controlling force in the new international apparatus of subversion.

"On the ideological plane, however, Maoism emerged triumphant, as the speeches of the delegates and the resolutions of the Conference attest.

"Castro, who has heretofore sought to straddle the fence between Moscow and Peiping, has now openly alined himself with Moscow.

"The actions taken by the Conference point to the immediate and massive intensification of terrorism and guerrilla activity throughout the Americas, as well as in Asia and Africa.

"The Communists were able to get the varied leftwing and radical-nationalist participants in the conference to designate United States 'imperialism' as enemy number one in every continent.

"The gravity of the threat posed by the Tricontinental Conference was the subject of a recent study prepared by the Special Consultative Committee on Security of the Organization of American States at its sixth regular meeting. Its study concluded:

"That the so-called first Afro-Asian-Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Conference constitutes a positive threat to the free peoples of the world, and, on the hemisphere level, represents the most dangerous and serious threat that international communism has yet made against the inter-American system.

"It is necessary and urgent, for the purpose of adequately defending democracy:

"a. That the (proven) intervention of communism in the internal affairs of the American Republics be considered an aggression, since it constitutes a threat to the security of the hemisphere.

"b. That the American governments define their position regarding the present treatment of every kind to be given to communism, and that they consequently adopt coordinated measures that will lead to the common goals."

Since it is clear, in the language of Justice Frankfurter in the *Communist Party* case, *supra*, that the legislative findings of the Internal Security Act of 1950 cannot be dismissed as "unfounded or irrational imaginings" and since it is also clear that for a decade and a half Congress has not seen fit to repeal or modify the statute, though continuously apprised by its investigative committees of the current nature of the Communist movement, the legislative findings are binding on the courts.

It should also be noted in this connection that the Internal Security Act of 1950 created the Subversive Activities Control Board for the purpose of holding the administrative hearings required by the Act. The appropriations necessary to continue the operation of the Board have, of course, been made from year to year by the Congress, which in and of itself is sufficient indication that the Congress continues to regard the legislative findings of fact contained in the 1950 Act as being of continuing vitality. See *Brooks* v. *Dewar*, 313 U.S. 354, 361; *Fleming* v. *Mohawk Co.*, 331 U.S. 111, 116, 118; *Swayre & Hoyt Ltd.* v. *United States*, 300 U.S. 297, 301–303.

J. Walter Yeagley,
Assistant Attorney General.
Kevin T. Maroney,
Benjamin C. Flannagan,
Attorneys, U.S. Department of Justice.
Attorneys for the Defendant Acting Attorney General.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that today I served the foregoing Reply Memorandum for the Defendant Attorney General on plaintiffs by mailing, postage prepaid, copies of said Memorandum to David Rein, Esq., 711—14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and William Kunstler, Esq., 511—5th Avenue, New York, New York, and to the defendant members of the Subversive Activities Control Board by mailing, postage prepaid, copies to Frank R. Hunter, Jr., Esq., 811 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Kevin T. Maroney,
Attorney for the Defendant
Acting Attorney General.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think that will dispose of that.

Now, the distinguished former Attorney General of the United States, who was not a little unvehement when he addressed the Senate on this subject last Tuesday in opposition to the bill, purported to speak authoritatively and with knowledge. And why should he not? After all, he has been the Attorney General of the United States.

The trouble is that the distinguished Senator from New York, one time distinguished Attorney General of the United States, made some erroneous statements of fact, and his speech is misleading in many parts. I am certain there was no intent on his part to win over any Senator by deception or misstatement, but I am duty-bound to call out what I think are the errors that were made.

The bill will disclose to the American people those groups and individuals who seek to destroy our form of government. It does so merely by eliminating from the existing law the unconstitutional requirement that after the Board has determined an organization or individual to be of a type covered by the law, such group or person must register with the Attorney General. Otherwise, the existing law remains unchanged.

As the former Attorney General knows, or should know, determinations are made by the Board only upon petitions that have been submitted by the Attorney General and on the basis of evidence presented in open hearings by attorneys for the Department of Justice. Most, if not all, evidence presented by those attorneys is furnished by witnesses and documents obtained through the investigatory activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. None of this is changed in S. 2171. It is a simple bill.

Now the former distinguished Attorney General builds his case on the erroneous premise that S. 2171 turns the Board into a solely investigatory body. The true fact is that the board has never had authority to investigate and will not have under S. 2171.

Under present law the Board has the duty, as I have said, to determine on petition of the Attorney General, and after full and open hearings, whether an organization or individual is, in fact, a type defined in the act. The Senator from New York knows, or having been the Attorney General he should have known, that the basic purpose of the Internal Security Act of 1950 is, and I say must remain, to combat communism by disclosure.

It is true that the Federal Bureau of Investigation knows who most of the Communists are in this country. This, however, does not do the public any good when they are solicited to join or support some group with high-sounding motives but which is actually a front for the Communist Party.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has a room full of files on the subject. Surely they know but they do not disclose that information. What is the public to do when some organization under a very fancy and glossy name comes around to solicit memberships and the average citizen, perhaps is taken in a little by the fancy and high-sounding name until he discovers what it is all about.

Mr. President, I had that happen on a number of occasions when certain constituents came to talk to me. One or two in particular had some talent, some energy, and some knowhow, and they wanted jobs in the Federal Government. If there were jobs, I was quite willing to help them. We advanced one of them along because he was an attorney. Then, I discovered he was a member of a front organization, so I had to hale him into my Chicago office. I said, "Look at that file. Is that true?

He said, "It is true."

I said, "Why didn't you say so?"

"Well," he said, "Senator, if the truth has to be known, my wife likes to join these organizations for the social prestige that is involved, and that is how I got into it."

I said, "Yes, and you did not tell me."

So, we see, that is the way it goes, including members and soliciting funds. The FBI knows, but the public does not. This bill is designed to bring about exposure.

It does not do college students any good when they are asked to join a group on the campus which is operating behind a false facade in an effort to indoctrinate our youths and make Communists out of them.

I say tell the American public which groups are Communist or are being run by Communists and we can depend on our citizens to remain loyal to their country and not support or be deceived into supporting those groups. The former Attorney General distorts this well conceived and fully lawful way of controlling the spread of the tenacles of communism. He says that those of us who favor S. 2171 are seeking to deceive the American people into believing that the law will assist the FBI or the Attorney General in dealing with espionage and sabotage—S. 14896.

I will not embellish this type of attack on the motives of the many Members of the Senate who have indicated support of S. 2171 by pointing out the completely erroneous nature. I say merely that I have full confidence in the ability of the FBI to apprehend and of the Department of Justice to obtain the convictions of those who violate the criminal laws relative to sabotage and treason. The Subversive Activities Control Act is not a criminal statute. Contrary to the apparent views of the Senator from New York, the act does have a strong preventive effect. The more the growth of Communist influences in this country is limited by exposure it is fundamental that there is less likelihood of sabotage.

Commonsense tells us that the security of the country is not preserved by apprehending someone after he has blown up a munitions plant. It perhaps should be added that in August 1966 the then Solicitor General of the United States, now an associate justice of the Supreme Court, stated in a brief filed in the Supreme Court that—

> The existence of criminal statutes dealing with acts of sabotage and espionage in defense plants could properly be regarded as inadequate protection for these vital facilities.

A distorted theme throughout the former Attorney General's speech was that the Department of Justice and the FBI have not received any information from the Board in 17 years that had not been uncovered in other ways. Again, he knows or should know that the purpose of the Board proceedings is not to obtain information for the FBI. Just the reverse, the purpose of Board determinations is to make available to the American people such facts about the Communist conspiracy as have been obtained by the FBI and can be established by a due process hearing and according to settled legal principles. These include the right of any group or individual to confront those who furnished information to the FBI so as to assure a full and true disclosure and not be termed Communist on incomplete or insufficient facts.

It would take too much of the Senate's time to go through Senator KENNEDY's speech and point out all of the erroneous statements. He questions the legality of the definition of a Communist-action organization because of vagueness when the Supreme Court has already and specifically upheld the definition against that specific attack. He implies that the Board imposes the sanctions which apply to organizations once they have been determined to come within the act. This is not true. The sole function of the Board, I repeat, is to hold hearings and make determinations on the facts when petitioned to do so by the Attorney General.

How wrong can one who should know be when he says, and I quote, "The Internal Security Act contains a number of sanctions which the SACB would still be apparently free to impose on those whom it investigates." The fact is that the sanctions, such as denial of employment with the Federal Government to those who remain members of a Communist-action organization after the organization has been determined to have that status, are completely separate and apart from the disclosure aspects for which the Board holds hearings. Moreover, the statute specifically provides that the enforcement of the sanctions is by the Department of Justice. The Board plays no part in enforcement.

Finally, a few words on the smokescreen which the Senator from New York has joined in attempting to build around S. 2171. This is the myth that the bill should be sent back to committee for further hearings.

On May 24, 1967, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary completed intensive hearings on the subject of "Gaps in Internal Security Laws." S. 2171 is an outgrowth of those hearings at which many expert witnesses testified. S. 2171 closes one of the gaps that was emphasized during the hearings. It closes a strictly legal gap, not one based upon the need for findings of additional facts. It closes the gap pointed out by the Supreme Court. It does so in the way suggested by the court of appeals.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a few questions?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am speaking with regard to section 15 of the present act. The present amendment purports to amend only subsections (a) and (b) of section 15 and leaves out the penalty provision of subsection (c) of the present act.

I have a minor amendment which I think would take care of that. I should like to inquire if it is the intention of the distinguished Senator from Illinois to leave out the penalty provision of subparagraph (c) of section 15.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was the desire of the Board, because they are going right back on one thing and only one thing; namely, exposure. The penalty provision must be read in light of the fact that the original act was compulsory. Insofar as registration is concerned, if they were contumacious about it, and would not register, obviously a penalty would have to be invoked. But, I have followed the advice of the Board with respect to that.

I would much prefer that that kind of amendment not be submitted.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then, to make it perfectly clear, this is not due to any legislative drafting oversight. The Board would rather get away from the penalty provision of section 15(c) of the present act because of recent court decisions, is that not correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Simply because we cannot compel them to register.

Mr. ALLOTT. I notice also, that the pending bill purports to delete the term "Communist infiltrated organizations" from section 5 of the present act. I am sure that this was a conscious decision, but it seems to me that some of these particular organizations are the very kind which, under the guise of some high sounding name, solicit money from unwitting people to finance their activities.

Is it true then that this term was left out for essentially the same reason, that is, that it was not thought enforceable?

Mr. DIRKSEN. To make absolutely certain that there was clear conformity in every respect with the decision of the courts, so that the Board would not be hamstrung in its endeavors.

Mr. ALLOTT. It was the Senator's feeling that if this was included, it might conflict with the finding of the Supreme Court and render the complete constitutional character of the Board, as the Senator envisioned, void; is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It could be. I cannot pass on it absolutely, as the Senator knows.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not know. The Senator's decision might be as good as the Supreme Court's decision.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, there, I am afraid, the Senator might flatter me.

Mr. ALLOTT. I was really more concerned about dropping the penalty provision of subsection (c) of section 15 of the present act. Since this is a Senate bill, however, it may be possible, either in the House or in the conference committee, to work that part over.

I do have a short statement I should like to make with respect to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just let me comment on what the Senator has said about the House.

Mr. President, there were 50 identical bills actually introduced in the House on the subject. The House committee has acted on H.R. 12601. That bill has 49 sponsors. They can have only 50 under the House rule.

Now, I understand it is a far more drastic bill than what we are seeking in the Senate. But there will be action in the House, just as surely as I stand in this Chamber in shoe leather. Then, of course, the outside frame of those two bills will become the domain of Congress. There will be plenty of time to include other items if there is any necessity to do so.

I have one other thing——

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate very much the Senator's answers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the attitude of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and two articles published in Stars and Stripes; a release from the Veterans of World War I; two releases from the American Legion; a release from the Military Order of the Purple Heart, a letter from the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States; a telegram from the national director of legislation of the Disabled American Veterans; a release from the Catholic War Veterans; a resolution of the Paralyzed Veterans of America; an article published in the Washington Evening Star on August 16, 1967; an article published in the Washington Post on August 16, 1967; an article published in the Baltimore Sun on August 16, 1967; an article published in the Washington Daily News of August 16, 1967; an article published in the New York Times on August 16, 1967; an article written by James J. Kilpatrick, who is a syndicated columnist, which was published in the Washington Evening Star on August 15, 1967; and an article published in the Washington Evening Star on July 30, 1967, in the nature of a book review on a book entitled "Road to Revolution," written by Philip Abbott Luce.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[A news release from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States]

VFW SUPPORTS SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 24.—The National Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Leslie M. Fry, Reno, Nevada, today announced "full support of the U.S. government's Subversive Activities Control Board."

Commander Fry said the V.F.W.'s action is necessary "because the present effort to discredit or abolish the Board has already been seized upon in the continuing efforts of Communist elements in this country to do just that."

In his statement the V.F.W. Commander noted that the present attack on the Subversive Activities Control Board followed the President's appointment and the Senate's confirmation of Mr. Simon McHugh, formerly of the Small Business Administration, as one of the Board members.

"The McHugh appointment, which has been confirmed by the Senate, is incidental to the issue of the compelling need for the continued existence and functioning of the Subversive Activities Control Board," Commander Fry said. "Those who are out to destroy this anti-Communist government agency are simply using the McHugh issue as a pretext and smoke screen for their attack on the Board."

Amplifying the V.F.W. position, Commander Fry said, "we of the V.F.W. vigorously support the Subversive Activities Control Board because it is needed in the interests of the defense of our government. This Board is the only agency in the Executive Branch of the government for determining and informing the American people as to the identity of Communists and other subversive groups working for the destruction of our government."

Continuing, Commander Fry emphasized: "It is no mere coincidence that this attack on the Board comes at this very time when the Board is putting the public spotlight on the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs which have been agitating so viciously against our Nation's stand against Communist aggression in Vietnam.

"Obviously, if the enemies of the Subversive Activities Control Board are successful in destroying the Board, they will be successful in protecting the DuBois club organization and its reported pro-Communist activities aimed at the American Youth.

"We of the V.F.W. believe that the citizens of our country are entitled to know who those are who are trying to destroy our country. This is a primary and necessary function of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

"To cut its appropriation or eliminate it would assist the Communists and handicap patriotic Americans."

Continuing, Commander Fry said, "the V.F.W. believes that instead of the Board being undercut or destroyed when it is so critically needed, it should be strengthened. At the present time," he pointed out, "there are two bills pending before Congress to strengthen the functions and status of the Board. These bills, essentially the same, have been introduced by a total of about 50 Democrats and Republicans. This underlines the non-political nature of the support of the Board.

"The V.F.W. takes this position for a very basic reason. At a time when American fighting men are dying to resist Communist aggression in Vietnam, we must keep our faith with them by resisting Communist subversion at home.

"It is the purpose of the Subversive Activities Control Board to help our citizens in this sacred endeavor. Our citizens must not be deprived of their right to know who the Communist elements are. The American people are entitled to have this information, which they can get only through the existence of the Subversive Activities Control Board."

[From the Stars and Stripes, Aug. 10, 1967]

VFW SUPPORTS SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The National commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Leslie M. Fry, has announced "full support of the U.S. Government's Subversive Activities Control Board."

Commander Fry said the VFW's action is necessary "because the present effort to discredit or abolish the Board has already been seized upon in the continuing efforts of Communist elements in this country to do just that."

In his statement the VFW commander noted that the present attack on the Subversive Activities Control Board followed the President's appointment and the Senate's confirmation of Simon McHugh, formerly of the Small Business Administration, as one of the Board members.

SMOKE SCREEN

"The McHugh appointment which has been confirmed by the Senate, is incidental to the issue of the compelling need for the continued existence and functioning of the Subversive Activities Control Board," Commander Fry said. "Those who are out to destroy this anti-Communist government agency are simply using the McHugh issue as a pretext and smoke screen for their attack on the Board."

Amplifying the VFW position, Commander Fry said: "It is no mere coincidence that this attack on the Board comes at this very time when the Board is putting the public spotlight on the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs which have been agitating so viciously against our Nation's stand against Communist aggression in Viet Nam.

Obviously, if the enemies of the Subversive Activities Control Board are successful in destroying the Board, they will be successful in protecting the DuBois club organization and its reported pro-Communist activities aimed at the American youth.

"We of the VFW believe that the citizens of our country are entitled to know who those are who are trying to destroy our country. This is a primary and necessary function of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

"To cut its appropriation or eliminate it would assist the Communists and handicap patriotic Americans."

BOARD NEEDED

Continuing, Commander Fry said, "the VFW believes that instead of the Board being undercut or destroyed when it is so critically needed, it should be strengthened. At the present time," he pointed out, "there are two bills pending before Congress to strengthen the functions and status of the Board. These bills, essentially the same, have been introduced by a total of about 50 Democrats and Republicans. This underlines the non-political nature of the support of the Board.

"The VFW takes this position for a very basic reason. At a time when American fightingmen are dying to resist Communist aggression in Viet Nam, we must keep our faith with them by resisting Communist subversion at home.

"It is the purpose of the Subversive Activities Control Board to help our citizens in this sacred endeavor. Our citizens must not be deprived of their right to know who the

Communist elements are. The American people are entitled to have this information, which they can get only thru the existence of the Subversive Activities Control Board."

[From the Stars and Stripes, Aug. 24, 1967]

SUBVERSIVE CONTROL BOARD WINS SUPPORT OF VFW

Francis W. Stover, National legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee on Aug. 17 relative to amendments to the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Stover cited the position of the VFW in the following statement:

By way of introduction, the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. is near an all-time high—almost 1,400,000. Our membership has always deeply concerned itself with the menace of Communism and all other subversive organizations, whose declared intent and purpose has been to violently overthrow our Government by any method or means, which they may deem appropriate.

It was this kind of background and history which led our membership to strongly support the creation of the Subversive Activities Control Board in 1950. It will be recalled that the purpose of the establishment of this Board was to reveal to the American people the Communist front, Communist-infiltrated organizations, and the members of the Communist organizations because such groups and persons, according to the findings of the Congress, constituted a real and continuing danger to our National welfare. Again the VFW lent its fullest support when legislation amending and enlarging the scope of the Board was approved by the Congress in 1954.

It has come as a shock to our organization to learn that legislation has been introduced in this 90th Congress which would abolish this Board. We welcome, therefore, the legislation which is before you which will continue to allow the Board to carry out the purpose and intent of the Congress when it established this Board.

Our organization is controlled almost exclusively by the mandates adopted by the delegates to our most recent National convention. Many of our members were cognizant of the lack of activity of the Subversive Activities Control Board when our convention was held in New York City, August, 1966—just about a year ago. As a result of this concern over the weakening of the Internal Security Act which had shrunk the jurisdiction of this Board, our organization adopted a resolution, identified as No. 268 entitled "To Strengthen Internal Security Act", which reads as follows:

Whereas, decisions of the United States Supreme Court have greatly weakened the Internal Security Act of 1950; and

Whereas, the Veterans of Foreign Wars was one of the sponsors and strong supporters of the Internal Security Act and amendments thereto since that time; and

Whereas, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has always led the fight to expose and identify Communists and others who would undermine and destroy our Government and way of life; and

Whereas, there is now pending in the 89th Congress a bill, H.R. 16584, which would greatly strengthen and improve the Internal Security Act and overcome the decisions of the Supreme Court which have greatly weakened the Internal Security Act; now, therefore

Be It Resolved, by the 67th National convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars supports H.R. 16584 and works for its advancement and approval by the Congress.

Pursuant to this resolution, together with a host of other resolutions, which indicates the great concern of our organization with Communism and its threat, both external and internal to the American way of life, we strongly support the purpose and intent of the bills before this Committee.

We do not come here as experts but only to lend our support to legislation which will make the Board effective in registering Communists and other subversives, as defined in this legislation, so that the American people can know who they are and to what extent they are a danger or threat.

It cannot be emphasized too much that the Subversive Activities Control Board is the only agency in the Executive branch which has the authority to provide this type of information to the American public.

The Board, however, does not operate in the dark—behind closed doors. On the contrary, it provides a full and fair hearing if there ever was one. It is a quasi-court which can hear and decide cases only after they have been brought before the Board by the Attorney General of the United States. All hearings are public. Like a court proceeding, there are reporters who keep a stenographic record of all that is said and copies of the hearings are printed. The Board, before it makes its decision, must make written findings of fact and conclusions of law. Lastly and most important, any final decision or order by the Board is subject to judicial review and when appealed the Board's orders cannot become effective until they have been reviewed and sustained by the court.

During the past 17 years, this Board has performed a magnificent contribution in exposing Communists and others of the same ilk as defined by the Internal Security Act. Unfortunately, the language of the Act has been construed on several occasions to be in conflict with the Constitution, which has greatly diminished the jurisdiction of the Board and apparently has been a great deterrent to the Attorney General in bringing more cases before the Board. Coupled with this are the long and lengthy appeals which have kept the orders of the Board tied up in the courts for long periods during which it was inadvisable to proceed with similar or other cases until a final decision had been handed down by the court.

The fact that there has been little activity on the part of the Board is the most compelling reason that this legislation should be favorably considered and reported by this Committee. Something is wrong with the present law and should be remedied as quickly as possible. Because there haven't been any or many cases before a court of law doesn't mean that we want to destroy or eliminate the court. Rather we want to strengthen the court. Similarly, we want to strengthen the Board so that it can do the job Congress intended back when it established the Board in 1950.

[A news release from the National Headquarters, Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., July 25, 1967]

William H. Walker, National Commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., defends the organization known as the Subversive Activities Control Board, currently under attack and investigation by the Congress.

Commander Walker stated, "In these perilous times, when our Nation is engaged in a mighty struggle against Communism in a country half-way around the world, as well as uprisings of devious nature right here in our own United States, surely a group born and created to control subversive activities is needed more than ever."

The Veterans of World War I fought against principles not unlike those practiced by subversive groups today, and agree that such groups now agitating against our Nation's stand on Communism should be made known to the people of our country, and this is the work of the Subversive Activities Control Board, an agency hamstrung in its efforts up to the present time, but one that is direly needed to help us safeguard the things we hold most dear.

"It is our understanding that there are measures now before the Congress," said Commander Walker, "which would open the way for this group to work more effectively, and this organization supports such legislation."

"Surely," continued the Commander, "the abolishment of the Subversive Activities Control Board, an agency of the executive branch of the government for determining and informing the American people of the identity of Communists and other subversive groups working for the destruction of our government, is definitely not in the best interest of this country. We of the Veterans of World War I vigorously support the Subversive Activities Control Board because we feel its need in pointing out subversive influences whose purpose it is to destroy our government which we have defended and are defending on fields of battle to this day."

[A news release from the American Legion, National Public Relations Division]

NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, JOHN E. DAVIS, DEFINES LEGION OPPOSITION TO CURRENT EFFORTS TO ABOLISH THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD, NOW BEFORE THE CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 25, 1967—John E. Davis (N.D.), National Commander of The American Legion, said today "The American Legion supports the Subversive Activities Control Board and believes that current efforts to abolish it are not in the best interests of this country."

Commander Davis pointed out that the American Legion supported the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950 which established the SACB and that the Legion's position has not changed.

Commander Davis said that the criticism directed at the Board by its opponents to the effect that the Board has accomplished little if anything since its creation "is unfair." The SACB is governed by the statute establishing it, he said, and it cannot act unless requested to do so by the Attorney General. The Board is not a free agent. The Board's alleged lack of accomplishments over the years, Commander Davis emphasized, has been due to time consuming litigation in the courts by those called to appear before the Board and the resulting court decisions declaring portions of the statute unconstitutional. The attempts by the Board to require the Communist Party of the United States to register with the Board and its current effort with respect to the WEB DuBois Clubs of America "are prime examples," the Commander said.

"At the present time," Commander Davis said, "legislation is pending in the House to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 so that the unconstitutional features will be eliminated and at the same time permit the Board to function as Congress intended it to do."

The Commander said "at a time when the Communist Party of the United States is accelerating its activity on the campuses of American universities, and elsewhere, it would be an injustice to the American public to eliminate the SACB which Congress established for the purpose of making a public record of these subversive activities."

[From the AMVETS National Headquarters]

STATEMENT BY AMVETS' NATIONAL COMMANDER A. LEO ANDERSON, ISSUED JULY 25, 1967

AMVETS' National Commander A. Leo Anderson on behalf of his organization today strongly urged the support of the bipartisan measures presently before Congress which are intended to provide the Subversive Activities Control Board with the requisite authority to permit its functions as originally intended by the U.S. Congress.

This Board is the only existing arm of the Executive Branch of the Government charged with the responsibility of scrutinizing and recommending specific action against subversive groups and activities whose aim is the destruction of the internal security of this Country.

Commander Anderson said, "When each day reveals ever more clearly the probable existence of a 'Fifth Column' directly working against our Country's policies in the Vietnam Conflict and its strong stand in foreign policies all over the world, we believe that the Board should be strengthened in its authority to function more effectively than ever.

"The sudden emergence of local pressure for the Board's abolishment at a time when well organized 'Fifth-Column-type' terror and public disorder is taking place is too much of a coincidence to pass unnoticed.

"The growing violence and malicious destruction of property and disregard of the lives and safety of the average citizen reveals the type of communistic guerrilla tactic which has become familiar throughout the world."

Anderson recommends most strongly the continuation and enlargement of the authority of the Subversive Activities Control Board to permit it to function in the preservation of the Nation's Internal Security in the crisis which is obviously here today.

Anderson said, "I firmly believe that it is the duty of every citizen to make known his support of the Board so that we may keep faith with our young men fighting in Vietnam and in other troubled areas throughout the world, by maintaining here at home the constant vigilance required to assure peace and tranquillity despite the planned activities by subversive organizations attempting to weaken the support required to carry out our National policies to successful conclusions."

Statement From the Military Order of the Purple Heart, July 25, 1967

The National Commander of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, John H. Burgess, Daytona Beach, Florida, today gave his "unqualified" endorsement and support to the U.S. Government Subversive Activities Control Board (SACB).

"With the threat of Communism spreading throughout the world and the new militancy of the communists in Asia, Africa and even South America, the American people require the services of this Board," Commander Burgess said.

"There has been a concerted effort to discredit the SACB," Commander Burgess pointed out. "Even reputable newspapers have referred to the panel as useless. However, recent Supreme Court rulings have played a large part in making the Board ineffective. Pending now before Congress are two bills which would correct the wording of the law under which the Board operates, and return it to its former status."

Commander Burgess contended that the American people deserve to know what organizations are Communist or serve as a Communist-front. "Only through the actions of the Board appointed in 1950 by Congress have the American people been alerted to the actions of some organizations which front as patriotic while serving, what Commander Burgess termed, "two masters."

"There is a continuous alert that must be maintained by our people and our Government against those who would destroy our way of life and replace it with foreign allegiance to Communist power. The Subversive Activities Control Board has been able to accomplish this task."

"With the ruling by the Supreme Court that the SACB was violating the Constitution by requiring Communists to register, the SACB has been stymied to a degree in its work of protecting this nation from Communist infiltration."

"With our active effort in South Viet-Nam against Communist aggression, we here at home have a new obligation to fight this threat within our own nation," Commander Burgess said. "I feel that the SACB has done an outstanding job, and I am sorry to see their hands tied by the recent court rulings. However, the new bills pending in Congress, if passed, will restore the SACB to its former position of vigilance and protector of democracy."

Congressional Medal of Honor
Society, United States of America, Chartered by the Congress,
July 26, 1967.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The Congressional Medal of Honor Society would like to express its support for the work being done by the Subversive Activities Control Board. The Board's efforts to protect the security of our Government and the peace and tranquility of the American way of life should not go unrewarded. We trust that the Board will be permitted to continue effectively for years to come.

Respectfully yours,
Thomas J. Kelly,
President.

Denver, Colo.,
July 29, 1967.

John Mahan,
Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D.C.:

The preconvention National Executive Committee meeting of Disabled American Veterans has just unanimously passed the following resolution whereas the price of liberty is known to be eternal vigilance and whereas freedom is threatened by communist aggression abroad and communist inspired subversion at home and whereas our Government has the responsibility to fully inform the people of the existence of their enemies wherever they may be found so they can effectively resist enemy activities at home as our men in uniform are deterring them overseas therefore be it resolved by the National Executive Committee of the Disabled American Vets that the U.S. Subversive Activities Control Board be supported in its patriotic endeavors to investigate and publicize those internal subversive groups and organizations which seek the destruction of our Government and be it further resolved that the Subversive Activities Control Board be strengthened in whatever way is necessary so it may continue to perform its work effectively in the vital interest of the defense of our Nation.

Charles L. Huber,
National Director of Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

[A news release from the Catholic War Veterans, Washington, D.C., July 25, 1967]

The National Commander of the Catholic War Veterans, U.S.A., today threw the weight of his organization "in support of the U.S. government's Subversive Activities Control Board."

"It has become obvious," Commander Riley said, "that a deliberate campaign is under way to discredit the SACB in an attempt to destroy its effectiveness."

"This must not be allowed to happen. It is vital that this Board continue its important work of identifying and exposing those in our nation who are actively working to destroy our government."

We of the Catholic War Veterans recognize that America's enemies are not always to be found on the battlefield. The danger from within is as great as that from without. We must always be on guard against those foreign-controlled political groups, or Communist-dominated or infiltrated groups that seek to overcome us through subversion.

The disbandment of the Subversive Activities Control Board would be a victory, indeed, for those elements which operate in darkness and flourish in secrecy. They cannot thrive in the light of public exposure, and so they resist any disclosure of their activities and any revelation of their purposes.

The Catholic War Veterans, therefore, not only vigorously oppose any weakening of the Subversive Activities Control Board but also urge Congress to reinforce its ability to function effectively by passing the amendments now pending before it.

It is important that the SACB be allowed to continue its work. The people have a right, for example, to be told more about the activities of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, which the Catholic War Veterans assisted in exposing, which have so flagrantly opposed our nation's commitment against the forces of Communist aggression in Vietnam. And, it is this organization which the Board now is investigating.

As the sole Executive agency charged with identifying subversive groups operating in America today, the Subversive Activities Control Board is vital to the interests of the defense of our government.

We strongly support its continued operation and vigorously commend its purposes.

Since this organization exposed the DuBois group, we would be glad to provide you with such data as we have collected.

Resolution

Whereas, our nation is engaged in a conflict against forces of aggression in Vietnam; and

Whereas, that battle is recognized as but part of our continuing struggle against a world-wide Communist conspiracy to crush freedom wherever it may exist; and

Whereas, our nation has an obligation to those men and women who have fought for her liberty in the past and who defend her principles today to expose those who seek to subvert her from within, as well as to resist those who threaten Democracy from without; therefore

Be it resolved by the 21st National Convention of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, that the U.S. Subversive Activities Control Board be supported, strengthened and continued so that it may effectively perform its vital task of identifying and publicizing those subversive groups and organizations in our nation who actively work to destroy our government.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 16, 1967]

Strong Support Won by Subversives Board

The Subversive Activities Control Board, target of an abolition campaign among some members of Congress, has picked up strong support within three important Senate and House committees and from the Justice Department.

In a fast round of developments yesterday:

1. The Senate Judiciary Committee approved, 11–2, a bill sponsored by Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois to strengthen the board by allowing it to identify subversives without requiring their formal registration.

2. The House Committee on Un-American Activities opened public hearings on a bill even stronger than the Senate measure, amid indications it would be reported to the floor by an overwhelming majority.

3. Several members of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee which must approve the SACB's budget request indicated they would support the agency's proposal for $295,000 in operating funds for the current year.

4. J. Walter Yeagley, assistant attorney general for internal security, told the Appropriations subcommittee that he "certainly could not support anything in favor of abolishing the board" because "it has performed a valuable public service."

Yeagley, representing the Justice Department at the hearing, was the first administration official to comment publicly on the board's future since the SACB became the center of a controversy almost one month ago.

The dispute was the result of President Johnson's nomination of Simon F. McHugh Jr. to a five-year term as one of the five board members. McHugh, 29, was named to the $26,000-a-year post less than one year after he married the former Victoria McCammon, a one-time personal secretary to the President.

Several members of Congress charged that McHugh's White House connections were his only qualification for the job. They demanded abolition of the board on grounds it had not held any hearings in the last 22 months.

Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., only critic of the SACB to appear before the Appropriations subcommittee yesterday, called on it "not to appropriate one penny" for the board because "its powers are virtually defunct and its annual activities add up to little more than zero."

Proxmire said it was "time to call a spade a spade—the SACB is dead and any threat to our society from communism can be handled legally and effectively by the police, such federal agencies as the FBI and the courts of this nation."

However, several subcommittee members disagreed. Senate Major Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana acknowledged that "little has been done over the past several years" but added:

"I think it should be enlarged in its responsibility and authority. If that is not done, then it seems consideration should be given to its abolition, but I think the SACB should be kept alive pending a determination by Congress."

Even stronger support for the agency came from Sen. Roman L. Hruska, R-Neb., who said: "The Communist conspiracy should be exposed and identified," and from Sen. John L. McClellan, D-Ark., who said: "We are finding alibis by the dozen not to do anything about lawlessness in this country."

The board was established in 1950 to hold hearings on complaints filed by the Justice Department alleging that an individual or organization was engaged in Communist or Communist-front activities. If an affirmative finding was reached, the law required registration of the person or group involved.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 16, 1967]

Unit Votes Bill To Keep Life in Dormant SACB

(By Jean M. White)

The Subversive Activities Control Board, which has not held a hearing for nearly two years, may emerge with new life from recent moves to abolish it.

Yesterday the Senate Judiciary Committee approved a bill that will keep the Board in business with changes designed to comply with Supreme Court decisions.

The Board would still continue to hold quasi-judicial hearings on cases referred by the Department of Justice and issue findings for public exposure of Communist and Communist-front organizations. But the proposed legislation abolishes the registration requirement declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court under Fifth Amendment protection against self-incrimination.

MANSFIELD BACKS MOVE

At a hearing before a Senate Appropriations subcommittee, Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield (Mont.) backed the move to revitalize the SACB and "fill the void left by the courts."

He called for legislation along the line of the Judiciary Committee-approved bill, which was introduced by Sen. Everett M. Dirksen (R-Ill.).

His comment came as the subcommittee heard from Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), who wants to abolish the SACB, which was created under the 1950 Internal Security Act.

Proxmire urged the subcommittee to cut every penny possible out of the SACB's request for $295,000. He said "its annual activities add up to little more than zero" and its five Board members, who receive $26,000 a year, are "virtually unemployed."

SPOTLIGHT ON ACTIVITIES

The move to abolish the SACB came after the spotlight was thrown on its activities by the furor over the recent appointment of Simon F. McHugh, Jr., to the Board. He is the husband of a former secretary to President Johnson.

It was apparent yesterday that many of the subcommittee members did not agree with Proxmire that the answer was to abolish the Board since it was stripped of most of its power by Supreme Court decisions.

Sen. John L. McClellan (D-Ark.), the subcommittee chairman, sharply questioned Proxmire on the Wisconsin Senator's suggestion that the Board's activities be transferred to the Justice Department. McClellan expressed doubts about the Justice Department's conducting hearings on charges that it filed.

Support for the SACB also came from a Justice Department official. J. Walter Yeagley, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Internal Security Division, said the Board has proved useful in public exposure of Communists and their organizations.

At one point, McClellan asked Yeagley whether Stokley Carmichael can be prosecuted for anti-American speeches made in Havana.

Yeagley said it was his personal opinion that Carmichael's statements could not be proved a clear and present danger within the meaning of Federal law since the Black Power leader was talking to Cubans.

On the House side yesterday Rep. Joe Pool (D-Tex.) introduced a constitutional amendment to empower Congress to designate certain acts as a cause for revocation of citizenship.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 16, 1967]

Boost Is Given Board for Subversive Control—Senate Judiciary Panel Votes New Power for Group Many Have Sought To Abolish

(By Nathan Miller)

Washington, August 15.—The Senate Judiciary Committee voted 11 to 2 today to give new life to the Subversive Activities Control Board—under fire since President Johnson named the husband of his former secretary as a $26,000-a-year member.

Under the bill introduced by Senator Dirksen (R., Ill.) the board's function would be to expose Communists and Communist organizations by holding hearings on charges brought by the Justice Department.

The Internal Security Act of 1950, under which the board was set up, would be amended to eliminate a requirement that groups found to be Communist register with the Justice Department. This procedure was ruled illegal by the Supreme Court in 1965.

PUBLIC EXPOSURE

Dirksen's bill is designed to conform to the Court decision while preserving a means of publicly exposing Communists.

Sanctions against members of such organizations would be triggered by the board's findings instead of the registration order.

Among the major sanctions are requirements that members of such organizations cannot work in designated defense areas and cannot work for the Federal Government unless they disclose their membership.

Senator Tydings (D., Md.) and Senator Edward Kennedy (D., Mass.) voted against the bill.

The spotlight was put on the board's lack of activity by the appointment of 27-year-old Simon F. McHugh, Jr., and his nomination which was whisked through the Senate.

Board members had complained that the Supreme Court decision had immobilized it, and there have been numerous demands that Congress abolish it, most recently from Senator Proxmire (D., Wis.).

BACKED BY MANSFIELD

Today Proxmire called upon a subcommittee holding hearings on a $330,000 budget request for the board to "slash every cent possible from this wasteful extravagance. . . . It is as if we had a full-time, five-man court without a single case before it, and none likely to come."

But Senator Mansfield (D., Mont.), the majority leader, told the same subcommittee that the activities of the board should be "enlarged in authority" by congressional action.

On the House side, the Committee on Un-American Activities, which also began hearings on the registration bill, was told by Representative Hall (D., Mo.) that the measure would help McHugh "earn his salary"

He urged that in addition to concentrating on Communists the bill should broaden the board's activities to coverage to require registration of "those who preach murder, riot, sedition and anarchy"

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 16, 1967]

The Subversive Activities Control Board would be put back into action under a bill approved, 11–2, by the Senate Judiciary Committee. Under the measure, introduced by GOP Leader Dirksen, the board would issue findings on whether organizations were Communist-dominated, but such groups wouldn't have to register with the Government. The board has been largely dormant since such registration was held unconstitutional. Some have suggested abolishing the board.

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 16, 1967]

Subversive Control Board Gets Shot in Arm

The Senate Judiciary Committee voted yesterday to give new life to the dormant Subversive Control Board. A similar bill was considered in the House.

The board came under congressional attack recently when President Johnson appointed to it a new member, Simon F. McHugh, husband of one of his former White House secretaries.

Critics not only questioned Mr. McHugh's qualifications but said his $26,000-a-year salary was a waste of money because the board had virtually nothing to do since the Supreme Court had ruled that it was unconstitutional to require subversive groups or persons to register themselves with the Government.

But the Senate Committee approved legislation yesterday to permit the board to hold hearings on Justice Department charges that certain persons are affiliated with communist or other subversive groups.

If they are found subversive, the board under the bill could order sanctions against them, such as prohibiting them from working in defense areas or from holding Federal jobs unless they openly disclose their membership.

The bill, introduced by Sen. Everett M. Dirksen, was approved 11 to 2. It was opposed by Sens. Edward M. Kennedy (D., Mass.), and Joseph D. Tydings (D., Md.).

[From the New York Times, Aug. 16, 1967]

Subversive Control Board May Remain Alive—Senate Panel Votes Against Abolishing Agency—House Unit Studies Security Act

Washington, August 15.—The Senate Judiciary Committee voted today to revive the activities of the Subversive Activities Control Board rather than abolish the agency.

The action came as the House Committee on Un-American Activities opened hearings on similar legislation designed to reactivate the Internal Security Act of 1950, which the Supreme Court has rendered virtually inoperative.

The Senate legislation would bypass restrictions placed on the board by three Supreme Court decisions by amending the Internal Security Act to eliminate from the board's jurisdiction the authority to issue orders requiring Communist-affiliated groups to register with the Justice Department.

The board would retain its authority to hold hearings on charges brought by the Justice Department and, if it finds that any groups are Communist, Communist-dominated or Communist-infiltrated, to expose them publicly.

PROXMIRE ASKS SLASH

The committee vote of 11 to 2 came after Senator William Proxmire urged an Appropriations subcommittee, which is considering a $330,000 budget request for the board, to "slash every cent possible from this wasteful extravagance."

House committee hearings on a bill introduced by Edwin E. Willis, of Louisiana, the chairman, and others, appear to be calling for action similar to the Senate legislation.

The House bill would require the board to determine the identity of members of Communist organizations and would require the Attorney General to enter these names in the public register.

"Instead of requiring the member of register we would require the Attorney General to keep a list." "If I had been a member of the Supreme Court I too would have held that admitting to be a Communist is so degrading that a person should not be compelled to admit it."

ALLUDES TO PUBLICITY

Mr. Willis also said the bill would give the five-member Subversive Activities Control Board, which administers the act, something to do. He alluded to recent publicity concerning President Johnson's appointment of Simon F. McHugh Jr., the husband of a former secretary to the President, to the board at a salary of $26,000 a year.

"It disturbs me no end to hear people holler politics and go after the hide of the S.A.C.B.," Mr. Willis said. "It is not the fault of the S.A.C.B. that it is not busy"

The first witness, Representative Durward G. Hall, Republican of Missouri, suggested that the legislation be broadened to include the registration of all those "who in fact preach murder, riot, sedition and anarchy."

"In the past few years we have observed the emergence of a new type of subversive organization, the militant, violent orientated racist groups which advocate guerrilla warfare within our cities," he said.

Mr. Willis agreed that "subversive elements are far broader than Communists" but reminded Mr. Hall that the committee would go into subversive elements involved in racial rioting in separate hearings that will begin later.

He noted that the committee staff had been investigating subversion in racial disorders for 10 months.

"We are going to hold hearings and let the chips fall where they may," Mr. Willis said.

During the hearing, a group called the National Committee to Abolish H.U.A.C. distributed copies of a critique of the bill by Vern Countryman, professor of law at Harvard.

Mr. Countryman wrote that the bill would "drastically abridge freedom of speech" and was "patently inadequate to overcome the constitutional and operational defects in the McCarran Act, though they may inspire the members of the board to restir themselves for a new round of harassing but ultimately bootless activity."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 15, 1967]

New Bill May Give SACB Fresh Lease on Life

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The Subversive Activities Control Board, or what little remains of it, occupies a pleasant suite on Vermont Avenue. From the spacious windows of their paneled offices, the board members can catch a nice glimpse of Lafayette Square. It is about all they have to look at.

Created by Congress in 1950, the board today is just about defunct. In the 17 years of its precarious existence, the agency has dealt with only 68 proceedings. Its orders languish unobeyed. The last petition it received from the attorney general, directed against the W.E.B. Du Bois Clubs, was filed in March 1966. The board has not conducted an evidentiary hearing in more than two years.

As the workload has declined from nil to nothing, the staff has dwindled sadly. Once the board had two hearing examiners; now it has none. Thirteen employes have been riffed, as the saying goes, in the last two years. Apart from the five board members, each of them drawing $26,000 a year, only nine employes remain. They rattle around in the empty offices, contemplating the puzzles of 21-down and 14-across, and praying that Congress will bring the agency back to life.

Bills now pending in the House and Senate would have that effect. The House Committee on Un-American Activities has scheduled hearings this week on one of these measures, sponsored jointly by 25 Democrats and 25 Republicans. Peering through the smoke of this summer's riots, one perceives a strong probability that the bill will pass.

In my own view, the bill ought to pass. Given a workable law, with a reasonable prospect of surviving court attack, the Subversive Activities Control Board is capable of performing a useful job. Here and there in the country, one may encounter a few children who doubt the existence of an internal Communist conspiracy. Grown men know better. In his just-published book, "Road to Revolution," former Communist Phillip Abbott Luce has provided chilling documentation of a danger that is real and not imagined.

Under existing law, the SACB is helpless to cope with the danger. The 1950 act was based on a scheme of registration. The board was to receive petitions from the attorney general, asking that organizations and individuals be tagged as Communist; if so, they were to register as such. But in a series of decisions, dragged out over 17 years, the courts now have declared the registration requirement void

In place of this requirement, the pending bills contemplate a new procedure. The board could not order anyone to do anything. It could only hear evidence and come to "determinations." If the board determined that an organization was a Communist front, or so deeply infiltrated that it was under Communist control, the board would issue a pronouncement to that effect. The stigmatized organization thereafter would have to identify its propaganda, in the fashion of foreign agents, with a notation of the SACB's finding.

There is reason to believe this scaled-down procedure might win approval from the U.S. Supreme Court. In its 5–4 decision of 1961, suspending the registration plan, the court seemed to agree that once the objection of self-incrimination was removed, a federal disclosure law might well be upheld.

Such an approach likely would command strong support in Congress. Senator Everett M. Dirksen, R-Ill., last month made it clear that he would not stand by quietly "and see the board shoved into limbo." Veterans' groups are clamoring for the board's continued existence. The general feeling on the Hill is to abolish the SACB or give it something to do. Every Molotov cocktail contributes to the board's rising prospect for survival.

As a general proposition, conservatives and liberals alike are opposed to government meddling in private organizations. Such a complaint has no relevance here. These Communist fronts are not private organizations. They are the troublemaking hands and arms of the international Communist apparatus. A Congress dedicated to truth-in-labeling should not hesitate in giving the SACB new power to pin on some labels where the people can see them.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 30, 1967]

New Whittaker

("Road to Revolution." By Phillip Abbott Luce. Viewpoint Books 165 pages. Paperback, $1)

Already called the "Whittaker Chambers" of his generation, Phillip Abbott Luce has chosen an appropriate time for the publication of his second book, "Road to Revolution."

In the midst of 1967's "long hot summer," Luce has provided us with a first-hand report of the perspective in which such events are held by Communists, to whom they are "rebellions," and not riots. Beyond this, his message is an alarming one. It describes in great detail, and with thorough documentation, the plans for guerrilla warfare in the streets of our cities already devised by domestic radicals.

Phil Luce at 29 is a former leader of the "New Left," organizer of two student trips to Cuba in 1963 and 1964, an officer of the Progressive Labor Party and editor of its monthly magazine, Progressive Labor, until his defection in January, 1965. He has written about his experiences in his first book, "The New Left," and one of the major reasons for his disillusionment with communism came when he found himself "involved in a series of plans in which the participants had no idea of the consequences . . . I left when it became obvious that the individual lives of the members of PL, let alone society, meant less than an abstract Communist catechism as envisioned by the 'gurus' of the movement." According to Luce his defection ranks him "somewhere near President Johnson and J. Edgar Hoover" as the "most maligned enemy" of PL.

STORED GUNS

Progressive Labor, the pro-Communist Chinese offshoot of the United States Communist Party, passed a resolution at its 1965 national convention stating that "black liberation" was the path for the coming guerrilla war in the United States. "The key to revolution in the United States," the convention declared, "lies within the interlocking interests in the black liberation movement and the working class struggle for socialism."

Just before the Harlem riots of 1964, William Epton, vice chairman of PL, said this to an open air rally: "We will not be fully free until we smash this state completely and totally . . . in the process . . . we're going to have to kill a lot of these cops, a lot of these judges, and we'll have to go against the army." Epton was later tried and found guilty of criminal anarchy.

Luce states: "While I was an officer of PL, I learned of a number of projects in which people where being prepared for a future guerrilla operation. Not only did we store guns in New York City, but target practice was held on Long Island prior to the Harlem riots. I was personally asked to find a hiding place suitable for target practice."

Another of the organizations planning such violent activity is the Revolutionary Action Movement, known as RAM. Max Stanford, leader of the group, said that "the black revolution will use sabotage in the cities—knocking out the electrical power first, then transportation and guerrilla warfare in the countryside of the South. With the cities powerless, the oppressor will be helpless."

VIOLENCE PLANNED

Luce points to a third organization which, he says, is rapidly becoming a part of this guerrilla movement—the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, no longer either nonviolent or dominated by students. He reports an August 29, 1966 SNCC fund-raising dinner in Harlem that featured an interesting trio of speakers—Stokely Carmichael, then chairman, along with Max Stanford of RAM and William Epton of PL. Carmichael said that in "Cleveland they're building stores with no windows. All brick. I don't know what they think they'll accomplish. It just means we have to move from Molotov cocktails to dynamite." He added: "They say we're stupid and don't do anybody any good and we deserve to be called that, because if we had any sense we'd have bombed these ghettos long ago."

Luce makes it clear that most Negro leaders have condemned the concept of "black power," and the exhortation to violence. As a result, they are as much the targets of violence as the white community. Only recently members of RAM, including Max Stanford, were arrested in an assassination plot. The targets: Roy Wilkins of the NAACP and Whitney Young of the Urban League.

Phil Luce repeatedly stresses that Communists do not begin trouble but take advantage of it, incite it, and exploit it. He understands, as some seem not to, that there are real grievances in the ghettos, lack of jobs, poor housing, inadequate recreation facilities. Yet others tend to minimize the influence of these radical organizations and their very real plans for revolution on our city streets.

In a balanced and provocative volume, he does not blame all evil on "outside agitators." Yet the public should understand the plans which Communists have for our cities. Phase one, as recent violence indicates, has already occurred. Armed with Luce's warning and our own awareness of the problems which must be solved, we may yet be able to avoid phase two.—ALLAN C. BROWNFELD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, is it not true that the letter which he received from Attorney General Ramsey Clark states:

> The bill provides the Attorney General "shall file . . ." proceedings with the Subversive Activities Control Board under the standards set forth. If it becomes law, S. 2171 will be enforced. Proceedings will be initiated with the Board as evidence warrants, consistent with the Constitution and the standards of the Act.

I want to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the author of this proposal, if he can conceive of any Attorney General answering this any differently.

Is it not true that, after all, when we ask the Attorney General to enforce the law, that is his job? His job is that of principal enforcing officer of the Government.

He did not say a word about whether he welcomed the bill, or whether the bill would help in the fight against internal communism; but he did say:

> Proceedings will be initiated with the Board as evidence warrants, consistent with the Constitution and the standards of the act.

What we have done, last week, is to place in the RECORD argument after argument by some of the most distinguished constitutional authorities in the country that the law will still have serious constitutional defects.

The law cannot be enforced because it does have those constitutional defects. I submit that when the Attorney General says that proceedings will be initiated consistent with the Constitution, he is not telling us his opinion as to whether or not he feels that he can comply with the Constitution; that he can, in fact, enforce the law, that he will use it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is this colloquy on my time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let the balance of this colloquy be on my time or the time of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time from now on will be charged against the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. During this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the first place, I would not expect the Attorney General to make any reply other than what he made. Had I been the Attorney General, I would have sent the same type of letter: "If you are going to put it on the law books, I will enforce it"; and obviously, within the framework of the Constitution, that must apply to every piece of legislation that goes across this floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Exactly. The minority leader is saying that the Attorney General, in reply to the letter of the minority leader, is not telling us whether or not the law will be enforced. He says it will be consistent with the Constitution, but the whole issue is whether this law is consistent with the Constitution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why should we ask the Attorney General if he is going to enforce the law? That is our business. If he does not enforce it, the minority leader is going to be around these vineyards to do something about it and take it out of his hands and not leave that discretionary power there.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But our principal business is to determine whether or not legislation we pass is constitutional and can be enforced. The great weakness of the 1950 act is that it did not comply with the Constitution. The minority leader supports the decision of the Supreme Court in the Albertson case. He says he is not arguing with that decision. We made a serious mistake at that time in not seeing to it that the Subversive Activities Control Act did not conform with the Constitution. Congress did not get adequate constitutional advice then. We certainly are not getting it now. And the constitutional authorities who have spoken out unanimously oppose this bill on constitutional grounds.

What I am saying now is that we do not have any assurance from the Attorney General that he believes this bill is in compliance with the Constitution. We should have the Attorney General's opinion on that. After all, he is the principal legal officer of this Government. He is the agent of the President of the United States. If we do not get his view on the record as to whether or not this bill is constitutional, we simply do not know whether we are passing an act which will have any effect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought that was one of the responsibilities of a member of the legislative branch when he goes up to that desk, holds up his hand, and takes an oath to uphold the law and the Constitution. We have as much of an interest in that document as has the Attorney General.

It is rather strange that, in a period of 17 years, only now the question of the compulsory self-registration has come up. If that weakness was there and the former Attorney General who spoke so eloquently, but without logic, in my judgment, on the floor, put any faith in it, why, when he was Attorney General for 3 years, did he not come up here and say, "Abolish the law. Take it off the books. Repeal it"?

Can the Senator recall any moment when the distinguished Senator from New York, when he was Attorney General, came before this body and asked to have this law removed from the statute books? Certainly not. He was a johnny-come-lately in that respect. Only now does he come before us——

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the Albertson decision was handed down after Senator KENNEDY was Attorney General. He was a Senator at the time the Albertson decision was handed down. It was only then that the statute was interpreted by the court. It was only then that there was a full opportunity to have a decision made by the court.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator just got through saying that the Attorney General has to determine whether or not he is going to enforce the law, not wait for the Supreme Court. When the Senator from New York was Attorney General, was he not supposed to take cognizance of this law? That is quite aside from the Albertson decision of the Supreme Court and quite aside from the decision in the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator knows perfectly well that this case was in the courts for years. The law was being tested. It took a long time to go the route to the Supreme Court. The former Attorney General made the statement that he did not receive one scrap of evidence from the Subversive Activities Control Board that the FBI and the Attorney General did not have. However, I think he was perfectly justified in letting the process work to its ultimate end before recommending to the Congress of the United States that the Board be abolished.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I just got through saying that this is not an investigatory board. That is the FBI's business. This Board, under the law, has to wait for a petition from the Attorney General, and then it acts by holding a hearing and ultimately making a determination.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the distinguished minority leader that he made a big issue of the argument that hearings were held on the bill; that hearings were held in June, 1966, and May 1967;

that the subcommittee held hearings. The legislation, however, at that time did not have a number. It had not been formally introduced. It was not introduced until August of this year, as I understand it.

May I say that this is very puzzling for a Member of the Senate who is not a member of the Judiciary Committee. As I understand the purpose of hearings, it is to inform Members of this body. The purpose of subcommittees is to have hearings so we can have a legislative record on specific legislation, so we can have copies of the hearings before us. I do not see anything that indicates a hearing was held on this bill. So, however useful it may have been to the Senator from Illinois to have had the hearings of last year, they have not been brought to the attention of Senators on this bill. Senators are not aware of these hearings, and after all this is the whole purpose of hearings to inform Senators who vote on the legislation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the first place, it is not unusual practice for the committee to work on other than printed hearings.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It may not be unusual, but why not have the hearings before us? Why the big secret?

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I add that there has been a lack of diligence somewhere along the line, because the hearings are available. I have never had difficulty in obtaining copies of hearings. I do not see any purpose in piling the hearings up high until they look like high-rise buildings. We had the hearings on the poverty bill on our desks. They were so high we could not see around the corner.

Mr. PROXMIRE. For the last week, Senator after Senator has risen in the Chamber and said, "We should have hearings on the proposed legislation." They made the point, over and over again, that we do not have a record on it.

The Senator from Illinois has been silent, until just a few minutes before we shall vote. We are going to vote on final passage today. Under the circumstances, we shall vote without having had anything in the way of a record before any Senator. Merely to say that a subcommittee had hearings on similar legislation last year and this year is not very helpful.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I never have any difficulty in getting hearings and other documents, because they are available. One little call to the clerk of the Judiciary Committee would have unearthed everything that even my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] wanted.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the distinguished minority leader, who is as able and competent a legislative craftsman as we have in this body, and who has been a Member of the House and Senate for so many years, feels that those hearings really applied to the bill, I cannot understand why they are not available and brought to the attention of Senators, when day after day the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] have asked, "Where are the hearings?" We have been kept in the dark until now.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. On the time of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I want only a minute or so, since the Senator has been kind enough to mention my name.

It seems to me that my friend from Illinois is in a procedural doghouse. He brought the bill to the floor of the Senate without a report or hearings. I have the feeling that he is trying to muscle it through. I think this sets an unfortunate precedent in this body of decorum and demeanor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The only response I have is that I hope the Senator will be around sometime when I really try to muscle a bill through the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I should not think I would need any other experience than this one.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It will be a great adventure, I assure the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the opinions of some of the most competent constitutional experts. They are in addition to those whose names I stated last week.

The first telegram I shall read states:

October 17, 1967.

Senator William Proxmire,
United States Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We believe S. 2171 to revive McCarran Act is unconstitutional, wholly unnecessary, and threatens basic freedoms of thought and expression. We also protest tactics of bills sponsors in attempting rush bill through Senate without hearings.

Professors Donald Trautman, Arthur Sutherland, Jerome Cohen, Charles Nesson, David Cavers, Morgan Shipman, Livingston Hall, Verne Countryman, and Frank Michelman, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass

The second one reads:

October 19, 1967.

Senator William Proxmire,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

S. 2171 perpetuates major constitutional and policy defects of Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. The act as amended would constitute serious threat to freedom of speech and association and would serve no legitimate or useful purpose. This bill should not be enacted without thorough reexamination of entire subject.

Nathaniel L. Nathanson,
Professor of Law,
Northwestern University.

This is a telegram from Harry Kalven, Jr., professor of law, University of Chicago, in the Senator's State of Illinois:

On my view Senate Bill 2171 to revive the McCarran Act has great constitutional weaknesses and represents a threat to the climate of freedom in America. These difficulties are aggravated by the fact that it appears to be a wholly unnecessary measure at this time. Moreover, it is most upsetting that a measure of this sort should come to the floor without any public hearings having been held. I hope you will continue in your vigorous opposition to the bill.

This is from Norman Dorsen, professor of law and director of the Arthur Garfield Hayes Civil Liberties Program, New York University:

Seriously concerned over Senate Bill 2171 designed to reactivate Subversive Activities Control Board. If bill passes consequences would be major inroads on freedom of expression and association. This especially harmful during wartime when pressures mount to stifle dissent. Fact that bill might be passed without hearings and opportunity for public criticism. Under score problem posed for all concerned with viable democracy.

This is from Thomas L. Shaffer, professor of law at the University of Notre Dame:

S–2171, HR 12601 promises to retard freedom of speech, thought, and association. Those who are not afraid of a free society applaud and support your courageous fight.

This is from Walter Gellhorn:

I warmly commend you for seeking committee hearings and careful Senate deliberation of Senate bill 2171. The bill seems to me to raise grave constitutional questions that need full exploration the necessity for any additional legislation at this time is highly debatable. In any event great care should be taken to avoid unintended impairment of hard won freedoms.

Finally, Mr. President, a wire from Saul Mendlovitz, professor of law, Rutgers University:

A number of my colleagues and I yesterday sent a telegram to Attorney General stating our opposition to Senate Bill 2171 which would effectively revive McCarran Act. We feel strongly that failure to hold hearings especially when there is good reason to believe the bill is unconstitutional, is highly arbitrary legislation dealing with freedom of expression.

And he specifies other reasons I have already put in the Record.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How did it happen the Senator got seven from Harvard, and only one from Notre Dame?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, I am sure there would be more from Notre Dame if we had made an attempt to round up all the support. This was done in a hurry, in a very short period of time.

I should, however, like to ask the Senator from Illinois why he got none out of Notre Dame, none out of the University of Chicago, none out of the University of Illinois, the faculties of all of which, I am sure, are proud of the great Senator from Illinois and his record as minority leader. How does it happen the Senator does not have any telegrams?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the first place, I did not even so much as turn a little finger to get any.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Neither did the Senator from Wisconsin. These are all unsolicited.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Second, it only goes to show what you can get out of a law faculty today.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Maybe it does; but I submit that the law faculties today are the best repositories of wisdom on the U.S. Constitution; among the best, certainly, together with the courts and the best of the distinguished practicing lawyers throughout the country.

After all, while I have the greatest respect for the veterans' organizations, I have talked with a number of veterans in my State during the past weekend and the weekend before about this issue, and have found a number of veterans in opposition to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, although I agree that there are some distinguished veterans who have wired the Senator supporting his position.

But I submit that when a question of constitutional law is involved, I will take the word of the outstanding constitutional authorities in this country, who have devoted their lives to the problem and have been recognized for their excellence in this area, rather than that of those who have been honored, however well deserved the honor may be, as the heads of veterans' organizations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, I will just wind this up by saying that, after all, it is only a question of how liberal some of these gentry want to be, considering the Communist menace in this country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to my good friend from Illinois that there is no Senator, I am sure, Republican or Democratic, who is not deeply concerned with the Communist menace. I am sure that the Senator from Illinois is not impugning patriotism.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We are all concerned with it. But I say we should fight it effectively. We should fight it with people in positions of authority who have competence to fight it, people who have had experience in the FBI, in the Central Intelligence Agency, in Army, Navy, or Air Force intelligence, or in the judicial system of our country, rather than, for example, a person who simply happens to be the husband of the personal secretary of the President of the United States, and who spent 6 months in the Small Business Administration. That is not the kind of man who is in the best position to deal with the threat of internal subversion. We have excellent personnel and organizations for dealing with such matters in the Department of Justice, or, for example, in the excellently staffed Internal Security Subcommittees of the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the Senator wanted to fight it by abolishing the Board. You do not deal effectively with a problem by abolishing the agency set up to deal with it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, and to transfer its functions to the Attorney General.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the Senator does not want to have any instrumentality except the Attorney General?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I want an effective instrumentality. I do not want a sinecure, a board that has not controlled a single subversive in this country in the 17 years it has existed and has held no hearings in at least 20 months, which has been idle, wasting the taxpayers' money. I submit that the Mansfield-Proxmire amendment—or the Mansfield-Proxmire-Dirksen amendment, now, since I understand the Senator will support it—which is before the Senate today, will result in a death sentence for the Board, which, in my view, is what the result ought to be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask the Senator to read the last sentence I have asked to have put in that amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have read the last sentence, and I think it is perfectly all right for Congress to state its legislative convictions on this matter, depending on what the Attorney General does and what the courts decide. But I still say that this will be the death sentence for the Subversive Activities Control Board and the people there who are getting $500 a week each for doing nothing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the Senator is greatly concerned about their jobs not being sinecures.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The amendment which I suggested to the majority leader, which is now before the Senate, will either put them to work or end their jobs. I submit that that is a logical position to take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, for a moment let us examine just what is proposed by amendment 415 to S. 2171, a bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts. It is simply this: the possibility that Congress is once more abdicating its responsibility for legislative oversight. Passage of this amendment would establish a procedure whereby the existence of the Subversive Activities Control Board would depend upon publication in the Federal Register by the Attorney General containing his determination as to whether proceedings of hearings had been instituted before the Board from the date of the passage of this amendment to December 31, 1968. The amendment requires nothing with regard to the nature of the hearings or determinations made by the Subversive Activities Control Board during this period. I, for one, would hope that passage of this amendment would not be interpreted as an interest by the Senate to satisfy or silence recent critical pronouncements about the way the Board has been functioning during the past 17 months.

Mr. President, let us not cloud the issue. The issue is not the President's most recent appointment to the Board; the issue is simply how does Congress expect the Subversive Activities Control Board to discharge its responsibilities under the law.

Congress has already spoken on this matter. Section 12(c)—and I think this should be emphasized—requires the Board to file a report at the end of each fiscal year with both Congress and the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

Mr. President, I suggest that Congress might have precluded the pantomime and travesty which trammels the stature of the Board had it exercised the legislative oversight required by present law. Obviously, the President understood the true status of the Board when he made a $26,000 a year addition to this empty, fossilized shell.

I fear that the Senate may be going further out on a limb with the passage of this amendment when it says to the Attorney General that he may, as of a particular date, tell the Congress, by simple publication in the Federal Register, whether the Subversive Activities Control Board shall continue to exist. Thus, we may be further separating ourselves from the proper functioning of the Board in the discharge of its responsibilities. Even though I shall vote for this amendment, I want to serve notice on the Board that I shall insist on the operation of the law—referring particularly to section 12(c)—by examining in detail the report which is required to be filed by the SACB as of the end of this fiscal year. If it is necessary, I think Congress should make the conscious effort with regard to the demise of the Board. I am going to be watching this question very closely. I shall not be waiting for some publication in the Federal Register to tell me whether or not a congressional creature shall continue to exist.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader talked about hearings before the Internal Security Subcommittee.

It is interesting, as has been pointed out, that the bill was not even introduced until long after those hearings took place. There are more or less continual hearing before the Internal Security Subcommittee. But the distinguished minority leader was unable to specify one single constitutional authority in the country, one professor of law, one judicial expert who supported the bill and stated that it is constitutionally sound.

I do not know what the hearings could have accomplished in 10 days, if they did not do this much.

The bill was introduced because of the decision by the Supreme Court declaring a provision of the law to be unconstitutional. If the hearings had any meaning at all, they would have been largely confined to developing constitutional support for an amendment to the bill.

I point out further that the Senator from Illinois challenged me to name more than one professor from Notre Dame who supported this measure. In the couple of minutes time that have intervened since the inquiry, I have found the names of some others. They are in addition to Prof. Thomas L.

Shaffer, also Prof. Bernard J. Ward, and Prof. Roger Paul Peters. I am sure that I could get many more names, but would probably be unable to do so before we vote on the measure.

Mr. President, I may be ready to yield back the remainder of my time. I would appreciate it if we could wait, however, until the majority leader is present on the floor. It is his amendment, and I should like to ask him a question about it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask this of the distinguished majority leader: If the amendment should be adopted, as I understand, this bill would go to the House, and it might be referred to the Judiciary Committee in the House or the House Un-American Activities Committee. It is possible that the amendment might not survive in the House, in which event the bill would come back for a conference. I ask the majority leader if he would feel, in view of the fact that it is his amendment—and I anticipate that the amendment will receive strong support in this body—that the Senate should take a very strong position in support of the amendment and recognize that it should be an integral part of the bill and part of the condition under which the bill is adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I feel very strongly in the affirmative about what the distinguished Senator has said about the Proxmire-Dirksen-Mansfield proposal. That amendment was offered in good faith. I would expect the Senate conferees to hold firm, and I would hope that it would be referred to the House Judiciary Committee, where I believe it would receive the consideration it deserves, as this measure, I believe, comes within the purview of that committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader, and I am happy to support our amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, in the course of his presentation, the distinguished Senator from Illinois made several comments concerning my remarks on the Subversive Activities Control Board. I should like to respond briefly.

The Senator from Illinois asserted that the Board does not have any investigative power. I ask this body to examine section 792(c) of the original act.

That section states that the Board shall hold hearings, that it has the power to "require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, paper, correspondence, memoranda, and other records." Its order to appear is binding—and a refusal to obey that order can be punished by contempt. It must, under the proposal of the Senator from Illinois, make final determinations concerning organizations and individuals. And then findings, supported by subpenas and required records, may subject groups and individuals to a range of civil—and perhaps criminal—sanctions.

In this sense the Board is investigating—even though it is not an FBI or congressional committee. It is in this sense that important questions, both of self-incrimination and associated freedom, arise. And it is in this sense that S. 2171 is inadequate.

The distinguished minority leader further asks why I, an Attorney General, did not come before the Congress and ask for the Board's abolition. As I pointed out twice before on the Senate floor, we tried to implement the act when I was Attorney General. It was after I left that post that the crucial decisions were handed down. It was the failure of these attempts, and the constitutional directives set down in their decisions, that convinced me that S. 2171 is inadequate.

FAVORING ABOLITION OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I will support the Mansfield-Proxmire amendment to give the Attorney General of the United States authority to abolish the Subversive Activities Control Board by 1969 if the Board has, in fact, remained inactive.

In my estimation this is a sensible attempt to place in the hands of the individual responsible for enforcing the legislation, the Attorney General, who has the wisdom and discretion and authority to make a sound and fair judgment at the end of a year as to whether or not the Board is an effective instrument of Federal policy.

Our colleague from Wisconsin should be highly commended for his efforts to work out a compromise with our distinguished majority leader after expressing so forcefully the concern felt by many of us regarding the wisdom of passing the Dirksen bill without hearings or a report from the Attorney General. The solution is by no means a perfect one. Nevertheless, Senator PROXMIRE's efforts to make sure that the Senate gave this hastily reported bill proper consideration before final passage have brought about an amendment that should result in the eventual abolition of the Board. It will result in the death of the Board, in my estimation, with substantial savings to the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall vote today for the Mansfield-Proxmire amendment because I believe it will ultimately bring about the death of the Subversive Activities Control Board. The reluctance of the Attorney General to come out in support of the Dirksen bill, his deep concern over fundamental human freedoms, and his wisdom in interpreting the law, all lead me to believe that he will use the authority conferred upon him by the amendment to abolish the Board.

The amendment itself, in my estimation, is a tribute to the efforts of Senators so involved in debate on this legislation to reach some sort of compromise which will permit us to take up other business. The lengthy debate of last week surely was necessary in view of the failure of the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on the Dirksen bill, or even to receive a report from the Attorney General. In fact, the wisdom of the debate is demonstrated by this amendment which arose out of a suggestion by Senator PROXMIRE, and was drafted and introduced by the majority leader. I commend the senior Senator from Wisconsin for his leadership, his eloquence, and his exceptional legislative adroitness in achieving this compromise which should be a death warrant for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I find it somewhat difficult to determine what my vote on the pending motion should be. On the one hand, it might appear that by leaving the future of the Subversive Activities Control Board in the hands of the Attorney General, we are creating a situation where he will be under tremendous pressure to bring cases, whether or not the interests of internal security so require, merely in order to ensure the continued life of the Subversive Activities Control Board. Those who take this view fear that the result might be a witch hunt for subversives between now and the end of 1968.

Upon careful consideration of this matter, however, I am convinced that if the pending bill is passed, it would be better to have it passed with the Mansfield-Proxmire amendment than without that amendment. I am persuaded toward this conclusion by three factors: First, the distinguished majority leader has assured us that if this amendment is included, he will expect and seek insistence on its retention in any conference. Second, I believe that by our action in adopting this amendment, we are making clear that we are surrendering our authority to determine the future of the Subversive Activities Control Board, and we are delegating that responsibility to the Attorney General. As the distinguished minority leader has pointed out, if I understand his remarks correctly, by adopting this amendment we would indicate that we are giving the Attorney General full discretion to bring cases before the Board or not, as he sees fit. That is, he need bring proceedings against any groups or individuals only if he believes that the interests of internal security require such action. If he believes that the interests of internal security can be protected in other ways, that the bringing of proceedings would be superfluous, duplicative, unavailing, or unproductive, and would thus merely require the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the Board itself to incur a needless expenditure of manpower and money, then he can feel fully free just to wait for the expiration of the test period, and then announce his determination that the functions of the Board should be terminated.

The third, and perhaps the most compelling, reason why I am constrained to vote for this amendment, is that I can conceive of no circumstances by which the present incumbent would not continue to hold the office of Attorney General throughout the test period, and until January 10, 1969, the date when the final determination regarding the Board's future would be made by the Attorney General. Having the fullest confidence in the integrity, wisdom, and judgment of the Attorney General, I am convinced that no matter what the pressures, and from whom the pressures came, the Attorney General would not countenance anything resembling a witch hunt. He would certainly be the one who will make the determination as to the necessity for any investigations, petitions, or proceedings, and I am willing to rely on his good faith in making such determinations.

I should point out and emphasize that I oppose the pending bill, and I will vote against it on both procedural and substantive grounds. But again I say, that if this bill is going to be enacted, we are better off adding to it a provision which gives a good Attorney General a chance to terminate the Board's activities if he finds that their continuance is not justifiable.

I think the majority leader and the Senator from Wisconsin should be commended for making possible this significant limitation on what many of us consider an unjustified, but apparently unbeatable, measure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Pursuant to the previous unanimous-consent agreement, there will now be a quorum call. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington may be recognized for 3 minutes, notwithstanding the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 23, 1967, p. 29596, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment in disagreement.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The House recedes and concurs with an amendment to Senate amendment No. 1, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$3,909,500,000."

The House insists upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 2.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 1; that the Senate further insist upon its amendment No. 2; that the Senate ask for a further conference thereon; and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate, at the further conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The two amendments in question probably can be resolved in the conference in a very short time. I hope the House can meet with us tomorrow morning, so that we can then return to the Senate and complete the NASA appropriation bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the Mansfield amendment. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I an- ing voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATIFIELD], the Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 296 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs

Brewster
Brooke
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark

Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin

Fong
Hansen
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—2

Bartlett
Kennedy, N.Y.

NOT VOTING—24

Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cooper
Dodd
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hartke
Hatfield
Jackson
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
Miller
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Pastore
Scott
Thurmond

So Mr. MANSFIELD's amendment was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader, inasmuch as many Senators are in the Chamber, about the possibility of considering the so-called interim resolution with respect to those appropriation bills which have not yet been enacted into law, and whether it is likely it will be considered tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, it is my understanding that the NASA and independent offices appropriation conference reports may very well be ready for consideration by the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They very well may be; yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Perhaps one or two others. It is the intention of the leadership to lay down the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968 at the conclusion of business today.

It is the leadership's understanding that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would like to make a few remarks——

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I should like to lay down my amendment and make a few remarks thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Also the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], will speak for about 30 minutes on matters affecting a number of Senators in the field of certain legislation.

I therefore believe that the Senate should be on notice that even though the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1968 will be the pending business, it is the intention of the leadership to bring in privileged matters such as conference reports which have been agreed to during the course of this consideration.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HARTKE, OF INDIANA, AT CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, after line 17, insert the following new section:

> SEC. —. Notwithstanding any amendment made by this Act or any other provision of law, the Subversive Activities Control Board shall cease to exist on January 1, 1968.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, time is controlled by the majority and minority leaders, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the Senate has now consumed several sessions debating the merits of S. 2171, Senator DIRKSEN's bill to amend the provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts. For the most part, the debate has transcended the questions raised by S. 2171, Rather, it has centered upon the merits of the provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act itself, and upon the desirability of having a Subversive Activities Control Act itself, and upon the desirability of having a Subversive Activities Control Board at all.

Last week's discussion clearly polarized between those who believe that a strong Board is desirable as a defense against the Communist threat to the United States, and those who assert that the Board is not only irrelevant to the defense against communism, but also poses a positive threat to the civil liberties of the American people.

Mr. President, I believe that we have lost sight of a fundamental proposition during the discussion of S. 2171. Passage of this legislation will not strengthen the present Subversive Activities Control Board, nor broaden the scope of its activities. Defeat of the bill will neither abolish the Board, nor reduce the powers with which it is presently vested.

S. 2171 amends the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so that the act will conform to two recent judicial decisions: Albertson against Subversive Activities Control Board, decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1965; and Communist Party U.S.A. against United States, decided by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in March of this year. The Albertson case determined that the provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act requiring registration by members of an association found by the Board to be a "Communist-action organization"—in the absence of registration by the organization itself—were invalid as in conflict with the guarantee against self-incrimination contained in the fifth amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Pursuant to the authority of the Albertson case, the circuit court later ruled in the Communist Party case that the requirement of registration by an organization found to be a "Communist-action organization" within the terms of the act was likewise a violation of the fifth amendment. The purpose of S. 2171 is is to remove from the Subversive Activities Control Act the provisions which these courts have determined to be unconstitutional; namely, those sections which require registration by individuals and organizations found by the Board to be Communist-action or Communist-front organizations.

Consequently, I believe it is clear that action upon S. 2171 in and of itself can never conclude the debate upon the merits of the Subversive Activities Control Board. The bill alters certain sections of the Subversive Activities Control Act to conform to relevant judicial rulings. Thus, the bill really contemplates no changes which have not already been announced by the judicial decisions in question. Nor will defeat of the measure prevent the implementation of such decisions, for the statutory provisions ruled unconstitutional have automatically already ceased to be effective, and will continue so irrespective of the action or inaction of Congress.

Mr. President, action upon S. 2171 will not resolve the debate upon the Subversion Activities Control Board. If the Senate is really concerned about the Board and its powers, let us turn our attention to the statutes which created the Board and which grant it its operating authority.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the time has come to recognize the unmistakable fact that the Subversive Activities Control Board has become an expensive and totally unnecessary encumbrance. It is time that we were rid of it. And it is for this reason that I ask consideration of my amendment, pursuant to which the Board will cease to exist as of January 1, 1968. With each passing day of this debate, it is becoming increasingly clear that the Board not only poses a potential threat to the civil liberties of the American people, but that it also has become meaningless to the defense of the United States against communism or other subversive activities.

I would like to address myself first to the question whether the Board is playing a significant part in the protection of the United States against subversives. Last Tuesday, the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota posed certain questions on the floor of the Senate. He asked, among others, the following:

> 1. Is Communism a menace to our way of life and our constitutional concepts of our individual freedoms and representative democracy?
>
> 2. Is it appropriate that a free society such as ours finds a means to protect its constitutional freedoms against the subversive attacks of the Communists?

Mr. President, not a Member of this body could do otherwise than to respond with a ringing "yes" to such inquiries. But do such questions go to the heart of the issue which confronts us? Should we not ask instead whether we have developed the proper machinery to protect our free society against the admitted threat posed by Communist organization and activity?

I suggest that we have developed the proper machinery. The task of investigating Communist activities within the United States has been assigned primarily to the Department of Justice, specifically to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The record of the FBI speaks for itself. The Bureau has the personnel, the equipment, and the expertise to undertake what is primarily a problem of investigation. If material is uncovered, the FBI is best equipped to present it to other branches of the Justice Department for presentation to grand juries and subsequent prosecution.

The Subversive Activities Control Board has been, and will continue to be, superfluous. Communist activities in the United States pose problems best handled by police and investigative agencies, not by administrative boards whose functions are public and likely to be extremely protracted. Even should the administrative agency conclude that a given organization is Communist-inspired, the Department of Justice will still have to undertake the investigative and other preparatory steps necessary before prosecution can be commenced.

It is clear that the Board has completely failed to be of even the most elementary assistance to the Department of Justice. In the 15 years of its existence prior to the Albertson decision, the Board did not manage to compel the registration of a single Communist organization or member of such an organization. The Board has not had a meeting for close to 2 years. The irrelevance of the Board's activities—to the extent that there are activities at all—to the work of the Justice Department was dramatized on the floor of the Senate last Tuesday by Senator KENNEDY of New York, the former Attorney General of the United States, when he stated:

> When I was Attorney General, we did not receive, to my knowledge, one piece of information from the Subversive Activities Control Board in connection with communism in the United States that we had not uncovered in other ways.

This must inevitably be the case. The Department of Justice is equipped to investigate threats posed by Communist organizations to the security of the United States, and the Subversive Activities Control Board is not. We have been supporting with sizable appropriations an agency whose work can be, at the very best, a duplication of that already done by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

At the same time, Mr. President, I believe that even the powers still vested in the Subversive Activities Control Board after the Albertson and Communist Party decisions are undesirable. Membership in the Communist Party makes an individual liable to prosecution. Obviously, therefore, the original registration requirements of the 1950 act placed the registrant in clear jeopardy insofar as prosecution was concerned, and it was inevitable that the provisions requiring such registration would be determined to be unconstitutional.

But it is still within the power of the Board to conduct public hearings at which witnesses may be compelled to appear to decide whether certain organizations are Communist infiltrated or otherwise Communist inspired. The very holding of such a hearing creates a threat to the individuals or organizations which are its subject. Such individuals or organizations are required to come forward and give public testimony with respect to their activities, despite the existence of Federal statutes under which association with the Communist Party or other subversive groups is designated to be criminal.

I am aware of the fact that an individual may claim before the Board the same fifth amendment right against self-incrimination which is available to him in judicial proceedings. Although this may technically satisfy the Constitution, as a practical matter it is not sufficient fully to protect the individuals involved. Assertion of fifth amendment privileges during public hearings held by the Subversive Activities Control Board will inevitably stamp the persons relying upon the privilege as Communists in the eyes of many.

If an individual or an organization is to be labeled a "Communist" and subjected to the public scorn and scrutiny which invariably follows, it should not be done by an administrative agency, but by a judicial tribunal where the rights of the defendants will be scrupulously observed, and where a final determination may be arrived at more fully and quickly.

Other undesirable provisions still remain in the Subversive Activities Control Act despite the effect of the recent judicial decisions. The definitions of the subversive groups to be examined and identified by the Board are extremely vague. They may be vague to the point of being unconstitutional themselves. The U.S. Supreme Court has been very clear to the effect that broad definitions of undesirable groups are unacceptable because of the risk that they will lead to the suppression of legitimate association and activity.

Mr. President, it is time for Congress to recognize that the Subversive Activities Control Board is contributing nothing to the protection of the United States. We already have an effective statutory framework which defines association with subversive organizations as criminal. We should continue to rely upon our regularly constituted investigative and judicial bodies to identify and to convict individuals and organizations guilty of subversive activity. It is time for Congress to admit that the Subversive Activities Control Board has been an expensive and inactive luxury, whose actions, such as they have been, have either duplicated the activities of other more skillful departments, or trespassed upon the constitutional rights and liberties of the American people.

Mr. President, I ask that the Subversive Activities Control Board be abolished. I ask for favorable consideration of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on last Friday I made a brief statement in the Senate concerning information about the origin, planning and carrying out of the demonstration then planned for last Saturday. I said, among other things, that the demonstration was planned, at least in part, by members of the Communist Party in the United States and Communist-front organizations.

I pointed out at that time the dates and places of like demonstrations elsewhere—almost around the world; at least a dozen of them—that had been scheduled some time ago, though the fact was not known to us then, to be held on the same date, October 21, and following the same theme: anti-America; anti-Vietnam.

I believe the happenings of last Saturday—which fortunately were not more serious than they were, due to some very fine planning by the military and others to take care of the situation—bore out those predictions and confirmed them in every important respect. I believe, moreover, that the demonstrations served to open the eyes of a great many American people to the practical side of the situation we face, not only as to the war but as to other procedures, disturbing influences, propaganda, and methods of expression.

Although the power and authority of the Subversive Activities Control Board has been reduced by a series of Supreme Court decisions, it nevertheless can have a high value to our national security. There is an urgent need for some official agency or board acting in behalf of the entire U.S. Government to identify individuals and organizations that are Communists or serve as Communist fronts.

Further, we need them if they do nothing more than make official statements for the benefit of informing the people, the editorial writers, the columnists, and other writers. Members of Congress and officials, to help foster enlightened comment on the identification of people as well as the analysis of events that occur.

We cannot close our official eyes to the fact that such information and such identification by some agency of the Government is necessary.

We must not close our eyes to the fact the Communist Party is working within our own country. For the U.S. Government to say it will not identify those persons and organizations known to be Communist or Communist fronts is to leave the American people helpless. Some Americans wish to avoid helping the Communist groups. That is a duty the movement generally. No private individual or organization can ferret out Communist groups. That is a duty the Government owes to its citizens.

This Board would render a valuable service if all it did was to point out individuals and organizations who support the Communists and who are opposed to our Government.

It is an obligation of our Government to provide this service.

We should be doing more against the spread of communism in the United States, not less.

I believe that this debate has been an illumination—although there could have been more with hearings—of the entire subject and the entire problem and for the reasons I have stated, I believe that the amendment should be defeated and the bill forthwith passed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a portion of a statement I made last week, prior to last Friday.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Mr. Stennis. Mr. President, I am greatly concerned that while we are sending men to fight a war against Communists ten thousand miles away, we are not fighting Communism as hard and effectively as we should be in our own country. It is a great dissappointment to me that in the 17 years since we passed the Internal Security Law of 1950, which required all Communists to register or go to jail, *not a single Communist* has been forced to register or pay the penalty for not registering.
>
> Through a series of Supreme Court decisions in their favor the Communists have been so successful in avoiding prosecution under that law and they have become so bold that they held a national convention in New York last year and announced they will have a candidate for President of the United States in 1968.
>
> For some time, the Communist Party has been involved in anti-American activities in this country that are calculated to hinder the war effort and to disrupt our society. The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, told a Congressional Committee recently that the FBI has approximately 150 *known* or *suspected Communist front* or *Communist*-infiltrated organizations under active investigation. He said further, that one of the primary recruiting targets of the Communist Party is the youth of America and that the Party has continued its intensified program aimed and directed at our youth. It is common knowledge, admitted by university officials and reported in the press, that the Communists were involved in many of the student rebellions that have rocked our campuses in recent months.
>
> Mr. Hoover stated also that the Communists have either started or have been active in every major demonstration against the Vietnam war. They have been particularly active in Stop the Bombing demonstrations.
>
> There is a definite Communist move on in South and Central America.
>
> I know of no problem more urgent than controlling Communism in the U.S. for if we are to send our men into battle halfway around the world to oppose the spread of Communism, we certainly should do everything within our power to stop it here in our own country.
>
> This threat in the next ten years may prove to be more serious than any international problem, so-called, that we may have. It is absolutely necessary that we take all steps possible to strengthen the law and stop Communist activity in this country. They will not overcome us, nor be able to infiltrate us successfully; but their attempt to do so may prove to be one of the gravest and most far-reaching problems we have on the home front.
>
> We should pass this bill now and also follow through until it becomes the law of the land. Then our interest should continue by insisting and urging the enforcement of its terms to the utmost by the Department of Justice.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the timely remarks of the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] again focuses our attention on the unwarranted attempts to interfere with the processes of government. I add that a key organizer, and perhaps the chief proponent of the march on the Pentagon, Mr. David Dellinger, stated while he was in the Capital City that he was a Communist.

According to news reports, he qualified his allegiance to that world doctrine by describing himself as a "non-Soviet Communist." It is a fact, however, that such elements were present in planning and carrying forward this disruptive demonstration. The impact of such leadership certainly contributed to the violence which did take place late in the afternoon of last Saturday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Massachusetts—who is, incidentally, a very distinguished lawyer—should be defeated.

The Senator makes the same mistake that the distinguished former Attorney General, now a Member of this body from the State of New York, made in the course of his remarks last week. He persisted in confusing the functions of this Board as including investigatory powers.

The Subversive Activities Control Board does not have investigatory powers. It relies on the Department of Justice, and specifically on the FBI. It was set up as a quasi-judicial body, to hear testimony and arrive at a judgment, and can enter an order, although, under the Supreme Court ruling, it cannot take a compulsory self-confession, because that would be self-incriminatory and in violation of the fifth amendment.

But I emphasize now what I have emphasized before, that it sits as a court, as it were; it sits as a board to take testimony and examine and evaluate all the data presented to it. The Board exposes.

That was the purpose of putting it in the 1950 act, in the first instance. The purpose was to bring these people out into the light. Why? There is a reason. Here is a list of organizations that at one time or another have come before the Board:

Communist Party of the United States of America.

Labor Youth League.

International Workers Order.

National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.

Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

Civil Rights Congress.

Jefferson School of Social Science.

Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

America Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

California Labor School, Inc.

The Washington Pension Union.

Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

I shall place the rest of the names in the Record. But the reason I submit these names now is for a very specific purpose. These are people who go out and solicit memberships as well as subscriptions. Surely, the FBI knows where they are. But the FBI does not disclose that.

The purpose of the Board is disclosure, so that this insane and nefarious business can be stopped once for all; so that such organizations cannot delude any segment of the American people and coax dollars out of their pockets, simply because they bear some very fancy, glossy, high-faluting name.

Another one is the American Peace Crusade. Who would not be overwhelmed somewhat by such a name? Are they given to a peace crusade? It is something that is easy to join until we find out that it is a "front" organization.

Another one is the Colorado Committee To Protect Civil Liberties. That is fancy, I must say. It ought to get attention out in California and coax some nuggets out of people's pockets. That is a thing that has to be stopped. That is the reason why this amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the organizations and information pertaining to them be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ORGANIZATION PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE SACB

Docket No.	Name of respondent	Petition filed	Location of hearing	Heard by—	Record pages	Number of exhibits	Completed by board	Disposition	Final court action	Disposition
51-101	Communist Party of the United States of America.	Nov. 20, 1956	Washington, D.C., New York, N.Y.	Panel	16,824	726	Apr. 20, 1953	Order of registration	Apr. 30, 1956	Reversed and remanded.
51-101	Communist Party of the United States of America (1st remand).		Washington, D.C.	Board	745		Dec. 18, 1956	Registration order of Apr. 20, 1953, reaffirmed.	Jan. 9, 1958	Remand.
51-101	Communist Party of the United States of America (2d remand).		do	Member	976		Feb. 9, 1959	do	June 5, 1961	Registration order affirmed.
102-53	Labor Youth League	Apr. 22, 1953	Washington, D.C., New York, N.Y.	do	5,583	187	Feb. 15, 1955	Order of registration	Jan. 8, 1962	Remand.
102-53	Labor Youth League (remand).		Washington, D.C.	Board	105	2	Feb. 2, 1962	Determination that there was not such a permanent dissolution so as to affect order of registration.	Apr. 25, 1963	Remand to place case in an indefinitely inactive status.
103-53	International Workers Order, Inc.	Apr. 22, 1953	do	do	343		Jan. 14, 1954	Order of registration	Nov. 19, 1954	Petition of Attorney General ordered dismissed.
104-53	National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.	do	do	Member	6,965	300	Feb. 7, 1956	do	May 16, 1963	Registration order vacated and petition dismissed.
105-53	Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.	do	do	Board	270		June 1, 1955	Order granting motion to dismiss petition without prejudice.		
106-53	Civil Rights Congress	do	Washington, D.C., New York, N.Y.	Member	7,211	372	July 26, 1957	Order of registration	Jan. 8, 1962	Remand.
106-53	Civil Rights Congress (remand).		New York, N.Y.	Board	39		July 11, 1962	Determination that CRC had not dissolved—Order of registration unaffected.	May 23, 1963	Motion to vacate order of registration denied. Order became final for failure to pursue appeal.
107-53	Jefferson School of Social Science.	Apr. 22, 1953	Washington, D.C., New York, N.Y.	Member	4,555	267	June 30, 1955	Order of registration	Jan. 8, 1962	Remand.
107-53	Jefferson School of Social Science (remand).		New York, N.Y.	Board	128	41	Feb. 2, 1962	Determination that school had not dissolved—Order of registration unaffected.	Dec. 17, 1963	Registration order affirmed.
108-53	Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.	Apr. 22, 1953	Washington, D.C., New York, N.Y.	Members	5,557	320	Dec. 21, 1955	Order of registration	Apr. 26, 1965	Remand.
108-53	Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (remand).						Apr. 20, 1966	Registration order vacated and petition dismissed on joint motion of parties.		
109-53	American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.	Apr. 22, 1953	Washington, D.C.	Examiner	8,447	567	June 27, 1960	Order of registration	Jan. 8, 1962	Do.
109-53	American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1st remand).		do	Board	32	4	Mar. 8, 1962	Recommendation that order of registration be affirmed.	Apr. 26, 1965	Do.
109-53	American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (2d remand).						Apr. 6, 1966	Registration order vacated and petition dismissed on joint motion of parties.		
110-53	Council on African Affairs, Inc.	Apr. 22, 1953					Sept. 15, 1955	Order granting motion to dismiss without prejudice.		
111-53	United May Day Committee.	do	Washington, D.C.	Member	2,036	426	Apr. 27, 1956	Order of registration	Dec. 17, 1963	Registration order affirmed.
112-53	American Slav Congress	do	do	Examiner	88	7	Apr. 14, 1955	Order dismissing petition on ground that jurisdiction was not obtained over respondent.		
113-53	Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.	do	do	do	116	5	May 9, 1955	Order dismissing petition on ground that jurisdiction was not obtained over respondent.		
114-55	Washington Pension Union	Dec. 29, 1954	Seattle, Wash.	Member	5,912	201	Apr. 14, 1959	Order of registration	Jan. 8, 1962	Remand.
114-55	Washington Pension Union (remand).		do	Board	143	8	June 20, 1962	Determination that respondent had not dissolved—registration order unaffected.	June 6, 1963	Petition for review dismissed for lack of party-petitioner. Registration order become final under statutory provisions.
115-55	California Labor School, Inc.	Mar. 31, 1955	Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Calif.	Member	3,085	281	May 21, 1957	Order of registration	Mar. 2, 1962	Remand.
115-55	California Labor School, Inc. (remand).		San Francisco, Calif.	Board	79		June 20, 1962	Determination that respondent had not dissolved—registration order unaffected.		Motion to vacate registration order and dismiss retention denied. Respondent abandoned appeal and registration order became final.
116-56	International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers.	July 28, 1955	Washington, D.C.	Member	10,384	388	May 4, 1962	Determination that respondent is a Communist-Infiltrated Organization.	Nov. 1, 1965	Remand.
116-56	International Union of Mine-Mill and Smelter Workers (remand).						June 16, 1966	Order determining union to be Communist-infiltrated vacated and petition dismissed on joint motion of the parties.		
117-56	American Peace Crusade	Aug. 1, 1955	Washington, D.C.	Member	1,235	199	July 26, 1957	Order of registration	Jan. 8, 1962	Do.
117-56	American Peace Crusade (remand).		do	Board	72		July 6, 1962	Determination that there has been no change in respondent so as to affect order of registration.	June 6, 1963	Remanded to place case in status of indefinite abeyance.
118-56	National Negro Labor Council.	Sept. 28, 1955					Sept. 23, 1957	Order granting motion of Attorney General to dismiss petition without prejudice.		
119-56	United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America.	Dec. 20, 1955	New York, N.Y.	Member	1,107	10	Mar. 30, 1959	Order granting motion of Attorney General to dismiss petition.		
120-57	Colorado Committee to Protect Civil Liberties.	Aug. 9, 1956	Denver, Colo.	do	505	19	Apr. 15, 1959	Order of registration	Jan. 8. 1962	Remand,
120-57	do		Washington, D.C.	Board	106		Julh 30, 1962	Recommendation that court fix a time within which evidence as to dissolution be taken or deny motion to dismiss and vacate order.	June 6, 1963	Remand to place case in status of indefinite abeyance.
121-57	Connecticut Volunteers for Civil Rights.	Aug. 9, 1956	Hartford, Conn.	Member	255	78	Apr. 14, 1959	Order of registration. Order became final when respondent failed to appeal.		

ORGANIZATION PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE SACB—Continued

Docket No.	Name of respondent	Petition filed	Location of hearing	Heard by—	Record pages	Number of exhibits	Completed by board	Disposition	Final court action	Disposition
122-57	Save Our Sons Committee	--------	--------	--------	------	------	Sept. 20, 1957	Order granting motion of Attorney General to dismiss petition.	--------	
123-57	California Emergency Defense Committee.	Oct. 1, 1956	Los Angeles, Calif., San Francisco, Calif.	Member	574	152	Apr. 14, 1959	Order of registration. Order became final when respondent failed to appeal.	--------	
124-57	Committee To End Sedition Laws.	do	Pittsburgh, Pa	do	943	45	Sept. 17, 1957	Order granting motion of Attorney General to dismiss petition without predjudice.	--------	
125-62	Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States (Mine-Mill Redetermination case.)	May 31, 1962	Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Calif.	do	2,405	98	Dec. 20, 1963	Order dismissing redetermination petition.	Nov. 1, 1965	Remand.
125-62	Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States (redetermination remand.)	--------	--------	--------	------	------	June 16, 1966	Order vacating order of Dec. 20, 1963, and dismissing proceeding as moot.	--------	
126-63	Advance and Burning Issues Youth Organization.	Jan. 10, 1963	New York, N.Y	Examiner	2,552	36	Sept. 10, 1965	Order placing case in status of indefinite abeyance on motion of intervenor consented to by Attorney General.	--------	
127-66	W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America.	Mar. 4, 1966	--------	--------	------	------	--------	--------	--------	
INDIVIDUAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE SACB										
1-1-62	William Albertson	May 31, 1962	Washington, D.C	Board	390	4	Oct. 29, 1962	Order of registration	Nov. 15, 1965	Registration order vacated.
1-2-62	Miriam Friedlander	do	do	do	407	4	Nov. 2, 1962	do	do	Do.
1-3-62	Arnold Samuel Johnson	do	New York, N.Y	Member	375	4	Nov. 27, 1962	do	do	Do.
1-4-62	William L. Patterson	do	do	Examiner	424	3	Dec. 18, 1962	do	do	Do.
1-5-62	Betty Gannett Tormey	do	do	Member	541	4	Dec. 19, 1962	do	do	Do.
1-6-62	Louis Weinstock	do	do	do	523	4	Jan. 16, 1963	do	do	Do.
1-7-62	Dorothy Healey	do	Los Angeles, Calif	Board	298	5	Dec. 18, 1962	do	do	Do.
1-8-62	Albert Jason Lima	do	San Francisco, Calif.	Member	263	6	Jan. 17, 1963	do	do	Do.
1-9-62	Burt Gale Nelson	do	Seattle, Wash	do	241	2	Jan. 21, 1963	do	do	Do.
1-10-62	Roscoe Quincy Proctor	do	San Francisco, Calif.	do	206	2	Jan. 18, 1963	do	do	Do.
1-11-63	Samuel Krass Davis	Dec. 6, 1962	Washington, D.C	Board	206	7	Mar. 8, 1963	do	do	Do.
1-12-63	Claude Mack Lightfoot	do	Chicago, Ill	do	299	4	Mar. 5, 1963	do	do	Do.
1-13-63	Flora Hall	do	Washington, D.C	Examiner	226	2	Apr. 26, 1963	do	do	Do.
1-14-63	Samuel Kushner	do	do	do	228	2	do	do	do	Do.
1-15-63	George Aloysius Meyers	Apr. 11, 1963	Baltimore, Md	do	213	1	Dec. 4, 1963	do	do	Do.
1-16-63	Thomas Nabried	do	Philadelphia, Pa	do	251	0	do	do	May 12, 1965	Do.
1-17-63	Mildred McAdory Edelman	do	New York, N.Y	Member	319	3	do	do	Nov. 15, 1965	Do.
1-18-63	Irving Potash	do	do	do	399	3	do	do	do	Do.
1-19-63	William Wolf Weinstone	do	do	do	373	3	do	do	do	Do.
1-20-63	Mortimer Daniel Rubin	do	do	do	235	0	do	do	do	Do.
1-21-63	John William Stanford Jr	June 13, 1963	Washington, D.C	do	174	2	Dec. 20, 1963	do	do	Do.
1-22-63	Benjamin Dobbs	do	do	do	140	0	do	do	do	Do.
1-23-63	William Cottie Taylor	do	do	do	200	0	do	do	do	Do.
1-24-63	Frances Gabow	do	Philadelphia, Pa	do	299	0	do	do	do	Do.
1-25-63	Aaron Libson	do	do	do	283	0	do	do	do	Do.
1-26-63	Lionel Joseph Libson	do	New York, N.Y	Examiner	203	1	May 21, 1964	do	do	Do.
1-27-63	James Joseph Tormey	do	do	do	262	1	Sept. 28, 1964	do	do	Do.
1-28-64	Michael Saunders	Nov. 19, 1963	Chicago, Ill	do	179	0	Nov. 13, 1964	do	do	Do.
1-29-64	Daniel Lieber Queen	do	do	do	244	0	do	do	do	Do.
1-30-64	Ralph William Taylor	do	St. Paul, Minn	Board	113	2	May 1, 1964	do	do	Do.
1-31-64	Betty Mae Smith	do	do	do	113	2	do	do	do	Do.
1-32-64	Marvin Joel Markman	do	New York, N.Y	Examiner	622	6	Jan. 13, 1965	do	do	Do.
1-33-64	Meyer Jacob Stein	do	do	do	620	6	do	do	do	Do.
1-34-64	Norman Haaland	do	Portland, Oreg	Board	444	5	July 22, 1964	do	do	Do.
1-35-64	Benjamin Gerald Jacobson	do	do	do	440	5	do	do	do	Do.
1-36-64	Milford Adolf Sutherland	do	Tacoma, Wash	do	558	0	do	do	do	Do.
1-37-64	Donald Andrew Hamerquist	do	do	do	559	5	do	do	do	Do.
1-38-65	Hyman Lumer	Sept. 30, 1964	New York, N.Y	Examiner	252	3	July 30, 1965	do	do	Do.
1-39-65	Elmer Charles Kistler	do	Seattle, Wash	do	222	0	do	do	do	Do.
1-40-65	Ralph Nelson	do	Portland, Oreg	Member	452	0	do	do	do	Do.
1-41-65	Otis Archer Hood	do	Boston, Mass	Examiner	420	0	do	do	do	Do.
1-42-65	Lewis Martin Johnson	do	do	do	418	0	do	do	do	Do.
1-43-65	Edward S. Teileira	do	do	do	410	0	do	do	do	Do.
1-44-65	Anne Burlak Timpson	do	do	do	418	0	do	do	do	Do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we took action on the Mansfield-Dirksen-Proxmire amendment. It was approved by the Senate by a vote of 74 to 2. It gives the Board 18 months of life.

The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] would give it life for just about 75 days, until January 1; then the Board would be abolished.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Eighteen months subject to the institution of proceedings; so the time might be extended indefinitely.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKE. Eighteen months is not a time certain.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am expecting that it will go on indefinitely. I expect to make it my business to see that it does go on, insofar as it resides within my power to give it authority, because the Government cannot be without an instrumentality to pursue people who are committed to destroy it, destroy its foundations, and destroy its very institutions. There has to be an agency to do it, and this is all we have.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Does the Senator agree that we have the Department of Justice, the Attorney General, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the entire judicial system of this great Nation to do exactly what the Board was authorized and created to do?

The names which have been called off by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois are names which appear in the files of the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator has never been in greater error in his life. They have 6,600 field agents in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. They have all the data down there. But try to get it. Try to let the American people get the information on the front page.

When these people go around with their tin cups to collect subscriptions and sign up members, try to get a warning to the American people: "This is a Red outfit. This is a front outfit." The information never gets to them. Exposure is the only weapon I know of, and that is the very essence of the matter. We must expose them.

Mr. BROOKE. In our system of jurisprudence, is it not the position of this Nation that it should provide sufficient evidence to bring about the public indictment of an individual or organization, and is it not true that our Justice Department operates under that great American tradition? The fact that it has information in its files and does not expose the concerned individual may very well mean that it does not have sufficient evidence to bring forth such an indictment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am afraid the Senator forgets in connection with the Federal Bureau of Investigation that it has operated in exactly the way it operates now ever since it was created and ever since J. Edgar Hoover became the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. However, we do not get the exposure that is necessary and that is superbly necessary today as never before.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Illinois put in the RECORD the role in these matters of the House Un-American Activities Committee and of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee?

I have always felt that when we entrust these inquiries to the Judiciary Committee, at least we have lawyers and a great body of tradition with respect to the handling of witnesses, executive hearings before public hearings, and the general precautions which get us away from the sort of disclosures which characterized the worst excesses during the period Senator McCarthy held forth. I wonder if the Senator should not complete the record—however Senators may vote—by delimiting the matter.

The proposal raised by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Montana will probably stay with us. I may very well support the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts. I think that it would be very useful, however, as legislative history, if the Senator were to delimit the role of the congressional committees which will continue to have jurisdiction—the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend, the senior Senator from New York was a member of the Judiciary Committee, and I do not recall that he offered that proposal when he was a member.

Mr. JAVITS. The proposal is not germane here.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct. I am speaking of the time when the Senator was a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JAVITS. The proposal is not germane here. In the Senate the question is in the hands of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. It is in the House that it is not in the hands of the Judiciary Committee.

I suggest that it might be well to have the record show, as the Senator analyzes the whole question, where he feels the work of the Internal Security Committee fits.

I have always felt that this kind of inquiry belongs in the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate. And I felt that it would be very useful if the Senator would outline here where the congressional committees fit in the scheme he has in mind—which would include the Board.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is hardly my function. That ought to be the function of the Committee on Rules and Administration, if they are going to delimit a committee. But the Internal Security Committee, in the very nature of the work it does, has to carry on a good deal of the work behind closed doors. It is an investigatory body. The Subversive Activities Control Board is not. It cannot move a muscle until there is an application or a petition by the Attorney General, and that discretionary power in the law will have to be changed also in order to make it effective.

The House is dealing with the matter. They reported a bill infinitely more stringent than the pending bill, and we are going to have this matter before us whether or not. And when finally we go to conference, there will be the four corners of two bills, and within that frame we will have to work out something to satisfy both bodies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think it would be well to have the Senator state why he does not consider it incompatible to have a board and the Internal Security Subcommittee look into the same matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Internal Security Subcommittee has its own investigators. For the Board, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Justice Department and the Attorney General and the Assistant Attorney General are the ones who appear and supply the evidence in connection with any of these organizations that the Attorney General sends to the Board. Exposure is the only answer.

It is not a case of sending them to jail. It was the very fact of exposure that caused these Reds to yelp like hit dogs. That is what they did not want. They did not mind going to jail, but they did not want to be exposed and put in the public eye, where all the world could see. Their pride was a little too much for that shame. And that is still one of the great weapons in a free country.

Mr. BROOKE. The distinguished Senator from Illinois said that public exposure is a great weapon and that it should be used by the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Exposure has been in the past, and can still be, very detrimental to this Nation, can be unconstitutional, and can violate the civil liberties and rights of American people, as it has done in the past.

It seems that we would better achieve our purposes to effectively combat the Communist menace in this country by utilizing the vast resources of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Justice Department, and the Attorney General who give maximum protection to the rights of all American citizens, who do not expose individuals or organizations without having sufficient evidence to warrant an indictment, and without holding public hearings, beyond the mere fact of calling witnesses before the committee to create the impression among people all over the country that persons who appear before the committee are either Communists or affiliated with Communist organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BROOKE. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROOKE. I believe that this country is great enough to give the rights of all American citizens maximum protection and at the same time protect itself against the Communist menace. We did it prior to 1950. We have done it since 1950 without the effective support of the Subversive Activities Control Board, for that Board has not rendered a service to the American people. I defy anyone to point to any cases that the Subversive Activities Control Board has brought before the courts which have brought out any facts about Communists or Communist-front organizations which were not already contained in the records of the duly constituted law enforcement agencies of this country.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that this Board should be abolished, that its life tenure should not be extended for 18 months or certainly even beyond that. I believe we are justified in abolishing this Board, not only because it has not done its job, but also because it is a potential threat to the civil liberties of the American people.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. What does the Senator say about the congressional committees that do investigating and disclosing? Is any of his argument based upon the fact that we do have a House Un-American Activities Committee and a Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which investigate and expose all the time?

Mr. BROOKE. Yes. I believe the distinguished senior Senator from New York has well brought out the point that we do have these committees on the House side and on the Senate side. Even these committees have investigators who make investigations and report events to them, which the Subversive Activities Control Board does not have, other than the FBI and the Department of Justice. I believe it is a duplication of effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr.

Pastore]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper and Mr. Morton], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield], the Senators from California [Mr. Kuchel and Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senators from California [Mr. Kuchel and Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 297 Leg.]

YEAS—17

Bartlett
Brewster
Brooke
Case
Church
Clark
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
McGee
Metcalf
Mondale
Nelson
Pell
Proxmire
Young, Ohio

NAYS—58

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Hansen
Harris
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McIntyre
Monroney
Montoya
Mundt
Muskie
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—25

Burdick
Cooper
Dodd
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Jackson
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
Miller
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Pastore
Scott
Thurmond
Tydings

So Mr. Brooke's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have three technical amendments which have been cleared with the distinguished author of the bill. I understand they are necessary to clear up the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 6, line 1, after "(a)" strike out "(I)" and insert "(1)"; at the beginning of line 8, strike out "(II)" and insert "(2)"; in line 14, after the word "part", strike out "(I)" and insert "(1)" in the same line after the word "part" where it appears the second time, strike out "(II)" and insert "(2)"; on page 12, after line 17, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 12. Subsection (f) of section 4 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended by striking the last sentence of the subsection."

And on page 12, after the amendment just above stated insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 13. Subsection (3) of section 3 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended by striking '(a)' and by striking the whole of paragraph (b)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire]. [Putting the question.]

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MONDALE (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. YARBOROUGH (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper and Mr. Morton], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield], the Senators from California [Mr. Kuchel and Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senators from California [Mr. Kuchel and Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 10, as follows:

[No. 298 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Hansen
Harris
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McIntyre
Metcalf
Monroney
Montoya
Mundt

Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—10

Bartlett
Brooke
Case
Church
Clark
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
McGee

NOT VOTING—25

Burdick
Cooper
Dodd
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Jackson
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
Miller
Mondale
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Pastore
Scott
Thurmond
Yarborough

So the bill (S. 2171) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 656, House Joint Resolution 888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. House Joint Resolution 888 making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be no further votes tonight, but I understand that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] intends to offer an amendment. The chairman of the committee will make some remarks at the conclusion of the morning business tomorrow.

I believe that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] also intends to make some remarks this afternoon.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. I hope it will suit the convenience of the majority leader. It would help me greatly if I could follow the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is up to the Chair.

Mr. MUNDT obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

AMENDMENT NO. 418

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the pending bill, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 419

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at this point, I submit an amendment and ask that it be read and printed in the RECORD in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that the committee amendments must be agreed to first.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am not calling up my amendment. I merely ask that it be printed in full in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken by the Committee amendment on page 1, line 6, beginning with the word "and", insert the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) Subsequent to the enactment into law during the first session of the Ninetieth Congress of the appropriation bills for fiscal year 1968, the executive branch is directed, subject to subsection (b), to reduce by at least 5 per centum each line item appropriation (other than appropriations for military functions and those items determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget not to be subject to administrative control) contained in such bills.

"(b) In order to provide for the most effective use of appropriations reduced in accordance with subsection (a), the President may make such transfers between appropriation accounts as may be necessary, but no such transfer shall cause any item of appropriation to be increased to an amount in excess of the amount provided in the appropriation bill."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the decision before the Senate on the continuing resolution is, in my opinion, one of the most important and far-reaching decisions which Senators will be called upon to make during the remainder of this session.

As I view it, there are three possible choices before the Senate. It can take the action as reported from the committee the other day with four dissenting votes, which is a simple continuing resolution, suggesting a delayed date for making renewed consideration of the appropriation bills possible.

At this point, by the way, Mr. President, I would ask that the pages in attendance in the Senate place on the desk of each Senator, the legislation, printed amendments, and the hearings, because I think they should be made available for study overnight.

Mr. President, if we were to take only the committee action, in my opinion, we would be guilty of engaging in a sharp repudiation and rejection not only of the House of Representatives which sent the bill to us with a vote of 253 to 143—an even majority of 110 votes—but also of the House Appropriations Committee itself which labored long and hard and came up with a formula for economizing.

The particular formula brought out by the House committee was amended, changed, tightened, and expanded by amendments adopted by the House of Representatives voting as a whole.

But if the Senate were simply to say, "We are disinclined to do anything about effectuating some economies now"; if we were to pass this simple Senate continuing resolution, in my opinion we would be doing nothing more than making a blunt rejection and a rebuke both of the action of the House as a whole and the action of the House Committee on Appropriations.

I doubt very much that there are very many Senators who want to participate in that kind of repudiation of the House efforts to economize at this juncture in our fiscal history.

I expect to show, in the course of my remarks today and tomorrow, some reasons why I think that would be the height of irresponsibility on the part of the Senate of the United States.

The second alternative is to adopt the House action as a substitute for the committee's continuation resolution. I understand that the Senator from Delaware at least has contemplated making that particular proposal. I think there were good and valid reasons why the Senate committee action did not take the House action in the form in which it came to us, because, in the first place, it was a House floor amendment which had not been considered at all in the hearings of the House Appropriations Committee and its exact ramifications are not clearly evident. It involved some areas of economy which it is doubtful whether the House Members themselves desired to be implemented and, as we held hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee, it was brought out that certain House actions would need to be corrected and changed in the national interest.

So if we were to adopt the House action without modification or alteration or amendments, we would be freezing without change that particular action on appropriations which I do not think is a prudent way to proceed in this area under the circumstances as brought out in the Senate hearings, copies of which I hope are now being distributed to the desks of Senators.

The third alternative, Mr. President, is to adopt the amendment which I have sent to the desk, which I believe is a prudent and proper compromise by Congress that will put in conference all the alternatives before the two bodies in terms of bringing about some meaningful economies in public spending. It will recognize the merit of House action—by a majority over 100 Members—in trying to effectuate some economies; it will support that purpose; and it will leave to action by the conference the precise procedures to be followed in approaching that objective.

I fully grant that there may be a fourth, or fifth, or sixth alternative in the form of amendments, of which I know nothing, but, at all events, our choice is significant and clear. In my opinion we should take some purposeful, constructive action now and equivocate no longer. Either we reject the economy drive of the House forthwith, if we accept the Senate committee's simple continuing resolution; or we accept that which they have done unquestioningly and assume the responsibility for all the ramifications flowing from a proposal which had not been subjected to hearings, and on which we had no testimony, and which, as was indicated in our hearings, would have results which I doubt many Members of the Congress would want to endorse; or we can accept my amendment or some other course which would be a meaningful demonstration of the desire of the Members of the Senate to do something effective about economy.

I speak in behalf of my amendment because it seems to me this gives us the tools required to build some economy into the current budget situation. The House has already spoken. Wisely or unwisely, the House has said it thinks there should be some reduction in expenditures. The House committee said it by an overwhelming vote, after it studied the matter. The House itself said, "This is good, but it does not go far enough," and added some cuts. But at least the House has demonstrated to the country that it wants some economy in Government and it wants it now. It is not willing to postpone action, in the middle of October, until the middle of November, or to postpone facing this issue. It has said, "We will dodge it no longer. We will duck it no longer. We will delay it no longer. We will face up to the emergency financial situation which prevails."

My plea to the Senate is that we be equally diligent in refusing to dodge, duck, and delay this most important consideration which must be made, and the most important issue which must be met. The Senate has to accept its responsibility, along with the House and the administration, for doing something meaningful about public spending, which has gotten out of hand.

My amendment assures the President and the executive departments that the Congress is willing to cooperate with them in reducing the current expenditures and the budgetary figures. The Senate will use these tools, we say to the President, to work with him at the workbench of economy, trying to do something together to bring about a reduction in expenditures.

If there are those in this body, and if there are, they are very few in number, or if there are those in the executive departments, and I hope they are also limited in number, who do not want to have any economies effectuated at all, who want to rely entirely on the prospect of higher and higher and higher taxes and costlier and costlier and costlier inflation to solve our problems, to them I submit my amendment has no appeal.

Or to those who say, "We think we should economize, but we did not do it last month when we had it before us and we gave a continuing resolution, and we do not want to do it now, so we should defer it until the 15th of November, and we will not want to do it then because the final supplementary measure will not have passed the Senate," and who will not want to do it when we finally pass the final supplementary measure at midnight or 2 o'clock in the morning before we adjourn—to those who want to kill the economy drive by delaying action on it or confusing or obscuring the issue, my amendment will have no appeal.

Finally, to those who do not want to either raise taxes or economize or take a look at whether or not this rich country can really afford to have bread and cake and guns all at the same time in this war—to them my amendment will have no appeal.

But to all others, I submit that this amendment proposes an honest, effective, across-the-board, objective formula for practical economy. It is a fair and a workable formula for breaking the logjam which the Nation knows now confronts the Congress and the country.

Mr. President, we all know what the logjam is. It has been a great buckpassing carnival. The Congress, the House, the Senate, the Ways and Means Committee, the Finance Committee—everybody says, on the congressional side, "Mr. President, you ought to economize. Tell us where you are going to effectuate some economies and engage in some cutbacks. We will not even continue hearings on taxes, as the Ways and Means Committee of the House has voted and announced, until you tell us when and where and how much you are going to economize."

The President passes the buck back to the Congress and says, "You tell me what I ought to do. You are the appropriations body. You are the tax-raising body. You make the cuts."

Congress rejoins, "We have to know the dimensions of the cloth before we can tailor the suit. We have to know just how much economy has to be made. Mr. President, you act first."

So what happens? We continue to spend. I do not think the taxpayer is too much enhanced or enchanted by this buckpassing game. I propose to bring it to an end. I propose to break the logjam. I propose to tell the President, "We want some economy. We would like at least a 5-percent reduction. We would like to have it across the board, but we recognize that in terms of competent management we cannot always horizontally wisely reduce expenditures.

"So you have the right to deviate from that a little bit. You have a right to cut some areas more than others. But the amendment provides you have no right to use any of the money to increase expenditures in any area. Your economies, your changes, your flexibility move downward only, in terms of expenditures."

Mr. President, I think it is important that this body go on record for some definite steps in terms of economy, for some specific suggestions for taking these pious speeches we all have been making for 90 days or 6 months, and doing something to give real meaning to them. I think it is time, sir, to either fish or cut bait. If we are going to fish, we shall have to say where and we shall have to say how, and we shall have to produce practical, specific, meaningful evidence of our good intentions.

So I submit that this is a good faith amendment. It is not, of course, a perfect amendment. We toyed around with different ideas. It was originally thought that perhaps we would give flexibility to the administration only to the extent of 3 percent, that we would make this a minimum 2-percent cut, right across the board, of all the controllable expenditures, and let the President move around with the 3 percent as his area of flexible determination.

There is some merit to that. I doubt that there is an agency of the Government that could not afford to save 2 pennies out of every dollar it receives. I doubt that there is a single one that could not buy a few less paper clips, turn the lights out a little earlier, do away with some overtime pay, reduce the payroll by an individual or two, or find some other way to save 2 cents out of a dollar. However, I was disappointed in the committee, where my amendment lost on a tie vote of 10 to 10.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was that a different amendment, or this amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. For all intents and purposes, this one. We left one paragraph flexible, for the staff to fill in.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was my recollection that the Senator was calling for a $3 billion cut.

Mr. MUNDT. No; the Senator is mistaken. This was the amendment in connection with which we decided to let the clerks write in substitute language for the phrase "locked in expenditures." They have now substituted a more meaningful phrase. It applies to controllable expenditures.

There was some suggestion also that perhaps the President is going to try to abuse Congress, that maybe he is going to vent some partisan spleen on the country; that if we do not put any limit on it, perhaps he will cut too much out of one area, and not enough out of another.

He can, of course, do that. I intend to show, from the record, that he can do it anyway. We already have written that in the law.

But, speaking as one fairly partisan Republican, Mr. President, I wish to submit to the President of the United States a good-faith proposal, relying on him to do the right and proper and effective thing. We will rely on him to make those cuts, without any minimum or maximum limitation, but in conformity with the legislative history of the bill and the language of the amendment.

Let us assume the worst, that the President will say, "Well, Congress has insisted that I economize. All right, fellows, I will give it to you hard, where you do not want it," and he will try to make the economy cuts as distasteful and as malicious as he can.

He could do a pretty good job of it, Mr. President, one time. But we are not going to abolish Congress. We are not going to eliminate the Appropriations Committees of the House and of the Senate. So we have the power. We have the tools. We have the weapons; and if he should do such a thing, we would also then have the motivation to stop that kind of capricious playing around with the public interest. He could never engage in such a punitive practice again.

I do not believe the President will do it now. I am willing to trust him that far. I want to give him a good-faith proposition, and say, "Look, let's work together and break this logjam. We have suggested how much be cut, we have suggested the areas, we have spelled out the agencies and bureaus over which you and we can control expenditures. We have suggested the procedure, across the board. You go ahead and use your good judgment. If there are areas which should not be cut at all, cut some others a little more, and come up with the aggregate 5-percent reduction."

I think we ought to pay a little attention, Mr. President, to another factor which has not been considered very carefully by Congress, and that is the exact status of the Federal budget.

The question of the amount of the deficit for 1968 is a matter that has received considerable attention recently. I wish to review briefly the various estimates used by the administration.

If we look at the President's budget that was submitted in January, we find an administrative budget deficit of $8.1 billion—"if," said the President, "Congress enacts legislation providing for an additional $5.5 billion in revenue."

That was the benchmark from which we started. That was the first ante. That was the beginning of the game. You will find it in the budgetary message last January.

In August there were some changes. The President revised his estimates and told us in August that we will have an administrative budget deficit of $14 billion, provided Congress enacts legislation providing for an additional $7.4 billion in revenue.

Stated differently, he was telling us we have a deficit of $21.4 billion, which could be reduced with a request for a $7.4 billion tax bill, provided Congress enacts such a tax bill.

Time marches on. They revised it again last week. Mr. Schultze, the Director of the Budget, referred to a possible deficit of $26 billion. You will find it in the record of the hearings on your desk—and I interpolate to suggest that every Senator read those hearings. They are brief. Senators who have not had the benefit of rapid reading courses can read them in 45 minutes or an hour. If you have taken the course, you can read them in about 20 minutes, I suppose. The record is very compact, very concise, very thorough, and very significant.

In those hearings, the Director of the Budget said that we are now facing a probable deficit of $26 billion, which allows for an increase of $4 billion in expenditures for the war in Southeast Asia, and assumes that Congress does not enact an increase in taxes.

So, Mr. President, the record is pretty clear. In voting on the amendment I have proposed, Senators should bear in mind that we are facing a deficit of $26 billion, which will be the largest since fiscal years 1943, 1944, and 1945, the peak years of World War II, when the deficits ran about $54 billion a year. The figures I have recited should be enough to convey to every Senator the realization that a slowdown in appropriations is in order. We are not legislating in normal fiscal times.

But even these figures do not give the complete picture. I call attention to table 10, entitled "Balances of Obligational Authority," found on page 51 of the President's budget. It will be noted that with respect to the administrative budget, it is estimated that at the beginning of the current fiscal year, there will be an obligated but unexpended total of $75.3 billion.

At this point, I remind the Senate that those are firm obligations, made pursuant to appropriations, that will not result in expenditures during fiscal year 1968.

Now, let us take a look at the estimate of the obligated totals at the end of fiscal year 1968. We find that item listed as $83.2 billion—or another increase of $7.9 billion. Mr. President, these are the Government's figures. These are the updated items. These are the bills that will have to be paid by the Government. There is no way, unless we rescind something or reduce something, that we can curtail that tremendous $83.2 billion figure. My amendment at least starts us on a constructive and corrective course.

When these obligations are considered, while it is clear that on an expenditure basis the Government will operate in the red during fiscal year 1968 to the tune of only $26 billion—which is more than three times the estimate we were given last January for fiscal year 1968—the new total deficits are substantially higher. Surely, the least we can do now, in the Senate this week, is to call a halt to these sharp increases in expenditures, and to adopt an amendment to start retrenching on some of the expenditures which we are still able to control. That, after all, is the purpose of what we are endeavoring to do in this area, in consideration of my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from South Dakota was present and heard the very able remarks of the Director of the Budget throughout our hearings several days ago, as I recall.

Mr. MUNDT. I was present. I heard it all.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator remembers, does he not, that the Director of the Budget agreed that the passage of the six annual appropriation bills which have already been passed in Congress reduce the President's budget by $2 billion?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, I do. The Senator is anticipating part of my speech, but he may go ahead.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator recalls, does he not, that in estimating the reductions in the President's budget on the nine remaining bills which have not yet been acted upon by both Houses of Congress and have not gone to the President, the Director of the Budget estimated that the additional reduction would be about $2.5 billion, making a total reduction of $4.5 billion from the President's budget.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator has hiked the ante from $2 billion to $2.5 billion. I am not sure the Senator can charge that estimate to the Director of the Budget. I think it can be charged to the discussion had around the table among the Senators who are going to have to say something about it. It was said that we hope to effectuate another $2 billion savings. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the distinguished Senator will look at the record. If he does, he will find that the Director of the Budget testified that in his judgment the additional cuts would be sufficient to bring the total reduction in the President's budget up to $4.5 billion. And I insisted that I thought it would be nearer to $5 billion. Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. MUNDT. I recall the colloquy. As I say, I do not think the Director of the Budget is the world's best authority on what Congress will do. The Senator from Florida is much more competent to judge that than is the Director of the Budget.

Mr. HOLLAND. At any rate, the Director of the Budget did, if the Senator will check the record, state that in his opinion the President's budget would be reduced by a total of $4.5 billion when all the appropriation bills of this session are finally passed upon.

Mr. MUNDT. I think I heard that figure booted about. He said he thought it would be $4 billion, but certainly $4.5 billion would be a pleasant surprise and a gratifying result to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator realizes that even after we pass the appropriation bills and even if we reduce the President's budget by $4.5 billion—and it is my feeling that it will be nearer $5 billion than $4.5 billion—if Congress should agree to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, there would be a mandate to the President to cut 5 percent on all items—reading from the parenthesis—other than appropriations for military functions and those items determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget not to be subject to administrative control.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator then feels that even after Congress has done its best, and even though we may reduce the President's budget by $4.5 billion, and the Director of the Budget thought that was the better figure—or $5 billion—as I think is probably the better figure—we should still, notwithstanding that very heavy cut, direct the President to cut all line items, except those few that are excepted, by 5 percent.

Mr. MUNDT. Subject to the transferability authority.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the total amount to be cut will amount to 5 percent on all line items other than those which are excepted.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct, and the Senator from South Dakota believes and would hope that it would amount to a substantial cut in addition, between $1.5 billion and $2 billion.

If the Senator from Florida is correct in his very optimistic prediction that we will save $3 billion more, to make a total of $5 billion, then we would have to do it by the use of items against which the 5 percent also works. So, my amendment would then produce less savings.

If we follow tradition and do not quite live up to expectations, my amendment would effect a little greater savings. If we achieve the cut which I think we should make, we would reduce the total then by an amount of between $6 billion and $7 billion, which is what the administration is now trying to raise by a 10-percent tax imposed on the taxpayers of America. It almost hits the figure on the nose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the wording of the Senator's amendment, is it not true that within the amount to be cut would be included 5 percent of all appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, except those for retirement and pensions and disability payments?

Mr. MUNDT. No; it is not true that it would take 5 percent off the Veterans' Administration for the reason I gave earlier, that we leave to the President's discretion in terms of efficient management, the right not to cut any particular function or agency which in his opinion on the basis of facts supplied by the Bureau of the Budget and by the record itself, he finds to be undesirable to cut. So, if the Veterans' Administration, in his judgment, needs the money appropriated, my amendment would have no impact on that.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has said that the 5 percent of all items for the Veterans' Administration, other than retirement, pensions, and disability benefits——

Mr. MUNDT. Other than all noncontrollable items.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would have to be cut either off the Veterans' Administration appropriation or off some other appropriation.

Mr. MUNDT. That is a horse of an entirely different paint job. That being a Government function, if the President should figure they need all that is appropriated, they would get it. However, if the President does not happen to like the Veterans, he could cut the amount by 20 percent. But he will not do it. He will take the money from areas where the cuts can be better made in the public interest. If the veterans need every dime appropriated, they will get it under my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator suggesting that 20 percent might easily be cut from certain appropriations less acceptable to the general public and to the Congress than is the Veterans' Administration appropriation?

Mr. MUNDT. I have voted for some substantial reductions in appropriations already made, and I believe the Senator from Florida has, too. And the RECORD will show, by our votes, that we must have felt that some meaningful cuts could be made in the appropriations already passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator must understand that in addition to the cuts voted for by him and by Congress——

Mr. MUNDT. I am talking about the cuts which failed.

Mr. HOLLAND. And many have been heavy cuts, the President would be directed by the amendment of the Senator to cut an additional 5 percent with the exception of the matters listed in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator runs out of breath before he gets the sentence completed. It is with the exception of the items in parentheses and with the exception of the transferability authority which enables the President to keep them at the same figure. He cannot increase them.

I recall that the Senator from Florida voted with me on cuts in some appropriation bills which did not prevail. We succeeded in getting some. However, we did not prevail on others.

I would hope that the President, in looking over those items would make some sharp cuts in those areas where a substantial number of Senators felt there should be cuts. I would put it up to him. This is a good-faith amendment.

We are trusting him to make the proper and the necessary cuts.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the distinguished Senator feel that the adoption of his amendment would indicate that Congress has more confidence in the President's judgment than it has in the judgment of a majority of Congress?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not think that. I think it simply recognizes the facts of life, that since we passed on appropriation bills, some of them several months ago, the financial situation has gotten tighter, the war has gotten more costly, the problems involving a tax increase have gotten more complicated, the fires of inflation are substantially hotter and we are taking a second look at conditions, as we should do now, and not 60 days from now or 90 days from now.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator knows that we have a right to take an additional look from this time forth at the nine appropriation bills that have not yet been passed, does he not?

Mr. MUNDT. For the nine that have not been passed; that is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator has more confidence in what the President will do after we have taken that look and after we have acted, in the light of our view that economies should prevail, he has more confidence in the President than he has in the righteousness of what Congress will do, has he not?

Mr. MUNDT. No. Because I have this much confidence in the President, I do not want the Senator from Florida to put me in the spot of implying I have complete confidence in everything the President does. I believe it manifestly unfair to give to a selected number of government activities, on whose appropriations we may already have acted, the right to continue at that level, and to effectuate all our economies in those that come later in the priority list. I do not believe it is fair or right or essentially effective.

Mr. HOLLAND. If that is the philosophy of the distinguished Senator, why does he not confine his amendment to the six bills which have already passed?

Mr. MUNDT. Because I want this to apply equally to all the bills. This is something which I believe we can reduce. It is true that since we have nine bills still to consider, members of the Committee on Appropriations may well reflect upon that as they arrive at the final figures. But I am convinced that few, if any, items in those bills which remain should not be subjected to the same type of scrutiny.

I believe it would be salutary in this country for every activity of Government to stop expanding for awhile and start examining the costs and the consideration of the taxpayer, and I am attempting to express this in an amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, that is one thing the Senator from South Dakota has said with which I can agree. The action of the Senator from Florida in the handling of his bill on the agricultural appropriations would so indicate, because it has been passed at a figure decidedly less than that in the Presidential budget. That attitude of the Senator from Florida is also being reflected, bill by bill, in the matters which are now being passed upon by conference.

But my question was this: If the Senator is trying to aim his action at the six bills already passed, why does he not say so in the amendment, rather than to discourage conferees on the nine remaining bills, and Senators and Representatives who are considering them, from making what they regard as maximum cuts on those bills?

Mr. MUNDT. I would hope that it would be a matter of encouragement, not discouragement, because they would have before them the mandate of Congress that it was highly interested in making some significant economy. The Senator from Florida can guess and I can guess. I do not know how our colleagues will react and neither does he. But I believe it would be encouraging to know that we have expressed this determination to have belt tightening all across the board except in those areas where the President finds it would be detrimental to the public interest. To that extent, certainly, I have confidence in the President.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida believes that the result in passing on the nine appropriation bills yet to be passed, the result upon the conferees, and the result upon individual Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate would be disappointing and would be unfavorable and would not lead toward the economy which the Senator so ardently desires; because both Houses would be advised—if the Senator's amendment were adopted and the resolution as adopted were passed—that however much they cut each item, it was still going to be cut an additional 5 percent, or at least was subject to being cut an additional 5 percent.

Mr. MUNDT. In response to the Senator from Florida, I say that I respect his right to speculate as to how our colleagues will react to anything we do, as he, of course, must respect mine, because neither of us has a diploma as a crystal-ball gazer. We must guess.

On the basis of what has happened so far in our conference committees in reaction to the House, it would be my conviction that if we take this action, it will have a salutary effect in inducing, in the nine remaining bills and the conferences which remain, a new energy displayed toward economy. Even the action that the House has taken so far in resubmitting bills and passing resolutions of this nature has resulted, as the Senator knows, in some of the conferences which we jointly attend, in the House remaining adamant on positions of economy which have been greater than those we have taken on the Senate side.

I agree with the Senator that we have made some major successful efforts—not adequate to meet the conditions of the time—to reduce the President's budget.

Otherwise, we would not have saved the $2 billion we already have saved.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has heard of legislative actions to indicate no confidence, but it was always no confidence in somebody else. But the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota appears to the Senator from Florida to be an invitation to the Senate to vote no confidence in itself, in its own actions, in the actions of the other body, and in the final actions of Congress. The Senator from Florida admits that he has not seen any such proposal ever made during his service in the Senate—more than 21 years—because, in truth and in fact, this is an admission in the RECORD that those voting for this amendment believe that Congress will not have done its duty toward economy and that, on the contrary, after they have done what they may regard as their duty, it believes that the President should cut an additional 5 percent.

It seems to the Senator from Florida that the amendment is very unfortunate, and it would be very unfortunate for it to be attached to the resolution.

Mr. MUNDT. This may reveal the difference of opinion which we have, because the Senator from South Dakota is not satisfied with the economy effort made thus far by Congress. If the Senator from Florida is, so be it; he should then oppose this amendment. If he believes we have done the best we could do or should do, he should oppose it. I do not believe we have. Under the circumstances as they confront us at this late date in October, I believe we should take another look and do some further economizing.

I believe we should set up a formula under which we can meet the problems of our times fiscally. I am unhappy with what we have done. If the Senator is happy with the situation, I can understand why he would say we should not make any change. This is not the first time we have done this. We did it in 1951 and at other times. We have passed legislation of this nature whereby we tighten our belt as we meet new conditions.

Some of the appropriation bills about which the Senator from Florida is talking were passed several months ago. Our financial conditions have vastly changed, and they have changed for the worse. Perhaps the Senator from Florida is not receiving mail from people concerned about inflation. I am. About the threat of high taxes. I am. About the fact that they, at least, are not satisfied with the job we have done up to date. And they say, "Cut it some more." I believe we should. This is one device to do it.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida believes that if in Congress we are successful in reducing the President's budget by $5 billion—and that is what he is working toward—we will have done a splendid job, the like of which has not been done at least in 21 years; and he would not want to put in the RECORD a confession that that is not a good job and that we want an additional 5 percent struck from all line items except a very few.

The Senator from Florida could not support this amendment because it seems to him that it is quite simply an expression of no confidence in Congress, and I do not feel that way about Congress as a whole, or about the Senate or the House of Representatives. We all know that economy must prevail.

He thinks that if we do cut the budget by $5 billion, which is what we are shooting toward, we will have done a good job which would entitle us to the commendation of the entire public.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. MUNDT. The difference between the point of view of the Senator from Florida and me seems to be primarily how much we should cut. We know we have cut $2 billion and I hope we can cut $2 billion more. The Senator from Florida first thought the figure should be $2.5 billion and now he thinks it should be $3 billion more. That is fine. I shall help him try to do it. I think it is still inadequate. The House of Representatives thinks it is inadequate. They proposed $7 or $8 billion and it was carried by a 110-vote majority in a rollcall vote. The other body is a little closer to the feeling of the people in connection with the economy than the Senate is.

In all events I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Florida. We discussed this matter on the same basis while in committee. All I can do is point out a formula which I think will save more money if it can be agreed to.

Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator is in the Chamber who asked me how long I was going to be, and I had told him I would be finished by 5 o'clock, I think I should hurry along so that he will not be inconvenienced. However, if there is something more which my friend, the Senator from Florida, wishes to say I yield to him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I direct the attention of the Senator to page 46 of the printed record of hearings, 10 lines from the bottom, where Mr. Schultze stated:

> My own judgment would be, on a conservative basis, that it looks as if Congress will have reduced appropriations by $4.5 billion. I may be a little too conservative, a little too optimistic, but somewhere in that ball park.

Does the Senator from South Dakota find that quotation?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. Mr. Schultze said, "somewhere in that ball park"; any place between $4 and $5 billion. I submit that he is not the best authority on that. He participates in no congressional debates, and he does not vote on appropriations. He is looking through a knothole in the fence of the ball park and making a speculation, but he is not and cannot be an authority in the field of speculating on future congressional actions. That is not his field of authority or expertise.

Mr. HOLLAND. We called him to testify because we wanted his advice.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I remember that the Senator from South Dakota was eager to have him testify and to have his views.

Mr. MUNDT. I was more interested in those areas in which he has expertise than where he has to look through the knothole in the fence to see the ball park. He has no way at all to know. Any one of our youngest Senators knows more about the actions in the Senate than somebody at the other end of the avenue just called to testify. He made a pretty adroit answer: He said he was being maybe a little too conservative, and maybe a little too optimistic. How can he be wrong?

Mr. HOLLAND. He told us about the $2 billion which we agreed on. Then, he suggested $2.5 billion more would be cut and he stated that was a conservative estimate.

Then, later on, in respect to my statement, I said, on page 62:

> My own feeling is that these reductions will probably be more than that; between four and a half and five billion. Are you predicting your estimate upon possible cuts in these different fields? Foreign aid, independent offices, space, military construction, antipoverty, and State, Justice, and Judiciary?

Mr. Schultze said, "Yes."

I was trying to make sure we were looking at the same picture. I wanted to call the attention of my distinguished friend very definitely to the fact that the two figures that were mentioned were $4.5 billion and $5 billion, rather than $4 billion, which he mentioned.

Mr. MUNDT. In justice to the Director, we should quote him precisely. He said:

> I may be a little too conservative, a little too optimistic, but somewhere in that ball park.

He left the matter open at both ends. That is why I say he was adroit and could not miss. He protected himself on both ends.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Director is proceeding not only on what he saw in the two bills, but on the basis of his knowledge of the difference in the House bill and the Senate bill in the six fields mentioned by me, which is what he said he was looking at. The Senator from Florida and the Senator from South Dakota are conferees on most of those additional bills.

Mr. MUNDT. The big bill is foreign aid, which I have not been estimating.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is my estimate we have a better chance to make a $5 billion cut and that is what my sights are on at this time.

Mr. MUNDT. I will help the Senator in every way I can to achieve the total $5 billion goal, which however, I believe is still inadequate. My proposal would give us $6 billion in total congressional savings which I think we should make, and that is what the President asks we provide in a new 10-percent surtax bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fact sheet concerning the Mundt amendment, indicating precisely what it does. I have set out estimated savings and how the figures go up or down.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT SHEET: THE MUNDT AMENDMENT

1. Senator Karl Mundt will offer the following amendment to House Joint Resolution 888, a Resolution to continue the authority of the existing Continuing Resolution, providing obligational authority to those

departments and agencies of the Government for which appropriation bills have not been enacted:

At the end of the Resolution, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) Subsequent to the enactment into law during the first session of the 90th Congress of the appropriation bills for fiscal year 1968, the executive branch is directed, subject to subsection (b), to reduce by at least 5 per centum each line item appropriation (other than appropriations for military functions and those items determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget not to be subject to administrative control) contained in such bills.

"(b) In order to provide for the most effective use of appropriations reduced in accordance with subsection (a), the President may make such transfers between appropriation accounts as may be necessary, but no such transfer shall cause any item of appropriation to be increased to an amount in excess of the amount provided in the appropriation bill."

2. *House-passed version of H.J. Res. 888:* As it passed the House of Representatives, this Resolution—

a. Provided for a 30-day extension of the authority granted in the existing Continuing Resolution;

b. Provides for various limitations on fiscal year 1968 expenditures which the Bureau of the Budget estimates will total approximately $7 billion in reductions in 1968 expenditures.

c. Imposes new maximum level of obligations under the Continuing Resolution with respect to the programs of the Agency for International Development and Office of Economic Opportunity.

3. *H.J. Res. 888, as reported:* Recommends—

a. An extension of the existing Continuing Resolution authority to November 15, 1967; and

b. Deletion of those provisions in the House-passed Resolution limiting fiscal 1968 expenditures and imposing new levels of maximum obligations with respect to the Agency for International Development and Office of Economic Opportunity.

4. *The Mundt Amendment:*

a. *Applicability:* Appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Government—the Executive. Legislative, and Judicial Branches.

b. *Effect:* Imposes a reduction of 5 per centum in each appropriation made for fiscal year 1968, including appropriations in those bills already enacted and those to be enacted with the following two *exceptions:*

(1) Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for *Military Functions;* and

(2) Those items determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget not to be subject to *administrative control.*

c. *Implementation:* Subsection (b) of the amendment authorizes the President to make transfers between appropriations as may be necessary to effect the 5% reductions, but provides that no appropriation can be increased over the enacted amount as the result of such transfers.

d. *Estimated savings:* The requests in the President's budget for appropriations (new obligational authority) for fiscal year 1968 total $145.2 billion. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget advised the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate that approximately $38 billion of this total was subject to administrative control. This total excludes appropriations of approximately $74.6 billion to the Department of Defense for *Military Functions* and $32.6 million for programs and activities that are not subject to administrative control, such as interest on the national debt, postal operations, veterans' benefits, and certain agricultural programs. When the proposed 5% reduction is applied to these controllable programs, which total $38 billion, a reduction of $1.9 billion results. However, it must be recognized that the Congress has already made some reductions in funds requested for these programs, and further reductions will be made in those appropriations included in the bills that have not been enacted. When these specific reductions are considered, it is likely that the Mundt amendment will result in further reductions of $1.6 to $1.7 billion in appropriations. It is estimated that such a reduction in appropriations will result in a reduction of from $700 million to $1 billion in expenditures, with the balance of the reduction to follow in later years.

5. *Precedent:* The Mundt amendment is in the nature of a general reduction in appropriations—not a limitation on expenditures. It is patterned after the following provision that was included in the General Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759, 81st Congress):

"SEC. 1214. Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations, and reauthorizations made by this Act for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government shall, without impairing national defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than $550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in section 1211 of this Act."

6. *Not an "item" veto:* The proposed Mundt amendment does not grant to the President any authority that can be termed an "item" veto. The amendment does grant to the President the authority to make transfers between appropriations, to the extent necessary, to efficiently accomplish the 5% reductions required under the proposed Mundt amendment. It should be remembered that under existing statutory authority the President, through the apportionment process, can refuse to obligate funds provided by the Congress.

This authority is to be found in P.L. 759—81st Congress, General Appropriations Act of 1951.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to point out further that we have had Congresses before which have faced up to this problem. They have not been too much concerned about whether they were criticizing themselves, the administration, or each other; but we have passed Economy Acts and rescission bills. I think this is a very serious problem. I do not think that a $5 billion cut from inflated estimates when there is a $26 billion deficit is anything to go home and brag about. I think we should do more. I think the White House should still do more if we cut this by $6 billion. If the President gets his tax bill through and raises $6 billion, that is $12 billion, at a time when we have a large national debt and a deficit which is creating certain signs of very dangerous inflation. I hope that beyond such cuts the President can slow down certain expenditures so we can begin to get the budget under control. We have more to consider than the personal feelings of each other on these problems. We must respond to the fiscal problems of our country and we must face up to them. I shall have more to say on this matter tomorrow when we come to the consideration of the amendment.

I join the Senator from Florida in hoping that Senators read the hearings which appear on pages 49 through 73, which incorporate what the Senator from Florida has said. Before that we had listened for almost 2 days to the Budget Director saying that it cannot be cut this way, that way, and so on. I said, "Mr. Budget Director, let us think ahead. This is a real problem." I told him I wanted him to say whether he thought it was a real problem or was not. The Senators will find that he did. It will be found in the hearings. We have his statements about it. I submit it is something we should consider carefully. If someone can present a better system for reducing the budget, so be it. I shall consider it and support it, but I want to get the problem understood and I believe we should take prudent and effective action now.

I was distressed by an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat under date of October 16, 1967. It said some pretty unkind things about the Senate and it said some pretty nice things about the House of Representatives. It said that the House of Representatives was facing up to the problem and that they were trying to do something about it over there, but that the Senate was thinking of one reason, one alibi, or another, for doing nothing. I hope before the Senate adjourns we do something. I have no pride in authorship in my amendment but it is an important step in the right direction.

I would welcome the support of the Senator from Florida to come up with a savings of $7 billion or any additional amount, or 8 percent instead of 5 percent, but I want to get started in the right direction. This is the most effective and reasonable way that I know. This is a good-faith approach. If any Senator has a better one, let him produce it. But by all means let us not settle now for doing nothing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> In view of its recent irresponsible behavior in approving money bills calling for even greater expenditures than President Johnson's excessive budget requests, the United States Senate has lost a great deal of prestige in the eyes of Americans who expected far better from the highest legislative body in the country.
>
> There appears an air of unreality in the Senate. Its members show no sign that the nation faces a $29 billion deficit from President Johnson's out-of-control budget.
>
> In its latest action the Senate approved a $4.77 billion public works bill (better known as the "pork barrel" bill) that tops the House-passed version by $1.53 billion.
>
> The Senate has tacked on $1.57 billion to the already huge $4.95 billion agriculture money bill approved by the House. In recent days its members also have added $198 million to the anti-poverty bill, seeking $2.25 billion for this fiscal year, and have passed a space budget in excess of $4 billion that also topped the House version.
>
> The House by contrast, is taking a stand against the President's drive to railroad through virtually all of his $143 billion budget.
>
> Refusal of the Senate to cooperate in the House budget-cutting efforts has tipped the balance in Mr. Johnson's favor, encouraging him to turn the screws on House members by freezing all government spending for rivers and harbors projects, military housing and other programs, rather than prune the budget.
>
> Unless members of the Senate quit playing politics with the people's money, the

near chaotic standoff between the House and the President can be expected to continue, greatly damaging the nation's economy and undermining confidence in Congress.

Members of both parties in the Senate should shake off this political stupor before the present impasse inflicts much greater harm to those they supposedly represent.

THE DOMESTIC DEVELOPMENT BANK AND THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY CORPORATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am sorry that events have kept us to this late hour. I had hoped not to keep my colleagues so late on this matter, but I believe the bills I am introducing today are critically important to relieve the situation facing the whole war on poverty as to require some elucidation to Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills may be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senators ALLOTT, BOGGS, BROOKE, CARLSON, CASE, COOPER, DOMINICK, GRIFFIN, HATFIELD, JORDAN of Idaho, KUCHEL, MURPHY, PEARSON, PERCY, PROUTY, SCOTT, TOWER, and YOUNG of North Dakota, a bill to establish a Domestic Development Bank to assist in the development of employment and business opportunities in certain urban and rural areas.

The second bill would amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to charter an Economic Opportunity Corporation to encourage the participation of private enterprise in the effort to rebuild urban slums and eliminate poverty in the United States.

There are 22 sponsors of this bill, which I introduce for myself and Senators AIKEN, ALLOTT, BAKER, BOGGS, BROOKE, CARLSON, CASE, COOPER, DOMINICK, GRIFFIN, HATFIELD, JORDAN of Idaho, KUCHEL, MUNDT, MURPHY, PEARSON, PERCY, PROUTY, SCOTT, TOWER, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

Now, Mr. President, it is well known that for many years I have urged the concept upon the minority of suggesting and recommending feasible alternatives. This is certainly one of the most important of those efforts which have been made and it is offered in the greatest spirit of cooperation and in the hope that it may appeal to enough members of the majority to make it law. But I think it is so important that a large body of members of my party have gathered to sponsor a very major effort in the poverty field as to very richly justify putting it forward as an alternative which was offered at this time solely by the minority.

It is most instructive, on one of these bills, that 22 Republican Senators commit themselves to an affirmative and most constructive antipoverty program, thereby, I think, answering decisively any doubts about whether the great body of Republicans will really enlist in this fight. I think it is, in that respect, extremely constructive and extremely important.

I. THE NEED FOR A NEW STRATEGY

For several decades, the phenomenon of urbanization has been the dominant domestic trend in this country—a trend far outrunning our ability to comprehend it and deal with it. Urbanization has proliferated the big city slum, the slum which over the past summer repeatedly gave birth to riot and tragic destruction of life and property.

But the crisis of the core city is also a crisis for rural America, whose people are taking flight to the cities as farm manpower needs diminish. No program or effort which seeks to resolve the problems of the city slum can stand alone—rural migration needs to be halted or at least slowed and the economy of rural America brought back into equilibrium.

The legislation which my Republican colleagues and I are offering today seeks to deal with two related problems which are fundamental to the substance of rural and urban poverty. This legislation is aimed primarily at resolving the problems of unemployment in both these areas and at raising the level of business activity owned and managed by local people in order that they may build an economic stake in the community.

But our strategy in this legislation is somewhat different from that which has dominated Federal programs to date. For in these bills, primary reliance is placed upon the forces of private enterprise with Government fund and resources being used essentially as levers to move those private forces into paths that will alleviate conditions of poverty and solve social problems.

A great many people, both citizens and politicians, are restless and impatient with the present antipoverty and welfare programs. Very few of these people would, I think, disagree with the goals of the war on poverty. Rather, they are concerned that these goals are not being reached and that we are not breaking the cycle of poverty and dependency. To some extent, such criticisms are premature, for the antipoverty programs are of only very recent origin and have been continually plagued by congressional delays in funding and by inadequate appropriations. Nevertheless, there are grounds to doubt the adequacy of the antipoverty effort, and too many of our programs are mere bandaids or palliatives which comfort the victim but offer him no cure for his condition. The bills I present today are designed to break this cycle, to advance beyond the band-aid approach.

These bills seek to tap the resources of what can be our greatest ally in the war on poverty—the private sector. Government by itself simply cannot marshal the funds nor the talent to solve this problem. But when used in conjunction with and to stimulate private efforts, Government funds can have a multiplier effect and hence a far greater impact.

Let me be perfectly clear on one point: As of now, with our present approaches, we are not winning the war on poverty and we may in fact be losing it. The gap between rich and poor is growing in this country. The unemployment rates in many rural and poverty areas are going up. It is no longer simply a matter of pious statement that it would be nice if private enterprise came to our aid in this struggle. Private enterprise should enter this struggle and Government must see to it that it does. Unless Government funds are used to this end and with this multiplier effect, results will not be forthcoming which are needed to sustain public support for the antipoverty program.

The legislation which I propose today would create two new vehicles, a Domestim Development Bank and an Economic Opportunity Corporation, to encourage and facilitate the participation of private enterprise in urban and rural antipoverty efforts. Each of these bills draws upon the experience of successful international institutions which are engaged in economic development and antipoverty activities abroad. I wish to emphasize that neither of these programs would replace the Office of Economic Opportunity or the present antipoverty program, but they would add a new dimension to it. With a greater involvement of private money and talent, Government would have a partner in the war on poverty and may find it possible to expand its own efforts more modestly.

I have received the important suggestions of a number of my Republican colleagues—suggestions which have been incorporated in these bills. Moreover, this legislation had had a great deal of study and analysis involving business, labor, foundation executives, professors, and economists. I first introduced a bill to establish an Economic Opportunity Corporation in June 1966, and these two bills being introduced today are refinements of that original measure.

II. THE DOMESTIC DEVELOPMENT BANK

First. The heart of the problem—unemployment and lack of business opportunity. The problems of unemployment and lack of business opportunity are the touchstones of this legislation.

We have been aware of massive and chronic unemployment in this country for sometime, but a series of 10 Labor Department slum surveys conducted in November 1966, gave us a first clear idea of the staggering dimensions of the problem. These surveys showed that the unemployment rate in these areas was about 10 percent, or three times the average for the rest of the country, and that "unemployment—or subemployment—in city slums is so much worse than it is in the country as a whole that the national measurements of unemployment are utterly irrelevant." Moreover, there is evidence that the situation is deteriorating—the Labor Department reports that "social and economic conditions are getting worse, not better, in slum areas."

The second fundamental problem, one which we have tended to overlook in terms of Federal programs, is the lack of involvement of the rural or urban poverty area resident in the ownership and management of the business community which serves him. The riots have shown us the depths of this alienation and resentment in the cities as white-owned stores were burned and looted while "soul brother" establishments were spared. Though he is tragically mistaken, the slum Negro sees himself as having no stake in the economic life of his community and no realistic possibility of becoming a part of it—hence there is no community morality against destroying it.

We pride ourselves on our system of private enterprise, secure in the belief that where everyone shares in the responsibilities and benefits, all will remain guardians of the system and will prosper. We must now ask what we are prepared to do to insure that all groups do in fact participate and have a stake in the preservation of the economic system. We must now seek to train and assist men to become owners and entrepreneurs in our society with as much vigor as we are now training them to become other people's employees.

Nor is small business ownership important only for the city slum residents—in depressed rural areas too, the development of small business opportunities would aid to stabilize the local economy, check outmigration, and offer a kind of economic opportunity heretofore denied to the rural poor.

Statistics on this problem of lack of business opportunity are hard to come by, particularly in rural areas, but the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity, which provides technical assistance to minority group businessmen, has developed the following data:

New York City, with a Negro population of about 1,100,000, has only about a dozen Negro-owned or managed enterprises employing as many as 10 persons;

Over half of Newark's 400,000 residents are Negroes, but only a little over 10 percent of its 12,172 licensed businesses are Negro owned;

In Los Angeles, with an estimated 600,000 Negro residents, there are 131,039 licensed businesses of which almost an invisible fraction is owned by the Negro minority;

In Washington, D.C., where 63 percent of the citizens are nonwhite, only 13 percent of the businesses are owned by Negroes;

The Department of Labor's statistics show that of the 3,000,000 self-employed persons in the United States, only 70,000 or less than 3 percent, are nonwhite;

According to a Fortune article, from 1950 to 1960 there was actually a decline of one-fifth in Negro ownership and operation of business enterprises.

The Interracial Council for Business Opportunity concluded, after reviewing this data, that "violent appeals will be less likely to occur in communities where the stabilizing influence of a successful Negro business class exists."

Second. The role of economic development: It is apparent that if the forces that stimulate business formation and location could be put to work in or near poverty areas, we would have a technique which at one time strikes at both unemployment and lack of business opportunity. Under such an economic development strategy, the aim would be to create businesses which would be both job producing and which would open presently closed doors to business ownership for residents of urban and rural poverty areas.

We cannot, however, rely upon present private market forces and the continued growth and prosperity for the average citizen to solve the problem of rural and urban poverty. For, as the Department of Labor slum survey concluded:

> No conceivable increase in the gross national product would stir these backwaters.

And, in fact, present trends in economic development are contributing to a worsening of the situation, for businesses are leaving the core cities and the depressed rural areas.

Between 1954 and 1965, almost two-thirds of all new industrial buildings and a little over half of all new stores were constructed outside the central cities. In some cities, the flight of new construction was even greater—rising in Los Angeles to 85 percent of the new industrial buildings and 63 percent of the stores.

A report entitled "Program Planning for Economic Development," prepared by the Economic Development Administration, projected employment, income and population changes for each county in the United States and concluded that by 1975—

> Even if all the labor force absorbed by expanding job opportunities in suburban and outer-ring counties comes from the central cities, 9.8 percent of the population of the 25 largest metropolitan areas still must either migrate to smaller, rapidly growing counties or find jobs at home not projected by our analysis. This 9.8 percent is an enormous figure in absolute numbers—7.1 million persons (or 2.9 million jobs).

The situation in the depressed rural areas is just as serious, and can be measured by the migration statistics. Some 11,000,000 Americans migrated from rural to urban areas between 1950 and 1960 and there is every indication that the trend will continue at least through the mid-1970's. The effects in individual cities are startling: for example, it is estimated that 1,000 displaced farmworkers pour into Watts every month. The magnitude of the in-migration trend is staggering: between 50 and 60 percent of nonwhites in those six Northern and Western cities of greatest Negro population—New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Washington, and Los Angeles—are in-migrants, and about 80 percent of those came from the South.

A new strategy of economic development, balanced between rural and urban areas, is urgently called for. This strategy must be carefully developed, in my view, so that it does not point irrevocably toward black core cities surrounded by white suburbs. Great care must also be taken to insure that, in the cities, this strategy focuses upon the right kind of business development and ownership. Certain kinds of establishments are typically more able than others to thrive in the core cities. These urban industries include service companies, office buildings, construction firms, distribution companies, and light manufacturing—enterprises which do not require extensive land and/or produce massive displacement, and which do not have substantial air and noise pollution attributes.

Third. The leverage of financing: For these kinds of businesses, a key inhibition to location or development in a rural or urban poverty area is an inability to get financing for the construction or purchase of fixed assets or for working capital. This is particularly a problem for minority group businessmen. At the present time no significant amount of long-term, low-interest mortgage money is available from public or private sources for such industrial and commercial projects; a particularly severe problem is the lack of financing for most of project costs; for example, 90-percent mortgage loans. Typically, the only mortgage loans for commercial purposes which are now available would be on the order of 15- to 20-year loans of 50 percent of project costs at a "constant factor"—interest plus amortization of principal—of 9 or 10 percent. Such loans would be available in poverty areas only to well established, credit worthy borrowers. At these terms, there is no incentive to locate facilities in a poverty area and no opportunity for any other than the most credit worthy businessman to get financing.

By far the larger number of potential borrowers in poverty areas cannot get loans at all, despite the fact that a great many are excellent credit risks. Virtually no loans are available to "speculative builders" who would construct office or loft buildings without previously leased or sold all of the space. The fact is, quite simply, that the banks, insurance companies, and other lending institutions have better risks elsewhere, given the demand for money in this tight credit market. Perhaps the only companies which would not have these credit problems on moving into a slum area are the large corporations—the General Electrics and U.S. Steels—who tend to finance their expansion activities from internal capital or by selling their own notes on the market.

This analysis suggests, of course, the provision of long-term, low-cost credit as a vehicle for producing the desired economic development. An alternative approach has been suggested in two bills which would use tax incentives for economic development. Both of these tax incentive bills have been coauthored by my colleague, Senator PEARSON, of Kansas, and I myself am a cosponsor of one of them. I want, for a moment, to sketch out the connections and distinctions between this and a tax approach. I am convinced that they are not mutually exclusive. In the first place, a tax incentive will only stimulate the development or location of a business in a rural or urban poverty area if the businessman already has the credit to become established. Tax deductions and credits come into operation only after the business is established and is making a profit; such incentives do not aid the businessman to get his initial mortgage money or working capital. Since only the biggest and most credit worthy companies are eligible in today's money market for credit to establish facilities in these poverty areas, a tax incentive approach alone would tend to favor only the larger and more established corporations. But an economic development strategy for the core cities must also appeal to other than such corporations, for large manufacturing plants with large land requirements are not always well suited to urban location. Aside from air and noise pollution problems, they would tend to produce severe relocation difficulties for displaced residents and may not be physically desirable in most ghettos, which are essentially residential areas. Moreover, they would almost always be absentee owned operations, and typically would not provide the important psychological advantages of local ownership which a small- and middle-sized business assistance program might produce. Finally, important questions arise as to the relative effectiveness of a tax approach. Tax incentives tend to be on inflexible instrument, and cannot be readily tailored to fit the needs of individual industries, businessmen, or geographic areas. Moreover, because of the size of the incentive has to be determined in advance, it may later prove to be a windfall for some businessmen or too small to provide adequate incentives for others.

At any rate, the tax incentive approach should be coupled with the credit approach so that there is encouragement both at the establishment stage and during the ongoing operation of the business. The target of these two approaches tends to be different, both in terms of the point in time at which the incentive comes into play and the nature of the business to which it is most appealing.

Credit for plant construction and purchase of machinery is just as serious a problem in rural areas as it is in the cities. Many communities have issued industrial revenue bonds to finance land purchases and plant construction, but such bonds depend on the credit worthiness of the company and hence tend to be a source of financing only for the largest and best established corporations. Moreover, this use of tax-exempt bonds is under strong attack in the Congress and may itself be eliminated. In short, the provision of long-term, low-interest financing is also a keystone of rural economic development.

An economic development approach stressing credit would not, of course, eliminate the need for Federal programs in other areas. Small business management counseling and training programs must accompany any effort to provide credit, and I am hopeful that the new small business technical assistance program which I have authored under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act will be approved by the Congress and will help to fill that need. Manpower training programs must also be continued and expanded, for it makes no sense to induce the location of job-producing industries in areas of high unemployment unless assistance is available to employers to upgrade and train those poverty area residents.

Fourth. The Domestic Development Bank legislation: The first bill that I am introducing today would propose the establishment of a Domestic Development Bank as a source of needed low-cost financing in high-risk areas. Aside from financing, it would also provide supportive technical assistance, insurance, and the opportunity for borrowers to avoid the redtape of a governmental program. In essence, it would be very much like the highly successful World Bank in its purposes, operations, and structure. The World Bank has demonstrated that the provision of attractive credit is a powerful development tool in underdeveloped areas and that such a venture can be economically sound—the Bank earned $169 million in net profits in the year ending June 30, 1967, and has never been required to call upon its reserves of government guarantees. The World Bank has made over $10 billion in loans and has raised over $3.4 billion from private investors for its development activities.

Another example of a banking institution of this type is Pridco—the Puerto Rican Industrial Development Company. Pridco has grown from a modest beginning to a $150 million organization with a gross income of $9.6 million in 1966, and has successfully sold several bond issues. It provides industrial facilities for sale or lease to industry, develops tourist facilities, grants short- and long-term loans to industry and engages in promotion and research activities. With the help of Pridco as the financing and real estate arm of its economic development program, Puerto Rico has attracted over 1,300 manufacturing enterprises to the island.

The Domestic Development Bank would be established by an act of Congress as a profitmaking corporation authorized to finance business and commercial projects where capital is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. The Bank would be empowered, in connection with such projects, to make loans, guarantees or participate in loans for plant, equipment, and working capital, and would be authorized to undertake insurance arrangements in connection with such facilities.

Such insurance arrangements might take the form of self-insurance on a project by the Bank, coinsurance between the Bank and the borrower, or reinsurance arrangements concluded by the Bank with insurance companies to protect the facility against casualty loss. Construction loans could also be made to construction companies in connection with the development of such business and commercial facilities.

Loans could go to businesses and projects of all sizes, both the large and middle sized job-producing enterprises and small business establishments which would tend to be locally owned. With small business loans, the Bank might choose to operate through guarantees to local banking and financial institutions or by using local banks as agents in handling the loans. Financing could also be made available to public or private organizations for essential infrastructure, such as transportation or power facilities, which could not be financed through other sources and which are needed to support private development, but this would not be the major purpose of the Bank. Mortgage loans, for example, would be on the order of 30-year terms for 90 percent of project cost at rates of about 6¼ or 6½ percent interest—or 7½ percent including amortization of principle. As a condition on financing the Bank would have to be satisfied that the borrower had adequate equity or other financial interest in the facility to insure his careful and business-like management of the project and to guard against fly-by-night operations; the share which the borrower would have to put up would vary according to conditions.

The Bank would not be authorized to make mortgage loans for residential facilities, since Government agencies—FHA—are now engaged in such housing financing programs on terms which the profitmaking Bank probably could not better. But where housing is integrated with business facilities, as on the upper floors over retail stores, the mortgage loan could cover the entire project.

The Bank could take the initiative in bringing management and capital together for projects and could itself act as developer or owner of the particular facility until such time came when a private purchaser could be found. Unlike a tax incentive economic development scheme, which is essentially passive, the Bank approach would provide an active entrepreneurial agent.

The primary condition on all loans, would be that the project would have to be first, located in urban or rural poverty areas designated by the Secretary of Labor as an area having a high proportion of concentration or unemployed or low-income persons; or, second, generate new jobs of which at least 25 in number and not less than 50 percent are to be held by persons who prior to such employment were unemployed or low-income residents of eligible poverty areas. Indian reservations would qualify as eligible areas.

I think it is important to offer this alternative for at least two reasons:

First, it makes little sense to insist that a plant be located in a slum area if it could be located, at less cost and at less disruption to the community, outside that area and still provide the needed job opportunities. Transportation assistance for workers can be provided as necessary under existing Government programs.

Second, and more important, it is probably unwise in the long run simply to focus on the slum itself by bringing jobs and plants within those areas. Efforts to improve the ghetto must be matched with efforts to open opportunities for its inhabitants outside. Otherwise, we only increase the magnet of the central city for the rural migrant, and we point resolutely in the direction of Negro occupied cities surrounded by white suburbs. At the present time, the tax incentive proposals are not drawn up in a manner which offers this option and opportunity for integration, and I am hopeful that the authors of those bills will accommodate this strategy. Certainly, to take the case of New York City, it does not make sense to insist that a large manufacturing company be located in Harlem if land is available in a nearby industrial park and if transportation can be arranged to get the workers from the ghetto to the job.

The borrower would have to be certified by appropriate local officials regarding acceptability of its proposed location, architectural design, and the provision of adequate relocation assistance for any families or businesses displaced. Further conditions would require that the Bank consult with and encourage the participation of local banking institutions, that it emphasize financing for facilities which will be owned by residents of eligible areas or in which opportunity for such ownership is made available, and that unemployed and low-income persons resident in the eligible area would be given preference in employment in the facility and in its construction. Other benefits, such as the generation of new small business opportunities in the supportive service trades and the esthetic benefits of new construction, would automatically accrue to the area.

The Bank would issue $2 billion in capital stock subscribed by the Federal Government. As was true of the World Bank, 20 percent of the Government subscription would be paid in initially—$400 million—with the Bank having a call on the remaining 80 percent —$1.6 billion—as a reserve to meet the Bank's liabilities on its own borrowings on the private bond market. In this manner, there would be a guarantee or reserve for private investors in the Bank's bonds. It would sell bonds at market interest rates, just like the World Bank, in order to raise the bulk of its loan funds; expected interest rates on the bonds would be approximately 6 percent. The initial $400 million paid in by the Government would be raised by the Secretary of the Treasury through sale of United States obligations on the market, so that there would be no draw on tax revenues to finance the Bank. This is the manner in which most of the U.S. Government contributions for the international development banks have been raised, including the World Bank, the Inter-American Bank, and the Export-Import Bank. Through this technique, only the credit of the United States is called upon; all the funds for the Bank's activities would come ultimately from private investors without burden on the taxpayer. The Government stock would earn dividends for the Treasury which should more than offset the cost to the Government of paying the interest and principle due on the Treasury bonds sold to finance its subscription to Bank stock.

This method of financing, using the sale of U.S. Government bonds rather than congressional appropriations, is necessary to insure private bond holders that the Government guarantee will be made good on the Bank's bonds. Otherwise, the Bank would have to go through the risky appropriation process whenever it called upon its reserves of Government stock.

The Bank would be organized through the establishment of a commission which would appoint incorporators. The Commission would be composed of the Vice President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives. The Commission would appoint incorporators, who would serve as the initial board of directors, two-thirds of whom would be representatives of the private sector and one-third Government officials or employees. The President would thereafter appoint the 18 directors, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for 4-year terms on a staggered basis—nine directors appointed every 2 years. Two-thirds of the directors would be from the private sector—six from business and finance, two from organized labor, two from private social welfare organizations or foundations which deal with the problems of poverty, and two representing the general public. The remaining six directors would be from government, including Federal, State, and local government.

The economic incentive provided by the availability of low-cost credit would be enormous. On the one hand, it would allow rents in business and commercial facilities to be up to one-third less than in areas where this financing was not available. Moreover, by providing a substantial percentage of project costs, the Bank would enable developers and industrialists to get their equity back within a very few years by use of the deductions presently available under the Internal Revenue Code. The Bank's bonds would be sold at competitive rates and I would hope that they would be particularly attractive investments for labor-management pension funds, foundations, insurance companies, and other investing organizations would like to put their capital to work in a socially useful as well as profitmaking manner.

III. THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY CORPORATION

First. The need for a national technical assistance organization: Beyond encouraging a flow of private loan and investment capital into rural and urban poverty areas, there is a need to engage the talents and personnel of businesses, labor unions and other organizations in the private sector in solving the problems of poverty. A preliminary review of the degree of business interest in solving poverty problems indicates a dramatically growing willingness to participate.

There is not now any organization which is specifically concerned with encouraging such private sector participation in antipoverty related activities, despite the tremendous potential. And, of course, to the extent that the private sector can be enlisted in the war on poverty in a whole variety of local efforts across the United States, the cost burden on the Government becomes correspondingly less. At the present time, there is no central point to which businessmen, union leaders, and others can go for information on the kinds of activities which they might undertake. People in city X can discover what is happening in city Y only by chance. There is no mechanism through which local civic groups or business firms can learn from the successes and failures of similar organizations in other areas. Moreover, there are a great many individual private initiatives spotted around the country. For example, in Rochester a group of employers has organized a prevocational and training program and has hired a private corporation to deliver the basic educational services. In California, innovative techniques have been employed to persuade businesses to lower their entrance requirements and to hire the hard core poor. In one of the better known examples, a business group is working in the Bedford-Stuyvesant community of Brooklyn to promote business development and training activities in that area. In that particular case, I serve on the board of directors of that group, and have personally received comments from several of its members that they would have been materially aided had there been some national group or central source to which they could have gone for information and technical assistance in the early stages.

Not only are interested private parties inadequately aware of what is going on in other areas of the country, but they are not generally informed about the wide variety of Government aids and incentives which are now available. There has been and will continue to be a proliferation of Government incentive programs which some one organization should be in a position to communicate and interpret to the business community and to other elements of the private sector. Moreover, in establishing and refining these incentive programs, I feel that the Government badly needs a top-level institution with which it can work and which will represent the views of the private individuals and organizations which wish to become involved.

Furthermore, there is clearly a need, in my view, for some central organization which will encourage business to participate more broadly in the solution of social problems by undertaking on a contract basis what have up to now been Government functions. To the extent that industry is willing to take on these functions, we can avoid building up more Government bureaucracies and can further contribute to the strength of the private economy.

Second. The Economic Opportunity Corporation: The second bill I am introducing today would establish an Economic Opportunity Corporation whose authority would be tailored to fit these needs. It would be a nonprofit, federally chartered corporation which would concentrate in three major areas.

First. The Corporation would be an information center and provide a source of technical assistance to the private sector in connection with antipoverty activities. It would conduct the first survey of what U.S. business and labor is currently doing to combat rural and urban poverty and slum conditions and would make a wide variety of case studies of battle-tested approaches available to firms and other organizations which propose to enter the field. It would be empowered to carry on pilot or demonstration projects with businesses to develop new forms of antipoverty participation, and would make informed personnel available on request to assist private groups in the initiation of their projects. The Corporation would also provide information and assistance on Government aids and incentives to interested parties and would cooperate with Government in refining and communicating those Federal programs to the private sector. All this would be accompanied by educational efforts communicating case studies and information by way of conferences, mailings, periodical publications, and the like.

The Corporation could be particularly useful to the local urban coalitions which are now in the process of formation throughout the country and which at present have no national umbrella organization to look to for any substantial assistance. The Corporation could provide a crucial service in making available program ideas, information and technical assistance to these coalitions.

Second. The Corporation would be a center for information, research and demonstration projects designed to develop opportunities for business to undertake on contract the performance of public services. As already mentioned, contracting to perform systems analysis and management functions in social welfare programs would be particularly important. Another area of particular promise for the establishment of profitmaking public service opportunities is in the area of manpower training. The Federal Government is now experimenting on an ever greater scale with hiring private firms to undertake such training on a contract basis, and private firms themselves are letting substantial contracts to organizations which can provide them with skilled labor—for example, the steel industry has given the Board for Fundamental Education a $1 million contract for an in-plant training program.

Third. The Corporation would develop the types of business enterprise which will benefit rural and urban poverty areas and at the same time be attractive ventures for private interests. The legislation provides that the Corporation could establish profitmaking subsidiary organizations which would serve as small business development and investment companies. Such subsidiaries would perform the initial research and feasibility studies on business opportunities and then would seek out appropriate entrepreneurs to implement them. For example, such business opportunities might be developed as joint ventures between the existing companies—for example, a sewing machine company and a textile company could collaborate on establishing sewing centers for poverty area residents, who could rent the machines and purchase mill ends. Alternatively, such businesses might be initially owned by the subsidiaries of the Corporation, if they were too risky to interest any private businessmen until proven out, or they might be franchised to the local entrepreneurs on a nationwide basis. The emphasis in these activities would, of course, be on developing local entrepeneurship and management by poverty area residents. In taking on the research, feasibility studies, and demonstration projects, the Corporation would be minimizing the risk for local entreprenurs and providing the entrepreneurial talent to put projects together.

This kind of activity has been pursued successfully on the international level by the International Basic Economy Corporation. Through IBEC, new business opportunities ranging from factories to fishing fleets have been identified and developed with the help of U.S. technical assistance and capital. Similar economic research, feasibility studies, and seed money financing made available in our domestic urban and rural poverty areas could have the same productive effects.

These subsidiary organizations should be profitmaking enterprises and might even be able to issue stock or securities to the public to raise investment and seed money capital. The parent Economic Opportunity Corporation would earn dividends on the operations of the subsidiaries and these funds could support the nonprofit or loss operations of the parent company. In this manner, it is hoped that the whole venture could be self-supporting.

The Corporation itself would be established as a nonprofit organization chartered in the District of Columbia. As with the Bank, it would be organized through a Commission composed of public officials who would appoint the incorporators who would then serve as the first Board of Directors. Five members of the 15-member Board would be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and 10 members of the Board would be elected by the private members of the Corporation. Any individual, corporation, labor union, or other organization could become a member of the Corporation either by making a stated minimum contribution to it, in which case the contributor would be entitled to a tax deduction, or by buying bonds of the Corporation. It is anticipated that funds would initially be raised from the private sector largely by the contributory approach, although if the Corporation were later to prove to be self-sustaining, it might be able to offer its bonds at competitive rates on the market. The initial seed money for the Corporation would be in the form of a Federal grant of $10 million, with provisions for up to an additional $10 million in Federal funds to match private contributions.

IV. CONCLUSION

I am offering these proposals today together with my Republican colleagues as what we hope to be constructive alternatives to present governmental policy and to give greater assurance than we now have that the war on poverty will succeed.

This is not, however, intended to be partisan legislation; I am hopeful that we will soon be joined by a number of our colleagues from across the aisle whom I know to be sympathetic with the goals of these bills and with the need for bringing the private sector fully into the war on poverty.

I am hopeful, too, that the administration will join us in support of these programs. Secretary Wirtz put the matter concisely in his press conference of October 3 with Secretary Trowbridge:

> I think jobs are the live ammunition in the war on poverty, and I think the right kind of jobs are jobs in private employment, and that the best kind of training of the hard-core unemployed for these jobs is what we have come to call on-the-job training.

I agree, and the provision of jobs and jobs in the private sector is one of the fundamental purposes of this legislation.

We are introducing these proposals now in the knowledge that they will probably not receive hearings and legislative action this year, but in the hope that they will spark deep consideration and analysis of the private sector role in the months ahead.

If we can give the private sector the incentives, the framework and the wherewithal in which to operate to become effectively involved in the creation of new jobs, in manpower training and in the establishment of business opportunities in poverty areas, we will have made a great advance in the war on poverty. No other approach offers greater promise of success.

EXHIBIT 1

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PERCY, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 2572. A bill to establish a Domestic Development Bank to assist in the development of employment and business opportunities in certain urban and rural areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Domestic Development Bank Act".

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to contribute to the elimination of poverty in the Nation by—

(1) promoting the economic development or urban slum areas and of depressed rural areas characterized by substantial outmigration of persons, by providing financing on attractive terms for the establishment and improvement of business and commercial facilities and supporting public development facilities in or accessible to such areas, in order to make job and business opportunities available for residents to contribute to the physical improvement of such area;

(2) stimulating private investment in such facilities;

(3) seeking to bring together in such areas investment opportunities, public and private capital, and capable management;

(4) providing technical and other supportive assistance to aid in such economic development; and

(5) seeking to achieve these purposes primarily by the application of the financial, management and technical assistance resources of the private sector.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "eligible area" means a rural or urban area designated by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 101(a).

(2) The term "business or commercial facility" means a fixed place of business, in or from which a manufacturing, processing, assembling, sales, distribution, storage, service, or construction business is carried on, including but not limited to—

(A) an office building or place of management,

(B) a factory, plant, laboratory, service center, or other workshop,

(C) a store or sales outlet,

(D) a storage, transportation or shipping facility, and

(E) any combination thereof, including a combination of any of these facilities in the same building with residential housing.

(3) The term "supporting public development facility" means an element of infrastructure, typically developed and owned by a public agency or private utility company, which is necessary to support economic development activities under this Act, such as a transportation or power facility.

(4) The term "low-income person" means a person whose adjusted gross income (as defined in section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code) in a particular period is less than an amount specified by the Secretary of Labor as the minimum amount reasonably necessary, in the area in which he resides, to adequately support himself and his family.

(5) The term "eligible job" means a new employment position, which did not exist prior to the provision of assistance under this Act, at the business or commercial facility or the supporting public development facility assisted, and for which the wages paid shall not be lower than whichever is the highest of (A) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the participant and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof, (B) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment, or (C) the prevailing rate of wages in the area for similar work.

TITLE I—DESIGNATION OF ELIGIBLE AREAS

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, shall identify and designate as eligible areas within the meaning of this Act—

(1) those urban areas which have high concentrations of unemployed and low-income persons;

(2) those rural areas which have high concentrations or proportions of unemployed and low-income persons and which are characterized by substantial outmigration of persons as a result of inadequate employment opportunities; and

(3) those Indian reservations which the Secretary of the Interior determines should be subject to the provisions of this Act.

The identification and designation of such areas may be made without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries and shall be made in coordination with similar identifications and designations under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and other relevant laws.

(b) The Secretary of Labor, with the cooperation of the Bureau of the Census, shall prepare and publish maps showing the location and boundaries of such eligible areas.

(c) The Secretary of Labor shall, upon the request of the Domestic Development Bank, promptly certify whether any specified location is within an eligible area, including such an area whose boundaries might not yet have been defined.

TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF A DOMESTIC DEVELOPMENT BANK—CREATION OF BANK

SEC. 201. There is hereby authorized to be created a corporation for profit to be known as the "Domestic Development Bank" (hereinafter referred to as the "Bank") which shall be an instrumentality of the United States Government. The Bank shall be subject to the provisions of this Act and, to the extent consistent with this Act, to the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act. The right to repeal, alter, or amend this title at any time is expressly reserved.

PROCESS OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 202. There is hereby established a Commission for the appointment of incorporators of the Bank. The Commission shall be composed of the Vice President of the United States, who shall serve as Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Commission shall meet within thirty days after the enactment of this Act and shall appoint incorporators, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve as the initial board of directors until their successors are selected and qualified. The incorporators shall include appropriate representatives of business, finance, labor, Government, social welfare organizations, and other relevant fields, but not more than one-third of such incorporators may be Government officials or employees. Such incorporators shall take whatever actions are necessary consistent with this Act to establish the Bank, including the filing of articles of incorporation, as approved by the President.

DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

SEC. 203. (a) The Bank shall have a Board of Directors consisting of eighteen individuals who are citizens of the United States, of whom one shall be elected annually by the Board to serve as Chairman. Members of the Board shall be selected as follows:

(1) The President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint six members of the Board who shall be officials or employees of government, including Federal, State and local government. The terms of directors so appointed shall be for four years, except that (A) the terms of such directors first taking office shall expire as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of two years, and three at the end of four years after such date; and (B) any director so appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. At the discretion of the President, any individual who ceases to be an official or employee of government during his term as director may, notwithstanding that fact, complete his term.

(2) The President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint the remaining twelve members of the Board from among representatives of the private sector. Of the twelve persons so appointed, six shall be from among representatives of business and finance, two from among representatives of organized labor, two from among representatives of social welfare organizations or foundations dealing with problems of poverty, and two from among representatives of the general public. The terms of directors so appointed shall be for four years, except that (A) the terms of such directors first taking office shall expire as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one-half of the members of each category at the end of two years, and one-half of the members of each category at the end of four years after such date; and (B) any director so appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term and shall be chosen from among representatives of the same category as his predecessor.

(b) The Board of Directors shall appoint a president of the Bank and such other officers and employees as it deems necessary to carry out the functions of the Bank. Such appointments may be made without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and persons so appointed may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The president of the Bank shall be an ex officio member of the Board of Directors and may participate in meetings of the Board, except that he shall have no vote except in case of an equal division. No individual other than a citizen of the United States may be an officer of the Bank. No officer of the Bank shall receive any salary, other than a pension, from any source other than the Bank during the period of his employment by the Bank.

(c) No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Bank shall in any manner, directly or indirectly, participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly personally interested.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

SEC. 204. (a) There shall be an Advisory Committee of not less than nine persons, selected by the Board of Directors on the recommendation of the president of the Bank, which shall be broadly representative of industry, commerce, finance, labor, private social welfare agencies, and government at all levels. The Committee shall meet annually and at such other occasions at the call of the president of the Bank, and shall advise the Bank on general policy and on such other matters as the Bank may direct. Members of the Committee shall serve for such terms as the Board of Directors may from time to time determine and they shall be paid their reasonable expenses incurred on behalf of the Bank.

(b) The Board of Directors may appoint such other advisory committees and councils as it deems desirable.

(c) Any official or employee of the United States Government may accept appointment and serve on any advisory committee or council established pursuant to this section, any other provision of law notwithstanding.

CAPITALIZATION OF BANK

SEC. 205. (a) Subject to the provisions of this section, the Bank is authorized to issue from time to time and to have outstanding capital stock of an aggregate purchase price not to exceed $2,000,000,000. Shares of such stock shall be nonvoting and without par value, and shall be eligible for dividends.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to and shall subscribe for and acquire on behalf of the United States, upon request of the Board of Directors, the full amount of the stock of the Bank of an aggregate purchase price of $2,000,000,000. The subscription of the United States shall be divided into two parts as follows:

(1) Twenty per centum shall be paid at the time of subscription shall be available as needed by the Bank for its operations.

(2) The remaining 80 per centum shall be subject to call by the Bank only when required to meet obligations of the Bank created under section 206(c), except that not more than 5 per centum of such amount may be called in any period of three months.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay the subscription of the United States to stock of the Bank from time to time when payments are required to be made to the Bank. For the purpose of making these payments, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction $2,000,000,000 of the proceeds of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such purpose. Payment under this paragraph of the subscription of the United States to the Bank and repayments thereof shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States.

(c) Stock and other securities issued by the Bank pursuant to this section and section 206(b) shall be exempt securities under section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77c).

OPERATIONS AND POWERS OF THE BANK

SEC. 206. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Bank is authorized to—

(1) make, participate in, or guarantee loans or provide other financing for real or personal property or for working capital to any public agency or private organization or individual for the establishment, expansion, or preservation of any business or commercial facility or supporting public development facility which (A) is to be established or is located in an eligible area, or (B) will provide eligible jobs of which at least twenty-five in number and not less than fifty per centum shall be held by persons who prior to such employment were unemployed or low-income residents of eligible areas;

(2) make, participate in, or guarantee loans or provide other interim financing for the construction or improvement of such facilities to building contractors, subcontractors, or other persons engaged in such work;

(3) provide or assist in the provision of insurance to protect any agency, organization, or individual receiving financing for a business or commercial facility or a supporting public development facility under paragraphs (1) and (2) against damage or casualty loss in connection with such facility;

(4) plan, initiate, own, and manage such facilities where no appropriate party is available and where the Bank determines that there is reasonable ground to believe that it can later terminate its ownership on satisfactory terms;

(5) provide such technical and other supportive assistance as may be necessary in connection with its financing operations;

(6) seek to bring together investment opportunities in such facilities, capital, and capable management; and

(7) carry on such other activities as would further the purposes of this Act.

(b) The Bank is authorized to—

(1) issue bonds, debentures, and such other certificates of indebtedness as it may determine and may issue such securities on a competitive or negotiated basis at the discretion of the Board of Directors;

(2) invest funds not needed in its financing operations in such property and obligations as it may determine;

(3) buy and sell securities it has issued or guaranteed or in which it has invested; and

(4) guarantee securities in which it has invested for the purpose of facilitating their sale.

(c) Whenever necessary to meet contractual payments of interest, amortization of principal, or other charges on the Bank's own borrowings, or to meet the Bank's liabilities with respect to similar payments on loans guaranteed by it, the Bank may call an appropriate amount of the unpaid subscription of the United States in accordance with section 205(b)(2). Moreover, if it believes that a default on financing provided by it may be of long duration, the Bank may call an additional amount of such unpaid subscriptions for the following purposes—

(1) to redeem prior to maturity, or otherwise discharge its liability on, all or part of the outstanding principal of any loan guaranteed by it with respect to which the debtor is in default; and

(2) to repurchase, or otherwise discharge its liability on, all or part of its own outstanding borrowings.

(d) The Bank is authorized to establish a principle office and branch offices in such locations as it may determine. It may establish regional offices and determine the location of, and the areas to be covered by, each regional office. It may make arrangements with public or private organizations at the regional, State and local levels, including banking organizations and other financing institutions, to act as agents or otherwise to assist the Bank in the conduct of its business.

(e) To carry out the foregoing purposes, the Bank shall have such additional powers as are conferred upon a stock corporation by the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act.

OPERATING PRINCIPLES

SEC. 207. The operations of the Bank shall be conducted in accordance with the following principles:

(1) The Bank shall undertake its financing, technical assistance, and other operations on such terms and conditions and for such fees as it considers appropriate, taking into account the requirements of the enterprise, the risks being undertaken by the Bank, the benefits to the eligible area or to the residents of such areas, and the conditions under which similar financing might be available from private investors.

(2) The Bank shall consult with and shall seek to encourage local banking and other financial institutions to participate in its financing and other activities.

(3) The Bank shall, to the extent feasible, give emphasis in its activities to providing financing and other assistance to facilities owned in whole or in part by residents of eligible areas or to facilities in which such ownership is made available to such persons.

(4) The Bank shall seek to revolve its funds by selling its loans, guarantees and other investments to private investors whenever it can appropriately do so on satisfactory terms.

(5) The Bank shall, to the extent feasible, deposit or invest funds not needed in its financing operations in order to benefit eligible areas, including the depositing of such funds in local banks, credit unions, and other lending institutions serving such areas.

(6) No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Bank shall participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly personally interested.

(7) The Bank shall not engage in political activities nor provide financing for or assist in any manner any project or facility involving political parties or used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, nor shall the directors, officers, or employees of the Bank in any way use their connection with the Bank for the purpose of influencing the outcome of any election.

LIMITATIONS ON FINANCING

SEC. 208. The Bank shall not provide financing for any business or commercial facility or public development facility, nor shall it plan, initiate, own or manage such a facility, unless it determines that—

(1) other public or private financing could not be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions;

(2) adequate arrangements have been made to insure that the proceeds of any loan or other financing are used only for the purposes for which the financing was provided, with due attention to considerations of economy and efficiency;

(3) the borrower or other recipient of financing has an adequate equity or other financial interest in the facility to insure his careful and businesslike management of the project;

(4) the governing body of the city or, as appropriate, the governing body of the county, parish, or other political subdivision in which the facility is located or is to be established, or an agency or other instrumentality of such political subdivision designated by such body, has certified to the Bank its approval of (A) the establishment of the facility at the particular location, (B) the proposed standards of construction and design, and (C) provisions for the relocation of any residents or businesses to be displaced;

(5) the establishment, expansion, or preservation of the facility in the particular location will contribute to raising standards of living and skills levels for residents of the eligible area;

(6) unemployed or low-income residents of eligible areas will be given preference in filling employment opportunities created by the establishment, expansion or preservation of the facility, including the construction thereof; and

(7) no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin, be excluded from employment in any facility, or in the construction or other physical improvement of any facility, which is financed or otherwise assisted by the Bank.

EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL TAXES

SEC. 209. For the purpose of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Bank shall be considered to be an instrumentality of the United States and exempt from Federal income taxes.

AUDIT AND REPORT

SEC. 210. (a) The financial transactions of the Bank shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Bank and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians. The audit shall cover the fiscal year corresponding to that of the United States Government.

(b) A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit was made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a statement of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus or deficit; a statement of sources and application of funds; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the Bank, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President and to the Bank at the time submitted to the Congress.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 211. Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year the Bank shall prepare and submit to the President and to the Congress a full report of its activities during such year.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER ACTS

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 301. (a) The sixth sentence of paragraph Seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), is amended by inserting before the comma after the words "or obligations, participations, or other instruments of or issued by the Federal National Mortgage Association" the following: ", or debentures or other obligations of the Domestic Development Bank".

(b) Section 5200 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(14) Debentures or other obligations of the Domestic Development Bank shall not be subject to any limitation based upon such capital and surplus."

(c) The first paragraph of section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)), is amended by inserting before the semicolon in the second proviso following "any political subdivision thereof" the following: "; or in debentures or other obligations of the Domestic Development Bank".

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PERCY, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 2573. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to charter an Economic Opportunity Corporation to encourage the participation of private enterprise in the effort to rebuild urban slums and eliminate poverty in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Corporation Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title IX as follows:

"TITLE IX—ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY CORPORATION

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 901. (a) The Congress hereby finds that—

"(1) conditions of rural and urban poverty and widespread urban blight threaten the general welfare and domestic security of the country and require an expanded dedication of effort and commitment of resources aimed at their elimination;

"(2) the major resources and strength of this country reside in the private sector of the Nation's economy and any successful effort to eliminate poverty and urban blight must involve a massive application of private resources;

"(3) a substantial number of individuals and organizations in the private sector, including business firms, labor unions, foundations, educational institutions, and professional and civic organizations, are willing to contribute to the solution of these problems but their participation is often inhibited by the lack of any central source of information about successful private initiatives, the unavailability of talented management personnel, and a lack of seed money from private sources; and

"(4) the full and effective involvement of the private sector in the solution of these problems can be facilitated by the Federal government but the organization and control of this effort is best left with the private sector.

"(b) It is the purpose of this title to establish a private, nonprofit corporation to stimulate greater participation by the private sector—agencies, organizations and individuals—in public and private anti-slum and antipoverty programs by—

"(1) providing a central source for information and research on opportunities for private sector participation in such programs;

"(2) furnishing technical assistance to private organizations and individuals in planning and carrying out such programs;

"(3) providing financial assistance to such organizations and individuals to serve as seed money and to stimulate the provision of capital by private sources;

"(4) initiating and participating in pilot business ventures designed to provide needed products and services and to increase local business ownership in urban slum areas; and

"(5) developing, in conjunction with public and private organizations, methods of applying modern business management techniques to the solution of social problems, and otherwise encouraging increased participation by the private enterprise in such programs and in providing needed public services.

"CREATION OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 902. (a) There is hereby established a nonprofit Economic Opportunity Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the Corporation) which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this title and, to the extent consistent with this title, to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act. The right to repeal, alter, or amend this title is expressly reserved.

"(b) No part of the net earnings of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any private person, and it shall qualify as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 501 (a) of such Code.

"PROCESS OF ORGANIZATION

"SEC. 903. There is hereby established a Commission for the appointment of incorporators. The Commission shall be composed of the Vice President of the United States, who shall act as Chairman, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. The Commission shall meet within thirty days after the enactment of this title and shall appoint incorporators, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve as the initial board of directors until the first annual meeting of members or until their successors are selected and qualified. The incorporators shall take whatever actions are necessary to organize the corporation, including the filing of articles of incorporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

"SEC. 904. (a) The Corporation shall have a board of directors consisting of fifteen individuals who are citizens of the United States, one of whom shall be elected annually by the board to serve as chairman. Five members of the board shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms of three years except that (1) the terms of the directors first taking office shall be effective on the date on which other members of the board are elected and shall expire as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of one year, two at the end of two years, and two at the end of three years after such date and (2) any director so appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Ten members of the board shall be elected annually by the members of the Corporation.

"(b) The Corporation shall have a president, and such other officers as may be named and appointed by the board of directors, at rates of compensation fixed by the board, and serving at the pleasure of the board. No individual other than a citizen of the United States may be an officer of the Corporation. No officer of the Corporation shall receive any salary from any source other than the Corporation during the period of his employment by the Corporation.

"MEMBERSHIP IN THE CORPORATION

"SEC. 905. (a) Any person may become a member of the Corporation by—

"(1) purchasing from the Corporation one or more of the debentures of the Corporation referred to in section 906(a); or

"(2) donating to the Corporation money or property (taken at fair market value) in an amount or amounts to be determined by the board, but in no event less than $100.

"(b) Each member shall be entitled to one vote regardless of the amount of debentures held by him or the amount donated by him to the Corporation.

"(c) Any donations to the Corporation shall qualify as charitable contributions within the meaning of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"FINANCING OF THE CORPORATION

"SEC. 906. (a) The Corporation may issue such bonds, debentures, or other certificates of indebtedness at such times and on such terms and conditions as the board may determine to be required for the fulfillment of the purpose of the Corporation.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make grants to the Corporation to assist it in meeting its organizational expenses and in carrying on its activities. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $20,000,000 for the purpose of providing financial assistance under this subsection, except that $10,000,000 shall be made available to the Corporation at the time of its incorporation and additional amounts, not to exceed in aggregate $10,000,000, shall be made available from time to time to match donations or purchases of debentures made pursuant to section 905(a). Appropriations authorized under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

"ACTIVITIES AND POWERS OF THE CORPORATION

"SEC. 907. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this title, the Corporation is authorized to—

"(1) establish an information and research center on how private individuals and organizations can participate in antislum and antipoverty projects, including information on existing government programs and incentives and on promising privately sponsored projects, and including research on new governmental and private incentives or forms of organization which would be helpful;

"(2) organize educational programs, including the use of conferences and mailings, to disseminate information in order to encourage private individuals, agencies, organizations and business enterprises to participate in antislum and antipoverty activities;

"(3) provide technical assistance to public and private agencies and organizations in the planning and operation of projects;

"(4) stimulate the establishment of, invest in and operate new business enterprises which, by reason of their location, employment effect, or products or services produced, would ameliorate conditions of poverty and urban blight, including new business enterprises operated for profit by the Corporation as well as enterprises which would be owned by existing firms or by other organizations or individuals;

"(5) establish one or more subsidiary corporations, including one or more corporations which qualify as small business investment companies under title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 681 et seq.), to invest in or operate such new business enterprises;

"(6) provide technical and financial assistance to private lending institutions and other private organizations in order to stimulate the provision of capital to new and existing enterprises located in urban areas of high concentration of low-income persons or owned by low-income persons;

"(7) develop in conjunction with public and private agencies and organizations methods for the application of modern business management techniques to the solution of social problems, and otherwise encouraging the participation of private agencies and organizations in providing needed public services; and

"(8) carry on such other activities as would further the purposes of this title.

"(b) In the performance of the functions set forth in subsection (a), the Corporation is authorized to—

"(1) enter into such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as the board of directors deems appropriate to conduct the activities of the Corporation;

"(2) charge such fees as the board of directors deems reasonable and appropriate;

"(3) carry out its activities, wherever desirable, on a State or local basis through such entities as the board of directors deems appropriate;

"(4) accept and use with their consent, with reimbursement, such services, equipment and facilities of agencies of the Federal government, State government or other local political subdivisions as are necessary to conduct the activities of the Corporation efficiently, and such agencies are authorized to loan, with reimbursement, such services, equipment and facilities to such corporation; and

"(5) exercise all powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

"Sec. 908. The Corporation shall transmit to the President and Congress, annually and at such other times as it deems desirable, a comprehensive and detailed report of its operations, activities and accomplishments under this title."

A REBIRTH OF RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am pleased and proud to lend my support to two bills which the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] has introduced today.

I am pleased because the Economic Opportunity Corporation and the Domestic Development Bank will provide the procedural machinery necessary to involve the private sector of our economy in the solution of important public problems. Only by such an involvement and partnership will we begin to make a significant impact on our complex and difficult urban problems.

I am proud because these two unique and original proposals represent sound Republican thinking. These bills manifest the best in Republican philosophy in that they call upon Government to do wnat it can do best and upon the private sector for what it can do better.

I have talked for many years about the need for an Alliance for Progress here at home where the public and the private sectors would cooperate in solving our domestic problems. However, rhetoric without machinery is meaningless. From my own experience in developing the National Home Ownership Foundation Act. I know that it is not always easy to conceive workable and practical procedures whereby this alliance can be accomplished. However, the distinguished Senator from New York has provided an outstanding service in thinking through the problems we face, deciding how the private sector can be most effective and then engineering the instruments through which these programs can be implemented.

The time has come for America to realize that Government cannot solve every problem. Government does not have sufficient financial resources or expertise to tackle the variety and scope of contemporary American problems. We here in the Congress must open new doors, travel new avenues, and test new programs in the hope of finding the most effective procedures with which we can meet the challenge of the future as well as the problems of the past.

If the Federal Government will take the lead in establishing quasi-public-private organizations like Comsat, the National Home Ownership Foundation, the Economic Opportunity Corporation, and the Domestic Development Bank, which will test the will and the ability of the private sector to contribute, I am confident that the American people will respond and we will see a rebirth of individual and organizational responsibility in our Nation which will result in the betterment of American life for all.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am prepared to move that the Senate adjourn, but in the event that any other Senators has something to say, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, October 24, 1967, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Seventy-three Percent Vote "No" on Gun Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Congressional Record the results of a poll conducted in Columbus, Ohio, on October 9, 1967.

In that poll following the 6 p.m. news program on channel 4, the question was asked, "Do you favor gun-control legislation?" Persons in the audience were to call one telephone number to vote "yes" and another number to vote "no."

The results were announced on the 11 p.m. news that same evening. Twenty-seven percent of those responding voted "yes" and 73 percent voted "no."

This tends to indicate again, Mr. Speaker, the strong opposition of the American people to legislation restricting the right of law-abiding citizens to acquire firearms for legitimate sporting and defense purposes.

Questions in the 1970 Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with those who question the need and propriety of so many clearly nonessential questions being included in the 1970 Decennial Census of Population and Housing. It would seem to me that only the essential questions should call for compulsory answers; answers to any others should, at best, be on a purely voluntary basis.

Basically, the purpose of the census is to provide the Congress with information needed to decide on a basis of population how the seats in Congress should be distributed among the various States. Any other purpose that is served becomes incidental.

I have examined the 67 subject items tentatively proposed to be included, with answers to each made mandatory. One who fails to answer any of the questions becomes subject to Federal prosecution, with a possible penalty of 60 days in jail or a $100 fine.

As I see it, essential questions should be those which relate to names, addresses, relationship of the head of the household, sex, birth dates, race or color, and marital status. A bill to that effect has been introduced.

It is proposed, for example, that the census taker ask whether you share your shower, how you enter your home, where you lived at a certain time in the past, whether you use a flush toilet or a refrigerator, the amount of rent you pay, and how many of the rooms in your home have running water.

It seems clear to me that many of the

proposed questions invade the area of one's privacy. As applied to some there is danger of harassment and embarrassment.

The census should be kept as short and simple as possible, and only failure to answer those questions which are essential should subject the citizen to prosecution.

The Congress should take a close look at this.

Judge John R. Coryn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1967

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the State of Illinois has just lost one of its outstanding jurists in the untimely death of Judge John R. Coryn, of the third district appellate court.

Jack Coryn was only 38 years old when he was killed in a plane crash in Canada on October 5 of this year. He was the youngest appellate court judge in the State of Illinois and despite the fact that he was a young man at the time of his death, Jack Coryn had already achieved excellence in his chosen profession, and prior to assuming the bench he was generally recognized as an outstanding trial attorney in western Illinois. His record as an appellate court judge will be remembered by the many opinions that he wrote which will be his legacy to the bar.

I had the privilege of living in the same neighborhood and growing up with Jack Coryn in Moline, Ill., and I along with all of the rest of his friends and neighbors had the opportunity to watch him grow in stature from the time he attended Sacred Heart School in Moline and then graduated from St. Ambrose Academy in Davenport, Iowa. He then went on to the University of Notre Dame where he graduated with a B.S. degree, cum laude, in 1951, and received an LL.B., cum laude, in 1953, from the Notre Dame College of Law, ranking fifth in his law class. From 1953 to 1955 he served in the U.S. Army with the office of the judge advocate general in Germany.

After his military service he became an assistant State's attorney in Rock Island County from 1955 to 1956, and Moline city attorney from 1957 to 1961. He then served as assistant attorney general of Illinois from 1961 to 1964. From 1958 to his election as appellate judge in 1964, Judge Coryn was a partner in the law firm of Sinnett, Rink & Coryn, in Rock Island, Ill., acting as trial counsel for that firm. He served as a Democratic precinct committeeman in Rock Island County from 1958 to 1964.

Judge Coryn was a former member of the board of governors of the Rock Island County Bar Association, and was a member of the Illinois Bar Association, American Bar Association, and American Judicature Society. He was on the board of directors of the Notre Dame Law Association, as well as a member of the Institute of Judicial Administration.

Not only was he intelligent and professionally competent, but he had the even more important virtue of genuinely liking and respecting people, and in turn people liked and respected him. He loved to hunt and fish and was an avid fan and backer of all sports. He possessed great integrity and a very deep sense of responsibility.

Surviving are his parents, the J. Ralph Coryns, of Moline; two brothers, Jim of Rock Island, Ill., and Bob of Davenport, Iowa; and a sister, Mrs. John McGhee, of Toronto, Canada.

Illinois has truly lost one of its leading young citizens and it is with deep remorse that we mourn his passing.

Younger Voting Age and Judicial and Legislative Reform in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 23, 1967

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have often spoken in the Senate and in forums across the Nation on the future of State governments. I have urged that State and Federal Governments work as vigorous partners to assure the renewed success of our federal system. But to bring this about, it is evident that many State governments must reconstitute and revitalize themselves.

Just such an effort is taking place in my own State of Maryland today. A special convention has been convened, made up of delegates chosen by the people, and charged with the drafting of a new and modern State constitution. When completed and approved, this fundamental law should place Maryland's governmental structure among the most efficient and progressive in the Nation.

On three occasions in the past several weeks I have had the privilege of testifying before committees of the Maryland Constitutional Convention.

I spoke first to recommend lowering the voting age.

On the second occasion, I commented on proposals to restructure the State judicial system and on the problem of unfit judges.

My third appearance was to recommend a commission to determine legislative salaries and to urge that the length of the legislative session be determined by the general assembly rather than by the constitution.

I ask unanimous consent that my testimony on those occasions be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Testimony of U.S. Senator Joseph D. Tydings Before the Committee on Suffrage and Elections of the Maryland Constitutional Convention, October 3, 1967

Madame Chairman and members of the Committee on Elections and Suffrage, I appear here this evening to testify in favor of extending the vote in state elections to two groups now denied the vote: first, residents of Maryland who would qualify to vote except that they live on federal enclaves within the state, and, second, residents of Maryland who are over eighteen and would qualify to vote except that they have not reached twenty-one years of age.

RESIDENTS OF FEDERAL ENCLAVES

In Maryland, as in almost every state, the federal government owns a good deal of real estate. Although Maryland retains jurisdiction over much of this property, jurisdiction over some of it has been ceded to the federal government by our legislature at various times.

Frequently federal employees live on this federal land. Except for that fact, these people are indistinguishable from other residents of the state. They bear substantially all the burdens of state residence. Yet, some of them are not entitled, under Maryland law, to the most precious of state benefits: the right to vote.

Marylanders who live on federal reservations can vote if the state has retained jurisdiction over the land. But if the state has ceded jurisdiction over the land to the federal government, the federal employees on it cannot vote, even though Congress has specifically authorized the states to collect income taxes, sales and use taxes, and motor vehicle fees from the residents of these federal enclaves.

The Maryland Court of Appeals has held, in the case of *Royer* v. *Board of Education, Supervisors, Cecil County* (231 Md. 561, 191 A. 2d 446 (1963)), that residents of federal enclaves are not "residents" within the meaning of Art. I, Section 1 of the present Maryland Constitution, the article which gives the residents of Maryland the right to vote.

I think this provision of our State Constitution, which keeps some Marylanders from voting just because they live on federal land within the state, is unreasonable, unjust, and should be changed.

Withholding the vote from Marylanders who live on federal enclaves not only prevents them from voting in state elections; it also prevents them from voting in federal elections, including the election for President, because the United States Constitution leaves it to the states to establish voter eligibility in federal elections.

The Constitutional Convention Commission has wisely and justly, I believe, recommended that the new Constitution should permit residents of federal enclaves to vote in state and national elections, if they meet all other qualifications of the election laws. This recommendation of the Commission is reasonable and fair. It corrects an injustice which has accidentally arisen under the present State Constitution. I support it, because a Marylander's right to vote should not depend on legal niceties between the state and federal government.

REDUCING THE VOTING AGE

The Constitutional Convention Commission has examined the question of reducing the minimum voting age and has recommended that the voting age should not be reduced from the twenty-one years required by the present Constitution.

I respectfully disagree with the Commission's conclusion. The minimum voting age should be that age level at which the average person of that age group has attained the maturity required to make an intelligent choice from among the various candidates for the leadership of his government.

Although the twenty-one year minimum is traditional in this country, it is not sacred or immutable. Two states, Georgia and Kentucky, long ago reduced the voting age to eighteen; Alaska allows voting at nineteen; and Hawaii at twenty.

I believe Maryland should reduce the voting age. I believe that the age of eighteen—the age of high school graduation—is a reasonable minimum voting age. This Convention may choose a higher age. But I urge you to reduce the twenty-one year requirement, because no argument can justify it.

As the Constitutional Convention Commission explicitly recognized, "any decision as to voting age must be arbitrary." But some ages are more arbitrary than others.

In its report, the Commission enumerated the primary arguments for retaining twenty-one as the voting age. I believe an examination of those arguments will show that none of them offer valid reasons against lowering the voting age.

TRADITION

First, the Commission noted twenty-one is the traditional age in forty-six of the states.

Whatever justification existed for imposing twenty-one as the minimum age a century ago, the fact is that today's American young people are achieving physical, emotional and mental maturity at an earlier age than ever before. While the traditional twenty-one year old voting age has remained unchanged, the character of our population has changed dramatically, especially with regard to the education, maturity, and responsibilities assumed by our young people.

Indeed, tradition itself is no reason at all for maintaining the voting age. If tradition were a good reason to maintain a constitutional provision, we would not be holding this Convention today to revise our traditional, but badly outdated Constitution.

We should deal with the facts as they are today. The fact is that most eighteen year olds are as personally qualified to vote as most of their elders. Indeed, in some instances they are more qualified.

OTHER 21-YEAR REQUIREMENTS

Some argue that since the common age for legal majority is twenty-one, the minimum age for voting should be twenty-one. There is no compelling connection between the age set as the minimum for voting and the age set as the minimum for other state-regulated activities, such as the purchase of alcohol or the administration of an estate. The law in each case should be shaped to the subject matter involved.

In the case of voting, the question is whether eighteen, nineteen, or twenty year olds are mature enough to make an intelligent choice in the voting booth for the government leaders who tax them, regulate their lives, and can send them to war. I think the answer is clearly that these young people are as qualified to make such political judgments as most of their elders.

TOO MUCH IDEALISM

In its report, the Commission notes the argument that lowering the voting age would add to the voting population many whose idealism has not been tempered by practical experience in adult society.

I do not think that we should fear a little idealism in politics. I think we should welcome it.

Moreover, although precise figures are unavailable, the Census Bureau has given me statistics which indicate that more than one of every five Marylanders between eighteen and twenty-one is a full-time wage earner. Many others work part-time while putting themselves through college. Thousands of Maryland boys between eighteen and twenty-one are not only getting practical experience in "adult society," they are getting it in a very hard school—in the jungles and and on the battlefields of Vietnam.

OUTSIDE INFLUENCES

The argument is made that reducing the voting age would add to the voting population persons highly influenced by their parents, schools, television, and special interests.

I reject the notion that young Americans are any more susceptible than their elders to parental political influence, political pitchmen, or special interests. My experience, as a Senator speaking to high school and college groups and answering their questions in every corner of Maryland, has been that these young people—as a group and as individuals—are as acutely aware of the world as anyone in society. They know their history and current events; they are earnest and informed; they are skeptical and searching; they are no more likely to be taken in by demagogues than anyone else. As a matter of fact, they are less likely. As for undue parental influence, if eighteen to twenty-one year olds take the advice of their parents on whom to vote for, it will be, if the testimony of many parents is to be believed, the only aspect of life on which a parent's advice is the prevailing factor at that age.

If a perfect test could be devised for determining who should be able to vote, so that arbitrary age limits could be eliminated, surely some eighteen to twenty-one year olds would fail it. But, I submit that a far greater percentage of present voters over twenty-one would fail it. Because no such perfect test can be devised, we will have to continue to have an arbitrary minimum age limit. But that age limit should be based on today's realities, not those of a century ago or legalistic concepts developed during the Middle Ages.

COLLEGE COMMUNITIES

Another argument offered against lowering the voting age is that small college communities might find their municipal governments overrun by college students. Of course, the same argument can be made against having the voting age at twenty-one. Perhaps it should be increased to twenty-two or twenty-three, since most people do not graduate until that time.

But basically this argument deserves little weight because the new Constitution will certainly provide residency and registration requirements which will discourage, and probably prevent, the registration of most college students in any but their home districts. A phantom fear about a few places should not prevent the extension of the franchise to thousands of qualified young people throughout the state.

All the arguments made against giving young adults the vote have been made against every expansion of the franchise. All of them were made, for example, against the 19th Amendment, which gave women the right to vote.

The tradition of nearly every state was against it.

Other state laws were against it. Women had been legally deprived of certain rights—such as the right to make contracts—for centuries, and, it was argued, this same legal inferiority should be continued in the case of the vote.

Giving the vote to women, it was said, would add to the voting population many persons whose idealism has not been tempered by practical experience. Women would be highly influenced by their parents, schools, and handsome rogues and demagogues.

Women, it was said, would affect elections even though they had little knowledge of, or interest in, local affairs.

Fifty years have now passed since these prophecies of doom, but the Republic still stands. I believe few would argue against the point that our political system is much richer and wiser because of the participation of women in the electoral process.

I think the fears expressed against extending the vote to persons under twenty-one are just as invalid today as these same arguments were a half century ago when they were used against the universal suffrage.

I hope this Committee will recommend a lowering of the voting age, if not to eighteen, at least to some more realistic level than twenty-one. But even if you decide against lowering the voting age in the Constitution, I urge you to do as New York's convention has done in the new Constitution to be voted on in that state in November: to leave to the legislature the setting of the minimum voting age, and not foreclose the question by specifying twenty-one in the Constitution.

[Appendix to testimony of U.S. Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS before the committee on suffrage and elections of the Maryland Constitutional Convention, October 3, 1967]

THE NATIONAL CURRENT EVENTS TEST

(Results of CBS news special as broadcast over the CBS television network, Tuesday, January 3, 1967)

On January 3, 1967, the CBS Television Network broadcast "The National Current Events Test," an hour long television program to test American public knowledge of the events of 1966, on the theory that "The decisions this country makes depend upon the sum total of what we know."

Prior to the broadcast, CBS employed the Opinion Research Corporation to administer the same test to a sample of adult Americans across the country. *In addition to this pre-broadcast testing, during the broadcast CBS simultaneously administered the same test to one hundred college journalism students, including some from Morgan State College in Baltimore.*

The test itself was composed by CBS and the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey. The test contained thirty-three questions on current events including such questions as those set out below.

In scoring the nation wide sample of adults and the one hundred college students who took the test, CBS counted each correct answer as three points, so that a perfect score on all 33 questions was 99. *The average score in the national sample of adults was 48, with only 2% over 84. In contrast, the studio audience of journalism students had an average score of 78, more than 50% better than the average adult in the nation wide sample.* The average college journalism student did almost as well (78%) as the *best 2%* of the adult national sample.

3) The Viet Cong control more of the land in South Vietnam. True or False?

9) Premier Ky of South Vietnam was elected to his office by the South Vietnamese Parliament. True or False?

11) How many seats did the Republican party gain in the United States House of Representatives in the 1966 elections? A) 7. B) 27. C) 47.

16) The newest position in the President's Cabinet is Secretary of Transportation. True or False?

23) Communist China has successfully developed and tested a missile capable of carrying a nuclear warhead. True or False?

26) There is an international treaty prohibiting nations without nuclear weapons from developing them. True or False?

30) The leader is Sukarno. What is the name of his country? A) Malasia. B) The Philippine Islands. C) Indonesia.

Testimony of Senator Joseph D. Tydings Before the Committee on the Judicial Branch of the Maryland Constitutional Convention, October 4, 1967

I would suppose that the average citizen never crosses the threshold of a courtroom for more than a tourist's visit. We are fortunate that entanglements with the law in court are not an intimate part of our daily lives. But as a result it is all too easy for any one of us to assume, without further thought, that our courts are functioning fairly and smoothly. Indeed, we have indulged that casual assumption for a long time and we have paid a high price for our sluggishness.

As Chairman of the United States Senate Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, my daily work has made me starkly aware that the judicial systems in this country are struggling through a period of crisis. In some States, court dockets are so congested and the machinery of justice so clogged that people must wait for periods of up to six years to have their disputes resolved. Maryland citizens are more fortunate, but the situation is hardly ideal; and the future, far from promising. In 1965–66 the average litigant in this State had to wait almost 18 months from the date of filing before a jury could decide his case. And in some parts of ths State, 'the period of delay ran as high as two and one-half years. The poet's complaint of the "law's delay" is not mere poetry. In these times, it is a clear description of reality and, though we have long ignored it, it is now a call for reform.

In some measure, the people of this nation are responding to the call. In the last decade projects for judicial reform have been completed in more than half the States.[1] In some states such as New Jersey and California these projects have met with electrifying success. In still others, more modest gains have been made. But unfortunately, in many areas proposals for reform have been blocked and stifled at every turn.

The State of Maryland now has an opportunity, unparalleled in its history, to meet the mounting demands of our times with an effective program for judicial modernization. I am here to render what help I can to ensure that we do not miss the opportunity or respond to it with less than the full measure of our capacity. With that in mind, I truly appreciate the opportunity to comment upon the proposed Judicial Article of the Maryland Constitution.

After two years of work, the Constitutional Convention Commission has proposed changes in the structure of the court system and in the selection and tenure of judges that I heartily endorse. I have one or two questions to raise that I think worthy of further consideration, but I want to stress my support for the Article as a whole.

If these proposals are adopted, Maryland will join the ranks of those States that have established a unified judicial system. The present multiplicity of courts, varying from locality to locality, bewildering to lawyer and litigant, and unnecessarily expensive, would be replaced. In their stead, Maryland would have a simple system, governed by uniform standards of jurisdiction throughout the State, ultimately financed economically by one authority, and administered on a daily basis under clear and simple lines of responsibility.

The principle of a unified judicial system in this country is over 50 years old.[2] But age alone does not warrant its adoption. Although details of the optimum structure may vary from State to State the unified judicial system is gradually gaining acceptance across the land because it has proved to be the only sensible and efficient way to run the courts. No modern corporation would dream of conducting its business with less than a streamlined structure and clear channels of responsibility. No modern State court system should expect to do the business of justice properly with less than such an organizational framework.

My only question with respect to the proposed court structure concerns the wisdom of establishing and freezing the four tier system with two trial courts in the Constitution. The second trial court, the District Court, would have jurisdiction comparable to that now conferred upon the trial magistrate and the People's Court. These are so-called "lower courts". The proposed fourth tier, then, would be a single "lower court".

Maryland should give the most careful attention to the future of the judicial institution that will deal with the problems of seemingly lesser magnitude. As the President's Crime Commission recently documented, conditions in the so-called lower courts in this country have been allowed to deteriorate disgracefully, and that can only have an aggravating impact upon the crime problem that concerns us all.[3] It is in these institutions, not in the appellate courts, that most of the people will have their contact with the law. What they see there of justice or injustice, efficiency or bumbling, will determine whether they look upon the courts and the law with respect or cynicism. How can we expect to promote respect for the law, if the courts that have the most direct impact upon the people are forced by shabby conditions and standards to treat the people crudely?

Your Commission recognizes that other States, Illinois and Indiana, have adopted or are working on court structures involving 3 tiers. In these States, the third tier is a trial court of unlimited jurisdiction with various divisions designed to handle special kinds of cases, including those ordinarily dealt with in the "lower courts". Such a structure promotes administrative economy and efficiency and it tends to ensure that all matters on the trial level will be handled by judges of comparable competence and community reputation. Although your Commission acknowledges that the fourth tier cannot justifiably be regarded as a "lower court," we must acknowledge certain realities. For example, it will tend to be manned by judges of lesser stature.

It is true that some states have adopted the four tier system with two trial courts pursuant to the American Bar Association's Model Judicial Article of 1962. And that degree of streamlining is so significant an advance over the present maze of courts in Maryland that I would hesitate to state a firm objection to it. But the fourth tier may prove as unnecessary here as it has in States such as Illinois that have adopted more simple structures. For that reason, I would oppose enshrining the fourth tier in the Constitution. In my view the wiser step would be to establish a three tier system with a single trial court, leaving the power to the legislature to create the fourth tier if the simpler structure proves unwieldy in our State.

I might add that the elimination of the so-called lower court is a recommendation of the President's Crime Commission as well.[4] And the Journal of the American Judicature Society has already predicted that three and even two tier court systems are the wave of the future.[5] The basic point is that there is no such thing as a lower problem, a lower dispute or a lower crime, although we sometimes tend to think so. Likewise there should be no lower trial court, unless experience proves that a single trial court is unworkable. By honoring the concept of the lower trial court with the constitutional seal of approval we would make it very difficult for Maryland to establish and test the merits of a single trial court system.

Before I leave the subject of reform in the system's structure, let me touch upon one point that has given rise to an objection in some circles. One of the principle advantages of a unified judicial system is its flexibility. By contrast with the rigid structure of the system as a whole, the parts within a unified system can move about more freely. For example, a system designed for administrative efficiency can discover and transmit information quickly when needs for judicial manpower develop in certain localities. Using his powers as administrative head of the system, the Chief Justice may then promptly assign judges for temporary services in the areas of need. And under the pending proposals, he will no doubt receive important assistance from the chief judges of the appellate and trial courts acting in their administrative capacities.

Some people have expressed concern that under the transfer power their local judges will be whisked away recklessly and too often. It should be noted, however, that transfers of judges of the circuit courts already take place in this State, although the authority for them, said to be found in Article IV, Sec. 18A of the present Constitution has been questioned.[6] The pending proposal clarifies the existence of the power to transfer any judge but it also provides a streamlined administrative structure for the courts that will tend to guarantee that the power is used more intelligently. The informed use of the transfer power is an essential of an efficient judicial system. There is no reason to set up a system so inflexible that it is paralyzed to act when temporary, remedial action is called for.

Ultimately, however, any fears we may have about the use and misuse of power within the judiciary can be quieted only by assuring that we select and maintain judges of the highest quality and integrity. The pending proposals take a long step toward providing that assurance by recommending important reforms in the selection process. I regard these reforms as critical to the success of the projected modernization of the Maryland system. And we should note as well that they are fully consistent with the recommendations of the President's Crime Commission for stepping up the efficiency of our war on crime.[7] Although some have questioned the wisdom of embodying new selection procedures in the Constitution, I have no such doubt. The procedure for choosing our judges is so fundamental a feature that it deserves a central place in our fundamental document.

There is no sound reason for maintaining the present diversity of methods by which Maryland judges are selected.[8] And even less reason for retaining those features of the present system that permit contested popular elections for judicial office. The present system unfortunately permits the least attractive features of our political system to come into play in the least appropriate form. Although the proposals before you would provide for certain differences in the structure of the nominating commissions responsible for suggesting the names of candidates to the Governor, they would essentially establish a uniform process of judicial selection modeled upon the Niles Plan and known nationally as the Missouri Plan. The proposed Niles Plan resembles in every major principle the plans for judicial selection that are gradually being adopted in a greater number of states. And it should be noted that in a significant number of states and localities, the people themselves have chosen to adopt some such plan when they were given the option at the polls. In recent years, the voters of Kansas; Iowa; Nebraska; Dade

---

[1] See, Winters, *The National Movement to Improve the Administration of Justice,* 48 J. Am. Jud. Soc. 17, 19–21 (1964).

[2] See Pound, The Causes of Popular Dissatisfaction with the *Administration of Justice,* 29 Rep. Bar Ass'n. 395 (1906).

[3] See, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society 128 (1967).

[4] *Id.* at 128.

[5] 50 J. Am. Jud. Soc. 185 (1967).

[6] Annual Report of the Administrative Office of the Courts 1965–1966, p. 31.

[7] The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society 146 (1967).

[8] Judges are not only selected by different methods from level to level, but selection of judges within the lower levels differs from political subdivision to subdivision. Judges in the Orphans' Courts are popularly elected, but Trial Magistrates and Committing Magistrates are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. And the City Council appoints People's Court judges in Montgomery County.

County, Florida; and Colorado have elected to install some variant of the Missouri Plan. And in other major States, governors and mayors have voluntarily used nominating commissions for judicial selection.[9] In short, judicial selection reform along the lines of the Niles proposal has failed of adoption for the most part in cases where state legislatures have smothered it.[10] There is no question in my mind that the citizenry of Maryland would vote overwhelmingly in favor of replacing political factors with merit and competence in the selection of our jurists.

The Niles Plan would ensure perfection in judicial selection. Everyone agrees that no plan could do that. But it would minimize the negative impact upon selection and tenure that partisan political elections are bound to have and have historically had in Maryland and elsewhere.

Modern surveys demonstrate conclusively, for example, that the people have little or no idea of the names of judicial candidates in partisan elections.[11] And, as a result, able State judges have been swept out of office for no better reason than that they belonged to the political party suffering a landslide defeat in a general election.[12] The Commission's proposal would allow the people to evaluate a judge's performance by rejecting or reconfirming him at the polls. But since the judge would run only against his record, he need have no fear of being washed out of office in the wake of shifting political tides. Eliminating this fear can only help to attract men of high quality to the bench.

Both the nominating commission and the modified form of popular election are thus features of the Niles Plan well calculated to improve the quality of Maryland judges. Accordingly, I urge that the selection and tenure provisions of the Commission's draft be embodied in the document submitted to the people of Maryland for approval. The electorate of our State should have the opportunity that has been given to the people of other States to evaluate by ballot an important suggestion for reform in the selection of those who administer justice.

Once a process for selecting judges of high quality is set up, an effective judicial system should be equipped to retire and remove judges who are not longer fit to serve. The proposed Judicial article contains two such devices.

The first is the provision for mandatory retirement at age seventy, carried over from the present Constitution and extended to cover every judge in the system. Coupled with an important provision authorizing the temporary designation of a retired judge to perform judicial duties, the mandatory retirement age seems well suited to ensure the maintenance of an able bench.

Age alone is not a certain index of judicial disability, but it cannot be denied that disability frequently does accompany advancing years and most men in that position will not easily admit that to themselves. A mandatory retirement age, however, enables the aging and tiring judge to step down without having to make such an admission. It also avoids the necessity for the potentially embarrassing case-by-case investigations that may be conducted, formally or informally, when allegations are made that particular judges are fading into senility. The provision for temporary assignment of retired judges, on the other hand, tends to ensure that the law will not lose the service of those judges who can continue to function well, in limited or extended capacities, beyond the retirement age. It is true that decisions to designate or not to designate retired judges in particular instances may occasion some of the embarrassment that the across-the-board retirement age is designed to avoid. But the difficult situations are likely to be few once all judges over 70 are retired. And the provision for Supreme Court approval of these decisions will ease some of the discomfort that the chief justice might otherwise feel in relation to particular judges. In any event, I would be willing to pay that small price for a system that retains the service of older able judges.

In another important provision of the proposed Constitution, the new Supreme Court would be empowered to remove or retire judges no longer fit to serve. Again, I think a provision of this kind is so essential to a sound judicial system that it deserves Constitutional status. Maryland's present Constitution already provides for a Commission on Judicial Disabilities that may recommend removal or retirement of a judge to the General Assembly. Insofar as the proposed provision would shift removal and retirement power from the legislature to the Supreme Court, I think it would bring about an important change. An allegation of judicial misconduct or disability is a grave allegation indeed and it deserves the considered judgment of a body all of whose members have the time to devote full attention to it. As the history of impeachment proceedings in the United States Senate unmistakably demonstrates, it is highly unlikely that all the members of a legislative body can turn their full attention to such a matter when an occasion for judgment arises. Moreover, final removal and retirement power should properly be lodged with the judges themselves in order to preserve as nearly as possible the independence of the Judiciary.

In another respect, however, I regard the proposed provision as seriously deficient. It fails to give Constitutional status to a Commission that would receive and review complaints as well as recommend action to the Supreme Court. The draftsmen of the proposal indicate that they contemplate establishment of such a Commission under the new Supreme Court's rule-making power. But I would not leave any such uncertainty about the need for a preliminary reviewing body. In a real sense, it is the heart of an effective removal and retirement procedure.

The Commission is indeed the heart of the California system whose remarkable success has inspired the creation of similar institutions in Colorado, Florida, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas and Utah. No doubt the happy results of the California Commission also fostered the development of Maryland's interest in an effective removal and retirement process.

In connection with our work on fitness in the Federal judiciary, my Subcommittee held two days of hearings in San Francisco and Los Angeles to investigate the workings of the California system. And we learned there how critical to the process the initial Commission review is. I have presented materials from those hearings in the Appendix to my testimony, including the annual reports on its system that California has published thus far. But let me give you just a brief idea here of what the Subcommittee learned during its visit.

California voters adopted their constitutional amendment creating removal and retirement machinery in 1960. The preliminary Commission, of mixed lay and legal membership, receives complaints and investigates allegations. It does no more than inform the complainant if it finds his charge frivolous. If a substantial problem of judicial fitness appears, however, the Commission may act either of two ways. It may simply inform the offending judge without publicity, if it determines that a charge is sound but not of the magnitude that would warrant removal or retirement. Or if the graver sanctions are called for, it permits the judge to retire or resign on his own. In the event the judge refuses to step down, the Commission provides for a hearing, held in confidence, and subject to rules designed to ensure fairness. Rules such as these could properly be left to the rule-making power of a State's highest court. If the hearing convinces the Commission to recommend retirement or removal, the judge is entitled to a full hearing before the Supreme Court of California.

The genius of the California system is that the existence of the process at the Commission level encourage voluntary and confidential solution of most judicial fitness problems. Thus far, only one case has reached the Supreme Court whereas from seven to ten judges each year have voluntarily left office under investigation. I think you can see, too, that the confidential workings of the process are particularly appropriate for the troublesome case in which a judge must be persuaded that he has become physically or mentally unable to perform his duties. And the presence of the Commission serves a very important purpose even in frivolous cases. People are assured that someone will listen to grievances they may feel in connection with the behavior of an otherwise seemingly authoritarian judge.

One witness before my Subcommittee summarized the value of the Commission as follows:

"Thus . . . besides providing a fair and effective method for terminating office where cause exists there are important corollary effects.

"First, the very existence of the commission . . . is an important deterrent. This is with respect to situations which never become cases before the commission. It fosters a high level of performance and encourages retirement when bad health prevents carrying out the judicial function.

"Secondly, violations of ethics and derelictions which are of a minor nature not warranting removal can be dealt with.

"Thirdly, irresponsible and baseless accusations against judges can be disposed of without harm to the judiciary or without harm to the judge.

"In summary, the judicial branch is given a tool so that it can exercise its judgment for the public good on matters of fitness and conduct. This cannot help but raise public confidence in the judicial process." [13]

I cannot stress too strongly the importance of the healthy impact of the Commission upon "public confidence in the judicial process." Public confidence in the courts is a key to public respect for the law. It is no wonder, then, that the President's Crime Commission has focused upon it so sharply. Just as its report urges the upgrading of the lower courts, so it recommends adoption by the States of "commissions on judicial conduct taking the approach used in California. . . ." [14]

Accordingly, I heartily endorse the proposals for removal and retirement pending before you but I would not leave any uncertainty about the need for a Commission as the front line of defense against unfitness in the judiciary. So critical is it to the effective functioning of a sound judicial system, that it deserves a specific place in the new Constitution. To leave this important area out of the Constitution would in my judgment very likely result in the failure of the removal machinery.

---

[9] See Voters Back Judicial Reforms 50 J. Am. Jud. Soc. 115 (1966).

[10] North Dakota is the one instance in which the people have failed to approve such a selection plan at the polls. The vote was very close: 82,644 to 73,231. And the State legislature has submitted another similar proposal for voter evaluation in September 1968.

[11] See e.g. Nelson, Variations on a Theme—Selection and Tenure of Judges, 36 So. Cal. L. Rev. 4, 5, at n. 10.

[12] See Traynor, Rising Standards of Courts and Judges, 40 J. State Bar of Cal. 677, 684 (1965).

[13] See, Statement of Jack E. Frankel, Executive Secretary, California Commission on Judicial Qualifications, in *Hearings*, "Judicial Fitness," Part 2, before the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 89th Congress, 2d Sess., p. 162.

[14] The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, p. 147 (1967).

Testimony of Senator Joseph D. Tydings Before Committee on the Legislative Branch of the Maryland Constitutional Convention, October 11, 1967

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on the Legislative Branch. I appreciate this opportunity to express my views on the proper structure of the Maryland legislature. I am here specifically to make two points. First, I do not believe that a limitation on the length of the legislative session has any place in a modern state constitution. Second, I do not believe that the setting of legislative salaries should be solely the prerogative of the legislature, but rather that there should be a constitutionally-created Commission to propose adequate compensation scales to the legislature for approval.

I. THERE SHOULD BE NO LIMIT ON THE LENGTH OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

As we all know, the present Maryland Constitution provides an absolute limitation of seventy days on the session of the General Assembly. The draft constitution would relax this limitation somewhat. The seventy-day session could be extended for not more than thirty days upon the three-fifths vote of each house. Furthermore, the Governor could be forced to convene a special session upon written request of three-fifths of all the members of each house.

While the draft constitution would give the General Assembly greater control over the length of its session than presently allowed, I do not believe it provides sufficient control to the legislature. Like the Constitutional Convention's Committee on the Legislative Department, I believe there should be no constitutional limitation on the length of the legislative session. I endorse the concept of the General Assembly as a continuing body.

The constitutional limitation on the length of state legislative session has been, along with malapportionment, inadequate compensation, and insufficient staff and resources, one of the prime impediments to the effectiveness of state legislatures. The restricted legislative session has been a strait jacket which has constricted the legislature's ability to analyze and act to correct state problems and which, consequently, has nullified to a great degree legislative initiative. Worse, the limited legislative session has been a favorite tool of the obstructionist who need only delay legislation until the clock runs out to foil the will of a legislative majority. The constitutional limitation on the length of the legislative session allows time, not votes, to decide the fate of proposed legislation.

The constitutional restriction on the length of the legislative session is premised upon the falacious assumption that a state legislature can competently deal with an increasingly complex budget and growing state problems if it works less than one-fourth of the year. Legislating for Maryland's welfare can no longer be such a part-time job. When I entered the House of Delegates in 1955, the state operated on a budget of but $136 million. Yet, I found that my legislative responsibilities required almost all of my time during the session and about one-third of it during the remainder of the year. Today, the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, a national organization composed of business, labor, and educational leaders, estimates that the typical legislator spends half of his time the year round on legislative duties. This increased demand on a legislator's time is not difficult to understand. State responsibilities are ever-expanding. For example, the Maryland budget jumped from $136 million in 1955, to more than $564 million by fiscal year 1965.

For fiscal year 1967 Governor Tawes presented an $888 million budget to the General Assembly for consideration, and, as we all know, Governor Agnew proposed a billion dollar budget to the last session of the legislature. Adequate review of these growing budgets cannot be expected of a legislator who must watch the clock as well as the budget. Adequate review is not assured by placing a time limit on the opportunity to analyze and act.

An unrestricted legislative session would give the members of the legislature, not the clock, control of the session. It would provide a heretofore unknown flexibility to the legislature. It would allow the legislature to meet either for a condensed, consecutive period, as now, or several days a week throughout the year. It would allow the legislature to determine its working conditions rather than having them frozen in the constitution.

I am certain that no one would believe it wise to constitutionally restrict terms of court or gubernatorial activities to seventy days a year. Yet, there was probably a time in Maryland history when a judge or chief executive could work such a relaxed schedule without causing a breakdown in governmental machinery. But today we all know that such a time has long since passed. We expect our judges and chief executive to work full time by setting their own schedules. This Convention is even considering a provision for removal of judges who persistently fail to perform their duties and for retiring one permanently disabled. There is also under consideration a provision for determination of a governor's disability. What makes legislating such an easy task that the legislature should be only a restricted, disabled branch of government? Do we want only a rubber stamp legislature which can only react to executive initiative rather than take its own initiative?

Of course, merely ending the time restriction on the legislative session will not assure a vigorous, effective branch of government. The General Assembly must also be properly apportioned, adequately compensated, and served by a competent, professional staff. But, by removing the constitutional restriction on the length of the legislative session, this Convention can remove a real as well as psychological impediment to an improved legislature.

In opposition to a constitutionally unrestricted legislative session, it will be argued that a restriction on the length of the session provides an "impetus for prompt and efficient conduct of legislative affairs." I do not agree with this argument. The restriction on the length of the legislative session inevitably means a flood of hasty and ill-considered enactments as the concluding hour draws near. And it means, as I have argued, that an obstructionist can thwart the legislative will by time when he cannot by a vote.

The notion of a restricted session really is a vestige of an era when legislatures, as all government, were distrusted, as much because there was little information available about legislator's activities during the session as for any other reason. The people feared sending representatives to far-away Annapolis where little could be known of their activities. But that day is gone. With modern transportation, Annapolis is no longer "far away," and our modern news media keep us well-informed of activities in Annapolis.

I urge this committee to recommend to the Convention a provision making the General Assembly a continuing body. The General Assembly, not the Constitution, should determine the working time of the legislature. The will of the legislators, not the clock, should terminate a session. The legislature should have as much flexibility in setting its work schedule as the Constitution will allow the other co-equal branches of government.

II. ASSURING ADEQUATE SALARIES FOR LEGISLATORS

Legislators in Maryland and most other states receive abysmally small compensation for their public service. In thirty-five of our states, legislators receive less than $5,000 a year and in eighteen they receive less than $2,000 annually. Compensation of legislators in most states, therefore, is markedly less than the median annual salary of $25,000 for governors, $22,000 for judges of the highest state courts and $8,500 for city councilmen of cities with more than 500,000 population.

As you know, our Maryland legislators receive $4,185 annually in salary and expenses. Maryland thus ranks twenty-fourth among the states in legislative compensation, although it stands eleventh in per capita income and fifteenth in terms of economic growth. The compensation of the Maryland legislator does not begin to approach that paid to members of the executive and judicial branches. Maryland's Governor quite properly receives $25,000 per annum and associate judges of the Court of Appeals get a $32,500 salary. The compensation of the Maryland legislator also lags behind that paid in most progressive states. For example, California provides $16,000 annual salary to its legislators; Michigan pays $15,000; Pennsylvania provides $12,000; Ohio gives $8,000; and New Jersey pays $7,500. Our neighboring state of Delaware just raised the legislative salary to $6,000, and even Georgia pays $5,388 per annum to its legislators.

Why have we Marylanders allowed state legislative salaries to lag so far behind those of other state officials and other state legislators? Undoubtedly, one reason has been the concept of part-time work that surrounds the legislature and is perpetuated by the restriction on the length of the legislative session. I have already testified on the growing demands on our legislator's time.

He is continually faced with ever-increasing budgets and evermore complex problems. We expect him to develop a legislative program of his own, to introduce bills, to attend floor sessions and to participate in debate, to vote, to exercise surveillance over the state governmental bureaucracy, to answer correspondence, to perform liaison between his district and the state government and to take part in ceremonial activities. Being a state legislator is no easy or part-time task and it is time the compensation of a Maryland legislator reflected more accurately this fact and his responsibilities.

Perhaps another reason why we have allowed legislative salaries to lag has been the low esteem which many people, I fear, have for state legislators. As Adlai Stevenson said a few years ago, "To a deplorable degree, the public lacks confidence in state government, particularly the legislature." This lack of confidence has been bred by accounts of legislative incompetence and buffoonery, bribery and conflicts of interest which all too often have been true. Citizens who hear, as Marylanders did in 1965, that their state Senate had spent the last hours of its session debating the location of a garbage incinerator instead of pressing issues of vital state-wide significance, can hardly be expected to view their legislature with pride. In addition, due to malapportionment, most state legislatures have been unresponsive to the growing urban and suburban problems causing the public to look to the federal government whenever it looked beyond the local government for help. This has bred an ever-expanding and over-centralized national government whose continued growth can be attributed largely to the failure of the states to meet their responsibilities.

But all of this is beginning to change, particularly in Maryland. Reapportionment has revitalized the Maryland legislature and allowed it to come to grips with vital statewide issues.

The record of the last session of the General Assembly has been widely acclaimed. Perhaps its most important action was to enact the enabling legislation necessary to convene this Constitutional Convention.

These signs of life in Annapolis are gaining public attention and raising the prospect of truly effective state government in Maryland. More and more competent and civic-minded citizens are being struck with the idea of seeking public office in the state legislature. Yet for most of them the decision to run is a difficult one, in light of the present financial sacrifices required.

Because legislative salaries are so low, the prospect of state legislative office means severe financial sacrifice to the conscientious person not blessed with independent wealth. Many potentially excellent state legislators—family men without private means—simply cannot afford to seek and hold legislative office. Others will inevitably decide that they cannot afford to lose time from active and promising private careers for public office offering meager compensation. Our state cannot afford to lose the legislative services of these citizens.

We must realize that legislating for Maryland's welfare is no longer a part-time job and we must pay our legislators enough so that they can devote substantially all of their energies to public duties. We must compensate our legislators commensurate with the great and growing importance of their office. And we must begin to measure legislative compensation against the amount a Senator or Delegate would expect from the same time spent at his private occupation. In 1964, attorneys nationally averaged almost $14,500 a year. Even if we were only willing to compensate a legislator as well as the "average" attorney, Maryland would have to more than triple the compensation of legislators.

This Convention must take the action necessary to give hope of increased compensation for our legislators. The draft constitution takes a great step forward by removing the constitutional freeze on legislative salaries. But I do not think this is enough particularly in view of the popular rejection in 1966 of a constitutional amendment to the same effect. I believe the risk of the draft proposal is not that our legislators will give themselves too great a salary but rather that the salaries they enact will continue to be too small. An astute legislator will remember that in 1962 the Maryland electorate rejected a constitutional amendment to raise the legislative salary by $600 to $3,000 a year.

By leaving to the General Assembly the job of deciding legislative salaries, we ask each legislator to evaluate his own worth to the state—a task we do not ask of our governor, our state judges, or, indeed, any state official other than the legislator.

I do not believe we should ask any man in public life to set his own salary. I do not believe that we can leave the General Assembly with the sole responsibility for setting legislative salaries. Therefore, I propose a device which will relieve the legislator of the onus of determining what he is worth.

I propose that the new constitution establish a Commission which would meet every two years in order to review and set compensation the state provides its legislators and, indeed, all statewide elected officials. I would have the Commission selected from private life by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. I would suggest that the Commission have approximately fifteen members and I would hope that they would represent a broad spectrum of the community.

I believe that this Commission should forward its recommendations on legislative and other compensation to the General Assembly. These recommendations could be raised or lowered by the General Assembly but only by two-thirds vote of each House.

In setting legislative salaries, I suggest that the Commission be guided by the following general criteria:

(1) That legislative compensation should be set at a level which would attract the best qualified citizens to public service; and

(2) That legislative compensation should be competitive with what legislators could expect to receive for work of comparable importance and responsibility in private life.

The notion of a citizen's commission to study the adequacy of legislative and executive pay is not unknown to Maryland's sister states. Such commissions exist now or have finished their ad hoc work in Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah and Washington. While each of these commissions was created by executive order or legislation, I believe we in Maryland now have the opportunity at this Convention to create a viable continuing body to constantly reappraise the salary levels of legislators and state-wide elected officials to assure they are in line with rising living costs and growing legislative responsibilities.

Such a commission would not be without precedent in Maryland. The State Employees Standard Salary Board (Maryland Code, Art. 64A, §§ 26–30) was first created in 1941, although it was reorganized in 1953 and again in 1956. The Board prepares and recommends to the Governor a pay plan for all state employees to assure that comparable salaries are paid for comparable duties, experience, responsibility and authority. In establishing rates of pay the Board must give consideration to, among other things, prevailing rates for comparable public and private employment, living costs, and the State's financial condition. If the Governor accepts the plan, the plan has the force of law at the enactment of the next State budget if funds for the plan are provided in the budget as enacted.

I have offered but a basic framework of a Commission I consider a vital element of our Constitution. Such a Commission has ample precedent—both in Maryland and her sister states. I urge you to give it every consideration.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, we are grateful for the unquenchable impulse for things high and holy which Thou hast planted within us. As in the heat and burden of this epochal day we are called to serve the Nation and all struggling humanity, lead us for Thy name's sake to the abiding springs of fresh hope and confidence for a better tomorrow, a new faith in Thy goodness which faileth never, and in the unrealized possibilities of Thy erring children, in spite of the stupid folly by which they have devastated the good earth.

God the all-righteous one, man hath defied Thee, yet to eternity standeth Thy word.

We pray for fidelity not to shirk the issues of these momentous days. Where our deeds can help to make this a fairer world, where our words can keep despondent men on their feet, where our prayers can hasten the coming of a cleansed social order in which Thy will shall be done among men, let us speak and act and pray.

We lift our prayer in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 20, 1967:

S. 2310. An act to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

On October 23, 1967:

S. 2121. An act to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 23, 1967, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Frank W. Lehan, of Glendale, Calif., to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 657 and 658.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (H.R. 4772) to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 673), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to initiate allotments for savings deposits for members of the Armed Forces who have been captured or are missing in action.

EXPLANATION

Public Law 89–538, which was enacted on August 14, 1966, established a new savings deposit program for members of our Armed Forces. The objectives of the new program were to provide an attractive savings program for our troops overseas and to lessen an adverse balance of payments by reducing expenditures of members of the Armed Forces stationed overseas. The new law authorized the President to fix a rate of interest at not more than 10 percent per year. By Executive order, the President prescribed an interest rate of 10 percent annually compounded quartely effective September 1, 1966.

The Missing Persons Act provides authority for the Secretaries of the military departments to continue to pay and allowances of a person captured or in a missing status as a result of active service. This act also grants broad authority for the secretaries to initiate, continue, discontinue, increase, decrease, suspend or resume payments of allotments from the pay and allowances of persons in a captured or missing status, but there is no authority for the head of the department to initiate an allotment for a person in a captured or missing status to participate in the savings deposit program. This bill would provide specific authority for the secretaries of the departments to initiate allotments for members of the Armed Forces in a captured or missing status to participate in the savings deposit program. The provisions of the bill are broad enough to permit the initiation of such allotments for members of the Armed Forces who enter a missing status after the effective date of the new savings deposit program.

COST

It is impractical to estimate the cost of this bill but the Department of Defense informed the committee that the increased interest payments will not increase the budgetary requirements of the Department.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4903) to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, at the beginning of line 6, strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$17,500,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 674), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill as amended is to increase from $12 million to $17,500,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated in any fiscal year for obligation and expenditure within the Ryukyu Islands for programs approved by the President.

BACKGROUND

Since the end of World War II the United States has exercised full powers over the Ryukyu Islands, of which Okinawa is the largest. Before the war these islands were an integral part of Japan. Following Japanese surrender, they were treated as a separate and distinct territory for the purpose of occupation. Unlike Japan, where occupation was carried out under Allied authority, the occupation of the Ryukyus proceeded exclusively under American control. While control has been restored to local institutions to a large extent, the United States has overriding administrative authority and responsibility.

The treaty of peace with Japan that was ratified by the Senate on April 28, 1952, provided for an administrative separation of the Ryukyus from Japan and for the continued exercise of all powers over the Ryukyus by the United States. Under the terms of article 3 of the treaty, Japan agreed that it would concur in any proposal of the United States to the United Nations to place these islands, as well as certain others, under its trusteeship, with the United States as sole administering authority, and that pending such disposition "* * * the United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands * * *."

In Executive Order No. 10713, dated June 5, 1957, the President assigned to the Secretary of Defense the responsibility for the exercise of U.S. powers, subject to the approval and direction of the President. This Executive order charged the Secretary of Defense with the "development of an effective and responsible Ryukyuan government, based on democratic principle and supported by a sound financial structure" and with making "every effort to improve the welfare and well-being of the inhabitants."

In the budget of the United States for fiscal year 1961 the President stated:

"* * * since a system of military bases and other installations pertinent to the defense of the Pacific area has been developed in these islands, which are of critical importance to the security of the free world, it is expected that the United States will be responsible for their administration for an indefinite period."

In a sense there are two governments in the Ryukyu Islands. One is the local government of the Ryukyuans themselves. This is called the government of the Ryukyu Islands. The other government could be considered an extension of our own Government to the Ryukyu Islands. This is called the U.S. civil administration of the Ryukyus.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 86–629 provided a legal basis for U.S. programs designed to promote the development of the Ryukyu Islands. Among other things, that law provided the following authorities:

"(1) All fines, fees, forfeitures, taxes, assessments and any other revenues received by the government of the Ryukyu Islands are covered into the treasury of the Ryukyu Islands and are available for expenditure by that government;

"(2) Revenues derived by the U.S. civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands from certain designated sources are deposited in separate funds and are available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with annual budget programs approved by the President of the United States; and

"(3) Not more than $6 million was authorized to be appropriated in any fiscal year for obligation and expenditure in accordance with programs approved by the President for purposes specifically set out in the law."

Public Law 89–629 did not substantially change the situation that then existed in the Ryukyus, but it gave legal sanction to a de facto condition. It did, however, provide specific statutory authorization for appropriations made previously on the basis of treaty authority.

Public Law 87–746 increased the amount authorized to be appropriated in any fiscal year for aid to the Ryukyu Islands from $6 million to $12 million.

CURRENT SITUATION AND COMMITTEE ACTION

Since 1962 the United States has been working toward a goal of raising the levels of public health, education, and welfare services in the Ryukyu Islands over a period of years to those obtaining in comparable areas of Japan. Such programs in the Ryukyus still lag behind those in Japan. But the committee understands this has always been true and there is evidence that the standard of living of the Ryukyus has been substantially increased during the period of U.S. administration.

In response to our request, the Government of Japan has increased its contribution to the economic development of the Ryukyus. It provided $16.1 million in fiscal year 1967 and has budgeted $25.8 million for fiscal year 1968. Although these amounts are larger than the direct U.S. participation in programs for public health, education, and welfare, the committee believes the U.S. contribution to the development of the Ryukyus cannot be accurately or fairly measured in terms of direct aid alone. The United States has provided other forms of assistance to the economy of the Ryukyus. In fiscal year 1956, for instance, U.S. expenditures entering the Ryukyuan economy totaled $239.5 million, including $20.6 million for the employment of 60,000 Ryukyuans, $64.6 million in public and private loans and investments, and $60.4 million in expenditures by U.S. personnel and our nonappropriated fund activities.

One of the reasons the committee considers it not inappropriate for Japan to make larger direct payments for public health, education, and welfare services in the Ryukyus Islands is that the existence of U.S. military power provides defense protection for Japan, as well as for the Ryukyus. Without these expenditures for defense by the United States the Government of Japan and the government of the Ryukyus would need to spend large sums for defense.

The executive branch proposed aid to the Ryukyu Islands in fiscal year 1968 of $19.5 million, $7.5 million more than the current authorization. Of the $7.5 million of additional authorization, $6.1 million was intended for education programs, $1.2 million for public works, and $0.2 million for economic development—$5.6 of the $6.1 million in educational programs was for the compensation of teachers. In reality, the United States would have discharged this much of teacher salary expense now being borne by the government of the Ryukyu Islands, thus making these funds of the government of the Ryukyu Islands available for other improvements.

Okinawa, the largest island of the Ryukyus, is our most important military base in the Far East and the United States has a large financial investment there. The committee recognizes the responsibility of the United States for contributing to the welfare of the people of the Ryukyu Islands. The committee also was mindful of the fiscal importance of reducing U.S. expenditures under circumstances now obtaining. Accordingly, the committee recommends a new authorization ceiling of $17.5 million. Consequently, $2 million of the proposed $7.5 million in additional programs for fiscal year 1968 must be postponed. Identification of the programs to be reduced or postponed depends upon a reevaluation of relative priorities.

COST

If appropriations are made in full against the new authorization, enactment of this measure would result in additional annual costs of $5.5 million.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize an increase in the number of permanent professors at the U.S. Military and Air Force Academies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., expressing the urgency of legislation to carry on the necessary expenditures of that Office (with an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

[State of Illinois, 75th General Assembly]

SENATE RESOLUTION 178

Whereas, the rescue of Lake Michigan from death through pollution being caused by the oil and industrial waste being dumped into it is the number one problem facing the people of Illinois, and of Chicagoland particularly, today; and

Whereas, the State of Illinois, although it has the greatest stake in preserving Lake Michigan as a viable lake, is not the principal source of the pollution being dumped into it and is barred by the territorial jurisdiction of other states and the power of our federal government over navigable waters from effectively controlling most of the sources of this pollution; and

Whereas, both bodies of this 75th General Assembly have jointly and severally urged Congress to enact legislation designed to save Lake Michigan as a viable lake and a priceless asset of all the people whose life and livelihood are dependent upon its usefulness; and

Whereas, Senator Dirksen and Senator Percy, our two senators from Illinois have responded to this pending disaster being inflicted on the people of Chicago and, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin and Michigan, by introducing in the Senate on September 25, 1967, Senate Bill 2457, which makes it a dangerous offense to release oil in the Great Lakes; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Senate of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we urge Congress to pass Senate Bill 2457 recently introduced therein by Senators Dirksen and Percy concerning the releasing of oil into Great Lakes waters, providing stiff penalties for violators and charging the Secretary of Interior with its enforcement; that we stress the emergency that we feel is involved as to the well being of the people of Illinois and others along Lake Michigan's shores; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is directed to transmit suitable copies of this preamble and resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to all the members of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the Senate, October 16, 1967.

W. R. ARRINGTON,
President pro tempore.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

CONVENTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC ORGANIZATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive O, 90th Congress, first session, the Convention on the International Hydrographic Organization, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the Convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed for the use of the Senate, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Senate, for your advice and consent, the Convention on the International Hydrographic Organization, done at Monaco on May 3, 1967, and signed for the United States on September 13, 1967. The general and financial regulations annexed to the convention are transmitted for your information.

The convention provides a treaty basis for the work of the International Hydrographic Bureau, an association of 41 maritime states founded in 1921 to make navigation easier and safer throughout the world. The United States has participated in the Bureau since 1922, pursuant to congressional authorization.

The primary task of the Bureau is to coordinate the activities of national hydrographic offices, promoting uniformity in their nautical charts and documents and encouraging adoption of reliable and efficient hydrographic surveying methods. It operates effectively in the field of hydrography but has been hampered in administrative matters through lack of recognized status. The convention would remedy this by establishing an international organization, with juridical status, within which the Bureau would continue to operate.

This scientific and technical association provides an opportunity for international cooperation in the hydrographic sciences and performs a valuable service to maritime navigation. The convention would facilitate and carry forward its important work. I recommend that you give the convention your early and favorable consideration.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 24, 1967.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 5894. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 676).

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America (Rept. No. 678).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi (Rept. No. 681);

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion (Rept. No. 680); and

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego (Rept. No. 679).

RE-REFERRAL OF H.R. 6167 TO FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 677)

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report H.R. 6167, a bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and a new loan, and for other purposes.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] has requested me to have the bill referred to the Foreign Relations Committee in order that they might examine certain aspects of it. I have discussed the matter with him today over the phone.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to report back to the Senate within 14 days.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide more equitable treatment for U.S. export trade; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2575. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture under certain disaster conditions to purchase hay and other feed in order to provide for surviving livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKE:

S. 2576. A bill for the relief of Antoinetta D'Amico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2577. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Giannakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 2578. A bill for the relief of Yuen Hing, Wong Hing, and Wu Fuk Ching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (by request):

S. 2579. A bill to amend the Enabling Act of the State of New Mexico with respect to miners' hospitals for disabled miners; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2580. A bill for the relief of Joaquin G. Serantes; and

S. 2581. A bill for the relief of Dr. Edmee Serantes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study the poverty program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO LIBERALIZE SUBPART G OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, which would modify sections 970 and 971 of the Internal Revenue Code.

This legislation has been formulated as a result of the work of the Action Committee on Taxation and Exports of the National Export Expansion Council. This committee submitted its report in February 1966, and among its recommendations was the following:

> The complicated and restrictive rules for obtaining tax benefits as an export trade corporation under Sections 970, 971 and 972 of the Internal Revenue Code should be simplified and liberalized. As a minimum step, the limitations on the profits excludable should be changed to one overall limitation of 10% of gross receipts each year. Furthermore, an export trade corporation should be allowed the benefits of these sections when selling to a related corporation in a foreign country provided that the related corporation resells the U.S. goods to an unrelated trade customer.

The chairman of the committee, Carl A. Gerstacker, has suggested to me that it would be useful to cast this recommendation in legislative language for the purpose of encouraging further discussion of the possibilities which such legislation may have for increasing U.S. exports and improving the Nation's balance of payments.

Generally, this bill proposes to liberalize the restrictions imposed by subpart G to the code in 1962, relating to "export trade corporation" and "export trade income." A reading of subpart G suggests that these provisions may be somewhat complex and limiting.

The specific operation of the proposed legislation is explained in a section-by-section analysis which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2574) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide more equitable treatment for United States export trade, introduced by Mr. Smathers, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. Smathers is as follows:

Section-by-Section Analysis

The sections affected by introduction of the proposed legislation—970–972—make up Subpart G of the Internal Revenue Code and originated as a part of the Revenue Act of 1962 (26 U.S.C. 970–972; P.L. 834, 87th Cong.).

Generally, the 1962 Act subjects to current U.S. taxation the foreign income of "base companies," i.e. corporations which are affiliates of U.S. parent companies and are headquartered in one foreign country while selling to other foreign countries. The function of Subpart G is to reduce the Subpart F income subject to tax in the case of "export trade corporations" with "export trade income" as defined by these sections.

SECTIONS OF THE BILL

Section 1. The first section of the proposal would amend Sec. 970(a) (2) to eliminate the overall limitation prescribed by the subsection for all taxable years after January 1, 1967.

Section 2. This section would amend 970(b) to repeal the re-inclusion provision of the sub-section for all taxable years after January 1, 1967.

Section 3. This would make 1966 a permanent base year for the computation of decreases in investments in export trade assets dealt with by sub-section 970(c). The effect of the proposal would be that a decrease described by this Section would arise only if the investment falls below the 1966 figure. For example, if there were net increases in investments of $5 million in 1967, and decreases of $1 million in each of the next four years, there would be no Statutory decrease, because the net investment would remain above the 1966 figure.

Section 4. This would allow the foreign base company to resell to another related party or affiliated company, as long as the ultimate sale of the merchandise would be to an unrelated party for purposes of use and consumption. The application of this section would be to so-called "super distributing companies" which might be dealing with wholesalers in many countries.

Section 5. This section would amend subsection 971(d), which now requires that "export promotion expenses" can only qualify for Subpart G exclusion if 90% of the expenses were incurred in the United States, and the 90% figure is met with respect to each of the four separate categories of expenses: salaries, rentals, depreciation, and other ordinary and necessary corporate expense. The proposal would apply the 90% test in an overall unitary manner.

Section 6. This section proposes an effective date, the tax year beginning January 1, 1967.

Mr. SMATHERS. In addition to the proposal contained in this bill, there were other recommendations in the Export Expansion Council's report, and there are still others which are receiving the active consideration of business groups and Government agencies. I hope that the measure introduced today will widen rather than narrow the alternatives which are presently being discussed.

In this connection, the Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has long recognized the importance of stimulating new exports by the more than 90 percent of the Nation's manufacturers and agricultural units which are small businesses.

It has been reported that there were 12,000 U.S. firms engaged in exporting in 1960 and, by 1966, this figure had risen to only 13,000.

Early this year the committee authorized a series of field hearings designed to interest all segments of American business in assessing the potentials and problems of building export industries in regional products over the next decade. The first of these sessions was held in the Pacific Northwest at Portland in May. The second is scheduled for November 10 and 11 in Mobile, for the gulf, and the third on the St. Lawrence Seaway will take place in Milwaukee on December 1 and 2. The fourth in the series, for the North Atlantic, will be held sometime next year, and I hope that we will be able to hold the concluding hearings in my State of Florida.

On the latter occasion, I believe that we could examine the question of tax incentives for exports, and develop some balanced legislation which would have the effect of affording practical benefits to small exporters and proposed exporters, and would be consistent with our international obligations while at the same time satisfying the Treasury Department that any loss in revenues would be minimal.

In my opinion, legislation of this kind is needed in view of the prolonged balance-of-payments deficit and the recent shrinkage in our trade surplus. For the past year, 1966, the balance on the export-import account fell to $3.7 billion, the lowest such surplus since 1959. This year, trade is looking only slightly better, at about $4.5 billion—compared to a $6.7 surplus in 1964—and the overall deficit appears to be worse. The Wall Street Journal of August 17 reports that the deficit for the first half of 1967 ran at a rate of $2.1 billion, a substantially poorer showing than the $1.4 billion the first 6 months of 1966. In an article in the Washington Post, columnist Joseph Slevin predicted this year's deficit "would match or exceed a 20-year high of $3.9 billion that was reached in 1959 and 1960."

I have said on several occasions that tax incentive and other measures to increase exports were more positive and desirable methods of improving the balance of payments than the controls of capital which others seem to favor.

In the months to come, I am looking forward to having the Small Business Committee cooperate with the departments, agencies, and business groups concerned, in the interest of arriving at an export incentive measure upon which the Treasury Department, the Congress and the business and industrial communities can join forces.

It is my hope that the combined efforts of all who are working in this field will result in the establishment of a sound foundation for lasting progress in the Nation's export trade and balance of payments.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles to which I have referred be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks for informational purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The articles presented by Mr. SMATHERS are as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 17, 1967]

PAYMENTS DEFICIT WIDENED FROM 1966 IN THE SECOND PERIOD—GAP AT SEASONALLY ADJUSTED $513 MILLION WAS SLIGHTLY LESS THAN FIRST QUARTER'S—LOANS TO FOREIGNERS CLIMBED

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. balance-of-payments deficit stayed nearly as deep in the second quarter as in the first and was much worse than in the like 1966 period, the Commerce Department said.

The overall deficit was a seasonally adjusted $513 million, the report said, somewhat less than the $536 million in the first period but considerably wider than the $122 million of the second quarter last year.

Despite further fattening of U.S. gains on merchandise trade and some statistically beneficial transactions with other governments, the report showed that the total dollar outflow continued excessive mainly because of dealings for which details aren't yet available, including military, investment and tourist outlays. In addition, bank lending put more dollars into foreign hands for the first time in a year.

In the first half of this year, the deficit ran at an annual rate of almost $2.1 billion, a substantially poorer showing than the total of less than $1.4 billion for all 1966.

The U.S. has a payments deficit when foreigners acquire more dollars than they return in all transactions. Those dollars ending up in the hands of foreign central banks and governments generally may be used to buy gold from the Treasury at the fixed price of $35 an ounce.

The deficit total reported by the department doesn't clearly show the actual change in foreign dollar holdings, though, because it combines this sum with a change in U.S. reserves and because it adjusts the dollar changes to smooth out seasonal swings.

Without seasonal adjustment, the report showed, foreigners ended the second quarter holding $614 million more than at the end of the first quarter. Dollars held by private foreigners rose by $96 million, and those in foreign official accounts rose by $518 million.

The reserves that the U.S. uses to cope with such deficits, however, increased by $419 million in the quarter. The U.S. gold stock declined by $15 million, but automatic ability to borrow foreign currencies from the International Monetary Fund rose by $10 million, and the Government's ownership of foreign currencies rose by $424 million.

The unadjusted trend was "probably a little worse" than in the first quarter, one analyst said, because of heavy purchases by foreign government accounts of certain securities with original maturities of a year or more. Dollars put into such securities, often bank certificates of deposit, cause a "statistical improvement," the report said, because they don't count as part of the deficit. However, they are roughly as real a threat to the U.S. gold stock as dollars kept in instruments of less than one-year maturity, officials believe.

In the second quarter, foreign official accounts acquired $607 million of such deficit-shrinking securities, almost double the $306 million of the first quarter. Investment in such securities can be viewed as an indication that other governments don't intend to cash in their dollars quickly for gold, officials say, but the large amounts involved make some officials wonder if the favorable dealings can continue for very long.

The basic favorable factor in the quarter, officials said, was that U.S. exports rose to a $30.9 billion seasonally adjusted annual rate while imports slipped slightly to a $26.3 billion rate, so that the surplus on merchandise trade alone mounted to a $4.5 billion annual rate. The 1966 trade surplus totaled $3.7 billion.

Farm products accounted for most of the U.S. export gain, the report said, with lackluster economic growth in many European countries and a decline in foreign-aid-financed shipments to Asia working against a broader gain. The relatively slack U.S. economy limited imports by reducing the need for industrial materials and by inducing many businesses to work down inventories, the report said. Also, the excess capacity in U.S. manufacturing let domestic companies supply more of the nation's needs, it added.

While banks remained well within the guidelines set by the Federal Reserve Board to limit their loan outflows to foreigners, the report said that the adjusted net outflow from their transactions was about $170 million. This was the first increase in bank credit to foreigners since the like quarter of 1966 and "probably reflected the easing of money market conditions here," the department stated.

Altogether, capital movements for which data are available were slightly on the favorable side in the second quarter after a net outflow in the first, the department said. U.S. investors on balance sold off existing foreign securities, and their purchases of new foreign issues declined slightly despite a "considerable increase in purchases of Israeli bonds." Net sales to foreigners of private U.S. securities drew in some $350 million from abroad after seasonal adjustment, compared with a little more than $100 million in the first quarter.

In another development, Treasury Secretary Fowler said the U.S. dollar outflow through transactions subject to the interest-equalization tax was "very small" in the first half, but he stressed that the question of what tax rate to apply next is still open.

Under recently enacted legislation, the tax on Americans' purchases of foreign securities from foreigners was increased by 50%, with President Johnson empowered on Aug. 30 to keep it at its current level or set it at any lower rate. The tax currently adds 22.5% to the cost of foreign-stock purchases and 1.5 percentage points to the borrowing costs of foreign bond issuers.

Previously, officials indicated that the tax would be set in the upper end of the permissible range. But Mr. Fowler didn't give any hint of what will be decided.

The secretary stressed a recent narrowing of the gap between U.S. and European interest rates; this, other officials added, could let a relatively low tax rate serve as a sufficient deterrent. However, an opposite consideration, they added, is that they hope U.S. interest rates will be brought down soon by President Johnson's income-tax increase proposal.

Separately, the Internal Revenue Service said securities dealers considered "participating firms" and "participating custodians" under the interest-equalization tax law have more time to file their "transition inventory" statements. Companies that qualified before Aug. 15, the IRS said, are being given an extension to Aug. 28 from the previous deadline of Aug. 15.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 5, 1967]

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT STILL RISING

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

Gold and dollars are pouring out of the United States at a disturbingly rapid pace.

The critically important balance of payments deficit is going to be bigger this year than it was in 1966. Top officials glumly say that no substantial improvement is in sight.

Administration flash reports indicate that the gold and dollar outflow climbed to a $2.2 billion a year rate in the first half of 1967. The total loss amounted to a markedly smaller $1.4 billion last year.

Officials hope that the second half of this year will be somewhat better than the opening six months but they frankly admit that it could just as easily be worse.

The weakening of the U.S. payments position comes as a fresh setback to President Johnson's faltering campaign to balance this country's foreign accounts. The deficit now is surging above the $2 billion mark for the eighth time in the past ten years and the President's goal of a surplus has been pushed further into the future.

Actually, this year's real deficit will be even bigger than the total that the Government will report. The Administration uses an assortment of gimmicks to dress up its payments accounts just as it uses them to make its budget deficits look smaller. Informed officials say the blunt truth is that the 1967 deficit would match or exceed a 20-year high of $3.9 billion that was reached in 1959 and again in 1960 if it were not for the Administration's sleight-of-hand.

The U.S. chronically runs payments deficits because it lends, spends, and gives away more than it earns from overseas transactions. Foreign countries take payment partly in gold but mostly in dollars. They now have more than $29 billion in claims that they theoretically could present for collection against the shrunken $13 billion U.S. gold stock.

Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler stresses that Vietnam is a major cause of the worsening payments position. The U.S.

> is spending some $1.3 billion a year in Asia to buy oil, cement, steel, food, and other supplies that it needs for the war.
>
> Vietnam costs are going up slightly less swiftly this year than in 1966 but they still are rising. Defense outlays in Europe and elsewhere contribute to the deficit. So do new business investments in foreign countries, foreign aid, and the increasingly heavy expenditures of American tourists.
>
> The Administration now plans to carry out a full-scale review of the U.S. payments problem this fall.
>
> European financial officials are not happy about the mounting flow of paper dollars that they have been taking in settlement of the U.S. deficits. The Administration will be under heavy pressure to adopt a tougher payments program unless the U.S. situation suddenly improves.
>
> The proposals to be considered will include tourist spending curbs, foreign aid restrictions, controls on capital movements, and firmer limits on the foreign operations of American companies.
>
> All have been discussed and rejected before. They are politically distasteful and they run counter to the freer trade principles that the U.S. advocates. But there is a growing conviction that the payments situation cannot be allowed to deteriorate further.

AMENDMENT TO FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1965—TO SAVE LIVESTOCK IN DISASTER AREAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, under certain disaster conditions, to purchase hay and other feed to be provided for livestock.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2575) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture under certain disaster conditions to purchase hay and other feed in order to provide for surviving livestock, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when the immediate fury of a sudden disaster has subsided, people in the disaster area begin the salvage job. The salvage job is always difficult, but in the case of farmers and ranchers, the process can be complicated. For example, a flood will scatter cattle; some will be stranded and some lost. A flood or a blizzard can make it impossible for the owner to get to cattle to feed them.

I had a personal experience in this respect when I was in south Texas during and immediately after Hurricane Beulah. I inquired about the cattle losses. The ranchers said:

> We don't know. The cattle have floated down the river. We hear that some got out of the water and didn't drown.

Bodies of drowned cattle were found at various points, scattered by the floods. It will take time to round up the cattle and find out how many drowned and how many are alive.

Federal law currently allows the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, following a declaration of major disaster, to furnish Commodity Credit Corporation-owned feed grains free of charge. It goes to the appropriate State agency on a short-term basis for feeding livestock stranded, unidentified, or commingled because of hurricane, flash flood, or other sudden disaster. Such feeding will continue until their owner can reassume responsibility for them. The CCC has no funds to buy hay or mixed feed, only grains.

Generally horses, sheep, or hogs can handle straight grain. Cattle need hay or mixed feed.

In order to furnish mixed feed or hay, the Secretary of Agriculture must negotiate a contract with the Office of Emergency Planning for funds with which to buy it—after the declaration of major disaster has been issued. By the time this negotiation has been accomplished, the cattle either have found feed for themselves, have starved, or they are weakened to such an extent that they die of disease. Many that do not die are in such bad shape that it might take up to 2 months to bring them back to predisaster condition.

The Secretary of Agriculture can feed people immediately without any of these time-consuming delays. He should have the same authority to feed cattle as he does to feed people in the case where a sudden emergency occurs—that is, without a declaration of major disaster, without any negotiation with the OEP.

Congress has been reluctant in the past to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to make donations without a declaration of major disaster from the President. This is a wise policy whenever it can be utilized without unwarranted consequences. This policy is especially suited to a situation where the disaster builds up slowly, such as a drought. But where the disaster occurs suddenly such as a flood or blizzard, the delay occasioned by waiting for the disaster declaration can have ruinous consequences. Even when the request from the Governor is immediately forthcoming, delay is still a problem, since the Secretary cannot feed hay until he has negotiated a contract for funds with the OEP.

This livestock problem is common to all the hurricane-prone States on the Atlantic and the Gulf; the flood-prone States on the Pacific; and the middle and northwestern blizzard-prone states.

To remedy this situation, I propose this bill to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. This bill would amend title VII of section 709 by adding a new subsection. It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use CCC funds to purchase hay and mixed feed and to make it available to livestock that are in need due to sudden disaster on a temporary basis. This hay and mixed feed would be furnished without charge to livestock that are stranded or whose ownership is unknown or uncertain because of such a disaster. The Secretary of Agriculture could purchase and feed this hay and other mixed feed without the necessity of a declaration of major disaster from the President and without negotiations with the OEP.

BIPARTISAN STUDY OF THE POVERTY PROGRAM: THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION ACT OF 1967

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution that would establish a bipartisan Economic Opportunity Commission to study the many aspects of the poverty program and determine the degree to which State and local public agencies participate in such programs and activities. The measure places particular emphasis upon the community action programs and the degree of cooperation between local public agencies and community action agencies and the policy and procedures to be followed to encourage local participation and cooperation. Another specific area of the study will be the proper role of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the executive departments of the Federal Government in the administration of antipoverty programs.

The Commission itself is to consist of 12 members, four appointed by the President from private life; four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate, and two from private life; and four by the Speaker of the House, two from the House, and two from private life. The appointments in each category are to be evenly divided between the majority and the minority parties.

Mr. President, the need for such a bipartisan study of this controversial program and I stress the bipartisanship of the Commission, is essential if we are to have the facts before us in order that the further activities of the poverty program may be judiciously considered. I have heard it often said in defense of the program that perhaps no other new concept in our Nation's history has been more studied and investigated. This is most probably true; however, in the main such studies have been conducted by the Office of Economic Opportunity itself. We need an objective inquiry into these activities to give us an unbiased account of this entire field of operation.

The need for such a study is quite clear; we are constantly hearing charges that the entire program is being carried out in a most inefficient manner; these charges are answered by claims that this is not so. The only thing that we in the Congress have been able to rely on thus far is the studies to which I have referred. Self-introspection on the part of poverty program officials will not suffice.

The results of this Commission's work, called for in my proposal, can only be beneficial to the Nation. If it is proven that the Office of Economic Opportunity and other agencies are now performing their functions well, then public confidence, which is badly shaken, can be restored. If on the other hand, it is found that the program is being run badly, as is feared by many, then we in the Congress could correct these inequities and help the program to achieve direction and real meaning for the Nation's poor.

Mr. President, I would hope the Senate would act swiftly on this matter. It is our duty to see that any money spent by this Government is money well spent and not merely used as a political tool. Confidence in our Federal programs must be maintained.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 118) to

establish a Commission to study the poverty program, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS JOINT RESOLUTION, 1968—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 420

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware proposed an amendment to the amendment of Mr. MUNDT (amendment No. 419) to House Joint Resolution 888, which was ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when proposed by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 421

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 422

Mr. ALLOTT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House Joint Resolution 888, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. ALLOTT, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2419) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels, and for other purposes.

CORRECTION OF COSPONSORSHIP OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on October 19, 1967, an error was made in a unanimous-consent request for the RECORD in which the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] were added as cosponsors of S. 2467. I ask unanimous consent that the consent be withdrawn and that, at its next printing, their names be added as cosponsors of S. 2463 to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 so as to eliminate therefrom certain provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to certain individuals otherwise eligible therefor because of their membership in certain subversive organizations or their prior conviction of crimes involving subversive activities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WHY NOT HEED THE VIEWS AND ADVICE OF GENERALS BRADLEY, GAVIN, AND RIDGWAY?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Gen. Matthew Ridgway was one of the very great commanders of our Armed Forces in World War II. I am proud to say that I was a humble major in our Army overseas, and he was my commanding officer. Later, General Ridgway became commander of the United Nations forces in Korea following the dismissal of General MacArthur. Subsequently, he was appointed Chief of Staff of the Army. When holding hearings in August on our policy in Vietnam, did the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate invite him to appear as a witness? It did not.

General Ridgway is one of our most experienced and outstanding military leaders. It is noteworthy that his views regarding the involvement by President Johnson of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers in a ground war in Vietnam coincide with the expressed views of Gen. Omar Bradley, one of our greatest World War II field commanders and a former Chief of Staff, and of Gen. James Gavin, former Chief of Plans and Operations of the Army. General Gavin, of course, is one of the most brilliant strategic thinkers of our Army and is a former Ambassador to France. Surely, these great generals and their convictions that we are waging the wrong war in the wrong place and at the wrong time and that what we are doing in North Vietnam and in South Vietnam adds up to the gravest mistake that any U.S. President ever made should not and cannot be dismissed lightly. Their views certainly should be considered.

Would any sane man claim that Walt Rostow has had as much on-the-job training as Gen. Matthew Ridgway, for example? Could Dean Rusk wave off with stern disdain that his knowledge and his judgment are superior to the knowledge, judgment, and the sound experience of Generals Ridgway, Gavin, and Bradley? At that, this list of generals, who were heroes and great leaders in World War II and who are utterly opposed to our Vietnam involvement, could be considerably expanded, as numerous other experienced and knowledgeable retired generals and admirals consider our Vietnam involvement a horrible blunder.

Gen. Matthew Ridgway months ago publicly endorsed retired Gen. James Gavin's advice that we should immediately cease the bombing of North Vietnam, that we should stop that bombing without attaching any conditions, and then withdraw our Armed Forces to coastal enclaves such as Saigon and Cam Ranh Bay and other Guantanamo-like bases where our forces would have the cover of our airpower and the support of our 1st and 7th Fleets. These generals are deeply dismayed, and they are perplexed and dumbfounded over the military course the leaders of the executive department of our Government have been taking in Vietnam.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. General Ridgway also responded immediately to criticism of the enclave tactic. He said we have been and are engaged in an enclave war in Vietnam. He said this would continue to be the situation until and unless this administration undertook a foolhardy invasion of North Vietnam by our ground forces. Unthinkable as that should seem to any sane-minded American, we hear more and more talk of the possibility of a land invasion of North Vietnam by our forces and by the friendly forces, so-called, of South Vietnam—although, I may say parenthetically, they are too friendly to fight even on their own soil in South Vietnam, where they do no fighting, let alone to fight in North Vietnam.

General Ridgway is the author of a book on the Korean war, recently published, and in that book he makes it crystal clear that he is dismayed by and opposed to our involvement in the Vietnam civil war. Furthermore, he is apprehensive at the sound of voices such as Dean Rusk's, or as he stated:

> Influential voices assuring us that China would not dare make a move against us.

He expresses wonderment and doubt that our military planners could be lulled by faulty reading of the Communist Chinese mind.

It is evident he has an acute recollection that his then commanding officer in the Korean fighting, General MacArthur, ignored the intelligence furnished him by our Air Force that the Chinese had some hundreds of thousands of men of their armed forces on the northern bank of the Yalu and were about to invade North Korea. General MacArthur scornfully disregarded the Air Force intelligence and accepted the intelligence and confident assurances of the Central Intelligence Agency and of the Army that our troops could safely advance northward in North Korea to the Yalu, and that the Chinese would not cross the Yalu and attack.

General MacArthur was so deceived by the CIA and Army intelligence, he announced that the war in Korea had been won and the boys would be home by Christmas. The next day the Chinese attacked. MacArthur's two armies were caught in the strategically unsound position of having a mountain range cutting his forces in two. The forces of the United Nations were hurled back and we Americans suffered thousands of casualties in the terrible days and nights of fighting that followed.

General Ridgway recently called attention to the fact that although we Americans controlled the air over the entire Korean peninsula, General MacArthur acknowledged our inability to isolate the battle area by air bombardment and our inability to choke off the flow of reinforcements and supplies to the south from North Korea. General Ridgway stated in Vietnam results have repeated this lesson. Rails and bridges are repaired and functioning within a few days of a bomb attack. Infiltration routes have not been cut off. Yet, there is more and more clamor for saturation bombing of North Vietnam in an effort to cut off North Vietnam from the south. He says that effort is bound to fail.

Finally, it is evident to General Ridgway that President Johnson and Secretary Rusk are intent on total victory in Vietnam and not a diplomatic settlement. This means an all-out war. General Ridgway believes, and he states:

> The ending of an all-out war in these times is beyond imagining . . . It may mean the turning back of civilization by several thousand years, with no one left capable of signalling the victory.

It is said that President Johnson, more than any other President, has a fine habit of telephoning to secure a consensus, or in other words, the benefit of the views and advice of those he calls. It seems strange indeed that apparently he has never telephoned General Ridgway. General Ridgway was asked this very question. He responded quietly, "No, I haven't been in Washington lately."

This question and answer were of more than a year and a half ago. Since that time a hundred thousand of the finest young men and the best trained and best equipped ever fielded by any nation for war have been killed or wounded in Vietnam. The hour is late, but it is not too late. I urge that our President seek the advice of Generals Ridgway, Bradley, and Gavin. It would be well, too, were the members of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee to call these three generals into an executive or public session of the subcommittee to learn and benefit from their experience, expertise, training, and knowledge.

SIMCHATH TORAH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the nearness of Simchath Torah, the Jewish holiday, reminds of the great asset to all who love freedom that those of Jewish extraction and faith have been.

One can point to their service and devotion in government at all levels. Their faith and practice of democratic principles. Their understanding and leadership in science, medicine, and the arts. Their total commitment to freedom around the globe.

These qualities remain largely unused, frustrated, and unfulfilled in Communist lands, led by Russia.

Russia stubbornly refuses to let them leave but gives them little incentive to stay. Responsible positions in government are denied them. Synagogue doors are closing. Yiddish schools are no more. Jewish works are not published. Jewish spirits have been dimmed.

We are not talking about a handful of people. There are roughly 3 million persons of Jewish extraction in Russia.

Certainly their brothers throughout the world grieve for them. But they are not alone. The rest of us grieve too.

Our free world could use this talent, and this spirit and awaits the day when Russia either stops this oppression or lets those of Jewish extraction rejoin their fellow freemen.

FIRST AMERICAN FISH EXPOSITION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had the pleasure of going up to Boston this past week to participate in the First American Fish Exposition, sponsored by the Boston Globe. Mr. Davis Taylor, publisher of the Globe, was president of the exposition, and Boston attorney, Mr. Richard Sullivan, was executive director.

Unlike many boat shows and expositions I have attended over the years, this one was dedicated entirely to the commercial fishing industry and, in my judgment, it was an event of consequence and a tribute to the sponsors and those who participated.

I was particularly proud, Mr. President, of the number of firms from my own home State who felt that this gathering of the commercial fishing industry was important enough to travel themselves and bring their exhibits the great distance necessary to be present. To me it was important that our Pacific coast people—manufacturers, suppliers, and fishermen—were joining with those on the Atlantic to make the exposition a success.

On Friday evening a banquet was held and the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, made an address on the need for a program of rebirth for America's fishing industry, a subject and theme upon which I have often risen to discuss on the floor of the Senate. Senator KENNEDY's remarks were well received by those present and I am confident that he made a contribution toward unity within the fishing industry which is sorely needed.

Although we appeared on different days at this first exposition and had no contact as to subject, it was particularly interesting and significant to me that the themes we presented were unusually similar. It was with extreme regret that I was unable to attend the Friday banquet when Senator KENNEDY presented his program, but in studying his message I am pleased that we enjoy a dedication of common purpose toward helping the fishing people and industry, which I refer to as "America's First."

Mr. President, I spoke of the need for unity, and before asking unanimous consent that his remarks be included in the RECORD at this point, may I emphasize his closing statement. Senator KENNEDY said—and the statement is a clear legacy to America's commercial fishermen, Atlantic, Pacific, gulf, or wherever—of the late President John F. Kennedy:

> There must be a national voice, speaking clearly for the fishing industry. For only in this way will the industry's future be proud of its past.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator KENNEDY's speech be included in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The speech ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

A PROGRAM FOR THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN FISHING INDUSTRY

(By Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY before the American Commercial Fishing Exposition, Boston, Mass., October 13, 1967)

In recent times—most strongly in the last twenty years—the tides of fortune have turned against the American fishing industry. Let me cite a few examples.

In 1948, U.S. fishermen caught about 4.5 billion pounds of fish, and in 1966 caught about 4.3 billion pounds. In 1948, this catch supplied 80 per cent of the fish eaten in this country; in 1966, it supplied only about 40 per cent. In the meantime, the U.S. has grown to become the world's foremost importer of fish and fish products, at an annual value of nearly $750 million. These are not statistics of a growing industry—they are statistics of an industry lying dormant in the face of determined foreign competition.

A 1966 survey of the U.S. commercial fishing fleet showed that, of the nearly 14,000 documented vessels, the average age was twenty years, the average length less than 70 feet, 92 per cent had no refrigeration facilities, 84 per cent did not have hydraulic winches, 77 per cent did not have radio direction finders, and 48 per cent did not have radio-telephones. These are not statistics of a modern fleet—they are statistics of an obsolete, outmoded fleet whose owners are unable to finance the high costs of modernization.

The yearly per capita use of fish for the table in the United States is 10.5 pounds; for beef the per capita use is 104 pounds; for pork it is 58 pounds and for chicken 36 pounds. These are not statistics of an industry which aggressively markets its products—they are the statistics of an industry which lacks the power that organization brings.

In 1963 the Russians caught 50 million pounds of fish in waters off the coast of New England; in 1964 they caught 165 million pounds. In 1964, landings at the Boston Fish Pier totaled 106 million pounds; in 1966, they totaled only 89 million pounds. These statistics tell the story of one nation bent hard upon expanding its fishing industry, and of another nation letting it die.

These indicators of how far from its peak our domestic industry has fallen may be a cause of alarm. But they should not bring a feeling of hopelessness.

For there is hope. We have the knowledge. We have the means. We have the desire. We have the dedication.

What we need is a program and a determination to bring about the rebirth of the American commercial fishing industry.

This kind of rebirth is essential. It can mean new jobs to fishermen and processors. It can mean new orders to shipyards and suppliers. It can mean the rebuilding of our port facilities. It can mean more and better food to the hungry people of the United States and all the world. It can mean added tax revenues for our hard-pressed municipalities.

And it can mean that the faded reputation of the American fishing industry can be restored—a reputation which dates from the time when the swift schooners of Gloucester marked the crest of world fishing ability and knowledge.

A program to bring about the rebirth of the American Commercial fishing industry must focus on each link of the chain sustaining the industry—the fish, the fishermen, the processors and the marketers. Each link is necessary to a sound industry and overlooking any of the four can be fatal to our success.

I propose a 10-point program for the rebirth of the industry.

THE FISH

The waters where fish breed and feed must be protected from destruction, and the fish stocks themselves must be protected from the dangerous pressures of overfishing.

First, estuaries. If any single place can be called the cradle of the world's fish, it is estuaries, where fresh and salt waters meet. But in the last ten years, more than 55,000 acres of estuaries on the East Coast of the U.S. alone have been filled in, dredged out, or ruined. With the disappearance of each acre goes a storehouse of food for fish and shellfish, and a place where most fish spend a part of their life cycles. The catch of seafood which is dependent on estuaries amounts to nearly four billion pounds a year, and brings over $300 million annually to fishermen. Early this year I introduced a bill, S. 695, to give the Interior Department authority to protect vital estuaries from destruction. The House is nearing completion of its work on a similar bill, H.R. 25, and I am confident the Senate will act this session on a companion measure. This is a vitally important measure for the fishing industry, and I am hopeful that its members will be energetic in supporting it.

Second, the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act. We must continue our efforts under this Act and continue to protect the spawning grounds of those fish which are born, spawn and die in fresh water, but who mature in the salt water. The salmon, the herring—these fish are vital to American fishermen, and they and others must be protected. I will propose legislation next year to strengthen this act.

Third, international agreements. We must be very aggressive in seeking mutual agreements with other countries on the best methods of preventing over-fishing and the consequent depletion of fish stocks. For example, we have an agreement with Russia on limiting the size of vessels her fishermen use in the waters off the Pacific Northwest, and also on their fishing in certain areas technically beyond the 12-mile jurisdiction of the U.S. A delegation from the U.S. will travel to Russia on November 13, as Senator Magnuson mentioned on Wednesday, for the final phase of negotiations on similar matters for the waters off the Northeastern states—the Grand Banks, Georges Bank, Stellwagen Bank, Nantucket Shoals, and others. Senator Magnuson also discussed in detail the need to construct international agreements on the annual catch of various species, and I subscribe fully to the need both for the agreements themselves and, even more important, for an effective policing machinery.

Fourth, the fishing grounds. We all know of the disastrous effects on fish of using explosives for off-shore oil exploration. We all know of the thousands of nets torn when snagged on underwater refuse. We all know of men injured or killed when unexploded bombs dragged up in nets suddenly explode. And we all know of the sludge, garbage and other wastes and refuse dumped into the sea. We continue to dump refuse into the ocean at the risk of ruining forever the fishing grounds themselves and the fish which use them.

The Marine Sanctuaries Study Act of 1967, S. 2415, of which I am a sponsor would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to survey and study which specific underwater areas should be preserved and protected from exploitation or dumping. If passed, this would help guarantee that our prime fishing grounds are not destroyed or forever damaged, but continue to produce the fish they always have.

Fifth, research. We must continue our basic research into fish spawning, migration, feeding habits and resilience to heavy fishing. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the National Science Foundation, the Sea Grant Colleges, the Office of Naval Research—all these and more are financing studies in this field, and they are increasing our fund of knowledge daily. Last year's creation of the Cabinet-level National Council on Marine Resources will mean that for the first time the various research programs will be closely coordinated, and this can only mean better information for the fishing industry. I will request of this Council that a mechanism be set up whereby the members of the fishing industry themselves will have a voice in what research that is done.

In short, there are a few existing efforts aimed at protecting the waters and the fish underway, but they need to be both expanded and supplemented by measures presently pending in Congress.

THE FISHERMEN

Sixth, the fishing fleet. On September 18th of this year, I introduced, as part of the proposed Fisheries Development Act of 1967, an amendment to the Fishing Vessel Construction Subsidy Act of 1964. My amendment would change the subsidy rate for construction of new fishing vessels to a flat 50 per cent, and eliminate time-consuming paperwork involved in obtaining comparative bids from foreign shipyards. This can eliminate the bottleneck in the program, a bottleneck which is clear in its statistics: from December, 1964, through June, 1967, only 55 subsidy applications were approved and only 22 contracts were actually let. This program activity is far too small to have any major impact on our outmoded fishing fleet, and it is the reason I believe the subsidy program must be amended. Furthermore, I will introduce legislation in this session of Congress to provide more favorable loan terms under the Fisheries Loan Program.

Seventh, the fishermen. Another provision of the Fisheries Development Act would create a Fisheries Extension Service in the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. This extension service could prove a milestone in the development of modern capabilities in America's fishermen, just as the extension service of the Department of Agriculture did for America's farmers. Vast amounts of information on fishing techniques, currents, bottom typography, and so forth are generated by the more than twenty government agencies involved in oceanography, but they are not correlated or gathered in any single location. This is where an extension service would be useful—it would provide the means for a port extension officer, or teams of port extension officers, to brief fishermen on new developments.

A companion to this extension service, also provided for in the Fisheries Development Act, is a program of Federal technical assistance grants. These grants should be used to demonstrate the power of new technology by financing the purchase and demonstration of advanced equipment.

Eighth, state laws. Presently, regulation of the fisheries is governed by a welter of overlapping and contradictory state laws, which were in many cases developed years ago and never brought up-to-date. The Fisheries Development Act calls for a comprehensive study of state laws and regulations, designed to give us the information we need to proceed to a common sense, instead of haphazard, regulation of the fisheries.

In short, we need to overhaul what little machinery we have to help the individual fisherman increase his knowledge and his capabilities, through education, and to upgrade his ship, through assisting in construction costs.

THE PROCESSORS AND MARKETERS

Fishermen can bring their catch to the pier, and the catch can be unloaded—but there must be a major new effort to develop a national marketing campaign for fish and fisheries' products if the rebirth of the industry is to reach its potential.

Ninth, cooperatives and marketing agreements. Under Title II of the Fisheries Development Act, fishermen and fish processors would be encouraged to band together in voluntary, dues-paying organizations for the joint advertising of marketing of their products, and would be exempted from the antitrust laws if they did so. Similar legislation exists for farmers, and it is, to my mind, one reason why the agriculture industry's performance in marketing has far outstripped the fishing industry's.

Formation of cooperatives and marketing groups has proceeded faster on the West and Gulf Coasts than on the East Coast. This may reflect only the traditional individualism of the Yankee, but it hurts the fishing industry of the Northeast, and I urge my fellow Yankees to follow in the steps of their Southern and Western colleagues. As the Department of the Interior has pointed out, only 10 per cent of American fishermen belong to cooperatives, but they produce 20 per cent of the marketed seafood.

Tenth, fish protein concentrate. Another important step for the processors and marketers of fish is the development of new products. Main among these must be fish protein concentrate, which can create a whole new processing industry as well as open up whole new markets. Last year the Congress authorized funds for the construction of one and the leasing of another plant for the commercial production of FPC. These plants, when operational, can be dramatic evidence of what FPC will mean to the industry and to the consumer.

In August I proposed an Amendment to the Foreign Aid bill which authorized $2.5 million to encourage the use of FPC in the devoloping nations of the world. Specifically, the Amendment, which passed the Senate August 16 and the House a week later, would provide for diet introduction studies and demonstration feeding programs in Asia, in Latin America, and in Africa. In the short run, the Amendment will mean that AID will purchase $1 million worth of FPC on the American market, and will include FPC in food shipments overseas. In the long run, wide-spread use of FPC in our foreign aid program could help transform the fishing industry, by providing a market for fish now discarded. This would mean work all year, without seasonal fluctuation, and conservation of our fisheries resources, by providing a wider range of useful species.

But we must do more research into the means of producing FPC if we are ever to realize its full potential. Another provision of the Fisheries Development Act would increase the funds available for research and development into the means of reducing whole fish to FPC, research which is badly needed and which should proceed quickly.

Presently, only one process of the three basic types—physical, biological and chemical—is approved, but I believe this to be only a temporary situation. When one looks at the world's race against the clock of hunger, one comes to the inescapable conclusion that we should be doing, today, all the research we can so that when our budgetary restraints are less severe we could move swiftly into the production of this invaluable substance.

In short, we must urge our processors and marketers to take advantage of the strength of unity and the power of new products. Then, and only then, will the consumer respond to fisheries products with the same enthusiasm as he does to agricultural products.

The ten specific points I have just cited can provide the nucleus of a program for the rebirth of the fishing industry, but they will do so only if the voices of the industry—of the fishermen, of the processors, of the unions, of the management, and of the marketers—are heard in Congress in favor of them.

At present, the National Fisheries Institute speaks as a national voice for the industry, but it cannot do so with the authority or decisiveness of some other national organizations. The reason is plain: The industry has never thought it needed a powerful, unified voice. I would like to take issue with this complacency by citing a few examples of its result.

Many U.S. fishermen favor the establishment of import quotas on groundfish. But the importers, also members of the fish industry, are against quotas because it would deprive them of their livelihoods. Similarly, New England ground fishermen were in favor of extending the territorial fishing limit from three to twelve miles in 1966, while their colleagues in the Gulf of Mexico and on the Southern West Coast were not, fearing reprisals from foreign governments whose shore waters they fished. The difficulty of establishing priorities among these conflicting positions would greatly ease if there were a single, national voice for the industry.

Further, I think the formation and operation of such a national association would have an immediate effect on the programs available to help the fishing industry and on the funds available under these programs. I urge all members from all parts of the industry to resolve their differences, and to join forces in the common cause—for the cause itself is too important to be stalled by small differences.

A last area I would like to discuss is the troublesome one of import restrictions. The figures do indeed show a steep rise in imports, as Senator Magnuson explored in depth on Wednesday. And they show specific instances in which fishermen and businesses have been hurt by the imports. It is small wonder, then, that sentiment in the industry favors broad restrictions on imports of foreign fish and fish products.

It is my own feeling that we should take this step only as a last resort. I believe that we, as a nation, can compete equally with any other nation in the world provided that our equipment is up-to-date and efficient. That is why the thrust of my efforts has been to develop programs of assistance for the development of a vigorous industry, for the introduction of new techniques, and for the construction of new vessels. I believe in the strengths of American industry and enterprise, and believe that if our commercial fishing industry is reborn that we will recapture the business our fishermen have now lost to foreign competition.

But because there is a long lead-time involved in reconstructing our fleets and undertaking a large program of public education, there may well be a need for a bill of the type introduced by Senator Wayne Morse, to limit groundfish imports.

In closing, let me emphasize that the need for a regeneration of the fishing industry as a whole should transcend the needs of the component parts, and that only through a strong national association can the program be enacted.

The first Chapter of the Bible admonishes man to "have dominion over the fishes of the sea." But we never will, so long as our ships are outmoded and our knowledge slight. We must put our knowledge and our capabilities to work, as we never have before.

There must be a national voice, speaking clearly for the fishing industry. For only in this way will the industry's future be as proud as its past.

THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENCY SHOULD BE TREATED WITH RESPECT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in this morning's mail I received a copy of a WTOP editorial by Jack Jurey which I think is worthy of the attention of the Senate. Mr. Jurey, in a few words, compresses a lot of meaning in what he has to say. In part, he says:

> President Johnson, for one, doesn't deserve the cruel things said about him the last couple of days.

I have been somewhat disturbed by the vilification and obscenities which have been hurled in the direction of the Chief Executive, the scorn heaped on the President, the demonstrations against Lady Bird and other acts which I think are beneath the dignity of the people who have the right to redress differences through petition and the ballot box. It is my very strong belief that the right of dissent guaranteed under the Constitution should always be allowed, but that right does not entail license, anarchy, or a breaking of the law.

Insofar as the Office of the Presidency is concerned, it should be treated with respect and courtesy, and that applies to the individual who happens to hold it at a given time. In other words, all Presidents, who only hold the office temporarily, should be entitled to the respect which the permanent Office of the Presidency calls for and is entitled to.

The President is trying as hard as he knows how to find an honorable way out of the difficulty in which we find ourselves in Vietnam. He has not succeeded to date but that does not mean his efforts will diminish. We may agree or disagree with him, but certainly we ought to be aware of the fact that he is seeking an honorable way out; that he will continue to do so; and that, in so doing, he is representing the will and the desire of the American people as a whole no matter how they may be designated. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial previously referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMONSTRATION AS AN ARGUMENT

> This is a WTOP Editorial.
>
> The United States is a country built on the principle that the more people argue about public issues, the more informed their final decisions are likely to be. What we saw here in Washington over the weekend in the peace demonstration was a kind of argument conducted for the most part with dignity and within the limits of the law. Of course, among the many thousands who assembled there was a core of people intent on making trouble for the sake of trouble itself. This minority got in a few licks at the Pentagon, was restrained and eventually dispersed. Those militants didn't achieve anything; their only result was to tend to discredit the whole protest effort.
>
> Now that it's all over, what's been proved? Not very much, we think, that wasn't known before. Very few wars are popular and the Vietnam war is more unpopular than most. It is inconclusive, bloody and apparently interminable. The premises on which it is being fought can be subjected to severe intellectual challenge. But the men at the top level of government who are guiding the war are not bloodthirsty ogres. They are mortal men looking for an honorable way out of a desperate dilemma. President Johnson, for one, doesn't deserve the cruel things said about him the last couple of days. His critics are quick to condemn our policy, but the alternatives they offer are apt to be fuzzy, fuzzy-minded or both.
>
> Vietnam should be a matter of public debate because that's how this country operates. It would be nice, however, if that debate could deal with some of the hard questions that need answering: how, for example, do we control the process of escalation and how do we disengage without doing serious injury to our own interests and those of the South Vietnamese who have joined with us?
>
> These are not easy matters. They will not be solved by easy slogans. Nor, certainly, by peaceniks who fancy that an assault on the Pentagon is in some way an assault on the heart of the problem.
>
> This was a WTOP Editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

THE COPPER INDUSTRY STRIKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it appears that the strike in the auto industry has been settled. It appears that the strike involving the steel haulers has been settled. However, in the copper industry there is a strike which has been in existence now for more than 100 days. There is no solution in sight, and the segment of our economy affected includes many of our Western States, and, incidentally, States in the East and Middle West which have fabricating plants.

Over the past several weeks, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and I have met with members of the union and with Steelworkers Union representatives in Washington, at their request. We have met with Secretaries McNamara, Wirtz, and representatives of Secretary Trowbridge, at the suggestion of the President; and we have also met with the chairman of the Anaconda Co.

We reported back to the people of Montana the results of all of these discussions and have urged the people we represent, as well as the Anaconda Co., to get together and to stay with the situation until an agreement is reached.

But, I find myself rising, once again, to stress the serious economic situation posed by the current national copper strike. Now in its 15th week, the strike is characterized by stalled negotiations, a dwindling but evidently a sufficient national supply of copper, higher prices for fabricators, reduced income for workers and companies, and a serious curtailment of State income in States like Montana.

Only a plentiful reserve of copper has permitted negotiations to drag out to this point. But reserves are shrinking, as reflected in constantly rising prices for the metal. It is my earnest hope that both sides will redouble their efforts to reach an agreement.

There continue to be suggestions that if the parties to the dispute do not resolve their differences, the Federal Government will step in. As I have pointed out repeatedly—most recently in a floor statement last Monday, and before that in Montana—I feel it would be a mistake at this time to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act. If no agreement were reached during the 80-day period, the strike would resume in the middle of winter. I say again that it is the responsibility of the parties to the dispute to resolve it—and get on with the business of bringing a measure of prosperity back to the affected regions.

Mr. President, an article entitled "Art of Nonbargaining: Copper Strike," published in today's Wall Street Journal, explains the dilemma posed by the strike, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Art of Nonbargaining: Copper Strike

(By Michael K. Drapkin)

The copper industry strike is in its 15th week, and the casual observer is entitled to assume that this prolonged shutdown is a product of the clash of two strong interests as they come to grips with economic issues.

But the casual observer wouldn't be quite correct. The closedown of this important metals industry in a dispute between copper producers and, essentially, the United Steelworkers of America, has endured this long and is likely to continue a good while longer precisely because the two sides haven't come to grips with economic issues.

Meanwhile, most copper capacity, plus some lead and zinc facilities, is closed. More than 42,000 workers are off their jobs in a dozen states. Seven Western states, notably Utah where an estimated 7% to 10% of the work force is idle, are taking a severe economic pounding.

For the first half of the fiscal year that began July 1, Utah cut by 4% the budgets of some state agencies as a result of lost revenue. Montana and Arizona have imposed emergency "temporary" taxes to make up for funds not flowing into state tills.

Utah officials estimate the strike is costing $288,000 daily in lost wages. They say $67,000 to $100,000 a day is being lost in state and local taxes. The strike is eating into the nation's supply of copper, much of which goes for defense purposes, though users still seem to have good stocks.

Why the two sides haven't come to grips with the issues is a matter of conjecture. It seems clear that neither the industry nor the Steelworkers union is in any hurry to get the mines open. Whatever their motives, just how they've been going about avoiding the task of doing some honest-to-goodness negotiation for more than three months should be instructive for that casual observer in the art of labor-management non-bargaining.

STILL FAR APART

The original strike deadline was July 1, but the contract with eight copper companies was extended by the USW and 17 other unions to July 15. The extension hardly seems to have been necessary, since the two sides were nowhere near reaching any agreement. They're still far apart.

Not that they've been as far apart as the labels that each side put on their offers and demands might indicate. That's one reason they've been able to avoid knocking heads on the issues. The different method each side uses for evaluating its own position and that of its adversary has muddled up the dispute even before haggling over the terms could start.

Copper makers presented offers that they said amounted to wage-and-benefit increases of about 50 cents an hour over three years. The union countered with demands that it didn't publicly label, but which it was understood to value at around $1.20 an hour over three years.

Ostensibly this was a simple enough, though sizable, bargaining gap. But the industry and union have made it much more complex. The companies, for instance, say the union's original demands would really cost $2 an hour, maybe $3. And the union figures the companies are really offering only 40 cents. What little talking there has been (and until the last few weeks, there has been extremely little) has centered around arguing that the other side isn't offering as much, or demanding as little, as it claims.

A key factor in this inability to agree on what the disagreement amounts to is the concept of "impact," sometimes called "creep" by copper industry officials. This involves the effect of any wage increase on certain labor costs directly tied to wage rates, such as overtime pay. The companies insist that this can boost the cost of a wage package by 20%. The union says such reasoning is highly questionable.

In any event, the two parties successfully resisted for some time getting beyond this argument over definition. Even when the union and Kennecott Copper Corp. were pushed into more consequential discussions by Utah Gov. Rampton three weeks ago, the argument remained—and a new one of similar character cropped up.

The USW scaled down its demand to what it said amounted to about 99 cents an hour. More like $1.57, said Kennecott. Not only did it ignore "impact," the company said, but union figures on pension improvement costs were 15 cents an hour too low. Kennecott thus accused the USW of reneging on its promise to detail a 99-cent demand.

For nearly two weeks, platoons of cost accountants haggled over whose methods were more up to date until, finally, the parties reached an agreement: Not to settle the total contract dispute nor on the valuation of each side's position, nor even which pension accounting system was correct. Kennecott simply agreed to supply some "underlying data," while the USW promised to "do some more work" on its pension costing.

"That point could have been cleared up in two hours, much less two weeks," says one Utah government official.

Meanwhile, whenever Federal or state government people tried to move the bargaining ahead, the two sides reacted angrily. One official publicly relayed the union's proposal to ask for 99 cents an hour, and Kennecott assailed him for "endorsing" the union's valuation of its demand.

"THAT'LL SUIT US"

At a negotiating session early this month between the union and Kennecott, a Federal mediator made several suggestions and comments until a union representative asked him to keep silent. He then said, "That's fine with me. In fact, I won't even come to tomorrow's session." The reply: "That'll suit us." Last Thursday the Kennecott-USW talks broke down amid recriminations by each side that the other wouldn't bargain in good faith.

And Utah Gov. Rampton, who has been insistent that the parties get together more often and get down to business when they do meet, has been clubbed a couple of times by Kennecott.

Once, for instance, the governor predicted the eventual settlement would fall within 10 cents of 75 cents an hour, about halfway between the union's demand of 99 cents and Kennecott's offer on June 7 of 50.6 cents. "Both the company and the union know this," he said, "and yet neither will come closer than 24 cents to this, even though they know they have got to move toward a central position."

Kennecott quickly said the governor "had absolutely no authorization on the part of the company to make any statement concerning a company attitude as to an area in which this year's negotiations might be settled."

One breakthrough opportunity seemed to appear a week ago, when locals of the Steelworkers and several other unions reached a settlement at small Pima Mining Co., valued by the company at 75 cents an hour over three years. (Some industry analysts say the cost of the package is closer to $1; while companies tend to boost union estimates of demands during negotiations, they often scale down settlements to show a victory.)

About 500 members of various locals at an Anaconda Co. mine in Nevada then offered to accept identical wage and fringe benefits, but Anaconda quickly squashed the proposal as too costly, saying the miners would be offered an agreement like the one finally arrived at in talks at main Anaconda bargaining with the USW.

The union called the Pima agreement an example of "realistic collective bargaining" that it hoped would be "duplicated" by the bigger companies. Union officials said some "real give and take" led to the settlement. But the companies say Pima's operations aren't comparable to those of the bigger concerns.

Why this reluctance to get down to cases, after three months of strike? The reasons are far from clear. "I know there's something not above board, but I don't know what it is. Maybe history will record it, I can't," says one government official.

The union charges that the companies are stalling things so that the strike will start to pinch the nation enough to force the Government to avoid resisting a price increase once the contract is settled. The industry says the USW won't be reasonable until it gets its previously stated goal of industrywide bargaining, instead of the current company-by-company talks; the union says it wants uniform wages and benefits, but doesn't care that much about industrywide bargaining.

It's quite possible that internal considerations bear on the length of the strike. One industry man says the slow pace of talks stems mainly from "power struggles" in both the union and company ranks. "We both know we're going to have to compromise, but other things will have to be settled first."

YOUNGER AND MORE FLEXIBLE

At the companies, industry sources say, a number of younger men who have recently filled executive positions are more inclined to compromise, but considerable say-so still lies with the older, less flexible industry leaders. As for the union, the copper concerns at least insist that the USW is taking an especially hard line because it wants to show the other unions and its new mining membership that it's tough. The union could also be flexing its muscles in advance of the 1968 steel bargaining. The Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, which previously bargained separately with the copper industry, merged with the USW just prior to the current strike.

One state government official believes both sides think they can get a better settlement if the Federal Government steps in than in collective bargaining. This is always problematical, of course; frequently, unions think they don't get as much when the Government supervises a settlement, and companies often believe they're forced to give away too much that way.

> The two parties have been able to put off hard-core negotiations because the nation's supply of copper, plus that available abroad, has proved to be surprisingly large. When the pinch comes, the picture is likely to change, especially if the Government decides it better move. Until then, the strike goes on—as the two sides artfully dodge any opportunities for settling it.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I heartily concur with the remarks of my distinguished colleague. Collective bargaining must be just that: Collective bargaining. The people who are confronted with these problems at the start have to sit down and bargain together. The United Auto Workers, for instance, had hundreds of various shop rules in conflict but they sat down with the company and worked them out and finally reached a solution. We have had complete failure, in the copper strike, of these people getting together.

Kennecott got together only after Governor Rampton, of Utah, knocked some heads together and said, "You have got to sit down and bargain."

But even that failed. Even talking about the same program in the same language, the United Steelworkers, after Governor Rampton suggested that they come in with a counter offer, said that they would come in with something under $1.

As pointed out in the article published in the Wall Street Journal, which my colleague has placed in the RECORD, it was 99 cents so far as the steelworkers were concerned, and around $1.50 so far as the company was concerned. Now surely they could resolve the conflicts, when the auditors come in. In a few hours they should negotiate them. They should sit down and work them out.

There can be no collective bargaining when someone sits in one corner and someone in another and they will not meet together.

The Pima settlement should be the pattern for the settlement of the whole copper industry. The Anaconda Co. in Utah has about the same numbers, about the same problems, and about the same working conditions as Pima. They should have been started and we should have had a cascading settlement after the Pima agreement was reached.

Kennecott has stated that there is no pattern at all, that there is no reason whatever to continue collective bargaining. Therefore we still do not have anything.

Anaconda, Kennecott, and Phelps Dodge should do just as the Ford Motor Co. has done and just as the truckers have done. We do not want to tell them what their settlement should be, but they should sit down and make collective bargaining work, or the people of America are going to get so tired of it that they will step in and take it over.

Let me say one word about the Taft-Hartley law. One of the unfair features of the Taft-Hartley law is the proposition that an injunction can be sought at any time.

We should have provided in the Taft-Hartley law, of course, that when the public interest becomes involved during a strike, the Federal Government should step in and state, "We want an injunction early in this strike." It would be most unfair for us to come in now and say, as a matter of public interest, after 100 days of a strike, that we should invoke an injunction of 80 days under the Taft-Hartley law, which would be around the Christmas holidays, and then strike all over again in the middle of winter, especially in Montana, and then have to go through this process all over again. I hope that we do not look to the Taft-Hartley law. I know that we have a sufficient supply of copper to take care of our military needs. I wish that the people at Anaconda, Kennecott, and Phelps Dodge, and the United Steelworkers would start to negotiate, and instead of the art of nonbargaining, demonstrate the art of bargaining collectively.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with my colleague about the inadvisable use of Taft-Hartley in this situation. If it is ever going to be invoked, it should be invoked at the beginning of a strike and not after it has gone on for 3 or 4 months. Its nullifying effect is so evident as to make it practically worthless.

So far as the Government is concerned, to the best of my knowledge, and I think I speak with a degree of authority, there will be no release of copper from the stockpile, and there is no intention on the part of the Government to interfere otherwise in the present strike. It is our hope and the hope of all of us in the copper-producing States, especially in Montana, that the process of free collective bargaining between the companies and the unions will operate as it started to operate briefly in Butte on Tuesday and Wednesday of last week.

It is my understanding that at the first meeting there were in excess of 100 union representatives from all over the country as well as officials from Anaconda. I believe it would be better if fewer union officials met with the companies concerned. I believe it would be a good idea if the officials of the Mediation and Conciliation Service were used as go-betweens. But I do want to say that in the interest of the people whom we represent, the time is long past due when both the companies and the unions met around the negotiating table, operating on a day-to-day basis and, if need be, on a 24-hour basis, in order to achieve a settlement before winter steps in. Only in that way can the difficulties which have confronted the people of Montana for over 100 days now be alleviated to some degree.

The fact is, we are losing many good people, people who are going to the coast and elsewhere. We do not want to lose these Montanans but a number, I understand, have nevertheless departed the State; a factor that alone demonstrates the grave effect this impasse is having.

Mr. METCALF. Again, the most important thing for the unions in the copper industry and for the executives of the copper industry to do is to sit down and negotiate and settle this strike. There is no work in the management of that business, and in the management of union affairs, more important than to negotiate, as my colleague has stated, 24 hours a day if need be, in order to reach a settlement.

This business of meeting only 1 hour a week is nonsense. It is destroying the economy of many States and it is destroying the whole process of collective bargaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is up to the unions and companies, not to the Federal Government, to settle this strike, and to settle it on the basis of free collective bargaining.

A NEW CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise today to say a word about a new crisis in the Middle East.

The Middle East and a nervous world face a new crisis today over the sinking this past weekend of Israel's destroyer, *Elath*. This violent breach of the cease-fire, following other outbreaks of sporadic fighting on land, sea, and in the air, could well shatter in a tragic instant the tenuous truce in the area.

I hope very much that Israel will restrain a very understandable military reaction in force since a new round of full-scale warfare could seriously endanger efforts to effect a peace. However, if Israel exercises such restraint, the other nations, especially the major powers, must face up to their responsibilities and at once.

First, negotiations for a peace settlement cannot now be deferred. It is the duty of the United States and the other major power members of the Security Council of the U.N. to press for such negotiations promptly. As peace negotiations demand concurrence of the parties, direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States are really the only way; true peace cannot be imposed from outside by third parties. Since Israel is in possession of territories the Arab States wish to have returned, the United States and the other powers should be able to bring the Arab States to some form of direct negotiations at this time.

Second, the Soviet Union must be warned that its crash program of rearming the United Arab Republic and other Arab States—not only in quantity but with the latest in advanced sophisticated weaponry—has again reached a peril point of endangering world peace. This needs to be said openly and publicly by the United States in and outside of the United Nations.

Since 1948, the peace of the Middle East has been shattered by three full-scale wars between Israel and the Arab States, plus innumerable skirmishes, border raids, terrorism, economic warfare, boycotts and blockades, propaganda and diplomatic assaults. How long world peace can survive under these conditions and under sudden emergencies like the attack and sinking of the *Elath* is just too dangerous to risk.

A massive and aggressive effort, especially of U.S. diplomacy, is urgently required. Considering the posture of both Israel and the Arab States, a formula for at least undertaking negotiations can be found. The only way, in my judgment, to supersede the new crisis atmosphere clearly indicating a resumption of hostilities is by peace negotiations between the principal parties and an end to the

Soviet-spurred arms race in the Middle East. The hour is late; let us not hold off decisive action until it is beyond recall.

I ask unanimous consent to have 2 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLEAN AIR: OUR MOST BASIC RESOURCE

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, I call attention to a fine, 14-page report recommending a five-point program on clean air, by the Republican Coordinating Committee, and ask unanimous consent that it should be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEAN AIR: OUR MOST BASIC RESOURCE

The principal sources of air pollution are the combustion processes which lie at the heart of many of our most vital industries and services—transportation, heating, electric power, and incineration. Indeed, a completely combustion-free society would be most primitive. We must realize that pollution is a by-product of our highly developed economy, and learn to think of the cost of adequate control measures as a price we pay for enjoying an advanced standard of living.

The harmful effects of air pollution are numerous and widespread.

Statistical and laboratory evidence appears to link a number of respiratory diseases such as emphysema, bronchitis, asthma, and possibly lung cancer with concentrations of air pollution. For example, the lung cancer death rate in large metropolitan areas is twice the rural rate, even after full allowance is made for differences in smoking habits. Scientists believe that this may be explained in part by the higher levels of air pollution generally found in urban centers.

Levels of carbon monoxide found in heavy traffic may reduce driver alertness and reaction time and correspondingly increase the probability of automobile accidents. In each of six cities where recent measurements were made in traffic, at least 10 percent of the samples exceeded what is considered to be a safe concentration of carbon monoxide.

Photochemical smog and other obstructions to vision caused by pollution can be physically irritating, and often hamper the safe operation of motor vehicles and aircraft. The Civil Aeronautics Board reported six aircraft accidents in 1962 in which smoke, haze, sand, or dust was listed as a contributory cause.

Air pollution damages crops and vegetation. For example, in New Jersey pollution injury to 36 commercial crops has been reported, and in parts of Florida orange trees have been severely damaged.

Air pollution disasters occur—given unfavorable weather conditions which permit the build-up of unusually high concentrations of pollutants. Six major episodes accompanied by death and disease have been recorded over the past generation.

Although complete scientific explanations of the relation of air pollution to specific health effects and other harmful occurrences are not in every case available, the evidence does point to air pollution as a matter which should today be a major concern of all Americans and is a major concern of the Republican Party.

Today's problems of atmospheric pollution will in the future become more severe and the incidence of harmful effects will increase apace unless appropriate actions are taken. This is portrayed graphically by the following projections of increased activity over the next decade among the major sources of pollution:

The number of motor vehicles on our highways—autos, buses and trucks—will increase from 90 million to 120 million.

Output of electrical power will more than double and some of the increase will require generation from coal and oil fuel sources.

Industrial production is expected to increase by over 50 percent.

Urban population will grow twice as rapidly as the population as a whole.

Our concern and our efforts must, therefore, be geared not just to the problems of today; we must anticipate and plan for the future. For air pollution is growing—faster than our population, and faster than our efforts to combat it—and only a vigorous and sustained commitment can save and preserve our most basic resource.

A REPUBLICAN CLEAN AIR PROGRAM

Republicans believe that past efforts to cope with the mounting problem of air pollution in a growing urban society have been inadequate, and recommend a redoubling of effort on the part of all concerned—government, industry, and private citizens.

At the urging of President Eisenhower in his 1955 State of the Union address and with support of Republicans in both Houses, the first Federal law in the field of air pollution was enacted by the 84th Congress. This basic law has been elaborated and strengthened by major Congressional actions in 1963 and 1965.

To lead the commitment to cleaner air as we approach the 1970's, the Republican Party proposes a broad, constructive five part program as outlined below.

1. *Eliminating Gaps in our Knowledge and Technical Capability.*

Efforts to combat air pollution control must include a frank awareness of the limits of our knowledge of the problem and of our ability to apply control measures effectively and efficiently. Gaps in our knowledge and technical capability appear across the entire spectrum of the air pollution problem.

With regard to *health effects*, in April 1967 the U.S. Surgeon General stated:

"It would be foolish to say that we do not need more research on the health effects of air pollution. Of course we do."

Intensified research is needed to gain more complete scientific explanations of the effects of specific pollutants on human health and to determine the levels at which air pollution becomes harmful. To date the Public Health Service has established and published data on harmful levels for only one of five major classes of pollution. Lacking additional information, local control authorities have great difficulty in setting desirable air quality objectives and standards.

Another deficiency is that *precise measurements of the actual levels of pollution* in the atmosphere of our major cities in many cases are not available. At the present, continuous measurements are made in just nine cities. In air pollution control, as in any other activity, it is difficult to know where you are going and how to get there, unless you know where you are now.

Related to this is a lack of well developed equipment and procedures for *measuring emission levels from particular pollution sources* accurately and rapidly. In the case of automobiles, for instance, no simple instrument has been developed which would permit large-scale annual inspection of cars equipped with exhaust controls. Use of available instrumentation either would not give sufficiently accurate readings, or would involve unduly time-consuming test procedures.

Of utmost importance is the fact that, according to many witnesses, the *engineering technology of emission control equipment* has not progressed as rapidly as our desire to combat the pollution problem. For example, full-scale tests of one of the most promising methods of removing sulfur oxide emissions from the stacks of electric power plants have not yet been conducted. Also, preliminary experience with auto emission control devices in California indicates that the effectiveness of these devices degrades with time, partially nullifying the large expenditures required, and pointing to the need for improved technology.

The above factors taken together indicate that the planning of an air pollution control program can be seriously hampered by our lack of knowledge or technical capability in many vital areas. This situation has been caused in part by a neglect of research and development activities on the part of the Federal Government. In 1966 the Federal Government allocated only $14 million to air pollution research and development activities. This amounts to less than one-tenth of one percent of the total Federal research and development budget, and does not appear consistent with the verbal emphasis and priority which the Administration has placed on air pollution control. Moreover, by shifting and moving Federal pollution research facilities from place-to-place, the Administration has created unnecessary delays in our research efforts.

We recommend an accelerated and improved research and development program, under the leadership of the Public Health Service, to reduce or eliminate the gaps in our scientific and technological knowledge of air pollution and control methods. No amount of legislation, regulations, or verbal support will solve the air pollution problem until we have the scientific and technical tools at hand to plan and implement an effective control effort.

In addition to plugging the gaps identified above, an accelerated research and development effort should also be directed toward greater exploration of techniques to recover usable products such as sulfur from industrial emissions, and to the investigation of radical changes in energy sources, including research on battery powered automobile engines.

2. *Emphasizing Regional Agreements Among State and Local Governments in the Control of Air Pollution.*

Republicans continue to believe that air pollution control is primarily the responsibility of State and local governments, the policy enunciated by Congress in the Clean Air Act of 1963. For this reason we are distressed by the original version of the Administration's proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 which we find inconsistent with this policy.

The problem of air pollution is not uniform throughout the country. The level, composition, and frequency of occurrence of harmful emissions in the air varies greatly from one locality to another. The prevailing level of sulfur dioxide in New York City is many times greater than in Detroit or San Francisco, which in turn have a greater problem than many small towns and rural communities. To us it is evident that programs to combat air pollution must be tailored to meet the varied needs of individual regions and areas.

The Administration's legislative proposal recognizes the geographical variations of air pollution: a provision of the bill would establish Regional Air Quality Commissions composed of Federal, State and local officials to police pollution on a regional basis. However, the details of the legislation reveal that the Regional Commissions would simply provide a thin veil for greatly expanded Federal control in this field. The bill would empower the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to:

Define and establish (or abolish) Air Quality Regions.

Appoint (or remove) all members of the Regional Commissions, none of whom must be officials of established State, local, or regional air pollution control agencies.

Control the budgets of the Regional Commissions.

Overrule the Regional Commissioners in the establishment of air quality and emission standards.

Grant any exemptions to such standards for particular industries or activities.

Determine when standards have been violated and issue cease and desist orders to violators.

Plainly, these provisions of the Administration's proposal do not constitute regional control, but rather a prescription for complete Federal control with all power lodged in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This we cannot accept.

For those areas of the nation which would not be included in Air Quality Regions, the Administration proposes to establish uniform emission standards for each industry which contributes to pollution of the atmosphere, backed by Federal enforcement authority. The application of uniform emission standards to any sizable geographic area represents a solution which is bound to be at odds with the intrinsic non-uniformity of the problem. Inevitably, uniform emission standards would be unnecessarily stringent and unfair for some industries, and not sufficiently stringent for others.

Republicans do not advocate a doctrinaire, negative approach to the role of the Federal Government in the enforcement of air pollution regulations. We accept Federal standards for automobiles, since centralized production and high mobility of automobiles make uniform national standards the most practical solution. In the case of interstate air pollution disputes, Federal intervention authority is clearly necessary, and under the 1963 Clean Air Act Federal efforts have resulted in the initiation of pollution abatement actions in nine interstate areas. These are examples of existing Federal enforcement authority which we support.

With regard to new Federal control authority, we endorse the approach embodied in the legislation passed by the Senate on July 18, 1967 with full Republican support. This measure would permit the Federal Government to set and enforce regional air quality standards, but only if the States should fail to act within a prescribed time period after they have received the scientific, technological, and economic information necessary to establish meaningful standards from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

But the Administration has failed at this time to make a compelling case for a sudden application of detailed Federal controls in regional areas or for uniform Federal emission standards outside those regional areas.

The Administration proposal also fails to recognize the record of accomplishment and the opportunities for progress at the State, local and regional level aided by the Federal Government under the terms of previous legislation. In 1961 there were 17 air pollution control programs in existence at the State level; today there are 40 established State programs and 130 local agencies engaged in control activities. The budgets of these agencies have doubled over the past three years.

Air pollution does not respect established political boundaries and in many, if not most cases, interstate or metropolitan area solutions are highly desirable. We are encouraged that some State and local governments have been moving in this direction. Two interstate compacts involving Indiana-Illinois and New York-New Jersey have been approved by the respective States and await Congressional action. Of the 50 largest cities in the nation, 22 or nearly one-half are engaged in regional or metropolitan area control programs.

State and local governments should take steps to strengthen existing air pollution control programs or establish new ones, as necessary, and we recommend strongly the greater use of interstate compacts and metropolitan area solutions in this field. This approach is the best means to combat a problem which does not match established political boundaries and which is so clearly not uniform across the nation.

The Federal Government can do more to encourage interstate and metropolitan solutions to the problem of air pollution. At the present time multi-jurisdiction air pollution control agencies may receive Federal grants for 75 percent of the cost of establishing control programs compared to 67 percent for single jurisdiction agencies, and for 60 percent of the cost of maintaining such programs, compared to 50 percent for single jurisdiction agencies. For many State and local governments these small differentials favoring multi-jurisdiction solutions are probably insufficient to surmount the normal political and administrative hurdles of entering into interstate or metropolitan area agreements.

We recommend that the degree of Federal financial support for multi-jurisdiction solutions be sharply increased to encourage formation of interstate and metropolitan control agencies. Further, we recommend that multi-jurisdiction agencies be given first priority in Federal technical assistance activities.

3. *The Need for Economic Analysis.*

Air pollution represents an economic drain on our society. Lives may be cut short, medical bills are increased, crops are damaged, and cleaning expenses run up. At the same time, the economic impact of controlling air pollution promises to be far-reaching in terms of public and private outlays, possible market and job dislocations, and even changes in foreign trade patterns. In dealing with air pollution we must include an explicit awareness and an open discussion of the economic implications of the effects of pollution and of various control measures.

The Federal Government has given inadequate attention to this aspect of the problem. There has been almost no explicit analysis or discussion of economic factors in Presidential messages or in Executive agency announcements or publications on air pollution.

We recommend that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare be required to present economic analyses of all proposed legislation, standards, and regulations relating to air pollution with estimates of the total costs to be incurred and the expected benefits. The Congress and the general public are entitled to this information in order to permit a balanced public discussion of the issues. We recommend that State and local control agencies conduct similar analyses whenever possible.

4. *Tax Benefits for Controlling Pollution.*

Polluted air affects nearly everyone and the costs of control measures should be widely shared. At present the costs of pollution control are borne principally by industries through outlays for control equipment, and by their customers through higher prices. One way to distribute more fairly the costs of combatting pollution is through a system of tax advantages to industry for investments in pollution control devices. A number of States have adopted laws of this type. Legislation to permit an increased investment credit or to allow rapid depreciation for pollution control equipment on Federal tax returns has been introduced by Republicans in both the Senate and the House and has received widespread support. We urge hearings and enactment of a bill embodying these principles.

Another means of encouraging industry to make the necessary outlays is the granting of low interest loans by an appropriate government agency or authority for the purchase of pollution control equipment. The State of Pennsylvania is proposing an experimental program of this type, which if successful, could provide a model for similar action by other States.

5. *Cleaning-up Air Pollution from Federal Installations.*

In 1963 Congress included in the Clean Air Act a provision requiring all Federal agencies to cooperate in preventing and controlling air pollution from Federal installations and activities. Four years later the Administration has taken virtually no effective abatement action at Federal installations. Executive Orders and directives have been promulgated to give the appearance of action, but very little has actually been accomplished. A prime example of the Federal contribution to air pollution is the Kenilworth Dump, 5 miles from the White House, where 1,000 tons of garbage and trash are burned into the open air each day. Meeting after meeting of Federal officials has been held, promises to the public have been made, but the burning goes on.

If the Federal Government is going to legislate in the field of air pollution, it must in its own activities adhere to exemplary practices in controlling harmful emissions from Federal buildings and installations. The present Administration has violated this principle.

The Republican Party calls for immediate abatement action at all Federal installations.

SUMMARY

Air pollution is pre-eminently an urban problem. This fact supports the proposition that increasingly the future of America is linked to the future of our great urban centers.

Today, two thirds of our population lives in metropolitan areas and over 80 percent of the growth in population is concentrated there. This growth and concentration have created an array of public policy problems in fields such as housing, transportation, education, human rights, and natural resources—including the problem of controlling the quality of our air. As we enter the last third of the twentieth century, there is no greater challenge than the design of public policies to meet these problems and to make our urban centers more liveable. The Republican Party accepts this challenge.

The program and policies outlined in this paper can become the basis for a well coordinated attack on the pollution of our atmosphere, and can contribute to the attainment of our goals for urban America.

To summarize, the Republican Party recommends:

1. An accelerated research and development program to reduce or eliminate gaps in our knowledge and in our technical capability, so that our ability to control air pollution will be matched to our desire to do so. The Federal Government should take the lead in this effort.

2. Greater use of regional and metropolitan area agreements among States and local governments in the control of air pollution, so that solutions may be matched to the geographical pattern and wide variations of the problem, and to minimize Federal controls consistent with the approach contained in the legislation recently passed by the Senate. The Federal Government should offer increased financial incentives to State and local governments to encourage them more strongly to enter into regional and metropolitan area agreements.

3. Greater use of economic analysis in the formulation of public policies for air pollution control, so that the economic implications of the problem and of proposed control measures can be more fully understood and considered. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare should be required to present economic analyses of all proposed legislation and regulations in this field.

4. A system of Federal tax benefits to industry for investments in air pollution con-

trol devices, so that the costs of controlling pollution will be widely shared, as well as the benefits. Congress should hold hearings and act favorably on legislation of this type.

5. Effective action rather than words to halt pollution emanating from Federal installations, so that the Federal Government in its own activities will be above reproach and can provide more effective leadership.

We commend this program to the attention of the American public.

The problem of air pollution is fundamentally a question of conservation, which Theodore Roosevelt once described as "dealing intelligently with what we have." Future generations will judge whether this generation dealt intelligently with our most basic resource—the air we breathe.

NASSAU COUNTY U.N. DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on October 22 the Nassau County U.N. Day Committee organized a very successful public meeting at the A. Holly Paterson Auditorium in Uniondale, Long Island. The purpose of the meeting was to commemorate the 22d anniversary of the United Nations. The principal address was delivered by Ambassador Seymour M. Finger, the senior adviser to Ambassador Goldberg.

This meeting was an example of the outstanding public spirit of the citizens of Nassau County. The people of Nassau County and of the town of Oyster Bay have taken a key interest in the work of the United Nations since its founding in 1945. It will be remembered that the original meeting home of the United Nations was Lake Success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of a proclamation by Mr. Michael N. Petito, supervisor of the town of Oyster Bay, declaring Tuesday, October 24, 1967, as United Nations Day.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, every American President in office since the United Nations was founded in 1945 has shared the belief that the United Nations is an essential element in efforts to achieve a world at peace with freedom and justice for all; and

Whereas, it is imperative that the American people understand fully the major objectives of the Charter of the United Nations, which are: to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war; to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights and the sovereign equality of nations, large and small; to establish conditions under which justice and respect for International Law can be maintained; and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom; and

Whereas, the vast majority of the American people believe that the United Nations effectively promotes the peace in the world and favors continuing United States support of the world organization;

Now, therefore, I, Michael N. Petito, Supervisor of the Town of Oyster Bay, declare Tuesday, October 24th, 1967, as United Nations Day, and urge the citizens of the Town to observe that day by studying the United Nations, its accomplishments, its strength, its limitations and its potential for the future, so that this information will contribute to a realistic understanding of the aims, problems and achievements of the United Nations and its associated organizations.

ARMY PROCUREMENT POLICY

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on three separate occasions I have made speeches on the floor attacking certain military procurement policies which have been employed by the Army. In those speeches I carefully delineated the cases I have questioned, one involving a very small Colorado company and one involving a Brooklyn firm.

The other day, as a result of my speeches on this subject, I had an opportunity to meet with the Secretary of the Army, who, in my opinion, is an extremely fine, very able, and dedicated man. I am delighted that he is serving in that office. At that meeting he gave me a letter, dated October 20, 1967, dealing with the Army's reply to the charges which I had made in my speeches; and I ask unanimous consent at this point that the letter be included in the Record, because I want to be completely fair in the presentation of these cases.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1967.

Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DOMINICK: I read with concern your statements in the Congressional Record of 19 and 28 September and 4 October concerning Army procurement policy. I have personally inquired into the matters you raised. For the reasons which follow, my conclusion is that Army actions were made honestly and in accordance with the needs of our combat forces in Southeast Asia.

You raised first the question of award of the research and development contract for a multi-shot portable flamethrower to Northrop Nortronics, and suggested that the award should have been made to Custom Packaging Company of Aurora, Colorado. Nine manufacturers submitted proposals in response to the Army's request. After a careful technical evaluation Nortronics was ranked 1, Custom 9. Weighting certain factors used in the technical evaluation did not affect Custom's ranking, since no company received a lower score in four of the five characteristics evaluated—technical approach, technical personnel, background experience, and facilities. If the elements of the evaluation had not been weighted at all, the ranking of these two companies would have been exactly the same: Nortronics 1, Custom 9.

You emphasized that Custom proposed a price of $167,608 for the contract, compared to Nortronics' estimate of $387,000. The Army took these cost proposals into account in making the award. But such cost figures, inevitably based on difficult estimates, cannot be made the controlling factor in a research and development contract, in which the paramount goal is to obtain a product which will meet field requirements. This fact is recognized in the Armed Services Procurement Act, 10 U.S.C., Sec. 2304(a)(11), and also in ASPR 4–106.4 and 4–106.5, which make clear that in research and development contracts estimates of cost seldom can be the controlling factor. Custom's proposal simply was not up to the standard required, and the Army would have been wasting money and imperiling the entire development program to award the contract to a company offering so little prospect of success.

Other questions concerning Custom's efforts to obtain the contract were thoroughly considered by the Comptroller General, who set out in detail the efforts of Custom to interest the Army in its product. See Ms. Comp. Gen. B–160809, 29 June 1967. While the Army was ready to give Custom every consideration, that hardly can be regarded as a solicitation. The fact the contract was awarded one working day before the date once estimated as the approximate time of award was of no consequence, and Custom was promptly notified. The Army did not use or disclose any of Custom's proprietary data, and the Comptroller General concluded that there was "no substantial basis" for such an allegation.

The other question you raised concerned several aspects of the development and procurement of the AN/PRC–25 and AN/PRC–77 portable field radios. I shall discuss briefly the principal points which you mentioned.

First, you suggest that the Army paid too much—$951 per unit—for the 4158 PRC–25 radios purchased for the Marine Corps from RCA by contract of 18 August 1965. That contract was awarded by competitive negotiation to meet an urgent requirement from Southeast Asia for 13,158 PRC–25s. Military necessity required delivery of the entire amount by 30 June 1966, 10 months thence. Only two companies—RCA and Memcor—were in production and could meet that deadline. The Army awarded a contract for 9,000 to Memcor, the lowest-price proposer, which represented that company's total capability to meet the deadline. The remaining quantity, 4158, was awarded to RCA at a unit price of $881.00, not $951. This price understandably was higher than the $625 previously bid by RCA on an earlier buy because the quantity was less (4158 instead of 7278), the production leadtime was less (4 months instead of 12) and Government-furnished equipment was less ($3 per unit instead of $53).

Second, you expressed concern over the necessity of contracting sole-source for production of the PRC–77 on 28 April 1967. RCA's first production contract called for delivery of a running set of drawings (those used for the initial production run) on 31 March 1967, the date of delivery of the first PRC–77. The initial running set was delivered on 3 May 1967, only 33 days after the originally specified delivery date. This delay resulted from changes in Army operational criteria imposed by new requirements for related communication equipment which were not furnished RCA until February 1967, eight months after contract award. Unavoidable delay by the Army in developing interface data for the related communications security equipment also necessitated a rollback in production deliveries. After negotiations, deliveries were rescheduled to begin in August 1967, five months after the original contract schedule. The contract was modified accordingly. Satisfactory undated production drawings reflecting the communications security interface data were submitted on 6 September 1967. Thus delay in delivery of drawings was attributable to modifications in Army requirements, not to RCA. The delay was necessary in order to assure proper characteristics of the production model.

It is regrettable that military urgency sometimes requires us to begin and to increase production of vital equipment before the widest competition can be obtained. Yet the military requirement was real, was formalized in a memorandum signed by Mr. Vance, then Deputy Secretary of Defense, and could not be ignored. All such requirements are examined carefully to substantiate the urgency of the need. But once the need of our men in the field is clear, the Army always will choose to act at once and save lives, rather than delay in the hope of saving dollars.

Third, you discussed the PRC–77 contracting officer's rejection of a letter offer by Decitron Electronics Corporation of Brooklyn, New York, to produce the PRC–77 at a unit price of $893.75, or $43.41 per unit less than the price in the contract awarded RCA.

Decitron's unsolicited letter was not an acceptable proposal. It merely named a price

and requested information on the product to be built. The company had only the most general knowledge of the PRC–77. To build it Decitron would have needed extensive technical data to be obtained from the first production contract, and to wait for them would require slippage in necessary delivery schedules. Without these data, any radio built by Decitron, even if it met most of the general performance standards of the PRC–77, could not be a PRC–77. It would be a new item, with many parts not interchangeable with those of the PRC–77 and probably unable to interface with the amplifier and classified equipment which the PRC–77 uses.

You also referred to two modifications of the second PRC–77 production contract increasing the quantity, while extending the delivery time. Actually, only one of the modifications you mentioned increased the basic contract quantity. This occurred on 31 May for an additional 1298 units at the basic contract price, in order to meet an urgent need for Southeast Asia—priority "06." Deliveries will not stretch out beyond the contract term: the 1298 radios will be delivered by RCA between February 1968 and August 1968 at no increase in unit cost to the Government. The production period of the basic contract is February 1968 through May 1969.

The action on 16 August 1967 was not an increased buy. It was simply the exercise of the second-year part (5400) of the basic two-year contract. The Army awarded a two-year contract in order to obtain a substantially more favorable price per unit on the first-year buy.

You stated that a foreign company is building the PRC–77 with the RCA drawings. I assume you referred to the radio being manufactured by Tadiran, a company in Israel. That firm does not have the PRC–77 drawings, and as far as the Army is aware is building only a PRC–25 with some improvements designed into it by that firm. It is not a PRC–77.

In regard to the PRC–62 radio, award of the contract followed established procedures for research and development awards, as is well documented in the General Accounting Office, report of 13 February 1964 to former Congressman Wilson which you noted. The Army did not imply that ITT, Bendix, Advanced Communications or General Motors cannot build a portable radio. As the GAO report to Congressman Wilson states: "All fifteen proposals received were considered responsive." The award was made to RCA because it submitted the proposal judged most capable of meeting the Army's requirements.

You implied a favoritism by the Army toward RCA, and toward larger contractors in general, which simply does not exist. The Army certainly makes every effort to award contracts to small business, but cannot do so at the sacrifice of meeting military needs. RCA is a highly competent company and has played a major role in development of portable radios over the years. That it obtains some of the Army's electronics contracts can hardly be surprising. But RCA is by no means the Army's major electronics contractor. It received only $28.5 million out of $851.1 million total USAECOM awards in FY 1967. Nor does Decitron, the company which attempted to obtain the second PRC–77 production contract, lack military business. On 21 September 1967 the Defense Contract Administration Service advised that Decitron's capacity is so overloaded that a plant survey will have to be conducted before placement of any additional Government contracts with the firm.

Although no names or instances were specified, you implied possible misconduct of Army personnel in award of the PRS–25 and PRC–77 contracts to RCA. I have no reason to entertain such a suspicion and no evidence to support it. However, if any misconduct is revealed by you or by the investigative agencies now on the scene, I shall of course take prompt action.

Assuring fair, honest and efficient practices in all Army procurement agencies is a responsibility which is taken seriously at all levels of the Army. I should be pleased to discuss the matters covered above, or any others, with you at any time. I believe that in reviewing them you will conclude that the contracting decisions in question were made not only honesty, but wisely and prudently as well.

Sincerely,

STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary of the Army.

Mr. DOMINICK. In the first case which I brought up, we were dealing with a new weapon. It was developed, engineered, and carried out by a constituent of mine who produced the first hardware for this weapon, with an open-bore type arrangement that had not yet been produced at the Edgewood Arsenal. As I say, this company is a small firm.

Although it is a small firm, it has fine engineers. It has done defense work, in a minor way, largely subcontracting, in other fields.

The main reason the firm was denied the research and development contract was on the basis of "technical evaluation," as the Army called it.

In one of my speeches I pointed out that the Comptroller General will not exercise any independent determination of the Army's position on technical evaluation. Here is one of the comments that the Secretary made:

> Weighting certain factors used in the technical evaluation did not affect Custom's ranking, since no company received a lower score in four of the five characteristics evaluated—technical approach, technical personnel, background experience, and facilities.

If one looks at that in the abstract, it sounds very reasonable—the contract should have been given to Nortronics Divisions of Northrop because it had better facilities and better personnel. But we are dealing with a small company whose people spent over $100,000 of their own money, and that of their friends, in developing and producing the only hardware that was presented. So the allegation that they did not have the "technical approach, technical background experience, and facilities" to produce the weapon is patent nonsense, in my opinion. Even though the letter is signed by my friend the Secretary of the Army, I am sure he could not have had knowledge of this when he wrote the letter.

It seems impossible for me also to agree with the statement on page 2 of the letter, in which he says:

> Custom's proposal simply was not up to the standard required, and the Army would have been wasting money and imperiling the entire development program to award the contract to a company offering so little prospect of success.

This is the very company that initially developed the weapon. This is the very company that fired it. This is the very company that proceeded to have a colored film shown to the Army procurement people, they had the hardware, had the ammunition, had the weapon itself fired in Colorado and at the Edgewood Arsenal.

It is incredible to me that the aids, or whoever it may have been in the Army, could make that kind of statement, when it was impossible to make it with any degree of accuracy or actuality.

The letter also goes into the question of the RCA contract. I shall have to go into that in more detail at a later date, but I want to say at this time it would seem to me there were certain elements in the RCA contract which could not have been known when I originally gave my speech.

RICHARD GARDNER ARTICLE IN AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION JOURNAL MAKES STRONG CASE FOR U.S. RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Hon. Richard N. Gardner, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in the office of the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, is presently Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization at Columbia University.

Professor Gardner also serves as a consultant to the U.S. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg at the United Nations. In addition, he recently compiled a most interesting and valuable book entitled "Blueprint for Peace," a composite of the recommendations made by the various committees at the White House Conference on International Cooperation Year in 1965. An earlier book, "In Pursuit of World Order," by Gardner is one of the best books ever written on the United Nations.

Professor Gardner, in the current issue of the American Bar Association Journal, has authored a penetrating and persuasive brief in favor of U.S. ratification of the Human Rights Conventions. This article, aptly titled "A Costly Anachronism," points out the company this country is keeping by our continuing failure to ratify a single one of the Human Rights Conventions, as well as presenting a strong case for U.S. participation.

Because of Professor Gardner's exceptional eminence in both legal and diplomatic fields, and because I believe this article constitutes a major contribution to our dialog on human rights, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "A Costly Anachronism" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COSTLY ANACHRONISM

(By Richard N. Gardner, Henry L. Moses, Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia University)

In 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations, responding to American initiative and American leadership, approved overwhelmingly the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Only a few countries abstained—the Communist bloc, Saudi Arabia and the Union of South Africa.

Today, less than two decades later, only three of the original fifty-one U.N. members have failed to ratify *any* U.N. conventions embodying the basic principles included in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These three are Spain, the Union of South Africa—and the United States.

To be sure, the United States has demonstrated its concern with the promotion of human rights in ways other than through adherence to human rights conventions. We have advanced proposals for strengthening U.N. procedures in this field. We have spoken out clearly against specific violations of human rights in different parts of the world. And, most important of all, we have earned widespread respect from the members of the United Nations for the dedicated manner in which we have set about eradicating discrimination and injustice in our own society.

Nevertheless, our inclusion in the small company of U.N. members who have refused to ratify any human rights treaties has become an increasing diplomatic embarrassment. Our friends cannot understand it. Our adversaries exploit it. It is a costly anachronism which should be eliminated without delay.

As a representative of the United States at numerous international conferences during the last few years, I must admit that I was unable to find a convincing answer to the simple question: "Why is the United States unwilling to make an international commitment against human slavery?"

A subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently completed hearings on three U.N. human rights conventions sent to the Senate in 1963 by President John F. Kennedy—the Conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor and the Political Rights of Women. It is to be hoped that the Senate will give its advice and consent to ratification of these instruments without delay—and that it will then give sympathetic consideration to the Genocide Convention, pending in the Senate since 1949.

HUMAN RIGHTS BASED ON NATIONAL TRADITIONS

Does it really make any difference whether the United States ratifies these instruments? I believe that it does. We have an interest in the international promotion of human rights which springs from our most basic national traditions. Since the Declaration of Independence, the United States has been dedicated to the pursuit of human rights and freedoms, not just for Americans, but for "all men". Thomas Jefferson expressed a deep faith of the founding fathers when he predicted that from American shores the "fire of freedom and human rights" would be "lighted up in other regions of the earth". Throughout American history, and still today, the world looks upon us not merely as an arsenal of weapons or a storehouse of commodities but as a society committed to the promotion of the dignity of man.

Our support for human rights is, therefore, an essential and irreversible part of our American tradition. It is also more than that. It is a basic ingredient of our position as a world power. The vitality of our society and its international influence are both affected by our success in promoting the basic values of human dignity at home and abroad. In these days, foreign policy inevitably has a moral dimension.

By our leadership in international efforts on behalf of human rights we can clarify the fundamental issues that agitate the world today. Some countries put human freedoms very low on their scale of priorities; they are prepared to violate them in their drive for world power or rapid economic growth. It is the belief in human rights, in the importance and worth of every individual, that distinguishes us from totalitarians of the left and of the right.

Peace and security, economic and social development and human rights are the three sides of the triangle of world order. In the absence of any one of them, the triangle is incomplete. We have learned from hard experience of the intimate interdependence between human rights and peace and security. Nazi Germany should have taught everyone the lesson that internal suppression is often the handmaiden of external aggression—that the destruction of freedom at home can quickly lead to the destruction of freedom abroad. Dictators typically employ foreign adventures to solidify their domestic power; and the recklessness of their foreign policy is directly facilitated by the systematic destruction of domestic dissent. The other side of the coin is no less true: The more a country is threatened from without, the more dangerous it is for human rights within.

Therefore, those concerned with the preservation and development of human rights in free societies cannot fail to be concerned with the promotion of human rights on a world-wide basis. The same is true for those concerned with the pursuit of peace and security. World-wide progress in the vindication of human rights and fundamental freedoms will also be progress in creating a peaceful and stable world order. As President Kennedy put it at American University, peace is "in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights".

United States adherence to the three conventions now under study by the Foreign Relations Committee can make a practical contribution to the basic national interest of our country in promoting human rights around the world.

The Supplementary Convention on Slavery, thus far ratified by sixty-seven countries, supplements the 1926 Slavery Convention, to which the United States is already a party, by dealing with conditions akin to slavery. It requires contracting parties to take all practicable and necessary measures to bring about as soon as possible the complete abolition of such practices as debt bondage serfdom, involuntary marriage or transfer of women for payment, transfer of widows as inherited property and exploitation of children.

The Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor, already ratified by seventy-five countries, pledges each contracting party to suppress and not to make use of any form of forced or compulsory labor—as a means of political coercion or education or as a punishment for holding or expressing political views ideologically opposed to the established system; as a method of mobilizing and using labor for purposes of economic development; as a means of labor discipline; as a punishment to those having participated in strikes; or as a means of racial, social, national or religious discrimination.

The Convention on the Political Rights of Women, ratified by fifty countries, provides that women be entitled to vote in all elections on equal terms with men and without discrimination; that they be eligible for election to all publicly elected bodies established by national law; and that they be entitled to hold public office and to exercise all public functions established by national law.

These basic rights have long been taken for granted in our own country. But they are not taken for granted everywhere. Indeed, they are very much at issue in many countries of the world. By adhering to these conventions, we help give international effect to fundamental rights we have long enjoyed at home.

POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES OF U.S. ADHERENCE

Nobody, of course, believes that words on paper are enough in themselves. Nobody thinks that signing a human rights convention brings automatic improvement in the condition of people around the world. The positive consequences of United States adherence are hard to measure. Nevertheless, they are very real:

1. Ratification by the United States will encourage other nations to adhere to these conventions and implement their provisions in their own territories. This is particularly true of newly independent countries that frequently take U. N. conventions as a model. Ambassador Goldberg, in his testimony before the subcommittee, put this point sharply: "Without the support of the United States, these agreements may appear insignificant to many other countries. If we do not consider it important to sign the conventions, why should they? Or, more important, why should they implement the conventions?"

2. Ratification will put the United States in a better legal and moral position to protest infringement of these human rights in countries that have ratified the conventions but failed to implement them in practice.

3. Ratification will increase United States influence in the continuing U.N. process of drafting legal norms in the field of human rights. As long as the United States fails to ratify any human rights conventions, its views will carry less weight than they deserve.

4. Ratification will dissipate the embarrassing contradiction between our failure to ratify these conventions and our traditional support of the basic human rights with which they are concerned.

The predicament in which our failure to ratify these conventions has placed United States representatives in the United Nations is obvious. Consider, as an example, the following summary record of the attack launched by the Soviet delegate last year upon Morris Abram, our distinguished representative in the Human Rights Commission:

"An objective analysis of the political orientation of the proposal so ardently supported by the United States and its allies soon revealed that the proposal was designed to give world public opinion the impression of active participation in the cause of human rights by States which in practice obstinately refused to fulfill their obligations under the multi-lateral international conventions in the field of human rights drawn up under the auspices of the U.N. and its Specialized Agencies. The U.S. representative had admitted that the U.S. had lagged in that sphere. That was an understatement; he would mention some of the conventions which the U.S. had not ratified."

The Soviet delegate proceeded to cite examples, emphasizing the conventions which are the subject of these hearings. The Soviet statement, of course, was hypocritical in the extreme. Mr. Abram quickly pointed out, for example, that while the United States had not, like the Soviet Union, ratified the Genocide Convention, no one had accused our country of the Katyn Forest Massacres. Mr. Abram's answer was effective, yet the question persisted in the minds of many friendly delegates: If the United States is really against such practices, why is it not prepared to commit itself to United Nations treaties outlawing them?

ARGUMENTS AGAINST U.S. ADHERENCE

Thus the arguments in favor of ratifying these conventions are substantial. At the same time, there are no convincing reasons of law or policy which should prevent us from ratifying them. A study of the literature on the subject of human rights conventions reveals several arguments which have been used against United States adherence.

One argument is that ratification of human rights conventions would alter in undesirable ways the laws of the United States. This argument is inapplicable to the conventions before us today since they would involve no changes in American law.

Another argument is that ratification of human rights conventions would move into the federal domain certain subjects hitherto reserved for state action. This argument is also inapplicable to the three conventions before us today since all of them deal with matters which the Constitution has already placed within the federal domain.

I hasten to add, although it is not directly relevant to the conventions before us, that a human rights convention should not be rejected by the United States simply because it deals with matters hitherto reserved to the states. In *Missouri* v. *Holland*, 252 U.S. 416 (1920), the Supreme Court decided that the Constitution authorizes Congress to pass legislation in implementation of valid treaty commitments on certain matters otherwise reserved to the states. From the point of view of policy, there would appear to be no reason to refuse to adhere to a human rights convention dealing with matters hitherto reserved to state jurisdiction—the Genocide Convention and the Marriage Convention are examples—unless the disadvantages of moving such matters into the federal domain outweigh our foreign policy interest in the conventions.

The third argument employed against ratification of human rights conventions is that they are not proper subjects for the exercise of the treaty-making power.

Some members of the American Bar Association have argued that the United States cannot under its Constitution enter into human rights treaties because they deal "entirely with domestic matters, *i.e.*, with the relation between a state and its own citizens." This proposition has no basis whatsoever in United States law or treaty practice. The relevant test laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States is whether a treaty deals with a matter "which is properly the subject of negotiation with a foreign country" (*Geofroy* v. *Riggs*, 133 U.S. 258, 267 (1890)). Charles Evans Hughes laid down a similar standard when he declared that the treaty power can be used only to deal with matters of "international concern".

It is obvious that many matters involving the relations between a government and its own citizens can be of sufficient "international concern" to be included in treaties between the United States and other countries. The 1926 Slavery Convention, ratified by the United States during the Hoover Administration, commits the parties to abolish slavery within their respective jurisdictions and also to take measures to prevent forced labor within their jurisdictions from developing into conditions analogous to slavery. Surely things which were within the treaty power forty years ago cannot be outside the treaty power today. Moreover, the United Nations Charter, itself a treaty obligation of the United States, commits us to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the organization to promote human rights for people within the United States as well as overseas.

There are many other conventions to which we are a party committing the United States to regulate the activities of American citizens within this country for many purposes not relating to human rights—to control the production and international traffic of certain drugs, to obtain statistics on causes of death, to prescribe rules of the road and to preserve wildlife. If the United States Government can enter into a valid treaty commitment to restrain American citizens within this country from shooting animals, it is difficult to see why the United States Government cannot enter into a treaty commitment to restrain American citizens within this country from enslaving other Americans. I know of no constitutional provision which suggests or implies that animals are more important than people.

Clearly, if slavery, forced labor and the denial of women's basic rights are of "international concern" in the year 1967—and the testimony at recent hearings before a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee was unanimous that they are—there is no legal impediment to ratification of the treaties. Quite apart from the general interrelation between the denial of basic human rights and United States foreign policy interests, there are special reasons why these three conventions are of international concern for our country.

PRACTICAL REASONS FOR INTERNATIONAL CONCERN

Slavery and forced labor practiced abroad, in addition to breeding political and social tensions, can have a direct impact on the sales of American products in the United States and foreign markets.

The denial of basic rights to women, by affecting adversely one half the human resources of a less developed country, constitutes a major obstacle to progress in less developed countries that receive quantities of American aid. To give a very specific example: family planning programs, the essential means of de-fusing the population explosion, will never be wholly successful until women come to enjoy their political and social rights and cease being regarded as household possessions.

Those who oppose United States adherence to any U.N. human rights conventions have often cited the 1953 statement of John Foster Dulles to the Senate Judiciary Committee. Mr. Dulles, then Secretary of State, said: "We do not ourselves look upon a treaty as the means which we would now select as the proper and most effective way to spread throughout the world the goals of human liberty to which this Nation has been dedicated since its inception."

Mr. Dulles's use of the world "now"—and the fact that this statement was motivated by the desire to discourage the then active Bricker Amendment—suggests that Mr. Dulles's statement was a statement of policy rather than law, and that it does not preclude a different approach in the present situation. Moreover, Mr. Dulles was previously on record as a private citizen in support of the Genocide Convention, and as a United States Delegate in the United Nations he expressed support for human rights conventions.

Finally, it could hardly be maintained even in 1953 that human rights conventions were not proper subjects for the exercise of the treaty-making power. The United States was party to treaties regulating the slave trade during the nineteenth century and ratified the 1926 League of Nations Convention outlawing slavery—the predecessor of the treaty now under discussion here. If the outlawing of slavery can be the proper subject for treaty making, why not the outlawing of forced labor? And why not the denial of basic rights to women at a time when human dignity and a maximum use of a nation's resources are so obviously a matter of international concern?

Mr. Dulles also declared: "I do not mean to imply that the boundary between international and domestic concerns is rigid and fixed for all time." Indeed, it is not. The treaty-making power is broad enough to encompass all matters of international concern as determined by contemporary fact, rather than by the outmoded conceptions of a distant past.

"I am not an advocate of frequent changes in laws and constitutions", Jefferson once wrote. "But laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed and more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions changed with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times."

There are many urgent questions at present before the Foreign Relations Committee and the United States Congress. In particular, Congress is preoccupied with the war in Vietnam and all the problems it poses for our country. But foreign policy has many dimensions. We must not permit our preoccupation with one dimension to divert us from others which are also important.

There is a moral dimension to our foreign policy. Cynics deny it until they are obliged to recognize its effect upon our power. Our concern with human rights is not just altruism—in the long run, it is essential to our national security. At a time when we are discharging at great cost a commitment to human freedom in Vietnam, we should also discharge our unfinished business in the world-wide promotion of human rights.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES BECOMING FOSTER PARENT FOR ALL OF ASIA, IN RUSK'S VIEW

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the press conference which Secretary Rusk held on Thursday, October 12, was enlightening. His presentation—I wish I could say testimony—may serve to focus attention on the vital Vietnam issues that confront the American people.

So that part of the record will be clear, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the end of these remarks the press conference of October 12, 1967, by Secretary Rusk on the subject of Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HARTKE. Before discussing the substance of the press conference, I comment briefly on the apparent unwillingness of the Secretary of State to meet in public session with appropriate congressional committees to discuss the war in Vietnam.

A fundamental constitutional issue is involved here.

In terms of our British antecedents, the issue is whether the Cabinet ministers of the King—or President—are immune from legislative process.

Could the Committee on Foreign Relations, for example, compel the Secretary of State to appear before it in public session to testify either in connection with legislation, or in connection with the more general function of advice and consent?

This issue has never been fully resolved, although it seems clear that the President could order his Cabinet minister not to appear on grounds that such appearance would not, in the President's view, be in the public interest. It is unlikely that any congressional committee would be so insistent on the exercise of a legislative function, however, that it would push the power of subpena to the point where it could be tested by the courts—as would be the case if a minister of the President were sought to be jailed for contempt.

I advocate no such course.

There are other devices which the Founding Fathers built into our system of checks and balances. Congress could, for example, refuse to appropriate funds, or the Senate could refuse to act on nominations, or other harassing tactics could be used designed to compel a Cabinet minister in public session to testify in response to the queries of Members of Congress.

I do not advocate such courses of action.

My sole purpose in making these few introductory comments is to be sure that as a U.S. Senator I have not, by failing to note Secretary Rusk's unwillingness to debate these issues with Members of Congress in public session, contributed to establishing a precedent that Cabinet members are immune from such appearances. It is my personal view that the administration—and specifically the Secretaries of State and Defense—should be willing, indeed, eager to test their policies and policy objectives in the forum of public debate and within the bounds of the American Constitution.

Last evening, at the University of Notre Dame, in my State of Indiana, where I was to address an audience of students, just before I made my remarks it was announced that the Secretary of Defense intended to appear before the same group, and would submit himself to questions from the audience.

I stated last night, and state again now, that it is remarkable to me that the Secretary of Defense finds it possible to submit himself to the students of Notre Dame University, but finds it impossible to submit himself to the U.S. Senate and the duly elected members of the Senate committees.

It is not enough for a Cabinet member to be willing to expose himself to the kleig lights only under circumstances which he can control. As the Secretary of State remarked last Thursday:

> I think that an idea stands or falls on its own merits.

But the point is the American system of free debate and discussion requires, as I believe Mr. Justice Holmes suggested, that ideas be tested in the marketplace—not that they be handed down by a King, a President, or a Secretary of State as if they had been thereby inscribed in granite.

Let us assume, however, that the Secretary of State will continue unwilling to engage publicly in discussion with his elected foreign policy critics. Under these circumstances we must do the best we can. That to me means that if we are to permit the Secretary to dodge his critics, if he is permitted to rely on defending his policies on grounds of his own choice, then we have a duty at least to propound the kinds of questions he should be willing to discuss with the people and their representatives.

Incidentally, the fact Secretary Rusk held a conference—even that substitute for discussion—was probably provoked by criticism apparent in congressional debate, public opinion polls, press dispatches from the United Nations and from Vietnam, and by perceptive and troubled columnists and editorial writers.

One final point before commenting on a few of the specifics of the Secretary's press conference:

American involvement in Vietnam and what we do about it has now reached the point where our American policy must be determined largely by the exercise of good judgment. Where American policy in Vietnam goes from here cannot be justified on the basis of implications that there exists a body of "facts" to which the administration is privy, but of which the public is not aware.

We are dealing with big issues upon which there are no pat answers.

The President and his Joint Chiefs of Staff do not know what, if anything, will trigger the other side to call for Chinese or Russian Volunteers. Secretary Rusk did not know what would bring China into Korea in 1951, as is shown by the record, and he does not know today the threshold beyond which we cannot go without bringing on world war III.

The administration does not know the point beyond which the American public will not support them.

The Joint Chiefs and the President do not know whether a little more bombing will bring the other side to negotiations, or whether the North Vietnamese have the same staying power as Texans at the Alamo.

They do not know who will be in charge in South Vietnam in 6 months.

They do not know how many Americans will be needed in South Vietnam to pacify that country;

They do not know what to do to get additional contributions either from allies already in Vietnam or how to get help from NATO countries, or India or Indonesia, or Japan—all of which, according to Mr. Rusk, are threatened.

In short, the judgment of any reasonably interested and knowledgeable American citizen is as good on this kind of issue as the judgment of the President or the Joint Chiefs of Staff—a number of whose ex-members, I might note, disagree seriously with the present members of the Joint Chiefs.

What we do know very definitely and certainly is that our American system is based on the proposition that the judgment of the American people on issues like these is more likely to be right than the judgment of any specialist—be he President, the world's greatest jet ace, or an authority on enzymes.

I turn now to the statement of the Secretary of State last Thursday as he met with the press.

Not having had opportunity to question the Secretary, I hope I do him no injustice in my interpretation of the main points in his press conference.

The Secretary's principal emphasis was upon his conclusion that American security—using his term—is at stake in Vietnam because "within the next decade or two, these will be a billion Chinese on the mainland, armed with nuclear weapons, with no certainty about what their attitude toward the rest of Asia will be." Although we have not "nominated outselves to be the policemen of all Asia," said the Secretary, "we have a tremendous stake in the ability of the free nations of Asia to live in peace." Therefore, as a "Pacific" power he contends that we have formed alliances and have "accepted a share in their defense as part of the vital national interest of the United States."

The Secretary stated:

> The almost unbelievable power of the United States has been harnessed to the simple notion of organizing a peace in the world.

What Secretary Rusk concludes from this summary of his statement is that the United States must use its tremendous power to provide a shield until such time as "the free nations of Asia brace themselves, get themselves set; with secure, progressive, stable institutions of their own, with cooperation among the free nations of Asia—stretching from Korea and Japan right around to the subcontinent."

> This is necessary—

Says Secretary Rusk—

> if there is to be peace in Asia over the next 10 or 20 years.

I hope I have done Secretary Rusk justice. I hope I have quoted him accurately. I have quoted him as much as possible. I believe the foregoing is a fair statement of his message which, if I may summarize it in my words, is as follows:

Asian Communist imperialism, represented by 1 billion Chinese, will be able within the next few years, and with nuclear weapons, to threaten to impose communism on 1 billion free Asians. The Communists will be likely to succeed in this venture unless the United States assists the free nations of Asia by supplying American manpower and material and equating stability and progress in these nations with the national security of the United States.

> The objective of Asian communism—

Says Secretary Rusk—

> is to cut the world in two and as long as that is the objective, the "hundreds of millions of people in the free nations of Asia . . . will be under the deadly and constant pressure of the authorities in Peking . . . their future . . . circumscribed by fear.

As Vice President HUMPHREY amplified this new theme a few days later, October 15, Doylestown, Pa.:

> Imagine what kind of world we would be living in if the sweep of Asian Communism should include all of Southeast Asia with its millions of people and its vast resources. The entire power structure of the world would be destroyed and drastically changed.

If this be the true reflection of the American basic objectives in Asia, I would have liked to ask Secretary Rusk and the administration such questions as the following:

First, if free Asia is threatened by Asian communism as suggested, then why is it that the most populous nations which are so threatened are not helping the United States in Vietnam with men and materiel? Specifically, why do not Japan, Indonesia, and India not see the threat in Secretary Rusk's terms? Do not those three nations combined have more industry, more raw material, and more manpower than exists in all of mainland China?

Second, is it not true that the United States is paying directly, or indirectly, the full costs of the troops of Korea, Thailand, and the Philippines who are with us in Vietnam? Would they be willing to help us without subsidy?

Third, why is it that most of our NATO allies do not see the threat in the Secretary's terms? Does the United States have a particular clairvoyance on this subject?

Fourth, do a majority of the members of the United Nations agree with the conclusion of the Secretary that "one of the most important historical facts in this postwar period has been that the almost unbelievable power of the United States has been harnessed to the simple notion of organizing the peace in the world"? Does not the United Nations have a role in organizing the peace? Or, has the United States preempted the world quest for peace?

Fifth, how many troops does mainland China now have stationed outside her borders? Is that more or less than the number of Americans stationed in Asia? Does this disposition of troops suggest to the world community that Chinese communism is on the march?

Finally on this point, but not in the nature of a question, I suggest that a candid statement of the Secretary's conclusion is that American boys must bear the brunt of the attacks of Asian communism on the free nations of Asia until they are ready to do so themselves. This conclusion is deficient in two fundamental respects.

First, the Secretary assumes that if American boys and American materiel will supply a shield, the free nations of Asia, will "brace themselves, get themselves set" and then create "secure, progressive, stable institutions of their own."

That assumption simply does not accord with either the nature of human beings or the nature of society. American citizens need only to consult their own judgment to assess the validity of that assumption. Why should any Asian state worry about protecting itself if the Americans will do it for them?

A shield of American boys will not encourage the Japanese, Indonesians, or the Indians to fight their own battles any more than the shield of American boys in Vietnam has induced the South Vietnamese to build up their own forces or develop their own institutions.

The best way to build indigenous free Asian defenses is to let these states see their own freedom threatened—not for the United States to lecture them. The fact that both India and Indonesia have asked the United States to stop the bombing and that the Japanese Government stands quiet in embarrassed silence suggests our lectures, pleas, and military action are not in their view in defense of freedom or assurance of peace.

The second fundamental deficiency in Secretary Rusk's conclusion that Americans must protect free nations of Asia from Asian communism is that he assumes the more Americans are ready to do the job, the more we will be respected.

Again, I suggest this does not accord with human nature, or the facts.

Is it reasonable to expect that somehow, after Asians kicked out the colonialists—French, British, and Dutch—that now they are going to be anxious to embrace Americans?

I think not.

It is this kind of judgment that any American citizen can make by consulting his own conscience.

Mr. President, Secretary Rusk spoke of the "importance of precision" in our discussions of Vietnam.

I suggest the Secretary was somewhat imprecise himself when he said that "the debate in which we are now involved is essentially a debate about detail."

This is rather imprecise. We are debating the role of the United States in the world and we are not agreed what that role should be. He unfortunately assumes that his view of the U.S. role is the correct view.

Is this Nation torn as it is today by discussion over "detail"? I think not.

As for imprecision, it seems to me that word characterizes very well one of the things that is wrong with our policies toward Vietnam. At one time or another the American people have been told that we are in Vietnam because we must honor our commitments, that we are fighting there for the principle of self-determination, that if we do not fight in Vietnam we would have to fight on the Pacific coast, that we are fighting to stop aggression, that we are there because the United Nations is ineffective, and now we are told that we are in Asia to prevent Asian communism from cutting the world in two.

We are warned that we must not be imprecise. Are we children?

This imprecision goes also to lesser matters, hardly worth mentioning except to warn that everything said or written by administration spokesmen should be taken with a grain of salt.

For example, in the press conference of October 12, Secretary Rusk said:

> We have had at least five substantial cessations of the bombings.

But at an earlier conference on February 9 of this year, Mr. Rusk said:

> We have on two occasions stopped the bombing of North Vietnam to discover whether there might be some constructive reaction from the other side.

We were then in the midst of the short "Tet" pause in bombing.

This discrepancy seems to me rather imprecise—especially in view of the fact that, since Tet, there has been only one further bombing pause, on May 23, Buddha's birthday.

Mr. Rusk made a great deal of the point that the United States is responding to its commitment under the SEATO Treaty. But as late as March 8, 1965, a State Department official paper describing the legal basis for U.S. actions against North Vietnam failed even to mention the SEATO Treaty. And on August 1, 1964, when Senator ERVIN asked the Secretary of State—during the hearings on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution—whether we were assisting South Vietnam under the obligations of the SEATO Treaty, the Secretary replied:

> We do believe that the obligations of the SEATO Treaty are both joint and several, and that the SEATO Treaty is a substantiating basis for our presence there and our effort there although, however, we are not acting specifically under the SEATO Treaty.

The Secretary also stated at his conference on October 12, that "five signatories have engaged their forces alongside Korean and Vietnamese troops." But he failed to note that the most powerful members of SEATO are not with us—namely, France, Great Britain, and Pakistan. He also failed to note that the United States has as many troops in South Korea as there are South Koreans in Vietnam—all of whom, of course, are paid by the United States.

The Secretary also stated that the "proportion of non-U.S. forces in South Vietnam is greater than non-U.S. forces in Korea." But he failed to note the key fact, that in Korea the South Koreans supplied two-thirds of the frontline troops, whereas in Vietnam, the United States is doing most of the fighting, and the South Vietnamese forces are engaged in garrison duty.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I commend the Secretary's press conference of October 12 to the most careful study—word by word. Imprecise as it is, it is the most precise statement of the role which the Secretary envisages for the United States in this world.

We are the world's greatest power. No doubt of it.

This administration plans to use that power to save Asia from communism, even if we must do so virtually single-handed—as seems likely—and without regard to the cost of our domestic society. We stand ready to save a billion free Asians from a threat most of them do not feel.

This is a crusade we had better not embark upon—certainly not until a consensus has developed which is much larger than now exists in the country.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 13, 1967]

RUSK: "CENTRAL OBJECTIVE IS A . . . RELIABLE PEACE"

(*The text of Secretary of State Dean Rusk's news conference yesterday:*)

Secretary RUSK: I should like to begin with a brief comment on the current public discussion of Vietnam.

I find no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Vietnam and abandon Southeast Asia to the fate which Asian communism has planned for it. Similarly, I find no serious opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war.

We Americans are, therefore, debating variations on a theme—but the theme is a central position resting upon (a) the need to meet our commitments and defend our vital national interests; (b) the pursuit of our limited objectives by limited means, and (c) our earnest desire to bring this conflict to a peaceful conclusion as soon as possible. Hanoi particularly should not misunderstand the character of this debate.

Our commitment is clear and our national interest is real. The SEATO Treaty approved with only one dissenting vote by our Senate, declares that "Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area . . . would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger . . ."

The Treaty says "each party" will act. The fidelity of the United States is not subject to the veto of some other signatory—and five signatories have engaged their forces alongside Korean and South Vietnamese troops. Indeed, the proportion of non-U.S. forces in South Vietnam is greater than non-U.S. forces in Korea.

In August, 1964, the Congress by joint resolution declared, with only two dissenting votes, that "The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia." This was not a new idea in 1964. It was the basis for the SEATO Treaty a decade earlier. It is no less valid in 1967. Our several alliances in the Pacific reflect our profound interest in peace in the Pacific, and in Asia where two-thirds of the world's people live, no less vital to us as a Nation than is peace in our own hemisphere or in the NATO area.

I have heard the word "credibility" injected into our domestic debate. Let me say, as solemnly as I can, that those who would place in question the credibility of the pledged word of the United States under our mutual security treaties would subject this Nation to mortal danger. If any who would be our adversary should suppose that our treaties are a bluff or will be abandoned if the going gets tough, the result could be catastrophe for all mankind.

It is not easy for our people to wage a struggle by limited means for limited objectives. We Americans are an impatient people—a quality which has helped to build a great Nation. The present impatience about Vietnam is thoroughly understandable—and is shared by those who carry official responsibility. But our overriding object is—and must be in this modern world—the establishment of a reliable peace. It is easy to rush into total catastrophe. It requires courage and determination to act with both firmness and restraint in the interest of peace. An examination of the crises in which we have been involved since 1945 will show, I think, the supremacy of the objective of a reliable peace.

President Johnson has emphasized, time and time again, his interest in a prompt and peaceful settlement of the present struggles in Southeast Asia. Just two weeks ago, in San Antonio, he said:

"The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussions. We, of course, assume that while discussions proceed, North Vietnam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation."

Can there be a more reasonable proposal? Is there anything unfair about such a simple proposition? Is it not clear that if Hanoi is interested in peace it could say "yes" publicly or privately to the President's offer?

A rejection, or a refusal even to discuss such a formula for peace, requires that we face some sober conclusions. It would mean that Hanoi has not abandoned its effort to seize South Vietnam by force. It would give reality and credibility to captured documents which describe a "fight and negotiate" strategy by Vietcong and the North Vietnamese forces. It would reflect a view in Hanoi that they can gamble upon the character of the American people and of our allies in the Pacific.

Earlier I referred to variations on a theme. The debate in which we are now involved is essentially a debate above detail—this or that military move, this or that diplomatic step, this or that formulation of what is in fact a common middle position. If that be true, precision is important. People at least should make it clear whether they are arguing with Washington or with Hanoi.

When people talk about a pause in the bombing, they should know that Hanoi calls a pause an "ultimatum." When a Senator says that he wants to stop the bombing but, of course, wishes to continue to bomb in support of our Marines south of the DMZ, he should know that Hanoi categorically rejects any such notion. When people say "Negotiate now," they should know that the President would meet with Ho Chi Minh and other chiefs of state concerned tomorrow—and that I would depart today for any mutually convenient spot if I could meet a representative of North Vietnam with whom I could discuss peace in Southeast Asia.

Chairman Thieu and Prime Minister Ky have repeatedly offered to meet with the authorities of Hanoi to arrange a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement. They and we both responded affirmatively to U Thant's proposals of last March. Had there been a similar response from Hanoi, there would have been discussions to arrange a military standstill, preliminary conversations and a convening of the Geneva conference. Literally dozens of proposals made by ourselves, other governments or groups of governments have been rejected by Hanoi.

I cannot tell you when peace will come. I am encouraged by progress toward peace in South Vietnam, but I cannot name a date. But we shall continue our effort both by resisting those who would impose their solutions by brute force and by an unremitting exploration of every path which could lead to peace.

I am ready for your questions.

Q: Mr. Secretary, with regard specifically to President Thieu's offer, reported offer to meet with Hanoi and then arrange a week's pause in bombing if they agreed to talks, one was the United States consulted on this offer first, and did it agree, and, two, do you think such a limited offer has any chance of success?

A: My understanding is that a press officer repeated what President-elect Thieu had said during his campaign, I think in August. And that this was not itself a new development. Of course, we would be very much interested in Hanoi's response to such a suggestion.

The problem is that dozens and dozens of suggestions have been made to Hanoi through all sorts of channels, with all sorts of formula, and that Hanoi has categorically rejected all of them.

Now, this is the sort of an idea which is no problem for Washington. What is needed is some response from Hanoi to this or any one of a dozen other ideas with which Hanoi is thoroughly familiar.

Q: Mr. Secretary, some question has arisen in connection with the report from Saigon today as to whether the United States was consulted about President Thieu's proposed move, and how President Thieu can make a bombing offer when he is not doing the bombing.

A: Oh, I think there is no problem between ourselves and the government of South Vietnam on that. We have had at least five substantial cessations of the bombings. Everything turns on what Hanoi's attitude is. We and the government of South Vietnam keep in close touch on these matters, but the answer does not come just from Saigon and Washington. The answer must come from Hanoi as well.

SIGN FROM HANOI

Q: Mr. Secretary, you talked in your statement about the importance of precision, and with that in mind, sir, I wonder if you could help us understand whether the United States now still requires a military sign of deescalation from Hanoi in exchange for cessation of the bombing, or whether the President's statement about assuming Hanoi will not take advantage of a bombing pause represents a change.

A: Well, I think we ought to be clear that as far as the United States is concerned, we would engage in negotiations without any conditions whatever at the earliest possible moment. I frequently said we will do that today.

Now, the other side has raised a major condition. That condition is a permanent and unconditional cessation of the bombing. And they have also indicated that they will take no corresponding military action on their side but would expect to go ahead with their part of the war with complete intensity, with all of the effort that they can mobilize.

Now, President Johnson in San Antonio stated an assumption. This is an assumption with respect to the condition imposed by Hanoi. The assumption would be that if we stopped the bombing there would not be military advantage taken by that cessation of the bombing by Hanoi.

Now, Hanoi knows what this means, and we have had not the slightest indication that Hanoi is prepared for those prompt and productive talks to which the President alluded in his San Antonio reference.

ENCOURAGEMENT

Q: Mr. Secretary, you said you were encouraged about the prospects of peace in Vietnam. Why are you encouraged in view of the lack of reaction from Hanoi?

A: Well, there are many things. I know that some reporter in Saigon invented the word "stalemate." Our military authorities do not believe there is a stalemate. Ambassador Bunker doesn't believe there is a stalemate. We see defections from the Vietcong double what they were last year. We see the recruitment of southerners to the Vietcong dropped by approximately a half. We see desertions from the South Vietnamese forces sharply reduced over last year.

You have heard Gen. Larsen's report on what is happening in the II Corps area, which is half the land area of South Vietnam, the opening up of roads, the opening up of railways, the areas under government control, the sharp reduction of areas under Vietcong control. There are many indicators that the government and Allied forces are getting on with the job on the military side.

Beyond that, despite all the tongues-in-cheek, despite all the skepticism, the South Vietnamese have come through with what really ought to be considered almost a miracle in politics.

In the midst of a dirty, tough, mean, guerrilla war, they have elected a Constituent Assembly; they have adopted a Constitution; they have had hamlet and village elections throughout the country; they have elected a President and a Vice President and a Senate; they will shortly elect a lower house of the Legislature, in a situation where the Vietcong in most areas has said, if you vote, you die, and they are getting on with it.

Now, it is not easy, and we can sit back here comfortably and be skeptical about details, worry about this or that particular point, but the overriding fact is that in the midst of this kind of struggle, the South Vietnamese have been moving steadily toward a constitutional system.

Now, these elections were held in areas representing some 75 per cent of the population. A very high percentage of those who registered voted favorably, compared with our own elections in this country. The economic situation has been improving. In other words, the Vietcong have not achieved their objective. The country is moving ahead. And I see no reason for us to be gloomy simply because it is not over yet. We have had our combat forces there for approximately two years, and other Allies have put forces in there, and the situation is moving.

Now, one can find individual incidents here and there that would throw doubt on it, and the skeptic can always find some basis for his story, but there are at least a thousand stories a day that could be filed from Saigon, many of them of success, many of them reflecting close cooperation, friendship and acts of kindness among South Vietnamese and Americans.

When you look at the total situation it's moving, and I have no reason myself whatever to subscribe to this notion of a stalemate. It is not a stalemate at all.

SOVIET MOTIVE

Q: Mr. Secretary, what is the motive of the Soviet government to reject the reconvening of the Geneva conference? Did you explore this with Mr. Gromyko in New York?

A: I find it difficult to get into motives. I would suppose that Hanoi categorically refuses a Geneva conference, and therefore the Soviet Union is unwilling to step out in front and join with the British Cochairman to convene a conference to which Hanoi and Peking both strenuously object. We ourselves will be very glad to have such a conference convened, about Vietnam, about Laos, about Cambodia, or about any subject related to Southeast Asia.

A Senator the other day in the course of a Senate debate was asked what his alternative was for Vietnam, and he said, "well, I would like to see a Geneva conference." Well, he is not arguing with Washington. We have tried over and over again to use the Geneva machinery for the purposes for which it was established. We will be glad to see the two cochairmen say, go to Geneva, and put themselves in touch with elements or parties in the dispute. We would be glad to have the three ICC countries do the same thing or to make arrangements for the demilitarization of the DMZ or to assure Prince Sihanouk that Cambodia's neutrality will not be abused.

So there is no problem with us on that. The problem is that Hanoi says "no".

SHIFT OF TALKS

Q: Mr. Secretary, what do you think of the thesis of turning negotiations upside down and beginning instead between Washington and Hanoi at some lower level within the countries, specifically between the government of Saigon and the NLF, or elements of it?

A: Well, we, as you know, draw no major distinction between what is called the NLF and Hanoi. I think that the United States view is affected by the fact that as far as peace is concerned, our problem is with Hanoi. We did not put our combat forces into South Vietnam because of dissident elements in South Vietnam. We put our combat forces in there because North Vietnamese forces moved into South Vietnam. So that our problem of peace is with Hanoi.

Further than that, we know from captured documents, testimony of prisoners and other sources of information that the NLF is directed from Hanoi on a daily basis.

Now, we have no objections to exploring the possibilities of contacts with the NLF, nor do we have any objections to the government in Saigon doing so. But I would not want to mislead you by thinking that in my judgment that is going to solve the problem of North Vietnamese regiments in South Vietnam for the purpose of imposing a solution on that country by force. Hanoi has a major role to play in peace in this situation, and until there is some indication from Hanoi that they are prepared to make peace, then I don't think that lesser formulae are likely to solve the problem.

DEVELOPMENTS IN 1967

Q: Mr. Secretary, on the same day the Russians ratified the Outer Space Treaty and announced their biggest ever rise in their arms budget. Would you please appraise the relative weight of these two events in U.S.-Soviet relations?

A: Well, as far as the arms budget is concerned, I believe that the defense budget as they announced it is about the same proportion of their new budget as it was in the previous budget. In any event, it indicates some increase. Just what direction that increase will take we have no way of knowing. There was some indication that it related to the need for more military assistance to other countries. And we know that they are increasing their military assistance to North Vietnam. But it is true that we signed the Space Treaty, and I think it is worth pausing to reflect a little on 1967 despite Vietnam.

It turns out to be a most constructive year. The Kennedy Round negotiations were successfully concluded. The International Monetary Fund took a major step in the field of international liquidity. The Space Treaty was ratified unanimously by our Senate. We concluded the Consular Treaty with the Soviet Union. We and the Soviet Union filed a joint draft of a nonproliferation treaty in Geneva. The Presidents of the Western Hemisphere decided to go for a Latin American Common Market in this next decade. The Asian Development Bank became a going institution this year. Even though there was a distressing and sharp war in the Middle East, the fighting was ended in four days without the intervention of the great powers.

In other words, there have been some very constructive developments this year looking toward a general peace and a general solution of problems despite the pain and the tragedy of Vietnam. We should not be negligent of those important developments.

FULBRIGHT VIEW

Q: Mr. Secretary, in a speech in the Senate yesterday, Sen. Fulbright asserted that the United Nations is being deterred from action concerning Vietnam more by the failure of the United States to encourage it to act than by the opposition of the Soviet Union. What are your views on that, sir, and what role do you think the United Nations can play?

A: Well, I don't have his statement in front of me. I—relying upon the way you stated it—

Q: Would you like for me to get it verbatim?

A: —would say that it is not true. The United States would be glad to have the United Nations take up this question and deal with it responsibly. We have pending in the Security Council a resolution which the Security Council does not wish to act upon.

I think the general attitude in the United Nations seems to be that since Hanoi and Peking and Moscow are saying that this is not appropriate for the United Nations, that an effort by the United Nations to resolve this problem might get in the way of the use of other machinery, such as the Geneva machinery or quiet, bilateral, diplomatic exploration.

Now, I have said many times that we ourselves do not share this view because we believe that the United Nations has a responsibility for general peace and security in the world and we'd be glad to see them take it up. But, on the other hand, there are some problems about going through an exercise of futility, if that is what it appears to be, to satisfy some critics among our own people.

We can't say to you that a resolution will come out of the Security Council because of the Soviet veto, and the Soviets have made it perfectly clear they will veto. And we have no reason to think that the General Assembly will address itself in this matter in the same way in which the U.N. is addressing itself to the Middle East. In the case of the Middle East, they have had a long association with these problems. They played the crucial role in establishing the state of Israel. They have had peacekeeping forces out there and they have had armistice machinery out there, and this matter has been before the United Nations year after year. They have the United Nations machinery for refugees in the area, but this is not the attitude in the United Nations about South Vietnam. I think that they are somehow hoping that other means and other procedures will find the key that will unlock this problem, when they are on notice by most of the parties concerned—that the United Nations will not be permitted to find that key and not be permitted by Hanoi, Peking and Moscow.

INTELLECTUALS

Q: Mr. Secretary, may I ask, in view of a widely published report, whether in your nonpublic appearances around the country you are denouncing the intellectual critics of the war, including Arthur Schlesinger, and whether as reported you have dismissed Roger Hilsman.

A: No, I am not going to comment on third-hand reports on what I was alleged to have said in a private meeting. These things get out of context very quickly.

It is not true that I have any generic attitude toward all those people who call themselves or are called intellectuals.

I've been around them a good deal in my time.

I do recall, once in a while—perhaps you will forgive me for this—as friends used to say of Einstein—that he was a genius in mathematical physics, an amateur in music, and a baby in politics.

Now, I think that an idea stands or falls on its own merits and the fact that a man knows everything there is to know about enzymes doesn't mean that he knows very much about Vietnam or how to organize a peace or the life and death of nations.

So, I have great respect for intellectuals, but I don't feel that I'm intimidated by them.

(Laughter.)

PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Q: Mr. Secretary, you said in your opening statement that essentially we are engaged in a debate about detail, but the record would indicate that there has been increasing defection in the ranks of Administration supporters in the Congress. Do you contemplate, sir, a further sequence of public appearances in the Congress to try to clarify, amplify this position?

A: Well, I'm not sure that as far as the Congress is concerned the way to clarify and achieve accord is through public appearances. I myself greatly enjoy serious, responsible, candid consultation with the great committees of Congress in circumstances in which such discourse can take place. I do not think such discourse can take place always in open session.

As far as I'm concerned, a public hearing has some of the same problems as does a press conference. There are very few secrets, if Americans can discuss these matters among themselves without the rest of the world listening in. But when our allies in the nonaligned world and the Communists are listening in, there are some inhibitions at least upon the Secretary of State, because what I say in my official capacity does have repercussions in other places.

Now, these repercussions don't occur when there can be private consultations in executive sessions.

Now, that doesn't mean that I'm opposed to public discussion. I have taken part in a good many of them and made a good many public appearances in the Congress. But in terms of exercising the great constitutional responsibilities of the President and of the Congress in the national interest, I think myself that close consultation behind closed doors is one of the better ways to do it.

We do have men engaged in combat. We do have some very serious and delicate problems in front of us. And these are not problems that can always be fully explored or resolved with the kleig lights and the rest of the world all looking on and listening in.

BOMBING HALT

Q: Mr. Secretary, I'm not clear yet on your explanation of the President's statement in San Antonio. Is that intended to modify, reduce, or leave ambiguous our terms, our conditions for a bombing pause in North Vietnam?

A: Well, I think we ought to just read the statement for what it says and reflect upon the absence of a response from Hanoi.

Now, you may wonder about the details of this expression that they will not take advantage of a bombing halt. There's no point, as I have said before in these conferences, no point in my negotiating the details of that with you because you can't stop the bombing. We are prepared to discuss the details of that with Hanoi. They know it—they know it. But the point I was making is this: It seems to me that this is an essentially reasonable and fair proposal for anyone who is interested in peace. And it seems to me that it is hard for anyone to reject this proposal without confessing at the same time that they are not interested in peace and that they propose to continue their effort to move in on Southeast Asia.

This is not, by the way, just a question of Vietnam. I have never subscribed to the domino theory; it's much too esoteric. There are North Vietnamese regiments today fighting in South Vietnam. There are North Vietnamese armed forces in Laos being opposed by Laotian forces. There are North Vietnamese-trained guerrillas operating in Northeast Thailand. There are Communist dissident elements in Burma who are being aided, encouraged and helped from outside Burma across the Chinese frontier.

There was a major Communist effort in 1965 to pull off a coup d'etat against Indonesia. You don't need the domino theory. Look at their proclaimed doctrine and look at what they're doing about it.

Now, we would like to see peace in South Vietnam and in Southeast Asia just as quickly as possible. It takes two to make a peace; and we would like to see some indication from the other side that they accept the notion that all countries, large and small, as the U.N. charter puts it, have a right to live in peace without molestation from across their frontiers.

When that moment comes, there can be peace very quickly, indeed; and the United States will be no obstacle whatever in making a peace on that basis.

ASIAN ALLIES

Q: Mr. Secretary, do you foresee a greater effort or greater participation by some of the Asian allies in Vietnam, and what are the prospects for a meeting of the seven nations contributing troops there?

A: On the question of a meeting the seven nations do keep in touch with each other by various means. There is no present time or date for such a meeting. We would expect that one might well occur, but that does not mean that we're not in continuing contact with each other.

As far as forces are concerned, this will be for each country to determine for itself; and each country would make its own announcements on that subject.

Of course, we would be glad to see additional forces from other countries involved in South Vietnam.

I do want to emphasize that the present effort is not negligible. South Vietnam has something like 700,000 men under arms. I think the comparable figure for us would be somewhere in the range of nine million compared to their population or any other measure you want to put on it.

The Laotian forces are engaged in Laos. The Thais are engaged in Northeast Thailand, in addition to what they have been putting into South Vietnam.

So that there is a significant effort by the countries of Southeast Asia to fend off this pressure from the North.

CHE GUEVARA

Q: Mr. Secretary, I'd like to ask you on another subject for a second—whether you have satisfied yourself that the man killed in Bolivia within the week was indeed Che Guevara.

A: Well, I have no—when you say have I satisfied myself, I have no personal, independent proof. But, on the other hand, I have no reason whatever to doubt the reports which have come in from the Bolivian government. And I am proceeding on the basis that it was Che Guevara, and without any reason whatever to doubt it.

RED ARMS TO ARABS

Q: Mr. Secretary, would you assess for us the stand of Soviet arms delivery to the Arab nations, especially in view of the conflicting estimates?

A: Well, I think I wouldn't want to get into figures. I've seen some estimates that appear to me to be too high. There was some significant resupply of certain of the Arab forces by the Soviet Union following the events of last June. We have, as you know, publicly, as well as privately, proposed that the principal arms-supplying countries get together with the countries in the area and try to find some ceiling on the arms race in that area. It is the one point on which we have been, I think, most disappointed up to this point; but I wouldn't want to try to straighten out figures, as between 60 per cent or 80 per cent and figures of that sort.

MIDEAST DIPLOMACY

Q: Mr. Secretary, on the diplomatic front in the Middle East, there have been several U.S.-Soviet meetings on the subject lately. Does this diplomatic activity indicate that you're making any progress within the present framework on this subject? Can you report anything to us on that?

A: Well, in our business we work at such questions very hard, on the basis that progress is possible and that a good result can be achieved. We have not yet reached that result. It is, therefore, little hazardous to indicate whether we feel that real progress is being made.

What is happening is private consultation among the countries in the area, or with countries in the area and among certain of the countries outside the larger powers, to see if we could find a basis on which there can be a permanent peace in the area.

Now, this turns critically upon the attitude of the countries in the area. At the present time I do not think that it turns upon major differences or conflicts among the great powers but, nevertheless, it is not easy for the great powers to agree among themselves unless they know what the attitudes of the countries in the area will be.

Now, I think this process is likely to continue. I don't think that time is working now on the side of a peaceful settlement. I think it is important for some movement to get started and that the United Nations has both a responsibility and an opportunity here in this situation.

So these discussions go on. They go on in great detail, with many governments. And I would hope that before too long we could find a formula which would move this situation toward that permanent peace which we desperately hope for, and which I think the ordinary peoples of the area would welcome if it could be obtained.

U.S. IMAGE ABROAD

Q: Mr. Secretary, one of the elements in the public discussion over stopping the bombing particularly, in Congress, seems to be senatorial worries about how the United States is regarded abroad. Senators have heard the opening debate in the General Assembly, where Foreign Minister after Foreign Minister has urged the United States to stop the bombing.

When you are confronted with a concern like that—I think almost 30 Foreign Ministers asked for a pause in the bombing—how do you reply to that concern. And, linked with that is Sen. Cooper's proposal to stop bombing except on the infiltration routes above the DMZ.

A: Well, on the last point—a proposal to stop the bombing except on the infiltration routes would be categorically rejected by Hanoi; and not move us one inch toward peace, unless Hanoi makes a major change in its position. Your count on Foreign Ministers is a little higher than mine, in terms of stopping the bombing.

You know, I haven't found anyone in the world—private citizen, or public official, in this or other governments—who have come to me and said, "If you stop the bombing, and there is no response from Hanoi, then our attitude would change."

I had a group of private citizens in not long ago to talk about this, and they wanted us to stop the bombing. I said, "All right, if we stop the bombing"—we have stopped it on a number of occasions—"If we stop the bombing and Hanoi does not respond, will you then change your view?" They said, "No, of course, not."

I could only say well, if we can't influence you by stopping the bombing, how do you expect us to influence Hanoi by stopping the bombing?

Now I would be glad to hear from any of these Foreign Ministers what their governments will do if we stop the bombing, and there is no response from Hanoi. And I want to hear that. I haven't heard it from anybody.

I do know what the British Cochairman would do if we stopped the bombing: Make a maximum effort to get this matter moved toward peace.

But, if Hanoi is saying "No," all the time, then he has very little chance. And, if the other Cochairman won't cooperate, there is very little chance.

So I would like to hear somebody tell me what they would do if we stopped the bombing. It is not just Hanoi who is not saying that.

HANOI OFFER?

Q: Mr. Secretary, on that point, is it not correct that this Government was informed by the Soviet government, on the authorization of Hanoi, that if the bombing was stopped there would be a conference between the United States and North Vietnam within three or four weeks?

A: No, we were not informed that. We were not informed of that. There was a public statement by Mr. Kosygin, in London. But Hanoi has not said that, to our knowledge. Anyhow, just in case they should say it, why three or four weeks? Why not the next morning?

Q: Is that a material difference?

A: Well, I don't know. But I don't know what waiting for three or four weeks means.

But what we need—There is no one in the world who has been able to tell us what Hanoi would do if we stopped the bombing.

Now, we don't have to speculate about this; we checked this out with Hanoi. We don't have to speculate and engage in wishful thinking, and proceed on a hypothetical basis, and think that maybe the atmosphere would be improved. Of course, the atmosphere would be improved over North Vietnam. But what we want to know is "What would happen?" and Hanoi is not willing to tell us what would happen, and no one else is able to tell us what would happen. So, we want to hear something.

For us to say, "We will stop, you go right ahead with your war; you live there safely and comfortably, without being disturbed while you send your men and arms into South Vietnam for the next 50 years," where would be the incentive for peace?

Now, we are interested in peace; we are not interested in a sanctuary which will let them carry on these operations against South Vietnam and Laos for eternity; while they sit there in their sanctuary taking their own time, paying no price, trying to seize their neighbors by force. Now, let's not be children.

Yes.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Q: Mr. Secretary, one of the questions—basic questions—that seems to be emerging in this Senate debate is whether our national security is really at stake in Vietnam, and whether Vietnam represents an integral part of our defense perimeter in the Pacific.

Your earlier statement indicates that you think our security is at stake in Vietnam. I think it would help in this debate if you would perhaps elaborate and explain why you think our security is at stake in Vietnam.

A: Within the next decade or two, there will be a billion Chinese on the mainland, armed with nuclear weapons, with no certainty about what their attitude toward the rest of Asia will be.

Now the free nations of Asia will make up at least a billion people. They don't want China to overrun them on the basis of a doctrine of the world revolution. The militancy of China has isolated China, even within the Communist world, but they have not drawn back from it. They have reaffirmed it, as recently as their reception of their great and good friend, Albania, two days ago.

Now we believe that the free nations of Asia must brace themselves, get themselves set; with secure, progressive, stable institutions of their own, with cooperation among the free nations of Asia—stretching from Korea and Japan right around to the subcontinent—if there is to be peace in Asia over the next 10 or 20 years. We would hope that in China there would emerge a generation of leadership that would think seriously about what is called "peaceful co-existence," that would recognize the pragmatic necessity for human beings to live together in peace, rather than on a basis of continuing warfare.

Now from a strategic point of view, it is not very attractive to think of the world cut in two by Asian communism, reaching out through Southeast Asia and Indonesia, which we know has been their objective; and that these hundreds of millions of people in the free nations of Asia should be under the deadly and constant pressure of the authorities in Peking, so that their future is circumscribed by fear.

Now these are vitally important matters to us, who are both a Pacific and an Atlantic power. After all, World War II hit us from the Pacific, and Asia is where two-thirds of the world's people live. So we have a tremendous stake in the ability of the free nations of Asia to live in peace; and to turn the interests of people in mainland China to the pragmatic requirements of their own people, and away from a doctrinaire and ideological adventurism abroad.

COMMITMENTS

Q: Could I ask just one follow-up question on that, sir:

Do you think you can fulfill this very large commitment of containment and still meet the commitment of the Manila conference—to withdraw within six months after a peace agreement has been reached?

A: Oh, yes, I think so.

That does not mean that we ourselves have nominated ourselves to be the policemen for all of Asia. We have, for good reasons, formed alliances with Korea and Japan, the Philippines, the Republic of China, Thailand, Australia, and New Zealand; and South Vietnam is covered by the Southeast Asia Treaty.

That doesn't mean that we are the general policemen. Today, the Laotian forces are carrying the burden in Laos on the ground. The Thais are carrying the burden in Thailand; the Burmese are carrying the burden in Burma; the Indians are carrying the burden upon their northeastern frontier—the Sikkim border—and whatever other threat there might be in that direction.

But we have our part; we have accepted a share, and we have accepted that share as a part of the vital national interest of the United States.

Now what I don't understand is that Senators would declare in August, 1964, that the United States considers it a vital national interest of this country that there be international peace and security of Southeast Asia. And, then, two years later, some of them seem to brush that aside as having no validity. Now that wasn't a Tonkin Bay reaction. Paragraph 1 was Tonkin Bay. Paragraph 2 was Southeast Asia.

Now if people change their minds, then it is fair to ask the question:

"On which occasion were they right?"

Now I personally believe they were right in August, 1964. And perhaps they will be right again if they come back to that position—1968 or '69.

But these are not matters that change with the wind. These have to do with the possibility of organizing a peace on a planet on which human beings can destroy each other. Now perhaps we could at least agree that that is the central question, even though there could be some debate about how you do it.

And I believe that those who think that you can have peace by letting one small country after the other be overrun have got a tremendous burden of proof in the light of the history of the past four decades; and they have not sustained that burden of proof.

CENTRAL OBJECTIVE

Q: Mr. Secretary, would you describe the net objective here than as the containment of Chinese Communist militancy?

A: No. The central objective is an organized and reliable peace.

Now if China pushes out against those with whom we have alliances, then we have a problem, but so does China. If China pushes out against the Soviet Union, both China and the Soviet Union have a problem.

We are not picking out ourselves, we are not picking out Peking as some sort of special enemy. Peking has nominated itself by proclaiming a militant doctrine of the world revolution, and doing something about it. This is not a theoretical debate; they are doing something about it.

Now we can live at peace—we have not had a war with the Soviet Union, in 50 years of co-existence, since their revolution. We are not ourselves embarked upon an ideological campaign to destroy anybody who calls themselves Communist. But we are interested in the kind of world structure sketched in Articles I and II of the United Nations charter, in which all nations, large and small, have a right to live in peace.

And the aggressors nominate themselves—we don't choose them—the aggressors nominate themselves by what they say and do. And when they do, then those who are genuinely interested in peace have a problem on their hands, and sometimes it gets tough; and sometimes we are tested, and we find out what kind of people we are. And I think one of the most important historical facts in this postwar period has been that the almost unbelievable power of the United States has been harnessed to the simple notion of organizing a peace in the world.

Q: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

THE VICE PRESIDENT ADDRESSES THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in an address to the 40th anniversary meeting of the Future Farmers of America, a one-time smalltown boy from Doland, S. Dak., now the Vice President of the United States, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, made a plea to the young people participating to help provide leadership to build up our rural communities and create a good life in smaller towns away from our stricken cities.

I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA, KANSAS CITY, MO., OCTOBER 11, 1967

This 40th anniversary of the Future Farmers of America is a great occasion for me. I can make a claim none of you young people can—I have followed your progress for the full forty years.

Just a few weeks ago I had an excellent progress report from your national officers who visited me in Washington.

Let me hasten to add that I cannot remember the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act for Vocational Training in Agriculture which got this whole movement started.

Because of what I know about you I have the greatest confidence in your future.

I am confident primarily for one reason—I feel that you have always had, and continue to have, a sense of the tremendous and exciting opportunities open to you. Despite a bad impression created by a very few, I know that faith in the future is a characteristic of most of your generation. And since half of our citizens are under 25 today, it is a hopeful sign for this nation.

What kind of a future are we going to build for ourselves and for America? (I say "We" because I fully expect to be in this with you for a long time).

One thing is certain: Whatever path we choose, we will have a lot to work with.

Our country is rich, and it is going to grow a lot richer as we move through the last third of this Twentieth Century.

American farms produce a greater abundance than any other farms in the world, and that abundance will surely increase.

Planes and cars will be faster, communications quicker, life longer. Our astronauts will move farther out into space, our oceanographers will probe the depths of the sea.

By every measurement of quantity, size and speed we shall move forward.

But what about the quality of American life? How are we going to use our abundance?

A great American President—and citizen of this state—Harry Truman—once said: "Democracy is based on the conviction that man has the moral and intellectual capacity, as well as the inalienable right, to govern himself with reason and justice."

Is it reasonable and just when smoke and waste from our automobiles and industries poison the air we breathe and pollute our water?

Is it reasonable and just when one family in seven in this rich country doesn't have enough to eat, enough to wear, a decent place to live?

Is it reasonable and just when young people your age cannot share your hope in the future because they were born in poverty . . . because they had to leave school too soon . . . because they grew up in broken homes?

Is it reasonable and just that rural America should lose precious human resources while at the same time our cities grow ever larger, more congested, more burdened with slums?

It is that last question I especially want to discuss with you today—as young people who have a personal stake in finding the right answer . . . who have a stake in proving that Americans do have the "moral and intellectual capacity" to govern themselves with reason and justice.

What are the hard facts of the emigration from rural America?

Between 1950 and 1960, 11 million Americans moved from the countryside to the city. During that time, the population of our rural areas was static. All the growth of American population occurred in the cities, and that trend has continued. We can expect to have 100 million more Americans by the end of this century—just over thirty years from now. And if the present trend continues, they are almost all going to be jammed together in a few sprawling metropolitan areas.

People leave the country for many reasons. Poverty is one. Many who leave are Negro Americans who see their only chance in the city.

But they don't have the skills they need to hold a city job. They know nothing about city life. They find themselves confined to crowded, run-down apartments and neighborhoods . . . humiliated and frustrated in an alien world of unemployment, welfare and crime. And their dream of hope turns into a nightmare of despair.

But these Americans are only part of the story. A lot of people leave perfectly comfortable homes in our small towns and on our farms because they think they have to go to the big city to enjoy a decent standard of living . . . get a good education . . . provide a better life for their families.

Most of those people are under thirty, and by far the largest group are young people who have just finished high school—people about your age whose whole productive lives are ahead of them.

It is sad but true that those people often pack up and move with good reason.

One third of the Americans who live on farms, live in poverty. The figure is only one-seventh in the cities—not good, but a little better.

The average rural teenager completes about 9 years of school. The figure is over 12 in the cities.

The proportion of people without jobs is twice as high among agricultural workers as it is for industrial workers. Some 73 percent of urban households, headed by a man with a job, have an automobile, telephone, hot-and-cold running water, and sound housing. The figure is 60 percent in rural towns, and less than 50 percent on the farm.

Only a small percentage of small or middle-sized towns offer live theater, an art gallery, an orchestra, first-rate medical care, a variety of stores and shops. Almost all our metropolitan areas do.

We know these facts are misleading and do not tell the whole story. But they do point to reasons why rural America continues to lose some of its best people.

They leave, and what does it mean?

It means there are fewer people to pay taxes in the rural areas . . . that the schools cannot afford the most modern equipment . . . that shops and businesses close. More people leave, and the vicious cycle continues.

A recent Gallup Poll showed that half of the American people would prefer to live in the country or in a small town; but most do not. They simply feel they do not have a choice.

By now, most of you are probably saying, "I didn't know we had it so bad."

Well, don't worry. My speech is not over, and before I am done you may feel a little better about it.

Because there is something we can do about the quality of life in America—both urban and rural America.

Unlike any other nation in history—unlike almost any other nation in the world today—we have the technology and the resources to extend all the benefits of modern living to every American, regardless of where he chooses to live.

We can have real freedom of choice in America.

The challenge is to put our technology and resources to work in the right combination, in the right places.

The problems which we see in our cities need treatment now. Slums . . . pollution . . . congestion . . . crime . . . unemployment . . . lack of education, require a direct attack.

They cannot be treated indirectly with trickle-down progress.

But many of our urban problems have their roots in the rural problems which I have mentioned.

We cannot save our cities by creating a better life in the country. It is far too late for that.

But it does mean that if we make up for our past neglect of farm communities . . . and of the middle-sized towns of 10-thousand, 30-thousand, 50-thousand people that dot this country, we will be building a better America for all Americans, wherever they live.

I am not talking about recreating those mythical "good old days" down on the farm. I lived those good old days—dust storms, mortgage foreclosures, isolation, the one-room schoolhouse, life on the fringe, and dreams turned away.

I am not even talking about unpolluted air and the smell of fresh cut hay.

There is more to life than that and I think we can all share the best.

In the 1930's modernizing rural America meant rural electrification and a movie theatre in every town.

In the 1940's, it meant many and well-paved roads.

Now, it means airports capable of handling short-hop jets . . . community colleges . . . modern hospitals and good doctors . . . the very best in elementary and secondary education.

It means golf courses and ballparks. It means drama groups and art classes in addition to quilting bees.

We know it can be done, because we have seen it done. To make my point, let me give you an extreme example: Huntsville, Alabama.

Huntsville used to be a small Southern town—a place where people were born and died, but where they spent little time in-between.

Then the TVA went into action. Huntsville got access to electric power. It got access to water for transport and for recreation.

Then scientific and space installations moved in. Other industries followed. New stores began to meet the needs of new customers. New taxpayers built new schools.

Huntsville is today a good place not only to be from but to be.

But Huntsville is the exception and not the rule.

It tells us what can be done, if all things come together in the right way.

A basic ingredient of success is obviously jobs—jobs based not only on agriculture but on medium and small industry . . . on research facilities . . . on distribution centers . . . on enterprises which do not have to be in large metropolitan areas to prosper and grow.

There is a lot that government at all levels can do to help. We can use the economic weight of the Defense Department and other government contracts for research, development, and production. We can offer tax incentives, subsidies, new programs of cooperative partnership between government and private enterprise, such as we are putting to work in our big cities.

We can help to provide the same things, on a smaller scale, that have made Huntsville such a positive example.

But other initiatives will have to come from those who live in rural America—and especially its young people.

You can work through rural community development groups to attract the kind of job-producing enterprises your communities need.

Sell businessmen on the natural resources and recreation opportunities available in your town. Tell them about the manpower available—manpower that has handled machinery since childhood.

Show them clean communities. Show them active civic groups. Show them schools, churches and parks—the things that prove you care about your future.

For in the last analysis it is the people themselves who know their own needs best and can best build the kind of future they want.

You have the chance now, as future leaders of your towns and communities, to help build an America that truly does offer freedom of choice:

Where young people can find a rich and rewarding life in every community.

Where stimulating work . . . the best in education and health care . . . sports and recreation . . . music and the arts, are as much a part of everyday life in Kansas as in Chicago, Nebraska as in New York.

And, by so doing, you have the chance to help restore, too, to urban America the sense of community and of neighborliness . . . the human values that have been so much a part of American heritage.

In the words of President Johnson:

"History records a long hard struggle to establish man's right to go where he pleases and live where he chooses. It took many centuries—and many bloody revolutions—to break the chains that bound him to a particular plot of land, or confined him within the walls of a particular community.

"We lose that freedom when our children are obliged to live someplace else . . . if they want a job or if they want a decent education.

"Not just sentiment demands that we do more to help our farms and rural communities . . . the welfare of this nation demands it."

I have no doubt that we shall meet this challenge of providing a true life of choice for all Americans.

That is the opportunity history has given us in the last third of the Twentieth Century.

We can do it.

In the words, again, of Harry Truman: "It is not our nature to shirk our obligations. We have a heritage that constitutes the greatest resource of this nation. I call it the spirit and character of the American people."

POSTAGE STAMP TO COMMEMORATE GEN. GEORGE CATLETT MARSHALL, ORIGINATOR OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, today, on the 20th anniversary of the Marshall plan, the Post Office Department is issuing a stamp to commemorate the originator of that plan, Gen. George Catlett Marshall.

The first-day ceremonies for the stamp, one of the Department's "Prominent Americans" series, are being held this afternoon in Lexington, Va., at the George C. Marshall Research Library of Virginia Military Institute, General Marshall's alma mater.

In an address dedicating the George C. Marshall stamp, Postmaster General O'Brien recalls that it was Winston Churchill who wrote of Marshall:

> Succeeding generations must not be allowed to forget his achievements and his example.

The issuance of the Marshall stamp will be of great help, I am confident, in the continuing effort of the Marshall Research Library to keep the memory of General Marshall alive in the minds of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent the address by Postmaster General O'Brien be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE FIRST DAY CEREMONY OF THE GEORGE C. MARSHALL STAMP, GEORGE C. MARSHALL RESEARCH LIBRARY, LEXINGTON, VA., OCTOBER 24, 1967

I am very pleased to join with so many distinguished Americans here today in honoring General Marshall.

I have always felt that the character of a nation is best discovered, not in its material wealth, not in its literature or art, not in its cities, not in its natural resources—but, rather, in the caliber of men it chooses for leadership.

If we apply that touchstone to George Catlett Marshall, we need not fear for the future of our nation.

For truly, George Catlett Marshall was a leader in the American mold.

He was completely devoted to duty and to country.

Honored at home and abroad he sought no honors for himself.

While often wounded by men of narrow vision, he shrugged off those attacks as unrepresentative and unworthy of a free people.

When his true brilliance and splendid potential were bypassed by the slowness of promotion in our neglected Army before World War II, he did not fulminate against the Republic, he did not plot, he did not curse his fate, and, above all, *he did not quit*. Instead, he swallowed the injustice of the system, and worked and planned for a military force capable of assuring the security of our nation.

Few Americans have served longer or with more distinction than this man, who began his military career outside the traditional channel of a West Point education. Few men have risen so high by force of intellect, by solid achievement, by devotion to the common good.

And few have stood more consistently for the ideals and beliefs which they cherished.

And through that consistency he helped mold our concept of what an American should be.

His character, so unblemished, so rock-fast, has made plain the wisdom of the Founding Fathers when they agreed that no titles of nobility should be granted by the United States Government. For the recognized nobility of General George Marshall soared far beyond the scope of some external title. His was the *true* nobility, the *earned* nobility, the nobility of soul and mind.

During the most critical hours of our nation's life, when we were in a death struggle with the most evil tyranny to stalk mankind since Attila the Hun, and later, when we grappled with the chaos and the ruins after the destruction of that tyranny, George Catlett Marshall was one of the handful of men who guided the destiny of our nation.

Our free institutions yet stand, and tens and hundreds of thousands of people are alive today because of the clarity of his vision, the unerring foresight of his counsel.

I have spoken to many who knew or closely observed George Marshall during those dark days of wartime conflict and post-war confusion and all were united in their assessment of his steadiness under even the most extreme provocation.

He chose his course wisely, but that course was always based on ideals—ideals that reflected the best in our American tradition.

And those ideals in which he did believe he espoused with a fervor and sense of deep conviction often lacking in some quarters today. In these times it seems many are twisted by momentary winds of change, by transient opinion, and lose their balance under the buffeting of so many complex events.

When our nation faced its most awesome test, when its military force was in disarray, when we needed above all the very best that we could produce, when we asked, "God give us statesmen!" we turned to George Catlett Marshall.

When we recognized that "A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands," we turned to George Catlett Marshall.

When we needed "Men who possess opinions and a will; men who have honor; men who will not lie," we turned to George Catlett Marshall.

We turned to him and we placed crushing responsibilities on his shoulders. He accepted the burden and he succeeded. With high honors he retired to the peaceful life he much preferred.

And then his nation turned to him once more, and he responded as all who knew him expected he would.

Appointed special emissary to a crumbling China in a mission that could not succeed, he did all that man could do to restore peace . . . appointed Secretary of State, his brilliant mind produced the plan which bears his name, the plan that Churchill once called "the most *un*sordid act in history". . . appointed Secretary of Defense, he welded our military force into a new and greater unity and power.

It is important to remember George Catlett Marshall for two reasons.

The first is that greatness in and of itself demands respect and remembrance.

The second is equal in importance and often overlooked.

For a great career exemplifies the finest response by a fellow human being to periods of crisis and stress.

To ignore the lesson and merely concentrate on a eulogy is to do a disservice to George Catlett Marshall.

And so, my friends, I would like to propose for your consideration what I consider to be the most significant lesson from the life of this man, a lesson that might serve us well in our own days of crisis.

In my mind, that lesson is the willing acceptance of the hard road of responsibility rather than the easy road of comfort and acclaim.

I vividly recall seeing in England a memorial to President Kennedy with the words from his inaugural address—"Ask not what your country can do for you. . . ." Well, General Marshall always asked what he could do for his country. He gladly accepted the responsibility.

I think he would be saddened but not surprised that those who follow after him still face a world in which violence is more common than cooperation. He would be saddened, yes, but he also would not choose now, as he did not choose during life, to ignore the crises or to suggest that the threat to his country would disappear by wishing rather than by acting.

Where would George Marshall have stood on the question of Vietnam?

There is no doubt about the answer.

He would have deeply regretted, as President Johnson deeply regrets, the necessity of fighting in Vietnam.

He would have mourned, as President Johnson mourns, the death of American fighting men in Vietnam.

He would have tried to bring about peace and cooperation, as President Johnson is trying with every ounce of his energy, to bring about peace and cooperation.

But he also would have done what must be done to protect America and preserve our democratic process.

Not for a moment would he have confused what should be—a peaceful world—with what is: a world where aggression still blights lives and seeks to destroy freedom.

He would have fought for a finer world as a legacy to America's children.

He would *not* have chosen, as President Johnson does not choose, a legacy of peace that is no more than a pause while our enemies regroup, rearm, rebuild.

Presented with the choice between an agonizing struggle and an America fleeing from a difficult problem, I am certain where his choice would lie.

He refused to retreat from the hard, responsible road when he was under personal attack. He once said that, "The hardest thing I ever did was to keep my temper. I had to work with those people, and that was that." He knew his responsibility, and he accepted it.

This is why I am proud to dedicate the George C. Marshall stamp on this Twentieth Anniversary of the Marshall Plan—which also, as you know, is United Nations Day. This stamp will serve as millions of reminders of the greatest cooperative effort ever undertaken. And that is well. But it will also turn our eyes millions of times to the undeniable fact that here was a man who was great because of his courage, of his willingness to submerge his own ambition to the common good, who understood that the right decision is often not the easy decision, but that a great people do not remain great by easy answers and wishful thinking.

Winston Churchill, writing of General Marshall's career, stated that "Succeeding generations must not be allowed to forget his achievements and his example." This stamp will reinforce the efforts continually being made by the George Marshall Research Library to keep the memory of this gentle warrior.

My friends, I am honored to issue this stamp in our "Prominent Americans" series for a man who was certainly first in war and among those first in the hearts of his countrymen. George Marshall was a Prominent American, truly a great American.

ESCALATING THE WAR AGAINST HUNGER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I sometimes regret that newspapers do not headline noncontroversial news as prominently as they do our difficulties and our differences.

What I regard as the major news story of the month from official quarters was the sending last Saturday of an airgram to our AID missions around the world, signaling increased food-for-peace assistance.

Our missions were advised, over the signature of Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

> There is ample food available to meet program requirements which were curtailed last fiscal year because of limited supplies of some commodities.

The missions were further advised:

> The President has a personal interest in seeing that our food resources are used to improve nutrition and child feeding and he has been assured by the Secretary of Agriculture and the A.I.D. administrator that special attention will be given to using our food resources for this purpose. We believe that there are additional opportunities for imaginative use of Title II commodities for the expansion or establishment of meaningful programs to combat malnutrition, particularly in infants and pre-school age children, to provide school children with nutritious meats, and to promote community development and other self-help activities, with particular emphasis on increasing agricultural production. Such activities may be carried out under the auspices of voluntary agencies as well as government-to-government programs.

Because I have been impatient for just such an order as this, I invite attention to it and commend the administration for its dispatch and express the hope that our missions, AID, and the Department of Agriculture will, in the words of the airgram.

> Utilize more effectively title II authority to help developing countries gain ground in the food and population race, and to help speed up social and economic progress.

I am advised that the same sort of acceleration, or escalation, of the title I concessional sales program authorized under food for peace is underway at the Department of Agriculture.

This is what Congress intended and authorized in the Food for Peace Act of 1966.

The war against hunger is the one war in which we have a great tactical and logistic advantage; a war that can be waged with humanitarianism rather than bloodshed; and a war from which all mankind will benefit—a war we can win if we try.

The dispatch of Saturday's airgram will be good news to millions of Americans, and it will have the approval of an overwhelming majority of all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the airgram to our AID missions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the airgram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From: Aid/Washington.

Subject: War on Hunger—Expanded Use of Title II Food for Freedom Commodities.

1. Consistent with the new FFF legislation which authorizes the use of PL 480 Title II food supplies to combat hunger and malnutrition, stimulate agricultural productivity abroad and promote general economic and community development in the developing countries, emphasis has been placed on tailoring U.S. production to meet requirements at home and abroad. There is ample food available to meet program requirements which were curtailed last fiscal year because of limited supplies of some commodities. Our task now is to utilize more effectively Title II authority to help developing countries gain ground in the food and population race and to help speed up social and economic progress. Increased availability of PL 480 commodities, particularly wheat and wheat products, coarse grains and vegetable oils offer opportunities to help offset the economic and political effects of reduced levels of other forms of assistance.

2. The President has a personal interest in seeing that our food resources are used to improve nutrition and child feeding and he has been assured by the Secretary of Agriculture and the A.I.D. Administrator that special attention will be given to using our food resources for this purpose. We believe there are additional opportunities for imaginative uses of Title II commodities for the expansion of establishment of meaningful programs to combat malnutrition, particularly in infants and pre-school age children, to provide school children with nutritious meals, and to promote community development and other self-help activities, with special emphasis on increasing agricultural production. Such activities may be carried out under the auspices of voluntary agencies as well as government-to-government programs.

3. We are attaching for your information and for the special attention of Food for Freedom Officers two examples of effective Title II programs (Korea, Morocco). A third example involving an American Voluntary Agency (CRS), and the Government of the Philippines will be made available shortly. These illustrate the role Title II programs can play in social and economic development in rural areas and are the types of activities we have in mind.

4. We recognize that increased administrative resources may be needed by the Missions, Voluntary and International Agencies and host governments to effectively implement food programs in light of the foregoing. Missions are urged therefore to evaluate the management available to direct, administer and monitor expanded Title II activities. It is important that proposed programs do not exceed effective management capabilities; that they conform to the concept of self-help and in no way detract from the basic objective of assisting aid recipients eventually to stand on their own feet. It is also important that programs conform to Sec. 202 of the Act: ". . . Except in the case of emergency, the President shall take reasonable precaution to assure that commodities . . . will not displace or interfere with sales which might otherwise be made . . ."

5. *Action Requested.*—Review the possibilities of increasing the use of commodities available under Title II consistent with the priorities set forth in the Guidelines which were transmitted with AID Circular XA 2367. dated 4/5/67. Please advise AID/W of the outcome of this review by not later than November 15, 1967.

6. New program proposals or amendments to current programs received by March 1, 1968 will be processed as FY '68 programs. Submissions received after that date will be considered as part of the FY '69 programs.

RUSK.

PRESS FREEDOM BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the De Pere, Wis., Journal, whose editor and publisher is Mr. Paul J. Creviere, recently published an excellent editorial on the freedom of the press, which I commend to the attention of all Senators. The editorial deals with a truth too often forgotten—that the newsman's right to know is really an extension of the public's right to know. To put shackles on the newsman's freedom to obtain information about the workings of local, State, or National Government is to limit the public's right to know, thus threatening the very foundations of our democracy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS FREEDOM BELONGS TO PEOPLE

Who ever told that nosey editor he had a right to pry into what happened at our council meeting? What gave that reporter any idea that he could write about the school directors the way he did?

The answer is that there is no law, rule, regulation or order that specifically requires a newspaper reporter to cover city council, school board or court sessions. The Constitution says "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of the press." One can search out all of the laws of the Federal Government, right down to the Freedom of Information bill passed by the 89th Congress, and find nothing further about "the press."

The same can be said of state law. Most state constitutions recognize freedom of the press to publish news, but none particularize these rights, or set down any press responsibilities.

The newspaper is not required to report the city council meeting or send someone to the school directors' sessions. The reporter could stay home. Nor do laws specify that "the press" be accorded any special treatment before any public body. "Open meeting laws" never mention newspapers, reporters, or news media. They simply affirm the right of the public at large to attend and observe meetings of governing assemblies.

Mrs. Smith, then, can "cover" the city council—for her club, her neighborhood, or just for herself. The principle of open government meetings was established for the people—the resident, the voter, the taxpayer, all the governed—not solely for the press or its representatives.

Then why is it that "the right to know" and "freedom of information" always seem to be linked with the press?

In the very early days of American settlement all of the people of a local community would gather in the town meeting and determine the affairs of the community. Almost everybody attended, and those who didn't, soon learned from the informed majority.

But villages soon grew into cities, and the "pure democracy" of the town meeting gave way to representative democracy. Government was growing more remote from the people. It was also growing more complicated. Yet the citizen, as a voter, had the same responsibility to keep himself informed.

It followed naturally that the Nation's fledging press should fill the role of reporter and commentator on public affairs. No one passed a law requiring it. The Founding Fathers simply had faith that a private press, given the guarantee of freedom to do so, would accept the responsibility. And of course it has. For nearly two centuries newspapers have attended meetings of governing bodies, reporting and interpreting in behalf of the public.

The reporter attends city council meetings as a member of the public. He has a right to be present only if the public retains that right. The editor comments on the council's decisions—or lack of them—as an ordinary citizen. While he is aided in his function by the printing press at his disposal, it gives him no special rights. He can comment only so long as the public has a privilege of commenting.

The "right to know" and "freedom of information" are concepts with which the newsman works every day. The same professional tradition which sends him to the city council meeting compels him to resist inroads on these public rights. For he knows, and the public should always realize too, that in all that he does, the newspaperman acts as a citizen, in behalf of his fellow citizens.

SUPPORT FROM AUSTRALIA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Australia's External Affairs Minister, Paul Hasluck, in a statement recently to the U.N. General Assembly said, in effect, that the world we live in is still round and is still governed with regard to the relationships of one nation to another by military power in many instances. He said:

> Surely we are using double standards and falsifying the issues if, recognizing the realities of power, we find it improper or worse for one small nation to be protected by a great ally but unexceptional for some other small nation to be protected by its ally.

Essentially, what Mr. Hasluck was asking, as the Evening Star pointed out in an editorial October 20, was why some think it wrong for Australia, which is helping out in South Vietnam in a very substantial way, when such actions always were applauded in Europe.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Support From Down Under," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial

was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Support From Down Under

Australia's External Affairs Minister, Paul Hasluck, made a statement to the U.N. General Assembly last week which is worthy of more than passing attention. And since Australia can hardly be classed as a "client state," we trust that his remarks will be duly noted by Senator Fulbright and all others who share the Arkansas senator's views on the war in Vietnam.

Australia is assisting South Vietnam with both troops and civilian aid. An increase in the Australian troop commitment has just been announced in Canberra. And Australia also made its contribution to both great wars in Europe. Australia, in short, believes in freedom and opposes aggression.

Mr. Hasluck wanted to know whether his country was right in standing up for these things in Europe but wrong in standing up for them in Asia. He went on to say: "Unfortunately, this is still a world in which peace is kept and security maintained by military power. . . . Are such realities as these to be recognized only in one hemisphere and not in another? Are arguments that peace and security are global to be true in European or Atlantic power situations but not true when crises of power arise in Asia and the Pacific?"

The Australian representative concluded on this note: "Surely we are using double standards and falsifying the issues if, recognizing the realities of power, we find it improper or worse for one small nation to be protected by a great ally but unexceptional for some other small nation to be protected by its ally."

We have seen nothing which states the case better for what the United States and its allies are doing in South Vietnam, or which more effectively reveals the hollowness, one might say the disingenuousness, of the arguments used to condemn what is being done.

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE FOR PRIVATE NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, one of the most vexing problems faced by many private nonprofit organizations engaging in the rehabilitation of residential buildings in slum areas is that of relocating the displaced families.

If the area happens to be owned by a local urban renewal authority, relocation assistance to families displaced by demolition or rehabilitation has been available through section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949. Suppose the rehabilitation of dwellings within the urban renewal or concentrated code enforcement area is performed by a private nonprofit neighborhood improvement group, rather than by the local public agency conducting the urban renewal program. Would the displaced families be eligible to receive relocation assistance from the same source?

Inasmuch as this question had apparently not been raised before, I requested a legal opinion from the Department of Housing and Urban Development on it. I am pleased to announce that, in the opinion of the Department, relocation assistance can be provided to families displaced by private rehabilitation programs as well as those conducted under public auspices, provided only that the displacement occurs within an urban renewal or concentrated code enforcement area and the program is conducted in accord with the plans and regulations applicable to those areas. This opinion opens up an important new avenue of assistance to neighborhood organizations, and I ask that its full text be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Questions in Senator Percy's Letter Concerning Availability of Relocation Payments

Senator Percy asked if an individual or family displaced from residential property in an urban renewal or concentrated code enforcement area as a result of rehabilitation activities conducted by a nonprofit organization with private funds would be eligible to receive a relocation payment. We believe that under these circumstances the individual or family would be eligible. The important consideration here is that the program of rehabilitation would be carried out in accordance with an approved urban renewal plan or program of code enforcement. It is not necessary that the work be done with public funds. The rehabilitation which causes the vacation of the property is made necessary because the housing must be brought up to the standards of either the urban renewal plan or the codes applicable in the code enforcement area. The Relocation Regulations as published in the Federal Register, 30 F.R. 15145-49, December 8, 1965, clearly spell out the eligibility conditions which must be met before payment can be made for the type of displacement contemplated; see Sections 3.103 and 3.103a, respectively, of the Regulations. A copy of these Regulations is attached.

Senator Percy's letter also asked whether a family or individual would be eligible for relocation payments if the displacement occurred as a result of new construction instead of rehabilitation. This apparently relates to a situation where the standards of an urban renewal plan or the codes applicable in a code enforcement area necessitate a certain amount of rehabilitation or repair work on a structure to bring it into conformity with these standards, but the owner of the building desires instead to erect a completely new structure. Where the required rehabilitation or repair work would cause displacement of the occupants of the structure, we believe the necessary statutory determination could be made in the event of alternative demolition and new construction so as to permit relocation payments.

Of course, if the property on which the new structure was built had first been acquired and cleared by the local urban renewal agency and then sold to the nonprofit organization, anyone displaced by the activities of the urban renewal agency would be eligible for relocation payments. Also, if the structure was ordered to be demolished because of its failure to conform with code standards, the occupants of the structure would be eligible for relocation payments.

Thomas C. McGrath, Jr.,
General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

October 2, 1967.

INTERNATIONAL FISH EXPO IN BOSTON

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a few days ago the first American Commercial Fish Exposition was held in Boston, Mass. This exposition drew representatives from all aspects of the commercial fish industry—fishermen, shipbuilders, equipment manufacturers, processors, marketers, Government officials, and news media representatives—and delegates from a great many foreign countries. The exposition was sponsored by the Boston Globe, whose distinguished publisher, Mr. Davis Taylor, was the guiding force behind this assembling in one place, for the first time, of all the many faces of the fishing industry. All of us who visited the expo were impressed by its scope, and I am sure that each visitor would agree with me that Davis Taylor deserves high praise for his work.

Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce and former chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries [Mr. Magnuson] visited the exposition on October 11 and made a forthright speech discussing the problems facing the industry. Senator Magnuson was particularly lucid in his statement of the need for effective international agreements to govern the use of the fishing grounds and catch of the various species. The upcoming conference in Moscow, to which the Senator referred, holds high promise for fishermen in the northeastern part of the United States, and I, like Senator Magnuson, hope that its negotiators are as successful as they were when dealing with the waters of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, I know that many Members of the Senate will want to review the speech Senator Magnuson made in Boston, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety at this point in the Record. It is another in the long chain of speeches, statements, and—most important—actions which indicate that my good friend Warren Magnuson intends to stand second to no man in his support for the American commercial fishing industry.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Government Fishing Subsidies

(Opening remarks by Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, before a panel at the American Commercial Fish Exposition, Boston, Mass., October 11, 1967)

First of all, may I congratulate the citizens of Boston, the fishermen, industry, suppliers and exhibitors, who have gathered here for the first American Commercial Fish Exposition. And especially, the Boston Globe and those others who have associated with it in sponsoring this event. Boston and the entire State of Massachusetts should indeed be proud for the leadership demonstrated in organizing the mass of exhibits and a week of discussion dedicated to this nation's commercial fishermen and industry.

Frankly, when your great Senator Ted Kennedy, and the nationally honored and respected Speaker of the House of Representatives, John McCormack, came to me and asked that I speak and discuss fisheries with a panel here in Boston, I readily accepted. Whenever anybody talks to me about discussing fish, the answer is seldom anything but an enthusiastic "yes." The invitation was loud and clear, but when they mentioned the subject—fishing subsidies—I think their voices dropped to a whisper, for I can think of no more controversial subject during the past decade or so. But my agreement would have been no less enthusiastic for subjects of this kind need to be brought out in the open, and I look forward to the exchange of views with the three members of our commercial fishing industry, each an expert in his respective discipline, and I hope from the discussion following my brief remarks we may find some good direction in this area of controversy, and often, bitter disagreement.

As most of you know, the Senate's Commerce Committee has jurisdiction in the area of Merchant Marine and Fisheries; in fact, one of the subcommittees is so named. For a long time I served as chairman of that subcommittee, in addition to the chairmanship of the full Committee. It was with great reluctance that I had to give consideration to relinquishing the responsibility in fisheries, but the opportunity to appoint Alaska's senior Senator "Bob" Bartlett to the post gave me the needed assurance that the future of this great American industry—which I refer to as America's first industry—would be in capable hands. And as Senator Bartlett would tell you—were he here today—I'm not only a member of his subcommittee, but my interest in the fisheries is greater than ever. Senator Kennedy and I have worked closely together in this vital area, and the staff of my Commerce Committee has enjoyed an especially close relationship with his own staff in trying to develop some programs of benefit to the United States fisheries.

Some four or five years ago—and the date is no longer of great importance—I introduced and was successful in securing unanimous adoption of a Senate resolution calling for a World Fisheries Conference. This was before we had any serious problems of depletion from foreign fishing in adjacent waters on the West Coast of the United States, and very likely it preceded serious conservation problems here in the Atlantic, on George's Bank or, certainly, in the mid-Atlantic bight. We had some salmon problems with Japan, however, on the great red salmon stocks of Bristol Bay up off Senator Bartlett's State, because of some problems of interpretation of the International North Pacific Fisheries Convention. Such subjects as "spirit and intent" were rapidly giving away to purely legalistic interpretation of that Treaty by the Japanese.

We were just then beginning to take this question of world hunger seriously, and it was my judgment—and still is—that the ocean resources offered the best hope for solution of that hunger problem. I have not wavered from the philosophy I expressed then—that hunger and war go hand in hand, and alleviation of the growing world food crisis could well be a key to the path toward peace.

But I also saw in this expansion of world fish harvest some dangers. I'm not going to point to any particular nations this morning, neither am I going to maintain that our own fishing industry enjoys some kind of conservation purity in ocean harvest. Again, there is no point in selecting industries or fisheries, but most of you have been around this fishing business long enough to know that the philosophies upon which our sea harvests have been based for centuries, that with modern fishing technology and mass fishing techniques, the oceans are not inexhaustible.

My proposal for a World Fisheries Conference lay dormant over in the State Department for some years. I suppose there were several reasons for this. One being, of course, that everybody didn't visualize the forthcoming massive effort off our own shores, which to me seemed inevitable. Then, our fisheries position in the U.S. State Department—where the logical motivation for such a World Conference rested—was not at a very high level. As I recall, Dr. W. M. Chapman, the first fish man there—and it was not an easy battle to get the office established was a "Special Assistant to the Undersecretary for Fish and Wildlife." His office may not have been in the basement of the State Department, but he had a tough time getting very far upstairs. Bill Herrington, since retired, was in the same position.

We had an office there, even if it was not much more than a "listening post". The need was apparent, however, for upgrading. It is here that I want to pay a little more tribute to your good Senator Kennedy—and a lot of other fishery-minded Senators from both the Atlantic and Pacific, the Gulf, and some from the inland areas who joined with me to upgrade that office. Believe me, it was not an easy task. We didn't get a Secretary of Fisheries as many wanted, but today Don McKernan, who succeeded Bill Herrington over in the State Department, is a Special Assistant to Secretary Rusk, and further, when we negotiate with other countries, fisheries need no longer be embarrassed for Mr. McKernan now enjoys the rank of Ambassador at such meetings.

There were other problems in this World Fisheries Conference idea, one of which was, and still is for that matter, the divided interests we have in the United States fisheries community. We are both a "coastal" nation and a "fishing" nation. That is, we have the fleets in Boston and my own good friends out in Seattle who fish primarily off our own coasts. But a large segment of this nation's domestic production comes from other people's shores—Southern California tuna and Gulf shrimp are prime examples. To these people any such world gathering as I suggested could conceivably depart from my desire for conservation discussion into jurisdiction, and thus further complicate problems which already are plaguing them with nations who claim two hundred miles or more—some not merely for fisheries but as a territorial sea, a matter of great concern to our national security.

A compromise was reached, and the United States went to the Fisheries Department of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, with the hope that they might assist in sponsorship. We've been in this exercise now for some years, and though the progress has been steady, it has been painfully slow. Perhaps, Senator Kennedy and I—and others interested in this area—may have to go back to my original intent if there is to be a conference at all.

In the last Congress we passed into law a nine mile fishery zone for the United States, commonly referred to as the twelve mile limit. You fishermen here in Boston and our fishermen out in the State of Washington said 200 miles was needed—or perhaps, the Continental Shelf—but twelve miles was the best we could do and it was not adopted without some pretty dedicated effort on the part of a number of us in the Congress.

The idea of a world conference has some interesting supporters, and some interesting objectors in the world community. I'm not going into many names here, for such would not be helpful if we are to be successful. But the Soviet Union is among those indicated support, and some other nations we count as closer friends in the normal world community have battled the U.S. efforts with near bitterness.

If we're going to be realists nowadays, we'd better recognize that we live in a new world; one where travel is reduced to hours instead of days, weeks or months. We also live in a world where an estimated two-thirds of our population go to bed hungry, and if peace is our goal, we'd best not totally ignore these desperate and growing statistics. But neither am I prepared to accept the kind of internationalizing of the oceans which seems to be getting unduly popular at the United Nations these days. And some of the breath for strength to these proposals comes from our own Congress. Although some of the economists are still busy dividing the oceans up into little squares for some kind of distribution to the fishing nations of the world, thus promoting some kind of Utopian efficiency, the recent move to advance such proposals through the United Nations seems to have abated some. It has not abated, however, as far as the wealth of the ocean floor is concerned, and there has been much discussions in the Congress of late on this subject. I would make it very clear to you today that any such proposal coming before the United States Senate is going to have to get past my opposition, and the objections of a good many other members of that body. To me, the division of the ocean floor for minerals, or whatever, is only a step away from division of the fisheries, and I shall regard it as just such a threat.

This does not mean, however, that I oppose the efforts of the United Nations. I think very often we are inclined to look more at their failures and forget their successes. The newly established Fisheries Department, for example, in the FAO in Rome, headed by Roy Jackson, formerly the Director of the North Pacific Commission, is progressing well. The even more-recently formed Committee on Fisheries—or COFI—as they refer to it, with some 30 nations as members, is also doing well. Their work is important, and thought the World Fisheries Conference may be moving very slowly there, I would urge a stronger support to them on the part of each of you, as well as our Government.

No one can really profit from depletion—certainly not in the long run. To be sure, some of the more greedy fishing nations have in the past been able to be sort of ocean opportunists. Deplete a fishery here, then move on to another. In our day, however, the world is running out of new frontiers, or virgin fishing grounds. In the absence of that World Fisheries Conference, which I have long maintained could induce some reason into this wild "race for fish," the United States has been forced to become concerned about foreign fishing off our own Coast. I could talk about some of the flatfishes in the Bering Sea; halibut in Eastern Bering Sea; Pacific Ocean perch off the State of Oregon, or better perhaps, George's Bank, or the red hake of the mid-Atlantic bight. These are immediate problems—crises if you will—and the United States through its upgraded fisheries office in the Department has been forced to move quickly.

We now have short term bi-lateral agreements with both the Soviet Union and Japan on the West Coast. They are not ideal to me—nor to the fishermen out on the West Coast—but then again neither are they welcome restrictions to the foreign fishermen offshore. But they are bringing a semblance of rational utilization and perhaps a degree of conservation into our adjacent fisheries.

On the Atlantic side, you will soon be meeting in Moscow on the second—and hopefully final—round of negotiations toward agreement on some of the dangeroulsy low stocks—red hake, for example—in the mid-Atlantic bight. You will not come home with everything you seek but it is a beginning toward international understanding of proper use of our ocean resources. The Senate Committee on Commerce has taken a new and unusual interest in these negotiations and agreements. Senator Bartlett and I have gone to these countries and these meetings when our schedules permitted, and I believe the record will show that if we could not attend we have had a staff representative at every one in the last year and a half, including your Atlantic negotiations in Boston a few months ago and the discussions with Mexico in Washington, D.C., and then more recently in Mexico City. We, on the Senate Committee on Commerce, want to know what's happening here. We want to know of the progress. We want to be aware of the problems, for our interest in the fisheries of this nation will continue until America once again achieves its rightful place in the production and prestige of the world fisheries community.

At this point I would like to make a suggestion to those of you present, perhaps to the Boston Globe and those responsible for this First American Commercial Fish Exposition. My own experience in fishery negotiations—and the reports from the Commerce Committee staff—have indicated very clearly to me the need for competent industry advisors at these meetings with other nations. I am not detracting from the knowledge or ability of our people in Government, but when you begin talking about specifics—the trades and compromises which unfortunately are always a part of the road to agreement—the particular expertise of the fishermen themselves, the processors, the people who will have to live with these agreements, is essential. As I mentioned earlier, the United States delegation will be journeying to Moscow soon hopefully to finalize an agreement with the Soviet Union on Atlantic fisheries, and I have been advised that many of those who need to be there will not be able to attend because their organizations lack the necessary funds. I will say no more about this—perhaps I have said too much already—but profits, if any, from this exposition could not be put to better use than in seeing that delegates from industry are in Moscow to provide the necessary local advice that our negotiators may be successful. Tom Fulham, sitting on this panel here today, can provide details better than I.

Let us look now at the problems of our own domestic fisheries. Why are we slipping in this world production picture? Why are imports constantly rising to take an even greater share of our expanding domestic market?

In my judgment, there is no better place to discuss the beginnings of this problem than right here in Boston. It was this industry which in the 1950's, following a reasonably prosperous era, found that the war-decimated fishing fleets of foreign nations were rapidly being replaced, and the catch of these modern vessels was finding its way into the American market at an alarming rate. The New England groundfish industry then made application to the U.S. Tariff Commission for relief. On two different occasions the Tariff Commission agreed with the petition of your industry, but the recommendation was rejected by Executive veto.

In an effort to partially meet this problem, the Congress passed the Act of June 12, 1960, the beginning of fishing vessel subsidies. This provided up to 33⅓ percent to help offset the cost of domestic construction as opposed to lower cost foreign shipyards. The law of 1793, of course, bans American fishermen the use of vessels over five net tons constructed in foreign yards.

Obviously, the answer to the problem of the New England groundfish fleets—and the fleets out on the Pacific Coast—would have been solved by adequate tariffs. It was equally apparent, however, that tariffs were not only unpopular but quite impossible in the Congress. I suppose the next approach might be some kind of quota arrangement whereby the American fishermen would be assured of a reasonable share of the U.S. market; or at least such increases which might be effected by advertising and promotion. But quotas are tariffs in a sense, and if we are to be realistic about these problems, the prospects are not too hopeful. In both the United States Senate and House of Representatives, at this moment, however, are groundfish quota bills, and I am included as a sponsor on one of these. Fishermen have long asked for such an effort, and I can promise you that we will give it our best, but again, any chance of success will be measured by the kind of support we may receive from those of you in the industry.

There have been many other legislative approaches to our problems, some successful, others which have failed. I have sponsored many of these, just as have your good representatives in the Congress from the Atlantic States.

One of these approaches, as I mentioned earlier, was the expansion of the original Fishing Fleet Improvement Act of 1964. This extended the subsidy program to other segments of the U.S. fishing fleets. Frankly, a good deal of the opposition to this extension of the subsidizing of fishing vessel construction came from my own State. It is equally interesting to note, however, that just in recent months I have received numerous letters from fishermen who, though they opposed our efforts in 1964, now see this as at least a partial solution to the problems of the American fisherman.

Early last year, I ordered a Commerce Committee survey of the commercial fishing industry on a number of subjects, including expressions on the question of vessel subsidies. The response on this question was more varied than on any other. Some favored the present program; a number asked amendments; a few asked that the law be repealed. Few, however, offered alternatives which in my judgment had such hope of passage in the Congress—particularly in times such as these when economy is the theme in Government.

Certainly one of the problems we have in the Congress is in securing some kind of concensus as to the needs of our American fishermen and industry. Although it is, to me, one of the most important segments of our economy, now and even more particularly in the future, it does not enjoy the same priority with the majority of the Congress. It is absolutely essential, then, that we receive the advice and counsel of those of you actively in the business—fishermen, processor, supplier—and it is my hope that in this panel discussion on subsidies this morning, that we may be able to determine some direction in this area which can be useful in our efforts in the Congress to achieve success in our common goal of returning American fisheries to their rightful place in the scale of world ocean harvest.

Thank you.

A HOPEFUL REPORT FROM VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a report entitled "The Hopeful View From Saigon," by Dr. Edward W. Mill, chairman of the Chevalier Program in Diplomacy and World Affairs at Occidental College, and an observer at the recent elections in South Vietnam.

The report is taken from the Los Angeles Times for Sunday, October 15, 1967:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Hopeful View From Saigon

(Note.—Dr. Edward W. Mill, chairman of the Chevalier Program in Diplomacy and World Affairs at Occidental College, has served in both governmental and academic capacities in Southeast Asia. He was most recently there in August and September to observe the national elections of Vietnam.)

(By Edward W. Mill)

On the way into Saigon from Tan Son Nhut airport, a route heavily lined with security installations, one suddenly notes the large billboard sign, "Welcome to Sunny Saigon!" This somewhat bland, tourist-type sign in English contrasts sharply with the rest of the martial air about Saigon. But it is also a reminder that while the war dominates there is also another side to Vietnam, and perhaps a more cheerful and slightly more optimistic one.

To those who witnessed the Sept. 3 elections in Vietnam, there was some reason to believe that a sunnier day could dawn for the republic in the days ahead.

The transitional government of Nguyen Van Thieu and Nguyen Cao Ky received a respectable endorsement from the voters as the future president and vice president of the republic. True, since election day, numerous charges of fraud and intimidation have been heard from some of the defeated presidential candidates, Tri Quang and his Buddhist group have marshalled their forces to demand new elections, student groups have staged parades, and some uncertainty was cast for a while on the action to be taken by the Constituent Assembly in accepting or rejecting the results of the election.

But these negative factors hardly took away from the fact that the holding of the national elections had generally been a most significant event in the history of Vietnam and Southeast Asia. A look back at the elections, six weeks after, confirms this more than ever.

For some 27 years the people of Vietnam have been in conflict in one form or another, ranging from the days of World War II, to the fight against the French, to the present struggle between North and South Vietnam. Much of the time this has been a bitter and desperate struggle that has left little time for thoughts other than survival. Talk of democratic development somehow seemed very secondary when one's life was at stake or the life of the nation in doubt.

Moreover, democracy, as understood in the Western sense, was largely an alien concept with very few roots in Vietnamese soil. To combine winning a war with establishing democratic institutions was a task that seemed almost impossible; many today still think it cannot be accomplished. But somehow, beginning with Ngo Dinh Diem in 1954, the effort was made, and the results two decades afterwards are not unimpressive.

The years of Diem (1954–1963), mixed with both progress and acute controversy, were followed by years (1963–65) of instability. The "parade of the generals" began with Duong Van Hinh ("Big" Minh) on Nov. 1, 1963, continued with Nguyen Khanh from Feb. 8, 1964, to Oct. 26, 1964, and in June, 1965, brought Nguyen Cao Ky and Nguyen Van Thieu to power, respectively as prime minister and chief of state.

Whatever their imperfections, it cannot be denied that in the past two years the team of Thieu and Ky has brought some major advances in constitutional government to South Vietnam. In those two years, at least three significant steps have been taken. One was the move to develop a new constitution. This was marked by the election of Sept. 11, 1966, to form a Constituent Assembly to draft the constitution. The second step was the completion of the constitution in the spring of 1967 and its proclamation on April 1, 1967. The third major step was the holding of the recent national elections for president and vice president and the Senate. Oct. 22 will bring the windup of the process when the House of Representatives is elected.

More needs to be said about the new constitution of the Republic of Vietnam. Drafted by the elected Constituent Assembly, it is a democratic document that compares favorably with the other constitutions of Asia and is not too dissimilar from the American Constitution. It provides for the traditional separation of powers and the checks and balances of the American system. There are a president and vice president serving four year terms, a bicameral legislature consisting of a Senate elected for six year terms, and a House of Representatives elected for four year terms, and an independent judiciary.

Where a main difference occurs is in the Vietnamese provision for a prime minister. The prime minister is appointed by the president and responsible to him. Presidential powers, while strong and reflecting the wartime position of the country, are subject to important controls by the legislature.

Constitutions have often become scraps of paper in the developing nations of Asia and Africa. Or they have become so loaded with "emergency powers," loosely permitting executive rule and domination, that any pretense at democratic rule has soon gone out the window. No one can predict in these early months that the new Vietnamese constitution will enjoy a better fate. But the developments of the past two years in South Vietnam, and especially of the past two months, give some grounds for modest hope that South Vietnam may have a constitution that could last for a while and perhaps for a long while. The best symbol of this hope thus far has been the national election of Sept. 3, 1967.

To express some hope for the future is not to concede that numerous serious problems do not still confront the Republic of Vietnam. At least five major problems will severely test the new government in the days ahead:

The Progress of the War. When all is said and done, the overriding factor in the present situation is the war. Without some continued progress, and perhaps even dramatic progress, any government in Saigon is going to have a very difficult time.

Internal Unrest. To a considerable extent, the Saigon government has had to fight the war with one hand tied behind its back. That hand has, in effect, been tied by various divisive groups, chiefly led by the Tri Quang Buddhist faction. Exhilarated by their success against Diem in 1963, they have subsequently been a thorn in the flesh of all succeeding governments.

In July, 1967, the Thieu government made an agreement recognizing the more moderate faction of the Unified Buddhist Church, led by Tam Chau, as the official Buddhist church. Tri Quang, already at odds with Thieu, has never forgiven him for this step.

The professedly non-political Tri Quang has become the most vocal political leader in Saigon. Just how the new government will deal with him and his allies in the future remains a big question. Meanwhile, it could be assumed that Viet Cong infiltrators and agents are missing no opportunity to fish in these troubled political waters.

The Future Role of the Military. Since the fall of 1963, South Vietnam has been run by a military government. The generals have become accustomed to the exercise of power. Will they now adapt themselves to the exercise of much greater civilian power? If the National Assembly should somehow engage in major resistance to the leadership of Thieu and Ky, how will the military take it? If the Tri Quang group and other dissidents engage in massive defiance of the government, what will be the military response?

During the campaign, Thieu declared that at least 50 officers were under investigation on charges of corruption. How will the armed forces react to any sweeping house-cleaning of their ranks? There are ample reasons to believe that the military may prove thin-skinned in many of these matters and in no mood to see their power base eliminated. Some also professed to see in the Military Council and in the National Security Council, both provided for in the constitution, possible new devices for military control of the civilian authority. Presidential control of these agencies might, however, minimize any military bid for dominance.

Ky Versus Thieu. One of the favorite items of speculation in Saigon this summer was how long Marshal Ky would work with Gen. Thieu in the post-election period. Their basic animosity and rivalry appeared to be taken for granted by many people. If Ky should somehow find his vice presidential role confining and degrading, it was assumed that he might be tempted to join with some like-minded military brethren to remove Thieu.

But some of this random speculation may be just that: random. Both men have had a vested interest in the success of the new constitution, developed during their time in office. They have also achieved a formal victory at the polls. Their main activities have come under an international microscope in recent months. There are thus many reasons why they may work together effectively to get the new government off the ground.

Legislative Responsibility? The new National Assembly of Vietnam will have the greatest powers given to any legislative body in the history of Vietnam. It will also be a legislative body in which many will be gaining their first legislative experience. Just how the legislature and the legislators will respond to their newly gained status is one of the main unanswered questions. Not only will there be a need for the full utilization of constitutionally granted powers, but there will also be a need for responsible performance.

North Vietnam hardly has to worry about these matters. There are no real elections in the Communist-run state; no one would be so silly as to propose them. There are no political parties except the master one. Executive-legislative cooperation is mainly automatic. What South Vietnam is attempting would be inconceivable in North Vietnam.

For these reasons, Hanoi was openly anxious about the success of the electoral process in the south, and the Viet Cong did all they could to discredit the elections and the government. During election week, they killed 190 civilians, wounded 426, and kidnaped 237 persons. Despite their all-out campaign of terrorism against South Vietnamese voters, they failed: 83% of those registered actually voted Sept. 3. The North Vietnamese pattern hardly seemed to be what the people of South Vietnam wanted.

The new government of South Vietnam faces a need for fresh and vigorous leadership. Thieu and Ky must seek to form a broadly-based government, which provides the opposition with meaningful recognition. It must also provide leadership for a people that is war-weary and numb after years of conflict. The attitudes of Hanoi do not offer much hope for realistic negotiation, but Thieu is committed to a full exploration of all possibilities. His government must also work to build a stronger and more effective way. The pacification effort in the villages must be improved. The government must become more of a visible symbol of economic and social progress for all the people of Vietnam.

In two years the people and government of the Republic of Vietnam have made some impressive strides towards constitutional government. Can they now implement this initial success and bring about a better and enduring republic? The world is watching.

HOMEOWNERSHIP

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, George Sternlieb, author of a housing study in Newark, N.J., "The Tenement Landlord," has had an article on homeownership published in the October issue of Trans-action magazine. His article, entitled "The Case for the Tenant as Owner," indicates that homeownership has advantages for the neighborhood. In his study of Newark, Sternleib examined the conditions of housing in the city and found that maintenance quality had a direct relation with ownership. To quote his results.

> Where you have an owner-resident in a tenement you will get good maintenance. Where you do not have an owner-resident in a tenement, you are not going to have good maintenance.

This is just one more piece of evidence on the need to broaden our housing policy to include a program of homeownership for lower income families. This seems to be the one "missing link" in our policy. Congresswoman SULLIVAN established the opening wedge last year with her program that created the 221(h) program. Now, we need to broaden the opportunities for homeownership.

Hopefully, we will pass legislation this session that will accomplish this. There are two approaches for us, both of which should be enacted into law. There is the FHA program, which will provide sales housing for the lower income family, and there is a program introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] which will make public housing units eligible for purchase.

Mr. President, the St. Paul Dispatch in an editorial indicates that this latter program has a great deal of merit and that it should be given full hearings this session. I, too, agree that this program has advantages, so that hearings for it should be held at the first feasible moment. If what Sternleib says is true, the owner-resident concept should be instituted in public housing as soon as possible.

However, we must always keep in mind that homeownership programs, whether they concentrate on sales housing through the FHA, condominium ownership of existing units, or conversion of public housing projects, are not a panacea for the ills of the cities. The belief that homeownership will act as a magic wand, changing the dismal ghettoes into suburban neighborhoods, is a false illusion. What homeownership programs will do, however, is to expand the opportunities available to the lower-income person as he seeks a safe and decent dwelling for his family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Public Housing for Sale," published in the St. Paul Dispatch, and George Sternlieb's article, "The Case for the Tenant as Owner," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING FOR SALE

A number of bills are before Congress that would provide federal assistance for low income families to purchase their own homes.

One highly publicized proposal involves the merging of plans of Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota and Sen. Charles Percy of Illinois designed to make conventional home loans available to the poor through existing federal agencies. A special national home ownership foundation would be created to promote the program.

The theory is that home ownership helps build a sense of responsibility and pride and that slums can be rebuilt and communities revitalized through this approach.

Home ownership, of course, is not a panacea for the ills of the slums. But it should be part of an overall attack on the slums and the ghettos.

However there is another bill in Congress which has received less attention and could be just as far reaching in its impact as the Mondale-Percy measure. Sen. Mondale is a sponsor of this bill, too, along with Sen. Joseph Tydings of Maryland. It would allow poor people to purchase their public housing units (homes or apartments) when their incomes improve.

Co-sponsored by Rep. Henry Reuss of Wisconsin, the bill would allow the tenant to purchase the unit on extended terms—monthly payments not exceeding 20 per cent of the purchaser's income. For example, a family earning $4,200 a year would not pay more than $70 a month. Public housing projects, Sen. Tydings says, need no longer be considered as temporary dwellings or as a "shelter for failure." Allowing successful families to remain would encourage others, he believes.

Coupled with this measure would be funds to rehabilitate and modernize the housing projects (an estimated $5 million the first year) and proposals to promote resident organizations to foster self government within public housing units.

It is an idea that has a great deal of merit and should get a thorough airing in Congress this session.

THE CASE FOR THE TENANT AS OWNER

(By George Sternlieb, director, research center, Graduate School of Business Administration, Rutgers)

The element I would like to focus on is the alienation between owner and tenant. Tenants are typically living in multiple-family residences in the slum areas that I know of, and they typically do not own these parcels. Not only do they not own them, but the people who own them are strangers. They are not uncommonly strangers in color and in speech—and this holds true, by the way, whether these strangers are people from the public housing administration or the local slum landlords. Tenants feel no great desire or obligation to maintain these parcels.

Any effort at rehabilitation that does not involve the enthusiasm and the basic guts involvement and agreement of the tenants is just transitory. Such an effort appeases the middle-class conscience, but has no lasting effect.

The research that we have just recently completed—which I would guess is the occasion for my being called here—is in the study, The Tenement Landlord. Our goal was to define who owns the tenements and what makes them tick and, even more adequately, how can we make them tick in a fashion which is appropriate to the way society wants them to tick.

We analyzed condition of parcel, tax aspect, financing, ownership patterns. We took 566 tenements for the study in a random structured sample. We got depth interviews with approximately 70 percent of the owners of all the parcels. When we cross-tabulated the results of all we got, there was only one factor which makes for good maintenance—the owner-resident. Where you have an owner-resident in a tenement you will get good maintenance. Where you do not have an owner-resident in a tenement, you are not going to have good maintenance.

Newark, the area that we were working in, has the largest portion of nonwhite population of any major Northern city with the possible exception of Washington. There are a growing number of Negro landlords. (I would suggest, by the way, that cities like Newark and a couple of the other major Northern industrial towns are deserving of intensive study because they are front-runners. They are a vision of things to come. Their problems are the problems which the bulk of the other Northern cities will be experiencing over the next 10 or 15 years.) In Newark there are a growing number of Negro landlords. They are typically resident landlords whose size of family or income level has kept them out of public housing. Or they may be just people who want to buy a house because they want to own something, and the only house they can afford is a tenement house which will bring in some rent to hopefully cover the mortgage.

I would like to suggest that there is more hope for lasting rehabilitation, for providing model leadership to the community, for a genuine upgrading of the life styles of the urban poor in this and similar owner-resident patterns than there is in any externally imposed uplifting pattern. But how do we move toward new forms of ownership?

I think it has to be understood that most of the current attitudes toward the slums are reflective of past conditions rather than present facts. Basic among the facts of the case is the fact that the slum real estate market is weakening radically. If this offends the concept of slumlords and the profitability of slums, I am afraid it will have to. What has happened is that there has been a tremendous outmigration, not merely of whites, but also of nonwhites as well. This is perhaps more true of a city like Newark, whose environs provide much more in the way of open housing, than may be the case in other major cities, but I would suggest that again Newark is a front-runner here.

In the course of a study which we recently completed, I had occasion to interview a whole series of churchmen, all of whom had congregations in the central city. When we interviewed the white churchmen, the pattern which we got was pretty much what we had anticipated—a substantial number [of the members] have basically switched their affiliation to suburban churches. . . .

On the other hand, when we interviewed Negro mainline ministers—and by "mainline ministers" I am referring to the African Methodist and Abyssinian Baptist groups—we got very much the same pattern. For these main-line ministers in the central city were discovering that their nonwhite congregations also were moving out, that not uncommonly as much as half of their congregations on a typical Sunday were no longer residents of the central city.

Now this has weakened the slum tenement market. When the market weakens, when the demand goes down, the owner has a variety of choices. What we would like him to do probably is cut rents and possibly improve his parcel so that he will be more competitive. But there is a third choice, and that is to cut your maintenance—assuming you have been doing any—to the bone, get what little is left out of the parcel, put in as little as you possibly can, and if you start getting too many violations, walk away.

It is this last pattern of behavior which we are getting. We are getting it in Newark, in New York City, and in many other major urban centers. The cry goes out for code enforcement, and code enforcement obviously is essential; but not uncommonly, when you put the screws on for code enforcement, what you get are one of three patterns of conduct. One pattern is the one that you would really like: People fix up the parcel. That is fine. Another pattern is that people avoid the code one way or another. The third pattern is that people abandon the parcel, and, in a weak market, there is a tendency toward abandonment. . . .

If you do get code enforcement, not infrequently you get it at the cost of raising rents and driving the poor out. So we have a very complicated picture before us. . . .

We have examined and interviewed in detail a number of these new [tenant-] owners. I would like to focus on these people, because I think they have great promise for the future and I think they need a lot of help.

How do these people buy a parcel? We examined the sales of parcels in terms of their assessments, in terms of their values, and what we see is the new owner not atypically paying anywhere from 150 to 200 percent of what the going market is for his tenement. Very frequently he does not even know how much he has paid for it. He buys it the way he buys a car. How much is the down payment? What are the monthly payments? The inflated price would not be so bad, except that it typically is covered by short-term mortgages, and these are purchase-money mortgages. There is no legitimate financing in the hard-core slum areas. Bankers and savings and loan presidents continually have meetings in which they pledge that they will be putting up funds in the future, that there is no such thing as a blacklist. The records call them liars.

There are only purchase-money mortgages. These purchase-money mortgages come either from the former slum landlord or from money sharks. In the several hundred mortgages that we examined, none of them are for periods of over 10 years. The amortization is murderous. There are at least a couple of landlords that we examined who were using the "yo-yo" principle, if you will forgive our inventing a phrase. The yo-yo principle is very simple. You take the 500 bucks that a Puerto Rican or Negro can scrape together. You put enough paper on his parcel so that it sinks in two or three years. You take back the parcel and you look around for another sucker. Not all of them are this way. There are some, however, who are.

The new landlord and his acquisition are further victimized by every fast-talking home improvement specialist in the country. One of my field people used the phrase "the storm-window syndrome," because we saw so many of them. You go through the slums and you have a whole bunch of houses that are pretty much stuck together with asphalt and prayer, and in the midst of these you find a house with new storm windows—those very fancy aluminum three-way combinations. Not infrequently it will have a new roof and a new everlasting siding job.

In the course of this tenement landlord study, I interviewed a big-time money lender specializing in first and second mortgages—not a bad guy. He said, "You know, every time I take one of those parcels back—and I don't want to take them back any more, I used to be in that business, but I am not in that business any more—I want to get out. Every time I take one of them back, the poor guy comes in here and he is carrying the books."

I asked him what he meant by "the books." He was referring to payment books; on all of these installment things you are given something that looks like a Christams club book so you can keep tabs on your payments. This money lender pulled open his desk drawer, and it was filled with these books that had bounced back with the parcels that he had had to retake because he called his own major mortgages. These are a reflection of the pride that these new owners have in their parcels. These may be the first things of significance they have ever owned, and in their pride they are open for unscrupulous salesmanship.

The new owner needs guidance. I have suggested in the study, and I would suggest here, that there may be considerable mileage in the equivalent of what the U.S. government did for western lands under the Homestead Act. Basically what we did was turn to people who did not have very much money but had a fair degree of muscle, and say, "If you settle on a piece of government-owned land, you improve the land, and you live there over a period of years, we will provide you with inexpensive financing and, through the county agent system of the Agriculture Department, with guidance, and if you can stick it out, you can end up owning something." And it worked.

I think that what we need here in the central-core city is some means of providing a piece of the action—ownership for the poor. I think we are going to need more adequate financing than is presently available.

If for the moment, I can wax back into my collegiate role, there is a very basic theory which I do not think has ever been disproven. When you have a whole series of legislation on one point and the same point comes up year after year after year, it means that legislation is not working. So in the financing of rehabilitation, we have had enough FHA numbers to fill a small telephone book. I would suggest in their sheer redundancy, in the sheer number of them, we confess that we are not getting a heck of a lot of mileage out of it. . . .

We are going to need financing for rehabilitation, and it is going to have to be a lot more sensible than some of the FHA requirements for rehabilitation presently. . . .

We are going to need an advisory service, and let me stress an advisory service, not a service telling people what to do, because . . . the time for telling people what to do in the central city is pretty much over. . . .

In closing, there is no one magic wand that is going to create a new life for the people in the city, and similarly there certainly is no magic wand which is going to recreate the city. I would suggest that the home ownership pattern may be a very small step but I think perhaps a very positive step in that direction. The urgency of this situation I do not think has been made clear. And I am not talking about people getting out in the streets and rioting, though that may well happen.

The urgency basically is the fact that as the market weakens in the city, as its functions are lost, you get into a degenerative spiral. A good deal of the business of the city is taking in each other's wash, so you have a dynamism here, and that dynamism is going down hill. . . .

THE YELLOW PERIL ISSUE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is useful for us to know the background of the recently used and much abused phrase "yellow peril." Some have laid at Secretary of State Dean Rusk's door the responsibility for having again raised the yellow peril issue, but the Secretary has done no such thing. In his remarks, Secretary Rusk made no racial references to Asian peoples, but to the numbers under the thumb of international communism and to the numbers of Asians threatened by this ideology.

Gould Lincoln, in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, October 21, pointed out that the yellow peril issue was laid to rest long ago, in fact, shortly after it was raised in 1907. Secretary of State Rusk has not resurrected it. His critics, who have done so, have done a disservice, I believe. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lincoln's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YELLOW PERIL LAID TO REST LONG AGO

(By Gould Lincoln)

Sixty years ago Rep. Richmond Pearson Hobson of Alabama, a Navy hero, day in and day out in Congress blasted the Japanese as a threat to the security of the United States. Out of Hobson's speeches and his writings grew the phrase "yellow peril."

Hobson's "yellow peril" of 1907 has nothing in common with Secretary of State Dean Rusk's warning of the threat of international communism to the security of the United States and the non-Communist countries of Southeast Asia and the Pacific nor with his defense of this country's war against the Communists in Vietnam, North and South. But for political reasons the cry of "yellow peril," with its implied racial overtones, has been tied to Rusk's statement by members of Congress—especially Senator Eugene McCarthy, D-Minn., and some columnists—all of whom should know better.

It is to be presumed that Senator McCarthy knew the facts about Hobson and his "yellow peril" speeches and warnings, even though McCarthy was not born until nine years after Hobson had been sounding off in the halls of Congress and elsewhere. There is no slightest doubt that Hobson was warning that the yellow races of Asia, led by the Japanese, constituted a real danger to the United States—that a racial conflict was involved. But McCarthy and the others now shouting "yellow peril" in their attacks on Rusk must know that the secretary of State, was warning not against the yellow race but against international communism; that he was speaking in defense of a billion members of the yellow race against possible and probable aggression by the Communists if the United States should quit its defense of the anti-Communist people of South Vietnam.

Rusk was prompted in a denial that there was anything racial involved in his assertion that the safety of the United States and of the free nations of Asia is at stake. And properly so. The "yellow peril" criticisms, however, whether so designed or not, could only rouse resentment against the United States in the minds of Indians, Malaysians, Japanese, the people of Thailand, Burma, etc., unless the truth were brought out.

That, apparently, means nothing to the opponents of the war in Vietnam. The aim of many of them is not only to get us out of Vietnam—at any cost—but to get Lyndon Johnson out of the White House. First, to deny him renomination for President, and if that fails, to defeat him for reelection.

Japan, at the time of Hobson's "yellow peril" diatribes, had emerged as a strong military and naval power in the Far East. It had defeated China in the war in 1894–5. And ten years later, in 1904–5, it had defeated Russia, on sea and on land. It had, and was in the process of building, a navy rated only after the British and American navies. Hobson argued that Japan would win the backing of China in a war of "Asia for the Asians." There was one angle to Hobson's fears for the United States that was outside racial lines, however. He spoke out bitterly against the British who had entered into a military alliance with Japan—he called it "an unholy alliance," which might lead Britain to side with the Japanese if they undertook to run us out of the Pacific. At that time we held the Philippines and Hawaii, Hobson claimed the Japanese were in a position to take both in a sudden attack, and the United States would not have heard anything about it until word came by ship, some ten days later.

Theodore Roosevelt was President. He had announced his policy of "speaking softly and carrying a big stick"—although he did not always speak softly. At times, too, he waved "the big stick." Early in his administration, he forced Kaiser Wilhelm II and a Tory government in Britain to arbitrate claims they had against Venezuela. The Germans were threatening to send naval forces into Venezuela. Roosevelt gave the Kaiser ten days in which to withdraw the order, or he, Roosevelt, would send Admiral Dewey and his fleet to blow the Germans out of the water. Further, Roosevelt had used his influence, by then becoming worldwide, to bring Russia and Japan to a peace table at Portsmouth, and there he steered them to a peace treaty which neither of them liked. He received, not a military medal, but the Nobel "Peace Prize." Also, Roosevelt sent an American fleet around the world.

The consequence was the American people, with some exceptions, put their faith in "Teddy" Roosevelt, and paid little attention to Hobson's "yellow peril." Hobson, a graduate of the Naval Academy, with seven volunteers, took the collier Merrimack into Santiago Harbor during our war with Spain, and sank it. Later he received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

EFFECTIVENESS OF F–111 AIRCRAFT SYSTEM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, two very penetrating and objective articles have been published recently about the effectiveness of the F–111 aircraft system. Knowing of the interest of Senators in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD. One is by Jim Lucas of Scripps-Howard, the other by Henry Keys, of the Pueblo, Colo., Chieftain.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 20, 1967]

"THIS IS THE ONE WE'VE BEEN WAITING FOR": F–111 IS "ONE HELL OF AN AIRCRAFT"

(NOTE.—Much has been written about the controversial F–111, formerly the TFX, soon to be sent to Vietnam. But how do the men who will fly it feel about this plane which has created such a storm in Congress and the Pentagon? Jim G. Lucas, just back from Vietnam, spent three days this week looking at the plane and talking to the men who fly it. This is his report.)

(By Jim G. Lucas)

NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEV., October 20.—The desert air was crisp and clear when Col. Ivan Dethman brought her gently down, too new even to have a tail number.

"This is the one we've been waiting for," said Air Force M/Sgt. Charles Hennessee, who heads a 35-man maintenance crew—"the one with all the bugs out."

This—at 1:32 on a Tuesday afternoon—was not just another landing. It was an historic event. This—the 31st F–111 built and flown—was the first production model off the General Dynamics asesmbly line at Ft. Worth. It could revolutionize flying. Or it could turn out to be a $5 billion dud.

An Air Force F–111 crashed yesterday near Bowie in northeast Texas. The two crewmen—General Dynamics employes—ejected safely. But Air Force men concede such mishaps are inevitable, and this one is not likely to alter the basic confidence in the F–111 that I found among the men at Nellis.

"We make or break the F–111 right here," Maj. Al Sonnett said.

The controversial F–111 program was budgeted at the outset at $5 billion; it will come to more than that. Each Air Force F–111A was ticketed at $2.8 million. No. 31 cost $5 million. The Navy F–111B, still a year and a half away, will cost $8 million.

The F–111 contract award to General Dynamics was opposed by some who favored Boeing. It has been called the biggest blunder of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, who has pushed it with singleminded intensity. The Navy has never been happy about being dragged into the program; a Chief of Naval Operations who told Congress so, was fired by the late President Kennedy. Sen. Karl Mundt (R., S.D.), wonders why the landing brakes don't work better than they do.

The Marines have backed off, claiming they don't need the F–111, but the British are in to the tune of $786 million, and so are the Aussies.

"All that has been said about this aircraft before it arrived at Nellis is no concern of ours," says Brig. Gen. Ralph G. Taylor, head of the Air Force Tactical Weapons Center. "Our job is to prove or disapprove its capabilities."

Gen. Taylor has flown the plane. And he says:

"This is one hell of an aircraft we've got here. I tell my men—and they've read a lot and are confused—'Don't knock it until you've flown it.' After you've flown it, you're hooked.

"It gives us a capability we've always needed, but lacked, in the Tactical Air Force. The successes we're having with it are unprecedented."

With a note of realism, Gen. Taylor adds, "sooner or later, we'll lose one—that's inevitable—and because it will be an F–111, and because a lot of people are emotionally committed against it—there'll be an uproar, there'll be a lot of 'I told you so.' But that won't prove anything."

There can be no doubting the enthusiasm here. In the officers club the talk is even more enthusiastic, if that is possible, than on the flight line.

"I'll tell you this," Sgt. Hennessee says, "I helped bring the F-4 into the Air Force in 1963, and I wouldn't want to go back."

There are six F-111s in Nellis, Nos. 26 thru 31. The others are elsewhere in the Air Force training and research system. The first five here were hand-built, and there were problems. For one thing, after 1450 miles per hour, they tended to surge and stall. There have been two stalls here, but Gen. Taylor points out, "We've had a worse stall in the F-105."

There were problems with brakes. Treetop speed levels are questionable.

"Surging and stalling have been licked," says George I. Davis of Ft. Worth, the General Dynamics representative here. "The thing now is to incorporate the changes into the production models."

Recent Congressional testimony was that treetop level speeds are one-third of that guaranteed.

"I'll be honest with you," Gen. Taylor grins. "I don't know that was guaranteed. But as a flier I'll say we are eminently satisfied with this bird's speed at all levels."

Col. Dethman flew No. 31 the 1047 miles from Ft. Worth to Las Vegas on automatic pilot—"I touched the controls on landing and takeoff.

"I never missed a turning point by more than a foot or a yard," he said. "It was unbelievable."

George Stonehouse, British Minister of Aviation and a former RAF pilot, flew an F-111.

"It's perfect," he said as he climbed out of the cockpit.

All the men flying the F-111 are Vietnam veterans, and many were skeptical at first.

"Ken Blank came in with a negative attitude," says Lt. Col. Bobby Mead, commanding the 4481st Fighter Squadron. "He's positive now."

Maj. Kenneth Blank, admits he was doubtful: "Who isn't when he's given a new toy to play with?" Maj. Blank was the first F-105 pilot to bag a MIG in North Vietnam.

"I like this bird," he says. "When I came back from over there, all I knew about it I'd read in the papers, and that wasn't good. It has the best avionics I've ever seen. I'm doing things with it I've never done before."

[From the Pueblo (Colo.) Chieftain, Oct. 12, 1967]

HOT DEBATE CONTINUES: HAVE THE F-111'S CRITICS OVERSTATED THEIR CASE?

(By Henry Keys)

WASHINGTON.—The F111A—the most hotly debated aircraft since the B52—becomes operational within a matter of days.

This achievement is unlikely, however, to cool down the fierce controversy that has raged throughout the five years it has taken to develop the highly unusual plane to combat-ready status.

Which is unfortunate, for when all's said and done, the F111A—Air Force version of the six-member F111 family—promises to be the most revolutionary and widely capable fighting flying machine ever built.

Witness the fact that Britain and Australia are so impressed with it they rushed to place orders, Britain for 50 and Australia for 24.

Yet there are those who still condemn the F111, like Chairman John L. McClellan, D-Ark., of the Senate permanent investigating subcommittee.

McClellan says the whole family of F111 planes is falling far short of expectations and costing more than twice as much as anticipated. "The prospects for the F111A are better than for the others," he adds, "but it is never going to be the plane they thought they were going to get."

CONDEMNS NAVY VERSION

It is the Navy's version of the plane, the F111B, that has incurred the greatest congressional wrath.

"A dog," it has been called by Rep. William E. Minshall, R-Ohio, a member of the House subcommittee on defense appropriations.

To stand off and look back at the political infighting that has raged around the F111 program from its inception is to come to the conclusion that it is coming off the production line, ready for service, almost solely because of the dogged determination of one man—Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

It is clear, too, that the row about it is due also to the actions of McNamara.

The dispute over the plane boiled over in Congress, in the Pentagon and in the aircraft industry. It was reminiscent of the explosive fight which erupted in the 1950's over the long-range B52 bomber.

The storm burst in 1962 when McNamara enraged Congress by (1) giving the go-ahead to develop the plane, (2) by the nature of ground rules he established for its design, and (3) by his decision to award the contract for its development and production to General Dynamics Corporation, of Fort Worth, Texas, when his own Defense Department experts unanimously said the contract should go to the Boeing Company.

He aroused inter-service ire particularly in the Navy, by insisting that the plane, then called the TFX or "tactical" fighter experimental, should serve both Air Force and the Navy.

ELIMINATE WASTE

The "commonality" thus achieved, he said, would result in a single weapon system capable of use by different services for different missions—would avoid the wastefulness of a multiplicity of weapons serving similar ends and result in an eventual saving of $1 billion.

Congress and the services joined forces to go after McNamara's scalp. The "commonality" concept was not only impractical but nonsensical, the argument ran.

McClellan set out to prove this, and also that McNamara had been guilty of something unsavory in giving General Dynamics the contract over Boeing. He held committee hearings which amassed 3,000 pages of testimony and provoked McNamara to protest that the committee inquiry was impugning his integrity.

The committee never has produced a report or published any findings, but today, four years later, McClellan and others are still hot after McNamara on the issue.

Actually, though, developers have hit close to their "commonality" target. On design and construction of the "A" and "B", 80 percent of the aircraft components and 27 percent of the electronic gear components are identical.

BEHIND SCHEDULE

So far as the program is concerned, the critics have hit where it really hurts—the lagging development of the Navy's F111B.

Production of the first combat-ready F111B already is 2½ years behind schedule because of innumerable difficulties in developing the basic design to aircraft carrier requirements.

Unfortunately, the troubles with the "B" have obscured from the general public the dramatic progress made with the "A", and, indeed, the astonishing nature of both aircraft.

As Air Force Col. Alfred L. Esposito, assistant for F111 programs, says, "We are flying in areas where no one has ever flown before and no one else is even attempting to fly today."

Precise figures relating to speed, altitude and range are top secret. But it is known it is a supersonic aircraft, with a top speed in the order of 2½ times the speed of sound, or in excess of 1,500 miles an hour. It will be able to fly without refueling to either Europe or Asia.

It can fly at treetop level, under enemy radar, at supersonic speeds, just as it can at altitudes in excess of 80,000 feet.

It is a superbly effective weapon, able to deal with enemy aircraft as effectively as it can place bombs and missiles on ground targets.

OEO AND THE RIOTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this summer witnessed a score of riots and disturbances in our cities. This was one of the most painful experiences this Nation has undergone. We saw American soldiers battle their fellow citizens and watched as our cities were turned into armed camps. This postriot autumn should be a time of reflection and contemplation, a time in which we attempt to devise programs and strategies to deal with the immediate and long-term causes of the riots.

However, there has been a tendency not to do this, but rather, to fall prey to the temptation to find a scapegoat for the riots. There are always those, who, in times of crisis, prefer to find a scapegoat rather than face the reality of the situation. To these people, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been the scapegoat. This is a new agency, with new programs, and without a powerful constituency. It is therefore in a weak position and has been subject to much criticism. It is ironic that this agency, which is dedicated to dealing with the roots of the riots—poverty, ignorance, unemployment, and depravation—has been chosen by these people as a focal point for resting blame for the riots.

The July 31 issue of Barron's magazine contains an article entitled "Poverty Warriors" which catalogs most of the charges that have been made against the Office of Economic Opportunity with regard to the riots. Upon reading this article, I was most disturbed to see a publication of the caliber of Barron's report such a story. I immediately contacted the Office of Economic Opportunity for a report on the allegations made in this magazine. I have now received this report, and it notes that the charges made by Barron's are not substantiated when the facts are explained.

Mr. President, in order to clarify the situation, I ask unanimous consent that the Barron's article, my correspondence, and the report of the Office of Economic Opportunity be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There is something terribly wrong with this country when a dedicated agency is singled out for abusive and false criticism, when the same agency is denied a pay raise because its policies are objectionable to some Members of Congress. Mr. President, I hope that this issue-by-issue refutation of the charges against the Office of Economic Opportunity will assist in clarifying the role of the agency and point up the work that it has done to prevent riots, not to cause them.

There being no objection, the material

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Barron's, July 31, 1967]

POVERTY WARRIORS: THE RIOTS ARE SUBSIDIZED AS WELL AS ORGANIZED

Marion Barry and Rufus Mayfield are angry young men. Former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Mr. Barry in August, 1965, took part in a protest demonstration organized by the so-called Assembly of Unrepresented People. He was arrested and charged with disorderly conduct while leading demonstrators onto the Capitol grounds. "Riot power and rebellion power," he was quoted as saying last week, "might make people listen now." Mr. Mayfield is a Black Muslim. Twenty-one years old, he has spent most of the past eight years in prison for various offenses, including petty and grand larceny. This month Marion Barry acquired gainful employment. He was hired as a $50-per-day consultant by the United Planning Organization, top anti-poverty agency for the District of Columbia. Rufus Mayfield, according to Rep. Joel T. Broyhill (R., Va.), will serve as Barry's "back-up man."

While perhaps more arresting than most, these are not isolated instances. On the contrary, the files fairly bulge with equally radical cases in point. Thus, federal and state investigations of New York's Mobilization for Youth, pilot project for the Job Corps, disclosed that its staff included several members of the Communist Party. LeRoi Jones, who was taken into custody during the riots in Newark and charged with illegal possession of deadly weapons, once ran a hate-the-whites Black Arts Theater which got $115,000 in federal funds from Haryou-ACT before police discovered an arsenal on the premises. The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association of Selma, which the Office of Economic Opportunity recently granted $700,000, numbers among its principals John Zippert and Shirley Mesher. Louisiana's Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities recently documented Mr. Zippert's association with radical causes, including the Kremlin-financed World Youth Festival. According to the Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace, Miss Mesher, a former coordinator for SNCC, is "a prime participant in the Black Panther movement designed to overthrow the government . . ."

Right after Watts (Barron's, August 23, 1965), we observed: "In the name of civil rights, a small band of ruthless men has not hesitated to stir up violence, break the law and undermine duly constituted authority. The so-called civil rights revolution . . . has begun to mean exactly what it says." Since then compelling evidence, including eyewitness testimony and the findings of a Cleveland grand jury, has shown that the riots are less spontaneous outbreaks than carefully planned subversion. To judge by the record, moreover, civil unrest is not only organized but also subsidized. Thanks to the Office of Economic Opportunity, the U.S. taxpayer now has a chance to finance his own destruction. The Great Society, so Newark, Detroit and scores of other smouldering cities suggest, cannot coexist with the American way of life.

Like the poor, slums and rats have always been with us. Only the devastating riots—and the professional agitators who prepare the tinder, await a spark and fan the flames—are significantly new. The 1964 outbursts in Harlem turned up William Epton, vice-chairman of the Red-Chinese-oriented Progressive Labor Party, who taught people how to make Molotov cocktails. Mr. Epton was convicted of criminal anarchy for his part in the riots. The Rev. Billy Graham called Watts a "dress rehearsal for revolution," a description in which radical spokesmen ever since have gloried. Last year's riots in Cleveland, charged Sen. Frank Lausche (Dem., O.) were the work of a "national conspiracy executed by experts." Shortly afterward a Cleveland grand jury, after hearing the testimony of detectives who penetrated the conspirators' ranks, found that "the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals." In a story on the Newark riots, the current issue of Life Magazine describes its reporters' "clandestine meeting with members of the sniper organization." Finally, SNCC's Stokely Carmichael, whose subversive interests range far and wide, openly boasts of what's afoot. After a quick trip to Prague, he landed last week in Havana. There he told newsmen: "In Newark we applied (guerrilla) war tactics . . . We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas . . . It is going to be a fight to the death."

So much for subversion, which the country will ignore at its own risk. As to federal subsidy of violence, an ominous pattern has emerged. From the beginning, as radicals recognized, the war of poverty, notably the Community Action Programs, had impressive troublemaking potentials. Somehow CAP has expanded much faster than OEO expenditures as a whole, surging from $246.5 million in fiscal '66 to an estimated $500 million in the current fiscal year. As noted above (much of the material comes from a forthcoming book, "Poverty Is Where the Money Is," to be published by Arlington House and written by Shirley Scheibla, Washington correspondent for Barron's), some of the money funded dubious ventures and put jailbirds and subversives on the federal payroll. Mrs. Scheibla cites other horrible examples: John Ross, member of the Progressive Labor Party, who served on an anti-poverty board in San Francisco; Howard Harawitz, member of a similar board in Berkeley and former member of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, which the FBI calls "Communist-spawned"; and a number of U.P.O. personnel in Washington, D.C., who turned out to be SNCC organizers and agitators.

Taxpayer-financed trouble has exploded in one part of the country after another. Last fall the mayor of Perth Amboy, N.J., accused the local anti-poverty leader of seeking "to foment and incite unrest, agitation and disorder," a charge which the city manager of Rochester echoed last week. Newark's police chief weeks ago warned that the city faced anarchy because of agitation by federal anti-poverty workers, several of whom were arrested during the riots. In New York City five marauding young Negroes, collared while looting stores on Fifth Avenue, worked for the anti-poverty program; one wore a sweater blazoned, after the OEO-funded agency, "Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited."

To fight riots with OEO grants, in short, is like fighting fire with gasoline. However, Sargent Shriver alone is not to blame. Some of the fault lies with local officials like New York's Mayor Lindsay (tapped last week to serve on the President's special advisory body), who repeatedly refused to condemn the appearance of his Human Rights Commissioner at the Black Power conference in Newark, as well as with Mayor Cavanagh of Detroit (first recipient of OEO aid and welfare state showcase), who tied the hands of the police for the first few strategic hours. On the federal level, the country should call to account the Office of Attorney-General and its three recent occupants: Robert Kennedy, who once wrote a letter to the head of an identified Communist front, seeking advice on a national service corps; Nicholas Katzenbach, who shrugged off all evidence of conspiracy; and the incumbent, Ramsey Clark, who testified against pending anti-riot legislation. The blame reaches right up to the official White House family, to Vice President Humphrey, who last summer said that if he lived in a rat-infested slum: "there is enough of a spark left in me to lead a pretty good revolt."

Law and order are the stuff of civilization; they are also the first duty of government. On the record, "liberals" of both parties, by tolerating subversion, have made a mockery of their oaths of office and forfeited the public's trust. Appeals to prayer are all well and good, but what this country needs is a political and philosophic call to arms.

AUGUST 24, 1967.

Mr. GEORGE D. MCCARTHY,
Assistant Director for Congressional Relations, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCARTHY: Enclosed you will find a copy of an article which appeared in *Barron's* magazine on the 31st of July this year. As you will note, this article is quite critical on the War on Poverty and alleges that OEO has subsidized the recent riots.

I would appreciate it if you could compile a report on the allegations made in this article and send to the attention of John Maguire of my staff.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

WALTER F. MONDALE.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
October 10, 1967.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for your letter of August 24 with regard to the Barron's article of July 31, 1967. I am sorry for the delay in our reply.

Enclosed is a list of Barron's charges and the facts, which show the false presentation of this article concerning "OEO's connection with the riots."

If you should have any further questions please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. MCCARTHY,
Assistant Director for Congressional Relations.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C.

BARRON'S ARTICLE, JULY 31, 1967

The July 31st issue of *Barron's*, a financial weekly, carried an article attacking the Office of Economic Opportunity: "Poverty Warriors: The Riots are Subsidized as Well as Organized."

The article attempts to line those engaged in the task of fighting poverty with the riots that have appalled the Nation. No attempt is made to be objective or thorough in presentation. Instead, a collection of incidents and allegations are strung together to try to discredit the anti-poverty program.

The following is a list of charges made and the facts which are readily available to all.

CHARGE

The riots are subsidized. "Thanks to OEO, the U.S. taxpayer now has a chance to finance his own destruction."

ANSWER

No riot is subsidized—by OEO or any other government agency. War on Poverty programs are squarely on the side of law and order. Instead of fomenting disorder, OEO workers are doing all they can to cool things down. Since the overwhelming majority of anti-poverty workers actually live in areas where disorders could, or did occur, the surprising fact is that so few were involved in disturbances.

OEO gathered statistics on 32 cities in which riots occurred this summer. Anti-poverty workers, i.e., employees of OEO-funded agencies, in these cities number 30,565. Only 16 of the 13,050 persons arrested in these 32 cities were paid anti-poverty workers. Only six of these were full-time staff members, nine were summer employees, and one was a VISTA.

Most public officials, contrary to *Barron's* view, have lauded the poverty program for being an effective weapon *against* riots.

Hugh J. Addonizio, Mayor of Newark, said, right after his city's riots: "It is my position that anti-poverty programs have been helpful to my city, and that these programs need to be greatly expanded . . . I support the program and all it has done to bring hope to many . . ." Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr., of Atlanta wired,

"Recreational funds and EOA CAP centers have contributed greatly to cooling off summer problems. CAP center and personnel provided quick communications facility for easing the explosive situation in the Dixie Hills disturbance."

Mayor Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., of Providence, Rhode Island, told a group of poverty workers: "As far as I am concerned there is no telling how bad this might have been if it hadn't been for you guys." Mayor Robert M. L. Johnson, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, said: "The Community Action Program here, . . . was in a great degree responsible for a calmness and sensibility throughout the Negro community some days ago when most of the white community panicked because of rumors of riot . . . as a result Cedar Rapids did not have any incidents despite the fact that for four days this community was blanketed with every conceivable rumor of race riot potential.

From the Chief of Police of Little Rock, Arkansas: ". . . we have detected a considerable decrease in the vandalism and destruction of property . . . in the poverty areas of our city . . . it is obvious to me that a good portion of this reduction can be attributed directly to the . . . various programs conducted under OEO."

And for one last example, Mayor Sorenson of Omaha wrote to Mr. Shriver: "As you are well aware, Omaha's 'long hot summer' has been kept 'cool' to date by programs we have initiated with your help."

CHARGE

The riots are organized. A Cleveland grand jury has found that the riots are less spontaneous outbreaks than carefully planned subversion."

ANSWER

No responsible person or organization has found that the riots are organized or planned subversion. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has testified that the FBI has found no evidence that the disorders were organized. The Cleveland grand jury heard a great many charges and allegations, but it refused to return a single indictment.

CHARGE

Marion Barry is a former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Rufus Mayfield is a Black Muslim who has spent most of his last eight years in prison. Together they have found gainful employment working for UPO, the top anti-poverty agency in Washington. (The implication is that OEO hires subversives and dangerous criminals.)

ANSWER

The article identifies Marion Barry as a former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Mr. Barry never held such a post. He was former head of the Washington, D.C. branch of SNCC, and resigned sometime ago to devote more time to District affairs. As head of the Free D.C. Movement, Mr. Barry has taken an active role in efforts to bring Home Rule to the District, to increase jobs for minority groups, to oppose transit increase and to fight the blight and decay—both spiritual and physical—of Washington slums.

Because of Mr. Barry's demonstrated ability to effectively organize young people and channel their energies in constructive channels, he has been employed by the United Planning Organization, the District's anti-poverty agency, to help this group in its work with young people. A national magazine recently said of Mr. Barry: "Barry, after breaking with his SNCC cohorts, is now the mastermind for youth programs in the anti-poverty division and is quietly showing intellectuals how to communicate."

While it is true that Rufus Mayfield has been in trouble with the law, he has been operating what is regarded nationally as an extremely successful anti-poverty effort, hiring more than 1,000 poverty-stricken youths for a neighborhood clean-up program in Washington, D.C. This program, fittingly named "PRIDE", has been so effective—as an example, it killed some 10,000 rats in less than three weeks—that even those who first expressed doubts about the feasibility of the project, are now counted among its warmest supporters. So successful has the project been that the Labor Department has refunded it on a year-round basis. One additional note—Mr. Mayfield is working for the Labor Department, not UPO.

CHARGE

The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association (SWAFCA) received $700,000 from OEO despite the fact that it numbers among its principals such "subversives" as John Zippert and Shirley Mesher.

ANSWER

SWAFCA was granted $400,000 by OEO, not $700,000 as *Barron's* erroneously reports. Furthermore, neither Shirley Mesher nor John Zippert is a "principal" or even a member of the cooperative. SWAFCA, incidentally, is a coop project whose membership is composed primarily of poor Negro farmers, who are being provided help to raise their incomes through their own labors.

CHARGE

OEO has jailbirds and subversives on the federal payroll. Two examples are John Ross, of the Progressive Labor Party, who served on the anti-poverty board in San Francisco; and Howard Harawitz, a former member of the W.E.B. DuBois Club, who serves on a similar anti-poverty board in Berkeley.

ANSWER

This is a classic example of brutal character assassination. First, neither of these men was on the "federal payroll." Board members serve on a volunteer basis—without pay.

Second, neither of the above organizations, despite the radical beliefs expressed by some of their members, is included on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations.

Finally, OEO has strictly enforced rules and regulations covering the subject of subversives and character qualifications both for board members and for employees.

"Membership in subversive organizations or lack of sympathy with the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, are inconsistent with membership on the governing bodies and police advisory committees of community action agencies. Moreover, all members of such bodies and committees shall be persons of good character; recent conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude shall be considered strong evidence of failure to meet this standard."

Another memorandum, No. 23-A, covers the question of employees:

"Membership in the Communist Party or in any other organization whose objectives include the overthrow of the government of the United States by force and violence is inconsistent with employment in a community action program."

These memorandum clearly spell out OEO's policy on membership in subversive organizations and in the absence of any proof from *Barron's* that they are being violated, it can only be assumed that the magazine is more interested in attacking the program, than it is in getting at the truth.

CHARGE

New York City's Mobilization for Youth, pilot project for the Job Corps, was investigated by federal and state officials which found several staff members who were also members of the Communist Party.

ANSWER

Barron's goes back to 1964 to attack New York's Mobilization for Youth project. The program is not, and never was a "pilot project for the Job Corps." Contrary to what the article says, investigation of the agency disclosed no members of the Communist Party.

CHARGE

LeRoi Jones "hate-the-whites" Black Arts Theatre got $115,000 in federal funds from Haryou-Act before police discovered an arsenal on the premises.

ANSWER

The Black Arts Theatre was funded without the knowledge or approval of OEO as part of Project Uplift in the summer of 1965. When it became evident that the theatre was not fulfilling a legitimate purpose, funds were cut off and it was shut down. Later, a private group took over the premises. Following a shooting incident, police did find a number of guns in the building, but there was no connection between this and the defunct anti-poverty project.

CHARGE

OEO fights riots with grants.

ANSWER

Absolutely untrue. Our purpose is to help people help themselves out of poverty. In a message of July 20 to all Community Action Program personnel, Mr. Shriver said: "Lest there be any misunderstanding about what OEO policy has been and continues to be, let me make it unmistakably clear once again. There will be absolute insistence that every OEO employee and every employee of an OEO grantee scrupulously avoid and resist participation by OEO-funded resources in any activities which threaten public order in any community. I shall insist upon immediate and full penalties for any individuals found guilty of wrong behavior in this connection. Furthermore, I shall insist upon the withholding of OEO funds from any grantee or delegate agency which is shown to be encouraging or tolerating such behavior."

CHARGE

"Several" arrests in Newark and five arrests in New York.

ANSWER

Only one of nearly 2,000 anti-poverty workers was arrested in Newark. He has not yet come to trial. There were three (not five) Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees, out of more than 30,000, arrested in New York. These enrollees are recipients, rather than workers, in the anti-poverty program. Since these recipients, as residents of slum areas, are among the group most exposed to the possibility of racial disturbances, the relatively small number arrested (.0017 of the enrollees in the cities surveyed) is a strong indication of the effectiveness of OEO programs in helping avoid disturbances. In most cases, including Newark and Detroit, NYC enrollees were highly praised by police chiefs for their role in helping control the riots.

CRISIS IN LIBERALISM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, New Leader magazine for October 23 contains a think piece which I am sure not all Members of this body, or of my party, will agree with. It is controversial. It does raise possibilities that some may say could never occur. But it also should cause us to think. I refer to an article entitled "The Liberal Crisis," written by Gus Tyler. It is a commentary on the dangers of the so-called dump-Johnson movement within the ranks of liberal Democrats. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dangers of the Dump-Johnson Movement: The Liberal Crisis

(By Gus Tyler)

As the nation moves toward the 1968 elections, American liberalism faces the most serious crisis of this century. The peril to the liberals arises from dark and destructive forces at work in the country, and from deep divisions within the progressive-minded community. Unless liberalism can close political ranks to check the onrush of reaction, America can be swept into a dismal abyss of prolonged reaction.

The drama of the 1968 elections will be played against a double backdrop: violence and Vietnam. Both will profoundly affect the outcome in the voting no matter what the Johnson Administration does either in urban America or in Southeast Asia.

The racial riots of 1967, like other riotous moments in America, are part of a continuing and developing movement with its own momentum and inner dynamic. What started many years ago as spontaneous and sporadic outbursts has, in recent years, taken on form and direction. Riot and threat of riot are used as conscious instruments to win demands—specific and vague. Out of the cauldron is emerging a political coalition of black revolutionaries, Muslims and the Negro underworld which seeks to use violence as a tool of purpose. The most irreconcilable elements in this loose combine are the extremists who do not believe that America is a viable civilization, who feel the only hope lies in a nihilistic and uninhibited destruction of the society.

The riots of 1967 are a prelude and rehearsal to those of 1968. While a massive program for the ghettos would undoubtedly do much to dampen the explosive materials of riot, even the most generous effort is unlikely to have meaningful impact by 1968. And it is far less likely that the present Congress will enact any program—massive or midget. The fuel for the fire will be on hand next summer. The leadership for the systematic use of violence will, by 1968, have established its authority—in no small part as a result of operations run in 1967. If one is to trust knowledgeable rumor, the next move will be to carry the flames outside the ghetto to adjacent neighborhoods.

But whether or not riots, inside or outside the ghetto, are on the drawing boards of the "revolutionaries," there are enough combustibles around for the most accidental spark in 1968 to set off the explosion. The response to such an explosion can be predicted from several centuries of American experience with social conflict. Riot makes counter-riot; violence makes vigilantism. In 1968, the ever dormant spirit of vigilantism is likely to arise brutally—both on the streets and at the polls.

If the spirit of violence should flag either in the ghetto or in the surrounding white community, there are racist and reactionary forces to whip up the fury. Legislators can do it by callous disregard; Right extremists can do it by financing the sparks to set the fire; parochial politicians will do it as a cheap and easy way to fame and fortune.

In 1968, there will be a vigilante vote—as well as vigilante violence. It may prove the pivotal power for putting a like-minded man in the White House.

Peace in Vietnam is not apt to reverse or check racial conflict. Indeed, quite the opposite is probable. If peace was made in Southeast Asia before the first of the year, the most immediate impact on the American economy would be a dip in employment. Demobilization of Negro soldiers, fewer job openings, a higher rate of Negro joblessness—especially among the young—could only add fuel to the flame. While it is entirely possible and desirable for America to work out "peacetime" plans to take up the slack, such plans would get little backing in the present Congress—and in no event could they have an effect in time to provide needed employment before the fall of 1968.

For the militant Negro idealogue or demagogue, American withdrawal from Vietnam would provide conclusive proof that this civilization is on the way out, about to be pushed into oblivion. This conviction would be incendiary propaganda in the mouths of the militants.

Thus whatever the merits may be for hastening a settlement in Asia, it is a vast misjudgment to assume that the fate of the ghettos will be settled in Vietnam. The notion that peace over there means peace over here is a self-delusion induced by incantations in a dovecote.

Regardless of Johnson's actions in Vietnam between now and Election Day, moreover, the issue will be with the country on that fateful Tuesday. If he makes a settlement it will, of necessity, be frayed with loose ends: boundaries, role of the Vietcong, presence of guarantors, etc. The Republicans will grab each loose thread to unravel the Administration, wrapping their yarn around the accusative query: "Is this what our boys died for?" If Johnson continues on present course, he will be hit from both sides: either "get out" or "go all out" or both.

Johnson would overcome both these obstacles—violence and Vietnam—with a united liberal front. But this unity is lacking . . . at the moment. Within the progressive community in 1967 there is a group whose basic strategy is negative: "beat Johnson." Its logic runs in three steps:

1. Any Republican, including Richard Nixon or Ronald Reagan, is more likely to settle Vietnam than Johnson, in the same way that Eisenhower settled Korea after Truman.

2. Even if this does not happen, in 1972 the Democrats could oust the Republicans.

3. At that time, the Democratic party will be in the hands of its liberal wing.

For a brief moment, this faction in the liberal community toyed with a third-party movement: the Spock-King ticket. The Negro nihilists knocked that notion out of their heads at last month's National Conference for New Politics in Chicago. So the "beat Johnson" faction now turns to the Democratic party (a) to name convention delegates to nominate someone or anyone other than LBJ; (b) to undermine Johnson in the election of 1968; (c) and then in 1972 to use this movement to name a true liberal to take the White House.

The strategy is simple and suicidal.

The first victims of this "beat Johnson" movement will be the Representatives and Senators in the "peace wing" of Congress. A battle over convention delegates will deeply divide the Democratic party ranks. Congressmen and Senators will not escape the conflict unscathed. In the case of a George McGovern (D.-S.D.), or others like him, who are already in deep trouble because of their "dove" posture, a further division within their party is a guarantee of defeat. Put otherwise, in a divided and splintered liberal coalition, the first to suffer will be the men who are liberals on domestic issues and who are foreign policy doves. But they will not be alone. The resolve of the peace-at-all-cost people to defeat the Johnson crowd will also hit the liberals who back the Administration on Vietnam. In short, the "beat Johnson" movement inevitably, if not intentionally, becomes a beat-the-liberals-for-Congress movement: both liberal doves and liberal hawks.

A conservative Congress—much more conservative than the present—will not only affect legislation but may very well turn topsy turvy all calculations on the presidency in 1968. In this regard, 1968 could be unlike any other election in American history.

A George Wallace candidacy would have a peculiar effect on the *electoral*, as distinguished from the *popular* vote. In terms of *popular* vote, Wallace would help LBJ win a plurality. Johnson's liberalism—especially on civil rights—has lost him many voters who in 1968 would go Republican. If Wallace runs, however, many of the same voters would vote Dixiecrat instead of GOP, thereby cutting into Republican strength.

But in terms of the *electoral vote,* the Wallace candidacy could have an altogether different impact on 1968—and on the future of American politics. If he carries as much of the South as predicted, he will garner some 100 electoral votes. In that event, it would be necessary for either the Democratic or Republican candidate for President to win at least 270 electoral votes out of the remaining 438—to be elected. Had this happened in 1948, or 1960, neither Truman nor Kennedy would have had enough electoral votes to win.

If neither Democrat nor Republican get a majority of the votes in 1968, then the contest goes to the House of Representatives—at which point the political complexion of the House becomes decisive because it is the body that will now pick the President out of the top three runners.

In the House, the balance of power would be in the hands of the South. Indeed, its power is heavily exaggerated since each state including the thinly populated states of the South, casts only one vote: Louisiana equals Illinois; Mississippi equals New York; and Alabama equals California.

Southern strategy in this situation must be envisioned against the background of riots in the summer of 1968. The first impact of such disturbances would be to swell the Wallace vote—both North and South. The second impact would be on the Southern Congressional delegations that would *normally* vote for the Democratic candidate for President if the contest went to the House. In 1968, they might do otherwise.

The South may now lead America down the path to reaction—by playing an independent role. Discussing 1968 at a political action meeting of the AFL–CIO, Bayard Rustin recently said: "The nation moves toward 1968, a year of historic importance, in a mood of confusion, unrest, uncertainty. Exploiting Vietnam and the Negro's agony, the Right wing prepares to launch a comeback. If successful, it will profoundly alter the direction of American politics and most grievously set back the Negro." In setting this altered direction, the South would be in the driver's seat.

Given the choice between a Johnson and a Reagan, the Southern delegations could decide to go for Reagan or—if wooed by LBJ—to succumb at a devilish price: my body for your soul. Given the alternate choice between a Johnson and a Rockefeller, the South could say, "a plague on both your houses," and cast its vote for Wallace to elect no President. (This is constitutionally possible, since the top three names for President go before the House and a *majority* is needed for election.)

The latter course, a stalemate in the House, is unlikely because as matters stand right now the GOP candidate will not be Rockefeller but someone more congenial to the Southern spirit. But if Rockefeller (or someone like him) is the candidate and the South should decide to stalemate the election, the political potential becomes bizarre: The Senate chooses the Vice President on a one-man-one-vote basis, and if the House cannot agree on a President, then the Veep becomes Prexy.

This improbable, but possible, freak could put a Reagan directly in the White House, although he runs for Vice President rather than President. At present, the strongest ticket the Republicans can field against Johnson is Rockefeller-Reagan. Should it turn out that the Senate—and not the House—chooses the President, Reagan becomes a real possibility for the Presidency, riding into the White House on Rocky's coattails.

The Southern Democrats in House and Senate would normally not bolt their Presidential candidates. But 1968 will not be normal. The election is apt to be run against a background of flaming cities, with a reactionary South discovering new allies in the North and a last best hope to run America. The year 1968 may be as abnormal as 1860, when a new party on a newly realigned base came to power. In terms of issues, 1968 could be 1860 played backwards.

Ordinarily, if Southern Democrats bolted their party they would be jeopardizing the prized seniority and chairmanships that the Dixie solons enjoy. But in a "realignment" the South could easily make a deal with GOP leadership—and the President-to-be—to "organize" both houses in an overt conservative coalition thus preserving Southern superiority in the Senate and House committees. (In the New York State Legislature just a couple of years ago, it was the Republicans—together with "Wagner" Democrats—who gave Anthony Travia and Joseph Zaretski the necessary votes to head the Legislature. There is no constitutional provision to prevent the same from happening in the U.S. Congress.)

Such an eventuality would be a bit of historic irony for liberals who have long urged party realignment. So far, the liberals have failed to convert the New Deal coalition into a "party." In Congress, the conservatives have long had such an informal "party" on Capitol Hill, voting in consistent concert. In 1968, this Congressional coalition of conservatism may have its first chance to elect its President by its own acts—with the South holding the power and mapping the strategy.

In discussions about the forthcoming elections, 1968 has been analogized with other recent contests, particularly 1948 and 1952, with pro-Johnson people pointing to the former and liberal anti-Johnson people the latter. In fact, both analogies are right—and wrong.

In 1948, Harry Truman—like Lyndon Johnson today—appeared to be in trouble. His "left" wing was being torn away by Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party; his "right" wing by Strom Thurmond and the Dixiecrats. The "left" Democrats were hitting Truman because of his cold war policy, the "right" Democrats were hitting him for his pro-civil rights policy. Americans for Democratic Action started a "dump-Truman" movement and turned to Dwight Eisenhower as an alternative, just as some individual liberals (though not ADA this time) are now involved in a "dump-Johnson" movement that seeks another General as a possible candidate, James Gavin. In the election itself, Truman came galloping up to win—with liberal backing, as may happen with LBJ.

Thus far the analogy holds, but not much farther. The support for George Wallace is much greater than that for Thurmond. If Truman had lost the whole South, he would have lost the Presidency. A Reagan is not an Eisenhower—especially if a Republican President is elected in the House with Southern aid. But above all else, the mood of the country is different: Black "revolution" is stirring white "counter-revolution," an atavistic return to a dark dead past.

The "dump-Johnson" people, such as James Wechsler, prefer to parallel 1968 with 1952. That was the year Truman decided not to run, allegedly because he was scared off by the New Hampshire primary. Anti-Johnson liberals hope to scare LBJ off from running in 1968.

If this is carried one step further, though, it becomes most unappetizing. Upon Truman's withdrawal, the Democrats named Adlai Stevenson, the liberal's dream boat, for the Presidency. He ran a bright, brittle campaign in which he restored the English language to its proper place in Western civilization. But it was not he—it was Ike and Dick—who ended up in the White House. And four years later there was more of the same, only more so.

Should the history of 1952 repeat itself, liberals would have a chance to relive the agony of the Ike age in a time of trouble and turmoil. Ike put the New Deal on ice; a Republocrat President in 1968 and beyond would put the nation on fire.

The liberal community has not, until recently, been even dimly aware of the dangerous potential. The great preoccupation has been with Vietnam—both pro and con—almost exclusively. The far greater danger arising from the political crisis *within* the country has gone almost unnoticed.

Until recently, some of the loudest voices in liberal circles spoke out for a third party. The big moment was to be the meeting of the National Conference for New Politics in Chicago over the Labor Day weekend. Whatever evils issued from that confab, it was an ill wind that blew some good. It killed a national third-party, for this year. The formal burial took place at the ADA national board meeting in September, when the organization formally went on record as opposed to a third party. Nobody spoke for the corpse, including those who—in the recent past—were for it.

With the collapse of third-partyism, some of its sponsors together with other anti-Johnson elements began to beef up a "dump-Johnson" campaign. The plan is to run anti-Johnson delegates to the Democratic national convention.

At the September meeting of ADA—the commonly alleged establishment of the liberal community—the question of a "dump-Johnson" movement was at the core of the agenda. Although the press reported this as a gathering to formulate policy on Vietnam, the ADA board was actually without any authority to act on that subject because the Spring convention of the organization had already mapped policy. The board meeting dealt with *political*—rather than *foreign*—policy, concentrating on matters such as third-party, "dump-Johnson," convention and endorsement strategy.

The heaviest blow against the "dump-Johnson" movement was struck by Joe Rauh—Mr. ADA—in a memorandum he had circulated on July 28, 1967. He opposed the movement on practical grounds; it would fail, and it would discredit the movement for peace: "Just as the Kennedy-Fulbright draft will fail to produce delegates because Kennedy will repudiate it in most dramatic form, so any other similar effort in behalf of anti-Johnson delegates will fail because no responsible people inside the Democratic party will allow their names to be connected with a drive against a Democratic President, and especially so hopeless a drive. Here, too, the net result is bound to be few, if any, delegates and a minimization of the peace strength in America to a fraction of its true proportions."

The positive alternative proposal in the Rauh document was a drive to write a peace plank into the Democratic party platform. There were several attempts to reverse the Rauh approach at the ADA board, probably the best attended in its history. The first proposal—to have ADA back the "dump-Johnson" movement—was defeated 73 to 12. Two other moves were defeated: one to allow chapters and individuals to join the dumpers in the name of ADA; the second to instruct ADA to seek an alternative candidate to LBJ.

The board decision, however, has not inhibited a handful of individuals in ADA (though without ADA authority) from going ahead with their "dump-Johnson" effort. From their view, they cannot lose: If LBJ is beaten at the convention, they will have won; if LBJ is defeated in 1968, they will also have won. They talk about 1968 but they mean 1972. They are thinking like Louis XV standing on his head: *Après le déluge, moi.*

If one must look for historical analogies for 1968, it is less in the America of the 1940s and 1950s than in the Germany of the 1930s. Then the great danger was Hitler. But to a sector of the Left—the Communists—the real enemy was social democracy. The coalition that might have halted Hitler was torn with fratricide. The Communists termed the Social Democrats "social-fascists"; they turned the "main fire" against those closest to them; they welcomed Hitler to power with the proclamation: *Nach Hitler, Kommen Wir.*

No doubt this analogy—like most historical parallels—is faulty. But in terms of long-range historic impact, what happened in Germany in the '30s may be closer to the danger we face in 1968 than what happened in America in either 1948 or 1952.

OPEN HOUSING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in the New York Times of Sunday, October 8, Mr. Fred P. Graham wrote an article concerning the Jones against Mayer Co. lawsuit pending before the U.S. Supreme Court.

The article concludes by stating that should the Court rule for the complainants, the effect would be to eliminate the need for new fair housing legislation.

This, in my judgment, does not follow. Legislation will still be necessary even should the Court declare for the complainants in the Jones against Mayer case. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from David A. Brody, of the Antidefamation League, dealing with this subject. His letter makes very clear that legislation will be necessary, and it explains why.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COURTS MAY SETTLE OPEN HOUSING

(By Fred P. Graham)

WASHINGTON.—Events are quietly under way here that could lead to the creation of an effectual Federal fair housing law—not by an act of Congress, but by a decision of the Supreme Court.

As the Court opened its 1967 term last week with the usual round of secret conferences on pending petitions for review, two factors made this result possible.

One was the presence among the petitions of an appeal which contends that the United States already has a law against racial discrimination in housing—an 1866 statue that has been enforced once in this century as a fair housing law but has since been almost forgotten.

The other was a series of discussions that were held in the Justice Department, where some top officials are arguing that the Government should enter the case as a friend of the court and urge the Supreme Court to resuscitate the old law so that the lower courts can use it to bar discrimination in housing.

These events date back to the summer of

1965, when Joseph Lee Jones and his wife Barbara Jo picked out a pleasant lot in Paddock Woods, a new subdivision in suburban St. Louis, and offered to pay the advertised $28,195 price to have a house built on it. But Mr. Jones is a Negro and his wife is white, and their offer was rejected.

A LONG SHOT

Congress at that time had not even begun to consider the ill-fated fair housing law that succumbed to a Senate filibuster in 1966. So the Joneses' lawyer tried a long shot. He sued the developers on the theory that existing statutes and constitutional amendments, read in the light of the latest Supreme Court decisions, already add up to an enforceable fair housing law.

At the heart of the argument is the civil rights act of 1866, passed to implement the 13th Amendment, which outlawed slavery. The law said: "All citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every state and territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof, to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold and convey real and personal property."

This law has been recodified and blended with subsequent legislation down through the years, but it still exists on the statute books, currently in Section 1982 of the United States Code.

In 1903 a Federal judge in Arkansas did enforce it to block a landowner from refusing to lease land to a Negro, but otherwise most lawyers have assumed that a succession of Supreme Court interpretations of the reconstructions laws and amendments have made it unenforceable.

These decisions held that the 13th Amendment, which can be enforced against individuals, could be used only to stop people from treating Negroes as slaves. Efforts to eliminate racial discrimination against the freed slaves were held to be enforceable only under the authority of the 14th Amendment.

Since the 14th Amendment forbids only discrimination by state action and does not touch bias by private persons, lawyers assumed that the 1866 law could not be enforced against individuals to block racial discrimination in housing.

On these grounds the Joneses lost in Federal District Court and in the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

PLAUSIBLE REASONS

But now the case is up on appeal to the Supreme Court, where the Joneses (and a coalition of civil rights groups that have taken up their cause) have offered the Justices a number of plausible legal reasons for upholding their right to sue.

They claim that Negroes' inability to purchase homes on equal terms with whites is a remaining "vestige of slavery" that can still be attacked under the 13th Amendment.

Further, they contend that the state was involved in the developers' discrimination in violation of the 14th Amendment, because it had the legal power to stop it but permitted it to happen.

Finally, they cite statements in opinions signed by six of the Justices in a 1966 civil rights decision to the effect that "state action" is no longer necessary in certain 14th Amendment cases.

Lawyers can differ on the relative soundness of these arguments, but most would agree that they are substantial enough to support a decision for the plaintiffs if a majority of the Supreme Court is disposed to do so. On far shakier grounds than these the Court last spring upheld California's fair housing law, despite an overwhelming vote by the people in favor of abolishing it.

Since then, the Court has acquired its first Negro Justice, Thurgood Marshall. His presence should strengthen sentiment on the Court in favor of taking the plunge on housing discrimination, as the Court did on the school segregation issue in 1954.

Congress is frozen on fair housing, as it was on school desegregation, yet political reaction against a bold housing decision might not be too severe; a majority of both Houses of Congress voted on the side of fair housing before the filibuster killed it in 1966.

If the Court should hand down the sweeping decision the Jones appeal asks, the effect would be to eliminate the need for new fair housing legislation; Federal courts could bar racial discrimination in housing—in any form, including private sales between individuals—anywhere it occurred in the country.

ANTIDEFAMATION LEAGUE,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1967.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As Fred P. Graham points out in his timely and informative column in the New York Times of Sunday, October 8, if the Supreme Court should agree to hear the case of *Jones* v. *Mayer Co.* and later uphold the contention of the petitioners that the 1866 Civil Rights Act bars housing discrimination by private individuals even where there is no state involvement, that decision would mean that the nation already has a national fair housing law. But, it would not, as Mr. Graham goes on to state, eliminate the need for new fair housing legislation.

If the 1866 law should be held to bar housing discrimination by private persons, enforcement of the right to equality of housing opportunity would be left to individual suits brought by the aggrieved individual. While the private law suit has accounted for many of the Court's landmark decisions in the area of racial discrimination, most notably the 1954 school desegregation cases (indeed *Jones* v. *Mayer Co.* itself may prove to be such a landmark case), it is a retail, costly, time-consuming and not too effectual approach for dealing with the still pervasive and persistent problem of discrimination.

Experience has demonstrated that if civil rights statutes are to be meaningful and more than mere wholesome declarations of policy, the responsibility for carrying out the mandate of the law must be shifted from the individual complainant to the specialized administrative agency which must have the power to initiate proceedings on its own motion without first waiting for individual complaints, as well as the power to issue judicially enforceable cease and desist orders after a full administrative hearing. Consequently, as welcome as a decision by the Court would be that the nation already has a federal fair housing law, additional legislation would still be needed. Vindication of the statutory right must not be left solely to the victim of the discrimination. What would still be required is effective administrative enforcement machinery and authority for the Attorney General to institute suits against recalcitrant builders and realtors who may continue to practice discrimination in violation of the law as provided for in S. 1358, the Fair Housing Act of 1967 introduced by you and a bipartisan group of 21 Senators. Only in this way can the right of equal housing opportunity be effectively secured.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. BRODY.

INDIA'S VIEW OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a dispatch from New Delhi, published in the Washington Post of Saturday, October 21. It gives an informed analysis of India's view of the war in Vietnam. The dispatch, by Bernard D. Nossiter, goes to the heart of the dilemma posed for India by its desire for peace but its lingering suspicion of western powers in Asian affairs.

India's concerns are, as Mr. Nossiter points out, primarily her own concerns. She wants to feel secure, and for that reason wants American forces in Asia, if not in India.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM WAR POSES A DILEMMA FOR INDIA

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

NEW DELHI, October 19.—Of all the puzzles in India's foreign policy, there are few as perplexing as this government's ambiguous stand on Vietnam.

The confusion arises because New Delhi is pulled in two directions. It has a direct interest in peace in Southeast Asia and harbors some lingering suspicion of the role played there by a Western power such as the United States. At the same time, India looks on China as its primary enemy and is not unhappy that the world's most powerful military force is present in the region to check Peking.

Today was the fifth anniversary of India's clash with China and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi reminded her countrymen:

"Whatever else has changed in the last five years, China's aggressive posture has not stopped. Indeed, China has continued to show open hostility to India . . . Let us be on guard against this continuing menace."

CROSSED SIGNALS

The twin pulls, the wish for peace and fear of China, lay behind the crossed diplomatic signals India sent out earlier this month. The Defense Minister and likeliest candidate for the Foreign Ministry post that Mrs. Gandhi now fills, Sardar Swaran Singh, told the U.N. General Assembly that he was "confident" that Hanoi would "respond favorably" to a halt in American bombing. The next day, Mrs. Gandhi observed tartly that this was just one man's opinion.

India is in constant touch with North Vietnam. Both nations maintain consuls general in each other's capitals. Indian diplomats have been pressing Hanoi to give some pledge that they will make a reciprocal response if the United States halts its bombing. New Delhi has not tried to specify what the response should be, because the talks have never gone that far.

India has gotten no assurances in reply. Instead, the North Vietnamese have repeated that they will make an appropriate response to a bombing halt.

Whether this means that Hanoi would stop sending troops south, sit down to peace talks or something else, the Indians do not know.

WORTH THE RISK

Nevertheless, New Delhi believes that there is little to lose and probably much to gain by stopping the bombing. Officials here cite American statements that bombing has not materially affected Hanoi's infiltration of the South. They believe that a cessation would lead Hanoi to peace talks, that North Vietnam would then stand up to strong Chinese pressure for continued fighting. The Indians acknowledge that this is an opinion, and that bombing halt could disadvantage the United States. The argument here is that this is a risk worth taking.

If peace was restored, New Delhi believes two important consequences would follow. North Vietnam would be free of Chinese pressure and, with aid from the Soviet Union and its own anti-Chinese tradition, would drift away from its close ties to Peking.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union would be free to invest more heavily in the development of Southeast Asia. The

Indians believe that the Chinese are a threat primarily to unstable regimes and that a big investment program would make the region less vulnerable.

There is an even more direct Indian interest in peace in Vietnam. New Delhi sees itself protected from China by two powerful forces, the United States and the Soviet Union. Continued division between Peking and Moscow is an essential condition for support from the Soviet Union, support that now takes the form of both arms and economic aid. Indians fear that if the Vietnamese war is prolonged, the great split in the Communist world could be healed and China would have a more open road into the subcontinent.

India's stake in Vietnamese peace does not mean that New Delhi wants American forces to withdraw from Southeast Asia. Indians simultaneously believe that stable regimes can withstand the Chinese and that it is a good thing to have American troops nearby.

TROOPS TO STAY

New Delhi hopes that American forces will remain in Laos and Thailand. India would like to see Cambodia and Burma someday welcome American airmen and soldiers. Even in a peaceful Vietnam, Indians say there is no conflict between their interests and a continued American military presence. In other words, India likes the idea of having U.S. troops on all sides, but not in India itself.

New Delhi's fear of China is leading to a renewed effort for a settlement with Pakistan. India would like to convince its neighbor that China is their big mutual worry.

India and Pakistan are about to restore telephone and telegraph links broken after their 1965 war. Negotiators will next work at reviving air travel between the two.

Sometime next year, India plans to propose talks that would reopen trade, which has also been cut off since the war.

However, it is questionable whether Pakistan will go along with this. From Pakistan's standpoint, the burning issue is not China, but India's possession of Kashmir. And despite India's fear of China and talk of a settlement with Pakistan, New Delhi regards Kashmir's adherence to the Indian Union as an irrevocable fact.

GOVERNMENT ACTION KNOCKS DOWN PRICE OF HIDES

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an article entitled "Cattle-Hide Prices Reach 2-Year Low as U.S. Demand Shrinks and Exports Drop," published in the Wall Street Journal.

The opening sentence of this article reads:

> A shortage of cattle hides that prompted the Government to curb exports 19 months ago is turning into a glut; prices have fallen since late summer and currently are at a two-year low.

Low hide prices mean, of course, either lower prices for live animals, or higher prices for meat, or both.

About a year and a half ago, in response to pressure from the buyers of cattle hides in this country, the Federal Government hastily imposed quotas on the exports of hides, on the theory that the country faced an impending shortage.

That action was most ill advised. No shortage was impending. Within a few months it became apparent that the country had a surplus, not a shortage of hides. The principal effect of that action was to frghten our foreign customers into looking for alternative sources of hides. In other words, it was destructive of our long-range position in foreign markets, and harmful to the price of hides, and to the price of cattle. It was a class action; it favored one economic group—the makers of leather and of shoes and other leather products, at the expense of another group, the livestock industry.

In response to heated protests from Members of Congress and others, that restriction on exports was lifted a few months later, but not until much damage—pernament damage—has been done.

Mr. President, last week the Congress of the United States was treated to some stern lectures on the importance of the export trade by four members of the President's Cabinet, who appeared before the Senate Finance Committee to denounce various proposals to regulate the flow of imports of several key commodities into this country. The committee was told in no uncertain terms that it must not meddle with our foreign trade policy, and that the President's official family was best qualified to handle such matters, and also that they were engaged in protecting and promoting our export trade at every opportunity. One of those who appeared was the Secretary of Commerce, Alexander Trowbridge.

It is regrettable that the Department of Commerce was not as sedulous in promoting our export volume of hides early last year. It was the Department of Commerce which imposed the restrictions on hide exports in March of 1966. Presumably the Department of Agriculture concurred, or at least made no objection. Now, it is obvious that a tragic mistake was made from which the livestock industry of this country will suffer, but which it is now too late to repair.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMODITIES: CATTLE-HIDE PRICES REACH 2-YEAR LOW AS U.S. DEMAND SHRINKS AND EXPORTS DROP

(By Laird B. Anderson)

CHICAGO.—A shortage of cattle hides that prompted the Government to curb exports 19 months ago is turning into a glut; prices have fallen since late summer and currently are at a two-year low.

The price decline means lower raw-material costs for shoes, gloves and a host of other leather products. But it also means higher costs for beef processors who count on hide sales to offset part of what they pay for live steers.

"I can't see where the market is going to show any improvement," says one hide broker gloomily as he surveys the outlook for the troubled commodity.

Hide prices have been swinging sharply in recent years, in large part because of a head-on clash between new patterns of leather consumption and Government efforts to ensure enough hides for domestic needs.

The upside part of that price swing started almost two years ago. At the time, greater affluence overseas was spurring foreign demand for leather shoes. But, at the same time, Argentina, a major world supplier of hides, was being forced by drought and other factors to reduce its offerings to the world market to 6.8 million in 1965 from 12.1 million hides in 1962.

On the Chicago market, the quote for light native cow hides, a high-quality grade used to make the upper part of shoes, nearly doubled in little more than a year, to a six-year high of 26 cents a pound in February 1966 from 13.5 cents a pound in January 1965.

GOVERNMENT STEPS IN

Then the Government stepped in. Commerce Department planners, concerned that U.S. hide merchants were exporting too many hides needed for the U.S. and other leather industries, decreed in March 1966 that exports had to be cut 16% from the 1965 level. Such exports in 1965 had climbed to 13.3 million hides from 11.5 million the year before. The Commerce Department was predicting then that exports would continue to rise to over 14 million in 1966. By the agency's reckoning, this would leave U.S. users in 1966 with 21.1 million hides, or 2.7 million less than they needed.

As might be expected, domestic prices fell on the quota plan. By May 1966, when the Government had eased somewhat its export restrictions, the Chicago price for hides had declined from the previous February's 26-cent level to 23 cents a pound, and the price continued to slump to a 1966 low of 15.5 cents a pound in October.

By then, however, Commerce Department strategists had decided it was time to withdraw the export restrictions. Again, the Chicago hide market reflected the change. Prices turned up sharply from October's 15.5-cent low to 19.5 cents at the end of 1966, and continued to rise through February of this year to 21.5 cents a pound.

By about that time, however, according to industry officials, a backlash against the Government's export quotas was beginning to hit the domestic industry. The quotas actually had failed to hold exports below the level that Commerce Department statisticians had predicted before the controls were imposed. Even with the restrictions, U.S. hide exports climbed to 14.1 million hides last year from 13.3 million in 1965.

COURTING DISENCHANTED CUSTOMERS

But John K. Minnoch, president of the National Hide Association here, says the quotas were eminently successful in convincing foreign buyers that they had better look outside the U.S. for their hide supplies. Argentina, where production was just starting to recover, began aggressively courting disenchanted customers and started lifting sales sharply by the close of last year. Argentina's sales climbed to 8.1 million hides in 1966 from 1965's depressed level of 6.8 million.

That switch away from the U.S. is intensifying this year. U.S. exports, unencumbered by any Commerce Department restrictions, declined 11% in the first eight months of this year, to 8 million hides from more than 9 million a year before. Argentina's exports, by contrast, rose 4.5% to more than 5.6 million from 5.4 million in January-August 1966.

Synthetic materials also are being used increasingly by foreign shoemakers as substitutes for the leather they had been buying in the U.S.

And, to the woe of both U.S. hide merchants and U.S. leather product manufacturers, more of these foreign-made products (with their foreign-origin leather) are being imported into the U.S., thereby reducing the demand for domestic hides.

HIGHER IMPORT BARRIERS URGED

In the first eight months of this year, shoe imports into the U.S. soared almost 30% from the 1966 level, to 88.6 million pairs valued at $141.4 million. According to the Tanners' Council of America, leather handbag imports jumped 38%, glove imports climbed 40% and imports of such smaller products as wallets were up 38%.

Understandably, U.S. production declined as imports swelled. Output of leather shoes and boots by domestic makers dropped 9.1% in the first seven months of the year from the 1966 pace, to 341.3 million pairs. The decline, says Irving R. Glass, executive vice president of the Tanners' Council, is as "serious as anything I've seen."

Some shoe manufacturers are predicting that domestic output may bounce back by the end of the year. Others, however, aren't so sure, and both tanners and shoemakers are pressing Congress to erect higher import barriers against foreign-made leather goods.

What's more, to the further chagrin of the U.S. hide industry, synthetic materials are being used increasingly in the number of shoes being produced in the U.S. Du Pont Co. said shoemakers last year bought enough Corfam, its leather substitute, to make 12 million pairs of shoes. That would account for only 2% of U.S. shoe production, but it was almost 2½ times the amount of Corfam sold in 1965. Still further gains are being posted this year, Du Pont says. Industry sources say that a Japanese substitute, Clairino, also is boosting sales.

For Mr. Minnoch of the Hide Association, the double onslaught of declining export and shrinking domestic demand has prompted dire forecasts that the industry may end up the year stuck with 500,000 to one million spoilable hides.

On the Chicago hide market, the declines have triggered a predictable price slide. The key grade of light native cow hides currently is quoted at 14.5 cents a pound, up slightly from the 13.5-cent quote in effect during late August and early September, but still off substantially from the 24.5-cent level of eight months ago.

For shoe manufacturers, who figure that hides account for 20% to 25% of the cost of making a better grade of men's shoe and 30% of the manufacturing cost of a woman's shoe, the lower hide price means lower outlays for materials. But some big shoe manufacturers, even so, recently posted price increases of 3% to 4%, saying spiraling wage costs and technical improvements have more than offset the lower hide prices.

In the packing industry, by contrast, lower hide prices mean higher net costs. At current prices, packing houses can sell the hide from an average 1,200-pound steer for only about $10, down from nearly $14 this past February. That $4 difference is reflected in higher meat prices.

HO CHI MINH, "MAN OF THE YEAR"

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, columnist Howard K. Smith, in the Sunday Star, counters the propaganda widespread even in this country, which pictures Ho Chi Minh as a "wise little Uncle Ho."

It is not so, says Smith, piling up the record of a despot, including the numbers of dead left behind as Ho consolidated his power in North Vietnam, then moved to extend it to the south. It is a fraud. But it is a fraud being fed these days by a handful of writers permitted to take conducted tours of North Vietnam. They come back and joke about Ho's claims that there are no North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam. It is a bald faced lie, but they joke. Then they turn the President of the United States on a stake labeled "credibility gap" because he withholds a bit of information for state reasons.

Perhaps Ho Chi Minh is indeed wise. But he is certainly playing some people for fools.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's column nominating Ho Chi Minh as "Man of the Year" for his achievements in fiction be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HO AS THE "MAN OF THE YEAR"

About this time each year the well known news magazine begins to sort out possible choices for its Man of the Year. I doubt if I will get around to mailing it but my nomination is Ho Chi Minh. The formidable wisp is one of the bloodiest despots of a bloody century, as immoral as he is incompetent at government—yet, in the guise of wise little Uncle Ho, he is winning the Vietnam propaganda war.

Ho's transcendent talent has been in organized destruction. But after Dien Bien Phu in 1954 he had to run a nation instead of merely destroy it, and the results were almost all disastrous.

First of all nearly 900,000 of his people abandoned homes and jobs and farms and fled to South Vietnam. If the Economist of London is right, 250,000 more were ready to flee when the borders were shut.

Then to break opposition he presided over a bloodbath of vast proportions for a small country. The late Dr. Bernard Fall estimated close to 50,000 were murdered. That, however, could be a minimum based on a few cases in which trustworthy eyewitnesses were present. One such case occurred when peasants stormed a Jeep containing the Canadian member of the International Control Commission and begged to be allowed to go to South Vietnam. He sent a division of troops to that region and 6,000 were "deported" or executed.

After two years, Ho's General Giap said in a famous speech, "We made too many deviations and executed too many honest people. We attacked on too large a front and, seeing enemies everywhere, resorted to terror which became too widespread . . . torture came to be regarded as normal practice."

After that Ho stopped executing "too many" honest people and resorting to terror that was "too widespread," and merely applied enough. He won his 1960 election with a 99.91% vote, somewhat aided by the fact that he had no opponent.

Ho not only had the reputation of being a great national popular hero who fearlessly faced public opinion, but also of being a great social reformer, friend to the peasant. That was due to his great land reform in which land was taken from the rich and given the poor—though Russian statistics show the rich were comparatively richer afterwards. Anyhow, there was enough abandoned refugee land left so that yields of rice per hectar rose a little until 1960; since then low morale and bad management have sent them ever downward.

A British expert argues that the reason Ho decided to go south and resume the more familiar arts of destruction was that construction was not doing well in the north. In the south, his minions assassinated 30,000 South Vietnamese civilians in a decade, not counting those killed in combat action.

Ho's military success is not mysterious. Destruction is simply vastly easier than construction. It takes six years of college education and about a year more of work to build a bridge. It takes a half-hour of explanation and ten minutes of work to set the fuses to blow it up.

Ho's triumph is in creating and maintaining an image of being conciliatory—or even peace-loving, a nationalist George Washington, and a constructive social reformer. All that is pure fraud

He succeeds due to the perverseness of human nature. One and all may go freely to South Vietnam, see what they wish and write without censorship. A useful few are admitted to North Vietnam on strictly supervised tours. From the free writers in south Vietnam come venomous and unfair articles like Mary McCarthy's admittedly loaded observations. From the restricted few in the north comes a dutiful parroting of Ho's line.

Thus Harry Ashmore, back from Ho's presence, added his weight to the view that the U.S. frustrates Ho's conciliatory peacefulness. Yet the U.S. is on record almost weekly for peace talks while Ho has not once abandoned the line expressed in his newspaper Hoc Tap: "The liberation of South Vietnam can be settled only by force . . . it cannot be settled by treaties and agreements." Mr. Ashmore cares nothing for this.

Last weekend we watched on television Messrs. Harrison Salisbury and David Schoenbrun—two of the handful let into the north—confirming one another's information that the Viet Cong in the south are fiercely independent of Ho Chi Minh—though how they got an objective reading on that in a blinkered visit to the north was not explained. In any case it is not right. The two were almost jocular about Ho's insistence that there are no North Vietnamese troops in the south. It seems that if the President of the U.S. withholds information for reasons of state it is a credibility gap; but when Ho tells a bald lie it is real cute.

Come to think of it. Man of the Year is not enough for Ho. He should also get the Nobel Prize for fiction. The remarkable thing is, he doesn't even have to write his fictions himself.

DUAL DRUG PRICES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senate Monopoly Subcommittee hearings looking into high prescription drug prices has run into some interesting revelations in the past several weeks.

Among them is a document sent to the committee by Mr. George Squibb, until recently a vice president of the drug company bearing his grandfather's name. The theme of his statement is that drug prices are the Achilles heel of the pharmaceutical industry.

He supported the statement with the fact that the drug companies spend only 6.4 percent of their total sales dollar for research—research which FDA Commissioner Goddard suggests is highly inefficient and unproductive—and that the firms cannot blame their high prices on this research cost.

Recently the president of E. R. Squibb & Sons testified to the committee.

Mr. Richard Furlaud attempted to defend the pricing structures the drug companies have set up.

The New York Times on October 17, 1967, editorialized that Mr. Furlaud's defense based on research and on advertising costs was "unpersuasive."

The editorial writer is of the opinion that drug manufacturers still have not presented a "convincing justification" for the "present enormous discrepancies in the prices of branded and generic medicine."

Five drug companies have now appeared to testify before the committee.

The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association will appear on November 16, November 29, and on another date in December.

I am informed that 15 or 16 PMA witnesses will spend about 16 hours before the committee in order to justify the prescription price system the drug companies use.

I think that should be ample time to prove their case.

I ask unanimous consent that the New

York Times editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dual Drug Prices

The president of E. R. Squibb & Sons has given an unpersuasive defense of the curious two-price system for drugs in this country. A much better argument will have to be made to explain why Congress should not outlaw the present anomalous practice under which the same medicine may be very expensive or very cheap, depending upon whether a doctor has prescribed it by its brand name or its generic name.

Taken at face value, the strongest point made by Squibb's president, Richard Furlaud, is the need to cover costs of research aimed at finding new drugs. Unfortunately for the pharmaceutical industry, the force of that argument has been weakened by the recent testimony of Food and Drug Commissioner James L. Goddard. He reported that much of the drug firms' research is "poorly executed" and "has not resulted in the introduction into medical practice of genuinely new therapeutic agents." The relative fruitlessness of this research is, as Dr. Goddard noted, a kind of "expensive inefficiency" whose involuntary subsidization by consumers is hardly justifiable.

Particularly unpersuasive is Mr. Furlaud's effort to defend the huge advertising and promotional spending of the drug industry, costs that are then used to justify the exorbitant prices charged for many branded pharmaceuticals. Every practicing doctor in the nation is deluged with such advertising material, much of which employs themes more appropriate to cigarette or automobile advertising than to the sale of products concerned with human health.

Doubtless, as the drug companies contend, some fraction of this promotional expense does contribute to the education of practicing physicians, but this is surely a far from ideal—or economical—solution to the problem of postgraduate training for clinicians. A drug company advertisement or salesman must aim primarily to sell that enterprise's products—a goal quite different from that of medical educators engaged in bringing up to date the knowledge of their colleagues who actually treat patients.

Passage of a law requiring all drugs to be prescribed and sold by generic names would be an extremely radical step, one that Congress should not take lightly or hastily. But the demand for it will increasingly be heard if the present enormous discrepancies in the prices of branded and generic medicines are not narrowed substantially, and if the drug companies do not give a more convincing justification for the differences that remain.

ECONOMY AND HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. **FANNIN**. Mr. President, the administration apparently is again considering freezing funds for the Federal highway system. While all savings are laudatory during periods of fiscal crisis, cutbacks in the highway construction program would be a dishonest, foolish and even dangerous form of economy. A recent editorial in the Arizona Republic placed the issue in proper perspective. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Where To Cut Spending?

President Johnson has spoken often of the dilemma every Chief Executive faces in trying to keep everyone happy, or at least in trying to keep anyone from being too unhappy.

That dilemma is nowhere more apparent than in the arm-wrestling taking place between LBJ and Congress over how much of the budget should be cut, and where. The House Ways and Means Committee, by a vote of 20–5, said that it would not even consider the President's 10 per cent tax surcharge unless the administration proposes substantial cuts in government spending.

But the administration is reluctant to do so, what with next year being an election year. That is why President Johnson recently summoned reporters to his office to insist that he could not recommend major budget cuts because his original budget was already tight, and the job of cutting appropriations traditionally belongs to Congress.

Nevertheless, the President is casting around for areas in which to cut federal spending. Probably because he knew of the furor his suggestion would arouse, LBJ said the search for frugality might cause him to freeze federal spending for highways.

The lobbyists who stand to gain the most from highway construction naturally joined the nation's governors in condemning the proposed freeze on the $4.8 billion in federal aid highway funds already apportioned to the states for fiscal 1969. But we also think that would be a foolish place to try to economize.

The fact is that—except for certain forest highways and public land highways—construction of federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban roads has been financed since 1956 from the Highway Trust Fund, which by law operates on a pay-as-you-build basis. Revenues derive from various highway user taxes—on gasoline and diesel fuel, on new trucks and buses, on rubber, lubricating oil, etc.—paid into the Fund.

Thus, highway funds are not in the category of pork-barrel appropriations, voted by Congress and authorized by the President in order to repay political debts. They are funds paid for by motorists who derive benefit from our public highways.

Even if they weren't, it would be wrong to cut back on highway construction. For whereas last year approximately 53,000 people were killed and 4 million injured on the nation's highways (approximately 600 killed and 23,000 injured in Arizona), at an estimated economic loss of $10 billion ($115 million in Arizona), 100,000—repeat, 100,000—motorists will die on American highways by about 1980 even if we maintain the present construction rate.

In order to reduce that death rate, we will have to spend even more money. So it should be obvious to everyone—and certainly to the President—that we cannot, under any circumstances, cut back on present highway construction and thereby invite an even greater carnage as a result of outmoded and unsafe roads built for autos of another era.

We approve of the effort to keep federal spending within strict bounds. But we believe the President should look elsewhere in his search for frugality.

"A LONG, LONG TRAIL A-WINDING"

Mr. **NELSON**. Mr. President, recently the distinguished editor in chief of Forbes magazine, Mr. Malcolm S. Forbes, in his column called "Fact and Comment," stated that not very many "thinking" people can "fault the President" for his "consistent, determined support of some imaginative efforts toward the conservation of parks, our wilderness areas, and of some remaining unspoiled, unbelievably attractive American scenery."

Mr. Forbes has particular reference to the national trails system supported by the administration and which I pushed hard for in the 88th Congress.

Again we are at the crossroads of a decision. Action by the Congress can save "a wondrous thing . . . for the mind as well as the muscle," as Mr. Forbes puts it so well.

Out of 2.3 billion acres available in our country, only 220,000 would be kept for nature lovers, hikers, and strollers, and at a fantastically low cost.

Mr. Forbes again says it:

> We can't afford that? We cannot not afford it.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Let's Keep "A Long, Long Trail A-Winding"

The Johnson Administration may have messed up a lot of major programs according to which party you support or which measure gored whose ox, but I don't think that too many thinking Americans will fault the President and the First Lady for their consistent, determined support of some imaginative efforts toward the conservation of parks, our wilderness areas and of some remaining unspoiled, unbelievably attractive American scenery.

To be against "beautifying" of course would be like opposing motherhood, so Administration measures of this nature have seldom been attacked frontally. Ridicule is the weapon. Make the measure seem funny so it gets the teeth laughed out of it.

This has happened in a big way to the federal program aimed at curbing the Billboard Blight, as well as to the effort to curb the crawling sprawl of dead cars, empty iceboxes, cooked-out stoves and sprung bedsprings.

Another really good Administration proposal may bite the dust as a result of invidious attack by leer and sneer.

President Johnson, with the support of both the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, has proposed a National Trails system, with four trails to start it: the 2,000-mile Appalachian Trail from Maine to Georgia; the 825-mile Potomac Heritage Trail through Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia and the District of Columbia; the Pacific Crest Trail, 2,300 miles down the West Coast from Canada to Mexico; and the Continental Divide Trail, 3,100 miles from Southern Canada to southern New Mexico.

I don't know if you have ever taken a walk in the country, or if in your younger years you ever joined contemporary neighboring adventurers on hikes. If you did, you know what a wondrous thing it is for the mind as well as the muscle.

If you never did, you should have and would be the better for it.

One thing sure: In this great land that sheds its light from sea to shining sea, some trails to walk over it should be kept by and for those of us now here, and preserved for those to come.

The bill that would ensure this simple, uncostly good is being attacked on some of the most groundless grounds. One "spokesman" told the Senate Interior Committee that the trails would have a "sweeping and serious impact" on the country's livestock industry and future food supply and that "they would be 20,000 miles of interference with or obliteration of food and fiber production on at least 50,000 acres of land."

"Grandiose and fey" thunders the American Cattlemen's Association.

It is hard to believe that Congressmen would take such guff seriously. Out of the 2.3 billion acres that constitute our continental limits, 220,000 would be kept traily.

Some big deal.

We can't afford that?

We cannot *not* afford it.

Look at the muddles we manage to make despite the places still left to walk about in the green of the country. Imagine the mess we'll make when there is no place left to refresh, refurbish the mind.

Congressmen take seriously the testimony of proponents and opponents who make it a business to be heard on measures that may concern them.

They will take even more seriously the spontaneous letters of people who have no angle but their love of our land.

If that includes you, write the men on Capitol Hill.

If enough do, the trailmakers will be heard.

And heeded.

THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH ON OUR VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, since my days as a college student many years ago, I have regarded the St. Louis Post-Dispatch as one of the greatest newspapers in the world. It is certainly among the top three or four metropolitan dailies in our Nation. On numerous occasions, I have been inspired by the brilliance of its editorial columns.

No other newspaper has been more farsighted and correct in its analysis of our tragic and growing involvement in Vietnam. The melancholy stalemate in which we now find ourselves was forecast by the St. Louis Dispatch long ago.

In an editorial dated October 15, 1967, entitled, "Let's Not Be Children," the editors of the Post-Dispatch have presented one of their finest editorials outlining the fallacies in administration assumptions about Asia and especially Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD, and I urge every Member of Congress to read it with care.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S NOT BE CHILDREN

The alienation of the Johnson Administration from the American people, who have undergone a tidal change of opinion against the Vietnam war, was never more sharply expressed than in Secretary Rusk's vehement press conference last week. With the desperation of a man clinging to a sinking dogma, Mr. Rusk set forth his familiar and increasingly unconvincing rationale for the war, and contemptuously flung out at all who disagree with him by crying, "Let's not be children!"

The American majority which has now beyond doubt swung against the Rusk doctrine will not, we suspect, take kindly to being dismissed with a schoolmasterish charge of infantilism. If it is childish to question Mr. Rusk's obsession with a Chinese menace which only he perceives, and to doubt that America's vital security interests demand our fighting an Asian war which the South Vietnamese themselves will not fight, then a great and growing number of Americans are consigned to something less than the mature wisdom which Mr. Rusk claims for himself.

Dissenters from his policy, Mr. Rusk said, put the nation in "mortal danger" and risk a "catastrophe for mankind" by placing in question the credibility of American "commitments" under the Southeast Asia treaty. The people are entitled to ask what has become of the commitment made to them by President Johnson when he sought election in 1964 on a peace platform directly contrary to the Vietnam policy he has followed since. The "pledged word" cited by Mr. Rusk as justification for endless involvement in an Asian land war conflicts with the pledged word of Mr. Johnson not to send Americans to fight Asians' battles. Which promise is the more important?

But it is, of course, untrue to say that half a million troops and a vast air-naval armada are in Vietnam to carry out a solemn national commitment. There never was a commitment, either by President Eisenhower or President Kennedy, to make the civil war in Vietnam our own, and both of their administrations refrained from doing so. President Johnson is exclusively responsible for converting a program of aid and advice into a unilateral war. The Southeast Asia treaty did not require such escalation. By undertaking it unilaterally we violated our most solemn commitments under the United Nations charter.

If Mr. Rusk is right in saying we must wage a war like this in order to sustain world faith in our treaty commitments, then it follows that we have an inescapable obligation to fight other people's wars for them in every quarter of the globe. He is preaching a doctrine of unlimited military intervention under which America sets itself up as judge and jury of every revolution, every border dispute, every national conflict, and undertakes to decide them with its own power.

The American people are rebelling against this doctrine. They do not find credible any longer Mr. Rusk's claims that we are fighting in Vietnam to protect a vital national interest in blocking the expansion of Chinese Communism. It is clearly not China we are fighting, nor Communism either, but rather an indigenous nationalism determined to throw off the remnants of colonial rule which offers a far stronger barrier to Chinese expansion than a puppet government supported by permanent American military occupation. And it is permanent American occupation, let there be no doubt about it, which Mr. Rusk is advocating. If our national interest in Vietnam is as vital as he claims, we could not afford to entrust it to a Saigon government which would not survive two weeks without our support.

The American people do not demand precipitate and reckless withdrawal from Vietnam, though more and more of them are beginning to tolerate even that idea. This newspaper does not favor such withdrawal. We are convinced, however, that a peaceful settlement could be obtained, on the basis of the Geneva agreements, if the United States adopted negotiable objectives and stepped down the war instead of steadily stepping it up.

Mr. Rusk insists he is ready to negotiate, that only Hanoi is unwilling. What he is ready to negotiate, however, is Hanoi's surrender—the abandonment of the Viet Cong by North Vietnam, thus leaving the field clear for the Saigon regime backed by our then unchallenged military power.

It is no mystery that Hanoi refuses to negotiate on these terms, under the intimidation of aerial bombardment. But there is every reason to believe that Hanoi would negotiate a compromise settlement which gave the Viet Cong a place in the country's political future commensurate with its strength, which contemplated the ultimate withdrawal of all foreign troops and settlement of their political differences by the South Vietnamese people themselves—if these ever became America's objectives.

An honorable alternative to endless war does exist, and more and more Americans are coming to insist upon it. We have a feeling that if this Administration cannot find the wit or will to work its way out of the Vietnam morass, the American people—or "children," if Mr. Rusk prefers that word—will elect an administration which can.

THE DANGERS OF DESTRUCTIVE CRITICISM

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the American public is increasingly feeling the many deep sacrifices involved in our long and bitter struggle in Vietnam. With this increasing awareness of the cost of defending freedom, some are responding with a wave of excessive criticism directed at President Johnson and his handling of the war. I would like to take a few moments today to survey some of the effects of this excessive criticism, for I believe they are potentially much more damaging than most of those who utter them have so far realized.

The right to criticize, to dissent from public policy, is of course fundamental to our system of government. I am not one who feels that this is a fine right as long as it remains unexercised, at least not exercised during wartime. It must be exercised whenever people find grounds for criticism, whether in war or in peace. And there is, of course, no assurance that such criticism will always be logical or well founded.

Surely our democracy has great room for tolerance for many kinds of dissent. And yet, some types of criticism are indeed posing dangers. Let us review some of the things that are being threatened today through abuses of the right of dissent.

The Presidency represents both a man and an office. It is an office of great prestige, probably the most widely respected office on earth. On the respect and prestige of that office, much of the Nation's influence in the world depends. I would like to associate myself with the comments of our distinguished minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN, when he said not long ago that you do not demean the President in the eyes of the people abroad "for when you do, you demean the prestige of this Republic. And I do not mean to do it, as the one remaining, great, free republic on the face of the earth"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 3, 1967, page 27577. I think all of us would do well to keep Senator DIRKSEN's warning in mind. Certainly we can keep any criticisms within the framework of respect for the Office of President.

The President is not only the Republic's sole organ in foreign relations and the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces; he is also charged with the execution of our national laws. Only he—not the Congress—nor the Supreme Court—has the constitutional responsibility to see that the laws are faithfully executed. It can be a severe blow to the maintenance of domestic law and order generally when respect for the Presidency is undermined at home. The current spirit of defiance of law which is abroad in our land will only receive encouragement from those whose criticism goes beyond the bounds of respectful dissent.

Respect for the Office of President implies, too, I believe, a respect for the constitutional power of the President to direct the Armed Forces of the United States. This authority arises from his powers as Commander in Chief. Some of the criticism of the President seems to be based on the assumption that the Congress, rather than the President, should determine the manner in which the war in Vietnam is conducted. We have had a tragic warning in this regard. During the Civil War, the Congress established a Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, perhaps the most powerful and controversial investigating committee ever set up by the Congress. It conducted sweeping inquiries into the conduct of military operations and the management of the Union war effort. But it did far more than investigate. It tried to usurp some of Lincoln's powers as Commander in Chief. Among other practices which have received widespread criticism, its members made a practice of traveling into the field, of calling military officers. The results, as might be expected, were of near-disaster proportions on military morale and on many aspects of the conduct of the war.

It is hardly necessary to labor the point that destructive criticism of the President and of the war effort at home adversely affects the course of events in Vietnam itself. My hat is off to the resolve and fortitude of our men in Vietnam. They endure indescribable hardships while many at home engage in criticism that is neither respectful nor constructive. But however high their morale may be, their difficult task halfway around the globe could be made much lighter if those who criticize intemperately were to take more account of their understandable feelings. The factor which no doubt hurts our troops more is the false encouragement which destructive criticism lends to the Hanoi regime and the forces seeking to take over South Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh knows that there is now no hope of military victory over South Vietnam. His only hope, and a very misguided one it is, lies in the discouragement and ultimate withdrawal of the United States and our allies from South Vietnam. Unfortunately, he can draw encouragement from the violent, disrespectful, and theatrical manner in which so much of our dissent is cloaked today.

There is much that is said today which seems to support such a mistaken impression. There is almost a form of "one-upmanship" in some quarters—a sort of political competition to see who can hit the President the hardest. This could reach disaster proportions as the presidential election of 1968 approaches. The real defeat would be for the country as a whole. My hope is that people will increasingly distinguish between politicians who criticize constructively and those who criticize for purely partisan purposes or in disrespect of the fundamental values of freedom.

Their actions, Mr. President, brand them as beneath contempt. Their brand of opportunism will give comfort to all those who doubt the ability of democracy to act in crisis. Indeed, democracy would be rendered impotent if the ship of state offered its helm to opportunists willing to trade on their country's agony for fleeting political expediency.

Events in Washington last weekend illustrate the kind of chaos that can result when responsibility gives way to angry emotion and the communications by which we reach national decisions break down for want of respect of basic American institutions. Those individuals who participated in the march on the Pentagon have demonstrated that they are neither worthy nor ready to participate in intelligent, dispassionate and reasoned dialog, which is so essential to our national goals.

The President has been doing the best he can under the most trying of circumstances. Surely his policies should be criticized. I ask only that the criticism be constructive, that it be respectful, and that it show some regard for the men who are defending this country's security 12,000 miles away.

If the President succeeds, it will not be his victory. It will be the victory of America's fighting men. If the President fails—and I pray this event will not come to pass—then it will not be his failure so much as it will be a disaster for the country and for the men who have been called upon to answer their country's call.

VIETNAM—HOW NOT TO UTILIZE AIRPOWER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, with respect to airpower utilization in Vietnam, I ask unanimous consent that testimony under the heading, "Enables Enemy To Get Wise," of Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, U.S. Air Force, retired, before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee on August 29 be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF MAJ. GEN. GILBERT L. MEYERS, USAF, RETIRED, BEFORE PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE, AUGUST 29, 1967

ENABLES ENEMY TO GET WISE

Mr. KENDALL. Would not the North Vietnamese get wise to that practice and say, well, it was hit today and it was not knocked out so they would build up their defenses around that particular target?

General MEYERS. Very much so. This is why we wanted a greater number of targets to work on in a given period of time, so we could attack with small flights. If they destroyed the target, fine. If they did not, we would move to a different area, and work on that target, and if we were successful, fine. We would move back and attack the other one. Using that approach, the enemy would not know where we were going to attack next.

We ended up with a very stereotyped operation due to the limited number of targets that we had available. We were convinced that we lost many pilots in attacking these targets which would not have been necessary had we had a greater number to select from. We recognized that there were political constraints associated with attacking various targets, but once you accepted the facts that a target system should be destroyed, turn that system over to the military and let them work on it based on weather factors and forces available and various other military considerations. The existing practice of doling out the targets one, two, and three at a time is too restrictive and results in more pilot and airplane losses.

For example, if it is decided that the bridges on a given line of comunication should be destroyed, give that line of communications with the five or 10 bridges that might exist to the military planners and let them select what bridge should be hit at a given point in time.

You know the weather over there is very critical. It runs roughly on the north-south line. That is, the west is in the monsoon period when the east is not, and vice versa at other times of the year. Consequently the targets should be spread as far across the country as possible to give maximum flexibility of attacking them when the weather is best.

Mr. KENDALL. Have you finished? I do not wish to interrupt.

General MEYERS. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. As distinguished from that, as I understand it, as to each specific bridge, at least during this period, and each barrack and each other fixed target you had to come back to Washington to get specific approval to hit it; is that correct?

General MEYERS. That is correct on all fixed targets of that type.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE AND VIETNAM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, it seems to me that the failure of the National Governors' Conference to consider a resolution in support of the administration's Vietnam policy has had a far greater effect than it deserves both at home and abroad.

Few Governors are actively engaged in the formulation or implementation of the Nation's foreign policy. Their day-to-day contact with the problems of Vietnam is limited. Nevertheless, by the very nature of their office, it is assumed that Governors are especially well informed about the attitudes of their own citizens. Hence it follows—although not with complete logic—that their statements in regard to national policy reflect the consensus of public thought within their jurisdictional borders. They managed to forget all about this in the political pressures present during the Caribbean cruise.

Partisan political consideration motivated a good deal of what went on there. Nevertheless, the Republican Governors had a remarkable opportunity to present solid-front support to the President's Vietnam policy. And they failed to take advantage of it.

To point out that the Republican Governors merely refused to consider a Vietnam resolution is to evade the issue. Ostensibly, they did not wish to approve the administration's present course of action. And this led, inevitably, to the easily arrived at conclusion that they disapproved.

Approximately half the Governors present were Republican, official spokesmen for about half the population of the United States. They failed to speak out, clearly and forcibly, in support of what this Nation is doing in Southeast Asia. Their reticence encourages military dissent at home, hardens the resolve in Hanoi to prolong the conflict and limits the President's freedom of action.

The political factors involved in the Republican decision have already been lost in the more obvious failure, per se, to support a solid, nonpartisan front. The implied disapproval of present policy provided respectability—and, perhaps, prestige—to militant individuals and groups who oppose the war. This respectability enables the radical fringe to preach "anarchy" under the cloak of "dissent," to advocate "disorder" in the name of "protest."

Thus, as the demonstrations grow in number, intensity and violence, there is reaction in Hanoi, and Peking and Moscow. It is not difficult for foreign observers to misinterpret what is happening here. The size and significance of the dissent has no doubt been exaggerated.

However, the specific dissent, implicit in the Republican Governors' failure to support present policy, has encouraged belief in Hanoi that a change of administration in the United States will create a more benign climate for achievement of its objectives.

I could suggest there is more than coincidence in this week's announcement from Hanoi that there will be no negotiations whatsoever in regard to Vietnam until after the 1968 presidential election.

Even more dangerous, the Republican decision seriously inhibits the President's course of action. Since the present policy is one of limited military effort to achieve limited political objectives, the GOP abstention was, by implication, certainly, a repudiation of that policy. It poses the fascinating question about the Republican position. In which direction does it lean? Toward escalation to the point of invading North Vietnam? Or toward complete and unconditional withdrawal?

The President's political expertise is unquestioned. He recognizes the reasons for the Republican Governors' reluctance. As he has done in the past, he will continue to resist efforts to tug him away from the firm, middle-ground course he has steadfastly sustained.

The administration's consistency of policy does not diminish the danger of the Republican Governors' action during the conference. The conduct of the war is—or should be—above the reach of partisan politics. For the Republican Governors to have superimposed political considerations upon a matter of such vital national welfare indicates a lack of responsibility toward the people whose interests they are sworn to preserve.

PLAIN DEALER NEWS ITEMS RESULTED IN SAVING TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, recently when speaking on the Defense Department announcement of new rules for firms seeking defense contracts to assure compliance with the Truth in Negotiating Act, I had printed in the RECORD two articles which appeared in the Plain Dealer, a great newspaper in my home city of Cleveland, Ohio. At that time I commended both the Plain Dealer and Sanford Watzman, its Washington bureau reporter, for focusing national attention on gross mismanagement in contracting procedures in the Defense Department and had two Plain Dealer articles printed in the RECORD. I reiterate that praise today. Inadvertently a part of one item was omitted.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the articles entitled "Pentagon Yields, Orders Defense Contract Audits," and "PD Stories Got Action," which were published in the Plain Dealer on October 3, be printed in the RECORD. I congratulate Sanford Watzman and the Plain Dealer for accomplishing a substantial savings of taxpayers' money. Pentagon yielded; ordered audits.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 3, 1967]

PENTAGON YIELDS, ORDERS DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDITS

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—The Defense Department has finally agreed to launch an audit program aimed at assuring a fair price on key defense contracts.

The move will strengthen enforcement of the 1962 Truth in Negotiating Act, which is supposed to protect the government against profiteering by companies selling weapons and other war material.

The decision was made known yesterday when copies of a Pentagon order were personally delivered to the offices of Rep. William E. Minshall, R–Cleveland, and Sen. William Proxmire, D–Wis., by Assistant Defense Secretary Thomas D. Morris.

Both legislators have criticized Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara for not making full use of the law. Last June 6 they introduced legislation to goad the Pentagon into making more audits.

A series of Plain Dealer articles last April focused public attention on this loophole in the program. Congressional hearings resulted, folllowed by introduction of the Proxmire and Minshall bills.

The new Pentagon order was regarded as achieving the purpose of the identical Minshall and Proxmire bills. In effect, McNamara now has agreed to do on his own what the lawmakers were proposing to force him to do through an amendment to the "Truth" act.

The order also means that the Defense Department has acceded to demands that it assume the major responsibility for detecting overpricing of contracts and starting action for a refund to the government when overcharges are found.

Until now McNamara has been relying on Congress' General Accounting Office (GAO). Over a 10-year period GAO has uncovered overpricing at the rate of $13 million a year.

This has resulted from minimal spot-checking by GAO, which has a relatively small auditing force. With its own vastly superior army of auditors, the Pentagon will be able to check systematically a far larger number of contracts.

Assistant Defense Secretary Morris suggested to aides of Minshall and Proxmire that the lawmakers might now choose not to push their bills—so the Pentagon will have an opportunity to test the effectiveness of the order. Both Minshall and Proxmire were away when Morris called.

The five-paragraph edict was dated last Friday. It was in the form of a memorandum, under the letterhead of the secretary of defense. It was signed by deputy secretary Paul H. Nitze, No. 2 man at the Pentagon.

A defense spokesman explained that Nitze had acted for McNamara, who was at a NATO conference in Turkey last week. The memo is addressed to Morris and other ranking defense officials, including the secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force.

John M. Malloy, Morris' deputy, told The Plain Dealer it will take about 30 days before the order reaches all defense procurement offices and is put into effect.

Purchasing officials are commanded to include in future contracts a provision granting defense department auditors the right to examine corporate records after a contract is completed. This would be a condition of the contract.

The purpose is to determine whether the contractor had acted in good faith at the time of negotiations—that is, whether he had supplied to the government accurate, current and complete information in figuring his costs.

The estimate of material and labor costs is one of the chief elements involved when corporations and the Pentagon agree on the price to be paid for military hardware. Profit allowed the contractor is based on this estimate.

The order covers the so-called firm fixed price (FFP) contracts used in most major procurements. More and more such contracts have been signed since McNamara became defense secretary in 1961.

Once the price is agreed on, the contractor assumes all the risks. He may end up making money or losing money. If his own efficiency entitles him to greater profits than anticipated, he is entitled to keep the extra money—providing he is not found to have deliberately overstated his probable costs.

McNamara favors FPP over an older form of contract, known as the cost-plus-fixed-fee (CPFF). Under the latter, the contractor is guaranteed a profit no matter how inefficient he may have been in regulating overhead costs.

Because GAO found cases where contractors had not been entirely frank with the government, it urged the Pentagon to follow the GAO lead and to begin a comprehensive audit program.

The recommendation was made two years ago. After considerable delay, McNamara agreed to go along—but excluded the FFPs from his new audit program, reserving his decision on the multi-million-dollar contracts.

McNamara's advisors split on the GAO recommendation as it pertained to the EEPs. His auditors urged him to accept the proposal and aggressively to implement it.

But the secretary's procurement people warned McNamara that this might damage relations with many contractors on whom the government is dependent for materiel.

The procurement men argued that an audit after a fixed price is "second guessing" the contractor, thereby undermining the incentive principle of FFP.

McNamara's long-awaited decision came in the face of mounting criticism in Congress. Another congressional panel, the subcommittee for special investigations of the House Armed Services Committee, opened hearings last week.

Members of that group accused the Pentagon of stalling. At that point the Defense Department had not yet filed its comments on the June 6 Proxmire-Minshall legislation.

GAO spokesmen told The Plain Dealer they were gratified by the decision. But they quickly added it is now up to the Pentagon to prove by its enforcement actions that new legislation really is not needed.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 3, 1967]

PD STORIES GOT ACTION

WASHINGTON.—The new Pentagon policy on auditing of defense contracts is the third positive response by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara to articles in The Plain Dealer, beginning last April.

The newspaper brought to light hitherto obscure reports of the General Accounting Office, a congressional agency, which charged McNamara with weak enforcement of the 1962 Truth in Negotiating act.

Last May, the Defense Department, under fire from Congress' Joint Economic Committee because of The Plain Dealer disclosures, announced proposals for new regulations requiring documentation of the "truth" certificates.

Contractors have been given an opportunity to comment. A final draft of the new code is expected later this year.

A second major criticism was lack of teamwork by Defense Department personnel in implementing the four-year-old law and apparent misconceptions about its provisions.

The response was organizing of truth-in-negotiating "seminars" for defense procurement personnel across the country. A conference on the issue for Pentagon officials is scheduled for Oct. 30 at Hershey, Pa.

The new edict on auditing will serve an additional check by detecting overcharges after contracts are completed.

RAILWAY POST OFFICE SERVICE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have been an outspoken opponent of the policies of the Post Office Department relative to the discontinuance of railway post office cars.

Many other Members of Congress, from both parties, and in both Houses, have expressed similar opposition. Our voices have not been heard by the Post Office Department, however, and now nearly every long-distance passenger train still operating in the United States is threatened with discontinuance proceedings because of the loss of RPO service.

Hundreds of organizations and groups across the country have expressed grave concern over this latest development, and have proposed action of one sort or another. But one group has taken what I consider to be extremely appropriate action under the circumstances. The National Association of Railroad Passengers, through its executive director, Mr. Anthony Haswell, has wired the President, asking him to reverse the present policies of the Post Office Department. It would appear at this point, that only the President would be able to undo what has already been done. I sincerely hope that he responds favorably to this telegram, for the economic harm which the policies of the Post Office Department have already caused is irreparable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Haswell's telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 11, 1967.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President,
White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The Santa Fe Railroad has announced plans to discontinue most of its passenger trains on account of termination of railway post office service by the Post Office Department. In recent months, other train discontinuance plans have been announced by other railroads for the same reason. Our information is that several other railroads will soon follow Santa Fe in proposing drastic cutbacks in passenger service, also on grounds that post office action in discontinuing RPO cars will deprive the trains of vitally needed revenue.

The National Association of Railroad Passengers is made up of users of railroad passenger service and other concerned citizens who believe that passenger trains are essential and valuable, and should be preserved and improved rather than discontinued. The association objects to the present policy of the post office department, in that it clearly endangers the continued operation of much needed and useful passenger service.

The association does not insist that present patterns of mail transportation be frozen indefinitely. However, we do believe that no more RPO cars should be discontinued until a thorough study can be made of the potential for rail passenger transportation throughout the United States. If RPO cars are removed from the trains before completion of such a study, many of the trains will likely be discontinued, thus rendering the study an academic exercise. History teaches us that once a given passenger train is discontinued, it is seldom if ever restored. On the other hand, if mail is retained on the trains for the time being, we will have the opportunity to determine which passenger train service should be preserved and improved, and what steps are necessary to ensure their continued operation in the most efficient and economical manner possible, with or without mail transportation.

Postal officials have alleged that the recent changes in mail transportation will provide better mail service at lower cost, and that therefore the department cannot "subsidize" the railroads by paying a higher price for an inferior transportation service. However, we point out that the department has never provided intelligible figures to prove its allegation that the new methods are saving money. Furthermore, reports from many parts of the country indicate that mail service has gotten worse, not better, since the institution of the "sectional center" system and the demise of many RPO cars. The department has rejected constructive suggestions for improvement of RPO service, and has refused to participate in experiments for faster mail hauling in conjunction with the high speed train service soon to begin between New York and Washington. But even if the department's claims were true, the timing of its actions shows a callous disregard of the public interest in view of the certain destructive effect these actions will have on passenger train service before the future scope and form of such service can be adequately determined.

We conclude that the unilateral, arbitrary, and premptory action of the post office department in terminating railway post office service is unjustifiable and contrary to the national interest. Accordingly, we respectfully urge that you initiate a thorough study and investigation of the nationwide potential for rail passenger service, and that you request the post office department to reinstate and/or continue the operation of all RPO cars which were in service as of September 1 of this year, until completion of the study.

ANTHONY HASWELL,
Executive Director, National Association of Railroad Passengers.
CHICAGO, ILL.

OUR CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE AND VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the question of our action in Vietnam is more than a political question. It is a question of conscience.

For this reason, as rarely in the past, church bodies—the National Council of Churches, official nationwide denominational meetings, regional and local religious groups—have spoken out on our national dilemma. Across the country, pastors of churches have expressed their views from the pulpit.

One such is the Reverend Dr. Guy D. Carpenter, senior minister of the Methodist Temple in Evansville, Ind., who preached a sermon on September 24 with the title "Our Christian Conscience and Vietnam." Dr. Carpenter did not speak until he had studied the question, read much on the subject, and reached the conclusions he preached—as many of us have done—on the basis of conviction derived from analysis of the facts.

For that reason, Mr. President—because this is a strong sermon looking at the evidence in the light of Christian conviction, not because Dr. Carpenter is a minister in my home city—I ask unanimous consent that the text of his sermon be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE AND VIETNAM

No one—almost no one—"likes" the war in Vietnam. In the vivid bluntness of General Sherman of Civil War days, war is always "hell". This one today is dirty, messy, hard, bloody, and bitter. Those are reasons not to "like" the war in Vietnam; but more than that, the issues involved are the most complicated and confused ever faced by Americans. In past wars we believed—rightly or wrongly—that we were fighting *for* something: *independence* in the Revolutionary War, *to preserve the union* in the Civil War, to "make the world safe for democracy" in the First World War, *to destroy totalitarianism* in World War II. But what is the issue in Vietnam? Will we by armed might halt the advance of Communism?

Few people are perfectly clear about what is right or wrong, or what is to be done. Some are determined that—bad as it is—there we must stay, see it through . . . and win!

Whatever our personal opinion, this we know: the war in Vietnam is becoming more brutal; it is taking a heavier toll of civilian lives; it is escalating; it is endangering international trust—as did race riots this past summer.

Where is the voice of the Christian?

As Dr. Robert McAfee Brown says in his book: "A time comes when the issues are so momentous that not speaking is a greater sin even than speaking wrongly. For wrong speech can at least elicit right speech, whereas silence implies consent to an evil that because of the silence escapes unchallenged."

Hear then the voice of the Church! And it is not just the pulpit of the Methodist Temple, it is churches and synagogues across this land. The three major religious traditions—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—while on many issues we are divided, on the issue of Vietnam we are not. As a devastating war grinds on we must take account of the Old Testament prophets and the gospel of Jesus of Nazareth, and be willing to face the moral implications before it is too late.

How did the United States become involved in Vietnam? Some highly responsible men like Richard N. Goodwin, Senator McGovern, and the writer, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., agree that it was "almost by accident." It is nearly unbelievable. "For nine years following 1945 we denied the people of Vietnam the right to independence. For nine years we financially supported the French in their . . . effort to recolonize Vietnam. Before the end of the war we were meeting 80% of the French war costs." They were defeated at Dien Bien Phu, but before that, the French were despairing of their reckless actions. But we encouraged them with many dollars and military supplies to continue the war even after they had lost the will.

Former President Eisenhower considered sending bombers to the surrounded French. Lyndon Johnson—then Senator—firmly refused to endorse military intervention.

During the election year of 1964, even President Johnson was saying: "We don't want to get tied down in a land war in Asia . . . We are not about to send American boys 9 or 10,000 miles away from home to do what Asian boys should be doing for themselves."

But we now have the war! Our boys are miles from home doing what Asian boys did not do. We didn't officially declare war, but we are paying billions of dollars to continue it.

I. *The fire power the Americans are exerting in Vietnam is enormous,* well nigh unbelievable. General Dayan, the now-famous military hero of Israel, recently reported from the scene in Vietnam that more shells were fired in a single engagement in a single night than in whole wars in the past. The *San Francisco Chronicle* reported this startling fact: "By December 31, 1966, the United States had dropped a total of almost 800,000 tons of bombs on North and South Vietnam—more than Germany got during the entire Second World War."

Those who saw some of those horrible ruins from bombs in Europe will marvel at the fact that ruins today may be worse; and we may be at it longer. Already we have been waging war in Vietnam longer than America has ever waged any war in our history! Military experts are predicting that from 5 to 15 years may yet be needed for us to "win". Will much of anything be left of that benighted land?

One wonders—are we men of blood, or men of peace? Watch a few actual scenes from this war on television;—it makes us uneasy!

II. Will we ever learn it? *Force always develops resistance.* It isn't a military law, but it is the way people react. Force stiffens the will to resist. Strategic bombing has proved in the past to be clumsy, bloody, and very inefficient; far from breaking a people's spirit, it rallies them round their leaders.

It was the *New York Times,* in January this year, that reported: "The morale of the people in Hanoi is clearly not being destroyed, but solidified by the bombing."

Professor Reischauer, "a life-long specialist in Oriental studies and former ambassador to Japan," points out that our increased bombing and destruction of property is stiffening the will of the Viet Cong to resist us; it drives uninvolved people into their ranks, rather than diminishing their power.

Didn't many of us observe it once in our lifetime? When the Nazis stepped up their bombing of Britain it only strengthened the determination and solidified the resistance. Prime Minister Churchill called that "their finest hour"!

To defeat communism is our policy; and we have united the Communism world with our bombs and power, and divided the free world! Who in the world is *for* us?

III. *It's a Different Kind of War.* We have used fiendish new weapons. Among these are napalm and chemicals to defoliate and render useless for harvest the soil for many years to come. The use of napalm is commonplace. It is a so-called "superior brand" with better "adhesive" qualities, which means—bluntly—that the burning white-hot jelly cannot be scraped off the skin, nor extinguished with water, and its burning disfigures, produces prolonged agony, and often kills! It does not distinguish between combat soldiers, nursing mothers, children, and aged grandparents.

"If this is liberation, it is liberation for starvation and ruin."

It is a war in which civilian casualties are greater than military. Napalm has made this a dreadful fact; plus bombing of villages and heavy jungle fire. Correspondents like Neil Sheehan have reported far more civilians being killed than soldiers; about half the civilians killed are children; the lowest ratio of civilian to military deaths is 3 to 1; the highest is 9 to 1.

How short our memories are as a nation! In World War II the Nazis attacked cities, killed civilians, leveled towns to the ground and departed destroying fields. It was called a "scorched earth" policy, and we were horrified! We condemned both people and actions at the Nuremberg trials.

But where is our national outrage as we are doing precisely the same thing now in Vietnam? Is it any wonder that the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, called this mismatch between United States technology and a small undeveloped nation "one of the 'most barbarous' wars in history."?

It's a different kind of war in Vietnam. Many of the enemy are not in uniform; it's difficult to distinguish a Vietcong from a native. Henry Cabot Lodge, who has spent years as our official representative in Vietnam, considers the highly trained "guerrilla terrorist"—they number about 150,000—in the various villages to be the "real cancer."

We are trying to ferret them out with fire power and napalm. We can't be certain whether a non-uniformed Vietnamese is a Vietcong, so we hurl our napalm; we burn a village; we defoliate the fields. We trust we are *cremating* a Vietcong—only to discover to our dismay that we *created* a Vietcong! If the native's loved ones are hurt, his home destroyed, his livelihood shattered—why not join the force that is fighting back against this massive power that is claiming to liberate him?!

IV. *At this moment we are at an impasse.* We will not cease bombing until there is a sign from the other side of a willingness to negotiate. The other side indicates it will give no sign until we stop bombing.

It was *The Saturday Evening Post* that asked Secretary-General U Thant to take steps to bring about a negotiated settlement, and he declared immediately "the first step would be for the U.S. to stop bombing North Vietnam, not for a brief 'pause' but permanently and unconditionally."

But the Administration has ignored this, and President Johnson has said just this week that he is satisfied with our present policy. "It's worth the price".

The President has on several occasions questioned the loyalty of those who oppose him, referring to them as "nervous Nellies." We have reason to be nervous. I would change the term, however. Not "nervous Nellies" but "Concerned Christians." Concerned over the increasing chorus of warning voices from Far-Eastern experts and other nations; concerned over the increasing momentum pushing toward an abyss; concerned over policies that are uniting the Communist world while dividing the Free World; concerned over the ghastly cost in human life.

"Blessed are the peacemakers," said Jesus, "for they shall be called the children of God." Those who seek peace are not traitors. Those who desperately seek peace in an unfortunate spot in the world are subject to the "hard, clean question" in Jesus' powerful parable of the Last Judgment: What did you do for those in need? Yes, we have the needy right here in Evansville; but we have them in a special way in Vietnam.

Dare we answer the question—Have we, in Vietnam, created hunger by defoliating their crops? Have we made them sick and lonesome by killing children and civilians with napalm and bombing their villages?

There is an old word—a Biblical word dominating both Jewish and Christian scriptures. That word is "Repent!" And we had better not forget what it means! It means "Turn around—begin again—make a fresh start." It is never easy, and it is hardest of all for the nation. But God walks with us along a difficult and often discouraging road. God will sustain the nation if we invoke Him; God will judge us harshly if we continue to ignore His ways, and will ". . . hold us accountable for the horror we continue to unleash."

Many—far too many—young Americans have died in Vietnam. Let us work and pray that they shall not have died in vain. And they shall not if we are big enough as a nation to admit our mistakes and to know that there is more honor in self-correction than in "saving face."

V. *What are the alternatives?* One is to win the war as quickly as possible, escalate rapidly, and use nuclear warheads if necessary. The destruction and loss of life among the enemy would be immense, and we could conceivably ignite World War III.

Another alternative is to withdraw; "tuck tail and run," as President Johnson has described it. But this is not feasible. It would imply that a weak nation had defeated a strong nation. It would imply that thousands of young American lives had been given in vain. It would be an open invitation to Communism to go elsewhere and do likewise.

If these are the only alternatives there seems to be no other course but to continue as we are. But suppose there is yet a third possibility—long and torturous, not easy, for history does not present us with easy choices? We can seek now for a negotiated peace. It is not withdrawing our forces and our voice. It is "remaining in strength" by withdrawing to key defensive points and halting our bombing in the North. It is "quieting the war." Let us wait for Ho Chi Minh to come to the conference table. It is sitting down with *every* combatant in the war; that includes the Vietcong. This is a policy stubbornly opposed by President Johnson.

It is amazing at times how some events happen "coincidentally." In July, I read the powerful book, *Vietnam: Crisis of Conscience,* and determined to preach a sermon on this critical subject on the first Sunday the student body had returned to the University of Evansville. Now—coincidentally—highly respected and influential religious leaders of Judaism, Protestantism, and Catholicism have, meanwhile, put out a clarion call for a million signatures of church people in America to a petition to be signed on a Sunday or Sabbath in September and forwarded to a convocation early in October of business, labor, civic, political, and religious leaders in Washington, D.C. This position will be handed to Senators, Representatives, and administration officials. The movement is known as "Negotiation Now!" The petition supports U Thant and the United Nations in new negotiations, calls for the halting of our nation's bombing of North Vietnam and the taking of further initiative leading to truce. It asks that North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front respond affirmatively to our initiative leading to a standstill ceasefire. It asks that South Vietnam respect and join in these steps.

Peace without victory! Peace without further bloodshed and destruction! Putting an end to war—is there anything more Christian? Being mindful of the words of the late John F. Kennedy, speaking before the United Nations, "Mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind," let us Christians do something besides wringing our hands and murmuring "how awful." We can do something to assist the power and influence of the Church and Synagogue. We can be the body of Christ, even though we take our licks and are broken and bruised . . .

After a cross, that "body" may rise again, as it happened that first Easter!

THE UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND'S FIRST COMMERCIAL FISHERIES SCHOOL, OCTOBER 19, 1967

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in two areas today the United States has fallen steadily in its world ranking. I am thinking particularly of offshore fisheries and the merchant marine.

I am happy to say that in Rhode Island, the University of Rhode Island at Kingston is host to a new program which should help to reverse the trend of national weakness in the field of fisheries. At URI a 2-year program has just been opened to train men for a life in commercial fishing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "URI Fisheries College Unique in Nation," published in the Westerly, R.I., Sun of October 4, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URI FISHERIES COLLEGE UNIQUE IN NATION

Twenty-five young men have started classes in the first college curriculum of its kind in the country—a two-year program at the University of Rhode Island to train men for the commercial fisheries.

Members of the first class are mostly recent high school graduates, but include a few men in their 30's. The students come from as far away as Alaska, California and Puerto

Rico, although most are from the northeastern states. Thirteen are from Rhode Island.

The curriculum combines classroom theory in subjects such as physics, marine technology, fishery hydrography and marketing, and sea-borne experience aboard a training vessel and trawlers at nearby Point Judith in subjects such as navigation and fishing gear. Graduates will receive an associate in science degree.

The curriculum has been designed to give the best possible education to potential captains and mates of the fishing fleet, and to individuals who wish to work in related marine industries such as processing and marketing.

Operated through a department of fisheries and marine technology in the University of Rhode Island's College of Agriculture, the program is headed by a 33-year-old British-born naval architect, Dr. John C. Sainsbury. He was chairman of the department of naval architecture and shipbuilding at the College of Fisheries in St. John's, Newfoundland, before coming to Rhode Island to direct the new program.

"Many of the students here come from a fishing background," Dr. Sainsbury said, "while others are from families with no history in the sea or fishing. They share without exception, however, an intense interest and belief in the commercial fisheries and its future, and are all entering wholeheartedly into what is a very time-consuming schedule for a university program."

The students must take six hours of classes and laboratories every weekday except Friday afternoon, in addition to studies that must be done on their own outside those hours.

A 47-foot former oceanographic research vessel, the Gail Ann, is being converted for fisheries training. When it is put back in the water, the students will alternate taking work trips at sea. They are also required to work aboard a variety of commercial fishing vessels during the summer after their first year.

A building at the former Photek plant in nearby West Kingston is being used for laboratories in seamanship, nets and fishing gear technology, navigation, vessel engineering and electronics until a new facility can be built in the Point Judith fishing port area.

Dr. Sainsbury said interest in the program is increasing and that inquiries are already being received from young people inside and outside the United States for the 40 places that will be available in the entering class next year.

Thirteen of the students in the first class are Rhode Islanders, including Paul S. Schauer of 10 West Beach Street, Westerly; Gary A. Brooks, Edward A. Conley and Marshall Rose of Block Island and Dennis W. Webster and Robert B. Westcott.

One of the two students from Connecticut is Bohdan Mutz of North Stonington.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 888, as reported to the Senate, provides continuing authority until November 15, 1967, rather than the date of November 23, 1967, as provided in the resolution as it passed the House.

This resolution is necessary to provide authority in those cases where the appropriation bills have not been enacted into law. As of today, six of the regular annual appropriation bills have been sent to the White House for signature. There are five appropriation bills in conference, or the conferences have been concluded but the conference reports have not been agreed to in both Houses.

There is one appropriation bill in the Senate Committee on Appropriations—the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The committee has been holding on this bill pending enactment into law of the new revenue act for the District. It is difficult to attempt to make decisions on how much should be appropriated until the committee has received firm estimates on the revenue for the District of Columbia.

One bill is on the House Calendar—the military construction appropriation bill.

The remaining two appropriation bills—the foreign assistance appropriation bill and the supplemental appropriation bill—are pending in the House Committee on Appropriations awaiting authorizing legislation—principally the poverty program in the case of the supplemental and, of course, the foreign assistance authorization in the other instance.

The committee has expressed the hope that action can be completed on all of these appropriation bills by November 15, in which event further amendment to the continuing resolution would be unnecessary.

The resolution, as referred to the Senate committee, contained several provisions unrelated to a continuing resolution, which have been stricken by the committee. These provisions were designed to effect economies in Federal expenditures by blind, across-the-board reductions.

While the appropriations process may not be perfect, nevertheless, it has evolved over a period of many years and affords the most logical method of providing funds for Government operations.

The delay in the appropriation bills is undesirable. However, in most instances, this delay results from the fact that it is necessary, under the rules of the two bodies, for authorizing legislation to be enacted into law prior to making the appropriation.

All of the appropriation bills have been reported to the House by the House Committee on Appropriations except the foreign assistance appropriation bill and the supplemental appropriation bill. Since there is, as of today, still no foreign assistance authorization, it is not within the rules to report the bill. This is also true of the supplemental bill, especially in regard to the poverty program.

There is no better process that I know of than to have these appropriation bills considered by the committee in the House and then on the floor of the House; by the committee in the Senate and then on the floor of the Senate; and then to resolve any differences in conference.

General provisions designed to effect economies by blind, overall, across-the-board reductions are bound to be inequitable, inefficient, and it is impossible to access their results at the time they are being considered.

According to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in one agency alone—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the provision adopted on the floor of the House of Representatives would result in an appropriation reduction of $2½ billion. This figure was calculated by the Bureau of the Budget because the provision in the resolution would cut $1.1 billion in expenditures in fiscal year 1968.

To reduce $1.1 billion in expenditures in a single fiscal year would mean a much larger reduction in obligations, grants, or contracts, and it is estimated that to secure $1.1 billion in expenditure reductions would require about $2 to $2½ billion reductions in obligations—a cut from $2 to $2½ billion—a cut ranging from 28 to 33 percent. I cannot believe that the House of Representatives was aware of this at the time the provision was voted.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development would be required to make a $500 million expenditure reduction and such a reduction would require a very large proportionate cut in new contracts, mortgage purchases, sewer, water, and open space programs, and the like, because, again, to get a $500 million expenditure reduction, one would have to make a much larger reduction in commitments and contracts.

For the farm programs under the Depatment of Agriculture, a $400 million reduction in expenditures would be required.

The committee was also advised that many agencies would be required to introduce reductions in force. These reductions would have to be concentrated in the last 7 months of the fiscal year because one-third of the fiscal year has expired. Severance pay and terminal leave would have to be taken into consideration, as well as 30 days' advance notice to affected employees—which would mean that in some agencies personnel to the extent of perhaps 20 percent would be removed from the payrolls.

I do not believe there was any such intention on the part of the House of Representatives in passing the resolution referred to.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget estimated that the reductions in expenditures in fiscal year 1968, under the resolution as it passed the House, would amount to approximately $7 billion.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a list of the agencies where the approximately $7 billion will be found.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 888—Estimated reduction effected by resolution as passed House

	1968 expenditures
Defense	$2,500,000,000
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,100,000,000
Agriculture	400,000,000
Commerce	250,000,000
Housing and Urban Development	500,000,000
Public Works	40,000,000
Interior	150,000,000
Justice	45,000,000
Labor	20,000,000
State	10,000,000
Transportation	75,000,000
Agency for International Development	140,000,000
Atomic Energy Commission	120,000,000
General Services Administration	30,000,000
Office of Economic Opportunity	400,000,000
Veterans' Administration	180,000,000
Pay Raise	600,000,000
Small Business Administration	200,000,000
National Science Foundation	60,000,000
Total	6,821,000,000

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if it is necessary to reduce expenditures at this time, before the Congress adjourns, I recommend that the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses undertake an examination of the bills which have been signed into law, and the bills which will be sent to the White House soon—and if the amounts are found to be excessive that a rescission bill be considered in the two Houses.

Any attempt to effect economies by a blind, across-the-board general provision is impracticable.

I urge that the committee amendments be agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The first committee amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 5, after the word "thereof", strike out "November 23, 1967" and insert "November 15, 1967".

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The action of the Committee on Appropriations in reporting House Joint Resolution 888 as strictly a continuing resolution until November 15 represents a clear declaration that Congress, not the executive branch, still wields the power of the purse. The appropriations process is the tried and true method by which Congress exercises this power. This continuing resolution will enable all of the Federal Departments and agencies to pay their bills for the next three weeks. In the meantime, the Appropriations Committee will have an opportunity to consider deliberately each authorized program contained in the remaining appropriation bills. It will scrutinize each dollar contained in the budget estimates for those agencies. It will use to the fullest the collective experience and judgment of its members to cut out every ounce of fat, to scrap every nonessential. This is the way to effect savings, with rational, informed judgment.

The House-passed resolution, on the other hand, substitutes a meat ax for the finely honed scalpel, abdicates the traditional right and duty of the Congress to consider each and every appropriation request on its merits, deals a crippling blow to many vital Federal programs.

Why a crippling blow? On the surface, holding spending to the 1967 level, with certain exceptions, does not seem too bad. But let us look further. The effect of the House resolution is to cut about $7 billion from 1968 spending. But since expenditures always lag behind appropriations, and since the fiscal year is already nearly one-third over, this $7 billion cut in expenditures would mean a $14 or $15 billion reduction in obligations—the best measure of the level of Federal programs in a particular time period.

That is not all. As the Budget Director spelled out in detail for the Appropriations Committee, this $14 or $15 billion reduction must come largely from that relatively thin slice of the Federal budget which is not already locked in. When national defense, interest on the public debt, veterans' pensions, price support payments, and other obligations fixed by law are taken out, $38 billion is left from which to cut. Taking $14 or $15 billion away from this $38 billion amounts to cutting almost 40 percent from every single controllable program. The Budget Director listed 75 of these programs for us, and that was not a complete list. The list ran all the way from grants for educational activities to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The House-passed resolution would wreck many of our most vital programs. It has wisely been rejected by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

My very good friend, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], has stated his intention to call up an amendment to the continuing resolution in the Senate today. His amendment would reduce, by 5 percent, every appropriation item not related to national defense, except for those determined by the Budget Director to be beyond administrative control. The amendment would also give the President blanket authority to transfer money around among the agencies so long as no line-item appropriation was increased above the amount provided in the Appropriation Act.

To be sure, the Mundt amendment is an improvement over the House-passed resolution. The Mundt amendment would cut about $1 billion in expenditures in the fiscal year 1968 instead of $7 billion, as would be provided by the House-passed resolution. But the real price of this $1 billion in savings is very high. A vote for the Mundt amendment is a vote for the meat axe approach—even though the axe has a smaller blade; a vote for the principle that the President and the Budget Director—not Congress—should wield the power of the purse in the U.S. Government; a vote against the combined wisdom and judgment of the members of the Appropriations Committee. In effect, the amendment says, "No matter what recommendations you make to the Senate on appropriations bills, you are 5 percent wrong."

We cannot even foresee the impact of this amendment. The President is not allowed to increase any appropriation above the amount we include in the law, but he can surely reduce some of them by much more than 5 percent, by 10 percent, or even by 100 percent, if he so wishes.

For example: Suppose he determines that aviation safety activities cannot be cut without endangering airline passengers. He can take it out of the school lunch program instead; suppose he determines that the Internal Revenue Service and the Customs Bureau cannot be cut without losing a much greater amount of Federal revenues. He can take it out of impacted area school aid instead; suppose he determines that veterans' medical programs cannot be cut without decreasing the quality of patient care. He can take it out of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation instead; suppose he determines that the Post Office cannot be cut without delaying the mail. He can take it out of the food stamp program or the FBI instead.

Can we really stand here today and say to the American people: "The Senate of the United States hereby declares that it wants no part in making these decisions—decisions affecting every citizen"? I do not think so. I feel that it is our responsibility to determine where the cuts should be made and that we should not, in the words of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], put the cat on the President's back.

And what does this amendment say to the members of the Committee on Appropriations? Does it say: "Now, you gentlemen are to go back and deliberate for the next 3 weeks on the remaining appropriations bills. You are to bring to bear the wisdom and informed judgment which you have acquired over the years. And when you're all done and have made a decision on each line item, you're to add 5 percent to every one, so that when it's taken back out again by the President, your judgment will be vindicated."

No one in this body is more interested in economy and efficiency in Government than I am. I have the utmost respect and sympathy for the sentiments which prompted this amendment. But I submit that the way to make savings in the budget is not to flail away with a meat ax—with results that no Senator in this body can even venture to predict. The way to save money is by using the tried and true appropriations process.

So, I hope that Senators will vote down this amendment, and any other similar amendments. Let us vote for a straight, clean, continuing resolution until November 15. During the next 3 weeks, let Congress work its will, let the Senate Appropriations Committee work its will on the remaining appropriation bills, saving every penny where we can justifiably and wisely save pennies.

Let it not be said that today, or tomorrow—whichever it may be—the Senate passed the buck, or that the Senate voted away its birthright—the cherished power of the purse.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say that I am in thorough agreement with what the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has just said. I may add that this morning we were in conference on the public works bill and the Senate saw fit to cut back a little over 10 percent on all the projects by way of slippages. Now, to add another 5 percent, there is no doubt that the work now in progress on all the dams and rivers and harbors programs would suffer considerably.

I would much prefer leaving this in the hands of the Congress than to let somebody in the departments do the cutting. What that amounts to, in reality, is granting to the Executive the right to the item veto. Congress has always refused to grant this authority, and with very good reason. No other single act would transfer to the Executive so much additional power at one fell swoop.

The continuing resolution sent to the Senate by the House was very difficult of interpretation, to say the least. No one could predict what effect its provisions would have on the workings of our Government. In large part, this was because the difficult decisions were transferred from the legislative branch to the executive.

Another effect of the resolution was to wipe away all the work already performed by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. In effect, its adoption would make unnecessary all of the work that must yet be done on the bills still remaining. Perhaps others are willing to see this slate wiped clean so that the blanks can be filled in by the clerks of the executive branch. I, for one, am not.

The responsibility lies with the Congress and its committees. Reductions should be recommended by the committees on a selective basis, as has already been the case with every appropriations bill to pass the Congress this year. To attempt to lodge this responsibility anywhere else would be to allow and invite an infringement on the prerogative of Congress.

In my view, too much infringement of these prerogatives has already taken place.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana for his very helpful statement. I want to congratulate him, as chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, for the very fine work he does, consistently, every year, year in and year out, scrutinizing most meticulously the budget requests and the requests submitted to his committee by Members of this body, the other body, and outside witnesses. He does a fine job, as do all the other members who work with him in that committee. He has done a fine job this year in the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the first committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10442. An act to facilitate exchanges of land under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), for use for public schools, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11627. An act to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 11767) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 10442. An act to facilitate exchanges of land under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), for use for public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and

H.R. 11627. An act to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Public Works.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA AT DEDICATION OF LEETOWN, W. VA., FISH HATCHERY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on last Saturday I delivered an address at the ceremony marking the opening of the Leetown, W. Va., Fish Hatchery.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my address on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, AT THE LEETOWN FISH HATCHERY

My friends, it is always a pleasure to take part in the dedication of a new federal facility.

And this particular dedication gives me great pleasure because this complex of facilities is more than just a place where fish are hatched and reared.

Rather, it is a complex which represents the latest advances in the field of fish husbandry.

It combines well planned production facilities with an internationally respected research center.

But before I go into further detail about this particular center I should like to present a little bit of background about our national fish hatchery system and its importance.

Since its inception in the late 19th century our fish hatchery system has increased in numbers, in productive capacity and in the quality of fish grown.

Today there are some 100 federal fish hatcheries which are supplemented by about 500 state-run hatcheries.

There has been a greatly increased interest in all types of outdoor recreation during the years since World War II and fishing—along with all other outdoor sports—has burgeoned apace.

The recent National Survey of Fishing and Hunting gives us some indication of the size of this increase. It states that some 33 million Americans participated in these sports during 1965 and, in so doing, spent some $4 billion.

Without the help of our federal and state hatcheries, mother nature would be hard pressed to meet the need for more and more fish.

As an example of the tremendous growth of sport fishing in recent years, let me cite as an example the experience of our own state of West Virginia.

West Virginia's waters are stocked with fish produced both naturally and from State and Federal Hatcheries. Almost 450,000 pounds of fish, mostly trout, were planted by state and federal officials.

About half of these fish—225,000 pounds—were produced right here at Leetown, at the Bowden Hatchery near Elkins, and at the White Sulphur Springs Hatchery in Greenbrier County.

And great though this volume of fish may seem, the federal allocation of fish for West Virginia waters is three times greater today than it was four years ago in 1963.

So, as one can see, these hatcheries play a tremendous role in keeping our state's anglers happy and their catches bountiful.

Now, I would like to tell you a little more about this particular hatchery. It is a fine one indeed.

If you look into the water in the raceways, you will be able to see a number of species of trout. And near where we are standing, there are a number of large ponds that produce other fish such as bass and sunfish.

These fish are grown in the newly constructed hatchery building. This structure incorporates all the latest developments in fish husbandry, and its staff is able to produce the highest quality fish under the most carefully controlled conditions.

The fish begin life as eggs, spawned in other hatcheries which maintain specially selected brood fish. These eggs are placed in special tanks until they hatch into tiny, helpless, near invisible, fry.

These small fish are then carefully nurtured. They are fed a nutritionally balanced diet, and when they are large enough to live outside, they are moved to one of the large raceways for further growth.

When they have reached a sufficient age

and size best suited to survive in the wild, they are released into the state's streams and lakes.

From there, well, that's up to the anglers to determine—whether these fish become a fish dinner or, instead, perhaps the dinner of some other fish.

But the Leetown Hatchery does more than just to produce and rear fish. Its internationally known Eastern Fish Disease Laboratory has provided much of the information available to scientists on fish diseases.

Experts in the diagnosis and treatment of the illnesses that plague fish have been trained here for service throughout the U.S. and the world.

As an example of its work, last July the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife proposed a new regulation designed to prevent the importation and spread of two particularly dangerous trout diseases. Although the initial responsibility for examining these fish will reside in the country of origin, we must have facilities and people to run spot checks to see that the regulation is enforced.

As a further example of its work, many states will soon enact regulations requiring inspection and certification of interstate transfers of fish or fish eggs. The Federal Government must be prepared to assist the Bureau in performing this vital function. Personnel here at Leetown will probably be called upon to play a major role in this regard.

Other activities are also carried on at the Laboratory. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife uses this hatchery as a base of operations for a number of its in-service training schools where Bureau employees, persons from state conservation agencies, and personnel of foreign governments can be trained in modern fish growing methods.

This is important because sport fishing in West Virginia and across the nation is not only fun; it is also big business. According to the National Fishing and Hunting Survey I mentioned earlier some $4 billion was spent in the pursuit of these sports. This money generally goes to those areas where good fishing, or good hunting, is found.

In the days ahead, even more fishermen will be participating in this great outdoor pursuit, and, as their numbers increase, our waters must of necessity, be managed to provide the necessary fish.

I am sure that our National Hatchery system in general, and the Leetown Fish Hatchery in particular, will do their part to see that these demands are met.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment has not been agreed to yet.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, has the committee amendment been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been acted upon.

Mr. HOLLAND. I know of no debate on the committee amendment that would change the date.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection to changing the date but I would like to make a brief statement first in connection with the entire problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

THE CHAOTIC FINANCIAL SITUATION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, two major problems confront our country: First, the war in Vietnam; and, second, the mounting deficit and the resulting inflation, as evidenced by the rising cost of living and the highest interest rates since Reconstruction days in 1870.

So much has been said about the first problem, the war in Vietnam, by the various experts that I know of nothing I can add which would help the situation. I shall therefore pass over this subject with just one comment: With a half million men in the war zone, we have no choice except to back them with all our resources, and as one Member of the Senate, I shall continue to give them that support.

Today I shall confine my remarks to a discussion of the chaotic financial situation in which we find ourselves. I refer to our fiscal situation as being nearly chaotic because never before in the history of our country has there been so much confusion both at the executive and at the legislative levels as to what is happening or what should be done.

For the past several months, both the White House and Congress have been advocating a reduction in Government spending; but both the executive and the legislative branches have been approving new programs, expanding old ones, and voting for ever-increased expenditures. And yet no one has faced up to the problem of what this will mean in ultimate inflation and higher taxes.

First I shall review the spending record of the Senate.

Since January 1, 1967, the Senate has acted on 13 appropriation bills.

As passed by the House these appropriation bills call for total appropriations of $134,881,670,839. As passed by the Senate these same bills contained appropriations totaling $138,936,819,459, or an increase of $4,055,148,620 over that originally approved by the House.

These same 13 appropriation bills contained appropriations of $3,175,648,998 over the amount allowed for the same agencies in fiscal 1967.

During the consideration of these bills 21 efforts were made to reduce these appropriations. Every effort to reduce them was defeated on rollcall votes in the Senate.

Had these 21 efforts been successful they would have resulted in lowering the overall appropriations under these 30 bills by $4,467,177,919.

It is true that some items had been reduced by the Senate committee before reporting the bills to the Senate, but it is ironic to note that the only amendments to any of these appropriation bills which were approved by the Senate were amendments which added to the cost of the bills.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a chart of these appropriation bills along with the amount of each as it passed the House, the amount as it passed the Senate, and the corresponding increases or decreases as compared to the 1967 appropriations.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1968 APPROPRIATIONS

Date	Bill	Amount in House	Amount in Senate	Senate increase (+) or decrease (−) over House	Amount 1967 appropriation, increase (+) or decrease (−)
Mar. 17	H.R. 7123, supplemental Defense	$12,196,520,000	$12,275,870,000	+$79,350,000	----------
May 19	H.R. 7501, Treasury, Post Office, Executive Office	7,499,230,000	7,555,167,000	+55,937,000	+$459,108,865
May 16	H.R. 9029, Interior	1,365,310,150	1,399,242,050	+33,931,900	+66,083,250
May 17	H.R. 9481, 2d supplemental	2,041,826,133	2,260,246,933	+218,420,800	----------
Aug. 29	H.R. 9960, Independent Offices and HUD	9,985,878,782	10,431,460,900	+445,582,118	+880,461,600
	(Part. cert.)	881,000,000	3,235,000,000	+2,354,000,000	+1,555,000,000
Aug. 1	H.R. 10196, Labor and HEW	13,137,488,000	13,409,835,000	+272,347,000	+393,270,800
Sept. 26	H.R. 10345, State, Justice, Commerce	2,194,026,500	2,185,870,500	−8,156,000	+52,782,300
	(Part. cert.)	150,000,000	150,000,000	----------	−700,000,000
June 29	H.R. 10368, Legislative branch	228,089,952	273,662,404	+45,572,452	+3,159,461
July 11	H.R. 10509, Agriculture	[1] 3,370,580,950	[1] 3,797,673,400	[1] +427,092,450	[1] +332,101,950
	(Part. sales)	800,000,000	700,000,000	−100,000,000	+100,000,000
Aug. 4	H.R. 10738, Defense	70,295,200,000	70,156,420,000	−138,780,000	−73,202,000
Sept. 28	H.R. 11456, Transportation	1,530,198,372	1,651,407,272	+121,208,900	−69,910,228
Sept. 28	H.R. 11641, Public works and Atomic Energy	4,622,922,000	4,776,064,000	+153,142,000	+465,893,000
Oct. 3	H.R. 12474 NASA	4,583,400,000	4,678,900,000	+95,500,000	−289,100,000
	Total	134,881,670,839	138,936,819,459	+4,055,148,620	+3,175,648,998

[1] Restoration of capital by CCC not included.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, following this, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed a statistical breakdown of the numerous amendments, including dates, vote numbers, and so forth, which dealt with efforts to reduce the amount of these appropriations. This list does not include amendments offered to authorization bills.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD VOTES ON REDUCTIONS IN 1968 APPROPRIATIONS

	Vote No.	Date, 1967	Vote	Amount of reduction or increase
H.R. 10509, Agriculture (Williams), limit subsidy payments to $10,000	129	July 13	14–76	$329,174,519
H.R. 10509, Agriculture (Williams), reduce from $220,000,000 to $120,000,000 new ACP authority	130	do	10–82	100,000,000
H.R. 10196, Labor-HEW (Williams motion), recommit bill to reduce 5 percent	144	Aug. 2	19–64	675,000,000
H.R. 10738, Defense (Kennedy, Massachusetts), reduce from $482,000 to $200,000 rifle practice funds	170	Aug. 22	23–67	228,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (Young, Ohio), reduce civil defense funds by $20,000,000	188	Sept. 19	32–55	20,000,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (Williams), cut public building construction funds by $21,036,200	189	do	27–57	21,036,200
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (committee), increase funds for Federal office building construction.	191	do	63–23	16,130,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (committee), increase authorization for sale of VA part. cert.	192	do	56–31	550,000,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (committee), increase grants for neighborhood facilities.	193	do	60–23	15,000,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (committee), increase model cities funds.	194	Sept. 20	62–28	$300,000,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (Harris), increase funds for National Science Foundation	197	do	63–25	46,000,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (committee), increase authorization for sale of HUD part. cert	198	Sept. 21	57–30	1,804,000,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (committee), increase funds for HUD part. cert. insufficiencies	199	do	54–32	19,115,000
H.R. 11456, Transportation (Proxmire), reduce supersonic transport funds	283	Oct. 5	19–54	141,375,000
H.R. 11456, Transportation (Williams), reduce FAA equipment funds	284	do	2–68	37,000,000
H.R. 12474, NASA (Proxmire-Williams), reduce funds for several programs	286	Oct. 6	30–36	100,500,000
H.R. 12474, NASA (Williams), reduce funds for Voyager program	287	do	31–34	26,000,000
H.R. 11641, public works (Williams), reduce general construction funds	289	Oct. 9	12–61	18,516,000
H.R. 11641, public works (Williams motion), recommit to cut funds	290	Oct. 10	27–54	247,808,200
H.R. 10345, State, Justice (Williams), eliminate SACB funds	295	Oct. 11	37–54	295,000

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the above chart shows the overwhelming margin by which these efforts to reduce appropriations were rejected. An argument can be made that the particular amendments referred to in this report were not the best way in which to achieve reductions in expenditures; however, in answer to that argument I point out that these were the only efforts made to reduce these appropriations and therefore we can proceed on the assumption that at least no one in the Senate knew of a better plan or procedure.

I mention this record, which shows that the Senate has consistently increased the appropriations above those originally approved by the House, to illustrate that we in the Senate cannot dodge our responsibility for the ever-expanding deficits which are now confronting our Government.

However, lest there be any misunderstanding that I am placing the sole responsibility for this high rate of spending on the Senate, I point out that the White House had the veto power to stop these expenditures and did not use it. The President and his political party have control of both the House and the Senate. Almost daily the White House has been sending to the Congress its recommendations for new programs and for increased expenditures under old programs, and until the last few weeks the White House has displayed very little, if any, concern for the tremendous deficits it has consistently piled up for the past 5 years. Not only has the administration been encouraging the expansion of these new spending schemes which were initiated by its Great Society bureaucracy, but the White House has consistently been urging substantially increased expenditures on its own initiative.

For example, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 12080, the bill which provided over $3 billion in additional annual benefits to those living on social security and welfare. Within a few hours after House approval of this bill the administration's representative, Secretary Gardner, was denouncing it as inadequate, and when he testified before the Senate Finance Committee he presented the administration's recommendation asking that $3¼ billion more be added to the House-passed bill.

To pay for the $3¼ billion additional benefits the administration recommended a social security tax increase of only $200 million during the calendar year 1968. Under the President's plan the increased taxes necessary to finance these additional benefits costing $3¼ billion would not become effective until January 1, 1969, or 60 days after the 1968 presidential election.

Furthermore, the administration also recommends that at least one-half of the increased taxes necessary to pay for the $3 billion benefits under the House-passed bill likewise be postponed until after the 1968 election.

Thus we have a situation where now the Johnson administration is recommending a social security bill which would pump over $6 billion extra cash into the economy in calendar year 1968 with only $1.3 billion of this amount being raised in revenue during this same calendar year. Under the administration's plan, payroll taxes to pay for the other $5 billion will not be effective until after the 1968 election.

How can the administration possibly reconcile these contradicting positions wherein on one hand it testifies before the Finance Committee in favor of a bill which will pump an additional $5 billion in spending money into the economy during 1968 and then 2 weeks later recommend to the same committee a 10-percent across-the-board increase, one of the stated purposes of which is to combat inflation by siphoning from the economy $7 billion of what is described as excess spending power?

It is this type of contradiction by the Johnson administration which has created so much confusion not only in the minds of the Members of Congress but also in the minds of the American people in general, and it is this type of contradiction or zig-zagging which has brought our country to the verge of disastrous inflation.

Now for a moment let us discuss this Johnson inflation and examine the results as it affects millions of wage earners and retired citizens.

Wages for the factory workers are rising, yes; but the cost of living is rising equally as fast with the result that the wage earners—Government employees, factory workers, farmers, small businessmen, and so forth—are on the treadmill. Ask any American housewife, and she will tell you about the cost of groceries. She understands what this inflation means.

History shows that the real victims of inflation are always the low- and middle-income groups with the highest penalties being paid by the retirees—those living on fixed pensions.

Today's inflation is the direct result of the Johnson administration's policy of planned deficits.

Today's inflation and today's staggering budget deficit are the direct result of the reckless spending policies of the Johnson administration and its 4-year insistence that we can finance a large-scale war in Vietnam without any sacrifice on the home front.

Today we are reaping the whirlwind of inflation as the result of the seeds of bad fiscal management under the Johnson administration.

To comply with the administration's request to increase taxes only to provide additional revenue to finance the extravagant ideas of the Great Society bureaucrats would only make the situation worse.

To combat inflation effectively a reduction of expenditures must precede action on taxes, and lest there be any misunderstanding I am not interested in promises of reductions either at the congressional or at the executive level. Past experience shows that these expenditure reductions must be made mandatory by law. We are about to go broke on speeches and promises of economy which far too often in the past have been followed by increased expenditures.

However, in view of the size of the

deficits which have been accumulating over the past several years and particularly in view of the staggering deficit which confronts us for fiscal 1968, I am not sure we can bring this situation under control entirely through the reduction of expenditures. It may very well take a tax increase as well as a bona fide reduction in expenditures to control this serious inflationary trend with which we are now confronted. While I am not endorsing a tax increase as the solution I will state that as far as I am concerned the solvency of this country is paramount, and if after a bona fide reduction in expenditures has been achieved it appears that a tax increase would still be necessary I would support it. I would support it on the same basis and for the same reason that I opposed the administration's $2 billion tax reduction which was pushed through the Congress last March.

I am far more concerned over the disastrous results of a continuation of this inflationary trend than I am over the political consequences of a tax increase. My criticism of the Johnson administration has been and will continue to be that under its reckless spending policies, disguised as planned deficits and so-called controlled inflation, it has allowed our country to drift toward this financial crisis.

Millions of our retired citizens, who are living on fixed incomes, social security, Government and private pensions, life insurance policies, savings accounts, and so forth, have been pauperized as a result of this deliberately planned Johnson inflation represented by the increased cost of living, or the diminishing purchasing power of the dollar.

Thousands of these citizens have retired on what they thought was adequate to take care of their needs, yet they are now being forced to apply for public welfare to meet necessary living expenses.

This administration keeps repeating its great concern over the millions of poverty-stricken people in America. Why should it not be concerned? It is the inflationary policies of the Johnson administration which are responsible for a lot of those people being in poverty today.

It is the inflationary policies of the Johnson administration which have created the highest interest rates in the 20th century.

During the Eisenhower administration, when interest rates rose from 3½ percent to between 4 and 4¼ percent, Democratic Members of the Senate almost daily were denouncing the administration on what they referred to as high interest policies. The leaders of that daily brigade of speakers were the then Senators Lyndon Johnson and HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Today with interest rates at the highest level in the past 100 years, and 50 percent higher than the peak levels of the Eisenhower administration, both President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY are strangely silent. Significantly, not an echo of concern can be heard from the other side of the Senate Chamber.

Why? Why are they so strangely silent? Is it that the members of this Great Society are ashamed of their achievements of forcing on the American public the highest interest rates since the post-Civil War days, Or is it because they just hope that the people will forget and that maybe this problem will solve itself and vanish?

But the solution is not that easy. Congress and the executive branch are both confronted with some hard political decisions—decisions which cannot be postponed much longer.

Interest rates today are at a historic 100-year high.

Interest charges on our huge national debt in fiscal 1968 will be in excess of $14 billion.

This compares with annual interest charges of $9.8 billion when President Johnson took office in January 1964—an increase of over $4 billion in interest charges on our national debt in just 4 years, with approximately one-half of this extra $4 billion representing the interest charges on the money borrowed to finance the deficits that have been created under the Johnson administration in this same period.

President Johnson, while serving as the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, was a strong and almost daily critic of what he described as the high interest policies of the Eisenhower administration, yet under his administration interest rates have increased by over 50 percent and the interest charges on our national debt have increased by $4 billion, or over 40 percent.

Today AAA industrial bonds are selling to yield in excess of 6 percent annual interest, while U.S. Government bonds are selling at prices which yield in excess of 5½ percent interest.

The only money which the U.S. Government today is borrowing at less than 4¼ percent interest is the money it is borrowing from the workers of America through the sale of series E bonds.

I quote President Johnson's remarks of June 14, 1957, at which time he was a Member of the Senate:

> This administration has managed to perform an impossible task. While the value of the dollar has gone down and down for those who spend it, it has gone up and up for those who lend it.
>
> We cannot exist indefinitely as a Nation in which the most profitable activity is lending.

I most respectfully suggest that the President should read his speech on that particular date.

Were these remarks a prophecy? Interest rates in 1957 were 50 percent lower than today's high level. To show just how rapidly interest rates have advanced under the Johnson administration I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table as appearing in the September 1967 "Treasury Bulletin" which shows the average yields on Treasury bonds for each of the years beginning with 1957 and extending through September 1967.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Period:	*Treasury bonds*
1957	3.47
1958	3.43
1959	4.08
1960	4.02
1961	3.90
1962	3.95
1963	4.00
1964	4.15
1965	4.21
1966	4.65
1967 September	4.95

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, following that, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report as appearing in the Wall Street Journal of October 20, 1967, which shows today's price and yield of U.S. Government bonds and notes.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT, AGENCY, AND MISCELLANEOUS SECURITIES, OCT. 19, 1967

TREASURY BONDS

[Over-the-Counter Quotations: Source on request. Decimals in bid-and-asked and bid change represent 32ds (101.1 means 101 1/32). a–Plus 1/64. b–Yield to call date. c–Certificates of indebtedness. d–Minus 1/64]

Interest rate	Maturity		Bid	Asked	Bid change	Yield
	Year	Month				
3⅝	1967	November	99.31	100.1	(a)	3.08
3⅞	1968	May	99.7	99.9	--------	5.19
3¾	1968	August	98.23	98.25	--------	5.30
3⅞	1968	November	98.15	98.17	−0.1	5.31
2½	1963–68	December	97.4	97.8	--------	5.00
4	1969	February	98.8	98.12	--------	5.30
2½	1964–69	June	95.23	95.27	−.1	5.17
4	1969	October	97.10	97.14	--------	5.41
2½	1964–69	December	94.17	94.21	−.1	5.16
2½	1965–70	March	94.4	94.8	--------	5.08
4	1970	February	96.21	96.25	--------	5.51
4	1970	August	96.1	96.5	−.1	5.49
2½	1966–71	March	91.23	91.27	--------	5.15
4	1971	August	94.23	94.27	+.1	5.52
3⅞	1971	November	94.0	94.4	+.1	5.51
4	1972	February	93.2	93.6	+.2	5.53
2½	1967–72	June	89.10	89.18	+.2	5.05
4	1972	August	93.20	93.78	+.2	5.46
2½	1967–72	September	88.26	89.2	+.2	5.04
2½	1967–72	December	88.4	88.12	--------	5.10
4	1973	August	92.6	92.14	+.2	5.54
4⅛	1973	November	92.16	92.24	+.2	5.55
4⅛	1974	February	92.6	92.14	+.2	5.56
4¼	1974	May	92.28	93.4	+.2	5.51
3⅞	1974	November	90.14	90.22	+.2	5.48
4	1980	February	86.8	86.24	−.4	5.49
3½	1980	November	81.16	82.0	−.12	5.44
3¼	1978–83	June	77.0	77.16	−.26	5.40
3¼	1985	May	76.24	77.8	−.18	5.15
4¼	1975–85	May	86.18	87.2	−.8	5.40
3½	1990	February	76.22	77.6	−.10	5.24
4¼	1987–92	August	83.22	84.6	−.2	5.41
4	1988–93	February	81.12	81.28	−.6	5.32
4⅛	1989–94	May	81.14	81.30	−.6	5.41
3	1995	February	76.2	76.18	--------	4.50
3½	1998	November	76.12	76.28	−.8	4.97

GOVERNMENT, AGENCY, AND MISCELLANEOUS SECURITIES, OCT. 19, 1967—Continued

U.S. TREASURY NOTES

Rate	Maturity	Bid	Asked	Yield
4⅞	November 1967	100.1	100.3	3.30
5⅝	February 1968	100.6	100.8	4.16
1½	April 1968	98.16	98.22	4.53
4¾	May 1968	99.23	99.25	5.15
4¼	August 1968	99.4	99.6	5.28
1½	October 1968	97.6	97.10	4.45
5¼	November 1968	99.25	99.27	5.40
1½	April 1969	95.10	95.18	4.72
1½	October 1969	93.28	94.4	4.70
1½	April 1970	92.14	92.19	4.75
1½	October 1970	91.2	91.18	4.60
5	November 1970	98.16	98.20	5.50
5⅜	February 1971	99.16	99.18	5.52
1½	April 1971	89.20	89.30	4.70
5¼	May 1971	99.8	99.12	5.45
1½	October 1971	88.8	88.24	4.66
5⅜	November 1971	99.17	99.21	5.47
4¾	February 1972	96.25	96.29	5.57
1½	April 1972	86.26	87.26	4.56
4¾	May 1972	96.22	96.26	5.55
1½	October 1972	85.10	86.12	4.62

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, next, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing how the total interest costs of our national debt has practically doubled between the fiscal years 1957 and 1968.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Total interest cost
1957	$7,244,000,000
1958	7,607,000,000
1959	7,593,000,000
1960	9,180,000,000
1961	8,957,000,000
1962	9,120,000,000
1963	9,895,000,000
1964	10,666,000,000
1965	11,346,000,000
1966	12,014,000,000
1967	13,391,000,000
1968 (estimated)	14,050,000,000

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, where are all those self-proclaimed authorities on monetary policies who during the Eisenhower administration almost daily proclaimed their grave concern over interest rates which at that time were 50 percent lower than today's level?

For years the Johnson administration has been telling the American people that our country can afford both guns and butter. It still insists that all of the Great Society programs can be financed and expanded while at the same time we finance a full-scale war in Vietnam.

The free-wheeling spenders of this Great Society in Congress echo the same tune and then attempt to justify their positions on the false premise that if a tax increase must be enacted it would be placed on the rich and wealthy rather than on the low- and middle-income groups. Such arguments are pure political hypocrisy.

To answer that fallacious argument, I had the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation compile a tabulation which shows just how fictitious that claim is. For example, if we were to enact—

A 100-percent tax—that is, complete confiscation—on all incomes in America in excess of $50,000—$100,000 joint return—it would provide but $700 million in additional revenue.

A 100-percent tax on all personal incomes in excess of $25,000—$50,000 joint return—that is, confiscation of all incomes in excess of $25,000—would provide but $2.1 billion in additional revenue, or just about enough to offset the current deficit of the Johnson administration for 1 month.

A 100-percent tax on all income in excess of $10,000—$20,000 joint return—would provide but $13.2 billion in additional revenue, or not even enough to balance our budget in fiscal 1968 assuming there would be no reduction in expenditures.

Even these estimates of tax revenue are based on the false assumption that all of those earning in excess of the amounts referred to will continue to work just as hard as they now do for the sole purpose of turning it all over to Uncle Sam.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated September 29, 1967, signed by Mr. Laurence M. Woodworth, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, wherein these figures are confirmed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL
REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, September 29, 1967.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reference to your request of this morning (by telephone through Mr. Vail) for an estimate of the revenue gain which would result from taxing at 100% all taxable income over $10,000 ($20,000 for joint returns), over $25,000 ($50,000 for joint returns), over $50,000 ($100,000 for joint returns), and over $100,000 ($200,000 for joint returns), respectively.

At estimated 1967 levels of income, we estimate the revenue gain to be as follows:

If taxable income were taxed at 100 percent—	The revenue gain would be—
Over $10,000	$13.2 billion.
Over $25,000	2.1 billion.
Over $50,000	0.7 billion.
Over $100,000	0.2 billion.
Capital gains subject to alternative tax.	1.9 billion.

Sincerely yours,
LAURENCE N. WOODWORTH.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call these statistics to the attention of the Senate and the country to emphasize the fact that as Congress increases its spending it will be the low- and middle-income groups who pay the tax.

I regret the necessity for taking this much time of the Senate to make this report, but in my opinion, second only to our problems with the war in Vietnam, the fiscal policies of this country are of paramount importance.

For too long both the administration and the Congress have been following a drifting policy with the result that our balance of payments has been getting worse. Our supply of gold has dropped from $17.804 million in 1961 to $13.075 million today. Our national debt today stands at $340 billion, an alltime high. Our expenditures for the past 5 years have been exceeding our national income by an average of over $10 billion per year, and today our deficit is running at a substantially higher rate.

As a result of the artificial ceiling of 4¼ percent on longtime Government bonds, a farcical situation which is being perpetrated upon the insistence of the Johnson administration, our Government for the past several years has been unable to sell any bonds with maturity in excess of 7 years, until 1967, this was 5 years. The result is that we have been financing our deficits on short-term basis, or in effect monetizing our national debt.

It is ironic to note that the only money which the Federal Government is borrowing today at 4¼-percent interest rates is by virtue of the series E bonds which it is selling to the American workingman and the schoolchild. I say it is ironic because this discrimination among lenders is being practiced by an administration which is always speaking so much about its concern over the little investor; yet today, when regular Government bonds with 7-year maturity, are selling at yields in excess of 5½ percent, the Johnson administration insists that the small investor should not be paid over 4¼ percent.

I know of no better way to express my opinion on this practice of the Johnson administration's discrimination against the small investor who buys these series E bonds than to quote the words of the Vice President of the United States, Mr. HUMPHREY, who, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, when discussing this same point on June 1, 1959, said:

> When one sifts through all the arguments of the administration as to the virtues of tight money and soaring interest rates, he really gets down to the fundamental fact that the administration simply believes it is all right for the bankers to boost their prices and reap a harvest, but that somehow it is not quite proper for wage earners to ask to share in the increased productivity of the economy. What the administration actually believes in is the old trickle-down system, whereby the main course goes to the high and the mighty, and the leftovers to John Q. Public.
>
> If the administration really wants to do something about the cost of living, I suggest that it stop and re-examine its position on monetary policy.

There is nothing which I can add which would state more eloquently the situation as it exists under the Johnson administration today than to quote the Vice President.

These high interest rates have been especially harsh on the home buyers of America, the farmers, and the small businessmen who could not pass on these excessive charges as part of the cost of a Government contract.

Today nearly 50 percent of our $340 billion debt has a maturity of less than 1 year as compared with only 38 percent for a similar maturity in 1960 and 32 percent in 1955.

Such a trend automatically reduces the percentage of our national debt which is financed with bonds with maturity dates in excess of 5 years.

Our deficit situation is serious, and this inflationary trend cannot and must not be ignored any longer.

The continuing uncertainty as to whether the President is sincere or not sincere in his request for a tax increase and the uncertainty as to whether Congress will or will not comply with his request for the enactment of a tax increase is creating a state of confusion in our financial and business world.

For Congress to adjourn and go home without having answered this question of whether a tax increase will be enacted or to postpone this decision until the first of next year will only further add to this state of confusion.

The American dollar is not in a position secure enough whereby either the Congress or the administration can afford to dillydally. The day of decision is here. Flowery speeches and more promises are not enough. This is the time for action.

The American people are entitled to the truth as to the precarious financial situation with which we are confronted.

In the past too much has been said in an effort to play down the real size of our deficit spending.

One of the major reasons the President is having such difficulty in selling his tax program to Congress and to the American people is largely due to the fact that they do not trust his estimates of deficits, nor do they trust his promises of economy.

In fact, ever since last January, when the President first asked for a 6-percent tax increase, questions have been asked: Is he sincere, or is this just another political maneuver to give the President an image of fiscal responsibility?

This question of the President's sincerity in recommending a tax increase was accentuated by comments of the Nation's top business leaders who met at Hot Springs, Va., just last week. I quote from press accounts of this meeting as appearing in the Evening Star of October 20, 1967:

EXECUTIVES SAY JOHNSON IS NOT PRESSING TAX RISE

> The Johnson administration is urging the nation's top businessmen to speak up louder for a tax increase, but privately the businessmen feel it's the President who needs the pep talk.
>
> The administration has sent an impressive array of officials to Hot Springs, Va., to spread the word on taxes during a private, two-day meeting of the Business Council, a select group of more than 100 of the nation's leading businessmen and industrialists. The meeting opened today.
>
> Prior to the session, Commerce Secretary Alexander B. Trowbridge told a meeting of the Young Presidents' Association here that although businessmen understand the need for an inflation-fighting tax rise, "they don't speak loud enough to be heard very clearly on Capitol Hill or in their communities."

FEELING IS MUTUAL

> But in talks with business leaders attending the Hot Springs session, it appeared that many of them feel Johnson is not promoting his proposed 10 percent income tax surcharge measure with the energy he mustered to win a major tax cut back in 1964 . . .
>
> "I think he shows economic and leadership bankruptcy," said one businessman who claimed he had previously supported Johnson and was considered something of a "leftist" by the more conservative members of the council.
>
> He said, Johnson had not pushed his tax increase proposal vigorously enough. "I don't think he is really sincere in advocating the tax increase," he added.

HOUR FEARED TOO LATE

> But he and other council members believe Johnson will not give up on a tax increase. In any event, another businessman said, "I think it's too late. If there is a big buying rush at Christmas, with no tax increase by January, inflation will be here and it will be too late."

Nor are these questions of the President's sincerity entirely without foundation because 6 weeks after his January 1967 message advocating a tax increase, the administration had reversed its direction and asked Congress to approve a $2 billion tax reduction.

This sudden reversal of direction was reminiscent of the 1965 episode when the administration and Congress approved a $1 billion reduction in excise taxes on communications and automobiles to be effective January 1, 1966, only to repeal this reduction just 90 days later. That established an all-time record as the shortest tax reduction in American history.

Let us review this record of other misleading statements as to budget deficits and expenditure reductions.

Let us go back to January 30, 1961, when President Kennedy in his state of the Union message, told Congress:

> It is my current intention to advocate a program of expenditures which with resulting revenues from a stimulation of the economy will not of and by themselves unbalance the budget.

The deficit for fiscal 1962—that same year—was $6,378 million, or more than $500 million a month.

The following year, on January 11, 1962, President Kennedy addressed a joint session of Congress. He said:

> I am submitting for fiscal 1963 a balanced Federal budget.

The deficit for fiscal 1963 was $6,266 million.

On January 14, 1963, President Kennedy in his message to Congress said:

> I will shortly submit a fiscal 1964 administrative budget which, while allowing for needed rises in defense, space, and fixed interest charges, holds total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level.

The deficit for fiscal 1964 jumped to $8,226 million, or an average rate of almost $700 million a month.

On January 21, 1964, President Johnson, in his first state of the Union message to Congress, said:

> My proposals call for administrative budget expenditures in 1965 of $97.9 billion—$900 million less than required in the 1964 budget . . . . This marks an important first step toward a balanced budget.

The deficit for this fiscal year was $3,435,000,000, or about $300 million a month. The actual deficit this year based on past accounting practices was $4.8 billion.

On January 4, 1965, President Johnson in his state of the Union message said:

> We will continue along the path toward a balanced budget and a balanced economy.

The deficit reported for fiscal 1966 was $2,251,000,000. I shall point out later how the actual deficit this year was over $8½ billion.

On January 12, 1966, President Johnson, in presenting his 1967 budget, during his state of the Union message said:

> If you approve every program that I recommend tonight our total budget deficit will be one of the lowest in many years. It will be only $1.8 billion next year.

Their reported deficit for fiscal 1967 was $9,937,935,200. The actual deficit, as I will later show, when you eliminate all the fancy bookkeeping, was over $18 billion.

On January 24, 1967, President Johnson in his budget message predicted an $8 billion deficit for fiscal 1968. I quote from that message:

> Administrative budget expenditures will amount to $126.7 billion in 1967 and $135.0 billion in 1968. In these 2 years, revenues in the administrative budget are estimated to rise from $117.0 billion to $126.9 billion. As a result, the budget deficit will fall from $9.7 billion in the current fiscal year to $8.1 billion in 1968.

Estimates of the 1968 deficit now range from $22 billion to $28 billion.

As late as June 1967 when testifying before the Senate Finance Committee Secretary Fowler had revised the President's January estimate of an $8.1 billion deficit and predicted a deficit of around $11 billion.

Both the January and June estimates were based on the premise that the President would ask for a 6-percent tax increase, but as late as July 14, 1967, the administration was still uncertain as to its 1968 tax policies.

To confirm this latter point I ask unanimous consent that my letter of June 28, 1967, and Secretary Fowler's reply thereto on July 14, be printed at this point in the RECORD. This correspondence confirms that as of that date the administration had not made a decision on its tax policy for 1968.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1967.

HON. HENRY H. FOWLER,
Secretary of the Treasury, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: According to recent press accounts the Administration is planning to submit to the Congress sometime before its adjournment a request for a broad tax increase.

Before any tax increase is enacted many of us feel that certain recognized loopholes in our existing tax structure should be reexamined. I am therefore trusting that the Administration's decision will be submitted to the Congress far enough in advance to give us adequate time to consider these revisions along with your request for new taxes.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, July 14, 1967.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Your letter of June 28 suggests that some problems of loopholes in the tax structure should be reexamined in connection with Congressional consideration of a tax surcharge. You indicate, therefore, that the President's Message on Tax Reform should be submitted to the Congress in time for consideration in connection with the surcharge.

As you will realize, a number of factors must be taken into account in settling on the timing of specific Presidential requests to the Congress.

With regard to the relationship of tax revision to the surcharge, I would like to refer to the President's Economic Message where he said, "This work of basic reform should proceed independently of the requirements for raising taxes or the opportunities for tax reduction." When the surcharge recommendation is made in definite form, the Congress will want to concentrate on the central issues of the size of the needed tax increase and the timing. The needed rapid action could be lost in a protracted debate on substantive tax revision.

For this reason it seems desirable that tax reform and stabilizing tax rate adjustments be approached separately.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In January 1967 the President recommended a 6-percent across-the-board increase in our corporate and individual taxes. Six weeks later, in February, he was recommending a $2 billion tax reduction—restoration of the 7-percent investment credit—and at the same time Secretary Fowler informed Congress that the administration's plan was to reduce the excise taxes on automobiles from 7 to 2 percent and the telephone tax from 10 to 1 percent effective March 31, 1968. These latter two actions would represent an additional tax reduction of over $1 billion.

On August 3, 1967, President Johnson sent a special message to Congress canceling his earlier proposed 1968 cuts in automobile and telephone taxes and asked instead for a 10-percent tax increase, which would yield approximately $7 billion on an annual basis. To support this proposal he predicted that without the tax increase the deficit for fiscal 1968 would approach $28 billion or $30 billion while with the 10-percent tax increase the deficit would be in the neighborhood of $22 billion.

What happened between June and August that caused such a wide change in the administration's estimates of expenditures and deficits? The estimate in June of a potential $11 billion deficit was based on the assumption of a 6-percent tax increase. In August based on a 10-percent tax increase the estimated deficit was projected at $22 billion. Was this an effort to scare Congress into quick action?

However, it should be noted that the aforementioned deficits as reported do not tell the true story. This is due to the fact that under the Johnson administration they have been juggling their financial statements, selling our assets—participation certificates—and diverting the proceeds into the general revenue as though they were ever-recurring income. This unorthodox method of financing our public debt has cost the taxpayers an extra one-half percent interest charge.

The silver content of our coins has been reduced with a resulting profit of around $2½ billion to the Government. This profit has been included as a part of general revenue. Payments of corporation and withholding taxes have been accelerated to move additional revenue into the past 4 fiscal years.

All of these nonrecurring items have been used as general revenue to defray current expenditures and thereby minimize the amount of the true deficit as it was being reported to the American taxpayers.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statistical report prepared with the assistance of the committee staff which takes all of these budget-juggling factors into consideration, and gives the true deficit for each of the fiscal years 1964 through 1968 as they would have appeared had normal accounting practices been followed by the Johnson administration.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTUAL DEFICITS, 1964-68

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal	Reported deficit	Sales	Speed-up		Seniorage	Total actual deficits
		FNMA	Accelerated corporation tax payment	Excise and accelerated withholding		
1964	$8,226		$300		$69	$8,595
1965	3,435	$300	1,000		117	4,852
1966	2,251	1,840	2,900	$900	649	8,540
1967	9,937	2,900	4,300	[1] 375	1,072	18,584
1968 [2]	14,000	4,000	[3] 1,600		519	20,119
Total	37,849	9,040	10,100	1,275	2,426	60,690

[1] Includes $100,000,000 in speedup of withholding deposits and $275,000,000 in excise tax payments from a monthly to a semimonthly basis.

[2] Estimate, allowing for proposed tax increase.

[3] ½ of this includes the President's 1968 proposal for speedup in corporate tax payments.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This chart shows that during the 5 years from 1964 through 1968 the deficit of the Johnson administration will be in excess of $60 billion, or $12 billion per year, which is more than $1 billion per month; and this based upon the conservative estimate of a $14 billion reported deficit for fiscal 1968.

Not only has this administration been juggling the budget figures in an effort to mislead the American people as to the true extent of the deficit spending, but it has also misled the public as to the sincerity of its promises to curtail expenditures.

For example, on December 1, 1965, President Johnson, speaking from his Texas ranch, announced that he was issuing an Executive order to reduce civilian employment in the Federal Government by at least 25,000 jobs during the remainder of that fiscal year, which would end June 30, 1966.

This announcement was hailed throughout the country as a great step toward reducing the cost of Government.

What happened? Instead of reducing employees by 25,000 in the succeeding 7 months they actually added 187,506 employees.

The Budget Bureau estimates that these 187,000 employees, who were added in violation of the President's own Executive order, will cost the taxpayers over $1½ billion per year.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of an article appearing in the New York Times of December 2, 1965, concerning this reduction followed by a statistical breakdown of the 187,000 additions to the public payroll in the following 6 months.

There being no objection, the article and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT BACKS A CUT IN U.S. JOBS—APPROVES PLAN TO RETIRE 25,000—SPENDS QUIET DAY

AUSTIN, TEX., December 1.—President Johnson approved this afternoon a plan that could eliminate 25,000 Government jobs.

The plan, contained in a memorandum from the Budget Bureau and released here, instructs the heads of Government departments and agencies to reduce their employment by 1 to 1.25 per cent by the end of the fiscal year 1966, which ends next June 30.

Joseph Laitin, assistant White House press secretary, said the plan did not mean that present employees would be dismissed. It is designed, he said, to take advantage of stepped-up retirements from Government jobs.

These retirements have been increasing because of a new law offering certain inducements, including larger pensions, to employees who retire before the first of the year.

"The vacancies thus created," the memorandum said, "present an opportunity to take new specific action to carry out the President's long-standing instructions to hold Federal employment at the minimum necessary to carry out Government operations effectively."

The President spent a quiet day at his ranch studying reports and preparing for a meeting tomorrow with Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

The main topic at the meeting is expected to be the world food situation and Mr. Johnson's forthcoming talk with President Mohammad Ayub Khan of Pakistan.

Mr. Rusk is expected to join Mr. Johnson and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara for a discussion of world problems this weekend or early next week. The White House announced yesterday that this meeting would be held tomorrow or Friday. However, officials explained today that administrative work at the Pentagon would keep Mr. McNamara in Washington longer than expected.

The President also spoke by telephone with his special assistant for national security affairs, Mr. McGeorge Bundy. Mr. Laitin, in response to a question, said that the subject of Mr. Bundy's future had not been discussed and that, to the best of his knowledge, the two men had never discussed it. Mr. Bundy has been offered a post as head of the Ford Foundation.

Year and month	Employment	Increase
1965—December	2,550,742	
1966—January	2,555,572	4,830
February	2,580,518	24,946
March	2,610,780	30,262
April	2,644,153	33,373
May	2,665,160	21,007
June	2,738,248	73,088
Amount of increase December 1965 to June 1966		187,506

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But that was just the beginning of the false economy promises which were coming from the White House.

On September 20, 1966, about 6 weeks prior to the election date, the President, recognizing the criticism he was receiving from the previous action, issued an Executive order freezing employment at the level of that which prevailed on July 1, 1966.

Again this Presidential action was hailed throughout the country as a step, though belated, in curtailing unnecessary Government expenditures.

But like the similar statement in the preceding December, this was but another political propaganda maneuver. Instead of holding employment at the July 1 level, another 206,432 employees were added to the public payroll. All of these additions to the Federal payroll were above the normal replacements due to resignations, retirements, and so forth.

The cost of these additional 206,000 employees to the American taxpayers will be a minimum of $1,500,000,000 annually.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the Executive freeze order of September 20, 1966, and a list of employees added thereafter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Executive order and the list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., Sept. 20, 1966.

Memorandum for the heads of executive departments and establishments.

Subject: Fiscal year 1967 employment ceilings.

1. The President has directed that the head of each agency take necessary steps to:

a. Hold employment in *full-time permanent positions* for the remainder of fiscal 1967 to a level at or below that prevailing as of July 31, 1966. (Those agencies whose employment is already above the July 31, 1966, figure should reduce their employment to the July 31 level as expeditiously as possible by not filling vacancies.)

b. Hold employment in *temporary, part-time, or intermittent positions* for the remainder of fiscal 1967 to a level at or below that prevailing as of June 30, 1966, except for meeting normal seasonal changes in agency workloads. In no event should such employment on June 30, 1967, exceed that on June 30, 1966.

2. These actions are an essential part of President Johnson's efforts to reduce Federal expenditures.

3. Each agency head should make every effort to achieve the lowest possible level of employment. We must increase our productivity, redeploy our personnel, simplify our procedures and strip work to essentials in order to meet the employment ceilings established by this memorandum.

4. In view of the personnel requirements involved in the Viet Nam conflict, the Department of Defense and the Selective Service System are specifically exempt from paragraph 1 of this memorandum. For these two agencies, employment ceilings heretofore in effect will remain in effect subject to adjustment during review of the 1968 budget.

5. In the case of the Post Office, the June 30, 1967, employment ceiling established in the January budget review will remain in effect.

6. Requests for exception to the levels established by this memorandum will be presented to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by the agency head under the following circumstances *only:*

a. When the need for employment increases can be related directly to requirements for Southeast Asia, or

b. When employment increases are needed for new programs which were not in existence on July 31, 1966, and for which appropriations or other funds have been provided and have been apportioned by the Bureau of the Budget, or

c. When employment increases are needed for emergency situations involving the protection of life, property, or the national security, or

d. When transfers of functions from one agency to another or from headquarters to the field result in a need to adjust employment levels.

In any of the above cases, *exceptions will not be requested* until the *agency head* has determined that it is clearly not possible to meet the required employment needs by redeploying personnel from other areas so as to remain under the employment level established by this memorandum. *Exceptions will not be granted* unless agencies clearly demonstrate that such shifts have been evaluated and that they are not feasible.

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director.

LIST OF EMPLOYEES

Year and month	Employment	Increase
1966—September	2,773,724	
October	2,798,212	24,488
November	2,834,940	36,728
December	2,842,528	7,588
1967—January	2,848,249	5,721
February	2,864,626	16,377
March	2,882,639	18,013
April	2,899,673	17,034
May	2,905,599	5,926
June	2,980,156	74,557
Total		206,432

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I regret the necessity for taking so much of the Senate's time to make this report, but I thought it necessary to review the record and to show the American people just how we have drifted into this near state of financial crisis. Also, this report is intended to show why there is so much uncertainty as to just how sincere the administration is in its promise to cut expenditures or in its efforts to raise taxes.

I am not a pessimist. We have a great country, and I am confident that we can solve this financial problem with which we are now confronted. The stability of the American dollar not only can but must be preserved. This inflationary spiral must be checked; otherwise the life savings of millions of Americans will be destroyed. We can all agree that Congress has no alternative but to provide whatever is necessary to back the American boys in Vietnam. That comes first, but we can tighten our belts here at home. We can postpone or hold in abeyance some of the expenditures on domestic programs.

The most important steps toward the solution of any problem are first, to recognize that it exists; second, to understand what caused it; and then to be willing to take the necessary steps to solve it.

Both the administration and Congress know that our country, as great as it is, cannot stand these $20 billion to $30 billion deficits being piled on top of an already weak financial structure.

Both the administration and Congress know what caused this financial crisis—and it is a crisis when we are confronted with a $30 billion deficit, an expensive war in Vietnam, accelerated inflation, and interest rates at the highest level in 100 years.

Both the administration and Congress know that unless some action is taken to check this inflationary threat the next step could well be a demand for price and wage controls. This could be disastrous to our private enterprise system.

Yes, the problem is here; we know the cause, and now let us, the administration and the Congress, get together and seek a solution.

In this respect I recognize that Congress too has a responsibility, and it is in recognition of our responsibility that I am making the following suggestions:

First. A bona fide reduction in Government spending, including the postponement of all new public works projects and the suspension of activities on all existing projects until such project or projects have been certified either as being essential to our national defense or that postponement would result in an unnecessary economic loss.

Second. Reduce the personnel on the civilian payroll of the Government down to the level existing on September 20, 1966, at which time President Johnson issued his Executive freeze order. This one action alone would reduce the public payroll by over 200,000 and result in an annual reduction in expenditures of around $1.5 billion. This reduction could be achieved without hardship to present employees by merely curtailing all hiring for replacements of normal resignations or retirements.

Third. Repeal the fictitious 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds. This ceiling is a farce and has cost the taxpayers several hundred million dollars in unnecessary interest charges.

Fourth. Congress should take definite action before it adjourns to settle the question of whether there will or will not be a 1968 tax increase. Both the administration and the Congress have the responsibility to eliminate this cloud of uncertainty now hanging over our securities and financial markets by either accepting or rejecting the President's tax proposals.

This continued uncertainty can have a serious effect in financial markets and on our entire domestic economy; therefore, to facilitate this decision I recommend that the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee or some Senator in the President's party introduce President Johnson's tax propcsals in the U.S. Senate and then the Senate Finance Committee should promptly schedule public hearings.

It has always been traditional that the chairman of the appropriate committee introduce the President's recommendation even though he personally may not agree or be willing to support the bill. It is customary to introduce administration bills upon request.

It is inconceivable to me that the President of the United States could not get a single member of his own political party in the U.S. Senate to introduce his recommendations, or that the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee would reject a request from him for public hearings on his tax bill.

If, however, the relations between the President of the United States and the members of his own political party in the Senate are of such a strained nature that not one will introduce his tax proposals I volunteer as the ranking minority member of the Senate Finance Committee that if he will send his recommendations to my office I will not only introduce them in the Senate but join him in petitioning the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to conduct public hearings. I have entirely too much respect for the Office of the President to have his recommendations completely ignored regardless of how we as individual Senators may feel.

By following this procedure the Senate would be able to move promptly after the House takes action, or if the House does not act, the Senate could, if it so desired, attach the bill as a rider to a previously House approved revenue measure.

There is a precedent for such Senate consideration before House action on revenue bills, and as an example I cite none other than the situation whereby for 3 days last week the Senate Finance Committee held public hearings on various proposals to impose quotas on oil, steel, textiles, and so forth. All such measures must either originate in the House or be attached as amendments to a previously enacted House measure. Likewise, the President's proposal to finance election campaigns out of the Federal Treasury was first introduced and hearings were held in the Senate. Furthermore, this procedure of Senate consideration before House action had administration approval.

I realize that these suggestions embrace some unpleasant steps. Adoption of these expenditure reduction measures would mean that some of the programs which I like, some of the projects in my State, as well as some of the programs and projects in the States of other Senators would be affected. But real economy and a bona fide reduction in Government expenditures can only be obtained by every American citizen's recognizing the seriousness of our present financial situation and agreeing that all of us will tighten our belts and postpone some of these projects and programs which under normal conditions would be considered highly meritorious.

After these expenditure-reduction steps have been taken—and I emphasize "after"—if the financial position of our Treasury is still not under proper control, I would recommend that this Congress enact a tax increase before we adjourn. It may very well take a combination of a reduction in Government expenditures as outlined plus a tax increase to restore this country to a degree of solvency where the American dollar can be protected and the ravages of inflation avoided.

But I cannot overemphasize the importance that whatever action the administration and the Congress are going to take it should be done promptly and before this Congress adjourns.

This administration and this Congress have passed the laws drafting the youth of America, and we have today over one-half million American boys fighting in Vietnam for the protection of their country and the cause of freedom.

Daily those men are displaying heroic courage in the discharge of their assigned duties. Can we in the executive and legislative branches do any less in the discharge of our responsibilities?

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota. Mr. President, I would like to be able to support the continuing resolution as it came from the House rather than the resolution now pending before the Senate which is simply a continuing resolution of the sort that we have passed many times in previous years and twice before this year.

I am in full accord with the House position of trying to save from $5 billion to $7 billion, but how they do it is another matter. The manner in which these cuts are to be made are very ambiguous; and when the resolution is examined closely, I believe it will be apparent that some very unfair cuts would be applied.

Director Schultze, of the Bureau of the Budget, did not know how the cuts would be applied in many cases. He said that in many instances an interpretation of the Comptroller General would be necessary to determine what was required by the House action. He did give us some idea as to where he thought these cuts would be applied under the Whitten amendment to the resolution that passed the House. The Whitten amendment would require a cut of approximately $7 billion, and the expenditure, not on appropriations, for the present fiscal year could not exceed 1967 appropriations, except in certain instances.

There were two or three exceptions, as I recall. One exception was for Department of Defense operations relating to Vietnam.

The Budget Director indicated that the cut might apply in the following manner: It would require a mandatory cut in the Defense Department appropriation of $2½ billion on top of the $1½ billion we have already cut in the regular appropriation bill and this at a time when war requirements in Vietnam are increasing. Agriculture would be cut $400 million; Commerce, $250 million; Interior, $150 million; State Department, only $10 million.

This cut would apply in the case of the State Department because its present appropriation is approximately the same as that of last year. I am not aware that the State Department has had any new functions added to its appropriation.

In the case of the Department of Agriculture, where the cut would be $400 million, many new functions have been added from year to year which have little or nothing to do with agriculture. For example, the food stamp program has been added to this year's budget. In the last couple of years, we have added housing for towns and cities with a population up to 5,500 and under, and for farmers, to the Agriculture appropriation bill. And we have had the sewer and water system program added to Agriculture, which affects not only farmers but also towns and cities with a population up to 5,500.

So Agriculture would receive a larger cut because of the functions that have been added to the Department of Agriculture. The State Department would receive a cut of only $10 million, which certainly would not hurt it at all.

The Veterans' Administration would be cut by $180 million, and they have a vastly increased load because of the increasing casualties returning from Vietnam. I do not believe this department can afford any cut at this time.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks. These figures were presented by Budget Director Schultze before the Committee on Appropriations as to where he believed cuts would be required under the House Joint Resolution 888. It should be noted, however, that in many instances a determination by the Comptroller General would be necessary to know exactly how the House joint resolution would apply.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Areas where appropriations are controllable (not locked in)

[In thousands of dollars]

Agriculture	3,900
Commerce	970
Corps of Engineers	1,300
Health, Education, and Welfare	7,500
Interior	1,600
Housing and Urban Development	1,100
Justice	437
Labor	530
Post Office	585
Transportation	1,500
Treasury	920
Agency for International Development	2,600
State	300
Atomic Energy Commission	2,600
General Services Administration	560
National Aviation and Space Agency	4,500
National Science Foundation	526
Veterans' Administration	1,600
Office of Economic Opportunity	2,060
Military and civilian pay raises	1,000
Other	2,000
Total	38,088

House Joint Resolution 888—Estimated reduction effected by resolution as passed the House

	1968 expenditures
Defense	$2,500,000,000
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,100,000,000
Agriculture	400,000,000
Commerce	250,000,000
Housing and Urban Development	500,000,000
Public works	40,000,000
Interior	150,000,000
Justice	45,000,000
Labor	20,000,000
State	10,000,000
Transportation	75,000,000
Agency for International Development	140,000,000
Atomic Energy Commission	120,000,000
General Services Administration	30,000,000
Office of Economic Opportunity	400,000,000
Veterans' Administration	180,000,000
Pay raise	600,000,000
Small Business Administration	200,000,000
National Science Foundation	60,000,000
Total	6,821,000,000

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, these appropriations cut would be applied to what the Budget Director calls "not locked in" items, interest on the national debt, payments to veterans, and items of that nature would not be affected. The total of the "not locked in" items would be approximately $38 billion, and to this amount would have to be applied largely the $7 billion cut in the House resolution.

This would mean a sizable cut in many of these departments.

We are not exactly clear—at least I am not—as to whether the President could cut, say, $5 billion in expenditures from the Interstate Highway trust fund. He withheld the spending of these funds last spring. Could he now withhold, say, $5 billion in Interstate Highway trust funds to make up $5 billion of the $7 billion required under the House resolution?

These are only some of the ambiguities in the House-passed bill.

If we do not add amendments to the pending resolution, I believe everything would be in conference and we could come up with a much more understandable and effective resolution than the one we received from the House and still retain their objectives.

Of course, I shall support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], which would require a 5-percent cut in all appropriations.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM WAR

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, and Secretary Rusk have recently made some significant comments about the war in Vietnam. It is good that they do so. I, too, submit some views in this regard.

At the very outset, I wish to say that American troops engaged in war in Vietnam deserve to be supported and supplied with all equipment and the materials necessary to enable them to accomplish the mission assigned them by their superiors with maximum effectiveness and minimum loss of life.

Let it be emphatically understood, however, that such support has not and does not reflect approval on my part of the policies and decisions that have led to our involvement in Vietnam in its current proportions.

Support of our troops in battle is one thing; approval of national policies and decisions which put them there is quite another. What has been done has been done. I voice my deep concern at this time, not with any idea that the calendar can be reversed; not for the purpose of expressing criticism, but in the hope that a searching public analysis and debate of the present may possibly be of some help in shaping the momentous decisions in the days and months ahead. The responsibility of a U.S. Senator and the dictates of conscience impel me to participate in the great, ongoing national debate now underway not only in the U.S. Senate, but also around every fireplace and coffee table.

I sincerely hope that what I, and many others, may say at this time and in the days to come will assist the American people in arriving at a collective national opinion as to just why we ought or ought not be waging war in Vietnam. For the really disturbing thing about this entire Vietnamese episode is that the country is cruelly and deeply divided and this division is affecting all phases of our national life. We must resolve the Vietnam question and arrive at a true unity. Only then can we get on with the task of fulfilling our national destiny. It is in this respect that I venture to speak.

Is U.S. security truly involved in the war in Vietnam? For what lesser cause would we send men to fight and die? That has always been the central issue, as I have seen this problem. It is precisely on this level and upon this point that our policies, particularly our future policies, should be examined.

The real question posed by the recent statement of administration leaders is not whether it constitutes a change in our reasons for being in Vietnam, but whether this thesis is valid.

I do not think that President Johnson has shown—or that anyone has shown—that our national interest in Vietnam is "real." I do not believe that he has offered convincing evidence—or indeed any evidence—that no matter what the outcome of the war in Vietnam we will secure a peace that is either "organized" or "reliable." We have not yet achieved such a peace in the absence of conflict. How can we expect to achieve it through a major international disruption?

The truth, as I see it, is that the war in Vietnam is a quagmire into which we have stumbled, and from which we must extricate ourselves as honorably, as cleanly, and as gracefully as possible. Other nations have found the political courage, the will, and a manner with honor to extricate themselves from untenable and dangerous positions—Russia from missile bases in Cuba, France from Algiers.

The invocation of the threat of China—perhaps obsession would be a better word—is as true today as it has ever been. But does this establish a mortal danger for the United States in happenings in Vietnam?

I think that most experts on Vietnam would concur that North Vietnam is far from being an actual—let alone willing—Chinese puppet or satellite. Two thousand years of Vietnamese-Chinese relations have left the Vietnamese with feelings toward the Chinese which one eminent authority has described as "like those of the Irish for the English of Oliver Cromwell's day." And as the war continues—although the pronouncements of the administration repeat, and repeat, and repeat the view that it is Peking that stands behind Hanoi—the Soviet Union has become North Vietnam's chief military and economic provider. Chinese rifles and mortars are fired by enemy troops against American soldiers, but the North Vietnamese fly Soviet Migs, shoot down American planes with Soviet missiles using Soviet radar, move their armies with Soviet oil and fire Soviet artillery.

Several months ago, the Wall Street Journal reported that Soviet arms aid to North Vietnam totaled $25 million in 1964, $200 million to $225 million in 1965 and about $200 million in 1966. In the same years Chinese military aid varied from $35 to $60 million a year. It has been estimated that between 1955 and 1966 Soviet military assistance totaled $1.5 billion compared to a Chinese total of some $200 million. In October of last year at a meeting in Moscow, the Soviet Union and a number of other Communist countries reportedly said that they had agreed to help Hanoi with an additional $1 billion in material and money and only last month, when a new Soviet trade and aid agreement was signed with North Vietnam, the communique issued on that occasion stated that in 1968 the Soviet Union would provide: airplanes, antiaircraft and rocket equipment, artillery and small arms, ammunition, and other military equipment as well as complete installations, vehicles, oil products, ferrous and nonferrous metals, foodstuffs, chemical fertilizers, medicines, and other material.

Even taking the administration's case at face value—which I do not, except for purposes of argument—if the war in Vietnam is a confrontation between "Asian communism" and the free world, a confrontation that will determine not only the future of Asia but also the future of the United States—the battle is being fought in the worst possible place and at a place and under conditions of the enemy's choosing. And to carry this argument to its logical conclusion, if our real enemy is Communist China why do we not strike at the root of the problem? Are we unwilling to face up to the logical consequences of our policy, or do we suspect that there is a logical flaw in our argument?

I believe our leaders are mesmerized by mirages in Vietnam and that as a result they see national interests there where none exist. But this is only part of the tragedy of this quagmire war. The other part of the tragedy is that, mesmerized by mirages, we are unable to see where our real national interests lie.

It seems clear to me—it has for some time—that our real national interests lie in our present and future relations with the two other great powers in this world, the Soviet Union and China. What is the war in Vietnam doing to this fundamental national interest, to our relations with these two great powers?

Some believe that the war is bringing China and the Soviet Union closer together. The more sophisticated opinion is that the ideological differences between these two countries are so great that even an attack on a fellow Communist country has not been able to heal the breach—at least not yet, although I must say we seem to be working hard at it. But, unquestionably, the war in Vietnam is worsening our relations with both the Soviet Union and Communist China, and, I might add, with most of the rest of the world.

Let us debate our involvement in Vietnam, then, on a more rational basis than has thus far been the case, and perhaps we can then come to some national conclusion and true concensus as to just what we ought to do. Once we know what we ought to do and what we want to do, I, for one, believe our country has sufficient genius to find an honorable conclusion to this bloody war.

I have said that I am not persuaded that we have a "real" national interest in Vietnam; that the visions of containing Chinese expansion and deterring wars of national liberation are just that: visions, dreams. In any event, I do not believe we are containing Chinese military expansion in Vietnam. How could we be when we are fighting not a single Chinese but have engaged half a million men in fighting against 50,000 North Vietnamese and 250,000 South Vietnamese Vietcong—a task the 700,000 South Vietnamese forces are apparently unable to undertake. Are we teaching China a lesson for the future when 100,000 American boys have been killed or wounded but not one Chinese has been scratched? Will this inhibit China from any desire to "overrun" her neighbors, as Secretary Rusk has suggested? And, for that matter, is China now "overrunning" her neighbor, North Vietnam?

If there is no Chinese military expansion to contain, perhaps we are fighting in Vietnam to contain local grievances. Whether any individual war of national liberation, by this or any other name, succeeds or fails in this or any other particular instance, it seems to me that the danger of a local Communist insurrection will continue to threaten as long as the conditions exist which permit such a movement to arise, enable it to grow, and encourage it to succeed.

We are in Vietnam, in the words of Secretary Rusk, only now clearly stated, because it is in our "vital national interest" to be fighting there, and the enemy is China.

President Johnson and Secretary Rusk presumably believe that we are fighting in Asia against Chinese aggression. Secretary Rusk, at least, feels—at least his words indicate he so feels—that we must not let any of the arrangements made at the end of World War II, arrangements which we hoped would guarantee world stability, to be reversed or undone. Our "vital national interest," he feels, demands that we fight a land war in Asia to maintain this particular brand of stability.

But does it? Now we reach the heart of the matter. Are we required in defense of the United States, to send an army to fight jungle guerrillas in any part of the world threatened with an alteration of the status quo? Is this advisable? Is it possible? Is it truly in our national interest?

I think the answer to these questions must be a resounding "No." We cannot police the world. To attempt to do so, outside of our truly "vital" areas, is to court national disaster.

We must act in our true national interest. This is axiomatic. In a nationalistic world—and let me say that we live in a nationalistic world, in the Communist areas no less than in the "free" areas—all nation-states operate in ways considered by them to be in their own national interest. This has been so ever since there have been nation-states, and I daresay it will be so for many years to come.

But when any nation's leadership has a false conception of what is the true, vital, national interest, the nation is in trouble. This is the case now. We are in trouble. We are a deeply troubled people—a deeply divided people. Secretary Rusk evidently fears that this conception of the national interest will not be supported by the American people. For that reason, perhaps, we have, since 1961, witnessed the erection of this facade and camouflage, using vague slogans about "commitments" and generalizations about "freedom" and "aggression." These slogans have served only to confuse and give rise to unprecedented dissent.

President Johnson and Secretary Rusk seem to believe that our national interest is involved in the choice of a government for every country in the world. They have a right to hold such views. Others have a right to differ. I do. And I challenge the validity of the position that somehow the United States is placed in mortal peril by what occurs in the jungles of Vietnam.

Surely it is in our interest to have a peaceful world. Surely it is in our interest to have a less militant brand of Russian communism. Surely it is in our interest to have a China which will give up its desire to dominate Asia. Surely it is in our interest to have a government in South Vietnam friendly to the United States.

But having said that, I have said nothing, really. These statements are virtual tautologies. But this is what President Johnson and Secretary Rusk appear to have been saying, and on such a basis they seek to justify U.S. involvement in a land war in Asia.

I think they are mistaken. There is no personal criticism here. I am undertaking as studiously as I can to examine the position with reason and logic and no personal animosity is involved in it whatsoever.

We do have real and vital national interests—and these we must defend with whatever force is required. In such a case, the requirement is its own justification. But our vital interests must be more narrowly defined than they have been thus far by the Johnson administration. They cannot encompass all countries, freedom everywhere, vague commitments to every country no matter how remote, how small, how backward, or where located. And, so far as I am concerned, they do not justify a major war against China at this time.

Above all, in narrowing down our interests, we must balance capabilities with desires.

This, I believe, is where this administration has been at fault. The hard lines have not been drawn. The priorities have not been kept clearly delineated. We have drifted into a major war on the basis of vague commitments and a general defense of freedom. But, above all, and most important to the public debate on Vietnam, the administration has misled itself and the public as to our real national interests and intentions.

If, as I contend, our national interests—and even our existence—are tied to the future of our relations with the Soviet Union and with Communist China, the question we must ask ourselves is how Vietnam is affecting these relations. As I have said, I believe that the war is causing our relations with both of these countries to deteriorate. We complain about, and fear, China's militancy as we once complained about, and feared, Russia's militancy. Yet Vietnam provides China with a target enabling Chinese leadership to be even more militant and obliging the Soviets to compete in a contest that can only do us harm. What is that contest in which

China now challenges Russia? It is the great game of anti-Americanism.

Is it in our long-term national interest to facilitate this, to encourage this, to make it possible?

The war in Vietnam is thus reversing a trend in Soviet-American relations, a hopeful trend in terms of our future security and in terms of world stability. While our relations with the Soviet Union were by no means perfect before the war in Vietnam became largely an American war, the situation had certainly improved.

We and they are the world's two leading nuclear powers. I speak now of Russia and the United States. More than any other countries, we therefore have a basic common interest in avoiding a nuclear war, or a war which might become nuclear, for any nuclear war would be bound to destroy us both. It is paradoxical to reflect that these two countries, which were literally at each other's throats 20 years ago, now have a common interest—indeed a vital interest in every sense of the word—in preserving peace. What deeper mutuality of interest is there than the avoidance of nuclear war by the two nations bound to suffer destruction in a nuclear holocaust?

This common interest has produced tangible results. The first, and most important result, is that there has been no war involving the United States and the Soviet Union in direct hostilities. There have been close escapes—far too close for comfort—in Berlin, in Korea, in Cuba, and now in Vietnam. But peace—peace in the sense of an absence of a war involving the armed forces of these two countries—has been preserved. And at the same time, there has been a gradual movement toward mutual accommodation, with agreements reached on a partial test ban treaty, an outer space agreement, the draft of a nonproliferation agreement, a consular convention and many executive agreements on various commercial, cultural and other matters. American citizens visit the Soviet Union and their citizens visit here. We exchange publications and cultural performances and our leaders meet to talk. While they do not agree on every subject they are able to communicate frankly and rapidly.

I do not mean to deny that many fundamental, serious—and even dangerous—problems remain. Even if the war in Vietnam ended tomorrow, there is a basic ideological hostility between ourselves and the Soviets that would undoubtedly persist for years to come and would inhibit the relationship between our two countries. The burden of past grievances—of broken promises and hostile actions—is indeed heavy. But the trend of events—the sweep of history—has been in the right direction between the United States and Russia. If there were to be as much progress in Soviet-American relations in the next 20 years as there has been in the past 20 years, or half as much progress in our relations with China, the future would look brighter indeed.

But as long as the war in Vietnam continues, the chances for such an improvement—for continuing this hopeful trend—grow ever dimmer. And this is the other danger in our seeing mirages in Vietnam. The illusions we see necessarily blind us to the realities, both at home and in the world where American prestige and position is eroding.

So, again as I sincerely believe, we are not defending but damaging our national interests in Vietnam. Despite official disclaimers, we are bogged down in a land war in Asia fighting not Chinese but Vietnamese armed with Soviet equipment; dissipating that most precious national resource of all—American lives—as well as hard-earned American money; damaging our relations with most nations in the world and in particular with the two other most powerful countries in the world; and risking the danger that they will be dragged into the quagmire with us and cause a wider war—perhaps the war which will be the final holocaust. In short, we are not, as a high State Department official contended only a few days ago, "maintaining the balance of power," but upsetting it.

At any rate, now that the administration is emphasizing the fact that we are in Vietnam in furtherance of what it feels are our real and vital national interests, we can debate on this level and the public can decide whether this is correct.

But for my immediate purposes, let me move a step further. What do we do now?

The administration says it wants to negotiate. But what is there to negotiate if we are truly protecting our vital national interests in South Vietnam? If in fact we are in mortal peril in Vietnam, what is there to negotiate? We are not going to be able to negotiate an American colony in South Vietnam. Moreover, would it really be in our interest to have an American colony in South Vietnam? If that is what the administration means by negotiations, we might as well forget that and begin sending over more U.S. troops. And if we are really fighting China, should we negotiate anything at this point?

There is something that may be negotiable, and that is the neutralization of Southeast Asia. So far as I am concerned, this would be in our true national interest. Thus far, the administration does not seem willing to negotiate on this basis.

A negotiated settlement is the solution on which there is broad national consensus. It has for some time been officially proclaimed policy of the administration. The difficulty has been that no way has been found to move the controversy to the conference table.

I wish to make clear that I do not question the sincerity of the Johnson administration in its statements that it desires to resolve the Vietnam conflict by peaceful negotiations. I doubt whether any man living desires peace more than President Johnson. I am sure that both diplomatic and unofficial channels have been used to convey our desire to negotiate.

On the other hand, it appears clear, both from administration statements and from our action, that we seek, primarily, to persuade the North Vietnamese to come to the conference table by means of increasing military pressure. It is said that they will be willing to negotiate when they realize that they cannot win on the battlefield. The apparent theory is that when the military pressure reaches the point that it cannot be withstood, when the price becomes too heavy to pay, Hanoi will then be willing to bargain. In such case we would be bargaining from a position of strength and they, of course, from a position of relative weakness. In reality, this is tantamount to a declaration that we shall persevere until the North Vietnamese surrender.

If there are to be negotiations, there must be something to negotiate. True negotiations involve concessions on both sides. The subject of negotiations, if there are to be any, must be the political posture of Southeast Asia, in general, and South Vietnam, in particular, in the context of the East-West struggle.

Implicit in the statement of Secretary Rusk is that our national interest requires a Western bastion in Southeast Asia to contain China and to insure that Chinese domination does not extend to all of Asia. On the other hand, Hanoi, with the support of Peking and Moscow, seeks a Southeast Asia devoid of Western influence and a Vietnam unified under the control of Ho Chi Minh. Behind the facade of Communist bleatings about U.S. imperialism and our own slogans about self-determination, this is what the struggle is all about.

If we are willing to continue to pay the price in terms of military pressure, there is no way the North Vietnamese can achieve their objective. We have the military power to crush North Vietnam if we are willing to commit substantially larger forces to Vietnam than are there now and to invade and occupy North Vietnam. Even the proponents of a "hard line" in Vietnam concede that this would entail grave risk of war with China and possibly with the Soviet Union.

No one knows what Red China would do. It is my opinion that the Chinese would not allow Hanoi to capitulate even if Hanoi should wish to do so, in view of the fact that such would result in a U.S.-dominated Southeast Asia. We must consider possible Soviet reaction to such a possibility.

The question before the American people is whether, under the circumstances, we should be willing to accept less than what is and has been our real objective in Southeast Asia in return for a cessation of the conflict.

While we have stated our willingness to negotiate without conditions, we have not made clear, at least publicly, the kind of Vietnam we envision when negotiations have been completed, other than in such phrases as "independent," "free," "self-determination," and the like.

Something less than our real objective in Vietnam would be the neutralization of Southeast Asia. It would also be something less than the apparent objective of the Communists supporting the Vietcong. It just may well be that an indication of our willingness to settle for neutralization would produce the negotiations we have sought for many months. There remains the question of whether such a settlement would serve our vital national interests. In my opinion, it would.

There are some who equate neutralism with procommunism. Others may argue that a neutralist Southeast Asia is tantamount to U.S. surrender. Admittedly, we would prefer that all the states in the area be strongly pro-Western.

In reality, however, I believe neutralism is the best we can hope to achieve under present circumstances. Such a result must be measured in the light of the cost and the risks involved in continuing present policy, and in the light of more vital interests in other areas and in other respects.

It seems to me that it might be constructive to examine some of the possible reasons why the well-advertised peace offensive brought no affirmative response from those directly and indirectly supporting the efforts of the Vietcong against the Saigon government. First, there is the point of view that Hanoi has not responded because of a belief that the Vietcong will achieve a military victory, that if hostilities are continued the United States ultimately will become tired of the conflict and withdraw. According to this theory, the Vietcong, with support from Hanoi and Peking, will then defeat the Saigon regime militarily and engulf South Vietnam and the rest of Southeast Asia by force of arms. If the Vietcong leaders and the Communist leaders in Hanoi and Peking believe this, they should reassess their position. Recent votes in Congress should make it clear to them that despite reservations held by many concerning wisdom of our policy, the American people, acting through Congress, will provide whatever funds are required to support our military forces committed to battle in Vietnam or elsewhere. As one who believes strongly that we should not have committed combat troops to South Vietnam, I have consistently supported the appropriation of funds, and I have sought to make it clear that I do not advocate withdrawal of our forces under present circumstances. In my view, any reasonable analysis of the history of our country and of our people should convince both friend and foe that we will not be forced out of Vietnam by military pressure.

There is a possibility, although many refuse to concede it, that neither Hanoi nor Peking is in a position to stop the hostilities in South Vietnam, even if they should desire to do so. The general view is expressed by many that the Vietcong are merely puppets and agents of the Hanoi regime. On this basis, however, there are very few facts on the public record. There is abundant evidence of support from Hanoi, both in terms of manpower and material. I think there is little question but that officials in Hanoi are in a position to, and do, exercise a great deal of control over both the strategy and tactics employed by both their forces and indigenous forces in South Vietnam.

On the other hand, the same may be said about the Saigon regime. Hanoi and Peking charge that the Saigon regime is an outright puppet of the United States. Without deciding this question, I think it is clear that the regime could not survive without both our economic and military assistance and the presence of American combat forces in South Vietnam. It must have been disconcerting, if not revealing, that in the recent Vietnam election the military junta that campaigned with all the trappings of power and obvious U.S. Government support received about one-third of the popular vote. Yet we are apparently not in a position to control the regime in all respects. Its cooperation is required to implement our policies. In some degree the regime can exercise a sort of veto. Of course, we hold a club over the heads of this regime, so to speak, in the sense that if it withholds its cooperation, we could threaten to withdraw our support. But this power is limited by the fact that use of it would require our withdrawal from the scene, and our Government is not prepared to do this.

In the light of the facts of record, I think it likely that we are in a position to impose our view upon the Saigon regime to an extent at least as great, if not greater, than the extent to which Hanoi can impose its view on the Vietcong. But our freedom of action is not by any means absolute, and it is possible that Hanoi's is not either.

For this reason I do not think we can simply dismiss the Vietcong as agents of North Vietnam. At least, it seems to me, we should recognize the possibility that Hanoi may not be in a position to dictate completely the course of action to be followed by the Vietcong except by exercise of its ultimate power to cut off support and withdraw completely from the conflict. If such conditions should in fact exist, Hanoi might conceivably find it as difficult as would we to exercise its prerogative of withdrawing all support.

This raises the question, Mr. President, of recognition of the Vietcong as a party of interest to be dealt with, should a negotiation of the controversy become feasible. Frankly, I do not see how a cease-fire could be negotiated over the heads of the Vietcong unless we assume that the Vietcong have no leadership at all other than that which comes from Hanoi. In the light of the publicly known facts, it seems to me at least possible that this is an unwise assumption.

On the question of dealing with the Vietcong, the position of the administration is not entirely clear. the President has said with reference to possible negotiations:

> The Vietcong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented, if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an insurmountable problem.

I am unsure whether the quoted statement means or is intended to mean that we would consider negotiating with the Vietcong as one of the parties of interest or whether it means merely that it is our position that the views of the Vietcong could adequately be represented by Hanoi or someone else.

In my view the points should be clarified. I assume that the administration has more information about the Vietcong, the individuals located in South Vietnam who are its leaders, its organization, and so forth, than is available to the public generally. It is said that the Vietcong have some kind of governmental or quasi-governmental structure, that it levies taxes and exercises other governmental powers in the areas of South Vietnam which it controls. There is bound to be some kind of local organization of the effort of the Vietcong on the local scene. Direction of the Vietcong military effort and its other activities simply could not be exclusively effected by those pulling strings from Hanoi. If such is in fact done, Hanoi has apparently perfected administrative techniques which are extraordinarily effective.

I do not have the facts upon which to base a firm conclusion about the degree of autonomy, if any, exercised by Vietcong indigenous to South Vietnam. It is my hope that more facts on this point will become available and it is my hope that the administration will clarify its position on this point in the interest of facilitating possible negotiations of the controversy.

If negotiations are to be held, it is first necessary to determine the parties who are to be participants. In considering this matter it is pertinent to note that the struggle now underway in Vietnam is, in many respects, but a continuation of the conflict which began after World War II which the Geneva accords of 1954 attempted to resolve. The "settlement" in Geneva involved all of what was generally known as Indochina. Dissident elements in the areas known as Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam were in revolt against the French. Separate cease-fire agreements were reached with respect to each of the three areas, but they were all a part of the same package.

U.S. policy in Vietnam cannot be considered separate and apart from our policy in all of Southeast Asia. If there is to be a political settlement it must be a settlement to which all concerned will subscribe or agree.

No lasting settlement or accommodation can be achieved if negotiations are conducted only among major powers with the thought that the terms upon which the major powers agree can be imposed upon Southeast Asia without regard to the wishes of the people there. In my view, if negotiations are to produce lasting benefit, they must involve discussions at multiple levels.

First, if negotiations are held under any conditions short of total destruction of the Vietcong, it would seem that there will have to be negotiations between the Saigon regime and the National Liberation Front.

At the next level up the scale, negotiations will be required between South Vietnam and North Vietnam for the purpose of resolving whether and under what circumstances the reunification of Vietnam is to become a fact or whether there are to be two permanent sovereign nations.

Negotiations will be required on what may be called the Southeast Asia level including participation by Vietnam—

North and South—Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Burma for the purpose of determining what will be the relationship among these countries and resolving such conflicts as may arise.

Further negotiations between major world powers will be required if there is to be an accommodation with respect to major power interest in Southeast Asia. Without such an accommodation there could be no lasting stability in this area of the world.

Fifth and finally, there should be negotiations at the United Nations level to invoke the seal of world opinion on the overall settlement.

I do not suggest that there should be five different conferences running seriatim or concurrently. It does seem to me, however, that the question of peace in Southeast Asia involves understandings and resolution of problems at each of the levels I have indicated. A settlement dictated from above will surely come unraveled if it merely covers up and does not resolve possible conflicts of interest at each level. The problems of bringing about negotiations in such depth are formidable and challenging, but if we are to avoid the wider war about which concern has been expressed, something along this line will be required.

Another possible reason why there has been no affirmative response to the President's call for negotiations is that Hanoi, Peking and/or the Vietcong—if indeed the Vietcong does have an identity separate from Hanoi—may feel that they do not have sufficiently certain knowledge about our objectives in Vietnam and in Southeast Asia generally. This is not simply a question of whether our official statements are to be believed. I refer rather to the fact that official statements by the President and the Secretary of State are sometimes not specific about the kind of Vietnam we seek or would be willing to accept. Without in any way undertaking to attack the credibility of the administration, I must confess that there is some doubt in my mind about the official position of the United States with respect to some of the subjects upon which it would be necessary to reach agreement if there is to be a meaningful negotiation of the Vietnam problem.

President Johnson has stated on numerous occasions that we seek only limited objectives in Vietnam and that the United States is prepared to participate in "negotiations without preconditions." I, at least, am not sure just what this means. I interpret Presidential pronouncements in this regard to mean that the United States would not insist upon banning discussion of any relevant issue raised by any party to negotiations and that we would not in advance stake out any issues, as many as are negotiable.

I do not see how any statement could be broader in terms of our willingness to discuss anything with anybody at any time, but in essence such statements are of a procedural rather than a substantive nature. They do not constitute a policy or a program for Southeast Asia; rather they reflect, perhaps, our disposition to keep an open mind on any question.

The most concise and complete statement of the U.S. position with respect to negotiations of which I am aware was included in the presentation of the Secretary of State in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In his prepared statement the Secretary outlined the limited nature of our objectives. He disavowed any selfish motive for our involvement in Southeast Asia, and he reiterated the 14 points which, when issued by the Department of State on January 3, were described as "elements which the United States believes can go into peace in Southeast Asia."

The recent statements of President Johnson and Secretary Rusk are ringing. Unfortunately, however, the specifics of what we actually propose as an alternative to a war for total victory in Vietnam are not so clear. By way of illustration I cite the vagueness and ambiguities inherent even to this day in official statements on just what our position is.

First. I have already referred to the lack of clarity in official statements about the role, if any, that would be played by the Vietcong if negotiations are held.

Second. In his statement before the committee, Secretary Rusk said:

> What we seek in South Vietnam is to bring about a restoration of the conditions contemplated by the Accords of 1954.

A somewhat similar statement is incorporated as point No. 1 of the 14 points which outlines our position. Point No. 1 provides:

> The Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962 are an adequate basis for peace in Southeast Asia.

Quite frankly, Mr. President, I do not know what these statements mean. The Geneva accords contained provisions for a cease-fire which were to be followed by free elections throughout Vietnam which were scheduled to be held in 1956 for the purpose of establishing a government in all of Vietnam in accordance with the wishes of the Vietnamese. I will not at this time go into the reasons why these elections were not held, but the fact is that they were not held. And we know why they were not held. The point to which I now address myself is the fact that the Secretary does not now speak of elections to be held throughout Vietnam but only of elections in South Vietnam. This is not what was "contemplated" in the Geneva accords of 1954.

U.S. position with respect to elections is set forth in point 9 of the 14 points. It states as follows:

> We support free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice.

Later in his testimony before the committee, as found on page 655 of the hearings, Secretary Rusk again made it clear that when he spoke of elections he meant elections in South Vietnam.

This is far more than merely an exercise in semantics. It goes to the heart of the question of whether we have in fact totally rejected the concept of reunification contemplated in the Geneva accords in favor of a permanent division of Vietnam into two nations.

Point No. 10 of our 14 points states:

> The question of reunification of Vietnam should be determined by the Vietnamese through their own free decision.

I confess also, Mr. President, that I do not know what this statement means. In the light of Secretary Rusk's testimony, and subsequent statements by President Johnson and the Secretary of State, I do not believe it means that the United States has agreed to endorse and abide by elections to be held throughout Vietnam. Perhaps it may mean that after dual sovereignty is established, the question of reunification should be determined by the people of the two nations acting separately in accordance with the majority will in each.

In my view, it would be helpful if our position on this question were clarified.

Third. Point No. 8 of the 14 points states as follows:

> We do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is assured.

Of course, Mr. President, we do not "desire" to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is assured. But by so stating we do not outline the conditions under which we would agree to withdraw our troops.

Obviously, troops from some source will have to remain in Vietnam for a number of years before peace is assured. Just what do we propose in this regard? Is there perhaps a proper role for the U.N. to play in providing an international security force along the lines of that dispatched to the Middle East to assure that the terms agreed upon at any conference are fulfilled? It seems to me the point is worth developing.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the eloquence of President Johnson and Secretary Rusk, I have neither seen nor heard a clear statement of the kind of settlement we would seek by negotiation if negotiations are held. I doubt if we can realistically expect meaningful negotiations until there is such a statement.

It is perfectly proper to say and to reiterate that we will confer with anybody at any time at any place and about anything. I observe, however, that if discussions are held with no more concrete an agenda than this, they are unlikely to be fruitful. It is said that we cannot afford to lay all of our cards face up on the table lest we be asked to make concession in the interest of reasonable compromise. There is some validity to this argument as a general proposition. If our proposals are fair, however, as I am sure ours would be, and if they were presented from a position of strength, which our forces already in Vietnam assure, there is no reason why we should be called upon to retreat from them.

There is certainly no guarantee that a more precise statement of U.S. objectives would bring our adversaries to the conference table. I believe, however, it is worth trying. We should continue to avoid imposing "conditions" for negotiations, but I believe we should propose more clearly and more precisely the conditions for peace.

We have stumbled into a morass in Vietnam. We must decide to negotiate ourselves out of it. We must decide—decide definitely and irrevocably—to negotiate disengagement from Vietnam, not from Asia but from Vietnam, honorably and honestly, which means, in my opinion, on condition that Vietnam be neutralized.

Having lost our innocence in Vietnam, can we retain our honor? I believe that we can because of the common interests—if we and they can but see them through the smoke and fire of war—that exists even between the North Vietnamese and the people of the United States. Even between antagonists there are common interests—common interests that are forgotten in the heat of war where the first casualty is always truth and the second might be said to be objectivity.

The first common interest we share is a desire and need to end the war. American lives are being lost and American treasure spent, but the North Vietnamese are losing far more. By ending the war, we could save our lives and our precious material resources. But they could save their country.

The second, and more subtle, common interest is that it seems logical to me to assume that neither the North Vietnamese nor, for that matter, the Soviets would want necessarily to see the United States humiliated and bereft of power in Asia, for the result would surely be a surge of Chinese influence throughout the Asian Continent. A peace with honor is, therefore, not only essential for us; it should be essential for North Vietnam as well, if she still clings, as she has clung for a thousand years, to her own nationalism.

Of course, if our vital national interest demands that South Vietnam be a U.S. satellite, we should not try to negotiate neutralization. But, in my view, such is not the case.

There are indications that our position and policy in Vietnam is now under review, or has been under review. Careful review is certainly imperative.

It is disturbing to recall that each time our policy has been reviewed by President Johnson, the result has been a deeper involvement, a further escalation. As we have become more heavily committed, step by step, the problem has become more complex, solutions have become more elusive, and the potential consequences of any course of action have become graver.

This pattern of step by step escalation of our commitment, accompanied with repeated assurances that "we seek no wider war," concerns me greatly, and I am apprehensive that this pattern may now be continued.

We have been told repeatedly that we are in Vietnam only to help the Vietnamese help themselves. This was not to become an American war. But we have gone by successive stages from the extension of economic aid, to military aid, to military "advisers" and technicians, to troops to protect vital American installations, and finally to full-scale offensive commitment of U.S. ground forces and bombing of North Vietnam. It has become an American war, and now involves, we are told, our vital national interests.

From a review of the record, it seems clear to me that we have no legal commitment that requires us to expend the effort we have undertaken in Vietnam. What actual commitment we have there, we have managed to create for ourselves. It is as if, by saying over and over publicly that we are committed to restore order and tranquillity in South Vietnam, we have somehow convinced ourselves that we are legally bound and honor bound to do so, whatever the cost.

In addition to whatever formal legal commitment we may or may not have in Vietnam, there is what is called our moral commitment to assist a people in quest of freedom. Lest we be carried away by this emotional, idealistic appeal, let us remember that there are many other Communist regimes, in China, in Russia—yes, and there is one in Cuba. Our moral commitment to liberate our neighboring people in Cuba should be at least equally strong. Even so, it does not necessarily follow that we should launch a major military effort to overthrow Castro. These indefinite "moral commitments" have their limitations. They must be measured by our own "vital national interest."

In the final analysis, we should be guided by these vital national interests. It has long been my view and, as I have said, it is now my conviction that our national interests are not served by a major military operation in Southeast Asia.

Even if we accept the inevitability of military solutions to cold war problems, it is difficult to imagine more disadvantageous conditions under which to wage war than those which prevail in South Vietnam.

Moreover, we stand virtually alone in the struggle. We have received only token support from a few of our small allies. Other free world nations do not even agree with what we are doing in this unhappy area. They find it difficult to understand why we are there, why we wage war there. It is not that our Government has failed to declaim our position. It is, I believe, simply that they do not believe that either their interests or our vital interests are served by this war. In going it alone, we violate the sound principle of collective security to which we committed ourselves when we subscribed to the United Nations Charter. We cannot, standing alone, remake the world, and it does not serve our vital national interests to try on the scale and under the conditions which prevail in Vietnam.

We must be guided, I submit, by our position and our posture on a global basis, with recognition of the fact that our strength, though greater than that ever enjoyed by any other nation, is not limitless.

As we have become increasingly committed in Vietnam, other pastures look correspondingly greener to our major adversaries. The Soviets were and are tempted, I believe, to encourage trouble in the Middle East by our deep involvment in Vietnam. They may be tempted toward other adventures in Latin America, in the eastern Mediterranean, in Berlin, in Africa, or elsewhere in Asia. If so, our heavy commitment in Vietnam lessens our capability to respond quickly and effectively, or at least the Communists may think so.

Every time the war is escalated, the danger of war with China, and perhaps with Russia, too, increases. If we continue to escalate, such a conflict may well become inevitable. With or without initial Soviet intervention in a United States-China war, such a conflict would almost certainly degenerate into a nuclear war. We could hardly fight the hordes of Chinese on their home grounds without resort at least to tactical nuclear weapons. And when nuclear weapons are used, the very existence of our civilization is in jeopardy.

Mr. President, these are some of the difficulties and some of the dangers we face. From the standpoint of our national interest, the basic question is whether the stakes are sufficiently high to warrant the risks we assume. In my view, they are not.

Once more, I earnestly advise and entreat that this war be kept within bounds which appear manageable, with limited goals and limited commitments, that goal being a tolerable political arrangement that would permit honorable disengagement of U.S. combat forces at the earliest feasible time. Once again, I advise and entreat against a wider war, against a commitment to total military victory in a major war in Asia. Once again, I urge the view that this would be contrary to our true national interest. Here, it seems to me, is the great issue now under debate, as I have said, not only in the U.S. Senate, but also around every fireplace and around every coffee table.

I do not say lightly that we are not serving but disserving our national interests in Vietnam. I say it with the deepest of convictions and would only say so while entertaining such convictions.

Secretary Rusk said last week that "the debate in which we are now involved is essentially a debate about detail." I think that he is quite wrong. We are not debating about "detail" but about the most important questions a nation can debate: Whether its sons are dying for a true cause, whether its leaders perceive or misperceive where the country's vital interests lie, what the present promises for its citizens and the future holds for its heirs. These are the questions that all of us—and particularly those of us here who hold a public trust—must ask ourselves without fear of the consequences.

THE RIGHT TO DISSENT IS A DISTINCTION OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the right to dissent is a distinction of democracy. Difference of opinion has marked every war of our Republic including the Revolution that gave us birth.

Only a third of the colonists fought that war for freedom. One-third remained stanchly loyal to Britain. One-third sat on the sidelines—uncommitted.

History repeats itself. We defend the right peaceably to assemble—even when the dimensions of the assembly are overplayed by our modern miracles of communication. Such was that Washington assembly Saturday.

Some media saw it in its proper light. The Providence Sunday Journal of last

Sunday, in part, made this comment:

> The eyes of the world were on Washington this past weekend. . . . Both those who marched and those who watched or read should remember that the right peaceably to assemble and protest is not a license to abuse the rights of others, to interfere with the operations of a city or to hamstring the functioning of our government. The right peaceably to assemble and protest carries the responsibility of doing just that—and only that.
>
> If the demonstration had held within peaceful bounds, the guard would have been superfluous—but there was disorder—and there was no choice but to bring it under control.

Now, the majority of the marchers were peaceable—and the militant minority only damaged their cause—and brought shame on themselves—and shame on all of us if the world thinks that they represent America.

One commentator declared it "was difficult to repeat publicly the ugly and vulgar provocations of many of the militants. They spat upon some of the soldiers of the front line at the Pentagon and goaded them with the most vicious personal insults."

And these soldiers—thus vilified—might be your sons—obeying the command—serving at the post of duty.

What the post of duty means to a soldier—and to his father—is exemplified in a letter I had the honor to receive this past week.

Above all the headlines of hate—above all the mad marches of the misguided—above all the voices of violence—to turn from the spit-stained walls of the Pentagon to the beauty of this letter is to find a faith in America refreshed and renewed.

Mr. President, there is evident between the lines of a letter from a father's heart an exhortation of patriotism and pride in his fellow men. I am honored to read to the Senate this father's letter.

> PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
> *October 12, 1967.*
>
> DEAR SIR: First may I extend my sincere thanks for your assistance a year or more ago, when at that time, I asked your help in determining, due to an ear injury, whether my son a member of the United States Marine Corps, was fit for combat duty.

Mr. President, the next two paragraphs are complimentary to me. They are not pertinent to the point I wish to make and, therefore, I shall skip them and I shall now read the next paragraph:

> It has been a good many months since you were of such tremendous help to me. I thought you might be interested in knowing that my son, this boy whom you did so much for, has just returned home to Providence on a 30 day leave.
>
> He has volunteered to return to Viet Nam and leaves Providence on Nov. 4th to return directly to his outfit in the Third Marine Division where he has been stationed in the D.M.Z. for the past 15 months. He has been at the Marine outpost at Con Thien. He returned home with two Purple Hearts. The first time he was hit he was flown to the hospital ship Repose where he spent 35 days and then flown back to his outfit just below the border zone.
>
> His second wound was from a poisoned bamboo stake which penetrated the sole of his shoe when he dropped into a hole the VC had set up with these poisoned stakes sticking up in the hole.
>
> I am neither a Dove nor a Hawk, and must admit that I have been, and still am very confused as to our policies in Viet Nam. However one thing I am sure of, leaving aside our policies, I can now state that there is no doubt in my mind as to whether or not we should be there. After spending many long hours, late into the night, talking to my son, talking about all phases of Viet Nam I am firmly convinced that we have no choice—we belong there—we can't pull out. We have to see this through to the end.
>
> I have given my only son to this cause, he has been returned to me for 30 short days, at the end of this leave he will return to Viet Nam. There is a very good possibility that we will never see him again. I think therefore I can speak with authority. I am convinced that he should go back. Just as I am sure that while we don't have a solution, we have got to keep going, there can be no wavering, there can be no indecision, we need neither Doves nor Hawks.
>
> It is very easy for a person to get up on the floor of the Senate and criticize, but what constructive substitute is this person offering to help our cause? There is no one who has more at stake in this Viet Nam affair than I have.
>
> I have a tremendous amount of respect for you, the President, and all the others who have the weight of responsibility for solving Viet Nam on their shoulders. There have been mistakes made in the past and there will certainly be more made in the future.
>
> None of us are God, we are all from the President on down just human beings, who will make human mistakes, wrong judgments, and all the other weaknesses that make us human.
>
> All we need is a firm determination that we are right, a united front, and a will to win, with these three simple things the more complicated solution to this Viet Nam problem will come in time. A return to the idea of my country right or wrong wouldn't be a bad start.
>
> I only wish there was some way that I could get across to our vacillating country that our biggest enemy is not the V.C. or the Chinese, or the Russians. It is simply our own lack of determination, will to win, and whole hearted support of our President and our duly elected representatives.
>
> Very truly yours,
> FREDERICK B. JOHNSON.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, would the clerk restate the first committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will restate the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the word "thereof," strike out "November 23, 1967" and insert "November 15, 1967."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 416

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that the clerk read it for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will first report the second committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on page 1, line 6, strike the following language:

> And by adding the following language:
>
> "Provided further that for fiscal year 1968, unless hostilities in Viet Nam and Southeast Asia should cease earlier, Federal spending of appropriated funds except expenditures from trust funds by each Department and Agency of government, including the Legislative and Judicial branches, except for military expenditures of the Department of Defense directly related to our involvement in Southeast Asia, including pay of all military personnel, the payment of interest on the National Debt, payments under the Social Security Act, veterans and other retirement benefits, medicare and old age assistance payments, shall not exceed the amount expended during fiscal year 1967, except that the limitation on the Department of Transportation shall not be more than 95 per centum of the Budgeted amount for 1968. Provided further that where deemed necessary to maintain mail service, the President is authorized to exempt the Post Office Department from the provisions of this Act; and provided further, should the President deem it necessary for collection of revenue, he is authorized to exempt, to the extent necessary, the Internal Revenue and Customs Services.
>
> "Provided further that such reduction of expenditures insofar as practical may be made by stretching out the time schedule of performance and payment on contracts so as not to require the elimination of new construction starts, and by each Department and Agency not filling vacancies.
>
> "Provided further, that net aggregate administrative budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 shall not exceed $131,500,000,000, except by those expenditures in excess of $22 billion that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia.
>
> "Provided further, that appropriations made by Public Law 90–102, as amended, shall be available for activities budgeted under 'Office of Economic Opportunity, Economic Opportunity Program' at a rate not in excess of that which would be provided for by an appropriation of $1,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.
>
> "SEC. . Obligations during the period by section 1 hereof for activities to be authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 (S. 1872 or similar legislation) shall not exceed an annual rate of $2,000,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will now state the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment on page 1, line 6, beginning with the word "and", insert the following:

> SEC. 2. (a) Subsequent to the enactment into law during the first session of the Ninetieth Congress of the appropriation bills for fiscal year 1968, the executive branch is directed, subject to subsection (b), to reduce

by at least 5 per centum each line item appropriation (other than appropriations for military functions and those items determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget not to be subject to administrative control) contained in such bills.

(b) In order to provide for the most effective use of appropriations reduced in accordance with subsection (a), the President may make such transfers between appropriation accounts as may be necessary, but no such transfer shall cause any item of appropriation to be increased to an amount in excess of the amount provided in the appropriation bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as I said in the Senate yesterday, in discussing in detail the amendment which I mentioned I would offer today, the purport of my amendment is simply to add to the continuing resolution, in which we have just agreed now to the date in November, a meaningful manifestation and an effective effort to associate the Senate of the United States with the House of Representatives in its efforts to bring about economy in this period of perilous inflation. So my amendment would mean, in addition to extending the date to shortly before Thanksgiving, that we would also include instructions to the President that we want a 5-percent cut in appropriations of those controllable expenditures which are listed in the committee report and in the hearings, and where it is possible to bring about these economies.

In order to be abundantly sure that this is done in an effective and efficient manner, it provides, in the second paragraph, that the President shall have the right to exercise limited transferability; so that if there is, in his opinion, and on the basis of information provided by his expert advisers, certain particular line items which could not be cut by 5 percent without damage to our national security, such as the FBI, for example, or which would do damage, perhaps, to a situation such as we confront with the constantly increasing number of veterans being handled by the Veterans' Administration, a lesser cut, or no cut at all, could be made in those areas, and a larger cut in other areas where economies can be very definitely implemented. So that the overall picture is a 5-percent cut, as against a basic factor of $38 billion to $40 billion in controllable expenditures. This would mean that we would instruct the White House to bring about a further cutback of $1.9 billion or $2 billion, as against the appropriation levels passed by the Congress of the United States.

In brief, this amendment offers the Senate an opportunity to join with the House in an effective effort to bring about some order in our fiscal policies, which everybody now realizes have gotten so far out of hand that we face the necessity, as the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has said so eloquently this afternoon, of having to pass a big tax surcharge. Even with that, the tax money so raised would amount to only as much as my amendment would permit to be saved, when we totalize it in terms of economy effectuated by the Congress.

Mr. President, if conditions are bad enough to justify increases in taxes, they are bad enough to justify some economies being implemented by this Congress first; and if we did both, we would be bringing about a situation providing perhaps $12 billion in a saving of expenditures as against a $26 billion projected deficit for this fiscal year. So we would still be well over 50 percent beyond the anticipated deficit which the President of the United States announced was going to be the result of his budget when he gave us his budgetary message last January and told us we would confront only an $8 billion deficit.

I believe the country wants, and it is very obvious because of its action that the House wants, and I think the Senate should want, this particular Congress to do something to meet these challenges. I think we ought to have less spending, and I think the country wants less spending, less deficit spending, in this era of war. I think we ought to provide action to create less inflation. I think that is imperative if we are not to impose upon the poor people of this country, and those with fixed incomes, the elderly, and those on the farms and ranches who have little protection against it, what the President has rightfully called the cruelest tax of all—the tax of inflation—because the effect of inflation is exactly like that of a tax increase. It reduces the purchasing power of the householder. It reduces the purchasing power of every citizen of this country precisely as though a national sales tax had been imposed, to reduce the capacity of his earning power and his resources to supply the needs of his family.

Mr. President, I think the country is tired—just dog tired—of this Congress and this administration following any longer the hypocritical theory which originated with Harry Hopkins when he said they were proposing to spend and spend and spend and tax and tax and tax. I thought we had had enough of that Harry Hopkins era, but we are right back to it again, and somebody has to break this logjam.

I think the country is sick and tired of this buckpassing between the President and the Congress. My proposal involves a joint effort. It is—I repeat—a good faith amendment. If we are to bring about any economies, we will not get them by Congress begging the President to tell us what economies he is going to bring about before we pass a tax bill. We are not going to bring economies about by having the President say, "Pass a tax bill and, some day, I will surprise you by telling you how I will effectuate some economies." We have had this stalemate for over a month. The time has come to break it and get action. This is a joint effort; this is a cooperative effort; this is not a buckpassing effort. This tests the sincerity of the White House, as it tests the sincerity of the Congress. Do we want to economize or do we simply want to talk about it some more with happy and pious and meaningless phrases?

The statistics are about as follows. The Congress has economized to the extent of about $2 billion on the appropriation bills which we have thus far enacted, which means that we have given the President about $2 billion less than he requested. That is an economy brought about by congressional action. On the remaining appropriation bills that are in conference or that have not yet been enacted, it is hoped we can save another $2 billion or perhaps $3 billion. This means that we expect to reduce the Presidential requests by a total effort of from $4 to $5 billion.

By this amendment we will slash back from controllable expenditures approximately another $2 billion. So we will wind up with a total congressional saving, if my amendment is adopted, as against the budgetary requests of the President, of between $6 and $7 billion. That is almost the precise amount the President says he will get by taking it away from the taxpayers with a 10-percent surtax, if Congress makes it possible for him to do so.

I think the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] makes good sense when he says we may have to do more than recognize the $2 billion we have saved, the $2 to $3 billion we would expect to save, in the remaining appropriation bills, and the $2 billion to be saved by the Mundt amendment. We may still face a tax bill and the necessity of passing one, because the fires of inflation are burning hotter every day. Pick up any newspaper; ask any financial economist. This country is flirting with financial disaster while Congress and the President engage in meaningless buckpassing and counteraccusations as to who should initate economy.

The House has met that challenge. The House has proposed to cut out an amount roughly estimated to be $7 billion by adopting an amendment the ramifications of which nobody can define accurately.

The testimony before the Senate Committee on Appropriations is in the hearings. As I said yesterday, I hope every Senator will read the hearings before he votes on these decisions, because the hearings are a small package of about 85 pages. The most meaningful discussions begin at page 49 and end at page 73. What occurred prior to that was merely the old drama of buckpassing.

Director Schultze was saying, "You cannot economize in this way; you cannot economize in that way. You cannot take that course of action. The House action is wrong here; it is dangerous there, it is discriminatory there."

Finally, I said, "Mr. Director, we have been listening for 2 days to the dirge of 'do nothing.' Do you or do you not belive that the Nation faces a financial crisis?"

He said, "Yes," because he is an honest man.

I said, "Look ahead. Let us throw away the big, composite basket of nyets and noes and try to find some way in which we can light a little candle in the darkness and move down the road to economy."

We had the able assistance of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. His questions are in the hearings. He induced the Director of the Budget, finally, to list the items, the agencies, the activities, and the functions of the bureaus and departments of the Government which have a total of almost $40 billion which is controllable by reductions; where there are no fixed charges; where there would be no effect on veterans' pensions or interest on the national debt; but on which we can work and as to which we can tailor some kind of economy measure.

So I urge my fellow Senators not to delay longer. This is almost the end of October. We have been talking about economy for more than 10 months. Now we have a chance to do something specific about it. The era of conversation should be past, and the period of action should be here.

I do not think it is the proper approach to take the House action per se, and lock up in conference with no flexibility and no right of review a $7 billion cut spontaneously initiated on the floor of the House of Representatives. My proposal will give us some flexibility of action.

It will provide an opportunity for review and careful analysis. We will put the Senate of the United States on record in favor of economy, just as the House has been put on record, and will take to conference those messages from both Houses. We will meet in the old U.S. Supreme Court Chamber. We will have the whole picture before us. We will have the record of definite action by the House membership before us. We will have the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee, which was another approach to a cut, before us. We will have this proposed amendment before us, and, within the broad boundaries of those limitations on the conference committee, we will have just one simple directive: "When you come back, do not come back with just a continuing resolution that says 'Mr. Taxpayer, we ducked the issue, we delayed the decision; we do not want to face up to the facts.' Come back with some economies included."

We will be under a mandate from both Houses of Congress saying, "Do something about some economy. Do not wait until November 15, when it is too late to make any appropriate deductions, to make that decision which you should make now, but sit there in conference until you come up with a continuation resolution which has some meaningful words in terms of reducing Federal expenditures."

I think that one big merit of my approach is that it does not lock any doors. It does not freeze anything into a fixed formula. It enables us to bring in the Director of the Budget, the Comptroller General, and the heads of agencies, and search out some places where we can make cuts with the least pain and agony to the public and the country generally and which are most conducive to the public interest.

I am not saying we can make cuts that nobody will oppose, or that we can expect to find some happy places where we have been so reckless in our expenditures that we can save a couple of billion dollars completely painlessly. But we have to have a priority list. We begged and pleaded and tried as hard as we could to persuade the Director of the Budget to suggest some priorities, and we were unsuccessful.

But my amendment provides complete flexibility of action. We can rewrite the approach; we can fix the amounts; we can expand or decrease the limit of transferability; we can raise or decrease the economy percentages; we can take the House amendment; we can take the amendment of the House Appropriations Committee; or we can take the Mundt amendment but we cannot come back and say, "No, our colleagues of the House and the Senate, we have ignored your mandate for economy and we are just going to keep on spending." For there will be a mandate from both Houses to economize.

So my amendment, first of all, puts a mandate on the U.S. Senate for some belt tightening.

Second, Mr. President, I am not going to vote simply for a continuing resolution, even if I am the only Senator to vote "No," because to do that is to repudiate and reject the House of Representatives, which, by a majority of 110 votes, said, "We want some major economies"; and they enacted it into their bill and sent it over to us. I shall not be among those who would say to our colleagues in the House of Representatives, "You do not know what you are talking about, saving. That is an old fashioned notion. What do you mean by passing something to save some money?"

I salute the House Members for their effort. I applaud them for the diligence with which they approached the problem. I think there are some errors in their approach. We should approach the matter with the greatest degree of skill and efficiency possible. But I am not going to repudiate their efforts to bring about some economy by saying, "Oh, no, we in the Senate say, 'Just continue the resolution to November 15 and go on record as asking for no economy at all.'" Count me out when that rollcall comes. I will be voting a perhaps very lonely "No."

Third, this gives the Senate a positive approach, a positive formula for action, rather than continuing a do-nothing attitude of negativism, whereby we simply postpone and defer decisions which we actually should have been making 2 months ago, if not 4 months ago. We have run out of waiting time; because we are approaching the end of this session of Congress and of this calendar year.

I point out again that this amendment would provide us with latitude, in conjunction with a directive of both Houses of Congress to meet in conference and bring back to both Houses for further consideration the approach recommended by the conference for economizing in this particular session of Congress, and with this particular budget.

Mr. President, if the Senate has the will to economize—and I do not know; I have heard the speeches, but I suppose we are going to have to test it with a vote—but if the Senate has the will, this is a way. I am talking only about the Mundt amendment. I am talking about the fact that we will have placed before this council of our elders, the ranking members of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, meeting in conference together, a mandate to cut back on expenditures now.

That is the way. I repeat, if we have the will, this is the way; this is the place; and now is the hour. Let no one delude himself into saying, "I will just vote for a continuing resolution now, as I did in October and as I did in September, and then maybe just before Thanksgiving Day, we can settle the whole thing on some sunny afternoon."

That cannot be done. It will take some time. It takes time to establish priorities. It takes time to study and rationalize the differences between the two Houses. So above all, I hope we do not duck the issue this time when we vote today or tomorrow.

Some criticisms of my amendment have been raised, Mr. President. I share in the criticism. It is not a perfect approach. I suppose one reason why, at this late hour, we are still scrounging around trying to find the answer is that there are no perfect approaches. A lot of good men and true have been working on the problem, planning on it, and trying out amendments; but there is no perfect way to reduce expenditures. There is no painless way.

But it can be done, with prudence. It can be done, with skill. It can be done, after careful examination—if we have got the will to do it. We cannot do it by delaying the decision to November 15 or some other magic date.

If some Senator comes up with some other proposal, during the course of the debate, which will supplement mine, or improve it and help to accomplish the objective with prudence, efficiency, and effectiveness, I shall support that proposal. My amendment, I am convinced, would be a move in the correct direction.

Some have said, "Ah, this is a Presidential item veto." They recall speeches that I have made on the floor of the Senate against the item veto by the President.

I am against the concept of a Presidential item veto. I opposed it when President Eisenhower suggested it. I oppose it now. I opposed it for 10 years in the House of Representatives, and have opposed it for 19 years in the Senate. I shall continue to oppose it is a modus operandi for financing the Government in ordinary times and as permanent prevailing policy.

But we face an emergency. Make no mistake about that. I oppose appropriating great amounts of money for military events which do not occur. But when we are in a war, I vote for the appropriations and support them, just as I shall vote to meet this emergency on the home front as it confronts us here and now.

Mr. President, for those who are leery about the fact that our old Senate colleague, President Johnson, is going to single out some of those who vote for economy now and say: "All right. You asked for it. Here it is—all in your State, all on your project, all on those special programs with which you are associated."

I said yesterday and repeat now—Republican partisan though I am—that I do not believe President Lyndon Johnson would play ball that way. I do not think he would engage in that practice. I do not think he would try to victimize those who are concerned that if they vote for economy they will lose something for their State. I believe he would not stoop to such tactics. He might, and he could, of course. But woe and alas I discovered that he can do it anyhow. He can do it now.

I am going to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this juncture an extract from Public Law 759 of the 81st Congress, enacted in 1951, at which time we gave the President the right to exercise essentially an item veto in connection with mandates of economy which we directed to him.

The President has been exercising it at times. We have not all agreed with the decisions he has made. Some have complained that he does not have the constitutional right. I do not know about the constitutional right, but he has the legislative right because we gave it to him.

The Senate can reject my amendment unanimously, but it would not by such action take away that right. If somebody wants to repeal that law, let him speak up now and advocate it. Otherwise my amendment would neither decrease or increase his power over our appropriations.

If rescission of that power is advocated in normal financial times, I will join in the advocacy of such a proposal. I doubt that I would vote to repeal now this concession which we have made because of the perils we are today confronting on the fiscal front.

It is under the apportionment process. Let me read it.

Generally speaking, all appropriated funds must be apportioned to the Bureau of the Budget before they are available for obligation by the agency to which appropriated.

Section 665(c)(1) of title 31 of the United States Code provides:

> Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental apppropriations for such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, . . ., shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof.

And we added a new paragraph reading:

> In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or *to effect savings* whenever savings are made possible, . . .

It is through this procedure that the executive department exercises control over appropriations granted by the Congress.

We are all familiar with the Presidential withholding of funds and delaying of funds and postponement of funds which have been appropriated. So, I submit that while reference is often made to the constitutional aspects with respect to the exclusive right of the Executive to make use of the appropriations granted by Congress, there is statutory authority cited by the statute. So it is no longer necessary to resort to a constitutional argument, at least until such time as Congress decides to repeal the authority which we have freely and meticulously conveyed, and it is a part of the law today and has been since 1951.

If some Senators are still skeptical, if they are still worriers about the fact that if they vote for economy, they will lose an apple off a tree in their own backyard, let me point out that even then Congress has not surrendered its weapon.

Suppose the President should do that—which I am sure he will not do—in a vindictive spirit, to try to penalize especially those who advocate economy. Would that leave us powerless? It would not.

The last bill we will pass, Mr. President, before we adjourn—if we ever do adjourn this year—will probably be the final supplemental appropriation bill. Usually, it keeps us here until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning because it is the last thing that comes up.

If the President should unwisely and unfairly and unncessarily or vindictively slash some appropriation which should not be slashed, the same Congress that giveth is the Congress that can taketh away. And we can shore up that appropriation with a supplemental at that time.

If the President were to do this after we had adjourned—when we do adjourn, late in November or some time in December in time for New Year's Eve, or whenever it is—one of the first bills that we would pass in 1968 would be a supplemental appropriation bill for the new year, and we can correct the situation then.

So, I say to my friends that they should not worry about this. This is a good-faith amendment. This is a fair-play amendment. This is not trying to slip a Mickey Finn to the President. It is not trying to gain any advantage for Congress. It does not expand the existing Executive authority.

It merely states that working in harness under this kind of approach we can do something to save the taxpayers some money. Perhaps we can stop the tremendous drive toward inflation. Maybe we can provide for a delay in the institution of a tax bill. I do not know. That is a matter for the Finance Committee to decide. But my amendment provides for a cooperative effort.

There is not any way that the President can take advantage of this Congress even though he has this amendment and the directed authority outlined in it. The authority has been there now for 16 years.

Presidents have tried once or twice to stop certain activities of Congress by the exercise of a strong Executive arm, and Congress has changed their opinion and made different decisions. We can do it again. We still control the purse.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that some of the news stories and editorial comments which I read about the U.S. Senate disturb me because I would hate to think they are true. I cannot believe they are true. But they picture us as a body of spenders engaged in squandermania. They do not realize that when the House passes a bill and it comes here several months later, new authorizations have been added and new conditions have arisen and we frequently have to add more money.

It has been said on the other side of the Capitol: "The Senate is the Upper House. We in the House economize, and the Senators load on extra expenditures." It is not true. But this time we confront a challenge which might make it ring pretty true and might in fact make it true since they took this courageous step—and it was not easy in the House—but they made this meritorious effort to economize and in return we say: "Forget it. We laugh at you. We are just going to continue in the merry old way we have been going." I suspect that the editorials and the comments will get worse if we are guilty of such evasion and inaction.

Here is a UPI story. It says:

> The Senate Appropriations Committee junked a House-passed economy ultimatum to President Johnson Friday and approved a simple extension of spending authority for fundless government agencies.

I do not know whether we junked it. It was turned down with four dissenting votes. We failed, but we tried to tie in an alternative proposal. We lost the first time on a 10-to-10 tie vote. We lost the second time by a vote of 14 to 8. But I do not want to have the United States Senate plead guilty to the fact that if we now do nothing at all we are junking an economy effort made by the House.

Perhaps we can modify it. Perhaps we can improve it. Perhaps we can alter it. But I pray you, let us not junk it. At least, we are not guilty, I hope, of that particular definition of junketeria.

Second, here is an editorial from the Sunbury Daily Item of Sunbury, Pa. It is typical of a good many which have come to my desk in recent days.

I am not sure where Sunbury, Pa., is, but I am sure this is a well-read newspaper published in a fine American community.

It starts out by discussing the financial situation of this country and the various proposals. It then quotes our distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Delaware, as say: "Never before in history has any man in the White House said so much about economy and done so little about it."

If the Senator from Delaware said it, it must be true. But if we here in the Senate do nothing about this now, the editorial can change a couple of words and say: "Never before in the history of this country has the U.S. Senate talked so much about economy and done so little about it." I should hate to have that happen but if it is true of one, it is true of the other. This is the test.

I ask unanimous consent that the UPI story and the editorial from the Sunbury Daily Item be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE PANEL KILLS BUDGET ULTIMATUM

WASHINGTON.—The Senate Appropriations Committee junked a House-passed economy ultimatum to President Johnson Friday and approved a simple extension of spending authority for fundless government agencies.

However, the action came after a 10–10 tie vote defeated a proposal for five percent across-the-board cuts. In line with the House demand, it would have forced spending cuts of about $1 billion in the current fiscal year.

The five-percent proposal, aimed at $38

billion worth of programs where government spending is not locked in by legal requirements, was offered by Sen. Karl E. Mundt, R-S.D. Committee Republicans said they will try again when the Senate considers the stop-gap appropriation legislation next week.

The extension of spending authority for government agencies to Nov. 15 was finally approved 16 to 4. No vote was taken on the House-approved economy action which would make it mandatory to hold non-Vietnam spending to last year's levels.

[From the Sunbury (Pa.) Daily Item, Oct. 10, 1967]

THOUGHTS IN PASSING

Honest confession is good for the soul, but there is no apparent inclination on the part of the Johnson administration to humbly acknowledge that reckless, at times witless spending has gotten out of control.

Why a proposed reduction of $5 billion in proposed expenditures of $135 billion during the fiscal year has created such agony and led to such palpable evasion of responsibility is not readily understood by the average citizen. A householder with an allotment of $135 who could not readily find ways of economizing to the extent of $5 would be considered inept. The great difference between those who loosely handle the public's money and those who spend what is left to them after tax grabs is that the former considers the sky the limit and the average citizen knows from harsh experience that he cannot endlessly permit outgo to exceed income—that always there comes a day of reckoning.

The shocking record of the Johnson administration recently cited by Senator John J. Williams of Delaware, involves deficit spending in the amount of $60 billion during the past five years, notwithstanding the fact that budget levels have gone up and up and up. This means an average expenditure of more than $50 million a day over and above tax receipts. Also interest charges on this added debt amounts to $3 billion a year which requires three per cent across-the-board in income taxes, or nearly one third of the ten per cent tax boost now sought of Congress. Even so, the national debt pyramid, now at the $334 billion level, is in for another elevation due to another projected deficit—at least $29 billion unless the Johnson demand for a 10 per cent tax hike is granted.

Ways of reducing federal spending are numerous, but wielding the meat axe has political implications that both the White House and the Congress shun like the plague. In this hiatus savings of only $2.86 billion have been toted up by the House Appropriations Committee and the painful quest drags on. Action Wednesday night for a $7 billion cut, the President to do the paring, is one more abdication of responsibility.

As Senator Williams says, "Never before in history has any man in the White House said so much about economy and done so little about it." Typical was the promise Mr. Johnson made in December, 1965 to reduce federal payrolls by 25,000, followed in the next seven months by the addition of 187,506 jobholders. Also there was the recommended elimination of certain excise taxes in January, 1966, followed two weeks later by reinstatement of those levies.

As the people grow poorer under the double pressure of taxation and inflation produced by spendthrift policies, honest confession is the point of beginning for what the nation needs.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall desist now, with the determination to resume if anything is to be gained by debating the matter further; but I desist with one repetitious plea: I hope Senators will read the RECORD. I hope Senators will read the painful procedures by which it was finally possible to evolve a percentage formula for bringing about some economy. Those who live in the optimistic opinion that we can just duck the issue now and meet it again on November 15, when much of the money will have been spent, should read what Director Schultze said about the long and tortuous process of arriving at a priority list.

It took me a half hour or 45 minutes to get him to agree at all that it could ever be done, and then he calculated the time in periods of weeks that it would take, and they would have to know the entire financial picture at the time they began, and then once again relay to Congress any recommendations they might make. But time will not wait—we cannot stop the calendar. That process would take us deep into 1968 before decision time arrives again.

This is salutary reading. I believe every Senator should read the RECORD of this debate and the hearings before he makes up his mind on the issues now before the Senate.

Mr. President, reserving the right to resume, I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I agree completely with the Senator from South Dakota that the Senate does have a responsibility to demonstrate not only to itself and the House of Representatives but also to the country that we, too, recognize the seriousness of our fiscal situation and are willing to do something about it.

As I understand the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota it would reduce the appropriations by $1.8 billion. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator's understanding is reasonably accurate. It is a sort of flexible figure which can vary, depending upon what we do with the remaining appropriations bill, but it will save between $1.8 billion and $2 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding.

The original resolution as passed by the House proposed a reduction in expenditures of $6,820,000,000. If we accept the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota and reject the House amendment we would reduce expenditures by $1.8 billion rather than $6.8 billion.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. It would not mean that. It would mean that we had proposed an alternative approach to economy which would effectuate from $1.8 billion to $2 billion of economy now, but in conference would also be the $6.8 billion proposal of the House. And I presume that some place between the two, after careful examination of all the facts, would be the point of compromise and agreement which we would bring back to the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Conceivably, they could bring back the complete text of the House proposal, or, conceivably, they could accept only the amendment agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. Or any place between.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Or any place between, as the Senator points out.

The Mundt amendment is a step in the right direction, but I question that it goes far enough. I believe we have reached the point at which we will have to cut these appropriations until it hurts each of us by eliminating projects in our respective States. We cannot escape that situation if we really want to reduce expenditures.

As I pointed out today, in earlier action on 13 appropriation bills the Senate has added a total of $4,055,148,620 of spending money over and above that which was approved by the House of Representatives, and these same bills as passed by the Senate were $3,175,648,998 above the appropriations for these same agencies in 1967.

It is true that they were somewhat below the 1968 budget requests. The pending Mundt amendment would reduce this amount by $1.8 billion, but I believe we will have to go further than this if we are to avoid a painful tax increase or if we want to check this inflationary threat.

On September 26, 1967, Representative Bow introduced his proposal which would have accounted for a reduction of $5 billion in spending authority for fiscal 1968. I will read his first resolution:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, net aggregate administrative budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 shall not exceed $131,500,000,000; except by those Department of Defense expenditures beyond $72,300,000,000 for military purposes that the President may determine are necessary.

Continuing, the second section provides for a rescission of the $5-billion obligational authority which would result from this reduction in expenditures.

The Bow amendment, as proposed on that date, would have provided for a reduction in expenditures of approximately $5 billion. The same proposal or a similar one was included in the pending resolution as it was passed by the House. This original Bow amendment had been amended on the floor of the House to bring the total reduction to $6.8 billion.

We now have a parliamentary situation in which if the Senate supports the Mundt amendment, with its proposed cut of $1.8 billion, it would strike out the proposal of the House and send the bill to conference with a cut of only $1.8 billion.

This is a difference of about $5 billion; however, if the Senate will attach the Bow amendment to the Mundt amendment it would then mean that the Senate would be on record in favor of reducing the 1968 expenditures by around $6.8 billion, or about the same amount as approved by the House of Representatives.

The Senate prides itself upon being recognized as the Upper House, but let us not make that title symbolic of the Senate's "upping" of expenditures. Thus far the Senate has a poor record in this Congress when it comes to reducing expenditures; this is a chance for us to redeem ourselves.

I believe that we should add the Bow amendment to this pending proposal and demonstrate that the Senate, likewise, is willing to cut expenditures. Why pass this responsibility on to the conferees or the

House of Representatives? Let us accept it right here.

I realize, as the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, that we are conferring upon the President certain discretionary power over where these cuts will be made. I regret the necessity for doing this, but we have no choice. We are now in the position where most of the appropriation bills have cleared the Senate and are in conference. This may be our last chance.

Therefore, I suggest that we amend the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to include the original Bow amendment, as introduced on September 26. This proposal was approved by the House by an overwhelming vote. Its adoption would provide for an additional reduction in expenditures of $5 billion. If we add this proposal to the Mundt amendment we would then go to conference with a proposal calling for a reduction of $6.8 billion.

This is just about the same amount as the reduction approved by the House.

This is the Senate's chance to tell the country that we really intend to check these ever-increasing expeditures.

It should be pointed out that if we accept the Bow amendment, which I shall offer, spending in fiscal 1968 would be reduced not to exceed $131.5 billion. The expenditures in fiscal 1967 were approximately $126.5 billion. This means that while there would be a saving of around $5 billion, at the same time the administration could still spend $5 billion more than it spent last year. This would certainly provide leeway enough.

In addition, the amendment provides an exception that if Department of Defense expenditures go beyond $72.3 billion for military purposes and the President determines it is necessary to increase such expenditures he will have the authority to do so. There would not be a ceiling on expenditures necessary to finance the Vietnam war. That is true also of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

If this amendment is approved, however, as an addition to the Mundt amendment it would reduce expenditures by a total of between $6.5 billion and $7 billion. By so doing, we would demonstrate to the country that we are making a bona fide effort to roll back expenditures before we act on a tax bill.

I do not think there is any question but that the Senate will have to face up to the responsibility of making a decision on taxes before Congress adjourns. At least, we should face up to such a decision and decide the question, either affirmatively or negatively. Earlier this afternoon I discussed the reasons why I thought such action was necessary, so I shall not labor the Senate further on that point now.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] proposes an amendment, at the end of the language proposed to be inserted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], to insert the following:

"SEC. 105. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, net aggregate administrative budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 shall not exceed $131,500,000,000; except by those Department of Defense expenditures beyond $72,300,000,000 for military purposes that the President may determine are necessary.

"SEC. 106. Not later than ten days after the last day of the first session of the Ninetieth Congress, estimated administrative budget expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 shall be reduced, through the apportionment process, by $5,000,000,000 (the difference between currently anticipated administrative budget expenditures for fiscal year 1968 of $136,500,000,000 and $131,500,000,000). Obligational authority in an amount equal to the $5,000,000,000 reduction in expenditures shall no longer remain available, and such sum shall be covered into the Treasury."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this is identical to the Bow amendment as introduced on September 20, 1967, and it would provide for an additional $5 billion reduction in expenditures for 1968. This is in line with the action taken last week by the House.

I am willing that there be a vote, and, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it does not seem to me that we are going to enhance the stature of the Senate very much if we have a vote on an unwritten amendment of this magnitude and complexity without having a chance to examine it in print; nor do I think we are really measuring up to our statute if we vote on either of these amendments until they have been discussed before at least more than a dozen Senators. More than twice as many as have heard this debate discussed the matter in the Committee on Appropriations. We have perhaps a dozen Senators in the Chamber and most of those who are now present are members of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not think Senators should make up their minds on this issue by perhaps flipping nickels as they come over to the Chamber from their offices.

Before voting on an item that has not been printed, and that involves the entire financial structure of the Government, I urge that we cease and desist until tomorrow, and then the amendment will be printed, and we could hopefully have at least one-third of the Senators present to determine what we can best do to avoid bankruptcy. I do not want to vote today until Senators have had a chance to read the RECORD. This is not fair to them, and this is not fair to future generations of taxpayers in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have no objection to this amendment's being carried over until tomorrow. I point out, however, that this is not a new proposal. It is identical to that made by Representative Bow on September 20, which proposal later passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote. It is a part of the pending resolution, House Joint Resolution 888, which is presently before the Senate and which was considered by the Committee on Appropriations. Hearings were held. My amendment would carry out exactly that part of the Bow amendment which is included in House Joint Resolution 888 but which would be stricken by the Mundt amendment.

The amendment which I am introducing does not include the Whitten amendment which was added on the floor in the House of Representatives. This is the Bow amendment which is referred to in the printed hearings which are on the desk of every Senator.

There is nothing new in this proposal. It just puts the Senate in a parliamentary situation whereby we can get a direct vote on the proposal passed by the House of Representatives last week.

AMENDMENT NO. 422

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate, but I want to send to the desk an amendment and to have it printed—and I may desire to call it up tomorrow—which is somewhat similar to the Williams amendment but not subject, perhaps, to some of the technical differences which may exist.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, frankly, I think there is a great deal to support what the Senator from South Dakota has said at the moment. Many of us came to the Chamber earlier this afternoon and we were prepared to proceed on this matter and to stay on the matter all afternoon. We immediately got involved in one speech that was pertinent and another speech that was not pertinent to the business at hand.

Having spent a great many hours in the Committee on Appropriations these last few weeks with both the majority party and the minority party on this matter, I think that is one of the gravest matters concerning us.

Frankly, I am concerned about some of the implications of the Mundt amendment, but I am just as concerned about the resolution as it is reported from the Committee on Appropriations because after receiving from the House a resolution which I believe in its actual and practical aspects is unworkable, but nevertheless exhibiting on the part of the House a desire to confront themselves with the very critical fiscal situation in this country, I think this matter needs a good deal of airing and explanation.

I returned to my office this afternoon when we got into these extraneous matters and I became involved with some matters touching my constituents and I did not get back to the Senate Chamber even in time to hear the statement of the Senator from South Dakota.

However, I personally feel that the Senate would be subject to a great deal of dereliction if we sent to the House of Representatives a continuing resolution after their great effort over there to show their concern with the fiscal situation in this country, even though we modify that resolution and put in the date November 15 instead of November 23.

Now, the Senate has to face its responsibilities. I have a great deal of discussion which I may want to contribute to this matter also with respect to our fiscal situation. I would like to make an inquiry of the Senator from West Virginia, the acting majority leader, as to whether he is willing that at this time this matter do go over until tomorrow.

Frankly, it is a matter of great inconvenience to me. There is a very important meeting which begins tomorrow evening in Colorado involving my party and involving all 11 Western States. I was expected to be there with some other Senators and it is a matter of great inconvenience, but also this is a matter of great importance.

I would like to inquire of the acting majority leader what his intentions are. If we have to vote on this matter now we will do it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In response to the distinguished Senator from Colorado I wish to say in view of the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota to the effect that he does not want to have a vote this afternoon either on his amendment or on a perfecting amendment, I am trying at the moment to work out some agreement between the two, and then I should like to consult with the majority leader.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, that being the situation, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, my understanding is that an agreement is now being worked out between the majority leader and the other Members; therefore, under those circumstances, I yield the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado very much for his generosity and courtesy.

CONFEREES ON HEW APPROPRIATIONS SHOULD INSIST ON SENATE POSITION ON BELTSVILLE FDA SITE IN LIGHT OF HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I appeal today to the conferees on Labor-HEW appropriations to reopen in conference the question of the site for the proposed new Food and Drug Administration Laboratory. This laboratory building should be located in Beltsville, Md.

I make this request of Senate conferees and House conferees in light of the scathing criticism of FDA procedures in this matter made by the House Committee on Government Operations last Friday.

I referred to this House committee report yesterday in the Senate, page 29685. This respected House committee, after a careful study of FDA procedures and the history of this question, has issued a devastating case against the restriction inserted in the appropriation bill by the House to prevent location of the facility at Beltsville and, in effect, force its location in Madison, Wis.

Senators will recall that the Senate Appropriations Committee rejected this House language and the Senate confirmed that judgment.

Mr. President, the fact is that the Beltsville site is the most economical one and the original FDA cost study showed it would be at least 5.4 million dollars cheaper to build it at Beltsville. It is no secret that the pressure behind the House Appropriations Committee action to force location of the facility at the more costly site in Wisconsin is a minority member of that committee from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, is not this situation one of remarkable paradox? The minority member on the one hand claims to be leading a fight for economy, but on the other hand he uses his position in the Appropriations Committee to force location of the FDA laboratory in his State at a severely greater cost to the taxpayers.

It may offend the rules of this body to suggest inconsistency or bad faith on the part of a Member of the other body, so I will not make such comments. Nevertheless, the facts do have a peculiar ring.

I ask the conferees to reopen this question because the House Government Operations Committee report makes an overwhelming case that FDA selected the Madison site as an alternative—and I quote the House committee report—"without an adequate study and without complying with HEW site selection regulations."

Moreover, the House committee report states that during hearings on FDA's appropriation in this matter:

> FDA witnesses did not mention the disadvantages the agency had previously stated would result from location of Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 in the midwest.

Mr. President, in other words, FDA witnesses withheld pertinent information from the House Appropriations Committee. The House report goes on to say:

> In fact the attitude expressed by FDA was completely inconsistent with its previously stated position.

The report states:

> No mention was made of FDA's own estimate that the alternative site would substantially increase initial and operating costs.

The House Government Operations Committee concludes that the procedures used by FDA in selecting an alternative site for Headquarters Laboratory site No. 2 were "completely inadequate."

Mr. President, the appropriations bill, H.R. 10196, is still in conference. On October 4, the House returned the bill to conference with instructions to reduce items to budget request figures and to effect other economies. Therefore, it appears both possible and appropriate for this question to be reopened.

It would be highly appropriate, in the light of the new evidence in the House committee report and in the interest of economy and efficiency, that the conference reject the House restriction and instruct the FDA to build its new lab at whatever site economy and efficiency require. I am certain that regard for economy and efficiency will dictate that the lab should be at Beltsville.

Mr. President, not only will construction and operation of the facility in Madison be more costly but this radical geographical shift will also force the expensive relocation of personnel from the Washington area.

I believe that my constituents in Maryland and all the taxpayers of the United States deserve better treatment in this matter and that the laboratory should be in Beltsville.

Mr. President, I am today making this request by letter to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Senate conferees. I commend to all members of the Senate Appropriations Committee and to the Senate the summary of the Government Operations Committee's findings, conclusions, and recommendations which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have the perfect answer to the proposal just raised by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. The most modern Air Force base in the country, at Glasgow, Mont., which cost about $150 million, and which has everything, is about to go out of existence—in July 1968. So if anyone is looking for something which will be economical, efficient, and already in being, I would suggest that these Senators who have divergent viewpoints look to Glasgow, Mont. They could not make a better choice. Everything is there.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 12:30 p.m. tomorrow, half-hour of debate be allowed on the pending Williams amendment, and that the vote on that amendment take place at 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following action on that amendment, the Mundt amendment be considered, and that there be a time allocation of 1 hour on that amendment, the time to be equally divided between the proposer of the amendment and the manager of the joint resolution or whomever they may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inquire of the majority leader, who is to control the time on the Williams amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], chairman of the committee.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That request is not in order at this time.

Mr. MUNDT. The amendment is on the table.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator will get the yeas and nays.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I was going to suggest, in order to expedite the time, that, in the event other amendments were offered, as far as I am concerned, we could have unanimous consent that on any other amendments offered there be a limited time—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of one-half hour, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ALLOTT. Several other matters have come up here, including a conference report. Is there anything in the unanimous-consent request that would preclude me from offering, at the proper time tomorrow, the amendment which I have sent to the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is nothing which has been proposed in the unanimous-consent request that would preclude the Senator from Colorado from doing that.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Chair. I have no objection to the time limitation that has been requested, except that I would not want a time limitation in the event I called up the amendment which I have just sent to the desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, further, I ask unanimous consent that on all other amendments, there be a half-hour, the time to be equally divided between the sponsor of the amendment and the manager of the bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden]; and that there be 2 hours on the joint resolution; and, if need be, more time will be allowed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have no objection. I think it has been very fairly stated. I was wondering whether or not the majority leader might be inclined to enter into an objection to any committees meeting between 12 o'clock and about 2:30, the time of the vote, so that at least Senators could be here if they wanted to be here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would not be averse to that request if the Judiciary Committee could meet, because it is faced with a deadline imposed on it by the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. We could waive that one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What was the time?

Mr. MUNDT. From 12 to 3.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that all other committees not be allowed to meet during the period from 12 noon to 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. I realize that that is not going to guarantee that every Senator will be in his seat, but it will at least destroy any alibi as to why Senators could not be here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inquire of the Senator from Montana if the time to be allowed tomorrow is to be in the usual form?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, later reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, October 25, 1967, during the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, except amendment No. 419, offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] on which there shall be 1 hour, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to ½ hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader or the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden]: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That the Senate proceed to vote at 1 p.m. on amendment No. 420, offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] on which the debate shall commence at 12:30 p.m.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is hoped that we will be able to take up some conference reports tomorrow. I am glad to note that there will be one now. There will be no voting tonight.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Breskin, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and that the House insisted on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Evins of Tennessee, Mr. Boland, Mr. Shipley, Mr. Giaimo, Mr. Marsh, Mr. Pryor, Mr. Mahon, Mr. Jonas, Mr. Minshall, Mr. Wyman, Mr. Talcott, and Mr. Bow were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 to the bill and concurred therein; and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 58, 59, and 67 to the bill.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I make a brief explanation? The distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], who is chairman of the conferees and is the chairman of our Subcommittee on Independent Offices, is unable to be here, but has asked that we bring up the conference report, which has just been adopted by the House, and to take certain action on it.

I have conferred with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], who is the ranking minority member of that committee, and he is agreeable to that course of action.

With that understanding, I ask that the conference report be reported.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, that is the report that involves rent supplements and model cities. I would like to know of the intentions in that respect before I consent to going on with it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am very happy to assure my friend that the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], who is not able to be here, completely agreed with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] and myself that, after agreeing to that part of the conference report that is in agreement, we will ask the Senate not to recede from its position in those two matters but to ask for an additional conference on them, and to appoint conferees.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] be recognized in the interim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Baker].

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in conversations with my colleagues in this body and in the House of Representatives, I have heard certain expressions of reluctance to oppose the Senate-House conference report on redistricting since there is a possibility that without the legislation recommended by the report there would be no effective prohibition against elections at large.

May I, therefore, at this time state my definite intention to introduce, at the appropriate time and to appropriate pending business, an amendment that will immediately and permanently outlaw at-large elections to the House of Representatives from all States that have more than one Representative.

So that my intention may be entirely clear, I shall now read for the Record the amendment I propose to offer:

> In each State entitled in the Ninety-First Congress or in any subsequent Congress thereafter to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled "An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives" (46 Stat. 26), as amended, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative.

I believe that the proposal in the conference report, if enacted, will be found entirely unconstitutional as an unauthorized invasion of the constitutional jurisdiction of the Federal courts since the report, in effect, attempts to prevent the judiciary from ordering equitable redistricting prior to 1972. Since the conference report carries no severability clause, if the special census provision of the conference report were found unconstitutional, the entire enactment, including that prohibition in the conference report against elections at large, will also be struck down.

If that eventuality, unhappy in its prospects, were to occur, the effect of the conference report would be to unintentionally heighten the possibility that many of the 174 Congressmen from Indiana, California, New York, New Jersey, Texas, Missouri, Ohio, and Florida might have to run at large in 1968.

My amendment is the same as a provision contained in the sound congressional redistricting legislation passed in the Senate on June 3 by the convincing margin of 55 to 28.

I think that both bodies of Congress will readily agree that the amendment should be dealt with immediately and favorably. No one wants the incredible political distortions that would occur if entire delegations in several major States were forced to run at large.

I believe that my proposal for eliminating at-large elections is preferable to the proposal contained in the conference report because:

First, this proposal will be immediately effective and will not be clouded by doubts of constitutionality as is the conference proposal. Standing alone, an at-large election prohibition is clearly constitutional under article I, section IV, of the Federal Constitution.

Second, this proposal permanently resolves the question; the conference proposal would only eliminate at-large elections in 1968 and 1970.

Third, this proposal applies to all States entitled to more than one representative; the conference report excludes New Mexico and Hawaii from the at-large prohibition.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, once again we may soon have before us proposed legislation dealing with one of the most cherished rights of all Americans, the right to vote. As the Supreme Court said in the Wesberry case:

> No right is more precious in a free country than that of having a voice in the election of those who make the laws under which, as good citizens, we must live. Other rights, even the most basic, are illusory if the right to vote is undermined.

And, unfortunately, once again we may be asked to pass upon a congressional districting—or nondistricting—proposal which would undermine the right to vote of millions of American citizens. It is a proposal which proceeds from a fallacious assumption to an unsupportable conclusion. It is a proposal which—though it stems from bills that might have implemented the Constitution's one-man, one-vote principle as articulated by the Supreme Court—would delay and dilute and obstruct the realization of that constitutional mandate. It is a proposal that under the thinnest veneer of superficial order and reason carries a heavy coat of confusion, irrationality, unworkability, conflict, unconstitutionality, and delay, and more delay, and still more delay.

It would be a giant step backward on a road where the House had determined to take a small step forward, and where the Senate, in three separate and convincing votes, expressed its determination to take a major step forward. It would constitute a serious breaking of faith with our sworn duty to preserve and protect both the Constitution of the United States and the interests of the people we represent. It would put Congress in the position of attempting to overturn constitutional decisions of the Supreme Court designed to protect our constituents.

We in the Senate have already rejected a bill far less objectionable than the present one. Moreover, the House in June recommitted a similar conference bill and independent observers said we would have voted to do the same. We passed a reasonable, practical, constitutional, and forward-looking substitute. It was incumbent on our representatives in conference to seek to preserve the good work of this body; and if they had done so, an acceptable compromise would have resulted. Instead we are faced not with a compromise, but with an imposition—an imposition on the desire of the House conferees to report out some bill; an imposition on the Senate's right to consider that issues which had been foreclosed by both Houses would not be reopened, and that the conference would seek a solution between the positions of the two Houses; an imposition on the State legislatures which are looking to Congress for guidance and assistance; an imposition on the courts who would have to untangle the myriad of webs this bill would spin; and, most of all, an imposition on the American people, who expect Congress to protect their rights, not frustrate them.

We are lawmakers, and we preach obedience to law—law wherever it is found, in the Constitution, in the statute books, and in court decisions. But we must practice what we preach. Neither as individuals nor as legislators can we let our own disagreements with constitutional precepts, legislative utterances, or court interpretations supercede our obligation and oath to abide by these mandates. This is especially so when we exercise our legislative functions.

We are not in a contest of power with the courts. It is our job to write and pass legislation which is clear, clearly constitutional, and solves problems instead of creating them. It is the courts' job to review, interpret, and apply both the Constitution itself and the bills we pass. These are cooperative, coordinate, and consistent functions, rather than competitive and conflicting ones, and we must treat the courts as allies in the law, not antagonists.

Unlike some of its predecessors, the conference bill has almost no redeeming qualities whatsoever. It is a blatant and cynical attack on the Supreme Court, tantamount to a sophisticated act of civil disobedience by people who should, and I believe do, know better.

As Senators may recall, nearly 5 months ago the Senate passed by a vote of 57 to 25 a substitute for the House-passed congressional redistricting bill, H.R. 2508. Our bill provided for immediate vindication of the one-man, one-vote mandate of the Constitution and the Supreme Court by requiring States not now in compliance with that requirement to comply before the next congressional election. It also provided a clear and enforceable proscription against gerrymandering, the pernicious along racial, political, or economic lines.

Our bill was widely hailed as a sensible and true answer to the districting problem. It had the common support of such normally disagreeing newspapers as the Lincoln, Nebr., Journal & Star and the New York Post, and the full backing of citizen groups, labor unions, legal scholars, and thousands of ordinary citizens whose interests it protected.

Our effort was especially important because it relieved Congress of the embarrassment of the House-passed bill.

That was a bill which had had no hearings in either House. It had been rushed through committees on both sides, becoming progressively encumbered with layer upon layer of special interest provisions. While it went into the House with a prohibition against gerrymandering, it came out with an invitation to gerrymandering. It tried to leave to the very institutions—the States—which had been unable to resist the temptation to gerrymander, the responsibility for controlling gerrymandering. It provided temporary guidelines which, while not insignificant, were meager and subject to misunderstanding. The 30 percent cutoff point on population variation was designed by its authors to relieve most States of the constitutional obligation to redistrict, although many who might have tried to take advantage of this would have failed in the end. The Senate committee, without any hearings or basis in fact, attempted to raise the cutoff point to 35 percent.

I detail these factors because they indicate the kind of attitude with which some supporters of the bill have proceeded. One might indeed have thought that the bill's apparent supporters were its worst enemies in view of what they have done to it at every step of the way. They seem to have made it as irrational and irresponsible as the traffic would bear each time they had a chance to change it.

But in any event the Senate was not frightened away by this sort of overreaching, and passed a responsible bill. Six Senate conferees, only one of whom had voted for passage of the bill, were appointed and sent to conference to carry out the Senate's expressed desire "to insist on its amendment."

Unfortunately only one of the six Senate conferees seemed to want to meet this desire. The other five moved almost immediately to adopt bills which not only failed to preserve any of the gains offered by the Senate bill, but actually attempted to turn the House's partial mandate for redistricting in 1968 and 1970 upside down into a practical prohibition against such districting. They succeeded in persuading the House conferences to report such a bill in June, but even the House would not accept that. Now we may be faced with a very similar bill, if the House does not reject the conference report.

Perhaps the incredibility of the bill now before the House can best be understood by an element by element comparison of the principal features of the bills passed by the House and Senate and sent to conference.

Both bills had a permanent maximum deviation between districts of 10 percent. The present proposal has no permanent guidelines whatsoever.

Both Houses addressed the problem of gerrymandering. While the two approaches were different, compromise would have been possible. Yet, the present proposal contains no standards relating to compactness.

The House's temporary provision would have automatically mandated redistricting in all States where the disparity was over 30 percent, and would not have interfered with court-ordered redistricting in other States. The Senate version automatically required redistricting in States with deviations above 10 percent, but also contained no barrier to court redistrictings. In both versions the population measurements could be based on either the 1960 census or a subsequent special census. Again compromise should have been easily attainable. Redistricting should automatically be required for all States with deviations above some figure between 10 and 30 percent, based on the 1960 census or a special census. The present proposal bears no relationship to either House's version or to any logical compromise. It does not require districting of any States no matter how unequal their districts. In the contrary it purports to preclude redistricting, possibly even where there are existing court orders based on the Constitution, unless the results of a special Federal census are available.

Whatever the rules of the Senate and House may technically permit conferees to do under the circumstances relevant here, the spirit of these rules must require some respect for the will of both Houses of Congress. There are precedents for achieving appointment of specifically committed conferees, but this kind of formal arrangement should not be necessary among men of good will. Yet if this is so, how can we explain a conference bill which requires no State to redistrict now when both Houses required at least those over 30 percent to do so; which interferes with use of the 1960 census when both Houses approved its use; which has no permanent standards when both Houses had permanent standards.

I do not think we need the answer now to proceed with the task at hand. With a quick look at the substance of the conference bill, we can see that it has no rationale and no virtues, and thus we can, and must, reject it out of hand.

The conference bill is unclear, unwarranted, unenforceable, and unconstitutional. Its most objectionable and invalid provision says that no State shall be required to redistrict unless it has the results of a special Federal census available. The theory of this limitation is that the 1960 census is unusable.

The fact is that there is no need for any such provision. The courts and the States themselves have repeatedly used the 1960 data to comply with the existing Supreme Court standards over the past 3½ years, and there was no evidence before either House that this has caused any problems—certainly not anything like the inequities caused by the disparities in many States' present districts.

Both Houses of Congress specifically found the 1960 data acceptable. And rightly so. This is the data we use for apportioning congressional seats among the States. And this is the data which the States would have used to district in a constitutional manner in 1961, if they had done so.

The Nation has traditionally been willing to live with the kind of changes which occur solely as a result of population changes between decades, as long as we start the decade with substantial equality. Moreover, it is sheer fantasy to suppose that a State with, say 40-percent deviation based on the 1960 census, will have less deviation in current terms than the same State if it had started out with 4-percent deviation on a 1960 basis.

This is especially so since the 1960-based districts can be fixed now with the benefit of hindsight, so that the fastest growing areas can be put in the smallest districts, and declining-population areas in the largest districts. This would mean a significantly decreased variation in current terms for a State which really wanted to do an equitable job.

There is certainly no justification for a blanket rejection of mandated redistrictings based on the 1960 census. First, if there are States which are under court order and can show that good faith use of other reliable figures would clearly produce more equitable districting than use of 1960 figures, the courts would certainly be able to take note of this fact. Second, if States can district voluntarily on the basis of the 1960 census, as this bill permits, under no reasoning can the same census be held inappropriate for the same or other States when they are ordered to redistrict. Third, as was well known to the conferees, in many States it would be impossible to obtain a special census in time for the 1968 primaries; thus the 1960 census is the best, and usually the only, reliable population data available.

As a practical matter, the courts would take one of two courses with this bill. The could simply hold that in any State where the special census is not and will not be available for 1968, the requirement is an unconstitutional interference with the one-man, one-vote principle, and need not be followed. Thus, immediate redistricting could be ordered. Or they might merely void existing districts without ordering any substitute, pending the special census. The State would then have to decide whether to redistrict voluntarily in the meanwhile on the basis of the 1960 census, or choose to have at-large elections until a special census can be conducted.

This is the kind of confusion and conflict the conference bill promises. For lack of perfection in 1960-based districting, it would seek to prevent any movement toward fairer districting. It is irresponsible and unreasonable. It should be shelved and forgotten. While the Senate bill remains as the most effective and useful one proposed, we need not insist that all of its reforms be instituted immediately and fully if this insistence will result in no reform. On the other hand we cannot accept any proposal which—like the conference bill—is far worse than no bill at all.

There were in fact several compromises suggested in conference which seemed most appropriate and logical. They would certainly have been acceptable to me, and also, I believe, to those Members of the Senate who supported the substitute for which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] fought, as well as many of those who did not. At the very least the 90th Congress should be able to agree on a measure which bars at-large elections, and while this appears an inadequate alternative to me, I would not oppose an attempt to adopt it.

Our constituents are depending on us to vindicate their rights to equal representation in Congress. The judges and State legislatures and State executives are hoping that we will relieve them of the shadow of doubt and debate which would hang over them under the conference bill. And we owe it to ourselves to do what is right to secure an undiminished vote for every American. Again, in the words of Wesberry:

> That is the high standard of justice and common sense which the Founders set for us.

JAMES R. HOFFA

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, at some date, I believe during last April, Mr. William Loeb, a newspaper publisher in my State and an old personal friend, brought Mrs. Hoffa, wife of the Teamsters' president confined at the Federal penitentiary at Lewisburg, to my office. Knowing Mr. Loeb to be a sincere and ardent supporter of Mr. Hoffa and a believer in his innocence, I rather anticipated a request for some sort of cooperation in the matter of Hoffa's appeal case, which was then pending.

Somewhat to my surprise, the request that Mrs. Hoffa made was a very simple one. She wanted me to intercede in her behalf and ask that her spiritual adviser, Msgr. W. Joyce Russell, be placed on the list of those allowed to visit Mr. Hoffa in prison. This seemed to me to be a very reasonable request, and I gladly consented to make it for her.

Accordingly, on April 25, I addressed a letter to the Attorney General asking that permission be given. Frankly, I anticipated no difficulty and thought it would be granted as a matter of course. To my surprise, I received a reply under date of May 8 from Myrl E. Alexander, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, and I ask unanimous consent that my letter and Mr. Alexander's reply be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 25, 1967.

Hon. RAMSEY CLARK,
The Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have been requested to ask that the privilege of visiting Mr. James R. Hoffa, presently confined at the Federal Penitentiary, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, be extended to the Right Reverend Monsignor William Joyce Russell, St. Catherine Laboure Rectory, 11801 Claridge Road, Wheaton, Maryland.

It is my understanding that Monsignor Russell serves as Mrs. Hoffa's spiritual confessor and is anxious to comply with the family's desire that he offer similar comfort to Mr. Hoffa during permitted visitation periods. It is my further understanding that Mr. Hoffa wishes to avail himself of Monsignor Russell's ministrations.

I am sure you will agree that wherever possible inmates of our penal institutions should have reasonable access to and assistance from clergymen of their choice, and I hope you will find it possible to authorize the addition of Monsignor Russell's name for this purpose.

Sincerely yours,
NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
BUREAU OF PRISONS,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1967.

Hon. NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COTTON: The Attorney General has asked me to reply to your letter of April 25. I have given considerable thought to the request that Monsignor Russell be allowed to visit Mr. Hoffa and to act as his spiritual advisor.

It is our policy that persons in our custody should have access to religious counseling and advice from an ordained minister or priest. For this reason, we have full time Protestant and Catholic chaplains at all of our major institutions.

At the United States Penitentiary, Lewisburg, where Mr. Hoffa is confined we have two dedicated young chaplains who are doing an outstanding job. I am certain that either of them would be happy to act as Mr. Hoffa's spiritual advisor, and both are readily available at any time he desires their services.

An ideal situation would exist if we could allow each person in our institutions to have his choice of clergymen from the community but as I am certain you realize, this is administratively impossible.

I can assure you that the staff at Lewisburg will make every effort to fill Mr. Hoffa's spiritual and religious needs. If you would like further information on our religious programs, or if I can be of assistance in any matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,
MYRL E. ALEXANDER,
Director.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I read from my letter:

> It is my understanding that Monsignor Russell serves as Mrs. Hoffa's spiritual confessor and is anxious to comply with the family's desire that he offer similar comfort to Mr. Hoffa during permitted visitation periods. It is my further understanding that Mr. Hoffa wishes to avail himself of Monsignor Russell's ministrations.
>
> I am sure you will agree that wherever possible inmates of our penal institutions should have reasonable access to and assistance from clergymen of their choice, and I hope you will find it possible to authorize the addition of Monsignor Russell's name for this purpose.

The reply which I received from the Director of Federal Prisons indicated that there were two regular chaplains at the institution and that it was the invariable rule that prisoners in the institutions could avail themselves only of the regular chaplains at the institution and not have the privilege of being visited by clergymen of their choice from outside of the institution.

To say that I was amazed at this response is to put it mildly. I can quite understand that prison authorities would take every precaution to see to it that Mr. Hoffa is not given any privileges not accorded to other prisoners. I can also understand that they might well take special precautions to see to it that Mr. Hoffa would not have such an extended list of visitors that he could in a sense run his union from the prison cell, but certainly a Catholic priest of the rank of monsignor would not be visiting for any other purpose than to give spiritual advice and consolation. Furthermore, I found it very hard to believe that it could be a fixed and universal rule to forbid prisoners in our Federal institutions the opportunity to receive visits at reasonable times from reputable clergymen of their choice. Therefore, I took the matter up with my friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] who is on the Judiciary Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Federal Prisons. He kindly queried the Bureau of Prisons and came up with the same information, that it was an invariable rule to permit prisoners to have spiritual advice only from chaplains assigned to the institution.

In the meantime, it has been reported to me that Monsignor Russell had conferred with a clergyman from a nearby community who also acts as assistant to a full-time chaplain at the prison, and had been advised to desist from any attempts to visit Hoffa, because "this case is loaded with dynamite. We will have to wait until things quiet down." I do not know how much Mr. Hoffa stands in need of spiritual comfort, but it would seem he would obtain little from a chaplain under this kind of pressure.

By this time I had resolved to pursue the matter further. I hold no brief for Mr. Hoffa and have never attempted to examine or form an opinion on the facts of this case. The courts, not the Senate, are charged with this function, and I am sure that Mr. Hoffa is and has been represented by fully competent counsel. As I stated, I believe he should receive exactly the same treatment that every other prisoner receives—no more, no less. I was not prepared to accept, however, the insistence that it was an ironclad rule that prisoners could never receive spiritual attention from any clergyman except the prison chaplains. And I determined to try to ascertain the truth of this assertion.

Naturally, I communicated these facts to Mr. Loeb and suggested that as he was so deeply interested in the case, he might take steps to ascertain the true facts, because my staff is burdened with other matters and I would not have the means to conduct any survey.

On September 28, I received from Mr. Loeb a copy of a report made to him by one of his reporters, Arthur Egan, who had interviewed for 1½ hours the warden of the Federal prison at Danbury, Conn. In the report Mr. Egan quotes the warden as follows:

> "We encourage all members of all faiths to come here and work or talk with our inmates, priests, ministers, or rabbis—makes no difference to us—all are welcome," said the warden.
>
> "We do everything we can to assist these people. We, and the entire Federal penal system place great stress on and need for outside religious help. These people are the link between the inmate and the community—they keep the man's faith up, they get down to the grass roots of the situation so to speak."
>
> When I stressed the point the right of a priest was denied, the warden said, "The inmate must be an exceptional inmate, must have committed an exceptional crime."

His report further states:

> The warden expressed utter disbelief that any member of any faith was denied the right to visit an inmate in a Federal institution. "Not allowing an outside minister, priest, or rabbi to visit an inmate is contrary to the policy and regulations of the Bureau of Prisons," was the warden's remark when I told

him a Catholic priest was denied the right to see an inmate.

When asked if this was the policy because his institution was a minimum security prison he said it wasn't—that the same policy holds true for all Federal Prisons regardless of security.

Mr. President, I cannot vouch for the accuracy of Mr. Egan's report, but certainly I have no reason to doubt it. I feel that the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries of the Committee on the Judiciary should investigate further into this matter and seek to ascertain the policy of the Bureau of Prisons with respect to visits by spiritual advisers. I informed the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that I intended to speak of this matter on the floor and invited him, if convenient, to be present. I would, of course, welcome any comments he may have to make on any further light he may throw upon this question.

I hope that this matter can be settled, not because it concerns a rather notorious prisoner, but because it would seem in the public interest to know exactly whether this is the policy and, if so, why.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I gladly yield to my friend, the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire should be commended for the persistence with which he has pursued this matter. I believe the matter illustrates the great variety of situations and inquiries with which Members of the Senate are confronted from time to time.

One of my assignments as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for the last 10 or 12 years has been to be a member of the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries; and in pursuing that assignment I have come to have a high regard for the tremendous progress that has been made in the prison system of this country. Under the brilliant leadership of James Bennett, who has retired, tremendous steps have been taken to cover the matter of rehabilitation, of education, of training, and of fitting men, even under a work release program, for reentry into society. There has not been neglected the matter of religious education and the provision for such ministers, rabbis, or priests as might come along.

When the Senator from New Hampshire asked me about this matter, I told him I would be most pleased to inquire into it, because it would be a specific inquiry in an area about which I have made frequent inquiry on my own, in connection with my official duties. So I addressed an inquiry to the present Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Mr. Myrl Alexander, and under date of August 3 he replied to my inquiry.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his letter be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. The sum and substance of the reply is that Mr. Hoffa is not being handled in any way inconsistent with the policies and procedures of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. I have in my hand a copy of the policy memorandum on the subject of religious beliefs and practices of inmates, issued by the Bureau of Prisons on April 6, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that pertinent parts of the bulletin bearing upon this subject be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Based upon the text of that policy memorandum and upon the letter, I would say that what Mr. Alexander said in his letter of October 3 is true and correct.

I have not seen the report that Mr. Egan made to the publisher of the newspaper, Mr. Loeb. I do not know its contents.

I would say this, however: It would appear that the warden at the Danbury institution is right—there is resort to the ministers, the rabbis, and the priests of a community in which the institution is located, for the purpose of furnishing a link with the community, and to furnish, also, such religious ministrations as the prisoners might desire when they cannot be supplied within the institution itself. Of that I have personal knowledge. But to import a member of the clergy from one community to a distant institution would open tremendous administrative difficulties in large institutions such as those at Lewisburg, Atlanta, Fort Leavenworth, and others across the country.

I believe that Mr. Alexander has truly spoken. What I should like to do, however, and I offer to do it willingly—again, in line with the duties that have been assigned to me as a member of this subcommittee—is to refer the entire matter, including the Egan report, to Mr. Alexander, and let him comment upon it.

But I do believe that Mr. Hoffa is not being discriminated against, and that he is being handled in a proper fashion in this regard.

All of his spiritual needs are being taken care of that can be taken care of. Perhaps they are not being taken care of on the basis he would like to have it. Maybe the dentist who works on his teeth is not the dentist he would have if he were at large. Maybe the clothes he wears are not the same clothes he would wear. However, that is a part of the price he is paying for having violated certain laws. The matter was litigated and maybe he is a little discommoded, unhappy, and provoked, but that is beside the point. The point is that this is the policy within the prison system, from my inquiry. I would be happy to supply any new material which the Senator from New Hampshire has received and we will see what the judgment of the prison system is on that score.

EXHIBIT 1

AUGUST 3, 1967.

HON. ROMAN HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: I have your recent inquiry in which you, as a member of the National Penitentiaries Sub-committee, requested information on the visiting privileges accorded Mr. James R. Hoffa at the U.S. Penitentiary, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania. I understand that you have been contacted by another member of the Senate concerning the possibility of a Catholic Priest visiting Mr. Hoffa while he is in our custody.

Since his commitment, Mr. Hoffa has been handled in a manner consistent with our policies and procedures. He is not discriminated against and, by the same token, he receives no privileges which are not accorded to other inmates in the institution.

As you know, it has been our long standing policy that all inmates have access to religious counsel and have the opportunity to worship in accordance with their faith. Consistent with this policy, we have two full-time Chaplains on the staff at the Lewisburg institution, one Protestant and the other, Catholic. Their sole responsibility is to minister to the spiritual needs of the inmate population.

All offenders confined in our institutions are permitted to receive regular visits from members of their immediate family and from attorneys of record. In Mr. Hoffa's situation, he has been receiving regular visits in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Lewisburg institution. As I am certain you can appreciate, it is not possible for us to extend visiting privileges beyond those I have mentioned. To do so, would be administratively impossible due to the limited size of our visiting facilities and the number of inmates confined in our institutions.

I hope that this information will be of assistance to you. If I can be of further help, please let me know.

Sincerely,

MYRL E. ALEXANDER,
Director.

EXHIBIT 2

1. POLICY: FREEDOM OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF AND PRACTICE

a. The objective of the Bureau of Prisons is to extend the greatest amount of freedom and opportunity in this area as is consonant with the total mission of the Bureau. This includes the requirements of maintaining security, safety, and orderly conditions in the institutions and of distributing available resources as wisely as possible among the many kinds of services and activities which contribute to these aims and to the purpose of rehabilitating offenders. To this end we have established these policies.

b. Chaplains employed by the Bureau are available to serve all inmates, assisting them to deepen and expand their knowledge, understanding and commitment to the beliefs and principles of the religion of their choice and to resolve such personal conflicts as they may have relative to religious beliefs.

c. Achieving these purposes may, and at times should, entail utilization of resources beyond those normally available within the institution, including clergymen or other representatives of churches in the community.

* * * * *

We recognize the fact that members of some religious faiths have special needs which cannot be met by the services of the institutional chaplain. For example, there are some Protestant denominations in which there are special requirements surrounding the administration of the Sacraments. Jewish inmates, members of the Church of Jesus Christ and the Latter Day Saints, Jehovah's Witnesses, and others also have special religious needs.

The chaplains are responsible for coordination of all religious services. When inmate request shows the need for such denominational activity, the chaplain may, with the approval of the Warden, provide contract coverage from the local community, or as suggested by the appropriate administrative office of the denomination involved. Such special denominational activities shall be scheduled at a time when the institution can provide adequate staff supervision. Serv-

> ices conducted by a regularly appointed chaplain, contract chaplain, or approved civilian religious leader shall be open to the general population, with consent of the religious leader involved. Where religious groups with special needs are without the services of a visiting clergyman, they may, on recommendation of the chaplain and with approval of the Warden, be permitted to meet for religious activities under supervision of a staff member. Inmate conducted religious activities are not open to the general population, but shall be limited to bona fide members of the group holding the service. Under no circumstances will members of a religious group be permitted to proselytize members within the institution population.
>
> * * * * *
>
> e. The policy of augmenting usual religious services does not contemplate the admission of clergymen to conduct worship services except on invitation of the chaplains pursuant to the policies set forth above.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his very courteous, thorough, and enlightening explanation of the situation. I know my friend from Nebraska and the other members of the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries of the Committee on the Judiciary and I feel sure and I hope they will give this matter a fairly thorough investigation, and not because Mr. Hoffa or other individuals are involved. However this is a point upon which I am sure—and this in no way reflects upon my confidence in the Senator from Nebraska, as there is no Senator in whose sincerity and directness we could have greater confidence—a renewed inquiry to Mr. Alexander is not going to resolve the question.

I have a distinct feeling, having known Mr. Bennett in the years of his very constructive service as the Director of Prisons, that had he been the Director of Prisons and I had written him a letter merely requesting that a Catholic priest be allowed to visit the prisoner, I doubt very much if I would have received the same kind of reply.

It was indicated in Mr. Alexander's response to me that he was only—and I repeat the word "only"—entitled to ministrations of the regular chaplains in the prison. Now, in his subsequent communication to my good friend from Nebraska he seems to draw a regional line and to be saying that they do permit outside clergymen to come in, but only from adjoining, contiguous, or fairly nearby communities. I cannot quite see the point in that. There is no suggestion that a priest from a distant community or the home community of the prisoner be transported to the penitentiary.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I fear that I must have created the wrong impression or given the wrong statement in respect to this policy memorandum and also with reference to the use of members of the clergy from the area around the institution where the prison is located. It is not that way. Wherever there is a need for them, they come from that community. It is not in every case that they can come in. There are regulations and the text of some of the regulations I have inserted in the RECORD show that to be the case.

Obviously, if there is a full-time Catholic priest in the institution, as there is in Lewisburg, Pa., there is no call for any additional personal services at the hands of another priest, certainly not unless there are so many in the prison he would not have time to minister to all of them. That is one of the things borne out in the policy memorandum, and I understand it is the policy of long standing, even under James Bennett, the longtime administrator of the prison system.

If I did mislead the Senator from New Hampshire I am sorry, but I think that a perusal of this policy memorandum will clear the matter up in this regard.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we are holding up the proceedings of the Senate and I do not want to prolong the matter. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his comment. He was kind enough to show me, just a moment ago, the provision in a memorandum of policy, as I understood it—not a regulation.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is entitled, "Policy Memorandum."

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. It is a policy memorandum which, to me, is somewhat different than rules and regulations adopted for the administration of Federal prisons. It is a statement of policy. Apparently, as I read it, it indicates that there is a distinction drawn between permitting a clergyman to come in from the immediate vicinity as opposed to one coming in from a distance. Perhaps in many cases they make use of persons residing in the community. Again, I repeat, I hold no brief for Mr. Hoffa as an individual, but in this matter of permitting a priest, who ministered to his family, having the opportunity to see him, that situation certainly is not similar to the dentist who works on his teeth. It is not quite the same as the kind of haircut one gets in prison. It is not in any manner similar to the style or quality clothes they wear.

Mr. President, it has been my impression—and not in connection with Federal institutions, of which I know little—that in many State institutions it is the policy to encourage, and unless it became a nuisance and the visits were so frequent as to interfere with the prison regime and discipline, to welcome the work that would be done by a clergyman of a person's choice in rehabilitating and assisting that prisoner. I still think that is the right policy. I am not convinced it has not been, to some extent at least and within reasonable restrictions, the policy in Federal prisons.

I again express the hope that the subcommittee will look into this matter rather carefully in order that the principle may be clearly established.

I apologize to my friends on the committee who have this conference report for taking the time, and again I thank the Senator from Nebraska who has been most cooperative.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, by agreement between the acting leaders of the majority and minority, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the conference report is signed by all conferees of both Houses. I regret to report that the conferees are not in agreement on all items in conference. I ask first that the conference report be approved, and and I want to say that the savings made by the conference report up to this time, without considering matters which will be left to be determined in subsequent conferences, is something in the neighborhood of $500 million below the President's budget.

I shall ask for adoption of the conference report, but first yield to my distinguished friend from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator, of course, is right. I think it is proper to call attention to this matter and also to state at this time that it is the intention of the distinguished Senator from Florida, with my full consent, after adoption of the conference report, to send back to conference the items in disagreement. That is our intention at the present time.

That is all I have to say at this moment.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the joint intention, Mr. President. We have assured one of our distinguished friends, very much interested in this matter—he has now come into the Chamber, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]—that it is our intention to insist on the Senate amendments that deal with model cities and rent supplements.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Florida for his customary courtesy in giving me notice.

Mr. President, I shall not take myself as an example, but will take the members of the Appropriations Committee on the hardheaded way in which they worked on this problem. In spite of the tremendous difficulties faced by our cities today, they came to the conclusion that both programs were eminently justified.

I realize the problem of budget cutting going on in the other body, but with all respect, they are completely indiscriminate and the President is greatly at fault in not giving Congress his concept of the order of priorities. I shall be arguing that point on tomorrow's question of the continuing resolution, but I am mentioning it now because I appreciate the feeling of the conferees in view of the considered judgment of the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee is certainly not likely to go wild on the so-called liberal side, but this was a hardheaded consideration and they came to the conclusion that it is justified.

I greatly appreciate the attitude of the conferees, who stood by that finding of the committee in the Senate today, as to what humanly can be done with it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want to say, without any variance at all, that all the conferees on the Senate side stood by the Senate action on the two highly controversial items, model cities and rent supplements.

There has been no weakness or yielding on the part of Senate conferees. The items were reported in disagreement. The House stood by its position. We shall, of course, after adoption of the conference report, insist upon those amendments on these two matters and we shall ask for a further conference in the other body and for the appointment of Senate conferees on these two items.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was adopted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there is one amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the first amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$1,000,000".

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment. There is a split between the two amounts. It is now our duty, under what was agreed in conference, to agree to this particular amendment of the House.

Mr. President, in Senate amendment No. 3, we are not going into detail but I think it will be necessary and I move now that the Senate do agree to the amendment of the House just adopted to Senate amendment No. 3.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope that the RECORD will contain an explanation. I think that Senators should be able to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Now, Mr. President, we come to the three amendments which are in actual disagreement and I ask that they be considered en bloc, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the three amendments.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 58, 59, and 67 to the aforesaid bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I state again that these are the three amendments, two of which deal with the model cities program as handled in the Senate bill, and the other with the rent supplements.

I now move that the Senate insist on its amendments No. 58, and 59, which deal with the model cities program, and No. 67, which deals with the rent supplement program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move that the Senate request a further conference with the House on these three amendments and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

WELL DONE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I believe that our administration deserves a "well done," in connection with the restraint and fairness with which it handled the peace demonstration of this past weekend. Just as I salute the bravery of our soldiers in Vietnam, so I salute the restraint of the young soldiers at the Pentagon this past weekend.

I wonder, too, what other great nation could permit such a massive demonstration to occur—and where, if it occurred, so little violence or mayhem would have accompanied it. Press reports indicate that not a shot was fired, and not a single individual was hospitalized for more than a day or for major injuries.

Certainly such a demonstration could not have occurred in Russia, or China, or North Vietnam. I rejoice that the freedom of our institutions and the restraint of our Government are such that it could take place in our own great country.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MANSFIELD AFTER THE PRAYER AND APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the prayer and approval of the Journal, the able and distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], be recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 25, 1967, at 12 noon.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 24, 1967:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

Frank W. Lehan, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation (new position).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 24, 1967:

IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning John F. L. Ghiardi, of Michigan, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, and ending Miss Mary Eileen Welch, of California, to be a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 20, 1967; and

The nominations beginning J. Wesley Adams, Jr., of Illinois, to be a consular officer of the United States of America, and ending, Daniel E. Zellmer, of Missouri, to be a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 20, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Chaim Z. Rozwaski, First Hebrew Congregation, Peekskill, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Heavenly Father, Thou sustainest daily in Thy kindness the works of creation and guidest the destiny of man and nations.

Once more Thy servants of this great and noble House gather to deliberate the way to discharge their responsibilities.

Grant them the courage to match their actions with their words, the wisdom to perceive the needs of their people at home, and the ability to fulfill them with honor and compassion.

Give them understanding to grasp the meaning emanent in the historical foundations and role of the United States of America. Shower upon them the wisdom to reach decisions that will preserve this Nation as a fortress of humanity, freedom, and dignity and make it an example unto all the nations of the world. Enlighten their minds to discern what are the fleeting and the firm interests and values of our society so that this decade of ideological and moral convulsions should come to an end. Grant them the resolve to stand by the highest office in the land in this time of trial and preserve it as a tower of national resolution and unity in the face of spreading discord and discontent.

In this age of international crisis of conscience, the eyes of the world look toward this House for leadership, and the hope of mankind rests upon the daily actions taken here. May it be Thy will that these hopes will be sustained and the deliberations and undertakings of this House will be guided and blessed by Thy divine grace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2171. An act to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE IN RE WILKINSON VERSUS THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1967.

Re civil action file No. 2643–1967.
The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives

DEAR SIR: By this letter I am transmitting to you a summons in a civil action directed against the United States of America and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. I was served with this petition on the 17th of October by a Deputy United States Marshal. In addition to notifying you of this action in accordance with 2 U.S. Code 118 a copy of this summons is being forwarded to the U.S. District Attorney for the District of Columbia. In accordance with the provisions of this statute I am requesting the U.S. District Attorney to enter an appearance, file an answer and defend this civil action. Additionally I am notifying the Attorney General of the United States that this suit has been filed against me in my official capacity as Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. Copies of these letters and notification are attached hereto.

This summons is attached and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Respectfully submitted.

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the summons and pleadings will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The documents are as follows:

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

(Summons in a civil action—Civil action file No. 2643–1967)

ODESSA WILKINSON, GUARDIAN OF VEEDA KAYE WILKINSON, PLAINTIFF, *v.* UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, DEFENDANT

To the above named defendant, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

You are hereby summoned and required to serve upon Cobb, Howard, Hayes & Windsor, George H. Windsor, plaintiff's attorney, whose address is 613 F Street, NW., Washington, D.C., an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 60 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgement by default will be taken against you for the relief described in the complaint.

ROBERT M. STEARNS,
Clerk of Court.
MARY B. DEAVERS,
Deputy Clerk.

Date: October 13, 1967.

NOTE:—This summons is issued pursuant to Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

ODESSA WILKINSON, GUARDIAN OF VEEDA KAYE WILKINSON, 819 MADISON STREET, NW., WASHINGTON, D.C., PLAINTIFF, *v.* UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D.C., DEFENDANTS—CIVIL ACTION NO. 2643–1967

COMPLAINT FOR STATUTORY DEATH BENEFITS

1. This Court has jurisdiction to grant the relief sought under United States Code, Title 28, Sections 1346(a)(2), 2201 and 2203.

2. The plaintiff is an adult citizen of the United States residing in the District of Columbia. She is suing in her representative capacity as the duly appointed, qualified and acting guardian of her minor daughter, Veeda Kaye Wilkinson, in Guardianship No. 13,783 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. She is not suing in her individual capacity as she was divorced from Roy P. Wilkinson, deceased, in Civil Action No. 3151–55 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

3. The United States Government is named as a defendant because the plaintiff seeks an adjudication that she has a right to the payment of funds from the Treasury of the United States.

4. The Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States is being sued in his official capacity under Rule 25(d)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

5. Veeda Kaye Wilkinson, minor, is the daughter of Roy P. Wilkinson, who died March 18, 1965 a resident of the District of Columbia. She resides with her mother, the plaintiff, in the District of Columbia. Prior to the death of her father, Roy P. Wilkinson, she was being supported by him pursuant to Order of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in Civil Action No. 3151–55. The said Veeda Kaye Wilkinson is the sole heir at law and next of kin of the said Roy P. Wilkinson under applicable law of the District of Columbia.

6. The aforesaid decedent, Roy P. Wilkinson, for many years prior to his death and at the time of his death was employed by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and upon his death his heirs at law and next of kin became entitled to the payment of a monetary benefit under United States Code, Title 2, Section 125, 1965 Supplement.

7. Veeda Kaye Wilkinson, aforesaid, upon the death of her father, Roy P. Wilkinson, was his sole heir at law and next of kin became entitled to the statutory benefit above referred to in paragraph 6.

8. Plaintiff, as guardian and on behalf of Veeda Kaye Wilkinson, has made several demands upon the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States for payment of said benefit, which demands have been refused.

9. The refusal of the Clerk, as aforesaid, to make payment to the plaintiff, as guardian of Veeda Kay Wilkinson, of the aforesaid statutory benefit is wrongful, arbitrary and capricious, and without proper regard for the rights of the minor child, Veeda Kaye Wilkinson, and the legal responsibility of the defendant Clerk to act rationally and responsibly in paying such statutory benefits.

Wherefore, the promises considered, the plaintiff prays that this Court enter judgment declaring that Veeda Kaye Wilkinson is entitled to the payment of the statutory benefit above referred to in paragraph 6 as the sole heir at law and next of kin of Roy P. Wilkinson, deceased, and for such other and further relief as to the Court may appear appropriate.

Cobb, Howard, Hayes & Windsor, Attorneys at Law, 613 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

By: GEORGE H. WINDSOR.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1967.

Re civil action file No. 2643–1967.
Hon. DAVID G. BRESS,
U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia,
U.S. Courthouse, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRESS: I am sending you a copy of a summons in a civil action that was served on me in my official capacity as Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. This service was accomplished on October 17 by a Deputy U.S. Marshal.

In accordance with 2 U.S. Code 118 I respectfully request that you enter an appearance, file an answer or take such other action as you may deem necessary in defense of this suit against the United States of America and the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

This office will assist you in any way possible in preparation of your answer and defense. If you have any questions regarding this matter or if you need additional information please contact my legal advisor, Mr. Bill Hollowell.

Respectfully submitted.

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1967.

Re civil action file No. 2643–1967.
Hon. RAMSEY CLARK,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: I am sending you a copy of a summons in a civil action filed against the United States of America and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. I was served with this summons on October 17 by a Deputy U.S. Marshal.

In accordance with 2 U.S. Code 118 I have sent a copy of this action to the U.S. District Attorney for the District of Columbia requesting that he enter an appearance and defend this action. Realizing that the defense of this action will be conducted under the supervision and direction of the Attorney General I am also sending you a copy of the summons as well as a copy of the letter that I am forwarding to the U.S. District Attorney.

Respectfully submitted.

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

RABBI CHAIM ROZWASKI

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it was our privilege to have the invocation delivered this morning by one of my constituents and a good friend, Rabbi Chaim Rozwaski, spiritual leader of the First Hebrew Congregation of Peekskill, N.Y.

Rabbi Rozwaski, a graduate of Roosevelt and Purdue Universities and the Hebrew Theological College, is a leader in his community and in Westchester County. Among his many community activities he is presently serving as the president of the Peekskill Area Pastors' Association and as chairman of the Northern Westchester Board of Rabbis.

I am very happy that Rabbi Rozwaski

was able to join us today and thank our Chaplain, Dr. Latch, for affording him this opportunity.

So that our colleagues may be better acquainted with Rabbi Rozwaski, I insert herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, a copy of his curriculum vitae:

A BRIEF CURRICULUM VITAE OF RABBI CHAIM ROZWASKI

OCCUPATION

Rabbi, First Hebrew Congregation of Peekskill, 1821 East Main Street, Peekskill, N.Y.

EDUCATION

A. Hebrew: Ordination, Hebrew Theological College; B.H.L., Hebrew Theological College; Certificate, Hebrew University, Jerusalem Maimonides College; Graduate work, Jewish philosophy at Hebrew Theological College.

B. Secular: B.A., Roosevelt University; M. Sc., Purdue University; 45 postgraduate hours in philosophy and sociology.

C. Publications: Contributed articles to various Jewish national magazines and yearbooks.

D. Public appearances: Lectured at Hillel Foundation and Adult Education Forums; appeared on the radio in own regular weekly program as well as panelist and guest speaker.

E. Public positions:

1. President, Peekskill Area Pastors' Association.

2. Chairman, Northern Westchester Board of Rabbis.

3. Vice president, Eastern Regional Rabbinical Alumni Association, Hebrew Theological College.

4. Secretary, Eastern Seaboard Alumni Association, Jewish University of America.

5. Chaplain, Cortlandt Civil Defense.

6. Cochairman, Publication Committee of the Rabbinical Council of America.

7. Member, New York Board of Rabbis.

8. Held various other public positions in the past.

F. Marital status: Married and the father of four sons.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 10345—APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 10345, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11641—PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 11641, making appropriations for public works and the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE NEWEST DEMONSTRATION

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the newest demonstration, held in Washington in protest of the war, was a comparatively mild affair. Undoubtedly this was due in large part to the fact that adequate preparations were made to preserve law and order and the marchers were well alerted to this fact. Very probably the same results could have been obtained in other cities where rioters created a living hell for decent, law-abiding Americans, if Federal, State, and city officials had made it plain in advance that they intended to uphold the law of the land.

It had been anticipated that the Washington demonstration would draw 200,000 protesters. Only 55,000 participated. Six hundred of these were arrested for getting out of line and this show of force caused the whole affair to disintegrate rapidly.

The fact remains that the demonstration showed that too many Americans are willing to let themselves be used by professional agitators. America has been forced to witness another example of the way that freedom can be abused. It is to be hoped that this fiasco is not accepted by Ho Chi Minh as a true expression of American sentiment, for these antics of the lunatic fringe should not be the means by which the war is prolonged. Toleration at home of these demonstrations can cost the lives of additional American fighting men in Vietnam and the life of one American fighting man should be worth more than all the spectacles of all the protesters in the Nation.

AN INEQUITY IN THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this House a restriction in the military selective service law which is absolutely contrary to the fundamental concept of the national effort to halt high school dropouts. In fact, this provision of the law, which probably escaped the attention of the Congress, actually creates dropouts, not to mention the fact that it is highly discriminatory.

Under existing law, a young man attending high school who reaches his 20th birthday may be pulled right out of school by the draft board, even though his academic work is satisfactory and regardless of the reason for his being behind the rest of his class in age.

I might point out one instance of a young man who came here, the son of immigrant parents from Italy, who did not start school until he was 9 years of age because of the language barrier. He is a good student. He has received an induction notice for November 3, notwithstanding the fact that his academic record is good.

On the other hand, there are many cases where young men have dropped out of school and been recruited by the poverty program for the Job Corps and subsequently put into apprenticeship programs wherein they are deferable.

So we have a law which actually caters to the voluntary dropout, on the one hand, and frequently produces an involuntary dropout on the other. It is incongruous, it is inequitable, and it demands correction.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it was necessary for me to be absent yesterday while in my district on official business, and I missed responding to rollcall No. 333. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 23, 1967, it was necessary for me to be in Florida.

Had I been present on rollcall No. 333, final passage of H.R. 11627 which authorized the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland. I would have voted in the affirmative.

PROPOSED INTIMIDATION AN INSULT TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have read in this morning's paper that a proposal has been put forward by Martin Luther King that if the Congress does not pass on certain legislation as proposed by certain groups, demonstrations will be used to interrupt the work of Congress in order to pressure the Congress.

I think this city and this Nation have seen enough of these demonstrations. I consider it an insult to the Congress that any man would think the Congress can be intimidated by such threats.

The legislation which comes before the Congress will be, and should be, considered on its merits.

The fact that civil disobedience is involved in this intimidation only makes such a statement more repugnant to me personally, and I think my colleagues feel the same way.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 334]

Ashley
Aspinall
Bell
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Corman
Dent
Diggs
Flood
Ford,
  William D.
Fountain
Gibbons
Griffiths
Hanna
Hébert
Herlong
Holifield
Jones, Mo.
Kleppe
Kyl
Long, La.
McCulloch
Macdonald,
  Mass.
Mathias, Md.
Philbin
Poage
Rarick
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Roybal
St. Onge
Smith, N.Y.
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 803)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) "making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 6, 9, 12, 16, 26, 27, 30, 31, 37, 38, 42, 45, 47, 48, 50, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 64, 66, 70, and 76.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 13, 24, 28, 32, 33, 41, 43, 46, 62, 65, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, and 77, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,983,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$36,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "including funding of Interagency Boards of Examiners,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"COMMISSION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $25,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$260,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$63,757,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Federal office building (substructure), Seattle, Washington, $4,500,000; and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$68,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$23,460,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "purchase of two aircraft,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,975,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$45,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$665,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 58, 59, and 67.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.,
DAVID PRYOR,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS
(except amendments
Nos. 43, 44, and 71
through 76),
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
(except amendments
Nos. 43, 44, and 71
through 76),
LOUIS C. WYMAN
(except amendments
Nos. 43, 44, and 71
through 76),
BURT L. TALCOTT
(except amendments
Nos. 43, 44, and 71
through 76),
FRANK T. BOW
(except amendments
Nos. 43, 44, and 71
through 76),
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
GORDON ALLOTT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

TITLE I

Office of Emergency Planning

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $4,700,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $4,740,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Science and Technology

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $1,550,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $1,450,000 as proposed by the House and $1,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

President's Commission on Postal Organization

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $1,000,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Funds appropriated to the President

Disaster Relief

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $20,000,000 for disaster relief instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The full extent of damage in recent hurricanes is not known.

Independent offices

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $8,983,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $8,900,000 as proposed by the House and $9,066,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Civil Service Commission

Amendment No. 6: Authorizes $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses as proposed by the House instead of $2,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: Appropriate $36,000,000 for salaries and expenses, including funding of interagency boards of examiners, instead of $23,000,000 as proposed by the House and $38,033,000 as proposed by the Senate specifically earmarking $14,614,000 for interagency boards of examiners.

Amendment No. 9: Restores limitation of $700,000 as proposed by the House on the amount that may be used for investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations.

Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $25,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate. The Commission is expected to complete its activities with this additional amount.

Federal Communications Commission

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $19,100,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $19,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Federal Power Commission

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $14,220,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $14,445,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $15,150,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $260,500,000 for operating expenses, Public Buildings Service instead of $260,000,000 as proposed by the House and $261,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $63,757,900 for construction of public buildings projects instead of $54,511,900 as proposed by the House and $70,641,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Deletes Senate proposal to authorize $5,784,000 for a Federal office building, Mobile, Alabama.

Amendments Nos. 17 through 23: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer motions to concur in amendments of the Senate increasing amounts authorized for certain previously funded and approved projects.

Amendment No. 24: Deletes "and" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Authorizes $4,500,000 for Federal office building substructure, Seattle, Washington, as proposed by the Senate, and adds the word "and".

Amendment No. 26: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate $1,100,000 for a United States Tax Court Building (substructure).

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $20,285,000 for sites and expenses for public buildings projects as proposed by the House instead of $21,074,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $1,000,000 for expenses, United States Court facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,175,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $68,500,000 for operating expenses, Federal Supply Service instead of $67,500,000 as proposed by the House and $69,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $350,000 for National Historical Publications Grants as proposed by the House instead of $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Deletes proposal of the Senate to appropriate $100,000 for the working capital fund.

Amendments Nos. 32 and 33: Strike out language proposed by the House and insert language proposed by the Senate relating to approvals required for lease construction projects, as proposed by the Senate.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $23,460,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $23,400,000 as proposed by the House and $23,530,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Science Foundation

Amendments Nos. 35 and 36: Authorize the purchase of two and operation and maintenance of three aircraft instead of the purchase of three and operation and maintenance of four aircraft as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $495,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $505,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $17,350,000 as proposed by the House for salaries and expenses instead of $17,445,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans' Administration

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $13,975,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses instead of $13,650,000 as proposed by the House and $14,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $45,850,000 for medical and prosthetic research instead of $45,250,000 as proposed by the House and $46,458,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42: Appropriate $52,600,000 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $52,000,000 as proposed by the House; and delete the language proposed by the Senate earmarking $600,000 for a specific project.

Amendment No. 43: Authorizes the issue of $850,000,000 of beneficial interests or participations in loan assets as proposed by the Senate instead of $300,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $665,000 for payment of sales insufficiencies instead of $333,882 as proposed by the House and $946,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Defense

Civil Defense

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $20,000,000 for research, shelter survey and marking as proposed by the House instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Deletes House language relating to construction of fallout shelters as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Emergency Health Activities

Amendment No. 47: Restores House language and appropriates $9,000,000 to carry out emergency health activities of the Public Health Service and deletes Senate language to appropriate $9,426,000 for emergency health and welfare activities.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Amendment No. 48: Deletes proposal of the Senate to appropriate $1,000,000 for Alaska housing.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $30,000,000 for grants for neighborhood facilities instead of $27,000,000 as proposed by the House and $42,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $31,950,000 for salaries and expenses, Renewal and Housing Assistance as proposed by the House instead of $32,773,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates $25,000,000 for housing for the elderly or handicapped fund instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House and $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates $45,000,000 for urban planning grants instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House and $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates $75,000,000 as proposed by the House for open space land programs instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55: Restore House language limiting grants for open space land programs to 50 percent of cost, and delete Senate language excepting not to exceed $1,000,000 from such limitation.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates $6,100,000 for salaries and expenses, Metropolitan Development, as proposed by the House instead of $6,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates $175,000,000 for urban mass transportation grants as proposed by the House instead of $205,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 58 and 59: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 60: Appropriates $2,200,000 for urban information and technical assistance instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Appropriates $3,000,000 for community development training programs instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate to appropriate $500,000 for fellowships for city planning and urban studies.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates $10,000,000 for urban research and technology instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 64 and 65: Appropriate $1,850,000 as proposed by the House for salaries and expenses, Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations, instead of $2,200,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfer $2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 66: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate pertaining to metropolitan expediters and the administration or implementation of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.

Amendment No. 67: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates $1,100,000 for administrative expenses of the rent supplement program instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates $4,000,000 for general administration instead of $3,950,000 as proposed by the House and $4,230,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70: Appropriates $5,300,000 for regional management and services as proposed by the House instead of $5,430,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 71 through 75: Provide participation sales authorizations of not to exceed $2,385,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $581,000,000 as proposed by the House in not to exceed the following principal amounts: $80,000,000 in the public facility loan fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the House; $1,600,000,000 in the college housing loan fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $300,000,000 as proposed by the House; $250,000,000 in FNMA special assistance functions as proposed by the Senate; and $355,000,000 in FNMA management and liquidation functions as proposed by the Senate instead of $131,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates $23,000,000 for payment of participation sales insufficiencies as proposed by the House instead of $42,115,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Strikes out House language relating to transfers to a working capital fund as proposed by the Senate.

Joe L. Evins,
Edward P. Boland,
George E. Shipley,
Robert N. Giaimo,
John O. Marsh, Jr.,
David Pryor,
George Mahon,
Charles R. Jonas (except amendments Nos. 43, 44, and 71 through 76),
William E. Minshall (except amendments Nos. 43, 44, and 71 through 76),
Louis C. Wyman (except amendments Nos. 43, 44, and 71 through 76),
Burt L. Talcott (except amendments Nos. 43, 44, and 71 through 76),
Frank T. Bow (except amendments Nos. 43, 44, and 71 through 76),
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we present this report on the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill for 1968. This is a good bill, it is an important bill, and it has been carefully considered in the House and in the Senate. This bill contains appropriations of $10,064,173,000. We have made reductions that total more than $756 million below the budget estimates. This is a cut and reduction of more than three-quarters of a billion dollars. The conference bill is $450,357,000 below the amount approved in the other body.

We have been able to prevail in conference for almost a half billion dollars in cuts. There were 77 items in disagreement. We have reached agreement on all except two programs—the model cities and the rent supplement programs. I hope we will adopt the conference report, and then we can have separate votes on these two programs which we are bringing back to the House in disagreement.

The House conferees prevailed on about 75 percent of the dollar amounts of difference between the two bodies. We believe we have done a good job, and we believe we are bringing a good conference report back.

The Senate receded on $150,357,000 in increases, and the House on only $51 million. We hope the House will sustain the conference report. That will give us an opportunity to work out the two remaining amendments in disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, we have reached settlements favorable for the House to the extent of about 75 percent. If the House sustains the position on the two items on which we are in disagreement, the favorable ratio for the House position will be 90 percent. We believe this is a signal victory on a major appropriation bill.

As I have indicated, there were 77 items of disagreement in conference. The Senate receded on 25 items. The House receded on only 17, and the Senate agreed to reductions on 24 other items. Thus the Senate either receded or agreed to reductions on a total of 49 of the 77 items in conference.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, that we won in the conference in a very substantial way.

As Members will recall, the House considered the model cities program on May 17th. The House approved the model cities concept at that time in a very modest amount—$237,000,000.

The Senate bill provides $537,000,000 for model cities, including the full budgeted amount of $12,000,000 for planning grants, $400,000,000 for model cities, and it also includes $125,000,000 instead of $250,000,000 as requested for urban renewal projects in model cities. The House felt they could not use all the budget estimate in the first year.

Concerning the rent supplement appropriation, which we will be discussing later, the Committee on Appropriations of the House originally recommended $10 million of the $40 million budgeted for the program for 1968. Our subcommittee recommended $10 million, and the full committee approved the $10 million. When the matter reached the floor, after full debate, the House rejected the $10 million on a record vote by a margin of 61 votes.

The Senate has restored the full amount of $40 million. They strongly favor this program.

As I said earlier, I feel the rent supplement approach is a better approach to meeting the needs of the poor than public housing. We have been in public housing for over 25 years. We are appropriating about $275 million a year for annual contributions for public housing. The rent supplement approach is a free enterprise approach.

We will discuss this matter further when we consider the items in disagreement later. There have been problems in Detroit and New Haven, and many things have happened in the summer since we considered the bill in May of this year.

Private insurance companies, for example, have recently promised to commit $1 billion to help improve slum conditions in the ghettos of this Nation. They are counting on the Congress to make some commitment too in this area. They want us to show our good faith. America is watching and waiting for action in this area.

I repeat: we recommended $10 million in the subcommittee and the full committee, and the House did not approve it. The Senate put in $40 million. We hope something will be worked out soon to resolve this important issue.

But these are two items we hope to discuss after the conference report is adopted. They are not before the House in this conference report. We hope the conference report will be adopted so that we can get on with the business concerning the other items in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are other items in this important bill and we have made substantial reductions all along the line.

Construction of public buildings is $61.5 million below last year.

Airline subsidies have been cut and reduced to $11 million below last year. This reflects the healthy condition in the airline industry and we are all pleased that the airlines are making such good progress.

We have trimmed civil defense $15 million below 1967.

There are many, many other cuts and reductions in this bill.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness that there are four items in this bill where we are recommending amounts which reflect an increase over the budget—only four. These are all items we feel the House would want us to approve. They are to be compensated for many times over by the many reductions which we have made. We have made a reduction below the budget of over three-quarters of a billion dollars in appropriations.

We are recommending $25,000 for the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel—the so-called Hatch Act Commission, composed of our colleagues in the House and the Senate. This will allow the Commission to complete their study and report. This is the final amount that will be provided.

We also approved $6 million as an additional amount for public buildings projects which have previously been funded and approved. Plans have been drawn and sites have been acquired and appropriations have previously been made. The amount added is necessary in order that bids on some of the projects can be accepted. It is less costly, as the GAO has pointed out, to build these buildings than to lease the equivalent space. If this is delayed longer, and labor and building costs continue to go up, this will increase the ultimate cost of these necessary buildings—to construct them now represents economy. This work should go forward now.

A small increase is provided for the Veterans' Administration program and $5 million is added for disaster relief. We have had a serious disaster recently, a hurricane in Texas, and there have been other disasters at various places.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, we bring you a conference report which I think is a good one. The House position has been sustained by more than 75 percent. Reductions have been made amounting to more than $450 million from the amounts approved by the Senate. We think this is a good report and we ask that the conference report be adopted.

I know that my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, has his own views on the participation sales program. This is a budgetary and a Treasury matter. It relates to a matter of financing which has been long recognized and used. A majority of the conferees in the House and the Senate favor these participation sales. There are some Members of the House who had reservations as to the participation sales program. However, only two items are in disagreement—the model cities and the rent supplement programs.

We urge you to adopt the conference report, and then we can discuss these other matters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is always interesting to know how many times the Senate and the House recede in a conference, but when you get to the House floor and you find that a conference report, as in this case, is $51 million more than the House originally approved, and is some $400 million, as I understand the figures—and correct me if I am wrong—more than was expended for the same general purposes last year, then you become convinced that there is no economy in this bill and conference report.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. In response to my distinguished friend, I would like to suggest that the House passed a new bill of rights for the Vietnam veterans. When that bill was passed it created 4.5 million new veterans and added them to the benefit rolls. A large portion of the increases in the bill are for veterans benefit programs—compensation and pensions, medical care, and readjustment benefits. These are the result of legislation that the House has previously passed. New legislation has been enacted by the Congress in the last 2 years for cities and localities. These are now requiring appropriations which we are funding only in necessary amounts. We made reductions of over three-quarters of a billion dollars in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me this is an awfully good place to start to establish priorities. The gentleman mentioned the veterans. Why not slice the bill in other places where there is less priority and present a bill with some real respect for economy?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank my friend. We have done just what he recommends.

Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks I include the following comparative statement of the conference action on the bill, reflecting the motions to the House on the items reported in disagreement:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968 (H.R. 9960)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION

Item	Appropriations, 1967 [1]	Budget estimates, 1968 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with— Budget estimate	Conference allowance compared with— House allowance	Conference allowance compared with— Senate allowance
TITLE I								
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT								
National Aeronautics and Space Council								
Salaries and expenses	$525,000	$524,000	$524,000	$524,000	$524,000			
Office of Emergency Planning								
Salaries and expenses	4,700,000	4,780,000	4,700,000	4,740,000	4,700,000	−$80,000		−$40,000
Salaries and expenses, telecommunications	1,600,000	2,245,000	1,945,000	1,945,000	1,945,000	−300,000		
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies	4,000,000	[2] (3,688,000)	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+3,000,000		
Total, Office of Emergency Planning	10,300,000	7,025,000	9,645,000	9,685,000	9,645,000	+2,620,000		−40,000
Office of Science and Technology								
Salaries and expenses	1,200,000	1,837,000	1,450,000	1,650,000	1,550,000	−287,000	+$100,000	−100,000
Total, Executive Office of the President	12,025,000	9,386,000	11,619,000	11,859,000	11,719,000	+2,333,000	+100,000	−140,000
President's Commission on Postal Organization								
Salaries and expenses		[3] 1,500,000		1,500,000	1,000,000	−500,000	+1,000,000	−500,000

See footnotes at end of table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968 (H.R. 9960)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1967 [1]	Budget estimates, 1968 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—Continued								
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT								
Disaster relief	$24,550,000	$15,000,000	$15,000,000	$25,000,000	$20,000,000	+$5,000,000	+$5,000,000	−$5,000,000
Alaska mortage indemnity grants	2,600,000							
INDEPENDENT OFFICES								
Civil Aeronautics Board								
Salaries and expenses	12,200,000	9,066,000	8,900,000	9,066,000	8,983,000	−83,000	+83,000	−83,000
Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization)	63,500,000	54,000,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	−1,500,000		
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board	75,700,000	63,066,000	61,400,000	61,566,000	61,483,000	−1,583,000	+83,000	−83,000
Civil Service Commission								
Salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation	22,900,000	[4] 38,033,000	23,000,000	38,033,000	36,000,000	−2,033,000	+13,000,000	−2,033,000
By transfer	(6,431,000)	(6,129,000)	(6,100,000)	(6,100,000)	(6,100,000)	(−29,000)		
Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations	600,000							
Annuities under special acts	1,430,000	1,336,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	−36,000		
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits	36,644,000		40,748,000	40,748,000	40,748,000	+40,748,000		
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund	73,000,000		71,000,000	71,000,000	71,000,000	+71,000,000		
Payments to trust funds		111,748,000				−111,748,000		
Total, Civil Service Commission	134,574,000	151,117,000	136,048,000	151,081,000	149,048,000	−2,069,000	+13,000,000	−2,033,000
Commission on the Political Activity of Government Personnel								
Salaries and expenses	175,000			25,000	25,000	+25,000	+25,000	
Federal Communications Commission								
Salaries and expenses	17,852,300	[4] 19,221,000	19,000,000	19,100,000	19,100,000	−121,000	+100,000	
Federal Power Commission								
Salaries and expenses	14,220,000	[4] 14,830,000	14,220,000	14,445,000	14,220,000	−610,000		−225,000
Federal Trade Commission								
Salaries and expenses	14,378,000	15,225,000	15,000,000	15,150,000	15,150,000	−75,000	+150,000	
General Services Administration								
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	244,091,000	262,152,000	260,000,000	261,000,000	260,500,000	−1,652,000	+500,000	−500,000
Repair and improvement of public buildings	80,000,000	89,800,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	−9,800,000		
Construction, public buildings projects	125,318,000	62,545,700	54,511,900	70,641,900	63,757,900	+1,212,200	+9,246,000	−6,884,000
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	14,132,000	15,276,000	20,285,000	21,074,000	20,285,000	+5,009,000		−789,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	6,746,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000			
Expenses, U.S. court facilities	1,500,000	1,640,000	1,175,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	−640,000	−175,000	
Additional court facilities	6,000,000							
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	65,000,000	70,508,000	67,500,000	69,500,000	68,500,000	−2,008,000	+1,000,000	−1,000,000
Salaries and expenses, automatic data processing coordination	500,000							
Automatic data processing fund		10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000			
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	17,121,000	17,610,000	17,580,000	17,580,000	17,580,000	−30,000		
National historical publications grants	350,000	500,000	350,000	500,000	350,000	−150,000		−150,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service	5,900,000	6,000,000	5,880,000	5,880,000	5,880,000	−120,000		
Operating expenses, property management and disposal service (indefinite appropriation of receipts)		(27,440,000)	(27,300,000)	(27,300,000)	(27,300,000)	(−140,000)		
Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(9,000,000)							
Strategic and critical materials (indefinite appropriations of receipts)	(20,091,000)							
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	1,747,000	1,823,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	−76,000		
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000			
Administrative operations fund (limitation)	(16,716,000)	(16,699,000)	(16,650,000)	(16,650,000)	(16,650,000)	(−49,000)		
Working capital fund	100,000	100,000		100,000		−100,000		−100,000
General supply fund	45,000,000							
Total, General Services Administration	613,740,000	540,539,700	521,613,900	541,607,900	532,184,900	−8,354,800	+10,571,000	−9,423,000
Interstate Commerce Commission								
Salaries and expenses	28,479,000	23,784,000	23,400,000	23,530,000	23,460,000	−324,000	+60,000	−70,000
Payment of loan guarantees	17,400,000							
National Capital Housing Authority								
Operation and maintenance of properties	37,000							
National Science Foundation								
Salaries and expenses	479,999,000	526,000,000	495,000,000	505,000,000	495,000,000	−31,000,000		−10,000,000
Renegotiaton Board								
Salaries and expenses	2,537,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000			
Securities and Exchange Commission								
Salaries and expenses	17,550,000	17,445,000	17,350,000	17,445,000	17,350,000	−95,000		−95,000

See footnotes at end of table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968 (H.R. 9960)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1967 [1]	Budget estimates, 1968 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—Continued								
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued								
Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration								
Salaries and expenses	$800,000							
Selective Service System								
Salaries and expenses	58,940,000	$57,455,000	$57,455,000	$57,455,000	$57,455,000			
Veterans' Administration								
General operating expenses	182,437,000	184,342,000	183,221,000	183,221,000	183,221,000	−$1,121,000		
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	14,312,000	14,300,000	13,650,000	14,300,000	13,975,000	−325,000	+$325,000	−$325,000
Medical and prosthetic research	44,258,000	46,458,000	45,250,000	46,458,000	45,850,000	−608,000	+600,000	−608,000
Medical care	1,292,875,000	1,357,293,000	1,357,293,000	1,357,293,000	1,357,293,000			
Compensation and pensions	4,474,000,000	4,558,000,000	4,558,000,000	4,558,000,000	4,558,000,000			
Readjustment benefits	369,400,000	427,200,000	427,200,000	427,200,000	427,200,000			
Veterans insurance and indemnities	3,500,000	5,150,000	5,150,000	5,150,000	5,150,000			
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	1,136,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000			
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	52,125,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	52,600,000	52,600,000	+600,000	+600,000	
Grants for construction of State nursing homes	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000			
Participation sales authorization	(260,000,000)	(850,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(850,000,000)	(850,000,000)		(+550,000,000)	
Payment of sales insufficiencies		[6] 946,000	333,882	946,000	665,000	−281,000	+331,118	−281,000
Loan guarantee revolving fund (limitation on obligations)	(401,750,000)	Language	(386,046,000)	(386,046,000)	(386,046,000)	(+386,046,000)		
Total, Veterans' Administration	6,438,043,000	6,651,014,000	6,647,422,882	6,650,493,000	6,649,279,000	−1,735,000	+1,856,118	−1,214,000
Total, Independent Offices	7,914,424,300	8,082,296,700	8,010,509,782	8,059,497,900	8,036,354,900	−45,941,800	+25,845,118	−23,143,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE								
Civil Defense								
Operation and maintenance	66,100,000	73,100,000	66,100,000	66,100,000	66,100,000	−7,000,000		
Research, shelter survey and marking	35,000,000	37,900,000	20,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	−17,900,000		−5,000,000
Total, Civil Defense, Department of Defense	101,100,000	111,000,000	86,100,000	91,100,000	86,100,000	−24,900,000		−5,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE								
Public Health Service								
Emergency health activities	10,000,000	12,500,000	9,000,000	9,426,000	9,000,000	−3,500,000		−426,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT								
Renewal and Housing Assistance								
Alaska housing		1,000,000		1,000,000		−1,000,000		−1,000,000
Grants for neighborhood facilities	17,000,000	42,000,000	27,000,000	42,000,000	30,000,000	−12,000,000	+3,000,000	−12,000,000
Salaries and expenses		32,773,000	31,950,000	32,773,000	31,950,000	−823,000		−823,000
Urban renewal programs:								
Grants, fiscal year 1968	750,000,000							
Grants, fiscal year 1969		750,000,000	750,000,000	750,000,000	750,000,000			
Administrative expenses	15,395,000							
Rehabilitation loan fund	1,396,000							
Low-rent public housing annual contributions	255,000,000	290,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	−15,000,000		
Administrative expenses, public housing programs	18,950,000							
Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund	80,000,000	80,000,000	20,000,000	40,000,000	25,000,000	−55,000,000	+5,000,000	−15,000,000
Total, renewal and housing assistance	1,137,741,000	1,195,773,000	1,103,950,000	1,140,773,000	1,111,950,000	−83,823,000	+8,000,000	−28,823,000
Metropolitan Development								
Urban planning grants	33,000,000	50,000,000	40,000,000	50,000,000	45,000,000	−5,000,000	+5,000,000	−5,000,000
Metropolitan development incentive grants		30,000,000				−30,000,000		
Open space land programs	55,000,000	125,000,000	75,000,000	100,000,000	75,000,000	−50,000,000		−25,000,000
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities	100,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000			
Salaries and expenses		6,430,000	6,100,000	6,250,000	6,100,000	−330,000		−150,000
Urban transportation activities:								
Urban mass transportation grants, fiscal year 1968	125,000,000							
Urban mass transportation grants, fiscal year 1969		230,000,000	175,000,000	205,000,000	175,000,000	−55,000,000		−30,000,000
Administrative expenses, urban transportation activities	735,000							
Total, metropolitan development	313,735,000	606,430,000	461,100,000	526,250,000	466,100,000	−140,330,000	+5,000,000	−60,150,000
Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations								
Model cities programs	11,000,000	[7] 662,000,000	237,000,000	537,000,000	[8] 237,000,000	[8] −425,000,000	([9])	[8] −300,000,000
Urban information and technical assistance		6,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,200,000	−3,800,000	+200,000	−800,000
Community development training programs		5,000,000	2,500,000	5,000,000	3,000,000	−2,000,000	+500,000	−1,500,000
Fellowship for city planning and urban studies	[6] (500,000)	500,000		500,000	500,000		+500,000	
Urban studies and housing research	500,000							
Urban research and technology		20,000,000	5,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	−10,000,000	+5,000,000	−5,000,000
Low-income housing demonstration programs	1,575,000	2,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	−500,000		
Housing and building codes, zoning, tax policies, and development standards	1,500,000							
Salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation		3,350,000	1,850,000	2,200,000	1,850,000	−1,500,000		−350,000
By transfer		(2,500,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)		(+500,000)	
Total, demonstrations and intergovernmental relations	14,575,000	699,350,000	250,350,000	564,200,000	256,550,000	−442,800,000	+6,200,000	−307,650,000

See footnotes at end of table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968 (H.R. 9960)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1967[1]	Budget estimates, 1968 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with— Budget estimate	Conference allowance compared with— House allowance	Conference allowance compared with— Senate allowance
TITLE I—Continued								
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—Continued								
Mortgage Credit								
Rent supplement program:								
Annual contract authorization	($20,000,000)	($40,000,000)	------------	($40,000,000)	[9]	[9] (−$40,000,000)	[9]	[9] (−$40,000,000)
Appropriation for payments	2,000,000	5,000,000	$5,000,000	5,000,000	$5,000,000	------------	------------	------------
Administrative expenses	900,000	1,150,000	1,000,000	1,150,000	1,100,000	−50,000	+$100,000	−50,000
Total, mortgage credit	2,900,000	6,150,000	6,000,000	6,150,000	6,100,000	−50,000	+100,000	−50,000
Departmental Management								
General administration	------------	4,510,000	3,950,000	4,230,000	4,000,000	−510,000	+50,000	−230,000
Regional management and services	------------	5,563,000	5,300,000	5,430,000	5,300,000	−263,000	------------	−130,000
Office building equipment and furnishings:								
Appropriation	575,000	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------
By transfer	(125,000)	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary	8,574,000	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------
Participation sales authorizations	(1,420,000,000)	(2,385,000,000)	(581,000,000)	(2,385,000,000)	(2,385,000,000)	------------	(+1,804,000)	------------
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies	[6] 8,200,000	[6] 42,115,000	23,000,000	42,115,000	23,000,000	−19,115,000	------------	−19,115,000
Working capital fund	------------	1,500,000	[8] (1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	−1,500,000	------------	------------
Total, departmental management	17,349,000	53,688,000	32,250,000	51,775,000	32,300,000	−21,388,000	+50,000	−19,475,000
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	1,486,300,000	2,561,391,000	1,853,650,000	2,289,148,000	1,873,000,000	−688,391,000	+19,350,000	−416,148,000
Total appropriations	9,550,999,300	10,793,073,700	9,985,878,782	10,487,530,900	10,037,173,900	−755,899,800	+51,295,118	−450,357,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts (proceeds of sales)	29,091,000	27,440,000	27,300,000	27,300,000	27,300,000	−140,000	------------	------------
Grand total	9,580,090,300	10,820,513,700	10,013,178,782	10,514,830,900	10,064,473,900	−756,039,800	+51,295,118	−450,357,000

---

[1] Includes amounts contained in the 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1967.

[2] Included in budgets of individual departments and agencies.

[3] Contained in S. Doc. 40.

[4] Budget amendment in S. Doc. 36 increases by $14,614,000 for interagency boards, and decreases by $664,000 for investigations.

[5] Includes budget amendment in H. Doc. 114.

[6] Estimated amount of indefinite appropriation.

[7] Additional contract authority, beginning July 1, 1967, on urban renewal projects within comprehensive city programs, authorized sec. 113.

[8] By transfer.

[9] Reported in disagreement. Figures reflect recommendations of House conferees.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitation on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Appropriations, 1967[1]	Budget estimates, 1968 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with— Budget estimate	Conference allowance compared with— House allowance	Conference allowance compared with— Senate allowance
TITLE II								
CORPORATIONS								
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:								
Administrative expenses	($4,410,000)	($4,540,000)	($4,540,000)	($4,540,000)	($4,540,000)	------------	------------	------------
Nonadministrative expenses	(13,465,000)	(13,650,000)	(13,650,000)	(13,650,000)	(13,650,000)	------------	------------	------------
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	(285,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	------------	------------	------------
Department of Housing and Urban Development:								
College housing loans	(2,089,000)	(2,270,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(−$70,000)	------------	------------
Housing for the elderly or handicapped	(1,232,000)	(1,242,000)	(1,232,000)	(1,232,000)	(1,232,000)	(−10,000)	------------	------------
Public facility loans	(1,205,000)	(1,187,000)	(1,187,000)	(1,187,000)	(1,187,000)	------------	------------	------------
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)	(110,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	------------	------------	------------
Federal Housing Administration:								
Administrative expenses	(10,650,000)	(11,125,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(−125,000)	------------	------------
Nonadministrative expenses	(85,000,000)	(88,500,000)	(87,000,000)	(87,000,000)	(87,000,000)	(−1,500,000)	------------	------------
Federal National Mortgage Association	(9,931,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	------------	------------	------------
Total, administrative expenses	(128,377,000)	(132,512,000)	(130,807,000)	(130,807,000)	(130,807,000)	(−1,705,000)	------------	------------

---

[1] Includes amounts contained in the 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the chairman of the managers on the part of the House on this bill, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], has made a thorough and clear explanation of the contents of this conference report.

I am in general agreement with the gentleman. However, there will be a motion to recommit the conference report, with instructions to the managers on the part of the House, to insist upon the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendments numbered 43, 44, 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75.

Mr. Speaker, all of these amendments deal with the sale of participating certificates and the subsidies or insufficiencies that are required to make these participations salable.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I endeavored to make clear the fact in my opening statement on the conference report that the rent supplement question as well as the model cities question are not contained in the conference report. These items are outside of the conference report and will come up after the conference report is adopted.

The gentleman from North Carolina is addressing himself to the participation sales, which sales have been approved by a majority of the conferees.

As I understand the gentleman's position, he favored participation sales, up to a specific amount, but the gentleman objected to those sales going to the budget level; is that correct?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to give a little background information on the subject. We should all understand that what is involved here is the difference between the House-approved figures of $581 million and the figures approved by the other body, $3,235 million; that is, for the sale of participation certificates.

The total sales authorization—and all of us understand the fact that the law requires Congress through its Committee on Appropriations to authorize the sale of these participating certificates and to fix the level of sales and to provide for the payment of insufficiencies—in the bill that passed here authorized sales of $881 million in participating certificates in a pool of mortgages that are taken from various programs such as College Housing, Housing for the Elderly, FNMA, and programs operated by the Veterans' Administration.

However, the other body restored the full budget request and granted authority to sell participation up to the sum of $3,235 million.

So, that is the issue pending before us today and that will be the issue involved in the motion to recommit—shall the House of Representatives sustain its originally taken position?

Mr. Speaker, the reason I think the position of the House should be sustained is simple. It is that the sum of $881 million is all that is required to finance these ongoing programs during fiscal year 1968. The record is abundantly clear that the administration intends to use the sales or excess proceeds from the sale of these certificates to pay general operating expenses of the Government.

I do not believe that is a sound way to handle the sale of capital assets if, indeed, this is a sale, which it is not. Actually, what it is is a device to borrow money, but it is the most expensive way the Government has of borrowing money today. The extra cost of interest alone will be at least one-half of 1 percent. The total cost of the interest subsidy in 1968, if these authorizations are approved, will amount to $71 million for the sales that have been made in 1967 and 1968.

Now, this is a recurring and continuing subsidy and the length it continues depends upon the maturity of the sales agreements. They are selling participation certificates now in a range of from 2 years to 20 years and, assuming that 10 years is the average, you can see by multiplying $71 million by 10 that we will pay out $710,000,000 in subsidies for the privilege of borrowing money this way. And this is the most expensive way of borrowing money.

Now, if we were selling these mortgages it would be a different thing. If we were doing like they did in the Eisenhower administration, exchanging these mortgages for Government bonds and then canceling the bonds, that would be a different thing. I could support that kind of a deal. Because by doing it that way you would be reducing the national debt, and that is exactly what they did under the Eisenhower administration. What was done then was to exchange mortgages for outstanding bonds that were part of the national debt. They got those bonds in and canceled them. And this amounted in effect to a reduction in the national debt.

Not only is this the most expensive way of borrowing money, but it is a misuse of capital assets of the United States.

I do not believe we ought to dispose of any interest in capital assets, particularly after having paid such a heavy subsidy in order to get people to buy them, without applying the proceeds on the debt which was partially created by the funds that we used to acquire the mortgages. It is like canceling out your savings and loan account in order to pay your grocery bills. It is like selling a share of stock in order to pay the house rent. You just do not do those things. It is not prudent.

If we were actually going to dispose of our capital assets, and I am in favor of disposing of as many of these mortgages as possible; if we are going to dispose of them, in my judgment, we should not use the proceeds to pay current operating expenses. We ought to use that part of the proceeds that is necessary to finance on-going programs during the year, and the balance ought to be applied as to reduction on the national debt, because otherwise we are disposing of and wasting capital assets and consuming those capital assets in day-to-day living expenses of the Federal Government.

That in brief is my objection to the participation certificates program. That is why—and I point out again that the bill that passed the House in my judgment contains all of the authorizations required to finance on-going programs that these mortgages are applicable to. The balance of about $2.5 billion of excess money will then go into the Treasury, and will be consumed in day-to-day operations of the Federal Government. I just do not believe that is a sound way to run the Government. That is the reason why I believe the bill ought to be recommitted.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman has a position on this matter—he is opposed to the sale of participation certificates which many of us favor to provide financing for a number of important programs.

In view of the budgetary situation, and to obviate the necessity for increased appropriations, it would seem to me that the gentleman would favor selling certain assets of our Government at this time. We should move some of these frozen assets.

I would say that the gentleman has won two of his points related to the sale of these participation certificates. The law provides that the Congress shall set the limit of participation sales that may be sold through the appropriation process. In conference we have agreed to set the limit on sales at the budget level for 1968. The gentleman wants to go below the budget level on this.

The budget had proposed an indefinite appropriation for insufficiencies. But both the House and Senate bills do not have an indefinite appropriation—there is a definite appropriation.

The gentleman has insisted on having a line item in the bill for the specific amount of the interest cost. We now have that in the bill and he has won his point with regard to having the interest cost carried in the bill. So we know what the maximum cost will be.

In view of the budgetary situation and the obvious need to move some of these frozen assets and avoid the need to appropriate more funds. I would hope that the gentleman would withdraw his motion to recommit.

Mr. JONAS. I cannot do that but I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee, that I am glad to hear him endorse the line for insufficiencies. If he will think this thing through, I believe he will agree with me that my position with respect to the sales is sound also.

I am in favor of selling what they need to use for these ongoing programs. But I am not in favor of selling additional capital assets and using the money up for their day-to-day operations and expenses.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that the President in his budget recommended the sale of $5 billion worth of participation certificates in 1968. What we are considering in this bill today relates only to sale of participations in assets held by two agencies—the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

If the gentleman wants to vote against programs for the cities and for the veterans, then he should vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. JONAS. I might say in answer to my friend that that is not at issue at all. The motion to recommit would not restrict or curtail the activity of a single one of those agencies. It contemplates the sale of all of the participation certificates expected to be used in 1968.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman from North Carolina knows that in the committee and on the floor of this House that I supported his position in this regard and I still do. I think everything he says is perfectly sound. I would also join him in his last observation that certainly our action here will not in any way curtail the activities of the Veterans' Administration. I think that is a completely erroneous idea.

Furthermore, if the gentleman from North Carolina, as a signer of the conference report, is technically foreclosed from offering the motion to recommit, the gentleman from Illinois, being opposed and not being a signer of the conference report, is prepared to offer the motion to recommit.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished manager of the bill a question as to what the able gentleman from North Carolina just said. The Treasury, over and above the on-going programs, needs this money more than they need the securities which the Government now holds as the basis for these participation certificates; is that not true?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct. This is a recognized financing method. This is a sound concept—the substitution of private credit for public credit. The Treasury Department recommended this, the Bureau of the Budget recommended it and the President has recommended it. The Committee on Appropriations has approved it and the conference committee has approved it.

Mr. ALBERT. Is there not a precedent for this, going back to the Eisenhower administration?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Oh, yes, there is ample precedent—this principle is long established—and it is true that this practice was initiated during a previous administration. It has worked well and this is an extension of the same program. This is a recognized, efficient method of financing.

This program has worked well over the years.

It is a sound concept—based on sound principles of financing.

There is nothing new or novel about this program or this concept.

This type of financing is well accepted in financial circles and by financial institutions.

The participation certificates sales program of the Federal National Mortgage Association has been recommended by the President in his budget, by the Treasury Department and by the Committee on Appropriations.

The Participation Sales Act of 1966 provides a method of utilizing frozen assets which have now accumulated and grown to a total of $33 billion.

In fiscal 1967 FNMA—as trustee—was able to sell in the private market some $2.9 billion of participation certificates in loans and mortgages.

These loans and mortgages are owned by the Department of Housing and Urban Development—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the Department of Agriculture—the Small Business Administration—and the Veterans' Administration, among others.

The Participation Sales Act was designed to substitute private credit for public credit—and this it has done.

The Participation Sales Act was designed to establish a more efficient and orderly method of selling financial assets owned by Federal agencies—and this it has done.

The Participation Sales Act was designed to put the Government's frozen assets to work in the public interest—and this it has done.

And—I must add—this can be done to a greater extent, thereby obviating the necessity for increased appropriations.

This is what is proposed in our report this afternoon.

There have been four major advantages to the use of participation sales.

These are:

First. Cost of the sales—to the Federal Government and to the customer—has been reduced.

Second. The range of the market has broadened—because participation sales have been more readily accepted.

Third. The impact of the sales has been spread over a broad range in the capital market rather than concentrated in one specialized area—housing mortgage.

Fourth. The net returns have been much greater than could have been achieved through a comparable volume of sales of individual loans.

The alternative to approval of this sound and accepted method of financing is sharp curtailment in needed and necessary loan programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Federal Housing Administration, the Small Business Administration, and the Veterans' Administration, among others.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the answer of the gentleman from Tennessee to my question of a moment ago.

The Republicans suggest that there is something novel, something bad about participation certificates. They seem to forget that the Eisenhower administration commenced sales of these types of assets in the 1950's and that the Republicans were the innovators whose innovations have been tested by time and accepted. Now they wish to repudiate this procedure for an overtly partisan reason. Between 1954 and 1960 there were $3.2 billion worth of sales of assets sold to private investors. They were then called certificates of interest but the principle is the same as participation certificates. These certificates represented interests in the pooled loans of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The participation certificates of 1967 are being treated under the same accounting procedure that was adopted 12 years ago for certificates of interest.

The sale of these kinds of assets have been publicly supported by Republicans. In 1960, in response to a question concerning sales of assets at a press conference, the then Budget Director Stans said:

> I think it is proper business judgment in the Federal Government as in any other enterprise, when you are in that kind of position to look to assets you can liquidate in order to pay your bills. . . . It is like an individual selling off 100 shares of stock in some year in which he has to pay for some operation for his wife.

To the question:

> Would you describe it as a bookkeeping device simply to balance the budget?

Mr. Stans replied:

> No, sir, I would not. This is a financing means that is employed in this budget.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. In light of the remarks made by the gentleman with reference to the motion to recommit it, a number of us voted against the sale of these participation certificates before. But is it not the case now that with the possibility of a $29 billion deficit that if we do not sell some of these assets, the Government will have no choice and to the degree that we do not sell these certificates, it will mean the Government will have to borrow which will result in an increase in the deficit which will probably place pressure on the money market?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is exactly correct.

If we want to improve the budgetary situation, we will vote down the motion to recommit. If we wish to obviate the necessity of increasing appropriations, we will vote down the motion to recommit. Those who are for fiscal responsibility will vote for these participation sales.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that this matter has been placed in a somewhat different position than when it was initially on the floor of the House. It will be recalled, and I am sure my friend from Tennessee remembers, that in consideration of the last debt ceiling, the PC's were placed under that debt ceiling, so that it is no longer a means of financing obligations outside of the debt. That objection has been eliminated.

It is my understanding—and if I am incorrect, correct me—that the conference report comes back to us today with a separate line item for the amount of interest which is involved in the PC sales. Is that correct?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me, then, that another argument has been eliminated. The question now is being advanced that maybe this is a more expensive way to finance borrowing. That may or may not be true. It seems to me that we are facing a situation as we go through the next several months of great uncertainty about what the Government itself will have to pay on its regular Government obligations. We do not know what the price of interest will be as we go down through these next few months.

It may be that through the use of this device, to the extent that we can use it, we can on some occasion, perhaps on all occasions, tend to reduce the effect of what may happen in the money markets as a result of the great rollover that the Treasury has to go through each year on the debt created in prior years. All of us know that there is about $175 to $177 billion of the total debt that rolls over every year, and as it has rolled over in the last few years it has become shorter in duration.

We have a limit, as you know, on the interest that can be paid on long-term obligations. In connection with the last debt ceiling bill we also made an exception to that, allowing the Treasury to float bonds without regard to the interest rate for a 7-year period. We are disturbed about the effect of Government borrowing on the money markets, and it is that impact of the Government on the money markets that seems to be causing a lot of people trouble when they go to the money markets. Higher rates are the end result.

I would think that we have answered enough of the arguments about the PC's to at least allow the executive departments this additional method of coping with the problems that they meet constantly in the money market under these kinds of conditions.

Maybe it would be well for us to figure out some other ways for them to go to the market. But even if this may, as my good friend from North Carolina points out, cost a little more in the long run, the total effect upon the economy may be far less through the use of this than the effect would be without it. I would hope that we could avoid sending this back to conference on this point.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman agree that the motion to recommit as to this item should be defeated?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes. I had hoped my friends would not even offer it.

We are playing with a pretty serious thing, as I see it. Most of the Members know my own views about it, but I am concerned, I must say, with the future problems we are going to have in this country in the money markets.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I admire the tenacity and determination of my esteemed colleague and friend, Congressman Jonas from North Carolina. However, in view of the budget situation and the budget proposal, in view of the Secretary of the Treasury's recommendation and the conferees' approving it, and in view of the fact that it involves only two items for the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I wonder if the gentleman would withdraw his motion to recommit the conference report on this point.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield, because I have the greatest respect for my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, but we cannot just go out and pick up the money on the street. We have to go to the money markets for the sale of the PC's just the same as we go to the money market for the sale of bonds. I would point out $1,600,000,000, of the PC's involved in this are 3-percent notes. The gentleman himself knows we are not going to be able to sell a 3-percent note at anything like par.

Mr. MILLS. This is the reason for the device.

Mr. JONAS. And we are going to have to pay a substantial subsidy for anybody to buy these loans bearing 3 percent interest. I think the Record is abundantly clear on the basis of what has transpired so far, that we can count on having to pay at least one-half of 1 percent more for this sort of borrowing than for regular Treasury borrowing.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am not disagreeing with my friends about the fact that it is borrowing. I thought I made it plain I am not disagreeing with my friend from North Carolina that it may cost a few points more to go this way than the other regular way of borrowing. What I am thinking about is whether we know that there is less overall effect with or without this device. That is all I am saying. I think it is worth slightly more in the way of interest cost to have it and to use it if the result of using this vehicle is less depressive and creates less havoc in the marketplaces.

I do not think anybody can say it will or it will not, but I believe as we go forward in this circumstance we need to have this additional vehicle. If this vehicle is useful, if it could avoid some of the problems that regular conventional borrowing would involve and entail, it would be better to go this way.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit me to make a comment?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield 1 additional minute to my good friend from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman from Arkansas, I am sure, understands I am not trying to eliminate the sale of all PC's. It is just a question of whether we are going to sell the amount of PC's required for the ongoing programs or whether we are going to use this device as a method for borrowing money for ordinary operating expenses of the Government. I just do not happen to believe this is a good way to run the Government.

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will yield, I do not disagree with my good friend about the concern he has about what we should do in normal times. The only thing I am trying to impress upon my friend is that, so far as I can see ahead in the next several months, when it comes to the money markets we are not going to be going through normal times. It seems to me we have what everybody has described as a real crunch coming up in the money markets. Whether PC sales will help I do not know, but I do not think anybody can say this would not help. So what is the harm in having it if it could possibly help the situation?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I think we should support the position of the committee in the sale of the participation certificates. From listening to the discussion, I do not know that any time has been given to just what is involved here. I opposed initiation of this program, because what this is, in a nutshell, is the Government selling or committing its assets, notes owed to the Government, as security for the participation certificates. It amounts to mortgaging particular assets instead of borrowing money directly.

The PC's are nothing except I O U's backed up by notes which the Federal Government already owns.

I thought it unsound at the outset for our Government to start selling or committing its assets, which were not included in the determination of the amount of the public debt. As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills] said, we are now including such participation certificates as a debt within the meaning of the public debt.

The House took action the other day, approving a motion or amendment I offered to hold all Government spending from appropriated funds back to 1967 spending, agency by agency and department by department. Exceptions were made as to trust funds, the Vietnam war, social security, veterans, medicare and other retirement and relief programs. Of course the REA, the CCC, TVA and a number of other organizations do not come within the term "appropriated funds." I appreciated the overwhelming support of the Members of the House. My amendment is estimated to cut the budget increases back by $6 to $8 billion—unfortunately in 2 days hearings in the Senate, the Director of Bureau of the Budget opposes our action, apparently so the executive department can decide what to hold back—and some of our colleagues on the other side seem to want the right to add items. As I told you then, we will be fortunate to continue to carry on as we did in 1967 for we have a war with wartime costs. Now as to the immediate issue. If we prohibit this sale of Government debentures for which our assets are collateral, whatever the technical facts may be, the public will take it that the deficiency between income and expenditures will be that much greater.

Believing it unwise at the outset to sell or commit our assets to pay operating costs, on a basis that would not list them as a part of the debt, I believe that we have gotten ourselves into a position now though we do count such certificates as a part of the debt, if we cut them out, because of public reaction we will increase the dangers of further inflationary pressures.

I hope that the other body—though I have my doubts—will go along with the action of this body in holding spending to the 1967 level, save the $6 to $8 billion in increases provided in the 1968 budget. If the Senate will only agree it will help much. However, if we strike out this item, we will have to borrow that much more money through regular channels, and in the public mind it will increase the spread between income and outgo, and further increase inflationary pressures, and demands for a tax increase.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire, a member of the committee [Mr. Wyman].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am confused concerning what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] said about it being inflationary not to do what is proposed at the present time with this costly participation certificate sales. It was my understanding this is just contrary to the facts of the situation.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas] said that if these additional participation certificates are issued it is going to cost approximately an additional unnecessary $71 million. We know the period of maturity for these PC's will range from 2 to 20 years. Even if we strike a median on that, it appears that an additional financing charge of between $700 and $800 million will be added to the burdens of the Government of the

United States if this method of financing is adopted.

It seems to me that this would be demonstrably inflationary as well as wasteful, if the money can be procured in another and less expensive fashion—as it can by direct borrowing.

I believe it is our obligation here, representing the taxpayers, to insist that the Government not throw in its last chips as security for PC's, leaving little or nothing else to borrow on. We ought not to sanction this added waste. The motion to recommit should be supported.

I cannot agree with the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] that a vote to limit the sale of participation certificates to the needs of the agency whose assets are being sold is a vote against funding for veterans and cities. This is not the case.

On the contrary, it is a vote to conserve those assets for the possible continued funding of the needs of veterans and cities for years to come. Those who urge the sale of these assets and use of the proceeds to finance the general operating costs of Government are in truth and reality the ones who are voting against veterans and cities.

Likewise, with all due respect to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], to suggest that in the long run the sale of these PC's has the prospect of stabilizing the money market is equally erroneous. There is no surer way to demoralize the money market in the long run than to permit Government refinancing at a subsidy level that is outright wasteful.

All are agreed that it costs more to issue PC's than to have Treasury borrowing. With long maturities and high interest payments there is nearly a billion dollars of unnecessary added cost to the American taxpayers in the present proposal which is supported by the administration in this body to make the present debt seem to be a little less than it actually is.

This is deception. It is fiscally irresponsible. In the long run it will cost every man, woman, and child in this country added taxes for playing politics with the Treasury.

I refuse to be a party to this and I hope other Members on the other side of the aisle will do the same. I could not support this practice were a Republican administration in office. We should not be paying such a premium for this type of financing. Hundreds of millions of wasted dollars are involved and the people should know this. Why take the most expensive way when we do not have to? We face a fiscal crisis.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I supported the Sales Participation Act when it was before this House some time ago, and I support the effort here today, in this conference report, to authorize the marketing of sales participation certificates to the extent of $3,235,000,000 for two agencies, the Veterans' Administration and HUD.

At the time we considered initially the sales participation legislation argument was made that it would be all right to dispose of these capital assets under certain curcumstances. It was said it would be all right if we included whatever assets we did dispose of by borrowing or by sales under the limitations of the national debt. This we have since that time done.

The argument seems to be today, to me, that no one is arguing we should not dispose of at least some of these capital assets. The argument simply seems to be how many of these assets are we going to authorize the disposal of? The budget recommended up to $5 billion.

So the question to me, quite simply, is one of how much since we all agree that we should utilize this method under these conditions of tight money, where inflation is running rampant, to help finance the Federal Government. The money market is in real trouble. Chaos and uncertainty prevail.

If we are all agreed that some certificates should be marketed, it should not be too difficult, it seems to me, to agree to go ahead and authorize sales well under the budget request of $5 billion, to the extent of $3,235 million. Some say that this is a bookkeeping gimmick to make the deficit appear less. I do not know whether it is a gimmick or not, but if it is, it still seems to me the most simple way under existing circumstances of lessening the impact of inflation by making more money available to the Federal Government to help finance what is already a too large deficit and has been for too long. The impact of additional direct Treasury borrowing upon the already short supply of money simply seems to me to dictate that we should go ahead and utilize these capital assets to lessen the impact of inflation on the economy. In fact we have no choice, grasping straws as we are to avert economic disaster. It might well be the most economical way.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let us get one thing clear. The actual deficit is not going to be changed one penny by whether we authorize participation certificate sales or not. It may change the bookkeeping, but it will not change the deficit picture one iota. The President's Commission on the Budget concept recently came out and said that it should not be used as a device to make expenditures look different than they otherwise are. What will you be doing if you adopt this conference report? You will be authorizing the Government to go out into the money market, in a tight market, with the most expensive type of borrowing participation certificates command the highest interest rate of any kind of Government borrowing. How silly can we be? We are worried about high interest. The way to prevent it is to borrow at the cheapest rate of interest possible—not at the highest rate possible. We are worried about the cost of carrying the national debt. Authorizing the sale of participation certificates only increases that cost. That is the issue here.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Surely I yield. The gentleman yielded me my time.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman made a good argument for the participation certificate sales during the previous administration. I commend him for his position then.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No, I did not, because in fact we had no legislation on it in those days. It was done in a limited area and a small amount.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

In fact, if you want to look at the facts, we had sales of about $1 billion over a period of some 10 years prior to 1965. And now $11 billion of these participation certificates have either been sold or are contemplated to be sold in the next year. The point I want to make is that the Secretary of the Treasury in appearances before the Committee on Ways and Means a couple of months ago admitted that the sale of participation certificates as a means of financing the deficit would not have any effect as far as lessening the pressures of inflation are concerned and would not have any effect on lessening the credit crunch.

The real issue before us is whether we are going to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow $2 billion in the most expensive way possible. There is no question that it will cost us more to borrow through participation certificates than would be the case if we borrowed in the usual manner.

The motion to recommit should be supported. The authority to borrow $2 billion by the sale of participation certificates should be eliminated.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, there are at least three ways to improve the budget situation—and everybody, of course, wants to improve our budget situation. One way is to cut appropriations. We have done that in this bill to the tune of more than three quarters of a billion dollars. Second, we can authorize the sale of participation certificates. Third, we can have a tax adjustment and plug the tax loopholes. The Committee on Ways and Means has not acted in the latter area. At the present time we are considering the matter of participation certificates. We believe the Secretary of the Treasury should be allowed to sell these participation certificates in the next year. We have $33 billion worth of frozen assets that should we put to work in the public interest.

This is a sound concept—a concept proven by practice.

This is another way to improve the

budgetary situation and this is the way to move important programs forward.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Members of the House would vote down the motion to recommit and allow the full budget level of participation sales to be approved.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 9960, making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

Most specifically, I rise in opposition to the adoption of amendment No. 48, which deletes the proposal to appropriate $1,000,000 for native housing in Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very disappointed to see members of the conference committee from the other body unanimously recede from their position of demanding the inclusion of funds for Alaska native housing; and I was equally disappointed to find that not one member of the conference committee on either side of the aisle, in either the House or the other body, reported disagreement with the action of a majority of the committee to delete this small appropriation for Alaskan natives.

The $1,000,000 was originally removed from the House version of the bill, allegedly because at that time no plans and specifications had been submitted to the Appropriations Committee. The plans and specifications were subsequently completed and forwarded to Washington, and were placed before the other body when the bill was being considered. Members of the conference committee were furnished with the plans and specifications and supporting data, thus fully meeting the objections which were stated in the House committee report. Thereafter, I contacted each of the conference committee members pointing out the extreme importance of this small appropriation to the impoverished Alaskan natives.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I have failed to convey how desperately this assistance is needed for the Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts. These rugged Americans have mastered one of the most inhospitable areas on earth—the frozen tundra, the arctic coastline, the harsh and unforgiving winter isolation in the desolate and sparsely populated interior regions of Alaska, and the unpredictable and harsh Arctic and Bering Sea winter icepacks. Some of the Alaska natives live in urban areas, and some in the milder but still very difficult areas of central, southeastern, and southwestern Alaska. But, many of these Alaskan natives have endured in a land where life is not retained without considerable personal effort. Most of the homes of the natives are dilapidated and beyond any hope of meaningful repair. Most of these units are characterized by inadequate original construction, and are frequently built from such materials as packing crates, cardboard, driftwood, crude lumber, and tarpaper. Their homes are small and inadequate by any other standard, usually with a single heat source—an oil stove—are poorly ventilated, and frequently have no insulation. Anywhere else in America, these homes would be considered completely unfit for human habitation, and yet these wonderful people must somehow survive in harsh arctic and subarctic climates where temperatures drop below −50° Fahrenheit.

I know that I am called upon from time to time to ask for special consideration for the natives from Alaska. Although I am compelled to do so, I do it gladly because the situation is entirely unique under the American flag. By comparison with the appalling poverty in many of the native communities of Alaska, the worse pockets of poverty in the remotest areas of Appalachia seem to be areas of wealth and affluence. This is not a humorous comparison, but quite a sad commentary. As a matter of national policy, the United States is committed to helping disadvantaged people around the globe find a path toward economic self-sufficiency and personal dignity.

Some of the Alaskan natives have successfully made a transition from the old culture to the new. Most have not, despite tens of millions of dollars spent annually by the Federal and State Governments in their behalf. Many live in conditions that surpass the worse urban slums to be found anywhere in the United States—perhaps anywhere except the deepest recesses of Africa, where frigid temperatures are not a factor for survival.

These people, the Alaskan natives, represent about one-fourth of Alaska's civilian population. As such, they can be either a tremendous economic burden or a great reservoir of opportunity. Their future is perhaps the most critical problem the State of Alaska faces today.

While 25 percent of the civilian population of Alaska is native, unemployment is appallingly high, probably averaging 60 percent unemployment across the length and breadth of Alaska. Jobs are simply scarce in the villages, other than subsistence hunting, fishing, and other related activities. In some Alaskan villages, the only person regularly employed is the janitor in the school run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

If the Alaskan native were lazy, lacking in personal resources, he could not have survived for long. He is a strong, gentle, able individual; but today he is caught between two worlds—and if his life is appalling and embarrasing to the nonnative observer, it can only be more shamefully degrading to him and the other individuals involved.

Mr. Speaker, I can follow no other course than to solemnly urge that the conference report be recommitted to the conference committee. While the motion to recommit will contain no specific instructions to report H.R. 9960 back to the House with a provision appropriating the $1,000,000 for Alaska native housing, I do nevertheless solemnly urge you to vote overwhelming for recommittal, and then importune each and every member of the conference committee to courageously reconsider this matter and include the Alaska native housing appropriation so desperately needed.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion to recommit and I am casting my vote today in favor of authorizing the full amount of participation certificate sales provided for under the conference report on H.R. 9960. I feel the time has come to put an end to attempts to make this tried and tested form of Government financing into a political football. Time and time again our Republican colleagues have unsuccessfully challenged this sensible way of selling Government assets, and again today they are doing the same thing in nothing less than a political attempt to embarrass the President in this difficult time in our country's fiscal affairs.

We certainly have enough real issues and problems before us so that we do not have to resurrect an imaginary issue involving the sales of participation certificates. The Congress in 1966 saw fit to approve the participation sales program, and now, in keeping with this decision, we should grant authority for it to continue smoothly ahead as programed.

I want to make it clear at the outset of my remarks that there is no real link between participation sales and spending. Participation certificates are merely a financing technique. They are clearly not a supplemental source of funds or a means of avoiding congressional control over Federal spending.

The participation sales program over the years has become a tested and successful method of disposing of "pooled" Government assets of various Government agencies. The program has the support of financial experts in and out of Government and of such organizations as the American Bankers Association, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and other veterans groups.

It is incongruous to me that our Republican colleagues should attack this program. By a similar pooling of Government assets, the Eisenhower administration had sales totaling about $1.5 billion. President Eisenhower said in his budget message of 1955:

> Private capital will be gradually substituted for the Government investment until Government funds are fully repaid and private owners take over responsibility for the program.

Mr. Speaker, these comments are the basis of the participation program under the Johnson administration. This program, as in the Eisenhower administration, is sound and sensible.

First, it permits a partnership between public and private initiative by permitting the flow of private credit into Federal programs.

Second, by facilitating this flow of credit, a more effective bridge between Federal loan programs and the vast capital resources of the private market is established, allowing for maximum advantage of the flexibility, ingenuity and efficiency of these markets.

And lastly, the program is a means of bringing greater coordination to the asset sales program in a far more orderly, efficient and cheaper way than by the disorganized, competitive efforts in the past of individual Government agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to the harsh, unfair, and unworthy political attacks that have been made against this participation program today, and I have cast my vote accordingly.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the Eisenhower administration I was fortunate enough to obtain from the administration agreement on a 12-year program for the regeneration for our hospital and medical system operated by the Veterans' Administration. As originally conceived, we planned to appropriate $75 million each year for this project. In many instances this has been achieved and generally speaking we are just about on schedule or just a little bit behind.

In fiscal year 1964 the appropriation was $76 million; in 1965 it was $98 million; in 1966 it was $90 million and in 1967 it was $52 million. The Department of Medicine and Surgery for fiscal year 1968 requested $126 million. This was reduced by review in the Comptroller's Office of the Veterans' Administration to $106 million. The Bureau of the Budget chopped this in half and set the figure at $52 million, and this is the exact amount which the House voted on the 17th and the Senate committee concurred in this amendment, but added $600,000 for modernization and expansion of the Veterans' Administration hospital at White River Junction. The conference agreement which I am supporting here today provides for $52,600,000 but deletes any provision earmarking $600,000 for a specific project. I cite this history to give the background for this long-term program which the Congress has always supported and also to emphasize the point that the appropriation we are hopefully voting today has already been cut in half from the need originally estimated by the Department of Medicine and Surgery. Specifically this $52 million appropriation would provide for the following projects:

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

Item	Total cost	Amount requested
Replacement and relocation hospitals:		
Chicago, Ill. (760 beds), funds to complete	$24,565,000	$2,672,000
San Diego, Calif. (1,040 beds), construction funds	30,000,000	29,000,000
Seattle, Wash. (bed expansion), design funds	24,667,000	1,000,000
Tampa, Fla. (720 beds), funds to complete	18,762,000	1,295,000
Total replacement and relocation hospitals		33,967,000
Other hospital improvements:		
Chillicothe, Ohio (modernize boiler plant), construction funds	1,341,000	1,221,000
Columbia, S.C., cardiopulmonary clinic	196,000	196,000
Los Angeles, Calif., smoke barriers and standpipes	109,000	109,000
Mountain Home, Tenn. (boiler plant), design funds	1,300,000	100,000
West Haven, Conn. (exterior brick repairs), construction funds	2,381,000	2,281,000
West Haven, Conn., outpatient clinic consolidation	208,000	208,000
West Haven, Conn., fire sprinklers	188,000	188,000
Intensive care units at selected hospitals	6,825,000	6,825,000
Miscellaneous projects, $25,000 to $100,000	1,298,000	1,298,000
Administrator's discretionary fund	500,000	500,000
Total other improvements		12,926,000
Research:		
Denver, Colo. (10,000 net sq. ft. addition), design funds	$702,000	$107,000
Madison, Wis. (16,000 net sq. ft. addition), funds to complete	1,014,000	465,000
Oklahoma City, Okla. (15,082 net sq. ft. addition), funds to complete	1,525,000	380,000
Minneapolis, Minn. (animal research facility), design funds	233,000	25,000
Palo Alto, Calif., 10,000 net sq. ft. addition	775,000	775,000
Pittsburgh, Pa. (8,000 net sq. ft. addition), design funds	620,000	73,000
Washington, D.C. (20,000 net sq. ft. addition), construction funds	1,407,000	1,305,000
Total research		3,130,000
General administration		1,977,000
Total request, 1968		52,000,000

Mr. Speaker, I also want to recall to Members of Congress the fact that last year the President signed into law the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act providing benefits for veterans who served on or after January 1955, including those now on duty in Vietnam. The bill was patterned after the Korean GI bill of rights and passed both Houses by unanimous vote. Recently we have liberalized this provision again by unanimous vote, and this new law is designated Public Law 90–77. Readjustment benefits are provided for in this appropriation in the amount of $427,200,000, and thousands of veterans who are taking training are those who have only recently returned from service in Vietnam. The most recent public law which I have made reference to will produce 110,000 compensation and pension adjudication cases attributable to the Vietnam group, 82,000 applications for education and training and a little over 30,000 housing and loan applications.

These are commitments which we have made and we must now pay for them. It is one of the rising costs of war, and I know that all Members of this House want to meet their responsibilities in this field. I cite these facts and give this history because I think it is pertinent for us at this time to keep this in mind when we are considering the 1968 appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, which has been passed by the House totaling approximately $6,650,000,000.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks on the participation sales program at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and then I shall yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations such time as may remain and then move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, by a margin of only a very few votes the House in May 1966 passed the Participation Sales Act. Many of us at that time opposed this measure as a budget gimmick and warned that sale of these participations at an interest cost of about one-half of 1 percent over Treasury financing would exert upward pressure on the money market causing diversion of badly needed funds from the home mortgage market. Events proved us to be correct even to the point that the Treasury itself for a period of months banned the sale of participations.

We are again in a period of tight money with long-term governments and municipal bonds lower in price than even the low points reached in the monetary stringency last fall. For instance, long-term Treasury 4¼s of 1987–92 are about three points lower in price than they were at the worst period last year.

The conference report proposes that this appropriation bill restore $2.35 billion of participation sales authority for the current year which was knocked out by the House in passing this appropriation bill. Mr. Speaker, in view of the disorganized state of long-term Government and municipal market it is perfectly obvious that if an attempt was made to sell long-term participations in this market that it would completely and disastrously disrupt the long-term bond market. If the administration would attempt to sell $2.3 billion of participations in the short-term market there is no question but that this would force up short-term interest rates to the point where Government agency securities again would be sold at prices to yield over 6 percent. The result would be that high yielding participation certificates would again draw funds from the savings institutions which provide home mortgage credit. The home mortgage market which has been enjoying a splendid recovery would be thrown into a tailspin just as it was last fall. If we want to provoke a new crisis in the home mortgage market, granting this participation sales authority as provided in this conference report, would be a sure way of creating that result.

The President's Commission on the Budget has included in its report a recommendation that participation sales be treated the same as Treasury obligations in the budget. If that recommendation is carried out, stripping participation sales of budget gimmickery there will be no incentive for using the participation sales device. It is pure misleading budget gimmickery costing the taxpayers at least one-half of 1 percent more interest than would otherwise have to be paid by the Government to finance through conventional Treasury borrowing.

Mr. Speaker, pending the time when the Congress ends the mockery of participation sales financing we should move on the problem as it comes before us. Specifically, this conference report should be rejected or recommitted with instructions to delete this $2.3 billion of participation sales authority.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the balance of the time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to take 15 minutes, but to take only a moment.

This question has been thoroughly discussed; it has been reviewed and sifted. I think that most of the Members have made up their minds as to their position upon it.

Principally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize the primary point of interest here, and undertake to make it very specific. The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] have already undertaken to make clear the fact that we have pending before us the conference report on this legislation.

The rent supplement matter and the model cities matter will come up separately; they are not involved in any way in the conference report.

We are voting now, and separately, upon the conference report.

The largest amounts in the conference report, of course, are those for the Veterans' Administration. I would hope that we would bear that in mind.

It is my opinion that it would be most unfortunate, in principle, for us to recommit the conference report at this stage, when we have worked for months and months in an effort to try to reach agreement and bring these matters to a final resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that within a bill which carries appropriations of more than $10 billion, one cannot hope to obtain complete agreement, one cannot have everyone in the House fully agree.

There are some items about which there is considerable disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to participation sales certificates there was some complaint to the effect that they were not being counted within the budget ceiling. That point, however, does not remedy the fiscal situation. Where we are confronted with a possible budget deficit of nearly $30 billion, in essence, as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] has pointed out, I can see nothing wrong with selling some of these assets with which to finance governmental programs. We are doing it with our eyes open. No one is trying to deceive anyone and no one can tell what the situation may be which will confront us within the next few months.

We are threatened with a deficit of perhaps as much as $29 billion, and if this motion to recommit is adopted and should become the law, it will contribute over $2 billion toward the final deficit figure.

So I see no reason why we should worsen the fiscal picture at this stage. I see no reason why we should deny the executive branch the opportunity for some flexibility. While it may cost some more in the next few months—it may or it may not—in the long run it has the prospect of helping to stabilize the money market and bringing about more orderly management of our current fiscal problems.

I believe the Members have made up their minds on the issue before us and I believe the majority will vote "no" on the motion to recommit. Mr. Speaker, I join the subcommittee and I join the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] and others in urging that this conference report not be recommitted; that the conference report be approved; and then that we proceed to the more controversial matters in the separate motions involving rent supplements and model cities.

I would hope that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] would move the previous question at this point.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, let me say again that the Senate has receded or reduced items on 49 of the 77 items in the conference report, and the House conferees have sustained more than 75 percent of dollar differences between the two bodies on the items in conference. The savings below the Senate-passed bill are almost half a billion dollars. This is based on the motions we will make in the House today after the conference report is adopted. Furthermore, we will have an opportunity to vote separately on appropriations for the rent supplements and model cities programs. If the House adopts the conference report and chooses to sustain its previous position on the items in disagreement, we will have prevailed on more than 90 percent of the total dollars in conference.

In my judgment we have brought the Members a good conference report, and I believe it should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report, and I urge that the Members vote down the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. JONAS. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONAS moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 9960 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 43, 44, 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the nays appeared to have it.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 208, answered "present" 5, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

YEAS—184

Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Betts
Biester
Blackburn
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Findley
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gardner
Gathings
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Heckler, Mass.
Horton
Hosmer
Hunt
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Nelsen
Ottinger
Passman
Pelly
Pettis
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pollock
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Robison
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebell
Schweiker

Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Vander Jagt
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—208

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Ashmore
Barrett
Bennett
Bevill
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Carey
Casey
Clark
Cohelan
Conyers
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McFall
McMillan
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pool
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Rees
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
St Germain
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Watts
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wolff
Wright
Young
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Bates
Berry
Conte
O'Konski
Yates

NOT VOTING—35

Ashley
Aspinall
Bell
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Celler
Corman
Diggs
Gettys
Hébert
Herlong
Jones, Mo.
Kleppe
Kyl
Long, La.
McCulloch
Macdonald, Mass.
Mathias, Md.
Murphy, N.Y.
Philbin
Poage
Rarick
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Roybal
St. Onge
Smith, N.Y.
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Boggs against.
Mr. Bates for, with Mr. Philbin against.
Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Poage against.
Mr. Conte for, with Mr. St. Onge against.
Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Kleppe for, with Mr. Gettys against.
Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.
Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Celler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Button.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Corman with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.

Mr. EVERETT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea". I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. ST. ONGE]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: On page 3, line 17, insert:

"PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON POSTAL ORGANIZATION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For necessary expenses of the President's Commission on Postal Organization, established by Executive Order 11341 of April 8, 1967, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and including reimbursement to the Post Office Department for funds advanced to the Commission from the appropriation for 'Administration and regional operation,' $1,500,000, to be available from August 1, 1967, and to remain available until June 30, 1968."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the several amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: On page 12, line 3, insert:

"Post office and courthouse (construction and alteration), Hammond, Indiana, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, $265,000;".

Senate amendment No. 18: On page 12, line 8, insert:

"Post office and Federal office building, Springfield, Massachusetts, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, $1,177,000;".

Senate amendment No. 19: On page 12, line 22, insert:

"Fedral office buildings, Goldsboro, North Carolina, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, $205,000;".

Senate amendment No. 20: On page 12, line 24, insert:

"Post office, courthouse and Federal office building, Raleigh, North Carolina in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, $1,693,000;".

Senate amendment No. 21: On page 13, line 1, insert:

"Post office and courthouse, Wilkesboro, North Carolina, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, $234,000;".

Senate amendment No. 22: On page 13, line 3, insert:

"Post office and Federal office building, Fargo, North Dakota, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, $437,000;".

Senate amendment No. 23: On page 13, line 10, insert:

"Federal office building, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, $735,000;".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendment No. 58 and Senate amendment No. 59 be considered en bloc, since they relate to the same item.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report

the Senate amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: On page 36, line 23, strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$125,000,000".

Senate amendment No. 59: On page 37, line 2, strike out "$237,000,000" and insert "$537,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 58 and 59.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GIAIMO

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GIAIMO moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 58 and 59 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, these two amendments numbered 58 and 59 relate to the model cities program including the amount for urban renewal projects in model cities areas. These amendments do not relate to the rent supplement program. That will be considered later.

This has to do with the model cities program which the House previously adopted and which the Congress has favored.

The item of $12,000,000 for planning is not in conference. The House and Senate have agreed on the full amount of $12,000,000 for planning for the model cities program. The House recommended a modest beginning of $150,000,000 for the model cities program. The Senate insists on $400,000,000 which is the budgeted amount, the full amount, for the model cities program.

The other item relates to urban renewal projects in model cities. The House has approved $75 million for this phase of the model cities program. This will enable urban renewal in model cities to get started on a modest basis. The Senate recommended $125 million for the first-year funding for this purpose. Over all, by way of totals, the House is recommending $237 million for planning, for model cities grants, and for urban renewal. The Senate is recommending $537 million. So there is in disagreement $300 million.

My colleague from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] wants to yield to the position of the Senate for the full amount. Feeling that we should support the position of the House and the Appropriations Committee, I thought the matter should be brought back for a separate vote. My motion is that the House insist upon its position.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I support the position of the gentleman from Tennessee and oppose the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut. The preferential motion would accept the Senate figures. We think they are too high. The only way to avoid doing so on this item is to vote down the preferential motion, and then the vote will come on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the House insist on its disagreement with the Senate. This matter will then go back to conference where we will have another opportunity to have a meeting of the minds and to compromise these differences.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, I should like to say that if you vote down the preferential motion, we will have an opportunity to go back to conference and work out the matter on model cities. We hope we can reach an agreement.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. There is another reason I support the position of the gentleman from Tennessee. We are now in the second quarter of the new fiscal year. This House by a substantial vote agreed with the Appropriations Committee back in the spring. There is more reason to agree with us now than there was then, because half a year has already elapsed and the Department has not moved one iota from the position it was in a year ago today. It has had $11 million of planning money available for nearly 12 months—and it has not disbursed one dime of it. It has not selected one city.

The testimony before the House committee was that it will require from 6 months to a year for the cities to get their plans in once they get their planning money.

I therefore submit that the department will not use more than the House figures for construction money even if we should grant it. In view of the budgetary situation I certainly concur in the view of the gentleman from Tennessee that the House should not abruptly accept the Senate figures but should send us back to where another effort will be made to reconcile the differences.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] 5 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House adopt the Senate figures on this item because of the fact that this is the model cities program about which we have heard so much. In effect, what we would do would be to adopt the $400 million instead of the $150 million for supplemental grants, and $125 million instead of the $75 million for urban renewal, which is tied to the model cities program. It is most important, in my opinion, that we give extremely serious consideration to this bill and to this amendment, because in my opinion and in the opinion of many of us, this is the most important aspect of our poverty program.

We have heard much discussion about the poverty program. I have been one of those who in many instances has criticized the poverty program. It is no secret that attempts will undoubtedly be made, strong attempts, to cut certain parts of the poverty program in the very near future. But if there is one program that deserves our merit and consideration, if there is one program which will really try to do a good job, it is the model cities program.

We have to get it off the ground and get it moving, and get it moving quickly. I want to stress that we are not talking about expenditures of moneys. We are talking about obligational authority and appropriations. Very little of this money is going to be spent in the immediate future, but what it is going to do is to allow HUD and the cities of this Nation to begin their planning, to begin real planning looking toward the day when the cities will qualify with HUD, and when they will be able to get the funds to initiate these all-embracing, comprehensive model city programs.

It would be shortsighted to cut this program at this present day. This is not the kind of program that we can put over until next year, and it is not a good argument to say that quite a few months in the fiscal year have passed and that HUD will not be able to expend all the moneys this year.

Again, I repeat, we are not talking about expenditures of money. We are talking about enabling HUD to plan and to make its long-range plans with the cities, so HUD can get started.

There is a long leadtime in all these programs involving cities, certainly in any urban renewal program, so we have to take account of the fact that there has to be good planning, long leadtime, so we can have some results in the near future. Again, it does not mean the money is going to be expended immediately. I cannot help repeating that.

It is going to enable HUD and the cities to study it comprehensively, to begin their planning, to get those plans in to HUD and get this very important program moving.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman speaks of long leadtime planning requiring this sum of hundreds of millions of dollars, does he mean this money is needed so that contracts or obligational authority may be permitted or entered into?

Mr. GIAIMO. Exactly.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. That unless this money is appropriated there can be no contracts, no authority to enter into any obligation insofar as model cities are concerned and planning is something separate and apart. The only way we can avoid holding up this program for years is to enable contracts to be entered into within a reasonable time and, without this, the contracts may have to be held up for several years?

Mr. GIAIMO. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I trust the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut will be voted up. He is asking this House to recede and concur with the Senate amendment on the model cities program. That provides for $537 million, of which $125 million is for urban renewal in model cities areas and $400 million is for supplementary grants in the model cities programs.

The $537 million recommended by the Senate is $125 million less than that which was asked for by the Bureau of the Budget. This item, Mr. Speaker, was considered by this House on May 17 of this year. The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee brought his bill to the floor at that time, and since that time there have been very considerable changes and incidents which have occurred all over this Nation. There has been some different kind of thinking on the part of, I believe, everyone as to how best to meet the terrible and complex problems that are perplexing the cities of this Nation. This program is addressed not only to the great and large cities, but also to some of the smaller cities in this Nation.

This whole program is addressed to solving the problems that our larger and smaller cities have been experiencing in the past couple of years.

Incidentally, this is not a partisan matter. Many Members on the other side voted favorably on the model cities program. A great number of Governors throughout this Nation have expressed their concern and feeling on this program. They favor it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings developed by the Senate there were a number of Governors who expressed their concern over the failure on the part of the Congress to fully fund the model cities program, to fully fund it as budgeted by the Department. That expression was offered to the Senate by the Governors of Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, this clearly shows it is not a partisan matter. It transcends all political considerations. The question here is whether or not Congress is willing to do what it has to do if we are to meet the severe problems and the heavy burdens that the core cities are staggering under.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a telegram which I believe is important. It was sent to the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Independent Offices. It reads:

> Conference committee failure to agree on full funding for model cities and rent supplements portends further disaster for urban areas. Our August emergency convocation urged that "Congress must move without delay on urban programs. The country can wait no longer for measures that have too long been denied the people of the cities and the Nation as a whole". We ask your support of the Senate position on these measures.

Mr. Speaker, this telegram was signed by Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the board of Time-Life, Inc., and A. Philip Randolph, the head of the Sleeping Car Porters of the United States, both of whom are cochairmen of the Urban Coalition in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is all the proposal of the gentleman from Connecticut attempts to do. It asks the House to stand by the position of the Senate, to put in this item to increase the amount from the House figure of $237 million to $537 million, a $300 million increase.

I hope the House will vote for the proposed increase.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I support full funding of the model cities program.

I want to speak briefly on a subject of serious consequence for the cities of our country—the pending appropriations for the model cities program. I was deeply disturbed last May when the House voted to cut the President's request of $400 million for the model cities program to an inadequate $150 million, and the grants for urban renewal projects in model neighborhoods from $250 million to $75 million. I cannot believe that the majority of this House fully recognized either the seriousness of the problems this program will attack or the sizable impact this program can have on the lives of the people in these problem-ridden slum areas.

In plain talk, our cities need these funds and our people need these funds. Given model cities they can begin rebuilding our cities in earnest. Without them we are all back where we started from—in the festering breeding grounds of riots and violence.

A brief analysis of the 193 applications for model cities funds shows that the program is accurately aimed at the truly hard-core slum areas that Congress intended the program to attack when we authorized it last year. Applications came from large and small cities and counties throughout the country, including my own city of Philadelphia, and gave a rather frightening picture of the problems slum neighborhoods face.

Problems of blight and deterioration are not restricted to our large cities, or to one section of the country. Of the 193 applications 75 came from cities of under 50,000 and six cities with less than 5,000 people want a model cities program. Applications came from 47 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Over 7 million people live in the deteriorated neighborhoods selected for upgrading by these cities. Three out of every 10 families have incomes of less than $3,000 annually. This is roughly twice the proportion of low-income families living in all urban areas at the time of the last census. Unemployment among people living in these neighborhoods is 2½ times the rate for the entire civilian labor force. Almost one-third of the houses in these areas are substandard, triple the rate for all urban areas. Education, basic in these people's battle for a better life is sadly lacking—3 out of every 10 adults have not had as much as 8 years of schooling. These are conditions which no reasonable or compassionate person can ignore. These are conditions which have transformed quiet desperation into open violence.

The model cities program offers us an entirely new approach to doing something about the poverty, illiteracy, poor housing, and unemployment in these neighborhoods. By mounting a concentrated attack on all of the problems, model cities will enable cities to make the most effective and efficient use of urban programs which Congress has already put on the books and funded. What makes model cities unique is that it will give cities the chance to tie together all of the Federal programs and end the piecemeal, fragmented approach that has too long frustrated city administrators and obstructed progress in our cities. At the same time it will require the locality to coordinate all its efforts, both public and private, to make the best use of Federal aids.

The impact the model cities program will have on the grave problems I have outlined is far more than the funds authorized. Because this program builds on the effective use of existing programs and the coordinated input of State, city, and private resources, the funds will have a striking multiplier effect. Every dollar we vote now for supplemental or operating funds will generate $10 from local public funds, private sources, and other Federal funds.

Therefore, we are talking about $4 billion or more worth of help for our hard-pressed cities. I cannot believe that any Member can cast a vote for anything less in the face of the needs of our urban citizens. We must seize this opportunity to improve the lives of slum residents and to upgrade whole blighted areas of our cities. The price of doing it is cheap. The cost of not doing it can be hazardous. Let us vote the whole appropriation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly urge and hope that the House will recede from its earlier action and accept the full appropriation, as approved by the Senate and recommended by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, for the model cities program contained in this Independent Offices Appropriations Act conference report now before us.

Over the past few months, our appropriation action on this particular subject has taken on increasingly vast significance to the unity of this country and our people and it further represents the measure of our response toward curing a disease that is threatening the very foundations of our society.

Whatever varying reflections we may have upon and about the tragic violence and destruction that has recently been occurring in so many cities throughout the country, I think it is universally and unmistakably clear that the underlying causes of such tragedy ought to be and must be corrected at the earliest possible moment.

The vehicle through which this correction can be most surely and effectively carried out is the appropriation containing adequate aid to the cities of this country that is included in the Senate version of this conference report.

Very truly if such an appropriation is

permitted to stand reduced to the point of practical obliteration or elimination of urban programs, most of our cities will be left without any hope of help in a vital task that is obviously beyond their individual capacities.

May I further say that such action might well become one of the greatest imprudences of modern history since it would undoubtedly generate new and higher despair and frustration among great numbers of our people throughout this Nation.

Let me please remind you that when this Congress passed the original model cities bill, it was making practically an inherently binding promise not just to a comparatively few and restrictively selected cities that might come to be afflicted with riots and property destruction, but to all those numerous cities qualified for assistance on the basic grounds of low-income population, adequate housing shortages, and associated standards.

At the present time, hundreds of such cities all over the country have invested much time and overtime of community officials and expert volunteers, together with community money, to apply for this assistance, and this includes my own home city of Worcester, Mass., which has a nationally recognized reputation for community cooperation, dedication, and efficiency and accomplishment in planning, projection, and fulfillment of development programs. If this House is now to refuse adequate appropriations and funding for the fundamentally qualified city applicants for this particular Federal help, it will be tantamount to a contradiction and betrayal of the words and promises that were enacted into law less than a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to again exhort my colleagues here to approve the Senate adopted model cities appropriation to permit my community—and all other qualified communities—to participate in this demonstration cities program that is so wisely designed to grant all of our citizens, of whatever race or color or circumstance, the opportunity to rightfully share in our national heritage and to enable this country to truly fulfill its destiny of leadership in a world at peace.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when this issue was before the House earlier this year I supported the funding of the model or demonstration cities program at the $237 million level which was adopted by the House. I still support the program and believe it holds great potential for elimination of many of our urban ills. The program is tailored along the lines of the block-grant approach and with this I also concur. However, I cannot support the motion of the gentleman from Connecticut to recede and accept the Senate version of the funding of this program, which more than doubles the amount provided by the House. I will continue to support the amount the House initially voted for the funding of this program and would support a reasonable increase in such funding. I am certain that defeat of this motion will permit the conferees to arrive at an appropriate level of funding which recognizes both the need for, and value of, the program and our present budgetary problems.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I supported the Giaimo motion that the House recede to the Senate figure of $537 million for the model cities program. This would have provided $300 million more than the House figure of $237 million for this important and urgently needed program for our cities. I deeply regret the Giaimo motion was defeated.

I also supported the Yates motion that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment to provide $40 million for the rent supplement program. It is unfortunate the House had provided no funds for this program, and it is even more unfortunate the Yates motion to correct this error was defeated. I have been a strong supporter of both the model cities program and the rent supplement program and naturally I am distressed over action taken in the House today.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in considering this conference report pertaining to the appropriation on independent offices, Housing and Urban Development, I do hope that the Members will support the amendment offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, Congressman Giaimo, a member of the Appropriations Committee.

The other body has provided for a reasonable sum of $537 million to support the installation of the model cities program. This reduction which the minority party and some Members on the Democratic side are supporting, will reduce the model cities initial appropriation from $537 to $237 million.

If this reduction of $300 million is adopted by the House, the model cities program will be greatly handicapped and the organization and progress of a program which will eventually aid many urban families throughout the United States, will be impeded.

It is good economy for Members to vote for sufficient money to establish programs to indirectly aid millions of needy families in the urban areas throughout our Nation. The expenditures made in this program will pay off over a period of years and bring millions of dollars worth of taxes into the local, State, and Federal treasuries from families who are now on relief or do not have sufficient income to pay taxes unless jobs and employment are offered to some of our more unfortunate urban citizens and thus help them provide for themselves.

It has been announced in the papers only yesterday that our population has reached 200 million. In 1915 the population of our Nation was but 100 million. In 50 years' time our population has increased 100 million. It is estimated that the next 20 years will bring about another increase of another 100 million.

Seventy-one percent of our population today lives in cities or urban centers. In another 20 years we will have about 70 million more persons living in our congested cities. Unless a program similar to the model cities under consideration today is approved, our relief rolls, discontent, illiteracy, unemployment will grow and the progress of our Nation will eventually be curtailed and law enforcement jeopardized.

The time to start solving these great problems for our future prosperity and preservation of our free Government is now. A vote today to curtail this program by over 50 percent is not a vote for economy but it is a vote submitting to reckless politics. Our cities during the last few years has been a victim of riots, uprisings, and general discontent by the younger generation principally. Unless programs of this kind are sustained by our Congress, this general discontent of the underpaid, uneducated, unemployed will expand and grow, and the Nation and our Government will pay the penalty eventually.

I hope the Giaimo motion to sustain the Senate appropriation without curtailment will be sustained.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who care to do so may extend their remarks on the model cities program at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

In response to the argument made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] wherein he alleged that there was a growing need for this extra $300 million predicated on some of the riots and civil disturbances we have had, I would merely say we have had another change since May 17, 1967, which ought to influence Members on the vote today.

On May 17, when the House voted 213 to 193 to sustain the figure in the House version, $237 million, it was a close vote between $237 million and nothing, actually between $237 million and $12 million.

In the interval since May 17, when that vote was taken, until today, we have had a totally different picture presented to us so far as the fiscal situation of the Federal Government is concerned.

The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on May 17 were still alleging that we were going to have a deficit of $8.1 billion. Today, October 24, they freely concede that the deficit of the Federal Government is going to be from $24 billion to $30 billion. We have had a significant shift in how our Federal Treasury is operating, in the interval conditions have gone from bad, to worse, to deadly serious.

I think one has to weigh the deterioration of the fiscal situation of the Federal Government on the one hand against the problems raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts on the other.

It seems to me that a vote today to increase the House figure by $300 million will have a most adverse effect on the situation as far as the Treasury is concerned. I do not think it will significantly change the problems in the big cities that occurred in the last 3 or 4 months. I know that there may be some—and I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts does not fall in this category—who favor the solution to the problems of Detroit and Newark and so forth by saying the way to correct the problem is to double, triple, or quadruple the amount of money coming from the Federal Treasury. That is not the answer. Three hundred million dollars of obligational authority on this occasion will not solve those problems of the big cities. But a reduction in expenditures could be very helpful in helping to solve the problem which we face as a nation in the fiscal mess that we are in.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. I listen with interest always to the distinguished minority leader.

I do not think anyone contends action on the part of the Federal Government will save all of our cities and will solve all of the problems consonant with all of our cities, but there has to be leadership on the part of the Federal Government. I think the gentleman from Michigan will agree with me that we are getting that kind of leadership by bringing into the ghetto areas some indication on the part of business that they are willing to contribute and to do their part to lift the burdens of the cities about the Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if I might respond to that, Congress last year made available $11 billion in planning money for this agency to get the demonstration cities program off the ground. It is my best information that as of today—almost 12 months later—they have not disbursed one penny of that money. How can they properly absorb the additional money included in the House version of $237 million much less the $537 million included in the Senate version? It seems to me that that agency's record of performance is so poor that we should not trust them with an extra $300 million over and above the $237 million that the House has allocated. Therefore, I hope and trust that the Members will vote "no," so that we will stand by the $237 million figure included in the House version.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Giaimo motion to agree to the Senate amount of $537 million for the model cities program.

I might say to the distinguished minority leader that an appropriation bill for military construction will be before us shortly where he can easily save $300 million if he really wants to, or a great deal more. However, the minority party should not save money at the expense of our cities, which is just what the minority leader proposes to do. It is urgent that we face up to the problems which confront us in our urban areas. The proposal of the Senate to fund this program at $537 million will only begin to meet the needs.

Earlier this afternoon the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices pointed out the recommendations of the House conferees would amount to three-quarters of a billion dollars in reductions below the budget estimate; $756 million. I might point out that $689 million, or 90 percent, of that reduction comes out of the funding of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD. And out of the $689 million reduction, some $425 million comes out of the model cities programs.

So the model cities program and the rent supplement program, which will come up later, have been the principal victims of the budget slashes. If we are serious about our concerns about disorder in our cities which were expressed so often on the floor of the House last summer, it is important that we begin now to fund this program which was enacted by the Congress last year in order to deal with the very, very serious problems which have been permitted to fester over a long period of time. The time to start is now.

When the House reduced the Housing and Urban Development budget estimates by some $689 million last May 17, the administration request was already $599 million below available authorizations. In conference the House conferees yielded and agreed to increase its figures by only $19.3 million, or less than 3 percent, while the Senate conferees yielded $416 million—if we use the House figure on model cities and rent supplements.

The Bureau of the Budget estimates that, if the recent Whitten and Bow amendment restrictions on overall expenditures stand, programs in housing and urban development will be cut back by another half billion dollars. It was reported yesterday that as a consequence of these steps, most of FHA's special assistance programs have been suspended, including special assistance for urban renewal, cooperative housing, housing for the elderly, and other low-income programs.

The mood of this House to chop away the major portions of critical domestic programs has lost any logical relation to war spending or to the size of the projected deficit. It has taken on a logic all its own. When the House reduces spending for a program or an agency millions of dollars below an already reduced administration request, it is not dealing in sterile mathematical calculation, but in people's lives.

Compared with the enormity of the crisis in our cities, the administration program—even if every last dollar of available authority were appropriated—constitutes a woeful minimum. If the administration were able to go ahead with its $662 million model cities program, some 60 or 70 cities would receive an average of $10 million each, a sum entirely inadequate to the problem. The entire administration rent supplements request would provide some 45,000 units throughout the Nation, when there are half a million substandard units in New York City alone; and no single State could have over 6,750 units because of the 15 percent limitation.

And yet, this House has seen fit to rip this minimal program to shreds. I have prepared a table on the fate of certain housing programs, which I include at this point in the RECORD:

[In millions of dollars]

	Authorization	Administration request	House appropriation	Conference report
Neighborhood facilities	121	42	27	30
Rehabilitation loans	100	0	0	0
Housing for the elderly loans	95	80	20	25
Urban planning grants	84	50	40	45
Metropolitan development incentive grants	50	30	0	0
Urban mass transportation	205	175	175	175
Community development training grants	30	5	2.5	3
Urban research	20	20	5	10
Open space	125	125	75	75
Alaska housing program	10	1	0	0
Urban information and technical assistance	8	6	2	2.2
Model cities	662	662	237	(1)
Rent supplement	40	40	0	(1)

[1] In disagreement.

To summarize briefly, let us look at histories of certain critically important programs: For example, neighborhood facilities authorizations total $121 million; the administration request was only $42 million; the House slashed this further to $27 million, and the conference restored only $3 million.

An authorization of $100 million for rehabilitation loans was scrapped entirely by the administration.

Housing for the elderly was reduced from $95 million to $80 million by the administration. The House cut this back to $20 million, and only $5 million was restored in conference.

Funds for urban mass transportation were slashed by $30 million, and the conference accepted the House figures.

The open-space program was reduced by $50 million, and Federal participation limited to 50 percent. The conference likewise accepted the House figures.

And so on for over a dozen critical urban programs.

The most devastating reductions occur in rent supplements and model cities. The Federal Government has been subsidizing housing for more than 30 years; and with costs rising and the degrading conditions of slums worsening, it cannot cease to do this now.

The rent supplements program was envisioned as a means to permit this subsidy to operate to stimulate the market mechanism. It has been widely hailed as a creative means of increasing the supply of moderate-income housing. The $40 million request which this House rejected would barely make a dent on our housing needs.

Similarly, the model cities program, as modest as it is, provides the beginning of comprehensive planning to restore blighted areas of our urban centers. And last May 17 the House saw fit to reduce the funds requested available for this program by approximately 64 percent.

Those actions were taken before the massive civil disorders of this summer, which are symptomatic of the enormity of the problem. Those riots might have been expected to move the Congress to action. Instead, they produced a perverse logic of "punishment," which would deny the funds to begin to eliminate the degradation of America's decaying core cities.

Let us exercise more wisdom than we did 5 months ago. Even with restored funds in model cities and rent supplements, authorized programs to aid our cities would be cut by nearly half. The cities have been shortchanged for too long. Our aid should not be halved, it should be doubled. As a beginning, I urge the House to agree to the Senate amount.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the House bill included $237 million for the model cities program, and the vote on which this question will be taken will be whether or not to increase it by the sum of $300 million and accept the position of the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I move to sustain the position of the House on this question.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question and urge that you vote against the preferential motion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will a vote for the Giaimo motion be a vote for a greater sum of money for the model cities program?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that a vote for the Giaimo motion is a vote for receding and concurring in the Senate amendment, which is the same thing.

Mr. YATES. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Giaimo] that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments No. 58 and No. 59, and concur therein.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 156, nays 241, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

YEAS—156

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Annunzio
Ashley
Barrett
Bingham
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Conyers
Cowger
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Irwin
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kyros
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McDade
McFall
Machen
Madden
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse, Mass.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Rees
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Ryan
St Germain
Satterfield
Scheuer
Schweiker
Sisk
Stafford
Staggers
Stratton
Sullivan
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Whalen
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—241

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Gathings
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Harrison
Harsha
Hays
Henderson
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Lukens
McClure
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Moore
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Sandman
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—35

Aspinall
Bates
Bell
Blatnik
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Corman
Diggs
Gettys
Hébert
Herlong
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Kleppe
Kyl
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
Macdonald, Mass.
Mathias, Md.
Mills
Philbin
Poage
Purcell
Rarick
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Roybal
St. Onge
Smith, N.Y.
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Gettys against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. McClory against.

Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Reid of New York for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Mr. Button for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Mathias of Maryland for, with Mr. Kleppe against.

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Kyl against.

Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Utt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Blatnick with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Bates.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. SCOTT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate No. 58 and No. 59.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 67: On page 38, line 25, strike out "*Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for incurring or discharging:" and insert "*Provided*, That the limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under such section is increased by $40,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. YATES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67 and concur therein.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, there are many in the House who will say that the gentleman from Illinois has moved in where angels fear to tread. However, Mr. Speaker, I am strengthened by the knowledge that I am in good company.

I keep company with Mr. Conservative himself—Republican Members may want to hear this—I keep company with the late Senator from the State of Ohio, the former minority leader of the other body, Senator Robert A. Taft. Together, Mr. Speaker, we appeal to the conscience of the House, for that is what is involved in the amendment that is under consideration at the present time—the conscience of the House.

This is an amendment which seeks to provide funds for the poor, for the sick, for the disabled, for the dispossessed, for every group that is at the bottom of the economic ladder in our country at a time when others are enjoying record prosperity.

The question is raised, Mr. Speaker, by many as to why should we pay a portion of the rent of our neighbors. Well, let us see what Senator Taft had to say about this, for his arguments are logical and persuasive. He said this when there was under consideration in the other body the question of the public housing program:

> The American people are a charitable people, and are a humane people. They do not want to see hardship and poverty in the midst of plenty.

He said:

> This requires a tax on the other four-fifths of the people, perhaps the other three-fifths of the people, to pay most of the taxes, but I believe these people are willing to pay the tax in order to accomplish the purpose of seeing that we no longer have any serious problem of hardship and poverty in the United States and that the children of all the families in the United States have an equal opportunity or a substantially equal opportunity to get started in life and that if they have the abilities to make use of them to the full extent they can so that the United States may remain a country of free opportunity.

And that argument is applicable, too, in the motion under consideration at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we keep in mind the people who are to be benefited by this program. Who are they? This is not a windfall for a favored group. It is for the underprivileged. It is applicable only to the people who can qualify for public housing. Nobody who has an income above the limits established for public housing can obtain rent supplements under this program. In addition to that basic qualification, Mr. Speaker, what others exist? Secondly, the program is for elderly people. In addition to the fact that their incomes are limited to those of public housing qualification, they must be over the age of 62; or they must be handicapped people with a physical handicap; or they must be displaced people—they must be evicted as a result of some governmental action. Or, they must be slum dwellers; they must live in ghettos or live in substandard dwellings; or they must be disaster refugees , those who have been displaced by storms or floods or hurricanes such as the people in the State of Texas recently suffered.

Mr. Speaker, these are the only ones who can qualify under this program. These are the poor, the elderly, the sick, the deplaced. The people, in short, who need our help. That is why I say that this is a matter that tries the conscience of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I shall be very glad to yield to my friend, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois has made the statement that only the people living in those categories which he has previously mentioned are eligible to live in the facilities that would be built under this program.

Is that a matter of law or regulation?

Mr. YATES. That is a matter of both law and regulation, I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. It is a matter of law in establishing the level of income and of the regulations in conjunction with other qualifications.

So that by both law and regulations these people, and only these groups at the present time are qualified to live in facilities for which rent supplements are directed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, may I comment upon the gentleman's observation. Will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield further?

Mr. YATES. I shall be glad to yield further to the distinguished minority leader, [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, I believe is accurate in what he has said. It is a matter of both law and regulation.

Mr. YATES. Right.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. By law, the Congress has given to the administrative agencies the right to establish criteria, and by law they can do so by regulations. But, Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has not written any guidelines such as the gentleman from Illinois has described for the occupancy of the units. Those guidelines are written by agency regulations and these regulations could be changed tomorrow.

Mr. YATES. That does not make any difference. Even if that were true, the law as it stands today is as I reported it to the House, I still insist that it is a matter for the conscience of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], in this regard.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I say to the gentleman from Illinois that he is very persuasive in his advocacy of this matter. However, I still think the better position for us to take on this occasion today is to reject the Senate $40 million figure so that the conferees can bargain from a position of strength. The House should not capitulate to the Senate and the President.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, that position would represent a vote against Americans who need help. The gentleman from Michigan is rejecting the position espoused by former Senator Taft——

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further I do not think this rent subsidy program was even a gleam in the eye of Senator Taft in 1948. And, let me say this in furtherance of my statement——

Mr. YATES. Let me say further, first, that the program to which the former distinguished Senator from Ohio, Senator Taft, was addressing himself was one of housing totally subsidized by the Government. Certainly he would favor and support a housing program which would be carried out by private industry.

Can the distinguished gentleman from Michigan imagine the fact that the former distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, would not be for this kind of a program?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further? Let me say that if Senator Taft were here today—and I am sure that perhaps his distinguished son would be a better spokesman than I on the views of the former distinguished Senator—I am sure that the former distinguished Senator, Senator Taft, would take into consideration the fact that under the public housing program the Government of the United States has expended some $5 billion and with many disappointments as to its effectiveness. Today the people who advocate rent supplements are using the same arguments that were used 20 years ago for public housing, while the expenditure of the sum of $5 billion for public housing has not done the job.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has just admitted my point. It is his opinion and mine that the former distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, would be supporting this program. Therefore, the arguments upon his behalf to provide for this program, he would have been against?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman willing to do away with the

$275 million which is contained in this bill with which to subsidize the public housing program and to call for the advocacy of a new program while abandoning public housing? It is my opinion that rent supplements may have many advantages over public housing, but why does not the gentleman take some of the $275 million which is contained in the public housing program and put it into this rent subsidy program or, even better, into the rent certificate program.

Mr. YATES. I say to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], that the poor are with us and that they will continue to be with us. This program is a step in the right direction and deserves our support.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me make this observation. The gentleman talks about the poor, and as I understand the agency regulations that we have for this program, people who have outside assets of up to $25,000 can still qualify. Is that correct?

Mr. YATES. I will tell the gentleman that is wrong. It may have been true at one time, but it was corrected.

I remember that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] so argued at one time, but subsequently, after correction, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] favors this program, unless I am mistaken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman what are the income limitations that apply to the rent supplements? How much money can a person have under the regulations in outside income, and still qualify for the rent supplement?

Mr. YATES. I will tell the gentleman from New Hampshire that the income ceilings vary from community to community. What is the limitation for New York may not be the limitation for one of the cities in the gentleman's district in New Hampshire, or for other small cities. But generally it depends upon the cost of living in the particular city.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. STEPHENS. I believe we would have to refer back to the limitations under the amendment that I offered that only those people who are eligible for public housing projects are eligible for rent supplements.

Mr. YATES. That is what I said.

Mr. STEPHENS. That is the law, and it is not a regulation.

Mr. YATES. That is right.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Georgia tell us what the figure is?

Mr. STEPHENS. It would be that which applies to the community under consideration under the law. I can tell the gentleman what it would be in my community.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is right; it varies from community to community.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. What is the highest figure? Will somebody please tell us what the highest figure is?

Does not anybody know who justifies this program? I cannot imagine that.

Mr. STEPHENS. It is the same as the highest figure in public housing.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. Mr. Speaker, the income limitation, as I stated varies from community to community.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to vote against this preferential motion, but the gentleman from Michigan and some others have now made me wonder if my position is correct.

The distinguished minority leader asked the question whether anyone could tell us the figure for the bottom limit and the highest limit. And the argument may be that the limit is too high. Can the gentleman tell us what the limit is?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The last time we had a figure given on the floor of the House by the proponents of the rent subsidy program it was said the tenants could have outside capital asset accumulations of up to $25,000, and I have seen no one deny that or give us an alternative figure. If the situation is different I believe we ought to have some information on this from the proponents of the rent subsidy program at this time.

Can they give us this information?

Mr. HAYS. Or, if not, can the opponents tell us?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in an endeavor to put this matter in proper perspective, let me say that the President recommended in his budget $40 million in contract authority for the second full year of the rent supplement program. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended $10 million when the bill came before the House on May 17, the subcommittee recommended $10 million—and the full committee recommended $10 million. The House voted down the $10 million rent supplement by a 61 majority in a record vote.

The Senate has recommended the full budget request of $40 million.

Personally, I feel that the rent supplement program should be given an opportunity to work. The gentleman from Michigan and others have said we have appropriated from $265 million to $275 million a year on public housing.

This rent supplement program is a new approach, this is a new concept. This is a private enterprise concept. Public housing is Government owned, Government controlled, Government managed, and Government subsidized. We have been in the public housing business for more than 25 years, and now here is a new approach, here is a program to substitute private capital for the public funds. Here is the possibility of an alternative to public housing keyed to the free enterprise concept.

Projects built under the rent supplement program are privately owned, privately managed, and privately controlled.

This program has the broad support of our mayors and other city officials, many churches and charitable institutions, and the strong support of the housing sector of our private economy, including the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the National Association of Home Builders, as well as the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Council of the Aging, and many other church, business, and charitable organizations.

I repeat: Public housing is government owned, government built, government operated, government managed, and not on the tax rolls.

Rent supplement housing is privately built, privately financed, privately owned, privately managed, and the property is on the local tax rolls.

Many people feel that this is a better approach and a better concept than public housing.

Since the committee acted on May 17, private insurance companies have committed a billion dollars to assist in providing low-rent housing in our cities. They recognize the problems of the cities and the ghettos and they recognize that something must be done about these problems. The insurance companies feel that the rent supplement program is a sound proposition and they are recommending a billion dollars to be committed for housing in our cities.

I might say that they are expecting the Government to show some expression of good faith in this program. Congress has approved the program—it is underway—it should be given a fair trial.

In addition, the law provides that no rent supplement program will be approved unless the local community approves it.

I cannot see in view of the need for housing why we cannot give private enterprise an opportunity to participate in low-rent housing programs, and I believe that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, will agree with me that our hearings convinced us all that this approach was better than public housing.

I have brought this back in disagreement because of the House vote against it. I favor going back to conference to try to work out an agreement on some level of funding to continue the rent supplement program that now stands in wide disagreement between the House figure of zero and the Senate figure of $40,000,000.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee wants it to be understood by the House that he supports his own motion but that he opposes the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois. His own motion will take this back to conference where there will be an opportunity to have a meeting of the minds and get closer together than we are as of right now.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say that if anybody wants to vote for the $40,000,000, that is his privilege.

Mr. JONAS. I hope that that is not true. A vote for the preferential motion would be a vote——

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. A vote for the preferential motion would be to vote for $40,000,000 and so get together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 more minutes to give the Members of the House some additional facts.

Mr. Speaker, the $32,000,000 previously provided for the rent supplement program has all been committed and allocated. This covers 451 projects in 304 cities in 47 States. This includes a total of 47,677 units, of which 15,313 are supplemental.

What I have just given you is the current status of the rent supplement program.

I now want to give you a picture of requests for the future that cannot be funded.

As of October 20, Friday, of last week, HUD had applications on file for $13,543,000 in rent supplements in projects for which funds are not available. These involve 148 projects in 123 cities in 32 States. This backlog includes 15,352 units—of which 15,313 would be supplemental.

I am advised that another $7 million in applications have not reached Washington.

And so the need is pressing—the need must be met.

This program offers prospects of playing an important role in the providing of housing for our cities, large and small.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. In response to the inquiry made by the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader, I would point out that the asset limitation for eligibility for rent supplements is $2,000, and $5,000 for elderly people, I think the gentleman used the figure of $25,000. That is way out of line. The asset limitation is $2,000 and it increases if the individual is in the elderly category to $5,000.

With reference to the income limitation, as the gentleman from Georgia explained, it is different in different sections of the country depending on what the cost of living might be in a particular area. As you know it has been the highest in New York City. My understanding is that there is a limitation there of about $6,100 for a family of a mother, father, and five or more children. The income limitation there could be about $6,100.

Mr. Speaker, in further response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], the hearings indicate that the asset limitations are $2,000 on a family and $5,000 for the elderly and handicapped. This is total outside assets—liquid and nonliquid. It also includes the cash value of life insurance policies.

With respect to income limitations, the law provides that the income of persons whose rents are to be supplemented can not exceed the limits for public housing—low-income housing. And those income limits for public housing are established by the local housing authorities subject to HUD review and approval. These income limitations are not, of course, the same in every geographical area. Income limitations are higher in high-cost areas. I will supply for the RECORD a table showing income limits for rent supplement housing and for section 221(h) rehabilitation sales housing for low-income purchasers. I note that the highest income figure on the list is $6,100 for a family of seven or more and that area is New York City.

The table referred to follows:

INCOME LIMITS FOR RENT SUPPLEMENT HOUSING AND FOR SEC. 221(h) REHABILITATION SALES HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME PURCHASERS, LIST NO. 5

State and locality	Number of persons in family						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+
Alabama:							
Birmingham	$3,200	$3,200	$3,600	$3,600	$3,800	$3,800	$3,800
Florence	2,400	3,200	3,500	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000
Huntsville	3,000	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Mobile	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	3,900
Montgomery	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300
Ozark	2,900	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
Tuscaloosa	3,000	3,500	3,700	3,800	4,100	4,200	4,300
Anniston	3,000	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,400	4,500
Bessemer	3,000	3,500	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400	4,500
Decatur	2,400	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,200	4,400	4,500
Dothan	2,600	3,100	3,300	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,800
Phenix City	2,600	3,100	3,200	3,300	3,700	3,800	3,900
Prichard	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	3,900
Selma	3,000	3,500	3,800	3,900	4,200	4,300	4,400
Alaska:							
Anchorage	4.600	5,200	5,800	6,200	6,400	6,400	6,400
Fairbanks	4,400	4,800	5,600	5,800	6,200	6,400	6,400
Juneau	4,800	5,400	6,000	6,400	6,400	6,400	6,400
Arizona:							
Phoenix	3,300	3,300	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800	3,800
Tucson	3,000	3,000	3,400	3,400	3,700	3,700	3,700
Eloy	3,300	3,300	3,500	3,500	3,900	3,900	3,900
Mesa	2,600	2,600	2,800	2,800	3,100	3,100	3,100
McNary	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,500
Winslow	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800	3,800
Whiteriver	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,500
Window Rock	2,800	3,400	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100
Flagstaff	3,300	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000
Arkansas:							
Batesville	2,800	3,200	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700
Blytheville	2,900	2,900	3,200	3,200	3,600	3,600	3,600
Fort Smith	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Little Rock	3,120	3,120	4,120	4,120	5,280	5,280	5,280
North Little Rock	3,000	3,600	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
Pine Bluff	2,700	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
West Memphis	2,700	2,700	3,000	3,000	3,300	3,300	3,300
Hot Springs	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900
Russellville	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300
California:							
Altadena	3,000	3,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600
Bakersfield	2,800	3,500	3,800	4,000	4,400	4,700	5,000
Beaumont	2,800	3,200	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900
Compton	3,000	3,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600
Fresno	2,600	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400
Long Beach	3,000	3,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600
Los Angeles	3,000	3,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600
Modesto	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400
Napa	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400
California—Continued							
Oakland	$3,300	$3,800	$4,300	$4,700	$5,100	$5,500	$5,900
Pittsburg	3,300	3,800	4,400	4,800	5,100	5,400	5,700
Redlands	3,800	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,300	4,300	4,300
Richmond	3,700	3,700	4,100	4,100	4,400	4,400	4,400
Riverside	2,800	3,200	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900
Sacramento	3,300	3,500	3,900	3,000	4,400	4,500	4,600
San Bernardino	3,800	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,300	4,300	4,300
San Diego	3,900	3,900	4,300	4,300	4,600	4,600	4,600
San Francisco	3,200	4,000	4,500	4,900	5,300	5,700	6,100
Santa Barbara	3,800	3,800	4,200	4,200	4,500	4,500	4,500
Santa Cruz	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,300	4,700	5,000	5,400
San Jose	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400
Santa Monica	3,000	3,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600
Stockton	3,700	3,700	3,900	3,900	4,200	4,200	4,200
Upland	3,000	3,200	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900
Vallejo	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400
Visalia	3,000	3,300	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900
Oxnard	3,400	3,800	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,600	4,700
Eureka	3,000	3,300	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,200
Salinas	2,800	3,400	4,000	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,400
San Buenaventura	3,400	3,800	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,600	4,700
Colorado:							
Canon City	2,800	3,100	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600
Denver	3,300	3,300	3,900	3,900	4,300	4,300	4,800
Pueblo	2,000	3,100	3,400	3,600	4,100	4,400	4,600
Thornton	3,300	3,300	3,900	3,900	4,300	4,300	4,800
Loveland	2,800	3,200	3,600	3,800	4,100	4,300	4,600
Boulder	3,200	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,500	4,700	5,100
Connecticut:							
Bridgeport	3,600	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,200	5,400	5,600
Bristol	3,800	4,200	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,100	5,300
Danbury	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Farmington	3,600	4,500	4,800	5,000	5,200	5,600	6,000
Greenwich	3,600	4,000	4,600	4,600	4,800	4,800	5,000
Hartford	3,900	4,200	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,500	5,800
Meriden	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,400	4,800	5,200
Middletown	3,600	3,900	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Milford	3,600	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
New Britain	3,500	4,200	4,700	5,200	5,500	5,800	6,100
New Haven	3,100	3,400	3,700	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600
Norwalk	3,600	4,500	4,900	5,300	5,700	6,100	6,100
Norwich	3,500	4,100	4,500	4,900	5,100	5,400	5,700
Shelton	3,600	4,200	4,700	5,100	5,400	5,700	6,000
Stamford	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Waterbury	3,400	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
East Hartford	3,900	4,200	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,500	5,800
New London	3,600	4,200	4,700	5,000	5,400	5,700	6,100

INCOME LIMITS FOR RENT SUPPLEMENT HOUSING AND FOR SEC. 221(h) REHABILITATION SALES HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME PURCHASERS, LIST NO. 5—Continued

State and locality	Number of persons in family						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+
Connecticut—Continued							
Stratford	$3,600	$4,400	$5,000	$5,000	$5,500	$5,500	$5,700
West Haven	3,600	4,500	4,900	5,200	5,500	5,700	5,900
Delaware:							
Dover	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Wilmington	3,100	3,100	3,400	3,400	3,800	3,800	3,800
District of Columbia: Washington	3,200	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Florida:							
Clearwater	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,700	4,000	4,100	4,200
Collier County	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,700	4,000	4,100	4,200
Daytona Beach	2,600	3,300	3,500	3,600	3,900	4,000	4,100
Fort Lauderdale	3,000	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,300	4,400	4,500
Fort Myers	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,900	4,000	4,100
Gainesville	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300
Jacksonville	2,600	3,200	3,500	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000
Lake City	2,700	3,400	3,600	3,700	4,000	4,100	4,200
Miami	3,000	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Miami Beach	3,000	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,200	4,300	4,400
Panama City	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Pensacola	3,500	3,500	3,700	3,700	3,900	3,900	3,900
St. Petersburg	2,900	3,000	3,200	3,300	3,600	3,700	3,800
Tallahassee	2,800	3,300	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,200
Tampa	3,200	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,200	4,300	4,400
West Palm Beach	3,000	4,200	4,300	4,400	4,500	4,600	4,700
Melbourne	2,800	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,200	4,300	4,400
Gifford	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Merritt Island	2,800	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,200	4,300	4,400
Opa Locka	3,000	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Fort Pierce	2,500	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,700
Key West	4,200	4,200	4,400	4,400	4,600	4,600	4,600
Lakeland	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,500
Sarasota	2,700	2,700	2,900	2,900	3,100	3,100	3,100
Georgia:							
Albany	2,400	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,000
Athens	2,400	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Atlanta	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,300	4,400
Augusta	2,400	3,200	3,600	3,800	4,100	4,200	4,300
Cartersville	2,400	3,100	3,300	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,000
Columbus	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,000
Decatur	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Gainesville	3,200	3,700	3,900	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Hampton	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,500	3,700	3,800	3,900
Macon	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Savannah	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,400
Waycross	2,900	3,300	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,000	4,100
Americus	2,400	3,000	3,200	3,300	3,600	3,700	3,800
Millen	3,000	3,600	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
East Point	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,300	4,400
Marietta	2,400	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Rome	2,200	2,900	3,000	3,100	3,400	3,700	3,800
Valdosta	2,800	3,900	3,900	4,000	4,100	4,200	4,300
Hawaii:							
Honolulu	4,000	4,200	4,700	4,700	5,300	5,300	5,500
Halawa	4,000	4,200	4,700	4,700	5,300	5,300	5,500
Hilo	3,500	3,700	4,200	4,200	4,800	4,800	5,000
Idaho: Boise	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Illinois:							
Cairo	2,400	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Carbondale	2,800	4,000	4,400	4,800	5,000	5,200	5,300
Champaign	3,400	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,200
Chicago	3,000	4,200	4,400	4,800	5,000	5,200	5,400
Decatur	2,500	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,200	5,400	5,600
East Chicago Heights	3,400	3,800	4,100	4,100	4,300	4,300	4,600
East St. Louis	2,800	3,800	4,500	4,900	5,100	5,300	5,500
Joliet	3,000	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,100	5,300	5,500
Oakbrook	3,000	4,200	4,400	4,800	5,000	5,200	5,400
Pekin	3,000	3,600	3,900	3,900	4,200	4,200	4,200
Peoria	3,000	4,000	4,900	4,900	5,000	5,000	5,000
Richwoods Township (Peoria County)	3,000	4,000	4,900	4,900	5,000	5,000	5,000
Rockford	3,000	4,500	4,800	5,100	5,400	5,700	6,000
Rock Island	2,800	3,800	4,600	4,100	5,500	5,700	6,000
Springfield	2,600	3,400	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,000
Waukegan	3,000	4,300	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600	5,800
Bloomington	2,900	4,400	4,600	5,000	5,200	5,400	5,600
Danville	2,600	4,000	4,500	5,000	5,300	5,500	5,800
Freeport	2,500	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,400
Granite City	3,000	3,800	4,500	4,900	5,100	5,300	5,500
Chicago Heights	3,400	3,800	4,100	4,100	4,300	4,300	4,600
Moline	2,800	3,800	4,100	4,500	4,900	5,100	5,300
Quincy	2,800	3,100	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Urbana	3,400	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,200
Indiana:							
Bremen	2,800	3,800	4,200	4,300	4,700	4,800	4,900
Columbus	2,900	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,500
Elkhart	3,000	4,400	4,800	5,200	5,400	5,600	5,800
Evansville	2,500	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,250	4,500
Fort Wayne	2,800	3,900	4,300	4,600	4,800	4,900	5,000
Gary	3,000	4,400	4,800	5,200	5,500	5,800	6,000
Hammond	3,000	4,300	4,600	5,000	5,200	5,400	5,700
Indianapolis	2,900	3,800	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,500
Jeffersonville	2,600	3,800	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,700	4,800
Michigan City	2,800	3,400	3,800	4,100	4,400	4,500	4,600
Mishawaka	2,800	4,200	4,500	5,000	5,300	5,500	5,800
Muncie	2,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
New Albany	2,800	3,600	3,800	4,150	4,350	4,550	4,700
South Bend	3,000	3,800	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,600	4,700
Terre Haute	2,400	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300
Vincennes	2,800	4,400	4,850	5,100	5,300	5,500	5,700
Goshen	3,000	4,400	4,800	5,200	5,400	5,600	5,800
Bloomington	2,500	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800
Kokomo	2,600	3,800	4,300	4,500	4,700	4,800	4,900
Iowa:							
Cedar Rapids	$2,600	$3,600	$3,700	$3,800	$3,900	$4,000	$4,100
Denison	2,700	3,300	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Des Moines	2,600	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100
Eagle Grove	2,700	3,300	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Garner	2,700	3,300	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Sioux City	2,000	3,300	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100
Walnut	2,700	3,300	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
West Des Moines	2,700	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100
Rockwell City	2,700	3,300	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100
Kansas:							
Kansas City	3,400	3,900	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,200	5,300
Topeka	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Wichita	2,800	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,400	4,700	5,000
Kentucky:							
Covington	3,000	4,400	4,900	5,200	5,400	5,500	5,600
Frankfort	2,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,700
Fulton	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100
Lexington	3,000	3,900	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	4,900
Louisville	2,400	2,950	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Paducah	2,800	3,600	3,900	4,000	4,400	4,500	4,800
Bowling Green	2,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,500	4,600
Henderson	2,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,500
Newport	2,800	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,600	4,700	4,800
Owensboro	2,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Hopkinsville	2,400	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,000
Louisiana:							
Batchelor	2,400	3,100	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700
Baton Rouge	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,300
Lafayette	3,000	3,000	3,800	3,800	4,600	4,600	4,600
Lake Charles	2,500	2,500	2,800	2,800	3,100	3,100	3,100
Morganza	2,400	3,100	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700
New Orleans	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,000
New Roads	2,400	3,100	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700
Pineville	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Ponchatoula	2,400	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900
Shreveport	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,000
Simmesport	2,400	3,100	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700
Vinton	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Westwego	2,700	2,700	3,000	3,000	3,300	3,300	3,300
Monroe	2,400	2,400	2,700	2,700	3,000	3,000	3,000
Alexandria	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Bossier City	3,100	3,100	3,600	3,600	4,000	4,000	4,000
New Iberia	3,000	3,000	3,600	3,600	4,000	4,000	4,000
Maine:							
Portland	3,100	3,300	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300
Waterville	3,600	4,000	4,400	4,700	4,800	5,000	5,200
Maryland:							
Annapolis	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Baltimore	3,300	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,700
Hagerstown	3,100	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Landover	3,500	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,400	4,500	4,600
Silver Spring	3,200	3,700	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100	5,400
Cumberland	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Rockville	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800	3,800
Massachusetts:							
Boston	3,600	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,100	4,100	4,400
Brockton	3,600	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,100	4,100	4,400
Brookline	4,200	4,200	4,600	4,600	4,800	4,800	5,000
Cambridge	4,400	4,400	4,600	4,600	4,800	4,800	5,000
Chicopee	3,500	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,200	5,400	5,600
Fall River	3,600	3,600	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Falmouth	3,600	4,000	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Holyoke	3,500	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,200	5,400	5,600
Lawrence	3,800	3,800	4,400	4,400	4,800	4,800	5,200
Lowell	3,800	3,800	4,400	4,400	4,800	4,800	5,200
Lynn	4,200	4,200	4,600	4,600	4,800	4,800	5,200
Malden	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600
Medford	4,100	4,100	4,300	4,300	4,500	4,500	4,700
New Bedford	3,900	3,900	4,200	4,200	4,500	4,500	4,700
Newton	3,300	3,700	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Pittsfield	3,500	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,200	5,400	5,600
Quincy	3,600	4,000	4,400	4,700	4,900	5,100	5,300
Somerville	4,200	4,200	4,600	4,600	4,800	4,800	5,000
Springfield	3,800	3,800	4,400	4,400	4,800	4,800	5,000
Taunton	3,500	3,500	4,400	4,400	4,800	4,800	5,200
Waltham	3,600	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Worcester	4,200	4,200	4,600	4,600	4,800	4,800	5,000
Chelsea	3,000	4,300	4,900	4,900	5,400	5,400	5,700
Framingham	4,200	4,200	4,600	4,600	4,800	4,800	5,000
Gloucester	3,300	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Northampton	3,900	3,900	4,400	4,400	4,800	4,800	5,000
Revere	3,300	3,300	3,900	3,900	4,300	4,300	4,800
Woburn	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	4,200
Michigan:							
Ann Arbor	2,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600	5,850
Battle Creek	2,000	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,500
Belding	2,900	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,000
Benton Harbor	2,400	3,600	4,100	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,100
Dearborn	3,000	3,600	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200
Detroit	3,000	4,500	4,800	5,100	5,400	5,700	5,950
Jackson	2,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600	5,850
Kalamazoo	2,950	4,300	4,650	4,900	5,150	5,400	5,650
Lansing	3,000	4,500	5,300	5,600	5,800	5,900	6,000
Muskegon Heights	2,400	4,000	4,400	4,700	4,900	5,000	5,100
Pontiac	2,800	3,800	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,500	5,700
Royal Oak	2,600	4,000	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200	5,400
Saginaw	2,800	3,800	4,300	4,700	5,000	5,200	5,300
Wyandotte	2,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Hamtramck	2,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Inkster	3,000	3,800	4,500	4,800	5,000	5,200	5,400
Port Huron	2,800	4,000	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200

See footnote at end of table.

INCOME LIMITS FOR RENT SUPPLEMENT HOUSING AND FOR SEC. 221(h) REHABILITATION SALES HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME PURCHASERS, LIST NO. 5—Continued

State and locality	Number of persons in family						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+
Minnesota:							
Austin	$3,100	$3,500	$4,100	$4,200	$4,400	$4,600	$4,800
Duluth	2,800	3,500	3,900	4,200	4,400	4,500	4,600
Elk River	3,000	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,150	4,400	4,700
Glenwood	2,700	3,100	3,400	3,700	3,900	4,200	4,500
Litchfield	2,800	3,300	3,500	3,750	4,000	4,250	4,500
Minneapolis	2,400	3,300	4,300	4,300	4,800	4,800	4,800
Montevideo	2,600	3,200	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
St. Cloud	2,600	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
St. Paul	2,800	3,200	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,700
Thief River Falls	2,600	3,100	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Rochester	3,400	3,800	4,400	4,800	5,000	5,400	5,800
Mississippi:							
Biloxi	2,600	3,700	3,900	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Canton	2,500	3,300	3,500	3,500	3,700	3,700	3,900
Greenville	2,600	3,000	3,300	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,000
Gulfport	3,100	3,700	3,900	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Jackson	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,700	4,000	4,100	4,200
Meridian	2,600	3,300	3,500	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,000
Mound Bayou	2,300	2,800	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800
Hattiesburg	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,700	4,000	4,100	4,200
Laurel	2,900	3,500	3,700	3,800	4,100	4,200	4,300
Vicksburg	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Missouri:							
Concordia	3,500	3,700	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,700	4,900
Independence	2,800	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Kansas City	3,500	3,500	4,100	4,100	4,600	4,600	4,600
St. Louis	3,900	3,900	5,000	5,000	6,100	6,100	6,100
Kinloch	3,600	3,600	4,200	4,200	4,700	4,700	4,700
Columbia	3,105	3,105	3,450	3,450	3,795	3,795	3,795
Jefferson City	2,700	3,200	3,500	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Montana:							
Billings	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600
Glendive	2,900	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800
Great Falls	2,800	3,400	3,800	3,800	4,200	4,200	4,200
Plentywood	2,900	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800
Butte	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	3,900
Nebraska:							
Lincoln	2,600	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100	5,400
Omaha	2,400	4,000	5,600	4,600	5,200	5,200	5,200
Nevada:							
Las Vegas	4,000	4,000	4,300	4,300	4,700	4,700	4,700
Reno	4,000	4,000	4,400	4,400	4,700	4,700	4,700
New Hampshire:							
Manchester	3,800	3,800	4,600	4,600	4,800	4,800	5,200
Nashua	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	3,000	4,000	4,500
Portsmouth	3,500	4,000	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,200	5,400
New Jersey:							
Asbury Park	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Atlantic City	3,600	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,700	4,900
Bayonne	4,000	4,500	5,200	5,400	5,600	5,800	6,000
Bridgeton	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,700
Camden	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,400	4,400
East Orange	3,600	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Elizabeth	3,600	4,400	4,700	4,900	5,200	5,500	5,800
Hackensack	3,600	4,200	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200	5,400
Irvington	3,600	4,000	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,000
Jersey City	4,000	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600	5,800
Lakewood	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Newark	3,600	4,200	4,380	4,560	4,740	4,920	5,100
Passaic	4,100	4,100	4,400	4,400	4,600	4,600	4,800
Paterson	3,700	4,100	4,500	4,900	5,300	5,700	6,100
Perth Amboy	3,800	4,100	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,100	5,300
Rahway	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,100
Trenton	3,600	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Union	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,000	5,100
Woodbridge	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,100
Carteret	3,600	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Hoboken	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,000	5,100
Long Branch	3,600	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,400	4,600	4,800
New Brunswick	3,600	4,200	4,600	5,200	5,400	5,600	5,800
North Bergen	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,000	5,100
Orange	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,700	4,800
Plainfield	3,600	4,300	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,100	5,300
West New York	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,000	5,100
New Mexico:							
Albuquerque	2,800	3,500	3,700	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Roswell	3,000	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Santa Fe	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900
Las Cruces	2,800	3,600	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
Clovis	2,500	2,500	2,900	2,900	3,300	3,300	3,300
Las Vegas City	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900
New York:							
Albany	3,400	3,800	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Auburn	3,000	3,700	4,400	4,600	5,000	5,400	5,800
Binghamton	3,200	3,600	3.900	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100
Buffalo	3,600	3,900	4,500	5,000	5,000	5,880	5,880
Newburgh	3,000	3,500	4,100	4,100	5,200	5,200	5,400
New York	3,888	5,256	5,760	5,760	6,100	6,100	6,100
Niagara Falls	3,300	3,500	3,700	7,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Ossining	3,600	4,600	5,200	5,400	5,700	5,900	6,100
Rochester	3,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,700	6,100
Rome	3,600	4,000	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,400
Schenectady	3,500	4,000	4,250	4,500	5,250	5,500	5,500
Syracuse	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,500	5,000	5,500	6,000
Troy	4,200	4,200	4,500	4,500	4,800	4,800	5,100
Utica	3,600	4,200	4,900	5,100	5,300	5,500	5,700
Watertown	3,400	3,400	4,000	4,000	4,600	4,600	4,800
Yonkers	3,800	4,700	5,000	5.400	5,600	5,800	6,100
Amsterdam	3,600	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Elmira	3,600	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,100	4,100	4,300
Freeport	3,800	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400	5,800	6,100
Kingston	3,600	4,000	4,600	4,700	4,900	5,100	5,300
Lackawanna	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Long Beach	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100	5,250	5,400
North Carolina:							
Asheville	$3,000	$3,600	$3,800	$3,900	$4,200	$4,300	$4,400
Charlotte	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,800	3,800	3,800
Durham	3,300	3,300	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	3,900
Goldsboro	2,600	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,900	4,000	4,100
Greensboro	2,800	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
High Point	2,800	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Raleigh	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,600
Salisbury	3,200	3,800	3,900	3,900	4,100	4,100	4,100
Wilmington	2,400	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,900
Winston-Salem	3,500	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,400	4,500	4,700
Fayetteville	2,600	3,500	3,700	3,800	4,200	4,300	4,400
Rocky Mount	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,600
Wilson	2,400	2,900	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,500	3,600
North Dakota:							
Beach	2,600	3,300	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,500	4,800
Fargo	2,400	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Garrison	2,600	3,200	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Southwest Fargo	2,600	3,200	3,600	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400
Ohio:							
Akron	2,800	3,800	4,100	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Canton	2,500	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100
Cincinnati	2,700	3,200	3,500	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600
Cleveland	2,900	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Columbus	2,500	3,700	4,100	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,200
Dayton	2,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Hamilton	2,700	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Lorain	2,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600	5,900
Mansfield	2,400	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100
Martins Ferry	2,600	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,500	4,800	5,000
Mayfield Heights	2,900	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
New Boston	2,700	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000
Oberlin	2,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600	5,900
Parma Heights	2,900	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Perrysburg	2,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Springfield	2,800	3,400	3,700	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900
Toledo	2,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Youngstown	2,500	3,700	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Steubenville	2,600	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,500	4,800	5,000
Warren	2,800	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,500
Zanesville	2,200	3,500	3,800	4,000	4,300	4,500	4,800
Oklahoma:							
Enid	2,700	2,700	3,300	3,300	3,600	3,600	3,600
Eufaula	2,800	2,800	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Lawton	2,800	2,800	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Muskogee	2,500	2,700	2,900	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Oklahoma City	2,800	2,800	3,000	3,000	3,300	3,300	3,300
Tulsa	2,800	2,800	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Oregon:							
Corvallis	2,900	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Eugene	2,800	3,200	3,500	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000
Milwaukee	3,400	3,400	4,200	4,200	4,800	4,800	5,200
Portland	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800	4,100	4,100	4,100
Salem	2,800	3,200	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Pennsylvania:							
Allentown	3,200	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,800	3,800	3,800
Bethlehem	3,100	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Braddock	3,500	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,600	4,700
Chambersburg	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Chester	3,200	3,740	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Easton	3,200	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,800
Erie	3,300	3,300	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	4,200
Harrisburg	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Jenkintown	3,500	3,800	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000
Johnstown	3,500	3,500	3,700	3,700	3,900	3,900	4,100
Lancaster	3,000	3,100	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Philadelphia	3,200	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,200
Pittsburgh	3,400	4,000	4,400	4,400	4,600	4,600	4,800
Rankin	3,500	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,600	4,700
Reading	3,000	3,100	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	4,800
Scranton	3,000	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Swatara Township	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
York	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,700
Aliquippa	3,500	3,500	3,900	3,900	4,300	4,300	4,700
McKeesport	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,000
New Castle	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	3,900
Ridley Township	3,200	3,500	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Puerto Rico: All localities except Ramey Air Force Base	1,750	2,125	2,500	2,875	3,000	3,125	3,250
Rhode Island:							
Cranston	3,800	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200
Newport	3,200	3,800	4,100	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Pawtucket	3,000	3,300	3,600	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,000
Providence	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Warwick	3,300	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100
Woonsocket	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,500	4,500	5,000
South Carolina:							
Charleston	3,000	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,700
Columbia	3,200	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,600
Darlington	2,700	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Greenville	3,000	3,900	4,200	4,400	4,500	4,600	4,700
Sumter	3,000	3,600	3,700	3,800	4,100	2,200	4,300
Georgetown	2,800	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Rock Hill	2,800	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Spartanburg	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,400
South Dakota:							
Alcester	2,600	3,200	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Mitchell	2,600	3,200	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Pine Ridge	2,000	3,300	3,700	4,100	4,500	4,800	5,000
Spearfish	3,000	3,500	4,100	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000

See footnote at end of table.

INCOME LIMITS FOR RENT SUPPLEMENT HOUSING AND FOR SEC. 221(h) REHABILITATION SALES HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME PURCHASERS, LIST NO. 5—Continued

State and locality	Number of persons in family						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+
Tennessee:							
Athens	$2,400	$3,300	$3,500	$3,700	$3,900	$3,000	$4,100
Chattanooga	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Clarksville	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,000
Clinton	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Cookeville	3,000	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Dickson	3,000	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,000	4,100	4,200
Franklin	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Greenville	2,400	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Harriman	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,700
Jackson	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Johnson City	3,000	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,600
Knoxville	2,400	3,400	3,600	3,780	4,000	4,100	4,200
McMinnville	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Memphis	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,500
Milan	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,500
Morristown	3,000	3,900	4,100	3,400	4,500	4,700	4,800
Nashville	3,300	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,400	4,400	4,400
Pulaski	3,000	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,400	4,500
Shelbyville	2,800	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Springfield	2,700	3,300	3,500	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100
Cleveland	2,400	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Paris	2,400	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Kingsport	3,000	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,600	4,700
Texas:							
Austin	2,500	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,800	3,800	3,800
Beaumont	2,800	2,800	3,600	3,600	4,500	4,500	4,500
Big Spring	3,000	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Bridgeport	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Commerce	2,400	2,400	2,700	2,700	3,000	3,000	3,000
Corpus Christi	2,800	2,800	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,500
Dallas	3,000	3,000	3,300	3,300	3,600	3,600	3,600
Denton	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Diboll	3,200	3,800	4,300	4,500	4,700	4,800	4,900
Dublin	2,700	2,700	3,300	3,300	3,500	3,500	3,500
Edinburg	2,400	2,400	2,700	2,700	3,000	3,000	3,000
El Paso	3,250	3,550	3,750	3,950	4,150	4,250	4,350
Forth Worth	2,880	2,880	3,400	3,400	4,000	4,000	4,000
Galveston	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Henderson	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,500
Houston	2,640	2,640	3,040	3,040	3,780	3,780	3,780
Laredo	2,800	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,600
Lubbock	2,500	2,500	2,800	2,800	3,100	3,100	3,100
Mercedes	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Mission	2,640	2,640	3,120	3,120	3,600	3,600	3,600
Orange	3,200	3,200	3,600	3,600	4,000	4,000	4,000
Port Arthur	3,000	3,000	3,600	3,600	4,000	4,000	4,000
San Angelo	2,500	2,800	3,100	3,300	3,500	3,700	3,900
San Antonio	3,100	3,350	3,600	3,600	3,850	3,850	3,850
Waco	2,800	2,800	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	3,500
Wichita Falls	2,600	2,880	3,460	3,460	3,840	3,840	3,840
Corsicana	3,200	3,200	3,400	3,400	4,000	4,000	4,000
Carthage	3,100	3,300	3,500	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100
Denison	3,300	3,300	3,600	3,600	4,000	4,000	4,000
Bryan	2,800	2,800	3,400	3,400	4,000	4,000	4,000
Crockett	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900
Jefferson	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,000
Baytown	2,500	2,500	3,000	3,000	3,300	3,300	3,300
Brownsville	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Greenville	3,000	3,300	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Texas—Continued							
Harlingen	$2,400	$2,400	$2,700	$2,700	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000
Kingsville	2,500	2,500	2,800	2,800	3,100	3,100	3,100
Longview	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
McAllen	2,900	2,900	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,500
Temple	3,200	3,200	3,800	3,800	4,400	4,400	4,400
Texarkana	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,000
Texas City	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,600
Victoria	2,600	2,600	2,900	2,900	3,200	3,200	3,200
Gainesville	3,000	3,300	3,600	3,800	4,100	4,300	4,600
Jacksonville	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,100	4,300	4,600
Troup	2,800	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Palestine	2,800	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Paris	2,500	2,500	2,800	2,800	3,100	3,100	3,100
Utah: Salt Lake City	2,800	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,600	4,000	4,400
Vermont: Burlington	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Virginia:							
Alexandria	3,700	4,500	4,700	4,700	5,100	5,100	5,300
Charlottesville	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Herndon	3,500	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,400	4,500	4,600
Lynchburg	2,700	2,700	2,900	2,900	3,200	3,200	3,200
Newport News	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800	4,200	4,200	4,600
Norfolk	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,400	4,400	4,800
Norton	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Portsmouth	3,000	3,500	3,900	3,900	4,400	4,400	4,400
Richmond	3,100	3,100	3,400	3,400	3,700	3,700	3,700
Roanoke	3,300	3,330	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800	3,800
Danville	3,000	3,000	3,300	3,300	3,700	3,700	3,700
Washington:							
Everett	3,500	4,000	4,600	4,600	5,000	5,000	5,000
Kelso	3,300	4,000	4,700	4,900	5,200	5,400	5,600
Pasco	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100
Seattle	3,000	4,000	4,700	4,700	5,200	5,200	5,200
Tacoma	3,000	3,500	4,325	4,500	4,800	5,150	5,500
Vancouver	2,800	3,100	3,500	3,800	4,200	4,500	4,900
Walla Walla	2,800	3,100	3,400	3,700	4,000	4,300	4,600
Bremerton	3,800	3,800	4,200	4,200	4,700	4,700	4,700
Yakima	3,100	3,100	3,300	3,300	3,600	3,600	3,600
Stanwood	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,000
West Virginia:							
Charleston	3,300	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Huntington	2,700	2,700	2,900	2,900	3,200	3,200	3,200
Parkersburg	3,100	3,300	3,500	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Wheeling	2,600	3,300	3,450	3,450	3,800	3,900	4,150
Fairmont	2,600	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000
Wisconsin:							
Bloomer	2,550	3,700	4,050	4,250	4,450	4,700	4,900
Madison	2,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Milwaukee	3,000	4,400	4,650	4,900	5,150	5,400	5,650
La Crosse	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800	3,800
Superior	2,800	3,500	3,900	4,200	4,400	4,500	4,600
Wyoming:							
Casper	2,900	3,200	3,500	3,800	4,100	4,400	4,700
Cheyenne	2,800	3,100	3,400	3,700	4,000	4,300	4,600
Cody	2,800	3,100	3,400	3,700	4,000	4,300	4,600
Powell	2,700	3,000	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500
Douglas	2,800	3,000	3,400	3,700	3,900	4,200	4,500
Laramie	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100
Lusk	2,700	3,000	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500
Torrington	2,800	3,000	3,300	3,800	4,100	4,400	4,700

[1] To be established at a later date.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlemen from Georgia, a member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. STEPHENS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, we seem to be debating a question that is not germane here. We seem to be debating a question as to whether or not we are going to vote for a rent subsidy in housing or not vote for a rent subsidy in housing. That is not the question at all. The question involved is this. We already have a rent subsidy in the form of public housing. We have had it for 30 years. The question is: How are we going to provide housing? Shall we continue that subsidy? Or are we going to provide a subsidy at less cost to the taxpayer? Are you going to continue the public housing subsidy at the taxpayer's expense to the extent of 100 percent of the amount, or are you going to turn to a rent subsidy that is at the expense of private enterprise?

The question is not whether we have a rent subsidy. We have a rent subsidy. And it is not going away. You must decide and then vote how, with the least amount of expense, we will provide a rent subsidy that is here and is going to stay.

The Senate has acted to restore cuts in the rent supplement made by the House. I have advocated the rent supplement, as you know, and sponsored amendments that limited its original scope. I would like to point out again why I believe in this as a move in favor of private enterprise.

When the original bill was presented 2 years ago, I had an immediate reaction against the idea. I questioned the fact that anybody's rent should be paid by the Government. I listened in hearings and when people devoted to free, private enterprise advocated the program, I began to think that perhaps I had made a snap judgment.

My study has convinced me that the principles involved do foster free enterprise and will save our Government millions of dollars in construction. It is also the first time since the passage of the initial act on public housing that private enterprise has had a chance to compete with public housing.

I would appreciate it if you will listen to the reasoning processes set out below through which I became convinced that the rent supplement is a sound, private enterprise program. I would also be glad to have your comments on my analysis.

First of all, we already have a rent subsidy. We have had this rent subsidy since the first public housing project was built. This subsidy is in the form of lower rent in Government projects than a tenant would pay in comparable housing owned by private owners.

We know, to be practical, that public housing is here to stay. Therefore, the subsidy in public housing will stay as well.

The question then becomes how to finance this subsidy with less cost to the taxpayer.

The present method of financing this subsidy is to construct housing with public funds, to operate the housing by public agencies, to repose ownership in public agencies and to remove the real estate from all tax digests of cities, counties, and the States. In short, the existing subsidy is financed almost 100 percent at the expense of the taxpayer.

The rent supplement offers the following alternative to the present subsidy: People eligible for the existing public housing subsidy will be provided comparable housing of the same standard and quality in private housing. All the Government will pay is a difference in the rent the tenant can afford and the actual rent. Private capital will finance the construction, private enterprise will operate the housing, private enterprise will own the housing and the real estate will remain as taxable property on all city, county, and State tax digests. In short, the proposed subsidy will be financed almost wholely at the expense of private enterprise.

My premise, then, as I said, is that I have a choice but this choice is not whether we will have a rent subsidy. It is whether we will have a rent subsidy financed largely at public expense or largely at private enterprise expense.

Of course, with this choice I select the way of private, free enterprise.

There are elements which have influenced my thinking on the rent supplement. Free enterprise asked for this legislation. It has been endorsed by the National Home Builders Association, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the Georgia Association of Real Estate Boards, and the Georgia Realtors.

No project will be approved unless it has the approval of local officials.

It would be a method to accelerate the building of houses that we are not able to do with public funds unless we substantially extend the public housing program. In this connection, if we accelerate the war in Vietnam, it is not only military housing that is going to have to be provided for people, but also private housing for civilians that will have to be built.

There are detailed restrictions, too, in the law. First, as to who may be a beneficiary of the rent supplement; second, restrictions on income of the beneficiary; and third, restrictions on who may be the landlord of the housing units.

The first of these restrictions limits beneficiaries of the rent supplements to people who are eligible for public housing and who are also either elderly, handicapped, living in substandard housing or displaced by Government action or natural disaster.

The final restriction to prevent windfalls for landlords is that the legal entity constructing the housing for rent supplement benefits or acquiring such housing shall be a nonprofit corporation, a cooperative association, or a limited dividend corporation.

In conclusion, I recognize that it is difficult to compare costs of public housing and rent supplements. The Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates—and this is in the printed record—that over the long haul the housing of the same number of families by rent supplements will be less costly than the public housing.

But—in terms of immediate impact on Federal spending—and we are all concerned about the present budgetary situation—rent supplements will clearly provide more housing for less current expenditure than will public housing.

In my hometown of Athens, Ga., it costs a little less than $16,000 to produce one low-rent public housing unit. At an average annual rent supplement payment of $900 per year, this same $16,000 would provide housing for some 18 families.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, is it true that the distinguished minority leader of the other body, the senior Senator from Illinois, in view of the improvements made in this program and the guarantees against abuses, is now supporting this program?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my friend that I have read press statements to the effect that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois is supporting both the model cities and the rent supplement programs. I have not talked with the Senator personally, but I have read reports that he is in favor of the rent supplement program.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. May I point out that one of the most vigorous and strongest opponents of public housing was the National Association of Real Estate Boards. All of us were besieged with their protests when the issue of public housing came up. That association is strongly in favor of this program.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. The rent supplement program is being supported and advocated by many responsible organizations. Among them are the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Council on the Aging, many churches, charitable organizations, private enterprise, and many others.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I think some things should be said that have not been brought out in the debate so far. The question here is not whether we will pay rent subsidies or not. There is $5 million in this bill that is not in dispute for rent subsidies. That is agreed by the House and the Senate. What we are talking about here is whether we will give the administration $40 million of additional contracting authority, meaning authority to go out and contract to build houses and pay subsidies for 40 years on those houses.

So what is involved here is not $40 million, but it is $1,600,000,000, 40 years times $40 million.

Now, there are some of us who are not willing to commit the Federal Government today to another brand new obligation of $1,600,000,000, superimposed upon $275 million this year in subsidy for public housing; and superimposed upon a $750 million appropriation that is in this bill for urban renewal; and superimposed upon $30,000,000 for neighborhood facilities, $25,000,000 for special housing for the handicapped and elderly, $75,000,000 for open space land, $165,000,000 for water and sewer facilities, $175,000,000 for mass transportation and upon millions upon millions for other programs designed to benefit certain segments of society.

I think we ought to move a little more slowly, particularly since we have a collateral program that is responsible for building more rooms for occupancy by poor people than the rent subsidy program has built. I refer to the rent certificate program, which is usable today, and which is available, and which can be utilized to far better effect and with less expense and less cost to the Government, and which requires, I might add, only 20 percent of the payment of income in rent, whereas the rent supplement program requires 25 percent.

It is a far better program for the poor than the rent supplement program. It is already in effect.

I would add that 95 percent of the houses now being rent supplemented are houses that have been rehabilitated. They are not new construction that has been constructed under this program. They are rehabilitated housing. That is similar to the rent certificate housing that is now available to all.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman from North Carolina tell us how much money is being spent, how much money it costs the Government to supplement rents?

Mr. JONAS. The average is $900 per year per unit.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The gentleman is talking about rent supplements?

Mr. JONAS. I am talking about rent supplements. The average payment they are making is $75 per month per unit.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. What is the total amount being expended under that program?

Mr. JONAS. I do not remember offhand. There is $5 million in this bill, not in dispute, to continue payments on programs outstanding.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Forty million dollars under the same budget is for construction of additional units?

Mr. JONAS. For new contract authority to permit them to go out and make contracts that will run for 40 years in the future.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, regrettably, we have acted with utmost disregard today against programs which hold the promise to help smooth the journey of America through the difficult times ahead.

For fiscal year 1968, President Johnson asked $12 million in planning funds, $400 million for actual model cities programs, and an additional $250 million for urban renewal. Of this amount requested this body approved the full $12 million for planning, but only a meager $150 million for actual programs and only $75 million for urban renewal. Today, we have refused to reconsider our initial judgment, and we have made this determination after a long, hot summer of riots and turmoil, caused in many instances by the very environmental elements which the model cities programs would work to combat. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Senate will remain firm in its appropriation of the full amounts for both planning and model cities programs. There are currently nine New Jersey cities with model cities program applications pending, including Jersey City.

The second worthy program which we have disposed of today involves rent supplements. The Senate has recommended $40 million. We have recommended nothing. Mr. Speaker, this is one answer to the urgent cry for more and better housing for poor and elderly families. The cost of decent housing, at today's prices, weighs disproportionately on the income of many poor families. The rent supplements program gives a chance to move up in the society. And I might add that $40 million is not much money to help an estimated 44,000 families and single individuals.

Mr. Speaker, there are three proposals for rent supplements programs stagnating in the Washington office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development from lack of funds. In Bayonne, N.J., Laborer's Pride Apartments, Inc., has submitted a plan for 130 units costing $80,000. In Jersey City, St. Michael's Methodist Church is sponsoring a project for 109 units costing $83,000. In Elizabeth, Humane Renewal is proposing 44 units at a cost of $33,600. Mr. Speaker, when these people ask why the House cut these programs, what answer should I give?

We have gutted today the heart of programs designed to stop the great cities of the United States from sinking down into a bog of slums, places filled with crime, hate, and intolerance. Admittedly, these programs would not be a panacea for our problems in the cities. But combined with other programs to improve law enforcement and municipal facilities we will have at least made a start.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, in August of 1965, the 89th Congress passed legislation establishing a rent supplement program. Since that time we have authorized $32 million for use in the program. All of that funding has been allocated.

This money has been earmarked to help 34,000 families and individuals obtain good, clean, decent housing.

The question now before us is this:

Are we going to allow this to be our complete effort in helping poor Americans to live in dignity, and with hope?

We have the opportunity to continue the funding of the rent supplement program. Thousands of families, living in the slums and tenements of urban America, are looking to us for help.

They are looking to us for a chance to rise out of the degradation of slum living. We cannot fail them.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of my fellow Members join me in welcoming the growing bipartisan support for the rent supplement program.

It shows that the fog of misunderstanding and confusion about this much-needed program is dissipating.

This is an encouraging and hopeful sign to those who are poor and poorly housed in this country.

Rent supplement housing serves low-income families only—those who have incomes at or below the local public housing requirement. There is a provision limiting family assets as well.

These requirements guarantee that the program serves the low-income market as it is intended. There is no limit placed on the ability of a tenant to improve his economic lot in life, however.

Rent supplement tenants pay one-fourth of their income toward the market rent for their home. Any difference between that payment and the full rental is made up by a supplement to the private owner of the housing.

Because he receives this supplement, the owner can make decent housing available to families who do not make enough to compete economically for standard housing in the private market.

We ought to provide the funds necessary to keep it moving.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when funding of the rent supplements program was before the House earlier this year I supported the level of funding of that program recommended by the Appropriations Committee; to wit, $10 million. I continue to support the concept of the rent supplement program and feel that it should be given reasonable funding this year. However, I cannot support the full measure of funding recommended by the Senate; to wit, $40 million, during this time of fiscal crisis. I do not feel in our present fiscal situation that we can afford the $40 million funding level of this program proposed by the Senate, although it may be very desirable. I, therefore, intend to vote against the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recede, which would have the effect of accepting the Senate funding figure of $40 million, in order that the matter may be returned to conference and the conferees may have an opportunity to agree upon a reasonable funding level consistent with both the value of the program and our present fiscal situation.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1967, the House adopted my amendment to H.R. 9960, to prohibit the expenditure of funds to be appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the administration or implementation of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, Public Law 89-754.

Section 204 established the procedures and requirements for areawide planning within standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States. The section required that any applications for Federal grants-in-aid for a large category of projects—hospitals, airports, libraries, water supply, and distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, highways, transportation facilities, and water development and land conservation be subject to the review by these metropolitan area planning agencies and that the views of such planning agencies accompany any application submitted to Federal departments and agencies for grants-in-aid therefor. The implementation of section 204, as originally contemplated by HUD before my amendment, would have permitted Federal agencies to withhold Federal funds from projects under the numerous grant-in-aid programs I have just mentioned in order to push for metro government in standard metropolitan statistical areas through federally dictated regional planning agencies.

At the time the act was considered last year, I voiced concern over the possible effects of section 204. I suggested that many States did not have authority to authorize the establishment and continuation of areawide planning agencies. I suggested further that such an areawide planning requirement tended to usurp the responsibilities and authorities of local, county, and municipal elected officials with respect to areawide planning, unless such officials participated in the creation of and in the subsequent decisionmaking of these areawide planning agencies.

On May 17 I offered my amendment to prohibit HUD, the principal agency involved in the initial administration of section 204, from using any funds appropriated for fiscal year 1968 to administer section 204. The House agreed to my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened with respect to section 204 since May 17?

HUD has assumed no responsibility for administration of section 204 since June 30, 1967; and because of my amendment, HUD does not now have any authority with respect to section 204. As a consequence thereof, since June 30 the Bureau of the Budget has been overseeing the Federal responsibility for section 204.

I have been informed that since June 30, 1967, HUD has proceeded no further with dictating the designation of metropolitan areas or areawide planning agencies to carry out the provisions of section 204. Areawide planning agencies were designated for all but 40 of the metropolitan areas designated by HUD prior to June 30. The Bureau of the Budget advises that all 40 of these areas now have areawide agencies properly designated by the Governors, so that every standard metropolitan statistical area now has an areawide planning agency designated to carry out the provisions of section 204. The Bureau of the Budget further advises that no applications are being received by any Federal agency for programs covered by section 204 unless such applications are accompanied by the views of the areawide planning agencies. The Bureau of the Budget expresses the view that HUD does not have to proceed any further with any additional designations of areas or agencies in that the Governors have done so and that they feel that HUD's responsibilities in this regard are complete.

The acceptance by the House of my amendment has done much to accomplish that which I felt was essential if the State and local government are to maintain effective control of these areawide planning agencies, not letting them become mere instrumentalities of the Federal Government. The slowdown in the designation of areas permitted many States to act responsively to the program, without undue pressure from HUD, which might have otherwise been the case. Most of these planning agencies are made up of local elected officials, something which I felt was essential to the proper functioning of areawide planning. The Governors now appear to be satisfied with the implementation of section 204 during the past several months. It is my understanding that many State and local officials feel that the objective, flexible, and responsible administration of section 204, as it has been carried out during the past few months, was a direct outgrowth of the Federal agencies' recognitions of the desires of the House by acceptance of my amendment. No funds have been cut off and basic programs have thus been preserved. In this regard, I think my amendment has served a valuable purpose. What could have become a tightly controlled Federal dictation over local areawide planning is apparently being turned into an objective approach that is responsive to the needs of all levels of government.

My amendment applies only to funds appropriated for administrative expenses within HUD for fiscal year 1968, thus enabling these areawide planning agencies to achieve, during this fiscal year, the stability which will be required for the proper administration of section 204 requirements over the years to come. My amendment will affect only those programs administered by HUD, not programs under other departments. By the end of fiscal year 1968, when my amendment will expire, perhaps HUD will realize that its original envisionment of this section has had to necessarily give way to an objective, responsible approach, which gives full recognition to the responsibilities of elected local officials. This is very important, because it may have the effect of preventing HUD from vacating the decisions and judgment of the local agencies with respect to applications submitted.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9960, as reported by the conference committee, has retained my amendment. I commend the conferees for their farsightedness in this regard. State and local governments will benefit greatly from the strong position taken by the House conferees in support of my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the position of the House and of the conference committee with respect to section 204 points our clearly the need for Congress to take a new look at section 204 of the 1966 act. I think the weaknesses of the section have been highlighted by the turmoil which the section created. I strongly urge the House Committee on Banking and Currency to hold hearings on section 204 and related sections of the 1966 act at the earliest possible date, to consider what revisions if any, are needed to assure continued local or areawide rather than Federal control over planning.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I support full funding of the rent supplement program. Many long and arduous hours have been spent by the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee—a subcommittee which I am proud to chair—to develop programs which would meet the housing needs of all people.

It was through the work of this committee that the rent supplement program became a reality. We set about the task of aiding low- and moderate-income families so that they too could live with decency and pride.

This was not a task for Government alone. We asked and received the assistance of private enterprise in getting this program moving.

And private industry has responded effectively and enthusiastically. The total allocation of $32 million for rent supplements was exhausted in the first year of program operation.

This money will be used to help 34,000 families, of which 1,200 are now living in rent supplement units.

But this is not enough. This is only the beginning. Congress has a responsibility to the thousands more who need our help.

Are we going to tell the less fortunate in Newark or Detroit—New York or Los Angeles—Philadelphia or Chicago—or any other American city—that we have done our part—that our job is done? I should think not.

Are we going to tell the private sponsor, the builder, the lending institution that they no longer are needed? I hope not.

We have been called upon to assist our fellow Americans live better lives, bring their children up in decent surroundings, and reside in a decent home which they can afford.

This Congress, as those before us, is responsible for the welfare and well being of all America's citizens. Are we going to shirk that responsibility?

The rent supplement program is designed to help the poor, the handicapped, the elderly—people who need our assistance, people who are living in the slum, the ghetto, the tenement.

The rent supplement program deserves the support of all of us. The people who need and want this program deserve our support. The sponsors, the builders, the lending institutions, which have supported this program because we requested them to, deserve our support.

There are applications for over 15,000 rent supplement units from all over this country which cannot be acted upon until we act. Are we going to let them sit in a file, gathering dust? Or are we going to respond to the needs, the wants, the aspirations of the people we represent?

The time for action is now. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in this House will join me in support of adequate funding for the rent supplement program.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in 1965, we passed a new housing program to aid some of the millions of Americans who are forced to live in substandard housing. The rent supplement program was, and still is, one of the most creative and potentially valuable approaches to this problem to come along in many years.

Initially we were gratified with this indication of a new Federal approach. At last, we had a program which would help individual families obtain much needed improvements in their housing at rates they could afford to pay and without the stigma which often accompanies residence in public housing projects. It is now possible for a family to obtain a good home and receive a subsidy which would permit them to pay a higher rent for better housing. Then as the family's income increased, it would pay a larger share of the rent. If the family's income eventually surpassed the level of eligibility for the rent supplement program, the family could still remain in the housing and thus not be penalized for having achieved a higher standard of living.

It was only a short time after the implementation of the program that we came to know that while the Federal Establishment might have given way to a brainstorm in creating the rent supplement program that it was not going to be guilty of creative financing. The first year of the rent supplement program was miserably underfunded and the second year was unfunded. Earlier this year, the House decided that the new program should not only be crippled, but killed. However, we have been offered a second chance to save the rent supplements by giving it a $40 million reprieve.

The $40 million which is being asked for the very young rent supplement program will be money which is well spent. We have not seen the real benefits of the program because we have not given it the opportunity which it so richly deserves.

My only objection to the proposed $40 million appropriation is that it is woefully inadequate in terms of really meeting the housing crisis in America. I recently introduced a Full Opportunity Act which calls for funding the rent supplement program at the level of $250 million per year as part of an overall effort to eliminate substandard housing. While I shall continue to advocate and seek a higher level of funding for this very valuable program, I urge this body to pass the $40 million appropriation today so that the rent supplements can at least aid the few, until we reach the obvious conclusion that we must assist the many who are forced to live in inadequate housing.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is too much to hope that the House will have learned from the events of last summer that its action of May 17 in denying any appropriations for the rent supplement program contributed to the sense of hopelessness and despair which permeates the ghettos of our cities. However, perhaps the House will recognize the importance of this program. The vote on the motion by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will tell.

I certainly urge support for the $40 million Senate figure. It is a very modest amount and will not make much impact upon our severe housing shortage. It will only provide some 45,000 units of rent supplement housing for the entire Nation; and because of the inequitable 15-percent limitation no single State will be eligible for more than 6,750 units.

Congressional treatment of this program is indicative of an appalling lack of concern for the ill-housed people of America.

The total of congressional authorizations for rent supplements is $105 million—$30 million for fiscal year 1966, $35 million for fiscal year 1967, and $40 million for fiscal year 1968. Despite the obvious need and the urgings of the administration, only $12 million was appropriated for fiscal year 1966, and $20 million for fiscal year 1967.

Now the administration's request of $40 million for fiscal year 1968 hangs in the balance, having been accepted by the Senate but denied by the House. I regret that the conferees did not agree to the $40 million Senate figure, but we can do it now.

Mr. Speaker, although the Senate did accept the $40 million figure, the Senate Appropriations Committee wrote into its report a requirement which would cripple the program. It said that nonprofit sponsors of rent supplement projects should provide 5 percent equity if assistance is sought under the special assistance program of FNMA. The effect of this requirement would make it impossible for labor, educational, religious, fraternal and civic organizations, which lack the necessary capital, to become sponsors. These are the very groups which should be encouraged to sponsor rent supplement housing. I spoke about this problem on September 27 when H.R. 9960 was sent to conference, and I have discussed it with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], and other House conferees. I urge the conferees to oppose the imposition of such conditions.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, about 34,000 American families will be aided in obtaining decent housing under the present allocation of rent supplement funds. Some already are receiving this aid. Others must wait on new construction.

The 34,000 families that will be helped when all of these projects are in operation should only reflect the start of a productive era of assistance to our poor.

We can help bring these people out from the breeding place of poverty—the slums. We can help these people attain the dignity that comes with decent, clean surroundings. We can help these people begin new lives.

Thousands of families across this Nation are waiting and hoping that we will act. The elderly, the handicapped, the poor need our help.

Where before these people had nothing to look forward to but the filth and degradation of the slums, they can now see a glimpse of a future.

We must not fail them.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the rent supplement program at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, occasionally during the session it is not surprising to hear testimonials made about a relative of mine by Members on both sides of the aisle. I will say this body does not offend as often in this regard as does the other body, but frequently I have been tempted to reply to such statements. It has always seemed to me that with the period of time that has passed and the complications of our present life that perhaps to speculate upon what a particular man might say or do on a particular issue at a particular time is nothing more than speculation. To borrow something reported to have been said by Abraham Lincoln, "It seems to me if I spend all my time answering one way or the other the way my father has been quoted to me, I would have little time to do anything else."

With respect to this bill, however, I would like to say a couple of things. It seems to me that the question on the conscience of the House is not whether we wish to provide adequate housing for Americans. Indeed, I am sure we do. Rather, it is what is the most effective method of providing that housing? We have public housing, and many of us have supported the rental certificate plan, which is the most effective program lately, from the facts and figures available. We have the various FHA programs in the private enterprise category. We have proposals now made to encourage homeownership, which I hope will reach the floor of this House in this session.

I would like to ask this: Is there anything in the record as to the real difference between the rent supplement programs and the rent certificate programs? The difference is that the rent certificate program will be administered by Washington, by a bureaucracy, by HUD, and they will be the ones setting the standards and administering the program. Are we better off to keep the public housing down, as the rental certificate program does, at the metropolitan level and have those authorities make the decisions?

It is on that basis I have made my decision as to how I would vote on this program, and I have heard nothing that has convinced me I should do otherwise.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, last May when this House, by a vote of 232 to 171, refused to approve additional contract money for the rent subsidy program, it did not kill the program. It merely restricted the rent subsidy scheme to the $32 million a year already authorized for 40 years by the Congress.

We should not agree to increase the appropriation for the purpose of expanding this scheme. Let us not forget for a moment that under the present law every additional contract dollar we add to this program obligates us for 40 years. So that when we speak of an additional appropriation of $40 million, we are actually speaking of $1.6 billion because we obligate ourselves to this amount.

To those who argue that this is a great piece of free enterprise, let me remind them that the only reason the real estate, banking, and building industries like and support this rent subsidy scheme is because for 40 years they will have nothing to worry about. The rentals in these buildings will be guaranteed by a 40-year contract. Why should not the building, banking, and real estate people be for this scheme when it means a guaranteed profit for 40 years?

This tricky scheme—a social planner's dream disguised in housing terminology—was projected not to provide needed, adequate housing per se, but to place the poor in middle-income housing for the purpose of promoting economic integration.

Let us make no mistakes about it. This is a scheme to federalize American residential patterns and subsidize forced economic integration.

I say to you that if you support an expansion of this rent subsidy scheme, you will be supporting a program that will help to undermine and destroy the incentives of Americans to better themselves by their own efforts and hard work—a traditionally American economic philosophy.

Under this tricky scheme, a tenant eligible for public housing can be eligible for rent subsidy in middle-income housing if he agrees to pay one-fourth of his income toward the rent.

Let me give you a classic example. Take a family of four members making $4,400 a year. They can move into an apartment where the rental is $2,100—or $175 per month—if they pay only $1,100 toward the rent. Who picks up the tab for the difference? Uncle Sam. The Government will pay the $1,000 a year difference.

In my book, this scheme would subsidize the spongers and the loafers to the discouragement of the middle-income tenants who have to work hard to pay their full rent. Under this tricky scheme of rent subsidies, these hard-working tenants would have to pay their own full rent and also help pay part of their neighbor's rent.

I say to the Members of this House that if they are concerned about decent and adequate housing for the poor, we can provide twice as much housing for the same kind of money through an expanded program of public housing and rent certificates. If we are interested in housing needs and not economic integration, we would be building more public housing. There is no question that the rent subsidy program is extremely wasteful and much more expensive than public housing. It stands to reason that under this program only middle-income housing will be built which requires a higher level of subsidy. Secretary Weaver has even said that only someone with a heart of gold but a head of lead would build low-income housing under this program.

The experience we have had so far clearly indicates that rent supplements would average about $950 per year per unit which is more than twice the average subsidy paid for public housing units. This is wasteful.

I would like to refresh the memory of the Members of this House by reminding them that the rent certificate program, which we here in the House designed, has worked well and is doing the job of providing genuine low-income housing for the poor. Right now, it is helping six times as many poor people as the rent subsidy program at a lower cost.

To those of you who are unaware of public opinion on this rent subsidy scheme, let me remind you that from coast to coast, the people—your constituents—are overwhelmingly against this scheme.

I would like to read the results of congressional district surveys taken on the rent subsidy question which I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 15 of this year.

I will read the percentage of people in each district who support the rent subsidy program:

In Lansing, Mich., only 19 percent support rent subsidies.

In Rochester, N.Y., 16 percent.

In suburban San Francisco, 16 percent.

In Berkeley, Calif., 28 percent.

In suburban Chicago, 15 percent.

In southeast Illinois, 10 percent.

In Cleveland, Ohio, 19 percent.

In Pittsburgh, Pa., 8 percent.

In Columbus, Ohio, 5 percent.

In suburban Indianapolis, 5 percent.

In north-central Pennsylvania, 35 percent.

In Mobile, Ala., only 18 percent support rent subsidies.

These polls were taken in 1965 and 1966, before the great riots. I have only been able to find two polls taken in August and September of this year: Springfield, Ill., where 27 percent of the respondents supported rent subsidies, and Scranton, Pa., where 28 percent agreed. There you have it. All over the United States, public opinion has figured this program out. I cannot see why anybody here would vote for it when the American people are so obviously against it and it is such a tricky, wasteful program.

It might also be important to point out that in this period of war, we cannot afford experimental frills and gravy.

With the serious threat of inflation and rising costs and the prospects of higher taxes, I say to you that now is no time to waste the taxpayers' money. Certainly this is not the time to expand a program which has been proven to be a tricky, expensive way of meeting low-income housing needs.

I urge the Members of this House to maintain their position against increasing the appropriation for this rent subsidy scheme.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to try to put the record straight.

The minority leader apparently seems to be somewhat confused as to who will be the beneficiaries of this money in rent supplements.

Of course, this is privately financed, as the gentleman from New York just pointed out.

The gentleman from Michigan wanted to know whether or not one could be eligible for rent supplement housing if he had $25,000 in the bank? The answer is he would not be. He must meet the criterion of the relief recipient. And he must pay 25 percent of his monthly income as rent.

The gentleman from North Carolina says he would supplement that person for 40 years. That is not true. We would supplement the family, if it were a large family, and that family would grow and its children would have income. As the income increased the rent supplement would go down.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania misunderstood me. I did not say we would supplement the rent of every tenant for 40 years. I said the Government would be obligated to pay the amortization on the cost of the building for 40 years.

We are going to have to keep the building occupied, but these units may be occupied by different families.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the gentleman must be careful, because I think he gave the wrong connotation in this, because as the rent increases and the subsidies go down there would be that much less amortization by the FHA.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a no vote on the preferential motion will mean that the rent supplement issue will be returned to conference where we hope to work out a reasonable level of funding. If the House votes down the preferential motion, I feel that we can come back from conference with a reduced level of funding from that recommended by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 67 and concur therein.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 250, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

YEAS—152

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Annunzio
Ashley
Barrett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Conyers
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dellenback
Dent
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Esch
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
McDonald, Mich.
McFall
Machen
Madden
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Sisk
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Whalen
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—250

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Hays
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Kee
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.

Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tunney
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—30

Aspinall
Bell
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Corman
Diggs
Gathings
Gettys
Hébert
Herlong
Jones, Mo.
Kleppe
Kyl
Long, La.
McCarthy
McCulloch
Macdonald, Mass.
Philbin
Poage
Purcell
Rarick
Resnick
Roybal
St. Onge
Smith, N.Y.
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Gettys against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Mr. Button for, with Mr. Gathings against.

Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Kleppe against.

Mr. Brown of California for, with Mr. Kyl against.

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. **GOODELL** changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. **GATHINGS.** Mr. Speaker, I do not qualify on this vote. If I had been present when my name was called I would have voted "nay."

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

The **SPEAKER.** The question now is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 67.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 12474, APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, 1968

Mr. **EVINS** of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, insist upon the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 1, and insist on the disagreement to Senate amendment No. 2, and agree to the further conference requested by the Senate.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, GIAIMO, MARSH, PRYOR, MAHON, JONAS, MINSHALL, WYMAN, TALCOTT, and BOW.

PERMISSION UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO FILE A REPORT ON S. 2388, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. **PERKINS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight Friday next to file a report on S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PROUD ZAMBIA'S THIRD BIRTHDAY

Mr. **O'HARA** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of Zambia marks its third year of independence. In this short time, Zambia has made remarkable progress in self-development, thanks to the dedication of its leaders, the industry of its people, and the continuing successful exploitation of its rich mineral resources.

Zambia has been able to maintain a position as the fourth largest exporter of copper and already has succeeded in diversifying its routes to the sea to the extent that it is no longer so heavily dependent upon Southern Rhodesia.

In agriculture and education, the Government is spreading profits from copper to the entire population. Local industry is being established to diversify the economy. Zambia is encouraging American business to share in this growing economy. In my remarks of yesterday, which appear on page 29616 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 23, 1967, I was happy and privileged to note the marvelous economic strides Zambia has made and Zambia's attraction to private foreign capital.

At the same time that he is providing his country inspired leadership with his philosophy of "humanism" which emphasizes the common man, President Kenneth Kaunda is proving himself an outstanding statesman in African affairs. He has offered assistance to the Republic of the Congo in ridding itself of mercenaries, he is helping to mediate the long and difficult Kenya-Somalia dispute, and he has been attempting to stop the bloodshed in the Nigerian civil war.

To the people of Zambia, to their great leader, and to His Excellency Rupiah B. Banda, Zambia's Ambassador to the United States, I extend my heartiest congratulations as Zambia completes its third year of independence.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mr. **SIKES.** Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13606) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] and myself.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 13606, with Mr. ULLMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] will be recognized for 1 hour. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. **SIKES.** Mr. Chairman, may I say in the beginning, there are no nonbudgeted items in this bill. Then let me say that the fiscal 1968 budget estimate for military construction was $2,937 million. The bill before the House carries $2,142 million. This is a reduction of $794 million, or 30 percent. The bill is $362 million below the authorization, or a reduction of 15 percent below the authorization. Very probably these are the most drastic cuts made on any bill brought to the House this year. In all frankness, we may have cut too deeply. I recognize the fact that there is a need for improved facilities for military personnel throughout the Military Establishment in all categories of construction. Many structures now in use are of World War II construction, or older. Some were built to last for a very short period of time, nominally 5 years. Many of them have gone just about as far as they can, further than they should. In many instances the maintenance costs are excessive and the buildings are very unsatisfactory.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be kept in mind that the budget processes relating to military construction are usually very severe. Actually, military construction gets what is left, after pay and allowances, subsistence, procurement of weapons, research, and other essential matters in the military budget are taken care of. Then, Mr. Chairman, the needs for new military construction are considered. The amount available usually is not very much.

I can say truthfully that just about every line item which survives the budget processes downtown and which is sent to Congress is needed.

Mr. Chairman, we do not put men in uniform to be the goats of the economy drive. We recognize that there are requirements for adequate facilities in the field of military construction. This is an essential part of the defense program. However, we are confronted with an unusually difficult fiscal picture and with a very strongly economy-minded Congress.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to certain specific cuts. Take the matter of family housing.

As contained in the budget, there was a request for 12,500 units of family housing. The committee has funded 8,500 units. This represents a cut of just about one-third below the budget request. That is a very heavy cut.

Family housing is considered to be one of the most important of all considerations for the retention of service personnel. Further, there is at this time a need for approximately 40,000 family housing units at the various military installations. To cut more deeply in this important area would serve notice to military personnel, many of them now engaged in combat in Southeast Asia, that we really do not care whether they have adequate housing for themselves and the members of their families.

Mr. Chairman, the point has been made that there is a backlog of something over 5,000 houses which have been funded in prior year programs but not constructed. Consequently, there is a question whether the Government can or intends to build all of the housing which has been requested.

There were two principal reasons for the backlog of housing. One reason is the freeze on construction that took place about a year and a half ago and which delayed virtually all military construction for substantially a year. Then, there is the problem of increased costs of construction which made it virtually impossible to build adequate housing for military families at the authorized limitation of $17,500 per unit.

In the military construction authorization, the cost index has now been increased to the sum of $19,500 per unit. This results in a more realistic figure which will permit reasonably adequate housing. This program is ready to proceed promptly and realistically with the award of contracts for units approved in prior years and those contained in this bill.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there was the matter of a request for $200 million in emergency funds for use of the Secretary of Defense. The committee has allowed only $100 million. The emergency fund was requested in large part because of the requirements in Southeast Asia. We have spent $2.3 billion for construction in Southeast Asia, and there is carried in this bill $96 million for additional Southeast Asia construction; all that was requested. Consequently we feel that the real pressure for emergency funds is over. Obviously in a changing and fluid military situation there can still be requirements for emergency construction, but we consider that $100 million should be adequate, and we have reduced the funds in the bill accordingly.

There are in unexpended funds over $1 billion within the military construction program. This is a serious matter which requires committee consideration. The situation results from a number of things. The freeze order which I mentioned, and which applied very generally to construction, was a factor. Rising construction costs have made it difficult to contract within the appropriated limits. However, there is the possibility that some projects yet to be built will be cancelled. If in a changing military picture it should be found that they are not needed, they should not be built. There has been a new temporary freeze, and I am glad that we are assured that it is a temporary one.

But these factors combined may make it impossible or unnecessary to spend all of the unexpended funds. So we cut $100 million out of this bill to be applied against the general availability of funds for construction. I hope this will not work hardships and that it will prove to be a sound action.

Another item is the Defense Intelligence Agency building, a $20 million structure—and a somewhat controversial structure.

This is a very important agency. It is the intelligence gathering branch of the services. Undoubtedly there is a need for the new facility. We may be doing DIA a disservice because of the importance of their work by denying this $20 million building, but they are housed, and they are doing their work, and the committee is taking the chance that we can postpone this item another year.

Generally, Mr. Chairman, we have deleted administrative facilities. We have deleted facilities where planning is not far enough advanced to insure that the construction contract can be let, and the construction begun during the current fiscal year. After all, this fiscal year is one-third over. It is late October. And we have deleted those buildings where the troops do have facilities that it appears they can make do with for the time being, not as well as they should and not as well as we would like, but in view of all the circumstances, buildings where they can make do for the time being.

One real problem is the new freeze order, and what this may mean for the future. And we have been assured that it is temporary, that it is intended to be a 30-day freeze, and that only a limited number of projects are under scrutiny. But before the committee brought this bill to the House we asked specifically what plans Secretary McNamara has for the fiscal 1968 funds, and here is what he said—and I believe this is something all the Members will have an interest in.

The letter is addressed to me under date of October 16, 1967. It is from the Secretary of Defense, and I will quote only the essential parts. The remainder of the letter is in the committee files and is available for Members of Congress who wish further information on the matter:

> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of October 6 requesting that I provide your Committee with details concerning my decision of October 5 with respect to construction contract awards for military construction and family housing. As you are aware, this action was taken as a temporary measure since the Congressional judgment on the federal budget is not clear and the various Congressional viewpoints on the budget have not been reconciled. I thus instructed the various Department of Defense components to review their construction programs and determine what projects could be temporarily delayed until November 9, 1967. That is to say, I instructed them not to request new bids and not to open bids received subsequent to October 9 until at least November 9, except for construction projects required for new weapons systems or in direct support of Southeast Asia. I hope this temporary delay can be terminated before November 9.
>
> It should be noted—

And this is the key part—

> It should be noted that this delay affects primarily the 67 and prior-year programs, with a very limited effect to planning and minor construction in the 68 programs. Furthermore, it is not my intention to indefinitely postpone bid openings or invitations to bid; nor does this action have any relation to our intention to proceed with all projects in the FY 68 military construction program in the normal manner.

Now in all fairness to Secretary McNamara, let me spell out the fact that this letter was prepared at a time when the fiscal picture was not at all clear; when Congress has not determined the extent of the budget cuts which may be made; and when readjustments in the defense spending program may be required. But he has expressed quite clearly the intent of the Department to proceed in an orderly manner to carry out the fiscal year 1968 Military Construction program.

Mr. Chairman, let me suggest that the Members of the House carefully study the report which is before you. It is quite complete. It deals with a number of programs that are new to the Congress and on which I believe the Members of Congress will want information.

For instance, there is the beginning of construction for the anti-ballistic-missile program. For this purpose we have $64,000,000 in this bill. The presently programed thin line—to cost $5 billion—will require construction in the amount of $1.2 billion. This thin line is almost certain to be expanded. We are, of course, far behind the Russian ABM program and the one programed probably will not even be adequate to meet the Chinese threat at the time that the Chinese nuclear threat becomes a serious one. So it is almost certain that this program is going to have to be expanded. There has to be a beginning and this is the beginning of an ABM program that many of us have argued for during the past 2 years.

It is a new program. It has some resemblance to the missile launching site program of a decade ago, where much had to be learned and costly mistakes were made. Fortunately, much of the experience gained in that program can be utilized in this one.

The report is quite detailed and I think the Members will know much more about the ABM construction program and what is required, if our report is studied.

Now, I would like to discuss the NATO infrastructure very briefly. This item is included for the first time in this bill. Previously it was carried in the foreign aid appropriation. The request before us was for $60,000,000. The committee felt that $50,000,000 would be adequate.

This program permits the joint construction of military facilities with the NATO allies. Whatever is needed in the NATO program for the construction of facilities can be built under this program.

I would like to point out that we, on the Committee are more than a little concerned by the fact that heretofore our negotiators have only recovered from our allies about 25 percent of the cost of the NATO infrastructure.

In other words, dear old Uncle Sam with all his generosity has been paying about 75 percent of the bill for the military facilities needed for the NATO program. That seems to us to be an unnecessarily high percentage. In this measure we propose that our NATO allies meet us half way on costs, and I strongly insist that our negotiators keep this more realistic figure in mind in their dealings with our allies on cost sharing.

Let me touch on homeowners' assistance. This is possibly a controversial program, but it is a part of the law. We have a responsibility to provide funds to carry it out. It is for the relief of homeowners, both military and civilian, whose property lost value because of base closures. The Department asked for $27 million for the remainder of the fiscal year. Again, the fiscal year is a third gone. We know this program must start. We support the program, but we feel that $20 million is as much as can be utilized properly, and that is the amount we recommend.

The committee calls attention again to the need for a long-range construction organizational structure in the Department of Defense. During each war we have had to plan construction programs from scratch. Southeast Asia, with its tremendous construction tasks, was a classical example of inadequate advance planning for a construction program.

Obviously money and time can be saved through advance planning for such programs. These plans are a logical step, just as we have plans for war emergencies in various areas. We stressed this need last year, but it went largely unnoticed.

It is hard to breech the walls of OSD thinking. Sometimes they make it appear that they know almost everything that they are interested in knowing. The committee expects more attention to be given to this particular problem.

Let me discuss very briefly the effect of the Whitten amendment on this bill. As far as I can determine from a study of the Whitten amendment, it deals with expenditures. It is intended to hold the agencies of the Government to the fiscal year 1967 expenditure level. This bill, according to present indications, will be below the fiscal year 1967 expenditure level. Therefore, the effect of the Whitten amendment upon it would be minimal.

Let me summarize what I am trying to bring to your attention. We have stressed living quarters and training facilities primarily in this bill. I question that there is any one facility which is more important to long-range morale uplift than proper living quarters. I know the necessity for training facilities. I know that support facilities are essential. But the place where a man lives is the one which is really closest to his heart and which has the most influence in determining whether he feels his is a good base or a poor one, and whether he wants to continue to wear the uniform.

In training facilities, service facilities, and others, no less than in living quarters, we provide, there is a tangible testimonial to men who are doing nothing less than protecting our national heritage. They bear witness to our concern for the individual, for officers and enlisted men alike. They testify to the Nation's appreciation of the relationship between proper living conditions and excellence in performance of duty. And never had the performance of the individual serviceman been as important as it is today.

In this technological age in which we live there is always the danger of losing sight of the importance of the individual to military readiness and strength. This is an age of computers and numbers, of weapon systems and missiles. But the fact remains, if you omit the individual serviceman from any defense equation of computers and stockpiles of weapons, you actually have no equation and you have no defense posture.

Hanson Baldwin wrote in 1962:

> We are apt now in this mechanistic age to forget the simple truths of military history. That Man and not machines dominate the battlefields of the world.

Adm. George W. Anderson, U.S. Navy wrote in 1964:

> There is another alarming peril found in a modern fallacy that computers, or economics, or numbers of weapons win wars. Alone, they do not . . . . Our nation will defy every lesson of history if we think that stockpiles of weapons or the decision of computers win wars. Man, his wits, and his will are still the key to war and peace, victory and defeat.

That is why it is important not to forget training and living and supply facilities for men in uniform in our planning for defense.

Mr. Chairman, this committee has looked long and critically at the fiscal year 1968 military construction programs. In cooperation with the authorizing committees, these programs have been substantially reduced. There are projects which have been deleted which many of us would like to have seen funded. I am firmly convinced that to further reduce this program, would be to break faith with the men in uniform who are now fighting in Vietnam and with their families and loved ones who are supporting them. It would be false economy of the highest sort.

Military construction is one of the necessary tools of war and one of the necessary means to a sound and effective defense. We have tried to provide that which is essential.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I gladly yield to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, which has contributed so much to good legislation for the members of our armed services.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the chairman. I, of course, cannot find any fault with the overall decision of the committee. The only place where I have any question is in relation to the living quarters. I ask the gentleman this question: Should the DOD show good faith in proceeding with the authorized and the appropriated strength, that is, 8,500 units, would the gentleman feel that next year we should continue to accelerate our interest in the backlog and the continuing deficit in this area, which touches the very fountainhead of morale?

Mr. SIKES. I certainly do feel that way. I feel that we have cut to the very minimum when we reduce the requested level of housing units from 12,500 to 8,500. I hope that there will be no further attempt to reduce it. I feel that the entire field of living quarters is a problem which the Congress must face up to, and I hope that we will extend our interest in providing adequate living quarters to assure that there are proper barracks and bachelor officers' quarters throughout the military defense program.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the chairman, and I hope the chairman will insist, when he goes to a conference with the other body, on the House position because we authorized, I understand, about 10,600. You brought the number to 8,500. Even this is a calculated risk. I hope the gentleman will insist on the 8,500 figure in the conference, because to go below that would result in more than a calculated risk in the long-term reduction of the bill, and we can ill afford to lose those units.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the gentleman's interest and his support.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have read with a great deal of appreciation in some respects and concern in others, the report. Beginning on page 5 of the report the committee launches into a devastating attack on Secretary of Defense McNamara, doing about everything but actually calling him the "congenital prevaricator." This, I would generally applaud.

Mr. SIKES. I do not believe that that is in the report.

Mr. GROSS. No, it is not. I believe I said that the committee did everything but this. The report cites instances in the past when the Secretary has said one thing and then has done the opposite.

Yet the committee goes on in the rest of it's report to give Secretary McNamara money—and plenty of it—about $500 million above last year's appropriations for the same purposes—saying it expects, hopes, and trusts he will do what the committee wants him to do. The gentleman has read the letter from the Secretary, and the committee has the assurance of the Secretary of Defense that it is his intention "to proceed with all projects in the fiscal year 1968 military construction program in the normal manner."

My question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is: What is the normal manner with respect to dealing with the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, who has failed to carry out his assurances to the committee in the past? What reason have we to expect him to do so in the future?

Mr. SIKES. I know there is a very definite need for everything in this bill. I feel that we have the assurance of the Secretary that he intends to proceed as best he can to provide these facilities, and I see no choice but to accept his word. We know these facilities are needed, and I do not think we could, in good conscience, refuse to provide them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to take very little time today, because the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has covered this legislation quite thoroughly. It is very complicated in that it contains so many line items that are involved in military installations all over the world. I believe it would be next to impossible for the Committee of the Whole House to be apprised of all the detail that is in this bill. If anyone has any particular questions to raise, he can raise them.

I just want to comment on the colloquy between the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Florida. I think a reading of the discussion in this report which starts on page 5, under the title of "Fluctuations in the Implementation of the Military Construction Program," will pretty well document that there is a credibility gap in the Pentagon. My personal conviction—Secretary McNamara's letter notwithstanding—is that they will not put under contract all of the funds that are carried in this appropriation. I would be extremely surprised if that were done, because we have the past record to go on, and we have the fact that we are already a long way into this fiscal year.

Further in commenting on this legislation, I think, as has been brought out, there is approximately $540 million more in this bill than was appropriated last year. The expenditure rate for fiscal year 1967 was in the area of about $2 billion, and, really, this year we are appropriating in the area of $2.1 billion.

The Armed Services Committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from South Carolina, reduced the authorization bill substantially, and then, of course, we reduced the fund requested in addition to that. That brings us back to roughly an appropriation of $2.1 billion. But I want to agree with my chairman when he says that almost all of the items here requested are items that well can be justified as needed at our military installations.

I do not doubt at all that we could probably have reduced this bill further, and that we could make do with some of the facilities that we have, even longer than we have already. But we are getting to the point, and I think we have to recognize it, where many of the installations which are being used are 25 years old or older. Many of them are temporary structures from World War II. The cost of maintenance is becoming a rather substantial problem. Many of these are due to be replaced.

I believe it is fair to say that the various services have done a very good job in maintaining and using these facilities which were built back in World War II. They have made them do and have found ways to try to use them, but most of them have given just about all the service possible.

I believe we must recognize that the cost of military construction goes up every time we have a new weapons system. Every new weapons system requires additional construction to take care of changes in the configuration of aircraft or other things. Modifications have to be made. This shows up in our bill.

As far as housing is concerned, I am not convinced, looking at the contract rate for the first quarter of this fiscal year, that we will have anywhere near the 8,500 housing units approved under contract in fiscal year 1968. We still have approximately 5,000 units that are still available from prior-year programs. If these 8,500 are put in, that would amount to roughly 13,500 housing units which would have to be awarded in fiscal year 1968. I am just not convinced that is going to happen.

I believe it is perfectly realistic to say that if they are able to place 6,000 to 7,000 units under contract in fiscal year 1968, that will be about it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Reading from page 41 of the committee report, the committee states:

> For the past several years the committee has discussed with the Department the question of the responsibility of occupants of family housing for damage to such housing during their term of occupancy.

The report goes on to say in general that during these years several similar studies have been made.

Then we get down to the statement from Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, the Honorable Paul R. Ignatius:

> Quite frankly, I am disappointed that we have not made any significant progress on this matter. It has been studied too long. I will take steps to bring this to a conclusion as soon as is reasonably possible and to take the action required to implement the necessary improvements.

The fact remains that he now goes "up"—I presume, to his reward as Secretary of the Navy. Having accomplished nothing in this Department, he is rewarded by a full secretaryship in the Navy.

It is about time we got some people in the Department of Defense who saw to it that these studies had some meaning.

The money we are called upon to expend in this bill is more than $2 billion. It is almost an $539 million increase over last year.

What kind of dupes are we of the Congress to permit this kind of situation to go on?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Realistically, I believe we must recognize we have thousands of military housing units spread all over the world. It is a little difficult at times to maintain them. We know that they should be maintained better. That is why we bring this to their attention.

In addition to that fact, some of these units are getting a little difficult to maintain. This is why we have a problem.

I believe the base commanders must share a great deal of this responsibility. Actually, I could take the gentleman to some installations and show him where maintenance is rigidly enforced, and the base commander is the man who is responsible for that.

Of course, the buck stops at the top. We are just calling it to their attention. We are not unmindful of their problem, nor are they unmindful of this particular problem. I hope that the colloquy here today will jack them up a little further.

Mr. GROSS. I am not being critical of the subcommittee or of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I know.

Mr. GROSS. What I am saying is, it is about time we got some performance out of these people over at the Pentagon. We are building a new building to house a little Pentagon on this side of the Potomac River, to house the increased employment there and in the Defense Establishment. It is time we got something from this.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I should like to say, with respect to the matter just raised, there has been a great shortage of maintenance money. Families have been forced into many of these units which have not been adequately prepared for them.

As a consequence, when they move in there you cannot expect them to pay the same penalty as they would have to pay if they moved into one that was just refurbished.

I take this time to make an inquiry of the chairman of the subcommittee. I note all of the unbudgeted items have been stricken from the report. I do not take issue with it as a general matter, but I note that of the items which were unbudgeted and were eliminated from the bill some would have paid for themselves in 2 or 3 years. It seems to me it would be prudent and good business to have these items incorporated in the bill because we not only promote efficiency but save money in so doing. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee will address himself to that specific question.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I assume my distinguished friend is referring to the naval shipyard at Portsmouth, N.H., in particular.

Mr. BATES. That is one that I have in mind.

Mr. SIKES. I know of the interest of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts in that particular naval shipyard and also of the interest of the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] in this important facility. If I may address myself specifically to that facility, I recognize the need for an upgrading of some of the facilities that are at the Navy yard. The committee had no budget request for these items. As I stated earlier, there are no unbudgeted items in this bill. I know that there is justification for the projects under discussion. It would be my hope that there could be a budget request within a reasonable time which would permit us, under the ground rules we are following, to give further consideration to this.

Mr. BATES. I think the ground rules that the gentleman is following apply. I do hope that the subcommittee will see to it that they do have an analysis made of this particular situation and that a substantiation of the facts will be sent to the Congress immediately so that it can be incorporated in this year's bill by the Senate.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman from Michigan will yield further while I interrupt my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, the committee is studying this very matter and has asked for clarification of it by the Department of the Navy.

Mr. BATES. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman and thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I have three questions for simple information. One is, I was very intrigued by the statement that the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, made about the number of housing units we are actually appropriating for outside of the 8,500 that might be completed. Did I understand the gentleman to say there are some 5,000 previously authorized and appropriated for in the pipeline?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Around 5,000.

Mr. HALL. So that we might have a total of 13,500 if they use all in this year's appropriation and those from prior years, that are so badly needed at this time of strained morale for the dependents back home?

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is correct. The latest information is that there are approximately 5,000 units funded in prior years for which contracts have not yet been awarded.

Mr. HALL. In the homeowners assistance fund brought on through the authorizing and appropriating process by the Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, are there any recommendations, as I have not read the report and the bill itself, as to the $20 million the chairman of the subcommittee referred to? Have there been any recommendations or is there any legislative record made in the hearings or any history as to the allocation of that? You may remember originally the authorization was only for the military displaced under this act. That was taken out in the other body, and finally approved here. Can the gentleman inform us concerning that? Will this cover all foreseeable needs for military and civilians who might be displaced by McNamara's base closures?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think this will cover everything in the foreseeable future in fiscal year 1968. This program has a great potential for growth.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is correct. It does cover military and civilians. There is no allocation between them. This is the beginning and there will be a requirement for considerably more money than that carried in this bill. We have a long way to go.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Surely; we have been trying to hold this amount down. We requested—and it is my recollection that the defense services agreed—to go slow on this question because the types of matters involved have resulted in increased costs. We must have the guidelines, regulations, and procedures properly worked out or costs will soar.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, I certainly agree with the gentleman from Michigan that while this represents a worthwhile endeavor, I believe we, perhaps, are opening up a Pandora's box for the future. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, my final objection pertains to page 22 of the report. In the bill we have the sum of $8 million for the southern command. It is my understanding that this is for an electric powerplant at Fort Clayton, which is referred to on page 22 of the report.

I am familiar with and am cognizant of the situation which exists at Fort Clayton. I have visited there. Certainly, I am one who wants to keep our military strength in the Canal Zone up to full par. But did the Committee on Appropriations, in its wisdom, take into consideration the fact that we are liable to have to build a powerplant there and that the three treaties that are still pending before the Panamanian Government, and which as I understand it, are not yet pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but are lying on the desk of the Commander in Chief, might result in us going in and constructing an electric powerplant which we might have to desert?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Missouri recognizes the fact that the proposed treaty to which he has referred is in a state of limbo at the present time. We thought we could not defer this needed project much longer. Actually, as I understand the treaty—and I might say that I have serious reservations about the treaty and that I am not in favor of it—we retain these responsibilities in any event. I am only generally familiar with the terms of the treaty. However, that is the manner in which I interpret the terms of it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will yield further, the only treaty which I have read comes from a Panamanian paper which was bought for a dollar which, allegedly, carries all three pages of the treaty, printed in complete detail. It has not been made available to our own Government for anyone to comment upon, and especially has not been subjected to the scrutiny of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as I am personally concerned, I hope—and it is only a forlorn hope—that our military perhaps will still stay there after we get out our other civilian elements. I do not think that this matter should be kept too long in a state of limbo.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I share the sentiments which have been expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, in the military construction authorization bill there was a provision for construction of certain rest and recreational facilities at Fort De Russy, Hawaii.

I note the complete absence of any appropriation for this project in the appropriation bill, H.R. 13606, now before us.

Can the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] state the reason or reasons for the noninclusion of any funds for the construction of the authorized facilities at Fort De Russy?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] that I regret the fact I have never had the opportunity to visit the great State of Hawaii and to enjoy the pleasant climate of Honolulu. I would especially hope that one of these days I might be able to do so.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to advise him that had he visited Fort De Russy, he would have been shocked by its termite-ridden facilities that are badly in need of replacement.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am delighted to ield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

I think the chairman of the subcommittee will agree with me that all of us are concerned about the rest and recreation facilities.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I feel that we have opened up an entirely new field. I am sure that it must be distressing to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATASUNGA] and to the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], that my good friend from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] has not been to their great State of Hawaii. I think that this omission would be one of the first orders of business on the schedule of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Florida that it shall be.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield further?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield further to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. When the gentleman undertakes this trip, we shall endeavor to meet the gentleman with flower leis and hula maidens, not to influence him in any way, to be sure, but just to be in keeping with the custom of our Aloha State.

Mr. SIKES. Now, if I may go ahead with the question of the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii. May I say the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii had previously mentioned this to me. I know of the great interest of both the Members from Hawaii in Fort De Russy. First of all, this is not a budgeted item. I do not know how the money would be used if it were appropriated. The planning is not very far advanced. I have a letter here which appears on page 736 of part 4 of the hearings, from which I quote—and I am advised that there is an inaccuracy in the Record itself, but the original letter in the files of the committee says this:

> Development of Fort DeRussy for rest and recreation purposes has been under discussion for some time and we have directed the Department of the Army to submit for consideration in the fiscal year 1969 estimates a comprehensive program which will provide for high density development of this property. Accordingly, we are not in a position to use the proposed fiscal year 1968 authorization at this time.

So that it is not a budget item, and the committee would be reluctant to appropriate for a nonbudgeted item for which plans are not complete. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics says in effect, "We are not in a position to use the money."

May I assure the distinguished gentlewoman and the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii that the committee does recognize the seriousness of the need for the rest and recreation program. We know the need for additional recreational facilities in Hawaii for servicemen and their families. We applaud the fact that more and more men are using Hawaii for rest and recreation rather than going to other areas where a gold flow problem would be involved. We are not unsympathetic with this problem, but this just is not the time to appropriate the money for this item.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for providing this information. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will recall that I conferred with him some time ago in connection with this matter, about 10 days ago, and that that information was then provided me. It was my understanding then that the necessary appropriations for construction funds will be made as soon as the Army is in the position to use it, and that in the meantime funds for planning purposes will be available from a general fund.

Mr. SIKES. That is correct, and I am glad to confirm that.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee very much, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to add on this legislation. It is adequate, I believe, to take care of the needs that are required for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my disappointment that funds included in the 1968 military construction authorization bill for the development of new facilities at Fort DeRussy in Honolulu were not included in this appropriations bill we are considering today. Men serving in Vietnam are choosing to spend their rest and recreation leaves in Hawaii in ever-increasing numbers.

The Fort DeRussy Recreation Center was opened on June 8, 1942, and was the first off-base rest and recreation center in Hawaii for servicemen and their families. It was redesignated the Armed Forces Recreation Center in June of 1949 and was declared a permanent military installation on March 22, 1956. Today DeRussy has two primary functions—it is the center of Army Reserve training activities for Oahu and continues to serve as a recreation center, particularly for the rest and recreation leaves for Vietnam-based servicemen. Since the Secretary of the Army designated Hawaii as a rest and recreation area in August 1966, approximately 50,000 men have found respite from their war-zone duties on our hospitable shores, and the number is on the increase. It is estimated that 75,000 military personnel will be on rest and recreation in Hawaii in 1967, with some 70 percent of them being joined by wives and children when they arrive. Pan American Airways is running about 40 flights a month on contract with the Government to bring 160 men each time on daily flights from either Saigon, DaNang, or Cam Ranh Bay.

We in Hawaii have taken these servicemen to our hearts. Local people assist in every way to make these men feel welcome as they truly deserve, and the reaction in letters I have received and in letters to the editor in Honolulu has been that the program is a fantastic success. Hotels and gift shops universally offer all services and goods at discount rates. Yet with all the good will in the world, there must be additional action taken to insure the continued utility of Fort DeRussy as a haven and center for men resting from the war.

Fort DeRussy itself has only 680 beds in temporary quarters at present, and the Army estimates that it could make immediate use of 2,000 rooms with the present demand. Hawaii is famous as a resort, and its many outstanding hotels fully deserve their international reputation, but the attractions of my State are bringing visitors at a pace almost faster than we can accommodate them. In 1966 we had over 700,000 visitors pass through Hawaii for varying lengths of stay, and this year the projected visitation is a stunning 925,000. This tremendous influx of visitors, which includes rest-and-recreation servicemen and their families in its totals, has strained the day-to-day capacity of our hotels, and I therefore feel that we should go ahead with the $7 million authorized for the development of these 416 new billets at Fort DeRussy. This hotel-type facility will be built well back from the beach so as not to block any of the splendid shoreline view, and full consideration I am certain will be given to preserving the natural beauty of the area. Since the planning of this facility will take 6 to 7 months, I believe that we should give the go-ahead as soon as possible for the initial phases of the work so that the initial occupancy can be scheduled within a year.

There is no indication that the flow of men on rest-and-recreation leave into Hawaii will diminish as our tourism shoots up also, the chief reason being that it is the only rest and recreation area where servicemen's families may join them without going to excessive travel expense. About 85 percent of these men, including dependents, now stay in local hotels, but as our tourist inflow grows, we may be faced with serious problems not till now encountered in finding satisfactory accommodations for all. The military now has an average of 1,460 rest-and-recreation personnel in the State at any given time.

I would hope that the House will see fit to allow the Army to move ahead with plans for these facilities so necessary to meet the need for reasonably priced accommodations for our men in uniform and their families on rest-and-recreation leave from Vietnam.

On this point I wish to address a question to the chairman of the committee.

Are there funds currently contained in this appropriation bill which will permit the Department to do the necessary planning, so that when they do present the 1969 budget the construction funds will be considered by your committee at that time?

Mr. SIKES. I am glad to be able to assure the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii that there is a general fund for planning which can be used for this project. Under the terms of the letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, which I quoted earlier, planning should proceed on this important facility.

Mrs. MINK. I thank the gentleman for his assurance.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. Pettis].

Mr. PETTIS. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman a question.

I note that 200 bachelor officer quarters units at the Norton Air Force Base at San Bernardino are cut out of this bill. This is now an embarkation point and it would seem that this is very necessary in spite of the fact that many of these officers are coming and going on almost a daily basis.

I was wondering if the chairman could tell me why these 200 officers quarters were taken out of the bill?

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield, I will be very glad to respond.

These units were eliminated by the authorization action. They were, therefore, not before our committee.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 mnutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida, or any other member of the Committee on Appropriations several questions concerning the inclusion of funds for the conversion from coal to gas for heat and power generation at Elmendorf Air Force Base at Fort Richardson, Anchorage, Alaska.

My first question is, can the gentleman tell me why the Defense Department did not comply with the previous request of the Congress to conduct a study of the proposed conversion with regard to the economic impact on the coal mining industry and on the communities in the Matanuska Valley and the Alaska Railroad?

Mr. SIKES. I am not sure that I know specifically to which study my distinguished friend refers. But I can assure him that this is a matter which has been under virtually continuous study for at least the last 5 years. It has been before the Congress most of that time. I am certain that the facts which have been brought forth about the justification to make the conversion have been researched to the point where there can be no question about their validity.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, in these days of frugal, careful expenditure of funds, why does it seem imperative that the conversion from coal to gas take place at this time? I think it is important that the cost factors involved be discussed at this point and be made a matter of record. More specifically, what will the conversion cost?

Mr. SIKES. I would refer the gentleman to page 366, part 4 of our committee hearings. For the two Alaskan bases now using coal, the conversion will cost $1,980,000. The savings, Mr. Chairman, are $2,432,000. Consequently, the conversion will pay for itself in less than 1 year. The amortization period is 10 months.

If the distinguished gentlemen will yield further—and I applaud his interest in this matter; I realize that he and his constituents are very vitally affected—I would like to point to the fact that the Congress has gone into this question with extreme care. We know that there is in Alaska a small coal industry which has been important to the miners and to the owners. We have delayed this conversion for a number of years, hoping that some method could be found whereby we could continue to use coal without too excessive a cost to the taxpayers. But each year, while we delayed this matter, the cost of coal has gone up, and the amortization period has shortened. The savings have become greater and greater year by year.

During the period of careful research and study by Congress, the other major coal users—including an REA organization—have given up coal and converted to gas.

Finally, with all respect to the efforts to preserve a local industry, we in the committee feel that we can no longer ignore a saving of such magnitude. Consequently, we recommend the conversion this year.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, do you suppose that if the unit cost had not been raised after each annual continuation of the coal contracts, the conversion would still be taking place today?

Mr. SIKES. It is difficult to assess what might have happened or what the amortization might have been. Certainly, if the costs of coal had been kept at a lower level so that the savings were not so great, the committee could have given more consideration than is possible under the present cost data.

Mr. POLLOCK. This may be a difficult comparison, but do you have available the unit cost as between gas and coal?

Mr. SIKES. I am sure those figures are in the record. It is quite voluminous. If the gentleman will bear with me, I will find them and make them available to him.

Mr. POLLOCK. While the gentleman is getting some assistance in finding the answer, I would like to ask another collateral question——

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will turn to page 366, he will find the cost analysis in the record.

If the gentleman wants the unit fuel costs, he will find them spelled out on page 366 of the record. I trust that will be adequate for his purposes.

Mr. POLLOCK. I have one primary concern, and that is if, as you say, the unit cost has been going up year after year in the coal industry after the contract has been extended, do you anticipate this kind of thing in the gas industry? After all, what you will be doing is creating a monopoly for gas. Have you taken any measures during your hearings to prevent this?

Mr. SIKES. There is a 10-year contract for the gas for Fort Richardson and Elmendorf at the cost which is now spelled out. Thus we know there should be no increase in costs for at least for the next 10 years.

Mr. POLLOCK. There is no anticipation, then, that during that period of time the unit costs will be reduced?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. POLLOCK. It will be a fixed amount for the 10-year period.

Mr. SIKES. That is my understanding.

Mr. POLLOCK. There is no doubt in your mind from the facts we have that the amortization for the entire conversion at Fort Richardson and Elmendorf will take place in a 10-month period?

Mr. SIKES. In this business you have to trust somebody.

They brought some very convincing figures to us. We have examined this carefully. They are printed in our hearings for everyone to see and examine and question, and thus far no one has questioned them.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for his candid response. I am sure the gentleman appreciates the concern I have that perhaps we are going to be spelling the death knell for the coal mining industry in Alaska, and it is going to be working a hardship on our people.

Mr. SIKES. I know the gentleman's interest in the industry, and I assure the gentleman the Congress has tried to be extremely patient in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure that the record does not indicate that the great Committee on Appropriations is committing itself to a course of only appropriating money which has been requested by the Department of Defense. We recognize in this day and time, particularly this year, that conditions are very different and unusual. But if we commit ourselves only to take the course of action of funding projects which come from downtown, the Congress is nothing more or less than an agent of the Department of Defense, and hence we are defaulting in our constitutional responsibility by not authorizing and appropriating for projects which we believe necessary, after receiving testimony before the respective committees.

I hope the chairman of this subcommittee will assure this committee that the fact we are not appropriating money that has not been requested is not to be taken as underwriting and rubberstamping only those things which emanate from downtown. I hope the gentleman will give me that assurance.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am happy to subscribe to what my distinguished friend has just said. The gentleman from South Carolina has set some very fine examples in not being bound by budget guidelines. I assure the gentleman I have the same feeling about exercising my responsibility as a Congressman to help provide for the Department of Defense those funds which are needed for a sound defense of our country.

Mr. RIVERS. And the gentleman will agree with me that this year is unusual, and he will follow the course of not making a precedent of this year?

Mr. SIKES. The situation this year has caused some unusual actions. We are not merely following the guidelines of the executive branch. Our actions with reference to unbudgeted items is certainly no precedent for the future.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE].

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and I thank him not only for yielding to me but also for showing me great personal courtesy in my efforts to properly represent my district. I refer to the Port Chicago item and the $20 million appropriation that has been approved subject to the requirement that the Navy and the Department of Defense come up with an alternate plan, other than the one they had heretofore submitted which called for condemnation of the community of Port Chicago in my district.

I trust the alternate plan will take, as a takeoff point, the recommendation of both the Senate authorizing committee and the conference committee in terms of the authorization bill, wherein it was stated that the Navy's proposal to solve the hazardous problem to which my district is subjected, namely, the condemnation of 5,000 acres surrounding their defective ammunition loading piers, and was not in accord with the view of those respective committees.

I trust they will address themselves to the correction of the defect in those piers insofar as they do not comply in any respect, even minimally, with Navy safety standards applicable to piers handling 9 million pounds of high explosives.

I hope also they will take into account the fact that the county of Contra Costa is unnecessarily exposed to an explosion of 24 million pounds of high explosives and will be so exposed unless those piers are corrected.

I conclude by saying that in the event the Navy study does not show that correction of those defective piers is the solution to which they must first address themselves, the study will be very unhappily received by the people I represent and to whom the Navy owes the greatest protection—those who work on the piers and reside near them.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, we are considering today the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1968. The administration budget estimate for this program was $2,937,000,000. The Armed Services Committee has authorized a total of $2,333,255,000. The Committee on Appropriations has recommended a total appropriations of $2,142,693,000 which is $794,307,000 below original budget estimates.

Given the present state of our economy and the conflict in Vietnam both the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee faced the task of drastically paring down Federal expenditures. I feel that they have acted in a responsible manner under very difficult circumstances. Although I recognize that the state of our economy and the conflict in Vietnam has required a curtailment of Federal spending, I question the Appropriations Committee's deletion of $4,754,000 for the construction of a 15th Air Force Headquarters facility at the Strategic Air Command's March Air Force Base in California. I hope that the funds will be restored in the very near future since they are needed and were authorized by the Armed Services Committee.

The Appropriations Committee points out in their report that:

> The Committee has generally approved the items authorized for the Strategic Air Command which are basically in support of the essential mission of SAC to maintain a force in a state of readiness capable of conducting intensive and conclusive world-wide aerial bombardment against enemies of the United States.

It is apparent from this statement that the deletion of the $4,754,000 for March Air Force Base in California, a major and strategic SAC base, was a difficult decision for the Appropriations Committee and came about only because of our present economic difficulty. It is essential that these funds be restored as soon as our economy permits since it is important that a major command like 15th Air Force have the best equipment and facilities available to carry out its mission to defend our national security.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, the Military Construction Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee has denied the request for $4.4 million required for the construction of an engineering building at the Mare Island Yard in my congressional district based upon the following assertion:

> The request of $4.481 million for the construction of an Engineering Building at this Shipyard is denied. The San Francisco Shipyard actually consists of the former Hunters Point Yard at San Francisco proper and Mare Island Yard at another location in the Bay Area. These Yards are now classified as divisions of the Naval Shipyards, San Francisco. Activities of the Shipyard are being carried out now as they have in the past in facilities existing at Hunters Point and Mare Island. The Committee fails to see the justification for a consolidation of these activities at the present time and the request has therefore been denied.

The engineering staff at Mare Island is currently located in the Main Administration Building No. 521 as well as in approximately 11 other locations throughout the shipyard complex. The buildings which currently house these engineers and technicians vary in age from 113 years to 25 years and vary in original construction from warehouses to production shops.

It is my understanding that it is the intent at Mare Island to consolidate all the engineers and technicians into one physical location and to provide space for the acquisition of an additional 400 engineers and technicians vitally needed in the support of the submarine construction program currently at Mare Island and which men will be required in the future as the technology in ship construction increases.

It is my further understanding that any consolidation which would be effected as a result of the building of this engineering building such as bringing engineers and technicians from Hunters Point would be limited to such items as allowance preparation, damage control, computerized design research and like items. These numbers would be small. The difficulty of obtaining and retaining qualified personnel in the engineering disciplines is well known. Mare Island has been experiencing all of these problems.

In addition the provisions of proper housing which can be solved by the building of this minimal facility is one which will not only attract engineers but it has been estimated that the simple consolidation of engineers and technicians into one location will increase the total effectiveness of the shipyard by at least 1 percent. This as a minimum will result in the savings of $1 million per year, amortizing the cost of this structure within 5 years.

I realize the futility of trying to amend back into the pending bill the one $4.4 million deletion. I would hope that the Senate or a later House-Senate conference would restore this essential item.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to urge immediate passage by the House of H.R. 13606, the military construction bill for fiscal year 1968. Appropriation of the funds herein provided will help make possible the provision of modern facilities vitally needed by the military services in these crucial times. More specifically, I have in mind the allocation of a portion of the military construction funds for the modernization and improvement of such installations as the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

The Philadelphia Naval Shipyard is one of the oldest shipyards in the country. It is the possessor of a long and distinguished history, dating back to 1776 with the construction of the frigate *Randolph*. It is also one of the finest naval shipyards. Its superiority was attested to by a 1964 Department of Defense report entitled "Study of Naval Requirements for Shipyard Capacity." On the basis of all factors evaluated, the Philadelphia yard ranked as the single best naval shipyard on the east coast with the most favorable overall industrial potential, the greatest range of capabilities, the best general facilities, and the largest and most efficient layout. The Philadelphia yard also ranked highest in productivity. Furthermore, the report noted that this yard had extensive freshwater berthing which could be rapidly activated in case of war mobilization, and could acquire a nuclear submarine overhaul capability at the least cost compared to other naval shipyards. Unfortunately, however, parts of the Philadelphia yard have been allowed to decay, and some of its facilities are badly run down due to lack of sufficient funds. This is a situation which the Nation can ill afford. Overall improvements and modernization of the facilities of this invaluable yard should not be delayed if it is to remain a powerful element in the Nation's defense. Strengthening of the Philadelphia Naval Yard is made all the more imperative by the fact that two major east coast yards—the Brooklyn Naval Yard and the Portsmouth Naval Yard—have been closed in recent years. The remaining east coast yards therefore carry an increased portion of the workload and responsibility for maintenance of the U.S. fleet in a high state of readiness. It is for these reasons that naval construction funds provided in H.R. 13606 are urgently needed.

We must never forget that our naval shipyards constitute an integral part of our first line of defense. It is axiomatic that fleet base support is basic to naval strength. The Navy must maintain a strong in-house capability that is responsive to the needs of the naval operating forces. This can be achieved only if the physical plants of the shipyards are thoroughly streamlined. This Nation has paid a high price in past wars for its maritime weaknesses. As Members of the Congress, responsible for the security of this Nation, we must not let our maritime capabilities suffer further decline.

Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned about the personal welfare of the officers and men who serve in the U.S. Navy, especially that aspect of their welfare that involves their right to decent up-to-date housing. Thousands of Navy men and their families, associated both with the naval shipyard and the naval station, live in the Philadelphia area. I want to see to it that the Congress make available to them and to our Navy men everywhere the most adequate housing we can possibly provide. Any investment in improved living conditions of our naval personnel and their families will certainly yield a high return in improved morale.

I venture to suggest that, if more tangible public interest were shown for the welfare of our Navy men, the Navy might not have so critical a personnel reenlistment problem. Such positive congressional concern, as would be evidenced by provision of better housing for them, seems all the more essential at the present time when our servicemen are recipients of a great deal of undeserved abuse from various domestic agitators. I believe it is the duty of Congress to see that the men of our Armed Forces receive a decent break from the U.S. Government. We have the ability to do this in substantial measure by our power to appropriate the funds to meet their basic living needs.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I noted with interest the committee's comments on the need for a critical evaluation of serious deficiencies in the military construction program. The typical generosity of the Congress in funding the military budget is an invitation for wastefulness.

The committee has wisely pointed to the desirability of deferring construction of some facilities and the need to make better use of existing buildings at a time of increasing pressure on the budget. It also notes loose management of military construction funds. The accumulation of unobligated balances reduces congressional scrutiny. It is sensible that certain reductions have been recommended.

Where are the budget cutters today? The 1968 appropriations approved by the committee represents an increase of $539 million or about 34 percent over fiscal year 1967 levels. This is a greater percentage increase than the increase in the military budget as a whole, which includes the great escalation of the war in Vietnam.

I note that the committee recommendation includes $723 million for military housing; while this is about 10 percent below the administration request, it represents a 50-percent increase over fiscal year 1967 levels. One cannot fail to note the contrast with the HUD appropriation conference report which cuts the administration request by over 25 percent. And the HUD administration request itself was a reduction of $599 million in available authorization.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when domestic needs are suffering because of a frenzied and irrational compulsion to cut budgets, there is no reason for the military budget to be sacrosanct.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my concern over the excessive expense of the military construction program which is before us today. I will vote against this appropriation.

The military construction and family housing appropriation for this year calls for $2,142,693,000. This is an increase over last year's appropriation for these items of $538,623,000. Together with unexpended construction funds from previous years, this appropriation will make available more than $3,850,000,000 for military construction and family housing.

At a time when we are faced by urgent problems at home and abroad, when we are facing a large budget deficit, when inflation is a danger, military construction of almost $4 billion must be viewed with considerable circumspection.

I recognize the advantages military family housing provides to the families of those serving in the Armed Forces, and I have always been a supporter of this program. I also believe that those projects which have been approved by the committee are important and worth while.

However, the real question is whether these items are all more urgent, more vital, and more worth while than all the projects which we will not fund because there is not enough money to go around.

I cannot believe that all of this military construction is, at this time, of higher priority than many of the health, education, employment, and housing programs which are also in need of funds.

From my experience on the Armed Services Committee, I am convinced that much of this military construction can be deferred with only minor inconvenience and most certainly with no strategic loss. Because of the other more urgent demands that are being made upon us at this time, in my view those items which can be deferred without reduction of our strategic capabilities should be deferred.

Thus, I believe that we must further cut back this appropriation and I would hope the conference committee will make the necessary cuts. I will vote for a level of program somewhere near the level of the 1967 expenditures.

I also would like to note my concern over the $64 million which this bill provides to begin deployment of the Chinese-oriented anti-ballistic-missile system. I view this step with great skepticism. I am presently involved in an intensive independent study of this program. If the facts warrant, I will present a critique of the program. Meanwhile, I accept the judgment of the Secretary of Defense with especial emphasis on his warning against escalation of the program from the so-called "light" defense to the $40 to $50 billion "heavy" defense.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ULLMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13606) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 362, nays 26, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

YEAS—362

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Calif.

Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Pickle
Pirnie
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
St Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—26

Adams
Bingham
Bolling
Cohelan
Conyers
Culver
Curtis
Edwards, Calif.
Fraser
Griffiths
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Kastenmeier
Kupferman
McCarthy
Michel
Myers
Ottinger
Pike
Rees
Robison
Rosenthal
Ryan
Scheuer
Sullivan

NOT VOTING—44

Ashmore
Aspinall
Barrett
Bell
Berry
Boggs
Bolton
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Celler
Clausen,
  Don H.
Dawson
Diggs
Downing
Eilberg
Gettys
Gross
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Joelson
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kleppe
Kyl
Landrum
Long, La.
Macdonald,
  Mass.
Madden
Moorhead
Philbin
Poage
Rarick
Roybal
Ruppe
St. Onge
Schweiker
Smith, N.Y.
Utt
Vander Jagt
Watson
Williams, Miss.
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Utt.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Philbin with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Kleppe.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Schweiker.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Moorhead.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Joelson with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Holland.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

DICKEY-LINCOLN POWER PROJECT

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, there has been much disagreement concerning the Dickey-Lincoln power project in the State of Maine. Those of us who oppose the Dickey-Lincoln project are sometimes charged with being tools of the private utility interests. At other times we are charged with distortion of the facts. Nothing could be further from the truth. The truth is that we oppose the wasteful expenditure of $380 million of the taxpayers' money.

The Dickey-Lincoln powerplant, on the upper St. John River in northern Maine, would be built solely for power purposes. The only question it raises is whether it represents the most economic way of providing power for New England.

Dickey-Lincoln would provide two kinds of power—100,000 kilowatts of baseload power, and 623,500 kilowatts of peaking power. The baseload power would be delivered for use in southern Maine; the peaking power would be delivered in Boston for use in southern New England.

According to the Federal agencies, if built, Dickey-Lincoln could be completed and "on-the-line" in 1975. Including the $82.5 million required for the special transmission facilities needed to bring its output down from the remote wilds of the Canadian border to southern Maine and to Boston, Dickey-Lincoln would cost not less than $380 million when completed in 1975. The figure of $312 million sometimes used for its cost is the Corps of Engineers' estimate of what it would have cost if built in 1966. The corps' subsequent testimony, and the findings of the House Appropriations Committee's independent investigative experts, show that by 1975 Dickey-Lincoln would have cost $380 million.

As this is a lot of taxpayer money, and because Dickey-Lincoln would be built solely for power purposes, the question is whether there is a cheaper way of providing the same power. According to the independent experts and the Federal Power Commission, the only water resource purpose Dickey-Lincoln would serve other than power; that is, flood control, would account for two-tenths of 1 percent of its total claimed project benefits. This claimed flood control benefit could be provided independently at a total cost of $1 million.

The findings of the House committee's independent experts, and of the FPC, show that Dickey-Lincoln represents the most costly of all possible methods the Federal Government could pursue or promote for providing power in New England. According to the independent experts and FPC, the total cost of construction an alternative conventional baseload plant in Maine and an alternative pumped storage peaking plant near Boston in 1975, by Government or private industry, including transmission facilities to Dickey-Lincoln markets, is as follows:

[In millions]

Dickey-Lincoln plants	$380
Alternative plants:	
Baseload (150,000 kw, in Maine, including transmission)	18.5
Peaking (600,000 kw, near Boston, including transmission)	71.5
Total	90
Excess cost	280

If financed by the Federal Government, construction of the alternative baseload plant probably would be by one or more or by a combine of the several rural electric cooperatives in Maine, as done in other States. If financed by the Federal Government, construction of the alternative peaking plant probably would be by the Corps of Engineers, as done in other States, at one of the 16 economic pumped storage sites selected within 100 miles of Boston by FPC.

The findings of the House experts and FPC show that the annual cost of providing equivalent baseload and peaking power in Dickey-Lincoln markets from these alternative plants would be incomparably less than the annual cost of Dickey-Lincoln power—that is, $10.6 million as opposed to $16.9 million. Thus:

[In millions of dollars]

	Total	Baseload (100,000 kw.) (438,000,000 kw.-hr.)	Peaking (623,000 kw.) (672,500,000 kw.-hr.)
Dickey-Lincoln plants	16.9	3.2	13.7
Alternative Government plants	10.6	2.6	8.0
Excess cost	6.3		

If Dickey-Lincoln had been built at the corps' estimate of its 1966 construction cost, the annual cost of its power would have been $14 million, rather than $16.9 million.

Actually, due to the fact that the interest charge on REA-financed plants is 2 percent, the annual cost of alternative baseload power would be considerably less than the $2.6 million figure shown above, as it assumes, along with the House experts and the FPC, an interest rate of 3⅛ percent.

I believe the foregoing sets forth in a clear manner the costliness and wastefulness of the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric powerplant. By classifying as a multipurpose project what is, in fact, merely a hydroelectric powerplant, the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior are misleading the Congress and the American taxpayer. We must not allow this to happen.

POSSIBLE VIOLATION OF HATCH ACT WITH REFERENCE TO CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN LOUISIANA

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, last evening I received very disturbing news from the State of Louisiana; information which I feel obligated to bring to the attention of the House.

I have been advised by an unusually well-informed source that orders have been sent down from Washington to some of the heads of some of the Federal agencies in the State, instructing them to solicit among their civil service employees 300 so-called volunteers to act as so-called poll watchers in the November 4 Democratic primary election. I have been advised that instructions are that if 300 volunteers cannot be found, then 300 men and women are to be directed to volunteer. Rental cars are to be furnished these Federal employees. They are to be paid overtime, since the election is on Saturday and annual leave credited to them.

Mr. Speaker, this is Big Brother in operation. It is not only that, it is a clear and direct violation of the Hatch Act which prohibits civil service employees from engaging in this kind of political activity. It, as well, violates the rights of civil service employees.

How far are we from a dictatorship or totalitarianism if the Federal Government can direct civil service employees to violate the letter and spirit of the law to poll watch or act in any supervisory capacity in any election? There is not a single Federal office at stake in this election. It is entirely local and State contests.

Last evening, when I received this information, I sent a telegram to the Attorney General of the United States, calling this political activity to his attention and asking the pointed question if these employees would be prosecuted by his Department for violating the Hatch Act if they engaged in this activity. I have not yet had a reply, but I await it with a great deal of interest.

This is not a Louisiana problem. This affects every polling place in every congressional district in the Nation. I know of no precedent for this sort of Federal interference and I know of no authority for it.

If this is allowed to happen, then no district is safe from Federal invasion and no election in any State is immune from this same treatment by this or some future administration. The principle is large; the security of free elections is at stake.

I will advise the Congress of the reply I receive from the Attorney General and, if these Federal civil service employees engage in the political activity I have described, a detailed indictment will also be made a part of the RECORD at the appropriate time.

RECORD PROSPERITY HAS ITS PROBLEMS

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the mighty economic growth and prosperity of this country in recent years is one of the great achievements of our time. The dimensions of this achievement, which began under our late beloved President John F. Kennedy, and was continued under the leadership of President Johnson, have been excellently documented in an October 10 Wall Street Journal article.

This article outlines our stunning economic success, pointing out that the current business expansion will enter the record books next month as the longest boom in American history. But as with any success, there are always forces at work that threaten to destroy or diminish it.

Such is the case today with our economy. In short, prosperity has its problems. Many eminent economists agree, that unless taxes are raised we run the serious risk of unbalanced and dangerously inflationary growth in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, we must be mindful of the problems of prosperity and not shirk our responsibility to solve them. What these problems are and how they came about was recently put into excellent perspective in a speech by Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr. Entitled "In Times of Prosperity, Good Lord Preserve Us," the speech was delivered to the Boston Economic Club on October 4. I commend the speech to the attention of my colleagues, and insert it, along with the Wall Street Journal article, in the RECORD at this point:

IN TIMES OF PROSPERITY, GOOD LORD PRESERVE US

(Remarks of Hon. Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, before the Boston Economic Club, Boston, Mass., October 4, 1967)

One of the oldest litanies in the Christian Church is one that I believe dates back to around 400 A.D. The priest chants the theme, and the congregation responds with "Good Lord Preserve Us," The priest chants "In times of bereavement. . . ." and the congregation responds, ". . . Good Lord Preserve Us," or "In times of plague. . ." and the response, ". . . Good Lord Preserve Us." One section of the litany has always intrigued me. It goes, "In times of prosperity . . ." "Good Lord Preserve Us."

I am sure that this ancient bit of human wisdom is repeated in most other religions in one form or another. My friends who are better acquainted than I am with theology have explained to me that the chant refers to the theological belief that men tend to become morally flabbly in times when life is easy.

I have often thought, however, that the ancient litany has a different and special significance for Secretaries of the Treasury of the United States. A distinguished resident of this community, Professor Paul Samuelson, has said on occasion that "The job of Secretary of the Treasury can't be an easy one; it's to suffer." I will argue today that their suffering is compounded in times of prosperity, and most particularly in times of excessive prosperity.

Today, a Secretary of the Treasury who fought long and hard for tax reduction as the keystone of long-run national economic policy is pressing the case for a tax increase. And, throughout government, the public purse strings must be pulled tighter. For these are the times when the lessons of the "new" economics merge with those of the "old". Economy takes on its traditional meaning and a measure of fiscal restraint is essential to the national interest.

I now would like to take just a few moments to place my theme and our current dilemma in a historic perspective.

The economic debate in this country over the past quarter-century has in large measure revolved around the question of how to maintain prosperity through the full utilization of our labor, our plant, and our savings. In 1940, when our GNP was running at a rate then estimated at some $97 billion, I can remember my distinguished professors at Harvard exhorting everyone in sight to use all possible ingenuity to get rates well beyond $100 billion per year. With unemployment still far too high in 1940, there was ample cause for concern.

It has often been pointed out that the great depression left my generation oriented towards material considerations. I believe that this is probably correct. We were—and perhaps are—rather materialistic in our outlook.

Perhaps it is time someone said a few words in defense of materialism. As is so often the case, I find that someone has already said them. Not Professor Samuelson this time, although they do appear as a preface to a chapter in his textbook, where Francis Hackett is quoted to good effect:

"I believe in materialism . . . I believe in all the proceeds of a healthy materialism—good cooking, dry houses, dry feet, sewers, drain-pipes, hot water, baths, electric lights, automobiles, good roads, bright streets, long vacations away from the village pump, new ideas, fast horses, swift conversation, theatres, operas, orchestras, bands . . . I believe in them all, *for everybody*. The man who dies without knowing these things may be as exquisite as a saint, and as rich as a poet; but it is in spite, not because, of his deprivation."

A materialistic outlook in this better sense possibly accounts in some measure for the emphasis we have seen in this past quarter-century on science and technology, on sophisticated techniques of business management, and on conscious use of national economic policy to promote economic expansion.

Our success in all these areas has been little short of spectacular. As a result, the vast majority of the people in this nation have reached a level of affluence few would have dreamed possible in 1940 The interaction of our success in the areas of science and technology, business management, and our use of national economic policy has changed this country mightily.

On the whole, I believe that the change has been to the good. I believe that the American economy running at full employment is a mighty engine of social progress and reform. I believe that it has brought the opportunity for a useful and productive life to millions of American men and women whose usefulness might well have been lost—as it was, for a time, in the depression decade. I believe that our success has enabled us to export a measure of hope to a large portion of the world where in much of recorded history hope had been nonexistent.

Having said all this, I must also say that no human situation is perfect, and even prosperity—as the ancient divine so clearly recognized—has its problems. The problems are clearly visible from the United States Treasury. Let me cite just a few of the problems that have developed in the wake of the prosperity that has characterized this last quarter-century.

Twenty-five years ago the problems of pollution, decay in our cities, and the gap between the haves and have-nots in our country were present, but not in the magnitude nor with the urgency that they afflict us today.

The pressures on our systems of transportation and our higher educational complex were simply not present twenty-five years ago.

The intensity of present demands on our capital markets and our savings was not dreamed of during an era in which 3-month Treasury bill rates had remained below 1 percent for 15 years (between 1932 and 1947).

The perils of inflation were usually shrugged off as pure theory or applicable only to situations in which "printing press" money was used.

The danger implicit in a balance of payments deficit was a subject so esoteric that it was rarely alluded to in academic circles.

The real measure of a nation, in my opinion, is its willingness to recognize and acknowledge new problems as they arise. I personally take great pride in the fact that we in this nation do recognize and are fighting for answers in the areas of pollution, urban decay, transportation, education, poverty, fiancial imbalances, homebuilding, inflation, and the balance of payments. Solving many of these problems will not be easy—perhaps not as easy as resolving the question of how best to promote overall economic growth. But we are attacking these areas; we are responding to the challenge.

These problems—the ones associated with normal, healthy economic growth—have been under attack for several years. They must be attacked head-on, for they cannot be avoided. We cannot and should not accept stagnation as an escape from the difficulties that come with healthy and desirable growth. At the moment, however, the country is preparing to attack a new issue—the question of how to head off the perils of an *unhealthy* and *excessive* rate of expansion resulting from a resurgent demand from the private sector and a continuing heavy demand from the Federal government. These new perils can and must be avoided.

You may well ask at this point, "Why all the fuss?" "What is so different in this current situation?" "Just what are the perils of an unhealthy and excessive rate of expansion?" Let's try to answer the second question first and examine some of the differences between the current situation and those of, say, a few years ago. It seems to me that the main differences are:

1. *The economy is operating in the full employment range.* In contrast to the situation of a few years ago, there is no longer any sizable margin of unutilized resources upon which the economy can draw, and skilled labor is scarce. To be sure, the slowdown in the early part of this year caused the average industrial operating rate to fall back somewhat, but unemployment remains below 4 percent. Relatively full utilization of resources places a fairly definite limit on the rate at which national output can safely expand.

It is estimated that at full employment the overall productive capacity of the economy now grows by about 4 percent annually. Over the next year or so, real output could probably grow at a little more than 4 percent, perhaps 4½ or even 5 percent, while plant utilization rates are rising. Allowing for a 2½ percent rise in prices—as measured by the so-called GNP deflator—GNP in current prices might safely rise by 7 percent or so in the next year. As a steady diet, this would be a shade too much since price rises of 2½ to 3 percent annually are too large. But, if the rise of GNP in current prices were held to 7 percent or so in the next year, we would be on a path leading to a less inflationary environment.

We no longer are in a situation where strong rises in demand will yield sizable gains in output and employment. Instead, if the total of public and private spending were allowed to rise at an excessive rate, the consequences would be sharply higher prices. Therefore, with the economy nearing unsafe speed, we cannot keep a heavy foot on the accelerator. We must throttle back to a safer cruising speed.

2. *Price and cost pressures are readily apparent.* The upsurge in demand in late 1965 and early 1966, associated with the early impact of the Vietnam build-up, was checked by monetary and fiscal restraint. But, one unwelcome consequence of that burst of spending was the disruption of a previous pattern of cost-price stability. For example, the wholesale price index rose by 3½ percent between mid-1965 and mid-1967 in contrast to a total increase of less than 3 percent during the previous four years. Similarly, the wholesale prices of industrial commodities rose by about 3½ percent between mid-1965 and early 1967 in contrast to a total increase of less than 2 percent during the previous 4½ years. The consumer price index rose by 5½ percent between mid-1965 and mid-1967, only slightly less than its total rise in the previous 4 years.

In delayed reaction to the burst of demand in 1965 and 1966, cost pressures have intensified. By the middle of 1966, labor costs per unit of output in manufacturing had risen about 2¼ percent over mid-1965, but were still below the level of early 1961. But, by the middle of this year, they had risen a further 6½ percent. With strong "cost-push" factors already present in the economy, a renewed burst of demand could start wages and prices on an upward spiral.

3. *Interest rates are already at or near last year's levels.* Another crucial difference between the present situation and that of several years ago, is the height of interest rates and the degree of credit availability. Let me say that after last year's "credit crunch," I have no desire whatsoever to see a repeat performance—and I don't think anyone else does either. But, wishing will not make it so. If we are determined to avoid a repetition of last year's difficulties, we must avoid undue reliance on monetary policy to achieve restraint.

Last year the combination of strong credit demands and monetary restraint pushed interest rates to peak levels. By late summer and early fall, not only was credit expensive, its availability was severely limited.

Prompt action was necessary last fall to relieve the overall pressure on financial markets and calm the feverish competition for savings. That action was forthcoming. It included temporary suspension of the investment credit, interest-rate ceilings on consumer-type time deposits, and a temporary slow-down on agency financings and sales of participation certificates. The improvement in financial markets was dramatic. Now, a year later, the situation is substantially different.

Savings flows to thrift institutions have been at record levels this year. Mortgage commitments have been rising strongly. The recovery in residential building has carried the seasonally adjusted annual rate of housing starts back to nearly 1.4 million units in contrast to an August 1966 low of about 850 thousand. Commercial bank credit has risen at a 13 percent annual rate in the first 8 months of this year as the Federal Reserve has pursued a course of relative monetary ease.

In short, credit is much more readily available now than it was a year ago. But, there is a disturbing similarity between the two periods. Interest rates, especially long-term rates, are back at very high levels despite a continuing policy of monetary ease since last fall. Basically, this is because private demands for credit have been extremely heavy this year, partly in reaction to last year's squeeze. Also, the private demands for credit are probably reflecting the faster pace of economic activity since late spring.

Net Federal credit demands have been relatively modest although the picture is changing now. Net Federal demands on the private credit markets can be measured by the change in private holdings of Federal credit instruments, including Federal agency securities and participation certificates along with Treasury issues, by excluding the change in holdings of the Government investment accounts and the Federal Reserve. On this basis, Federal credit demands were only about $3 billion during calendar 1966 in a total credit flow of some $70 billion. In the fiscal year ending this past June 30, the net contribution of the Federal sector to total credit demands was actually negative, or near neutrality after allowance for an unusually low Treasury cash balance at the end of the fiscal year. But, in the current fiscal year, even with tax and expenditure action, net Federal demands on the credit markets will rise to the $10 to $12 billion range. In the absence of tax action, that figure would soar to the $20 billion range. This would be beyond the capacity of the markets to handle at anything like the current level of interest rates.

Frankly, even current levels of interest rates are higher than we like to see them. And, without tax and expenditure action, there would be only one way for interest rates to go—up from their present high levels. In contrast to the situation of several years ago, interest rates are already high and the financial system is wound up pretty tightly. Liquidity is at a premium. We have to operate cautiously in such an environment. Therefore, we need—and need very badly in my opinion—an extra degree of fiscal restraint.

4. *Too rapid expansion can hurt our trade balance.* Recent experience also highlights the importance from a balance of payments standpoint of holding the domestic expansion within prudent limits. During the years 1961 through 1964, GNP in current prices rose by an average of about 6 percent per year—more in some years, less in others. During that period, our trade surplus rose by nearly $2 billion. It was $4.8 billion in 1960 and $6.7 billion in 1964, when there were special favorable factors. Not all of the improvement is directly attributable to the relatively moderate rate of domestic expansion. Our exports depend upon the pace of business activity abroad and there are other complicating factors.

In striking contrast, during 1965 and 1966 when GNP in current prices rose at rates between 8 and 9 percent, there was an extremely sharp rise in our imports. Even though exports continued to rise, the trade surplus narrowed to $4.8 billion in 1965 and to $3.7 billion in 1966. Indeed, by the last quarter of 1966, the trade surplus had shrunk to a $2.9 billion annual rate. With a slower rate of expansion this year, the trade surplus recovered to a $4.0 billion rate in the first quarter and improved further to a $4.5 billion rate in the second quarter.

An overly rapid rate of domestic expansion can hit our trade balance from both sides. As recent experience clearly shows, the rise in imports is abrupt when the economy presses hard against capacity. Too rapid domestic expansion can also undercut our ability to export. In the interest of payments equilibrium, we must keep our exports competitive. There can be little doubt that a sustained upward drift in our costs and prices relative to those abroad would soon begin to affect our competitive position adversely.

5. *We are fighting a costly war.* Extra expenditures for Vietnam are running at a rate in excess of $22 billion per year. While those expenditures do not bear as heavily on the economy as defense expenditures did at the time of Korea, their impact most certainly is felt. Without Vietnam, Federal administrative budget expenditures would amount to only some 14 percent of Gross National Product in fiscal 1968; with Vietnam included, Federal expenditures may rise to 17 percent or a bit more. This would be about the level of 1955 and 1959 and well below the 21 percent reached at the time of Korea. But, it would amount to an appreciable rise over the 14.8 percent ratio in fiscal 1965.

These are the crucial differences in the economic picture at the moment and the picture as it appeared in 1964. Now, what about those perils of an unhealthy and excessive rate of expansion? I would list them as follows:

We are in grave danger of losing control of a relatively stable price structure.

Sharply higher prices throw wage-price relations out of kilter and set the stage for a cost-push inflation.

Cost-push pressures tend to narrow profit margins and encourage efforts to raise prices.

Sharply higher prices put the nation at a severe disadvantage in our competitive relationships internationally.

At home, the burden of higher prices falls cruelly on those least able to protect themselves.

And, of course, a strong resurgence of private demand, unchecked by tax and spending actions, can create some very bad days ahead for the Treasury debt managers and for everyone who borrows money.

If our experience since 1960 is any guide, it would seem that we as individuals, as corporations, and as a nation prosper most when our rate of growth is held within the bounds of our productive capacity. Perhaps in this town of investment advisors you believe that you can protect yourselves against inflation. Perhaps you can protect a small minority of our people for some period of time. But inevitably the well-being of your clients can not be divorced from the well-being of the nation as a whole. Parenthetically I might add that I do not envy those of you who are keeping your clients ahead of the game as "in and outers" in stocks that I can only rarely identify.

In conclusion, I would argue that the risks and perils that confront us are formidable but avoidable. The prudent course for this nation to follow is clearly set forth in the President's recommendations. I can only hope that next year as I join the litany "In Times of Prosperity . . . Good Lord Preserve Us," I will be referring to our moral fibre and not our national economic well-being.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 10, 1967]

Profile of a Boom: Economic Expansion Enters 80th Month, Matches Old Record—GNP Soars 49 Percent Since 1961—Profits, Personal Income Rise Even More Sharply—Problems: Housing and Gold

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

If the current business expansion continues through next month, it will enter the record books as the longest boom in American history.

Even the more pessimistic forecasters are convinced that the expansion will indeed set a record. The longest expansion until now has been the 80-month business boom that went on during most of World War II, ending in February 1945. The current expansion, which began in February 1961, is now entering its 80th month. Altogether, there have been 26 previous U.S. business expansions, according to records kept back to 1854 by the nonprofit National Bureau of Economic Research. The average length: A mere 30 months.

The full dimensions of the current expansion can be gauged by reviewing some of the changes that have taken place in the U.S. economy since 1961. The magnitude of these changes is impressive, as the following review shows.

Gross national product: At more than $775 billion annually, the nation's output of goods and services has risen some $255 billion since 1961. The gain alone dwarfs the annual GNP of such major nations as the United Kingdom, West Germany and France. The table below translates America's multibillion-dollar economic growth into percentage terms and also shows how rapidly the major components of the GNP total have risen during the great boom:

Percent gains since 1961

Gross national product	49
Consumer spending	46
Government spending	63
Business spending	47

Within the fast-expanding governmental category, the sharpest rise since 1961 has occurred in Federal nonmilitary expenditures, which have soared 77% in the period. Federal outlays for defense have climbed 52%, and overall Federal expenditures are up 56% since 1961. Spending by state and local governments has risen 70%—much faster than total Federal outlays.

Inflation, of course, accounts for part of the GNP rise since 1961. If "growth" stemming simply from higher prices is discounted, the "real" GNP increase since 1961 works out to 34%, rather than 49%.

The consumer-spending category is by far the largest of the various GNP components. This spending breaks down three ways—for durable goods such as appliances and autos, for nondurables such as food and clothing and for services such as medical care and rent. The tabel shows how the three subcategories have fared since 1961:

Percent gain since 1961

Durable Goods	64
Nondurable Goods	39
Services	48

Although spending for durables has risen fastest, the consumer still spends a good deal less for such products than for nondurables or services. Currently, consumers devote about 44% of their budgets to nondurables, 41% to services and only 15% to durable goods. Overall, the statistical breakdown for consumer spending indicates that the economy has not become as "service oriented" as is often suggested. In 1961, consumers spent about 40% of their budgets on services.

The 47% rise in business spending, of course, has brought a big increase in the capacity of the country's factories. U.S. plant capacity has grown by about a third since 1961. This admittedly is less than the dollar rise in business spending, but the capacity rise is based on physical volume of goods and therefore isn't "inflated" by rising prices.

As a result of the 33% capacity increase, U.S. manufacturers are able to produce a far greater volume of goods now than in 1961 without putting undue strain on their production facilities.

At present, U.S. factories are using about 85% of their capacity, on average, well below the 90%-plus operating rates at which severe strains traditionally begin to show up. At operating rates above 90%, overtime costs rise sharply, and many producers are forced to use inefficient facilities that would otherwise stand idle or be scrapped.

Personal income: The rapidly rising earnings of most Americans have supplied much of the fuel for the economy's long climb since 1961. The personal income of Americans now exceeds $631 billion annually, some $215 billion more than the 1961 income total. The rise reflects a variety of factors, not just the steadily climbing wages and salaries of all sorts of workers. The table below lists the key income sources of Americans and shows how rapidly each category has risen since 1961:

Percent gain since 1961

Total personal income	51
Wages and salaries	53
Fringe benefits	86
Dividends	71
Interest income	87
Income from rent	26

As in the case of service spending noted above, the income record since 1961 holds some surprises. Landlords' income from rent has risen only half as fast as overall income, a fact that should surprise many tenants. And income from interest and dividends on investments has climbed much faster than income from wage and salary payments, a fact that may give some second thoughts to people who worry that labor is getting far more than its share of the income pie; fringe benefits paid to workers, however, have risen much faster than wages and salaries.

At present, dividend and interest payments make up about 11% of total personal income. This compares with only 9% in 1961. Wage and salary payments make up 67% of the total, about equal to 1961.

The overall rise in consumer income is considerable even if rising prices and an increasing population are taken into account. After-tax per-capita income in the second quarter reached a record annual rate of $2,388 in terms of 1958 dollars. This was 25% higher than the comparable 1961 per-capita figure. In the view of many economists, this income measurement comes as close as anything to a "standard-of-living" index for the U.S.

Accompanying the big rise in consumer income has been a big rise in consumer savings. These savings have recently been running at an annual rate of about $36 billion, up 70% from the 1961 level (a sharper rise than the 65% increase in consumer credit outstanding over the same period). Time deposits in commercial banks have attracted the largest share of these savings.

The rise in consumer income reflects a massive improvement in the U.S. employment picture during the economic expansion. Many more jobs exist, workers toil longer hours and pay levels are considerably higher.

Today, there are more than 76 million civilian jobs in the U.S., up from less than 66 million in 1961. The increase exceeds the population of New York, the nation's largest city. The rise in jobs not only has opened up work for the country's increasing population—there are 15 million more Americans now than in 1961—but has given work to millions who couldn't get jobs early in the decade. Unemployment in the nation is below the 3 million mark; in 1961, it was close to 5 million.

Employes generally work a longer week now than in 1961. In manufacturing, the average workweek of nearly 41 hours is almost a full hour longer than the 1961 workweek. In the construction trade, the average workweek has recently exceeded 38 hours, up from less than 37 in 1961. An exception: Retailing, where the average has dropped from more than 38 hours in 1961 to less than 36 recently. Factors in the retailing trend, say analysts, include the increasing use of part-time employes and self-service in stores.

Most employes, moreover, are receiving much more pay per hour. The average hourly pay level in manufacturing is about $2.80, up from $2.32 in 1961. In construction, the average is nearly $4.10 an hour, some 90 cents higher than in 1961. In retailing, the average pay level is about $2, up from $1.68 at the start of the expansion.

Corporate profits: The climb of corporate profits during the long boom has been even more spectacular than the rise of consumer income. The before-tax earning of U.S. companies currently total nearly $80 billion a year, up from $50 billion in 1961. Within the broad corporate category, however, there has been considerable variation between different types of industries. The table below shows the overall profits rise, plus the gains for particular groups:

	Percent gain since 1961
Total corporate profits	57
Durable goods makers	85
Nondurable goods makers	49
Transport and utilities	51
Finance and miscellaneous	44

In 1961, the profits of durable-goods makers totaled some $500 million less than those of nondurable-goods producers. Currently, however, durables firms are earning some $3.3 billion a year more than nondurables companies. The big boom in auto-buying in recent years is a major factor in the profit rise for durables. It should be noted, however, that the durables group traditionally fares extra well in expansion periods and extra badly in recessions. The other categories listed above generally react less dramatically to changes in the overall course of business.

A footnote to the profits story: Since 1961, the after-tax earnings of corporations have climbed 71%, a considerably faster rise than the 57% gain in before-tax income. This, of course, reflects the 1964 income tax cut.

To be sure, the economic record of the U.S. since 1961 is not without blemishes.

LAGGING HOME STARTS

New-home starts last year totaled less than 1.2 million units, actually down from the 1961 level of 1.3 million units and far below the 1963 level of 1.6 million. In recent weeks, housing has shown some signs of a pickup, but the industry's record still stands in bleak contrast to the general economic boom since 1961.

In part, the housing industry's trouble reflects overbuilding at least of middle and upper income housing in the earlier post-World War II years. The mortgage funds for home building have been relatively scarce at times during the boom. Ironically, if other segments of the economy hadn't been so strong in recent years, there doubtless would have been more money available for home building, and the industry almost certainly would have fared better.

The U.S. gold supply also has declined during the long expansion. The Government's coffers now hold some $13 billion of gold, down from more than $17 billion at the beginning of the expansion.

Technically, this drop has occurred because the U.S. has been spending more dollars abroad than it has been taking in from foreigners. Foreign governments, in turn, have been buying U.S. gold with many of these dollars at the Treasury's offering price of $35 per ounce, a price that many foreign officials apparently feel is a bargain.

But the deeper cause of the gold drain involves the growth rate of the U.S. economy. If the economy hadn't grown so fast in recent years, there probably would have been less price inflation, and the U.S. trade surplus—the excess of exports over imports—would no doubt have held up better, thereby curbing the outflow of dollars and gold. The U.S. trade surplus actually has declined about 5% since 1961. Without a trade surplus to bring some dollars into the country, the flow of U.S. funds abroad to support foreign-aid projects, troops overseas and other foreign programs would reach intolerable proportions, most economists believe.

Perhaps the most lamentable blemish in the boom is the high unemployment rate for teen-age Negroes—25% in 1961 and 25% in boom-time 1967. Another dismal statistic: Some 7.8 million Americans are on relief at present, about 600,000 more than in 1961.

IN DEFENSE OF LEGAL AID FOR THE POOR

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the extent to which the poor can or should be given free legal assistance is currently under challenge in the State of California. In a recent article by the labor editor of the Los Angeles Times, the issues are quite clearly set forth.

The California rural legal assistance program, an OEO-funded nonprofit organization, has been charged by some writers with improper conduct for using Government funds to sue Government agencies. "A strange spectacle," to quote Governor Reagan.

But the right of the CRLA to bring proceedings against a Federal agency, which in its opinion is not complying with congressional mandates, has been heartily supported by the President of the American Bar Association, the courts, legal advisers to the assistance program, and the Department of Labor, which was itself a defendant in a suit instigated by CRLA.

There is nothing unique about Government money being used to finance two sides of a lawsuit. A very recent example is the suit brought by the Justice Department challenging the FCC's approval of the ITT–AP merger.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said during the past summer about the necessity of removing conflicts from the streets into the courts. CRLA helps toward this objective. The important role that the CRLA is playing in the effort to dispense justice equally is very well described in the following article.

By attacking the CLRA, the Republicans are once again playing politics with the legitimate needs of the poor. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to endorse the CLRA and associate myself with the following article from the Los Angeles Times. Under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the RECORD:

LEGAL AID TO POOR STIRS STATE FIGHT—CRITICS HIT USE OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS AGAINST GOVERNMENT UNITS

(By Harry Bernstein)

The nation's largest legal aid program for the poor is under heavy attack in California, and the battle's outcome will set patterns for the entire country.

Gov. Reagan and U.S. Sen. George Murphy are leading the criticism of the California Rural Legal Assistance organization, a nonprofit corporation funded as part of the war on poverty through the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The basic argument against CRLA is that it uses government money to challenge government rulings and government agencies. To those who oppose CRLA, the organization is an improper government creation because it is spending $1.5 million a year in California alone and part of this is to attack the government.

QUESTION ON CIVIL CASES

Officers of CRLA answer the charges by proudly admitting it's true that lawyers, paid for by the government, are taking on cases from the poor and these cases, at times, challenge government decisions.

Should the government finance legal attacks against itself, at times? In criminal cases, an indigent is guaranteed a lawyer by the government to fight the government, but what about in civil cases?

The governor, in an address to the Republican State Central Committee meeting last Saturday in Anaheim, called the situation a strange "spectacle," and said in one instance CRLA is using taxpayer money to "harass a county welfare officer."

Indications now are that the governor will veto the next CRLA appropriation for $1.5 million to finance its operations in the state for 1968.

The OEO in Washington can override the veto and give the money anyway, but so far CRLA has no assurances that this will be done.

CITIZENS HORRIFIED

And if California funds for the legal aid program are cut off because of the current argument, the same thing will happen in other parts of the country.

Sen. Murphy said California citizens "have been horrified by the spectacle of CRLA lawyers, paid by their tax dollars, going to court against the secretary of labor and his Justice Department attorneys, also paid by the taxpayers."

Murphy said CRLA has turned what was "a good and worthy proposal intended to help the poor into what seems to be an extension of the extremely long organizing arm of Mr. (Walter) Reuther and his allies in the farm unionization cause."

James D. Lorenz, Jr., a Harvard law school graduate who is the director of CRLA, says the whole point of the program is "to take the side of the poor in legal cases."

EQUAL REPRESENTATION STRESSED

"If we tell men and women without money that we will help them, but only in noncontroversial cases and cases which do not challenge government agencies or growers with political influence, then we might as well quit," Lorenz said in an interview.

"The people we are in contact with, and trying to help, know damn quickly whether we are there to help them or not.

"If we were to consistently refuse to take cases of merit on behalf of poor clients because they might result in controversy, our clients would know that they were not receiving representation equal to that enjoyed by people who can afford to hire lawyers."

And, Lorenz said, this unrestricted lawyer-client relationship with the poor is the prime base of the legal aid program.

Murphy and other opponents of CRLA also say the organization is closely tied to labor unions, especially Cesar Chavez's AFL–CIO United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

RIGHT TO CHALLENGE CITED

Therefore, the CRLA critics say, the organization is using government money to help unions, and this is unethical and improper.

The unions agree with CRLA in such cases as the fight against importation of the Mexican farm workers.

But CRLA says indigent farm workers themselves, who are eligible to get legal help from CRLA, cannot be denied the right to challenge government orders on their own, even if the union agrees.

And this is true, CRLA contends, even though in theory the CRLA could tell an eligible client to go to his union or elsewhere for help.

It isn't up to CRLA to get rid of a client by referring him to a union or a company for help if he comes to CRLA, Lorenz said.

The union may be pleased with the CRLA case results, but that should not mean that CRLA cannot take on such cases just because a private organization is interested or pleased with the results, he said.

Chavez is a member of CRLA's board of directors, and it's no secret that the organization works with the union on occasions.

WELL-KNOWN LEADER

"How could it be otherwise?" asks Lorenz, who says Chavez is obviously a well-known leader among Mexican-Americans and among farm workers, and it would be impossible to ignore him or his union.

The battle over CRLA has already moved to the national level.

Latest move came from the special advisory committee set up by OEO to advise it on the entire legal services program around the country.

The advisory committee, which includes the present and past presidents of the American Bar Assn., as well as the ABA president-elect, strongly defended CRLA's role.

NO HELP TO PROGRAM

It said the entire program could not be "wisely or effectively served" if cases against the government were forbidden.

The committee then unanimously praised lawyers in the poverty program for "meeting their professional responsibilities," and called on OEO to "resist efforts to restrict the program."

Lorenz said he and the 30 other lawyers, working for CRLA have handled 4,600 cases since it was started 15 months ago.

Only three have provoked major controversy so far.

The first was when CRLA represented poor clients who challenged the cutbacks made by Gov. Reagan in California's Medi-Cal program.

The governor was known to be furious about the allegations made by CRLA lawyers that his cutback of funds to Medi-Cal were illegal.

He was even more upset when Superior Court Judge Irving Perluss blocked the cuts at CRLA's request pending further hearings.

The validity of CRLA legal charges that Reagan improperly cut Medi-Cal funds is still being tested in the courts.

But CRLA insists that the poor are hurt by such cuts and as lawyers for several indigent users of Medi-Cal, CRLA has an obligation to do everything it can for those clients.

The second case was CRLA's challenge of the Department of Labor decision to let 8,100 Mexican nationals come into California to help harvest tomatoes.

Reagan said "Even Labor Secretary (W. Willard) Wirtz, no friend of California farmers, approved the effort to bring in the (Mexican) workers.

"So we have the spectacle of a federal government body (CRLA) opposing the decision of an officer of the President's Cabinet," the governor said.

Again, CRLA not only admits it is challenging the Department of Labor, but says such a move is a vital part of its operations.

Here's what happened in the farm labor case:

The California Department of Employment said there is a need for supplemental foreign labor to help harvest tomatoes. The U.S. Department of Labor approved.

Then CRLA got a court order blocking the importation of the Mexicans on grounds that there are jobless U.S. citizens available for the work and that some tomato growers were not meeting the minimum standards set by the government to qualify them for foreign labor.

An out-of-court settlement of the argument was reached, and the court injunction was dismissed.

MERIT SEEN

The out-of-court settlement between CRLA and the labor department provided that the Mexicans would come in, but also said, in writing, that current regulations would be more adequately enforced.

CRLA says its prime purpose was to make certain that there is compliance with state and federal laws.

"The fact that the Department of Labor finally entered into a settlement agreement to better insure that the law would be enforced is a clear indication that the suit we filed had considerable merit," Lorenz said.

The CRLA case also won the support of the federal judge who issued the injunction against the Department of Labor.

Harold Horowitz, UCLA law professor and member of the national advisory committee to OEO, likened the case to a situation where a private corporation challenges a government ruling.

REPUBLICAN'S VIEW

"Obviously, no one would want the corporation to be prevented from challenging the government ruling in the courts. It should be equally obvious that indigent workers should be allowed to do the same thing, and, if the process of law is going to work, the poor should not be prevented from doing so because of a lack of funds," he said.

Maynard Toll, of the law firm of O'Melveny and Meyers, is also a member of the legal advisory committee to OEO.

He said that "as a life-long Republican, I find it incongruous for Republicans to be attacking a concept of providing legal counsel to people in danger of having their rights engulfed by big government.

"I thought that was part of the Republican philosophy.

"It must be understood that the system of justice we have is based on the idea that all citizens are entitled to legal services, and this must include legal squabbles with government since these squabbles sometimes tend to make up a pretty good share of a poor person's legal problems," he said.

The governor is getting no support from the Department of Labor either, even though it was one agency which the governor said is being abused by CRLA.

Glenn Brockway, regional director of the department in San Francisco, declared: "Naturally, I do not feel CRLA needed to go to court to stop the importation of the Mexican nationals. I believe our ruling was correct in the first place."

But, Brockway quickly added: "Certainly CRLA lawyers had every right to defend their clients just as if they were private lawyers. They have the right to take on me or anyone else in government in pursuing the interests of their clients."

CRLA has submitted its specific charges against certain growers who are accused of refusing to recruit domestic workers in addition to an alleged failure to pay the required minimum wages and to meet other U.S. standards.

The Department of Labor is now investigating the charges.

SUTTER COUNTY CASE

The other CRLA case to bring major protests was in Sutter County, which was also referred to by Reagan in an address last Saturday.

Reagan said the CRLA is using government funds to harass a county welfare office "to the point where that county's Board of Supervisors has had to use the taxpayers' money to hire a lawyer at $35 an hour to protect its county welfare director."

Reagan said the director saved the county $200,000 in welfare costs last year, and in the eyes of some of these people, saving taxpayers' money is a crime."

Before Reagan made his charge, the Sutter County Taxpayers Assn. said taxpayers there "strongly object to and detest the work being done by CRLA."

STOP FUNDS

And the Sutter County Board of Supervisors asked OEO in Washington to stop all CRLA funds.

CRLA says its involvement began in April when four farmworkers asked for legal help in their efforts to get aid from the Sutter County Welfare Department.

The Department, headed by Mrs. Mary Quitoriano, had rejected their request for help. The four were also told they were not eligible for any aid program administered by the California State Department of Social Welfare.

Charges were filed by CRLA alleging the four and others were improperly denied help and were not accurately informed of their rights.

"Even Gov. Reagan's own state welfare director, John Montgomery, sent letters of reprimand to Sutter County officials for refusing to allow the poor to apply for welfare," according to Lorenz, who added:

"And of the 10 decisions handed down so far in that case, our clients have won all 10 of them. Clearly, the cases were not frivolous."

WELFARE CRACKDOWN

The CRLA said Mrs. Quitoriano was hired by Sutter County supervisors in the first place as part of a "crackdown on welfare cases."

And the supervisors there, CRLA said, "were the same men who refused to continue the local mental health program and refused to approve other poverty programs on the grounds that there is no poverty in Sutter County."

But the strongest argument CRLA has is the statement from Montgomery, who, as Reagan's appointee, "should have straightened the governor out," the CRLA said.

Montgomery, in a written report, said Sutter County officials were not following practices "in accordance with the law."

Nor had the officials there taken corrective actions "sufficient to meet the responsibilities of local government on conserving and utilizing the human resources so necessary to our modern economic and social system," the Montgomery report said.

TEAM OF SURGEONS FROM LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE GOES TO GREECE

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning an unusual venture in international goodwill and meaningful foreign aid will begin when a seven-man heart team from San Bernardino County, Calif., leaves Washington for Greece to perform lifesaving heart surgery on Greek adults and children, and conduct teaching sessions for the thoracic surgeons of that country.

This team from Loma Linda University School of Medicine, on a 6-week mission away from the United States, will perform a heavy schedule of open-heart surgery during their stay in Greece. More than 2,000 pounds of special heart surgery equipment will accompany the team on its lifesaving, people-to-people program for the Greek people.

The purpose of this humanitarian trip to Greece is twofold—to offer the benefits of open-heart surgery to as many of the Greek people as possible and to demonstrate the techniques of open-heart surgery to Greek doctors, thereby helping them to start their own programs. The team will conduct a program of lectures, seminars, and demonstrations for the Greek physicians.

We hear much debate on this floor about foreign aid programs which cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars. It is refreshing to me to note that there are still Americans who believe that the best kind of foreign aid is the kind that does not cost the American taxpayers one thin dime, but involves people of this country with the people of other countries on a person-to-person basis with love, charity, and humanitarianism the only goals.

The Loma Linda project erases the "ugly American" concept and will give the man on the street in Greece a favorable attitude toward Americans because what is being done for their people is being done by Americans whose only motivation is the desire to do good and cannot be cataloged as aid in the form of money backed by the concept that we can buy friends around the world.

Heading the heart team on this clinical tour is Dr. Ellsworth E. Wareham, of Oak Glen, Calif., professor of surgery at Loma Linda University School of Medicine. Dr. Wilfred M. Huse, of Grand Terrace, Calif., assistant professor of surgery, is the team's second surgeon. Dr. C. Joan Coggin of Loma Linda, Calif., assistant professor of medicine, is the team's pediatric cardiologist. Other members of the team are school of nursing instructor Lavaun W. Sutton of Redlands, Calif.; cardiologist, Dr. Roy V. Jutzy of Loma Linda, assistant professor of medicine; Dr. Berfnard D. Briggs, Loma Linda, professor of anesthesiology; Mr. Raymond M. Savage, Loma Linda heart-lung machine technician; and John Parrish of Loma Linda, director of public information at the university, will accompany the medical personnel as general administrative secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Loma Linda University School of Medicine and their heart mission team for the vital role they are playing in reaching and uplifting mankind everywhere, and I am sure that these ambassadors of good will will leave a tremendous impact upon the people of Greece.

VISIT OF HEART SURGERY TEAM FROM LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY TO GREECE

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of what my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PETTIS] has just said concerning the forthcoming visit of a team of heart surgeons from Loma Linda University to Greece for the purpose of performing a number of cardiac operations in Athens.

I have worked with the gentleman from California on this project and I have been greatly impressed by his dedication and concern that the visit of this group of outstanding American physicians be expeditiously and effectively conducted.

The humanitarian impact of a mission of this kind must be obvious. The heart patients who will receive the benefit of the skills of these surgeons will be given a better chance for a healthy life.

The opportunity that will be afforded to Greek physicians to observe this heart surgery will expand medical knowledge in Greece and thus multiply the benefits of this visit.

I believe that Loma Linda University is to be greatly commended for its dedication and leadership in this endeavor.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that last month I had the privilege of visiting the medical center in Athens, at which these operations are shortly to be performed, Evangelismos Hospital, and of talking to the head of the hospital, Dr. Thomas A. Doxiades, and I can say, therefore, from firsthand knowledge that the forthcoming mission will be greeted with great enthusiasm and appreciation.

I might add, finally, Mr. Speaker, that the visit of the Loma Linda heart surgeons is one more instance of the close links that have for so many years existed between the people of the United States and the people of Greece.

Again, I want to commend Congressman PETTIS, who was vice president of Loma Linda University before coming to Congress, on his outstanding effort in this matter.

VISIT OF HEART SURGEONS TO GREECE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I add my personal and professional congratulations to the group here in Washington that is proceeding to Greece, according to the well-stated narratives of the two preceding speakers in the well. Indeed, these men prove that "M.D." stands for "medical diplomat."

CONGRESS MUST PROVIDE A DETERRENT TO THOSE WHO ORGANIZE AND PREACH VIOLENT CIVIL DISTURBANCE BY PASSING H.R. 421

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, this Nation witnessed, and the world watched, an attack on the Pentagon itself, the spitting in the faces of our soldiers, the throwing of bottles and debris at Federal uniformed officials.

The Communist countries headlined this massive effort at disruption of the operation of Government in the United States.

The undisputed organizers included the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, a Communist-front organization; the Progressive Labor Party, who support Communist China; the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, followers of Stokely Carmichael who preaches rebellion and anarchy from Communist countries; and joined by the New Left, an activist ultraliberal group preaching violent civil disturbance and mouthing support for the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front against which American men are fighting in the swamps and jungles of South Vietnam.

Congress was quick to pass a stiff law against disrupting Government on Capitol Hill, which I cosponsored.

But Congress, or at least the Senate, is reluctant to pass much-needed antiriot and antiviolent civil disturbance laws similar to my antiriot bill, H.R. 421, which is tied up in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

It is imperative that Congress pass this bill so that the organizers and instigators of future marches that end up in violence and disruption of the people's Government can be punished as the criminals they are. It is imperative that Congress speak out in unmistakable condemnation of organized anarchy in America, in support of full FBI authority to investigate this insidious plot of rebellion, in support of full and forceful prosecution of those who organize massive civil disobedience anarchy, and in support of law-enforcement efforts to protect the governmental institutions at all levels and on all fronts.

The march on the Pentagon last weekend gave the Communist enemies in South Vietnam and around the world more aid and comfort—by making it falsely appear that many in America are not really behind our fighting men in Vietnam—than any major victory on the battlefield could provide.

My bill would put not only Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown out of business, but would end the Communist-oriented activities of those who organized the march on the Pentagon, such as Dave Dellinger, a supporter of Red China who visited North Vietnam and Communist China late last year, with Ho Chi Minh early this year and who went to Cuba in 1964; such as Jerry Rubin, a leader of the free speech movement at Berkeley, who disrupted the HUAC meeting in August 1966, and was an observer at the 1966 convention of the Communist Party USA and visited Cuba illegally in 1964; such as Ivanhoe Donaldson, director of SNCC in New York and an observer at the 1966 Communist Party USA convention; and such as Mrs. Dagmar Wilson who traveled to North Vietnam.

A further challenge is offered to Congress by Martin Luther King who is following up his conversion to the activist movement when he advocated massive civil disobedience and the disruption of government at all levels by his use yesterday of the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders to call for a massive "camp-in," intended to bring Government to a halt in Washington.

Intentional, planned, and massive disruption of the operation of the U.S. Government, that has the duty of serving all the people, is anarchy. Those who organize such massive disobedience to law and order should be put on notice that such action will be punished.

I call on Congress to act now before the organizers of anarchy have another chance to invade Washington or any other seat of government. It is the duty of Congress to pass stiff antiriot, anticivil disturbance legislation which already passed the House, 349 to 70, if the most noble experiment in man's governing of himself in freedom, the United States of America, is to be preserved.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY TAX FUND

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's recent threats to either cut back or withhold highway construction funds not only have no basis in written statute but violate longstanding and near-unanimous congressional intent. Careful reading of the 1956 debate, when the highway trust fund was established, shows plainly that the will and desire of the Congress was to guarantee this construction money to the States without interruption.

H.R. 10660, which became Public Law 84–627, the Highway Act of 1956, passed the House by a vote of 399 to 19, in itself evidence of the overwhelming support for the concepts of this legislation. The following statements made at the time by Members of both parties are indicative of a sentiment which has not changed:

> Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. The public realizes it will have to pay the increased taxes no matter upon what industries or articles they may be levied. The public also knows that you spend the money in building the roads and they will pay for them and nonetheless will bless you for the benefits conferred upon them in according them safe means of highway transportation.
>
> The American people are on the verge of having their highway problem settled.
>
> Its fundamental provisions—the allotment of Federal aid to the several road systems of the 48 States and the tax schedule which will finance that aid—have been intelligently prepared and are almost unanimously approved by everyone who understands the highway problem and its solution.
>
> The passage of this bill is in the national interest.
>
> Mr. SCHWENGEL. The subject of my remarks on this occasion is roads. Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin in 1808, had this to say of highway construction: "No other single operation within the power of government can more effectively tend to strengthen and perpetuate that union, which secures external independence, domestic peace, and internal liberty."
>
> Mr. GEORGE. One thing that was stymieing the people of the country was not the fact that they were not paying enough taxes for highway construction, but the big end of our trouble was gasoline taxes were being diverted on the national level to pay general operating expenses.
>
> Mr. REED. I believe that it is important to emphasize that the bill provides for the establishment of a highway trust fund. The receipts from the taxes levied to finance this program will be required to be placed in this trust fund. The existence of this fund will insure that these receipts will not be diverted to other purposes. Moreover, it will make it easier for the Congress as well as the public to know exactly how much the program is costing and to determine to what extent the costs are being met on a pay-as-we-build basis.
>
> Mr. BOGGS. No. 1: The creation of the so-called highway trust fund. For a great many years now highway users have complained, and I think with some justification since the conclusion of World War II and the Korean conflict, that vast revenues were being collected from them but were not being used for purposes of building highways. This bill recognizes that complaint and it establishes the highway trust fund which dedicates most of these funds to highway construction and for that purpose only.
>
> Mr. BOGGS. Thus, for the first time, the American motorist will pay these taxes with the assurance that he will be the direct beneficiary of every penny which he pays and he will pay with the knowledge that every cent derived from these taxes will be devoted exclusively to his personal convenience and safety.
>
> Mr. KEAN. Fourth. If the proceeds of these taxes went into the general revenue fund there would be a false budget picture. We do not want to balance the budget with these taxes. In the early days of the program it is probable that more money will be collected than will be needed, but in the long run every nickel will be necessary. If these taxes went into the general revenue, it would result in a false picture of the budget. These taxes might serve to balance the budget in the next couple of years, and then unbalance it when the money to actually build the roads was called for. We do not want to do this.
>
> In general, putting all of the proceeds of these taxes in such a trust fund to be used for the road program only should make us at all times know exactly where we stand.
>
> Mr. MILLS. The certainty resulting from the trust fund concept permits the administration to plan future budgets in reliance upon fixed highway expenditures and with the knowledge that revenue will be provided without resort to deficit financing.

Those remarks were taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26, 1956, when the House was debating the Highway Act of 1956. Congressional intent has seldom been more clear.

I also wish to quote briefly from the United States Code, title 23, "Highways," chapter 1, section 126. This section is titled "Diversion" and states:

> It is unfair and unjust to tax motor-vehicle transportation unless the proceeds of such taxation are applied to the construction, improvement, or maintenance of highways.

It is just exactly that—unfair and unjust—and to remedy this injustice to the American motorist, I am introducing legislation to repeal the Federal excise taxes that are earmarked for the highway trust fund.

If the American motorist is not going to be able to reap the benefits of the taxes he pays, then the administration has no right to collect them. If and when the administration indicates it is ready to deal in good faith with the Congress, the States, and the American highway users on this matter, then this legislation will no longer be necessary.

FREE WORLD FLAG SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, of the many aspects of the war in Vietnam that are of deepening concern to the American people, one of the most disturbing has been our failure to stop the flow of supplies supporting the Hanoi war economy as well as Vietcong and North Vietnamese units in the south. For over 2 years now I have urged that more effective steps be taken to deny the enemy these supplies, particularly those carried to North Vietnam in ships flying the flags of free world countries.

While some progress has been made

to reduce the level of free world traffic, a persistent and appreciable amount continues to exist. According to the State Department, they have done all they can to eliminate it. In the face of this some may be satisfied to simply try to pretend the problem no longer exists. I, for one, on the other hand, contend that more effective ways and means can and must be found. The administration, has, I submit, devoted too much of its attention and energy toward rationalizing inaction instead of decisively facing up to the hard realities of the conflict. What is needed is not an apology for this traffic but effective action to stop it completely.

A cold review of the facts will quickly indicate why still more must yet be done about the enemy's seaborne sources of supply. I have now been provided by the Department of Defense with information concerning the number of ship arrivals in North Vietnam during September of this year, as follows:

MERCHANT SHIP ARRIVALS IN NORTH VIETNAM BY FLAG OF REGISTRY, JUNE 1965 TO SEPTEMBER 1967

Date of arrival	Free world	U.S.S.R.	East European	Chinese	Total
June 1965	23	6	5	9	43
July	20	7	4	8	39
August	12	7	3	15	37
September	11	3	3	8	25
October	15	4	4	11	34
November	14	7	6	16	43
December	13	10	4	14	41
January 1966	18	9	5	15	47
February	12	10	1	14	37
March	6	12	4	13	35
April	7	11	2	11	31
May	6	9	5	5	25
June	5	12	3	9	29
July	1	13	3	9	26
August	3	11	1	7	22
September	4	7	5	10	26
October	2	8	7	13	30
November	6	9	3	14	32
December	4	11	6	15	36
January 1967	6	16	5	11	38
February	5	25	4	10	44
March	3	24	5	12	44
April	5	18	4	9	36
May	9	18	2	10	39
June	11	9	3	11	34
July	5	10	2	5	22
August	6	12	1	3	33
September	7	8	2	8	25
Total	239	306	102	285	932

CARGO CAPACITY OF FREE WORLD SHIPS IN NORTH VIETNAM, 1967

Month	Flag: British		Cyprus		Maltese		Italian		Total	
	Number	Dead weight tonnage	Number	Dead weight tonnage	Number	Dead weight tonnage	Number	Dead weight tonnage	Number	Dead weight tonnage
January	6	48,850							6	48,850
February	3	10,730	1	10,900	1	10,900			5	32,530
March	3	10,700							3	10,700
April	4	24,800	1	10,900					5	35,700
May	7	32,220	1	10,600	1	10,900			9	53,720
June	9	57,620	1	10,800			1	10,000	11	78,420
July	5	26,430							5	26,430
August	4	25,520	1	10,600	1	10,900			6	47,020
September	6	49,730					1	10,000	7	50,730
Total	47	286,600	5	53,000	3	32,700	2	20,000	57	384,100

Let us look first of all at the free world flagships. During September, seven such vessels, six British and one Italian flag, arrived in North Vietnam, representing a cargo capacity of some 50,730 tons. This brings the total for the first three quarters of 1967 to 57 free world ship arrivals, with a total cargo capacity of over 380,000 tons.

Comparing the level of traffic during 1966 and 1967 by quarters shows that the number of arrivals is again on the increase; and that there is every indication that the 1967 level of traffic will be approximately equal to if not more than that of 1966.

FREE WORLD FLAGSHIP ARRIVALS IN NORTH VIETNAM

	1966		1967	
	Number of arrivals	Cumulative total	Number of arrivals	Cumulative total
1st quarter	36	36	14	14
2d quarter	18	54	25	39
3d quarter	8	62	18	57
4th quarter	12	74		

In other words, this year there has been little or no progress in reducing this traffic further, to say nothing of eliminating it.

To emphasize the persistent nature of this traffic, I would point out that of the seven ships arriving in September, six of these have made a total of 32 voyages to North Vietnam since January 1966.

To indicate the importance of the goods that ships flying free world flags have brought to North Vietnam, I would point out that in 6 of the first 9 months of this year cargoes have included suspected or known strategic goods. I would further stress that despite the administration's insistence that free world ships do not carry any goods of importance to the war effort that, according to the classified information made available to me by the Department of Defense, we simply do not know the nature of the cargoes in the holds of a great many of these ships.

The Pentagon estimates that as much as 10 percent of all goods imported by North Vietnam originate from free world sources. What is more, if I can believe what I am told, some free world flag ships also carry Communist goods; consequently, these vessels provide the transportation for an even greater percentage of the total imports.

Mr. Speaker, the recent bombing strikes in the Haiphong area are, of course, a clear indication of the importance of that port to the enemy. In testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee released this month, the Secretary of Defense acknowledged that 80 percent to 85 percent of all North Vietnam imports come by sea, and that Haiphong is the "easiest and cheapest means of import."

In the course of the same hearings the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earl G. Wheeler, revealed that—

> The Joint Chiefs of Staff have advocated that we should find a way of obstructing or stopping the flow of war-making materials and other supplies through the major ports.

I would particularly point out that this statement underscores the importance of denying the war economy of Hanoi not only what may be technically called "warmaking materials" but also "other supplies" as well.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff know what is keeping this war going and have called for the closing of the port of Haiphong. The question is whether or not the administration is really interested in taking decisive action to stop once and for all this source of supply for the enemy.

THE FUTURE OF THE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, both the President and the Congress are now actively involved in looking for new ways of cutting expenditures. This is not a time when it is possible or sensible to undertake a large number of new Federal programs and there may be some legitimate question about maintaining certain existing programs at their current or proposed level of funding. The Congress must certainly be particularly active in the area of appraising the relative priority of the large number of funding requests which are placed before it, and reductions must and will be made. At the same time, I do not think that the Congress or the President should consider the abandonment of existing programs which have proven to be essential.

In particular, I wish to refer to the cropland adjustment program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I cannot agree with the action of the House of Representatives in recommending that the program be temporarily suspended. For one thing, I feel that this places the future of the conservation reserve, or soil bank type or program, in jeopardy and I feel that this is a step which deserves very serious reconsideration.

Throughout the Nation there are still some 11 million acres of farmland under conservation reserve program contracts. As land comes out from under these contracts it may, and probably will, be put to another use if a similar program is not in existence to provide the opportunity for continued diversion of this land from production of surplus crops on a long-term basis.

In 1966 $30 million was made available for these cropland adjustment contracts representing about 2 million acres of land and composed of 36,000 individual contracts. In 1967 the appropriation totaled $50 million. The acceptance of this program by the farmers as a means of rationally controlling production at a fair price to the farmer has been clearly demonstrated by the ever-increasing number of them that have entered into such contracts. Many Members of Congress received letters and telephone calls from their constituents wanting to know about the availability of funds and the rules of eligibility.

The cropland adjustment program provides tangible benefits for both the farm and the nonfarm sectors of the economy. For urban and suburban citizens it is a bargain in preserving open spaces and in helping to keep the food markets of the Nation on a stable basis. The public gets a real dollar bargain out of this program compared to other means of holding land out of the production of surplus crops. In 1966, for example, corn producers received an average of $38.89 per acre in diversion payments on a 1-year basis. In contrast to this, they received $24.03 per acre for long-range diversion under the cropland adjustment program. Feed grain producers receive $25.56 per acre on a 1-year basis under the feed grain program and $15.55 per acre under the long-term cropland adjustment program.

Thus, the taxpayer pays less. While the individual farmer received less per year under this type of long-term arrangement, it provided him the very real benefit of an assured income over a long period of time and a basis for consistent planning of the use of his other agricultural resources.

Thus, I believe that everyone in the Nation benefits from this program through its preventing overproduction, market instability, and the accompanying expenses of dumping, Government control, and surplus storage.

On August 24 of this year I wrote a letter expressing my concern to the members of the House-Senate conference committee providing information on the impact of this program in my congressional district. I would like to include the text of this letter as a part of my remarks:

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am taking this opportunity to communicate with you on the subject of the proposed 1968 Cropland Program appropriation, which is now before your Conference Committee (H.R. 10509).

As you know, the Senate has provided over $52 million for new CAP contracts while the House has provided no money. Reviewing the House Committee report (House Report 330, page 4, pages 45–47), it appears that the reason for the recommendation of the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, as subsequently accepted by the House, was a feeling that withdrawal of cropland from production would be inappropriate at this time in view of the reduction of our national stockpiles and increased domestic and foreign demands for food products.

I can understand the feeling that the proposed withdrawal of additional land from crop production should be reviewed with care. However, I think there is a distinction between a program which would withdraw large amounts of land from current production and a program which will carry forward the sound policy of keeping marginal land out of production.

I would like to refer to the specific example of the situation in the Third Congressional District of Colorado. Figures available for the two years of CAP in the Third Congressional District indicate that in 1966, 184 contracts representing 35,993 acres were signed and that in 1967, 207 contracts representing an additional 48,277 acres were signed. I suggest that these figures be compared with the following figures indicating the amount of land on which soil bank contracts will be expiring in the Third Congressional District during the next three years:

1967	2,018 contracts, 682,000 acres
1968	1,706 contracts, 586,000 acres
1969	264 contracts, 85,000 acres

I believe that a comparison of these figures reveals the very drastic effect which reduction in the CAP Program will have in bringing land which has been withdrawn from production over a long period of time back into production. In short, the decision not to make additional funds available to expand the CAP Program would represent an active decision to bring thousands of acres of marginal farm land in southeastern Colorado alone back to production.

I have checked carefully with individuals who are familiar with the situation in southeastern Colorado and the best information that I can obtain indicates that as much as 50% of this marginal farm land which was withdrawn under soil bank contracts would go back into production under the House version of the bill. In our area of the country this means that severe wind erosion in dry years would result.

I must advise the Committee that it is the opinion of many farmers in the area that bringing this land back into production will create a long-term problem of erosion and marginal farm income and that the continuing withdrawal of this land from production is a desirable objective.

I appreciate your attention to the above comments and would certainly be glad to make additional information available to the Committee.

Most sincerely yours,

FRANK E. EVANS,
Member of Congress.

A PLEA FOR RELIEF FOR THOSE WHO SUFFERED IN THE GREAT DISASTER ALONG THE RIO GRANDE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being repetitious I am again speaking on the matter which concerns me most at this time—the great disaster that hit my beautiful district along the Rio Grande in the form of Hurricane Beulah and ensuing floods.

Homes were destroyed. Possessions were lost. The savings of a lifetime were swept away. The Lord was good that there was no loss of life along the Rio Grande, usually a lazy old stream carrying little water. But when, about a month ago, fed by flood swollen rivers, the Rio Grande rampaged, devastation was left behind.

People save, buy their homes, furnish their homes, provide the little extras along the way, clothing for work, play, and the kids at school, some of the niceties of life where they could be afforded, the necessities always.

To try to help these people help themselves, I yesterday introduced House Resolution 954 to refer a private bill for relief from these damages to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims. The private bill is H.R. 13642, for the relief of Jesus J. Rodriguez, who lost practically everything he owned in the disaster.

Mr. Speaker, this is no more than an effort on my part to afford a forum for these people who have nowhere else to go, nowhere to turn, no one from whom to seek assistance than our Government. The Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims will listen to their claims. He will make his recommendations to the Congress based on what he sees and hears.

As the House knows, this legislative route is known as the congressional reference. This measure was enacted last Congress. As far as I know, this is the first time the procedure has been utilized for an action of this magnitude.

I am hopeful, naturally. Hopeful that a compassionate government will find for reparations, that it will be mindful that these people are not looking for handouts, that they want someone to get down there to see their plight and make the determination therefrom.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the imminent meeting of the House-Senate conference to resolve public works appropriations questions including whether or not $1.6 million will be provided the Corps of Engineers to complete planning for the Dickey-Lincoln project in Maine, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the fact that those conservation groups which have studied this issue "on the ground" now stand in firm opposition to construction of Dickey Dam. The opposition of these groups stems from their determination that one of America's truly great wild rivers of major proportions shall not be destroyed as a wildland recreation resource.

Their position is summed up in this statement, adopted by the governing council of the Wilderness Society at the national conservation organization's annual meeting at Camp Phoenix, Sourdnahauk Lake, Maine, earlier this month:

> The Wilderness Society is opposed to the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School dams in view of the wilderness and free-flowing characteristics of the St. John River and because alternate sources of power are available nearer to the prime markets in this region.

Members should note that the council of the Wilderness Society arrived at this conclusion—that it should place its 40,000-member national organization on record as opposed to Dickey Dam—only after comprehensive discussion of the issue with Maine conservationists and firsthand observation of the damsite and the entire length of the St. John River itself. It then joined the Appalachian Mountain Club, the Massachusetts Audubon Society, and other State and regional conservation groups familiar with the issue in their opposition to Dickey Dam.

The Dickey project, located on the St. John River above its confluence with the Allagash, calls for construction of a 2-mile-long dam at the hamlet of Dickey, with five smaller earthen dams and a regulation dam at the Lincoln School site. These dams in combination would create a reservoir covering about 88,600 acres—approximately 136 square miles.

The St. John River above Dickey is one of the longest remaining stretches of relatively wild, undeveloped rivers in the eastern United States. The country is best described as remote; it is "near wilderness," being lumbered in areas and with some open farm country and small hamlets but for the most part removed from all signs of civilization. The river provides excellent canoeing with stretches of rapids. The total present canoe run of about 90 miles would be cut back by approximately 30 miles if the proposed reservoir comes into being.

Sound conservation reasons exist for opposing this project on the basis of irreparable damage which would be done to wildlife and to future recreational possibilities. The St. John River above Dickey is one of the longest remaining stretches of relatively wild undeveloped rivers in the eastern United States. Furthermore, in recent years, the recreational use of the adjacent Allagash has reached such proportions that increased recreational use of the St. John is almost bound to occur in an effort to escape overcrowding.

The only argument offered in the Dickey project's defense is that, instead of destroying the Allagash as well as the Upper St. John River Valley as the once proposed Rankin Rapids project would have done, Dickey-Lincoln would only destroy the Upper St. John River Valley. To the increasing number of Americans concerned with preserving scenic and wild lands, this is not a responsive, responsible answer.

The St. John River rises above Moosehead Lake in northern Maine, and flows northward to become the boundary line between Maine and Canada. Although the St. John is quiet, almost lazy in its beginnings, it soon becomes a thing of speed and direction. In its upper reaches, particularly in the 50-mile stretch that would be flooded out by Dickey Reservoir, it swirls and boils, smooths out, and races on again, just as it did thousands of years ago. Endless square miles of forests spread out from its banks forming a canopy of uninterrupted peace and solitude for deer, bear, moose, and wide variety of bird and wildlife.

All this would be destroyed forever by the Dickey powerplant reservoir. The swaths cut through the deep Maine woods by its sprawling project roads, transmission switchyards and substations, and towering, extra-high-voltage lines and towers, represent an additional equally irremedial desecration.

Dickey-Lincoln would be constructed solely for power purposes. It is totally unnecessary. As the U.S. Supreme Court recently observed in Udall, Secretary of the Interior, against FPC, in reversing an FPC project license on the Snake River:

> A river is more than an amenity, it is a treasure; preservation of the reaches of the river affected . . . [may] be more desirable and in the public interest than the proposed development—

Further—

> nuclear power will shortly be alternative sources of supply.

This is the position of the conservationists regarding Dickey Dam, Mr. Speaker, and I am hopeful that the public works appropriations conferees will take it into serious account in their deliberations.

MAJ. DON HOLLEDER

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days nationwide attention has been focused on the antiwar demonstrations at the Pentagon. That this gives a distorted view of American public opinion is an understatement, and I feel it is particularly unfair to the hundreds of thousands of brave men fighting in Vietnam. These are the men who should receive our praise and attention, for they daily risk their lives so that we can remain safe at home.

In a recent article, syndicated columnist Col. Earl "Red" Blaik tells of one of these brave men, Maj. Don Holleder, who recently made the supreme sacrifice for his country. Blaik's moving story of this young man is the kind of tribute we should all pay to our fighting men in Vietnam. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of Colonel Blaik's article:

(By Col. Earl (Red) Blaik)

Last week I read where Washington witnessed the march of 70,000 peace demonstrators whose object was to "confront the war makers in Washington and to surround the Pentagon as the symbol of evil."

What these demonstrators failed to comprehend is that the career soldier does not commit this country to war—war is the judgment of our civilian leaders elected and appointed. The Pentagon implements this judgment and the career soldier is the one whose duty it is to answer the call of his country—not to question why. These men, in going to war, leave youngsters and wives with a smile, but more often with heavy hearts as they realize there may be no return. For demonstrators to suggest that the men of the regular military service want war and the Pentagon is a symbol of evil is to forget that Sherman said, "War Is Hell" and that MacArthur eloquently stated in taking the Japanese surrender on the U.S.S. Missouri, "it is my earnest hope and indeed the hope of all mankind that from this solemn occasion a better world shall emerge out of the blood and carnage of the past—a world founded upon faith and understanding—a world dedicated to the dignity of man and the fulfillment of his most cherished wish—freedom, tolerance, justice."

Military men abhor war as they know it in the raw and to them the action of the belligerent demonstrator is incomprehensible.

I am greatly saddened by the news that Major Don Holleder of Army football fame, has been killed in Viet Nam. Holly, like so many fine young Americans, made the *supreme* sacrifice in terrain better suited to wallowing barnyard stock. War, to Holly, meant leaving a lovely wife, four children and a devoted mother.

Last December, in accepting the Gold Medal Award of The National Football Foundation, I referred directly to only one former Army player and that reference was to Holleder. You will better understand this brave young officer and his dedication to duty from those remarks which follow.

Axiom—Good fellows are a dime a dozen, but an aggressive leader is priceless. The 1955 season was most trying for me as we had a lean squad and no quarterback. A coach has never known trouble unless he has the senseless temerity to change an All America End into a "T" quarterback in one season. There was hardly an officer or cadet at West Point who didn't believe this switch was a colossal error. Even my friends of the Press called the move "Blaik's Folly."

Sunday afternoon after the Michigan defeat the Superintendent, my former football teammate, came to my office and inquired as to whether I was aware of the local sentiment about our quarterback. I told him that the team was aware, the staff was aware, and I was aware, but far more important they all believed as I did that our only chance to defeat the Navy was with Holleder at quarterback.

A few minutes after the Superintendent left Holleder came to see me. As he entered the office I got up, placed my hand on his shoulder, and said, "Holly, you played a good game yesterday and I am proud of you. You're making fine progress as our quarterback." With moisture in his eyes, Holly replied, "I know what the cadets are saying, I have heard the officers talk, and I came fully prepared to get my old number back, but I want you to know I prayed all the way here that you would not give up on me."

Now, it is many weeks later. It is the night before the Navy game. As was usual, I took the squad for a bedtime walk on the golf course which ended with a few words about the big game. I recall saying: "Three times this season I took the long walk across muddy fields to congratulate first Benny Oosterbaan, then Ben Schwartzwalder, and then Jordan Olivar. It has been a trying season and I am a bit weary from those walks. Tomorrow before 100,000 spectators and fifty million television viewers I want you men to know it would be the longest walk of my coaching career if I cross the field to congratulate the Navy coach."

There was silence for a moment—then a voice spoke out with resolution. It was Holleder. "Colonel, you're not taking that walk tomorrow."

The Cadets won an upset victory over the Navy. The Press stated it was Holly's vindication. It wasn't—it wasn't at all. It was an unforgettable demonstration that an aggressive leader is priceless.

This priceless leader is now the late Major Don Holleder.

THE BOGOTÁ CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY ACTION—AN OPPORTUNITY TO EVALUATE COMMUNITY ACTION AS A FORM OF CAPITAL FORMATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to the Fourth Annual Conference of the Bolivarian Nations on Community Development, which meets in Bogotá, Colombia, on November 5. The weeklong meeting will be devoted to evaluation of community action programs in Bolivia, Colombia, Equador, Peru, and Venezuela.

This meeting results from the interest of the Pan American Union and the Organization of American States in community action as an instrument of development. Significantly, it is the product of Latin American leaders. These conferences were initiated in 1964 under the leadership of the Department of Social Affairs of the Union to further the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

Latin America has been divided into three regions for this purpose. In addition to this group, there are the Central American and southern groups incorporating the other nations of the Alliance. Each group meets annually to explore and expand the utilization of community action in support of national development. These are working meaningful conferences of the actual leaders and technicians who direct national programs.

The Bolivarian meeting is of particular significance because it brings together the directors of the oldest and most successful community action programs in the New World, Dr. Vicente Pizano Restrepo, of Colombia; and Dr. Carola Ravel, of Venezuela. These programs, as I have noted before—on pages 6368, 8632, and 20292—have made major contributions to internal development since their respective inceptions in 1958 and 1960.

The experience and performance of these programs covers an adequate period of time to provide a reliable basis for evaluation of community action and its future potential as a factor in the developmental process. Moreover, these two programs offer contrasting applications of the community action technique.

Under the able leadership of Dr. Ravel, Venezuela has pursued the "coordination" approach, utilizing the services of existing agencies by training their personnel to employ community action concepts in promoting development. Dr. Pizano has implemented a program through the agency of village-level community action workers. Interestingly, as the two programs have developed they have evolved by incorporating certain of the basic organizational techniques of each plan. Indeed, among the more interesting developments in the use of community action is underway today in Colombia.

There under the leadership of President Lleras, the massive involvement of all the many entities, both public and private, active in the social welfare field is evolving. Integracion Popular, as the program is named, under the direction of Emilio Urrea, as special assistant to the President is experimenting with solutions for the problems of poverty. One of the more interesting facets of the program is the utilization of organizations such as Rockefeller-supported Feprenal, largely an organization of businessmen, and the Colombian Institute of Social Development, a lay organization of the Catholic Church, as prime contractors responsible for comprehensive developmental programs, both social and economic in relatively large geographic areas.

The Bolivarian meeting also will evaluate the performance of the Bolivian program, which was instituted under the influence of USAID, and the Peruvian program which has received about one-third of its financial support from a U.S. loan, as well as a $20 million loan from the Inter-American Bank—see page 22297.

In response to a request from the new Bolivian Government in 1964, USAID undertook a study of the problem of rural development. In essence this was a replacement for a U.N. program which had produced only negligible results through the use of rural training centers designed to provide vocational training for the Indians who live on the Andean Plain.

David Anderson, an AID specialist in community development, with long experience in the Middle East, devised a comprehensive program based on the village-level worker concept. Under his direction, the implementation of the program began in December 1964. One unique aspect of the program brings the training school to the locality in that programed administrative centers are utilized as training centers for the 5-month course which is provided for the village workers. The students are drawn from the individual communities where they will live and work following graduation.

By March of 1965, Anderson had developed a 2,000-page curriculum in Spanish for the course and the first group entered training. By the time Anderson was rotated in the normal course of AID procedures in July 1966, 197 village workers had been trained and assigned, to service 1,418 communities representing about 30 percent of the rural population. Ten area operations offices were functioning, through which 321 local projects were underway or completed, in which the local residents were contributing more than 75 percent of the cost. As of January 1, 1966, the program was transferred to Bolivan National control.

By April of this year—the most recent data available—an additional seven area operations offices were established; 58 more village workers were trained and assigned; 95 additional workers were in training; 430 new communities were covered by the program representing an additional 10 percent of the rural population; and 572 more projects had been approved. In addition to these accomplishments, a loan of $1.1 million was obtained from the Inter-American Bank, to support a loan program to the communities which was substituted for the direct grants used prior to that time. Of the project applications, 28 percent were for schools and more than 50 percent were related to upgrading of agriculture.

Significantly, the program functioned without a U.S. advisor until late summer of this year.

Within the context of attitudes manifest in floor action on the Foreign Assistance Act both here and in the other body, and this brief discussion of the four major programs to be evaluated in Bogotá, I believe the results of the Conference are of particular significance to the United States.

The record of our support of community action programs is at best spotty. The evidence is persuasive that U.S. officials for the most part fail to grasp the value of community action as underpinning for the total program effort in structuring economic development. Thus it has been implemented only sparingly, and under special case circumstances. In all cases with which I am familiar, such programs have been undertaken in response to the insistent demands of a national leader as is true in the Philippines, Pakistan, Taiwan, and Peru, or in the desperate search for solutions which is inspired by revolutionary crisis, as is true in Bolivia, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, and Vietnam.

A measure of indifference to the value of community action within the AID hierarchy is the paucity of information in point at both the Washington and mission levels. For this reason, the data I have accumulated on community action programs comes from a variety of sources, largely outside of official channels, and so is subject to the caveat, that although it is the best I can obtain, it is probably faulty in detail.

A second measure of this indifference is reflected in the financial support extended by AID. For example, out of more than $6.5 billion committed during the life of the Alliance for Progress, no more than $30 million, and probably less, has been allocated to community action programs. Moreover such breakdowns are simply not available at AID/Washington, and can only be obtained by careful analysis of the individual country assistance programs. Yet in this same period, these five countries which are represented in the Bogotá meeting have spent at least twice that amount, excluding local community contributions of labor materials, money, and services, on community action programs.

In fiscal year 1968, AID has programed about $8.6 million in support of the concept, yet Colombia, Peru, and Venezuela alone will spend about $35 million of their own funds through their community action programs.

The level of interest in the concept in Colombia is indicated by the simple fact that Colombia is paying the expenses of the participants in the November Conference. Similarly the commitment of such relatively large sums in support of community action as noted above reflects the alliance of foreign leaders to the community action concept. Similarly, the late President Magsaysay of the Philippines confronted with the Huk insurgency committed major resources including over 10,000 college graduates to a village-level community action program as the backbone of his campaign to "win the hearts and minds" of his people.

The quantitative proof of the value of community action is notable for its absence, which again reflects the unwillingness of our Government to commit resources to its evaluation. Nonetheless, the raw evidence is persuasive, and what little research there is supports the conclusion.

Pakistan was stagnating until it instituted its rural public works program based on community action. Today, 6 years later, it is the showcase offered by AID as proof that foreign assistance works. Moreover in an analysis of the startling change in the rate of development in Pakistan developed by Walter Falcon and Carl Gotsch of the Harvard University advisory project for the planning commission of that country, they attribute 75 percent of the currently high growth rates of that nation's agricultural sector to the community action works program.

The simple truth is that community action where it has been utilized appears to work. The more sophisticated analysts of the concept insist on measuring its value in highly esoteric terms of political and community development, which are undoubtedly products of its application. For our purposes, however, I believe it is best viewed as a medium of capital formation in developing nations.

It would seem axiomatic that the key to economic progress lies in the spirit and labor of a nation's people. Among the most notable illustrations in point is the evolution of Japan, a country renowned for its lack of natural wealth, whose people are praised for industry and genius. Community action techniques lend themselves to the mobilization of precisely these qualities which if not latent in a people, necessarily preclude the possibility of economic progress.

Most importantly, these techniques are most productive in providing the social infrastructure necessary to rural modernization. Obviously, if the people themselves can build the schools, dams, roads, and irrigation canals so vital to agricultural progress, the central government can apply the funds so saved to some meaningful capital requirement for national development. It is for this reason that community action should be regarded as a form of capital formation.

The Latin experience has been largely in public works. The results are impressive. Well over 5,000 classrooms, quite possibly as many as 10,000 have been built. Literally thousands of kilometers of access and feeder roads have opened isolated villages to the urban markets. Many miles of irrigation canals serving vast numbers of previously parched acres have produced land which grows badly needed food crops. Health stations have been built. Water, safe to drink, has been supplied to large numbers of the rural population. Environmental sanitation facilities have helped reduce the spread of debilitating disease.

In short the Latin experience demonstrates unmistakably that community action is a path to modernization of rural life. The principal products of these people-oriented programs are the essential ingredients of advance in agriculture, education, and health.

It would appear to take little imagination to visualize the application of this experience to human development under the Alliance.

In Colombia, schools have been consistently completed through Accion Communal for about $1,300 including an apartment for the teacher. This is roughly one-third the cost of conventional construction.

In Panama, rural housing has been successfully built through the self-help program for $300 a house.

In Peru, all-weather mountain access roads, built at a cost of about $750 per kilometer, one-tenth of the usual price, are in use at this moment.

Community action techniques utilized in various areas of Latin America demonstrate beyond question that the concept can be employed in comprehensive rural development programs.

Improvement of agricultural productivity was dramatically demonstrated in El Salvador, where the increment in income represented $375 for each dollar invested by public sources.

Nationwide community action programs lend themselves to utilization as improvised agricultural extension services. The levels of current practice are rudimentary, thus the level of sophistication of extension work permits the use of alert rural residents with the equivalent of a high school education, often less.

Experience indicates the cost of administration is low. In Colombia, for example, a field level employee can be maintained for less than $600 a year.

Each of the major programs was structured to serve modernization of agriculture, although lack of funds has discouraged intensive use for improvement of farm practices. With additional resources it is generally believed that this can be a contribution of major importance. In evaluating any effort to improve life in rural areas, it is important to remember that progress by Latin standards differs from ours. Perhaps as many as 80 percent of farm units remain today at the handtool level. The simple introduction of the animal drawn plow offers potential for major advance in farm income.

A recent AID loan to the community development program in the Dominican Republic earmarks $1.4 million for agricultural development. An evaluation of the program made by a specialist for AID in February reflects that efforts in this field have been on the pilot program level, yet the specialist is encouraged by the response.

A major test of this phase of community action is just getting under way in Peru where the Inter-American Development Bank is financing over half of a $39.5 million 3-year plan. Just under a third of these funds will be directed into extension and supervised credit. Significantly both of these loans have been subjected to careful analysis in terms of potential to create income-producing improvements. Both rely heavily on the agricultural imputs to produce additional revenue to both the people and the government through taxation.

In both Pakistan, as noted earlier, and in Taiwan comprehensive community action programs have apparently been responsible for dramatic improvements in the growth of the agricultural sector.

With this pattern of experience in mind, community action programs would seem extremely attractive vehicles for accomplishing the new goals the President called for in his message on foreign assistance. There he proposed that "the act establish agriculture, health and education as our primary concerns" for these as he said are "the fundamentals of a decent life." Indeed, that message alludes to the success of the program in Taiwan as proof that "men—acting together—have the power to shape their destiny."

Yet the community action concept is highlighted only by omission from the long list of suggested priorities.

At the time leading figures in the administration were discussing the summit resolution with Members of the Congress, I raised this precise question. In fact small changes were made in the wording of the resolution in an effort to give greater prominence to the concept. Once again U.S. officials reiterated their belief in the community development approach. Pressed for explanations of the failure to give greater emphasis to community action programs, they cited shortages of expert personnel and the political sensitivity of community action as major limitations.

While both are no doubt problems, I find them wanting as justifications.

There is a wealth of experience among Latins. At this moment there are nearly 1,500 of them working full time as employees of the programs I have mentioned. Clearly there are many more available in the many isolated programs which are active throughout the hemisphere. There are at least 15,000 rural communities in these same countries with organized local community action councils. Well over 20,000 individual projects have been completed in these countries during the life of the Alliance.

Among our people, there are many former Peace Corps volunteers with major experience in community action. The United Nations has managed to find a number of Americans who are experts in the field. There are also many private organizations staffed by personnel with a depth of experience.

The problem of political sensitivity seems a different sort of animal. It is my impression that this term is used most often as an excuse for inaction for which there is no other admissible reason. We have time and again demonstrated our willingness to use the AID program for political purposes, and the essentially political goals of the Alliance are unmistakably set out in the Charter of Punta del Este. Indeed the probable political ramifications of community action could not be more eloquently described than they are in the second and fourth paragraphs of that charter.

I think the best explanation can be found in the economic ideology of AID mission directors. Dedicated to a sophisticated concept of forced industrialization as the only satisfactory means to accomplish economic development, they simply cannot see the importance of the bootstrap approach. In discussions with U.S. personnel from all levels of AID, I find that those at the highest and lowest levels are convinced that community development can be a valuable tool. In contrast the intermediate levels, directing country programs from capital cities, demonstrate little understanding and less interest in the concept. I feel they have forgotten both their mission and their history.

Community action is as American as the hotdog. It played a major role in our development. Its widespread use astonished de Tocqueville, who in his own words admired:

> The extreme skill with which the inhabitants of the United States succeed in proposing a common object to the exertions of a great many men, and inducing them voluntarily to pursue it.

It is a simple process, probably intrinsic in the earliest social organization of man. It is no more than an ad hoc action in which men discover that they can best serve their mutual benefit acting in concert. From such beginnings great governments grow.

There are, too, more immediate advantages. In Vietnam it has been found that village facilities built by the hands of the villagers are free from terrorist destruction, simply because the Vietcong know they will alienate those whose work they destroy.

Universally it has been found that maintenance of facilities built by the local inhabitants is no problem because those with a vested interest in a project both respect it and keep it in good repair.

Facilities built with local contributed labor are invariably those which the community wants, and so are used.

Participation by those who have nothing to give but their labor leads to contribution of materials and money by the more affluent.

Involvement of the people gives them a sense of participation, and provides demonstrable evidence that somebody in the distant capital really cares.

These are among the lessons of the Latin Experience. The programs have proven workable and highly valuable instruments for integrating large numbers of widespread isolated communities into the national mainstream, thus inviting political stability.

In my judgment the evidence is clear that community action is a valuable developmental tool. Intensive study of the techniques of proven utility should be undertaken immediately. Understandably AID, confronted with the necessity of careful conservation of its funds, may have overlooked the concept. However, it is very clear that we must make every possible effort to develop possible areas in which the tax dollar can be more effectively used. Accordingly, I would urge the appropriate committees to undertake a detailed study of the best manner in which community action can be used in furthering the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act.

In this effort the reports of the Bogotá Conference appear an excellent point of beginning. Hopefully, AID officials have already made arrangements to obtain copies of these proceedings which can be used for this purpose.

Community action is not a panacea, for there are no panaceas. Nonetheless, it deserves first rank among the priorities of implementation in the foreign assistance program. It is not the easiest solution. It involves headaches of administrative organization. There is a shortage of personnel, though not so great as the apologists would claim. It is also true that certain political risks develop. But the development of the emerging nations is not a comfortable home for the "nervous Nellies" of the world.

Our national heritage is eloquent testimony that man's legitimate aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by free men working within the framework of democratic institutions. I have no fear of the results. The ultimate test of our sincere dedication to this national heritage is our willingness to trust the future to the will of free men. If we fear this end, we have lost our faith.

BATTLING COMMUNISM

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 50th anniversary date of the Soviet revolution, it behooves Americans to take a close look at the balance sheet compiled by our No. 1 enemy. We should not ignore the "gains" which communism has made in building a war machine and in extending its brand of influence, but by the same token, we should not forget the fact that these "gains" have been made at the expense of others, oftentimes the Russian people themselves.

In this context, it pleased me to note a recent editorial in the Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital on "Battling Communism," which outlines the proper way for Americans to observe November 7. I commend the Citizens for Freedom for promoting this idea, and I trust that November 7 will be a day of mourning in a majority of the communities of this land.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place this editorial in the RECORD for my colleagues to read. The editorial follows:

BATTLING COMMUNISM

Americans who hate communism have something constructive they can do about it. They can observe Nov. 7 as a day of mourning for the victims of communism, as suggested by a group of patriotic citizens, and dedicate the week in which the day falls to countering Communist propaganda.

The day of mourning was set on the date the Soviets have organized world-wide celebrations to mark the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia.

Observance of the mourning, says the Citizens for Freedom which proclaimed the date, can help spread the truth about communism.

"During the last half century, communism has been responsible for the extermination of at least 85 million people through civil war, man-made famine, purges, genocidal deportations and executions, in torture chambers and in concentration camps," the proclamation says truthfully.

"Communism has systematically destroyed moral and spiritual values; imposed incalculable sufferings on nations and people; has persecuted all religions and placed myriad minds in the chains of thought control.

"Communism set the pattern for Fascism, Nazism and other varieties of totalitarianism, and its relentless drive for world domination has kept nearly 100 million people of East-Central Europe in bondage and the world in a state of turmoil.

"Since 1917 not one of the nations conquered by force or seized by subterfuge has been permitted a free election, nor has any free people ever voted to adopt communism in preference to democracy.

"During these 50 years, Communist dictatorships have preached 'liberation' while practicing unlimited oppression to consolidate their rule based on terror."

To combat communism, every American community can rededicate itself to restoring freedom to those oppressed by the Communists.

This is doing something constructive to counteract the destructive force represented by the hammer and sickle.

RICE COUNCIL ADVERTISING

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I am of the very strong opinion that the current advertising campaign of the Rice Council for Marketing Development, which seeks to promote the sale of rice by belittling potatoes, should be investigated by the Federal Trade Commission, and I have written to the FTC requesting that this be done.

The campaign should also be investigated by responsible elements of the national advertising media who strongly advocate the right to police themselves—a right that could be lost if irresponsibility creates a demand for Federal control of advertising.

If the current advertising campaign of the Rice Council is not actually illegal, it certainly is in exceedingly poor taste in that it attempts to build one product by tearing down another.

Consider the July ad in Life magazine which shows what must be a cull potato with a caption under it: "Ugh." The message continues:

> Just think. You never have to peel rice. All you need to make rice is hot water. Hot diggity! Bury it in butter. Or add gobs of gravy! Rice fills you the long way . . . . Not the round way. Come on now—swear off mashing, beating, peeling, whipping. Rice is the reckless one!

I think, perhaps, that the "reckless one" is the Rice Council's advertising copywriter.

The unpeeled potato may not be the most beautiful object in the world, but it compares very favorably with a handfull of rough rice. Forgetting esthetics, it seems to me that the thrust of the Rice Council's advertising is that rice makes you slim and potatoes make you fat. The council's September advertising asks, in boxcar type:

> Did you ever see a fat Chinese?

This over a picture of a porterhouse steak with a pile of butter-laden rice alongside. Although an obese Chinese may be a rarity in food-short Red China today, in happier times this was not true. No one ever confused Charlie Chan with the "Thin Man."

If the Rice Council's advertising copywriter believes that "gobs of gravy" on rice is less fattening than on potatoes, let him consult his calorie counter—or better yet, his family physician. The U.S. Department of Agriculture publication "Nutritive Value of Foods," reports that a baked potato weighing 99 grams contains 90 calories, while a cup of cooked rice weighing 168 grams has 185 calories. In other words, there is a little less than 1 calorie per gram in potatoes and a little more than 1 in rice. The report also says that both potatoes and rice contain only a "trace" of fat.

Obviously, the calorie count in butter or "gobs of gravy" remains constant, whether used on potatoes or rice.

Thus, the Rice Council's advertising campaign is not only unfair to the potato industry, but is both deceptive and misleading to the consumer.

In reply to protests over the campaign, the Rice Council has said, in part:

> The industry's intent is to call attention to rice in a light, humorous manner in a campaign not unlike the widely-recognized Avis-Hertz efforts.

This is a very poor parallel. It would not really be very humorous if Avis advertised that Hertz vehicles were unsafe, which is approximately what the Rice Council seems to be saying about potatoes to a cholesterol-conscious, diet-minded public.

The potato industry is a highly important segment of American agriculture. Potatoes are a major cash crop for a great number of Idaho farmers. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the average price received by farmers for potatoes on September 15, 1967, was $1.90 per hundredweight, as compared with $2.07 a year earlier. This represents only 67 percent of parity, or two-thirds of what is considered a fair price.

With this depressed price, about the last thing potato growers need is a national advertising campaign designed to scare consumers away from this delicious and nutritious food.

One of the proposed ads states, in part:

> The Idaho has got to go.

It is my understanding that magazine publication of the ad has been stopped. But it is also my understanding that the Rice Council has been distributing a folder which plays on the same sentence. And, inasmuch as the word "Idaho" is copyrighted for our potatoes, does not this make the Rice Council subject to legal—and possibly punitive—action?

Certainly, those who control the copyright provisions of the word "Idaho" as it pertains to potatoes should study any possible infringement of their rights.

I have also written to the Department of Agriculture asking whether, directly or indirectly, Federal funds are paying for part of this campaign.

According to the Commodity Credit Corporation's report of its operations for the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1967, total commitments to the rice program, including inventory losses, export subsidies and sales under Public Law 480, were $175,862,724. Since there are only about 10,000 commercial rice growers in the United States, this means an outlay of about $17,500 per operator in a single year.

I doubt that the Federal Government, through the Department of Agriculture, would directly subsidize an advertising program such as the one being conducted by the Rice Council. However, in view of the fact that the rice industry is so heavily subsidized, can it not be assumed that some of this Government assistance is being used by the Rice Council for this campaign?—particularly in view of the fact that the money probably would not have been in the hands of the rice growers had it not been for Government subsidies.

This matter demands investigation by the responsible Federal agencies and departments. Should it be concluded that the advertising campaign is false, or based on a false premise or premises, it should be immediately terminated. And, should it be developed that Federal money is, indeed, either directly or indirectly involved, steps should be taken for its return to the Federal Treasury.

APPLICANTS TO MEDICAL SCHOOLS WILL RECEIVE ADMISSION TEST SCORES

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been concerned with our Nation's shortage of physicians, nurses, and other health personnel, I have been deeply disturbed by many of the policies and trends in medical education.

One area which has been particularly distressing is the medical school student admissions system which has been established by the medical schools, the AMA, and the Association of American Medical Colleges. Perhaps the single, most important factor in deciding whether a college graduate will be admitted to medical school is his performance on the medical college admissions test. However, the policy of the AAMC and the Psychological Corp., which formulate and administer the test, has been to withhold test results from both the student and his undergraduate school. Thus, individual scores on this critical examination have been available only to medical schools.

The aura of secrecy surrounding medical admissions test results has had may adverse effects: Undergradute colleges or universities are at a loss to evaluate the adequacy of their premedical educational policies and curriculum; guidance departments and premedical advisers have been unable to formulate and review their counseling efforts; students who were denied admission faced uncertainty if they sought remedial or supplementary education to prepare themselves for a second attempt.

However, I am pleased to inform the House that this policy has been recently reevaluated. According to information supplied me by the executive director of the American Association of Medical Colleges, beginning with the test which will be administered in 1968, scores will be transmitted to each student and to the college which he attended.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend both the AAMC and the Psychological Corp. for this important decision. I share the hope of those who have instituted this action that it will reduce medical student attrition rates, improve the system of premedical education, and result in a fairer testing procedure.

However, it should be realized that the release of test scores is but one aspect of the medical school admissions system. In view of the increasing shortage of physicians, I urge that organized medicine, the academic community and the Congress continue to reexamine the structure of medical education in the United States.

SECTION 406 OF TITLE IV OF THE POVERTY BILL

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, just last week I received a telegram from C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, calling my attention to section 406 of title IV of the poverty bill. Until I read that telegram, I had not realized that this section was a cleverly concealed attempt to transfer to the Department of Commerce some of the more vital functions now being carried out by the Small Business Administration.

If I recall correctly, there have been several efforts, during recent years, to have the Small Business Administration transferred to the big-business-oriented Department of Commerce. On each occasion, these efforts have failed. Now, it would seem that failing to carry out this feat openly, a back-door attempt is being made to do the same thing.

Section 4A of the Small Business Act states specifically that SBA "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government."

It is obvious that it is the intent of Congress that SBA be an independent spokesman for the small business community. If I am correct in my reasoning here, it then follows that SBA functions as well, are not to be subordinated to any other Federal agency.

I hope the House will reject this section 406 of title IV of the poverty bill when it gets to the floor. We should not support this attempt to merge and submerge SBA functions into the Department of Commerce.

ISRAEL-ARAB SITUATION

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely concerned about the attitude of the United States with regard to the increasingly serious Israel-Arab situation. An Israel warship has been the victim of unprovoked attack by Russian-supplied radar-controlled missiles. It is the first time in history that this type of radar missile has been used to sink a ship of any flag.

It is highly significant that the attack occurred at the same time that Soviet Deputy Defense Minister Zakharov arrived in Cairo—with a large military delegaton from Moscow—to add to the estimated 8,000 Soviet military advisers and technicians already in Egypt. It proves that the two troublemakers, Russia, worldwide, and Egypt, in the Middle East, are hand in glove in their determination to start war again between Israel and the Arab nations.

It greatly disturbs me, in fact, it is inconceivable that the Johnson administration, with evidence of Arab-Soviet ties of the strongest kind, is reneging on its commitment to Israel.

This country promised to sell a limited number of military jets to Israel, a commitment it has not yet honored.

It seems to me that it is essential for the United States to live up to this commitment to Israel. By withholding this sale of jets to Israel, at a time when Russia is pouring military weapons into the Arab nations, we are encouraging further Communist Russia intervention into the Middle East. This country should sell to Israel the weapons she needs for her defense, a sale which we promised a long time ago.

ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks we have seen a startling example of confused thinking within the Justice Department in the application of our antitrust laws. Rockwell-Standard Corp. of Bethany, Okla., was required by the Department, as a condition to approval of its merger with North American Aviation, to divest itself of the manufacturing rights to the Jet Commander Model 1121 business-type aircraft. The rationale behind the demand was that the Aero-Commander jet and North American's highly successful business jet aircraft would otherwise dominate or monopolize the market for such planes.

In the first place the facts simply do not bear this out. The two planes offer far different service characteristics to the prospective buyer and one costs nearly twice as much as the other. Foreign manufacturers also already have a dominant share of this market.

Under pressure of the Justice Department and its doctrinaire antitrust philosophy, Rockwell-Standard sold its rights to the plane to the Israel Government for $25 million, after futilely attempting to change the Department's position. We therefore have the almost ludicrous situation of the U.S. Government, in the name of "protecting" the American consumer market, engineering the surrender of one of the best U.S.-built jets to a foreign nation, and in the process destroying one of our important manufacturing resources for a type of highly sophisticated machinery which our security requires. Also vitally affected are the several hundred people in the Oklahoma plant whose livelihood has been threatened by this whim of the Justice Department.

This matter was brought to my attention by Mr. Atherton Bean, chairman of the board of International Milling Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., whose corporation owns and uses the Jet Commander. They have been advised that by this transfer of manufacturing rights to a foreign nation they can expect the value of their aircraft to decrease by as much as 50 percent.

Of course, future servicing, parts, modifications, and so forth, must be affected by virtue of the fact they now own a plane whose manufacturer is situated in an area of continuous political tension and turmoil. Mr. Bean well makes the point in a letter of protest to the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department that they may have "protected" International Milling Co. and other aircraft owners into not only a substantial loss on resale value of the aircraft but also into possible future disastrous accidents through possible decreased competency and availability of the new foreign manufacturers.

Such whimsical application of the antitrust laws is incredible to me, and while the entire episode appears to be closed, the facts certainly need to set out in the cold light of day to the end that this sort of action is not repeated. I insert Mr. Bean's letter to Mr. Donald F. Turner, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, protesting this matter in the Record at this point:

International Milling,
Minneapolis, Minn., October 4, 1967.

Mr. Donald F. Turner,
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Turner: Various Minnesota Senators and Congressmen to whom I sent a copy of my letter of August 30, 1967, protesting what seemed to us the unnecessary action of your Department in requiring Rockwell-Standard to divest itself of the Jet Commander business before it would be allowed to merge with North American Aviation, have sent me copies of your letter of September 18th in which you describe the now well-publicized fact that Rockwell-Standard did get rid of the business to Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd. In addition I thank you for your direct reply to me of September 13th over the subscript of Mr. Lewis Bernstein.

What I say hereafter will be with full knowledge that further protest is futile. The deal is consummated. Various damages inflicted upon (a) those of us who own the previously purchased Jet Commanders, (b) the community of Bethany, Oklahoma, (c) the future competitive situation in business jets are done. Yet I choose to make a point or two.

How curious, how impersonally abstract, how unrelated to any point made in my letter is the sentence which reads: "Investigation of the capability and projected plans of the purchaser indicated no basis for concluding that the sale would probably substantially weaken competition in the sales of business jets in this country." I wasn't worrying over a changed competitive situation. I was making the point that your action undermines the confidence of the present owner and the future possible purchaser of a Jet Commander now in service for its safety and modification for its continuous modernization. You simply comment that the "purchaser *appears* (italic is mine) to be an established and competent aircraft manufacturer . . ." Do your people seriously believe that Israel Aircraft is the technical equal for our purposes of Rockwell-Standard? Do they really think that a manufacturer situated in an area of continuous political tension and turmoil is as good a source of servicing and parts, etc. as an American manufacturer in Bethany, Oklahoma, or Southern California—as dependable a source of continuous modification technology? Jet planes are not automobiles and the people who buy them, though they may already be dealing with Butler Aviation and have a degree of confidence in their operation, still know that the source of parts and modification technology is in the future by your action to be a company new to an exotic area of the aircraft business, distant in geography and politically and militarily exposed.

I suggest that this is a clear case of doctrinaire antitrust philosophy applied with either cynical or playful disregard of the interests of a whole group of American executives and American companies and of the American economy. The allegation is made that this was done in order to protect us. Now the people who buy jet planes at net prices from $600,000 to $2 or $3 million are not children in the economic wilderness. If there is any group in the U.S. economy which should not have government time and money expended for its "protection," this is surely it.

We strongly suspect that you have "protected" us into a substantial loss on the resale value of our plane. You may have "protected" us into a future disastrous accident. There is a line in Oscar Hammerstein's libretto for "The King and I" that fits our situation perfectly: "If allies are strong with power to protect me, might they not protect me out of all I own?"

Your advisers have gone completely off balance on this one. There is, of course, nothing that we can do about it now because your desires have been met and our interests sacrificed to their philosophy. But I trust that the hazard and damage of this curious pedantry will not be lost on you as other similar cases come to the fore for decision and action. This displayed thoroughly bad judgment.

Yours very truly,

ATHERTON BEAN,
Chairman of the Board.

GIVE LIGHT AND THE DAILY NEWS WILL STILL BE LOST

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News has editorially indicated that they, too, will continue to call the Commissioner of the District, "mayor," and will disregard both fact and law.

They plead guilty, at least in part, to the charges of the "Ashb'k swivet" directed against both the political ploy of the President and the propagation of it by the news media.

I assume that if such lofty pillars of journalism as the News and the Star can call things what they are not—the Evening Star scooped the News to the same conclusion by several days—then why do not we all. Thus, for those wishing to join in, let me suggest that for openers, these remarks will be appended by the editorial clipped from the Washington Daily "magazine." Why not?

I am sure it will not disturb several of the radio stations if we change their names and henceforth identify them as television stations, or in reverse, identify TV stations, and their personalities, as radio stations and radio personnel.

Then, of course, there will be radio when what we really mean is TV, and magazines when actually they are newspapers when they are in truth magazines, and on and on, ad nauseam.

Of course, it is a bit ridiculous, but "radio" is easier to write in a headline than "television" or "magazine" and "newspapers" might get left out altogether since they have the longest count of all.

If one looks hard enough, one notices that the motto of the Washington Daily "magazine" reads: "Give Light and the People Will Find Their Own Way."

Let us hope so. In the controversy over mayor versus Commissioner, the News is not helping much. Their motto should read: "Give Light and the Daily News Will Still Be Lost."

The editorial follows:

MAYOR IT IS

When is a mayor not a mayor? When the law says he's a commissioner.

That's not a line from a Gilbert & Sullivan ditty, but a simple deduction by which Congressman John M. Ashbrook seems to have worked himself into quite a swivet.

The legislation which set up the District's new government, the Ohio Republican reminds us, designates our chief magistrate as a commissioner, not a mayor. Mr. Ashbrook suggests that persistent use of the title of mayor may be a piece of political skullduggery by "members of the Johnson Administration, especially the President." Moreover, he says, the White House has used newspapers as a patsy in this little ploy; they don't even use quote marks around "mayor." (There, we did.)

The members of the Johnson Administration, "especially the President," will have to fend for themselves. As for the newspapers—well, this newspaper, anyway—we're inclined to plead guilty, at least in part.

No headline writer in his right mind is going to refer to a public official as commissioner when he can get away with mayor. Without quotes. Commissioner in a one-column headline? Forget it, Cong. Ashb'k.

DARTMOUTH STAGES A PARTY FOR THE ENEMY

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last weekend Dartmouth College held a symposium on the theme, "The Soviet Union and the West—Evolving Contrasts and Convergencies." The purpose of the undertaking was to consider the achievements of the Soviet Union from 1917 to date. It is to be hoped that during the weekend a period of mourning was observed for the literally millions of human beings who perished through Communist aggression in the last 50 years. It is to be hoped that the responsibilities of intellectual honesty served to temper academic freedom in recognizing the tremendous loss to mankind inflicted by the Communist movement on familial and religious life, labor and—oh, yes—academic freedom. It is to be hoped that discussion of Soviet technological advances included Soviet missile sites and Mig planes and their possible use against Dartmouth alumni in Vietnam.

No one in his right mind would celebrate the anniversaries of Dachau and Buchenwald with film festivals and concerts. Rather, these are times for mourning.

The Manchester Union Leader of October 19, 1967, carried a guest editorial by my good friend, Mel Thompson, of Orford, on the Dartmouth symposium. Like many other patriotic Americans, Mel simply cannot forget the American lives lost in Korea or Vietnam through Soviet aid. Nor can he dismiss the Soviet's avowed purpose of domination of the free world.

I include the editorial, "A Party for the Enemy," by Meldrim Thompson of Orford, from the Manchester Union Leader and the account of the Dartmouth observation from the Valley News of October 16, 1967, in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Oct. 19, 1967]

A PARTY FOR THE ENEMY

Guest editorial by Meldrim Thompson of Orford.

* * * * *

The measure of how far we have drifted as a nation on the sea of imbecility will be drawn this weekend on the Dartmouth College campus.

A grand party is being planned to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of an enemy who has sworn "to bury" Americans, presumably beneath the debris of a nuclear holocaust.

During this "Russian Weekend", there will be dinners, discussion panels, concerts, art exhibits and a film festival, all draped around a symposium theme "The Soviet Union and the West—Evolving Contrasts and Convergencies." The symposium, to be attended by many visting professors, will consider Soviet achievements from 1917 to date.

Surely, no honest American can doubt the fact that Russia is our sworn enemy. The record is long, tragic and clear. Russian guns and equipment snuffing out American lives in Korea; Russian rockets implanted in Cuba and aimed at our heartland; and Russian materiel accounting for a large percentage of the 100,000 American casualties in Vietnam.

What manner of madness afflicts us that, while our soldiers perish daily in distant rice paddies from Russian mortar fire, a leading American college celebrates the anniversary of an absolute tyranny determined to destroy our culture?

A "Russian Weekend" that carefully analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of our adversary, or compared and extolled the virtues of our American civilization with the retrogressive Russian revolution, would be a real contribution to the public that has been invited to attend the observances. But an observance that affords a certain breed of intellectuals an opportunity to sing hosannas for their form of Paradise Regained will be another lost weekend on the calendar of American patriotism.

If the colleges and universities, now so heavily supported by our tax dollars, would invest a tiny fraction of their time celebrating, observing and fostering the concept of human liberty and dignity under our constitutional form of government, this nation would be a far safer home of the free than it is today.

Instead of a party for the enemy here at the cradle of American freedom, Dartmouth College might better guide its students and the visiting public along the constitutional highroad of individual liberty.

[From the Valley News, Oct. 16, 1967]

RUSSIAN REVOLUTION ANNIVERSARY WILL BE OBSERVED AT DARTMOUTH

HANOVER.—The fiftieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution will be observed at Dartmouth College by a Russian Weekend Oct. 19–21 (Thursday through Sunday).

A symposium. "The Soviet Union and the West—Evolving Contrasts and Convergences" will be attended by many distinguished visiting professors.

The Hopkins Center will contribute its full facilities for the arts to exhibitions of Russian art, cinema, theater, and music. All events will be open to the public.

The symposium, sponsored by the Russian department at Dartmouth with the assistance of the Student Council for International and Comparative Studies, will consider the Soviet achievement since 1917. Participants include professors from Harvard, Columbia, MIT, Swarthmore, NYU, Cornell and Dartmouth.

Thursday afternoon the theme of Soviet achievement will be highlighted by J. P. Nettl, visiting professor at NYU, in his keynote address. At other panels during the weekend Joseph Berliner, of Brandeis, and George Fisher, of Columbia, will discuss Soviet Economy and Society. George Gibian, of Cornell, and Thompson Bradley, of Swarthmore, will concern themselves with the artist in a revolutionary society. At the conference dinner, open only by invitation, Henry Roberts, of Dartmouth will speak on the Historicity of the Russian Revolution. Soviet politics and History will be the subject of a discussion Saturday morning by Uri Ra'anan, of MIT, and Robert V. Daniels, of the University of Vermont.

Concurrent with the symposium, The Dartmouth Players will present "Uncle Vanya," by Anton Chekov in the Studio Theater of Hopkins Center each evening at 8:30 p.m.

The Yale Russian Chorus will give a concert in Spaulding Auditorium at 8:30 p.m. Friday. This choral group, formed in 1954 by a small group interested in Russian culture, has gained world-wide popularity from its frequent tours abroad. Their program of Russian music will include folk songs, brigand ballads, and Cossack tunes.

A Russian film festival has been in progress for two weeks sponsored by the Dartmouth Film Society. Performances of "Ivan the Terrible" and "The End of St. Petersburg" were greeted with much enthusiasm. For the Russian Weekend the Film Society will present "Ballad of Love" and "There Was an Old Couple" at 8:30 p.m. Thursday in Spaulding Auditorium.

An exhibit in the Jaffe-Friede Gallery—"Dada, Surrealism and Today"—will be open daily. Other art and poster exhibits will be displayed in the Lower Jewett Corridor of Hopkins Center and the Main Lobby of Baker Library.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on congressional redistricting as currently constituted. As my colleagues know, the bill merely prohibits at-large elections of Representatives—except Hawaii and New Mexico—and provides that no State shall be required to redistrict before 1970 unless it has available the results of a special Federal census. When we voted on H.R. 2508 in June, I was forced to vote against it.

My quarrel with the bill was not that it provided a statutory standard of permissible deviation but instead that it was unconstitutionally broad for the interim elections of 1968 and 1970. As my colleagues will recall, the bill allowed a 30-percent deviation among congressional districts in a particular State. It was my opinion at that time if congressional intent said only up to 10-percent deviation would be allowed in 1972 and thereafter, then in keeping with that one-man, one-vote concept, only a 10-percent deviation should have been allowed in 1968 and 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my distinguished colleagues on the Judiciary Conference Committee that redistricting should be done on up-to-date figures. It would be inequitable and a futile act to redistrict a State based on census data 7 or 8 years old.

But my specific opposition to the bill in its present form is this:

Congress is again abrogating its constitutional responsibility. In a number of its opinions, the Supreme Court in this area has stated, "in absence of an expression of congressional intent" then they go on to hold that a certain percentage would be acceptable to them. Likewise, when we pass laws, most of the time specifics of how the law is to be implemented are left up to the executive branch by the phrase, "and the Secretary shall promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out this act." As is too often the case, at some later date, we then become upset because the Court does not interpret or the Secretary does not run the programs in the way we intended.

This is an area of clear-cut congressional responsibility which I feel requires immediate and definite action. In order to carry out our constitutional responsibilities, we must enact definite statutory standards for congressional districts. As the only completely popularly elected branch of the three, it is our job. Granted, it is not an easy task; it is not a pleasant task. But it is a job that should not and cannot be delayed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that several members of the committee intend to offer separate bills on the floor that will provide for a specific expression of congressional intent and a permanent solution to the problem. It would be my hope that my colleagues join with me in giving these bills careful consideration and then pass a bill which will fairly and equitably implement the one-man one-vote principle.

A BETTER LIFE FOR OUR CITIZENS HERE AT HOME

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, it had been my hope that many of my colleagues would have reconsidered their previous vote amputating the model cities and rent supplements funds and now thought through the alternatives to it.

The Senate had given Members of this House a chance to do just that.

Decent housing for low-income families is an urgent need in nearly every city in the Nation. If business cannot fill that need, then it logically follows that Government will do so, sooner or later.

The fact is that the business community—builders, bankers, and brokers—support the rent supplement program. So do mayors, city managers, labor, churches, and other organizations. The program has this wide-based support because it represents a working partnership between government and private enterprise. The features of the program are:

It is available for new or rehabilitated housing, privately financed, and privately managed. The property stays on the local tax rolls.

Only the really poor are eligible. Income limits are the same as for public housing, but tenants are not required to move if income rises. The supplement is simply reduced or eliminated, therefore not discouraging self-improvement.

It tends to reduce Government control over housing construction and management.

It stimulates private investment. To date, $500 million in private financing has been triggered by the $32 million of Federal funds approved for rent supplement payments. Recently, the life insurance industry committed $1 billion to attack the problem of urban slums, most of which will be used in the rent supplement program.

In short, the program joins public and private resources in a common attack on developing the housing which low-income Americans in the cities, large and small, so badly need.

Both local and Federal tax burdens will benefit in the long run.

SECRETARY McNAMARA'S POSITION ON SOVIET-FIAT DEAL QUESTIONED

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. WALDIE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the Soviet Union and other Communist nations are supplying weapons and materials and supplies which are used to kill and maim our men and our allies in Vietnam it is especially difficult for Americans to see why we should help these very same Communist nations build up their economic and industrial strength.

What is also a matter of deep concern in this regard are some of the arguments and the tactics employed by administration spokesmen in trying to promote trade which would assist the Soviet Union and Communist countries in building up their economies.

One example I would like to bring to the attention of the House is a recent statement by Secretary of Defense McNamara criticizing Congress for taking action aimed at denying U.S. financial assistance and exports of equipment to help equip the Fiat automobile plant to be constructed in the Soviet Union. As part of his argument that if we help build up the Soviet automobile industry Soviet resources will be diverted away from defense to consumer goods, the Secretary gave the impression that the Soviet Union has no automobile industry at this time.

The statement to which I refer appears in a printed interview with the Secretary in the September 29, 1967, issue of Life magazine. In his response to a question about areas of mutual interest between the United States and the Communists, the Secretary, in part, mentions trade, and said:

> Look at the failure of Congress to support the Administration's program of building bridges of trade with the Eastern European nations. Its actions included the denial of the Administration's request to participate in the $50 million loan to the Fiat Corporation to help the Soviets expand their automotive industry. This would be like putting them on dope. Once they get an automobile industry, they will never get off it. And that simply means they divert resources away from defense to consumer goods. How could that possibly be contrary to our interests? We are misguided if we fail to recognize these potential areas of common interest, as distinguished from their basic, aggressive foreign policy.

Note that he said, "Once they get an automobile industry."

It seems incredible that anyone in a position such as the Secretary of Defense would attempt to leave the American people with the idea that the Soviet Union has no automobile industry at present. Yet there seems to be no other way to interpret the comment, "Once they get an automobile industry * * *" as set forth in that statement.

I think it is important that it be pointed out that the Secretary's statement is highly misleading.

Let there be no mistake or doubt in anyone's mind: The Soviet Union does today have an automobile industry.

The following is a brief description of brand-name passenger automobiles which are produced in the Soviet Socialist Republics as listed in car catalogs for 1966 and 1967:

Chaika.—Limousine, seven-passenger, 4-door. Engine: 8 cylinder in V; 192.3 net horsepower at 4400 rpm; automatic transmission; length—220.5 inches; weight—4079 pounds.

Zil-111.—Limousine, seven-passenger, 4-door. Engine: 8 cylinder in V; maximum 230 horsepower at 4200 rpm; automatic transmission; length—241.7 inches; weight—5732 pounds.

Moskvich 408 (*or Mzma 408*).—Sedan, five-passenger, 4-door. Engine: 4 cylinder in line; maximum 60.5 horsepower at 4750 rpm; transmission—4 gear plus reverse; length—161 inches; weight—1984 pounds.

Moskvich 426.—Station wagon, five-passenger. Engine: 4 cylinder in line; maximum 60.5 horsepower at 4750 rpm; transmission—4 gear plus reverse; length—161 inches; weight—2116 pounds.

Volga (*Gas 21*).—Sedan, six-passenger, 4-door. Engine: 4 cylinder in line; maximum 95 horsepower at 4000 rpm; transmission—3 gear plus reverse; length—189 inches; weight—2997 pounds

Volga (*69M*).—Jeep-type vehicle, five-passenger, 4-door. Engine: 4 cylinder in line; maximum 72 horsepower at 3800 rpm; 4-wheel drive; transmission—3 gear plus reverse; length—152 inches; weight—3076 pounds.

Zaporozhets 965A.—Coupe, four-passenger, 2-door. Engine: 4 cylinder, Vee slanted; maximum 27 horsepower at 4000 rpm; transmission—4 gear plus reverse; length—131.1 inches; weight—1323 pounds.

Soviet automobiles are constructed at the following locations:

NAME OF FACTORY AND PRODUCT

Gor'kiy Motor Vehicle Plant, Gaz trucks and Volga and Chaika autos.

Likhachev Motor Vehicle Plant (Moscow), Zil trucks and Zil-114 autos.

Moscow Plant for Low Powered Vehicles, Moskvich autos.

Motor Vehicle Plant in the Urals (Miass), Ural-Zis trucks.

Ul'yanovsk Motor Vehicle Plant, Uaz trucks.

Minsk Motor Vehicle Plant, Maz trucks.

Kremenchug Motor Vehicle Plant, Kraz trucks.

Zaporozh'ye Motor Vehicle Plant, Zaporozhets autos.

Izhevsk Motor Vehicle Plant, Moskvich autos.

Kutaisi Motor Vehicle Plant, Kaz trucks.

Belorussian Motor Vehicle Plant (Zhodino), Belaz trucks.

In addition to the above, there are many specialized automotive equipment plants, such as the Moscow carburetor plant, the Zavolskiy engine plant, the Yaroslavl tire factory, and so on.

Also there are many additional plants properly belonging to other industries which supply materials to the Soviet automotive industry.

Some of the automobile factories, such as that in Gorki and the Likhachev in Moscow, are very large, highly integrated plants much like the Ford River Rouge plant in their self-sufficiency. The latter factory is reported to have approximately 70,000 people on the rolls.

As for their automobile manufacturing capability, the Soviet motor vehicle production in the year 1960, for example, was 362,000 trucks and 138,800 passenger cars. Soviet production by 1966 had risen to 408,000 trucks and 230,200 passenger cars. Incidentally, jeeps constitute about 17 percent of the annual production of what are classified as passenger cars in the Soviet Union.

While Soviet automotive production is well below automotive production for the United States, from these figures it is obvious that the Soviets have a significant automotive industry.

It is a matter of concern that the Secretary of Defense apparently saw fit to attempt to pass off to the American people that the Soviet Union has no automotive industry.

Possibly the Secretary felt this approach would be effective in connection with his follow-up comments that if the U.S.S.R. is supplied with credits, machine tools, and other capital goods for automotive production then that will somehow force the Communist Party leadership to alter their economic plans.

The Secretary's reference to diverting Soviet resources away from defense to consumer goods is, I believe, a commendable wish and a desirable hope. But wishes and hopes cannot be the basis for national policy judgments.

In fact, the Central Intelligence Agency for one, in an intelligence report on the U.S.S.R. automobile industry which was reproduced in a March 1, 1967 committee print of the House Banking and Currency Committee, indicates that the Soviet automotive buildup will not divert resources away from their defense and space industries.

The CIA reports that the announced plans—for increased auto production—are not so grandiose as to require a significant alteration in traditional Soviet economic priorities, and would leave military and space programs unimpaired.

Such a finding is clearly understandable. The size of the Soviet automotive industry and the proportional output of autos and trucks, armored personnel carriers, buses, tanks, and tractors are based on decisions of the Communist Party leadership.

Output is centrally planned and rigidly controlled. Their planned product-mix, which limits the number of automobiles, certainly will not be altered or controlled by any wishful thinking that the Soviets will "divest resources away from defense to consumers goods."

The operation of Soviet industry and Soviet military and space programs are based upon the Soviet economic plan. This plan is law. Throughout the length and breadth of the Soviet empire it is the Soviet economic plan which has such a tyrannical impact on the lives of all peoples and, in fact, an adverse impact on peoples throughout the world. And what is the Soviet economic plan designed to accomplish? Nikolay Baybakov, the Chief of Soviet economic planners, put it this way:

> The targets set in the plan for 1967 are designed to strengthen the economy and the defensive might of the USSR.

As for the idea that the products of the Soviet-Fiat plant will go to the average citizens of the U.S.S.R. and that this will start a movement which will force the Soviets to divert large segments of the economy toward filling consumer needs that will then develop, the CIA has studied that aspect of the planned expansion of the Soviet auto industry and has reported that:

> Essentially, the new Soviet program is designed to produce automobiles for the bureacratic and managerial elite, not for the average citizen.

Another important factor to consider, and this, of course, is not publicized by administration spokesmen, is that the Soviet Union is actually an exporter of automobiles. Soviet autos are now being exported to approximately 60 countries. And it appears Soviet autos will be exported in greatly increased numbers once the auto industry is expanded as the U.S. Secretary of Defense proposes that it should be.

It is estimated that 54,000 Soviet automobiles will be exported this year and that this number will increase about 500 percent to 250,000 by 1974 if the plans publicized by the Soviets should materialize.

Mr. Speaker, it is readily apparent that the Soviet Union does, today, have an automobile industry and that the Soviet leadership wants to increase and update the production of automobiles in the Soviet Union.

It is also clear that the Soviet leadership seeks to enlarge this base without impairing Soviet military and space programs.

What is not so apparent and not so clear is just why the United States should at this time assist the Soviets in any way with their economic plans.

Our trade policies in this regard obviously can and do have a significant bearing on our national security and welfare. The House should, therefore, mount a special effort to look into and evaluate the implications of trade with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

This is a subject which relates closely to a number of areas of interest and jurisdiction from the point of view of our existing House committee structure. However, there is a need to create a means which can focus attention on and effectively embrace and represent all important aspects of the subject. For this reason, legislation has been introduced in the House, cosponsored by 120 Members of the House, to create a Select Committee on East-West Trade.

The committee would look into the impact of East-West trade on the productivity of nations which supply North Vietnam and other Communist nations with military, technical, economic or financial assistance, the extent of financial assistance given to nations supplying Hanoi and other Communist nations, and the effectiveness of U.S. laws and regulations on governing trade with such nations.

This legislation is pending before the House Rules Committee. As a cosponsor of the legislation, it was my privilege to appear before the Rules Committee on October 11 and 12 to testify in its behalf. The resolution on which hearings have been held is House Resolution 843.

As one who has long been interested in and concerned about what is occurring in the field of East-West trade, I respectfully solicit support for this legislation when it reaches the floor of the House of Representatives for consideration and vote. There is a pressing need for the study that would be authorized by House Resolution 843.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AT THE LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE LAIRD YOUTH LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP, WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY, STEVENS POINT, WIS., MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1967

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Education Day in central Wisconsin. It was my privilege to cosponsor with Wisconsin State University at Stevens Point an all-day conference of young people and school officials from every high school in my congressional district.

I was especially pleased that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, accepted my invitation to keynote Education Day in the Seventh Congressional District and to participate in the highly successful youth leadership workshop portion.

The Secretary's remarks were so pertinent to the occasion that I think they should be read by every Member of this body. Under unanimous consent, I include Secretary Gardner's remarks before the luncheon banquet of the youth leadership workshop in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, along with the program.

Mr. Speaker, Education Day in central Wisconsin is such a unique and rewarding undertaking that I would like to take a moment to acquaint my colleagues with it.

It is a two-part conference, cosponsored by Wisconsin State University and myself as the Representative from the Seventh Congressional District. There is an adult conference and a youth conference conducted simultaneously.

The youth conference, officially called the youth leadership workshop, is the highlight of Education Day.

At my invitation, two juniors and two seniors from each of the 63 high schools in our district were selected by student body action to attend the workshop.

Six discussion topics were established in six separate workshops for these students to discuss the top issues of our day with outstanding discussion leaders.

In addition to Secretary Gardner, for example, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mrs. Esther Peterson, conducted a workshop on "Career Opportunities in a Changing World," and Maj. Gen. Richard Stilwell, commanding general of the 1st Armored Division at Fort Hood, Tex., was the discussion leader for the workshop on "The Individual and Foreign-Military Policy." These top national leaders, together with the other resource leaders and moderators made Education Day the outstanding success it was.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the entire program for Education Day in central Wisconsin in the RECORD following the Secretary's address.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak too highly of Secretary Gardner's contribution to the success of Education Day. His remarks provided much food for thought for all who participated, and I feel they should be shared with my colleagues in this body.

His central point had to do with the problem in our society of attracting good young people into leadership roles in our society. To use the Secretary's words:

> Ask our brightest and best young men and women what careers they intend to follow. How many plan to run for office? How many plan to enter State or local government? How many into national affairs? Of 3106 National Merit Scholars selected during the first 4 years of the program, less than 2 percent of the boys and about 6 percent of the girls looked forward to careers in government service. A followup study of the same Scholars a few years later showed that even fewer retained an interest in government service, 1.7 percent of the boys and 1.5 percent of the girls.
>
> Now in our kind of society, government has no monopoly on leadership, so you might imagine that able young people such as these have in mind some of the other areas of vital leadership in our society. But they do not.
>
> They aren't particularly interested in being corporation presidents, or labor leaders or university presidents. They want to be professionals—unentangled, unencumbered, unbeleaguered, loyal only to their craft.
>
> Now I am all for professionals. They have created the modern world—but I don't hold that against them. They are a priceless asset to any society.
>
> But we also need a steady flow of extremely capable people into the decision-making roles of the society. And we aren't getting enough of them.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary's comments, as you can see, are well taken. They are not made often enough by public officials in leadership capacities especially when talking to young people who are still deciding what kind of career of pursue.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Gardner's remarks made a profound impression on the young high school leaders who attended Education Day, and I am pleased to call them to the attention of my colleagues.

The material referred to above follows:

SECRETARY GARDNER'S REMARKS AT THE YOUTH LEADERSHIP LUNCHEON

When Woodrow Wilson asserted that our purpose in entering World War I was "to make the world safe for democracy," Gilbert Chesterton commented "The world will never be safe for democracy. It's a dangerous trade."

He was right. The governing of a free society is a difficult and hazardous business—full of trouble and traps for the unwary.

Since the time of Wilson and Chesterton, the world has become very much more complex. The rate of change has increased enormously. Questions of public policy have become immensely technical and resistant to common sense analysis.

To suggest the scope and difficulty of the tasks facing us, let me run through very quickly what I conceive to be the agenda for your generation.

(1) First, the most pressing problem of your generation, as it was for my generation and my parents' generation, will be to build an enduring peace. If the Viet Nam war were to end tomorrow, that problem would remain.

The task is not to abolish tensions among nations, which is quite impossible, but to create procedures and institutional arrangements that will hold those tensions within safe bounds.

(2) I'm not going to attempt to list these problems in any order of importance, but since we began with peace, I shall list next the closely related problem of the *developing nations*. The combination of poverty and rising expectations that exists among half the world's population today is as volatile and threatening in its own way as the bomb.

(3) Third is the problem of *population control*. Throughout the world there is a growing awareness of the gravity of unbridled population growth. There are now about 3.3 billion people in the world. By the year 2000 there will be an estimated 7.5 billion, most of them hungry. And as Harrison Brown says, "Hungry people are combustible."

(4) The fourth item on my list is *equality of opportunity*. Today, racial discrimination is the chief barrier to equality of opportunity, and that is why it is unquestionably our number one domestic problem. But the racial front is not the only one on which

we are struggling to provide equal access to the benefits of American life. There are other massive barriers to individual fulfillment—poverty, illness, ignorance, physical and mental handicaps. Our goal today is breathtaking in scope, but easy to describe. We don't want *anyone* to be hurt or handicapped or shut out from the life of the society by circumstances that can be prevented.

(5) The fifth problem on my list is a corollary to the fourth. It is to create an *education system that will provide the maximum individual fulfillment* for each American. In the slums of our great cities today boys and girls who could easily be brought to the full use of their powers are left stunted, inarticulate and angry. We need an educational system that will lift them. We need schools that will nurture talent, that will awaken the spark of curiosity and eagerness to learn.

(6) Sixth, we must bring *new life to our cities*. Today our cities are plagued with every conceivable ill—apathy, crime, poverty, racial conflict, slum housing, polluted air and water, inferior schools and hospitals, and snarled transportation. We are going to have to do more than build bridges between the inner city and its opulent periphery. We need a totally new concept of metropolitan organization.

(7) Seventh is the problem of our *natural environment*. We can't avoid some alteration of the natural world we live in. But man, even industrial man, is a part of nature, and must find some limit to the headlong destruction and fouling of the natural environment. How much fouled air can we breathe? How much filth can we spew into our rivers and lakes? How much bleakness and ugliness can we tolerate?

(8) Eighth is the *problem of government*, the age-old problem of how best to organize ourselves to accomplish our shared purposes. We have indulged ourselves far too long in the luxury of supposing that everything in this country must change and develop except our governmental structure and processes.

(9) My ninth problem concerns *economic growth*. Since the Great Depression we have made impressive gains in stabilizing and managing the economy. Because of what we now know about the sources of economic growth we can envisage the elimination of poverty, the rebuilding of our cities, wise use of our natural resources and more imaginative use of human skills.

(10) The final item on my agenda is the *relationship of the individual to society*. All that we achieve must finally be measured in terms of its effect on the individual. We set out to create a free and just society in which the individual could flourish. But our highly organized society carries its own threats to individuality.

The threats need not materialize. We can't escape size and complexity in our organizations and institutions, but we can design them so that they serve the individual as well as the system. Our goal should be a society designed for people, and if we want it badly enough we can have it.

It seems to me that those are the problems that constitute the agenda for your generation.

Whether or not we solve those problems will determine our survival as a nation. And our chances of solving them will depend heavily on the quality of leadership that the institutions and communities and States of this Nation can provide in the years ahead.

And I must tell you that with respect to the emergence of leaders we face a considerable problem.

With all their extraordinary vision, the Founding Fathers failed to foresee one fairly central difficulty that this Nation would face. They did not see that leadership in a free society would not prove to be the only or even the chief magnet for good men. They did not see that with the rise of the professions a career ideal would emerge that would be far more attractive to our best young people than a career in public life or in any other leadership role.

Ask our brightest and best young men and women what careers they intend to follow. How many plan to run for office? How many plan to enter State or local government? How many into national affairs? Of 3106 National Merit Scholars selected during the first 4 years of the program, less than 2 percent of the boys and about 6 percent of the girls looked forward to careers in government service. A follow-up study of the same Scholars a few years later showed that even fewer retained an interest in government service, 1.7 percent of the boys and 1.5 percent of the girls.

Now in our kind of society, government has no monopoly on leadership, so you might imagine that able young people such as these have in mind some of the other areas of vital leadership in our society. But they do not.

They aren't particularly interested in being corporation presidents, or labor leaders or university presidents. They want to be professionals—unentangled, unencumbered, unbeleaguered, loyal only to their craft.

Now I am all for professionals. They have created the modern world—but I don't hold that against them. They are a priceless asset to any society.

But we also need a steady flow of extremely capable people into the decision-making roles of the society. And we aren't getting enough of them.

I believe that there are few facts in our national life more disturbing than that. Our society and our world have grown so complex, social change occurs at such a bewildering pace, and the sheer technical demands of leadership have mounted so swiftly that I think we're headed for disaster unless our ablest people take a hand in running the society.

We need them as leaders, not just as buttoned-up and buttoned-down professionals living secure and tidy lives. We need them as leaders in business and in education and in every other area of our national life—but most particularly we need them in public life.

We are producing the most educated, articulate and brilliant sidewalk superintendents the world has ever seen. We have a limitless supply of people with the intelligence and expertise to analyze the society's problems, but very, very few with the motivation and stamina to leap in and help solve them.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the gravity and complexity of some of the problems we face today. To solve them is going to require a great surge of citizen dedication.

It has always been hard to stir our people to significant social action except in periods of great crisis. I would have no hope of changing that national attribute. I would simply say that another of our historic moments of crisis is upon us.

During the years ahead, our society will need the lifelong attention and concern of its most highly educated young people. They must lend a hand.

And those who hope to change the world for the better will have to have the fortitude and the staying power essential to the long, difficult task of accomplishing social change. Making a bad world better is tough, grinding, never-ending work.

I have little sympathy with those who have impossibly high hopes for social betterment and then the next day are wallowing in disillusionment and self-pity because their high hopes weren't realized. Social change isn't that easy. Creating a better world isn't that easy. Life isn't that easy.

If enough of our young people are willing to commit themselves to a serious concern for the future of their society, then I have some hope for the years ahead. As some of you know, I have been keenly interested in what it is that makes nations decay. And as those of you who have read my book *Self-Renewal* know, the evidence convinces me that the decline of nations is not inevitable. As I said in the book if we go into a decline, we shall not be able to blame the inexorable forces of history. It will be an avoidable failure of the mind and heart and spirit of the American people. We now know beyond all doubt that nations die from within, and they are attacked less often by traitors within the gate than by traitors within the heart—complacency, apathy, cynicism, intolerance, self-deception and an unwillingness on the part of the individual to lend himself to any worthy common purpose.

Every morning and evening as I ride to and from work, I pass the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, and I often think of the men and events they commemorate. But as I look at the perfection of the monuments, I try to remember—and I ask you young people to remember—that this great Nation was conceived and designed by human beings, imperfect as you and I are imperfect; capable of mistakes, even as you and I; who were once young, as you are now; who were subject to weariness and doubt and confusion, as all of us are. But with all their human fallibility, they had the courage and heart to believe that man *might* create a free and just society. And that made all the difference.

It is easy to be cynical about that effort because no society anywhere or anytime has really been wholly free and just. But over the years and over the generations we have moved slowly and often painfully toward those goals. And we have done so because some people had the vision and the steadfastness to try to make an imperfect world better.

That is hard and not always glamorous work and it is never finished.

A nation is never finished. It has to be built and rebuilt. It has to be recreated in each generation by believing, caring men and women. It is now your turn.

The agenda for your generation—the list of tasks that must be undertaken if our nation is to survive, and if your world is to be a better world—is formidable. I hope that each of you will care enough to lend a hand.

EDUCATION DAY IN THE SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, OCTOBER 23, 1967

(Sponsored by Wisconsin State University, Stevens Point, and the Laird Youth Leadership Foundation; keynoter, John W. Gardner, U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

YOUTH LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

8:00–9:15: Registration. (Coffee and milk served in Frank Lloyd Wright Lounge for registrants.)

9:15: Opening session, Wisconsin Room of the University Center. Dr. Lee S. Dreyfus, President, WSU-Stevens Point, and Congressman Mel Laird, 7th Congressional District.

9:45: Workshops convene. Muir-Schurz Room: *The Individual and Foreign-Military Policy*. Its effect upon our nation and you. Major General Richard G. Stilwell, formerly Chief of Staff, U.S. Military Assistance Command in Vietnam. Currently, commanding general 1st Armored Division, Fort Hood, Texas.

Nicolet-Marquette Room: *The Individual and Career Opportunities in a Changing World* (Learning, earning, and yearning). Esther Peterson, U.S. Assistant Secretary of Labor.

General Billy Mitchell Room: *The Individual and Morality: Respect for Law and Order.* Father Stephen Boehrer, Chairman Religious Department, Holy Cross Seminary, La Crosse and Professor of Theology, Viterbo College, La Crosse.

Hamlin-Garland Room: *The Individual and the Equality of Man*. The Reverend Perry

Saito, Pastor, Lake Street Methodist Church, Eau Claire, and member of the Governor's Commission on Human Rights.

Charles Van Hise Room: *The Federal System: Who Governs Whom?* Dr. John Bibby, Assistant Professor Political Science, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

Frederick Jackson Turner Room: *Responsibilities of Business and Industry to Society.* Kenneth Haagensen, Executive Vice President, Wis. State Chamber of Commerce.

11:10: Reconvene in general session, Wisconsin Room. Summary reports by workshop moderators.

11:40: Open discussion, Wisconsin Room. Moderator, Congressman Mel Laird. Participants: Workshop resource leaders and students.

12:30: Luncheon, Allen Center. (Combined attendance everyone participating in both conferences.) Keynote address, John W. Gardner, U.S. Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare.

2:00: Afternoon Workshops Convene. Muir-Schurz Room: *The Individual and Foreign-Military Policy.*

Nicolet-Marquette Room: *The Individual and Career Opportunities in a Changing World.* (Learning, earning and yearning.)

General Billy Mitchell Room: *The Individual and Morality: Respect for Law and Order.*

Hamlin-Garland Room: *The Individual and the Equality of Man.*

Charles Van Hise Room: *The Federal System: Who Governs Whom?*

Frederick Jackson Turner Room: *Responsibilities of Business and Industry to Society.*

3:25: Reconvene general session in Wisconsin Room. Open discussion with John Gardner, all resource people, moderators, students participating. Moderator, Congressman Laird.

3:50: Final Summaries: Resource Leaders and Congressman Laird.

4:15: Presentations: Certificates to student participants.

5:00: Adjourn.

ADULT WORKSHOP

Education in central Wisconsin—Our students, their needs and government resources

12:30: Luncheon, the Allen Center, University Campus. Welcome by Dr. Lee S. Dreyfus, President, WSU-Stevens Point. Introduction of conference leaders by Congressman Mel Laird.

1:15: Keynote address. John Gardner. U.S. Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare.

2:00: Workshop session, Wisconsin Room, University Center. *The Village Center,* Dr. Lee S. Dreyfus, President, WSU, Stevens Point. *How the Regional Office Can Help You,* Dr. Peter Mousolite, Regional representative of U.S. Office of Education. *Educational Projections to 1984 in Central Wisconsin,* Leon Case, Coordinator, Educational Service, Agency No. 7.

2:40: Workshop session, Wisconsin Room. *Changes in the Elementary and Secondary Education Program.* B. Alden Lillywhite, Deputy Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education. *Changes in the Higher Education Program,* Dr. J. Wayne Reitz, Director Graduate Programs, Bureau of Higher Education.

3:25: General Session, Wisconsin Room. Reconvene with Youth Leadership Workshop participants. (Everyone is invited to join with the students and resource leaders for the discussion and summary of the Youth Workshop.)

STUDENTS ATTENDING

Paul Kinkhammer, Lou Ann Rueden, Fred Dauffenbach, Bob Maslanka, Abbotsford Senior High School.

Bill Broga, Jill Garringer, Darrell Renner, Elna C. Staples, Adams-Friendship High School.

Shirley Peterson, Michael Smart, Cindy Cooper, William H. Gilbert, Alexander High School, Neekoosa.

Bruce Koehn, John Mehne, Patricia J. Swan, Mary Kay Wysociki, Almond High School.

Daniel Glodowski, Timothy Harvey, Michael Patoka, Judy Wimme, Amherst High School.

Mary Blaskey, Mark J. Bradley, Danene Rabe, Charles Szmanda, Antigo Senior High School.

Beverly Bade, Gary F. Getzin, Thomas Thibodeau, Rosemarie Tosch, Assumption High School, Wisconsin Rapids.

Gayle Ann Punke, Roger Weiler, Gary Guralski, Rita Lesczynski, Athens High School.

Victor Karaliunas, Dawn Kolstad, Sue Ellen Grassl, Claudine Weber, Auburndale High School.

Cindy Beversdorf, Randy TenHaken, Elaine Bauch, Michael B. Knauf, Birnamwood High School.

Michael L. Lorge, Robert H. Stark, Gary J. Jansen, Robert L. Meyer, Blessed Sacrament Seminary.

Carol Krause, Tom Magee, Susan Kupsky, John Simon, Bonduel High School.

Gail M. Grosskopf, Jeanne Marquardt, Susan Bents, Robert Brei, Bowler High School.

Beverly Bate, Kenneth Eberhardt, Ann Kay Arvey, Terry L. Olson, Clintonville Senior High School.

Gene Reineking, James Staffeil, Barbara Meyer, Joyce Tesmer, Colby High School.

Stanley Charron, Thomas J. Schuetz, James Haselberger, Fritz Hastreiter, Columbus High School, Marshfield.

Peter J. Davison, Tom Tupper, John Halverson, Katherine S. Wilson, Crandon High School.

William Alexejun, Douglas W. Tietz, Robert Gibbs, JoAnne Webster, D. C. Everest Junior-Senior H. S., Schofield.

Barbara Burger, Nancy Ann King, Gary Fergot, David Joswiak, Edgar High School.

Sheldon Bergen, Linda Boettcher, Bonnie Froland, David Marquard, Elcho High School.

Kathleen Bruehl, William Olson, Mary Landry, David Nevaranta, Florence High School.

Cynthia Butek, Joe Pawlik, Jim Galarowicz, Josephine Sromek, Gilman High School.

Elaine Anderson, Colleen Angel, John Hillert, Terrance Rand, Granton High School.

Jim Behrens, Warren A. Mondloch, Duane Jackson, Bill Toburen, Greenwood High School.

Ted Gjerston, Charles Koehler, John Bobbe, Bruce Meagher, Iola-Scandinavia High School.

John Cronkrite, Molly Killoren, Ronald W. Otto, Krista Van Engelen, John Edwards High School, Port Edwards.

Nancy Clark, James H. Weidner, Matthew Annis, Andrea Milak, Laona High School.

Lyle R. Helke, Susan Ann Hoffman, Thomas Molski, Marty Tuca, Lincoln High School, Wisconsin Rapids.

Kenneth Trnka, Randy Zimmerman, Randy Haslow, Paul L. Noeldner, Loyal High School.

Colleen Mary Casey, Scott A. Ploger, Marsha A. Lindsay, Michael R. Marcy, Manawa High School.

Kathryn R. Ross, Raymond Starzinski, Gary Ruplinger, Alvina Starzinski, Marthon High School.

Gail B. Gregor, Monica Soroka, Cindy Sorenson, Sheila M. Stark, Maria High School, Stevens Point.

Charles Anderson, Cristy Byers, Patricia Halpop, Katie McInnis, Marion High School.

Melaine Murray, Letha Wood, Katherine Custer, Mary Restall, Marshfield Senior High School.

Kathy Cashman, Joan Schmitt, Thomas A. Lindow, Paul Stenklyft, Medford High School.

Brian Jensen, Stuart A. Kraft, David Adams, Susan Schotz, Merrill Senior High School.

Neil Bandt, Rae Lynn Johnson, Paula Coddington, Richard Orienti, Montello High School.

Steve Jonas, Mary Liedtke, Goerge Knoedler, Beth Scholtens, Mosinee High School.

Mary Lou Olson, Howard Paulson, Victor Lutz, Marcy Van Gorden, Neillsville High School.

Patricia Lynett, Patrick K. Riley, Gregory Laska, Anne Vander Wall, Newman High School, Wausau.

Linda Hildebrand, Kathi Otis, Randy Judd, Therese McLaughlin, New London Senior High School.

Maxine Albrecht, Pam Hodgson, Our Lady of the Holy Cross H. S., Merrill.

Steve Johnson, Kay P. Klabon, Kris Lee Arneson, Allen Beck, Owen-Withee High School.

Brian Eagon, Rick Hurlbut, John A. Lehman, Carl Yambert, P. J. Jacobs High School, Stevens Point.

Wayne Bushman, Larry Cundari, Bob Breitenstein, Wayne Kostroski, Pacelli High School, Stevens Point.

Jake Emmerick, Janice Jagielo, Bjorne S. Jensen, Steve Miner, Pittsville High School.

Richard Reichert, David Rhody, Karen Niggemann, Randy Powers, Rib Lake High School.

Barbara Sommers, Mike Wanserski, Ralph Laska, Cindy Larson, Rosholt High School.

Linda Kriewaldt, Kurt Kroenke, Jean Raddant, Greg Zeoske, Shawano Senior High School.

Bruce Michael Cook, Patrick Staege, M. Constance Carpenter, Francis E. Manina, Spencer High School.

Susan Franckowiak, Kirk Klemme, David Gliniecki, Myra J. Meissner, Stratford High School.

Mark Ahles, Douglas Woodworth, Gwen Ellyn Anderson, Debbie Haas, Thorp High School.

Barbara Breitenfeldt, Harvey W. Kriegel, Jr., Anna Hirt, John Laatsch, Tigerton High School.

Cynthia Fischer, Kathleen Sweeney, John Drew, Robert Steigerwaldt, Tomahawk High School.

Dale Reid, Sherry Renner, Lenny Palek, Debbie Warner, Tri-County Area High School, Plainfield.

Ted Bartels, Joan Neuenfeldt, Marilyn Neddo, George Scheenzer, Wabeno High School.

Sue Holly, Eric Peterson, Kathleen McGinnis, Lee Morey, Waupaca High School.

Anthony S. Albright, Stephen Schaller, Evan Jay Cutting, Eric Wuennenberg, Wausau Senior High School.

Tom Pearson, Cheryl Schwebel, Pat Henne, Donald Nowak, Wautoma High School.

Marcia Rumann, John Schreiber, Charlene Quinn, Westfield High School.

Tom Hartfield, Ann Hutchison, James Nolan, Janice Wendt, Weyauwega High School.

William Conn, Myron D. Heistad, Colleen Peters, Susan J. Robinson, White Lake High School.

Jim Osypowski, Steve Shoemaker, Sally Graves, Linda Linke, Wittenberg High School.

FRAUDULENT STOCK SALES BY OHIO FARM BUREAU COOPERATIVES

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, writing about a brilliant con game, O. Henry once said:

> It was beautiful and simple as all truly great swindles are.

O. Henry might well have been writing about the Farm Bureau's activities in the State of Ohio—activities, by the way, to which the attorney general of that State has given his fatherly blessing.

Several days ago, I introduced an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer describing how the Tuscarawas County Farm Bureau Cooperative Association established an egg producing business which promptly moved into the market and undersold its own members, driving many of them out of business.

As swindles go, it was not a bad effort at all. But for sheer "beauty" and "simplicity," not to mention the necessary touches of tragedy and heartache, it does not hold a candle to the activities of the Holmes County and Portage County Farm Bureau Cooperatives in the Buckeye State. These groups have developed a ruthlessly simple and direct method of making money. Taking advantage of the phony "Snow White" image they have carefully built up over the years, they sell unregistered, worthless stock to helpless and unsuspecting farmers. The farmers buy it without even seeing a prospectus or financial statement, in the innocent belief that it is a safe, conservative investment. The stock is sold with the promise that the Farm Bureau Cooperative will redeem it at any time upon 30 days notice. But the promise, given verbally, is forgotten immediately. The stock is not redeemed in 30 days. It is not redeemed in 30 months. From all present indications, it will not be redeemed in 30 years, despite great financial hardship and personal anguish being suffered by the owners of the stock.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer, in the greatest tradition of crusading, responsible American journalism, has put the spotlight on these criminal acts. It has very recently written in depth about the circumstances and consequences of two such fraudulent sales—sales made to poor, hard-working farm families who sunk all they had into this worthless stock, and who now live on the grim edge of poverty because their stock certificates cannot be redeemed, sold, traded, or used as collateral, and which does not even draw dividends.

Both articles tell essentially the same story of calculating deception on one side, and despair and desperation on the other. In both cases, the stock is now owned by women who must make their own way in the world, and who have nowhere to turn for help. The Farm Bureau Cooperatives which sold them the stock have turned their backs on them and have made it clear that they feel no responsibility toward the purchasers of this stock. I have personally checked these stories out, and have verified their accuracy.

These stories are simply one more variation in the Farm Bureau's favorite game, "farming the American farmer." Under unanimous consent, I respectfully include these articles in the RECORD so that they can be brought to the attention of all the American people:

[From the Plain Dealer, Oct. 12, 1967]

WOMAN IN NEED CAN'T SELL CO-OP STOCK

(By Richard C. Bixler)

KENT.—Mrs. Helen Dingeldein used $1,000 she inherited from her mother's estate to buy preferred stock in the Portage County Farm Bureau Co-operative Association, Inc., in 1949 and 1950.

Soon after, she was left alone to rear two sons and try to provide a good education for them with a scanty income. She said she could have used the $1,000. She tried to redeem the stock at the co-op and to sell it to others. To this day, she has been unable to redeem or sell it.

Operations of farm bureau co-ops in Ohio presently are being investigated by U.S. Rep. Joseph Y. Resnick, D-N.Y., who has criticized some of their practices as a "con game."

Farm Bureau officials in several counties have told The Plain Dealer they regret being unable to redeem patronage dividends issued to members instead of cash earnings.

"These farmers are really not out of pocket on anything," one farm bureau official said. "They didn't put anything into the stock. They just didn't get the cash dividends it represents, but maybe one of these days they will."

Mrs. Dingeldein's situation is different.

She did pay cash to buy her stock.

She is out of pocket money she has needed many years.

She now has written to The Plain Dealer, seeking help after all else has failed.

Mrs. Dingeldein lives in a large rooming house here at 227 E. Summit Street. The house is owned by her oldest son, who provides rented rooms for Kent State University students.

She and her sister, Miss Anna Mudrick, live in a small apartment on the ground floor which "we get at a reduced rate for helping look after the house," Mrs. Dingeldein said.

"My husband and the boys and I lived on a small, 25-acre farm when I bought the stock. We bought a little feed from the farm bureau and when I inherited the money, the salesman who sold us the feed convinced me it would be a good investment.

"The first two or three years it paid a small dividend. After that we didn't get anything from it.

My husband left us. I got a divorce. I got a job but it was hard to make enough money to get along. I especially wanted to get the money back when the boys were in college, but I kept getting the runaround from the people in the office at Ravenna."

Mrs. Dingeldein has four certificates. The first is dated April 26, 1949, and is for 16 shares of preferred stock with par value of $25 per share. The others are for eight each of the same shares and are dated Nov. 17, 1949; March 24, 1950, and July 13, 1950.

They are issued in the names of Mrs. Helen Dingeldein and Miss Anna Mudrick, who both said has worked to help support Mrs. Dingeldein's sons, said she would want Mrs. Dingeldien to have the money if the stock could be sold or redeemed.

Mrs. Dingeldein said the last communication she had from the Ravenna Landmark office was a letter dated Nov. 19, 1963. It stated:

"Dear Mrs. Dingeldein: In regards your letter asking for a record showing that you did not receive dividends from your stock.

"There has been no dividends paid on this stock for a few years back; and there is no net worth at present time on county stock. Hoping this answers your question, if any other please feel free to call.

"JOHN WESTERBECK,
"*Manager.*"

Mrs. Dingeldein is 52 She has been unable to find work for several years. She said:

"Any place you go they either want someone under 40 or someone with a college degree. I just can't find anything and the boys have their hands full supporting themselves."

Earl Villers, of Edinburg in southeastern Portage County, is serving his fifth year as president of the co-op's board of directors.

Villers said the co-op in Portage County, like many others, has a history of many losing years. Stock value had gone far below net worth and even though the co-op has made money the last few years it will be several more before the stock regains its original value, he said.

"It is true. There have been cases of real hardship and these are unfortunate," Villers said.

"Preferred stock should be worth at least its par value and the owner should be able to trade it the same as any other corporation stock on the stock market. But because of the bad years the value has dropped to nothing.

"In a private corporation this would never have been allowed to happen. After two or three losing years, the directors would have been forced to close down, sell out or merge with another company."

Villers continued:

"But our directors kept operating in the red, hoping the next year would be better. The same laws do not apply to co-ops that govern private corporations.

"Our stockholders not only didn't get dividends but they were unable to sell or redeem their stocks. We can't redeem it because the law forbids it as long as its worth is less than par value."

[From the Plain Dealer, Oct. 19, 1967]

WOMAN MAY HAVE TO SELL HOME DESPITE CO-OP STOCK

(By Richard C. Bixler)

NASHVILLE, OHIO.—Gladys Reed, 67, says she will soon have to sell her family home here in this Holmes County Village unless she is somehow able to recover her life savings of $5,000 tied up in stock of the county farm bureau.

U.S. Rep. Joseph Y. Resnick, D-N.Y., is checking Miss Reed's complaint against the county farm bureau in connection with his one-man investigation of U.S. farm co-ops and those in Ohio.

Miss Reed said she took her savings out of a local bank when a farm bureau stock salesman assured her the money would earn higher interest and would be readily available should she need it.

"During the depression," Miss Reed said, "my dad had to let his insurance lapse. I knew if he or mother ever got sick, it would fall to me to pay the bills.

"I worked as a domestic and at factory jobs in Akron and Shreve, and saved as much as I could."

Miss Reed's father was an interior decorator. Her family never had anything to do with farming or the farm bureau. But they were well acquainted with the manager of the Holmes County Farm Bureau Cooperative Association, Inc.

"He worked on my folks and then on weekends he'd talk to me trying to get me to buy this stock," she said. "He kept telling me that the bank was only paying 1½% or 2% interest and he could guarantee me 4% in dividends."

"I told him I wouldn't be interested because if anyone got sick, I wanted to be able to draw out money right away. He said he would guarantee me I could get all my money any time after 30 days' notice."

Miss Reed holds certificates that show she purchased stock in $1,000 lots in 1950, 1951, twice in 1952, and 1957.

Her records show she received dividends of about 4% a year through December, 1960, but none since then. She paid federal income tax of about 20% on each dividend, and personal property tax of $10 a year on the stock several years after it ceased paying dividends, leaving her with net gain of no more and maybe less than bank interest would have amounted to, she figures.

"In March, 1961, Dad got sick," she recalled, "and I went to the Farm Bureau office to redeem some of the stock," she related. "The manager was no longer there and the new manager said he would have to check with the directors. Later, they told me they were sorry, but they couldn't redeem it.

"Dad died in June, 1961, and there was a large funeral bill to pay. I asked them again to redeem some stock and they again said they were sorry but they couldn't do it.

"Then, in 1962, mother broke both hips and someone had to be with her all the time. If I had been able to get that farm bureau stock money I could have hired help. But at what I was making it would have taken all my pay to hire someone. The farm bureau again refused to help me.

"I had to quit work and take early retirement on Social Security at age 62, at a 20% cut below what I would have got at age 65. I wouldn't have lost that if I could have cashed in my stock, either."

Miss Reed's mother died in 1964, leaving another funeral bill to be paid. She tried again to redeem farm bureau stock and said she received "the same tired answer 'we're sorry but . . .'" She said she could probably live the rest of her life in the nine-room home if she could get back her $5,000.

Miss Reed had consulted Loudonville lawyer Donald Nash on other legal matters over the years. She recently asked his advice on her stock redemption problem. Nash wrote and talked to local co-op officials.

Nash said he was told "that the co-op was in financial trouble and that its debts and liabilities amounted to more than its net worth, thusly the stock presently has no value."

Last month Nash wrote a letter to the co-op in which he complained about Miss Reed's inability to get cash for her stock. He questioned the co-op's action in selling the last $1,000 worth of stock in 1957 when the co-op's annual report showed operating losses of $286.

Nash said he believed it might have been illegal to sell stock and guarantee redemption in 30 days when the business was operating at a loss and couldn't even pay debts it already owed.

A 10-year statement issued in 1964 showed the co-op lost money every year from 1957 on, with total losses through 1964 of more than $150,000.

In the Sept. 7 letter, Nash also stated he planned to offer help to Mrs. Norma Williams, of Nova (northern Ashland County) who has been unable to redeem patronage dividend stock. Mrs. Williams was among the first to write Congress about questionable practices of the Farm Bureau.

In answer to his letter to the Holmes County co-op, Nash received a letter from the law firm of Howard Dresbach & George W. Morrison of Columbus. It said, in part:

"There is no similarity between your client's problem and that of Mrs. Williams. Your offer to help Mrs. Williams is a questionable practice and you would be well advised to refrain from doing what you suggest in your letter of Sept. 1, 1967."

Nash said: "If this is not an outright threat, then it is certainly a matter of them questioning my integrity. The implication is that I'm soliciting business. I didn't intend to charge Mrs. Williams a nickel for anything I might be able to do for her. There is no Legal Aid Society in Ashland County to handle cases for people who do not have sufficient funds to hire a lawyer, in civil matters.

"But as an officer of the courts, I have an obligation to help these people and that's exactly what I'm doing. I'm not charging Miss Reed, either, if it matters."

SELF-HELPING HOUSING

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, nearly half of all the substandard housing in this country can be found in our rural areas, where only a third of our total population resides. In the same rural areas, half of our Nation's poor families reside.

In the face of these grim facts, it might seem there is little hope to better the housing conditions in rural America—other than a massive housing subsidy program. Low-income families, rural or urban, just do not have the debt-repaying ability to finance new homes.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the Farmers Home Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is now developing a self-help housing program for low-income rural families that holds great promise for improved housing for many poor people.

In my own congressional district, a Farmers Home Administration-financed self-help housing project will soon be completed at Ellenville in Ulster County, N.Y., which will provide new housing for seven families—all of them with family incomes of less than $5,000 per year.

The project is being made possible by USDA-FHA loans to the seven families totaling $75,780 at 4 percent interest, which were used to buy building lots and materials from a local dealer, plus funds furnished by the Office of Economic Opportunity for the purchase of tools and to hire a skilled construction supervisor.

When completed, the families will have all-modern homes with monthly payments on loans that will average less than $50.

Today, most of the same families are paying more than this in rent for grossly inferior living space.

To build their homes, which are mostly in the three-bedroom, 1,000-square-foot category, the heads of the seven families work evenings and weekends in helping each other build the homes. They work together in a cooperative effort and they estimate the self-help effort saves them at least 25 percent of the cost of their homes.

In the few years, Mr. Speaker, during which the Farmers Home Administration has been experimenting with this self-help housing project, nearly 400 such homes have been built under the FHA program.

In addition to providing new and adequate housing for low-income rural people, the program has had another notable and beneficial effect. Many of the men have learned the fundamentals of the building trade and with additional experience have now become first-class carpenters with steady employment and incomes much greater than they had before.

I have high praise for the Farmers Home Administration for pioneering and experimenting in this program to bring better housing to rural people who could not afford it under the usual policies of the program.

And, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the seven wonderful families of Ellenville, for their enterprise, their fine cooperative efforts, and their sense of pride that truly makes this project possible.

ST. MARY OF NAZARETH HOSPITAL

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Sister Mary Edelburg Slomka is administrator of the St. Mary of Nazareth Hospital at 1120 North Leavitt, Chicago, Ill. This hospital is located in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent.

Sister Mary Edelburg is one of the outstanding hospital administrators in our city. She has done a remarkable job in purchasing new equipment so that St. Mary of Nazareth Hospital today has the finest medical equipment in every department and is efficiently meeting the needs and wants of the people of the Seventh District of Illinois.

All of us know if we are to provide the best medical facilities available to care for the health needs of the people of our Nation that our Government must establish a partnership with these hospitals and the communities which they serve in order to meet these health needs.

Sister Mary Edelburg has written an article on the organization of a department of government relations in a voluntary hospital as evidence of ongoing partnership. I am happy to insert excerpts from her article at this point in the Record because it will help all of us to better understand the problem of providing adequate health facilities for our communities:

INTRODUCTION

Many fear for the future of the voluntary hospital in the face of continued extension of Government financing of hospital construction and services. Thus, it is essential that a positive outlook be adopted to facilitate an orderly analysis and a non-disruptive evolution of trends which affect services, economics and organization of hospitals.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS

The increased complexity of hospitals, a larger number of programs that are Government-sponsored, economic, social and political pressures, the psychological and physical demands, the meeting of ethical standards—in short the gamut of environments exerting pressure and emphasis on the hospital complex—calls for more than a cursory review of the ecology of the hospital and its effects on the hospital.

ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

Hospitals long have worked cooperatively to control economic forces through sophisticated accounting, data processing, and more recently with advanced systems. Supply of services was always geared to public need and demand regardless of the economic status of the individual. Of recent date, the Medicare Program has focused attention to the economic aspects of hospital organization.

SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

The sociological program has been emphasized mainly through the various personnel management programs, group dynamic techniques in their approach to organized decision making systems, and the behavioral sciences in their effect on the "person" and the "other-oriented" methods. The influx of social welfare agencies resulted from the recent emphasis in education on sociology and its related sciences.

PSYCHOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

The psychological environment has been given specific attention through educational programs in which the "individual" patient, employee, or group needs were stressed and given concentrated attention, so stimulating as to create programs of psychological testing, guidance and counseling techniques, self-teaching and the like, all in an effort to satisfy needs of the person, to offer greater security and fulfillment.

ETHICAL ENVIRONMENT

Hospitals have traditionally based their services on high ethical code standards such as those promulgated by the Hippocratic Oath and the Florence Nightingale pledge. The origin of hospitals attests to the moral response to individual human needs. The professions themselves have developed criteria of membership with such high ethical standards that the preservation of these codes and standards has spelled the success of these provisions and contributed generously to the dignity in care of the patient and the public.

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

In their development, hospitals have emphasized the physical environment as conducive to good patient care, with the restorative and rehabilitative powers of such are basic.

POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT

When considering the political for sake of political environment, there appears to be a deficiency in portraying demonstrably the hospital's position in relationship to the political world. The recent Government intervention in health care itself and its various aspects, with Medicare itself being the most prominent factor affecting all hospitals across the board, indicates that hospitals are for the first time facing the fact of the political environment. The impact of this fact calls for immediate action. The effect of Government intervention is far and wide and will be sensed throughout the hospital field to the extent that every service will be affected by it. However, it is obvious that as long as passivity will be assumed by hospitals, governmental control will be imposed to a far greater extent. The only logical course of action that appears to be valid is that of hospital initiative by positive and cooperative association with government. The concept of association indicates some type of correlation based on equality of prerogatives. It indicates equality in rights and obligations, regardless of the role of either, complementary, supportive or otherwise. Each must sense and fulfill responsibility of obligation. Each must assure control over an area of responsibility and activity. It will be contrary to the law of partnership to exercise control over activities that do not fall within the realm of action, perfomance or responsibility. Hence, to combat Government control over the quality of service, the hospital must exert efforts to initiate the programs that spell high quality. If the economics of such a program are beyond the reach of the institutional capacity, then governmental subsidy is required, but only after both the hospital and the Government set the standards of quality. Likewise, the extent of Government subsidy and controls over economic support and expenditures should be cooperatively defined and realistically controlled by methods cooperatively predetermined.

If the hospital retains the role of provider of services, it must retain the responsibility for determinations of that service. If Government retains the role of associate in the provision of health, it, too, must be participative in rendering such services to hospitals that are supplementary and or complementary of that service rather than usurp total control. The hospital and the Government together can determine what the care will be and how the care will be provided. Private enterprise cannot be squelched. It should be encouraged to effect public welfare. Defining the role of the Government and the role of the hospital in the association must allow for the mutual success of the program in behalf of public interest without the need for disengaging either the hospital or the Government from the health program and likewise without having over-riding controls for one over the other. It is hoped that a simple resolution to a complex problem is in the offing.

TOWARD THE SOLUTION

Kenneth Williamson of the American Hospital Association recently stated that "the partnership will succeed only if the voluntary field recognizes its potential; is determined to meet the needs; is willing to change, and puts forth every ounce of effort as a responsible leader, as a firm advocate of the wisdom of voluntary effort, and maintains a staunch and constant role as a defender of individual thought and opinion."

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

If partnership is the solution to governmental participation in health programs, what are the proposals that need be examined. Solutions may be complex or simple:

1. The possibility of the Government permitting hospitals to continue in their services to the public on a voluntary basis without Government intervention.

2. The possibility of hospitals becoming "servants" of the Government and under Government leadership and control with hospitals under one governmental authoritative body.

3. Hospitals, on a local basis, possibly joining hands with the Government, each providing complementary services, in mutual association servicing the health needs as well as economic needs of the public.

Such may result through an organized program of governmental relations constituted in a department such as public relations.

Alternative 1 is not the solution because hospitals have attempted to continue their services on a basis that would be public-satisfying. However, the needs of the indigent groups were not met because of such person's lack of ability to pay for services necessary. The needs of the indigent group were cyclically affected because of economic status. Usual health environmental needs were not provided for and increased illness incidences resulted, increased frequency of hospitalization was required, increased demands for money to provide for medical needs was necessary, no money was available, public taxation doubled, and public solicitation for assistance to satisfy needs of indigent tripled the burden of the public. In final analysis, this alternative provided no solution to health care provision. Supportive assistance was necessary, adequate assistance which could not be borne by the hospital if continued services were to be rendered, and improvements in care facilities, requiring a heavy outlay of capital and labor, made. Hospitals cannot afford to go it alone.

Alternative 2 is not a choice because it interferes with the American way of life which encourages free enterprise. The public sets the standards of health care to a great extent. It also realizes that such standards must be achieved. If a hospital cannot attain and maintain standards the public demands, the Government is forced to edge its way in and to assume responsibility of such care in terms of public welfare. However, if total health care is Government provided, the Government will set standards, it will indicate the limits of such care, and hence the voice of the public will be lessened, power and governmental control will become imposed on the public and voluntariness and democracy will disappear.

Alternative 3: Hospitals and the Government can develop an association that will provide a program of health for the public that is:

1. In the interest of the public.
2. Provided voluntarily.
3. Supported by the Government in areas that neither the Government nor the hospital can function alone.

To implement a solution as proposed under alternative #3, it is recommended that a hospital department of Government Relations be established that will in a positive manner emphasize the cooperative relations that exist in the hospital with government sponsored agencies, that will provide recognition to the promotions of governmental good will, that will engender understanding of hospital problems.

Analysis of solution on environmental theory basis

There is evidence found to support a belief that changing environment plays a significant role in corporate growth. It provides the opportunities on which institutions are able to capitalize. Institutional growth seldom occurs without the helping stimulus of environmental change. Once the environmental stimulus is present, management is the intermediary link able to translate potential into actual growth in these ways:

1. Proper timing of action in response to stimulus.
2. Effective long range strategy.
3. Courage and willingness to shift to service fields of greater potential.

The result of unawareness of changes in Government policy as it relates to health care can lead to crisis management. Hospitals cannot panic for such panic would be at public expense.

The diagram in Exhibit 1, shows the process of growth designed as a method to illustrate the relationship of environmental change to institutional growth and to demonstrate the critical importance of the timing of strategic institutional planning.

The importance of the services of a hospital as a determinant of growth is great. However, it is vital that sufficient emphasis be given to the institution's outlook on what might happen in its environment in contrast to what is happening. Thus, management must recognize institutional potential, must work energetically and courageously to plan growth by recognizing opportunities that will yield service to the public, and must have a willingness to commit corporate destiny to this conviction.

1. Management must be *aware* of potential for change and have an open mind and willingness to acknowledge that future many and will be different from present.

2. Management must *identify* changes with an organized program of monitoring present and potential changes, together with a method for identifying opportunities.

3. Management must *determine* which opportunities or threats are inherent in the changes that fit the hospital's capabilities and goals. It must have the inventive ability necessary to translate potential trends into tangible services.

4. Management must *develop* and *implement* a strategic long range plan to capitalize on the opportunity to avoid such threats.

In order to plan for change caused by governmental intervention in health services, a Department of Government Relations is recommended which should be included in hospital organization chart.

In the past, legislators have been hopeful that voluntary hospitals would provide the leadership and plan for government's essential role in health care. It is suggested in the discussion, that hospitals seize in a last attempt the opportunity to recoup the position that could have been theirs. This can be achieved through a cooperative venture of hospitals with government. On the practical level, this requires the establishment of a Department of Government Relations to give evidence of such willingness. What is recommended in this presentation is only a basis for the reestablishment of such a relationship. The future will relate to what added extent the hospital's role can be better expressed in fulfilling community health needs in partnership with government.

INFLATION IS THE WORST KIND OF TAXATION

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed, as I am sure most of our colleagues are, over the tax and spending impasse that now exists between the Congress and the administration. I fear that if this deadlock continues we will seriously endanger the economy by our failure to act upon the most important issue now pending before Congress: The President's proposal for a temporary 10-percent surcharge for individual and corporate taxpayers.

I regret very much that this pressing issue is no longer being considered by the Ways and Means Committee. Although I recognize the need for extended, exhaustive deliberations on the vital question of whether taxes should be increased, I am of the opinion that the dialog between the administration and the Ways and Means Committee should not have been halted.

I recognize, as well as anyone else, the need for economy in Government. With the growing deficit, I am in complete agreement with advocates of spending cuts. But I do not believe that the question of economy in Government is the same question of whether Congress should increase taxes.

Let me say at the outset that I am disturbed that Members of Congress should suggest that the President make the spending cuts. It has always been the constitutional prerogative of the Congress to control expenditures, and the attempt by some Members of this body to "pass the buck" to the President sets a dangerous precedent. The Constitution is quite definite about where the power over expenditures reside. Article I, section 9, states:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

This constitutional perogative should be jealously guarded by the Congress. This perogative should not be transferred to any President—for any reason.

As I see it, Congress has been given the power to stop, start, or reduce any program recommended by the President—either when the authorization of the program is being considered, or before or after it is proposed to spend the money in the form of an appropriations bill.

Therefore, the real issue at this juncture over spending cuts, I submit, is not whether Congress or the President makes the reductions. It is rather whether the Congress will properly and promptly assume its obligation and responsibility to do the job.

The distinctive feature of the congressional phase of the budget process in this country, as we all know, is that expenditures and taxes are considered separately and are the concern of different committees. The job of the Ways and Means Committee is to recommend to us, the Members of the House, the important question of whether and how much taxes should be raised or lowered to meet the Nation's revenue needs. And the equally important job of recommending to us the level of Government expenditures is that of the Appropriations Committee. In both cases, it is then up to us in this House to make the ultimate determination.

I have the highest regard and respect for the chairman and members of the House Ways and Means Committee. It is a proud and independent panel, and rightly so, for it has earned the respect of the Nation for more than a century of initiating tax policy.

However, I do believe that the question of economy in Government is not the same question of whether taxes or revenues should be increased. Admittedly revenues and expenditures are very closely linked. Once the Congress has acted and the money lawfully appropriated, the Ways and Means Committee has no right to veto the expenditures. Only the full Congress may do that.

I do not believe that the tax writing or the appropriations committee should try to determine policy in the other's area of jurisdiction. Such action could potentially stymie the will of the majority of the Members of this House.

Admittedly, criticism in recent years from various quarters has beben leveled at the fact that this division of responsibilities allows no consideration of the administration's revenue and expenditure budget as a unified proposal. The critics may be absolutely correct.

Nevertheless, a division exists between the House Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee on revenue and expenditure matters under House rules. If these rules are in need of a change, then let us entertain a motion to change them. Otherwise, it would seem to me that we must seek a better arrangement that assures greater harmony in the jurisdictional operations of these two great committees so that each can fulfill its own obligations and its own responsibilities.

Why am I today speaking in favor of resolving the spending and tax impasse and resuming consideration of the needed 10-percent surcharge proposal? Let me say that I feel compelled to speak out because of my abiding concern for the health of our economy, which, to be sure, all Members of Congress share.

It has been made abundantly clear from the President's August 3 tax message and from congressional testimony that the Nation cannot cope with the size of the deficit now in prospect, largely because of Vietnam costs, unless taxes are increased. Without higher taxes, the health of our economy—and the economic health of the citizens of every State in the Nation—will be seriously impaired. Inflation will result, eroding the living standards of many, and robbing those on fixed and falling incomes. Interest rates also will rise, making credit purchases, whether for consumer goods, cars, or homes, much more costly.

Another problem which will confront us without a tax increase is, undoubtedly, a worsening in our balance of payments, the excess of dollars spent abroad over dollars earned here. Our international balance of payments has been in deficit since 1953. Inflation that would result without a surcharge would cripple efforts to correct the payments deficit. It would add to the price of our exports, and make cheaper imports more attractive, thus aggravating our payments picture.

There is no question that passage of a tax bill will make a big difference in the economic life of this country, domestically, internationally, and in terms of the average American's pocketbook. The surcharge, in short, will cost him less in the long run than rising prices and interest rates which are in prospect without the small, additional, temporary tax.

To illustrate, let us examine what the surcharge, inflation, and higher interest rates mean in terms of the pocketbook of an average American family with two children and an income of $7,500. This family for 1966 paid an income tax of about $686 a year. The surtax proposal in 1968, during its first full year, would add $70 to their tax bill, or about $5.83 per month. Let us now examine what the cost will be to this average family if there is a jump in consumer prices because of the inflation which will come about if a tax surcharge is not enacted into law. Last year, prices, as measured by the Labor Department's consumer price index, rose 3.3 percent, up from 1965's increase of 1.7 percent. Many economists believe that year-to-year jump will be nothing compared with what might happen without the surcharge. Economists have estimated that the upsurge in prices next year might be 5 percent or more.

To be on the conservative side, let us assume that the prices next year rise 4 percent more than they otherwise would have. This will mean that $100 of consumer purchases—food, clothes, and appliances, will cost $104. If our average family spends one-third of its $7,500 income, or some $2,500 for purchases of consumers goods, it would cost them

$2,600 with the 4 percent increase in prices. This means an additional monthly cost to our average family of $8.33, compared with the added cost I referred to earlier of $5.83 per month which would result from the surcharge. This is but one clear-cut example of how an average family would be better off with the surcharge than with inflation. In fact, the surcharge would save the family money—about $30 a year—if you compare the total yearly cost of the surcharge with the cost of inflationary price increases.

Another good example of why our average family would be better off with the surcharge than without it can be illustrated if they were to buy a new home. As I stated before, heavy borrowings by Government to finance the estimated $29 billion budget deficit would drive interest rates up for the prospective buyer of a new home, automobile, a major appliance, or wherever credit may be used for a purchase. Here is what would happen in the case of our average family's purchase of a new home costing $20,000. Let us assume that they make a down payment in cash of 10 percent, or $2,000, and get a first mortgage of $18,000 for 30 years in duration. The average interest rate now for a home mortgage is about 6.5 percent, which would amount to $113.77 in monthly payments of principal and interest. If the tax proposal is not enacted into law, the resulting upward pressures on interest rates could drive mortgage rates up 1 or 1.5 percent, perhaps even more. Under such circumstances, our average family would find that a 7½-percent interest rate would cost them $125.86 in monthly payments of principal and interest, or $132.08 in such costs if the rate went to 8 percent. It is clear to see from this that our average family could be paying anywhere from $12.09 to $18.31 per month more for their new $20,000 house than they would have been with the surcharge. As I mentioned before, the increased cost to the family from the surcharge would be only about $5.83 per month.

When the increased cost which would be incurred by the purchase of the new house is combined with the increased cost of consumers goods which our average family would have to bear, the cost of inflation, which the proposed surcharge would curb, becomes even more dramatic. The combined cost of higher prices and higher home mortgage interest rates—a 7½-percent rate—would be $20.42 per month, nearly four times as much as the $5.83 per month surcharge our average family would have to pay. The total yearly cost would be $245.04, as contrasted to the $70 surcharge.

In other words, the economists tell us that without the surcharge our average family will be forced to spend approximately $175 more next year as a direct result of inflation and higher interest rates. In this light, the additional surcharge of $70 becomes a very small price to pay to ward off even more costly inflation and high interest rates. Thus, I can only conclude that the only prudent act for the Congress to take is to enact the President's surcharge proposal forthwith. The surcharge is in the best interest of the Nation's economy, and perhaps more important, it is in the best interests of our constitutents who are the consumers and who are the families who will be purchasing homes in the coming year.

The impact is even greater on the family paying no income tax or so little that there will be little or no increase in taxes until the surtax is enacted. Without the surtax paid by those who can afford it, every family will be taxed with the increased cost of family necessities caused by the inflation which must be curbed.

OUR VANISHING CONSTITUTION

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Baring] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the Record the following article by Noble George W. Nilsson, 33°, K.T., which appeared in a recent issue of the Al Malaikahan. In these days of demonstrations and the hue and cry of "our rights" by various groups, I feel that it is time we take stock and see just what has happened to our rapidly vanishing Constitution.

I commend to my colleagues, and to all readers of the Record, the following article:

Our Vanishing Constitution

(By Noble George W. Nilsson, 33°, K.T.)

A few days ago, on July 4th, we celebrated the 191st Anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. That document is the introduction to, and contains some of the fundamental principles upon which our Constitution is based. It should be studied very carefully, because many of the evil charges against George III in the Declaration of Independence are still with us.

The Declaration of Independence in five places refers to "Deity." It cannot be too often emphasized that the foundations of our Constitution and Republic are a belief in a Creator (GOD); individual liberty and local self-government.

Thomas Jefferson said:

"The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time. Can the liberty of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God?"

In a few days, on September 17th, we will celebrate the 180th Anniversary of the completion and signing of that document, which was adopted by the people in 1788.

How long has it been since you have read and studied that document? It is important that you do so NOW if we are to keep its principles. We may keep the form of the Constitution with our individual rights obliterated.

As the text for this essay, I quote from the funeral oration delivered by Pericles, the Athenian orator and statesman, in the year 430 B.C., for the young Athenians who had died during the first Peloponnesian War:

"I would have you day by day fix your eyes upon the greatness of your country until you become filled with the love of her; and, when you are impressed by the spectacle of her glory, reflect that it has been acquired by men who knew their duty and had the courage to do it."

What are you doing to ". . . preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of The United States"?

I. CONDITIONS DURING 1775 TO 1791

Have you thought about conditions on July 4, 1776? No roads; no electric lights; no automobiles. Everything was primitive according to present standards, but—

The people believed in fundamental principles, and had convictions, so they fought for those principles.

At the time of the American War for Independence and the adoption of our Constitution there were 13 States along the Atlantic seaboard; with a population of approximately 3 millions.

You remember that the Declaration of Independence was written after the War for Independence started at the battle of Lexington and Concord in 1775. Brother George Washington was given command the same year.

The war lasted eight years, from 1775 to 1783. Defeat after defeat, and such disheartening experiences as the winter at Valley Forge.

1783 to 1787 was a critical period; quarrels between States; rebellion; chaos; almost anarchy.

The Constitution was signed September 17, 1787. It was adopted in 1788, and the Government began to function March 4, 1789.

The Bill of Rights, the first 10 Amendments, became effective December 15, 1791.

Note this carefully: In spite of war, numerous emergencies and the many problems confronting them, the people of the United States in 1787 and 1788 still feared a central government which might become too strong, and therefore they placed in the Constitution a great many checks and balances, and granted only limited power to the central government. They would not ratify the Constitution until guaranteed a Bill of Rights.

In contrast to the sixteen years, 1775 to 1791, now there are 50 States; our population is more than 190 million people.

Since the citizens of the 13 original States, in spite of war and chaos, insisted that their Constitution contain checks, balances, constitutional limitations and a Bill of Rights, surely with such a great multitude of Americans citizens in our day, with wealth and every material facility and luxury, "We, the People" should have the integrity and courage to insist that these checks, balances and constitutional limitations be maintained, and that they not be destroyed or diminished by the centralization of power in Washington.

Thomas Jefferson warned what well might happen if we fail. He said:

"Our peculiar security is in the possession of a written Constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction.

* * * * *

"To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specifically drawn around the powers of Congress, is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition."

II. THE MEANING OF THE CONSTITUTION

The Constitution of the United States was hammered out in a convention as a result of more than three (3) months of debate by a group of statesmen who have been considered the finest group that ever met at one time. They knew exactly what each word meant that was put into the Constitution.

Later the document was submitted to the people of the 13 States for ratification. Again the document was argued thoroughly in each of the States over a period of months. In order to secure ratification, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and to some extent, John Jay, during the year 1788 wrote 85 essays which have been gathered together in a book entitled "The Federalist Papers." These essays thoroughly explain the Constitution, and we might say, were the advertisements which sold the Constitution to the people of the United States.

Under these circumstances, how can any sound American contend that today the Constitution should have a meaning different from the clear language of the Constitution?

Is any present member of the Supreme Court of the United States equal to any of the members of the Constitutional Convention, so as to permit him to decide that he knows better what the Constitution means than men who were in the Convention and helped to write the Constitution?

Were all the lawyers, judges and statesmen who had anything to do with the Constitution for more than 150 years less learned than the modern lawyers, judges and statesmen who have been "revising" the meaning of the Constitution for some years?

The Constitution is a statement of principles. Principles do not change, even though the affairs or events to which they apply may have changed. In other words, the Constitution should be read as written. If any explanation is needed turn to the Federalist Papers, written at the time of debate, by those who helped to prepare and ratify it.

III. CHECKS AND BALANCES

The members to the Constitution Convention of 1787 wrote into the Constitution checks and balances and division of powers with the object that there should be no centralization of power and that no dictator could ever take over.

Only limited power was granted to the Federal Government. This is clearly explained in the Federalist Papers. See especially Paper No. 45 where James Madison says:

"The powers delegated by the proposed constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State Governments are numerous and indefinite."

Then in Federalist Paper No. 41 James Madison clearly enumerates and explains the limited powers of the Federal Government.

Here is a summary of the checks and balances:

1. The people are sovereign. The Constitution of the United States begins with "We, the People" and so does the Constitution of every one of the fifty States. To further prove and safeguard sovereignty of the people, the Ninth and Tenth Amendments were adopted.

2. As stated by James Madison, the States will handle the matters not given to the Federal Government.

3. The Federal Government was divided into three departments. This separation of powers is fully explained in Article XXX of the Bill of Rights adopted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in October of 1780. Note that this was adopted in spite of the reverses of the Army during that year. That article reads as follows:

"XXX. In the government of this commonwealth, the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers, or either of them; the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers, or either of them; the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers, or either of them; to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men."

Unfortunately, during the last 30 years too much power has been relinquished by the people and the States to the Federal Government, and in Washington too much power has been concentrated in the Executive Department, and now the Judicial Department has taken up legislation. This will be discussed more later.

IV. MORAL LEADERSHIP IS NECESSARY TO RETURN TO LAW AND ORDER

It would be very pleasant to review the Constitution as we used to do years ago as the greatest instrument of its kind ever produced and discuss all of the good things that we enjoy under it. Unfortunately, however, this pleasant exercise we cannot continue because there are many problems and the individual rights of the people under the Constitution are in greater danger now than they have been at any time since the Constitution was adopted.

de Montessuie said, in his great book "The Spirit of Laws," (Book 8):

"The deterioration of any government begins with the decay of the principles on which it was founded."

Our country cannot be destroyed from abroad. It can only be destroyed from within. This was pointed out by Abraham Lincoln in an address delivered at Springfield, Illinois, on January 27, 1837, entitled "The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions."

He said:

"At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reach us, it must spring up amongst us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

As a youth I used to read books written by George A. Henty, all of which had to do with young men who went into military service in various countries. One book is entitled "The Young Carthaginian." This has to do with the war between Carthage and Rome, by which Rome conquered Carthage. Here is his analysis between character and weakness:

"It seems to be the fate of all nations that as they grow in wealth so they lose their manly virtues. With wealth comes corruption, indolence, a reluctance to make sacrifices, and a weakening of the feeling of patriotism. Power falls into the hands of the ignorant many. Instead of the destinies of the country being swayed by the wisest and best, a fickle multitude, swayed by interested demagogues, assumes the direction of affairs, and the result is inevitable—wasted powers, gross mismanagement, final ruin."

Then he contrasts it with Rome:

"Rome, on the contrary, young and vigorous, was a people of warriors. Every one of her citizens who was capable of bearing arms was a soldier. The manly virtues were held in the highest esteem, and the sordid love of wealth had not as yet enfeebled her strength or sapped her powers. Her citizens were men, indeed, ready to make any sacrifice for their country; and such being the case, her final victory over Carthage was a matter of certainty."

A few hundred years later Rome followed Carthage into oblivion.

The burning of the American flag, the burning of draft cards, and riots in our universities would seem to indicate that the vigor of many of the American people has deteriorated.

Dr. Will Durant, assisted by his wife, has been engaged for more than 20 years writing "The Story of Civilization." Volume III of the set is entitled "Caesar and Christ," and covers the history of Rome. Here is what is said on pages 664 and 668:

"The two great problems of history are (1) how to account for the rise of Rome and (2) how to account for her fall.

* * * * *

"A great civilization is not conquered from without until is has destroyed itself within. The essential causes of Rome's decline lay in her people, her morals, her class struggle, her failing trade, her bureaucratic despotism, her stifling taxes, her consuming wars.

* * * * *

"The political causes of decay were rooted in one fact—that increasing despotism destroyed the citizen's civic sense, and dried up statesmanship at its source."

There are plenty of signs of decay in the United States: increase of crime (refer to F.B.I. uniform crime reports); juvenile delinquency; immorality—in books, motion pictures, as well as among individuals; increase of bureaucrats and centralization of power with resulting loss of self-government and individual liberty.

The newspapers for months have been full of reports about disrespect for law and order at universities and elsewhere. Just a few weeks ago there were riots at beach resorts during Easter—a Holy Day.

What about the Fifth Commandment?

"Honor thy father and thy mother; that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

What about family and school discipline? In a recent magazine article it was stated that the Chinese District in New York City was the most law abiding. Why? Because the family was still intact.

Too often lately young delinquents particularly are excused on the theory that they are not responsible because their delinquencies are due to society or because of a difficult childhood, etc. This country grew up on the principles that each person had personal liberty and that he also had personal responsibility. One of the first rules I learned in law school was that a man was responsible for the natural consequences of his acts.

Here is a simple fundamental rule stated by Past-President Eisenhower:

"Here we were, a poor family who didn't know we were poor. We lived on the wrong side of the tracks yet we had everything that counts. We have love and discipline and proper moral guidance, and the priceless opportunities that our kind of democracy offers its youth—the opportunity of education and the opportunity to rise above humble beginnings."

The outstanding success of General Eisenhower from humble beginnings, and the success of millions of other Americans from similar humble beginnings, is clear proof of the effectiveness of the foregoing simple rule.

Let's get back to personal responsibility as well as individual liberty.

UNCHECKED AND UNBALANCED

In contrast to the checks and balances written into the Constitution, it now seems that many of these checks and balances have been and are ignored so that we may say that we now have a system which is unchecked and unbalanced. For instance, individuals, instead of standing on their own feet and being responsible for their own acts, turn to the Government for assistance.

Instead of local self-government, cities, counties and states figuratively go with "hat in hand" to Washington to receive Federal money. After all, this is not money of the Federal Government—it is money which has been collected from the people in the various States. Then instead of the separation of the three departments, we find the following situations.

ABDICATION BY CONGRESS

Article I of the Constitution of the United States, Section 1, reads as follows:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Note it says all legislative power.

Therefore, neither the Executive Department nor the Judicial Department has any right to legislate. Nevertheless, it has become the custom of the Executive Department to prepare bills and give them to Congress to pass, and many times, the Congress has been only a rubber stamp. As a matter of fact, the practice is still in vogue because from time to time I receive reports on hearings on proposed legislation and find that the Committee is holding hearings on bills sent to the Congress by the Executive Department.

A book was published in 1934 entitled "The Challenge of Liberty." It was written by the late distinguished patriot and former President, Herbert Hoover. At page 125 he said:

"The greatest shock of Regimentation, Fascism, Socialism, and Communism is upon Representative Government.

* * * * *

"The encroachments upon our liberties may not be overt—by repeal of any of the Constitutional guarantees—but they may be insidious and no less potent through encroachment upon the checks and balances which make its security. More particularly does the weakening of the legislative arm lead to encroachment by the executive upon the legislative and judicial functions, and inevitably that encroachment is upon individual liberty."

And at page 126 he said:

"It is in the legislative halls that Liberty commits suicide, although legislative bodies usually succeed in maintaining their forms. For 200 years the Roman Senate continued as a scene of social distinction and noisy prattle after it had surrendered its responsibilities and the Roman State had become a tyranny."

The Herald Examiner here in Los Angeles, published a series of three articles under the heading "A New Constitution Crisis," written by E. F. Tompkins. The first one, published on September 17, 1966, was entitled "Abdications by Congress." The second one, published September 24, 1966, was entitled "Executive Encroachments," and the third one, published on October 1, 1966, was entitled "Judicial Usurpation."

EXECUTIVE USURPATION

As has been pointed out, the executive department is intruding on the Legislative branch.

Also, employees of various Administrative Tribunals go beyond or ignore provisions of the laws they are supposed to administer.

ARE PUBLIC OFFICIALS OUR SERVANTS OR MASTERS?

Justice Brandeis, in his dissenting opinion in Olmstead v. U.S., 277 U.S. 438, 478, said in part:

"The makers of the Constitution . . . sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the government, (their own government) the right to be let alone—the most Comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized man."

We are supposed to have a government of laws, not of men. Unfortunately, now bureaucrats often do as they please. To illustrate:

FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS

In the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 104(a)(6) was inserted because the officials in Washington were interfering with social organizations, such as fraternities. The Section reads as follows:

"(6) Nothing in this or any other Act shall be construed as authorizing the Commission, its Advisory Committees, or any person under its supervision or control to inquire into or investigate any membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, any college or university fraternity or sorority, any private club or any religious organization."

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Masons are directly interested in maintaining public schools. Educationists seek federal control of schools through federal aid.

This can be accomplished only by ignoring the Ninth and Tenth Amendments.

Perhaps these individuals mean well, but Justice Brandeis warned us against "dogooders." Referring again to his dissenting opinion in Olmstead v. U.S., he said in part:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficient. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."

From time to time the statement is made from Washington that the Federal Government will not interfere with the running of local schools. However, the employees of that Department do interfere.

For instance, in 1961 the United States Bureau of Education issued a pamphlet in which it showed how it would interfere with preparing the curricula, etc. in local schools. It even went so far as to say Unesco would help to prepare the curricula for local American schools.

To make it clear that there should be no such interference, Congress inserted Section 604 in the "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89–10. It reads:

"Federal Control of Education Prohibited.

"Sec. 604. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional material by any educational institution or school system."

Section 804 was added to the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–329):

(a) Prohibiting Federal control of Education;

(b) Prohibiting interference with sororities, fraternities, etc., financed privately.

In spite of this specific prohibition, the United States Commissioner of Education is advocating a number of projects in local schools which certainly are not within the scope of the Federal Government, such as moving city children from city schools to suburban schools and children from suburban schools to city schools. (Read article in "United States News and World Report" issue of February 27, 1967, page 68.)

If we cannot take care of our schools locally, then we must admit we cannot govern ourselves.

Are you ready to admit that?

JUDICIAL USURPATION

The third of the series of articles published by the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner referred to above, was entitled "Judicial Usurpation." Many Americans, both lawyers and laymen, feel that the Supreme Court of the United States often goes beyond its judicial duties and is actually legislating.

In 1958 Judge Learned Hand, one of the great judges and legal minds of our age, delivered three lectures at Harvard Law School on the subject "The Bill of Rights." His three lectures have been published by Harvard University Press under the title "The Bill of Rights." At page 42 Judge Hand says:

"Such definition leaves no alternative to regarding the Court as a third legislative chamber."

At page 55 of the book, he again refers to the Court as "a third legislative chamber."

Justice Felix Frankfurter, a great constitutional lawyer, dissented in the case of *Baker* v. *Carr*, a case decided in March, 1962. This was the first case which the Supreme Court interfered with reappointment by the States. Justice Frankfurter pointed out that the Supreme Court for more than 100 years had refused to pass on apportionment matters because they were political actions which belonged to the States or Congress. He also pointed out that only five years previously, the current court had thus ruled.

Many of the opinions of the Supreme Court, which I believe are improper, are decided by five Justices, with four Justices dissenting.

On May 29, 1967, five Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the Constitutional Amendment adopted by the people of California by a vote of 4,526,460 to 2,395,747 was unconstitutional. This was known as Proposition 14, and after adoption by the people it became Article 26 of the California Constitution.

This means that five Justices can overcome the right and votes of "We, the People" to amend our State Constitution. Five Justices against 4,526,460 citizens of the State of California who adopted a constitutional amendment after a thorough argument of the proposition before the people.

Is this what our Constitution means? What is left of the rights of "We, the People" who adopted the Constitution of the United States, and then further insisted for their own protection on adoption of the Ninth and Tenth Amendments?

Most of you have heard a statement credited to Confucius on the subject of judicial usurpation. He said:

"Detest the magistrate who is wiser than the law, setting in its place his own notion of right."

CONCLUSION

Our problem is dramatically presented in the last two paragraphs of a book "Freedom and Federalism" by Felix Morley:

"When Caesar stood on the banks of the Rubicon, deciding whether or not to strike down the sadly corrupted Roman Republic, he argued to himself that the issue was really already settled. 'It is nothing,' he said, 'to be a republic, now a mere name without substance or character.'"

"If that is the way we have come to feel about federalism, then is our Republic also, in less than two centuries of history, on the way out."

What must we do to return to principles and re-establish our Constitution?

1. Read, re-read and study the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

2. In September take part in the Constitution observance at your Lodge. If you do not belong to a California Lodge, attend some Lodge. There will be joint meetings such as one which will be held in the new Scottish Rite Temple on Wilshire Boulevard.

3. When you read papers or magazines about proposed legislation, either at Sacramento or Washington, compare it with the Constitution to see if the proposed legislation conforms to the Constitution.

The time for action is now!

Sir Winston Churchill pointed out that procrastination could be fatal. He said:

"If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival . . . There may be even a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

Either we are free and must exercise our responsibility as citizens or ultmately become slaves.

"We, the People" are the sovereign power. Let each of us resume our individual responsibilities so as to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution" and thus retain our individual rights and self-government.

"For what avail the plough or sail, or land—or life itself—if freedom fail?" ("Boston" 1873—Ralph Waldo Emerson.)

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL 1968

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gilbert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I voted to recommit the resolution for a continuing appropriation and I voted against the resolution in final passage.

I strongly disapprove of the House action on this bill and I do not believe it was in this body's best tradition of responsible government. I understand the zeal that many of the Members have to cut the budget. I do not, however, regard this bill as the appropriate vehicle for those cuts, nor do I approve of the haphazard fashion in which they were voted.

This body has highly developed procedures for cutting appropriations. There is no reason why they cannot be followed.

What the House did on this bill was to slash indiscriminately. Surely, as men of judgment, we must recognize that some programs have a higher priority than others, that some cuts can be made with less damage to important undertakings than others. I would be in no posiion to object if those who are anxious to cut the budget studied carefully the programs they want to reduce, then put their proposals before us. Such a procedure was not followed. What we encountered was an emotional expression in behalf of budget cutting, not the careful deliberation that this process requires. I hope that when this bill is returned to us, after consideration by the Senate, it will receive the scrupulous care that it deserves.

COMMONS DEBATES

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the United States and Canadian Interparliamentary Group, I have long watched closely the debate in the Canadian House of Commons about the role of the United States in Vietnam.

Because Canada has been a loyal friend and stanch ally through the years, I believe that their discussions have great importance for us in the United States. I have been impressed by the high level of responsibility shown in these debates. Frequently, the American press will point up the very few areas of disagreement between our two Governments while neglecting their clear recognition of our shared heritage and common purpose.

For this reason, I would like to insert in the Record at this point a portion of the debate of October 12, 1967. It is my belief, based on many trips to Canada with the Interparlimentary Group and the many conversations I have had with legislators there, that the Honorable F. J. Bigg is voicing an opinion held by many Canadians. Mr. Bigg lays before his fellow Members of the House of Commons a sober view of world problems and a most gracious and relevant discussion of the career of President Johnson.

At a time when many unfriendly words are being quoted about this administration from citizens of other lands, I feel that it is very useful for my colleagues in the House and for the American people to have an opportunity to ponder the perceptive and understanding remarks of our fellow legislator in Canada, the distinguished and very able F. J. Bigg.

Excerpts from the debate follow:

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca). Mr. Speaker, we have a great many problems at home in Canada today which I should like to discuss if I had the time. However, there is a problem abroad which far transcends all our domestic problems. I refer to the deplorable fact that most of the people of Canada are being systematically brainwashed. I am not accusing the present administration of having a hand in this, apart from the contribution they make because of ineptitude. I give this administration full credit for meaning well. Nevertheless this ineptitude on the part of those in positions of responsibility to this house and the nation makes it evident that they are guilty of serious neglect.

Although I am not an expert on foreign affairs I intend to take a few minutes of the time of the house to attempt to outline what is so obvious to me as a layman and novice in foreign affairs. A true picture of the international situation is not being presented to us. We have an enemy in this world, international communism and I am in no way hesitant about saying that. These people have friends in this country, although as I have said before I do not think any of them sit in this house.

The Canadian war crimes tribunal organization which seeks to put President Johnson of the United States on trial for his so-called war crimes is allowed to operate. Free discussion in Canada has always been our prerogative and I would be the last to suggest that a person does not have the right to say what he wants as long as he is willing to accept the responsibility involved. Having regard to the anti-United States propaganda to which this country has been subjected, I have waited in vain for a clear voice from the fourth estate, from the television and radio media, yes even from responsible members of the government and of this house, to give what I consider a fair and balanced picture of the situation.

(5:30 p.m.)

It is passing strange that Ho Chi Minh, the leader of the North Vietnamese and the soul of the Viet Cong, should always be given the benefit of the doubt and favourable publicity. I have in my hand a paper which clearly indicates in straight, factual terms, Mr. Ho Chi Minh's record. I think it would be fair, and perhaps interesting, to know in chronological order what have been the actions of Ho Chi Minh during the last 47 years and what have been the actions of one Lyndon B. Johnson, who bears the responsibility both militarily and politically for maintaining the freedom of at least the western world, and in Viet Nam certainly some semblance of freedom amongst the small nations of Asia.

On December 25, 1920, Ho Chi Minh, a Viet Nam born Chinese, became a member of the Marxist wing of the French socialist party while attending the party conference in Paris. Lyndon B. Johnson was at this time attending high school in Johnson City, Texas. He had the same kind of background as most of us in the house have enjoyed. He was raised on a farm and received a western-style free education.

Lyndon B. Johnson found it necessary to work with his hands and learned that he needed energy and individual effort in order to finish his schooling. Ho Chi Minh was educated at the expense of the international socialist party. In 1923 Ho Chi Minh became the editor of *Le Paria*, a French communist publication, and received one year's training in Moscow. In December, 1924, he was sent to Canton, China, as interpreter for the communist Michael Borodin. At that time Lyndon B. Johnson was graduating from high school as president of his class and had already achieved a reputation as a debater.

At that time President Johnson did not know of his rendezvous with fate. He did not know that he would one day be President of the United States. In fact, he scorned higher education. He was a young, energetic man who went out looking for work, which was not easy for an untrained man to find even in those days. It was difficult for him to find suitable work to which he could devote his great talents. Therefore Lyndon B. Johnson wandered about the United States working with his hands. He graduated from the school of hard knocks. Lyndon B. Johnson recognized that education was necessary for all young people and he went back to school.

In January, 1930 we find that under Ho Chi Minh's leadership a conference was held in Hong Kong with Chinese communists to integrate three Vietnamese communist parties, the Oriental Communist Party, the Annamese Communist Party and the Oriental Communist League. These became the communist party of Indo-China, a branch of the Third International of Moscow, and it so remained until 1940.

Let us go back to our friend Lyndon B. Johnson. He enrolled at Southwest Texas Teachers State College and became a school teacher. He was a school teacher for a year. He then continued his studies at college, obtained a degree and took up public speaking. He was just a nice, friendly school teacher. In 1931 Lyndon B. Johnson, having a great interest in politics even from his early years, became secretary to a congressman. Mr. Hoover was the Republican president. From his early days Lyndon B. Johnson was liberal with a small "l".

In 1932 Lyndon B. Johnson attached himself to Mr. Roosevelt's administration and worked unceasingly for the New Deal. I think the most rabid of critics of that program cannot say that the New Deal was anything but a tremendous attempt to maintain the dignity of the individudal and the right of little people to share in the great wealth and progress of North America.

On May 19, 1941, Moscow disbanded the Third Communist International. The Vietnamese communist party established the Doc Lap Dong-Minh, or the Viet Minh, to wage guerrilla warfare. They went underground. Who was the spiritual leader of this group? It was Ho Chi Minh. In 1940 Viet Nam, together with most other southeast Asian countries, was occupied by Japan. At the end of the eastern theatre of world war II the power of the United States was ascending. Ho Chi Minh at this time continued his program of the march of communism.

Where was Lyndon B. Johnson at this time? He is a man who has always thought for himself. He heeded United States' public opinion and came out flatly for entering world war II on the side of the free nations. In 1941 England stood alone. Lyndon B. Johnson, who has always been a very strong nationalist, came out flatly in favour of his country fighting with Britain. He said that the United States needed the draft and he worked toward that end. Mr. Johnson was the kind of man who did not only talk but acted. He stood for principles. He promised the young men of the United States, on the day he voted for conscription to send America's young blood to fight for freedom, that he would be with them. Less than three hours after he put his name to the draft bill Lyndon B. Johnson joined the United States navy. He worked in the theatre of war in which Ho Chi Minh was working underground with the communists.

President Johnson, as he now is, served as a volunteer lieutenant in the United States navy. His short term of service in the Pacific was exciting. His courage was rewarded by being decorated by his country. The president of that day, believing that Lyndon B. Johnson and his ability to organize the war effort were of more use in Washington, ordered him back for duty.

(5:40 p.m.)

On August 15, 1945 Japan surrendered to the allies. On August 17 and 18, 1945 an uprising was provoked in Hanoi. On August 19, 1945 Ho Chi Minh launched his take-over. On September 2, 1945 Ho Chi Minh established his regime in Hanoi, ousting Bao Dai, the former emperor of Annan. Where was Lyndon B. Johnson at that time?

* * * * *

Mr. BIGG. In 1945 Mr. Johnson ran for the United States senate. In the senate, until the time he became president, he fought for all those things which leftists talk about and do nothing about and which he himself backed whenever it meant that the strength of the strong should be used to help the poor. There was no segment of society, however small and neglected, that President Johnson did not support, and this has been affirmed by minority groups such as the one composed of Germans in his own state during world war II and the negro minority. During his term in the senate he instituted and pushed with all his might for reforms which it had taken 82 years to put on the statute books of the United States.

I had hoped in the 20 minutes allotted to me to present the full record of this man but it would take hours to review in detail the accomplishments of this great president. I am sick and tired of hearing criticisms of the noble efforts made by President Johnson himself to bring peace to Viet Nam and the noble efforts made by the American people and their sons to continue the fighting. I think we should level criticism whenever we can if we think an injustice is being done, and the point I am trying to make this afternoon is that an injustice is done when those who feel the way I do not give lip service at least to our American friends and allies.

A partisan politician would say it is better to support his party no matter how bad it is than to support the other party no matter how good it is. That has never been the style of Lyndon B. Johnson. He has always had the courage to stand up against those things in which he did not believe and he is exceptionally good at getting things done. I believe that Ho Chi Minh is also exceptionally good at getting things done that he wants done, but as I read the reports of his achievements I find they are all negative and all designed to destroy freedom. However, as I read the record of Lyndon B. Johnson's career I find that for the last 35 years at least he has only had one end in mind, to uphold the dignity of the human being. Because he lives in an imperfect world and can only work through political organizations, imperfect as they are, and because it is difficult even for the Americans who use restraint to achieve peace and security in our world, it is beneath our dignity to sit here in smug security north of the line and have nothing but bad to say about those who are at least doing their best.

Attempts are being made to force us to talk about dollars and cents and not to talk about things on a high plane. I can do that. I think the Canadian people should pay 10 per cent of the cost of freedom along with the Americans. I go further and say, as I said in 1939, that more than our money should be at stake. President Johnson thought his life was at stake. He thought that strongly about the matter and I do not think he has changed. But I do think we should change.

(5:50 p.m.)

Some may sit here quietly, accept things as they are and say, "We know all that, Bigg, why don't you sit down?" If these facts are known, I do not hear about them. I read the newspapers daily and I listen to the news broadcasts. One would really think President Johnson was the leader of some kind of international gang. It is for this reason I ask hon. members to consider these facts. They are in every "Who's Who." When I am doing my homework, my desk is piled high with papers containing these facts. These articles were not written by President Johnson's friends. As I said before, President Johnson is a liberal with a small "l", while I am a conservative with a small "c". However, like President Johnson, when the welfare of my country is at stake I have no politics. I have seen these very issues kicked around, even on the floor of this house, for cheap political reasons, and I do not point my finger at the Liberals when I say that. We on this side of the house are condemned by our own silence as well as by interpreting the remarks by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin), who is seized with the responsibility of giving us the whole truth, nothing but the truth.

I am not afraid of the truth. It has been said many times that the truth will make one free. If we are only going to be given half truths, then I say half truths will lead to slavery. It will be the same kind of slavery that President Johnson has spent his whole life fighting. He has risked his political career fighting it. Slavery is not dead in the United States. President Johnson knows that, as do many other people in the United States. However, it is not politically wise to stand up and say so because down there feelings run high. Thank God, we do not have it in this country.

Some parliamentarians from England were visiting us last week. They said that our prospects are greater than our problems. If we take the attitude that the war in Viet Nam is none of our business, then we should at least keep quiet about those who think they have a stake in it and think they are doing their best. If we have a better alternative, then what is it? Ho Chi Minh is represented as a man who is working for the self-determination of people. Well, there are a lot of people in South Viet Nam as well as in North Viet Nam. If this man Johnson wanted to use all the power he has to stop the war, we know only too well how quickly that war could be stopped. We also know at what cost. Here is a man who is not going to use all the power he has for cheap political purposes.

I wanted to go through his record to indicate that while Ho Chi Minh was busy undermining the small nations of Southeast Asia President Johnson was quietly doing his duty. Since President Kennedy is dead, it is safe to make him a hero. However, since President Johnson is still alive he can still be used for cheap political purposes. I say it is time we in Canada cut it out. This man was chosen by President Kennedy. Kennedy said of him, this man is even more fit to serve the American people than I am. When Kennedy got the opportunity to sit in high places he knew that he needed the wisdom and dedication of this man Johnson to help him guide the United States through very difficult times.

I, for one, thank God we have a man of Johnson's calibre as our neighbour. I fear no invasion from the south. President Johnson has always supported the United Nations. He has done all he could to make the United Nations effective. President Johnson has offered to give up his right to decide these issues if the United Nations is willing and able to deal with them. When he has made these suggestions he has been turned down. The facts are here and we all know them. Less than 18 months ago the United States did stop the bombing for six weeks. What has happened to the memories of those men who write this propaganda we are getting? What did North Viet Nam do? They methodically and coldbloodedly built up their military strength. More United States soldiers died because this man Johnson was reasonable enough to give North Viet Nam every opportunity.

There are many nations in the world today in which both sides of this story will not be told. The iron curtain encircles them. There is only one press and only one party in those countries. I thank God again that here we have two parties. If a man is delinquent or is interpreted as not telling us the truth, then it is my plain duty to ask the truth. I am not afraid the people of Canada will condemn me for that. I put freedom above all other things, and it is the truth that will make us free.

FEDERAL GRANTS FOR STAFFING OF OFFICIAL STATE AND LOCAL HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSIONS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to provide Federal grants to help staff official State and local human relations commissions.

The solution to race relations problems—through the achievement of equal opportunity for all, and the creation of understanding between the races—is among the most crucial items on the agenda at every level of government in America today. It occupies the attention of every agency of the Federal Government, and of State, county, and municipal officials throughout the Nation.

The Justice Department's community relations service was established by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide communities with Federal help in coping with disputes, disagreements, and difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based upon race, color, or national origin. One of the community relations service's jobs is to answer requests for help in setting up or improving local human relations commissions. In CRS's view—

> These organizations potentially are one of the most hopeful ways that communities can work effectively on problems in race relations.

Human relations commissions provide the machinery for dealing with the problems of racial discrimination in a democratic framework.

There are currently 69 cities and six counties with professionally staffed human relations or community relations commissions—both terms are used interchangeably. Human relations commissions also exist in some 35 States.

A large number of these commissions

are public agencies—that is, they were established by State or local ordinances. Their very establishment as an arm of public policy signifies that the community is concerned about and committed to peaceful methods of resolving differences among its citizens.

The most successful of these agencies have two other common characteristics:

First. The commissioners are respected community leaders and representatives of leading racial, religious, business, labor and civic groups; and

Second. The commission has specific responsibilities and goals set out in the establishing ordinance or mayor's executive order.

The job of the human relations commission is twofold. In those States and localities with a local ordinance banning discrimination in employment, education, public accommodations, and other areas, the human relations commission may be assigned the responsibility for administering the ordinance. This is the role of the Baltimore Community Relations Commission, originally established by a 1956 city ordinance as an equal employment opportunity commission, and given a broader title and responsibilities when the mayor signed an antidiscrimination ordinance in 1964.

The second commission role is to facilitate orderly social change by opening up channels of communication between groups, setting up procedures for the airing of grievances and relieving of tensions, mediating disputes when they do arise, and providing leadership in recognizing and solving potential problem areas before they boil over.

The existence of a paid, professional staff—and public appropriated funds to pay them with—often make the difference between a successful, permanent human relations commission, and a weak, short-lived one. In its guide to the formation of effective commissions, the Justice Department's CRS has said:

> A commission without an adequate staff is seriously handicapped in its efforts to serve the community in the field of human relations.
>
> Experience throughout the country—

Says the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials—NAIRO—

> shows a very high mortality rate for city committees without staff, as compared with those which have staff.

One of the most serious operational difficulties that human relations commissions face today as they attempt to deal with the No. 1 priority problem in American society is a serious shortage of staff.

The problem is serious because commission staff are so busy putting out fires of racial disharmony after they are lit, that they are unable to spend sufficient time on the creation of racial understanding which is their long-range goal.

If a commission is to be successful, its staff members must develop contacts and relationships within the community they are serving. Insufficient staff also precludes the opening of neighborhood offices to deal with problems where they arise.

Moreover, according to NAIRO Executive Director Frederick Routh, there is no State agency with regulatory powers that does not have a serious backlog of claim cases before it.

The career of compliance officer is a relatively new one, having come into existence chiefly after the passage of numerous civil rights laws in the early 1960's. A compliance officer is a key man in any agency with regulatory powers, because he is responsible for the administration of antidiscrimination laws. Regardless of a college graduate's major, he is a beginner in compliance when he joins a human relations commission. Only 2 years of on-the-job training will produce a good compliance officer.

But the field of human relations work is so new, the number of experienced people in the field so small, and the salaries offered so low, that no sooner does the staff person gain experience than he leaves for a better job at higher pay in another city. It is not only a public or private agency at the city, State, or Federal level which recruits the human relations commission staff member. Human relations work is so low paying, that a good person with several years' experience is also offered higher salaries by other—and equally community service oriented—professions, such as urban development.

Even at the beginning level, the human relations commission offers little employment incentive. In many cities, the starting salary for an inexperienced compliance officer is less than the beginning salary for a teacher or welfare worker. Because competent people cannot be attracted at the lowest levels, there are not enough replacements for higher level people who are attracted elsewhere, and for the new posts being created every day.

In the last year alone, according to a U.S. Conference of Mayors survey, 48 persons were added to city and county community relations commission staffs, bringing the total number of staff to 527 in 69 cities and six counties surveyed. Despite the fact that 36 of these commissions increased their annual budgets in the same year, the mean staff size is still only three.

The bill I have introduced today is designed to provide Federal help to official State and local human relations agencies to help them tackle this urgent nationwide emergency by providing funds to develop leadership on the local level. It will strengthen those human relations commissions which are already staffed, and serve as an incentive to encourage the contribution of local funds toward the staffing of the 200 commissions which still do not have permanent personnel.

My bill amends title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which established the Federal community relations service. Under this legislation, the Attorney General would be authorized to make grants to State and local public agencies and organizations engaged in programs designed to resolve disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color or national origin. The money would be used for the employment of necessary staff, and the acquisition, furnishing and procurement of necessary administrative support services—including office space, supplies and equipment, and travel expenses—for such agencies and organizations.

The bill also contains a provision designed to insure that Federal aid will supplement and encourage local contributions to human relations agencies, and will in no case supplant such funds.

Finally, a sum of $3 million is authorized for the first year of the program.

The suggestion for this legislation was originally made to me by David Glenn, the talented young director of the Baltimore Community Relations Commission. I would like to include as part of my statement Mr. Glenn's letter describing the problems he and human relations directors throughout the country are facing today.

I would welcome the support of my colleagues and their cosponsorship of this legislation to strengthen the capacity of local governments to deal with race relations problems.

The letter referred to follows:

BALTIMORE COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION,
Baltimore, Md., July 27, 1967.

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: At the end of our meeting with the Mayor several weeks ago, you requested that I correspond with you relative to my suggestion that the Federal government assume some of the responsibility for staffing and otherwise subsidising local human relations commissions such as our own. I am bold enough to make this suggestion for two reasons.

First of all, I think that recent events in urban centers throughout the country indicate that the Federal government not only has a responsibility but also a role to play in alleviating, or setting up machinery to alleviate, the problems which have caused the disorders which are now sweeping the country. Most of the local commissions which have enforcement powers administer laws which are basically adequate to cope with the problems which need attention. If local commissions have any problem with respect to administering local laws, it is that these commissions do not have adequate staff to deploy on the various problems—specifically employment and community organization—which deserve maximum attention under present conditions. I am aware of the fact that the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission have contacts and programs, to a limited degree, in the major urban centers; however, these agencies, operating out of Washington, can never hope to be as effective as the local agencies which administer local laws, and which have intimate knowledge of the problems in the areas they serve.

Second, it seems to me that, where the enforcement of Federal law is concerned (Civil Rights Act of 1964, etc.), the local agencies might be able to secure greater compliance than is now achieved through various Federal agencies with headquarters in Washington and regional offices around the country.

Thus, I return to my original point, namely, that the Federal government has a role to play, and that some kind of program and/or formula for assisting local human relations commissions in a realistic way should be immediately devised. When I say realistic, I obviously am talking in terms of dollars and cents, since I believe that these commissions can only be effective if they have proper staff capable of "zeroing-in" on the multitude of problems which come within their purview. I think that the amount of money involved—while substantial in terms of the resources of local communities—would not be too great a burden for the Federal government, particularly in view of the potential benefits which would accrue to the local communities as well as the Federal government. Certainly, one of the side results of such an effort by the Federal government would be the possibility of getting a greater commitment to human relations commissions from cities which now have them; and, also the possibility of having those communities, which do not presently have such commission, develop such agencies in their own locales.

If you feel that my suggestion has any merit whatsoever, I would be more than happy to sit down with you, and any others whom you would wish to include, to discuss ways in which this idea might be effectuated.

I appreciated having an opportunity to meet with you and the other members of the Congressional delegation, and I look forward to getting together with you again in the near future.

Yours sincerely,

David L. Glenn,
Director.

EGYPTIANS ATTACK ISRAEL SHIP "ELATH"

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the attack by Egypt on the Israel ship *Elath* is a deplorable act of aggression. This and the renewed fighting which is reported today is obvious evidence of the unwillingness of Nasser and his henchmen to live in a peaceful world side by side with the nation of Israel.

It really matters not who fired the first shot today, and there are conflicting reports from the scene of battle. The aggressive act which renewed the tragic fighting was the attack by Egypt on the Israel ship *Elath*.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped the fighting was over. Obviously, this was wishful thinking. I urge our Government to take whatever steps are necessary through the appropriate forums to see that this latest Egyptian aggression is not a profitable venture for them. A peaceful state of affairs, rather than continued strife, must prevail in this troubled area of the world.

GI QUESTIONS WITHOUT ANSWERS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Addabbo] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, as we read the newspapers and listen to the radio and television commentators, we are constantly bombarded with what seem to be unanswerable questions on taxes, inflation, poverty, rural problems, urban problems, ad infinitum. All of these are important, but I wonder how much thought is given by the average American citizen to the "unanswered question" which must be on the mind of every American serviceman, Just how much thought is given by our citizenry to the sacrifices they are making every day?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent column written by my friend, Walter Kaner, which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press. I wish every American could read it, and I commend it to your attention:

GI Questions Without Answers

(By Walter Kaner)

He was just a kid.

A babyfaced kid with a crew cut. He looked too young to be a soldier.

But among the ribbons he wore on his uniform was a Purple Heart for the chunk of mortar shell that ripped his leg in Vietnam.

When I last saw him two years ago his world was baseball, football, dates and souped up jalopies.

Now, he looked older and sadder and his eyes seemed aged by the sight of death and pain and suffering.

And I realize he wasn't a kid anymore.

As we were having dinner in a restaurant crowded with people drinking, laughing and dining, he asked: "Does anybody know there's a war on?"

He didn't wait for an answer. "Isn't it everybody's war? If it's a war for us—isn't it a war for everybody?"

He gazed at the crowded, noisy bar. "Nothing's changed here. Over there, guys are getting killed. Here? Everybody's busy chasing a buck. Watching TV. Going to ball games. To restaurants."

His voice didn't sound angry or bitter, but hurt. "Some of the guys would turn over in their graves if they knew . . . if they could see what's going on here. If a guy dies fighting for his country . . . it's gotta count . . . it's gotta mean something. If you ask a guy to sacrifice his life for his country . . . shouldn't the people back home sacrifice something too?"

I didn't answer. Because I couldn't find the words.

He lit a cigarette, then gripped his drink so tight his knuckles turned white. "Aren't you going to ask me, like everybody else, what it's like over there?"

Again, he didn't wait for my reply. "I'll tell you. It's a dirty, rotten stinking war. The bugs, the heat, the rain, the mud and the stinking swamps drive you nuts.

"And you're scared. Damn scared. Because any minute you're liable to get your head blown off or your guts ripped out."

He toyed with, but didn't touch his food. "Funny," he smiled a hollow sort of smile, "I remember the day I went in the Army. You joke and you tell your folks not to worry and how you'll be home soon and everything's going to be OK. But inside you're worried and scared and you wonder to yourself if you're really coming back and if you'll ever see your folks and the house and the old neighborhood again."

"The first couple of weeks are the toughest. You're so lonely and homesick you hurt inside. Sometimes, when you're trying to sleep, you cry a little. But you write letters home telling your folks not to worry and how great everything is and inside you ache something awful."

I groped for something to say. I heard myself saying: "How'd you like to go to a nightclub?" He shrugged and nodded.

As we drove over the Queensboro Bridge he turned on the radio as a newscaster was saying: "Red troops ripped into the rear platoon of a U.S. Marine company with withering small arms and machinegun fire eight miles southwest of Quang Tri City. Ten Marines were killed and 19 wounded."

He cursed, snapped off the radio and stared silently out the window. Finally he said: "Do you know what it's like to visit the folks of one of your buddies who was killed?"

He lit a cigarette. "What do you say to them? You mumble about what a great guy he was, and how brave he was, and how he died for his country and how they should be proud of him.

"Then you leave, and you look at the people who really don't know there's a war, and you want to smash your fist through a wall."

As we entered the night club and sat down at a table, he stared solemnly at the jam-packed room and the couples dancing the Twist. At the next table a woman was saying: "So for the party Saturday, I found this divine dress . . ." And from a nearby table a well dressed man could be heard remarking: "I made so much this year, I can't take any stock profits . . ."

The kid stared grimly at his drink. The show started. Pretty dancing girls in scanty costumes, a shapely singer, a comic with fast gags. The kid watched disinterestedly. His thought seemed thousands of miles away.

Mid-way through the show he turned to me asking: "Wait, do you mind if we leave?"

As I drove him home he turned to me asking: "How do you think the guys feel when they hear about the draft card burners? And the hippies who aren't in the Army? And that antiwar demonstration in Washington yesterday? Mad! Damn mad."

And I kept thinking of the kid's painful question:

"Doesn't anybody know there's a war on?"

THE MAYOR OF WASHINGTON, OR WHAT'S IN A NAME

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, there has been some objection in the Congress to the popular and journalistic custom of calling the chief executive of the District of Columbia "Mayor" Walter Washington instead of using his technically correct title of District Commissioner. This surely must be one of the more minor issues facing the Congress, but I thought the Members might like to read why the Washington Star prefers Mayor Washington:

Mr. Mayor

In a letter the other day one of our readers asked a good question: Why, all of a sudden, is everyone going along with this business of calling Walter Washington the new mayor when his real title is District Commissioner?

There is no mystery about how it started, or why. The President began using the term, rather pointedly, at Washington's oath of office ceremony three weeks ago. He has taken every opportunity to use it since. He obviously wants it to take hold. And the reason is that "mayor" makes the District sound more like other cities. It implies that through the Johnson reorganization plan the new District head has been vested with powers which would be quite impossible if he were merely a "commissioner."

None of which is really true, and no one, of course, should be taken in by this political ploy. So why are we being taken in?

Well, we might, weaving and dodging, note that Webster does define "mayor" as the "chief executive officer of a municipal corporation," which Walter Washington certainly is. Or that mayors, in some cities, are in fact appointed rather than elected. Or even that Walter Washington, after all, needs all the prestige just now that he can muster by any means.

But the simple truth is that we are persuaded by a consideration of purely personal convenience: the word "commissioner," to put it bluntly, just doesn't fit in headlines. "Mayor" fits fine.

It used to be that we got around this dilemma by using names such as Tobriner, Duncan or Mathe. But "Washington," let's face it, counts nearly as long in the copy book as "commissioner." Besides, the person is apt to be confused with the city. And we've never been one of those who call people FDR or LBJ—so WW is out.

Mayor, it is. Our copy readers are overjoyed. You should get better headlines. And so long as no one is deceived, what's the harm?

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 15, 1967, the Italo-American groups of the city of Garfield, with appropriate ceremonies, unveiled a statue honoring Christopher Columbus, the explorer who first saw the Western Hemisphere and recorded it for posterity.

This 14-foot monument, depicting Columbus as a navigator, stands in the beautiful surroundings of Columbus Park, Outwater Lane, and Midland Avenue; and was erected by Unico, a national Italo-American group.

Taking part in the unveiling ceremonies were several hundred persons, many of them members of Garfield's Italo-American societies; the Garfield Knights of Columbus; Unico president, Joseph Comino; Vincent Rigolosi, mayor of Garfield; and myself.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to include the text of the speech which I made at this unveiling ceremony:

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. I wish to express to you my deepest appreciation for inviting me here today to participate in the dedication of this statue to the honor and glory of a brave Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus.

Lord Macaulay, the eminent English historian, once wrote: "Italian civilization, nearly 3,000 years old, has never faded out. The nights which have descended on Italy have been nights of Arctic summer, the dawn always reappearing before the reflection of the preceding sunset has faded from the horizon."

And, indeed, this judgment is a sound one, proclaiming to the world the debt which all of the Western civilization owes to Italy—that Nation which Virgil believed destined by the Gods to greatness.

On this occasion, in the dedication of this statue, we remember the name and the achievement of one of history's few individuals whose actions substantially altered the progress of human development. That man is Christopher Columbus. It would be superfluous to recount here his accomplishment—so much more than the mere distinction of doing first a task whose fulfillment was inevitable. The place which Columbus holds in history is owing to his extraordinary determination to defy the strictures of unfruitful convention, and to persist in pursuit of an ideal whose worth he believed. In short, Columbus was one of those rare men in history who have acted in a way wholly consistent with their convictions.

I think that on an occasion such as this it is proper for us to pay tribute not only to Columbus the man, but also to the heritage he so gloriously fulfilled—the heritage of Italy, his native land. For Columbus stands, in the eyes of posterity, as a symbol, the perfect example of all that has been productive, affirmative, and innovative in the Italian character.

A statue, such as we are dedicating here today, is a monument to a moment in the lives of a people. It pays tribute, constant and visible, throughout the years, to some noble achievement of these people and their Nation.

It is important to remember that the influence of Italy upon America began with the discovery by Columbus of this New World. It is significant that this influence has never ceased to act as a positive and fruitful force upon the progress of our Republic.

The history of this Nation bears proof to my claims, and vindicates the tribute we give today. It has become a cliche to note that some of the finest words in the Declaration of Independence were inspired by an Italian—by Philippo Mazzei, friend and confidante of Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin. Italians were prominent members of the New York, Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia colonies before Revolution had ever been broached. After Revolution had been accomplished, Italians were instrumental in winning the frontier country. Colonel Francesco Vigo, a scout, spy, and banker—contributed immeasurably to winning the Northwest Territory. Italians have fought in large numbers in every war waged by America in the defense of liberty; nearly one million men of Italian extraction served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II.

Not only in defense of the Nation have Italians offered valuable service. Consider the area of art: Constantino Brumidi, known as the "Michelangelo of the United States Capitol," and Carlo Franzoni, who sculpted the famous Car of History in our Capitol's Statuary Hall, this famous sculpture is also known as the Franzoni clock. Both of these Italian artisans have left their indelible and imperishable marks on this our National symbol of Unity.

Consider Saint Francis Xavier Cabrini—the first and only United States citizen to be canonized as a Saint. As founder of the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart, she demonstrated a compassion and a spirituality indicative of Italian religious devotion and sound moral awareness.

Consider music: Italians like Toscanini, Caruso, Tebaldi, and Michelangelo have enriched the American cultural sphere beyond measure.

And in the art of science; you think immediately of Enrico Fermi, the developer of the atomic energy reactor.

And, when we consider entertainment; who does not know the names of Perry Como or Jimmy Durante?

Although there are many Italians in the political field, the great immortal of politics is Fiorello LaGuardia—the "Little Flower"—deeply enshrined as a permanent fixture of American political history.

Let no voice discredit this amazing Italian navigator of ingenuity and dedication. His indefatigable efforts were motivated by two clear purposes. He had a religious dedication. He wanted to propagate the Christian faith in Asia and convert the Grand Khan. He wished to rescue the holy sepulcher of Jerusalem from the Moslems. He had also an explorer's dedication. He wanted to reach the far continents believed to be Asia. Attempts have been made to diminish the importance of his role in the discovery of America. Let these documented facts speak for themselves. Let every Italian-American stand in the proud glory of this historic day of October 12, 1492.

To give further glory to Christopher Columbus, the Congress has before it many bills which would make Columbus Day a national legal holiday. Just a little over a week ago, a sub-committee of the House of Representatives Judiciary Committee held hearings on establishing such a national holiday. I have introduced legislation to this effect and have supported the proposal before the sub-committee.

We should recognize the fact that it is an official holiday in 36 states and this alone should be persuasive reasoning why the United States should enact a law making it a nationwide observance.

The sole justification for making it a national holiday is to pay tribute to the discovery of America. October 12th is the birthdate of the Western Hemisphere. It is a date which commemorates the opening of the Western Hemisphere to the countries of Europe.

There are many arguments as to who arrived in America first. Whether the Norsemen where here first, whether Leif Erikson did in fact come here, whether the Irish were here ahead of others, all of this is immaterial to the essential point. It was the coming of Columbus to America and his landing here on October 12, 1492, which opened the New World to the Old World.

Through the gate he opened to the West 475 years ago, there has flowed an ever-widening stream of freedom-seeking humanity. Those who came in his wake can read a nation's creed which he could never have written:

"Give me your tired, your poor—
  Your huddled masses yearning to breathe
    free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore
  Send these, the homeless tempest-tossed
    to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

These are the words taken from the base of the Statue of Liberty, so proudly standing in New York harbor.

Now, let us dedicate this statue to a noble Italian, in gratitude for the contributions made by the sons and daughters of Italy—the spiritual heirs of Columbus—to the United States of America. May this dedication ceremony, the unveiling of this statue, serve as a visible expression of our respect for the land which gave birth to Columbus and inspired so much that is good in our civilization.

REVITALIZING THE SCHOOLS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to set forth in the RECORD at this point the address made by Hon. Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at the Queens opening dinner of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, held at the International Hotel, John F. Kennedy International Airport, Jamaica, Long Island, N.Y., on Monday evening, October 23.

We are most grateful to Under Secretary Cohen for accepting the invitation to be the guest speaker at the kickoff dinner for the federation campaign in Queens County, and we hereby once again publicly express our appreciation to him for fitting this speaking engagement into his very busy schedule.

The speech follows:

Revitalizing the Schools

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

I am very pleased and honored to participate in the 50th Golden Anniversary of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. One of the most unique characteristic of Americans in their generosity in giving time, money and energy in voluntary efforts to help create a better life for their neighbors and community. Your organization can take pride in its efforts to make the United States a better place to live.

As President Johnson stated in his message on Education and Health to the Congress last year: "A nation's greatness is measured by its concern for the health and welfare of its people. Throughout the history of our democracy, this concern has grown and deepened."

This concern with the well being of people has been evident in the growth of your organization.

Ever since the founding of this Nation, private generosity has pioneered the great social advances. For example, the bitter battle for free public education in this country was led by religious and charitable organizations. Even after the battle was won, private organizations continued to pioneer in new directions in education. For example, private generosity stimulated:

The establishment of normal schools for teachers.

Schools for the deaf, the blind and the mentally retarded neglect schools.

Kindergartens and summer schools.

And of course, higher education in the United States was founded and has been encouraged by the philanthropy of many Americans.

Private support of great social causes has often stimulated governmental action when it was needed. And generally, governmental activity has not replaced but stimulated more private support for social programs. The American people have indicated that they want a better life for all and they are willing to contribute more through both taxes and private giving to attain the goal.

Actually it was not until 1917, fifty years ago, an anniversary coinciding with the initiation of your organization, that the Federal Government became directly involved in education. Although the Government has always had an interest in education, dating back to the Northwest Ordinance of Jefferson's term thru the Morrill Act of 1862, providing Federal assistance for vocational training under the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, was the real beginning of Federal support for education. Since that time, of course, support has grown—notably in the past three years, where it became increasingly clear that Federal help is required to maintain and improve the quality of education. The unprecedented expansion in educational activities had to be paralleled by an unprecedented degree of support for education from the Federal Government. With States and local communities devoting 37 percent of their expenditures to their schools, there was no other way.

Today about 56 million students are enrolled in schools and colleges in the United States. That's more than one-fourth of the nation's population. About 2 million men and women are now teaching in our grade and high schools and almost half-a-million more in our colleges and universities. The importance that Americans place in education is reflected in the growing sums of money spent for that purpose. Expenditures for education will reach about $49 billion this year—or about 6½ percent of the Gross National Product. Spending for education by all levels of government has increased dramatically from $13 billion in 1956 to $34 billion in 1966; and most of the funds come consistently from State and local government sources. However, in the last two years, the Federal share has increased from 12 percent to 16 percent of the total.

The importance that Americans place on education is also reflected in private spending. Since 1955 the amount spent has nearly tripled, due mainly to investments in higher education. In 1955, the private section was investing $1.3 billion higher education. By 1966, the outlay was about $3.5 billion.

But in spite of these growing, public and private investments, we are still far from solving the serious, complex problems of American Education. Dramatic social, economic and technological changes, characterized by population growth, urbanization, growing wealth and production and the rising expectations on the part of all citizens to share in this prosperity, but tremendous demands on the educational system. Educators must accommodate growing numbers of students. Educators must provide better education and more educational opportunities for all who seek them and they must reach out to large minority groups who have been ignored in the past. The system must adapt to the changing role and meaning of education, and the services it provides must reach upward, downward and throughout the whole age range of our population. It must foster and provide life-long learning opportunities and become oriented to leisure time and cultural pursuits. And it must become increasingly involved in the affairs of the local and worldwide community. Education must become a vital process of innovation and interaction—for the student, the teacher, the parent, the educational institution, the community and the nation.

The growing sum of money spent for education is helping the system meet some of the demands thrust upon it. But money alone, although we do need more, will not solve all the problems nor guarantee attainment of the goals we have set for education—to foster individual fulfillment and to nurture the free, rational responsible men and women without whom our kind of society cannot endure.

We want to improve the distressingly poor education provided in most low income areas. We want to overcome early educational handicaps of deprived children. We want to upgrade teaching staff. We want to prepare young people for a world of work which will be considerably different than the one today.

Right now we are educating children who will be making their living in the year 2000 and after—just think of the implicational! These are tasks which cannot be left to the educators alone. Parents, school board members, local officials and responsible citizens must help in this difficult and exacting job of redesigning the school to meet today's and tomorrow's demands. This job is going to take a vast expenditure of imagination, energy and money.

Although new Federal funds give schools the leverage to work on vital national challenges to education, the Federal Government does not assume day-to-day financial support of schools. That is the job of the States and localities. And it is up to the citizens of the community to institute the changes they want made in the schools. Working through the PTA, citizen action groups and your own organization, with other organizations, you can influence the decisions that are made on education in your community.

Most of our cities' schools are in trouble in numerous ways—economically, socially, and culturally. Let me give you a few examples of the great unmet needs of our schools today.

Without any change in the present teacher pupil ratio—increasing elementary and secondary school enrollments will require an additional 7,000—8,000 teachers a year. By 1972, 90,000 additional teachers will be needed.

Teacher's salaries range from $4,650, to over $8,000 with the national average $6,820. An increase in the salaries of elementary and secondary school teachers is necessary to attract and hold capable imaginative and enthusiastic individuals as teachers of the Nation's youth. Over $2 billion annually would be needed to raise the national average to $8,100 (the California and New York average).

One out of ten school age children in the United States has a mental or physical handicapped condition that requires special educational attention. At present, there are only 60,000 teachers and other professional personnel available in the field of education of handicapped children. By 1973, more than 300,000 teachers and other personnel will be needed. At a cost of $5,400 per person, $150 million would be required to train the required number of personnel to meet the educational needs of handicapped children.

As a result of accommodating the postwar baby boom in classrooms our school districts are faced with a rapid increase in bond indebtedness and serious neglect of the needs for replacement modernization, and expansion of obsolete facilities. To relieve overcrowded and unsafe public elementary and secondary school classrooms today, the United States needs 382,000 classrooms at an estimated cost of nearly $15 billion.

Almost 50 percent of the Nation's elementary school children attend schools without libraries or with substandard libraries. About one billion dollars would be needed to bring school library book collections up to standards.

Quality pre-school opportunities are necessary for disadvantaged children if they are ever to have the hope of succeeding in regular classroom situations. Yet only 710,000 of the 2 million children aged 3–5 from poor families received preschool training last year in Head Start programs. To expand the program to remedy the background deficiencies of 2 million children would cost $405 million a year.

About 2 million school children between the age of 6 and 15 are underachievers and need compensatory education. The present $1.4 billion programs are reaching only about one-fourth of these children.

Approximately 80 percent of the students enrolled in the 5th grade of elementary school will not complete a 4-year degree program; more than 1 million students a year do not complete high school. By 1972, an estimated 18 million individuals will be in need of vocational education, but only 11.4 million will be enrolled in current programs unless new ways are found to meet the special needs of disadvantaged youth and school dropouts.

These are just a few examples taken from a voluminous list of great unmet needs of the schools. However, they can give you some idea of the scope and magnitude of the problems.

Now these problems are not going to be solved by pushing a button or putting a coin in the machine. They can only be solved by a coordinated, intensive effort of herculean magnitude and the effective use of the Nation's resources. And we are going to have to tap every available source for new and imaginative ideas. Every conceivable group, public and private will have to work together if we are going to beat the crisis in education and revitalize our schools so that they can do the job the Nation requires. I urge you with other groups in your community to explore new ideas, encourage research and experimental programs and help bring about the adoption of proven innovations in the school room.

It is a truism that the way to excellence in education is research which leads to innovation and then into generally applied practice. But the United States has lagged in applying this principle to education. While financial support for educational research and development has increased in the past few years as the result of Federal legislation, the amount is still small when compared with spending by other basic industries. Less than one-half of one percent of the Nation's total outlay for education is spent on research and development, compared with ten percent of total outlay in other major industries—nearly 60 times as much, for example, is spent on defense research.

Not only is the amount and quality of research in education low, but there is relatively little feedback—even from good research—to the local school system. Unpublicized innovations—however, successful in experimental application—are far too often not adopted simply because they are unknown. Others are not adopted because most school systems are run by such antiquated managerial methods that they are literally unable to change—to accept and adopt new ideas and techniques.

The results of research in education are too long delayed in application, or lost. It has been estimated that overall there is a 30-year lag between development of an innovation in education and its widespread adoption. It is 15 years before three percent of the school districts have made the change. Twenty regional educational laboratories established under Federal legislation in 1965 are designed to close this gap by speeding up the dissemination of research findings and putting research results in operation. The Laboratory operating here in New York, under the leadership of Robert Dentler is doing an excellent job of closing this gap. The world is moving too rapidly to wait 30 years for a good idea to be put into practice.

But what can you and your organization do to help bridge this gap and to meet other needs of the schools? Work with your local school board. Help them modernize and streamline their operations. But get involved. Most of you here tonight have knowledge and skills to contribute to the task—accountants, lawyers, doctors, businessmen, social workers—there isn't a profession today that could not contribute to the gigantic effort that must be undertaken.

Financial problems plague practically every city school system. Since the forties and fifties, city schools get proportionately less State aid than suburban schools. A recent study of 35 cities shows that the cities' average was $125 per pupil in State aid last year, while suburban districts got an average of $165 per student—$40 more.

These imbalances arise from excessive reliance on one factor to determine the allocation of funds: the number of dollars of assessed value behind each student in the district. I think we are going to have to rely more heavily on sources of revenue other than the property tax which is an inflexible source of funds.

In general, cities have to spend a greater proportion of their income on nonschool services than suburban areas. Last year, the cities spent an average of 65 percent of their local tax dollars on nonschool services—police and fire protection, garbage collection—many services that benefit not only their own residents but the commuters who use the services daily without adequately paying for them. The suburban areas spent about 35 percent of their revenues for this purpose.

While the demands on the cities' services are increasing, the tax base is decreasing as the exodus of business and workers to the suburbs continues. Thus, the money available to the city schools is decreasing while the need for more money is increasing and the problems in the school become more critical.

Some States are beginning to adjust their tax distribution pattern so that the cities will be treated more equitably. Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania for example, have made encouraging progress.

But further steps will have to be taken because in spite of these adjustments. Money for city schools is going to be in short supply for a long time. Thus we must continue to correct some of the inbalances in economics and we are going to have to make our dollars go farther.

This may mean coordinating programs, so that they serve a number of functions. It means seeing the school as an integral part of the community not as an isolated entity. It means that educators will have to learn how to communicate with the community and vice versa.

We will have to use every available resource not only for efficiency's sake but because a frank and mutual exchange of ideas among many diverse groups can be stimulating and provide new approaches that perhaps reliance on one group might not provide. For example, your organization, working with a local community action group, the PTA, and a local businessman's organization, might be able to devise a better program for school dropouts than the school could do alone.

There are a number of new ideas being discussed today. Some are very controversial, some are well accepted, and some may work in one city but not in another. But let us clear away some of the cobwebs in our thinking and try out a few of them.

Economically, socially and culturally it is advantageous to keep the schools open evenings, weekends and summer. We really cannot afford to close the school door at 3:00 p.m. everyday. For one reason it is a waste of valuable property. Isn't it more efficient and wouldn't it help to provide the answer to some of our problems, if the school was used as a community cultural center? It can serve the diversified and creative needs of the whole community. Why not introduce new courses that children and parents could participate in together in the evenings or on Saturdays. For example, some schools sponsor evening classes on family life instruction which mothers and daughters attend together. Another class is offered for sons and fathers on the subject.

This might be the first step in getting parents involved in the child's life as a student and in the school itself. Experience under Head Start programs has already proven the inherent benefits of parent involvement in the child's education. There must be a number of approaches to getting the parent involved in the child's education in the school. Parents must play a large role in school planning, school decisions and school operations and this means more than just PTA activities. It means a permanently established program in which parents become a part of the school structure in classroom activities, as teacher aides and not only as members of school boards.

Another idea you might explore is making space available in inner-city schools for commercial establishments such as grocery stores or beauty shops. This would be an excellent way to provide new services to the community, part-time job opportunities for students and extra revenue for the school system.

You might also provide rent free space in the school for local craftsmen—artists, potters, silversmiths, with the provisions that they devote some of their time to teaching students.

Or perhaps your community may want a building that would integrate the school with retail stores, banks, offices and apartments.

You might want to develop a consortium for elementary and secondary schools like those developing on the college level. All schools could have open enrollment and a student could attend the school that best suited his needs and provided the course he was interested in.

Couldn't students be offered more alternatives to a rigid full time schedule where they are either in school or out of school? Some students have individual needs, interests and problems and often they have no other choice than to drop out of school. Couldn't we let them drop-in on a part-time basis? Couldn't we set up work study programs?

These are just a few suggestions of what might be done to help revitalize our schools. I think it is going to be one of the most difficult, but one of the most exciting tasks we will face in the next decade. But I am confident that if we all work together as members of public and private organizations and as interested and involved citizens, there will be dramatic improvements in education before the end of the decade.

It will take a vast expenditure of time, money, and effort but it can be done. It has to be done. "It is the first work of our time", as President Johnson has said. Our survival as a Nation is dependent on it.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN FORESAW THE UNITED NATIONS ROLE

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as we recall the anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, we might remember with gratitude the foresight of President Harry S. Truman who marked its first anniversary 21 years ago with a speech at the General Assembly's opening session in New York.

I include extracts of his address which is still pertinent today:

> This meeting of the Assembly symbolizes the abandonment by the United States of a policy of isolation.
>
> The overwhelming majority of the American people, regardless of party, support the United Nations.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Lately we have all heard talk about the possibility of another world war. Fears have been aroused all over the world.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I have been reading reports from many parts of the world. These reports all agree on one major point—the people of every nation are sick of war. They know its agony and its futility. No responsible government can ignore this universal feeling.
>
> The United States of America has no wish to make war, now or in the future, upon any people anywhere in the world. The heart of our foreign policy is a sincere desire for peace. This nation will work patiently for peace by every means consistent with self-respect and security. Another world war

> would shatter the hopes of mankind and completely destroy civilization as we know it.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Every member of the United Nations is legally and morally bound by the Charter to keep the peace. More specifically, every member is bound to refrain in its international relations from the threat, or use, of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.
>
> . . . I remind you that 23 members of the United Nations have bound themselves by the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal to the principle that planning, initiating or waging a war of aggression is a crime against humanity for which individuals as well as states shall be tried before the bar of international justice.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The United States will support the United Nations with all the resources that we possess.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The course of history has made us one of the stronger nations of the world. It has therefore placed upon us special responsibilities to conserve our strength and to use it rightly in a world interdependent as our world today.
>
> The American people recognize these special responsibilities. We shall do our best to meet them, both in the making of peace settlements and in the fulfillment of the long-range task of the United Nations.
>
> The American people look upon the United Nations not as a temporary expedient but as a permanent partnership—a partnership among the peoples of the world for their common peace and common well-being.
>
> It must be the determined purpose of all of us to see that the United Nations lives and grows in the minds and hearts of all people.

DICKEY-LINCOLN GIVES CONSUMER CHANCE FOR PRICE COMPETITION

Mr. **PURCELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ROSENTHAL**. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the paradoxes of the consumer protection field that we who speak for the consumer must often do so by quoting the credo of private enterprise to our opponents.

We see this paradox in many ways: We ask grocery chains to compete in both price and services for the low-income consumer but there is often only a smile in reply. We ask drug companies to practice free enterprise by competing for low prices and elaborate excuses for high prices result. And we ask private power to understand the Northeast's interest in lower electric power rates through a commendable public power project which competes by price comparison and we find 100 reasons why monopolies are better.

The Dickey-Lincoln project will give the Northeast what every other segment of the country has already, a comparative base for electric power costs. Those who back this project think competition is good for all businesses. We wish that preachers of free enterprise would practice what they preach.

UNITED NATIONS DAY

Mr. **PURCELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PEPPER**. Mr. Speaker, throughout history wars have blemished the relations among men; yet throughout history mankind has sought peace. The United Nations has existed so long in our memories, that we sometimes tend to forget how exciting an experiment in peacemaking it is and how recent to man's history is the establishment of a permanent international peacemaking organization.

I had the honor of serving in the Senate to which the Charter of the United Nations was presented, and I am proud to say I was among those who strongly advocated U.S. participation in the United Nations. I wish I could convey to you the atmosphere in the legislative chambers of our Government during that momentous period when—with the deepest sense of responsibility to the people of this Nation and to the succeeding generations of Americans—the U.S. Senate deliberated on ratification of the United Nations Charter. On this day which has been designated United Nations Day, let us all pause to recall the fervor with which the war-stricken people of the entire world desired lasting peace, the idealism with which the Charter of the United Nations was imbued, and the efforts of the drafters of the charter to provide the machinery to implement those desires and idealism. Let us pause to reaffirm the support of the American people for the United Nations and our faith in the principles on which it was based.

We must recognize that the United Nations has not proven capable of fully obtaining for the people of the world those objectives for which it was designed, because the nations of the world have been unwilling to put the idealism expressed in the charter into practice. Despite the innumerable accomplishments of the United Nations in temporizing conflicts, restoring peace and order, providing to nations various alternative methods for peaceful settlement of disputes, despite its record of successes as an instrument for peace, the critics of the United Nations dwell on its weaknesses. The weaknesses of the United Nations, however, are largely due to the vast transformations of the state of world affairs which have taken place over the past two decades. When the charter was drafted the cold war had not yet been waged by our adversary, the nuclear age of fear had not begun. The United Nations has been forced to adapt to these changes. It is against this tableau of changes that the weaknesses and strengths of the United Nations must be measured. Such an evaluation will clearly show that the United Nations has repeatedly demonstrated its utility for peace, its durability in face of obstacles, its worth as a testing ground for international cooperation for world order—so new to the history of man.

We are indeed witnessing an exciting experiment in man's search for peace. On this United Nations Day, let us call on all the nations of the world to join with the American people in rededicating ourselves to the goals expressed in the United Nations Charter that one day we will have secured for succeeding generations a world in which, as it is so beautifully expressed in the Bible:

> They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

A NEED TO REMOVE LIMITATIONS ON OCEAN CRUISES

Mr. **PURCELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PEPPER**. Mr. Speaker, I have been, for a long time, concerned with the need to provide an opportunity for U.S.-flag passenger vessels to operate profitably after their subsidy. To this end, I introduced H.R. 13630, a bill to remove certain limitations on ocean cruises. Today I was pleased and honored to appear before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in support of this legislation. I would like at this time to insert in the Congressional Record the text of my statement before that fine committee:

Statement of the Honorable Claude Pepper Before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee Regarding H.R. 12639 and H.R. 13630, "To Remove Certain Limitations on Ocean Cruises," October 24, 1967

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished Committee: I am pleased to appear before your Committee to support H.R. 12639, introduced by Chairman Garmatz, as well as a companion bill which I have introduced, H.R. 13630, which is identical to the Chairman's. In my opinion, this legislation is an extremely important piece of legislation, and I am honored also to add my name as a sponsor.

I believe in American-flag passenger vessels, and that the United States must have a fleet of modern passenger liners as an essential part of its Merchant Marine. But in order to have a viable fleet of American-flag passenger vessels, we must remove restrictions that presently hinder the operations of these vessels. Certainly the operators of American-flag passenger vessels must have the same operational flexibility that is enjoyed by companies operating foreign-flag vessels.

Removal of restrictions placed on US-flag vessels in connection with cruise operations is long past due. Under the so-called cruise legislation now in effect, the U.S.-flag vessels in the subsidized fleets are not permitted to engage in cruise operations for more than one-third of each year. Even after authority to make cruise voyages has been granted by the Maritime Board, there are several limitations which hamper operations and result in earnings which are less than could be secured from cruise business.

Among the restrictions which would be removed by H.R. 12639 is the portion of the year within which a vessel may engage in cruise business. Many US-flag vessels are not required for berth services for as much as two-thirds of the year and under existing regulations must lie idle or make voyages which incur losses to the operators.

Another very important change would be removal of the requirement that passengers be embarked only at domestic ports on the same seacoast as that to which the vessel is assigned on regular services. In the future US-flag vessels engaged in cruise operations would be permitted to carry passengers round-trip or one-way between domestic and foreign and other domestic ports without diminution of subsidy, the only restriction being that they not carry passengers between ports regularly served by another US-flag passenger liner unless specifically authorized by the Board on findings that existing operator's service would not be adversely affected.

US-flag vessels are not able to engage in round-the-world cruises. Removal of this prohibition would allow greater US-flag participation in the growing round-the-world cruise traffic. Much of the business now goes to foreign-flag lines which operate without such restrictions. Participation in the round-the-world cruise business and greater freedom in other cruise voyages would result in greater utilization of liners and contribute to a strong merchant marine. Our national interests require that our merchant marine be as strong as possible.

There appears to be no reason for continuing to prohibit carrying mail and/or cargo aboard cruise vessels. H.R. 12639 would repeal this prohibition and permit cruise vessels to carry mail and/or cargo except between ports where other U.S.-flag vessels provide the service on their regular routes. Where authorized by the Board on finding such carriage would not adversely affect the existing operators' service, mail and/or cargo could be carried between ports where service already is being provided.

Because cruise operations would no longer be restricted to seacoasts on which the liner is authorized to operate, H.R. 12639 would repeal Section 613 (f) of the Merchant Marine Act, which defines seacoasts.

In view of the importance of the merchant marine to the nation, and the problems of maintaining merchant fleets adequate for our national purposes, these needless restrictions should be removed as soon as possible. The passenger vessel service which formerly was available along our coasts has disappeared. It is no longer possible for many people wishing to travel by ocean from one port in the country to another except in a few instances. Cruise ships sailing from the North Atlantic ports, if they were able to stop at intermediate ports, could tap a source of traffic in the tourists who would travel by ship to Miami, for example, when they would not be able to travel the entire cruise route. Also, tourists could join the cruise at Miami and travel to another port or continue for the entire cruise. A considerable volume of passenger traffic would be generated if the existing restrictions were removed as provided by H.R. 12639. This would redound to the benefit of the port areas as well as to the liner operators. Our US-flag operators must be allowed, in fact should be encouraged, to utilize their vessels to the best advantage and in full time voyages which would generate revenue rather than loss.

In my opinion, there is a great untapped market for passengers desiring one-way or round-trip ocean travel between U.S. North Atlantic ports and Florida and between U.S. Gulf ports and Florida. It is also paradoxical that one of the most attractive cruise markets, between Florida ports and Puerto Rico is presently unable to be served because of statutory restrictions.

In 1968, a permanent exposition, Interama, will open in Miami. In addition to the other well known features and attractions of the Miami and Florida area, this exposition will provide an excellent basis and point of interest for passenger cruise operations. I have noted that twenty-two cruises carrying 10,652 passengers were operated between United States North Atlantic ports to Montreal in connection with Expo-67. Only seven of these cruises were by American-flag vessels. I am certain that cruises between United States North Atlantic ports and Miami would provide a much more attractive and significantly greater cruise market than cruises to Montreal. However, because of the restrictions in the present law, such cruises between United States North Atlantic ports and Miami by subsidized American-flag passenger vessels would be prohibited.

I urge your Committee to give H.R. 12639 your prompt and favorable consideration so that this desirable piece of proposed legislation may be enacted into law on the earliest possible date.

Thank you.

SINKING OF THE "ELATH"

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the sinking of the Israel destroyer *Elath*, with the loss of some 51 Israel seamen, demonstrates beyond peradventure of a doubt which side in the Middle East stands for peace and which side stands for war.

We have heard a great deal of talk from various governments that Israel should withdraw to some earlier frontier, having no relation to its defense. The *Elath* incident points up how ridiculous that talk is.

As the Times of London says in an editorial:

> Israel hoped for two things as a result of the war * * * recognition of her existence by the Arabs and more defensible frontiers. If she cannot get the first, she will concentrate on the second and a new round of fighting is likely to lead to fresh territorial conquests by Israel.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the Arabs in their unprovoked attack on the *Elath* indicated they were spoiling for trouble. The incident cannot be overlooked. If the sovereign nations of the world cannot see to it that Israel is secure, then Israel must see to it herself.

To say the least, I am deeply disappointed by the attitude of our own Government to this act of unprovoked hostility. The State Department indicated that it finds the sinking "regrettable," but refused to criticize the Egyptians for it as if somehow both sides were equally to blame.

I regard this position by our Government as unfortunate.

For the United States, the act has particular significance, because it puts on display a powerful Soviet weapon, perhaps operated by Soviet technicians. Are we to let the Middle East be a proving ground for Soviet missiles and Israel be their target? I should hope that we shall not.

The situation in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker, is dangerous once again. It is time for this country to assert itself to make certain there is no repetition which might touch off a general resumption of the fighting.

LT. COL. TERRY ALLEN, JR.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the death of every serviceman in Vietnam is a great personal tragedy to someone—sometimes to many, sometimes to just a few. But, occasionally the death of one man seems to capture the attention of the entire Nation, and to focus our thoughts anew on the challenge of the great war for freedom in which we are engaged.

When 58 brave young Americans gave their lives in a bitter battle northwest of Saigon last week, Lt. Col. Terry Allen, Jr., was a battalion commander of the 1st Infantry Division. He had been twice decorated for bravery in combat before he gave his life in last week's action. Both the name of Terry Allen and the unit, the 1st Infantry Division, were already legends in the field of U.S. military history.

Colonel Allen's father, Gen. Terry Allen, Sr., commanded the 1st Division, the Big Red 1, in its smash across North Africa in World War II. In peacetime, he was equally renowned as one of the Army's great polo players. Both father and son are products of my home city, El Paso, Tex. Both married into prominent pioneer El Paso families. The death of Colonel Allen, as you might expect, had a great personal impact on the people of El Paso. The El Paso Herald Post expressed, I believe, the feeling of our community in its editorial of Thursday, October 19, written by Robert Lee, which I would like to place in the RECORD at this point:

ONE OF MANY

> The name of Terry Allen is a notable one in El Paso, for Major General Terry Allen of this city was an authentic hero of World War II, the much decorated commander of the Big Red One Division.
>
> Thus it is that news of the death of another Terry Allen—son of General Allen and a lieutenant colonel and Battalion Commander of the Big Red One in Vietnam—is perhaps of more than ordinary interest.
>
> Lieutenant Colonel Allen was a worthy son of a valiant father. He was twice decorated for heroism in recent months, and had established himself as an outstanding leader.
>
> Yet, Lieutenant Colonel Allen was only one of many young men from El Paso and from many other sections of our nation, who have lost their lives in Vietnam. Their names represent a cross-section of America. No one death is more "important" than another—they are all terribly important to all of us.
>
> Each life lost, whether it is that of a high ranking officer or a private, increases the strains already evident in our country, and adds to the clamor to "pull out" or "get it over with". To pull out would be to make a mockery of all these men have died for. To get it over with means more loss of lives.
>
> We face an enemy with admittedly less financial resources than our own, and ad-

mittedly less power. Yet one virtue they possess—patience, or if you will, dogged determination. They count on this for victory. They count on our impatience to cause us to quit.

Lieutenant Colonel Allen and the thousands of others slain in Vietnam possessed the determination to win. The test is whether the rest of us possess the same.

REPRESENTATIVE MOSS ADDRESSES MONTANA FARMERS UNION CONVENTION

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, recently delivered an outstanding address at the annual convention of the Montana Farmers Union in Great Falls, Mont.

In it, he expressed views with which I strongly agree, and I recommend his thoughtful comments to every Member of the House.

I include Congressman Moss' remarks in the RECORD at this point:

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, OF CALIFORNIA, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MONTANA FARMERS UNION, GREAT FALLS, MONT., OCTOBER 19, 1967

It is very refreshing to be here today to discuss with you some of the problems facing the rural communities of your great and beautiful State of Montana.

I might add that it is refreshing as well to be away from the discords, pressures and bickerings which pervade our national capital today.

There are myriad critical problems besetting our Nation both at home and abroad. But their magnitude does not minimize the seriousness of the problems facing you right here in your own backyard. In fact, the worsening state of the nation's rural economy demands immediate and thorough study and corrective action.

The progressive National Farmers Union is in the forefront of a growing national campaign to remold and reinvigorate our rural economy, advancing new ideas and concrete proposals. In Montana, under the leadership of your long-time president Leonard Kenfield, you have worked diligently to preserve the best values of rural life in modern society. Each of you deserve the highest praise and the fullest cooperation of all thinking Americans.

In the last few years the spotlight of national concern has centered, for the most part, on the urban communities of America and their large pockets of grim and debilitating poverty. Certainly the problems of our cities cry out for speedy and effective solutions. And you will agree, I know, that we cannot evade our responsibilities in this regard.

While the plight of our rural economy has been somewhat obscured by the violence and upheaval in the cities, there is a growing awareness that America's rural communities and farmers also face complex and serious problems. There is indeed a close relationship between the urban and rural dilemmas now brooding over the nation.

The crisis in our cities is caused in large measure by the gross congestion of people which breeds economic instability, shocking housing conditions, and explosive discontent. Many of the 30 million persons who migrated from American farms to American cities since 1940 were "rural dropouts" who left the farming communities because of the sagging rural economy. "There's no home on the farm," they said, "so let's try the city." And, I'm afraid, that despite the urban convulsions the mass migration to the cities is continuing.

It is a particularly sad and revealing fact that most of the people leaving the land for the cities are under thirty years of age. The largest group comprises young people who have just finished high school and are facing the productive years of life.

I know this figure is probably out of line in Montana, but one-third of the Americans who live on farms, live in poverty. In addition, the proportion of people without jobs is twice as high among agricultural workers as it is among industrial workers. Furthermore, our rural communities, generally speaking, do not offer first rate medical facilities, maximum cultural opportunities, or a great variety of stores and services.

The flight to the cities also means fewer people to pay the taxes in rural areas, and thus less money for public education, public medical facilities, libraries, and other institutions which are the mark of social progress.

How can we stem, indeed reverse, this flow of manpower to the cities? The answer is obvious but mighty hard to come by—make our rural areas economically attractive and provide better homes, better roads, better schools, better amenities of all kinds. I agree fully with your President, Mr. Kenfield, who recently said:

"Rural America has vast spaces with clean air and is capable, if allowed to share in a larger part of the national income, of providing wholesome living for more families on more farms and in more rural communities. . . . A dynamic program of improvement in rural America will help the cities by relieving them of depressing congestion and shifting their burdens into more self-sustaining areas."

A recent Gallup poll tells us that half of the American people would really prefer to live in the country or in a small town, if they felt they could obtain the economic and social advantages of urban and suburban areas.

The challenge we face, then, is simply this: we must harness our technology and resources—which are the greatest in the world—to provide the benefits of modern living throughout our rural communities, benefits equal to or higher than those existing elsewhere in the nation.

Rural areas need more jobs based, not only on agriculture, but also on medium and small industry, on research facilities, on distribution centers, and other enterprises which do not have to be in large metropolitan areas to prosper and grow. The economic weight of Defense and other government contracts for research, development, and production, as well as tax incentives and other programs of cooperative partnership between government and private enterprise, should be used for farm areas as well as in the big cities.

But government cannot do the job alone. Rural communities must develop their own civic consciousness, organize development groups to attract job-producing enterprises, and make the most of their natural resources and recreational opportunities. There must emerge a dedicated and imaginative local leadership in our rural communities.

The basic element for improving rural America is, of course, to eliminate the high cost—low price squeeze now throttling our farm communities. The decline of parity to 73 this September, largely because of higher machinery prices and lower hog prices, is not good for rural America. It is, indeed, tragic that the increase of 233.8 percent in our gross national product since 1947 has been accompanied by a decrease of 6.6 percent in net income of farmers since 1947.

Government and private enterprise must evolve programs and policies which will reverse this disastrous trend. Unless effective corrective action is taken, efforts to rejuvenate our rural communities will be of no avail. It is good that in these trying times the National Farmers Union is putting forth restless and active leadership in proposing innovative possible solutions to the farmer's economic problems, nationwide and in the State of Montana, including such proposals as setting up a mechanism for enabling farmers and ranchers to engage in collective bargaining, commodity by commodity, with buyers, handlers and processors; limiting government payments to any one farm operator; providing more government low-cost credit to farmers and ranchers; and abolishing the so-called corporate farm.

The National Farmers Union stands foursquare for family farming, as I do. This is why I have always endorsed, and will always seek to preserve, the effective acreage limitation in the Federal Reclamation law limiting the Bureau of Reclamation from furnishing water at a cost carrying significant subsidy to more than 160-acres for each landowner. That provision is the bedrock of family farming in great areas of our nation, as much today as when it was enacted some 60 years ago.

You, the farmers and consumers in Montana, are particularly fortunate to have such a champion as my great and good friend, Senator Lee Metcalf. He is truly a dedicated public servant, who fights vigorously and continuously for the consumer's interests. His efforts against high cost electricity are particularly epochal and noteworthy. He has documented, time and again, the overcharges and the unconscionable high rates of return received by electric power companies at the expense of the consumer.

Montana has these problems too. Here in Great Falls, the consumer pays the Montana Power Company about $5 per month more than he would pay in comparable cities elsewhere in the country, while the Company's actual rate of return—11.37 percent—is one of the highest of any electric utility in the country.

One reason for these high charges, and high rate of return, is lack of competition. Montana is the only State, except Hawaii, without a single municipal power system.

Traditionally there have been three principal means to protect the consumer's interest in low-cost, reliable, electric service. First, by the competition of other forms of energy, but such competition is now rapidly becoming obsolete even where the local power company doesn't own the gas company too. Second, by governmental regulation of rates and conditions of service, but such regulation has seldom been very effective and frequently it is pure sham. Third, by the yardstick of public and cooperative power which helps to measure the reasonableness of the rates and services of electric companies by comparison with the operations of municipal, public utility district, and rural cooperatives electric systems.

The yardstick depends largely on the hydropower generated at Federal dams. This is because of all the electric energy generated in this country in 1966, State and local bodies produced only 10 percent, and cooperatives produced only 1 percent, whereas the Federal Government produced 13 percent. All the rest (76 percent) was produced by the investor-owned, profit-making companies. But the yardstick is not as effective as it ought to be, because less than half (48.6 percent) of this Federally generated power was sold to preference customers such as municipalities, rural cooperatives, public utility districts, States and other public agencies. About one-sixth (17.8 percent) was consumed by the Federal

Government itself, and over one-third (33.6 percent) was sold to private industry and investor-owned utilities.

The Federal Power Commission predicts that total electric consumption in the United States will at least double between now and 1980. Federal power production, therefore, should also double, at least, if we are to maintain even the present inadequate yardstick. Unfortunately, the trend is in the other direction.

We must begin to think very seriously about public agencies engaging in thermal generation of electricity if we are going to be able to maintain the Federal yardstick. Traditionally, Federal power has meant hydropower. Even today, TVA is the only Federal entity with its own thermal generation. However, hydro alone will not provide the large increase in Federal power and energy required to maintain the present minimum Federally-generated proportion of all power produced in this country.

Furthermore, as new hydropower sources become scarce, and existing Federal hydropower is more and more reserved for peaking operation, it tends to lose its yardstick quality. With private steam plants carrying the base load, and the coordinated output sold at composite rates, which often include a private wheeling toll, it becomes difficult or impossible to compare Federal and private prices.

At the same time, however, the growing importance of hydropower for peaking purposes will make it feasible to develop many marginal hydro sites which previously were thought to be uneconomic because of their limited amount of water to produce energy. We should therefore urge that all such sites be reevaluated for Federal development as peaking plants. In many cases, these marginal sites can be made very useful for peaking power by inclusion of pumped storage facilities, which make possible the carrying of large peak loads with very small streamflow, provided, of course, they are operating as part of an adequate base load system.

Hydropower, therefore, can still have a great role in the future of the yardstick. However, it is under heavy attack. Unless consumers act to protect their interest in low cost electricity, its role is going to be whittled away. It is ironic that the well-financed campaigns by private power companies against new Federal hydropower projects has been inadvertently aided by well-intentioned people, who are as devoted to conservation as I am, who fear that dams will damage fish, birds or whitewater canoeing.

I do not think that dams are necessarily destructive to the principles of resource conservation. On the contrary, the reservoirs provide water for municipal purposes, flood control, irrigation, industrial use, and many forms of recreation, including boating, swimming, fishing, etc. Hydropower dams are a renewable resource, and frequently are less destructive to the natural environment than any other form of electric generation. They do not pollute the air with smoke and radioactivity, or the water of our rivers and lakes with heat or radioactive wastes.

Conservation consists of the most effective long term use of the resources of nature for the benefit of mankind. It involves respect for mother earth. It does not imply idolizing one value—for instance, the sport of shooting rapids in rubber boats—to the exclusion of all others. It means reverent use, not non-use, of the gifts God has provided to man.

If we are to have more Federal dams, we must take our case to the public. We must describe the dangerous alternatives. We must explain the true meaning of conservation. But it is not enough simply to have Federal dams and powerplants. It is also necessary to be vigilant in protecting the public's rights to the power produced by such Federal powerplants. For example, on July 31 of this year the Secretary of the Interior signed a long-term contract with the Pacific Gas and Electric Company which makes the entire Central Valley Project power system in California an appendage of the company until the year 2005, freezes the load growth of existing preference customers, excludes the opportunity of other preference customers to obtain the benefits of low-cost Federal power, and subjects the Government and its customers to an intricate set of restrictions that will almost inevitably insure their permanent domination by the company.

For four years I fought, along with several other Members of Congress, to eliminate or modify the many unconscionable features of the contract, some of which were severely criticized by the Federal Power Commission and the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice. Our efforts resulted in various changes which improved the contract in some respects for both the Government and its preference customers.

I am sorry to say, however, that the contract was still heavily loaded in the Company's favor. Secretary Udall has said he will try to help the various smaller municipalities of Central and Northern California to assure their future power needs at economical costs. However, I have the gravest misgivings that the contract which he signed with the Company, over my objection, will make it most difficult, if not impossible, for the municipalities to develop their own sources for their future power needs, and for the Secretary to be of much help to them.

The struggle for low-cost electricity in the next decade or two will become increasingly great in the field of nuclear power. I understand that 55 percent of the new generating capacity contracted for in the United States last year was for nuclear power plants. The most significant feature of these plants is their large size. The average capacity of the 32 plants contracted for construction after 1967 will be 625 megawatts. The average size of the nuclear generating units ordered last year—which is the latest figure in the AEC report—will be 790 megawatts. Indeed the smallest plant in the list for future completion is 450 megawatts.

Of course, the economies which result from large generators is the reason for the increasing capacity of new atomic plants. The AEC estimates the cost of production from a 500 megawatt nuclear plant at 4.4 mills per kilowatt hour. TVA has already begun construction of two nuclear plants, each over 1100 megawatts, which will produce energy at a cost of 2.37 mills per kilowatt hour.

4.4 mill nuclear power may or may not be competitive with coal, but 2.37 mill energy is competitive even with hydropower. But you have to be awfully big to afford an 1100 megawatt plant. TVA is paying $122,700,000 for two of them—plus costs of the transmission plant, contingency allowance, and interest during construction, which run the bill up to $247,000,000—plus $232,000,000 for a twelve-year fuel supply. Significantly, however, even the investment in the plant itself, on a dollars-per-kilowatt basis, will be less than for a comparable coal plant—$116 compared to $117. But there are few non-Federal public power agencies or rural co-ops that are big enough to engage in the generation of atomic power.

Of the 20,003 megawatts of total capacity of nuclear power plants under contract for completion after 1967, only TVA's 2,229 megawatts and the Omaha Public Power District's 450 megawatts—the smallest on the list—will be publicly owned.

The Hanford plant on the Columbia River, the only other large publicly owned nuclear power facility in the country, was built by the Atomic Energy Commission to make plutonium for bombs. The Commission considered producing electricity at Hanford itself, but the Congress would have preferred to waste the steam. Only after a bitter fight was this waste prevented, by legislation permitting a group of Washington State public power districts to recycle steam from the cooling water through their generator to produce 786 megawatts of useful power—but then only on condition that they offer 50 percent participation to the private companies. The private power interests today are very strong indeed.

Another example of their strangle-hold is shown in the recent struggle over appropriations for the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam in Maine, the first Federal hydroelectric project in the Northeast, which Congress authorized in 1965 by a narrow margin. In this Congress, the House of Representatives, with the approving votes of most of the New England Congressmen, where power costs are the highest in the Nation, voted against the appropriation. It is most significant that the very threat of this project has led to at least five rate reductions from private power companies in Maine.

The very success of the TVA in developing a once poor and backward region has made the private power industry vow never to permit it to happen again; and so far, they have kept their vow. There are no plans to repeat even the Hanford 50 percent public-50 percent private arrangement. Even half a loaf to the public is too much.

A potential new fuel for making electricity is geothermal steam—natural underground steam. Certainly steam under the public lands of the United States is a public resource that ought to be developed for public benefit either by the Government itself, or at least by public and cooperative bodies under a preference clause. The Department of the Interior proposed a leasing act to this Congress for geothermal steam. It contains no preference clause. Instead it provides for sale of steam leases to the highest bidder—again pricing the little fellows out of the market.

Almost sixty years ago, in vetoing a bill to give away a hydropower site on the James River in Missouri, President Theodore Roosevelt wrote as follows:

"The people of the country are threatened by a monopoly far more powerful, because it is in far closer touch with their domestic and industrial life, than anything known to our experience. . . .

"To give away, without conditions, this, one of the greatest of our resources, would be an act of folly. If we are guilty of it, our children will be forced to pay an annual return upon a capitalization based upon the highest prices which 'the traffic will bear'. They will find themselves face to face with powerful interests entrenched behind the doctrine of 'vested rights' and strengthened by every defense which money can buy and the ingenuity of able corporation lawyers can devise. Long before that time they may and very probably will have become a consolidated interest, controlled from the great financial centers, dictating the terms upon which the citizen can conduct his business or earn his livelihood, and not amenable to the wholesome check of local opinion.

* * * * *

"I esteem it my duty to use every endeavor to prevent this growing monopoly, the most threatening which has ever appeared, from being fastened upon the people of this nation."

We need another Roosevelt today.

Already electric power is the nation's largest industry. Its capital assets are 60 percent larger than those of the next largest industry—petroleum refining. Twelve percent of all capital invested in business in this country is under the control of the privately-owned electric power utilities. And they grasp for more at the public expense.

The State of New York has a fine public power authority, which generates 20 percent of the electricity produced in that State, from the waters of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers. These rivers are now almost fully developed. Logically, to maintain the yardstick, and to retain the public share of the market, the New York Power Authority, like TVA, should begin building nuclear plants.

This is not what the State Administration has proposed. Instead, it proposes to bring power costs down by providing free atomic fuel to the private companies.

Unless an enlightened and outraged public demands otherwise, this may be the ultimate fate of the yardstick—to be replaced by a subsidy to the private companies which enables them to impose their excessive rates on both our light bills and our tax bills.

The proportion of Federally-generated power to privately-generated power must be maintained at least at its current level. How can public power survive the establishment of the large regional power pooling combines that are coming to be the predominant pattern of the electric power industry, if public generation does not keep pace with industry expansion? Either we maintain the balance between the private and public sectors of the industry or the electric industry will become ever more dominated and controlled by the large private monopolies within the next decade.

The second method of protecting the consumer from abuse by the monopolistic electric utilities is through government regulation of rates and services. There is vast room for improvement in this field, both by the State Commissions and by the Federal Power Commission. However, I believe that despite the prior inadequacies of such regulation, we should continue to work to improve and strengthen the regulatory role of both the Federal and State Commissions, and not abandon regulation as a tool for protecting the interests of the consumer.

Most of you are familiar with the efforts made during the last Congress by the private utilities to enact the Holland-Smathers bill which would exempt them from FPC jurisdiction. The bill was on its way to passage when the great Northeast Blackout of November 9, 1965, occurred. That Blackout graphically demonstrated the interstate character of the electric industry and the need for more regulation, rather than less regulation, and effectively killed the Holland-Smathers bill in the last Congress.

But the private power utilities are not easily discouraged. The Holland-Smathers bill has reappeared in this Congress. It would exempt from Federal regulation, including Federal accounting and disclosure requirements, any electric company "whose facilities are all situated in a single State and are not used to transmit or receive electric energy by direct connection, from or to any other State, or by indirect connection, from or to any other State except for temporary or emergency purposes."

The Florida Power and Light Company, which is one of the principal supporters of the present Holland-Smathers bill, is the largest utility in the State of Florida, with assets of about a billion dollars. It is ninth in revenues, among the almost 3600 electric systems in the Nation. It claims that the "onerous" FPC accounting requirements will force it to raise its rates, and that it is already adequately regulated by the Florida Public Service Commission.

In 1964, Florida Power and Light Company's rate of return was 12.3 percent, the third highest rate of return on invested capital of any power company in the country. In 1965 the Chairman of the Florida regulatory commission testified before the Senate Commerce Committee that in his opinion the best utility regulation "is little or no regulation." In 1966, a newspaper reporter who asked the director of the finance department of the Florida Commission about Florida Power and Light's rate base was told: "Where it is, if it still exists, I don't know." The law of Florida does not provide for any regulation of wholesale rates and service. Thus, if the Holland-Smathers bill should pass, there would be no one to require Florida Power and Light Company to sell electricity to a co-op, and perhaps ultimately, no more co-ops in Florida.

Florida Power and Light is not directly connected to any out-of-state utility. It is connected to Florida Power Corporation, which in turn is connected to the Georgia Power Company. The interchange contract between Florida Power and Light and the Florida Power Corporation is not to be found in either the FPC or the Florida Public Service Commission files. It apparently has never been put in writing. It remains more secret even than Florida Power and Light's rate base.

The new Holland-Smathers bill, although apparently motivated to fit the Florida Power and Light pattern, can also serve as the vehicle for exempting many other private electric utility companies from FPC jurisdiction, simply through the device of setting up a separate corporation to hold title to a substation, or other facility (even merely a 10-foot stretch of wire) at the state boundary, so that the utility is not connected "directly" to facilities in the next state.

I intend to continue opposing the Holland-Smathers bill. What the country needs is not exemption from FPC regulation, but more FPC regulation to insure better performance, better reliability, more equitable prices and conditions of service, and maximum protection from blackouts in the Nation's electric power industries.

Perhaps these benefits may come in the proposed Power Reliability Act which the FPC sent to Congress after the blackout of last June on the PJM system in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland and Delaware which affected 13 million people.

In my opinion, the FPC bill offers a sound approach to the problem of reliability and adequacy of power planning and power transmission. However, as I studied the FPC bill I found a number of oversights or defects which should be corrected. Therefore, on August 14, I introduced a revised bill (H.R. 12322) which would, in my judgment, remedy those deficiencies.

The purpose of this legislation is not merely to prevent more cascading power failures. It is also designed to assure, in accordance with the national policy adopted 32 years ago, that there will be an abundant supply of electric energy throughout the United States, with the maximum possible economy and with due regard to the proper utilization and conservation of natural resources. This bill would also clarify the Congressional mandate to the Federal Power Commission to consider esthetic and historic values in carrying out its regulatory duties concerning electric power.

The FPC bill, and to a greater extent, my bill, views the electric power industry as one nationwide public utility, consisting of all the local generating and transmission entities, including the public, private, and cooperative segments thereof. Both bills require organization of the industry into regional councils to plan, coordinate, and provide the most reliable, efficient, and economic service to all the people of the region, regardless of who provides retail distribution service, and to exchange and coordinate power with neighboring regions.

Strong interconnection between adequate generation is the key to power reliability in areas of heavy energy consumption. Every one of the 18 cascading power failures starting with the great Northeast Blackout of November 9, 1965, occurred because of inadequate interconnections. The Holland-Smathers bill in addition to its many other faults, would discourage interconnection, and hence decrease reliability. The Electric Power Reliability bill would help strengthen interconnections and thus increase the reliability of electric power systems.

Both the FPC bill and my bill seek to achieve these objectives by voluntary cooperation of the various managements within the regions. Both bills require that the regional councils be open to membership by all segments of the power industry so that all plans developed by the regional councils will be the product of all the power systems, including the public, private, and cooperative power networks within the same region.

My bill corrects an oversight in the FPC bill to provide for participation, on a voluntary basis, by State regulatory commissions as well as the utilities, in regional council work. Both bills empower the FPC to compel participation in council work by recalcitrant generating and transmission entities; however, my bill adds an explicit provision requiring such entities also to share reasonably in the council's expenses. Both bills provide that the FPC may review, and, if necessary, revise regional council plans; but both provide that the plans are to be developed in the first instance by the local utilities in the region.

The FPC bill provides that those who act pursuant to a regional plan shall be immune from suits for damages and injunctive relief under the antitrust laws by those who are hurt by such actions. I think such grant of immunity from suit under the antitrust laws would be a dangerous weakening of the protections against arbitrary monopoly actions. Furthermore, I believe the courts are a better forum than the FPC to resolve disputes under the antitrust laws. Hence, my bill does not authorize the FPC, by its approval of the plans of the regional councils, to confer antitrust immunity.

Both bills contemplate the establishment of mandatory reliability criteria by the FPC for bulk power supply facilities, which may be of nationwide or regional applicability. These criteria would be promulgated only after consultation with the regional councils, and may, in fact, be developed in the first instance by the councils. My bill differs in only two words from the FPC bill concerning reliability standards. I say the Commission "shall" promulgate regulations setting forth reliability criteria; and the FPC bill says it "may". Clearly, the criteria must be promulgated, and my bill explicitly so provides.

The FPC bill recognizes that the construction and operation of extra-high-voltage lines, those over 200,000 volts, will involve aesthetic values. I want to provide increased protection to these values.

The FPC bill would authorize the FPC to appoint advisory coordination review boards, but does not explicitly encourage the appointment of persons interested in conservation and aesthetics to those advisory boards. My bill will do so.

In addition, my bill expressly prohibits the grant of rights-of-way for extra-high-voltage power lines in national parks, national monuments, national battlefields, historic sites, and all other areas administered by the National Park Service, except three types of areas. The excepted areas are national parkways, which are narrow strips hundreds of miles long, and two varieties of recreation areas which frequently surround existing power dams and do not have preservation of the natural environment as their primary purpose.

My bill also goes beyond the FPC bill by authorizing the administering agency of Federal land to veto a proposed EHV power line over Federal lands, not only on the ground that it would endanger aesthetic or historic values, but also if it would endanger identified species of flora or fauna. I have also added a provision to clarify that the Electric Power Reliability Act will not supersede the Wilderness Act in any way.

Both the FPC bill and my bill require review by the FPC before extra-high-voltage transmission lines may be built. One reason is to provide a forum for reviewing the aesthetic consequences of proposals such as Potomac Edison's plan to run an EHV line near Antietam battlefield in Maryland. The other reason is technological. The FPC will have an opportunity to determine whether the EHV line is adequate to do the job for which it is intended, whether it will increase the reliability of service at both its terminals, as it should, or increase the chances of cascading failures, as it should not.

My bill goes another step beyond the FPC bill, and makes extra-high-voltage lines true public utilities, giving to every electric entity the right to increase the capacity of such lines, by whomever owned, at its own expense and subject to FPC regulation and technological review, and to participate in joint use of such lines. This addition to the bill is important, both aesthetically and economically, because it will reduce the need for unsightly and costly paralleling facilities. It recognizes the fact, which is far too frequently overlooked, that transmission lines are part of this Nation's transportation system.

I have revised greatly the FPC bill's provision for granting rights-of-way across Federal lands for EHV lines. Under my bill rights-of-way over Federal land may be granted for a limited term, not in excess of 50 years; or for an unlimited duration. However, if the right-of-way is granted for an unlimited duration, then the FPC will have continuing jurisdiction at intervals of not less than 10 years to add to or change the conditions of the right-of-way grants.

The FPC bill makes no provision for payment to the United States for use of its land. Mine does.

The FPC bill completely overlooks Indian rights in Indian reservations. The Indians, rather than the Government, are the true owners of the reservations, many of which were set up by solemn treaty guaranteeing that no one would ever be permitted to reside or cross over them without the Indian's consent. My bill requires Indian consent before any EHV right-of-way can be granted through an Indian reservation, and, when consent is given, it requires the utility to pay the Indians for the use of their lands.

Both bills authorize the FPC, on its own motion, to compel interconnections between power systems—again giving priority to efficient public service for the consumers of a region. My bill, however, goes further, requiring each entity, public or private, to wheel power for other entities to the extent of excess capacity in its lines. For this service, it would, of course, be entitled to fair compensation.

I have added provisions to the FPC bill at several places to insure that the public receives notice of what is proposed and has access to information on file. Thus, when a statement of organization of a regional council, or a regional plan, is filed, I would require the FPC to give notice of the filing in the Federal Register, whereas the FPC bill requires such notice only in case of an EHV transmission line proposal. Furthermore, under my proposal, all filings which are permitted or required to be made will be available for public inspection, including coordination contracts, such as for joint ownership or operation of generators and transmission lines.

I have also included a new section directing the Federal Power Commission to survey existing and planned extra-high-voltage testing laboratories in the United States and to report to Congress within one year whether any action is needed to provide more laboratories and to make them available to all persons desiring to test their EHV facilities. At the present time there are only two laboratories in this country, in contrast to 20 abroad, able to test extra-high-voltage equipment under operating conditions. Both American laboratories are maintained by individual manufacturers for their own use. I need not stress the hazard that inadequately tested equipment presents to reliable service.

You will be interested to know that I have been receiving considerable mail from people all over the country supporting and commending the revisions which my bill would make in the FPC's Electric Power Reliability bill. These include conservation groups (such as the National Audubon Society, the Izaak Walton League, the Citizens' Committee on Natural Resources, the Sport Fishing Institute, the National Recreation and Park Association, the North American Wildlife Foundation, and others), various Indian tribes who support the provisions of my bill which will protect against arbitrary seizure of their lands, and public power groups such as the Northeast Public Power Association which advised me that it endorses and supports my bill and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which commended the "very substantial improvement" my bill makes over the FPC version. I was particularly pleased by the letter from the Cooperative League of the USA which stated:

"The changes and additions you have made to the original FPC bill, in their general thrust and intent, perform a valued service for the American Consumer and for the typical member of an American cooperative . . . You have come up with meaningful improvements . . . These proposals reflect a deep and valuable understanding of this whole involved field . . . which puts in your debt the American electric consumer in whose behalf you have fought so valiantly."

The private power utilities, however, have not been idle. They are mobilizing all their resources to oppose the bill, in communications and contacts with the Federal Power Commission, the Committees and Members of Congress, and within the Electric Power Fraternity. Unless you, as consumers speak up to protect your interests in low-cost power and maximum reliability of electric service, you will have only yourself to blame if your electric bill goes up instead of down, and your electric power flickers or goes out when you need it most. I assure you that those who will be considering this bill in the days ahead—the Committees and Members of Congress, the Federal Power Commission, and the President—all of them want to know, indeed, need to know—what the consumer thinks about this bill.

I cannot predict when this bill will be enacted. A few more blackouts may hasten its enactment. But of this I am sure—that the national need for maximum reliability of electric service will inevitably demand the enactment of this bill, or similar legislation.

In the meantime, as consumers who want low-cost power, you must work together to make sure that the economies of large-scale generation and transmission will be passed on to the consumer instead of into the salaries of company officials and the dividends of company stockholders. You must work to strengthen the governmental tools for protecting the consumer's interest. This includes both improved regulation of the monopolistic utilities, and the maintenance and strengthening of the yardstick of competition resulting from the availability of low-cost public power. You must participate in all the benefits of pooling, and not permit the public and cooperative sectors of the electric industry to be smothered by private power domination of the benefits of large-scale generation and transmission. For example, the new 125 miles of 345 kilovolt transmission line which the Bureau of Reclamation will soon be building between Fort Thompson, South Dakota and Grand Island, Nebraska will help strengthen the Upper Missouri River Basin electric grid and confer regional advantages that will greatly benefit your members, the region, and the nation too.

I am confident that you will maintain your alertness to the opportunities and the dangers that lie ahead for the consumer of electric power as the industry continues its massive expansion in the next decade.

I intend to continue my efforts to help consumers obtain all the electricity they desire, at the lowest possible cost, and with the maximum possible reliability of service. I shall welcome your support and cooperation. I shall be glad to work with you in the common cause.

HOW THE OEO WORKS IN TROY, MO.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in newspapers in my district October 5 and 6, 1967:

OEO MAKES CLAIM ON TROY TRAINING

KANSAS CITY.—Troy, Mo., was cited Wednesday by a federal official as an example of where careful investment of tax funds have produced tangible results.

Don Thomason, director of the North Central Region of the Office of Economic Opportunity, said in a speech at a regional meeting of the Better Business Bureau Wednesday that in two months time there have been 100 families in the Lincoln County seat of about 1,800 persons who have become self-supporting through the program.

"A manpower coordinator hired for the area served by the Daniel Boone Human Development Corporation immediately organized a high school equivalency class of 165," he said.

He said that during July and August 100 people had been placed in jobs, and of these about 90 per cent were heads of families and over 60 per cent had been referred to the program by the Welfare Department. Their average monthly salary is now approximately $281.45, and two earn over $600, he said.

The net gain in monthly salaries in the Troy area of $28,145 is impressive, he said.

This claim was both interesting and startling to me since I live in Troy, Mo. One hundred families would represent about 400 people—at four to a family—or some 22 percent of the 1,800 people the poverty press release says live in the Lincoln County seat of Troy.

I wrote to find out who my 400 fortunate neighbors were. I found out that when the OEO says Troy, it means Lincoln, Franklin, Warren, St. Charles, and Montgomery Counties in Missouri. So you must translate Troy, Mo., to include over 3,000 square miles and that means to include the population of those five counties. So you should translate 1,800 people into 132,000. Unfortunately, this ruins your percentage of social betterment because your increase goes from 22 percent to .001 percent.

When I at last received the list of the 100 families, by then I should have realized it would not contain 100 names. It did not. It contained 125. And, of the 125, 18 were from Lincoln County. This does not necessarily mean they were from Troy, but let us give the poverty program the benefit of the doubt because they will take it anyway.

Of these 18, two have become self-supporting by working for the poverty program, I suppose this is "Operation Bootstrap." Twelve of the remaining residents of Greater Troy have been made so self-supporting that they now earn from $156 to $208 per month.

I recognize some of the names as recent high school graduates who might have found a job and gone to work after getting out of high school even without a poverty program. None of the 18 from Lincoln County have been made self-supporting at a rate as high as $400 per month.

The about 1,800 persons the OEO found in Troy does represent a substantial part of the actual population of Troy, which is 2,470. I defer to their mathematician as to whether this error is 25 percent or 33⅓ percent.

If success like this can be continued, we may even see the day when the project officials, whom I am assured now earn more than $156 a month, will become self-supporting.

NORTH CAROLINA SELLS TO THE WORLD

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a trade mission from North Carolina left on a 3-week trip through South America, seeking new trade and investment opportunities for North Carolina businesses. The 12-man team was organized by the State of North Carolina, with assistance from the U.S. Department of Commerce. Before they left, the members met with Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge, for an all-day briefing on the South American market situation, and for tips on how to expand exports. Gov. Dan K. Moore hosted a reception for the group and for the ambassadors of countries that the trade mission will visit, as part of the sendoff ceremonies.

The itinerary includes Venezuela, Peru, Chile, and Brazil. This practice of sending trade missions overseas is not a new experience for North Carolina businessmen. Last year, a similar group went to Europe where they made on-the-spot sales of $170,000 and established contacts having an estimated sales potential of $10 million for the future.

This year's group includes: Edward L. Mercaldo, export consultant, North Carolina State Department of Conservation and Development, will head the group.

Other members are J. H. Berkelhammer, director of sales, United Brass Works, Inc., Randleman, N.C.; P. H. Brown, president, P. H. Brown & Associates Inc., Raleigh; H. J. Caldwell, president, Charlotte Aircraft, Charlotte; John Votta, export manager, Wica Chemicals, Inc., Charlotte; R. G. Gurley, president, Gurley Milling Co., Selma; James A. Hackney, president, J. A. Hackney & Sons, Inc., Washington; Roger L. Knight, president, Winton Products Co., Charlotte; Paul A. Linney, manager of international operations, Aeroglide Corp., Raleigh; Clarence M. Robbins, sales manager, Long Manufacturing Co., Tarboro; Donald Kuntz, vice president, Superior Continental Corp., Hickory, and Harvey Diamond, president, Plastic-Vac, Inc., Charlotte.

The way to create more jobs and higher profits is to go out there and sell. The North Carolina trade mission demonstrates that we are ready and able to do just that.

DICKEY-LINCOLN PROJECT

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, it seems almost incredible to me that today, or some time this week or next we are to be called upon to reconsider the Dickey-Lincoln project.

Rejected by a majority of 64 votes within recent weeks, we are asked to accede to the unreasonable demands of the Senate in appropriating additional funds for this wasteful project.

We are asked to accede to our sister legislative body in the face of the fact that 2 years ago the legislative papers of this project were literally stolen—frustrating the then and now will of this House—and leaving us in a completely untenable legislative position: accept the entire public works authorization bill or reject it all over this worthless project.

I am normally a reasonable and calm man, but I cannot stand in this Chamber and see such a project pass. I cannot accept in good faith any move made from this floor to accede to the Senate on a matter in which extremely bad faith has been clearly exhibited.

Mr. Speaker, rarely, if at all, have I known of lobbying efforts as practiced on such a scale for this wasteful, duplicatory, obsolete, taxeating project. Its supporters have reached to some of the highest places in the land to actively lobby for it.

Mr. Speaker, the view of this House is more than abundantly clear—we have rejected and rejected this project—we have been sidetracked and maneuvered; but I believe our resolution and determination is clear—save the taxpayers—the weary taxpayers of this Nation—reject finally this turkey of gold.

A TRIBUTE TO LT. CHARLES WILLIAM (BUTCH) DAVIS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic events in the recent history of our country occurred here in the Nation's Capital last weekend. The tragedy of this so-called peace demonstration is not that it happened here or that some of the soldiers and marshals were injured preventing a mass takeover of the Pentagon. Neither was it tragic that it cost the American taxpayer an untold amount of money to protect their military nerve center and to clean up after Dr. Spock and his flower children. It is sad, but not tragic, to see the dirty, bearded, shaggy young people who flocked to the Capital to participate in this fiasco. We can hardly feel sorry for the adults, or I should say, older people who were on hand. All this is unfortunate, but not tragic.

The real tragedy of this demonstration over the weekend came, in my estimation, from the messages of congratulations sent to the marchers from officials of North Vietnam and the Vietcong. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind now that such public outbursts of opposition to our Nation's policies give aid and comfort to our enemies. Article three of our Constitution states, and I quote:

> Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort.

Mr. Speaker, these demonstrators were adhering to our enemies and giving them aid and comfort just as surely as Benedict Arnold gave aid and comfort to our enemies years ago. Because of their actions and their demonstrations, our enemies of today will continue and even strengthen their fight to take over Southeast Asia. Many of these demonstrators cry loudly for "negotiations now." Why should the enemy negotiate when the world press proclaims that the American public is against the war? They will never negotiate as long as there might be a chance that we will give in to the peaceniks and get out of Vietnam.

While the flower children were demonstrating against a cause they know nothing about, the town of Tallassee, Ala., was mourning the death of a young man who had given his life for this cause and for our country. Lt. Charles William Davis died as a result of enemy action in the Mekong Delta in South Vietnam. Lieutenant Davis was not a draft-dodger, physically unfit or a misfit, as were many of those at the Pentagon Saturday. As a result, he was killed fighting to protect the freedoms that each of us in America, including those demonstrators, enjoy.

This demonstration was headlines in every major newspaper in the world this weekend. Every television and radio station carried it as their lead story. Not one word of all that was worth as much to me as a small article on the second page of last Thursday's Tallassee Tribune. This article was a tribute to the memory of Lieutenant Davis, written by a former high school classmate of his. Mr. Speaker, I insert this article to be printed in the RECORD in its entirety:

A TRIBUTE TO LT. CHARLES WILLIAM (BUTCH) DAVIS

(By Nan Bragg, 1962–63 editor, Talla-Hi News)

It is hard for many of us to accept the war in Vietnam and what is happening over there. Right now it is especially hard for the people of Tallassee because on October 6, 1967, a very dear friend of everyone, young and old alike, was killed in action in the Mekong Delta area of South Vietnam.

Twenty-four year old Charles William "Butch" Davis was known for his smiling face and great personality. This is well illustrated in the nickname "Monkey" which his friends at Marion Institute gave him and which he carried to Jacksonville State University. He was a casual friend of thousands and a close friend of many. If you met Butch even one time, I am sure you know what it means to say he is unforgettable. If you got down in the dumps, Butch was always there to cheer you up and if he couldn't do it, then you might as well forget it because it couldn't be done.

Football has always been close to Butch's heart and this can be seen as he is remembered as the captain of the 1961 Tallassee High School football team. That was the year Tallassee won the Border Conference championship. It was a cold winter's night in Lafayette, Alabama. Tallassee must win the game to become the champions. There were 33 seconds left in the game and Lafayette was ahead. On the next play the ball was handed to Butch and he ran with all his strength and might as was the case every time he carried the ball. He shook off two tacklers and drug three more into the end zone with him as the referee yells touchdown and the fans cheer as Tallassee becomes the new Border Conference champions.

Butch was just as hard working and determined in anything he tried to do. Well, maybe football and loyalty to his family and friends did win out over everything else but that is the way it should have been.

Now Butch is gone and we must learn to accept the fact that he is in Heaven gazing down over the whole world and watching with those smiling brown eyes and that cute grin the actions of each and everyone of the members of his family and friends.

Yes, Butch is in Heaven with God and the only consolation to his family, relatives and to us who knew and loved him so dearly is that Lt. Charles William Davis died fighting for his country and for the lives of the people that he loved so dearly.

Butch will always be remembered as brightening the lives of people. His laughter, his kind words and everything about him shall never be forgotten. One day we shall join him in heaven and can talk and laugh with him again personally as I am sure he is doing right now with his relatives and friends who were already receiving the blessings of heaven.

I have fought a good fight,
I have finished my work.

—2 Timothy 4:7

CREATIVE FEDERALISM IN AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that air pollution respects no political boundaries. One State's industrial waste can become another State's health problem as easily as the autumn breezes can change direction. This element of geographical instability might well have been used as an excuse for an air pollution program totally funded, administered, and controlled by the Federal Government. Instead, however, President Johnson has wisely urged the Congress to attack the problems of air pollution within the framework of creative federalism. Vice President HUMPHREY elaborated on the wisdom of this approach last December when he told the Third National Conference on Air Pollution:

> Some people believe that the problem can be solved locally, and they believe it very strongly. Others suggest that we have come full circle, and that the Federal Government must assume the full responsibility. Well, I am not like that old fellow who said, when he was asked to take a stand on an issue in the local election: "I have friends on both sides, and I stand squarely with my friends."
>
> I think there is a rather realistic and meaningful approach to our problem. It is my view that you can't do this locally, and it is my view that the Federal Government—on every single problem that confronts this nation today— while it must assume a sense of direction, or coordination, and do its part can't do it all. And even if it could, it shouldn't.
>
> I happen to believe in what we call creative Federalism. I happen to believe in our system of government. I happen to believe that social responsibility is not only the duty of government—it is also the duty of citizens.
>
> I happen to believe that one of the ways in which you can strengthen local and State government is to bring about a partnership of the three levels of government—Federal, State, and local.
>
> So what I say is that neither approach, local control alone or Federal control alone, is adequate by itself. What we need is a working partnership among all levels of government, Federal, State, and local—a partnership that must also include private industry.

Mr. Speaker, the creative federalism concept described by the Vice President is embodied in the existing Clean Air Act and is continued and expanded in the Air Quality Act of 1967, as recently reported out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. On the first page of its report, the committee describes the principal purpose of the Air Quality Act of 1967, as follows:

> The bill is intended primarily to pave the way for control of air pollution problems on a regional basis in accordance with air quality standards and enforcement plans developed by the States.

The Air Quality Act of 1967 has the support of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the President, and air pollution experts across the Nation. I urge the passage of this legislation in order that we may expand our efforts to control air pollution within the framework of creative federalism.

PROFILE IN COURAGE

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, historians, 20, 30, or 50 years from now, will give a valid ranking to President Johnson on his performance as President. If his place were to be determined on the basis of a lot of the opinion that currently is being heard and read, his position would be low indeed. I do not attempt to place the President in his final historical context, but I am certain that a majority of the harsh judgments that are being made of him are unfair and I therefore enjoyed the following comments that appeared in Green's Commodity Market Comments on October 18, 1967:

PROFILE IN COURAGE

> Every day appears to be a good day to criticize the man in the White House. Recently, even a leading magazine took time out to participate in the contest of disparaging epithets directed against the 36th President of the United States. We do not propose today to take a stand for or against the issues so vividly and irresponsibly discussed by so many, but we will try to analyze Lyndon Baines Johnson's motives for action.
>
> Usually good actors are poor playwrights, and good playwrights do not perform well on the stage. John F. Kennedy was an excellent actor, his personal appearances were inspiring, his press conferences were literary events, and the brilliancy of his on-stage performance made up for the mistakes of judgment. A tragic event left the promise of youth unfulfilled, created a myth and put the subsequent President at a disadvantage. This problem was compounded when the intellectuals who played first violin in the JFK orchestra, unwilling to play second violin in the LBJ Band, decided apparently in unison to unload their frustration on the new conductor. The Schlesingers, Goodwins & Company must be forgetting that the greatness of America lies in its unsophistication, not in intellectual snobism. American democracy is horizontal, unlike Western Europe's, where it is vertical, and where political power, money and education are represented usually by a single person or combined in one family or club.
>
> The man from Texas, who replaced the man from Boston and Hyannis Port, and who does not have the same aura of "savoir-faire" and "savoir-vivre" as his predecessor, recently stated what every thinking American should have known all along, i.e., that if he were concerned only with his own popularity, he would not have been going about things the way he has and would not suggest higher taxes or more war or similar unpopular actions. And that is the crux of the matter: LBJ is putting his own political future in jeopardy for the sake of his belief that he is doing the right thing for the United States.
>
> We all know that even Johnson's enemies do not consider him incapable, not smart, or a political amateur; obviously, he has the opposite qualities and certainly weighs carefully the pros and cons of all his decisions, particularly those that concern the future of America and/or his own. The record shows that in this context he always chose America. Now whether or not President Johnson's judgment is right, only history will tell. But one thing is sure, that in pursuing his policy in a most unselfish way he has proven to be a better American than his critics. LBJ has stuck to his guns even at the cost of alienating large segments of the U.S. population; few political figures would do it. This courage and self-denial—not egotism as others claim—have brought the President nothing but abuse. Another "despised" man, in a letter to his sister written 200 years ago, made timeless and pertinent remarks about such slanderous assaults:
>
> "As to the abuses I meet with . . . I number them among my honours. One cannot behave so as to obtain the esteem of the wise and good, without drawing on one's self at the

same time the envy and malice of the foolish and wicked, and the latter is a testimony of the former. The best men have always had their share of this treatment, and the more of it is in proportion to their different and greater degrees of merit. A man has therefore some reason to be ashamed of himself when he meets with none of it. And the world is not to be condemned in the lump because some bad people live in it. . . ."

Not only adults—senators, teachers, taxi drivers, barmen and the like—abuse the presidency, but so do teenagers and college students, and there appears to be some sort of a race going on in the United States for the No. 1 spot in irresponsibility, blindness and vulgarity. American political life has always been full of it, yet reason ultimately prevailed in spite of the fact that those whose had the least to say always yelled the loudest, as, for instance, students of some American universities who have an excellent record of wrong political judgment. In 1946, when an honorary degree was bestowed by Columbia University on one of the greatest men of this century, the then students demonstrated violently against him.

The "despised" man who 200 years ago wrote the letter quoted above was Benjamin Franklin; the man abused in New York 21 years ago was Winston Churchill. To the loneliest man in the nation, Lyndon Baines Johnson, today's target of vicious and irresponsible attacks, our sympathy and respect.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Waldie). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago the Hungarian people rose up in a valiant and courageous effort to regain their freedom. The events of the Hungarian revolution may have become dimmed with the passage of time so it would do well for us to review this historic uprising.

On October 23, 1956, what began as a peaceful demonstration by students and workers for their personal rights ended in a bloodbath as the Russian controlled secret police brutally machinegunned hundreds of people in the streets. Incensed by this act the Hungarian people, unaided and by their own bold heroism, drove the Russian occupation troops from their homeland. For 5 brief but glorious days the people of Hungary enjoyed the freedom the Communists had deprived them of since 1949. A governing body was quickly established and appeals for aid were sent to the free world. Moscow waited apprehensively to see how the United States and other nations would react. Finally, on November 4, upon the hesitation by the free nations, the Kremlin invaded Hungary with its tanks.

In the wake of this tragedy thousands of Hungarians fled their homeland, fearing for their lives and knowing that with the return of the Russians, liberty and freedom would be denied them. The United States did take action and opened her shores to hundreds and hundreds of homeless refugees.

The valor and heroism of the Hungarian people will go down in history as one of freedom's finest hours. It is imperative that we keep in mind what the Hungarian revolutionaries fought for and what they fought against. The same forces of organized tyranny that oppressed Hungary are still striving to conquer all free nations and people. It would be wise for us, on the 11th anniversary of the Hungarian freedom revolution, to be fully prepared to meet the challenge of aggression in the years ahead.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Pollock (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for tomorrow and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. McCulloch (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business—National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Laird (at the request of Mr. Pettis), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Purcell) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Feighan, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Kastenmeier, for 30 minutes, on October 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Boland to include extraneous matter and tables in his remarks on H.R. 9960.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee to include a summary report and tables with his remarks on the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation conference report today.

Mr. Sikes to include letters, tables, and other material with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 13606.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Pettis) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Harsha.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Purcell) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Eilberg.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 25, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1173. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize an increase in the number of permanent professors at the U.S. Military and Air Force Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1174. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed amendment to extend for 1 year, from October 1, 1967, through September 30, 1968, the concession contract authorizing Best's Studio, Inc., to provide a general art and photographic business for the public in Yosemite National Park, Calif., pursuant to the provisions of 79 Stat. 969; 16 U.S.C. 20; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. S. 343. An act to provide that the Federal office building to be constructed in Detroit, Mich., shall be named the Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building in memory of the late Patrick V. McNamara, a U.S. Senator from the State of Michigan from 1955 to 1966 (Rept. No. 811). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12912. A bill to give the consent of Congress to the State of Ohio to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the acts of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157), and November 2, 1966 (80 Stat. 1156); with amendment (Rept. No. 812). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13165. A bill to extend the period during which Secret Service protection may be furnished to a widow and minor children of a former President (Rept. No. 813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report entitled "Automobile Insurance

Study" (Rept. No. 815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 955. Resolution for consideration of S. 780, an act to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize planning grants to air pollution control agencies; expand research provisions relating to fuels and vehicles; provide for interstate air pollution control agencies or commissions; authorize the establishment of air quality standards, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 816). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules: House Resolution 956. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5754, a bill to amend section 1263 of title 18 of the United States Code to require that interstate shipments of intoxicating liquors be accompanied by bill of lading, or other document, showing certain information in lieu of requiring such to be marked on the package (Rept. No. 817). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 957. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 12144, a bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 818). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 396. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 11641. An Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 820). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROONEY of New York: Committee of conference. H.R. 10345. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 821). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11254. A bill for the relief of Jack L. Good (Rept. No. 814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT (for himself, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. Stubblefield, and Mr. Wampler):

H.R. 13653. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 13654. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 13655. A bill to repeal certain Federal excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 13656. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend (from 3 to 6 months following the quarter of use) the period within which claim for domestic drawback may be filed with respect to distilled spirits used for certain nonbeverage purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 13657. A bill to amend section 504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the tax exemption of certain organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 13658. A bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 13659. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes on Coffee Creek, Trinity County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 13660. A bill to amend title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide for grants for administrative support services to facilitate the participation of State and local public agencies in community relations programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 13661. A bill to provide for the payment of debt service construction charges, and increased operation and maintenance charges when irrigable lands are taken for nonagricultural uses under Federal programs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 13662. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13663. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 13664. A bill to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act to migrant health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 13665. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to authorize a program of research and demonstration for the control of pollution in lakes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 13666. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies and volunteer ambulance and rescue companies the rates of postage on second- and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 13667. A bill to authorize a survey of the Chiltipin Creek at and in the vicinity of Sinton, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 13668. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an additional monthly allowance for disabled beneficiaries who are in need of regular aid and attendance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 13669. A bill to amend section 2734 of title 10 of the United States Code to permit the use of officers of any of the services on claims commissions, and for other purposes; to amend section 2734a of title 10 to authorize the use of Coast Guard appropriations for certain claims settlements arising out of Coast Guard activities; and to amend section 2736 of title 10 to authorize advance payments in cases covered by sections 2733 and 2734 of title 10 and section 715 of title 32 involving military claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 13670. A bill to authorize the county of Presidio, Tex., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Presidio, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 905. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H. Con. Res. 540. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POOL:

H. Con. Res. 541. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session to hear a former Vietcong prisoner of war; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 958. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 356; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 959. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 356; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13671. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Contino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 13672. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Rembisz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 13673. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Antonio Davi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 13674. A bill for the relief of Peter Stroitigoulakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 13675. A bill for the relief of Edward E. Hara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13676. A bill for the relief of James Renjilian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13677. A bill for the relief of Winfield Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 13678. A bill for the relief of Bettie J. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

To Our Millions of Elderly Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, phenomenal has been the growth in recent years of golden age clubs, senior citizen organizations and retired men and women's groups; perhaps the most significant sequence to this movement has been the issuance of worthwhile publications slanted in the direction of their interests and needs of these elderly citizens.

Only recently has there been satisfactory communication between the growing number of retirees, in the fostering of information having particular application to citizens in their latter years.

One of the outstanding mediums helping to fill this void has been Lobby 65 Digest, published in Massachusetts by Frank Le Roy Johnson, 2 Wright Street, Cambridge, Mass. 02138, now in its second year.

Its readers are offered helpful hints for the use and exchange of talents; the understanding of ailments and ways to achieve savings in the purchase of drugs for their treatments; also suggestions for obtaining travel tour information, hearing aids and timely articles by competent authors on matters of common concern.

Lobby 65 Digest now has a wide distribution in Massachusetts. It is chartered by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a charitable, tax free, nonprofit, nonpartisan, nonsectarian corporation.

Its columns have been filled by such men of competence as the following; Dr. Howard F. Root, Boston, of the Diabetes Foundation; Dr. William S. Clark, New York, on arthritis; Dr. Charles I. Schottland, former U.S. Commissioner of HEW, presently the dean of the Florence Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University.

Others have contributed articles, including Dr. Naif L. Simon, F.A.C.A. anesthesia department chief at the Quincy city hospital; Dr. Fredrick J. Stare on nutrition—Harvard School of Public Health; Judge Robert Gardner Wilson, the Shrine Burns Institute for Children in Boston; and Dr. Irving S. Cooper of St. Barnabas Hospital, New York on use of cryoprobe in cryosurgery, the technique for relief of Parkinson tremors.

Articles have also appeared in Lobby 65 Digest concerning the American Cancer Society; the Deafness Research Foundation of New York, and the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Blindness.

Most of this information is useful in every State, especially when supplemented by information in local areas in which the publication is distributed. That probably accounts for the many inquiries Mr. Johnson has been receiving from other States seeking the licensing of Lobby 65 Digest under his copyright. This publication is unique in the composition of its advisory board, which includes outstanding representatives among different races and religions.

It is dedicated to advancement, education, and service to the elderly; and seeks to spread the gospel of good will, mutual assistance, and spirit of togetherness—through the medium of "each helping the other." This undertaking of publishing Lobby 65 Digest has come about through the initiative, imagination, generosity, and talents of 69-year-old Frank Le Roy Johnson, a retired American citizen who has been received by Richard Cardinal Cushing and Gov. John W. Volpe, who have paid him high tribute for helping to solve the concerns, sharing sources of common interest, and for obtaining information most applicable to men and women—who under our American system of social security, face retirement after they reach the age of 65.

In addition, Lobby 65 Digest lists the names of officials of all the known clubs serving retired groups in Massachusetts—and aids in keeping each of these in contact.

Circulation of this publication under a charter license in other States will find ready recipients to share its intrastate valued columns and rewarding in the helpfulness it gives to its subscribers.

Carnegie Foundation Award Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the courageous act of a very outstanding young man residing in Ohio's Sixth Congressional District. As a result of his outstanding feat of heroism, Paul Welton, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Welton, Portsmouth, Ohio, was selected by the Carnegie Foundation to receive an award for heroism.

Last February, Paul, who has been a carrier for the Portsmouth Times for almost 4 years, had just finished his route when he noticed the house across the street from where he was standing was afire. In spite of the imminent danger to himself, Paul ran into the house and rescued 7-month-old Ray Lee Traylor, carrying the baby to safety seconds before the room where he had been sleeping was engulfed in flames.

I know Paul Welton's parents and the citizens of Portsmouth are very proud of him for his courageous act of bravery. It is reassuring to know that we have such outstanding young citizens like Paul who reflect credit upon their families, communities, and Nation.

I would like to join with the many others who are congratulating this young man and extend to him my sincerest wishes for future health and happiness. He is indeed a credit to our younger generation.

The United Nations Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, October 22, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, who now serves a dual role as U.S. Representative to the 22d session of the United Nations General Assembly, was the guest speaker at United Nations Day ceremonies in Oak Park, Mich.

After reading over Representative BROOMFIELD's address—focusing attention on the crucial future role of the United Nations—I knew his remarks would be of interest to all Members of Congress. His address follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS ROLE

The United Nations was founded twenty-two years ago by nations that had just lived through a terrible war. It is dedicated to the ancient hope of all mankind for a world at peace—and the trees we plant here each year testify to our belief that all nations can work together toward this goal.

The trees we plant this year—in honor of Laos, New Zealand, and Belgium—mark the desire we share with these countries that where the peace is broken, it will be healed, and that where men now live at peace, the peace will be preserved.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have always taken an interest in the affairs of the United Nations. My appointment as a member of this year's delegation to the United Nations General Assembly has bestowed on me a great honor—not only to represent the United States in these critical times, but also to work directly with the Permanent United States Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg.

Ambassador Goldberg has asked me to bring his personal greeting to all the people of Oak Park on UN Day, and has asked me to read this message:

"The United Nations, that great center for harmonizing the action of nations, has served the world community through twenty-two turbulent years. Amidst the troubles and dangers that still prevail, we pause today to pledge anew our dedication to the United Nation's great aims of peace.

"The United Nations was founded not in the belief that it would guarantee permanent freedom from conflict and disagreement, but in the belief that the basic hopes of man are for peace rather than war, for rule by law rather than rule by violence, and for economic and social progress rather than disorder and stagnation.

"In working toward these goals, the United Nations will not always succeed. When its members are not sufficiently faithful to its purposes, it may fail. But as long as cooperation and mutual tolerance are essential to our survival, its members will have no choice but to try again.

"In this great cause, in which the United States bears such a heavy burden, the faithful support of the American public—in times of difficulty as in times of success—is an invaluable source of strength. The citizens of Oak Park, through their interest in the United Nations, will help all of us as we work toward the goal of a more peaceful world."

Signed, Arthur J. Goldberg.

As the United Nations continues its work this fall, the world faces many stubborn problems: the unresolved conflict in Vietnam, the uneasy situation in the Middle East, the danger of nuclear weapons, and the unending struggle against hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance. But we must not lose patience because these problems are difficult.

The United Nations has long since demonstrated that when its members give it its support, it can be invaluable in the solution of the hardest problems. In its twenty-two years, the United Nations has contributed to peace and to the security of nations in such places as Iran, Greece, Kashmir, the Middle East, the Congo, and Cyprus. It has contributed to progress in arms control, in human rights, and in the development of nations. Recently, it helped in concluding the Outer Space Treaty, a major success in the diplomacy of peace. Last June, it achieved a ceasefire in the Middle East and sent truce observers to prevent renewed fighting.

It is impossible to tell where the conflict in the Middle East might have led if there had been no United Nations to help bring it to a halt. And since the ceasefire, United Nations Truce Observers have assisted in preventing renewed outbreaks of fighting in the Suez Canal area which might have led to a major conflict, with the inevitable danger of big-power involvement.

The United States is continuing its search for ways in which the United Nations can contribute to a lasting Mid-east peace settlement. Largely bacause of the strong stand taken by the United States, along with other members of the United Nations, the Soviet Union was unable last summer to get the Emergency Session of the General Assembly to condemn Israel. Neither was the Assembly willing to adopt a Yugoslav resolution calling for immediate and unconditional Israeli withdrawal and postponing indefinitely the key issue—Arab renunciation of belligerency toward Israel. The United States believed that these resolutions would have done nothing to correct the basic causes of instability in the Middle East and could only have set the stage for renewed conflict.

The United States position was—and it still is—that the United Nations can contribute to a stable peace in the Middle East. The U.S. has said, however, that withdrawal of Israeli troops should not be considered in isolation from other factors—that withdrawal should be expected only in a context of peace. The key development must be Arab willingness to recognize that Israel has a right to exist independently, to live in peace and security free of claims or acts of belligerency. We believe the Arabs cannot reserve for themselves the right to maintain a state of war against Israel while demanding that Israel undertake the obligations of peace.

We also believe that bringing peace to the Middle East will require on both sides an affirmative will to resolve the issues through a process of mutual accommodation. Neither the United States nor any other outside power can dictate a solution. The United Nations can provide its good offices to help bring about agreement between the two sides—but any real solution must be one agreed upon by the states of the Mid-East themselves.

There are a number of basic features which the United States believes should be part of any lasting Mid-East peace settlement:

Each nation in the area must accept the right of others to live. The least that this requires is that all should renounce any state or claim of belligerency.

Troops must be withdrawn—and withdrawn in a context of peace. For some parties cannot be left free to assert the rights of war while others are called upon to abide by the rules of peace.

There must be justice for the refugees.

Free and innocent passage through international waterways must be assured for all nations.

The status of Jerusalem must not be decided unilaterally but in consolation with all concerned, and in recognition of the historic interest of the three great religions in the Holy Places.

The political independence and territorial integrity of all states in the area must be respected.

Boundaries must be accepted and other arrangements made, superseding temporary and often violated armistice lines, so as to afford security to all parties against terror, destruction and war.

Last week, the President of the General Assembly, with the approval of the member states, proposed that the debate on the high priority Middle East item be postponed for a short period pending further consultations. It was generally agreed that unless the outlines of an agreement could be worked out before debate began, another round of debate on the Middle East could only have the effect of freezing positions, making an ultimate solution more difficult.

Ambassador Goldberg and other members of the United States Delegation have been among these engaged in intensive discussions throughout the past week in the attempt to help the states involved find the outlines of a generally acceptable United Nations resolution on the Middle East. Exactly what the results of these consultations will be, it is not yet possible to say. The goal toward which our delegation at the General Assembly continues to work is that of a stable peace.

The second great issue in the minds of all delegates to the UN today is the problem of Vietnam. The United States has repeatedly sought to have the UN Security Council act on Vietnam. Unfortunately, two permanent members of the Security Council have opposed any United Nations involvement with Vietnam and the Soviet Union has blocked Security Council discussion. In addition, the Hanoi government has denied the authority of the UN to even consider Vietnam. In the face of this hostility, the United Nations has been unable to act.

The United States, in both public and private statements at the United Nations, has made clear its commitment to a negotiated, political solution of the conflict in Vietnam. We have emphasized our willingness to base a settlement on the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962. And even though it may be unable to act on Vietnam, the United Nations continues to serve as a listening post, both for the United States to present its views, and for other nations to communicate with us.

It is said by some that Hanoi will agree to begin negotiations if the United States ceases the bombing of North Vietnam—that this bombing is the sole obstacle to negotiations. But no third party—including those governments which are among Hanoi's closest friends—has conveyed to us any authoritative message from Hanoi that there would in fact be negotiations if the bombing were stopped. On its part, the United States has made clear that it would be glad to consider and discuss any proposal that would lead promptly to productive discussions that might bring about peace in the area.

I know from my own work at the United Nations and in the Congress that the United States is looking and will continue to look for any possibility that the United Nations may be able to act in this situation. Our ultimate purpose is—and must be—to find a negotiated settlement of the war in Vietnam—a negotiated settlement which will preserve the right of the South Vietnamese to self-determination.

The United Nations faces a number of other issues this fall—the question of a treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, a communist demand for withdrawal of United Nations forces from South Korea, and continuing issues involving race relations in the southern part of Africa. Less dramatic than these, but perhaps equally important to the future of the UN itself, are a number of questions pertaining to the budget and administration of the UN. I myself have the responsibility for presenting the U.S. position on these issues in the Budget and Administrative Committee of the General Assembly.

The United States, as the richest nation in the world, is also the largest contributor to the United Nations. For this reason, it has a great interest in helping the UN to strengthen and improve its administration and management. I am pleased to report that we are continuing to press for reforms which will enable the United Nations—and in fact the many specialized agencies associated with it—to get the maximum effectiveness from each dollar it spends. One of the principal items thus far debated in the budget and administrative committee deals exclusively with this problem. It is only natural that the United Nations, faced with its many diverse and intractable problems, needs to keep its administrative machinery under constant scrutiny. With our great experience in management techniques and methods, we can and must help the United Nations to operate efficiently as possible. This is a difficult and stimulating assignment, and I hope to carry it out effectively.

As Ambassador Goldberg has said, the United Nations will not always succeed as it approaches the tasks before it. Often, the United Nations may seem to be long on debate and short on accomplishment. But when the United Nations does succeed—as it succeeded this summer in achieving a ceasefire in the Middle East—we recognize that the UN is not only one of man's greatest dreams, but can become one of his great accomplishments. Indeed, we cannot look for an alternative to the UN, for there is none. What we must do is strengthen the UN—and work through it toward the day when all men will be able to live their lives in justice and in peace.

Lake Charles Memorial to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation's Capital is cleaning up the aftermath of the thousands of so-called "anti-war" demonstrators here over the weekend, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues another and more heartening movement being undertaken by the Young Men's Business Club of Lake Charles, La., in my district. The young men who comprise this club have raised 90 percent of the funds needed to erect what will be known as the Lake Charles Memorial to Peace. The purpose of the proposed monument which will be called a "peace" rather than a "war" memorial, is neither to condemn nor condone the war in Vietnam, but instead to pay tribute to our American men who have fought and died there. Uniquely and functionally, the proposed Peace Memorial tower will stand 110 feet, support 46 aluminum purple martin castles, and will house swallows which can each day eat over 4,464,000 mosquitos and other insects which create nuisances and health hazards to our areas along the gulf coast.

I commend and support the members of the Young Men's Business Club of Lake Charles in their work and can think of no more fitting tribute to the American servicemen who have made the supreme sacrifice for our country while fighting Communist aggression. I cannot help but contrast the action of the young men of this club to those of the draft card burners and protestors who assembled in Washington to spew their venomous obscenities and leave a wake of destruction and filth.

Nongovernment Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me in these days when the interests of the United States are directed toward assisting developing nations toward self-help, determination, and growth, that it should be pointed out that nongovernmental voluntary agencies, based in the United States, are making some tremendous contributions to our national goals.

Let me cite an example—the Medical Mission Sisters, whose American Provincial House is at 8400 Pine Road, Fox Chase, Philadelphia, Pa. They were recently asked by the Government of Ghana, West Africa, to expand and upgrade the nurses' training school in their Berekum Holy Family Hospital. Theirs is the only school of nursing and midwifery in the Brong-Ahafo region, with a population of nearly 600,000. The average life expectancy in Brong-Ahafo is 38 years, with a particularly high infant and maternal mortality rate. The Medical Mission Sisters' school of nursing has an average of 300 qualified applicants each year, but can presently accommodate only 20. The Government of Ghana is unable to assist the expansion efforts financially, but has promised communal labor.

Even more interesting to me is that the people who will be educated in this upgraded program will be the indigenous people of the Brong-Ahafo region. They in turn will join the teams fanning out from this institution to bring medical aid and health education to the thousands out in the "bush." All of these services give to the people of Ghana not only health care and health education, but also give a sense of personal dignity and hope for development to a people trying to forge out a new nation.

This organization of Medical Mission Sisters has worked long and hard under trying circumstances in this area. They have won the respect and confidence not only of the people they have nursed and doctored, but of Ghana's leaders who are striving for gains in every field of governmental endeavor. The Sisters' know-how, not only in medicine but in the daily lives of these people, their hopes and aspirations, has come to be a security to the people of Ghana. In changing times this group of women remains steadfast in its dedication and service to the needs of people everywhere and particularly now in developing nations.

Our country and its legislators should be aware of these efforts and the efforts of many other groups from the United States who have gained the confidence of the people of the emerging nations. It seems to me that if other countries and private foundations—the local governments and corporations involved in the area—are interested in the work of these groups, the U.S. Government through its AID program or other extensions of assistance on the part of our Government, should focus particular attention on practically adding our backing to the projected efforts of such groups wherever we can. We can only gain good will by such well-organized and recognized sources of help.

We here in the House, in meeting our responsibilities of following up on the expenditure of our appropriations, might do well to "count our blessings," back them up, and increase their yield, rather than to cry over misadventures which are past history and beyond second chances.

Mr. Speaker, this work of the Medical Mission Sisters may not be world shattering, but it is consistent, dependable and always yielding friends. I am compelled to call it to your attention and to that of my colleagues here in the House. It is an impressive contribution, not only in Ghana, but also in six other countries of Africa, and in India, Pakistan, the Philippines, Indonesia, Jordan, Venezuela, and South Vietnam. I personally wish to commend this group of sisters in particular, and all such groups in general for the contribution which they make to their country as well as to the country in which they operate.

Speaker John W. McCormack Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues, the fact that Monday, October 23, our distinguished and beloved Speaker received the coveted award of Statesman of the Year from the Argo Lodge of the B'nai B'rith.

For the information of my colleagues, and so that we may join in paying tribute to our honorable Speaker, I would like to insert the speech of Speaker John W. McCormack, and the remarks of the other speakers who joined to honor him:

TRIBUTE TO B'NAI B'RITH

(Remarks of Hon. John W. McCormack)

Dr. Greenwood, President of Argo Lodge, ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege and a pleasure to be at the Argo Lodge with you this evening. It is with the utmost humility and yet, paradoxically, with the greatest pride, that I accept this award which you have seen fit to bestow upon me—that of "Statesman of the Year": with humility, because I know that my efforts, in the context of history, must of human necessity be limited; with pride, because I value so highly the approval and recognition of an organization such as B'nai B'rith—an organization which has always distinguished itself by devotion to the political ideal of democracy, the social ideal of equal opportunity, and the humanistic ideal of individual dignity and worth.

B'nai B'rith is, as I am sure you must know, the oldest Jewish service group in the world, celebrating its one hundred and twenty-fourth birthday this month. B'nai B'rith has always, in my estimation, stood as a singular force in the long struggle of men for realization of their common bond in human brotherhood. It is an association devoted to preserving the cultural identity of Judaism, while seeking, nevertheless, to reconcile the best in Jewish ethical tradition with the American concept of democracy. In the Nation, and here in Washington, where it is so well represented by the Argo Lodge, B'nai B'rith has been an unrelenting devotee to the causes of citizenship, education, charity, and moral soundness—causes which both Judaism and Americanism have consistently espoused.

Let us consider for a moment the work of B'nai B'rith in educating the populace for responsible citizenship. This abiding concern of B'nai B'rith is anteceded in the words of the great Hebrew sage Hillel, who counseled two thousand years ago: "Separate not thyself from the community." B'nai B'rith has staked its very existence upon this precept—that a man can realize his proper potential only by relating in an active and meaningful way to the society in which he lives. By cultivating in American citizens a sense of the richness of their heritage, and a concomitant sense of the responsibilities imposed by that heritage—by constantly striving to clarify the value and meaning of American citizenship, B'nai B'rith contributes substantially and unreservedly to upholding the principles which have made America strong.

In serving the ideal of education, no less than that of citizenship, B'nai B'rith is engaged in the vital task of reaching the minds and souls of youth—of guiding both the spiritual sensibilities and vocational aptitudes of that segment of our population upon which the very future of the Nation will depend. The B'nai B'rith Youth Organization, the B'nai B'rith Vocational Service, and the Hillel Foundations are vital adjuncts of B'nai B'rith's commitment to young people of the Jewish faith—and, in a larger sense, of all America.

The cause of charity is a special interest of B'nai B'rith—more urgent perhaps, than the causes of citizenship and education—though no less vital: and I mean *charity* in the sense of benevolent social work, as well as *charity* in the sense of human compassion and brotherly love.

In the first case, to illustrate, I point out that B'nai B'rith actively participated in disaster relief thirteen years before the birth of the Red Cross, and established both orphan homes and hospitals soon after its inception in the mid-nineteenth century. Throughout its history B'nai B'rith has been active in providing for Jews throughout the world who have suffered the bitter consequences of discrimination and oppression.

Of prime importance, in fact, in illustrating B'nai B'rith's concern for the cause of human understanding, is the task your organization has undertaken in seeking to dispel, wherever possible, the ugly manifestations of prejudice and intolerance. Created to inspire in all men a tolerance for others, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has many times over proved its effectiveness and worth. I think it is no exaggeration to say that the Anti-Defamation League stands among the vanguard of those organizations by whose efforts we enjoy a modicum of racial and religious harmony in the U.S. today—however, marred by rude intrusions of bigotry and violence that harmony may be.

Finally—in promoting the solid and time-proven ethical values contained throughout history by the vessel of Jewish culture and faith—in working to synthesize the ancient Jewish heritage of moral affirmation—based upon the threefold foundation of study, service, and benevolence—in working to synthesize the Jewish heritage with the distinctively American legacy of democracy and political freedom, B'nai B'rith is working to ensure the coming of that day when men may answer with proud affirmation the ancient question: Am I my brother's keeper?

The fundamental and salient purpose of B'nai B'rith is aptly summarized, I think, in a recently published statement of the B'nai B'rith Foundation:

"[B'nai B'rith] is both a creature and defender of Judaism. The programs it undertakes have a single underlying purpose—to strengthen and stimulate Jewish community life.

"This . . . is a task of two dimensions. In a free society where Jews have that greatest of freedoms—the right of being themselves—there is a correlative responsibility for Jews to express their religious heritage creatively, in ways that contribute to democratic living.

"This is B'nai B'rith's cause.

"The other side of the problem exists in lands where Jews are told *how* to be Jewish—denied the right to be Jews on their own terms. Here the task is to fight against the discriminations and the forced erosions of Jewish religious and cultural life.

"This too is B'nai B'rith's cause."

In short, B'nai B'rith is a source of constant strength in our National striving for the recognition by every man of the integrity of every individual and of every religious and ethnic group; for the triumph of principle and the vindication of right; for the noble assertion of mind and spirit over the baseness of appetite and the pride of passion. The long history of your organization, which has grown from 12 to over 500,000 members, is a testament to the opportunities for human improvement which democracy provides. It is as the late President Kennedy so aptly stated:

"Voluntary organizations such as B'nai B'rith are an essential part of a free society. The long history and wide range of B'nai B'rith interests have been a positive and constructive force for a good part of the history of our Nation."

May you continue in your positive and constructive influence, secure in the knowledge of past accomplishment, yet challenged by the rich opportunities which the future so numerously bestows.

REMARKS BY EDWARD ROSENBLUM, PAST PRESIDENT, ARGO LODGE, B'NAI B'RITH; PAST PRESIDENT, DISTRICT GRAND LODGE NO. 5, B'NAI B'RITH; NATIONAL HILLEL COMMISSIONER, B'NAI B'RITH

Mr. Speaker, friends, it is strikingly fitting that we who represent America's oldest, largest and most distinguished Jewish service organization, B'nai B'rith, have voted unanimously this year to honor you, Mr. Speaker. You have similarly given not only to America but to citizens of the world a long and distinguished service. I searched thru Webster's dictionary as it defines "statesman." Webster says: "One advanced in the principles or art of government; one actively engaged in conducting the business of government or in shaping its policies; one who exercises political leadership wisely without partisanship, in the general interest." But this we know only partly defines our eminent honoree. Your host of friends and admirers everywhere would add your deep compassion for all humans regardless of faith, color or creed, your striving to uplift the poor, and seeking greater dignity and worth for the individual. We respect your deep moral and spiritual belief and fervor. We applaud your compelling love and affection for children and the aged, and your diligent labors which reach out and benefit all segments of our great American community.

Because of your attributes as a great American, a great leader, a great servant of the American people, and not the least, a great friend, we in Argo Lodge of B'nai B'rith—which means as you know, Mr. Speaker, sons of the covenant—honor you tonight with the highest award it is within our power to give—our statesman of the year award.

It is my pleasure to present to you now a young Massachusetts attorney, formerly associated with one of your distinguished colleagues, Hon. Torbert McDonald, 7th Massachusetts District, Mr. Erwin G. Krasnow, vice president of Argo Lodge, who will now, on behalf of the mass membership of our lodge, make the formal presentation.

REMARKS BY ERWIN G. KRASNOW, VICE PRESIDENT OF ARGO LODGE, B'NAI B'RITH AND CHAIRMAN OF STATESMAN OF THE YEAR AWARD COMMITTEE

It has been said that the difference between a politician and a statesman is that a politician thinks only of the next election, whereas a statesman thinks of the next generation.

We are here tonight to pay tribute to a great statesman, Speaker John W. McCormack, a man whose distinguished career in public service is marked by an ability to think and act on behalf of the next generation.

The recipient of the 1967 Statesman of the Year Award ranks as one of the greatest leaders in our national history. Beginning in 1917 when he was elected as a member of the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention, John McCormack has devoted half a century to public service. Prior to coming to Washington, D. C. as a Congressman in 1928, he enlisted in the United States Army and subsequently served in both Houses of the Massachusetts Legislature.

To give proper recognition at this time to his manifold achievements during 39 years of service in the Congress is as futile as trying to telescope onto a small television screen the dimensions and grandeur of the stars in the universe. Speaker McCormack has been in the forefront of leadership as inspirational architect, master parliamentarian and resolute fighter for the passage of laws to help the underprivileged and oppressed, to strengthen our country's defenses and to preserve basic democratic freedoms.

For example, John McCormack's leadership in the 1930's as a ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee played a large role in the passage of the early Roosevelt legislation which brought our country out of the deep 1929 depression. Name any landmark measure enacted by the Congress in recent times—be it the Selective Service Act, the secret financing of the vital Manhattan atomic bomb project, the liberalization of our immigration laws, the establishment of our space program, the passage of civil rights legislation—history will show that John McCormack, working diligently behind the scenes, has been largely responsible for these achievements.

We pay tribute tonight to a man who has been honored many times in the past by his fellow man. The leading institutions of higher learning in our nation have acclaimed him for his work in education and for his efforts in other legislative areas directly affecting the well being of children by conferring honorary degrees of Doctor of Law upon the Speaker.

He has been honored by all religious faiths. He holds the Peace Medal of the Order of Catholic Laymen. He has been honored by the Vatican as a Knight of Malta. Several Jewish organizations have paid tribute to the Speaker for his unrelenting support of the democratic State of Israel. Indeed, Argo Lodge presented him with its coveted Americanization Award in 1957.

The people of his district and his home state of Massachusetts have honored him on many occasions. Last year the Commonwealth of Massachusetts officially declared March 16th as John W. McCormack Day. The people of Boston have named a new $3 million school building in Dorchester in his honor. The John W. McCormack School will provide for the education of more than 1100 pupils each year. Such an honor—the naming of a new public school—has not been previously granted to a public figure during his lifetime.

His colleagues in the Congress have honored John McCormack by unanimously selecting him as Speaker of the House during the 87th through 90th Congresses. The Speaker, a man whose word is his bond, is one of the most loved and respected Members of the House.

He has been honored on many occasions by Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, each of whom has looked to Speaker McCormack for advice and counsel. President Johnson has stated that he knows of no person who has been more devoted, who has been more courageous under fire, and who has been more compassionate for his fellow man than our beloved Speaker. The President sent the following telegram to the Lodge and asked that it be read to the Speaker tonight The telegram reads:

"I was delighted to hear that the Argo Lodge of B'nai B'rith is presenting its 'Statesman of the Year Award' to my good friend, John McCormack. Speaker McCormack's entire public career has reflected his dedication to the democratic principles which your own organization has done so much to uphold. Your award is most fitting—and I deeply appreciate this opportunity to add my own voice to those of the Speaker's many admirers.

"Please convey my warm best wishes to him and to all who are present tonight.

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON."

Speaker McCormack, no single plaque or citation could even begin to describe the outstanding contribution you have made to the nation, the world and mankind. We of Argo Lodge are forced to be content with the following phrases:

"Argo Lodge, B'nai B'rith salutes Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker, United States House of Representatives, as Statesman of the Year for his faithful service to the United States as a dedicated legislator, compassionate humanitarian and courageous fighter for freedom and world peace. Washington, D.C., October 23, 1967."

The officers and members of Argo Lodge wish you many more years of similar outstanding public service.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding.—Proverbs 3: 5.

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our Father, unfailing source of light and life, we thank Thee for Thy presence which gives power to Thy people and courage to Thy children. With Thee may we find strength in the time of trouble, deliverance in the hour of temptation, and serenity in the moment when we wrestle with worry.

Save us from false ambitions and feverish activities, from plans and policies which are contrary to Thy will, and from a foolish trust in our own powers. Turn us to Thee in all humility that Thou canst forgive us and heal us and lead us in paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake.

Teach us to love Thee with all our hearts and our fellow man as ourselves. Give us such a measure of Thy spirit that we may be used by Thee to usher in a greater day for our country and a better day for all mankind. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On September 29, 1967:

H.R. 10738. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

On September 30, 1967:

H.R. 13026. An act to extend through March 1968 the first general enrollment period under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (relating to supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged), and for other purposes.

On October 2, 1967:

H.R. 472. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase certain land from Texas Southmost College, Brownsville, Tex.

On October 3, 1967:

H.R. 12257. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and expand the authorization of grants to States for rehabilitation services, to authorize assistance in establishment and operation of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults, and to provide assistance for migrants.

On October 5, 1967:

H.J. Res. 853. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

On October 21, 1967:

H.R. 3979. An act to amend section 6409 (b)(1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General; and

H.R. 11722. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

On October 23, 1967:

H.R. 11456. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

On October 24, 1967:

H.R. 678. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3973. An act to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and further insists on its amendments Nos. 58, 59, and 67, requests a further conference with the House, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. HRUSKA as conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE DELIBERATE SINKING OF AN ISRAEL SHIP BY THE COMMUNIST PUPPET REGIME OF GAMAL NASSER AND ITS RELATION TO H.R. 10915, REDUCTION OF EXTRA-LONG-STAPLE COTTON QUOTA

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, while the attention of the Congress has been occupied with the serious problems of Government spending at home, the developments in the Vietnam war, and the hippie march on Washington over the weekend, a very serious incident has occurred in the Middle East—the deliberate sinking of an Israel ship by the Communist puppet regime of Gamal Nasser. The Israel Government rightfully retaliated by destroying the fuel which helps feed the war machine of the Egyptian aggressor. The Soviet Union immediately announced its support of Egypt and requested the United Nations Security Council to declare Israel the aggressor. As usual the Communists are 180 degrees out of phase.

I urge our administration to make it clear that the United States of America supports Israel in its great struggle and to emphatically notify the world that our word is not only good in the Far East—it is good in the Middle East. We should also stop buying goods and raw materials from the Egyptian Government as it is obvious that they use the dollars earned in trade with this country to purchase arms and ammunition from the Communists for use against Israel. The Members of the House will have a chance to vote on H.R. 10915 today, reduction of extra-long-staple cotton quota, which has a direct bearing on this important issue.

THE HONORABLE JAMES A. RHODES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to put the Republicans on notice that I am about to make a speech praising a Republican. The Governor of my State, the Honorable James Rhodes, is a Republican, and I believe it is to his eternal credit that down in the Virgin Islands he alone among the Republican Governors had the intestinal fortitude not to change his position on Vietnam that he had taken 2 years before, but to assert that he still supported the U.S. troops in Vietnam, and still supported our position. He did not follow the will-o'-the-wisp in hunting votes that some of them did by their rather vague meanderings indicating arrangements to sort of desert our troops out there. And I believe his position will look better and better the closer we get to the election of next year.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I hope that my friend from Ohio will pass the word that he has just indicated over to some of the Democratic Senators on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. HAYS. I believe the distinguished minority leader well knows that I have not been bashful in criticizing some of these Democrats, and even in naming their names, and I will continue to do that from time to time.

HATCH ACT VIOLATIONS IN THE LOUISIANA DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, since bringing to the attention of the House yesterday the action of the Federal Government in making plans to send Federal civil service workers in violation of the Hatch Act to oversee as poll watchers the November 4 Democratic primary in Louisiana, I believe the House would be interested to know that the Federal Government has now issued instructions to the Federal agencies in Louisiana that they should not answer any inquiries from anyone, from the press or anyone else, with regard to their plans; that they should refer all inquiries to the Civil Service Commission in Dallas and allow answers, if answers are indeed to come forth, to come from the civil service office in Dallas.

If no more attention is to be given to replying to their requests for information than the Attorney General has given me in answering my request as to whether or not this was so, and what plans would be made, or were being made to prosecute civil service employees who violated the Hatch Act, then no answer will be forthcoming.

My colleague, the dean of the Louisiana delegation, Eddie Hébert, from New Orleans, told me this morning by telephone that he had directed the same inquiry to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has not even seen fit to answer his request either.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION LIMITING FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, of course, the House is aware of the issue involved in the continuing resolution; namely, that Federal expenditures for which appropriations have not yet been enacted are limited to last year's levels. The Members are also aware of the fact that expenditures in the last fiscal year were $125.7 billion.

In the resolution that is still pending in the other body, the figure of $131 billion has been inserted. I think it is important to realize what the administration is doing in this context. The Economic Indicators of this month, October, are now out and on page 35, "Federal financing," we can see what the cumulative totals of expenditures for the first 3 months of the fiscal year 1968 are—$36.7 billion, multiplied by 4 to get the annual expenditure rate of $146.8 billion.

It seems very apparent to me that the scofflaws are not just those who were around the Pentagon and involved in rioting in the streets.

Apparently, people high in this administration are having difficulty in abiding by the laws.

AIR QUALITY ACT

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There is no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules reported out favorably the rule on the bill, S. 780, the Air Quality Act which we will have an opportunity to debate and amend in the House next week.

I support this rule because certainly air quality is something that must be given serious attention and consideration in all parts of our country, and in particular in the Los Angeles area where I come from, where we have a very serious air pollution problem, where we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to get rid of air pollution in California in the last 20 years.

But now comes an amendment by John Dingell from Detroit, known as the Dingell amendment, which would specifically deny any State from establishing standards. Only after the State of California begs and pleads with the Secretary if he desires—not mandatory—to allow standards more stringent than the national standard. It is inconceivable to me that this House in its good judgment could deny the right of any State to do what it can for itself, spending its own money to improve the health of its citizens and to improve the livelihood of its suroundings and its communities. What has happened to the Great Society? Are we becoming champions of demiocrity? What about the little man in the street we were concerned about? Or are we now concerned only about the automobile manufacturer? They are the only ones who can truly benefit from the Dingell amendment.

It must be substituted.

AUTOMOBILES AND AIR POLLUTION IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Reinecke] for his remarks relative to the legislation on the Clean Air Act, so called. It is logical that there should be national standards, minimum standards, in relation, say, to drugs, because the effect of drugs is essentially the same on people wherever they are in the country.

But this is a vast country, and the effect of automobile emissions are quite different in some parts of the country than they are in others. In California of necessity there are, with temperature, layer inversions, and so forth, much higher standards required in that regard to protect human life and health than there are in other parts of the country. To deny by Federal legislation the opportunity for a State to protect its people by imposing such standards is to deny it the opportunity to exercise its inherent power to protect its citizens.

Therefore, we hope that this permission will be allotted to California and to any other State whose peculiar circumstances require extra care in the control of gas emissions to establish standards more strict than those applicable nationally.

In addition to that, if we are going to have progress in this field of pollution control, there must be some area or areas in the country where standards are raised above others, so that new procedures and devices can be tested out and used as a mark for the rest of the Nation to shoot at. Therefore, I hope when this bill comes before the House, certainly the opportunity will be given the States to establish their own more strict standards when they deem it necessary or desirable to protect the health and even the lives of its citizens.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF FINLAND'S INDEPENDENCE

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor of the House to announce that a group of Members is today introducing resolutions expressing our sincere congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence.

During those 50 years, the relations between the United States and Finland have been good and productive.

The friendship which has traditionally existed between the people of the United States and the people of Finland has been strengthened by the wonderful contribution to our own society made by Finnish immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have followed with great interest the course of United States-Finnish relations. I have been deeply impressed by the leadership provided by Finland on the international scene particularly on the question of strengthening the United Nations' peacekeeping capacity and improving other international arrangements which would advance the cause of peace in the world.

I think it is only proper for all of us to join in expressing our congratulations to the Finnish Nation upon the 50th anniversary of its independence. For this reason, I would hope to schedule early action on the resolutions being introduced today as soon as these are referred to our subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, the Members who are cosponsors of the resolutions today include, in addition to myself, Mr. Blatnik, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Hays, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Monagan, Mr. Culver, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Taft, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Keith, and Mr. Wyatt.

JEWISH HOLIDAY—SIMCHAT TORAH

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the Jewish holiday of Simchat Torah, the observance of the "Joy of the Law." This is one occasion during the year on which Soviet Jewry is permitted to observe a Jewish holiday publicly by dancing and celebrating in the streets and synagogues of Moscow and Leningrad.

The "Law" which is celebrated today by the Jewish community, the principle of justice, was the well spring which watered and nourished the development of that concept in all Western civilization.

While I am pleased that the Jews of the Soviet Union are permitted to celebrate on this occasion, the very concept of justice which they celebrate cries out for their full freedom, and their full right to exercise their religious life openly and unmolested by law, regulation, or other form of intimidation.

I join with my colleagues today in expressing grave concern over the unjust restrictions placed upon Soviet Jewry and the hardship endured by them. I express my fervent hope that this, as their past travails, will pass.

ELEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT ON THE TRADE PROGRAM — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, even though the Presidential messages are becoming fewer, I make the point of order we should have a quorum present to hear the messages, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 339]

Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bell
Berry
Blatnik
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Culver
Dent
Diggs
Evans, Colo.
Ford, William D.
Gettys
Gibbons
Griffiths
Gross
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hébert
Jones, Mo.
Kyl
Long, La.
McEwen
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
Ottinger
Philbin
Pollock
Rarick
Resnick
Rivers
Roybal
St. Onge
Stuckey
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ELEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT ON THE TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 177)

The following message from the President of the United States was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 11th annual report on the trade agreements program. This report is required by section 402(a) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, covering calendar year 1966.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-six was another remarkable year for international trade. World trade during the year rose by 9.5 percent, bringing great benefits to all the nations of the free world. The United States shared fully in this growth. Our foreign trade set new records, adding to the strength of our economy and to the income and welfare of our people.

The United States played a major role during 1966 in efforts to improve conditions of world commerce and to stimulate the growth of trade. The drive to conclude the Kennedy round—the most ambitious multilateral attempt to reduce trade barriers ever undertaken—was the most important of these efforts. This negotiation was successfully concluded on June 30, 1967, and will pay dividends for every American and the entire free world.

We have had two decades of unprecedented growth in world trade which contributed greatly to the economic progress of this country and of our trading partners. We must maintain this momentum.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *October 25, 1967.*

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 9960, INDEPENDENT OFFICES, AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with certain Senate amendments thereto, further disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Evins of Tennessee, Boland, Shipley, Giaimo, Marsh, Pryor, Mahon, Jonas, Minshall, Wyman, Talcott, and Bow.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9960, INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 9960, a bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman if the conferees who desire to file this report have met and concluded their conference and if the report is written and ready for filing.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The answer is "No," I will say to my friend; it is not ready. It will take some time to prepare the report. There have been some preliminary discussions on the matters of disagreement since the votes on yesterday.

Mr. HALL. Is there unanimity on the part of the conference at the time this unanimous-consent request is made?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. On the question of asking for the conference report, yes; I believe all Members are in agreement. We feel we should move forward with the conference report.

Mr. HALL. Has it been checked with the minority members among the managers on the part of the House?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. With Mr. Jonas and Mr. Bow; yes.

Mr. HALL. And the other conferees?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Some of the Members named as conferees were not present, but the majority were in attendance.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances I will withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12474, NASA APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 12474, making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

RECENT OUTBREAK OF HOSTILITIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the most recent outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East is doubly disturbing. Not only does it pose the threat of a resumption of full-scale war but it undermines what efforts have been made in recent weeks to devise some long-range solution to the disputes which have plagued that troubled region for two decades.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Soviet Union, which was the culpable outsider in the May-June outburst, has encouraged and facilitated the renewed Arab aggression. In the wake of the June war, as the world community devoted itself to securing a stable peace in the Middle East, the Soviet Union provided massive arms assistance to the same Arab States which had demonstrated their aggressive intent.

The sinking of the Israel destroyer, *Eilat*, without warning, was calculated to stimulate either retaliation or, at a minimum, an expanded response by Israel to the next United Arab Republic provocation. The exchange of artillery fire in which the Suez oil fields were hit can be judged only in the light of the Soviet-applauded United Arab Republic sinking of the *Eilat*.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that our Government has lifted the embargo on arms shipments to Israel. To have done less in the face of Soviet arms shipments to those Arab States openly committed to Israel's destruction would have left Israel less able to defend herself. The Soviet Union's present attempts to induce the U.N. Security Council to condemn Israel is consistent with its attempts to produce a false impression of who initiated the crisis in the Middle East only 5 months ago. Our Government's opposition to these Soviet efforts in both cases is eminently correct.

The Soviet Union has once again fanned the flames of armed conflict in the Middle East and a too-willing Nasser has responded with violence. Both deserve the condemnation of a world anxious to see a viable peace in this troubled area.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 820)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11641) "making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 10, and 17.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 6, 11, and 16; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$34,445,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$87,135,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,523,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$181,866,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$92,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,140,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$369,133,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$61,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, and 13.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
THOMAS G. MORRIS,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN J. RHODES (reserve on amendment No. 2),
HOWARD W. ROBISON (reserve on amendment No. 2),
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN STENNIS,
ALAN BIBLE,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

General investigations

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $34,445,000 instead of $33,745,000 as proposed by the House and $36,246,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes a net increase of $300,000 for navigation studies consisting of deletion of funds ($19,000) for the Falmouth Harbor, Maine, study and $319,000 for studies as listed below; $320,000 for flood control studies; and $80,000 for special studies including $30,000 for the Potomac River review and $50,000 for the Rampart Canyon, Alaska study.

The increase provided over the House bill shall be allocated to the following projects:

Alaska:	
(N) Krudson Cove	$5,000
(Spec.) Rampart Canyon	50,000
(FC) Tanana River (Fairbanks)	50,000
California: (FC) Petaluma Creek	10,000
Colorado: (FC) South Platte River	40,000
Delaware: (FC) Little Mill Creek	5,000
Florida: (N) Tampa Harbor	[1] 62,000
Indiana: (N) Cross Wabash Valley Waterway (reconnaissance only)	50,000
Louisiana:	
(N) Amite River, Bayou Manchac and Comite River	5,000
(N) Mississippi River, gulf outlet	5,000
Maine: (N) Penobscot River	5,000
Maryland: (Spec.) Potomac River Review, Maryland and Virginia	30,000
Michigan: (N) New Baltimore-Harrison Township	10,000
Mississippi: (FC) Pearl River and tributaries from Town Creek at Jackson, Miss., to vicinity of Byram, Miss	40,000
Nebraska:	
(FC) Lost-Dry Creek and Twin Creek Basins	$20,000
(FC) Loup River Basin	10,000
(FC) Republican River, Harlan County Reservoir	15,000
New York: (N) Hudson River—New York City to Albany	20,000
North Carolina:	
(FC) Roanoke River (South Boston and vicinity) Virginia and North Carolina	25,000
(N) Wilmington Harbor—Northeast (Cape Fear) River	20,000
North Dakota: (FC) Souris River	45,000
Ohio: (FC) Reno Beach and Howard Farms area	10,000
Oklahoma: (N) Central Oklahoma project	75,000
Oregon: (FC) Alsea River	5,000
Pennsylvania: (FC) Schuylkill River at Pottstown	[1] 10,000
Puerto Rico:	
(FC) LaPlata River	15,000
San Juan Harbor	20,000
South Carolina: (N) Little River Inlet, North Carolina and South Carolina	20,000
South Dakota: (FC) Missouri River subimpoundments at Lake Francis Case and Oahe Reservoir	5,000
Texas: (FC) Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers	15,000
Washington: (N) Elliot Bay small boat harbor	22,000

[1] Increase in House bill figure.

Construction, general

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment providing a total appropriation of $968,474,000, of which $875,000 shall be available to continue planning on the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and Reservoirs, Maine. The funds appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as shown in the following tabulation:

	Construction, general, State, and project [1]	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1968 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Alabama:				
(N)	Alabama River channel improvement	[2] $1,250,000	----------	$1,250,000	----------
(N)	Claiborne lock and dam	7,000,000	----------	7,000,000	----------
(N)	Holt lock and dam	3,033,000	----------	3,033,000	----------
(R)	John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam (spillway)	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------
(N)	John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam	----------	$200,000	----------	$450,000
(MP)	Jones Bluff lock and dam	2,900,000	----------	2,900,000	----------
(MP)	Millers Ferry lock and dam	12,700,000	----------	12,700,000	----------
(N)	Perdido Pass	----------	----------	300,000	----------
	Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi. (See Mississippi.)				
(MP)	Walter F. George lock and dam, Seaboard Airline RR., relocation, Alabama and Georgia	495,000	----------	495,000	----------
	West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)				
	Alaska:				
(MP)	Snettisham power project	[2] 4,700,000	----------	4,700,000	----------
	Arizona:				
(FC)	Alamo Reservoir	3,260,000	----------	3,260,000	----------
(FC)	Pinal Creek	1,798,000	----------	500,000	----------
(FC)	Santa Rosa Wash (Tat Momolikot Dam)	----------	100,000	----------	100,000
(FC)	Winslow	----------	170,000	----------	170,000
	Arkansas:				
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:				
	(a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	5,500,000	----------	5,500,000	----------
	(b) Navigation locks and dams	100,400,000	----------	100,400,000	----------
(FC)	Bayou Bartholomew (1950 and 1966 acts)	----------	200,000	----------	200,000
(MP)	Dardanelle lock and dam	3,500,000	----------	3,500,000	----------
(MP)	De Gray Reservoir	9,400,000	----------	9,400,000	----------
(FC)	De Queen Reservoir	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000	----------
(FC)	Dierks Reservoir	700,000	----------	700,000	----------
(FC)	Garland City	110,000	----------	110,000	----------
(FC)	Gillham Reservoir	1,400,000	----------	1,400,000	----------
(FC)	Maniece Bayou, upstream extension	470,000	----------	470,000	----------
(MP)	Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit	715,000	----------	715,000	----------
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La	8,700,000	----------	8,700,000	----------
(MP)	Ozark lock and dam	12,000,000	----------	12,000,000	----------
(FC)	Pine Mountain Dam	----------	200,000	----------	200,000
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	600,000	----------	600,000	----------
(FC)	Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee District	----------	----------	620,000	----------
	California:				
(FC)	Alameda Creek, Del Valle Dam	4,300,000	----------	4,300,000	----------
(FC)	Buchanan Reservoir (land acquisition only)	----------	----------	[4] 750,000	----------
(FC)	Corte Madera Creek	300,000	----------	300,000	----------
(N)	Dana Point Harbor	1,700,000	----------	1,700,000	----------
(BE)	Doheny Beach	446,000	----------	446,000	----------
(FC)	Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Reservoir	[3] 2,315,000	----------	2,315,000	----------
(FC)	Eel River (reimbursement)	1,325,000	----------	950,000	----------
(FC)	Eel River (Delta area) 1965 act	----------	250,000	----------	250,000
(FC)	Hidden Reservoir (land acquisition only)	500,000	----------	[4] 400,000	----------
(FC)	Klamath River	----------	220,000	530,000	220,000
(FC)	Lakeport Reservoir, Scotts Creek	----------	100,000	----------	100,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	12,900,000	----------	12,900,000	----------
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	[3] 684,000	----------	684,000	----------
(FC)	Lytle and Warm Creeks (1965 act)	----------	350,000	----------	350,000
	Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif, and Nev. (See Nevada.)				
(MP)	Marysville Reservoir	----------	----------	----------	100,000
(FC)	Mojave River Reservoir (West Fork)	[3] 2,170,000	----------	2,170,000	----------
(FC)	Mormon Slough	650,000	----------	650,000	----------
(FC)	Napa River (1965 act)	----------	300,000	----------	300,000
(FC)	New Bullards Bar Reservoir	5,040,000	----------	5,040,000	----------
(MP)	New Melones Reservoir	2,750,000	----------	2,750,000	----------
(N)	Oakland Harbor	500,000	----------	500,000	----------
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir	13,700,000	----------	9,275,000	----------
(FC)	Pine Flat Reservoir (Kings River) (resumption)	----------	----------	500,000	----------
(N)	Port San Luis	----------	115,000	----------	115,000
(FC)	Redwood Creek	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------
(FC)	Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam)	100,000	----------	100,000	----------
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	420,000	----------	420,000	----------
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection	1,200,000	----------	1,200,000	----------
(N)	Sacramento River deep water ship channel	100,000	----------	100,000	----------
(N)	San Francisco Bay to Stockton	----------	50,000	----------	100,000
(FC)	Tahquitz Creek	----------	200,000		200,000
(FC)	Walnut Creek	2,900,000	----------	2,900,000	----------
	Canada:				
(FC)	Duncan Lake Reservoir, British Columbia (reimbursement)	11,100,000	----------	11,100,000	----------

See footnotes at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project [1]	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1968 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Colorado:				
(FC)	Chatfield Reservoir	[2] $10,725,000		$11,350,000	
(FC)	Las Animas		$145,000		$145,000
(FC)	Trinidad Reservoir	[2] 1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Connecticut:				
(FC)	Ansonia Derby	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Black Rock Reservoir	1,550,000		1,550,000	
(FC)	Colebrook River Reservoir	2,900,000		2,900,000	
(FC)	Danbury		80,000		80,000
(FC)	Derby		210,000		210,000
(FC)	Hop Brook Reservoir	825,000		825,000	
(FC)	New London Barrier	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Stamford	1,510,000		1,510,000	
(FC)	Stratford		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Trumbull Pond Reservoir		100,000		100,000
	Delaware:				
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)				
(N)	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal), pt. II, Delaware and Maryland	10,000,000		11,000,000	
	Florida:				
(N)	Apalachicola River channel improvement	100,000		100,000	
(N)	Canaveral Harbor	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Central and southern Florida	12,400,000		12,400,000	
(N)	Cross Florida Barge Canal	11,400,000		11,400,000	
(N)	East Pass Channel at Destin	[2] 511,000		511,000	
(FC)	Four Rivers Basins	3,000,000		4,000,000	
(N)	Gulf County Canal (Port St. Joe)			100,000	
(N)	Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee to Anclote River	[2] 550,000		550,000	
(N)	Jacksonville Harbor (1965 act)		50,000	500,000	50,000
(N)	Key West Harbor	336,000		336,000	
(BE)	Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	10,000		10,000	
(N)	Palm Beach Harbor	[2] 1,377,000		1,377,000	
(BE)	Pinellas County (Treasure Island)			258,000	
(N)	Ponce de Leon Inlet		50,000	450,000	50,000
(BE)	Virginia Key and Key Biscayne	223,000		223,000	
	Georgia:				
(MP)	Carters Dam	8,500,000		8,500,000	
(MP)	Lazer Creek Dam		200,000		200,000
(N)	Savannah Harbor, 40 feet (1965 act)	[2] 1,780,000		1,780,000	
(N)	Savannah Harbor (sediment basin)			450,000	
(MP)	Spewrell Bluff Dam		245,000		245,000
(MP)	Trotters Shoals Reservoir, Ga. and S.C.		300,000		300,000
	Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)				
(MP)	West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga	8,100,000		8,100,000	
	Hawaii:				
(N)	Barbers Point Harbor		168,000		168,000
(N)	Honokahau Harbor			200,000	
(N)	Lahaina Harbor		34,000		34,000
	Idaho:				
(FC)	Cottonwood Creek Reservoir		40,000		40,000
(MP)	Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir	41,400,000		41,400,000	
(FC)	Heise-Roberts extension	2,100,000		2,100,000	
(FC)	Portneuf River and Marsh Creek	2,670,000		2,670,000	
(FC)	Ririe Reservoir	[2] 1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	Stuart Gulch Reservoir				60,000
	Illinois:				
(BA)	Calumet River, bridges	(3)		(3)	
(FC)	Campbell's Island		32,000		32,000
(FC)	England Pond levee	692,000		692,000	
(BE)	Evanston (reimbursement)	220,000		220,000	
(FC)	Freeport	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Henderson County Drainage District No. 1	250,000		250,000	
(N)	Horse Island and Crescent Bridge (Mississippi River), Illinois and Iowa	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District	80,000		80,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	5,400,000		5,400,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway duplicate locks		400,000		400,000
(FC)	Indian Grave Drainage District	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Kaskaskia River (navigation)	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Levee District 21 (Vandalia), Kaskaskia River		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Levee District 23 (Dively)				50,000
(FC)	Lincoln Reservoir		150,000		150,000
(N)	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:				
	(a) Chain of Rocks	300,000		300,000	
	(b) Regulating works	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	Mound City lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky		210,000		210,000
(FC)	Mount Carmel	1,147,000		1,147,000	
(FC)	New Athens	521,000		521,000	
(FC)	Oakley Reservoir (land acquisition only)			[4] 450,000	
(FC)	Peoria		125,000		125,000
(FC)	Prairie DuPont Levee and Sanitary District	821,000		821,000	
(FC)	Rend Lake Reservoir	5,900,000		5,900,000	
(FC)	Richland Creek	[2] 100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee	877,000		877,000	
(FC)	Rockford		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Rock Island		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Saline River and tributaries	[2] 700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Shelbyville Reservoir	8,850,000		8,850,000	
(N)	Smithland (Dog Island) lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Sny Island Levee and Drainage District	1,689,000		1,689,000	
(FC)	South Quincy Drainage and Levee District	235,000		235,000	
(FC)	Wood River Drainage and Levee District				20,000
	Indiana:				
(FC)	Big Pine Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Brookville Reservoir	3,480,000		3,480,000	
(N)	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	10,600,000		10,600,000	
(FC)	Clifty Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Huntington Reservoir	3,650,000		3,650,000	
	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Island levee			50,000	
(FC)	Lafayette Reservoir		185,000		185,000
(FC)	Levee unit 5, Wabash River	710,000		710,000	
(R)	Michigan City Harbor	280,000		280,000	
(N)	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	12,000,000		12,000,000	
(FC)	Patoka Reservoir (land acquisition only)	500,000		[4] 442,000	
(N)	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	12,500,000		12,500,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project[1]	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1968 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Iowa:				
(FC)	Ames Reservoir		$150,000		$150,000
(FC)	Des Moines	$1,300,000		$1,300,000	
(FC)	Dubuque	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	Fort Madison Harbor				75,000
(FC)	Guttenberg	200,000		200,000	
	Horse Island and Crescent Bridge, Mississippi River, Ill. and Iowa. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Ida Grove (sec. 205)			(404,000)	
(FC)	Marshalltown			200,000	
(FC)	Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	2,900,000		2,900,000	
(N)	Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	4,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Muscatine Island levee district and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No 13	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Rathbun Reservoir	5,430,000		5,430,000	
(FC)	Red Rock Reservoir	8,600,000		8,600,000	
(FC)	Saylorville Reservoir	5,900,000		5,900,000	
(FC)	Waterloo		200,000		200,000
	Kansas:				
	Arkansas—Red River chloride control, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. (See Texas.)				
(FC)	Atchison	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Cow Creek, Hutchinson			150,000	
(FC)	El Dorado Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Fort Scott Reservoir		155,000		155,000
(FC)	Great Bend				75,000
(FC)	Grove Reservoir		275,000		275,000
(FC)	Hays		120,000		120,000
(FC)	Hillsdale Reservoir				75,000
(FC)	Lawrence	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Marion Reservoir	778,000		778,000	
(FC)	Melvern Reservoir	2,200,000		2,200,000	
	Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Osawatomie	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Perry Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	Topeka	900,000		900,000	
	Kentucky:				
	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Carr Fork Reservoir	5,800,000		5,800,000	
(FC)	Cave Run Reservoir	4,600,000		4,600,000	
(FC)	Fishtrap Reservoir	8,520,000		8,520,000	
(FC)	Frankfort, North Frankfort area	920,000		920,000	
(FC)	Green River Reservoir	6,630,000		6,630,000	
(FC)	Kehoe Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(R)	Kentucky Peninsula	100,000		100,000	
(MP)	Laurel River Reservoir	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(N)	Lock and Dam No. 52			1,800,000	300,000
(FC)	Martin		65,000		65,000
(FC)	Martins Fork Reservoir		230,000		230,000
	Mound City lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky. (See Illinois.)				
	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Paintsville Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Red River Reservoir	330,000		330,000	
	Smithland lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Sturgis	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Taylorsville Reservoir				100,000
	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Yatesville Reservoir		200,000		200,000
	Louisiana:				
(FC)	Bayou Bodcau and tributaries		20,000		150,000
(BA)	Berwick Bay Bridge	(3)		(3)	
(FC)	Caddo Dam	770,000		770,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River and Pass	1,457,000		1,457,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier	262,000		262,000	
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	2,750,000		2,750,000	
(FC)	Grand Isle and vicinity		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Lake Pontchartrain	[3]3,260,000		4,500,000	
(N)	Mermentau River		75,000		125,000
(N)	Mississippi River, Gulf Outlet	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Monroe floodwall				40,000
(FC)	Morgan City and vicinity		70,000		100,000
(FC)	New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection	500,000		500,000	
	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)				
(N)	Overton-Red River Waterway			[5]1,700,000	
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
	Maine:				
(MP)	Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and Reservoirs		1,676,000		875,000
	Maryland:				
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and Channels	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Bloomington Reservoir (land acquisition only)			[4]2,000,000	
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), pt. II. (See Delaware.)				
	Massachusetts:				
(R)	Newburyport Harbor	259,000		259,000	
(N)	Plymouth Harbor	1,040,000		1,040,000	
(R)	Plymouth Harbor (dike)	146,000		146,000	
(N)	Provincetown Harbor			400,000	
(N)	Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers			800,000	
(FC)	Whitmanville Reservoir		60,000		60,000
	Michigan:				
(R)	Grand Marais Harbor	220,000		220,000	
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Kalamazoo River		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Lansing		50,000		50,000
(N)	Leland Harbor	140,000		140,000	
(N)	Poe lock, St. Marys River	1,845,000		1,845,000	
(N)	Point Lookout Harbor (Au Gres River)			125,000	
(FC)	River Rouge	1,900,000		1,900,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River (flood control)	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	Saginaw River (navigation)	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(R)	Saint Joseph Harbor	200,000		200,000	
(R)	South Haven Harbor	300,000		300,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

	Construction, general, State, and project[1]	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1968 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Minnesota:				
(FC)	Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River (land acquisition only)			[4] $375,000	
(FC)	Mankato and North Mankato			200,000	
(N)	Minnesota River	[3] $1,159,000		1,159,000	
(FC)	Roseau River		$130,000		$130,000
(FC)	Rushford	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	St. Paul and South St. Paul	1,754,000		1,754,000	
(FC)	Zumbro River				90,000
	Mississippi:				
(N)	Biloxi Harbor			180,000	
(FC)	Okatibbee Creek Reservoir	3,240,000		3,240,000	
(FC)	Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi	525,000		525,000	
	Missouri:				
(FC)	Chariton River	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	Chariton-Little Chariton Rivers (including Shoal Creek)		100,000		100,000
(MP)	Clarence Cannon (Joanna) Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Des Moines and Mississippi Levee District	577,000		577,000	
(FC)	Gregory Drainage District			200,000	
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir	8,800,000		10,000,000	
(FC)	Long Branch Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Meramec Park Reservoir (land acquisition only)	500,000		[4] 450,000	
	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)				
	Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Pattonsburg Reservoir (Highway I-35 crossing)	834,000		834,000	
(FC)	Platte River				50,000
(FC)	St. Louis	6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	Smithville Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(MP)	Stockton Reservoir	10,700,000		10,700,000	
(FC)	Union Reservoir		100,000		100,000
	Montana:				
(FC)	Great Falls	850,000		850,000	
(MP)	Libby Reservoir	44,300,000		44,300,000	
	Nebraska:				
(FC)	Gering Valley	591,000		591,000	
(FC)	Little Nemaha River		95,000		95,000
(FC)	Little Papillion Creek	786,000		786,000	
	Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Norfolk	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC)	Salt Creek and tributaries	993,000		993,000	
	Nevada:				
(FC)	Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev.	700,000		700,000	
	New Jersey:				
(BE)	Atlantic City (reimbursement)	305,000		305,000	
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorages), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Elizabeth River		280,000		280,000
(N)	Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers			1,000,000	
	New York and New Jersey Channels, Kill Van Kull entrance, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)				
(FC)	Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays	[3] 700,000		700,000	
(N)	Shrewsbury River Inlet		100,000		100,000
(FC)	South Orange, Rahway River		60,000		60,000
(MP)	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y. (land acquisition)	4,000,000		4,000,000	
	New Mexico:				
(FC)	Albuquerque	4,200,000		4,200,000	
(FC)	Cochiti Reservoir	3,700,000		3,700,000	
(FC)	Galisteo Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Las Cruces	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Los Esteros-Alamogordo Reservoir (resumption)				100,000
	New York:				
(FC)	East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay		200,000		200,000
(BE)	Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet (1962 act)		165,000		165,000
(BE)	Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point (resumption)			2,000,000	
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	1,950,000		1,950,000	
(BE)	Hamlin Beach State Park				30,000
(FC)	Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet	950,000		950,000	
	Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.).				
(N)	Lake Montauk Harbor	500,000		500,000	
(N)	Little Neck Bay	550,000		550,000	
(N)	Moriches Inlet, Long Island		150,000		150,000
(N)	New York Anchorages			1,000,000	
(N)	New York-New Jersey Channels, Kill Van Kull entrance, New York and New Jersey	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Nichols	[3] 305,000		305,000	
(FC)	North Ellenville	[3] 580,000		580,000	
(N)	Oak Orchard Harbor		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Red Creek		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Rosendale	[3] 500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Salamanca	655,000		655,000	
(FC)	South Ellenville	1,240,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill		200,000		200,000
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y. (See New Jersey.)				
(FC)	Wellsville	472,000		472,000	
	North Carolina:				
(N)	Cape Fear River above Wilmington			500,000	
(BE)	Cape Lookout		50,000		
(FC)	Carolina Beach and vicinity	800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Falls Reservoir		215,000		215,000
(FC)	New Hope Reservoir	3,120,000		3,560,000	
(N)	Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (1962 act)	2,795,000		2,795,000	
	North Dakota:				
(R)	Garrison Reservoir (embankment repair)	900,000		900,000	
(FC)	Missouri River, Garrison Dam to Oahe Reservoir	502,000		502,000	
	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)				
(FC)	Pipestem Reservoir (land acquisition only)			[4] 250,000	
	Ohio:				
(FC)	Alum Creek (land acquisition only)			[4] 1,400,000	
(N)	Ashtabula Harbor (1965 modification)	[3] 1,770,000		1,770,000	
(FC)	Athens			200,000	
(N)	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	8,218,000		8,218,000	
(FC)	Big Darby Creek Reservoir	1,400,000			
(FC)	Buck Creek Reservoir	4,500,000		4,500,000	
(FC)	Caesar Creek Reservoir	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)	1,500,000		1,500,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

	Construction, general, State, and project[1]	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1968 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Ohio—Continued				
(N)	Conneaut Harbor (1962 modification)	$900,000		$900,000	
(FC)	Deer Creek Reservoir	7,523,000		7,523,000	
(FC)	East Fork Reservoir	1,420,000		1,420,000	
(FC)	Eastlake, Chagrin River		$125,000		$125,000
(FC)	Fremont	650,000		650,000	
(N)	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	8,070,000		8,070,000	
(N)	Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, Ohio, and Pennsylvania		2,000,000		750,000
(N)	Lorain Harbor	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Mill Creek Reservoir, Scioto River Basin		425,000		455,000
(FC)	North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir	750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Paint Creek Reservoir	2,700,000		2,700,000	
(N)	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	9,500,000		9,500,000	
(N)	Vermilion Harbor		75,000		75,000
(N)	Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	4,500,000		4,500,000	
(FC)	Youngstown, Crab Creek	850,000		850,000	
	Oklahoma:				
	Arkansas Red River chloride control, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. (See Texas.)				
	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
(MP)	Broken Bow Reservoir	5,200,000		5,200,000	
(FC)	Candy Reservoir				40,000
(FC)	Crutcho Creek		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Hugo Reservoir	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Kaw Reservoir	4,700,000		4,700,000	
(MP)	Keystone Reservoir	4,579,000		4,579,000	
(FC)	Lukfata Reservoir		120,000		120,000
(FC)	Oologah Reservoir	1,350,000		1,350,000	
(FC)	Optima Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Pine Creek Reservoir	5,600,000		5,600,000	
(MP)	Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam	13,000,000		13,000,000	
(FC)	Shidler Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Waurika Reservoir		190,000		190,000
(MP)	Webbers Falls lock and dam	14,700,000		14,700,000	
	Oregon:				
(FC)	Applegate Reservoir		206,000		206,000
(FC)	Blue River Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000	
(MP)	Bonneville lock and dam (2d power unit) Oregon and Washington		400,000		400,000
(FC)	Cascadia Reservoir		400,000		400,000
(N)	Chetco River			100,000	
(N)	Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington	2,700,000		3,000,000	
(N)	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington		65,000		65,000
(FC)	Elk Creek Reservoir		220,000		220,000
(FC)	Gate Creek Reservoir		350,000		350,000
(MP)	Green Peter Reservoir	4,940,000		4,940,000	
(MP)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	38,700,000		38,700,000	
(MP)	Lost Creek Reservoir	[2] 2,050,000		2,050,000	
(N)	Port Orford	232,000		232,000	
(N)	Siuslaw River and Bar			500,000	
(MP)	The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington (additional power units)	786,000		786,000	
(N)	Tillamook Bay and Bar (South Jetty)			500,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection	375,000		375,000	
(N)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor	2,500,000		2,500,000	
	Pennsylvania:				
(FC)	Aylesworth Creek Reservoir	[3] 993,000		993,000	
(FC)	Beltzville Reservoir	5,320,000		5,320,000	
(FC)	Blanchard Reservoir	9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC)	Blue Marsh Reservoir		275,000		275,000
(FC)	Chartiers Creek	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Cowanesque Reservoir		400,000		400,000
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)				
(FC)	Dubois		65,000		65,000
(FC)	Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	6,989,000		6,489,000	
	Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, Ohio and Pennsylvania. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Raystown Reservoir	[2] 2,700,000		2,700,000	
(FC)	Scranton	1,086,000		1,086,000	
(FC)	Tioga-Hammond Reservoir (land acquisition only)			[4] 1,000,000	
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y. (See New Jersey.)				
(FC)	Trexler Resrevoir		175,000		175,000
(FC)	Turtle Creek	713,000		713,000	
(FC)	Union City Reservoir	1,450,000		1,450,000	
(FC)	Woodcock Creek Reservoir	500,000		500,000	
	Rhode Island:				
(BE)	Cliff Walk, Newport				80,000
(N)	Providence River and Harbor	[2] 3,500,000		3,500,000	
	South Carolina:				
	Trotters Shoals Reservoir, Ga. and S.C. (See Georgia.)				
	South Dakota:				
(MP)	Big Bend Dam-Lake Sharpe	1,800,000		1,800,000	
	Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River. (See Minnesota.)				
(FC)	Cottonwood Springs Reservoir	[2] 500,000		[2] 500,000	
(MP)	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	1,100,000		1,100,000	
	Tennessee:				
(MP)	Cordell Hull lock and dam	7,600,000		7,600,000	
(MP)	J. Percy Priest Reservoir	5,500,000		5,500,000	
	Texas:				
(FC)	Abilene Channel improvement		180,000		180,000
(FC)	Arkansas Red River chloride control (pt. 1), Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas				150,000
(FC)	Arkansas-Red River chloride control (supplemental studies), Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas		1,000,000		1,000,000
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	3,700,000		3,700,000	
(FC)	El Paso		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension	900,000		900,000	
(FC)	Freeport and vicinity	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(R)	Galveston Harbor and Channel (groins)	500,000		500,000	
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Chocolate Bayou			500,000	
(FC)	Highland Bayou		110,000		110,000
(FC)	Lake Kemp Reservoir	900,000		900,000	
(FC)	Lakeview Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement	[2] 3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Liberty, Trinity River		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)	7,400,000		7,400,000	
	Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway 40 feet and channel to Echo	3,900,000		3,900,000	
(FC)	San Antonio Channel	1,500,000		1,500,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

	Construction, general, State, and project[1]	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1968 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Texas—Continued				
(FC)	San Gabriel River tributary to Brazos River (land acquisition only)	$1,800,000		[4] $1,532,000	
(FC)	Stillhouse Hollow Dam	3,717,000		3,717,000	
(FC)	Taylors Bayou		$150,000		$150,000
(FC)	Texas City, hurricane protection	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	Trinity River Bridges	[2] 2,825,000		1,035,000	
(FC)	Vince and Little Vince Bayous	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Wallisville Reservoir, Trinity River	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(Spec.)	Whitney Reservoir (road repairs)			130,000	
	Vermont:				
(FC)	Bennington			350,000	
	Virginia:				
(FC)	Gathright Reservoir	[2] 1,450,000		1,450,000	
(N)	Hampton Roads	6,500,000		6,500,000	
(BE)	Virginia Beach (reimbursement)	85,000		85,000	
	Washington:				
	Bonneville lock and dam (2d powerplant, Oregon and Washington). (See Oregon.)				
(MP)	Chief Joseph Dam (additional power units)		300,000		300,000
	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
	Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(FC)	Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2	685,000		685,000	
(MP)	Ice Harbor lock and dam (additional units)		200,000		200,000
	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(MP)	Little Goose lock and dam	44,000,000		44,000,000	
(MP)	Lower Granite lock and dam	9,200,000		9,200,000	
(MP)	Lower Monumental lock and dam	23,700,000		23,700,000	
(N)	Olympia Harbor (restudy)				20,000
	The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(FC)	Wynoochee River Reservoir	[2] 3,000,000		3,000,000	
	West Virginia:				
(FC)	Beech Fork Reservoir	855,000		855,000	
	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)				
(FC)	Burnsville Lake (land acquisition only)			[4] 400,000	
(FC)	East Lynn Reservoir	3,170,000		3,170,000	
	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	R. D. Bailey (Justice) Reservoir	[2] 4,000,000		4,000,000	
	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Rowlesburg Reservoir		535,000		700,000
(FC)	Stonewall Jackson Reservoir		75,000		375,000
	Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
	Wisconsin:				
(FC)	Eau Galle River, Spring Valley	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(N)	Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(R)	Kenosha Harbor	60,000		60,000	
(FC)	LaFarge Reservoir and channel improvements, Kickapoo River (land acquisition only)			[4] 300,000	
(N)	Manitowoc Harbor		25,000		25,000
	Miscellaneous:				
(FC)	Emergency bank protection	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation (sec. 205)	6,000,000		6,404,000	
(FC)	Snagging and clearing	500,000		500,000	
(N)	Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $500,000 (sec. 107)	1,500,000		1,500,000	
BE)	Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $500,000 (sec. 103)	250,000		250,000	
	Recreation facilities, completed projects	9,000,000		9,000,000	
	Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	580,000		580,000	
	Aquatic plant control (1965 act)	900,000		900,000	
	Employees compensation	625,000		625,000	
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages and availability of carryover balances	−90,025,000		−115,025,000	
	Grand total, construction, general	951,831,000	21,161,000	946,954,000	21,520,000
		($972,992,000)		($968,474,000)	

---

[1] Key to symbols:
(N)—Navigation.
(FC)—Flood control.
(BE)—Beach erosion.
(R)—Rehabilitation.
(MP)—Multiple purpose including power.
(BA)—Bridge alteration.
(Spec)—Special.

[2] Original budget amount revised in budget amendment submitted in H. Doc. 114.

[3] Funds for this activity are being budgeted for by the Department of Transportation.

[4] Allowance is for additional planning and land acquisition only.

[5] For work on lower 31-mile reach only.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in disagreement.

Operation and maintenance, general

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $190,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $189,000,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill is to permit the Corps of Engineers to initiate the clearing of inlets and channels silted as a result of Hurricane Beulah.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $87,135,000 instead of $83,400,000 as proposed by the House and $91,480,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill consists of the following: Examinations and surveys, $55,000, including New Madrid Floodway, Missouri, $10,000; Greenville Harbor, Mississippi, $10,000; and Obion and Forked Deer Rivers and tributaries, Tennessee, $35,000; Mississippi River levees, $150,000; Channel improvement, $2,525,000; Old River control, $175,000; St. Francis Basin, $330,000; and Atchafalaya Basin, $500,000.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 6: Provides a limitation of $162,000,000 on the capital of the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, as proposed by the Senate instead of $156,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $16,523,000 instead of $16,000,000 as proposed by the House and $21,555,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: for atmospheric water resources research, $368,000; for reconnaissance study of the Green River, Wyo., $25,000; to initiate a reconnaissance survey of the Juniper division, Wapinitia project, Oregon, $30,000; and a restoration of $100,000 in the undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays.

Amendment No. 8: Provides that $13,058,000 of the appropriation shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the House instead of $16,113,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $181,868,000 instead of $172,700,000 as proposed by the House and $185,005,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill consists of the following: for preconstruction planning of the Folsom-South Canal, Auburn-Folsom South Unit, Central Valley project, California, $700,000; for an additional amount for the Columbia Basin project, $400,000; for initiation of construction of the Fort Thompson, S. Dak.-Grand Island, Nebr., 345-kilovolt line, $7,863,000; feasibility study of supplying water to Minot, N. Dak., $40,000; a reconnaissance study of the Big Horn Bench unit, Montana, $40,000; and for additional preconstruction planning on the Midstate division, Nebraska, $125,000.

LOAN PROGRAM

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $15,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $15,400,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes $200,000 to initiate a loan to the Malad Valley Irrigating Co., Idaho, under the provisions of the Small Reclamation Project Act.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $5,015,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,035,000 as proposed by the House. The decrease in the House bill amount results from deletion of funds for planning the Kaysinger Bluff-Clinton transmission line, Missouri, pending negotiations for the provision of the required transmission services by a non-Federal utility in the area.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

WATER SUPPLY AND WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $92,800,000 instead of $90,800,000 as proposed by the House and $94,935,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for research and development grants under Section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. The conferees are in agreement that within available funds provision may be made for the establishment of 10 management intern positions to the extent qualified Federal employees are not available for recruitment, and for not to exceed $400,000 for comprehensive basin planning in connection with the Upper Ohio River water pollution survey.

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS FOR WASTE TREATMENT WORKS

Amendment No. 13: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $2,140,000,000 instead of $2,125,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,142,402,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is for additional requirements under the weapons program arising from the decision, made subsequent to House bill passage, to deploy an anti-ballistic-missile system. The amount allowed for the raw materials program includes not to exceed $355,000 for resource investigations, including $100,000 to be allocated to colleges and universities in uranium producing areas for special study of the uranium supply problem. The discovery and development of new uranium reserves should be the responsibility of the U.S. Geological Survey and appropriate provisions for this purpose should be reflected in its future budget proposals. No funds are included in the bill to provide for the establishment of a separate fire department for the Los Alamos Community.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $369,133,000 instead of $367,733,000 as proposed by the House and $369,633,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase in the House bill amount is for the addition to the biomedical building, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

ATLANTIC-PACIFIC INTEROCEANIC CANAL STUDY COMMISSION

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $6,100,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,115,000 as proposed by the House.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Amendment No. 17: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 232 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the House instead of 272, of which 232 shall be for replacement only, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $61,000,000 instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House and $62,150,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase in the House Bill amount is for restoration in part of the House reduction for anticipated delays and savings in the capital outlay estimate.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
THOMAS G. MORRIS,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN J. RHODES
(reserve on amendment No. 2),
HOWARD W. ROBISON
(reserve on amendment No. 2),
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the bill agreed to in conference is a good bill considering the need to reduce Federal expenditures at this time to a minimum because of the serious fiscal situation facing the country. I regret that I cannot say that it is a good bill for the water resource development of our Nation. In that regard it makes provision for only the most essential requirements, primarily to fund contractors' earnings under going projects.

The bill total is $4.7 billion of which $2.5 billion, or 53 percent, is for the atomic energy program. The bill is $177 million below the budget request. With one exception, every appropriation item in the bill is at or below the budget request. This one exception, involving the appropriation for flood control for the Mississippi River and tributaries, represents an increase required over the budget to restore the program to the 1967 level.

The Senate bill provided an increase of $153,142,000 over the House bill. The final conference agreement includes $67,891,000 of this increase, of which $15,000,000 is for additional requirements for the atomic energy weapons program arising from the decision, made subsequent to House bill passage, to deploy anti-ballistic-missile system. Additional, sizable requirements under this program will have to be absorbed by the Atomic Energy Commission within the funds provided.

Although the bill does provide an increase of $380,642,000 over fiscal year 1967, $310,103,000, or 82 percent, is to meet additional requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission. This AEC increase, $136,967,000 less than requested, is required primarily to finance continuing activities funded last year with carryover unobligated balances and program revenues and to meet increased requirements of the weapons program.

The net increase over 1967 of $70,539,000 for all the other agencies in the bill includes an increase of $62,737,000 for the Federal water pollution control program.

Excluding AEC, the bill total is $2.2 billion. Included in this is $295.8 million for the Federal water pollution control program which is being carried in this bill for the first time this year. For water pollution control research and development grants and the operating program, the bill makes an 8-percent reduction in the budget estimate. For construction grants for waste treatment works the House conferees have insisted on an allowance of only the budget request of $203 million as provided in the House bill compared with the authorization of $450 million. The Senate bill increased the House and budget figures by $22 million. We have brought this item back in disagreement and will ask for a separate vote to insist on the House figure.

Another $259.9 million in the bill is for the annual operation maintenance requirements on completed projects of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the power agencies. The bill reflects a reduction in the budget request for these items of $9.5 million. Any significant additional reductions are not possible without neglecting essential maintenance items, resulting in more costly rehabilitation in future years.

The bill also carries $40.5 million for the operation of the Canal Zone Government of the Panama Canal which is repaid to the U.S. Treasury out of revenue from the operation of the Panama Canal Company. Another $21.2 million in the bill is to cover the cost of operation and maintenance of the national cemeteries, including Arlington Cemetery.

The balance of $1.6 billion remaining in the bill is primarily for the activities of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the power agencies of the Federal Government. Excluding the investigation programs and necessary administrative expenses, $1.4 billion remains for the going construction programs of these agencies for flood control, water supply, irrigation, and power facilities. Of the $1.3 billion included in this total for construction by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, only $24.2 million is to initiate construction on new starts. The balance of the appropriations—98 percent—is to finance the continuation of construction during the current fiscal year of projects previously approved by Congress. Under the Corps of Engineers, for example, about 70 percent of the funds is required to meet obligation commitments on continuing contracts and the remaining 30 percent is to provide for new contracts required to meet construction schedules on going projects. Many of these pending new contracts are essential to avoid project shutdowns and to prevent damage and loss to works already put in place under prior contracts.

The allowance made in the bill for each construction appropriation item already reflects a general, lump sum reduction, averaging over 10 percent, to be applied to the individual amounts programed for the projects. In turn, the committee has taken full advantage of actual carryover funds available from last fiscal year and has reduced the new appropriation requests accordingly. In total, the allowances for the construction programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation reflect lump sum reductions of about $140 million which will have to be met from carryover funds and through slippages, delays, and stretchout of contract awards, with the resulting reduction in expenditure requirements for fiscal year 1968.

In summary, unless we are ready to cancel present contract commitments on projects now under construction—with the costly consequences now and in the years to come—I feel it is just not possible to make any additional large-scale savings in appropriations or expenditures beyond those which have already been made in the bill.

Realizing the need to hold down capital expenditures at this time, the bill makes provision for only 34 new construction starts under the Corps of Engineers' program involving a total cost of $177.8 million to be funded over the next 3 or 4 fiscal years. As completion is scheduled this year on 51 projects which have been financed annually over several years at a total cost of $735.5 million, there will be a sharp reduction of $557.7 million in the level of the construction pipeline of the Corps of Engineers.

In order to limit new starts wherever possible to projects involving a low total cost, the committee disallowed construction funds for four—with a total cost of $130.3 million—of the nine budgeted items, with approval being granted at this time only for additional planning and the initiation of land acquisition. The net total cost, therefore, of the 34 new starts is only $24.9 million more than the cost of the new starts proposed in the budget. The average total cost of the new starts is only $5,200,000, 19 of which have a total cost of less than $3,000,000. The very limited number and low total cost of the new starts in the 1968 bill is in sharp contrast to the appropriation bills over the past 5 years which have averaged about 60 new starts annually with an average total cost of about $1 billion.

Because it reflects both the defense expenditures required under the atomic energy program as well as the funds for water resource development, as I said when we had this bill on the floor back in July, perhaps this appropriation bill best demonstrates that we cannot afford to fight a war with its tremendous expenditures and at the same time make provision for even the most essential current requirements for the development of our own Nation. It means that we will have to pay a large price in the future and I hope it will not be too late. The large annual losses due to flood damages, the critical water and power supply situation facing many areas, and the increasing problems arising from water pollution are known to all of us. Unless it is possible at an early date to make provision within the national budget for the funding of the most essential projects to help alleviate these conditions, the Nation will be faced with a most serious situation necessitating a most costly and inefficient crash program.

Finally, we have brought back in disagreement the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and Reservoir project in Maine. As you know, funds to continue and complete planning on the project were deleted by floor amendment here in the House. The Senate restored the full budget request of $1,676,000 to complete the planning. The House conferees have insisted that the item must be brought back for a separate vote in order that the House may again have an opportunity to work its will. At the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment allowing only $875,000 to permit the Corps to continue with a minimum program of exploration work and preliminary design on the dam and spillway and the diversion tunnel, at a cost of $480,000. The balance of the amount, $395,000, is required to complete outstanding commitments on site surveys and explorations and to pay outstanding bills in connection with the project. This allowance would provide us with valuable additional information to verify cost estimates for further review. There would still be a balance of about $800,000 required to actually complete the planning in future fiscal years. As you know, our committee recommended the budget request of the $1,676,000 to continue planning on the project as our extensive committee staff investigation confirmed that the project is economically feasible, with a benefit-to-cost ratio 1.9 to 1, and would provide efficient hydroelectric power at reasonable rates for peaking purposes as well as firm power to preference customers in Maine. I therefore have personally supported the project and recommended that you approve the allowance of $875,000 to continue planning when it is brought up for a separate vote.

SUMMARY TABLE—PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Item	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimate, 1968 (as amended)	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL									
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY									
Cemeterial Expenses									
Salaries and expenses	[1] $17,148,000	$24,637,000	$21,200,000	$21,200,000	$21,200,000	+$4,052,000	−$3,437,000		
Corps of Engineers—Civil									
General investigations	32,450,000	39,745,000	33,745,000	36,246,000	34,445,000	+1,995,000	−5,300,000	+$700,000	−$1,801,000
Construction, general	967,460,000	[2] 972,992,000	935,074,000	1,010,823,000	968,474,000	+1,014,000	−4,518,000	+33,400,000	−42,349,000
Operation and maintenance, general	179,000,000	197,634,000	189,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	+11,000,000	−7,634,000	+1,000,000	
Flood control and coastal emergencies	7,000,000					−7,000,000			
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	87,135,000	77,400,000	83,400,000	91,480,000	87,135,000		+9,735,000	+3,735,000	−4,345,000
General expenses	[3] 18,014,000	19,914,000	18,950,000	18,950,000	18,950,000	+936,000	−964,000		
Total, Corps of Engineers—Civil	1,291,059,000	1,307,685,000	1,260,169,000	1,347,499,000	1,299,004,000	+7,945,000	−8,681,000	+38,835,000	−48,495,000
The Panama Canal									
Canal Zone Government:									
Operating expenses	[4] 34,746,000	36,191,000	36,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000	+1,254,000	−191,000		
Capital outlay	2,000,000	5,024,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	+2,500,000	−524,000		
Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general and administrative expenses	[5] (12,278,000)	(13,267,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(+722,000)	(−267,000)		
Total the Panama Canal	36,746,000	41,215,000	40,500,000	40,500,000	40,500,000	+3,754,000	−715,000		
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	1,344,953,000	1,373,537,000	1,321,869,000	1,409,199,000	1,360,704,000	+15,751,000	−12,833,000	+38,835,000	−48,495,000
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR									
Bureau of Reclamation									
General investigations	15,075,000	16,523,000	16,000,000	21,555,000	16,523,000	+1,448,000		+523,000	−5,032,000
Construction and rehabilitation	[6] 192,825,000	[7] 181,868,000	172,700,000	185,005,000	181,868,000	−10,957,000		+9,168,000	−3,137,000
Operation and maintenance	[8] 42,350,000	49,540,000	48,300,000	48,300,000	48,300,000	+5,950,000	−1,240,000		
Loan program	12,995,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,400,000	15,000,000	+2,005,000			−400,000
Upper Colorado River storage project	50,198,000	[9] 41,260,000	41,000,000	41,000,000	41,000,000	−9,198,000	−260,000		
Emergency fund	1,000,000					−1,000,000			
General administrative expenses	[10] 11,567,000	11,356,000	11,356,000	11,356,000	11,356,000	−211,000			
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	326,010,000	315,547,000	304,356,000	322,616,000	314,047,000	−11,963,000	−1,500,000	+9,691,000	−8,569,000

See footnotes at end of table.

SUMMARY TABLE—PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimate, 1968 (as amended)	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued									
Bonneville Power Administration									
Construction	$109,000,000	$120,006,000	$110,500,000	$110,500,000	$110,500,000	$+1,500,000	−$9,506,000		
Operation and maintenance	17,010,000	19,000,000	18,500,000	18,500,000	18,500,000	+1,490,000	−500,000		
Total, Bonneville Power Administration	126,010,000	139,006,000	129,000,000	129,000,000	129,000,000	+2,990,000	−10,006,000		
Southeastern Power Administration									
Operation and maintenance	1,000,000	1,000,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	−150,000	−150,000		
Southwestern Power Administration									
Construction	3,950,000	[11] 5,505,000	5,035,000	5,015,000	5,015,000	+1,065,000	−490,000	$−20,000	
Operation and maintenance	2,115,000	2,240,000	2,240,000	2,240,000	2,240,000	+125,000			
Continuing fund (appropriation of receipts)	(3,700,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,200,000)	(−500,000)			
Total, Southwestern Power Administration	6,065,000	7,745,000	7,275,000	7,255,000	7,255,000	+1,190,000	−490,000	−20,000	
Underground Electric Power Transmission Research									
Salaries and expenses		2,000,000					−2,000,000		
Federal Water Pollution Control Administration									
Water supply and water pollution control [12]	75,439,000	101,114,000	90,800,000	94,935,000	92,800,000	+17,361,000	−8,314,000	+2,000,000	−$2,135,000
Buildings and facilities	[13] 4,624,000	1,920,000				−4,624,000	−1,920,000		
Construction grants for waste treatment works [12]	153,000,000	203,000,000	203,000,000	225,000,000	[18] 203,000,000	+50,000,000			−22,000,000
Total, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration	233,063,000	306,034,000	293,800,000	319,935,000	295,800,000	+62,737,000	−10,234,000	+2,000,000	−24,135,000
Total, direct appropriations	692,148,000	771,332,000	735,281,000	779,656,000	746,952,000	+54,804,000	−24,380,000	+11,671,000	−32,704,000
Total, appropriation of receipts	3,700,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	−500,000			
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	695,848,000	774,532,000	738,481,000	782,856,000	750,152,000	+54,304,000	−24,380,000	+11,671,000	−32,704,000
TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION									
Operating expenses	1,923,000,000	[14] 2,169,900,000	2,125,000,000	2,142,402,000	2,140,000,000	+217,000,000	−29,900,000	+15,000,000	−2,402,000
Plant and capital equipment	276,030,000	[15] 476,200,000	367,733,000	369,633,000	369,133,000	+93,103,000	−107,067,000	+1,400,000	−500,000
Total, title III, Atomic Energy Commission	[16] 2,199,030,000	[16] 2,646,100,000	2,492,733,000	2,512,035,000	2,509,133,000	+310,103,000	−136,967,000	+16,400,000	−2,902,000
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES									
Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission: Salaries and expenses	[17] 4,000,000	7,500,000	6,115,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	+2,100,000	−1,400,000	−15,000	
Delaware River Basin Commission:									
Salaries and expenses	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000				
Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission	115,000	134,000	134,000	134,000	134,000	+19,000			
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	160,000	179,000	179,000	179,000	179,000	+19,000			
Interstate Commission on the Potomac Basin: Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000				
Tennessee Valley Authority: Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority fund	63,700,000	62,150,000	60,000,000	62,150,000	61,000,000	−2,700,000	−1,150,000	+1,000,000	−1,150,000
Water Resources Council:									
Water resources planning	600,000	1,340,000	1,070,000	1,070,000	1,070,000	+470,000	−270,000		
Financial assistance to States	1,875,000	2,470,000	2,470,000	2,470,000	2,470,000	+595,000			
Total, Water Resources Council	2,475,000	3,810,000	3,540,000	3,540,000	3,540,000	+1,065,000	−270,000		
Total, title IV, Independent Offices	70,340,000	73,644,000	69,839,000	71,974,000	70,824,000	+484,000	−2,820,000	+985,000	−1,150,000
Grand total, titles I, II, III, and IV:									
Total, direct appropriations	4,306,471,000	4,864,613,000	4,619,722,000	4,772,864,000	4,687,613,000	+381,142,000	−177,000,000	+67,891,000	−85,251,000
Total, appropriation of receipts	3,700,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	−500,000			
Total	4,310,171,000	4,867,813,000	4,622,922,000	4,776,064,000	4,690,813,000	+380,642,000	−177,000,000	+67,891,000	−85,251,000

---

[1] Includes $2,050,000 in 2d supplemental 1967, H.R. 9481, 90th Cong., 1st sess.

[2] Includes $20,419,000 in H. Doc. 114, 90th Cong., 1st sess.

[3] Includes $464,000 in 2d supplemental 1967, H.R. 9481, 90th Cong., 1st sess.

[4] Includes $1,342,000 in 2d supplemental 1967, H.R. 9481, 90th Cong., 1st sess.

[5] Includes $278,000 in 2d supplemental 1967, H.R. 9481, 90th Cong., 1st sess.

[6] Includes $450,000 in 2d supplemental 1967, H.R. 9481, 90th Cong., 1st sess.

[7] Includes $1,900,000 in H. Doc. 114, 90th Cong., 1st sess.

[8] Includes $1,350,000 in 2d supplemental 1967, H.R. 9481, 90th Cong., 1st sess.

[9] Includes $1,600,000 in H. Doc. 119, 90th Cong., 1st sess.

[10] Includes $267,000 in 2d supplemental 1967, H.R. 9481, 90th Cong., 1st sess.

[11] Includes $400,000 in H. Doc. 114, 90th Cong., 1st sess.

[12] Reflects transfer of $20,000,000 in 1967 and $10,000,000 in 1968 for activities transferred in the estimate from "Construction grants for waste treatment works" to "Water supply and water pollution control."

[13] In addition, unexpended balances of $1,655,618 reappropriated in 1967 Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act.

[14] Includes $40,000,000 submitted in H. Doc. 62 and decrease of $14,900,000 submitted in H. Doc. 80.

[15] Includes $59,800,000 and $68,200,000 submitted in H. Docs. 62 and 111, respectively.

[16] In addition, it is estimated that receipts and reimbursements will be made available from non-Federal sources totaling $66,610,000 and $58,840,000 for fiscal years 1967 and 1968, respectively.

[17] In addition, unobligated balances of $2,691,000 reappropriated in 1967 Public Works Appropriation Act.

[18] House figure; item in disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report, although I took exception on amendment No. 2. I took exception because of the fact that the Senate has added several items for construction above the budget.

When the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee reported the bill, we were very careful not to add anything over the President's budget as to ongoing projects. However, on the other side there were some 19 projects for which funds were added.

We do not say the projects are not worthy. They probably are. But we do recognize the fact that a budgetary situation is facing us in this country today which certainly calls for prudence rather than liberality so far as expenditures like these are concerned. I took an exception for that reason on amendment No. 2.

There were some eight ongoing projects which the House conferees agreed with the Senate to fund above the budget. I thought it was wrong, and therefore I took the exception.

I should like also to mention one amendment which is brought back in disagreement. This is amendment No. 13, with respect to an item of $22 million which the Senate added to the budgeted amount of $203 million. This item is for construction grants for waste treatment works under the water pollution control program.

I do not know anyone in the House who does not feel a sense of urgency for construction for waste treatment works. The whole country wants to provide clean water not only for ourselves but also for those who will follow after us in this country. The treatment of waste is one of the subjects in which we are most interested, and which has the sympathy of the entire Congress.

Mr. Speaker, again, we are in a budgetary situation in which prudence certainly is dictated. The House committee approved the budget figure provided by the administration—$203 million was asked; $203 million was approved.

We were told in the conference that many Senators felt it would be a good idea to add funds for this item to show the support of the Senate for the program. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the House has already shown ample support for the program by going up to the budget figure as provided by the President.

The budgeted amount which we approved is some $67 million over last year's figure. Also, there are unexpended funds which are available for this item.

It would be my hope that the House of Representatives, so far as amendment No. 13 is concerned, would vote to sustain the position of the House.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay a compliment to my chairman and to the members of the subcommittee. It is a privilege to serve with them on the Appropriations Committee.

I know, as other Members do, we have many problems at this time. They have been subject to discussion for months. We have budgetary problems. We have deficit problems. We have military problems. We have every kind of problem one can mention including the breakdown in law enforcement. I have been active in all these areas as one of 435 Members of this House.

However, with all the problems facing us today I feel that I am especially privileged to discuss the necessity for continuing attention to river and harbor, watershed, and other resource protection and development. In 1959 I made the successful motion to override President Eisenhower's veto of the public works appropriations bill. With the support of the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, the gentleman from Kentucky, BILL NATCHER, and 17 other members of the Appropriations Committee, including two Republicans, we said to the Congress and to the world, "Whatever our problems, however large may be our debt, we must not let our own Nation's physical resources go to pot."

We sold that viewpoint to the committee and to the Congress, overrode the President on the second try—the only time in history—and, saved a number of necessary construction starts.

I feel the same way today. As you know, last week, after being told if we did not cut back the budget, the executive department would, I offered a substitute, which was adopted by a vote of 253 to 143. This motion, if the Senate will only approve, will reduce increased spending requests by the Bureau of the Budget by $6 to $8 billion, by holding spending to the 1967 level by department and agency, with the essential exceptions of military expenditures of the Department of Defense directly related to our involvement in Southeast Asia, including pay of all military personnel, the payment of interest on the national debt, payments under the Social Security Act, veterans and other retirement benefits, medicare and old-age assistance payments.

Of course, this does not damage the school lunch and school milk programs, soil conservation, water and sewage loans, price supports, the REA, and other programs we had to save from the Budget Director and the executive department last year. It protects them.

I am proud to say that the House supported me 253 to 143. Now the executive department, through the Budget Director, says they are opposed to this tie-down of Federal spending. Numerous Senators say they are opposed to taking away their right to add to appropriations. The executive department has said it is going to hold back if Congress does not and, of course, the Budget Director would hold back where he wants to, and leave free those programs he is for.

Now I say, with a war on, what department or agency, Federal official or citizen, could find fault if we set out to help them "carry on at least as well as usual."

In this bill before us we have provided $1,300,000,000 for flood control, and rivers and harbors, and reclamation, which is about the same we had this year; and of particular interest to the Central South for the lower Mississippi and tributaries, the amount of $87,135,000 which is the same we have had this year.

I know we must take care of our own country, its rivers and harbors, its watersheds and forests, its highways, and the other material resources to which we must look to meet all our problems of the present and to which our children must look in the future.

At this point I would like to express my appreciation to the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, the Soil Conservation Service, the ASCS, the Extension Service, the REA, the TVA, and many other groups with whom I have worked through the years to develop and save our country.

I am pleased to report that in line with the action of our committee in providing a new study and report on Yellow Creek, a preliminary study has been made by the Tennessee Valley Authority and prospects for port facilities on Yellow Creek in Mississippi seem very good indeed. When this project proceeds, the development of harbor and port facilities should add greatly to industrial development of chemical and heavy industry in Mississippi, which in turn would mean much to all north Mississippi.

I include a table at this point:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries

	Conference allowance
1. General investigations: (a) Examinations and surveys:	
Mississippi River, east bank, Warren to Wilkinson Counties, Miss.	$20,000
Mississippi River, western Tennessee tributaries	5,000
Yazoo River, lower tributaries, Mississippi	45,000
Hatchie River, Tenn. and Miss.	40,000
Tallahatchie River and tributaries, Mississippi, Yazoo-Big Sunflower Basin	20,000
Greenville Harbor, Miss.	10,000
2. Construction and planning:	
Mississippi River levees	3,550,000
Channel improvement	35,225,000
Yazoo Basin:	
Sardis Reservoir	40,000
Enid Reservoir	35,000
Arkabutla Reservoir	35,000
Grenada Reservoir	40,000
Greenwood	225,000
Main stem	270,000
Tributaries	1,542,000
Big Sunflower River, etc.	445,000
Yazoo backwater	1,600,000
Biloxi Harbor (N)	180,000
Okatibbee Creek Reservoir (FC)	3,240,000
Tombigbee River and tributaries (FC) (Alabama and Mississippi)	525,000
Studies:	
Cadet Bayou (N)	8,000
Gulfport Harbor (N)	20,000
Pascagoula Harbor (N)	20,000
Pearl River Basin (compliance) (Miss. and La.)	175,000
Pearl River and tributaries from Town Creek at Jackson, Miss., to vicinity of Byram, Miss. (FC)	40,000
Tombigbee River (FC) (Miss. and Ala.)	25,000
TVA	------

In addition, this year's House report states:

> The committee requests TVA to expedite its feasibility analysis of the river port development on the Yellow Creek embayment of the Pickwick Reservoir. In making such analysis, it is suggested that TVA evaluate and include potential benefits from industrial development, increased employment and income, the economic effects of a railroad extension to the port site, redevelopment benefits and identifiable stimuli to the economy of the affected area which may be expected to result from such a river development.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in failing to sign this conference report and in opposing this conference report I certainly mean no disrespect and consider it to be no reflection upon the diligent efforts of my fellow conferees, for I think it is fair to say that the position of the House was better sustained, overall, by the House conferees than was the position of the Senate by the Senate conferees.

However, this bill, in my opinion, in the light of all the fiscal problems, was too loose in many respects when it passed the House in the first place and, after our experiences with the Senate, it is looser now. That is usually the case.

We found ourselves in this instance, as we nearly always do, defending ourselves against any reductions which were made in the House and defending ourselves not on the basis of merit but defending ourselves against arbitrary individual demands by individual Members of the other body.

Oh, I know we have heard a lot of cheering coming from over at the other end of the Capitol about reductions in spending. We have one Member of the other body from my own State who has publicly announced we could cut $4.5 billion out of the public works appropriation even though there is only about $4.75 billion in the entire bill, including the Atomic Energy Commission. But all it comes down to, as we get down to it in this conference, and judging from the reported actions we are getting from over there on expenditure limitations, is that we must conclude that it just has not yet seeped up into that lofty Chamber that we are engaged in a conflict which is embroiling half a million of our men and $30 billion a year of our substance in a place halfway around the world.

There are two major items of dispute in connection with this conference report on which you will have an opportunity to express yourselves. One of them is with respect to amendment No. 2, the construction of the Corps of Engineers, where there are several increases in the budget figures, where there are several restorations of House reductions and several new projects, not included in the budget, added by the other body.

Then, with respect to amendment No. 13, which my colleague from Arizona mentioned, the water pollution control grants. And, there, it is in my opinion safe to say that the budget figure, the one which I hope this House will sustain—while of course it cannot measure up to the $450 million of authorization, for this year—it is my opinion, because some of the States have not and will not qualify themselves for grants during this fiscal year—will be given reallocations later in this fiscal year, a reallocation to those States which have been diligent in this area and will substantially meet the level that the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration is prepared to meet.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion that is a fair statement, based upon the record of my interrogation in committee of our former colleague, Mr. Quigley, who is now in charge of that program.

Yet, it should be said that even if the position of the House is sustained with respect to the major amendments which are in disagreement, we will still be left with a bill which carries funds over the budget in several important instances.

Mr. Speaker, it can be claimed that this conference report is within the budget overall. However, this is because of anticipated slippages, rather than reductions in projects. If this conference report is adopted, we will be left with a bill which will include about $155 million for one river and its tributaries alone—and I am not referring to the "father of waters," but to another river—which will represent a highly accelerated program and an acceleration which in my opinion is most untimely in view of the critical budgetary situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, based upon these circumstances, it is my intention at the proper time to offer a motion to recommit this conference report. I feel strongly, in line with the statements which have been made by our chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], in recent weeks, that the full Committee on Appropriations ought to review this public works program very thoroughly, in light of the commitments involved, and the critical fiscal situation in which we find ourselves.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on July 25 when this bill passed the House I said that, by and large, this is a good bill."

I would still feel that way, if—but note the "if"—if these were normal times.

Our problem is—and we are all by now well aware of it—that these are not normal times, and our budgetary and fiscal dilemma has worsened and deepened even since July 25.

On several occasions since then, this House has made a public commitment to the need, in principle, for restraint now in Federal spending—but, to our embarrassment, we continue to find it difficult, if not impossible, given our own divisions and the seeming lack of a similar commitment to restraint in the other body, to use such machinery as we have at hand to produce selective, specific cuts of the kinds that—we all agree—this Congress ought now to be making.

Personally, I have been glad to note the rather steady growth in the number of Members, here, who have been willing to make at least that commitment to the principle of restraint in spending but, at the same time, I have not been particularly proud—nor, I think, can any of us be—of the way we have continued to flounder around in our efforts, up to now, to apply that principle.

So, then, Mr. Speaker, what do we do with a bill such as this one now before us—the details of which have already been given to you?

Well, we will vote eventually this afternoon on certain items that are in actual or technical disagreement. One of those, as you already know, involves the so-called Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and Reservoir, in Maine, the pros and cons of which are, by now, well known to all of us. I voted against this project back in July—and I expect to do so again, today, for nothing has happened since then to change my mind about it; it is still a project of doubtful value and justification in my mind, and I would question the wisdom of going ahead with it even in normal times. And, given our present fiscal situation, which as I said earlier is not a normal one, I should think there was even added reason for deferring further work on it, at least for the time being.

We will also, I assume, have an opportunity to express ourselves on that portion of the conference report—to which I made reservation—which involves bringing back to this House a recommendation for agreeing to some $6.8 million worth of increases made by the other body for certain budgeted construction items for the Corps of Engineers.

And on this, it seems to me, we should hold firm to the original House position wherein we did not—I repeat, did not—go over the budget figure on any such item.

Now, I admit that, in certain instances, there may seem to be justification for our doing so, for certain conditions do change, certain local hazards to which these projects address themselves do intensify, between the date when that budget to which we refer was made up and the date of our final action on this portion of it, but I think we need to remember in this respect that we are already about one-third of the way into this fiscal year so that, even if we yielded to the Senate's judgment here, there would be doubt that such additional moneys could or would—particularly in view of the President's own current freeze order—be spent.

So, again, I would say I hope that the House will send us back to conference on these items.

And, certainly, the same hope would apply to that item in the report pertaining to the other body's "token increase"—for that is what they called it—of $22 million for the construction grant program by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. On page 40 of the Senate report you will find this increase explained as indicating the other body's support of this program.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we all support this program—it is a good one, it is an essential one, and it is deserving of being assigned one of the highest of priorities even in a difficult budgetary situation.

But I do not believe we need to give further indication of our support for it by going above the President's own request for this program—by going above his own carefully documented assessment of his needs this fiscal year.

For certainly, if we do so—bowing once again to our too-often-demonstrated eagerness to show how much we are individually for—or against, as the case may be—something merely by throwing more money at it than can wisely and efficiently be used—then, assuredly, Mr. Speaker, it can be said that this Congress, at least, is simply not capable of setting this Nation's fiscal house in order.

But, what now of the bill, itself?

Can further reductions in it be made?

I am confident the answer has to be "Yes"—and I have spent the last several hours pondering over how best to go about that.

One of the things I have had in mind was the possibility of attempting to make, say, a 5-percent cut—in order to produce an orderly stretch-out, if you will—in the funds for each construction item contained in the bill. I believe this is feasible—I believe it would do little harm to anyone or to any project—and something like this may very well turn out to be the very kind of restraint the President, himself, will ultimately seek to apply against the spending programs herein encompassed.

However, to do this now would surely entail a further, long-drawn-out conference with the other body whose Members are, I fear, too comfortably distant from their constituencies and still too distant from any unpleasant decision over the need for a surtax, when compared to our situation, to yet feel any real need for restraining Federal spending.

Also, I recognize both our chairman's feeling of urgency—as well as the value to all of us in our current dilemma—in getting this year's appropriation process over and done with without further delay so that we can begin to wind up the affairs of this session.

I am, therefore, prepared to bow to that desire on the part of our chairman [Mr. MAHON], but at the same time I would like to inquire of him if he still intends to follow through on his previously expressed plan to bring out a bill—an omnibus bill of sorts—suggesting possible rescissions of appropriations made in the regular manner.

I would hope his answer would be "Yes," for—while I do not have any great hopes that such an action on our part could survive in the other body—it seems to me that this is what we on the Appropriations Committee ought to be doing. As a matter of fact, as most of you know, we did, indeed, make a beginning of sorts on such an exercise and, on the other subcommittee on which I serve—that chaired by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] and covering the budgets of the Treasury and Post Office Departments—we did produce what I feel is a list of cuts or deferrals in spending items that, unpleasant though some of them might be, ought now to be considered by the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, a bill of the kind now before us lends itself even more readily to the kind of exercise once contemplated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and this is because most of the items therein funded—particularly the construction items—are specific items, having some relative priority, some greater or lesser degree of local need, among themselves.

And, unfortunately, under our regular subcommittee procedures, this question of relative priorities—which is something that is of utmost importance to us today—is not something to which we have addressed ourselves. We have done our best to be sure that the items in the bill are economically justifiable, have the necessary ingredients of local cooperation and support, and so on, but we have not really compared them, one against the other, in any sort of effort to determine their relative priority—having left that, if we have thought about it at all, I suppose, up to such agencies as the Corps of Engineers, itself, or the Bureau of the Budget, and so on.

Now, I do not think this is good enough under existing circumstances; and, very probably, it is not good enough even under normal circumstances, thus indicating a need for a possible change in our own, annual approach to our duties.

So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that when this bill gets through conference—if that is what we are waiting for—our subcommittee will be called back to reconsider its provisions from this standpoint of priorities, that we will do our best to sort those priorities out and, then, render our report to the full committee for the eventual consideration of the House.

I believe this to be necessary even if we get no further than the rendering of that report for, at the very least, then, we would have indicated—as this Congress we agree ought to be doing—our own suggested areas for recisions or deferrals, or stretchouts, if you prefer, rather than leaving that task up to the President or to the Bureau of the Budget to do for us.

Back on October 4, our distinguished chairman [Mr. MAHON] complained:

> How can I bring in a resolution to rescind if I do not have the recision troops?

Speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas where do I go to enlist?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has been talking about reductions and rescissions. We brought in a bill last week—House Joint Resolution 888—as the gentleman knows, proposing appropriation reductions and rescissions in the amount of about $1½ billion additional to the $6 billion plus that we expect to cut in the regular bills for 1968. That joint resolution, as reported, did not satisfy a majority of the House, and one reason apparently, was because it made specific, pinpointed cuts—that is, in the request for civilian personnel and in research and development.

We proposed in that resolution to cut civilian personnel rather sharply. Yet, when the bill was here on the floor, amendments were offered to lessen the impact of the reduction on the Post Office Department and on the collection of revenues. The House then leaped to the opportunity to abandon the body of the bill as reported from committee, significantly, I believe, because it was too specific in its particulars. In its place, the House substituted an overall cut which, if enacted into law, would have to be made by the President on an agency-by-agency basis without any meaningful guidelines or specifications from the Congress as to where the reduction should be made.

When that bill was before the House, Members were free to offer any germane amendments. One amendment was offered on the supersonic transport program. Others were offered.

With a couple of exceptions, Members did not undertake to offer amendments to make specific cuts on a line-item basis, which led me to believe that there was a general disinclination on the part of the House as a "body" to make item-by-item reductions.

We had also proposed in the committee resolution that research and development be reduced. But this was eliminated here on the floor.

We also provided in the resolution as reported for the absorption of the civilian pay increase of some $625 million. This also went down the drain here on the floor. Had the committee resolution been adopted, and if it were enacted into law, it would have reduced spending for the fiscal year 1968 by a very considerable sum probably in excess of $1 billion.

Mr. ROBISON. If the gentleman will permit me, what I am seeking to discover from our distinguished chairman, for whom I have the greatest respect, is whether or not he feels that eventually our full committee will consider a rescission bill of some sort.

Mr. MAHON. I do not know what may come back from the other body on the continuing resolution, House Joint Resolution 888, which I understand is being debated today, or what may develop in that connection. Certainly, if the cuts recommended should go into effect, the reductions would be considerable.

I wish to emphasize my feeling that we must make savings wherever we reasonably can. If the minority members, the top minority members of the subcommittees, would get together and make some suggestions to me as to how we might safely make further cuts, and if subcommittee chairmen would get together on cuts which they think can and ought to be made on bills with which they are most familiar, that would be something that would be considered.

This, it seems to me, is generally where we now find ourselves on the matter of further rescissions.

I do not at the moment see much hope for another rescission bill in view of the present situation.

Mr. ROBISON. If the gentleman will permit me to make this observation.

I think the trouble with your so-called rescission bill—if that is what it was or if that is what it can be called—was that it was a pretty blanket sort of approach rather than a specific item by item approach, as I understood the gentleman from Texas had suggested some weeks ago.

This, I think, is what we ought to attempt and I would be disappointed, really, if this effort was dropped in an effort, perhaps, to get this session over with and go home.

Mr. MAHON. We could, I suppose, introduce a single package bill and give the House an opportunity to again work its will on each individual appropriation item. That would permit us to again take up the supersonic transport, and the Dickey-Lincoln project, and defense spending, and all other items. But having done this once—and I think we in the House will make appropriation cuts in excess of $6 billion—but having done this once, it might take a month or two, or more, to go through that whole process in a single bill.

So it is very difficult to know how to approach this situation. I do applaud the gentleman's sincere effort—and he is an able and sincere legislator—and I applaud him for his interest here. These things seem rather reasonable in the abstract but when we get into specifics, we get into very difficult problems.

I shall be very glad to work with the gentleman and try to find a way to achieve more economies. As I said, I think the total reductions in the appropriations requests are going to be very considerable.

Mr. ROBISON. I am deeply appreciative of the chairman's response, and I pledge him my full cooperation in whatever we can do along these lines.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. In relation to the provisions passed by the House, since I was the author of the amendment, I think I should attempt to clarify the record and to give my own version of what the provision provides. The amendment which was adopted by the House overwhelming provided that we spend to 1967 levels with the exceptions with which the gentleman is familiar, by department and by agency. We have been served notice by the executive department that if we did not reduce appropriations, the executive department would reduce them at its own will.

The executive department has given notification that trust funds for highway construction would be withheld. These funds my amendment would free from congressional withholding.

I do not know how you could have better guide rules to hold to 1967 levels than those which the Congress provided by tying it down by department and agency as we did. And inferentially, what the Congress approved for 1967 would be that which would be the orderly way in which to handle the programs for the present year. We did not tie expenditures down by line items but only by departments and agencies.

We tried to give such elbow room and leeway as the circumstances might require within reason. I do not know how we could tie it down any more effectively nor soundly than we have done by department and agency.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to express my agreement with the conference report, particularly since, as the chairman of the subcommittee knows, I have brought to his attention previously the question of the Burnsville Dam and Reservoir and the Stonewall Jackson Reservoir. I am pleased that the funds for these two projects in my congressional district are approved.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman has on many occasions called my attention to that matter.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio very much.

Mr. Speaker, my interest in this bill is well known to my colleagues, since I have exerted every effort to seek approval for the two public works projects in my district, for I felt they should receive the highest priority in public works appropriations bill. I was successful in obtaining the initial authorization for one of these, the Stonewall Jackson Dam, in the Flood Control Act of 1966. The second was the Burnsville Dam and Reservoir, for which I was successful in obtaining planning funds in 1968, and successive years though authorized as far back as 1938, had never received any appropriations for construction.

Though devastating floods had been common to these two river basins located in the heart of West Virginia, it was ironic this year of 1967, that these two streams wreaked their greatest destruction ever. On March 8, 1967, heavy rains in central West Virginia resulted in floodwaters that received national attention for the terrible chaos caused and the damages to both property and person.

In the basin of the Little Kanawha River, the site of the proposed Burnsville Dam, estimates of loss ran as high as $3.2 million and the loss of two lives. The West Fork River, the site of the proposed Stonewall Jackson Dam, took a similar toll in property damage. Less than 1 week after the first floodwaters were receding, another period of heavy rains resulted in a second flood which, of lesser degree, nevertheless added to the extensive damages already suffered in the area.

Mr. Speaker, these floods and their disastrous effects have served to emphasize that the Congress can no longer afford the delay on these programs.

The total estimated Federal cost of the Stonewall Jackson project is $35,700,000. As the House is aware, there was originally a recommendation of $75,000 for preconstruction planning included in the President's budget submitted prior to the floods for the fiscal year 1968. Upon my request of the Corps of Engineers that a crash program on planning be developed the capability of the Corps of Engineers was increased to $500,000. The conference report has recommended $375,000, certainly a reasonable sum. I commend this to my colleagues and urge that the Corps of Engineers take most expeditious action in planning this project.

I have been informed by the Corps of Engineers relative to the Burnsville project that they have for the fiscal year 1968 the capability of expenditure of $1 million for construction. The conference report has realistically, I believe, recommended $400,000. This gets us moving.

Mr. Speaker, the severe flooding on the Little Kanawha could have been avoided. The dam, if completed, would have prevented the major portion of the tremendous damage suffered by the residents of the area.

The town of Glenville situated below the Burnsville site was almost completely inundated by the rising waters. The business and residential areas of the community which is the county seat of Gilmer County shared equally in the heavy losses. Two hundred and five county residences, together with practically all of the business establishments of the town were directly affected by the high waters.

Glenville was but one of the communities affected by this destruction. Grantsville, the county seat of Calhoun County, likewise bore the severe brunt of the river's destructive force.

The representatives of the Corps of Engineers stated that had the dam been in existence during the recent floods that the crest in Glenville would have been 5 feet less and that damage to the property in the community would have been negligible. In Grantsville it would have been 4.1 feet less with the same results. Burnsville, and a score of smaller communities and villages as well as some of the locale's most productive farms, were likewise the victim of the river's destructive force.

The Stonewall Jackson Reservoir to be constructed on the West Fork River, which joins the Tygart River at Fairmont, W. Va., to form the Monongahela River, is to be located in Lewis County. This project will provide substantial flood protection not only for the West Virginia communities of Weston, Clarksburg, Shinnston, and Fairmont, but will also do much to alleviate downstream flooding in the Pennsylvania area to Pittsburgh. I have strongly advocated this project for many years and was gratified and appreciative of the Congress when the project was authorized in 1966 at my request. The program, however, cannot afford a 30-year delay such as has occurred in the Burnsville project.

With the preconstruction planning authorization to the maximum capability, precious time would be saved in consummating this project. The Corps of Engineers had, prior to the flooding, determined that the project would produce a 1.7-to-1 benefit-cost ratio, including not only the prevention of flood damage but providing further, a stable water supply, excellent water quality control, and a much needed recreation facility.

The Stonewall Jackson Reservoir also directly affects the city of Clarksburg in Harrison County, central West Virginia's largest metropolitan area, as well as Shinnston, Enterprise, Worthington, and Monongah. Forty-five houses were inundated in Clarksburg alone, with extensive damage to a score of industries. The rich agricultural valley north of Clarksburg also suffered major damage. The preliminary total damages of this year's floods in the West Fork River ran in excess of $2,600,000, according to the estimates of the Army Corps of Engineers. The Engineers further estimated that had the Stonewall Jackson Dam existed that of this total cost almost $1,-

750,000 would have been saved in damages.

I call upon the Congress today to consider carefully what these installations mean to the residents of these areas. For more than 30 years their hopes have been diminished by interminable delays. They are hopeful that the disasters that they have suffered will bring the necessary action by the Congress to realize the completion of these projects. I know of no more direct way by which the Federal Government can make a contribution to the welfare and protection of the counties and the people of West Virginia involved and at the same time promote the growth and development of the region.

I would urge my colleagues to support these projects.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] on his success, and on the zeal he has shown in protecting the interests of his area. We have discussed these projects many times. I am gratified that we were able to accede to his request and that money will be available for these purposes.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his help as well the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to support this conference report and to sustain the same reservation expressed by the gentleman from Arizona. I believe that it is important for me, as the ranking member on the Flood Control Subcommittee, to bring this dialog back into proper perspective.

In my judgment, there are some things that you can postpone and some things that you simply cannot postpone. I think that each and every one of us serving in the Congress has a responsibility to decide in what areas we should establish priorities as far as spending is concerned. I am fully aware of the fact that we do have some serious budget problems. But this is the only way in which we can adequately express ourselves. I have joined the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman, and other members of the Flood Control Subcommittee, in visiting many of the areas; namely, Fairbanks, Alaska, Colorado, northern California, the Pacific Northwest, the Mississippi, Montana, and, most recently, the aftermath of Hurricane Beulah in southwest Texas. I have covered practically all the floods in the United States.

It is my humble opinion that you cannot postpone some of these flood control emergencies that exist. Therefore, I think we should go forward with this kind of program and support this conference report, because this genuinely represents an investment in America that will help those people who are dependent upon these projects for the security to their property and enhance their ability to broaden their economic base.

Each year the Federal Government has had to spend millions of dollars through the Office of Emergency Planning to repair damages from devastating floods. This will continue until we complete these desperately needed public works, water conservation, and flood control projects. Let us help build America for a change.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman for the statement he has made. His attitude, ever since he has been in Congress, has been to move forward with these projects. The mere fact that most of the water that falls on the Pacific coast falls in the district which the gentleman represents has certainly caused him to be cognizant of flood problems. He has been zealous in working for flood control projects throughout the country, and his efforts are appreciated by all of his colleagues.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I believe anyone who visits these areas—and only those people who visit these areas—that have the experience of the dangers that take place can fully appreciate the problems the people and the areas affected actually face. I think Members of the Congress ought to heed the advice of members on these investigating committees who deal with these problems.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that I was somewhat disappointed that the public works conference did not see fit to appropriate the money for a construction start on the flood control project on the San Gabriel River tributary to the Brazos River. This is a project which has been in the making for over 20 years now, and I, along with the many good people to be affected by the project, was hoping that this would be the year when the actual or technical "new construction" would factually begin.

The conference followed a policy first set out by the Appropriations Committee in their report on the bill. This policy was that when the total cost of a given project is comparatively high, then the funds for the coming year will be diverted for advance land acquisition, with no appropriations for construction starts.

I am, of course, glad to see that the land acquisition will begin or be accomplished. In my opinion, this is a sound alternative when the funds for the coming year are so short. It will allow the Government to acquire the land before the market becomes too disrupted, and it will enable the current owners to be rid of the uncertainty that has clouded them for some years.

On the matter of new starts, the budget request for the coming year asked for only nine. The House took five of these—omitting San Gabriel along with three others—added 16, and arrived at the sum of 21 new starts—most all of them involving low total costs.

In the Senate, the four deleted starts were reinstated, and 25 new starts were added; hence, the conference had a total of 50 proposed starts to consider. Of these, they approved 34. Again, most all involved projects which would not require large appropriations in the coming years. The average total cost for these new starts is quite low, and I commend the committee and the conference for their conscientious and unyielding efforts in making significant economies in this year's budget.

I would like to add one final point, however, and that concerns the outlook for the coming years. I can understand the immediate reason for postponing today the "starts" which will involve large long-range costs. Our current budget situation demands that. But I would quickly add that, in my estimation, this step will boost the priority due the San Gabriel project in the coming year. San Gabriel has now done its share in keeping current expenditures in line, and next year, I would indeed be disappointed to see that a construction start would again be denied to such a worthy flood control project.

The average total cost of the new starts we approve here today may be low, but the total cost is not so low. And I say that we cannot measure the merit of the projects in sheer numbers alone. A lot of small projects do not necessarily improve the national picture more than a few good, comprehensive ones. And I hope it is with this idea in mind that the committee next year approaches the matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I serve as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power. Our subcommittee has held hearings all over the country on the problems and burdens afflicting our country as a result of the gross pollution of our Nation's waters from sewage, industrial wastes, and all manner of other pollutants which are being dumped into our rivers, streams, lakes, bays, estuaries, and coastal waters. The growing tidal wave of filth and pollution constitutes one of the greatest nuisances to our national welfare. People all over the country are demanding action to abate this continuing destruction of our waters.

The Congress responded to this national demand by enacting the Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Water Restoration Act of November 1966. I point out to you that we there wrote into law a national policy of moving more rapidly toward the goal of controlling and abating the national menace of water pollution. We authorized an increase in the rate of expenditures for research, construction of treatment facilities, establishment of water quality standards, and enforcement measures. One of the key provisions in this all-out national war against water pollution was the authorization of $450 million for construction grants for waste treatment facilities during the 1968 fiscal year. In this House, the authorizing legislation was approved without dissent. Since Federal construction grants generate at least five times as much total construction of waste treatment facilities, the appropriation of that sum would have resulted in the construction of over $2½ billion worth of waste treatment facilities. Even that sum would hardly begin to eat into the backlog of treatment facilities which must be constructed.

I believe that we are breaking faith with the people of this Nation by appropriating only $203 million for the 1968 fiscal year, which is already 4 months gone. I am fully aware of the stringent fiscal limitations now hampering this country as a result of our expenditures for space exploration, the Vietnam War, and high interest costs. But I think we are cutting off too closely when we ignore the dangers to our economic welfare that are slowly engulfing us in the polluted waters all around us.

We are fighting a losing war against water pollution. At our present rate, it will take at least 90 years or more to catch up to the need for sewage treatment works. The backlog of requests from municipalities for Federal assistance in construction of sewage treatment plants is tremendous.

It is estimated that over 1,600 such projects are under consideration or in the planning stage and that these projects would require about $910 million in Federal grants.

Certainly, when we passed the Clean Water Restoration Act last year we gave the American people the assurance that we were mounting a national drive, once and for all, to clean up the Nation's waters. We authorized $450 million for fiscal year 1968, $700 million for fiscal year 1969, $1 billion for fiscal year 1970, and $1.25 billion for fiscal year 1971.

I wish we had more than $225 million because our needs require a greater sum, but at least the additional amount proposed by the Senate would generate construction of another $100 million worth of treatment facilities. We need them desperately now. If we delay this construction, we shall pay much, much more for them in the future—both in increased costs of construction and in the losses resulting from the adverse effects of mounting pollution.

It is to be regretted that the figure of $225,000,000 is the maximum we can consider. Even though this is greater than the House proposal, we need to do more.

Mr. **GALLAGHER.** Mr. Speaker, the conference committee has wisely retained the funds included in the Senate version of the public works appropriations bill to begin construction on the Newark Bay-Hackensack River project.

I recently read a newspaper article which points up the most convincing evidence of the need for this project. Many of the great commercial shipping lines are moving the bulk of their operations to the Newark Bay ports of Elizabeth and Newark. The reason behind this move is the availability of the new containership facilities at both ports, but most conspicuously at Elizabeth-port. It is estimated that six of the world's largest shipping lines will eventually concentrate most of their containership operations at Elizabeth-port. French Line, Cunard Line, the new Atlantic Container Line consortium, Sea-Land, and the other big names are moving, or have moved, to Elizabeth. Elizabeth-port well deserves the title, "Container Capital of the World."

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one factor that could reverse this very favorable trend of commerce and jobs flowing to Elizabeth and Newark and which could negate the millions of dollars that have been invested in these facilities. At the present time the channels and approaches in Newark Bay are sadly inadequate to handle the present day traffic. The main channel, only 400 feet wide in most places, severely restricts traffic on the bay and creates a very real and ever-present accident hazard. The Newark Bay channel, in fact, has been obsolete for almost 20 years. Even the relatively small Liberty ships—small when compared to the tremendous containerships and super-tankers planned for the bay—come dangerously close when passing in Newark Bay. The tragic collision between two fortunately unloaded tankers in June 1966 demonstrated beyond doubt the need for these improvements from a purely safety standpoint.

Mr. Speaker, I could stand here for the rest of the day and cite statistics and facts which show beyond question that these navigational improvements are essential to the continued growth, prosperity and safety of the entire Newark Bay area. I could quote predictions that point to Newark Bay eventually becoming the hub of commercial shipping activity in all of New York Harbor—the largest port and the busiest port in the world. What I am not able to give are good and valid reasons why we should deny these improvements. The cost of the improvements is minuscule when compared to the money State and local governments and private industry have put into developing the ports and accompanying facilities. Without the Federal Government's recognition and carrying out of its responsibility, this investment in the future will literally be clogged up by its success, and the resulting bottleneck will force future expansion to go elsewhere. Newark Bay and the surrounding land areas offer a chance to increase American shipping capacity and help insure that the United States remains first in development and implementation of the revolutionary concept of containerization. We cannot now afford to jeopardize this lead or sacrifice the benefits of full development of our resources.

Mr. Speaker, I urge most strongly that we accept the conference committee's recommendation for $1 million to begin this project.

I would like to place an article from the Newark Evening News dealing with Newark Bay at this point:

Jersey Shift a Shocker to Dockers

New York.—When the Suffren—a sleek, new, 7,500-ton cargo vessel—left this harbor on her maiden eastbound Atlantic run, she departed from Pier 12, one of the glossy docks built by the Port of New York Authority in Brooklyn.

When the Suffren returns a week from today she will dock in Port Newark. It will be her new American home.

The Suffren will be riding the wave of the future.

The Suffren is a French Line ship and will figure in the extensive freight business of that line, along with five other vessels. But the French Line, one of the oldest of the lines in this port, is now moving over to New Jersey.

Cunard, the most notable name in shipping, likewise is moving to Port Newark.

SIGNALS START

Only last month the motor vessel Atlantic Span, the first ship built for completely container service, poked her bow into the new docks in Elizabeth, signaling the start of the Atlantic Container Line operations in New Jersey.

Eventually, six of the port's largest shippers will concentrate most of their container operations in the Elizabeth docks, which will feature a Golden Mile of contiguous piers for those ships alone.

French Line and Cunard have under construction roll-on, roll-off container ships that will utilize the Atlantic Container Line facilities in Elizabeth.

But both companies have decided it expedient to move to Port Newark almost at once. For that purpose they have taken over piers formerly used by the Wallenius Line, one of their members in the consortium. Those piers are on the north side of the Port Newark Channel and are backed up by Warehouse Sheds 291 and 292.

The Suffren is a partial container vessel, capable of carrying about 100 of the big boxes in which cargo can be stored at the point of origin and opened only on the arrival at its destination.

NEW VESSEL

The French Line has ready for service the new Rochambeau, also a partial container carrier, and the Winnepeg. Cunard has the Andania, Alaumia and Samaria, which will use the old Wallenius docks.

The moves mean that Cunard is closing down its operations at Pier 51, the famed "whisky pier," and will in the future operate, save for Pier 94, from Port Newark.

The French Line has been using Pier 12 in Brooklyn, and is giving up that facility where weekly shippings have been scheduled over the years.

Holland American Line, another member of the consortium, has ended freight operations at its expensive Pier 40 to participate in the Elizabeth operation. Swedish American Line and Swedish Transatlantic, other members of the consortium, plan to close down completely their use of Pier 4 in Brooklyn. This means cargo that had kept 10 ships busy will, after next month, be flowing exclusively through the Elizabeth piers.

JOBS DWINDLE

The move has wrenched violently at the stability of the work pattern in the port. The most deeply affected area is the West Side piers which, in the not distant past, were the most favored sites on the waterfront. Now they are becoming bare of cargo ships. Jobs have dwindled.

The envious eyes cast by the West Side workers on conditions in New Jersey have resulted in the present feud between port newcomers and veteran longshoremen. The dispute caused the recent strike in Port Newark.

The changing job pattern has caused unrest through much of the port, with the result that intra-union rivalry has been intensified in the ranks of the International Longshoremen's Association, AFL–CIO.

The possible effects this rivalry may have upon negotiations for the new contract that must be agreed upon by next September drew a warning Wednesday night when Alexander P. Chopin, chairman of the New York Shipping Association, spoke before the Foreign Commerce Club.

AIRLINE THREAT

Chopin also outlined other dangers. He noted that the increased cargo capacity of airplanes constituted a bigger and bigger threat to the shipping business.

But Chopin's main concern was with the decision of the ILA to seek an industry-wide contract instead of one which would deal only with the New York area. Chopin said the demand has stymied contract negotiations just as they were beginning.

The shifing conditions on the docks, as exemplified by the growth of Port Newark and Elizabeth at the expense of other port areas, are expected to create more problems in the coming months.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, there is a tide in the affairs of men, and there is a tide in the public affairs of the Nation. We must take the current of public support when it serves, or our ventures, if not lost, will surely lose in impetus. That is why I am concerned, deeply concerned, at the failure to implement, with a meaningful increase in funds, the vastly expanded program of waste treatment works construction grants which Congress authorized in 1966.

When we enacted, without dissent, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, we built on the solid foundation of a 10-year program of demonstrated worth, the program of Federal grants to assist in the construction of needed municipal waste treatment works, which began with the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as permanent law in 1956. The program was enlarged and the provisions of assistance liberalized in 1961 and again in 1965. By the end of that calendar year, 6,582 projects had been approved for Federal grant assistance totaling $728 million. These grants had generated expenditures by local communities of an additional $2.7 billion. They were designed to serve a population of 53 million Americans, and to enhance water quality in 55,000 miles of streams. These figures include accelerated public works projects in 1962 and 1963. It was not an untried Federal program which we voted to expand in 1966.

Nor did we act without information as to the critical need to build more plants and to improve existing facilities if the Nation expected to overcome a backlog of facilities requirements and to keep pace with population growth and other factors contributing to the ever-mounting load of wastes entering the country's waterways. Needs through 1972 for our 100 largest cities alone were shown to near $4 billion. The Congress responded to the need. The Federal Government, we determined, would step up its support of a nationwide water pollution control effort. We authorized an increase in appropriations for Federal grants from $150 million in 1967 to $450 million in 1968, with successive increases to $1.25 billion in 1971. We encouraged with provision for increased Federal grants the participation of States in waste treatment works financing, and the application of water quality standards to the receiving waters.

Congress was spurred in its action by a dramatic upsurge in the public demand for clean water. Excitement supplanted the apathy of years. The lonely cause of conservationists and a few other concerned people was taken up by vast numbers of Americans both in and out of public office. Few domestic issues could now rival water pollution and its control in public concern. That is what we stand to lose if we do not fulfill, with appropriated funds, the bright promise of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. When the tide of pollution is at the flood, will public support be at ebbtide?

The war in Vietnam has put a strain on the budget, which makes it difficult to press for more money for even the most critical domestic programs. I had hoped that construction for clean water might have fared better in the setting of priorities than a $203 million appropriation request would suggest. Senate amendment No. 13 to H.R. 11641, reported in disagreement, proposes a token increase in the appropriation to $225 million, half the authorized amount. House acceptance of even a token increase would provide more support for the protection of our water resources, and it would let the States, the communities, and the concerned citizens of the country know that we want to get on with the monumental job of cleaning up pollution.

When the President signed the Clean Water Restoration Act almost a year ago, he said that it "gives us power to rescue the once-clear waters of our streams, rivers, and lakes from the growing menace of pollution." I hope that it will be possible for the administration to seek a supplemental appropriation early in 1968 for the act's effective implementation.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit the conference report.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 11641 to the committee of conference.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the nays appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 117, nays 278, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

YEAS—117

Abbitt
Adair
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Bates
Betts
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Duncan
Dwyer
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Findley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Goodell
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hall
Harvey
Heckler, Mass.
Horton
Hunt
Hutchinson
Joelson
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Lukens
McClure
McCulloch
McDonald, Mich.
MacGregor
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
Ottinger
Pirnie
Poff
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Riegle
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Smith, Calif.
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Vander Jagt
Wampler
Watkins
Whalen
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyman

NAYS—278

Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ashmore
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Bevill
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Colmer
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Moss
Multer

Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Pool
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Schweiker
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wylie
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—37

Adams
Aspinall
Barrett
Bell
Berry
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Cabell
Diggs
Ford, William D.
Gettys
Gross
Hébert
Helstoski
Jones, Mo.
Kyl
Long, La.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Morse, Mass.
Pepper
Philbin
Pollock
Rarick
Resnick
Rivers
Roybal
St. Onge
Stuckey
Tenzer
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wydler

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Berry.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Long of Louisana with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. McFall.
Mr. Williams of Tennessee with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. BIESTER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SCHEUER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 2: On page 4, line 13, strike out "$935,074,000" and insert $1,010,823,000,".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KIRWAN

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Kirwan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$968,474,000, of which $875,000 shall be available to continue planning on the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and Reservoirs, Maine,".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, when the bill was considered by the House, the House deleted this item. When the bill went to the Senate, the Senate restored the budget estimate of $1,676,000 for planning on this project. We brought the item back in disagreement so that the House would have an opportunity to vote again on the project.

Mr. Speaker, the Dickey-Lincoln Dam and Reservoirs is a very good project, with a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1. Our investigation staff has conducted an exhaustive study and thoroughly reviewed all aspects of the project. The results of the study confirm that the project is feasible and will contribute greatly to lower power rates in New England, which are the highest in the Nation.

Today we will see many pleading to keep this dubious distinction for New England. I cannot understand it.

Throughout the Nation we now find private power and public power cooperating by pooling their facilities and providing efficient, low-cost power to the consumers. In connection with the Northwest-Southwest intertie, private industry is investing hundreds of millions in cooperation with the Federal Government. The private power companies are fully supporting the appropriations in this bill, totaling about $240 million just this year, for power projects in the Northwest. They endorse the economic and engineering findings of the Corps of Engineers on these projects. But the utilities are telling a different story in New England. They know Dickey-Lincoln will provide low-cost power or they would not be making this all-out fight to stop it.

If we are sound in what we are doing elsewhere, we should support this project for New England.

It is an excellent project and will repay the cost with interest within 50 years.

I hope that the Congress in its wisdom will see that this provision stays in the bill.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to explain what this amendment will do. It is amendment No. 2 in the conference report, and it concerns itself with the item "Construction, general." This is the item which embraces some 300 projects all over the United States which the Corps of Engineers will be engaged in constructing and planning in the next fiscal year.

The committee brought back the item with a total amount of $967,599,000 in the bill.

The motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the subcommittee—one of the most distinguished Members in this body—increases this amount by $875,000. The $875,000 that the motion provides for will increase the total to $968,474,000. The $875,000 is totally attuned to the Dickey-Lincoln School project. The $875,000 will enable the Corps of Engineers to continue planning on this project. It does not get into construction. It merely permits the Corps of Engineers to continue with the planning on this project.

When the project was before this House—exactly 3 months ago today, on July 25—this House by a record vote deleted the Dickey-Lincoln School project. At that time the amount in the bill was $1,676,000 for this project. We have gone to conference, and the Senate put the whole $1,676,000 in the bill. This has been a very difficult conference with the managers on the part of the other body on this particular item. So, living up to our agreement with Members of this House who opposed this project a few months ago, we bring this item back in technical disagreement. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan], has asked that the Members of this House accept his motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendment, which provides $875,000, and which was agreed to by the majority members of the House conference.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the intent of the motion. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Ohio will prevail.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Giaimo].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I express my gratitude to the chairman of the great Subcommittee on Public Works of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. Kirwan] and to the conferees for the opportunity to bring this question of the Dickey-Lincoln project, which has been before this House so many times, back to the House in disagreement, so the House can have an opportunity once again to work its will upon Dickey-Lincoln, and not run into the parliamentary problem which we ran into several years ago when we were precluded from having a separate vote on this matter.

At the outset, let me say what is before us here today, my colleagues, is not a question of lowering the power rates in New England. The reason for high power rates in New England is low density, high taxes, and multiplicity of companies, all of which are being tackled by the Federal Power Commission and by the New England companies in order to do something about lowering rates for New England, which is so far removed from the sources of fuel. We do have the answer. The answer is atomic power, and we have atomic powerplants in existence at the present time, giving us low power costs in New England.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman in the well if, before the advent of the Dickey-Lincoln School power project—that is, before it was brought to the attention of the House and before hearings were held before the Public Works Committee, specifically, and before the subcommittee of that committee—the power companies in New England did make any overtures whatsoever toward reducing the power rates in New England?

Mr. GIAIMO. The gentleman can draw that inference if he wishes, that it is because of the threat of a so-called yardstick, of the Dickey-Lincoln School project, that power costs are coming down. But I hardly think the expenditure of $380 million is a yardstick.

Now, if I may continue with my statement, we have this question—not a question of how to reduce power rates, which is a problem in itself—but it is a question of whether it is feasible to continue with this project. The House has consistently studied the Dickey-Lincoln power project and has seen fit on two occasions overwhelmingly to vote against it.

At the present time we are here once again to make another decision on the part of the House, which, incidentally, has been the body which has done the real study on this program.

The question is not a question of varying amounts of money. It is not a question of $1.7 million. It is not a question of $875,000, which is in here today for planning money, and not a question of a possible $375,000 which may be in here at some future date, perhaps, if the motion is voted down, as it should be.

The question is, do we continue with this project which is going to cost us $380 million, if not more?

We talk about economy. We talk about finding places to save money. We save money by cutting expenditures which will be made in this fiscal year. But nonetheless we must save money by cutting unnecessary expenditures in future fiscal years if our Government is to remain viable.

Let me give one argument against this project. Let us assume that we desire to have public power in Maine. Let us assume that we decide the Federal Government should go in there and build that power both for baseload power in Maine and for peaking power in the Boston area.

Is this project the most efficient or the most feasible way of doing it?

The answer is "No."

The evidence is clear, from the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers, and clear from the staff report of the Appropriations Committee, that this project can be done cheaper by an alternative Federal project. I submit to the Members what I inserted in the RECORD the other day, which cannot be negated, that we could have an REA project in Maine for baseload power in Maine giving the same power as Dickey-Lincoln.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 additional minutes?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, we could have this same project by an alternative future method giving us baseload power in Maine through a local Maine REA cooperative and peaking power through a pump storage plant in the Boston area, serving the Boston area and New England, at a total cost of $90 million instead of $380 million.

In no way can we justify this expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

We heard reference made to New England. I assure my colleagues, it is not an area of the country that survives on kerosene lanterns. Anything but.

The fact of the matter is that there is no hydroelectric powerplant of any substantial size I know of in the New England area. This is an attempt purely and simply by the public power people to go in there and build a $380 million hydroelectric plant, basing their justification for it on the fact that it is to be a multipurpose dam.

Do the Members know what the purposes are? By the very testimony of the Department of the Interior, the multipurposes are insignificant, to use their expression.

They speak of flood control. True, it would provide flood control. That flood control could be provided by a simple dam costing $1 million.

That is the extent of the multipurpose nature of this dam.

If ever in my 9 years in Congress there has been a project which should be stopped at its inception, before they get into the completed planning operations, and before they get into the construction program, it should be this project.

Ask one final question. Why is it, in a public works bill, that so many of us from the New England area have consistently opposed this plant and project which is supposedly of such great benefit to us in New England? I submit that our purpose and reason is to try to save $380 million.

I urge that the motion of the gentleman be voted down.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY].

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman.

This Dickey-Lincoln School project has had a long, bumpy, and tiresome road already. I know you have heard many of the arguments made by both the gentleman from Connecticut and myself before. However, I would like to point out to you just a couple of things that may not have been mentioned in the past.

First, in answer to the argument of the gentleman from Connecticut that it is going to cost $380 million, this is not borne out by the staff study which indicates the Corps of Engineers figure, $227 million, for the construction of the dam as the correct figure. An estimate of the transmission line costs of $75 million is also supported. This brings the total cost to approximately $300 million. In the benefit-cost ratio which is computed for this project at 1.91 to 1, that is $1.91 to every $1 invested, the transmission line figure is also considered.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. HATHAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I hope that the House will take into account the fact that in the debate on this proposition in 1965 we went into tentative cost estimates. I do not know that there has ever been a project handled by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives that was examined more closely over a longer period of time than this project. None could be more worthy. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Ohio will prevail.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HATHAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut but very briefly, since I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Just briefly, because we went through this in the debate in the early part of the year.

The benefit-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1 is very seriously questioned. The staff report shows at best it is about 1.39 or 1.5. I forget at the moment which one, but it is in that neighborhood. The 1.9 figure is definitely out.

Mr. HATHAWAY. To answer the question of the gentleman, I realize the staff study said it was 1.39 to 1 at one point, but that was in answer to the New England utilities argument that the benefit-cost ratios would be much lower than the Corps of Engineers estimate. The staff study said after taking the New England utilities figures, which were not corect, it was 1.39. I want to point out to the gentleman that in the committee report where there are no minority views, by the way, that the committee report presented to this House last July said that the benefit-cost ratio is 1.9 to 1. It is the same Corps of Engineers that evaluated the other 300 projects that we have in this report today. I cannot see how the same Corps of Engineers will come out with a benefit-cost ratio of 1.4 for the gentleman's project in his district in this bill and 1.3 and 1.2 and so forth for all of the others and be correct on those but be incorrect on the Dickey-Lincoln project when they are considering it on the same basis as the others.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HATHAWAY. I am sorry. I cannot yield any further to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HATHAWAY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. I want to refer to what the gentleman said with respect to the benefit-cost ratio. The benefit-cost ratio developed by the staff study conducted by this Subcommittee on Appropriations came out with a report of 1.5 to 1 as the ratio. The project is economically feasible and does have a good benefit-cost ratio and is better than many projects that this committee and this Congress have funded in the Nation and many of which are carried in this bill.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I do not have any additional time during which to yield to the gentleman.

However, I wish to answer the point that the gentleman brought up in response to my principal argument. The gentleman said that this is really a question of money. In my opinion there are two categories of opinion represented by people who are opposed to the Dickey-Lincoln project. There are those who, like my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] are opposed to it or who are opposed to the project altogether and upon any grounds. In other words, it does not make any difference whether it is 25 cents or $25 billion, they would be opposed to it. And there are those who oppose this appropriation for reasons of economy at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the merits of this program have been studied most carefully and even more carefully than any other project which is contained in this bill. However, Mr. Speaker, to go back a little bit and in order to review the progress of this project. The first authorization for any study of this project was made or supported by the distinguished Senator, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, under the Eisenhower administration way back in 1954. It was studied at that time and it was studied in 1960 again under the administration of the late President Kennedy.

It was further studied under the administration of President Johnson. He recommended the construction of this dam.

After the various studies heretofore mentioned had been completed, it passed the Committee on Public Works and then it passed the House of Representatives and the other body.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have had two appropriations votes taken upon this project. This represents a third appropriation requested therefor.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the matter has been studied thoroughly and enough. I do not think that the appropriations route should be used to cut out the project altogether.

Mr. Speaker, if there are those who believe that it should not have been authorized, then they should submit a bill to rescind the authorization or to amend the authorization.

I do not believe this is the time for action to delete the appropriation of $875,000 for this project and to cut the pins out from under the project, a project which has been studied in so much depth insofar as the economic aspects of the project is concerned.

Further, Mr. Speaker, if there are those who need an economy vote, I would remind them that when the amount was $1,676,000 we would be able to start construction on the project in the fall of 1968. However, with this figure of $875,000, we will not be able to start upon this project until the fall of 1970.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to those Members of this body that if you want an economy vote, you will have it on this reduced amount because construction funds of $10 to $20 million will be postponed.

I regret that my time has expired because I have much more to say.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to support the motion.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for yielding this time to me and for giving to all of us the opportunity to debate this issue. It is my opinion that this issue represents one about which almost everyone in the House of Representatives knows, word by word. However, now, I would like to give to the Members of the House a little bit of the history as to where this project is located, what it is proposed to do, and of what it consists.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, there is in the uppermost part of Maine the location for this project. The proponents of this project know in order to build this project that water must be diverted from the Canadian area to the United States. Of course, everyone knows that whenever this is done, there is going to have to be a treaty to be ratified with respect thereto.

None of us knows what the terms of this treaty are going to be. However, I can say from past experience that it will be quite some time before this portion of the matter will be taken care of.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. CLARK. I only have 3 minutes during which to discuss this project. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] had 7 minutes. Therefore, I would like to finish my general statement, and if I may obtain some additional time, then I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Maine.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that as a result of the construction of this proposed project the water will be backed up to the extent of some 60 miles. Further, I would like to say that every leading conservation group in the United States is against this project. Therefore, I say to any of the Members of the House who are conservation-minded, this is a good time and a good place to not only cast a good economy vote, but to cast a vote for conservation.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, we have the support of the following conservation groups who are opposed to the construction of the Dickey-Lincoln School project: The Natural Resources Council of Maine, the Maine Fish and Game Clubs, the Maine State Biologists Association, the Maine Audubon Society, the Massachusetts Audubon Society, the Appalachian Mountain Club, the New England Advisory Board on Fish and Game Problems, the Sierra Club, and the Wilderness Society.

All of these organizations have taken active positions against this project. This project, of course, when it is finally approved, if approved, would cost approximately a half billion dollars. At $380 million plus they are going to have a transmission line going all the way from Canada down into the area of the users in Boston and Connecticut. I say that this is not very good transmission as far as I can see for electricity.

The flooding of the Canadian water in itself is enough to make a treaty something that would be almost impossible.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman O'NEILL, last year stated on the floor that it would be better for the Dickey-Lincoln people or the tourist people in Maine to cement or concrete the St. John's River for 400 miles into the Boston area so that the tourists can go up into Maine. I submit that that is a good proposal. I believe something like this would be a lot better than a hydroelectric dam which is now out of date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this extra time.

A couple of weeks ago this House defeated this project by a very substantial margin, and I would ask that today after we defeat this project today—and I hope it is by a substantial margin—that the conferees will hold fast and not let the other body take control of the conference.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HATHAWAY. On the point of a treaty which the gentleman mentioned, I have been in touch with the State Department, and negotiations are coming along on the treaty very well, and they expect it will be nailed down very shortly. So I believe the gentleman's point of not getting any treaty at all is not well taken.

With regard to the matter of the transmission line that the gentleman mentioned, I am sure the gentleman knows we have transmission lines much longer than this in some of the other Federal power projects in the West, transmission lines have gone as much as 600 miles.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the question of any treaty with Canada has no basis or merit here this afternoon. The fact is there is no treaty, it has to be worked out, and when it is worked out it will be worked out between the State Department and the other body. Certainly, this House, which is coequal with the other body, does not wish to be put into the position where it ratifies and approves something before it is even agreed upon, and arrived at the treaty stage with the other body, and the State Department. At such time as they do have a treaty then let them come into the House of Representatives and make their proposal.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to make a few points on this Dickey-Lincoln School project. First of all, it will eventually cost the taxpayers of the entire Nation approximately half a billion dollars.

Second, it will not benefit the taxpayers from Arizona, Arkansas, Minnesota, Montana, Washington, or Wyoming. It will have no national benefits, and, therefore, is not in the national interest.

Third, it will not even benefit the New England States, because, as the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston has pointed out in a thorough study, it will produce power at 15 to 20 percent higher cost than power that can be produced by private, investment-owned companies spending their own money, and not the taxpayers'.

Fourth, it will work entirely to the detriment of the coal-producing areas of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and surrounding States, because it will substitute high-cost water power source for the lower cost coal-burning, steam-electric plants, or nuclear-powered plants.

Fifth, the investor-owned electric companies of the New England area are now well into a $1,500 million building program—the largest building program ever undertaken in the region.

Six of the so-called Big Eleven Powerloop plants are already under construction, and have been for upward of 5 years, totally obviating the argument that they are a response to the Dickey proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the project be voted down by a large majority and the conferees stand fast.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. KYROS].

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion before the House.

I should like to point out that the $875,000 appropriation which we are considering is only half the budgeted amount which was approved for the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric power project by the other body. These funds would be used to complete the advance planning and engineering studies of this project—for which purpose Congress approved a total of $1,900,000 in earlier appropriations. If for no other reason, we should complete the planning stage of this project in order to at least realize full return on our investment.

Popular demand for this hydroelectric power project has arisen from the power plight of New England, where electric rates are among the highest in the Nation. I recently polled more than 175,000 of my constituents in the First Congressional District of Maine to determine the extent of public support for this project. I can tell you that the response to my public opinion poll showed overwhelming support for the project as the best means of reducing power rates and encouraging economic development in this northeast corner of the United States. I would like to mention at this point several comments included in a recent Washington Post editorial supporting the Dickey-Lincoln project and discussing its relative merits:

> It has been argued that conventional hydro-electric plants are outdated; but they continue to be essential power suppliers, with a national prospect that capacity of such plants will double in the next 25 years. Plants like Dickey-Lincoln are being built right now. Their usefulness as peak-load suppliers makes them efficient complements to steam or thermonuclear plants.
>
> Private interests now are planning a large thermonuclear plant at Wiscasset, Maine, but no one believes that it will be adequate to all future needs in the region. Some voices have been raised against its effect on recreational and wildlife values; but the foremost defenders of such resources support the project as vastly superior to an alternative site that would affect the wild-river program on the Allagash.
>
> The project has been thoroughly studied. It contemplates the addition to the Nation's power resources of an efficient supply that will be available to private distributors, municipalities and cooperatives in a region where there is a deficit and where rates are high.

Planning appropriations for the Dickey project in 1967 were considered in committee on the basis of a staff study to further determine the project's economic feasibility. The study affirmed earlier findings that the project is fully justified, using normal benefit-cost ratios. Dickey-Lincoln has a benefit-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1. It is interesting to note again that 134 projects included in the current public works appropriations bill have less favorable benefit-cost ratios than Dickey and are included in districts of Members who have consistently opposed Dickey.

Why, despite the many favorable reports and studies and despite a very favorable benefit-cost ratio, has this project again been singled out for intense scrutiny and such searching inquiry? The reason is very simple and very clear. Dickey has attracted the powerful and unyielding opposition of New England's private electric utilities. In an effort to protect a comfortable monopoly, they have fought hard in the last 6 years to destroy all chances for the Dickey project.

I am intimately familiar with the unremitting hostility the private power interests have shown in opposing this project, for at one time I served as counsel for the Maine Public Utilities Commission. Since 1947, the private utilities in Maine have come before the Commission time and time again to ask for higher electric power rates, despite the fact that Maine already has the highest power rates in the continental United States. It is only recently, since the Dickey project became a mere possibility, that they have shown any willingness to consider any reduction in rates.

The Congress has patiently entertained the objections of those private utilities, and has given careful consideration to each of their arguments and contentions. It was at the insistence of opponents of the project that the Appropriations Committee staff study was undertaken. Surely the private utilities have no cause to say that they have not received every consideration.

This project has the bipartisan support of Maine's Governor, her legislators, and her representatives in the Senate and in the House. They have no doubt that the Dickey project is the best means for meeting New England's future peaking power requirements and for reducing electric rates. Nor should you.

Maine is a small State. I ask you to give her people their long-deserved relief from oppressive electric power rates. I ask you to join with me in voting for this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, one point that I would like to make while I am down here in the well is to ask you to look at this chart which purports to show the isolation of this power project from New England load centers. If there is one argument for voting for the Dickey-Lincoln project today, it is this chart.

This is one of the clearest cases of distortion and misrepresentation in interpreting a chart that I have ever seen.

Power is not going to go 400 miles to the southern New England load centers. The power is going to be used by the people of the State of Maine.

Contrary to what this chart portrays; namely, that there are only 100,000 people in the State, there are nearly a million people in my State.

This power project can be interconnected and will go over into New Hampshire and Vermont and provide the whole of northern New England with blocks of peak power at low cost.

As to the second argument that atomic powerplants are coming in, I wish the gentleman who made that argument would realize that the atomic powerplants are for base power—and this is for peaking power—those extra power needs that come in the morning and come in the evening when all requirements are heavy for industry and other use.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYROS. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. The gentleman from Maine referred to my people telling me to say things, and I think the gentleman should yield.

Mr. KYROS. The third point I have is as to conservation.

It was not until this year, years later, that in this House the question has been raised about conservation.

The most appropriate answer to this issue appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 23, 1967, at page 29670 in an article which sets forth at length the efforts made and studies undertaken to assure that fish, wildlife, land and recreational resources will not be disrupted.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYROS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HATHAWAY. What I would like to point out is that the Izaak Walton League did in effect support the project in the first instance because we had relocated the site of the dam so that the Allagash River would not be flooded.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYROS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TIERNAN. I want to say as a Representative from the State of Rhode Island that we are very much concerned since this project gives us help in cutting down consumer costs in our State for electrical power and also industry and commerce are very much concerned because of the high cost of electric power in our State.

Mr. KYROS. I would like to say there has been talk about the reduction of rates by the power companies. It is a remarkable fact that in the past few years for the first time in 20 years in Maine's history the power companies have commenced to reduce power rates. The primary reason for reducing these rates, in small increments is that they are worried and concerned that this project will be successful and will be a yardstick in comparing their rates. Actually they need have no fear because I am certain both public and private power can flourish in serving our people. I ask you to vote in favor of this motion.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support adoption of the motion on the floor; to speak in support of the Dickey project; and to urge my colleagues to join me. Those of us in the Pacific Northwest have received the benefits of hydroelectric generation.

I know the importance of this project. I know that New England power rates are the highest in the Nation and Maine and Massachusetts the highest of all States. Experience demonstrates that new public power in an area reduces rates inevitably and sharply. Regional distribution rates are coming into existence and will continue to grow as there is no good reason why the people of Maine and New England should not have the advantage of rate reductions. And local distributing groups have the right to buy from public as well as private generating facilities.

New England's private utilities through the Electric Coordinating Council along with powerful allies, have waged a fierce and unrelenting battle to defeat the project. I have no quarrel with this. It is their privilege to oppose measures not to their liking. I am sorry it is still their feeling because in our area public generation has combined with private distribution and public distribution to benefit everyone.

Judging from the difficulty which Dickey, an eminently deserving project, has had in this House, it is apparent that they have been largely successful in these efforts.

Their latest ploy, and to date the most shocking was their effort to misrepresent the conclusions of the Appropriations Committee investigative staff.

My colleagues will recall that the study was undertaken at the insistence of Dickey opponents to resolve any remaining areas of doubt about the soundness of the data supporting the project.

The study was undertaken and carried out under conditions which assured objectivity of investigation and the validity of the conclusions reached. The report resulting from this investigation, accepted by the Appropriations Committee, supports Dickey and rejects the alternative plans offered by the private utilities. The report clearly concludes that Dickey merits our support.

The investigative staff found Dickey to be solidly supported on engineering, economic, and other bases and found that no alternate plan proposed by the private utilities deserved serious consideration.

On this score the Appropriations Committee is explicit. The committee print committing the Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill for 1968 reports:

> The extensive investigation conducted by committee staff has confirmed that the project is economically feasible, with a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1.

I, for one, am prepared to accept the judgment of the staff investigators, and our Appropriations Committee as final.

Reason dictates that we should adopt the motion on the floor, and that the modest reduced appropriation for Dickey should be approved along with all others affected by that motion.

Simple justice demands that we countenance no action which would unfairly discriminate against the people of New England.

I shall vote for the motion now on the floor. I shall support the Dickey project—and I urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to point out three or four simple things in this discussion in the time that I have available to me. First, this has nothing to do with schools. "Lincoln School" is the name of a town, and no Member should be concerned with schools on this vote. What is proposed today here is leading to a cost of at least $300 million, which, by the admission of the gentleman from Maine, is the minimum. Then for the transmission line, another $75 million for peaking power purposes. All this is for a power standby that private power utilities can do for one-third that cost; and will do when needed. We have a fiscal crisis and we should not be taking a road that will lead to this $300 million cost, which is largely outright subsidy when the option is private capitalization to be added to the rate base, recovered through rates and all without burden to the taxpayers of this country.

We ought not to saddle the American consumer with $300 million additional for this project. I hope Members will take a good look at the map that was just before us and see that this facility, which would be 450 miles up in the woods, would require a transmission line costing $75 million for limited peaking power availability.

Mr. Speaker, so much has been said on this particular project already that I hesitate to take up much more of the House's time which becomes increasingly more valuable as we move, hopefully, closer to eventual adjournment.

I continue to be opposed to the appropriation of any additional funds for this unnecessary project. As has been stated emphatically time and again, the power produced by Dickey-Lincoln, if built, would be but a tiny portion of the total power in the New England area, and its effect on the consumer rates for power in that area would be miniscule, if, indeed, there would be any effect whatsoever.

Equivalent load and peaking power to that produced by Dickey-Lincoln could be provided by alternate means for less than one-third of the $300 to $380 million eventual total cost of this public power project. This fact has been repeatedly confirmed.

Mr. Speaker, this project is simply not warranted and I cannot support further appropriation of tax money for Dickey-Lincoln. The American taxpayer is already overburdened, as everyone knows, and this is one instance where we can save them some money.

Mr. Speaker, much has been made of the role of the private utilities in this particular controversy and many allegations made. In this light I have asked for specified answers by the private utilities in our area to specific charges made relating to Dickey-Lincoln and have received comprehensive replies to each allegation. I insert these charges and answers in the RECORD at this point and commend their reading to all concerned with Dickey-Lincoln:

STATEMENT NO. 1

"The private utilities have said Dickey is not needed because they have planned a comprehensive program called "The Big Eleven Power Loop" to meet New England's power needs of the future. The fact is the Big Eleven Loop is only a public relations gimmick."

Answer

The fact is that the Big Eleven Power Loop is proceeding on schedule although there may be future procedural delays originating at the hands of regulatory agencies. While the project is not formalized to the extent of being in the form of a written agreement among the participating private utilities, it is the result of coordinated planning through the Electric Coordinating Council of New England and covers the years 1967 through 1972.

A report of progress on the Big Eleven Power Loop with photographs was included as Appendix I to "A Progress Report on Electric Power Development in New England" issued by the Coordinating Council in March, 1967. Since that time, all eleven projects have shown further progress. Completed since then are (1) Connecticut Yankee and (2) Boston #2.

Insofar as the transmission facilities of th Big Eleven Power Loop are concerned, planning and construction are proceeding at the required pace. The first section of EHV line from Pleasant Valley, New York, through Connecticut to Charlton, Massachusetts, is now operating at the rated 345,000 volts. Substantial sums of money have been spent by Public Servic Company of New Hampshire and others to acquire necessary rights of way and to start construction on the balance of the 345,000 volt transmission lines associated with the Loop.

STATEMENT NO. 2

"The private utilities have said they are doing the best job possible in serving New England today. The fact is they have consistently overcharged New England customers and have given us the highest electrical rates in the nation."

Answer

This statement embodies three different subjects. The first raises the question as to who presumed to be the spokesman for New England's private utilities in stating "they are doing the best job possible in serving New England." As long as utilities, whether private or public, are operated by human beings, there always will be room for improvement. However, as between private and public power, it seems to be pretty generally conceded that private operation is more efficient than government operation and it is certain that private operation puts more money in the public coffers than government operation.

The second subject which has to do with "overcharging" seems to be completely unsupported. While it is true that the Federal Power Commission reported rates of return for the major privately owned companies for the year 1965 in its "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1965—Privately Owned" starting on page 651, it does not appear that FPC had anything to say about overcharging. As a matter of fact, FPC preceded the reporting on rate of return with the following words which also appear on page 651.

"It should be noted that this review of rates of return calculated by the Commission's staff is not intended as an evaluation of the reasonableness of the earnings of any electric utility company under applicable regulatory standards.—Finally, no one rate of return is universally applicable, but the allowable rate of return will differ from one company to another and among different jurisdictions."

As a matter of fact, 6 per cent is no longer regarded as an adequate rate of return for private utilities—a fact which Senator Metcalf, an outspoken and militant critic of the utilities and one whose writings and speeches may have influenced Senator Muskie, has conceded. At a public hearing before the Committee on Economic Development of the New York State Constitutional Convention on July 26, 1967, Senator Metcalf said in part, "Well, the 6 per cent return, as the members of the Committee know, was reached by regulatory commissions and by decisions of state and Federal courts and is established by a long line of precedent. Perhaps it is inadequate in these present days of developing high interest rates. Maybe a 7 per cent return or a 7½ per cent return could be established as a basis."

The third subject has to do with the words "the highest electrical rates in the nation". While it is a fact that New England's electric rates on a regional basis are higher than rates of some other regions of the United States, it is not true that they are the highest for all classes of service when compared on the basis of the charge for a specific usage block, which is the soundest way to make inter-regional rate comparisons. Furthermore, the reasons for the relatively high level of New England's electrical rates are either beyond the control of the utilities or are in the process of being corrected. The principal reasons are higher fuel cost, higher taxes, unfavorable customer density, and many small generating stations. The first three are beyond the control of the utilities; the last is being corrected by the Big Eleven Power Loop, together with other planning for the future. In the over-all picture, the private utilities under good government regulation have provided New England with electric service equal to any in the world and at constantly reducing prices per kilowatt-hour over the years in spite of the steady rise in the cost of living.

As an example of a rate comparison for specific amounts of use for industrial electric service in certain regions with which New England's industry is in competition, a statement titled "Comparative Bills for Industrial Electric Service for New England, Middle Atlantic and East North Central Regions Communities of 50,000 Population and Over, January 1, 1966" is offered. The source of the material is from the Federal Power Commission as indicated at the bottom of the statement, and the record is favorable rather than unfavorable to New England and to Public Service Company of New Hampshire.

STATEMENT NO. 3

"The private utilities have said that Dickey has not been studied enough. The fact is that no project has received such close scrutiny."

Answer

There is one point to which the private utilities can agree if the extravagant words, "no project has received such close scrutiny," are ignored. It can be agreed that the private utilities have studied the Dickey project in sufficient depth to know that the power it might produce will not significanly affect power costs in New England and that by the time it can become available, other more favorable sources will have become available.

The claim of lack of study by the private utilities has been directed to a well engineered determination of the probable cost of the project and the amount of such cost chargeable to electric power.

If the project has been sufficiently studied, why is there a need for a further appropriation of $1.6 million in the present omnibus bill for planning and engineering for this particular project?

STATEMENT NO. 4

"The private utilities contend there is no market for Dickey's power."

Answer

While it is true that no private utility has indicated any interest in Dickey power at the price at which it would have to be offered to meet present requirements for authorization to construct, it is equally true that so-called preference customers such as municipals and cooperatives in Maine and Massachusetts cannot now or in the foreseeable future make economical use of any substantial proportion of the short-hour peaking power which Dickey will produce. Furthermore, there is no provision in cost estimates now available to indicate the cost of transmitting the power from Dickey to the municipals and cooperatives in Maine and Massachusetts.

STATEMENT NO. 5

"The private utilities have said that hydroelectric power is outdated."

Answer

This statement is the result either of a misunderstanding of the position of the utilities or of a deliberate attempt to mislead by lifting words out of context. The position of the private utilities with respect to hydro-electric power is simple, direct, and understandable. Where new hydro-electric developments can be economically justified when compared with other sources of power, they should be built. However, in the more mature (electrically) New England region, practically all economically justifiable hydro-electric plant sites have been developed so far as conventional plants are concerned. This means that most future growth will come from other sources. There is nothing surprising about this. Already TVA, which started as a 100% hydro-electric system, is now generating more than 82% of its electricity in steam plants. Also, in the Pacific Northwest, where huge government hydroelectric plants like Grand Coulee, Bonneville and others have been constructed, the use of steam power is being planned to take care of growth.

The hydro included in the Big-11 Loop is *pumped storage* which is a type of development that offers much promise for New England. There are many good sites in the area, and it seems clear that additional installations of this type will be coming along in the future.

STATEMENT NO. 6

"The private utilities have said that atomic energy is the cheapest power source of the future."

Answer

Several sizable atomic power plants are now nearing completion. In the not too distant future, they will provide the answer as to the relative cost of power from nuclear plants and fossil fuel plants. Every indication is that nuclear costs will be competitive.

As to Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation which Senator Muskie says is four years late, Mr. Albert A. Cree, President of the Corporation, authorized the statement on September 28, 1967, that the plant is not "four years late being put in operation or even one year late". He further stated that any delays in scheduled progress up to the present time have been due to regulatory processes.

STATEMENT NO. 7

"The private utilities have said that Dickey will cheat Maine out of tax revenue. The fact is that private utilities are tax collectors. They simply adjust their rates so that the tax is passed along to the consumer. . . ."

Answer

The average private utility pays about 22 cents out of each dollar collected from its consumers to the tax collector. On the average, 11 cents of this is based on assessments on property and franchises and is paid directly to the states and/or the various communities in which the utility operates. On the other hand, government power projects pay little or no taxes. It, therefore, must follow that for every government project built, be it for the generation or transmission of electricity or any other purpose commonly engaged in by private enterprise, there will be less construction by private enterprise and, therefore, less taxes collected through these sources—and more necessarily from other sources.

Dickey is not economically sound and cannot begin to make up in lower electric rates for the taxes which would result from the construction of more sound and more sensible generating facilities by the private utilities.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to my colleague from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire, my distinguished colleague [Mr. WYMAN], who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, for yielding to me at this time. I commend him on his statement and the facts that he has presented.

Once again I, too, oppose the Lincoln-Dickey hydroelectric power project. The proponents of the project claim that it may reduce the cost of electricity in New England. This claim has not been conclusively proved. What can be proved, however, is that this is a very expensive and uneconomical and unnecessary way of producing electric power. It will cost the taxpayer an estimated $380 million, and by 1975, the forecasted completion date, electricity from atomic powerplants and other facilities in New England will be available at substantially reduced rates.

According to the Dickey report, published in 1965 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the cost for 723,500 kilowatts of power will be $375 per kilowatt. Only last June, the same Army Corps of Engineers rejected a power dam project—the Pontook—on the Androscoggin River in northern New Hampshire, and yet the estimated cost for this project was less than $250 per kilowatt. In addition, the corps estimates that the cost per kilowatt year at Lincoln-Dickey would be $23.50, whereas at the Pontook Dam on the Androscoggin, it would have been only $10.30 per kilowatt year. If the Pontook Dam was found uneconomical, I find little justification in believing that the Lincoln-Dickey dam is.

Lincoln-Dickey is primarily for producing power. Its one other benefit, flood control, could be provided for a total of $1 million, compared to the estimated $380 million cost of the whole project. Two types of electric power would be produced at Lincoln-Dickey, 100,000 kilowatts baseload power for use in southern Maine, and 623,500 kilowatts peaking power for use in southern New England. In other words, the electricity produced by Lincoln-Dickey is not destined for the people in northern Maine where the dam is located. I submit it would be cheaper to build two separate powerplants at the locations where the electricity will be used.

On previous occasions here on the floor of the House I have spoken against this proposal. I have pointed out to my colleagues before, and wish to do so again, that private utilities which can meet the needs of New England for electricity for less total cost, pay taxes! I submit that it makes little sense to use taxpayer dollars to create a tax-eating and non-taxpaying facility that does not even have the saving grace of fulfilling an unmet need.

In conclusion, there is an important and relatively overlooked aspect to this matter involving conservation. There are many people in the country, and I am one of them, who have become convinced that when facilities such as this are planned, detrimental effects involving conservation should be far more thoughtfully and carefully considered. Thus, I was pleased to hear today from the Sierra Club that their Atlantic chapter opposes this project. The National Wildlife Federation, the National Resources Council of Maine, the Maine Audubon Society and the State Biologists Association of Maine, have also echoed doubt as to the wisdom of this project.

If an important public works project is to be awarded to Maine and if, as some of the speakers have suggested, northern New England is deserving of help from the Federal Government, I suggest that we all get together immediately behind an east-west highway which would link northern New England with New York State. I am sure that such a project would have the strong support of the Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York delegations. Such a highway for which I have long argued would also have far greater economic value, not only for northern New England, but for the entire country.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House of Representatives will stand its ground today and, once again, vote down further funds for the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project in Maine. In response to our last vote on this matter, the Lynn, Mass., Daily Evening Item on October 18 published this editorial:

> LET'S FORGET DICKEY-LINCOLN
>
> The House of Representatives in Washington for the third time has voted overwhelmingly to eliminate from the omnibus public works bill planning funds for the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project in northern Maine. Twice before, the Senate has put the funds back in.
>
> Although several million dollars have been spent in planning, this is only a token compared to the hundreds of millions the project could ultimately cost. It is time the project was forgotten.
>
> Here we have a proposal to build a hydroelectric project 400 miles from the load centers. The project would produce power that could be produced cheaper elsewhere. It would flood thousands of acres of virgin forest and would be partly on land Canada owns.
>
> Usually, all members of Congress want money to flow back into local areas if a project is at all economically feasible. However, 16 of 23 voting New England congressmen wanted the Dickey-Lincoln appropriation removed, which hardly speaks well for the project.
>
> Dickey-Lincoln, if built, would pay no taxes. It would place a further burden on the taxpayers because it would borrow money from the federal government at a lower rate than the government has to pay to get it in the first place. This is certainly no bargain for the people of New England or the nation.
>
> It is time the Senate put a final quietus on this indefensible proposal.
>
> We suggest you write your Senators: It is time the project was forgotten.

It is highly significant that conservation-minded people strongly oppose this project. As Robert Waldrop, of the Washington office of the Sierra Club, observes in a letter on Dickey-Lincoln, this debate has primarily centered on the economics of the issue. He continues:

> But the scope of this dialogue has overlooked aspects of the project which have a great number of people in the Northeast and across the nation quite concerned. This aspect is the impact the Dickey-Lincoln project would have on the scenic, wildlife, natural, and other intangible values associated with the present St. John riverscape.

Among New England and other conservation organizations which have voiced concern about the Dickey-Lincoln project, Mr. Waldrop notes that the Atlantic Chapter of the Sierra Club recently passed the following resolution:

> The Atlantic Chapter of the Sierra Club wishes to go on record in opposition to the construction of the proposed Dickey-Lincoln Project in Maine because of the anticipated effect such a project would have on the scenic and wildlife values associated with a free-flowing St. John River.

The National Resources Council of Maine has declared:

> Much of what is being said about this project appears to be based on the assumption that Maine people strongly favor it, but so far we have been unable to detect any substantial public support for the Dickey project within the state. On the contrary, it seems to us that there is a rising body of opinion which is opposed to flooding the upper St. John River valley.

The Maine Audubon Society expressed it this way:

> In an extremely detailed study of the testimony on this project before the House Committee and of the debates in the Congress, it is apparent that the wildlife conservation values of the St. John have not been taken into consideration. The Supreme Court this summer in its decision on the Snake River, stated that wildlife conservation values shall be given due consideration. If the cost benefit ratios of this project are partially derived by the inclusion of flood control benefits, and an omission of other conservation values, the validity of these ratios may be justly questioned.

The State Biologists' Association of Maine stated its opposition as follows:

> We, the Board of Directors of the State Biologists' Association, are opposed to construction of the hydroelectric project commonly referred to as the "Dickey-Lincoln dam." Our opposition is based primarily on the conviction that the Upper St. John area has a far greater value in its natural state than is admitted by the planners of the Dickey-Lincoln project.

Mr. Speaker, it is ever more apparent that the more people consider the Dickey-Lincoln project, the more they are aware that it is costly not only in hard cash but also in matters of conservation. There is no public desire nor necessity for this project. It is, as the editorial I have quoted here today says, time that Dickey-Lincoln is forgotten.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, one of the dangers of staying on the floor and listening to debate is that the more you hear, the more confusing it gets. I have always opposed this Dickey-Lincoln project for the simple reason that I come from a coal-producing region of Ohio. Most of the coal in Ohio is located in my district. We are naturally interested in fossil fuel to generate power.

Today I heard the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] say that the solution to this is atomic power, which now the coal people are very much against because they claim the refuse in poisoning the country. There is no place to dump it. I thought that I, perhaps, had better change my position and be for good, clean, God-given water power. I do not know.

Perhaps what I should have done was to stay in my office and not have listened to this debate in the first place.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. The gentleman knows I have a great deal of affection and admiration for him. I do want him to rest easily in his mind that he will be helping his coal people. In New England, by 1975, in planning what is known as the big 11 power loop, there will be 11 new, efficient electric generating plants, three or four of which will be atomic power, which leaves seven or eight as thermal powerplants. I assure the gentleman that in New England we are going to be purchasing coal from his people for a long, long time.

Mr. HAYS. May I suggest that there be one or two atomic powerplants and nine or 10 coal-using plants?

Mr. GIAIMO. That is a bad ratio. Perhaps 7 to 4.

Mr. HAYS. I just think that we ought not to be building any more atomic powerplants until we have had more study on them.

Incidentally, I and many other Members of Congress have introduced resolutions to have a further study of what we do with the waste from these atomic plants, before we build any more atomic power reactors. I am against any more atomic plants and I will have to vote accordingly.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make it clear to the Members here that Dickey-Lincoln is not the only thing involved in this motion to recede and concur with an amendment. This also involves a number of projects which were put in that were not in the budget. It involves a number of projects on which the Senate increased the amounts, from what had been allowed in the House, whether or not they were in the budget. It involves restoration by the Senate, within projects, of amounts where the House had made reductions with respect to particular projects.

So those who vote against the motion of the chairman of the House conferees have a number of reasons for doing so, without regard to their attitude on the Dickey-Lincoln project.

The only way we will actually be getting at the crux of the matter with respect to Dickey-Lincoln, as I see it, is to vote against the motion of the gentleman from Ohio, vote down this motion to recede and concur, and then there will be an opportunity specifically to get at the matter of the Dickey-Lincoln project on its own merits.

So those who believe we ought not concede these increases in projects that have been made by the other body and conceded to as a matter of necessity, those who believe that we ought not have this commitment for Dickey-Lincoln, all of those people should vote down the motion of the gentleman from Ohio, and then we will have an opportunity to discuss on its merits the question of the Dickey-Lincoln project itself.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am frankly a little puzzled by the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is a very knowledgeable and persuasive member of our committee. I fail to see how we can get at the merits of the Dickey-Lincoln School project if we vote down the motion of the gentleman from Ohio. The motion of the gentleman from Ohio provides the $875,000 necessary to continue planning for this project. If we accept the motion, if we recede and concur with the Senate amendment, then we will have provided the $875,000 that the majority of the conferees suggested and recommended in this report.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We will also have provided for the additional funds for other projects and for the Senate increases.

Mr. BOLAND. There is no question about that. I pointed that out when I explained what the intent of the motion is. It does involve 300 other projects throughout the United States. But the only way we could bring this item back so that the House could get a vote on Dickey-Lincoln was to provide for this motion by the subcommittee chairman, to provide the $875,000 above the amount that was recommended in the bill.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, is it not correct to say that the effect of the motion of the gentleman from Ohio would be that if we vote down this motion, we dispose of the $875,000 for Dickey-Lincoln, after which other motions would be in order as to the other projects which are in the amendment?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is exactly correct. If the motion of the gentleman from Ohio is voted down, then $875,000 goes out the window, and immediately the gentleman from Ohio will offer another motion with the total amount minus the amount which is provided for the Dickey-Lincoln project.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is exactly as I understood it. I thank the gentleman for his clarification.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been serving with the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations for a number of years. We have a position that is national in scope. Members may wonder why I take part in this debate, but the motion made by the gentleman from Ohio represents the feeling of the majority of the subcommittee—I think of all of the subcommittee on our side of the aisle.

Thus, I feel I should make clear why we feel as we do, having a responsibility to the whole Nation.

I happen to come from an area where half of the district is served by the Tennessee Valley Authority and the other half by the Mississippi Power & Light Co. I have had to know something about both sides, in self-defense, one might say.

I say to my friends in New England, keep this in mind: The closer to the Tennessee Valley Authority the private company is the more they reduce their rates and the greater the increase in their consumption and profits. The further away from it they are the less they have grown and the less the rates have come down.

I was one of those who supported the St. Lawrence Seaway. I had letters and calls from New Orleans and from the Mississippi gulf coast in opposition. I supported the seaway anyway.

Let us think a little bit. In less than 33 years we are going to have 150 million more people. What cities will be able to take care of them? We cannot take care of the people we have in the cities now.

I grant that in this area, from all accounts, the area is very sparsely settled, and it always will be, unless we make some provision so that a larger number of people can live there in comfort.

But let us forget all that. The issue before us is whether to continue the planning which we started. This is not for building the project. This is only $875,000 to complete planning which has been authorized and has been partially completed.

We will cross the bridge about whether to build it or not later, but in my opinion, it would be very shortsighted to retard the development of any section of the United States, with this growth in population facing us, and it would be even more shortsighted to cut planning off in the middle.

I hope the Members will support my friend and colleague from Ohio.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this project ought to be built. This planning money ought to be put in. This whole controversy ought to be put to rest.

I do not believe there are two people in this House who have done more to build this country or who are sounder builders than the gentleman from Alabama, BOB JONES, who spoke in favor of this project a few minutes ago, and the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, who has built projects and favored projects and supported projects all over this country.

I remember the first time this came up 2 years ago. A former Member, from Maine, said, "You know, the greatest export from my State is our young people. This is the thing we export, because we do not have low power rates or other economic inducements to keep them there."

In the West public and private power have learned to live together. The gentleman from Washington told you about it. We have few of these fights in the Southwest anymore. Private power gets the shakes when it has a monopoly. They talk about free enterprise, and they run ads, but they have a monopoly. They find when they once feel the cold air of competition that they still survive and do a better job.

When private power and public power have to compete, as the gentleman from Mississippi pointed out, the rates come down. They both do better. The area prospers. This has been the experience all over the country.

I hope that this project will be built. I hope that this matter can be put to rest today. I strongly urge the Members of the House to support the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

I further believe that the Dickey project has been proven to deserve our support and should receive fair treatment.

Permit me to summarize, in 10 brief points, the facts pertinent to the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power project.

First. Electric rates in New England are the highest in the country.

Second. The record shows that New England's private utilities have done little to reduce these rates.

Third. Over a period of several years, the Dickey project has been studied in great detail by numerous federal departments and agencies.

Fourth. Engineering feasibility and economic justifications of the project have been demonstrated beyond any possible doubt.

Fifth. The Dickey project, as designed, is uniquely suited to fulfill the role it is destined to play in providing power to New England consumers.

Sixth. The project will provide electricity at the lowest cost to consumers.

Seventh. A market exists for the power Dickey will generate. In fact, the peaking power to be available for shipment out of Maine is already oversubscribed.

Eighth. The private utilities have been unable to offer a plan which can challenge Dickey for efficiency of operation or cost of electric energy production.

Ninth. The private utilities are unable to promise that they can significantly reduce rates to consumers nearly as much as Dickey will.

Tenth. The Dickey-Lincoln project is by all odds and by any standard the best means of reducing electric rates in New England.

These are not simply my views, but the considered judgment of all Federal agencies expert in such matters and of our own Appropriations Committee.

I am completely satisfied with the merits of this project and am proud to lend it my support. I urge all of my colleagues to support the motion on the floor and give New England a modest appropriation to continue preliminary study and engineering on the Dickey project.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if we had been sitting in this House about 30 years ago, instead of the Dickey-Lincoln project we might be deciding today whether to authorize the Grand Coulee project in my district of the State of Washington. Instead of hearing about a project "400 miles in the woods" we might have heard something else. I want to tell the Members what was said a little more than 30 years ago about Grand Coulee. It was said that it was a great white elephant, that it would be built only to provide electricity to jackrabbits and sagebrush.

Let me tell you also what has happened as a result of the authorization and of the construction of Grand Coulee. It has changed the economy of my district from one almost entirely agricultural to one which supports a great light metals industry, and other thriving industries providing year-round employment. This project has electrified farms and towns. It has provided electricity to public and private electric utilities. It has helped change our whole way of life. It made possible in the early 1940's the creation of the great Hanford works, which provided the atomic weapons which ended World War II.

We now quote the "jackrabbit and sagebrush" taunt only to show how wrong some people can be.

We are talking today about a project which involves one six-thousandths of the budget of the public works program. Some gentlemen are for economy: they want to shave one six-thousandths of that budget.

There are gentlemen talking about conservation today who I have never heard talk about conservation in the House before.

The fact of the matter is that the private utilities of New England have not yet learned the benefits that can come to them as well as other New England citizens by sharing the development of their region.

This is an important bill for New England. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] and my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS], know the benefits of partnership in building the West. As for economy, the wisest money we spend in this House is the money we invest in developing our natural resources and in building the strength of our economy.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYMAN. Does the gentleman seriously contend that there is a valid comparison between Grand Coulee and Dickey-Lincoln?

Mr. FOLEY. Let me remind the gentleman that 2 years ago when I sponsored a bill to build a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam my bill had the unanimous support of Members on both sides of the aisle from the Pacific Northwest and was supported by public bodies and private utilities, by labor unions and chambers of commerce throughout the Northwest. Most of the opposition votes came from the New England area, and the gentleman's vote was one.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I dislike burdening the membership of this House as often as I have in the last week. I think those who have served with me for some time know that I have seldom done it. I have only done it when I have a deep interest in and some real concern about some program or project which I think America benefits from and which I think the people themselves benefit from.

Let me reason, if I can, for a moment, with some of the Members who voted against this project exactly 3 months ago. At that time, the Dickey-Lincoln project was deleted from the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations bill by some 64 votes. At that time the bill provided for an appropriation of $1.676 million. This was knocked out last July. It went over to the Senate where they put in the entire figure of $1.676 million. If any Member of this House has sat in a conference committee with some of the Members of the other body, they can recognize the difficulty that we do have with some problems arising in conferences. The Senate put in the entire amount. We sat for some time on a couple of occasions in conference and finally came up with a figure that we felt was a just figure and one which would not kill the project but which would continue the planning for it for at least this year.

The amount here provided is $875,000 for the purpose of continuing the planning.

I can understand the concern of a lot of other Members who do not live in New England about the opposition of Members of New England. It is a justifiable concern that they have, and the question you ask as to why they are opposed is a good question and deserves an answer. One of the real answers is that there has been so much misinformation on the figures relating to this specific project that everybody is bewildered, and properly so. I was myself.

I never supported this project until this year. I supported the project as a result of a study that was ordered by our Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations by the investigative staff. We found that there have been an awful lot of figures quoted by the Department of the Interior, the Federal Power Commission, the Corps of Engineers, and by the New England Electric Coordinating Council, and by a whole raft of other experts as to whether or not this is a feasible project and whether or not it should be built.

So, Mr. Speaker, on that basis alone this subcommittee had a staff report and an investigation made. The report was filed several months ago and it clearly and simply and emphatically indicates that this is a feasible project; that the cost-to-benefit ratio was 1.9 to 1. However, after the project was reevaluated, based upon the escalation of costs, there was a reduction in the benefit-to-cost ratio from 1.9 to 1, to 1.5 to 1.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, this committee and this Congress has funded projects all over this great land of ours, in every nook, cranny and corner, north, south, east and west, projects whose benefit-to-cost ratios do not come close to comparing with the established benefit-to-cost ratio of this project.

So, Mr. Speaker, on that basis alone, the project is worthwhile and most deserving. However, based upon the carefulness of the Committee on Appropriations with reference to the cost involved, a staff of the committee came back to the committee with a report that it would cost $212 million to construct the project. That price has been escalated to the sum of $227 million.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of the House will take a look at this project and at the report, they will find that the escalating constructon cost as contained in the report was made based upon the figures which are available today and that is why the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] indicated that the ultimate cost would be $227 million.

Mr. Speaker, who agrees with this cost? Not the private utilities in the area concerned; but the Federal Power Commission, the Corps of Engineers, and others of those who agree that this is a fair and reasonable cost of this project. Upon that basis they arrive at a benefit-to-cost ratio that is feasible.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said by some that this project is located some 450 miles away, up in the great wilds of this country. I say to the Members of the House that this is where you build hydroelectric projects—that is the kind of an area in which this type of project is constructed.

Mr. Speaker, I have often said that I wished that this great Nation of ours had been settled from the west to the east. Then we would have had the great and large States and the opportunity to fully develop the potential of our great rivers.

Mr. Speaker, the issue today is a very simple one. Permit me to address myself to my friends on the left side of the aisle as well as to my friends on the right side of the aisle who voted against this project. I am asking you to permit this amount of money to be retained in this bill with which to commence planning only for this project. Within the next year we will know whether we can go ahead with the construction of the project.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House of Representatives who serve on this committee have been voting to fund projects in many States—projects that are just as and more costly than the one we now are discussing—projects which have ranged anywhere from $95 million to $450 million. Some of us who come from the northeastern section of this country have done so because we are interested in building America.

So, Mr. Speaker, the real, simple issue—and it is a very simple one—revolves around the question as to whether this Congress, this 90th Congress of the House of Representatives, is going to kill this project that in its ultimate completion will mean so much to the great States of the New England area, and the people who live there who pay the highest electric rates in the Nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, the issue is a simple one: Are you going to permit this project to be kept alive or are you going to kill it by denying funds to continue planning?

Mr. Speaker, this probably represents the first, the last, and perhaps the only Federal hydroelectric project that will ever be constructed in New England—a large-scale hydroelectric project.

The item involves the expenditure of $875,000 with which to continue the planning for this project. That is all we ask you to do. We ask you to give us this permission, we only ask you to give us an opportunity, an opportunity in the great northeastern section of this Nation, to ascertain whether or not this project will do the same job, will do the same thing as similar and like projects have done for every section of this great, country of ours, east to west, north to south. We ask you to only extend to us the same opportunities as we have extended to you in the development of this great country of ours. This is all we ask.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this House will adopt the amendment which has been proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Is it not the impression of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] that much misinformation has been spread upon the RECORD today during this debate, as well as in prior instances?

Among the things we have heard stated during debate this afternoon is the fact that some of the New England Members got up and said, "We in New England do not wish this project, we are not in favor of it."

The gentleman in the well is from New England. The State of Rhode Island, the most densely populated State in the New England area, with one-sixth of the population of the New England States, is unanimously in support of this particular project. The entire delegation from the State of Rhode Island supports the Dickey-Lincoln School project.

Mr. BOLAND. Let me say that no one is more proud of the entire delegation from the State of Rhode Island than this Member from the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD votes of the 89th and 90th Congresses show that the House of Representatives categorically opposed appropriations for the Dickey-Lincoln powerplant, in any amount.

Mr. Speaker, the RECORD also shows that all organized electric utility labor unions throughout the New England region also oppose appropriations for the Dickey-Lincoln powerplant, in any amount; namely, Utility Workers Union of America, affiliated American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, United Mine Workers, District 50, Brotherhood of Utility Workers of New England, Inc., New England Utility Council of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am again opposing the Dickey-Lincoln power project and the reasons which motivate me are the same as they have been since this project was first mentioned.

The present companies supplying power to our section of the country are doing a good job and their growth which is current and prospective will adequately serve our people.

Even if some long-range benefit might be claimed for this project the timing of its initiation is certainly vitally important and I feel very strongly that the present is not the time to embark upon a project which will cost $300 million.

Even though the amount immediately before the House represents less than $1 million, it will in my judgment serve as a commitment on the part of the Congress to develop the project to completion.

I favor other programs which would benefit the State of Maine, either from a point of view of distributing power or in aiding the underprivileged, but I cannot support the project which is before the House today.

As for a characterization of the project itself, I shall not use my own words, but simply include here a letter which I have received from a woman who lives in the town of South Portland in the State of Maine. I believe that this provides a complete answer to the claims of the proponents of this project:

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: I have just read in the local newspaper that you are opposed to the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric power project on the St. John River, and I am writing to compliment you for your stand on this costly, wasteful, needless monstrosity. You deserve a medal. I wish we had more like you in Congress.

I am just a lowly working girl, and I don't know a megawatt from a kilowatt, but I don't need to to know that the Dickey Dam is a worthless pork barrel deal. I have read a great deal about this project, including the report of the proceedings of the committee hearings, and I can find no justification for it economically or otherwise. I strongly resent having my hard-earned taxes spent on this project when there are so many vital and essential items requiring our attention and financial support. Why, even the proponents of Dickey admit that public power can be generated by other methods cheaper than by Dickey, that Dickey would provide less than 2% of the power needed by 1975, and that Dickey would result in no savings to the small consumer.

Of course, to us here in the State of Maine, Dickey is particularly objectionable, as it means the loss of 125,000 acres of one of the most unique and beautiful areas of the country and the marring of thousands of additional acres of scenic countryside and woodlands by the erection of power lines, poles, and towers.

The Dickey Dam is an unneccessary project, paid for entirely by the taxpayers, which is outdated already, and the functions of which can be performed by other means at less or no cost to the taxpayers and no sacrifice of our irreplaceable natural resources. I hope it meets the fate it deserves, and I and many other State of Mainers like me want to thank you for having the good sense to oppose it.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 2 and concur therein with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 162, nays 236, answered "present" 1, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

YEAS—162

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Baring
Bennett
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Carey
Celler
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dingell
Dow
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Pa.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
McCarthy
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Morris, N. Mex.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Poage
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Watts
White
Whitten
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—236

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Fallon
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood

Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Gathings
Giaimo
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hammer-schmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lpscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McMillan
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan

Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Neill, Mass.
Patten
Pelly
Pettis
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Robison
Rodino
Rooney, Pa.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Vanik
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Nedzi

NOT VOTING—33

Aspinall
Barrett
Bell
Berry
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Diggs
Everett
Fountain
Gettys
Gross

Hébert
Helstoski
Jones, Mo.
Kyl
Long, La.
McEwen
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
Philbin
Pollock
Rarick

Resnick
Rivers
Roybal
St. Onge
Staggers
Stuckey
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wydler

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Nedzi against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. McFall for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. McEwen against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Kyl against.

Mr Barrett for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Helstoski for, with Mr. Gettys against.

Mr. Brown of California for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Stuckey against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Gross.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD]. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Messrs. McCULLOCH, LIPSCOMB, and CARTER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KIRWAN

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$967,599,000".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 2 and concur therein with an amendment.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, is it the parliamentary situation at the present time in regard to the amendment No. 2 such that it would provide almost $1 billion for construction by the Corps of Engineers, and that we are voting on these funds without the $875,000 for Dickey-Lincoln?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the House has before it the motion by the gentleman from Ohio that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$967,599,000".

Mr. GIAIMO. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this takes out the $875,000 for Dickey-Lincoln?

The SPEAKER. That is not within the prerogative of the Chair to state.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, can we get an explanation from the committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it is too late for that. However, it is the understanding of the Chair that would be the result.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 284, nays 111, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

YEAS—284

Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ayres
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Bevill
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Colmer
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings

Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kyros
Landrum
Langen
Leggett
Lennon
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClure
McDade
McMillan
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen

O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Rees
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roush
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watts
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wylie
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—111

Abbitt
Adams
Anderson, Ill.
Arends

Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bates
Betts

Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Bow

Bray
Brock
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Byrnes, Wis.
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fulton, Pa.
Goodling
Grover
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Heckler, Mass.
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Joelson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Laird
Latta
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Lukens
McClory
McDonald, Mich.
MacGregor
Marsh
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
O'Konski
Ottinger
Pirnie
Quillen
Railsback
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Riegle
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Stafford
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Tuck
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyman

NOT VOTING—37

Aspinall
Barrett
Bell
Berry
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Diggs
Everett
Fountain
Gettys
Gross
Hébert
Helstoski
Jones, Mo.
King, Calif.
Kyl
Long, La.
McCulloch
McEwen
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
O'Hara, Mich.
Philbin
Pollock
Rarick
Resnick
Rivers
Roybal
St. Onge
Stuckey
Utt
Vander Jagt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wydler

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Utt.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. O'Hara of Michigan.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Everett.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. MONAGAN and BELCHER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: On page 4, line 19, insert:

"*Provided further*, That in connection with the rehabilitation of the Snake Creek Embankment of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir Project, North Dakota, the Corps of Engineers is authorized to participate with the State of North Dakota to the extent of one-half the cost of widening the present embankment to provide a four-lane right-of-way for U.S. Highway 83 in lieu of the present two-lane highway:".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KIRWAN

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, a little explanation is required on this amendment.

This amendment authorizes the Corps of Engineers to finance one-half the cost of widening the present Snake Creek embankment to provide a four-lane right-of-way for U.S. Highway 83 in lieu of present two-lane highway.

The widening of the Snake Creek embankment to provide the necessary right-of-way should be accomplished at the time the riprap on the embankment is being repaired.

The work qualifies for 50–50 financing under the Federal Highway Act; however, the Bureau of Public Roads does not have this portion of U.S. Highway 83 in its current funding schedule. It is therefore proposed the Federal portion, estimated at $1,852,700, be funded by the Corps at this time while it is undertaking the repair work.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 3 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: On page 22, lines 6 and 7, strike out "$203,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$225,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KIRWAN

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and the several motions is laid on the table.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like a rollcall vote on that motion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

As I understood the situation, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] yielded to me 2 minutes. May I have the full 2 minutes?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous action taken on the conference report and the various motions is hereby vacated.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the vote had been concluded upon the motion which had been offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and it is my opinion that the Chair should not rescind that action.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on this motion I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the vote had been taken and it had been so recorded. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] was recognized subsequent to the vote having been taken, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair was very slow and saw no one arise and the Chair stated that without objection the motion was agreed to and then proceeded and stated that a motion to reconsider the conference report and the other motions thereon were laid on the table and that concluded the matter as it related to the pending conference report.

Now, the Chair is perfectly willing to cooperate with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I had been yielded time by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has no control of any time at this point in the proceedings. That is why the Chair asked unanimous consent, and there was no objection, that the gentleman from Massachusetts be recognized for 1 minute. That is the limitation of the Chair in respect to that question.

Does the gentleman from Massachusetts wish to be recognized for 1 minute?

Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that there was an objection raised to vacating the ruling of the Chair by the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I seek a record vote upon this item involved here is that this amendment concerns the grants for waste treatment plants, for water pollution control. There was an authorization for $450 million for fiscal 1968. Our committee approved the full budget of $203 million and it is my recollection that there was a division vote of 47 "ayes" to 135 "noes" when there was an amendment offered on the floor to increase this amount to $450 million. The House defeated that amendment. The matter was sent to the other body and they increased the sum to $225 million, $22 million above the House figure and the budget estimate that this House voted upon no less than 3 months ago.

I think there should be some more positive action on the part of the House to support our conferees. Of course, Mr. Speaker, everyone is looking for economy and those who are for economy come from either side of the aisle.

It would seem to me that everyone would be glad to have this vote which would indicate to the other body that the House insists strongly upon its position on this matter.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the motion was offered by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and was approved by the House. The House has acted. This should be an indication to the other body that this body is going to insist upon its position.

Mr. BOLAND. I understand that, but

I believe we ought to have instructed them explicitly, and the only good way to do that is as we did yesterday on the HUD bill. Our conferees had hoped we could do the same here, and that is why I wanted a record vote.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I recall the way the Speaker put the question and the response of the Members, we had the unanimous vote of the House. This should be a clear indication to the other body that the House is serious in supporting President Johnson's budget figure for water pollution.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Senate has added $22 million, being not only above the House amount, but also exceeding the budget by that amount.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 10196, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on the bill H.R. 10196, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, may be called up for consideration immediately after it is filed tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this unanimous consent with the absolute assurance to the Members of the House that under no circumstances will this conference report be filed if it does not conform strictly with the instructions of the House and the motion to recommit the original conference report on that bill. I give the Members that assurance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe I understand that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and of the Managers on the part of the House has in mind; inasmuch as he has seen fit to ask, and he has consulted with various Members about his situation.

I simply have one question:

Does this mean that, as in the case of the other subcommittee chairman and the Committee on Appropriations, earlier in the day, that first, the conference is not yet in full agreement; second, the conference report is not yet written and ready to file; third, we will be acting tomorrow, if this unanimous consent is given, without a printed copy of the report before us, and fourth, that this is in the interest of expediting the business of the House in the waning days of this session?

Mr. FLOOD. May I say this to my very good friend, the doctor—and I have great respect for doctors, as the gentleman knows, for many reasons—that on the first three points the gentleman from Missouri raises, the answer of course is technically yes. But I want to add to the last point that I can assure the gentleman I am not concerned at this moment, with this request, with expediting any of the business of the House of Representatives except that of my subcommittee. I have not been consulted about the last point the gentleman raises, I do not know what the program of the House is to be, and I do not know if the gentleman does. So the answer to the fourth point the gentleman raises is absolutely no, as far as the gentleman from Pennsylvania is concerned.

I want to add this in connection with the first three points:

This is the HEW bill which we had all wrapped up in a very nice, neat package, with the aid of the minority leader and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], the ranking Republican member of my subcommittee, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], ranking minority member of the full committee, and with the cooperation of Mr. Michel. We had a love feast going on here, which consisted of Mr. Laird telling Mr. Flood what a great guy he was and Mr. Flood telling Mr. Laird and Mr. Michel what great guys they were.

That was the debate. Unfortunately, without any warning, the chairman of the full committee took the floor, and for reasons that I do not know, shot us out of the water and the minority very properly recommitted the bill. Had I been over there, so would I.

I assure the gentleman from Missouri and the House that absolutely nothing in this report of your managers will be changed one iota except for the 13 amendments that were over the budget in the first conference report. The only thing at issue will be these 13 amendments. Ten of these are NIH.

I assure the gentleman that this conference report will not exceed the budget on a single appropriation. It will come back at the budget line. If not, we will bring back the 13 amendments in disagreement for a separate vote.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his very detailed explanation. I think that is a good position. The saving grace clause is that we will not exceed the position of the House.

Mr. FLOOD. Absolutely not.

Mr. HALL. I do want to serve notice that we cannot in the interest of expediting business—even though we are all anxious to go home——

Mr. FLOOD. I am not.

Mr. HALL. As I say, I serve notice that we cannot in the interest of expediting business, even though we are all anxious to go home, be expected to act on conference reports or on any other business of the House that is not printed available ahead of time, or indeed on which unanimous consent is given in advance without the Members having the chance to review this information because some of us who customarily do our homework, would like to have that chance.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in view of that saving clause and these statements, I withdraw my reservation of objection in this particular instance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood]?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the public works conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so missed the rollcall No. 340.

Had I been here, I would have voted "nay" on the motion to recommit.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House to read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 821)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10345) "making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, and 25.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 9, 12, 22, 23, 26, and 27, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$193,640,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$61,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 3.

John J. Rooney,
Robert L. F. Sikes,
John M. Slack, Jr.,
Neal Smith,
John J. Flynt, Jr.,
Charles S. Joelson,
George Mahon,
Frank T. Bow (except
as to amendment No.
27),
Glenard P. Lipscomb,
Elford A. Cederberg,
Mark Andrews,
Managers on the Part of the House.

John L. McClellan,
Allen J. Ellender,
Spessard L. Holland,
John O. Pastore,
Gale W. McGee,
J. W. Fulbright,
Margaret Chase Smith,
Roman L. Hruska,
Norris Cotton,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $193,640,000 for "Salaries and Expenses" instead of $193,150,000 as proposed by the House and $194,130,000 as proposed by the Senate.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $4,100,000 for "Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service" as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate.

International Commissions

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $2,700,000 for "Chamizal settlement" instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $2,760,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees expect the Department to complete the project within the total sum allowed.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSIONS

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $2,125,000 instead of $1,975,000 as proposed by the House and $2,375,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the additional amount provided over the House allowance, $100,000 is for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, and $50,000 for the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission.

Educational Exchange

MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 6: Provides that not less than $25,000,000 shall be used for payments in foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States as proposed by the Senate instead of $23,500,000 as proposed by the House.

General Provisions—Department of State

Amendments Nos. 7 & 8: Delete language proposed by the Senate. The majority of the conferees are in agreement with language inserted in the Senate relating to North Vietnam but feel that it should be a part of a legislative bill rather than an appropriation bill.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal Activities and General Administration

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $7,500,000 for "Law enforcement assistance" as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Federal Prison System

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $61,750,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons" instead of $61,000,000 as proposed by the House and $62,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Economic Development Administration

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $20,000,000 for "Operations and administration" as proposed by the House instead of $21,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $70,000,000 for "Appalachian Development Highway System" as proposed by the Senate instead of $95,000,000 as proposed by the House.

United States Travel Service

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $3,000,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Environmental Science Services Administration

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $105,000,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of $110,846,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $24,000,000 for "Research and development" as proposed by the House instead of $26,997,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing for the purchase of one aircraft.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $5,200,000 for "Facilities, equipment, and construction" as proposed by the House instead of $5,710,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that $165,000 may be used for a station on the Guadalupe Islands within the amount allowed.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $31,750,000 for "Research and technical services" as proposed by the House instead of $33,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Deletes language of the Senate providing for the modification of a boiler plant.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $240,000 for "Plant facilities" as proposed by the House instead of $290,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of State Technical Services

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $6,500,000 for "Grants and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

Customs Court

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $1,480,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,430,000 as proposed by the House.

Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $7,800,000 for "Fees of jurors and commissioners" as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,900,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $9,000,000 for "Arms control and disarmament activities" as proposed by the House instead of $9,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

United States Information Agency

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $156,479,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of $157,119,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $8,604,000 for "Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency appropriation)" as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,158,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 27: Deletes language proposed by the House relating to expenditures.

John J. Rooney,
Robert L. F. Sikes,
John M. Slack, Jr.,
Neal Smith,
John J. Flynt, Jr.,
Charles S. Joelson,
George Mahon,
Frank T. Bow,
(except as to
amendment No.
27)
Glenard P. Lipscomb,
Elford A. Cederberg,
Mark Andrews,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House for approval, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, as agreed to by the conferees, contains a total of $2,169,012,500.

Once again I would like to point out—and would like to call to the attention of everyone present—that this bill is now below the amounts of both the House and the Senate bills.

Despite the fact that the Senate considered additional supplemental estimates of $4,861,195 over those considered by the House, this bill as agreed upon in conference is now $25,014,000 below the bill as it passed the House, and is $17,093,000 below the bill as it passed the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that my colleagues on the subcommittee, Messrs. Sikes, Slack, Smith of Iowa, Flynt, Joelson, Bow, Lipscomb, Cederberg, and Andrews of North Dakota, who were also conferees on this bill, together with the chairman, the distinguished chairman of the full House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] have done excellent work both in the committee and in the House-Senate conference, and are to be commended therefor.

Credit should also be given to the Senate subcommittee and their conferees headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, and on the minority side by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH].

Working together, we have made substantial reductions, without disrupting services or causing undue hardship to anyone. The bill as it now stands is $178,790,695 below the amount of the budget estimates.

I firmly believe that the resultant action as presented here by the conferees is the sort of action that could be and should be taken on every appropriations bill. We should inspect closely every single item with a view to saving as much of the taxpayers' money as possible. My fellow conferees will agree that when we went into this conference we gave the conferees of the other body a proposition. It was this. There were three items in disagreement which were truly supplemental items and which the House had not considered. It was proposed by the House conferees that we would negotiate as to those three items, but as to the remaining 24 items in disagreement we would take the low figure, regardless of whether it was the House figure or the Senate figure. This is true economy.

It turned out that although we did have to bow to the Senate conferees in a few instances, so that we did not religiously adhere to that proposition, in general we did come back to the House with a low figure, whether it was the House figure or the Senate figure.

This committee cut out nearly 2,000 additional positions which had been requested by the departments and agencies downtown. The other body made some restorations principally in the Department of Commerce where they proposed to add 643 positions over and above those allowed by the House.

The conferees denied every single one of these 643 proposed additional employees. How could you do any better than that?

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing the actions of the House-Senate conferees with regard to the various departments and agencies contained in the bill. The table reads as follows:

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1968

Item	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	House	Senate
Department of State	$394,547,000	$407,743,000	[1] $382,327,400	[1] $386,467,400	[1] $385,667,400	−$8,879,600	−$22,075,600	+$3,340,000	−$800,000
Department of Justice	408,740,000	437,424,000	419,373,000	417,873,000	417,623,000	+8,883,000	−19,801,000	−1,750,000	−250,000
Department of Commerce	1,016,088,000	1,138,752,000	1,059,291,000	1,049,194,000	1,034,291,000	+18,203,000	−104,461,000	−25,000,000	−14,903,000
The Judiciary	89,850,700	96,480,195	93,997,100	93,947,100	93,947,100	+4,096,400	−2,533,095	−50,000	----------
American Battle Monuments Commission	2,160,000	2,370,000	2,370,000	2,370,000	2,370,000	+210,000	----------	----------	----------
Commission on Civil Rights	2,500,000	2,790,000	2,650,000	2,650,000	2,650,000	+150,000	−140,000	----------	----------
Office of Education: Civil rights educational activities	8,028,000	30,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+1,972,000	−20,000,000	----------	----------
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	5,240,000	7,170,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	+1,260,000	−670,000	----------	----------
Federal Maritime Commission	3,419,000	3,725,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	+181,000	−125,000	----------	----------
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	2,000,000	1,275,000	1,275,000	1,275,000	1,275,000	−725,000	----------	----------	----------
National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws	200,000	----------	----------	----------	----------	−200,000	----------	----------	----------
President's Commissions on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice and on Crime in the District of Columbia	550,000	----------	----------	----------	----------	−550,000	----------	----------	----------
Small Business Administration	8,100,000	12,341,000	11,250,000	11,250,000	11,250,000	+3,150,000	−1,091,000	----------	----------
Southeast hurricane disaster	9,000,000	----------	----------	----------	----------	−9,000,000	----------	----------	----------
Special representative for trade negotiations	566,000	566,000	490,000	490,000	490,000	−76,000	−76,000	----------	----------
Subversive Activities Control Board	289,500	330,000	295,000	295,000	295,000	+5,500	−35,000	----------	----------
Tariff Commission	3,562,000	3,775,000	3,675,000	3,675,000	3,675,000	+113,000	−100,000	----------	----------
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	9,000,000	10,000,000	9,000,000	9,500,000	9,000,000	----------	−1,000,000	----------	−500,000
U.S. Information Agency	172,748,000	193,062,000	187,933,000	187,019,000	186,379,000	+13,631,000	−6,683,000	−1,554,000	−640,000
Total	12,36,588,200	2,347,803,195	2,194,026,500	2,186,105,500	2,169,012,500	+32,424,300	−178,790,695	−25,014,000	−17,093,000

[1] Plus $15,606,000 to be derived by transfer.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that this is one of the best bills that has been brought into the House for a long time. We have a bill here that is below either the House or the Senate figures. We actually have a bill which, as it left the House, provided $2,194,000,000, a little more than that, but the conference considerably cut both the House and the Senate figures. This is something that I think ought to be done in all bills.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Yes, I am glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to take advantage of this moment to again point out that this bill represents a savings of $178,790,695 in the amount of the budget estimates submitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman. Let me say this: This is one of the bills that the Bow 5-percent amendment was put on. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] offered the amendment, and it carried by a vote of 171 to 156. This shows it is a pretty good thing to do. When we put the Bow amendment on, it comes back from the Senate lower than either the House or the Senate. So we served some notice that we needed some economy. I think we served some purpose by adopting the so-called Bow amendment, which says that not more than 95 percent of the funds budgeted for that year would be spent.

What happened is this conference came in with a bill that is 7.5 percent under the budgeted amount. So actually, as we have this, the Bow amendment was not necessary at all, but we put it on and we served notice that we were going to have some economy, and we now have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean to inform the House that the report of the conferees is even more economical than the bill would have been as passed by the House had the Bow amendment been applied?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to my distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was going to make the same point. I think the explanation given by the gentleman from Ohio is entirely accurate. Under this particular bill, because most of the appropriations are 1-year funds, the reduction of 7 percent actually results in an expenditure reduction of approximately that amount. Would the gentleman from New York agree to that?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, the net result of a cut of about 7 percent in appropriation authority results in an expenditure reduction of almost the same amount?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Pretty closely, I would say.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So if it is a 7.5-percent reduction in obligational authority, it is at least a 5-percent cut below the President's expenditure figure for this appropriation.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, I should add, if the distinguished minority leader will permit me, for the information of these Members who have not been here so long, this is the sort of business this particular subcommittee has been engaged in for many years, with the help of the distinguished minority leader and the help of the distinguished ranking minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from New York and the subcommittee and the conferees. I think they have done a very good job.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We have not done any agency any harm. Under this proposed action the FBI is fully protected, the law-enforcement agencies included herein are fully protected, at a time when we are all so much concerned with crime.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to button this whole thing up. How is this in relation to expenditures for 1967? Is this a lesser amount than 1967 or a greater amount?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is a greater amount to the extent of about $32 million obligationwise. Of course, out of that $32 million, there is $25 million additional to pay contract authorizations previously entered into by the Maritime Administration; so really it is only about $7 million greater than 1967 fiscal year if that amount were deducted.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me, and I hope everybody appreciates my yielding all my time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, immediate adoption of this conference report will be most stimulating and in the best interest of our American merchant marine. It will permit the Maritime Administration to immediately go ahead with the construction of additional ships to carry the American flag on the high seas.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: On page 5, line 1, insert: ", of which such amount as may be necessary may be transferred to the appropriation under this heading for the fiscal year 1967."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF NEW YORK

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rooney of New York moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the motion was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the conference report and on the motion, and in making that request I should like to thank my distinguished friends the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg], the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Andrews], and all those on the majority side for their unusual cooperation in working out a good bill, which is what we have for 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10915, REDUCTION OF EXTRA-LONG-STAPLE COTTON QUOTA

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on rules, I call up House Resolution 827 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 827

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10915) to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Quillen], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 827 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 10915 to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The purpose of H.R. 10915 is to reduce the present global quota on extra-long-staple cotton by an amount equal to the average imports during the 5-quota-year period 1961–66 from nations which severed diplomatic relations with the United States during the 1-year period prior to the enactment of this legislation. Any such nations—the United Arab Republic and the Republic of the Sudan at the present time—would also be prohibited from participating in the reduced global quota for extra-long-staple cotton until such future time as the Congress might change the basic applicable statutes. At the same time, it would afford domestic producers of extra-long-staple cotton the opportunity to expand their production to meet the demand in the United States for an amount of extra-long-staple cotton equal to the amount of the imports reduced by the bill.

The bill applies only to the quota for extra-long-staple cotton. It does not apply to any shorter staple lengths. It does not involve in any manner the importation of textiles.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 827 providing for immediate consideration of H.R. 10915.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Are there any waivers of points of order in the rule? Apparently copies are not available.

Mr. SISK. I am sorry; they should be available. I say to my colleague from Missouri, it is an open rule, with no waiver of points of order.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] has stated, House Resolution 827 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 10915.

The purpose of H.R. 10915 is to reduce the present global quota on extra-long-staple cotton by an amount equal to the average imports during the 5-quota-year period 1961–66 from nations which severed diplomatic relations with the United States during the 1-year-period prior to the enactment of the legislation.

Any such nations—the United Arab Republic and the Republic of the Sudan at the present time—would also be prohibited from participating in the reduced global quota for extra-long-staple cotton until such future time as the Congress might change the basic applicable statutes.

At the same time, it would afford domestic producers of extra-long-staple cotton the opportunity to expand their production to meet the demand in the United States for an amount of extra-long-staple cotton equal to the amount of the imports reduced by the bill.

This bill applies only to the quota for extra-long-staple cotton—that is, cotton with a staple length of 1⅜ inches or longer. It does not apply to any shorter staple lengths—that is, long-staple cotton or upland cotton.

This legislation does not involve in any manner the importation of textiles.

There are no departmental views expressed in the report, nor are there any minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule. I have no requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 13510, INCREASE BASIC PAY FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 952 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 952

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13510) to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 952 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 13510 to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The basic purpose of H.R. 13510 is to provide necessary cost-of-living adjustments in the regular compensation of members of the uniformed services, both active and retirees. To accomplish this purpose, the proposed legislation—

First. Increases the rates of basic monthly pay to provide a 4.5-percent increase in "regular compensation."

Second. Increases the allowances provided under the Dependents Assistance Act for enlisted personnel in the lowest pay grades with less than 4 years of military service.

Third. Provides authority to pay the basic allowance for quarters and the dislocation allowance to certain bachelor personnel in conjunction with a permanent change of station.

Fourth. Provides a special basic pay rate for the senior noncommissioned officer position of each military service.

Fifth. Provides authority for the payment of "continuation pay" to physicians and dentists of the uniformed services to insure their retention on active duty beyond their obligated periods of service.

Sixth. Provides a needed refinement in the formula for computing future increases in the retired pay of uniformed services personnel responsive to changes in the Consumer Price Index.

Seventh. Eliminates an inequity in the computation of retired pay for personnel retired prior to the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

Eighth. Provides language which will insure that uniformed services personnel will, in the future, be given increases in the level of their compensation comparable to that enjoyed by their civilian contemporaries in the Federal Government.

Certainly, the men and women of the uniformed services are entitled to an adjustment in compensation to assure them and their families that their compensation for service will be on a scale comparable to that of their 2.5 million civilian coworkers, and to insure retention in sufficient numbers of skilled manpower.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 952 in order that H.R. 13510 may be considered.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the able gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] has stated, this bill under the provisions of the rule comes to us under an open rule providing for 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the pay and other benefits received by the uniformed services in an amount comparable to the pay increases recently approved by the House in H.R. 7977.

A 4.5-percent pay increase is provided. Dependents allowances are increased for enlisted personnel in the lowest grades, E-1 through E-4, who have less than 4 years of military service. A special basic pay rate is provided for senior noncommissioned officers. Language is also included which will guarantee comparable pay increases for the uniformed services when civilian employees have their wages increased.

The wage increases are to take effect on October 1, 1967. For the 9 months of fiscal 1968, the cost of the 4.5-percent pay increase will cost $544,400,000. The other increases included in the bill raise the costs in this fiscal year to $626,100,000. For the entire fiscal year 1969, the costs are $726 million and $810,400,000, respectively.

As noted, the bill is tied to the provisions of the recently House-passed H.R. 7977. That bill provides for a pay raise on October 1, 1967, and two additional pay raises over the next 2 years to bring Federal employees up to comparability with employees in private industry. The cost of the second and third increases are therefore difficult to tie down; this also causes the later pay raises provided by this bill to be vague as to amount. The difference is significant, and estimates are generally lower than actual costs. Depending on the future rate of increases for civilian employees, the uniformed services increases authorized by the bill will range from a total cost, over fiscal 1968 through 1970, of $1,752,200,000 to a top figure of $2,769,400,000.

The committee reported the bill without dissent. The Department of Defense supports the bill as does the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time. However, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a little information, for the benefit of the Members of the House, with reference to the program for tomorrow which necessitates our leaders seeking an early meeting in spite of committee meetings and other plans?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. HALL. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I shall be glad to advise the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that we have a major conference report tomorrow having to do with congressional redistricting. Also, we have a major legislative bill, as the gentleman from Missouri well knows, being a member of the Committee on Armed Services, for the consideration of the House, the military pay bill. Also, there may be other conference reports for the consideration of the House.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, it was my understanding that we were going to consider the conference report on congressional redistricting today.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further ?

Mr. HALL. I yield further to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, we shall have, probably, three conference reports on appropriation bills.

Mr. HALL. But we are not going to consider that today, the conference report on the reapportioning of congressional districts?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct, we are not going to consider it today.

Mr. HALL. It is a little difficult to keep up with the reprograming actions on the program on the floor today.

Mr. ALBERT. This change in the program was made at the request of a very distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALL. Then we will consider the military pay bill tomorrow, and the conference report on the reapportioning?

Mr. ALBERT. And conference reports on certain appropriation bills.

Mr. HALL. For a total of three; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. Probably a total of three.

Mr. HALL. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it the plan of the distinguished majority leader to schedule business other than the joint session on Friday?

Mr. ALBERT. Not if we finish the business that is pending; not if we finish the pending legislative business.

Mr. HALL. That is a pretty big "if."

Mr. ALBERT. If we do not finish it, we will have to finish it on Friday.

Mr. HALL. That would require a unanimous consent, would it not, to declare a recess?

Mr. ALBERT. To declare a recess would require unanimous consent, but not continuing with the legislative program if it is not finished tomorrow.

Mr. HALL. But unanimous consent has not yet been given on declaring a recess.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe, if the gentleman will refer back, we did obtain unanimous consent for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time on Friday, which is the customary unanimous-consent request when we have a distinguished visitor.

Mr. HALL. I know it is customary for that purpose, but not in addition to other business.

Mr. ALBERT. It would be only for that purpose.

Mr. HALL. As the distinguished majority leader will remember, this was obtained on Friday, October 20, past—but it was then stated that such permission was for the sole purpose of the Speaker declaring a recess for the joint session.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, in view of the press of business.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REDUCTION OF EXTRA-LONG-STAPLE COTTON QUOTA

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10915) to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10915, with Mr. PUCINSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is intended to correct what has long appeared to many of us to be a fundamental error or injustice in the present quota laws of the United States.

At the present time our American extra-long-staple cotton growers—and extra-long-staple cotton is something quite different from ordinary cotton, and is under a different quota—have a quota in the United States of extra-long-staple cotton of roughly 75,000 bales. Foreign nations, of which the United Arab Republic is the largest supplier, have a quota of 82,500 bales, or a little more than half of our American requirements.

The suggestion has been made that Americans cannot produce this much, but those very American farmers did produce it in the 1963 and 1964 season. They produced 161,200 bales of extra-long-staple cotton, which is more than we are using. We are using about 150,000 bales a year.

Foreign nations are supplying about 60 percent.

This legislation simply says that we will take the quota from any country which has broken diplomatic relations with the United States during this current year and will then transfer it to the American producers.

The effect of that would be to take from the United Arab Republic about 56,000 bales; from the Sudan about 400 bales and it will leave Peru which is the only large supplier of extra-long-staple cotton exactly where it had been during the last 5 years, or an average of approximately 27,000 bales of cotton, of extra-long-staple cotton per year.

There has been the suggestion further raised that we might run into some kind of shortage. But the figures of the Department of Agriculture show that instead of a shortage, the carryover as of August 1, 1967, excluding the stockpile was 232,000 bales, which is about as much as we will use in a year and a half without any production or without any importation.

We have a stockpile of 34,000 bales which is not included in these figures. In these figures, the Commodity Credit Corporation owns 125,000 bales so it does not appear that there could possibly be any shortage of extra-long-staple cotton in the United States.

The question boils down to this. Do we feel that we have a greater obligation to the cottongrowers of the United Arab Republic or to the cottongrowers of extreme west Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California because, frankly, that is the only area which grows this extra-long-staple cotton.

So that there may be no confusion, I do not want to suggest to any of our Members from the Deep South that they are growing any extra-long-staple cotton, because they are not.

Extra-long-staple cotton is defined in the law as being 1⅜ inches in staple length or more and it is actually ginned on a roller gin whereas ordinary cotton is ginned on a saw gin.

The result is there is no competition between the extra-long-staple cotton and ordinary upland cotton.

Ordinary upland cotton is a very large and important crop. Extra-long-staple cotton is a very limited crop in a very limited area, but it is of extreme importance to the people of those areas in which it is grown. We feel, at least I think I speak the view of the members of the Committee on Agriculture—we feel that those people in the United States who are in a position to grow this cotton should be allowed to grow it rather than to see their production curtailed because of importations of extra-long-staple cotton from the United Arab Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is about all the bill covers and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues and the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and the distinguished minority leader of the House Committee on Agriculture in urging enactment of this legislation. I am one of its cosponsors and represent a large cotton-producing area of the high plains of Texas.

Although cotton producers of my district do not grow extra-long-staple cotton, I feel that enactment of this bill will benefit the cotton industry generally.

Imports of Egyptian and other foreign-produced cotton has displaced substantial domestic acreage that could certainly be used to good advantage by U.S. cotton farmers.

This bill would permit an increase in production by American farmers of some 69,000 bales previously supplied by Egypt. This would virtually double U.S. production which now amounts to about 70,000 bales a year.

Cotton acreage has been severely curtailed for the past 2 years under the 1965 act in a successful effort to reduce a huge surplus to a manageable level. That goal has now been accomplished and we are attempting to rebuild our export trade. We are also growing a better quality cotton than ever before and, in fact, have no need for the extra-long-staple cotton that we have been buying from Egypt.

The National Cotton Council of America has advised me that American extra-long-staple producers are fully capable of supplying our entire domestic market for this type of cotton.

Over the last two decades, those producers have greatly improved the quality of their fiber through heavy research investments and have also assessed themselves $3 a bale to promote their product under the trade name "SuPima."

I feel that our domestic producers are entitled to the full share of a market they have developed through their own efforts and money. And I feel that this is especially desirable in view of the presently depressed state of the entire farm economy—the low level of farm parity prices and the severe cutback cotton farmers have taken in order to reduce surplus stocks.

But, on top of this, I can see no sound or logical reason why we should continue to reserve a large part of our domestic market for this type of cotton for a country that has not only severed relations with us, but continues to stir up trouble in the Middle East.

Not satisfied with having created one world crisis, President Nasser now twists the lion's tail again—with Soviet assistance—by sinking an Israel destroyer.

Nasser has severed diplomatic relations with the United States and had even before that, told us to take our foreign aid and go jump in the lake.

I recall that a few years ago Mr. Nasser made a deal with the Soviets for some tanks and guns for which they agreed to take cotton in part payment. That cotton was then dumped on the world market to lower the price Egypt got for cotton she sold to other countries.

So I believe we should now let Mr. Nasser take the cotton we have been paying hard American dollars for and let him make another deal with the Communists and see if he might then appreciate what Nasser calls, imperialistic U.S. dollars he would lose.

I believe it is high time we told Mr. Nasser to take his cotton somewhere else—we do not need it—and I am tired of seeing us turn the other cheek every time Mr. Nasser slaps us. In fact, he is now kicking us in the teeth and I can see no reason to continue our attempts at appeasement.

There is apparently only one language Mr. Nasser, as a Communist stooge, understands, and that is the language of force and forceful action. I hope we will impress Mr. Nasser with our vote here today that we will no longer force ourselves or our U.S. dollars on him.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE]. I commend him for his outstanding remarks in the House on behalf of the American foreign policy and the American farmer, who is decreasing in numbers because of the economic disadvantage he has today in the market system.

I also commend the gentleman from Texas for his close sponsorship of this bill. It is a good bill, and I hope it is favorably considered today in the House. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Is long-staple cotton either in surplus or is it paid any subsidy? I do not believe it is, is it?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. No. At the present time—and the chairman will correct me if this is not so—long-staple cotton is selling well above the support price.

Mr. ADAMS. In other words, it is selling above the support price and does not need a subsidy. It is not in surplus in the United States. We are not stockpiling it as a surplus commodity, nor is the Commodity Credit Corporation stockpiling it?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. We are stockpiling it. We have 30,000 bales of extra-long-staple cotton in stockpile now which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns. There is in storage 135,000 bales of extra-long-staple cotton now, and there is something like 50,000 bales in the hands of the trade at the present time.

There is enough extra-long-staple cotton in the United States at the present time to last us, at the present consumption rate, for about a year and a half or a year and 9 months.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman of the committee, is this defense stockpiled or is it stockpiled in order to maintain price in this case? As I understand it from the testimony that came out in the Agriculture Committee on the agriculture bill, long staple cotton is in pretty good supply. It has not been supported and does not need that, and it is capable of supporting itself.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly true that long-staple cotton is not receiving any kind of subsidized price. There are 30,000 bales presently in stockpile, purchased during the Korean war. We have not been able to get it out of the stockpile in this time. The U.S. Government has an investment in it, and is losing storage and carrying charges on it every day.

I do not think it can be said we are not faced with a surplus of cotton. We are faced with an excess of foreign long-staple cotton in the United States, because this is foreign cotton which we are talking about that is in the stockpiles. There are about 50,000 bales of American cotton in the hands of the trade. It is a substantially large amount, and we will get the new crop in within the next few months, so by the first of the year there will be enough long-staple cotton to run us for two and a half years.

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BRASCO].

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10915. The thrust of this bill is for us in the Congress to declare unequivocally that we will not continue to subsidize to any extent countries who think so little of us as to withdraw their diplomatic recognition, while using the benefit of our trade to continually stir unrest in the Middle East and to continually maintain a state of war with a small democratic nation, the State of Israel, which has been a declared friend of ours and which country has so many historical ties with ours.

The second thrust of this bill, under these circumstances, is to allow American producers of cotton the opportunity to supply this extra-long-staple cotton. Under present world circumstances I would think it most unwise and unjust to allow otherwise to happen.

I call attention of the House to an amendment that I intend to introduce at the proper time, which I think will cure an injustice and possibly an oversight on the part of the committee. There have been a number of American cotton importers who have entered into contracts with the countries affected by this bill. The thrust of the amendment which I will introduce at the proper time would allow these companies who already contracted for cotton, to complete their contracts. I think this is only fair and fitting under the circumstances. I hope the House will see fit to adopt the amendment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this legislation. During the many hours of hearings held by our committee on the question of increasing minimum wages and maximum hours, the question of imports in general came into great discussion—and cotton was one of the imports.

Recently there has been quite a barrage of high talent parading its wares in all of the daily newspapers about the Congress taking a so-called protection racket stand. One of the great pro forma arguments of the so-called free traders is that it is necessary to trade with a nation, whether we need the product or not, in order that the nation join the family of nations in a friendly, neighborly way of life.

We have been buying cotton from the United Arab Republic when we have had a surplus of cotton in the long staples and would have a sufficiency for all our needs if our long staple cotton growers were given the go sign to produce as much as it is possible to produce.

However, following the free trade theory, we bought from the United Arab Republic, from the Sudan, and from others, in the hope and in the prayer that this would create within these nations two things.

One was a feeling of good neighborliness, which of course they have not displayed to the neighbors next door to then in any instance. And they have not revealed any kind of an appreciative friendship for the United States.

The second thing the free traders have said is that when we buy from these nations and give them our markets, whether we have a use for the markets or not, we create within their economy a higher wage base and a better way of life for those who produce the goods for shipment to the United States.

Now, long-staple cotton is a very important point in this discussion, because it flows through the markets of the United States not at a cutrate price but at a high premium price, equal to the high price that must be paid for American cotton produced at wage levels our economy demands. Yet there have been no increased advantages to the workers in the United Arab Republic. There have been no symptoms of peaceful relationship or peaceful coexistence with their neighbors or with others.

It has been proved beyond a doubt that the time has long passed when we can discuss the economics of trade in relation to international diplomacy.

So this legislation is of great importance at this time not merely because of the fact that the United Arab Republic ought to be at least told how we feel, but also because it is a lesson in trade economics which ought not to be missed by any Member of this House.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that we have not given adequate consideration to the foreign policy aspects of this legislation which is here before us today. In an effort to try to clarify some questions which are in my mind, and I presume in the minds of others, I should like to put certain questions to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

The first question I should like to ask is, Is this legislation as now proposed permanent?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. This legislation is permanent legislation.

Mr. ADAIR. If it is to be changed, then, it would require affirmative legislative action by the Congress in the future?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right. It would require exactly the kind of legislative action which is required to change the existing law today.

Mr. ADAIR. A following question would be, Is there any discretion left to the President in this bill as proposed? Suppose, for example, that he should find that it would be in the national interest to change what we are doing here today, to modify it in any way. Does he have any discretion whatsoever?

Mr. POAGE. This is legislation by the Congress and not by the Executive. This is legislation which fixes the policy as determined by the Congress. It does not pass authority to fix policy into the hands of the Executive.

Mr. ADAIR. Then the specific answer to the question is that there is no Presidential discretion in this bill.

Mr. POAGE. That is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. Further, Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman give us the attitude of the Departments of Agriculture and State with respect to this proposed legislation?

Mr. POAGE. I cannot because I cannot find out just what their feelings are. We have tried to find out from both of these Departments and have had their people up before the committee. I cannot, in all honesty, tell you what the real attitude of either one of those Departments is. The State Department made it rather plain that they were opposed to the bill in its present form. I presume that the amendment by the gentleman from Washington will probably meet their objections, but it would kill the bill. I must, therefore, accept their statement at face value.

Mr. ADAIR. Did the Department of Agriculture give any indication, Mr. Chairman, as to whether it favored or opposed this bill?

Mr. POAGE. They gave us the State Department report. I presume they were following instructions.

Mr. ADAIR. I am sorry. I did not hear the last part of the statement.

Mr. POAGE. I presume they were instructed to file the same report that the State Department did, because they sent us a copy of the State Department report.

Mr. ADAIR. Which, as the gentleman just indicated, is moderately in opposition to the bill?

Mr. POAGE. I would say it is in opposition.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The committee report on page 10, lines 4 and 5, indicates that there was a report from the Department of Agriculture. I wonder how the chairman reconciles that statement with his statement that he has no idea what the legislative departments desire.

Mr. POAGE. I said the report of the Department of Agriculture was identical to the State Department's report, and I assume it must have been sent under instructions. Therefore, I cannot tell you what the feeling of the Department of Agriculture is.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Agriculture uses the same words as the letter which is in the committee report signed by William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. That is exactly what I mean.

Mr. ADAIR. I have a further question. If this legislation is adopted, it does not reduce the amount of cotton that can be produced and made available to users in the United States, does it?

Mr. POAGE. It would leave the total quota exactly where it is today. Yes, sir.

Mr. ADAIR. Do I understand it would permit domestic producers then to increase their production?

Mr. POAGE. By exactly the amount it takes away from the United Arab Republic and Sudan.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman a moment ago stated that there were 30,000 bales now in storage.

Mr. POAGE. Yes. In stockpile. There is much more in storage.

Mr. ADAIR. And 135,000 bales held——

Mr. POAGE. Held by CCC.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is an expert in this field. Is that an adequate amount? Is it too great an amount?

Mr. POAGE. In my judgment, it is about four times what the stockpile and reserve should be.

Mr. ADAIR. Therefore, we are not, by the passage of this legislation, if it does become law, getting to the question of too much cotton? We are simply saying to the United Arab Republic and Sudan that for the foreseeable future you cannot sell your cotton to the United States.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right. That is the only point in question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Is the gentleman trying to suggest that if you enact this legislation, we will only temporarily deprive the United Arab Republic and Sudan of their participation? The deprivation is going to be permanent, and the Members ought to know that it will be permanent. They ought to know that if we get or we hope to get a new and more liberal attitude on the part of that state or perhaps a change in regime more friendly to peace in the Middle East and to relations with the United States and we do resume diplomatic relations with them and want to encourage them to follow a more liberal policy, it will be impossible because of this legislation to assist them with their economy.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the gentleman did not get the thrust of my earlier remarks when I sought to develop that point of view.

Mr. FOLEY. I did indeed, and I compliment the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair] for his remarks. I only wanted to make the record clear to the effect that with reference to my introducing this amendment, it would make clear to the Sudan and to the United Arab Republic something that is not going to be restored, something that the United Nations cannot restore, something that can be restored only by this legislation.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by saying that the remedy proposed here is far too drastic for the malady. It seems to me it is too restrictive and may not in the long run be in the best interest of our country. Certainly the regime of Mr. Nasser deserves criticism from us, but hopefully it may soon be replaced by a better one.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, this legislation has never been misrepresented by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage]. The distinguished gentleman from Texas is an able man, he is a knowledgeable man and he is an honest man.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this legislation is to take the cotton quotas away from the United Arab Republic and the Sudan and give them permanently to the farmers in the Southwestern United States.

This bill will interfere with the flexibility of the President of the United States in conducting foreign affairs, and, if adopted will not be of any meaningful help to the cotton farmers of the United States, farmers whom I would like to help and who I will vote to help if we have a reasonable piece of legislation designed to do that.

Mr. Chairman, cotton is in a depressed state. Cotton prices are down and the cotton farmers of our country need assistance, but not by this means. Less than 2 percent of the cotton growers of the United States are involved. This bill does not direct the provisions thereof toward helping the cotton farmers

throughout the States of the Union, or even the four States where cotton is grown.

However, if adopted, it would do and cause immense mischief in the conduct of our foreign affairs and which could result in damage to our interests; and incidentally the interests of Israel—a strong U.S. friend and ally.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members of this House encourage a reasonable attitude by United Arab Republic toward other nations in the Middle East, as well as a more liberal regime in the United Arab Republic, itself, they should realize that we will be less able to encourage that sort of result through the adoption of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, no one deplores more than I the precipitate and irrational behavior of the United Arab Republic. That nation's activities have jeopardized not only the legitimate security interests of the State of Israel but the peace of the world in recent months. The Egyptian sinking of the Israel destroyer *Eilat* in the Mediterranean on Saturday night is simply the latest in a series of Egyptian provocations. But the Egyptian attack and the not unexpected Israel retaliation is also a vivid reminder of the necessity for getting a lasting Middle East settlement at the earliest possible time. The United States is taking the lead in trying to arrange a durable accommodation. And the President needs every tool he can get to help speed the realization of a peaceful Middle East. My amendment would enable the President to make use of the provisions of H.R. 10915 to encourage such a settlement. The changes I propose would make H.R. 10915 one of a number of incentives for the United Arab Republic to return to a policy of reason, and to acquiesce in the legitimate security interests of the State of Israel. Without these or similar changes, H.R. 10915 must be seen as a narrowly protectionist bill which also severely complicates our efforts to make peace in the Middle East. An unamended H.R. 10915 strikes not only at the economy of the United Arab Republic. It is also a blow to the interests of the United States and the State of Israel.

In brief, my amendment would—

First. Leave unchanged the global quota of extra-long-staple cotton.

Second. Give the President discretionary authority to restore the participation of the United Arab Republic and the Sudan in the quota after diplomatic relations have been restored.

Imports of extra-long-staple cotton—ELS—are limited to an annual quota established under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended. The quota is global; that is, it is not allocated to specific countries.

The maintenance of such a quota has been excepted from U.S. obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT. However, we are obligated under the GATT to administer quantitative restrictions on a nondiscriminatory basis.

The ELS quota for the 1967–68 marketing year is approximately 82,500 bales. H.R. 10915, however, would have the effect of permanently reducing the quota to approximately 27,000 bales. Domestic production would be relied upon to make up the shortfall.

H.R. 10915 would permanently bar the United Arab Republic and the Sudan from shipping ELS to the United States. ELS cotton is Egypt's oldest and principal export to the United States.

By limiting imports of ELS to some 27,000 bales a year, H.R. 10915 also would hinder trade relationships under the Alliance for Progress. Peru, the only other major supplier of ELS to the United States in the past, shipped nearly 43,000 bales to this country in 1965–66.

LONG-STAPLE COTTON IN THE UNITED STATES

What is our domestic economic interest in long-staple cotton?

Mr. Chairman, let us consider these facts:

Extra-long-staple cotton—ELS for short—is grown on less than 4,000 farms in the United States. Upland cotton is grown on nearly 700,000 farms.

ELS constitutes no more than 1 percent of the cotton grown in this country. Production in the 1966–67 cotton year totaled only 73,000 bales out of a total cotton crop of over 9 million bales.

ELS is grown in only four States. It accounts for 2 percent or less of the total cotton production of these four States; for 2 percent of the farms growing cotton there; and for 1 percent of the cotton acreage harvested.

The entire domestic production of ELS in 1966–67 had a market value of only $17 million. The cost to the Government, not including interest or investment or the cost of irrigating land, of producing this $17 million crop was about $7.5 million.

My amendment to H.R. 10915 would also assure adequate availabilities of extra-long-staple cotton to consumers during a period when the provisions of the legislation might be invoked.

Domestic extra-long-staple cotton is planted in the spring of the year, harvested in the fall, and marketed through July 31 of the following year. During this period of over a year, it would not be possible for domestic producers to increase production in order to meet shortfalls in supply which may result from the enactment of the bill.

Accordingly, my amendment would give the Secretary of Agriculture discretion to draw upon inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation to meet such shortfalls. Without this additional provision, temporary shortages in the supply of extra-long-staple cotton to consumers could result.

There seems to be a feeling in some quarters, Mr. Chairman, that the section 22 import quota is a device that permits foreign producers to invade a market that by right and tradition belongs to domestic producers. Again nothing could be further from the truth. As long ago as the twenties, some 30 years before extra-long-staple cotton was put under section 22, imports of ELS totaled as high as 300,000 bales a year. In recent years, however, the section 22 quota has totaled only 82,481 bales a year; and H.R. 10915 would reduce it still further to slightly under 27,000 bales.

TRADE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

We know that in 1966 our exports to the United Arab Republic and the Sudan totaled $202.9 million, while our imports from the same two countries were valued at only $24.2 million, leaving a net export balance of $178.7 million in our favor.

Out of the $202.9 million of exports, $75.6 million—or three times the value of our imports—were commercial operations, privately financed. Of the remaining $127.3 million of exports—privately produced and exported through the private trade, but Government financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation or under Public Law 480—only $5.4 million was in the form of donations. Some $73.3 million is repayable in dollars; $15.1 million is returnable in the form of goods or services for which we otherwise would have to expend foreign exchange; and $33.5 million is for use in mutually agreed development projects in the recipient country. Our most recent Public Law 480 agreements with the United Arab Republic ran out on June 30, 1966.

Furthermore, the ability of the U.S. Government to collect debts already owed to it by the United Arab Republic for exports financed by CCC credits or under Public Law 480 depends, in part, on the State of the United Arab Republic economy.

WAR AND PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. Chairman, let us not hinder the restoration of peace to the Middle East and thereby jeopardize the security the State of Israel has earned so many times over, by approving a narrow and protectionist bill. The administration strongly supports my approach—through the instant amendment—to turning H.R. 10915 into a useful instrument of U.S. foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, this House has a responsibility to do all it can to strengthen the President's hand in resolving the chronic and increasingly perilous Middle East crisis.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I certainly want to agree with the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY]. In my opinion this would represent direct interference with the conduct of our foreign policy by the President of the United States. I wonder if the Committee on Agriculture went into the GATT agreements during the hearings, a matter toward which we should direct our attention in discussing this bill?

Mr. FOLEY. I think the distinguished chairman refers to the obligation which we may incur under GATT if this bill passes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, who is going to pick up the check with reference to this proposed action?

Mr. FOLEY. I think the taxpayers of the United States will have to do it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this course of action which is being recommended by the Committee on Agriculture in my opinion impinges upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The President certainly should have discretionary authority to restore the participation of the United Arab Republic and the Sudan in the quota after diplomatic relations have been restored.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman from Washington discuss the nature of his substitute? I missed the first part of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. FOLEY. My substitute, if adopted, will simply give authority to the President of the United States to restore these quota participations in the event that the U.A.R. or other nations who break off diplomatic relations, resume them and if the President finds that the restoration of the quota participations is in the national interest.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Washington who was just in the well, I would appreciate a little clarification on the amendment the gentleman plans to offer.

Am I correct that the amendment would give the President discretion to restore quotas to either Sudan or the United Arab Republic when and if diplomatic relations with those countries are restored?

Mr. FOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct. The President would have no discretion to restore those quotas until and unless diplomatic relations were restored, and only if he makes a finding that it is in the national interest of the United States so to do.

Mr. FINDLEY. I want to congratulate the gentleman. I really feel that his amendment would improve the bill immensely, and make the bill very much in order.

I can sympathize with anyone who wants to give vent to anti-Nasser feelings under the present circumstances. I have been a critic of that regime repeatedly, and I have complained about the extent of the U.S. taxpayer aid that has gone to Nasser in recent years during a period when he has undercut every one of our policies in Africa and the Middle East. But it seems to me unfortunate for the Congress of the United States to simply shut the door forever on any business with Egypt in regard to extra-long-staple cotton. This is I believe the oldest item of commerce we have with that country, and it stretches back many years. And even though we are disgruntled over the turn of events in Egypt presently, we all hope for a better day, and there are very few tools of influence that we have at our disposal in the Arab world. Certainly one of them would be the hope on the part of that country that by acquiring more responsible leadership Egypt could once more sell us some cotton.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will be glad to yield further.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] has been outspoken in his criticism of the present regime in the United Arab Republic, and he has commented time and time again to my knowledge on the outrageous conduct of that regime. He has been one of the leaders in the House in that regard. So I am especially grateful for his comments today. He is concerned, as I am, that this bill is not striking a blow at the present regime; it is striking a blow at a future, and hopefully more liberal regime that we all hope will lead Egypt to peace with Israel and stability and progress in the Middle East. If such a regime comes to power we do not wish to be powerless to encourage it.

Mr. FINDLEY. Those who attended the briefing presented by the Department of State today must recognize the tremendous strategic importance Egypt has in the future of Africa and of the Middle East. Our position in NATO is far different than it was a few years ago. Soviet influence is growing not only in the eastern approach to the Mediterranean but the western as well. It is highly important that we keep open every opportunity for better relationships with Egypt, because of its influence on the Suez Canal. I favor cutting off quotas under present circumstances but feel the action should not be permanent.

Mr. FOLEY. I agree with that statement, and I suggest, and I believe the gentleman will agree, that the Soviet Union is trying to fish in the troubled waters of the Middle East, and I believe this bill would only trouble the water a little bit more, and make the fishing a little bit better.

Mr. FINDLEY. May I ask a question if there is any precedent for this Congress to specifically disqualify a nation permanently from a quota?

Has this ever happened before?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. A few years ago Cuba had 98 percent of the sugar quota in the United States. Today Cuba has not one single pound of sugar quota.

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, but I am sure that the gentleman will recognize that the Sugar Act is a 5-year act, whereas today we are dealing with permanent legislation without any terminal date. I am sure the gentleman will agree with that point, and I urge my colleagues——

Mr. POAGE. I ask the gentleman what difference does it make?

Mr. FINDLEY. It makes a great deal of difference, because at the termination of that 5-year period the Congress will then decide whether or not quotas should be established for Cuba. Under the present proposal I question whether the Congress might ever consider the question as to whether Egypt and Sudan would get quotas for extra-long-staple cotton.

I hope that the Members will support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Washington.

If that amendment fails to become a part of the legislation, I do urge an opposition vote on this bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the position of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, in support of H.R. 10915.

Mr. Chairman, my district produces some of the world's finest extra long staple cotton. Producers have put forth many years of organized effort to improve its quality and develop its markets. Despite these efforts, the growers have suffered severely from acreage reductions and unfavorable regulations. As a result, as has been indicated by my distinguished colleagues, production has decreased greatly.

For many years, the cotton farmers of my district have labored under unequal competition. At a time when they have tried to build a strong long staple cotton industry, against the influx of synthetics and all the other ailments afflicting the cotton industry, our country has permitted increasing quotas of imports from such countries as Egypt. When they have asked why, the answer has been that this is in the best interests of good international relations.

Now, one country to which we have given such favored treatment, Egypt, has repaid our favor by severing relations with our country, damning us before the world, and concocting the most irresponsible of charges in an effort to draw us into a worldwide conflict. Under these conditions, how can we now explain to the American farmer that these quotas are in the best interests of international relations? How far can we go before we pay more deference to our own farmer who is trying to harden the sinews of our economy?

I think the time has arrived for a revision of our policy, and therefore, I am pleased to be a coauthor of this bill.

At the present time, the import quota for extra long staple cotton, largely supplied by Egypt, is 85,600 bales, which could be produced here in the United States. The producers of this cotton have suffered considerable reductions in allotments over the last few years. To give you some indication of how drastic these cuts have been, in 1963 the allotment was 149,880 acres; in 1966 it was 70,500 acres, a cut of more than one-half. Not only are the producers of this cotton able, but they are anxious to fill the market for what has been supplied previously by Egypt.

We do not face a shortage by cutting off Egyptian imports, because there are now stocks of approximately 200,000 bales in this country.

For these reasons, I strongly urge favorable action on H.R. 10915.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer my support to H.R.

10915 which would bar the importation of extra long staple cotton from the countries that have broken diplomatic relations with the United States.

It is my understanding that this bill would cancel the import quotas of the United Arab Republic and the Sudan. This reduction in imports would amount to a decrease in imports of approximately 56,000 bales of long staple cotton. This represents a market of approximately $12 million in the United States.

In the past few months, I have read with interest the vile and untrue manner in which the officials of the United Arab Republic have criticized the role of the United States in the Middle East crisis. In fact, the United States along with Israel has been made the whipping boy for every problem imaginable in the United Arab Republic.

The record reflects that the United States has offered financial and technical assistance in the face of violent criticism through the years to the United Arab Republic and the Sudan. In that these countries have severed diplomatic relations with the United States, I believe they have made clear their positions toward the United States. It is time for a reappraisal of our entire trade policy with these countries.

In light of the fact that the long staple cotton producers of our country are capable of producing an amount of long staple cotton ample for the needs of this country and are willing to do so, I believe that they should be given the opportunity.

For 31 years our Government has permitted the importation of long staple cotton. Since 1951 the number of bales imported from the United Arab Republic has varied from 66,900 bales in 1951 to 44,500 in 1966. Since 1962 the average allotment for domestic production has been reduced by 50 percent. So, it appears that our trade policy has been geared to assist a belligerent critic of the United States and at the same time reduce an important segment of the cotton industry to a stepchild status.

Mr. Chairman, I believe now is the time to take action which has been long overdue in behalf of the long staple cotton producers of this country. I urge that H.R. 10915 be favorably considered by the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. In doing so, I would point out that my district does not produce any of the long staple cotton. But I think this bill is in our national interest.

I also would like to say I have examined the proposed amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BRASCO]. I think it is fair and equitable and I also support that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I see it, the major question in H.R. 10915 is whether we are going to vote in the national interest of the United States or the national interest of Egypt. This bill would deny those countries which break diplomatic relations with the United States the right to sell extra long staple cotton in the United States at the expense of our domestic cotton producers.

For us to continue to support the Egyptian cotton industry, which is the mainstay of the Egyptian economy, enables the Nasser government to have the means with which to obtain Russian arms, to create instability in the East, to condemn America in the U.N., and to oppose the United States on every front, is a national disgrace. At last, I am glad to have the opportunity to show where I stand on this issue.

I can see no justification, diplomatically or otherwise, for the insistence by certain agencies of this Government that we should continue to be a willing market for Egypt's major cash crop. It was Egypt that took the initiative in breaking diplomatic relations with the United States, and this in itself is sufficient justification for our taking like measures. If Egypt chooses to break diplomatic relations, she must realize that every move the United States makes cannot be predicated on what is best for Egypt. Not only did Egypt break diplomatic relations but Egyptian mobs have burned our flag, destroyed our libraries, and desecrated American diplomatic missions in Egypt.

This cotton we have been importing is of strategic importance, and shortages of this cotton created a national emergency when supplies ran out during the Korean war. I think it is time that we lessen our dependence on an unfriendly nation for the supply of this vital speciality cotton, particularly when domestic producers are fully capable of meeting our consumption requirements.

Our domestic producers have had their acreage allotments cut from a high of 149,880 acres in 1962 to 70,500 acres for 1968—an action necessary to prevent surpluses from becoming unmanageable and to allow Egypt to send an average of 56,000 bales of cotton to the United States each year. Our American producers are willing and anxious to supply this cotton, and I think that our American producers who have done so much to promote their cotton should be given the opportunity to produce the supplies that heretofore have been produced in Egypt generating funds enabling the Nasser government to continue its harassment of the United States on every front.

Mr. Chairman, a vote for this bill is in the national interest of the United States, and I urge the passage of H.R. 10915.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have only one more speaker on this side, and suggest that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] yield time on his side.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and in enthusiastic support of the bill.

I trust that the amendment proposed to be offered by the gentleman from Washington will not prevail and that the bill will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my strong support for H.R. 10915, to reduce the import quota on extra-long-staple cotton. The purpose of the bill is to reduce our global import quota by the amount of our imports from nations which have severed diplomatic relations with us; the bill further prohibits such nations from exporting this cotton to the United States under the reduced quota. I strongly oppose the proposed amendment by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] which I believe would take the guts from the bill and which I trust will not prevail.

The cotton quota as established permits imports from the major producers of this cotton, two of which are the United Arab Republic and the Sudan. I am unable to believe that these two countries, which have spurned any diplomatic ties with the United States, have any right to continue to be the beneficiaries of such significant economic support from our consumers. It is my firm conviction that such purely economic arguments as can be mustered against this legislation are considerably overruled by the moral and diplomatic principles reflected in the bill.

During the crop years 1961–66, the United States imported an approximate average of some 80,000 bales of extra-long-staple cotton. These imports came almost exclusively from three countries: Peru, the United Arab Republic, and the Republic of the Sudan. The United Arab Republic supplied the major portion of these imports, an approximate average of 56,000 bales; the Sudan was responsible for an additional 400 bales per year.

It seems to me unconscionable and against the best interests of the United States that we should permit these nations to vilify our country in international forums, to consider us unworthy of diplomatic connections, and yet to continue to reap great economic benefit in trade relations with us. Indeed, it would seem that we are offering economic reward for diplomatic and political misconduct.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation H.R. 10915. I suggest that it is high time that we demonstrate to the world that destructive political machinations on the part of other nations will not go unnoticed and unchecked by the United States.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL].

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

I wish to congratulate the distinguished chairman and the distinguished minority leader of the committee.

I also want to oppose strongly the amendment to this legislation. I think this Nation has been condemned on the international scene during the past decade as much for what has been called dollar diplomacy, as for anything that I can think of. This is the most typical example of attempted dollar diplomacy and I am speaking of the proposed amendment—that I have seen. Not only do I dislike dollar diplomacy, but I hate for that dollar to be taken out of the pockets of that part of agriculture that can least afford it.

I happen to be from the cotton capital market, Memphis, Tenn., and I wish that the people who are talking about poverty could see the poverty in that market. As Members might know, the New Orleans Market has closed. The Memphis Cotton Market is in bad shape. I am not concerned about the effect it might have on some interim regime in Egypt or the Sudan. In fact, I think we should make any treatment like these two nations have given this country a very serious thing that cannot be taken over by one simple act of the President of the United States.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this proposal. It strikes me as a very unwise move, a far more recourse than need be the case if we want to be anti-Arab—and I can understand the temptation to be anti-Arab.

I would like to point out that the administration—both the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture—have come out in flat opposition to the bill as proposed, and I think with good reason. The reason is—and I think this is a major failure—that we are, because two countries have broken relations with us, going to deprive them on a permanent basis of their ability to share in the quota that we give foreign countries. Surely there is no necessity for this kind of penalty for their decision at the height of the Middle East crisis to break off diplomatic relations with us.

I would not say it was dollar diplomacy to suggest that the President should be given the authority to reinstate quotas if in his discretion he feels that advisable, and once diplomatic relations have been resumed, no one is suggesting that there should not be a suspension of this kind of privilege to participate in these quotas during the time when diplomatic relations have been broken off.

To suggest, as has the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, that it makes no difference whether it is a permanent deprivation or a temporary one, is to overlook the far-reaching foreign policy implications of what we are doing. I can understand from a domestic-cotton-producing point of view how we would like this opportunity to get a far larger share of the market. But to do so at the expense of ever being able to restore some of that market to major producers which have provided us with cotton in the past strikes me as a temptation we should resist.

I do hope that we defeat this bill if it should not be amended, and that we vote in favor of the amendment which would make this a temporary proposition, an indication of our present displeasure with two countries, in that specifically we will deprive them of the right to participate in these quotas. I do not think this would be undesirable.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this legislation, not because of the United Arab Republic or the Sudan at all. I have a long history of trying to help long-staple-cotton growers, most unsuccessfully. I have been to the State Department in Republican administrations and in Democratic administrations trying to get something done about the import quota of long-staple cotton. The history of the whole thing is borne out graphically by the fact that the American growers have declined from 149,180 acres in 1963 to 70,500 acres in the current year. The first figure is about half of what it used to be back in the 1950's.

The fact is that the long-stable grower has been going down, down, down. I would like to do something to help him.

This, I believe, is certainly a good thing to do. It has been said that this is a permanent deprivation of a quota. I doubt that that is so, because if this Congress has acted once, it can act again. One Congress, as is well known, cannot bind a subsequent Congress. If we want to give these countries a quota, it can be done by passing another law, as we hopefully will pass this one tonight.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I wish to join my colleague from Arizona in supporting this legislation and urge its adoption by the committee and the House.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 10915 and to give this bill my support today.

I do so, recognizing that this Nation's trade policy should be based on the good of the country as a whole and not just the good of one segment, one area, or one narrow, parochial interest. In this case I think the good of the country will be advanced by an action which, incidentally, will constitute a boost to a given industry.

Patience and long suffering are virtures, whether practiced by individuals or by governments, but they have limits. The large quotas of extra-long-staple cotton assigned to Egypt and the Sudan in past years may have been a good foreign policy risk. Tolerating the antics and abuse of President Nasser may have made sense prior to last June. I have no particular quarrel with the decisions of our administrations from Harding through Johnson to permit a large portion of the domestic market in this commodity to go to Egypt and the Sudan. But I think continued patience and long suffering, after the severance of diplomatic relations by these countries, and after they have accused the United States falsely of making war upon them, would be ridiculous. The world can only read such patience as weakness and such long suffering as stupidity.

Mr. Chairman, the cotton growers of this country are quite capable of producing all of the extra-long-staple cotton previously imported from Egypt and the Sudan, and I think it's time we gave them a chance. They will appreciate the business; Nasser will not.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, my sponsorship of H.R. 10915 arises out of my deep concern over U.S. foreign trade policy affecting the production and sales of the domestic cotton industry. While the legislation under immediate consideration has been precipitated by the recent withdrawal of U.S. recognition by the Egyptian Government, I wish to emphasize that I have long been aware of the manner in which our foreign trade negotiations have prejudiced the position of the American cotton producer with regard to his foreign competitors. My concern has its roots well in advance of the recent Middle East situation.

The action of the Egyptian Government only serves to intensify the skepticism with which I regard recurring trends in our foreign trade policy which works to the neglect and detriment of domestic producers. Those who consider expanding foreign trade to be a panacea for problems in our foreign relations seriously misread both the long- and short-range interests of the United States. Those who seek to expand such trade without regard to its effect on the domestic economy act with even greater irresponsibility. The situation with Egypt is a case in point; it underlines my conviction that it is unrealistic to believe we can trade entrance into our profitable markets for the good will of foreign nation. A policy which turns to expanding imports as a tool of foreign relations can seriously weaken the market position of our own American producers, of whose loyalty we may be certain.

Nevertheless, such has been the case with respect to the importation of cotton. As early as 1951 and 1952, the Department of Agriculture bought roughly 120,000 bales of Egyptain cotton. It has taken 16 years to liquidate this cotton alone, much to the detriment of the domestic long-staple cotton market. In recent years, while the Government has been continually cutting the acreage allocated to cotton production in this country, it has been steadily increasing the volume of cotton imports. In 1966, such importations amounted to more than 1 million bales equivalent of raw cotton. In spite of recurrent evidence to the fact that our cotton industry is being severely hurt by this policy, the trend continues.

The effects of such foreign trade policy have been particularly acute with respect to the importation of long-staple cotton. The acreage allotted to American growers has declined from 149,880 acres in 1963, to 70,500 acres for the current year. This reduction of over 50 percent has had substantial impact on the cotton producers of Arizona, with whose problems I am particularly concerned. While 83,000 bales of long-staple cotton are imported each year, American cotton interests, of which a great number are in my district, have been forced to cut their production from the 161,000 bales produced in 1963 to the current annual production of 71,000 bales.

It is significant to recognize that of the 83,000 imported bales, some 69,000 have come to us from Egypt. While even under normal circumstances it is hard to conceive of the justification of an importation policy which works to the serious detriment of the American producer—and offers no appreciable gains in return—it is even more deplorable that such a policy would be allowed to work to the advantage of a country which manifests disdain and disrespect for the United States through the severing of diplomatic relations.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation would again give domestic producers their rightful opportunity to produce long-staple cotton in a market unhindered by unwise foreign imports. It would serve the rational purpose of returning to the American farmer, and to the farmer of Arizona, the right to produce the cotton he has been long capable of supplying. As well, Mr. Chairman, it would exemplify to those countries with which we trade the reluctance with which many of us regard a foreign trade policy detrimental to American producers, used mainly as a tool of foreign relations. Particularly, it would indicate to the Egyptain Government that the benefits we confer upon them in allowing them preferential and profitable entrance into our domestic market are contingent upon mutual respect and fair treatment. Their recent attitude indicates the very opposite. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge favorable consideration of H.R. 10915.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, there is one question I would like to ask the gentleman about the State Department letter in the report. Under GATT agreements the United Arab Republic as the interested republic would be entitled to compensation for injury to its trade interests resulting from the enactment of H.R. 10915. Who is going to pay this compensation?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not think anybody will have to pay anything until the Court for International Justice—the World Court—decides that somebody owes it. This is a great bugabear which people bring up, in which I take no stock whatsoever. The GATT agreement, it seems to me, is subject to interpretation. It has not been interpreted by the Court, and I doubt very much whether a nation which has broken diplomatic relations with another nation has very much standing to demand payment.

Mr. MORGAN. According to the letter from the Department of State concerning GATT, the nations are not linked by diplomatic relations, and somebody is going to have to pay.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10915, which provides for a reduction of the extra-long-staple cotton quota. This bill would, in effect, cut off imports of extra-long-staple cotton from Sudan and Egypt, two countries currently alined with the Soviet Union and working openly in opposition to the interests of the United States.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I was very interested in this cotton bill, and was very pleased when it received near unanimous bipartisan support when it was favorably reported by the committee on July 25. I thought it highly significant, too, that this legislation was cleared by the Rules Committee just 2 days later, on July 27. I allowed myself a hint of optimism in thinking that floor action would be as imminent.

It soon became apparent, however, that a series of subtle stumbling blocks had been placed in the path of action by the administration, who feared the bill would hurt U.S. relations with Sudan and Egypt.

Frankly, I cannot see how we can significantly damage our relationship with two countries which have burned our flag, desecrated our Embassies, denounced our country, and broken off diplomatic relations with us. And I do know that because of imports from these countries, especially the huge quantities of cotton obtained from Egypt each year, our own American producers are suffering. While U.S. producers have been ordered to cut back production, foreign cottons have been permitted to come into this country without diminution.

The purpose of H.R. 10915 is to reduce the present global quota for extra-long-staple cotton by an amount equal to the average imports during the 5-year period 1961 through 1966 from nations which severed diplomatic relations with the United States during the 1-year period prior to enactment of this proposed legislation. Any such nations would also be prohibited from participating in the reduced global quota for extra-long-staple cotton until such time as the Congress might change the basic applicable statutes.

The current U.S. import quota for extra-long-staple cotton is approximately 82,500 bales per year. Imports of the extra-long-staple cotton from the United Arab Republic and the Republic of Sudan over the past 5 years average about 56,500 bales of which total the United Arab Republic supplied 56,098 bales. It should be noted, however, that the quota provisions applied to only about 52,500 bales supplied by the two countries.

The reduction in the global quota will not affect the imports of long-staple cotton from Peru. Imports from that country have averaged about 26,950 bales during the past 5 years.

Production of extra-long-staple cotton in the United States has fluctuated from 61,000 bales in 1961 to 161,200 bales in 1963. In 1966 production totaled about 71,200 bales. During the 5-year period from 1961 through 1966 acreage allotments for extra-long-staple cotton ranged from a low of 64,000 acres in 1961 to a high of 150,000 acres in 1963. The allotment for 1967 is only 70,500 acres.

While our producers have had to face this reduction in production, foreign nations have been permitted to continue to supply our domestic markets with approximately 82,500 bales of extra-long-staple cotton every year. This was and is being done when our own producers are able and willing to supply the domestic market, and if given the opportunity, could provide for any unforseen emergency.

U.S. cotton producers have produced over 160,000 bales of extra-long-staple cotton in a marketing year and have the potential to supply the American mills with ample supplies of high-quality cotton every year. While U.S. producers have been forced to curtail production, foreign cottons have been permitted to enter this country without a reduction even when cotton stocks increased to burdensome levels.

Mr. Chairman, there is no way we can justify allowing a country which is certainly no friend or ally of ours to be permitted to continue to usurp American markets at the expense of American producers. This is an unfair situation which we have been forced to live with for a number of years.

H.R. 10915 is a step in the right direction to correct this inequitable situation. This bill will not only improve the economic position of our producers of extra-long-staple cotton but will benefit our national economy and improve our balance of payments. I therefore urge that it be enacted without further delay.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 10915 and I hope the House will pass this legislation overwhelmingly.

The intent of this bill is to reduce the quota of extra-long-staple cotton in order to prevent competition to our producers of this type of cotton from nations which have broken diplomatic relations with this country. The practical effect, of course, is to prohibit imports of extra-long-staple cotton from Egypt and the Sudan.

Our policy in the past, which I have never supported, has been to penalize our own farmers at the expense of supporting nations which have never missed an opportunity to embarrass us in the eyes of world opinion. I have no sympathy for those who would attempt to appease the Nasser regime and feel that we can buy his support with vast amounts of foreign aid and extremely favorable trade policies.

The Arab world has been the object of a long and intimate courtship by our State Department. I am sure we can all agree that this particular courtship has proved to be entirely fruitless. Surely the time has come to penalize those who would take our money and then attempt to discredit us.

I think I can safely say we all agree that we have a desire and an obligation to help those nations of the world less fortunate than ourselves. We wish to help the developing countries reach their full economic potential. We want to make certain that we do not enact arbitrary trade barriers which might hurt the economies of the underdeveloped countries which are just now seeking economic independence.

On the other hand, however, we cannot and must not support those nations who enrich themselves at our expense only to respond to our assistance by severing diplomatic relations with us without the slightest provocation. We are fortunately a wealthy Nation. Even so, our resources are not so great that we can afford to cure every ill or feed every hungry mouth. A choice must be made and in this case, I firmly believe we must end the severe restrictions the administration has placed on our own growers of extra-long-staple cotton and end the importation of increasing amounts of this product from a nation which is hostile to us and which broke diplomatic relations with us during the crisis in the Middle East.

I think the committee report makes it clear that this legislation is in no way intended to harm the cotton imports we receive from Peru. Our Peruvian friends will not be penalized by enactment of this legislation inasmuch as they can export to the United States an amount equal to their average exports for the past 5 years. With the single exception of Castro's Cuba, I would not support trade restrictions against any Latin American nation.

I strongly urge overwhelming support of this legislation and I certainly hope it will not be allowed to languish in the other body. It is time we took action against the policies of the Nasser regime and if the administration is unwilling to do so, the Congress must.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10915 which would reduce the present import quotas of extra-long staple cotton of those nations which have severed diplomatic relations with the United States.

The legislation would deprive the United Arab Republic and Sudan of their quotas but would protect the quota of Peru which has consistently been friendly to us. The bill is based upon the philosophy that we should increase the quotas of the American extra-long-staple cotton grower and protect the interests of a friendly country. Those who oppose this bill do so on the theory that it would not be a sound policy in dealing with nations in the Middle East where the United Arab Republic and Sudan have chosen to break off relations with our country and further, to eliminate the import quotas with these countries would not be consistent with our general trade policy.

This type policy is wrong. It needs changing. These Mideast nations chose to sever relations with the United States. It was their move—not ours. We did not renege. We sought only friendship and understanding and pumped in U.S. assistance to the United Arab Republic under Public Law 480 the sum of $166 million in 1965 and $268 million in 1964.

Under the leadership of Abdel Nasser we have been subjected to continuous vituperation and abuse which ended in his breaking relations with us. It seems to me that we cannot justify allowing a country which is unfriendly to usurp our American markets when our farmers are ready, willing, and able to provide our extra-long-staple cotton requirements.

Representatives of the Supima Association of America appeared before our committee in support of this legislation. The Supima organization was organized in 1954 with extra-long-staple cotton producers as members in the States of New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona, the purpose of the organization being to produce a good quality product extra-long-staple cotton and to sell it in the domestic economy. The farmers who grow the extra-long-staple cotton in these States contribute $3 a bale to promote the domestic market for the brand name Supima cotton. The organization has had real success in expanding markets for their products. At one time our farmers produced 160,000 bales in 1 year. The domestic allotment in 1962 was 149,880 acres. Their quota has been cut down by more than one-half that size today. This allotment today is 70,500 acres.

This bill puts the burden on the economy of the country that is hostile to us and protects the interests of America's farmers. I hope the legislation will be approved.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la Garza].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the gentleman from New Jersey mentioned that this might be anti-Arab legislation. I want to assure the gentleman that those of us who support this bill are not anti-Arab. Nothing in this bill is anti-Arab. This is something which should have been done long ago. The element of timing has come advantageously at this time, but this legislation should have been enacted long ago.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and of the Brasco amendment. I wish to commend the Committee on Agriculture for its leadership, and I commend the legislation to my colleagues.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I wish to make one or two remarks.

One has to do with permanent legislation. This is permanent legislation in the respect that it does not have a termination date.

I do not know of any legislation that is permanent in the sense that one might define it from the dictionary. I do not believe there will ever come a time when a great committee of this Congress will not listen to and will not consider a request from the executive branch of this Government to consider changes in legislation.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. When Nasser severed his relationship with the United States he did not fix any termination date for that, did he?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I do not recall any, if he did.

Mr. ABERNETHY. So far as the record shows, it is permanent, is that correct?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I would assume it is.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I yield briefly to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, for whom I have high regard but with whom I happen to disagree on this piece of legislation.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank my distinguished friend from New Mexico.

I am a little confused by the proponents of the bill. My friend from Texas stands up and says it is not anti-Arab and it is just doing something which should have been done long ago, and implies it is a permanent reduction which should have been taken care of long ago.

Then my friend from New Mexico gets up and says no, it is not permanent legislation, we can change it at any time we want to.

Is the gentleman not really suggesting that what we do is take away the quota from Egypt, from the United Arab Republic and give it to the producers of the Southwest, including the gentleman's State? Will not the gentleman be candid and say he never intends to do anything else except to leave the situation as it would be?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that I tried to define as simply as I could what permanent legislation means. Permanent legislation is legislation that does not have a termination date. That does not mean a change could not be made.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman would not support a change, would he?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I do not know. I would not support legislation that changed it under the present conditions, of course. I do not know that I would support it under the conditions the gentleman's amendment would involve.

I will say this: I would certainly consider any request.

So far as the gentleman from Texas saying that it is not anti-Arab, I believe it is pro-American.

Let us clear up one other item. The statement has been made that this will not help domestic cottongrowers in the United States. There is a rule in mathematics which says zero plus zero equals zero. If the gentleman from Washington considers that the present cotton which is produced in the United States is worth zero, then this bill would not mean anything, but I do not happen to agree with that statement.

I think it will mean something. It would double the quota of the States and farmers who produce cotton in the various States.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10915, a bill that would prohibit purchases of extra-long staple cotton produce from nations that have severed diplomatic relations with the United States. My own bill to similar effect is H.R. 11776.

The main objective of this bill would eliminate one of the United Arab Republic's major export outlets of extra-long-staple cotton. Extra-long-staple cotton in the raw or processed form constitutes over 35 percent of the United Arab Republic's export trade. These exports bring foreign capital into the United Arab Republic with which it can purchase military hardware for aggressive acts against Israel. Further, as long as the United Arab Republic has such sources of foreign exchange, she can afford to keep the Suez Canal closed and inflict trade difficulties on all nations using that international waterway.

To fulfill our domestic cotton demand, the Department of Agriculture has informed me that we have about a year and 3 months' supply of extra-long-staple cotton sitting in Government surplus storage. Furthermore, this measure will strengthen our own extra-long-staple cotton production which currently runs around $18 million annually, but has been estimated to be able to reach over twice that production level.

In light of these facts, I see no reason why the United States should continue to subsidize indirectly, a nation whose enmity toward the United States is daily made obvious, and whose avowed goal is the destruction of Israel—a model of democracy, and one of our Nation's most stalwart allies.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10915

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, raw, semiprocessed, or processed extra long staple cotton, as described in section 347(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which is the product of a country which has severed diplomatic relations with the United States during the one-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this legislation shall not constitute any portion of the quota of such extra long staple cotton set forth in subsection (a) of this section and such quota shall be reduced by the amount of extra long staple cotton received from any such country during the 1964–1965 quota year. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall give domestic producers the opportunity to produce an amount of such extra long staple cotton equal to any reduction in supply which may result from the enactment of this subsection."

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 2, after the words "shall not" insert the words "at any future time".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation strikes me as an attempt to seize on a passing mood of resentment against a temporary regime in order to vote what will be undoubtedly a permanent exercise in protectionism. Anybody who knows anything about the political facts of life must realize that once the quota is reduced by the Congress, it will be almost impossible to get the Congress to act to raise it again. I oppose this legislation as a step in the wrong direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the remaining committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 5, after the words "by the" insert the words "average annual"

On page 2, line 6, strike out the words "1964–1965 quota year." and insert in lieu thereof the words "five quota years immediately preceding the quota year in which such severance of diplomatic relations occurs."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation now under consideration, H.R. 10915. I earlier introduced a companion bill, H.R. 11019, and am confident and hopeful that the Congress will pass the measure today.

The hearings on this bill confirmed what was clear at the time I introduced my bill on cotton; that we never really needed Nasser's cotton, and we do not need it today.

Production of extra-long-staple cotton in this country has declined from 161,000 bales in 1963 to an estimated 71,000 bales this year. In the 1964–65 quota year, Egypt shipped 69,431 bales of extra-long-staple cotton to the United States. Furthermore, Commodity Credit Corporation has in inventory about 140,000 bales of extra-long-staple cotton—a figure almost equal to 2 years of domestic production.

The proposed bill would close U.S. markets to "raw, semiprocessed, or processed extra-long-staple cotton which is the product of a country which has severed diplomatic relations with the United States during the 1-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this legislation."

It also directs the Secretary of Agriculture to "give domestic producers the opportunity to produce an amount of such extra-long-staple cotton equal to any reduction in supply which may result from this enactment."

There has never been any sound reason for importing cotton or any other farm commodity which our own growers are able to produce in sufficient quantity. Passage of the bill now under consideration, to reduce imports of extra-long-staple cotton, is a good step toward cutting down the increasing amount of imports currently flooding the domestic markets and forcing down prices received by American farmers.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRASCO

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRASCO: On page 2, line 14, After the word "subsection", strike out the period and the quotation marks, and insert the following: "And any contracts entered into for the purchase and shipment of such extra long staple cotton from such countries, shall be allowed entry into the United States subject only to existing United States quota limitations, if said contracts have been entered into before September 15, 1967."

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to preface my remarks in connection with this amendment by stating that unequivocally support H.R. 10915 and I intend to vote for it notwithstanding the fate of the amendment that I propose.

I mentioned this amendment before, and I believe it to be a rather simple one. I do not intend to take up too much time on what the amendment would do. Very simply what it would do is this: There are a number of cotton importers who have been doing business with the countries who would be affected by this legislation. They have continued to do business with these countries, I believe, in good faith. Now, the amendment would state very clearly that contracts which have already been entered into in good faith by American cotton importers would be allowed to be completed notwithstanding the passage of this legislation.

And, there was a cutoff date, also, which would prevent anyone from scurrilously entering into agreements from this point on. In other words, the cutoff date would be September 15, 1967.

Mr. Chairman, when many of my colleagues stated that we would be hurt among certain countries, many of the irresponsible countries in the world of nations, I agree with them. However, what we should do, or undertake to do to protect those of us here in the United States who grow long-staple cotton, and I agree with them.

Mr. Chairman, all I suggest is the fact that we have a number of American business people who have entered into contracts and who have entered into subsequent contracts with mills and who have people working in these mills who would be hurt by the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRASCO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. With reference to this question as to who would or would not be hurt, I am disturbed about the fact as to whether the Committee on Agriculture has given full and deliberate consideration to this question.

Could the gentleman enlighten the members of the Committee as to whether or not the problem toward which the gentleman's proposed amendment is directed and which it seeks to correct was not discussed in the Committee on Agriculture? In other words, was any consideration given to these contracts that had already been entered into and what should be done about them?

Mr. BRASCO. Well, I might say this to the gentleman from New Jersey: I do not believe that any considerable period of time—at least not during the time I was present—was given to this question. Obviously, I, coming from the State of New York, do not have any cotton interests. In fact, I was contacted with reference to this problem rather late. I certainly did not bring it up in the committee. I have offered the amendment in good faith and directed toward obtaining justice for these people which would be commensurate with what we are trying to do, and that is to protect our people at home.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say that the amendment would seem to me to be advisable. However, what worries me is the fact that consideration by the Committee on Agriculture of this question was quite apparently slipshod, if this question were not discussed and no attempt was made to cover this point before the bill was brought to the floor of the House for consideration.

Mr. BRASCO. I do not agree that the consideration of the bill was slipshod.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if the committee did not discuss this question, how could one characterize its action as being other than slipshod?

Mr. BRASCO. I again repeat—and I cannot speak for any other members of the committee—I do not come from a cotton State, I come from the State of New York, and do not claim to possess any particular expertise in the area of the work of the Committee on Agriculture to which I have been assigned. This information came to me rather late, in fact, after the committee had already reported the bill. I thought, as I said before, without having any prior information whatsoever heretofore, it would be only a matter of equity and justice to bring this question to the attention of the Members of the House for their consideration.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. BRASCO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman tell me again when his cutoff date is?

Mr. BRASCO. September 15, 1967. That date was suggested in order to take care of all the contracts which had been entered into. And, I might add that I doubt seriously and sincerely whether or not we could abrogate those contract rights by subsequent legislation. I could not get any action on the bill, but I think these people should be protected in the provisions and the consideration of the bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand the purpose of the amendment is to take care of those individual concerns in the United States who have existing contracts and to permit them to be fulfilled?

Mr. BRASCO. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that those who have contracts to purchase this cotton have undoubtedly sold yarn or goods against the cotton, and that would, therefore, put them in a very unfortunate situation to be denied access to the cotton already purchased?

Mr. BRASCO. The gentleman from North Carolina is correct in that statement.

Mr. JONAS. I think the gentleman's amendment is sound and reasonable and I shall support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(On request of Mr. ABERNETHY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BRASCO was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the gentleman's amendment, but I think it should be made clear to the members of the Committee that even if the amendment were not adopted, there is an adequate supply of this quality and type of cotton available today in Government stocks; is that not correct?

Mr. BRASCO. I have no reason to doubt the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and when he says that, I believe there were 35,000 bales that we had——

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is right.

Mr. BRASCO. And 135,000 by the CCC, that very well may be so.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I believe the remark of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] that it was given rather slipshod consideration, does not exactly fit into the situation.

Mr. BRASCO. I agree.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The truth of the matter is there is an adequate supply of cotton in Government stocks today to fulfill every demand made by American mills and purchasers.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRASCO. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. That will not take care of the existing contracts that these mills are obligated on.

Mr. BRASCO. I believe that is really the point in question. It is going to be very difficult, I believe at this time, to make the kind of substitution that would be necessary.

I might also add that the importers—and I do not know that there has been any record on it, but I believe the importers have not gone on record as opposing this piece of legislation.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand that.

Mr. BRASCO. Their only concern is that they be allowed to fulfill obligations which they made.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am going to support the gentleman's amendment, but if the gentleman's amendment fails I still say that they could buy the quantity of cotton that they need from the American stock.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRASCO. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I believe it should be pointed out that, while the American extra-long-staple cotton may be available, that in the thread industry it has been discovered that the Egyptian cotton does have qualities which the purchasers of the thread desire, and that, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] has indicated, some of these people have already sold their product in advance, taking into account orders previously placed for Egyptian cotton, and this would very seriously hamper some of them in filling their orders with the quality of product the purchasers have sought to purchase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to state the position of the committee on this matter before any more of the Members commit themselves to what appears to be a sound and equitable procedure.

The picture painted by the gentleman from New York is, of course, attractive to all of us who want to try to deal fairly with everybody. I believe there is much merit to his basic idea, and I believe the committee agreed that there was much merit to it, but it was presented to the committee for the first time this morning, long after the bill had been reported, and after a rule had been granted and after a date had been set for a hearing on the legislation.

The committee did discuss it, and suggested that if we could agree upon July 1, which is 15 days after the bill was introduced, and after everybody had notice of what was happening, or what might happen, that the committee would not oppose the amendment. We, too, recognize that there should be some opportunity for those who in good faith have entered into contracts of this kind. We did feel that the amendment as it is now written is so broad that it did open the door to those who, recognizing that there was no way of getting extra-long-staple cotton out of Egypt at this time, could go there and buy this cotton for almost nothing at the present time. I do not believe there is any established market in Egypt now. One can go there and pick up the cotton on almost any contract he wants to offer. I do not believe there are adequate safeguards in the amendment to make sure that these contracts it would protect are not simply contracts entered into for the very purpose of evading this act although it does say that they must have entered into in good faith—but there is no provision in this amendment to require the contracts to be the kind mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina. There is nothing to even suggest that the people who would be protected have sold against the contracts.

As a matter of fact, all that they have to have is a contract which says: "I will take so many bales of cotton at half the normal price." They are not required to post any deposit. If in fact this legislation passes, they can escape with no penalty whatsoever. If the legislation does not pass, why then they have simply bought this cotton at a great profit. There is nothing in this amendment which assures us that its benefits will go to those who would without it suffer loss. It creates a windfall for some.

I think the committee was well aware that if we could safeguard this thing so that it would apply only to those contracts where there was actually a possibility of loss to somebody, we would have no objection in the world to taking the date that the gentleman suggested. But since there were no safeguards of that kind, the committee suggested giving them 15 days after they were put on notice and accepted July 1 as the effective date, which would probably be equitable.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRASCO. We did discuss the date of July 1, but as I informed the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the date of July 1 would not be adequate to cover all the people who have obligated themselves by these contracts. I would like to say this——

Mr. POAGE. Would the gentleman let me proceed. I am glad to yield to the gentleman for the purpose of asking a question but not for him to make a speech.

I would like to continue, to point out that there is nothing in the amendment that requires any showing that anybody would lose a dime before we let him import this unneeded cotton to simply add to the cost to our Government. It merely requires a showing that they entered into a contract. It does not say that it has to be a contract on which there is any forfeiture.

It does not say that any loss is going to be sustained, but merely that they have entered into a contract. It is pretty easy to get contracts with Egyptian cotton owners and it is still quite easy to do it. There is not any requirement that you have to show any loss or any possibility of a loss. There is merely a requirement that you show you have written a contract, no matter what your escape clause may be.

I think the committee would be quite willing, if this were so limited that there had to be a showing of loss to the individual—we can accept that. In the alternative, we felt that we ought to get it down to an earlier date.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I would like to say, in response to what the gentleman from Texas said, that I am only interested in those U.S. citizens who have entered into binding, legal contracts, and have entered into equally binding contracts with their customers.

The point at issue here is whether Congress is going to take action that will adversely affect American citizens who in good faith have entered into contracts on which they are legally liable for damages if they do not live up to them.

I do not think the Congress of the United States ought to deal that unfairly with any of its citizens.

I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is fair and reasonable and we ought to accept it.

Mr. BELCHER. I might ask the gentleman from North Carolina, Do you know how they make contracts in Egypt? You know how they do in North Carolina, but do you know how they make contracts in Egypt where they do not have any market for the product at all?

Mr. JONAS. May I say to the gentleman that it does not make any difference how they make them in Egypt. The contract is enforceable in the United States by the Egyptian exporter against the American importer. It is the American law that is binding. Moreover, my information is that U.S. purchasers have been required usually to make a cash deposit or deliver a letter of credit before the exporter will sign the contract or act upon it.

Mr. BELCHER. I would just state it as a horseback opinion, but I doubt if any American citizen can be sued because the law prohibited him from carrying out the terms of a contract. I do not think the gentleman believes that either.

Mr. JONAS. The law did not prohibit him from doing that at the time he entered into the contract.

Mr. BELCHER. The law prohibits him from accepting that cotton today, and this is the time for cotton that has already been delivered. There is no argument about that.

I agree further with the gentleman that, under the circumstances you point out, in which American citizens have contracted in good faith to buy cotton, I do not believe that any act of Congress should disturb that contract. But that is not the thing we are concerned about. We are concerned about the phony contracts which were made between the 1st of July and the 15th of September, at a time in which they could not deliver the cotton; they could not make a contract in good faith with any hope of carrying it out at that time. So that contract is a different contract from the one which is made in good faith.

We agree that any contract made prior to July 1 would, we presume, be made in good faith, and there would be no prohibition against carrying out the full terms of those contracts. But those contracts which were made between July 1 and September 15 certainly were not made in good faith.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I would say this—and the gentleman from Texas adverted to this also—I do not think the mere introduction of legislation is any notice to any citizen that he might be affected by that legislation, because it is well known that the road of legislation between introduction and passage through Congress is a very tortuous one.

Mr. BELCHER. There is a lot different situation existing between Egypt and the United States when diplomatic relationships have been severed and a time they cannot make delivery of their cotton and a time when this legislation has been enacted.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRASCO. I just wanted to suggest, in answer to your question whether or not these contracts were entered into in good faith, that I concur with the gentleman from North Carolina. This is a situation where there may have been or may not have been some notice to individual importers that this legislation was going to be introduced. If you were in business, or any Member on this floor were in business, you would not stop doing the business that you had been doing in the past when there was no way of knowing whether or not this legislation would ever become a reality.

Mr. CAELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CABELL. I wish to point out in reference to this proposed amendment that, with the Near East in the turmoil in which it was at the time this legislation was introduced, and with Egypt having severed diplomatic relations at that time, is there anyone in this House naive enough to believe that the mills involved were not conscious of the circumstances involved? Is there anyone in this House naive enough not to have known through their various lobbying interests that this legislation was introduced? Is there anyone in this House naive enough to think that successful American businessmen did not take those situations into consideration and enter into a contract from which they had no escape clause?

Gentlemen, no successful mill has ever been successful by being that juvenile in its operations.

I would like to call your attention to another thing which to me is rather serious. The mills of the Southeast are pushing legislation to impose quotas on textiles. I have joined with them in that endeavor. I have joined with them on that because I think they are entitled to some protection.

But bear in mind that I come from the State of Texas. The biggest customer that we have for Texas cotton is Japan, and of the many textile imports are Japanese imports of Texas cotton that has been bought and paid for. I am willing to deny, to abdicate certain parochial dealings with reference to this in order to help the overall textile industry. But if the Southeastern textile industry are not willing to do their part to protect the American grower of long staple cotton and are able to make a windfall out of the chaotic conditions existing in the Egyptian market, where they do not even know that they can get delivery of this merchandise, then I am willing to forswear my support of the textile industry on textile imports and protect my Texas cottongrowers.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct this inquiry to the distinguished chairman of the committee. I understood him to say that the bill protects those merchants who had entered into contracts up until July 15, but I do not find any provision in the bill for that.

Mr. POAGE. I did not intend to suggest that.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman said something like that.

Mr. POAGE. I said the committee, in discussing this with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BRASCO], recognized there was some merit to what he was proposing, and that we had felt it would be equitable and adequate if we gave some 15 days during which everybody knew about the proposal, and if we fixed a cutoff date of July 1. The committee voted we would accept such a proposal, if he cared to offer it, an amendment to fix this cutoff date at July 1 rather than September 15, and that if he would take the date of July 1, the committee stood ready to accept his amendment. But there has never been any intention that we were to accept any date giving anybody until July 15. Maybe we should add 2 weeks, but we have no such agreement.

Mr. JONAS. The committee does not now propose to offer a committee amendment to do that?

Mr. POAGE. The committee did not propose any amendment. I simply stated if the gentleman from New York [Mr. Brasco] cared to offer an amendment that fixed this date as proposed in his amendment, at July 1, the committee did vote this morning to accept that.

Mr. JONAS. I would think if the committee agrees this would be equitable, we might anticipate a committee amendment to that effect, but I do not find one.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman will not find one. The committee did not vote for any amendment. The committee simply said if the gentleman from New York [Mr. Brasco] cared to make his amendment effective July 1, rather than September 15, the committee would interpose no objection.

Mr. JONAS. I would think the committee would be as interested in these people as the gentleman from New York [Mr. Brasco].

Mr. POAGE. The committee did not have this bill before it. The bill had been reported some 3 months ago. This morning we were only passing informally on the suggestion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JONAS. I think it should be understood that there is no saving clause in this legislation whatsoever.

Mr. POAGE. There is not.

Mr. JONAS. No saving clause for the protection of anybody who entered into a contract in good faith at any time.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Brasco].

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, on the question of the July 1 date, the answer to that is a simple one. It just would not cover all the companies that had existing obligations. What I was afraid it might very well do if we put July 1 as a cutoff date, if that was settled on, it might then be interpreted as cutting any contract off made after July 1. I submit that while I agree with the legislation—and I cosponsored this legislation—I agree that we should protect our people in this country, under the circumstances that exist with those countries today.

I would agree, and I think the House would agree with me, that we should protect those importers who incurred contracts and obligations. That is why I could not settle for July 1.

Mr. JONAS. Those are the only people in which I have an interest at the moment—those U.S. businessmen who in good faith have entered into the binding contracts for the cotton and have sold goods against it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this discussion, if nothing else, is an indication that the bill might well be recommitted to the Agriculture Committee. The chairman himself, in a virtuoso performance of what must have gone on in the committee, has admitted there is merit in some kind of protection for these importers, but he is rising in opposition to the specific amendment that seeks to provide such protection.

I would think if September 15 is not the date the committee thinks desirable, the least they can do is recognize there is some need to protect importers who in good faith took certain action before the first of July. Yet, if we should be unfortunate enough as to defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, and the committee has nothing else to offer, we know we are writing bad legislation. I would think this would be a good reason to recommit it to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation appeals to me in view of the attitude of the Egyptian Government toward our country and in view of my own attitude over the years about textile imports.

I believe it should be pointed out that so far as my office is concerned we have had no contact from the textile industry organizations. I have had none from the general textile industry firms which operate in our part of the country.

But today we have had contacts from two different thread manufacturing companies. They are not great big companies which have lobbyists here in Washington. Apparently they are only today learning of the effect of this legislation upon their orders and upon their commitments to their customers.

My friend from Texas [Mr. Cabell] is a stanch friend. I certainly do not want to lose his support in meeting our major textile problems. However, I do believe we should give some thought to the fact that in this country we have a few small companies which manufacture sewing thread. They find it desirable to have Egyptian cotton in order to satisfy their customers.

Perhaps this can be changed on the basis of later orders, where the thread companies can communicate with their customers to advise that they will not be able to use Egyptian cotton and will thereafter use American-grown extra-long staple.

I would hope that in some way we could find some resolution of this problem so that these people, not the giants of the industry, who have these commitments—the small thread industry of our Nation—might be able to get some relief from what they say will be a burden upon them if this bill is passed without some amendment similar to that offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Brasco].

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CABELL. I never thought the day would come when I would be on opposite sides with a man whom I admire as much as any man in this House, my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I hope we are not on opposite sides.

Mr. CABELL. I do not believe we are at cross purposes even now.

I should like to ask the gentleman a question, if I may.

It is conceivable that those brokers and those small thread mills, for whom the gentleman has a just concern—and I share the concern—is it conceivable that any broker or any buyer of foreign commodities in July or after July would enter into a contract with a nation that has severed diplomatic relations with the United States, that has castigated us for every type of pirate and brigand that the dictionary holds? How many of those men would enter into contracts with other countries with which we have no diplomatic relations when, as a matter of fact, relations are definitely strained?

I will not say I question their integrity, but I say I question the judgment of anyone who would enter into contracts even between May and July for deliveries of Egyptian cotton, unless he were taking a calculated risk, where the odds were awfully high. When one takes a calculated risk with high odds, one is also taking a risk of loss.

I believe this applies in this case.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman for his comment. Let me say that certainly I believe those of us who have major goals other than this for the American textile worker may be taking a risk in raising this issue. I do feel, though, that here in the Congress of the United States even that small manufacturer, who is not a member of an organization with lobbyists, has a right to have his representative at least present to this House for consideration the position which he takes. This is his due even when his position may be inconsistent with the position of the overall textile industry of America.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRASCO

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Udall to the amendment offered by Mr. Brasco: Strike the words "September 15, 1967" and insert in lieu thereof the words "July 15, 1967".

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the amendment is simply an attempt to reach a middle ground compromise in the light of our discussion here in the last 15 or 20 minutes. It seems to me that the gentleman from New York has a point in suggesting that people may have made contracts and textile firms may well be penalized by a cutoff date of the sort suggested in the original legislation. Under my amendment to the amendment the cutoff date would be July 15 rather than September 15. This bill was introduced on June 15, and this would give a company 30 days' notice. I think it is a more reasonable solution to the problem, and I urge the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I cannot speak for the committee and can only speak for myself, but as far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELCHER. I can speak for no one but myself, also, but as far as I am concerned, I would accept July 15.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while I usually find the judgment of my good friend from Arizona is always the best, today I find that there is something basically fallacious in his reasoning in proposing this amendment. He stated there was merit and justification for the amendment I propose, but then he goes on to say that maybe we can find a happy middle ground and use July 15 as a cutoff date. Either there is merit and every American businessman who has a contract for this cotton is entitled to complete the contract or there is not. That is my opposition to it.

I want to say further that while I do appreciate the concern of many of my colleagues on the committee and on the floor to protect those who grow long-staple cotton here in the United States, I do think we are under an obligaion to protect those people who have been doing business in their regular course of business in their industry. Here, too, we owe an obligation to them. I do not see how on the one hand we can say that we should protect those at home and then on the other hand say damn all the other individuals.

I want to say as a matter of basic contract law one could not by the proposal of a new law cancel out contracts already entered into. I reiterate that I called the Department of Justice, and again I am sorry this amendment came to me very late and I could not get an answer from them as to what the effect of it would be. It would be my own feeling that we could not abrogate those existing contract rights, but whether we could or could not, we cannot morally take it on ourselves here to go out of our way to hurt American businessmen. If it is good business on July 15, it is most certainly good on September 15.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRASCO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I wonder what the gentleman feels about the argument that the mere introduction of a bill on a certain date automatically gives notice to anyone who might be engaged in the importing business that they should be concerned about protection that might be afforded them should this legislation be enacted?

Mr. BRASCO. I do not honestly place much stock in that kind of an argument, because if we went along with that premise, any businessman affected by any legislation proposed by any legislative body would be in a heck of a shape in terms of continuing business. It is necessary to follow this kind of rule so that we can have a logical continuation of business when this legislation comes up, whether it is here or in any other legislative body.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, before we shed too many tears about these people who made contracts with Egypt, with Nasser, whether last year or the year before, I sponsored an amendment in this House of Representatives to refuse aid to any country that furnished anything to Cuba or to North Vietnam.

Now, in the first place, I do not think that any American citizens should be dealing with a country which refuses to have any diplomatic relations with the United States, regardless of their contracts. They could not enter into contracts in good faith. In other words, if they are our friends they should not have been dealing with the enemy.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I would merely point out the fact that these people about whom I am concerned were not dealing with the Egyptian Government; they were dealing with businessmen with whom they have had contractual relationships for years.

Mr. BELCHER. Yes, and the same thing could apply to these people we are furnishing materiel to in Vietnam. They are selling to people over there with whom they may have had relationships for a number of years. However, I do not believe we should shed a lot of tears about American citizens who go to Egypt, after they know the relationship which exists between our two Governments and after they know that they could not get delivery within any reasonable period of time, within the foreseeable future, and claim then that they are making contracts in good faith.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, they should not be dealing with our enemies.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. There seem to be quite a few statements made about what was not heard in the committee.

We did have a gentleman by the name of John Ceresole, vice president of the Cotton Import Association, who testified before the committee either on July 12 or July 13. I would rather think that it was on July 13. We have the printed hearings showing both dates.

Mr. Chairman, at that time, Mr. Ceresole made the remark as follows:

> On the Arab Republic, nobody in his right senses would dream of buying a bale of cotton there now if they had it for sale, which they do not.

Mr. Ceresole continues in the dialog with the chairman of the committee who stated:

> May I point out one thing? It seems to me that from your testimony if this bill does not become law before August 1, 1967, that your people could protect themselves?

Mr. Chairman, the dialog continues on page 72 wherein Mr. Myers was questioning Mr. Ceresole and he said at the time:

> I cannot imagine why anybody would not be down here saying, "Look, I am stuck with this" so that we could do something.

And, Mr. Ceresole continues to say:

> I feel that I am here on behalf of those people, but I do not have the figures with me. Maybe this development moved a little too fast for us.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRASCO. Is the gentleman from Ohio suggesting at that point that there was any other individual, other than the gentleman who testified, whose name escapes me at the moment, but who came before the committee, who was not aware of all the ramifications and that we should penalize individual importers?

Is the gentleman suggesting that the purpose of this legislation is to penalize anyone who made a contract even before this legislation becomes law, because that is exactly what we would be doing?

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. As a member of the Cotton Exporters Association he so testified.

Mr. BELCHER. This man is their representative.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS. I wonder if the gentleman who has introduced this amendment warned the representative of the importers of this pending legislation and if the gentleman has any figures of the actual industries which would be affected by the adoption of this bill?

Mr. BRASCO. I do not have, as I stated before, when I spoke on the amendment. I do not have any figures. This was brought to me and I thought as a matter of merit and as a matter of doing a good job in the American way, any contracts in existence should be honored. I note that the imports from the Sudan and the United Arab Republic are about 57,000 bales, or 56,000 bales of cotton per year.

The cotton that is involved here would be something less than that, but I do not know how much less specifically.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BELCHER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose not to talk on the amendment, but rather to ask the chairman of the committee if he can give us some information as to how much longer he intends to go on with this bill.

Is it possible we can finish the bill shortly or, if not, can we put it over until next week, perhaps?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I believe the gentleman sees the disposition of the House, and I believe they are about ready to vote on this particular amendment. There will probably be one other amendment.

Mr. ARENDS. I understand that amendment is somewhat controversial, and therefore I can envision us sitting here until after 7:30 or 8 o'clock at the rate we are going.

Mr. BELCHER. It looks to me as though it will take quite a long time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes, I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. In order to keep the Members of the House informed, let me say that in talking with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture earlier today I suggested we might bring the bill up Friday, and he thought that we could go into the Committee of the Whole for a while today. And he said that he did not want to go too long on the bill today. And I do not believe it is justified to do so under the circumstances, since we have disposed of some important business today. He agreed, and I agreed with him to go along, and if we did not get through in a reasonable time the Committee could rise and we would take it up possibly on Friday, or some day next week.

Is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct, and we can rise at any time the Speaker wishes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would suggest then that after we act on the next amendment then the Committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BRASCO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POAGE), there were—ayes 59, noes 49.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BRASCO and Mr. UDALL.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 67, noes 63.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BRASCO], as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PUCINSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10915) to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, had come to no resolution thereon.

DEPARTMENT STORES AND MAIL-ORDER HOUSES MAY WIN BY DEFAULT IN THE TRUTH-IN-LENDING BATTLE BECAUSE BANKS, AUTO DEALERS, AND OTHER CREDIT FIRMS ARE NOT BEING HEARD FROM IN SUFFICIENT STRENGTH

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson once again told me last night at the White House that he wants a strong bill on consumer credit with the loopholes of the Senate-passed truth-in-lending bill closed. He has repeatedly told me of his great interest in this issue and his support for my efforts.

But it is obvious that unless the automobile dealers in every city and town in this country, and the banks—big and small—get busy and let their Members of Congress know the vital importance to their businesses of having all credit grantors treated the same in the legislation, the department stores and chainstores and mail-order houses using "revolving credit" may win a great victory over competing types of consumer credit.

The retailers' lobby has been working diligently, and with great effect, in trying to convince Congress that revolving credit is so different from other types of credit that it should enjoy the special exemptions voted by the Senate, and not have to disclose finance charges on an annual percentage rate basis.

Under the Senate-passed bill, the banks must give an annual rate, the automobile dealers must do it—even on those accessory items on which the department stores compete with them for business—the small loan firms will have to give an annual rate, the furniture stores and other installment houses, which also compete with department stores, will have to do it, but the department stores and Sears, Wards, Penney's, and other users of revolving credit will not.

So if you buy a set of tires from your automobile dealer on credit, he would have to tell you the finance rate on an annual basis, while the department store selling you the same set of tires on the same credit terms exactly would be free to quote you a monthly percentage rate. In the one case, the rate would be stated as 18 percent a year; in the other, 1½ percent a month.

Testimony before our Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs showed that most consumers believe a monthly rate of 1½ percent on credit charges is very low. In shopping for credit, they almost always choose such a rate in preference to one of 18 percent a year. Of course, they are the same rate, but the customer does not realize it.

If the automobile dealers and the banks and others which extend credit do not want to lose business or at least spend a large proportion of the time and effort in completing a credit transaction in trying to explain why their rate is competitive with the department store rate, they had better let their Members of Congress know quickly why they feel the Senate-passed bill is terribly discriminatory.

Otherwise, I am very much afraid the nonusers of revolving credit may lose this battle. We are divided six to six in the subcommittee on this issue. Most of us have received very few letters on it from businessmen except from furniture dealers. The others have not been heard from in any volume.

I can say this, Mr. Speaker, truth-in-lending legislation is going to pass. The overwhelming majority of the House has indicated support for legislation in this field. The question is whether the legislation will be fair to all, or will discriminate against banks and retailers and loan firms which extend credit on other than the revolving charge basis.

THE 4-H ACTIVITIES SHOW THE WAY

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, from published reports, the poverty program is moving along but is still in the same place. It is failing to accomplish its goals. The millions of dollars that have gone into it have not made any appreciable progress in lifting participants out of either the social or economic levels which qualified them for the program in the first place.

None of us should be satisfied with a dragging makework program that neither stimulates nor provides for advancement. To fail to provide opportunity is to destroy initiative.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is obviously in need of a new approach and new ideas. For this reason I would suggest that officials of the poverty program look into the Nation's 4-H Clubs for a possible insight into the fundamentals of proper training that lead to productive careers.

For years 4-H has developed, almost without notice, thousands of young men who could qualify as expert automobile mechanics. Most of the training is only incidental to an overall program that makes 4-H members self-sufficient operators of farm equipment and of most of the machines that are a part of the modern household.

Somehow the OEO has failed to emphasize in its myriad of educational endeavors the very great employment opportunities that come with mechanical training. There is a crying need for machinery repair and maintenance men, and with the never-ending outlook for fantastic growth in the world of automation there will also be continually greater demand for technicians in local television, home appliance, and other service industries.

Young ladies involved in 4-H work likewise receive training that can lead to careers other than farming, and OEO needs to familiarize itself with these programs. All the while that young boys and girls are fashioning talents in various crafts, they are also absorbing a spirit and enthusiasm that lead to a better and more fruitful life as homemakers and citizens. Their very attitude is an inspiration which would be of immense value if transmitted into the poverty program.

Two recent editorials should make interesting reading for OEO personnel. One, from the Punxsutawney Spirit, is entitled "National 4-H Week." The other, from the Kittanning Leader-Times, is on "4-H Helps Build." Both of these publications are Pennsylvania newspapers. I include the editorials in the RECORD:

[From the Punxsutawney (Pa.) Spirit]

NATIONAL 4-H WEEK

It's a treat this week to read and hear so many good things about hometown teenagers who are members of a real go-go group—4-H. During National 4-H Week, we join the nation in saluting nearly 3 million of the finest boys and girls anywhere in the world.

4-H'ers are always on the go—both at home and abroad. The spread of 4-H to 75 countries is further proof that the "learn-by-doing" program for youth is sound and successful.

Parents of 4-H members are on the go, too. They volunteer as club or project leaders; serve as judges of projects such as livestock, clothing, safety, health and scores of others. They chauffeur members to meetings, fairs, camp and social events. They "finance" projects that require a cash outlay to get started. They encourage sons and daughters to keep trying until desired results are achieved. They see to it that 4-H is recognized in the community and throughout the country as a valuable experience for the development of Head, Heart, Hands and Health, and the making of responsible citizens.

If you are not yet acquainted with 4-H, we hope you'll make an effort to learn more about this unique youth organization. Then urge your children 9 to 19 to join. The Cooperative Extension Service of the State land-grant university supervises 4-H through its state and county staff.

4-H has something for every boy and girl, no matter where they live.

The slogan for the 1967 4-H Week is "A World Of Opportunity—join 4-H". And this we heartily endorse.

[From the Kittanning (Pa.) Leader-Times]

THE 4-H HELPS BUILD

Take a look around you—at the 4-H members in Armstrong County towns and villages and at the 4-H program throughout the Commonwealth. The sight is impressive and encouraging.

About 45,000 4-H members live in Pennsylvania which includes 450 from Armstrong County. These are young people directing their energy and talents toward building for tomorrow, says Assistant County Agent Dale Cree.

Each member is involved in one or more projects for which he or she alone is responsible. Although members receive counsel and guidance from volunteer adult leaders, the value of the finished project is up to the individual.

This is National 4-H Week, Sept. 30-Oct. 7, an opportunity for everyone to take a better look at the fine work of these young people, also to salute this outstanding informal educational program for its contributions to America today and tomorrow.

During National 4-H Week, attention turns to the head-heart-hands-health youth programs. The "learn by doing" concept carried out in dozens of project areas illustrates the 4-H way of preparing young people for tomorrow.

For example, 4-H automotive projects offer a solid basis for marketable skills in mechanics. Young girls now involved in nutrition work can easily make the transition into the world of consumer and homemaker. They gain valuable experiences that would often be more costly later on.

Good citizenship is part of the 4-H project array. The participant learns to be a good citizen by being one. Members have a chance—through 4-H citizenship projects—to contribute to America long before they are of voting age.

National 4-H Club Week is a good time to check into the opportunities the 4-H program can offer. The Cooperative Extension Service Office in every county seat is a local 4-H information center.

THE PENTAGON IS CLEAN AGAIN

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon is clean again. The painted slogans have been erased from the walls, and the debris has been carted away. Even the smell of the demonstrators may have abated somewhat, but the smell of their cause and their conduct will be around for a long time to come. So will some questions about the so-called peace march.

As to their conduct, the obscene slogans painted across Government property reveal to the world the sick minds involved in this seditious episode. Those so opposed to violence injured more than 25 soldiers and U.S. marshals in violent attacks. Those who preach "love" and shout "peace" wrote "death to L. B. J." on a Pentagon wall and observed a moment of silence in honor of Che Guevara, one of the most vicious killers this hemisphere has known. These hypocritical halfwits demonstrated their belief in free speech and freedom of assembly by violently attacking the leftovers of George Lincoln Rockwell's Nazi group who were staging a counterprotest.

It is difficult for the average American to fathom such conduct, and it is unthinkable that it should be tolerated. The fact that some nationally known Americans involved themselves in the affair lends no dignity whatever to the happenings last Saturday.

Whatever their interests in peace, their interests in the welfare of the United States—or the lack of it—is not hard to determine. The North Vietnamese premier, Pham Van Dong, broadcast before the march began the thanks of the Communists to their "friends in America and wished them great success in their mounting movement."

It has been said that the demonstration accomplished nothing. I wish it were so, but two things were definitely accomplished. For one thing, the enemy in Vietnam was encouraged to continue the bloody war as much by the demonstrators as by a new shipment of mortar shells from Soviet Russia. On the other hand, the demonstration was closely followed by the threat of a camp-in to disrupt the National Capital and the orderly functioning of Government.

The big question in the minds of the people of this Country is why the demonstration was permitted at all. All of us cherish the right of peaceful and responsible protest, but this was neither peaceful nor responsible, and predictably so. Would a permit have been issued to a pro-Hitler group in the 1940's when we were fighting a vicious European dictator? Certainly not. Why then do we allow a pro-Ho crowd to demonstrate when Americans are dying to defend free South Vietnamese against Communist aggression?

Anyone who cannot see the difference between responsible protest and sedition should start the first grade over. An official of one of the Government agencies issuing the demonstration permit told my office that this permit was given "special treatment." I wonder what special treatment would be given loyal citizens if they attempted to protest grievances by the same methods.

I have said for some time now that the permissiveness, the kid-glove treatment, the coddling of the irresponsible and criminal elements in society would only encourage greater outrages. This has come to pass and will continue. If the camp-in promoters are permitted to bring a huge crowd to Washington, it will constitute further proof of the shallow-thinking philosophy against which I have been protesting for many years. The Justice Department, the Defense Department, and other agencies which had a hand in this should learn from this experience. What kind of disorder do we need for them to learn a lesson?

I raise the question also of who sponsors these mass meetings of social throwbacks. The bus fares, car costs, and fines could hardly have been borne by many of the protesters themselves when both sight and smell would show that they were too poor to afford even a bath. I think the Nation as a whole has long wondered at the ability of large numbers of people to travel from the far ends of the country to engage in parades disruptive of orderly society.

There are many different questions to be asked. What kind of parent permits a child to become so irresponsible? What was the cost of the fence, the Government personnel, the repair, and the cleanup brought about by the march? A taxpayer making a salary of $10,000 a year should get mad as a hornet to think that all the taxes he has paid for the last 5 years probably would not cover the cost of the fence alone. And what would happen to one of us ordinary pro-U.S. types if we defaced the Capitol with painted signs opposing, say, the waste in foreign aid? Would we be held responsible for the cleanup costs? The questions could go on endlessly, but I think it is time that someone provided the answers. This sort of thing should never have happened, and it most certainly should not be permitted to happen again. I think an investigation is in order so that the public may know the answers to the questions raised in the unpeaceful peace march and that Congress may consider appropriate action to see that effective measures of prevention and, if possible, cure are taken.

I close with a commendation for the soldiers and marshals. They were firm when they had to be. We are in their debt.

I now call upon the President and Congress to end this tolerance of the allies of the Vietcong and to treat treason and sedition, violence and disorder as they have been justifiably treated by civilized societies for thousands of years.

REMARKS ON MARIHUANA BY FOOD AND DRUG COMMISSIONER DR. JAMES L. GODDARD

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in a further effort to clear up any misinterpretations that may have been drawn from recent remarks on marihuana by Food and Drug Administration Commissioner Dr. James L. Goddard, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an exchange of letters and information that has taken place between Dr. Goddard and myself.

After reading an account of the Commissioner's remarks in the Washington Post last Wednesday, October 18, I immediately requested of Dr. Goddard a summary of the research into the effects of marihuana upon which he had based his opinions. I further indicated that I would request the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to call Dr. Goddard for an appearance before that committee to explore the studies that FDA has made in the area of drug use, abuse, and dangers so that public information media or individuals would not interpret his remarks about marihuana improperly or as applicable to all narcotics or hallucinogens.

In his reply to my request, Dr. Goddard said that the Food and Drug Administration has not made any studies of the effects of marihuana. He pointed out that his statements as to the relative dangers of marihuana reflect his views as a physician as well as the views of colleagues whose works have been published in scientific literature.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that these credentials may not be adequate scientific evidence upon which to base so weighty a judgment for one who occupies such a responsible position in Government.

Dr. Goddard reiterated his feeling that present penalties imposed for use and possession of marihuana are disproportionate to the hazards presented by the drug. And yet he admits that we do not know what the long-term effects of smoking marihuana or using marihuana in other forms might be.

The Commissioner calls for more long-term research to detect any possible serious side effects from chronic usage of the drug. He admits that our meager knowledge must be fortified with scientific research. I must question, then, why the Food and Drug Administration has not seen that such studies of the effects of marihuana are made and how the administrator can make any conclusions, public or private, while admitting that the scientific evidence for such conclusions is inadequate.

In my most recent letter to Dr. Goddard, I pose a number of questions that must be answered if we are to proceed with reason in any discussion of marihuana, its usage, and penalties for possession. I am most anxious to share the answers to those questions with my colleagues and with the public. We all have a need to know.

The letters referred to follow:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: This is in reply to your letter of October 19, regarding remarks attributed to me concerning marihuana.

I am enclosing a copy of the transcript of the remarks made at the October 17, Minneapolis press conference and two statements I have issued on the subject. A review of the enclosed material will show that I have not advocated free use of marihuana; that I have not dismissed its possible dangers to health; and that I have not failed to recognize the fact that possession of marihuana is illegal.

You will also note that I did not advocate the use of marihuana as has been reported. The report that I stated that I would not object anymore to my daughter smoking marihuana than to her drinking a cocktail is not true.

It is my feeling that the present penalties imposed for use and possession of marihuana are disproportionate to the hazards presented by the drug. This is a view held by many responsible persons in our society.

The Food and Drug Administration has not made any studies of the effects of marihuana. My statements as to the relative dangers of marihuana reflect not only my views as a physician but the views of colleagues whose works have been published in the scientific literature. It is my understanding that further studies of the effects of marihuana are now in progress at the National Institute of Mental Health.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated and I hope these remarks can be used to set the record straight.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES L. GODDARD, M.D.,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

TRANSCRIPTION OF WCCO TAPE OF GODDARD PRESS CONFERENCE OCTOBER 17, 1967, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Dr. GODDARD. First of all, marijuana is under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Narcotics, U.S. Treasury Department. I've been asked to comment on the subject a number of times and I've tried to make my position clear, that first we need more long term research to detect any possible serious side effects from chronic usage. But, secondly, I feel that the present penalty for personal possession is too severe, and I've simply said that the penalties for sale and distribution should remain but, I favor a penalty more comparable to that, that we have for the other hallucinogens. LSD, which is far more a serious and toxic drug than marijuana is, after all, a mild hallucinogen. It just isn't a rational kind of set of penalties for these two classes of drugs.

Question: Would you describe it as being more dangerous than alcohol? Marijuana is more serious than alcohol?

GODDARD. Well, trying to compare two different drugs is a very risky business itself. They have quite different mechanisms of action; alcohol's a depressant, where marijuana is a mild hallucinogen, at best, or maybe a euphoric.

Now, they both share some properties in common, however, they both distort our sense of reality, and therefore it's dangerous to operate heavy equipment or to drive a vehicle when we're under the influence of either one of these.

Alcohol, probably lends itself more readily to control on the part of the individual, with respect to the dosage he's receiving than marijuana does, at least to the inexperienced.

So, there are some similiarities, but there are also some differences. And as I've mentioned many times, we don't know what the long term effects of smoking marijuana or using marijuana in other forms might be, and we have to carry out this kind of research before, I for one, would be satisfied to say that the drug is safe under any conditions.

STATEMENT BY COMMISSIONER JAMES L. GODDARD, M.D.

(NOTE.—Filed in response to inquiries, Oct. 18, with the New York Times—Schmeck—and CBS Washington—McLaughlin.)

Some press reports allege that I see no difference between smoking marijuana and having a cocktail. This is false. The possession and use of marijuana carries a very severe legal penalty, while the use of alcohol has no such severe penalties attached. But we do know the physical and mental penalties that the alcoholic must pay—that is well documented. For the user of marijuana, the threat is of the unknown effects, which science must yet determine. Smoking marijuana and drinking both present dangers to the individual and, in this respect, as a physician as well as a parent, I do not dismiss the subject as casually as has been reported.

TEXT OF TELETYPE ISSUED TO FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION DISTRICT OFFICES, BDAC FIELD OFFICES, AND REGIONAL ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS, OCTOBER 19, 1967

The following statement was issued today by James L. Goddard, M.D., commissioner of food and drugs, in response to questions concerning the relative hazards of marijuana and alcohol:

"The statement that marijuana may not be more hazardous than alcohol can be misleading to those who are not familiar with the hazards of alcohol. It is estimated that there are 11,000 deaths from alcohol each year—and most experts regard that as a conservative figure. There are some four to five million Americans partly or wholly incapacitated by alcohol. Alcohol contributes to or

is associated with approximately half of our fatal traffic accidents.

"No month goes by in which the food and drug administration is not ruling adversely on drugs which are less hazardous than alcohol.

"The research on marijuana and its effects is still extremely deficient and we must know a great deal more about its effects upon the individual."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 24, 1967.
DR. JAMES L. GODDARD,
Commissioner, U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. GODDARD: This is to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of October 20th with accompanying information regarding your recent remarks on marijuana.

As you may remember, my letter of October 19th included a specific request that you forward to me a summary of experimental work on which your conclusions were based. Since your letter made no reference to my request, am I to assume from your reply that your expression was not based on a comprehensive study, but, rather, on the views of colleagues whose works have been published in scientific literature and on your insight as a physician and father?

Your credentials as a physician and parent may be admirable. But I am concerned that they and the published studies of colleagues may not be adequate scientific evidence upon which to base so weighty a judgment for one who occupies such a responsible position in government.

In your letter to me you state your feeling that "present penalties imposed for use and possession of marijuana are disproportionate to the hazards presented by the drug". And yet you also say. ". . . we don't know what the long term effects of smoking marijuana or using marijuana in other forms might be . . .". If our knowledge is incomplete, is it sufficient upon which to base your feeling—whether that feeling is personal or official?

Any relaxation of penalties as established by present law must be founded on detailed and scientific information and official conclusions. Your call for more long term research to detect any possible serious side effects from chronic usage of marijuana would seem to suggest that such studies and conclusions do not exist. Why, then, has the Food and Drug Administration not seen that such studies of the effects of the drug are made?

Does not the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control have the responsibility to initiate and conduct programs designed to emphasize the social, physiological, and psychological aspects of drug abuse control? Are you satisfied with no more than an "understanding" that the National Institute of Mental Health is conducting further studies?

I would like to know whether or not you consider the Food and Drug Administration to have a prime interest in such research. I would like to know what research has been completed and what conclusions, if any, have been reached. What studies are now under way? If none have been completed or none are under way, then I would appreciate your opinion on what agency or agencies should be actively engaged in research on marijuana, what you have done to see that such studies are undertaken, and what, if any, reasons or circumstances have prevented such research from being conducted.

I appreciate your prompt response to my earlier letter, and I trust you will agree that the sooner the above questions are satisfactorily answered, the better for everyone concerned. In this I speak not only as a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but as one who is sorely worried by the possibility that any misinterpretation of the facts in this matter may lead to disaster for even one individual who might have read into your earlier remarks a license to indulge in the traffic or use of marijuana.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.,
Member of Congress, Seventh Ohio District.

WE MUST UNTIE OUR HANDS IN VIETNAM

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned about the ever-growing war in Southeast Asia. Casualties are on the rise and more and more of America's young men are being sent off to the jungles of Vietnam.

And there is no end in sight.

We are told that we must be patient—be prepared to fight a 10- or even 20-year war. But, we also hear that our military leaders could end this war—if only their hands were not tied behind their backs by the civilian planners in Washington.

If this is true, Mr. Speaker, let us untie their hands.

I think it is time to let the military men have their say for a change. The politicians and the bureaucrats and the diplomats and even our noncombatant allied leaders have had their say.

In short, I think it is time for President Johnson to convene a "Council of War" of military experts to chart a course of action leading to victory in Vietnam.

I have written to the President outlining my reasons for making this suggestion.

Under unanimous consent I place the text of my letter to the President in the RECORD at this point:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Like all Americans, I am gravely concerned about our military progress in South Vietnam. Having served for fifteen years on the Armed Services Committee in the House of Representatives, I am aware of the alternatives our Nation faces there. I am in full agreement with your stated intention of continuing our policy of guaranteeing freedom and peace to the people of South Vietnam.

It is apparent to me, Mr. President, that the time has come when we, as a Nation, must recognize the hard facts of our dilemma. We must act forcefully with the strength we possess.

We politicians, of which I am one, and the bureaucrats and the diplomats and even our non-combatant allied leaders have had their say. Now let the military leaders have theirs. Our confrontation with a small, weak, poor nation has grown into the Country's third most costly war, in terms of casualties, money, and time. Victory is not yet in sight.

We have been told that this is a different type of war—that political and diplomatic considerations must override military decisions. This is the crux of our problem. It seems to me, Mr. President, that you as our Commander in Chief must realize that military considerations are of paramount rather than secondary importance at this point in time.

I respectfully suggest that those non-military individuals who counsel you so freely to withdraw, or halt the bombing, or stay out of North Vietnam or keep Haiphong open or closed are not competent to make decisions of this type or magnitude. You are receiving political and diplomatic recommendations as proposed answers to military problems.

For the first time in our history, the civilian leaders of the Defense Department and State Department are overriding repeatedly the strategic and tactical recommendations of our military leaders to the detriment of our fighting forces and unquestionably at greater cost in casualties, money, and world prestige.

I respectfully urge you, Mr. President, to call together immediately your top military commanders, plus the Joint Chiefs of Staff, plus recently retired military leaders, in whom you have confidence. Give these experts all the facts, and allow them without political restraint or bureaucratic veto to make current and long range military recommendations that will bring victory in Vietnam.

Deliberations of such a Council of War should encompass such questions as:

1. How can sea power and air power be used more effectively?

2. Should North Vietnam's industry and nonstrategic installations be bombed as in Germany during World War II?

3. Should Haiphong be quarantined, isolated, or bombed out?

4. Would a Congressional Declaration of War clarify our intention to carry the conflict to a conclusion?

5. Is invasion of North Vietnam necessary to victory?

It is obvious, Mr. President, that our commitment to defend our allies as enumerated in the NATO and SEATO pacts is being evaluated carefully in every capital in the world. If we fail in our stated objective in Vietnam, our role as leader of the Free World will be damaged irreparably. There is no substitute for victory as a prelude to peace in Vietnam.

May God grant you the strength, the courage, and the wisdom to make these momentous decisions.

THE PRACTICE OF WARTIME CIVILIAN SURGERY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article from the North Carolina Medical Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest examples of unselfish service in the cause of humanity is the great contribution that American civilian physicians are making to improve the health of the civilian population of South Vietnam under the volunteer physicians for Vietnam program sponsored by the American Medical Association.

I have seen the unselfish work that these physicians have performed in South Vietnam. I am aware of the contribution they are making to the improvement of the general health of the Vietnamese people. Several of the volunteer physicians have been from my congressional district.

Dr. W. Grimes Byerly, Jr., M.D., F.A.C.S., of 24 Second Avenue NE., Hickory, N.C., recently returned to the

United States after performing volunteer duty in South Vietnam. The October 1967 issue of the North Carolina Medical Journal, published by the Medical Society of the State of North Carolina, carried a very informative article by Dr. Byerly entitled "The Practice of Wartime Civilian Surgery in South Vietnam."

All of us are greatly interested in the military, economic, and social conditions existing in that tragic land. I believe my colleagues will be particularly interested in reading Dr. Byerly's article regarding some of the public health problems confronting the Vietnamese people.

The article is as follows:

Tte Practice of Wartime Civilian Surgery in South Vietnam

(By W. Grimes Byerly, Jr., M.D., F.A.C.S.[1])

There are mines in the rice paddies, punji sticks on the trails, snipers' bullets along the roads, and machine guns across the fields. At night the mortars shell the villages. Day or night there may be air strikes by jet fighter-bombers. There is no safe zone. The war impartially catches soldier and civilian alike. There is no front, no rear, no side. To escape today places you in the middle tomorrow. Trapped in poverty and superstition, crushed by the Viet Cong and the Saigon Government alike, the vast majority of the peasant population of Vietnam don't know which way to turn. Volunteer Physicians for Vietnam (VPVN), sponsored by the American Medical Association, meets only a small part of the need—but at least it is an attempt to do something about the overwhelming amount of misery that exists in Vietnam.

HISTORY OF THE VOLUNTEER MEDICAL AID PROGRAM IN VIETNAM

Because of pressing military needs and the decrease in training facilities, medical treatment of Vietnamese civilians has deteriorated rapidly. The few Vietnamese doctors left in civilian practice lack assistants, aides, laboratories, and materials, and have too many patients. As a rule, the native physicians are intelligent, sensitive, and cultured. Many of them speak French and a few know some English. What they have been taught, they know well. There are a few Vietnamese medical specialists in Saigon, none elsewhere.

In 1962, when the South Vietnamese government asked the late President Kennedy for medical assistance, the United States Public Health Service recruited four surgical teams of six persons each: two surgeons, two nurses, an anesthetist, and a combination laboratory and x-ray technician. These teams, intended to supplement local staffs of the existing provincial hospitals and also to be used for teaching, were assigned to the overseas tactical branch of the State Department, which is now called USAID (United States Agency for International Development) and was then known as USOM (United States Operations Mission).

The first team arrived in Can Tho (the largest city in the Delta area of South Vietnam) in the fall of 1962. Soon thereafter, other teams went to Nha Trang, Danang, and Pleiku. By early 1966, there were 10 of these teams. Other USAID teams added throughout the country since that time have been supplemented by volunteer physicians and surgeons sponsored by the American Medical Association under its Volunteer Physicians for Vietnam (VPVN) program. In addition FWA (Free World Assistance) teams have arrived from countries such as Australia, New Zealand, Spain, Iran, the Philippines, Korea, Japan, Holland, West Germany, and Italy.

THE HOSPITAL AT RACH GIA

I volunteered for the VPVN program in February, 1967 and was assigned to serve as general surgeon with the U.S. Navy surgical team in Rach Gia, a rice and fishing community of about 40,000 persons which is situated on the Gulf of Siam. Besides being the second largest city in the Delta area of South Vietnam, it is the capital of Kien Giang Province, which has a population of about 500,000.

The hospital in Rach Gia, nominally a 450-bed hospital, is the only facility for medical and surgical care in the entire province. The hospital is a relic of French Colonial days, charming and ancient, which has been somewhat modernized by the USAID military provincial hospital program. The hospital, which operates on the old French *Medicin Chef* system, has only two (civilian) Vietnamese physicians to take care of the medical cases. Thus the surgical team is left to run its own show.

U.S. SURGICAL TEAM

As there are no Vietnamese surgeons in the province, the U.S. Navy surgical team maintains a 100-bed surgical unit in the hospital and performs all the surgery that is done in the area. The team (a part of the Military Assistance Team 54) consists of a plastic and an orthopedic surgeon (both USN), a general surgeon (VPVN), a male nurse-anesthetist (USN), and four female nurses (two USN and two USAID). Vietnamese personnel in the surgical unit are a male anesthetist, two male nurse-technicians, and six operating room nurses. To this team is entrusted the complete surgical care of all Vietnamese civilian and military personnel in the area. American military personnel are given only first-aid treatment at the Rach Gia hospital, and are then evacuated by air to Saigon. There is a separate ward for members of the Vietnamese Army and Navy consisting of 30 beds—always full.

Since this team is the only surgical treatment echelon in the area, we followed all our patients from admission to discharge. There is no other place to refer them. The work load is heavy, averaging 250 to 300 operations per month, and about 250 surgical admissions for nonoperative conditions such as burns, minor injuries, and investigation of pain.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VIETNAMESE PEOPLE

The attitude of the Vietnamese people toward physical misfortune—be it disease, accident, or war—is one of amazing stoicism and is most impressive. Their bodies are wiry, supple, and muscular; their endurance and their tolerance to pain and discomfort are little short of fantastic. Many patients are transported for miles with fractured extremities unsplinted, with tension pneumothorax, with intraperitoneal hemorrhage, or with soft-tissue infection that has been present for hours and days; they apparently accept the pain as part of the way of things. They tolerate narcotics poorly, and 25 mg of Demerol is usually enough to relieve the pain of the most severely injured man.

Most inhabitants of the Delta area have enough food and our surgical cases were not complicated by nutritional deficiency or avitaminosis. Most of the patients are anemic, however, the average hemoglobin being 9 Gm. One is often forced to operate on a hemorrhaging patients with a hemoglobin of this value, when no blood is available for transfusions. Surprisingly, most of the patients stand it well. *B* is the most common blood type in Vietnam, and no Rh-negative blood was encountered among 1,000 donations from the Vietnamese population.

Vietnamese civilians come to the hospital only as a last resort, always having tried first a round of Chinese folk medicine, and the lesions they present are always well advanced. Once in the hospital, the patient who decides against a proposed elective surgical procedure or course of medical treatment, or who simply decides that he has had enough, just leaves. As the Vietnamese say, "The patient, she escape" (or "she elope"). We had patients take themselves out of the hospital in whole-body spicas, and one patient with a fracture of the femoral shaft left wearing a Boehler's traction device. With the wards open on all sides, this situation is very difficult to control. The family comes and goes at will, and there may be two or even three persons sleeping in the same bed with the patient, while the children sleep on the floor beside the bed. Without the help of interpreters, it is often impossible to tell which one is the patient.

If the family believes that death is approaching, they will carry the patient off in the middle of the night. It is part of Vietnamese folklore, intensely believed, that if one dies away from home his spirit will wander around forever.

One learns early to accept the Vietnamese way of doing things. Americans who are autocratic or extremely professional in their manner are soon frozen out and become ineffective. While the patient hemorrhages, the Vietnamese personnel, if they wish, will look the American doctor blandly in the face and tell him they don't have blood, they can't find the keys or, more usually, they don't understand. If he gets angry, they laugh at him while the patient's life ebbs away. They seem to have no devotion to duty, to the patient, or to science. Their only interest is whether the job they are asked to do is easy and safe. In Vietnam "yes" means only "yes, I hear you"; not, "Yes, I agree," or "yes, I will."

THE PROBLEMS OF SURGICAL PRACTICE IN A VIETNAMESE MILITARY-PROVINCIAL HOSPITAL

At least 50 per cent of the total patient load at any given time is made up of war casualties. There is no organized system for the evacuation of casualties from hamlet to center, and patients arrive by cycle, bus, or sampan. Fractures are never splinted; the patients are frequently exsanguinated or in shock; and the wounds are dirty and hours or days old.

In the emergency room the male nurse-technicians take care of minor lacerations and wounds, perform the incision and drainage of abscesses, and the splinting of simple fractures. The Vietnamese surgical technicians and anesthetists do a good job, although they are poorly paid and are trapped in the system. They speak no English, and it is difficult to work with them unless an interpreter of some sort is present.

The surgical schedule begins between 8 and 9 A.M., depending on the mood of the operating room crew. If they have had emergency cases during the night and feel tired, they take their time about getting started. By 12:30 everyone is becoming anxious to quit for siesta, which lasts until 3 P.M. The American Bac Si (doctor) can work between 1 and 3 if he wishes, but it is impossible to get any of the Vietnamese personnel to make x-rays, help with suturing, or perform any other duty until siesta time is over.

In the afternoon the team holds surgical clinic, which consists of seeing between 30 and 50 people in one small room and trying to make sense out of three different patients talking through interpreters who say "permit card" when they mean "spermatic cord." All the patients crowd in, shouting and shoving, so as to make the deadline before closing time. The local populace peek through the windows and offer advice during the course of physical examinations, including pelvic and rectal exams. It sometimes reminds one of the Mad Hatter's party in *Alice in Wonderland*.

---

[1] A volunteer physician for the Volunteer Physicians for Vietnam program, sponsored by the American Medical Association. From the Kien Giang Military Provincial Hospital, Rach Gia.

The practice of medicine and surgery is purely clinical in approach, almost veterinarian in style. Interpreters are needed, and most of them are poor. One learns a few simple words; but in Vietnamese, even more than in other Asian languages, a difference in tonal quality completely changes the meaning of a word or phrase, and this tonal change is difficult for untrained Western ears to appreciate. The language barrier makes it difficult to obtain any kind of reliable history, even of the present illness. Trying to review the systems of a Vietnamese patient or to find out if his father had diabetes only prolongs the agony and usually ends by evoking laughter from the interpreter, the patient, and all the curious onlookers.

The difficulty of obtaining a reliable history and the lack of dependable laboratory aids leave one largely dependent on what can be seen by physical examination. It is interesting to rediscover how much can be learned about a patient from only his vital signs and symptoms. The hospital has a 15-milliampere portable x-ray machine with which the Vietnamese technician can get fairly good films of fractures. It is also possible to determine whether the chest is clear and occasionally to see bladder stones in the abdomen or air under the diaphragm—but that is the limit. Studies employing barium or contrast media are nonexistent. The laboratory can do a complete blood count, a urinalysis, a gram stain, and a stool examination. There are no facilities for blood chemistry determinations, or cultures.

Pathologic specimens can be sent to the Pasteur Institute in Saigon, but a report cannot be expected for four to six weeks. By that time the patient, having thought the biopsy was the treatment, has long since left the hospital and disappeared into the rice paddies. Consequently, one relies on the clinical pathologic picture, and judgments are made at the operating table. Since the patient will receive no medical care at home, whatever is done in the hospital has to be the final answer to his particular problem.

If the patient lives through surgery, he usually recovers—sometimes after a prolonged postoperative course. The infection rate for clean, elective operations is relatively low; but since most cases are dirty and delayed, the postoperative morbidity is high.

General nursing care is one of the weakest links in the system. If the Vietnamese nurse does not like to perform the more disagreeable and aesthetically offensive parts of nursing care, she doesn't. At night there is often only one "learner" nurse for two or three wards containing a total of 100 patients, and she may sleep part of the time. Charts and records are of dubious value. If I ordered 600,000 units of penicillin b.i.d. for six days, the medication would be entered on the chart twice every day, whether the patient received it or not. If I asked why the patient did not receive the medication, the answer might be, "we are out." The answer to the next question—why it was charted would be—"Because you ordered it."

It was something of a shock to learn that a patient with peritonitis, who was supposed to have been receiving Chloromycetin for five days, had received none because the pharmacy was "out." This word merely meant that the pharmacy was down to its self-established low limits of normal. I was told once that the hospital had no penicillin, and upon investigation I found 1,000 vials on the shelf. The pharmacist would not dispense these, however; they were for emergencies. In three years the American surgical team has been unable to persuade the pharmacist to change this rule.

The problem of controlling medication, and antibiotics in particular, is compounded by the fact that the patient's family will often purchase antibiotics (any type, without rhyme or reason) and bring them to the hospital to administer to the patient. We frequently found a half-used bottle of streptomycin hidden under a straw pallet, or saw the wife handing penicillin tablets through the window to her husband.

Statistics are of very little value in the average Vietnamese hospital. Most of the admission details are written in longhand, quite illegibly, and kept in notebooks which are often misplaced. When this happens, a new one is begun until the old one is found. Because of the patients' custom of taking French leave when they or their families feel they have had enough, the discharge statistics are even less reliable.

Dependable follow-up is unobtainable, as time means nothing to the Vietnamese. A patient may return to get his stitches out only when they begin granulating in the skin, or he may wear a cast for weeks beyond the time appointed for x-ray examination and a change.

SURGICAL CONDITIONS ENCOUNTERED AND METHODS OF TREATMENT

Wounds

Sixty-five percent of the surgical cases seen at the Rach Gia hospital are wounds and injuries and, as has been stated, 50 percent are casualties of war. The majority of injuries are caused by gunshot and missile fragments. Probably the most extensive injuries seen are those caused by the American M16 weapon with its 5.56-mm missile having a velocity of 3,250 feet per second and a characteristic "tumbling effect."

Head wounds and closed cerebral injuries, with or without skull fractures, are all treated conservatively; rarely are depressed fragments raised or a subdural hematoma evacuated. The mortality associated with more extensive brain surgery would be prohibitive. Tracheotomies are done on all patients with serious injuries to the head, neck, or thorax, and jaw fractures are wired. Chest injuries are handled largely by closed thoracotomy tube and underwater drainage and repeated thoracenteses.

All thoracoabdominal, abdominal, and suspected intraperitoneal injuries are explored. Watchful waiting is out of the question under the conditions that exist in a Vietnamese military provincial hospital. Every conceivable injury and combination of injuries to the intraperitoneal structures are encountered. Our team has removed every abdominal organ, or a portion of every organ, at least once during any six-month period.

Open fractures are cleaned and lightly debrided in the emergency room, and are then immobilized by external fixation; internal fixation would be disastrous in the face of the potentially dirty, delayed wounds and the lack of dependable antibiotic coverage. A modified Trueta method has been found useful when the hospital is faced with an influx of casualties. Reconstructive and corrective procedures are staged. The decision to amputate is a most difficult one to make, except when it obviously offers the only hope of saving the patient's life. The realization that these patients will never receive any sort of rehabilitation and will never have a prosthesis makes the surgeon most reluctant to remove a limb. Paraplegics are lucky if they die early instead of rotting in the hospital wards or going home to die a lingering death.

The punji stick is a weapon peculiar to the Vietnamese war that causes an agonizing injury to the foot. On any ward one can see half a dozen patients with one foot propped up and covered by bandages soaked in Dakin's solution. Examination of the foot will reveal it to be swollen, brawny, painful, and nonfunctioning. The punji stick is a small, fire-hardened, sharpened stick contaminated with fecal material and set in the ground at a slight angle so that it pierces the foot or the ankle region. It causes a low-grade, smoldering cellulitis and osteomyelitis that linger for months or years and do not respond to antibiotics.

Among the 15 percent of injuries not related to the war are those caused by vehicle accidents, such as we see in America, and injuries about the groin, genitalia, and rectal areas caused by the horns of water buffalo.

CONGENITAL DEFORMITIES AND OTHER CONDITIONS REQUIRING PLASTIC SURGERY

Of the congenital deformities, the most common is the *cleft lip*. Although this condition is probably no more frequent in Vietnam than in the United States, we saw a large number of these patients and operated on them successfully. The unusually high incidence of cleft lip among our cases was doubtless due to the American Armed Forces Psychological Warfare Program and to the fact that the plastic surgeon on the team was particularly interested in the correction of this condition. *Cleft palate* is also common, but because the defect does not show, the patients rarely seek surgical help. *Imperforate anus* is another common congenital deformity and is the most frequent cause of intestinal obstruction in infants. I operated on a number of babies with this condition, most of them females. Congenital pyloric stenosis is not seen.

A great deal of plastic surgery is done. Skin grafts of all types are required to cover a varied assortment of soft-tissue defects (most of which are caused by long-term chronic infections following injury to the soft tissues) and to free contractures resulting from burns.

Almost all Vietnamese patients have worms (the high incidence of anemia may be related to the prevalence of intestinal parasites in the Vietnamese population). I removed innumerable ascarides, trichurides, and hookworms during bowel resections and peritoneal toilets. In one six-month period our laboratory collected 500 stool specimens containing parasites. Those most commonly found were, in order of frequency, *Ascaris, Entamoeba histolytica*, hookworm, and *Trichuris*. Malaria is uncommon in the Rach Gia area, and flukes are rare.

Patients with amebiasis rarely present a distinct surgical problem. The majority of patients with low-grade chronic colitis due to *E. histolytica* look well and have intermittent low-grade diarrhea, which is so common among the Vietnamese and American military personnel as to be almost normal. Children usually complain of vague abdominal pain. Amebiasis is primarily a generalized intestinal disease, but it may spread via the portal system and become extracolonic; in such cases, surgical problems may be encountered. We did not recognize any amebomas of the rectum or liver, but we did remove one ameboma of the skin. This appeared as a painful tumor on the dorsum of the web space of the hand. It was well circumscribed, greenish-purple, and contained a jelly-like substance. We encountered only one amebic abcess of the liver. This was in the left lobe and was drained extraperitoneally with no complications.

TUBERCULOSIS

It is reported from the Ministry of Health in Saigon that one third of the population of South Vietnam has infectious tuberculosis. Many of the chest x-rays that we saw showed evidence of some sort of pulmonary disease, but the quality of the film was usually too poor to allow a definite diagnosis. Chief among the surgical problems caused by tuberculosis are draining cervical lymphadenitis and tuberculous peritonitis. Patients with the latter condition complain of generalized, rather nonspecific abdominal pain of long duration. Characteristically, the abdomen is doughy and slightly distended. Although it is seldom possible to make an exact diagnosis preoperatively, the pathologic picture at operation is classic. All structures within the peritoneal cavity show diffuse, multiple granular nodules; adhesions are sometimes present, and cloudy ascitic fluid is seen. After a primary toilet is performed, the abdomen is closed. The patients do exceptionally well during the post-operative period. Healing is by primary union, and we saw no obstruction or wound problems. As we had no drugs with which to treat tuberculosis, all patients were lost to follow-up.

TYPHOID FEVER

Although blood cultures are positive in the first week of typhoid fever, stool specimens positive in the second week, and Widal tests positive in the third week, none of these procedures were available to us; hence the diagnosis is made clinically by the Vietnamese doctors, who can "smell" the disease better than we uninitiated Americans. Typhoid fever may become a surgical problem if intestinal bleeding or perforation occurs. Blood transfusion is the only specific treatment for hemorrhage, which occurs in 2 to 5 per cent of all cases of typhoid fever, usually in the second or third week of the disease. A fair number of patients with typhoid fever are admitted directly to the surgical service because of abdominal pain; surprisingly, this is accompanied by constipation as often as by diarrhea. An increase in abdominal pain occurring late in the second week or early in the third week of typhoid fever and accompanied by distention, a silent abdomen, and perhaps pneumoperitoneum calls for immediate operation. The pathologic picture is that of an overwhelming inflammation of the entire bowel and peritoneal cavity, with a perforation in the ileum. Some of these defects are quite large and, because of the granularity of the bowel wall, hard to suture. A resection would appear to be the best approach, but I had been warned that the mortality associated with resection under these conditions was always greater than 50 percent. It has been found best to use an omental patch or to suture two loops of bowel together so that one serosal surface could be used to cover the defect.

Two cases of typhoid periostitis have been seen; operation was performed in one case (involving the radius) but not in the other (involving the tibia). I did not see any biliary tract disease secondary to typhoid fever.

OTHER CONDITIONS CAUSING ACUTE ABDOMINAL PAIN

The differential etiologic diagnosis of acute abdominal pain is based largely on the duration of symptoms prior to the onset of the pain. If the interval is less than a week, a ruptured appendix or intestinal perforation due to ascariasis is the most probable cause; if between two and three weeks, perforation due to typhoid fever; if greater than one month, perforation of a peptic ulcer or tuberculosis of the cecum with perforation. The diagnosis of *duodenal ulcer* is based on the presence of pain and vomiting of the obstructive type. I treated this condition by vagotomy and pyloroplasty.

Appendicitis is as frequent as in the United States, if not more so. In all the cases we saw the appendix had ruptured and the patient had peritonitis; in 90 percent, the appendix was retrocecal. Nearly all the patients were young people who complained merely of having been sick "a few days"—that is, three or four. Occasionally a patient who said he had been sick for only one day would be found to have advanced peritonitis. It is probable that the history of pain dates from the time of rupture with the subsequent onset of peritonitis. To the average Vietnamese, whose intestinal tract harbors various parasites, physical discomfort is so normal that the pain of obstructive appendicitis is of little consequence. Perhaps because of the low carbohydrate diet, appendicitis rarely causes vomiting or anorexia.

Physical examination reveals an acutely ill patient with high fever, a rapid pulse, and obvious signs of generalized peritonitis: a distended, silent, diffusely tender, rigid abdomen. The leukocyte count is usually above 14,000; the pulse is fast. The differential diagnosis lies between a ruptured appendix and a perforation of the ileum secondary to typhoid or ascariasis.

It has been said that patients in the tropics do not stand generalized peritonitis well, and that it is better to treat the condition conservatively and operate later. Our experience does not confirm this theory. When a ruptured appendix was suspected, I used a modified McBurney incision, extended above the superior spine of the ilium, rather than below it as in the classical incision. This approach permits fairly easy removal of a retrocecal appendix and gives quick access to the abdominal cavity. If a right rectus or midline incision must be made to correct another condition, the McBurney incision can be used for drainage. Pelvic Penrose drains are used in all cases of peritonitis, and the wound is either closed loosely or packed open.

The most important part of the postoperative management is the administration of intravenous fluid for five to seven days. Levin tubes are inserted in an effort to keep the gastrointestinal tract quiet while the peritonitis abates; however, the suction pumps are unreliable and the patients or their families will remove the tubes at night when there are no nurses around. Occasionally parents will slip food and drink in to their children. When available, penicillin, Terramycin, or Chloromycetin is ordered; but if the pharmacy's supply of the prescribed antibiotic becomes low, the patient may go without any antibiotic for several days before the doctor discovers that he is not receiving it. Most patients who are operated on for a ruptured appendix have peritonitis with paralytic ileus for five to seven days and a draining wound for two to three weeks. Our mortality, however, was zero, and no patient had a fecal fistula.

ABDOMINAL MASSES

In Vietnam the diagnosis of an abdominal mass is always made by operating. One encounters intestinal parasites, liver abscess, kidney tumor, ovarian cyst, and so forth. Although ovarian cysts are always of the proverbial "ten-month pregnancy" size, they cause no intestinal obstruction. Most of the women are in their thirties or forties—that is, old—and for a long time considered themselves pregnant.

MISCELLANEOUS CONDITIONS

During the three years that the surgical team has been at Rach Gia, no tonsillectomy or adenoidectomy has been performed. *Tonsillitis* is rare indeed.

Enormous *colloid goiters* are encountered. Considering the large amount of seafood in the diets in this coastal area, the prevalence of this condition is difficult to explain. Most of the patients are reluctant to undergo thyroidectomy.

Large *bladder stones* are common and recurrent. The etiologic factors are believed to be diet and long-standing borderline dehydration, causing the urine to be of high specific gravity. This theory seems to be borne out by the sharp rise in stone formation among American troops during the early days of the military buildup, when the men unknowingly allowed themselves to stay in a state of borderline dehydration.

Infections and abscesses of the soft tissues are very common. Since the patients usually come when the abscess is far advanced and has become fluctuant, incision and drainage are easily done without anesthesia.

Thrombophlebitis and *varicose veins* are almost never seen. During one three-month period, however, at least three postoperative patients had the clinical picture of pulmonary embolization.

CANCER

Cancer is relatively rare. In one seven-month period, during which more than 900 operations were performed and 2,500 patients admitted, 12 cases of cancer were seen by the surgical team. In addition to 4 cancers of the breast, there were 2 of the stomach, 1 of the cecum, 1 of the parotid, 2 developing in leg ulcers, and 2 of the uterine cervix. One of the cervical cancers was a recurrence one year after hysterectomy.

CONCLUSION

Physicians and surgeons volunteering for The Volunteer Physicians for Vietnam Project are told that their job is threefold: (1) to win friends and influence the population (political); (2) to teach someone something useful (educational); (3) to save lives and limbs if possible (humanitarian). I don't know how successful I was in carrying out the first two objectives (at Rach Gia there have been no Vietnamese physicians or medical students to train in three years), but I do know that I saved some lives and some limbs. The experience I had during the time I served in Vietnam can never be forgotten and will, I pray, never be duplicated here in America.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere thanks go to the members of the U.S. Navy Surgical Team and the U.S. Military Assistance Advisory Team 54, who assisted and encouraged me. Particularly: Comdr. Joe E. O'Maley, MC, USNR (MOC); Lt./Comdr. Robert Richter, MC, USNR; Lt./Comdr. Anne Wilson, NC, USNR; Lt./Comdr. Winnie Copeland, NC, USNR; Lt. (jg) Jerry Hasaka, NC, USNR; Beverley Rotherham, RN, USAID; Kathy Corniea, RN, USAID; and HM3 Dennis Renander, USNR.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO RELATES MARVELOUS STORY OF CHICAGO'S SUPREMACY IN HOUSING

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under Mayor Richard J. Daley, Chicago has led the cities of America and of the world in providing decent roofs over urban families. Whenever there have been displacements, necessitated in the march of progress, the Daley administration has made it the rule to see that new housing is available for families to be displaced even before work has started on contemplated improvements.

Our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], whose long service as educator, State official, and legislator, has given him a rich background of experience, in a noteworthy address before the Chicago Metropolitan Chapter of the National Association of Housing and Development officials at the Chiam Restaurant in Chicago on October 20, 1967, told the marvelous story of Chicago's mighty strides in the effort to give to Chicagoans the best and finest housing of any metropolis in the universe. As a dedicated, knowledgeable, and hardworking member of the Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction in the field of housing, Congressman ANNUNZIO spoke from a firm basis of firsthand knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the address by the Honorable FRANK ANNUNZIO with the recommendation of its reading by all my colleagues:

Mr. Toastmaster and distinguished guests, it is a pleasure for me to welcome you today to the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent. Chiam Restaurant in Chinatown is one of many fine Chinese-American restaurants, and I am distinctly proud that Chinatown is located in my District and that it does such a wonderful job in satisfying the appetites of so many Chicagoans who desire good Chinese food.

My subject today is, "A Congressman Looks at HUD." This infant Department began in 1965 and is charged with the responsibility of finding the solutions to many of the urban problems which face our nation today.

I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency which is responsible for all of the great and important programs that come under the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. As you know, we have had some fierce struggles to create such new programs as the rent supplement program and the model cities program which have such a powerful potential for providing better housing for our people and better cities for our nation.

And you are all familiar with the year-in, year-out battles we have to expand and improve our basic programs of urban renewal and public housing.

In addition to the legislative responsibilities of our Committee, we also have what is known as the function and responsibility of oversight. It is our responsibility to see that the laws we pass are properly carried out and that the basic objectives of the Congress are achieved.

I am proud of our great City of Chicago and our Mayor, the Honorable Richard J. Daley, for the maximum use and benefit which the Administration and our City have made of all the HUD programs. Chicago has been in the vanguard in the fight against urban blight and decay.

No one knows better than the members of your organizaton, who do the hard basic work of converting legislation into action, how important these programs have been in the Chicago area. For all of the obstacles to housing legislation and the recurrent shortage of funds, the City of Chicago alone now has 47 urban renewal projects representing $187 million in Federal aid already approved and many more in process. We have nearly a half billion dollars worth of low-rent public housing providing homes for little over 40,000 of our poorest families. Again, more of this housing is in the pipeline. Under the mass transit program, Chicago has had nine projects approved for $51 million. Chicago, in fact, participates in every one of our housing programs but, as you well know, we are still a long way from solving all of our problems. It is vital to us to increase the basic authorizations for our programs.

I will not dwell on the urban scene today. You who are the urban professionals are far more familiar with it than I am. You wrestle with its problems daily. You know the details of shortages of decent housing and the vast problems of renewing rundown areas with their crowded masses of people in the deepest need. No less important than the problems of our inner cities are the problems of bringing orderliness to the massive urban and suburban growth which is already underway throughout the land.

Our irreplaceable resource of land is being devoured by growth at a tremendous rate. That rate, if anything, is going to increase between now and the end of this century, when four-fifths of all Americans are going to be living in urban areas.

All of these problems fall within the scope of HUD's charge of leadership in urban affairs. Few tasks on our contemporary scene are more titanic.

I want to say categorically that I think HUD has responded magnificently to the challenge. In a scant two years, it has joined four formerly semi-autonomous administrations with a myriad of programs into a working team. With fine administrative wisdom, HUD has enlarge the decision-making authority of its regional offices and made possible the full and speedy application of their first-hand knowledge to the problems of local communities.

These are tremendous accomplishments.

But HUD's achievements go beyond the administrative, and record a very considerable gain in the field of action.

New and imaginative legislation—matching our far greater understanding of the urban problem—has been developed and framed and acted upon by the Congress.

I refer, of course, to the dramatic Model Cities concept of attacking our urban problems broadside with teams of programs meshed to meet total problems.

I refer to Metropolitan Development; concerned with bringing coherrence to our planning for growth and with minimizing waste of our resources. Unfortunately, the Congress has so far refused to fund this program.

I refer to Intergovernmental Relations; engaged with the vital job of gathering together the efforts of Federal agencies which deal with various aspects of the urban problem.

I think I voice a consensus of officials within the Department of Housing and Urban Development when I say that vast credit must go to my good friend and former colleague, Tom McGrath and his legal staff, for their eminent performance in putting the expertise of HUD's planners into legislative form for Congressional consumption.

Even this profile skimps on the forward steps which HUD has taken in its brief existence. HUD program planners have formulated new concepts of using tools already at hand, and these have found a wide acceptance, and are drawing the private sector into an increasing participation in the job at hand.

Let's take a brief look at some of the vigorous and imaginative approaches that HUD is bringing to bear on the urban problem.

Foremost among HUD's programs, and the oldest, is low-rent public housing. We now have approximately 657,000 low-rent housing units available for occupancy, and an additional 177,000 units under contract. Public housing for those with the lowest incomes has become an accepted function of government. Much of this acceptance is due to such innovations as the leasing from private owners of units in existing housing; the scattering of public housing residences in small projects or individual units, and the turnkey process which permits private builders to construct public housing on their own sites, to their own plans, and then the housing authority purchases the completed facility.

As a result of its close tie with private enterprise, the turnkey process has given a solid acceleration to our battle against our low-income housing shortage. Very recently, Secretary Robert C. Weaver reported to the President that, by emphasizing the turnkey method, and by giving processing priority to projects which can be put under contract within 9 months, HUD will at least double the annual number of public housing projects started in the next 12 months.

Our distinguished Secretary of HUD, Mr. Weaver, was the driving and motivating force behind the creation of this Department so that today even our enemies agree that it is doing the best possible job with the small amount of money that has been available in order to carry on these programs. I congratulate Secretary Weaver and his top echelon for their dedication and devotion to the public interest.

HUD's efforts have not been confined to low-income housing alone. The moderate income housing program has borne rich fruit. It, too, is deeply involved with the private sector. As of June 30 past, some 145,000 units for moderate income families and individuals had been provided, or were being processed under the program.

The most recent of the major housing programs is the rent supplement program. It is surely one of the most significant recent steps that the Federal government has taken to assist in housing low-income families. It has the decided advantage of deeply involving the private sector of the economy. Not only in the housing built, owned, and managed privately, but it is also designed to be financed privately at a market interest rate.

Let me remark on a very recent example of the magnetic pull of HUD programs on the private sector.

On September 13, a group of major insurance companies of the Nation announced the earmarking of $1 billion to be invested in supporting housing and employment opportunities in the neglected areas of our cities for the deprived people who live in our central cities. This is significant evidence of private enterprise's commitment to urban America, and particularly to the urban poor.

These, briefly, are some of the major existing HUD activities in the field of providing housing for low and moderate income families.

Let me touch with equal brevity on the subject of urban renewal.

One fact that is striking to me is lag in public recognition of changes. Initially, urban renewal was somewhat insensitive about relocating families. It did often tear down housing of moderate and low income families and rebuild housing for the affluent. It did, too, often emphasize bulldozer clearance. And it did take its lumps from the critics. Those characteristics have been significantly modified—yet the old reputation clings, though it is no longer accurate or fair.

Today eight out of ten persons displaced by urban renewal are helped or help themselves, to move into decent, safe and sanitary housing. Urban renewal today upgrades the quality of housing for the vast majority of those who originally lived in the slums and blighted areas involved.

Last year a score of mayors and other officials helped HUD to re-examine urban renewal. One result of that examination is that many of these cities have said that rebuilding their pockets of poverty will be their highest priority. Another result is that HUD adopted a new policy that says specifically that our urban renewal aid must advance these goals:

(1) It must conserve and expand housing for low and moderate income families.

(2) It must develop new employment opportunities for the unemployed and the underemployed.

(3) It must emphasize renewal of urban areas that have the most critical needs.

Culture is essential to an exciting city. Thus there will continue to be civic centers and university extensions in urban renewal areas. But cities must concentrate first on housing those who need it most.

I think FHA suffers a similar reputation lag. FHA has been accused of having concern only for the suburbs, or upper income groups in the central city; of having been a principal instrument in the spread of racial, residential segregation in the past. It continues to be labeled by many as unconcerned about housing the poor and those who are the victims of discrimination.

But what are the facts about FHA today? It is a principal source of mortgage financing for existing homes purchased by nonwhites across all of the urban complex. It has lifted the barriers that once prohibited insuring mortgages in changing neighborhoods. It is taking positive steps to finance the rebuilding of blighted areas in the central city. It is increasingly involved in building and rebuilding housing for low and moderate income families. Indeed, today FHA is an effective instrument that is providing opportunities to nonwhites in all parts of the urban complex.

Let me mention two other developments. In recent weeks, FHA initiated a pilot effort in five cities to counsel low-income, minority, veteran, elderly, and other families in securing housing. The FHA counselor interviews prospective buyers and renters. He helps them determine their financial capacity. He tells them about all FHA-acquired or insured housing that is covered by the President's Executive Order on Equal Opportunity in Housing.

Through the interview, families select properties they like, and they are assisted in getting appointments to see them. All of this has several results.

It directs families to properties they like and can afford. That avoids useless explorations.

It alerts owners, managers and real estate firms that FHA will insist on open occupancy practices in its programs.

It provides machinery for seeing to it that those who are required to follow open occupancy practices are in fact doing so.

A second development, equally significant, is FHA's recent instructions to field offices requiring them, in accordance with new legislation, to insure mortgages in riot-torn areas, or areas threatened by riots. Thus FHA today is operating in many ways in the slums and blighted areas of our cities.

These are some of the things I see when I look at HUD.

HUD does not have all of the answers to our urban problems—nor does it pretend to. Nor does its Secretary or its staff argue that it is perfect in its performance. It is indeed open to criticism.

There is always a need for informed criticism—but criticism should be rooted in facts.

The central fact today is that this Nation needs all of the tools and weapons it can muster to meet the urban problems that affect all of us. HUD possesses many such tools. Our continuing need is to find the ways to make them increasingly effective.

So next year will be a busy year for our Committee in housing and urban development legislation and we will welcome the help and expertise of your group in helping to perfect our legislative product.

And in conclusion, I want to extend my congratulations to Congressman Bill Barrett of Pennsylvania, who is Chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. I am not a member of this particular Subcommittee. I am a member of three other Subcommittees—Consumer Affairs, Domestic Finance, and Bank Supervision and Insurance. But, as all of you know, legislation originates in the House, then is assigned to a particular Committee, and then it is reassigned to a Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee then reports to the full Committee, and as a member of the full Committee and as one who has spent many years in helping to resolve some of the problems of the poor, I want to assure you that I will give all the support that I can to expanding HUD to make sure that HUD has sufficient funds to meet the needs and wants of our people.

And, of course, the distinguished Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable Wright Patman of Texas, is one of the strongest supporters of HUD in Congress. As long as we have men such as Wright Patman on our ide, HUD can be assured of continuing Congressional support.

The first session of the 90th Congress is coming to a close. It is unfortunate that we have so many in the Congress who shut their eyes and plug their ears and who, under the guise of economy, are hurting the people who need help the most.

Those of us who believe in HUD must be vigilant and must be alert at all times so that this program which is in the best interest of the people of American can go forward.

DO-IT-YOURSELF CARS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, 1967, I addressed the House of Representatives concerning my decision not to purchase a 1968 automobile because it took the intervening several years to get my 1965 automobile completed under the dealer warranty. In the course of this speech, I declared that automobile manufacturers are using the warranty program as a do-it-yourself completion device during which the owner is given the opportunity to complete his own car and get essential things done—such as attaching the steering wheel, rewiring the horn, and getting the brakes hooked up.

My position in this experience was completely corroborated by the overwhelming mail that has been directed to my office by citizens who have suffered with comparable experiences with their recent-model automobile purchase. In today's Washington Post, it is revealed that one car manufacturer has recalled over 1.3 million 1965 automobiles for such things as the completion of a steering arm assembly and other comparable problems.

The total recall for the industry is considerably greater, reaching perhaps 20 percent of production. When one-fifth or one-sixth of the vehicles produced are critically defective, something is terribly wrong with "quality control" on the production line.

I wish to include in the Record the following article which appeared in the Washington Post of today:

One Million Three Hundred Thousand 1965 Cars Are Recalled by GM

(By Robert W. Irvin)

Detroit, October 24.—General Motors announced today it is recalling 1,333,000 of its 1965 model Chevrolets and Pontiacs to replace steering idler arm assemblies.

The callback, believed to be the industry's second largest, involves 1,143,000 American-built Chevrolets and 190,000 Canadian built Chevrolets and Pontiacs.

The biggest previous recall involved 1.8 million of the 1964–65 Chevelles and 1965 Chevrolets brought back for installation of a throttle splash shield.

Some of the same cars are being recalled again for the steering arm assembly. Only full-size cars were involved, not intermediate or smaller models, GM said.

GM said four accidents were reported alleging failure of the idler arm assembly, but it added that no one was injured.

GM admitted it had been called about the problem Aug. 10 by an official of the National Highway Safety Bureau in Washington, after the Bureau received a letter from a Chevy owner telling of the problems.

Chevrolet said it was already checking, and following the call made more tests. It said in its statement today that "the decision to replace the parts, without costs to owners, was reached after studies revealed that after extended mileage the original assembly, in some cases, may separate and result in a severe pull to the right when brakes are applied at low to moderate car speeds."

Almost all of the 1965 vehicles are beyond the 24-month 24,000-mile warranty.

The splash shield recall was announced early last year. The cars were equipped with Powerglide automatic transmissions. They were brought back because there were some cases of the throttle linkage sticking due to winter slush. The small metal splash shield was designed to correct that.

Chevrolet said that the latest check showed 1,672,000 of these vehicles—or 92.7 per cent—had been brought back and the splash shield installed.

A BREATH OF FRESH AIR

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that on last April 15 an American flag was burned in Central Park in New York City by participants in the Vietnam Week demonstration. Almost a month later on May 13 many thousands of patriotic Americans marched in the support-our-boys-in-Vietnam parade along Fifth Avenue in New York City. The parade supporting our servicemen in Vietnam served to wash away some of the bad taste which remained in the mouths of New Yorkers after the distressing spectacle of the Vietnam Week affair.

The commemoration for our servicemen was conceived by Mr. Ray Gimmler of the American Legion who, with the assistance of Mr. Charles Wiley and many others, gave New Yorkers something to remember for a long time.

This time Messrs. Gimmler and Wiley were ready when the lefties and the Vietnam dissenters staged another raucous protest. While the Vietniks ranted and raved at the Pentagon here in Washington over the weekend, parades and vigils, coordinated by the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism under the title "Operation Gratitude" and supported by 32 Governors and the mayors of nine cities, demonstrated to our servicemen and to the world that citizens at home have not forgotten them.

Here are two accounts from the New York Daily News and the Philadelphia Inquirer of October 23 describing the various operations which I insert in the Record at this point:

[From the New York Daily News, Oct. 23, 1967]

HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS JOIN BACK-GI FETES HERE

(By Edward Benes and Paul Meskil)

With parades, speeches, songs, bands, flags and auto headlights, hundreds of thousands of New York area residents showed their support for U.S. forces in Vietnam yesterday.

Ceremonies in Manhattan, Brooklyn, Bronx, Newark and Hempstead, L.I., climaxed the second day of a 31-hour demonstration that started Saturday noon and ended at 7 o'clock last night.

LINDSAY AT BATTERY PARK

Mayor Lindsay paid a brief visit to Battery Park, scene of Manhattan's Operation Graditude, but the qualified position he expressed on the conduct of the war left many of the veterans fuming.

Addressing about 150 persons gathered for a 9:30 a.m. religious service, Lindsay cited the "deep division" on long-range goals of the war and said: "I count myself as one who doesn't agree with those long-range goals."

GODSPEED AND SAFETY

But as a World War II veteran, Lindsay said, he wished those in Vietnam "Godspeed and safety."

Amid a scattering of uncertain applause, a young marine veteran of Vietnam shouted: "Hey, Mayor Lindsay, thanks for your speech. I fought nine months over there for that?"

SAYS SPEECH "STUNK"

"It stunk," said Frederick Frischman, commander of the New York Council of Disabled American Veterans.

Between 15,000 and 20,000 persons visited the park during the two-day demonstration. Most of the cars in the area had their lights on as a symbolic gesture and displayed American flags.

FIFTY SPEND NIGHT IN PARK

Besides patriotic speeches, the crowds listened to strolling musicians and watched folk dancers. About 50 demonstrators spent Saturday night in the park.

They were joined around 2:30 a.m. yesterday by about 100 uniformed policemen who had just finished their duty tours on the 6 p.m.-to-2 a.m. shift and wanted to take part in Operation Gratitude.

"I got the life scared out of me when all those cops arrived," said William Lewis, New York County commander of the American Legion. "I thought they were expecting trouble from the anti-war groups."

COPS' LIGHTS WIN SUPPORT

Patrol car cops who left their headlights on during the vigil in defiance of departmental orders were promised the support of the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association last night by PBA President John Cassese.

Cassese warned department brass: "As soon as we hear that charges have been brought against a single officer, you'll hear from the PBA as you never heard before."

Informed of the Cassese statement, Chief Inspector Sanford Garelill said: "I don't want to get involved in this thing at all."

In Brooklyn, some 1,000 members of veterans and other patriotic organizations marched from Washington Ave. and Eastern Parkway to Grand Army Plaza for a rally in front of the John F. Kennedy Memorial. The marchers were cheered by an estimated 30,000 spectators.

An estimated 20,000 persons marched in the Bronx parade along Grand Concourse from Tremont Ave. to Poe Park, where a rally "to support the boys in Vietnam" was held.

FIFTEEN THOUSAND MARCH IN HEMPSTEAD

An estimated 15,000 marchers from 60 Nassau and Suffolk communities took part in a mile-long parade through the Village of Hempstead. Outside the Psychedelight Center, a hippie-type store at 159 Main St., Hempstead, four shaggy-haired peaceniks waved signs saying "Support Our Boys in Vietnam—Bring Them Home Now."

The marchers ignored them but spectators grabbed the signs and ripped them up.

In Newark, thousands of New Jersey residents paraded on Broad St. as part of the nationwide observance.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct, 23, 1967]

THOUSANDS BACK VIETNAM WAR AT VIGILS, PARADES

New York, October 22.—Mayor John V. Lindsay said Sunday at a vigil to support American GIs in Vietnam that Americans are behind the fighting men 100 percent but that there are deep divisions on long-range political goals.

"I count myself as one who doesn't agree with these long-range goals," he said.

MAYOR CHIDED

His brief remarks surprised many of the 150 persons at the Battery Park two-day vigil.

One man yelled, "Hey, Mayor Lindsay, thanks for your speech! I fought nine months over there for that?" The man refused to identify himself. He said he served as a Marine in Vietnam.

Lindsay, a Republican, several times has gone on record against the large expenditures of the war and the resulting lack of funds for domestic programs, especially for the Nation's cities.

TEN THOUSAND AT VIGIL

More than 10,000 persons, by vigil sponsors' estimate, at various times attended the vigil at Castle Clinton, in Battery Park at the lower tip of Manhattan. It began at noon Saturday and ran through sundown Sunday.

The National Committee for Responsible Patriotism, organizer of the vigil, said that it had shown that "the overwhelming majority of the American people have been outraged by the lawlessness and the lack of respect for our country, our flag and our heritage" displayed by peace demonstrators.

The weekend support demonstrations concluded Sunday with scheduled parades in the Bronx, Brooklyn and Hempstead, N.Y., Newark, N.J., and Waterbury, Conn.

PARADE IN NEWARK

Nearly 100,000 persons either watched or marched in one of the largest parades in Newark.

Parade officials and police reported minor incidents with placard-carrying antiwar demonstrators who tried to push their way to the reviewing stand in front of City Hall. Policemen surrounded the few demonstrators to prevent any confrontations between them and the marchers.

LIGHTS TURNED ON

Throughout the weekend Americans were asked to turn on car headlights during the day and leave a light burning all night in their homes and offices in tribute to the soldiers.

The largest reported response was in New York City, where city and suburban highways were ablaze with light Saturday. A number of lighted cars were on the streets again Sunday.

In another phase of the support drive, 32 governors and the mayors of nine cities—St. Louis, Mo.; Corpus Christi, Tex.; Berkeley, Calif.; Providence, R.I.; Camden, N.J.; Billings and Helena, Mont., Lynn, Mass., and Mt. Vernon, N.Y.—backed "operation gratitude." They urged local groups to extend special welcomes to servicemen returning home this weekend.

A DAY OF CELEBRATION—OR OF MOURNING

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the observance of an anniversary can be one of either celebration or mourning. The Fourth of July is certainly a festive event while December 7 in the United States recalls the tragedy of Pearl Harbor. American citizens have no trouble in distinguishing the significance of these anniversaries for the events commemorated were as dissimilar as freedom is to brutal aggression.

On the first Tuesday of next month, November 7, the 50th anniversary of the October Bolshevik Revolution will be observed. In the Soviet Union and in some circles both here and abroad it will be a joyous occasion. For those familiar with the true effects of the revolution on mankind it will be a day of mourning.

A group of prominent Americans and over 60 organizations in the United States—patriotic, civic, veterans, ethnic, captive nations, and religious—have issued a proclamation commemorating November 7 as a "day of mourning for the victims of communism." Members of the coordinating committee set up to assist the effort include Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Hal Lehrman, John M. Fisher, Dr. William E. Kintner, Father Daniel Lyons, Rev. David Head, Col. James W. Gerard, Eugene Lyons, and Lady Malcolm Douglas-Hamilton. The sponsoring group is the Citizens for Freedom, Post Office Box 556, Lenox Hill Station, New York City 10021, to which suggestions and endorsements can be mailed.

Among the first prominent Americans to sign the proclamation are: Cardinal Spellman, Rev. Daniel Poling, Cardinal Cushing, Rev. Frank W. Lowry, Hon. Frances Bolton, Prof. Frank N. Trager; Gen. Thomas S. Power, U.S. Air Force, retired; Prof. Stefan T. Possony, Hon. Spruille Braden, Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, U.S. Army, retired; Elliott Macrae, Hon. Charles Edison, Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, Prof. Anthony T. Bouscaren, Igor Sikorsky, Allan B. Kline, Patrick J. Frawley, and William L. White. As of October 18, more than 100 signatures have already been received from other American leaders.

To attempt to foresee what the future hold in store for us, it is necessary to review the past. Realizing that the past is prolog, the proclamation, "Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism," seeks to remember the victims of the world's greatest aggression while calling on us to rededicate ourselves to restoring freedom to communism's captives. Only then will we be assured of peace and freedom in the next 50 years.

I place the proclamation, along with the news release of the Citizens for Freedom and its recommendations for action, in the Record at this point:

Proclamation: Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism

November 7th will mark the 50th anniversary of one of the greatest disasters in history—the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia. From that country the communist blight has spread until it torments a billion human beings.

We free Americans record:

That during the last half-century, communism has been responsible for the extermination of at least 85 million people through civil war, man-made famine, purges, genocidal deportations and executions, in torture chambers and in concentration camps;

That communism has systematically destroyed moral and spiritual values; imposed incalculable sufferings on nations and people; has persecuted all religions and placed myriad minds in the chains of thought control;

That communism set the pattern for Fascism, Nazism and other varieties of totalitarianism, and that its relentless drive for world domination has kept nearly a hundred million people of East-Central Europe in bondage and the world in a state of turmoil;

That since 1917 not one of the nation's conquered by force or seized by subterfuge has been permitted a free election, nor has any free people ever voted to adopt communism in preference to democracy;

That during these 50 years, communist dictatorships have preached "liberation" while practicing unlimited oppression to consolidate their rule based on terror;

Therefore, believing it to be the solemn duty of those who cherish freedom and conscience to speak for the silenced and to honor the martyred dead,

We, free American individuals and organizations, do proclaim November 7th a Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism;

We call on free men everywhere to observe that day and that week by commemorations and prayers; and

We call on every community to rededicate itself in its own way to restoring the freedoms already destroyed for a billion human beings and threatened by communism for the rest of mankind.

Citizen Groups Proclaim November 7 "A Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism"

New York, N.Y., October 18, 1967.—The Soviets have organized world-wide celebrations for November 7th, to mark the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia.

To counter these celebrations of communist power, November 7th has been proclaimed a "Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism" by a group of prominent Americans and over 60 organizations in the United States—patriotic, civic, veterans, ethnic, captive nations and religious.

Announcement of the Day of Mourning was made by a Coordinating Committee in behalf of the participating groups, many of whom represent world-wide opposition to international communism from Cuba to China, and in behalf of well-known Americans supporting the action. They described the effort as a spontaneous voluntary response to the wish of many organizations and individuals, hitherto unassociated, to counter together the massive Soviet celebration which has been in preparation for over two years.

The formal Proclamation, made public today, calls upon communities throughout the country to observe the week of November 7th with memorial ceremonies, religious services and in other ways to "remember the heroic dead" and indict the crimes of communism.

Acting on American initiative, the Day of Mourning was also proclaimed by a resolution adopted on September 28th by the World Anti-Communist League and the Asian People's Anti-Communist League, at their joint conference, just concluded in Taipei, Taiwan. The Conference represented organizations from 72 nations plus 15 international organizations. The American delegation was headed by former Congressman Dr. Walter H. Judd.

Members of the Coordinating Committee set up to assist the effort include Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Hal Lehrman, John M. Fisher, Dr. William E. Kintner, Father Daniel Lyons, Rev. David Head, Colonel James W. Gerard, Eugene Lyons and Lady Malcolm Douglas-Hamilton. The Committee's address is given as Box 556, Lenox Hill Station, New York City 10021, to which suggestions and endorsements can be mailed.

Among the first prominent Americans to sign the Proclamation are: Cardinal Spellman; Rev. Daniel Poling; Cardinal Cushing; Rev. Frank W. Lowry; Hon. Frances Bolton; Prof. Frank N. Trager; Gen. Thomas S. Power (USAF Ret); Prof. Stefan T. Possony; Hon. Spruille Braden; Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer (USA Ret); Elliott Macrae; Hon. Charles Edison; Dr. Kenneth D. Wells; Prof. Anthony T. Bouscaren; Igor Sikorsky; Allan B. Kline; Patrick J. Frawley and William L. White. More than 100 signatures have already been received from other American leaders.

Anti-Communist groups in other free countries have been appraised of the American action and already, according to the Committee, it is clear that the Day of Mourning will be observed in many ports of the non-communist world.

"During this half-century" the Proclamation declared, "communism has been responsible for the extermination of at least 85-million people; has systematically destroyed moral, intellectual and spiritual values; persecuted all religions; set the pattern for Fascism and Nazism; has preached "liberation" while practicing unlimited oppression."

The undertaking was prompted by the need to "counter-act the anniversary barrage of propaganda for communism now inundating the world". The Committee expressed appreciation for the tremendous initial support from all quarters and suggests that churches, synagogues, civic and fraternal groups and communities throughout the U.S. arrange solemn memorial events.

Recommendations for Action—"Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism"

What can *you* do, directly and through your organizations, to make the "Day of Mourning" an effective condemnation of communist crimes and a rededication to principles of political and spiritual freedom? We offer what follows simply as suggestions for your interest and guidance. You will, we are confident, think of other ways to call attention to the Proclamation and initiate public action in its spirit.

1. Arrange a religious service in your church or synagogue. Contact local ministers, priests, rectors, rabbis, asking them to set and announce a special service of prayer as a memorial to the tens of millions of men, women and children who have lost their lives since 1917 as a direct result of the oppressions and aggressions of international communism. Sunday, November 5th, is an appropriate date, but the following Sunday, or any day in the anniversary period, would do as well.

2. Contact the City Editor of your local newspapers and other publications, urging them to publish the enclosed press release and especially the full text of the Proclamation.

3. Ask your local radio and TV stations to put on programs built around the news release and the Proclamation. The programs should emphasize the 90 million dead as a result of communism, and the billion human beings now under the communist yoke. Local citizens well informed on the evils of communism could be invited to speak, singly or in panels, on the all-important issue.

4. Summon special meetings of your clubs, organization chapters, etc. to mark the "Day of Mourning" with appropriate speeches, resolutions and publicity.

5. Utilize any and all other channels and devices to publicize the Proclamation and encourage its observance. If possible, have it run as an advertisement in the local papers, as it stands or signed by prominent citizens in your area. (Some publisher, we feel sure, will cooperate by giving the space gratis.) Have the Proclamation read on radio and television stations, either by their own commentators or by an invited guest known to their audience.

6. Write letters to the editor based on the facts in the Proclamation; the importance, as a matter of conscience, of memorializing the victims; the necessity to counteract pro-Soviet propaganda. In particular, do not allow such propaganda in the press and on the air to go unchallenged.

7. If you or your family or organization are related in any way with a country behind the Iron Curtain, including Russia itself, wear a black arm-band on your sleeve on November 7th, in solemn remembrance of the victims of communism.

8. Local groups in many parts of the country are organizing patriotic parades in October in honor and support of our boys fighting in Vietnam, sponsored by the Committee for Responsible Patriotism or in connection with Veterans Day sponsored by The American Legion or Veterans of Foreign Wars. Cooperate with these efforts, and make sure that placards play up the "Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism".

9. Arrange a Prayer-Breakfast—held at a club, fraternal house, home or hotel—to mark the "Day of Mourning". The presence of a sympathetic clergyman to conduct the prayers would, of course, be essential.

10. Arrange for as many flags as possible in your area to fly at half-mast on November 7th. If your local Mayor will proclaim November 7th as a "Day of Mourning"—and he probably will if properly alerted—then flags on official buildings would be at half-mast. In any case, as many individuals as possible should be persuaded to lower their flags in deference to the millions of innocent victims.

11. A fateful struggle is now under way between a large portion of the Soviet intelligentsia and the totalitarian regime. Especially young people, students and writers, are defying the censors and the thought police, at

the risk of arrest, incarceration and confinement in lunatic asylums. At your "Day of Mourning" meetings and prayers, and in your resolutions, express your sympathy for these freedom fighters and condemn the regime for persecuting them.

12. Write to your Senator, Congressman and other public officials, urging them to take cognizance of the "Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism" by speaking on the floor of their Legislature, introducing resolutions in the spirit of this Proclamation, or in any other way they may choose to assert their compassion for those sacrificed on the altars of communism.

13. November 7th is Election Day in most of the country. This should not be considered a deterrent to observance of the "Day of Mourning"; on the contrary, it means that many people will not be working and can participate in activities.

ISRAEL DEFENSE

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I strongly recommend that the U.S. policy in the Mideast protect our friend and democratic nation of Israel.

We in Congress must face realities and facts in the Mideast, and must make sure the threats of genocide of the whole Israel people cannot be carried out by the Arab nations or by their leaders, nor by any nation or group of nations. Israel has every right to exist, and live in peace with her neighbors, and contribute to the progress and stability of the whole Mideast.

In previous wars in the Mideast, and threats of war, I have urged the U.S. State Department to actively aid in Israel's defense through supply of defensive weapons, to lessen the chance and possible success of attack.

Let us take the sinking of the Israel destroyer as a tragic mistake of policy by Egypt, that will surely cause further loss to Egypt, her people, and her economy, through reprisals. These incendiary acts can lead to escalation, and according to the authority of Clausen, can inevitably swing back and forth, in a succession of incidents, resulting in general and tragic war.

I strongly recommend that the U.S. Congress pass a resolution under sponsorship of the House Armed Services Committee giving to Israel at once, a late series destroyer to replace the Israel destroyer *Elath* that has been sunk by Egypt through missile attack. Israel has the *Elath* crew to man the destroyer which the United States promptly should make available, wherever in the Mediterranean such a U.S. destroyer is deployed. The Israel *Elath* crew should be immediately flown by aircraft to such U.S. destroyer.

I firmly believe the United States must live up to its commitments to Israel to deliver 48 Skyhawk planes. This should be done now.

It is especially necessary that Israel be treated fairly for Israeli defense, as the U.S. Johnson administration has just given notice of the resumption of delivery of arms to Arab States in the Mideast. These Arab leaders still openly state that Israel and the Israel people must be destroyed.

What a tragedy, what a travesty of justice, and a disregard of the basic human right even to exist, if the destruction of Israel and the slaughter of the Israel people is accomplished with United States and U.S.S.R.-supplied weapons.

I have for years favored a Marshall-type plan for all the nations of the Mideast to bring progress, security, and peace to this vital strategic area, so that all peoples can rise and in democracy look forward to a happy, rewarding, and secure tomorrow. Wars, death, and destruction are a poor substitute for such a United States, European, and world policy.

ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT CONTINUES VITAL ROLE OF PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESSMEN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our time has seen the adaptation of great scientific achievement to the mass production of a variety of products. Improved materials—plastics; improved production techniques—automation; improved marketing and transportation services—television and air transport are a few among the many that have each contributed to the great prosperity our society now enjoys. Such scientific achievement, however commendable and desirable, must not be used as the excuse for destroying enduring social, economic, and political values which form the bedrock of this country's greatness.

While economic gain is certainly the legitimate goal of corporate management, its thrust must be tempered by the demands of the public good. Increased corporate efficiency and economies of scale are not acceptable substitutes for political and economic freedom in this country. Ever increasing economic concentration poses such a threat to these freedoms. Nevertheless, the attempt is being made to justify such dangerous concentration in terms of economic efficiency. The road to totalitarianism is paved with such excuses.

Our antitrust laws, uniquely fashioned to our experience, serve to preserve our proven ways. It has been established time and again that competition, not monopoly, in the marketplace produces the greatest efficiencies and economies. For over 30 years the Robinson-Patman Act has protected the small businessman from possible discrimination by his giant competitors. Its success may be measured by the extensive criticism leveled against it by those whose predatory impulses it curbs.

A recent article in the trade magazine Sales Management posed the question, "Is the Robinson-Patman Act Obsolete?" The editors of the magazine were gracious in printing my answer to the question in their issue of September 20, 1967. I insert my response to this vital question at this point in the Record for the information of my colleagues:

SALES MANAGEMENT'S SEPTEMBER 1 ISSUE ASKED: "IS ROBINSON-PATMAN OBSOLETE?"

(Note.—The Honorable Wright Patman (D-Texas), a co-sponsor of the original 1936 law, here challenges some of the views expressed in our article and offers some constructive comment of his own, for which we thank him.)

Having suffered the slings and arrows of criticism about the Robinson-Patman Act for so many years, I have developed a certain thickness of skin and perhaps a degree of immunity. Indeed, I usually refrain from commenting about the words of my critics, and this course of action has, through the years, been rewarding. For, despite a high chorus of criticism which flows in a continuous stream from certain quarters, the Robinson-Patman Act continues to have many friends and supporters, and the Supreme Court, the ultimate authority, upholds the Act in the most crucial cases.

I first was reluctant to comment on "Is Robinson-Patman Obsolete?" for three reasons: (1) In general, the article itself seems quite fair in discussing recent cases; (2) the administration of the Robinson-Patman Act seems to be in good hands; and (3) recent decisions indicate that the Act is achieving its basic purposes.

In reading through the article I felt that no comment is needed from me except for two things, the title of the article, "Is Robinson-Patman Obsolete?," and the concluding paragraph, which seems to welcome a so-called "mounting chorus . . . urging that the Robinson-Patman Act be reviewed and updated."

ROBINSON-PATMAN IS NEITHER OBSOLETE NOR IN NEED OF REVISION

Long years of experience as a member of Congress have taught me that if any bills you have initiated either pass without enormous criticism and foreboding of disaster to follow or after becoming law remain uncriticized, something was basically wrong with the legislation itself or its enforcement. By this standard, Robinson-Patman must be a pretty good piece of legislation. It is recognized, of course, that one of the principal purposes of an article such as the one we are discussing, in a magazine such as *Sales Management*, is that sales managers, particularly of large industrial multi-market/multi-product firms, want to plan their activities and programs in the light of the court decisions. Certainly these managers of substantial corporations have good legal advice and need no guidance from me. Indeed, I question whether they would accept any "advice" from me, even if offered.

On the other hand, a very brief review of a few of the basic objectives of the Robinson-Patman Act, as we who worked for its passage view it, may provide some of your readers with a certain perspective.

BASIC OBJECTIVE OF ROBINSON-PATMAN WAS TO PROVIDE EFFICIENT SMALL- AND MEDIUM-SIZE FIRMS WITH FAIR OPPORTUNITIES TO COMPETE IN THE MARKETPLACE

At the outset, let me admit to a certain basic sympathy for the local businessman who is trying to compete against the large national corporations. The local businessman provides the seed corn for expansion at home. The national corporation, remotely controlled from some faraway financial center, inevitably siphons off the cream from the local community. All my life it has been my endeavor to do what I could to promote and preserve local values and opportunities for the local businessman to survive and prosper. Despite all the so-called progress claimed by the corporate giants of today, I still believe that the unfair elimination of locally owned businesses seriously cripples our society.

This is not to say, as some of my critics always do, that I am a "protectionist"; that I seek to shelter "inefficient local enterprise." This is the furthest from the truth. The fact is, the continued survival of so many important local firms is clear testimony that they must be efficient, for how else could they survive against all of the tremendous market advantages enjoyed by the large corporations? Bear in mind, these large corporations wield tremendous power. They can isolate their various markets and take whatever competitive measures they wish to knock out the local man. They can discriminate in price. They can engage in all sorts of predatory techniques to bring the local man to his knees. When our antitrust laws step in to prevent these kinds of act, they are not interfering with efficiency. On the contrary, they are protecting the small man's efficiency against efforts of the giant corporations to destroy it.

I recognize, of course, the implicit line running through your article, to the effect that recent Supreme Court and FTC decisions seem to be lowering the standards of proof of competitive injury in Robinson-Patman 2(a) cases. My reading of the various decisions, however, does not support this conclusion. Some observers seem to feel that if you don't bring into court a corpse that has quit bleeding, you haven't established competitive injury. Such critics quite obviously have no interest in attacking monopolistic practices in their incipient stages.

The Utah Pie Co. case is a very good one with which to examine this question. Utah Pie was a highly efficient local concern. Because it was located in the local market and was very efficient, it gained a large share of the market by selling at low prices. In fact, it brought down the price of pies from the high price levels previously enjoyed by the absentee giants—Continental Baking Co., Pet Milk Co., and the Carnation Co.—to the benefit of Salt Lake City consumers. The large national companies lost business to this efficient local entrepreneur and retaliated by engaging in area discrimination and a price war, with the effect of bringing about what the Supreme Court determined could have been such a "deterioration in the prices" of frozen pies as to injure competition in the Utah frozen-pie market.

Now the facts seem to indicate that Utah Pie continued to be a strong, viable competitor despite the predatory price actions of the absentee companies, which shipped their frozen pies all the way from California and sold them in Salt Lake City for as little as $2.75 a dozen while charging customers in areas closer to their own plants, such as in California communities, something like $5 per dozen. The critics of the Supreme Court's decision in this case seem to take the position that we should never attack discriminatory practices until a local company has really suffered irreparable harm. I submit, however, that that course of action would make a nullity of the Robinson-Patman Act. In a corny phrase, the Robinson-Patman Act wasn't passed for the purpose of closing barn doors after horses have been stolen. It was designed to get at incipient monopoly before the damage had been done and efficient local enterprises, that could not engage in discriminatory tactics, were driven to the wall.

ROBINSON-PATMAN, AN EFFECTIVE STATUTE—NOT IN NEED OF "MODERNIZING"

So my final comment is: Let us not heed those who claim that Robinson-Patman needs revision. Rather, let us recognize that whenever a law is severely criticized—especially by corporate lawyers, the press, and the hired representatives of big business—it is indeed an effective law working in the public interest.

NEW TEXAS LENDING LAW SHOWS VALUE OF CREDIT UNIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the summer, the State of Texas adopted a new regulatory loan act that, among other things, raises rates charged by lending institutions on certain loans.

When the legislation was considered by the Texas Legislature, credit unions were among those who would have been eligible to charge the higher rates. However, the credit unions did not wish to increase their rates, but chose to be governed by their 1 percent a month on the declining balance maximum charge which is 6 percent a year.

To make it clear that they were not interested in raising their rates, hundreds of Texas credit union members literally stormed the State capitol to dramatize their case. They arrived by bus, car, and every other means of transportation from every corner of the State. When the law was finally enacted, credit unions had achieved their goal, they were not included in the new rate structure.

The October issue of the Texas Credit Union League Bulletin contains a highly informative article that quite clearly shows the benefits that credit union members receive because the credit unions voted against having their interest charges raised.

For instance, under the new law, annual interest rates for lending institutions other than credit unions range as high as 240 percent, while the maximum that credit unions can charge on the same loan is still only 1 percent per month on the unpaid balance or an annual interest charge of 6 percent.

The article presents a side-by-side comparison of charges under the new law and the savings that can be obtained by securing a loan from a credit union. For instance, on a $2,500 loan for 1 year, the new Texas law provides for interest in the amount of $230, or a true annual rate of 16.98 percent. This charge does not include credit life insurance, which repays the loan in the event of the borrower's death. Since most lenders require such insurance, this item would be an additional charge on top of the $230. The same loan at a credit union would cost the borrower $162.50, which includes credit life insurance. Thus, the borrower would save at least $67.50 by obtaining his loan from the credit union.

Other savings are equally dramatized by the comparative charts. On a 2-year loan of $1,800 to purchase an automobile from 3 to 4 years old, the law allows an interest charge without insurance of $450, or a true annual interest rate of 24 percent. The same loan at a credit union, including insurance, would cost only half that much, or $225. I do not think anyone would dispute the fact that a savings of 50 percent is the rarest of bargains.

I have long said that, next to the church, the credit union accomplishes more good than any other institution in the community. The savings the Texans can obtain through credit union membership fortifies my belief. I am enclosing as part of my statement the charts published in the "Texas Credit Union Bulletin" that depict the savings obtainable at credit unions when compared with rates charged by other lenders under the new Texas lending law:

COMPARISON—LOANS LESS THAN $30

Amount for 1 month	Charge (no insurance)	True annual rate (percent)	Cost at credit union with insurance	Indicated savings
$5	$1	240	$0.05	$0.95
10	2	240	.10	1.90
15	3	240	.15	2.85
20	4	240	.20	3.80
25	5	240	.25	4.75

Note: Under art. 3.16, a charge of $1 for each $5 advanced the borrower up to $29.99. Maximum length of the loan permitted is 1 month for each $10 advanced, up to a maximum of 6 months. No insurance charges or any other charges are permitted.

COMPARISON—LOANS $30 TO $100

1 MONTH

Amount	1/10 of cash advance	Handling charge	True annual rate (percent)	Total charge	Cost at credit union with insurance	Indicated savings
$30	$3.00	$3.00	240.1	$6.00	$0.30	$5.70
35	3.50	3.00	222.9	6.50	.35	6.15
40	4.00	3.50	225.1	7.50	.40	7.10
70	7.00	3.50	180.1	10.50	.70	9.80
80	8.00	4.00	180.1	12.00	.80	11.20
100	10.00	4.00	168.1	14.00	1.00	13.00

COMPARISON—LOANS $30 TO $100—Continued

Amount	1/10 of cash advance	Handling charge	True annual rate (percent)	Total charge	Cost at credit union with insurance	Indicated savings
2 MONTHS						
$30	$3.00	$6.00	240.0	$9.00	$0.45	$8.55
40	4.00	7.00	220.0	11.00	.60	10.40
70	7.00	7.00	160.0	14.00	1.05	12.95
80	8.00	8.00	160.0	16.00	1.20	14.80
100	10.00	8.00	144.0	18.00	1.50	16.50
3 MONTHS						
$40	$4.00	$10.50	217.5	$14.50	$0.80	$13.70
70	7.00	10.50	150.0	17.50	1.40	16.10
80	8.00	12.00	150.0	20.00	1.60	18.40
100	10.00	12.00	132.0	22.00	2.01	19.99
4 MONTHS						
$40	$4.00	$14.00	216.0	$18.00	$1.00	$17.00
70	7.00	14.00	144.0	21.00	1.76	19.24
80	8.00	16.00	144.0	24.00	2.02	21.98
100	10.00	16.00	124.8	26.00	2.50	23.50
5 MONTHS						
$80	$8.00	$20.00	140.0	$28.00	$2.40	$25.60
100	10.00	20.00	120.0	30.00	3.00	27.00
6 MONTHS						
$80	$8.00	$24.00	137.1	$32.00	$2.82	$29.18
100	10.00	24.00	116.6	34.00	3.53	30.47

Note: No insurance can be required on loans under $100.

COMPARISON—LOANS $100 TO $2,500—1 YEAR

Amount	Charge (no insurance)	True annual rate (percent)	Cost at credit union with insurance	Indicated savings
$100	$18.00	33.23	$6.50	$11.50
200	36.00	33.23	13.00	23.00
300	54.00	33.23	19.50	34.00
400	62.00	28.61	26.00	36.00
500	70.00	25.84	32.50	37.50
600	78.00	24.00	39.00	39.00
700	86.00	22.68	45.50	40.50
800	94.00	21.69	52.00	42.00
900	102.00	20.92	58.50	43.50
1,000	110.00	20.31	65.00	45.00
1,500	150.00	18.46	97.50	52.50
2,000	190.00	17.54	130.00	60.00
2,500	230.00	16.98	162.50	67.50

RETAIL CHARGE AGREEMENTS ("REVOLVING CHARGE ACCOUNTS") EFFECTIVE JAN. 1, 1968

COMPARATIVE EXAMPLE

[$1,200 for 12 months, payments $100 per month plus charges]

Monthly balance	Monthly charge	True annual rate (percent)	Monthly credit union interest	Indicated savings
$1,200	$14.50	14.50	$12.00	$2.50
$1,100	13.50	14.72	11.00	2.50
$1,000	12.50	15.00	10.00	2.50
$900	11.50	15.33	9.00	2.50
$800	10.50	15.75	8.00	2.50
$700	9.50	16.28	7.00	2.50
$600	8.50	17.00	6.00	2.50
$500	7.50	18.00	5.00	2.50
$400	6.00	18.00	4.00	2.00
$300	4.50	18.00	3.00	1.50
$200	3.00	18.00	2.00	1.00
$100	1.50	18.00	1.00	.50
Total	103.00		78.00	25.00

Note: Charges: A time price differential not to exceed 15 cents per $10 per month on the unpaid balance not over $500; and 10 cents per $10 per month on that portion over $500. Seller may require credit life and credit accident and health insurance, and may require buyer to insure property involved.

RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES

LESS THAN $100, 3-MONTH TERM[1]

Initial principal balance	Charge (no insurance)	True annual rate (percent)	Cost of credit union with insurance	Indicated savings
$10	$6.00	360.00	$0.65	$5.35
25	6.00	144.00	1.63	4.37
30	9.00	180.00	1.95	8.05
75	12.00	96.00	4.88	7.17
$100 TO $2,500, 1-YEAR TERM[2]				
$100	$12.00	22.15	$6.50	$5.50
300	36.00	22.15	19.50	16.50
500	60.00	22.15	32.50	27.50
600	70.00	21.53	39.00	31.00
900	100.00	20.51	58.50	31.50
1,000	110.00	20.30	65.00	45.00
1,500	150.00	18.46	97.50	52.50
2,500	230.00	16.98	162.50	67.50

[1] The Code allows minimum price differentials of $6 on an initial balance of $25 or less; $9 on a balance between $25 and $75, and $12 on a balance of $75 or more.

[2] Charges permitted of $12 per $100 per year on first $500, $10 per $100 per year on next $500, $8 per $100 per year on principal above $1,000. Late charge of 5 percent of installment, or $5, whichever is less, also permitted.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSTALLMENT SALES[1]

COMPARATIVE EXAMPLES

Amount financed	Charge (no insurance)	True annual rate (percent)	Cost at credit union with insurance	Indicated savings
Class 1—New Cars—3-Year Term[2]				
$3,000	$675.00	14.59	$555.00	$120.00
2,500	562.50	14.59	462.50	100.00
2,000	450.00	14.59	370.00	80.00
1,500	337.50	14.59	277.50	60.00
Class 2—Cars 1 or 2 Years Old—2-Year Term[3]				
$2,500	$500.00	19.20	$312.50	$187.50
2,000	400.00	19.20	250.00	150.00
1,500	300.00	19.20	187.50	112.50
1,000	200.00	19.20	125.00	75.00
Class 3—Used Cars 3 or 4 Years Old—2-Year Term[4]				
$1,800	$450.00	24.00	$225.00	$225.00
1,500	375.00	24.00	187.50	187.50
1,200	300.00	24.00	150.00	150.00
1,000	250,00	24.00	125.00	125.00
Used Cars Not in Class 2 or 3—2-Year Term[5]				
$1,200	$360.00	28.80	$150.00	$210.00
1,000	300.00	28.80	125.00	175.00
800	240.00	28.80	100.00	140.00
400	120.00	28.80	50.00	70.00
Exception: Older Used Cars, Balance $300 or Less—1-year Term[6]				
$300	$54.00	33.23	$19.50	$34.50
200	36.00	33.23	13.00	23.00
100	18.00	33.23	6.50	11.50

[1] On all motor vehicle installment sales, seller may require buyer to provide credit life and credit health and accident insurance, and may require buyer to insure property involved.

[2] Class 1: Any new domestic motor vehicle designated by manufacturer by a year model not earlier than the year in which sale is made and any new foreign motor vehicle. Rate: $7.50 per $100 per year.

[3] Class 2: Any new domestic motor vehicle not in class 1 and any used domestic motor vehicle designated by manufacturer by a year model of the same or not more than 2 years prior to year in which sale is made and any used foreign motor vehicle not more than 2 years old. Rate: $10 per $100 per year.

[4] Class 3: Any used motor vehicle not in class 2, and designated by a year model not more than 4 years prior to year in which sale is made, and if foreign, not more than 4 years old. Rate: $12.50 per $100 per year.

[5] Rate on used cars not in class 1 or 2, $15 per $100 per year. See exception below.

[6] Code provides that if principal balance is $300 or less, time price differential may be $18 per $100 per year.

CLEVELAND FEDERAL RESERVE BANK SNOOPING INTO PRIVATE LIVES OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the subject of wiretapping, electronic eavesdropping, and other similar invasions of privacy has received a great deal of attention in our country during the past year. Some Government agencies have been heavily criticized for their use of wiretaps. Now it appears that the Federal Reserve System is also guilty of going beyond the bounds of propriety in seeking information.

On September 29 of this year, the vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, Mr. Elmer F. Fricek, wrote to all employees of the Cleveland Federal Reserve Bank, reminding them that the board of directors of that bank required that every employee submit a detailed report on certain private activities. The letter also included a form for reporting the information, and carried a warning that every question on the form should be answered, and "failure to submit correct information may be cause for dismissal."

Reproduced below is a copy of Mr. Fricek's letter, as well as a copy of the confidential report form to be filled in by the employee:

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF CLEVELAND,
Cleveland, Ohio, September 29, 1967.

To All Employees:

As required by the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, please submit a report of your indebtedness, outside employment or business connections, law suits pending, ownership or interest in bank stock, public or political offices held, and speculative dealings (as distinguished from investments), as of September 30, 1967. Two copies of the confidential report, Form *PR 27, and an envelope addressed to me are attached for this purpose.

Every question on this form should be answered. Failure to submit correct information may be cause for dismissal.

The original copy should be returned to me as soon as possible, but no later than October 13, 1967. The second copy may be retained for your records.

ELMER F. FRICEK,
Vice President.

*PR 27

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

Name

Department

Classification

1. Do you have any personal indebtedness? ☐Yes ☐No
If "Yes" please furnish the information requested below:

To whom indebted	Date incurred	Purpose for which money was used	Original amount of indebtedness	Additions to original loan		Payment		Present balance
				Amount	Date	Amount	Frequency	

DO YOU RECEIVE ASSISTANCE IN PAYMENT OF ABOVE DEBTS?.. ☐ YES ☐ NO
IF "YES" ASSISTANCE COMES FROM: .... IN WHAT AMOUNT OR PERCENTAGE?..

2. Are you a co-maker, endorser, or guarantor of any note or other obligation?.. ☐ YES ☐ NO

Name of creditor	For whom	Original amount	Present balance	Purpose for which money was used

3. Do you have any employment or business connections other than Federal Reserve Bank? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Name of employer	Position and nature of work	Hours worked per wk
		Salary per wk/hr

4. Are any lawsuits pending against you? ☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Do you own stock, debentures, etc. of any bank or bank affiliate? ☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Do you hold any public or political office, such as in a precinct, city, county, state, or school district? ☐ Yes ☐ No

7. Do you engage in speculative dealings (as distinguished from investments), whether on a margin or a cash basis, and whether in securities, commodities, real estate, exchange, or otherwise? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If your answer to question 4, 5, 6, or 7 is "Yes" please give details below: (Use reverse side if necessary)

I hereby certify that the above is a true, accurate and complete statement as of..............................
(Date)

Date completed

Signature

Among other things, the report asks the employee to list all indebtedness and the purpose for which the money was borrowed. It also requires the name of any comaker, endorser, or guarantor of any note or other obligation of the employee and inquires as to whether the employee has any business or other employment outside the Federal Reserve bank. The report then goes on to ask a series of questions such as, "Are any law suits pending against you?" "Do you own stock, debentures, and so forth, of any bank or bank affiliate?" "Do you hold any public or political office, such as in a precinct, city, county, State, or school district?" "Do you engage in speculative dealings—as distinguished from investments—whether on a margin or cash basis and whether in securities, commodities, real estate, or otherwise?"

It is clear that the Cleveland Federal Reserve Bank is playing Peeping Tom with the private lives of its employees in an area that is not involved in the public interest.

No legitimate purpose can be served by the snooping tactics of the Cleveland Federal Reserve Bank. I am shocked that the bank even considered such an action.

I have written to Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board asking him to take immediate steps to see that this flagrant violation of the rights of individuals does not continue. I am also interested in learning if any other bank in the Federal Reserve System operates such a spy system.

I want to know why Members of Congress and appropriate committees of Congress are kept in the dark about the operations of the Fed while, at the same time, the Fed is conducting an eavesdropping campaign against its employees.

For a number of years, the Banking and Currency Committee has attempted to secure the minutes of the Federal Open Market Committee, the supersecret organization that sets monetary policies for our country. However, the Federal Reserve Board has agreed only to release the minutes after they become 6 years old.

Thus, the Fed does not want Congress to know what it is doing but, at the same time, at least one of its banks is going overboard to keep tabs on its employees.

This is the second time within a year that the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland has tried to pull a fast one on its employees.

Last fall, the bank decided to stop paying its employees by check and instead deposited the payroll in a local Cleveland bank. The Fed employees had to withdraw their funds from that bank or open an account at the bank in order to receive their money.

It was explained by officials of the Cleveland Federal Reserve Bank that the new system was adopted because it would cost the bank less to process its payroll and would thus save the taxpayers' money.

That myth was exploded when we learned that the bank was spending thousands of taxpayers' dollars on items such as dues to the American Bankers Association; engraved silver plates; cigars and cigarettes, subscriptions to popular magazines, elaborate dinners, and hundreds of other nonbanking items.

I sincerely hope that Chairman Martin can correct the situation in Cleveland, and convince bank officials that they are dealing with employees and not slaves.

Perhaps if Mr. Martin cannot straighten out his Cleveland bank, the House Banking Committee might have to do it for him.

CHARLES C. HASLET RETIRES AFTER 43 YEARS WITH AP

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the House Press Gallery will lose one of its most respected and effective members on November 1, when Charles C. Haslet retires after 43 years of distinguished service with the Associated Press, the world's largest newsgathering organization.

Oklahoma's entire congressional delegation joined in a luncheon honoring Charlie Haslet last Monday, October 23.

Both of our Senators, our majority leader, CARL ALBERT, and other delegation members saluted this able newsman and his outstanding journalistic career, which has included 30 years of Capitol Hill coverage.

In his 30 years of covering congressional activities, Haslet concentrated primarily on the Southwest, and he became an authority on many matters affecting that region—including oil and gas. For years, he wrote a petroleum industry column which was distributed throughout the country, and his friends in the House Press Gallery sometimes hailed him good-naturedly as an "oil baron."

Haslet has been on a first-name basis with virtually all of the Governors and top State officials of his native Kansas, and adjoining Oklahoma and Missouri, for the past three decades.

Among his best remembered national stories was a "profile" of outspoken Representative Clarence Cannon, the Missouri Democrat who once headed the powerful House Appropriations Committee.

Heredity apparently played some role in Haslet's success as a legislative correspondent, because Charlie's father was the mayor of Wellington, Kans.—Charlie's birthplace—and later was a member of the Kansas State Legislature.

Charlie began newspapering while still in high school. Later he got a full-time job as reporter for the Wellington Daily News.

He joined the AP at its Chicago bureau in 1924, later held key positions at AP bureaus in Tulsa, and Oklahoma City, Okla., before being promoted to the wire service's internationally strategic bureau in the Nation's Capital in 1937.

Meanwhile, he had built up a rich journalistic background—ranging from coverage of murder stories to local and State politics.

Charlie's first wife—mother of his son, Charles, Junior—was killed in an automobile accident in New Mexico years ago. His second wife, Nell, is a native of Verden, Okla.

The Haslets are active and popular members of the Arlington Forest Methodist Church, of whose official board Charlie has been a member since the 1940's.

The Haslets have two lovely grandchildren—Brenda, 6, and Sharon, a little over a year old.

Few reporters working in Washington have won the respect and affection which are held for Charlie Haslet by both his colleagues of the press and the Members of Congress. He is universally liked and trusted, in a city where few men can claim to have served as long or as effectively.

I am sure all of us join in wishing many years of happiness and contentment to Charlie Haslet and his family.

VIETNAM

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not to throw any further coals into the raging fire of debate that engulfs our involvement in Vietnam. Rather, today, I wish to simply point out that we are involved in Vietnam; that we have committed thousands of our men to fight there; and that we, the Government of the people of the United States, are in turn committed to lend our full support to our fighting men who are placing their very lives on the line each day.

These gallant men, whose belief in our Nation is expressed in the form of physical action rather than rhetorical verses, should, among other things, be given the best that this Nation has to offer in the way of equipment, clothing, and food.

Therefore, it is with great dismay that I have learned from constituents, whose sons are fighting in Vietnam, that these courageous men are not being given the proper clothing needed to meet their needs on the battlefields in Vietnam. I am told by one of my constituents that they received a request from their son in Vietnam for a raincoat and later, a rain suit—both of which were promptly sent to him. Further information has reached me revealing that our fighting men are not getting proper food either.

In addition to being a disgrace, this all appears incredible.

We are spending some $2 billion a month in Vietnam. If what I have been told is true, then it seems quite obvious that this money is not reaching our fighting men in the form of proper equipment and food. And, if it is not, then I think that the Congress should be told why it is not.

A REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION INTO HIGH COST OF HOSPITAL CARE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am requesting a complete and immediate congressional investigation into the high cost of hospital care in this country. Steadily increasing cost of hospitalization has been an open concern for many years now, and it is obvious that the costs are continuing to rise despite efforts and stories, and investigations on the fringe areas.

But the main item in the cost of medicine is, and has been, involved in the hospitalization phase. I have read numerous reports and stories authored by experts in the field that many of our Nation's hospitals are poorly administered and run on a basis that would make the average businessman shudder.

Hospitalization is an obvious concern to every person in the Nation. I know that many people dread the thought of entering a hospital because of the cost, and there is ample evidence that our elderly who must undergo extended stay in hospitals find their life savings depleted.

We have already collected much information about hospitals from previous hearings, but we have never gone to the very heart of the issue—reducing the cost of hospital care.

We have limited manpower, and we are not now using what manpower we do have to optimum efficiency and thus are not realizing optimum results.

In a newly published report the Brookings Institution study on medical cost makes special reference to the forecasted rates of hospital costs reaching $100 per day in the near future.

Who among us can think of such rates without shock? I am sure that we can find methods to cut costs in our hospitals and in doing so, find a way to save money for every American.

One of the reasons for the increase of costs, which according to the Brookings report have risen between 6 and 8 percent per year for the past two decades and doubled each of the past 2 years, has been the rising costs of manpower.

The total expenditures of voluntary short-term hospitals—average stay 10 to 12 days—went from $1.5 billion in 1950 to more than $6 billion in 1964 and the percentage attributable to payroll rose from 56 to 62 percent during the same time.

We are in a field where new discoveries mean a need for more personnel instead of less, as is the case in many industries. But we are not producing the necessary manpower and are not using what we have to the optimum.

We are training skilled technicians and not getting the full rewards for that training. We are using these people to do menial and rote work which could possibly be done by electronic equipment. If computers and other electronic devices can be developed, they would free some of this pool of talent to do jobs they were trained to do.

The report we had last year when we considered the allied health professions bill indicated we are presently producing only one-third of the manpower which will be needed in the paramedical professions by 1975. We need to produce more, and supplement them with new innovations, such as electronic equipment.

And I feel we must rethink our present structure concerning our highly trained and experienced personnel on the professional levels. They should be directed at problems equal to their skills. Less experienced and less highly trained personnel should conversely direct their efforts to less complex problems.

We find expensive, yet limited-use equipment in several hospitals which are geographically close. This is the result of poor planning and a duplication of services which only serve to increase the cost of operation.

The cost of hospitalization has skyrocketed alarmingly over the past decade, well ahead of other service areas in our economy. I hope that hearings will be called soon by Chairman HARLEY STAGGERS, of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and that these hearings will result in finding out all of the "whys" of this situation and possible solutions that will bring about a change in this trend of increased costs of hospitalization.

DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES BELOW THE FLOOR OF THE OCEAN BEYOND THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution which would make it the sense of Congress that the development of the resources lying on and below the floor of the ocean beyond the Continental Shelf should be through international cooperation, rather than through rivalry and competition among nations, and I invite other Members to introduce the same or similar resolutions.

The text of my resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 558

Concurrent resolution concerning the development of the ocean floor through international cooperation

Whereas there are vast untapped resources lying on and below the floor of the world's oceans; and

Whereas such resources beyond the Continental Shelf are not subject to the sovereignty of any nation; and

Whereas the development of these resources through international cooperation could be a boon to mankind providing a source of revenue that could solve the financial problems of the United Nations and could help to meet the desperate needs of the less fortunate areas of the world, which create a dangerous imbalance between rich and poor nations; and

Whereas the development of such resources if allowed to become the subject of rivalry and competition among nations could become a dangerous source of possible armed conflict; and

Whereas the President of the United States has stated: "The wealth of the ocean floor must be freed for the benefit of all people;" and

Whereas the following item has been included on the agenda of the current twenty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly: "Declaration and treaty concerning the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and of the ocean floor, underlying the seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind:" Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that:

(1) the resources on and below the world's oceans beyond the Continental Shelf should be developed through international cooperation rather than by rivalry among nations; (2) the President should initiate within the United States Government, and should support at the United Nations and in other appropriate international agencies, such steps as will lead to the development of such resources through international cooperation; (3) as the first such step, intensive studies should be undertaken as to the most desirable method of achieving this objective, including the possibility of a treaty.

I regret that some of my colleagues in Congress have seemingly become alarmed by the initiative taken at the United Nations General Assembly by the Government of Malta and have introduced resolutions condemning the idea of turning over jurisdiction of the ocean floor to an international agency. Such resolutions, in my judgment, are premature, in that there is no immediate prospect whatever of any such action being taken, and they are also misguided in that they point in the direction of competition and possible conflict in the development of these resources, rather than in the direction of international cooperation.

I believe it would be helpful for this House to have before it the request by the Government of Malta for the inclusion of the item in question on the agenda of the General Assembly, and Malta's supporting memorandum, and I insert them at the conclusion of these remarks.

These documents make clear that Malta is not asking for any transfer of the ocean floor to the U.N., but is asking for steps to be taken to draft a treaty dealing with the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. Obviously no nation would be bound by such a treaty unless and until ratification had taken place.

I believe it would also be helpful for the House to have before it the statement made by Ambassador Goldberg with regard to the inscription of this item on the agenda of the General Assembly, and this statement will also be inserted at the end of these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, it would be a tragedy, and shortsighted in the extreme, for the United States, with all its wealth, to be greedy and try to snatch for ourselves the wealth of the ocean bottom beyond the continental shelves. We should proceed to deal with this problem, as we have done with regard to outer space and Antarctica, by moving in the direction of international cooperation, rather than national competition and rivalry.

It is far too early to say just what form of international cooperation should be involved. The treaty governing Antarctica provides a useful precedent, but the applicability of that precedent is limited because of the fact that the resources gleaned from Antarctica are apparently minimal. The same comment may be made with regard to the uses of outer space.

I would not myself be disposed to the view that title of the ocean bottom should be vested in the United Nations or any of its presently organized subsidiary bodies or affiliated agencies. I would assume that, after serious and intensive study, a new and specially designed international agency could be set up, possibly along the lines of the international agency proposed in the Baruch-Acheson-Lillienthal plan for the control of atomic materials put forward by the United States in 1946. Through such an agency, some part of the wealth now lying untapped, and largely unidentified, on and below the ocean floor could be put to use for the benefit of all mankind.

Specifically, it might eventually provide sufficient revenue to solve the difficult problem of financing the United Nations and its peacekeeping operations, and it could also be used to help the less fortunate areas of the world, whose desperate needs today create such a dangerous imbalance between rich and poor nations.

A great opportunity lies before us. Let us open the door to it, in a spirit of long-range statesmanship, not slam it shut, in a mood of shortsighted selfishness.

The statements referred to follow:

Request for the Inclusion of a Supplementary Item in the Agenda of the 22d Session

Declaration and treaty concerning the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and of the ocean floor, underlying the seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind

(Note verbale dated August 17, 1967, from the Permanent Mission of Malta to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General)

The Permanent Mission of Malta to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to propose under rule 14 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly the inclusion of the following item in the agenda of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly: "Declaration and treaty concerning the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and of the ocean floor, underlying the seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind."

An explanatory memorandum is attached in accordance with rule 20 of the rules of procedure.

Memorandum

1. The sea-bed and the ocean floor are estimated to constitute approximately five-sevenths of the world's area. The sea-bed and ocean floor, underlying the seas outside present territorial waters and/or the continental shelves, are the only areas of our planet which have not yet been appropriated for national use, because they have been relatively inaccessible and their use for defence purposes or the economic exploitation of their resources was not technologically feasible.

2. In view of rapid progress in the development of new techniques by technologically advanced countries, it is feared that the situation will change and that the sea-bed and the ocean floor, underlying the seas beyond present national jurisdiction, will become progressively and competitively subject to national appropriation and use. This is likely to result in the militarization of the accessible ocean floor through the establishment of fixed military installations and in the exploitation and depletion of resources of immense potential benefit to the world, for the national advantage of technologically developed countries.

3. It is, therefore, considered that the time has come to declare the sea-bed and the ocean floor a common heritage of mankind and that immediate steps should be taken to draft a treaty embodying, *inter alia*, the following principles:

(a) The sea-bed and the ocean floor, underlying the seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, are not subject to national appropriation in any manner whatsoever;

(b) The exploration of the sea-bed and of the ocean floor, underlying the seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, shall be undertaken in a manner consistent with the Principles and Purposes of the Charter of the United Nations;

(c) The use of the sea-bed and of the ocean floor, underlying the seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and their economic exploitation shall be undertaken with the aim of safeguarding the interests of mankind. The net financial benefits derived from the use and exploitation of the sea-bed and of the ocean floor shall be used primarily to promote the development of poor countries;

(d) The sea-bed and the ocean floor, underlying the seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, shall be reserved exclusively for peaceful purposes in perpetuity.

4. It is believed that the proposed treaty should envisage the creation of an international agency (a) to assume jurisdiction, as a trustee for all countries, over the sea-bed and the ocean floor, underlying the seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction; (b) to regulate, supervise and control all activities thereon; and (c) to ensure that the activities undertaken conform to the principles and provisions of the proposed treaty.

[Press release, USUN-138, Sept. 21, 1967]

Statement by Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Representative, in General Committee on the Inscription of the Item Dealing With the Peaceful Exploitation of the Ocean Beds

My delegation has listened with great attention to the explanation of the distinguished representative of Malta, Ambassador Pardo, in support of the request of his delegation for inscription on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly of an item concerning the peaceful exploitation of the ocean beds.

Now, it must be obvious to us that this is an item of very great importance and we conceive it to be a most timely one and we are pleased to support its inscription on the agenda.

Having in mind, the existence of past and future items on our agenda dealing with the "Resources of the Sea", and an item which we have already decided to recommend for inscription this year "Development of Natural Resources" which is related to this topic, I would, with your permission, Mr. President, address some general remarks so as to set forth the view of my delegation as to the context in which this item is set, and the reasons why we support its inscription.

Though man has travelled and fished on the seas for many centuries, this portion of the earth—five-sevenths of the surface of the globe—remains in many respects as strange and unknown to us as that other vast and little exposed realm of outer space. Both outer space and the sea, however, through science and technology, promise much to human benefit and both require for the fulfillment of the promise that we the nations of the world, through this organization, address ourselves to our tasks in cooperation and not in conflict.

Man's mastery of the oceans, and of all that lies beneath them, despite the use of them for so long, is still in an early stage of development. But we know already from scientific discoveries that the oceans contain immense stores of protein to add to urgently needed human food supplies. We believe that one day the floors of the deep sea can be mined for immense quantities of metals, hydrocarbon fuels, and other substances useful to mankind. We know also, though in far too little detail, how deeply the oceans affect the land—the building and erosion of our coastlines and the making of weather.

A rapid increase in our mastery of all these fields—and in the number of qualified scientists and engineers involved in them—becomes more and more urgent as human population expands at an astonishing rate and the demands of the human family for food, energy, and raw materials correspondingly increase.

In recent years many government and scholarly organizations have made important efforts, both separately and through international organizations, to spur research on oceanography and related fields. My own government has intensified its work in this field, especially since the enactment of the Marine Resources Act of 1966. But compared to what lies ahead, all these efforts to date have been rather insignificant. Our work must be redoubled, and it must, as Ambassador Pardo has correctly pointed out, be put on a more effective international footing, if the needs of future generations are to be met in time.

We therefore strongly endorse the expanding interest of the General Assembly in this field. This organization is in a position to assume leadership in enlisting the peaceful cooperation of all nations in developing the world's oceans and ocean floor.

At the appropriate time, when we come to the substance of the matter, my delegation will have certain specific proposals to advance. What we face today, as Ambassador Pardo commented, is the procedural question as to how the Assembly is to come to grips with this complex subject.

Mr. President, we believe that the General Assembly has met with considerable success over the years in its consideration of the peaceful uses of outer space, and, indeed, one of the great achievements of the last Assembly was the consummation of the Outer Space Treaty. While recognizing a number of differences between these two harsh environments, at the same time we see certain useful similarities. We have here an item, like outer space, of which some aspects might well have been considered within the context of the Sixth Committee, other aspects in the Second Committee, concerned as it is with the subject of resources. We also noted that the delegation of Malta made a strong plea for the reservation of the ocean bed exclusively for peaceful purposes. In so doing the Maltese Delegation raises a question related to the regulation of armaments, one which may call for our most serious study.

All things considered and taking into account the very explicit language of Rule 101 which specifies the First Committee as the "political and security committee (including the regulation of armaments)" my delegation will support the allocation of this item to the First Committee.

Rule 40 reminds us that this General Committee can address itself to the question of what priority should be accorded to an item and my delegation will likewise support the early consideration of this item in the First Committee.

SUPPRESSION OF THE SOVIET JEWS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the completion of the season of the Jewish high holiday period—the eve of Simchath Torah. Observed for many hundreds of years, this festive holiday commemorates the "rejoicing over the law" by the ancient Jews of Palestine.

During the last 3 years, this holiday has served as a symbol to thousands and thousands of young Soviet Jews who have used it to demonstrate in Russian synagogues and the streets outside them, their deep and moving desires for a meaningful Jewish existence—an existence which is categorically denied to them in Russia today.

As a characteristic of their generation, these young people have become increasingly conscious of their identity, their sources, and their religious heritage, with its positive strengths for today's world. To them, Judaism is more than a religious ceremony—it is a way of life, a form of identification, a means of self-expression. And yet fear and persecution stand as barriers to be overcome in order to exercise this simple and yet so meaningful expression.

Much has been written concerning the signs of literary freedom and "creative" intellectualism currently being extended in the Soviet Union. Indeed, many attribute this hopeful change in Soviet society as the major impetus to the sudden outward manifestation of pride being exhibited by the young Soviet Jews. Yet the hope for a lifting of the cultural and religious suppressions affecting Soviet Jews still remains so totally far removed.

In fact, it appears that the Soviet campaign against Judaism is increasing, despite the promises held out in official proclamations. The illustration of but a few poignant examples, according to information available at this time, conclusively reveals the fundamental contradictions between the stated principles and the actual practices of the Soviet system.

Soviet Jews are identified as both a nationality group and a religious faith. Soviet ideology, constitution, law and practice actively encourage nationalities to perpetuate their group existence through cultural and educational institutions and activities in their own language. While in the first three decades this policy was effectively applied to Jews as well as to the other 107 nationality groups within the U.S.S.R., there has been since 1941, no Yiddish school, and since 1949, no Yiddish theater in the U.S.S.R.

In comparison, many of the other nationality groups, far smaller in population than the Jews, are provided by the state with educational and cultural facilities in their native languages.

Although the U.S.S.R. is committed to atheism, it formally accords freedom of religious worship. The state asserts the principle of equality of religion with no special privileges for any religion. Yet, unlike other recognized religious bodies, Judaism is not permitted any semblance of a central structure. Each congregation must function in isolation from each other. Whereas other faiths in the U.S.S.R. are allowed to publish periodicals and religious literature, and have formal contacts with coreligionists abroad—Protestant, Catholic, and Moslem groups maintain such contacts—Judaism cannot.

The effects of such discriminatory practices are all too apparent: In 1956 there were approximately 450 synagogues in the Soviet Union—today there are 62; the average age of a rabbi in the U.S.S.R. today is between 67 and 68 years of age—the only Yeshiva in Russia—theological seminary—is barely functioning. There are less than five students currently enrolled. By systematically isolating and repressing the life of the Soviet Jewish community, Judaism within the U.S.S.R. is presently being doomed to cultural and spiritual extinction.

The Soviet Government cannot in any conceivable manner reconcile their anti-Jewish policies with their professed image of the U.S.S.R. as an egalitarian society. Even Communist leaders and parties in Western countries have publicly condemned Soviet efforts to curtail Jewish life.

On November 7, the Soviet Government will celebrate its 50th anniversary. Many speeches and publications will proudly acclaim the many achievements of the postrevolutionary Soviet regime. We, as responsible Americans, should not hesitate to acknowledge the accomplishments that have taken place in Russia in the last 50 years.

However, the most basic failing of their society which existed in 1917 still exists today—the lack of the primary freedoms that mankind holds so dear.

The present plight of 3 million Soviet Jews, resulting from just such lack of freedom, is a problem which causes great concern and anxiety throughout this country. I know that I can speak for the great great majority of people in this Nation when I express my hope and my prayer that steps will be taken soon to make available to Soviet Jews those simple rights granted to other religious and nationality groups in the Soviet Union, and those basic rights to which every man and woman in this world is entitled.

GOVERNMENT TAKES HIDES INDUSTRY FOR A SKINNING

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an article in the October 23 issue of the Wall Street Journal outlining the roller-coaster story of domestic hide prices since the Government decided to get in the act.

The article records how the Government decided to step in to curtail U.S. hide exports 19 months ago, ostensibly to protect against a domestic leather shortage. In March 1966, such exports were cut 16 percent from the 1965 level. The action dropped domestic hide prices to nearly half their former high, from 26 cents in February 1966, to 15.5 cents in October 1966.

While Commerce Department strategists had by this time eased the export restrictions, foreign buyers had begun getting hides from more dependable foreign suppliers, synthetic materials use boomed in the United States and abroad, and foreign competitors were taking advantage of the jumbled U.S. situation to increase imports of leather goods, reducing domestic demand for hides.

Now, the article notes, the domestic hides market is glutted, with prices standing at 14.5 cents a pound, and the domestic industry is warning it may wind up at year's end with 500,000 to 1 million spoilable hides on its hands.

Mr. Speaker, the currently depressed U.S. hides market is a prime example of the chaos caused by excessive Government interference in the free market. Government tampering has led to a declining market abroad by disillusioned foreign buyers who suddenly found their source of supply cut off, and to the substitution of synthetic materials for leather.

In addition to beating down prices farmers are getting for their hides, Uncle Sam's excessive interference has resulted in higher meat prices passed on to consumers by meatpackers whose profits have been undercut.

I include the full text of the article at this point in my remarks:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 23, 1967]

COMMODITIES: CATTLE-HIDE PRICES REACH 2-YEAR LOW AS U.S. DEMAND SHRINKS AND EXPORTS DROP

(By Laird B. Anderson)

CHICAGO.—A shortage of cattle hides that prompted the Government to curb exports 19 months ago is turning into a glut; prices have fallen since late summer and currently are at a two-year low.

The price decline means lower raw-material costs for shoes, gloves and a host of other leather products. But it also means higher costs for beef processors who count on hide sales to offset part of what they pay for live steers.

"I can't see where the market is going to show any improvement," says one hide broker gloomily as he surveys the outlook for the troubled commodity.

Hide prices have been swinging sharply in recent years, in large part because of a head-on clash between new patterns of leather consumption and Government efforts to ensure enough hides for domestic needs.

The upside part of that price swing started almost two years ago. At the time, greater affluence overseas was spurring foreign demand for leather shoes. But, at the same time, Argentina, a major world supplier of hides, was being forced by drought and other factors to reduce its offerings to the world market to 6.8 million in 1965 from 12.1 million hides in 1962.

On the Chicago market, the quote for light native cow hides, a high-quality grade used to make the upper part of shoes, nearly doubled in little more than a year, to a six-year high of 26 cents a pound in February 1966 from 13.5 cents a pound in January 1965.

GOVERNMENT STEPS IN

Then the Government stepped in. Commerce Department planners, concerned that U.S. hide merchants were exporting too many hides needed for the U.S. and other leather industries, decreed in March 1966 that exports had to be cut 16% from the 1965 level. Such exports in 1965 had climbed to 13.3 million hides from 11.5 million the year before. The Commerce Department was predicting then that exports would continue to rise to over 14 million in 1966. By the agency's reckoning, this would leave U.S. users in 1966 with 21.1 million hides, or 2.7 million less than they needed.

As might be expected, domestic prices fell on the quota plan. By May 1966, when the Government had eased somewhat its export restrictions, the Chicago price for hides had declined from the previous February's 26-cent level to 23 cents a pound, and the price continued to slump to a 1966 low of 15.5 cents a pound in October.

By then, however, Commerce Department strategists had decided it was time to withdraw the export restrictions. Again, the Chicago hide market reflected the change. Prices turned up sharply from October's 15.5-cent low to 19.5 cents at the end of 1966, and continued to rise through February of this year to 21.5 cents a pound.

By about that time, however, according to industry officials, a backlash against the Government's export quotas was beginning to hit the domestic industry. The quotas actually had failed to hold exports below the level that Commerce Department statisticians had predicted before the controls were imposed. Even with the restrictions, U.S. hide exports climbed to 14.1 million hides last year from 13.3 million in 1965.

COURTING DISENCHANTED CUSTOMERS

But John K. Minnoch, president of the National Hide Association here, says the quotas were eminently successful in convincing foreign buyers that they had better look outside the U.S. for their hide supplies. Argentina, where production was just starting to recover, began aggressively courting disenchanted customers and started lifting sales sharply by the close of last year. Argentina's sales climbed to 8.1 million hides in 1966 from 1965's depressed level of 6.8 million.

That switch away from the U.S. is intensifying this year. U.S. exports, unencumbered by any Commerce Department restrictions, declined 11% in the first eight months of this year, to 8 million hides from more than 9 million a year before. Argentina's exports, by contrast, rose 4.5% to more than 5.6 million from 5.4 million in January-August 1966.

Synthetic materials also are being used increasingly by foreign shoemakers as substitutes for the leather they had been buying in the U.S.

And, to the woe of both U.S. hide merchants and U.S. leather product manufacturers, more of these foreign-made products (with their foreign-origin leather) are being imported into the U.S., thereby reducing the demand for domestic hides.

HIGHER IMPORT BARRIERS URGED

In the first eight months of this year, shoe imports into the U.S. soared almost 30% from the 1966 level, to 88.6 million pairs valued at $141.4 million. According to the Tanners' Council of America, leather handbag imports jumped 38%, glove imports climbed 40% and imports of such smaller products as wallets were up 38%.

Understandably, U.S. production declined as imports swelled. Output of leather shoes and boots by domestic makers dropped 9.1% in the first seven months of the year from the 1966 pace, to 341.3 million pairs. The decline, says Irving R. Glass, executive vice president of the Tanners' Council, is as "serious as anything I've seen."

Some shoe manufacturers are predicting that domestic output may bounce back by the end of the year. Others, however, aren't so sure, and both tanners and shoemakers are pressing Congress to erect higher import barriers against foreign-made leather goods.

What's more, to the further chagrin of the U.S. hide industry, synthetic materials are being used increasingly in the number of shoes being produced in the U.S. Du Pont Co. said shoemakers last year bought enough Corfam, its leather substitute, to make 12 million pairs of shoes. That would account for only 2% of U.S. shoe production, but it was almost 2½ times the amount of Corfam sold in 1965. Still further gains are being posted this year. Du Pont says. Industry sources say that a Japanese substitute, Clairino, also is boosting sales.

For Mr. Minnoch of the Hide Association, the double onslaught of declining exports and shrinking domestic demand has prompted dire forecasts that the industry may end up the year stuck with 500,000 to one million spoilable hides.

On the Chicago hide market, the declines have triggered a predictable price slide. The key grade of light native cow hides currently is quoted at 14.5 cents a pound, up slightly from the 13.5-cent quote in effect during late August and early September, but still off substantially from the 24.5-cent level of eight months ago.

For shoe manufacturers, who figure that hides account for 20% to 25% of the cost of making a better grade of men's shoe and 30% of the manufacturing cost of a woman's shoe, the lower hide price means lower outlays for materials. But some big shoe manufacturers, even so, recently posted price increases of 3% to 4%, saying spiraling wage costs and technical improvements have more than offset the lower hide prices.

In the packing industry, by contrast, lower hide prices mean higher net costs. At current prices, packing houses can sell the hide from an average 1,200-pound steer for only about $10, down from nearly $14 this past February. That $4 difference is reflected in higher meat prices.

CREATION OF FEDERAL COMMISSION ON NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT TO REVIEW AND REEVALUATE THE EXISTING NUCLEAR PROGRAM

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Carter] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly endorse House Joint Resolution 599, introduced by my colleague, John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania, and cosponsored by several Members of the House, including myself. This resolution calls for creation by the Congress of a Federal Commission on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing nuclear program of the United States.

The president of the United Mine Workers of America, W. A. Boyle, has warned the American public of potential dangers to all Americans of the current system of disposal of atomic waste from nuclear reactors. Until Americans can be positively assured that such waste from nuclear powerplants can be disposed of safely, the Congress should reconsider its appropriation for this program.

My concern is for the health and safety of the American people. The effects of atomic waste, radioactive air and water pollution, malfunctioning of nuclear plants in heavily populated areas constitute a threat to the health of our people.

Also of great concern is the $1 billion a year we are spending for this civilian program. Such spending is virtually unsupervised and is almost entirely a subsidy to the electrical power industry at the expense of the competing energy sources, which receive little or no subsidy from the Federal Government. This billion dollars might well be spent to supplement programs designed to help education and train unemployed Americans.

THE UNITED STATES AND VIETNAM—WHAT LIES AHEAD?

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Carter] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the recent speech of the Honorable Morris Udall, of Arizona, deserves the intense study of all Members. It is comprehensive and shows an unusual understanding of the diverse facets of the Vietnam problem.

I include it at this point in the Record:

The United States and Vietnam—What Lies Ahead?

(Speech by Hon. Morris K. Udall)

Tonight I come to talk about war and peace, about Presidents, dominoes, commitments and mistakes. I want to start with some of my own commitments and at least one of my own mistakes.

When I went to Congress six years ago I made some commitments to myself: to make the tough and unpleasant decisions as they came; to speak out at times when remaining silent might be easier; to admit my own mistakes; and to advocate new policies when old ones, no matter how dearly held, had failed.

Two years ago, when this country had fewer than 50,000 men in Vietnam, I wrote a newsletter defending the President's Vietnam policy and pleading patience and understanding for what he was trying to do. I have thought about that newsletter many times with increasing dismay and doubt as the limited involvement I supported has grown into a very large Asian land war with half-a-million American troops scattered in jungles and hamlets, fighting an enemy who is everywhere and nowhere, seeking to save a country which apparently doesn't want to be saved, with casualties mounting and no end in sight, with more and more troops being asked for and sent, and with the dangers of World War III looming ever larger.

In the past two or three years I have attended many Vietnam briefings of the White House and State Department. Every time I've been told things are starting to look up. The "crossover point" may be just around the corner. The "kill-rate" is usually up. The pacification program, despite difficulties, is showing "real progress." Enemy morale is always down; in fact, each report brings new evidence of gloom for the enemy's forces. And the South Vietnamese army is always beginning to be ready to fight instead of run.

To be fair about it, I presume some progress has resulted from our enormous expenditures in lives and resources. I would hate to think otherwise. But each American escalation has been matched by escalation on the other side. And the grim probability as I speak tonight is that new and bigger escalations lie ahead. Unless we change our policy I predict we will have 750,000 troops committed to Vietnam within the next 18 months. There will be more bombing, more civilian deaths in South and North Vietnam, more American casualties, and great new demands of the American taxpayers to pay for all this.

I have listened to all the arguments of the Administration, read all the reports available to me, attended all the briefings, heard all the predictions of an eventual end to hostilities, and I still conclude that we're on a mistaken and dangerous road. In my judgment continuing our present policy will require that we send several hundred thousand more American troops to thresh around almost aimlessly in the jungles of Vietnam, thousands more of them dying and many more losing arms and legs and eyes without ever achieving what we know as "victory," all the while the material cost of this war is climbing from the present thirty billion dollars a year to forty or fifty or more.

What's even worse, I increasingly fear that the inevitable result of this policy will be a wider war. Already the major battles along the Demilitarized Zone are bringing talk of an invasion of the North, and as our bombers get ever closer to the Chinese border and Russian ships in Haiphong, one can see the stakes in his contest rising. I know there are those who say Russia and China would be foolish to come in with all the advantages they are enjoying from the present stalemate. But these people and this line of thinking were wrong in Korea, and they may well be wrong again.

Many of the wise old heads in Congress say privately that the best politics in this situation is to remain silent, to fuzz your views on this great issue, and to await developments. I hear few dovish noises in Arizona, and I suspect that silence would be the best personal politics for me. This would be especially true if it should turn out that we are at last starting to "win" this war.

THE OVERRIDING ISSUE

Then why am I here tonight? Vietnam is the overriding issue of this troubled year, and the people of my state are as entitled to my honest views as I am to theirs. I have come here tonight to say as plainly and simply as I can that I was wrong two years ago, and I firmly believe President Johnson's advisors are wrong today. Victory may indeed lie ahead; nothing is certain in this life. But life goes on, and men must make decisions based on the best information available to them at the time. Waiting for things to happen is not leadership, and steering a safe political course is not the highest order of public service.

This speech is not an easy or pleasant task for me. I am of the President's party; I admire him and the great things he has done for America. I have defended him on a great many occasions, including a visit I made to Cambridge University in England last February when my questioners were highly critical of our role in Vietnam. I know from history and from observing two Presidents firsthand what a man-killing job the Presidency is. So I take no satisfaction in disagreeing with a policy he feels he must pursue. I respect President Johnson for doing what he firmly believes is right, and it grieves me to add to his burdens. But I would be serving neither the President nor the country to pretend to agree when I feel we must modify our national course.

As I look back over the last two years I see the United States mounting a treadmill that goes ever faster—so fast it seems almost impossible now to get off. Yet I am convinced that we must get off that treadmill and that we can. The hour is late, but I believe this nation of ours has the brains, the know-how, the courage, the imagination to begin to extricate itself from a war we should never have blundered into.

Now, I don't want to fool you or myself. The steps I will propose in a moment will cost something, too, and, if taken, may have convulsive effects for a time in our own national life. But, in my judgment, the costs of staying with a mistaken policy will be far greater.

The great rationalization for our involvement in Vietnam is that we are there to stop the march of communism, to demonstrate that the United States honors in commitments, to strengthen the free world. We are failing, and I believe we will continue to fail as long as we maintain our present policy of military escalation. Indeed, I believe this policy is strengthening the Communist cause, weakening the free world, and raising grave doubts about the capacity of the United States to back up its commitments elsewhere.

I am advocating a change, not out of any fear or love for communism or admiration of Ho Chi Minh, but out of love for America and for its national aspirations. I am convinced our present policy in Vietnam does not serve our interests, and in a way it is as though we had designed it to serve our enemies. This may seem too utterly ironic, but let's think about it for a minute.

Let's suppose there had been a world Communist meeting in, say, July 1964. Everything was in disarray. The once-monolithic Communist movement was in a shambles. The two major Red powers, the Soviet Union and China, were at each others' throats. The Russians had suffered humiliating reverses in Berlin, Cuba, Africa and elsewhere. I recall *U.S. News and World Report* the previous fall had published an article entitled, "Is Russia Losing the Cold War?", and concluded that it was.

Suppose that at this imaginary meeting a brilliant young theorist had come forward with a dramatic plan to reverse the unhappy trend. Let me recite what he might have said.

"Comrades, I have a plan. By means of it we can enmesh the United States in the Asian land war its leaders have always warned against. Within three years I promise you 500,000 American soldiers will be hopelessly bogged down in jungle fighting, consuming huge amounts of supplies and vast quantities of ammunition while gaining essentially nothing. They will be seen as white men fighting Asiatics, colonialists, burning villages, destroying rice crops, killing and maiming women and children. Their casualties will be heavy—perhaps 100,000 by late 1967. They will have to boost their draft quotas and raise taxes. The war will cost them $30 billion or more a year. And this will upset their economy, cause inflation, threaten their balance of payments, and play hob with all their domestic programs. There will be great internal dissension and even riots in their cities. And, comrades, in spite of our differences, this is one cause that will bring us together, fighting on the same side. Furthermore, we can achieve all these wonderful results without committing a single Russian or Chinese soldier, sailor or airman, and at a total cost of perhaps one or two billion a year."

This is sheer invention, of course. There was no such meeting and no such plan. But the fact is that a dedicated President, surrounded by advisors with the highest patriotism and aided by a well-meaning but pliant Congress—all with the best intentions—has achieved essentially these results. We have handed our enemies all of this on a platter, and today many sincere Americans are ready to hand them a lot more of the same.

What we are doing today, as I see it, is essentially engaging in an act of national rationalization. We talk about having no alternatives, but if you boil that down to its essence, what it means is that we're too big and powerful to admit we made a mistake. I refuse any longer to accept a tortured logic which allows little mistakes to be admitted, but requires *big* ones to be pursued to the bitter end, regardless of their cost in lives and money. As a nation let's not adopt the senseless psychology of the compulsive gambler at the race track. If he's lost a whole week's wages on some unfortunate nag, he ought to quit and go home, sadder but wiser. But no, he'll go to the bank, draw out his savings, mortgage his house, and wipe out his children's chances for a college education, all in the vain hope that he can recoup his losses. I think this is the direction we're headed in Vietnam.

WHY PEOPLE ARE TROUBLED

When I talk to people about this war, I find them most troubled by this fundamental question:

Why is it that the United States, the most powerful, efficient and successful nation on earth, can't defeat a little, miserable, backward country like North Vietnam and do it overnight—or at least in six days like the Israelis?

On the face of it it *is* ridiculous. But there is logic and reason behind every event if we will only search for it. There are answers to this tough question—and they make sense—if we'll only look the truth in the face. Those answer as I see them come down to four fundamental propositions:

You cannot win a political and guerrilla war in South Vietnam by any amount of bombing in North Vietnam. President Johnson knows this, but I don't think the people do. Too many, I suspect, think that more bombs can win the war.

You cannot win this kind of war when the government you are backing is largely run by wealthy landowners and a military elite who have no real interest in the poor, illiterate peasants over whom the war is being fought. Unless they will give their support to that government, any military victory will be short-lived, if it can be achieved at all.

You cannot save a people who do not want to be saved and will not fight for the government which runs their lives.

You cannot win in this deadly poker game when any escalation "bet" on your part can be matched by a much smaller escalation on the part of the enemy. We cannot continue to assume that when we increase our forces the other side will stand still giving us a clear margin of superiority. Every time the result has been the same: stalemate at an even higher and more dangerous and costly level.

These are the grim truths about Vietnam, as I see them; before I go on I want to discuss them just a little further.

Our policy seems to assume you can win

this kind of war in South Vietnam with a bombing sideshow in North Vietnam. In my judgment there simply isn't a cheap, easy, sanitary way you can convert the people of South Vietnam into supporting the kind of government we've seen in Saigon, and that is what the war is all about.

It should be starkly clear to everyone by now that our bombing policy has failed. It began with *two* objectives—to stop or restrict the flow of men and materials to the south, *and* to bring Hanoi to the conference table. It has done neither.

In January 1965, the enemy strength overall was about 120,000. Today, despite huge casualties, it's estimated at 296,000. If we could believe all these Pentagon body counts, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong lost 149,000 men in 1966 alone. And yet their forces have doubled in size. By the math of guerrilla warfare which requires that we outnumber them at least 4 to 1, the Communists have more than matched our buildup to 500,000 men.

As far as the other objective is concerned, President Johnson tells us he hasn't heard from Hanoi. So apparently the bombing hasn't accomplished anything on that score either. Indeed, the strange fact is that stopping the bombing might bring talks; continuing it almost surely won't.

You know, when I hear people say we aren't bombing enough—and that is their explanation of our failures—I wonder what kind of scale they're using. I presume most of you were living during World War II, and you recall the merciless, intense bombing raids the Germans made upon England and the far greater devastation we rained upon the major cities of Europe in 1944–45. The peak was about 80,000 tons of bombs a month, yet we're dropping more than that now on a little country half the size of Arizona.

The fact is, we've substantially destroyed the production facilities of North Vietnam. Since their war materials are now coming from factories in China and Russia which we aren't able to bomb, it is argued that we must destroy the goods in transit, no matter what risks are involved.

I wonder how many people really believe the issues in Vietnam are worth the risk of a larger war. Vietnam is a nation whose history has been marked by turmoil, and by sporadic warring between North and South, for a thousand years. It is a nation that has known oppression at the hands of the Chinese, Japanese and French. It has never been able to develop a strong national government. The only government the people ever see is the tax collector. Some of the areas we are trying to liberate today haven't paid allegiance to Saigon for years. In fact, the whole history of Vietnam is one of local autonomy and great hostility to any central government, and one of the reasons so many local officials have been murdered by the Vietcong is that they were imposed on the villages by the Saigon government. This is where the struggle lies. We are fighting to preserve the residue of French colonialism in Indochina—an oligarchy of well-to-do, landed beneficiaries of a century of French rule. And when I read that absentee landlords often follow our troops into former Vietcong areas—to collect back rent as high as 60 per cent of the total rice production—I wonder how much chance we have of ever winning this struggle.

I sincerely hope that the recent election represents a turn toward popular government and attention to the needs of the people. And I recognize the problem of trying to build a nation in the midst of a civil war. But thus far there has been little to give one a feeling of encouragement.

A DISCOURAGING SITUATION

I wonder if you realize just how discouraging the situation is. Officer commissions in South Vietnam can be bought. Military supplies are stolen constantly. For many, bribery is a way of life. And in three years of fighting, out of 600,000 South Vietnamese, I understand only one officer of the rank of major or above has been wounded, and none has been killed. Can ordinary men be expected to follow leaders like this?

I might mention that through February of this year the United States lost, not one or two, but 109 of its officers of the rank of major or above in this military action. The number is even higher today.

As an American I also feel considerable resentment that our young men are required to risk their lives in Vietnam while that nation permits perhaps 200,000 of its own young men to dodge the draft and another 100,000 or more to desert the army every year. And it is shocking to me to realize that young Vietnamese can be deferred from the draft to go to college even if they never show up in class.

I suppose the average American imagines that our soldiers over there are spending their time fighting North Vietnamese who have infiltrated to the South. Let's not fool ourselves about who is fighting whom. Eighty per cent of the troops opposing us are South Vietnamese. Recently along the Demilitarized Zone we have been fighting some North Vietnamese main force units, but these constitute only a small portion of what we call "the enemy." The truth is that in most battles *Americans* are fighting *South Vietnamese*. I ask you: what are we doing? What are Arizona boys doing fighting South Vietnamese on behalf of other South Vietnamese whose leaders lack the will to fight?

I said earlier that we are fighting this war on the enemy's terms and with the odds stacked against us. Let me give you an example.

An American lieutenant recently talked to a news correspondent as he viewed the battle in a valley. Three helicopters were fluttering over a jungle area and shots were ringing out. The officer observed, "Look at this. I have three million dollars worth of equipment and twelve or fifteen highly-trained, well-educated men. Opposed to them over in that clearing is one peasant with a fifty-dollar gun. If the peasant is lucky, he wins the whole ball game."

Or think about this. We may gamble a $2 million airplane, $10,000 worth of bombs and the priceless life of an American pilot against a $25 rope bridge which will be rebuilt tomorrow even if we're lucky enough to make a direct hit. These are the odds we're playing over there.

Where does all this end? Already it has cost us close to $100 billion and over 100,000 casualties. And what have we gained for our country, for Vietnam, or for the cause of freedom? The time has come, I believe, to look at this war to see what we stand to gain by continuing our present policy—or to lose by trying some other policy.

THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION

The fundamental question is: How important is Vietnam in the scheme of things? Is this Armageddon? Is this the ultimate test of strength between government by consent and government by coercion, between capitalism and communism? Is the government of South Vietnam the one whose existence will determine the future course of civilization? Is this the showdown for the concept of "wars of national liberation?" Will this really determine whether our grandchildren live under communism? Does it really mean that we'll only have to fight later in Hawaii, Oregon or Arizona? If the answers to these questions are "yes," then we must proceed at all cost to win this war and insulate the government of South Vietnam from all future attack, subversion or rebellion.

But suppose, as I believe, that this is not Armageddon. Suppose this is just one of many episodes of revolution and turmoil occurring, and about to occur, in a world that is seething with the forces of change. Suppose that our extremely costly and exhausting response to this episode reveals to our enemies that we obviously can't afford to go through this process again soon. Suppose that a very possible result of this fantastically expensive enterprise will be a delay of just a few years in the ultimate success of the National Liberation Front. If this is the case, then I believe we must put greater emphasis upon our goals as a nation and less on the immediate military goals proposed for the conduct of this war.

I have reflected long and hard on what this war is, what significance it holds, and what effects various courses of action would have on our future role in world affairs. And I will tell you frankly I no longer see the war in Vietnam as Munich or Valley Forge. And I'm no longer very interested in hearing how we can capture one more hamlet or rocky hill. I'm interested in hearing how we can cut our losses, reduce our future expenditures in lives and resources, and bring this venture down to scale. I'm convinced our national interest—not Russia's, not China's, not North Vietnam's—demands that we sharply modify our present policy and that we start doing so now.

A great fallacy of our present policy, as I see it, lies in the assumption that stopping this "war of national liberation" will prevent any and all future wars of this type. Such wars were beaten back in Malaysia and Korea, yet this did not stop Vietnam or Cuba or the Congo. We are only due for more frustration and anger in the years ahead if we spend more blood and treasure to get some kind of significant "victory" in Vietnam.

This brings me to the hard question the President's advisors always put to their critics: "All right, you don't like what we're doing. Precisely what would you do, and what are the likely results of your policy?"

This is a fair question that demands an answer. I'll tell you what I propose, but first let me make clear what I do *not* propose.

We are in South Vietnam. It was a mistake to get there, but we're there. I am not suggesting any "cut and run" policy or proposing that the United States now withdraw from this war at once. I am not suggesting that we surrender to Ho Chi Minh. I am not suggesting that we turn our backs on those in South Vietnam who have come to rely on our commitments—people who, if we departed, might be victims in a blood bath of the kind we saw in Indonesia. I am not suggesting that this country violate the limited commitments we originally made. I do not propose that our investment in American blood and money be abandoned without giving the South Vietnamese every reasonable chance to save themselves.

And let me make clear there is another thing I am not doing. I am not breaking with President Johnson, either as Chief Executive or as leader of my party. Nor am I joining that group of anarchists who are marching on Washington, attempting to block the entrances of the Pentagon, counseling defiance of Selective Service, or sending money to the Vietcong.

Furthermore, I am not proposing anything particularly new. I don't pretend to have all the classified information necessary to formulate detailed alternatives. Rather, like Senators Mansfield, Church, Cooper, Morton, Percy and others who appreciate the President's sincerity and his anguish over the progress of this war, I feel I must try to convince him that our present policy is wrong and should be changed or modified.

Now, what *do* I propose? I propose that the United States halt all further escalation and Americanization of this war and that it discontinue sending any more Americans to do a job that ought to be done and can only be done by Vietnamese. I am suggesting that we de-escalate and de-Americanize this war and that we begin the slow, deliberate and painful job of extricating ourselves from a hopeless, open-ended "commitment" we never made. I am suggesting that we start bringing American boys home and start turning this war back to the Vietnamese. I am suggesting that we offer the people of Southeast Asia something better than the prospect of Vietnam-type wars as an answer to threats of subversion or aggression.

I would say to President Johnson: facing this decision will take the courage and greatness of which you are capable. People will villify you, or accuse you of appeasement. Countless armchair generals will tell you victory was just around the corner. But in the end I believe the American people will rally behind you when they realize that this decision will strengthen our country and advance its interests.

THE PRESIDENT SPEAKS

Major policy changes are tough to explain and defend, but I would propose that the President go on television and speak plainly to the American people, to the people of South Vietnam, to the leaders of North Vietnam, to the Soviets and the Chinese, and to our allies and friends around the world. I would propose that he tell them something like this:

"I didn't start this war but I enlarged it. I did this in the honest belief it could be won at moderate cost. My best advice in 1964 was that fewer than 100,000 troops would do the job. This didn't work. I was told that 300,000 would do the job. This didn't work either. Then I was told 500,000 was enough. It isn't. Now I'm hearing that another 100,000 or 200,000 will be the magic number. I was told that bombing extensively in the North would stop infiltration and bring Hanoi to the peace table. Instead, infiltration has increased as we have increased the bombing, and we're farther from the peace table than when we began. On the basis of all this advice we're dropping more bombs on this small, miserable country than the allies dropped on Europe at the peak of World War II, and yet our objectives elude us. So far I've seen 700 of our most costly aircraft destroyed and 1500 of our best pilots downed. I've seen 15,000 of our young men killed and 85,000 wounded, and countless others confined under unspeakable conditions in Communist prisons.

"I tell you frankly, my fellow citizens, that my advice was wrong and the decisions I made were wrong. As your President I now refuse to compound these mistakes, to follow this advice any longer, or to subject you and your sons and your tax dollars anymore to a course which is defeating this country's interests and dividing its people. I happen to believe that the pacification of Detroit and Newark is at least as important as the pacification of jungle hamlets in South Vietnam—and we can't do both.

"Accordingly, I am ordering a halt of the bombing of North Vietnam. I am ordering a gradual de-escalation of our entire war effort and I am directing our military men to prepare plans to back our troops off within a reasonable time to those areas of South Vietnam which can be defended most readily and to turn over the remaining defense job to the South Vietnamese themselves. Within a reasonable time after that we will turn over the balance of this war effort to the South Vietnamese and bring virtually all our troops back home. In keeping with our commitments, we will continue to supply whatever is needed to maintain the South Vietnamese forces while this threat continues and as long as we are convinced the government of South Vietnam is working in the interest of its own people."

The President having done this, I would suggest that he call upon our allies in the free world to assist this country in formulating a program of land reform, economic development, health and education throughout Southeast Asia, and that he ask the Congress to authorize a small part of the money saved through reduction of our war effort for a fund to begin this program.

Finally, I would suggest that the President send a message to the eight nations which participated with us in the Geneva Convention of 1954. It is in the breakdown of that convention—and the United States carries a large share of responsibility for that breakdown—that one finds the seeds of the conflict in Vietnam today. I would have him propose that the nations which were a party to that convention reconvene at the earliest possible date to set up procedures for a cessation of hostilities and for a return to the principles of that convention.

A WORD TO SAIGON

Now, what about our allies—and our enemies? To the elected leaders of South Vietnam I would think the President might say something like this:

"Our commitment to you was to assist you in repelling external aggression, not in defending your central government from your own people. We promised to help you build a free and non-Communist government, not to perpetuate a military or unrepresentative regime. Insofar as we have seen this war in terms of invasion from the North we have felt obligated to honor these commitments, and we have done so at tremendous cost in lives and in dollars. Wherever we have met main force units of the North Vietnamese, we have defeated them decisively. We are not leaving just yet, but we're cutting back because we think it is time for you to do your own fighting. This is your country and your war, not ours. And if your own people need pacifying, only you can pacify them; we can't begin to do a job like that. You must now build an army which can win this war; we can't win it for you. We will provide you with supplies and ammunition, but we are tired of cheating and blackmarketing and stealing while your people laugh at us. And a condition for our support will be stern measures by your government to bring these practices to an end.

"You have had your elections now, and it is up to you to begin immediately to build a government which will root out corruption and nepotism, and that will be concerned about the health and education and safety of ordinary people. If you will do this, we will help you finance a new program of public health, education, economic development and land reform that can provide a stable base for peace in Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

"I think it is time that you give more than lip service to the principles you espoused in Geneva—a united Vietnam and free and open elections, both North and South. This war is more than a conflict between abstract ideologies, more than a chess game between the Communist and non-Communist worlds. This war is mainly a product of real forces at work in your own country. No matter how difficult these problems are, you the people of Vietnam ought to be working at them. We Americans cannot settle these differences, but perhaps you can."

A WORD TO HANOI

To Ho Chi Minh and the other leaders in Hanoi I would suggest the President say something like this:

"We have beaten your main force units in every engagement, and we can continue to do so indefinitely. But we don't choose to do so because this is your kind of war, not ours. No longer will American troops contest you for every ridge, hill or patch of jungle. You will now be fighting your fellow countrymen. If you choose to fight our forces while they remain in Vietnam, you're going to have to attack us in strongly fortified areas where we have all the advantages. And this is going to be the new fact of life for you in Vietnam. No longer are we basing our plans on forcing you to the conference table in a hurry with one escalation after another. We're settling down now and building a firm base for the government of South Vietnam—but we're ready too, to return to Geneva and to the principle of a unified Vietnam.

"Furthermore, if you want to continue fighting, you should understand that you can take absolutely nothing for granted. While we will confine ourselves principally to certain areas of South Vietnam, the South Vietnamese will be everywhere, and we will not hesitate to come out and spoil offensive preparations directed against those areas we control when we feel so inclined. And whatever happens, American air power and naval power will remain in the Pacific.

"You have said a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam might persuade you to negotiate. Note that I am ordering a halt to the bombing. I suggest you now have an obligation to meet your part of the bargain."

A WORD TO OUR ALLIES

To our allies and those nations of the world which have complained of our bombing and escalation policies I think the President might say this:

"These policies you objected to have ended. Now let's see what you can do to find an avenue to peace in Vietnam."

To Secretary U Thant of the United Nations he might say "You talked a lot about our bombing operations blocking any hope for peace. Now here is your chance. If the Russians really want peace, as you have suggested, if an end to the bombing can bring an end to the war, let us now see results. Let *both* sides de-escalate. Let the Russians now de-escalate their supply operation. Let them show good faith in their statements about bringing this matter to the conference table—either that or stop talking peace while making war."

There you have it—a plan I believe might start to get us off the Vietnam treadmill. I frankly admit there is nothing very heroic about it. It's a far cry from "damn the torpedoes", "surrender, hell, we've just begun to fight", and other such stirring phrases from our history. But I think it is a prudent and humane proposal which will advance our country's interests. I'm just enough of an optimist to believe that a dramatic change of this kind would command support from a large majority of American mothers and fathers and sons and taxpayers and people who are concerned about the problems of our cities and our environment. I'm optimist enough to believe that a majority of our citizens regard the welfare of this country and the peace of the world as more important that "saving face," whatever that means. This country wants leadership, and it has always wanted to be told the truth—even the unpleasant truth.

I don't know how the ornithologists ever got involved in this war, and I have little hope that this speech won't get me labeled as some variety of dove, chicken hawk, pigeon, owl or ostrich. However, if it should happen that I dropped dead leaving this meeting tonight, I would hope that my tombstone might read: "Here lies a realist." Not a hawk, not a dove, but a man who was willing to face painful and unpleasant realities. It is my judgment that both so-called "hawks" and "doves" have erred in our recent debate over Vietnam and that both have been unrealistic, in part, in what they have advocated. I will return to this in a moment, and I'll have some critical things to say to each.

In this life every choice has its consequences. It isn't enough to complain of a policy one doesn't like; one must have alternatives and be prepared to face their consequences. I realize that my proposals, too, will have some pretty distasteful ramifications. But I'm willing to face them, as I expect I will have to do in the question period tonight.

FIVE STERN REALITIES

Because I think so much of our debate on Vietnam has been up in the clouds, I'd like to take a moment here to face up to five hard, stern realities which limit our options over there. Two of them the "hawks" refuse to face; three of them tend to be ignored by the "doves."

The *first* of these is that no amount of bombing is going to stop transportation of enough supplies to keep the Communist effort going in the South. The supplies aren't made in North Vietnam. They are made in Russia and China. If we permanently destroyed every railroad track and every bridge in the North, enough supplies would go through to keep this war at the present level indefinitely, and we have this on the word of Secretary McNamara in sworn testimony before the Senate. In 1966 the North Vietnamese were sending about 100 tons a day into the South. Today, following a year of the most intensive bombing in the history of the world, they're not sending 100 tons—they're sending 300 tons a day. And yet we are told that 100,000 tons of bombs a month, instead of 80,000 will change the result.

The *second* of these stern realities is directed to those who write me saying, "Let's pull out the stops." I wonder if they have thought about where this will lead. As you know, the United States got into this mess through certain commitments made by a succession of Presidents. Other nations have made commitments, too. When commitments like this come into direct conflict, wars get started. Political scientists still like to play games with the combination of treaties and ententes and obligations of various kinds existing among the nations of Europe prior to World War I.

My second reality, then, is this: No living man can give us any assurance that Russia or China, or both, won't come into this war with both feet in the next week, or month, or year, if we keep on as we are. As a realist I have to agree that the odds are they will not. But what a crazy gamble. If we lose that gamble, we are talking not of 500,000 American troops and $30 billion a year but perhaps five million troops and $300 billion a year—and maybe nuclear warheads on Tucson and every other important city.

Let's not forget Korea. Recall that President Truman met with General MacArthur on Wake Island on October 15, 1950, and in that conference MacArthur told Truman the war was all but won and assured him neither the Russians nor Chinese would intervene in spite of our invading North Korea. With Truman's acquiescence MacArthur proceeded to launch a "final" offensive on November 25, followed one day later by Chinese intervention and one of the most costly retreats in American history. We ignored reality then; let's not repeat it.

I gather that among the "birds" here tonight are some "doves." I have some hard counsel for you, too. Many of you have written saying that if we will but stop the bombing, Ho Chi Minh will join us in sincere talks. I hope I'm wrong, but I have to tell you of my third stern reality—the improbability that Hanoi will pull our chestnuts out of the fire, or help us find some easy way to save face. I've studied the arguments about past peace efforts and the charges that we resumed bombing just as negotiations were about to begin. Our peace efforts have been clumsy, and probably insufficient, but I don't believe that Hanoi in the past three years has really been willing to make a peace our government would have accepted. The President was encouraged last winter to make something out of the "Tet" truce, and we stopped our bombing activities for a few days. Knowing this was coming, the North Vietnamese loaded up every truck and sampan they could find, and in those four days moved really huge amounts of supplies. But they didn't move a single diplomat, or a single peace feeler.

In spite of this gloomy peace prospect I think my program makes sense because it's right for our country. I'm tired of having decisions affecting 200 million Americans being determined by what some hard-nosed Politburo in Hanoi or Peking decides to do.

And this brings me to stern reality number *four*. There are legitimate, effective, democratic means available to work a change in the policies of our government. They still work, and I'm trying to use one of them tonight. Violence and disruption and name-calling will contribute nothing to the solution of our problems or the advancement of reasonable alternatives.

If alternatives are to be regarded as more than mere posturing, they cannot start with the assumption that anyone taking a different view is ignorant of the facts, blind to truth, oblivious to history and basically wicked. Reasonable men can differ on the course to follow in Vietnam, and they're not likely to come to agreement through the shaking of fists or flinging of epithets.

Thinking about the consequences of my proposal, I feel I must face up to one *final* very harsh reality, and that is the slim prospect that the present government of South Vietnam and its army will be able to do the job I have outlined for them. On this level I am frankly pessimistic about my proposal. But if we give them a fair chance, if we assure them of all the supplies and ammunition and military hardware they need, and in spite of this they are unable to manage their own defense after a reasonable length of time, then so be it. The Lord has not assigned us the job of defending South Vietnam in perpetuity. The French withdrew from Indochina and Algeria. Britain did the same in India, Egypt and various countries of Africa. The Dutch did it in Indonesia. There were internal convulsions in each case, but those nations survived and prospered.

How ironic it is that we can live in this prosperous country and go calmly to bed at night while governments which call themselves "Communist" rule in Warsaw or Budapest, or indeed Havana. But we must accept tens of thousands of American casualties and put out endless billions of dollars to assure, at all cost, that there is never such a government in Saigon. I'd far prefer to see friendly governments in all of Asia; but there are limits to what this country can do and to the costs I'm willing to pay.

U.S. CAN "DO NO WRONG"

I have always wondered why it is that every other country can lose wars, admit mistakes and retreat once in a while, all without permanent injury, but the United States can do none of these things without loss of honor.

I say let's continue to supply South Vietnam. Let's make clear we will withdraw our forces gradually. But in the end let's put the destiny of Vietnam in the hands of the Vietnamese, and let's get back to our own serious problems in this country.

As I speak tonight we're about a year from our next Presidential election. Nearly everyone, I supppose, has been speculating about the choices that will face us in that contest. If the Republicans reveal more judgment than I tend to credit them with, they might present us with an option such as I have outlined tonight. If they do that, there might well be a Republican President in the White House in 1969. But I don't think they will give us this kind of option. I expect their candidate will be a Nixon or a Reagan who promises us even more bombing and more escalation and more likelihood of blundering into World War III. And the end result, after more years of bloodshed, bombs and war bonds—if we're lucky—will be some kind cessation of hostilities without victory. And then a few years later some Asian Charles de Gaulle will boot us out, and we will have gained nothing but bitterness and debt.

I might say that, if President Johnson could work some miracle and get a cease-fire tomorrow, I would expect this same result a few years hence. Charles de Gaulle may be a unique personage but he has no monopoly on ingratitude.

As I spoke of the consequences of my proposal, I'm sure some were saying, "Yes, but how about the Domino Theory?" My answer is that countries aren't dominoes, and wars aren't games. What's going on in Vietnam can't be explained simply in terms of a world ideological struggle. There are real issues involved in Vietnam and the other countries of Southeast Asia. A country that ignores these real problems is headed for trouble. A country that works at solving its problems probably is going to make out all right.

If you want my best judment regarding the Domino Theory, it is that our military operations in Laos and Thailand have made those countries far more likely to topple, like dominoes, than if we had never fought in Southeast Asia at all.

That brings me to the subject of commitments. Last spring in a House speech I quoted Historian Henry Steele Commager as saying that the succession of commitments we have made in Vietnam were essentially "mindless." I agreed with this and said it was as though at each of the crucial moments when world-shaking decisions were to be made we had our minds on other matters and regarded these decisions as of little consequence. I still believe this, and as a Member of Congress I regret that our Presidents in the last twenty years have committed this nation to assume certain obligations without fully consulting the Congress or initiating any dialogue that could produce a clear mandate for such commitments.

Each of these commitments were made, I believe, with the assumption that this was all that was needed to carry out U.S. objectives in Vietnam. Now we are told that with just another 45,000 troops, and perhaps bombing of the last remaining targets in North Vietnam, we can do the job. Who really believes this?

COMMITMENT TO BANKRUPTCY

Some years ago, when I was practicing law here, a troubled businessman of modest means came to me as an old friend. His closest friend during a terminal illness had asked him to help the sick man's son, who was just starting in business. He readily agreed; in other words, he made a solemn commitment. Subsequently he loaned the boy $5,000 after his friend's death. It soon became apparent the boy didn't have any business sense, but the agreement was a solemn one. Soon he had $25,000 of his own money and half his working hours invested in a clearly losing venture, and he was neglecting his own business affairs. When he came to see me, he had just talked with his banker about mortgaging his home. It was apparent to me he was on a course that would lead eventually to bankruptcy.

I believe the "war hawks" in this country are following a similar sort of logic. They say it was a mistake to commit ourselves, but we did, and therefore we have no alternative but to carry it on at any cost, no matter how great or for how long, until we can conclude it on terms which we consider satisfactory.

I told my Tucson friend that he had kept the spirit and word of any commitment he had made to his dead friend and that now he should tell the boy frankly that he could go no further. I told him, as I tell my countrymen now, that your first commitment is to your own people and your own future. Beyond this you do what you reasonably can for your friends, but no more.

Finally, I'd like to talk about that magic national attribute called "face." As I recall, this is something we used to say the Orientals were terribly concerned about. Now apparently it's become vital to us.

I don't accept this. In the long run a nation's prestige and greatness and "face" depend on doing what is right for its own people and taking the consequences. There is no dignity greater than that of a strong man, or strong nation, admitting a mistake, correcting it, and taking the consequences. There is no course more likely in the long run to destroy one's dignity or "face" than to become a prisoner of past mistakes.

I'm against Communist aggression and for building up the strength of the free world, and this is why I propose that we quit playing a Communist game on Communist terms. I propose that we put greater emphasis on America's self-interest.

Perhaps this sounds isolationist. Well, I'm no isolationist. I don't think America can or should turn its back on the world. With the population explosion, technological development and all the rest, it's vital that we play a role in world affairs. But I do not believe the Lord ever put his foot on Plymouth Rock and assigned us the mission to settle every controversy in every corner of the world. In the past quartercentury we seem to have taken on such a role.

What we must do is put Vietnam in perspective. If we could but read the history of the coming century, I think we would see that the struggle in Vietnam was but one of dozens of struggles in the underdeveloped, formerly colonial areas of Asia and Africa and Latin America. There are great forces of change at work in the world, and I'm not talking about communism. I'm talking about the aspirations of two-thirds of the human race to enjoy the good life now enjoyed by the other third. We can't prevent change from occurring, even if we wanted to do so. And we can't police the world and right every wrong.

By policing Vietnam we hope to make our commitments credible, yet increasingly we are making them less credible. To illustrate, earlier this year the President dispatched three lonely transports to the Congo to aid in quelling the latest eruption there. It provoked a violent storm of congressional criticism on the grounds that it represented the first step toward another Vietnam involvement. I'm not saying the criticism was right or wrong, but this episode reveals the hard truth that, precisely because of Vietnam, the United States is far less likely ever again to intervene in places where intervention is favorable, is called for, or might be successful.

MANY REVOLUTIONS TO COME

There are some 125 nations in this world. In the years ahead many of them are going to be involved in civil wars, revolutions and clashes with their neighbors. In most cases our best policy will be to stand back, as we did in Indonesia, the fifth largest nation in the world, a rich source of many raw materials, an area far more important in any power struggle than Vietnam. For years this nation had what amounted to a Communist government under Sukarno. He broke relations with the United States, burned our libraries, denounced us at every turn. Surely here was a situation touching our interests. Yet we committed not a single soldier nor for many months a single dollar of aid. What was the result? Because we stood back and waited, the people of that country took matters into their own hands and threw Sukarno and his Communist friends out. While many problems still beset it, Indonesia has started on a better course.

In Vietnam the task has been made infinitely more difficult by our actions of the past two decades, but we can still help the Vietnamese people to do the same thing for themselves. And, in any case, we should know by now that we can't do it for them.

The world has always been full of evil, suffering and injustice. I wish it were not so. But I agree with President Kennedy who said not so many years ago:

"We must face the fact that the United States is neither omnipotent or omniscient—that we are only 6 per cent of the world's population—that we cannot impose our will on the other 94 per cent of mankind—that we cannot right every wrong or reverse each adversity—and therefore there cannot be an American solution to every world problem."

I agree with these words of President Kennedy, yet I am also aware that he shares with Presidents Truman, Eisenhower and Johnson a partial responsibility for the fix we are in today in Vietnam. To me, this contradiction illustrates the dilemma of America's post-war role as a world leader. We have no territorial designs. We believe in the free determination of people to choose their own form of government. Yet we also seem to feel we have a missionary duty to stop anything labeled "Communist" wherever it appears. With such conflicting, if not contradictory, policies it's no wonder our country gets itself into trouble.

Sydney Smith, a British theologian of the last century, stated our predicament very well in one sentence when he said, "Errors to be dangerous must have a great deal of truth mingled with them." We have allowed ourselves to be convinced of the "rightness" of incompatible ideas because there was so much truth mingled with them. I think the time has come to re-examine those ideas to see that they don't lead us to even more serious trouble.

And as I fly back to Washington tonight I'm going to be thinking of the prayer which that wonderful organization, Alcoholics Anonymous, teaches to its members; it might teach this nation something too:

"Oh Lord, give us the strength to change the
things which can be changed;
The courage to accept the things which cannot be changed,
And the wisdom to know the difference."

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There is no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, no one who has looked at the darkening skies over all of our large cities, or who has experienced the feeling that he may choke if he takes another breath, can doubt that the problem of air pollution is indeed serious; moreover, it is steadily worsening. If we act now, we can deal with it in a rational and deliberate way. If we wait, the problem will inevitably reach such critical proportions that drastic measures will be necessary.

The proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 would enable us to take the more intelligent course. It would result in strengthened control efforts at all levels of government. It would call on Federal and State agencies to furnish guidelines for constructive action. It would greatly increase funds and facilities for research and control activities. And, finally, it would help us to provide the degree of protection against air pollution that people have a right to expect, no matter where they live.

The provisions of the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 constitute an appropriate response to the growing challenge of air pollution. It is just as appropriate now as the Clean Air Act was in December 1963.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S POPULARITY REACHES ROCKBOTTOM

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Kleppe] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, the popularity of our Attorney General, already at a low ebb, is in the process of reaching rockbottom. There is justification for the slide. It has been caused by the Attorney General himself. From certain actions that have been recently reported, the Department of Justice is certainly inconsistent in its action, if not downright lax in its policy.

To show the divergent paths that the Department is taking, consider the following: The first incident is one of a department of Government, which has a duty, by law, of protecting the interests of the Congress, and has refused to follow that directive. The statement of the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. Broyhill] on the floor of the House on August 31, 1967, spells out the story (page 24843). Briefly, whenever the constitutionality of an act of Congress affecting the public interest is put in issue, the Attorney General is notified by the court that such is the case and is given an opportunity to enter and respond to the lawsuit. See 28 U.S.C. 2403. The District of Columbia's 1-year residency requirement for eligibility for public welfare assistance (3 District of Columbia 203) has been called into question on the basis that it is both a denial of due process and is an unconstitutional restriction of the right to travel. Some 40 States have such residency requirements. The Attorney General was notified by the court hearing the case, for the purpose of permitting his intervention, but he chose not to respond. The only governmental respondent was the Corporation Counsel's office which represented the District welfare agency.

I do not know the reason for the nonintervention by the Justice Department, but it is possible that they were simply too busy with the legal activities in Louisiana to follow closely the interests of Congress on a matter of national importance. It has been reported that the Justice Department has intervened in the case of a Washington attorney who has been charged with practicing law in Louisiana without a State license. The Department is reportedly seeking an injunction to prevent such prosecution. One cannot overlook the fact that the attorney so charged is associated with a well-known Washington law firm that has figured prominently in the Johnson administration.

I find it anomalous that on the one hand, the Attorney General chose not to intervene in a matter affecting the constitutionality of an act of Congress on an issue having national repercussions, after having been notified; and, did intervene, on his own motion, in the case of a private attorney charged with practicing law without a State license.

When one notes the disjointed and seemingly inconsistent actions of the Department of Justice, it is understandable why the popularity of the chief legal officer of the United States is at rockbottom. The meanderings of the Department of Justice are, at the least, lacking in positive direction, if not lax in policy.

SUPPRESSION OF RUSSIAN JEWRY

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in late April of this year I joined a number of my colleagues in a statement condemning the suppression of Jewish spiritual and cultural life in the Soviet Union. I rise to speak on this grave situation again today, the day ending the Jewish high holidays, the eve of Simchat Torah, marking "the rejoicing over the law," observed for hundreds of years.

For the past 3 years, this holiday has brought thousands of Soviet Jewish young men and women to Russian synagogues and the streets outside in a moving demonstration of their intense hunger for a distinctive Jewish experience in the face of Soviet pressure. It is particularly fitting, therefore, I feel, that our concern with the plight of approximately 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union be renewed and stressed again most strongly on this day.

Rabbi Israel Miller, chairman of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, issued a statement not long ago, conveyed to President Johnson, which pointed out most clearly that the hope for lifting the suppression of the Jews' cultural and religious life has not been fulfilled.

Permission allowing even a "trickle of emigration" of Soviet Jews to join their relatives abroad was completely shut off last summer after only a brief period. A widespread vilification campaign against Israel and Zionism has made life uncomfortable, at the very least, for these people. The rights granted to other nationality and religious groups have continually been denied to the Jews.

The instances of injustice and suppression need not be listed. They are clear enough in a world in which the struggle to recognize the equality of all men and the right to live and worship freely grows stronger with each passing day.

As I said earlier this year, and am repeating now, and, if necessary, will do so over and over again, the suppression which the Jewish people suffer in the Soviet Union stands out starkly as a flagrant violation of human rights, not only against the Jewish people, but against all mankind. All men concerned with these rights must continue to give the fullest support to the determined efforts of the American Jewish community and every individual working to expose the patterns of discrimination against Soviet Jewry until Soviet policy is reversed.

CONDEMNATION OF DISCRIMINATORY ACTS AGAINST RUSSIAN JEWS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, today is the beginning of Simchat Torah, a Jewish holiday whose name, in translation, means "joy of the law." With what is surely some form of sardonic irony, it is the only holiday that the Soviet Government permits the Jews of that nation to celebrate.

In 2 weeks that same Soviet Government will be celebrating 50 years of Communist power with panoply and display. It will trumpet to the world the great material progress of the Soviet Union, and may even try another space spectacular. Yet in what really matters, how the Government treats human beings, the Soviet Union is just where it started. Men are still instruments of the state, to be used as the state sees fit.

Certainly the 50th anniversary of the Russian revolution gives Soviet Jews no cause for rejoicing. The U.S.S.R. has consistently practiced toward the Jewish religion and culture a policy that has reduced the Russian Jewish community, to paraphrase the New York Times, to a state of "desiccation" unparalleled among the religious and ethnic communities of the Soviet Union. No Hebrew bibles or prayer books are printed in the Soviet Union; no books have been published in Hebrew since the year of the revolution, 1917.

But not only religion is attacked. All forms of secular Jewish culture, which once flourished in Russia, have disappeared through attrition or suppression, except, of course, for a few publications which are nothing more than creatures of the Communist rulers.

The continued existence of Soviet Jewry is tenuous at best. Soviet Jews know that when scapegoats are needed, the Government can concoct another "doctor's plot"; that when "economic criminals" are singled out, their numbers will be disproportionately Jewish. Any expression of sympathy by Soviet Jews for their fellow Jews in Israel, a most natural human emotion, is out of the question. How could it be otherwise, when the Soviet press and spokesmen have likened the Zionist movement to the worst forms of fascism?

Let the Soviet Union boast. Its military power is mighty. Its technology is advanced. But for the Soviet Jews, and indeed for all people who love freedom, the boasts ring hollow.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ESCH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives considered a program which I believe to be of major importance to our Nation and to the ordered redevelopment of our troubled urban areas. I am disappointed at the action taken by the House yesterday and urge the House conferees to report a compromise indicating strong continued support for this program. I refer, of course, to the rent supplement program.

I fully share the belief expressed by so many of my colleagues that in this time of budgetary crisis we should move to save money and to cut back on Government spending. Indeed, I have consistently supported economy moves by my votes. However, it is mandatory that we not cut back on the essential programs that are doing the most to help our people. The violence faced by cities throughout the Nation surely indicate that we can no longer ignore their problems. Certainly the problems of decent housing are among the most urgent facing the urban areas. The rent supplement program is a good first step in providing decent housing. Failure to give our full attention and action to programs such as this can only lead to further frustration in our cities, and perhaps to further violence. Our budgetary cuts must come in areas which will not adversely affect the future of our urban areas.

The rent supplement program, as now authorized by law, is a limited program to help those who are in greatest need of decent housing: the elderly, the handicapped, the displaced, the slum dwellers. Families receiving rent supplements must be eligible for public housing and cannot have more than $2,000 in assets or $5,000 if the individual is over the age of 62. Each family must devote one-fourth of its income to housing and the rent supplement program assumes the remainder of the cost.

We have had rent supplements in this Nation for many years. Indeed, our entire public housing program is a form of rent supplements insofar as it provides decent housing for families at lower rent to them than could be acquired elsewhere. But public housing involves Government ownership, Government management, and Government control. It also involves very large Government capital outlays.

The rent supplement program, on the other hand, makes use of private capital, private ownership, private management, and private control. It puts our system of private enterprise to use in solving significant problems of our Nation. Thus, it puts Government money to a highly productive use. The same amount of Federal money will yield assistance to far more people and will provide significantly greater numbers of decent housing units than any other program presently under way. The $40 million which we discussed yesterday would have provided decent housing in more than 45,000 units. The success of any proposed solution to the problems of our cities depends on the degree to which we can enlist total community involvement, and through its coordination of the Government and private industry this program is a useful one.

In short, the rent supplement program is an effective way to provide decent housing for disadvantaged persons at a reasonable cost to the taxpayer by employing the expertise and capital of the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of new initiatives in improving the quality of life in our cities is obvious. For this reason, I not only support the rent supplement program, but other imaginative and creative programs as well. Certainly Senator PERCY'S pioneering efforts through the National Home Ownership Act to bring homeownership within reach of the poor is an outstanding example of the types of programs this Congress should give its attention to. I am extremely hopeful that the Committee on Banking and Currency will report this measure to the entire House for action within the near future.

ECONOMISTS SUPPORT SPENDING CUTS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in its hearings over the past 2 years, the Joint Economic Committee had heard from a number of private economists as well as Government officials on the necessity of restraining the growth of Federal spending and the responsibility of the administration to insure this is done. I have asked the staff of the committee to identify some of the significant statements supporting these principles from recent witnesses appearing before the Joint Economic Committee.

Under unanimous consent I include this material in the RECORD at this point:

JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT, 1967, UNANIMOUS STATEMENT OF AGREEMENT

In view of the substantial budget deficit projected for the fiscal year 1968, there should be reduction of expenditures. In the first place, there should be greater assertion of priorities in terms of economic growth and national interest. This is imperative as part of our efforts to achieve an efficient allocation of resources. We agree that there is considerable room for reducing lower priority items or in some cases improving efficiency in government. The prospect of reduction in expenditures reduces the case for a tax increase even if the economy's expansion is restored during the second half of the year.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON THE 1967 PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

FEBRUARY 3, 1967

Senator **PERCY.** Does the Budget Bureau have an initiative responsibility for pressing on the administration delays in programs or budget cuts as you see a condition unfolding which is unfavorable and unhealthy for the country?

Mr. **SCHULTZE.** Yes. I would say yes with one modification. I don't think I like the term "pressing on the administration" because somehow it seems to indicate pressing on a reluctant administration, but apart from that, yes.

FEBRUARY 6, 1967

Secretary **FOWLER.** This attitude of preferring to reduce nondefense expenditures, which was espoused by the minority of the committee last year, is the policy that we in the administration felt was the appropriate policy, and during the spring and summer, as I have indicated, we did go to great effort to try to hold down increases in both authorizations and appropriations that would give rise to this thrust for increased expenditures.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR F. BURNS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH, FEBRUARY 15, 1967

No one reading this table, or the budget message as a whole, can very well escape the impression that Federal spending is now growing in nearly every direction.

When the nation's budget gets into such a condition, the first and foremost necessity facing the Congress is to subject every expenditure program to the most searching reexamination.

For, unless a determined effort is made by the Congress to check the proliferation of Federal spending, the foundations of our economy may be weakened. With public revenues increasingly rapidly in these good times and the public debt still growing, there is a danger that scarce resources are being applied to projects of marginal or even doubtful value. Not only that, but the recent spurt in public spending is bound, sooner or later, to lead to higher taxes. This already happened last year and the President is now requesting additional tax increases.

STATEMENT OF PAUL W. M'CRACKEN, PROFESSOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, FEBRUARY 16, 1967

What, therefore, would the budget look like if the $5 billion or so of fiscal restraint were applied to nondefense expenditures instead of to taxes? The fact is that these outlays for services supplied by the private sector could still rise at the annual rate of 7 percent—still 50 percent higher than the noninflationary growth rate for GNP.

Thus limiting the rise in these nondefense outlays is a reasonable budget target.

TESTIMONY OF BERYL W. SPRINKEL, VICE PRESIDENT AND ECONOMIST, HARRIS TRUST & SAVINGS BANK, CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 17, 1967

Avoid a tax increase because of its adverse effects upon private expectations, but at the same time apply unusual restraint on Government expenditures. . . .

At a minimum, Government programs should be carefully evaluated in terms of results rather than objectives before additional funds are authorized. Higher taxes are neither a necessary nor a desirable means of getting an easier monetary policy.

STATEMENT OF HENRY C. WALLICH, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, YALE UNIVERSITY, FEBRUARY 21, 1967

Even if inflationary pressures should mount sufficiently to require counteraction, expenditure cuts would present an alternative to a tax increase. Federal expenditures in the NIA budget, including for Vietnam, are scheduled to reach 21 percent of GNP, contrasted with 18 percent in recent years. After this, as after any other war, expenditures are unlikely to return to their earlier GNP relationship. Hence the case for holding them down now is a good one if economic balance calls for restraint.

The quite unjustified view seems to have gained ground that cuts must necessarily and virtually exclusively fall upon the new programs in the areas of space, education, poverty, health, pollution, urban life, and the like. Clearly, almost all Federal expenditures are capable of being cut. The fact that a program has been going on without much change for many years seems more nearly a reason for examining it closely than for leaving it undisturbed. It may be more difficult to cut an old program than to block a new one, but it may not be better economics.

INVITED COMMENTS ON THE 1967 PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(By Emilio Collado, chairman, research and policy committee)

With the economy operating at or near the peak of its capacity as we enter 1967, it is especially important that the Federal Government examine its spending plans with extreme care. The total of Federal expenditures must be such that these demands together with the total of demands from the private sector as a whole do not exceed the economy's potential to produce at stable prices. As we said in our program statement in December,

This committee believes that holding down the rate of Government expenditure growth would be preferable to raising taxes as a way of achieving the necessary surplus; temporary tax increases tend to remain in effect and the revenues they generate tend to be absorbed in permanent spending programs. But it would not be realistic to expect the required expenditure reduction in the next 6 to 8 months, when it is most needed.

HEARINGS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISCAL POLICY ON TAX CHANGES FOR SHORTRUN STABILIZATION

STATEMENT OF C. LOWELL HARRISS, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, MARCH 16, 1966

The present budget includes expenditure proposals which were made many months ago, when it was presumably assumed that no increase in tax rates was called for. If there is now need for an increase in tax rates, some of those programs are probably not justified, at least on the ground of the original decisions. The rise in market rates of interest creates a presumption that some long-term projects would not meet the criteria of acceptability at this time.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES M. BUCHANAN, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, MARCH 16, 1966

Mr. **BUCHANAN.** I think it is very difficult if you try to argue that this particular program should be cut and this program should be cut . . . You could make a strong defense for any of these programs. I think, for this very reason, the type of cutting that has to be done, and makes a lot of sense, is just simply an across-the-board type operation.

TESTIMONY OF ALFRED C. NEAL, PRESIDENT, COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, MARCH 18, 1966

Senator **PROXMIRE.** Suppose we simply cut roadbuilding sharply—cut 25 percent, or 50 percent. You could do that right away.

Mr. **NEAL.** I think that the Government should explore every avenue for withholding money appropriated; and as a matter of fact, in another statement, we have recommended that the President's power in this respect be made very, very clear.

THE STATUS OF SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, suppression of minorities in any land can operate most effectively in quiet darkness. It is most important that men of good will do all possible to enlighten public and world conscience to unjust discrimination among human beings and supression of liberty wherever it occurs.

This month marks the 50th anniversary of the Communist Revolution in Russia, and today marks the eve of a most sacred Jewish holiday. Perhaps too little known within the free world are the travails and attacks suffered by the Jewish people of the Soviet Union. Recently the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry held a national leadership conference in Washington, D.C., to call attention of Americans to the increasingly dire plight of Soviet Jewry. The conference was titled "The Ceremony of the Eternal Light"—light against unjust discrimination—an old American tradition for all people—and so badly needed at this time for these people.

CURRENT ECONOMIC TRENDS AND THE OUTLOOK FOR EMPLOYMENT GROWTH AND PRICES

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was most privileged to have the opportunity yesterday to appear before the eighth conference on "The Metropolitan Area, Its Prospects and Problems," presented as part of the urban affairs program of the National Institute of Public Affairs. This program entails several 2-week conferences each year in which local government and metropolitan community officials engage in intensive study of the problems and prospects of metropolitan areas.

The subject matter of these conferences varies widely. I am inserting in the RECORD for the interest of Members my remarks containing a critical review of economic patterns and trends, with particular emphasis on their implications for urban employment, development, and revenue:

CURRENT ECONOMIC TRENDS AND THE OUTLOOK FOR EMPLOYMENT GROWTH AND PRICES

(Remarks of the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS before the National Institute of Public Affairs October 24, 1967)

The art of economic forecasting is seldom without hazards, but I think it is fair to say that today the economy is entering a period where the outlook is fairly clear.

What I see ahead for the coming year—and I think most economists would agree—is a moderate gain in real output, price increases of up to 5 percent, and possibly more, and a continuation of extremely high long-term interest rates. Along with these problems, we are likely to see more serious labor disputes. This year we have already had more strikes than in the past 14 years. Next year should also witness an increase in our balance of payments deficit and further pressures on our gold stock.

In short, except for employment—which probably will hold up reasonably well—the economic outlook is bleak. Even employment is ultimately going to suffer as the economy makes the painful, adjustments that will be required to restore our lost cost-productivity-price stability.

A dangerous inflationary psychology is taking hold in our country. It is leading investors and businessmen to shape their decisions on the obvious need for protection against coming price increases. If any proof were needed, you have only to look at long-term interest rates. Last year interest rates reached painfully high levels, and in the late summer, the country was on the brink of a financial crisis. The housing industry fell into a deep recession from which it has not yet recovered. Where do long-term rates stand today? It's hard to believe, but they are actually higher.

Look what's happening to State and local governments. Interest rates on tax-free municipal bonds recently reached the highest levels in 33 years, exceeding even last summer's peak. Several weeks ago, an affiliate of the Bell System paid the highest rate of interest on a bond issue paid by any member of the Bell System since 1921. One leading New York banker has said that he foresees high interest rates at least for the next two years, and possibly to 1975. The reason is perfectly clear. The investment community expects inflation and high interest rates will be a fact of life for the foreseeable future. The obvious course is to borrow now before money gets even more expensive. The trouble is that, as always, actions in anticipation of inflation have the effect of bolstering the inflationary forces that individuals are trying to avoid.

The most fundamental economic problem we face today is the sharp rise in wage costs, combined with a slow growth of productivity and resultant rise in unit labor costs, which are up about 6 percent in the past year. During the first half of 1967, major union contract settlements provided for average increases in wages plus benefits of nearly 5 percent a year. This is obviously far in excess of the Administration's now defunct 3.2 percent guideline for noninflationary wage increases.

One can hardly blame labor for trying to catch up with inflation, rising State and local taxes, and increased Federal payroll taxes. The fact is that the average worker's weekly paycheck—after discounting inflation and higher taxes—increased by only $1.17 in the past six months and is still below the level reached in the fall of 1965. What lies at the root of recent strikes, particularly the protracted labor dispute in the auto industry and the strong possibility of a strike in steel and other major industries next year, is the erosion of purchasing power caused by serious inflation.

But workers are not the only ones being hurt. Business profits have fallen sharply this year as increases in wage and other costs have been absorbed. Most analysts believe that corporate profits will not rise at all next year if the 10 percent tax surcharge is enacted. Even if taxes are not increased, gains in profits will be modest. The current expansion is beginning to be labelled "profitless prosperity," and you can bet that once the economic climate improves, businessmen are going to try and recoup some of their higher costs by passing price increase on to consumers.

The fact is that business can't be blamed any more than labor for trying to protect its position. At least both business and organized labor are in a position to protect themselves. The same cannot be said of social security recipients, other pensioners, and the unorganized poor of the country. These are the real and largely forgotten victims of inflation.

What does the recent price record show? Are we having or building up to a serious inflation? I think the facts are quite clear. In the first three months of the year, the consumer price index rose slightly over one percent at an annual rate. The rate in the first half of the year speeded up to 2.3 percent. In the third quarter, however, we were experiencing inflation at an annual rate of 4.5 percent. Perhaps even more significant for the future is the fact that after a period of stability, there has once again been a sharp renewal of increases in wholesale prices of raw materials and industrial goods.

Mind, you, this has occurred during a period when growth has been slow because of a major adjustment of inventories which business has been carrying on. It has occurred despite the fact that industry has been operating far below capacity. The question we have to face is what happens when demand rises sharply. The signs of a resurgence of homebuilding and a sharp step-up in retail sales already exist. Once demand pressures are superimposed on existing cost pressures, the groundwork will be laid for an inflationary superboom, followed by an almost inevitable contraction of activity.

Another important point to remember is that there is very little slack in the labor force. The unemployment rate has been hovering at or below the 4 percent rate all year. This is due less to government policy, however, than to the effects of the defense buildup. Since fiscal 1965, civilian employment generated by defense spending has increased by one million—or by 23 percent of the total increase in civilian employment during this period. Another 700,000 were taken into military service and thus out of the civilian labor market.

But whatever the reasons for the current level of employment, the economy is going to experience even tighter labor markets once economic activity begins accelerating next year. Tight labor markets combined with higher consumer prices provide a classic setting for an even more severe wage-push problem.

Naturally this outlook assumes a continuation of the Vietnam conflict. The end of the war would change our calculations, although probably by less than we now expect. Defense spending would fall more slowly, I believe, than most people realize, thus permitting a gradual adjustment of the private economy. Assuming for the moment that defense expenditures will continue to increase, however, I think the picture that I have drawn is reasonably accurate. It should raise questions about how we got where we are today and what we can do about it now that we're there.

It was not too many years ago that the "new economists" were suggesting that the business cycle had been tamed. We were assured that frequent and timely changes in taxes and in monetary policy would enable the economy to grow in step with its steadily growing capacity to produce. Unemployment would be at a minimum and prices would increase by only 1 to 1½ percent a year. Obviously this hope has been shattered within the past two years. It has become painfully clear that Government stands all too ready to stimulate economic activity when employment is high, but is loathe to pull in the reins when inflation threatens.

Between 1961 and 1965, the task of economic policy was relatively simple. Because of necessary but unpopular measures taken in the Eisenhower Administration, the economy in 1961 was in balance. Wage costs were advancing roughly in step with productivity. Prices were reasonably stable. Unemployment was too high, but much of the unemployment that was attributed to a deficiency in aggregate demand was in fact caused by the lack of skills of many unemployed persons to fill the millions of jobs that were going begging in our society.

Nevertheless, through tax cuts, the investment credit, higher Government spending, and easy money, the economy was stimulated by Government action. GNP began to rise rapidly, and unemployment dropped. The concerns expressed by many individuals that the expansion was proceeding too rapidly fell on deaf ears. Regrettably, inflation also gained a foothold.

The result was that when the buildup began in Vietnam, the economy had little or no slack left to absorb war-time demands. On top of large increases in defense spending, nondefense spending was also sharply increased. Since mid-1965, defense spending has increased at a 22 percent average annual rate, while spending for purposes other than defense has risen at a 13 percent annual rate. The real Government budget deficit soared, although it was obscured in the official figures by such expediencies as accelerating tax payments and the sale of Government financial and other assets. At the same time that fiscal policy was highly stimulative, the Federal Reserve also contributed heavily to the economic expansion by supplying large quantities of reserves to the banking system.

The increase in the discount rate in December 1965 and the move to a tighter monetary policy last April signalled the deep concern of the Federal Reserve about the inflationary time-bomb contained in the emerging economic situation. While the Administration made some moves toward fiscal restraint in 1966, it is now widely recognized that it did not do enough. In the end, it was the necessary but painful monetary squeeze instituted by the Federal Reserve which halted the inflationary boom in its tracks.

The slowdown in economic activity earlier this year, however, led both the Federal Reserve and the Administration to move with haste to stimulate the economy once more. The Federal Reserve shifted aggressively to an easier policy. In the past 9 months, the money stock has increased at a 7 percent annual rate, the fastest rate of increase for any 9 month period in over 20 years, and a sharp reversal from the actual decline which occurred through most of last year. Other monetary indicators have also reflected extreme ease.

Fiscal policy has also been one of the most stimulative on record, even though the economy has been at full employment. The best measure of the economic impact on the Federal budget, at least according to the Council of Economic Advisers, is contained in the so-called high employment budget analysis. On this basis, the budget deficit was an estimated $12 billion in the third quarter of 1967, the most stimulative since World War II.

With an Administrative budget deficit of $29 billion now likely for the current fiscal year, with the monetary and fiscal throttles still wide open, it is not surprising that the outlook is for more inflation. Demand is being pumped up at the same time that cost factors are pushing up prices. Our first order of business—and it must come before the inflationary psychology spreads much farther—is to check the wage price spiral which is already well under way.

The key question, and the one around which so much debate is raging, is what form that restraint should take.

The Administration has recommended a 10 percent tax surcharge on corporations and individuals as a means of controlling inflation. Others—including myself—believe that reductions in Federal expenditures would be more effective and pose fewer risks.

Nearly everyone agrees that the Federal Reserve should slow down monetary expansion, but this is extremely difficult as long as the Treasury is going into the financial market on a massive scale. It used to be said that budget deficits didn't matter. It is now clear that deficits do matter. They matter because they must be financed. The size of the fiancing required and the timing of Treasury borrowing may have a powerful impact on the cost and availability of credit to private borrowers and thus on the growth of the economy. Today monetary policy is virtually a hostage of the Administration's fiscal policy. Until fiscal order is restored, the Federal Reserve is unable to perform its full role in combating inflationary forces at loose in the country.

I have suggested that a tax increase would be less effective and pose greater risks than a reduction in Federal spending. Why is this true?

First, dollar for dollar, a cut in spending has more anti-inflationary impact than an increase in taxes. An increase in taxes cuts spending by only 93¢ or 94¢, since 6 percent to 7 percent of income goes into various forms of savings. But when Federal expenditures are reduced, demand is cut by the full amount of the reduction.

Second, a hike in taxes increases corporate costs and reduces consumer disposable income. With corporations already facing a profits squeeze, an increase in taxes is likely to be passed on in whole or in part through higher prices. Meanwhile, with take-home pay further reduced, workers are going to ask for larger wage increases, thus contributing even more to cost pressures.

Third, higher taxes would be detrimental to the long-run growth of the economy. Taxes already are too high and exert a drag on the growth of the economy. Businessmen too often make basic investment and other decisions for tax reasons rather than for good economic reasons. We all know the history of "temporary" tax increases. If the surcharge is enacted, I predict it will be a long, long time before taxes are cut again. In the meantime, the greater tax burden will serve to depress investment and growth in the private economy.

A reduction of Federal spending based on a careful assessment of national priorities avoids the hazards of the tax increase and offers some additional positive benefits of its own. Programs of low or marginal value should be pruned or eliminated altogether. A reduction in Federal expenditures would cut the deficit and thus reduce the upward pressure on interest rates coming from the Federal sector. It would release resources for State and local needs as well as for the needs of consumers and business. In addition, pruning low priority programs now would pave the way for an increase in expenditures on high priority national programs once the Vietnam emergency is over.

I want to make clear that I am not speaking now of 1968 expenditures alone. The 1968 budget must be cut, but even more important, there must be a successful effort to hold down spending in the budget which the Executive departments are now preparing for fiscal 1969. The most effective time to control the size of the budget is before it is submitted to the Congress.

The debate over taxes and spending reductions which is now taking place is of crucial importance to the country. Essentially that debate concerns the amount of resources which will be devoted to the Federal sector. The issue of controlling inflation is important as well, but we should not fool ourselves into thinking that a tax increase or reductions in spending will stop inflation. At best, a stiff dose of fiscal restraint will only slow inflation from a gallop to a fast trot.

I believe that we must make that effort. But at the same time, the way in which fiscal restraint is applied will be as important as the fact that we do it. That is why I support a reduction in spending over a tax increase and believe that the best interests of our economy for the near future as well as over the long run would be best served by such action.

HEW'S WELCOME SHIFT TO REHABILITATION

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on September 14, 1967, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—25638—an article from the New York Times of August 29, entitled "Training of Needy Broadened by the United States—Health Unit's Rehabilitation Includes Youth and Aged." At that time I hailed this as the "Welcome 'New Concept' at HEW" coming as it did a short time after a speech by Presidential Aid Joseph Califano implying strongly that the idea of rehabilitation had gone out the window at the White House. Mr. Califano revealed regressive assumptions about social welfare programs in a speech before the Washington chapter of Sigma Delta Chi on April 19, 1967, when he stated that "only about 50,000 males are capable of being given jobs and training that will make them self-sufficient" out of the 7.3 million people on welfare.

Today I am inserting in the RECORD an additional article also from the New York Times, August 20, 1967, describing the "realinement of rehabilitation programs into a single agency." I am pleased to see this reversal toward rehabilitation and hope that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will continue in this direction. It is by far the most humane approach we can take for the individuals involved, and the most beneficial for society as a whole.

It is in error to think that automation, or cybernetics, renders or has rendered certain people economically obsolete.

The article follows:

SOCIAL SERVICE SHIFT—GARDNER REALINEMENT OF REHABILITATION PROGRAMS INTO SINGLE AGENCY IS HAILED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

A major realinement of Federal welfare, rehabilitation and social service programs was announced last Tuesday by John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

The new agency, the Social and Rehabilitation Service, will carry out the functions of the Welfare Administration, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Administration on Aging and the Mental Retardation Division of the Bureau of Health Services.

The administrator of the new agency is Mary E. Switzer who for the last 17 years has headed the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. The total budget for the new agency for the current year is $4.8-billion.

Secretary Gardner pointed out that there were these key features in the new agency—which is known as the Social and Rehabilitation Service:

It brings together the various services that deal with special groups: the aged, the handicapped and families, particularly children.

It separates the administration of public assistance payments from programs concerned with services to people.

It establishes a single regional commissioner of the new service in each of the department's nine regions throughout the country.

The action taken by Secretary Gardner in this new alignment is far more than administrative streamlining.

The basic objective is to bring the rehabilitation concepts exemplified by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration into programs for the needy, disadvantaged children, the aged and the mentally retarded.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Secretary Gardner chose Miss Switzer to head the new agency.

When asked how she prefers her career to be described, Miss Switzer has always said: "A career public servant."

When Miss Switzer was appointed director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in 1950, The New York Times commented editorially as follows:

"The first woman to hold such a high post in rehabilitation activities, her appointment should be greeted with warm approval by professional rehabilitation workers, by the medical profession and, most important, by the handicapped persons who will benefit from her ability and experience."

This prediction has certainly been more than fulfilled.

In commenting on the reorganization plan and Miss Switzer's appointment, Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, stated:

"Rehabilitation is very much the keynote of the new H.E.W. organization. The administrator of the department's new Social and Rehabilitation Service is one of the nation's authorities on rehabilitating people.

"I know Miss Switzer well. She is practical, she knows how to get the most out of bureaucratic machinery and she has absolutely no respect for red tape. She knows the great potential in even the most disabled human being and she is a past master at organizing opportunities for human growth and development.

"She is not afraid to experiment and innovate.

"I welcome the Social and Rehabilitation Service. We need it and we need the approach it will bring."

Since she became director of the public program of vocational rehabilitation there has been an appreciable increase in the number of handicapped persons rehabilitated into employment in each of the last 17 years.

Last Monday, Miss Switzer announced that 173,000 handicapped persons were rehabilitated in the year ended June 30, 1967. This was an increase of 12.5 per cent over 1966.

Significantly, three-fourths of the persons rehabilitated last year were not working prior to rehabilitation. Many of the remaining had only marginal or part-time jobs.

Rehabilitation philosophy and techniques that have proved so successful with the handicapped will be applied particularly to public welfare recipients, for disability and dependency usually go hand in hand.

In partnership with state and local government, and with voluntary agencies and institutions, the Social and Rehabilitation Service will have responsibility for a large number of persons.

About 7.6 million persons (4 per cent of the population) receive cash assistance at any given time under federally aided programs. These payments total about $4-billion annually, of which 62 per cent comes from the Federal Government and the balance from state and local governments.

Almost 175,000 persons are rehabilitated for gainful employment each year through vocational rehabilitation programs.

Over six million needy persons receive medical services each year through federally assisted programs, including the new Title XIX Medicaid program.

Over 600,000 children receive child welfare services related to adoption, foster care or neglect.

Over 450,000 crippled children receive medical services each year with Federal assistance.

More than 250,000 women received family planning help last year through Children's Bureau programs.

More than 700 projects assisted by the Administration on Aging provide services for many of the 19 million Americans over 65.

RELATED PROBLEMS

When an individual of a family is in trouble, it is usually the result of the combination of a number of related problems. The solution requires a combination of approaches.

The combining of the various services that can contribute to the solution of multifaceted problems of troubled individuals or families makes sense not only administratively but also from the standpoint of philosophy and program.

APPROVAL OF PASSAGE OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 241

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong approval of the House's unanimous action last Friday in the passage of House Resolution 241, to transfer jurisdiction over national cemetery legislation from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the Veterans' Affairs Committee. The distinguished chairmen of the three involved committees, Congressman Teague of Texas, Aspinall, and Colmer, are to be commended on their continuing interest in this excellent resolution.

Many of us have been deeply concerned in the past few years over the administration's adamant opposition to expansion of the national cemetery system. The administration takes the position that burial benefits, such as those now payable by the Veterans' Administration and the Social Security Administration, are preferable to fulfilling the Government's commitment to our veterans by providing sufficient national cemeteries. The administration has agreed to a small expansion of five closed cemeteries, including Fort Rosecrans in my district in San Diego, Calif., primarily because of the national outrage that these cemeteries had no space for our Vietnam dead. This is only a stopgap measure, however, and does not indicate any basic change in policy.

All of us realize that there is no "pat" solution to expanded national cemeteries. But, certainly a nation of our size and technical proficiency is more than capable of establishing and maintaining an effective and equitable national cemetery setup. The random construction or expansion of a cemetery here and there is not the solution. For this reason, I am reintroducing my legislation from the 89th Congress to provide for a National Cemeteries Site Selection Advisory Board to govern further development of the national cemetery system. This Board would consist of two Members of the House appointed by the Speaker, two Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, and five members appointed by the President of the United States. One of the Presidential appointees would be a veteran, active in veterans' affairs. No more than two members may be officers or employees of the executive branch of Government.

I realize that passage of this resolution will not immediately solve the problem of national cemeteries, but do feel it is an affirmative step toward a permanent solution. I am hopeful that the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee will consider my resolution and other cemetery legislation at his earliest convenience.

LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT RED GUNS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, a suggestion that weapons—including small arms and artillery—captured from the Vietcong and other Communists in Vietnam be brought back to the United States and put on display in every American city is made in an editorial of the San Diego Independent.

The idea is that this would drive home to the American people, including the minority of doubters, that we really are fighting against Russian and Chinese guns, mortars, and other weapons. This would make clear graphically, too, that the Communists are not the peace lovers they try to paint themselves. The Independent notes that Civil War and World War I cannons and field guns have been so displayed permanently in many American towns and cities.

Since four-fifths of the war materiel used to kill and maim Americans in Vietnam is Russian supplied and the rest Red Chinese, this would underline who our real enemies are in Vietnam and seems to me an excellent idea. I recommend it to the appropriate authorities.

Under unanimous consent, I introduce the cited editorial:

Let's Take a Look at Red Guns

Not too many years ago, in almost every city and town in this country, courthouse lawns and municipal parks spouted elderly, grey-painted cannons, relics of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and of World War I.

Although most of these now-unfashionable reminders of long-past strife have succumbed to erosion and the scrap merchant, they did serve a certain purpose. To adults they were a tangible, ever-present reminder of the horrors of war. To children they were steel and wood pages of history that could be climbed upon, touched, and examined.

Now, we are engaged in a bloody, frustrating, and seemingly endless war in Vietnam. True, we see battle movies on television, we read story after story about the fighting in newspapers, but, to the average citizen, it all seems remote, unreal.

The Independent proposes that the military bring captured Viet Cong, North Vietnam, and Chinese small arms and cannon back to this country and put them on permanent display in every major city and town in the United States.

Why? These exhibits will show that the enemy carries lethal weapons, not children's toys. Too, they will show everyone, hawk or dove, that the Viet Cong, the North Vietnamese, and the Red Chinese are not simpering, peace-loving agrarians, but determined, war-mongering fanatics determined on enslaving the free world.

The Army and the Marines have no use for these weapons. Let's put them to good use here.

A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FRAUDULENT RUSSIAN BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with all the anti-Vietnam war demonstrations staged in our Capital City, it is high time that we realized that the psycho-political cold warriors in Moscow and its associated Red syndicate members have targetted the United States as an object of traditional Russian divide-and-conquer strategy and tactics. To simply thwart these demonstrations by police and military force is not enough. The propaganda effects are far-reaching, and to our disbenefit in Vietnam and elsewhere in the world.

TIME FOR PROPAGANDA COUNTERATTACK

The time now is for a positive counterattack, specifically the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. By all evidence, this action by the people's Representatives will, without question, bring the Red totalitarian regimes to a reevaluation of their strategy and go a long way toward changing the Vietnam episode in the cold war to our victorious benefit.

The Captive Nations Week of 1967 emphasized this point to show by select example the scope of this popular demand, I include the following in the Record: First, an article in the Friar October magazine by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky on "What Is Our Moral Purpose"; second, the proclamation by Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin, of Baltimore, Md., on Captive Nations Week; and third, the program on Captive Nations Week, 1967, in Phoenix, Ariz., and the address by George W. Abbott, the tribute by Rev. Michael E. Reynolds, the beneficiary by Rev. Wesley Darby, and the news accounts in the Arizona press:

[From Friar magazine, October 1967]

What Is Our Moral Purpose?

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Professor of Economics, Georgetown University)

Today, we are told, there is a new ferment and restiveness among youth, not only here but throughout the world; we are told that change has engulfed mankind, and that we are confronted by uncertainties and challenges of unprecedented proportions. Youth, as the present foundation of the future, needs a firmer perspective than this.

Essentially, youth today is no different from that of thirty years ago, or fifty or one hundred years ago. Indeed students are more civilized today than they were in medieval times when many a professor was catapulted through a window. Those of the past also had their problems, their pressures, anxieties, and frustrations, and their periods of restiveness and rebellion. The historical setting was of course different, but the conditions of problem-solving and emotional stress were the same.

Also, the way some talk about change in the present, you would think the world stood changeless and static in preceding generations. Technologic, social, cultural, economic, religious and other changes were as real then as now. The quantities and mases involved, the pace and rapidity are, of course, different now, but real change by way of transformation and becoming was present in yesteryear, too.

True, there were no TV transmitters, space shots, automotive miracles, horrendous missiles, LSD drugs and so forth, but these are only the accidents of change, not its essence. For the comforts they provide, the labor costs they reduce, the pain they relieve, and the new horizons they open, the means of change are important and determinative. But in the years to come, what we consider stupendous today will be viewed with the same attitude as we view the innovations of the past.

The twentieth century, a period of massive change, is in fundamental respects strikingly similar to the fourteenth century, a turbulent period of transition from the medieval world to the modern. Institutions were subjected to critical change and revision then, as the minds and souls of men, formed by the rational and spiritual disciplines of the Church, charted new avenues of existence in the dominant spirit of "Love God and do what you will."

"Love God and do what you will" is not a message of license to indulge in whatever you please or desire, regardless of consequences both to yourself and those about you. Positively, it is a message of personal, moral freedom and liberty, aimed toward a rational and volitional order within yourself and thus, by automatic contribution, to the society in which you live. To love God means to love His creation and daily to do all that is necessary for the wholesome and ordered fulfillment of both His creatures and works. It is a rule, born not of arbitrary dictation but of pragmatic experiences upon experiences over centuries.

Today, even some theologians teach "God is dead," but this thesis, philosophically repugnant on the surface, is both indicative of our period and, in my judgment, explosive for the long-run good. It indicates not that God is dead, for this is philosophically self-contradictory, but that God as a self-subsisting Reality is dead in the minds and souls of modern men who have lost their love of God and seek to do what they will, often without moral principle, charity and justice.

Is it any wonder that amidst the marvelous changes of this century, our history is tragically marred by bigger and fiercer wars, by Nazi and Russian genocide condemning millions to gas chambers and slave labor camps, and by the growth of a totalitarian Soviet Russian empire which, behind the facade of Communism, is unprecedented in the annals of history.

Merely to provide economically better plumbing systems, more jobs, and even more education of certain types does not insure moral rectitude and purpose, the development of a rich and balanced personality, and a happy and engaging life. Nazi Germany was not inadept in such provision, and yet the soul and mind of a nation were twisted and distorted. The Russian imperio-colonialists are trying to become equally adept, but at the frightful costs in life and treasure to the millions who make up the captive nations in the Soviet Union and beyond.

Without appearing to be super-patriotic and self-inflating, it is important today to recognize the invaluable uniqueness of our nation. This precious quality is not derived from the fact that we are the materially richest nation in the world or that we are the most powerful militarily. On the contrary, these and other dominant facts are themselves derived from the basic physical and moral nature of our nation. We are unique in that our people are ancestrally related to almost every nation and people in the world. We are also unique in our democratic institutions and our fundamental idealism, based upon the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, which in turn are founded on religious principles of the Judeo-Christian tradition.

Today, more than ever, these truths must be taught and re-taught as many in our society have lost their sense of heritage and are easy pawns for enemy manipulators. Plans are being made for a bicentennial celebration of the American Revolution in 1976. You will be astounded to know that in almost all the resolutions submitted in Congress for the preparation of this glorious event, hardly any emphasis is placed on the Declaration of Independence. And yet it is this event which conspicuously distinguishes the American Revolution from the French, English, or Russian. The Russian imperio-colonialists are celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of their morally fraudulent Bolshevik Revolution, and there are some fools among us paralleling our revolution and the totalitarian Russian one.

The American Revolution was a revolution for national independence and freedom to insure the opportunities for personal freedom. It is this kind of revolution that every captive non-Russian nation in the Red Empire thirsts for and strives to achieve.

The world is beset by many problems—problems of hunger, disease, economic underdevelopment, regional differences and conflicts. These are not new problems; they have always been and will continue to be for some time. To mix these problems with the predominant problem of our time, that of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, is to display a mixed-up mind; and we have many such minds expressing themselves today. You wouldn't know from this why we are spending over fifty billion dollars annually for military hardware and our men and women are dying in Vietnam.

Clearly, the chief source of this problem of problems is imperio-colonialist Moscow.

The USSR is the power center of world Communism. As you well know, it has become so because of early Soviet Russian conquests of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia and other formerly independent states. On the scale of power politics, no part of the present Red Empire—whether Red China, Poland, Yugoslavia or Cuba—would long survive if, for one reason or another, the USSR were to collapse. As an empire within an empire, the USSR is greatly vulnerable because of the rampant Russian imperio-colonialism among the captive non-Russian nations in that empire-state. The nature of the conflict today is not between socialism or Communism and Capitalism, not between peoples in one sector of the world and another, but between democratic freedom and totalitarian Sino-Soviet imperio-colonialism.

You might not believe it but people like Senator Fulbright still think that the population of the USSR consists of "over two hundred million Russians." One of the most powerful weapons Moscow possesses is the protracted ignorance of many of our fellow citizens regarding the basic, multi-national weakness of the USSR. Love God and do what you will means broadening our knowledge in this all-crucial area.

It is a politico-moral tragedy when many an American whose career has been interrupted by the conflict of the world admits he does not know what he is fighting for or against. What you give of yourself to the higher ideals and to others less privileged, you will reap in the consciousness of your own fruitful development.

Life, whether in the past, present or future, is always challenging. It becomes more so when it is wholesomely oriented to a future with moral purpose and freedom. To know right from wrong, to attest with firm conviction to truth as against falsehood, to become self-reliant rather than reliant, to work for moral and civil order, to advance freedom for the billion of unfree, and to further the goal of peace with freedom and justice—all this and more will be richly realized when you "Love God and do what you will."

Proclamation by Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin Designating the Period of July 16 Through July 22, 1967 as "Captive Nations Week" in Baltimore

In accordance with Public Law 86-90, adopted by the 86th Congress, The President of the United States will proclaim the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week" in order to demonstrate the sympathy of our nation for the millions of subjugated people who are aspiring to regain national independence and the enjoyment of human rights.

"Captive Nations Week," observed throughout the cities of our nation, will provide a positive demonstration that our people have not forgotten the plight of others, and that free men everywhere are opposed to the totalitarianism of Eastern Europe.

The restoration of self-determination and personal liberties to the enslaved nations would help promote the spiritual unification of Europe and its eventual political reunification. Observance of "Captive Nations Week" will dramatize the need for peace through freedom.

Now, therefore, I, Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of the city of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim the week of July 16 through July 22, 1967, as "Captive Nations Week" in Baltimore, and do urge the people of our city to demonstrate the solidarity of the American people with their captive brethren in East-Central Europe and to reemphasize our concern.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the City of Baltimore to be affixed this seventeenth day of July, in the year of Our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven.

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,
Mayor.

Captive Nations Week Observance, August 8, 1967, Phoenix, Ariz.

S.J. RES. 111

Joint resolution providing for the designation of the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week"

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Viet-Nam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

PROCLAMATION ON CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas, to all men freedom is the most sought-after goal in the world today; and

Whereas, there are those who, by the aggressive actions of more powerful nations, have been forcibly denied this God-given right; and

Whereas, the desire for self-government and personal freedom are forever strong, even under the domination of a foreign power; and

Whereas, it is the duty and responsibility of all free men to aid the efforts of those nations which desire to retain "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" in order that they might enjoy the fruits of these liberties and thereby enable them to know and appreciate the full meaning of freedom in their lives and the lives of their children;

Now, therefore, I, Jack Williams, Governor of the State of Arizona, recognizing the struggle for independence which daily faces each captive nation, do hereby proclaim the week of July 16 through 22, 1967 as Captive Nations Week in the State of Arizona, and urge each citizen to diligently strive to determine how he might best aid the cause of freedom for those under the yoke of oppression.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the Great Seal of the State of Arizona.

Done at the Capitol in Phoenix this 12th day of July in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty Seven and of the Independence of the United States the One Hundred and Ninety-first.

JACK WILLIAMS,
Governor.

Attest:

WESLEY BOHN,
Secretary of State.

NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE, ARIZONA BRANCH

Hon. Barry Goldwater, Honorary Chairman; Paul Fannin, U.S. Senator; John J. Rhodes, U.S. Representative; Sam Steiger, U.S. Representative; Jack Williams, Governor of Arizona; Wesley Bolin, Secretary of State; Marshall Humphrey, Pres. Arizona State Senate; John B. Conlan, State Senator; Wing F. Ong, State Senator; Wilson D. Palmer, Clerk of Superior Court; Paul E. Blubaum, Police Chief; Rt. Rev. Msgr. R. J. Donohoe; Charles S. Poling, D.D.; Rev. Paul D. Urbano; Elwood Driggs, Esq.; Thomas J. Dunlavey, Esq.; Lou Grubb, Esq.; Ned Mullan, Esq.; Arthur L. Peterson, Ph. D.; Weldon P. Shofstall, Esq.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Walter Chopiwskyj, President; Vytas Mozart, Vice President; Albert T. Koen, Executive Director; Shirley Beckman, Secretary; Wayne Wallick, Treasurer; Eva A. Krone, Public Relations; Rev. Michael Horoshko, Chaplain.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Gary Allhiser, Mykola Burda, James F. Crispelle, Betty Hashu, Alexander Iwasiw, Burton C. Johnson, Ethel M. Johnson, Emily Josen, Iwan Kissil, Alexander Linevych, Helen Marty, Dobri Nikolic, Janina Rimavicius, Alimpija Velimirovic, Saveta Velimirovic, Fern Wallick, Wayne E. Wallick, Semen Wasylenko, Dmytro Wladymir.

RALLY, AUGUST 8, 1967, ENCANTO PARK BAND SHELL

National and Armed Forces colors, U.S. Marine Corps Insp. Instr. Staff, U.S. Air Force Luke AFB, U.S. Navy Reserve, Arizona National Guard.

Invocation, Rev. Frank Brunton, Epiphany Episcopal Church, Tempe.

Pledge of allegiance, Exec. Director Captive Nations Committee, Albert T. Koen.

National Anthem, 541st Air Force Band Luke AFB.

Roll call of nations, Wilson D. Palmer.

Welcoming remarks, Vice-President, Captive Nations Committee, Vytas Mozart.

Review of U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R. resolution, President Captive Nations Committee, Walter Chopiwskyj.

Proclamation, Governor of Arizona, Jack Williams.

Introduction of distinguished guests, Wilson D. Palmer.

Tribute to our fighting men, Rev. Michael E. Raynolds, Church of All Christian Faiths, Chaplain Lt. Col. U.S. Army Ret.

Salute and taps, American Legion Thunderbird Post #41.

Keynote address, The Honorable George Abbott.

541st Air Force band, Luke AFB, "Born Free" and other selections.

Salute to the flag, Narrated by Mike Nobel and Sea Explorer Scouts, Mesa.

Benediction, Rev. Wesley Darby, West High Baptist Church.

Closing of program, Dismissal of Flags, Wilson D. Palmer.

Master of Ceremonies, Wilson D. Palmer; also participating, Boy Scouts Troop #129.

PATRONS

Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Androjna, Mr. Walter Chopiwskyj, Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Iwasiw, Mrs. Emily Josen, Maricopa Chapter Daughters of American Revolution, Metropolitan Republican Women's Club, Felix Milius, Mr. and Mrs. Vytas Mozart, Mrs. Charles Randall, Mr. and Mrs. Rimavicius, Mr. and Mrs. Wayne E. Wallick, Mr. Dmytro Wladymir.

BOOSTERS

Mr. Alexander Barton, Mr. and Mrs. Leo Benhle, Mrs. Della Clark, Mr. and Mrs. William Faber, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Green, Mr. Joseph Grusdaitis, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Ignatas, Mrs. Emily Josen, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Kaston, Mrs. Helen Kruft, Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Linevych, Mr. and Mrs. Dale W. Mooring, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Podinas, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Sesser, Mr. and Mrs. Joe Sesser, Mr. and Mrs. Vytas Sinkus, Mr. and Mrs. L. Strikauskas, Mr. and Mrs. Ronaldas Stasiunas, Mr. and Mrs. George Sutterlin.

Keynote Address of Captive Nations Week Observance, Phoenix, Ariz.

(By Mr. George W. Abbott)

Mr. Chairman, Fellow Americans, and particularly fellow Westerners, it's always good to be back in Arizona, to greet old friends and particularly to join another group, as we have for each year during the last eight, to recognize Captive Nations Week.

I am glad that there are young people in the audience tonight and servicemen. Because I have a question for all of the fellows in the band down here, and all of you out here, and all of those over at the side. I'll come to it in a minute, because I think it applies to all of us.

To know where we are going, we have to know where we are, and where we have been. This applies as much to each of us as individuals as it does to the State of Arizona, the State of Nevada, to our Nation, and I think indeed to a whole civilization.

We're told that in this country in just 67 years, this century, man has made more progress than was made in all of the nineteen hundred years following the birth of Christ at the opening of this century.

Within the past twenty years, men have raced the speed of sound. There wasn't an airplane that flew under Allied colors in World War II that could catch a United airliner today, if it were a jet. Man raced sound in the last 20 years, and beat it several times over, and now we seem to be racing the speed of light. We seek to conquer outer space, we reach for the moon. And my question of all of you is: What about inner space? What about Maricopa County? What about the State of Arizona, what about this great sprawling open robust area—we call the American West, with the decisions that will guide this nation that have to be made within the next 25 years. And what about this nation of ours, and its relationship to all the other peoples on earth? You know, we say that adults run things. I guess, that's true in every household, but my own. But in any case we are supposed to run things on earth.

So let's start with some little words for littler people, and then move on to all of us. And I borrow, from what I hope you have all found, and preserved, from a law-enforcement officer in an eastern seaboard state, when he said: "Always, we hear the cry of teen-agers. What can we do, where can we go, what can we do, where can we go?" And his answer is: "Go home, rake the leaves, mow the lawn, wash the car (the family car—not yours), learn to cook, scrub the floor, get a job, visit the sick, study your lessons, and when you are through and not tired—read a good book." We suggest—American History.

Your parents do not owe you entertainment, your town does not owe you recreational facilities, the world does not owe you a living—you owe the world something. You owe it your time, and energy and talent, within the capacities that God has given you. Quit being a cry baby, get out of your dream-world, start acting like a young man, or a young lady. This is the advice to teen-agers.

But wait a minute: a nation, a State, a community, each goes where its adult members go, and children follow. Or each goes where those in charge let them go on their own. So how about some big words for bigger people. A 21 year old today, a person who was born as World War II was dying, could read history, and reading it he would know that our nation was born because our founders gave recognition to the greatest of human principles. Faith in the individual. In reading our history he would know, that it has thrived as a Republic because we kept that faith throughout most of our history. That it has sustained itself, because we have known that freedom of the individual, of our society, is not born without cost, that it cannot be maintained without cost. And because we have known that freedom that true liberty, as has been so well said, we have known that freedom is not free.

At a time when our nation was half slave and half free, over a century ago, Abraham Lincoln asked himself the question: What is the strength of our system? What is it, that we in the United States stand on? What is our reliance? And he answered his own question.—"Our reliance, he said,—is not in our battlements, not in our war or warships, not in the guns of our fleets but it is the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense, he said, is the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as a heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere, at all times."

Today, a world is half slave and half free. And today's teen-ager knows that in a little more than his lifetime, since World War II alone, indeed in 2000 days after World War II, a great powerful and industrialized United States, could not or would not find a way, or would not force a way, alone or with other nations, to block the march of Communist conquest, to halt the enslavement of a half billion people and to then and there try.

We did not try to preserve some fifteen nations. After 1940, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Rumania, and so on down the long list of those flags, now totaling more than 24 national groups, captive over one third of the globe. They would know that we could not find a way, or force a way, alone or with other nations, to strike down and root out during our lifetimes a cluster of tyrants determined to destroy freedom, determined to bend people through force and not choice, to a Godless slavery. In those 2000 days following World War II, the United States had unquestionably the greatest military might ever mounted. The power physically in August of 1945 to stop the Communists was there—the will was not.

When my infantry outfit wound up in Heidlberg-Heppenheim vicinity in Germany in 1945, there was a pause for several weeks, and then on those summer days on the Rhine River, and into the Odenwald mountains, and into Bohemia and Moravia, Slovakia, before we drew back and into Vienna, we saw the flags come out. The flags first of Norway, of Denmark, of Finland. And then we would find in clusters those of Estonia, those of Latvia, and those of Lithuania. I remember in Heppenheim, Germany when I see Azerbaijan here. That, and Georgia, and Byelorussia. The Germans had been so impetuous because they were going to take these areas from the Russians—they did not. But we saw these flags come out, as the hope existed that perhaps now these captive nations, the occupied nations, were going to be free. It was not to be.

While we were indulging in the belief that you can give just a little to Communism, while we were forgetting the lessons of history, while we were trying to invent and to innovate, tens of millions of people became captive, and from time to time, since then, the free world has shown, it has learned a little from these lessons. It did not, when the freedom fighters fought in Budapest, it did, when we landed troops in Lebanon, it did, when we insisted that Austria, that portions of Laos and Guatemala be salvaged. When we insisted that Quemoy and Formosa not fall to Communism—we indicated that at least we had learned part of the lessons. But more recently, our will to preserve freedom is tested in Vietnam. Just as more recently, we stood at the edge of a major test in the Middle-East, between Israel, and those who would have destroyed her.

Some lessons we have learned, yes—but how well? I think that two or three times a month into my law-office come parents, and they say: "George, I have an eighteen year old son, or 19 year old son, or a 20 or whatever. He is going into military service, in combat arm or in a combat zone. What can I tell them? Because that person expresses doubt, and maybe like myself or as myself, is a Veteran of World War II, or the Korean War, and those 4 years that we put in, that others put in, we believed and knew was for a cause. Sometimes, perhaps, the cause seems very clear, but the means to it very unclear today. But in any case, all I can say is: Let the young people decide for themselves, because they will. They have an instinctive sense, as to what they should do. And asking them, and asking ourselves: Have we learned our lessons, and if so how well? We know that if communist leaders have been forced in recent years to limit some of their ceaseless efforts of open threats of assault, and open threats of invasion from outside, isn't it still the case that they continue relentlessly to pursue, and pursue, and pursue from the inside? That they have never stopped that goal, that they say: They will bury us? And too often it appears that we are handing them the tools to do so. We know that a Godless Communist Hierarchy will continue from Moscow, from Red China, from Havana to shout peace, to threaten war, and to risk world oblivion before they will surrender their own control over their own captive peoples. And we know that man through technology has the power today of obliterating human misery or of obliterating humanity itself. And yet, we know too that of all the lessons history teaches, is this one: That man will be free, and we in our time with the will to do so, can and must keep alive the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of those conquered nations. We can set in motion, and keep in motion the steps that will force the loosening of the shackles of communist slavery around the globe. And I think two early steps appear in order.

Today, our major cities are torn with strife and defiance of the law. Who would have dreamed two years ago that military tanks would be parked in the main streets and boulevards of ten or twelve of our cities? The national dream seems almost overnight to have grown fuzzy, and blurred around the edges. National leadership, for whatever reason, or combination of reasons, and at both, the executive and legislative levels, and in both national political parties seems paralyzed and unable to find a direction or to force a direction. National voices, it seems to me dwell very long on our shortcomings, failures and our unrealized dreams and unrealized ambitions, and too often overlook the strength of the real fibre and stuff of the American people.

You know, we are taught in school that there are seven continents. And in the last 25 years, including World War II, Americans have died upon and have been buried on all seven of these continents, in the name of freedom. Up until two years ago, we knew that at this time in the evening on any month, in any week, in any day, over the Arctic Ocean, over the China Sea, and over the Red Sea, and over the Mediterranean, there were bombers of the American Strategic Air Command. Each of them with very young men as their air crews. This is our curtain for freedom. We have expanded that, the nuclear submarines, we still have the muscle. With the demand we think to make that muscle work, and be felt, is that we substitute hard self-discipline for soft self-pity, and mourning. That we substitute convictions for the questions we raise, and optimism for pessimism.

We seem to need to replace national resignation with national self-confidence, and national despair with determination. In short, again, we need only to draw on the lessons of history, to know what we need only to replace those who indulge the new style American doubt with men of old-fashioned American determination. Second, I think to prepare for tomorrow we need only rediscover the lessons learned in the past from the communists and to look at today. We must maintain vigilance and suspicion; we must apply it firmly. And if we do, we can do much to frustrate the aims of the communist tyrants, in spite of all counsel to the contrary. All we have to do there, is remove the blinders of the past. We have to be alert, we have to inquire, we must counter the working from within and without.

And for example, those who believe, the House of Un-American Actvities Committee function should be abolished, need only look at events at Havana the past three months, to have reason to re-examine their position. Don't you agree with me?

In the remaining two or three minutes, I want to remind you that history shouts to us: That there is no such thing as give in a little or wait until the dust settles with the communists or any tyrant.

Hitler dined on Central Europe in small bites. I was a senior in high school, when we had a special convocation to listen to the bombers go in to Prague in Czechoslovakia. And we didn't know what was happening. We then heard Poland invaded, we watched the Netherlands, and Belgium fall to tyranny. We watched and we listened, powerless. We could hear those sounds again. The world watched.

Lenin and Stalin did the same. Khrushchev and Mao and their successors or counterparts would have done the same by now around the globe, in Europe and Asia from within and without, but in recent years, we have drawn a part of a line.

In Vietnam, we now approach the crossroads. As those taps were blown tonight, there were 12,000 dead Americans: dead in Vietnam on that horizon outside Phoenix. There were another 80,000 wounded Americans. In a war that we are not there to win, and in a place we are not there to get out.

Why can't we find the six words—Fight to win or get out in Vietnam?

The demands will grow louder that we get out, but picture this as a boxing ring. Here is the United States with 220 pounds, a heavy weight. Here is the Vietnam at a 120 with its handlers—Red China. And it's a normal boxing match, except for two things: One, there is a line across the center of that boxing ring, and our opponent can step across any time he wants to, but we cannot. And every time he goes back to the corner he puts on more weight, and so does his handler. That's one thing. The other thing is—I think the umpires are fixed in that fight. What do you think?

Demands will grow louder that we get out, counter-demands will grow louder that we stay. Meantime, we only know that we pay a fearful toll in South-East Asia. For those of you who are worried about the color of a man's skin, I simply suggest to you that among those 100,000 dead or wounded, the blood is all red. Whether they are negro, or white, or American-Indian or otherwise. And never forget it.

It ought to be a time for great unity in this nation, not pulling apart and tearing apart. And at the crossroads, the strengths of freedom will be tested. Just as they were at Lexington and at Concord, and at Bunker Hill, and at Gettysburg, and at the battle of New Orleans, and at the Presidio in Monterey, and at the Little Big Horn, and for heaven's sake in our own American Civil War when we believed enough in freedom that brother fought brother. If we can recapture the spirit.

Perhaps, we will demand that we fight to win or get out, and it seems clear that in any case, the American people will demand of leadership that it lead and that leadership level with us. That it's time that this be done.

To close on a solemn note. I know that every one of you here, believe with me that no force on earth can withstand the strength of freedom, if we but maintain our faith in God, and each other. If we use those strengths of freedom wisely. If we will believe in ourselves and exercise the priceless right of free people to make known the national mood, that our nation continues to believe we must inspire enslaved people. All of these flags representing them and so many more elsewhere where the flags have not been hauled down yet. That we must inspire them that their dream of freedom has overwhelming support in this freest of all lands.

That we are determined to replace handwringing with fist closing, to substitute national will for national won't, and national can do for national can't. We need only to remind ourselves of those words of a 100 years ago of Abraham Lincoln. "Our reliance is a love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms, our defence is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere at all times. Destroy this spirit, he said, and you have planted the seeds of despotism around your own doors. Familiarize yourself with the chains of bondage, and you are preparing your own limbs to wear them. Accustom to trample on the rights around you, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first tyrant who arises."

We know, that no man is truly free so long as any man is unfree or is any nation, including or own, uncaptive so long as any nation is captive.

As we mark Captive Nations Week, we need only to read history, and to guide ourselves by that history,

Thank you for permitting me to join you tonight.

TRIBUTE TO OUR FIGHTING MEN

(By Rev. Michael E. Raynolds, Church of All Christian Faiths, chaplain, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army retired, Phoenix, Ariz.)

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a solemn occasion, and shall we stand and pray together.

Almighty and Eternal God, We lift our hearts this evening in thanks-giving to Thee for the many many blessings that Thou has showered upon us. We in our non-deserving condition because of our own sin, and our waywardness, our lack of vigilance, and lack of watchfulness, in the freedoms that Thou has given us. And because of Thy great mercy Thou has so blessed us uniquely above all the nations of the world. Thou has placed solemnly upon our shoulders the responsibilties to fight the fight of Faith, to use the guns that Thou has given us, the great material resources, the vast wealth Thou has showered upon us above all nations of the world, to fight a common enemy that is enslaving the world and who has promised to bury us.

And so, our Father, as we lift our hearts to Thee in humility asking first for Thy forgiveness of our sins because we have come short of Thy glory, and we have turned away from Thy mercy and our own arrogance, and our pride. So our Father, as we look to the past, we have seen the great victories Thou has given us in the many many battles, and in the many wars in the past, that our sons and daughters have fought, our forefathers have fought. The battle of Iwo Jima, the Silvery Sands of Saipan, the jungles of Guadalcanal, the battle of Normandy, of the Bulge, and back into the Argonne Forest, and even to Bunker Hill, Lexington and Concord, and the small but memorable place of Gettysburg that is so mindfull of an occasion. Thou has been so good to us and given us victories and these and many other battles. Thou has brought us safely through Korea, and many others in times past that we fought. Thou has been with us and Thou has blessed us because we have been a great people, and we have been a faithful people, and because we have been strong and have been vigilant in days of oppression, and we have loved liberty above life. And therefore, we have given our allegiance and our pledge to fight for that which is right. Not only for ourselves but for other peoples of all the world.

We are thankful in a very special way this evening for our fighting men in Vietnam, and we pray Thy mercy and Thy blessing upon all of them. God bless them all and protect them from the ravages of the totalitarian enemy who is unmerciful, without heart, without God, without Faith, and so we pray for mercy, and we pray for victory, and in this connection our Great Father, we pray that Thou will bless the President of the United States of America, and in all places and positions of high trust and high responsibility. We pray that You would give him the wisdom of God, to know the decisions that he ought to make. And our Gracious Lord, we pray that he should have the courage to follow through with these decisions, to give victory over our enemies.

Let the blood that our fighting men and women have shed, not be shed in vain but let it be shed for the cause of liberating those who are enslaved, and who are in bondage. So we pray that Thou should bless in a special way these Captive Nations, and we know that humility and the hurt of these people. We have seen their hunger and we have seen their bloodshed, and we have seen their lives freely given for the cause of liberty. God grant wherever they are: in Europe, in Asia, throughout the far flung world, the millions who are enslaved that Thou would give liberation to them from behind the Bamboo Curtain, and the invisible Iron Curtain, and the Stone Walls of Berlin. In other places over which the guards of the Universe of the totalitarian enemy are standing, and guarding, and shooting down as animals those who would seek their freedom.

Be merciful, and bless these people. Give them food to eat, give them even under bludgeoning of the Communist tyranny, give them great hearts to stand tall, and to stand courageously, and to be valiant and to be patient, and to continue the fight against the enemy, and Almighty God, we pray that Thou should bring the day speedily, when the lights of freedom should go on all over the world, and that Thou would bring again sweet freedom and peace to all nations of the earth, and that Thou would bless in a unique way our aims, and our purposes as we here this evening rededicate ourselves anew to the cause of freedom. That we might bring our children up in an exemplary way, and in a proud way, and in a patriotic way that we remind them of our liberties, and now blessed we are, and not to take lightly these things that have been bought in blood, our liberty and our freedom and the greatness of our land. We pray that they should know and that we should teach all of these things to our children, that they should hear from our lips the greatness of our land, because of the blessings of Almighty God, who is not dead but who is alive, and who has mightily blessed us as a great land.

All of these things we ask this evening as we rededicate ourselves in You to the cause of peace and to the cause of liberty for all men. We ask in the name of the Great Commanding General of the Universe, Almighty God, our Father and His Son our Saviour, The Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

BENEDICTION

(By Rev. Wesly Darby, West High Baptist Church, Phoenix, Ariz.)

Almighty God and Heavenly Father, Because of our sin, it is impossible that we could come before Thee this night, except through the shed blood of Jesus Christ, our Saviour. And as each generation seems to have it's besetting sin, the one that will be the shame of our generation through all the ages to come, is that we have tolerated the captivity of these nations set before us this night, so long.

Almighty God, all we can pray is, Heaven forgive us for our lethargy in tolerating it while we should have freedom, there are men upon this earth that have not that freedom. Forgive us, for enjoying our freedom and our wealth when so many are starved for that freedom. Heavenly Father, our Saviour while he walked upon this earth, warned us not to be afraid of those that can kill the body, but to be afraid of those that can destroy the soul. In the words of the psalmist, "Lord, help us that we like David can say that we hate Thy enemies with a perfect hatred."

Clear the confusion from the minds of our leaders, clear the fog from the minds of those that should make the valiant decisions of our age.

Heavenly Father, give us a chance that in our generation we can strike a blow for freedom. You've given us the strength, you've given us the knowledge. Lord, we ask this one additional blessing. Give us the chance, the leadership, that we might strike a blow for freedom in our time. Help us with this step that we might set these captive nations free. That the Prince of Peace, might have a chance to be whispered into ears of the countless multitudes today, whose churches have been burned, whose pastors and priests have been put to the edge of the sword and shot with bullets. Your spirit alone can make men free. Help us to strike down the Iron Curtain, the Bamboo Curtain, the Sugar Curtain that keeps men from hearing of the name of Jesus.

For we ask it in Jesus name. Amen.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic, Aug. 6, 1967]

RALLY TO HEAR TALK BY FORMER IKE AID

George Abbott, assistant interior secretary during the Eisenhower administration, will speak at a Captive Nations Week rally at 8 p.m. Tuesday in the Encanto Park band shell.

The rally, sponsored by the Arizona branch of the National Captive Nations Committee, will also feature U.S. Marine Corps, Air Force and Navy color guards and American Legion, Sea Explorers Scout and Boy Scout marchers.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette, Aug. 7, 1967]

VIETNAM IN SPOTLIGHT AT RALLY

The Arizona branch of the National Captive Nations Committee will hold its annual rally at Encanto Park Band Shell at 8 p.m. tomorrow.

The public is invited to the ceremony—particularly parents and members of the families of Vietnam servicemen.

The 541st Air Force band will perform. George Abbott, an adviser to the Eisenhower administration, will speak.

The Marine Corps, Air Force and Navy will provide color guards and American Legion Thunderbirds Post 41 will fire a rifle salute. "Taps" will be played in tribute to the fighting men in Vietnam.

WOMEN HEAR CAPTIVE NATIONS PRESIDENT

In 1959 the Congress of the United States resolved that the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the Untied States to observe such a week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

"The last proclamation issued by President Johnson, omitted the word communist throughout the proclamation," Mr. Chopiwskyj told the group.

Mr. Chopiwskyj will be traveling to Formosa in September to attend a meeting for the formation of the World Anti-Communist League.

"Most Asian Countries send their prime ministers to this conference, the United States does not send an official representative," he said.

Tuesday night at 8:00 p.m. at Encanto Park Phoenix will observe Captive Nations Week.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette, Aug. 9, 1967]

EX-IKE AID: TIME TO WIN VIETNAM WAR

"It's time to get in the Vietnam war to win," a former member of the Eisenhower administration told the annual rally of the Arizona Branch of the National Captive Nations Committee.

Speaking to nearly 300 persons last night at Encanto Park, George Abbott, former assistant secretary of the interior, said, "No nation is uncaptive so long as any nation is captive."

"We may look at the war as a boxing ring with a line drawn across the center. The U.S. is like a 220-pound fighter and North Vietnam a 120-pounder with Red Chinese and Russian handlers. They may cross that line, but we may not."

Walter Chopiwskyj, president of the Arizona branch, said the National Captive Nations Committee seeks to aid the cause of freedom in nations under Communist control.

"We must replace those who indulge in new-style American doubt with men of old-fashioned American determination," Abbott said.

He is an attorney, Republican state chairman of Nevada and Republican chairman of the 13 Western states. He served with the Eisenhower administration from 1953 to 1960.

The rally was part of Captive Nations Week ceremonies being observed throughout the nation. Some of the delegates represented various Communist countries in native costumes.

Mayor Milt Graham was present with members of the U.S. Marines Corps 9th Engineering Co. of Phoenix, the 541st Air Force Band from Luke Air Force Base, U.S. Navy Reserve, American Legion Post 41, Boy Scout Troop 129 and Sea Explorer Scouts from Mesa.

THE 109TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a special order devoted to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, Friday, October 27, is the 109th anniversary of the birth of an outstanding American, a great President, and a dynamic leader of the Republican Party—Theodore Roosevelt.

In these troubled times in world affairs, we can gain new insight into the problems of today by considering his handling of the problems of his era. I am proud to bear the name of a man who brought the United States to a position of power and influence yet, at the same time, maintained peace in the trouble-spots in the world.

Theodore Roosevelt opposed the imperialist designs of the czarist nation, whose Communist successors have not changed in that regard. He let the Russians know that the United States would not countenance persecution of the Jews in Russia, a situation that also mirrors the present day. Nonetheless, his foresight and political expertise helped him successfully to settle the Russo-Japanese War and win him the Noble Peace Prize in 1906.

This historical excerpt is not an incident to itself. It reflects on and can be applied to the troubled times of today. Like the late President, we must admonish "those who would lightly, undergo war in a spirit of mere frivolity, or of mere truculence"—Harbaugh, William Henry, "Power and Responsibility—The Life and Times of Theodore Roosevelt," New York, 1961, page 292. He showed us that you can stand up to the Russians, you can stand up to Communists, you can stand up to aggression, but you don't have to be involved in a stupid war.

It is only proper that in commemoration of Theodore Roosevelt's birthday, we salute his greatness and call for comparable leadership to tackle and solve the difficult problems of today.

In New York City as a police commissioner, Theodore Roosevelt brought civic reform. His worthy successor today is Mayor John V. Lindsay, my predecessor as the Congressman from the 17th Congressional District of New York. He later went on to become Governor of the State of New York bringing brilliance and progress to State leadership. His worthy successor today in that office is Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller.

We look forward to a Republican of Theodore Roosevelt's caliber leading the Nation in the Presidency.

While, I, as a Republican, have a special interest in Theodore Roosevelt, he belonged to the whole country regardless of political affiliation.

I know that my colleagues, whatever their persuasion, are also interested.

For example, our colleague, Congressman ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., of the 10th District of Georgia, calls attention to the fact that T.R.'s mother came from Georgia.

Under unanimous consent, I am including Congressman STEPHENS letter to that effect and the source material from which it is derived.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1967.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TED: Thank you for your letter concerning the special order in commemoration of the birthday of Theodore Roosevelt and of his great service to the country.

When you praise President Theodore Roosevelt, remember his mother's family came from Georgia. I am enclosing a little sketch also of his great-grandfather General Daniel Stewart, which comes from "Historical Collections of Georgia," by Rev. George White.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

BOB.

[White, Rev. George, "Historical Collections of Georgia," New York, 1854]

GENERAL DANIEL STEWART

The chronicle of Georgia's great names would be incomplete without that of this distinguished citizen. He was frequently in battle under Sumter and Marion, and rendered important services to the State by the judicious measures he adopted to defend its frontiers against the attacks of the Indians. He died in the sixty-ninth year of his age (p. 533).

Stewart County: This division of the State was formed from Randolph in 1830, and named after General Daniel Stewart, whose name stands high upon the annals of Georgia (p. 637).

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join the gentleman from New York this afternoon in marking the 109th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt. I am glad that our colleague who bears this distinguished name has taken this time so we may reflect upon the principles which President Roosevelt advanced and the example which his great career offers to us.

Theodore Roosevelt rose to leadership in America at a time of great and rapid change in the Nation and the world—change in the distribution of power and wealth among nations; change in the relations between government, business, labor and the public in our own country; change in American concepts of the role and responsibilities of government in directing progress and improving the general welfare. Rather than shrinking from such change, Roosevelt welcomed it. Rather than fearing difficulties and uncertainties, Roosevelt advanced to meet them. Through vigorous activity and exhortation, backed by the example of unstinting personal energies, he brought America into and through the first challenging years of the 20th century.

Roosevelt's enduring influence on the Nation and the Republican Party stem both from the specific achievements of his administrations, and from the spirit in which he approached every task. He was fundamentally a constructive conservative, who sought to preserve our great natural heritage, to protect our system of free enterprise by mellowing is less fortunate aspects, and to maintain a strong America as the best insurance of international peace. His deep faith in our country and his emphasis on the rewards of labor and creative work now stand as examples for us in the difficult time of transition in which we are now engaged.

There is no better theme for us today than this statement which Theodore Roosevelt, then Vice President of the United States, made in 1899:

> Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] in commemorating the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

Few men have personified with more lasting effect both the drama and the responsibilities of the Office of President of the United States; few Presidents have left a more dynamic image of a man, an administrator, and a leader. Even today, "The Square Deal," "Trust-busting," "The Great White Fleet," and other phrases are well-known slogans which both identify and describe this great President.

Theodore Roosevelt was imbued with a strong sense of personal service and a dedication to his task which was reflected in every facet of his activities. Never a passive man, he displayed the kind of strength, courage and energy which gained him the respect of supporter and opponent alike.

It was Roosevelt's brand of dynamism and perseverance which led to his varied accomplishments as President: Investigation of corruption in Government and the ensuing civil service reforms, reorganization of the Armed Forces, programs for veterans, negotiation of the Panama Canal Treaty and initiation of Panama Canal construction, attempts to conserve our natural resources, and insistence on making The Hague Court a workable organization.

President Roosevelt honestly believed in the American people and in the ideals of democracy. In fact, all that we have learned about his capabilities and influence in the governmental and political spheres remains a timely lesson for our leaders today. We, like President Roosevelt, must be constantly aware of the responsibilities of citizenship and leadership; we, too, must be able to see our Government as a force for social betterment; we, too, must be able to feel that special kind of optimism which encourages continuing efforts despite occasional disenchantment.

President Roosevelt's idealism was tempered, however, by a somewhat more realistic view of man. It is appropriate, I believe, to close a tribute to President Roosevelt by a quotation which demonstrates how realism can also incorporate a challenge. In Theodore Roosevelt's words, "Do what you can where you are with what you have."

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we pause here today to honor an American president who richly deserves the adjective "great." Theodore Roosevelt exemplified in his public and private life the qualities of honor and courage, the qualities of moral and physical strength, which we associate with greatness.

As a child, his delicate health prevented normal childish pursuits. Unable even to play or attend school with other children, he was taught by private tutors. But, young Teddy Roosevelt determined to overcome this weakness. He set for himself a strict schedule for developing his mind and strengthening his body. This enabled him to graduate from Harvard, attend Columbia University to study law, become a cowboy, a deputy sheriff hunting rustlers in the western Dakotas, and a leader of the U.S. Volunteer Cavalry in the Spanish-American War.

The picture we have of him is of the robust roughrider who became known and beloved as a decisive and forceful President and affectionately referred to as "Teddy Roosevelt."

One example of this dedicated American's courage is illustrated by an incident that occurred during his campaign for the Presidency in 1912. Although a would-be assassin's bullet penetrated his flesh "Teddy" refused to permit this to interfere with the delivery of his speech. With the bullet in his chest, he spoke for an hour before allowing his friends to obtain medical assistance.

Mr. Speaker, our revered Teddy Roosevelt, man of action, was noted for his accomplishments in the field of foreign diplomacy, winning the Nobel Peace Prize in 1906 for his efforts to negotiate peace between Russia and Japan.

He was an ardent advocate of conservation of our natural resources and through his foresight this Nation now has millions of acres of land in its national park system that might not otherwise be so protected.

His example stands today as a noble one for us to follow: to conserve and preserve the best in our heritage, to live at peace with our neighbors, and to strive for individual self-improvement which culminates in improvement for all mankind. Such guidelines provide America with goals and incentives.

It is a high privilege to pay this tribute to a great American—and incidentally a great Republican—President Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, October 27 marks the birthday of one of America's great men—Theodore Roosevelt. His spirit lingers in the America he loved and guided through some of the most trying crises in history. He was a composite of many Americans: Cowboy, explorer, author, naturalist, soldier, and, of course, statesman. A youthful leader in a youthful land, he was the youngest President in history until the election of the late President Kennedy. He came to leadership in an America that was a sprawling youngster scarcely aware of any world beyond the seas; and he left it an international power with worldwide responsibilities. He spoke that wisest of all sayings as to international affairs: "Speak softly, and carry a big stick." Teddy Roosevelt made the world aware of us as well as ourselves aware of the world when he sent America's strengthened Navy, the "Great White Fleet," around the world as a silent reminder of America's power. In the short span of his life, only 60 years, he had managed to fit several careers and more service to this country than it seems possible one man could in so short a life. Honoring him today is reminder of the recognition we should give Teddy Roosevelt for his outstanding devotion to this Nation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Theodore Roosevelt was a giant among men, not merely as strong as a bull moose. He was a vigorous leader, and his leadership was based unwaveringly on the principles that have made America the foremost Nation in the world.

A rancher, a soldier, and a devoted public servant, Theodore Roosevelt was endowed with a gallant spirit. It was the kind of spirit which inspired all Americans and gave them pride in their country, a spirit that flowed from the personal bravery Teddy Roosevelt displayed in leading the 1st U.S. Volunteer Cavalry in the charge up San Juan's Kettle Hill.

This is the kind of man America needs in the White House today—a man who places truth and honor above all else, a man who strives always to do right without fear or favor.

It was Teddy Roosevelt who spelled out a basic American credo when he said:

> The first requisite of a good citizen in this Republic of ours is that he shall be able and willing to pull his weight.

It was Teddy Roosevelt who preached the doctrine of the "strenuous life" and demanded a "square deal" for every man, woman, and child in America.

This is the kind of leadership the times cry out for today, as we prepare to mark the birthday of the 26th President of the United States.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, October 27 marks the anniversary of the birth of one of the most outstanding men who has ever lived. I therefore think it is only fitting for us to take this opportunity to praise both the life and the work of our past President and great American, Theodore Roosevelt.

When he was a child he suffered severely from asthma. He refused to succumb to the illness. He fought it. He had courage and strength. He was to display these same fine qualities throughout his entire life.

This was a man of the highest moral character and integrity. It can be seen in his numerous accomplishments, those that are so well known to the public but also those less publicized but equally meaningful acts on behalf of his country.

We can look to his fierce struggles during the early part of this century to preserve our free enterprise system. He fought the monopolistic trusts which so endangered our competitive economic system. Teddy Roosevelt was not against big corporations or big business or economic progress; what he was opposed to were monopolies, discrimination, fraudulent practices, and all the other acts that so injured the trade and commerce of this great land.

We can also look back to magnificent efforts on behalf of conserving this country's great natural resources. He was one of the first people to make this country aware of the importance and absolute necessity of protecting our forests, our minerals, and our lands. He realized so early that this must be accomplished if America was to progress in the future as we had done in the past.

This has special significance to me for I have, ever since I can remember, been deeply involved in the fight to preserve this Nation's natural resources. I had the privilege to serve while in the Massachusetts State Senate, as chairman of the Joint Commission on Natural Resources and am presently a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

Anyone involved in this struggle of man to preserve what God and nature has given him, inevitably goes back to the accomplishments of Teddy Roosevelt as a standard of just how much can be accomplished in this area.

But Teddy Roosevelt certainly did not think only in terms of trees and rocks and streams. He thought of people, and he thought of them every day of his life. He was concerned with each man getting his fair opportunity to succeed in our society. And these feelings did not just spring up in him when he became President of the United States.

While he was a member of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, he fought for and had 26,000 jobs, that were previously received by appointment, awarded on the basis of a competitive examination. When he was an assemblyman from New York, he fought horrid conditions that he had observed in the process of the manufacturing of cigars.

We would probably note such incidents for every day of this man's life. But perhaps, above all, we must note that Theodore Roosevelt was a man of integrity. He said:

> I do the things that I believe ought to be done. And when I make up my mind to do a thing, I act.

This more than anything else probably summarizes the greatness of this man.

The quality and integrity of leadership which Theodore Roosevelt possessed uniquely qualified him to serve this country. He did so in a manner which will be remembered throughout history and which we commemorate and remember today.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with the sentimental emotion stirred by old and sweet memories that I listened to the eloquent tribute to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt by our distinguished and able colleague from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN], whose full name, and fittingly, is THEODORE ROOSEVELT KUPFERMAN.

It is difficult for me to realize that on Friday of this week Theodore Roosevelt, if alive, would have been 109 years old. He was 40 years old when I first saw him. Three days after the landing of the Roughriders in Cuba, the 33d Volunteer Michigan Infantry, of which I was a member, landed from small boats on the soil of Cuba at Siboney. The Roughriders were living in pup tents not too far from the rows of pup tents that accommodated the 33d Michigan.

The first morning after our arrival, an officer on horseback not of our regiment, came riding up and started giving us orders. Our Michigan infantrymen, most of them like myself, kids out of high school, were not minded to be bossed by strangers and told him, in language not too gentle, to be on his way.

The rider reversed his course and turned in his saddle, looking back at us as he rode away. That was my first glimpse of the toothy smile of Teddy Roosevelt that afterward became so famous.

My last meeting with him was during his last hours in the White House as President when graciously he received a delegation of Chicago schoolchildren, prizewinners in a contest conducted by the Hearst Newspapers. As an old comrade of the campaign at Santiago, I had asked for the appointment and, not as President to a citizen but as one comrade to another, he had granted it, and we remained with him as the minutes of his historic Presidency clicked away until the time came for the ride to the inauguration of President Taft.

Teddy Roosevelt was the voice of a new America, aroused by the war with Spain from the quiet ways of an isolated and contented town-and-country nation to meet its challenge of destiny as a world power. He was forceful, magnetic, and spectacular in everything that he did and said, and all was genuine and sincere.

During the time of the Republican convention, just prior to the birth of the Bull Moose, I was present at a pep meeting of Teddy's followers in a hall in downtown Chicago. He was reading from a large handful of pages on which was written his message. There were only 30 or 40 words on each page. I shall never forget the manner in which Teddy raised aloft each page after he had read it, and then with a full and dramatic sweep of his arm, threw it on the floor as he continued reading the next page. He extracted drama, power, and force from everything. His every motion as well as his every word evoked an emotion and something akin to a worship among his fellow countrymen.

Under Teddy Roosevelt, America experienced a rebaptism of patriotism—good old-fashioned patriotism, honest pride of and in our Nation, its people, its soil, its forests, and its water, and, above all, in its achievements, its purposes, and its mission. He was a conservationist through and through, and this administration of the Presidency of this country was marked by the first program to preserve our out of doors and all of nature's rich treasures for future generations. Chief Justice Warren, I am reliably informed, once said that the two men to whom Americans owe the most for the preservation of the forests and other beauties of nature were Theodore Roosevelt and our own colleague, the Honorable MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN.

In every way, in every sense, by any measure, Theodore Roosevelt was a great American. He will live forever in the hearts of his countrymen.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **KUPFERMAN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HOUSE REPORT NO. 801 AND FDA LAB NO. 2

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **KASTENMEIER.** Mr. Speaker, for a number of years, Congress has clearly enunciated a governmentwide policy for decentralization of Federal facilities from the immediate Washington area. In view of this, much of the present controversy surrounding the location of the Food and Drug Administration Laboratory No. 2 has lost sight of this consideration.

Both the House and the Senate have emphasized a commitment to decentralize the FDA laboratory facilities outside the 50-mile radius of the District of Columbia. Indeed, previously, the inclusion of this Laboratory No. 2 as a planning item for Beltsville, Md., was rejected by the House for fiscal 1966 appropriations. On that occasion, the House Appropriations Committee did not allow the requested planning funds and questioned whether "additional work planned to be done in the headquarters laboratories, and perhaps even some of the work now being done in those laboratories could be decentralized to field laboratories and be accomplished just as well or better." The Senate Appropriations Committee, expressed concern about planning a facility at the Beltsville site, and did not approve of the requested funds for fiscal 1967. This year, the House of Representatives had spoken through its vote on the HEW appropriations bill which directs that the Laboratory be built outside the 50-mile radius of the District.

House Report No. 801, recently filed by the House Committee on Government Operations, deals with the lack of procedures followed by the FDA in selecting Madison, Wis., as an alternative site to the Beltsville, Md., location for the construction of its second laboratory. The fact that the FDA, indeed, did not act in full accordance with HEW site selection procedures is well known. Furthermore, it has been generally expected that following final congressional approval of HEW appropriations, a site selection committee, in full compliance with departmental procedures, will investigate and visit all proposed sites for the laboratory.

Although correctly reporting that the site selection process was inadequate, the Government Operations Committee report is completely inaccurate with respect to the cost estimates for the proposed Madison, Wis., site for the Food and Drug Administration Laboratory No. 2. The report, based on earlier estimates, places purported construction costs as $5,400,000 more, if it were located in the Midwest, rather than at Beltsville. On the other hand, the August 1, 1967, report of the Senate Appropriations Committee contains new information which refutes the House committee's report that the costs of constructing the laboratory in Madison will be greater than in Beltsville. The Senate report notes that:

> An important additional consideration is the element of cost and, contrary to published reports, construction costs at one site publicly mentioned outside the Washington area would be less than construction costs in the Washington area.

I might further add, that costs in some other area in the Midwest, Milwaukee, rather than Madison, were used in determining the construction costs for the laboratory. Indeed, E. H. Boeck & Co., the source GSA uses to determine cost comparison, finds that Madison, Wis., is below the national average in construction costs. In addition, according to the latest data available from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, dated July 1, 1967, labor costs are actually cheaper in Madison than in the District of Columbia. For example, differences in hourly wages between Madison and Washington, D.C., range from 7 cents an hour lower in Madison for asbestos journeymen to 70 cents an hour lower in Madison for bricklayers. Lastly, although quality differences between the two areas—District of Columbia and Madison—were not considered, E. H. Boeck & Co. has estimated that Madison standards are considerably higher than Washington standards, thus, leading to higher building life and lower repair costs.

A previous analysis of the difference between the cost of locating the laboratory in the Midwest and locating the laboratory in Beltsville, shows the cost for the Beltsville site to be $17.5 million and the Midwest site to be $22.9 million. As was stated by Dr. Goddard during the hearings held by Congressman FOUNTAIN's subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, this report is dated and does not apply today—the report was prepared for submission to the House Committee on Appropriations in the spring of 1966.

Thus, the statement that $5.4 million is the difference in costs between locating Laboratory No. 2 in Wisconsin instead of at Beltsville is erroneous for the following reasons:

First. The above totals were based on the philosophy that a remotely located Laboratory No. 2 would be built to accommodate chemistry, nutritional, and microbiological research instead of pharmacology, nutritional, and microbiological research; hence there would be additional cost of converting Lab No. 1 to pharmacology occupancy, and additional costs for constructing a 75-man building to accommodate additional pharmacology staff that could not be housed in the converted Laboratory No. 1. These two items account for $2.365 million in the above totals that would no longer be applicable under the present philosophy of constructing the relocated Laboratory No. 2 to house pharmacological research. Hence, because there will be different occupancy as a result of accommodating different disciplines in the new laboratory building, the difference of $5.4 million can now be reduced by $2.365 million.

Second. The $22.9 million figure for the Midwest facility includes a land acquisition cost of $1.6 million that is no longer applicable if Laboratory No. 2 is to be located at the University of Wisconsin where free land is to be provided. Robert L. Clodius, vice president of the University of Wisconsin, has stated that:

> The necessary land for the Food and Drug Research Laboratory can be provided at no cost to the Federal Government.

Hence, the $5.4 million difference would be further reduced by the $1.6 million figure.

Third. The cost for construction of the laboratory in the Midwest was based on anticipated costs derived a year and a half ago. The construction costs figure was based on a representative location in the Midwest and not at Madison, Wis. Therefore, the $835,000 difference between the cost of construction at the Midwest location and Beltsville does not relate specifically to possible construction costs at Madison, Wis.

Mr. Speaker, let me further point out that the University of Wisconsin, with its world renowned faculty and its excellent research facilities, will be able to make major contributions to Laboratory No. 2. The University of Wisconsin is unique in having specialized in most of the topics in which the FDA Laboratory will have programs and, furthermore, it has the traditions and mechanisms for providing an attractive environment for the FDA Research Laboratory.

In 1966, the FDA, trying to rationalize its preference for the Beltsville site, presented cost figures which were self-sustaining. The House Government Operations Subcommittee should have been aware of this and, accordingly, should have understood this to be the case. Furthermore, as a result of action by Congress, the FDA finally went through the formality of selecting an alternative site, but, without complying fully to HEW standards. For this inadequate performance, the FDA, now, should not be rewarded by receiving its earlier preference site, in contradiction to the well established policy of decentralization.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that a new HEW site selection committee report, complying with HEW site selection regulations and the Government-wide policies for decentralization, will reaffirm the earlier decision that Madison, Wis., is the most desirable location for the FDA laboratory No. 2.

A SAD RECORD OF GOP OBSTRUCTIONISM ONCE AGAIN STALLS PROGRESS FOR URBAN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are maintaining a consistent course of irresponsible opposition on the part of a major political party in this session of Congress. This irresponsible course of action was fully demonstrated in their overwhelming vote yesterday to stall the rent supplements and model cities programs and to send them back to the conference committee.

This is a tragic waste of time. For time is indeed running out for our cities to come to grips with the overwhelming needs of the American urbanite.

The Republicans are obviously indifferent to these needs. They seem blind to everything but narrow partisan politics that seek to embarrass the Johnson administration.

I think it is also noteworthy that Governor Romney, who has expressed interest in the problems of our cities and visited several slum neighborhoods to show his interest, did absolutely nothing to help line up support on the model cities vote among the Michigan Republican delegation.

It goes without saying that Governor Reagan did nothing. And neither did Governor Rockefeller.

The American city-dweller now knows which party is determined to help him, and which party is trying to block all meaningful progress in his behalf.

I might add that when a compromise comes out of the House-Senate conference committee we shall see once again how sincere the Republicans are meeting the needs of the cities.

But the American people already know where the Democratic Party stands.

In each of the four messages on cities he has submitted to Congress during the past 4 years, President Johnson has warned that we cannot become two people—the suburban rich and the urban poor.

He urged us to begin planning and building today to keep pace with an urban population that will double in the next 40 years; and emphasized that while we do not possess all of the answers to urban problems, we must move quickly to "make right what has taken generations to make wrong."

In his 1965 message on the cities, the President declared:

> The modern city can be the most ruthless enemy of the good life, or it can be its servant. The choice is up to this generation of Americans. For this is truly the time of decision for the American city.

In his 1966 message on the cities, the President asked:

> Shall we make our cities livable for ourselves and our posterity? Or shall we by timidity and neglect damn them to fester and decay?

And this year, in his message on urban and rural poverty, the President said:

> Many of our early efforts have revealed the dimensions of the work that remains to be done. For some, this has inspired a pessimism that challenges both the value of what has been accomplished and the capacity of our Federal democracy to complete the task. For others, it has inspired a sober determination to carry through with programs that show great promise, to improve their administration and to seek still more effective instruments of change.

Who are the doubters and who are the doers for urban America?

The record shows that the 36th President and the 89th Congress provided a new charter of hope for the American city.

This leadership created a Department of Housing and Urban Development to focus the needs of the cities in the highest councils of Government.

And 93 percent of House Republicans voted against this bill.

This leadership created the model cities program of 1966 and the rent supplement program of 1965—two pioneering concepts to speed new housing for the urban poor.

And 84 percent of the House Republicans voted against model cities, while 93 percent voted against rent supplements.

This leadership created a home rehabilitation program to assist low-income homeowners; an Urban Mass Transit Act to modernize transportation facilities in urban centers; and a relocation assistance program to help urban poor displaced by urban renewal.

Again, these programs passed against overwhelming Republican opposition.

All told, some 30 legislative proposals for the urban poor have been enacted by the Congress over the past 3½ years. All of them have been strongly opposed by the Republicans.

This is the record. And those Republicans seeking political advantage from the tragic events of this summer cannot be allowed to bury the bones of their dismal voting record on the cities in the Democratic backyard.

At this very moment, Congress has under consideration 14 pieces of major legislation to help our cities in the months and years ahead.

These proposals were submitted by President Johnson long before the riots, which have made the need for these programs even more compelling than they were even a few months ago.

I say this knowing that there are some in Congress and elsewhere who are trying to exploit the ill-will generated by the riots to sabotage badly needed urban programs proposed by President Johnson.

This strategy must not succeed. For to confront acts of physical destruction with acts of legislative revenge would be to compound hatred and bitterness that can only lead to more tragedy.

The greater tragedy growing out of the summer riots are the thousands of innocent victims who watched helplessly as their homes and businesses were destroyed. We cannot turn our backs on those who suffered the most at the hands of a few.

And we know, too, that the sins committed by a few cannot be charged against an overwhelming majority who are innocent.

The task of this Congress is clear. We must move forward from yesterday's destruction to tomorrow's rebuilding. We cannot abandon programs that have just begun; and we cannot ignore the President's requests for further remedial action to help the urban poor.

THE CONDITION OF SOVIET JEWRY, 1967

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the condition of Jewry in the Soviet Union is deplorable. Since June of this year, from all available information, the condition of Soviet Jews has become increasingly acute, and more intolerable than before.

It is urgent, to prevent the extinction of Jews in Russia, that the United States and other God-fearing nations must use their good offices and act now to end the tragic situation that now exists.

In the weeks following the Israel defeat of the Arabs, the Soviet press became more vicious and more virulent than ever before in its attacks on Israel and on the Russian Jews. Prior to the 6-day war there were numerous accusations against, and trials of, Jews who methodically were sentenced on false charges of espionage and lesser crimes against the state. There is no doubt that anti-Semitism is widespread in the Soviet Union and is condoned by Soviet authorities.

Many of the improvements in the cultural and religious situation of Russian Jewry promised over recent years have remained unfulfilled or have been given only token implementation. Except for the wider availability of matzoth for Passover in 1967, at least in Moscow, Leningrad, and other large cities, the restraints and repressions on Jewish religious or cultural expression that have been imposed since the Stalin era remained substantially unrelieved during the past year. A statistical survey of books in Yiddish—according to Folkstimme, a Yiddish periodical appearing in Warsaw—showed that from 1961–66, of a total of 750, only seven had appeared in Russia, which has the largest population of any country in the world declaring Yiddish as mother tongue. In the United States, the survey showed, 240 books in Yiddish were published. An occasional concert or recital of Jewish songs or music in one or another of Russia's large cities—almost always by an amateur group lacking state support such as is given theatrical companies of other national and ethnic groups—served chiefly to demonstrate by the quick sellout of tickets and the packed theaters that there is a great hunger for Jewish cultural fare among Soviet Jews.

A scheduled visit by Israel's philharmonic orchestra was canceled, rescheduled, again canceled. Israeli performers were extremely popular in Russia. Cheering Jewish crowds gathered outside theaters where they appeared, but were forcibly prevented from approaching the performers or speaking to them. On one such occasion, Russian security police arrested three Jews, who subsequently were jailed.

Dramatic expression was given, also, to the hunger for distinctively Jewish experience by the outpouring of tens of thousands of students into major synagogues and the streets outside to celebrate "Simhath Torah"—one bit of evidence among many that are now emerging of the desire among Russian Jewish youth for ways of identifying with the Jewish people.

The growing sensitivity of Russian intellectuals to the situation of Russia's Jews was reflected in such writings as the novel "Babi Yar" which includes a moving account of the Nazi massacre of Jews and others on the site of that ravine that became a mass grave. Yet, the long promised monument at Babi Yar still does not exist. A Soviet history of World War II, published in 1966, omitted any reference to Babi Yar and in its 600 pages found space for only two notes on what happened to Jews during the Nazi invasion.

As it is indicated from past experiences, the Soviet regime is sensitive to the growing condemnation of its treatment of Russian Jews by the world outside its borders, and this was further shown during the past year. For the first time in any publication of general circulation within the U.S.S.R., the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry was mentioned in the spring of 1967 in Sovietish Heimland—of course, to be savagely denounced.

Certain it is that the programs of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry have had a continually mounting impact on public opinion in the United States of America and in other countries. Our Government officially projected its concern in various bodies of the U.N. during the year. Some measure of the responses of non-Jewish Americans to the campaign of exposure and condemnation conducted under the aegis of the conference are to be seen in the statements issued during the past year by 90 U.S. Senators, by 315 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, by more than 150 Negro leaders. The number of individuals of all faiths and all walks of life involved in the Passover vigils and other programs mounted in some 15 cities by organizations working through the conference is another measure of the reach of its message. Simultaneous assemblies in 34 cities on Human Rights Day, 1966, observed a day of dedication to Soviet Jewry. Adopted at a national leadership conference in the spring of 1966, the Declaration of Rights for Soviet Jewry was posted in Jewish community centers, synagogues, and many public places with ceremonies involving Christian ministers, Negro leaders, political officials, and others. A million copies of a supplemental Passover prayer, titled this year the "Matzoh of Hope," were distributed and recited in hundreds of thousands of homes as part of the Seder service.

During the coming program year, the U.S.S.R. will be observing the 50th anniversary of the Russian revolution. It will be an appropriate setting in which to call upon the Soviet regime to fulfill the promises of the revolution as embodied in the Soviet law and formal policy statements on national self-determination and religious freedom, for Russia's 3 million Jews.

I urge the State Department to use its diplomatic channels more vigorously to impress upon the Soviet Union the grave concern of the U.S. Government about this problem.

I urge the Voice of America to beam programs aimed at the Jews of the Soviet Union to express the deep concern of the United States over the sad plight which has enthralled them.

DWINDLING SILVER SUPPLIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this floor before, as I am taking it today, and as I will no doubt have to take it in the future to express my deep concern about the administration's handling of our dwindling silver supplies.

The Treasury Department has exercised a singular and critical lack of foresight in dealing with this question which has resulted in an utterly chaotic and unreasonable market for this precious commodity.

The first meeting of the Joint Commission on the Coinage was held on May 18, 1967, almost 2 years after it was authorized by Congress. This Commission was set up to deal with, among other things, just this problem of what our silver policies should be. It should have met shortly after it was authorized so that proper planning and programs could have been provided for. The President, however, refused to bring this Commission into effect by not appointing its public members for almost 2 years.

The results have been devastating. Anyone who has followed the path of silver this year has been on an endless roller coaster ride.

The transition from a silver market pegged at $1.29 per ounce to a "free market" has been as far removed from an orderly transition as one could possibly conceive of.

The Treasury Department has precipitated crisis after crisis in the silver market by its consistent failure to foresee the problems that have arisen and to provide an adequate long-range plan for dealing with them.

Just within the past few days, the price of silver has skyrocketed, based on speculation and false rumors, to $1.90.

Fortunately, the Treasury Department moved to clarify this situation and put an end to any false impressions which existed concerning its present policy.

But we have been consistently faced with the Treasury Department dealing with these situations as they arise on a piecemeal basis, meeting each situation as it arises and failing to implement any kind of comprehensive plan.

This could have and should have been avoided. And it would have been if the Coinage Commission had been called into operation in 1965 rather than 1967.

One of the first steps that should have been taken was to eliminate the minting of silver half dollars. I have pointed out time and time again that we cannot continue to waste our precious silver on a coin that is not being used by anyone as a coin. And I will continue to point this out until the Treasury stops minting that coin. Our silver has too many important and useful functions to see it wasted in a coin which goes into someone's dresser as a souvenir rather than being used as a medium of exchange.

Miss Eva Adams, Director of the Bureau of the Mint, in reply to my recent letter to her concerning this absurd situation states that "the 50-cent piece remains in great demand today." This is an absolutely absurd and ridiculous statement. The only demand that exists for these coins is to hide them and take them out of circulation. If Miss Adams means to say that the mint is interested in filling this demand rather than providing coins for circulation, I suggest that perhaps a reevaluation of the mint policies would be in order.

We are today holding 999 fine silver in the Treasury for use in coins while Treasury refuses to sell any more 999 fine silver to industry because of its short supply. There is no excuse for this. There is no reason for this. There is no justification for this. That silver should be made available to the public rather than being held for disappearing coins.

I call upon the Treasury once more to stop minting silver half dollars.

THE GRAVE NEW SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the grave new situation that has developed in the Middle East as a result of the sink-

ing of an Israeli destroyer by a Soviet-manufactured missile. Thousands of Soviet military technicians and advisors are now in Egypt. This fact is known to U.S. intelligence agencies and to the administration. The administration's refusal to point a finger at the guilty party in the sinking of the destroyer merely invites an intensification of Soviet-Arab collaboration to Israel's great danger.

I do not see how the State Department could ignore the fact that Egypt was responsible for the treacherous attack on the ship and that Russia was also directly or indirectly involved.

When the State Department stated it could not find fault with Egypt in the sinking of the destroyer, it indicated a tendency to avoid facing the grim fact that escalation has occurred in the Middle East conflict. This evasion by our policymakers will only tempt the Russians to send more men and weapons into the Arab States. It will only contribute to the refusal of the Arabs to go to the peace conference table.

I cannot understand how the administration can afford not to take a stand on the side of Israel and, doing so, to denounce the cowardly sinking of the destroyer. This is the same administration that demanded and got a Gulf of Tonkin resolution in 1964 when the Communists merely made hostile gestures at U.S. destroyers but did not sink a single one.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD COMMUNITY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in President Johnson's eloquent and moving remarks to the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical, and Technical Employees meeting here in Washington, one theme was recurrent: "The world remains man's first community." And the United States has an obligation to that community.

This is true when it comes to economic development and expanded international trade.

It is true when discussing military security in Vietnam or in any other place in the world where freedom is threatened.

The President stressed our commitments to international security when he said:

> In every way we can, we search for peace in Vietnam. Those who began the war are not willing to explore ways to end it. They cling stubbornly to the belief that their aggression will be rewarded—by our frustration, our impatience, our unwillingness to stay the course. It will not be so.

The President talked about an emerging regionalism in world trade, aid, education, mutual security—and we are indeed part of that growing regionalism.

Today, as we speak about global challenges, we are in the habit of reading only about America's contributions to other nations; of America's military assistance; of America's trade with other nations.

Yet, the world community is a two-way street. Without other nations, the United States would stand alone. Without trading countries to purchase America's products, we might not enjoy the level of prosperity we have today.

And if we want to go back to our earlier history, we might never have had a successful American revolution without the aid and support of other nations.

Therefore, the strong American relationship to the world must be kept inviolate.

We must stand for what we believe and protect the American economy. At the same time we must work in every forum toward a true community of nations where war is no longer an instrument of foreign policy, and where men and nations trade freely and peacefully across the boundaries only of space and time.

I insert in the RECORD the remarks of President Johnson before the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical, and Technical Employees on October 23:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF COMMERCIAL, CLERICAL, AND TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome you here for your first conference in this hemisphere.

I have been familiar for many years with your work.

In 1961, I took one of the most rewarding and exciting trips of my life with your President—Jim Suffridge. We visited a number of your countries together, on a mission for President Kennedy. It was on that journey—with Mr. Suffridge as my guide—that I saw some of the worldwide activities of FIET.

I saw then in other lands what I knew well in my own—working people building better lives for themselves and better futures for their families through their labor organizations. I saw schools, new housing and health clinics, credit unions and cooperatives which had been created largely with the help of their trade unions.

As you meet to study the problems and the promise of tomorrow, I join you as one who shares your vision of the good life. I come as a representative of 200 million people who want very much to see a world in which all the guns of war are stilled; in which every nation is free to mark its own course; in which every man is able to build—through his own effort—fulfillment for himself and opportunity for his children.

We can agree quickly that this is the goal we all seek—because we are not the first to put it into words. In this generation, many men from many lands have talked hopefully of a stable world of growing promise—because for the first time in man's history it is realistic to think in global terms about improving man's condition.

The fact that mankind now can rid this planet of ignorance and hunger is one of the most awesome bits of knowledge we live with.

It is History's cruel paradox that man should finally acquire this ability, after all his years of struggle, just as he also gains the power to destroy his race.

The rest of his story will be told—if it is told at all—in terms of which power he employs.

He can use his atomic might to make the deserts of the world bloom—or to incinerate his planet.

We can use our science to develop weapons that dwarf the mind—or to expand men's minds with learning.

We can commit our sons to a new generation of peril—or leave them the foundation stones for a new civilization.

The will to live is the strongest human impulse. It generates a stubborn optimism which runs deep in the human spirit.

An eloquent American writer has given it voice in our time. "I believe," he said, "that man will not merely endure; he will prevail. He is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice, but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance."

William Faulkner spoke those words almost two decades ago. It is a measure of how far we have come that they sounded braver then than they do now.

The great victories of reason and agreement, which can assure the survival of the human race, still lie ahead of us.

The ones behind us are modest and small. But they are victories nonetheless.

We have not yet passed safely through the danger we have created. But we have walked far enough to dare to hope that we will make it

The fact that war itself has not yet disappeared is a matter of infinite tragedy.

Many thousands of our countrymen are today involved in a bitter conflict in a land far from here—because armed invaders try to impose their will on their neighbor.

In every way we can, we search for peace in Vietnam. But we appear to be searching alone. Those who began the war are not willing to explore ways to end it. They cling stubbornly to the belief that their aggression will be rewarded—by our frustration, our impatience, our unwillingness to stay the course.

It will not be so.

Peace and stability will come to Asia only when the aggressors know that they cannot take another people's land by force.

Our Asian allies fighting beside us believe this.

And so do the leaders and the people of those free nations in the path of conquest.

But to end the threat of war, we must do even more than keep aggression in check.

Most wars are bred in conditions of human misery. Aggressors are boldest when they can exploit a people's discontent.

This discontent churns in a world where illiteracy cripples two-fifths of the adult population—and where disease still dooms children to an early death.

The experience of the last decade proves that violence erupts most often in nations which are poor.

The great work of our day, then, is to change the conditions that encourage war—to do something about the old tyrannies of hunger and disease and ignorance, which still enslave two-thirds of the human race.

That work has well started.

I am proud of the role my own Nation has played in the beginning of this worthy adventure. A leading public figure of a free Asian country recently said about the United States: ". . . This is perhaps the first time in history that a world power has consciously used its strength and wealth to promote the interests of weak and poor nations."

On behalf of our people, I believe that tribute is well-deserved. The American people have used their resources in a constructive and compassionate way—because we have had to learn quickly the lessons which history forced upon us overnight.

Today, history teaches us all a new lesson. A concept of world order is quietly emerging which offers the world its best chance for constructive change.

It is a new sense of community. It links together states that share a common geography.

There is no word which can adequately describe it and convey the excitement and hope it generates. But for want of a better term, we refer to it as regionalism.

It is built on an awareness which has grown rapidly in the minds of many men. That idea is simply this—despite the passions of nationalism, the problems of an area respect no national borders. There is a belief that action can be more effective when it is taken in unison. There is a determination to work together in shaping a common destiny; through economic development.

The logic of this idea first became evident in Europe. The chaos of war forced the leaders of Western Europe to look with new insight into the old patterns of rivalry. They reached a significant conclusion. They saw that the more they could travel together, the faster they could move to a prosperous future. Going it alone, they might never make it. The European Common Market was a result of this thinking.

In Latin America, economic integration is clearly seen as the key which can unlock strength dreamed of for centuries.

In Asia the same idea has now begun—for the very first time—to persuade separate nations of their common purpose.

Africa, too, is feeling the stirrings of a regional spirit.

Only in the Middle East do ancient rivalries and frustrations still seem to inhibit the prospects of cooperation. But in our search for new solutions to old challenges, there is hope even here that men will look together at the problems they share.

Nowhere is the road easy, and nowhere has that road yet been fully travelled. But men and nations are moving ahead.

In my years of public life, no development in world affairs has encouraged me more. Behind the headlines of crisis, a new spirit of progress has been quietly at work.

The United States will continue to encourage its development and to support its growth.

But the world itself remains man's first community. And problems still must be met on a global basis—weather control, for example, and the spread of nuclear weapons, and international monetary reform.

World trade is yet another.

Just five years ago, the major trading countries began the most ambitious round of trade negotiations ever undertaken. Because these talks were initiated by a great American President, they took his name, and became known as the Kennedy Round.

This past summer, the Kennedy Round was successfully concluded. It brought tariff reductions greater than any in history. It moved the world closer to the healthy trading conditions on which the prosperity of many nations depends.

It was an historic landmark in the efforts of all of us to create a sounder world community.

Preserving the gains won in the Kennedy Round is essential to the world's harmony and well-being.

It will not be easy. Freer trade often causes temporary but painful dislocations. And today, once again, we hear protectionist voices rising out of the past.

But larger interests must prevail. We must consider our common interests in protecting our consumers; in promoting healthy and competitive industry and agriculture; in raising the productivity and wages of our workers.

We have an enormous stake in keeping and extending the benefits of 30 years of constructive trade policy.

And our overall interest lies in working together to establish new conditions for a peaceful and more prosperous world order.

To the developing countries, striving to reach the 20th Century industrial world, trade is the lifeline of hope.

The leading nations of the Free World are together studying ways to improve the trading position of those emerging lands. In the meantime, the Kennedy Round increases the trading opportunities they so badly need.

That increase in strength is not enough to assure their industrial success. But it is a step forward.

The world is moving fast. Developments measured a step at a time may not stir the mind as forcefully as the headlong rush of crisis can.

And through a generation of peril, progress has often moved forward by short steps. Yet those steps now add up to many miles.

It is good for us all, I think, when we are burdened by the awareness of how far we must still go, to look back and reflect on how far we have come.

Thank you.

PROMINENT AMERICANS STRONGLY SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, an independent committee of distinguished Americans—including former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower—has done a great service for its country by strongly supporting American policy in Vietnam.

In their historic first policy statement, these Americans joined in voice to tell the world that "we strongly support our commitment in Vietnam and the policy of noncompromising, although limited resistance to aggression."

Like President Johnson, these prominent Americans—who include two former Presidents, two former Secretaries of State, a former Secretary of Defense, General of the Army Omar Bradley, and former Senator Paul Douglas—recognize the need to stop Communist aggression in Vietnam before its fires spread to the entire Asian mainland.

And, like the President, these concerned Americans recognize the need to temper our nuclear might—to "follow a sensible road between capitulation and the indiscriminate use of raw power."

For far too long, a small vocal minority of American's have captured headlines with strident dissent. For too many months, the voices of dissent have received attention far out of proportion to their numbers, their influence, and the feasibility of their empty alternatives.

This committee will speak for the vast majority of Americans who support America's efforts to stop the forward thrust of militant Asian communism.

They will assure that Hanoi and Peking hear—loud and clear—the true voice of America.

A voice filled with pride at the job being done in Vietnam and the men doing it.

A voice unswerving in its conviction to see this conflict through to an honorable solution for all sides.

The distinguished citizens who have of their own initiative spoken out today, speak with the assurance of long years of experience in foreign affairs.

It is their considered and knowledgeable judgment that American involvement in Vietnam is vital to the future of Southeast Asia and to the free world.

I agree wholeheartedly.

So do millions of Americans, who refuse to allow the outnumbered voices of dissent to stampede the truth.

Under the unanimous consent agreement, I insert at this point the full text of a press release issued today by the Citizens Committee for Peace with Freedom in Vietnam, as well as the text of a policy statement issued by the committee, remarks of Hon. Paul H. Douglas, organizing chairman of the committee, at a news conference this morning, and a membership roster of the committee:

[Press release of Citizens Committee for Peace With Freedom in Vietnam, Oct. 25, 1967]

PEACE WITH FREEDOM GROUP TO SPEAK FOR "SILENT CENTER"

The formation of the Citizens Committee for Peace with Freedom in Vietnam was announced in Washington, D.C. at a press conference coordinated by Former Senator Paul H. Douglas, Organizing Chairman, General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, Co-chairman, and Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, Vice Chairman. The Committee's initial policy statement is attached as well as a membership roster of the committee.

The 107-member Committee includes all four living men who have occupied the offices of President of the United States or Secretary of State.

Among the Founding Members of the Committee, in addition to former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower and former Secretaries of State Byrnes and Acheson, former Senator Douglas, General Bradley and Mrs. Lord are: George Meany (Co-chairman), Archbishop Lucey (Co-chairman), Former Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Dr. James B. Conant, Benjamin F. Swig, General Lucius D. Clay, Nobel Laureates E. L. Tatum, Harold C. Urey and Eugene Wigner, and 31 distinguished intellectuals almost all from university faculties, including 19 recognized authorities on Asian affairs, history and political science.

The Committee has excluded from membership all elected and appointed Federal officials, including all Senators and Congressmen; Governors, publishers and foundation heads.

The Committee is bi-partisan and is incorporated in the District of Columbia as a non-profit organization.

Charles Tyroler 2nd, Committee Vice-Chairman, Research, will be Director of Staff Operations. Abbott Washburn, Committee Secretary, will be Deputy Director. Huntington Harris is Treasurer.

PEACE WITH FREEDOM

(A policy statement of the Citizens Committee for Peace With Freedom in Vietnam, unanimously adopted by the founding members)

We are a group of concerned citizens who seek peace *with* freedom in Vietnam.

We do so in the conviction that our own vital national interests are at stake in that troubled land. We are not ashamed to admit that our primary motivation is self-interest—the self-interest of our own country in this shrinking world. America cannot afford to let naked aggression or the suppression of freedom go unchallenged. To Americans, peace and freedom are inseparable.

Our committee is national and non-partisan—it is composed of Democrats, Republicans and Independents, and of "liberals," "moderates" and "conservatives" drawn from all sections and all sectors of our country.

We believe in the great American principle of civilian control and a civilian Commander-in-chief. And we strongly support our commitment in Vietnam and the policy of non-compromising, although limited, resistance to aggression. All four of the post-World War II American Presidents—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—have proclaimed America's basic purpose of defending freedom. We are not supporters of a President or of an administration; we *are* supporters of the office of the Presidency.

As a committee, we shall strive to stay above partisan politics, political personalities and transitory opinion polls. Our concern is not with politics or popularity, but with principle.

We are opposed to surrender, however camouflaged. Yet nothing we advocate can be interpreted as unnecessarily risking a general war in Asia or a nuclear war in the world. We favor a sensible road between capitulation and the indiscriminate use of raw power.

We believe that, in this, we speak for the great "silent center" of American life, the understanding, independent and responsible men and women who has consistently opposed rewarding international aggressors from Adolf Hitler to Mao Tse-Tung. And we believe that the "silent center" should now be heard.

A great test is taking place in Vietnam—that test is whether or not the rulers of one territory can cheaply and safely impose a government and a political system upon their neighbors by internal subversion, insurrection, infiltration and invasion. These are the tactics of the communist "wars of liberation" which depend for success upon achieving their goals at an endurable price and a bearable risk.

Our objective in Vietnam is to make the price too high and the risk too great for the aggressor. This is why we fight.

Vietnam is a small country and we Americans had little contact with it until after World War II. It still seems isolated and remote to many of us, although all of our Presidents for thirty years have had to concern themselves with our national interests in East Asia. For better perspective, we must turn our sights to the edge of East Asia, that enormous area of peninsulas and islands from Korea and Japan south to Taiwan and the Philippines, then west across Southeast Asia to Burma, then southeast to Malaysia, Indonesia, Australia and New Zealand.

That area contains 370 million people—approximately twice the population of the United States. Each of these nations is different from the others but they have one thing in common—all of them are free from *external* domination. Will this be true if we abandon Vietnam? Or will Peking and Hanoi, flushed with success, continue their expansionist policy through many other "wars of liberation," each conducted at a price which they can endure and a risk which they can bear? We believe they would.

Never in over a century has there been as much loud and violent opposition expressed in America to a conflict in which our fighting men are heavily and heroically engaged. Our committee specifically affirms and supports the right of opponents of our national policy to criticize that effort and to offer alternatives consistent with our national interest and security. However, we are concerned that voices of dissent have, thus far, received attention far out of proportion to their actual numbers.

Our objective as a committee is not to suppress the voices of such opposition. Our objective is to make sure that the majority voice of America is heard—loud and clear—so that Peking and Hanoi will not mistake the strident voices of some dissenters for American discouragement and a weakening of will. And, at the same time, we want to give renewed assurance to our fighting men that their sacrifices are neither in vain nor unappreciated—or unwanted—by the great bulk of their fellow citizens.

We want the aggressors to know that there is a solid, stubborn, dedicated, bi-partisan majority of private citizens in America who approve our country's policy of patient, responsible, determined resistance which is dependent for its success on having the enemy realize that we shall keep the pressure on and not back down, that the peace we insist upon is a peace with freedom and, thus, with honor.

Today, America is a great world power, shedding its blood and expending its treasure in a distant country for the simple privilege of withdrawing in peace as soon as that country is guaranteed the effective right of self-determination. We ask nothing for ourselves and insist upon nothing for South Vietnam except that it be free to chart its own future, no matter what course it may choose. Surely this is a noble and worthy objective consistent with all that is best in American life and tradition.

Our committee has been formed to rally and articulate the support of the concerned, independent-thinking, responsible citizens in America who favor our nation's fundamental commitment to peace *with* freedom.

Will you join with us?

Remarks of Former Senator Paul H. Douglas, Organizing Chairman, Citizens Committee for Peace With Freedom in Vietnam, October 25, 1967

Good morning. You all have before you the policy statement of our Committee which states our purpose and objective and gives our views on a sensible policy on Vietnam. You also have a list of our members, all of whom subscribe to the statement. Our Committee is still in formation so this should be considered as an interim listing. In fact, there are some additional members this morning.

We are a non-partisan, or if you will, bi-partisan group and we are incorporated as a non-profit organization.

As you will note in the statement, we seek to speak for the "silent center" in America. Thus, we are excluding from membership all elected and appointed Federal officials, including all Senators and Congressmen; governors, publishers, foundation heads and generally those people who have public forums of their own whereby they can speak their piece on a regular, organized basis and those people who have special organizational affiliations which might conflict in a fundamental way with their membership on the committee. Our committee will have no organizational affiliates. All members will serve in their individual capacities and not as official representatives of any other group or organization.

Let me invite your attention to one fact respecting the membership that I think is of great significance. On our founding committee are the only four living Americans who have been President of the United States or Secretary of State, excepting, of course, the present incumbents.

All four of them are with us—each one of them is a signer of our statement and each of them is a founding member of our committee. Their combined span of service began in 1944 and continued right up to the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations.

We don't have *some* of them with us, we have *all* of them.

Our Committee has a relatively long title, Citizens Committee for Peace with Freedom in Vietnam, but in the few days that we have been in existence, we have found that people sort of naturally drift towards calling us the "Peace with Freedom" group. That's O.K. with us. Maybe that's what we should have called ourselves in the first place.

A word on finances. We haven't much money. Just enough to get started. But we are confident that whatever money we need to be effective will be forthcoming, because we are convinced that the job we are taking on is not only necessary but absolutely essential. Up to now, all of our contributions have come from the members of our Committee. Everything we have received has been contributed voluntarily on the sole initiative of the giver.

Now about the Committee's operation. We hope that we are moving into the vacuum that has resulted from the inertia of those who support the non-partisan (or bi-partisan) fundamentals of American foreign policy.

As President Eisenhower expressed it to us the other day, we are making the common sense presentation of the alternatives to the extremes which have become known as the doves and the hawks—the extremists who want to either pull out on the one hand or start dropping nuclear bombs all over the place and very possibly starting World War III on the other.

I can't stress too strongly that we are free independent citizens on this Committee. We recognize no ties or obligations to the Administration, to political parties, to other private organizations or to our individual or corporate pocketbooks. We are speaking as *citizens* concerned solely with the security and best interests of our country.

We hope to perform a vital and, we think, much needed public service by speaking for the hitherto "silent center" of America.

Let me also make it clear that we are not in business to defend everything that has taken place in the past.

There have been mistakes in the past—things were done that shouldn't have been done and things weren't done that should have been done. We were not going to dwell on those past mistakes. We are not going to cry over spilt milk. We are not going to rake over the past. We are facing up to the realities of our present position and we are not going to talk about what might have been or what never was.

There will undoubtedly be mistakes in the future. When we think that mistakes are being made or being seriously considered, we will speak up. When we think the right decisions are being made, we will speak up, too—however unpopular the position may be at the time.

Now, if I may, I'd like to anticipate three questions—

The first is whether this Committee should be viewed as backing Lyndon Johnson and his policy. I noticed that one mid-western paper last week speculated that our project would be the final action in an Administration counter-attack against its Vietnam critics.

Well, that just isn't so. We aren't part of any attack or counter-attack and we have no ties to anyone or anything except our own consciences.

Yes, we *are* backers of the office of the Presidency—we recognize and respect the power of that office and the huge resources of information, intelligence and analyses that the occupant of that office has—but we are not in business as a Committee to support Lyndon Johnson. We are concerned with the future of the United States which is bigger than any one of us—or any group of us. We are backers of the *office* of the Presidency—that office belongs to the citizens—to *us*, if you will. It may be a *fine* distinction between backing the office and backing the man who occupies it, but it is a very real distinction.

As a Committee we may well be wrong at such times as we criticize some Administration actions. We won't go out of our way just to try and find something to criticize but when we do see something, we will speak up.

We are a *citizens* Committee in the truest sense of the word *citizens*. Many of our members have held high positions of trust and responsibility in previous Administrations—both Republican and Democratic. They know the complexity of the problems being dealt with. They are, to that extent, sympathetic with those who now occupy these positions. But at the same time, they are well aware of the fallibility of any man and they don't and won't blindly accept everything that is told them or every decision that is made.

As a Committee, we don't have to worry about offending *anyone*—in *our* government or in *other* governments throughout the world. We are a free, unfettered voice. That is one of our greatest strengths—possibly our greatest strength.

The second question that I should like to anticipate is how do we stand on bombing policy—do we favor more bombing, less bombing—bombing closer to China, farther away or what?

The answer is that our committee has not discussed bombing policy except to the extent that it is implied in our statement. Everything that we have agreed upon so far—in fact, everything that we have discussed as a Committee—is incorporated in the statement which we distributed to you—a statement, incidentally, which was personally edited in long hand by a former President of the United States. And, I might add, he is a mighty adept wordsmith.

Now, on bombing—it is very possible that our Committee will speak up, from time to time, on bombing policy. We may well deal with such alternatives as bombing pauses, "terror" bombing and the like. But not today. As a Committee, we simply haven't had time to go into all of these matters.

As a personal aside, I might add that the statement suggests our recognition that, in any armed conflict, risks must be taken. We want to avoid a war with China and therefore we advocate avoiding *unnecessary* risks of bringing that about.

The third question and, by all odds, the most important is "what will the committee do?" Our effort is *not* a one-shot affair. We shall stay in business until the job is done.

Our principal activity will be educational. Basically, we plan to inform the American people on the Vietnam situation. And we shall strive to make our material clear, readable and authoritative.

I view this educational effort as embracing four general areas:

First, understanding the Vietnamese people and their country—their background and their culture. One of the foremost Asian experts told us the other day that, prior to 1950, America didn't have a single scholar who was recognized as, or even claimed to be, a Vietnamese expert. We are fortunate in having on our Committee some of the foremost Asian scholars and historians in the United States and we view this not only as testimony to the rightness of our general position but as an important resource in performing the educational job that we have set for ourselves.

Second, we want to explain the reasons why we are in Vietnam with the great burden of manpower and resources that it requires. We believe that these reasons are not only good reasons but compelling ones.

Third, we are going to report on how we are doing in Vietnam and what the Vietnamese and our allies are doing—our and their accomplishments and shortcomings.

Fourth, and finally, we are going to try to inform the American people on what still lies ahead—the job that must be done, and how much it may cost in men, money and time.

To do our educational job, we are organizing a speakers bureau, we will publish pamphlets, we will issue policy statements from time to time and engage in a variety of other educational activities. We will maintain an office here in Washington for the preparation and distribution of our materials and the coordination of our Committee's activities.

Let me also say that our Committee does not intend to engage in any name-calling. We plan to keep on a high plane of rational discussion and to respect the right of others to disagree with us.

If you have any other questions, I'll be glad to try and answer them. But, in all candor, I don't feel that there is much more I can say today as a spokesman for the Committee.

But first I would like to present two distinguished members of our Committee and I hope that they will help me to answer the questions you may have. Our Co-Chairmen, General of the Army Omar Bradley—one of our only two living 5 Star officers—the other being former President Eisenhower—General Bradley, the victorious commander of the largest army in the history of the world while being, at the same time, a kind and gentle man, and Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt's successor at the United Nations. Mrs. Lord is our Vice-Chairman. I also see that we have some other members of our Committee present . . .

MEMBERSHIP ROSTER AS OF OCTOBER 24, 1967

Harry S. Truman—33rd President of the United States.

Dwight D. Eisenhower—34th President of the United States.

Acheson, Dean. Former U.S. Secretary of State.

Alexander, Holmes. Syndicated Columnist.

Arnold, Thurman. Former Solicitor-General of the United States.

Bandler, Ned. Business Executive.

Barnett, Frank R. President, National Strategy Information Center, Inc.

Baron, Murray. Industrial Consultant.

Beirne, Joseph. President, Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

Bradley, General of the Army Omar N. Former Chairman, U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Breit, Dr. Gregory. Donner Professor of Physics, Yale University.

Brown, Dr. J. Douglas. Professor of Economics, Princeton University. Former Dean of the Faculty.

Brown, Edmund G. Former Governor of California.

Burns, Dr. James McGregor. James Phinney Baxter Professor of History and Public Affairs and Chairman, Department of Political Science, Williams College.

Byrnes, James F. Former U.S. Secretary of State; Columbia, S.C.

Cabot, Thomas D. Chairman of the Board, Cabot Corp., Boston. Former Director, Office of International Security Affairs, Dept. of State.

Cherne, Leo. Executive Director, The Research Institute of America, Inc.

Clay, General Lucius D. Senior Partner, Lehman Brothers.

Conant, Dr. James B. Former President, Harvard University. Former U.S. Ambassador to Germany.

Connelly, Marc. Playwright.

Darden, Colgate. Former President, University of Virginia; Norfolk, Virginia.

Davis, Thurston N., S.J. Editor-in-Chief, *America*.

Douglas, Paul H. Former U.S. Senator from Illinois.

Draper, Gen. William H. Partner, Draper, Gather & Anderson.

Drummond, Roscoe. Syndicated Columnist.

Ellison, Ralph. Author.

Emmett, Christopher. Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

Engel, Irving M. Attorney-at-Law. Past President, American Jewish Committee.

Farland, Joseph S. Former U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic and to the Republic of Panama.

Farrell, James T. Author.

Fisher, John M. President, American Research Foundation; Chicago.

Gaston, A. G. President, Booker T. Washington Insurance Company, Birmingham, Alabama.

Gates, Thomas S. Chairman, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. Former U.S. Secretary of Defense.

Gideonse, Dr. Harry D. Chancellor, New School for Social Research.

Gullion, Dr. Edmund A. Dean, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University; Medford, Massachusetts.

Gunderson, Mrs. Robert. Former U.S. Civil Service Commissioner; Rapid City, South Dakota.

Hacker, Louis M. Historian and Professor of Economics, Columbia University.

Handlin, Dr. Oscar. Director, Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History, Harvard University.

Hanes, John W., Jr. Investment Banker. Former Assistant Secretary of State.

Harris, Huntington, Dr. Business Executive.

Hecht, Rabbi Abraham B. President, Rabbinical Alliance of America.

Hoffer, Eric. Author and Longshoreman; San Francisco.

Jones, Dr. Frank. Physician and Surgeon.

Keeler, W. W. President, Phillips Petroleum Company; Bartlesville, Oklahoma.

Keggi, Dr. Kristaps J. Ass't Prof. Orthopaedic Surgery, Yale University. Former Chief of Orthopaedic Surgery, Third Surgical Hospital (Mobile Army), Vietnam, Captain MC USAR.

King, Wilson. Farmer; Rock Falls, Illinois.

Lapp, Dr. Ralph E. Nuclear Physicist and Author.

Liebman, Morris I. Attorney-at-Law, Chicago.

de Lima, Oscar. Business Executive. Chairman, Executive Committee, United Nations Association; Stamford, Connecticut.

Lindsay, Howard. Playwright, Producer and Actor.

Locke, Edwin Allen, Jr. President, Modern Homes Construction Co.; Valdosta, Georgia.

Lodge, George C. University Official. Former Assistant Secretary of Labor; Beverly, Massachusetts.

Loomis, Henry. Former Director, Voice of America.

Lord, Mrs. Oswald B. Former U.S. Representative on Human Rights Commission, United Nations.

Lucey, Archbishop Robert E. Archbishop, Archdiocese of San Antonio.

McCaleb, Claude B. Book Company Executive; Indianapolis.

McDougal, Myres S. Sterling Professor of Law, Yale University.

McGill, Ralph. Syndicated Columnist; Atlanta, Georgia.

Marshall, Brig. Gen. S. L. A. (Ret.). Military Historian; Birmingham, Michigan.

Martin, C. V. President, Carson Pirie Scott & Company, Chicago.

Martin, David. Washington, D.C.

Meany, George. President, AFL–CIO.

Michael, Franz. Associate Director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University.

Nash, Dr. Philleo. Consulting Anthropologist. Former U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Nevins, Allan. Historian.

Newman, Ralph G. Author, Publisher and Columnist.

Porter, Paul R. Chief, E.C.A. Mission to Greece, 1949–50.

Randall, Mrs. Ann Hagen. Television Producer and former Foreign Correspondent.

Reid, Whitelaw. Business Executive.

Robinson, Professor James A. Director, Mershon Center for Education in National Security, Ohio State University.

Roosevelt, Kermit. President, Kermit Roosevelt & Associates.

Rose, Dr. Frank. President, University of Alabama.

Rowe, James H., Jr. Former Assistant to President Roosevelt and Former Assistant Attorney-General of the U.S.

Rubin, Rabbi Schulen. New York City.

Sacks, Professor I. Milton. Dean of the Undergraduate School, Brandeis University.

Saltonstall, Leverett. Former U.S. Senator from Massachusetts.

Saltzman, Charles E. Investment Banker. Former U.S. Undersecretary of State.

Scalapino, Professor Robert A. Professor of Political Science, University of California.

Seabury, Dr. Paul. Professor of Political Science, University of California.

Seitz, Dr. Frederick. President, National Academy of Sciences.

Shuster, Dr. George N. President Emeritus, Hunter College.

Smith, Howard K. News Analyst, Commentator and Author.

Smithies, Dr. Arthur. Nathaniel Ropes Professor of Political Economy, Harvard University.

de Sola Pool, Dr. Ithiel. Professor of Political Science, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Sonne, H. Christian. Chairman, National Planning Association.

Stephens, Charles J. Student, University of California, Berkeley.

Stout, Rex. Author.

Strauss, Miss Anna Lord. Former President, League of Women Voters of the U.S.

Strauss, Lewis L. Former Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Stulberg, Louis. President, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL–CIO.

Swearingen, Rodger. Professor of International Relations, The University of Southern California.

Swig, Benjamin H. Chairman of the Board, Fairmont Hotel Company, San Francisco.

Tatum, E. L. Dr. Nobel Laureate in Medicine and Physiology. Professor, The Rockefeller University.

Taylor, Professor George E. Director, Far Eastern and Russian Institute, University of Washington.

Thacher, James. Attorney-at-Law, San Francisco.

Trager, Frank N. Professor of International Affairs, New York University.

Tyroler, Charles, II. President, Quadri-Science, Inc.

Urey, Dr. Harold C. Nobel Laureate in Chemistry. Professor of Chemistry-at-Large, University of California.

Van Dusen, Dr. Henry P. Clergyman, Educator and Author. Chairman, Foundation for Theological Education in Southeast Asia.

Washburn, Abbott. Former Deputy Director, USIA.

White, Robert P. Student, University of Oklahoma; President, Associated Student Governments of the United States.

Whitney, John Hay. Former U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain.

Wigner, Eugene P. Nobel Laureate in Physics. Professor of Physics, Princeton University.

Williams, Professor T. Harry. Boyd Professor of History, Louisiana State University.

Wilson, Joseph C. Chairman of the Board, Xerox Corporation.

(NOTE.—All Committee members serve as individuals. Affiliations are listed for identification purposes only.)

PROJECT UPGRADE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of my colleagues Project Upgrade, which is being sponsored by the Brunswick Corp., Community Resources Division, and the U.S. Department of Labor through funds provided under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

This is another example of the private sector of the economy cooperating with the Federal Government in order to train unemployed and underemployed Americans so that they can take their useful place in our society. No American wants to be a liability to his country. Every American is proud of his country, and wants to be an asset to his country.

I take this opportunity to commend the Brunswick Corp., located in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent, and the U.S. Department of Labor, for the positive approach they are taking in training people so that they can become employable. This legislative body, through the passage of effective legislation, has made possible this joint cooperative venture and this positive approach to the solution of the unemployment problem.

I would like to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief description of Project Upgrade and a list of those residents of the Seventh Congressional District who have participated in Project Upgrade:

PROJECT UPGRADE SPONSORED BY THE BRUNSWICK CORP., COMMUNITY RESOURCES DIVISION

BACKGROUND OF THE PROGRAM

A. A continuous tightening in the economy, with unemployment at only 2.3 percent of the total civilian labor force, has made it increasingly difficult (in many cases, virtually impossible) to draw upon the existing labor pool for personnel with requisite skills and/or training needed for the many available job openings.

A short time ago, the Chicago Tribune contained the greatest number of Help Wanted ads in the 118-year history of the newspaper. As the Help Wanted lineage has increased progressively over the past years, there has been a proportionate decrease in Situations Wanted lineage; this situation is representative of a national trend.

Since 1962, programs initiated under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) have trained and retrained many literate citizens in a reasonably rapid and successful manner, and the resulting labor input has greatly helped not only the individual citizens but also industry.

But increased needs for manpower persist. In the Chicago Metropolitan area, need for the following categories of workers is paramount:

Skilled and semi-skilled workers, especially various types of machine operators.

Professional personnel, especially caseworkers, chemical-civil-electrical engineers, electrical and mechanical draftsmen, nurses, and tool designers.

Clerical positions, especially qualified typists and secretaries.

Service workers, such as nurse aide and licensed practical nurses.

B. With reference to special training programs, the Illinois State Employment Services is finding it increasingly difficult to procure literate manpower for its regular MDTA programs. The Cook County Department of Public Aid is having great difficulty finding sufficient literate manpower for its regular employment development and training programs.

One solution to this serious problem—lack of manpower—is the realization that disadvantaged citizens are perhaps our largest remaining manpower resource. But just who are these "disadvantaged citizens?" People . . . who are: educationally deficient; handicapped, physically and mentally; long-term unemployed; minority group members; older workers; poverty-income level; prison releases; disadvantaged youth; and, military service rejectees.

In addition to the above-mentioned characteristics, many of these disadvantaged persons are functionally illiterate. Literate manpower is defined as consisting of individuals who have a literacy and numerical skill capability of above the sixth grade level and otherwise generally meet minimum employment requirements. Persons who are functionally illiterate are those who have a literacy and numerical skill capability below the sixth grade level. Because functional illiteracy is so frequently related to cultural deficiencies, these individuals are usually lacking in basic living skills. Because this population is so disadvantaged, they generally cannot meet minimum employment standards.

The pure humanitarian objective to alleviate the plight of these disadvantaged citizens is, in and of itself, sufficient justification for the effort and expenditure inherent in this project. However, beyond that, finding, training and job placement of our many disadvantaged citizens will contribute to the maintenance, strength, and advancement of the economy of our nation.

PROJECT UPGRADE FACT SHEET

Project Upgrade is a unified pre-vocational, basic education, on-the-job training and counseling program for 800 unemployed and disadvantaged persons in the Chicago area.

Sponsor

Project Upgrade is sponsored by the United States Department of Labor through funds provided by the Manpower Development Training Act.

Operation

Project Upgrade is managed by the Community Resources Division of the Brunswick Corporation. Management of the entire program, training recruitment, on-the-job training, placement, and counseling are provided directly by staff of the Community Resources Division.

Pre-vocational training and basic education are provided by the Marion Business College, Midway Technical Institute and American Institute of Engineering and Technology, three Chicago-based trade schools that have proven their effectiveness in training unemployed and disadvantaged persons for the past 22 years. These training sites are located in easily-accessible areas throughout the city. The Community Resources Division supervises all training and educational activities.

Evaluation of the total program and cost effectiveness analysis is under the direction of Roosevelt University, an acknowledged leader in the field of labor research.

Recruitment

The Community Resources Division has developed a number of innovative techniques for the rapid recruitment and "screening" of unemployed persons who are not actively engaged in seeking employment. Recruitment involves the painstaking process of canvassing neighborhoods and local agencies in search of the ordinarily-reticent and poorly-motivated unemployed person. The success of these techniques has been demonstrated recently by the rapid recruitment and screening of 800 trainees in the remarkably short period of three weeks. In fact, Brunswick could have recruited more than 1,500 trainees. The success of the recruitment program allowed an almost immediate initiation of the program of learning.[1]

The program

The major emphasis of the Brunswick "Upgrade" project is placed upon motivating each trainee with a desire to learn and work by acquainting him with a number of employment areas. On the basis of this acquaintance, the trainee himself (with the aid of a counselor) *chooses* that area of employment that most fully matches his interests and abilities.

Phase I of the program introduces each trainee to five pre-vocational training areas in which the trainee is familiarized with the duties, tools, and vocabulary of each area. As trainees rotate in small groups through each of the six pre-vocational areas, they are given the opportunity to find an interest that naturally suits their abilities and personal satisfaction. Phase I provides the basis for establishing a basic motivation to learn.

Phase II exposes the trainee to a 20-week coupled program of pre-vocational training, basic education, health care and counseling.

Pre-vocational training

Every student spends 4 weeks in each of five pre-vocational training areas: Electricity and Electronics, Mechanics, Machining and Fabrication, Office Practices and Marketing, and Service Area.

The program of instruction in each area places maximum emphasis on learning vocabulary and skills and at the same time, learning the rudiments of job responsibility.

Basic education

At the same time that the pre-vocational courses are being taught, the trainee is exposed to fundamental areas of basic education: Language Arts, Mathematics (computational skills), and Urban Skills.

The course of basic education is correlated with each of the vocational areas so that lessons learned in basic education courses have an immediate application to the pre-vocational training. Even in the course of Urban skills the two areas are correlated by showing the student how to read job advertisements for the pre-vocational area he is then studying, how to determine working conditions and salary levels, et cetera.

Counseling

Counseling is maintained on an individual and group basis throughout the duration of the program to reinforce motivation and to identify problems before they cause students to drop out or lose interest in the program.

Health

During Phase II each Trainee is examined by a physician and dentist in order to upgrade his general health. The examination provides the basis for a program of health care that will hopefully establish a pattern of self-care in each trainee.

Phase III: At the termination of Phase II, each trainee discusses a specialty area with his counselor and then chooses one of the five pre-vocational areas for a nine-week-in-depth course of study.

Each trainee works on simulated jobs within each pre-vocational area. These simulated jobs are modeled after eventual on-the-job training situations that the trainee will encounter upon leaving the pre-vocational training sites.

Phase IV: Phase III terminates the trainee's pre-vocational training and Phase IV initiates on-the-job training. Each on-the-job training situation is matched to the course of pre-vocational study. Counseling and health services are maintained during the duration of Phase IV.

Phase V: Phase V could be termed the "pay-off". In this phase each trainee is checked for three months following placement in a job in order to determine his job security and his ability on the job. Results of Phase V reflect back upon each of the preceding phases and provide a basis for "tightening" the program and increasing overall effectiveness of training.

SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT STUDENTS

OJT 15–6–7031 1

(Name, address, sex, and year of birth)

Bey, Muhammeth H., 813 West 14th Street, female, 1944.

Crenshaw, Jeanette, 1222 S. Laflin Street, female, 1950.

Davis, Charles, 220 N. Karlow, male, 1946.

Davis, Lillie, 3206 West Fulton, female, 1931.

Davis, Troy, 1548 West Madison, male, 1926.

Dunton, Rose H., 2819 West Wilcox, female, 1914.

Ewing, Johnny, 813 S. Kolmar, male, 1937.

Flowers, Barbara, 2719 West Monroe Street, female, 1939.

Hammel, Georgia Mae, 1387 West 13th Street, female, 1941.

Holmes, Mattie Lee, 2559 W. Washington, female, 1949.

Hope, Joan Ella, 1336 S. Union, female, 1951.

Howard, Mattie Lue, 124 N. Hoyne No. 706, female, 1932.

Huggins, Rosie Lee, 2142 West Jackson, female, 1950.

Jackson, Barbara, 1159 N. Larrabee, female, 1942.

Jefferson, Derotha, 120 N. Hermitage, female, 1938.

Kennedy, Florence Ann, 1956 West Washburne, female, 1947.

Lemmon, Emma Jean, 3213 West Lake Street, female, 1946.

Lundy, Gwendolyn Louise, 1454 W. Washburne, female, 1948.

Mitchell, Laura, 1749 West Adams, female, 1946.

Murray, Agnes, 2735 W. Jackson, female, 1949.

Neylon, Minnie Lee, 2023 West Jackson, female, 1944.

Owen, Maxine, 1743 West Adams Street, female, 1947.

Parker, Josephine O., 140 N. Wood Street, female, 1940.

Pitts, Johnnie, 3310–16 West Adams, female, 1929.

Pledger, Elma Lillian, 1116 S. Francisco, female, 1946.

Powe, Carrie, 1219 S. Fairfield, female, 1937.

Prather, Dortha Lee, 5015 West Monroe Street, female, 1943.

Robeson, Jessie B., 1365 West Hastings Street, female, 1930.

Rogers, Odessa, 2922 West Wilcox, female, 1944.

Rojas, Gustavo, 2120 S. California, male, 1943.

Ross, Charlene, 2149 West Warren Blvd., female, 1948.

Ross, Eva, 3014 West Warren Blvd., female, 1944.

Ross, Leonard Lee, 3011 West Warren, male, 1946.

Shearer, Clarence, 1510 W. 13th Street, male, 1946.

Streater, Arlene V., 2514 W. Van Buren, female, 1942.

Streater, Emma R., 1948 W. Washburne, female, 1947.

Strowder, Cora Mae, 2501 W. Monroe, No. 714, female, 1941.

Terry, Elizabeth, 2439 West Adams, female, 1912.

Toliver, Dorothy Mae, 3052 West Arthington, female, 1943.

Williams, Claretha, 2142 West Jackson, female, 1947.

Williams, Robert, 1928 W. Washburne, male, 1941.

Woods, John L., 1831 West 13th Street, male, 1940.

SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT STUDENTS

OJT 15–6–7031 11

(Name, address, and sex)

Bennett, Mary, 2705 W. Washington, female.

Bowers, Alma, 2710 W. Ogden Act., Apt. 110, female.

Bynum, Robert, 1728 W. 15th Street, male.

Coburn, Beatrice, 801 S. Keeler, female.

Crockett, Johnnie, 2826 W. Adams, male.

Dulaney, Katherine, 3417 W. Adams, female.

Elders, David, 1649 W. Washington, male.

Garrett, Morris, 1125 S. Francisco, male.

Gray, Velma, 1510 W. 14th Pl., female.

Harris, Francis, 2501 W. Monroe, Apt. 102, male.

Harris, Phillip, 120 N. Hermitage, male.

Howlett, Larry, 2000 W. Warren Blvd., male.

Jackson, Fannie, 1315 S. Loomis, female.

Jackson, Willie Mae, 264 N. Sacramento, female.

Johnson, Assie, 1111 W. Roosevelt Rd., female.

Johnson, Elizabeth, 3129 W. Fulton, female.

Johnson, Lula, 2530 W. Monroe, female.

Larkin, Magnolia, 2811 W. Warren, female.

Little, R. C., 3256 W. Washington, male.

Lockhart, Myrtle, 2501 W. Monroe, female.

Lynch, Willie, 1646 W. 15th Street, male.

Moore, Betty, 700 S. Central Park, female.

Nash, Emma, 12 S. Wood Street, female.

Pocheco, Amelia, 714 S. Oakley, female.

Perez, Joseph, 1633 W. Madison Apt. 804, male.

Randall, Eliza, 1361 E. 13th Street, female.

Roundtree, Helen, 2111 W. Lake Street Apt. 305, female.

Saffold, Sylvester, 2823 W. Warren, male.

Smith, Bill, 3269 W. Maypole, male.

Smith, William, 330 S. Loomis, male.

Steward, Betty, 4342 W. Washington, female.

Sykes, Louise, 1126 S. Richmond, female.

Vaughn, Willie, 2501 W. Monroe, male.

Walker, Charles, 4351 W. Washington, male.

Washington, Annie, 2014 W. Monroe, female.

Withers, William, 340 S. Western Apt. 150, male.

Saulter, Dora, 1108 S. Richmond, female.

Walker, Helen, 2111 W. Lake Apt. 107, female.

Scott, Joseph, 111 N. Woods, male.

OJT 15–6–7031 1

(Name, address, sex, and year of birth)

Beard, Bob, 2030 S. State Street, male, 1946.

Berry, Wallace, 2642 W. Flournoy, male, 1947.

Brown, Clementine, 1848 W. Fulton, female, 1948.

Horton, Dannette, 1510 W. 14th Place, female.

Lawrence, Beverly, 2341 W. Roosevelt Road, female, 1948.

Platt, Ira, 840 W. Maxwell, male, 1949.

Riley, Sherry, 1828 W. Fulton, female, 1950.

Woodward, Carolyn, 311 S. Karlov, female, 1946.

Young, Eve, 928 S. Lytle, female, 1931.

---

[1] Brunswick coordinated its recruiting activities with those of local and state agencies in order to make maximum use of existing facilities and reduce, by a substantial amount, unnecessary duplication of effort. Of particular aid in this regard was the Illinois State Employment Service (ISES) which provided invaluable aid in the areas of recruitment, screening and certification. Owing to the success of the cooperative effort between Brunswick and ISES, all future recruiting efforts will be coordinated with the Chicago ISES office.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the pollution of the air we breathe is on its way to becoming one of the major crises confronting America. There is no resource in the world that has, throughout human history, been taken more for granted. Yet, just last January, in recommending that the Congress adopt the Air Quality Act of 1967, President Johnson warned us that this resource, absolutely essential to all forms of life on this planet, is becoming increasingly a danger to health because of its pollution by man. The President said, in part:

> Polluted air corrodes machinery. It defaces buildings. It may shorten the life of whatever it touches—and it touches everything.
>
> This is not a problem of our largest cities alone. Weirton, W. Va., and Gary, Ind., are two among many communities that suffer days when the sun seems a pale orange ball hidden in a noxious cloud. Small towns, farmlands, forests—men, animals, and plants—all are affected by the waste we release into the air.

Mr. Speaker, in hearing testimony on the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has gathered support for the administration's position that we must act now to halt the rising tide of air pollution. I would like to call your attention to a statement by Andrew J. Biemiller, director, Department of Legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, delivered to the Committee on August 30, 1967.

> Air pollution is part of the general dilemma produced by the massive changes in the total environment produced by this industrial and technological age. The enormous dislocations in the world's ecological arrangements have gathered tremendous momentum in the past half-century. It is only recently that some of the possible long-range dangers to health and to life on this planet have been identified.
>
> Air pollution is not a simple matter of dirty smoke pouring out of the stacks of factories and steam power stations, or exhaust gases belched out of innumerable motor vehicles. It is also a product of the way traffic is routed and handled, the way of the winds and the weather, the geographic and topographic characteristics of places where people live, work and travel, the kinds of industries that have been created, the way solid wastes are handled. These elements, singly and together, make the problem of air pollution complex and dynamic and make air pollution control a staggering and never-ending responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the Air Quality Act of 1967 provides the tools for controlling and preventing air pollution from industry and motor vehicles, and it gives us the means to enforce this control at all levels of government—local, State, and Federal. It includes provisions for research in all aspects of air pollution so that our knowledge of the problem will dictate the methods by which we solve it.

I feel this legislation is drastically needed. Each day that air pollution continues unchecked there is more illness, and there are more deaths. That is why we must not hesitate to enact this national program for clean air now.

WASTE NOT, WANT NOT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am quite certain that a great many of our colleagues felt that the House demeaned itself when it deliberately excluded the employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity from participation in the Federal pay raise bill. If there is any doubt on that score, those who voted to exclude the OEO employees should read the following editorial which appeared in the October 23 editions of the Trenton Evening Times. The editorial reads as follows:

WASTE NOT, WANT NOT

> By an 86–68 vote a few days ago, the House of Representatives deliberately and with malice aforethought excluded 2,700 employes of the Office of Economic Opportunity from participation in the federal pay raise bill.
>
> The only thing better than freezing the pay of the poverty warriors, said Rep. Durward G. Hall, D. Mo., would be to eliminate the entire poverty war budget bill—"in the sad event" that it gets on the floor in the current session.
>
> At about the same time all this was happening, the Republican mayors of 22 cities, containing more than 14 million people, petitioned the Republican leadership of Congress to support the President's request for $2.06 billion for O.E.O. this fiscal year.
>
> "It is our considered opinion," said the mayors in a telegram, "that the programs are a positive force in lessening social tensions in our cities. All of us are confident they will continue to improve and are so meaningful as to give our less fortunate citizens a new hope in life . . .
>
> "The strong leadership provided by this agency in administering the various projects has been most impressive."
>
> Not universally impressive. Not to those who are blindly against the war on poverty and everything connected with it.

ALTERATION OF HISTORY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in George Orwell's frightening book, "1984," he describes how a totalitarian government could change history by altering old records, and by constant repetition of new and amended versions of history to meet new needs. An earlier era's hero might become a villian in one new edition of history, and, by the systematic deletion of his name from old books and newspapers, he might even become a "unperson"—a figure about whom nothing was remembered, and who might as well never have lived.

I have recently seen a document which indicates that the minority party's campaign experts, perhaps in a dress rehearsal for the 1984 elections, are trying to alter history as drastically as any of Orwell's sinister creators of "unpersons."

In a publication called, inappropriately enough, New Directions, the Minorities Division of the Republican National Committee now seeks to describe "how congressional Republicans are working to change"—that is their word, Mr. Speaker—"and effect the major issues of the day."

All of us remember vividly, some with a sense of shame that still lingers, how a rat control bill was literally laughed off the floor by the Republicans when it was first brought before the House. Amid a volley of bad jokes and tasteless humor, the Republicans, led by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], refused even to pass the rule, while 59 voted against it. The issue was joined clearly in this vote, and the Republicans by an overwhelming majority were against rat control, while the Democrats by an overwhelming majority, were for it.

Rat control was not killed permanently, Mr. Speaker. Two months later, the House was considering the partnership for health bill, H.R. 6418, which had nothing to do with rat control. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] introduced a rat control amendment to that bill with, I am happy to state, the support of the Republican gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], and the amendment was adopted by the House.

Comes now the Republican National Committee, and tells us that H.R. 6418 which they say is "More commonly known as the rat control bill" was passed on September 20, and, they proudly point out, 68 Republicans voted for it. Mr. Speaker, in one of the most flagrantly dishonest analyses in my experience, the same document which boasts of the 68 Republicans voting for the rat control amendment to H.R. 6418, says not one word about the 110 Republicans who voted against the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are clearly on the record. There have been two efforts in the House to enact rat control programs. The first one was beaten by the Republicans, with some assistance from conservative Democrats. The second attempt was successful because of the votes of most Democrats, and a minority of Republicans. But in both cases, the Republicans, by an overwhelming majority, voted against rat control. To attempt to describe the second and successful effort, which they tried their best to prevent, as a Republican achievement, is not exaggeration, Mr. Speaker. It is not even distortion. It is pure bunk.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this incredible statement from the

GOP National Committee be printed in full at this point in the RECORD, and I suggest, to publishers who bring out further editions of Orwell's classic, that they print it in the appendix, to show what Orwell was talking about, as it is practiced in 1967:

SPOTLIGHT ON THE HILL

"Spotlight" will be a regular feature of our Minorities Division Newsletter and will carry—in brief—a description of how Congressional Republicans are working to change and effect the major issues of the day:

HR 6418—Partnership for Health Program (More commonly known as "Rat Control Bill") was passed on September 20, 1967 by the House. Bill authorizes grants to the states and nonprofit private agencies for health programs. The "Rat Control" Amendment was added on by Republican Representative, Charles McC Mathias, Jr. (Md.), and Henry S. Reuss (D. Wis.).

Vote.................... 68 Republicans For

OIL SHALE DEPOSITS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial the Sacramento Bee warned of the need for the public to guard carefully its interest in oil shale deposits.

It is a warning we should heed and I therefore submit for the information of my colleagues the Bee editorial.

[From the Sacramento Bee, Oct. 6, 1967]

PUBLIC SHOULD GUARD ITS OIL SHALE LANDS

The American public should make itself aware of the fantastic potential wealth it owns in the vast shale oil fields of Colorado, Utah and Wyoming. Only by doing this can it make sure its property is being properly managed by its public servants in the Congress and the Department of the Interior.

Shale is a rock formation containing minerals. It is estimated the Green River Formation in the three states contains rich aluminum and sodium deposits in addition to the oil. But most attention is being paid to the oil.

There are about 2 trillion barrels of oil in the shale formation of the three states. This is about 70 times the nation's proved reserves of crude petroleum. When it is considered the nation uses only about 3.5 billion barrels of oil yearly, the great wealth of the oil shale potential is almost beyond imagining.

For instance, it has been figured that if this oil were produced and sold, according to the "Magazine of Wall Street," the money raised would be sufficient to pay off the entire national debt with a $10,000 bonus left over for every man, woman and child in the United States.

About 80 per cent of the oil shale lands is owned by the federal government, most of the remainder by major oil companies.

However, great problems stand in the way of realizing the wealth. First of all, technology has to be perfected to make mining of the oil feasible. This will take large amounts of investment in plant and equipment, research and development.

Various suggestions have been offered on how to handle the oil production, including government-private enterprise partnership or public development along the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The important thing is that the public demand the federal government protect its rights against monopolization and make sure whatever policy is adopted insures the fullest possible return.

The oil shale deposits are a great national asset which belong to all the people. Therefore, the first beneficiaries should be all the people and not a few private interests.

STATE AND LOCAL HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSIONS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation to provide Federal grants to help staff official State and local human relations commissions.

Human relations agencies are set up to assist communities in resolving disputes, disagreements, and difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin. The agencies face serious operational difficulties, which my bill is designed to help solve.

On introducing the bill, I included as part of my statement a letter from David Glenn, the director of the Baltimore Community Relations Commission, who originally suggested the legislation to me. At this time, I would like to place in the RECORD another letter which I received from Mr. Glenn, describing some of the experiences and needs of local human relations commissions.

BALTIMORE COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION,
Baltimore, Md., October 24, 1967.

Hon. CLARENCE D. LONG,
House of Representatives, Longworth Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: As a follow up to our recent conversations regarding the proposed legislation, whereby the federal government might make funds available to local commissions, I thought it might be well for me to comment on some of the experiences which we have had locally which indicate the need for federal assistance to local and state human relations commissions.

As I stated, both in our conversations and in earlier correspondence, local commissions have not been able to respond effectively to the increasing demands prompted by civil rights activity—particularly those demands which stem from the frustration and unrest of people in the ghetto communities. For example, as you undoubtedly know, the Congress of Racial Equality, in May of 1966, designated Baltimore as its target city, and immediately thereafter set about to organize people in the East Baltimore ghetto area. As a result of CORE's activity, the eastside community was awakened and there were numerous concerted drives aimed at eliminating discrimination in certain places of public accommodation, and also other activities directed toward improving the status of people in the area. Obviously, once this kind of activity gets under way, both the unrest and the scope of the activity increase.

Of course, the agency which is first involved in the attempt to resolve the grievances and demands which result from such activity is the local human relations commission. It is clear that in a large metropolitan community such as Baltimore, one agency with limited staff (our present complement is 16 including administrative staff) cannot adequately respond to the demands which result from such mass activity. This is particularly true when there is every possibility that several thrusts of this type may be going on in the overall community at the same time. As a matter of fact, this was the case in Baltimore over the past summer; for, along with CORE's drive in East Baltimore, a number of other organizations were marshalling forces and carrying out the same types of activity in West Baltimore. It is apparent that when so many efforts are in progress, government must be able to respond, and the failure to respond only increases the frustration and, as a matter of fact, adds fuel to the arguments of those malcontents who say that government will not respond; therefore, the "deprived" citizen must resort to more extreme measures.

It is important, however, that I not leave you with the impression that the only role of local commissions is to react and respond to the activities of civil rights groups. Another responsibility is that of interpreting the civil rights movement to the white community, and attempting to make certain that the activity of civil rights groups does not result in heightened counter-response by those who are adamantly opposed to progress in the civil rights field. Here in Baltimore we have had our share of this kind of activity, and thus far we have been successful in warding-off a major confrontation and explosion between these opposing elements. There is nothing, however, to guarantee that we will be so lucky in months and years to come.

Now, getting back to the legislation. If the Congress sees fit to pass the bill which you are considering introducing, it will allow local commissions first of all to add staff—particularly staff which can be assigned to handle community problems, hopefully on a long-term program basis rather than on a short-term "reaction" basis such as is now the case with the vast majority of local commissions throughout the country. Additionally, the legislation would permit local commissions to establish offices out in the community where commission staffs might be closer to the communities and their problems, and be in position to develop programs aimed at meeting and resolving these concerns.

In any event, I just thought it might be helpful if I put these few thoughts on paper so that you might understand why I think it is desirable that the federal government make an effort to assist local commissions to act quickly and more effectively relative to the problems which must be faced in all urban communities.

Should you have any further questions or comments regarding my feelings on the subject, I will be more than happy to meet with you to discuss them.

Yours sincerely,

DAVID L. GLENN,
Director.

CAN SOVIET JEWS CELEBRATE?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, times are always appropriate for us to speak out in support of human rights and freedoms, and for us to decry all efforts to restrict these rights. The cultural genocide of Jews living in the Soviet Union is now well established. This grim fact stands today as a particularly repugnant abridgment of human freedom. The current Soviet cultural assault on its Jewish citizens demands the sustained outrage of free men everywhere and at all times. This week, though, marks the joint celebration of the Jewish holiday of Simchat Torah and the 50th anniversary of the Soviet revolution, and this conjunction offers us a special chance to reaffirm America's dismay at the plight of Russian Jewry today.

Fifty years ago, the progenitors of the November revolution promised peace and freedom to all the Russian peoples, but today there is no peace and no freedom for 2½ million Soviet Jews. The Soviet constitution promises its Jewish citizens protection from anti-Semitism and this same Soviet Constitution guarantees its support for the maintenance of the many national minorities of the Soviet Union. These promises stand unfulfilled today, and on the eve of Soviet Russia's 50th anniversary, I feel compelled to recount these barren promises in the hope that they might yet bear fruit.

For Jews throughout the world, Simchat Torah has been celebrated as a joyous day, and the very name of the holiday may be translated into English as "rejoicing in the law." This festival's joint occurrence this year with the Soviet national holiday reminds us, however, that the second largest Jewish community in the world cannot publish Hebrew language versions of that same law, that no seminaries presently exist within the Soviet Union for the education of rabbis able to interpret that law, and that this law is increasingly inaccessible to young Soviet Jews. In the aftermath of the recent Arab-Israel war, the situation I have just described has been made even more grim by the onset of a crude smear campaign against Jews living in the Soviet Union, and against hitherto safe Jewish communities of other Communist states, Clearly, then, Jews can find little cause for celebration at the start of Soviet Russia's golden jubilee.

Elie Wiesel, a prominent novelist who has written movingly about the current agony of the Russian Jewish community in "The Jews of Silence," reminds us, nevertheless, that Soviet Jews will celebrate Simchat Torah this week along with their brethren in more favorable circumstances. According to Mr. Wiesel, Simchat Torah has in fact become the occasion chosen for Soviet Jews to reassert their Jewish identities. Thus both Jewish and non-Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union are about to celebrate major festivals this week, but their reasons are antithetical in nature.

Mr. Speaker, we can help Soviet Jews celebrate their holiday by reminding the leaders of the Soviet Union of the pledges made by its founders 50 years ago. I urge the Members of this body to speak out forthrightly and clearly on this issue. I urge the State Department to press its case in support of Soviet Jewry with Soviet officials at all levels, and I urge that they do so with renewed vigor. I urge that the Voice of America increase its coverage of Jewish affairs for a Jewish Soviet listenership starved for news.

The simultaneous celebration of two major holidays affords us a great opportunity to remind Soviet leaders of many empty promises. I can only hope that by continuing our efforts on behalf of Soviet Jews throughout the year, these promises may soon be met, and that future generations might eventually look back to this anniversary as golden and not merely gilt.

WILKINS SEES RIOTS LINKED TO EXPLOITATION OF POOR

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the concern of responsible leaders for the many ways in which the poor are exploited is growing.

We are all aware that the poor do not need sympathy or paternal solicitude nearly as much as ways to develop their skills and obtain jobs and housing on the same basis as the rest of our society.

But the despicable practices of exploiting the poor precisely because they are poor raises not only profound moral questions but also substantiates, to the poor, their doubts about America's real earnestness in providing equal opportunity.

Roy Wilkins wrote recently about an aspect of consumer protection which relates to this general question of our commitment to justice and, specifically, to the role of sensed injustice in the ghetto riots. His syndicated article, which appeared recently in over 50 newspapers, follows:

CHECK DAY FOOD PRICE HIKES RELATE TO RIOTS

(By Roy Wilkins)

The testimony before a House subcommittee that prices in a supermarket chain rose 9.1 per cent in poor neighborhoods in Washington, D.C., on the day welfare checks were distributed has significance as far as riots are concerned.

Of course, people do not stage a riot because of a percentage increase in food prices. But the cheating is stored up in their minds. It is added to the bits and pieces that altogether, convince them that the world is out to get them because they are black or poor or both.

Let a policeman hit or shoot someone at the wrong time under the wrong circumstances and an upheaval is on. The actual participants may have a wide variety of excuses for their conduct—all of them contrary to law and most of them to common decency—but the vast majority is moved by the opportunity to strike out at the world that has held them back.

The common knowledge in the ghetto that prices are upped on welfare check days may not be of the stature to command the attention of high-level investigatory bodies, but it is a factor in the build-up of the riot atmosphere. More importantly, it helps to account for the lack of cooperation in efforts to stop riots among many communities.

Three housewives told a subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee that they checked 10 items in three stores in poor areas and the same items in six stores in middle and upper income neighborhoods. The checks were made on the same dates at two-week intervals. Only on September 1, the welfare check date, was the difference between the "poor" prices and the "rich" prices as wide as 9.1 per cent.

This practice is in effect in at least 50 cities. It is so well known in the ghettos that no one talks of it any more. As a duty to his corporation, an assistant general counsel of a food store chain told Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Elmhurst Democrat, chairman of the subcommittee, that there was "no truth in the accusation." Rep. Rosenthal properly replied "that the lawyer, being from the Pacific Coast, was not in a position to rebut the charges."

Just to rivet down what all Negroes already know, Arthur Ross, commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, told the subcommittee that in connection with the probe of the Watts riot of 1965, a survey had shown a tendency of prices to rise in the Watts neighborhood of Los Angeles "when relief checks were distributed."

Thus, Negroes as a whole not only have less employment at less wages, as well as scores of thousands who are welfare clients, but what little they manage to "get hold of," as they say, is sliced off in 9 per cent food price increases.

The man who lives in an $8,000 and up income neighborhood need not fear that his food bill will jump on a day certain each month. It is the welfare family that gets it in the neck.

More heated speeches are delivered in the nation on communism, racial disorders and the "bums on welfare" than on any other topics. An extremely rough and minimum calculation, based upon only 100 relief families in each of only 200 chain stores at a price jump of only $8 each month comes very close to the respectable sum of 2 million dollars annually. The total could easily be as high as 5 million. Not bad—especially since it is in addition to the regular profit.

All food chain store executives and shareholders who have not made speeches or conversational remarks about the "welfare bums" will please stand up.

THE INTOLERABLE SITUATION OF JEWRY IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we are all painfully aware that the lot of the Jewish people has not been a happy one for centuries. Fate has been extremely cruel to them, especially since the rise of Nazi dictatorship in Europe in the early 1930's. During the decade of mid-1930's and mid-1940's they faced total extermination in Central and Eastern Europe. Hitler's heartless lieutenants almost succeeded in their diabolical design; and the survivors of this wholesale genocide faced their fate with exemplary fortitude.

While millions of Jews were thus being done to death in many parts of Europe, it was hoped that Jews in the Soviet Union would be allowed to live in relative safety, immune from such treatment. Since the end of the last war, however, we have learned that our hopes were groundless, and that even in the Soviet Union's classless society the Jews, while not experiencing the horrors of Nazlism, were still suffering under extreme forms of discriminations and inequities.

The Soviet regime at times gave the impression of allowing the Jews perfect equality and free expression to Jewish talents, thereby benefiting immensely by their genius as scientists, as leaders in the arts and literature, and in many other fields of activity. But when the men in the Kremlin exercised their limitless power indiscriminately and with iron rigidity, the Jews seem to have suffered more by the deliberate and subtle racial policy of the authorities. In the performance of religious worship there the Soviet Jews were treated as the "least favored of religious communities," according to a recent report in the Christian Science Monitor. The Government's policy of limiting the quantity of paper for publications in the Hebrew language seems a deliberate discrimination against the Jews. And the extremely harsh punishment imposed upon Jews for minor offenses also has the ugly tinge of racial discrimination.

Until very recently all Jews in the Soviet Union, numbering some 3,000,000, endured unjust and unequal treatment at the hands of Soviet authorities, but in recent months their lot has worsened. The recent Israel-Arab war has caused this worsening. The Soviet government, which supported the Arabs and therefore suffered a clear setback by the defeat of the Arabs, seems to take the attitude that even Jews in the Soviet Union had a share in the Arab defeat—a preposterous attitude, but one that bespeaks quite eloquently for the Soviet's anti-Semitic posture. The government-owned and rigidly controlled Soviet press is allowed to brand Zionism as a hastily inspired concept. In its "cold war" against the Jews, the Soviet Government barred the emigration of some 6,000 Soviet Jews to Israel late in August; and it is reported more recently that Soviet authorities are exerting some pressure upon the governments of Soviet satellite countries in Europe to do likewise, preventing the departure of Jews to Israel.

The overall picture one sees through such ugly instances is not a bright one. While we of the free world are limited in what can be done in a concrete way to aid these victims of Soviet anti-Semitism effectively, still, we as free men in a free society have an obligation to use what means we do have available, the most important of which is our freedom to speak, to raise our voices in protest against Soviet actions taken against Soviet Jewry.

RESOLUTION URGING U.N. ACTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Edwards] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, October 24, was United Nations Day—a day in celebration of that time, just 22 years ago, that the charter of this international organization for peace went into effect. With this, the United States and the other nations committed themselves to the peaceful settlement of disputes which seem to be inevitable between modern nation-states and which today could result in the destruction of a third of the world in just a few seconds.

We are all familiar with the structural problems these past 22 years have revealed in the U.N. We all know, too, the many times our own country has abdicated our solemn treaty responsibility under the charter. We face just such an agonizing and dangerous situation today in Southeast Asia.

I am today joining Congressman Herbert Tenzer and several other Members of the House in sponsoring a concurrent resolution that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should submit a resolution to the United Nations for the establishment of peace in Southeast Asia. The resolution asks the President to request an emergency meeting of the Security Council for action to end the conflict in accordance with section 25 of the U.N. Charter and if the Council cannot act, then consideration by the General Assembly under the "united for peace" rules.

Our Nation is being torn apart by internal conflict and decay of our own institutions while valuable resources are bogged down in a disastrous land war in Asia. If indeed China is the real threat in the coming years, this self-defeating and self-debilitating policy is no way to meet that threat.

Many of us believe that our tenuous and questionable commitment to the Diem government could never justify the massive escalation and Americanization of the war which has occurred. Furthermore, many of us believe the commitment made by signing the Charter of the United Nations is a far more significant and compelling commitment and thus ought to be the guide for our national policy in today's world.

I therefore urge Members of the House and the Senate, which tomorrow begins hearings on a similar resolution, to support this means of seeking a peaceful, political settlement to this tragedy in Vietnam.

ADMINISTRATION GUN BILL PUTS REPUBLICANS ON SPOT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Rees] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks President Johnson has sharply stepped up the drive for enactment of gun-control legislation. Starting with his speech to the International Association of Chiefs of Police of September 7, and following with his September 14 letters to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, President Johnson has indelibly placed himself on record as opposing the senseless slaughter of thousands of American citizens by firearms each year.

The editorial pages of our great newspapers have been echoing these sentiments and adding their own weight in favor of firearms control. One of the best and most penetrating articles I have seen appeared in the September 24, 1967, edition of the Los Angeles Times, which I append to these remarks. This article makes very clear the weakness of Republican proposals on firearms control, and the posture they will assume by opposing effective firearms control.

I am delighted that all this concerted activity by the President and others is achieving significant results. The Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has favorably reported the administration's firearms bill. Our own Judiciary Committee is actively considering this legislation at the present time.

I sincerely hope that firearms control legislation will promptly reach the floor in both Houses so that this protection can be promptly provided to all Americans.

The article from the Los Angeles Times follows:

ADMINISTRATION GUN BILL PUT REPUBLICANS ON SPOT—GOP OPPOSITION TO CONTROLS RUNS COUNTER TO MAJORITY VIEWS IN PUBLIC OPINION POLLS

(By John H. Averill)

Washington.—In singling out his gun control bill as an anticrime measure that Congress should enact promptly, President Johnson appears to have put the Republicans on the spot.

Whether or not this was Mr. Johnson's intention, many observers feel the President made a shrewd political move when he appealed to Congress the other day to pass the gun bill.

Public opinion polls indicate that an overwhelming majority of the American people favor federal controls over trafficking in firearms. Congress, for at least five years, has been considering legislation to curb mail-order gun sales. Yet neither house of Congress has done anything about it.

While the opposition also includes several congressional Democrats from those states, particularly in the South and West, where hunting is a major pastime, it has been the Republicans who have been most conspicuously outspoken against gun controls.

CAMPAIGN ISSUE

This clearly hasn't been overlooked by Mr. Johnson at a time when the Republicans show every sign of trying to make crime in the streets and urban violence major issues of the 1968 presidential campaign.

There was no mention of Republican opposition when the President sent a special message to Congress Sept. 15 urging prompt action on his bill to prohibit interstate mail order gun sales.

Yet Mr. Johnson nevertheless put the onus on the opposition when he cited FBI statistics showing increase in crimes involving guns and said:

"A civilized nation cannot allow this armed terror to continue. An enlightened Congress must not allow it to continue. The time has come for action."

TAUNTS CRITICS

In words that had all the earmarks of taunting critics who accuse him of not doing enough to combat street crime, the President said his bill would help provide a climate of security for all citizens.

"Talking about morality, speaking about

crime, deploring the conditions that exist cannot get the job done," he said. "The time is here and now to stand up and vote against crime."

The message was loud and clear: put up or shut up.

From the Administration's standpoint, what the Republicans are putting up is something totally inadequate.

OFFER ALTERNATE

Most Republicans who oppose the Administration bill admit they would prefer no federal gun legislation at all. But as an alternative to an outright ban on all interstate mail order gun sales, the Republicans are offering a bill that would put some curbs on mail order sales of handguns only. Rifles or shotguns would not be affected.

Under this bill, sponsored by Sen. Roman L. Hruska (R-Neb.), prospective handgun buyers would have to submit affidavits attesting to good moral character and background.

Hruska, chief ally of the National Rifle Assn. in the fight against outlawing interstate gun sales, said he will ask the Senate Judiciary Committee to substitute his bill for the Administration measure.

Hruska succeeded in such a maneuver last year. With the 16-man Judiciary Committee evenly split over the Administration bill, backers of the President's legislation reluctantly voted for the Hruska measure in hopes they could strengthen it on the Senate floor. But Congress adjourned before the Senate could act.

Leading backers of the Administration bill, such as Sens. Thomas J. Dodd (D-Conn.) and Edward M. (Ted) Kennedy (D-Mass.), concede they may have to do the same thing this year if the Judiciary Committee deadlocks. But Kennedy said his preferred course in the event of a deadlock is to try to attach the Johnson bill as an amendment to some other legislation that has a better chance of passage.

Another hope is to induce one or both of two committee Democrats who have opposed the Administration bill, Sens. Philip A. Hart (Mich.) and Quentin N. Burdick (N.D.) to change their position.

Hart and Burdick are liberals who usually support Administration domestic programs. But coming from states where hunting and shooting interests exert much influence, both have balked at curbing sales or rifles and shotguns.

It is largely because of Hruska that the Republicans have been so closely identified with the opposition to the Administration's bill. Hruska is a power in the Senate GOP establishment. He also is second-ranking Republican (just behind Illinois' Sen. Everett M. Dirksen) on the Judiciary Committee and is ranking Republican on the judiciary subcommittee that approved the Administration gun bill by a 5–4 vote last week.

OPPOSITION VIEW

Asked why he is opposed to applying the gun sale curbs in his bill to rifles and shotguns, Hruska said:

"Because it would impose a lot of hardship and red tape on sportsmen." He also said such weapons are not a major factor in crimes involving guns.

This position is an argument that President Johnson already has shown skill in handling.

Clearly alluding in part to snipers in recent ghetto riots, the President said his bill "is aimed solely at keeping deadly weapons out of the wrong hands" and that it would "impose no real inconvenience" on sportsmen and legitimate gun buyers.

"But under any circumstances," Mr. Johnson added, "who would measure inconvenience against the personal safety and security of thousands of American citizens?"

DIRKSEN CHANGES

One Republican who seemed to sense the political pitfalls posed by the President's words was Dirksen. Until recently Dirksen has been opposed to any gun legislation stronger than the Hruska bill. But last week Dirksen said if the Hruska substitute effort fails he might be disposed to vote for the Administration bill.

Yet even if the Senate passes the Administration bill, its prospects of getting through the House are not regarded as good.

Reps. Emanuel Celler (D-N.Y.), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and James C. Corman (D-Calif.), his chief lieutenant on gun control, predicted tough sledding.

"We've got to have strong bipartisan agreement to get any kind of bill out of committee and then get it through the House," Corman said. "And the Republicans don't seem to want anything stronger than the Hruska bill."

PREDICTS DEFEAT

This was confirmed by Rep. Richard H. Poff (R-Va.), second-ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee.

"Anything stronger than the Hruska bill doesn't have a prayer in the House," Poff said in an interview. "And some of our people think even the Hruska bill goes too far."

If Poff's prediction comes true, observers suggest, Mr. Johnson may have some ammunition when the Republicans talk next year about crime in the streets.

BILL TO PROHIBIT BANKS FROM SALE OF LOTTERY TICKETS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Murphy] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate Banking and Currency Committee favorably reported a bill which would prohibit banks from selling lottery tickets. As a sponsor of this bill, which has already passed the House, I am happy to see it one step closer to final enactment.

In my own State of New York, where a lottery has recently been established to raise money for education, the bill will have particular impact because banks are the major source of ticket sales. Many people in New York who oppose this bill do so on the grounds that it will damage the lottery and thus the educational system in New York State.

I would like to correct the record on this point. The New York lottery is a failure right now, before this bill has become law and with full benefit of banks acting as ticket agents. The lottery is failing, and thus New York's educational system is threatened, because Governor Rockefeller does not have the political courage to admit the lottery's failure and establish a sound system for financing education in New York State.

It has been obvious from the very first that the lottery could not live up to its expectations. It was supposed to earn $360 million a year—$30 million a month—of which $198 million would be used for education, but so far sales have produced less than one-fifth of this expected volume.

In the first month 6.4 million tickets were sold, in July, 4.1 million, August, less than 6 million, and September, 5.8 million.

If this trend continues, New York City, which budgeted $55 million in school aid from the lottery, will receive less than $20 million. This disastrous situation has not, unfortunately, produced an adequate response from the Governor's office. Instead, we are assured that things will be better. After the first month we were told that it was just a problem of advertising, and that a better effort would be made to advertise, but better advertising did not improve lottery sales. Recently we have been told that we need more sales outlets, but there is no evidence that access to ticket outlets has been a problem. Even the Governor's use of pretty girls in miniskirts to sell tickets did not work, and if cheesecake cannot sell tickets, Mr. Speaker, nothing can. Next, the lottery's failure will be blamed on this bill. Maybe that is why Governor Rockefeller is postponing his unavoidable decision, so he can use the bill as a scapegoat for his own failure to act.

But the truth is that it is Governor Rockefeller who has failed. He has failed the people of New York by dodging his responsibility to finance education and by trying instead to revive an inadequate lottery already on its deathbed.

If sales were only a few million short of the expected volume, it would be entirely reasonable to try and boost sales, but we are faced with a volume of ticket sales less than one-fifth of that needed to meet New York State's educational budget needs. Even the best Madison Avenue public relations firm could not increase sales by five times, nor can increasing sales outlets accomplish the massive transfusion job. In fact, because they are already behind, sales would have to be increased six or seven times to catch up.

What is needed, and what Governor Rockefeller is avoiding, is the establishment of a sound plan to finance education in the State of New York. The delay now being employed can only cause harm. It was obvious after the first month that the lottery was not an adequate means of financing education; certainly after 2 or 3 months the Governor could have made a decision to find a better means of raising money; now we are in the fifth month of the lottery, and all we hear is that a decision will be made sometime in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I call on Governor Rockefeller to stop his stalling and foot dragging and come forward with a sound plan to finance education in New York State. The answer is not to try and strengthen the lottery, because the lottery has shown beyond any doubt that it is not an adequate means of raising money for education. The sooner Governor Rockefeller recognizes this, the better it will be for New York's educational system. Further delay can serve no purpose, and can only cause serious harm.

VIOLATION OF CEASE-FIRE IN MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, now that all the facts are in, it appears quite clear that Egypt engaged in a serious violation of the cease-fire in the Middle East the other day in sinking the Israel destroyer, *Elath*.

Our Government announced that it found the event "regrettable" but it chose to cast no blame for the aggression.

If the United States seeks to serve as an instrument for peace, Mr. Speaker, it cannot simply be a disinterested bystander to the uncomfortable cease-fire in the Middle East. It must be a positive force. It must be worthy of its power and its tradition in working for stability in the region.

Obviously, our neutrality in dealing with the sinking of the *Elath* did not add to our credibility as such a force. Our behavior was weak. It will, in my view, only serve to encourage the Arabs to transgress the armistice agreement once again, believing they can do so with impunity.

I am aware that we have just announced the impending delivery of 48 Sky Hawk aircraft to Israel and, coming as it has just after the *Elath* incident, this announcement might be interpreted as a rebuke to Egypt. I do not know if it was intended as such, particularly since these planes are also being sent to several Arab countries. The original sale of these Sky Hawks was announced many months ago. But I do not want to be begrudging of our Government's action. In view of Russia's arms deliveries to Syria and Egypt, I must commend the United States for its decision to end its arms embargo to Israel. I cannot, however, interpret this announcement as having any deterrent influence on mischiefmaking Arab chieftians.

I, therefore, propose that the United States do something of which the meaning would be unmistakable. I propose that the United States deliver, under favorable terms, a first-class destroyer to Israel to replace the *Elath*. I am certain that our Navy can spare such a ship. This act on our part would leave no doubt that we intend to contribute to the maintenance of Middle Eastern stability. It will show that we will not stand by to let aggression be rewarded. I urge the President, to whom I have telegraphed my request, to give immediate consideration to the transfer, under favorable terms, of a destroyer of the *Elath's* class to the Israel Government. I am convinced that such an act will serve the cause of peace.

RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this body will have the opportunity, once again, to help less fortunate Americans obtain a decent place to live.

The rent supplement program is coming before us for another hearing. This time, we must not fail to give it the fair and equitable treatment it deserves.

No one program can be the cure-all for all of the ills of poverty. But, the rent supplement program does forge the way for a beginning to the solutions of these ills.

It is a step toward creating a new environment which will allow the elderly, the handicapped, and the poor to move out of the abrasive squalor in which they now survive.

Aid from the program is help, where help is needed, and assistance, where assistance is needed.

As of September 14, 1967, reservations of the authority for rent supplement contracts have exhausted the entire $32 million available.

Reservations cover 445 projects from 301 communities in 47 States, providing 34,168 supplemented units out of 47,764 total units. Well over 600 potential sponsors have expressed interest in the program.

Thus, at the present time the $32 million appropriation is exhausted, leaving a backlog of unsatisfied fund requests at the beginning of fiscal 1968. The unfunded backlog as of September 20 totaled $20.4 million.

Nearly $500 million of private mortgage investment for new construction and rehabilitation will be triggered by the $32 million for supplement payments. The availability of private investment has been assured. On September 13, 1967, the Nation's leading life insurance companies committed $1 billion to improve urban slum areas. Most of that amount will be invested in rent supplement projects.

The rent supplement legislation contains important provision for enlisting private enterprise in our efforts to increase the Nation's supply of housing for low-income families.

In my view, a vastly expanded use of the private sector of the economy in providing this housing is essential if we are to meet the need for this shelter—a need which grows daily as urban renewal progresses.

In addition, an intangible, but perhaps even more significant benefit flows from the part private enterprise plays in this program. The housing is sponsored by nonprofit organizations or limited dividend corporations, built with Government-underwritten market rate mortgage financing, and privately owned and managed.

Thus, rent supplement tenants live in private housing. Furthermore, they live next door, in the same project, to others who pay full economic rents. As a result, they are not set off from their immediate neighbors or the community because of the rental assistance paid on their behalf by the Government to the landlord.

In every way, they can have the sense of living in regular housing, a sense of belonging.

And in these troubled times, the value of building this kind of morale cannot be overemphasized.

REAGAN AND ROMNEY—TWO POLITICAL WARHORSES IN THE SAME SADDLE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Govs. Ronald Reagan and George Romney have decided to ride the Vietnam issue to what they believe could be political heights.

In all my years in politics I have never seen two men scramble so madly in search of votes on a foreign policy issue.

Reagan advocates what amounts to atomic annihilation of North Vietnam. He says we are really winning, but the President is not telling the American people we are winning.

Romney tells us that he was "brainwashed," that the war is going badly, and that the President is not telling Americans that it is going badly.

I have never seen two allegedly responsible Governors so mangle a vital national issue, with one of them even going around reading other people's mail just to embarrass the President of the United States.

Americans have always liked their politics rough, but this kind of political flip-floppery makes a mockery of bipartisan foreign policy.

What happened to the philosophy of Vandenberg that politics stops at the water's edge?

What ever happened to the time when American leaders considered the demoralizing effects of their comments on our fighting men overseas?

These men forget that they are not just playing with words. They are playing with American lives.

Let us take the politics out of the American commitment to Vietnam.

Let us condemn everyone and anyone who is ready to capitalize politically on life-and-death issues.

The press of the country has now repudiated these tactics by both Governor Romney and Reagan. I trust that the American people do likewise.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times and the Baltimore News American which justifiably criticize transparent and divisive political tactics:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 1967]

REAGAN FALLS OFF THE HORSE

If the subject were not so serious—discussion of Vietnam policy at the National Governors' Conference—it would be as farcial as an old Ronald Reagan movie. Not "Bedtime for Bonzo" or even "Cattle Queen of Montana" but perhaps, "Accidents Will Happen."

One did, when by mistake Mr. Reagan obtained a radiogram from the White House addressed to former Gov. Price Daniel of Texas, White House liaison man on board the Independence. What did Governor Reagan do? He read the private communication, with full knowledge that it was not addressed to him, and then saw to it that copies were circulated to Republican Governors and reporters aboard ship. The information in the cablegram, concerning gubernatorial positions on Vietnam, was used gleefully by Governor Reagan for political purposes. Vietnam itself, which might have been debated intelligently, was removed from the Governor's agenda.

Commenting about Mr. Reagan's outrageous interception of mail, another governor put it well: "Every man has to live with his own ethics and morality. I don't read other people's mail and messages." Governor Reagan, who has frequently mounted a high moral horse in the tradition of the Old West, or Western, can now come off it.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News-American, Oct. 9, 1967]

FAR OUT

Ambitious politicians, even in ordinary circumstances, are apt to let fly with some pretty wild comments when shooting from the hip. When they are competing for a chance at the White House, the odds for ill-considered off-the-cuff nonsense are increased immeasurably. Thus, as pressures build in the battle for the 1968 Republican presidential nomination, hot air blasts can be expected in ever-growing frequency.

Two sterling examples came in television interviews over the week end and both, not surprisingly, involved the Vietnam war. One was from Gov. George Romney of Michigan, who already held some kind of malarkey award for claiming he had been "brainwashed" into his previous support of the war effort. The other came from Gov. Ronald Reagan of California, another top prospective GOP candidate despite his formal denial of the role.

Romney, in his new bombast blast, accused the administration of following a "ping-pong policy" in Southeast Asia. He said it first declares the United States is fighting to protect South Vietnamese interests, then it contends our own national interest is preeminent there. Reagan, in his own TV interview, accused President Johnson of using the war for political purposes. He said we are "doing much better in the war than we are being told" and that the good news is being withheld for release "when it's politically advantageous."

Both far-out charges are political hip shooting at targets which don't exist. The Romney charge, in fact, isn't even a charge—it's a statement of fact. By fighting to save South Vietnam from Communist aggression we most certainly are simultaneously furthering our own interests in Southeast Asia. Why Romney sees this as some kind of an inconsistent ping-pong policy is something only an expert on political double talk would try to explain.

As for Reagan, it is he who was using the war for political purposes—to keep his name in the headlines. It is no secret we are winning the war, slowly but surely. Bob Considine, in his exhaustive, on-the-scene study serialized in the News-American last month, reported the facts in detail. They confirmed what the administration has been saying right along, that with perseverance the clearly turning tide will inundate the Communists eventually. At the same time there is no early end in sight and certainly no reason for encouraging the public to think otherwise.

The week-end declarations on the war by Romney and Reagan—the one a dove, the latter a hawk—have more in common than their mutual balderdash. Each, in its own way, tends further to muddle the public mind about the war. As such, both are to be regretted. Unfortunately, since the war inescapably is a campaign issue, we can expect even greater and more regrettable balderdash in the weeks and months ahead.

DETROIT'S CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR GIRLS PROGRAM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD a series of five articles written by Sharon Nelton, Detroit Free Press staff writer, on pregnant schoolgirls and Detroit's continuing education for girls program. When a girl becomes a school dropout and goes on welfare with her illegitimate child, there is every possibility that she will never have any training that enables her to work, and that she will not marry but continue on welfare. This represents the greatest conceivable cost to the taxpayer. A program of education and training for pregnant unwed girls has the potential of saving the taxpayers more than any other type of training program, besides enriching the lives of both the girl and child.

MUST CLASS BE CLOSED TO PREGNANT SCHOOLGIRL?

(NOTE.—Society virtually has ignored the need of thousands of pregnant schoolgirls to continue their education. Often, instead of being school dropouts, they become school "pushouts" because of public attitudes that condemn them and deny them the right to an education. The recent slash of funds for Detroit's Continuing Education for Girls program has brought attention to the low-income, unwed schoolgirl. Today, the Free Press begins a five-part series on her problems in getting an education and becoming self-supporting. It also explores some of the people in her life.)

(By Sharon Nelton)

Thousands of Michigan schoolgirls are tossed into society's scrapheap each year for one reason: They are pregnant.

"School dropout" has a male sound to it—like the teen-age hood hanging out on the street corner.

But the truth is, about 43 percent of Michigan's dropouts are girls. In 1964–65 alone, there were more than 16,000 female dropouts. And although the State Department of Public Instruction has no statistics, it is known that many of these girls drop out because they are pregnant.

Throughout Michigan and the rest of the country, pregnant girls are forced out of school—often permanently—by policies that attempt to avoid "condoning" their behavior.

But experts on the problems of the unwed mother point out that these girls often wind up on the welfare rolls if they are not able to complete school. What's more, their children also may get caught up in the generation-after-generation welfare cycle.

"Most school systems close their doors to the pregnant girl and young mother, the rationale being that her very presence will contaminate her contemporaries, and that she does not deserve the benefits of public education," said Ruth Chaskel, director of the National Council on Illegitimacy (NCI), New York City.

"She is virtually condemned to a future of ignorance and dependence upon public support; and, in a vicious circle, the girl is proven unfit."

Of a total of 11,319 dropouts in Detroit from September, 1966 to June, 1967 there were 3,498 girls.

Only 412 were listed in Detroit dropout records as pregnant. But another 174 girls left school because of marriage, and still another 2,568 left once they passed the compulsory school age.

School officials say it is likely that a high percentage of these were pregnant, too.

The Detroit Public Schools system can pat itself on the back. Its own attitude toward the pregnant schoolgirl, wed or unwed, has not been quite so unsympathetic or punitive as in other communities.

Nevertheless, its own forward-looking Continuing Education for Girls (CEG) program—aimed at keeping pregnant girls from becoming dropout statistics, and possibly welfare statistics—was drastically cut back this year.

Its director, Mrs. Nancy Boykin, had expected to be able to accept 170 girls at a time in the program this year. This would have cost her somewhat more than last year's budget of $227,000 for the same number of girls, because of the need to meet staff raises and hire a nurse for the program.

But Detroit school officials reassigned priorities under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, where CEG funds come from. Mrs. Boykin was told that CEG would have to settle for $149,000 so funds could be diverted to such improvements as reducing class sizes in the lower grades of inner-city schools, and for the purchase of more textbooks.

As a result, CEG cut back its student load from 170 to 110, and its professional and clerical staff has been more than cut in half.

The program is reaching the 110 girls with the same amount of money it took to reach 60 girls during the first year of operation. But the scope of the program has had to be reduced, Mrs. Boykin explained, and some services were dropped entirely.

CEG has had a reputation as one of the best programs for pregnant girls throughout the country. Its cutback was a shock to experts on illegitimacy and education.

"Cutting it back?" asked New York's Ruth Chasel. "But it never was very big!"

And in Lansing, a State Department of Public Instruction spokesman said that instead of cutting CEG, "they probably should expand that program four times what it is now."

He's probably right. CEG has received more than 1,700 applications since it began in March, 1966. But it has been able to accept only 296.

CEG applications show that the dropout rate because of pregnancy is much higher than school statistics indicate. And Mrs. Boykin points out that it still is higher than the CEG applications suggest—because only the most highly motivated of the low-income group that CEG is aimed at, tend to apply.

WHY THE PROGRAM IS SO HIGHLY PRAISED

Why has CEG won such acclaim?

Professionals who work with unwed mothers point out that CEG touches almost every aspect of the girl's life to redirect her life pattern, keep her in school and help her learn to have confidence in her own ability.

The program:

Makes it possible for the pregnant girl to continue her schooling without interruption.

Requires that she see a doctor before she's accepted. This starts her on pre-natal care as early as possible, so she's more assured of having an uncomplicated pregnancy and a healthy baby.

Enables her to get professional counseling from a social worker.

Provides her with child-care information and sex education.

Reaches into her own home by requiring her parents to be with her at registration and by trying to involve them in a special group program for "young grandparents." Often, a social worker will visit the girl's parents.

Until the cutback, CEG also aggressively sought out the unwed father in order to help him with his problems, which often were as serious as those affecting the girl.

"Our client is the pregnant girl," said Mrs. Boykin. "But unless we reach out to the forces that surround this girl, we will not have reached the girl."

Nancy Boykin is disappointed about the cutback, but says: "Detroit Public Schools are way out in front in terms of recognizing the need and initiating this kind of program. The step is one that many, many cities cannot take—dare not take. The climate is not conducive to it."

SEEK TO FREE EXISTING FUNDS

Other sources of funds are being sought. The Wayne County Department of Social Services, for example, is working through the State Department of Social Services (SDSS) to get funds—probably in the form of a demonstration grant—under Section 1115 of the Social Security Act.

According to Mrs. Jean LaRosa of the SDSS Special Projects Unit, these funds would go entirely to reinstating and even expanding the social and psychological services of CEG. Then the funds CEG already has can be entirely freed for educational purposes.

Continuing a girl's education is a special problem among low-income families—particularly Negro families. Nearly always, the unwed Negro mother keeps her baby because it is too difficult to find adoptive parents.

Then, such a pregnant girl faces not only the problem of schooling interrupted by pregnancy, but also the problem of day care for her baby if she wants to continue school.

In Detroit, a pregnant girl under 16 is legally excused from school once her pregnancy is verified by a physician's notice. The attendance officer follows up to see if she is able to return to school after the baby is born. But if she is unable to find child care for the baby, she is not forced to return.

If the girl is 16 or over, she can drop out because she is over compulsory school age. No follow-up is made of her case unless she indicates she wants to return to school.

CEG's aim is the girl under 16 or the one close to graduation. And Mrs. Boykin admits that CEG is nct geared to reach the "hard-core," low-income family, which needs an even more aggressive approach.

AT 16, A NIGHTMARE PREGNANCY

(NOTE.—Marcia, an unwed mother at 16, might have dropped out of school forever if she had not had the right help at the right time from the Continuing Education for Girls program of the Detroit Public Schools. Here, in the second of a five-part series on education for pregnant schoolgirls, is Marcia's story.)

(By Sharon Nelton)

Visions of football heroes, proms and graduation parties dance in the heads of most young ladies in their senior year of high school.

But the reality faced by Marcia S. last year was a pre-dawn to midnight schedule that involved:

Feed her fatherless baby.

Catching the 7 a.m. bus to be on time for morning classes.

Lunch and study during the noon hour.

Working in the afternoon for $1.25 an hour under the Detroit Public Schools work ("co-op") program.

Home again by 5 p.m. to help with supper for her brothers and sisters while her mother, who worked nights and cared for Marcia's baby during the day, got some sleep.

After supper, washing diapers, playing with her baby, and finishing up homework.

Marcia, whose son Robert is now 15 months old, had two B's and two A's in her last semester of 12th grade. That's a far cry from the nearly all-failing marks she was getting as an 11th grader.

That was right before she got pregnant.

Marcia, just 18, is shy. But she wanted to tell the Free Press why she was disappointed to learn that Detroit's Continuing Education for Girls (CEG) program has been cut back.

Marcia (not her real name) was enrolled in the program designed to prevent pregnant girls from becoming school dropouts. And CEG changed her whole life.

"I was living in a kind of a dream world," Marcia said. "It (CEG) gave me a better outlook on life. I faced facts."

How did CEG help her the most?

"By getting me back on my feet scholastically," she answered quickly. "I felt somebody was with me. I didn't feel so all alone."

Early in high school, Marcia had gotten caught up in a fast-moving crowd of kids who would skip school the same day. They'd go downtown together, or to somebody's house.

Often, Marcia says, it was her own house. Her mother was working days then, and there was no grown-up to bother them.

But the old gang began to break up.

"I was looking for something new to get into," Marcia said.

So she started running with an older crowd, and she got involved with a married man she heard was about 40. But he was young-looking, she said, like he might be in his late 20s.

Meanwhile, her grades had slipped miserably. She was so far behind in school that she lost interest in trying to catch up again.

When she discovered she was pregnant, Marcia told herself the baby's father would get a divorce and marry her. When she realized he had no intention of doing this, she broke off and hasn't seen him since.

(She and her mother later tried to get child support. But the man denied paternity, and they decided it would be better to have no contact with him at all.)

Mrs. S. learned about her daughter's condition by the time Marcia was two months along. She was upset and blamed herself for her daughter's mistake.

But Marcia, willing to take the blame herself, says she doesn't think it was her mother's fault.

"We really got along pretty good," she said.

Marcia always intended to keep her baby. Like all other girls who've been in CEG so far, Marcia is Negro. And nationally, about 95 percent of Negro unmarried mothers keep their babies, largely because of lack of adoptive homes for children's minority groups.

Her mother's understanding support was crucial. Without it, Marcia might have been a dropout statistic now and a welfare statistic later, because of her inability to earn a decent living.

Marcia didn't want to drop school.

"I wanted to go to school—but not to regular school," she recalls. And school policies would have kept her from attending regular classes once authorities knew she was pregnant.

But Mrs. S. had heard of the CEG program and urged Marcia to enroll. So Marcia joined the first class when CEG opened its doors in spring, 1966. With other girls in the same predicament, she attended classes from 9 a.m. till 2:30 p.m. at one of CEG's two centers.

Her studies included the standard items, such as English and history. She also had the benefit of continued counseling with a social worker. Nurses connected with the program held once-a-week classes that included child care and sex information. Marcia also had a chance to learn some homemaking.

And since CEG requires a girl to have a physician's examination before she's accepted, Marcia got started early with the routine doctor's visits that are so important to a healthy pregnancy.

Marcia's baby was born four months later.

And while she had to be confined at home, she would pick up assignments at the center and finish them at home.

When Robert was two months old, Marcia was back in regular classes at a different high school. And she graduated in June—just as she originally would have.

Marcia plans to start college soon, and hopes to be a teacher or guidance counselor. "Getting a job is the biggest problem right now," she said.

Marcia today speaks of an entirely different Marcia when she talks about herself as she was two years ago.

"I saw marriage as an escape. I was building up a fantasy," she said. "I was trying to find any easy way out."

FOR GIRLS, THE CRUCIAL AGE IS 15

Age 15½ seems to be the crucial age in the lives of the 296 pregnant girls who've been in the Continuing Education for Girls (CEG) program of the Detroit Public Schools.

"We've had two as young as 12," said Nancy Boykin, program director, "and we're noticing an increase of those that come to our attention in the 14-year-old group."

But on the average, the pregnant girl who comes to CEG for help is in the first semester of the 10th grade. This is the break between junior high and high school, Mrs. Boykin explained, adding "This seems to be a very crucial break. The girls become a part of a larger group where they lose their identity."

They also lose many close ties—a favorite teacher, or perhaps a girlfriend who was sent to a different school.

What's more, many of these inner-city girls come from families of 10 or more children.

"Someone is bound to get lost in a family like that," said Mrs. Boykin.

Getting pregnant, then, is one way to get attention and to fill the void of lost relationships. It's not so much a question of being popular, Mrs. Boykin pointed out.

One result of the girl's drive is that she's not promiscuous but tends to develop a relationship with one boy—a boy she believes really loves her.

UNWED FATHERS, HAVE THEY BEEN SCARED AWAY?

(NOTE.—Unwed fathers might not run away from their responsibilities if society were more understanding. This third installment in a five-part series on pregnant schoolgirls describes what Detroit's Continuing Education for Girls program has learned about the fathers of illegitimate babies.)

(By Sharon Nelton)

Just as society often forces the pregnant, unwed girl to become a school dropout, it also may be forcing the unwed father to "run away," even if he feels a sense of obligation.

Instead of being punished for his mistake, the boy needs someone who will help him with his own problems, which often are as serious as the unwed mother's.

These are the observations of James W. Brogdon Jr., until September a social worker with the Continuing Education for Girls (CEG) program of Detroit Public Schools. In what is probably the country's most far-reaching effort to help the unwed father, Brogdon worked during the last year with 63 "illegitimate" fathers ranging in age from 14 to 23.

The results of his work were promising. And his discoveries about these boys were laying the groundwork for greater understanding in an area where there is virtually no research.

But CEG's services to fathers of illegitimate babies had to be cut out of the program this year when CEG funds were slashed to two-thirds of what they were in 1966–67. And Brogdon has been shifted to the schools' Pre-School and Parent Education program.

The unwed fathers, Brogdon says, are "concerned youngsters who want help and respond to it."

Here is what he found in his work with them:

Most want to help the girl and baby if

possible, but they are ill-equipped financially and emotionally to do very much.

At first, they experience reactions of fear and helplessness.

Most volunteered an awareness of contraceptive devices but hadn't wanted to sacrifice pleasure for prevention.

Very few denied responsibility for the girls' pregnancy. They often expressed a sense of obligation to the girls, such as a willingness to get married.

"The general feeling is that boys want to deny responsibility and run away, but I didn't find this to be the case," Brogdon said.

Many of the boys were schoolboys—perhaps working part-time, Brogdon pointed out. They could not reasonably be expected to be able to support the child.

And like a majority of the girls in the CEG program, many came from deprived inner-city families where the financial outlook was dismal to begin with.

Out of Brogdon's group, 32 married the girls—which meant Brogdon often ended up as a marriage counselor.

Nearly half of the total group were school dropouts.

Many of these boys were around age 17½ when they got the girl into trouble. Brogdon thinks this age might represent the "threshold of manhood," when a boy takes the first step toward getting involved in a more intensive relationship.

Why would a boy of any age get involved this way?

"He would feel a void in his life," Brogdon said. "Many of the boys felt personally inadequate but tried to mask this with a show of extreme confidence."

These boys want help, Brogdon insisted, but they're also afraid of punishment—such as being taken to court for child support.

These boys' names were volunteered by the girls when they entered CEG. Brogdon would call the boys or look them up at home, assuring them that his only interest was assisting them.

"They usually had some degree of resistance—though it was easily broken down in our initial contact. They were extremely eager for help after they were convinced I was not there in a critical or punitive sense," he said.

The need for help was so great that these boys sometimes would bring in friends for discussions with Brogdon. And these talks, he said, "inevitably came around to girls."

None of the boys denied Brogdon an interview—although some did not keep their appointments with him. Brogdon had been given a total of 108 names, but some of the boys were inaccessible—in the armed forces or the Job Corps.

Or their addresses were unknown.

TRIED TO PROVE THEIR MANLINESS

Brogdon was able to help these boys by counseling them about further schooling, helping them to find jobs, or assisting them with family difficulties, particularly with problems that resulted from the girl's pregnancy.

Sometimes, Brogdon saw important changes in the boys' attitudes about girls.

"In most instances, they wanted to assert their manliness—to be the dominant factor in the life of the girl, rather than her being dominant," he said.

But with Brogdon's help, some of the boys began to understand the one-sidedness and selfishness of their feelings.

Some cases require intensive work.

For example, Johnny was a ninth-grade dropout. He was 16 when Brogdon offered help.

From a poor family, Johnny needed a job but was having a hard time getting one because of his youth and his lack of skill, Brogdon drove him to one social agency where the boy was given a job referral. Then Brogdon took him to the job interview and he was hired.

Brogdon later checked up on Johnny and learned he wasn't doing well. His boss wanted to let him go. Brogdon convinced the employer that Johnny deserved another chance to get the kind of experience he lacked.

Brogdon also talked to Johnny. And when he followed up on the case three months later, Johnny was working out satisfactorily.

Johnny never married his child's mother. But once he was employed, he did contribute to the baby's support.

CEG director Nancy Boykin says she knows of no other program in the country that works so aggressively with the unwed father, or, as she calls him, "the forgotten man."

Some programs, she says, do deal with him, but they may be aimed at adoption of the child.

Adoption agencies may contact the father to learn more about him so that more is known about the hereditary factors of the adoptive baby. Or juvenile courts may attempt to work out child support with the father.

But CEG's approach—now stalled—was to help the boy himself.

Pregnant Schoolgirl: To Help Her, You Must Also Help Her Parents

(By Sharon Nelton)

When an unwed schoolgirl from a poverty-stricken, inner-city family gets pregnant, her parents are just as shocked as middle-class parents from the suburbs would be.

This is what the staff of the Continuing Education for Girls (CEG) program of Detroit Public Schools has learned about the parents of the inner-city pregnant girls CEG tries to keep in school.

Like any other parents, these stunned grandparents-to-be—many of them just in their 30s—wonder what they did wrong in bringing up their daughters.

"Trying to raise adolescents is rugged, even for the most enlightened family," says Nancy Boykin, CEG director. "And how much more difficult it is if the situation is compounded by poverty, bad housing, poor health and marital problems."

"Practically all the parents have aspirations for their daughters to complete school," she says. They see their daughters' condition as "a blocking of this aspiration."

Inner-city girls' lives are complicated by the fact that most of them keep their babies. National, 95 percent of the Negro unwed mothers keep their babies, largely because of the lack of adoptive homes for babies from minority groups.

Not all of CEG's girls are Negro, but the rate of CEG girls who keep their babies runs even higher than 95 percent. This means that many of the girls bring their babies into the same home life with the same problems that led to their getting pregnant in the first place.

And frequently, with three generations living under one roof, conflicts arise over how the new baby is to be reared.

CEG's designers knew they couldn't do much for the pregnant schoolgirl unless they could help her parents, too. So they decided from the beginning to make every effort to reach the girl's parents while she was going to school under CEG—which allows her to continue her education throughout her pregnancy.

The recent cut in funds has not affected CEG's service to parents. But that service never has been as extensive as the CEG staff thinks it should be.

In addition, for every girl who is accepted by CEG, there are at least four who have to be turned down because the program simply can't handle them.

One girl who wanted in is a pregnant 15-year-old, Judy B. (not her real name). Judy's older unmarried sister dropped out of school not too long ago because of pregnancy.

Her sister's baby is being reared by Judy's mother, who is on welfare.

Mrs. B. already was taking care of Judy's half dozen brothers and sisters. Now she'll probably care for Judy's baby, too.

Mrs. B. wants Judy to continue school, and Judy wants to go. Mrs. B. also is worried about Judy's younger sisters. Will they get pregnant and drop out of school, too?

If CEG had room for Judy, it also could help Mrs. B.—perhaps by enabling her to create a home that would guard the younger daughters from taking the same path Judy and her older sister did.

CEG works with parents in two ways: A social worker counsels each family individually, spending extra time with families where problems are critical. CEG also holds sessions with groups of parents every second week.

In the group meetings, parents "ventilate" their own feelings in talking about the problems they all share—such as the impact the daughter's pregnancy has had on the whole family, and how they can communicate with these girls and help them handle pressures placed upon them, especially those related to sex.

When they hear each other talk about these problems, parents often can understand more than they can in individual sessions with the social worker, CEG has found. They feel freer to talk.

One mother kept complaining about her daughter's rebellious attitude. Then another mother remarked that if the first mother would quit finding fault with the girl and pushing her, the girl might feel less aggravated and become less rebellious.

But whether it's individual counseling or group work, the goals are the same: To help the family resolve its problems so that a good home is made for the new baby, and so the conditions that led to the girl's pregnancy are eliminated.

According to Mrs. Boykin, CEG eventually wants to get full parent participation in its small group meetings.

And it wants to provide more education on child-rearing so that young grandparents will be better equipped to rear their own youngsters as well as co-operate with the daughters in bringing up their new babies.

Pregnant Schoolgirls Helped, Quietly

(Note.—High costs and the possibility of bad publicity often keep a school district from plunging into programs for pregnant girls. In the last of a five-part series, the Free Press describes what's happening in Michigan in a slowly growing effort to keep pregnant girls from becoming permanent school dropouts.)

(By Sharon Nelton)

It's unusual for school systems to reach out in an effort to keep the pregnant girl from becoming another school dropout.

Those that do, often do it quietly. As one Macomb County educator from a small community said: "This isn't something schools put in an annual report."

People misinterpret a program like this, he said. They start blaming the school for the rate of illegitimate pregnancies. "I don't know what it's like in Detroit, but out here . . ." his voice trailed off.

Even in Detroit, public school administrators cooled any attempts to publicize the Continuing Education for Girls program until CEG funds were cut back by a third this year.

In spite of the cutback, CEG still is Michigan's best effort to keep pregnant girls from becoming school dropouts. And Elizabeth M. Goodman of the U.S. Office of Education ranks it among the top four programs for pregnant girls in the nation—along with Washington, D.C., Los Angeles and Chicago.

But even CEG is reaching fewer than a

fifth of the girls who apply. And there are many more pregnant girls in Detroit who aren't motivated enough to apply.

However, programs are beginning to spring up across the state. Saginaw has served about 150 girls in its "Continuation School" in the past year and a half. A girl is moved into the program as soon as it is learned she is pregnant.

Doors opened to 50 pregnant girls in the Kalamazoo area in September in a brand-new program operated by Kalamazoo Public Schools for nine school districts within the Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District.

An Ecorse program, operating under the auspices of adult education, now reaches 15 girls.

Usually, these programs reach low-income girls who can't afford, or don't know about, the services that would enable them to have their babies quietly and place them for adoption. Or they are from minority groups that have extreme difficulty finding adoptive parents.

In spite of the fact that more than 4,000 illegitimate babies are born in Detroit each year, there are only three maternity homes for unwed mothers in the tri-county area: Florence Crittenton, Marillac and the Booth Memorial Home and Hospital. Their total capacity is about 160.

If a girl is lucky enough to get into one of these, she can attend classes taught by a teacher from a school program for homebound students.

Another service called Oak Hills, which arranges foster care for the unwed pregnant girl, will help her continue schooling if she requests it—usually through an adult education course or a correspondence course. It has a caseload of about 12 girls.

CEG's comprehensive approach—combining education, health and social services—makes it unique. Many programs have one of these approaches or perhaps two, but not all three.

The Mott Children's Health Center in Flint is strictly a counseling program so far, although one of its aims is to help the girls get either vocational training or more formal education so she can become self-supporting.

Girls are also encouraged to return to school through other special programs. The Detroit Urban League, in co-operation with the American Red Cross, offers a course in pre-natal and post-natal information for low-income unwed mothers. An attempt is made to counsel the girl and get her back into school.

But the girl has to take the initiative to enroll in the Urban League program and out of 200 referrals the agency has received this year, only 15 girls have enrolled.

A new Study Committee on Illegitimacy and Services to Unwed Mothers of United Community Services expects to give attention to the problems of disrupted education of unwed mothers.

One of the Committee's first steps probably will be to survey how education for pregnant girls is handled in each of the tri-county's 96 school districts, according to Eben W. Martin, UCS family and child welfare consultant.

"The major question I have is whether the school district offers a variety of educational opportunities to the unwed mother," Martin said. While the CEG-type program is excellent, he said, it might not be the answer for every girl or every school system.

Dr. William J. Emerson, superintendent of the Oakland County Intermediate School District, agreed. With fewer children spread over his county's 900 square miles than in Detroit's city llimits, a program like CEG might be impossible for geographic reasons. So the homebound teaching program picks up the education of pregnant girls.

There is no State Department of Public Instruction policy regarding the education of pregnant schoolgirls. Usually, such policy decisions are left up to the individual school district, as in Wayne County.

To really do an effective job, a program for pregnant girls must provide not only instruction but also help with personal problems so the girls do not "gravitate to permanent lives on welfare," according to Dr. William W. Wattenberg, associate superintendent of Detroit Public Schools.

But the cost is placed at about twice what it costs to educate a regular student.

"If schools can get help with the second aspect, they are much more likely to engage in the first," he said.

CEG is funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as are many similar programs across the nation. It is seeking additional funds from other sources so that social services eliminated by this year's cut can be restored and expanded.

The nature of a program often determines the sources of funds it can qualify for. For example, the Kalamazoo program gets some of its money from the Michigan County Special Education Act (Public Act 190).

Contributions from such private sources as service clubs would be helpful, too, since they could be used for purchasing equipment according to Dr. Wattenberg.

In spite of any hesitancy it might have had about a program like CEG, the Detroit school board is proud of it, he indicated.

"As we look at what's happened to the first girls in the program," he said, "we have the feeling there are a number of them who are now going to be stable, both economically and emotionally."

"Other big cities have been looking over our shoulder," he said.

OEO NEEDS SUPPORT OF CONGRESS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected newspapers in America, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, has editorially implored this Congress to "Stop the War Against OEO."

We will very shortly have the new OEO legislation before us. The Senate has already acted. The OEO has been without new legislation since the fiscal year ended last June. The needs of the poor are still very great. Clearly the time is at hand for speedy approval of the 1967 Economic Opportunity Amendments. As the Cleveland Plain Dealer so rightly says:

> If Congress welshes now, it will break its solemn promise to the poor.

As my own newspaper, the Baltimore Sun, has stated, it is "No Time for Politics."

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of economics and self-interest as well as a matter of honor. It is an obvious fact that antipoverty expenditures for programs under the OEO—Headstart, Upward Bound, Job Corps, and so on—are investments in our fellow citizens which will bring important returns. As people become self-sufficient, they become taxpayers, not welfare consumers of the tax dollar. As youngsters are given the opportunity to learn to the limits of their ability instead of being inhibited by the limitations of their purse, our society is enriched. And as heads of households learn new skills, and jobless youth learn motivation and gain job training, we are all benefited by their production.

In my own State of Maryland, funds in the amount of $34 million have been expended to help nearly 115,000 Marylanders: 16,323 youngsters have participated in the summer Headstart program; 68,903 Marylanders of all ages have participated in community action programs which operate in 21 of the 23 counties in my State; 8,607 young people—and their families—have benefited from Neighborhood Youth Corps programs; and 11,317 trainees have profited from the work experience programs. These Marylanders have been helped across the poverty line in the last 2½ years. Instead of being welfare recipients, these Marylanders are now contributing members of society.

I think my very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], spoke eloquently on this subject when, in a recent speech before the House, he said that—

> The solutions to the problems of poverty, when conducted in good faith and with honesty and with innovation and with the recognition of the human character of the problems of poverty, cannot be dismissed as "nonessential." These vital programs of OEO cannot be cut in favor of non-people-oriented programming. These are not nonessential programs because the people, and the problems for which these programs have been developed, are not nonessential.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Mr. VANIK's wise counsel, and that of the editorials appearing in the Baltimore Sun and the Cleveland Plain Dealer will guide this body in the days ahead.

I include these two timely articles at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Oct. 1, 1967]

No Time for Politics

When the administration's antipoverty program was launched three years ago this month it got off to "a shaky start," to quote news comment at the time. It had a relatively small budget and political enemies. The idea of setting up a separate Office of Economic Opportunity was unwelcome to officials in the old established departments concerned with labor, welfare, and education.

It still is. The House Education and Labor Committee is now considering proposals to transfer some of the OEO programs to other agencies, such as the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. Some Republican members want to bypass OEO entirely and replace it with a council of economic opportunity advisers to the President.

At the same time, the current effort in the House to tie a $5 billion cut in nondefense spending to President Johnson's proposed 10 percent tax increase threatens to knock out much of the financial support of old and new antipoverty programs.

Three years is a short time to get so ambitious a program as the attack on poverty in full stride. Trial and error was inevitable. But many efforts have been promising and the hopes of poor people have been aroused.

Already, however, some programs have been cut back for lack of funds and once-hopeful people have been deeply disappointed. This attitude can have serious consequences. It is out of frustrated expectations that violent revolution is born.

Efforts of critics of the program to make radical changes in its administration at this time should be subjected to the closest scrutiny. Political motivation should not be permitted to dictate the future course of antipoverty programs. Finding jobs for unemployed teen-agers, helping little children from deprived homes to get a good start in school, creating service opportunities for the elderly should not be a subject for party feuding.

The country cannot afford to decide such issues on less than humanitarian grounds. There is no occasion for a partisan victory in this debate.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Oct. 15, 1967]

Stop the War Against OEO

There is a plot afoot in Congress to ambush the poverty war. From Washington sources we learn that its most confident champions hesitate to bring it to the floor because they know they don't have the votes to save it.

The Senate passed the Office of Economic Opportunity's Amendments for fiscal 1968, by a 60–21 vote, Oct. 5.

Many forward-thinking senators wanted to couple a big federal job package with this bill. They—and the Urban Coalition, and the experts probing the causes of riots, and thousands of social scientists—thought OEO should be strengthened, not weakened.

Witnesses galore testified that OEO must go on intact.

Over in the House, on grounds of partisanship, petulance, or in the name of economy, congressmen lie in wait ot give OEO the ax.

They are wrong. They are blind to these realities:

First, even with OEO help, thousands of young American are missing the last car on the train of a fast-moving economy. If they lose out on education, training or job experience, they may well become the street rabble whose future lies in violence or alienation.

Second, the OEO keeps the problem of poverty in the national spotlight. If dispersed, its functions will disappear into the wings, and public attention and commitment will become disconnected from it. The sense of urgency will be lost.

Third, poverty inflicts worse wounds on human beings than lack of a dam or lack of a highway or lack of many other things which Congress readily spends money to supply.

As U.S. Rep. Charles A. Vanik, D–21st, said in a floor speech last week, OEO cannot be held to standards of measurement that apply to a wheat-cotton subsidy, to flood control dams or a space shot.

Nobody tells a teacher she must deliver a certain number of straight-A students or she will be fired. Nor is a summer camp dismembered because it cannot prove in dollars how much it did for slum youngsters. OEO's training and teaching is valuable but not readily measured with micrometers.

The House had better not waylay OEO. Congress as well as President Johnson pledged this war on poverty. If Congress welshes now, it will break its solemn promise to the poor.

IMPROVING MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the House Rules Committee has now granted a rule on the meat inspection bill, and it will be coming to the floor soon. I would like to bring two newspaper articles dealing with the subject to the attention of the House.

When the lobbyist for the large packers and processors, Aled P. Davies, testified before a House Agriculture subcommittee, he said:

> We believe that generally speaking they (the state inspection systems) have provided the kind of consumer protection in the various states that the people living in those states have thought necessary and have been willing to pay for.

Those of us who support a stronger meat inspection act have contended that the public's satisfaction is mainly due to the mistaken belief that all meat is wholesome and federally inspected.

A recent survey by the highly respected Minnesota poll tends to confirm our opinion.

After the Minneapolis Tribune, which is distributed throughout Minnesota, ran a lengthy series of articles explaining that much meat is not federally inspected and that the Agriculture Department has discovered improper conditions in hundreds of nonfederally inspected plants, the Minnesota poll showed these interesting statistics:

Eighty-seven percent of Minnesotans favor expanded Federal meat inspection. Ninety-three percent of women do. Only 9 percent oppose more Federal inspection.

Fifty-three percent believe the meat supply is as wholesome as it should be. But 38 percent believe it is not as wholesome as it should be.

The poll, from the October 22, 1967, Minneapolis Tribune, is reprinted below:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Oct. 22, 1967]

More Inspection of Meat Favored

Almost nine out of 10 Minnesotans (87 per cent) favor expanded federal inspection of meat-packing plants, according to a statewide survey conducted by The Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota Poll.

Opposition to stronger meat inspection laws was expressed by 9 per cent of the state residents interviewed. Four per cent offered qualified answers or had no opinion.

More than half of the people questioned (53 per cent) said it is their impression that most of the meat sold in stores is as wholesome as it should be, but a contrary opinion is held by 38 per cent.

A recently completed nationwide investigation by the Agriculture Department found unsanitary conditions in many packing plants, including some in Minnesota, North Dakota, Iowa, Wisconsin and Nebraska.

Federal meat inspection laws, which now apply only to plants which ship meat across state lines, exempt about 25 per cent of meat processing and 15 per cent of meat slaughtering. Many of the 25 states requiring inspection of all meatpacking plants acknowledge they do not have enough personnel for thorough inspection.

Expansion of federal legislation is opposed by the American Meat Institute, which represents the largest meat-packers. It is their position that more federal controls are not needed and that state inspection can be improved.

This is the question which was asked of a cross-section of voting-age Minnesotans from all parts of the state:

"An investigation of the meat industry has revealed unsanitary conditions in some meat-packing plants. Would you favor or oppose more federal inspection of meat-packing plants?"

The responses:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Favor more Federal meat inspection	87	82	93
Oppose	9	13	5
Other answers	1	1	*
No opinion	3	4	2
Total	100	100	100

"I'm in favor of stricter controls, but not necessarily federal laws," said a 30-year-old Minneapolis man.

The first survey question was:

"Is it your impression that most of the meat sold in stores is or is not as wholesome as it should be?"

The replies:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Is as wholesome as it should be	53	54	52
Is not	38	36	40
Other answers	1	1	1
No opinion	8	9	7
Total	100	100	100

Twin Cities area residents are more critical of the meat they buy than are people from other parts of the state. Forty-seven per cent indicated a belief that most meat is wholesome and 45 per cent expressed a doubt about it.

"The wholesomeness of the meat depends on the grocery store," a Minneapolis housewife commented.

An editorial appeared in the Des Moines Register of Monday, October 16, 1967, dealing very specifically with the subject matter and is self-explanatory. It is as follows:

Improving Meat Inspection

Congressional action is expected soon on legislation to amend and expand the Federal Meat Inspection Act of 1907 and strengthen state inspection systems. Two bills are now on the House floor and chances are good one will be approved and sent to the Senate.

Though similar in most details, the bills have one major difference which should draw much of the House debate. Neal Smith (Dem., Ia.) introduced a bill to extend federal inspection to packing plants not selling interstate but which do more than $250,000 worth of business a year. The other bill, sponsored by Graham Purcell (Dem., Tex.), does not contain this provision.

Both proposals would update the original meat inspection law, almost unchanged in 60 years, and authorize grants to states for up to 50 per cent of costs for making their inspection systems consistent with federal programs.

Smith says his stronger bill is needed because of the filthy conditions in many uninspected or state-inspected plants, as revealed by recent Department of Agriculture national surveys. Many plants limit themselves to intrastate sales to escape federal meat inspection. These same plants, however often come under federal regulations in other matters, such as labor relations.

Advocates of the Purcell bill say expanded federal inspection would seriously curtail, or destroy, the effectiveness of state and municipal agencies now doing excellent jobs. The Smith proposal would dilute the federal system by bringing in many intrastate plants, they say. L. B. Liddy, Iowa secretary of agriculture, supports the Purcell bill because he thinks it would require the least federal government intervention into state affairs.

It appears to us that these arguments for the Purcell bill are inconsistent. It is hard to see how relieving the workload of state inspection agencies that are already inadequate in many cases would curtail their effectiveness. Indeed, it should allow them to more thoroughly inspect the small, local plants. The Smith bill would still exempt some 2,100 other plants not doing $250,000 worth of business. States would retain control of their inspection agencies, and the proposed grants to states are voluntary.

The federal inspection system is doing a good job—even critics of both bills admit this—and it shouldn't be difficult to expand this program without "diluting" it.

The assurance of wholesome meat that comes with federal inspection or federally supervised state inspection should not be limited by a rigid definition of interstate commerce. Unsanitary conditions and abuses by intrastate firms with little or no state inspection, and the attempts of national packing firms to avoid federal inspection of their small plants, have been clearly exposed.

The Smith bill, we believe, offers the logical and necessary steps that need to be taken to stop this.

THE REPUBLCAN WRECKING CREW HAS DONE IT AGAIN—DASHING THE HOPES OF URBAN AMERICA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the question we may well ask ourselves these days is whether the United States, the richest and most productive nation in history, has the will to tackle head on a problem that has never been tackled before—the rebuilding of urban America.

Mr. Speaker, we have the resources and we possess the means to do what must be done.

But do we have the will?

If we in the House represent the people's will, then it is by no means certain that we are committed to this enormous task.

For by their actions yesterday on the rent supplements and model cities programs our Republican colleagues have once again heartlessly rejected progress for the cities.

In effect, they have turned the American dream of a better tomorrow into a Republican nightmare of indifference and neglect.

The question is, Mr. Speaker, do these Republicans truly represent the views of their constituents? Or, are they blind to every consideration except attempting to wreck the Johnson legislative record.

I suspect the latter is the case, Mr. Speaker. I think these Republicans have determined to do everything they can to sabotage the President regardless of the people's interests or the national welfare.

There is simply no other way to explain their continuous opposition to each and every urban or poverty program offered by the administration.

A few months ago they based their opposition to rent supplements and model cities on the lame excuse that private enterprise would not be interested in participating.

This was before the Nation's insurance companies announced their willingness to invest $1 billion in these programs.

Now what is their excuse?

I suppose, if asked, these Republicans would voice some pious declarations about curbing Government spending. We have been hearing this tune for more than 30 years now, and we are all sick and tired of the silly refrain.

The American people are now in the 80th consecutive month of economic expansion. This is a record. And I do not think that this Democratic administration which has guided us through these excellent weeks and months of solid prosperity need any lessons on economics from Republican recession experts.

What we do need from the Republicans—and what we have never received—is their cooperation to get on with the work to be done to improve the quality of American life.

We shall have another opportunity to vote on rent supplements and model cities when it emerges once again from the House-Senate conference committee.

We shall see then how sincere our Republican friends are in doing their share to help our cities during a difficult period in our national life.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., LODGE OF ELKS HONOR JAMES E. MURPHY, DURHAM CALDWELL, SEYMOUR BECKER AS NEWSMEN OF YEAR

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last week we celebrated National Newspaper Week. We are all aware of the impact of the news media on public opinion, and therefore the importance of objective reporting. It is only fitting then that we take this time to pay tribute to those newsmen who effectively perform this service.

On Friday, October 13, the Springfield Elks Lodge No. 61 honored three newsmen from my district for excellence in their field. James E. Murphy, associate editor of the Springfield Union, was named local newspaperman of the year. A veteran of 40 years service with the Union, Mr. Murphy was praised for his long years of dedication.

This year the observance was extended to include both radio and television also. Durham Caldwell, news editor for WHYN–TV Springfield was cited for his proficiency in television news work. Seymour Becker, of station WSPR, was awarded for distinction in radio news reporting.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record I would like to include the newspaper account from the Springfield Union October 14, 1967, concerning National Newspaper Week observance by the Springfield Lodge of Elks, and a story by the 1958 recipient of the Elks Newspaperman of the Year Award, Columnist Frank B. Murray, who wrote in the Springfield Sunday Republican October 22, 1967, of the timely patriotic pamphlet distributed at the dinner by Exalted Ruler Michell Krach, of the Springfield Elks, entitled "I Am the Nation":

Veteran Union Editor Named Newsman of 1967

Veteran newsman James E. Murphy, associate editor of The Union, was named local Newspaperman of the Year Friday by Springfield Lodge No. 61, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, at a luncheon honoring press, radio and television newsmen in the Student Prince, Fort St.

The luncheon and awards were part of the local lodge's observance of National Newspaper Week, extended this year to include both radio and television newsmen.

STARTED AS REPORTER

Murphy has been associated with The Union for more than 40 years, starting as a reporter in 1927. He held various desk jobs on both the morning and evening editions of the paper until the evening edition was discontinued in 1947, after which he became associate editor of the present morning paper.

Officers and trustees of Lodge 61 and invited newsmen heard Frank B. Murray, a member of The Union editorial staff and 1958 recipient of the award, praise his long-time associate on the local news scene, recalling floods, fires and other disasters that they both covered earlier in their careers. Murray referred to Murphy as a "truly great gentleman."

The awards were presented by Exalted Ruler Mitchell P. Krach who praised the newsmen for the coverage of the lodge's endeavors in "making America a better place to live."

LARGEST LODGE IN STATE

Awards in the media also were granted to Durham Caldwell of WHYN for television news work, and to Seymour Becker of WSPR for radio.

The organization, celebrating its centennial year, has a national membership of 1.5 million, with the Springfield lodge being the largest in the state. The order fosters patriotism and better citizenship through education, donating over $1 million in scholarships in Massachusetts alone.

In addition to those named other recipients of the annual award over the past 12 years include: Victor N. Wall, sports editor, The Union; Stephen N. Lemanis, chief photographer, The Daily News; Brian F. King, roto editor, The Republican; the late George W. Hargraves, city editor, The Daily News; the late George "Duffy" Clark, copy editor, The Daily News; and Charles Bellamy, copy editor, The Daily News.

Also, Richard W. Husband, news editor, The Daily News; Horace B. Hill, chief editorial writer, The Republican; Sidney R. Cook, treasurer, The Springfield Newspapers; the late Darrell N. Toohey, columnist and editorial writer, The Union; and Carroll W. Robbins, assistant managing editor, The Daily News.

"I Am the Nation"

(By Frank B. Murray)

Mitchell Krach, exalted ruler of Springfield Lodge of Elks, passed out a patriotic reminder at the annual Newspaper Week Dinner last week which honored Jim Murphy, associate editor of The Springfield Union as the 1967 Newspaperman of the Year.

Because there seems to be a great deal of confusion, even among thinking people, as a result of the Vietnam War, politics, labor and racial strife, we think that the pamphlet distributed by the Elks through Exalted Ruler Krach's office bears reprinting at this time if for no other reason than to remind Americans of their glorious heritage and assure them that today's turmoil and confusion shouldn't be lost in a welter of emotions.

Entitled "I Am the Nation," the pamphlet reads:

"I was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of Independence is my birth certificate. The bloodlines of the world run in my veins, because I offered freedom to the oppressed. I am many things, and many people, I am the nation.

"I am 195 million living souls—and the ghost of millions who lived and died for me.

"I am Nathan Hale and Paul Revere. I stood at Lexington and fired the shot heard around the world. I am Washington, Jefferson and Patrick Henry. I am John Paul Jones, the Green Mountain Boys and Davy Crockett. I am Lee and Grant and Abe Lincoln.

"I remember the Alamo, the Maine and Pearl Harbor. When freedom called I answered and stayed until it was over, over there. I left my heroic dead in Flanders Fields, on the rock at Corregidor, on the bleak slopes of Korea and in the steaming jungles of Vietnam.

"I am the Brooklyn Bridge, the wheat lands of Kansas, and the granite hills of Vermont. I am the coalfields of the Virginias and Pennsylvania, the fertile lands of the West, the Golden Gate and the Grand Canyon. I am Independence Hall, the Monitor and the Merrimac.

"I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific . . . my arms reach out to embrace Alaska and Hawaii . . . 3 million square miles throbbing with industry. I am more than 5 million farms. I am forest, field, mountain and desert. I am quiet villages—and cities that never sleep.

"You can look at me and see Ben Franklin walking down the streets of Philadelphia with his breadloaf under his arm. You can see Betsy Ross with her needle. You can see the lights of Christmas, and hear the strains of 'Auld Lang Syne' as the calendar turns.

"I am Babe Ruth and the World Series. I am 130,000 schools and colleges, and 320,000 churches where my people worship God as they think best. I am a ballot dropped in a box, the roar of the crowd in a stadium and the voice of a choir in a cathedral. I am an editorial in a newspaper and a letter to a congressman.

"I am Eli Whitney and Stephen Foster, I am Tom Edison, Albert Einstein and Billy Graham. I am Horace Greeley, Will Rogers and the Wright Brothers, I am George Washington Carver, Daniel Webster and Jonas Salk.

"I am Longfellow, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman and Thomas Paine.

"Yes, I am the nation, and these are the things that I am. I was conceived in freedom and, God willing, in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

"May I possess always the integrity, the courage, and the strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world.

"This is my wish, my goal, my prayer in this year of 1967—one hundred and ninety one years after I was born. I am the nation. I am an American."

EVERY HELP FOR RUSSIAN JEWS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Philbin] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this evening's sundown will usher in the last day of observance comprising the Jewish High Holy Day period—Simchath Torah, the day set aside for Jews everywhere to "rejoice over the law," the ancient law which lives on today.

It seems particularly fitting that we should focus our attention on a segment of the world's Jewish population that cannot celebrate this or any other of its religious holidays without fear of governmental reprisals of one kind or another. That is the Soviet Jew, who has been the target of continuous campaigns by Soviet leaders intent upon eliminating almost every vestige of Judaism and Jewishness from its population.

The ways of the Soviet Union are infinitely more subtle than were those of Hitler, but its restrictive ordinances to ban all expressions of the Jewish faith, are designed to accomplish some of the same end results.

This policy of ruthless, religious persecution is naturally abhorrent to all true Americans, regardless of race or religion, because it brazenly violates the principle of religious freedom, which this Nation cherishes.

We must continue to sustain the efforts of our leaders and our Government, which has been attempting for some time to lift the culture and religious suppressions imposed by the Soviet Union affecting the Jews.

We can do no less, if we would honor our own religious freedoms and hold out the hand of encouragement and help to a great, historic people, who throughout long centuries have furnished basic religious truths that have become part of the religious faiths many Americans embrace, and who have made immeasurable contributions in war and in peace to the perpetuation and enrichment of this great land of ours.

It is especially appropriate that on the sundown of Simchath Torah, we should reaffirm in this House our purpose to do everything in our power to liberate the Jews of Russia from the yoke of religious persecution that now afflicts them.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS FOLLOWING JOURNAL

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Burton] may be permitted to extend his remarks following the approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY CONCERNING EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN RECORD

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. A most unusual request has been granted, I full well agree, by unanimous consent, for a gentleman to extend his remarks after the reading of the Journal. Does that mean anywhere after the Journal for this date certain?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After the approval of the Journal.

Mr. HALL. My inquiry is, Was the gentleman granted unanimous consent to insert his remarks today in the Record, which will be delivered tomorrow, at any time after the reading of the Journal today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It was a 1-minute speech, and it will be printed in the Record after approval of the Journal.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 888. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.J. Res. 888) entitled "An act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Hayden, Mr. Russell, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hill, Mr. Holland, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Mundt, and Mrs. Smith to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Tenzer, for Wednesday, October 25, at 4 o'clock p.m., for the balance of the week, on account of observance of religious festival—last days of Feast of Tabernacles.

Mr. Stuckey (at the request of Mr. Flynt), for the balance of the week, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Albert, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Feighan, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Pettis) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Conte, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Halpern, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Eckhardt (at the request of Mr. Montgomery), for 60 minutes, on November 2; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Pettis) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Button.

Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Utt.

Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Montgomery) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Kee.

Mr. Dulski.

Mr. Eilberg.

Mr. Moorhead.

Mr. Brooks.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 26, 1967 at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1175. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report, pursuant to the provisions of section 511(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1176. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report of the relationship of obligations to expenditures, fiscal years 1967 and 1968, the judiciary (except the Supreme Court); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1177. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Committee of Conference. H.R. 9960. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 822). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Committee of Conference. H.R. 12474. An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 823). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 13679. A bill to prohibit the introduction of merchandise into interstate commerce if a guarantee is made with respect to such merchandise unless the merchandise bears certain detailed information with respect to the guarantee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 13680. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13681. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide survivor benefits for military career personnel; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself and Mr. McClure):

H.R. 13682. A bill to permit a compact or agreement between the several States relating to taxation of multistate taxpayers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13683. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 13684. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax deduction in certain cases for costs incurred by a disabled individual in employing an attendant; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD (for himself, Mr. Horton, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Shriver, and Mr. Whalen):

H.R. 13685. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for enlisted members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 13686. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 13687. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act to require that drugs provided by, or under programs receiving Federal financial assistance pursuant to such titles, must be prescribed and furnished on a nonproprietary or generic basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself and Mr. Taylor):

H.R. 13688. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, to permit the free entry of citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California (for himself, Mr. Mailliard, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Ayres, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Matsunaga, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Holland, Mr. Dent, Mr. Pucinski, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Brademas, Mr. O'Hara of Michigan, Mr. Carey, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Gibbons, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Meeds, Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts, and Mr. Pollock):

H.R. 13689. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 13690. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 13691. A bill to require the establishment of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 13692. A bill to govern further development of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 13693. A bill to encourage worldwide interest in U.S. developments and accomplishments in military and related aviation and equipment by authorizing Federal sponsorship of an International Aeronautical Exposition in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.J. Res. 906. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 907. Joint Resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.J. Res. 908. Joint resolution designating the second Saturday in May of each year as National Fire Service Recognition Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 909. Joint resolution to establish a National Cemeteries Site Selection Advisory Board to govern further development of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.J. Res. 910. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Con. Res. 542. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Con. Res. 543. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 544. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Con. Res. 545. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H. Con. Res. 546. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H. Con. Res. 547. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H. Con. Res. 548. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Con. Res. 549. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 550. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. Con. Res. 551. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Con. Res. 552. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEITH:

H. Con. Res. 553. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT:

H. Con. Res. 554. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H. Con. Res. 555. Concurrent resolution providing that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should submit a resolution to the United Nations for final and binding improvement of peace in Southeast Asia in accordance with the appropriate article of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TENZER (for himself, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Cohelan, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Eilberg, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Leggett, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Multer, Mr. Roybal, and Mr. Scheuer):

H. Con. Res. 556. Concurrent resolution providing that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should submit a resolution to the United Nations for final and binding improvement of peace in Southeast Asia in accordance with the appropriate article of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 557. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of the Constitution of the United States as amended to February 10, 1967, together with the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 558. Concurrent resolution concerning the development of the ocean floor through international cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13694. A bill for the relief of Gioacchino Plaia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 13695. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Arcangeletti and daughter, Antonella Arcangeletti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 13696. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Cipolla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13697. A bill for the relief of Antonio Sammartino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 13698. A bill for the relief of Pasqua Spedicati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 13699. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chandra Prabha Lal and her husband, Daya N. Lal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 13700. A bill for the relief of Fernando Antonio Porqueddu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13701. A bill for the relief of Silvestre de Brito Caetano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

190. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city of Thousand Oaks, Calif., relative to tax sharing to provide additional revenues to local government, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercy, at this altar of Thy sustaining grace, Thou art the center and soul of every sphere, yet to each loving heart how near; nearer than the hands and feet that serve us, nearer than the problems that front us, nearer even than the comrades who walk beside us.

In and through the change and confusion of these bewildering times, we are made confident by Thy divine promise, "as thy day, so shall thy strength be." Thou knowest that our needs are many, but our greatest need is of Thee. Through the lips that speak in this forum of freedom, above all differences of judgment, may there be heard by a listening world the solemn summons to men of good will of all races to a new commonwealth in which power shall be held as a sacred trust dedicated to the common good.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 24, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business, after I complete my remarks, be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the order entered yesterday, the Senator from Montana is recognized.

VIETNAM RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 37 other Senators, I submit a sense-of-the-Senate resolution seeking a U.S. initiative to assure United Nations Security Council consideration of the Vietnam conflict. I ask that the resolution be read, but not the names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 180) as follows:

S. Res. 180

Whereas the question of the Vietnamese conflict is a matter of which the Security Council of the United Nations is seized by action previously taken by the Council in connection with a letter of the Permanent Representative of the United States dated January 31, 1966, submitting a resolution seeking a settlement of the hostilities, and

Whereas more than 100 members of the United Nations through their Chiefs of State or Foreign Ministers or Permanent Representatives have expressed their deep concern with the continued hostilities and their desire for a peaceful and honorable settlement of the Vietnamese conflict: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States consider taking the appropriate initiative through his representative at the United Nations to assure that the United States resolution of January 31, 1966, or any other resolution of equivalent purpose be brought before the Security Council for consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at an appropriate place after my remarks certain memorandums which I have received, at my request, from the Library of Congress; a copy of a letter which I addressed to all Senators on the procedural questions having to do with the issue of Vietnam and the Security Council, dated October 9; a press release dated October 7; and an article published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for Sunday, October 15, headlined "U.S. Bombing Halt Suggested Since September 21 By 50 in U.N."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the documents will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, this is U.N. Week, and the General Assembly is talking a great deal about Vietnam while the Security Council is endeavoring to do something about the situation in the Middle East.

In this U.N. Week, celebrating the anniversary of the world's peacekeeping agency, the largest North Vietnamese airfield at Phuc Yen has been bombed. The military targets of any consequence left untouched in North Vietnam can now be counted on the fingers of two hands, possibly one. Just as the military targets are decreasing in number, so are the alternatives and options which could lead the way to negotiations and a possible honorable settlement of the conflict. There have been countless proposals advanced, many of which I have endorsed: proposals such as that of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] to confine the bombing to the 17th parallel and the so-called Ho Chi Minh trail in that region; General de Gaulle's proposal for a guaranteed neutralization of all of Southeast Asia; a return to the Geneva accords of 1954; the building of a barrier across the 17th parallel, and many others.

I am, today, submitting a Senate resolution which would seek to bring the question of Vietnam before the U.N. Security Council, for discussion and debate, and a possible recommendation. This proposal is not original with me, by any means. The initiator of Senate consideration of a U.N. approach is the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. He has been talking about it for several years and, as a matter of fact, for the past several months he has pressed a draft resolution which seeks to have the United Nations dispose of the matter. The draft resolution is now before the Foreign Relations Committee.

It is my view that while the United Nations Security Council has a significant role to play, it may not be able to resolve this issue, if for no other reason than that several of those critically involved in Vietnam are not members of the U.N. I do know, however, that a formal discussion of this issue can be brought about by the Security Council and that all those directly and indirectly concerned in the war, whether members or not, can be invited to appear before the Council. In that way, perhaps, it may be possible to begin to mark a path which could lead to an honorable settlement.

Initiation, not resolution, is the key word as far as the Security Council is concerned.

Some will say, as they invariably have since the President first directed an exploration of the matter many months ago, that this is not the time to propose a resolution of this sort. All I can say is that with our casualties in excess of 100,000 and increasing, and with no end in sight in the struggle in which we are engaged, any time is a good time, and now, most especially, during this anniversary week, when the very rationale of the U.N. is clouded by the conflict in Vietnam.

If the Ambassadors of the United States and the U.S.S.R. at the United Nations can introduce and push resolutions on the Middle East, what reason can there be for evading the question of Vietnam? Can it be said that Vietnam is not a threat to the peace of the world? Can it be said that Vietnam is not the foremost question of the hour insofar as this country and its people are concerned? Certainly, the least that can be expected is that the Ambassador of the United States at the United Nations shall undertake an initiative based on the resolution on Vietnam which he presented in January 1966 at the direct request of the President of the United States and that the roll be called on the members of the Council on the question of taking up this or some equivalent resolution.

Mr. President, it is high time that we find out and that the world finds out where the members of the Security Council stand on this question. What is the Security Council waiting for? What are we waiting for? The only way to find out is for a resolution to be brought to a vote, if necessary, and that the nations stand up and be counted. If there is to be an end of the conflict, there must be a beginning in the use of the machinery for peace. I think that the nations of the U.N. Security Council must face up to this matter at once.

Over 50 nations have discussed the bombing of North Vietnam and the great majority have advocated that there be a cessation. Over 100 nations have expressed their concern with the situation in Vietnam in one way or another in the U.N. General Assembly.

Words mean little or nothing if they are not followed by acts; and, in my opinion and in the opinion of those who have joined in sponsoring the resolution which has just been introduced, it is time for the U.N. to face up to its responsibility on the question of Vietnam. It is time for the member states of the Security Council to carry out the responsibilities which are imposed on them by the solemn treaty commitments of article I of the charter.

I repeat, Mr. President, just as the military targets of significance in North Vietnam are becoming fewer, so, too, are the options for peace becoming more difficult to find.

Mr. **AIKEN**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. **AIKEN**. Mr. President, I wish to support the position of the distinguished Senator from Montana, the majority leader, and I would like to add emphasis to what he has said by saying that the United States should insist that the United Nations face the issue of bringing the Vietnam war to an honorable conclusion.

It may be, as Secretary Rusk stated during his recent press conference, that Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow are opposed to such a move.

I assume that he particularly refers to Russia which has already made it clear that it would attempt to block such a move in the Security Council.

Have we not kowtowed to Moscow long enough?

If Russia is opposed to ending the war, is it not time to let the world know it?

If any other members of the Security Council are opposed to ending the war, let them also admit it to the world.

The greater part of our losses in planes and flyers in Asia is caused by Russian weapons and presumably Russian ground personnel.

Is that any reason why we should be considerate of their feelings in the United Nations?

Secretary Rusk stated at his recent press conference that:

> The general attitude in the U.N. seems to be that since Hanoi and Peiping and Moscow are saying that this is not appropriate for the United Nations, that an effort by the United Nations to resolve this problem might get in the way of the use of other machinery, such as the Geneva machinery or quiet, bilateral, diplomatic exploration.

What "quiet, bilateral, diplomatic exploration" does he refer to?

I hope the Secretary is not naive enough to think that Russia would take our part in a war with China?

Or, as he implied, does he worry that any move on our part to get United Nations action would be jeopardizing the reconvening of the Geneva Conference?

If this is the reason he should recall that the Russians blocked all efforts to end the war by reconvening the Geneva Conference some time ago.

And what of the United Nations itself?

Has this organization become so wishy-washy and impotent that it no longer dares to strive for world peace for fear of offending "Hanoi and Peiping and Moscow"?

If this is the case, I see no reason for giving the U.N. our support except on the same pro rata basis as other members.

It seems that we may have been overly generous in the past.

As of now I see three parties responsible for blocking any effort to resolve the Vietnam situation through the United Nations:

First. The U.S. State Department which obviously does not intend to seek an end to the war through the most logical agency for peace—the United Nations.

Second. The United Nations itself which cannot awaken its conscience enough to even consider the matter on its own initiative; and

Third. Russia—apparently happy that the United States is bogged down in a costly and deadly war 10,000 miles from home and also on the verge of a possible no-win war with China.

Again, I say the United States should force this situation into the open without delay.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont and say to him, if I read his remarks correctly, that in the vernacular it is about time for the United Nations to "fish or cut bait."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished majority leader upon the introduction of the resolution. I wish to endorse and support the resolution.

Surely this world organization of which we are a part has as its first obligation, its first goal, the maintenance of peaceful relations between nations. This is a function which it should perform and which we should beseech it to perform.

Therefore, I wish to fully support the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, during the last month, the administration has stated a new policy to support our presence in Vietnam which, could extend the fighting in Vietnam in time and scope. The policy will, if adhered to, establish a new and extended role for the United States in Asia.

During the last month our bombing has increased, our forces have increased and ground fighting has been deadly. The attacks by the North Vietnamese and their use of heavier weapons, supplied by Russia and China have increased.

The issue of Vietnam steadily becomes deeper involved in party politics in the United States.

It is reassuring that in this atmosphere the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] again speaks to the Senate, to the administration, and the country with the calm voice of reason asking that the issue of Vietnam be submitted to the United Nations.

It is no excuse for the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations to argue that jurisdiction should not be assumed either because of a possible veto, or of possible inability to secure the approval of recommendations by the parties. If there has been any dispute, breach of the international peace, or war since the founding of the United Nations which ought to be submitted to it and upon which it should assume its responsiblity, it is the issue of Vietnam.

As I have said many times, I believe the United States has been more faithful in its obligations to the United Nations than perhaps any other nation. The submission of the issue by the United States to the U.N. would demonstrate our stand against aggression, our support of a settlement of disputes by international and peaceful means and a true leadership in the world.

I hope very much that this advice, this plea of the distinguished Senator from Montana, this voice of reason in the climate and enviroment which has grown about this war, will be heard by the administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall yield to the Senator from Wisconsin; but first I wish to say that the President has indicated personally on four occasions in the White House his intense personal interest in the United Nations giving consideration to the Vietnamese situation.

I hope that on the basis of this resolution, which imposes no restraints whatever on the President, this will be helpful to him.

In my opinion, we are now at a fork in the road. We have possibly five major military targets of significance which have not as yet been bombed: The Gia Lam Air Force Base 3 miles from Hanoi, which is both a military and commercial field, Haiphong, and Hanoi, and perhaps another installation or two. If and when all of those places are bombed, what are those who have said that bombing North Vietnam is the answer, and who say it is the way to a quick, easy, and decisive victory, going to say?

What will they say if the result which they have stated would be accomplished by bombing is not brought about?

I think at this fork in the road it would be better to get away from the idea of bombing within 24 seconds of China and recognize, frankly, that there are few military targets left. They should ask themselves, those who have urged this course, what the next step will be if and when these remaining targets are bombed.

There is another fork in the road which is being urged here today. It might just possibly lead to an honorable conclusion.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am very proud and happy to have been one of the cosponsors of the resolution of the distinguished majority leader.

I believe that the logic of his argument that the Vietnam dispute should go to the United Nations is unassailable. In the event that there should be a veto by the Soviet Union, we could press on to the General Assembly. We have done this before and we could do it again.

I would like to say to the distinguished Senator from Montana, and I am sure he would agree on the basis of what he said about the President's position, that this does not contradict or oppose the position that President Johnson has taken.

This would be perfectly logical and consistent with the position the President has expressed many times, that he wants to negotiate and that he wants to use the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I say once more, I am very happy that the majority leader, with his prestige and his following in the country, as well as in the Senate, has taken this forthright step.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, if ever there was a situation which constituted a threat to peace as envisaged by all of us at San Francisco more than 20 years ago, it is certainly the Vietnam situation. The fact that the participants are not members of the United Nations is immaterial. The United Nations can take cognizance of this problem, if it wishes, and take appropriate action, flushing out those governments which criticize us publicly while sometimes urging us privately on a different course.

This is a question of almost fish or cut bait; whether the United Nations wants to continue to sit on its hands, or take a positive approach to the problem.

Finally, it would seem to me, if we do send this problem up to the United Nations and are successful in its being seized by the United Nations, we should say in advance that we will abide by the vote of the United Nations, that we will abide by the collective verdict and collective judgment of the United Nations no matter what that verdict will be or how distasteful to us.

Part of the process of going to the United Nations requires the acceptance of its arbitration and its wishes in this matter.

I am very proud and very glad, indeed, to be one of the many Senators who are cosponsoring the resolution of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana.

If ever there was a Senator who knows more about the subject of Vietnam, and has added to his knowledge over a longer period of years, it is the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to commend the able majority leader for the incisive and cogent remarks he has just made.

I congratulate him on his previous statements on this same subject, and most of all I congratulate and salute him for the action he has taken today in this regard.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the resolution, and I want to express my gratitude to the majority leader for extending the invitation to me to join as a cosponsor.

I hope that the Senate will act promptly to approve the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his comments.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I am very pleased, indeed, to be among those cosponsoring the resolution of the Senator from Montana.

It seems to me that the greatest threat to world peace since World War II and the Korean struggle should avail itself of the very best of the limited machinery we have to maintain and secure that world peace. There are those who say—as the majority leader has noted—that this is not the right time, that this is a political expedient in the international field to force some of those nations who are indifferent to take a position at this time.

Well, if this is not the time, there never will be such a time.

I think it does no good to our cause and to the goals we seek, if we do not give the United Nations every opportunity and every encouragement to utilize its very best offices to seek a peaceful solution of this serious problem, as I have stated, the greatest threat to peace since World War II and Korea.

I commend the majority leader. I hope his efforts will be fruitful. If not, they are still serving a very great cause. I salute him for introducing the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas. I agree wholeheartedly with what he says, except as it applies to me personally.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am very happy to be a cosponsor of the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the majority leader.

He has long been a student and good authority of foreign matters, particularly those relating to the Asiatic area.

I usually find myself in complete accord with his views. I am, in this instance.

It seems to me that if the United Nations is to serve the world and justify its existence, it should at least attempt to try and resolve the Vietnam situation.

The United Nations may be—and probably is—the only alternative we will have, except to continue the battle as it is presently being waged.

The solution, so far as military operations are concerned, are not too promising. At least, we are not making much progress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the dangers involved in today's world demand that every possible avenue be explored which will lead to peace, not only in Vietnam but everywhere in the world as well.

We know that various possible roads leading toward a solution of the Vietnam conflict have been blocked. There seems little hope of removing many of the obstacles. Yet we must proceed on the basis that peace will come someday and can be hastened by an active and imaginative search on our part.

It is with the hope that the United Nations will live up to its early promise as a force for peace in the world that I support the resolution introduced by the distinguished majority leader.

This effort may or may not be successful. But some effort, someday, will be successful, and we cannot afford to allow any opportunity for peace to remain unexplored.

In addition, Mr. President, it seems to me that the United States, in asking the Security Council to take an active role in bringing the Vietnam conflict to an honorable end, is showing itself to be ready to stake its reputation and motives in debate before the world.

This in itself would serve to underscore the fact that we are in Vietnam for honorable purposes and seek to leave that country under honorable circumstances.

EXHIBIT 1

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1967.

To: Hon. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD.
From: Foreign Affairs Division.
Subject: United Nations Members Expressing Concern Over Vietnam.

Representatives of the following members of the United Nations, numbering 104, expressed their concern over the situation in Vietnam in the general debate or opening statements at the 22nd Session of the General Assembly which began September 19, 1967:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Kinshasa), Costa Rica.

Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan.

Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland.

Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somali Republic, South Africa, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, and Zambia.

(SOURCE.—Verbatim Records of the General Assembly, September 19–October 13, 1967.)

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., October 9, 1967.

To All Senators.

DEAR ———: In the past few months, some thirty Senators have expressed the view that the United Nations might play some role in finding peace in Viet Nam. I have been among the thirty. It has been and still is my hope that the Security Council might serve to spur negotiations (whether under its own aegis or in a reconvened Geneva Conference or some other appropriate forum) which might lead to an honorable settlement.

In my judgment, much might be gained and nothing is to be lost in a sustained attempt to get the U.N. Security Council to consider Viet Nam. At worst, an open defeat of specific moves in this direction can hardly be more opprobrious than rumors and allegations that the United States is preventing negotiations. Even if we cannot muster the votes or are estopped by a permanent member's veto, I believe we have a responsibility to pursue whatever means may be proper and open to us in the Security Council, if for no other reason than to make clear our willingness to lay our position on Viet Nam formally on the line.

The appropriateness of a U.S. initiative in the United Nations in connection with Viet Nam is underscored by Article I of the Charter. The fact is that U.N. members have bound themselves by Treaty commitment:

". . . To take effective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace . . . and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes. . . ."

Obviously, this responsibility falls with particular weight upon the Permanent Members, including the United States.

At one time, this nation did make a start towards raising the Vietnamese question in the Security Council. In a letter to the President of that body on January 31, 1966, on instructions from the President, Ambassador Goldberg requested the calling of an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the situation in Viet Nam. In a supplementary letter, he submitted a draft resolution on Viet Nam.

A meeting of the Security Council was called for the next day, and two items were listed on the Provisional Agenda for the meeting. The first was the adoption of the provisional agenda (which is invariably the first item to be considered at a Council meeting). The second was the letter from the United States representative.

The vote on the adoption of the provisional agenda was taken on February 2, 1966. The results were 9 in favor, 2 opposed, and 4 abstentions. Although one of the negative votes was that of the Soviet Union, the agenda, nevertheless, was formally adopted. That is because the adoption of the agenda is a procedural question on which decisions in the Council are made by a vote of any nine of the fifteen members. The Soviet negative vote, therefore, did not act as a veto.

However, instead of next calling up the draft resolution of the United States (that is, the second item of the agenda or the U.S. letter on the question of Viet Nam) the Council adjourned indefinitely for informal consultations. These consultations proved ineffective; some of the Council members even refused to participate in them. Since that time, the Security Council has not explored, in formal debate and under public scrutiny, the issues of Viet Nam.

Insofar as the Council is concerned, then, the status of the Vietnamese problem has long been that of one item in an extensive list of "Matters of which the Security Council is Seized" under the title, "Letter dated 31 January 1966 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council." In analogy with Senate procedure, the item is on the Calendar, waiting to be called up.

The text of the proposed U.S. resolution which lies in this situation is as follows:

"*The Security Council,*

"*Deeply concerned* at the continuation of hostilities in Viet-Nam,

"*Mindful* of its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security,

"*Noting* that the provisions of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 have not been implemented,

"*Desirous* of contributing to a peaceful and honourable settlement of the Conflict in Viet-Nam,

"*Recognizing* the right of all peoples, including those in Viet-Nam to self-determination,

"1. *Calls* for immediate discussions without pre-conditions at ________ on ________ date, among the appropriate interested Governments to arrange a conference looking towards the application of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in South-East Asia;

"2. *Recommends* that the first order of business of such a conference be arrangements for a cessation of hostilities under effective supervision;

"3. *Offers* to assist in achieving the purposes of this resolution by all appropriate means, including the provision of arbitrators or mediators;

"4. *Calls on* all concerned to co-operate fully in the implementation of this resolution;

"5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to assist as appropriate in the implementation of this resolution."

It is this U.S. introduced resolution which was permitted to go dormant after having been motioned up almost two years ago and which we have since made no formal effort to revive. Initially, the principal reason for leaving it in limbo, as I understand it, was to avoid jeopardizing the efforts of the Secretary-General who, in his diplomatic capacity, was quietly trying to bring about negotiations through other channels. This effort and other secret approaches at the time were believed to hold more promise for peaceful settlement than formal consideration of the problem by the Council.

However, it is now almost two years later. In the interim, a range of alternative approaches to peaceful settlement has been pursued with great vigor but with singular lack of results. All the while the war in Viet Nam has intensified and the options for opening negotiations for peaceful settlement have grown fewer. In these circumstances, it seems to me that the United States has an obligation to itself and, under the Charter—commitments to the people of the world, to resume the formal effort (which we began almost two years ago and then dropped almost as soon as we began) to get the question of Viet Nam before the U.N. Security Council.

In my judgment, the United States resolution which was submitted in January 1966 is still valid as a vehicle for this purpose. However, an alternative draft resolution could be offered by the United States, or by another country, for the purpose of opening consideration of the problem of restoring peace in Viet Nam.

If we choose to resume the initiative, the United States representative has only to ask for a meeting on the resolution on Viet Nam of 1966 and the item would be taken from the list of matters of which the "Security Council is seized" and included on an appropriate provisional agenda. The question of the adoption of the provisional agenda would then arise at a meeting of the Security Council, and it would be determined without vote if no objection were raised. In the event of objection, adoption would require the vote of *any* nine members. In short, if there are any nine members of the Council willing to have the Security Council face up to Viet Nam, the Council can begin the attempt to open the door to peaceful solution.

Of late, there have been rumors and innuendoes to the effect that "we do not have the votes" and so, therefore, we have not moved on the matter. It seems to me, however, that if there are not nine members of the Council prepared, at this late date, to acknowledge in concert this most serious threat to the world's well-being, it is high time for this nation to clarify by a recorded vote—win or lose—who is willing and who is not willing to bring the U.N. into the effort to restore peace in Viet Nam.

If the Security Council elects to do so, moreover, it can invite parties to the Vietnamese conflict, even though they are not members of the United Nations, to participate in discussions of the question. Again, the precedents clearly indicate that an invitation of this kind involves a procedural decision and, hence, requires *any* nine votes for adoption. Indeed, there are several cases in which invitations to participate in Security Council proceedings have been extended to non-U.N. members notwithstanding a negative vote of a permanent member. The precedents include the extension of two invitations to Communist China in 1950 (one of which was opposed by both the United States and the Republic of China and the other by the Republic of China) during the Korean Conflict. Precedents include even an invitation to an individual to appear and to speak in the Security Council after his diplomatic credentials had been thrown into doubt. (Dr. Jan Papanek, the Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations at the time of the coup was invited, despite the negative vote of the Soviet Union.)

In short, the Charter and procedural practices of the U.N. clearly make possible a formal initiative on Viet Nam in the Security Council. While there have been of late, apparently, corridor-explorations by the United States of the possibilities of resuming the approach of almost two years ago, as yet, no specific procedural steps have been taken.

Needless to say, an initiative along these lines by the United States appears to me to be most desirable. May I say that I would not expect consideration of Viet Nam by the Security Council to be a substitute for direct negotiations by the parties involved or for the Geneva Conference or, for that matter, the personal diplomacy of the U.N. Secretary-General and other third parties. Nor am I sanguine in the expectation that this approach will necessarily be more fruitful than the others which have already been tried without avail. We cannot know what the results will be until the attempt is made. In my judgment, it would have been a worthwhile effort even if consideration by the Security Council served only to clarify the various positions of those directly and indirectly involved in this conflict by bringing them together in face-to-face and open discussions.

In closing, let me emphasize that I write to you not to seek an endorsement of any particular approach to the problem of Viet Nam. Each of us has his own views even as we share, I know, a deep concern and a deep desire for the prompt restoration of peace. I write you only to elaborate, as of possible interest, certain procedural and other ramifications which would be deeply involved in the event of a resumption of a U.S. initiative on Viet Nam in the Security Council.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

P.S.—I am sending along a copy of a statement made on Sunday which also bears upon the matter.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, DEMOCRAT, MONTANA

The current session of the General Assembly has brought an outpouring of foreign office statements which urge the United States to call a halt to the bombing of North Viet Nam. Led by the Soviet Union, twenty or more nations have publicly pressed this advice in recent weeks. There are probably additional nations which feel the same way even if they have not yet expressed themselves.

In my judgment, this nation should not make light of this international advice. In some cases, it comes from nations with which we have had a long and intimate association and whose well-being is linked closely with our own. In any event, it is not necessarily either gratuitous or misdirected but arises, I am sure, from a deep and worldwide concern with the prolongation and expansion of the war in Viet Nam. This government has a responsibility, as do all governments, to pay a decent respect to the concerns as well as the opinions of other nations.

Well-intentioned or not, however, international advice is not likely to prove very helpful in this instance unless there is a willingness to couple it with a measure of international responsibility in seeking the termination of the Vietnamese conflict. That willingness, I regret to say, is still conspicuously lacking. A willingness to attempt a concrete contribution to a solution of the Vietnamese problem is not present among the Geneva Conferees and it is not present in the Security Council.

The Soviet Union, which is a member of both, has been in the forefront of the nations which insist that a discontinuance of the bombing is an essential in the restoration of peace in Viet Nam. Indeed, we are advised—almost assured—that the cessation will lead to negotiations with North Viet Nam. If the Soviet Union is convinced that this is the course to peace, it would seem to me to be appropriate for that nation to put its conviction into a formal resolution and present it for consideration to the Security Council. Until that is done, eloquent pleas and statements calling for an end of the bombing, particularly as they come from members of the Security Council can hardly be regarded a contribution to peace or even as a fulfillment of elementary responsibilities under the Charter.

I would hope, therefore, that the Soviet Union or any other member of the Security Council for that matter, which is persuaded that an end to the bombing is the way to peace, would frame its conviction as a draft resolution and present it to the Council. In that way, the regular procedures of the Charter will be engaged. In that way, perhaps, a path to peace may yet be uncovered either inside the U.N. Security Council or through its initiatives, in some other forum.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Oct. 15, 1967]

U.S. BOMBING HALT SUGGESTED SINCE SEPTEMBER 21 BY 50 IN U.N.

(By Donald Grant)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., October 14.—Since Sept. 21, a total of 50 nations has suggested in the General Assembly that the United States should stop bombing North Vietnam, a tabulation of the general debate just concluded shows.

Last year, the suggestion was made by 28 nations in the general debate in the assembly.

Discussion of the war in Vietnam induced more nations than ever before to participate in the general debate this year. Out of a total UN membership of 122, 109 nations took part.

The United States was supported in its Vietnam policies without qualification by six nations. A dozen other nations gave the United States qualified support.

BIGGEST IN AFRICA

The greatest increase in the number of nations criticizing American policy in Vietnam was among the Africans. Last year, nine African nations criticized American policy in Vietnam; this year 20 nations from Africa offered such criticism, coupled with appeals to stop the bombing.

Two years ago, the representatives of 24 nations spoke in the general debate without mentioning Vietnam. Last year, the representatives of 16 nations spoke on other issues but were silent on Vietnam. This year, all but half a dozen or so mentioned Vietnam in one way or another.

Seven Western Hemisphere nations that supported the United States policy in Vietnam last year no longer give such support, the general debate showed. Two Western Hemisphere nations—Canada and Jamaica—are among those calling for an end to the bombing.

The relatively ardent supporters of American policy as shown by the general debate are Australia, New Zealand, Nationalist China, The Philippines, Thailand and Argentina.

QUALIFIED SUPPORT

Qualified support came from Iceland, Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Luxembourg, Britain, Belgium, Greece, Israel, Japan, Laos and Bolivia.

Nations asking for an end to the bombing, in the order that they spoke, were Denmark, Sweden, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Upper Volta, Senegal, Canada, Somalia, Kenya, France, Burundi, Indonesia, Albania, Egypt, Bulgaria, The Netherlands, Finland, Poland, Hungary, Norway, Ethiopia, Yugoslavia, Mongolia, Mauritania, India, Nepal, Kuwait, Tanzania, Chad, Jamaica, Romania, the Sudan, Cyprus, Mali, Morocco, Gabon, Algeria, Nigeria, Iraq, Cambodia, Yemen, Congo (Brazzaville), Ceylon, Camaroon, Togo, Syria, Rwanda and Cuba. The Ukraine and Byelorussia, Soviet republics, also were on the list.

Last year, Arthur J. Goldberg, the chief American delegate, attempted to answer the accumulated criticisms of American policy in the general debate with a statement of his own before the assembly. This year he did not do so.

SOME AMBIGUITY

Among nations giving nominal support to United States policy in Vietnam, there was often a degree of ambiguity in the debate. Latin American speakers tended to praise the efforts of Secretary General U Thant in seeking to bring the war in Vietnam to a halt—without stating directly that Thant's efforts had included a repeated call for a halt in the bombing.

Among the large powers, only Britain gave any support at all. Such praise for American policies as was offered by British Foreign Secretary George Brown later was repudiated by the British Labor party convention in Britain.

Cambodia was the most severe critic of United States policy in Vietnam.

WARMEST SUPPORTERS

The warmest defenses of United States policy were given by Australia and New Zealand.

Goldberg, speaking on the opening day of the debate, urged "the active participation of the United Nations in the quest for peace in Vietnam." Similar suggestions have been made in Congress.

After wide consultations, however, Goldberg concluded that the time was not ripe for seeking support in formal United Nations meetings, either of the General Assembly or the Security Council, in order to get resolutions adopted that would be favorable to American policy.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the United Nations resolution (S. Res. 180) be kept at the desk until 5 o'clock for further signatures, and that, in the meantime, the names of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] be added as cosponsors, which I think brings the total number to 40 or 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of 18 more Senators may be included as cosponsors of the U.N. resolution now at the desk, bringing the total number to 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 177)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 11th annual report on the trade agreements program. This report is required by section 402(a) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, covering calendar year 1966.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-six was another remarkable year for international trade. World trade during the year rose by 9.5 percent, bringing great benefits to all the nations of the free world. The United States shared fully in this growth. Our foreign trade set new records, adding to the strength of our economy and to the income and welfare of our people.

The United States played a major role during 1966 in efforts to improve conditions of world commerce and to stimulate the growth of trade. The drive to conclude the Kennedy round—the most ambitious multilateral attempt to reduce trade barriers ever undertaken—was the most important of these efforts. This negotiation was successfully concluded on June 30, 1967, and will pay dividends for every American and the entire free world.

We have had two decades of unprecedented growth in world trade which contributed greatly to the economic progress of this country and of our trading partners. We must maintain this momentum.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 25, 1967.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 13606) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 13606) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Township Committee of the Township of Randolph, County of Morris, State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation in connection with the selection and retirement of members of the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 2275. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Vallejo Samala (Rept. No. 682).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H.R. 8580. An act to convey certain land to the Squaxim Island Tribe of Indians (Rept. No. 683).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1752. A bill to amend the act prohibiting fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by vessels other than vessels of the United States and by persons in charge of such vessels (Rept. No. 684);

S. 1798. A bill to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended (Rept. No. 685); and

S. 2047. A bill to exempt certain vessels engaged in the fishing industry from the requirements of certain laws (Rept. No. 686).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1260. A bill to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (Public Law 845–81) (Rept. No. 687); and

S.J. Res. 106. A joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a survey of the coastal and fresh-water commercial fishery resources of the United States, its territories, and possessions (Rept. No. 688).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Howard J. Samuels, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

S. 2582. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act for 1967 to defer policemen and firemen from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRIFFIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 2583. A bill for the relief of John W. Harte, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2584. A bill for the relief of Ludger J. Cossette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2585. A bill for the relief of Kim Kap Rai; and

S. 2586. A bill for the relief of Kim Young Nam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2587. A bill for the relief of Dr. Roberto Garcia-Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 2588. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto Caburian DeVera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

OBSERVATION OF 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND

Mr. MONDALE (for himself and Mr. HART) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) to observe the 50th anniversary of the Republic of Finland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MONDALE, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

SENSE OF SENATE RESOLUTION SEEKING U.S. INITIATIVE TO ASSURE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. PELL, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. HART, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MORTON, Mr. CASE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. SPONG, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. TOWER, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. ANDERSON) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 180)—a sense-of-the-Senate resolution seeking U.S. initiative to assure United Nations Security Council consideration of Vietnam conflict, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

TOWARD MORE EFFECTIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, nothing is more important to our security—to our total defense system—than adequate protection against crime and fire.

Without such protection; our rights as citizens can soon become rather meaningless.

Policemen and firemen are our first line of defense. They are essential to the maintenance of law and order. We depend upon them not only for personal safety, but for the very survival of our society.

But today, Mr. President, domestic security is gravely threatened.

The civil disorders which ravaged some of the Nation's urban centers this summer have underscored a desperate need for more adequate police and fire protection.

In addition, the riots focused attention upon the increasing danger to which local police and firefighters are subjected.

Metropolitan police forces must contend not only with the serious acceleration of crime, but with outbursts of collective violence as well.

The Nation's response to the problem must be two-pronged. In the first instance, we should endeavor to cure the social and economic ills which breed frustration and disaffection. Second, we must insure that law enforcement agencies and fire departments are adequately staffed and trained to defend society.

In order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of these vital public services, Mr. President, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to defer policemen and firemen from the military draft.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2582) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to defer policemen and firemen from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. GRIFFIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, as I shall point out, such a step can be of great assistance in the effort to strengthen local law enforcement.

According to the Task Force Report on the Police, issued by the President's Crime Commission, approximately 420,000 persons are employed in the criminal justice field in the United States. In 1965, there existed a ratio of 1.7 police officers to every 1,000 citizens, as reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its "Uniform Crime Reports, 1965."

As the crime rate increases, particularly in urban areas, the role of the police and their responsibilities multiply and grow more complex.

Due to expanding population and attrition in present ranks, 50,000 new police officers will be needed in 1967 alone—"Task Force Report: The Police," President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, page 133. Yet police departments are notoriously unsuccessful in their attempts to recruit qualified candidates. Today it is commonplace to find departments well below authorized strength. The Municipal Yearbook for 1967 states as follows:

> Continuous recruitment of police candidates by a formal recruitment program prevails only in cities over 500,000.[1]

Resignations are a major drain on staff. This is indicated by table I, which I shall place in the RECORD following my remarks, along with other data compiled in the Municipal Yearbook of 1967.

The shortage of eligible manpower has become a chronic handicap to effective law enforcement. The problem is not so much the lack of applications as it is the lack of qualified aspirants. In 1961, a survey of 368 police departments showed that only 22.3 percent of all applicants were hired. The acceptance rate dropped from 29.9 percent recorded in 1956.

The Commission's Task Force Report on the Police sets forth several practical recommendations to make police work, as a career, more attractive to able young men.

But the immediate problem remains. The manpower deficiency is acute.

Other tables show more clearly than words what we are up against. By population group, city type, and geographic region, the cities reporting in table II indicate a cumulative lag in actual personnel. Table II illustrates that the widest gap between authorized strength and existing manpower is in the central city areas. Of 176 metropolitan police departments reporting, as against independent cities and suburbia, 3,879 personnel are claimed to be needed to meet specified enrollment. And it is precisely the urban metropolis where crime and violence are most prevalent.

The urban rate for robbery, for instance, was 88.6 per 100,000 inhabitants, as compared to a rate of 9.9 in rural communities. The urban rate of aggravated assault was more than double the rural rate. These figures are drawn from "Uniform Crime Reports, 1965," published by the FBI.

In the cities, the incidence of petty and serious crime is much greater than in outlying or nonurban areas. And one cannot, of course, omit from this alarming equation the occurrence and possible reoccurrence of mass rioting and looting, which thrust extra burdens upon undermanned local and State police forces.

The third table carries information on duty hours, salary, recruitment practices, expenditures, and other statistics of police departments in major U.S. cities. Particularly revealing is the column on authorized strength and needed personnel. Of 54 cities reporting with populations from 250,000 to over 1 million, only three departments were at authorized strength.

According to the 1967 Municipal Yearbook, Detroit, in my own State of Michigan, lacked 459 police officers. Apparently, the shortage varies only modestly from month to month. As of August 1, the Detroit Police Department needed 451 additional men. The impact of such a continuing deficiency can hardly be overstated.

The low acceptance rate compounds Detroit's problem of maintaining its force at or near authorized capacity, which is 4,855 men. Between the period January 1, 1967, and September 1, 1967, only 228 candidates were accepted out of 2,369 applications received.

Detroit Police Commissioner Ray

---

[1] The Municipal Yearbook, 1967, page 443.

Girardin, testifying before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures on March 8 on this year, explained the issue in these terms:

> Detroit and other major cities are facing a crisis in recruiting and retaining qualified officers.
>
> The situation will become critical in the 1970's when the many officers who were hired in the abundant postwar labor market of the late 1940's become eligible for retirement.[3]

Of 92 cities with populations from 100,000 to 250,000, table III records that only five of them were adequately staffed. In Michigan, this includes Dearborn, Grand Rapids, Lansing, and Warren, all of which were below full strength.

I have used these facts to elaborate the dilemma police departments are experiencing in maintaining and enrolling sufficient personnel. Right here in the Nation's Capital, vacancies on the police force rose to 369 in September, as against 350 recorded for August.

Undoubtedly, the danger and harassment to which firefighters are also increasingly subjected act as a deterrent to recruitment. Recent rioting starkly underlines the often unpredictable hazards of firefighting. Last year, the International Association of Firefighters issued a survey which showed that, out of 507 cities reporting across the Nation, there were 55 line-of-duty deaths per 100,000 firemen in 1965. This study revealed that the fatality rate for firemen was approximately 2½ times greater than the prevailing rate for policemen. The firemen's rate compares very unfavorably to the 7.2 on-the-job deaths registered per 100,000 civilian Federal employees—"International Fire Fighter," October–November 1966, pages 4 to 7.

The IAFF Department of Education and Research also reported that out of 24 national occupations, injuries per 1 million man-hours of exposure in the firefighting service were exceeded only by marine cargo handling in 1965. In cities with populations above 300,000, firefighters averaged 74.5 injuries. Nationally, the police injury frequency rate was also comparatively high at 33.7.

In 1965 alone, 2,400,000 fires killed 12,000 men, women, and children. Economic loss was valued at $1.5 billion.

On August 30 of this year, Albert E. Albertoni, secretary-treasurer of the International Association of Firefighters, testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that 418 firemen had been injured and four killed during the riots inflaming eight cities this summer. During the violence firemen were often confronted by sniper fire and open hostility on the part of the local populations and rioters.

In view of these alarming trends, and the critical nature of police work and fire control, every possible effort must be exerted to spur recruitment and retention of competent men in these two hazardous fields.

We cannot afford to be remiss in this vital public service, which most directly affects the health and safety of our citizens.

Much depends upon the initiative of local and State authorities in applying the many recommendations of the President's Crime Commission and other studies. But the Federal Government, within its limited jurisdiction, can play a role in helping State and local governments to solve its manpower problem.

Accordingly, I advocate that policemen and firemen, employed full-time or otherwise pursuing requisite training, be deferred by statute from the military draft.

At the present time, policemen and firemen are drafted or deferred on a "hit and miss" basis, depending upon the attitude of local draft boards.

Neither of these occupations is recommended for deferment in the current list of "Essential Activities and Critical Occupations," which is dispatched by the Federal Government to every local draft board for guidance. This list includes such civilian specialties as chemist, astronomer, foreman, patternmaker, and tool-and-die maker. It is not mandatory for draft boards to defer automatically those in the categories enumerated. However, spokesmen at the Nation's headquarters of the Selective Service System indicate they are reasonably certain that local boards generally apply the list routinely.

Nonetheless, there are no figures available to substantiate the extent to which the list is actually applied. It appears that there is no feedback of data, from local and State boards, which would indicate in detail to what extent local authorities are implementing the list, and precisely what kinds of occupational deferments are being granted, and how many.

Presently, the Inter-Agency Advisory Committee on Essential Activities and Critical Occupations is reviewing the list, under the auspices of the National Security Council. The existing list, it should be noted, has not been altered significantly since 1962, although one amendment was issued in March 1965. The committee has nevertheless held regular monthly meetings since 1962, subjecting the deferred occupations to reexamination.

It is apparently true that local boards generally respond affirmatively to written representations from local police departments when it is claimed that a certain officer is indispensable. However, there are no national figures to indicate how many seasoned policemen and firemen have been drafted. Furthermore, it is clear that the draft system seriously restricts the ability of police agencies in their efforts to recruit potentially qualified men.

Most police departments do not hire anyone under 21 years of age. This puts the police at a disadvantage. Those persons not attending college generally determine employment or career direction before they reach 21. And under present pay standards, university graduates simply do not embark upon careers with the police.

Under the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, the Government is to begin drafting the youngest eligibles first. It seems to me that such a policy will further inhibit police recruitment, at a time when forces across the country are already dangerously understaffed.

Since 1962, draft boards have been deferring essentially the same occupational categories, if the recommended list is taken as evidence. The list, in effect was compiled on the basis of crucial national need in relation to available—or unavailable—skills. Inasmuch as the list has not undergone alteration since 1962, except for one addition—programer, engineering, and scientific—and one change—substituting scientific linguist for structural linguist—one can easily, though perhaps erroneously, infer that our needs and our lack of manpower to meet those needs have remained constant.

Despite the fact that police vacancies constitute an ominous and universal deficiency, police work is not classified as critical. And despite the increasing threat to personal safety and property, the enormous rise in crime and violence, police and fire protection are not classified as essential. Such blatant anomalies in administrative practice cry out for statutory correction.

I understand that Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, has recommended that the Inter-Agency Advisory Committee consider the inclusion of firemen and policemen on the forthcoming revised list of Essential Activities and Critical Occupations. But even if the committee determines to add firemen and policemen to the list, there is no guarantee that such inclusion will form a sufficient inducement to higher enrollment, or that the inclusion will be enforced uniformly.

The Selective Service System continues to argue against rigid exemptions which, it is claimed, remove the flexibility now exercised by local draft boards. But I insist, to the contrary, that the absence of nationally applicable standards has riddled the system with contradictions and inconsistencies which, manifestly, have helped to produce widespread controversy about our military draft policy.

It has also been suggested that mandatory deferment of firemen and policemen would create an artificial and undesirable surplus of personnel. Logically, this is impossible. For under a mandatory exemption, police and fire departments reaching full strength will not recruit beyond normal turnover demands.

Nor can it be inferred, as some have done, that a statutory exemption will interfere with police qualification standards, which are justifiably high. The fear that police departments might become havens for draft dodgers is baseless.

The only relevant question is this: Should police and firefighters be placed in a privileged draft exempt status not accorded to other essential employment, public or private?

The answer is that nothing is more important to our internal security than adequate protection against crime and fire. We cannot afford to bargain with the physical safety and well-being of our citizens.

To be secure in one's person is essential to the functioning of a free society. Yet today, the threat to life and property, particularly in urban areas, is already critical. The confidence of the people in the capacity of their government to provide basic protection is eroding at a fast clip.

---

[3] "Controlling Crime Through More Effective Law Enforcement." Hearings before the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, Senate Judiciary Committee, 1967.

Crime statistics reveal the true dimension of the problem. Since 1960, crime has risen by 62 percent compared to a population increase of only 9 percent. In the first 6 months of this year, crime went up by 17 percent nationally over the rate recorded for 1966.

Law enforcement is our first line of defense. It is indispensable to the full enjoyment of citizens' rights. But with each passing month, there is fresh evidence of our inability, as a society, to provide law-abiding Americans with the basic defense against crime to which they are entitled.

The frightening acceleration of lawlessness and violence will persist unless we are willing to heed the warning signals and equip responsible authorities with the means to cope with the problem.

I seriously doubt whether the mere inclusion of the police and firefighting professions on the list of essential activities and critical occupations will have much impact at this point. The list has been revised only once since its first appearance in 1962, which suggests that the skilled trades recommended for deferment on the list did not automatically encourage greater career pursuit.

Moreover, other than information supplied by public employment offices, the precise effect of the list, in helping to meet the demand for certain critical skills, is impossible to calculate.

The unpredictability of the foregoing proposal leaves us with only one alternative. The Nation cannot meet the needs of domestic security by relying on suppositions and half-measures which carry no real assurance of closing the manpower gap. Right now the adequacy of police protection is in question, in part because police departments are woefully undermanned.

Congress can take action to upgrade the status of police and fire personnel and provide an incentive for the recruitment of qualified applicants.

The bill I am sponsoring will help attain this objective.

I am convinced that the crucial responsibilities borne by such personnel, and the crisis we face in reducing the manpower shortage, impels such action.

The President's Crime Commission and other studies have pointed to additional steps which should be undertaken to attract young men to police work as a career. By itself, statutory deferment will not solve the continuing predicament of understaffed police forces. But it is an essential part of our national effort to mount a meaningful attack on crime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill which I introduce be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2582

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (f) of section 6 of the Military Selective Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 456(f), is amended by striking out "The Vice President" at the beginning of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) The Vice President"; and by adding at the end thereof two new paragraphs as follows:

"(2) Police officers of the States, territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and of the subdivisions of the States, shall, while employed in such positions on a regular full-time basis, or while pursuing an authorized and official course of training or education in law enforcement, be deferred from training and service under this title in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"(3) Firemen of the States, territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and of the subdivisions of the States, shall, while employed in such positions on a regular full-time basis or while pursuing an authorized and official course of training or education in firefighting, be deferred from training and service under this title in the Armed Forces of the United States."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, also, I ask unanimous consent that certain tables referred to during my remarks, drawn from the Municipal Yearbook of 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICE DEPARTMENT STATISTICS

TABLE 1.—REASONS FOR LOSS OF POLICE PERSONNEL

Population group	Number of cities reporting	Total loss	Death		Retirement		Disability		Resignation	
			Number of men	Percent of total	Number of men	Percent of total	Number of men	Percent of total	Number of men	Percent of total
Over 500,000	19	1,914	133	7	594	31	195	10	992	52
250,000 to 500,000	23	731	36	5	185	25	52	7	458	63
100,000 to 250,000	67	1,044	46	4	164	16	28	3	806	77
50,000 to 100,000	146	1,137	34	3	177	16	56	5	870	76
25,000 to 50,000	206	989	26	3	127	13	30	3	806	81
10,000 to 25,000	375	1,205	28	2	107	9	28	2	1,042	87
Total	836	7,020	303	4	1,354	19	389	6	4,974	71

TABLE 2.—POLICE PERSONNEL NEEDED TO REACH AUTHORIZED STRENGTH

	Number of cities reporting	Personnel needed to reach authorized strength	Patrol		Traffic		Detective		Juvenile		Identification and records		Other [3]	
			Number [1]	Percent [2]	Number [1]	Percent [2]	Number [1]	Percent [2]	Number [1]	Percent [2]	Number [1]	Percent [2]	Number [1]	Percent [2]
Population group:														
Over 500,000	17	1,632	1,206	74	109	7	128	8	49	3	19	2	121	7
250,000 to 500,000	24	696	532	76	74	11	43	6	14	2	11	2	22	3
100,000 to 250,000	80	1,239	907	73	156	13	105	8	26	2	17	1	28	3
50,000 to 100,000	128	908	683	75	87	10	58	6	15	2	13	1	52	6
25,000 to 50,000	155	744	559	75	86	12	42	6	28	4	9	1	20	2
10,000 to 25,000	211	631	470	74	51	8	48	8	14	2	18	3	30	4
Total	615	5,850	4,357	74	563	10	424	7	146	2	87	1	273	5
City type:														
Central city	176	3,879	2,911	75	354	9	289	7	86	2	47	1	192	5
Independent city	208	827	611	74	94	11	57	7	28	3	16	2	21	2
Suburb	231	1,144	835	73	115	10	78	7	32	3	24	2	60	5
Total	615	5,850	4,357	74	563	10	424	7	146	2	87	1	273	5
Geographic regions:														
Northeast	122	1,269	1,033	81	61	5	56	4	33	3	25	2	61	5
North-central	215	1,635	1,235	76	159	10	102	6	30	2	21	1	88	5
South	157	2,072	1,436	69	276	13	189	9	47	2	24	1	100	5
West	121	874	653	75	67	8	77	9	36	4	17	2	24	3
Total	615	5,850	4,357	74	563	10	424	7	146	2	87	1	273	5

[1] Number of men needed to reach authorized strength for each function.

[2] Percentage of total personnel needed to reach authorized strength; percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

[3] Includes training, communications, marine, community relations, maintenance, and general Administration.

TABLE 3.—POLICE DEPARTMENT DATA FOR CITIES OVER 10,000

FIREARMS CONTROL

[Data in this section concern only firearms defined as "any pistol, revolver, sawed-off shotgun, or other firearm of a size which may be concealed upon a person"]

Legal Authority

None—City has no legal authority to control the sale and possession of firearms.
Y—City has legal authority to control the sale and possession of firearms.

Source of Legal Authority

1—State law.
2—City law.
3—Both State and city law

Permits

Y—Yes.
N—No.

Registration

Y—Yes.
N—No.

Police-Community Relations Program

[Data in this section concern police-department-initiated program designed to offer an opportunity for police and other public and private agencies and individuals in the community to discover their common problems, ambitions, and responsibilities and to work together toward the solution of community problems. Major emphasis is that police are part of and not apart from the community]

None—City does not have such a program.
Y—City does have a police-community relations program.

Citizen complaints

Special board

Y—City has special board which handles citizen complaints against police officers.

N—City does not have a special board.

Investigative powers

Y—Special board has investigative powers.
N—Special board does not have investigative powers.

City	Employees		Duty hours per week	Salary of patrolmen—Entrance, maximum	Below authorized strength, number of men needed	Recruitment practices			Firearms control—Legal authority, source permits to purchase, registration	Citizen complaints—Special board, investigative powers	Police community relations program, year created	Police department expenditures, 1966 (in thousands)	
	Total	Civilian				Frequency, area covered	Methods	Residence policy				Salaries and wages	Total for department
Over 1,000,000:													
Chicago, Ill	12,378	1,478	40	$6,792–$8,316	N	1–2	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11	3	Y–2–Y–N	Y–	Y–65	$95,192	$103,396
Detroit, Mich	4,827	520	40	7,424– 8,335	Y–459	1–3	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	2	Y–1–Y–Y	Y–Y	Y–56	37,104	38,682
Houston, Tex	1,605	260	40	6,097– 6,695	Y–767	1–4	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11	N	Y–1–N–N	N	None	9,248	10,613
Los Angeles, Calif	6,620	1,445	42	7,692– 9,060	Y–167	1–5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11	N	Y–1–Y–N	Y–Y	Y–50	57,957	61,644
New York City, N.Y	27,749	1,900	40	7,032– 8,483	Y–479	1–4	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	N	Y–3–Y–Y	Y–Y	Y–66	269,348	281,605
Philadelphia, Pa	7,268	597	42	6,395– 6,879	Y–298	1–1	1, 3, 8, 10, 11, 12	1	Y–3–N–Y	Y–N	Y–55	50,350	52,700
500,000 to 1,000,000:													
Atlanta, Ga	858	123	44	4,836– 5,967	Y–50	1–5	1,4,5,8,11	N	Y–3–N–N	N	None	5,365	6,431
Baltimore, Md	3,185	288	44	5,604– 6,780	Y–391	1–4	1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	N	Y–1–Y–N	Y–N	Y–58	22,223	24,306
Boston, Mass	2,674	196	40	5,803– 7,306	Y–70	–1	12	N	Y–1–Y–N	Y–Y	Y–66	20,050	21,383
Buffalo, N.Y	1,514	202	40	5,200– 6,500	Y–17	6–2	....	N	None	Y–Y	Y–62	10,055	10,678
Cleveland, Ohio	2,375	342	40	6,078– 7,482	Y–740	1–2	1,3,4,7,8,10,11,12	N	Y–2–Y–N	N	None	16,057	....
Columbus, Ohio	829	138	40	5,967– 7,436	Y–76	–5	1,3,4,5,7,8,10,11,12	N	Y–2–Y–N	N	....	6,122	....
Dallas, Tex	1,381	205	40	5,904– 6,516	Y–110	1–3	1,3,4,5,6,8,10,11,12	N	None	Y–Y	None	10,511	....
Denver, Colo	974	153	40	5,700– 7,056	N	3–5	1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11	1	Y–3–N–N	Y–N	Y–65	6,614	8,376
Indianapolis, Ind	1,056	148	42	5,825– 6,325	Y–40	1–2	1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11	N	Y–1–N–N	N	Y–66	6,504	7,226
Kansas City, Mo	1,171	256	40	5,520– 7,044	Y–10	1–4	1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11	2	Y–1–N–N	Y–N	Y–56	7,453	8,550
Memphis, Tenn	1,031	197	40	5,325– 6,420	Y–110	1–2	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11	N	Y–3–Y–N	Y–Y	None	6,219	6,912
Milwaukee, Wis	2,055	232	40	6,363– 7,620	Y–90	1–3	1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12	2	None	N	....	16,165	17,519
New Orleans, La	1,163	129	40	6,267– 7,120	Y–319	1–5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	N	Y–2–Y	....	Y–66	7,899	9,009
Phoenix, Ariz	800	129	40	6,024– 7,392	Y–33	1–5	1,3,4 ,5 ,6 ,8 ,11	3	None	N	Y–66	5,463	6,777
Pittsburgh, Pa	1,619	31	40	5,963– 6,900	Y–30	1	1	1	None	N	None	11,912	12,516
St. Louis, Mo	2,626	591	40	6,110– 7,670	Y–197	1–4	1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12	N	Y–3–N–Y	N	Y–55	17,608	20,795
San Antonio, Tex	810	115	40	4,485– 5,820	Y–90	6–3	1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11	4	None	Y–Y	None	4,603	5,529
San Diego, Calif	884	145	40	7,578– 8,988	Y–37	1–4	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11	N	Y–1–N–N	N	Y–63	7,395	8,169
San Francisco, Calif	2,031	254	40	8,220– 8,820	Y–23	1–3	1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11	N	Y–3–Y–N	Y–Y	Y	17,589	18,389
Seattle, Wash	1,170	148	40	7,470– 8,040	Y–25	1–3	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11	N	None	N	Y–65	8,100	9,592
Washington, D.C	3,102	282	42	6,700– 8,400	Y–280	1–5	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12	N	Y–2–Y–N	Y–N	Y–64	27,729	29,627
520,000 to 500,000:													
Akron, Ohio	310	20	42	6,552–7,488	Y–12	6–2	1,3,4,5,8,10,11	1	Y–2–N–N	N	None	2,276	2,467
Birmingham, Ala	541	57	40	5,340– 6,468	Y–13	6–2	1,3	1	Y–3–Y–N	N	None	3,377	3,845
Cincinnati, Ohio	967	101	40	6,965– 7,921	Y–45	4–2	1,3,4,5,8,10,11	3	None	N	Y–66	7,041	7,667
Dayton, Ohio	446	57	40	6,864– 7,977	Y–22	1–2	1,3,4,5,6,8,10,11,12	N	None	N	None	3,573	3,949
El Paso, Tex	434	73	40	4,824– 5,964	Y–21	6–4	1,3,4,7,8,10,11	4	None	Y–Y	None	....	2,505
Fort Worth, Tex	578	70	40	6,120– 6,120	Y–51	1–2	1,2,4,5,7,8,11,12	N	None	Y–Y	Y–45	....	4,459
Honolulu, Hawaii	1,008	125	40	6,048– 7,716	Y–20	6–3	1,3,4,5,7,8,10,11,12	N	Y–1–Y–Y	N	Y–48		....
Jersey City, N.J	915	88	40	7,012– 7,512	N	6–1	1,4,5,11	1	Y–1–Y–N	N	None		
Long Beach, Calif	724	111	40	7,458– 8,976	Y–31	–2	1,4,6,8,11	3	Y–1–N–N	N	None	6,202	6,856
Louisville, Ky	648	109	40	5,380– 6,179	Y–7	1–2	1,3,5,10,11	N	Y– – –N	N	None	3,853	4,412
Miami, Fla	854	235	40	6,000– 6,888	Y–50	6–5	1,3,4,5,7,10,11	N	Y–3–Y–N	Y–Y	None	5,252	6,222
Minneapolis, Minn	775	69	40	6,768– 7,524	Y–36	6–3	1,3,4,5,9,10,11	2	None	N	None	5,877	6,519
Nashville, Tenn	631	110	40	4,680– 5,832	Y–16	6–1	1,5,11	1	Y–3–Y–Y	N	None	4,005	4,770
Newark, N.J	1,668	274	40	6,551– 7,602	Y–37	3–1	1,6,8,10,11	1	Y– –Y–N	N	Y–66	11,896	13,962
Norfolk, Va	484	45	40	5,112– 6,420	Y–8	2–2	1,4,5,8,11	4	Y–3–Y–N	Y–Y	None	3,718	3,859
Oakland, Calif	860	205	40	8,232– 8,772	Y–34	1–5	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	N	Y–1–N–N	N	Y–64	7,222	8,161
Oklahoma City, Okla	458	49	44	5,250– 5,700	Y–67	1–4	1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11	4	Y–3–Y–N	N	Y–65	2,338	2,600
Omaha, Nebr	472	55	40	5,640– 6,900	Y–49	6–1	1, 8	1	Y–2–Y–Y	N	Y–66	3,056	3,392
Portland, Oreg	835	139	40	6,968– 7,696	Y–14	1–4	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	N	Y–3–N–N	N	Y–47	5,277	6,635
Rochester, N.Y	597	76	40	6,123– 7,319	Y–34	6–2	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12	N	Y–1–N–Y	Y–Y	Y–66	4,491	4,794
Sacramento, Calif	490	81	40	7,740– 9,420	Y–4	6–5	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11	3	Y–1–Y–N	N	Y–65	3,649	4,058
St. Paul, Minn	460	60	40	6,486– 7,626	....	–4	1, 3, 4, 5, 11	N	....	Y–Y	None	3,554	3,823
San Jose, Calif	380	31	40	7,848– 9,312	Y–8	–3	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11	N	Y–1–N–N	N	Y–66	3,461	3,901
Tampa, Fla	622	146	40	5,136– 5,952	Y–50	1–5	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11,12	N	None	N	None	3,283	3,830
Toledo, Ohio	622	40	40	6,660– 7,740	Y–21	–2	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11	1	Y– –N–	N	Y–	4,236	4,689
Tulsa, Okla	366	57	40	4,296– 5,808	Y–30	4–3	1, 6, 11	N	N–	N	None	1,790	2,080
Wichita, Kans	398	83	40	5,502– 6,540	Y–34	1–4	1,3,4,5,6,10,11	3	N– – –N	Y–Y	Y–	2,367	2,803
100,000 to 250,000													
Abilene, Tex	132	21	40	4,800– 5,280	Y–2	6–3	1,3,10,11	1	N	N	None	660	814
Albuquerque, N. Mex	328	42	40	5,408– 6,490	Y–44	1–4	1,3,4,5,6,8,10,11	----	N	N	None	2,093	2,355
Alexandria, Va	172	27	40	5,900– 7,535	Y–15	1–4	1,4,5,11	N	Y–2–Y–N	Y–Y	None	1,559	1,745
Allentown, Pa	178	26	44	5,150– 6,150	Y–1	6–2	1,10,11	2	Y–1–N–Y	N	Y–63	907	1,057
Amarillo, Tex	214	39	40	5,040– 5,280	Y–8	6–4	1,3,4,5,8,10,11	4	Y–1–N	N	None	963	1,222
Anaheim, Calif	263	48	40	7,356– 8,940	Y–2	5–2	1,8,11	N	N	N	Y–64	2,658	3,060
Arlington, Va	227	28	40	6,052– 7,737	Y–6	4–4	1,4,5,10,11	N	Y–1– –N	N	None	1,784	2,136
Austin, Tex	245	97	40	4,872– 5,220	Y–25	1–2	1,3,4,5,8,10,11	4	N	Y–Y	None	1,838	2,194
Baton Rouge, La	298	42	40	4,860– 5,700	Y–37	6–3	1,2,3,6,9,10,11	N	N	N	None	1,803	2,136
Beaumont, Tex	165	18	40	5,460– 5,460	Y–30	1–2	1,4,5,6,7,8,11	4	N	N	None	812	969
Berkeley, Calif	172	12	40	8,469– 9,317	Y–1	1–3	1,3,4,5,8,10,11,12	N	N	N	Y–65	1,579	1,955
Bridgeport, Conn	382	14	40	5,208– 6,108	Y–70	6–1	1,4,11	1	Y–3–Y–N	N	Y–61	2,414	2,803
Cambridge, Mass	240	10	40	5,800– 6,958	N	1–1	1	1	Y–1–Y–N	N	Y–63	1,785	1,858
Camden, N.J	251	17	42	5,250– 6,425	Y–24	6–1	1,8,10,11,12	1	Y–1–Y–N	N	....	1,662	1,944
Canton, Ohio	176	13	40	5,750– 6,800	Y–4	5–2	1, 5, 7, 10, 11	N	Y–2–Y–N	N	None	1,076	1,272
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	139	23	40	5,580– 6,180	Y–10	6–3	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11	4	N	N	None	808	973
Charlotte, N.C	396	43	40	5,400– 6,600	Y–15	1–5	1, 3, 10, 11	N	Y–1–N–N	N	....	2,682	3,011
Chattanooga, Tenn	236	28	44	4,680– 5,600	Y–8	6–1	5, 11	4	Y–1–N–N	N	None	1,104	1,390
Columbia, S.C	173	14	44	4,706– 5,603	Y–18	1–3	1, 8, 11	N	Y–1–N–N	N	None	914	1,118
Columbus, Ga	206	14	48	4,874– 5,908	Y–26	......	7, 11	N	Y–2–Y–N	N	None	1,132	1,352
Corpus Christi, Tex	262	28	40	5,130– 5,424	Y–3	6–3	1, 3, 5, 10, 11	4	N	Y–Y	None	1,447	1,684
Dearborn, Mich	200	23	40	6,912– 7,838	Y–23	6–2	1, 5, 8, 11	2	Y–1–Y–Y	N	None	1,568	1,615
Des Moines, Iowa	269	29	40	6,107– 7,047	Y–19	4–3	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11	4	N	N	Y–66	1,761	2,157

TABLE 3.—POLICE DEPARTMENT DATA FOR CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

FIREARMS CONTROL—Continued

City	Employees		Duty hours per week	Salary of patrolmen—Entrance, maximum	Below authorized strength, number of men needed	Recruitment practices		Residence policy	Firearms control—Legal authority, source permits to purchase, registration	Citizen complaints—Special board, investigative powers	Police community relations program, year created	Police department expenditures, 1966 (in thousands)	
	Total	Civilian				Frequency, area covered	Methods					Salaries and wages	Total for department
100,000 to 250,000—Continued													
Duluth, Minn.	129	13	40	$5,673–$6,672	Y-8	5-1	1, 3, 10, 11	1	N	N	None	$855	$944
Elizabeth, N.J.	287	17	40	6,250– 6,850	Y-15	6-1	1, 8, 11, 12	1	Y-1-Y-N	N	Y-66	2,273	2,440
Erie, Pa.	208	27	40	4,845– 7,800	Y-6	6-1	1	1	Y-3-Y-N	N	Y-66	1,110	1,355
Evansville, Ind.	236	0	40	5,200– 6,100	Y-8	0-2	1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 11	1	Y-1-N-Y	N	None	1,404	1,475
Flint, Mich.	384	53	40	6,301– 7,371	Y-2	6-5	1,2,5,11,12	N	Y-3-Y-N	Y-Y	Y-66	3,131	3,492
Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	327	76	40	5,284– 7,364	Y-17	1-5	1,4,5,6,8,11	N	None	Y-Y	Y-59	1,791	2,091
Fort Wayne, Ind.	257	14	40	....	Y-11	1-2	1,3,4,5,10,11	4	Y-1-Y-N	N	Y-64	....	....
Fresno, Calif.	290	39	40	7,140– 8,688	Y-1	3	3,5,7,11	2	Y-3-Y-Y	N	Y-65	2,484	2,883
Garden Grove, Calif.	144	25	40	7,228– 8,580	Y-2	6-4	1,4,5,11	N	None	N	None	1,420	1,613
Gary, Ind.	306	39	40	7,020– 7,020	Y-9	3-1	1,8,10	1	Y-1-N-N	N	None	1,965	2,183
Glendale, Calif.	174	41	40	7,260– 8,736	Y-10	1-1	1,4,5,11	1	Y-1-N-Y	N	None	1,545	1,795
Grand Rapids, Mich.	260	44	40	6,058– 6,864	Y-33	1-3	1,3,4,5,8,10,11,12	N	Y-1-Y-N	N	None	1,726	2,032
Greensboro, N.C.	244	25	42	5,292– 7,116	Y-22	1-4	1,3,4,5,6,8,10,11,12	3	None	....	None	1,461	1,797
Hammond, Ind.	184	15	40	6,480– 6,900	Y-3	1-1	8,10,11	1	Y-1-N-Y	N	None	1,283	1,477
Hampton, Va.	117	19	40	5,300– 6,100	Y-18	-4	1, 11	N	None	N	None	729	858
Hartford, Conn.	388	5	40	6,091– 7,124	Y-30	4-4	1,3,4,8	N	Y-1-N-N	Y-	None	2,989	3,162
Huntsville, Ala.	230	55	46	5,225– 5,650	Y-2	1-5	1,3,11	N	Y-3-N-Y	N	None	1,226	1,559
Jackson, Miss.	309	53	40	5,634– 6,072	Y-20	1-1	5,11	1	None	N	None	2,193	2,444
Jacksonville, Fla.	477	85	40	5,343– 5,646	Y-15	6-3	1,4,10,11	N	Y-2-Y-N	N	....	3,127	3,592
Kansas City, Kans.	240	18	48	3,360– 6,600	Y-21	1-2	1,11	2	Y-2-Y-	Y-Y	Y-66	1,530	1,805
Knoxville, Tenn.	276	54	48	4,410– 5,400	Y-47	4-1	1,8,11	1	Y-1-Y-N	N	Y-65	1,560	1,972
Lansing, Mich.	222	41	40	6,742– 7,414	Y-5	3-2	1,4,5,11,12	3	Y-3-Y-N	N	None	1,494	1,738
Las Vegas, Nev.	308	60	40	6,288– 7,956	Y-8	1-4	1,4,5,6,11,12	N	Y-2-N-N	Y-Y	Y-61	2,389	3,104
Lincoln, Nebr.	184	30	40	5,412– 6,108	Y-4	6-2	1,5,6,10,11	3	Y-3-N-N	N	None	962	1,112
Little Rock, Ark.	187	25	40	4,860– 5,580	Y-17	1-3	1,4,5,6,11,12	3	None	N	Y-63	933	1,114
Lubbock, Tex.	208	17	40	5,004– 5,736	Y-3	6-4	1,3,5,6,7,8,11	N	None	N	None	1,018	1,281
Macon, Ga.	165	3	48	5,202– 5,820	Y-3	6-3	1,3,6,10,12	3	None	N	Y-65	892	995
Madison, Wis.	248	50	40	6,192– 7,104	Y-18	6-5	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11	2	Y-3-N-N	Y-Y	Y-55	1,938	2,229
Mobile, Ala.	331	79	40	4,296– 5,364	Y-42	1-2	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11	2	Y-3-Y-N	N	None	1,766	2,086
Montgomery, Ala.	236	46	40	4,320– 5,760	N	6-3	1, 8, 11	N	None	N	Y-63	1,357	1,545
New Haven, Conn.	409	....	40	6,490– 6,890	Y-19	6-2	1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12	N	Y-1-Y-N	Y-	Y-59	2,814	3,066
Newport News, Va.	147	10	40	5,112– 6,744	Y-13	1-4	1, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12	N	Y-2-Y-N	N	None	954	1,090
Niagara Falls, N.Y.	182	20	40	5,787– 6,510	Y-3	....	....	....	None	N	None	1,431	1,526
Paterson, N.J.	360	28	40	....	N	6-1	1, 4, 10, 11	1	Y-1-Y-Y	Y	Y-	....	....
Peoria, Ill.	173	23	40	6,084– 7,046	Y-16	2-1	1, 3, 6, 10, 11	1	Y-2-N-Y	....	....	1,386	1,678
Portsmouth, Va.	173	12	40	4,920– 6,060	Y-27	1-1	1, 11	1	Y-2-Y-N	....	None	1,048	1,203
Providence, R.I.	511	70	40	....	Y-45	1-2	1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12	4	....	....	....	....	....
Raleigh, N.C.	184	17	42	5,280– 6,144	Y-10	1-3	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12.	2	N-	N	None	992	1,201
Richmond, Va.	459	34	44	5,330– 6,864	Y-18	1-4	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.	N	Y-3-Y-N	N	None	3,202	3,701
Riverside, Calif.	179	37	40	7,194– 8,532	Y-9	6-3	1 4, 5, 8, 11	N	Y-1-Y-N	N	None	1,346	1,614
Roanoke, Va.	143	7	40	4,920– 6,168	Y-12	....	1, 5, 6, 11	3	None	....	Y-58	930	1,039
Rockford, Ill.	191	25	40	6,074– 7,238	Y-16	1-4	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12	N	None	Y-N	None	1,256	1,416
St. Petersburg, Fla.	334	79	40	5,265– 6,214	Y-21	6-5	1, 4, 5, 11, 12	N	None	N	....	1,902	2,265
San Bernardino, Calif.	207	46	40	7,344– 8,688	Y-4	1-2	1, 8, 11	2	Y-1-N-N	Y-N	Y-55	1,587	1,789
Santa Ana, Calif.	202	....	40	7,620– 8,940	Y-24	1-5	1, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12	N	Y-1-N-N	N	Y-55	1,763	2,249
Savannah, Ga.	212	35	48	4,500– 5,592	Y-7	1-5	1,2,4	N	Y-2-N-N	N	Y-66	1,019	1,391
Scranton, Pa.	188	14	40	....	N	6-1	1	1	Y- -Y-N	N	None	....	....
Shreveport, La.	303	55	48	4,284– 4,728	Y-52	1-3	1,11	4	None	N	None	1,339	1,738
South Bend, Ind.	205	11	40	5,700– 6,732	Y-10	-1	1,5,11	N	Y-1-Y-N	N	Y-	1,433	1,614
Spokane, Wash.	262	31	40	5,585– 6,420	Y-2	6-5	1,4,10,11	N	None	N	None	1,651	2,088
Springfield, Mass.	351	23	40	5,928– 6,864	Y-20	6-1	1,10,11	1	Y-1-Y-N	Y-Y	Y-65	2,555	2,678
Springfield, Mo.	126	6	48	4,560– 5,544	Y-4	1-3	1,6,11	4	None	N	None	677	821
Stamford, Conn.	211	9	40	5,950– 6,850	Y-22	1-1	1,10,11	1	Y-3-N-N	Y-Y	Y-65	1,515	1,679
Syracuse, N.Y.	470	61	40	5,400– 6,915	Y-8	6-2	1,4,5,6,8,9,10,11,12	N	None	N	Y-63	3,167	3,383
Tacoma, Wash.	247	23	40	6,600– 7,740	Y-3	6-5	1,5,6,10,11	N	Y-3-Y-N	N	None	2,075	2,474
Topeka, Kans.	165	25	40	5,040– 5,940	....	1-2	1,7,11	2	None	N	None	931	1,104
Torrance, Calif.	187	33	40	8,148– 8,976	Y-5	6-5	1, 5, 11	3	Y-1-N-N	Y-Y	Y-64	1,736	1,925
Tucson, Ariz.	348	80	40	5,880– 6,900	Y-25	1-5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	N	None	N	Y-63	2,290	2,779
Upper Darby Township, Pa.	168	29	42	5,650– 6,200	N	6-1	1, 11	1	None	N	None	880	1,804
Utica, N.Y.	184	8	40	5,000– 5,750	Y-6	4-2	1, 3, 4, 10, 11	N	Y-1-N-	....	....	1,113	1,203
Virginia Beach, Va.	147	11	40	4,896– 6,144	Y-9	6-1	1, 11	2	....	N	None	816	1,048
Waco, Tex.	120	33	40	4,980– 5,100	Y-18	1-2	1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11	2	None	N	None	685	798
Warren, Mich.	172	23	40	7,273– 8,000	Y-42	3-1	1, 4, 6, 11, 12	1	Y-3-Y-Y	Y-Y	None	1,329	1,587
Waterbury, Conn.	234	6	40	....	Y-10	6-2	1, 6	2	Y-1	N	None	....	....
Wichita Falls, Tex.	130	19	40	5,184– 5,940	Y-7	6-2	1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11	4	None	N	None	682	843
Winston-Salem, N.C.	216	21	42	5,580– 6,780	Y-22	1-2	1, 5, 6, 8, 11	N	None	N	Y-66	1,322	1,653
Worcester, Mass.	420	50	40	5,865– 6,864	Y-13	5-1	1	1	Y-1-Y-N	N	None	2,715	3,168
Yonkers, N.Y.	481	40	40	6,000– 8,210	Y-7	4-2	1, 5, 11	N	Y-1-Y-Y	N	None	3,903	4,081
Youngstown, Ohio	316	25	40	5,754– 6,330	Y-5	5-1	1, 11	1	None	N	None	1,896	2,033
50,000 to 100,000:													
Abington Township, Pa.	68	2	42	5,850– 6,770	N	6-2	1,4,8,11	1	Y-1-N-N	N	Y-63	443	520
Alameda, Calif.	81	7	40	7,920– 8,724	N	5-2	1,5,8,11,12	N	Y-1-N-N	Y-Y	None	729	788
Alhambra, Calif.	103	18	40	7,464– 8,856	N	-2	1,5,8,11	N	Y-1-N-N	N	None	820	937
Altoona, Pa.	104	12	40	4,500– 5,200	N	6-1	1,9,10,11	1	Y-3-Y-N	N	....	459	562
Anderson, Ind.	124	17	40	5,550– 5,750	N	6-2	1,5,10,11	4	Y-1-N-N	Y-Y	None	693	850
Ann Arbor, Mich.	90	24	40	6,266– 7,150	Y-12	1-4	1,4,5,6,8,10,11	N	Y-1-Y-	....	....	855	964
Appleton, Wis.	82	11	40	5,820– 6,660	Y-3	6-3	1,5,6,10,11	N	None	N	....	510	595
Arlington, Tex.	63	3	40	4,764– 5,796	N	6-2	1,5,6,11	2	None	N	None	314	441
Arlington, Mass.	91	11	40	6,224– 6,880	Y-8	5-1	....	1	Y-1-Y-N	N	None	648	694
Asheville, N.C.	122	7	40	4,160– 5,200	N	3-3	1	1	None	....	....	653	770
Atlantic City, N.J.	231	36	40	5,250– 5,750	N	1-1	1,11,12	1	Y-1-Y-N	N	Y-66	1,500	1,657
Augusta, Ga.	147	15	40	4,620– 5,400	Y-11	1-2	1,3,6,10,11	N	None	....	....	786	869
Aurora, Colo.	67	7	40	5,682– 6,786	Y-4	6-4	1,2,4,11	2	Y-3-N-N		None	429	494
Aurora, Ill.	102	13	40	6,120– 6,408	Y-8	6-2	11,12	N	None	N	None	461	838
Bakersfield, Calif.	160	37	40	7,248– 8,400	Y-8	1-2	1,3,4,5,10,11	2	Y-1-Y-N	N	Y-57	912	1,050
Bay City, Mich.	90	8	40	5,477– 6,077	Y-2	6-2	1,3,5,6,7,10,11	3	None	N	None	574	644
Bayonne, N.J.	222	48	40	....	Y-15	6-1	1,5,11	1	Y-1-Y-N	N	Y-	....	....
Bellflower, Calif (contracts for police service, Los Angeles County).	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Berwyn, Ill.	62	5	40	6,242– 7,290	Y-1	6-1	1,11	....	Y-2-Y-N	Y-Y	None	426	426
Bethlehem, Pa.	120	11	40	4,600– 6,200	Y-4	6-2	1,4,6,10,11	3	Y-3-Y-N	N	None	721	791
Billings, Mont.	78	7	40	5,148– 6,744	N	1-1	1,6,11	1	None	N	None	459	536
Binghamton, N.Y.	149	13	40	5,650– 6,450	Y-1	5-2	1,3,4,6,8,10,11	2	Y-1-N-N	Y-Y	None	985	1,056
Bloomington, Minn.	55	3	40	6,336– 7,716	Y-1	5-5	1,2,4,5,9,11	N	Y-1-N-N	N	None	105	490
Boise City, Idaho	102	14	40	4,896– 5,484	N	6-2	1,3,6,10,11	N	None	Y-Y	None	517	615
Boulder, Colo.	70	7	40	5,364– 6,468	N	1-5	1,2,6,11	N	Y- -N-N	N	None	346	434

COMMEMORATION OF FINLAND'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. **MONDALE**. Mr. President, on December 6, 1967, Finland will celebrate 50 years of independence. Few peoples have so diligently earned their independence; fewer still have done so much with it.

Finland today boasts a modern economy, largely private, which produces products of excellence renowned throughout the world and supports an enviable standard of living for the Finnish people. Extremes of poverty have been all but abolished, while an advanced social system insures that those needs fundamental to the dignity of the individual are fully met. But most importantly, this economic and social progress has been carried out in a free society by a representative government freely elected by democratic means.

Finland is a comparatively small country of slightly over 4½ million people, yet it is widely known and admired in the United States. Those of us from the North Central American States are particularly fortunate in having as friends and neighbors many persons of Finnish extraction. Our fathers saw their fathers arrive and out of a wilderness of forests and lakes reminiscent of their native Finland, create what are today thriving and industrious American communities. From Longfellow's epic poem "Hiawatha," greatly indebted to the Finnish national epic "Kalevala"—KAL'-a-val-a—to the bold and imaginative architecture of the Dulles International Airport on the periphery of this city, Americans are grateful for Finnish contributions to American society and culture.

There is a Finnish word "sisu"—SEE'-soo—which, roughly translated, connotes a combination of courage and perseverance. We Americans have had occasion to observe these qualities of courage and perseverance in the Finnish nation through years of adversity as well as years of progress. In a world filled with unrest, they offer a lesson to all peoples.

I therefore believe, Mr. President, that it is fitting that we today, in recognition of the long ties of respect and friendship which exist between Finland and the United States, take this opportunity to convey to the people and the Parliament of Finland our best wishes on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Finland.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I submit a concurrent resolution to observe the 50th anniversary of the Republic of Finland, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 49

Whereas the year 1967 marks the Fiftieth Anniversary of the independence of Finland; and

Whereas these fifty years have been marked by close ties of friendship and association between Finland and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that the Congress of the United States extends it congratulations and best wishes to the Parliament of Finland on the occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the independence of Finland and in affirmation of the affection and friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Finland.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 423

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 12080, and ask that it be printed and referred to the appropriate committee.

This amendment would remove an inflexible, arbitrary requirement as to the notice requirement for termination of coverage of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, and instead provide the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with some measure of discretion in termination cases.

This amendment would improve the administration of the social security laws, and I urge its adoption.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 423) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 424 AND 425

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, two amendments to H.R. 12080, the omnibus social security and welfare bill which is now pending in the Senate Finance Committee. The first provides for a 20-percent across-the-board increase in retirement benefits, for raising the minimum old-age benefit to $100 a month, and for financing these increases out of a limited general revenue contribution to begin in 1972. It is cosponsored by Senators CLARK, HART, INOUYE, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MONDALE, MONTOYA, MORSE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH. The second is a comprehensive series of amendments to the public assistance portion of the bill, which would remove the restrictive provisions recently enacted by the House. It is cosponsored by all the Senators mentioned a moment ago, plus Senator PELL, and minus Senator MONTOYA. I have prepared a memorandum explaining the amendments, as well as two others which I introduced last week regarding title XIX—medicaid—and I ask unanimous consent that this memorandum be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

I. SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. Mr. President, the reason for the first proposal is simple: our social security system has grown extensively over the years—so that 95 million people are now insured and 23 million receive benefits—but we have not yet succeeded in lifting millions of older Americans into a retirement of security and self-respect.

The 12½-percent increase in retirement benefits enacted by the House would barely get beneficiaries back to the level of real income they had in 1954. The two increases of 7 percent each which we enacted in 1958 and 1965 actually fell short of restoring the 1954 purchasing power of benefits—for the cost of living has risen about 25 percent since that time. Thus four-fifths of the increase which the House provided would be used up just to get back to 1954 levels. Meanwhile, wages have risen above 50 percent in those 13 years. The wealth of our Nation has steadily increased, but our older citizens have not shared in that affluence. Instead, many elderly couples retire each year—into a life of poverty.

We in Congress must share the responsibility for the inadequacy of retirement benefits. The plan I propose is feasible. It would raise benefits substantially at a cost we can afford. I am assured by officials of the Social Security Administration that it is in long-range actuarial balance. It would not result in any contribution from general revenues until January 1, 1972, and even then the contribution would be only 11 percent of the total financing of the social security system.

We have an obligation to our retired citizens, some 5 to 7 million of whom live in poverty. And no wonder—last year social security benefits averaged $84 a month—just $1,000 a year for individuals, and $142 a month; $1,704 annually, for couples. Passage of this amendment is the least we can do to begin to alleviate the difficulties of our elderly fellow citizens. It is a modified version of legislation which I introduced in the 89th Congress, and reintroduced earlier this year.

The latter bill, S. 1009, which was cosponsored by 10 Senators of both parties, would provide benefit increases averaging over 50 percent, and would finance these increases by a gradual infusion of general revenues. It envisioned a levelling off of the general revenue contribution at 35 percent of the costs of social security by the late 1970's.

At the moment, when we are engaged in a deepening war in Vietnam which saps our resources and consumes over $2 billion each month, it seems impractical to urge the full scope of these proposals.

But we must do everything that can feasibly be done for our older citizens. We could do more than the House provided, and we could do it equitably if we began a partial changeover to general revenue financing.

The payroll tax is scheduled under present law to increase to 4.85 percent each on employer and employee in 1973, plus a contribution for health insurance. The House bill would raise that to 5 percent each, plus 0.65 percent each for health insurance. But a tax on payrolls is highly regressive. For low-wage employees particularly, a required contribution beyond that contemplated in the House bill would be very burdensome. Many workers already pay more in payroll taxes than they do in income taxes.

General revenue financing would be a far more equitable way to raise revenues for the social security system, particularly revenues which would be used to provide additional benefits for low-income people—for those who worked either so irregularly or at such low wages that their contributions do not really finance the benefits they receive.

I emphasize this because the proposal I make today to broaden the scope of H.R. 12080 would give relatively more help to the poorest of our elderly, to those who have the most difficulty in finding dignity and comfort in their retirement. If we are to provide a meaningful floor of protection for older people as a matter of social insurance, I believe it is only fair to other workers that we finance it through general revenues.

I propose that the across-the-board increase in benefits be raised to 20 percent. I propose, in addition, that the minimum benefit be raised to $100 a month, $150 for couples. These proposals combined would produce an average benefit increase of 29 percent.

To finance this proposal my amendment provides first, that the contribution and benefit base be raised to $8,400 next January and to $10,800 on January 1, 1971; and second, that general revenue contributions be infused at the rate of 11 percent of the total financing of the system beginning in 1972.

The increases in the contribution and benefit base are no more than what the Administration proposed in H.R. 5710, except that the $10,800 figure would go into effect 3 years earlier than the Administration proposed. This is substantially less than was proposed in S. 1009, under which the base would have risen to $15,000 on January 1, 1971.

These increases in the earnings base are justified to bring the social security system up to date. For 87 percent of American workers the $10,800 figure would result in benefits based upon everything they earned—a comprehensiveness of coverage lost nearly 30 years ago as workers' incomes grew faster than the earnings base was increased. For the man already 50 years old, for example, this change would mean an increase of over 40 percent in the benefits he will get when he retires.

In contrast to S. 1009, the general revenue contributions would not have to begin until January 1, 1972. What this means is that we would be promising now that we would spend $4.5 billion a year beginning 4½ years from now.

I believe this is a promise we can and must make. It is not a huge amount of money. Our gross national product will exceed a trillion dollars by that time, and 1972 is far enough off so that we can easily plan to set aside this amount of money. What we get for this promise is a 20-percent increase in benefits now, plus what I regard as all important—the increase in the minimum payment to $100.

The net cost of the increase which I propose would be considerably less than the financing I have described. For the people who will benefit from this increase are people who must now turn to old age assistance in order to eke out enough of a living to survive. Old age assistance has decreased markedly over the years as social security benefits have been liberalized. Only 11 percent of the elderly population receives such assistance now, as opposed to 22 percent of the population in 1950. Even now, more than half those receiving old age assistance in New York are on welfare because their social security pensions are inadequate. Thus, raising the minimum benefit to $100, and raising other benefits 20 percent will correspondingly decrease the number of people on the old age assistance rolls and the amounts which those who remain on the rolls will require.

S. 1009 contained a number of other proposals for the liberalizing and updating of the social security system, but I include only two of the most important in the amendment I introduce today.

First, I propose a cost-of-living provision to make social security inflation-proof, and to insure that future benefit increases granted by Congress do more than just make up for lost ground. The civil service and military retirement systems have cost-of-living adjustment features. It is time the social security system did likewise, although I emphasize that this must not be at the expense of benefit increases which allow older citizens to share in our expanding productivity.

Second, I propose raising the benefits for the uninsured to $50 a month for individuals and $75 for couples. The House bill raised this benefit only to $40. There are 1.2 million people, many of them quite poor, who have been helped by this constructive addition to the law. The difference in cost between the House bill and the $50 figure would be about $163 million annually from general revenues and $28 million from the trust fund.

Mr. President, what I have suggested are, I think, the minimum changes which we in the Senate must make if we are to keep faith with our older citizens. The conditions in which millions of retired Americans find themselves after having worked productively for decades are a disgrace to us all. Adoption of the proposal I have described would begin turning our social security system in the direction long advocated by experts in the field, and would allow us to provide real hope at last to our elderly poor that they will be able to live out their lives in some measure of ease and self-respect.

II. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

My second amendment is a comprehensive set of proposals which would reverse most of the public welfare restrictions enacted by the House of Representatives. The amendments to our public assistance program which the House enacted will not help, in my judgment, to solve the crisis in employment which grips the ghettos of our cities and the most impoverished of our rural areas. They will not help us to lighten the increasing fiscal burden of public assistance in any constructive way. Public money might be saved, but only because people badly in need of assistance would be eliminated from the welfare rolls without having anywhere else to turn. In short, the House proposals seem to punish the poor because they are there and we have not been able to do anything about them. But if this is our approach, they will still be there when we are done. And the problem will be no closer to solution.

About a year ago, the distinguished members of the President's Advisory Council on Public Welfare reported that welfare is "desperately handicapped" in both "legislative mandate and financial resources." The Council prescribed "a major updating of our welfare system."

The House bill not only fails to heed the Council's prescription, but is, in my judgment, a major step in the other direction.

I can well understand what motivated the other body in its action. It was concerned that the welfare system as it exists today has failed to enable its recipients to obtain jobs and end their dependency. I share that concern. It was concerned at the recent rise in the number of children and mothers on aid to dependent children. I share that concern. It therefore sought to create a system which would train children and mothers on welfare, provide day care, and establish incentives to work. I, too, believe such a system is needed.

Indeed, I believe that we will never succeed in restoring dignity and promise to the lives of people whose frustration exploded into violence in the cities this summer until we develop a system which provides jobs—enough jobs and good jobs.

For the people of the inner city live today with an unemployment rate far worse than the rest of the Nation knew during the depth of the great depression. In the typical big city ghetto, only two out of five adult men have jobs which pay $60 a week or more—enough for each member of a family of four to eat 70 cents' worth of food a day. Only half the adult men have full-time jobs at any rate of pay. Less than three out of five have any work at all.

We must, then, work out a system to provide jobs. But I do not believe that the approach adopted in the House bill will provide these jobs. The fact is, as the alarming unemployment and underemployment figures I have mentioned indicate, that there are not enough jobs available at the moment. We must find them, but in the meantime, it will not do to force people into training programs for jobs that are not there.

This is the basic problem which we must look to. For this problem welfare is neither the cause nor the remedy. But welfare has its role: helping those in need—and the House bill will hinder it in fulfilling that role. Indeed, instead of helping at all, it almost appears intended to punish the poor. And punish it will, particularly in areas of the country where welfare authorities have done their best to demean and degrade the recipient of welfare even under existing law.

First, the House bill says that no State may have a higher percentage of children on welfare than it had at the beginning of this year. This would force States and localities either to deny additional aid when more children are born into a family or to come up somehow with the money needed to pay the difference. The latter, of course, would shift the burden from the level of government that can best afford it to the one that can least afford it. But the more prevalent result will not be more local money for welfare, but more families cut off welfare even though they are in need. For the House bill, with all of the other restrictions on eligibility which it contains, is an open invitation to welfare departments in some areas of our country to find ways to tidy up their caseloads and discourage new applications.

Second, the coercive provisions on community work and training fit into this pattern. The objective of enabling welfare recipients to obtain productive employment is of course laudable; indeed, as I have indicated, I believe it is the only hope we have for avoiding the deep division in our society which the creation of a permanent class of welfare poor would bring. But attempting to bring about employment by compulsion is not the way to do this. There are many mothers who should not work. Some particularly in progressive States and cities, will be excused from working. But in other States with less enlightened welfare programs, many will either be driven off the welfare rolls or will be discouraged from applying. And they will still be poor—a little more invisible, for the time being, than they are now, but no less poor, no less miserable.

There is more than one State in this country which, even under existing law, has had what has come to be known as the "employable mother" rule. Under this rule, if the welfare officials judge the mother to be employable, she is stricken from the rolls. Coincidentally, these rulings tend to be made at the time of the year when people are needed to pick crops at $3 a day. This rule is being challenged in litigation, but the provisions of the House bill on compulsive work and training imply that from now on the "employable mother" rule would be sanctioned by a national policy.

Third, the punitive intent of the House bill is evident as well in the provisions on aid to children with unemployed parents. For the first time, the parent must have had a substantial connection with the labor force in order to qualify, a provision which will eliminate many men who have never had an opportunity for steady employment. In addition, the provision denying assistance to unemployed parents who have applied for or are receiving unemployment compensation will keep aid from many who need both forms of help in order to survive, and will cause some to receive neither kind of aid. The House provision will only succeed in forcing more families to break up, forcing more fathers to leave home so the family can obtain assistance by the traditional ADC route.

We in the Senate must go on record as opposing this almshouse approach. We must go on record as forcefully as we can that this is not the direction which we want welfare to take. We must not allow this backward step.

What I propose, therefore, is a package of public assistance amendments that would eliminate the most objectionable features of the House bill: the arbitrary freeze on payments under the aid to dependent children program, the blanket compulsions on mothers and children to work, and the restrictions on assistance available to children of unemployed fathers. It contains a number of other proposals as well, and these are explained in the memorandum which appears at the close of my remarks.

This comprehensive package of amendments is in large part supported by the administration. It consists of most of the public assistance amendments which the administration has suggested to the Finance Committee; I have added in addition a number of other proposals which I believe should also be adopted if the punitive features of the House bill are to be neutralized.

Let me emphasize again that I do think our welfare system is unsatisfactory. But every reason why I think it is unsatisfactory will only be accentuated by the House bill.

I believe our welfare system is unsatisfactory, because, in general, it provides aid for broken families and not for whole ones. The House bill accentuates this by refusing to adopt the recommendations of H.R. 5710 to expand aid to unemployed parents, and by restricting that program instead. My amendment would remedy this backward step.

I believe our welfare system is unsatisfactory, because it imposes degrading conditions on eligibility, and encourages the enforcement of those conditions by demeaning investigation. The House bill accentuates these defects by adding a whole raft of new conditions for eligibility and a whole new set of incentives for the State to investigate welfare recipients. My amendment would remove most of these new opportunities for abuse.

I believe our welfare system is unsatisfactory because, once a family does penetrate the bureaucratic maze and qualify for aid, the benefits it receives are in many States not even enough to live on. The House bill accentuates this by refusing to require States to meet their own definitions of minimum need, as H.R. 5710 proposed, and by enacting instead a freeze on ADC payments. My amendment would both reverse the freeze and require States to meet their own definitions of need.

I believe our welfare system is unsatisfactory because it causes welfare recipients to lose a dollar of benefits for every dollar they earn. The House bill does provide a small work incentive—$30 a month plus one-third of additional earnings. But this incentive is so small that it may well fail to encourage significant numbers of welfare recipients to work, and opponents of the idea may then succeed in claiming it will never work. My amendment provides a work incentive of $85 a month, plus one-half of additional earnings. That is a more realistic level, and should result in thousands of welfare recipients being encouraged to work.

Mr. President, if the proposals I make today are not adopted in large measure by the committee or by the Senate when the bill reaches the floor, I shall move to strike title II—the public assistance provisions—from the bill. The House bill provides useful new programs in day care and in work training, but does so in a context which invites serious abuse in some parts of our country. There is no question, in my judgment, that adoption of the provisions suggested by the House of Representatives would be a great step backward and I will act accordingly when this measure reaches the floor. For we must have the perspective to see that the welfare system is not something that exists by itself, that has no effect on the world in which its recipients live. We cannot afford to bury our heads in the sand. Our Nation has been ripped apart this summer by violence and civil disorders that have taken dozens of lives and caused billions of dollars of property damage. We face in our cities the gravest domestic crisis to confront this Nation since the Civil War. We are not going to solve that crisis by lopping people off the welfare rolls. We are not going to solve that crisis by forcing welfare recipients to accept training for jobs when we have absolutely no idea whether jobs will be available to them after their training. We are not going to solve that crisis by punishing the poor and hoping that they will bear that punishment silently, invisibly, graciously, without bitterness or hostility for their "benefactors."

The amendment I introduced today would reverse the punitive approach adopted by the House in title II of H.R. 12080, and put us back on the road toward developing the system for which the President's Advisory Council called "a nationwide comprehensive program of public assistance based upon a single criterion: need."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments (Nos. 424 and 425) were referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXHIBIT 1

MEMORANDUM: AMENDMENTS OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY TO H.R. 12080

I. SOCIAL SECURITY

Under this amendment, benefits would be increased 20 percent across the board instead of the 12½% which the House enacted. The minimum benefit would be raised to $100 a month, $150 for couples. A cost-of-living provision would be added to the law, and benefits for uninsured elderly people would be raised to $50 a month, $75 for couples. The contribution and benefit base would be raised to $8400 next January and $10,800 on January 1, 1971. The long-run financing for the increases in benefits would come from a limited general revenue contribution—11 percent of the total financing of the social security system—beginning January 1, 1972. This would be a cost of $4.5 billion a year beginning 4½ years from now.

The 12½% increase in retirement benefits enacted by the House would just barely get beneficiaries back to the level of real income which they had in 1954. The two increases of 7 percent which were enacted in 1958 and 1965 actually fell short of restoring the 1954 purchasing power of benefits—for the cost of living has risen about 25% since that time. Thus four-fifths of the increase which the House provided would be used up just to get back to 1954 levels. Meanwhile, wages have risen about 50 percent in those 13 years.

The increase proposed in this amendment is more realistic than the House bill. The financing proposed is feasible. Officials of the

Social Security Administration indicate that it is in long-range actuarial balance.

II. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

This amendment is a series of amendments to Title II of H.R. 12080. Their purpose is to eliminate the most objectionable features of the House bill: the arbitrary freeze on payments under the Aid to Dependent Children Program, the blanket compulsions on mothers and children to work, and the restrictions on assistance available to children of unemployed parents.

This comprehensive package of amendments is in large part supported by the Administration. It consists of nearly all of the public assistance amendments which the Administration has suggested to the Finance Committee, as well as a number of other proposals which should also be adopted if the restrictive features of the House bill are to be fully neutralized.

A more detailed analysis follows. Paragraphs 1 through 12 are the Administration's proposals, except (1) the $100 million figure in paragraph 1 is more responsive to the need than the $60 million which the Administration proposed; (2) the $85 figure in paragraph 2 will create a greater incentive to work than the $50 which the Administration proposed; and (3) the portion of paragraph 7 relating to the elimination of vendor payments was not proposed by the Administration. Paragraphs 13 through 15 are additional proposals developed after consultation with independent experts.

1. Meeting full need.—Present law requires States to establish public assistance needs standards but does not require that payments meet the need in full. The amendment would: (1) require States to meet full need as reflected in their own standards; (2) require the standards to be at least as high as they were in January 1967; (3) require standards to be updated on July 1, 1968, and reviewed annually and modified with significant changes in the cost of living; and (4) provide an authorization of $100 million in fiscal years 1970 and 1971 to help States with special fiscal problems meet the new requirements.

2. Earned income exemptions.—The House bill requires States to allow AFDC recipients 16 and over an earned income exemption of the first $30 monthly earnings plus one-third of additional earnings. The amendment proposes: (1) to increase the exemption to $85 monthly plus one-half of additional earnings, and (2) to extend this same exemption to the aged and permanently and totally disabled.

3. Work Training.—The House bill requires States to establish community work and training programs (with 75% Federal matching) for virtually all appropriate AFDC adults and children over 16 not attending school full-time. In lieu of the House work training provisions, the amendment provides those proposed in H.R. 5710. This proposal would authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide work and training programs for AFDC recipients over 16. Funds for these programs would be transferred from public assistance appropriations. If the Secretary of Labor does not operate a program, or finds it impractical to do so throughout a State, programs could be set up by the State welfare agency. The Federal Government would pay 90% of the cost of training, supplies and material. The proposal also provides for training incentive payments of up to $20 a week for trainees, and project grants for needy persons ineligible for AFDC.

Present law requires that appropriate arrangements be provided for the care and protection of a child while his parent is participating in a work training program "in order to assure that such absence and work will not be inimical to the welfare of the child." The House bill omits the clause containing the word "inimical." The amendment restores it. No cost is involved.

4. Mandatory work training.—In the House bill, work training is mandatory both on the State and on the individual: The state must provide work training, and the AFDC recipient must accept it (unless she has good cause) or face the loss of assistance. The amendment recognizes the requirement that work training be offered in all parts of the State with significant numbers of AFDC recipients, but provides that acceptance of training not be mandatory on AFDC mothers. With such positive features of the bill as the availability of work training, training incentive payments, day care, and earned income exemptions, AFDC mothers do not have to be compelled to undergo training.

Along the same lines, the plan required by the House bill for each AFDC family should be truly comprehensive and not aimed solely at employment.

5. Limitation on Federal participation in AFDC.—The House bill requires that the rate of child dependency due to the absence of a parent be frozen as of January 1967 for purposes of Federal matching beginning January 1968. The amendment would delete this limitation.

6. Definition of unemployed parent under AFDC.—The House bill sets a Federal definition of unemployment. The amendment would delete these two limitations on the definition in the House bill: (1) the exclusion of fathers who have received any unemployment compensation during the month and (2) the exclusion of fathers who have had little or no connection with the labor force. The House bill associated no significant savings to these limitations since they involve relatively few persons; hence there is no significant cost in their reinstatement.

7. Protective and vendors payments.—The House bill requires all States to have a program of protective payments and vendor payments, which can be used in those relatively few cases of demonstrated, fiscal irresponsibility. The present law limits the existing provision to 5 percent of the cases. The House provision is appropriate insofar as it relates to protective payments, but the provision for vendor payments is unprecedented and invites coercion and abuse of recipients. Even as to protective payments, a State should be limited in their use to prevent abuse. The limit, however, might be raised from 5% to 10%, and the amendment would accomplish this. Since this provision concerns the method of payment rather than the amount, it would involve no significant cost or savings.

8. Emergency Assistance.—The House bill allows the State a large measure of flexibility in an emergency situation by providing 50% Federal matching or emergency assistance to children and their families for up to 30 days in a 12 month period. The provision in the House bill is an excellent one, but the time period is too limited. Emergency assistance should be available for up to 120 days, and the Federal share should be increased to 75%.

9. Migratory workers—The amendment would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make project grants for temporary assistance to migratory workers and their families. The assistance would be limited to 60 days duration and would be consistent with assistance payments in that State.

10. Repatriated United States Nationals—Legislation originally enacted in 1961 authorized HEW to provide temporary assistance and care to United States citizens who have been returned to this country because of destitution, illness, war or similar crises and who are without resources. Since 1961, the program has assisted repatriates from two countries involved in such crises—Cuba and the Dominican Republic. The present authorization expires by June 30, 1968. The authorization for this small but significant program should be made permanent.

11. Public assistance demonstration grants—Five years ago, the Congress established a program under the Social Security Act to support demonstration grants in the area of public assistance. The program has a $2 million limitation under present law. The House bill increases this limit to $4 million. The amendment contemplates an increase in the authorization to $10 million in 1968 and $25 million thereafter.

12. Home repairs—The House bill provides 50% Federal matching to meet the cost (up to $500) of repairing the home of an assistance recipient if the home cannot be occupied and if the cost of rent would exceed the cost of repairs. This provision may prove a useful tool in allowing some recipients to remain in their own homes. Unfortunately, the House bill excludes AFDC recipients from this provision. The amendment would remove this exclusion. Since this provision can only be used if a higher rental is involved, there will be no additional cost.

13. Cooperation with the Courts in Cases of Desertion, Support, and Neglect—The Administration amendments do not touch a most dangerous section of H.R. 12080 beginning on line 7 of p. 109 insofar as coercion, threat, and intimidation of mothers is concerned. The mandate to report cases of neglect, abuse, or exploitation among AFDC families to the courts is an invitation to a double standard (especially in the light of the House Committee report and recent lower court actions as in Prince Georges County, Maryland) and acts primarily as a threat and deterrent to applications. The mandate to determine paternity of illegitimate children and seek paternal support likewise operates as a threat, deterrent, and ready excuse for discriminatory terminations. To the extent that these steps are practical at all, they are now taken. Thus this legislation will certainly be interpreted by some states as open invitation to purge their rolls of unacceptable (Negro) mothers of illegitimate children. The amendment therefore deletes all of the language which has the effect of putting the welfare department into the police and law enforcement business.

14. Exansion of AFDC–UP—The amendment would make the program for children of unemployed fathers a mandatory provision in the state plan, and extend it to children of underemployed fathers as well. Underemployment as used in the bill is intended to cover situations where the earnings of a father of a child or children otherwise eligible for assistance under Title II of H.R. 12080 and the laws it amends are insufficient, together with other resources available to the family to meet the definition of minimum need established for public assistance purposes by the State.

15. Child Welfare and Day Care Standards—The language of the bill is ambiguous on the point of whether child welfare services (including day care) furnished to AFDC recipients or potential recipients are to be governed by the same standards regarding licensing of institutions and similar matters governing now under Title V Part 3 and incorporated by H.R. 12080 into Title IV as Part B. The amendment clarifies the situation.

16. Day Care Facilities—The amendment authorizes $50 million a year for five years to aid in the construction and renovation of facilities to provide the day care services that are authorized elsewhere in the bill.

III. SHELTER COST AMENDMENT TO MEDICAID

This amendment contemplates variations in the income levels of eligibility within a State based on differences in shelter costs within a State. Studies have shown that shelter costs are the most significant variable in the cost of living as between urban and rural areas. The cost of rent and home purchase in rural areas is far less than in the cities. An income of $5,000 a year therefore buys far more in rural areas than it does in the city. As a result, there is no real need that eligibility levels for Medicaid be as high in the rural areas of New York State as they are in its large cities, and this amendment would require the States to take variations in shelter costs into account when they determine eligibility levels. Officials at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare assisted in the drafting of this amendment, and indicated that it is feasible and workable.

This amendment would alleviate what has become a near-crisis situation in New York State. In some of our rural counties 75 to 80 percent of the population is eligible for Medicaid under the income eligibility levels which the State established. In these counties, welfare costs have skyrocketed over the past eighteen months. Increases of 50% and 60% in the cost of welfare are common, and 90% or more of the increases are due to the cost of Medicaid. Under this amendment, the State would objectively determine differences in shelter costs around the State, and would accordingly establish differences in eligibility levels. The result would be decreases of as much as 20% in eligibility levels in some of the counties which are the hardest pressed at the present time. A further result would be that Medicaid would come closer to being a program which in fact serves only those who need it.

IV. AMENDMENT REGULATING COSTS AND UTILIZATION OF SERVICES UNDER MEDICAID

This amendment would allow far more stringent regulations of the costs of hospital care and physician services than exists at the present time. It would also require the States to establish procedures to safeguard against unnecessary utilization of care and services. Medical costs have risen greatly in the past year and a half, and it is no accident that this has occurred since Medicare and Medicaid have been in effect. Many of these costs are unavoidable, of course, as nurses and other personnel finally begin to receive a living wage for their work. And the costs of materials and supplies have risen. But in some areas of our country, unfortunately, there are some physicians who and some institutions which have literally reaped bonanzas from these programs. A newspaper report recently, for example, indicated that in California 1200 physicians have received $83 million in the last eighteen months in reimbursement under Medi-Cal, that State's Title XIX program, an average of $70,000 for each physician.

In New York State, the physicians' fees paid under Medicaid have increased substantially over the past year. Fees for office visits to general practitioners and specialists have more than doubled. If these fees, as well as the reimbursement to hospitals and nursing homes, were regulated under this amendment, the fiscal pinch which many counties in New York have felt as a result of Medicaid would be substantially alleviated.

The amendment would operate as follows: for in-patient care, it would limit payments to hospitals and nursing homes to the amount paid for comparable services by either the Blue Cross Plan in the area or Title XVIII, whichever is less. At the same time, it would provide incentive payments for the efficient operation of hospitals and nursing homes based upon their demonstrated ability to develop new management procedures and discharge patients promptly. For out-patient care, the amendment directs that an out-patient visit be defined and that it must include seeing a physician, and it limits payments to a hospital for an out-patient visit to a ceiling of 18% of the per diem payment for in-patient care. For payments for the services of physicians and other professionals, the amendment directs that fee schedules shall be based upon the average level of fees charged in the county or metropolitan area over the ten years previous to the adoption of the plan. The amendment would allow the development of special reimbursement methods for group practice plans.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2573) to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to charter an Economic Opportunity Corporation to encourage the participation of private enterprise in the effort to rebuild urban slums and eliminate poverty in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2572) to establish a Domestic Development Bank to assist in the development of employment and business opportunities in certain urban and rural areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] be added as cosponsors of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) relative to the establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM—HOW NOT TO UTILIZE AIRPOWER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, only 1 percent of sorties flown in 1966 against North Vietnam by Air Force and Navy pilots were against targets recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There follows additional testimony to this end given before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee last August 29 by Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, U.S. Air Force, retired.

The testimony speaks for itself and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Testimony by Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, U.S. Air Force, Retired, Before Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, August 29, 1967

ONLY 1 PERCENT OF SORTIES IN 1966 AGAINST JCS TARGETS

Mr. Kendall. We have in the record already the fact that less than 1 percent of the total sorties flown during 1966 were flown against JCS-designated targets, and that most of the remaining sorties were against pressure points in the armed recce role.

Let me ask you whether or not, in your opinion as an expert in this field, that is efficient use of our airpower?

General Meyers. No; not in my judgment, and I have participated in three wars. I have also been involved in planning interdiction programs in three wars. Obviously the most effective, most remunerative targets in North Vietnam, of course, were not struck. They generally consisted of the 97 targets that we discussed earlier; namely, the ports, the bridges, the ferries, and various targets of this nature which North Vietnam had, and was using in its LOC system.

Of course, some of these targets were given to us over a period of time, but when you attack them over a period of time I repeat, you lose the impact that accrues when a series of targets are destroyed at one time. Our present approach provides the enemy an opportunity to, as I have said, to put his resources in position to repair in the shortest possible time. He has organized 500,000 troops to make repairs on his lines of communications. This took some doing. It was not done overnight. But we provided him with the time to do this sort of thing, which obviously reduced the effectiveness of our air campaign.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Economy of the Joint Economic Committee in Government will start hearings next week on the report of the President's Commission on Budget Concepts.

The report calls for far-reaching changes in the Federal budget to improve public understanding of the economic impact of Federal spending.

The Commission has made extensive proposals for revision of the present budget format. It has recommended that the confusing three-budget system now used by the Federal Government be replaced by a single comprehensive budget designed to give the public a better picture of the full range and effect of Federal financial activity and the Congress a better grip on these operations.

This is a proposal of major significance to the economy. The Federal budget, after all, is crucial in measuring the impact of Federal spending on the economy. If the Commission's proposals were adopted, the result would be a budget drastically different from the one to which we have become accustomed.

Because of the overriding importance of the Commission's report, the Subcommittee on Economy in Government intends to explore the Commission proposals in great detail.

We will hear on Tuesday, October 31, from Mr. David M. Kennedy, chairman of the board of the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago and Chairman of the Commission on Budget Concepts, along with senior members of his staff.

On November 2, we will hear from Mr. Maurice Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. William Capron, former Assistant Director of the Budget Bureau, and Prof. Herbert Stein of the Brookings Institution, one of the country's leading fiscal economists.

The subcommittee will hear later from the administration as well as from other expert witnesses when they have had more time to evaluate the report in detail.

MARINETTE, WIS., LOSES A TOP-NOTCH MAYOR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, sitting astride the hot seat at the top of a local government is one of the most difficult and thankless jobs a man can be called upon to do. And one of the ablest of the men I have known who willingly took on that task is Ed Woleske, the mayor of the city of Marinette, Wis., and a dear friend of mine. After sitting on the hot seat for 6 years, however, Ed Woleske has decided to step down. Marinette is the loser because of that decision. There are those in Marinette who are trying to convince Mayor Woleske to change his mind. Needless to say, many of us are hoping they succeed. But if they do not the man who succeeds Mayor Woleske will have the solid foundation of accomplishment of the past 6 years to build on. Ed Woleske was a mayor with matchless energy who used it with great wisdom and imagination.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent article from the Marinette Eagle-Star and an editorial, both dealing with Ed Woleske's decision to resign, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Marinette (Wis.) Eagle-Star, Sept. 7, 1967]

MARINETTE SHOULD BID TO HOLD WOLESKE

We respect Mayor Edward Woleske's decision to resign so that he can accept a much better paying position in federal service. As he has pointed out, he has a young family whose welfare he must think of in a situation which these days stresses increased financial competence. We respect his decision but we don't think the Marinette City Council and the responsible citizens of this community should accept it without trying to make it worth his consideration to continue as mayor.

At least five very good reasons support this conclusion:

1. His background is that of a businessman and he has 27 years of experience in municipal government, eight of them as the city's chief executive.

2. He is a doer. Woleske has overcome some rather formidable problems in city administration, including improvement of the water and sewage systems and speedy repair of extensive damage resulting from a flood soon after he became mayor.

3. He knows his way around in the confusing maze of federal and state financial assistance programs and has won for the city a number of grants, including one under which a new fire station was erected. He was wise in withdrawing from an urban renewal plan when it became apparent that it would not work out to the city's advantage.

4. Marinette has a thriving Industrial Park and those who have been close to its development frankly admit that it would not have become a reality without the mayor's vigorous support. He sent city crews to clear away the brush on a factory site and convinced one of the initial tenants there that the city was cooperative. He established a drainage system which left the industries there undisturbed by heavy rains and flood conditions. He expanded the water and sewage capacity to cope with industrial needs.

Additional expansion of the water supply and pressure is in progress and it will include a new water tower and increasing the height of the existing tower in City Park. He has provided surfaced roads and a railroad spur to serve the industrial area.

We do not wish to convey the impression that Mayor Woleske was singlehandedly responsible for all of these improvements. He himself was the first to acknowledge in tendering his resignation the help of the council, other city officials and many public spirited citizens. It is, nevertheless, an inescapable fact that he was the leader and the prime mover in accomplishing many of these projects. He should, therefore, receive a generous measure of credit for increasing the city's tax base and improving its general economic well being along with increasing employment.

5. He has courage, not only to face up to formidable problems but to resist the pressures which threaten to interfere with the city's progress. The Menekaunee Bridge has been a bottleneck and a hazard to transportation for many years and he, with the support of his city council, has refused makeshift repairs to put it back in service. The result remains in doubt but the objective of building a more serviceable full-capacity bridge to replace the existing crippled structure never will receive stronger advocacy than Woleske has given it.

The mayor has stuck his neck way out in the purchase and wrecking of the former Hotel Marinette. A city executive with less courage and vision could have let the corner go to an unfortunate development. He has undergirded financially and otherwise the Marinette Downtown Development Corporation's efforts to convert it into a showplace with practical functions to serve this community and its guests.

This strategic corner at the moment is an unsightly hole in the ground but it isn't going to stay that way if the foresight of Woleske and MDDC prevails. We believe that the strongest insurance that it will prevail is to keep him on the job as mayor.

If Woleske has gathered the impression from the foregoing paragraphs that we're trying to make it tough for him to leave we don't deny it. We concede that other able men in the community could handle the job with credit to themselves and their fellow citizens. But Woleske has been shaped to the office and he has filled it to date with distinction.

The Eagle-Star hasn't always agreed with Mayor Woleske and if he should be persuaded to keep the office we may disagree with him again, perhaps even oppose him in some matters. But we think his leadership overall has been good.

We urge the city council and responsible citizens to confer with him at the earliest opportunity to determine what consideration would persuade him to stay in office. Obviously it would require a substantial increase in pay. For the reasons given and many others which might be mentioned, we think he is worth it.

[From the Marinette (Wis.) Eagle-Star, Sept. 6, 1967]

WOLESKE RESIGNS POST AS MAYOR—ANNOUNCES HE PLANS TO TAKE FEDERAL DUTIES—EFFECTIVE DATE SET AT DECEMBER 15

Mayor Edward Woleske informed the Marinette City Council Tuesday night that he is resigning his post as the head of the city government effective Dec. 15.

The mayor's decision to quit the post he has held since the city returned to the mayor-council form of government in 1961 came as a surprise to the aldermen. They were informed of the resignation just prior to their 8 p.m. council session.

Although Mayor Woleske will not vacate his position officially until mid-December, he announced that the Tuesday night council meeting would be his last. He announced his intention to utilize unused vacation time accumulated over the past five years and, in effect, would leave his post about Sept. 13.

However, Woleske assured councilmen that he would assist in completing many of the projects which now are pending. He also said he would assist with the preparation of the 1968 municipal budget.

The mayor's formal letter of resignation was read to the council by Sharon Johnson, deputy city clerk. It was the first word of the stunning news for most of the department heads and spectators in the audience.

"The economic factors involved" and "a generous offer" from his future employer were listed by Mayor Woleske as the prime reasons for ending a career in municipal government which began with his election as fifth ward alderman in 1940.

Both in the letter to the council and in a lengthy statement following its reading, he declined to disclose the nature of his new employment. However, he indicated that he had been offered an appointment to a federal government position and that his new job would require him to leave Marinette.

"This didn't come by haste," Mayor Woleske assured the aldermen. "It required a deep amount of thought on the part of myself and my family."

Four of the mayor's children were present.

He cited the increase in the city's evaluation from $28 million in 1961 to more than $36 million today as in indication of the community's progress in recent years. He pointed out that the growth has not been confined to industry noting that Marinette has built four new schools in the past five years as an example.

He reminded aldermen that the progress was accomplished with an increase of only $1 million in the city's indebtedness including schools and that the indebtedness incurred by the water utility was not a direct obligation of the city.

"It was with your cooperation and your vision that things have changed for the good," Woleske told the councilmen. He also praised the heads of city departments for their loyalty to him and their dedication to the welfare of the community.

Also singled out for commendation were the more than 70 citizens who serve without compensation as members of various city boards and commissions. And he praised the civic clubs, labor groups, chamber of commerce and other community organizations for their interest and participation in city affairs.

"That's what's making Marinette," Mayor Woleske declared in his brief but highly emotional remarks. And he added a special commendation to George S. Robbins, secretary of Marinette Area Chamber of Commerce, whom he described as "a dedicated man."

Turning to pending affairs, the mayor discussed the long negotiations which he said will culminate in construction of a five-story Holiday Inn motel on the site of the former Marinette Downtowner.

He told the aldermen that failure of the Holiday Inn board to approve the contract between the developer and operator of the motor inn had stymied progress on the project in July. He revealed that lack of sufficient parking facilities appears to be the final obstacle to be overcome before construction of the new facilities becomes a reality.

The mayor informed the council that land already procured for the project would provide for only 119 cars. Space must be provided for 160, he said.

"To buy the additional land would be too costly," he stated. He revealed that he had held a special meeting with the aldermen at which it was agreed to expand the parking lot at the rear of Stephenson Public Library to make the added parking space available.

According to Woleske, the parking facilities would be leased for use by the motor inn from 5 p.m. to 8 a.m. It would be available for public use during the daytime shopping hours.

Because expansion of the library lot will require filling in of a portion of the Menominee River, permission of the Army Corps of Engineers must be obtained, he said. The council authorized an application for the authority. The mayor said this action along with an agreement to lease the expanded lot to the motel operator "will be enough at this point to get the show on the road."

"My resignation is not to be misconstrued as my having weakened or being fearful of any problem facing Marinette," he added. He declared that his firm stand on the Menekaunee Bridge problem had not changed and that he intended to testify in behalf of the city against claims filed by Moke H. Adams.

"It's Marinette I have at heart and I will be here to protect your interests," he declared. He added a call for more citizens to play an active role in city government.

Woleske re-emphasized that his decision to leave the mayor's office and the community was a matter of economics. He added that he and his family always would be "100 per cent for Marinette" and that all of its members had enjoyed working for the betterment of the community.

"I think this news is a sad occasion for the people of Marinette," was the response of Louis W. Staudenmaier, president of Stephenson National Bank, first of those present to respond. He said he was unaware the salary being offered by the mayor's new employer but whatever it be, "you are worth more to the City of Marinette."

George Robbins, chamber secretary called on the council to "do whatever we need to do to continue the present administration."

William Hansen, president of the council, read letters from Marinette Area Industrial Development Corporation urging the council to take whatever steps might be necessary to persuade the mayor to remain at his post.

"In the best interest of the City of Marinette, I believe that something should be done immediately to retain Edward Woleske as mayor," E. D. Bargren, MAIDC president wrote. He credited the cooperation of the mayor and council for the "fine progress" made by the city in recent years. He called upon the council to offer a substantial increase in the mayor's compensation.

Charles Goldberg, president of the development corporation, wrote: "If salary remuneration should be the prime consideration involved in the acceptance of a federal governmental position, we urge the city council to consider doing whatever may be necessary from a salary standpoint to retain Mayor Woleske."

Several of the aldermen also added their commendations and councilmen voted unanimously to refer the matter to the personnel and finance committees.

CHINA-WATCHERS DISCOUNT PEKING AS A THREAT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The Administration's present effort to portray Communist China as an aggressive, expansionist power posed to sweep across Asia is widely considered by the community of Far East experts here to be inaccurate, misleading and, perhaps most important, potentially detrimental to future United States policies in the Orient.

This telling sentence begins a story in this morning's Washington Post by Stanley Karnow.

Writing from Hong Kong, where he has spent many years, Mr. Karnow notes that Asian experts see China not as a "menacing colossus" but as a poor and backward country focusing on its own critical domestic problems. He questions the administration's presumption "that a huge population represents strength." He characterizes the thesis that "China has failed to overrun Southeast Asia because we are there resisting aggression" as a gross misinterpretation of Peking's revolutionary dynamics which, in fact, emphasize that revolutionaries must pursue their own struggles and stress self-reliance as the key to Communist victory.

In this connection, Mr. Karnow observes that the most active revolutions in the Far East have strongly resisted satellization by China." And he remarks that the record shows that Asian communism is most successful where it is identified with nationalism and not solely inspired by Peking.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Karnow's article to the attention of my fellow Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 25, 1967]

China-Watchers Discount Peking as a Threat

(By Stanley Karnow)

Hong Kong, October 24.—The Administration's present effort to portray Communist China as an aggressive, expansionist power posed to sweep across Asia is widely considered by the community of Far East experts here to be inaccurate, misleading and, perhaps most important, potentially detrimental to future United States policies in the Orient.

As analysts here see it, China is scarcely the menacing colossus described by Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and others, but rather a poor, backward country primarily focused on its own critical domestic problems and desperately seeking strategists to hasten its lagging development.

With a century of foreign domination and humiliation behind them, moreover, the Chinese are justifiably or fancifully persuaded that they are being encircled by the United States and the Soviet Union.

FEAR BRINGS BLUSTER

This fear, coupled with an awareness of their weakness, has prompted Peking to bluster belligerently while behaving with extreme caution—very much the way superstitious Chinese beat drums and explode firecrackers to scare off ghosts and spirits they wouldn't dream of fighting.

Therefore, specialists here submit, the Administration is committing the serious error of exaggerating China's intentions and capabilities at a time when it might better be preparing American public opinion for the possibility of a rapprochement with the more pragmatic Chinese leaders who may follow Mao Tse-tung's crumbling dynasty.

One shortcoming in the Administration line, implied in Rusk's prediction of a billion Chinese in the coming decades, is the presumption that a huge population represents strength. In reality, people are China's greatest liability, weighing heavily as they do on the country's marginal food resources.

To suggest that the Chinese might spill into Southeast Asia in quest of food is, in the opinion of the Hong Kong experts, an outmoded, 19th Century-type geopolitical notion. The total rice surplus of Southeast Asia is only about 4 million tons—hardly worth the cost of a military operation, much less the trouble of an occupation.

At the same time, the thesis advanced by Humphrey that "China has failed to overrun Southeast Asia because we are there resisting aggression" is also regarded by analysts here to be a gross misinterpretation of Peking's revolutionary dynamics.

There is no doubt that the Chinese Communists, publicizing their own experience as the model, are urging activists in Asia, Africa and Latin America to initiate "wars of national liberation." And in a relatively modest manner they are encouraging these activists with money, weapons and moral support.

Peking has repeatedly emphasized, however, that revolutionaries in other lands must pursue their own struggles. Indeed, the concept of "people's war" as defined by Mao's chief adjutant, Lin Piao, is war fought by peoples themselves. At a reception for the President of Mauretania in Peking last night, Premier Chou En-lai similarly stressed that "self-reliance" is the key to communist victory.

DUAL CONVICTION

That theory is underpinned by Peking's dual conviction that deteriorating economic and social conditions in underdeveloped countries will inevitably make them ripe for revolution, and that the United States cannot realistically become engaged in several Vietnams concurrently.

Consistent with this doctrine, the Chinese have limited their military thrusts to situations involving their national interests rather than their revolutionary aspirations.

They conquered Tibet, probed Quemoy and Matsu, grabbed a disputed piece of the Indian border, and intervened in Korea after United Nations troops crossed the 38th Parallel. But they have prudently avoided committing more than measured aid and unrestrained rhetoric to so-called "wars of national liberation" in Laos, Thailand, Burma and Vietnam.

Despite Humphrey's claim that "militant aggressive Asian communism" has its headquarters in Peking, moreover, evidence points to the fact that the most active revolutionaries in the Far East at present, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong, have very strongly resisted satellization by China.

LITTLE VIETMINH AID

The record shows, too, that Asian communism has scored most significantly where it has been identified with nationalism, and not where it has solely been inspired by Peking. The Vietminh beat the French with only a modicum of Chinese help. Chinese propaganda has done little to fortify Communist insurgents in Burma, Borneo or India.

There also is a good deal of doubt among analysts here that China's growing atomic arsenal will necessarily make Peking more threatening, as Dean Rusk recently asserted.

For one thing, these experts indicate, China's arithmetical nuclear progress is being outstripped by geometric American and Soviet strides. It is believed, consequently, that the Chinese realize that they would get the worst of an atomic exchange with either the United States or the Soviet Union.

These experts also calculate that in the years ahead, as China strives to modernize its weaponry, Peking's future leaders are apt to be increasingly concerned about the vulnerability of their painfully built industries.

In contrast to the Administration's warnings against Chinese might, several specialists here paradoxically contend that the real danger to the United States lies in China's prolonged weakness.

As their argument goes, a continuation of the turmoil that has convulsed China over the past year might eventually tempt both American and Soviet intervention, just as the break-up of Chinese empires throughout history was attended by foreign penetration.

American intervention on the Chinese mainland would plainly be the road to nowhere. So the prevailing view among Hong Kong's Far East analysts is that the Administration may gain more from toning down its alarmist talk about the perils of Peking, and perhaps join with Singapore Premier Lee Kuan Yew in praying, as he did in New York yesterday, for a modern, prosperous China.

DOES ASIA FEAR RED APOCALYPSE?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the things which bears on what I have just been stating, dealing with the question of to what extent Asia is concerned about Chinese aggression, was skillfully handled in a recent column by Clayton Fritchey, entitled "Does Asia Fear Red Apocalypse?" in which he comes to the conclusion that the Asian nations are not half as afraid of China as we are.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fritchey's article may appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOES ASIA FEAR RED APOCALYPSE?

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Secretary of State Dean Rusk now denies raising the specter of the "Yellow Peril" in defending the Vietnam war as a means of containing China, but his rebuttal is, to put it politely, as careless and wide of the mark as his press conference statement of last week.

In that statement he foresaw a future Asia perilously balanced between "a billion Chinese, armed with nuclear weapons," and a billion non-Communists looking to the U.S. for help in saving themselves from Red China. "They don't want China to overrun them on the basis of world revolution", Rusk said.

The State Department's principal spokesman now explains that Rusk was only giving voice to the fear that Asia itself feels over the supposed menace of "militant" Chinese communism. The secretary was just "calling attention to the concern of the free nations of Asia, and the concerns their leaders have expressed in similar terms about their long-term security."

If there is any evidence to support the proposition that most Asian leaders share Rusk's apocalyptic view of the future, it is not in the public domain. This contention is as unfounded as Rusk's claim that Asia supports our conduct of the Vietnam war, and our containment policy in general.

With the exception of three small client states (Thailand, South Korea, South Vietnam) nearly all Asian mainland nations disagree with U.S. policy in the area, both as it relates to the war and our three-alarm assessment of future Chinese intentions.

This is significantly true of the nations that border on China: India, Pakistan, Nepal, Russia, Burma, Laos, North Vietnam. They would be the most vulnerable to Chinese aggression, but their leaders are not "expressing" themselves in "similar terms" to Rusk. Quite the contrary.

Although India has to depend on American wheat to stave off mass starvation, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has flatly rejected the Johnson Vietnam policy. She calls the war a "brutal and tragic conflict." On Oct. 6, India's Defense Minister told the United Nations there should be an "unconditional ending of the bombing of North Vietnam." On the same day, Prince Souvanna Phouma, premier of Laos, warned that prolonging the war might lead to the "disappearance of all the small nations of the area."

In Pakistan (a SEATO ally of the U.S.) President Ayub says, "There is no danger to the subcontinent from China provided no uncalled-for provocation is aimed against that country." The government of Nepal strongly supports U Thant, the Burmese secretary-general of the U.N., in calling on the U.S. to stop bombing North Vietnam.

Russia, locked in a bitter struggle with Peking, would have the most to gain from a Chinese setback, but it obviously thinks the Vietnam escalation is neither good policy nor good containment. It apparently rates the Yankee Peril ahead of the yellow one.

To the east, the Japanese government, deeply beholden to the U.S., keeps a civil tongue in its face, but meanwhile quietly promotes trade and cultural relations with China. Japanese polls show 75 percent of the people against Johnson's Vietnam policy.

Even Indonesia, after one of the greatest Communist purges in history, is against us. Ambassador R. Nugroho says U.S. bombing is hindering peace negotiations, and warns that it may trigger a nuclear world war. Finally, although the United States makes much of its supposed obligations under SEATO, none of the other major signatories (Britain, France, Pakistan) are with us in Vietnam.

There is the record. China may be haunting Rusk, but clearly not Asia. It also may be that Rusk understands Asia better than most of the foreign ministers of that area put together. And finally it may be that the United States has a duty to intervene and help these nations against China whether they want to be helped or not.

This destiny, however, is not manifest to the East. Even the administration's great friend, Lee Kuan Yew, the prime minister of Singapore, who has been visiting the White House this week, has said, "The Americans don't understand the overseas Chinese. They don't understand the Vietnamese. That is why it is such a mess . . ."

COMMEMORATION OF RECEIVING OF THE LAW BY JEWISH COMMUNITIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Friday Jewish communities around the world will commemorate the receiving of the Jewish law. Like their brothers in other nations, many Jews in the Soviet Union will come together to rejoice in remembering the event which is at the center of their history. Yet for Soviet Jews that celebration will be to some degree a hollow one, for it will represent an increasingly rare expression of their communal life, undertaken against the pressure of severe restrictions on their existence as Jews.

So it is a fitting time for all men committed to the protection of human rights and dignity to reiterate their alarm at the Soviet policy of cultural starvation which is pinching so much of the life out of Soviet Jewry. Evidence is abundant that this policy persists and that it gravely threatens the future of the Jewish community. Alone among nationalities represented in the Soviet Union, Jews are forbidden those educational and cultural activities and institutions which permit the preservation and enjoyment of a common heritage. Alone among the religions represented in the Soviet Union, the Jews are forbidden both access to seminaries for the training of clergy and nationwide organizations of their congregations and religious leaders. Prohibited from publishing even the Bible and prayerbooks, lacking a daily or weekly newspaper, without representation in the curriculum of any university, without general access to any volumes of Jewish history in any language, discriminated against in higher education and employment, Soviet Jews must mount a constant struggle against the quiet forces of cultural annihilation by attrition. And the struggle must be carried on in an atmosphere thick with the fear which comes from knowing that the synagogues themselves are laced with networks of informers, and that the anti-semitism of the general public is frequently and easily inflamed.

Such hardships cannot fail to cause anguish among all men who value the basic human right to discover and exercise one's own identity in the light of his religious and national heritage.

The Jewish community in the Soviet Union represents the last major segment of the huge culturally and spiritually rich East European Jewish community which was decimated under Hitler. On Friday those Jews and others throughout the world will celebrate the receiving of the moral law which is at the heart of their history. In response, let all of us pay heed to the moral law which is binding on all men, and urge the Soviet Union to free its Jews to celebrate their heritage in peace and in hope.

THE PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in the winter of 1966, I paid an extended visit to the Soviet Union, and in addition to the other purposes of my trip, I saw for myself the unhappy plight of the many Jews who live there. I reported my impressions in the May 1967, issue of the National Jewish Monthly. Because today is the eve of the Jewish holiday of Simchath Torah, which for the past 3 years has seen an outpouring of Soviet Jewish youth to the synagogues and the streets outside to express their fervent desires to uphold the religion of their forefathers, I believe it is appropriate to invite to the attention of the Senate the unfortunate situation of Soviet Jewry as I saw it. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that my article in the National Jewish Monthly be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATOR VISITS JEWS IN THE U.S.S.R.

(By Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Joseph D. Tydings has been U.S. Senator from Maryland since January, 1965. The son of the late Sen. Millard E. Tydings and grandson of Ambassador Joseph E. Davies, he was a close friend of the late President John F. Kennedy. He has been a delegate to several international conferences, is chairman of two Senate subcommittees, and before he entered the Senate he was active in the Baltimore Junior Chamber of Commerce, YMCA, and other civic agencies.

(Senator Tydings spent 10 days in the Soviet Union as a representative of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Between his official appointments he explored the status of Soviet Jewry as described in this article.

(During his talks with Soviet officials, the Senator interceded on behalf of two American Jewish families with relatives in the Soviet Union. Recently, Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin in Washington informed him that both cases had been successfully resolved: permission was granted for the mother of a Baltimore family to emigrate from the Soviet Union, and another family has been reunited through the location of a missing relative.)

"Is not peace, in the last analysis, a matter of human rights?" President John F. Kennedy once asked rhetorically. This is the fundamental truth of our epoch, and those of us who are morally obligated to search out every avenue to reduce internal tensions are compelled to focus upon the state of human rights everywhere, for therein often lie the irritants that can lead to national and international strife and violence.

A principal purpose of my mission to the U.S.S.R last winter was aimed at making some small contribution to the promotion of greater understanding between our two powerful countries, and to the removal of those frictions that spark suspicions and conflict. It was in this context that I took it upon myself—in addition to my other duties—to visit synagogues in the Soviet Union, for the condition of Jewry in any country is frequently a measure of the human rights standard of that country. What I found was not encouraging.

My first stop of any duration was in Tbilisi, the capital of the Republic of Georgia, between the Black and Caspian Seas. It was there that I made my first effort to see a synagogue: It was frustrating there—and at other Soviet cities. The conversation with my Intourist guide, Gela, went like this:

"Is there a synagogue in town?"

"Well, yes, there is, but not very many people go to it any more."

I asked, "Why is that?"

"Well, we are just not a very religious people. We think it's an outmoded pattern of cultural behavior."

"Is the synagogue right in the city?"

"Yes."

"Can we stop by and take a look?"

"Well, if you really want to, perhaps we can. But there is nothing there of interest to see. It's a part of town that is somewhat run down, and all of the interesting things we had planned for this morning will take all our time."

After I insisted, Gela finally shrugged and we drove to a street that followed the Kura River. We obviously were leaving the central, more modern part of the city and turning into a much older section.

The synagogue was an imposing structure that looked as though at one time it had been a building of some grandeur. It was meticulously clean on the inside—obviously well cared for—and sunlight streamed in the windows into the main room of worship, creating a very pleasant and cheerful atmosphere. There were small groups of people standing around and sitting or reading in the pews. It must have been about 10:00 a.m. I asked for the rabbi, but was told he had been ill for about two weeks and unable to participate in any of the functions of the synagogue. How old was he? Sixty. Was there any other rabbi in Tbilisi? No.

By this time most of the questions were being fielded by a comparatively young man of about 40. He wore a very attractively-decorated skull-cap—little beaded designs of white upon black. The rest of the circle was comprised of men in their 60's and 70's, plus one or two who looked ancient. The latter were some of the most magnificent looking individuals I have ever seen. Long white beards, wire-rimmed glasses, and in appearance the very epitome of wisdom and experience. Virtually everyone held a prayer book. The books appeared very old and much used—not tattered, but gradually worn by many years of careful handling.

"Who conducts the services when the rabbi isn't able to do so?" "I do," the younger member of the assemblage responded. "Do you have any formal training in leading the services?" "No, but I am the synagogue's ritual slaughter, and as such I am as close as anyone to the position of the rabbi." "Do many of the young people come to worship?" "A few, but most of the congregation is older." "Why is that?" The young fellow shrugged his shoulders.

"What are you going to do when your rabbi is so old that he can no longer lead the services?" "We shall have to get another rabbi." "Is there anyone in training for the rabbi's position?" "Yes." "Who?" "Well, I don't know." "Is there a seminary where young people who want to study to be rabbis can go and be trained?" "Yes, in Moscow." Most of the people present were listening very intently. "And how do you know that there are in fact people studying to be rabbis in Moscow?" "I have been told that." "Are there any persons from Tbilisi studying in Moscow to be rabbis?"

There was a slight pause, and the younger fellow turned and talked to the members of the congregation surrounding him. There was a discussion for a few moments, then he turned back and said, "No one that we know of." "You don't have anybody in mind, then, that you can turn to if and when your rabbi becomes so old that he is not able to continue his duties here?" "No," the young man said, and looked at the floor.

The lengthy exchange was warm and friendly and we left with the impression that the Georgian Jews were carrying on because of deep devotion to their religious convictions, and "making do" with what they have in a not altogether sympathetic climate for religious activity. But the religious climate in Georgia was much better than elsewhere in the USSR.

The saddest part of the encounter in Tbilisi was the hopeless look on the people's faces when asked what they would do after the present rabbi passed away—the only one in the capital of Georgia. It was clear that they did not know what they were going to do, that there would be no rabbi to replace him. I wondered, as we drove away, whether our visit had done any good. I suspected that everything that had happened would be carefully reported back to the Soviet officials and I hoped that the fact that a non-Jewish American official had been concerned about the plight of the Jews in Tbilisi might give Russian officialdom some pause.

From Tbilisi I flew to Tashkent in Uzbekistan, about a thousand miles to the east. Tashkent is a city of over a million people, which the Soviets have tried to make the show-place of Central Asia. Upon my arrival, late on a November Sunday evening, I told our Intourist guide, an Uzbek of about 30 years of age, whose name was Lufthala, that we wanted to visit some of the mosques and synagogues in Tashkent while we were there. His immediate reply was, "Well, I don't know whether we can visit any of the synagogues. We shall be very, very busy while you are here, and I'm not sure that any of the synagogues are active any more. However, there are some mosques that we can take a look at."

We let the matter rest there. The next morning, however, when I sat down to confirm the arrangements for interviews with high-ranking Soviet officials that had been made prior to our arrival, I re-emphasized to both Lufthala and the head of Tashkent's Intourist Bureau that I wanted to take a look at the synagogues. "We shall see," was the answer.

EXCUSES, EXCUSES, EXCUSES

We set out for our previously scheduled interviews. Throughout the day I would ask Lufthala periodically, "We have 30 minutes now, can we go by the synagogue?" The excuses were numerous. First, Lufthala claimed he didn't know where the synagogues were. After being directed to find out, he said, "Well, we know where they are, but they are not open today. There are no services going on there now." "Why don't we just drive by and take a look from the outside and see if there happens to be someone there." "Well," Lufthala shrugged his shoulders, "we could do that, if you want to, but I think it's not a very good idea. It's in a part of the city that was heavily damaged by the earthquake and we are not supposed to go there." "Can't you drive in that part of the city? Is it impossible to walk through the streets there?" "Well, no." "Then let's go." "Well, there isn't time between now and the next appointment." "All right, then, we'll go after the appointment." "We shall see," Lufthala responded.

Finally, after a day and a half of verbal jockeying, I flatly told him that I wanted to go to a synagogue, and *right away*. We drove through the streets of Tashkent in stony silence. It was in the very late afternoon, and a slight drizzle was falling slowly. The weather seemed to match the mood inside the car. We had left the shiny new central part of the city that the Russians have built in the last 20 years, and were now winding our way through narrow streets lined by clay-walled houses, many of which had been badly damaged by the recent earthquakes. On street corners old Moslem Uzbeks in their *tubiteikas* were gathered in clusters of two and three. Ours was the only car in the streets. The driver stopped in front of a small alley.

We got out and started to walk down the unlighted passage which was perhaps 8 feet wide and lined with about an inch of mud. On either side were hovels even more depressing than the ones that lined the streets. Most of the walls were made of mud. There were some shacks that had tin siding. I wondered how they could have withstood the earthquakes. Finally, after about a hundred yards, we came into a small courtyard.

On one side, there was a small frame building painted pale blue. From the Star of David over the doorway, we could see that this was the Synagogue. We went inside. It consisted of a single room perhaps 20 or 25 feet square. The building was badly run down, but inside there was an air of opulence because of the rich tapestries and rugs that hung on the walls or were draped over the *bima* in the center of the room. There was a pot-bellied stove in one corner. As we came in, it was evident that a service was under way. There were only 10 or 12 people present, most of whom appeared to be in their 70's or 80's. Once again I was struck by the magnificent features of the old men, with their long beards and the wrinkles of the ages on their brows.

Our entry disrupted everything. We stood for a moment a bit ill at ease. Finally, the old man who had been leading the service came over to us. I shook hands with a few people and then began inquiring about their circumstances. Was the fellow who had been leading the service a rabbi? No. Did they have a rabbi? No; they had had one until a few months before, but he had to go to a larger synagogue in another city, where the rabbi had died. Was anyone in Tashkent in training to be a rabbi? Not that they knew of. They understood that the Yeshiva in Moscow was training rabbis, but they did not know of anyone from Tashkent who was studying there. What about the congregation; did many people come to worship at the synagogue? Not very many any more, was the answer. Only the old people came. How young was the youngest person who came? Perhaps 40. What would happen when the generation that was present in the synagogue today passed on? Would there be anyone to carry on the traditions and the faith? There was no answer.

Did they do anything to teach their children the Jewish faith? Yes, they did. There were no schools for that, but they gather their young children informally and try to educate them in some small way in their religion and language. How often did these informal gatherings take place? Every day for an hour or so in the afternoon; there were usually 25 or 30 children in attendance, and sometimes more. How many synagogues were there in Tashkent? Four; this was the largest. I thought to myself that this could not possibly be the largest, but later, when I had seen a second one, I could believe it.

The rabbi who had left recently to go to the other synagogue was a new one; his predecessor had died. In Tashkent now, they said, there were two rabbis for the four synagogues, but both were old and sometimes sick and did not come to lead the services very often.

THE SAME OLD STORY AGAIN

Did the Jews have any publications in Tashkent? No, there were no Hebrew or Yiddish language periodicals in the city. Why don't the young people study more, or why don't they attend services in the synagogue? They did not know, was the answer. Do they have any source for new prayer books? No, all the prayer books they had were old ones.

Could they send anyone outside the country, say to Israel, for training to be a rabbi? They did not know. They said that they were Bukhara, or Oriental Jews, and that no Bukhara Jews immigrated to Israel. Did any European Jews go to Israel for rabbinical training? They did not know.

We left the synagogue in silence, and headed back toward the main part of town. Lufthala was very unhappy. I now demanded that we go to one of the European synagogues. He said, "I only know where one of them is, and it's closed. It has been condemned because of earthquake damage. There have not been any services there for several weeks." "Take us there," I said.

We changed our course. After some weaving through the city, we wound up on a bumpy unpaved road, again lined with mud-walled hovels. We finally reached the right neighborhood. It was difficult in the car to locate the precise address we had been given, so we got out and walked up and down the muddy street, and I could feel the dampness seeping into my shoes. By this time, night had fallen and it was pitch dark. There were no lights in the street and very few in the buildings on either side. We used the headlights of the car to guide us. Finally, we came to an unmarked gate in a wall. We knocked, and a gatekeeper admitted us.

The synagogue was behind the wall, facing on a courtyard. We walked over to the building. It had received a considerable amount of earthquake damage; by looking through the dirty windows one could see huge cracks in the plaster walls. It was very difficult to see much of what was inside.

"Is there a rabbi around?" I asked. "No," the gatekeeper said. "There is no one around. No one has been to worship here since the earthquake." "Before the earthquake, did many people come?" "Not very many, but people came regularly every day."

We took another look through the windows. We could see the Star of David and the Menorah painted on the *hima*. Sadly, I turned and walked back to the muddy street.

VISIT TO MOSCOW SYNAGOGUE

Moscow was my next stop. Having benefited from the agonizing experiences in Tbilisi and Tashkent in attempting to see the synagogues, I decided the best procedure was not to ask but simply to go, accompanied by foreign service officers from our Embassy. We decided to take an Intourist driver, however, so that the report of our visit would be sure to reach appropriate ears. We drove to the principal synagogue in Moscow, on a comparatively nice street. It is a rather imposing building, sand-colored in appearance, perhaps made of some sort of stucco material. There is a long flight of steps leading up to the main entrance. We walked into a dimly-lit corridor.

To the right there was a lot of chanting and activity. We went into a large room, perhaps 60 feet long and about 40 feet wide, where a service was being conducted. This was on Friday, at 9:30 or 10:00 a.m. There were perhaps 50 worshippers in the room. They were well-dressed, but all old men. There was no one in the room whom I could identify as being under 50, and most were obviously in their 60's and 70's with gray or white hair, and long beards.

We stood for a moment before we were recognized by anyone, then a couple of the worshipers in the back rows came over to ask us what we wanted. We inquired first if the rabbi was there. No, they said; he was away "resting." Was there a school at which the young were taught the tenets of Judaism? There was no school as such, one of the people volunteered, and the young were taught mainly on an individual basis. Did the congregation have enough prayer books? After exchanging glances and words with each other, they noted that there were some prayer books, but that they could use more. What would happen when the rabbi at the synagogue died? The single word, "Yeshiva," was spoken. Are there any people in training to be rabbis at the Yeshiva? The question was not answered.

At this point a comparatively younger man of about 45 or 50 came up and said he was the president of the congregation; if we had any further questions to ask, he would answer them for us. He invited us into his office. Meanwhile, the small circle of people who had been around us began drifting away. In the president's smallish office, he delivered a long speech welcoming us, saying how privileged the synagogue was to have an official visitor from the United States.

I returned to my previous inquiries. What will happen when the rabbi dies? That will be no problem, was the ready answer; there is a seminary in Moscow, a Yeshiva to train new rabbis. Were there any students at the Yeshiva now? Yes. How many? There are 12 students there now, he answered, and arrangements are being made for many more. (All of this was simple fabrication, I subsequently learned from our Embassy.) This synagogue, the president continued, is the largest in Moscow, and the congregation has a number of recruits or possible candidates for the seminary.

DISTRUSTS SOME ANSWERS

I turned to other questions. "Do you have bar mitzvahs?" "People prepare for this at home and not in Jewish schools." "How many of the congregation were at the recent celebration of Simchath Torah?"

"Very difficult to say," the president responded. "Perhaps as many as 30,000; there were at least 15,000. All the young people were here," and then he emphasized, "they were all in *perfect* order. There was no disorder, no rioting." Then, as though we didn't believe him, he continued, "This was even announced abroad, including the numbers of people who were here. It was reported in your own press."

"Is it possible to obtain kosher meat?" "Yes, we prepare our own meat. We have enough." "What about matzoth?"

At this point, with a very pleased look on his face, the president turned around and whipped out a notebook in which there were a number of photographs encased in plastic envelopes, in the best salesman's display technique. "Of course, we have enough matzoth. Here," he said, pointing to a couple of the pictures, "these are pictures of our own rabbi baking the matzoth for the congregation. We do it every year."

"How many new prayer books do you need?" I asked. "Well, there is no great shortage of prayer books," was the answer. "We have placed an order for 10,000." "When were they ordered?" "Not long ago. The problem is in getting them run off. They are already being put in type." (The fact is that the promise to print more prayer books was made over two years ago and it has yet to be kept.)

SEES CULTURE THROTTLED

I decided to inquire about schools or classes in the native tongue of the Jews—Yiddish. "Other nationalities in the USSR have their own schools; do Jews?"

"No," the president responded. "The parents themselves do not want a Yiddish school. The regular schools are free and the parents want the best education they can have for their children. They want them to go on to the schools of higher education and to become professional people, and the quality of education would not be as good if there were a Yiddish school, so no one wants it." There was silence for a moment. The president then shifted back to religion. "The government here allows perfect freedom of religion. All who want to pray, come and pray. Indeed, the situation is so open and free that the rabbi from the synagogue here was invited to the Kremlin not long ago. That shows the status of religion in the Soviet Union."

It was useless—this robot-like response. But the reality of the situation spoke louder than the apologetics. In terms of culture, no schools in Yiddish or Hebrew, and but a single periodical (*Sovietish Heimland*) to keep alive a rich tradition that as late as 1946–47 was still comparatively healthy. With reference to religion, as my own experience showed, the situation is even more poignant. Today, there are but 62 synagogues left in the Soviet Union—some 400 having been shut down since a decade ago. With a somewhat smaller number of rabbis, whose average age is 65–70 years, and a Yeshiva virtually closed (I was advised that it has but one or two students) the immediate future of Judaism in the USSR borders on the abyss.

The tragedy is that these throttling circumstances should not and need not be. For the Soviet Constitution and ideology purport to provide guarantees of national and religious rights. Uniquely, they are observed in the breach so far so far as Jews are concerned. This is the kind or irritant that needs to be removed if we are to attain that type of mutual understanding for which our peoples long.

THE FUTURE OF AVIATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MONRONEY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, at the October 13, 1967, convention of the Association of Local Transport Airlines, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] delivered a noteworthy speech in which he took a look at the future of aviation.

Probably no other Member of this body knows as much as the senior Senator from Oklahoma knows about aviation. He has had and, I am sure, will continue to have an important hand in this fast changing, fast developing industry.

In his Boston speech, he painted an exciting picture of the future of aviation, but, as he pointed out, it is a picture requiring bold, imaginative strokes if it is to live up to its potential.

Senator Monroney outlined a number of major problems which must be solved if the aviation industry is to take full advantage of changes in technology.

Senator Monroney's speech should be read by anyone interested in the future of aviation, in particular, and of the transportation industry in general. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address of Senator A. S. Mike Monroney Before the Association of Local Transport Airlines, Boston, Mass., October 13, 1967

Twenty-three months ago I had the pleasure of joining ALTA at Houston. I spoke to you about the past, present and future of the local service industry as it then appeared. I find myself now reporting back to you that history has done well by my predictions. The Golden Age which was then dawning for the local service carriers is becoming a reality.

At Houston I said you should strive to maintain the highest level of service possible and attain the independence to operate a successful and profitable enterprise. You are rapidly reaching that goal.

Passengers reached an all-time high of almost *17 million* in the twelve months ended June 30, 1967, up 37% from 1965. Revenue passenger miles reached *3.9 billion*, up 48% over 1965.

The quality of your service has been dramatically modernized with pure jet and jet prop aircraft replacing older, obsolete equipment.

This magnificent growth has been achieved with declining support from the federal government in terms of subsidy payments. Subsidy for the twelve months ended June 30, 1967, was down more than $10 million from 1965's level of $66 million. Subsidy declined to 14.8% of total operating revenues as compared with 22.7% in 1965.

In an age when subsidy has become a permanent part of certain other industries, I believe that the air transportation industry should be applauded for its cooperation with the CAB in finding ways to reduce subsidy need drastically. I urge the carriers and the Board to continue their efforts in this direction. But I would caution that we not take subsidy away so fast that the carriers find themselves in deep economic trouble during 1967 and 1968 when the carriers introduce large volumes of new service with new equipment. Profits frequently are tempered during such a period. I am confident that the CAB will administer its subsidy reduction program wisely during this transition period.

Equipment upgrading, schedule improvement and new promotional fares are yielding a multitude of benefits for your customers. I am impressed with the aggressive attitude being shown by the management of the carriers. You are, indeed, moving in the very direction which I urged two years ago.

Equipment is being improved at a rapid rate. The CAB's route policy is rapidly providing economic strengthening for the carriers. I wish to take this opportunity to express Congress' appreciation to the CAB for a positive, active role in promoting a larger role for the local carriers. The CAB's efforts on your behalf are producing a reduction in your dependence on federal subsidy, while vastly encouraged by the CAB's open-mindedness in awarding you authority in markets which a few yearr ago were the sole preserve of the grandfather carriers, and by its continuing efforts to modify its procedures so you will not have to wait until 1975 to share the wealth of our current travel boom.

The policy has been possible in large part because of the dynamic growth pattern of the air transport industry. *American economic growth is without doubt the significant factor for the airline industry.* It produces a continuing demand and need for more and better air service.

The nation has grown tremendously since the original certification of local service carriers 20 years ago. Our population reached almost 200 million persons by 1966, with a gross national product of $740 billion compared to only $234 billion in 1947.

In September 1965 the CAB issued a 10-year forecast of revenue passenger miles for the scheduled domestic operations of the trunklines for the years 1965 through 1975. For 1975 the forecast reflected a range between 84.4 and 118.9 billion RPM's.

The CAB recently released an updated 10-year forecast for 1968 through 1977. It is significant that the 1975 range as estimated in this forecast is for a low of 132 billion to a high of 197 billion revenue passenger miles. This compares with an estimated *70 billion* to be generated in 1967. The new CAB forecast for 1971 is approximately the same level as that originally forecast for 1975. *The industry, therefore, would appear to be four years ahead in reaching the estimates made just two years ago.*

At Houston I urged that you re-examine the way in which small marginal points can be served with new, small twin-engine aircraft, either through actual operation by local service carriers or by contractual agreement with air taxis. Two of your membership have moved in this direction. West Coast has launched an experiment with light, twin aircraft in the far northwest. Allegheny has recently devised a program which appears to be a "responsible replacement" by an established air taxi at Hagerstown, Maryland. Through such experimentation we should learn much about the ways of providing improved service at these small marginal points while reducing the economic burden.

At Houston I also urged the carriers to consider mergers as a means of providing the greater area, strength and resources which you will need. The accomplished merger of Frontier and Central, the proposed merger of Bonanza, Pacific and West Coast, and the consolidation of certain of the Alaskan carriers, are evidence that this trend is growing.

This change is also reflected in various efforts to label yourselves more in harmony with the job which you are doing. Whether the designation of your class of carrier should be "regional", or "regional trunk", or some other designation, the important thing is that we all recognize that the role which you should fulfill is *regional in character*, without being encumbered by unnecessary restrictions.

In my opinion, you should have equal stature with our trunklines within your service area, since the service you can and will render should be of equal, or better quality. But whatever label is used, do not forget your obligation to serve the smaller marginal points, and be sure that *all* service which you provide does credit to your name.

Now I would like to discuss aviation and the problems that will confront the industry in the 70's—a short time away when you consider the tremendous lead time inherent in reaching solutions. I think it is essential to start long-range thinking *now* in order to identify the problems that will arise by 1975. Of course, many of the problems facing aviation today will still be with us in 1975. The only difference will be the degree of magnification. There will also be entirely new sets of difficulties with which to cope. But basically they deal with the spectacular growth in the air travel market.

The lead time required to initiate and implement solutions to the technical and sociological problems of our transportation system is increasing. So to begin now to formulate solutions is not a minute too early. There is always a technological lead time. But I think the lead time problem which will be more serious is that required to get our government institutions prepared to handle air transportation problems effectively, efficiently and fairly.

Beginning in the 1950's and continuing on a much greater scale through the 1960's, private industry, the government and our educational institutions have joined in a cooperative effort to solve the problems of modern America. Industry has been responsible for amazing technological advances and, through the systems approach perfected by the aerospace industry, has placed a major role in bringing the benefits of modern technology to every American.

The government has helped greatly by providing a major share of the money needed to fund these technological advances. Government has, through its regulatory function, exercised a restraining influence where unfair competition or aggressive pursuit of profit threatened to destroy the transportation industry. It has been an impetus to advancement where the short-range profit motive of the private enterprise system deterred actions which were in the long-range interest of the public, as well as private industry.

Our educational institutions have provided the impartial, intellectual objectivity which has given important guidance to the direction of our private and public endeavors.

Having served as a legislator during the past two decades—when advances in aviation technology made many of our legislative solutions out-moded and obsolete before the printer's ink was dry—I know that the developments in the 80's and 90's will present greater challenges to the representative branch of government.

Before discussing some of the inevitable problems of air transportation, I think we must make some basic assumptions as to what the technology will be in 1975 and what our society will be like. I will take technology first, because the research and development work which has been done in this decade has *already* determined what the technology will be. And what the Congress does now, for example on the SST and on airports, will determine the extent to which technology will alleviate or aggravate the sociological and governmental problems caused by aviation's rapid progress.

For example in the past few weeks we have read the announcement of the retirement by the Cunard Line of the Queen Mary and the Queen Elizabeth. This marked the passing of an era of transportation over the main line routes of the sea. From here on the role of the ship in passenger service will undoubtedly be that of a floating deluxe hotel.

In my own state—and in yours undoubtedly—you have seen the crack trains of the past reduced by 50 to 75 per cent because the passengers—like those who formerly sailed the Queens—just naturally prefer to travel by air. We are seeing—I believe—even the bus falling prey to the tourist jet or at least the supplemental jet. And the family car is too slow to carry us great distances and thus waste days on our treasured vacation tours. And on top of that we are too spoiled by four hours to Los Angeles to spend four or five days to make the same trip by car. And besides that, it is actually cheaper and safer to fly.

Thus, instead of being the tiny brother of the transportation family, air transport has become the major means of moving people everywhere—except those going for short distances. Thus the problem is more complex because we are talking about almost all transportation of persons—and soon an ever-increasing amount of cargo as well that can travel faster, better and in certain cases cheaper than by train, barge or truck.

Let's look at what has happened in the meantime to aviation. For more than a score of years aviation survived essentially on one all-purpose airplane—the venerable and respected DC–3. It is still flying, although it has retired from the general purpose field to the specialized field of short haul air transportation. Nobody has found a substitute for it to this day. Gradually we moved into longer haul and larger planes—designed for different loads and various stage lengths.

In 1975 we will be in an era of highly specialized aircraft designed for specific transportation purposes. There will be twin-engine air buses for use on medium haul routes which will carry 250 to 300 passengers. The Boeing 747 jumbo jet will have been in operation for five years hauling up to 500 passengers at the cheaper and conservative subsonic speeds on the long haul high density routes. In all probability Lockheed will have a civilian version of the C–5A both for cargo and for extra cheap tourist fares for people. The Concorde will already have been operating on the international trans-oceanic routes at Mach 2 and, hopefully the U.S. SST will be ready for its inaugural flight.

With respect to short-haul transportation in high density markets, the Civil Aeronautics Board's investigation of V/TOL, V/STOL and STOL service in the Northeast corridor will long since have been completed by 1975. I commend the Board for launching this far-sighted investigation into the aviation needs of the future.

In the short-haul high-density markets on the East coast and West coast, and in other selective markets, there will be V/STOL aircraft operating to haul the business traveler, whose time is valuable enough to pay for this premium transportation, from city center to city center. They will be operating off short, inexpensive 1000-foot or less runways near the city center or, in places like New York and San Francisco, right off the wharves or from roofs of special terminal buildings.

I doubt that the economics of V/STOL aircraft will have been refined to the point where they can be operated profitably at a low enough fare to attract the average passenger. They will, however, probably be in use for specialized purposes where price is not the determining consideration. The operational problems of the V/TOL will largely be solved and with continued improvements in power plants the prospects for economic break-throughs by the late 80's and early 90's will be good.

We will not see the resurrection of the dead, but a transfiguration of the railroad into a new trim body, for on the ground there will be high speed surface transportation through the high density and far-flung population corridors of the megalopolis. The work being done now by the Department of Transportation will be successful, I believe, and in those parts of the country where high speed surface transportation is available, the competitive impact on the short-haul air trips will be severe.

By 1975 we will have begun actual planning of the first breed of hypersonic aircraft made of boron filament material, using hydrogen fuel, and designed to fly at speeds of 6000 miles per hour at an altitude of 150,000 feet with a range of better than 10,000 miles. But where will the hypersonic fit into the aviation activities of the 80's when SST's and large subsonics are plying the airways of the world? What will its civilian uses be? What are the commercial prospects of the hypersonic? We know it will be technically feasible to construct the hypersonic. We need to state clearly now why we should build it and the purposes for which it will be used.

And will it be able to earn its own living against the slower SST's? Its ultimate cost, of which I shall say more later, may be far more a determining factor than the cost of the SST. And I keep asking myself where will the customers come from—or—go to?

Active research will be underway on a nuclear-powered, subsonic aircraft weighing one to one and one-half million pounds capable of carrying 500,000 pounds of cargo half way around the world.

The introduction of laminar flow control on production aircraft to reduce drag substantially will be eminent, as will engines with by-pass ratios of ten to one.

From the socio-economic standpoint, massive changes of great consequence will occur. Our cities will be much larger, but different in nature. They will extend across state boundaries connected by a series of contiguous smaller, self-sufficient communities. The political problems of jurisdiction will not have been solved and they will still be in desperate need of new sources of revenue.

By 1975 the gross national product will be $1.3 trillion! The population will probably be in excess of 225 million people, over half under the age of 25. Just think of the millions of teenagers who will be begging their parents for a new fuel cell automobile.

There will be more leisure time. Disposable income available for leisure activities will be $80 billion—more than double that available today. Travel will become the great hobby of the American people.

If you will concede these basic assumptions, let us now get into the future problems of air transportation. First, let's look at it from the standpoint of the *airlines* and the *aircraft manufacturers*. *What difficulties* will they encounter in providing air transportation which will move one passenger or one ton of cargo from point X to Y in the fastest, most convenient and most economical manner?

For both the airlines and the manufacturers, financing will continue to be a major problem. For the manufacturer, his cost of production will run into the billions of dollars. The SST will require almost $5 billion from private and public sources before the first production model is delivered.

The technical director of IATA has estimated that the peak investment required for production of a hypersonic may be $20–$25 billion. This represents by way of comparison the total overseas income of the United Kingdom. It is four times its defense budget and twice the gross annual trading profits of all companies in the United Kingdom.

How does the manufacturer raise this much capital? For that matter could the United Kingdom itself afford that much investment in one project? What sources of capital will be available? To what extent will the government play a continuing role in aircraft research and development and provide funds for aircraft production?

For the airlines, where will one airline get the $250 million needed to finance a fleet of 747's, the $300 million needed for a fleet of 20 air buses and the $500 million needed for ten SST's? That adds up to a capital requirement in excess of $1 billion just for one presently foreseeable airline fleet.

Just buying a few DC–9s or 737s is an expensive proposition. Legislation to extend the guaranteed loan program, which I recently introduced, will be needed, if these fat years are followed by the biblical seven lean years.

I have seen one estimate of the amount that will be required by 1985 for commercial aircraft investment for a worldwide fleet by 5,000 aircraft. The total is *$100 to $150 billion dollars!* That is too big for Wall Street and Switzerland combined.

The insurance risk alone on a 747 carrying 500 passengers would expose an airline and its insurer, should a fatal crash occur, to a minimum loss of $75 million. It would be about $125 million for a 1000-passenger aircraft. If the safety record is not improved and traffic increases as vastly much as predicted, can the airlines absorb this much risk? Two crashes could bankrupt an airline and shake the public's confidence in the safety of air travel.

Another financial problem for the airlines will be a vast increase in landing fees which will be enacted to pay the cost of airport improvements. I will discuss the airport issue in greater detail in a moment, but I believe that the cost of airport improvement will be a major concern to the commercial airlines. Stuart Tipton estimates the airlines will be paying a quarter of a billion dollars for landing fees just by 1971 up from $80 million in 1966. By 1985 the figure will be at least one billion dollars a year.

What will the competitive picture be in 1975 vis-a-vis other modes of transportation and among the airlines themselves? Will the airline industry still be divided into international carriers, domestic trunks, local and air taxis? In line with our purpose of getting from X to Y, actually from portal to portal, should the structure be changed so that one carrier could provide service the whole distance?

I think we are going to see a change in this structure, even during the next five years. For all practical purposes the locals and the trunks are operating the same type of equipment today. The pressures will be to upgrade the locals into regional trunks. At the same time many domestic trunks are trying to expand into the international field. The clear line of distinction we have had in the past will become blurred as this trend continues.

How will the airlines divide up the transportation market? Is surface transportation more efficient on short hauls than air transportation and if so, should the airlines be relegated the role of medium to long haul transportation? To what extent will low ton mile costs permit aviation to invade hitherto untapped cargo markets? Can the intermodal documentation and multi-standard container barriers be breached to permit greater coordination in the movement of cargo among modes of transportation domestically and internationally? Is it possible that we may see a 1975 model piggy-back movement by C–5A's of especially designed truck trailers—less wheels—that can roll on or roll off with the greatest of ease?

As the big jets come into the fleets, the airlines will undoubtedly tap a greater share of the cargo market and begin to transport lower priority items. Bulk freight will still be the province of rail and barge. The future of air freight is tied, however at both ends of the journey to ground transportation and the interfaces which currently exist between air cargo transportation and surface movement must be eliminated.

When you consider the advances which will be made in containerization of cargo, the improvements in ground handling techniques and the availability of an aircraft like the nuclear-powered subsonic air freighter, I believe this ugly duckling of Air Cargo can become a Cinderella overnight. The Princes of the Airlines will be courting her with the same ardor they now bestow on over-coddled passengers. (Those riding in first class, that is.) Those who fill the plane and make possible the profits will still be crammed into seats too close and too small except for a troup of Singer's Midgets.

Low cost, bargain-basement air freight rates, coupled with the "factory fresh" delivery air transportation can give, will attract to the air thousands of products and produce now lumbering on a one week's trip across continents and a month's trip over oceans by rail and by ship. But again, I emphasize that air freight is tied at both ends to surface transportation and the technical and competitive problems which exist today between modes have got to be removed.

It is possible—yes, probable—that air cargo may develop so well that combination cargo and passenger transports with low steerage type rates may introduce an entirely new service into air transport.

Let's look now at the airport problem. The Senate Aviation Subcommittee held hearings in late August on airports. So far we have come up with lots of unanswered questions and no visible solutions.

Everything that goes up must come down, the old childhood saying goes. That's true for the aircraft of today and tomorrow. Only an airport can launch and retrieve an airplane. I'm afraid that our airport problem, mundane as it is, may be the most crucial transportation problem of tomorrow. For with the ground problem goes the upper side of the coin—the air space above the airport and the approach zones into that air space. It is limited, a point few airline operators have realized.

First, where can we find sufficient land, properly located and usable? How can we possibly dig up the money to pay for the tremendous investment in new airports which must be made? I think by 1975 we will have completed what I call the second round of airport construction that is essentially beginning now. By 1975 the total cost of this second round of development will be $6 billion, including terminals and other facilities for which federal funds are not presently available. I think we will need another two dozen new jet airports in major cities which already have existing airports.

There are two measures of an airport's capacity—its IFR and its VFR capacity. We have already exceeded the instrument weather capacity at virtually all our major airports during peak hours. We are rapidly approaching the time when our good weather capacity will be exceeded. We have already passed it at Washington National and the estimates are that it will be exceeded in the New York area by 1970. This means not just an increase in the size of the airport. It means new airports at different locations in the same metropolitan area, because of the dangerous air space congestion over and around an airport.

It takes a good seven or eight years from the initial planning to the construction of a major airport. So you have to decide now how many new airports will be needed to handle the traffic demands of the future, where they will be located and what type of aircraft they will handle, and then try to get by with the property owners with a neighborly spirit.

This entails some discussion as to what kind of airports there will be. Can we continue to have airports open to all kinds of traffic or should we have specialized airports, some for general aviation, some for suburban and feeder lines, some for domestic trunks and some for overseas airlines?

Also with respect to the airlines, would it be better to have relatively close-in low cost airports to handle STOL flights and separate far-out airports for long haul and international flights? I think we must come to a system of specialized and separate airports, not only for convenience but also for safety. The CAB's Northeast Corridor Investigation will, I believe, lead to this conclusion.

At the same time we construct new airports, we must modernize the air traffic control system above the airports. The Senate has appropriated $50 million above the President's budget request for fiscal 1968 for just this purpose, much more will be required.

With the tremendous increase in general aviation aircraft, anticipated to be at least 180,000 by 1976, our airways will become as crowded as our highways are during peak traffic hours. Since most of our air trips, particularly general aviation, are 250 miles or less, I think we can anticipate quite a traffic jam in the airways which are not now under positive control.

I believe positive control itself must be extended to all types of aircraft. This presents quite a problem for general aviation because the electronic equipment now available that is compatible with the present control system is prohibitive in both cost and weight for general aviation aircraft. Serious research efforts must be made during the coming decade to perfect low cost, light weight electronic equipment, so that general aviation aircraft could be placed under positive control. But what system can handle positive control for all commercial transports plus 180,000 possible small aircraft?

From the government policy standpoint, I think the systems approach, coupled with the technology which will be available in the late 70's and early 80's, will require a close examination of our concepts of competition, common ownership of transportation companies, and antitrust laws. The Department of Transportation will play an active role in this examination and in recommending to the Congress the policies that should be adopted.

If the capital requirements are too great for any one airline to finance its fleet, should we then permit a merger between major airlines? What substitute for competition would you have if mergers reduce the number of airlines to a few giant companies? It may be that new airline companies will have to be formed to raise the capital and provide the service required by the public in the 80's. This means a relaxation in current government attitudes on new entrants.

Secretary Boyd has already indicated in public speeches that he is looking very deeply into the question of common ownership of transportation companies. This crosses modal lines and is contrary to current views on competition.

Noise and air pollution will be significant problems, unless technology can produce a quieter engine and a cleaner fuel. We are rapidly reaching the time where an aroused citizenry will just not tolerate any more noise around the airport.

There are just a few problems that come into the mind of this legislator. I must confess they are more of a policy nature than some which you will undoubtedly encounter in operating your airlines. But I toss them out in the hope you will give them some consideration, because I do not believe that air transportation can ever be the effective mode of transportation it promises to be unless some of the social problems technology creates are solved.

Before I close I want to say that the questions I have raised and the manner in which I have phrased them do not in any way indicate any particular inclination of my own. In most respects I just regard them as problems that will arise for which solutions must be found.

I have enjoyed being with you again and appreciate the opportunity to talk aviation with you. I commend you on the progress you have made and urge you to continue your tradition of excellence and public service.

THE FEDERAL HEARING EXAMINER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today at noon, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] made a speech at the fifth annual seminar luncheon of the Federal Trial Examiners Conference, entitled "The Future for the Federal Hearing Examiner." I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE FOR THE FEDERAL HEARING EXAMINER

(Speech by Senator FRANK CARLSON, Fifth Annual Seminar Luncheon, Federal Trial Examiners Conference, University Club, Washington, D.C., October 25, 1967)

My good friend George, Chairman Youngblood, Chairman Macy, ladies and gentlemen and members of the Federal Trial Examiners Conference.

I feel deeply honored to appear before this distinguished group of jurists in the field of administrative law. I also welcome the opportunity to talk with you today because I think it is a good thing for those of us on Capitol Hill who serve our government as members of Congress to have this kind of direct contact with others who serve our government in a different but equally important way. In your case—the most important and interesting area of administrative law.

You know, I accepted your cordial invitation to speak with some nervousness. I am just a little nervous about speaking to an audience comprised of lawyers. I am hopeful you will give my remarks a fair and unbiased hearing. Inasmuch as I am not a lawyer, I feel somewhat like our belabored President, surrounded by many experts. Perhaps I should have taken a poll amongst you to determine my subject.

I have a great respect for lawyers. The legal profession has—as all Americans know—made tremendous contributions to our remarkable and frankly, I think wonderful, basic principles of government.

Today, you good people here at this luncheon, are continuing this great tradition. Your contributions have been made possible through a new and exciting addition to our government—some have even called it the fourth branch of government.

This fourth branch was conceived only a score of years ago—a short time in the history of any branch of law—when the Administrative Procedure Act was unanimously approved by Congress. Since becoming a member of the Senate, I have become keenly aware of its importance and more important, the effect its personnel system has had on our nation.

Enthusiastic supporters of the Act hailed it as a "bill of rights" for the hundreds of thousands of Americans whose affairs are controlled or regulated in one way or another by agencies of the Federal Government—they called it a long sought advance in democratic government—or comprehensive charter of private liberty and a solemn undertaking of official fairness.

The Act actually shaped your future destiny. It bound the activities of administrative agencies, it changed the status of hearing officers, it assigned more responsibility to the Civil Service Commissioner in the field of administration and to all of these people it presented challenging problems—some of these problems we still have with us today, problems that are of concern to all of us.

The passage of the Administrative Procedure Act, and it might well be called your act, climaxed years of effort and controversy. Its infancy was stormy and its adolescence painful. Now, today, it is still misunderstood and not appreciated by many whom it should challenge and who might help shape its still unfulfilled future. You who are appointed under the Act, make records and recommend or hand down binding decisions of Government that have far reaching impact on the individual rights and property that affect the daily lives of every American.

There are three items that perhaps I can touch on very briefly that concern your most important responsibility. In your fall newsletter, your most able president talked about ways in which compensation of examiners might be increased. I know that in these times of inflation that honest, forthright discussion concerning compensation is a necessary topic.

Secondly, I know there is strong sentiment among you for elevating the status and dignity of your position and the proceedings over which you preside to the level enjoyed by our courts. I share this sentiment.

Finally, I want to make it very clear how I feel about the importance of the Administrative Process in our government, and therefore, in our way of life.

It has been my privilege to serve many years on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the Senate—a committee I know you are familiar with. I have long made it a special point to get adequate pay and appropriate prestige and recognition for all Federal employees. I assure you that includes the high level classification that you here today presently hold—and I am sure enjoy.

Frankly, I feel your President's remarks in your fall newsletter are as candid and proper as any that I could make. President Youngblood said, and I quote:

"I do not believe that a primary thrust should be made in the area of increased compensation for Hearing Examiners in the immediate foreseeable future. The climate is not right on the Hill and off the Hill among those whose support we would need for a successful campaign.

"We will, of couse, be alert for any change in the situation that might affect this conclusion."

Your President continued by saying:

"I am pleased to report, however, that all former GS-14 examiners except four, are now at the GS-15 level. We will continue to upgrade all examiners."

Now I know that some of you feel you are not yet adequately paid for the high level and most important service you render—I happen to share this view. I hope, however, you will reflect seriously on the improvements that have been made in the years that coincide with your own tenure in office.

I assure you that many of my colleagues on Capitol Hill have joined me in continuing to narrow the differential that has existed in pay available from Government and the private sector of our society. This work has not been in vain. We narrowed the gap and I promise our efforts will continue. I think the key thing to remember concerning an increase in pay is the statement by your President—

"We will, of course, be alert for any change in the present situation that could lead to realistic proposals for increased compensation."

I am sure that virtually everyone that works for a living feels proper compensation is his basic or primary goal. However, this country is beginning to realize that all Americans—regardless of occupation—must also have recognition and dignity. Dignity that stems from the knowledge that they are doing an important job—and doing it well.

Frankly, I feel the confusing title of Hearing Examiner now applied to your office should be replaced with something more accurately describing the service you perform—a title that would also dignify your office.

All too often in government today, names are changed to protect and perhaps project the ego of the agency. However, I feel that any change that would add to the dignity and the definition of your office in the eyes of the public and those people who come before you as witnesses and litigants is certainly worthwhile. I have heard several suggestions—Administrative Judge or possibly Federal Trial Judge—both, I think, more accurately describe your work.

Whatever the title, it should lend dignity and clarification to your office. Many people do not realize who Hearing Examiners are or what their function is.

I am reminded of the time a man in a rural community read in the local newspaper where a Hearing Examiner had been assigned to a specific case. He told his friends a traveling ear specialist had come to town.

Now, I know few people would come up with that definition, but it is quite likely many more are not fully aware of the wide scope and tremendous importance of the decisions a Hearing Examiner makes. Usually, the agency you represent, state or federal, gets the credit—or the blame—but if the job is well done and credit is due, it should go to that man who is known now as a Hearing Examiner and whose title in the future should reflect this kind of contribution towards our American Government.

Let us look now at the other side of the coin and mention a word that many times seems to be forgotten in today's world—responsibility. Quite a storm raged around Administrative Law in the past. Your critics argued that administrative agencies were infringing upon the traditional function of the court system and charged with bitterness that there was a basic defect in a system that permitted one entity to act as prosecutor, judge and jury in a given case.

I feel this storm has subsided considerably and largely due to your efforts. It is tremendously important that we who work in government must remain impartial. We must eliminate the mistaken idea that administrative decisions are based on partisan politics. It should be the goal of you here today to achieve that degree of public acceptance and high respect paid to our courts and judges.

In a highly publicized decision some years ago, involving the "Appalachian Conspiracy" and the Mafia, a U.S. Court of Appeals said, "we cannot state too strongly our view that it is incumbent for trial judges to analyze with meticulous care the evidence as to each defendant. You, as trial judges, have a grave responsibility to go over the evidence in every case you try and to relate it to the Congressional intent of the statute you interpret, rather than to render decisions on a basis of personal opinions concerning social improvement.

In essence, what I am trying to say is that your interpretation of social justice must not become the controlling reason for pronouncing our citizens in violation of administrative law as a substitute for adequate evidence and proof of the violation.

I have a pretty strong conviction that no court can be better than the judge presiding over it and that no quasi-judicial system or Administrative Process can be any better than the individual or the Board or the Commission that renders the decision. It seems certain to me that no one individual has as great an impact on the end result of the whole Administrative Process as the Hearing or Trial Examiner who makes the initial decision.

The importance of what you ladies and gentlemen are doing really becomes significant when we realize the Administrative Process reaches into our lives and affects each and every one of us in the vital problem areas of what we shall eat—what we shall wear—what we shall earn—and under what conditions we shall work. Every step that you take must be with the highest integrity—the greatest ability—and the fairest sense of justice.

Reflecting upon the importance of your task, it becomes obvious to me that you should be adequately paid—that you should enjoy the recognition and dignity that your performance of this most difficult and important job deserves—that you should be provided with the appropriate facilities needed to render your services at a maximum level of performance.

Too often we take the obvious for granted however. I acknowledge that it is one of my duties and the duty of each of my colleagues to keep in close touch with the requirements necessary for trial judges to continue to do such a fine job.

When I started this talk, I made a mental note that I wouldn't try to outtalk a group of talented lawyers. It occurs to me that perhaps I have already spoken too long and said far to little.

I want to say though, that I have really enjoyed being here with you—that I appreciate so much having been invited—and that I personally have a keen respect for the most important and vital job that you are doing.

We are both so very lucky. You as lawyers—and more precisely as lawyers who exercise your legal skill as judges—and I as a member of that great lawmaking body called the United States Senate, are both engaged in activities unexcelled in the opportunities they afford to be of service to mankind.

There can be no finer service or occupation than guaranteeing to all men everywhere, reasonable justice, personal liberty and a favorable climate and situation in which every individual can secure for himself and his family the fruits of a life well lived.

This is your purpose and your function. It is also mine. I pledge to you my continued support of your activity and congratulate you for what you have done and what you will continue to do.

JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this year the Soviet Union celebrates the 50th anniversary of the revolution which brought its present form of government to power.

It is a time for Russians to look back at what they have accomplished and to look forward to what may be possible. Taking stock is serious business for a great power in a world which depends for its future existence on improving international relationships.

Still unaccomplished in the Soviet Union is the complete guarantee of rights to 3 million Jewish citizens who seek nothing more than to be allowed to be Jews. Although there has been considerable progress in recent years, Soviet Jews who wish to practice their religion and cultural tradition are still not as free to do so as other minority groups in that country.

Publication of devotional literature and production of devotional articles are both restricted. Official communication with Jews throughout the world is prohibited, in contrast to the practice with other religious groups. Study at home and abroad for prospective religious leaders is almost completely prohibited, and worship facilities themselves are becoming increasingly inadequate.

Jews who wish to leave the country are kept from doing so, and Jews are discouraged from holding significant positions in and out of government. In short, there is still an important difference in the Soviet Union between the treatment of Jews and the treatment of other minority groups.

Mr. President, it is difficult to understand why this should be true. Soviet ideology condemns anti-Semitism, and officially there is no rationale in Russia for discrimination against Jews. Still, even though the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union today bears no resemblance to earlier persecution there and elsewhere, Russian Jews remain a disadvantaged minority—with restrictions which affect the practices and traditions which are vital to their continuing existence as Jews.

The desire of Russian Jews to be Jewish is certainly no threat to the Soviet structure. It is difficult to see why Soviet Jews should be denied the rights afforded other religious and ethnic groups.

Mr. President, every great nation of the world has much to accomplish in guaranteeing the rights of minorities of all kinds. Let us hope that one manifestation of continuing progress toward a better world will be the relief of discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union.

THE CHAMIZAL TREATY: NOT AN END, BUT A BEGINNING

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this Saturday will be a historic day in my State, and a landmark day in the history of cooperation and friendship between the people of Mexico and of the United States. On Saturday, President Lyndon B. Johnson of the United States and President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz of Mexico will meet on a piece of land between the cities of El Paso, Tex., and Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua. The land is called "El Chamizal" by the Mexicans, which means "the thicket."

The two Presidents will sign the final acts carrying out the Chamizal Treaty, finalizing an agreement that stems from three score years of negotiations, settling a long disagreement over the boundary that runs along the Rio Grande between my State and the Mexican state of Chihuahua.

But the signing of the deeds under the Chamizal Treaty is not just the end of a friendly disagreement. It is the beginning of a whole new chapter in what has already been a beautiful and rewarding brotherhood between the people of Texas and the United States as a whole and the Mexican people. On Saturday, Americans and Mexicans should feel a deep sense of pride and satisfaction as we clasp hands in friendship founded upon mutual respect. Although the Chamizal is a small tract of land, the eradication of doubt about its possesion is a monumental event in international relations and an event that could only happen in an atmosphere of absolute trust and cordiality.

Many people have played a role in this settlement. The late President Kennedy went to Mexico on June 29, 1962, on a state visit to discuss hemispheric and international problems with then-President Adolfo Lopez Mateos of Mexico, and it was during that meeting that the seeds of agreement on the need for settling the Chamizal dispute came about. The next day, June 30, the two Presidents issued a joint communique affirming a new era of friendship and understanding between Mexico and the United States and pledging to find a solution to the Chamizal question.

Since that day 5 years and 5 months ago, the spirit of cooperation and mutual determination to settle this area of conflict has been magnificent. The list of credits in this remarkable negotiation should include hundreds of persons—representatives of the U.S. State Department, the Mexican Foreign Office, the States of Texas and Chihuahua, the cities of El Paso and Juarez, officials of El Paso County, and many private citizens representing business, labor, the church, schools, and virtually every aspect of community life.

Two key figures in what must often have been a tediously complicated affair were Joseph F. Friedkin and David Herrera Jordan, the American and Mexican members, respectively, on the International Boundary and Water Commission. Mr. Friedkin and Mr. Herrera Jordan and their staffs worked tirelessly for 5 years and 5 months toward this settlement, and Saturday's ceremony should be a very satisfying climax to their labor.

The same praise is certainly justified for our former Ambassador to Mexico, my fellow Texan, Thomas Mann, for Mr. Manuel Tello, the former Mexican Secretary of Foreign Relations, and for Mr. Antonio Carrillo Flores, who was Mexican Ambassador to the United States when the Chamizal talks were initiated in 1962 and who is now the very capable Minister of Foreign Relations under President Diaz Ordaz.

Locally, former El Paso County Judges Glenn Woodard and Travis Johnson worked closely with American and Mexican Government representatives, as did Mayor Judson Williams, of El Paso. The city officials of Juarez have been extremely helpful throughout the negotiating and planning, and Congressman RICHARD WHITE and the present El Paso County Judge, Colbert Coldwell, have been instrumental in following through on final details.

Mr. President, since the days of President Taft, every U.S. President has made a concerted and honest effort to resolve the Chamizal border question, but it was not until President John F. Kennedy took action that a settlement seemed a possible reality.

At the Chamizal ceremony in El Paso, on September 25, 1964, to commemorate the successful signing of the Convention, President Johnson remarked:

> Let us always remember that . . . (a) great man whose visionary statesmanship made this possible was John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Through the determined efforts of our late President, U.S. policy on the Chamizal dispute was viewed in a new light. It was President Kennedy's belief that this longstanding dispute should not continue to interfere with United States-Mexican harmony, and he took definite steps to insure that a complete solution, satisfactory to both Governments, be arrived at.

By August of 1963, a Chamizal Convention was drawn up and signed which provided for the ceding of 437 acres of land in the El Paso area to the Mexican city of Juarez, near the lines of a 1911 arbitration award.

The Senate of the United States ratified the Chamizal Treaty on December 17, 1963. It was my privilege to present the case for ratification to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and to speak on the floor of the Senate for ratification. As a young lawyer, I lived and practiced law in El Paso for 3½ years, and to me the settlement of this old source of irritation between our two nations was a matter of prime importance. I am glad to have been privileged to have a small part in the ratification chapter of the settlement.

A few days later, in December of 1963, President Johnson signed the instrument of ratification, and on January 14, 1964, the convention entered into force.

To the people of El Paso, the Chamizal settlement means a new future for the growth and development of their city, hitherto impeded for the past 100 years. Property owners who had been plagued by uncertain titles to land in the disputed area can proceed with improvement projects. The Chamizal settlement has removed an area of Mexican territory in downtown El Paso which had before been an obstacle to construction of efficient traffic arteries and public utility projects. The riverfront on both sides of the boundary has been enhanced as part of an overall beautification project. With the eradication of the dispute, international flood control measures are being instituted for the general benefit of both cities. Always harmonious ties between El Paso and Juarez—sister cities of the Rio Grande—are even stronger today.

The 1964 conclusion of the Chamizal Convention was only the first phase of the termination of this dispute. The responsibility for fulfilling the terms of the settlement fell upon the U.S. Government, and President Johnson saw it through. The U.S. Government was charged with acquiring all the land to be ceded to Mexico. In order for this to be accomplished, 4,500 U.S. citizens, residents of that land, had to be compensated and relocated in other parts of El Paso. Businesses had to be moved, Federal facilities and railroads had to be relocated.

The challenge was met. The U.S. Congress responded to the needs by appropriating $44.9 million to facilitate the settlement. From the beginning, President Johnson and the Congress were determined that the cost of the Chamizal settlement should not fall upon the citizens of El Paso. Proceeding on this premise, the Government consulted and worked closely with officials and civic leaders of the city. All attempts were made to make adequate compensation to the dislocated citizens and to aid them in making new homes.

Mr. President, this is a great day for the people of Texas and for inter-American relations. The signing of this treaty represents a victory for reason. In the words of President Johnson the Chamizal Treaty will stand as "a symbol to all the world that the most troublesome of problems can yield to the tools of peace."

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST JEWS IN THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in approximately 2 weeks, on November 7, the Soviet Union will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Russian revolution. No doubt there will be dancing in the streets and other joyful events that accompany a nation's celebration of its birthday.

One segment of the Russian society, however, will have little or no reason to join in these festivities. Mr. President, I speak of the 3 million Jews who now live in the Soviet Union.

Today, October 25, is the eve of the Jewish holiday Simchath Torah—meaning "Rejoice in the Law." For the past 3 years thousands of Soviet Jewish youth have demonstrated in the streets and synagogues on this day to illustrate graphically their intense hunger for a distinctive Jewish experience in the face of Soviet pressures. It also provides an occasion for measuring Soviet performance against its continued denial to Soviet Jews the rights permitted other Soviet nationality groups.

There is ample evidence of religious and cultural discrimination against Jews in the U.S.S.R. Today, for example, there is not a single Yiddish school or a single Yiddish class in the Soviet Union, although Soviet law requires the organization of such classe at the request of 10 parents.

There are no schools or clases in any language to enable Jews to learn something Jewish; whether it be history, culture, literature, or even their most recent past—the martyrdom of Soviet Jews during the Nazi holocaust.

Jewish communal-cultural institutions have been destroy. Jewish publishing houses and book distributing agencies do not exist.

The famed Jewish State Theater of Moscow has been "padlocked" since 1949. Jewish participation in political affairs is unknown.

The paradox is that Soviet ideology, practices, law, and the Soviet Constitution all encourage nationalities to perpetuate their group existence through cultural and educational institutions in their own languages. And Jews are legally defined by Russia as a nationality. But the suppression of Jewish culture and religion is without parallel among religious and ethnic minorities of the Soviet Union. The extent to which this suppression is carried is reflected in the latest edition of the large Soviet Encyclopedia. Yiddish is there defined as the "former language of the Russian Jews." We might call this "linguacide."

Mr. President, we must not commit the sin of silence. The basic and fundamental injustices practiced against Soviet Jewry must be exposed in the marketplace of world opinion.

I call upon the United Nations to continue and to strengthen its discussion of the religious and cultural persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union. It is through this international forum that world opinion can make itself most effectively felt in Russia.

JOB CORPS TRAINING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, earlier this fall, the Senate enacted a 2-year authorization to continue and expand the programs of the war on poverty.

One of the most successful and productive of those programs has been the Job Corps. It has been the subject of much controversy and much criticism, much of which is undeserved.

The Job Corps has attempted to deal with the most severely disadvantaged of America's young people. It attempts to make productive taxpayers out of potential welfare clients. In a recent article printed in the Commercial Car Journal, the work of the Camp Kilmer Job Corps Center in New Jersey is described. At Camp Kilmer young men are trained to handle trucks and to drive them. This is just an example of the work and training Job Corps trainees receive. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Job Corps Drivers Better Than "90 Day" Wonders

(By Carl Glines)

Depending on your political and sociological outlook, Sargent Shriver's "War on Poverty" program is either a total success or total failure or somewhere in-between.

Most so-called liberals accept the successful theory. Their opposite numbers—the arch conservatives—think the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) is a mountain of bureaucratic gobbledegook. The white racist doesn't like OEO because it involves Negroes. And Negro leaders don't like it because they say it doesn't do . . . or go far enough.

There are 180 million Americans walking the face of this country, most of them have some kind of opinion about OEO. That means 180 million different opinions.

This is not a story about Sargent Shriver or OEO, or what 180 million Americans think. This is one reporter's opinion, about one school producing skilled drivers for the nation's trucking industry at one Job Corps Center in one OEO program.

The school, located at Camp Kilmer in Edison, New Jersey, is called officially the "Transportation and Warehousing School." In practice, it is an elaborate experiment in American sociology . . . a project aimed at giving those youths from the bottom of the social, economic and educational bucket another opportunity before they are zapped by society and industry alike for good.

A representative for Rentar Corp., operators of the school for Federal Electric Corp., OEO's prime Kilmer contractor, described the show for CCJ this way:

"We take raw animals and turn them into human beings." Maybe so. But comparing human beings to raw animals is a crass comparison. Those who share similar opinions are without question in the minority.

PAST MEMORIES

For the interested, Camp Kilmer looks today much like it did during the days of World War II. Most of the two-story barracks still stand, although time, weather and an occasional fire have taken their toll. The camp is still partially surrounded by a high barbed-wire fence bearing the legend: "U.S. Government Property. Keep Out."

If one stands silent, it seems almost possible to hear the sounds of pounding feet of GIs.

But today's pounding feet belong to a new—if not down-trodden generation—of 16, 17 and 18-year olds walking to classes, some for the first time in more than 12 months. (Being a school drop-out is one of the basic requirements for the Job Corps.)

Phil Green, FEC's spokesman at Kilmer, says approximately 1000 Corpsmen have entered the "T&W" school since it opened. Of this number, 502 have graduated from one of the four—light, heavy, tractor-trailer or forklift—courses offered. Of the remaining 500, 275 are still attending courses and another 225 have either dropped out or transferred to other Job Corps centers. Officials report that of the 225 drop-outs, about 150 lacked the skills necessary for driving trucks. The remaining 75 were chronic disciplinary problems. They are the ones who have been zapped.

The "T&W" course is actually four in one. All corpsmen entering the program must complete the 12-week light truck course. If they successfully navigate the first three months, they can go on to the nine-week heavy truck course. The tractor-trailer program is next. That's six weeks. Those who can't negotiate the light truck course are shuttled over to the six-weeks forklift program.

Whether or not a corpsman ever enters the program is determined from basic testing given when he arrives.

And from whence does he arrive?

"HELL, WE DON'T KNOW"

"Hell, we don't know where they come from. All we know is that Washington tells us they're sending us some corpsmen. Who they are, what they are, we don't know. That's one of the things that we have to determine," a Job Corps official explained.

Indoctrination includes a complete physical examination, criminal record and education check, outfitting in a blue uniform and and cap. One uniform to the corpsman. The cap color designates the school. The uniform must be returned, but corpsmen can keep their caps.

Those who have serious criminal records (10% of all corpsmen have one serious conviction; 27% minor) are weeded out. They must also be at least 18 years old and have a 4th or 5th grade level education. A corpsman with some high school training may not be any better equipped educationally than one who hasn't, especially if he is non-white and comes from the South. The average reading level of all corpsmen is 4.7 grade level with seven years of schooling.

The ratio of Negroes and non-whites to whites is high, 70–30, according to records. Most of the corpsmen I talked with came from the South, but not all.

Although some who enter the Center may already come armed with driver licenses, each corpsman is re-educated with the viewpoint that they have never been behind the wheel of a vehicle.

Sometime during the 12-weeks of the light truck course, they are given the written driver's test administered by the N.J. Motor Vehicle Department. If they pass the written test, they are given the driver's examination and eventually a Garden State license.

The driver's license is a convenience (they also get a regular government permit) because sometime later, corpsmen are permitted to drive outside the camp area as part of their training. Under new procedures just recently adopted, "T&W" corpsmen have assumed almost all the hauling for the entire Kilmer JC Center. The corpsmen are assigned to take a tractor-trailer into the New York-North Jersey area, with each student limited to a total of three hours behind the wheel per trip.

Originally, Rentar equipment was used for practical driver training. This equipment—23 vehicles—has since been purchased by FEC for the government from Rentar for $69,690, for Kilmer use. Rentar officials declined any comment on the terms of the sale.

EQUIPMENT SHORTAGE

One major difficulty at Kilmer is the lack of training equipment. The inventory includes three 1963 series Mack COE's; one White 7000 tractor with a 10-speed Road-Ranger, leased to the school for $1 a year; three used I-H tractors, four Ford Econoline and seven Dodge vans; nine Dodge pick-ups; six 38-ft vans and one lowboy trailer. Most equipment is grabbed off from military surplus as it becomes available and refurbished at the center's corpsmen-operated automotive repair school.

Aside from the 90 minutes daily of academic instruction, a corpsman gets three hours a day driving practice. The program begins in the class room with the Drivotrainer, an electronic driver-trainer device, and progresses on to instruction in highway driving, city driving, pre-trip inspection, material handling and range skills. (The range was the site of the July Mid-Atlantic States Safe Driver Roadeo.) Lack of equipment, however, forces many corpsmen to wait for their chance behind the wheel in some instances. The equipment to pupil ratio is one-to-four. Admittedly the school could use additional tractors.

Each incoming "T&W" corpsman is given a dark blue plastic briefcase containing such items as White's "Driver Manual"; Babaco's trailer alarm book; Smith's "Defensive Driving Manual"; Pure's truck stop directory; ICC's 1967 Safety Regulations; ATA's driver fact book and a driver's daily log.

A corpsman who successfully completes the light truck course has 180 hours behind the wheel. The wheel time jumps up to 316 hours if he continues into the heavy truck program and 436 hours if he completes the tractor-trailer course.

NO PROMISES

A corpsman entering Kilmer gets no guarantee of a job. He is guaranteed at least three job interviews. This phase of the program has complications, however, because reportedly each corpsman must return to the area he came from. Corpsmen under 21 who want to relocate must have written parental permission.

Whether OEO has a firm policy of placing corpsmen in jobs within their own community is disputed. Rentar officials maintain that such a policy does exist. But FEC people deny it. One FEC official says such a policy would be self-defeating because sending some corpsmen home is the last thing they want to do. The situation does pose major problems for Rentar who runs what it calls a nationwide employment office at Kilmer.

How, for example, do you place a corpsman trained as a truck driver in a job if he comes from the Virgin Islands where some have? Obviously, job opportunities for drivers are few. Or how do you get a JC graduate a driving job if he lives in a rural or farming area? Obviously, again, you don't and some corpsmen have completed the school only to return to the family farm.

Rentar and FEC officials both agree that placing graduates has been difficult. The age factor is one major stumbling bloc, but racial prejudice and discrimination among employers is suspected to be wide-spread.

Of 192 corpsmen graduated from the program in the past 7 months, 86.5% have obtained employment, but not necessarily in the trucking industry. Because of the lack of any comprehensive and continuous follow-up program there is no realistic way of telling how many of these have stayed. The best figures available from Federal Electric is that 82% or 358 corpsmen of 437 placed since the school opened have stayed on the job for at least two months.

As one official said: "We are dealing with boys who because of their family and educational background tend to be very mobile."

Since the school opened, officials estimate that 25% of the "T&W" graduates are working at jobs other than for what they were trained.

Some long-haul common carriers are reportedly hiring corpsmen as "yard jockies" until they reach 21-years or older. But the greater employment opportunities appear to be with firms in the soda bottling business, such as Coca-Cola, 7-Up and Pepsi-Cola, for example.

Many are getting jobs as garbage and refuse drivers while still others end up as delivery men for grocery stores, florists and small specialty shops.

Just how good is a Kilmer corpsman?

PROGRAM GOOD—BUT

The answer obviously depends on the individual. But at least three major common carriers in the North Jersey and New York City area are more than satisfied with the training.

"Marvelous." "The best." "Top-notch." This is typical of fleet reaction.

Harry Stevens, a safety supervisor for Eastern Express says: "The training is great and I'm sorry there isn't another school like it around."

Still and despite the enthusiastic support from the field, corpsmen working for Eastern Express and Bilkay's Express and others are *not* working there today.

"One came from Tennessee and after a few weeks became homesick. Another lived in Brooklyn and had a commuting problem," Stevens says.

At Bilkay's, the corpsman, also from Brooklyn didn't know the territory and was let go after two weeks. But while he was there, he handled himself better than many professional drivers, one company official said. "He checked under the vehicle every day for leaks. He positioned himself in the cab and adjusted the rear-view mirrors so he could see. And he asked for a rag to clean the windshield." Bilkay's says they would rehire him if he could learn the streets and avenues. "And that's something that we don't often promise," the official added.

Eastern and others say they would hire JCs if they lived within reasonable commuting distance to company operations. Others said they would hire them if they were older, but too many are under 21.

When OEO first opened the Job Corps program, critics said it cost more to train a corpsman than it did to keep a boy in Harvard for a year. JC officials admit that in the beginning at least, the criticism was factually correct. But the longer the program runs and the more youths who are trained, the lower the costs become.

In 1966, for example, the cost of training a single corpsman was $6090 for nine months and $8120 for a year. This year the costs dropped to $5825 and $7765 and reportedly haven't bottomed yet.

INDUSTRY SUPPORTS THE JOB CORPS

Some of America's industrial giants are behind the Job Corps program 100%. They include RCA, Litton Industries, General Electric, IBM, Xerox and others. Like Federal Electric, they are making it work.

Kilmer Job Corps center opened in February 1965, with Federal Electric and Rutgers—The State University—as working partners. FEC bid $11,520,000 to operate the center under the original contract. Last year, FEC received a second contract for $12,687,000 covering a 17-month period which expires next June. Federal Electric's profit—before taxes—for running the center is estimated at about 4.2% or approximately $500,000. Rutgers has dropped out as a partner because of some basic and rather disagreeable developments. The State University did have about 30 members of its faculty involved in the academic side of the program. Now, it has only one and he is just a part-time consultant. Others are on call, however, for special academic problems.

Although publicly disavowed, a report leaked to the press in the fall of 1965 attacked the center for overcrowding, high absenteeism, slow implementation of vocational programs and other assorted criticisms. The charges were denied by FEC, but the bitterness and memory of the incident still lingers.

The Job Corps isn't perfect. Nothing ever is. But if only 15, 20 or 25% of the graduates can be converted into tax paying, wage-earning American citizens, then the national return is many times greater than the national investment.

OEO has started the merry-go-round turning and some of those who have climbed aboard are beginning to reach for the brass ring that spells jobs, income and more important, self-respect.

Camp Kilmer Job Corps Center houses five training schools:

1. Automotive, building and metal trades
2. Electrical, printing and welding
3. Food service
4. Transportation and warehousing
5. General vocational

The courses and training hours for the transportation school are:

Light truck, 360 hours, 12 weeks.

Heavy truck, 270 hours, 9 weeks.

Tractor trailer, 180 hours, 6 weeks.

Classroom sessions incorporate the following subjects:

ICC Regulations, Safety standards, Customer relations, Personal injury prevention, "Smith" system of defensive driving, Preventive Maintenance, Pre-trip inspection, Tire inspection and care, PUC regulations, Fire prevention, Freight handling.

Obtain information on availability of graduates by contacting:

Placement Department, Rentar Corporation, Transportation-Warehousing School, Kilmer Job Corps Center, Edison, New Jersey 08817.

SOVIET UNION CONTINUES TO PERSECUTE JEWS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I join many of my distinguished colleagues this week in calling attention to the continuing problems of those of the Jewish faith in the Soviet Union. Stories of incidents of persecution and discrimination have reached such a proportion that the U.S. Senate has, on several occasions, expressed itself formally on this issue.

This Nation of ours—a "nation of immigrants" as President Kennedy called it—understands the rich heritage that different cultures and traditions give to a country. And we realize as well that the culture and tradition and religious observances of any one group of citizens must be completely respected and fully protected or else the entire nation suffers an irreparable loss of freedom.

Unfortunately, evidence indicates that the Soviet Union has confiscated synagogues, closed Jewish cemeteries, arrested rabbis and lay religious leaders, and discriminated against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education. Such persecution against any culture affects all freedom-loving men everywhere and compels us to speak out against it.

The Soviet Union will soon celebrate its 50th anniversary. The time of celebration should also be a time of examination—and the world will judge the Soviet performance that has been outstanding in some areas against the continued denial of those rights so eloquently spelled out in the Russian constitution. We all hope that this 50th year can mark a turning point in national policy and a new day of decency and of humanity that will provide freedom and dignity for Russian Jews.

IS PRIVACY DEAD?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President—

The bugs—they're coming in the windows, thru the hole in the back fence, down the chimney. Tonight, they may be listening in on you.

This is the theme of an article by Philip Wylie which was published in the Chicago Tribune of September 24, 1967. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS PRIVACY DEAD?

(NOTE.—The bugs—they're coming in the windows, thru the hole in the back fence, down the chimney. Tonight, they may be listening in on you.)

(By Philip Wylie)

Our recent indignation at the use of "bugs" by almost anybody for nearly any reason has lessened since the Supreme court acted. Now we know who will be legally allowed to bug others. But we will remain uncomfortable because we've learned how easy it is to spy-by-gadget. A bright teen-ager can acquire the know-how to monitor your phone or bug your bedroom—for a gag.

Privacy is our right. A man's house, if not quite a fortified castle, is subject to forcible entrance, or to secret invasion-by-gadgetry by constituted authority, solely, and under court-defined conditions. It's in the communist- and dictator-run nations that "Big Brother" watches everybody. For liberty *means* privacy: the secret ballot, the right to hold any opinion, discuss any idea, so long as the widest use of that privilege does not lead to acts endangering the very government that is guarantor of such freedom.

Privacy is essential for liberty. Big Brother cannot get at free men to learn their every act and word so as to force them to conform to his will. No tyrant can take over a free people while they defend the right not to be watched. But vigilance is required. Rights can be lost by ignoring their defense.

Suppose, for example, growing numbers of people in a liberty-loving land allowed others to watch them in various acts that had previously been held private? And suppose everybody else realized such invasions of privacy were being allowed but, instead of being furious, they were merely avid to learn whatever was discovered? Wouldn't such people still be free? If people authorized the bugging of their houses, where's the violation of privacy? And if everybody is permitted to know what happens in the monitored homes, isn't that more freedom, not less?

It's a vital question, these days, but one nobody asks, much. Vital, because you and I and all Americans *are* being watched, by hordes of experts—for thousands of special purposes. And we permit this intrusion into our personal lives. We do so because the people-watchers convince us that their motives are sound. They say our assent to being watched [or questioned intimately] will advance science. Or it will aid industry. Assist progress. Discover our future wants and help business supply them. So we agree to set some part of our privacy aside for what seems the general good.

But *is* it?

When the people-watchers sample what they say is a scientific cross-section of all Americans, they assume their figures represent a true picture of whatever they surveyed. That may be correct—for the time of the inquiry already past, that is, historic. But even if it's correct, the effect will be harmful.

Whatever emerges from the appraisals of the watched or questioned volunteers is taken as a standard by all but the hardiest individuals. Most will try to adapt to what the polled sample indicates as the general or popular response. For we want, naturally enough, to be on the winning side. To do the "in" thing. To keep up with [or surpass] the folks next door. People-watchers have now shown us how, in some special form.

So, at the very least, people-watching tends to make us less ourselves and more and more *conformist*. It limits us—and our choices.

One of the major concerns engaged in TV rating studies, I am told, monitors the sets of a few thousand families [or less] who have been chosen "scientifically" to make up a sample of all Americans with TV sets. Therefore, what they tune in—or tune out—has a powerful influence on which programs all of us will [and won't] be able to view, in the year ahead, and the years ahead. That seems satisfactory to the networks and even to most TV viewers. At the level of persons addicted to daily, multihour TV viewing, it may even *be* satisfactory. But not every family would allow a rating company to monitor its TV set, or sets. Why? To let watchers watch what *you* watch on TV, you must first be willing to assume that your taste is good enough to be used in setting TV standards for everybody.

TV sampling to determine universal programming is but a single, if flagrant, instance of people-watching we allow, and of results that we endure. Somebody, these days, is scrutinizing somebody else's every act and word, no matter how intimate. Using samples who volunteer. Who are these human bugs?

Well, scientists, among others. Anthropologists, say, who study cultures as minutely as they are able: primitive, rural, barbaric, pre-literate, and American cultures. Psychologists, too—people who are forever probing into our private [and even our unconscious] lives, and turning out mountains of printed reports. Sociologists—in slums, suburbs, penthouses, and on farms—asking questions and getting answers from people willing to cooperate with that "science." Many others.

Then there are market survey people. Their invasion, whether by phone or in person by door-to-door survey, is aimed, ostensibly, at finding out what we consumers need. However, as John K. Galbraith has declared in a new book, such market studying is mainly aimed at calculating what we consumers can be *made* to buy in the years ahead. What products, too, that industry can manufacture at the maximum profit. For, in a society as technical as our own, long-range planning is a goal. The products that will sell five years hence must be known now so they can be designed, tested, and so the machines for their mass-production can be built.

The old idea that competition rules industry and insures high quality in our gross national product, as Galbraith insists, is false. America, he says, is not a buyer's market now; it is a nation of buyers pre-polled to find what goods and services they could pay for, and how to lead to that. What you get, then, may or may not be what you need; but it will surely be what the market-survey snoops found you could be induced to *imagine* you needed and would purchase in sufficient quantities to justify the surveys, the long planning, the changes in factory equipment, and the final, massive output of each item—at, remember, maximum profit.

Poll-takers are, of course, yet another and very visible species of people-watchers. Poll-watching is, in turn, a fervent occupation of almost everybody in our land, the President, included. On the face of it, the pollsters' efforts seem both interesting and harmless. Their scientific cross-sections are sampled daily about all sorts of subjects; and their computerized reports appear as if instantly.

Yesterday's question may have been: "What do you think of teen-age and college boys who wear long hair?" Today's report will show that "X" per cent of us detest male tresses; another "X" per cent think the custom is all right; and a third fraction will be noted as having no opinion.

The scores of millions who pore over such polls will then assume they know where America stands on the long-locks-lads. [Mostly, of course, "agin'."] Those already against the pageboy-bob, or the Robert-Kennedy-uncut, will feel confirmed in their view. Those for it, or neutral, will, perhaps, perceive how out-of-step their permissive opinion has been—and some will change their attitude to match the majority. As to those with no opinion, the pollsters are forever mute. Plainly, on some subjects, such as Viet Nam, say, some Americans actually have no useful or lucid opinion. Often, however, people with intensely held views feel them to be private; and no people-watcher can get a usable word out of them. Yet in close differences of opinion these silent ones may hold the final decision.

Their right not to expose their views is constitutional and guaranteed. Poll-takers, inquiring photographers, market-researchers, and all the rest haven't the slightest right to expect any answer, or even a true one from those who reply. Yet their figures are regarded as sound—and often, I am sure, influence myriads. In that way, we are in danger of becoming followers, conformists, people eager to be "with it" irrespective of what "it" may be so long as their act provides a seeming of sophistication, style, status—a sense of what's popular and momentarily right. Polls, then, may sway opinion—even where elections are concerned. Who wants to vote for a candidate the polls show a sure loser. Not *most* of us!

When people-watchers approach us, furthermore, we may tend to do something very un-free, and so, non-American. We may try to find out which answer would please the people-watcher, and give him [or her] *that* response. We don't want to hurt his feelings, or disappoint him; we dislike to take a view that his query suggests would be contrary to the expected reply. And how often we do so is not known.

As my friend Bill Lederer said in a book title, are we a nation of sheep? Boosters, scared to knock? People who won't bail the boat that's sure to sink, otherwise—because bailing rocks the boat?

Anything in human thought or experience is now open to scrutiny and public assay. The late Dr. Alfred Kinsey was a comparative fuddy-duddy by current criteria. He confined his efforts to a long series of questions asked privately and designed, he said, to rule out liars, boasters, and guilty truth-hiders. That is people-watching at one remove, but, even so, the Kinsey reports created a sensation. Times have changed.

A medical doctor and his woman associate recently published the results of direct people-watching in the same area. They observed the erotic activities of thousands of men and women both directly and by tape-recorded movies. Their highly technical summary was the recent best-seller, "Human Sexual Response."

One must admit that its authors, the Masters-Johnson team, were people-watchers of the most dedicated and intimately probing sort. Moreover, some of their findings about psychological nature of impotency, for example, are of value, tho they were known before verification by these scientific Peeping Toms. However, I, at least find it difficult to accept all their ideas, since I don't believe that either the witnessed responses or the subjects who responded can represent everybody.

The first subjects were paid. Later, many hundreds volunteered, in behalf of science. A noble deed. But when such an effort involves one's erotic acts, one's sexual responses and/or one's real love-life, under scrutiny and on camera, I am not sure that the results can be regarded as of general relevance. Most of us [the sex revolution to the contrary notwithstanding] would not respond in our usual manner under those conditions. Most of us wouldn't volunteer, no matter how urgently scientists begged.

The extent and the perils of people-watching are not always noticed by the general public. And I began my concerned assay only lately. That happened when a friend who publishes a magazine sent me a brochure about its proven readership in an area where it is generally found: barbershops. A device called Dynascope had been invented, the brochure exulted, and several had been set unobtrusively in barbershops chosen at random. Focused on the chairs where men waited their turns, each Dynascope snapped a picture every 30 seconds. When developed, these showed that, of the men who read anything while waiting in those barbershops, nearly a third read my friend's magazine.

He was jubilant since he had proof for readership claims [and, doubtless, could raise his advertising rates as a result]. He was entranced by Dynascope. His brochure said, in effect: *Think how many other, equally priceless uses it will have!*

I began to do that: *Think.* About being watched.

I thought right away that I don't like my picture snapped without my knowledge or consent. Legally, one's photograph cannot be used for any commercial end unless one consents. Here, of course, tho the every-30-seconds snapshots were being used indirectly to boost my friend's business, the subject didn't consent—being unaware. Whether that use of photographs [or tape or whatever] is legal or not, only the Supreme Court could decide, perhaps.

But my thinking led me on, fast and far. Hundreds of banks are robbed every year. Shoplifting in supermarkets causes an annual loss of a billion. Such places, in consequence, are often fitted with closed circuit TV so that all who enter are watched constantly.

But I, for one, feel nobody has a right to watch me, covertly on any medium, Dynascope or TV. Not, that is, without either a legal writ or else my knowledge and permission. I think that quasi-public places like banks and supermarkets should be obliged to notify all persons of any surveillance. By big signs, say, that announce they are on TV or facing a Dynascope. Such signs would tend greatly to discourage thieves so the actual and costly apparatus might be dispensed with. And only a few of us would avoid such banks and stores.

As I realized we'd become a more watched people than those under the eye of "Big Brother," I tried to find out how many people-watchers there are. I could not. Almost nobody watches people-watchers in our land. But I did arrive at some scary orders-of-magnitude.

Take science. A recent questionnaire sent out by a publication that lists America's scientific and technical people had 1,000 different classes of these specialists. There are tens and tens of sorts of chemists, for example. Scores of sorts of biologists. Engineers of special sorts that most of us never heard of. However, a study of them all was made to ascertain how many categories consisted of, or were founded on, or engaged part time in *people-watching*. Answer: 289, or, nearly a third.

Almost 300 *branches* of science are, therefore, directly or indirectly involved in watching you—and me—and everybody in America. That means there are *hundreds of thousands* of those specialist watchers, alone!

To try to find out about the rest—the market-surveyors, pollsters, phone-inquirers, industrial researchers, public relations quiz people, and so on [almost endlessly] I finally asked the research department [people-watchers, all] of a great corporation to act for me. In time, these wizards reported there was *no way* to count or even estimate the nonscientific [trained and/or amateur, but hired] watchers.

But that research outfit, tho defeated, did help in one way. Its experts pointed out endless kinds of people-watchers I hadn't even considered. Doctors and health officials who report intimate facts about all of us. Census takers. Even clergymen may get up reports on quizzed parishioners. Many perfectly legal inspectors [as of fire hazards] can also be peeking furtively into other details of our ways, habits, and possessions. Lots of canvassers, furthermore, are deceptive, apparently trying to learn one's taste in carpets while actually noting the lack [or ownership] of a hi-fi, power mower, you-name-it.

People can even pass by your house in an electronic-spy truck and find out if your TV is on, and the channel to which it is tuned. People can hear what you say, blocks away, with certain gadgets, and find out various things, especially if you're talking to a trained and skilled stranger, who leads you in some desired way.

It shook me severely to realize how vast the army of people-watchers has become, not even including those who needle and peek in the name of science or law. Hundreds of thousands more. Their sum in the United States surely passes a million. And they are setting goals for us that meet their wants. Not ours!

The situation, obviously, calls for rebellion.

To rebel while we still have any hope of being or again becoming individuals, the target must be seen. The foe. If we can thwart the people-watchers, we can lick the trend toward conformity they foster.

It wouldn't be too difficult a campaign, as rebellions go.

Meek troops will merely refuse to respond to any opinion sampler, poll-taker, or phone-interrogator; they will refuse to volunteer to be watcher, sampled, tested, or to allow even the baby's rattle to be monitored. They need just—*refuse*.

If even a small fraction of us do that, the people-watchers are going to suffer. Their computations will be less accurate. The corporation employers, the politicians who hire them, and all the self-serving rest, will begin to lose faith in them. Even scientists will start to think twice before they start on people-watching. Only legally constituted authorities, then, will be able to get your slant on anything, whatever.

If there is to be any exception here—as, for scientific ends—let the would-be watchers get a license for their espionage—and also a favorable, two-thirds-majority vote of their colleagues, prior to embarking on watching our table manners, or the way we behave in bed with our wives, etc.

Hardier recruits to an army in rebellion against people-watchers can accomplish more than the great lot that would be done by mere negation. Generally, I oppose lying and regard cheating as near the lowest of all shameful deeds. Here, however, the criteria are other. Here, the enemy is wide open to sabotage.

Thus whenever I get an opportunity to assist people-watchers I take it as a chance to foul up the foe. My phone rings and [say] a pleasant-voiced dame asks me [after a little chat that shows she's attached to some big foundation or the like] about our laundry. Do we send it out? No, I reply. Have it done in a washer, at home? Again, I say, no. Wash it by hand? Her voice, now, will be startled. So—how *do* we have our clothes washed? She has an inspiration: Our laundress takes them home?

No, again, I say. My wife, I say, launders everything as they do on the gahts at Benares, India. She uses the nearby canal and beats our wash clean, with a board.

That, perhaps, is little better than not answering at all. The lady phone pest will write me off as a "no opinion," or, perhaps, I'll be skipped entirely.

The reader, however, will see the opportunities I imply for creative wrecking. I could have told that [imaginary] laundry-surveying dame that I was a chemist and had invented a molecular substance that dry-cleaned all material in seconds. No need for any laundering. *That* would have really rocked her—since she would be doing her survey for some washer manufacturer, detergent maker, sewage pollution investigation, or the like.

If her call was for business reasons [as would be most probable] my answers, if honest, might have brought a real dame on our doorstep with a product or gadget to demonstrate. But my fanciful tale of a wash-all chemical would likely have gotten some vice president around, posthaste. In any case, I'd have wasted enough of the woman's time to cut five or six other [probably eager and truthful] fools off her day's schedule.

Those examples suffice to show how you can help rescue America from the Big Brotherhood watching us, the horde that slowly squeezes us into shapes that increase them but leave us diminished.

One last word to all hero-volunteers. Do not write in to say you want to enroll in the anti-people-watching movement. Don't ask for an organizational chart and pertinent literature. There isn't any organization, any gung-ho pamphlet or printed instruction book.

Such things are precisely what I here oppose.

You must act as an individual if at all. You can urge friends and neighbors to emulate you, but don't form clubs or groups. *Think!* The first time you refuse to volunteer as a watched or questioned person in a sampling, the first time you hang up the phone on an inquisitor or turn your back on a poll-taker, will be your first step in self-emancipation. And the first time you deliberately foul up such a people-watcher or one of their questionnaires, you'll have made your first step as a crusader, a creative individual, the supreme sort of human being.

That's why this must be a do-it-yourself effort.

For its purpose is to disorganize the organized assault upon us all. That counterattack must be personal and impromptu, not planned and arranged. The people-watchers would soon see thru organized opposition and circumvent that sort of thing. It's the way *they* operate, after all. But they will never be able to go on shattering our privacy, busting into our homes, culling our secret thoughts and then using it to make us ever squarer squares, and smaller ones, at that. You all set to help? Fine!

Want to know what my wife and I are having for supper tonight?

Well, liver. And, incidentally, we're cannibals.

SIMCHAT TORAH

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this evening Jews throughout the world will usher in the holiday of Simchat Torah, a celebration which reaffirms the dedication of the Jewish people to the law and traditions of their forefathers.

But for 3 million of the world's Jews, this day is not a cause of rejoicing or of celebration. For the persecuted masses of Jews living in the Soviet Union, this day is but another in the struggle to survive, to continue to live. For 50 years, since the Bolshevik revolution of 1917, the Jewish religion has been suppressed in the Soviet Union. More than any other group, its adherents have been discriminated against. Religious studies are forbidden, publications are not available, and religious articles nonexistent. But still the spark of religious life flickers among the Jewish youth of the Soviet Union.

Though they are largely ignorant of the tenets of their faith, they learn to identify with their people. Government suppression has limited the number of young people who dare to appear at the one remaining synagogue in Moscow on holidays. But still thousands come.

At this crucial period of world history, when the Soviet Union and the United States both recognize the imperative need for coexistence and reason, I would hope that the Soviet leaders would abandon their heartless and senseless suppression of the Jewish people.

Throughout history nations have persecuted and sought to physically exterminate the Jews and they have failed. Spiritual genocide will also fail.

AMERICAN COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM REAFFIRMED

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, with headlines still fresh about the Washington protest march against our Vietnam policies, Congress must not overlook the fact that there were corresponding demonstrations of support for U.S. policies in cities across the country.

Lest we let our minds be turned by seeing only one side of the news, I would like to cite recent news stories from different parts of the country which demonstrate that there is stronger grassroots support for the President in Vietnam than one might believe.

A strong and clear article by Victor Riesel, noted labor writer, published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of October 13, dwells in great detail on the overwhelming support for the American position in Vietnam by the 14 million members of the Nation's labor organization, the AFL–CIO.

Mr. Riesel said that organized labor believes "it is America's obligation to fight in Vietnam. And that no choice need be made between spending billions for guns, butter or ghettos because there is enough for all."

The Democratic Farm Labor Party of Minnesota recently gave its strong endorsement to the President's stand in Vietnam and commended him for "sticking to the rough road of responsibility both at home and abroad."

In Colorado, the former Governor of that State, a distinguished Democrat, Steve McNichols, was reported as saying to a party meeting that "supporting the President is the quickest way to end the war."

There is a good deal of support in the country for our present balanced position in Vietnam, only we don't always hear about it.

The President has chosen to exercise U.S. might with restraint, although no American doubts that we could annihilate Vietnam if we wanted to. But this is the line of fanatics, and the President is not a fanatic.

We cannot withdraw from Vietnam until we receive assurances that what we are fighting for—independence for South Vietnam—is guaranteed.

So the long hard fight will have to continue. And we will have to call on the fundamental citizenship of every American to sustain our President in these hard and terrible days.

I ask unanimous consent that articles published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, the Denver Post, and the Minneapolis Tribune, all supporting President Johnson in Vietnam, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Oct. 13, 1967]

LABOR LEADERS BACK JOHNSON VIETNAM POLICY

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—Those bird watchers who are transfixed by the doves and the hawks and are impressed by the foreign policy polls are overlooking a mighty force whose legions, equipped with every weapon of modern political warfare, will march solidly behind Lyndon Johnson into the next presidential campaign.

Leaders of these legions have just issued a call to action which says bluntly that it is America's "obligation" to fight in Vietnam. And that no choice need be made between spending billions for guns, butter or ghettos because there is enough for all. And that the South Vietnamese are fighting the very same kind of war as that fought by America's early revolutionists.

These words—and a good deal more—are in the official call just issued by the national AFL–CIO headquarters to the American delegates to its Seventh Constitutional Convention opening December 7 in Bal Harbour, Fla.

Labor's leaders go all the way with LBJ. It is the signal to their 14 million followers to mobilize. Hardly insignificant, this. The federation is the most solidly organized force in the land. It has the most futuristic political campaign machinery in the world. One of its lesser efforts, for example, will be a drive to put 100,000 campaign workers into the precincts in Pennsylvania alone.

No doubt the AFL–CIO will be the most cohesive and dependable bloc behind Mr. Johnson next year, what with defections from his policies piling up on the left and right.

It may well be the only united force in his camp by mid-1968. If Vietnam should be the issue in '68, there is no doubt that labor's leaders will be the loyalists of the year. And there will be no variation on this theme. It has gone unreported, for example, that the recent convention of the huge (two million-member) New York State AFL–CIO adopted a strong pro-Vietnam policy resolution by a vote of almost 1,000 to 12. That's a fairly comfortable margin.

Thus it is across the land; at the Oregon AFL–CIO conclave, the delegates cheered a resolution calling for "bringing to bear whatever power is necessary to prevent a Viet Cong victory."

All this does not insinuate that the labor leaders are just hawks. If anything, the bird watchers from now on will note that the powerful union chiefs are falcons, should there be any room in the aviary.

This can be observed in the unreported unpublished call to the National Convention which is being whipped into a series of resolutions for the 900 delegates who will attend the national gathering. Since all this will make the headlines on Pearl Harbor Day, the call's most urgent words should be put into the record now:

"Beyond the domestic issues there remains the grave problem of the defense of freedom in South Vietnam," says AFL–CIO president George Meany.

"It is testing as never before the calmness, the patience and the good sense of the nation.

"There are some who cry for a wider, 'get it over with' war, regardless of risk. There are others who call for total disengagement, regardless of the impact on freedom's cause. And from both camps . . . rises the charge that there must be a choice between war and social progress; that America cannot afford both at once.

"This vast, rich . . . country has no need to make an impossible choice. The fight for freedom in South Vietnam must be carried on, with patient restraint and with continuing efforts to reach an honorable peace . . ."

These words are the labor chiefs' challenge to the leaders of the dump-Johnson movement. Inside the Democratic Party, these words may well drown out the cries of the hawks and the cooing of the doves.

[From the Denver Post, Oct. 11, 1967]

STEVE MCNICHOLS BACKS PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM POLICY FULLY

(By Tom Gavin)

An uncluttered Vietnam policy—one of simple support of President Johnson's approach to the war in Southeast Asia—was enunciated by former Gov. Steve McNichols Tuesday night.

McNichols appeared with State Rep. Tom Farley, D-Pueblo, in the second in a series of Denver Democratic district captains' meetings at which prospective candidates for the party's 1968 U.S. Senate nomination are being heard.

The Denver party leaders heard Farley, as he has in at least one other public appearance, differ sharply with the President on Vietnam—but declare he will support Johnson's anticipated re-election bid without reservation.

McNichols, although he didn't state it baldly, seemed to equate support of Johnson on Vietnam with patriotism.

"As a group of party people, and a group of good Americans, we ought to support our President," he said.

AMERICAN FIRST

And, at another point: "I always try to support my President. I feel I am an American before I am a Democrat, and I think Senator Dirksen (Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen, who has also supported Johnson's Vietnam approach) feels he is an American before he is a Republican," McNichols said.

McNichols also said he feels that "supporting the President is the quickest way to end the war" and that "the more we talk about this the less chance we have to end it."

The Vietnam war, he added, should not be a party issue, nor a reason for dissident Democrats to abandon their party.

Farley, as he did before Denver Young Democrats last week, said he is in "serious disagreement" with Johnson on Vietnam, but added:

"I want to emphasize that I will strongly support the (presidential) nominee of this party—and it's 99 and 99-100ths per cent certain that the nominee will be Lyndon Johnson."

If the nation is to solve its problems, Farley added, "we are going to have to have someone who is liberally oriented, as the Johnson administration is."

ANTI-JOHNSON FEELING

Farley, minority leader in the State House of Representatives, said he has encountered "a lot of anti-Johnson feeling around the state," however, and added: "I seriously doubt that Johnson can carry Colorado" in the '68 presidential election.

McNichols, too, talking about Colorado voters' proven leanings toward split-ticket voting, said it is possible that Colorado Democrats could lose in presidential balloting next year while winning the Senate election against incumbent Republican Peter Dominick.

Farley, as he has earlier, called for a Vietnam policy involving American willingness to negotiate peace terms with the Viet Cong as well as North Vietnam; ultimate admission of both North and South Vietnamese participation in both pacification and military efforts there.

BACKS U THANT

He also endorsed the suggestion of U Thant and others that an unconditional halt in American bombing of North Vietnam would lead to peace negotiations in four to six weeks.

"I think this is a limited risk we cannot afford not to take," he declared.

Farley, in discussing next year's senatorial campaign, said no Democrat should seriously consider challenging Dominick unless he can count on a campaign treasury of at least $225,000.

"I think that anyone who doesn't have $225,000 ought to forget it," he said, and added with a smile: "Right now I don't have $225,000."

McNichols at times sounded as if he were still campaigning against Republican Gov. John Love, who won the governorship from him in 1962. He cited Love's 15 per cent tax cut campaign pledge, and later tax increases, as evidence that the credibility gap in politics is Republican, not Democratic.

SCOFFS AT DOMINICK

He also criticized Dominick, though, saying Colorado suffers from not having at least one Democrat with access to the White House in the Senate. He also ridiculed Dominick's publicized horseback look at the controversial Red Buffalo interstate highway route through a wilderness area west of Denver.

"Our senator waits for three years," he said derisively, "and then he goes over the hill on horseback. What he should have done is look at the bill three years ago when it came through the Senate."

Farley said Democrats could be in political trouble next year because of feeling against War on Poverty programs. Its weak spots must be shored up, he said, but the program is of great ultimate value and must not be emasculated.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Oct. 15, 1967]

DFL Backs Johnson on Vietnam—State Central Group Divides on Resolutions

(By Frank Wright)

Willmar, Minn.—A resolution supporting President Johnson's Vietnam policies but welcoming dissent was adopted Saturday by the DFL State Central Committee.

Action came on a divided voice vote after an hour of debate and the defeat of proposed amendments criticizing the administration.

Between 150 and 200 of the committee's 416 members attended yesterday's meeting.

The issue came to a head when several resolutions, most of them opposing the war, were submitted to the committee by local DFL clubs in the Twin Cities area.

The key section of the statement adopted yesterday commended the administration for "sticking to the rough road of responsibility both at home and abroad" and pledged the state party to work for "responsible" Democratic victories in next year's elections.

That section was added on the floor at the urging of William Kubicek, Bloomington, party secretary. It gave a distinctly pro-administration flavor to a Resolutions Committee draft that attempted to find a middle ground acceptable to the President's supporters and critics in the party.

The Resolutions Committee, chaired by Kingsley Holman, Bloomington, party treasurer, had hoped that its draft would preserve party unity and delay an all-out battle at least until next year's state convention.

The State Central Committee is the party's governing body between state conventions.

In addition to commending the President, yesterday's resolution called upon all Democrats to remain within the party organization and attempt to settle the issue there rather than through third-party movements.

The resolution expressed the hope that "all possible avenues be explored with maximum effort in our search for a response to all peace efforts."

It further urged that U.S. military forces be withdrawn from Vietnam "as areas become stabilized, to the fullest extent consistent with the national security of the people of South Vietnam."

Although there was objection, a section backing the President for "his refusal to yield to the pressure of those reckless advocates who impatiently call for the further extension of the war" was retained.

The Central Committee set aside an amendment by Mrs. Kitty Alcott of Hopkins which favored unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam.

Nat Hart, a faculty member at University of Minnesota, Morris, and Stevens County DFL chairman, attacked the resolution on grounds that it offered "aid and comfort" to Mr. Johnson and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey but none to administration critics such as Sen. Eugene McCarthy and Reps. Donald Fraser, Joseph Karth and John Blatnik, all Minnesota DFLers.

Hart was booed when he said Mr. Johnson, who campaigned on a platform of restraint in 1964, had "deserted" the party by escalating the war since his election.

Sen. Walter F. Mondale, who has been the strongest administration supporter in the Minnesota DFL congressional delegation, said the Central Committee "acted responsibly on the most decisive issue confronting the party and the country."

Mondale spoke at a Central Committee dinner last night.

Supporters of the resolution said they believed that it accurately reflected the views of the state party organization, but opponents claimed it did not. They pointed out that less than half the committee attended the meeting and claimed that many of those who did were fearful of any resolution which might tend to embarrass the Vice-President, a former Minnesota senator.

In other business, the committee:

Heard Finance Director Warren Spannaus report that the state party's $64,600 in outstanding obligations and unpaid bills had been virtually wiped out by proceeds from last Sunday's "Night of Stars" gala and a prolonged Sustaining Fund drive.

Set June 20, 21 and 22 as the dates for next year's state convention in St. Paul.

Adopted a resolution commending Humphrey's proposal for a "Marshall Plan" to aid U.S. cities, a proposal which has been quashed by the President.

Listened to four Minnesota farm leaders discuss programs for farmers. The four were Ed Christensen, president of the Minnesota Farmers' Union; P. D. Hempsted, president of the Minnesota Farm Bureau; William Pearson, master of the Minnesota Grange, and George Matson, president of the Minnesota Branch of the National Farmers' Organization.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, tonight in the Soviet Union thousands of the 3 million Jews in that country will gather at their local synagogues to observe Simchat Torah, the climax of the Jewish holy season.

This celebration for them will only serve to underline their continuing desire to follow their cultural and religious traditions free of Soviet pressures.

Soviet leaders claim that their people have freedom and equality. But Jews are not allowed contact with their own people abroad as are members of other minority groups in Soviet Russia. Since 1956, the Government, directly or indirectly, has closed more than 380 synagoges. As a result, today less than 70 remain; and accordingly, education and instruction in their own cultural and linguistic heritage is denied them.

I join with millons of those who today would welcome efforts by the Government and people of the U.S.S.R. to assure equal rights for Soviet Jews, thereby ending discriminatory practices against this minority group.

EDITORIAL OF SCHOOL BOARDS MAGAZINE ENDORSES BILINGUAL EDUCATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the September issue of School Boards, the publication of the National School Boards Association, contains an endorsement of the bilingual education bill (S. 428). Communities having large numbers of non-English-speaking children are advised to "look anew at the language barrier problem of the first few grades."

The article is indicative of the growing awareness of the problem which faces children entering schools with limited English-speaking ability, and it illustrates the growing support for the establishment of bilingual education programs. Only this morning, the House Subcommittee on General Education reported out a bill to establish bilingual education programs. The Senate Subcommittee on Bilingual Education has already favorably reported out the bilingual education bill and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will soon have it under consideration.

To illustrate the need for this important legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Language Barrier," published in the September issue of School Boards, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Language Barrier

Educational handicaps are not limited to those of a physical, emotional, racial, or poverty nature. One type of handicap currently receiving attention is that associated with the non-English speaking student.

Significant numbers of children who have little or no ability to speak the language of their teacher are now enrolled in public schools. These children may come from homes in which a language other than English is spoken.

Imagine, by way of comparison, an American child enrolling in a French school where neither the teacher nor the majority of the students spoke English.

Communication and understanding problems facing such children are enormous and cannot be dismissed lightly.

However, efforts are being made to alleviate the linguistic handicap confronting millions of this nation's children.

The Bilingual American Education Bill (S. 428), introduced by Senator Ralph Yarborough (D-Tex.), at press time is being considered in the Senate. Washington observers predict the passage of this bill—either in separate form or as an amendment to ESEA.

The measure would provide federal funds to local districts to develop programs to teach non-English speaking children in their native language. Districts having large Spanish-speaking populations would be encouraged to treat English as a second language in the early grades.

California is one state that is striving to make the first day of school this fall a richer experience for its one-half million Spanish-speaking children. A new state law provides that Spanish can be used in school. English would replace Spanish as the major language by the third grade—after the children have learned the concepts and fundamentals of the basic three R's.

School boards representing communities having large numbers of non-English speaking children would do well to look anew at the language barrier problem of the first few grades. The child's initial exposure to school is indeed *el primer paso importante*—the "first big step."

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY AND SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS FOR THEM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on October 6, 1967, the Honorable John T. Connor, one of America's finest public servants and most enlightened industrialists, made an eloquent speech before the North Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association meeting at Pinehurst, N.C., in which he discussed some of the problems now confronting the American textile industry, and advanced certain suggestions for their solution.

This speech merits the thoughtful consideration of all Americans interested in the welfare of this great industry and of the Americans who work in it. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Mr. John T. Connor, North Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association, Pinehurst, N.C., October 6, 1967

The invitation you extended to me through Charley Myers to speak at your meeting was most welcome. For several reasons: First and most important, I think I have something to say that will be of interest to you. Second, it seems to me that people from various industry groups should talk more often across industry lines, rather than just within our own circles. After all, so many of our problems and opportunities have a common basis and some common interest, especially when relationships with the Federal Government are involved. And last, you have provided me with a legitimate excuse for visiting this wonderful mecca of golfers—good, bad and even indifferent, although I personally know very few indifferent golfers.

What I have to say can be stated simply and directly, and is based on my experience, in and out of government, with the trade problems of the U.S. textile industry. In my opinion the time has come to make an all out effort to extend import controls—of the kind now applicable to cotton textiles—to all segments of the textile business, that is, to man-made fiber textiles, wool textiles and blends. And have them cover all stages of the manufacturing process, from yarns through such finished products as sweaters, dresses and blankets. Preferably, this effort should be made with the understanding and support of the Administration in Washington. But if, for understandable reasons affecting international relations, that support is not forthcoming, the effort should nevertheless be pressed as vigorously as possible in the Congress, with the expectation that, if the effort is successful, some accommodation will be made by the Congress with the Administration at an opportune time. The evidence is quite persuasive by now that textile import quotas, as determined on some reasonable basis to fit the overall needs of both foreign and domestic manufacturers in the orderly development of U.S. textile markets, are needed in the broad public interest—if we are to avoid the chaotic and disruptive conditions characteristic of some earlier periods.

The problems are more acute than they otherwise would be because of the recent conclusion of the Kennedy Round of international trade agreements in Geneva.

The Kennedy Round is an accomplished fact. It's an international obligation into which this country has freely entered. Regardless of reservations some of us may have about some of its provisions, about its effect on various American industries, about how it came into being, and about what was left undone, we all have the obligation to make whatever accommodations are necessary—and learn to live with it. No less than others, the textile industry must make these accommodations and adjustments.

Now, the big question is: Where do we go from here?

And the simple answer, as I see it: to seek more equitable non-tariff importation practices—which will enable foreign producers to participate in an orderly way in the growth of U.S. textile markets, but not to dominate or disrupt them.

Imports of textiles into the United States have risen sharply in recent years, even before the Kennedy Round goes into effect. I mix together all categories of textiles: cottons, wools, man-made fibers and blends, in all stages of process, from yarn to finished product. In fact, the rate of the increasing volume of imports is outstripping the growth rate of the domestic market in textiles and apparel, and by a wide margin.

Domestic production has expanded since 1961 by approximately one-third. But in that same period, imports of cotton and wool textiles have just about doubled and since 1962, those of man-made fiber textiles have about quadrupled.

The problems of all segments of the textile business must be settled on a multi-fiber basis, not sparately, as though their interests coincided only by occasional accident. Although on the face of it cotton textiles appear to be in better shape than wool or man-mades or blends, most observers say that cotton imports have risen more substantially than was contemplated when the Long Term Arrangements were negotiated.

The evidence is clear. For their own sound business purposes, foreign manufacturers have increasingly been blending their cottons with polyesters and other synthetics, thereby effectively excluding them from LTA controls. And of course they are sending man-made fibers into this country in ever-growing volume to compete with U.S. cotton products, as well as with U.S. man-made products.

I realize that not everybody shares the view that the American textile industry should be treated differently from other industries. The general industrial community in the United States is being asked by our government to accept the effect of broad reductions in trade restraints among nations. In an era when economics and diplomacy are so closely entangled, why make an exception of the textile industry? Why the special treatment?

It isn't enough to answer: With regard to imports, the government has treated the textile industry as a unique entity—as a matter of tradition.

The meaningful answer is *survival*. Without such special treatment, this industry might well have gone under years ago. In 1935, President Roosevelt, at the recommendation of Secretary of State Cordell Hull, authorized an agreement by which the Japanese, from whom we received most of our imports, volunteered to cut their exports to the United States. This was a particularly significant agreement in light of the fact that Mr. Hull was a staunch supporter of the concept of reciprocal trade. In 1956, President Eisenhower also limited Japanese cotton textile exports to this country when they rose to a dangerous level. In 1961, President Kennedy, too, offered special protection—by negotiating the LTA. This year, even while the Kennedy Round was being conducted in Geneva, the Johnson Administration was holding separate discussions that led to the extension of the LTA—for a period of three years.

These presidential decisions have not been made as a sign of favoritism or as acts of grace on behalf of textile manufacturers. They were made because economic realities required them. And they still do today, as much as ever.

What are the characteristics of the unusual economic metabolism of the American textile business? Why does it require special consideration?

One of the major reasons lies outside our own borders, within the developing countries of the world.

Having decided that industrialization is a good route to financial viability, these nations have concluded that the production of textiles is a sensible point of departure for their largely untrained and unsophisticated labor force.

Clearly, the infant textile operations of many of the developing nations cannot prosper if they are not able to export a large part of what they produce. And in the years after World War II, one of the few logical markets was the United States—since this was one of the few countries that could afford to pay for foreign-made goods.

At the same time, as other countries built or re-built their industrial capacity, they found it imperative to protect their home markets from external competition. The result is, the United States is effectively barred from trading in textiles on a freely competitive basis with large areas of the world. Simultaneously, the U.S. became the destination of products from fiercely protective nations that could ship them to few other places.

Fortunately for our favorable standard of living, wages in the American textile industry are manifestly higher than they are anywhere else in the world. That means, of course, that competitors abroad can produce the same items we do at considerably less cost. And, as time passes, their capacity and refinement grow. They use better machinery, train their workers in improved techniques, produce higher-quality fabrics. Many of them, starting from scratch, use the latest equipment—even if that means a lower rate of employment.

Before the mid-thirties, we had no real textile import problem. The average U.S. tariff on all dutiable imports, including textiles, was 47%. Last year it was 12%. I've already spoken of the recent precipitous rise in imports of yarns, fabrics and garments. From the mid-thirties to the present, imports shot up from $124 million to $1.5 billion.

Curtailed in its efforts to compete in international markets, forced to compete in domestic markets against goods that are manufactured more cheaply abroad and are offered for sale here at lower competitive prices, the U.S. textile business was in serious trouble by the late fifties. In those years, from '57 to '60, imports of cotton textiles jumped from 400 million to over a billion square yards. In the domestic industry, wages fell, unemployment rose, the rate of return on investments declined, research activity dropped. So did investments in capital equipment. In effect, the textile industry became a depression industry, with serious ramifications for the entire national economy.

As much as many of our overseas competitors, we were hurting. Recognizing the problem, President Kennedy instituted a seven-point program to help textile manufacturers to help themselves. He said at the time—and I might add it is equally true today—"That it was one of the industries essential to our national security." And it was, he added, "of vital importance in peacetime and it has a direct effect upon our total economy. All studies have shown that unemployment in textile mills strikes hardest at those communities suffering most from depressed conditions."

One of the most important aspects of the seven-point program was that it offered financial incentives to those investing in new textile machinery and equipment. As Mr. Stanley Nehmer, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce, recently said, "It has been estimated that the liberalized depreciation guidelines and the subsequent seven percent investment tax credit increased the average return on new equipment investments by 35 to 45 percent for all manufacturing industries, including textiles." It's interesting to note that capital spending in textiles, in the five years from 1961 to 1966, rose from a level of $500 million to $1.2 billion a year.

Another point in the textile recovery program was the legislation that enabled American mills to buy cotton at the world market price, thus ending the domestic industry's disadvantage in raw material costs.

Probably the most famous and unusual aspect of the program was the call by President Kennedy for an international conference to negotiate a cotton textile agreement on a voluntary basis. The result was the 1962 Long Term Arrangement for cotton textiles. Although some may argue that the LTA is not working out as expected, all in the U.S. textile industry will agree, I'm sure, that it was a step worth taking. In spite of complaints from some exporting countries that its provisions are onerous, and from some domestic manufacturers that its administration is not tight enough, the arrangement has provided a fairly satisfactory answer to a difficult problem.

What was the effect of the whole Kennedy-Johnson program? I've already spoken of some of them. The others: Textile profits rose to an almost decent level. Sales and production levels reached new highs. So did average weekly wages and salaries. Plant and equipment expenditures rose at almost twice the rate of the rest of American industry. By early 1966 the worst was over, and the textile industry was back on its feet, although profit levels were still below the average of American industry.

Then came a real test—one that was met successfully, for two specific reasons: because the textile industry is so well organized to conduct necessary activities in Washington. And because management and labor officials work together so well on these matters for the good of the industry. And the test itself: As the United States commitment in Vietnam rose sharply through 1965 and into 1966, the demand for textile products for the military also rose, again emphasizing the need for a strong domestic textile business for defense purposes. Although there were anxious moments, this demand was satisfied by a combination of increased domestic production and some import quota and "one shot" accommodations. By early 1966, government officials concerned with economic stabilization activities feared that the effects of the law of supply and demand would result in serious price rises. In their view, the way to maintain economic stabilization was to liberalize—even demolish—our import quota agreements for cotton textiles—so there would be a vast influx of textiles into the country, and thus drive down the price levels.

Others of us in government disagreed strenuously. We urged delaying a decision until the completion of a study of supply and demand prospects for the rest of 1966 and into 1967—a study to be made jointly by the Department of Commerce and the Council of Economic Advisers, and which would include data and opinions from the industry. It would thus properly reflect realities and realistic prospects.

As a result, the study was made—with management and labor representatives participating—including long and short term, in-depth projections of the state of the market. The conclusion reached was that there would be a sufficient increase in the availability of cotton, wool and man-made textiles, including those produced at home and those imported under the current quota levels, to meet foreseeable needs, normal and emergency. Further, the prediction was made, based on the opinions and commitments of industry leaders, that there would be no increase in the level of textile prices. Therefore, the study concluded that no drastic rise in import quotas was necessary or desirable.

You people are of course better acquainted with what happened than I am. In short summary: early in the second half of 1966 and continuing into 1967, textile production levels, prices and profits declined. By April of 1967 employment in the textile and apparel industries dropped 3.5% from the 1966 high. Investments in plant and equipment declined, but average hourly wages arose. Even cotton textile imports declined in the first five months of 1967, although man-made fiber textile imports soared 37% above the comparable 1966 figure.

What a mistake it would have been if the import quota system had in fact been junked! And it probably would have been if your industry leaders had not been alert to the situation. And if they had not had the industry's vital statistics organized for presentation.

I realize not everybody sees the quota system in the same light. The opponents of quotas and other non-tariff barriers are legion. They are articulate. They are influential. The reputable *Wall Street Journal*, in its August 16th lead editorial, said, in part, "By curbing import competition, quotas naturally tend to push domestic prices higher than they otherwise would be; like tariffs, they thus represent a hidden subsidy to domestic producers, a subsidy paid by consumers through the higher prices."

Yesterday's *Wall Street Journal* carried another editorial to the same effect, entitled "The Pains of Protectionism." The conclusion is stated as follows: "For some businessmen, import competition can prove quite painful. From the standpoint of the rest of the nation, however, the agonies of protectionism could be a good deal worse."

Professor Milton Friedman, the eminent Republican economist, agrees in spades, and deplores the imposition of quotas as the mark of the special interest state. Other prominent economists, most of whom seem to be constitutionally addicted to free trade, contend that the less restricted our trade the greater the number of jobs that are created.

Many of us would agree that in an ideal world people would be far better off if all the nations could trade across frontiers without regard to tariff or non-tariff barriers of any kind. Where, ideally, one nation could exploit to the fullest its own geographical and geophysical resources, its skills and techniques, its artistic and technological excellence. And exchange them for the complementary goods and services of a neighboring or distant people. Where everything one people had to sell could find a market, at home or abroad. But the facts of today's world and of the tomorrow we see on the horizon do not make that possible. We do not, alas, live in a utopian world community. We live on this so familiar earth. Where some nations are agricultural, some industrialized, some highly advanced, some undeveloped. Where living standards and traditions differ, where wages and costs vary enormously, where each nation has its own sharply delineated views of economic self protection, and rigorously applies them. Where unemployment ratios differ, where governments take dissimilar stands on subsidies to domestic industries. Where natural resources are limited or abundant. Where political objectives differ widely from nation to nation and bloc to bloc.

It seems to me that we must re-examine our nation's position from time to time, in the light of new developments and new realities. However admirable our role of big brother, no matter how urgent and justified earlier pleas for assistance, the fact is: conditions change. Nations develop a certain degree of security, self-reliance, capacity for achievement. They back away from the brink of disaster; if they are not altogether viable—sociologically and economically—the prognosis for their survival is at least hopeful. They may still require help, but possibly less than before. Or help of a different nature.

And by the same token, our own needs change. And the kind of help we're in a position to offer changes from time to time, particularly by way of trade arrangements.

As conditions change in the constant ebb and flow of international concourse, it even becomes necessary to use new terms to label those new conditions and the ways we look at them.

The terms free trader and protectionist don't really tell the full story any more. They leave a gap in the philosophical spectrum of international trade relations, far too complex and polarized today not to require at least one bridge between them.

What about the label: conservationist? A conservationist, as I see it, wants to conserve for the American people the wage levels to which they are accustomed. And the profit levels. And the high standards of investment and research and general working conditions.

Do we want to see the U.S. textile industry revert to the depressed conditions of the late fifties and very early sixties? Or its employees plunge to the living and working standards of their opposite numbers in many other countries?

Today a conservationist would not *bar* imports, but wants to see them enter this country on an orderly, reasonable basis, avoiding disruption and hardship among domestic producers.

I would say a conservationist is a realist. In respect to textiles, he realizes that under present conditions imports will increase substantially because of a combination of factors: the Kennedy Round, the increased capacity of foreign manufacturers, the easy availability of the latest technology to other countries, the continued divergence in production costs between home and abroad, and the continuing subsidies given to private producers by some foreign governments specifically to encourage exportation.

The conservationist also realizes that the result will be a smaller share of the U.S. market for domestic manufacturers. And probably a decreasing share of the world market, as well, since U.S. textile products are totally or partially barred from many countries, either by price levels or nationalistic or regional barriers.

Consequently, the conservationist is not afraid of world competition, but is not eager for American producers to enter the fray with one arm tied behind their backs. He wants an arrangement that will offer reciprocal and equitable terms to all nations and that will offer special consideration for those developing countries still in need of it.

Such an arrangement might require the renegotiation of GATT. But possibly not, since signatory countries are already allowed to impose quantitative restrictions—including quotas—if there are balance of payments difficulties. Or, if the Administration is willing, steps could be taken to extend the existing cotton textile arrangements to other textiles on a voluntary basis. And the LTA stipulates that a signatory country may take corrective action if any provision of the agreement is being frustrated. I think it's a fair claim that the excessive importation of blends and man-made fibers, as substitutes for cotton, does frustrate the cotton LTA's terms.

But even if the U.S. government can arrive at no suitable diplomatic conclusion with other nations, if it comes to it I think we should consider new ground rules for textile imports on a unilateral basis, by force of Congressional action.

In 1966, the U.S. textile trade deficit in dollars was $902 million. The total balance of payments deficit for the country was $1.4 billion. That means that the deficit of the textile trade amounted to almost two-thirds of the total U.S. balance of payments deficit. And the deficit between exports and imports is continually widening as a result of the increase in imports of yarn, fabrics and garments from abroad.

The textile industry doesn't stand as an isolated operation. It consumes the products of other industries. It buys their goods and services. In one way or another, directly or indirectly, the fate of textiles affects the chemicals, synthetic, fiber, transportation, oil, machinery suppliers, electrical and dozens of other industries. The employees of the textile industry spend money for groceries, automobiles, houses, furniture, professional services, entertainment and countless other items. Clearly, what distresses textiles affects unfavorably the whole country.

And what affects us all becomes the concern of us all. None of us in a business close to textiles can hold aloof from its problems anymore than textiles can hold aloof from the problems of other related industries.

The fact is, we need an adjustment of textile import regulations. All textile imports—cotton, wool and man-made fibers—should be regulated. We don't object to sharing the growth in our market with foreign manufacturers on some reasonable basis. But we do object to the prospect that they will take over our market to any substantial degree.

What can be done about it? Those of us in textiles and related enterprises are able to exercise our rights as American citizens, individual and corporate, to save ourselves from the serious economic consequences of current trends.

The study of the situation by the U.S. Tariff Commission just ordered by the President should be helpful, particularly if it covers trends and prospects—not just historical data. Their report is due by January 15, 1968—in time for action in an election year—a good omen!

We all know that the point of view I've expressed has a number of friends in the Congress, including some very close at hand. We have an obligation, I believe, to continue to bring to their attention, and to the attention of their associates who do not yet understand these problems, information on the textile situation as it develops.

We saw early in 1966, in connection with the tight demand pressures arising from the Vietnam procurement program, that intelligent and timely industry action can be effective. For an even more important cause, you must try again—speaking as one voice—and make yourselves heard in Washington.

SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the plight of Soviet Jewry disturbs us deeply.

Jews living in the Soviet Union yearn for religious and cultural identity—for the opportunity to give free expression to their faith—and adherence to the bonds of unity they cherish.

One of the most moving expressions of their hopes and dreams comes at Simchat Torah, the Day of Rejoicing in the Law.

In recent years, worshippers overflow the Central Synagogue in Moscow. And after the solemn service ends, many thousands of Russian Jews pour into the streets outside the Synagogue. They dance and sing. They enjoy long hours of merriment together.

Can anyone doubt the depth of their despair—or the depth of their religious devotion?

As we again approach Simchat Torah, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks before the meeting of the leadership of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, held in Washington, D.C., on October 11, 1967, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Abraham Ribicoff

By tradition the High Holidays are a period of spiritual accounting for people of the Jewish faith.

It is fitting that leaders of the Jewish community should gather at this time in Washington to discuss the plight of Soviet Jewry. For American Jews are concerned. So are enlightened people throughout the world.

They know that the High Holidays are a period of special significance for Jews in the Soviet Union. There, thousands—both the old and the young—fill those synagogues that are still allowed to function—the synagogues attended by relatively few during most of the year. For, thousands are taking this opportunity not only to pray, but also to show their Jewish identity—as they crowd the synagogues and overflow into the streets beyond.

It is especially tragic that many of the young who gather at the synagogues cannot participate in the service. For the Soviet Government has not permitted them to learn to read Hebrew characters.

This year the Holidays fall on the eve of an historic date—the fiftieth anniversary of Soviet rule. To celebrate this occasion, government officials have announced changes in Soviet life that will bring a higher standard of living and a more pleasant existence to millions of people throughout the land. Also, just last month, the Supreme Soviet announced a decision to restore the Tatar minority which was expelled from the Crimea after World War II. This is the latest step in the restoration of rights for a number of minorities which were persecuted during the reign of Stalin.

It has long been the hope of concerned people that on the eve of the October celebrations the Soviet government would take major steps to improve the lot of the Jewish minority—that their religious, social and cultural rights would be guaranteed.

Unfortunately this has not been done.

In fact, at the beginning of the Middle East crisis, the Soviet press launched a propaganda campaign that continues to spread the poison of anti-Semitism. Tales of a world Jewish plot—dating back to the dark ages—have been revived.

On the eve of Rosh Hashana, an article filled with slander and myth appeared in an official Moscow newspaper. The article attacks world Jewry, and specifically American Jewry. It equates Zionism with Nazism, and describes a world Jewish conspiracy in the service of an Imperial Octopus, the United States.

This is the latest in a series of articles which has appeared throughout the Soviet press. Even the God of Hebrews has not been overlooked. An article in a Ukrainian paper on September 6, 1967 insists that the Jewish religion has its origins in viciousness, and that the God of the Jews is angry and brutal.

So long as the Jews of the Soviet Union have no way to defend their right—so long as there is no cultural, religious or social framework within which they can live in accordance with their wishes—concerned people throughout the world have a moral responsibility to defend this minority. For they are deprived of those fundamental rights guaranteed to every national group by the Soviet constitution. These include the study of their language, the development of their culture, and contacts with Jewish life outside the Soviet Union. They include the religious life which other religions in the Soviet Union enjoy.

Until a better, a freer life is the way of the Soviet Jew's life—we will continue to protest and condemn the lot of Russian Jewry.

Until a better, a freer life is the way of the Soviet Jew's life—we must take every opportunity to discuss the plight of Soviet Jewry.

Surely the time is long overdue for the Soviet regime to remove the heavy burden that Stalin placed on Soviet Jews.

The true nature of a system of government expresses itself in the treatment of its people. If during the 50th year of its rule the Soviet government will bring to Russian Jews the freedom—the life they yearn for—surely this move will add to the over-all quotient of good will and cooperation in the world today. Never has it been needed more.

This is our call to the Soviet Union on the eve of its anniversary celebration.

URBAN-RURAL POPULATION IMBALANCE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the problem of urban-rural population imbalance has prompted a variety of plans and programs to resolve this national dilemma.

From reviewing these proposals, one fact is clear. A blend of public support and private initiative will be necessary in order to intensively develop the industrial, recreational, and agricultural potential of the countryside and take pressure off our overcrowded cities.

We simply have too many people living on too little land in our cities and too few people living on too much land in our rural areas. This pileup of people in the urban areas has resulted in chronic unemployment, skyrocketing welfare payments, disintegrating families, massive slums and rising crime rates.

Meanwhile, many of our rural communities have suffered by the loss of promising young adults and already productive people to the false lure of better opportunity in the city.

The challenge we face is to develop our rural areas into attractive locations for building new industries and into attractive communities for raising new families. This will relieve the tension in our cities and revitalize our countryside so that local families can remain and city families who wish can move in.

Many communities, through aggressive leadership and tremendous local spirit, have already accomplished a great deal. One such example is the Congaree Iron & Steel Co., Inc., Columbia, S.C., which has grown from a seed of an idea 9 years ago to a flourishing business employing 400 people today.

The Congaree story is a stirring one. Throughout its development is woven the able assistance of the Small Business Administration and the local rural electric cooperative, which provided electricity after the private utility in the area had insisted on extremely unrealistic costs for the service.

I ask unanimous consent that a Milwaukee Journal article by Laurene C. Eklund, entitled "New Plan To Help Cities: Create More Rural Jobs," and an article by Congaree President W. F. Threatt, entitled "We Have Broken the Poverty Chain," published recently in the Rural Electrification magazine, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Sept. 24, 1967]

New Plan To Help Cities: Create More Rural Jobs

(Note.—As the nation's major cities struggle with problems of crisis proportions in the improvement of living conditions, their resources are strained and their troubles compounded by the continued high rate of influx of newcomers, white and Negro, from impoverished rural areas. While this is only one of many factors in the plight of the cities, some attention is being given to offering the rural poor alternatives to migration. Here is a report.)

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Calls for a new national policy of "rural-urban balance" are being voiced by some Johnson administration officials as one means of easing the current agony of the cities. The most outspoken promoter of the policy—Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman—used the phrase last month in a speech to the National League of Cities in Boston. "There is a growing awareness of this rural-urban imbalance, and a growing resolve, at least in rural areas, that it must be corrected and that the endless migration that is compounding your agony must be halted, even reversed," Freeman told the mayors.

Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey sounded the same note last week in a speech at Greenville, S.C. Noting that "urban ghettos are full of people who could not make a decent living in rural areas" he called for building up job opportunities in small communities for people from surrounding rural areas.

REPORT THIS WEEK

Thomas S. Francis, federal co-chairman of the Upper Great Lakes Regional commission, also used the term recently in calling for measures to slow the migration from rural areas to cities and perhaps even to bring about an eventual reversal. He told the Upper Peninsula Committee for Area Progress at Menominee, Mich.:

"We know the tragic result of this march to the cities—discord, riots, fires and human isolation in the midst of almost incredible human congestion."

The "keep 'em down on the farm" effort was given a further boost last week by no less a personage than Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson on her midwest tour hailing the good rural life, on visits to farms and communities in Wisconsin and five other states.

In his speeches, Rural Electrification Administrator Norman M. Clapp stresses federally assisted rural electrification as an essential key to balanced development of the nation. (Clapp is a native of Ellsworth, Wis., and was publisher of the Grant County Independent at Lancaster for 15 years before coming to Washington.)

The idea is to create more jobs in rural areas, especially among poverty stricken Negroes in the south, so as to slow down the mass exodus to the cities of from 500,000 to 600,000 jobless persons annually.

This is believed to be the theme of a report to be made to President Johnson Wednesday by his advisory committee on rural poverty, which has been studying the problem for a year.

Representing the midwest on the 25 member commission in preparing what has been called a "high voltage" report were Wilson King, a farmer of Rock Falls, Ill., and James Bonnen of the faculty of Michigan State University.

The commission is said to have concluded that while the migration to the cities cannot and should not be stopped it can be slowed down and rechanneled more intelligently.

The initial success of a steel joist company in Congaree, S.C., is being cited as a most dramatic manifestation of the type of revitalization that must take place throughout rural America if the rural-urban balance theme is to prove significant.

Founded nine years ago with the help of the small business administration and the rural electrification administration, the Congaree Iron & Steel Co. employs 400 persons, 85% of whom are Negroes, many of them illiterate.

On a recent visit to the project near Columbia, S.C., Secretary Freeman publicized the venture as "a picture book example of what needs to be done all over the nation."

"We have broken the poverty chain," Frank Threatt, the president of Congraee Iron & Steel, told the house rural development subcommittee here recently.

His testimony was an inspiring recital of how local initiative, a government program and a progressive rural electric co-operative transformed a poor black belt community into a bright pattern for the future.

Congaree, with its 85% Negro population, is the historical home of the Hampton Red Shirts, who were dedicated to running out the Negroes and white carpetbaggers shortly after the Civil war.

The Ku Klux Klan flourished there in the 1920s and 1930s and more recently a white citizens' council was started with the aim of fighting integration.

Extremists who controlled the council threatened officers and employes of the new company with violence because it hired Negroes, but the threats were ignored and now the council is out of existence.

"Our local purchases and salaries amount to two million dollars a year," Threatt told the obviously impressed members of the subcommittee, which is part of the house agriculture committee.

"Our schools are integrated. Our Negroes and whites live in peace with mutual respect for one another. The typical charge that Negroes are lazy and cannot be trained for highly skilled jobs has been disproved."

Threatt, himself a white man who had been impressed by the Negro troops he commanded in World War II and in Korea, recalled how Congaree's young Negro men left the community "in droves" for New York, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee and other large cities.

YOUNG PEOPLE RETURN

"We have reversed this trend and they are returning home to us," he testified. "We are luring our young people back home out of the ghettos of the north.

"We have every confidence we can set up similar operations near large cities in rural areas and duplicate the business we have at Congaree with minority groups."

Negro heads of family who were making $600 a year at the time the company was started now average slightly more than $3,400 a year, with some making more than $10,000 in supervisory positions.

Threatt said his community is a shining example of what the intelligent use of federal funds can do for a rural area.

He told how the Tri-County Electric Co-op provided electricity for several months at $1.50 a month after the South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. had demanded $3,500 in advance for a power line. The co-op's electric bill now exceeds $3,000 a month.

As an indication of the rising standard of living, the kilowatt-hour consumption of the employees' families has more than doubled since just before the steel company was formed. This reflects their buying of many electrical appliances and improved home lighting.

Threatt proposes to create 600 more jobs at Congaree by building a mill that would use 200,000 crushed automobiles a year as raw material.

Other rural communities, he told congress, can create a thousand or more good paying jobs if they are near a large city with a large minority population, can get power from a local co-op and have the same kind of working arrangement his company has with the REA and the SBA.

We Have Broken the Poverty Chain

(NOTE.—The inspiring story of how local people, a government program and a progressive rural electric co-op transformed a poverty-wracked community into a bright pattern for the future.)

(By W. F. Threatt, president,[1] Congaree Iron & Steel Co., Inc., Columbia, S.C.)

Nineteen fifty-seven was not a very good year for starting a new, under-capitalized industry in Congaree, S.C. This was especially true if the business were located in a predominantly Negro rural area.

NEED FOR ELECTRIC POWER

Our first problem was to locate land that could be serviced with electricity. South Carolina Electric & Gas Company was the nearest utility. We contacted them, and after waiting two weeks a representative visited us. He could not give us an answer as to whether we could purchase power or not from SCE&G because it would be necessary to construct approximately 3,000 feet of power line to the property. Another three weeks passed before we received an answer. The answer was that we could get the power in four weeks by paying $3,500 in advance. Since this sum represented the bulk of our paid-in capital, at that time, we were discouraged.

RURAL ELECTRIC ASSISTANCE

A local board member of the Tri-County Electric Cooperative suggested we contact his manager, Herbert Norris, to see if he could help us.

This we did on Thursday of that week. The following Monday, the necessary lines had been constructed. The transformers were installed and we had power. The cost to us—absolutely nothing. Our first several power bills were a flat $1.50 per month, the minimum.

We hired ten unemployed Negro men from our community and started work installing a handful of second-hand equipment in an open field. When it rained, we stopped work and sat in our cars.

Our employees were illiterate or semi-illiterate. We did not have a building to house our operations. We were competing with the giants of the steel industry. They decided to destroy us early, for our nuisance value, by cut-throat competition. They almost succeeded. Suppliers were reluctant to ship us raw steel. They usually demanded, and got, cash in advance.

One week we nearly went under for lack of $500 to meet our payroll A good friend, who is now a director of our company, N. F. Megna, came to our rescue with a personal loan of $500.

From the outset we integrated our employees. We made no difference between Negro and white.

A RAY OF LIGHT

In 1958 we had the good fortune to meet a brilliant young attorney, Irvine F. Belser, Jr. He believed in us and what we were trying to do. He got us to incorporate and brought in new capital. Through Mr. Belser, we got our first bank loan from a sympathetic and helpful banker, Bonner Baxter, president of Commercial Bank and Trust Company of South Carolina.

With this new money we put a roof on our plant, hired 50 additional employees, and expanded our operations. Our Tri-County Electric Co-op was pulling out transformers and building heavier service every year. Our consumption of power increased proportionately.

---

[1] This testimony was presented by Mr. Threatt before the Rural Development Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee. It is an outstanding success story and proper follow-up of an article appearing on page 27 of the January 1967 issue of *Rural Electrification* magazine.

Business, employment and profits increased every year. However, we outran our capital structure again, and a series of financial crises occurred from 1960 through 1964.

ENTER THE SBA

During this period, we contacted the South Carolina director of the Small Business Administration, Howard M. McKenzie. He and his staff were watching our progress. In October 1965, we were granted an SBA Bank Participation loan of $466,667.

Demand for our product was still growing. We hired an additional 100 employees and put our plant to work around the clock. Before many months had passed it became imperative to find more space. Our employees were working almost elbow to elbow, machinery and men began breaking down from the strain and push necessary to maintain production.

The SBA was keeping a continuing watch over our progress. Charlie McKenzie, director of the 502 Program in the South Carolina office, investigated our needs and came up with a proposed solution.

TRI-COUNTY DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

Cost of the new plant was to be approximately $750,000, of which the SBA was authorized to loan up to $350,000 to the proposed development company. We could not raise the additional $400,000 in our community. The maximum we could raise was $80,000 among employees and friends in the community. At this time the Tri-County Electric Cooperative came to our rescue. Through their loan program for electrical equipment purchases, they participated with the SBA in lending another $300,000.

In less than six weeks the entire package was put together and we received a commitment to build.

Without the able assistance of Charlie McKenzie and Arthur Glick, who had taken over Howard McKenzie's job, we would have been lost.

We received the personal endorsement of Bernard L. Boutin, the National SBA Administrator and his staff.

On the REA staff, everyone from Norman M. Clapp, Administrator; Robert Long and Walter E. Fuller, assistants to the Administrator; Richard Hausler, Deputy Administrator; Noble Wrinkle, S. E. Regional Administrator; John Barringer, Lou Gittleman and Herbert Norris cut through red tape and expedited our application.

Our Congressional delegation—Senator Strom Thurmond, Senator Ernest F. Hollings, and Congressman Albert Watson—gave us undivided assistance when called upon. They opened many doors and expedited our project. Their advice and assistance cannot be measured.

In two months our new plant will be in complete operation. We are employing men as fast as we can train them. We now employ 400 people.

In our community, an economic and sociological miracle has taken place. Our sole purpose, at the outset, was to start a business and make money. What happened?

Two completely new schools and 27 classroom additions to existing schools have been constructed. The Head Start Programs, supervised by the Office of Economic Opportunity, are flourishing. Our children who had never seen inside plumbing, or had a physical examination, are now receiving these benefits.

Over 75 new homes have been bought or built by our employees. This could be tripled if we could overcome the resistance to making home loans to rural Negro people. We still need help in this area.

Three new filling stations, a bakery, a small shopping center, a new post office, a machine shop, two new laundries, two new churches, one new restaurant, a fish bait business, several small country stores are the result of our plant and its employment.

Our local tax base has increased five times over. Increased property values alone have more than tripled.

Our $1\frac{1}{2}$-million payroll is the backbone of our community.

SOCIAL CHANGES

Our schools are integrated. Our community is 85% Negro and 15% white. We live in peace with mutual respect for one another. We cannot change a way of life that goes back 200 years, but we are making progress. Our biggest worry is the outside paid agitators who visit our Negro churches. They say we go too slow and haven't done enough. We fight them with facts.

Our people vote and we encourage voter registration. We cannot predict how they vote, but we advise when asked for assistance. Our great President Johnson grows in stature every day in our area. Our Congressional delegation represents all the people black and white.

FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

Our Federal Credit Union has 296 members and makes loans for everything from a washing machine to houses. We have almost eliminated the "loan sharks" that preyed on our employees.

Our young Negro men left the community in droves going into New York, Detroit, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Los Angeles, Chicago, Washington, D.C. and other large cities.

We have reversed this trend and they are returning home. We have every confidence that we can set up similar operations near large cities, in rural areas, and duplicate the business we have here at Congaree, with American or Indian. This is provided we have the imaginative assistance in these areas that we have received from SBA and REA in our community. We challenge you to challenge us. You name the city and state.

THE FUTURE

We have broken the poverty chain in our area, but we still have a long way to go. In addition to a good job for a man, we must see that he has a decent home to live in, a school to educate his children, a hospital to treat his ills, an expanding job opportunity.

Last, but not least, we must make him regain his pride in being an American citizen, and not a second-class citizen. We measure our successes in inches and our losses in yards, but the inches are creeping up.

Many of our Negro employees earn over $10,000 a year. You can't get THEM to march, demonstrate and destroy property.

Unfortunately, we, the white minority in our area, still retain many of our old prejudices and we accept change slowly. The facts of life tell us that the only way to hold our Negroes in the gutter is to get in the gutter with them. We are too proud for this and elect instead to pull them up with us.

Time is our biggest enemy. We need time to change our thinking, but the radical elements in our society won't give us time. Consequently, we must hurry, and when we hurry we make mistakes.

CONCLUSION

We do not propose to speak for all Federal programs in our state. We can speak for the SBA and the REA. In the past few months, the SBA has made over $7,000,000 available for development companies similar to ours, through their 502 Program. REA has made power available to every man who requested it.

Our community is a shining example of what the intelligent use of Federal funds can do for a rural area. We hope that you will see fit to continue and expand the scope of these most worthwhile agencies. Time is short and this generation must hurry, even if we make mistakes.

ADDRESS BY DR. LELAND J. HAWORTH, DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, this past weekend I was honored to be present at the dedication of a new Physical Science Center at the University of South Carolina in Columbia. This center represents the culmination of years of planning and hard work dating back to my term as Governor of South Carolina.

However, the new center is far more than that: It is a milestone in the progress of the university. That the center is now a concrete reality is due in large part to the efforts of the university president, Thomas F. Jones. We in South Carolina deem ourselves fortunate to have a man like Dr. Jones heading our State's largest university. He is eminently qualified in that he combines the best qualities of a teacher and an administrator. Compassionately he deals with the problems which confront the young men and women at the university. His ideals instill in those around him great hope for the future. Yet at the same time he is a realist with the ability to implement as well as conceive.

The principal speaker at the dedication was another gentleman who played a very real part in making the dream a reality—Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation. In his remarks, Dr. Haworth pointed out not only the educational worth of the new center but also its relevance to the "regional, economic and social system of which it is a part". I commend Dr. Haworth on his statement and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF DR. LELAND J. HAWORTH, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA DEDICATION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCE CENTER, COLUMBIA, S.C., OCTOBER 20, 1967

Senator Hollings, President Jones, ladies and gentlemen, when Dr. Jones invited me to join with you, in dedicating the Physical Sciences Center for the University of South Carolina, I was delighted to accept both for personal reasons and as a representative of the National Science Foundation. In my association with the Atomic Energy Commission from 1947 to 1963, my duties with the Brookhaven National Laboratory and later as Commissioner, gave me a close familiarity with the people and programs of the Savannah River installation of the AEC, but it was your Physical Sciences Center which finally gave me the chance to actually visit the University of South Carolina and to see at first hand your advances in science, education, and industry. As a representative of the National Science Foundation, I am happy to be able to convey our pleasure in having been able to play a part in transforming the Center from idea to reality. Let us hope that the future will bring us together on other special occasions like this.

There are many people in this audience, and some who are not so fortunate as to be present, who have added their "blood, sweat, and tears" to the bricks and mortar of this Center. They deserve our sincerest congratulations for what they wrought.

In the consultative process leading to the construction of this facility, Senator Hollings, who was then Governor of South Carolina, gave significant assistance. I know, too, that Senator Thurmond is also extremely interested in the development of institutional capabilities in science in South Carolina and the Southeastern region of the United States.

At first, early in 1962, only a modest proposal for the renovation of the old chemistry building was made. However, after further consultation between the University and Foundation staff, it became clear that such an arrangement would not be permanently satisfactory because new facilities were already being developed for engineering and other sciences elsewhere on the campus. It is to the great credit of the staff involved that they were able to reconcile Federal grant requirements while still exercising local control and flexibility of action to permit the University to chart its own course and to take advantage of its special strengths. From their deliberations, it became clear that University needs would be better met, over the long term, by a comprehensive Physical Sciences Center which would accommodate chemistry, physics, a computer center, and a science-engineering library.

This new concept, formulated under Dr. Jones' guidance, was reviewed and evaluated by NSF staff and facilities consultants, and in August 1964 the NSF granted over one-half million dollars for the Physical Sciences Center. Fortunately, newly passed legislation in the 89th Congress enabled the Office of Education to add even larger grants to that of the Foundation. To these sums, the State contributed still more and the facility finally took the form we see today. The moral of his story is simply that it takes many people, working together, patiently and creatively, within the policy framework of constructive legislation, at both the State and Federal levels, to achieve real progress in science and education.

In admiring this Center, we should, however, not lose sight of its relevance to the total educational, regional, economic and social system of which it is a part. You have not merely constructed a building. Experience at other institutions has shown that we can expect that the strengthening of physical sciences at the University of South Carolina will bring valuable, sometimes pioneering, interdisciplinary activities with other departments on the campus. Also, we can anticipate that funds from other sources will be attracted, and that faculty recruitment will be enhanced—drawing staff from industry as well as traditional sources. Finally, we can anticipate that the students who will be attracted to apply for admission will have better training to begin with and come from higher quality schools. Already, we can see signs that these lessons from experience will be repeated at Carolina. Dr. Jones tells me that there has taken place a most gratifying buildup and improvement of the departmental staff. As a result, great progress has been made in chemistry and physics since the NSF site visits in 1962–63. Whereas the whole University awarded only six Ph.D's per year then, these two departments awarded over twice that many this summer. I am assured that the productivity of the chemistry and physics departments together will double again and exceed 25 doctoral graduates within two or three years.

As the capabilities of the University increase, it can make a commensurate contribution to the growth and progress of its State and the entire Southeastern region of the United States. We have come to recognize that regional growth and progress are linked closely to science and education. From such awareness has come the general concept and overall national policy that there must be an increase in the number of those universities and colleges where standards of excellence in scientific research and teaching are comparable with the best that prevail anywhere. This increase is needed so that the total national program in science and education can be improved and to assure that such institutions shall be present in every region of the land. We seek to achieve these purposes for reasons broader than the campus itself. Of course, the country needs the trained, skilled manpower and the knowledge which are the most visible outputs of a university. But the excellent university does more. It is a nucleus from which ideas radiate to influence community attitudes and values. The standards of truth and culture which it upholds set worthy examples for others who are outside the institution. At the same time, the charged atmosphere of the university attracts industry, economic development, and other desirable elements of society.

Our interest in the level of funding should not overshadow the kinds of programs through which available funds are allocated. The broad umbrella of promoting science and education covers many operational objectives, and varied and new programs must be devised to achieve these objectives. For example, this new Center helps to achieve the objectives of the Foundation's graduate science facility program. But since it is a permanent part of the University, it is evaluated on an institutional basis. This means that the environment for research and science education, the overall quality of the institution, and the aims, progress, and projected changes in the institution are major factors in support of new facilities.

Realizing that facilities are part of an institutional fabric, we can see that general institutional support by Government is a key portion of the total picture. Institutional development programs have been an important innovation in NSF programs. While many of you are aware of the activities of the Foundation, let me take a moment to give some background for the benefit of those not familiar with our work.

In its first 15 years, the Foundation vigorously pursued, as it does today, its main objectives of expanding scientific knowledge through support of basic research projects; the betterment of science education by granting fellowships, and traineeships, by providing funds for the equipment and facilities needed by academic institutions, and by a whole series of programs designed to assist improving the quality of education at every level through institutes for teachers at the pre-college institutes, curriculum development projects at every level, assistance to outstanding college and high school students who wish to take part in research programs, and so on. Our commitment to the objectives of basic research and education in science, together with the support of other Federal agencies, has contributed much to the flourishing state of American science. At the same time, our nation has formulated new goals of equality of educational opportunity. To meet such goals when faced with a growing enrollment, rising costs, and increased emphasis on the role of science and technology in solving the complex problems of our society, a new dimension of support was needed.

It became evident, a few years ago, that we not only had to strengthen science as such, and to maintain existing centers of excellence, but we needed to develop and improve the capability for research and education in the sciences at institutions not now among the foremost. To help meet these latter needs, a broader based, more comprehensive program of support for improvement of institutions was undertaken.

Improvement of institutional capabilities is carried out at several levels. The Foundation's University Science Development Program provides support on an institution-wide basis to a limited number of Ph. D. granting institutions which have substantial current strength and potential for planned progress. Our Departmental Science Development Program helps specific individual departments or areas of science in graduate level institutions which are not yet ready to move to the top rank on a university-wide basis. Finally, our College Science Improvement Program, which aids in the improvement at predominantly undergraduate level institutions, complements the two graduate level programs just mentioned, by extending the institutional science development concept across almost the full spectrum of higher education.

There isn't enough time to describe the details of each of these programs to you tonight. However, I think you might be interested to know that the program for University Science Development has, to date, made broad-gauged grants totaling over $100 million to 27 institutions in the past two years. Of these 27 institutions, 13 are located in the South and Southwestern parts of the United States. In addition five institutions including three in the South and Southwest, have been awarded a total of $3.5 million for projects of narrower scope, which grew out of more ambitious University Science Development proposals. The Departmental Science Development Program which started only last winter, has to date awarded about $5 million to assist single departments in eight widely-scattered institutions. The College Science Improvement Program, which also started last winter, has made broad-gauged awards totaling $2.5 to fifteen predominantly undergraduate colleges scattered around the nation.

About 40 percent of this money is for personnel, including faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, and technical and clerical personnel support. About one-third of the money is for equipment, including library books and periodicals, computer time and rental, travel, and various types of needed equipment. About one-fourth of the funds are for the renovation and new construction of facilities.

Programs of the type I have just described are in line with the policy of the President, announced in his memorandum of September 1965, to achieve broader institutional distribution of Federal funds to universities and colleges while maintaining strength at existing centers of excellence. Although NSF is unique in its across-the-board support for basic research and science education, it should be noted that a similar process is also taking place in the mission-oriented, science support of other Federal agencies. I think it most significant that during the period 1963–66 changes in the pattern of Federal funding showed a trend toward relatively greater Federal support of the developing institutions in the Southern and Western parts of the United States.

While emphasizing the importance of scientists and scientific institutions to the educational and intellectual life of a region and as a stimulus and aid to economic growth, we should keep in mind that other factors are alsc vital in a region's development. A region needs knowledgeable and dynamic local business, financial, and political leaders. It also needs resources in the form of the required raw materials, plant, capital, and skilled and dedicated managers and personnel.

The impressive growth of the Southeast shows that the fusion of all of these factors is taking place at an increasing rate in this region—here and now.

Like the ripples spreading out when a stone is dropped in water, one can identify many favorable effects from this new Physical Sciences Center to the University, to the State, and to the region of which it is a part. Although we have reason to be well satisfied with these prospcets, there is still much to be done to bring science into its own in this region. This Physical Sciences Center represents only one way to enhance science and education in a community. Many other approaches are open at both the individual and and the institutional level.

And, at the institutional level there are opportunities for both large and small academic institutions. In particular, I direct the attention of those of you in the audience from liberal arts undergraduate colleges to on-going NSF programs such as the programs for college science improvement grants, science faculty summer research participation, equipment for undergraduate improvement, and science faculty institutes. These programs represent only a small sampling of the kinds of opportunities which exist for individuals, institutions, and other local groups to progress.

Federal participation in the higher learning process is not a passing fad. It has become a prominent, if not permanent, feature of our social landscape, and can, objectively, be described as a constructive partnership, benefiting both sides. The Government has need of the university's knowledge and creativity, and the university, if it is to respond, needs the counsel, cooperation and support of Government. How we satisfy these common needs and maintain the relationship is a continuing problem. I took the time, earlier in my remarks, to detail the events that led to the construction of this Center, because I think it an excellent example of how well open minds and mutual respect on the part of many parties, at various levels of Government and academia, can join forces for progress.

However excellent an example this Center provides, the Foundation does not pretend to have all the answers on how best to promote science and education in science. The Foundation uses appropriated funds as a public trust, and yet we try not to paralyze our scientific and academic partners in red tape because of the trust delegated to us. More important than the possible irritations of administration are the substantive questions of maximizing return on the public investment. The Foundation has a national mission which is maximized when it takes into account local and regional concerns. We try to meet bona fide needs which can result in the improvement of science, and we are interested in finding out about significant needs so that we can give them consideration. Obviously, people like you, and your counterparts in other areas, can bring a unique and useful perspective which can lead to many helpful suggestions. The Foundation welcomes your suggestions on how to meet the special needs of your school and your region.

There are some who suspect that a Government agency would reject suggestions that are not tried and true. Speaking for the Foundation, which is not young enough to know everything, I prefer to follow the philosophy that it is better to ask some of the questions than to know all the answers. I think that we are flexible enough to foster our national purpose by meeting individual needs of the parts of our nation.

I want to invite each of you to visit the Foundation if you have occasion to be in Washington so that we can get better acquainted and explore joint problems. We may in our evaluation seem careful and traditional, but the facility we dedicate today is proof that we can think big together.

Up to this point, I have focused on the Government side of the coin. The other side of the coin is the increasing responsibility of individual academic institutions. The responsibility of an academic institution does not end when it receives more funding. There is need for an on-going, critical look at the real objectives of the institution and what, if any, plans it has developed to achieve its self-imposed objectives. Plans that are developed should avoid conventional projections of present trends and situations and aim at being imaginative ventures into unknown academic frontiers.

Personal and institutional self-evaluation is an inherent part of this examination of purpose and plan. Identifying areas of strength and weakness is not easy, and there is a human tendency to over-estimate the strengths and underestimate and perpetuate the weaknesses. It is the responsibility of the academic institutions to undertake this difficult task so that plans are based on a realistic assessment of its capabilities. In addition to these responsibilities, academic institutions should not separate education into small, individual cells. Instead an interdisciplinary treatment of problems should be fostered. We want to be sure that we don't splinter our available resources or fragment the educational experience of your students.

This facility, which brings together physics, chemistry, engineering, and the computing sciences, illustrates the points on academic responsibility that I have been making. Planning for this facility not only called for a proposed expenditure of money, but it also represented innovative planning which reflected a realistic assessment of University capabilities and a bringing together of interrelated disciplines.

This has been a long day, and there are more festivities to come. I look forward to them with eager anticipation. As a starter, I'm told that I will be lodged in your resplendent Women's Dormitory tonight—with my wife who has accompanied me. With such pleasant prospects awaiting us, let me conclude by noting that the ingredients for scientific, educational, and economic progress exist in the Southeastern United States. In many ways the ingredients present here are equal to the challenge ahead, as shown by the trends in your rate of academic and industrial growth. I am sure that the Physical Sciences Center and the students and faculty who are to use it will help the University contribute even more to the welfare of this area. I will watch with great interest the promising development of science and education in South Carolina and the region of which it is a part. Let me wish you well in the use of these new facilities and in the endeavors they will support.

THE PLIGHT OF THE JEWISH MINORITY IN RUSSIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, in 2 weeks the 50th anniversary of the Soviet Union will be celebrated. It is therefore an especially propitious occasion to call to world attention once again the plight of the Jewish minority in Russia.

Earlier this month a National Leadership Conference on Soviet Jewry was held here in Washington. Some 25 major Jewish organizations are pooling their moral leadership resources to bring into as sharp a focus as possible the spotlight of worldwide attention on the way in which basic human rights are denied to Jews in the Soviet Union.

Today, the eve of the Jewish holiday "Simchat Torah," has been chosen as a day for special emphasis on this problem and well it should be. For the past 3 years this holiday has brought to the Russian synagogues an outpouring of thousands of Soviet Jewish youth. This year it will undoubtedly happen again even though, by so doing, these young people run the serious risk of close identification with a minority which is suffering a denial of religious, social and cultural rights which should be enjoyed by all.

I therefore consider it a privilege to join with a number of my colleagues in speaking out on this issue today. We again call upon the Soviet Government to reexamine its policy toward its Jewish minority. Instead of the stepped-up program of Jewish vilification now so prevalent in the Russian mass media, we hope to see them use the occasion of their 50th anniversary year to institute a program which will bring to their Jewish citizens the same rights and privileges enjoyed by other minorities in the Soviet Union.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA JAYCEES TO THE PROGRAM OF THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of North Carolina's most alert young businessmen, Jim Melvin, of Greensboro, N.C., who is State chairman of the North Carolina Jaycees, has made an outstanding report in respect to the participation of the North Carolina Jaycees in the people-to-people program of the Partners of the Alliance. This report was published in the September 1967 issue of the official Jaycee magazine, Action.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this report be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NORTH CAROLINA PROGRAM

(By Jim Melvin)

With the support and interest of 37 Jaycee chapters throughout North Carolina and countless hundreds of other non-affiliated persons, the first year of the North Carolina Partners—"People to People"—can be termed a great success. Even though in operation just short of one full year, the North Carolina Partners group has been able to sponsor 60 individual projects ranging all the way from starting boy scout troops, home sanitation projects, water projects, school projects, hospital projects, private enterprise projects, to, last, but far from least, a visit by two North Carolina doctors. The more than 50 individual stories involved with this operation are just too many to publish. However, following are a few cases just to give some idea as to what has already happened in Bolivia as a result of the activities of the North Carolina Jaycees.

The Plymouth Jaycees joined forces with the Greensboro Service League and a local scout troop in Greensboro to provide tableware for the 50 some children in the Milk Drop Orphanage who up to now had been taking turns eating their meals with a limited amount of silverware. Similar joint sponsorship by other groups provided linen, mattresses and mattress covers for this same orphanage.

The Rocky Mount Jaycees have been able to make it possible for the people of El Paso to have water in their village, whereas, up to this time they had to walk several hundred yards to obtain water. This was truly a great moment in the lives of these people which could not have been possible without the help of the Rocky Mount Jaycees.

A nine-square block area in one of the poorest sections of Cochabamba has been cleaned up, thanks to the Burlington Jaycees and their home sanitation project. Also in Cochabamba, they now have a water system thanks to the help of the Goldsboro Jaycees. The people of this village held a big Sunday celebration for the completion of their work and dedicated their new public facility.

These are several free enterprise projects well under way such as the one sponsored by the Lexington Jaycees where they put 38 ladies in the laundry business, and the High Point Jaycees sponsored a sewing business by providing sewing machines.

The Hickory Jaycees joined forces with

Forest City's Jaycees and a church group to provide a set of surgical instruments that were desperately needed by the hospital.

A wonderful group of Wilmington Jaycettes sold cookbooks which produced enough funds to build a dormitory for the Ismael Montes School.

The Matthews Jaycees (some 35 strong) helped build the Buena Vista Rural School and made it possible for more than 50 children to go to school who before had not had this kind of opportunity.

The Salisbury Jaycees bought themselves an oxen, and thus allowed a lot of spring plowing to be done 3,000 miles from Salisbury.

The Asheboro Jaycees turned their "Christmas tree sales" into sewing projects.

The Thomasville Jaycees and the Greensboro Jaycees picked up paper and turned it into projects for their new Bolivian friends.

Of course, there were many non-Jaycee organizations who wholeheartedly supported the "People to People" program. The students at Grimsley High School in Greensboro by selling themselves as slave labor, raking yards, baby sitting, and washing cars raised over $980. This money was sent to Bolivia and in turn used to build the Tablas Monte Bridge which linked a community to the main road that for centuries had been separated by a deep gorge.

The Greensboro Dental Society made available one complete set of dental equipment and made it possible for more than 2,000 children to have free dental checks and toothbrushes.

A scout troop in Greensboro raised money to start a corresponding scout troop in Cochabamba by providing scout hats, handbooks and miscellaneous equipment.

The first year of operation was climaxed by two Greensboro doctors donating one month of their time to go to Bolivia to work and assist the Bolivian people. More than $10,000 worth of drugs alone were donated and taken down by these two men—Dr. Collins Mahaffee, M.D., and Dr. Charles Sims, Veterinarian. Two complete sets of new medical equipment were donated and taken down by these men to be left in Bolivia on their return. Miscellaneous hospital equipment with a value in excess of $5,000 was sent down by air express to be put in use by our medical team. This is certainly a fitting way to end the first year's operation.

In summary, more than $15,000 worth of money, $5,000 worth of equipment and $10,000 worth of drugs have been sent to Bolivia. This figure does not include transportation of the doctors and equipment which was considerable. The grand total would be in excess of $30,000. However large these figures seem, they are merely a drop in the bucket toward solving the many problems of our South American friends.

This project is certainly bringing to life our Jaycee creed which states that "Service to Humanity is the Best Work of Life."

MISS ANNABEL A. GARVEY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I note with sorrow the passing of Miss Annabel A. Garvey, a member of a most historic and noted family in Kansas.

Miss Garvey, who died in Topeka on September 26, was the granddaughter of two prominent and famous Kansans—Edward C. K. Garvey, one of eight members of the original town company that founded our Kansas capital, Topeka; and Col. W. D. Alexander who served with distinction in the early Kansas Legislature and was an intimate friend of President Abraham Lincoln.

In addition, Miss Garvey's great uncle, Cyrus K. Holliday, was Topeka's first mayor and the president of the Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Railroad. He was also one of our State's early pioneering attorneys.

Edward C. K. Garvey, as well as being one of the founders of our State capital, published what is believed to be the first newspaper printed in Kansas, the Kansas Freeman. Much of Kansas history concerns the rugged determination of men like Mr. Garvey to make Kansas a free State and to rid our then young Nation of slavery.

Evidence of the pioneering spirit of the Garvey family is still present in Kansas today as Mr. Garvey's first home, a substantial masonry structure called Garvey Retreat still stands west of Lecompton, Kans.

Miss Annabel Garvey carried on the proud tradition of her family and of her State. She was a professor of English at Kansas State University, served overseas with the YMCA in World War I, and later was an aide to the U.S. Trade Commission in Turkey. She was most active in the Kansas Author's Club and the Legion of American Penwomen and Quill Society.

Although I note her passing with sorrow, I am sure Miss Garvey and her family's tradition and proud spirit will continue to serve as examples for Kansans today. The rich heritage she and her family worked so hard for and achieved so well is one all Kansans look to with pride.

Mr. President, in these modern times of complex and pressing problems in virtually every segment of our Nation's society, perhaps we all should take time to reflect upon the lessons of the past. I am sure if we would approach today's problems with the same honest enthusiasm, rugged determination, and religious conviction that served our pioneer families, we can continue the job of shaping our Nation's destiny with honor and pride.

Let us hope the tradition we are building today serves our children as well as the proud tradition left by Miss Annabel A. Garvey and her historic Kansas family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Garvey's obituary as printed in the Topeka Daily Capital and a brief article from an early edition of the Sacramento Record-Union concerning her grandfather and President Lincoln be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Topeka Daily Capital, Sept. 29, 1967]

Rites Set for City Founder's Relative

Funeral services for the granddaughter of one of Topeka's founders will be at 11 a.m. today in Penwell-Gabel chapel. She was Annabel Alexander Garvey, 77, who died in a Topeka retirement home Tuesday.

Edward C. K. Garvey, one of eight members of the original town company and brother-in-law of Topeka's first mayor and first president of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., Cyrus K. Holliday, was an early-day attorney.

He also published what is believed to be the first newspaper printed in Kansas, the Kansas Freeman. Garvey built a substantial masonry home west of Lecompton in 1854, with walls two feet thick, which still is standing, and called it Garvey's Retreat.

Miss Garvey's grandfather, on her mother's side, was Col. W. D. Alexander who served in the Legislature.

Educated at Wellesley and the University of Kansas, Miss Garvey was a professor of English at Kansas State University and active in the Kansas Authors Club, the League of American Penwomen and Quill Society. She served overseas with the YMCA in World War I and, later, as an aide to the U.S. Trade Commission in Constantinople.

She is survived by a brother, Maj. Willis Garvey, Washington, D.C. Two cousins, W. Alex Spencer, formerly of Topeka and now of Washington, and William N. Garvey, Greenbrae, Calif., will attend the funeral.

[From the Sacramento Record-Union, Aug. 15, 1902]

A Lincoln Story

King Edward VII is credited with the saying that it is vastly easier to live up to the obligations of a play King than to those of a real one; and the same thought, with a slightly different turn, was once expressed by President Lincoln. In 1862 Colonel Alexander of Topeka, who was an intimate friend of the President, visited him at Washington, and found him in a greatly depressed state of mind.

"This being President isn't all it is cracked up to be, is it, Mr. Lincoln?" inquired Colonel Alexander.

"No," said Lincoln, his eyes twinkling momentarily. "I feel sometimes like the Irishman, who, after being ridden on a rail, said, 'Begorry, if it wasn't for the honor av th' thing, I'd rather walk!' "—London Spectator.

CONTINUING PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on the eve of Simchat Torah, the Jewish holiday which celebrates the completion of the annual reading of the Torah, I feel it appropriate that I join with many of my colleagues in commenting on the continuing plight of Soviet Jewry. Falling as it does just 2 weeks before the 50th anniversary of the Soviet revolution, it is a particularly appropriate time to examine the status and condition of this ethnic and religious minority in the Soviet Union.

In theory, ideology, and constitutional law, the Soviet Union encourages nationalities to identify with their particular group through cultural and educational institutions, and through activities in their own language. This does not, however, hold true for Soviet Jews, who rank 11th in numbers out of 108 U.S.S.R. nationality groups. There is no longer a national Jewish theater, a Jewish publishing house, or book-distributing agency. There are no schools or classes teaching Yiddish, Hebrew, or Jewish culture, history, or literature.

The U.S.S.R. is ideologically committed to atheism. However, while the Communist Party preaches antireligious principles, the State is supposed to accord freedom of religious worship, and, in fact, preaches the equality of religious groups in the Nation.

These principles of freedom of religion have not been granted to the Jews in the same manner in which they are granted to the other organized religious groups in the Soviet Union. Jews may not publish devotional literature or periodicals.

They may not produce essential devotional articles and are barred from having a central or coordinating structure.

Officially, the Soviet Union condemns and even legislates against discrimination on religious, national, or social grounds. Yet it indulges in anti-Semitism in official and unofficial acts. While anti-Semitism has declined since the Stalin era, the 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union still suffer seriously from discrimination.

They are attacked in antireligious propaganda. They have been used as scapegoats in a campaign against "economic crimes." They have been denied equal opportunities in religious and cultural pursuits and are excluded from many high offices in government. Rabbis have been denied travel visas to attend international Jewish conventions and Jews who wish to emigrate to join families or seek opportunity in new lands have been denied permits.

While we all recognize that every country has, and is experiencing, problems in making its constitutional guarantees and stated ideologies every day realities, I feel that it is evident that a sincere effort is being made in that direction. I would like to take this opportunity to call on the Soviet Union to join in that effort—to reevaluate its policies toward its Jewish citizens and take steps to eradicate discriminations against them.

A LETTER FROM VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, much has been written and said about Vietnam, but I wish to add a few more comments explaining why we are there and why we must support President Johnson in these hard, terrible days.

In my hand, I have excerpts from a letter written by a young American fightingman from Missouri who is serving in Vietnam. The letter is addressed to Secretary of State Rusk and expresses clearly why we are in Vietnam.

After reading about some of the disgraceful actions of so-called war protesters during the recent weekend, it is heart warming to read the story of our young men who are in Vietnam fighting for Asian freedom and American freedom.

Listen to the tone and patriotism of this letter:

> As you well know most of the GI's over here, of which there numbers over four hundred thousand, are between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five. I'm in that group. These people are Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives of all types of families. Yet I've never talked to a single GI over here and I probably never will who says "get out of Vietnam." We are fighting for the freedom of these people, as we once fought for our own . . .

There is a lesson for all of us in this letter from a young serviceman in Vietnam.

Let us support our President. Let us support our fightingmen. Let us support America.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD excerpts from this letter from a U.S. Air Force man stationed in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> As you well know most of the GIs over here, of which there numbers over four hundred thousand, are between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five. I'm in that group. These people are Democrats and Republicans, liberals, and conservatives of all types of families. Yet I've never talked to a single GI over here and I probably never will, who says "get out of Vietnam."
>
> We are fighting for the freedom of these people, as we once fought for our own. Of these thousands of young Americans over here we all take pride in fighting for the principles that made our country the greatest on earth. When our grandchildren read about Vietnam in history lessons we will be proud to tell them that we were part of that lesson. We will take our place in history with the Americans who fought for freedom in the Revolutionary War, both World Wars, and in Korea.
>
> We are not the only young Americans who feel as we do. There are thousands more in the States who share our feelings. The people in Washington are doing their best for their country, just as we do it over here.
>
> Not all young Americans, in fact not even a majority of us, sit in college classrooms, major in Political Science, and see fit to protest that which our government does. Not all young Americans share a room with the opposite sex and call it the new freedom in sex; not all young Americans attend LSD parties and park Volkswagens on the grass; and not all young Americans protest a war for freedom.
>
> We are proud to be here fighting for America; millions back home are proud of us, and the morale over here has never been higher!
>
> We all respect and admire our Administration and we know the feeling is mutual.

WE SHOULD SPEAK OUT IN OPPOSITION TO DISCRIMINATORY POLICIES IN THE SOVIET UNION AGAINST ITS JEWISH CITIZENRY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in expressing deep concern over the plight of Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union and in urging officials of our State Department to call upon officials of the Soviet Government to reexamine discriminatory policies. We in the United States should not remain silent when our voices can help bring justice to people denied justice.

In May 1945, we thought we saw the end of nazism; that it was dead and buried forever. Nazism and fascism are by no means dead. They have perhaps been driven underground, but they have not been eliminated. Anti-Semitism is not a disease peculiar to any one nation. It is a world problem; a deadly sickness that varies in degree from country to country.

In the Soviet Union, Jews are today the victims of what can only be described as cultural genocide. They are without political representation, denied community organization, and almost without religious or cultural rights. The prospects for Soviet Jewry are dire and gloomy. A once flourishing and rich cultural tradition is being extinguished. Discrimination is rampant. Attacks on Judaism in official antireligious propaganda have been virulent and clearly anti-Semitic.

Unlike other recognized religious bodies in the Soviet Union, Jews are not permitted any semblance of a central or coordinating structure. They are not permitted to publish periodicals and devotional literature including prayer books and Bibles. They cannot maintain formal relationships with coreligionists abroad. Other religious groups in the Soviet Union do maintain such contacts.

There is only one seminary for the Jews of the Soviet Union, and it is not functioning. Therefore, there are no replacements for the handful of aging rabbis and other religious functionaries. In 1956 there were 450 synagogues in the Soviet Union. Today there are fewer than 70. If only half of the Jews in the Soviet Union desired to attend worship services, this means one synagogue for every 22,000 congregants.

There are strict and discriminatory quotas against young citizens of the Jewish faith, or of Jewish parentage, who are seeking a higher education and improved employment status. By isolating and atomizing the Jewish community; by forcing Jews to live in fear and insecurity, the Soviet Government is dooming the Jewish community to cultural and spiritual extinction.

Mr. President, Soviet ideology officially condemns anti-Semitism. There are laws against incitement of hatred on religious, national, and social grounds. The Soviet Union officially proclaims equality for all minority groups. The Soviet Union is one of the two most powerful nations in the world. It holds a special responsibility for the example it sets for other nations in its treatment of its minority peoples. Few nations are perfect in that regard, including our own. The world has not been slow to remind us of our shortcomings. It is to the great credit of our form of government and to our way of life that we have listened and are taking steps to narrow the gap between the promise and performance of America.

Mr. President, as they celebrate the 50th anniversary of their revolution, leaders of the Soviet Union should reexamine those policies which bear an ugly resemblance to policies which prevailed under oppressive czars. I join with Senators and with other men of good will everywhere in calling upon them to end discrimination against Jewry in the Soviet Union.

I also urge officials of our State Department to use diplomatic channels more vigorously to impress upon the leaders of the Soviet Union the grave concern of the U.S. Government on this problem, and to encourage the Voice of America to broadcast regular programs aimed at Soviet Jews, so these people will know that they are not alone, not forsaken nor forgotten by the rest of mankind. America must do its share to provide them with hope.

SENATOR SCOTT CASTS DECIDING VOTE ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased to be able to report that a perfected version of the civil rights protection bill (H.R. 2516) was adopted by a vote 8 to 7 in the Judiciary Committee today.

I was contacted in Oxford, England, at

4 a.m. yesterday morning by the White House and the Justice Department and asked to return to Washington for this crucial vote. Arrangements were made to get me aboard a military cargo plane which was scheduled to depart for Washington. I arrived at Andrews Air Force Base in Maryland at 7:30 p.m. last night. I will return to Oxford shortly to resume the lecture series I had begun on American government and politics at Oxford University.

This important civil rights bill, supported by members of both parties, on which my vote proved to be decisive, provides heavy penalties for acts of violence or intimidation against citizens exercising their constitutional rights. It is intended to strengthen the Federal Government's capability to meet the problem of civil rights violence, an area of uncertain jurisdiction in the past.

The bill is very similar to a measure sponsored by myself and several other Republican Senators in 1963, but which was not acted upon at that time.

The effectiveness of the bill had been diluted by amendments made in a judiciary subcommittee. That version was set aside, and a substitute version was agreed upon in today's 8-to-7 decision. The version which was approved is substantially the same as the House-passed bill, which was originally title 5 of the omnibus civil rights bill of 1967, of which I was a cosponsor.

This bipartisan action today by the majority of the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee is an important step forward in providing the protection which will make every citizen feel at ease in pursuing their legitimate interests free from threats and acts of violence. I have received many telegrams and letters urging my continued active support for this legislation, including those from Roy Wilkins, president of the NAACP, and Arlen Specter, district attorney of Philadelphia, as well as from labor unions, church groups, and a general cross-section of interested citizens throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some of the wires I have received on this important measure be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 20, 1967.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The protections of title V of the Civil Rights Act of 1967 are desperately needed. The leadership conference on Civil Rights urges you to be present at the Senate Judiciary Committee meeting on Wednesday, October 25 and to vote for the Hart Substitute for H.R. 2516. If other titles of the Omnibus bill are offered as amendments, we urge you to vote to add them to the bill.

ROY WILKINS,
Chairman, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
October 24, 1967.

Hon. HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge that you vote in favor of Senator Hart's substitute to the Civil Rights bill (H.R. 2516) pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee. This substitute would provide desperately needed protection for citizens who are exercising the constitutional rights. The legislation provides jail sentences and heavy fines for persons using threats of violence and other forms of harassment to prevent people from civil rights activity.

ARLEN SPECTER,
District Attorney of Philadelphia.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
October 23, 1967.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Counting on your support against Ervin bill in Judiciary on Wednesday and for original bill or even better Hart bill.

REV. DONALD W. MCILVANE,
Religion and Race Council.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.,
October 23, 1967.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The kind of Civil Rights Bill the Nation and the world gets from this session of Congress depends on your presence and vote when the Senate Judiciary Committee meets Wednesday October 25th. Helpless Negroes of the South look to you for help by your presence and your vote at this very important committee meeting. You won't let us down, will you?

W. C. PATTON.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
October 23, 1967.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Know you will oppose Ervin bill before Judiciary Committee. Count on your support of House bill or Hart bill which is best of all.

BERG BROWN,
President, NAACP.

LEONIA, N. J.,
October 24, 1967.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge you support House version of 2516. Oppose Ervin substitute in Judiciary Committee.

NANCY HAWKINS,
Legislative Chairman, Department of Christian Social Relations, Episcopal Diocese of Newark.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
October 24, 1967.

Hon. HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to support H.R. 2516 in its original form. Am opposed Senator Ervin's version of the bill.

JESSE W. COOK,
Member, Republican State Central Committee.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
October 24, 1967.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge attendance for full session Judiciary tomorrow. Urge your ardent support for Civil Rights bill.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS CONFERENCE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

THE JEWISH MINORITY IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on the eve of the Soviet Union's commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, 3 million Russian Jews tomorrow will celebrate the Simchath Torah. It is particularly appropriate that we raise our voices with theirs at this time to decry the Communists' systematic and unceasing efforts to deny to Soviet Jews those most basic freedoms they so strongly desire.

While the Russian leaders remain deceptive in their practices, and continue their production and proliferation of arms and export war materials to trouble spots around the world, they should be directing their energies toward achieving progress in the area of religious toleration. Soviet law and Soviet leaders take the official position of allowing the free expression of religious beliefs. But, as the world is constantly reminded, in the ranks of Soviet officialdom, words are cheap.

The Communists have denied the Jews the establishment of Yiddish schools or classes, banned the Jewish State Theater of Moscow, closed the last remaining Jewish publishing house and nearly 300 synagogues in the last 10 years, and made it impossible for Jewish youth to enter into rabbinical training.

In the face of this pressure, there remains in the hearts of countless Jewish Russians an intense desire to keep alive their faith.

It is a conspicuous failing point of the Communist system—one about which they need to be reminded—that in half a century of rule they have been unable or unwilling to achieve in their country the equalities of the classless society promised by their theorists. That in this era of world progress in human understanding Russia should espouse revolution in the name of equality, while denying this very equality to its own citizens is a hypocrisy of which all should be much aware.

AAUW STATEMENT ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the American Association of University Women, an organization of more than 175,000 women who have graduated from accredited colleges and universities, has long been noted for the care with which it examines and considers public issues before going on record in support of or in opposition to any proposal. One of the items which the AAUW has consistently favored during the past several years has been the adoption of Federal legislation which would extend meaningful protection of basic civil rights.

Recently Dr. Victoria Schuck, chairman of the Legislative Program Committee, and Gloria Peters, area representative in community problems, prepared the official statement of the American Association of University Women on S. 1026, the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1967, for submission to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Unfortunately, it was not possible to complete and secure approval of this testimony before the date when the hearing record of the subcommittee was closed. In view of these circumstances, and because the stand taken by this distinguished organization on such an important issue should be available to Congress and the public, I ask unanimous consent that the brief statement of the AAUW in support of the civil rights bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN IN SUPPORT OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1967, S. 1026

The American Association of University Women is a voluntary organization with a membership of approximately 176,000 women who are graduates of accredited colleges and universities. We have active divisions in every state of the union and branches in every community where women who meet the qualifications of the organization wish to join together to promote common interests for the welfare of the community, of the state, and of the nation. Although we are brought together by a basic common interest in education—our own as well as a desire to see that every person has an opportunity to receive the best possible education he is capable of absorbing—our members' interests, expressed through their work in the Association, embrace every aspect of community life. And the community we live in today is a world community, in which our country is looked to as a leader—not only in the arms race, but in the race to establish equally for all men.

For many years, the Association's legislative program has included an item for support of the civil rights of individuals. This item has been consistently retained in the program year after year, and has been approved by members of our Association who live in the south and in the north—in the east and in the west; members from communities where minorities have traditionally not voted or served on juries; members who are not sure what the reaction of their own community will be when open housing becomes a reality. Nevertheless, we know that it is right and just that legislation be passed to insure the rights of all persons to participate effectively in their government and to enjoy the privilege of choosing where they will live. We have supported civil rights legislation in the past and we support the Civil Rights Act of 1967. We urge its enactment by Congress with all possible speed.

The Civil Rights Act of 1967 is designed to insure rights for minority groups that the majority of our citizens take for granted. And because they take them for granted and have never been denied the right to exercise them, the necessity for such legislation, especially on the federal level, is not apparent to them. Needed legislation often fails because of apathy.

Laws which will insure that juries, in both state and federal courts, are representative of the community from which they are chosen have become necessary. Our concern with civil rights in recent years began, in 1957, with the right to vote—the most basic of the rights relating to participation in government, and the right most in need of reaffirmation in our country. It is now time to turn our attention to juries and jury service. As was true with the right to vote, some states have not yet taken steps to assure the securing of juries which represent the entire community and which offer a real possibility of a fair trial to civil litigants and to persons accused of crimes who might otherwise not have this basic right afforded them. It is time for Congress to fill this gap in the interests of justice.

Another important element of the proposed legislation is the portion prohibiting interference with civil rights. Those of us who enjoy the rights and privileges of the majority would not tolerate any interference with those rights and privileges—but we have not succeeded in extending these rights and privileges to others without interference. A person who knows he has the legal right to vote or the legal right, or even just the moral right, to purchase property or obtain employment he is qualified to perform can still be intimidated, threatened, physically harmed, lied to, or otherwise prevented from exercising his rights—and he often is. Barriers other than legal barriers to the exercise of rights still exist and must be removed. A federal criminal law prohibiting interference seems not only a reasonable answer to this problem but a necessary adjunct to civil rights legislation.

Civil rights, in the past, have been defined only in terms of equal participation in specified governmental functions—voting, holding office, serving on juries, and similar matters. But the tragic events of the last few years in the nation's cities and towns—injuries and loss of life, damage to property, rioting, disorder—the discovery that 30,000,000 Americans live in poverty and that a large portion of them have little opportunity to reverse the vicious circle of poverty and dependency—have made us realize that denial of individual rights is even worse when we are denying men and women and children the right to participate equally in society. Segregated schools which serve nonwhite children are poor schools—this is a fact demonstrated over and over again by statistics and studies, and can hardly be denied anymore. Children educated in such schools do not attain the necessary degree of skill to get the good jobs, or any jobs, or to get into colleges, or to get into the unions which control access to many jobs. Segregated unions close the door to opportunity for many young people; segregated housing means that many who are not poor are forced to live on the fringes of poverty—that society accepts their skills and their contributions and their citizenship and sometimes their lives, but will not have them as neighbors.

Again, the states have been slow to end segregated patterns of living. The Civil Rights Act of 1967 will fill one of the gaps—that of discrimination in selling and renting homes.

Even among people who believe that civil rights belong to all and not just to the white majority, there are those who argue that protection of these rights, by enacting laws and enforcing them, should be left to the states. Still others argue that discrimination cannot be ended by the enactment of laws—that only in the hearts of men can the battle for equality be won. To answer these critics, we would point out, as has already been noted, that some states have taken the initiative in securing for all people their civil rights, but others lag far behind. And to those who believe that the enactment of laws does not change the hearts and minds of prejudiced or misinformed people, we can only agree that it does not. But even such people, for the most part, are reluctant to disobey the laws. Most reforms begin with the enactment of enlightened laws by a courageous legislative body. We can expect no less when we are dealing with the lives of so many Americans.

We urge enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1967, S 1026, as proposed by the Administration.

DR. VICTORIA SCHUCK,
Chairman, Legislative Program Committee.
GLORIA PETERS,
Area Representative in Community Problems.

JEWS IN RUSSIA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, tomorrow is the Jewish holiday Simchath Torah.

In the Soviet Union, as elsewhere, Jews will attend celebrations at synagogues, but there will be an important difference.

In this country, for instance, Jews will not have to think twice about participating in this joyous celebration. The same cannot be said for the Jews in the Soviet Union. More to the point, it is a tribute to Soviet Jews that they still turn out to celebrate such holidays at all, for the Soviet Government has made quite clear that there is a great gap between its ideology that condemns anti-Semitism and its policies which discriminate against Jews.

It is fitting that we call attention to this gap at this time, not only because Soviet Jews tomorrow will celebrate a religious holiday in spite of government policies, but also because 2 weeks hence will mark the 50th anniversary of the Soviet revolution.

Mr. President, it seems to me that at a time when Moscow seeks to put its best foot forward to demonstrate the success of that revolution, men of all persuasions who condemn bigotry of any sort should take this opportunity to call public attention to the discrimination practices against Jews in Russia. We should do this not out of spite, but out of the hope that public exposure of a national disgrace might prompt some rethinking in the Kremlin, particularly when the Kremlin seeks to project an image of progress and peace.

As I understand the situation in Russia today, Judaist public periodicals and most other religious items cannot be published, Judaist devotional articles are not produced, and leaders of Judaism cannot have formal contacts with foreign leaders of Judaism as is permitted leaders of Protestant, Catholic, and Moslem groups.

Following the pattern of some other totalitarian societies, the U.S.S.R., according to the International Commission of Jurists, used Jews as scapegoats in a campaign to stamp out certain society-wide economic practices in the early 1960's.

Further Jews are admitted to higher educational opportunities on a quota basis, and Jews have been excluded from high state and Communist Party posts.

Yet, in spite of such opposition and threats, Russian Jews have turned out in large numbers to celebrate such holidays as Simchath Torah. I am confident Soviet Jews will do so again tomorrow, again offering men of all nations an example of devotion to religious liberty, a devotion which can be attacked by governments but cannot be destroyed.

MUTUAL FUNDS CONTRACTUAL PLANS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate an unprecedented action taken today by the Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors. That association represents the segment of the mutual fund industry offering contractual plans with the so-called front end loads that have been the subject of a legislative proposal by the Securities and Exchange Commission and recent hearings by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Earlier this year, the SEC recommended legislation which would completely abolish all contractual plans for the sale of mutual funds. These are plans whereby a purchaser of limited means determines to follow a monthly purchase program through which he is able to accomplish an investment goal over a period of 10 to 12 years. One of the features of the plan is that an amount up to one-half of the total payment made by the purchaser during the first year may be absorbed by the salesman's commission.

On August 4, I spoke out against the far-reaching proposals which have been recommended by the SEC which in my opinion could undermine the mutual fund industry. At that time, I discussed the contractual plan and the risk that if a person canceled in the early stages of the plan he could lose as much as half of his first year's payments. I was strongly opposed, however, to the elimination of this widely used investment medium. Segments of the industry had taken steps to reduce the risk and I was confident that a plan could be developed to mitigate the possibility of loss on the part of the individual investor without destroying the industry.

I am pleased today to say that such a plan has been worked out by the industry which on its own initiative has voluntarily undertaken to provide full refunds for those purchasers of contractual plans who may decide that they want to withdraw from their investment program during the first 60 days after purchase. In addition, full refunds will be granted to those purchasers who during the first year of ownership encounter financial hardship.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the industry for making this very progressive step to overcome what many felt was an inequity in the system of mutual fund sales. Equally impressive to me is the fact that more than 95 percent of all contractual plan companies have agreed to participate voluntarily in the plan that the association has today incorporated into its code of ethical business conduct.

This is in the best spirit of industry self regulation and improvement, and I, for one, feel that the industry should be commended for its action.

I think it would also be appropriate for me to mention the part in this action that has been played by the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, my distinguished colleague from Alabama.

Throughout the hearings, and in fact, even before the hearings, he expressed his preference for industry self-regulation over a legislative solution to any problems that the industry might have.

I am sure that this progressive posture which the industry has now adopted is due in large part to the urging of the chairman and that it is in the interest of the investing public.

Mr. President, I ask permission at this point to include in the RECORD a press release issued by the Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors and a copy of a letter written by the association to the chairman detailing the plan which they have accepted.

There being no objection, the press release and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE OF ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL FUND PLAN SPONSORS, INC., WASHINGTON, D.C.

BAL HARBOUR, FLA.—The mutual fund industry today volunteered a unique refund plan in response to President Johnson's expression of concern for individuals who may be forced to withdraw from contractual plans at an early date.

In his Special Message on Consumer Protection early this year the President said of contractual planholders, "They may face a substantial loss if financial difficulties force them to withdraw from the plan at an early date."

Announcement of the industry's action was made here this morning by Mr. John H. Kostmayer, vice president of First Investors Corporation, speaking at the 19th Annual International Mutual Fund Dealers' Conference at the Americana Hotel.

Simultaneous announcement was made in New York by Mr. Rowland A. Robbins, chairman of First Investors Corporation and president of the Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors, and in Kansas City by Mr. Cornelius Roach, vice president of Waddell & Reed and chairman of A.M.F.P.S.

Mr. Kostmayer stated that 95% of all contractual plan companies have voluntarily agreed to participate in the plan that A.M.F.P.S. has incorporated into its Code of Ethical Business Conduct.

Under the new plan, which has nothing like it anywhere in the financial field according to Mr. Kostmayer, a purchaser of a contractual plan (generally a monthly systematic investment program) may request as an absolute right a refund of the full amount of his first two payments within 60 days of commencing a plan. Within the first 12 months of a plan an individual who has been unemployed for 30 consecutive days, or through illness or injury has been unable to work for 30 consecutive days, or who has a dependent member of the family hospitalized for 30 consecutive days may request a refund of the full amount of sales charges he has paid and may redeem his shares at the net asset value.

Mr. Kostmayer pointed out that the refund in full during the first year of all sales charges eliminates the possibility of a "substantial loss" to the planholder as expressed by the President.

Announcement of the refund offer follows closely the completion yesterday of hearings by the House Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance on mutual fund legislation proposed by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Similar hearings were conducted in August by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Kostmayer released at the Conference a copy of a letter to Senator John Sparkman, Chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, apprising him of the adoption of the refund plan by the Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors and nearly all non-member companies.

ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL FUND PLAN SPONSORS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., October 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: In his Special Message on Consumer Protection early this year President Johnson referred to a situation that is and has been a matter of concern to those of us in the contractual plan industry when he said of planholders:

"They may face a substantial loss if financial difficulties force them to withdraw from the plan at an early date."

The SEC's proposed solution was a recommendation that Congress abolish contractual plans.

At the hearing before your Committee on Banking and Currency on August 1, 1967, you may recall saying to representatives of our industry:

"Finally, in the area of so-called contractual plans, we would like to have your reaction to the Commission's proposal for abolition of the front-end load and your views as to how the industry can best meet its responsibilities to those people whose investments in mutual funds are made through this medium."

I believe we made it abundantly clear to the Committee that we consider the SEC's proposal to be unreasonable, unnecessary and unfair to our industry and to the American public.

It is with a great sense of personal pleasure and of pride in our industry that I can report to you that the Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors has voluntarily devised and incorporated into its Code of Ethical Business Conduct a refund plan to purchasers of contractual plans. In addition to the unanimous support of our members, the response from non-members has been such that we have approximately 95% of our industry agreeing to participate at this time. A few small non-member companies have not yet had time to respond.

Specifically this refund plan will include:

1. Refund as an absolute right within sixty days of purchase of the full amount of the first two payments, including the full amount of sales charge, and the net asset value of any additional payments made plus the full amount of the sales charge on such additional payments.

2. Refund within the first twelve months after purchase of the full amount of the sales charge if the planholder chooses to withdraw by reason of financial hardship caused by:

(a) disability as a result of injury or illness of the planholder which prevents him from engaging in gainful employment for thirty consecutive days;

(b) the illness or injury to a dependent member of the planholder's family which requires the hospitalization of such dependent member for a period of thirty consecutive days; or

(c) unemployment for thirty consecutive days of the planholder or the head of the household of the planholder.

The right of planholders to redeem shares at net asset value at any time has always been a characteristic of mutual funds, including contractual plans, and, of course, is included in this new refund plan.

I would like to take this opportunity, Senator, to express to you the sincere appreciation of the members of our Association for the guidance we have received from you, the Members of your Committee and from your Staff. With this assistance we feel we have been able to fulfill your request ". . . as to how the industry can best meet its responsibilities to those people whose investments in mutual funds are made through this medium" and to provide an industry response to the President's concern for the contractual planholder.

I am sure I speak for the entire contractual plan segment of the mutual fund industry when I say how much we appreciate the personal interest and the many courtesies we have received from you.

Very respectfully,
CORNELIUS ROACH,
Chairman.

ANTI-SEMITIC POLICIES OF THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, there is no better evidence of the continuing vitality of America's attachment to religious liberty than the deep and widespread concern expressed by Americans of all faiths over the anti-Semitic policies of the Soviet Union.

No person of conscience can or will ignore the continuing efforts of the Soviet Government to bring about the cultural annihilation of 3 million Jews within their own borders.

The systematic denial of equal rights to Soviet Jews by their Government has been condemned by unanimous vote of the Senate. But so long as that campaign continues Americans and all other lovers of freedom must raise their voices in protest, as I am privileged to do today.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM IN SOUTH DAKOTA DRAWS PRAISE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have often felt that personal expressions of the participants in Neighborhood Youth Corps programs are as valuable as a report from the agency administering the program. Mrs. Carol Flanagan is a worker in the Southeastern South Dakota Community Action Agency, Inc., of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. This agency sponsored several neighborhood youth programs in southeastern South Dakota this summer and she has sent me various comments from both the young people and their parents.

These comments speak well for the worth of the program and from the documents sent to me, I have selected the following for inclusion in the RECORD. I, thus, ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALEM, S. DAK.,
August 20, 1967.

EVELYN LIND,
Salem, S. Dak.

DEAR MRS. LIND: I am writing in regard to the N.Y.C. program in our city. We have a son in it and he has done very well in saving for an education from his earnings.

His supervisors have trained him in many different phases of work which helped him to decide what kind of job he wanted. He will attend a technical college and take a short course in drafting or electronics.

I sincerely hope we can have this same program next year so that another boy or girl may have this wonderful opportunity.

A grateful parent,

MRS. BEN SCHEIER.

HUDSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 3,
Hudson, S. Dak., July 23, 1967.

SOUTHEASTERN SOUTH DAKOTA COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, INC.
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.:

In evaluating the NYC program this summer in Hudson, S. Dak., I have nothing but praise for the results we have had this summer. Not only for the employment opportunities they had, but also the change that has come over these young people we used this summer. I feel this is the first time in their lives they felt a sense of responsibility, and a noted change in their behavior has been observed. For the first time this summer we have not had any discipline problems with these kids, which we had the summers before. I think this is going to have an effect on their attitude toward school this coming year. I feel that a continued program of this sort will have profound effects in this community and in the school. I highly recommend continuing this program to help adjust some of these deprived kids, who don't seem to get the guidance and supervision anywhere else but in a program such as this.

DAVID J. GELLERMAN.

PARKER, S. DAK.,
August 1, 1967.

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, INC.,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

DEAR SIRS: I would like to give you a special thanks for giving me a job under the Neighborhood Youth Program. Without your help I would have been unable to return to college this fall.

NYC is certainly a very good program. There are many, like myself, who needed jobs badly and you have given one to us. Without your help, we would have wasted the summer, thus ruining the chance to further our education.

I enjoy working under this program and have gained much valuable information in different fields. Also, let us not forget the newly found friendships that have grown out of working with others.

Again, I would like to express a sincere thank you for helping me to help myself.

Sincerely,

CATHY BUCKLIN.

VIBORG, S. DAK.,
July 23, 1967.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

DEAR SIR: Due to the recent federal grant from the O.E.O. the Viborg Recreation Program has afforded many opportunities for youth and adults in the entire Viborg area.

The recreation program consisting of games, crafts, and swimming lessons has been met with tremendous response—our classes are overflowing! It is thrilling to see unoccupied and troublesome youth and those from low income families taking part in meaningful activities which would not be available to them if it were not for this federal grant. Remedial math is proving to be a great help to youngsters who need special, individual help in this area. Older youth have been kept busy with High School Baseball, Jr. High Baseball, and Girls' Softball.

Many adults have taken a keen interest in the activities provided for them. They are gaining both from interpersonal relationships as well as learning new skills they could not otherwise afford. It is surprising to note the number of high school girls taking advantage of these adult classes. Perhaps more of the program could be aimed at this group in the future.

The college age assistants have proved to be excellent help in conducting this program. The fact that they come from low income families seems to make them more willing to work—they are eager, enthusiastic, and ambitious because their next year of school depends on this financial assistance.

As director and assistant director we have also gained as a result of our relationships with others. As the old adage says, "experience is the best teacher." Thank you for these many opportunities provided for us and our community.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT SCHULTZ.

HURLEY, S. DAK.
July 19, 1967.

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, INC.,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

DEAR MRS. FLANNAGAN: On behalf of myself and my co-workers here at Hurley School, I would like to thank you and all others connected with this program for the wonderful job opportunity it has given us.

We enjoy both the surroundings and the work, but most of all the satisfaction that by doing our best we are helping to improve our local community as well as our state, and indirectly our country.

This job has taught us the full meaning of responsibility, perseverance, and how to work with others and corporate our efforts for the most effective results. Perhaps most important to us, however, is the money we are earning. This money, in some cases, may be the determining factor in being able to obtain a higher education.

We sincerely hope that this youth work program will be continued to give other young people the same opportunity which we are so fortunate to have.

Sincerely yours,

SUSAN JENSEN.

MONTROSE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL,
DISTRICT NO. 1,
Montrose, S. Dak., July 27, 1967.

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

To Whom It May Concern:

The Neighborhood Corps an agency under the Community Action Agency is certainly a worth while program. In our own community the eight people employed are learning some worth while skills; are finding the satisfaction of taking pride in their work; and are receiving sufficient remuneration so they should make an easy adjustment from this program to adult work.

If more people of a certain type (those of low incomes and also people who many times whose ambition is shattered because of welfare programs that require no work for service) could be helped to bridge the gap from teenage to grownup and whose initiative can be stimulated, we would have the most effective way of helping low income groups.

Not perfect results can be hoped for because some will still continue to be content with their meager existence deriving much help from public sources, but if a relatively high percentage can be inspired to rise up out of their condition, it will be money well spent.

I would urge its continuation during winter months for mainly girls and summer months for mainly boys, so their talents can better be geared to the needs of a community.

Sincerely yours,

B. J. GOTTSLEBEN,
Superintendent.

CANISTOTA, S. DAK.,
July 27, 1967.

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, INC.,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

GENTLEMEN: Before I began working this summer, I didn't think I would get to go to college next fall. Now, after the summer is over I will have almost enough for my 1st semester. I am going to South Dakota State University, majoring in English. After college I plan to teach in high school.

Other than the money we earn, we also learn a lot. I've become such a "professional" painter and learned so many tips about maintenance that I spend most of my spare time doing this at home.

I think that you have a very worthwhile program and would like to see it be continued. Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET TARRELL.

JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION AND THEIR FATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it has been the unenviable lot of the Jewish people to suffer injustices and iniquities in the hands of their fellow men for nearly 2,000 years. They suffered under the Romans in and out of their historic homeland, and then were barred from their beloved Jerusalem almost 20 centuries ago. This brought about their mass dispersion to other parts of the Roman Empire. But in their new abodes in nearly all parts of the then known world, they did not escape the oppressive hand of the Government of Rome. Their lot did not change for the better when the Roman Empire went to pieces and new feudal states came into existence in

Europe during the Middle Ages. In nearly all European countries they were regarded as outcasts and treated as such, giving rise to ghettos in many large communities in numerous countries.

In recent times the vast majority of European Jews were to be found in East European countries—including Rumania—and in the European parts of czarist Russia. They were numerous also in the Baltic countries. At the outbreak of the First World War millions of Jews, constituting perhaps more than half of the world's total Jewish population at that time, were to be found in the area extending from the northeastern shores of the Black Sea all the way north to the Baltic area, the east-west line of the area extending from the west of Moscow to East Prussia, including most of Poland, the Ukraine, parts of Austria and Hungary.

Late in the 19th century their status as citizens of these countries was often precarious; their loyalty to the regimes under which they lived was questioned, and their well-being, not to say their security, was threatened. This was particularly true in many parts of czarist Russia where the Jews were subjected to pogroms. At times the Russian authorities seemed to have a share in these outrages, and allowed the perpetrators of these criminal acts to escape punishment.

Thus for decades there seemed to be no safe haven for Jews in czarist Russia, and their sympathizers in the West could not help the Jews there in any effective way. But when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, it was fervently hoped that their misery and suffering had come to an end, and that they would be enjoying a new equality and freedom in the classless society that was being heralded in the new Soviet state.

The Jews naturally welcomed the revolutionary changes and anxiously looked forward to a new day in the Soviet Union. But it was not long before they saw the slow and gradual rise of anti-Semitism in this classless state. While the Soviet Government spread propaganda to the effect that it had disposed of such czarist tactics and had introduced ethnic equality among its national minorities, the ugly head of anti-Semitism could be seen in many spheres of official and unofficial activity. By the late 1920's the Government's failure to combat anti-Semitism became apparent, but as a sop to its critics it proclaimed as an area of Jewish settlement a strip of land on the Manchurian border in Siberia. By 1934 the Jews there numbered some 15,000 in a compact area; then it was named Birobidzhan and declared an autonomous Jewish province. During the next several decades its Jewish population grew to about 165,000. But even in their own autonomous province their activity and communal work were restricted.

Many Jews had migrated to Birobidzhan in the fond hope of creating and maintaining a Jewish cultural center. After several decades these Jews ruefully admitted that their expectations and cherished hopes could not be realized. They were not permitted to have Jewish names for their communities—except one, named Zimmernanski. They were allowed—until 1961—to publish only one newspaper in Yiddish and only as a supplement to a Russian daily. In schools the language was—and still is—Russian and no instruction in Yiddish or Jewish culture is offered. On three different occasions—1935, 1947, and 1955—Birobidzhan postmarks were both in Russian and Yiddish, but now not even the name Jewish autonomous oblast—province—appears on postmarks. There has been very little information on Birobidzhan in recent years, but it is known that many of its Jewish settlers, having found their activity restricted there, have drifted back to metropolitan centers of the western Soviet Union. Even in these centers, such as Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and other cities, the Jews have felt unsure of their status; officially and otherwise they are being regarded, and sometimes treated, as second-class citizens.

In recent months anti-Semitism has increased, as the result of Israel's victory over the Arabs. In government circles there seems to be a deep undercurrent of feeling that associates the Jews of the Soviet Union with Zionism in Israel. This in itself has tended to feed anti-Semitism in many parts of the Soviet Union. Thus some 3,000,000 Jews are experiencing in the Soviet Union something which they never dreamed would be possible in a so-called classless, cosmopolitan state. They are enduring injustices and iniquities, and are praying for their delivery from bigotry in the Soviet Union.

THE AUTOMOBILE AND AIR POLLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on January 6 of this year the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with eight other Federal departments and agencies, established a Panel on Electrically Powered Vehicles under the Commerce Technical Advisory Board, a group which has carried out a number of important transportation studies for the Government. The Panel was commissioned to study the technical feasibility of unconventional propulsion systems for vehicles in the context of the national concern over air pollution. The report of this study group has just become available and I would like to present the following comments about their work.

First, this effort is an example of the ability of various sectors of our society to effectively interact in the formulation of important public policy on pressing national problems. This type of meaningful interchange between the academic, industrial, and Government sectors is important to the strength of our political and economic system if we are to cope with new problems in reasonable ways and if we are to be assured that our new technology will benefit the public good.

The recommendations contained in the Panel report, entitled, "The Automobile and Air Pollution—A Program for Progress, Part I," cover a wide range of activities from Government organization to national goals. Several of the recommendations appear to be especially significant. One of the most important conclusions of the Panel is their proposal that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare develop and promptly implement an expanded program to establish quantitative information regarding the effects of air pollution upon health and welfare. This recommendation represents the core of the Air Quality Act of 1967, passed earlier this year by the Senate. The Panel has reinforced our conclusions that one of the most important information gaps in the attack on air pollution is determining the effects of contamination on health, property, and the quality of life.

Commenting on the current program for establishing standards for automotive emissions, the Panel concludes that better than 80 percent reduction in total emissions from new vehicles can be achieved by or before 1975, with further substantial reductions possible by 1980 or thereafter. To my knowledge, this is the first projection of emission reduction feasibility which has included a variety of academic and industrial viewpoints, including the automotive and oil industries. This finding will be a useful bench mark for discussion and planning for future control of automotive emissions.

The Panel has singled out lead in the atmosphere as a problem which demands immediate action. To date there has been no attempt to establish standards for the regulation of this particular emission from automobiles. The Panel concludes that growing levels of lead in the atmosphere are increasing the risk to human health and recommends that, since the margin between current body burdens of lead and toxic levels is small, the Nation should begin to control this contaminant and at the same time undertake an intensive research effort to determine the long-range impact of atmospheric lead on all population groups. This is a subject of continuing concern to the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution.

After a careful examination of the current system for setting exhaust emission standards, the Panel recommends that the criteria for the development of these standards should be changed from one of concentration of pollutant in the exhaust to the use of the total mass of specific pollutant emitted under an appropriate driving cycle. Such a procedure would insure equality with respect to contributions to pollution regardless of the power or size of vehicles. This is a meaningful recommendation to which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should give serious consideration.

The Panel also recommends that effective local inspection mechanisms to enforce vehicle emissions standards should be encourage by the use of Federal matching grants for training, equipment, and operation. Authorization for such a program is included in the Air Quality Act of 1967. I am pleased that the Panel specifically endorses this necessary part of a national plan for air pollution control.

The Panel report suggests the establishment of a $60 million, 5-year, Federal program to support innovative developments useful in the establishment of future emissions standards by carrying out work on new energy sources, vehicular propulsion systems, emission control devices, and special and general purpose vehicles. The report states that the intent of this recommendation is not to put the Federal Government into the business of building vehicles, but to allow the Government to collect the best possible information with respect to a wide variety of alternatives for pollution reduction.

In addition to this program, the Panel also recommends that the Federal Government incorporate low emission performance criteria as factors in the purchase of vehicles for Government requirements. This concept may be an appropriate role for Government in creating initiatives for private industry to create, develop, and use innovative concepts for pollution reduction. It is apparent that there is no individual consumer incentive sufficient to create demand for vehicles which have advanced pollution control concepts. But collective public action, and incentives created by the Government through such actions as imaginative use of procurement policies could be an important factor in advancing the technology of air pollution control.

In summary I want to congratulate the Panel, especially its chairman, Richard S. Morse, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for this excellent statement on an important national problem. The report is thoughtful and balanced and I am sure it will be an important contribution in the continuation of our efforts to bring about clean air for our citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the summary of findings of the Panel be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

I. THE RELATION OF AUTOMOTIVE EMISSIONS TO THE NATION'S AIR POLLUTION PROBLEM

1. Air pollution presents a serious threat of increasing significance to the health and welfare of this country and all industrialized areas of the world. Without prompt and effective action to control this contamination of the atmosphere, living conditions within and around the cities of the Nation will continue to deteriorate. Automotive vehicle emissions, namely carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, oxides of nitrogen, and lead compounds, are a principal contributor to this problem.

2. Emissions from automotive vehicles are largely responsible for the formation of photochemical smog in Los Angeles and some other areas, and vehicles are the principal source of carbon monoxide in the atmosphere. In addition to these known, specific effects, vehicle emissions combine with emissions from other sources, in ways and to an extent unknown, to contribute to general air pollution.

3. While there is evidence establishing ill effects from aggregate air pollution, there is an urgent need for more extensive information regarding the significance of specific and combined air pollutants on public health.

4. Population increase and urbanization trends require an overall national strategy for the control of all forms of air pollution and the early and effective implementation of emission standards to meet air quality goals. Local, state, and Federal agencies responsible for urban transportation systems have given inadequate consideration to pollution implications in the development of transportation systems.

5. The magnitude of expected future need for urban-suburban personal transportation requires the early development of virtually non-polluting transportation systems. The use of mass transportation systems can be a factor in the reduction of air pollution.

II. TECHNOLOGY AND THE CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

1. On the basis of current technology, it will be commercially feasible during the next decade to reduce exhaust emissions from new gasoline internal combustion engines to values at least as low as:

Hydrocarbons—50 parts per million (900 ppm)[1]

Carbon monoxide—.5% (3.5%)

Oxides of nitrogen—250 parts per million (1500 ppm)

2. During the next decade, in the normal course of events, no significant reduction in total air pollution will be achieved through the introduction of unconventional low-polluting vehicles into the current population of approximately 90 million vehicles.

(a) The state of technology does not permit the current development of an economically feasible electric car except for special-purpose, limited-range use.

(b) Current research activities indicate that significant technical advances may be expected in the development of improved electric energy storage and conversion devices. The time anticipated for the development and commercialization of such devices will not allow their use in a significant number of vehicles in the next decade. Any acceleration of this technology to make earlier commercialization possible will be helpful in controlling urban air pollution.

(c) Gas turbines are reasonable alternatives to internal combustion engines in the large sizes used in trucks, trains, and buses, but are not now economically feasible in the smaller units required for automobiles. Gas turbines produce low hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emissions, and can be designed to yield low nitrogen oxide emissions.

(d) Hybrid power plants involving combinations of high energy devices and high power devices could have satisfactory performance, but their economic feasibility for private passenger automobiles has not been established.

3. Vehicles using external combustion engines for propulsion, such as the piston-type steam engine of advanced design, potentially offer a satisfactory alternative to the present automobile and should have very low pollution and noise characteristics.

4. Diesel engines in trucks and buses emit highly undesirable smoke and odor, in addition to other pollutants. Smoke can be controlled now with proper maintenance and operation and the odor problem can probably be solved with adequate research.

5. Adequate energy sources are available at least for the remainder of this century to meet the vehicle transportation requirements of the country regardless of the type of power plant that may be used.

6. Over the next thirty years, the introduction and widespread use of any currently proposed propulsion systems will not be restricted by the supply of materials, with the possible exception of those which require large amounts of cadmium, platinum group metals, or silver.

III. THE ROLE OF INDUSTRY

1. There has been inadequate incentive for an individual automotive manufacturer to apply pollution control technology to the automobile in advance of its competitors.

2. There has been inadequate incentive for an individual fuel producer to introduce products with improved pollution characteristics in advance of its competitors.

3. The automotive and petroleum industries clearly recognize that Government has the primary responsibility to determine the effects of pollution and to establish realistic air quality goals and nationwide standards for automotive emissions.

4. The effective reduction of air pollution requires cooperation among automotive manufacturers, fuel producers, and the government at Federal, state, and local levels, as well as a clear understanding by all of their roles and responsibilities.

5. Apprehension with respect to anti-trust activity, and uncertainty concerning Federal regulations may continue to delay cooperative research activities and the implementation of technical programs of potential public benefit.

6. To meet competitive standards of reliability and economy in a mass-produced product, substantial time is required for the design, testing, and manufacturing of new automotive components. Under normal conditions significant innovations require three to five years for introduction into the automotive production cycle.

IV. THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

1. It is clearly established that Government has primary responsibility for research and the collection and dissemination of data relating to the effects of air pollution upon health and welfare and for the promulgation of realistic and effective national standards for air quality.

2. Vehicles meeting Federal standards for 1968, and California standards for 1970, will represent substantial progress toward control of automobile-generated air pollution, but additional controls will be required in the future.

3. The development of novel components and related automotive systems has been expedited through the use of Federal funds to support research and development in selected scientific areas.

4. The use of air pollution characteristics as essential criteria in the vehicle procurement process of Federal, state, and local governments could be a useful stimulant to the development and demonstration of low polluting vehicles.

5. Current automotive air pollution control devices are vulnerable to progressive degradation and alteration, and periodic inspection and adjustment are essential. The organizations, procedures and personnel for implementing this phase of a national program are not available.

6. State and local government agencies, with a few notable exceptions, particularly in the State of California, have not recognized the importance of the automotive air pollution problem.

7. Authority and responsibility for air pollution research and control activities have not been established at an organizational level within the Federal Government consistent with the magnitude and importance of this problem.

The Panel makes the following recommendations to the Federal Government as a Program for Progress in the control of air pollution:

Recommendation 1: The national goal for air quality should be the achievement of an atmosphere with no significant detectable adverse effect from air pollution on health, welfare, and the quality of life.

Recommendation 2: The Environmental Science Services Administration of the Department of Commerce should establish a research program to determine the effects of air pollution on atmospheric processes.

Recommendation 3: The Department of

---

[1] Estimated levels for uncontrolled vehicles.

Health, Education, and Welfare should develop and promptly implement an expanded program to establish quantitative information regarding the effects of air pollution upon health and welfare of the population.

Recommendation 4: The Federal Government should continue to establish standards for all harmful automotive emissions, and realistic timetables for the achievement of such standards.

Recommendation 5: The Federal Government should immediately establish standards for the lead content in gasoline which will prevent any further increase in the total quantity of lead emitted to the atmosphere. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should begin an intensive study of the long-term health effects of lead in the atmosphere to determine requirements for future action.

Recommendation 6: The Federal Government should set standards for emissions, including smoke and odor, for gasoline and diesel powered trucks and buses.

Recommendation 7: The Federal Government should increase its support for mass transportation research, development, and demonstration programs related to the reduction of air pollution.

Recommendation 8: All Government standards concerning vehicle emissions should be developed in terms of the total mass of specific pollutants emitted under an appropriate driving cycle, rather than as the percent of pollutant in the exhaust.

Recommendation 9: The creation of effective local inspection mechanisms to enforce vehicle emission standards should be encouraged by the use of Federal matching grants for training, equipment, and operation.

Recommendation 10: The Federal Government should develop cooperative mechanisms to accelerate worldwide interchange of information relating to air pollution, its effects, and control.

Recommendation 11: The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should establish primary operating responsibility for the air pollution control program at the highest possible organizational level.

Recommendation 12: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should establish a Technical Advisory Board reporting to the Secretary to assist in the development of plans, programs and research activities and to more effectively use the resources of the scientific and industrial communities.

Recommendation 13: A mechanism for coordination of all Federal activities relating to air pollution should be established as a continuing function at a high level in the Executive Branch.

Recommendation 14: The Federal Government should initiate a five-year program, in total amount of approximately 60 million dollars, to support innovative developments useful in the establishment of future emission standards, in the following areas: (a) energy sources for vehicles, (b) vehicular propulsion systems, (c) emission control devices, (d) special purpose urban cars, (e) general purpose vehicles.

Recommendation 15: Federal, state, and local governments should incorporate low emission performance criteria as factors in the purchase of vehicles for their requirements.

Recommendation 16: The National Science Foundation should review its basic research and educational programs in atmospheric physics, electrochemistry and other scientific and engineering disciplines relating to the air pollution problem and ensure that such activities are receiving adequate support.

PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the world has long been plagued by the attempts of men and of nations to deprive other men of their fundamental rights. When I speak of fundamental rights, I am referring to freedom of speech, right of privacy, freedom of religion, and freedom of assembly. These are inherent rights of men, and no government can justify a policy which reduces or destroys them. Among these rights none is more important than that of religion.

Our Nation has been built on the concept of equal and full rights for all. Most other nations have not been as concerned for the rights of their citizens. I firmly believe, however, that all nations are morally bound to grant to their citizens at least those rights which I have referred to as being fundamental. Furthermore, these rights must be enjoyed by all citizens; no one can be excluded.

Those nations which deprive citizens of these rights cannot say that it is an internal matter and of no concern to the rest of the world. There can be no justifiable internal policy of deprivation of these fundamental freedoms. When these freedoms are denied, all mankind is involved. All mankind is injured. All mankind is dutybound to protest.

It is significant that man's inherent freedoms, especially the freedom of religion, be discussed today. This is the eve of Simchath Torah, a Jewish holy day. This is the time when the reading of the Torah is completed and then begun again. It is the time when, as they have for the past 3 years, many thousands of Russian Jews will fill the few synagogues and spill into the streets to show their devotion to Judaism. And this, despite the fact that the Soviet Union consicously strives to eliminate both Jewish cultural and religious practices.

These gatherings demonstrate the dedication of the Russian Jews to Judaism even though they are deprived of the right to fully follow the teachings and practices of their religion. They also are discriminated against in other levels of endeavor.

One of the great attributes of Judaism is devotion to law. The Torah has been the symbol of Jewish life. The ironical fact in Russia is that it is through the violation of existing Soviet law that the Jews are being denied freedom of religion. Jews hold the law in high respect. If the civil laws in Russia were held in equally high respect by her officials, there would be no problem for the Jews. Theoretically, Russian law allows all men to practice their religion freely and encourages all nationalities to develop their cultural and national heritage. Jews are not allowed freedom in either respect. Jews in Russia are truly second class citizens.

In 1965, I supported Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 which condemned the Soviet Union for its persecution of Jews. I did not at that time, nor do I now, consider a statement such as this to be an infringement of the right of a nation to govern its internal affairs. The right to practice the religion of one's choice is a right of all men. When some are denied this right, wherever it may occur, it is our duty to speak out in protest.

Today the Soviet Union is one of the most powerful nations in the world. We are constantly being told of the great new gains Soviet scientists are making. Russia has advanced in technology but apparently not in understanding. She strives to further the laws of science but ignores the laws and rights of man. There is no possible justification for the subordinating of inherent human rights in striving for technical gains. There is no possible justification for the subordinating of inherent human rights at all.

Mr. President, I am proud to have the opportunity to add my strong protest to this discriminatory and unjustified practice, not only in Russia, but in all nations wherever basic freedoms are denied.

THE WAXTER CENTER FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the people of the city of Baltimore will be asked on November 7 to approve a referendum proposal for the establishment of the Waxter Center for Senior Citizens.

At a rally held in the Baltimore War Memorial Building last Sunday, speakers with both local and national perspective made compelling statements in support of the proposed center.

They also said in unmistakable terms that the center could well be a model for other community efforts elsewhere in the Nation.

Mr. President, I am proud of the leadership of those who have worked for years on behalf of the center. And I am convinced that no more appropriate monument could be conceived to honor the late Judge Thomas J. S. Waxter, who served so well as director of the Baltimore Department of Public Welfare and also as director of the State department of public welfare. Judge Waxter worked long and hard to provide health care and other services for all. The Waxter Center would be a logical extension of his philosophy and his dedication.

For the guidance of other community leaders elsewhere, I will now submit for the RECORD four statements made at Sunday's rally:

Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin—honored at age 67 during the rally as the outstanding senior citizen of Baltimore—told in his speech of the community spirit that led to the campaign for the center.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE of Minnesota, long a champion of the needs of older citizens, spoke of the value of the Waxter Center as an example to the Nation.

A Federal official, Commissioner William D. Bechill of the Administration on Aging, told of the significance of the center as a potential forerunner of similar projects elsewhere.

And Dr. Robert Butler, research psychiatrist and gerontologist at the Washington School of Psychiatry, gave a vivid description of the medical and psychiatric implications of the center for the health of senior citizens.

To all who will vote on November 7, and to all contemplating similar action in other cities, the speeches will be of direct interest and assistance, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin, at the Waxter Center Rally, War Memorial Building, Baltimore, Md., October 22, 1967

The Waxter Center envisioned for Baltimore epitomizes the spirit of a true humanitarian.

Thomas Waxter had a vision given to few men. He knew that caring was not enough—one had to work and dare to fight and persevere, to achieve any measure of success in truly helping others.

And his entire life was devoted to helping others. An eminent lawyer who was a graduate of Yale Law School, he founded the Legal Aid Bureau in Baltimore, and he also helped to modernize our juvenile court.

He was interested in the youth of our City. He always felt that it was important to get a good beginning in life in order to get the fullness of life in one's later years. And he was of course passionately interested in the problems of the aged. He always strove to make life happy for people in their later years and as the director of welfare, the first program he instituted was the old age assistance program.

Indeed, Thomas Waxter was interested in all phases of humanity. He was the first one responsible for a commission on the problems of youth as well as a commission on problems of the aged. In addition to his concern for youth and for the aged, for over three decades he carried on a tireless crusade to improve the lot of the unskilled, the minorities, the afflicted and the downtrodden.

Director of the Baltimore Department of Public Welfare for eighteen years and the State Department of Public Welfare up until the time of his death, Thomas Waxter was also a fighter in the field of medical aid for the indigent. In fact, the present Baltimore City Hospital is a living monument to his efforts to provide total medical care for the acutely ill and for the chronically ill patients.

So great has been the influence of Thomas Waxter on these around him that I can truthfully say that it was he who to a great extent stimulated my social consciousness. When I first became Mayor, he took me to every institution for children and old people in the city and impressed upon me by his dedication and by his instruction the vast importance of the need for increasing our efforts in behalf of those who are in need of help. His vision has truly been one of the foundations on which Baltimore has been built in this century, and just as Peabody, Pratt and Hopkins have meant so much to the cultural development of our City, Thomas Waxter has played the same vital role in the social development of Baltimore.

In one field especially, Thomas Waxter's influence has been monumental. Through his enthusiasm for this cause and under his inspired tutelage, Baltimore has emerged as the country's headquarters in research into the problems of the aged. It is only proper therefore that a center to be built for our senior citizens with a most unique approach to their problems be named after this man. The Waxter Center will have as its core a concept I find especially promising—the idea that various disciplines and departments work together for the same purpose. The juxtaposition of the well and the aged sick and the training and research activities that will be conducted in the center are forward-looking concepts which will certainly point the way for the rest of the country. With its enlightened programming, its highly skilled professional people and creative leadership, the Waxter Center will combine the functions of a health and activity center, a rehabilitation unit and a demonstration project. Not only will the center serve our present day aged, but it will also provide a forum for studying the problems of the aged in toto rather than in fragmentized portions.

The Waxter Center is a superb concept from a medical, humanitarian and financial point of view. It is the answer to those who view the present situation of caring for the aged as colossally complex with no answer in sight. I believe that the Waxter Center would truly be one of the best ways to demonstrate such a solution, and I cannot urge strongly enough that all Baltimoreans vigorously support this loan on the November 7 ballot.

There is no more fitting memorial to Thomas Waxter than in the creation of this center, for in its daily rescuing of many lives from unhappiness and illness and in its provision for greatly alleviating such pains for our future aged, the Waxter Center will be a vibrant remainder of the inextinguishable sympathy, the inexhaustible love Thomas Waxter had for all humanity.

But even more importantly, as Thomas Waxter himself would have said, this Center will help to make the later years of all of us truly those golden years that the Almighty meant them to be. Old age, to the unlearned, is winter; to the learned, it is harvest time. The Waxter Center—through research, through treatment and through care—will, I am certain, be the forerunner of many similar centers across the country.

The nationally distinguished speakers we have here today, each of whom I welcome to Baltimore, attest by their presence to the importance of this Center. They, too, realize that the Waxter Center will help open our later years into a joyous time of life.

New Ideas About Older Americans

(Address by Hon. Walter F. Mondale, at the Public Rally for the Waxter Center for Senior Citizens, War Memorial Building, Baltimore, October 22, 1967)

First I want to thank you for inviting me to be with you today. You have made me an honorary participant in a great effort for a great purpose, and I am proud to be with you as you prepare to make referendum day a victory day for the people of Baltimore.

It will be a victory for *all* the people, those who are elderly today and also those yet to come.

And it will be a victory for leaders who—in other metropolitan centers and in smaller communities—see the need for innovation and hard work on behalf of older Americans throughout the nation.

You are setting an example here.

You are saying that a great city, rich as it is and as busy as it is, loses much if it loses touch with its elders.

You are saying the communities *must* experiment if they are to cope with all the changes that occur as the nation's population past age 65 goes to 19 million and beyond.

And you are declaring—in terms that speak the loudest—that the people of this city are willing to put up the resources and the personal commitment needed to make your center a success.

The Waxter Center in the heart of your downtown will tell the nation what kind of people you have here in Baltimore. You are expressing new ideas about older Americans in your plans for your center, and I want to talk to you about the need for just such fresh thinking and innovation.

I mentioned a statistic—19 million persons past age 65—a little while ago. That is an impressive number, but it is just a very small part of the total story about the nation's elderly and what is happening to them in retirement.

I am beginning to learn a great deal more about that subject since I became chairman, earlier this year, of the Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual. That Subcommittee is one of the study units of the Senate Special Committee on Aging and it already has conducted hearings in Washington and in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

With each statement I heard at each hearing, I became more convinced that we here in this nation are in the midst of a retirement revolution involving significant and far-reaching changes in both the nature and dimensions of retirement as an institution and as a force for good or bad in the lives of each individual in our nation.

You here have already begun to prepare for many of the changes that will accompany this revolution. But too many other Americans still have not yet realized that both the number of retired individuals and the number of years they live in retirement have been increasing and will continue to increase in the years ahead. Automation, technology, and other forces are intensifying the pressure for earlier retirement, while Medicare and continuing medical advances are not only stretching life expectancy but producing greater youthfulness at ages we now regard as advanced.

Thus we are approaching a point where the average person will be spending nearly as much time in retirement as he now spends on the job and where nearly half of his life will be spent off the job.

Dr. Juanita Kreps, Professor of Economics at Duke University, gave testimony at our first hearing which dramatically illustrates some of the revolutionary and exciting choices which we will be able to make in the years ahead.

She points out that assuming no change in our present work system—that is, a 40-hour week and a 49-week work year—that our Gross National Product at projected rates of growth would be over $1.5 trillion by 1985, or about two and a third times its present level. This would mean that despite population increases, per capita GNP would rise from $3,181 to $5,802—an increase of 80%.

She then points out that if we were to decide to hold per capita GNP constant at $3,181 and take this growth in productivity in the form of leisure time, we would be able to reduce the work-week to 22 hours, or we would be able to reduce the work-year to 27 weeks, or we could lower retirement age to 38 years, or we would be able to keep half of the total labor force in retraining.

We will not, I am sure, use this fabulous economic growth in any single way alone, but rather in a combination of ways involving shorter work-week, shorter work-year, retraining, and earlier retirement. But I think it is most important that we realize that this revolution is here and is coming on at a rapid rate, and that we realize the options open to us and try to plan reasonably and logically so that we make decisions which will enrich the lives of all of us.

Accompanying this economic miracle is a medical miracle which was most dramatically illustrated by Dr. August Kinzel. Based on the rate of anticipated progress in biology, he predicted that by 1980 the man of 65 to 75 years of age who has availed himself of what is offered will have the health and vigor of a man 45 to 55 years of age and that he would retain much of this vigor until he dies when, like the old one horse shay, he will fall apart all at once. Dr. Kinzel also went out on a limb to predict in 100 to 200 years, we would be able to prolong life indefinitely with death occurring only by accident.

I'm not too sure how desirable immortality might be, but we don't have to worry about it anyway. We do, however, have to concern ourselves with the ramifications of constantly improving health in retirement and new medical and biological break-throughs.

As I noted in my statement opening our hearings in June, these trends and changes present us with new challenges and pose the question as to how ready we are for the retirement revolution.

The hearings made it abundantly clear that we are not ready in several areas.

We are certainly not ready in terms of income. Virtually every single witness emphasized the inadequacy of present income levels and the need to increase them significantly.

Nor are we ready in terms of our attitudes. Our attitudes toward retirement are showing their age—they are based on a time when a man of 60 or 65 really was an old man—and I think it is clear that we must work to revamp them.

And we are not ready in terms of understanding the subtle, yet profound, changes with which the individual must cope when he retires—voluntarily or otherwise—from his job in this work-oriented society of ours. There is a tendency to downgrade those who are no longer engaged in productive labor, and as a result, retirement to many becomes a time of being shunted aside and being made to feel useless, indeed, even worthless.

It is ironic, I think, that we refer to retirement as a problem. For through history, one of man's cherished dreams has been the elimination of heavy labor and perpetual toil. Now that industrialization and the rapid advance of technology are making this dream come true, we find ourselves feeling uncomfortable and uneasy and guilty about free time.

We find we don't know how to use our free time. We find that too much of our education is simply vocational training, education designed to prepare for a job. And one of the main points made by witnesses in our first hearing was the growing need for education for life off the job and acceptance of a philosophy that will enable us to bring about such education.

Another major point made by witnesses before the committee was the need for more educational opportunities, especially in midcareer. Secretary Gardner was most eloquent on the need for opportunities for the individual to return to school in order to renew himself, and other witnesses stressed the fact of educational obsolescence in our rapidly changing society.

And particularly important is the need to make the individual himself aware of this need. For one of the things with which I am most impressed is that there is little awareness of the impact that our economic and medical miracles are having on retirement. There is, in fact, a tendency to avoid thinking about retirement until it is upon us. Again, this goes to the heart of the problem, for failure to prepare for retirement is like allowing a child to grow to the age of 20 without schooling or training and then expecting him to be able to find a decent job and make a satisfactory adjustment in the work-a-day world.

We must, I believe, begin recognizing retirement for what it is: a separate and distinct phase of life which may last from 20 to 25 years before a person can be considered as entering old age. And we must realize that there is a great and growing need for earlier awareness and consideration of the realities of retirement, the explosion of leisure time, and the potentialities of the retirement revolution, so that those who are dissatisfied or bored with their present role will realize that they can change their lives and that they have a whole lifetime ahead of them when they retire.

What this all adds up to, I believe, is the need to institutionalize some sort of a midcareer pause. During this time, the individual could stop to take stock of his personal health and his social and job status, to determine what is important in his life, to reflect on where he has been and where he is going next, to consider a change in career, and to begin thinking about what he is going to do when he retires.

The problems of retirement are problems which reflect a serious lack of understanding, both on the part of society and the individual himself. And until we begin to understand the challenges and opportunities involved in earlier retirement, longer life, more free time and better health in old age, our efforts will go for naught.

Thus, I would hope we can elevate the nonmaterial needs of older people to the level of concern we have for their material needs. We have been able to make progress in the areas of health care, housing and income because we have been able to focus attention on the need and gain public acceptance for our goals. I would hope that we can now do the same with the problems of retirement adjustment fulfillment.

President Kennedy set forth our goal with this comment: "It is not enough to add new years to life; our objective must be to add new life to those years."

At this rally, during these final weeks before election day, you are doing your best to commit yourselves to the goal President Kennedy so well described.

It is not an easy goal to reach. We will have to do much hard thinking about older Americans before we get well on our way to that goal. And we will have to transform that thinking into action, as you here in Baltimore will do when you go to the polls next month. I wish you well, and I hope to visit your center soon after it opens its doors.

THE WAXTER CENTER IN NATIONAL FOCUS

(By William D. Bechill, Commissioner, Administration on Aging, Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

It is my pleasure to attend this public rally today at the invitation of the Citizens' Committee for the Waxter Center.

The Citizens' Committee under the able leadership of Mrs. Pearson Sunderland, Jr., General Chairman, and Mr. James W. Rouse, Honorary Chairman, have made a significant contribution through their many efforts to make the Waxter Center a reality. Behind the scenes aiding in these endeavors has been the Commission on Problems of the Aging with Mr. James C. Anderson as its Chairman and Mr. Franklyn C. Hochreiter, Executive Director.

I am here today in the dual role as Commissioner of the Administration on Aging and as a citizen of the State of Maryland. The proposed Waxter Center for Senior Citizens is indeed a bold new approach to the aspirations of your elder citizens. Likewise, the State of Maryland has pioneered and taken an aggressive role in meeting the needs of its older residents.

Maryland was among the first States to implement the Older Americans Act. Through the dynamic leadership of Senator Margaret Schweinhaut and the Director, Mr. Gerald Monsman, both of the Maryland Commission on Aging, 25 programs for older people have been established in the State of Maryland during the past 2 years. Four of these projects were begun in Baltimore City. One of these four in Baltimore City is the Metropolitan Senior Center.

The concept of the proposed Waxter Center for Senior Citizens embodies several of the objectives contained in the Older Americans Act. One, "the best possible physical and mental health which science can make available and without regard to economic status." The 80-bed nursing unit proposed for the Waxter Center underscores that objective. This rehabilitative unit adds a new dimension to what we have known in the past as the multipurpose senior center.

Two, "retirement in health, honor, dignity—after years of contribution to the economy." The gamut of activities and opportunities and options for older people to participate in an exciting program certainly lends meaning to retirement.

Three, "pursuit of meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities." The Waxter Center, already with considerable experience through its Metropolitan Senior Center program, has shown the way for meaningful and creative pursuit of unused time. It is important to note here the wide range of opportunities available to older people.

Four, "efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed." Trained staff will be on hand to assist older people, both residents and community people, with a variety of services *when* and *where* they are needed.

Five, "immediate benefit from proven research knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness." In addition to the many services and programs proposed at the Waxter Center, there shall also be opportunities for research and new ideas which may prove helpful to programs in other parts of the country. The Administration on Aging, through its research and development office, is vitally interested in opportunities for testing results of different kinds of programs and services for older people, as well as encouraging new and innovative concepts and techniques for helping and assisting older people.

Another of our concerns is that of manpower and training resources. The Waxter Center could be a training center in addition to providing services, so that people interested in learning to help older people can be trained, at least in part, at the Waxter Center.

Six, "freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives." This, I believe, is the heart of the Waxter Center, and that is its philosophy. The concept is not of doing *for*, but rather helping *with* and *doing with* older people. Programs which are oriented in a direction other than that of self-determination cannot truly meet the needs that exist today in our society.

We estimate today that there are approximately 2,000 senior centers that are open 3 days or more per week throughout the country. Some of these centers have been operating for many years. Approximately 250 of these have been funded as a result of the passage of the Older Americans Act. We in the Administration on Aging feel that the proper direction is for these centers to become multipurpose in character. By multipurpose we mean providing many different kinds of services, activities, and opportunities for older people, including the objective of having a good time. The multipurpose senior center provides a wide and varied program, aimed towards specific and relevant objectives, and under the coordinated direction of trained personnel and volunteer leadership. Among its purposes are the development of meaningful and creative services and activities for individuals and groups; the discovery of opportunities for older people to perform community service; and the availability of information about community resources and plans relating to older people.

The multipurpose center, like the proposed Waxter Center for Senior Citizens, provides visible evidence of a community's concern for its older citizens.

The multipurpose senior center is a central location for services. Social institutions, in their effort to meet the changing needs of people, too often become complex and highly impersonal. Older people in need of these services find the normal channels a formidable maze, too difficult to negotiate. Frequently, older people choose to do without these needed services, rather than to run from agency to agency in utter frustration.

A multipurpose senior center can be a focal point, affording older people a place for their concerns and interests that is generally not available in any other type of community program.

The multipurpose senior center is totally committed to the older person, his needs, his aspirations, and his ideas.

The multipurpose senior center is a bridge to the community. Participating in the center is indeed participating in the community. Essentially, the senior center, through its program, helps the older person to feel that he can and should continue to contribute to his community and that he is a valued part of that community.

Your proposed Waxter Center for Senior Citizens goes beyond the concept of the multipurpose senior center. It sets forth a bold new approach which combines a multipurpose senior center with rehabilitative services. This, I believe, has considerable significance, not only for Baltimore City, but for the State and the Nation. The Waxter Center might well serve as a model from which others may learn and develop new programs and techniques for assisting our older citizens.

In conclusion I think the major strength of the proposed Waxter Center has been the overwhelming citizen support for this program and the many dedicated and hardworking people who have for the past several years endeavored to make this dream a reality. I hope that on November 7 your dreams will become a reality, so that older people locally and nationally can benefit from your endeavors. Thank you.

The Waxter Center's Role in Rehabilitation

(By Dr. Robert N. Butler, at the rally for the Waxter Center for Senior Citizens, War Memorial Building, Baltimore, Md., Oct. 22, 1967)

Thank you very much. I am honored to participate on this most important occasion.

How has it come about that our older people who were born into a great and expanding nation and who gave of themselves to their society and who may now have manifested the results of the naturally-occurring accumulation of personal problems and the environmental assaults of living—how does it come about that having experienced these multifarious events that our old people have been placed in a marginal position—personally, socially, and economically—in our society?

We are gathered today for a significant reason—to rally the interest and the understanding of an entire community—that of Baltimore—of its people of *all ages*, of *all generations*, to help meet the legitimate needs of older citizens—needs, one must emphasize, which the younger will themselves eventually have. It is a case, in fact, of all people doing something *for themselves*. Our society, our culture, may be evaluated in years ahead by the depth of our concern for all groups contained within it—regardless of race, religion, creed *and age*. *Each* of the groups within our society have specific problems and requirements—which must be acted upon in different ways but always with *imagination, respect, and compassion*.

It is refreshing to me that the Junior League and other groups outside of the aged are prime backers of the Waxter Center which is named after Judge Thomas J. S. Waxter in honor of his devotion to the medical care of the indigent. In addition, the Center is partly the dream of a young physician, Dr. Mason Lord, whose untimely death should not be forgotten on this Sunday. Physician-in-chief of Chronic and Community Medicine in the Baltimore City Hospitals, he visualized a complex in the center of the city—not ostracized in the outskirts—where it would house in-patient and outpatient activities, offer education, recreation and counseling. The 95,000 older citizens of Baltimore would be served. But it could be a model for other cities of the United States. Those of us in gerontology and geriatrics know that more *knowledge has been accumulated than is applied*—because society has not provided the financial and psychological support—to see what can be accomplished. The plans of the Waxter Center distills the best of present thinking. I hope the $3,000,000 loan will receive a positive vote on the referendum November 7.

I was asked to comment concerning the medical and psychiatric implications of the Waxter Center for the health of our senior citizens. Our old are becoming young—and will become younger—the more so when we provide better medical services for the aged, of whom an astonishingly high number are poor, over 5 million of our 19 million elderly are below the poverty line. There has been progress in the delivery of medical services but there have been disappointments. For instance, there have been minimal advances in the state mental hospital programs with respect to the aged in the 26 states where Medicaid has been established.

I wish to tell you briefly of our studies of healthy aging conducted at the National Institute of Mental Health, beginning in 1955. A group of us, representing various scientific and professional disciplines, studied healthy community-resident elderly—in an endeavor to find the ingredients in "successful aging" and to define the baseline of healthy aging, in order to better understand pathological deviations.

We measured over 600 characteristics in each of our subjects. We wanted to explore the consequences of the passages of time, of chronological aging, and to disentangle the latter from social adversity, medical disease and institutionalization. We need more such studies and we are presently engaged in a 12-year follow-up of our original group, whose average age in 1955 was 71.

Contrary to previous studies, usually done on samples of institutionalized or sick older people, we found what the Romans knew long ago—a sound mind in a sound body. Given health, older people remain vigorous and resourceful. One cannot blame mental slowness, senility, etc. on age alone. Comparatively few differences were demonstrated in the many functions tested in the medical and laboratory survey between the aged and the young. Serum albumin, a protein, was significantly lower in the aged, but not as a consequence of poor nutrition. Changes in protein metabolism may be significant in aging. We also discovered in contrast to previous studies, that the amount of blood which goes to the brain and the amount of oxygen used by it are not decreased with age but by disease, especially arteriosclerosis. By studying our volunteers over the years we have learned some of the elements which contribute to successful adaptation and to survival. These include significant involvement in the world of the living and the presence of significant personal relationships as well as the presence of physical health.

The future of aging is optimistic. Recently Fuson, *et al* of Duke University, for example, reported upon a drug cholestyramine, a resin that binds bile acids in the intestinal tract and reduces serum cholesterol and triglycerine levels. It would be foolish to imagine an ageless future—a medical conquest of the inevitable processes of aging. However, chemical, surgical and other advances will lead to the prevention and treatment of arteriosclerosis, which accounts for nearly ⅔ of our annual deaths, and a far greater toll in morbidity. Developments in the physiology of memory (RNA) and sleep are evolving. Future changes in our environment will favorably modify aging through reduction in a variety of assaults, ranging from noise to pollution.

Projections into the future are always fascinating. As child psychologists have found—first, the child conceives the future; then, the past and present. Futurity partially defines man and it is his fate. Our task is to use and expand the present, exploit in full measure the here-and-now. Such centers as the Waxter will address themselves to the here-and-now. I consider it to be particularly wise that the Waxter Center will offer services to both the well and the sick. Perhaps the well may be encouraged to help the sick, and perhaps the sick may be heartened by observing the possibilities for "successful aging" manifested by the well. I hope, too, that the Waxter Center will contribute to the future of aging.

Thirty-three million Americans will be alive and retired in the year 2000. What are we to do to facilitate healthy adaptation to retirement, which currently tends to lead to nonparticipation in the mainstream of human life.

Shouldn't we reform the rite of retirement? Should we find new and useful social roles for the retired? For instance, Senator Harrison Williams has proposed a National Community Senior Service Corps.

Should we also consider going to the foundation of the problem and revise retirement as presently practiced? Instead of "retirement" being condensed into one period of life, often in the presence of ill-health and restricted finances, in the concluding era of life, why not distribute work, education, and leisure (or retirement) throughout the entire life cycle. At present, we concentrate education, work and retirement into three distinct periods; early life, middle life, and old age. Should we visualize a future, following the models of the academic sabbatical system and the industrial training programs, to build in a system of recurrent periods of work interrupted by leisure or retirement, education and retraining. Such a revision in our practices would require redistribution of our financial practices of credit, of monies for education, of monies for retirement.

Vitalization of present retirement practices is more likely to be introduced long before a major revision in our social institutions. I return to the here-and-now.

In our time, retirement is occurring earlier, occupying an expanding portion of the life cycle, and affecting an enlarging segment of our population. Our society must avail itself of the significant human resource presented by our retired elderly with their accumulated knowledge and experience. The elderly themselves can help lead the way—pressing their needs—and not accepting the position in which they have been placed.

I very much hope the Waxter Center may be a stimulus to the contributions of older people and will not simply *serve* the elderly as if they were helpless. And I hope the Center may be the focus of research into the nature of aging and of the aged, of health as well as diseases, of adaptation as well as maladaptation.

The Waxter Center, then, can contribute to the maintenance of the healthy and to the care and treatment of the sick. It can stand as an example of an outstanding program to other cities throughout our nation. Finally, it has the opportunity of discovery—of uncovering new knowledge both fundamental to our understanding of aging and the elderly and to the practical solution of problems of the here and now.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. **GRIFFIN**. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the blatant and persistent discrimination being sustained in the Soviet Union against the Jewish population.

I am well aware that this matter has been discussed in this body on a number of other occasions.

The important fact is that despite debate and despite the influence of world public opinion, the serious plight of Soviet Jewry has not substantially improved.

Token measures have been taken by Soviet authorities in an attempt to soften foreign criticism. But in reality, the Communists have shown no real disposition publicly to curtail anti-Semitism.

Ironically, the Soviet Constitution ostensibly guarantees equal rights to all nationalities and religious sects. In fact, the Soviets have gone through the motions of passing laws specifically banning racial and religious discrimination.

But, in effect, the Kremlin prevents the Jewish nationality from practicing those rights granted by its own laws.

There are approximately 3 million Jews in Russia.

During the first three decades of the Soviet regime, anti-Semitism was not so apparent.

But after World War II, Stalin initiated a methodical campaign to destroy Jewish institutions, including publishing houses. Yiddish actors, writers, and other communal leaders were liquidated in the late 1940's

The situation has not changed fundamentally today. The Soviet Government, reacting to opinion expressed throughout the world, has taken a few minor steps to counteract the more overt forms of its anti-Jewish policy.

All available evidence indicates a deliberate pattern of anti-Semitism continues in the Soviet Union which has not appreciably subsided since the days of Stalin. We cannot ignore the predicament of the Russian Jewish community which is today beset by the most difficult pressures.

In recognition of the objectives of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, I wish to assert my own deep concern about the problem of anti-semitism in the Soviet Union. I believe Americans of all races and creeds should be concerned.

I believe that our Government should, and I hope it will, pursue this matter with the Soviet Government through diplomatic channels.

TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, last week, the Committee on Federal Utility and Power Law of the Federal Bar Association held its fall conference on the subject "Toward a Comprehensive National Energy Policy."

Two of the presentations made at that conference have been brought to my attention and, because they are thoughtful analyses of specific power policy questions, I believe they will be of interest to my colleagues.

The first statement is that of Federal Power Commission member Charles R. Ross. Commissioner Ross discussed the question "Is low-cost power too costly in other human values?" To those of us concerned with preservation development and enhancement of our environment, his remarks are particularly pointed.

The Commissioner raises specific questions regarding the consideration given to air, water, and land pollution in development of power sources. After noting that a committee of scientists in southern California has requested a delay of at least 1 year on nuclear construction to allow time for evaluation of effects of radiation and heated discharge water, he states:

> By asking these question now, all parties are hoping to avoid the unfavorable experiences of earlier period of power development which have left us the beneficiaries of too many smokestacks belching pollutants and streams devoid of fish and recreational development.

Commissioner Ross goes on to say:

> Because it is a general practice for public agencies to choose that alternative which is easily measured in convenient economic terms, we are bypassing those alternatives that are not easily valued because of their more esoteric qualities.

Mr. President, this is an important point particularly at a time when Congress is considering funds for continuation of planning on the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in Maine. For a number of years prior to authorization of this project alternatives were considered which would have destroyed the Allagash, a river which is valued by conservationists for its wild state. The decision was made by the people of Maine that no dam should be built which would endanger the esoteric value of this wild river and therefore we were able to secure both an economic hydroelectric powersite and a preserved canoeway for recreationists.

The other presentation which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues is that of Mr. Alex Radin, general manager of American Public Power Association, the national association of municipally owned electric utilities.

Mr. Radin has prepared an excellent summary of the role of public power in national power policy. He has indicated the dilemma which confronts small consumer-owned systems due to the trend toward concentration in the private power industry.

Mr. Radin calls for cooperative public and private construction of generation and transmission and states:

> An over-riding reason for facilitating joint action in the construction of nuclear power plants is to insure that smaller systems have an equal opportunity to take part in nuclear power development. As was pointed out by Congressman Moss, nuclear power is a technology which was initiated, fostered, and developed through use of Federal funds. It would be clearly contrary to the public interest to find that the result of this investment was to secure a de facto monopoly of the end product for a few large privately owned electric utilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these statements printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS LOW COST POWER TOO COSTLY IN OTHER HUMAN VALUES?

(An address by Charles R. Ross, Commissioner, Federal Power Commission, at the Federal Bar Association, Committee on Federal Utility and Power Law, fall conference, Washington, D.C., October 16, 1967)

At the outset I'd like to state that it certainly is encouraging to me that someone on the planning committee decided that this conference found the question, "Is low cost power too costly in other human values?" an appropriate part of the conference theme, "Toward a Comprehensive National Energy Policy."

The public is demanding that industry and the government define their goals so the public can assure itself that its goals towards the "good life" are being promoted. Every day the newspaper reports the rise of a citizen's group or an individual to protest some decision by industry or a governmental agency that conflicts with the group's or the individual's concept of what is right. Increasingly, the courts are recognizing these outcries as legitimate legal claims. Industry and the governmental agencies are now being forced to take these citizen protests into account in their activities. As time goes on, I am sure that the public will expect that the industry and government will do more than just react to their more outspoken protests. In my opinion, the public has a right to question its institutions which do not respond in time affirmatively and at their own initiative to the public goals represented by these conflicts.

Because the protests received by any one agency or industry are illustrative of only a part of the total picture, I think it best to articulate what I believe is the general public goal being violated which generates the type and number of protests and interventions we are witnessing today. What people today want is a balancing of the environment; a feeling that their human needs for an invironment that is conducive to intellectual and artistic attainment and yet spiritually refreshing are not totally compromised by their natural desire for materialistic well-being. Throughout history, indeed, it has been those societies which were able to inspire and appreciate beauty and artistic expression (in addition to economic viability) that are recognized as contributing to the well-being of their citizens and to civilization.

Satisfying the desire for such a totally balanced environment is an awesome task for a decision-maker, whether he is in the government or in industry. To do his job, he must be aware of all the relevant inter-relationships between man and his environment. This is not easy, as one recent incident well illustrates. For example, a community decided to preserve its dwindling deer population by establishing a preserve. Without their usual, natural predators, and protected from hunters, however, the deer soon became overpopulated. As a result, most of the deer starved. Lack of foresight as to the total picture thus led to a most unhappy result. More sophisticated game managers today realize the futility of trying to preserve a single species apart from its total surroundings; only by simulating the balancing process of nature could the original goal say, of preserving the deer, be reached.

Just as single-directed attempts to save a certain species of animal can lead to unexpected results, a single-directed pursuit of some industrial goal can do likewise. We may be witnessing the genesis of this type of situation in the rapid building of nuclear plants by the electric industry. Although few plants are in actual service, the industry is obviously putting the bulk of its new generation in nuclear plants primarily because of the promise of attractive economic costs. Yet, there are others who are wondering aloud whether enough attention by the industry has focused on the side-effects of nuclear plants. The Los Angeles Chapter of the Federation of American Scientists recently called for a moratorium of at least one year on nuclear construction on the West Coast to allow time for statewide selection of sites and a thorough evaluation of the effects on marine ecology of radiation and heated discharge water from shoreline power plants. The Chapter particularly criticized the method of selecting sites one at a time. That this group is not alone in its thoughts is illustrated by the problem faced by the group of utilities constructing an atomic plant on the Connecticut River. Actual construction has been delayed while various state and federal authorities have been attempting to determine the effects of the plant's operation on the atmosphere and the water temperature. By asking these questions now, all parties are hoping to avoid the unfavorable experiences of earlier periods of power development which have left us the beneficiaries of too many smokestacks belching pollutants and streams devoid of fish and recreational development.

The method of looking at the total environmental effect of any given project is called ecology. Greater use of this science enables man to maintain equilibrium between himself and nature. While philosophers have remarked on the value of a harmonious relationship between man and nature for centuries, it is only within recent history that the natural scientists have been able to show that man's physical health is a function of his environment. For example, experiments conducted on stress-filled rats, that is, rats in disharmony with their invironments, showed direct physiological effects including "swollen, drained adrenals, shrunken lymphatic tissue, the gastro-intestinal ulcers."[1] Not surprisingly, recent scientific studies have also noticed the marked incidences of diseases like ulcers in human urban dwellers.

While scientists have yet to pinpoint to a certainty the effects of environmental changes upon the genetic structure of man, the effects of certain changes upon the living habits of man are readily discernible. For example, you may have been as struck as I by a recent photo in a newspaper showing school children in Japan wearing face masks while playing in the schoolyard in order to protect them from the polluted air. As a member of the International Joint Commission, I recently attended a hearing on air pollution in the Sarnia industrial area. Particularly moving was the testimony of a young mother, Mrs. Norma Richards. When her child requested permission to come inside, Mrs. Richards was asked, "Why does the fresh air hurt?" So, it isn't hard to conceive of a time when all children will be forbidden to play outdoors, thus ending a pattern that has been in existence surely as long as the world has known the existence of children.

On a larger scale, let us consider the effects of a possible by-product of the excessive dumping of carbon dioxides into the earth's atmosphere. Some scientists claim this is warming the earth's atmosphere, with possible grave consequences for humans. As the temperatures rise and the atmosphere becomes increasingly unable to absorb further pollutants, it is pos-ible that human beings will be unable to adapt under present living habits. We may have to retreat into glass domes, where life would necessarily be far more controlled than that of any walled town in medieval days. The examples are numerous—just imagine human life without trees, or without animal life or without a plentiful supply of water—or any combination of these.

Because the ramifications of a deteriorating environment are simply enormous for society, as we know it, it seems to me that our duty to future generations, at a minimum, should warrant a conservative attitude toward increasing the factors that disrupt our environmental balance.

However, we cannot simply halt all construction until definitive solutions are procured. So, how best can an agency or an industry proceed? I believe that a particular decision in the use of a unique or scarce natural resource should not irrevocably preclude other future options. John Krutilla of Resources for the Future has stated why it is so important to preserve future options today. Because it is general practice for public agencies to choose that alternative which is easily measured in convenient economic terms, we are by-passing those alternatives that are not easily valued because of their more esoteric qualities. For example, the present value of a swamp as an industrial site is more easily ascertained than the value of preserving that site for its unique contribution to the area's ecology.

Secondly, if we exhaust all our natural resources on the basis of existing economic considerations alone, Dr. Krutilla asks whether in due time we will have extinguished all other possible allocations of resources. That is, neither we nor our descendants will ever again have a choice about preserving bird life in that particular swamp.

We can and we should give weight to such values in today's decisions. One way of giving such weight is to permit the development of a resource in a manner which will not foreclose different uses of the same resource in the future. The Commission's decision in *Rumford Falls* represents a good example of my point. There the Commission was unable to predict the best use of a water resource for the future but did preserve for society the right to superimpose a different use when society finds such different use desirable.

We should be saving for future generations the opportunity to exercise their value judgments. The obligations to do at least this much for our posterity seems paramount, for once natural phenomena like glaciers, dodo birds and the Everglades are lost, they are irrevocably lost.

Where conflict is unavoidable—for example, if a site cannot be used both for white-water floats and power purposes, then it is critical that the loss of one or the other goal be fully ascertained before the choice is eliminated. To this end, legislation like Senator Neuberger's in the last session of Congress to determine the effects of overhead lines on property, community planning and public health—if conducted with an impartial and conscientious manner—should be most helpful to the industry's decision-making as well as governmental agencies. What such studies should reveal are the real costs of technology to society and, hopefully, ways to diminish detrimental effects if the choice to proceed with the technology is made.

Within the government, more than a conscious consideration of alternatives may be possible. Almost four years ago, I made a speech to the effect that "sooner or later, our nation is going to insist upon a Department of Natural Resources." Public hearings are being held, for the first time, on a bill introduced by Senator Moss to establish just such a department to halt what the Senator termed "a progressive deterioration of natural resources" in America. It seems that the "later" I spoke of is possibly imminent, and so far as I am concerned, the time has come for all of us to concentrate on the best method of achieving such a department. As a minimum, an essential part of any such department should be an environmental bureau that would provide guidance for the use of natural resources.

What is inescapable is that conflicts over the use of our nation's resources—air, water, landscape—are proliferating because of lack of planning and direction. Within the federal segment, "coordination" among the agencies ranges from a polite exchange of noncommital letters to outright hassles in court between two governmental agencies. While a Department of Natural Resources will not solve all these problems, its establishment could possibly do much to reduce conflicts among the various federal segments and provide a rational source of inspiration for natural resource development by the private, state and local interests. On the other hand, a place must be reserved within the decisional process for the expression of independent viewpoints by private organizations or individuals. No really satisfactory method has yet been found within the bureaucratic structure to give such expression the "full faith and credit" needed to expose each course of action to the fullest consideration necessary to reach the best decision.

I would like to note that the FPC's proposed reliability bill had recognized the necessity to consider land use and aesthetics, and specifically provides for their consideration by the Commission. Where there are responsible agencies to resolve such matters, the Commission would defer to their views unless inconsistent with the objectives of Part IV. Should this section become law, I am convinced that the FPC would have to seek the assistance of trained professionals, such as the landscape architect. Such assistance alone will not be enough. The Commissioners for their part will have to recognize that a greater number of appliances which provide increased leisure will be useless if there is such disharmony between man and his environment that man is unable to understand himself and his relationship to the universe.

Lewis Mumford has summed up what I've been saying in better words than I, and I'd like to quote them:

> In this new ideology, quantity will not reign supreme: it must always be modified and justified by quality. Our object is no longer the one-sided domination of nature, but the creation of sympathetic associations and cooperations favorable to life and to vivid intercourse with nature on many levels besides the physical one. To this end, we will seek not the maximum quantity of energy or the maximum power of external control, but the right quantity of the right quality at the right time and the right place for the right purpose. It is in this context that whole men, rather than perfect machines, mutilated organisms and underdimensioned men, will flourish."

The Role of Public Power in a Modern National Power Policy

(By Alex Radin, general manager, American Public Power Association, Washington, D.C., for presentation to fall conference, Federal Bar Association, Committee on Federal Utility and Power Law, National Press Club, Washington, D.C., Oct. 16, 1967)

What is public power?

In considering the role of public power in a modern national power policy, we should first answer this question, What is public power? I make no apology for this question, since I have found that many well informed people in sophisticated audiences such as this are not entirely clear what we mean by public power.

First, chronologically and in numbers of systems, public power includes more than 2,000 local publicly owned electric utilities. The largest group of these systems consists of the more than 1,900 municipal electric utilities, operating in cities, towns and villages in 48 of the 50 states. Other types of local publicly owned systems include country-wide power agencies, such as public utility districts, which are most prevalent in the State of Washington; state power agencies, which were organized in several states in connection with development of water resources; and some irrigation districts which produce and distribute power. All of these are included among what we term the local publicly owned electric utilities.

Public power also includes the Federal power program: the Tennessee Valley Authority power system, largest in the U.S.; the Bureau of Reclamation's hydroelectric projects and transmission systems; the hydro projects of the Army Corps of Engineers; and the power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior. Of ever growing significance, too, is the Atomic Energy Commission's role in electric power, although thus far this role has been confined to the development of the technology of generating electric power from nuclear reactors; the Commission does not now generate or market electric power for resale.

---

[1] *Future Environments of North America*, p. 348.

Public power does not include the rural electric cooperatives, which are privately owned by their members. These rural electrics have been largely financed through loans by the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture, but they are not public agencies. These systems, however, have some similarities to the local publicly owned utilities, in that both types of systems are consumer-owned and share some common problems as well as similar goals.

Thus, public power as we define it consists of both local publicly owned electric utilities and Federal power. (Appendix A indicates the size of the public power segment of the utility industry, relative to other segments.) Along with the rural electric cooperatives and investor-owned power companies public power forms our pluralistic electric utility industry in which each segment plays a distinctive role. I want to review briefly with you the record of the local publicly owned systems, and the role which these systems have played thus far in our national power policy.

The record of local public power

Although the most numerous, the local public power systems are perhaps the least well known segment of the industry.

According to the latest available Federal Power Commission statistics, consumers served by their own local publicly owned electric systems enjoy on the average substantially lower rates than the average customer of a private power company. And because of lower rates, residential consumers of local public power systems use substantially more electricity. In 1965, the latest year for which the FPC figures have been published, the average residential consumer of a local publicly owned system used nearly half again as much electricity as the average company customer, yet the public system consumer paid 8.4% less for his greater usage. To look at it another way, the power companies' average residential revenue during the year was more than 56% higher per kilowatt-hour. (Appendix B shows the most recent figures available from the Federal Power Commission on comparative revenues, sales and expenses of local publicly owned utilities and privately owned companies.)

Perhaps the most important contribution which public power systems have made to the electric industry of the United States is to demonstrate that the demand for electricity is elastic; if the price is lowered, the demand will increase. This theory was perhaps best stated by the late Leland Olds, former chairman of the Federal Power Commission, who stated: "The new residential rate concept says, base your rates on your future business. Then your rates will be low because your costs will be low because your sales will be high because your rates will be low."

The best demonstration of this theory can be found in the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest, where average rates are lowest in the Nation and average consumption is highest. The application of this policy has provided ancillary benefits to consumers served by privately owned companies. The Tennessee Valley Authority publishes a map showing rising electric prices in concentric circles around the TVA area, indicating that low electric rates spread like ripples in a pond when the pebble of low rates is dropped somewhere in the Nation.

Spurred by lower rates, the local publicly owned electric utilities have been growing in a number of categories at a more rapid rate than the power companies over the past several years. (See Appendix C.)

Apart from generally lower rates, local publicly owned electric service offers other benefits. Because it is owned by the consumers, the local public power system can be more responsive to needs of the people and the community. The earnings are retained in the community, and in many smaller towns the municipal electric system is one of the larger local industries.

Local public ownership of electric service dates back to the beginnings of the industry. In 1882, the first year of central station service, four municipal electric systems were established. In the years that followed there were many others. Some of the early ones have been absorbed by larger utilities, but a number of municipal systems date back before the turn of the century.

Local public power, then, had its beginnings half a century before TVA was created, and, rather than being a product of the New Deal days, has basically been a product of local do-it-yourself initiative and pride. A look at the location of the Nation's more than 2,000 local public power systems shows a concentration in such states as Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska and Minnesota, each of which has more than 125 municipal power systems.

The motives in setting up municipal systems were simple—to obtain service, usually street lights initially; or lower rates; or more reliable electric service, or to obtain greater financial contributions to the local government. Today, there are several communities where establishment of a municipal electric system is being debated; and there are others where a municipal system is threatened with sale. The important point is that the people in these communities can exercise their right to choose how they are to be served. This choice offers an element of competition in an otherwise monopolistic industry.

The ability of the people of a community to choose between providing themselves with electric service through their own publicly owned utility or authorizing this service to be provided by a privately owned—and usually remotely controlled—business enterprise is a crucial defense against monopoly in an industry that is vital to American life. Yet it is by no means universally available. State laws vary widely, and in many states it is far easier to sell a municipal electric system than it is to establish one.

The record that has been achieved to date convinces me that the right of the people to choose between consumer ownership and investor ownership of their electric service ought to be a cornerstone of a truly comprehensive national power policy. Of course, the legal right to make this choice is rather meaningless unless conditions are such that people have a viable opportunity to exercise such a right. Thus, our national electric power policy should seek to maintain conditions which give the people a realistic opportunity to exercise this right of free choice; and, if the people in an area have already made such a choice, they should have an environment which makes it possible for them to continue to own and operate their electric system, if they so desire.

Trends in the electric utility industry

In considering the elements of a modern national power policy, we need to consider several trends which promise to alter sharply the industry as we see it today. One of these is the increased concentration of control of electric service.

The 100 largest systems in the United States account for about 89% of total electric utility generation. The majority of these systems are private companies. Although the number of consumer-owned systems has remained comparatively stable in recent years, the number of private power companies has steadily declined. Since 1945, for example, the number of companies has shrunk from slightly over 1,000 to slightly less than 500, mainly by acquisition and merger.

The trend to fewer—and larger—privately owned power companies is continuing. One of your speakers today, president Donald C. Cook of American Electric Power, last year predicted that "we shall see a shakedown to about a dozen or 15 integrated systems throughout the U.S.," perhaps, he said, in 50 years or maybe even sooner. News reports of merger plans in the past few months and even weeks suggest the movement to fewer power companies is accelerating.

At the same time, and perhaps spurring the consolidation of private power companies, we have witnessed the growth of what we might call giantism in power generating and transmission facilities. Over the past few years, the sizes of conventional thermal generating plants have been growing, to take advantage of the benefits of large scale. As unit size in kilowatts increases, unit costs per kilowatt-hour decrease. Now, the advent of nuclear power is placing an even greater premium on large size.

Since the beginning of last year, more than half of all new thermal generating capacity announced in the U.S. has been nuclear, and without attempting to appraise the many and changing estimates, it seems clear that an increasing proportion of new capacity and of total electric generating capacity will be nuclear in the years ahead. Growing nuclear capacity will place new emphasis on large size because of the high capital costs associated with these plants, due primarily to protective measures considered essential in handling nuclear fuel and higher fuel inventory. Stewart Brown, chief of the Federal Power Commission's Bureau of Power, last year pointed out that a nuclear plant of 1,000,000 kilowatts capacity is 20 times larger than a plant of 50,000 kilowatts, but the larger plant costs only seven times as much to build.

Associated with huge new generating facilities are large transmission lines capable of moving large blocks of power over long distances.

I hardly need to note that the trend to giantism has important implications for the generally small consumer-owned electric systems. In the National Power Survey, the Federal Power Commission classed as "small" systems with annual net energy requirements of less than 100 million kilowatt-hours. By this measure, only 171 of the more than 2,000 local publicly owned electric systems and only 65 of the more than 900 rural electric cooperatives were *not* classed as small. Clearly, most of the nation's 3,000 consumer-owned electric systems will not be able to undertake individually the large-scale generating and transmission facilities of an era of giantism.

If this is so, then what will be the role of the smaller consumer-owned systems in the nation's electric utility in the future? I see two significant factors that should be recognized in a national power policy.

First, there is the growing need for competition. As the private sector of the industry becomes concentrated in fewer and fewer companies, with larger and larger facilities, the threat of monopolistic domination looms larger than ever before. The Federal Power Commission's National Power Survey declared, "The industry's pluralistic institutional structure, while perhaps inhibiting coordinated operations, has proven a powerful competitive stimulus to management improvement and cost reduction." As the economic and physical concentration of the electric utility industry increases, the need for "a powerful competitive stimulus" will become even more urgent, but at the same time more difficult to achieve.

A second important factor is that the economies of large scale that are assuming such great importance in generation and transmission do not apply to the vital function of distribution. The small system can distribute energy fully as economically as the larger utility. In fact, the latest available Federal Power Commission statistics indicate that the local publicly owned electric utilities have slightly lower distribution costs per kilowatt-hour than the generally larger privately owned power companies. Turning again to the Commission, we find this explanation: "Fundamental technological and operating factors make it necessary to distinguish between the distribution and production functions in evaluating the performance of small systems. The electric power industry is inherently capital intensive. There are large economies of scale in production—i.e., generation and transmission. Economies on the distribution side, however, are keyed to high usage per consumer and high consumer density per mile." And to this may I add that the figures which I cited earlier concerning the record of the local publicly owned electric utilities in providing more power to their consumers at lower cost demonstrates the leadership of these local public power systems in this basic area of electric service.

If smaller consumer-owned electric systems are to continue to provide benefits of an effective competitive stimulus in the electric utility industry, they must have access to the advantages of low-cost power supply. They can do this in at least two ways: (1) through purchase of bulk power supply from a utility system which is in a position to utilize large units; or (2) by joining with other utilities to share the cost and output of large plants. I shall explore these alternatives later in considering some of the specifics of a national power policy.

These trends I have been discussing have a variety of other policy implications. For example, the increasing concentration of control in the private sector of the industry gives new emphasis to the antitrust laws as related to the electric utilities.

Giantism in generation and transmission has new and little-explored monopoly aspects, but it also poses new geographical and physical problems. If we project present trends in the sizes of thermal generating plants, we can soon reach a point at which the number of possible sites with adequate cooling water is severely limited.

A. C. Monteith, at that time senior vice president of Westinghouse Electric Corp., told the World Power Conference in Tokyo last year that by the year 2000 some 200 new plant sites will be developed in the United States and suggested that some of these will be for installations of 10,000,000 kw or larger in size. Only five rivers in the United States will have sufficient water flow to support the cooling water requirements for a 10,000,000 kw plant, he said. If cooling towers or man-made lakes prove impractical to supply the water requirements for these huge plants, it is possible that most nuclear installations will be located near oceans and along the Great Lakes, with extra-high-voltage lines being used to move the power inland.

Intensifying this problem insofar as nuclear power is concerned is the fact that condensing water requirements for nuclear stations are as much as 50% greater than for fossil-fuel fired generating stations.

Commissioner Charles Ross of the Federal Power Commission has suggested that the public interest in nuclear power plant sites is analogous to that in hydro sites early in the century when a policy was established of withdrawing the land where such sites are located. He also has suggested that similar consideration be given to land for rights-of-way for EHV transmission lines.

Generating facilities and transmission lines of the sizes of the largest under construction and of those projected today not only challenge engineers and utilities, but they also require new thinking by those who would shape a comprehensive national power policy.

Goals of a national power policy

My answer to the question in the title of your session this afternoon—"Is There a Need for a Comprehensive National Electric Power Policy?"—is yes, although I believe it is quite apparent that such a policy cannot be feasibly included in a single Act of Congress. The broad scope of such a policy is apparent if we briefly look at some of the reasonable goals for a national power policy.

1. Reliability of Service. The Northeast Blackout of November, 1965, not only indicated the complexity of maintaining service on large interconnected systems, but it also assured that the public will insist that future power policies reflect a high priority for service reliability. The economic and social life of our country is too dependent on electric power to permit a recurrence of widespread blackouts, and it is not realistic to expect that the Federal government will stand idly by in such situations.

Although the desire of utilities to remain free of governmental control or intervention is understandable, it is also unrealistic, because the electric industry is too vital to the public interest and welfare. Furthermore, the electric industry is already subjected to some degree of governmental jurisdiction. The problem, in connection with reliability of service, is to find a means of exercising government's legitimate responsibilities without at the same time impinging on management initiative and judgment to such an extent that the industry will become stultified.

2. Low Cost of Power. Large scale generation and related technology produce tremendous savings. The National Power Survey estimated that these savings could be about $11-billion annually by 1980. The $11-billion question is: Who gets these savings? Will all or substantial portions of these savings be enjoyed by consumers?

The record of the various state regulatory commissions in requiring power companies to pass on savings to their customers is not encouraging. Sen. Lee Metcalf (D., Mont.) and his executive secretary, Vic Reinemer, have dramatically documented the shortcomings of state commissions in this regard in their book, "Overcharge." Their procedure is simple: if 6%—the traditional figure—represents a reasonable rate of return for regulated electric utilities, then earnings in excess of this figure are, in fact, an overcharge. They found that 106 power companies in the period 1956–62 had a total overcharge of $3.4-billion.

Public power has pioneered in demonstrating that there is a better way to make money in the electric utility business. It is simply to charge the lowest possible rates, thereby encouraging greater use, and ultimately creating greater revenues. But public power has no patent on this policy. A group of nine power companies surrounding the service area of the Tennessee Valley Authority have generally lower rates than companies farther away from the competitive influences of TVA's low rate schedules. Between 1937 and 1963, common stock earnings of these companies subjected to public power competition grew more than twice as fast as the earnings of all Classes A & B power companies.

The cost of electricity to the individual consumer is not just what he sees on his home light bill. The costs of kilowatt-hours are being reflected increasingly in the costs of goods and services, as new and expanded uses of electricity are made by business and industry. In some items, the price of electricity can be an important factor in the ability of American industry to compete with foreign manufactured products.

All of us have a growing stake in the cost of electricity, and a truly national power policy must strive to achieve the lowest possible rates.

3. Abundant Power. Assuring abundant power in an era of million-kilowatt generating units and 500,000-volt transmission lines poses new problems. Delays in bringing in new facilities of this magnitude can be more critical than with smaller sizes of equipment, as was demonstrated last June in the mid-Atlantic blackout that affected a 15,000-square-mile area. A modern power policy must provide for more precise planning and scheduling of construction than has been necessary previously.

4. Public Safety. The public safety problems associated with nuclear power installations are widely recognized and carefully regulated. Non-nuclear safety problems deserve more attention. These include air and water pollution from thermal plants, along with a variety of existing and possible electrical hazards resulting from the use of higher distribution voltages as well as EHV transmission.

5. Esthetic Considerations. The public is insisting with growing vigor that electric utilities' facilities be, if not more attractive, at least less obtrusive. And this public demand is coming at a time when electric generating and transmission equipment are becoming ever larger. A recent controversy concerning plans of a power company to build EHV transmission lines in the area of the Antietam battlefield in Maryland not only illustrated the high degree of public interest in esthetics but also brought into focus the problem of regulation of these lines. A modern power policy must recognize the demands of esthetics, while providing for orderly expansion of electric facilities. Orderly and equitable procedures for resolving conflicts in this area are needed.

At the local level, esthetic considerations are spurring the use of underground distribution lines to new residential developments and some conversion of older facilities. Generally good progress has been made in underground residential distribution, but undergrounding of transmission lines remains a goal of research. A national power policy should seek to encourage this research.

6. Conservation of Natural Resources. There has been a tragic deterioration in recent years in the relations between those who advocate orderly development of our river resources and conservationists—or perhaps more properly "preservationists"—who oppose any intrusion upon undeveloped areas.

It is my belief that the reaction that has set in against dam building in recent years is a kind of misplaced reaction against the uglification that has taken place in so many aspects of American life. Many of us are repelled by the manner in which home builders have bulldozed trees and other natural vegetation. We are offended by noxious fumes emitted from automobiles that choke our streets, and we are revolted by the pollution of our rivers.

But I wonder if those who regard themselves as conservationists are focusing on the really important issues in opposing dams that are located away from population centers, and that actually enhance the opportunity for mankind to enjoy nature.

The production of electricity by falling water is our only renewable energy source. Hydroelectric energy is especially valuable in providing more reliable electric service, as was pointed out by the FPC in connection with the Northeast blackout of November, 1965. Hydro projects will become increasingly valuable for storage of water, at a time when water supplies are becoming even more critical.

A national power policy should support continued orderly development of our water resources for many purposes. Here again, I believe, we must set a goal of providing some orderly, constructive method of resolving conflicts which may arise. (I submit that newspaper advertisements implying that proposed dams on the Colorado River would flood the Grand Canyon—or worse yet, one suggesting that they were comparable to flooding the Sistine Chapel—did not contribute to an equitable resolution of an admittedly difficult question.)

7. National Defense. With the nation's dependence on electricity so clearly evident, it is hardly necessary for me to elaborate on the relationship of power and national defense. Abundant and reliable electric service is a foundation of our industrial might for war or peace, and, of course, low cost power influences the price we pay for our defense establishment. Defense considerations may, in some areas, call into question the desirability of the currently heavy emphasis on large generating units and extra-high voltage transmission lines.

8. *Freedom of Choice.* Earlier, in discussing the record of the local publicly owned electric utilities, I stressed the significance of the right of the people to choose whether to serve themselves through their own consumer-owned electric system or by delegating this function to others. This freedom of choice is the keystone of competition in our pluralistic electric utility industry. To be fully effective, this right to choose should be supported by an entitlement to adequate wholesale power supply at reasonable rates, and under reasonable conditions. Such a provision in a national power policy would represent a real commitment to competition in our electric service.

These then are some of the goals I urge for a comprehensive national power policy. Now I want to look at the future role of public power in a national power policy.

FUTURE ROLE OF PUBLIC POWER IN A NATIONAL POWER POLICY

Given the multiplicity of laws, agencies, institutions and problems having to do with the public sector of the electric industry, it seems apparent that, in the immediate future, at least, it is unrealistic to think in terms of a single policy affecting the public sector of the industry. There should, of course, be unity in the policy, but at the same time there will necessarily be many facets of this policy, including the following:

1. *Federal power program.* Until now, the Federal power program, with the exception of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has been oriented entirely toward development of hydroelectric resources and associated transmission facilities.

In recent years, however, the Federal power program has come under increasing attack from "conservationists" and other allied groups, as witness the delay or abandonment of Federal plans to build the Hualapai and Marble Canyon Dams on the Colorado River, River Bend Dam on the Potomac River, Rampart Canyon Dam on the Yukon River, and other projects.

Because the multi-purpose aspects of hydroelectric power projects have made these projects particularly susceptible to development by the Federal government or other public agencies, the private power companies have traditionally been opposed to public hydro development, and in recent years they, too, have stepped up their attacks on proposals for Federal hydro projects.

The fact that some of the best and most economical sites have already been developed also has served to restrict the role of the Federal government in hydro development in recent years. At this particular time, budgetary considerations stemming from the Viet Nam war likewise place effective ammunition in the hands of those who are opposed to Federal hydro projects.

Yet, in spite of these circumstances, there remains about 115.8-million kilowatts of undeveloped hydro resources, according to the most recent report of the Federal Power Commission on this subject. Thus, only about 26% of the Nation's hydro resources have been developed, to date.

A countervailing pressure for development of hydro resources which I believe will build up in the next decade or more is the increasing need for water supply for all purposes. A Senate Committee report has estimated that the total daily water demand for all purposes in the U. S. will reach 559 billion gallons a day by 1980, compared with only about 300 billion gallons per day in 1954.

Predictions of world food shortages within the next decade also will lead to renewed interest in the reclamation program which traditionally has provided a source of power for utilities.

Still another factor which will tend to increase interest in hydroelectric power is the value of hydro as "peaking" power and as a means of preventing or curtailing region-wide blackouts.

Although it is difficult at this time to assess which of the forces favoring or opposing Federal multi-purpose projects will prevail, I believe that the great need for conserving and storing water supplies for domestic and industrial purposes and for bringing new lands into cultivation will result in a resurgence of interest in the Federal hydro program within the next decade.

At best, however, the Federal program is likely to provide a relatively declining share of the increased power requirements of the local public agencies and rural electric cooperatives—the so-called "preference customers." It should be noted, too, that the increased emphasis on use of hydro power as peaking power diminishes the usefulness of such power to virtually all the preference customers except the relatively few larger ones which have substantial generation of their own.

Even so, I believe it is important that the Federal preference clause, which has been a matter of law since 1902, should be maintained as an integral part of the policy in the marketing of Federally produced power. The small local public agencies and rural electric cooperatives which of themselves are unable to build large generating stations will continue to find that Federal power is essential if they are to remain a competitive influence in America's pluralistic electric industry.

Adherence to the preference clause and recognition of the needs of the preference customers also should serve to make the Federal power marketing agencies more aware of the importance of designing means for the marketing of Federal peaking power in such a way that it will be of maximum usefulness to the small as well as large—and non-generating as well as generating—local public agencies and rural electric cooperatives.

The relatively declining importance of Federal hydro power raises important questions about the future role of such Federal power marketing agencies as Bonneville Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration and Southeastern Power Administration.

As these agencies have less new power sources to market, they should not be relegated to a caretaker role, but instead should be used increasingly in power planning. The smallness of most local public agencies and rural electric cooperatives makes it obvious that they will have difficulty approaching power supply planning from a larger perspective than the needs of their individual utilities. Consequently, a Federal agency such as Bonneville Power Administration can be extremely helpful to the local public agencies and rural electric cooperatives in assisting in formulating region-wide plans for power supply.

If water supply needs become more critical, and if it seems unlikely that Congress will authorize diversions of water from one river basin to another, it is also possible that the Federal government will assume a more active role in building combination nuclear desalting and power stations.

In order to keep the cost of water from such plants at a competitive level, these plants will have to be so large that it is unlikely that a private firm or group of firms could undertake projects of this magnitude. Furthermore, the cost of public financing will be important in lowering the cost of both water and power. Should circumstances indicate the desirability of Federal construction of large combination power and desalting plants, the power from such plants should be disposed of in accordance with the traditional preference clause.

In view of the difficulties of the small local agencies in obtaining new sources of low cost wholesale power, combination nuclear facilities could be an important supplementary source of power for the local public agencies.

The building of such thermal plants also would tend to stabilize the share of total power capacity owned by the Federal government. At the present time, this share is declining, thus weakening the traditional role of the Federal power program as a "yardstick" and competitive influence on electric rates.

2. *Joint action of local public agencies.* In view of the technological trend toward larger and larger generating stations and the construction of extra-high voltage transmission lines, it is obvious that the smaller municipally owned electric systems can obtain the advantages of large-scale operation only by joint construction of facilities or by purchasing a portion of a large plant being built by others.

Recent years have shown considerable progress in this direction. A municipal power supply agency has been formed in the Missouri River Basin. In Colorado, five cities have created a non-profit corporation to carry out cooperative power supply programs, and similar organizations have been established in Arizona and Utah. Municipal electric systems in Massachusetts and North Carolina have banded together to obtain a common bulk power supply.

There are numerous other activities and approaches in other areas of the United States involving common efforts by municipal electric systems and rural electric cooperatives. In Vermont, representatives of both types of utility have set up a non-profit corporation for the purpose of importing Canadian hydroelectric power. Municipalities, co-ops, and public utility districts in the Pacific Northwest have formed a public power council to work out their future power supply needs as that region of the country moves into a mixed hydro-thermal generating pattern. In Texas, the Texas Municipal Power Pool consists of a dozen municipal systems plus the Brazos Electric Power Cooperative. A group of 15 municipal systems in Iowa incorporated their own co-op, and then joined an REA-financed G&T. In Kansas, a municipal system and a co-op installed two units in a common plant.

Joint action program also encompass efforts of consumer-owned systems and private power companies. For example, an organization called WEST, which includes public, co-op, and private membership, has been formed in the Southwest to plan large thermal stations in which participating utilities will hold a joint undivided interest and receive power proportionate to their share of the capital and operating costs. In the Pacific Northwest, discussions are being held concerning local public-private development of a major coal-fired generating station.

The concepts of joint action are as applicable to nuclear power as they are to fossil-fueled or hydro plants.

The Washington Public Power Supply System, a joint operating agency composed of 17 public utility districts and one municipality in the State of Washington, is currently operating the 860,000 kw Hanford steam plant, the output of which is shared with private power companies and marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration.

Another example is the agreement worked out between Consumers Public Power District in Nebraska and the Iowa Power & Light Company. Under this arrangement, CPPD will build a 800,000 kw nuclear plant, production from which will be shared. The gains for the two participants: (a) by building a plant to meet the power requirements of both utilities, the increase in size greatly reduces the ultimate power cost; (b) interconnections that will be made as a result of the installation will greatly improve the stability, not only of the two utilities involved but others in the Midwest as well; and (c) as a public agency, CPPD can finance this plant with revenue bonds, providing a saving to IP&L, and because of IP&L's agreement to take one-half of the output of the plant and assume one-half the cost of operation for the life of the bonds, CPPD will enjoy a better credit rating and the cost of money will be lower.

In Los Angeles, the Department of Water and Power plans to provide power from its proposed Malibu project to serve the needs of satellite cities with municipal electric utilities, and Sacramento Municipal Utility District is working with PG&E on a mutually beneficial arrangement related to SMUD's proposed nuclear plant.

Following a decision by the Vermont Public Service Board that Vermont municipalities and co-ops must be allowed to participate in future stock issues of Vermont Yankee, a corporation formed by 10 New England private power companies to build a 540,000 kw atomic station, all of the State's electric distribution systems have been offered stock and proportionate shares of power from the project.

Although progress is being made in joint action of local public power systems, the procedure is not without serious problems. Perhaps the most difficult is that of transmission of power from jointly owned ventures to the participating municipalities and other local public power systems, particularly in cases where the local public agencies do not have extensive transmission of their own, and do not have access to a Federal transmission system.

The transmission problem arises because: (a) Some municipalities have legal limitations in building transmission facilities outside their corporate limits; and (b) the relatively small loads of many of the participating municipalities make it uneconomic to build new transmission facilities to serve their needs.

In many cases where local publicly owned utilities are planning to build facilities jointly, or desire to own a piece of a new generating station owned primarily by private power companies, it would be more feasible for the municipalities to receive their power over existing transmission lines owned by other entities, or to heavy up new lines which are to be built. It goes without saying, of course, that the municipalities are willing to pay a fair price for such transmission service.

Because the power companies in many if not most cases are unwilling to permit use of their lines for this purpose, the only recourse which the local publicly owned electric utilities may have to require wheeling by the power companies is to seek relief from the FPC. Yet, it is unclear at the present time whether FPC has authority to require wheeling of non-Federal power.

If a case indicates that such authority does not exist at the present time, then I believe that the Federal Power Act should be amended to require wheeling of power, so that transmission lines—like highways—become true "common carriers" or "contract carriers." Such authority would permit the most economical use of transmission lines, and also would be in harmony with our objective of best utilization of transmission line rights-of-way.

If we are to assume that a modern national power policy should provide an environment which will permit the continued healthy existence of local publicly owned electric systems as part of our pluralistic electric industry, then I believe that legislation such as I have discussed is a necessity.

The alternative, in this age of bigness, is to force all of the smaller utilities to become wholesale customers of the large private power companies, with the result that they would not only become captive, but any vestige of competition in the generation of electric power would be eliminated. I cannot believe that such a consequence would be in the national interest.

3. *Participation of public power in nuclear power program*. In a recent speech, Congressman John Moss of California pointed out that the Federal investment in research and development for civilian nuclear power alone already exceeds two billion dollars.

"Surely," he said, "here is a resource more truly belonging to the people even than falling water, for the water was always available, but atomic energy remained locked in the nucleus of matter until public effort showed us how to release and use it.

"If any resource ought to be subject to a public preference clause, if not to exclusive public use, it is atomic energy," he said.

Yet, he pointed out, the preference clause in the Atomic Energy Act is "weak and worthless."

"As a result of the present Federal atomic policy," he continued, "nuclear power is becoming a private monopoly."

Although some public agencies are involved in the construction of nuclear power plants, most local publicly-owned electric systems are not participating directly in the current nuclear power boom, and, under present conditions, have no prospect of doing so. The reasons for this fact are twofold: (a) the characteristics of nuclear power plants, and (b) the nature of local publicly-owned electric utilities.

One of the most important elements in nuclear power economics today is the impact of scale. In 1962, the average unit size for nuclear power plants was 72,000 kw; the average size of atomic generating units ordered in 1966 was 790,000 kw.

This scale-up is based on a very simple fact: as unit size in kilowatt increases, unit cost per kilowatt decreases. Although this basic proposition is equally applicable to all thermal plants, it has special significance in the case of nuclear stations, which are especially sensitive to capital costs, due primarily to protective measures considered essential in handling nuclear fuel and higher fuel inventory.

A second, and related, fact about nuclear power today is the role that utility ownership and relevant fixed charges play in determining the cost of power.

As an AEC study pointed out in 1965: "In the past and to a lesser extent today, nuclear power plants have shown a capital cost disadvantage. As long as this disadvantage exists, a low annual fixed charge rate is important for nuclear competitiveness, since a low rate tends to reduce the effect of a capital cost disadvantage."

Various studies indicate that the price of nuclear power from plants of similar size may be reduced by a range of 0.8 mills per kwh to 2 mills per kwh with application of fixed charges of consumer owned electric systems as opposed to the fixed charges of privately owned companies.

In considering these twin factors of size and fixed charges, it is interesting to note power production costs associated with nuclear units of approximately 1,100,000 kw proposed by TVA and Pacific Gas & Electric. TVA's estimated cost is 2.37 mills per kwh; the closest comparable reported figure for PG&E is 4.04 mills per kwh.

An analysis prepared by the Northwest Public Power Association reveals the magnitude of the potential savings available through application of the lower fixed charges of consumer owned systems to large nuclear power plants. Assuming a difference of 1 mill per kwh over the 35-year life of a 1,000,000 kw nuclear unit with a plant factor of 80% and an annual production of just over seven billion kilowatt-hours per year, the study showed that savings would amount to $245 million over the amortization period. Compounding the annual benefits at 5% resulted in a figure of $630 million.

Unfortunately for the local public power systems, most of which are quite small, studies indicate that the economies of scale apply to nuclear power stations as well as to conventional plants. In the immediate future, therefore, the construction of smaller nuclear stations by individual local public power systems is not economically feasible. Consequently, joint action or the ability to participate in ownership of plants constructed by others appear to be the most realistic opportunities for the smaller local public power systems to participate in nuclear power projects.

There are a number of public interest reasons for governmental policies designed to encourage joint action in the field of nuclear power, including reasonable opportunity for direct participation in particular plants by *all* utilities—large and small, public and private—in the affected area.

a. Because the economics of nuclear power plants dictate large units, atomic stations can be constructed by only a relatively few major utilities without recourse to cooperative arrangements with other systems. Thus, failure to foster joint action approaches would undoubtedly mean increased concentration of control of generation in the United States as the electric industry increasingly turns to nuclear power for power production.

b. Direct participation by all utilities in nuclear stations can be a definite factor in achieving the economic advantages of nuclear power because of the necessity to "build big." The following figures, developed by Roland A. Kampmeier, consulting engineer of Chattanooga, Tennessee, and formerly of TVA, give some idea of relative costs associated with size:

	Plant size			
	1,000 MW	250 MW	60 MW	15 MW
Relative costs:				
Investment per kw.-hr	1	1.3	1.7	2.2
Fuel cost per kw.-hr	1	1.2	1.5	2.5
Labor cost per kw.-hr	1	2.0	4.0	8.0
Total cost per kw.-hr	1	1.3	1.8	2.5

c. Because of certain characteristics of nuclear power, there are a finite number of locations in which atomic stations can be placed. Siting considerations—such as health and safety factors, requirements for land and water, problems of "thermal pollution" and limited transportability of pressure vessels—are considerably more restrictive than those currently associated with fossil-fueled plants. These considerations intensify the need for joint actions in building nuclear power stations.

d. Air pollution problems posed by fossil-fueled generation stations have created an incentive to move to nuclear power plants. The motivation is often as strong for small systems as for large, but the means of carrying out this solution in the former case may be totally dependent on joint action with one or more other utilities (due to the economies of scale) while a large system may be in a position to implement the "atomic answer" without aid from other systems.

An over-riding reason for facilitating joint action in the construction of nuclear power plants is to insure that smaller systems have an equal opportunity to take part in nuclear power development. As was pointed out by Congressman Moss, nuclear power is a technology which was initiated, fostered, and developed through use of Federal funds. It would be clearly contrary to the public interest to find that the result of this investment was to secure a de facto monopoly of the end product for a few large privately owned electric utilities.

If the above reasons for implementing joint action in the construction and operation of nuclear power plants are valid, why does the concept pose a problem? The answer is two-fold:

a. Many private power companies, capable singly or in combination with other privately owned companies of building nuclear power plants, oppose participation by local publicly owned utilities, as was mentioned in the discussion above on joint action.

To the extent that private power companies aid publicly owned electric utilities in obtaining a low-cost source of power, the companies assert they are strengthening their competition. When limited to the confines of private power company interests, the argument is undoubtedly accurate. But in the context of the public interest in "competition by comparison", it is equally obvious that it fails. Furthermore, fundamental fairness dictates that publicly owned electric systems should not be denied reasonable opportunity to participate in the benefits of nuclear power in view of the massive public expenditure to achieve economic nuclear power.

Private power companies also allegedly fear that they will lose a source of revenue if present wholesale customers switch from power purchases to participation in a nuclear generating plant. Regardless of whether or not the fear is phantom, the fact of the matter is that even if every company wholesale customer in the country switched from purchase to joint generation through participation in a nuclear plant (a highly unlikely possibility), the companies would lose only 6.4% of present revenues, hardly a catastrophic decrease when it is remembered that this figure is about the same as the companies' annual rate of revenue growth for other customers.

Private power companies also like to charge that they are somehow unfairly bearing the burden of the unwelcome weight of local public power systems who seek a "free ride" on the coat tails of "free enterprise" solutions. Nothing could be further from the truth. Municipalities certainly expect to pay for what they get. What they seek is "equal" not "special" opportunity, and they fully expect to "put their money where their mouth is." Furthermore their participation in the building of nuclear power stations might make it possible to build larger stations than otherwise would be possible.

b. The second reason for difficulty in implementing the concept of joint action in the construction and operation of nuclear power plants is the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, states that it is the policy of the United States that the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to "make the maximum contribution to the general welfare," "improve the general welfare," "increase the standard of living," and "strengthen free competition in private enterprise." Nuclear matters are to be regulated "in the national interest." The Act also asserts that one of its purposes is to provide for "a program to encourage widespread participation in the development and utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes to the maximum extent consistent with the common defense and securtiy and with the health and safety of the public."

However, with respect to the licensing of nuclear power reactors, AEC has chosen to take a narrow view of its responsibilities as outlined in the declaration, findings, and purpose of the Act. AEC's regulatory staff has suggested that the Commission's licensing responsibilities under the Act are limited to questions involving protection of the health and safety of the public against radiological hazards and assurance of the common defense and security, and has opposed the intervention of municipalities who seek to participate in nuclear power plants proposed by private power companies, contending that the municipalities do not have an interest which is affected by such proceedings and that AEC cannot grant the relief sought.

Despite this general attitude on the part of the regulatory staff, one Commission licensing board has arrived at a contrary conclusion on procedure, allowing municipal intervention on the grounds of economic interest.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that while AEC's regulatory staff has chosen to apply a restricted view to the participation question, in another area of atomic energy the Commission itself has found that the words of the Act give it a responsibility to study and foster participation and competition in the nuclear equipment manufacturing industry.

In addition to the procedural point involving intervention, AEC's present policy of licensing all nuclear power plants as "research and development" facilities has the effect of preventing the application of certain public protections which become operative only when "commercial" licenses are granted. In the case of "commercial" licenses, the applicant receives a non-exclusive license, the Attorney General is required to render and publish an opinion as to whether or not a proposed license would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws, written notice of the application must be submitted to regulatory agencies and to utilities within transmission distance of the plant, and, in the case of conflicting applications for a limited opportunity to construct a plant, preference is to be accorded to high-cost power areas and to public or cooperative bodies. To date, AEC has declined to make the statutory "finding of practical value" which would trigger "commercial" licensing.

Yet, there is an abundance of evidence that large light water reactors are of practical value for industrial and commercial purposes, and are "commercial" in every real sense of the word.

This fact is widely recognized. As long as three years ago an interdepartmental energy study published by the Office of Science and Technology asserted that: "Light-water reactors are developed to the point where they are being sold commercially, hence Government support of this reactor type is being phased out."

Many municipal electric systems believe that a reasonable chance on the part of all utilities to participate directly in the benefits of nuclear power plants would be materially enhanced by (a) AEC recognition of a statutory responsibility to encourage and support "equal opportunity" for consumer-owned systems in the licensing of atomic stations for joint use, and (b) a prompt finding by the Commission that large light water reactors have "practical value" and must be licensed as "commercial" plants.

If existing law is inadequate to insure full and fair participation by smaller electric systems, then Congressional consideration should be given to the strengthening of the Atomic Energy Act for the purpose of properly protecting the public interest in nuclear power. Nuclear power promises to become too important to the national welfare to permit it to become the private province of a handful of companies.

4. *Role of regulation.* With the increasing degree of interconnection among electric utilities, thereby bringing more and more private power companies under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, regulatory activity of FPC has assumed greatly increased importance to local public power systems in recent years.

Thus, nearly 1,000 local public power utilities now obtain all or part of their power from power companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. Because most of these utilities are small and under today's conditions would not find it economical to generate their own power requirements unless they are able to build large facilities jointly or own a "piece" of a large facility, the very existence of many of these utilities will depend upon their ability to secure wholesale power at reasonable rates and under equitable terms.

The local public power systems consequently have a vital stake in the Federal Power Commission's responsibilities to regulate charges and contract conditions of jurisdictional companies which sell power to municipalities and other public agencies.

Local public power systems have found that the Federal Power Act represents an opportunity to obtain remedial relief from existing inequities in rate level, rate design, restrictive provisions, discrimination, and interconnection. Sometimes these complaints can be settled informally, with the Commission staff serving as mediator. In other situations, a formal proceeding is required. In either event, the ability of small systems to deal on equal terms with large wholesale suppliers has been materially enhanced. Here are a few examples of what has been accomplished through application of FPC jurisdiction:

1. The municipal utility of Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, had been served for years by a devious route which brought power to Shrewsbury via two affiliated power companies, both operating at the Shrewsbury substation. The city was forced to pay the higher rates of one of the companies, and went to the FPC for help in obtaining direct service from the company with the lower rate. FPC ruled with the city and ordered New England Power Company to serve the municipal utility at its lower rate. Savings to the city are estimated at more than $40,000 annually.

2. Six cities in Wisconsin filed a protest with FPC over a proposed rate increase by Wisconsin-Michigan Power Company. The company had filed new rates which would have increased the cities' wholesale costs from 13% to 30%. The cities appealed to FPC to reject the new rate schedule or to provide for hearings on the new rates, contending that their contracts with the company did not provide for such unilateral action. The Commission suspended the rate increase and called for hearings. After a full-scale case, the Commission ordered refunds of almost $500,000 to nine of the company's wholesale customers. The FPC also recommended a reduction of about $50,000 per year in the company's proposed new rate.

3. Georgia Power Company has for a number of years restricted its municipal customers from reselling power for industrial and commercial loads above certain sizes. FPC asked the company to show cause why such rate schedule provisions should be maintained, and a hearing was held. The Commission found that these limitations were "unjust, unreasonable and unduly discriminatory", and ordered them eliminated. It is not "normally consistent with the public interest for a wholesale supplier of electric power to restrict the manner in which its customer may resell the power," the Commission said.

4. A protest filed with FPC by North Attleboro, Mass, was settled when Massachusetts Electric agreed to withdraw an increase in wholesale charges of $38,800, covering an 18-month period.

5. Thirteen small municipal systems in Kansas, operating as a group through their state association, brought an informal complaint before the FPC staff charging that

rates charged by Western Light & Telephone Co. were unreasonably high. Subsequent negotiations with the company and FPC staff resulted in a rate reduction of about $40,000 annually.

6. The Village of Freeport, New York, sought an economically desirable pooling agreement with Long Island Lighting Co. which the company refused to grant, offering instead to buy the Freeport system. An informal complaint to the FPC yielded a satisfactory pooling agreement which insured the integrity of the Freeport system.

7. In Florida, a complaint filed with the FPC by 10 Florida cities against Florida Power Corporation stimulated a Commission investigation and a 10% reduction in wholesale power costs and estimated annual savings of in excess of $500,000. Similarly, the complaint of the City of Clewiston against Florida Power & Light Company, which had refused to provide direct service, acted as a spur to informal negotiations between Clewiston and its supplier which resulted in a rate reduction to Clewiston of 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour.

During fiscal year 1966, the number of wholesale rate filings submitted to FPC reached the highest level in the Commission's history, exceeding even the 2,576 filed in the preceding fiscal year. A total of 2,649 rate filings were received and 2,798 were completed during fiscal year 1966. Rate reductions of more than $6,500,000 were accepted for filing. Rate increases accepted for filing amounted to only $56,000. Staff activity was responsible for a substantial portion of the reductions, following studies which indicated that lower rates were warranted. At the end of the 1966 fiscal year there were 34 rate studies in progress, of which 22 were full cost of service studies.

FPC regulation also is of increasing significance with respect to the ability of local public power systems to participate in power pooling plans. Two important cases now pending before the Commission—involving the Crisp County Power Commission of Cordele, Ga., and the City of Gainesville, Fla.—bring into focus the important question of the ability of smaller generating utilities to participate in power pools as equals, and with due recognition being given to the mutual advantages which both the smaller local public systems and the larger utilities receive from participation in power pools by the local public power systems.

The action of the FPC in the cases I have described makes it clear that a strong, vigorous FPC is an essential element if the present pluralistic character of the electric industry—with both large systems and small, both public and private—is to be preserved and enhanced.

5. *Strengthening of Federal Power Act.* Although the Federal Power Act is adequate for the regulation of wholesale rates charged by power companies to local public power systems, the Act should be modernized in some respects. For example, I have already indicated, in the discussion of "Joint Action" above, that it might be necessary to broaden the Act in order to assure wheeling rights for all utilities over high voltage lines. The following amendments also should be considered:

(a) *Power supply planning.* Most of the pools which have been established thus far limit membership to utilities which have their own generating capacity; and, in some cases, the pools have been reluctant to admit any public agency or rural electric cooperative, irrespective of whether or not the consumer owned utility has generating capacity.

The rationale for this policy is that the pools are concerned only with generation and transmission of power, and hence utilities which have distribution systems only do not have a legitimate role in connection with operation of the pools. The arbitrary exclusion of non-generating utilities strikes hardest at the municipally owned utilities and rural electric cooperatives, both of which groups consist largely of utilities which do not have generating capacities.

The exclusion of non-generating utilities from participating in power pools effectively shuts these utilities out from the planning of power facilities, despite the fact that some of these facilities might be built to furnish power requirements of distribution utilities. Thus, the distribution utilities become "captive" customers, with no real voice in the planning of power supplies for their region and for their own needs.

Although a distribution utility may be too small at one time to own generating facilities, unusual growth patterns or other factors might well make it feasible for such a utility to be engaged in generation in the future. The incentive for a utility which has been a wholesale purchaser of electricity to own generation lies in the fact that under existing regulatory practices, prices paid are reflective of total system costs of the seller, and no test of efficiency is applied. In other words, the buyer receives only indirectly the benefits of new, large generating plants. However, with direct participation in ownership of new plants, a publicly owned system can obtain the full benefits of advanced technology.

Yet, the exclusion of non-generating utilities from regional power supply planning limits the opportunity of these utilities to become generating utilities in the future, or to hold part ownership in new generating facilities.

The significance of participating in power planning pools was well stated last week in the Federal Power Commission Staff Brief on Exceptions filed by Commission Staff Counsel George F. Bruder on October 12, 1967 in Western Massachusetts Electric Co. (Project No. 1889) and The Connecticut Light and Power Company, The Hartford Electric Light Co. and Western Massachusetts Electric Co. (Project No. 2485).

Said Mr. Bruder: "In general, the business advantage to a utility—whether publicly owned or investor-owner—of participating in regional planning activities is that it is in a better position to know what opportunities are available to it and to propose a course of action which will serve its needs. To use a simple illustration, a utility which is privy to regional planning will usually have a better knowledge of where power might be bought and where it might be sold. Or if a utility knows of plans for an emerging regional grid, it will be able to propose change in the design and location of the lines to its advantage, and it can more efficiently develop its own transmission system and schedule the installation of generation. Suppose, for example, that a utility has a good site for a generating station. The decision as to what size plant to install at the site may depend in part on the proximity of extra high voltage lines. A utility which is not familiar with the plans for regional transmission is at an obvious disadvantage in making the judgment as to how large a plant it should build. (Conversely, of course, those planning the grid are handicapped if they do not know of the utility's plans for the site.) Illustrations of this sort could be spun out at great length. The point is that in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent electric industry, regional planning constantly grows more valuable to the individual utility."

One remedy for permitting all utilities to participate in regional power supply planning can be found in the proposed Electric Power Reliability Act, which provides for representation of all utilities—generating and non-generating—in the regional councils which would be formed pursuant to provisions of the Act. The provision of this portion of the Act for representation of the non-generating utilities in regional councils is a recognition of the legitimate role which these utilities should be accorded in regional power supply planning.

(b) *Reliability of service.* In citing the goals of a national power policy, I called attention to the need for assuring reliability of service. The widespread importance attached to this subject is indicated by the unanimous endorsement by the Federal Power Commission of the proposed Electric Power Reliability Act.

Pending completion of a comprehensive review of this bill which has been undertaken by a special committee and five subcommittees of the American Public Power Association, I would reserve further comment on this bill at this time.

However, as I indicated previously, I believe that it is unrealistic to assert that the Federal government should exercise no responsibility for reliability of electric service. The maintenance of reliable service is too important to our national welfare and national defense for the Federal government to remain aloof from this problem. It seems to me, therefore, that the question is not whether the Federal government should exercise any responsibility in this field, but rather the extent and nature of that responsibility.

Thus, any truly modern national power policy undoubtedly will make provision for assurance of reliable electric service.

Aside from the specific provisions covered by the Electric Power Reliability Act, the broadening of national power policy which I have already discussed would, I believe, assist materially in assuring more reliable electric service by permitting the publicly owned electric utilities to play a more viable role in the planning, construction and operation of electric facilities.

6. *Applicability of antitrust laws.* Technological trends and the attendant formation of power pools are placing in a new perspective the antitrust laws relating to electric utilities.

In addition to whatever application general antitrust laws may have, Congress has enacted several statutes containing antitrust provisions directly related to utility operation. For example, the Federal Power Act provides in Section 10(h) with respect to licensing of hydroelectric projects that "combinations, agreements, arrangements, or understandings, express or implied, to limit the output of electrical energy, to restrain trade, or to fix, maintain or increase prices for electrical energy or service are hereby prohibited." The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides specifically in Section 105 that nothing in the Act relieves any person from operation of Federal antitrust statutes, and permits suspension or revocation of a reactor license upon violation; the Atomic Energy Commission is required to report to the Attorney General information regarding possible violations of antitrust policies, and to seek a determination from the Attorney General as to whether or not proposed activities of an application for a commercial reactor license "tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws."

With respect to Section 10(h) of the Federal Power Act cited above, an important development occurred last week in a landmark case now pending before the Federal Power Commission. The case, which I have cited earlier, involves the application of The Connecticut Light and Power Co., The Hartford Electric Light Co., and the Western Massachusetts Electric Co. for a license under Part I of the Federal Power Act for the proposed Northfield Mountain pumped storage development, Project No. 2485, on the Connecticut River, and the application of the Western Massachusetts Electric Co. to amend its license for the existing Turners Falls development, Project No. 1889, to authorize the raising of the Turners Falls reservoir so that it may be used as the lower pool of the pumped storage development.

The Municipal Electric Association of Massachusetts and the electric departments of the City of Chicopee, Town of Shrewsbury, and Town of Wakefield raised the issue as to whether the applicants are in compliance with Section 10(h). As stated by FPC staff counsel, the municipals claim "that applicants are party to the concerted exclusion of the municipals from various bulk power projects which are being developed or planned in New England. They argue that this exclusion is being accomplished, at least in part, by barring the municipals from the regional planning activities conducted under the auspices of the Electric Coordinating Council of New England."

I have already quoted the remarks of FPC staff counsel as to the importance of permitting the municipal systems to take part in regional planning activities. It is significant that FPC staff counsel, in Exceptions to the Examiner's decision, found that the Massachusetts municipals were denied participation in the planning activities of the New England electric power companies, and that such exclusion was detrimental to the interests of the municipals. The type of antitrust violation which the Massachusetts municipals appear to allege in these proceedings has been called a "bottleneck" agreement, according to FPC staff counsel.

The staff's proposal is that "the Commission grant the applications but make clear that it recognizes the existence of an improper exclusionary practice and that it expects applicants to take the necessary action either to terminate the practice or at least to free themselves of any further association with it."

Although it is to be hoped that the Commission will concur in the staff counsel's wholly commendable and statesmanlike recommendations, it should be noted that Section 10(h) of the Federal Power Act has limited applicability, in that it comes into play only in connection with the licensing of hydroelectric projects. Absent such a project in a region, the provision is not helpful to those utilities which are excluded from power pools.

Thus, it is heartening that Commissioner Ross of the Federal Power Commission stated last year at a legal seminar sponsored by the American Public Power Association: "Where a pool deliberately sets pooling terms that arbitrarily discriminate against small systems, without economic justification, then it is clear to me that the antitrust provisions against discrimination and restraint of trade should apply to the pool. Mergers of independent companies with discriminatory provisos against smaller companies in the area should likewise be scrutinized by the Federal Power Commission for antitrust implications before it gives approval to such a transaction."

The importance of antitrust laws in connection with a regulated industry such as the electric industry also has been pointed out by Donald F. Turner, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice. In testimony presented on July 13, 1966 before the Senate Commerce Committee on S. 3136. Mr. Turner declared:

"The fact that an industry is regulated does not, in itself, show that the firms within the industry should be excepted from the application of the antitrust laws. Regulation and competition may both help to achieve efficiency and productivity. In industries with certain technical characteristics—such as the electric power industry—regulation may be both necessary and desirable to insure an efficient allocation of resources. But, competition may still play an important role in insuring that such industries operate efficiently. After all, where there is regulation and no competition, firms may become lazy, for they may feel that they are, in effect, guaranteed a profit. On the other hand, if regulated firms also face some competition, they may work harder to keep costs down, to improve the quality of their service, or to devote sufficient resources to research and innovation. Thus the antitrust laws apply to many regulated areas of the economy such as insurance, banking, communications, fuel and agriculture.

"At the present time the power industry is just beginning to feel the competitive spur. Many of the same technological advances that make pooling and interconnection possible also make possible new forms of competition. For example, a firm with surplus energy or extra generating capacity can attempt to sell and transport electricity to an area with a power deficit, and, in doing so, it may compete with other firms also having surplus energy or extra generating capacity to sell. Similiarly, companies may compete to exchange power with areas that have offsetting peak periods. Competition in the industry will probably become more, rather than less, important."

As the electric industry becomes larger and more complex, it is apparent that the antitrust laws, as a protection for the smaller utilities, will become of greater importance. The application—or lack of application—of these laws to the utility industry in the next few years may well indicate whether changes are needed to bring them into harmony with a modern national power policy.

The recommendations which I have submitted are based on the assumptions that (a) the pluralistic nature of our electric industry should be preserved, and (b) meaningful institutional competition should exist between the public and private sectors of the industry. Much of the success which has been achieved to date in America's electric industry can be attributed to these factors.

New situations, new technology, new trends in our national life, and new leaders demand new thinking and new relationships. The patterns that have existed in the past may no longer be appropriate or applicable to the conditions of today and tomorrow. Thus, old rivalries may cease, old conflicts may be settled, new relationships might be formed . . . and new conflicts may arise. Yet, in the evolution of our national power policy, I believe that we must adhere steadfastly to the pluralistic nature of the electric industry and to the desirability of vigorous competition between public and private power.

Although my orientation understandably is toward the public sector of the industry, I do not believe that the recommendations I have submitted today would be detrimental to the long-range interests of the privately owned power companies. To the contrary, experience has demonstrated that the private companies are perhaps healthiest where they have been in an environment of vigorous institutional competition with publicly owned electric utilities.

It must be recognized, however, that the forces of technology and economic strength in recent years have been leaning in the direction of the private companies, and positive steps will have to be taken by the national government—and by the publicly owned utilities themselves—if public power is to continue to flourish. I believe it is in the national interest that we take those steps. By doing so, public power, by its very nature as a public enterprise, can be of invaluable assistance in meeting many of the goals of a national power policy, such as increased reliability of service, availability of an abundance of low cost power, conservation of natural resources, regard for esthetic considerations, assisting in the national defense, and giving people a freedom of choice to provide their own electric service or to delegate this important responsibility to a private company.

APPENDIX A—ELECTRIC UTILITY INDUSTRY, 1965

ELECTRIC OPERATING REVENUES

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	1965	Percent of industry
Local public systems	$2,295,185	13.4
Private power companies	13,400,050	78.1
REA borrowers	937,986	5.5
Federal Government	516,745	3.0

INSTALLED CAPACITY

[In thousands of kilowatts]

Local public systems	34,945	14.3
Private power companies	177,478	72.3
REA borrowers	2,800	1.1
Federal Government	30,133	12.3

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS

Local public systems	9,260,052	14.0
Private power companies	51,248,586	77.6
REA borrowers	5,541,478	8.4
Federal Government (not applicable)	----------	--------

NET ELECTRIC PLANT INVESTMENT

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Local public systems	$7,781,381	12.2
Private power companies	46,072,178	2.3
REA borrowers	3,575,868	75.6
Federal government	6,339,000	9.9

Source: Private company, local public and Federal power statistics projected from Federal Power Commission reports. Rural electric cooperative data is from Rural Electrification Administration.

APPENDIX B—LOCAL PUBLICLY OWNED ELECTRIC SYSTEMS AND PRIVATELY OWNED POWER COMPANIES PERFORMANCE COMPARISONS, 1965

	Average annual kilowatt-hour consumption		Average revenue per kilowatt-hour (cents)		Average annual bill	
	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public
Sales to residential consumers: 1965	4,618	6,634	2.39	1.53	$110.53	$101.26
Sales to commercial and industrial consumers: 1965	79,201	66,396	1.40	1.18	1,109.26	783.93

EXPENSE ITEMS, MANAGERIAL

	Accounting and collections per customer		Promotion and advertising per $100 revenue		Administrative and general per $100 revenue	
	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public
1965	$7.06	$6.15	$1.79	$1.14	$6.23	$5.80

	Production per kilowatt-hour sold (in mills)		Transmission per kilowatt-hour sold (in mills)		Distribution per customer	
	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public
1965	3.98	4.34	0.21	0.15	$17.48	$17.93

Source: All figures reproduced from, or derived from "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1965"; privately owned Federal Power Commission S-178, 1967; publicly owned, Federal Power Commission, March, 1967.

APPENDIX C

ELECTRIC OPERATING REVENUES

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	1956	1965	Percentage gain 1956 through 1965
Local public systems	$1,020,336	$2,295,185	124.9
Private power companies	7,780,147	13,400,050	72.2
REA borrowers	471,929	937,986	98.8
Federal Government	340,488	516,745	51.8

INSTALLED CAPACITY

[In thousands of kilowatts]

	1956	1965	Percentage gain 1956 through 1965
Local public systems	11,777	34,945	196.7
Private power companies	90,826	177,478	95.4
REA borrowers	925	2,800	202.7
Federal Government	17,553	30,133	71.7

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS

	1956	1965	Percentage gain 1956 through 1965
Local public systems	7,070,000	9,260,052	31.0
Private power companies	42,800,467	51,248,586	19.7
REA borrowers	4,361,896	5,541,478	27.0
Federal Government (not applicable)			

NET ELECTRIC PLANT INVESTMENT

	1956	1965	Percentage gain 1956 through 1965
Local public systems	$3,373,698	$7,781,381	130.6
Private power companies	26,524,408	46,072,178	73.7
REA borrowers	2,278,995	3,575,868	56.9
Federal Government	3,969,000	6,339,000	59.7

Source: Private company, local publicand Federal power statistics projected from Federal Power Commission reports. Rural electric cooperative data is from Rural Electrification Administration.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, we are under controlled time. How much time is allocated to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 13½ minutes. Each side has 13½ minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the pending amendment involves a very simple question for the Senate to decide. Under the existing situation the budget expenditures are estimated to be $136.5 billion. The proposed amendment provides that there will be a ceiling of $131.5 billion on expenditures in fiscal 1968, with the further proviso that the $5 billion obligational authority that is saved thereby will be rescinded. Thus the $5 billion which were appropriated would no longer be available but would automatically revert to the Federal Treasury.

We have before us this amendment which would result in a bona fide reduction in expenditures of at least $5 billion during the 1968 fiscal year.

I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the adoption of this amendment will not disrupt the operations of our Government because, even with its adoption, there will still be available for spending among the various agencies approximately $4.5 to $5 billion more than the same agencies spent in fiscal 1967.

It would seem to me that under the circumstances the adoption of this reduction is the very least that the Congress or the Senate could do to demonstrate that we are concerned about these expenditures.

I mention further that there is nothing new about this amendment. This same amendment was before the Appropriations Committee. It was considered by the Appropriations Committee, but unfortunately it was rejected as a part of the resolution which is now before us.

This is identical to the amendment that was offered by Representative Bow and is exactly the same as was passed overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives.

As to the need for this amendment, let me review these facts briefly. As I pointed out yesterday, the 13 appropriations bills upon which we have acted thus far this year have been increased by the Senate by $4.055 billion over the amounts approved by the House, and the bills carried $3.175 billion more than was appropriated in 1967 for the same agencies involved thereunder.

In reality, the adoption of this pending amendment merely brings the appropriations of fiscal 1968 in line with the amounts allowed for the same agencies last year.

When the carryforward obligational authority is considered they would still have about $4.5 billion more spending money.

I recognize that an excellent argument can be made that this method is a shotgun approach, a meat-tax approach, and that the proper way to cut expenditures is for the Congress to cut them on a project-by-project basis when these programs and appropriation bills are before the Congress. I agree completely with that reasoning. It was for that reason that while we were considering those appropriation bills I made that effort, and we had 21 rollcall votes, the purpose of which was to reduce the appropriations as they were recommended by the Senate committee. Every one of those 21 efforts failed. The only amendments to appropriation bills that were approved by the Senate on rollcall votes were amendments adding appropriations. The amendments to reduce the appropriations were all rejected.

Had those 21 efforts been successful they would have resulted in a reduction of $4.467 billion and would have achieved practically the same result we are trying to reach now by the pending amendment. But we were unsuccessful in those efforts. So the Senate has no choice now, if we want to cut expenditures, except to adopt an amendment of this nature at this time.

On the other hand, if the Senate wants to continue with these expenditures it should reject this amendment, and by so doing the Senate will have approved spending about $10 billion over and above what was provided last year. By our votes here we will determine to a large extent the size and the urgency of a tax increase proposal which may very well be considered before we adjourn in this session. I think the very least the Senate can do is to adopt this amendment to reduce this year's expenses by $5 billion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am surprised at the fact that my distinguished friend from Delaware, in view of his many positions of the past, and in view of the fact that he sits on the other side of the aisle, is now taking the position which he has just stated to the Senate.

I do not know how many times we have all heard the Senator from Delaware complain of the fact that the executive department was, in his view, trespassing upon the precincts of the legislative department; and gaining more power at the expense of the legislative department. Yet the distinguished Senator now asks us to give very great additional power to the Executive, in the coming year, to do things which can be better done here, and which are being better done here.

I say again, I am surprised at the source from which this suggestion comes, because it is a suggestion to reduce legislative power and greatly increase executive power, and to dump our problems into the lap of the Executive with certain rather general instructions stating that he should make reductions in accord with those general instructions, but with the admission that there must be many transfers, and that many objectives will be hurt in the process to a very large degree.

Mr. President, during the last few minutes I have had compiled, and completed except for further reductions accomplished this morning, the reductions from the appropriations budget which have been accomplished by the Appropriations Committee and by the actions of the two Houses of Congress during this session.

Mr. President, I have been predicting for a good long time that when all appropriation bills are enacted we would find that we had cut appropriations $5 billion. I find now that I have been too conservative in my expectations and predictions, because, as compiled by the chief clerk of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, the reductions already accomplished, or viewed as a certainty, amout to $4,832,000,000, without two additional reductions that were made this morning in the conference committees on the space bill and the independent offices bill. Those two additional reductions increase the total of reductions, Mr. President, to well over $5 billion.

To say that we have no confidence in our own work, no confidence in our own associates, no confidence in the institution of which we are a part, whether we regard it as the Senate or the Congress, and to say that somebody else can do it better, after we finish all of our appropriation work, when we have already shown an actual reduction of more than $5 billion in the appropriations budget, is, I think, the wrong thing for us to do; and I am greatly disappointed that my distinguished friend from Delaware suggests such a thing, because it is so apparent that Congress is making substantial reductions in accord with what the times require—and they do require very great economy.

Mr. President, I shall not place this list in the RECORD at this time, because we are making certain changes on it to reflect the additional reductions made this morning in the conference committees on the space bill and the independent offices bill, which, as I have already stated, will bring the total of reductions to well above the $5 billion figure.

Mr. President, in closing, I just wish to say that I hope the Senate does not vote a vote of no confidence in itself and its institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, as ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, I find it especially difficult not to agree with my friend from Delaware and support his amendment.

The amendment, in my view, would give additional and massive authority to the President of the United States, as if he did not already have plenty. He could make cuts in some items which I think would not be justified, at least in the minds of most Members of Congress, and perhaps make unjustified increases in others. His power of transferability is already very great.

I believe this is a matter of authority on expenditures that Congress should keep in its own hands. We have not been as frugal as we might have been here in the Senate, particularly in appropriating and saving money. I agree with the objective of the House of Representatives, and believe that we may have to go along with them in some of their provisions in this resolution in conference; but I hope and believe that something more specific and effective can be worked out in conference if this particular amendment is not adopted.

I shall support the Mundt amendment, which is a specific one; but I believe we shall be in a far better position if we reject the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Arizona have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. This proposal would place an absolute ceiling on Federal expenditures for the current fiscal year—with the exception of spending for the Department of Defense. It would do this, moreover, regardless of the amounts which we, the Congress, enact into law through the appropriations process. Your Appropriations Committee considers carefully each request brought before it. Agency witnesses are questioned closely and at length. Finally, recommendations are prepared for the consideration of the Senate—and these recommendations represent the best informed judgment of your fellow Senators who have heard all the relevant facts presented.

The amendment now before the Senate would undo this careful work—not only for the bills which have been enacted earlier but for those not even considered yet. It would substitute instead a sweeping meat-ax approach.

But it would do more. It would transfer to the President the power to determine which spending would be curtailed to stay within the ceiling. His judgment, not ours, would prevail. I cannot believe that the Senate of the United States would wish to pass to the executive branch the congressional power of the purse.

But even aside from these fundamental considerations—the separation of powers and the proven value of the appropriations process—there are three very practical problems associated with a limitation on total expenditures:

First, an expenditure limitation locks the door after the horse has gone. The Congress provides appropriations which grant the administration power to enter into contracts or obligate money. Expenditures are simply the process of paying off those contracts and honoring those obligations. You cannot control expenditures alone. You must control the initial contracts or obligations. An expenditure ceiling does not face this fact—it is like trying to stopper the mouth of the hose after turning the water on at the spigot.

Second, an expenditure limitation makes no allowance for uncontrollable changes in expenditures. The President would, of course, have to make an initial round of program reductions. But what then? Suppose later in the fiscal year, expenditures increased and the administration was powerless to stop them—in such locked-in progams as CCC price supports, veterans pensions, and medicaid, for example. These increases would immediately require even further cuts in other programs which could be controlled—aid to education, airway safety, and health research, for example. As a matter of fact, if substantial uncontrollable expenditure increases took place late enough in the fiscal year, some vital programs might well have to shut down completely to offset the increase and stay within the legal ceiling.

Third, an expenditure limitation would require a whole new and cumbersome set of controls. The entire Federal accounting system is set up to control at the point where contracts or commitments are made. Expenditures are simply an estimate of how rapidly checks will be written as work progresses, planes are delivered, States draw their grant authorizations, and so forth. But with a legal limit on expenditures, all the agencies would have to set up a whole new and wasteful management system to control those expenditures.

These are some practical problems which any limit on spending would bring in its wake. But let us also examine very carefully what our colleague's $5 billion expenditure reduction would mean for our Federal programs. Where could the President find cuts of this magnitude?

As I noted earlier, there are some things neither we nor the President can cut without changing basic law. Examples include veterans compensation and pensions, public assistance grants, the Government's matching share of medicare payments for the aged, and interest on the public debt.

He cannot cut the $15 billion of expenditures that are being paid out this year—and the year started nearly 4 months ago—to meet contracts and commitments made in prior years with funds we voted for that purpose.

With a war on, we cannot expect that the President will find much opportunity to cut spending for the national defense.

When all of these programs are subtracted from the total, only about $20 billion is left. The amendment before us would tell the President to cut $5 billion of that. Considering the normal timelag of expenditures behind obligations and the fact that the fiscal year is already nearly one-third gone, he would undoubtedly have to make program cuts—cuts in obligations—of around $10 billion.

It is hard to grasp the real meaning and impact of such massive reductions in Federal programs. None of us know where the detailed reductions would actually occur. But let me give one complete illustration—and one which is surely close to the mark. Let us assume that the President applies one uniform reduction to all grants; another uniform reduction to all loans, and so forth. What would such a cut really look like?

Mr. President, first, all new construction starts would be eliminated.

Second, every new contract for major ongoing construction work would be eliminated. Projects would be stopped in the early stages of completion for the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies.

Third, new loans would be cut 50 percent below totals planned for this year: loans to farmers for electrification, telephones, housing, and emergency needs; small businses loans; Fannie Mae mortgage purchases for low-cost housing and moderate-income urban renewal and cooperative housing; loans for veterans' housing, college housing, college students, and poor rural families.

Fourth, new grants to State and local governments would be cut by 30 percent: the elementary and secondary and higher education programs; Neighborhood Youth Corps and Headstart; school lunch, special milk, and food stamp programs; assistance to schools in federally affected areas; grants for maternal and child welfare, disease prevention, and other health programs; programs for model cities, urban transportation, the Department of Agriculture's Extension Service, water and waste disposal, and other grants.

Fifth, the SST would be canceled, and space programs would be cut by $1 billion below the budget—or about half a billion below the amounts now being considered by the Congress—thus slowing down the manned lunar landing program and crippling other space efforts.

Sixth, expenditures for all other controllable programs would be cut 15 percent: the food-for-peace program; veterans' medical care—some hospitals would be closed and some doctors, nurses, and other employees separated; atomic energy programs; research on cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and other areas; the Internal Revenue Service—many of the employees who review tax returns would be removed; operations of airways by the Federal Aviation Administration—this program would be reduced to its 1963 level despite an increase in air traffic of nearly 50 percent since that time; the FBI and other Justice Department programs; Interior programs for Indians, land management, fish and wildlife, and mineral resources; the Coast Guard; and a whole host of others, including agricultural research, weather and postal services, enforcement of labor standards, foreign relations, Treasury reporting and accounting, regulatory activities, basic research, and so on and on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 1 additional minute be allotted to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. President, I am as much in favor of economy as is any Senator. But imposing a rigid ceiling on Federal expenditures is simply not the right way to save money. The right way is to rely on the tried and true appropriations process. I therefore urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding to me.

I think that as a body the Senate should do something to meet the very serious and valid challenge that has been raised by the House of Representatives in its amendment. Whether the matter is wholly worked out now is not the entire issue.

I doubt that any amendment of this kind, or even the next amendment that is to be offered, would be suitable and on all fours in every way. But I think in view of the conditions of this mounting deficit, the difficulty that is going to be had in passing any kind of a tax bill, and, not the threat of inflation, but the actual inflation that has already started—which is the most cruel and unkindest tax of all—it is up to us to respond in some way rather than merely to go to conference singlehanded or ironclad in any position.

I think the House, by its recorded vote, is going to stand on some position of economy in conference.

I voted for this matter in the Appropriations Committee, and I am as guilty as anyone, or as the average one, in voting too much in appropriations not only this year but also last year and the year before. Do not say, however, that we cannot reduce the appropriations. We can do so if we make up our minds.

This year—due largely to the efforts of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I am not claiming any credit for it—after a very careful perusal of the defense bill by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from North Dakota, and others, there was a reduction made in the amount of $1.6 billion without touching topside or bottom the muscle or the bone that is necessary to have a sound, solid military program. We may have to increase the appropriations some in the supplemental bill next year, but not for the items that we cut out in that bill.

Congress can do these things, and Congress does have a part in such matters.

I hope that we will agree to the pending amendment or to the next amendment to be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for 11 years I have tried by my votes and arguments to reduce Federal spending, but I have failed woefully and painfully.

I have argued that the escape from Federal fiscal chaos and unbridled inflation required the stoppage of deficit operations. Those arguments fell upon deaf ears.

It was my opinion that in a period of prosperity, the moneys flowing into the Federal Treasury should be used in part to reduce the Federal debt. That argument fell upon deaf ears. Now, at the end of the 11th year, the cry is made that we should pass a 10-percent surtax in order to stop the damaging impact of inflation upon retired employees, ministers, doctors, and workers. The cry "stop inflation" is being heard throughout the Nation.

The time to have argued that point was during the past 11 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I tried to stop this threat. I voted on separate bills to reduce spending. I failed.

I realize that this is a sort of broadax chop in the appropriations, but I know of no other method to achieve what I believe has to be done to stop the fiscal disintegration of our country, the robbing of pensioners, the robbing of those who have bought U.S. bonds, and the robbing of all other thrifty people who believed in the American dollar and tried to save it.

I gladly support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself the remaining 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia outlined a broad list of calamities that allegedly would fall upon this country if the pending amendment is agreed to. I disagree completely with his position that agreement to the pending amendment would result in such a calamity.

I point out that even if the pending amendment, which would reduce the projected ceiling for the next fiscal year by $5 billion, were agreed to, it would still mean that these same agencies would be able to spend $4.7 billion more than they spent last year. Is it a calamity for the Senate to consider the plight of the taxpayer?

I note that the Department of Labor this morning reports that the cost of living has risen 39 percent since 1959. That is inflation at an average of 5 percent per year. It is time we recognize that we cannot continuously expand these spending programs without having a staggering tax increase and all the evils of inflation that go with it.

The suggestion has been made that the adoption of this amendment would be an expression of lack of confidence in the Senate. I do not interpret it that way, but frankly I will accept it. After all, the Senate up to this point has not reduced expenditures. Let us face it. On the contrary, by rollcall votes in the Senate, it has added $4,055 million to the appropriation bills over what was added in the House. Even the adoption of this amendment would only roll back to the House figures, and certainly the House is not un-American.

So far as conferring undue powers upon the President is concerned, certainly this procedure would confer upon him some powers; but we in Congress have failed thus far to adopt these amendments on a selective basis. Someone may argue that the efforts that were made to reduce the expenditures were poorly selected, poorly timed, and the wrong place. But no Member of the Senate has suggested any other place to cut the budget, so we must proceed on the premise that no Member of the Senate knew of a better place to approach the cut.

As an argument in favor of the pending amendment, I shall quote none other than the man in the White House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In 1957 Congress was trying to reduce the appropriations under a preceding administration. The effort to reduce those appropriations was then led by the Senator from Texas, Mr. Lyndon Johnson, and I quote Senator Johnson's statement as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 5, page 6973:

> Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When the vote on that question is taken, every Member who wishes to vote for more money, for more jobs, for more Government-kept press services, for more assistants, can line up, on one side, and say, "Here we are—the spenders, and we are proud of it." Those on the other side can line up and can say, "Here we are, the cutters—and we are proud of it."

I am ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 48, as follows:

[No. 299 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Allott
Baker
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Griffin
Hansen
Hickenlooper
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McGovern
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Russell
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—48

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Clark
Ellender
Fong
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Brewster
Brooke
Dodd
Fulbright
Gruening
Hatfield
Kuchel
McCarthy
Miller
Morse
Sparkman
Tower
Williams, N.J.

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend until we have order. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, do I understand that the debate now begins on my amendment under controlled limitations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct; there are 30 minutes allotted to each side.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly in connection with my amendment before yielding to other Senators who desire to speak in support of the amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order so we can hear the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to point out that the economy bloc lost by a margin of nine votes on the amendment of the Senator from Dalaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which increases my optimism and my hopefulness that the Senate will agree on a rollcall vote to the 5 percent cutback suggested in my amendment.

I know that some Senators who voted for the Williams amendment did so with reluctance because we felt that there are more systematic equitable and effective methods of achieving the desired objective. I also know that some Senators who voted against the Williams amendment will support my amendment. We therefore are now in the important area of trying to convince six or eight Senators to put the Senate on record in favor of some economy.

I wish first to read a statement from the morning newspaper that would tend to sharpen the issue. This article is a United Press International news release. The headline reads: "MILLS Says Committee Will Insist on Cuts." The first paragraph of the article reads:

> Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D-Ark.) predicted yesterday that House Ways and Means Committee will stand firm on its insistence that Federal spending be cut before it considers President Johnson's proposed 10 per cent surtax.

Mr. President, that is the lead paragraph in this news article. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILLS SAYS COMMITTEE WILL INSIST ON CUTS

> Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D-Ark.) predicted yesterday that House Ways and Means Committee will stand firm on its insistence that Federal spending be cut before it considers President Johnson's proposed 10 per cent surtax.
>
> He thus appeared to hold out little hope for enactment of the tax increase this year, although he declined to commit himself specifically.
>
> Mills conceded at a news conference that tax reform holds high priority, but indicated there is no hope for immediate action. Proposals now being prepared by the staffs of his Committee, the Treasury Department and the Joint Economic Committee will probably not be ready for consideration before next year, he said.
>
> But Mills said he understood that the recommendations will include "changes in the tax treatment of foundations," to cor-

rect abuses through which the mushrooming number of such organizations enjoy tax advantages while perpetuating family control of the estates.

He also expected that some change will be required in the tax-free status of church-operated business ventures.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I want to point out that Representative MILLS has said that over and over and over again. He is a very fine Member of the House of Representatives. His word is as good as his bond. He does not engage in loose talk. I know him well. He has said to Members of the Senate and House, "If you want to have tax consideration and if you want to put our fiscal house in balance, you have got to start by doing some effective economizing."

The House has responded to the challenge with a majority of 110 votes.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was nine votes short on his effort. I sincerely hope that we can increase the vote in favor of the pending amendment sufficiently to put the Senate on record as being in favor of going to conference, not empty-handed and not to repudiate or to reject the economy drive by the House, but to associate itself with their earnest desire to work out a conference report which will cut back on Federal expenditures.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am one of those Senators the Senator is speaking of. Reluctantly, I voted against the Williams amendment because it would give the President broad discretionary authority to wipe out some programs entirely if he wanted to.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. I was also reluctant to vote for it, but I think the situation is so desperate that we are going to have to move in some direction. I do not want to discourage any rational economy efforts being made at this time.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is more positive, and it spreads cuts across the board.

Mr. MUNDT. Correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. We will know exactly where it goes. Thus, I think it is a much better approach. We will have to work out something in conference. There will be enough leeway in conference and too, if the amendment is adopted it will indicate that some economies have been effected on the Senate side, too. It will make the discretionary authority more workable.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from North Dakota is precisely correct. One great advantage of the amendment is that it will open doors in the conference to all considerations for moving the budget downward and economizing, whereas if we simply reject the House, repudiate and scoff at it, send them a gratuitous insult, saying that we are not interested in economy, as we would do by approving just a simple continuing resolution, I doubt if we will have any effective conference at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Please explain to me what the Senator means by subsection (b), the authority of the President to place funds where he wants to, which is what I do not like about the resolution. I should like to vote for the first part of it, but I do not like the second part where I think we abdicate completely our authority and transfer that power to the President.

Mr. MUNDT. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if the Senator will refer to the speech I made yesterday. I have added nothing whatsoever to existing Presidential power to transfer funds——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then why not strike it out?

Mr. MUNDT. In the act of 1951. Now part of the Federal statute gave the President that authority. It will stay there until we repeal it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then why not repeal it?

Mr. MUNDT. We utilize that device to give him some flexibility in determining whether he should cut some agency 2 percent, or another agency 5 percent, or 3 percent, instead of making it straight across the board at 5 percent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Could he not cut it 50 percent?

Mr. MUNDT. Under present law, he can do anything he wants to with it. My amendment does not change present law in that respect.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then why not strike it out?

Mr. MUNDT. Because it is in conformity with the law at present. We live with the law. We bring the first paragraph into conformity with existing law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then it would be in conformity if the other is not repealed.

Mr. MUNDT. It says, straight across the board. I said yesterday that I thought some day we should try to figure out how to rescind that authority granted in 1951. I doubt now, when our big problem is to try to find some way to economize, that this is a propitious time to pull back that authority which we have given to the President since 1951.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish the Senator would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Well, it is in strict conformity with present law.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I read the distinguished Senator's amendment, it seems to me it would be the greatest grant of Presidential discretion which I have ever seen given to a President during my years in the Senate.

Is it not true that by the language of subsection (b), authorizing the President to reduce by at least 5 percent the line item appropriations, the President could reduce veterans benefits, pensions, and disability payment by 5 percent?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is entirely wrong. Let me correct him there. These cuts have to be on items which are subject to administrative control. Veterans benefits are not. We cannot touch them. They cannot be reduced even by one-tenth of 1 percent.

Mr. MONRONEY. We have appropriated money for the Veterans' Administration consistently. I do not see how we can place any limitation on the authority we would be giving the President to reduce funds that would be going to that agency. That is a big appropriation, as the Senator knows, because he serves on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator will refer to lines 7 and 8 of the amendment, I want him to read them, because I realize, also, that other Senators have not been here when this was discussed in great depth on yesterday:

> (Other than appropriations for military functions and those items determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget not to be subject to administrative control) . . .

Veterans' benefits are spelled out in the law. We cannot touch them—or interest on the national debt. In fact, he will find in the hearings a list of the expenditures which are controllable.

Mr. MONRONEY. On what page is that?

Mr. MUNDT. It is written here, on a mimeographed form. I hand it to the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

How would funds appropriated for public works projects be affected? Would we not be giving the President carte blanche power to reduce them to 1 percent of the funds which Congress has already authorized?

Mr. MUNDT. On that, I say to the Senator, as I stated to my good friend from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], they fall into two categories; first, where definite commitments are made we cannot cancel contracts; and, second, where we do not have authority to cut, they are subject to administrative control. Under present law the President can cut them out. In those cases, forget about the Mundt amendment. Live with the law as it was enacted in 1951. I put it all in the RECORD yesterday. The President has the authority now that we are talking about here. There is no change. The President has had that authority since 1951 in regard to contracts and slowing down projects and effectuating economies.

Mr. MONRONEY. But it is not right to reduce an appropriation down to 1 percent of the amount we have appropriated——

Mr. MUNDT. He has already at times reduced them down to zero under the authority we gave the President in 1951. My amendment does not expand the statutory authority he has had for 16 years.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the President has had that authority to do everything this amendment covers, why do anything in this regard, if he has all the power the Senator says he has?

I do not want to give the President of the United States, who is advocating the spending of billions of dollars for purposes with which I do not agree at all, the power to take away from my State the public improvements which will be a great asset to my State as well as to the Nation. I want to vote for economy but I do not want to vest in the President of the United States any arbitrary power, if he chooses to use it that way, to punish absolutely, to operate by Executive order, or whatever authority would be given him here, to reduce appropriations for projects to which I subscribe as being of great benefit and which are now in progress of being constructed and should not be retarded simply so that the President could lay his hands on additional money to use for some of his wild schemes with which I do not agree at all. That is why I cannot vote for the pending amendment. I should like to support it, however.

Mr. MUNDT. We had the Senator in mind when we wrote this amendment. We protected him. The President cannot take money from projects to help out in the building up of other programs. He cannot use the money saved to increase any appropriation anywhere. Thus, the Senator can forget about that. That is spelled out in the law. There is no change. There it is. The Senator has suggested that we repeal it. Such a repeal has not been considered in the Appropriations Committee. It is subject to rescission. But, there it is in the law until and unless we repeal it. We have got to live with the law as it is. I am merely providing the pattern of transferability in keeping with the Federal statute as it now exists.

If we want economy, we will have to economize. We cannot begin, by this amendment, to bar the power the President has as spelled out in the law already on the books.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the Senator say to the Senate that the total effect of this amendment will be to effect a reduction only on $38 billion in appropriations?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. We will get that big a reduction. If we figure 5 percent against that figure, we will get a reduction of $1.9 billion.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words this amendment will apply only to appropriations that are controllable, which amount to about $38 billion. Five percent of that would be a very small amount.

Mr. MUNDT. Perhaps the Senator should look at the hearings, instead of the memorandum he has in front of him.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have been looking at the memorandum. Where is it in the hearings?

Mr. MUNDT. For one thing, it is on page 29801 of the Record of yesterday. It is also in the hearings. Dr. Schultze, after painstaking effort on the part of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], put it in the hearings. It is in there. We are talking about $38 billion or $39 billion, and a 5-percent reduction against that, and retaining the law as it is, which bars the President from making any shifts in increases, would save the taxpayers $1.9 or $1.9½ billion.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] such time as he may need.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall vote for the Mundt amendment. This is not precisely having our way in this manner. This is a matter of coming to an agreement with the other body. The other body is headed, in my judgment, on a course which is averse to those of us who consider themselves liberals in both bodies, because, in my judgment, it would lead to a meat-ax cut, in programs to provide housing, in poverty programs, in aid to foreign nations, in education, and related programs. The President has shown his disposition, and nothing will come out of this continuing resolution unless we agree with the other body.

Unless we wish to encourage meat-ax cuts, in programs which I have described, and which has already been indicated in the other body, by taking 25 percent out of the poverty program, and cutting almost equivalent amounts in foreign aid, and various other cuts which would result in obtaining a $7-billion reduction, which is the other body's approach to this problem, we have to be for something affirmative.

We cannot let our conferees go into conference without affirmative action by the Senate. In my judgment, we can bargain much more by adoption of the Mundt amendment.

I hope by now the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] has ascertained the facts involved in this amendment. The 5 percent applies to $38 billion. That is roughly a reduction of $1.9 billion which could be envisaged. I am willing to take my chances with that kind of reduction on a total of about $40 billion rather than have a mandatory and enforced reduction, on a meat-ax basis, on the order of $7 billion, materially crippling major programs.

The other point I wish to make is that the Congress, in my judgment, will be faced with a tax surcharge, a tax increase, dictated by the inflationary situation in the economy. As a member of the Joint Economic Committee and other economic committees, I think Members of the Senate have reason to believe that I know something of what I am talking about in the economic field.

I deeply believe we shall be faced with these decisions. A tax surcharge of 10 percent would mean a reduction of the deficit by about $7 billion. A deficit of $29 billion is completely unacceptable. In my judgment, a reasonably acceptable budget deficit under the circumstances is somewhere in the range of $14 billion to $15 billion.

In my judgment we must take three closely related steps to deal with the fiscal situation of this country today, before any tax increase is enacted.

First, the administration must reevaluate its spending priorities.

Second, in order to cut down on the deficit, we must bring about a reduction in expenditures. We have already reduced expenditures by reductions of $2.5 billion in appropriation bills. The Mundt amendment will bring about a reduction of another $2 billion. It is logical to expect that another $2 billion reduction will be made in the appropriation bills which remain to be considered. In two of those, I, myself, am a conferee.

For the remainder, I would urge the President to send to Congress his long-delayed message on tax reform and press hard for at least some realistic measures to close loopholes in our tax laws, for example, in the oil-depletion allowance, which is certainly not for the benefit of anybody but those in the oil business, and I urge him to think about the benefit received, amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars every year, by people who might otherwise buy railroad cars, airplanes, and other equipment, but who can rent them and thereby get a tax advantage. I refer to such high-cost capital goods as computers.

Those are the three things I recommend by which the American people can meet the inflationary situation which faces us. As everybody knows, I am not given to cutting or economizing necessarily per se, but in this instance the interests of the country call for accepting Senator Mundt's approach as intelligent and reasonable in preference to the meat-ax approach of the other body. I am going to take what is the more promising approach for the things I believe in most.

The Senate has an opportunity to decide today what contribution it is willing to make in dealing with the $29-billion deficit facing the country at a time when the economy is operating at a relatively high level and the threat of inflation is looming ahead.

It is not easy for many of us to support any cuts in Federal programs, as many of these programs represent important answers to the principal social and economic problems facing millions of the American people. But unless we show the American people that we are willing to make some cuts—as proposed by the Mundt amendment—they will be justifiably angry at the Congress for even talking about a tax surcharge.

I am firmly convinced that once some cuts are effected in Federal spending and the President makes serious proposals to the Congress for some reform of our tax system, both the people and Congress will be ready to listen to the President's case for a tax surcharge, should conditions continue to warrant it.

The country is facing extremely difficult economic conditions today. Even if a tax surcharge were passed, the fiscal year 1968 budget will have the largest administrative budget deficit since World War II. Even with a tax increase, prices may rise as much as they did last year—which recorded the highest rise since 1957. Inflationary psychology is taking hold. Cost pressures are increasing with wage demands far exceeding the now defunct wage-price guidelines. The new settlement reached between Ford and the United Auto Workers—an estimated 7-percent-a-year increase in wages and benefits—confirms the seriousness of our situation. And interest rates are again heading toward the historic highs that were reached in 1966. Whether a tax surcharge will be enacted or not, high interest rates are going to be a fact of life at least for 1968, if not longer.

Clearly, the repeated and serious errors of judgment in the design and the execution of economic policy in 1966 have contributed to our present predicament. Our economy is in trouble and restoring balanced growth is bound to be a painful and prolonged exercise.

I support the Mundt amendment because I believe, under present circumstances, it is, in respect of appropriations, the best way out. At the same time, I reaffirm my belief that the Federal Government, in close cooperation with private enterprise and State and local government, must accept responsibility for remedying major national ills. I believe that even under present circumstances of extreme fiscal stringency caused by Vietnam, these major national problems, including those involving our cities and the poor, must be dealt with effectively. I believe that if modest cuts are made across the board, and we begin to work on making our tax structure more equitable and give serious consideration to a modest tax increase effective some time early next year, we will have dealt with the country's fiscal situation in a responsible manner. Should the steps I outlined be taken, we would still be left with a budget deficit of close to $15 billion. I believe that considering the costs of the Vietnam war—$2 billion a month—this country could live with a deficit of that size, but a higher deficit under existing economic conditions is unacceptable.

Therefore, facing the facts of life, I shall vote to support the Mundt amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I inquire what distribution has been made of the time thus far consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 7 minutes remaining. The Senator from Arizona has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. I would assume, then, that the Senator from Arizona would like to participate in this debate at this juncture.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arizona, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as I stated a while ago with reference to the Williams amendment, I am surprised indeed, by the source from which these proposals come. I have heard the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Delaware inveigh repeatedly on this floor and elsewhere against the giving of too great power to the Executive. I have heard them complain that the legislative department was surrendering too much of its power to the executive department. Yet now we find these two fine Senators the authors of proposals which would, if passed, surrender more power to the present President with reference to the expenditure of funds and with reference to the increase or decrease in expenditures than has been the case in any act that I know of that has ever been passed heretofore.

The Senator from South Dakota has referred to the act of 1951. I have gone back and reviewed that situation very carefully. The fact is that in 1951, in the middle of the Korean war, we did give to President Truman the authority to cut out $551 million, with certain instructions. It was a specific amount, which is not the case here at all. It was a much smaller amount than is involved here, and it was against a background completely different from what we have here; because, in that entire session of Congress, the reductions of the budget figures by the various committees and by the various acts totaled only $1.9 billion, compared to reductions already made in this session of more than $5 billion.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Just a moment.

Mr. President, I have been predicting for some weeks that we would have reductions in the appropriations, from the budget recommendations, of more than $5 billion. Some have smiled; some have laughed at that prediction. But the fact is that right now we have exceeded that prediction, because we have cut more than $5 billion from the budget appropriations recommended by the administration.

I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Am I correct or incorrect in believing that the Senator from Florida unintentionally misspoke when he said we had already cut $5 billion? Is he not talking about the total of what we have cut and what additional amounts he hopes to cut?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; I am talking about what we have cut already, including two cuts made this morning by conference committees, and estimating the smallest figures possible for cuts in the three remaining bills.

Mr. MUNDT. Then the Senator is anticipating future actions.

Mr. HOLLAND. And we are figuring no cut for the supplemental bill, and have figured the cuts for the military construction bill and for the foreign aid bill at the lowest possible figures, based on the information that is before us.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the fact remain——

Mr. HOLLAND. Considering those, the present cuts—and I am sure they will be well in excess of this figure when we get through—total $5,147 million.

I yield again.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not arguing what we may do. I am asking, is not the Senator incorrect to say that we have already made the cuts? He is hoping and anticipating; so am I. But will the Senator tell us what we have already cut?

Mr. HOLLAND. We have already cut $3,356,000,000, plus $315 million cut out this morning, which is $3,671,000,000. In addition to that, we have figured the cuts on the bills yet ahead at what seems to me to be the most reasonable figure possible; that is, the highest figure proposed by either House, or the highest figure in the authorization.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the Senator misspoke himself then. He said we have already cut $6 billion.

Mr. HOLLAND. We have already cut $3.671 billion, and the further cuts which are sure to be made, because they are the lowest cuts that can be made under the authorizations outstanding, will run that total to $5.147 billion.

I say to my friend, I think the cuts we are going to make in foreign aid are going to be bigger than we have figured here, because I think they will be bigger than the existing authorization permits. I think the cuts we will make in military construction will be bigger than we have figured here. But I am just stating that as of right now, we have an assurance of cutting $5.147 billion, and my prediction now is that the actual figure will be nearer $5.5 billion when we get through.

My distinguished friend probably does not know that we concluded this morning conferences on the space appropriations bill and on the independent offices, and raised the cuts already made and approved yesterday by both Houses by a total of an additional $315 million.

Mr. MUNDT. I am aware of that, and I heard the Senator say that. Of course, that is included in his calculations.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his questioning. I ask for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In behalf of the Senator from Arizona, I yield the Senator from Florida 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield such time as the Senator desires.

Mr. HOLLAND. The fact is that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has already indicated, by his line of questioning, that he has no confidence in our ability to cut. His amendment is addressed to what will be the case after we get through appropriating. He has shown no confidence in what the Senate will do, what the House will do, or what Congress will do. The Senator from Florida expressed high confidence weeks ago—even the Director of the Budget questioned my recommendations and beliefs at the recent hearings, which were attended by the Senator from South Dakota. It has now been made clear that the Senator from Florida was conservative, because I then underestimated the actual cuts that are being made.

My own feeling, Mr. President, is that this proposal is a proposal to vote no confidence in the Senate, in the House of Representatives or in Congress in handling these matters, and, instead, to say that we cannot do the job, and that when we get through, notwithstanding the fact that we know what the economic condition is, we want the Executive to apply an additional 5-percent cut to all controllable items, which, as I have figured them here, would be about $1.9 billion.

I yield again.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator wishes to define this as a no-confidence vote, the Senator from South Dakota will accept that definition, and relate it to the situation, as he sees it, now confronting Congress and the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator wishes me to yield for a question, I will be happy to do so, but not for a speech. I am on controlled time.

Mr. MUNDT. Is this not then, really, a no-confidence vote on the theory that if we expect to save $6 billion against a $26-billion deficit, that such a saving is enough? That is the kind of no-confidence vote it is. We have done a little, but we have not done enough.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator's amendment clearly shows no confidence in the Senate or the House of Representatives, because he plainly says:

> Subsequent to the enactment into law during the first session of the 90th Congress of the appropriation bills for fiscal year 1968—

That is, after we have done the best we can—

> the executive branch is directed, subject to subsection (b)—

Which is the transferability section—

> to reduce by at least 5 percent each line item appropriation—

which is controlled.

Mr. President, if that is not an expression of no confidence, an expression that he does not believe we are going to do our duty, that he does not believe we understand the economic situation, that he does not believe we would be able to take care of our people, I do not know what that amendment is.

Mr. President, I am especially distressed that this amendment comes from the distinguished Senator, because it strikes peculiarly at some of the very appropriations he has urged in the subcommittee which I head, and of which he is a distinguished member, or has been in the past, and in the full Appropriations Committee, and on the floor of the Senate time after time.

I refer back to the REA appropriations. Each year since I have been chairman of that subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has tried to raise substantially the budget amount. He did the same thing this year. We did raise the amount to some extent. However, that item was reduced in conference, so that we are now back to the budget figure.

The point I make is that the Senate is now asked to reduce that budget recommended amount again by 5 percent.

I received from the Department of Agriculture a preliminary statement showing how it interpreted the reduction would apply.

The statement contains the items to which that 5-percent reduction would be directed. I do not have the time to read the entire list as I would like to do, but for REA loans, the reduction could amount to $58.9 million. I think the Senator would almost have a spasm were I to say that he is now suggesting a cut in the budget amount on REA appropriations of $58.9 million.

The Agriculture Subcommittee has been very greatly interested in the Farmers Home Administration loan programs. Again, the Senator from South Dakota frequently has wanted to exceed the budget amount, and he did so again this year. In the statement I have received from the Secretary of Agriculture, he states that this amount might be reduced by $45.6 million.

To my mind, the position now taken by the distinguished Senator is completely inconsistent with the stand of his party, which is not to surrender legislative power to the executive and with his own position taken time after time on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere, and it is entirely inconsistent with the position he has taken in the Appropriations Committee, not only heretofore, but also in this present year and in the passage of these particular bills. And I am referring now to the REA items and the Farmers Home Administration loan items in the agricultural appropriations bill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Did I correctly understand the senior Senator from Florida to say that it would mean a reduction of $58.9 million in the REA loans?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have a statement from the Secretary of Agriculture in which he states that $58.9 million might be the cut in the REA loans and, on the Farmers Home Administration loans, it could be $45.6 million.

The Senator is forgetting, I think, that transferability is given, and he is forgetting that the duty will fall upon the executive branch, and that means largely upon the secretaries in the various departments, to decide where the reductions, as directed against all controllable items, will be applied.

When I see that the Secretary of Agriculture says that the crop insurance program will be subject to a cut of $5.9 million in funds, that makes me most anxious. And when I see that the REA loans will be subject to a cut of $58.9 million, it makes me anxious. And when I see that the Farmers Home Administration loans will be subjected to a cut of $45.6 million, it makes me anxious.

These possible reductions disturb me very much. The Senator from North Dakota has repeatedly shown his interest in all three programs. The Senator from South Dakota has done the same thing.

I call attention to the fact that if the Senators have not thought this matter through, now is the time to do so. The Senators are taking positions that are completely inconsistent with the positions they have taken on the floor of the Senate, in speeches they have made, and in committee. I hope that they will reconsider their position.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, $58.9 million would figure out to more than 20 percent of the loan authorization.

The Secretary can, of course, withhold all the funds if he wants to. The President of the United States last year held up some $40 million or $50 million, most of it until the last day.

The administration can rip up all of the appropriation, if they want to do so, and it can withhold this amount of money without the Mundt amendment.

Where the Secretary of Agriculture, however, gets the figure of $58.9 million is more than I can understand. This is being very unfair to the sponsors of the bill and to the farmers of this Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, all I can say is that the Secretary has given me that information, and I have put it where Senators may see it and realize that what they are being asked to vote for is something that may very seriously harm programs in which they are vitally interested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the senior Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am afraid that the wrong impression has been unconsciously given, and that the figures indicated by the senior Senator from Florida do not constitute the entire power that would be given under the pending amendment.

As I read the amendment, the President is directed to reduce by at least 5 percent each line item appropriation, other than the appropriations for military functions and items determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

So what we are voting on under the Mundt amendment is to give the power to the President to reduce not by 5 percent, but by as much as 100 percent the items outlined on page 29801 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The President can reduce the agricultural appropriation by $3,900,000,00 if he so desires. He can reduce the appropriations for the Corps of Engineers by $1,300,000,000 under the Mundt amendment. He can reduce the appropriation for Housing and Urban Redevelopment by $1,100,000,000. The President can reduce the appropriation for the Post Office by $585,000,000, over half a billion dollars.

Under the Mundt amendment the President would have the power to cut appropriations on certain items 100 percent.

The only way that I see to correct the situation would be to offer an amendment that the President must cut appropriations by 5 percent, but by no more than 10 percent. We should have some limitation, or we are empowering the President and his agencies to withhold or cut the entire amount of an appropriation. The Mundt amendment is unlimited with respect to the amount of reduction that can be made.

When we say that the President must cut appropriations by at least 5 percent, we are saying, in spite of all the arguments that have been made, that $1,600,000,000 of veterans' benefits are subject to reduction. The amount of the reduction will be at least 5 percent, or any amount more that the President might wish to make.

This constitutes a direction to the President, and I think the matter should be clarified so that there is some ceiling short of 100 percent that can be cut from the funds that Congress has allocated after many months of effort. The Senator has stated that $5 billion has been cut already from the President's budget.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. The list placed in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is a list furnished by the Director of the Budget. That list shows that $1,600 million of the Veterans' Administration's appropriations are subject to the cut. That is, they are controlled.

The remainder of the Veterans' appropriations is not controlled. That means the items for retirement, for disability payments, and for pensions are not controlled. However, the $1,600 million item is controlled.

Mr. President, I have had a regular outpouring of protests from citizens in my State and from organizations including the American Legion, the Veterans of

Foreign Wars, the Disabled Army Veterans, and other groups who say:

"This is aimed at our hospital projects and our medical protection and all of the other things except uncontrollable items."

Those uncontrolled items are few, and I have already named them.

I do not see how my distinguished friends can urge the Senate to direct such a meat-ax approach to that huge sum, $1.6 billion in veterans' appropriations.

Mr. President, I hope they will recant, and I hope they will decide that they cannot go along with this approach.

As the Senator from Oklahoma knows, I suggested in committee that there be a ceiling put on the cuts that could be made. The Senator from Oklahoma has correctly stated the situation, that when this cut of at least 5 percent is made in every controllable item, then cuts can be made wherever the executive wants to make them. We all know how the executive branch feels toward certain of our most cherished objectives.

Mr. President, I hope that we shall defeat this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to state for the Record, without encumbering it with the actual wires themselves the list of wires which I have received from veterans and other organizations in connection with this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the entire list be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

1. Telegram from Ralph A. Johnson, State Adjutant, American Legion, Orlando, Florida.
2. Telegram from Francis J. Beaton, National Commander, Disabled American Veterans, Washington, D.C.
3. Telegram from Charles N. Girard, National Representative, Disabled American Veterans, assigned to VA Regional Hospitals, St. Petersburg, Florida.
4. Telegram from Vance M. Watson, Commander, Department of Florida, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Ocala, Florida.
5. Letter from Howard M. Duncanson, Senior Vice Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Florida, Hollywood, Florida.
6. Telegram from Melvin T. Dixon, State Service Officer, VA Regional Center, St. Petersburg, Florida.
7. Telegram from Thomas F. Kehoe, President, County Service Offices Association, St. Petersburg, Florida.
8. Telegram from Dr. William C. Ruffin, Jr., President, Florida Psychiatric Society, Gainesville, Florida.
9. Telegram from Dr. Hayden C. Nicholson, Vice President for Medical Affairs, University of Miami School of Medicine.
10. Telegram from Robert D. Partridge, Acting General Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Mr. HOLLAND. I also see my distinguished friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], in the Chamber.

I have had wires from the heads of various mental health and psychiatric groups, insisting that they not be subjected to this cut, and that the research which is protecting those groups not be subjected to this inhuman cut; and I certainly add my voice to that plea.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield, if my time permits.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I suggest, in the interest of accuracy, that the Senator separate his list of wires with respect to those that deplore the House action and those that are directed against the Mundt amendment, because there is a difference in the wires received.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is some difference. Yet, the amount being shot at now happens to be the same, because our cut in the appropriations process is going to be over $5 billion, and the Senator's amendment requests an additional $2 billion cut, or $7 billion, and that is what they were aiming at in the House. So far as I am concerned, I see no substantial difference.

We are asking that mutilation be directed against certain of the appropriations which most of us hold very, very dear, particularly those of us who have served in the Armed Forces. I shall never be a party to applying such a huge cut against the Veterans' Administration program.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Under the House action, by a substantial majority, a $7 billion cut would be required. Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, a $5 billion cut would be required.

Mr. HOLLAND. No.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Under the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, about $2 billion would be cut. It seems to me that this is the lowest possible further cut we would want to make in the Senate, if we believe in economy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, to the contrary, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, in his remarks of yesterday made it clear that he was shooting at a $7 billion cut—$5 billion from the committee and $2 billion in addition through his amendment. I ask unanimous consent, to save time, that three portions of his remarks in the Record of yesterday be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts From Senator Mundt's Remarks of October 24, 1967, Congressional Record, Page 29808

The statistics are about as follows. The Congress has economized to the extent of about $2 billion on the appropriation bills which we have thus far enacted, which means that we have given the President about $2 billion less than he requested. That is an economy brought about by congressional action. On the remaining appropriation bills that are in conference or that have not yet been enacted, it is hoped we can save another $2 billion or perhaps $3 billion. This means that we expect to reduce the Presidential requests by a total effort of from $4 to $5 billion.

By this amendment we will slash back from controllable expenditures approximately another $2 billion. So we will wind up with a total congressional saving, if my amendmend is adopted, as against the budgetary requests of the President, of between $6 and $7 billion. That is almost the precise amount the President says he will get by taking it away from the taxpayers with a 10-percent surtax, if Congress makes it possible for him to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield time.

There should be some relevancy, some accuracy, in this debate.

The Senator from Florida has to know that his criticism is completely mistaken, when he says that my amendment would result in a $7 billion cut. The $2 billion has been cut. I wish I could claim credit for that, but I cannot. The $3, $4, or $5 billion he expects to be cut, if he cuts it, will be cut in the future. So neither can I claim credit for that.

My amendment deals with the residue which has not been cut, which is a maximum now of $1.9 billion; and any attempt to twist the semantics to make it appear that my amendment makes a greater cut falls into an arithmetical pitfall. It is wrong. You cannot argue with the multiplication table.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator interpret the meaning of "to reduce by not less than 5 percent each line item other than appropriated for military functions and those items determined by the Bureau of the Budget?"

We have a list to which he referred; $38 billion is controllable, and the Senator is proposing to cut this amount by not less than 5 percent. It can go to 100 percent, if the President wishes. This is the greatest grant of power I have ever seen offered by a Senator on the floor during my service in the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me point this out. I am not going to repeat it another time, because if the Senator will not listen, he will not.

I have said that I have put this in conformity with the law written in 1951. It is the law. You cannot change that.

The Senator's repetition of "5 percent" reminds me of Abraham Lincoln's unlikely experience, when he spoke of a debate he was having in a courtroom:

> Simply continuing to call the tail of a calf a leg is never going to prove that a calf has five legs.

The Senator's repetition of "at least 5 percent, at least 5 percent, at least 5 percent" will not change the law. Under the law and under my amendment he is not required to cut any specific line item in the slightest if he feels such a cut is unwise.

I yield to the Senator from Mississippi as much time as he requires.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I do not wish to be selfish with the time.

Mr. President, I said a few minutes ago that this is not the best way to reduce appropriations. But it is the second best way. I believe it is the only way left this year to make these reductions, and my overwhelming conviction is that we must move into this problem. We are facing a problem. It has a practical side.

There has been talk during the debate of cutting the appropriations for veterans' psychiatric wards. I do not believe that anyone—the President or Congress—will reduce money under this amendment for a psychiatric ward or any other need of a veteran. As I understand the figures, the reduction under this amendment could be no larger than $7 billion.

The Senator from Arkansas is very regular in his principles and what he stands for, but there still is an opportunity for him to reduce the programs he does not like in the bills that must come before the Senate. That is when a fight can be made with respect to them, and I know that he will fight them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is difficult, from my observation here, to get any encouragement, because the people who voted for these programs now come in and vote for a reduction.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Senator will have an opportunity to reduce them, quite frankly. He will have his day in court.

Mr. President, we already are faced with a deficit of approximately $29 billion. The deficit is mounting, and now the war is costing approximately $2½ billion a month. This is causing inflation, which is now with us, resulting in rising prices for the middle income, the lower income, the so-called little families, the little people.

I understand that already this year we have had an estimated 3-percent rise in prices due to inflation; perhaps it will be 4 percent next year. That would mean a 7-percent increase in 2 years, if the figures are accurate. I do not know whether they are. It is estimated that within 10 years, even if the increase is only 2½ percent per year, we will have inflation of 25 percent, which cuts into the very bone and muscle of every dollar a person has to spend.

When are we going to make an effort to stop it? If not in this bill, when?

We will have a supplemental bill before us in a few days. A year ago a bill that was supposed to take care of only deficiencies contained an appropriation of over $5 billion. That is the so-called supplemental bill. It is only supposed to cover deficiencies. I do not know what the amount will be this year. The figures I have given do not include the military. I suppose the amount will be somewhat less, but it will be a large sum of money—on and on and on.

This January, we had a supplemental appropriation for the military program on facts that had been known for a long time. This January, it ran over $12 billion. The January before, it was $13 billion.

That is what drives me to the conclusion I have reached. I do not like the idea of delegating authority to the President on these items. Who does? However, we are up against a situation here where the legislative year is virtually over, and I submit that something has to be done.

Mr. President, this is a mild, modest, small deduction. Do not be frightened by some of the scary stories. What is being said about this amendment could be said against any amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi on the joint resolution.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I did not know there was any further time available for debate.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that time has run out on Congress and more particularly time has run out on the Senate. I think we have to fill in this void, accept this challenge, go to conference with something positive on our side of the bill, and do the best we can to meet the situation with the House conferees. There is every reason to believe they would be reasonable about this matter; but until we show some kind of action on this side by a recorded vote I do not believe we are going to fulfill our responsibility, and I do not believe we are going to get much of a drive started to make these reductions. Many Senators, myself included, have voted for the appropriations that would now be cut. Perhaps we wish we could take back some of those votes.

Mr. President, I plead with the Senate not to go off on the sideline, but try to do something to meet this real problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the statement prepared for me by the Committee on Appropriations showing savings already accomplished and reasonably expected to be accomplished in the three remaining bills.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF ACTION ON BUDGET ESTIMATES OF "APPROPRIATIONS" IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, FISCAL YEAR 1968, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF OCT. 25, 1967

(1)	Budget estimates considered by House (2)	Passed House (3)	Budget estimates considered by Senate (4)	Passed Senate (5)	Enacted or Senate conference amount (6)	Plus (+) or minus (−) latest action compared to budget (7)
Bills for fiscal 1968, passed Senate and House:						
Treasury-Post Office	$7,613,787,000	$7,499,230,000	$7,615,148,000	$7,555,167,000	$7,545,641,000	−$69,507,000
Interior	1,443,793,000	1,365,310,150	1,458,218,000	1,399,359,550	1,382,848,350	−75,369,650
Loan and contract authorizations	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(16,200,000)	(−14,500,000)
Independent offices-HUD	10,804,642,700	10,013,178,782	10,820,513,700	10,514,830,900	[1] 10,139,473,900	−681,039,800
Contract authorization	(40,000,000)	----------	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(−30,000,000)
Labor-HEW	13,322,603,000	13,137,488,000	13,424,146,000	13,421,660,000	13,276,071,000	−148,075,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	2,342,942,000	2,194,026,500	2,347,803,195	2,186,105,500	2,169,012,500	−178,790,695
Legislative	231,311,132	228,089,952	276,005,210	275,885,804	275,699,035	−306,175
Agriculture	5,021,097,400	4,770,580,950	5,021,097,400	6,782,529,789	4,952,945,700	−68,151,700
Loan authorization	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(909,000,000)	(859,600,000)	----------
Defense	71,584,000,000	70,295,200,000	71,584,000,000	70,132,320,000	69,936,620,000	−1,647,380,000
Transportation	1,718,618,772	1,530,198,372	1,718,618,772	1,651,407,272	1,581,905,772	−136,713,000
Public Works	4,867,813,000	4,622,922,000	4,867,813,000	4,776,064,000	[3] 4,712,813,000	−155,000,000
NASA	5,100,000,000	4,583,400,000	5,100,000,000	4,678,900,000	[4] 4,588,900,000	−511,100,000
Subtotal, 1968 bills, passed Senate and House	124,050,608,004	120,239,624,706	124,233,363,277	123,374,229,815	120,561,930,257	−3,671,433,020
Bills for fiscal 1968, not passed:						
Military construction	2,937,000,000	2,142,693,000	2,937,000,000	----------	[5] 2,142,693,000	−794,307,000
Foreign assistance	3,818,736,000	----------	3,818,736,000	----------	[6] 3,137,113,000	−681,623,000
Supplemental (poverty, etc.)	2,284,949,000	----------	2,284,949,000	----------	[7] 2,284,949,000	----------
Federal payment and Federal loan appropriation, District of Columbia	113,099,000	113,099,000	113,099,000	----------	[8] 113,099,000	----------
Subtotal, 1968 bills, not passed	9,153,784,000	----------	9,153,784,000	----------	7,677,854,000	−1,475,930,000
Grand total	133,204,392,004	----------	133,387,147,277	----------	128,239,784,257	−5,147,363,020

[1] Final conference figure.
[2] Assumes Senate position, which is $20,661,000 over amount considered as House position.
[3] Assumes Senate figure of $225,000,000 for water pollution, $22,000,000 over House position.
[4] Final conference figure.
[5] Assumes House-passed figure will prevail.
[6] Assumes Senate authorization figure for title I and budget estimate on other titles.
[7] Assumes entire amount of budget estimate will be approved.
[8] Assumes House-passed figure will prevail.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to read some of the words of the Senator from South Dakota which appear on page 29808 where he said:

> This means that we expect to reduce the presidential requests by a total effort of from $4 billion to $5 billion—
>
> Incidentally, as I have just shown that amount will be over $5 billion—
>
> By this amendment we will slash back from controllable expenditures approximately another $2 billion. So we will wind up with a total congressional saving, if my amendment is adopted, as against the budgetary requests of the President, of between $6 billion and $7 billion.

It now appears the amount will be over $7 billion in view of the latest developments.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and it will be a brief quorum. I suggest it be taken out of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I had requested an additional 5 minutes on the bill primarily to respond to my congenial and able friend from Florida. For some reason or other, he has elected to make me the target of his remarks for about 20 minutes. I do not object to that. That is the responsibility of one who wishes to offer to economize in this country; and those who do not believe in the economizing single you out. I asked for it, and I got it. However, if he thinks he is going to frighten me out of fighting for economy because maybe some project in South Dakota may have to bear the burden of a cut, he is wrong. That may be so south of the Mason and Dixon Line, but not in the West. We are prepared to accept our share.

Second, I am appalled at the scare tactics he applied. I am surprised at the scare tactics he employed. He tells us, "Don't do this or $50 million will be taken off REA." Five percent, my friends, of the REA appropriation, if he took the whole 5 percent suggested, would be $20 million. But you do not have to encourage this fellow in the White House if he decides to be against REA. He took off over $50 million 2 years ago and corrective action had to be taken by the Senate. We had to move to rescind his action and we did. We could again put it back on the first supplementary bill that comes along. There was reference also to the veterans appropriations. If the President were to do that, he would use a malicious meat ax to beat people on the head. I challenge him to do it and get by with it, if the Senator from Florida has so little confidence in his demonstrating good judgment.

I do not share that lack of confidence. I do not think the President would engage in that business. Of course, it would be possible to do so under the law of the land as it prevails today.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. According to the figures given us by the Bureau of the Budget $3.9 billion would be subject to cut, in the agriculture appropriations bill and 5 percent of that amount would be about $200 million.

I refuse to believe that the Secretary of Agriculture is so against REA that he would apply more than a fourth of the mandatory cut to REA, when the repayment is about 100 percent. I refuse to believe he is that poorly advised. I know he is a poor Secretary of Agriculture in some ways, but not that bad.

Mr. MUNDT. The Secretary of Agriculture was sort of the leading advocate of expenditures in his State. He finally lost out as Governor because his State had gone into debt.

He is now a part of the President's team. This could happen if one has no confidence in his President. Here is one Republican who says that he does not believe the President is going to act with that kind of malice. If he does we can correct it. I do not think he will but should he do so, we have our own weapons available to correct such intemperate actions.

I would like to point out further that the Senator from Florida suggested that it could be taken away from the veterans, and they paraded a lot of amputees and serious mental cases around and said that is where the President would take it out. I do not know what kind of cruel person these Senators think the President is to believe and predict he would take the big meat ax against them. But we could correct such action also in the first bill that comes along and we would, and Senators know that we would.

With respect to most of the wires that the Senator from Florida read into the RECORD to the effect "don't touch the Mundt amendment," some people do not want any cut. I have discovered that when people do not want any economies they are most anxious to find arguments to support the position of spending. They talk about the possibility the President might cut this off or that off and do a lot of things which no responsible man would do, and consequently destroy certain functions of government.

Mr. President, it simply gets down to this: Do we want to do something about economy? This is the least you can do. Or would you like to send conferees of the Senate over to the House of Representatives emptyhanded, just carrying a couple of bottles of red ink and saying "Show us the conference report—no cut." Or do you want to send a constructive proposal over so we will have the entire problem before us in conference and out of this resolve the most sensible, effective, and efficient method to produce reductions in spending?

If we slap the House in the face, if we say to the 110 majority that voted for some cuts, "You are wrong; we do not have to economize," we shall be following the philosophy of Harry Hopkins—"Spend, spend, spend; bring on your tax bill."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield myself 5 more minutes on the bill.

It is important that we look at the situation rationally. It is easy to get excited; it is easy to get emotional. But this is, after all, a mathematical problem.

I am pleading now for five votes. The Williams of Delaware amendment was lost by nine votes. Since then, four Senators have announced themselves. They have come to me and said they will vote for my amendment. I need the other five votes. The country needs the other five. The taxpayers need the other five. With those five votes, we can switch the movement so that we can do something constructive and effective for economy.

I make the plea: Let us not repudiate the House. Let us not reject the House thrust toward economy. Let us take this 5-percent reduction amendment to the House. It will not be the final legislation. It will have to be discussed, analyzed, amended, and changed. It can be changed in any way we want to change it in the conference between the Senate and the House. But if we vote in favor of the amendment, we will join the House in one important declaration. The House has declared that it wants economy. The House has taken one approach. By agreeing to this amendment, we shall have declared that we want economy, and we offer another approach. Within those two directives, the resolution can come back to us for our consideration of any proposal resembling some economy, and we can look at it again.

We will have complete latitude to do anything but spend more money. We will have complete latitude in the conference to do anything to economize. This will open the door for a meaningful movement toward economy.

One final word: What are we going to do when the tax bill comes up? I wonder if any other Senators have said what I have said: That we are not going to vote for a tax bill unless something is done toward economy, unless we have done something to reduce expenditures. I have said that; I am standing on it. I am sure others have said the same.

We are confronted with a logjam. The House Committee on Ways and Means will not meet; the Senate Committee on Finance is not meeting on taxes. Congress says it will not tell the President where to cut. The President says he wants Congress to tell him where to cut. So we are stuck.

But while we delay, inflation marches forward steadily every day, imposing the most iniquitous tax of all on the people of our respective States, taking out of the households of America bits and pieces of coin every day.

We cannot close our eyes and say, "Go away. Let us delay this until November 15." How much smaller will the deficit be 2 weeks from now? It is time we faced up to the task of economizing. It is going to be a long conference, believe me, no matter what we do. We ought to provide some constructive guidelines.

We should say, "Mr. President, we will break the logjam. We will cooperate. We will go so far as to tell you how much money we want to save. We will name the places where you can save it; then you should proceed to reduce expenditures. We will give you flexibility, but we think you should cooperate." My amendment is cooperation. It is a step in advance.

I do not think our constituents are appealed to greatly by the fact that we say, "We stand on our own. Make the President cut first. He stands on his own." So why not cooperate?

I realize I am in a curious position as a Republican pleading the cause of Democrats, asking them to show some confidence in their President. But I have offered an amendment which I believe will do the right thing in being cooperative with the President. Some Democrats ought to be making this speech. I think we ought to have some confidence in the President in this effort to economize. We know he is making monumental decisions every day, decisions of far greater importance to the country, perhaps, than we make here today. If we have no more confidence in him than that, I think we are in serious condition and the country is in serious peril.

I am like the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I am glad we have effectuated some economies. I hope we will effectuate some more on our remaining appropriations bills. But I am disappointed that we are not doing better. I am proposing that we do more. I am proposing that we add an extra $2 billion to whatever amount we have saved and whatever we expect to save on the few remaining bills. Even then, when we are all finished, we will still be woefully short of meeting the challenge of a $26 billion or a $29 billion deficit and the President's persistent demands for more tax revenue.

We can ill-afford to brag about the dollars we have cut back from an inflated Presidential estimate. That is all we have done. Now we must reconcile ourselves to the facts. I urge that we do so. I urge all Senators to cast their votes in such a way as not to discourage this economy effort, not to reject it, but by an affirmative vote send to conference another workable approach to the problem of economy.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Budget Director, as I mentioned earlier, listed for the Appropriations Committee some 75 controllable programs of the Federal Government. The list was not complete, but it included the major items. As reflected in the printed hearings, the Director discussed the dollar level of these controllable programs. These are the agencies, the bureaus, and the individual programs which would be affected by the Mundt amendment.

As I mentioned earlier, it is impossible to tell where the cuts would be made because of the discretion given to the President. But I have made some rough calculations to see how a 5-percent cut would work out in dollar terms. And bear in mind that these are additional cuts. Before they would be made, the original budget request would already have been whittled down, step by step, by the department head, the Budget Bureau, the President, the House Appropriations Committee, and the full House, the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the full Senate.

Throughout these stages, experts with sharp pencils have been at work. The figure from which the following additional reductions would be taken can hardly have any real fat left. All of the following reductions would have the full, direct dollar impact on the programs themselves.

The list is a long one. I hesitate to impose on my colleagues a full reading of all of the items. But perhaps this is the only way to finally bring home to us the meaning of what we are considering here. One last thing to bear in mind—these are the dollar cuts required by the Mundt amendment.

Department of Agriculture: Food for peace, Public Law 480, $89 million; rural electrification loans, $22 million; Forest Service, $12 million; Agricultural Research Service, $12 million; school lunch, $10 million; food stamp, $10 million; special milk, $5 million; watershed protection projects, $4 million; Farmers Home Administration, water and waste disposal grants, $2 million; Farmers Home Administration, salaries and expenses, $3 million.

Department of Commerce: Economic development assistance, $20 million; weather and other environmental services, $9 million; Maritime Administration, ship construction, $7 million; Census, $3 million.

Corps of Engineers: General construction, $49 million; other, $17 million.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Education, elementary and secondary educational activities, $84 million; Office of Education, higher educational activities, $59 million; Office of Education, school assistance in federally affected areas, $22 million; Office of Education, expansion and improvement of vocational education, $13 million; Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health and National Institute of Mental Health, $77 million; Public Health Service, construction of health educational facilities, $10 million; Public Health Service, health manpower education, $9 million; Public Health Service, other disease prevention and environmental control programs, $8 million; grants for maternal and child welfare, $12 million; hospital construction Hill-Burton, $15 million.

Department of Housing and Urban Development: Model cities program, $33 million; water and sewer grants, $8 million; housing for the elderly or handicapped, $4 million.

Department of the Interior: Bureau of Indian Affairs, $11 million; construction grants for waste treatment works, $10 million; land and water conservation, $6 million; fisheries and wildlife programs, $5 million; Bureau of Reclamation, construction and rehabilitation, $9 million; power marketing agencies, $8 million; water supply and water pollution control, $5 million.

Department of Justice: Federal Bureau of Investigation, $9 million; legal activities and administration, $5 million; Immigration and Naturalization Service, $4 million.

Department of Labor: Manpower development and training activities, $20 million; wage and labor standards, $2 million.

Post Office Department: Plant and equipment, $10 million; administration and regional operation, $5 million; Research development and engineering, $1 million.

Department of State: Administration of foreign affairs, $11 million; educational exchange, $3 million.

Department of Transportation: Coast Guard, $26 million; supersonic transport, $10 million; other Federal Aviation Administration, $34 million; Federal Highway Administration, $3 million.

Treasury Department: Internal Revenue Service, $35 million; Bureau of Customs, $4 million; Bureaus of Public Debt and Accounts, $5 million.

Economic Assistance—Agency for International Development: Loans and guarantee programs, $65 million; Vietnam supporting assistance, $28 million; grants and other, $39 million.

Atomic Energy Commission: Operating expenses, $109 million; plant and capital equipment, $24 million.

General Services Administration: Operation of public buildings, $13 million; repair, improvement and construction of public buildings, $8 million.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Research and development, $200 million; administrative operations, $30 million.

National Science Foundation: Salaries and expenses, $26 million.

Office of Economic Opportunity: Community action programs, $51 million; Job Corps, $15 million; work and training programs, $32 million.

U.S. Information Agency: Salaries and expenses, $9 million; radio facilities, $1 million.

Veterans' Administration: Medical care, $68 million; general operating expenses, $9 million.

I urge the rejection of the Mundt amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield back the remainder of my time, unless it has all been used.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska, [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the

Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 300 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Allott
Baker
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Griffin
Hansen
Hickenlooper
Hollings
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McGovern
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Russell
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—46

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Ellender
Fong
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Pell
Randolph
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—11

Brooke
Dodd
Fulbright
Gruening
Hatfield
Kuchel
McCarthy
Miller
Morse
Sparkman
Tower

So Mr. Mundt's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to strike the language on page 1, line 6 beginning with the word "and." The time is under control.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question first is on the committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh. Mr. President, we have to amend before we vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have an amendment at this juncture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois offers an amendment in lieu of the committee amendment, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read the amendment of Mr. Dirksen, as follows:

> On page 1, line 6, beginning with the word "and" strike out down to and including line 13 on page 3 and insert the following:
>
> "Sec. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that—
>
> "(1) subsequent to the submission of the Budget for the fiscal eyar 1968 by the President in January of this year, conditions have drastically changed both as to estimated revenue receipts and estimated expenditures during the fiscal year 1968,
>
> "(2) these changed conditions make a substantial reduction in such estimated expenditures imperative for the economic well-being and solvency of the country, and
>
> "(3) the President has not taken or proposed action to effect a substantial reduction of such estimated expenditures.
>
> "(b) It is the sense of the Congress that, before any final adjournment or recess of the first session of the Ninetieth Congress, the Congress should enact legislation limiting expenditures during the fiscal year 1968, whether from funds appropriated for such fiscal year or prior fiscal years, to an amount which is at least $5,000,000,000 less than the expenditures proposed in the Budget submitted by the President, unless, prior to such adjournment or recess, the President has notified the Congress that he has taken the necessary action to reduce such proposed expenditures during the fiscal year by at least $5,000,000,000."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized. How much time does he yield himself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield, without losing his right to the floor and the time not coming out of his time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] may be recognized at this time, apart from the time limitation agreed to, and with the proviso that when he concludes, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], will regain the floor and that his amendment will be pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST SENATOR LONG OF MISSOURI

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this is a matter of a report from the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct concerning the allegations that have been made with reference to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]. I propose, for the committee, to read this report in full, after prefacing it by a few preliminary remarks, and then make a few additional remarks in conclusion.

I am sure this is of general interest, Mr. President, so I ask that we may have order, so Senators can hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, Senators will recall that this matter arose through the allegations of an article in Life magazine and another newspaper or two, which were pointed out here on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. Soon thereafter, the committee talked with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] about the matter, and he very willingly came in—may we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senate must be in order. The Senator will suspend until order is restored. Attachés and others who are milling about will remove themselves from the Chamber. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Missouri came in and met with the committee, freely answered all questions that we asked, and gave us such information at that time as we desired.

Then, by unanimous vote of the committee, the chief counsel was directed to interview various persons who might have information about the payments to Senator Long that had been mentioned in the magazine article and other related matters. In all, the committee staff interviewed 33 persons, and obtained records from three additional sources other than from those witnesses. The staff made four trips to interview people in St. Louis, New York, South Bend, and Chicago, in addition to Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, this report represents the unanimous agreement of the full committee of six members. I am very glad to be able to say that all members of the committee attended almost every meeting that we had—I think every member was present at every meeting except when one Senator was out of town.

The committee held seven meetings for the primary purpose of discussing and going over this matter, in addition to many other discussions that we had as individuals. The committee also held six hearings in executive session between July 17 and October 12 at which times the sworn testimony of 11 witnesses was heard.

I begin, now, to read the report, entitled "On the Matter of Senator Edward V. Long, of Missouri:

> The Committee has inquired into allegations against Senator Edward V. Long of Missouri. The allegations presented the principal issue as to whether payments made to Senator Long by Mr. Morris Shenker, a practicing attorney of St. Louis, Missouri, were made to influence the hearings on Invasions of Privacy conducted by the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, of which Senator Long was the Chairman, for the purpose of assisting Mr. James Hoffa of the International Teamsters Union.

That was the gravamen of the charge, or, as we call it here—the principal issue—whether or not the payments from Mr. Shenker to Senator Long were made to influence those hearings, any hearings, or any act on his part as a Senator:

> Senator Long came before the Committee and stated that all payments made to him by Mr. Shenker represented his share of fees earned by Mr. Shenker and himself between 1961 and the present for professional legal services rendered by them to five clients whom he named.

I call attention here to those dates, which cover really a broader period of time than was mentioned in the original charge:

> The Committee staff interviewed Mr. Shenker, the clients or their representatives, and others who were found to have knowledge of the relationship between Mr. Shenker and Senator Long and of the services rendered to the clients. Mr. Shenker, each of the clients or their representatives, and staff members of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure—

That was Senator Long's subcommittee—

> were then called before the Committee and testified under oath. At the direction of the Committee, the Committee staff obtained records of the clients and of Mr. Shenker—

I shall name these clients in a few minutes; they were substantial persons or groups, some of them associates in business enterprises of various kinds. I shall describe them more fully later; but most of them were not small clients by any means—

> relating to the fees, payments and services, which were presented in detail to the Committee. These records included copies of checks and their endorsements for all payments from four of the clients to Mr. Shenker, as well as all payments from Mr. Shenker to Senator Long.

Enlarging on that just a little bit, the clients paid the money to Mr. Shenker, and then Mr. Shenker paid Senator LONG the agreed part, representing the division between them.

With a few exceptions which we think are minor, we had before us all the cancelled checks of all those clients, showing the date paid by the bank and the bank's stamp endorsement. In addition, we had all the checks that Mr. Shenker gave to Senator LONG, also with bank markings:

> In the case of the fifth client, not all of the payment checks could be found, but other financial records substantiating the payments were obtained. All of the checks bore regular bank endorsements showing dates of the payment by the bank, and also showed the amounts and the names of the payers and payees. This information corresponded with that of the payments stated to have been made by the clients and by Mr. Shenker.

To summarize briefly at this point: The testimony of Senator LONG and Mr. Shenker was corroborated, without any deviation in substance, by the clients, and further corroborated by these checks for which we now have copies.

To mention just one by way of illustration, here is a check dated December 13, 1961, payable to Mr. Shenker, which shows that it was paid by a bank on December 27, 1961. All the checks bear similar markings by the bank, with the date always stated, as is customary.

> Mr. Shenker testified before the committee that the payments made by him to Senator Long represented Senator Long's share of legal fees earned from the five clients. The five clients or their representatives testified that the payments made by them to Mr. Shenker were for legal services rendered to them over a number of years. They testified that they knew that Senator Long was associated with Mr. Shenker in rendering legal and business counsel relating to the client's interests.

That is an important sentence. The word "they" means all the clients or their representatives. There was an estate involved and there were corporations involved:

> They testified that they knew that Senator Long was associated with Mr. Shenker in rendering legal and business counsel relating to the clients' interests.
>
> According to the testimony of their clients, or their representatives, and Mr. Shenker, the payments from the clients to Mr. Shenker as well as the payments from Mr. Shenker to Senator Long had no relationship whatsoever to Mr. Hoffa or to the Teamsters Union.

There was not any testimony showing any relation between these payments and Mr. Hoffa or the Teamsters Union.

> Ordinarily we would not consider it wise or necessary to disclose the names of clients in a case like this; but under the circumstances of this case we believe it is necessary in order to give completeness and clarity to the meaning of the other facts developed and in view of the seriousness of the charges made against Senator Long. Therefore, we name the five clients in question as follows: The R. L. Warren Company, a stock brokerage and underwriting firm in St. Louis; Banner Industries Inc., a retail merchandising chain based in St. Louis; the Associated Life Insurance Company, a life and personal casualty insurance company, those home office is in Chicago and which does business in various States including Missouri; Mrs. Thelma Manne, a St. Louis woman who died in 1962; and Mr. Max Lubin, a St. Louis businessman.

The payment in the case of Mrs. Manne was made by her estate.

> From the evidence and information that the committee has been able to develop, the committee has found no facts which show that either the payments to Mr. Shenker from the five clients, or the payments by Mr. Shenker to Senator Long, had any connection with Seantor Long's duties or activities as chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, the subcommittee hearings, or Senator Long's duties or activities as a Member of the Senate.
>
> Under this state of facts, the committee finds no basis for public hearings.
>
> As is true in all matters coming before it, the committee will hold itself in readiness to consider any additional evidence which may become available relating to this matter.

That would, of course, include evidence.

The report is approved on this, the 25th day of October 1967. It is signed by all six members of the committee.

In summary and in substance, this entire case comes down at the present time to this: There is no connection shown between these transactions and Senator LONG's conduct as a Senator.

I refer back now for emphasis to what we stated in the very beginning paragraph:

> The allegations presented the principal issue as to whether payments made to Senator Long by Mr. Morris Shenker, a practicing attorney of St. Louis, Missouri, were made to influence the hearings on Invasion of Privacy conducted by the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, of which Senator Long was the chairman, for the purpose of assisting Mr. James Hoffa of the International Teamsters Union.

That is, either in hearings or in any of his conduct, as a U.S. Senator.

That is what we inquired into and that is what we directed our attention to.

I think one other factual matter ought to be stated in fairness to Senator LONG. He and Mr. Shenker, who is a St. Louis lawyer with an extensive practice, have known each other for more than 25 years. That was part of the background that shed light on the case as a whole and showed that their association was not a sudden business connection that arose in this matter.

I think that covers the factual situation. I am not going to try to cover the evidence here, as I do not think it is necessary.

I did refer to the checks because they are documentary evidence showing the use of marking machines to indicate the date when the checks went through the bank in the normal course of business. They naturally have probative value.

Our activities were not confined merely to the persons I have mentioned here. Our activity went in other directions. We had sworn proof and testimony by some of the key staff members who conducted the subcommittee hearings. We went into many other matters. However, so far as we were able to determine, as I have said, there were no facts obtainable—and we can deal only in facts—that showed any connection other than that which I have described here and what the committee has described in its report.

That covers the report. I think it covers the necessary background of information. And I thank the Senate for the accommodation granted to the committee by way of unanimous consent.

Mr. President, for the sake of having the entire report in one place in the RECORD without any of my comments on the various parts thereof, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there was not sufficient time to prepare copies of the report for all of the Senators. However, we will make the report available to all Senators who request it. The report, of course, will be printed in the RECORD.

I especially thank every member of the committee for the long hours, the great concern and the utmost care given to this matter. Also I wish to thank our highly capable chief counsel, Mr. Ben Fern, and assistant counsel, Mr. Mike Spence. Each has performed in an admirable way.

I think the other committee members have all lived up to the finest traditions expected of a Member of this great body.

Mr. President, we will now return primarily to our labor of getting up a set of standards of conduct for the Senate. We have been interrupted on this task before. We have, however, been working on it to some extent even during the course of this investigation. I hope that we can have this ready some time during this session of Congress.

EXHIBIT 1

SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT, U.S. SENATE, REPORT ON THE MATTER OF SENATOR EDWARD V. LONG OF MISSOURI

The Committee has inquired into allegations against Senator Edward V. Long of Missouri. The allegations presented the principal issue as to whether payments made to Senator Long by Mr. Morris Shenker, a practicing attorney of St. Louis, Missouri, were made to influence the hearings on Invasions of Privacy conducted by the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, of which Senator Long was the Chairman, for the purpose of assisting Mr. James Hoffa of the International Teamsters Union.

Senator Long came before the Committee and stated that all payments made to him by Mr. Shenker represented his share of fees earned by Mr. Shenker and himself between 1961 and the present for professional legal services rendered by them to five clients whom he named.

The Committee staff interviewed Mr. Shenker, the clients or their representatives, and others who were found to have knowledge of the relationship between Mr. Shenker and Senator Long and of the services rendered to the clients. Mr. Shenker, each of the clients or their representatives, and staff members of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure were then called before the Committee and testified under oath. At the direction of the Committee, the Committee staff obtained records of the clients and of Mr. Shenker, relating to the fees, payments and services, which were presented in detail to the Committee. These records included copies of checks and their endorsements for all payments from four of the clients to Mr. Shenker, as well as all payments from Mr. Shenker to Senator Long. In the case of the fifth client, not all of the payment checks could be found, but other financial records substantiating the payments were obtained. All of the checks bore regular bank endorsements showing dates of the payment by the bank, and also showed the amounts and the names of the payers and payees. This information corresponded with that of the payments stated to have been made by the clients and by Mr. Shenker.

Mr. Shenker testified before the Committee that the payments made by him to Senator Long represented Senator Long's share of legal fees earned from the five clients. The five clients or their representatives testified that the payments made by them to Mr. Shenker were for legal services rendered to them over a number of years. They testified that they knew that Senator Long was associated with Mr. Shenker in rendering legal and business counsel relating to the clients' interests.

According to the testimony of the clients, or their representatives, and Mr. Shenker, the payments from the clients to Mr. Shenker as well as the payments from Mr. Shenker to Senator Long had no relationship whatsoever to Mr. Hoffa or to the Teamsters union.

Ordinarily we would not consider it wise or necessary to disclose the names of clients in a case like this; but under the circumstances of this case we believe it is necessary in order to give completeness and clarity to the meaning of the other facts developed and in view of the seriousness of the charges made against Senator Long. Therefore, we name the five clients in question as follows: The R. L. Warren Company, a stock brokerage and underwriting firm in St. Louis; Banner Industries Inc., a retail merchandising chain based in St. Louis; the Associated Life Insurance Company, a life and personal casualty insurance company, whose home office is in Chicago and which does business in various states including Missouri; Mrs. Thelma Manne, a St. Louis woman who died in 1962; and Mr. Max Lubin, a St. Louis businessman.

From the evidence and information the Committee has been able to develop, the Committee has found no facts which show that either the payments to Mr. Shenker from the five clients, or the payments by Mr. Shenker to Senator Long, had any connection with Senator Long's duties or activities as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, the Subcommittee hearings, or Senator Long's duties or activities as a Member of the Senate.

Under this state of facts the Committee finds no basis for public hearings.

As is true in all matters coming before it, the Committee will hold itself in readiness to consider any additional evidence which may become available relating to this matter.

Approved, this 25th day of October 1967.

John C. Stennis,
Chairman,
Wallace F. Bennett,
Vice Chairman,
A. S. Mike Monroney,
Eugene J. McCarthy,
John Sherman Cooper,
James B. Pearson,
U.S. Senators.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is needless for me to state that the report just given lifts a great burden off my shoulders. I am delighted with the report.

I express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the committee and to the other five members of the committee and to the members of the staff who have made this investigation.

This was a matter in which my honor and integrity were at stake for the first time in my entire career.

I am grateful to the committee and to the staff for going into this matter in so much detail. It was to my best interest that the matter be gone into in such minute detail as the chairman has outlined.

I express my gratitude and appreciation to the committee and to the staff for doing so.

I know that the investigation created a lot of work and a great problem for the members of the committee. I am sorry that I interfered with the work of the committee.

I am grateful that it is all over, and I appreciate the consideration and the effort that were put forth in bringing out all the facets and all the evidence in this matter.

Thank you so much.

Mr. STENNIS. Senator, I accept your expressions for the committee and for the entire Senate. You cooperated with us, also; you do not owe us anything, because we did not give you anything, except the honest conclusion to which the facts led us. I know you understand that, as does everyone else. But we do appreciate the spirit of the expression of gratitude as you have stated it.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged against either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Illinois is recognized. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, it has been said that the weakness of a democratic society is its refusal to face up to a crisis. I think, as I review as much history as I can encompass, that that is probably true. And that is probably true of our own society.

No one can serve in Congress a long period of time without concluding that when we are squarely up against a real crisis and a real challenge, we try to find ways to circumvent it instead of meeting it foursquare.

Now, let nobody argue that we are not confronted with a fiscal crisis, because we are. There is every indication that there is such a crisis and that it has to be met. First of all, we face this huge, looming deficit.

When the majority leader and I one evening spent 2 hours with the President, we went over that budget carefully and finally came up with a figure of $28.3 billion as a deficit. Well, that is a monumental deficit, if I ever saw one. And what it means, in homespun terms, is that after we have spent all the tax money which we take from individuals and corporations and from every other source, we shall still be short by $28.3 billion of paying our bills. It is that simple, and there is no prolixity or complexity about it.

I said to the President on that occasion:

> You might just as well throw that figure out of the window and make it $30 billion, because there are those unforeseen expenditures that are coming along, just as surely as day follows night, and they will have to be taken into account. I can't foresee everything that is down the road, but there is a crisis before the country, and a fiscal crisis is one of the most dangerous that I can think about.

You always have to consider the impact of this kind of deficit, first, on the interest rates, because this Government must borrow in the same market to which private enterprise, corporate entities, must go; and when there is keen competition for money, the interest rate is bound to go up.

If there is anything to the classical definition about inflation, that it means that there is more money than there are goods, and therefore goods will command higher prices, then of course we are going to have a dash of inflation.

This crisis also is affected by the fact that there has been an impasse on the so-called tax bill. The President has requested a surcharge tax of 10 percent, to yield, as I recall, roughly $6⅓ billion. That tax bill presently reposes in a pigeonhole in the Ways and Means Committee of the House, which is the revenue committee. We can do nothing about it, because all revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives. We can amend, of course, if a bill comes this way; but essentially it must originate there. That is part, of course, of the dilemma which confronts us at the present time.

In addition, it is further complicated by the additional appropriations which have been voted, certainly by the Senate, if not by the House, and by the pay bills and other measures that have come along.

What intrigues me about it, when I say that a free country, a democracy, does not face up to a challenge, is the rather quaint language that appeared in the original resolution submitted by Representative Whitten, of Mississippi, with respect to this interim resolution; because among other things was a rather interesting protective clause that nothing be done to permit the suspension of new starts in appropriations. That is by way of confessing, on the part of Congress, that you can get sacrifices where you will, but so far as we are concerned, we want no profane governmental hands to be laid upon public works projects, because those are peculiarly our own. If anything is needed to demonstrate that we refuse to face up to a crisis, that is it.

Then, in addition, were the exemptions there for the Post Office Department, for the Customs Service, and for the Internal Revenue Service, as if there might not be an opportunity to save money in those Federal activities as well.

Mr. President, it is not a happy thing to say; but, frankly, Congress is not doing its duty. The Constitution gives it the power of the purse. I am not unmindful of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, when we set up the General Accounting Office. We provided for a budget and a lot of other things. But that in no way relieves Congress of its responsibility when it comes to being keeper of the purse. That reluctance on new starts is an excellent example of how we have circumvented our duty. But the power of the purse is still here.

It is apparent that the President has made no recommendations, nor has anything been done under the General Accounting Act of 1921.

So the dilemma is here. I have spoken with some of the House leaders today. I know how adamant they are about this whole matter and what difficulty is going to be encountered in conference. It is not going to be easy. They are not going to be satisfied with a third or a fourth of a loaf. The Senate had better make up its mind to do something and if it does not, there is going to be a stalemate in that conference, or I will be badly mistaken.

This amendment, of course, is essentially only a sense of the Senate and House resolution. I can include the House and it still will not be subject to a point of order, in my judgment. But it calls attention to the fact that there have been changes since the original 1968 budget has been submitted and that there have been remarkable changes in the conditions that require action in the interest of our economic well-being and our solvency; and it calls attention to the fact that the President has not actually, nor has he proposed, any action with respect to a substantial reduction of estimated expenditures.

So it becomes the sense of the Congress that with respect to appropriated funds for the fiscal year 1968 and for funds previously appropriated that might be spent, there be a net reduction in an amount of $5 billion on those expenditures.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator could tell us what action Congress would have to take in order to meet the requirements of this amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Congress would have to take the same action that it took in 1946, for in that year we had a rescission bill, and that bill by line and page spelled out exactly where all reductions were to be made; and we did it and we did it in a good, workmanlike, and business fashion.

I think I can point that out very concretely. Here is a copy setting that forth. This is Public Law 301 in the 79th Congress. That was in 1946. Title I reads:

> Executive Office of the President, Independent Offices, and Executive Departments.

We started right in with the Office of Emergency Management, the Independent Offices, the executive departments, one by one.

Here is the 17-page report.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would mean all of the appropriations heretofore enacted by Congress would have to be gone over by the Committee on Appropriations. According to the resolution and the evidence that was given to us by Mr. Schultz, appearing on page 54 of the Senate hearings on House Joint Resolution 888, the areas where appropriations are controllable amounted to $38 billion. In order to accomplish a savings of $5 billion in expenditures he reported that a fiscal 1968 appropriations reduction of $10 billion would be required.

Is the Senator familiar with that testimony?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It might well be.

Mr. ELLENDER. Here is the testimony and I shall quote it:

> Now, the total that I have listed and a few other smaller ones I haven't mentioned come in appropriations to $38 billion, in round numbers. To get $5 billion in expenditures out, which the Bow amendment talks about, would take about $10 billion out of that $38 billion.

The total that the Budget Director referred to appears in the hearing record immediately above the testimony which I quoted. The amounts of controllable appropriations and the areas where they may be found are listed. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Areas where appropriations are controllable (not locked in)

	Thousands
Agriculture	$3,900
Commerce	970
Corps of Engineers	1,300
Health, Education, and Welfare	7,500
Interior	1,600
Housing and Urban Development	1,100
Justice	437
Labor	530
Post Office	585
Transportation	1,500
Treasury	920
Agency for International Development	2,600
State	300
Atomic Energy Commission	2,600
General Services Administration	560
National Aviation and Space Agency	4,500
National Science Foundation	526
Veterans	1,600
Office of Economic Opportunity	2,060
Military and civilian pay raises	1,000
Other	2,000
Total	38,066

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I have to say is that it is a question of whether the Congress of the United States has enough sacrificial spirit and enough diligence and is willing to tackle this job regardless of what any budget officer in this Government may say. To implement that fact I go back to what we did in 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can show cuts in 1946 that were holdovers from the war period, as low as $40 for the Naval Observatory; another is $572; for the Hydrographic Office, $94,942; the Office of Naval Intelligence, salaries, $2,932.

There was not an item that they did not go through, and with adequate staff. Mr. President, I am speaking now not off of the top of my head but from 17 years on Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

If we have the will to do the job we can do it. They can amend this resolution any way they see fit, but I have an idea that if we go to the other body, which is pretty adamant about this business, with a simple continuing resolution it is going to be a while before you will ever get an agreement in a conference committee.

Why should we not indicate our desire to get something done because the country is fully conscious and sensibly alerted to the whole question of economy? I do not want to be talking out of one side of my mouth and then going along like a good Senator with the Committee on Appropriations when they come in with a unanimous vote on an appropriations bill, when I may have violent objection to some item.

I want to declare an intent now, and when I am confronted with a charge that I was doing a lot of double talk on economy, this is the only way I have of saying to the country: Well, at least I submitted this proposal to the Senate and they did not take it. From then on I absolve myself of culpability and blame.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume my good friend from Illinois realizes that since the amount on which cuts are going to be made aggregates only $38 billion, that would mean a cut of almost a third. In this huge amount is the space program of $4.5 billion; agriculture, $3.9 billion; Corps of Engineers, $1.3 billion, and many other programs.

I am wondering where we will be able to obtain the $10 billion which must be cut from current appropriations out of $38 billion in order to accomplish what the Senator seeks to do. I doubt that anyone would advocate reducing each of the items on the list I have just inserted in the RECORD by one-third. That is what would be necessary, presumably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 10 minutes under the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator like to amend this to make it $4 billion?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I think I would rather leave it to the Committee on Appropriations as we have done in the past.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, you are.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Am I correct that in a rescission bill, like the original appropriation act, it must originate in the House of Representatives?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wonder about that. This resolution simply expresses the sense of the Senate that unless the President finds some way to reduce this amount we propose to do it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We propose to do it by a rescission act. This gives the President one more chance and if he does not do it we propose to do so by this resolution. We would bind ourselves to do it, and to stay here during this session of Congress until we bring out a rescission bill and undertake to work out cuts in it and that we find we can make, should make, or are willing to make, in order to bring in the appropriations and expenditures; is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Congress will still have the opportunity to meet its responsibilities, if the President does not. I do not know whether he will or not. I do not know how difficult it will be to take that much out of here, but at least a rescission bill can be brought in and Congress can work its will on making cuts in appropriations already made which, in my judgment, is the right way to do it. I voted against these other proposals because I do not want to tell the President, "Go and cut wherever you will. Take whatever you want to and apply it somewhere else." I think we should take that responsibility. I hope that there will be a rescission bill to which I can offer amendments to cut those things which I think should be cut. The Senator from Illinois can do the same thing, and other Members of Congress can do the same thing.

Finally, when we can work out certain substantial reductions in appropriations, I think that is what we should do. I think that is what we must follow. If I understand the resolution correctly, it expresses the sense of the Senate that that is what we should do.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Make the record abundantly clear that this is a matter before us of a House joint resolution—No. 888. It comes from the House Appropriations Committee. This is a sense of the Senate resolution. It is quite in order on a resolution of this kind. I do not bind them. I would just like to get a declaration of intent on the part of the Senate when they go to conference on this measure, because it is going to run up against the Rock of Gibraltar in the House of Representatives before they get through.

The Senator from Arkansas is so perfectly right in this matter, if we can agree to a rescission bill and see where they can cut. But that is a matter for both Appropriations Committees and for a further recommendation to vote.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was laboring under the impression that possibly a rescission bill would have to originate over in the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. They may so contend.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought the Senator said a while ago that he did not think so, but assuming it does, it will be their responsibility on what to cut in appropriation bills already passed, and to initiate a rescission bill. If they do not do it, and if we can do it, the Senate should do it here, I think.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. As a matter of clarification, if Congress winds up cutting appropriations under the budget estimate by $5 billion, would this apply?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think so.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Another $5 billion on top?

Mr. JAVITS. No, it would not. All appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am thinking of the total cut of $5 billion.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is in expenditures.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In expenditures, right.

Mr. ELLENDER. That means, then, a $10 billion cut in appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Both expenditures made under the 1968 appropriations and expenditures made under prior appropriations. There is a wealth of unobligated money floating around this Government by the billions of dollars which we have never touched, and somehow we do not try to touch it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Could we fill out the factual situation? Perhaps it would help everyone. That is the reason I am speaking, because I have it clearly in mind, and I think that I am right. We have already reduced appropriations below the budget by roughly $2 billion-plus——

Mr. ALLOTT. Three billion-plus.

Mr. JAVITS. Three billion-plus. The resolution to the pending bill may reduce it another $2 billion. That would mean $5 billion from the appropriations. I realize that is not yet what the Senator has in mind.

As to expenditures, the budget called for expenditures of approximately $135 billion in which, roughly speaking, some 70 percent or better are out of current appropriations, and 30 percent, roughly, in round figures, out of previous appropriations. The proportions may be somewhat different.

As I understand what the Senator has in mind on this resolution, if the aggregate cut in appropriations below the budget, those already imposed and those to be imposed, it would aggregate $5 billion. The Senator, notwithstanding the reduction in his resolution, would consider that that met congressional intent?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, and the language here bears on that point.

Mr. JAVITS. If the aggregate reduction in expenditures from the proceeds of the appropriation bills and the proceeds of appropriations already made exceeds $5 billion, then certainly this would have been satisfied? So that to speak of it as $10 billion is inaccurate, for this reason: Surely, if we are cutting $5 billion out of expenditures based solely on what we are appropriating in 1968 and the appropriation bills, we have to have the cut of $10 billion, but if we are not doing that, because we are addressing ourselves to the present appropriation bills already passed——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. JAVITS. In the early part of this fiscal year and those appropriations which carry over in terms of expenditures, on that basis I understand the Senator from Illinois clearly and I think the Senate does as well.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I notice that even the Bow amendment to the resolution in the other body exempts defense expenditures necessary in connection with Vietnam. Does the Senator think that that exemption at least should appear in his proposed amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not sure that any exemption should appear. I give the Senator some reasons why.

As the resolution was introduced, or at least got to the floor, by Representative WHITTEN of Mississippi, it contained exemptions for the military insofar as it related to Vietnam, social security, retirement pensions, veterans, and other items.

Almost always, in every discussion I have ever heard about rescissions, I know that a special point was made of those items. I do not quarrel with that. I do not believe it is necessary to tell Congress about it because both Houses of Congress are compassionate about our veterans and the Veterans' Administration. Both Houses of Congress are as much interested in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I doubt whether we have to pinpoint all those items. It would simply complicate the resolution. They went further and gave the President power to exempt the Customs Service and the Internal Revenue Service if the reduction had an impact on efficient collection of revenue. They went further than that and included a number of things. Then, for good measure, they added other proposals and exemptions and new starts, so that they could not be touched.

Now, I like to take the bitter with the sweet. If we are going to do something, let us not hump it all in under one department of Government. Let us exercise our responsibility under the Constitution, because the purse is still on Capitol Hill, whether we like it or not, and we cannot disdain, we cannot absolve ourselves from that responsibility, no matter which way or how thick we cut it.

Thus, that is one reason why I did not complicate this resolution with a lot of exemptions. Let the committees do it. I am not going to pinpoint and say, "Keep your hands off this" or "Do not touch that." There are a few sacred cows in Government, I found out long ago. But, there are not very many. I think everyone knows where they are.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator will recall, I suspect, that I have had a printed amendment at the desk which I had expected to propose, but it is not appropriate now because it was drawn up against the background of our having passed only six appropriation bills at that time and having achieved a saving of only $2 billion at that time, whereas that picture has decidedly changed now and I have not had a chance to redraft the amendment. But I call attention to the fact that on lines 8 and 9 of that amendment I stated as the sense of Congress—I did not use the same words—that Congress believes that a total saving of $3 billion can be accomplished in the spending budget for fiscal year 1968, without severe disruption of the vital functions of Government.

I drafted that amendment in anticipation of what I thought would be—and I recited it in the amendment—a total saving in appropriations of approximately $5 billion.

My own feeling now is that, as well intentioned as the amendment is, a $5 billion cut in expenditures when applied to a situation with appropriations which have been considerably reduced from what they were—we have not reduced appropriations of earlier years, but we have reduced very largely proposed appropriations for this year—will be too deep a bite and too great a cut to be readily placed anywhere in the controllable items.

I was wondering if the distinguished Senator would give thought to a change to $4 billion or even $3 billion in view of the fact that we have already shown that budgeted appropriations are going to be reduced in excess of $5 billion.

The Senator, of course, drafted his amendment, likewise, on the basis of what was available at the time it was drafted. We have been passing bills rapidly and have been bringing them out of conference—two bills which have not been acted on, as well as two yesterday—all of which had substantial reductions.

I was wondering if the Senator would give consideration to a proposed reduction of the $5 billion, which would be for the purpose of the spending budget, which is quite a different thing from the appropriations budget, to either $3 billion or $4 billion. I merely make that suggestion.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I understand the President is going to send over another supplemental bill totaling about $4 billion for the war in Vietnam. Would that mean we would have to effect a $9 billion reduction in expenditures?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is going to be in the 1968 budget and it becomes an expenditure, then we are going to have to find the $5 billion somewhere. I must emphasize that a cut in appropriations is one thing, because we can appropriate $500 million for a project, and then have an expenditure of only $10 or $20 million in the first fiscal year. But as we go along, that is when it begins to increase. It is necessary in this fiscal year and the next fiscal year, not 10 years from now, to meet this fiscal crisis. It is here.

I point out that Great Britain is in a dilemma and the Prime Minister is fighting like made to prevent the devaluation of the pound. We are informed that West Germany has agreed to buy $125 million of our bonds. Then we go into the open market to compete with business and industry, and watch the interest rates go up. I do not want that on my conscience.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I just call attention to the fact that payments are being made this year on ships or airplanes or Government buildings of any kind, or VA hospitals, or many other products which are not built in a year, and for which the appropriations made 2 and 3 and 4 years ago are in part applicable. All of that has to be considered. I was especially thinking about the defense matter, because we do have ships building and we do have planes in the pipe line. It seems to me the exception of at least the Vietnam defense spending might be helpful, but I simply suggest that to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not an easy thing, on a pleasant afternoon, when the Senate is in a good mood, to reduce the ante by $1 billion.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I want to ask the minority leader if, in requesting a $5 billion reduction below the budget request, he takes into consideration the probable reduction in the foreign aid program, which has not yet been authorized. I believe there will be a $800 million cut in the authorization, and there will probably be some further reduction in the appropriation. Will the $5 billion reduction be in addition to that reduction or will the additional billion come out of the $5 billion reduction which the Senator's amendment would provide. Would the reductions enacted up to now come out of the $5 billion proposed or will it be in addition?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Anything which is expended pursuant to appropriations in this fiscal year comes within this.

Mr. AIKEN. That would be within the $5 billion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

I make the emphatic point that everything that has been said in behalf of the tax bill which is languishing in the House Ways and Means Committee finally winds up with: "Sop up this extra spending money by a surcharge on present taxes, both individual and corporate. In so doing you take this spending money out of the economic bloodstream and you ease the inflationary pressures."

It can be done two ways. It can be done by taking it away from everybody after they have it. It can be prevented from falling into their hands during this fiscal year by chopping it off before it ever gets to the corporate treasury or to the hands of the individual. Take your choice.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. I would like to indicate my support for the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois for a number of reasons.

First, this Saturday morning, I was at a business council meeting, at which 200 of the most distinguished businessmen in this country, representing virtually every State, were in attendance. I have never, in the 12 years I have been attending these meetings, seen the business community so concerned about whether or not Congress will face up to its responsibility. Many of them have, individually or collectively, called upon the Congress to cut expenses and called upon the President to cut expenses. They have said they are so concerned about inflation in this country that many of them indicated their support for a tax increase. They all feel that the problem must be attacked first at the spending level.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PERCY. Second, I support the amendment because the Secretary of the Treasury has recently said that if we do not have a tax increase the economy will be in a shambles. The same effect can be had by reducing expenditures first, since the cuts now under consideration would yield $5 billion or $6 billion.

The third reason is that when the President put in his budget early this year, we had a forecast of an $8.5 billion deficit. Many of the appropriations were based on that figure. We now have a forecast of a $28 billion to $30 billion deficit. We have to reflect that in the votes we make on the floor, but the executive branch which formulated the appropriations should lend its expertise to the task as well.

Fourth, the cruelest tax of all is inflation. It is ridiculous to be voting for bills to help people in the lower income levels one day and the next day be voting for appropriations which impose the cruelest tax of all; namely, inflation. Everyone who is living on a fixed income and social security will suffer in an insidious decline in their standard of living.

Lastly, I addressed a group of businessmen who were visiting this country with the cooperation of private organizations for the purpose of encouraging them to invest in American industry. Those are the same people to whom, year after year, the Government has been saying and lecturing, "You must put your fiscal house in order. Cut down expenses and stop inflation." That is the very question they are putting to us today—what we have been telling them for 20 years.

I support the amendment because I believe it is a meaningful device wherewith to bring about spending reductions. In my maiden speech in the Senate, which was listened to by at least two or three of the pages in a late morning hour, I chose this subject; I thought then and I feel more strongly now: it is as important as anything we can do to cut the budget by $5 or $6 billion. After such cuts, if it were still necessary, I would support a tax increase to stop the spread of inflation.

This amendment is logical and needed, and I enthusiastically support it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my respected junior colleague that if any Member of this body can speak with authority, he can. He was at one time the head of one of the largest enterprises in this country, the Bell & Howell Co. in Chicago. It is a worldwide enterprise and a worldwide business, and it is big business.

He has been in and out of these problems over quite a period of time. So I welcome his testimony on this matter, because I do believe he speaks with rare authority.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, at the time of the unanimous-consent agreement, assurance was given by the distinguished majority leader that time would be yielded on the bill; and I wish to be recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will not be much time available. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. ALLOTT. Ten minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had better check and find out. Before or after the vote on the amendment?

Mr. ALLOTT. Before the vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 25 minutes remaining on the bill.

Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I have only one other observation to make. It was late last year that a celebrated French financier came here and was interviewed at considerable length and on a number of occasions.

Making it desperately emphatic, he said, "You are in jeopardy; you are headed for danger, and you will not face up to it."

What do Senators think is going to happen to the credit of this country in the treasuries abroad, with President de Gaulle raiding our gold supply—it gets thinner and thinner—and with stories in the air, now, that the cover will be taken off the Federal Reserve notes? What then? With the cover off of the demand deposits and Federal Reserve notes, what is left except a managed paper currency, and nothing more?

We are headed for trouble, and this kind of expenditure increases the danger. I do not believe we properly respond to our duty in this body by trying always to jockey for political position, to see whether we cut or whether the cut is coming from the other end.

The President is the executive branch, and, therefore, an independent coordinate branch of Government.

I want to see Congress do its duty under the Constitution. I am chargeable, as one Member of this legislative branch, and I wish to be able to go home and stand on a platform in front of everybody and say, "Here is what I tried to do, and I could not get support enough to do it, so I absolve myself from responsibility, and you put the blame where it belongs when these interest rates start going up, when inflation gets its fingers into the price of every commodity in every grocery store."

It will happen, just as surely as day follows night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PELL. Would I be correct in assuming that if passed, this cut could be made from the defense budget as well as any other item?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, it could, yes.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But can you imagine a Member of Congress so little interested in the security of this country as to cut the defense budget?

I say to my friend, I was around here for another war, and was on an Appropriations Committee when we were appropriating for war, and I was here when we had the rescission bill of 1946. I have a copy of that bill in the form it became law. I know what the general attitude of Congress is in these matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

We did not have to pinpoint it and say, "Do it here or do it there."

Mr. PELL. If this passed, I would hope some of it would come out of the Defense Department. I was wondering whether it could come out of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, they are free to vote for it, if that is the way they want to do it. But I leave it to the committees on this and the other side of the Capitol, and am willing to let them come in with their recommendations. This is no place to try to do it item by item or line by line, as anyone knows whoever had much experience on an Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I close by saying to the Senate, "You had better not go back to the other end of the Capitol empty-handed, because if you do, you are going to have trouble in the conference committee, believe me."

I yield the floor, and I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 10 minutes on the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, first I wish to say that I intend to support the amendment of the distinguished minority leader; but I think it is very important that the record be clear, because few people understand it, as to why the control of appropriations alone will not reduce expenditures accordingly.

May we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ALLOTT. To the average individual, it appears obvious that if you cut the appropriations $5 billion, you have therefore cut expenditures by $5 billion.

I refer anyone who is interested to page 49 of "The Budget in Brief," on which there appears a flow chart which illustrates more graphically than anything else I have seen why a cut in appropriations does not equal a cut in expenditures. In other words, to cut $1 billion from expenditures, you have to cut at least $2 billion, or perhaps $3 billion or even more at this time of the year, out of appropriations.

Referring to this chart, we see, for example, that the new authority recommended to Congress this year was $144 billion. Of that new authority only $95.7 billion was to be used in 1968. But unspent from previous years is $125.6 billion, of which $39.3 billion flows into 1968, making the total expenditures for 1968 $135 billion.

Those same past authorizations, unspent, flowing forward in later years, together with what flows forward from the authorization this year, result in unspent authorizations for expenditures in following years of $132.8 billion.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Using those calculations—and I think the Senator is correct—would it not follow, then, that this resolution, to cut expenditures by $5 billion, might require a cut in appropriations of about $10 billion?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct, and I intend to discuss that in a few moments.

Mr. President, various figures have been used on the floor here today to indicate the economies being effected. I have in my hands a table which is up to date as of noon today. This includes the action of the conference committee on NASA and the conference committee on Independent Offices, which we have every reasonable expectation, at the moment, to think that the House of Representatives will accept, although we might be surprised. In addition to those items, it includes all bills which have been enacted into law, and shows that thus far, the conference committees have agreed upon total appropriations of $100,118,000,000, which figure is $3,209,000,000 under the President's budget. That is as of noon today. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Dollars in millions]

Bill	Adjusted budget estimate	House passed	Senate reported	Senate passed	Budget (plus or minus)	Conference	Budget (plus or minus)	Public Law
Agriculture	$5,021.09	$4,770.58	$6,782.53	$6,782.53	+$1,761.43	$4,952.95	−$68.14	90–116
Defense	71,548.00	70,295.20	70,156.42	70,132.32	−1,427.58	69,936.63	−1,647.38	90–93
District of Columbia	526.06	463.34						
Foreign aid	3,818.74							
Independent offices	10,802.51	10,013.18	10,431.46	10,514.83	−305.68	10,139.47	−681.13	
Interior	1,458.22	1,365.31	1,399.24	1,399.36	− 58.86	1,382.85	− 75.37	90–28
Labor-HEW	13,424.15	13,137.48	13,409.84	13,421.66	−2.49			
Legislative	275.70	228.09	274.41	275.89		275.70		90–57
Military construction	2,937.00							
NASA	5,100.00	4,583.40	4,678.90	4,678.90	−421.10	4,578.90	−521.20	
Public works	4,867.81	4,622.92	4,776.06	4,776.06	−91.75			
State, Justice, and Commerce	2,342.94	2,194.03	2,185.87	2,186.11	−156.83			
Transportation	1,718.62	1,530.20	1,651.41	1,651.41	−67.21	1,581.91	−136.71	90–112
Treasury-Post Office	7,615.15	7,499.23	7,555.17	7,555.17	−59.98	7,545.64	−69.51	90–47
Total	131,473.99	120,474.87	123,036.90	123,098.35		100,118.35	−3,209.36	
Plus interest on debt	14,200.00							
Total	145,673.99							

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the real substance of the issue is that Congress has been irresponsible over the past 2 or 3 years in its spending authorizations, and has appropriated excessive amounts. It is a cold fact that there exists today a new breed of economists, who believe that we cannot spend too much on this Government, and can spend ourselves into prosperity. We have finally come down to the hard nub. We nearly came against the crash gates a year ago in September.

We have again come around that circle in another year, and are down to the hard nub. We have to do something about it.

I hold in my hand a UPI dispatch under today's date from the Department of Labor, I believe. It states as follows:

> An average city family of four needs an income of at least $9,191 to maintain a modest standard of living, according to the government.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire UPI dispatch to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COST OF LIVING

WASHINGTON.—An average city family of four needs an income of at least $9,191 to maintain a modest standard of living, according to the Government.

This is more than double the amount the Government estimated was needed in 1951 and is $3,091 a year more than was needed in 1959.

The most expensive city in the 48 adjacent States is New York, where the average family would need $10,293 per year.

The least expensive of the cities surveyed was Austin, Tex., where a family of four could get by on $8,088.

Honolulu was even more expensive than New York. A family there would need an income of $11,489 to maintain a modest standard of living. And Alaska is even more expensive than that, though not included in the survey.

The figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics yesterday represented living costs last fall. They are presumably even higher now.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is ridiculous to find that income requirements have more than doubled since 1951 to maintain a modest standard of living, but it does show what the policies of this Government have been. And we cannot exonerate ourselves, nor can we excuse ourselves from our part in this procedure.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee said yesterday in the Senate:

> Mr. President, if it is necessary to reduce expenditures at this time, before the Congress adjourns, I recommend that the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses undertake an examination of the bills which have been signed into law and the bills which will be sent to the White House soon, and if the amounts are found to be excessive, that a rescission bill be considered in the two Houses.

I agree wholeheartedly with that proposal except that I do not think that action will be taken.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues a bill that has been offered by me in the past and also this year. It is S. 1611, and it does for the Congress exactly what was proposed in the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

My bill would provide that before any one appropriation bill became law, all appropriations bills would have to be enacted and they would all have to be reviewed and Congress would have to adopt a resolution approving the total amount appropriated. Congress would then have put its final stamp of approval on the total appropriations, not just one of 15 parts.

So far, I have not been able to obtain any hearings on the bill. However, I commend the bill to the attention of my colleagues, because if we are going to gain control of the fiscal picture of this country, we must adopt some such approach as this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bill, S. 1611, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1611

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That unless otherwise expressly provided therein, no expenditure authorization contained in a general appropriation Act for any fiscal year shall become effective until there shall have been enacted—

(1) all other general appropriation Acts for such fiscal year; and

(2) a joint resolution containing a statement of the aggregate amount of expenditure authorizations for such fiscal year contained in all such general appropriation Acts, including any amendments thereto, and a statement to the effect that the Congress approves the expenditure of such aggregate amount.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "expenditure authorization" means an appropriation, contract authorization, authorization to spend from public or corporate debt receipts, limitation on expenditures authorized to be incurred against revolving funds or funds of government corporations, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriation, reauthorization, or any other authorization to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States, but does not include an appropriation of trust funds or a transaction involving public debt retirement.

(2) The term "general appropriation Act" does not include a deficiency or supplemental appropriation Act, or an Act or joint resolution providing temporary expenditure authorizations pending enactment of a regular appropriation Act.

SEC. 3. This Act shall be effective with respect to general appropriation Acts for fiscal year 1968 and subsequent fiscal years.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has apparently stepped off the floor for a moment. I think that his proposal would be better received in terms of reality if the figure in the proposal were reduced to $4 billion rather than $5 billion.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree completely with the distinguished Senator. I think that a $4 billion reduction in the spending budget is within reach and within reason. I would rather have it $3 billion, but $4 billion is within reach. I do not think that $5 billion is reasonable. It would destroy a great many vital activities of the Government.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has just returned to the floor. I have said in his absence that I am going to support his amendment because I feel it is just indefensible for the Senate of the United States—knowing the situation in England, knowing almost for a certainty what effect the reaction that takes place there will have on this country, and knowing that inflation is increasing day by day—after the efforts of the House, even though we may disagree with the way in which the House took action—were to simply go back to the House this afternoon with a simple continuing resolution saying: "We have changed the date from November 23 to November 15, but this is the best we can do."

It is not the best we can do. We can do a lot better. And that is the reason that I have voted for the Williams amendment and the Mundt amendment. That is the reason I will vote for the pending amendment.

I would vote for the amendment of the Senator from Florida, which he may or may not offer later; but we cannot say to the people of this country: "The Senate is so derelict in its responsibilities that, after the efforts on the part of the House to limit expenditures, the best we can do in the Senate is to come back to the House with a little continuing resolution after having exercised great ability here by merely changing the date of the continuing resolution from November 23 to November 15."

Mr. President, I cannot go home to my people and say that this is all we could do. Mr. President, I wish to propound a question to the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is allotted 2 minutes on the joint resolution.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in view of the explanation which the Senator heard me make yesterday, and the substance of which I have stated again today, relative to the position on appropriations and expenditures, would the Senator be willing to modify his amendment to $4 billion rather than $5 billion, which would be a more realistic figure, at least in my opinion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend, $1 billion is a lot of money to talk about on the Senate floor on a lovely afternoon when I am in a pretty good mood. That is my trouble. I always feel like bargaining, as the Senator knows, but how much we will have left by way of actual reductions before we get through, I do not know.

I will modify the amendment with respect to expenditures in Vietnam and use the language that appears in the House amendment—"except by those expenditures in excess of $22 billion that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia."

They fully agree on that. And I am content to add that to my proposal.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have discussed this suggestion with quite a few Senators, and I think there are some who realize the relationship of appropriations and expenditures and who honestly believe that a $10 billion cut is not within the realm of possibility, but that if a $4 billion expenditure limit were placed in the amendment, rather than $5 billion, some of them at least might be prone to support the amendment.

I offer that only by way of suggestion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will my friend bargain for $4.5 billion?

Mr. ALLOTT. Such an amount will not get the votes that the other amount would receive, I tell my friend.

The Senator has my vote anyway, but I think that $4 billion is a much more realistic figure.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a modification of the amendment which is on the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> In line 7 of subsection (b) and after "President," insert the following: "except by those expenditures in excess of $22 billion that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is accordingly modified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think there is still a little time left on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in looking over the proposal of the distinguished minority leader, there come to mind a number of questions which I think are worth considering. In the first place, this sense of the Congress resolution has to do not with appropriations, but with expenditures. And there is a great difference between expenditures and appropriations per se.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Florida has indicated that the Appropriations Committees have in mind a cut from the original request for this year of somewhere between $4 billion and $5 billion when all of the bills are taken care of.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. That has now gone well over $5 billion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With the other appropriation bills?

Mr. HOLLAND. With the bills already voted on and the cuts that are assured, meaning the highest figure enacted by either House, and without very great new cuts on the supplemental request—I think there will be cuts in the OEO for this year—it would still be well over $5 billion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think that speaks well for the responsibility which Congress has shown once again.

I think we ought also to keep in mind the fact that estimated revenue receipts are down, and estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1968 are up.

In the case of Vietnam, it is my understanding that there will be sought, a further increase of $4 billion, and it appears to me that under the proposal now before the Senate there are no exemptions for funds allocated to Vietnam.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that the original budget request was approximately $135 billion. Since then, it has been increased by $1.5 billion, so that now it amounts to $136.5 billion.

I hope that this matter will be studied thoroughly. I do not believe it is in the best interests of the Senate, much less the Congress, to adopt the amendment. Moreover, I take exception to subsection 3 in section 2, wherein it is stated that the President has not taken or proposed action to effect a substantial reduction of such estimated expenditures. Just what can the President do if Congress—both Houses—holds back on appropriations? At the present time the President has six, I believe, out of 14 or 15 measures; and except for the defense appropriation, some of the largest funding measures are yet to be sent to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I realize, of course, that the matter is based on "estimated expenditures," and I would point out that when you relate expenditures to appropriations, the ratio is in favor of expenditures and against appropriations.

This is an amendment the Senate could well do without, and I hope very much that it will be defeated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me emphasize again that what this amendment deals with is expenditures, not appropriations. The language is very clear: "to reduce to an amount which is at least $5 billion less than the expenditures proposed in the budget."

I am not concerned about the appropriations for the moment, because we can appropriate to our heart's content. The question is, Is the money going to be spent and pushed into the bloodstream of this country? That is the source of the inflation. That will be the source of our headaches from here on out with respect to prices and with respect to interest rates. So I emphasize again that it deals with expenditures; for to do otherwise would not get at the root of the evil.

Now, with respect to paragraph 3, I think that is only a statement of fact: "The President has not taken nor proposed action to effect a substantial reduction of such estimated expenditures." He has not. If he has, it should have come to this body in the form of a message from the President. It should have been an executive message of some kind. No such message has come, no such recommendation has come, either to this body or to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate or of the House, so far as I know. And if anyone can show that such a recommendation has come, I will be more than willing to strike paragraph 3 from the resolution. But I have not been able to find it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as the Senator well knows, the President has been pleading for the appropriation bills to be sent down, so that he could look into the factors of both appropriations and expenditures. He has almost gotten down on his knees; and so far, out of 14 or 15 appropriation measures, he has received six.

I would reiterate what the distinguished Senator from Florida has said: that the estimated reduction in appropriations for this fiscal year by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses—and we should have some faith in them because, after all, they are our representatives and our delegates—will amount to approximately $5,147,000,000.

Furthermore, I point to page 54 of the hearings on the continuing resolution, fiscal year 1968, where Mr. Schultze, the Director of the Budget, states in effect that it takes $2 of appropriations to get a $1 cut in expenditures. So what we are really toying with or considering in the pending amendment is a far higher figure than appears on the surface.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think the majority leader still continues to talk about appropriations. I am talking about expenditures.

I want to see him cut out the money and not spend it. Not a figure on a piece of paper that finally goes down to the other end of the avenue. It is the expenditure that counts, so far as the impact on the country is concerned. And that is the reason for holding this to an expenditure item.

With that, I think I will rest the case and yield back the remainder of my time, if the remainder of the time on the other side is yielded back.

Mr. President, at this point I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

MEDAL OF HONOR PRESENTED TO MAJ. HOWARD V. LEE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that an outstanding hero of the war in Vietnam, Maj. Howard V. Lee, was awarded the Medal of Honor today by the President of the United States for extraordinary gallantry.

Major Lee is the seventh Marine and the 21st awardee to win the Congressional Medal of Honor in the Vietnam war. He showed extraordinary leadership in rescuing a platoon he commanded, as commander of a total company, which would have been wiped out but for the valiant fire laid down by the major, who was then a captain, and only two additional soldiers. This indicates what an individual can do in a great struggle.

Mr. President, I know that his example will inspire all Americans, as it always has in our history; and I ask unanimous consent that the citation of this remarkably courageous New Yorker, who once was a resident of the district I represented in Congress when I was a Member of the House, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDAL OF HONOR PRESENTATION BY LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO HOWARD V. LEE, MAJOR, U.S. MARINE CORPS, AT THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON OCTOBER 25, 1967, AT 1300 HOURS

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to Major Howard V. Lee, United States Marine Corps, For service set forth in the following Citation:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as Commanding Officer, Company E, Fourth Marines, Third Marine Division near Cam Lo, Republic of Vietnam, on 8 and 9 August 1966. A platoon of Major (then Captain) Lee's company, while on an operation deep in enemy territory, was attacked and surrounded by a large Vietnamese force. Realizing that the unit had suffered numerous casualties, depriving it of effective leadership, and fully aware that the platoon was even then under heavy attack by the enemy, Major Lee took seven men and proceeded by helicopter to reinforce the beleaguered platoon. Major Lee disembarked from the helicopter with two of his men and, braving withering enemy fire, led them into the perimeter, where he fearlessly moved from position to position directing and encouraging the overtaxed troops. The enemy then launched a massive attack with the full might of their forces. Although painfully wounded by fragments from an enemy grenade in several areas of his body, including his eye, Major Lee continued undauntedly throughout the night to direct the valiant defense, coordinate supporting fires, and apprise higher headquarters of the plight of the platoon. The next morning he collapsed from his wounds and was forced to relinquish his command. However, the small band of Marines had held their position and repeatedly fought off many vicious enemy attacks for a grueling six hours until their evacuation was effected the following morning. Major Lee's actions saved his men from capture, minimized the loss of lives, and dealt the enemy a severe defeat. His indomitable fighting spirit, superb leadership, and great personal valor in the face of tremendous odds, reflect great credit upon himself and are in keeping with the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House further insisted on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 58, 59, and 67 to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. MARSH, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. JONAS, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. TALCOTT, and Mr. BOW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Mr. HOLLINGS. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President and under the provisions of Public Law 170 of the 74th Congress, announces the appointment of the following Senators to attend the Interparliamentary Union meeting, to be held at Rome, Italy, on December 3 through 9, 1967: Senators YARBOROUGH, HOLLINGS, ALLOTT, and JORDAN of Idaho.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note that in subsection (1) of paragraph (a) of the distinguished Senator's amendment, he refers to the fact that conditions have drastically changed "both as to estimated revenue receipts and estimated expenditures during the fiscal year 1968."

I take it that statement would mean that the Senator is not talking about applying his reduction to the original estimate of expenditures submitted in January but to the present estimate. Am I correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely so.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 11 minutes remaining on the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may I be recognized for 3 or 4 minutes?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, for the Senator from Arizona I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I voted for the last amendment sponsored by the Senator from South Dakota because I felt he was touching upon a responsibility which is that of the Congress itself. His amendment was confined to the appropriations.

On the other hand, Mr. President, this amendment has to do with expenditures. If any mistake has been made appropriating too much money, that was the responsibility of the Congress itself. It was our deliberate act.

Now, we are a three-branch government. I do not think it is within the jurisdiction of the Congress itself to mandate the President of the United States without his consent on expenditures of money.

Once we have appropriated the money, the responsibility to spend the money is an executive function. It is a function that belongs to the President of the United States and he can spend the money that has been appropriated or he can freeze the money that has been appropriated. But that is his exclusive jurisdiction.

Now, this is a simple joint resolution to extend the authority under the existing continuing resolution. In this amendment we are saying to the President of the United States in a very subtle fashion, "We, the Congress, have appropriated too much money but now, Mr. President, unless you do something about not spending $5 billion of that money which we have appropriated, then we are going to do this to you; we are going to do this to you before we adjourn this Congress."

I think if we want to address the President of the United States on the expenditure of money we should go hat in hand to the White House and say, "Mr. President, we have been too extravagant. Now, you, as a very judicious man, you as a very frugal man, will you please help us out of this dilemma and please not spend $5 billion of the money we sent you to spend?"

But all of this has political overtones. All we are doing here is trying to put the cat on the back of the President of the United States, and for what? For something we ourselves have done. We have appropriated too much money. Only 2 weeks ago we appropriated millions and millions and millions of dollars for public works that were not even budgeted—not even budgeted.

Now we are telling the President of the United States, "You go ahead, Mr. President, this is your responsibility. You do not spend $5 billion of this extravagant amount that we sent to you, including what we did 2 weeks ago."

That is what is wrong with this amendment. It is impertinent to the President of the United States. What we should do, if we want to do something, because of the situation that now exists that we did not recognize, is to say, "We ask you, please, Mr. President, won't you help us out of our dilemma? Won't you help us out of our injudiciousness, and please do not spend the $5 billion we sent you to spend."

Then we would be acting with a little bit of discretion and with a little bit of respect and courtesy.

All we are doing in Congress is appropriating, appropriating, and appropriating. Then, the next day, we are telling the President of the United States, "Don't spend it."

Oh, yes, it makes some fancy headlines, and it is the subject of every Republican Party dinner in the country, and it makes pretty good reading on the part of some people.

We are in financial trouble. The President of the United States anticipated an administrative deficit of maybe $25 billion. We cannot stand that deficit unless we either cut the budget or raise taxes. Otherwise, we run ourselves into inflation. We all understand that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. I will take 2 minutes more.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. But, Mr. President, the time has come when we assume the responsibility. The time is at hand when the supplemental bill comes up here to do what needs to be done on the appropriation bills which are still pending. That is our responsibility and we can do something about saving the money that needs to be saved.

But this very glorious, very dramatic gesture of making it appear that if the President of the United States does not do what we tell him to do, then before we go home we will teach him a lesson. My goodness gracious. Where is our commonsense? Where is our common courtesy? Shame on us, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one-half minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island is very persuasive, but I am sure he does not want the RECORD to show that after the work done by the Public Works Appropriations Committee we appropriated, I think he said, millions and millions and millions over the budget.

Mr. PASTORE. No; I did not say that. Unbudgeted items.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unbudgeted items.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. That is what I said.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand unbudgeted items of about $4 billion and the whole bill was millions and millions and millions of dollars under the budget.

Mr. PASTORE. I remind the Senate that $4 billion is billion, billion, billion, billion—four times a billion. [Laughter.] That is what I said. Whether it is peanuts or potsful of money, if it does not belong there, let us take it out. I voted against it, even though it had one of my projects in it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are about millions and millions under the budget.

Mr. PASTORE. I did not say that. I said that we voted unbudgeted—unasked for millions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am overwhelmed by the compassionate sentiments of my distinguished friend from Rhode Island. I am glad that he shares my view. I have said over and over again this afternoon that I want Congress to share and, in fact, to accept the responsibility for this budget. No one has yet stood in his place anywhere, any time, and stated as a matter of fact that the President ever proposed a cut or sent us a message. OK, I accept it. I will bleed with him if he does not want to do it. But I want to do my duty and this resolution states, in view of the fact he has not done so, we ought to stay in this session until we bring about a cut of $5 billion in expenditures.

What good does it do to cut an appropriation when it goes into the bloodstream out of previously appropriated funds that are roaming around in this Government by the billions that we cannot touch and have not touched. The only way to meet inflation and the dangers down the road is to take it out of the expenditure stream, because that is what is going to count.

The President gets in on the other end of the road. He said, "Give me a tax increase of $6.3 billion." I say let us cut $5 billion out of the expenditures and that comes pretty close to meeting the tax increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I rest the case.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have enjoyed this debate. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has made many fine speeches. I have heard him in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. I have heard him on platforms in Republican conventions. Some Members of the Senate seem to take the pending speech seriously.

This is a toothless resolution. It means nothing. It merely states that it is the sense of the Senate that, under certain contingencies, the Senate or Congress should do so-and-so.

Well, many of us know that there are many things we should do, but it does not mean anything unless we do them.

If the Senator from Illinois is sincere and wants to cut expenditures $5 billion, then let him offer an amendment rescinding the appropriations.

That would mean something.

This is just a stump speech—a toothless, meaningless stump speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? Is all time now yielded back?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has now been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from

North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 301 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Aiken
Allott
Baker
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Fannin
Griffin
Hansen
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
McGovern
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Percy
Proxmire
Russell
Scott
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—45

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Ellender
Fong
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Spong
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Brooke
Clark
Dodd
Ervin
Fulbright
Gruening
Hatfield
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
McCarthy
Miller
Morse
Nelson
Prouty
Sparkman
Tower

So Mr. DIRKSEN'S amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 888 was passed by the House of Representatives on Wednesday, October 18, by a vote of 253 to 143.

It is significant that 86 Democrats supported this resolution, including the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas.

Every member of the Virginia delegation—six Democrats and four Republicans—voted for House Joint Resolution 888. Insofar as Virginia is concerned, at least, this was not a partisan political matter.

The Virginia delegation in the House of Representatives was convinced, as am I, that drastic action must be taken to put the Nation's financial house in order.

While there are objections to House Joint Resolution 888, I feel that under the circumstances—faced with the tremendous deficit of approximately $20 billion—that its enactment is justified.

Mr. President, in August at a meeting with a group of businessmen at least one Cabinet official told these businessmen that the administration would reduce spending by $7½ billion.

As a result of that meeting, I sent the following telegram to the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation:

> I understand that at a recent meeting with a group of businessmen you asserted that the Administration would reduce spending by $7½ billion. I would appreciate an early reply of confirmation and, if possible, brief information regarding proposed cuts.

Mr. Boyd replied thusly, under date of August 23:

> The Administration has not prepared a list of specific items it intended to cut from the budget because of the fact that the Congress has not completed the appropriation process. It would be irresponsible to begin making cuts prior to knowing exactly those appropriated items from which the cuts would be made and sound expenditure control can best be brought about by knowing precisely what Congress will have appropriated for 1968. When Congress has completed all of the appropriations for 1968, the Administration then, after reviewing the new appropriations, will submit its list of items which it believes can best be cut from the federal budget.

Frankly, I am not impressed with the administration's reasoning.

What the administration's spokesmen say, in effect, is this: We can get by with $7½ billion less than the recommendations contained in the President's budget. We can get by with $7½ billion less, but you appropriate it anyway—and then we will not spend it.

Ten months ago the President estimated that the deficit for the current fiscal year would approximate $8 billion. Today we are told by the Treasury Department that the deficit will exceed $20 billion.

Thus it is clear that the whole fiscal situation has changed and, therefore, the budget ought to change with it.

Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee has eliminated every aspect of House Joint Resolution 888 with the exception of continuing the appropriations until November 15, 1967.

I realize the Appropriations Committee has been working long and hard to bring some order to the choatic condition created by the swollen and expanded budget recommendations of the President.

I would like to support the committee's position. But I feel the House action, under the circumstances facing us at the present time, was justified.

So I shall vote against the committee amendment, thus voting to sustain the action of the House, which would limit expenditures for the current fiscal year to $131,500,000,000, "except those expenditures in excess of $22 billion which the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, is the present vote on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is what the yeas and nays have been ordered on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The question is on the committee amendment to strike out the language beginning with the word "and" on line 6, page 1, down to the end of the joint resolution.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, is this a final vote, or is another vote still required?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote on passage is required.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll——

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the committee amendment is defeated, does it mean that the House joint resolution as it was sent over to the Senate will then be before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House language would come back into the joint resolution.

Mr. GRIFFIN. So a vote against the committee amendment would be a vote for the House joint resolution. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to strike the language beginning with the word "and" on page 1, in line 6, to the end of the joint resolution.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator frcm Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea" and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 302 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cooper
Ellender
Fong
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—34

Allott
Baker
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Fannin
Griffin
Hansen
Hickenlooper
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Percy
Proxmire
Russell
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—16

Brooke
Clark
Dodd
Ervin
Fulbright
Gruening
Hatfield
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
McCarthy
McGovern
Miller
Morse
Prouty
Sparkman
Tower

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of today, for tomorrow, and for the rest of the week, if he can tell us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, when we dispose of this bill, that will be the end of the business for today. We shall have some bills, not of major importance, for tomorrow. We hope to have three or four conference reports tomorrow and Friday. There may be some votes on those reports, because of the feeling which the subject of appropriations seems to have generated in both Houses.

On Friday at 12:15, the Senate will leave the Chamber in a body, to proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to attend a joint meeting, which will be addressed by President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz of Mexico.

So I hope Senators will be aware of the possibility of votes tomorrow and Friday, and will be cognizant of the distinct honor which is being paid us by the President of Mexico when in addressing a joint meeting on Friday next.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, first of all, I express my appreciation for the graciousness of the majority leader, because we had run completely out of time on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will withhold for a moment, until order is restored.

The Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. MUNDT. I take this brief time simply, Mr. President, to point out why I shall vote "no" on the question of passage, and to recommend that course of action to my fellow Senators. I know it will not be followed, because we have tested the waters of economy today, and found in them tremendous interest, much support, and a great deal of illuminating discussion. But we lacked the votes in order to quite make the grade in demonstrating any determination for economy on our side. I am gratified of course that only five Republican votes were included in those opposing my economy amendment.

Unfortunately, today, we have closed the door to any economy effort. But by voting "no," we could at least avoid locking the door, and we would keep the latchstring out and our options open.

If we vote "no" and the "nays" prevail, the matter will go back to our Appropriations Committee tomorrow, and we will have before us there all the matters which have been discussed and the objections which have been raised, and will be able to test the capacity of the Appropriations Committee to come up with some other type of continuing resolution containing some formula for effectuating economy.

If we simply vote "yea," we put ourselves in the position of throwing the cold water of indifference on the economy fires which are burning in the House of Representatives, and will really come close to extending to the House a gratuitous insult, because the best we shall have done with their effort will be to turn the whole thing down.

So I submit that voting "no" on passage will keep our objectives open, and keep the hopes for economy alive; and I predict, if that view should prevail, it would result in a shorter conference, in more constructive action, and in a faster disposition of this problem than if we simply shirk our responsibility now and vote to postpone the whole issue until November 15 by voting in favor of the continuing resolution.

I suggest the wisdom of a negative vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate but a few minutes.

I shall vote "yea" for the resolution. I believe that is the appropriate vote. I think when it came out of the large Committee on Appropriations with only four "nay" votes, that indicated that a good many Senators on that committee feel that this is the proper course, after having looked at the matter much more in detail than is possible here.

So far as I am concerned, I would have been glad to have voted for something like the Dirksen amendment, and offered to do so if the Senator had reduced his figure to a $4 billion reduction of the spending budget. I am sure there were many others who felt the same way. I was not willing to vote for a declaration which expressed the possibility of a cut beyond what I thought was reasonable or could be done, without destroying vital functions of Government.

A $4 billion cut in the spending budget means a cut of somewhere between $7 and $8 billion in appropriations for both this year and prior years. I felt that was the extreme limit to which we could go, and know that a good many other Senators felt as I did.

I believe we will have room, in conference, to work the matter out.

I must say that every time we pass an additional appropriation bill—and we have four of them, now, out of conference and ready to be passed—this resolution becomes more and more meaningless, and it will soon be entirely meaningless. Mr. President, I think that a "yea" vote is the courteous vote to the House of Representatives, and will show we are not simply disregarding what they have done.

But we think that in conference something can be better worked out than what they did on the spur of the moment on the floor.

I have talked to a good many Members of the House of Representatives who feel the same way and who are not happy about the action taken by the House on the floor, more or less on the spur of the moment, when four different amendments offered from the House took the place of the committee proposal that had come to the floor prior to that time.

I shall vote "yea" for the passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 303 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Eastland
Ellender
Fong
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—26

Allott
Baker
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Fannin
Griffin
Hansen
Hickenlooper
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Percy
Proxmire
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—15

Brooke
Clark
Dodd
Ervin
Fulbright
Gruening
Hatfield
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
McCarthy
Miller
Morse
Prouty
Sparkman
Tower

So the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the passage of the continuing appropriation resolution the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, adds another monumental achievement to an already abundant record of outstanding public service. Senator HAYDEN employed the same keen understanding of the problems involved in this funding measure that has characterized his efforts in behalf of so many of his past accomplishments.

The consideration of this particular resolution presented an issue basic to the nature and function of the appropriations responsibility of the Congress. In meeting that issue, Senator HAYDEN led the fight to sustain here in the Senate, what I feel is the proper role of the Congress with respect to funding measures. He deserves the highest commendation of the Senate for the vital part he has played in obtaining this success.

Joining Senator HAYDEN was the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] whose articulate support was most persuasive. As on all issues that gain his endorsement, Senator HOLLAND's advocacy was at once brilliant and highly effective.

The senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is likewise to be commended for urging so capably his strong and sincere views on this matter. Though he advocated a different position than that which ultimately prevailed, he did so with the same articulate expression and broad expertise that have always credited his participation. The senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], also deserve high praise for the strong advocacy they employed in urging their respective positions.

We welcomed and immensely appreciated the support of other Senators who joined the discussion. Notable were the contributions of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. They too, deserve high commendation.

And finally, to the entire Senate goes the deep appreciation of the leadership for the magnificent cooperation demonstrated by all Senators in disposing of this matter promptly, efficiently and with full consideration for the views of every Member. I am confident that the conferees on this measure will exercise their best efforts to assure swift action by the Congress so that the affected agencies of the Government will not be impeded in the administration of their various programs.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PERCY TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the transaction of morning business on tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the bill and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill, and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the bill and concurred therein; and that the House insisted on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 4772) to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND SOVIET DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ITS JEWISH COMMUNITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this year the Soviet Union is marking the 50th anniversary of the Russian Revolution and commemorating a half century of Communist rule. But today in the U.S.S.R. there remains a substantial group of people being denied even fundamental religious and cultural rights guaranteed to them by Soviet law—the 3 million Jews of that nation who comprise the second largest Jewish community in the world.

Although the Soviet Union is an atheistic country, Soviet law does provide for those who would observe their religious faith. However, unlike other faiths in the U.S.S.R., the Jews cannot publish devotional literature, manufacture religious articles such as prayer shawls, and cannot have official contacts with their coreligionists abroad. Other religious groups may have a central or coordinating structure; the Jews are denied this.

The discriminatory treatment by the Soviet Union of its Jewish citizens in contrast to the equality accorded them in other Communist countries in Eastern Europe. According to reports by the World Jewish Congress, the 110,000 Jews in Rumania, the 80,000 Jews in Hungary, the 18,000 Jews in Czechoslovakia, and the 6,500 Jews in Yugoslavia receive substantially the same treatment as do members of other religious faiths. This equality of treatment is what we ask of the Soviet Union.

As the Soviets commemorate the 50th anniversary of Communist rule we are reminded of the words from Leviticus which describe how, in ancient times, during the jubilee fiftieth year the enslaved were freed and, as is written on our Liberty Bell, liberty was proclaimed throughout the land. We hope that the Soviets, too, might honor this ancient injunction:

> And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year and proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a jubilee unto you;
>
> And ye shall return every man unto his possession and ye shall return every man unto his family.

JEWS IN SOVIET UNION CONTINUE OPPRESSED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, Jews in the Soviet Union continue to feel the weight of discrimination, despite the official Soviet policy which condemns anti-semitism.

It should be a matter of concern to the Soviets that their policy clashes with their practice. The Jewish minority should have the same opportunity to follow their cultural and religious traditions as other minorities in that country. They should not be subject to restrictive quotas in employment and education.

Mr. President, I join my Jewish friends in the hope that the yoke of oppression will soon be lifted from their fellow Jews in the Soviet Union.

FATHER JACQUES MARQUETTE—PIONEER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it will be 293 years on December 4 of this year that the renowned Father Jacques Marquette and two young French "woods rangers" disembarked from their canoe at what is now 28th Street and Damen Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and settled down for the first white man's winter in that area. Throughout the years, this outstanding event has been recognized by some event, beginning in 1924, but it has been a decade or more that December 4 has passed by without a mention of the contribution this Jesuit priest, who helped bring Christianity to the wilderness, made not only for those in the Chicago area but also for our State and Nation.

A political and social science teacher, John "Bill" Handzel, at Niles West High School, Skokie, Ill., is most interested in a park or marina at the site, or at least a replica of the hut where Pere Marquette spent that cold winter of 1674—the first white man's home in Chicago. The first Christian mission founded by Father Marquette is memorialized in Utica, Ill., where a marker stands on the grounds of St. Mary's Church.

Many in our Nation are filled with gratitude for those noble and brave men who experienced hardships, suffering, and even death in the building of our great Nation, and during these trying times it is even more important that we pause for reflection and commemorate those such as Father Marquette. December 4, 1674, is an important day in history.

SOVIET-HUNGARIAN RELATIONS—OCTOBER 25, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, 11 years ago this week the people of Hungary rose up against the cruel Soviet regime that maintained an iron grip on their country. Miraculously, the revolution took hold—for a few precious days. Hungarians looked to the outside world for help and recognition of their brave act.

Freedom is not so easily won when a small band of patriots struggling against impossible odds is coldly ignored by their powerful friends. Within a few days, Soviet tanks were rolling in the streets of Budapest, and the Soviets had crushed the spark of freedom. The West stands guilty for its failure to heed the call of humanity that week.

However, I do not intend today to speak of what is past. It is the present that counts for the most today. On all sides we hear statements that the terror of 1956 has abated, that the Hungarian Communist regime of 1967 is mellowing, and is becoming independent of the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, those who make such statements are not up-to-date on Hungarian affairs. I would like to point out that only last month, on September 7, 1967, the Hungarian puppet regime signed a Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance with the Soviet Union. Under this agreement, Hungary pledged itself to remain a Soviet satellite for another 20 years.

There are some who believe that the word "satellite" is out-moded when describing the Soviet empire. This treaty of September 7 should banish any such beliefs. The treaty proves that Hungary is completely integrated politically and economically with the Soviet Union. Moscow treats Hungary as a conquered nation, which must pay tribute to its masters. The terms are so humiliating, and so disadvantageous to Hungary that it is difficult to imagine that the Communist bosses would want it publicized. Yet I am told that the text was published in full in the official newspaper of the Hungarian Socialist Worker's—Communist—Party the day after it was signed. As in the days of Ghengis Khan, the conqueror glories over the conquered. New economic legislation to take effect on January 1, 1968, indicates the price that Hungary will have to pay to her masters.

I think it should be pointed out first that the top leadership of the Hungarian Communist Party is handpicked and trained in Moscow. As in every other Communist country, the Central Commitee of the Communist Party is the real ruling force of the land. No one is allowed on the Central Committee unless he obeys the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party implicitly.

The new treaty consists of nine articles. It replaces a similar treaty signed in 1948 and retains all important elements of the earlier agreement, but incorporates new provisions to bring it in line with present Soviet foreign policy.

The "eternal friendship" of the two countries "based on the firm principle of socialist internationalism" is emphasized in the preamble as serving the interests of the socialist community of the world.

Article 1 promises that the contracting parties will also strengthen this eternal friendship in the future and will act for the unity of the socialist countries.

Article 2 deals with the bilateral and multilateral economic, scientific, and technical cooperation in accordance with the principles of the "international socialist sharing of the workload" within the Comecon—the Communist "common market." Hungary's participation in Comecon activities, therefore, became a subject of bilateral state relations between the U.S.S. and Hungary.

Cultural cooperation and joint creative activities are the subject of article 3 which broadens the field of exchange in all phases of education, science, and culture.

Article 4 obligates both parties to strengthen the socialist world system and to aid nations "liberated from colonial rule and following the road of strengthennig their national independence and sovereignty."

The Warsaw Pact is mentioned in article 5 as the means to guarantee the present frontiers of the member nations to that pact, and to prevent "the aggression by the forces of militarism and revanchism"—an obvious reference to the United States and West Germany. The provision ties Hungarian policy even more closely to that of the Soviet Union than previously and lessens the possibility of any genuine Hungarian initiatives on the European scene.

Article 6 provides for immediate military and any other aid in case of aggression against one of the contracting parties based "on the natural right to individual or collective self-defense." This means that Soviet troops undoubtedly will remain on Hungarian soil.

The obligation to consult in important international matters affecting the interests of both countries is established in article 7. This provision, however, goes much further by prescribing that the parties "must act according to a common standpoint harmonized in accordance with their mutual interests."

The last two articles refer to formalities and provide that the treaty shall be in force for at least 20 years.

The treaty is regarded by an editorial in the official Communist paper as "not only one important factor of our foreign policy, but also an unalterable obligation belonging to the basic pillars of our socialist national existence which serves our best national interests as well as the cause of general peace and the worldwide progress of socialism." Such a candid admission of the fact that the existence of the present regime is dependent on the Soviet Union is one of the rare slips of the tongue printed in an official publication of the Communist Government of Hungary.

The chairman of the Council of Ministers, Jeno Fock, in his speech after the signing of the treaty, said:

> Our goals and principles are mutual, our parties and governments profess in the most important matters similar views and act in unity.

Janos Kadar, the head of the Communist Party, expressed his thanks to the Soviet Union for the internationalist help extended in 1956 to crush the revolution and promised the full cooperation of the Government of Hungary with the Soviet Union.

Leonid Brezhnev, the leader of the Soviet Communist Party, lauded Kadar and the Communist Party of Hungary for their contribution to the common cause of revolution.

The dependence of the Hungarian economy upon the Soviet Union was further increased through the Hungarian-Soviet trade agreements. The results of these agreements were recently published in Hungary on the occasion of the 22d anniversary of the first of such agreements.

The article does not contain data on the price structure of the foreign trade relations of the two countries which were always known to be discriminatory to the detriment of Hungary. However, the proportion of Soviet imports and exports clearly indicates that the entire Hungarian economy is at the mercy of its big partner.

In 1966 one-third of the entire foreign trade of Hungary was transacted with the Soviet Union. This in itself would be a very dangerous proportion for any country's economy. However, since Hungary in the past two decades was industrialized with emphasis on heavy industry—on instructions from the Kremlin—without having either the raw material basis or the necessary energy sources, an analysis of Hungary's imports from the Soviet Union quickly shows that the entire Hungarian economy can be brought to a standstill if the leaders of the Soviet Union decide to suspend the raw material and energy shipments.

According to the statistics published in the aforementioned article, 67.8 percent of all Soviet imports into Hungary consist of raw materials and semifinished goods, and 27.5 percent is machinery and factory equipment. If the percentage of the Soviet shipments is compared with the total imports of certain goods, the results are even more startling: 85.1 percent of crude oil, 76.8 percent of electric energy, 49.5 percent of cotton, 50.1 percent of coke, 62.7 percent of newsprint, 79.1 percent of lumber, 42.1 percent of rolled steel, and 97.5 percent of pig iron needs of Hungary are supplied by the Soviet Union.

The same article, praising the generosity of the Soviet Union, mentioned that there is hardly a worker in Hungary who does not work with raw materials or energy coming from the U.S.S.R.

The Hungarian exports to the Soviet Union show similar disproportions; 47.3 percent of the shipments to the Soviets consist of machinery and factory equipment, and 29 percent of industrial consumer goods.

Hungary exports to the Soviets more than half of the production of its entire machine and fine mechanical industry, and two-thirds of the total production of the Hungarian pharmaceutical industry.

Hungary's bauxite mining is foremost in Europe, but the bauxite is shipped to the Soviets for smelting, and the aluminum is sold—at a price much higher than the world market would justify—to Hungary for domestic needs. Yet it is well-known that the Soviets sell aluminum cheaply to Poland to make aircraft for the war machine.

In addition to these inequities, Hungary had to join the Comecon which controls the economies of its members. The official communique of the executive committee of this organization was issued on July 8 of this year which announced that the economic plans of the member states for the years 1971–75 must be coordinated. This coordination must extend to the international specialization of production, matters of cooperation and standardization, bringing into harmony the building of industrial establishments, geological explorations, scientific and technical cooperation, and matters of furthering the development of mutual trade. The chairman of the Executive Committee of the Comecon is the representative of the Soviet Union. No further comment is necessary.

On the home front the main concern of the leaders as well as of the majority of the population is the "new economic management" which is to begin on January 1, 1968. Although all features of the change in the economic structure of the country have not yet been made public, nevertheless, the facts already known indicate that the general uneasiness of the people is not without reason.

The new system of the economic structure stems from the realization that the totally centralized organization of the nation's economy, built up after the Soviet pattern, led the country close to bankruptcy. The balance sheets of the government-owned enterprises showed greater losses every year. The agriculture, socialized almost completely, could not even feed the nation, while in the past Hungary was able to export agricultural products in large quantities.

According to the rules of the planned economy, production plans were made at the highest level of the administration for the whole country. The plan prescribed what to produce and how much, regardless of the needs of the population. Prices were set by the government while disregarding the costs of production. The situation was similar in all countries of the Soviet-dominated bloc, and even in the Soviet Union itself. But, changes were already being introduced in most countries in various degrees.

Hungary's leaders decided to follow a unique method and change the whole system drastically and simultaneously in all fields of the economy.

The basic feature of the economic reform is that the economic management will be decentralized and the decisions pertaining to production will be made by the enterprises within the very elastic framework of the general national economic plan.

Another very important measure will be that most prices will be set by the enterprises on the basis of production costs and the artificially maintained price structure of officially established prices will be discontinued.

The main emphasis is put on the profitability of the economy as a whole as well as of the individual enterprises. To achieve this the government was forced to abandon several features of the hitherto existing system which, at least from the viewpoint of propaganda, were the most important achievements of the people's democracy: job security, free social benefits and the relatively low prices of services and certain goods.

Some of these measures are already shaped in the form of statutory rules, and several others still await publication. One of the most important steps was the enactment of an entirely new Labor Code which was unanimously adopted by the

Hungarian Parliament less than a month ago at its last session held on September 27–29, 1967.

Contrary to the previous code, which was quite a detailed regulation, the new code is only a framework of basic principles which will be flushed out with implementing decrees issued by the government.

One basic rule of the new code abolished virtually all restrictions pertaining to the termination of employment. Until now it was frequently pointed out by official Hungarian circles that in the people's democracy the workers enjoy the greatest job security, and their employment may only be terminated under conditions prescribed by law. Although in practice this system did not work as well as in theory, and employment was frequently terminated mainly for political reasons, it may be said that a certain degree of job security still prevailed, and managers—at least formally—had to comply with the provisions of the law.

Under the new system termination of employment in general will be left to the manager's discretion. At a time when the enterprise managers will be under the heaviest pressure from the government to show profit and use the manpower as efficiently as possible, this discretion undoubtedly will result in the firing of a sizable number of workers and employees. The fear of large-scale unemployment is so great that the Minister of Labor felt it necessary to say some reassuring cliches. He went so far as to refer to the Constitution which guarantees the right to work. The Minister, however, interpreted this provision in a manner which may lead to the conclusion that a large segment of the working population may only find work in fields other than their profession or trade, that is, only low-paid manual work.

In such a situation, political pressure undoubtedly will play an even larger role than ever before. Several signs in this direction may already be found in the daily press. The increased activity and power of the Communist Party in the field of personnel policies is heavily emphasized. A party secretary expressed the role of the Communist Party's organizations in the plants in the following manner:

> It must be indispensable that in selecting the cadres, on promotions and dismissals, in preparing the performance ratings the economic leaders must ask for the opinion of the party organization and the trade union, and these opinions must also be heeded.

The Communist regime was always proud of the fact that social benefits, such as working clothes, child care in the factory nurseries, meals at the places of work, use of summer resort homes, and so forth, were free or only a nominal sum was charged to the workers. In the future the workers will have to pay the total cost for these. Considering the fact that under the new economic management the prices of goods and services will be set according to actual cost and profits and, therefore, all prices will go up, the discontinuation of the free social benefits will considerably lower the already low living standards. At the same time there is no hope that wages will be raised.

At present the standards of living are unbelievably low. According to the official statistics the average yearly net income of a worker in the year 1964 was 12,762 forints, while the average expenditures of a person in the same year amounted to 13,437 forints. To provide a family of three—husband, wife, and one child—only with food a worker needed 14,610 forints, which means that the average working person is unable even to feed the smallest family.

It was an almost unique situation in Eastern Europe that peasants in Hungary, although forced to join the agricultural cooperatives—kolkhoz—retained their title to the land which they contributed to the cooperative. To acknowledge this right to ownership the cooperatives were obliged to pay a nominal rent for the use of the land owned by its members.

A recently enacted law put an end to this privilege and simply transferred the title to agricultural lands used by the cooperatives from the original owners to the cooperative by operation of law and without compensation.

The result of this measure will obviously make the peasant even more dependent upon the mercy of the state; the nominal rents that he formerly received will be abolished.

Mr. President, I want to remind my colleagues that the Hungary I have been speaking of is the Hungary of today. This is the same country which is supposed to be achieving independence and cultural freedom. Those people who make such statements are simply not being realistic. They express their own hopes, rather than the facts. The information I have been presenting today is taken directly from official Communist Hungarian sources. These are the real facts which we must look at if we wish to appraise Hungarian communism objectively. Eleven years after the Soviets put down the Hungarian revolution, they still remain the masters today.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, 22 years ago, when the regime of Adolf Hitler collapsed, one hoped that the age-old practice of anti-Semitism would also collapse. The Nazi era, characterized not only by naked aggression but also by the most heinous religious repression since the Inquisition, had awakened the conscience of the world.

Yet now, in 1967, 22 years later, Jews in the Soviet Union are subjected to great pressures and restrictions. They are not allowed to organize on a state or national level. The number of synagogues is steadily reduced. Rabbinical training is severely circumscribed. It is almost impossible to obtain religious articles. Jews receive harsh treatment in Soviet courts. The emigration of Jews is strictly controlled. Their contacts with foreigners are discouraged. They are excluded from certain areas of the government and the army. They may not attend international Jewish meetings, and they cannot show any interest they may have in their coreligionists in Israel. There is not a single Jewish school in the Soviet Union. Prayer books and Bibles cannot be published.

That is the sad story of official discrimination against the Jewish people of the Soviet Union.

But it is not the only story of anti-Semitism in 1967. Last June, when the Arab-Israel war erupted, the Government of the United Arab Republic moved harshly against Egyptian Jews, imprisoning hundreds of them and confiscating the property of the Jews of Cairo. Many of Egypt's Jews are still behind bars. When, on October 5, President Nasser sent his representative to a synagogue to present Jewish new year greetings to the Jewish community, it was discovered that the rabbi and many members of the congregation were still in prison.

Here are two nations, the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic, both practicing anti-Semitism against their own nationals of the Jewish faith. And they practice it in 1967, when many of us like to think that such prejudice belongs to the past.

In May of this year I communicated my strong feelings against Soviet anti-Semitism and Egyptian provocations against Israel to the Embassies of the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic in Washington. I urge my colleagues and all Americans of good will to make known their own objections to the outrage of anti-Semitism wherever it may be manifested.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON WORKS FOR PEACE—SENATOR RANDOLPH STRESSES OTHER PARTIES MUST BE WILLING TO NEGOTIATE—HO MUST SPEAK, SAYS THE ECONOMIST EDITOR

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Members of this body and the citizens of our Nation have been subjected to a steady stream of protests that President Lyndon Johnson is not actively and sincerely pursuing a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam conflict. A substantial number of those who offer suggestions for negotiations seem to place the entire burden of responsibility on the United States—this is unjust and unfair treatment of President Johnson and his advisers. His attempts to find paths to peace are a matter of public record. Although persons have the right to disagree with our Vietnam policy, I believe it is incumbent upon all citizens to give fair recognition to the President's endeavors for a just settlement.

Assuredly, no person has a greater desire for an end to the Vietnam struggle and for world peace, than the Chief Executive of our Republic.

President Johnson, in his recent speech before the annual meeting of the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical and Technical Employees, stated that America appears to be "searching alone" for peace in Vietnam. He further emphasized that "In every way we can, we search for peace in Vietnam. Those who began the war are not willing to sit down with us to explore ways to end it."

Mr. President, negotiations cannot be conducted by only one of the parties at issue.

The Christian Science Monitor, an

excellent daily newspaper, Friday, October 20, carried a reprint of a cogent commentary from the London Economist on this point. The article is entitled "If Only Ho Would Speak."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this material be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From The Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 20, 1967]

If Only Ho Would Speak

The guessing game about what goes on in President Ho Chi Minh's mind gets more complicated every week. The latest contribution comes from Mr. Humphry Berkeley in [The] Times. Mr. Berkeley says that U Thant told him recently that he could "guarantee" that the North Vietnamese would agree to negotiate with the Americans within three or four weeks if the Americans stopped bombing them. That word "guarantee" goes beyond anything the United Nations Secretary-General has said in public. U Thant has never claimed more than that he himself is "convinced" that things would turn out that way. Which is different. It is, in any case, curious that Ho Chi Minh's intentions should have to be interpreted through what Mr. Berkeley says U Thant says the North Vietnamese say.

The confusion this hearsay evidence can lead to was illustrated by what happened to India's defense minister. . . . Mr. Swaran Singh told the UN General Assembly on October 6th that he believed the end of the bombing would be followed not only by negotiations but also by a "cessation of all hostilities." For a moment it looked as if Mr. Singh was on to something important. . . . But two days later his own prime minister, Mrs. Gandhi, was obliged to say in Moscow that Mr. Singh's statement was merely "an opinion," and that she herself thought that no one could say anything so positive.

It would be much simpler if North Vietnam's leaders would confirm or deny the ideas that other people attribute to them; but they don't. Until they do, the second-hand hints that emerge from Hanoi could be either a spark of hope for negotiations or a wrecker's beacon. . . .

There are two unanswered questions—unanswered, that is by the North Vietnamese themselves. The first is whether President Ho is interested in negotiations at all, even if the bombing is stopped. He may rather keep on fighting until he knows, next November, who the next American president is going to be; or at least until he knows whom the Republicans are going to put up against Mr. Johnson. . . .

The second question is what they would do on the battlefield if talks did start. The North Vietnamese cannot reasonably be expected to withdraw their own troops from the south, or to stop supplying them. President Johnson made it clear as long ago as February that he understood that. But it is just as unreasonable to expect the Americans to let negotiations drag inconclusively on for a year or more—as they did in Korea—while the North Vietnamese assemble and equip a new army and push it into the south along routes freed from the danger of air attack. . . .

These are fair questions. Until somebody answers them, with authority, it will be hard to believe in those nods and winks from Hanoi.

—The Economist [London]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the urban crisis which our Nation faces has been widely discussed—in newspapers and magazines, on radio and television. Its widespread ramifications have been discussed by learned academicians and public officials, and by concerned citizens all over our Nation. Recently the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] gave an address entitled "The Summer of our Discontent," in which he summed up in a very few pages much of what others have taken chapters and books to say.

Senator Magnuson recognizes "that many American cities are no longer amenable places in which to live," and adds:

> They provide very little of the good life for a majority of their inhabitants and a great deal that is sordid, wretched, and hopeless. In many cases, they have been stripped of their beauty, excitement, urbanity, and splendor to stand as monuments to poverty, degradation, prejudice and humiliation.

The Senator's statement of our responsibility is clear and concise:

> I must insist that failure to take major and sweeping actions to relieve the legitimate tensions and grievances will further widen the gulf that already threatens to divide our nation . . . . The War on Poverty and the quest to rebuild urban America . . . [are] for all Americans because all Americans stand to gain.

Senator Magnuson's thoughtful remarks are matched by his actions in the Senate. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations, he led the successful fight to restore the model cities and rent supplement appropriations which the House slashed earlier this year. As chairman of the Committee on Commerce, he has become the leader of the fight to protect the American consumer. From auto safety to flammable fabrics, from cigarettes to door-to-door salesmen, the senior Senator from Washington has seen to it that the 89th Congress and the 90th Congress so far have produced more items of consumer protection legislation than any previous Congresses in our history. Senator Magnuson deserves the thanks of all of us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Magnuson's thoughtful and constructive address about the problems of our cities be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Summer of Our Discontent

(An address by Warren G. Magnuson, U.S. Senator from Washington, the Seattle Rotary Club, September 13, 1967, Seattle, Wash.)

In this summer just past we have seen the greatest domestic upheaval this nation has known in over 100 years. In city after city, from Portland, Oregon to Tampa, Florida disturbances ranging from minor rock throwing incidents to full-scale rioting bordering on revolt have erupted. The massive urban slums of Detroit and Newark were suddenly turned into embattled war zones. Businessmen, clerks, college students, and workingmen were mobilized in National Guard outfits and rushed to the erupting cities to shoot, arrest, and restrain fellow Americans who seemingly went berserk.

Policemen were forced to the streets in riot helmets. Armed with high powered rifles, they have had to fight what resembled small scale guerrilla warfare. To a degree almost unknown in previous American law enforcement history, policemen were exposed to grave personal risk. Rarely before have our dedicated law enforcement officers had to suppress such savage violence, billowing up from the depths of discontent, misery, and frustration, that have turned our cities into seething jungles of lawlessness.

Many, who are ordinarily law-abiding citizens, suddenly turned to looting upon seeing the complete disintegration of law and authority. Others, nurturing pent up hostilities and frustrations, fiendishly took to the rooftops armed with weapons believing that the anonymity of the mob would shield their brutal sniping at policemen, guardsmen, and even, in some cases, helpless bystanders.

Fire, one of man's oldest enemies, emerged once again as a terrifyingly destructive force. Out-of-control flames hungrily devoured homes, businesses, and public buildings. Our cities' firefighters were paralyzed by fear of snipers and mobs bent on assault. The flames from the arsonists' fire bombs spread from building to building, silhouetting the crazed looters senseless frenzy to snap up the riches.

The American public, up until now smugly complacent about the enormous tensions seething in our urban slums, have suddenly been assaulted with the avalanche of disorder. From the television screen and the pages of the daily newspapers, the headlines and sound tracks have screamed out across America to pierce a restless calm. A longtime erosion of general respect for the law has suddenly turned into a galloping disregard for lawful authority, the rights of property ownership, and a shallow value of human life and well-being.

To me, this domestic turmoil, this violence and mob rule is the most frightening development in American society in a hundred years.

And it is monumentally ironical.

It erupts in a period of unprecedented prosperity and well-being for the vast majority of Americans. It comes at a period in which the unemployed number less than four percent of the American labor force. It comes when the median American family is nearing a ten thousand dollar a year annual income. It comes at a period when more American young people are pursuing higher education than have ever done so in the past. It comes when most Americans can expect to live to 70 or past, relatively free of disabling, crippling or confining diseases. It comes at a time of magnificent bounty for the American people. And it comes at a time when many of us naively believed that we were making deliberate progress in improving race relations in the United States.

In the relatively short period of time since the uprisings have outraged our law-abiding American majority, a great debate has begun over where to place the blame. It has drawn in country preachers, black racists, local beat patrolmen, Congressmen, and Senators, poverty fighters, Communist propagandists, and critics at large. Each has tried to outrace the other in an attempt to point the finger and it has become fashionable in some quarters to place the blame on the war on poverty. That's a little like blaming the doctor when cancer strikes. Equally as absurd, some point to decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. Others argue that the rioting is caused by politicians attempting to appease the Negro vote. Still others claim the violence is a direct outgrowth of peaceful civil rights activities that have been successful in securing basic rights for America's Negroes. These are the simple, pat, black and white answers which it seems to me are inadequate explanations. I'm certain that sociologists, economists, and political scientists will spend days and years trying to arrive at answers, but I suspect that they will never be entirely successful.

One of the most troubling and perplexing truths that *has* emerged, spotlighted as it has been by the fires of mass revolt, is the fact that many American cities are no longer amenable places in which to live. Aristotle once observed that men come together in cities to live and remain together to live the good life. Judged by his standards, American cities do not measure up. They provide very little of the good life for a majority of their inhabitants and a great deal that is sordid, wretched, and hopeless. In many cases, they have been stripped of their beauty, excitement, urbanity, and splendor to stand as monuments to poverty, degradation, prejudice and humiliation.

Their once proud houses stand stooped and broken, testifying to long years of neglect by their opulent landlords who have fled to the burgeoning suburbs. Where great broad avenues once served as exciting channels of commerce and transportation, they now are a constant reminder of the congestion of vehicles and human being that threaten to choke these gasping urban transportation networks. Where children once played in green and open playgrounds sprinkled amidst the urban grandeur, there are now only office buildings, factories, shops and apartment houses. But the children don't play here anymore. Instead, they mass on narrow broken sidewalks, in the fetid alleys and on the sinking steps of the dank, gray, rat-infested tenement buildings.

This is urban America in 1967.

No, it isn't Seattle—at least not yet, Rather it's Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, New York, Trenton, Newark, Baltimore, Boston, Los Angeles, San Francisco and scores of smaller but nonetheless desperate cities. Some have had rioting, others have not, yet all share the misery, degradation, and poverty that foster a climate conducive to disorder.

Many have used the phrase "crisis in the city" to describe the shocking events of recent months. The phrase sums up well the fact that every American city faces monumental problems in housing, employment, education, and law enforcement. Problems of such scope and depth that an unrelated incident can trigger enough violence to tear apart an American city in a single night. But even this description does not envelop the core of the crisis. We face, not only a crisis in housing, employment, and law enforcement, but also a crisis of belief. The people of the slums are losing their belief in the promise of America. And the rest of us, though confronted with statistics that tell us one of three slum residents has a serious employment problem, still are unwilling to act upon the belief. The simple fact is that legitimate complaints are a major cause of the anger and bitterness that transform a local incident into a matter of national survival.

I will not argue that we can guarantee an end to violence by passing programs that would eliminate all the grievances and injustices that press so heavily on the residents of our central cities. But, on the other hand, I must insist that failure to take major and sweeping actions to relieve the legitimate tensions and grievances will further widen the gulf that already threatens to divide our nation.

I am becoming increasingly disgusted with those in this nation, and many are influential national leaders, who are demanding that we abandon our efforts to provide our cities and their people the decency and the escape from poverty and despair that remains despite this nation's astounding wealth and affluence. These classical reactionaries would rescind all civil rights legislation, kill the war on poverty, and discontinue funds for the federal government's urban rebuilding program in retaliation for what have been termed race riots. These are the voices who cry out in anger when they see television newsfilms showing Negro looters piling TV sets into Cadillacs in Detroit but who never wince when reading of a 3-year-old Negro girl bitten to death in her bed by rats. These unseeing Americans are victims of this senseless rioting, too. Victims, in the sense that they lash out with hatred and vituperation against all of our impoverished Negro Americans, including those who peacefully and lawfully await the day that the American dream of opportunity and equality will be a reality.

This new anti-Negro mentality is well exemplified by the column of a nationally syndicated newspaper columnist who recently dismissed American urban poverty this way, and I quote, "But nothing points up the phoniness of this cause more sharply than the news pictures showing Negro looters loaded down with cases of whiskey and television sets." Ordinarily such shabby reasoning would be dismissed as merely the prattling of a crank, but I am alarmed to note that this kind of reaction is widespread.

There is, it seems to me, a widespread misunderstanding concerning our desire to relieve the desperate plight of the cities which again and again has been labeled "appeasing rioters."

Let me make myself unmistakably clear.

Rioters, looters, murderers, and arsonists and those who incite and promote violence should not be spared the full and unremitting punishment of law. These reckless hoodlums, outlaws, punks and trouble-makers, whether they be black or white, must be swiftly and sternly punished. They must be forced to understand that violence will not be tolerated; they must be handled in the sternest manner if our great heritage of law and order is to prevail. We will not allow our precious heritage to be jeopardized by this lawless fringe who seize upon this spirit of restlessness, despair, and frustration and seek to destroy what little dignity the Negro urban American still possesses. Stern punishment must serve as an example to others who, alienated from this complex and sometimes unjust society, might seek to wreak their vengeance on our cities and their law abiding inhabitants. These black racists, most of whom are thoroughly discredited within the Negro community, must be constantly observed to see that their insurrectionist mouthings are not allowed to foment black Americans. Those who are frustrated by great promises of a better tomorrow but who, so far, have seen their urban ghettos slip deeper into the abyss of squalor and depravity.

But in our haste to safeguard our precious American heritage of law, we must not be deterred from the task of rebuilding urban America. Not only Watts, Detroit, Newark but all the American cities in which the dream of a great tomorrow somehow seems unattainable. We must not turn from the desperate plight of millions of law abiding Americans who, in this great age of richness, have been engulfed in the ever widening chasm between rich middle class America and their own world of abject poverty. These unfortunate Americans who have patiently awaited the opening of the doors of opportunity in the slums of American cities.

We have endured a summer of urban violence without parallel in the Nation's history. These events summon us to action. They are grim reminders of the intolerance which has become endemic in our cities. They pose a challenge to the reputation of the Nation and to the will of its people. The challenge is as immense as the task is clear. It is to preserve the domestic tranquility so that the promise of the Constitution may be pursued by all Americans under law and in order.

We do not reward rioters when we stimulate the building of the kind of housing and neighborhoods in which people can live decently and safely. We do not reward rioters when we seek to provide educational opportunities for youngsters unaware of the wonderful world outside the invisible walls of the ghetto. We do not reward rioters when we seek to train poor, uneducated men and women who are not equipped to be productive members of our complex society. We do not seek to reward rioters when we ask for funds to kill the rats that many of our major cities continue to ignore. Rats which bite thousands of youngsters and infants each year. We do not seek to reward rioters when we build city playgrounds and open spaces for children who have never seen a grassy field or a swimming pool.

No, we are not speaking of rewards but of responsibilities. Not responsibilities to rioters but obligations to the United States, its future and its people. We are challenged, wherever we may come from in the Nation whether from rural or urban States because, in the end, we are one nation and there is no future for any part of it unless there is a future for all of it. We are challenged to redress wrongs too numerous to mention, too old to ignore.

There are no overnight answers to this challenge, no instant solutions to the problems of the cities. Money alone is not the answer. Government action alone is not the answer.

But equally as clear and emphatic is the fact that no solutions are possible without money and no long-range solutions will take place unless there is government action, prompt and persistent and at all levels.

President Johnson summed up the nature of our responsibility recently when he said, "If we become two people—the suburban affluent and the urban poor, each filled with mistrust and fear one for the other—we shall as well condemn our own generation to a bitter paradox; an educated, wealthy, progressive people who would not give their thoughts, their resources or their will to provide for the common well being."

Where are the answers to meeting our responsibilities? Which is the path that will lead us toward a better, more productive future for our great urban masses? Where do we begin—at what level of government or with which resources of the private sector? How much do we spend? These are the questions that demand our attention, our best talent, and our total commitment. I don't have any pat answers or grand scheme. Neither does President Johnson nor Governor Evans nor Mayor Braman. But that should not detract from our continuing search and our efforts to organize and fund some imaginative ideas which have already been formulated.

Let's take a look at what we have now that is worth preserving and strengthening.

One hundred years after Abraham Lincoln established the Department of Agriculture, cities were given, in 1965, an equal voice in the Cabinet by the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The model cities program of 1966 and the rent supplement program of 1965 provided new and advanced legislative tools for rebuilding cities and improving housing for the poor.

In that short 2 year span, legislation has been enacted looking to the modernization of city transportation so that Americans may get into and out of and around in our cities easily, cheaply, and safely.

Minimum wages for 41 million workers were raised in 1966; nearly a million workers have been retrained under new man power programs.

More than 20 million Americans are receiving decent meals through a food-stamp and school-lunch programs.

Eight million disadvantaged youngsters, and nearly a million young college students, are today benefiting from the great commitment to education which was made by this

Government in the landmark education acts of 1965.

In 1964, pioneer legislation was enacted in an effort to break the appalling line of chronic poverty in America and two million Americans have already risen above that line.

During the past 3 years, we have invested more than $16 billion in new programs of this kind. Additional billions have gone into older programs, such as public assistance, public housing, social security, urban renewal, hospital construction, and unemployment compensation.

These programs have served to meet some of the more gaping of the gaps in metropolitan America and to meet the more urgent needs of millions of urban Americans. A *continuance,* and I stress a continuance, of these programs is essential if we mean even to hold the line against the rapid decay of the cities.

Recently, we in the Congress have been involved in a tremendous fight over two of the most important new programs to be put forward in years. The Rent Supplement Act and the Model Cities Program. Both have come under heated attack by many critics who have only recently acknowledged that they misunderstood the programs.

Rent supplement is an imaginative new concept which may offer long term hope for rebuilding America's urban housing. By utilizing the resources and the talents of American private enterprise to construct and manage low cost rental housing, we will be able to provide decent dwellings for millions of Americans who now know only the tenements. This is not a give-away program. This is not public housing. This is not endless welfare. It is the opposite. Rent supplement housing offers the disadvantaged and the unemployed the incentive to work, to care for a dwelling, and to take pride in a better city. It also provides incentives for private business and other interested groups to lend a hand in rebuilding our great cities.

Recently, my appropriations subcommittee has taken action to restore the 40 million dollars to this program that was slashed in the House. Next week, we will have the bill on the Senate Floor and I am hopeful it will be approved.

The Model Cities plan too, needs our urgent support. This is an entirely new concept aimed at an eventual total rehabilitation of our core cities. It is a local program, put together by local officials to meet peculiar local needs. I am pleased that our outstanding Mayor, Dorm Braman, has submitted one of the first applications for this important project and have every hope that Seattle will be among the first model city projects to get underway. Applications for programs have come in from all over the country, from big city and small and the only thing they share in common is unique and uncommon answers to some of the most compelling problems.

One city has requested funds to train residents of depressed neighborhoods in rehabilitation of housing. Another city has proposed a local training academy for the model neighborhood where community leaders, managers, and administrators would be schooled and trained in order that they could play a direct role in the rehabilitation of their core area.

These are imaginative ideas and they offer hope for a better tomorrow. They offer promise that the Model Cities program will be successful. Again, my appropriations subcommittee has increased the funding for this important effort over the sum approved by the House and I am hopeful that the Senate will fully support this action.

Let's not forget the war on poverty either. Of course, most of you here today are well aware of the splendid OEO programs now functioning in Seattle and Tacoma. The programs have the support of most of the community and have been well managed and planned, but too often mistakes or careless judgment by a couple of poverty workers stirs a storm of protest. What the protesters never remember is that in city after city this summer, the war on poverty people were in the forefront trying to cool tensions below the boiling point. There are dozens of examples of dedicated young men and women who personally intervened at grave danger to themselves in an attempt to quiet the mobs. Unfortunately, in many cases their efforts were too little and too late. But, this effort must continue—this program must go on because it offers millions of Americans the hope for a better tomorrow.

Now is not the time to damn the darkness. Instead it is the time to light a candle. Now is not the time for politics. Now is the time to resolve that the ghettos must go, that our cities must be rebuilt, that all our children must be accorded an excellent education, that every American must have equal opportunity for self-fulfillment, that, in short, the war on poverty must be won. This is the way to guarantee the preservation of our constitutional form of government, and of a society built upon law and order, law which is just, and order which reflects the dignity of all citizens, irrespective of the color of their skin or economic status in our society.

In conclusion, I want to say a word about ghettos. Right away we think of a city slum. But there is another kind of ghetto, an interior ghetto of the mind where we seal off parts of democracy that don't suit us, where we box off our obligations to justice and shut out our commitments to fairness. This ghetto of the mind is no less stinking and rotten than the ghetto of the city.

In truth, the war on poverty and the quest to rebuild urban America is not being fought for the poor. It is for all Americans because all Americans stand to gain by it. Not just with peace in our cities, but also peace in our hearts.

I thank you all very much.

VIETNAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, for many weeks, the Senate and the country have debated our policy in Vietnam. I have listened with attention to the diverse views expressed by my distinguished colleagues, and I share their deep concern. I have carefully reevaluated and reconsidered every proposal. Today, I wish to state my position.

Daniel Webster once said:

> It is one of the greatest reproaches to human nature that wars are sometimes just.

One might add that wars are never pleasant to either talk about or to conduct.

In 1968, the people of the United States must select their President. Throughout this year, attempts to tell the truth must not be labeled a campaign trick and mocked as an effort to frighten the people of the United States so that it may appear essential to keep in command the present Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. To admit that our democracy could not face the truth and act on it, even in a campaign year, seems to me an admission that democracy cannot survive. I will not admit that the structure of human freedom which has been built by Washington and Jefferson and preserved by Lincoln is doomed to perish because some men would question motives and sneer that patriotism is party politics.

Probably no person in the country is better informed on every aspect of the situation in Vietnam than is the President of the United States. His responsibilities are awesome. He deserves the respect of the Nation. I know that he is doing what he thinks best.

There are those who question his judgment, and such questions, if directed responsibly, can be constructive in serving to clarify the nature of the situation in Vietnam. But there also are those who question the President's motives. These people do the country, the President, and themselves a great disservice. They belittle their country, and they belittle themselves as well. There can be no reasonable questioning of the motives of the President, or of the Government, on the subject of Vietnam.

Mr. President, the right to disagree is one of the fundamental rights of our society. Disagreement and dissent within the bounds of law, order, propriety, and decency are healthy and should be welcomed.

But when we note the disagreement, the dissent, and the demonstrations that are sweeping the country, let us not lose sight of the proper perspective. As the Secretary of State said yesterday in Los Angeles, it is not the demonstrators but the fighting men in Vietnam who really speak for the American people today.

Some words spoken by Theodore Roosevelt also are appropriate here. He said:

> No nation ever yet retained its freedom for any length of time after losing its respect for the law, after losing the law-abiding spirit, the spirit that really makes orderly liberty.

I would remind my colleagues and this country that in America no man is above the law and no man is below the law.

Mr. President, we have all read the great editorials which have appeared in the press of the United States, but I have here an editorial from a British newspaper, the Daily Telegraph, which is directly on this point. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM MIASMA

Fortunately there is reason to believe that increasing criticism and organized protests in America against the Vietnam war, although they increase the strain in the White House and in the field, will not divert President Johnson from his course or seriously affect the war effort. Unfortunately what they are doing is to harden the North Vietnamese Government in its refusal to negotiate.

It has long been clear that the American Army cannot be beaten. The shaky political scene in South Vietnam has been transformed by successful elections in mid-war and despite a host of traditional problems (when will the North have elections?) As Mr. Rusk said a few days ago, without contradiction, defections from the Viet Cong have doubled in a year, Communist recruitment of Southerners has halved, areas under enemy control are being steadily reduced, roads are being opened up. Hanoi's latest hope is that civilian morale in America will crack under a small dent in affluent living and the irksome realities of responsibility, before the morale of the hunted, starving, outnumbered, battered and decimated Viet Cong and North Vietnamese.

That such a possibility should ever be conceivable is due to the influence of a distorting miasma composed of a variety of American weaknesses, frustrations, escapisms, personal rivalries and social conflicts, with a masterful infusion of Left-wing and Communist propaganda. Thus it is accepted that the Communists are justified in invading South Vietnam and systematically massacring loyal local officials. Thus Ho Chi Minh is not blamed for insisting on American withdrawal or for making it a point of honour not to reciprocate in any way for the cessation of bombing.

The critics of President Johnson would sweep the country if they could suggest a convincing alternative policy. Confronted by the facts they can only offer the hope that Ho would become another Tito. This is a prospect that non-Communist countries of Asia do not relish, and a risk they do not wish to take. Australia and New Zealand have given fresh proof of this by increasing their forces in Vietnam, and the Japanese Prime Minister by his projected visit to Saigon. If the Americans withdrew to strong points the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese would regain the countryside. If the bombing was stopped the flow of men and arms would increase. The sooner Ho realises that he cannot win on American campuses and boulevards the war he is losing in Vietnam, the sooner will he come to the conference table.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, any serious consideration of American policy in Vietnam, any serious analysis of the problems we face or the situation in which we find ourselves there, should begin by at least a review of the history of our involvement.

In the interest of brevity, I would take the Geneva Conference of 1954 as a point of departure. Prior to that, as we all know, Vietnam had fought and won a war for national independence from the French. The United States did not formally participate in the Geneva Conference of 1954 which ended this war. Nonetheless, we did play a critical backstage role at Geneva. The very fact of the possibility of military intervention by the United States may have influenced Hanoi in agreeing to settle for a temporary division of Vietnam at the 17th parallel and for independent states of Cambodia and Laos. When the Geneva accords were signed, the United States made it clear that we would view any aggression in violation of the accords with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security. We also made it clear, just as we had with regard to the divided nations of Germany and Korea, that we favored their reunification through free elections supervised by the United Nations.

A few months afterward, at Manila in September of 1954, we signed the treaty setting up SEATO, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. In this SEATO Treaty, South Vietnam and its territory were included as a "protocol state," and the signatories specifically accepted the obligation, if asked by the Government of South Vietnam, to take action in response to armed attack against South Vietnam and to consult on appropriate measures if South Vietnam were subjected to subversive actions. This treaty was ratified by our Senate in February 1955, by a vote of 82 to 1.

At about the same time, in late 1954, President Eisenhower committed the United States to furnish economic support for the new government that President Diem had organized and which was already showing itself considerably stronger and more viable than many had believed possible. Finally, in early 1955, without any formal statement the United States began to take over the job of military assistance to South Vietnam.

Thus, during the 1954–55 period the United States both undertook a major treaty commitment involving South Vietnam and began a major supporting role. Again, these actions were accepted with very wide support in the United States as the debate and the vote in the Senate abundantly proved at the time. Further, the relevant Senate documents state conclusively that there was full understanding of the grave implications of the Southeast Asia obligations, particularly as they related to aggression by means of armed attacks.

As long ago as 1954, and the reasons for this view only increased with the passage of time, there was a firm conviction in the Senate and in the public at large that a successful takeover by North Vietnam or Communist China of any state bordering them in Southeast Asia would in very short order also destroy the capacity of other nations of Southeast Asia, either neutral or aligned, to maintain their independence. These are the basic reasons underlying the position we took in Vietnam and Southeast Asia in 1954 and 1955.

This American commitment, undertaken for the good reasons outlined above during the administration of President Eisenhower, was confirmed and reinforced by President Kennedy, who firmly believed that our commitment in South Vietnam was not one that he could abandon without undesirable consequences throughout Asia and, indeed, the world. By the fall of 1961 the "guerrilla aggression" which North Vietnam had instigated, directed, and supplied had reached truly serious proportions, and morale in South Vietnam had been badly shaken. President Kennedy believed that the threat implicit in this North Vietnamese aggression could not be met without major additional U.S. actions. President Kennedy, rising to the challenge and the specific requirements of the situation, decided to commit a system of advisers, pilots, and supporting military personnel that gradually rose to the level of 25,000 men between 1961 and 1964.

By December of 1964, the North Vietnamese, apparently having exhausted their manpower pool of ethnic Southerners and casual replacements who would do their bidding in the South, sent a regiment of troops of the regular army of North Vietnam into the South. Several other regiments of the regular army of North Vietnam infiltrated into the South in the spring of 1965. It was in response to this massive and clearcut armed aggression that the United States brought in, first limited numbers of combat troops in the spring of 1965 and finally, in the late summer of 1965, committed a major combat force to the area.

Now, there is one simple question that all Americans must ask themselves. Is the freedom and security of South Vietnam vital to the United States?

If the answer to this question is in the negative, then our course is clear. We should withdraw our forces from South Vietnam immediately, admit our mistake to all the world and await the consequences. Perhaps we could establish the outposts of freedom somewhere else in Southeast Asia—perhaps we could retreat to the Philippines, the Marianas, or even the State of Hawaii. If our involvement is not vital, then clearly we should get out, just as quickly as we possibly can.

I reject this position. I believe that the freedom and security of South Vietnam are vital to the freedom and security of our country, and that we should oppose aggression in Southeast Asia with military force.

With that said, our purpose at the present time must be to determine how we can best achieve our goals—how we can protect freedom and prevent aggression; and how we can prevent the Communists from taking by force a strategic part of the world.

To begin with, there are three possible courses of action open to the United States:

First. Withdrawal of our military forces.

Second. Intensive escalation of our military effort.

Third. Continuation of the policy we are now following.

Let us examine these choices.

First, withdrawal. As I have just stated, this is unthinkable and impossible. It would have disastrous results.

It would likely bring about the collapse of South Vietnam, and then Laos, Thailand, Burma, Indonesia, and whatever else is left of Southeast Asia.

It would likely result in the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of people in South Vietnam and other countries who are relying upon the United States for their protection and the preservation of their freedom.

It would put a permanent stain—the stain of blood—on the honor of the United States. Our word, given and accepted in good faith, would be broken; our commitments rendered worthless; our credibility forever in doubt.

It would provide encouragement to the Communist movement around the world.

Two refinements of a policy of withdrawal have been advanced: the enclave theory, and a bombing pause.

The enclave theory is unworkable from a military point of view. It would establish our military forces as sitting duck targets for enemy attacks. The cost to the United States in casualties and dollars would be increased enormously.

Another bombing pause also would be inconsistent with our goals in Vietnam. We have tried this before. It never has worked. On the contrary, the enemy has taken advantage of bombing lulls to resupply its forces and repair the damage from previous raids. Clearly, a bombing pause would be to our disadvantage.

At the other extreme, there is the possible course of action that calls for an intensive escalation of our military campaign. This might include invasion of the North and the use of nuclear weapons against the enemy.

Adoption of this policy also could have disastrous results.

It might lead to a worldwide nuclear war that would destroy civilization as we now know it.

If the United States invades North Vietnam, then Red China may be forced into the war against us. This could very possibly lead to open collision with the Soviet Union in Vietnam or elsewhere. It obviously would result in a tremendous increase in U.S. casualties.

Moreover, the United States would be labeled the aggressor in such an escalation of our military campaign against the North. This is directly contrary to our purpose. We are not aggressors and we do not want to be aggressors. Our mission is to protect and defend, not to attack.

Thus, we are left only with the course we presently are following in Vietnam. I believe this is the best course among the choices available to us. It has proven effective to date and, given time, I believe it will lead us to the goals we seek in Vietnam; namely, peace.

We are an impatient people; we fear we are at an impasse, a stalemate, a draw in the Vietnamese conflict. Can memories be so short to forget that it was only 2½ years ago that the Vietcong were on the offensive throughout South Vietnam and were close to overrunning all the country? The administration has made information available which clearly proves that we have been making slow but steady progress. Over the past year, the South Vietnamese desertion rate has steadily declined. Defections from the Communist side have doubled over the rate in 1966 which was in turn double the 1965 rate. Two years ago, the South Vietnamese Army was losing three weapons for each weapon captured. Today the South Vietnamese Army is capturing four Communist weapons for each one they lose. The Communists are losing in combat more than four times as many men as all the allied forces. The Communists are on the defensive. Allied forces have shattered the enemy offensive across the DMZ. Food has become a critical problem for the VC even in the Mekong rice bowl. It is clear that there has been a favorable change in the military situation in the past 2 years. In a military sense, the North Vietnamese cannot win, and they know it.

Mr. President, while I support the present policy of the United States in Vietnam, I would offer several suggestions for improvements entirely consistent with that policy:

First. The tours of combat duty that our military men serve in Vietnam should be strictly limited. It occurs to me that perhaps our young men subject to the draft are bearing more than their share of the burden. A selective callup of reservists and National Guardsmen, individuals and units with needed skills, makes sense to me. These men are trained, readily available and certainly aware that they are subject to call. Greater use of these Reserve Forces would relieve the burden on our young draftees.

Second. Our present bombing strategy in the North should be intensified to fully accomplish its objective: the destruction of the enemy's supply sources. The port of Haiphong should be closed, either by bombing or mining, to prevent any importation of supplies into the North by ship. All military airfields in the North should be destroyed. All powerplants, military storage facilities, railroad lines, and roads of any military significance should be put out of operation.

Third. We must insist on a greater participation by the Army of South Vietnam. If necessary, we must be tougher with the Saigon generals. South Vietnamese and United States forces should be mixed in units whenever possible. We must demand reforms in the operations of the South Vietnam Government and an end to the corruption and inefficiency that often hinders the war effort.

Fourth. We must also insist on greater participation and cooperation by the other sophisticated and industrialized nations of the world. True, we are not alone in South Vietnam. Some 43 countries are involved. But we must toughen our stance toward some nations who, by other actions, are actually harming our war effort. No country that opposes the Communist aggression in Vietnam should trade with the enemy. Nor should the United States trade with countries which, themselves, trade with the enemy. The United States should curtail its economic aid programs to all these countries. The full economic, moral, and political power of the United States must be used to secure international cooperation in our undertaking to protect the freedom of all people.

Fifth. As I stated in the Senate a week or more ago, the United Nations must become actively involved in the efforts to seek a solution to the war. The United States should press vigorously, in the Security Council and the General Assembly, for a greater and more effective role by the U.N.

Mr. President, millions of impassioned words have been poured out in recent months about Vietnam. Yet, one single line in one single Presidential speech seems to sum up why we are there, why we fight, and what we are fighting for.

In his remarks to the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical & Technical Employees on October 23, President Johnson said:

> Peace and stability will come to Asia only when aggressors know that they cannot take another people's land by force.

That, in my humble opinion, is what Vietnam is really all about.

We do have solemn international treaties which we must honor.

There is our national interest and the national word of the United States to be honored.

There are the long-range interests of the United States as it faces Communist China with almost a billion people.

But the basic, commanding fact which committed us to Vietnam, and which makes us stay, is that Americans have never stood by while stronger nations battered weaker ones.

To back down now is not in the American tradition.

For good or evil, for better or worse, the United States is and must remain forever committed to the world community. There is no longer any place to hide.

Through war and peace, the United States has always tried to use its resources in a constructive and compassionate way.

We did so during the First World War, during World War II, during the Korean war, and during the would-be Communist-inspired civil wars around the globe. We are doing so in Vietnam today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of the President of the United States to the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical, and Technical Employees on October 23, 1967.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF COMMERCIAL, CLERICAL, AND TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES, OCTOBER 23, 1967

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome you here for your first conference in this hemisphere.

I have been familiar for many years with your work.

In 1961, I took one of the most rewarding exciting trips of my life with your President—Jim Suffridge. We visited a number of your countries together, on a mission for President Kennedy. It was on that journey—with Mr. Suffridge as my guide—that I saw some of the worldwide activities of FIET.

I saw then in other lands what I knew well in my own—working people building better lives for themselves and better futures for their families through their labor organizations. I saw schools, new housing and health clinics, credit unions and cooperatives which had been created largely with the help of their trade unions.

As you meet to study the problems and the promise of tomorrow, I join you as one who shares your vision of the good life. I come as the representative of 200 million people who want very much to see a world in which all the guns of war are stilled; in which every nation is free to mark its own course; in which every man is able to build—through his own effort—fulfillment for himself and opportunity for his children.

We can agree quickly that this is the goal we all seek—because we are not the first to put it into words. In this generation, many men from many lands have talked hopefully of a stable world of growing promise—because for the first time in man's history it is realistic to think in global terms about improving man's condition.

The fact that mankind now can rid this planet of ignorance and hunger is one of the most awesome bits of knowledge we live with.

It is History's cruel paradox that man should finally acquire this ability, after all his years of struggle, just as he also gains the power to destroy his race.

The rest of his story will be told—if it is told at all—in terms of which power he employs.

He can use his atomic might to make the deserts of the world bloom—or to incinerate his planet.

We can use our science to develop weapons that dwarf the mind—or to expand men's minds with learning.

We can commit our sons to a new generation of peril—or leave them the foundation stones for a new civilization.

The will to live is the strongest human impulse. It generates a stubborn optimism which runs deep in the human spirit.

An eloquent American writer has given it voice in our time. "I believe," he said, "that man will not merely endure; he will prevail. He is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice, but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance."

William Faulkner spoke those words almost two decades ago. It is a measure of how far we have come that they sounded braver then than they do now.

The great victories of reason and agreement, which can assure the survival of the human race, still lie ahead of us.

The ones behind us are modest and small.

But they are victories nonetheless.

We have not yet passed safely through the danger we have created. But we have walked far enough to dare to hope that we will make it.

The fact that war itself has not yet disappeared is a matter of infinite tragedy.

Many thousands of our countrymen are today involved in a bitter conflict in a land far from here—because armed invaders try to impose their will on their neighbor.

In every way we can, we search for peace in Vietnam. But we appear to be searching alone. Those who began the war are not willing to explore ways to end it. They cling stubbornly to the belief that their aggression will be rewarded—by our frustration, our impatience, our unwillingness to stay the course.

It will not be so.

Peace and stability will come to Asia only when the aggressors know that they cannot take another people's land by force.

Our Asian allies fighting beside us believe this.

And so do the leaders and the people of those free nations in the path of conquest.

But to end the threat of war, we must do even more than keep aggression in check.

Most wars are bred in conditions of human misery. Aggressors are boldest when they can exploit a people's discontent.

This discontent churns in a world where illiteracy cripples two-fifths of the adult population—and where disease still dooms children to an early death.

The experience of the last decade proves that violence erupts most often in nations which are poor.

The great work of our day, then, is to change the conditions that encourage war—to do something about the old tyrannies of hunger and disease and ignorance, which still enslave two-thirds of the human race.

That work has well started.

I am proud of the role my own Nation has played in the beginning of this worthy adventure. A leading public figure of a free Asian country recently said about the United States: ". . . This is perhaps the first time in history that a world power has consciously used its strength and wealth to promote the interests of weak and poor nations."

On behalf of our people, I believe that tribute is well-deserved. The American people have used their resources in a constructive and compassionate way—because we have had to learn quickly the lessons which history forced upon us overnight.

Today, history teaches us all a new lesson.

A concept of world order is quietly emerging which offers the world its best chance for constructive change.

It is a new sense of community. It links together states that share a common geography.

There is no word which can adequately describe it and convey the excitement and hope it generates. But for want of a better term, we refer to it as regionalism.

It is built on an awareness which has grown rapidly in the minds of many men. That idea is simply this—despite the passions of nationalism, the problems of an area respect no national borders. There is a belief that action can be more effective when it is taken in unison. There is a determination to work together in shaping a common destiny; through economic development.

The logic of this idea first became evident in Europe. The chaos of war forced the leaders of Western Europe to look with new insight into the old patterns of rivalry. They reached a significant conclusion. They saw that the more they could travel together, the faster they could move to a prosperous future. Going it alone, they might never make it. The European Common Market was a result of this thinking.

In Latin America, economic integration is clearly seen as the key which can unlock strength dreamed of for centuries.

In Asia the same idea has now begun—for the very first time—to persuade separate nations of their common purpose.

Africa, too, is feeling the stirrings of a regional spirit.

Only in the Middle East do ancient rivalries and frustrations still seem to inhibit the prospects of cooperation. But in our search for new solutions to old challenges, there is hope even here that men will look together at the problems they share.

Nowhere is the road easy, and nowhere has that road yet been fully travelled. But men and nations are moving ahead.

In my years of public life, no development in world affairs has encouraged me more. Behind the headlines of crisis, a new spirit of progress has been quietly at work.

The United States will continue to encourage its development and to support its growth.

But the world itself remains man's first community. And problems still must be met on a global basis—weather control, for example, and the spread of nuclear weapons, and international monetary reform.

World trade is yet another.

Just five years ago, the major trading countries began the most ambitious round of trade negotiations ever undertaken. Because these talks were initiated by a great American President, they took his name, and became known as the Kennedy Round.

This past summer, the Kennedy Round was successfully concluded. It brought tariff reductions greater than any in history. It moved the world closer to the healthy trading conditions on which the prosperity of many nations depends.

It was an historic landmark in the efforts of all of us to create a sounder world community.

Preserving the gains won in the Kennedy Round is essential to the world's harmony and well-being.

It will not be easy. Freer trade often causes temporary but painful dislocations. And today, once again, we hear protectionist voices rising out of the past.

But larger interests must prevail. We must consider our common interests in protecting our consumers; in promoting healthy and competitive industry and agriculture; in raising the productivity and wages of our workers.

We have an enormous stake in keeping and extending the benefits of 30 years of constructive trade policy.

And our overall interest lies in working together to establish new conditions for a peaceful and more prosperous world order.

To the developing countries, striving to reach the 20th Century industrial world, trade is the lifeline of hope.

The leading nations of the Free World are together studying ways to improve the trading position of those emerging lands. In the meantime, the Kennedy Round increases the trading opportunities they so badly need.

That increase in strength is not enough to assure their industrial success. But it is a step forward.

The world is moving fast. Developments measured a step at a time may not stir the mind as forcefully as the headlong rush of crisis can.

And through a generation of peril, progress has often moved forward by short steps. Yet those steps now add up to many miles.

It is good for us all, I think, when we are burdened by the awareness of how far we must still go, to look back and reflect on how far we have come.

Thank you.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from Maryland is a very hard-working Senator on the Armed Services Committee.

Today, he has presented to the Senate a thoughtful analysis of the situation as it confronts our country in its efforts to withstand aggression and subversion in Vietnam.

I commend the Senator on this very realistic and sensible evaluation of the situation and of our clear responsibility as a nation in meeting our commitments toward the Republic of Vietnam. I wish to thank the Senator for having made this statement. I think it was timely. It was needed. I trust that Senators and other Americans will read the very cogent and lucid speech that has been made by the senior Senator from the State of Maryland.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the acting majority leader, and my associate on the Senate Armed Services Committee, for his very gracious remarks.

I yield the floor.

DR. FELIX C. CABALLOL AND WIFE, LUCIA J. CABALLOL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives amending S. 1108.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1108) for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol and wife, Lucia J. Caballol, which was, in line 4, strike out all after "Caballol," where it appears the first time, down through and including "wife," in line 5.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on June 13, 1967, the Senate passed S. 1108 to grant permanent residence retroactively to a husband and wife, in whose cases it was stated that U.S. citizenship was a prerequisite for employment in their respective fields of medicine and teaching.

On October 17, 1967, the House of Representatives passed S. 1108 with amendments to delete the name of the female beneficiary.

So that there will be no further delay in providing relief for the principal male beneficiary, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1108.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

ROSEMARIE GAUCH NETH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives amending S. 445.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 445) for the relief of Rosemarie Gauch Neth which was in line 4, strike out all after "Neth" down through and including "Vietnam," in line 6.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on June 13, 1967, the House passed S. 445, to enable the widow of a U.S. citizen serviceman killed in Vietnam to file a petition for naturalization under the provisions of law applicable to spouses of U.S. citizens.

On October 17, 1967, the House of Representatives passed S. 445, with an amendment to delete the language in the bill referring to the deceased husband.

While the action of the House of Representatives was unnecessary, it does not affect the benefits provided in the bill, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 445.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 26, 1967, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Retirement of Russell S. Hilbert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I today bring to your attention the November 1 retirement of Russell S. Hilbert, superintendent of Redford Union Schools, Redford Township, Mich.

Russ Hilbert has dedicated 43 years of his productive life to educational administration, so his retirement, though a reward for his many years of service, is also regarded as a great loss for the Redford Union School system. During those 43 years, Russ has served as school superintendent, not only in the Redford Union School system, but also in the Michigan communities of Sebewaing and Romeo.

Except for postgraduate study done at the Universities of Chicago and California, Russ Hilbert has been a lifelong resident of the State of Michigan, having been born near Wayland in Allegan County. Russ attended Wayland public schools and did his undergraduate work at Western Michigan University. His masters degree was earned at the University of Michigan, where he also did postgraduate work.

During World War II Russ served his country as an officer in the U.S. Air Force. He saw action in the Pacific theater.

Russ Hilbert serves as chairman of the teachers retirement committee of the Michigan Association of School Administrators, is a charter member of the Redford Township Music Society, served as a director of the Redford Township Chamber of Commerce, and on the Governor's Committee on Pre-Paid Hospital and Medical Plans, and is a former president of both the Macomb and Wayne County School Administrators.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, Russell Hilbert has dedicated his life to bettering his fellow man, and the job he has done stands as a fine example for those who are to follow.

I share today in the pride which Mrs. Hilbert and the Hilberts' daughter, Mary Margaret, sons James and Roger, and six grandchildren derive from the contribution Russell Hilbert has made to enrich the lives of all those who know him.

Seized by Pettiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal spoke editorially Monday on a matter about which Members of this House have been generally silent, quite possibly from embarrassment.

I am referring to the arbitrary and lightly taken exclusion of employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity from the pay increase for Federal employees. The Wall Street Journal rightly condemns this as a "gratuitous insult." It is an insult not only to the dedicated employees of that agency and to the entire U.S. Civil Service, but it taints this House as well. This country enjoys the most competent and trustworthy civil service in the world. That some of these men and women have been singled out for financial penalty is an unhappy commentary on the legislative whims of this body.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have honest misgivings about certain aspects of the poverty program. Fair criticism must be based on the substance of the war on poverty, not on "seizures of pettiness," in the Journal's words, exemplified by the vote on the pay bill.

> You might hope—

Says the Wall Street Journal, that—

> The House had learned its lesson from the self-demeaning anti-rat episode, but you would hope in vain.

I continue to have hope, Mr. Speaker, not only that the wrong done by the House will be undone, but that when the economic opportunity bill comes before this body at long last, we will buckle down to work and act with seriousness, constructiveness, and good sense.

GOP Turns Its Back on Our Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, those Republicans who voted so determinedly against model cities and rent supplements yesterday should understand that by their actions they rang the bell for another round of urban riots.

It seems as if they would rather see blood run in the streets than lift one little finger to clean up the slums.

By their votes on these two bills, the Republicans showed their total disinterest in the problems of the cities—as well as demonstrating a full measure of hypocrisy.

Virtually all the Republican Presidential candidates, their Governors and mayors, as well as their members of Congress, screamed to high heaven at the time of last summer's riots that the Government must provide more assistance to the cities—and must encourage private industry to help.

But when the moment of truth arrives—when they are called upon to vote for programs which do exactly what they say must be done—they run like scared rabbits.

They are the first to scream that our cities are in a mess but they are the last to do anything about it.

Particularly in regard to rent supplements their vote shows clearly they do not want private enterprise joining the battle to rehabilitate our slums any more than they want the Government to.

Only a few weeks ago the Nation's insurance companies pledged a billion dollars to help improve slum housing and urged passage of the rent supplement program to help them in the job.

If the insurance companies are willing to pledge a billion dollars you would think that Congress would at least appropriate $40 million.

The Kee Report: Panama Canal Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this report is the proposed new treaty with Panama, governing the canal. The report follows:

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee Report.

I believe the American people take pride in the fact that building the Panama Canal was one of the greatest engineering feats in history. Every school boy knows that the primary purpose in building this waterway was to shorten the distance between the Atlantic and Pacific and thus, help both our commerce and our national defense.

This marine highway has now been open to ocean traffic a little more than half a century. During this time, which included two world wars, the canal has proved its usefulness in a substantial way. Although American cargo comprises the bulk of canal traffic, the ships of foreign nations pay the same tolls as our own. This has been helpful to the maritime nations and also to the countries of South America, because much of their import and export traffic passes through the canal.

Because canal traffic is expanding at a rapid rate, experts predict that another deep-sea channel between the two oceans will be urgently needed before too long. In fact, the need is so apparent that a Federal commission is now studying the project.

Meanwhile, the Republic of Panama has complained so loud and so long, that a new treaty has been prepared governing the operation of the canal. While this new treaty is still unpublished here, its terms have been freely discussed in Panama. Several radical changes are in the making, including dual operation of the canal and much higher payments to Panama to be paid for by increased tolls. I have no wish to prejudge this agreement, but experts are warning that a heavy boost in canal tolls could hit some American industries very hard, including the coal industry of West Virginia. In recent years, the industry has enjoyed a growing export business, helped in large part by the low carrying charges of ocean going vessels. Thus, coal from our West Virginia fields is transported by rail to the Eastern Seaboard, and thence by ship through the canal to Japan.

If canal tolls are revised upward to the extent now contemplated by Panama, the coal export trade to Japan would simply disappear. For the same reason, other American industries would be hard hit.

Advocates of the treaty assert that the annual payment to Panama of a little less than two millions of dollars is unrealistic in this age of inflation. This may be true, but it should be borne in mind that other business generated by the canal adds about 100 millions each year to the Panamanian economy.

In like manner, the proposal for dual operation of the canal should be carefully studied. Sabotage could put this vital waterway out of operation at a time of great peril to the United States. Panama has a large and active Communist party. In the light of these facts, the surest and safest guaranty of canal safety is for the Army Engineers to maintain complete control over canal personnel at all times.

The Government of Panama naturally wishes to get the best financial terms it can in payment for canal zone rights. But the American people likewise have vital rights which must be protected.

Because a mistake could be disastrous, the new treaty should be thoroughly explored before final action is taken.

Thank you for listening.

Pittsburgh Commerce Institute—Creative Initiative in Business-Government Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on November 17, Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge will lead a team of top officials of the Department of Commerce to the city of Pittsburgh, to participate in a seminar on the services and information available to businessmen from the Commerce Department.

This meeting might appear to be a very ordinary and commonplace event.

What lifts this seminar above the level of the ordinary, however, is the way it came about. Some farsighted business and civic leaders from Pittsburgh came to the conclusion that there are many facilities and services offered by the U.S. Department of Commerce which could be directly helpful to the businesses and the economy of the Pittsburgh area. But rather than wait for this information to come to them, they decided to take the initiative on their own.

The Pittsburgh Commerce Institute was established to provide the mechanism for a meaningful face-to-face meeting between Federal Government officials and businessmen from the Pittsburgh area.

To indicate the broad base of interest and participation in the institute, I would like to list the local organizations and local chapters of national groups represented on the steering committee.

The list includes: Advertising Club of Pittsburgh, American Marketing Association, Association of Industrial Advertisers, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Duquesne University, Economic Club of Pittsburgh, Engineers Society of Western Pennsylvania, Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, Patent Law Association, Pennsylvania Bankers Association, Public Relations Society, Purchasing Agents Association, Sales-Marketing Executives of Pittsburgh, Special Libraries Association, Traffic Club of Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh, and the Pittsburgh Field Office of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge responded by designating high-level officials from the National Bureau of Standards, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Travel Service Environmental Science Services Administration, Patent Office, Bureau of the Census Office of Business Economics, Business and Defense Services Administration, Office of Field Services, and the Bureau of International Commerce.

During the seminar, Pittsburgh businessmen will learn how to secure services and information on export expansion, the promotion of tourism, business statistics, marketing, and a broad range of other topics.

I am encouraged by this example of enlightened business-Government partnership, and I predict that both partners will benefit greatly from this meeting.

The Plight of Soviet Jewry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the end of the Jewish high holy day season. Families in synagogues across the world will celebrate Simchat Torah, "rejoicing over the law," as they begin the yearly cycle of the reading of the law.

This holiday has a twofold nature: solemn, because it ends the most holy period in the Jewish year, and joyous because it signifies the new year, the renewal of faith, and the celebration of the repetition of Biblical law.

The joy inherent in Simchat Torah is complete. Families attend services in the synagogue which are filled with singing and dancing. Often the children march up and down the aisles, carrying signs, flags, and noisemakers, while the older congregants sing Hebrew and Jewish folksongs. Often the service goes far into the night with music, food, and dancing by the oldest men around the Ark.

This celebration occurs all over the world; in the Soviet Union it takes place only because Soviet Jews have refused to let their religion die.

For 3 years, thousands of Soviet Jewish youths have thronged to Russian synagogues to experience the joy of Simchat Torah. Often the synagogues have been closed down by the Soviet Government. These young men and women have been denied a Jewish education; they have not been allowed to study the Jewish customs or religion of their parents. They have not learned Yiddish or Hebrew; and they have not even been allowed to participate in many of their most important ceremonies and festivals because the Russian Government has refused to permit the sale or manufacture of such vital objects as Passover matzoth, or taleissim and tfilin for daily prayer.

Soviet Jewry has been the brunt of restrictive measures far harsher than those applied to any other national or religious group. Ostensibly, the Soviet Union has a tolerant attitude toward national groups and religious groups which encourages them to develop institutions to perpetuate their cultures. This has not been their policy toward Judaism.

Many of their policies have been so restrictive that they have been destructive of the very substance of Jewish life. The news coverage and propaganda that surround actions by Jews and Jewish groups are often so virulent that they can only be classified as anti-Semitism.

In the past year, the Soviet Union has lessened some of the curbs which made the continuation of Jewish life almost impossible. We must continue to call attention to the fact that the theory and the reality of Soviet treatment of nationalities and religious groups are not the same.

At this time of the year, when Jews all over the world celebrate this joyous season, let us extend our support to Soviet Jewry in the hopes that the Government of the Soviet Union will relent and will allow this age-old people to continue following their religion and teaching their children the ways of their fathers.

Address by Hon. Paul A. Fino in Support of Our Boys in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House an address given by our colleague, the Honorable PAUL A. FINO, at the conclusion of the October 22 Bronx War Veterans rally in support of our boys in Vietnam. Mr. FINO's speech, which was extremely well received, puts Vietniks, beatniks, and their political allies in exactly the right perspective. We need more of these rallies and more men like PAUL FINO to support them. The voice of patriotism is so rarely heard these days that I agree with my colleague our men in Vietnam must know that the vast majority of Americans have not abandoned them. We do support them 100 percent. Mr. FINO's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN PAUL A. FINO

Mr. Chairman, Admiral Clark, Reverend Clergy, Distinguished Guests and Fellow Americans:

At the outset, let me say that I am proud to be here today and privileged to participate in these patriotic ceremonies.

Whether we agree or disagree with our tactics and policy in Vietnam is unimportant and immaterial. The essential thing to remember is that our American boys are fighting and dying over there, fulfilling their duty to their country, and it is our great obligation to give our fighting men all the material and moral support they need. They must know that their sacrifice is important and that it is appreciated and that we stand behind them 100%.

I cannot think of anything that makes me more ashamed than the actions of some high officials of our land who shun patriotic parades to meet with Soviet poets; who shun flag-raisings but applaud flag-burnings; and who mock the sacrifices of our young men in Vietnam while prancing around with hippies and peace-niks.

I cannot think of anything that disturbs me more than the persistent attempts by this Administration to build trade bridges with the Soviet bloc while we are engaged in a brutal conflict in Vietnam in which Red Russia is supplying our enemies with massive arms, weapons, ammunition and equipment.

I cannot think of anything that bothers me more than the demands of some of our politicians who urge that we reduce support of our boys in Vietnam so that priority can be given to domestic needs.

I cannot think of anything that makes my blood boil more than the actions of our city brass who justify the presence of ex-communists in our poverty program and identify them as "distinguished public servants."

I cannot stand here today and say that our involvement in Vietnam is the height of wisdom, because, like General MacArthur, I believe that it was a mistake for the United States to get involved in an Asian land war but I say to you that since we are heavily involved and committed in Vietnam we have an obligation to support our fighting men over there. We have an obligation to keep the flag-burners, the Vietniks, the draft-card burners, the peaceniks and the hippy-coddling politicians from stabbing our fighting men in the back.

The purpose of these ceremonies is to show the world that we, in America, will not ignore the valor and sacrifice of our boys in battle.

We want the whole world to know that we will give our fighting men all the material support they need.

We want the whole world to know that our moral support is total.

We want our fighting men in Vietnam to know that their sacrifice is important and that it is appreciated. It is our duty as Americans to give them our fullest and complete support. That is what we pledge here today.

Carroll Archie Hodges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the friends of Carroll Archie Hodges, and all those who knew him as a dedicated and conscientious postal employee, were shocked to learn of his sudden and untimely passing on October 10.

A mail handler who serviced the House and Senate post offices out of the City Post Office for nearly 20 years, he was a willing and courteous worker—never too busy to lend a helping hand.

On several occasions, Mr. Hodges was commended on his devotion to duty as a public servant. The day before his death he received his sixth annual award from the National Safety Division for safe driving.

Mr. Hodges was admired and well respected by all who knew him. We all share in the sorrow of his bereaved widow and family, and extend our heartfelt sympathy to them.

Utilizing the Information Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an important byproduct of technological revolution and scientific research in this country is information—stacks of information, tons of information, bales of information, shelves and books and tapes and files and offices full of information.

Until recent years, most of us simply have allowed information to accumulate. And it may seem, as the reports, monographs, reviews, critiques, releases, and clippings flow over our desks every morning, that the only thing we can do with information is to accumulate it.

But I am pleased to report to the House that progress is being made in the effort to bring the explosion of information under control and to put its growing energy to good use.

Just 11 years ago, the Congress first moved to put more information to better use by more people. It passed the Library Services Act of 1956 to expand and improve library services in this country. More than 72 million Americans living in rural areas benefited from the improved services.

The Congress followed up this first step with the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964. Under terms of that law, services were expanded and improved in urban and suburban areas, as well as in rural areas.

But until 2 years ago, there was no single Federal program to help information scientists in their efforts to control the explosion of information, to make better use of libraries and library services.

The Congress took two important steps in this field in 1965. First, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act, it authorized the Office of Education to provide library services and resources to the grade schools, high schools, colleges, and universities.

And second, through the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Congress authorized for the first time research in the field of library and information science. The research was intended to develop better uses and new uses of library resources.

A large and vital investment of public funds is at stake in this effort. The Federal Government is investing $16 billion in various kinds of research and development projects. The citizens' access to the results of this research depends directly upon the library and information science programs.

In September 1966, President Johnson called attention to the information explosion. He appointed the National Library Commission to recommend future directions of library programs and services in this country. The Commission received one of the first grants under the library and information science program.

Here are some areas in which research is being carried forward:

Manpower for libraries and information systems, organization of library and information science services, relationship of libraries, and information services to other agencies, better use of libraries in schools, control of new forms of information, and improved ways of preserving, reproducing, and giving access to information.

I say I am pleased that progress is being made in these efforts, but there is still a long way to go. It is estimated that more than 100 million Americans must use inadequate public library services. More than 15 million Americans have no library services at all.

College and university enrollments are expanding so rapidly that the number of library books per student is declining. It would cost more than $200 million to bring the present collection up to a standard demanded by the information explosion and increasing enrollment.

Almost 50 percent of elementary school students in this country go to schools without libraries, or with substandard libraries. According to a 1964 study, it would cost $1 billion to bring school library book collections up to standard.

Mr. Speaker, we are investing billions of dollars in research and development projects. Our citizens and scientists must have access to the results of this research. I strongly support the library and information science research program being carried forward as the Congress directed in the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Eloquent Words From the President About Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, in ceremonies today at the White House where President Johnson awarded the Medal of Honor to Maj. Howard V. Lee, U.S. Marine Corps, President Johnson put to rest the absurd charge that the American presence in Southeast Asia is based on the so-called yellow peril.

The President declared:

> We have fought side by side with Asians at Bataan and Corregidor, in Korea, and now in Vietnam. This Nation has utterly repudiated the racist nonsense of an earlier era.

We have made a commitment to Asia today because we believe that no man—regardless of race—should be delivered over to aggressors; and that freedom is not the exclusive possession of white Europeans or of Americans.

The President declared:

> Race has no place in our purpose. The American commitment is clear.

Mr. Speaker, the President also took note of those who dissent from his policies—especially those who have made their opposition known by demonstrating and causing incidents. He said:

> The existence of liberty in America—the liberty that permits any minority of our people to dissent from the policies of the majority—ultimately depends upon the courage and perseverance gallant men like Major Lee and his brothers in arms. Their willingness to risk their lives for liberty is what preserves it for their countrymen.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this statement is a fitting epitaph to last weekend's demonstrations here in Washington.

I insert the President's remarks today into the Record:

Remarks by the President at the Medal of Honor Award Presentation to Maj. Howard V. Lee

As we meet here, it is early Thursday morning in Vietnam.

My thoughts go back to October 25th one year ago—when I left Manila to visit our men at Cam Ranh Bay.

That day I saw some of America's bravest sons, men like Major Lee and his comrades. I talked with them; we ate and laughed together. Never, in all my life, have I been prouder of my country. Never have I been so moved by the courage and steadfastness of its sons.

I gave them this pledge: "We shall never let you down, nor your fighting comrades, nor the 15 million people of South Vietnam, nor the hundreds of millions of Asians who are counting on us to show here—here in Vietnam—that aggression can't succeed."

Twice before we have fought in Asia. Twice we have stopped the aggressor and achieved peace. We will achieve it again in Vietnam. Our men there do not doubt it. Our allies who fight beside us do not doubt it.

I wish every American could have a chance to see, in distant Asia, the battlefields of this and other wars: all the remote fields and hills where Americans have died for freedom—in Vietnam, in Korea, and in the Philippines.

There has been some furor in the past week or so about the "yellow peril." Let me take just a moment to point out the absurdity of this charge.

We fought side by side with Asians at Bataan and Corregidor, in Korea, and now in Vietnam.

We have utterly repudiated the racist nonsense of an earlier era. Indeed, we have made a commitment in Asia because we believe—

That no men, whatever the pigmentation of their skins, should be delivered over to totalitarianism;

That freedom is not a prize reserved for white Europeans or Americans in our private enclaves of affluence.

Race has no place in our purpose. The American commitment is clear. It was given clear and eloquent voice by a young American fighting man, who wrote to Secretary Rusk from Vietnam that:

"We are fighting for the freedom of these people, as we once fought for our own. Of these thousands of young Americans over here, we all take pride in fighting for the principles that made our country the greatest on earth. . . .

"Not all young Americans," he said, "in fact, not even a majority of us, sit in college classrooms . . . and see fit to protest that which our Government does. Not all young Americans attend LSD parties and park on the grass . . . Not all young Americans protest a war for freedom . . .

"When our grandchildren read about Vietnam in history lessons, we will be proud to tell them that we were part of that lesson."

The day is coming when Americans of another generation will return to Plieku, Con Thien and Cam Lo. They will reverse them—as we do Corregidor and Seoul—because, for a time, these were the outposts of freedom under fire.

One of the heroes of Cam Lo is with us today. Men like Major Howard V. Lee have stood ready—throughout our history—to pay whatever price their country asks.

The existence of liberty in America—the liberty that permits any minority of our people to dissent from the policies of the majority—ultimately depends on the courage and perseverance of men like Major Lee and his brothers in arms. Their willingness to risk their lives for liberty is what preserves it for their countrymen.

My message for them today—for those here and for all who serve beneath our flag—is the one I carried to Cam Ranh Bay a year ago:

"Make no mistake about it: The American people . . . are proud of you. There are some who may disagree with what we are doing here, but . . . we in America depend on you, on the young and on the brave, to stop aggression before it sweeps forward. For then it must be stopped by larger sacrifice and by heavier cost.

"We depend upon you. We know that a nation that stops producing brave men soon ceases to be a nation."

The message has not changed. Neither has America's mission in Vietnam. Nor will it until we achieve the peace we seek and all those young heroes are home with us again.

The M-16 Rifle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the M–16 rifle program has pitted cost effectiveness against the cost of lives and lost.

In 1963, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara designated the Army as the Defense agent for all users of this rifle and its ammunition with instructions, based on the cost-effectiveness factor, to procure only one rifle, rather than separate service versions, produced with minimum delay, with concurrence from all services on ammunition and such modifications as are absolutely necessary.

The Special Armed Services Subcommittee report on the M–16 was released October 19. Based on documented testimony in hearings and field investigations in the United States and Vietnam, the subcommittee's findings are appaling:

First. The M–16 rifle as initially developed was an excellent and reliable weapon which was modified, despite Marine Corps and Navy disagreement, not on the basis of test data, but as stated by the Army's rifle project manager:

> On the basis of direction . . . (which) emanated from the Department of the Army . . . was further coordinated with the Department of Defense and Secretary McNamara personally approved it.

There is still no proof that the modifications proposed will eliminate the malfunctions experienced with the M–16 used by our servicemen in Vietnam. But I certainly pray they will.

Second. Both Army and Marine Corps personnel have experienced serious and excessive malfunctions with the M–16, all based on corrective factors known to the Departments of Defense and the Army as early as March 1964, many of which have still not been corrected.

Third. No move has been made to correct ammunition deficiencies, even though Army officials have been aware since 1964 that the ball propellant ammunition currently used in Vietnam is the major cause of the M–16's malfunction. It is important to note that this type of ammunition is not used in the Army-supervised acceptance tests of the weapons, but no move has been made to supply the test ammunition to our fighting forces.

Fourth. Training publications on the M–16 provide misleading instructions on the care and cleaning of the weapon. Shortages of cleaning equipment, lack of proper training and supervision on the care and cleaning of the rifles have added to their malfunctions, as did the military's delay in providing effective lubricants. Note: The subcommittee's investigation confirmed the reported death of a corporal, killed while running up and down the line of his squad pushing out cartridges which failed to extract with the only cleaning rod in the squad.

Fifth. During one period, an acceptance test was waived and approximately 330,000 rifles were accepted by the military, thousands of which were shipped or carried to Vietnam with the Army on notice that the rifles failed to meet design and performance specifications and might experience excessive malfunctions when firing ammunition loaded with ball-propellant ammunition. Ninety percent of the ammunition used in Vietnam is ball propellant.

Sixth. No instructions to tighten production quality controls were issued even after continued reports of malfunctions were received from Vietnam.

Seventh. The State Department approved the sale of 20,300 of these rifles to Singapore at the very time that there was a shortage of M–16 rifles for training purposes in both the United States and Vietnam.

The subcommittee has called on the Departments of Defense and Army for immediate investigations and corrective action on these and many other aspects of the M–16 rifle program, including audits of the military contracts to the Colt Manufacturing Co. and the Olin-Mathieson ammunition suppliers.

Every possible step must be taken to effect immediate corrections and assure no possibility of similar failures in the future.

I have been opposed to Secretary McNamara's handling of the Vietnam war, as well as to his continued efforts to cut back our Nation's nuclear superiority to parity, whatever that is. The facts on the M–16 make one wonder how much confidence to place in any vital defense decisions dominated by the Pentagon's so-called civilian defense intellectuals.

Fool's Gold by the Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

FOOL'S GOLD BY THE BILLIONS

(By Representative JAMES B. UTT)

Fool's gold by the billions may glitter, but it is not gold in spite of what the International Monetary Fund managers tell the public. It is purely and simply a gimmick. Not one ounce of gold is involved; not one ounce of wealth will be created; only a new layer of credit expansion will be established; only more paper will be printed which still must eventually be paid off in hard metallic gold.

Steel, aluminum, tin, zinc and other base metals have each had tremendously important influence, both on constructive progress and on the destructive aspects of forcible control of nations. That influence, however, pales to insignificance when compared with the power of precious metals, especially gold.

Without gold, and the purchasing power it controls, the base metals would have been unavailable in necessary quantities, and their fabrication into sophisticated constructive and destructive complexities (airplanes, bombs, etc.) would have been impossible. Without gold, the incentive to do more than provide shelter and to find food would have been lacking. Incentive works for good and for evil, and gold has been responsible for much of both.

Yet excepting jewelry and other gold or gold-plated articles in common usage, few people today ever see the metal which affects their lives so completely. In 1934, gold was prohibited in commerce among our people. We also saw a "synthetic" gold in the form of paper printed a gold color, which was used as legal currency and was backed by a percentage of gold held in the Treasury. Such gold certificates were also outlawed in 1934.

Today, it is proposed that "paper gold" be reincarnated in international monetary affairs. Called "Special Drawing Rights" by their international architects, their use is claimed to provide "the most significant development in international financial cooperation" in many years. The scheme will be required to be approved and ratified by legislatures around the world, and formal adoption is not expected until late next year or early 1969.

Representatives to the International Monetary Fund, of which William B. Dale is the United States member on the twenty-man Board of Executive Directors, met jointly with the World Bank organizations in Rio de Janeiro. Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, Managing Director of the Fund, formally presented the plan as one that would create new reserves, and one by which "the international community should be able to control reserves, instead of reserves controlling the community," as he put it.

According to the plan, nations, having financial difficulties would be able to borrow some foreign currencies. Borrowing limits are to be based on each nation's IMF quota, which in turn is based on gold, and instead of being able to obtain 100% of the loan quota, a nation would be limited to 70% for an average five-year period. The amount we could borrow, if indeed further borrowing would be of assistance, would be less than enough to cover our annual gold losses through our Balance of Payments deficit.

We have been promised each year, for the past eight years, by the Secretary of the Treasury, that the Balance of Payments problem would be resolved within a year or, at the most, two years, but instead it has consistently worsened. In addition to the huge amount of goods and materiel which we furnish to areas throughout the world, from which there is no dollar income, we also provide sizeable sums of cash as gifts, even though some are called loans. Our tourists traveling to foreign lands number far greater than do visitors to this country, and they spend larger sums of money. All of this ends up as claims by foreign governments upon our gold supply in excess of our claims against them.

Those in attendance at the International meeting also heard World Bank President George Woods make an emotional and dramatic appeal for a glorified "share-the-wealth" plan on an international level. He demanded that the rich countries do a better job of helping the poorer ones.

The world, and particularly the oppressed taxpayers of the United States, would be in much better shape if men such as Mr. Woods would pay more attention to the anguished cries of pain as the many "poorer" countries of the world continue to kick us in the teeth for the exorbitant amount of "help" which we have given financially and militarily to practically all the world.

A let-up in the "generosity" of those in this country who are responsible for the billions of dollars of foreign-aid give-away (people who apparently find a great sense of satisfaction in their liberality with someone else's money) would do much to solve the problem of the Balance of Payments deficit. It is this imbalance that creates the International Monetary Crisis. Rather than to attack it at its source by eliminating the imbalance, a "patch" is proposed to be added in the form of paper gold to make the crisis "wearable" another year or two. For it to go into effect, the IMF nations must agree that it is then necessary in the interest of greater international liquidity. Some nations, particularly in Europe, now claim there is too much liquidity.

One of the largest demands for gold has been made by France. French Finance Minister Michel Debre is expected to object to the "paper gold" scheme until our Balance of Payments deficit is wiped out. France wants metallic rather than pulp gold. U.S. Treasury Secretary Henry Fowler, who supports the "new gold" but doesn't want it tied in any way to the deficit, made a statement to the press that it would not be necessary to bring about a balance in order to make the plan work.

The claim is being made that in dealings between nations, trade will expand because it no longer will be dependent upon gold and dollars. Yet the plan is to value the Drawing Rights in gold, and therefore their use will still be contingent upon the faith of nations in the ability of the purchasers of their products to pay for them, eventually, in gold. Regardless of how fancy the printing, or how many optimistic claims are made for it, it is still paper of no intrinsic value. It simply starts the printing presses rolling in international affairs, and probably the result will be no different than the national inflation the printing press money has caused in the United States.

Our dollars continue to flow outward, along with our gold reserves, and an annual deficit for many years now decreased our gold supply to its lowest point. As long as this situation continues, and as long as world faith in our credit lives, there will be many countries which will see little need, or desirability, for the Special Drawing Rights.

Any loss of faith in our credit, causing a substantial demand for gold in exchange for dollars held by foreign nations would, however, certainly not be mitigated by any "paper gold" in existence. On the contrary, since the use of such a scheme is expected to enlarge the debt structure, while causing no improvement in the deficit problem, it could hasten the loss of faith and accelerate the demand of many nations for true value in metallic gold.

Gold is one of the most powerful incentives. Gold and the power it provides cause dictatorships to come into being, personal rights to be violated and civilizations to fall. Our inflation would not have progressed as it did, if it were not for the printing press money made possible by its low percentage of backing in gold. Our national debt would cause much greater concern among influential financiers, and probably would not have reached its towering height, if it were not for the "gold" represented by the interest being earned by national and international interests, which in many cases also profit from the sale of a large share of the goods paid for by the borrowed money.

As long as financial gain of those in controlling positions would be adversely affected by sound programs, we will continue to see plans similar to the "paper gold" scheme advanced as panacea for world problems. We will find such schemes generally accepted on the basis that intelligent world leaders would not be supporting them unless they were workable and beneficial.

There probably was never a dictator in history who was not intelligent, but benevolence and altruism are not virtues which must accompany high mental capacity.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Father of all mercies: Again we come before Thee, standing in the need of prayer. We have not always recognized this need. We have thought ourselves equipped and adequate for whatever the day might bring forth.

But this day brings forth such massive responsibilities, raises such tangled problems, presents such complex moral demands that we are driven to seek a wisdom and power beyond our own.

Where else can we turn but to Thee, O God? For Thou alone hast the words of eternal life that give meaning to our mortal years and answer to the questions that taunt us.

Enable us, then, to receive Thy good gift of understanding as we turn to the duties at hand. Cast out the pride and prejudice that could preempt our minds and leave no capacity for thinking Thy thoughts after Thee.

May there be in the deeds and decisions of this day some quality that will yield evidence that we have wrought in the strength of prayer that has been heard on high. We ask it all in the name of Him who taught us to pray. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 445. An act for the relief of Rosemarie Gauch Neth; and

S. 1108. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 25, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon, tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MUNDT TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate returns to the Senate Chamber after the joint session tomorrow, which will be addressed by the distinguished President of Mexico, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be recognized for up to 40 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard J. Samuels, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDING OFFICER announced that on today, October 26, 1967, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code; and

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON MIDDLE EAST PETROLEUM EMERGENCY

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, supplemental report relating to the Middle East petroleum emergency, as of October 10, 1967 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE U.S.A., INC.

A letter from John H. Verkouteren & Co., transmitting a financial report of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., for the year ended September 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Cumberland, Md., Aerie No. 245, and the Grand Aerie International Convention, Kansas City, Mo., remonstrating against un-American demonstrations, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee submitted:

By Mr. **METCALF**, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 1602. A bill to create a Northwest Regional Services Corporation to provide a central location for various training centers and programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 689).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. **MONRONEY**, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated October 16, 1967, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **TYDINGS**:

S. 2589. A bill to provide for the regulation in the District of Columbia of retail installment sales of consumer goods (other than motor vehicles) and services, and for other purposes;

S. 2590. A bill to provide maximum finance and other charges in connection with retail installment credit sales in the District of Columbia;

S. 2591. A bill to provide a right to cancel retail installment-sales contracts in the District of Columbia in certain circumstances; and

S. 2592. A bill to amend section 521 of the act approved March 3, 1901, so as to prohibit the enforcement of a security interest in real property in the District of Columbia except pursuant to court order; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "RESEARCH IN THE SERVICE OF MAN: BIOMEDICAL KNOWLEDGE, DEVELOPMENT, AND USE"

Mr. **HARRIS** submitted an original resolution (S. Res. 181) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Research in the Service of Man: Biomedical Knowledge, Development, and Use," which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HARRIS, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "STATE UTILITY COMMISSIONS"

Mr. **MUSKIE** submitted the following original resolution (S. Res. 182); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the committee print of the Committee on Government Operations of the Ninetieth Congress entitled "State Utility Commissions" (a study submitted by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations); and that there be printed two thousand four hundred additional copies for the use of that committee.

CONSUMER PROTECTION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AREA

Mr. **TYDINGS**. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, four bills which are designed to enhance substantially the protection of consumers in the District of Columbia. From a number of sources it has come to my attention that a large number of consumers in the District of Columbia, and the entire Washington metropolitan area, are being systematically victimized by a quite small number of retail merchants in the area. Victimization practices are particularly prevalent in connection with retail installment-sales transactions.

At the present time there is no general legislative protection against fraudulent practices in retail installment sales in the District of Columbia, and there is no administrative machinery in the District of Columbia government with a strong, far-reaching mandate to protect consumers in this area. The legislation I introduce today would correct these serious shortcomings.

The beneficial effect of this legislation will not be limited to the protection of residents of the District of Columbia alone, but will extend to the entire Washington metropolitan area. This is so because the legislation will both protect consumers who purchase in the District of Columbia no matter where they reside, and will also significantly influence the practices of merchants in the entire area since consumers will be able to insist generally on the advantages provided to them by this legislation directly in dealing with District of Columbia merchants.

The first bill I introduce would accomplish basically two purposes. First of all, it would provide regulation of numerous aspects of retail installment-sales transactions.

Second, it would establish in the District of Columbia government a Department of Consumer Protection, with a broad mandate to protect consumers against fraudulent or deceptive retail practices, in such areas as advertising, sales, credit contracts, and collection practices. The Department would be empowered to accomplish this through investigations, administrative hearings and orders, enforcing regulations adopted under this and other consumer protection laws, and through court actions.

Among the many aspects of retail installment contracts which this bill would regulate are the following:

The bill would require broad and detailed disclosure of the terms of consumer credit contracts—the amount of interest charged, the percentage rates of interest, the payment schedules, and so on. These disclosure requirements are similar in effect and purpose to the truth-in-lending legislation which has recently passed the Senate, and by including these disclosure requirements in a bill designed specifically for the District of Columbia, additional, and therefore more effective, enforcement machinery is made available to protect consumers in this area.

The bill would also provide for elimination of the so-called holder in due course doctrine in retail installment sales transactions. This doctrine, as it is presently applied, permits retail sellers to assign their rights to payment under sales contracts to finance companies, so that buyers must pay the full sales price to the finance companies even if the sellers failed to perform their part of the contracts.

If the buyer purchases a television set, for example, which was defective and immediately breaks down, he still must pay the full purchase price to the finance company—the holder in due course—and then initiate suit against the original seller for return of his money. Many consumers lack the means to get any redress in this cumbersome manner and thus get cheated.

Under the bill, the buyer could use his defense against payment to the original seller, also against the finance company to whom the sales contract is assigned. This provision would not limit a seller's ability to obtain financing, since the contract remains assignable. But it would shift the risk that the seller has committed unlawful practices or become insolvent from the consumer to the finance company which is better able to protect its interest against the seller.

The bill also prohibits a number of specific provisions in sales contracts which have in the past been used by a few sellers to take advantage of consumers—provisions such as "balloon payments" which trap unwary consumers into many low payments for a long period of time and a sudden large payment at the end of the term which forces the buyer into default, forfeiting both the goods and all his payments thus far.

The bill also prohibits provisions by which a buyer waives his right to enforce any warranties which the seller may have made concerning the goods. When a buyer purchases goods, typically he believes he is getting a product which will do what the seller says or implies it will do. But in some instances, by signing a small-print contract, the buyer waives his right to enforce this reasonable belief.

The second bill which I am introducing would provide for regulation of finance charges and other charges imposed in connection with retail installment-sales contracts.

At present, legislation in the District of Columbia regulates maximum interest rates for loan transactions and for automobile credit sales. But there is no regulation of maximum interest rates for consumer credit sales generally. As a result, a few merchants impose sky-high interest rates and other hidden charges, which amount to exorbitant and wholly unreasonable expenses to consumers, all out of proportion to the risks which the sellers are taking and to the returns which reputable businessmen are obtaining in the same kinds of transaction.

This legislation would adopt the same maximum interest rates which are now imposed by law in two States—New York and California—and require that interest charges not exceed 20 percent per annum for the first $500 and 16 percent per annum for all debt above that amount. In addition, the bill would provide for regulation of credit insurance charges and other charges which are often imposed as disguised forms of interest to avoid maximum statutory interest rates.

This bill is designed to protect consumers, but not to penalize honest, reasonable businessmen. Accordingly, in the course of hearings on this bill—as on all the legislation I introduce today—I intend to explore with great care the experience of other States; such as New York and California, to ensure that the requirements imposed on the business community by this legislation would be both fair and reasonable.

The third bill I introduce establishes a right of consumers, during a limited time period, to cancel retail installment-sales contracts which they have entered. This bill is essentially directed at door-to-door home solicitation sales. A number of reports have indicated that, while the great majority of door-to-door salesmen are reputable and honest, in some circumstances other salesmen engage in high-pressure, deceptive sales techniques which are especially hard for consumers to avoid when they are virtually pursued in their own homes.

Unlike sales transactions in retail stores where the buyer has come seeking out the seller, the person who answers the door at home and is met by a salesman is often less prepared and more vulnerable in dealing with high-pressure and deceptive techniques. Accordingly, I believe it is reasonable to provide a "cooling off" period for such sales, in which the buyer can calmly consider his contract and perhaps consult with members of his family or others about it.

The legislation provides for a 3-day "cooling off" period during which time the buyer can cancel his contract. The cancellation period is the same as is now provided in Massachusetts and Illinois consumer-protection laws. Special account is also made for home-improvement sales contracts, where a seller might act to his detriment by, for example, installing storm windows or making extensive home repairs during the 3-day period, by providing that the buyer must cancel within 3 days or before good-faith performance of any services, whichever is earlier. For all other cancellations, provision is made for payment of a small cancellation fee and, of course, return of any goods delivered, to protect the interests of the door-to-door sellers.

The fourth bill I introduce provides that security interests in real property, such as "deeds of trust," can only be foreclosed through court proceedings. A recent series of articles in the Washington Post have revealed a widespread practice which victimizes consumers by persuading them, in effect, to mortgage their homes as security for credit purchases and automatically to forfeit title to their homes if they fail to make any credit payments.

Often the purchaser is misled regarding the effect of the document he signs. Often the purchaser refuses to pay for the goods because they are defective or because he has some other valid defense on the sales contract. But, under present practices, the purchaser still loses his home without any prior opportunity to make a case for himself in court. This bill would prohibit such automatic foreclosures and would require any foreclosure to take place through regular court proceedings where the homeowner would have an opportunity to protect himself.

These four bills were prepared with an intent both to protect consumers and to safeguard the legitimate interests of reputable businessmen—who are the vast majority of merchants in this area. As I have indicated, extensive hearings are necessary, and will be held, to insure that these legislative proposals have in fact accomplished these basic and essential purposes.

The first hearings will be held in the second week in December. A more detailed announcement of the exact coverage of the hearings will be made shortly. I am hopeful that legislation will ultimately result from these efforts which will be a model for consumer protection laws for the rest of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, as follows:

S. 2589. A bill to provide for the regulation in the District of Columbia of retail installment sales of consumer goods (other than motor vehicles) and services, and for other purposes;

S. 2590. A bill to provide maximum finance and other charges in connection with retail installment-credit sales in the District of Columbia;

S. 2591. A bill to provide a right to cancel retail installment sales contracts in the District of Columbia in certain circumstances; and

S. 2592. A bill to amend section 521 of the act approved March 3, 1901, so as to prohibit the enforcement of a security interest in real property in the District of Columbia except pursuant to court order.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 180) seeking U.S. initiative to assure United Nations Security Council consideration of Vietnam conflict.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 26, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 445. An act for the relief of Rosemarie Gauch Neth; and

S. 1108. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol.

REA IS A SOUND INVESTMENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, thousands of words have been spoken in the halls of the Congress recently on the subject of budget cutting and unnecessary spending.

It is therefore refreshing to cite the record of one Federal agency that has proved that funds advanced for financing one Federal program are a sound investment, paying handsome dividends.

The Rural Electrification Administration, in a report on the first 8 months of 1967, has produced figures showing that rural electric and telephone cooperatives are repaying more than $1 million every day of the loan money advanced to them by the Federal Government.

This cash flow back into the Treasury is the highest level of principal and interest payments in REA's 32-year history.

It is a great tribute to these cooperatives.

Most significant is the fact that REA cooperatives, in an effort to help minimize the net cash demand on our Government, are paying their REA obligations in advance of due dates.

In the last 8 months, a total of $203 million in interest and principal payments have been made, increasing total electric and telephone payments to more than $3 billion over the last 32 years.

When we compare this with the total of $6.6 billion in loan funds actually advanced to all these cooperatives and $324 million paid ahead of due dates, we see what a healthy investment this has been.

Total electric and telephone repayments of principal over the life of the two programs are $1.7 billion, and interest paid is more than $1 billion.

During the last 8 months alone, advance payments back to the Government increased by $38.2 million.

Electric borrowers, apart from the telephone cooperatives, have repaid $1.5 billion as principal due, $883 million in interest, and put $310 million back into the Treasury ahead of schedule.

These three items total $2.7 billion, compared with the $5.4 billion in electric loan funds made available by REA.

Figures for the telephone borrowers show $145 million paid back on the principal, $125 million in interest payments, and $14 million paid in advance of due dates, or a total of $284 million.

In total, telephone cooperatives have received $1.2 billion in loan money from REA.

Looking back over the 32 years the electric loan program has been in effect, only two borrowers have defaulted—to the very thin tune of $44,478.

This is eight ten-thousandths of 1 percent of the loan funds REA advanced, REA statisticians say.

For the 18 years the telephone program has been operating, there has not been a single loss.

Entirely apart from this remarkable record of repayment is the fact that this loan money has been used to generate many added billions of dollars of development in rural areas.

Without this Government capital to assist them, our rural areas would still lack many, many improvements that have encouraged farmers to stay on the farm and that have attracted new enterprise and new residents to the country.

I doubt if any commercial moneylenders could equal the record of development which REA has made possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statistics which have been supplied me by the Rural Electric Administration, at my request, showing the amount of loans advanced, the amount of principal paid, the amount of interest paid, the amount paid in advance, and total payments on a State-by-State basis. I ask unanimous consent, also, to have the same information printed with respect to telephone loans.

There being no objection, the statistics were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOANS, ADVANCES, AND PAYMENTS—REA ELECTRIC BORROWERS—BY STATES, AS OF AUG. 31, 1967

State	Loans advanced	Principal paid	Interest paid	Advance payments	Total payments
Alabama	$131,638,410.36	$38,907,910.08	$20,957,723.18	$6,462,570.76	$66,328,204.02
Arizona	52,425,931.63	10,021,897.24	6,841,802.34	2,356,793.68	19,220,493.26
Arkansas	171,961,701.62	41,520,143.07	25,999,274.61	4,681,729.95	72,201,147.63
California	37,312,230.85	14,286,069.12	6,870,518.91	129,807.43	21,286,395.46
Colorado	168,187,654.67	34,049,787.36	22,633,042.67	9,347,805.43	66,030,635.46
Connecticut	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Delaware	8,041,005.91	2,427,101.26	1,477,512.71	649,729.48	4,554,343.45
Florida	109,898,274.52	24,639,358.49	15,592,358.50	2,600,700.72	42,832,417.71
Georgia	174,394,440.21	58,698,882.94	29,734,123.12	9,663,507.97	98,096,514.03
Hawaii	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Idaho	30,453,913.44	9,360,172.45	5,300,715.42	786,945.68	15,447,833.55
Illinois	150,013,171.06	47,479,060.33	28,178,334.03	10,304,476.64	85,961,871.00
Indiana	99,362,389.99	39,409,470.51	15,817,066.08	4,864,534.87	60,091,071.46
Iowa	207,364,807.17	69,921,147.35	38,143,941.68	22,630,361.30	30,695,450.33
Kansas	134,654,137.65	43,322,113.39	26,138,022.88	9,197,362.52	78,657,498.79
Kentucky	265,786,103.26	62,626,259.14	38,920,924.04	11,649,187.09	13,196,370.27
Louisiana	105,637,184.36	29,386,897.29	15,145,889.86	9,235,829.72	53,768,616.87
Maine	4,477,091.10	1,283,402.90	839,034.12	2,575.33	2,125,012.35
Maryland	29,210,493.18	8,557,039.00	4,867,664.52	1,699,739.89	15,124,443.41
Massachusetts	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Michigan	98,433,026.04	27,937,935.77	17,767,311.72	1,249,286.22	46,954,533.71
Minnesota	240,884,861.26	79,196,902.62	41,162,877.28	15,439,121.22	35,798,901.12
Mississippi	139,207,839.86	44,013,896.55	24,211,848.29	8,027,373.26	76,253,118.10
Missouri	358,320,263.95	95,913,209.19	61,654,132.80	25,823,830.76	83,691,172.75
Montana	73,051,848.98	22,117,538.22	12,701,467.23	4,867,744.39	39,686,749.84
Nebraska	184,069,684.88	60,338,594.98	35,107,508.61	11,781,382.93	71,076,832.36
Nevada	9,038,147.84	766,559.43	848,617.80	173,346.66	1,788,523.89
New Hampshire	12,889,284.00	2,666,907.60	2,427,029.13	--------	5,093,936.73
New Jersey	2,471,774.55	1,346,316.66	420,016.16	28,252.25	1,794,585.07
New Mexico	118,273,643.51	29,473,489.07	17,218,508.65	9,848,927.09	56,540,924.81
New York	6,791,922.43	3,752,810.21	1,235,506.67	364,290.44	5,352,607.32
North Carolina	158,361,953.46	51,087,416.97	26,276,099.12	11,614,966.30	88,978,482.39
North Dakota	184,491,727.10	46,100,668.55	28,887,268.96	9,619,336.22	84,607,273.73
Ohio	89,841,284.88	40,426,047.10	17,529,252.43	4,633,685.26	62,588,984.79
Oklahoma	219,149,858.83	54,506,257.97	35,345,230.85	10,216,858.89	100,068,347.70
Oregon	66,613,509.91	18,195,634.84	10,814,641.48	1,428,597.51	3,043,887.83
Pennsylvania	58,958,290.11	18,967,028.42	11,174,737.70	2,326,794.97	32,468,561.09
Rhode Island	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
South Carolina	142,145,553.27	36,556,762.91	21,005,839.34	4,923,536.52	62,486,138.77
South Dakota	124,083,752.90	35,792,156.62	22,263,814.99	7,876,595.07	65,932,566.68
Tennessee	139,977,927.46	55,665,043.69	24,664,730.61	10,866,243.93	91,196,018.23
Texas	496,042,933.96	132,769,071.18	75,797,844.61	40,167,961.54	248,734,877.33
Utah	24,111,391.42	5,516,172.84	3,435,510.68	170,393.59	9,122,077.11
Vermont	7,530,201.94	2,727,772.65	1,362,116.91	31,149.16	4,121,038.72
Virginia	99,573,343.14	29,448,085.78	18,543,364.70	2,701,474.23	50,692,924.71
Washington	60,790,710.83	19,981,082.85	10,096,862.06	1,802,076.10	31,880,021.01
West Virginia	1,773,351.15	703,560.09	446,227.47	30,245.40	1,180,032.96
Wisconsin	167,907,264.19	51,342,597.49	29,760,763.98	12,802,263.30	20,223,859.73
Wyoming	47,718,583.78	13,363,195.39	8,027,682.79	4,530,872.95	93,905,624.77
Alaska	100,028,927.98	10,175,208.16	9,399,388.40	649,263.17	25,921,751.13
Virgin Islands	430,125.72	430,125.72	57,917.68		1,961,919.25
Puerto Rico	75,040,000.00	9,476,000.00	10,143,919.25	--------	--------
Total	5,397,821,930.31	1,536,650,761.43	883,245,987.02	310,259,527.79	2,730,156,276.24

LOANS, ADVANCES, AND PAYMENTS—REA TELEPHONE BORROWERS—BY STATES, AS OF AUG. 31, 1967

State	Loans advanced	Principal paid	Interest paid	Advance payments	Total payments
Alabama	$42,831,033.00	$3,974,516.37	$4,157,444.81	$420,326.85	$8,552,288.03
Arizona	10,473,042.00	767,254.27	903,487.98	79,770.68	1,750,512.93
Arkansas	23,254,271.64	2,080,542.34	2,300,496.07	5,635.79	4,386,674.20
California	21,627,204.00	2,352,448.05	2,452,580.79	36,457.31	4,841,486.15
Colorado	7,782,356.74	1,112,905.13	958,564.93	10,189.99	2,081,660.05
Connecticut	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Delaware	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Florida	25,796,971.09	3,730,693.28	2,863,072.20	10,478.20	6,604,243.68
Georgia	58,608,986.40	7,075,974.21	5,782,154.18	101,741.18	12,959,869.57
Hawaii	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Idaho	7,359,449.79	940,098.00	808,903.42	139,964.52	1,888,965.94
Illinois	41,558,998.17	5,398,826.87	4,977,028.28	679,307.91	11,055,163.06
Indiana	21,372,035.51	3,318,027.92	2,417,212.49	145,367.81	5,880,608.22
Iowa	43,861,678.72	4,269,297.24	4,511,390.02	832,329.96	9,613,017.22
Kansas	54,568,779.88	7,094,755.70	6,853,641.00	555,329.83	14,503,726.53
Kentucky	55,818,903.23	6,309,131.74	6,110,940.60	290,087.63	12,710,159.97
Louisiana	24,899,828.38	3,398,692.20	2,952,860.88	222,994.06	6,574,547.14
Maine	8,305,180.00	995,790.62	911,132.13	125,360.77	2,032,283.52
Maryland	836,334.00	32,080.50	57,347.87		89,428.37
Massachusetts	477,000.00	70,670.59	60,458.63	--------	131,129.22
Michigan	17,004,986.73	1,767,770.06	1,791,772.67	239,463.50	3,799,006.23
Minnesota	50,129,423.07	6,953,188.33	6,329,473.42	923,052.64	14,205,714.39
Mississippi	14,594,349.00	1,439,612.04	1,454,003.18	50,894.99	2,944,510.21
Missouri	59,541,367.20	6,749,803.29	6,498,788.78	607,342.51	13,855,934.58
Montana	21,093,604.00	4,324,903.08	2,490,582.38	653,259.65	7,468,745.11
Nebraska	13,776,350.43	1,471,163.87	1,377,802.80	252,829.90	3,101,796.75
Nevada	1,689,392.00	163,168.23	132,059.36	48,855.16	344,082.75
New Hampshire	1,268,363.00	116,089.11	134,557.28	302.11	250,948.50
New Jersey	6,022,304.00	582,293.65	592,220.16	74,801.08	1,249,314.89

LOANS, ADVANCES, AND PAYMENTS—REA TELEPHONE BORROWERS—BY STATES, AS OF AUG. 31, 1967—Continued

State	Loans advanced	Principal paid	Interest paid	Advance payments	Total payments
New Mexico	$6,206,314.00	$885,836.71	$804,385.29	$12,424.20	$1,702,646.20
New York	7,829,689.00	567,608.09	696,419.66	2,164.31	1,266,192.06
North Carolina	51,479,053.00	4,259,017.12	4,418,694.25	1,360,749.05	10,038,451.42
North Dakota	45,016,622.03	11,236,156.09	5,325,031.06	1,099,287.72	17.660,474.87
Ohio	2,963,102.14	395,982.99	362,927.86	53,005.58	811,916.43
Oklahoma	43,393,440.94	3,678,760.90	3,922,418.47	670,819.05	8,271,998.42
Oregon	14,983,811.45	5,209,677.99	1,833,516.07	73,711.63	7.116,905.09
Pennsylvania	30,404,062.00	3,435,863.53	3,137,343.21	263,249.06	6,836,455.80
Rhode Island					
South Carolina	36,951,713.18	3,856,322.76	3,245,480.98	591,140.15	7,692,943.89
South Dakota	19,598,085.00	3,029,776.84	2,543,681.92	352,953.15	5,926,411.91
Tennessee	47,775,369.41	6,083,848.54	5,665,538.19	438,356.94	12,187,743.67
Texas	101,555,316.38	12,536,204.07	11,236,744.90	1,557,086.21	25,330,035.18
Utah	6,082,263.39	1,821,961.24	644,505,17		2,466,466.41
Vermont	976,444.00	52,787.04	73,776.70		126,563.74
Virginia	20,548,925.00	1,827,685.61	1,855,656.96	362,616.21	4,045,958.78
Washington	13,801,051.90	2,876,192.58	1,662,126.03	134,460.28	4,672,778.89
West Virginia	15,386,331.91	1,399,316.19	1,644,674.06		3,043,990.25
Wisconsin	53,899,076.67	5,242,121.20	5,605,159.18	849,577.06	11,696,857.44
Wyoming	2,896,842.30	387,954.13	334,224.94	12,416.20	734,595.27
Alaska	2,135,738.00	197,870.50	203,388.67	52,310.18	453,569.35
Virgin Islands					
Puerto Rico					
Total	1,158,435,443.68	145,470,640.81	125,095,669.88	14,302,461.41	284,958,772.10

Mr. AIKEN. One other point occurs to me, Mr. President. We sometimes hear that the corporate utility companies can charge much lower rates than the REA. Well, there are two reasons for this: not only that the REA serves territory considered too thin to be attractive to the corporate utilities, but also, when the REA borrows money, it must pay the money back when it is due. However, in many instances when the utility companies borrow money by issuing bonds, and they become due, the companies reissue the bonds or borrow more money with which to pay them. Therefore, they can service areas for less than can the cooperatives serving the more sparsely settled sections of the country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, one of the fathers, if not the father, of REA, has seen fit to put this information in the RECORD.

I think that these farmer-owned and farmer-managed cooperatives have performed a great service to the rural population of this country. As a matter of fact, they came into existence only because private utilities would not undertake the risk envisaged in extending lines and service to sparsely populated areas; an endeavor that would yield little or no income for the companies concerned.

One factor that should be kept in mind about REA endeavors is the amount of business they are responsible for in the East and Midwest through the purchase of electrical equipment. It is my strong belief that companies such as General Electric, Westinghouse, and the like, owe a great deal to the REA for generating business inuring to the benefit of these private commercial interests. The fact is, REA's have done much to help the private sector of our economy.

Mr. President, again I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator from Montana. There is no question but what the REA has done as much or more to develop resources and increase the economy of this country than any other Federal agency.

I was looking for the record of payments from the State of Montana, for the benefit of the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. I find they paid back $5.5 million on their REA electric and telephone loans in advance of the time they became due. I think that all the cooperatives have been encouraged to do that this year by the Treasury of the Federal Government. They wanted to get all the money they could in as short a time as possible.

VIETNAM—HOW NOT TO UTILIZE AIRPOWER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, now that the airfield at Phuc Yen has finally been struck, and because of statements made by those who have believed that airpower and naval power should not be used to full advantage in this war, I ask unanimous consent that a colloquy in the testimony between the counsel of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee and Maj. Gen. Gilbert Meyers, who directed these air operations in Vietnam for some 15 months, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY BY MAJ. GEN. GILBERT L. MEYERS, USAF, RETIRED, BEFORE PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE, AUGUST 29, 1967

PHUC YEN AND ENEMY AIRFIELDS

Mr. KENDALL. Let me ask this, General, so we will have the complete picture.

As far as your headquarters was concerned, were the more important targets recommended for strike, or were your recommendations influenced or inhibited in any way by the feeling that they would not get approval; that you had recommended them before and you were wasting your time and would make waves by continuing to recommend them?

General MEYERS. Well, I think that this influenced our day-to-day recommendations, let's say, but overall, of course, we knew that we had recomended these targets, and that they were on the list, and that if they saw fit to let us hit them, they would. But obviously we did not think it was a good strategy to keep needling them by asking to hit the Phuc Yen Airfield, for example, every time we put in the target list. We had done that many times before and we knew that request was still on the record.

Now on the matter of the airfield, if I could develop that for a moment, I realize that the enemy air in North Vietnam did not pose a very serious threat to our air operations. However, I think one facet of that operation has never been quite understood, and that is that it was always a potential threat to our strike forces. As a result, we were forced to schedule combat air patrols, or fighter sweeps, every time we went on a strike mission.

These missions represented a large number of airplanes. It was a defensive technique which we had to use because if our fighter-bombers got shot down, we were always in serious difficulties answering why. To protect that force, to protect our own pilots, we had to provide them with air cover.

Literally thousands of sorties have been flown on these CAP missions that could have been flown with bombs had these Mig airplanes been eliminated from the scene. Again, this is another illustration of how our air resources were not being the most effectively utilized to carry the war to the enemy.

Mr. KENDALL. Were the airfields recommended for strike by your headquarters?

General MEYERS. Yes, sir.

ARKANSAS BASIN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on October 12, 1967, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] addressed the Arkansas Basin Development Association Convention in Wichita, Kans.

His speech at this sixth annual meeting defined most clearly the proper development and management of our available water resources to assure the fulfillment of all our imperative and rapidly expanding water needs.

We are grateful Senator MAGNUSON should come to Kansas and give us the benefit of his deep and rich knowledge of this most vital field. I ask unanimous

consent that his address on October 12 be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington, at the Arkansas Basin Development Association Convention, Wichita, Kans.

I am delighted to be here for your 6th Annual Meeting. In the comparatively short span of its life, this Association has built a fine reputation for concerted, aggressive action in support of a comprehensive program of water resources conservation and development for the Arkansas Basin in Kansas. And, of course, many of you individually have been prime movers in this field for many long years. I am sure you will all continue to put forth farsighted, vigorous, and sustained efforts. There is so much to be done! How well you succeed in doing it will have a most important bearing on how well this fine part of our country—and the Nation-at-large—is able to meet the challenge of the critical years which lie ahead.

One of the most urgent concerns throughout the Nation today—and one of our most formidable tasks—is the proper development and management of our available water resources to ensure the fulfillment of all our imperative and rapidly expanding water-related needs. Not only is our population growing at an explosive rate, but the per capita demand for water is also rising sharply. One reason is the increasing concentration of population in urban areas, which are the most difficult to supply. Another is the fact that we are becoming more and more dependent upon industrial production, which requires enormous quantities of water.

Some years ago it was my privilege to serve as a member of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, under the chairmanship of your good friend and mine, the late Senator Kerr. Our Committee conducted a very exhaustive assessment of long-range national needs. The projections made at that time clearly indicate the magnitude of the problem that confronts us—and it may well be that the course of events will prove them to be too low rather than too high.

It was shown that our overall demand for water will probably triple within the next 20 years, and in many urban areas might increase as much as ten-fold. It was estimated, for example, that three industries alone—steel, paper, and chemicals—might require four times the amount of water that public and private utilities were then supplying to all domestic and industrial users combined throughout the United States. We must remember that something like 65,000 gallons of water are used to make a ton of steel, 90,000 gallons to make a ton of ordinary bond paper, and 200,000 gallons to make a ton of synthetic fiber. It was also foreseen that by 1980 thermal power plants throughout the Nation will require an amount of cooling water greatly in excess of the average flow of the mighty Mississippi at St. Louis. The tremendous quantity of hot water returned to our rivers from these plants will create new problems due to the adverse effects of high temperatures on water quality and aquatic life.

A new nationwide program, involving the coordinated efforts of all Federal, State, and local agencies concerned in the water resources field, as well as civic groups and private interests, is now underway which eventually will provide an up-to-date inventory of all our country's water resources, and the general framework of action which should be taken to meet, insofar as possible, all our future water-related requirements. The Congress is now considering the establishment of a National Water Commission to consider the entire range of present and future water problems and explore all practicable solutions.

Although the overall supply of fresh water which nature provides is strictly limited, it is considered sufficient to meet our needs through the foreseeable future if we use it wisely. Part of our problems arise from the fact that the natural supply is very unevenly distributed by nature. Through effective comprehensive water resources development we can largely compensate for this maldistribution. For one thing, we can store up flood flows in reservoirs so that adequate water will be available when and where we need it.

The importance of water quality control is sharply increasing. Pollution has become a major national problem. It is making much of our precious water unfit for use. Even with the highest efficiency in waste treatment we can hope to obtain, there will be a large measure of pollution which can only be dealt with through sufficient augmentation of our streams during low flow periods to maintain acceptable water quality. This means that throughout the Nation we must reserve part of the runoff of our rivers to serve this purpose.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Sub-committee on Public Works, I have a front seat at the unfolding drama of accomplishment by the Corps of Engineers, the Interior and Agriculture departments, State agencies, and local interests—all working closely together toward the fulfillment of our water requirements. I am continually impressed by how many people of real vision and solid purpose in all parts of our country are actively engaged in this effort—how vigorously and effectively they are working, as you are working, for realistic development programs which will enable their localities to step out strongly in the parade of national progress.

It is one important function of water resources development in a growing country such as ours to open up new areas of opportunity where young people can settle and apply their energies and initiative to the building of a good life. The engineer's transit and slide rule are truly the weapons of the modern frontiersmen.

Such new areas of opportunity are sorely needed.

Almost three-fourths of our people are city dwellers today, and each year almost three million more, seeking jobs they cannot find elsewhere, are joining their ranks. Sprawling, congested urban-industrial complexes are expanding at a phenomenal rate. Within their steel and concrete confines we find most of our serious environmental health hazards, and the conditions that breed social conflict and crime. They are the major pollutors of our streams and lakes. One of these megalopoli—or strip cities—now stretches all along the Atlantic coast from Washington, D.C. to Boston—a span of well over 600 miles. Some 18 similar unwieldy concentrations are mushrooming in other parts of the country—along the western and southern shores of Lake Michigan, for instance . . . in the Detroit area . . . along Lake Erie . . . in the Upper Ohio Valley . . . on the southern California coast . . . to name a few of them.

Shall this blighting migration of our growing population to the megalopoli continue unabated? Or shall we, through the comprehensive development of the full potential of our river basins, provide the means to reverse it—to revitalize the towns and villages and rural areas of our countryside, encourage the building of new self-sustaining communities, and make possible a more satisfying, more truly productive life for the oncoming millions of Americans?

In my part of the country, progressive comprehensive development of the Columbia River for flood control, power, navigation, irrigation, and other purposes affords a good example of what can be accomplished. It has paced and supported tremendous economic expansion. Abundant, low cost electric energy sparked the establishment of the Basin's great aluminum industry, and many other new manufacturing enterprises, businesses, and commercial activities throughout the region. Irrigation has already brought productivity to hundreds of thousands of acres of good but formerly dry land, providing bountiful opportunities for the creation of prosperous family farms, new businesses, and affluent new communities. Slackwater navigation is also helping to open up new areas of opportunity by providing low-cost transportation to serve the needs of agriculture and waterside industry. When the Snake River dams now under construction by the Corps of Engineers are completed, barge navigation will be open from the Pacific Ocean 480 miles upstream to Clarkston, Washington, and Lewiston, Idaho. Booming recreational use of the lakes created to conserve the waters of the Columbia and its tributaries is becoming an asset of increasing importance to the whole region, both in terms of economic advantage and the well-being of its people.

The Arkansas Basin is on the verge of a similar transformation. Of the 42 reservoirs in the Basin's active program, 20 have already been placed in operation. Five of them are located here in southern Kansas. Ten more—one of them, Marion, in your immediate area—are under construction, and two of these, including Marion, will be completed in 1968. Of the remaining reservoirs, funds for completion of planning are available on four, and planning is underway on three others. These reservoirs are conserving water for municipal supply, navigation, quality improvement, irrigation, and all other beneficial uses. They have already prevented over $172 million flood losses—and in the meantime have become a water playground—13 million visitors last year, of which over 1,700,000 were hosted by your five reservoirs. The Corps of Engineers expects to have the 450-mile canalization of the Arkansas up to the vicinity of Tulsa completed by 1970. Substantial progress has already been made toward the development of ports and industrial parks along the river—the non-Federal facilities needed to attract and sustain large-scale private enterprise.

You people of southern Kansas have made it clear that you are going to continue to plan and work for the further development of your part of the great Arkansas Basin in order to realize its full potential. Much will depend upon the skill and vigor with which you plan for the future. You have a number of important advantages over some of the older developed areas. For one thing, you have the advantage of their experience, the lessons of their oversights and shortcomings. Here in southern Kansas you have extensive space, rivers, ground water, and other resources not yet put to full use. You still have plenty of opportunity to avoid over-concentrations of population, wasteful abuses of resources, and uncoordinated development which works at cross-purposes.

You have the opportunity to preserve and enhance a better balance between man and nature than can ever be achieved by some older areas which have allowed that balance to be destroyed. You can select, from among your streams and valleys and hills and plains, those which are to be developed for productive use and those which are to be left undeveloped for other, perhaps less economical, but equally essential uses—for example, the preservation of the natural environment and the conservation of fish and wildlife.

I am happy to see that the Corps of Engineers is investigating the feasibility of extending navigation into this area by two routes—up the Verdigris and Arkansas to the vicinity of this city, and by way of the Grand (Neosho). If such a waterway should be found feasible and built, it would provide you with the means of getting your wheat to the sea by low-cost barge transportation, and in other ways would be of real advantage in promoting the further economic development of southern Kansas. We in the Columbia Basin are seeking a similar extension of our navigation system from the present head of navigation on the lower Columbia to Wenatchee, Washington, in order that the interests of the interior of the State might be better served.

Although a high priority item on your agenda is the completion of the authorized program in this area, undoubtedly optimum development of its water resources to meet expanding needs will eventually—a few decades from now if not earlier—require many more reservoirs than those now included in that program, and that fact should be taken into full consideration in all your planning.

In too many places throughout the country, when the requirement for more reservoirs has become critically manifest, it has been discovered too late that the best sites have already been preempted by residential and industrial development and are out-of-bounds economically. Don't let that happen to you! Adequate sites ought to be identified as far as possible in advance of the need for them, and timely action taken to reserve them for future water conservation. Your positive leadership in this effort will pay high dividends in years to come.

Here in southern Kansas you have the water and the good land which could make it one of our Nation's greatest areas of expanding opportunity—a powerful magnet to help slow and reverse the migration of our population to the megalopoli. But it will never be enough to sit back and say: "Here are all the potential advantages that developed water resources can confer on an individual and a community. Here are the good water and the fruitful land—come and get them."

Little will really be accomplished unless local initiative is employed to the maximum extent in a positive program to create jobs and businesses which will attract people to the region—to undertake the actual building of new communities where people can come and make a good living and at the same time live a good life—communities which might well be based on your fine reservoirs. Your own vigorous and farsighted enterprise is the real key to the future. With everyone working together in a cooperative spirit, there is no limit to what can be accomplished in the Arkansas Basin in Kansas. Your Association has a busy and rewarding role to play in mobilizing and fostering such participation and cooperation. I am fully confident that you will continue to play it well.

NATIONAL OUTLOOK CONFERENCE ON RURAL YOUTH—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEARSON

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, this morning I had the opportunity of addressing the National Outlook Conference on Rural Youth on the subject of Revitalizing Rural America: Problems and Promises.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech I delivered on this date, October 26, 1967, in Washington, D.C., at the Departmental Auditorium, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVITALIZING RURAL AMERICA: PROBLEMS AND PROMISES

(Statement by Senator JAMES B. PEARSON at National Outlook Conference on Rural Youth, October 26, 1967, Washington, D.C.)

First let me say what a pleasure it is for me to have the opportunity to appear before you this morning as a participant in the National Outlook Conference on Rural Youth. Second, I want to commend the Department of Agriculture and the other Departments of the Executive Branch for taking the initiative in sponsoring this most worthwhile conference. As a Member of Congress and also as a member of the minority party I often find myself in disagreement with the Executive Branch. Therefore, it is particularly gratifying when we find ourselves on common ground.

The theme of this conference is, "New Prospects for Rural Youth." And I would suggest that the most promising new prospect for rural youth is the growing national commitment to the revitalization of rural America. It is too early to tell precisely where this new commitment will take us, but there is no mistaking the fact that there is growing national consensus on the need to stimulate the social and economic development of rural communities.

Rural America has been plagued with problems for a good many years, but ironically it is the great trouble in the urban rather than the rural areas which has finally caused us to more clearly see and understand the difficulties of the countryside and small towns.

The headlines of the past two or three years have made all of us painfully aware of the gigantic social and economic problems of urban America. And the term, "crisis of the cities" has come into common usage—a crisis described in terms of festering slums, rising crime rates, disintegrating families, chronic unemployment, racial tension, congested streets, polluted air and contaminated water.

We have now begun to recognize that many of these problems can be traced to the overcrowding of people and the excessive concentration of industry into a few great metropolitan centers. We are now beginning to realize that one of the most sensible and effective approaches to dealing with the crisis of the cities is to devise programs which will have the effect, hopefully, of slowing down or at least better controlling the great rural to urban migration which has for several decades continued to depopulate the countryside and small towns and to swell the population of our already overcrowded cities.

The long, hot urban summer of 1967 has proven to be something of a catalyst, and we have begun to accept the idea that as we attempt to deal with the crisis of the cities the challenge is not simply to make the cities more efficient and more livable for more and more people, but how to keep more and more people from crowding into them.

Increasingly we are coming to realize that the old assumption that the migration from the country to the city represents the first step up the ladder of economic opportunity and social advancement simply isn't valid. For in reality far too many of the rural poor have crowded into the deteriorated sections of the large cities where they have become entrapped by their own lack of skills and by the pressure from the surrounding communities which seek to isolate the slum population in physical ghettos. What was to be their economic salvation became their prison, and ill-equipped to resist the depersonalizing forces of the city, their sense of personal and social responsibility is dulled. As the darkness of despair crowds out the light of hope they are demoralized and devoured by the contagion of their slum environment.

The rural exodus is not, of course, composed only of the poor and unskilled. It also includes the talented youth and the highly educated. And because of this the rural communities are being bled of their best human talent and most productive economic resources, in a cycle that continually feeds upon itself: the loss of people means a loss of local income and the gap between the actual tax base and the costs of public services is widened. Rural communities are already stretched to the limit to provide the public resources to educate their children, but after they have been educated the youth move to other areas because of a lack of local economic opportunity and social amenities.

But this in turn magnifies the problem because it is the talented and educated youth who could best provide the initiative and leadership to revitalize the community. Ironically, the rural areas are subsidizing the cities by the continuing export of their educated youth.

Thus, we have begun to see the whole question of our rural-urban balance in a new perspective. And because more and more people are dissatisfied with what they see we are now in the early stages of a national debate centering on the question of how we can better control and moderate the great rural migration to the cities. This debate will continue for several years and it will provide us an opportunity to discuss the characteristics of our present society and to raise fundamental questions about the type of society we want to build in the future. I am confident that out of this national debate will come a series of public policy decisions which will have a major influence on the development of our society for several decades to come. Hopefully those policy decisions will be the correct ones.

This then is the promise of the commitment to the goal of revitalizing rural America. Now let me turn to some of the problems that will be encountered as we seek to translate this general goal into practical reality.

The basic problem, I think, is represented by the challenge of the long-held beliefs and notions about what constitutes economic and social development. Despite the growing national acceptance of the idea that the rural to urban shift has gotten out of hand, I don't think we have really come to grips with many of the fundamental questions which we are going to have to deal with. For example, despite the uneasiness about the continuing concentration of people and economic resources into relatively few highly urbanized areas, we still tend to assume that the social and economic forces which underlie this concentration are not only inevitable but basically desirable over the long run. In short, we are still something of two minds on this subject. Our doubts about the undesirable effects of massive urbanization tend to be counterbalanced by a general expression of a century-old article of faith that this overall movement toward a highly concentrated, urbanized society represents economic and social progress.

And, of course, it is true that the forces which underlie the rural to urban migration do represent progress in a very meaningful sense. But the massive and hideous slums and the deteriorating rural communities which are the product of these forces are damning testimony to our inability to diffuse this progress throughout the entire population.

Thus, what I want to emphasize here is that if we are going to do anything more than pay lip service to the idea of achieving a more desirable rural-urban balance, we are going to have to discard many of our attitudes and traditional dogmas and take a completely new look at the forces which have shaped our present social and economic structure.

In this effort to overcome these old stereotyped attitudes and beliefs, it is absolutely vital that we develop the best possible information and data. We already know a great deal, but we need to know a great deal more. We need to know in more precise detail those factors which influence industrial plant location. We need to know more about what conditions are necessary to assure efficient operations of industries outside our metropolitan areas. We need to know more about the economic costs and inefficiencies associated with the concentration of people and economic resources in the giant metropolitan complexes. We need to know more about why people migrate from one area to another. We need to know more about the human and natural resources that are currently available throughout rural communities of America. In short, we need a vast array of new data and theoretical explanations concerning the whys and hows of economic growth and population distribution.

This is one of the reasons why I think this conference is so valuable because one of its purposes is to encourage the dissemination of information and data that we now have and to emphasize the importance of future studies and analyses and the continuing exchange of this information among both governmental and non-governmental groups which are interested in this whole question of rural economic development.

Now, in the concluding portion of my remarks, I want to identify some of the specific steps that I think should be taken as a part of this effort to revitalize our rural communities.

First, and most obvious, rural areas need more jobs. Unless we can actually begin to increase the number of jobs available in our rural communities, nothing else that we can do will have any meaningful or lasting effect. In this connection, I would just like to briefly mention the Rural Job Development bill introduced by Senator Harris and myself in July of this year. This bill provides a series of tax incentives designed to attract new job-creating industries into rural communities. I am, of course, pleased to note that the bill has been extremely well received in the Congress and we have been most encouraged by the expression of support we have received from all around the country. I am most hopeful that we can get early and favorable action on this piece of legislation.

Second, we must expand educational opportunities in rural areas, particularly those types of programs involving vocational-technical training. New industries can survive in rural communities only if they are able to count upon a skilled labor force.

Third, we need a better system of making credit available to business firms which are interested in developing a new enterprise in rural areas. The type of capital that is needed to finance new industries is oftentimes simply not available outside the large metropolitan areas.

Fourth, we have got to substantially improve the quantity and quality of available housing. One of the first problems that smaller towns encounter in their efforts to attract new industry is a shortage of housing.

Fifth, the Federal Government must do a better job than it is now doing to achieve a more equitable geographical distribution in the spending and procurement programs. This is particularly important in regard to the awarding of research and development grants to the colleges and universities. The present pattern of distribution of funds actually tends to encourage the concentration of people, talent and economic resources in a relatively few areas. This is no reason whatsoever why more of these grants can't go to the small regional and community colleges. The strengthening of these institutions will have many indirect but important ramifications throughout the surrounding community.

Sixth, we must stop treating the problems of rural and urban areas as separate and distinct. Although manifested in different ways, the problems are interrelated and have common causes. Thus, it is essential that we develop more effective coordination of Federal Government programs—particularly those concerned with economic development and the reduction of poverty.

And seventh we must rededicate ourselves to a fresh, new effort to strengthen the institution of the family farm. I want to stress this point because a number of people who are stressing the need for a better rural-urban balance are saying that the continuing exodus from the farm cannot be stopped, and, in effect, I think, have written off the family farm as a viable institution. Now it would be neither possible or desirable to attempt to freeze the farm population at the present level, but to argue that we can't do anything to substantially alter the present trend is the very same type of economic fatalism which we have got to overcome if we are ever going to make any substantial progress toward a better rural-urban balance. We must strengthen the family farm not only because it is a valuable socio-economic institution but because it is the base on which so many of our smaller towns and cities depend.

These are some of the things that we need to do now. But as the debate on how to achieve a more sensible rural-urban balance continues, hopefully new proposals will be generated. And in this connection I would close by urging each and every one of you to renew your efforts on behalf of rural youth and to help stimulate discussion at the local level as to what individual citizens and private groups, as well as governmental agencies, can do to broaden the social and economic opportunities of rural America and thereby improve the quality of American society. Your work is absolutely vital to this whole effort and I believe you will be rewarded by your direct participation in meeting one of the most demanding, but also exicting, challenges of our time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for as long as may be required for my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HAS THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS BECOME "BUY AMERICAN?"

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly, and adversely, on the about-face of the Department of State with respect to the sale of F–5 aircraft to Peru.

When the Peruvians originally approached the United States with a request to buy F–5's some months ago, they were told quite properly that we were opposed to making the sale.

They then went to the British in an attempt to buy some Canberra bombers. The British were prepared to make the sale, but the United States, again quite properly, exercised its rights under the end-use agreement by which British manufacture of the Canberra was licensed, and vetoed that sale.

The Peruvians then went to the French to buy some Mirage V aircraft. At this point, the United States had no leverage left, and the State Department pivoted around 180 degrees from its original position. It told the Peruvians that they could buy F–5's after all, for delivery in 1969–70, which is about what the lead time on F–5's is, anyway.

Now, according to press reports over the weekend, the Peruvian Government, in a crowning ironical culmination of the Department's flip-flop, has politely said "No, thank you" to the United States.

As for the State Department, after having started out following the correct policy, it has now publicly abandoned its position and, in the process, has infuriated the British, who are the closest and most reliable friends we have left.

The British were understandably annoyed when we vetoed the sale of Canberras, but they recognized that we acted within our legal rights and in pursuance of a policy which, though they disagreed with it, at least up to that point had the virtue of consistency. We have now deserted our own policy, and have as much as said to the British: "We will not allow you to sell Canberras, but we will, ourselves, sell F–5's, in order to block the French."

We have said, in effect, to the Peruvians, and to all the rest of Latin America, "Don't take us too seriously when we talk about the guiding principles of the Alliance for Progress, the urgent need for internal reforms, and rapid economic growth for the benefit of the people, for we don't take all that too seriously ourselves. Our guiding principle, when you come right down to it, is 'Buy American.' Don't believe us if we turn you down the first time, we'll come around in the end if you find another source of supply."

Little wonder that John M. Goshko, Latin American correspondent for the Washington Post, should reply from Lima:

> Washington's about-face on the sale of the F–5 has touched off a wave of undisguised chortling in Peruvian political and press circles about what is regarded here as the hypocrisy and inconsistency of the U.S. position.

I ask, Mr. President, that the full text of Mr. Goshko's article may appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 22, 1967]

PERUVIANS SPURN U.S. OFFER TO SELL F–5 JETS AS TOO LATE

(By John M. Goshko)

LIMA, October 21.—In an effort to forestall Peruvian purchase of French supersonic Mirage jets, the United States has formally offered Peru the U.S. F–5 jet, only to have the proposal rejected.

The action came in the wake of this week's announcement in Washington that the Johnson Administration was reversing its long-standing ban on the sale of F–5s to Latin American countries and would consider Latin purchase requests for delivery in 1969 or 1970.

In Peru's case, it was learned, the initiative went even further. On Thursday, Ernesto Siracusa, charge d'affaires of the U.S. Embassy here, called on President Fernando Belaunde Terry to propose that Peru buy the F–5 instead of the French Mirage.

Belaunde is understood to have replied that although the F–5 was the plane originally desired by the Peruvian Air Force, the U.S. offer came too late. This strengthened the hints dropped in recent days by Peruvian officials that the deal with France already has been concluded.

The general belief here is that the purchase involves 15 or 16 planes. These are supposed to include 12 Mirage fighter-bombers and 3 or 4 Mirage trainers.

Meanwhile, Washington's about-face on the sale of the F–5 has touched off a wave of undisguised chortling in Peruvian political and press circles about what is regarded here as the hypocrisy and inconsistency of the U.S. position. It also is known to have caused great gloom among U.S. embassy and AID officials who feel the action has seriously undermined their ability to influence the Peruvian government on matters related to the jet deal.

The United States had feared that the acquisition of supersonic planes by one Latin country would spur similar purchases throughout the area and divert money needed for development into a regional arms race.

When it became apparent that the Peruvian government, under heavy pressure from its armed forces, was nevertheless determined to buy supersonic planes, the United States mounted a strenuous effort to prevent the sale. It tied a warning not to buy the planes to negotiations for a loan and even hinted at a possible cutback of other U.S. aid to Peru.

However, Belaunde decided he needed the support of his armed forces even more than he needs U.S. aid. Now, in the wake of reports that at least one other Latin country, Brazil, is negotiating with the French for Mirages, Washington has decided to start selling the F-5 in Latin America.

The apparent justification is that since the United States cannot prevent the introduction of supersonic warplanes into the area, it should become the prime supplier of them. This would make the Latins dependent on the United States for training and for replacement parts, thereby theoretically allowing Washington some control over the plane's employment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at Punta del Este last April, the Presidents of the members of the Organization of American States, including the Presidents of the United States and Peru, joined in a somewhat turgid declaration which nonetheless contains this succinct sentence: "Latin America will eliminate unnecessary military expenditures." No wonder there is a credibility gap—and not just in the United States.

The argument to which the State Department resorts to justify its reversal of policy is that if we do not sell F-5's, the French will sell Mirages. From this, the Department also argues that since the Peruvians are determined to acquire modern jet aircraft, it is better to sell them F-5's, which are cheaper, slower, and generally less sophisticated than Mirages. Finally, it is said that the sale of F-5's preserves U.S. influence with the Peruvian Air Force, maintains the dependence of that air force on the United States for spare parts and training, and prevents the intrusion of French military influence in the area.

None of these arguments holds water. I have not heard anyone seriously dispute the proposition that the acquisition of expensive, sophisticated, modern weapons is a squander of the limited financial resources of Latin American countries; that it is contrary to the goals of the Alliance for Progress, and in conflict with the fundamental objectives of our own foreign policy in this hemisphere, where hundreds of millions of our own dollars are being contributed each year to promote economic growth south of our borders.

It follows that the United States ought not to be supplying expensive, sophisticated military equipment to Latin America.

If the Latin Americans, either through undue influence of their own military establishments or a misperception of their true self-interest, are nonetheless determined to acquire such equipment from other sources, they must accept the consequences. Peru is a sovereign nation, and can do what it wants to with its own resources. But the United States should not be a party to the squandering of these resources by agreeing to sell Peru, or other poor nations of Latin American, F-5's. To argue, as the State Department does, that otherwise Peru would squander even more resources, is like justifying a sale of marihuana, on the grounds that the purchaser would otherwise buy heroin.

I completely fail to understand the horror with which the Departments of State and Defense view any prospect of an intrusion of European influence in Latin America. One would think they regard the area as the private preserve of the United States. Indeed, many Latin Americans do think they regard it that way, and this is one of the many handicaps under which the United States labors in that part of the world.

Nor, on the other hand, am I at all impressed with the advantages which the United States supposedly gains from its presumed influence with the Latin American military. There may have been an instance in recent years when this influence proved a source of restraint, but it does not readily come to mind.

On the contrary, one of the problems the United States faces in Latin America is its popular identification with the military. If we were to loosen some of these ties, we would disappoint some colonels and even some junta governments, but we would do a great deal to rehabilitate ourselves with the people at large, who are going to have more to say, in the long pull, about the future of Latin America than the colonels.

Finally, Mr. President, it will be interesting to see what the State Department does about supplying economic aid to Peru in the light of these aircraft purchases. Apparently, the Department had decided that it really could not justify an aid program if Peru bought Mirage V's; then subsequently found that it could justify an aid program if she bought F-5's from us. But the F-5 sale is now off, by Peru's choice. Will the Department now revert to a "no more aid" stance?

The Department has thus contrived for itself a conundrum which it will assuredly face not only in Peru, but also in Brazil and other countries, for no one should be so naive as to suppose that if these planes are offered to Peru, we can then avoid offering them to other Latin American countries as well.

Behind the Department's reasoning, there must be the thought that a cutoff of aid could be avoided by selling F-5's, whereas a cutoff could not be avoided if the Peruvians, Brazilians, and others bought Mirages.

This is really the most appallingly cynical part of the whole sordid business. It amounts to saying, "We'll give you aid if you waste your resources on something we sell, but not if you waste them on something others sell." What could be more calculated to destroy faith in the Alliance for Progress and to reinforce the image of the United States as "Mr. Money Bags?"

It is unfortunate, potentially tragic, that things have reached this pass. I have never believed that the aid program gave us very much leverage anyway, or that we ought to attempt to achieve our objectives by threatening to cut off aid. Such threats usually do no more than give offense to the threatened party and provide him with an added reason to do what he intended to do anyway, just to show his independence. Specifically, I do not believe a threat to cut off aid could have prevented the Peruvian-French deal for Mirages.

However, there is more than one way to get a point across. In the days before the aid program became an all-purpose crutch, diplomats used to have a degree of subtlety and imagination.

Furthermore, the conduct of diplomacy by blackmail works both ways. Just as we should not threaten the Peruvians, we should not allow ourselves to be threatened by them or by nightmare visions of our own making should they choose to disregard our advice.

To sum up: The United States was correct in its first refusal to sell the Peruvians F-5's. It was correct in exercising its rights under the end-use agreement with respect to the British Canberras. But when the Peruvians turned to the French, we should never have resorted to the indignity of reversing our own position and offering them F-5's instead. We should have stuck by our principles, and taken advantage of the occasion to reiterate that, in the administration of our own aid program, we intended to be guided by it.

In this connection, CIAP—the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress—has every right, in reviewing Peru's economic development program, to look at how Peru is using its own resources. In negotiating aid programs with Peru, the United States has similar rights. If it appears that Peru, or any other country, is not using its resources wisely, there ought not to be very much aid.

And, if we really want to prevent a new arms race for expensive jet aircraft in Latin America, this it seems to me, would have been the place to take our stand. I daresay it would have had a very sobering effect throughout Latin America if the United States had said plainly to Peru, "Look to the French, if you will, for your jets, and look to them also for your aid."

If we would only take that simple position once and stick to it, I am sure it would have a very salutary effect around the hemisphere. At best, it would reinvigorate the Alliance for Progress. At worst, it would save us a good deal of money. Either way, it would restore our self-respect—and incidentally, make us a good many friends among the little people of the hemisphere.

WHERE ARE THE SONGS?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Vietnam war is the most unpopular war in our Nation's history and the longest excepting the Revolutionary

War. There are no patriotic slogans being bandied about such as "Making the World Safe for Democracy" or "Remember the *Maine.*" Also, the fact that there are no war songs being sung anywhere in America relating to our GI's and airmen fighting in Vietnam is strongly indicative of how unpopular our involvement in this civil war has become. To the contrary, anti-Vietnam war songs are popular among young Americans in some of our universities.

In World Wars I and II, the Spanish-American War, and even in the Mexican War, which was also an unpopular war, there were war songs and parades with bands playing martial music. There is nothing like that in America now. The Vietnam war is as remote to most Americans as a television play. Many Americans neither feel in it nor a part of it. Most do not even relate to it. Sometimes it comes home to us when we read of a youngster we remember as a neighbor boy being killed in combat in Vietnam.

Remember those songs "Keep the Home Fires Burning," "Over There," "Keep Your Head Down, Allemand, If You Want To See Your Father, in the Fatherland," "White Cliffs of Dover," "There's a Long, Long Trail a Winding," "This Is the Army, Mr. Jones," "Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition." Nothing of that sort now. Most people do not even seem to miss the $2.5 billion blown up in smoke each month because leaders of this administration have blundered into a civil war in Vietnam and have converted it into a major American war in the worst area of the world for Americans to fight. South Vietnam, a little country in Southeast Asia far from our sphere of influence—in fact, 10,000 miles distant from mainland United States—is of no economic or strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States.

VISIT TO CONGRESS TOMORROW BY THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the appearance tomorrow by Mexican President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz before a joint meeting of Congress is put in perspective by an article entitled "Anti-Yankeeism Is Mexican Myth," written by Virginia Prewett, and published in the October 25 issue of the Washington Daily News, and by an article entitled "Warm 'Abrazos' Across the Border," written by William Weber Johnson, and published in the Los Angeles Times of October 26, 1967.

Mr. Johnson is a professor of journalism at UCLA, former foreign correspondent in Mexico and South America, and author of books, magazines, and articles on Latin America.

Miss Prewett in her article quotes pertinent sections of the Mexican Embassy's news release in announcing the visit, and other facets of the visit as well. She writes, in part:

> No specific matters are up for discussion as no problems exist at present between Mexico and the U.S. which would warrant it.

What a change, Mr. President, from United States-Mexican relations in the past. Of course, problems continue to exist, but I am confident the spirit of cooperation which has been nurtured and developed by the leaders of our two countries will also continue to prevail.

Mr. President, we can look with pride to our relationship with Mexico. As a chief architect of this happy situation, President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz is deserving of an attentive and sympathetic audience when he speaks to Congress tomorrow.

I also invite attention to an editorial entitled "Visitor From Mexico," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 24; and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial and the two articles to which I have referred be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 25, 1967]

Anti-Yankeeism Is Mexican Myth

(By Virginia Prewett)

The visit of President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz of Mexico this week, according to the Mexicans themselves, is simply and purely a "friendship visit."

Says the Mexican Embassy's news release of Oct. 17 announcing President Diaz Ordaz' visit: "No specific matters are up for discussion as no problems exist at present between Mexico and the U.S. which would warrant it."

In view of the past U.S.-Mexican history of border warfare, border irritations, accusations of territory-grabbing, expropriation of U.S. properties and all the rest, this pronouncement by the Mexicans is a kind of milestone.

Mexico and the U.S. do have questions pending—that of the ultra-salty waters of the Colorado River that flow into Mexico, for example—but they are being handled in friendly routine fashion.

This development in U.S.-Mexican relations illustrates how our country and its hemisphere neighbors can work out even the most troubling problems when the atmosphere is not poisoned by the ambitions of extra-continental powers, as in Cuba today.

Mexico is one of the most rapidly advancing of the Latin American countries. And U.S. cooperation, beginning notably with World War II, has played a large role in this development.

For in spite of Mexico's much-publicized stance of strict "independence"—a stance constantly dramatized by Mexico's refusal to follow the U.S. example in boycotting Communist Cuba—Mexicans actually have made an immensely good thing out of their relations with the U.S.

In two extremely important economic areas, industrialization and the tourist trade, Mexicans in the past 20 years have welcomed the U.S. contribution.

Hundreds of millions of U.S. capital has flowed into Mexico, to help that country develop to the point of exporting such manufactures as freight cars and seamless steel tubing to the U.S. itself.

Today around a billion and a quarter of U.S. dollars are directly invested in Mexico, nearly $800 million of it in manufacturing.

This has come about because the Mexican government and Mexican business have discarded the panic fear of U.S. investment that both communists and ultra-nationalists keep alive in many parts of Latin America.

The Mexicans set their own ground rules, and the U.S. investors have proved willing and able to comply. This fact is significant.

Far in advance of other Latin American countries, Mexico set about making their land a most pleasant place for Americans to visit. The result is around $850 million spent in Mexico last year in the tourist and across-border trade.

From the above it can be seen that tho the Mexicans appear to talk an anti-Yankee game, in major aspects their country over the past 20 years has proved quite pro-Yankee.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 26, 1967]

Warm Abrazos Across the Border

(By William Weber Johnson)

When President Johnson welcomes Mexico's President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz to Washington this week it will be 58 years, almost to the day, since the first meeting of the heads of state of the two nations. There have been some startling changes. In Washington there will be much pleasant pomp, mutual admiration, mutual trust. Business will be transacted forthrightly, with enlightened self interest and recognition of common concerns.

The atmosphere in El Paso, Texas, in October, 1909, was different. President William Howard Taft, returning from a western trip, halted his special train to meet Porfirio Diaz, the stony-faced old dictator who had ruled Mexico for a third of a century.

The occasion was completion of the new international bridge. Diaz, the old soldier, advanced cautiously to the mid-point of the bridge and was escorted to the El Paso Chamber of Commerce. There the two presidents held a brief, private conversation while their aides drank champagne. Then the party adjourned to the customs house in Ciudad Juarez where Taft and Diaz again talked briefly.

The Mexican press reported "there was exchanged *el Handshake.*" And that may have been the size of it. Diaz, once much admired in the United States for his hard-fisted maintenance of peace in troubled Mexico and for past favors to U.S. investors, had fallen from grace. Mexico was not cultivating European business interests. Diaz had dragged his feet on renewal of the U.S. Navy's lease of Magdalena Bay. And he had befriended Jose Santos Zelaya, the anti-U.S. dictator of Nicaragua.

Whether any of this was called to old Don Porfirio's attention is not known. But the following year when Francisco Madero launched his anti-Diaz revolution on Texas soil the United States did little to deter him. Within a year the Diaz regime crumbled. Diaz, among others, is credited with the saying: "Poor Mexico, so far from God, so close to the United States'.'

The following quarter century was a sort of dark ages of Mexican-American relations.

Madero, all ideals and good will, came to power only to be overthrown and assassinated in a conspiracy about which the American ambassador, Henry Lane Wilson, knew far more than he should have. Gen. Victoriano Huerta usurped the presidency with Ambassador Wilson's enthusiastic support. But Huerta ran afoul of the new U.S. President, Woodrow Wilson. The upshot was the occupation of Veracruz by U.S. troops, a move which outraged all Mexican sectors, both pro- and anti-Huerta.

When Huerta fell President Wilson tried vainly to unify and pacify the various Mexican revolutionary factions. But these factions, with their old enemy Huerta gone, were by now behaving like fractious tomcats. Only Pancho Villa, the half-genius, half-mad bandit warrior from Chihuahua, seemed friendly to the United States.

The man who emerged from all the confusion, white-bearded old Venustiano Carranza, was finally granted grudging de facto U.S. recogniton. Pancho Villa was furious and staged his raid on Columbus, N.M. Again U.S. intervention, this time by the Pershing-led Punitive Expedition, angered almost all Mexicans, particularly Carranza.

Carranza was petty and vain, but he was also a sincere and stubborn nationalist. Soon he was flirting with imperial Germany to the discomfiture of the United States, which was on the brink of entering World War I. Germany, eager to prevent U.S. entry into the war, proposed an alliance; Mexico would be rewarded with restoration of the lands she had lost to the United States in the war of 1846–48—the southwestern states. Whether Carranza considered it seriously or not, he pulled back from the entanglement at the last minute. But the tide of anti-gringoism was running high. On ceremonial occasions in Mexico City the American ambassador would be hissed and booed, the German minister greeted with cheers.

Matters did not begin to mend appreciably until Ambassador Dwight Morrow helped President Plutarco Elias Calles sort some order out of the economic wreckage of the Revolution. Franklin D. Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy and the relaxed, sympathetic approach of Ambassador Josephus Daniels continued the healing process. The first severe test of the rapprochement came at the time of Mexico's oil expropriation in 1938. Another came with Pearl Harbor. Mexico, under the leadership of Manuel Avila Camacho, entered the war on the side of the United States. It was the beginning of a new era of close cooperation.

In April, 1943 President Roosevelt interrupted a secret tour of U.S. military bases to go to Monterrey for a meeting with Avila Camacho. The next day they resumed their conversation at the U.S. Navy Air Base in Corpus Christi, Texas, where hundreds of young Mexicans were receiving pilot training.

"We have all of us," said Mr. Roosevelt, "recognized the principle of independence. It is time we recognize also the privilege of interdependence, one upon another."

The "privilege of interdependence" has been the guiding spirit of the 12 Mexican-American presidential meetings which have since taken place. Such meetings can never be commonplace. But they have, with increasing frequency, become expectable and fruitful.

Major problems of finance, trade, migrant labor, territorial claims (such as the old and troublesome Chamizal dispute) and international water policies have been worked out to the benefit of both sides. With sympathy and support from both public and private sectors of the United States, Mexico has become a model of stability in the traditionally unstable world of Latin America.

Her currency is firm. She is maintaining a phenomenal 6% economic growth rate to keep up with her booming population. In the process Mexico has become the United States' best customer in Latin America, buying twice as much from us as from the rest of the world. Cooperation has replaced intervention as a means of international adjustment.

There remain, and perhaps always will remain, areas of disagreement, as in the countries' respective attitude toward Castro's Cuba. But the differences are overshadowed by the demonstrable fact that two neighboring nations, so different in many respects, can find so much in common.

When Richard Nixon, then vice-president, returned from his unhappy trip to South America, he advised President Eisenhower that in dealing with Latins one should greet enemies with a handshake, friends with an *abrazo*, a hearty, back-slapping hug. Mr. Eisenhower and the Presidents who followed him all became adept at the *abrazo*—none more so than Lyndon B. Johnson, who comes from country Mexicans and Americans once fought over so bitterly. And, happily, *el Handshake* of the Taft-Diaz meeting seems to be gone for good in the area of Mexican-American relations.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Oct. 24, 1967]

Visitor From Mexico

When President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz of Mexico visits the United States this week, the occasion might remind "North" Americans that Mexico today is the largest Spanish-speaking power in the world, and the third largest nation of the New World. Many United States citizens today are well acquainted with their southern neighbor, yet it still is not always easy to appreciate the growth of the republic in population, in economic wealth and in progressive and stable government. Mexico demands attention and respect.

What brings President Diaz Ordaz to this country suggests that this was, unfortunately, not always the case. In 1852 the great Mexican liberator, President Benito Juarez, asked the United States to return several hundred acres of land near El Paso separated from Mexico by boundary river changes. This country largely ignored the claim, and in 1911 even rejected an arbitration award to Mexico. But this weekend, after the Mexican President addresses a joint meeting of Congress in Washington, he and President Johnson will formally exchange El Chamizal (the big thicket) in ceremonies in El Paso. This will culminate years of bargaining and a congressional agreement to compensate Americans losing their land.

From the standpoint of history and national pride, El Chamizal is more important to Mexico than to the United States, and the latter owes and can afford generosity in settlement. Beyond that the visit of Mexico's President represents a new measure of mutual respect between neighbors.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 660, and that the rest of the measures on the calendar, up to a certain point, be considered in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON CAREERS OF FEMALE OFFICERS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5894) to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove provisions of law which limit the promotion opportunity for, and restrict the career tenure of, women officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Fundamentally, the purpose of the bill is to remove inconsistent and inequitable legislative restrictions on the career opportunities available to our women officers. There is no logical reason why women in the Armed Forces may not have the same promotion and career tenure opportunities as those available to male officers.

The law that originally established women's components in the Armed Forces provided limitations on the grade to which female officers could rise, and the number that could serve in the more senior grades. This law also provided mandatory retirement provisions which were generally more restrictive than those applicable to male officers.

With but a few exceptions, these limitations and restrictions are still in effect. H.R. 5894 would remove these arbitrary limitations, and bring the women officers under the general retirement and promotion statutes that apply to male officers.

The bill will affect approximately 12,362 women officers. This includes 10,061 nurses and medical specialists, and 2,301 women in the WAC's, WAVES, WAF's, and women marines. The experience that we have had with this fine body of women in the service has proven, over the past 20 years, that they have a right to expect equitable promotion consideration.

Let me cite some of the important inequities that will be overcome by the enactment of this legislation. In the women's line components of each service only one position is permitted by law to the rank of colonel, or Navy captain, and then only for the period while the individual is serving as director of the women's corps concerned—that is the Women's Army Corps, the WAC's, women in the Navy, WAVES, women in the Air Force, WAF's, and women marines. A similar restriction applies to the grades of lieutenant colonel and commander.

The allowances permitted by law for nurse and medical specialist corps officers are somewhat larger, but these too are also highly restricted. In the Army Nurse Corps, for example, a total of five nurses can occupy the permanent rank of colonel and 107 can occupy the permanent rank of lieutenant colonel. These quotas were established on the basis of an Army force structure of 500,000. The same personnel limitations apply to the Air Force.

In the Navy Nurse Corps only one-fifth of 1 percent of the corps officer strength may be in the rank of captain. This contrasts with 5.3 percent authorized by law for this grade of male line officers. Due to such limitations, many women officers, regardless of their qualifications, length of service, and responsibilities may not reach a rank commensurate with their responsibilities, nor commensurate with the promotional opportunities available to male officers.

The Navy WAVE component has a particularly serious problem today due to statutory grade limitations. If these limitations are not removed, promotions to the rank of commander in the WAVES over the next 4 or 5 years will have to be suspended, and the average attrition among women line lieutenants will average 65 percent compared to a maximum desirable ratio of 20 percent.

There are many differences in the mandatory retirement and separations for women officers in the different services. Generally, however, they require the women to leave the service earlier than male officers.

While the purpose of this legislation is to give women officers equality of promotional opportunity consistent with the needs of the service, there is no indication that the Department of Defense will attempt to remove restrictions on the kind of military duties that women are

expected to perform. The Committee on Armed Services is aware that there cannot be complete equality between men and women in the matter of military careers. The demands of combat, sea duty and other types of assignments directly related to combat are not placed upon women in our society.

This legislation is not a promotion bill. It does not guarantee anyone a promotion. However, it does provide a woman officer filling an important billet the opportunity to advance to the rank appropriate to the billet she is holding. In short, it prevents discrimination because of sex. At the same time, the bill is not designed to speed up the promotion of women, and the committee has repeatedly made it clear that the bill will not be used for inflation of grades customarily held by women officers. The Defense Department has assured us that where the job, the size of the staff, and the responsibilities do not change, that it will not expect the grade of the officer to change as a result of the passage of this bill.

I should like to point out, that this bill does make it possible for a woman to rise to general or flag officer rank, but the Department of Defense assures us again that there are no special opportunities in view, and they do not predict that there ever may be such an opportunity for a woman. The question of whether a woman officer may achieve general or flag rank will depend entirely on her individual qualifications, and on the availability of a specific position for which she would be best qualified. The bill provides that in the event of such a promotion, the woman holding the rank of general or admiral would hold it only while serving in that specific position.

As a result of careful study, the armed services are expanding the women's line components by over 9,500 personnel in the near future. This will include approximately 800 more women officers. There is no question that there will be growing opportunities for women in a variety of staff and support positions, in such fields as logistics, intelligence, data processing, legal, financial management, personnel management, and, of course, the important nursing and medical fields. Thus it becomes increasingly important that we have fair and equitable career patterns for this essential part of our Armed Forces.

In view of the commendable service rendered by women in the Armed Forces, the many restrictions and limitations under which they have suffered for this period of time and the growing opportunities in staff and support positions for women in uniform, I urge the adoption of H.R. 5894.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 676), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would amend titles 10, 32, and 37 of the United States Code to remove the provisions that limit the career opportunities available to women officers so that on the basis of merit they may have the same promotion and career tenure opportunities as male officers in similar circumstances.

BACKGROUND

The several laws that have established the female components of the Armed Forces contain special provisions that (*a*) limit the grades which women officers can attain; (*b*) place numerical or percentage limitations on the number of women officers that can serve in the various pay grades; or (*c*) provide separate standards for the retirement and separation of women officers, including mandatory retirement for women at lower ages than those generally applicable to male officers. For example, in the women's components other than those for nurses and medical specialists, the highest permanent grade to which a woman can be promoted is lieutenant colonel or commander. Each service has one colonel (captain in the Navy) who holds that grade only while serving as the head of the women's component. When she completes that tour, she reverts to her permanent grade. The women nurses and medical specialists have somewhat larger allowances but the provisions applicable to them are also more restrictive than comparable provisions for male officers. In the Army Nurse Corps, for instance, a total of five nurses may occupy the permanent grade of colonel, and only 107 may have the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel.

The Wacs and Wafs are limited to 10 percent of their Regular officer strength in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel. The Waves and women marines are allowed 30 percent of their Regular officer strength in the combined commander-lieutenant commander or lieutenant colonel-major grades, with a limit of 10 percent in the grade of commander or lieutenant colonel.

On retirement and separation provisions, the laws applicable to women generally require that they leave the service earlier than a male officer but in some cases they permit women to remain on active duty for longer periods, than male officers. Under current circumstances, there is no logical basis for these differences.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

The bill makes many changes to titles 10, 32, and 37 of the United States Code to remove the arbitrary limitations and restrictions mentioned above. After enactment, the bill would allow Wacs, Waves, Wafs, and women marines to hold permanent grades up through the rank of colonel (captain in the Navy). It would authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to prescribe the grade distribution for the women components so that the promotion and career opportunities for women officers could be governed by generally the same standards that apply to male officers.

For the first time there would be authority to appoint women as flag or general officers.

The bill also would apply the same attrition and elimination provisions to women officers as those that apply to men. The only exception would be a special authority for the selective continuation of nurses.

STATISTICS

The table that follows shows the distribution of women officers on active duty in the Armed Forces.

Service	Line components	Medical components	Total
Army	851	3,881	4,732
Navy	500	2,300	2,800
Marine Corps	188		188
Air Force	762	3,880	4,642
Total	2,301	10,061	12,362

SELECTIVE CONTINUATION OF NURSES

Since the bill subjects women officers to the same retirement provisions that apply to male officers, it could result in the loss of nurses earlier than is true under present law. Because of the urgent need for nurses as a result of our deployment in Vietnam, it is undesirable to require an accelerated separation of military nurses now. Consequently, the bill contains selective retention authority for boards of officers to choose nurses who would otherwise be retired or separated for continuation on active duty for a period of 5 years. The continuation authority would end on July 1, 1962, but deferments of separations made before that date could extend to July 1, 1967.

ELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICE IN NATIONAL GUARD

Under existing law women may be appointed as reserves with a view to serving in the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard only if they are nurses or medical specialists. The bill repeals this limitation and permits the Federal recognition of female commissioned officers generally.

NOT A PROMOTION BILL

The bill is not a special promotion authority in itself. It does not guarantee any person a promotion.

The committee was assured that the bill is not designed to create special promotional opportunities for women officers and that there are no definite plans to establih general or flag rank positions for women. By removing dicriminatory and indiscriminate distinctions that now exist, the bill will permit normal operation of the personnel system to result in promotions on the basis of merit and performance. Whether a woman officer may achieve general or flag rank will depend on her personal qualifications and on the availability of a specific position requiring an officer of such rank for which she would be best qualified.

There have been some promotion and retirement inequities in the past that this bill should help to eliminate.

COST

It is impractical to estimate the cost of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time, and passed.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EXPLORATIONS OF FATHER JACQUES MARQUETTE

The bill (H.R. 1499) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 678), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish to the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission established by Public Law 89-187 up to 200,000 national medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America. The medals are to be furnished without cost to the United States. The design of the medal, including emblems, devices, and inscriptions, is to be determined by the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; the Secretary is authorized to determine the size or sizes and the composition of the medals in consultation with the Commission.

The medals are to be furnished in quantities of not less than 2,000. No medals may be made under the authorization of this legislation after December 31, 1973. The Commission is required to furnish security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint to indemnify the United States for full payment of the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAN DIEGO

The bill (H.R. 13212) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 679), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to the San Diego Two-Hundredth Anniversary, Inc., a not-for-profit organization created for the purpose of celebrating the 200th anniversary of the founding of the San Diego community, not more than 500,000 national medals in commemoration of the anniversary. The medals are to be produced and furnished at no cost to the United States. No medals may be manufactured under the authority of this legislation after December 31, 1969.

The design, sizes, and composition of the medals are to be determined by the organization sponsoring the celebration, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals may be ordered in quantities of not less than 2,000, and no work may be commenced on any order unless the Secretary has received security satisfactory to him for the payment of the cost of the production of each order, including labor, material, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, as determined by the Secretary.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The bill (H.R. 10160) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 680), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to manufacture up to 1 million national medals commemorating the 50th anniversary of the founding in 1919 of the American Legion. The medals are to be produced at no cost to the United States. No medals may be manufactured under the authority of this legislation after December 31, 1969. The design of the medals, including emblems, devices, and inscriptions, is to be determined by the American Legion subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. They may be of such size or sizes and of such composition as the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine, in consultation with the American Legion. They may be furnished in quantities of not less than 2,000 upon security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint to indemnify the United States for full payment of all costs, including the estimated cost of labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

THE AMERICAN LEGION SERVES THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM

The American Legion, the largest organization of veterans of our armed services, was founded in Paris, France, March 15–17, 1919. It has grown to a membership of 2,600,000 in 16,500 posts in this country and abroad.

Born in the crucible of war but dedicated to peace, the American Legion has been an integral part of the fabric of American life throughout most of the 20th century. From the beginning its objectives have included the strengthening of our way of life, maintenance of the national security, care for the children of America, and aid to those who have fallen in battle and to their widows and orphans.

The American Legion helped to conceive and pilot through Congress the broad structure of compensation, pension, and medical programs which now guard the safety, security, and health of the wounded and the disabled. The crowning achievement of this effort was the GI bill for veterans of World War II. This milestone in the history of veterans affairs was sponsored by the Legion and approved by the Congress so that the men and women of World War II would not return to a nation of unprepared to receive them as it was to receive the victors of World War I. Extension of this farsighted program to Korean veterans and later to veterans of Vietnam was supported by the Legion.

Through its rehabilitation program the Legion stands watch over the rights and fair treatment of all veterans and their dependents—with particular concern for the service-connected disabled and for the families of those who gave their lives.

Early in the life of the organization it recognized that the threat to the security of our country had not ended with World War I. Through the years it has worked diligently to alert the American people to the fact that communism poses a serious threat to the safety of the Nation.

The Legion recommended against the neglect which the armed services experienced in the years between the two World Wars. Consistently it urged that all branches of the military services be modernized. In the years since the end of World War II it has continued to urge a strong defense and to support the efforts of the armed services to maintain a state of readiness which would both deter aggressors and enable America to defend itself if attacked.

While concerned with matters affecting the welfare of the country in difficult times, the Legion has never forgotten that the future of the Nation depends upon its young citizens. Its child welfare program for nearly 50 years has demonstrated concern for America's children. With thousands of volunteer workers in the Legion and in its auxiliary—and with the broad principles developed in the field of child care—it is recognized as one of the leading nonprofessional private organizations in this area. Through the years the organization has spent hundreds of millions of dollars in direct assistance to children, and in addition has secured passage of enlightened legislation at both State and National levels for the benefit of all of the children of America. The Legion's Boys State and Boys Nation programs teach better citizenship to thousands of boys each year. The organization seeks to build character and desirable habits in young Americans through its sponsorship of over 4,000 Boy Scout units across the Nation and a quarter of a million American youth learn the rules of the game of life while playing American Legion baseball each year.

As plans go forward to celebrate its 50th anniversary the American Legion continues as a strong, vigilant, and responsible organization of patriotic Americans dedicated to maintenance of law and order and service to the community, State, and Nation, an organization which has contributed immeasurably to the advance of freedom.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

The bill (H.R. 10105) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 681), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish to the Agricultural and Industrial Board of the State of Mississippi not more than 100,000 national medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary on December 10, 1967, of the admission of Mississippi to the Union. The medals are to be furnished, in quantities of not less than 2,000, without cost to the United States. No medals may be manufactured under authority of this legislation after December 31, 1968.

The design of the medals, including emblems, devices, and inscriptions, is to be determined by the Agricultural and Industrial Board of the State of Mississippi, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals will be of such size or sizes and of such composition as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the board. Security must be furnished satisfactory to the Director of the Mint to indemnify the United States for full payment of the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 2275) for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Vallejo Samala was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE SQUAXIN ISLAND TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8580) to convey certain land to the Squaxin Island Tribe of Indians which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment on page 2, after line 12, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to declare that certain lands are held in trust for the Squaxin Island Indian Tribe."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 683), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 8580 is to hold in trust for the Squaxin Island Indian Tribe all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to 1.84 acres of land lying within the Squaxin Island Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington.

NEED

The Treaty of Medicine Creek of December 26, 1854 (10 Stat. 1132), set apart Squaxin Island and other areas for the "use and occupation" of several Indian tribes and bands, including the Squaxin Indian Tribe of Indians. In 1884, the entire upland area was allotted to 24 Indians as heads of families, pursuant to article 6 of the 1854 treaty. Thereafter, in 1913, the heirs of an original allottee conveyed the land to which H.R. 8580 refers by warranty deed to the United States for the purpose of establishing a day school.

The property has never been used for school purposes and because of the lack of utilities and public transportation, Indian families with children have moved off the reservation. Since the 1920's a few Indian families have lived permanently on the reservation and several have lived there part time. Only two to three cabins remain on the reservation and are used by Indian families for summer recreational purposes. There are no Indians permanently residing on the reservation at this time. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has no future use or need for this property.

Squaxin Island is within the Puget Sound area of the State of Washington, approximately 10 miles north of the city of Olympia. Access to the island is by private boat only and the subject property is located on the east side of the island and fronts waters known as Peals Passage.

The Squaxin Island Tribe of Indians owns no tribal lands as such, although it does own 8 miles of tidelands surrounding Squaxin Island. The tribe has a strong desire to own the 1.84 acres and considers ownership of this land essential to the preservation of its identity. Since 1960, there has been increased interest in the island as a potential for recreational homesite development. Several of the Indian allotments have been sold to outside interests.

The Squaxin Tribe, in addition, to regarding ownership of this property as essential to preserving its tribal identity, has developed plans to use the site as a community center for tribal meetings, tribal ceremonies and picnics, as well as establishing a museum for Indian artifacts and other recreational and cultural purposes. The surrounding tribal tidelands support excellent beds of clams and oysters. The tribe plans to establish an "Oyster Opening House" and provide seasonal employment to tribal members and a market for Indian oyster and clam growers.

The present appraised value of the land is $5,000. The only improvement on the property has a present estimated value of $1,125. There is no known oil, gas, or other mineral potential in the 1.84 acres declared to be held in trust by the United States for the Squaxin Tribe of Indians, as provided in this legislation.

COST

No expenditure of Federal funds is required under the provisions of H.R. 8580.

AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted two amendments, the first of which adds a new section 2 to the bill providing that the Indian Claims Commission shall determine in connection with any claim the Squaxin Island Tribe has pending the extent to which the value of any award made by H.R. 8580 shall or shall not be set off against any award made to the tribe.

The second amendment changes the title of the bill to properly describe the donation of the lands involved to the tribe in a trust status.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar for today.

Is there further morning business?

SENATOR RIBICOFF SPEAKS ON THE URBAN CRISIS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, few Members of Congress have been more concerned about, or become more familiar with, the problems of urban life in the United States than the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. After a distinguished career as a lawyer, member of the Connecticut General Assembly, Hartford city judge, U.S. Representative, and Governor of his State, Senator RIBICOFF served as the first Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Kennedy administration. In the Senate, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee, he has held extensive hearings for more than a year exploring many aspects of the plight now confronting most of our metropolitan centers.

Senator RIBICOFF's investigation has been instrumental in uncovering data and gathering testimony which will be extremely significant in any program designed to alleviate the multifold and complex problems of our cities. In particular, he has focused national attention on the urban slum and so-called ghetto areas where large numbers of unemployed, poverty-stricken, limited-opportunity people, often members of minority groups, are concentrated.

On October 22, Senator RIBICOFF delivered a major address at Butler University in Indianapolis, Ind., at a conference which had for its theme "The City and the Future." After reviewing some of the basic social, economic and, cultural factors which have contributed to the crisis situation in metropolitan affairs and which have sometimes resulted in violence, Senator RIBICOFF called for a realistic but positive approach. Pointing out that we do not fully understand the effect which ghetto living has on its inhabitants, especially the young, he reminded us that this is truly a national responsibility:

> We can no longer fall back on our ignorance of urban problems. To be sure, we are unfamiliar with a host of issues and situations that city building must deal with. But our age of innocence is over. The richest country in the world must become more than a schoolboy in the city gathering facts for a term paper.

Senator RIBICOFF suggested six elements which he believes to be essential in any program looking toward the ending of present day slums and building the city of tomorrow. In view of the timeliness and importance of his remarks and in order that other Members of Congress may read this thoughtful and provocative treatment of a primary national problem, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Contrary to popular myth, Americans have done pretty well in the city.

We have been there for several decades, and found a wide range of social, economic and political choice in cities of varying size, location and opportunity. And now that science and technology have given us the chance to build the kind of urban environment we claim we want, the journey to the 21st Century holds as much promise as any trip to the moon. And more of us will be on board.

But both the past and the future can be misleading.

Because the burning issue in America today is not how well the majority has done as an urban nation or what kind of life styles we will create by the year 2000. The issue is how—and whether—we unite a divided nation and bring into the American mainstream all those who feel separated from this country for reasons of technology, economic status, and race.

Sixteen million poor live in our metropolitan areas—10 million in our central cities. Another 26 million live in the shadowland of deprivation—with incomes above the minimum poverty level, but below what most authorities define as "adequate" means.

Among the Negro, this poverty is the most prevalent and the most severe. Three of every five persons living in poverty in our large cities are Negro. To a large degree, Negro Americans are an underdeveloped nation living in the heart of America.

This did not happen overnight. It took a century to develop—a century of neglect. Nor was it planned, although the results are as systematic and devastating as if it had been planned—every bit of it—down to the last detail.

If anyone doubts this, let him look at the statistics. For perhaps fact will succeed where rhetoric has failed.

The Negro migration to the city was the largest and fastest movement of a single group of people in all our history.

When the Negro began his hopeful exodus to the North and to the city in 1910, a total of 73 per cent of all Negroes in America lived on farms and in areas with a population of less than 2,500.

By 1960, these figures had been completely reversed, and 73 per cent of all Negroes were living in urban areas, as defined by the Census Bureau. Within a period of 50 years—

less than one lifetime—the Negro was transformed from a rural to an urban resident.

The concentration of Negroes in the central cities was just as dramatic. By 1960, half of all non-whites in America were living in central city ghettoes.

The stage had been set. The Negro had escaped from the rural segregation of the South to what he believed was the open society of the North. He had seen, as Ralph Ellison said in testimony before our Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, "the wonderful possibilities offered by the city to define one's individuality, to amplify one's talent, to find a place for oneself in this social situation."

But as soon as the Negro moved in, the whites moved out. They were abandoning the central cities for the suburbs. That alone was not disasterous. But they were taking the jobs and factories with them.

In the low-income neighborhood of an earlier generation, a man could walk to work. But between 1960 and 1965, three-fifths of all new industrial plants were going up outside the central cities. In some cities, the percentage of new plants being built away from the areas of highest unemployment was 85 per cent.

Finding a job—let alone getting to it—became a huge burden. Harry Dolan, a writer from Watts told the Subcommittee that his play, "The Sand Clock Day," came from such an experience.

Dolan said:

"It is the thinking of just one day spent looking for a job. . . . Of taking $2.80 just to go to the place, of taking two and a half hours to reach it, two and a half hours back. That is $10 or $12 a week. Sometimes it is even the house money that you are using to go look for a job."

There were jobs in the city all right. But they were largely skilled office and managerial tasks for which the low-income Negro often lacked the education and training.

Severe unemployment began to set in.

Unemployment rates in central cities jumped to twice and three times the national rate. In some places, the unemployment rate was the highest since the Depression of the 1930's.

Not even a steady job could guarantee a man a decent standard of living. A Labor Department survey found that one-third of the residents in 10 big city slums were unable to earn a living. They were either unemployed, were paid poor wages, or could find only part-time work. And those who were employed frequently worked at dead-end jobs that gave them little or no training for advancement.

The people kept trying—but usually without success. A Job Fair in Oakland, California, attracted 15,000 people and resulted in placement for only 250. In Philadelphia, a waiting list of 6,000 existed for one training program alone.

Meanwhile, a new generation was growing up. The post-war baby boom affected the city just as much as the suburb, with the result that in the typical urban slum, nearly half the population now was under 18. But they were suffering from even greater unemployment than their parents.

Whereas Negro adults had an unemployment rate twice that of white adults, unemployment among Negro teen-agers in certain areas was almost four times as great as that of white teen-agers.

Young Negroes applying for jobs often were told they were too young or too bright.

Johnie Scott, another resident of Watts, told our Subcommittee he took an intelligence test for a large company. The highest score was 200. A score of 100 was an "A". Johnie Scott scored 150. He told us: "They patted me on the back and said, 'You are a whiz kid. Come back when you are 18.'" He was 17 at the time. He had just graduated from high school.

Gradually, the people were being separated from the jobs—both physically and psychologically. And the greatest damage was in—and to—the mind, as the school dropout and achievement rates proved.

The average Negro was graduating from high school with *less* than a ninth grade education. Put another way, 360,000 young Negroes were entering the labor force each year with an education that did not even qualify them for a blue collar job.

High school or vocational graduates could not spell "brick" or "carpenter". They could not add inches or feet. A Building and Construction Trades Committee in New York City reported that Negroes were "the products of a social system that pushed them through the earlier grades of school without insuring that they had the basic tools necessary for a minimal academic education."

It was not that the youngsters lacked ability. The Banneker School District in St. Louis and the Demonstration School Project in New York proved that even in segregated schools, Negroes could do good work. But it often was expensive—$200 per pupil above the normal outlay in New York—at a time when big cities—having lost their tax revenues as well as their white residents—already were spending $135 less per pupil than the suburbs. And in the Banneker case, where no extra funds were spent, success demanded a commitment of people and time that few were prepared to make.

The situation worsened. Not only was a segregated education an inferior education, but segregation was on the rise.

In Washington, D.C., 90 per cent of the students were Negro. In New York City, Negroes and Puerto Ricans comprised the majority of the school population. In Baltimore, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and Cleveland, the situation was the same. Boston, a city with only a 15 per cent Negro population, had an elementary school population that was 30 per cent Negro.

The circle was complete. In his march from the farm to the city, the Negro had followed a path that led to bad housing, unemployment, poor education, and finally to a new and more frustrating form of segregation.

But if these facts existed for many years, why did they suddenly explode in 1964 and every summer since in cities both large and small? Clearly, there was no single answer. And just as clearly, the explosions were not as sudden as we might like to believe. An army of psychiatrists might never explain the riots and the conditions leading to them to our satisfaction. But one didn't have to be a psychiatrist to notice some dramatic changes among both whites and Negroes.

Even without a racial crisis, the post World War II years would have been difficult. For the last 22 years, change has been the largest single factor in our lives—change in our working habits, our living patterns, our institutions of business and government, and our role as a nation.

Much of this was due to new knowledge and technology. But the price of a mass society in which most people had a greater opportunity to participate in more events and situations frequently was fear, anxiety, loneliness and insecurity.

Men warned about technology and automation felt they were losing control over their own lives—even if they were not. Large organizations and bureaucracies now a fact of life, were feared automatically on the theory that these impersonal institutions would snuff out the human spirit.

The basic posture of the United States as a world power also was shifting and affecting our individual lives and collective identity.

In short, a whole social order was changing. We sought a familiar spot in which to anchor our feelings, but could not find one—often because we did not even know what our feelings were. America succeeded to a crisis mentality. Unable to comprehend either the change or its speed, many sought refuge in fear and hysteria, closing their minds to all thoughts save simple answers that would provide an easy way out of a troubled world.

And then, the man at the bottom began to push. World War II made the Negro a mobile person, and millions came to the city where television, their own eyes, and their own experiences taught them new lessons. No longer would they sit silently at the bottom while the rest of society changed. They wanted their share of the American dream.

Mrs. Rosa Parks decided she was tired of sitting at the back of the bus, and in 1955 the civil rights movement began in Montgomery, Alabama. The great unresolved crisis of America would now be played out. But it would take another decade before the Northern cities became fully aware of this fact.

For years, Americans had been able to live quite apart from the plight of the Negro. But now the Negro made his move at exactly that time when most Americans felt they had found some security in the modern world.

The movement, still fundamentally nonviolent, headed North, drawing strength and courage from sit-ins and jailings.

Soon the civil rights movement itself, which had centered around court-related matters such as voting and public accommodations, began to change. Although it reached its peak with the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, it now was clear that these actions were designed for the middle-class Negro and that they had little relevance to the concentrated poverty of the Northern ghetto. There the issues were more basic: unemployment, bad housing, poor schools, high crime rates, poor law enforcement.

Reaction was swift, and promises made in high places were believed by people far down the line. But when these promises were not met, when the only results seemed to be urban renewal and public housing programs that moved Negroes from one slum to another or a welfare system that perpetuated dependency, the Negro grew impatient.

Now the catalyst was added—the generation gap. The young Negroes of America were an urban generation. They were judging their lives not against the rural past of their parents but against the opportunities they saw in the city—and against the equality of those opportunities. It was true that life was improving in the sense that the Negro of the 1960's was better off than the Negro of 1945. But life was not improving fast enough. The Negro was falling further behind the white man—and that was the comparison that counted. The important doors were closed. And closed doors in an open society—whether due to outright discrimination or an inability to use opportunity—lead to a deep cynicism, anger, and rage.

The cynicism began very early in life.

Dr. Robert Coles, a child psychiatrist involved in the Operation Exodus school bussing experiment in Boston, said children between the ages of six and ten told him he was a fool for thinking better schools or better education would lead to anything.

And the cynicism grew. Dr. Coles told the Subcommittee:

"The problem that afflicts both these children and their teachers is that the teachers cannot give them jobs when they get to be about 15 or 16 . . . (The teachers) are being called hypocrites. (The students ask) where does it pay off? It hasn't paid off. The children—who are no longer children—are now asking: what kind of a naive, dumb idiot are you if you don't realize this?

And finally, a young man like Johnie Scott sums up the personal damage when he says:

"The ghetto is not the houses. It is the people. It is in the mind. The ghetto has a habit of reaching your life just when you think you've climbed to the top of the mountain and, in one fell swoop, bringing you crashing to the bottom to be buried beneath the rocks. (In the slums), evil is taken for granted. . . . One does not ever really escape from a ghetto. One only hopes that time will wear off the sharper, the cutting edges."

That was how the young Negro who did not riot felt. What about those who did?

So deep and so strong was the split between the generations that A. Philip Randolph, one of the senior statesmen of the American Negro community, told the Subcommittee:

"I have walked up and down the streets of Harlem for over 60 years, and I don't remember the time when I have met young men to whom I was unable to talk. (Now) the young teen-agers and Negroes who are in poverty don't trust the Negro leadership. They believe that they represent the will of the so-called white power structure. . . . I am alarmed about the change in the psychology of Negro youth, because here you have the foundation of the future generation. . . . They believe society is against them. They believe that the promise of a job is merely a hoax."

And Bayard Rustin told of listening to a group of young Negroes in Los Angeles talking about their manifesto. When he asked to see it, one youth held up a book of matches, lit one and said:

"That is our manifesto: Burn, baby, burn."

To call this a crisis of belief seems an enormous understatement. But that is what it is. For one reason or another, often for many at the same time, young Negroes have lost their faith in the promise of America. Unable to accomplish their goals in acceptable ways, some have resorted to violence. Often, the violence has accomplished what reasoned approaches and orderly protest could not—from sprinklers on fire hydrants to more job opportunities.

And this is tragic in itself. For it says more about us—those who do not live in the ghetto—then it does about those who do. It tells us that in spite of all the information, description and statistics we have heard and seen the past several years, we still do not understand what the ghetto does to people—to individual human beings. We do not understand the kind of life ghetto children are born into or what happens to a person who tries to lift himself out of the ghetto.

Our responsibility is clear. As a nation, we have been as unsystematic about ending the social and economic conditions of the ghetto as the ghetto has been systematic in its denial of opportunity.

We can no longer fall back on our ignorance of urban problems. To be sure, we are unfamiliar with a host of issues and situations that city building must deal with. But our age of innocence is over. The richest country in the world must become more than a schoolboy in the city gathering facts for a term paper.

The analogy may seem harsh. Yet in view of the unsolved problems that threaten to blow the lid off our cities and our response to them, it seems accurate. For our national effort seems pitifully out of scale with the enormity of the crisis.

Why is this so? I can think of many reasons, but they all come down to one: that we are unwilling to act upon the information we have.

We prefer to devise elaborate theories of urban behavior and develop techniques of systems analysis as if the articulation of these plans were equal to solving the problem.

The word has become tantamount to the deed. We seek out new technology in the hope that it will provide a cost-free solution. We offer visions of the future to people who are trapped in the present. We engage in national debates about what causes riots and what they represent in societal terms when we have mountains of evidence about severe unemployment in our central cities, the low quality of the public schools, the number of substandard housing units and the high crime rates.

It is time we changed—and began to put into practice what all of us are willing to do in theory: to develop and implement on a systematic basis a comprehensive and long-range strategy for building our cities and creating within them full security, full opportunity, full choice, and full freedom—so that, when poverty and injustice occur, as they inevitably shall, it will truly be a matter of accident and not strike the same families generation after generation.

And the place to start is just as clear as our responsibility. We start with jobs and make the commitment to full employment that we debated about in 1946 but never made. A growing society can provide employment for all if that society is willing. And many jobs can be tied to the improvements that we must make in our homes and neighborhoods.

I do not have the whole answer. Nor does anyone else. But I do believe that any program of ending the slums and building the city of tomorrow must include six basic elements:

First, Guaranteed job opportunities for all;

Second, Providing a decent home in a decent environment that includes personal security and public safety;

Third, Offering the maximum encouragement to private investment in rebuilding our cities and the lives of our people;

Fourth, Involving the individual in his own destiny and emphasizing neighborhood development;

Fifth, Reorganizing our Federal government so that the new ideas of today will not wither on the bureaucratic vines of yesterday; and

Sixth, Developing an educational system that will equip all children with the skills and resources necessary for an urban society.

I cannot promise—nor should anyone else—that we can guarantee an end to violence by mounting a full-scale assault on the problems of poverty and discrimination as they exist in our cities. Generations of injustice cannot be corrected overnight, nor can long suffering be forgotten quickly. But on the other hand, failure to take major and sweeping actions to relieve legitimate tensions and grievances that press so heavily on our central city residents will further widen the gulf that already threatens to divide our nation.

The question Lewis Mumford posed for urban society as a whole applies to America in particular. And that is whether mankind "shall devote himself to the development of his own deepest humanity, or whether he shall surrender himself to the now almost automatic forces he has set in motion."

The choice is that simple—and that crucial.

AMERICAN LEGION COMMANDER GALBRAITH REPORTS ON VIETNAM

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, one of the first undertakings of the newly elected national commander of the American Legion, Mr. William Galbraith, was a trip to Southeast Asia to visit our commanders and our troops in South Vietnam. As the leader of an association of former citizen-soldiers, it was fitting that he see at firsthand the situation of our present citizen-soldiers.

On October 18, Commander Galbraith, who, I am proud to note, is a fellow Nebraskan, delivered his report on Vietnam to the national executive committee of the American Legion, at Indianapolis. This report provides us with valuable and fresh insight into the situation in Vietnam. His description of the American fighting man is particularly welcome after the recent week of demonstrations and draft card burnings.

No American favors war. This point is sometimes obscured by the demonstrations and debate. Commander Galbraith put it well when he explained:

> What I have told you of the performance of the American fighting man in Vietnam should not in any way be construed as a glorification or a defense of warfare, for The American Legion, comprised of men and women who have know war, deplores this method of settling differences between men and nations probably more than any other organization in the world.

"Freedom Is Not Free" has been adopted as the American Legion theme for this year. The truth of this statement is being proven by the blood and sweat of America's fighting men. In concert with the South Vietnamese and our other allies, they are paying the price of freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Commander Galbraith's report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON VIETNAM

(By William E. Galbraith, national commander, the American Legion, before the National Executive Committee, at Indianapolis, Ind., October 18, 1967)

Distinguished guests and members of the National Executive Committee, I felt a deep obligation to report to you personally tonight on the observations of my recent trip to Vietnam for I would not have been there if not as your representatives.

Recognizing my first responsibility to my country and to you, as leaders of The American Legion, I am happy that the timing of events has permitted me to make my initial report to this distinguished gathering.

As most of you know, I have been a farmer and businessman most of my life, and I feel it would be in order for me to relate some of these experiences, not only as National Commander of The American Legion, but in terms of those things which I know best.

This is a complicated war, a new and different type of military operation from anything we have previously experienced in all of our history. This fact alone, I suspect, could well account for a great deal of the unrest among our own people today for we are not seeing the decisive battle results that have marked other periods of conflict. Lack of understanding may provide a reason, but a very poor excuse, for the dissension at home which is doing a genuine disservice to our fighting men.

Further complicating this situation is the fact that it is not a military operation alone, but involves the Revolutionary Development program formerly known as the civic action program which is aimed at establishing stability of both the government and economy of an emerging nation, a nation which has lived under the domination of three governments in the past 20 years—China, France, and the attempted establishment of a free and independent South Vietnam, which could and would have succeeded on its own had it not been for a communist aggression from the north.

After living for so long under foreign domination, and living with terrorism, violence and subversion in the few short years in which the South Vietnamese have endeavored to establish self-government, the lack of stability in this new nation today is readily understandable.

It is important too, to understand why the Chinese Communists are so intent on carrying on this war and to keep the North Vietnamese away from the conference table.

Here is where my background as a farmer stood me in good stead. It is obvious that Red China and communist North Vietnam want to control the rich farmlands of the Mekong Delta in the south. This area, if modern agricultural methods and techniques could be applied, is capable of providing food for 60 per cent of the population of Asia. The Chinese communists and communist regime of North Vietnam know this, and they look to this rich agricultural prize as a source of food for the teeming masses of Asia.

The stakes are tremendously high in this battle for food, for the reports emanating from Red China indicate a high degree of instability for the communist government on mainland China, and an adequate food supply is vital to a re-establishment of stability for that government.

Our own involvement in South Vietnam is based on solemn commitments and has objectives which are readily understandable to all who want to understand them. First, we are there to insure the security and territorial integrity of a nation which has not been permitted to stand on its own. That is our military commitment purely and simply. We do not seek territorial gains. We do not seek military or political domination or control.

The other part of our commitment, and no less important, is to help bring stability to both the government and to the economy of South Vietnam. To do this, we are helping with the building of roads so vital to transportation and communication. We are providing the tools and the know how to help develop the tremendous agricultural potential of the country, and effective system of public works is badly needed, for here are a people surrounded by water and virtually none of it is drinkable, railroads need to be built, and the educational facilities are in need of expansion and upgrading.

I can speak with some degree of authority on that latter point also, for I did spend 10 years of my life as a school teacher.

Now it is most difficult to accomplish these things under perfectly normal conditions, so you can well imagine how the problems of the South Vietnamese are magnified in attempting to do these things while a shooting war is in progress all about them. Progress, understandably, is slow, but I assure you that progress is being made both militarily, and from the civic action standpoint.

Now what did we actually see in Vietnam? We saw the modern world's foremost example of the theme I have selected for my term of office as National Commander of The American Legion; "Freedom Is Not Free."

We saw young Americans and young Vietnamese fighting shoulder to shoulder, under intolerable combat conditions, in a concerted effort to insure the blessings of freedom for a new nation whose people want to be free.

Saigon was merely a point of departure for us, although there we received the benefit of significant, in depth, briefings on the overall military situation from Gneral Westmoreland, the commander of the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam. From there, we went to the scenes of action, and I must phrase it that way because in this war there is no front. Here is the evidence of the new type of war, guerrilla warfare, which knows no front, which recognizes no rules or conventions, and which may erupt violently at any point and with no warning.

Probably the closest thing to a so-called "front" that exists in Vietnam today is that area just below the misnamed demilitarized zone which divides the two Vietnams. This is a misnomer, for from within it and from just to the north of it, the communists have levelled devastating artillery barrages into some of our Marine units, inflicting severe casualties over the past several weeks.

We can testify that it is a combat area for one of the helicopters in which our party was flying was hit by enemy ground fire. The defenses which our fighting men are holding just to the south of the DMZ can accurately be described as the most forward, the most exposed, and the most desolate real estate in all of South Vietnam.

What has this shelling of our positions accomplished? For the communists, nothing! For Americans, it has built a determination to hold those positions which are, in effect, the observation posts overlooking the traditional infiltration routes across the DMZ from North to South Vietnam. These men are holding as tenaciously as any American fighting men have ever held any position in the history of American arms.

Their performance, their dogged determination, their will to win, would stir the soul and quicken the pulse of any American patriot who ever wore the uniform of his country in time of combat, and of any other citizen of this great land with a knowledge of and a respect for the incomparable heritage of freedom that is ours.

We were privileged to go aboard the U.S.S. Constellation, an American aircraft carrier stationed in the Gulf of Tonkin, and from which young American pilots fly round-the-clock sorties against enemy military targets. The courage and the fighting spirit of America's modern day defenders of freedom is in keeping with the finest traditions of American fighting men from the days of the war for independence, through the great wars of the twentieth century, and every other conflict in which this nation has engaged in nearly two centuries of history.

I should tell you also, that we visited American military and diplomatic officials all along the western Pacific defense perimeter from Japan to Taiwan to Hong Kong and Manila, and it was here that we found what we considered to be proof positive that there is a great deal more at stake with the American presence in South Vietnam than the security and independence of South Vietnam itself.

The people of these areas look to a strong, firm and determined American presence in Southeast Asia as the means to their own salvation against further communist encroachment spawned by the communist government on mainland Red China.

What I have told you of the performance of the American fighting man in Vietnam should not in any way be construed as a glorification or a defense of warfare, for The American Legion, comprised of men and women who have known war, deplores this method of settling differences between men and nations probably more than any other organization in the world.

We do, however, believe that the cause to which we are now committed in South Vietnam is correct, proper and just, that it is in our own vital national interest, and that we must get on with the business winning this conflict whether it be on the battlefield or around the conference table. Like all other concerned people, we would prefer that the task might be accomplished through good faith negotiating, but since we seem to have nobody with whom to negotiate we must pursue the only other course available to us.

We of the Legion are deeply concerned about the great debate being carried on here at home regarding the conduct of the war and the validity and the wisdom of the commitment of United States forces to that war. We are concerned that those who oppose this commitment have failed to propose a reasonable alternative to the course we are now pursuing. We believe that if The American Legion is to fulfill a useful purpose on the American scene, if we are to serve the cause of those men who bear our flag into battle in Vietnam, we must participate in this debate with all of the strength and ability at our command.

We came away from Vietnam with some very definite conclusions, paramount among which is the belief that we are winning this war. It is not a dramatic victory of the type which we have experienced in other conflicts. It is a slow and steady process of attrition in which American and allied forces have the upper hand. We have the ability and the capability to do the job.

Second, we have a firm conviction, despite the harangues of the new left and of certain congressional critics, that this is not a civil war among the people of Vietnam but is very definitely a war of aggression being waged by communist North Vietnam—with massive support from the Soviet bloc and Red China—against the people of South Vietnam. The end of that war will come when that aggression ends.

Third, there must be no cessation of the bombing of the north, nor can there be any truce in the fighting unless we first receive the assurances from the other side that there will be meaningful negotiations, in good faith, designed to bring these hostilities to a prompt and reasonable conclusion.

While I have enumerated this as a third conclusion, it is really the most important of all. Everyone we talked with on this trip, from general and admirals to pilots and plain G.I.s, expressed the opinion that our bombing of strategic targets in North Vietnam must not be discontinued short of the conference table and a genuine cease fire on both sides.

We realize that this does not coincide with the theories of some of our congressional critics, arm-chair generals, pacifists and others here at home.

Personally, and for The American Legion, I accept the verdict of the officers and men who have to bear the brunt of reality of unimpeded enemy effort in the field as opposed to all the fancy theory of those who are far removed from the scene of action and can speculate in comparative ease, comfort and security.

We have been told by our military commanders in the field, and we have no reason to disbelieve them, that the bombing of North Vietnam keeps a half million communists fully occupied on the home front maintaining anti-aircraft defenses, rebuilding and repairing the damage from bombing raids, trying to keep factories operating, and rebuilding bridges and repairing roads and trails over which men and supplies are moved from North Vietnam to confront our own troops in combat.

As opposed to the arm-chair general's theories, the generals who are charged with the conduct of this war are convinced that our bombing is serving a very useful purpose. They believe it has hampered the enemy's ability to wage war. They believe it is damaging his morals. They believe it is effective. They believe it is necessary. I believe them and, incidentally, I don't believe I have been brainwashed.

The American Legion has gone on record, through action of our National Convention, in favor of removing political restrictions governing the actions of our military commanders, and having seen our commanders in action I am more firmly convinced than ever that this is a proper position.

If Americans at home were as firmly convinced of the propriety of our position in Vietnam as are the Americans who are doing the job in the field, I believe we would be farther along the road to victory than we are today. I assure you that it will be an important part of my work this year as National Commander of The American Legion to help convince the unbelievers.

We could speak at length of the voices of dissent here at home, and The American

Legion has said repeatedly that we do not contest the right of dissent and that we recognize the people peaceably to assemble to air their grievances and to seek redress of those grievances, real or imagined.

We seriously question the peaceable nature of any protest or expression of dissent, such as one which is said to be planned for our nation's capital this coming weekend, and which has as its announced objective the disruption of our country's defense establishment.

The best thing that could happen to this whole project would be for it to fail completely. We have heard that extraordinary precautions are being taken by both civilian and military authority in and around Washington, D.C., to prevent any acts of lawlessness by these misguided people. We trust they will be well prepared to thwart any lawless effort to cripple the Pentagon, even momentarily.

People who promote demonstrations of this type are those who fail to recognize that Freedom Is Not Free. The freedom they enjoy, they take for granted. They recoil at the thought of paying the price that freedom demands. They would impede the efforts of those who are paying that price.

We have passed the stage of permissiveness. Now we must put the foolishness behind us and give our total support to our men in Vietnam who everyday write history and record new proof that Freedom Is Not Free.

THE JOB CORPS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Director of the Job Corps, Mr. W. P. Kelly, which I feel is very significant.

He calls my attention to an editorial in the Livermore, Calif., Herald & News in which he takes justifiable pride, as it commends the Job Corps.

But what is equally significant is his condemnation of the protesters who stormed the doors of the Pentagon this past weekend, for in his letter to me, he states:

> As you can see from the editorial, Job Corpsmen are not storming the doors of the Pentagon, nor are they burning their draft cards or turning them in. They are, on the other hand, learning to accept all responsibilities of good citizenship—from financial independence to serving their country in the Armed Forces.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter and the editorial be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1967.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Member, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: As a Member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I think you will be interested in the attached editorial, which appeared in the Livermore, California *Herald and News*, October 19, 1967.

As you can see from the editorial, Job Corpsmen are not storming the doors of the Pentagon, nor are they burning their draft cards or turning them in. They are, on the other hand, learning to accept all responsibilities of good citizenship—from financial independence to serving their country in the Armed Forces.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

W. P. KELLY,
Director, Job Corps.

CONTEMPORARY CONTRASTS

Two current developments in Alameda County provide an interesting study in contrasts and inspire comment on a variety of topics, such as "rights," "patriotism" and "moral right."

One development is the besieging of the Northern California Induction Center at Oakland as part of a nationwide "anti-draft" movement. These protesters are exercising their "right to assemble," and their "right of free speech."

The other development is that of about 40 Parks Job Corpsmen enlisting in the first Job Corps paratroop platoon. They are part of a goodly number of corpsmen enlisting at Parks in all branches of military service.

One of the contrasts began with a comment by a corpsmen when he was asked how he felt about the protests at the induction centers: "I don't think most of them even know what they're protesting about."

This was from a young Los Angeles white man. He sat with two other paratroop enlistees, a Negro from Philadelphia and a Georgia-born Negro from Cleveland. All were from the ghettos, all from areas where protests have occurred and violence has flared, all high school dropouts, all considered by many Americans as "hoodlums."

It's an odd commentary that patriotism, which some claim has all but passed from the American scene, should be sounded so strongly from the throats of the minority which has made "organized protests" and "civil disobedience" watchwords of the 1960s. This is quite a contrast. Certainly it proves that all members of the vociferous minorities are not at the induction centers protesting.

But the corpsman's comment and the youths' actions in enlisting to fight in a war so many detest also provides a starting point for a commentary on the more basic issues of "rights" and "right."

The commentary is simply this: Does the "right" to protest against the Vietnam war include the "right" to prevent another man from exercising his right to be patriotic and serve his nation? Isn't the right to protest merely the legal privilege to give voice to one's conscience? And isn't that right distributed equally among all men—especially in a democracy?

The contrast between "under-privileged hoodlum" boys exercising simple, old-fashioned and strangely welcome patriotism and the literate, articulate citizens joining a mass protest is one we can perhaps take heart from. But then, simple things often bring the most hope.

THE WAVE OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I was much impressed by an address by Lewis F. Powell, Jr., former president of the American Bar Association, which was reprinted in full in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report magazine.

Mr. Powell takes as his theme the wave of civil disobedience which has swept the country in recent years, and which I regard as one of the most critical problems facing America today. Also, I think it is significant that increasing numbers of Americans are coming to realize that in a free and orderly society we cannot have people going about the country taking the law into their own hands, preaching racial hatred and disrespect for all established authority, and telling the people that they have a right to decide for themselves what laws ought to be obeyed and what laws ought to be disobeyed.

Mr. Powell is to be commended for his outstanding discussion of this problem, and I was particularly impressed by the fact that his well-documented address calls names and places blame where I believe blame belongs. I commend this article to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE: PRELUDE TO REVOLUTION?

(NOTE.—Are the militant advocates of "black power" and the New Left blazing a trail that will lead to the destruction of this country? A distinguished attorney examines the implications of their calls for defiance of the law—and warns of the results.)

(By Lewis F. Powell, Jr., former president, American Bar Association)

This will be a lawyer's talk about law and order and civil disobedience. The subject is related to complex social and economic problems—some of the most perplexing of any age. But there is no hope of solving these problems unless an ordered society is preserved.

There is deep concern today about the disquieting trend—so evident in our country—toward organized lawlessness and even rebellion. One of the contributing causes is the doctrine of civil disobedience. This heresy was dramatically associated with the civil-rights movement by the famous letter of [the Rev. Dr.] Martin Luther King from a Birmingham jail.

As rationalized by Dr. King, some laws are "just" and others "unjust"; each person may determine for himself which laws are "unjust"; and each is free—indeed even morally bound—to violate the "unjust" laws.

Coming at a time when discriminatory State and local laws still existed in the South, civil disobedience was quickly enthroned as a worthy doctrine. It met the need of intellectuals and theologians for a moral and philosophical justification of conduct which, by all previous standards, was often lawless and indefensible.

HOW PROTEST MOVEMENT HAS CHANGED

Initially, disobedience tactics were directed specifically against discriminatory laws. The sit-ins and demonstrations were aimed primarily at segregated facilities and denial of voting rights—largely in the South. But as the use of disobedience tactics expanded, the relationship between the act of protest and the law protested became increasingly attenuated.

Indeed, as the protest movement expanded to Northern and Western cities, its objectives broadened from specific discriminatory laws and practices of the South to the age-old social and economic problems of bias, poverty and unemployment. Predictably, disobedience tactics were soon employed in other causes—on the campus and across our country. Few voices spoke out against civil disobedience. Because of its association with the cause of civil rights, criticism of disobedience and its tactics was largely muted. Many persons of good will—including many clergymen and campus intellectuals—were so enchanted by the "causes" that they gave little thought to the means employed or to where the disobedience road would lead.

But all who advocated civil disobedience were not so naive. Political activists and extremists of all kinds were quick to recognize the potential of this doctrine as an extra-legal means of attaining goals—and even of promoting revolution. Moreover, a doctrine which tolerates and justifies disobedience of law—implemented by sit-ins and street mobs—is made to order for cynical leaders promoting rebellion and other extremist causes.

One of the few national leaders who had both the insight and the courage to speak out against civil-disobedience tactics was Mr. Justice Hugo Black [of the Supreme Court]. Writing early in 1966, he said:

"Governments like ours were formed to substitute the rule of law for the rule of force. Illustrations may be given where crowds have gathered together peaceably by reason of extraordinarily good discipline reinforced by vigilant officers. 'Demonstrations' have taken place without any manifestations of force at the time. But I say once more that the crowd moved by noble ideals today can become the mob ruled by hate and passion and greed and violence tomorrow. If we ever doubted that, we know it now. The peaceful songs of love can become as stirring and provocative as the 'Marseillaise' did in the days when a noble revolution gave way to rule by successive mobs until chaos set in. . . . It . . . [is] more necessary than ever that we stop and look more closely at where we are going."

It is notable that Mr. Justice Black wrote these prophetic words in February, 1966, before the emergence of "black power" as an overt doctrine, and prior to the riots of 1966 and 1967.

But few heeded his warning. Despite clearly visible danger signals, political, religious and intellectual leaders continued to tolerate and justify civil disobedience—even after such major eruptions as Watts [in Los Angeles], Cleveland and Chicago.

There seemed to be a curious unawareness that once lawlessness is tolerated and justified it feeds upon itself and leads either to revolution or violent repressive measures. It has been said wisely:

"Once you give a nervous, hostile and ill-informed people a theoretical justification for using violence in certain cases, it is like a tiny hole in the dike; the rationales rush through in a torrent, and violence becomes the normal, acceptable solution for a problem. . . . A cardinal fact about violence is that once initiated it tends to get out of hand. Its limits are not predictable."

So much for a review—obviously incomplete—of the origin and escalation of contemporary civil disobedience. This brings us to the year 1967—a year of crisis in which the symptoms of incipient revolution are all too evident.

Two movements have been emerging: (1) a militant Negro nationalist movement, summed up in the slogan "black power," and (2) a radical political movement called the New Left or New Politics, which hopes to change our form of government. The two movements have been converging, and now pursue the common causes of "black power" and frustration of America's attempt to contain Communism in Vietnam. Both of these movements rely heavily upon civil-disobedience tactics.

The public is widely aware of the Negro revolt. There is far less awareness of the New Left, its organizations and its radical goals. There are a number of New Left groups with varying degrees of militancy. Although not yet coalesced into a single organization, they are moving toward a united front—certainly on race and Vietnam issues.

THE WARNINGS OF MILITANT LEADERS

Most Americans—of both races—have been shocked and dismayed by a summer of unprecedented discord. The great majority of Negro citizens have been as dismayed as the whites. Yet, the average citizen, preoccupied with his own problems and pleasures, assumes that domestic tranquility is an inalienable right. There is a childlike disbelief that this land of the free—internally secure for 100 years—may be confronted with strife and violence on a massive scale. Complacent Americans would be well advised to heed the warnings of the militant leaders. Here are some random examples of what they are saying and planning—quite openly:

Stokely Carmichael—Mr. Carmichael has allied himself and "black power" with revolutionary Communism. Speaking at Havana, he said:

"There are no longer any isolated struggles. They are all correlated. . . . The only solution is armed struggle."

H. Rap Brown—Still at large, and even invited to speak in churches, Mr. Brown openly advocates violence and revolution. In language more racist than that of a Klansman, he urges:

"Get you some guns—(and) burn this town down.

"We'll make the Viet Cong look like Sunday-school teachers. Violence is necessary."

Dr. Martin Luther King—The prophet of civil disobedience, Dr. King, seems bewildered at times by the escalation of his own doctrine. On occasion he has joined moderate Negro leaders in criticizing riots. But he is arm-in-arm with Mr. Carmichael and Mr. McKissick (Floyd McKissick, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality) in slandering his own Government and in inciting violation of draft laws. He has said: "America is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today."

And he has compared the use of new American weapons in Vietnam to the Nazi testing of "new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe."

Dr. King's favorite role is organizing disruptive demonstrations. He is now urging "massive civil disobedience" for the purpose of "dislocating" Northern cities. He is planning such "nonviolent" tactics as weekly school boycotts, blocking plant gates with unemployed Negroes, and disrupting governmental operations with sit-in demonstrations in federal buildings.

CORE leaders—Although CORE has received support from the Ford Foundation and other responsible parties, its leaders are now committed to "black power" extremism.

Mr. McKissick, replying to a question by a white reporter as to what the Negro wanted, put in quite simply in the classic terms of revolution:

"The answer is—everything you got right now, and everything you hope to get."

A "New York Times" story reported that CORE's No. 2 leader, Wilfred Ussery, believes that: "Armed conflict between black and white can no longer be averted."

Father James Groppi—A newcomer to dubious prominence is Father Groppi, a Milwaukee Catholic priest. Working with the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] Youth Council, he has organized and led paralyzing demonstrations for open housing. The "liberal" mayor of Milwaukee, Henry W. Maier, charges that Father Groppi is "trying to incite riots," and that "rational discussions with him are impossible." Father Groppi has recently been quoted as saying: "Morally, I have no argument against the black man's right to use violence."

Dr. Benjamin Spock—Dr. Spock, a New Leftist dilettante, also has joined those who condone rebellion. Speaking at the recent Conference on New Politics, he said:

"The situation in America is desperate. The principal sign of it is the revolt of our black fellow citizens. . . . The Founding Fathers declared that people who are oppressed, and can find no other redress, must rebel."

Staughton Lynd—Mr. Lynd, a Yale faculty member on leave and an intellectual leader of the New Left, made an unauthorized trip to Hanoi. He insists that representative democracy is outmoded: that we must substitute a "participatory democracy"—which apparently would function through mass meetings and demonstrations. In a revealing article in "The New York Times Magazine" section, Mr. Lynd argues that the uprisings in the cities have been "rebellions" and not riots; and—citing the American Revolution and other irrelevant precedents—he justifies the Carmichaels and the Browns and their call for revolution.

The foregoing are only a few—if among the better known—of the leaders of militant civil disobedience. Their roles and views differ, and I do not suggest that each is equally responsible for the lawlessness which threatens to engulf our country. Yet these, and hundreds of lesser-known leaders, are men determined to remake America—not by the democratic processes of our institutions but by varying forms and degrees of coercion. The more radical of these leaders, like Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Brown, are openly advocating revolution.

Let us turn now from the leaders to examples of extremism in action.

The first is Vietnam Week of last April, when tens of thousands marched in New York and San Francisco. Draft cards were burned, placards of hate displayed, and vicious anti-American speeches made by Dr. King, Mr. Carmichael and Dr. Spock.

The initial planning for Vietnam Week took place at a Chicago conference, instigated and dominated by Communists and fellow travelers. The Communist-line objectives of Vietnam Week were to undermine United States opposition to Communism in Vietnam and to ferment racial discord.

Shortly following these marches, Dr. King announced the formation of "Vietnam Summer"—a coalition of opponents to American policy and includes well-known Communist allies and other luminaries of the "hate America" left. The avowed objective is "to organize opposition to the war in ghetto areas," and encourage our youth to "refuse to fight."

As Dean Joseph O'Meara of Notre Dame Law School has said, many of these who thus aid the Communist enemy "give themselves away":

"For never once do they condemn the terrorist tactics of the North Vietnamese; never once do they condemn Hanoi's rejection of all peace proposals; . . . never once do they lament the suffering and death borne by our forces in Vietnam. These persons weep only for the enemy."

FURTHER INROADS BY COMMUNISTS

Having attained some success and notoriety through Vietnam Week, the New Leftists then planned and held what was called the "National Conference on New Politics," attended by some 5,000 delegates. Its stated purpose was to create a united front among groups supporting the "black power" and "peace" movements. Dr. King and Dr. Spock were among the principal speakers. The Communist Party, as in the case of Vietnam Week, was active in the planning and manipulation.

The conference, dominated by "black power" militants, condemned "the savage and beastlike character that runs rampant through America, as exemplified by the George Lincoln Rockwells and the Lyndon B. Johnsons." It also adopted a straight Communist Party line resolution, which pledged "total and unquestioning support to all national peoples' liberation wars . . . particularly in Vietnam."

The flavor of the New Politics Conference was summed up by Walter Goodman, writing in "The New York Times Magazine," who said: "It stunk of totalitarianism."

Vietnam Week and the Conference on New Politics are chilling examples of growing extremism in this country. The dominant themes of both were hatred of fellow Americans and contempt for our institutions. Their goals are to be attained not by democratic processes but by various techniques of civil disobedience.

One of the major targets is American policy in Vietnam, now under virulent attack. Reasonable men may well differ as to the wisdom of this policy. But only those who are blinded by their prejudices, or who are indifferent to the consequences of lawlessness, will deliberately incite disobedience of valid laws.

A most recent example of this irresponsibility is the public demand by a group of some 320 clergymen, educators and writers that churches and synagogues be used as "sanctuaries" for youths who defy the draft law. If thousands of young men refused to fight for their country, as pointed out by Tom Wicker of "The New York Times," "the power (of the Government) to pursue the Vietnam war or any other policy would be crippled if not destroyed. The Government would then be faced, not with dissent, but with civil disobedience on a scale amounting to revolt."

Or, suppose the campaign against payment of income taxes gains widespread support. This is not an illogical possibility, as this relatively bland form of civil disobedience has appeal to a broad spectrum of disaffected citizens. But however appealing it may be, widespread refusal to pay taxes could bring orderly government to a halt.

So much for examples of nonviolent—though potentially disastrous—disobedience. But the greater concern has been the violent eruptions in our cities—where civil disobedience has reached its ultimate form.

I do not know whether any of the persons or groups named above was legally implicated in any of these riots. Let us assume no such implication. Yet few can doubt that the cumulative effect of the black-nationalist movement, and of the incitements to hatred and disobedience were major contributing factors. As J. Edgar Hoover [Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation] has said:

"Those who espouse the theory of civil disobedience and authorities who free guilty violators must share a portion of the blame and responsibility for the turmoil in our streets."

There have been riots or major disorders in some 75 cities in 1967. Detroit was the shocker, with 43 killed, hundreds injured and part of a great city destroyed. A less likely city for a race riot would be hard to find. Detroit had no housing ghetto; its Negro population was largely prosperous, and its race relations considered excellent.

The recent NBC documentary—in which Daniel P. Moynihan [director of the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Affairs] participated—contains a frightening analysis of the riot and the future prospects. Although apparently spontaneous in its inception, militant organized groups took over promptly, supplied the weapons, the Molotov cocktails, and directed the sniping and the arson. This was no revolt of oppressed people against local conditions. It was armed rebellion against American society.

Although the underlying causes are complex and deep-seated, America's acceptance of civil disobedience was both a cause and a justification. Mr. Moynihan, former Assistant Secretary of Labor, put it this way:

"We have legitimatized opposition to the police and disobedience to law. Now in the North it has become massive opposition to the rules of white society."

The Negro militant viewpoint, gaining increasing support, is that America is "irredeemably racist"; that Negroes should "forget America," and that the "only course for Negroes is to bring about a final, violent apocalyptic confrontation of black and white."

The NBC investigating team concluded that extremists already are planning future violence. Next time, it is said, they will attack and destroy the white sections of Detroit and other cities. As Frank McGee described it: "These black extremists are willing and eager to risk a bloody showdown with white society."

Sharing the same pessimism, [columnist] Roscoe Drummond recently said: "The black militants and their white associates are irreversibly committed to the destruction of American democratic society to achieve their racist goals."

GRAVEST POTENTIAL FOR DISASTER

One may hope that the views of these observers—competent as they are—exaggerate the danger. But none can doubt that America faces a crisis of lawlessness with the gravest potential for disaster.

No man knows all the answers, but to me—as a lawyer—some simple truths are self-evident:

An ordered society governed by the rule of law must be preserved. Without law and order, none of the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution can be safeguarded—for whites or blacks, "radicals," "liberals" or "conservatives." History has demonstrated that once a society condones defiance of law and due process, the liberties of all are lost in the excesses of anarchy which follow.

With these truths in mind, and if our cherished institutions are to be preserved, Americans of good will—of both races—must act together to assure the following:

1. Toleration of civil disobedience and justification of lawlessness must end—in government, in the pulpits, among the media, and on the ivory-towered campuses.

2. Those who incite riots and rebellion should be treated as the most dangerous of criminals and relentlessly prosecuted. The irresolution of our society is attested by the fact that we hasten to put petty criminals in prison and yet permit the Carmichaels and Browns to remain free. Indeed, some still dignify their criminality by inviting them to speak in our schools and churches.

3. Those who participate in riots and rebellion should also be prosecuted with vigor, particularly the arsonists and the snipers.

4. Criminal laws, at all levels of government, should be reviewed and strengthened to deal specifically with the foregoing crimes in light of present conditions. Penalties should be adequate to deter criminal conduct, and justice should be swift and certain.

5. Effective gun control laws should be adopted at State and federal levels; sniping at policemen and firemen should be made special offenses with severe penalties, and possession or use of Molotov cocktails should be serious crimes.

6. Those who incite and participate in nonviolent civil disobedience should also be subjected to criminal sanctions. Where needed, laws should be clarified and strengthened with appropriate penalties provided. This is a more difficult area, as First Amendment freedoms must be carefully safeguarded. But rights of free speech and peaceful assembly do not justify incitement to revolt or the willful violation of draft laws, income tax laws, or court decrees.

7. Laws, especially against those who engage in nonviolent civil disobedience, should be enforced uniformly and promptly. A few draft-law violators have been prosecuted, but most have been ignored—including the radical leaders who incite draft evasion. Public authorities have also failed to prosecute the growing number of dissidents who willfully refuse to pay all of their income taxes. How can officials sworn to uphold the law ignore its willful violation? In justice, how can a Cassius Clay [former heavyweight boxing champion] be sent to jail for draft evasion, while prominent self-styled intellectuals who refuse to pay their taxes are allowed to remain free?

8. In summary, America needs to awaken to its peril; it needs to understand that our society and system can be destroyed. Indeed, this can and will happen here unless Americans develop a new impatience with those who incite and perpetrate civil disobedience; unless laws against violence and disorder are strengthened, and enforced with vigor and impartiality; and unless we return once more to the orderly and democratic processes which alone can preserve our freedoms.

Now, a final caveat. I have spoken as a lawyer, deeply conscious that the rule of law in America is under unprecedented attack. There are, of course, other grave problems and other areas calling for determined and even generous action. The gap between the prosperous middle classes and the genuinely underprivileged—both white and black—must be narrowed. Many mistakes have been made in the past, and there is enough blame for all to share. But we have passed the point where recriminations and bitterness will solve problems.

We must come to grips realistically with the gravest domestic problem of this century. America has the resources, and our people have the compassion and the desire, to provide equal justice, adequate education and job opportunities for all. This we surely must do.

AVOID FOLLY OF REWARDING EXTREMISTS

At the same time, we must avoid the mindless folly of appeasing and even rewarding the extremists who incite or participate in civil disobedience. There must be a clearer understanding that those who preach, practice and condone lawlessness are the enemies of social reform and of freedom itself. In short, the one indispensable prerequisite to all progress is an ordered society governed by the rule of law.

WESTMORELAND FORCES HAVE VIETCONG ALL BUT OVER A BARREL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a column written by Mr. Joseph Alsop, from Saigon, which appeared in the October 23, 1967, edition of the Washington Post, and which was titled "Westmoreland Forces Have Vietcong All but Over a Barrel."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTMORELAND FORCES HAVE VIETCONG ALL BUT OVER A BARREL

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—After a month spent in a dozen different provinces and three of the four corps areas of South Vietnam, one leaves really bewildered by the defeatism that seems to prevail at home. There is no stalemate here. And by any rational test, Gen. William C. Westmoreland at last has the other side over a barrel.

The barrel consists of a basic contradiction. On the one hand, every observable sign—in the field, in the POW and defector interrogation, and in ton upon ton of captured documents—points to a central conclusion about the VC guerrilla base in the countryside and their control of the population.

The conclusion is that this VC base in its instruments of control cannot long survive without the active, fairly close-in support of the big units—the enemy's "main force" divisions, regiments and battalions, which are now chiefly North Vietnamese in three-quarters of the country.

On the other hand, every observable sign—again in both the field and the documents—points to an equally important conclusion about the "big unit war," as it is called here. This first phase of the war, which has endured since the American intervention, has in fact come to an end. The reason is that the North Vietnamese cannot pay the immense manpower bill for supporting the ambitious troop structure of big units they have deployed in South Vietnam.

That does not mean that there will be no more big units—for the Hanoi war-planners quite certainly dare not go as far as a complete return to classical, small unit guerrilla fighting. The effort to pin down American forces along the miscalled Demilitarized Zone may well be continued, to relieve pressure farther south.

In addition, the effort to keep in being some sort of big units—perhaps battalions instead of regiments and divisions—will certainly be continued in a good many areas, where this support is essential to the survival of the VC base in important and populous provinces. Yet the barrel will still be there, as can be seen by a glance at II Corps, for instance.

In II Corps, as recently as six months ago, there were supposed to be two full enemy divisions on the western border, in the Cambodian sanctuary. This was already a bit of an overestimate, yet the North Vietnamese troops of this "B-3 Front" were still fighting aggressively and continuously at that time. An entire U.S. Division, the Fourth Infantry, was engaged against them.

Only a few days ago, in contrast, Gen. Westmoreland returned from an inspection of the border with the conviction that the remaining regiments of the B-3 Front had been "degraded (as our army now so strangely says) to replacement depots." Obviously, this kind of diminution of the Cambodian sanctuary's threat will also diminish the U.S. troop requirement there.

Suppose, then, that only one U.S. brigade is needed to keep the border guard. That will free two more brigades for use in the populous and important coastal provinces of II Corps. And here the other side is already in dreadful shape.

On the coast, the Third and Fifth North Vietnamese have long since been torn to rags and tatters. But precisely because they are desperately needed to support the VC base in populous provinces (a need the documents show), these two unhappy divisions now have complete replacement priority. Even this replacement priority has failed to bring them back to effective life, however.

Increase the pressure here still further, as Gen. Westmoreland can so easily do if the big unit threat diminishes elsewhere, then the remnant of the big unit threat in the coastal province can also be eliminated. Whereupon the VC base and the VC population control will ravel away, for want of big unit support. And the coastal provinces will then be largely cleared.

This is, of course, far too schematic a description of what is necessarily a very complex process. As experience in vital Binhdinh Province shows, for instance, the raveling away of the VC base goes by stages. It is very fast at first, when the VC majority are killed or captured or defect. It slows down after that, when none but the ultra-hardcore minority of VC activists are left to be scooped up.

There are differences, too, from province to province, and from corps area to corps area. In III Corps, for instance, the famous Ninth VC Division may well be kept in being; while the two other divisions are broken down or wither away. Yet there is still that barrel, always at work.

If the big unit threat ends or even drops off at Point X, in other words, Gen. Westmoreland can intensify the pressure at Point Y—primarily in the most populous provinces, where the big units are harder to keep up to strength, too, than they are on the remote borders. If the pressure is increased enough at Point Y, the second stage of raveling away is reached. Point Z will then key in to feel more pressure. And so it must continue, with the same contradiction always bedeviling the enemy.

THE TWO WARS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] and I were among those who participated in the Methodist Dakota Convocation at Aberdeen, S. Dak., on October 7. Senator McGOVERN's address to the convocation was entitled "The Two Wars." I believe that many Senators would be interested in reading his remarks. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TWO WARS

(An address by Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, Methodist Dakota Convocation, Aberdeen, S. Dak., October 7, 1967)

President Briggs, Bishop Garrison, Bishop Heininger, and my fellow Methodists, the last time I talked to a churchmen's audience of this size in South Dakota was nearly ten years ago, when at the annual Methodist Conference I shared the stage as a freshman Congressman with then Governor Joe Foss.

In his opening remarks, Joe was relating the good things that come to us as Methodists—and he brought the house down when he said: "Most of what I know about politics I learned in the Methodist Church!".

I wouldn't put it quite that way, but I grew up in a Wesleyan Methodist parsonage, and my brother-in-law is an E. U. B. minister now on the staff at Westmar College. That has given me at least *some* of the armor one needs for political combat!

In any event, the more I grapple with the great issues of public life—both domestic and international—the more I come to realize that their solution depends upon the moral insights of the church.

Our nation and our world literally cry for the gospel of love and the healing power of brotherhood. If that cry is not heard, I tremble for the future of our beloved country and for the peace of mankind. As W. H. Auden puts it: "We must love one another, or die." It is in that spirit that today I want to talk about two wars—the war against hunger, and the war in Vietnam.

In recent months, we have moved from crisis to crisis both at home and abroad.

This past summer, to paraphrase Steinbeck, has been "the summer of our discontent".

It began with the eruption of the Middle East—that crucial area we call the Holy Land which gave us the Prince of Peace, but which has not found the ways that make for peace these 2,000 years.

Then came the tragic explosions in our great cities—Newark, Detroit, Cleveland, Milwaukee—with violence and destruction involving billions of dollars, lost lives, and blasted neighborhoods.

And then there is Vietnam—poor, suffering Vietnam—an obscure little jungle strip in Southeast Asia that has been drenched in blood continuously for a quarter of a century—a cockpit of hatred and violence that has killed 15,000 young Americans and maimed or wounded another 85,000—a confusing, interminable struggle which is swallowing $30 billion a year in American treasure while exhausting the energies of our leaders from the President on down.

Yet, victory eludes us and old friends desert us.

We started out as advisors and then as assistants—but somehow we now seem to carry the burden alone towards a steadily widening war that grows more costly and more uncertain with each day.

Yet, during this time of national testing—a time when we wonder if we may have temporarily lost our way as a nation—the world cries out to us for leadership and help.

While we grapple with the violence of our cities, the war in Vietnam, a skyrocketing military budget, and falling agricultural prices—most of the rest of mankind groans under the pain of those ancient enemies—hunger, misery and tyranny.

My first face-to-face encounter with the world's pain came in February 1961 when on a Food for Peace mission to Northeast Brazil, I stood on the mud floor of a little hut where a family was having their noonday meal. Lying with their heads on their mother's lap were two frail children, their eyes open but without childish light. A seven-year-old brother had died the day before of smallpox aggravated by the debilitating malnutrition endemic to the area. "She is the symbol of the underdeveloped country," said the Brazilian economist who was with me as he saw me staring at the shapeless, prematurely aged mother. In the next 18 months I was to see that scene repeated countless times around the globe.

For us, the supplication "Give us this day our daily bread" is a hymn of thanksgiving for our bounty—but for the Brazilian mother, or the Indian peasant, or the African villager—it is a cry born of man's deepest physical need—the cry for sustenance.

America has done much in the last two decades to heed that cry:

We helped to launch the United Nations as an international forum of peace and international assistance;

We financed through the Marshall Plan the reconstruction of Western Europe and Japan;

We have launched the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and Food for Peace.

But today, our entire annual overseas assistance does not equal what we spend in Vietnam in one month. The war cost is equivalent to $5,000 a year for every family in Vietnam.

If a band of ragged Vietcong peasants is spotted hiding in the jungle, we are prepared to launch a $20 million B-52 bombing raid to demolish them.

But what about the silent enemy that lurks in the jungle—old man hunger—that grim reaper who steals away the children at night in 10,000 villages around the globe—hunger, which says the energy of the student, the worker, the housewife—hunger, the chief killer and warper of mankind—hunger, the chief barrier to a peaceful, orderly developing world.

It is in the swamplands of hunger that Communism breeds.

It is injustice, and misery, and bad government that set the stage for Vietnam and are even now creating the breeding grounds for future Vietnams and future Cubas and future Mideast crises. There is no peace or freedom in the world of the hungry.

Would it not make more sense to concentrate on fire prevention rather than waiting until the fires of violence begin to rage—whether in the ghettos of Harlem or the jungles of Southeast Asia?

Can we afford to continue on our present course of pouring more and more of the blood and treasure of America into Vietnam to the neglect of our own nation and at the risk of a growing catastrophe abroad?

This is not a question of "hawks" or "doves". I despise those labels which cover up the central question we ought to be asking: namely, Is the steady enlargement of this war in our national interest and does it contribute to the peace and well-being of mankind?

I have opposed our military involvement in this war from the beginning because I felt it was basically a civil war—a family quarrel between two groups of Vietnamese which only they could resolve—even as we once fought and resolved a civil war between the North and the South in our country.

In the South, we have our ally, General Ky, who has said that his only hero is Adolf

Hitler. In the North, we have Ho Chi Minh, whose hero is Karl Marx.

Frankly, I am not very enthusiastic about either one of them. Neither one has any claim on the protection of the American flag—a symbol of human dignity and freedom.

Our basic mistake in Vietnam is one that I have been warning against for four years: we are trying to solve a political problem with military power from the outside and it just can't be done.

The political problem is that the people of South Vietnam do not have enough respect for their government to fight for it. While we have been sending 500,000 brave Americans to Vietnam, 200,000 South Vietnamese troops have deserted and gone home.

Secretary McNamara reported after his last visit to South Vietnam that while our marines and pilots and soldiers are dying at the rate of a thousand a month, the streets of Saigon are filled with draft-age youth who are not being called or who have deserted. He could have added that Saigon is also swarming with profiteers ranging from bar girls to large-scale black marketeers who are exploiting our troops and our taxpayers for their own selfish gain.

The South Vietnamese army and their government are riddled by corrupt, self-seeking generals and officials who are diverting American tax dollars and supplies to their own coffers. The land reform and social justice which we have begged the South Vietnamese officials to undertake has been put off by their ruling families—families who have always turned their backs on the peasant.

The South Vietnamese people are tired of this war and are giving it little support. It is fast becoming an American burden that we carry alone.

The clearest signal to come out of the September 3 Vietnamese election was the desire of the people of South Vietnam to settle the war on whatever terms are possible.

If the South Vietnamese really believed in their own government, they would have won this war long ago, considering the enormous support they have had from us.

I was startled to learn the other day that we are pouring more aid into South Vietnam each month than the total North Vietnam has received from all of its allies in the last ten years.

Apparently, the Vietnamese people believe that their government and their leaders are not worthy of their support.

The distinguished war correspondent, Peter Arnett, has written:

"The dispirited Vietnamese army, shot through with inefficiency, often lacks the will for combat and is increasingly prone to let the Americans do the fighting.

"Fighting statistics and a detailed survey of field operations bear out this observation. In much of the country the Vietnamese military effort has steadily tailed off as that of the Americans increased."

Why should we ask American troops and pilots to die for a government in South Vietnam that doesn't have the respect and support of its own people?

Why should we ask the American taxpayer to pay $30 billion a year to finance a war in Vietnam that the people there don't really believe in?

We can't export freedom and political strength to Asia in a B-52. We can't make the people of the South love their government by bombing the North.

I have long opposed our policy in Vietnam because I thought it was neither in our national interest nor theirs. I will continue to vote for appropriations that are necessary to defend our men. But I will work even harder to change the policy that is committing so many young Americans to the Southeast Asian jungle.

The Aberdeen editor wrote yesterday that we must back our boys with patriotic courage. Well, it doesn't take either patriotism or courage to stand on the curbstone, or in our living rooms, or even on the Senate floor and cheer our boys on to their deaths. It is our soldiers—our sons—who will die, and not the cheerleaders.

The best way to back our boys in Vietnam is to change the political policy that sent them there.

Instead of sending in another 45,000 American troops as the President is now preparing to do, we should bring 45,000 home.

Why don't we say to the South Vietnamese government that the time has come either for them to begin carrying a larger share of their own defense, or else to end this war on whatever terms they can reach with the other side.

This may not be an entirely happy settlement, but the alternative is a bigger and bloodier war—rising casualty lists, skyrocketing expenditures, and perhaps World War III.

And in the end, after thousands more are dead, even if we win, what would we have won? If the Vietnamese people do not believe enough in their own government to fight for it, then a military victory by us would simply postpone the day when Saigon would fall into Vietcong hands politically.

It is sometimes said that we are in Vietnam to stop Communist China. I submit we are playing into the hands of Communist China. How can anyone argue that we are weakening China by throwing half a million of our best young men into war with Vietnam—a war which the Chinese watch from the sidelines without the loss of a single Chinese soldier? How are we teaching China a lesson when in fact our bombing of North Vietnam is driving Hanoi into a closer alliance with Peking?

Freedom is worth fighting for, but we do not meet the challenge of Communism or advance the cause of freedom by asking our men to die for an unpopular military regime abroad which denies freedom and which is scorned by its own citizens. I do not want to see Vietnam or any other country embrace Communism, but that is an issue which they must resolve for themselves.

I have never regretted my service as a bomber pilot in World War II against Hitlerism. But I agree with the late Winston Churchill that Vietnam is not that kind of testing ground for freedom. It is instead a confusing civil conflict with no real certainty as to which side has the more legitimate claim to lead the country. I do not want to see my son or your son die in that kind of doubtful struggle.

It is said that we must be patriotic and support our government in time of war. But the highest patriotism does not consist of blind acceptance of mistaken policies that are hurting our nation. Thoughtful people can honestly disagree on American foreign policy. But the strength of our system is that we encourage frank criticism and maximum candor in public debate. "To criticize one's country," said Senator Fulbright, "is to do it a service and pay it a compliment. It is a service because it may spur the country to do better than it is doing; it is a compliment because it evidences a belief that the country can do better than it is doing."

It is said that Hanoi misconstrues American dissent and public debate. But we cannot sacrifice freedom in America merely because it is not understood by those abroad who have never known freedom. We dare not fight so blindly for liberty in Southeast Asia that we lose it in America.

To remain silent in the face of policies we believe to be wrong is not patriotism; it is moral cowardice—a form of treason to one's conscience and to the nation.

It is not easy to dissent in time of war. Congressman Abraham Lincoln spoke out against the Mexican War in the 1840's and his angry constituents drove him from the Congress after one term.

My courage has been more sorely tested on the Senate floor these past four years in warning against the Administration's Vietnam policy than on any one of the bombing missions I flew as a pilot against enemy antiaircraft fire in the 1940's.

I do not know how all this will come out. I do know that while the people of a State can easily secure a new Senator, a Senator cannot easily secure a new conscience.

I cannot promise the people of South Dakota that my judgments will always prove to be 100% right. But I can promise to say what I believe is right. I do not expect everyone to agree with me on every issue, but I am convinced that you prefer me to say what I honestly believe rather than to pretend that I am in full agreement with official policy. And so while continuing to respect the equally sincere views of those who disagree with me, I intend to go right on speaking my views openly and frankly. I love the United States Senate. I want to be re-elected, and I am convinced that by experience and background I can serve more effectively in the future as your Senator. But I do not want re-election so badly that I will ever sacrifice my convictions to achieve it.

If we are fully honest with each other, we will sooner or later find through the free play of ideas an acceptable end to the war in Vietnam. After so much suffering and sacrifice on both sides the path to sanity and peace in Southeast Asia will not now be easy. The way to a larger war is enticing and simple. But before we plunge further down that path, let us recall the words of Virgil: "Easy is the descent to Hell; night and day the gates stand open; but to reclimb the slope and escape to the outer air, this, indeed, is a task."

The enormous destruction of life and property in Vietnam will have served no lasting purpose unless we learn well the lessons of this tragic conflict.

For the future, Senators and Administration leaders will do well to heed the admonition of Edmund Burke: "A conscientious man would be cautious how he dealt in blood."

America has had a glorious tradition of respect for human dignity and freedom. We have had a record of unparalleled generosity in assisting others. We have for the most part used our great power with restraint.

I believe our people long for peace. The only war we really seek is the war against those ancient ills—hunger, tyranny and injustice. That is a war, not to kill and destroy, but to heal and to redeem.

If we can set our hand to that course, we shall one day come to know the Biblical promise: "When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him."

The author of Ecclesiastes has written that "to everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: . . . a time to keep silence, and a time to speak; A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace."

This is not a time to keep silence; it is a time to speak. This is not a time to hate; it is a time to love. And may God grant that this time of war, with our help, may become a time of peace.

HANOI HAILS WASHINGTON PROTEST

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times carried an account of Hanoi's reaction to last Saturday's anything-but-peaceful march on the Pentagon by the self-proclaimed National Mobilization Committee.

As might be expected, Hanoi was not

unhappy at the violence and magnitude of the demonstration.

The Times writer, Charles Mohr, writes in quoting North Vietnamese news sources, that—

> The demonstrations constitute a great encouragement for our people.

This seems to give considerable weight to the question framed yesterday by the Secretary of State when he asked:

> How do we prevent their (Hanoi's) misunderstanding the news that 40,000 or 50,000 people are demonstrating in front of the Pentagon?

Mr. President, while the right of dissent may be sacred to our way of life, the form of the dissent and the dissenters themselves are not. Nor does the right of dissent cleanse the hands of those who, through their actions, may be directly responsible for prolonging a bloody and indecisive war.

Those who dissent in the fashion of last Saturday's march on the Pentagon should not do so as "peace" marchers. By their actions, they are, in all likelihood, prolonging the war they ostensibly oppose.

I ask, Mr. President, that the New York Times article to which I have alluded be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hanoi Hails Protests in Washington Against War in Vietnam as a Great Encouragement

(By Charles Mohr)

Hong Kong, October 25.—North Vietnamese spokesmen termed today the recent demonstrations in Washington against the war in Vietnam "valuable support," for and "a great encouragement" to North Vietnam.

A lengthy discussion on the protest demonstrations of last Saturday and Sunday was carried by the official North Vietnamese press service, the Vietnam News Agency.

The press service transmitted the text of an editorial in the newspaper Nhan Dan, official organ of the North Vietnamese Communist party that said "the American people's growing movement against the U.S. ruling circles' aggression in Vietnam constitutes a valuable support for the Vietnamese people. We warmly hail the struggle."

In another dispatch, the Vietnam News Agency quoted an official of "the Fatherland Front Central Committee" as having said in a speech yesterday that the Washington rallies "marked a new step in the development of the movement in the United States against the Johnson Government's war of aggression in Vietnam."

CREATED BY HO CHI MINH

The Fatherland Front is the last and most exclusive of the front organizations created by Ho Chi Minh in recent decades to broaden support for the regime. It includes some nominally non-Communist elements. It is not believed to exercise real power.

Nguyen Xien, a member of the Presidium of the Fatherland Front, told an audience in Hanoi that "together with the world peoples' movement of solidarity with Vietnam and against U.S. aggression, it [the demonstrations] constitutes a great encouragement to our people."

The National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong guerrilla movement in South Vietnam, created a social group recently that hopes to get in touch with and encourage members of the antiwar movement in the United States.

MESSAGE TO U.S. COMMITTEE

Some political sources speculated today that the Fatherland Front's mass meeting yesterday might be a step in the same direction by the Hanoi Government itself.

Delegates at the meeting sent a message to the National Mobilization Committee to end the War in Vietnam which organized the Washington rallies, the Vietnam News Agency said. The message "warmly welcomed the success of the week of protest."

Mr. Xien said the people of North Vietnam rejoiced at the protests in Washington and in European capitals. He said, "We are all the more confident in the victory of our just fight and will be united still more closely to defeat the U.S. aggressors."

The Nhan Dan editorial also seemed to suggest that Hanoi would like to play some direct role in the antiwar movement in the United States. The editorial concluded with these words:

"By coordinating actions on both fronts in Vietnam and the United States and stepping up the struggle against their common enemy, the Vietnamese and American peoples will unquestionably defeat the U.S. imperialist aggressors."

Nhan Dan said an important aspect of the Washington rallies was that they marked the end of protest and the start of a "fierce struggle" against the war.

"The campaign in the U.S. for an end to Johnson's aggressive war in Vietnam has entered 'a stage of active resistance'," Nhan Dan said.

"It is no longer a mere manifestation of the American people's disapproval of U.S. intervention and aggression in Vietnam but a firm action aimed at staying the hands of the U.S. ruling circles and a demand to them to stop the aggressive war in Vietnam."

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, too often we at the Federal level have a tendency to legislate in a manner which we consider good for the country when, in fact, the program created may be a monster to administer at the local level. The result of this is programs that are complicated by redtape and delays, and are more trouble than they are worth. Luckily, there are organizations which represent local administrators and can advise Congress on the merits of suggestions. One of these organizations, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment has been in the forefront of those concerned about the quality of our urban programs.

NAHRO, as the organization is known on the Hill, and among professionals, is composed of local officials who are charged with successfully implementing our housing and renewal programs. It has been active at the Federal level in suggesting new programs, urging modifications in existing legislation, and, at times, opposing proposals which it feels would be detrimental to urban areas. Recently, the association held its 31st national conference in Portland, Oreg., where it adopted its policy resolutions for 1967–69. NAHRO was especially concerned about the civil disturbances that this country experienced this past summer, and saw them as indicators of the deep problems that afflict American urban life. It called for new attitudes to deal with these problems. NAHRO expressed its frustration over the reaction to the magnitude of the urban problems. It called for a new sense of realism and a new commitment of enthusiasm and resources by those responsible for our urban programs. Specifically, to quote from the preamble of the policy resolutions:

> NAHRO members are dismayed and frustrated over the lack of a sense of urgency in dealing with urban affairs; over inadequate funding of existing housing and community development programs; over insufficient flexibility in existing programs and the slowness with which requests for assistance are moved through the federal processing system; over the fact that a full measure of responsibility and initiative in existing programs is not vested in local agencies.

Mr. President, these complaints, voiced by those who administer our housing programs, should be viewed as a call for action on our part. We can excuse ourselves at times for passing inadequate legislation because we are not experienced in the administration of these programs. However, when the administrators take us to task, we have the responsibility to reexamine our policies and make those changes which are necessary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of recommendations offered by the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials be placed in the Record at this point. These recommendations are deserving of our serious consideration.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The 1967–69 Policy Resolution of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, Adopted at the 31st National Conference, Portland, Oreg., October 10, 1967

PREAMBLE

The urban situation in the United States is one of uncertainty and unrest. Disturbances in major American cities in the summer of 1967 were surface indicators of the deep problems that afflict American urban life. Some of the root causes of the problems can be found in the evolution of the country into an urban nation and in efforts to adapt traditional solutions to meet changing needs.

Nowhere can the tension over solutions to urban problems be observed more closely than in the experience of housing and urban development programs over the last few years. Because these existing programs have not succeeded in stemming the tide of blight and unrest in urban areas, they have been labeled by some critics as failures and as the wrong approaches. This criticism must be seen as reflecting not only second-guessing but also a very shallow conclusion. If some programs have lacked major impact, it can be traced in large part to the failure to fund them at levels adequate to permit them to realize their full potential; to the failure to provide for a flexibility of administration that would allow them to adapt to the shifting and varying needs of local communities; and to the failure to recognize that single-purpose programs were not designed to treat total urban problems.

The members of NAHRO, assembled in their 31st national conference, would like to express constructively, and very emphatically, their conviction that more must be done to enable existing housing and community development programs to meet critical urban needs. NAHRO members are dismayed and frustrated over the lack of a sense of urgency in dealing with urban affairs; over inadequate funding of existing housing and community development programs; over insufficient flexibility in existing programs and the slowness with which requests for assistance are moved through the federal processing system; over the fact that a full measure of responsibility and initiative in existing programs is not vested in local agencies.

Further, NAHRO believes that it is time for complete candor in urban affairs. Never before have the problems of urban areas had such concentrated attention in the public statements and discussions of important officials in both the executive and legislative branches of the federal government. Frustration and despair result when high-level attention does not result in action, in financed authorizations and appropriations. Frustration is generated when new program ideas are advocated as major "solutions" to urban problems when, in fact, they represent either untested theories or, even if workable, can be foreseen as exerting only a limited impact on the total need. There is a distinction between the goals we seek and a realistic appraisal of what actually can be achieved. There has been too much "action by press release" at every level of government.

There is need for a new sense of realism in urban affairs and a new commitment of enthusiasm and resources by all those charged with responsibility for urban programs. Only such a new outlook can sweep aside frustrations and inadequacies and provide a setting for future progress in meeting difficult urban problems.

1. Comprehensive programs and strategies

A complicated tangle of urban issues revolve around the so-called "poverty areas" in central cities and the sprawl of population and economic growth that is occurring in total metropolitan areas. Single-purpose improvement programs, such as urban renewal or public housing, are not geared to handle total urban problems. These problems are complex and demand complex solutions. Comprehensive program strategies are needed that combine physical, social and economic improvement efforts under a coordinated direction.

A comprehensive strategy for the renewal of *deprived neighborhoods in central cities* can be tested in the "model cities" program. A myriad of physical-economic-social activities can be combined in a coordinated effort to achieve a major impact. A total program strategy to guide the *growth and development of metropolitan areas* has not yet emerged. Present programs in metropolitan development consists largely of assistance to prepare land-use plans, to develop transportation systems, and to construct such basic public facilities as water and sewer systems. The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 authorized some new steps in this direction—incentives in additional funds to encourage a locality to develop basic facilities in coordination with a metropolitan plan and a new mortgage insurance program to assist in the assembly of land for development of new communities. But these new programs constitute only small pieces of what must go into a total metropolitan program strategy. Further, the gulf between the efforts to renew central cities and to guide the orderly development of metropolitan areas is rapidly evaporating. It will not be long before these two program efforts will not be able to proceed independently of each other. The next few years should witness a further pulling together of the major elements that can be shaped into a comprehensive program strategy covering both central cities and metropolitan areas.

Beyond a central city-metropolitan area program strategy lies a still less-explored urban frontier requiring exploration, covering such concerns as achieving an appropriate distribution of population and economic activity between urban and rural areas, programming the use of national resources, and considering the decentralization of some federal government activity to a regional and local basis. A *total urban strategy* requires long-range plans for meeting the urbanization problem on a national scale, covering perhaps the next 30 years.

2. Definition of goals for urban life

Progress towards meeting urban problems not only requires comprehensive program strategies but a re-evaluation of many of the traditional social philosophies and governmental processes that have dominated the American system since the beginning of the nation. It has been observed that our sophisticated technology is now capable of providing a wide range of living opportunities, which is the major virtue and appeal of urban life, but that our attitudes, our social structures—and the political machinery that reflects these attitudes and structures—are evolving with agonizing slowness.

In its 1965–67 policy resolution, NAHRO pointed to the lack of agreement as to what urban life should be and the need to develop an embracing philosophy of a new urban social structure in which the values associated with home and children, community life and friends, living and cooperating with nature, would have a chance to develop.

Reaching this agreement is still a most urgent task: we must set goals for urban life that will enrich the lives of all citizens, cover all aspects of environment, and help every citizen achieve independence and self-sufficiency. These goals should have the understanding and acceptance of a majority of the American people. It is only in the framework of such an understanding that we can answer the further question: can we organize our institutions and our resources to improve the quality of life for all Americans in a complex and rapidly-changing society?

To develop such agreement on goals for urban life requires adjustment of some traditional attitudes and practices which are constraints upon urban progress. They include:

The questionable ethic that anyone can lift himself into independence and self-sufficiency, without a national understanding of the enviroment of despair that we have permitted to exist in some of our deprived areas;

The growing trend toward federal government control over other levels of government, thus eroding the distinctive federal system of government written into our constitution, under which powers were reserved for non-federal jurisdictions;

The autonomy of very small units of government, without reference to their relationship to larger metropolitan and regional goals;

The practice of using planning and zoning requirements to stratify living patterns, without reference to the need to provide opportunities for low- and moderate-income families to find their places in the whole society;

The special privileges given highways and the automobile to operate without reference to their impact on the quality of urban development;

A traditional view of taxation as a limited, revenue-producing vehicle, without reference to how it might be used to achieve public policy goals;

A tendency to leave the development of land completely to the free play of market forces, without any reference to the need to protect natural resources and open space, and to guide an orderly development process;

A complacency growing out of the belief that a highly restricted commitment of the nation's resources can be made toward the solution of urban problems and that everything, given time, will turn out all right.

3. Creation of compatible conditions to assure urban progress

As the nation strives to bring some measure of order to urban life and seeks new approaches to pressing problems, NAHRO sees certain critical areas that require prompt attention. Action in these areas is an essential condition for urban progress.

Massing manpower for housing and urban development programs:

NAHRO reaffirms and reinforces the section of its policy resolution for 1965–67 that called for an immediate large-scale training and manpower development program for the urban development professions and continues to support the elements of such a program as spelled out in the resolution.

Giving the citizen a voice and the tenant a role in housing and urban development:

NAHRO reaffirms and reinforces the statement on citizen organization structure in its 1965–67 policy resolution, which called for development of a technique that actually brings citizens into an important advisory capacity, without precipitating clashes and power struggles. It further pledges its resources to assist local housing authorities to work constructively with tenant associations to achieve a maximum opportunity for tenant participation and advancement. Increased attention should also be given to "self-help" housing and home ownership opportunities for lower-income families.

Guaranteeing an equal housing opportunity and an option in housing location for every citizen:

The nation is entering a new era in civil rights. NAHRO states its firm conviction that appropriate actions should be taken at every level of government to assure an equal opportunity for good housing in a suitable living environment for all Americans. It further states its support for all measures that will insure a choice of housing opportunities and options in housing locations, in order that each individual citizen can achieve a maximum level of economic and social fulfillment. Further, the Association believes that these goals should not be left to unplanned development but that specific actions and programs should be formulated, on a time schedule, to bring about their accomplishment.

Achieving a workable process to coordinate Federal-State-local efforts in housing and urban development:

NAHRO reaffirms the statement in its 1965–67 policy resolution that calls for special study and demonstration in the area of intergovernmental relations in the urban development field. It particularly cites the following areas for special study: a broader base for federal assistance than categorical grant programs, the use of taxation as a public policy tool in urban development, the role of the state in housing and community development, and the coordination of housing and community development functions at the local and metropolitan area level.

Relating an expanded role by private enterprise to public policy goals and the functions of public agencies:

NAHRO welcomes an increased contribution by private enterprise to the improvement of urban conditions and reaffirms the important relationships of private interests to public activity detailed in its 1965–67 policy resolution. It re-emphasizes the importance for private activity to move forward in harmony with public policy goals and with a recognition of the primary role of public agencies in guiding an orderly housing and urban development effort.

Putting science and technology to work on behalf of housing and urban development goals:

The advances made in the area of national defense through the use of scientific methods and advanced technology have not taken place to any extent in the housing and urban development field. NAHRO calls for a full-scale research and demonstration effort to investigate new methods and techniques of housing and urban development, including the exploration of the feasibility of a systems approach to rebuilding our cities.

PRIORITY ACTION AREAS FOR 1967–69

The nation is in mid-stream in the evolution of its urban programs and policies. The task is to move ahead with tested housing and urban development programs on an expanded scale—and, at the same time, to fold these programs into a broader and more comprehensive urban program strategy. Concurrent steps should be taken to define and to implement the broader strategy. NAHRO sees these priority action areas for the next two years.

Preparing for future urban development

Developing a central city—Metropolitan area program strategy:

NAHRO believes that there is an urgent and growing need for dealing with urban housing and renewal problems within the context of total metropolitan growth. Local programs in many areas need to be expanding in scope so that slums, blight and substandard conditions in suburban and rural fringe areas can be treated in concert with central city programs. Relocation and the expansion of housing opportunities for low- and middle-income families need to be planned and executed on a metropolitan basis so that these families may share the advantages of newly-created environment and access to suburban employment opportunities. Greater concern must be shown in metropolitan planning for meeting these needs by dealing with such problems as taxation and restrictive practices and by laying physical plans for transportation, land use, and community facilities that are directly aimed at the goal of providing "a decent home in a suitable environment for every American family." The federal government, likewise, should make the national housing goal its chief criterion for granting assistance to metropolitan areas in the development of highways, mass transportation, open space, sewer and water, and other facilities.

Utilizing research to formulate goals for urban life and remove constraints to urban progress:

Reaching agreement on goals for urban life is so crucial to future urban progress that we can no longer leave the development of such goals to the unplanned play of forces at work on the urban scene. If we are to make progress in time to avoid further tragic mistakes—and if we are to achieve the broad-based public support necessary for success—a bold program of research and demonstration should be undertaken to plumb and test the important issues where national support and direction are needed. We should accelerate the determination of goals for urban life. This is a first order of business for urban research and demonstration.

Undertaking a long-range study of national urbanization policy:

To prepare for the development of a national policy on urbanization, NAHRO believes that a special commission should be established to direct a long-range study covering such concerns as national population distribution and the allocation of national resources. Such a commission might well include the best talent of private industry, the universities, public officials at all levels of government, and professionals in the housing and urban development field.

Making housing and urban development programs an integral part of the Federal budget and national economic policy:

NAHRO sees the need to plan now for the day when the fuller resources of this country can be directed toward its domestic needs, and particularly those needs in the housing and urban development field. Three actions are necessary immediately: (a) the establishment of a Congressional commission to recommend priorities of need in our domestic programs, with particular attention to urban program needs; (b) the consideration, at the highest economic planning levels of the federal government—perhaps the President's Council of Economic Advisors or the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress—as to how housing and urban development can become an integral part of national economic planning; (c) the building a shelf of housing and urban development activities, ready to go, so that there will be no time lost when a shift can be made from a defense to a domestic economy.

Setting annual goals for housing production:

The production of housing for low- and moderate-income families has reached a critical juncture. Despite the overwhelming evidence of need production of new housing for these families has proceeded at an extremely slow pace. To begin the process of a firmer national commitment to the housing needs of the nation, NAHRO proposes that the Congress adopt goals for national housing production at the rate of 2 million units a year for the next 20 years and that 500,000 units of this total production be established for low- and moderate-income housing. To expedite these goals, Congress should request that the annual economic report of the President include a progress statement on what was done during the past year to achieve approved housing goals and what can be expected during the next year, under projected national economic policy. Further, it is proposed that the Congress request a special annual report from the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, in conjunction with the annual economic report, which will indicate how proposed housing goals are to be implemented in the federal budget for the coming fiscal year. Since public housing continues to be the most viable method for bringing housing assistance to low-income families, at least half of any earmarking of annual units for low- and moderate-income housing should be reserved for an expansion of the public housing program.

Meeting current program needs

Adopting an interim improvement program to meet critical needs in areas designated for future urban renewal:

In 1967, the housing and urban development action that clearly combines the most urgent need and the largest element of national agreement is the improvement of living conditions in the most deprived neighborhoods in central cities. Comprehensive urban renewal treatment, or the more lasting actions inherent in the model cities program, cannot be effective for a number of years in most of these areas. An interim program to serve as a holding action, providing assistance to achieve minimum housing conditions and basic city services, should be adopted by the Congress as the first stage of a continuing renewal process.

Accelerating the decentralization of the Department of Housing and Urban Development:

Action to decentralize HUD to accommodate more decision-making at the regional level has not moved fast enough. Placement of more responsibility and initiative at the local level, particularly for experienced local agencies, has not occurred. Efforts to streamline processing of assistance, to provide needed technical guidance to localities, and to move programs through pipelines to completion have not been top priorities. NAHRO sees an immediate need to make the following objectives the first order of business: (a) the actual decentralization of the decision-making powers on operating programs to the regional administrator and his staff; (b) the streamlining of the assistance process in operating programs so that the assistance programs can be moved; (c) the granting to local community agencies of a full measure of initiative and responsibility, in accordance with the declaration of policy in the Housing Act of 1959.

Testing new methods for assisting lower-income housing:

There are a growing number of techniques being tested as methods to achieve maximum production of lower-income housing: the public housing program (including its new approaches, such as turnkey and leasing of private housing); the direct loan program for elderly housing; the below-market interest rate program of the Federal Housing Administration under Section 221-d-3, plus the FHA 221-d-3 market-interest rate program with rent supplements. There are also new home ownership programs for lower-income families. In addition, there are a number of active demonstration plans and other proposals under consideration for adoption. NAHRO restates the need expressed in its 1965–67 policy resolution to give special attention to methods of meeting the housing needs of the *large family* and the *very low-income family*, including the family receiving welfare assistance and living in poor housing.

In order to make this period of testing most meaningful, NAHRO suggests some guidelines—and some cautions. Every effort should be made: (a) to amend the legislative and administrative requirements of existing programs in order to achieve maximum flexibility in adjusting to current conditions and needs; (b) to insure that the quality of both design and construction is conducive to the achievement of the social goals inherent in low-income housing programs; and (c) to provide objective measures for judging the achievements of each of the assistance techniques, including both economic and social criteria.

Maintaining the pace of urban renewal and re-casting it as a total development program:

The urban renewal program has now passed the evolutionary stage and has proven its basic workability. Many urban renewal projects are being completed and their influence is beginning to be felt in many communities. At the same time, requests for urban renewal assistance continue to increase. Not only are communities already in the program undertaking additional activity, but new communities of all sizes are undertaking their first urban renewal action. Recent surveys indicate that the demand for urban renewal funds will remain at about two and a half times the supply through fiscal 1969. It is vital that this pace of activity be maintained and that communities have the financial support necessary to carry out plans already under way.

The techniques of the urban renewal process have been proven to be sound and workable. Many of these techniques can be applied on a broader scale—both in central cities and on a metropolitan area basis. NAHRO recommends that a major effort be made over the next two years to recast urban renewal as a total process for the physical improvement of the city, not confined to "project areas," but related to the execution of a total community development plan. Urban renewal will be the cornerstone of the "model cities" effort and this experience should be used as a basis to move it from a "project" to a total community improvement effort. Such a recasting should be moved forward under an incentives system, with a shift to the new approach not made mandatory at the present time.

Stepping up actions to preserve, basically sound neighborhoods:

More attention should be given to the preservation of neighborhoods that require immediate attention to prevent them from falling into still further decline. This is basically the task of housing code enforcement programs, together with provision of basic city services and other capital improvements. The concentrated codes program (Section 117), adopted by the Congress in 1965 as a major vehicle to arrest the decline of areas that are basically sound, should be expanded as rapidly as possible.

Giving flexibility to existing programs:

The experience of 30 years should not be cast aside in favor of wholly new and untried measures. Fundamental parts of successful housing and urban development programs are already on the statute books. They need to be strengthened.

NAHRO calls on the Department of Housing and Urban Development to review current administrative practices and regulations with a view to promoting flexibility in its assistance programs. Particularly, NAHRO sees a special need for a basic up-dating of the administrative organization and processes of the *public housing program* and a complete rethinking of the *workable program* and experience with it to date.

NAHRO also asks the Congress to approve needed legislative amendments that will make *all* housing and urban development programs flexible in meeting new needs. The Association presented a full report on needed legislative amendments in its 1967 testimony to the Congress; it will be making additional recommendations. Key legislative considerations include:

For the public housing program: write-down of site costs outside urban renewal areas; funding of a socially-oriented management function and of social services; annual contributions to modernize and update older housing developments; amendments to make possible a true opportunity for home ownership by public housing tenants.

For the urban renewal program: amendments to change the program from a "project" approach to a total development process; consideration of a 90 percent contribution formula and elimination of local credits; change in the local matching requirement for the urban beautification program to make it uniform with that of the open space program; separation of moving expenses and property losses in business relocation claims.

For the concentrated codes enforcement program: clarification of standards; broadening the types of improvements eligible as project costs; authorization of the acquisition and demolition of nonconforming uses; authorization to use the three-fourths matching grant in area redevelopment areas.

For demonstration programs: a more realistic funding of demonstration programs by removal of the two-thirds limitation on demonstration grants and making grants available to nonprofit institutions.

For the Section 202 and FHA 221-d-3 below-market interest rate programs: financial assistance to nonprofit sponsors to enable them to organize and develop projects; clarification of the conflicting provisions in these programs relating to organization and planning fees; payment for equipment, office, and community space; working capital; training; and workable program certification.

For the rent supplement program: authorization to use 50 percent of authorized funds in connection with below-market interest rate programs; reduction of the rent-income ratio from 25 to 20 percent; review of the unit construction cost limits.

Making relocation a centralized local operation and providing increased services: NAHRO continues to be concerned about providing the best possible relocation service to all persons and businesses displaced by governmental action. Although advances made in this area are promising—the establishment of central relocation services in many cities and the efforts to provide uniform relocation benefits—there is a continuing need for expanding relocation services.

It should be required that *all governmental programs* that displace households and businesses take on the additional responsibility of helping obtain relocation resources and that such assistance be under plans consistent with urban renewal and housing policies.

In the area of *residential relocation*, while the primary aim is to assist displaced persons in gaining access to decent, safe, and sanitary housing at rents or prices within their means, many families must also be assisted with services relating to education, employment, homemaking, and family adjustment.

In the area of *business relocation*, while the primary aim is to assist the displacee to find a new location for his business, there is also a need to include guidance and assistance on management policies and practices that will better insure his future economic success.

A program of expanded relocation services, including special services for displaced families and businesses, as well as training for relocation personnel, should be given priority attention.

THE 1967-69 PROGRAM POLICY/RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Chairman: Ira S. Robbins, Vice-Chairman New York City Housing Authority, New York, New York.

Melvin J. Adams, Executive Director, New Haven Redevelopment Agency, New Haven, Connecticut.

J. Ray Adams, Deputy Executive Director Seattle Housing Authority, Seattle, Washington.

Frederick T. Aschman, Executive Vice-President, Bartin-Aschman Associates, Chicago, Illinois.

Ellis Ash, Administrator, Boston Housing Authority, Boston, Massachusetts.

Thomas R. Bodine, Commissioner, Housing Authority of the City of Hartford, Hartford, Connecticut.

Richard F. Cahill, State Urban Renewal Director, Department of Economic Development, Augusta, Maine.

Napoleon Britt, Chairman, The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Richmond, Richmond, California.

Gordon Cavanaugh, Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections, Philadephia, Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Cushing Dolbeare, Executive Director, The Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Allan B. Elliot, Assistant Executive Director, D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency, Washington, D.C.

Karl L. Falk, Chairman, Housing Authority of the City of Fresno, Fresno, California.

Charles L. Farris, President, Urban Programming Corporation of America, St. Louis, Missouri.

T. Scott Fillebrown, Jr., Chairman, Nashville Housing Authority, Nashville, Tennessee.

Daniel Finn, Commissioner, Housing Inspection Department, Boston, Massachusetts.

Irbye Giddens, Director of Development, Miami Housing Authority, Miami, Florida.

Mark K. Herley, Assistant Director, Detroit Housing Commission, Detroit, Michigan.

Lewis W. Hill, Commissioner, Department of Urban Renewal, Chicago, Illinois.

Edward L. Holmgren, Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities, Chicago, Illinois.

LeRoy Jones, Commissioner, Connecticut Department of Community Affairs, Hartford, Connecticut.

Robert T. Jorvig, City Coordinator, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Robert D. Knox, Director, Detroit Housing Commission, Detroit, Michigan.

George D. Millar, Jr., Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Little Rock, Little Rock, Arkansas.

Gordon Manser, Associate Director, National Social Welfare Assembly, Inc., New York, New York.

William L. Rafsky, Executive Vice-President, Old Philadelphia Development Corporation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Chester Rapkin, Professor of Urban Planning, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Vernon L. Sawyer, Executive Director, Re-Development Commission of the City of Charlotte, Charlotte, North Carolina.

Walter M. Simmons, Executive Director, Memphis Housing Authority, Memphis, Tennessee.

Guy M. Tate, Director, Bureau of Sanitation, Birmingham, Alabama.

Oliver C. Winston, Director, Office Regional Resources and Development, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

NAHRO Staff: Mary K. Nenno, Associate Director for Program Policy and Research.

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, 11 years ago this week, the courageous people of Hungary made a valiant attempt to cast off the shackles of Soviet imperialism and reestablish the independence which was theirs before they were "liberated" by the Red armies in World War II.

The revolution at first succeeded, and then it failed. Bodies and stones were no match for tanks and cannon. The cost of the revolution to the Soviets was high, even though they crushed it. The cost to the Hungarians who were the revolution was, of course, much higher.

There are today in Hungary unknown thousands of political prisoners, most of them from the revolution. Hundreds—perhaps thousands—more have been executed.

Although some reforms followed the revolution, Hungary is still very much a captive nation—a colonial entity, governed in the cruelest and most rapacious fashion by the same powers who have the audacity to stand in the U.N. forum in New York and assail America for alleged "neocolonialism."

The only colonial power of any consequence left in the world today is Russia. But this is not discussed in U.N. circles.

A friend of mine visited Budapest in September of this year. He reported that:

> Budapest is an unhappy island of the averted glance, the hushed conversation, and the obvious austerity imposed by a foreign political and ideological system which has no room for economic pragmatism, political freedom, or national independence.
>
> The contrast between political systems—Communism and Capitalism—is never so patent as when one travels in a single day from the happiness, prosperity and purpose of West Berlin to the smothering unhappiness of Budapest, where the hammer and sickle festoons the boulevards, and the red star of Moscow adorns the buildings. You can just as readily be shot in attempting to flee from Hungary or Czechoslovakia to Austria as from East Berlin to the west.

History may record the failure of the United States and the free world to act in 1956 as the greatest lost opportunity of mankind.

The rapid imprisonment of political activists in Poland at the outbreak of fighting in Budapest was graphic evidence of fears in the Kremlin that the affinity of these two Catholic countries would ignite a two-headed revolution with which Russia could not cope.

The rapid, brutal movement of Russian police and troops in that October, 11 years ago, prevented the igniting of the spark in Poland.

Much has been written of the Hungarian revolution. On this 11th anniversary, a new book, "The Hungarian Revolution in Perspective," edited by Francis S. Wagner, is valuable reading. I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks, a commentary on the book carried in the October 23 Hungarian Freedom Fighter publication, be printed in the Record. I ask also that a commentary, "The Reality Gap in Eastern Europe," by Newsweek's F. Yorick Blumenfeld, be printed.

Mr. President, the people of Hungary proved in 1956 that in the final analysis, a soldier's pack bears down upon the shoulders of a nation less oppressively than do the chains of a prisoner.

Hungarians were defeated in their short-lived revolution not because they were wrong, nor because they lacked national support, but, despite the rightness of their cause, because they lacked the pure force of arms to defeat the foreign army sent to crush them.

Speaking on the fifth anniversary of the revolution in 1961, the late Albert Camus said of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters:

> If their distress is ours, hope is ours also. In spite of their misery, their chains, their exile, they have left us a glorious heritage which we must deserve: freedom, which they not only chose, but which in one single day, they gave back to us.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Hungarian Revolt in Perspective

A great deal has been written about the Hungarian revolution. However, most of this has been merely descriptive or evocative and very little has been devoted to the analysis of the revolution as a historical phenomenon. *The Hungarian Revolution in Perspective,* a book edited by Francis S. Wagner and published through the efforts of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Fed. Inc., by The Freedom Fighters Memorial Foundation, is an important contribution to filling that void.

The book begins with a collection of quotations which evoke the various moods and spontaneous reactions to the 1956 freedom fight. They include the eloquence of Pope Pius, the dismay of a Nigerian student that such "imperialism" could still exist in Central Europe, the prophecy of Milovan Djilas that the revolution marked "the beginning of the end of Communism," and the reproach of Pablo Picasso to the French Communists for failing to face the issue unambiguously.

In the second section of the book somewhat longer "reflections" of a handful of people eloquently restate the commitment to which the Hungarian fight for freedom calls the free world. There are contributions from Richard M. Nixon, Senator Claiborne Pell, Otto von Habsburg, and Thomas Molnar.

In an essay, Dr. Wagner has addressed himself to the thinking of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Using a number of unpublished sources from the Dulles Papers housed at the Princeton University Library, Dr. Wagner has indicated enough to show that the thinking and role of the Secretary of State should be the subject of an exhaustive study of its own. Another question which Dr. Wagner points to is the correlation of the Freedom Fight and of the Suez crisis.

The main portion of the book contains a number of original studies on several aspects of the freedom fight. Salvador de Madariaga puts it in the broader perspective of the philosophy of history and of the history of human efforts to become free. This great European statesman-philosopher's writings on Hungary have become legendary.

A longer study by Professor Gogolak is devoted to the sociology and ideology of the Hungarian regime against which the people of Hungary revolted in 1956.

In an essay the role of Communist China in the Hungarian revolution, David Hongtoh Bau gives an example of the deep repercussions of the revolt within the communist empire and traces the rerelationship of the revolt to the emergence of China as an independent communist state. In a well-documented study of the economic causes of the Hungarian revolt, George Kopits argues that the indirect factor of the soviet exploitation of Hungarian uranium deposits was a more important factor in launching the revolt than the direct factors of low standards of living, unavailability of basic consumer goods and the intensive socialization of the economy.

The book also contains an excerpt from the Congressional Record in which former Congressman Alvin M. Bentley, a strong supporter of the Hungarian cause and frequent critic of administration policies, debated the Hungarian issue.

The book closes with an extremely valuable bibliography, compiled by Dr. I. L. Halasz de Beky. Containing more than 1200 titles among them several in a dozen different languages, the bibliography will stimulate further research into the subject.

The Reality Gap in Eastern Europe

(By F. Yorick Blumenfeld)

(Note.—In recent years, the notion that the Communist states of Eastern Europe are making great strides toward liberalization has become part of the conventional wisdom of Western statesmen and journalists. But is it true? From his firsthand knowledge of the area, the man who was Newsweek's Eastern European correspondent from 1964 until August of this year challenges that view.)

Three years of reporting from the colorless, soot-covered capitals of Eastern Europe—so unlike what Americans see in travel brochures—have convinced me that the most serious problem facing the leadership of the Communist states today is the "reality gap." The continuing predicament of such Communist dictators as Poland's Wladyslaw Gomulka, Hungary's Janos Kadar, Czechoslovakia's Antonin Novotny, or Bulgaria's Todor Zhivkov (all of whom have maintained their undisputed grip on power since 1956) is how to grapple with actuality. The failure to make talk correspond to action and propaganda to reality flaws every aspect of so-called socialist life—from the halfhearted efforts at economic reform, which are accompanied by a universal refusal to close down unprofitable factories, to the irresolute attempts to keep alive the discredited notion of socialist realism in the arts.

The resulting atmosphere of fantasy, of unreality bordering on the absurd, distorts a wide range of issues. Some cases in point:

Recently, while I was lunching with two Rumanian literary editors in Bucharest, one of them earnestly asked me if it was true that America was helping Red China with its nuclear-weapons program. When I asked how he had come by such a startling idea, he answered: "I'm not sure, but I think it was broadcast by Radio Moscow." And, indeed, on checking back, I found that not only had the U.S. been accused of delivering atomic equipment to China, but that, according to Radio Moscow, Peking and Washington had even reached a "mutual understanding" on the Vietnamese war. Black propaganda? No. Most European Communists are paranoiac on the subject of possible Sino-American collusion.

On my last swing through Prague, Budapest and Belgrade, I heard self-assured, unflinching Foreign Ministry officials in each capital denounce Israel as a "willing tool of colonialism" and accuse the West Germany Army of having obtained an excellent "experimental range for its new weapons" in the Sinai Peninsula. Incredible? No. This is the official line in Eastern Europe.

In Belgrade, a usually rational senior official in the Yugoslav Foreign Ministry told an open-mouthed colleague and myself that the recent coup in Greece, the movements of the American Sixth Fleet in the Adriatic and the "sinister collusion" between Israel and the United States against Yugoslavia's friend Nasser were proof of a complex Western conspiracy against Yugoslavia's territorial integrity. Preposterous? To the Yugoslav Foreign Ministry the connection between these events seemed self-evident.

Sipping coffee with the editor of a Communist Party daily on the terrace of Budapest's Gellert Hotel, I asked him: "How much longer will Russian troops continue to be stationed in Hungary?" Without hesitation, he replied: "The Russians are here for our own protection, at the invitation of our government. This has nothing to do with our internal situation. Considering the increasing state of international tension, the further stay of these forces in Hungary is not only right but necessary." This was not a political fossil talking but a concerned man—who had swallowed the party line.

Discussing the problem of control over the arts in Prague with a lady bureaucrat from the Ministry of Culture. I was unsurprised, after numerous such encounters, to hear her blandly declare that "art for art's sake is self-deception." Primly and self-righteously, she then denounced individualism, artistic isolation and even apolitical attitudes. To hear her rant about the "degenerate, decadent artistic views of Western bourgeois circles" seemed like an embarrassing throwback to the era of Goebbels's National Socialism. Yet, this was official Prague, 1967.

One of the most insidious effects of such socialist verbiage is the fact that, eventually, Western journalists working in Eastern Europe come to accept it as the normal frame of reference. Together with the political sections of the Western embassies, the press begins to look for subtle variations in the public positions taken by party spokesmen—variations which may or may not be significant. Behind closed doors, or completely off the record, these same officials may occasionally take off their red contact lenses and make a tough, cold-blooded appraisal of a given situation. At a candlelight dinner party given by a French diplomat in Sofia last spring, a Bulgarian spokesman, whom I had come to regard as a dogmatist, presented me with a lucid assessment of America's involvement in Vietnam. He saw this not as "imperialist aggression" but as a "tragic case of escalation." American diplomats have, in fact, long become accustomed to hearing two entirely different records from their counterparts in the Communist countries.

As I now try to recall individual conversations with various officials, my memories are blurred by the flow of platitudes, the Kafkaesque vision of an endless series of musty rooms decorated with slightly moth-eaten, crimson velvet curtains, and the stench of stale tobacco and Lysol. Somehow, the anesthetized bureaucrats of Eastern Europe seemed incapable of recognizing the fact that a rise in industrial production does not axiomatically bring about the betterment of society. These *apparatchiki* seemed forever surprised when I refused to accept their statistics on the increase in the per capita output of steel, cement, or electricity as overwhelming proof that the quality of life itself was improving. One hundred years after the publication of Marx's "Das Kapital," the Communist mentality has fallen prey to its own, self-propagated illusions.

NEW SOCIALIST MAN?

Fundamental to the mistique about the superiority of "the socialist system" is the notion that Marxism-Leninism is producing—or is about to produce—a new socialist man. Ideologists throughout Eastern Europe seem genuinely to believe that a new society will evolve with the disappearance of the class struggle and the improvement of the standard of living. But as the brilliant young Czech motion-picture director Ivan Passer tried to show in his film "Intimate Lighting," the truth is that socialism has solved none of the basic human dilemmas. In his humorous portrayal of a humdrum Sunday dinner in a suburban Prague household, Passer destroys the notion that twenty years of Communist dictatorship have revolutionized the Czech way of life. Such a message might seem banal to Americans, but to the Czech Communist leadership, it is anathema. Few shibboleths are held more sacred than the notion that the inevitable result of Communist power must be the flowering of a new and revolutionary kind of existence.

But the Communists are not alone in being deluded by their own wishful thinking and propaganda. Coming back to the United States, I have found that Americans consider Stalin solidly buried in Svetlana's memoirs—while in actual fact, some forms of the dogmatic system Stalin instituted continue to flourish in Eastern Europe. Little of what I now hear in America about Eastern Europe, in fact, truly relates to the realities of Warsaw, Prague or Budapest.

Even some very sophisticated American observers prefer not to think in such unfashionable terms as the "Iron Curtain," or "police states." Yet, merely wishing the curtain away because it may gradually be replaced by more sophisticated electronic devices does not alter the fact of its existence. Numbers of East Germans, Czechs and Hungarians are still being shot trying to cross into Austria. This is a reality which is now largely overlooked by those who hope that Communism is entering an era of liberalization. Communist regimes are, indeed, liberalizing—but at the pace of two steps forward and one and three-quarter steps back. While there is experimentation with social and economic reforms, change proceeds at a much slower pace in Eastern Europe than most Americans can even begin to imagine.

America's outlook on Yugoslavia furnishes an excellent example. For years, we had been accepting the cleverly formulated Yugoslav position of nonalignment, of a break with Moscow and of Tito's independent course in foreign policy. But it only took the Middle East crisis to show how frail these assumptions were. Tito's first move last June was to fly to Moscow and condemn Israeli-American aggression against the Arabs. Then, having signed a joint declaration with the other Communist leaders, he broke off diplomatic relations with Israel in an unprecedented and arbitrary manner. Later in the summer, in a determined effort to patch up his image in the West, Tito suddenly turned into a self-appointed emissary of peace in the Middle East. This curious conduct, however, hardly seems less logical than that of Western observers who still choose to believe that in a showdown, Yugoslavia would side with the West or remain neutral.

REALISM

Of all Eastern European nations, only Rumania has shown any degree of realism in recent months. Seemingly, Rumania's leaders have tried to follow a policy of noninterference in the affairs of other nations to its logical conclusions. The Rumanian outlook on the ineffectuality of the Eastern European Common Market, the superannuation of the Warsaw Pact, and the built-in impotence of Communist summit conferences is gradually suggesting alternatives. Even such a staunch supporter of Moscow as Bulgaria's Todor Zhivkov, while still occasionally serving as the Eastern European spokesman for the Soviet Union, is aware that Rumania's insistence on mutually advantageous exchanges has more to offer than the unilateral dictation of terms from Russia. However, Rumania's voice is almost lost in the morass of Eastern European irrationality. The process of evaluating possibilities for independent thought and action evolves only gradually in that part of the world—and many years must still pass before realism will be found in any abundance among the Communist organizations from Tirana to Warsaw.

MAJORITY OF NATIONS OF THE WORLD CONSIDER HUMAN RIGHTS INTERNATIONAL CONCERN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on October 11 voted to report favorably one human rights convention—the Supplementary Slavery Convention. At the same time, the committee voted to table the Human Rights Conventions on Political Rights of Women and Forced Labor.

The tabling action by the committee not only struck a severe blow to the hopes of those people who have fought for U.S. ratification of all the human rights conventions, but also reduced U.S. participation in International Human Rights Year to almost a meaningless charade.

As we approach International Human Rights Year, I think it would be both interesting and revealing to list the nations which are parties to the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor and Political Rights of Women.

The parties to the Human Rights Convention on Political Rights of Women are: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Canada, Central Africa, China, Congo—Brazzaville, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Cuba, Iceland, India, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Mongolia, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Rumania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Thailand and Tobago, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, and Republic of Korea.

In addition, the Human Rights Convention on Forced Labor has the following nations as parties to it: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central Africa, Chad, China, Colombia, Cypress, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Cuba, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali Republic, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rivanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sweden, Syria, Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian S.S.R., United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Zambia, Guyana, and Republic of Germany.

THE CHICAGO CRIME COMMISSION SPOTLIGHT ON ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the Chicago Crime Commission has recently released a booklet entitled "Spotlight on Organized Crime—The Chicago Syndicate." It is noteworthy in several respects. I believe it will contribute significantly to the increasing momentum at all levels of government and among individual citizens of the effort to rid our society of the burden of organized crime.

The executive director of the commission, Virgil W. Peterson, outlines in the report of the challenge posed by organized crime to communities which find themselves infested by the mob. Those of my colleagues who have joined in the effort to arouse the public to the dangers of the mob will find his message particularly appropriate:

> [T]he successful prosecution of crime syndicate leaders, as highly important as that may be, is only one phase of the battle against organized crime. As long as citizens continue to patronize those activities which give the underworld wealth and power—gambling, vice, loan sharking—the battle against organized crime will never be won. When a citizen asks the usual question: "What are the authorities doing about organized crime?" he should be able to give a satisfactory answer to the query, "What am I doing about organized crime?"

As the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice pointed out, the basis for any successful effort to combat organized crime rests on an aroused citizenry. The Chicago Crime Commission report is unique, in my experience, in its response to the need to arouse and inform the public. The commission itself is a private-sector, nonpartisan, nonprofit volunteer citizen group. The publication of the report is timed to coincide with Chicago Law Enforcement Week, October 29 through November 4.

The report outlines recent progress made in successful prosecutions of mobsters, an encouraging record for which much credit is due the investigative and prosecutorial authorities responsible. While commending them, I sincerely hope they will redouble their efforts and increase even more the pressure on the mob. It will not only benefit Chicago, but the Nation as well.

Mr. President, I know there are many Senators and Congressmen who will wish access to this unique report. Not only in form but in substance can it be of great utility to local crime commissions throughout the country, and to the general public as well. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the report be inserted in its entirety in the Record. I commend it to all who are concerned with the problem of organized crime in our society.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Chicago Crime Commission Spotlight on Organized Crime—The Chicago Syndicate

CHICAGO LAW ENFORCEMENT WEEK OCTOBER 29 TO NOVEMBER 4, 1967

The Third Annual Chicago Law Enforcement Week, sponsored by the Chicago Crime Commission, is devoted to spotlighting organized crime in Chicago. We wish to express our gratitude to the law enforcement agencies who are supporting this effort:

Chicago Police Department.

Sheriff of Cook County.

State's Attorney of Cook County.

Cook County Suburban Chiefs of Police.

Illinois Crime Investigating Commission.

United States Government: Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Unit, Bureau of Narcotics, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Internal Revenue Service, Labor Department—Labor-Management and Welfare Pension Reports, Post Office Department, Secret Service, United States Attorney.

(Chicago Crime Commission, 79 W. Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603, Franklin 2-0101.

(The Chicago Crime Commission is a nonpartisan volunteer citizens organization founded in 1919 to fight crime in Greater Chicago. It is not supported by taxes, is not affiliated with any agency of government, nor is it financially supported by any of the civic or social agencies. The basic purpose of the Commission is to act as an independent investigative "watchdog" representative of the public interest.)

THE CHICAGO CRIME COMMISSION SPOTLIGHT ON ORGANIZED CRIME

This booklet—the first of its kind—is being published by the Chicago Crime Commission so that the honest citizen who wants to see the blight of organized crime driven from Chicago will accept the challenge of doing his part.

Organized crime is, plainly, a cancerous growth on our community. As the President's Commission on Crime has stated, the most remarkable aspect of the syndicate is that the public has tolerated it for so long. If an aroused citizenry demands action, it will go. If an apathetic citizenry tolerates it, it will stay.

The Chicago Crime Commission is dedicated to the goal of describing for the citizens of Chicago the impact that organized crime has on this community and everyone who lives in it.

We first document the victories that have recently been won. In the last 30 months a significant number of these hoodlums have been successfully prosecuted. We do this to demonstrate to our community that these parasites can be placed behind bars. Then, we list persons associated with the syndicate. We recognize that this is only a beginning. There are many others, and the Chicago Crime Commission will turn its spotlight on them in the months to come. Next, we describe the danger signs that indicate the hoodlums are moving in on a community. Finally, we list some of the businesses with which the syndicate is connected, directly or indirectly, through ownership or association.

First, let us define the syndicate. Syndicate, mob, outfit, Cosa Nostra—call it what you will—has numerous definitions. The economist may call it an illegal cartel; the student of political science or law may refer to it as a government within a government. We prefer to call it a cancer on the body of the cities of our nation where it exists. Whether tightly or loosely organized, the important fact is that it exists.

We will use for the syndicate a working definition that should be acceptable to all students of organized crime: It is that association of hoodlums, gangsters, corrupted public officials, hangers-on and fellow travelers who operate in multifarious activities, legal and illegal, for the express purpose of organized preying on the public. Its purposes are the gathering of immense profits and the power necessary to insure further profits without undue pressure from the authorities or legitimate competition. It is concerned not with the source of its profits—they may come from illegal or legal pursuits.

The syndicate does not consist only of the Accardos, Giancanas, Alderisios and Aiuppas. It is a social cancer whose membership is comprised mostly of leeches, parasites and fellow travelers. It is the conviction of the Chicago Crime Commission that the spotlight must be placed on the lowest level contributor to the workings of organized crime as well as the leaders who are prominently in the press. The leaders can operate only so long as they are insulated by those who do the dirty work and those who connive with them.

SUCCESSFUL PROSECUTIONS OF GANGSTERS

Before detailing the composition of the syndicate in Chicago, we emphasize that in recent years significant accomplishments have been recorded in Chicago's courts in the fight against the membership and fellow travelers of the syndicate. The accomplishments clearly illustrate that the syndicate can be prosecuted successfully. The historic "immunity" these parasites have seemed to enjoy can be penetrated and society can protect itself against the social cancer we call organized crime. The formula for success has not been the application of unique methods but rather has been the fundamental system whereby the investigative agencies, the prosecutor's office and a willing public have worked long and hard in common effort.

While there have been many successful prosecutions, the sentences, unfortunately, have frequently not been commensurate with the crime and the criminal. Far too little public attention is paid to the sentencing of syndicate members who have been successfully prosecuted. In some cases, such as those involving refilling of liquor bottles, providing false information on federal retail liquor dealer applications and hijackings with unspectacular sums involved, the sentences do not reflect awareness of the organized crime connection of the defendants or their businesses. Sentences like a $200 fine or an hour in the custody of the United States Marshal are not going to deter members of the syndicate. Neither will the imposition of a sentence to run concurrently with one earlier imposed, as occurred in a recent case involving a leading mobster.

Increased public attention to the sentencing of organized criminals is essential. The community, by its expressed interest, must do all that it can to demand sentences of sufficient impact to make career crime completely unprofitable.

The following convictions are a tribute to the dedicated investigators who uncovered the evidence, the conscientious prosecutors who persevered under ever tightening rules of evidence and procedures and especially to those few citizens who stepped forth to furnish the facts and testified as to the illegal activities that were the basis for these convictions.

The 1967 convictions

Anthony Menolascino, convicted of failure to pay federal wagering tax. Sentence: One year in prison.

Marshall Caifano, convicted of interstate fraud involving counterfeited stock certificates. Sentence: Twelve years in prison to run concurrently with the 10 year sentence he was already serving. (Caifano's co-defendants, John Fannon, Dominic Donato and Anthony Gallas were also found guilty and sentenced to three years and four years respectively.)

Albert Milstein, licensee of the Stop-Lite Tavern, convicted of possessing refilled liquor bottles. Sentence: Six months in jail and a $1,000 fine.

Ernest Infelice, Morris Saletko, Anthony Legato, Frank Gallo, Joseph Rossi, Thomas Daniel Bambulas, Emil Crovedi, Roy Nielson, Kenneth Bratko, John Anthony Borsellino, John Varelli and Albert Cardenas, convicted of conspiracy to possess goods stolen from interstate commerce. Sentences: 10 to 20 years. (These amounted to what is believed to be the greatest number of significant syndicate defendants and total number of years in sentences resulting from one trial.)

Richard Hauff, convicted of an interstate fraud violation. Sentence: Three years on each of five counts to run consecutively with a sentence imposed in 1966.

Sam Battaglia, Joseph Amabile and Dave Evans, convicted of conspiracy to commit extortion affecting interstate commerce. Sentences: Battaglia and Amabile, 15 years; Evans, 10 years.

William Messino, Joseph Lombardi, Jr., George Bravos and Sam Mecurio, convicted of aggravated kidnaping and related charges. Sentences: Messino, 10–30 years; Lombardi, 20 years; Bravos and Mecurio, 5–20 years.

Frank Parrillo, convicted of possession of refilled liquor bottles.

Joseph Iatarolo, George Victor Nasse, Orland David, Robert David and Herman David, convicted for auto theft conspiracy. Sentences: 3 to 5 years.

Pasquale Accettura, convicted of interstate transportation of a stolen motor vehicle. Sentence: 5 years.

Rocco Potenzo, convicted of failure to pay the retail liquor dealers' special tax. Sentence: $1,000 fine.

Anthony Rocco Silvestri, convicted on a charge of interstate transportation of stolen property. Sentence: 6 months in custody and 3½ years on probation.

James Vercillo and Frank J. Falbo, convicted for violations of the wagering tax laws. Sentence: 6 months in jail and 3 years probation.

John Fezekas, and Eugene Izzi, convicted on charges of interstate travel in aid of racketeering. Sentences: Fezekas, probation; Izzi, 3 years in custody of Attorney General.

The 1966 convictions

Hunter W. Hinson, Louis H. Sullivan and Doyle McGuire, convicted of interstate travel in aid of racketeering. Sentences: initially, 5 years but later reduced to 90 days.

Sheldon Teller and John D. Sullivan, convicted for violation of the Federal narcotics laws. Sentences: Teller, 18 years; Sullivan, 9 years.

Richard W. Hauff and Arthur N. Nasser, convicted of conspiracy in U.S. District Court. Sentences: 3 years.

Ernest Sansone, convicted of failing to register with Customs authorities before leaving the United States for Mexico. Sentence: 1 year.

Richard E. Gorman, convicted on charges of violations of the Internal Revenue code. Sentence: 3 years.

Anthony Maggio, charged with violation of a previous probation. Sentence: 1 year.

Vincent (the Saint) Inserro, convicted for failure to file income tax returns. Sentence: 2 years plus probation.

Leo Rugendorf and Larry Rosenberg, convicted for violation of the bankruptcy laws and interstate transportation of stolen motor vehicle laws. Sentences: 5 years in the custody of the Attorney General.

Josephine Pawlak, Charles Ross and Bernard Mayes, convicted of arson. Sentences: Pawlak, 2 to 8 years; Ross, 2 to 6 years; Mayes, 3 years probation.

Benjamin R. Stein, convicted on charges of making illegal gifts to union officials in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act. Sentence: 18 months.

Anthony R. Pinell, convicted of violating the Internal Revenue statutes. Sentence: probation 2 years, $2,000 fine.

Robert J. McDonnell, Ernest (Rocky) Infelice, Joseph (Cowboy) Mirro, Frank Santucci and Americo de Pietto, convicted on charges of conspiracy to transport stolen money orders in interstate commerce. Sentences: 5 years.

Rocco Pranno, Wayne Seidler and Peter Anderson, convicted for extortion and conspiracy. Sentences: Pranno, 15 years; Seidler, 5 years; Anderson, 3 years.

Jasper Campisi and Tony Cirignani were held in contempt of court and committed to Cook County Jail following their appearance before a Cook County grand jury where both men hid behind the Fifth Amendment.

Albert Roviaro, convicted on narcotics charge. Sentence: 10 years.

Pat Manno, Robert Wolcuff, Sanford Burton Wolcuff, John Lo Russo and Larry Freedman, convicted of violation of the bankruptcy act.

Murray Humphreys, indicted for perjury in his testimony before a Federal grand jury. Humphreys died before this indictment was prosecuted.

William Monaco and Robert Armidano were convicted for possessing a black powder bomb. Sentences: Monaco, 2 to 5 years; Armidano, 6 months jail and 4½ years probation.

Sam de Stefano convicted on a charge of conspiracy to commit perjury. Sentence: 3 to 5 years.

Joseph Jack Polito and Leo Enrico Casale, convicted for violations of a new Federal statute pertaining to sports bribery.

Felix (Milwaukee Phil) Alderisio, convicted for violation of the Federal extortion statute. Sentence: 4½ years.

Samuel Giancana, was sentenced to jail for contempt of the Federal grand jury. Served 1 year.

Willie Eugene Engram, convicted for violation of the Federal firearms act. Sentence: 5 years in custody of Attorney General.

Anthony Genna and Joseph Sarillo, convicted for battery and intimidation. Sentences: 6 months.

Also convicted during the past several years in various cases charging mail fraud, conspiracy, or bankruptcy fraud were Vincent Edward Winel, Morton Schulman, Allan Solomon, Alex Apuzzo, Al Hara, Robert Berk, Angelo Ferrara, Ronald Hamu, James E. Corcoran, Martin J. Santa, Joe Smith and George Dasho.

On February 24, 1966 the Cook County Criminal Court upheld the law creating the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission and that Commission's power to subpoena witnesses. The direct consequence of this ruling was that the following alleged juice racket gangsters will have to attend hearings before the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission when recalled or be in contempt of the Cook County Criminal Court: Fiore Buccieri, Frank Buccieri, Joseph Grieco, Chris Cardi, Dominic Carzulo, Joseph Gagliano, Peter Ori, Lenny Patrick and Anthony Spilotro.

During 1966, 224 convictions were obtained against defendants named in gambling indictments from Cook County. Pending in the Cook County courts are 130 wire room cases growing out of arrests made by the police.

In addition to its investigative work on many of the above cases, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been a major contributor to the program aimed at the gambling fraternity. During the past 4 years, over 140 raids have been conducted based on information supplied by the FBI. These raids have resulted in over 369 convictions, confiscation or destruction of one-half million dollars in gambling paraphernalia and over $150,000 in U.S. currency confiscated

THE CHICAGO SYNDICATE

An evaluation of the Chicago syndicate requires an effort at defining the upper echelon that really is the controlling force. In this upper echelon the Chicago Crime Commission includes the following names: Anthony Joseph Accardo, Gus Alex, Sam Battaglia, Fiore Buccieri, Jack P. Cerone, William Daddano, Sr., Paul "The Waiter" Ricca—DeLucia, Joseph DiVarco, Sam Giancana, Frank LaPorte, Ralph Pierce, Ross Prio, Edward Vogel.

Members of the Chicago crime syndicate draw their strength from loosely defined geographical areas of operation. While there is a continual shifting of boundaries and overlapping of areas of interest, the following are the major geographical areas of influence:

Chicago Loop—Gus Alex.

Chicago Near North Side—Joseph DiVarco, Joseph Arnold.

Chicago Far North and Northwest Suburbs—Leonard Patrick, Ross Prio.

Chicago Far West and West Suburbs—Sam Battaglia, William Daddano, Sam Giancana.

Chicago Southside—Ralph Pierce.

Chicago South and Southwest Suburbs—Frank LaPorte, Fiore Buccieri.

We have already defined the syndicate in Chicago as being a loose amalgamation ranging from the tightly knit hoodlums at the top down to the petty criminals who contribute so materially to its existence. There follows a group of persons who deserve to be identified with the syndicate because of their activities in recent years. They have one common tie—a contribution either direct or indirect to furthering the purposes of the syndicate. Some are clearly members of the Chicago crime syndicate, others are fellow travelers and still others are dupes of the "outfit." Many are the pawns that do the bidding of the mob, who break the laws and take the risks, all to insulate "Mr. Big" and his lieutenants from the courts.

(Note.—This list with ages and last known addresses does not purport to be all inclusive. Many names under indictment or investigation have of necessity been omitted.)

Able, Edward, 59, 6749 S. Laflin.

Accardo, Anthony Joseph, 61, 1407 N. Ashland Ave., River Forest.

Accetura, Pasquale, 38, 6137 S. Massasoit.

Aiuppa, Joseph, 60, 4 Yorkshire Drive, Elmhurst.

Alderisio, Felix (Phil), 56, 505 Berkeley, Riverside.

Alex, Gus, 53, 1150 North Lake Shore Drive.

Allegretti, James, 63, U.S. Penitentiary, Terre Haute.

Aloisio, William "Smokes", 60, 2434 North Lorel.

Altiere, Joseph, 33, 1543 W. Grenshaw.

Amabile, Joseph "Joe Shine", 51, 4N474 Linda Lane, Addison.

Anderson, Nelson, 51, 6242 S. Normal.

Anderson, Peter, 68, 1719 N. Mannheim Road, Stone Park.

Angilini, Donald, 41, 812 Euclid, Elmhurst.

Annoreno, Steve, 35, 938 Jackson, River Forest.

Arlotta, Joseph, 44, 721 Seward, Evanston.

Armidano, Robert, 26, 4715 W. Monroe Street.

Arnold, Joseph, 55, 2724 W. Winnemac.

Aureli, Frank A., 47, 5501 W. Washington.

Bacino, Phil, 65, 14 163rd St., Calumet City.

Bakes, Ned Charles, 63, 900 Lake Shore Drive.

Bacarella, Michael, 40, 1210 N. Parkside.

Backus, Joseph, 7607 Sheridan.

Bastone, Carmen, 36, 7207 Breen, Niles.

Batiste, Laurence, 118 E. 55th Street.

Battaglia, Sam, 62, 1114 N. Ridgeland, Oak Park.

Biasi, Dominick, 56, 1138 Park Ave., River Forest.

Brancatto, Dominick, 61, 1629 Sherwin.

Bravos, George, 54, 715 N. Pulaski.

Bravos, Nick, 53, 8831 Kathy Lane, Des Plaines.

Briatta, Louis, 59, 1074 Polk Street.

Bruscato, Frank, 39, 2417 Bryn Mawr.

Buccieri, Fiore, 62, 3004 S. Maple, Berwyn.

Buccieri, Frank, 48, 2020 Arthur, Park Ridge.

Buonaguidi, Lawrence, 51, 2618 N. Francisco.

Caifano, Marshall, 54, 222 N. Marion, Oak Park.

Campanelli, John, 49, 1401 Leymone, Melrose Park.

Campise, Jasper, 52, 1631 N. Newland.

Capone, Albert, 61, 1926 17th Ave., Melrose Park.

Capone, John Ermino, 63, 5427 Hyde Park.

Capone, Ralph, 74, Mercer, Wisconsin.

Cardenas, Albert L., 39, Route 20, Elgin.

Carrino, John A., 57, 7534 North Ave., Elmwood Park.

Caruso, Frank "Skid", 56, 215 West 23rd Street.

Caruso, Morris, 50, 218 W. 23rd St.

Catizone, Anthony, 40, 1710 17th Ave., Melrose Park.

Cernocky, Louis, 69, 111 Lincoln Ave., Fox River Grove.

Cerone, Frank John "Skip", 55, 4301 Judd, Schiller Park.

Cerone, Jack P., 53, 2000 N. 77th Ave., Elmwood Park.

Cesario, Sam, 49, 917 S. Bishop.

Ciapetta, Casper "John Carr", 49, 22 W. 326 Glen Park, Glen Elyn.

Ciconte, Frank D., 36, 1611 N. 23rd, Melrose Park.

Cimitile, John, 61, 1025 N. Parkside.

Cordovano, James R., 46, 462 W. 28th Place.

Corngold, Joseph, 71, 1828 S. 59th Ct., Cicero.

Cortina, Dominic P., 45, 2021 N. 76th Ave., Elmwood Park.

Coviello, Roy, 54, 6666 Devon.

Daddano, William, Sr., 54, 8109 W. 26th St., North Riverside.

David, Herman, 78, 14823 Grant St., Dolton.

David, Orland, 47, Frankfort, Ill.

David, Robert, 45, 14823 Grant St., Dolton.

De Biase, John "Bananas", 66, 638 N. Euclid, Oak Park.

De Chiaro, Guido, 61, 1725 Thatcher, Elmwood Park.

De George, James, Hancock, Wisc.

De Grazia, Rocco, 70, 171 N. 25th Ave., Melrose Park.

De Lucia, Paul, 71, 1515 N. Bonnie Brae, River Forest.

De Lulio, Leo E., 38, 608 S. May.

De Rosa, Anthony, 52, 4252 N. Whipple.

De Rose, Salvatore, 46, 1210 S. Austin, Cicero.

De Stefano, Mario, 52, 2613 S. Mayfair, Westchester.

De Stefano, Sam, 56, 1656 N. Sayre.

Di Bella, Dominick, 64, 2603 W. Wright, McHenry.

Di Caro, Charles "Specs", 55, 706 W. 26th Street.

Dine, John T., 54, 7445 S. Kingston.

Di Pietto, Americo, 51, U.S. Penitentiary, Leavenworth.

Di Varco, Joseph, 56, 4275 Jarvis, Lincolnwood.

Donato, Dominic, 52, 6107 W. 80th Place, Oak Lawn.

Ehrenberg, Sam, 64, 8238 E. Prairie, Skokie.

Eldorado, Anthony "Tony Pine", 51, 5643 W. Madison.

Emery, Ralph, 57, 848 Memorial Drive, Chgo. Heights.

Emody, Alfred, 43, 1017 W. 100th Place.

English, Charles, 52, 1131 N. Lathrop, River Forest.

English, Sam, 50, 1800 S. Austin, Cicero.

Eto, Ken, 47, 1034 Grandville, Park Ridge.

Eulo, Frank "Sharkey", 60, 1838 N. 77th Ct., Elmwood Park.

Falbo, Frank J., 42, 311 N. Pine.

Fannon, John, 46, 149 S.E. 14th Lane, Miami.

Fecaratto, John, 38, 201 Michaux Road, Riverside.

Ferriola, Joseph A., 270 South Cote Road, Riverside.

Fezekas, John, 57, 561 Ingram, Calumet City.

Fidanzi, Guido, 38, 220 Arquilla Drive, Chgo. Heights.
Frabotta, Albert "Obbie", 55, 3950 Lake Shore Drive.
Franze, Frank, 1729 Cambridge, Flossmoor.
Fratto, Frank, 60, 6300 N. Olcott.
Frisch, Frank W., 2600 W. 25th Street.
Gagliano, Joseph, 52, 1731 Thatcher, Elmwood Park.
Gallo, Frank K., 8307 Olcott, Niles.
Garambone, Nicholas, 3706 W. Huron.
Giancana, Charles, 45, Rt. #1 Lexington Field, Palatine.
Giancana, Sam, 58, 1147 S. Wenonah, Oak Park.
Gianola, Leonard, 57, 7344 N. Tripp, Lincolnwood.
Glimco, Joseph, 58, 629 Selbourne Rd., Riverside.
Glitta, Mike, 47, 238 N. Chester, Park Ridge.
Godfrey, Hyman, 59, 903 Newcastle, Westchester.
Grieco, Joseph, 39, 4600 N. Overhill, Norridge.
Griffin, Clarence, 41, 7144 S. East End.
Hauff, Richard, 33, Marina City Apartments.
Heckmyer, Max, 51, 6316 N. Mozart.
Infelice, Ernest Rocco, 47, 1407 LeMoyne, Melrose Park.
Inserro, Vincent Joseph, 56, 2236 Northgate, North Riverside.
Izzi, Eugene, 42, 13323 S. Commercial.
Kapande, James, 48, 3430 W. Parker.
Katz, Phil, 59, 2969 Sheridan Road.
Klotz, "Morris" Maurice, 54, 3110 N. Sheridan.
Kruse, Lester "Leslie Earl", 60, 8016 Prairie, Skokie.
Kushner, Henry "Red", 59, 2400 N. Lakeview.
La Porte, Frank, 66, 1730 Cambridge, Flossmoor.
Lardino, John, 60, 1201 Belleforte, Oak Park.
Larner, Hyman, 54, 1080 North Ave., Highland Park.
Leader, David, 33, 5650 Kerbs.
Le Gato, Anthony F., 37, 10340 S. Laramie, Oak Lawn.
Liebe, Gus, 67, 3644 Lake Shore Drive.
Lisciandrella, Frank, 49, 2136 W. Ohio.
Lombardi, Joseph, 38, 2210 Ohio.
Lo Russo, John, 43, 4558 S. LaCrosse, Mt. Prospect.
Luzi, Frank, 39, 212 W. 29th Place, South Chgo. Heights.
Mack, Florence, 39, 1619 N. Whipple.
Maggio, Donald, 40, 1624 N. Broadway, Melrose Park.
Mancini, Dominick, 36, 1629 N. Paulina.
Manfredi, Leo, 51, 1873 S. Austin, Cicero.
Maniscalco, Anthony, 5634 Goodman.
Manno, Pat, 34, 1101 Lyman, Oak Park.
Manzella, John, 44, 4503 N. Kedzie.
Martin, Fred, 43, 9326 N. Keeler, Skokie.
Matassa, John, 47, 1655 N. Nashville.
Mayes, Bernard, 36, 4833 Winthrop.
McDonnell, Robert, 42, 1246 Franklin Ave., River Forest.
McGuire, Doyle, 32, 2421 S. Sawyer.
McGuire, William, 44, 1419 W. Garfield.
Menolascino, Anthony, 35, 2541 N. 74th Court, Elmwood Park.
Mercurio, Sam, 44, 3357 N. Nottingham.
Messino, William J., 47, 2037 N. 77th Ave., Elmwood Park.
Meyers, Joseph "Yussie", 661 Sheridan.
Minkus, Sam, 50, 1127 W. Albion.
Mirro, James "Cowboy", 42, 1548 S. 61st Ct., Cicero.
Monaco, William, 28, 625 Washington, Oak Park.
Nasse, George Victor, 37, 5231 Sheridan Rd.
Nasser, Arthur N., 39, 616 W. Grace Street.
Nicoletti, Carl, 55, 5673 Washington Blvd.
Nicoletti, Charles, 50, 1638 N. 19th Ave., Melrose Park.
Nuccio, Dominic, 73, Webster Hotel.
Oberlander Aaron, 50, 40 East Oak.
Ori, Peter, 3817 Scott St., Schiller Park.
Orlando, Anthony, 52, 5040 S. LaCrosse.
Orlando, Frank, 48, 5626 N. Campbell.
Palermo, Nick, 58, 1201 N. Broadway, Melrose Park.
Panzica, Anthony, 53, 5612 St. Charles Rd., Berkeley.
Paternoster, Rocco, 48, 919 Cumberland, Park Ridge.
Patrick, Leonard, 54, 2820 W. Jarlath.
Photakis, George, 41, 3405 S. Cuyler, Berwyn.
Photakis, John, 47, 908 S. Keeler & 3405 S. Cuyler, Berwyn.
Pierce, Ralph, 62, 7743 S. Merrill.
Pinelli, Anthony, 67, 6054 School Street.
Policheri, Ben, 51, 8745 Oleander, Niles.
Potenzo, Rocco, 54, 8857 N. Kildare, Skokie.
Pranno, Rocco, 51, U.S. Penitentiary, Leavenworth.
Prio, Ross, 6485 Sauganash, Lincolnwood.
Raimondi, Matt, 43, 6360 N. Lowell.
Romanelli, Michael, 46, 619 S. Loomis & 625 S. Loomis.
Rosa, Sam "Slicker", 48, 805 N. 20th Ave., Melrose Park.
Rosenthal, Frank "Lefty", 38, Formerly of North Bay Village, Fla.
Reed, Robert J., 4121 N. Sheridan.
Ross, Charles, 35, 4628 Kenmore.
Rossi, Joseph, 30, 2216 S. Cicero Ave., Cicero.
Roviaro, Albert, 47, Cedar Lake, Indiana.
Rugendorf, Leo, 52, 4020 Chase Ave., Lincolnwood.
Ruthstein, Milton, 58, 7823 Jeffrey.
Saletko, Morris "Maesh Baer", 52, 4255 Chase Ave., Lincolnwood.
Salvatore, Rocco, 56, 1114 N. Ridgeland Ave., Oak Park.
Sansone, Ernest, 69, 6860 N. Loron.
Santucci, Frank, 45, 13 Pulaski Rd., Calumet City.
Sarillo, Joseph, 28, 4830 W. Thomas.
Saulters, Jean B., 43, 8145 S. Houston.
Sawyer, Harold, 44, 5630 N. Fairfield.
Schubert, Jerry, 2906 W. 82nd Street.
Schuster, Simon, 47, 1691 Berkeley, Highland Park.
Seidler, Wayne, 38, 10025 Grand Ave., Franklin Park.
Seritella, Chris, 46, 719 N. Kenneth.
Shapiro, Helene, 26, 5173 Hollywood.
Smith, Alyce M., 39, 4116 N. Damen.
Smith, Arthur, 36, 5234 S. Michigan.
Spadavicchio, Joseph, 39, 7633 W. Armitage, Elmwood Park.
Spilotro, Anthony J., 29, 1102 Maple, Oak Park.
Stein, Benjamin R., 61, 3300 N. Lake Shore Drive.
Sullivan, John D., 39, 5234 S. Dorchester.
Sullivan, Louis H., 33, 2822 S. Sawyer.
Szumal, Ray, 38, 6347 S. Lamon.
Teller, Sheldon R., 47, 9736 S. Longwood Drive.
Tocco, Albert Caesar, 37, 20507 Dutra Ave., Chicago Heights.
Tolomeo, Phil "Philly Beans," 40, 1829 N. Thatcher, Elmwood Park.
Torello, James "Turk," 36, 1836 S. 60th Court, Cicero.
Tornabene, Anthony, 49, 8 West Polk.
Tornabene, Frank, 51, 6605 N. Rockwell.
Tornabene, Louis, 52, 7130 Euclid Avenue.
Tufanelli, George "Babes," 71, 11860 S. Bell.
Varelli, John, 41, 1519 Bonnie Brae, River Forest.
Vercillo, James, 52, 1537 N. 17th Ave., Melrose Park.
Visco, Nick, 58, 7139 Milwaukee Avenue, Niles.
Vogel, Edward, 73, 7730 N. Milwaukee Ave., Niles.
Volpe, Dominick, 51, Plum Grove Estates, Palatine.
Williams, James "Kid Riviera," 45, 8005 S. Calumet.
Wolcoff, Robert, 32, 10081 Frontage Rd., Skokie.
Wolcoff, Sanford Burton, 29, 555 W. Cornelia.
Yaras, David, 53, 3600 N. Lake Shore Drive.
Zapas, Gus, 50, 4900 Morse, Skokie.

THE NINE DANGER SIGNS OF THE SOCIAL CANCER KNOWN AS ORGANIZED CRIME

There are nine recognizable signs that organized crime is moving in on a community:

Social acceptance of hoodlums in decent society.

Your community's indifference to ineffective local government.

Notorious mobster personalities in open control of businesses.

Deceptive handling of public funds.

Interest at very high rates to poor risk borrowers (the juice loan).

Close association of mobsters and local authorities.

Arson and bombings.

Terrorized legitimate businesses.

Easily found gambling, narcotics and prostitution.

We have referred to organized crime as a social cancer because of the consequences to a community that its continuing growth promises. The man on the street should recognize these danger signs as leading to potential trouble; we shall examine them briefly.

Social Acceptance. Social acceptance of hoodlums in decent society allows the gangster to receive the benefits of group living without sharing its responsibilities. Persons who consort with the hoodlums close their eyes to the impact they have on decent society. Take taxes as an example—you pay yours, but what about the hoodlum who lives down the street? If he is a businessman, did he take your money for state sales tax and then fail to turn it over to the state? What would your estimate be of increased revenues if all the hood-dominated enterprises paid their fair share of taxes? Is that "golfing partner" at the country club the one who receives the ultimate profit from 200 teenagers hooked on dope this year? Is that "part-time" legitimate businessman the one who gave the nod that resulted in one of the 1,000 gangland slayings? Do not associate with hoodlums.

Your Local Government. Has your community become indifferent to ineffective local government? Weak local government is the environment in which organized crime flourishes. Know your local government, participate in it and do not allow it to be ineffective.

Notorious Mobsters' Controlling Business. Notorious mobster personalities in open control of businesses that may be listed in a "front's" name is a fairly strong sign that your community is being infiltrated by the mob. When you see the man who cannot legally own a tavern or bar keeping his hands in the cash register, telling the employees what to do and making the purchases for the business it isn't because of special business skills. When you see this phenomenon ask yourself whether you are really interested in furthering the cause of organized crime, for this may be exactly what your dollars are doing. Refuse to patronize hoodlum businesses.

Deceptive Handling of Public Funds. Deceptive handling of public monies is not a new toy to the mob. One certainty is that it is quite difficult for an honest audit of the books to be made when the books are always in someone's brief case and for some odd reason this is the only set of records in existence. Again, take part in local government and keep the mobsters out.

Interest at High Rates. The juice loan follows the poor-risk gambler who cannot borrow from any other source to make another bet or roll another seven. Sometimes the unsuspecting find themselves in the grip of the "six for five" weekly interest rate loan shark. The majority of those hooked on the juice have no other source for financial assistance. Refuse to deal with these men and notify the authorities when you see them operate.

Close Association of Mobsters and Public Officials. When mobsters and public officials are so brazen as to meet in public without an effort at explanation, the tie between them is strong. For a long period of time certain public officials have walked both sides of the street. The Chicago Crime Commission will call to the attention of the news media those continuing associations in the future as we develop them and as they are reported to us by the public. Inform the Chicago Crime Commission of those you observe.

Arson and Bombing. Arson and bombing are not hallmarks of healthy competition. These tactics are used to assure a noncompetitive market for the products and services of the syndicate. Report any knowledge you have of these tactics to the authorities.

Terrorized Legitimate Businesses. Extortion, labor racketeering and all other forms of violence in the business world are tools members of the syndicate have used to gain an interest in a business or to extract payoffs from the businessman who deals with them. Report threats promptly.

Easily Found Crime. Where gambling, narcotics and prostitution prevail, the mob is at work. The profits from these vices—contributed by the public—make up the bank account out of which the mob payroll is met, the official is bribed, our system is corrupted and the empire of organized crime gets its basic strength. When Fred J. Cook wrote "A Two Dollar Bet Means Murder," he described the syndicate lifeline. Do not patronize the bookie, the dope peddler, the prostitute—when you see them operate, notify the authorities.

These are the signs of the organized crime cancer. If you feel it has a grip on your community and want assistance, call the Chicago Crime Commission.

LEGITIMATE BUSINESS AND THE HOODS

The huge revenue the crime syndicate receives from gambling and other illicit enterprises has been used to infiltrate almost every type of legitimate business. Powerful underworld leaders have engaged in the food manufacturing, distribution and sales business, automobile sales, the steel industry, oil wells, dairy business, breweries, liquor sales and distribution, stock brokerage houses, banks, savings and loan associations, restaurants, nightclubs, real estate, coin machine business, garbage collection, trucking, insurance, travel agencies, parking lots, shopping centers, television and radio manufacturing. There are few types of businesses or industries that have not been touched at one time or another by organized crime investments and there have been instances where crime syndicates have controlled substantial segments of the economy. In numerous instances the leaders of organized crime have controlled labor unions. And in whatever activity organized crime engages, legitimate or illicit, its method of operation is the same—the maintenance of a monopoly through extortion and violence or imposing the fear of violence.

The concern the hood has relative to the internal revenue laws—particularly since the fall of "Scarface" Al Capone—along with the many advantages to be gained from undisclosed ownership of a business has resulted in the concealment of the organized crime element names from most of the businesses they own or control. This concealment through the use of the "respectable" front as the owner is a device that results in the unaware public pouring more and more money into the coffers of the mob.

The Chicago Crime Commission feels that the public should know those businesses in which the hoodlums have an ownership interest as well as those where the facts show some association between the owners or operators and known members of the syndicate.

The following lists are set forth to illustrate the variety of enterprises involved and are not intended to be all inclusive.

I

Businesses that have ownership in some degree listed in the name of a member of the Chicago Crime Syndicate:

Apex Amusement Corporation, 7730 North Milwaukee Avenue, Niles, Illinois: Owns and installs juke boxes in various locations throughout this area with the revenue derived from the play of the machines being divided between Apex and the location owner or lessee. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect the officers of Apex to be Julius Zimberoff and Edward Vogel. The 1967 directors are Edward D. Vogel, Julius Zimberoff and William W. Vogel. In 1950, in hearings then being conducted before the United States Senate Committee headed by Senator Kefauver, Edward Vogel was identified as being in control of all juke boxes in the Uptown District of Chicago, Cicero and other parts of Cook County, Illinois. In 1963 this same Vogel was identified by the United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations as being a member of the Chicago crime syndicate.

B & B Finance Company, 1272–78 North Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Shares this address with Moeller Brothers, Inc., furniture store. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect the B & B officers as follows: James Bianco, president; Fiore Buccieri, secretary; and Melvin R. Parnell, registered agent. James Bianco is listed as president of Moeller Brothers, Inc. The 1963 Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the United States Senate identified Fiore Buccieri as a member of the Chicago crime syndicate.

B & D Acceptance Company, Inc., 2311 North Western Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Is a finance company dealing with local and some transient trade. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Charles English as president and Lorraine English as Secretary. Lormar Acceptance Company, Inc., and Lormar Distributing Company, Inc., are listed at the same address with the same officers. The United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations in October, 1963 identified Charles English as a top west side juke box racketeer in the Chicago crime syndicate. Charles English is married to Lorraine English.

Commercial Phonograph Survey, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Illinois: At the time this business was incorporated it had a listed purpose to promote understanding and public relations between location owners and operators of juke boxes and recorded music. The Illinois Secretary of State's records for the year 1965 revealed that the officers of the corporation were Michael Dale, president; Frank Smith, secretary; and Joseph Gagliano, treasurer. In 1965 this company was dissolved as a corporation but after that date there appeared in the Chicago papers an assumed name notice where the name Commercial Phonograph Survey, located at 25 East Chestnut Street, was reported along with the "true names and addresses of owners" being Michael Dale, 25 East Chestnut Street, and Joseph Gagliano, 25 East Chestnut Street. Frank Smith is a brother of Fred Smith who was reported along with Joseph Gagliano as being members of the Chicago crime syndicate by the 1963 United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee.

El-Car International Limited, 5939½ West Roosevelt Road, Cicero, Illinois: Manufactures and wholesales advertising specialties which commercial concerns buy to advertise and also as gifts for their employees. This firm was incorporated in Illinois in 1966 with the following officers: John Carr, president; Joseph Corngold, vice president; and Joseph Elkes, secretary-treasurer. John Carr, known to police authorities as Kasper J. Ciapetta, has been arrested several times on gambling charges. Joseph Corngold was identified by Louis Campagna (a top syndicate hood now dead), who testified before the Kefauver Senate Committee, that he was a partner in the El Patio Club (prominent Cicero gambling establishment) with Joseph Corngold. Corngold has been identified by other hoods as being a partner in several gambling establishments. Carr and Corngold are brothers-in-law.

H & H Restaurant, 208 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois: The 1966 records of the City of Chicago Collector's Office reflect that the licensee of the H & H Restaurant was Morris Saletko. Saletko is presently under a ten-year sentence for conspiracy in a syndicate oriented theft from interstate shipment ring that netted nearly $1,000,000 in merchandise for the thieves. Saletko is still on the street pending the outcome of his appeal. It is interesting that during his trial he stated that he earns $60 per week as a cashier in the H & H Restaurant. An astounding fact is that this wage has Saletko living in a $55,000 home in Lincolnwood. The 1963 Senate Permanent Subcommittee listed Saletko as a member of the crime syndicate.

J & R Cleaners, 6410 West Roosevelt Road, Oak Park, Illinois: Operates self-service dry cleaners and laundries in the Chicago area. Other locations are 653 North Cicero Avenue, 3659 West Division Street, 4124 West 63rd Street and 6240 West Cermak Road, Berwyn. The owners and partners of this company in March, 1967 were Otello Ramelli and Joseph Farriola. Farriola is also known as Joe Ferriola and Joe Negal. Ramelli is married to Fiore Buccieri's niece. Joseph Ferriola was named in 1963 by the United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations as being a member of the Chicago syndicate.

Hyde-Park Insurance Agency, Inc., 1660 East 55th Street, Chicago, Illinois: The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect the officers of this corporation to be Hyman Godfrey, president, and Maxwell Fields, secretary and treasurer. An April, 1963 police raid of the El Patio, 5015 Cermak Road, Cicero, Illinois, resulted in Godfrey's arrest. A surveillance of a meeting during August, 1963 of leading members of the Chicago crime syndicate—Tony Accardo, Frank Ferraro, Gus Alex, Ralph Pierce, John Cerone and Joseph Glimco—developed that Godfrey acted as the courier with telephone messages for the meeting hoods. Hyman Godfrey, whose true name is Gottfried, was identified as a member of the Chicago syndicate by the 1963 Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the United States Senate.

Lormar Acceptance Company, Inc., 2311 North Western Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Is a finance company which was listed in the 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records as having Charles English, president and registered agent, and Lorraine English, secretary. At the address listed for this corporation are the B & D Acceptance Company, Inc., and the Lormar Distributing Company, Charles English was identified as a member of the Chicago syndicate by the United States Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in 1963.

Shirts Unlimited, 843 North State Street, Chicago, Illinois: Is a men's haberdashery open to the public. The State of Illinois Department of Revenue, under Sales Tax No. 35728, reveals the owners to be Joseph Arnold and Joseph DiVarco. The United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in 1963 named Joseph Arnold and Joseph DiVarco as members of the Chicago crime syndicate.

II

Businesses that have an indirect connection with someone in the Chicago crime syndicate. This connection may be ownership of the business by a relative of one of the Chicago crime syndicate, continued business dealings with members of the Chicago crime syndicate, personal associations between the owners and members of the Chicago crime syndicate, use of premises as meeting places for members of the outfit or employment of an active member of the Chicago crime syndicate.

Alhara Management Corporation, 5206 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois: builds hotels and motels under the name of the Trans-American Construction Company, Inc. They are then managed by the captioned corporation. Both businesses are listed at the Sheridan Road address. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records list the officers of the subject corporation as Harry Boshes, president; Albert M. Nadolna, secretary.

Historically, Boshes has been identified with former North Clark Street strip tease joints as an operator having spent many years in this activity. In 1950 he was charged with beating two conventioneers who protested paying $28 for eight drinks. The battery was alleged to have been done with a baseball bat at the French Casino on North Clark Street. The license was revoked shortly thereafter and upon re-opening the name Albert Nadolna appeared as the new operator.

During the investigation of the Leo Foreman murder in 1963 the investigators discovered Boshes' name in the exclusive diary maintained by the murdered juice racket collector.

Jimmy Allegretti and Joey DiVarco were seen giving operating commands to Boshes when he was in the North Clark Street area. These are the same Allegretti and DiVarco who are listed in the Permanent Subcommittee records of the United States Senate as being members of the organized crime syndicate in Chicago.

B–G Builders, 5420 North Harlem Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records list Sander Caravello, president; Katherine Miller, secretary.

Caravello has been arrested numerous times and in 1937 he was sentenced to prison for five years for conspiracy. In August, 1965 Sander Caravello was arrested along with Joseph Lombardi, Sam Mercurio, George Bravos and Willie Messino and all were charged with aggravated kidnapping, aggravated assault, intimidation and conspiracy to commit those crimes. This Willie Messino was identified as a member of the Chicago crime syndicate by the United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee in 1963. The above juice trial resulted in a guilty verdict being returned against Lombardi, Mercurio, Bravos and Messino with a not guilty verdict returned against Caravello. During testimony at the trial, victims of these crimes testified that they were taken to the offices of B–G Builders where the demands for juice payments were made.

Belcore Electric Construction Company, Melrose Park, Illinois: The Illinois Secretary of State's records reveal that Anthony J. Belcore, reported in 1961 as owner of captioned company, is director of the Santa Fe Saddle and Gun Club. The Santa Fe Saddle and Gun Club is located on property purchased by convicted bookmaker Donald J. Angelini. Angelini and his wife deeded the property to Anthony Eldorado. Eldorado is a convicted armed robber and was identified in the hearings on organized crime before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee in 1963 as being a member of the Chicago crime syndicate. The taxes on the Santa Fe Gun Club property are paid by Joseph Scaramuzzo.

Investigators reported that Anthony Belcore was seen in the company of Frank and Fiore Buccieri departing for a fishing village in Montana, in October, 1966. Both Buccieris were identified before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee as being members of the Chicago crime syndicate.

In March, 1967 the Santa Fe Saddle and Gun Club sponsored a dinner dance at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in Chicago and some of the individuals reportedly in attendance were Joseph Aiuppa, Ross Prio, Joey DiVarco. Dominic DiBella and Willie Messino, all having been identified as members of the Chicago crime syndicate before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee in 1963.

Bern Electric Company, Inc., 5937 W. Grand Ave., Chicago, Illinois: The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records list Bernard Grizaffi as president; Catherine Marchionne, secretary; Bernard Grizaffi, Sr., registered agent. Grazaffi senior died in 1960.

This company was involved in construction of homes for Jack Cerone and Frank Cerone. Bernard Grizaffi was a vice president of Eden Land and Building Company, 1963, at the same time that Frank V. Pantaleo appeared as Eden president. Frank Pantaleo is the owner of Frank V. Pantaleo Company which supplied the concrete work in the construction of the above homes. Pantaleo was once a partner with Charles "Cherry Nose" Gioe and Pantaleo was also active in the construction and remodeling of homes for such syndicate members as Anthony Accardo and Joseph Glimco. Eden Land and Building Company in 1965 listed Sam N. Syracuse and Alfonse J. Cardamone as partners. Cardamone opened a west suburban bank account under the name of the Northern Illinois Music Company listing himself, Joseph Glimco and Sam Battaglia as officers of the company.

Bernard Grizaffi and Sam Giancana's chauffeur, Dominic Blasi, were shown in a Northwest News photograph welcoming new-comers into their Schiller Park, Illinois, home.

Chicago Heights Distributing Company, 1524 Union Street, Chicago Heights, Illinois: Sells liquor to Chicago Heights and Kankakee, Illinois, taverns. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Sam Maculuso, president, 261 Highland Drive, Chicago Heights, Illinois; Nick Costello, secretary, 1412 Schilling Ave., Chicago Heights, Illinois; and James Giambrone, principal agent, 956 W. Webster Ave., Chicago, Illinois.

In August, 1961 Nick P. Costello attended the Accardo-Palermo wedding. During the trial of Anthony J. Accardo for violation of the income tax laws, John Maculuso testified as a witness, relating that he had purchased beer from Accardo during the time Accardo was supposedly a salesman for Premium Brewery.

Fullerton Wholesale Tobacco Distributor, 2634–38 West Fullerton Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Does business out of the same address as Zenith Vending Corporation. It deals in the distribution of tobacco products as indicated by its company name. The officers are Charles Buffano, president; Kenneth S. Leonard, treasurer; and Ben King, secretary.

Charles Buffano was manager for the Suburban Cigarette Service headed by Ralph Capone for twenty years.

Leonard is also president of the Zenith Vending Corporation and when interviewed by a metropolitan newspaper reporter in 1963 he admitted that Chicago hoodlum Ross Prio was employed by him.

Interest in this case is directed to the Illinois statutes which provide for a rebate to wholesale tobacco dealers up to and including the first $700,000 purchased. After the $700,000 figure is reached the rebate decreases.

Gildom Cleaners, 3335 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Is operated by Dominic Carzoli. In 1966 he was arrested in a police handbook and wire room raid. Later in 1966 he was arrested again as a keeper of a gambling house in Chicago.

Records of the Illinois Secretary of State's office reveal that a Dominic Carzoli is president of the Leisure Lads Social Club which surprisingly is located at the same address as the cleaners. A telephone call to the Leisure Lads Social Club listing is answered as the Gildom Cleaners number.

Grizaffi and Falcone Contractors, Inc., 5937 West Grand Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: is a real estate subdivider, developer and general contractor. The officers of this corporation are the same as the officers of Bern Electric Company, Inc., previously mentioned. These two firms share the same office residence number.

Kankakee Distributing Company, 136 West Charles Road, Kankakee, Illinois: The principals of this corporation are the same as the Chicago Heights Distributing Company mentioned previously. President Sam Macaluso associates with Joseph Costello, a well known Chicago Heights hoodlum. He is also known to have associated with Americo Amadio who was closely connected with the Calumet City, Illinois, strip tease joints—Club 21 and Derby Club—which were shut down by authorities in Calumet City, Illinois. Amadio is associated with Babe Tuffanelli and Frank LaPorte, leading members of the Chicago crime syndicate in the southern Cook County area.

Leonard Wholesale Tobacco Distributor, 2634–38 West Fullerton Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: is another of the wholesale tobacco distributing companies operating out of the same address with the same principals as the Zenith Vending Corporation. Again, the $700,000 figure at which tax rebates are decreased is mentioned.

Mayo Plumbing Company, Inc., 1827 North 25th Avenue, Melrose Park, Illinois: Is a successful plumbing and heating contracting firm who lists the officers as James Langone, Helen Severino and Jean Buonomo. Formerly the company was known as the Melrose Park Plumbing and Heating Company owned by Nick Palermo. Palermo has long been an associate of Chicago crime syndicate members. James Langone is married to Palermo's daughter. Helen Severino is his niece and Jean Buonomo has been an employee of his for a long time.

Maxwell Liquors Incorporated, 915–17 West Maxwell Street, Chicago, Illinois: Was incorporated in 1958 and lists Concetta Briatta as owner of the premises. She is the wife of Louis Briatta. Briatta has been observed in the past in the company of such Chicago crime syndicate members as Gus Alex and was identified by the United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in 1963 as being a member of the Chicago crime syndicate.

Milano Incorporated, 1169 North State Street, Chicago, Illinois: Is a restaurant under the direction of Anthony Amadeo, Ruth Amedeo and Louise Grieco. During the years, numerous surveillances have reflected that this restaurant has been frequented by such Chicago crime syndicate members as Dominic DiBella, Dominic Brancata, Albert Frabotta, Charles English, James Allegretti and Marshall Caifano, the latter two presently receiving their culinary appointments under the United States Bureau of Prisons chefs.

Moeller Brothers, Inc., 1272 North Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Is a retail furniture store open to the general public that listed its officers as James Bianco, Salvatore J. Bianco and Melvin R. Parnell to the Illinois Secretary of State's office in 1966. The same James Bianco and Melvin R. Parnell are listed as officers of the B & B Finance Company which is listed at the same Milwaukee Avenue address. In 1963 a major appliance company awarded six (6) all-expense-paid tour tickets to Madrid, Spain to Moeller Brothers, Inc. and James Bianco, as a sales promotional prize. Two of the six tickets were used by "Milwaukee" Phil Alderisio and Frank Buccieri.

Northwestern Candy & Tobacco Company, 3651 West Armitage Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: is a wholesaler of candy and tobacco products to retail businesses and vending machine operators. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect George Colucci, president and registered agent, and Vito

Colucci, secretary. George Colucci is a brother of Joseph Colucci who was identified before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Investigations as a member of the Chicago crime syndicate.

Nu-Way Contracting Company, 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois: is a plumbing contractor located at 655 North Kedzie Avenue. On November 27, 1944 the company was originally incorporated as the Nu-Way Plumbing Service, Inc., with the incorporators being Henry Orth and Leslie Kruse. The 1967 annual report continues the name Henry Orth as president and director.

At the same Kedzie Avenue address is the Nu-Way Food Service Equipment Company, Inc., which company reflects the same officers as does the Nu-Way Contracting Company.

Frank V. Pantaleo Company, 8300 Center Avenue, River Grove, Illinois: is active in the concrete construction business. Frank V. Pantaleo, the proprietor, resides at 1141 Fair Oaks Avenue, Oak Park, Illinois.

Pantaleo has long been associated with individuals high in Chicago crime syndicate circles. In 1954 he was a partner with Charles "Cherry Nose" Gioe. Since that time he has been associated with Eden Land and Building Corporation who listed as a partner Alphonse J. Cardamone, self-admitted associate of Joey Glimco and Sam Battaglia. Pantaleo has done construction work for such Chicago crime syndicate hoodlums as Anthony Accardo and Joey Glimco.

Pyramid Exploration Limited, 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois: Engages in the development of general oil and gas drilling interests. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Stanley R. Kielmar, Jr., as president and director of the company. Stanley Kielmar was indicted with Marshall Caifono by a Federal grand jury in 1966, charged with conspiracy and fraud in the interstate transporting of certain forged certificates. He was subsequently acquitted.

In October, 1966 the following persons departed from O'Hara Field for a fishing village in Montana: Fiore Buccieri, Frank Buccieri, Tony Belcore, Stanley Kielmar and others.

Regal Vending Company, 754 Grant Street, Chicago Heights, Illinois: Is a cigarette vending company. During the 1960 income tax trial of Anthony Accardo, Joseph Lawrence Costello testified that he and one Ralph Emery started the subject company. Ralph Emery was identified in the 1959 Senate Rackets Committee investigation as a top crime syndicate boss. These Senate Rackets Committee investigators developed information linking Regal Vending Company's origins to Frank LaPorte and Frank Franze.

Sands Motel, 5301 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois: Is one of a group of hotels-motels controlled by the Alhara Management Corporation with a separate corporation listing Foster Lake Realty Company, Inc. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Harry Boshes and Albert Nadolna as officers in both the Alhara Management Corporation and the Foster Lake Realty Company, Inc.

Santa Fe Saddle and Gun Club, 91st Street & County Line Road, Hinsdale, Illinios: A non-profit organization incorporated in 1962. Santa Fe Saddle and Gun Club sponsored a dinner dance at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in March, 1967 at which time one of the largest assemblages of syndicate members was observed by Chicago authorities.

Snack Time, 4100 Roosevelt Road, Hillside, Illinois: Previously known as the Slo-Dawn Restaurant, currently is operated by Damian Constantine as a short-order type restaurant. In November, 1961 Chicago syndicate member Sam DeStefano purchased this restaurant. The following year there was a change in the licensee from the niece of DeStefano; however, the City Clerk's office records in Hillside reflect that the taxes on the building are paid by Sam DeStefano.

Spa Motel, 5414 North Lincoln Avenue, Chicago, Illinios: Is another of the hotels-motels owned by the Trans-American Construction Company, Inc., and controlled by the Alhara Management Corporation. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect the officers of these two corporations to include the names Harry Boshes and Albert Nadolna. The lounge in the Spa Motel was known to authorities as a hangout for Arthur "Boodie" Cowan who was recently found murdered, the body being in the trunk of his auto.

Thunderbird Motel, 7501 South Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois: Is one of the group of hotels-motels controlled by the Alhara Management Corporation, this one under a separate corporation listing—The Thunderbird, Inc. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Harry Boshes and Albert Nadolna as officers of both corporations.

Tides Motel, 5230 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois: Is another of the group of hotels-motels owned and controlled by Alhara Management Corporation, this one under the separate corporation listing of Foster Lake Realty, Inc. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Harry Boshes and Albert Nadolna as officers in both corporations.

Town Parking Stations, Inc., 332 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: controls parking lots at the following Loop locations: 410-16 South Wabash Avenue, 329 South Wabash Avenue and 401 South Wabash Avenue. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect the following persons as officers of this corporation: Alex B. Ponzio, president; Marie Ann Ponzio, secretary, treasurer, and registered agent, both at 332 South Michigan Avenue.

A newspaper clipping from the June 29, 1966 Chicago Daily News reported that the Monroe-Dearborn Stations, Inc., headed by Alex B. Ponzio, had planned to build a 5-story garage at 55-57 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Illinois.

Alex Ponzio and Paul Richard DeLucia, a son of Paul DeLucia, also known as Paul "The Waiter" Ricca, are assocated with Town Parking Stations, Inc., and are believed to hold principal positions with Renee and Associates, Inc., the owner of parking lots at 328 and 339 South Wabash Avenue which are leased to Airport Parking Company of America.

An automobile leased from Mars Oldsmobile by the Town Parking Stations, Inc., and driven by Paul DeLucia, Jr., was observed at the Santa Fe Saddle and Gun Club dinner-dance held at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in March, 1967.

The Marie Ann Ponzio who is listed in the records of the Secretary of State as an officer of Town Parking Stations, Inc., is a daughter of Paul DeLucia.

Trans-American Construction Company, 5206 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois: was the general contractor during the construction of the following motels: Dunes Motel, Thunderbird Motel, Tides Motel, Sands Motel, Delta Motel and 50th On The Lake Motel, and the American Motel of Gary, Indiana. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reveal the following officers for the subject company: Harry Boshes, president, and Albert Nadolna, Secretary.

Union Insurance Company of Illinois, 1221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois: is an agency that operates as a broker in the insurance field whose principal business is life and health insurance of union and welfare funds. Parent companies of the subject agency are the Health Welfare Agency of Georgia and the Costal Union Insurance Agency. The Illinois Department of Insurance records list the partners of this agency as Rose Dorfman and Allen Dorfman, her son, Allen Dorfman is the stepson of Paul "Red" Dorfman who was identified in the Senate Rackets Committee hearings as the "corrupt labor leader who introduced James R. Hoffa to the midwest mob." Testimony before the Senate Committee hearings indicated that James R. Hoffa had personally selected this company to handle the Teamsters Union health and welfare insurance.

In April, 1964 Allen Dorfman and his stepfather, Paul Dorfman, were indicted by the Federal Government on charges of attempting to extort $100,000 from a millionaire San Francisco insurance broker.

Unique Import Trading Company, 1644 North Honore Street, Chicago, Illinois: Shares office space with its affiliate, the M & E Sales Company. Unique operates as a consumer mail order firm with a mailing list of approximately 300,000 names.

The 1967 credit report reflects the subject company was believed to be incorporated January 3, 1967 with the following officers: Ronald Yaras, president; S. Z. Green, vice president; and Leonard Yaras, secretary-treasurer. S. Z. Green is believed to be identical with Sherman Z. Greenberg whose arrest record reflects a conviction for forgery in California in 1963. Ronald and Leonard Yaras are sons of David Yaras who was listed in the 1963 Senate Permanent Subcommittee records as a member of the Chicago crime syndicate.

Universal Vending Corporation, 2634–38 West Fullerton Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Operates as a cigarette vending machine company. The officers, according to the 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records, include Charles Buffano, president; Kenneth S. Leonard, treasurer and registered agent. This company is located at the same address with the Zenith Vending Company. Charles Buffano, prior to the incorporation of the subject company in 1963, was a manager of the Suburban Cigarette Service for Ralph Capone for many years. Leonard is the president of the Zenith Vending Company and in an interview with a Chicago Tribune reporter in 1963 admitted that Ross Prio was employed by him.

Wilco Tobacco Company, 2634–38 West Fullerton Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Is a cigarette vending company and a subsidiary of the Universal Vending Corporation located at the same address. The Universal Vending Corporation purchased the cigarette vending machines and routes from Wilco Tobacco and Music Company, Joliet, Illinois, in 1966. The Universal Vending Corporation uses the name of Wilco Tobacco Company, division of Universal Vending Corporation.

Zenith Vending Corporation, 2634–38 West Fullerton Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Operates as a vending company handling cigarettes, candy, soda and coffee. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Kenneth S. Leonard, president; Ben King, secretary; and Cyrus Garfield, registered agent. Garfield was murdered in 1963. The 1966 records continue to carry his name as the registered agent.

In a 1963 interview with a Chicago Tribune reporter Leonard is quoted as saying, "It is no secret that Ross Prio works for us." A July 31, 1967 Chicago Sun-Times news clipping reports that Ross Prio is identified as being on the payroll of the Attendant Service Corporation of which Kenneth Leonard is listed as president.

THE CHALLENGE

Virgil W. Peterson, Executive Director of the Chicago Crime Commission, poses the challenge to the community in these terms:

"Organized crime will cease to exist as a major problem in this country only when the vast majority of people merely assume the duties of good citizenship. Obviously included in such duties are the willingness to report information of known illicit activities to the authorties, the appearance as a witness when necessary before a grand jury or trial jury, service on a jury when called and the impartial appraisal of the evidence without fear or favor.

"But the successful prosecution of crime syndicate leaders, as highly important as that may be, is only one phase of the battle against organized crime. As long as citizens continue to patronize those activities which give the underworld wealth and power—gambling, vice, loan sharking—the battle against organized crime will never be won. When a citizen asks the usual question, 'What are the authorities doing about organized crime?', he should be able to give a satisfactory answer to the query, 'What am I doing about organized crime?' "

October, 1967.

WASTE, HEAVY COST LAID TO JOB CORPS CENTER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have long been critical of the Job Corps because of reported disciplinary problems, inordinately high cost per trainee, and an excessive drop-out rate. Recently, when the poverty bill was before the Senate, I supported an amendment to abolish the Job Corps.

Today's Washington Star carries an interesting story, by John Beckler, titled "Waste, Heavy Cost Laid to Job Corps Center."

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record Mr. John Beckler's article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Waste, Heavy Cost Laid to Job Corps Center

(By John Beckler)

A secret government report circulating on Capitol Hill presents a devastating picture of high costs, waste and disciplinary problems at a Job Corps center in California.

It shows that after two years of operation the estimated cost of the center had jumped from $12.8 million to $25.5 million, the dropout rate was 55 percent and only 8 percent of the enrollees were placed in jobs related to their training. The report also discloses that within a 60-day period, dismissal was recommended for 93 enrollees on disciplinary grounds ranging from assault, robbery and extortion to use of marijuana and sex perversion.

ON CONFIDENTIAL BASIS

The report is a preliminary study of the Parks Job Corps Center at Pleasanton, Calif., by the General Accounting Office.

It was released on a "strictly confidential" basis to members of Congress to help them draft antipoverty legislation.

The Senate has already passed a bill extending the antipoverty program for two years and the House is due to act on a similar measure soon.

The GAO said it also sent a copy of the report last March to the Office of Economic Opportunity, which directs the antipoverty program, asking for its comments. It said it received no reply.

The center is operated by Litton Systems, Inc., on a deactivated military base about 40 miles southeast of San Francisco. It has a capacity of 2,200 men.

The GAO review covers the period from the opening of the center in early 1965 through last December. Since then, it notes, there have been some improvements in procedures and other changes are under consideration by the contractor.

Much of the report is devoted to the costs of the program, designed to provide youths between 16 and 21, most of them school dropouts from impoverished backgrounds, with job training and basic education.

The contract was originally negotiated at an estimated cost of $12.8 million and a fixed fee for Litton of $600,000, says the GAO. But by November 1966, the total cost was up to $25.6 million including a fixed fee of $683,079.

SALARIES A BIG FACTOR

The report fixed salaries of center employes as a major cost item, accounting for $9.4 million when total costs were $20.3 million. It said the center had a staff of 1,078 for 1,869 enrollees at the end of 1965. At the insistence of the OEO the staff was cut to 955 by the end of 1966, when enrollment was 1,762.

In all, it said, the costs pushed the average enrollee cost per year to $11,000, although Congress has written into the antipoverty law a requirement that costs shall not exceed $7,500 per enrollee.

CONGRESS AND ADMINISTRATION STRIKE OUT ON CUTTING SPENDING—MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the struggle now going on in this Congress over how to cut an additional several billion dollars out of the budget should make resoundingly clear to us the necessity for establishing a system for determining priorities.

This is why I have risen on the floor day after day for weeks to propose that the Congress get on top of the kind of system of evaluation and priority determination that has at last brought order out of our chaotic defense spending.

Secretary McNamara has introduced a planning, programing, budgeting, technique that other Government departments have begun to adopt also.

This technique permits the departmental head to define his goals, assign priorities to those goals and then determine which of the various alternative methods of achieving the goal is the least costly.

Put another way, executive department heads are just beginning to apply the benefit cost evaluation to their departmental operation at least in part.

The Congress should hasten this process by constantly calling for the executive branch to give us their priorities and to justify those priorities.

This will provide us with a rational basis for determining our own priorities and deciding what should be reduced and what should not be cut.

If for example we had a set of priorities from the executive branch now, the problem of reducing an additional $5 billion from the level of spending approved to date by the Congress would present a far simpler problem.

This is not to say the executive branch will easily surrender those priorities to us. Of course they would not. Armed with these priorities, the Congress could and I think would eliminate programs the executive wants even if the priority assigned to the project was relatively low. The executive does not want Congress to assert that kind of power.

But if the Congress insists on getting this kind of information, the administration would certainly have to make it available.

Mr. President, in this connection, the Milwaukee Journal has published an excellent editorial that calls for this kind of sensible ordering of national priorities, economies that are logical and make sense.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Economy: for Someone Else

Bluff, bluster and, at times, buffoonery have marred the Washington debate over budget cuts and a tax hike. However, the unseemly spectacle of President Johnson and congress (especially the Republican-southern Democratic coalition in the house) trying to make a monkey of each other has been instructive.

It has revealed with extraordinary clarity that it's much easier to prattle about "economy" than to practice it, particularly when the ax chops close to a pet project. Figures indicate that after defense spending, almost sacred in wartime, and other fixed commitments, such as veterans payments and installments on the national debt, not much of the badly unbalanced $135 billion budget can be tampered with. And then the targets are likely to be education, health, urban revitalization and the poverty war.

This, in turn, suggests that budget battles will continue to be essentially foolish affairs until congress and the White House start to measure spending against a clear, re-evaluated set of national priorities and goals. Can the nation fight a major war abroad, shoot for the moon and still cope with urban upheaval? Can we save Saigon as well as Detroit—or Milwaukee? Can we probe the heavens without neglecting the inner city hells?

To pass, as the house did, a fuzzy resolution that would require the president to pare an unspecified $6 billion to $8 billion from current spending is no answer to basic questions of American purpose. Nor is a White House threat to freeze highway allocations and reduce mail service to four days a week.

There are many programs that can stand scrutiny—from space and supersonic transport to farm subsidy and public works (often a euphemism for favors to vested interests). As for more revenue, tax loopholes should be closed; there is no reason, for example, why nearly a score of millionaires pay no tax at all.

However, revenue and expenditures should be rationally related to explicit objectives. Both branches of government seem to rush ahead but they are not sure where.

STRENGTHENING STATE GOVERNMENT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, in our federal system of government it is axiomatic that the whole can be strong and viable only if all parts of the structure—at all levels of government—are strong and viable. Today there is a growing realization that State government must be strengthened to cope with the multitude of problems facing it and to function effectively in our increasingly complex fabric of government.

Criticism of government—healthy, constructive criticism—is the primary tool that citizens of a free nation may use to focus the searing light of public attention on weaknesses and imperfections so that they may be remedied.

The September 1967 issue of the Kansas Government Journal published by the League of Kansas Municipalities carries a lead editorial by E. A. Mosher entitled "Criticizing and State Government." In order that Mr. Mosher's thoughtful comments may be brought to the attention of all the Members, I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Criticizing and State Government

Critizing government is a favorite national pastime. Our national government seems to get the most brickbats, and is considered fair target for almost any kind of complaint. Next on the receiving line is local government, perhaps because of the "fishbowl" accessibility of local officials. Finally, this writer believes, comes state government. But if state government has escaped the volume of complaints and requests for "reforms" which has traditionally been heaped on our national and local governments, that day apparently has stopped.

Two recent reports appear to be symptomatic of this trend. The influential Committee for Economic Development in July gave nationwide release of its report "Modernizing State Government," with criticisms about state geographic handicaps, outmoded structures, inadequate use of resources and political weaknesses comparable to those ascribed to local units in its 1966 report "Modernizing Local Government," (see September issue of the *Journal*, 1966).

Now comes the prestigious Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, in its study on federal aid streamlining, which notes that a good many of the states' problems posed by federal grants "center around the inadequacies of their governors' administrative, budgetary and fiscal controls and of their legislatures' oversight and appropriation functions." The commission has recommended:

State constitutions, where needed, be amended to permit the governor to succeed himself.

Amending state constitutions to reduce greatly the number of separately elected state officials.

Strengthening the governor's budget authority to provide more effective executive management over state agencies receiving federal grant funds.

Developing a strong state planning capability in the executive branch of state government for coordination of state agency plans now required by federal grant legislation as a condition to receiving funds.

Authorizing the governor to reorganize the administrative structure of state government and to shift functions among state departments and agencies, subject to a veto by either house of the state legislature within a specified time period.

"Beefing up" the governor's executive office staff by the states to adequately maintain overall management and coordination of federal-state programs.

The Commission also found that state legislative organization, staff assistance, specialized services, and institutional spirit are still geared largely to the simple problems and small population of bygone days. The performance of state legislature, according to the Commission, determines in large measure the success of a state in exercising its responsibilities in making the federal grant-in-aid system work. In this area, the commission recommended annual sessions for all state legislatures and providing year-around professional staffing for the major state legislature committees.

E. A. M.

SURVEILLANCE AND FREEDOM

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Carnegie Quarterly, a publication of the Carnegie Corp. of New York, contains an article entitled "Our Not So Private Lives: Surveillance and Freedom."

As this appears to be a very thoughtful approach to the problem of privacy, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Not So Private Lives: Surveillance and Freedom

If someone gained access to your suit jacket, through the good offices of your cleaner, say, or a public check room, he could turn you into a walking radio within a matter of minutes. A microphone could be placed in one button of the jacket, a transmitter in a second, and a battery in a third, with conductive wire matching the seam thread to serve as an antenna.

Such a unit is only one of the many marvels of technology that now make it possible for those so inclined surreptitiously to hear what a man says and watch where he goes and what he does. Microphones the size of a sugar cube, suitable for installation in office or bedroom, are available for less than $10. There are cameras that can take good photographs from as far as a thousand yards, and a closed circuit television system the size of a cigarette pack that can send pictures from a wall socket where it might be hidden direct to the interested viewer's screen.

Modern-day surveillance, or spying, as some might put it, extends beyond the mere monitoring of an individual's words and actions. Mental tests, drugs, and emotion-measuring devices such as the lie detector provide for psychological surveillance as well. They can and do extract information about a person's innermost beliefs and attitudes—information which he might not know he is revealing, or might not wish to reveal, or might reveal without full awareness that he is exposing his private personality. The Constitution, incidentally, has attempted to protect citizens against having to divulge certain kinds of information—much of it, including attitudes toward religion, is of the sort we are dealing with here.

Finally, there is what might be called surveillance by data-processing. Computers make it easy for government, business, and other organizations to gather, save, and exchange more information about an individual than they could have (or would have wanted to, because of the difficulty of processing) only a few years ago. It is technologically possible that long before 1984, information about all important aspects of an individual's life could be collected on a running basis in master memory systems which would show at a glance how he did in nursery school and graduate school, the results of all the personality and aptitude tests he had taken over the years, how much he got paid for which job, his efficiency ratings, health record, and much more.

All of these developments, and others, make possible the almost total invasion of privacy—which is so intimately bound to freedom itself. While the framers of the Constitution clearly intended to establish the individual's inviolable right to a certain amount of privacy, neither legislaton nor judicial interpretatons have so far been able to cope effectively with the new problems posed by the new technology. For the right to privacy is not an absolute right; legitimate claims can be made for some surveillance under some conditions for some reasons. What has been lacking is a kind of Twentieth Century definition of what constitutes the proper balance between privacy and disclosure and suggestions as to how the balance might be achieved. These are the subjects of *Privacy and Freedom*, by Alan W. Westin, professor of Public Law and Government at Columbia University. The book will be published at the end of the summer by Atheneum Publishers ($10). Mr. Westin's study, which was made under the auspices of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, was supported by a Carnegie grant to the Association.

FOUR FUNCTIONS OF PRIVACY

In the totalitarian state, the right of authorities to keep the activities of citizens and groups under close surveillance is assumed, while the regime itself operates in tight secrecy. In a democracy, the situation is nearly reversed.

"The democratic society relies on publicity as a control of government and privacy as a shield for group and individual life," writes Mr. Westin. (Even government, however, has the right and necessity to carry on some of its business in private.) The democratic emphasis on privacy springs from the fundamental belief of the democratic creed—in the uniqueness and sacredness of the individual. But as sociologist Robert Merton has pointed out, "Privacy is not merely a personal predilection; it is an important functional requirement for the effective operation of social structure." For the democratic social structure, Mr. Westin argues persuasively, privacy performs four very important functions.

The human being has a deep need for personal autonomy—the sense of having some control over his own life and, of course, mind; the knowledge that he is not dominated or manipulated wholly by others; the ability to choose when and what to disclose to others about himself. Psychologists have described a series of zones or regions of privacy leading to the "core self" which shields the individual's ultimate secrets. There are some hopes and fears that a person wants never to reveal to anyone. Only grave social need, says Mr. Westin, "can ever justify destruction of the privacy which guards the individual's ultimate autonomy." And the democratic society itself is strengthened when individuals have a sense of personal autonomy, since it produces traits that are desirable in citizens of a free state: independent thought, diversity of views, and nonconformity.

The second great function of privacy, Mr. Westin points out, is to provide for emotional release. In the course of any given day, everybody plays a succession of roles—"stern father, loving husband, car pool comedian, skilled lathe operator"—and everybody needs an occasional opportunity to lay the masks aside, to be "himself" as he feels at the moment. Privacy also furnishes the safety valve without which our social and public life might be even more disorderly and tempestuous than it is. All people, including janitors and statesmen, need at times to blow off to intimates without fear of being taken really seriously, let alone reported. They need to be able privately to vent their anger and frustration—even maliciously, slanderously, or profanely—in order to be able publicly to think and behave with reason, dispassion, and decorum.

Privacy also provides the opportunity for self-evaluation: for reflection, for intellectual and emotional integration, and for inspection of the conscience. Finally, it permits limited and protected communication.

"The greatest threat to civilized social life would be a situation in which each individual was utterly candid in his communications with others, saying exactly what he knew or felt at all times. The havoc done to interpersonal relations by children, saints, mental patients, and adult 'innocents' is legendary." Limited and protected communication leaves us free to maintain the psychological distance which seems appropriate to various relationships and situations; it also means that a man can share confidences with his intimates and professional or religious counselors.

Human beings need privacy, but they have similarly powerful needs for disclosure, for sharing, for companionship. Each individual is engaged in the continuous process of making adjustments between his changing needs for solitude and company, intimacy and general social intercourse, reserve and disclosure. "A free society," Mr. Westin writes, "leaves this choice to the individual, for this is the core of the 'right of individual privacy'—the right of the individual to decide for himself, with only extraordinary exceptions in the interests of society, when and on what terms his acts should be revealed to the general public."

Privacy performs the same basic functions for organizations that it does for individuals. It contributes to the achievement of organizational autonomy, releases the organization members from formal role compliance, provides internal evaluation to prepare policies, and protects the organization's limited communication with others. Privacy, says Mr. Westin, is "not a luxury for organizational life; it is a vital lubricant of the organizational system in free societies."

A NEW GAME BY OLD RULES

By definition, all societies, whether primitive or modern, totalitarian or free, exert some sort of social control. Surveillance is one obvious means of doing so.

"Parents watch their children, supervisors watch employees, religious leaders watch the acts of their congregants, policemen watch the streets and other public places, and government agencies watch the citizens' performance of various legal obligations and prohibitions." Fair enough, Mr. Westin would say. A good deal of indirect surveillance (through the keeping of records, for example) is necessary to ensure that citizens pay their taxes and their parking tickets, and sometimes direct surveillance is required to maintain order. This has always been so. But the invention of the telephone, the camera, the lie detector, and the development of psychological tests have changed the playing of the game without a corresponding alteration in the rules of the game. What is at question is the current and proposed use of the new techniques.

Proponents of the no-holds-barred approach welcome the increasing sensitivity of surveillance devices as being protective of society and also, they say, of the individual himself. They reason that no accused person who is innocent should object to taking a lie detector test; that no one who is not plotting a crime should object to the fact that his telephone conversations are overheard by police; that no one who approves of proper personnel selection and placement should object to personality tests. They argue, as Mr. Westin says, that "the individual himself can now prove his innocence, virtues, or talents by 'science' and avoid the unjust assumptions frequently produced by 'fallible' conventional methods."

There are several arguments to be made against this plausible-sounding line of reasoning, perhaps the least important of which is that some of the surveillance devices are *not* scientifically perfect. Even if they were, the essential point is that the knowledge or fear of surveillance has a restrictive effect on human behavior, and not just on illegal behavior. It impairs many of the crucial functions that privacy performs—reduces personal autonomy, limits the opportunity for emotional release, lessens limited and protected communication. Who would ever put forward a tentative conclusion, "think out loud," make a heatedly damaging remark about the President, or, for that matter, make a declaration of love if he thought he was not only being overheard but that his words were being recorded?

The personality tests being widely used for purposes of personnel selection by government and business organizations invade the individual's very mind and heart, his ultimate "self." They inquire directly and indirectly into his attitudes and beliefs about religion, sex, and politics. People who object to this intrusion into hitherto protected realms consider it of small comfort that the purpose is not to find out specifically what they think on certain issues but to elicit a kind of psychological profile of themselves that can be measured against some "norm." Many individuals, Mr. Westin says, "do not want themselves to be sorted and judged according to standards that rest on the unexplained evaluations of professional psychologists in the employ of 'institutional' clients." Those who resist the tests say, in effect, to those in power: "If you make evaluative decisions openly, questioning me directly and justifying your decisions openly, I can fight out publicly your right to judge me in a certain way and American society will decide our conflicting claims, but if you invoke 'science' and 'expertise' and evaluate me through personality tests, the issue becomes masked. . . . Thus, where there are basic issues such as political ideology, religion, or race at stake, the selection process must be objective and public, and I assert my right of privacy to close my emotions, beliefs, and attitudes to the process of job evaluation in a free society."

KEEPING BIG BROTHER IN CHECK

Emotionally satisfying as it would be to take a decisive swipe at Big Brother, it would be unwise and unenforceable to grant all "private" acts total immunity from surveillance by device, Mr. Westin acknowledges. "The critical challenge now is to develop new public policies to protect privacy from unreasonable surveillance." What is needed is a rational weighing process with definite criteria by which claims for disclosure or surveillance can be gauged. He suggests five.

First, the seriousness of the need to conduct surveillance must be strongly established.

"Police want to solve crimes, corporations to control thefts, employers to select more successful employees, news media to tell the 'inside' story about leading persons and events, educators to identify personality problems in school children, behavioral scientists to observe real-life situations. But if all that need be done to win legal and social approval for surveillance is to indicate a social need and show that surveillance would help cope with it, there is no balancing at all, only a qualifying procedure for a licence to invade privacy. Therefore, the need involved must be serious enough to overcome the very real risk of jeopardizing the public's confidence in its daily freedom from unreasonable invasions of privacy."

Second, there are often several methods available to accomplish a given social end. The burden of proof should be on those who seek authorization for surveillance to show that there are not alternative techniques available which do less violence to individual and organizational privacy. The need for bugging and wiretapping to control crime, for example, has not been publicly proved on any crime-by-crime type of analysis. Mr. Westin personally believes that the case probably could be made for use in crimes such as extortion and kidnapping, but it has not been made in a satisfactory or convincing way. As for personality testing, there has been no research under scientific control procedures indicating that personnel selected by such measures are more successful than those chosen by other means—on the basis of their past work records, interviews, aptitude and achievement tests, and the like. Furthermore, there is no evidence whatsoever that the many organizations which do not use such tests—RCA, Du Pont, Metropolitan Life Insurance among them—hire larger numbers of emotionally disturbed employees than those that do.

Third, the degree of reliability of the surveillance instrument must be taken into account. The personality test is simply too unreliable to justify use by governmental or private organizations, Mr. Westin says, particularly "given the fact that the questions used in many such tests intrude into otherwise protected areas of personal life and private beliefs, and that preserving attitudes of nonconfession to authorities is a high social goal in American society." And when devices which are not now reliable enough (lie detectors, for example) eventually are perfected, as seems likely, society must then face the question of whether the process should be permitted even if it is wholly scientific. At any rate, no device which is not proved reliable beyond a doubt should ever be used without the individual's freely given consent.

The problem of consent to invasion of privacy, the fourth consideration, is a complicated one. Is an individual's consent implied by the fact that he accepts a certain kind of job, or that he has permitted certain kinds of surveillance previously? School teachers, for example, are accustomed to having their classrooms visited by principals; does their consent to this long-standing practice imply consent to the use of loudspeaker boxes by which administrators can monitor a classroom without the knowledge of teacher or pupils? A particularly difficult case is presented when employers require privacy-invading tests as a condition of getting a job or a promotion. In certain areas, American law does not allow individuals to waive their rights when their bargaining power is inadequate; "yellow dog" contracts, for example, under which workers promise not to join a labor union as the price of getting a job, are prohibited. Mr. Westin says that the nature of consent must be "carefully examined in each instance to see how freely given or how coerced it is in the full context."

Finally, there must be the capacity for limitation and control on those occasions when surveillance will be employed without the knowledge or consent of the surveyed. When, and under what safeguards, may the devices be used?

RULES FOR SURVEILLANCE

Mr. Westin suggests four basic steps. Rules should be set limiting those who may carry out the surveillance (for example, police should not be permitted to use eavesdropping devices, Mr. Westin believes). Detailed regulations should be set for the scope, duration, and operation of the surveillance. Rules of scope would determine, for example, what questions could be asked and what questions could not be asked in personality tests; they would also specify the types of crime for which physical surveillance is permitted. The duration of surveillance should preferably be of short, renewable periods.

A general agency should be created to set the standards, supervise practices under the rules, investigate compliance, and hear complaints, Mr. Westin says. And having set the rule for the surveillance itself, rules governing disclosure and use of the information obtained must be formulated.

In order to achieve control of surveillance technology, action by the federal and state legislatures and by the courts will be necessary. Mr. Westin says that legislation should be considered to apply to the three kinds of surveillance: psychological, data, and physical. He also believes that the Supreme Court shows signs of being ready "to identify a comprehensive privacy right based on the Constitution." The sections of *Privacy and Freedom* discussing possible legislative statutes and judicial alternatives are required reading for those in a position to act on them. But most of us are not lawyers or legislators or jurists, and Mr. Westin reminds us pointedly that individual citizens and private organizations and the professions have extremely important roles to play in protecting privacy and freedom. The fight against subliminal advertising, he points out, was won "not by legislation or judicial intervention, but by the force of civic and public opinion." He is encouraged that the moral concern and consciousness of influential individuals and groups running the political spectrum from right to left has been aroused, and believes that the climate of public opinion may now be ready "to support effective organizational and legal action to safeguard privacy, if such action can be intelligently framed and effectively presented."

Mr. Westin invites the scientific community, whose efforts in this area have been largely directed to developing more effective instruments of surveillance, to devise more scientific countermeasures—scrambling devices and the like—by which privacy can be protected. Organizations can exercise self-restraint in their personnel and other policies on behalf of the values of privacy. And he believes that the "enforcement of professional ethical standards protecting privacy could accomplish a great deal," citing the current debate among psychologists over the use of personality tests as a healthy sign.

"American society now seems ready—for the first time in a century—to face the impact of science on privacy and to restore the equilibrium among privacy, disclosure, and surveillance that was, until the 1880's, one of the greatest achievements of American law and liberty," Mr. Westin concludes. Perhaps we can lead the way. For the problem is not solely an American one.

"Sometimes in the name of Man and sometimes in that of Society, scientists throughout the West are at work to unlock man's mind through drug and brain-wave research. . . . Throughout the industrialized nations of the world, the computer networks grow, collecting their millions of bits of data, depositing the smallest details of the citizens' lives in the unforgetting and unforgiving memory units."

The technology is new. "But the choices are as old as man's history on the planet. Will the tools be used for man's liberation or his subjugation?"

NEW SUPPORT FOR FLAMING GORGE STATE FISH AND GAME PROTECTION AMENDMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have received new and welcomed support from an important body in my State for an amendment I have offered to S. 444, the Flaming Gorge Recreation Area bill.

I heartily endorse the Flaming Gorge legislation as a whole, but have deep reservations over section 4 which would give the Secretary of Agriculture jurisdiction over fish and game programs which have historically been administered by the State.

Support for my amendment to correct this in the bill has been voiced in a resolution by the State of Utah Coordinating Council of Natural Resources. The council handles all official State business in the natural resources field from water to recreation.

In its resolution, the council said it is deeply concerned with the present wording of the legislation "which does not specifically delineate State and Federal jurisdiction over fish and wildlife on the proposed recreational area."

The group "strongly urges" that the present wording be changed to that in my amendment, offered last week during hearings on the proposal before the Senate Interior Committee.

In addition to the State Coordinating Council of Natural Resources, support for the amendment has come from the Utah State Fish and Game Department, the Utah Department of Natural Resources, the Wyoming Game and Fish Commissions, the Western Conference of the Council of State Governments, the International Association of Fish and Game Conservation, and the Arizona Game and Fish Department.

All of these groups realize the precedent we may be setting here by allowing an agency of the Federal Government virtually to take over the fish and game operation on all Federal lands.

I would like to have inserted in the RECORD the resolution passed by the council.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COORDINATING COUNCIL OF THE UTAH STATE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, OCTOBER 19, 1967

Whereas, the Coordinating Council of the Utah State Department of Natural Resources has reviewed S. 444, which would establish the Flaming Gorge recreational area; and

Whereas, the Coordinating Council is deeply concerned with the wording of Section 4 of S. 444, which does not specifically delineate state and federal jurisdiction over fish and wildlife on the proposed recreational area; and

Whereas, the Federal Government through the Department of the Interior on several occasions has indicated that they do have jurisdiction on fish and wildlife administered by the Federal Government; and

Whereas, the question of jurisdiction of fish and wildlife on federal lands has become an increasing problem between state and federal agencies involved.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Coordinating Council of the Utah State Department of Natural Resources hereby strongly urges that the wording of S. 444 on Page 3, Section 4 be amended as follows:

"The Secretary shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on the lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the recreational area in accordance with applicable state laws. Hunting shall be permitted in accordance with federal laws only as they pertain to migratory birds."

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be sent to the appropriate Congressional delegation.

PRESERVING PRIVACY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, inefficiency in government is almost always unwanted. But the Christian Science Monitor, quoting the Buffalo Evening News, suggests that in relationship to our individual privacy, perhaps "conscious inefficiency rather than super-efficiency could preserve our essential privacy."

This same conclusion seemed to run through the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure's recent hearings on computer privacy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, published in the Monitor of October 4, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVING PRIVACY

A group of American experts on international law and politics is urging the United Nations to study the growing threat of computers and electronic snooping devices to individual freedom and privacy.

Quite properly, the group foresees grave potential dangers in "the merry march of technology and science without adequate consideration of the social effects of their findings."

Take only one example—storing countless separate details about every individual citizen in a central computer bank in Washington. Then all any efficient bureaucrat need do is press a button and—swish—out pops one person's life, replete with intimate details from his income tax returns, his census answers, his war and police records down to overdue parking tickets.

How very, very efficient. And, it seems to us, how very, very dangerous.

One reason the "merry march" to efficiency hasn't gone faster than it has, the American group observes, is that at present "the multiplicity of agencies and procedures and the resulting red tape protect the individual against undue invasion of his privacy by making it more difficult for various government officials to cause real trouble."

If that is true, there is more merit in red tape and bureaucratic confusion than we had realized. And perhaps this suggests an answer to the very real threat of government invasion of individual privacy.

We aren't recommending an official policy of keeping the red tape hopelessly snarled, of course. But in this time of increasingly sensitized snooping devices and rapid computer development, it surely isn't premature to consider a conscious public policy of fragmenting information about individuals by storing them in separate agencies and prohibiting, by strict law, the exchanging of this information among those agencies. On that narrow point of collecting and storing personal information, conscious inefficiency rather than super-efficiency could preserve our essential privacy.

UTAH RECEIVES NEW MEASUREMENT STANDARDS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, according to an announcement from the Department of Commerce, the State of Utah will be the fourth State to receive a new set of replacement weights and measures standards. This event will take place in Salt Lake City on Monday, October 30. Dr. Allen V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, will present the replacement standards to Gov. Calvin L. Rampton. Eventually, all 50 States will receive new sets of weights and measures standards. As a sidelight to this important occasion, I should like to note that Dr. Astin, a highly respected Government scientist and administrator, will no doubt take extra pleasure from the ceremony, since he is a native son of Salt Lake City, and completed his undergraduate studies at the University of Utah. The significance of this program, however, is more than symbolic. In the modern world, trade and commerce demand a degree of uniformity in measurement that is not possible to achieve with the existing standards in the various States. Many of these standards are more than 100 years old. There are variations among them, and the mass-market, mass-production economy of America today requires a better measurement foundation than the standards presently used by most States. The field of weights and measures is an interesting example of Federal-State relationships. Regulatory powers lie with the States. The Federal Government serves as a technical adviser to the States. This pattern might well be followed in other fields of joint responsibility. For the information of all Members, I ask permission to insert the announcement from the Commerce Department in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Oregon, Utah Receive New Weights and Measures Standards

In the next four days, Oregon and Utah will become the third and fourth States to receive new weights and measures standards under a program to replace the standards of all 50 States.

Dr. Allen V. Astin, Director of the U.S. Department of Commerce's National Bureau of Standards, will present one new set of weights and measures standards to Governor Tom McCall of Oregon at a ceremeny on Friday (October 27, 10:00 a.m.) at the new Agriculture Building in Salem. Dr. Astin will present an identical set to Governor Calvin L. Rampton of Utah on Monday (October 30, 3:00 p.m.) at the Department of Agriculture Laboratories, Salt Lake City.

Many of the standards and instruments used by the States in weights and measures administration were provided by the Federal Government 100 years ago or more. The National Bureau of Standards is supervising replacement of the State standards to update and extend measurement competence throughout the Nation as required by scientific and technological advances. Within the next few months sets will be presented to California, Connecticut, Delaware, Kentucky, New Mexico, and Tennessee.

It is expected that new standards and instruments will be provided to about 10 States per year until all State standards facilities have been modernized.

Each new set includes standards of mass (weight), length, and volume and necessary laboratory instruments, including high precision balances, all specially designed to meet State weights and measures requirements. Each set costs the Federal Government about $70,000, including calibration, installation, and training of laboratory personnel. The State contribution to the program, in the form of new or expanded laboratory facilities and better qualified personnel, will be considerably more than the Federal cost.

Measurement uniformity among the States began in 1838 when Congress authorized the Federal Government to supply each State with ". . . a complete set of weights and measures adopted as standards—to the end that a uniform standard of weights and measures may be established throughout the United States."

In the United States, the actual regulation of weighing and measuring equipment in commerce is retained largely by the States. The National Bureau of Standards is the principal technical resource for the States in this area.

DECISIONMAKING AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a guest article which appeared in the October 24, 1967, Morgantown, W. Va., Dominion-News, titled "Decisionmaking at the United Nations."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Decisionmaking at the United Nations

(Note.—This article was written by the Collegiate Society for International Affairs at West Virginia University for United Nations Day today. Dr. John Jacobson is adviser.)

Today, most of the major problems of this complex world rest upon the United Nations. Six main organs compose the structure of the United Nations—the General Assembly, Security Council, Secretariat, Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council, and the International Court of Justice.

The General Assembly is composed of representatives of each of the 122 member nations. According to Article 10 of the U.N Charter, "The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter," and "may make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or to both on any such questions or matters." The main feature of the General Assembly is that each member nation is represented on equal footing.

According to the Charter, the primary responsibility for maintainance of world peace and security rests on the Security Council. Although any member of the United Nations may participate in discussions, the Security Council is composed of 10 non-permanent voting members, each with a 2-year term, and five permanent members, each with the power of veto. The Security Council recommends ways of peaceful settlement and may stress actual means of resolvement. Investigation of disputes which involves two or more countries are brought to the Council's attention.

Administrative functions are performed by the Secretariat. The Secretary-General, head of the Secretariat, is appointed by the General Assembly with the approval of the Security Council.

Seeking to build security, prosperity, and stability in the world, is the Economic and Social Council. ECOSOC is composed of 27 members who are elected by the General Assembly on a rotation basis.

Entrusted with the administration and supervision of trust territories, the Trusteeship Council is composed of member countries with trust claims, permanent members of the Security Council, and, to insure equality in numbers, other elected members with terms of three years.

The final division of the United Nations is the International Court of Justice, which is the main judicial organ. The Hague in the Netherlands is base for the 15 judges, elected by the Security Council and the General Assembly. Each member state is pledged to comply with the decision of the Court.

A number of specialized agencies are related to the Economic and Social Council. The World Health Organization (WHO), International Labor Organization (ILO), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) are a few such functions. Each of these agencies aims to improve economic, social, and cultural conditions in the world and members of these agencies do not have to be members of the U.N. The World Health Organization, for example, encourages the membership of all nations of the world.

Conflicts among nations are referred to the United Nations only after the countries themselves fail to solve the problem. Nations are encouraged to settle disputes among themselves.

Three types of disputes come before the organs of the United Nations. Issues of fact include those on which nations are in disagreement over what has happened. Issues of law are those in which parties maintain that legal rights and duties are involved. Finally, issues of policy involve parties who pursue policies that clash.

The most common method of dealing with disputes is diplomacy, often called negotiation. Other forms of diplomacy are mediation, in which a third party enters the dispute and suggests solutions, and conciliation which is almost identical to mediation. Often mediation is done by one person representing a state or international organization while conciliation is done by a commission. In both mediation and conciliation, the primary purpose is to find an agreeable solution.

Arbitration and judicial settlement are processes of solution which emphasize the application of international law by judges.

When a dispute which cannot be resolved by the countries involved arises, it is brought to either the Security Council or the General Assembly where the issue is placed on the agenda and becomes a subject for debate. Its placement on the agenda is influenced by the urgency of the situation. A problem such as an internal struggle for the possession of territory would naturally be superseded by a problem causing immediate danger of war between nations.

An outstanding feature of all bodies is the free and open debate, which clarifies the issues involved in the controversy.

One prevailing danger is the exchange of propaganda to such a point where misinterpretation of the actual issue occurs.

Handicapping decision making are the lack of communication and the lack of authority to make decisions. Misinterpretation of phrases often leads to opposition which would normally be support. No one organ of the United Nations has actual power to make and enforce a final decision. Recommendations are often ignored rather than heeded.

The Security Council was originally meant to be the decision-making body of the United Nations, but due to the problem of veto, the General Assembly has replaced the Security Council as chief decision making body. One veto by a permanent Security Council member paralyzes the entire legislation under consideration. Therefore, the decision making of the Security Council is under a constant threat of blockage.

The most important feature of decision making at the United Nations is the fact that any member nation as well as any non-member nation may bring disputes or situations to the Security Council or to the General Assembly for consideration.

The United Nations is a meeting place for representatives of all nations—rich, poor, strong, weak—where all opinions are freely expressed and heard.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of yesterday, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield, without losing his right to the floor, so I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. TRADE POLICY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, during the past 3 years the national economy has reached new levels of output and employment. This has not occurred without strain and disequilibrium, notably in the money market and building industry. In the first half of 1967, there was pause for readjustment after the excess demand of 1966. Now indicators again show signs of upturn ahead, and the statements of businessmen and economists reflect this economic momentum. There have been troublespots. Inflation in 1966 was a serious problem. Now again it is becoming serious as the natural result of excessive stimulation of the economy in part due to unsound fiscal policy measures. I would expect injection to be in the neighborhood of 4½ percent during the next several months, as it has been running at that level for the last three months.

At a time of economic upturn it is regrettable that we find a wide range of industries seeking special measures designed to interrupt the normal operation of the marketplace and create special economic terms for some industries at the expense of others. These forces, latent in any economy, show surprising strength at present. Almost 90 percent of the Members of this body, and an equally large proportion in the House, have introduced bills proposing import controls, mainly quotas.

A quota is a particularly insidious form of trade protection. It is, in effect, a thinly disguised subsidy, the cost of which is impossible to calculate. It provides a position for its beneficiary, insulated from more efficient market sources of competition. Like other gratuitous privileges, the conferral of one quota—or even its prospect—produces a host of other would-be claimants for equal privilege.

Last week the Senate Finance Committee conducted limited hearings on a wide variety of quota bills. The number of restrictive trade measures introduced is no doubt a historic high water mark. In some cases there may actually be problems stemming from imports; in such cases congressional action may be required. Certainly in all cases the Congress owes an obligation to industry to examine its problems thoroughly and fairly, to seek the underlying causes of any maladjustment, and to enact appropriate relief measures.

But at the present moment studied and fair congressional action is impossible. No parliamentary body could responsibly deal with special claims being made by each of the industries in question in the time remaining in the present session. Each is a case of great complexity. Each requires and deserves special study. In each case, the solutions could well be different. And they might have nothing to do with imports.

Lumping the many quota and other restrictive trade bills into one package, and devising a mathematical approach that would cover all trade to try to achieve "orderly" or "stable" marketing of imported products, would be even less responsible. The effect of such action would be far more serious than the mere total of its parts.

BACKGROUND: U.S. TRADE POLICY

There are many factors that make the present circumstance unique—factors that require the careful attention of us all. One of these factors is the history of the U.S. trade policy.

Congress last legislated tariff rates or restrictive measures for imports in the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930, a bill that helped introduce a period of world economic decline. Smoot-Hawley proved that Congress should not legislate tariff rates, or indeed, legislate special measures for any single commodity. And with only a few exceptions; namely, the meat quota bill of 1963, Congress has refrained from doing so. Instead, our national policy has been to remove gradually the border restraints on trade on a reciprocal basis. Authority to do so has been granted to the Executive by the Congress in successive legislation since 1934. Since then Congress has provided the legal and procedural framework in which tariff adjustment should take place, but it has not made such adjustments itself.

Now this long standing principle of U.S. foreign economic policy is being challenged. The challenge cannot be treated lightly or hastily. These are matters of great complexity. Quotas are an extraordinary form of protection from imports. Not even their advocates deny this. For the world's leading exponent of the free-enterprise system to invoke on a wholesale basis a protective device which so profoundly negates the free-market system and the history of U.S. international economic policy should require both a highly unusual set of circumstances, and a reasoned rejection of other remedies. Neither requirement has been met.

CONSUMER ISSUES

Certainly the Congress if it enacts such quota measures will be called to account by the consumer, and rightly so. The consumer will want to know why such an inflationary program is considered at a time when the economy needs the counterinflationary effect of imports. He will want to know why he is called on to pay more for a wide variety of staple products, as well as luxuries. He will want to know why he should have less goods to choose from because of import restraints. He will want to know why certain industries tell their stockholders how good business is with one voice and with another ask the Government to protect them from the same competition that has led to innovations and technological improvement in other industries.

Anyone from Chicago knows that protection is often a racket, and that it is very expensive to the victims. In this case every consumer will be a victim.

Who is the consumer? We all are. And when angered we comprise the most powerful, if somewhat disorganized, lobby in the Nation.

One group of consumers buys finished goods for home, office, or industry consumption.

A second group of consumers buys raw materials and machinery for industrial uses—as inputs for the production of final products. Higher material costs for this consumer must be reflected in higher prices to his customers.

Both groups of consumers will pay the cost of quota legislation. Take for instance just one luxury item such as mink. The consumer should know she would suffer from mink quotas by paying substantially higher prices. Foreign imports of mink pelts have reduced the price of a mink jacket from $700 to $540, hardly an average housewife consumer item, but coming down into a much broader based market. Prices during 1967 have fallen sharply and there will no doubt be some upward adjustment of prices as Scandinavian producers modify their overproduction. But whatever the cause of the price drop, and however long its duration, the consumer clearly benefits.

How about the consumer of rugs? The textile industry, with the backing of fully 50 Senators, recently fought off a reduction in the duty on wilton and velvet carpets and the industry has opposed for years any type of tariff reduction on any textile product, rugs as well as shirts, sheets as well as stockings and tweeds. Indeed, it is in the vanguard in fighting for stricter quotas on all types of manmade fibers and wool, and stricter quotas on cotton textiles.

Does it not seem ironic that the rug industry cries out in alarm for quotas while doing much better than ever before? Note the following quotation in the Fairchild publication, Home Furnishings Daily, of October 16:

> Who says you can't see the forest for the trees?
>
> Not carpet manufacturers who are really shouting "timber" these days as they watch their sales acorns grow into mighty oaks.
>
> And they expect sales to sprout even more rapidly during the next few months . . . blossoming into lush green foliage by January floor covering market time.

Let me again pose the question on behalf of the consumer: are special import measures for rugs and carpets and their component fibers really necessary? It appears not. Does the industry profit and the consumer pay? It appears so.

Quotas have been requested for synthetic fibers, simply because in the last half of 1966 overcapacity and sudden new imports of synthetics caused American fiber producers to reduce prices. To many this seemed an adjustment process. To most of us this is elementary economics. To the manmade fiber manufacturers, however, those price decreases meant a strong new impetus to join forces with their cotton and wool textile colleagues to seek comprehensive quotas now contained in S. 1796, sponsored by over 65 Senators.

The consumer should know whether this restrictive trade policy for textiles is justified. Is it justified, for example, in terms of a recent report in the Daily News Record of September 19, which said:

> One thing fiber men are unanimous about: Business is better, prices are firmer, and everyone is much more optimistic than just a few months ago.

The consumer should also know whether a restrictive quota bill for footwear imports is necessary. Such a bill is S. 2540 introduced by nine Members of this body. A cursory analysis of import data would indicate that the problem is not as presented by some. Imports of shoes and slippers in 1966 totaled 43.3 million pairs and were equal to only 13.7 percent of domestic production of fully 316.6 million pairs.

Price information makes these figures more meaningful. The average price of the shoes imported during the last half of 1966 was $1.85, but the average price of the U.S. shoe was $4.25. On analysis another factor becomes clear. The cheap imported shoes do not compete with the more expensive U.S. shoes. They are of a different type. For example, 48 percent of all imports of shoes and slippers in 1966 were novelty items like women's boots and rainwear.

Again, let us ask ourselves some questions as representatives of America's consumers: Is it in the consumer's best interest to cut off imports of low-cost shoes? Is it to the consumer's best interest to want to maintain a fixed relationship between imports and domestic production of shoes? No. What is this concept of "stable and orderly" markets? It makes as much sense economically as restricting the new car customer to his nearest franchised dealer.

What about the other type of consumer: the businessman who needs lower cost raw materials such as steel, and petroleum? Steel imports from Western Europe are estimated to save this American consumer $19.80 per ton, and steel imports from Japan are estimated to save him about $35 a ton. Meantime the domestic steel industry is increasingly productive, and production is being absorbed by the domestic market.

Here is what the president of an independent small steel company has written to me:

> Since principal producers of the (raw product) also produce the (finished product) you can see that they not only control the disposition, but they control the prices we independents must pay for our raw material and at the same time fix the prices which we can sell our finished product for. They have seen fit to maintain the same basic spread between (the two prices) that existed in 1957. Twice in the last five years they have raised the price of the raw product . . . thereby increasing their profits, . . . without allowing an independent producer any price increase at all . . . As a result of this pricing, independents, like ourselves, were forced to turn to some foreign sources to get some relief from our rising costs, so that is why I say that by their pricing practices and domestic distribution practices the large producers have contributed to a large extent to the need for foreign steel.

The steel case is a very complicated one, and I will not oversimplify it here. But I wish again to point out that before acting on such a complex matter, the Senate and House have the obligation to find meaningful answers to these questions.

S. 2332, the oil import bill which received brief consideration in committee last week, would freeze into statute the present administrative quota on petroleum imports into the United States east of the Rockies at a level not to exceed 12.2 percent of U.S. production of crude petroleum and natural gas liquids in this area. And it would in other ways close the market to imported crude oil and petroleum products.

Seemingly advantageous from the point of view of the independent American oil producer, this quota program would be disadvantageous to the chemical companies that consume the derivatives of oil in making petrochemical products for sale to industry here and abroad. The domestic supply of such petroleum raw materials, called feedstocks, cannot be increased by use of heavier liquids from crudes because they have been made, the chemical industry claims, prohibitively expensive from a competitive standpoint by the oil import program. In contrast to the situation in the United States, foreign chemical producers have unrestricted access to petroleum feedstocks at lower prices, prices not determined by an artificial quota program.

These examples demonstrate that the quota bills before us must be individually studied. They are all complex, all different. In each case, I ask that my colleagues in the Senate and my former colleagues in the business world to ask themselves one fundamental question: Are imports only an excuse for your other real economic problems?

I have described why the present restrictive trade movement seems to me to be unique in terms of the history of U.S. commercial policy. I have described why the national interest is at stake. I have described why the consumer interest is paramount.

There are still other implications that I must emphasize.

FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES ENDANGERED

A critical aspect of the enactment of these measures would be their effect on our foreign policy.

At the moment we are fighting a difficult and costly war. There are aspects of this involvement about which many Americans have profound doubts. But an important element of our policy is to maintain all possible support for our position in Vietnam by the world's free nations.

Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, the Republic of China and many other countries have made contributions of men and materials to support this cause. Leadership in countries like Great Britain, in spite of potent domestic pressure, continue to accept our involvement in Vietnam.

But how long could we expect certain countries whose support is even now subject to internal pressure to continue to support us were we to take unilateral action to disrupt their economic well-being?

No member of the business, labor, or agricultural communities should forget that foreign economic policy and foreign policy go hand in hand. The objective of each policy must be to establish and to maintain world stability and prosperity. That these objectives are threatened by the pending legislation should be plain and clear.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEADERSHIP

By the magnitude of its economic strength the United States dominates free world affairs. We have attempted to use this responsibility for leadership wisely, through multilateral action among all free world nations. In creating an ever more peaceful free world community we create a tremendous magnetic field to which the more stagnant, less creative Communist bloc countries are inevitably attracted.

It was multilateral action which recently resulted in the greatest international trade negotiation ever consummated—the Kennedy round. In the fields of disarmament, balance-of-payments adjustment, international monetary policy, and less visible but equally important areas, the U.S. responsibly exercises its leadership in a community of nations. After 35 years of progress, to regress to unilateral action would be an admission of defeat by American business. I cannot believe that the business community in which I have lived and worked for over a quarter of a century is willing to make such an admission.

As a former industrialist who has faced the sometimes crushing problems of stiff import competition from Japan and Germany particularly, my associates and I also faced the decision: should we ask for protection from foreign competition or fight for our markets, here and abroad? We answered that question and chose the marketplace. The results over the past decade illustrate very well that such a decision not only served the Nation, the industry, and our company, but the consumer as well.

Mr. President, during the years I have testified before the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. I became deeply impressed with certain Members of Congress who seemed to have a firm grasp upon the economics involved in trade, recognizing that trade is a two-way street, that we cannot send our ships loaded with American products abroad and bring them back empty, because we are unwilling to buy from abroad. There have been some Senators and Representatives who have known that the American eagle on a dollar could really be a homing pigeon, and that there is no place that that American dollar can ultimately be spent rather than back here in the United States of America.

Two Members of Congress in particular have been, in my mind, outstanding: In the House of Representatives, TOM CURTIS, of Missouri—a scholar, a student, a dedicated disciple of good, sound economics and sound fiscal policy, a practical, hardheaded, realistic conservative who seeks to conserve what he believes is the strength of American enterprise by speaking on behalf of this country as a great exporting country as well as a great importing country, fighting for the employment of a fiscal soundness and integrity in our business system which says, "We believe in the free market"—has sought to protect that free market as a public office holder.

In the Senate, we have the senior Senator from New York, Senator JACK JAVITS, whose voice has been heard through the years speaking on behalf of sound fiscal policy. He is generally looked upon and regarded as a liberal, but his policies as a businessman I know to be in the essence of conservatism, seeking to conserve those basic factors of our free enterprise system that are our underlying strength. The strength of our country is not based upon tariffs or barriers that exist in this country or any other country; and Senator JAVITS has been realistic in recognizing that the strength of this country is in the freedom of its economy; and he believes in freedom of economy in all countries, to strengthen and maintain the free world.

The efforts and achievements of five administrations in this field of foreign economic trade policy are threatened. They must be defended. This is the immediate battle. And after this one is fought we must turn our attention to the true fiscal causes of the current protectionist campaign. Imports cannot be an excuse for failing to confront the underlying economic problems before us.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. First, Mr. President, speaking personally, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his kind words about me. He is gracious and generous, and I appreciate his statement very much. As befits a friend, perhaps he overstates my role, but nevertheless I appreciate his comments greatly. I know that Representative TOM CURTIS—also a very good friend of mine and Senator PERCY's, who serves with us on the Joint Economic Committee—would want me to express appreciation in his behalf also.

As to the merits of the situation, I know of no greater ally in this struggle—which is a very difficult one for Senators and Representatives to wage—than the Senator from Illinois. He comes fresh from the business world, and practices what he preaches. When he was a businessman, he came here repeatedly opposing protectionists policies, which would theoretically have helped Bell & Howell, his company—because he was sure that in the final analysis they would not; and his belief has proved to be correct. This is an important lesson for all American business leaders.

We circularized a great part of American business in connection with our hearings on these matters before the Committee on Finance, and received a great many telegrams and other responses from business supporting the position the Senator from Illinois and I have taken. Quite apart from the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, and in a separate place in the RECORD, to follow his remarks and this colloquy, I ask unanimous consent that telegrams and letters from the chairman of the board of R. H. Macy & Co., from the executive vice president for international banking of the Bank of America, from the chairman and president of International Packers, Limited; from the chairman of the Winton Co.; from the president of Xerox Corp.; from president of Crown Zellerbach Corp.; from the president of the United Aircraft Corp.; from the vice president of Honeywell; from the chairman of the executive committee of Gillette Co.; from the president of Motorola Co.; the telegram of the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce to Chairman LONG of the Finance Committee, and wires from other companies and representatives having the same position, be printed in the RECORD, together with some samples which I shall introduce of an enormous body of editorial comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Now, Mr. President, by way of direct comment upon the Senator's position, I think that it should be made known to the country that the people who take the position Senator PERCY and I take and Representative TOM CURTIS takes, are looking, to the interests of our whole Nation, and are really seeking to achieve what is in the best hardheaded financial interests of our Nation, rather than adopting some eleemosynary or charitable point of view that we want to build up other nations—a position which I would not take, nor would Senator PERCY, I am sure.

So I ask the Senator a specific question. I note with great interest a sentence at page 10 of his prepared remarks, which reads:

> After 35 years of progress, to regress to unilateral action would be an admission of defeat by American business.

I ask the Senator from Illinois for his view as to whether that statement could not be amended to read that American business would, if a protectionist policy were adopted in this country, lose enormous sources of income, enormous sources of profit, and enormous opportunities for development, advancement, and future investment?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I certainly would accept that amendment. There is no question the losses the gentleman has mentioned would certainly occur. I appreciate the opportunity to expand on that sentence. First of all, it would be an admission by Congress, if we were to agree to the array of quotas being requested, that this is not a consumer's economy, but a producer's economy, and that our job is to protect the producer and not to protect the consumer.

If that is true, then I have lived my whole business life wrong. I have always envisioned my responsibility as a businessman as being to serve the interest of this country and put my company behind the country and adhere to a position that is best economically as well as politically for the country and for the consumer.

It would be a defeat if we were to protect ourselves from what I feel are the tremendous advantages we would have in new ideas and new products coming from abroad.

Consider the automobile industry. That is one industry that has grown stronger and more vigorous because of its advocating freer trade. They have in good conscience advocated such a position because it is good for their industry and for the country.

They do not necessarily like all the competition coming in from Germany and Japan. No businessman seeks competition. But they have all admitted that this kind of competition—small cars and new features built into them—has been a stimulant to their own design departments. They have also recognized that when our supplies were shut down at a time of steel strikes, they could not have continued to keep going without the import of steel from abroad. And, I might add, it is partly as a result of shutdowns in the steel industry, that there has been brought about a reliance by industry on imported steel.

They recognize that it is a good thing to have imports of other products and other materials. There has been the development of the use of fibers and aluminum so that they might have substitute materials for the automobile industry.

It would be a tragic defeat for one of the greatest industries of the country if we were to slide behind a wall of protectionism.

We know that foreign countries are more ingenious in finding ways to inhibit trade. The Senator from New York knows better than anybody else that foreign countries are most ingenious, and have imposed on American industry quotas, embargoes, hidden types of taxes, variable import levies, and certain tax policies which have discriminated against us.

We have the job of fighting to remove these hidden barriers. What chance would we have if we were to accept defeat in this area and hide behind the protectionist wall and then try to remove the other barriers discriminating against American products?

It would be a tragic defeat to take this backward step and revise a policy which has experienced 35 years of forward momentum.

Mr. JAVITS. I gather that the Senator is not urging a complete removal of the U.S. tariff structure insofar as we do retain tariffs and do have the Tariff Commission hearings relating to findings of fact or serious injury, the national defense safeguards, and the other safeguards in our law through which we have made enormous progress as evidenced from the Kennedy round and the general reduction of tariffs in the world.

The Senator is not trying to make a case for the complete dismantling of that structure?

Mr. PERCY. Certainly not. That is why I used the words "freer trade" instead of "free trade." The world is not ready to accept free trade, and neither are we. There are provisions in the law to provide protection for hardship cases. But here we have had a wave of requested restrictions which, if all the bills were enacted into law, would restrict imports to the extent of half of the imports into the country.

We are trying to work within that framework and not try to impose an impossible structure for us to work under in the future.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator knows that the United States runs a substantially affirmative trade balance. We export merchandise which exceeds in value the merchandise that we import by between $4 and $5 billion a year.

Does the Senator regard it as a fair statement to say also that we do run—as the Senator knows, and as we all know—a very affirmative balance in terms of the return on our investments abroad—roughly in the area of $5 billion to $6 billion a year. And does the Senator feel that the pattern of such investments would be materially and adversely affected by a protectionist position which the United States would assume if it were to adopt a quota system such as we have discussed?

Mr. PERCY. There is little doubt of that. Our favorable balance of trade amounts to almost $4 billion at this time, and our balance of payments is highly dependent upon this favorable balance of trade.

If I may give the Senator an illustration of what would happen, I had a conversation a few evenings ago with an Ambassador from a country that is vital in their relationship to the United States. We are highly dependent upon them for certain products.

This Ambassador indicated to me that his country had an unfavorable balance amounting to several hundreds of millions of dollars in trade with the United States—they buy them from us then we sell to them.

He said that we would within 30 days turn the screws on that and shut us off. He further said that they hold hundreds of millions of dollars which they have the right to turn in for gold. And he said: "Even though we are friends of the United States, if your country does that to us, we will show you the economic power we have to retaliate. We will embarrass the U.S. Treasury by demanding gold for the dollars we hold now."

The whole rippling effect would spread across this country. There is no question that we would be retaliated against, and the favorable balance of trade we now enjoy would very quickly and seriously be eroded.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator, I gather, would favor any kind of enlightened reform—and I think some reform is necessary—of the trade adjustment provision of the Trade Expansion Act, so that anyone who is really harmed could, more feasibly than possible under the present statute, get some relief and compensation.

The present law is quite restrictive on that score. I have urged—and I hope very much the Senator can give this some consideration—the Finance Committee in dealing with the whole question to liberalize the adjustment assistance aspect of the present law.

How would the Senator feel about that?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter that I wrote to the Secretary of Labor this spring specifically to the point that the distinguished Senator from New York has raised.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 31, 1967.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is my understanding that in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on the Automotive Parts Trade Act of 1965, you indicated that the Administration was considering submitting a bill to Congress revising the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

As you know, the adjustment assistance program has been virtually inoperative since its inception. At the same time, the adjustment assistance provisions of the Automotive Parts Trade Act included criteria for eligibility that are much more generous than provided under the Trade Expansion Act. I believe that the Tariff Commission has certified an eligible seven groups of workers to date, that one application has been denied, and that six are still pending.

The special treatment granted under the Automotive Parts Trade Act seems to me highly inequitable, and I would hope that the Administration would send a bill to the Congress liberalizing the adjustment features of the Trade Expansion Act at the earliest possible time. The completion of the Kennedy Round lends particular urgency to this problem.

It is my understanding that the Administration has tentatively agreed on a draft bill. I would appreciate very much knowing whether this is the case, and, if so, when we can expect the bill to be sent up.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. PERCY. There is no question that industries and workers damaged by imports from past tariff reductions, as well as those under the Kennedy round, will require some form of adjustment aid. We have accepted this as a matter of principle in Congress, though I feel that we must take care to integrate closely such measures for trade adjustment with other measures that we have in the laws to help workers adjust to continually changing economic conditions.

When I worked for the 1962 enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Act, I discussed with President Kennedy, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor my feelings that industry would need support and help in this area just as employees who might be adversely affected require adjustment.

I wholeheartedly supported this aspect, and I have asked the administration whether they are fully implementing and using the powers available to them under this law to provide for assistance to companies that are more adversely affected by imports than others.

There was never a law to provide for help for a company that was manufacturing iceboxes and was put out of business because of the technological development of electrical refrigerators. That problem went through the normal course of adjustment.

I hope that American industry and labor unions will not abuse the privilege of Congress as written into this act. However, there has been a wise provision incorporated in the law, if the provision is wisely administered. The point made by the distinguished Senator from New York is well taken. We must update and liberalize this assistance as we continue to update and liberalize our trade policies.

Mr. JAVITS. Finally, I should like to ask this of the Senator: Many nettling nontariff barriers to trade continue in effect in certain countries which are important trading partners for us. There are road taxes, for example, which are expressly operated so that they actually discriminate against American automobile exports. Will the Senator give his opinion as to whether he believes we can do more or less in dealing with those nontariff barriers by legislating in these quotas. Or, does he believe it is likely to work in reverse, and if we put these quotas into effect, we will find it even more difficult and we will get many more tariff barriers than we now have?

Mr. PERCY. If we put these quotas on the variety of products such as has now been proposed—from steel to strawberries, from zinc to mink—I would say that not only would we be hypocrites to the world, but also, we would have destroyed every possibility that this administration has in the hard bargaining that it is carrying on, under the able leadership of Ambassador Roth, with a firm policy supported by the President and by every Cabinet officer—we would have destroyed their ability to remove the remaining barriers which exist against American exports.

Certainly, the distinguished senior Senator from New York knows that in his own State, in manufactured products worth 1,807,000,000 was exported in 1966, which is a 29-percent increase over 1963 and substantially more than that over previous years. So there is a general trend upward.

Employment in New York State and in virtually every State in the Union is dependent upon our ability to keep exports flowing abroad. The removal of the remaining hidden restrictions is the most important single function this administration can now perform in the bargaining process. We, in Congress, would be responsible for destroying the bargaining power to open up the trade lanes of the world to American products if we imposed this array of tariff quotas and restrictions.

Mr. JAVITS. This leads me to my last question: How would the Senator read such action, which would be widely interpreted in the world as protectionist in terms of the U.S. posture generally? Does he believe that the world would take this as a signal of an enormous reversal in American policy of withdrawal from the world, an insulated fortress America? Does he believe that such action could have enormously portentous consequences in terms of the adherence of various nations to the Soviet bloc rather than to the free world, it still being a fact, notwithstanding all our troubles, that the great preponderance of mankind—not only in resources but also in territory, in population, and in production—is still ranged on the side of what is called the free world?

Mr. PERCY. I cannot imagine anything that would cause greater joy in the Kremlin or in Peking or in Havana than a policy of restrictive quotas on products coming from abroad, to stop the flow of two-way trade between the United States and nations all over the world with which it now deals.

Through the centuries, political friendships have tended to follow the trade lanes; and the great strength of this country lies in the economic strength we have. This economic strength in the free enterprise system has made this, over a period of years, the most powerful nation on earth, has made us the wealthiest people on earth, and has enabled us to be the most generous people on earth.

But we would be saying to the rest of the world that this great, powerful enterprise and these powerful companies which are here clamoring for quota protection now no longer have faith, no longer are leading from courage, but are leading from fear—fearful that they cannot trade economically with the rest of the world, fearful that we cannot survive on the battlefield of trade, which has been the century-long battlefield in which we have invariably been successful, effectively made friends throughout the world and benefited our own people, as well as people of other countries.

What are we saying to the world—that we will aid you, we will give you gifts, but we will not trade with you? The very countries we are now assisting through our foreign aid program are the ones whose economic development depends most on the ability to wean themselves from aid by trade with the United States. Those would be the countries we would be affecting most adversely.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Moss in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **PERCY**. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I believe the Senator has given one of the most eloquent demonstrations in his career as to why the people of the State of Illinois sent him to Congress as their Senator; also, in my judgment, why the entire country is glad that the people of Illinois did.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. **PERCY**. I thank my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New York.

EXHIBIT I

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
October 20, 1967.

Senator JACOB JAVITS,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I want to commend you for your ardent opposition to the import quota legislation now before the Congress. I have always believed in the minimum of restriction being imposed on imports and exports as a means to maximum international trade and encouraging good will and understanding between nations. Keep up the good work.

JACK I. STRAUS,
Chairman of the Board,
R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
October 21, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

While recognizing that foreign countries continue to descriminate against many U.S. products we support the general principle of free trade as essential to future world trade expansion and hence your general position opposing import quota legislation before Congress.

ROLAND PIEROTTI,
Executive Vice President, International Banking, Bank of America.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
October 20, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I congratulate you on your forthright opposition to pending import quota legislation both in your effective testimony before the Senate Finance Committee yesterday and in your remarks from the Senate floor on a number of occasions. It is unfortunate that more Members of Congress do not recognize as you do that the foreign trade of your nation would be seriously jeopardized if the protectionist principles embodied in these quota bills were allowed to prevail. I trust you will continue to be a leader in the fight to avoid this threatened reversal of U.S. trade policy, the inevitable effect of which would be to penalize the consumer through higher prices and to ensure retaliation on the part of other countries.

A. THOMAS TAYLOR,
Chairman and President,
International Packers, Ltd.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
October 20, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Very well impressed with your testimony before Senate Finance Committee on restrictive legislation. If such legislation were enacted we would start turning back to the Smoot Hawley days of retaliation and depression and also increase cost of living in this country. Heartily approve your position. With best wishes.

DAVID J. WINTON,
Chairman, the Winton Co.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
October 23, 1967.

Hon. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly endorse your testimony Oct. 19 before Senate Finance Committee concerning import quota legislation. We hope these enlightened views prevail.

JOSEPH C. WILSON,
President, Xerox Corp.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
October 32, 1967.

Hon. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support position you took before Senate Finance Committee on import quota legislation.

G. H. GALLAWAY,
President, Crown Zellerbach International, Inc.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
October 28, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Have been informed of your testimony before the Senate Finance Committee opposing import quota legislation. This is to let you know that I strongly support your position in this matter and appreciate your willingness to testify in opposition to the pending legislation.

E. W. SPENCER,
Member, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Vice President, Honeywell, Inc.

EAST HARTFORD, CONN.,
October 28, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to voice strong agreement with your testimony before Senate Finance Committee. Completely concur in your opposition to any proposed bills establishing import quotas. Such legislation would lead to retaliation by nations comprising our export market. Any retaliatory action could jeopardize the present one hundred million dollar annual export business volume of this corporation and thus adversely affect the economic level of not only our immediate locale in Florida and Connecticut but also of the whole New England area in which we are largest single employer.

W. P. GWINN,
President, United Aircraft Corp.

TOBACCO ASSOCIATES, INC.,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We heartily applaud and commend you for your strong opposition to import quota legislation as set forth in your testimony yesterday before the Senate Finance Committee.

Tobacco is extremely sensitive to any restriction on imports as our exports account for a sizable percentage of the total amount of tobacco grown in this country. In the case of flue-cured which accounts for about half of our total production, exports run from 30 to 40 percent annually and are thus of vital importance to growers of this type in Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia and Florida.

Attached is a statement which we filed with the committee on October 18th.

Very sincerely yours,

JNO. D. PALMER,
President.

STATEMENT OF JOHN D. PALMER, PRESIDENT, TOBACCO ASSOCIATES, INC., TO COMMITTEE ON FINANCE IN THE MATTER OF IMPORT QUOTA LEGISLATION, OCTOBER 18, 1967

For more than three centuries and without interruption, exports of unmanufactured tobacco from this country have played a leading and vital role in the wellbeing of our economy. These are the facts as of today:

1. Exports in the fiscal year ended June 30 exceeded 700 million pounds, farm weight, with a value of $505 million.
2. Of that value, 79% represented cash sales and thus contributed nearly $400 million to our balance of payments.
3. Of the shipped weight, more than 31% went to the European Common Market.

America exports because it imports—exports tobacco and all the other commodities and products that add up to the $29.4 billion in calendar 1966. In the hands of Congress, or about to be introduced, are proposals that would build a wall against imports. That same wall would even more effectively shut off our trade overseas.

As far as tobacco itself is involved, here are the cold facts with respect to one area alone, the European Common Market which, as noted above, takes nearly a third of our exports. Before the Council of Ministers today are proposals by the Common Market Commission for an agricultural policy covering tobacco. In substance, that proposal would encourage increased production in the Community by high price support payments; and, when supplies of such tobacco reached surplus levels, imports would be reduced or cut off entirely under an import licensing system. Today, tobacco manufacturers in the Community are entirely at liberty to buy from third countries free of any form of restriction either as to quantities or values. Carried to the extreme, the Commission proposal could mean the loss of a market worth far in excess of $100 million annually to the American farmer. Thus far, the Council has not accepted the proposal, but let there be no doubt that restrictions by the Congress on imports would provide both a reason and an excuse to make it operative. By extension, retaliatory action in one form or another would inevitably occur in all other major markets overseas.

Let there also be no doubt on this point. While America is still the world's largest producer of tobacco, the world is not—I repeat not—dependent upon our crop. In every part of the globe—in South America, Africa, Eastern Europe and the Far East—production has been expanded enormously. In flue-cured, the principal component of cigarettes, production abroad has spiraled from less than 500 million pounds annually prior to World War II to five times that figure in 1966. It can easily and quickly expand to the point that American tobacco will no longer be needed. Mark you well that the tobacco industries of West Germany and Japan, our second and third largest customers today, were without our product all during the war years. It took a monumental effort to rebuild both markets. Unwise, unnecessary and unrealistic tariff walls on our part will cause them only superficial, temporary inconvenience. For the American farmer, the result could be irreparable damage.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 19, 1967.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I fully endorsed what you said to the Senate Finance Committee on October 19th. Enactment of import restriction bill now before the Senate would severely damage our trade achievement and the total national interest. Reports that the bill stand fair chance of being passed have all ready brought discredit to U.S. policy, creditability and to the Congress itself. I urge you to continue your effort to save the Senate from the falling of some of its own members.

CARL J. GILBERT,
Executive Committee, Gillette Co.

U.S. COUNCIL REGISTERS OPPOSITION TO IMPORT QUOTAS LEGISLATION

NEW YORK, October 18.—The United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce today sent the following telegram to Senator Russell B. Long, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

The Council statement was directed to hearings currently being held by the Finance Committee on several bills to impose import quotas on various commodities.

Representing some 300 major American companies engaged in international business, the Council statement strongly opposed enactment of these bills.

TELEGRAM FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE FOR FINANCE

"U.S. Council of International Chamber of Commerce strongly opposed to import quota legislation now before your committee. At deliberations today undersigned members executive committee unanimously agreed this legislation could serve only to reverse thirty years trade policy progress. Our country now stands to lose incalculable benefits of enlightened bi-partisan efforts to modernize world's commercial structure. Imposition of quotas will lead to retaliation from other countries. They would have no choice but to follow our example with world-wide restrictive chain reaction bound to result. This neither U.S. nor world can afford. Export earnings vital to balance of payments would be in jeopardy. Higher costs induced by quotas would add to inflationary pressures. The sacrifice of jobs generated by trade would deepen unemployment problems. Damaging effect of proposed quotas on overall policy position would be enormous. In terms of our national interest dangers are overwhelming. Major U.S. stake in world production structure would be imperiled. We have consistently urged upon other nations the benefits of free competition. We must practice it ourselves.

Chairman Executive Committee: James A. Linen, Time, Inc.; William Blackie, Caterpillar Tractor Co.; Max E. Gevers, Bankers Trust Co.; Patrick E. Haggerty, Texas Instrument, Inc.; H. J. Heinz II, H. J. Heinz, Co.; Walter Hochschild, American Metal Climax, Inc.; Amory Houghton, Corning Glass Works; Antonie T. Knoppers, Merck Sharp & Dohme International; Warren Lee Pierson, All American Cable & Radio, Inc.; Philip D. Reed, Former Chairman, General Electric Co.; Ralph T. Reed, Former Chairman, American Express; Hoyt P. Steele, General Electric Co.; Arthur K. Watson, International Business Machines Corp.; Leo D. Welch, Former Chairman, Standard Oil Co. (N.J.); Walter Wriston, First National City Bank; U.S. Council, Christopher H. Phillips, President.

MOTOROLA INC.,
October 17, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: On September 29, 1967, Senator Russell B. Long (D., La.), Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, announced that the Committee would hold three days of public hearings beginning October 18 on various proposals to impose import quotas on specified commodities. Among the commodities on which Chairman Long indicated testimony would be taken were oil, meat, lead and zinc, textiles, steel and dairy products. An article on page 3 of the Wall Street Journal for October 11, 1967, also mentions electronic products. The purpose of this letter is to advise you of Motorola's strong opposition to import quotas on electronic products.

In view of our plant at Arcade, New York, you might think we favor import quotas to gain protection from foreign firms whose wage costs are lower. On the contrary, we feel that our long run national interest is best preserved by less restrictive international trade. Our experience as an importer indicates to us that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to administer import quotas in an industry with such a wide variety of products. We also export many products made in the United States, and we fear that American import quotas would quickly bring retaliation abroad. In the United States consumers would be paying higher prices if we had import quotas. Inflation is already very much with us, even without fresh trade restraints to accentuate it. For these reasons we hope you will oppose any attempt to put import quotas on electronic products.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,
MOTOROLA INC.,
LEWIS D. SPENCER,
Vice President.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
October 23, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Rochester-Monroe County port authority is strongly opposed to import quota bills now being considered. Enactment of these bills would result in punitive restrictions against U.S. export sale and bring serious description if not strangulation of foreign trade. We respectfully urge your opposition to these measures.

ARNOLD B. MORRISON,
Chairman.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
October 19, 1967.

Senator JACOB JAVITS,
Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The following port members of the council of Lake Erie ports strongly oppose pending bill to impose import quotas and restrictions on selected products as an immediate incentive to sharp retaliation by foreign governments and thus an imminent threat to all people engaged in any aspect of world trade. Congress should know that this country is the world's leading exporter in spite of high wages and that universally it is modern machinery and advanced methods rather than hourly rates which determine whether domestic industry is competitive in the world market. Proponents of restrictions need better management not additional protection ports. Joining in this message are Ashtabula, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Erie, Fairport Harbor, Lorain and Toledo.

Respectfully submitted.

ARTHUR W. TODD,
Secretary, Lincoln Electric Co.

UNITED STATES WARNED OF REPRISALS BY COMMART

(By Gordon L. Weil)

BRUSSELS, October 13.—The Common Market has given the United States a thinly veiled warning that it will retaliate if protectionist legislation supported by members of congress is enacted.

The six member countries submitted identical notes to the State Department Thursday, complaining against "protectionist tendencies" that may "compromise" the results of the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations. The Kennedy Round, begun during President John F. Kennedy's administration and concluded last June, yielded an agreement to lower tariffs around the world.

[In Washington, the State Department said it is "deeply concerned" about the trade bills that may be filed in Congress, United Press International reported.

JOHNSON REMARKS

[Spokesman Robert J. McClosky called attention to remarks made Thursday by President Johnson, who said he believed promoting the expansion of world trade is in America's self-interest.

[McClosky said the State Department's position would be presented more fully at hearings next week before the Senate Finance Committee.]

At the same time the notes were sent, the European Community Commission, the independent executive arm of the Common Market, began studying possible retaliatory measures. Reprisals by the Common Market, the World's largest trading unit and a major American market, could wipe out many of the tariff cuts accepted in June.

The six show most concern over proposals by Rep. Wilbur D. Mills (D-Ark.) to boost American protection on textiles and watch movements. The Common Market believes that U.S. textile imports might be cut 37 per cent if such a bill is passed.

Omnibus import-quota proposals supported by Sen. Everett M. Dirksen (R-Ill.) also have the Six worried. Ana they have drawn up a list showing that specific protectionist legislation has been proposed for oil, meat, mink skins, lead and zinc, and strawberries.

Six separate notes—from France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, are sent when the Common Market wants to give maximum weight to a message. The Commission itself could have protested to the United States.

The Common Market notes do not mention individual exports, but the Commission is known to be giving top priority to forestalling American action against the "dumping" of European canned hams.

Market officials say privately that American negotiators in the Kennedy round knew of European supports for meat exports when they agreed to cut canned-ham tariffs 30 per cent. Many reciprocal reductions were linked to that agreement.

The Market has considerable flexibility in taking retaliatory action. Legislatures in the six countries have turned over most commerce powers to the executive branch, which in turn has vested them in the Common Market's Council of Ministers. Thus, once the Commission made a proposal, it could be enacted without lengthy hearings.

Tobacco is one of the products for which Common Market protection may be increased if antidumping action is taken against canned-ham imports. In the Kennedy round, the Six made substantial cuts in their duties on high-quality tobaccos, most of which come from the United States.

Much of the legislation to be before Congress would in effect revoke current American practices aimed at promoting freer trade.

A bill proposed by Sen. Margaret Chase Smith (R-Me.), for example, would remove the President's power to determine when an influx of foreign goods has made emergency protection necessary. Sen. Smith would substitute automatic measures at a certain level of imports.

Concern that American protectionist measures were imminent grew when the Common Market learned of the upcoming Senate Finance Committee hearings. The committee chairman, Sen. Russell B. Long (D.-La.), is himself the author of at least one bill, and reports reaching Brussels picture most of the Committee and the Senate as favoring protection.

Latin Americans Lodge Protest

Latin American ambassadors to Washington held an emergency meeting here yesterday to protest bills to limit imports or raise tariffs.

They said any protectionist measure would be a blow to Latin countries' efforts to broaden markets in the United States and speed their economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 20, 1967]

Japan, United States Approach Battle in Trade-Protection Dispute

(By Richard Halloran)

TOKYO, October 19.—Japan and the United States are on the verge of an all-out economic battle.

The Japanese government, business community, and press have let loose a salvo at the rising protectionist movement in the United States. It came partly in response to American demands that Japan open its economy to foreign private investment.

Yomiuri Shimbun, a leading daily, summed up the Japanese attitude this way: "We must be prepared for the worst and have countermeasures ready for any eventuality."

[The six European Common countries have formally protested the protectionist proposals, hinting retaliation. Australia also has protested, and Latin American and other nations have protested informally.]

The Japanese government announced yesterday that it is preparing plans to reduce American exports to Japan by almost 25 per cent if the U.S. Congress passes a number of bills the Japanese consider protectionist. Among them are acts that would restrict imports of textiles, steel, electronics, rubber footwear.

The government threatened to cut imports from America by $600 million, out of a total sale last year $2.6 billion. The Japanese said they would buy meat from Argentina, wheat from Canada and Australia, rice from Korea and Taiwan. The United States already competes with Communist China for the soybeans.

Japan also delivered a strongly worded note of protest to the U.S. Government this week.

The Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI), which oversees Japan's trade, and U.S. Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge will be invited to Japan later this month while en route to Korea to be informed of their thinking.

Yomiuri Shimbun this morning warned that, as a retaliatory measure, Japan also can postpone proposals to remove stringent restrictions against foreign investment here.

This is likely to hit a very sore point with internationally minded U.S. businessmen. Americans have been demanding for years, with little success, that Japan allow American investments in accordance with the basic U.S.-Japan commercial treaty.

Rudolph A. Peterson, president of the Bank of America, said here recently that Japanese criticism of American legislation while holding back on its own capital liberalization will increase U.S. resistance.

George Ball, former Under Secretary of State, was more blunt. He told Japanese businessmen they could expect greater American resistance to their exports unless they opened up their markets on a reciprocal basis.

[The Canadian government's "serious concern" over the import restriction bills before Congress was voiced in a note to the State Department delivered Tuesday, Gerald Waring reported from Ottawa.

[The note, presented in parliament Thursday, said the imposition of restrictions on imports from Canada would contravene trade agreements between Canada and the United States "and would raise basic questions in (their) trade relations."]

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Oct. 16, 1967]

Pastures for the Sacred Cows

It is astonishing to find how many people—including many of those presumably dedicated to the concept of free enterprise—are bemused these days with such phrases as "status quo" and "fixed share of the market."

American law, as it applies to American enterprise, finds both phrases abhorrent. They have been long regarded in this country as the slogans of the wickeder European cartels of old. And perhaps for a reason. Whenever two or more competitors agree to freeze their prime markets and minimize future competition between them, interlopers with new ideas are kept out, prices are kept up, technological progress sags and the general economy is made to suffer in the interests of greater comfort for the business giants.

But if the status quo is adjudged to be a dangerous kind of sacred cow for business to let out of the barn, what kind of cow does it become when brought forth by governments? And in particular by the United States government?

An alarming number of these cows are now loose on the landscape, all demanding their "fixed share" of the pasture.

They crop up in commodity stabilization agreements, in Brazilian efforts to freeze the carriage of coffee to North American markets and in a seemingly ever-widening range of quotas on imports—all of them dedicated to the proposition that everyone should keep what he has now and that all others are out of luck—a proposition that also has an almost hypnotic appeal to the major labor unions.

The biggest drive in this direction in recent history is now being mounted in Washington, where it is being openly said that import quotas on crude oil, and on cotton, wool and synthetic fibers are not enough.

The next candidates for the near freeze are cited as iron and steel products, glass, footwear, lead and zinc, electronic parts and such. Not since the political logrolling that produced the Hawley-Smoot Tariff of 1930 has such a concerted protectionist drive been organized. And to make it all the more intriguing—there are signs that the individual quotas will be slipped into the Social Security Bill as riders, the theory being that while President Johnson would probably veto them all if given the chance, he would think twice about blocking the Social Security changes he has wanted so much.

Now it can be argued, of course, that the quotas would not in all cases have to be inflexible, that some provision can be (and in practice, has been) made for new faces in a particular market, and that it would be simply too embarrassing all around to try raising tariffs now (in lieu of quotas) before the ink on the Kennedy Round is dry.

Perhaps so, but no matter how the cloth is cut, the objective of all these maneuvers, including those embedded in the commodity stabilization agreements, is maintenance of a rough sort of status quo of "fixed share of the market" system—the very system that the courts consider anathema when organized within the United States by private business.

Nor does it make much difference that the system now in vogue does not involve cartels in the old sense of the word, but division of a market by groups of national industries or—to put it another way, that even under a quota system American steel industries would still have to battle each other for the U.S. market and foreign steel producers would have to do likewise.

But the purpose of the import quota system is, after all, to dull the edge of competition by more or less fixing the share of a particular market as between domestic and foreign sellers. If this is considered a "bad practice" when organized by a group of companies on their own, by what sort of medieval alchemy does it suddenly become a "good practice" when given the blessings of a benevolent government?

As between what Congress has already sanctioned in the way of share-of-the-market import quotas and what business is specifically forbidden to do—is there really such a difference? Neither approach is going to increase anyone's efficiency, further technological progress or cut production costs. And a government-imposed quota offers no more hope of lower prices than an industrial cartel. Quite the contrary, as demonstrated by the workings of the crude oil quotas, a prime objective of these devices is to raise prices in the markets of the countries adopting them.

We don't say that the United States is the only bad actor in this particular picture. Far from it: herds of sacred cows are grazing in many foreign grasslands. We do regret that the one nation which more than any other has shown the world what free competition can produce in the way of economic progress now seems in danger of turning its head in a more desolate direction.

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 16, 1967]

Keep Trade "Free"

The dangers, the disadvantages, the nonsense involved in building a system of national trade barriers and quota systems are evident from history: Tariff retaliation by other countries, a choking off of world commerce, international antagonism, a decline in jobs.

Yet the foolish cry for protection continues, as events in Washington show today.

A number of congressmen, moved by industry wailing, are talking about higher trade barriers. Sen. Everett Dirksen of Illinois, the Republican leader, would have the Finance Committee approve import quota systems for a variety of items—oil, lead, zinc, dairy products, beef, steel, perhaps even electronics.

Sen. Russell Long of Louisiana, the committee chairman, thinks the U.S. oil industry needs more trade protection. Sen. Vance Hartke of Indiana joins Dirksen in advocating protection for steel.

These men, and the industries involved, take short-sighted, ill-advised positions. As William M. Roth, President Johnson's special trade representative, put it so well:

"If anything is done by Congress on this scale, there will be massive retaliation by other countries against" many major U.S. exports. Mr. Roth rightly adds that the scope of the planned Senate committee action "is so tremendous it would completely destroy our trade policy."

Mr. Roth hardly had uttered his statements before his fears were confirmed by more than a dozen of our best customers:

The six nations in the European Common Market sent a joint letter to the State Department broadly hinting at the retaliation Mr. Roth warned about. Latin-American ambassadors in Washington got together on a similar warning. Such retaliation by these countries would be a devastating blow to American business.

The White House has indicated it supports Mr. Roth's views and opposes the pending protectionist proposals. But in view of the growing campaign, the President himself would do well to speak in outright and complete opposition. He could echo Mr. Roth's arguments and add that better responses to foreign competition are more vigorous marketing policies by U.S. corporations, better management and more rapid modernization.

In one sense, the nation's "free trade" approach dates to Cordell Hull and Franklin Roosevelt. But in a broader sense such a policy is more deeply ingrained in our society. For it was Thomas Jefferson who proclaimed 168 years ago: "I am for free commerce for all nations."

[From the New York Times, Oct. 13, 1967]

THE PROTECTIONIST DRIVE

The six countries of the European Common Market have taken the unprecedented step this week of handing the United States a written diplomatic protest against the protectionist measures now pending in Congress. Other European countries and Japan have also been expressing alarm.

Textile, petroleum, steel, meat and dairy interests are, as we noted last week, in the forefront of this major protectionist drive. Their Congressional allies have introduced bills that would replace the country's declining tariff barriers with rigid import quotas that undoubtedly would trigger vast retaliatory moves abroad. Similar measures have been introduced to protect lead, zinc, watches, shoes, glass and even strawberries and mink fur. The whole chemical industry is engaged in a separate fight to head off tariff reductions negotiated in the Kennedy Round.

The Senate is the immediate focus of the protectionist. Considerably more than half its membership is already enlisted in support of one import quota measure or another. These proposals, taken together, would affect $3.6 billion of commerce, one-third of the country's dutiable imports. But plans are afoot now, according to Senator Dirksen, to add a single omnibus import quota bill that would cover virtually all other imports that offer competition to American producers. Committee passage next week is predicted.

On American initiative, the entire developed world has been engaged for five years in intensive negotiations under the Kennedy Round to dismantle most remaining protective tariffs. President Johnson signed the solemn agreements achieved in these negotiations only last summer. The measures now pending in Congress would vitiate the whole effort.

The nation and the world paid a heavy price in the 1930's when vested interests succeeded in barring competition from abroad, a step toward the repeal of capitalism in the name of an effort to save it. A return to trade restriction would injure the United States more than other countries since it exports more than it imports. The deficit in the nation's payments balance abroad would be increased, weakening the dollar further. A vital brake on inflation would be removed if imports were hampered. Far more workers, farmers, consumers and businessmen would lose through declining export markets and rising prices at home than would gain through added protection of a few domestic sectors of the economy. The blow that would be struck at the unity of the West and the value of the American word abroad would be incalculable.

The current success of the protectionist lobby can only be attributed to the power vacuum that has developed in Washington as Presidential leadership has faded beneath the frustrations of intractable issues such as Vietnam, the urban crisis and the tax fight.

There is a clear need for the bipartisan industrial, export, banking, farm, labor and consumer interests that have led the fight for freer trade since 1934 to organize themselves again to defend the achievements of five Administrations in this field.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 5, 1967]

THE PAINS OF PROTECTIONISM

Economists can, and frequently do, muster all sorts of arguments against import curbs. Though their case is convincing, the matter isn't entirely onesided.

To begin with, no academic reasoning will ease the pain of a businessman who believes he is being undone by imports. At the moment such major industries as textiles, meat, steel and oil say they are in that situation, or close to it, and are pressing Congress for new or increased protection.

They contend, quite correctly, that their economic health is important not only to them but to the nation. They also stress the difficulty of competing with foreign firms whose wage costs are lower.

When it comes to proposed relief, the import-troubled industries emphasize their eagerness to be reasonable. For the most part they do not want to shut out all foreign competition; instead, they would merely limit it to a "fair" share of the domestic market. Even that might not be necessary, some spokesmen say, if other nations would only allow the U.S. freer access to their own markets.

Before Congress comes to any decision, however, it should ponder this question's other sides. If the U.S. moves toward protectionism, for instance, what happens to the nation's export trade? As an international merchant, after all, this country still leads the world by a wide margin.

The answer is partly a matter of simple economics. If Country A can no longer sell quite as many textiles to the U.S., it won't earn as many dollars to buy American business machines. Thus the effect would be to limit U.S. exports, even if the only change in the situation was a higher U.S. tariff or lower import quota.

But that's not likely to be the only change. Among nations, as among little boys, there's a tendency to strike back when someone hits you. If history is any guide, then, new U.S. import curbs would quickly bring retaliation abroad, further crimping America's foreign sales.

Turning the question around another way, Congress might consider it from the point of view of consumers. What happens to them if the nation raises new barriers against imports?

For one thing, consumers would often be paying higher prices. Some people may like the snob appeal of a foreign label, but most Americans buy imports mainly when they believe they're getting more for their money. Trade restrictions, furthermore, obviously limit consumers' freedom of choice.

That brings us back to the economists, who focus most of their attention on a still broader aspect of import curbs: Their effect on the general well-being of the economy. As is their wont, the academicians take a fairly long-run view of things; they find little comfort in the economy's current health if it seems due to degenerate before long.

One prime worry is protectionism's upward pressure on prices. Inflation is already very much with us, even without fresh trade restraints to accentuate it.

Economists also fret about the effects of import curbs on the vitality of domestic industries. If foreign competition is curtailed, domestic producers will have less incentive to increase efficiency and develop new and better products.

Through the past three decades, the domestic economy has expanded enormously while U.S. protectionism has shrunk to a shadow of its former self. While there are numerous reasons for this happy development, not the least of them is stiff competition, some of it furnished by foreigners.

Trade restrictions, in sum, provide benefits for U.S. firms in the domestic market, though these gains may be only temporary. On the other hand, import curbs endanger the nation's exports, impose penalties on consumers and tend to weaken the vigor of the country's economy. Looked at from all sides, the package hardly seems appealing.

If a company is genuinely damaged by imports, machinery already exists to provide job-retaining, technical assistance and the like. If Congress decides that more help is needed, it would be better to pay direct Federal subsidies than to opt for the even more debilitating devices of trade restraint.

For some businessmen, import competition can pfove quite painful. From the standpoint of the rest of the nation, however, the agonies of protectionism could be a good deal worse.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of two or three of the bills that are pending in the Senate Committee on Finance at this time. One of the bills concerns a quota on dairy imports, and one concerns a quota on meat imports.

I voted for the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and I recently signed a report of the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee which sets forth policies regarding expanded trade and its need so far as the best interests of the United States are concerned.

I point this out because I hope the Senator from Illinois will understand that I believe, in my conscience, that I can take the actions I have mentioned with a clear conscience and be consistent at the same time.

I believe the Senator is familiar with Mr. Roth's testimony before the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee, that our position in the Kennedy round of negotiations before the Common Market countries was that we should be given access to their market for our feed grain.

We were not asking for anything more than a percentage of their market reflected in a base period. Mr. Roth, as I recall, stated that this was our negotiating position; and our position was, further, that as the economy and the populations of the Common Market countries grew, our percentage of the access would remain fixed, but the volume within that percentage would grow.

I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he believes that was a fair position.

Mr. PERCY. First, may I reply by stating my high regard for the intelligent approach always taken by the distinguished Senator from Iowa to these complex problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PERCY. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PERCY. I know, also, that he is well aware that his great State of Iowa, a sister State of Illinois, is one of the most productive States and areas in the world, and that it not only is a leader in industrial and manufactured goods production, but also in agricultural production.

Let me first comment on the dependence of the State of Iowa upon exports for manufactured goods. In 1966——

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I might remind my colleague that I have made many public speeches, not only in Iowa, but in other parts of the country as well, in which I have invited my audiences' attention to the degree to which the Iowa economy depends upon exports. So I am very familiar with that matter. But I should like to have a response from the Senator as to whether or not he believes that the position of Mr. Roth and our negotiators before the Common Market, with respect to the access of our feed grains, was a fair position.

Mr. PERCY. I should first like to put into the RECORD the figure indicating Iowa's great contribution to the exports of this country and to the balance of payments of this country—$353 million in 1966. That represents a large amount of employment in the area of manufactured goods.

On the subject of agricultural products, I think the important thing for us to remember is that Australia and New Zealand are the principal countries which wish to export dairy products into this country. Here we have two countries which are our stanchest allies in Vietnam. No one would take second place to the Senator from Iowa in his firm resolve to have this country and its allies stand firm in Vietnam. But I would simply ask whether or not the reaction of Australia and New Zealand, two countries which are already limited by quotas on the amount of products they can ship to this country, and are greatly desirous of buying from this country, should be taken into account when we consider foreign trade policy?

Second, I point to the fact that the great bulk of our exports, and our favorable balance of payments, lie in the field of agriculture. If we did not have these markets abroad, where countries could buy and pay for the food we ship to them, would not the economy of Illinois and Iowa be markedly injured?

We cannot select a few products and say these products need quota restrictions because as to them we have a less favorable competitive position than some other countries. We must look at the total complex and say that on some items we can produce cheaper than someone else; and we must be willing to take in certain imports from other countries when they demonstrate they can produce that food and put it on the American table more cheaply than our farmers can.

This is a two-way street. I feel that artificial restrictions in the way of imports of food products in the end severely injure the long-term interest of the American farmer, and most certainly the agriculture implement producers of this country whose tremendous exports have brought great dollar revenue and employment to this country.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would answer the question which I have asked him. I take it, by the fact that he has not, that he must feel the position of the U.S. Government before the Common Market, in asking not for any increase in our percentage of access to their market, but only the same percentage we had during the base period, was unfair.

Mr. PERCY. I think it is totally and grossly unfair to those in this country for them to impose an artificial restriction on imports, and it is unfair to those countries for us to do so, because they cannot expand and take advantage of the market.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. What would the Senator think if, as a businessman, I came to Congress and said, "We are perfectly willing to let cameras come in, but we want to take the base period of 1946, 1947, and 1948, and only allow them to ship in cameras so long as they do not exceed the percentages of those years. I saw it go from zero to 4, to 6, and 10, and in still cameras as high as 70 percent. But the combination of engineering, research, design, production, sales, and merchandising enable the U.S. photographic industry to recapture the markets we had had available to us on an economic basis and we are the stronger today because of it.

I think such restrictions would be totally unfair and unrealistic. Would we want other countries to say, "You cannot gain a greater proportion of our market than you have"? If we put this in the deep freeze, we would greatly restrict our ability to grow and we would greatly restrict our ability to produce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa seek recognition?

Mr. MILLER. I do, Mr. President, unless the Senator asks for additional time. I wish to continue the colloquy.

Mr. PERCY. I would like the Senator to have additional time. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I regret that my colleague thinks that Mr. Roth and his negotiators were taking an unfair position in asking the Common Market for a percentage quota for our feed grains. I do believe that they took a fair position, and the Senator knows the Common Market simply denied everything. I think the Common Market took a very unfair position. Because they took this very unfair position we do not have a two-way street. Free trade is not a one-way street; free trade is a two-way street.

Our negotiators asked the Common Market during the Kennedy round negotiations to let the United States continue to have this fixed percentage, fixed on the base period, and the Common Market slammed the door and we received nothing. However, I think our position was eminently fair. All of these bills I am talking about that are pending in the Committee on Finance take the same position with respect to ourselves as we asked the Common Market to take with respect to themselves.

We are not throwing up a protectionist wall and saying, "Keep your imports out of the United States." We says, "Continue your exports to the United States, but do not take the lion's share of our increased domestic consumption."

I can assure the Senator that the dairy industry in this country is a sick industry today because of what has happened in the last 3 or 4 years. If we are not careful we will have a milk shortage in this country one of these days because of the flood of imports coming in, which is causing dairy farmers to go out of business.

In 1960 we imported 300 million pounds in milk equivalent products. In 1965, the figure went up to 900 million pounds. In 1966, it went up to 2.7 billion pounds. This year it was running at an annual rate in excess of 4 billion pounds until the President took action on July 1 to cut it back.

I suggest to the Senator that I do not think it is being protectionist to say to them, "Continue to export your dairy products to the United States, but do not take the lion's share or all of our increased domestic consumption."

I do not think this is a throwback to the old Smoot-Hawley days of throwing up a wall. My record in support of the Trade Expansion Act is good evidence of how I feel about it. However, it must be a two-way street and not a one-way street.

I can assure the Senator from Illinois that the dairy farmers of this country are not asking for a great big protectionist wall, but they do say, "Make it a two-way street," and they think it has been a one-way street so far.

The same is true to a lesser extent in the livestock industry, and this relates not only to New Zealand and Australia; it also relates to Ireland and Argentina. I must say that while I recognize Australia would like to take over all of our meat market, they should be content to make it a two-way street, and it has not been that in the last 2 or 3 years.

It would be wrong for us to go to them and say, "Let us take over all of your increased consumption of manufactured products," when they are able to produce for a good share of their market.

I want to put this in perspective, because I know the Senator feels strongly about world trade. I feel as strongly as he feels, but I do not think we should be carried away with the spirit of exports and world trade to the extent that we ignore the abuse of that principle by some of our foreign trading partners.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for an additional 5 minutes. I wish to ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Oklahoma, who has been waiting, if it would inconvenience him for us to proceed with this colloquy.

Mr. MONRONEY. No, indeed. The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois is making a most important speech, one that I think needs to be thoroughly aired on the floor of the Senate, and he is an authority on that subject. I do not object to a continuation of the colloquy. I have time to wait and to enjoy the colloquy, as well.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

May I ask the Senator from Illinois this question, following the very interesting colloquy he just had with the Senator from Iowa: Is it not true that if the argument of the Senator from Iowa prevailed, the Senator from Iowa would have a particular part of the national economy seeking to retrade many aspects of a multilateral deal made between the United States and many other countries? He would have an excellent case for a particular product. But are we willing also to retrade that for the whole range of manufactured products which come under the Kennedy round, and to undo everything that has been done there, simply because we are worried or concerned about problems affecting the meat industry or the dairy industry?

My State happens to be a bigger State than the State of the Senator from Iowa in terms of dairying. New York would feel it very keenly, too, considering everything else involved in this situation.

One other question: Is it not true that we have an enormous export trade in agricultural products? It may not happen to be in the dairy business, but we do have an enormous surplus of agricultural products for export from the United States. Are we not faced with a problem in which we shall have to say to individual interests: "Surely, we understand your situation. We will do our utmost to cope with it"? That is why we have the adjustment assistance idea. That is why we are spending $5 billion to support agriculture in this country. I think much of it is necessary. But we have simply got to look at all our trade and make business deals on a multilateral basis, if we can. That does not mean we have to give up on agriculture. We had a pretty big fight on chickens in the foreign market, and we got results. But we cannot do that on every product, because we do not have everything to trade.

Mr. PERCY. First, I should like to emphasize that I am well aware that the distinguished Senator from Iowa has been outspoken in defending the principles of freer trade. He believes in the free market. He has lived that principle for all of his years in public life. I am well aware of the fact that he has a responsibility to look to the gross inequities that exist when we give away a trading point without getting a commensurate trading point in return. Overall, I have felt that the Kennedy round has been a satisfactory round. We have gained, I believe, as much as we have given. But there are certain inequities. I want better to inform myself on the subject, because I have the same vital dairy industry in my State that the Senator from Iowa has in his State.

I should like to discuss in detail what actually did happen in the trading round of negotiations to see whether undue discrimination held forth.

But I must not allow the Senator from Iowa to misconstrue my earlier remarks. I do not believe that the late Gov. Christian Herter and Ambassador Roth acted unwisely in taking the position they did vis-a-vis the Common Market. At the time, in 1963, that position seemed like the most reasonable and practical way of protecting our substantial grain exports to the Common Market. It did not work. We will have to try new approaches, approaches that will buttress the marketplace concept, rather than the trade restriction concept.

I should like to point out that in my judgment we have to look at the underlying source of these problems. I think that the agricultural industry, as such, is a sick industry because it has been subjected to too much rigidity, too much Government control, and not enough free play of the marketplace. The fact that the Government has been the largest buyer of dairy products, controlling prices and products, may well be the underlying cause for the fact that it seems unable successfully to compete in world markets today.

We cannot precipitately pull the rug out from under an industry which has been subjected to Government internal regulation for 30 years. Therefore, I should like to work with the Senator from Iowa to find ways to remove inequities and work toward—and I believe he agrees, and the distinguished Senator from New York would also agree—a freer market all over the free world as well as in this country.

Let us not, then, require the overall adjustment of the trade policy to be fitted into the pattern of any particular industry. We must deal with that inequity as such and try to find a proper remedy, but not mere expedients that wreck the whole policy. Of course, I know that the Senator from Iowa has no such intention because he has believed in it, spent much time and fought for it in the past, and has indicated that in 99 percent of the areas we are in complete agreement.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield, so that I may make a comment on that?

Mr. PERCY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I think that the Senator from New York has made two points. The first point is that for the sake of, let us say, the dairy industry, we should not gut the future of other industries, because that is what would happen if we had a quota based upon a reasonable base period, which would allow foreign exporters of dairy products to the United States to continue to export to the United States, but to be content with a percentage of our increased domestic consumption.

Now my reaction is pretty cold to that. I cannot understand why there would be a reaction on the part of our trading partners that because we said, "You are only going to be able to take a certain percentage of our market based upon the base period, and you are only going to be able to take an increased amount of our domestic consumption based upon that percentage," they would go back into their tents and sulk; and then say, "All right, we will cut off everything else so far as your exports to us are concerned."

They might retaliate by going for the very proposal that Mr. Roth and his negotiators presented to the Common Market; namely, that the United States will be allowed to continue to export at a fixed percentage based upon a base period, and thus to increase our volume within this percentage as their populations and their economies grow. I think that would be a wonderful way to retaliate. I wish that the Common Market had retaliated in that way. They did not. We got nothing.

The Senator from New York said that we had some trouble in the chicken war, yet we got some results.

I would remind the Senator that the results are that chicken exports from the United States to the Common Market are practically nil. I do not think those are very desirable results. If it is going to be that way, then we will end up with a one-way street in our foreign trade policy, and I cannot see anything but trouble ahead.

I think the tragic part of this situation is that it is a very complex subject. We have only a few bills pending in the Finance Committee. My guess is that they will not deal with more than 20 or 30 items. The Kennedy round negotiators spent years going through thousands of items. I cannot understand why dealing with a few items on a quota basis, and a fair quota basis, will jeopardize the whole future on all of the thousands of other items. I think that there is a little too much scare talk going on here. Besides, I think our position is fair.

It is not going to be responsive to suggest that we are becoming protectionists, putting up a wall, and not permitting any exports to come in here. I do not know of any dairy farmers, livestock raisers, or cosponsors of any of the bills in the Finance Committee who are standing for that.

If someone wants to set up a strawman and shoot it down, that would be a nice exercise, but it will not be responsive. We need responsive arguments here. The only point I wish to make is that we are oversimplifying a terribly complex and important subject. It will take a lot more than just a few minutes' discussion to get the job done, to have this subject thoroughly thought through on the floor of the Senate.

I very much appreciate my colleague's yielding to me.

Mr. PERCY. I certainly do agree with the Senator from Iowa that this is a very complex subject. In the body of my statement, that is the principal point I made. The complexity is so great that for Congress to attempt, in its closing weeks, to rush through some quota restrictions would do irreparable damage and would likely be inequitable because of the lack of time to give careful consideration to each of the complexities. And as I said earlier, the imports affected by the pending bills are approximately one-half of the total imports into the United States. This is no small amount.

Now, from the standpoint of the chicken war, I think it is a great tribute to the farmers of this country that today we can raise chickens in the barnyard here and put them on a table in Germany cheaper than Germany can raise them in their own barnyards.

I have such faith in the integrity, capacity, and ingenuity of the American producer, whether he be on the farm or in the factory, that I want to see that faith exemplified by greater efforts toward removal of restrictions abroad.

The only basis we have for knocking down those restrictions that prevent that chicken from getting on the table in Germany and lowering the cost of living for the people of Germany and other countries is by keeping our hands clean over here. I submit this is not the time to start imposing restrictions against other countries so that, rather than remove the restrictions they have, they retaliate with additional restrictions against us.

I want to thank the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] very much for his great patience and generosity in giving us this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be but 1 minute more to put a few facts in the RECORD.

I, too, would like to apologize to the Senator from Oklahoma for imposing on him and to thank him for his patience.

I am quoting from a document prepared by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, entitled "U.S. Foreign Trade Policy After the Kennedy Round."

I ask unanimous consent that a number of paragraphs be inserted in my remarks which show that while agricultural protectionism is very strong in the European Common Market—and I will stand shoulder to shoulder with my colleagues in fighting it—we do nonetheless sell to them. In 1966 the Common Market countries alone bought 30 percent of all U.S. agricultural products sold for dollars.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Agricultural protectionism in the European Economic Community continues to be strong. The imposition of variable levies on feed grains, wheat, and a number of other products important among U.S. agricultural exports, by which tariffs are levied against imports from outside the Community to equalize prices within the Community and world prices, is causing considerable worry in American agricultural circles. Nevertheless, in 1966 the Common Market countries purchased 30 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports sold for dollars.

U.S. farmers, as a whole, have little to worry about with respect to exports of agricultural products against which the EEC countries have not imposed variable levies. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture,[1] such commodities accounted for 58 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports to the EEC in 1966 and included soybeans, oil cake and meal, unmanufactured tobacco, fruits and vegetables, and raw cotton.

It is only with regard to the remaining 42 percent of agricultural exports that the variable levies of the EEC may prove troublesome. Principal among the commodities that are subject to such levies are: feed grains, wheat, rice, poultry and eggs. The most important question, from the point of view of U.S. agriculture, as a whole, is whether the expansion of the EEC in the course of the next few decades will result in increased demand for the commodities included in the noncompetitive group sufficiently to counterbalance the effects of European protection against imports of commodities subject to the levies.

There is danger, however, of reaching the premature conclusion that exports of products subject to variable levies will decrease, while only those not subject to such levies will increase. Such a conclusion is not warranted by U.S. export statistics through 1966.

Between 1962 and 1966 U.S. exports to the EEC of products that are subject to variable levies actually increased more rapidly (37.3 percent) than did the exports of products that are not subject to them (34.5 percent). Changes in U.S. agricultural exports to the EEC are shown in the following tables:

TABLE 3.—U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO THE EEC, 1962–66

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	1962		1966		Increase	Percent change
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent		
Subject to variable levy	$482,786	42.0	$662,657	42.4	+$179,871	+37.3
Not subject to variable levy	667,945	58.0	898,575	57.6	+230,630	+34.5
Total	1,150,731	100.0	1,561,232	100.0	+410,501	+35.7

Source: Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, USDA, March 1967.

It is natural, of course, that American farmers producing crops that are subject to variable levies should want to have those levies removed. Every producer, whether he produces for home consumption or for export, would like to have an assured market.

However, European farmers are as adamant about admitting competitive products from abroad as are those farmers in the United States who produce crops with which imports—if not restricted by tariffs or import quotas—would compete, such as tulip bulbs, dairy products, and tomatoes. In other words, it is argued that if American farmers and manufacturers want to secure ready access to European markets they will have to be willing that access be granted to United States markets.

TABLE 4.—U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO THE EEC, SUBJECT TO VARIABLE LEVIES, 1962–66

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	1962	1966	Increase or decrease	Percentage change
Feed grains	$317,081	$476,439	+$159,358	+50.3
Wheat	50,603	107,096	+56,493	+111.6
Rice	14,247	18,823	+4,576	+32.1
Turkeys	9,624	13,523	+3,899	+40.5
Poultry and eggs	43,281	9,379	−33,902	−78.3
Rye grain	18,709	4,417	−14,292	−76.4
Wheat flour	5,553	1,358	−4,195	−75.5
Pork	341	1,339	+998	+292.7
Dairy products	3,603	1,211	−2,392	−66.4
Beef and veal	64	900	+836	+1,306.0
All others	19,680	28,172	+8,492	+43.2
Total	482,786	662,657	[1] +179,871	+37.3

[1] Summary: Increases +$234,652; decreases −$54,781.

Source: Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, USDA, March 1967.

TABLE 5.—U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO THE EEC, NOT SUBJECT TO VARIABLE LEVIES, 1962–66

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	1962	1966	Increase or decrease	Percentage change
Soybeans	$162,320	$278,676	+$116,356	+71.7
Oil cake and meal	46,020	143,998	+97,978	+212.9
Tobacco (unmanufactured)	105,543	119,917	+14,374	+13.6
Fruits and vegetables	91,169	87,091	−4,078	−4.5
Raw cotton	105,973	65,885	−40,088	−37.8
Variety meats (fresh, frozen)	16,327	35,051	+18,724	+114.7
Tallow	26,375	34,660	+8,285	+31.4
Hides and skins	20,560	28,384	+7,824	+38.1
Vegetable oils, expressed	13,161	15,851	+2,690	+20.4
All others	80,497	89,062	+8,565	+10.6
Total	667,945	898,575	[1] +230,630	+34.5

[1] Summary: Increases +$274,796; decreases −$44,166.

Source: Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, USDA, March 1967.

---

[1] Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, U.S. Department of Agriculture, March, 1967.

Mr. JAVITS. I may not have made clear my point on the chickens. It is a fact that U.S. chicken exports to the Common Market countries have been cut in 1963 by $26 million, but we retaliated against that by cutting $26 million of their exports of brandy, trucks, dextrine, and potato starch to us. That is an entirely different picture than what is before us in the matter of these quotas.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MONRONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me, without losing his right to the floor, so that the Senate may take up a privileged matter?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for the purpose of bringing up a privileged matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. I shall not take long.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 25, 1967, page 29945, Congressional Record.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall make only a few brief remarks.

The total appropriation allowed is $2,169,012,500. This sum is $178,790,695 below the total budget estimates and $25,014,000 under the House allowance. It is $17,093,000 under the sum recommended by the Senate.

Generally, it is a good bill and provides sufficient funds for the necessary expenses of the various departments and agencies in fiscal 1968. As my colleagues know, the activities included in this bill have been operating since July 1 under the continuing resolutions of the Congress.

I should mention some of the important items that had been added by the Senate and were either reduced or denied in conference.

For the State Department, the conferees approved $490,000, or one-half of the $890,000 increase recommended for the passport office to cope with the increased workload and the financing of expenses for the final wrap-up of the sixth round of the Geneva tariff negotiations. The conferees disapproved the language amendment of the Senate relating to North Vietnam. However, a majority of the conferees were in agreement with such language but felt it should be a part of a legislative bill rather than an appropriation bill, and so stated in the report of the conferees.

As respects the Department of Commerce, the conferees disapproved the increases recommended by the Senate in the following categories: $1,000,000 for operations and administration, Economic Development Administration; $1,000,000 for the U.S. Travel Service; $9,353,000 for the Environmental Science Services Administration; $2,050,000 for the National Bureau of Standards; and $1,500,000 for the Office of State Technical Services.

Conversely, the conferees agreed to the Senate recommendation to reduce by $25,000,000 the House allowance for the Appalachian Development Highway System.

For the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the conferees agreed to the House allowance of $9,000,000 instead of the Senate recommendation of $9,500,000. For salaries and expenses of the U.S. Information Agency, the increase of $640,000 proposed by the Senate was not agreed to by the conferees.

The Senate amendment deleting the expenditure limitation as proposed by the House was agreed to by the conferees.

I urge adoption of the report, as I earnestly believe, under the circumstances that are present today, we have a very good bill. All conferees agreed to the sums finally reported for the various departments and agencies contained in the bill.

Mr. President, I think every member of the conference, both from the Senate and the House, were seriously cognizant of the fiscal problems that are immediate, and with which we are confronted, with respect to the heavy burden of financing the Vietnam war and other peacetime programs that have been inaugurated during recent years, and also of the appeals being made, and possibly the urgent need, for an increase in taxes to raise revenues to meet the costs of these obligations.

This was true in the Appropriations Committee, and also had its impact and influence in the discussions in conference. We simply had to do some giving and taking. There had to be some compromises and adjustments made.

I think the conferees deserve the confidence and approval of the respective Chambers, because I found that the conferees on the part of the House, under the direction of Representative Rooney of New York, were sympathetic to many of the increases that were made by the Senate in the categories to which I have referred, but again they felt constrained, as did many of us, to hold many of these expenditures down to the bare minimum that would permit the proper functioning of these agencies and the carrying on of these activities and programs. That is what we have tried to do, and I hope our labors and the conference report will have the approval of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not intrude further on the time of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] except on this issue. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I shall not challenge this report, which I think has been described properly by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan]. The basis upon which I would challenge it is too narrow to challenge so extensive a compromise agreement, but I think it is very important to challenge the lack of wisdom in cutting 25 percent out of the appropriation for the U.S. Travel Service, an appropriation of $4 million as provided in the Senate, and $3 million as allowed by the committee, which is really shortsighted in the extreme. It should be called markedly to the attention of the country.

I do it because I have a rather deep feeling about the financial condition of the country. The estimated deficit from travel this year, as between Americans that go abroad and what they spend there and foreigners who come here and what they spend here, is somewhere between $1.65 billion and $1.8 billion. The deficit last year was $1.644 billion.

Our principal travel competitors have increased their travel budgets by as much as 300 percent. Our budget has remained the same for 7 years now, and buys infinitely less because we all know costs have gone up at least one-third, in round figures.

The Arthur D. Little survey of the U.S. Travel Service indicates that our promotional efforts since 1961 have added a minimum of $250 million in revenues from foreign tourists, and perhaps $400 million. That is a ratio of 35 to 1 in terms of benefits as compared to what we have appropriated. An excellent case was made to show that more money put into the situation is directly translated into more tourists, more promotional literature, and more work in their offices.

I point out that this is terribly shortsighted economy. I do not know of anything worse we could do, when a $2 million or $3 million item in a budget of the size of the Federal budget is a very small amount, especially when translated into what it means to the United States in terms of added income to this country. The whole thing seems ridiculous to me, and I just have to protest it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to advise the distinguished Senator from New York that his position was not without the strong support of some who agreed with that position completely in conference. The Senator from Florida brought up this point in conference, and stated that in his opinion this would be an excellent investment. The Senator from New York will recall that he and I, at the hearings and in the committee, were both of the feeling that there could not be anything done which would more fully contribute to the solution of our balance-of-payments deficit than the enlargement of this program.

However, I am sorry to say that this matter of economy seems to have become a fetish to the degree that sometimes it operates to encourage false economy, and I think this is one of the situations in which it does.

I merely wanted to assure the distinguished Senator from New York that there were members of the conference who felt as he does, and who brought up this point of view. Unfortunately, we were in the minority.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much. I can assure him there is no other ally I would rather have than the Senator from Florida on this point, and that we will fight another day.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New York, and thank the able chairman for his competent handling of the matter in the committee, through passage, in conference, and now again on the floor of the Senate. This is a very difficult bill. There is no other bill which involves the handling of funds for four departments of Government. The Senator from Arkansas has, as always, done a most able job, and it has been a pleasure to be associated with him in the effort.

I am sure he feels as I do, that none of us were able to accomplish everything we would like to have seen accomplished, particularly because of the economy wave which is so pronounced at this time. I congratulate the Senator from Arkansas for the prudence, good nature, and dispatch with which he has handled this matter. I want him to know I think he has done a remarkably fine job.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, there were, as has been stated here, members of the conference who were very hopeful that the Senate figure could be retained; but we found, on the part of the House conferees, the disposition not to approve it, for the simple reason that has been stated—an effort to try to hold the total appropriation down.

I call attention, however, in the Senate report on this bill, on page 20, to the paragraph entitled "U.S. Travel Service"; and I ask unanimous consent that a portion of that paragraph be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 571) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE

In connection with this appropriation, the committee directs that the State Department, through its overseas embassies and consular offices, take much more vigorous action in the promotion of tourism in cooperation with the U.S. Travel Service. This should include efforts on the part of our embassies to work out with local governments the problem of the amount of funds which may be used for travel of their nationals to the United States. It is also directed that the Travel Service increase the amount of promotional material which they furnished the embassies and consular offices in order to carry out an accelerated program. In connection with the submission of the fiscal year 1969 budget justifications, the committee will expect a report on the progress made by this combined effort and an accounting of the results obtained from the increased appropriation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like, Mr. President, to emphasize the point made in this report that it is the belief of many of us that our embassies could be more active in this field than they are at present, and could well give a little more attention and a little more effort to encouraging tourist travel to the United States. I do not say that would be adequate, whatever they may be able to do, to compensate fully for the loss of this million dollars; but I do feel, Mr. President, that we should ask them to take note of these views expressed in this report, and I hope when the appropriation bill comes up next year, they will be able to come to us and point out some significant effort that they have made to be more cooperative, and to encourage tourist travel to this country.

Mr. President, if there is no further colloquy, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary table on the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN BILL FOR 1968

PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS

Item	Appropriation estimate, 1967	Appropriation estimate, 1968	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
Educational exchange fund	$353,000	$353,000	
Payment to the Republic of Panama	1,930,000	1,930,000	
Total, Department of State	2,283,000	2,283,000	
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION			
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies		5,888,000	+$5,888,000
Total, permanent and indefinite appropriations	2,283,000	8,171,000	+5,888,000

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Corporation	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill, 1968	Senate bill, 1968	Conference action	Conference bill compared with—		
						Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE								
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated	$2,512,000	$2,764,000	$2,714,000	$2,714,000	$2,714,000	−$50,000		

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968 (amended)	House bill, 1968	Senate bill, 1968	Conference action
ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS					
Salaries and expenses	$190,400,000	$195,200,000	$193,150,000	$194,130,000	$193,640,000
Representation allowances	993,000	993,000	993,000	993,000	993,000
Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad	15,500,000	13,350,000	13,350,000	13,350,000	13,350,000
Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad (special foreign currency program)	6,250,000	5,025,000	5,025,000	5,025,000	5,025,000
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	1,600,000	[1] 4,800,000	1,600,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
Total, administration of foreign affairs	214,743,000	219,368,000	214,118,000	217,598,000	217,108,000
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES					
Contributions to international organizations	104,126,000	109,362,000	[2] 93,735,400	93,735,400	93,735,400
Missions to international organizations	3,770,000	3,770,000	3,770,000	3,770,000	3,770,000
International conferences and contingencies	1,943,000	2,028,000	1,943,000	1,943,000	1,943,000
International tariff negotiations	850,000				
International conference on water for peace	500,000				
Total, international organizations and conferences	111,189,000	115,160,000	99,448,400	99,448,400	99,448,400

See footnotes at end of speech.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN BILL FOR 1968—Continued

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued

	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968 (amended)	House bill, 1968	Senate bill, 1968	Conference action
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses	$851,000	$851,000	$851,000	$851,000	$851,000
Operation and maintenance	1,985,000	1,985,000	1,985,000	1,985,000	1,985,000
Construction	5,754,000	[8] 9,769,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Chamizal settlement	4,200,000	2,760,000	2,500,000	2,760,000	2,700,000
American sections, international commissions	650,000	675,000	650,000	650,000	650,000
International fisheries commissions	2,125,000	2,375,000	1,975,000	2,375,000	2,125,000
Total, international commissions	15,565,000	18,415,000	16,961,000	17,621,000	17,311,000
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE					
Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities	47,000,000	49,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000
Center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West	6,050,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
Total, educational exchange	53,050,000	54,800,000	51,800,000	51,800,000	51,800,000
Total, title I, Department of State	394,547,000	407,743,000	382,327,400	386,467,400	385,667,400
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses, general administration	$5,743,000	$6,000,000	$5,858,000	$5,858,000	$5,858,000
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	21,981,000	22,525,000	22,375,000	22,375,000	22,375,000
Alien property activities, limitation on general administrative expenses	(80,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division	7,495,000	7,620,000	7,620,000	7,620,000	7,620,000
Salaries and expenses, U.S attorneys and marshals	35,404,000	36,575,000	36,400,000	36,400,000	36,400,000
Fees and expenses of witness	2,800,000	3,300,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
Law enforcement assistance	7,250,000	19,000,000	10,000,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
Salaries and expenses, Community Relation Service	1,500,000	2,700,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total, legal activities and general administration	82,173,000	97,720,000	87,353,000	84,853,000	84,853,000
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION					
Salaries and expenses	182,325,000	186,574,000	186,574,000	186,574,000	186,574,000
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE					
Salaries and expenses	78,835,000	80,400,000	79,946,000	79,946,000	79,946,000
FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM					
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons	60,707,000	[4] 63,230,000	61,000,000	62,000,000	61,750,000
Buildings and facilities		5,000,000	(5)	(5)	(5)
Support of U.S. prisoners	4,700,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Total, Federal prison system	65,407,000	72,730,000	65,500,000	66,500,000	66,250,000
Total, title II, Department of Justice	408,740,000	437,424,000	419,373,000	417,873,000	417,623,000
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	$3,908,000	$4,040,000	$3,970,000	$3,970,000	$3,970,000
OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS					
Salaries and expenses	2,800,000	3,180,000	2,868,000	2,868,000	2,868,000
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS					
Salaries and expenses	16,394,000	17,076,000	16,750,000	16,750,000	16,750,000
1964 Census of Agriculture	1,846,000				
Preparation for Nineteenth Decennial Census	2,750,000	7,650,000	7,650,000	7,650,000	7,650,000
1967 economic censuses	3,000,000	7,718,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
1967 Census of Governments	1,300,000	1,050,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Modernization of computing equipment	1,900,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
1968 sample household survey		20,000,000			
Total, Bureau of the Census	27,190,000	57,494,000	36,900,000	36,900,000	36,900,000
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE					
Development facilities grants	170,000,000	(6)			
Technical and community assistance	25,000,000	(6)			
Economic development center assistance	10,000,000	(6)			
Economic development	85,000,000	(6)			
Regional economic planning	6,100,000	(6)			
Development facilities	(6)	[7] 181,756,000	175,000,000	175,000,000	175,000,000
Industrial development loans and guarantees	(6)	57,900,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000
Planning, technical assistance, and research	(6)	[7] 29,450,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Operations and administration	(6)	[7] 22,344,000	20,000,000	21,000,000	20,000,000
Appalachian development highway system	100,000,000	100,000,000	95,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000
Total, economic development assistance	396,100,000	[7] 391,450,000	370,000,000	346,000,000	345,000,000
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	5,663,000	6,350,000	5,850,000	5,850,000	5,850,000
Defense production and industrial readiness	(8)	1,958,000	(8)		
Total, Business and Defense Services Administration	5,663,000	8,308,000	5,850,000	5,850,000	5,850,000
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
Salaries and expenses	11,358,000	12,387,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Export control	5,093,000	5,263,000	5,263,000	5,263,000	5,263,000
Total, international activities	16,651,000	17,850,000	16,963,000	16,963,000	16,963,000

See footnotes at end of speech.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN BILL FOR 1968—Continued

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued

	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968 (amended)	House bill, 1968	Senate bill, 1968	Conference action
OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES					
Salaries and expenses	$4,450,000	$4,800,000	$4,583,000	$4,583,000	$4,583,000
PARTICIPATION IN U.S. EXPOSITIONS					
HemisFair 1968 exposition	6,750,000				
Inter-American cultural and trade center	5,870,000				
Total, participation in U.S. expositions	12,620,000				
U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE					
Salaries and expenses	3,000,000	4,700,000	3,000,000	4,000,000	3,000,000
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	102,713,000	[9] 113,430,000	105,000,000	110,846,000	105,000,000
Research and development	20,537,000	[10] 29,979,000	24,000,000	26,997,000	24,000,000
Research and development (special foreign currency program)	500,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
Facilities, equipment, and construction	6,000,000	6,117,000	5,200,000	5,710,000	5,200,000
Satellite operations	27,000,000	32,200,000	28,100,000	28,100,000	28,100,000
Total, Environmental Science Services Administration	156,750,000	182,476,000	163,050,000	172,403,000	163,050,000
PATENT OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	37,050,000	[11] 39,975,000	38,200,000	38,200,000	38,200,000
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS					
Research and technical services	31,076,000	[12] 38,542,000	31,750,000	33,750,000	31,750,000
Research and technical services (special foreign currency program)	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Plant and facilities	550,000	1,470,000	240,000	290,000	240,000
Construction of facilities	1,200,000				
Total, National Bureau of Standards	33,326,000	40,512,000	32,490,000	34,540,000	32,490,000
OFFICE OF STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES					
Grants and expenses	5,500,000	11,000,000	6,500,000	8,000,000	6,500,000
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION					
Ship construction	106,685,000	143,000,000	143,000,000	143,000,000	143,000,000
Operating-differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authorization)	175,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000
Research and development	7,500,000	7,625,000	9,575,000	9,575,000	9,575,000
Salaries and expenses	15,701,100	15,947,000	15,947,000	15,947,000	15,947,000
Maritime training	4,558,900	4,620,000	4,620,000	4,620,000	4,620,000
State marine schools	1,635,000	1,775,000	1,775,000	1,775,000	1,775,000
Total, Maritime Administration	311,080,000	372,967,000	374,917,000	374,917,000	374,917,000
Total, title III, Department of Commerce	1,016,088,000	1,138,752,000	1,059,291,000	1,049,194,000	1,034,291,000
TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY					
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES					
Salaries	$2,000,000	$2,124,000	$2,031,500	$2,031,500	$2,031,500
Printing and binding Supreme Court reports	138,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
Miscellaneous expenses	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000
Care of the building and grounds	324,300	327,500	327,500	327,500	327,500
Automobile for the Chief Justice	8,900	9,100	9,100	9,100	9,100
Books for the Supreme Court	38,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Total, Supreme Court of the United States	2,629,200	2,775,600	2,683,100	2,683,100	2,683,100
COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS					
Salaries and expenses	471,000	483,000	483,000	483,000	483,000
CUSTOMS COURT					
Salaries and expenses	1,265,000	[13] 1,580,595	1,430,000	1,480,000	1,480,000
COURT OF CLAIMS					
Salaries and expenses	1,440,000	1,519,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES					
Salaries of judges	15,857,000	16,540,000	16,300,000	16,300,000	16,300,000
Salaries of supporting personnel	38,290,000	41,217,000	40,490,000	40,490,000	40,490,000
Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners	7,700,000	8,000,000	7,900,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	6,000,000	6,249,000	6,113,000	6,113,000	6,113,000
Administrative Office of the United States Courts	1,950,000	2,574,000	2,074,000	2,074,000	2,074,000
Referees, special account:					
Salaries of referees	(4,318,500)	(4,514,000)	(4,514,000)	(4,514,000)	(4,514,000)
Expenses of referees	(6,930,000)	(7,528,000)	(7,360,000)	(7,360,000)	(7,360,000)
Total, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services	72,797,000	78,080,000	76,027,000	75,927,000	75,927,000
Total, title IV, the judiciary, excluding special accounts	78,602,200	84,438,195	82,123,100	82,073,100	82,073,100
Total, title IV, the judiciary, including special accounts	89,850,700	96,480,195	93,997,100	93,947,100	93,947,100
TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES					
AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	$2,160,000	$2,370,000	$2,370,000	2,370,000	$2,370,000
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS					
Salaries and expenses	2,500,000	2,790,000	2,650,000	2,650,000	2,650,000

See footnotes at end of speech.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN BILL FOR 1968—Continued

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued

	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968 (amended)	House bill, 1968	Senate bill, 1968	Conference action
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
Office of Education: Civil rights educational activities	$8,028,000	$30,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	5,240,000	7,170,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	3,419,000	3,725,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	2,000,000	1,275,000	1,275,000	1,275,000	1,275,000
National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws	200,000				
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSIONS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND ON CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
Salaries and expenses	550,000				
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation	8,100,000	[14] 10,991,000	9,900,000	9,900,000	9,900,000
Transfer from revolving funds	(45,750,000)	(48,147,000)	(47,647,000)	(47,647,000)	(47,647,000)
Participation sales authorizations	(850,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies		[15] 1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
Total, Small Business Administration	8,100,000	12,341,000	11,250,000	11,250,000	11,250,000
Southeast hurricane disaster	9,000,000				
SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS					
Salaries and expenses	566,000	566,000	490,000	490,000	490,000
SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	289,500	330,000	295,000	295,000	295,000
TARIFF COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	3,562,000	3,775,000	3,675,000	3,675,000	3,675,000
U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY					
Arms control and disarmament activities	9,000,000	10,000,000	9,000,000	9,500,000	9,000,000
U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY					
Salaries and expenses	152,238,000	[16] 159,679,000	156,479,000	157,119,000	156,479,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	10,941,000	10,158,000	10,158,000	8,604,000	8,604,000
Special international exhibitions	2,709,000	3,584,000	2,709,000	2,709,000	2,709,000
Special international exhibitions (special foreign currency program)	350,000	387,000	387,000	387,000	387,000
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities	6,510,000	19,254,000	18,200,000	18,200,000	18,200,000
Total, U.S. Information Agency	172,748,000	193,062,000	187,933,000	187,019,000	186,379,000
Total, title V, related agencies	227,362,500	267,404,000	239,038,000	238,624,000	237,484,000
Grand total	2,136,588,200	[17] 2,347,803,195	2,194,026,500	2,186,105,500	2,169,012,500
Consisting of—					
Special accounts	11,248,500	12,042,000	11,874,000	11,874,000	11,874,000
Indefinite appropriations		1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
Direct appropriations	2,125,339,700	2,334,411,195	2,180,802,500	2,172,881,500	

---

[1] Includes $3,200,000 supplemental estimate, S. Doc. 38.

[2] Plus $15,606,000 for 1968 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Loan to the United Nations."

[3] Reflects decrease of $2,300,000 contained in H. Doc. 114.

[4] Includes $1,130,000 supplemental estimate, S. Doc. 32.

[5] $4,500,000 to be derived from prior year funds.

[6] Contained in different item due to realinement of appropriation structure.

[7] Excludes budget estimate for Appalachian assistance programs not authorized.

[8] Funded under Office of Emergency Planning.

[9] Includes increase of $676,000 contained in H. Doc. 114.

[10] Includes increase of $150,000 contained in H. Doc. 114.

[11] Includes increase of $300,000 contained in H. Doc. 114.

[12] Includes increase of $227,000 contained in H. Doc. 114.

[13] Includes $101,195 supplemental estimate, S. Doc. 32.

[14] Includes $430,000 supplemental estimate, S. Doc. 32.

[15] Requested in the budget as a permanent, indefinite appropriation.

[16] Reflects decrease of $1,221,000 contained in H. Doc. 114.

[17] Includes $4,861,195 supplemental estimates, S. Docs. 32 and 38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend from Oklahoma for his courtesy in yielding out of order.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS' 40 YEARS OF SAFE WORLDWIDE AIR TRANSPORT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on Saturday, October 28, Pan American Airways will be 40 years old. I want to take this opportunity to salute Pan American and its great leader, Juan T. Trippe, and congratulate them both for jobs well done.

Pan American is one of the world's greatest airlines—a pioneer and innovator. Its string of "firsts" in scheduled commercial air transportation is envied by other airlines. And because of these "firsts" the air traveler of today enjoys fast, economical, and safe air transportation anywhere in the world.

The inaugural flight that carried the U.S. flag into the international skyways 40 years ago was 25 minutes late in taking off—and for a very good reason. Capt. Hugh Wells, who was to pilot the big Pan American Airways eight-passenger trimotor Fokker F–7 on its maiden voyage from Key West, Fla., to Havana, Cuba, traveled by rail from New York—and the train was late.

However, the flight did get off at 8:25 a.m. on October 28, 1927, from Meacham Field and landed 1 hour and 20 minutes later in Havana. The event was banner headline news in that afternoon's Key West Citizen.

Making up the three-man crew with Wells were Navigator Ed Musick, later famed as master of ocean flying, who blazed many of the air trails across the Pacific, and Engineer John Johnnsen.

Pan Am's flight No. 1 landed in the middle of a tropical downpour that forced Cuban officials to shift formal welcoming ceremonies from Camp Columbia to a drier downtown location. There, unhampered by the U.S. prohibition law, the F–7 was christened officially as the *General Machado*, in honor of the Cuban President.

The cargo that day was seven bags of mail and no passengers. Since that time Pan American has flown more than 70 million passengers in its varied and always improving fleet of Pan Am Clippers. From that small Fokker F–7 the Pan Am fleet has grown to more than 130 jet clippers which traverse 77,818 miles of route linking 121 cities in 84 countries on six continents. In most cases in these 40 years Juan Trippe has signed the first order for new members of the American aircraft family.

In 1958, Pan Am introduced to the world scheduled jet air service, and it will be the first airline to use the 747 Superjet, in the fall of 1969. Pan Am was also the first airline to order a supersonic airliner—the Anglo-French Concorde—and has placed orders for 15 American-flag SST's to be produced by the Boeing Co.

On September 19 of this year the most recent pioneering program of Pan American was unveiled by Juan T. Trippe, founder of the airline, who now serves as Pan Am's chairman and chief executive officer. He announced that Pan Am's board of directors had approved a final agreement between the airline and the Port of New York Authority whereby Pan Am would operate and develop two airports in the Metropolitan New York area for private and business aircraft. The airports are Teterboro, in Teterboro, N.J., and Republic, in Farmingdale, N.Y.

The objective of the new program is to provide alternate accommodations for business aircraft and air taxis and thus reduce air traffic delays at Kennedy International, La Guardia, and Newark Airports. Again Pan Am is proving a leader in the business of moving people swiftly, comfortably and safely in the bustle and congestion of our fast-paced world.

AIR CARGO AFTER 40 YEARS

Pan Am, under Trippe's strong leadership, has been an innovator in the field of air cargo too. Its first Clipper cargo warehouse at Miami, Fla., in 1951 contained only a battered wooden desk, its top piled with a carton of baby chicks, a few cans of newsreel film and a small cardboard box of auto parts.

Today Pan American maintains the largest and most sophisticated air freight terminal in the world. Costing more than $8½ million Pan Am's vast cargo building at Kennedy International Airport in New York City contains more than 230,000 square feet of warehouse space which is crammed with packages, bales, pallets, conveyor systems, moving tracks, and electronic controlled consoles.

This new building and the new concepts Pan Am has developed in freight processing, will enable it to keep pace with the worldwide anticipated cargo growth rate over the next 10 years—nine times greater than today.

Pan Am's freighters have flown more than 100 million cargo ton-miles, accounting for 12 percent of the airline's total operating revenues. These impressive figures document Pan Am's active interest in the movement of freight by air and its determination to improve this concept of freight movement.

Pan American World Airways' 747 Superjet Clippers capable of carrying more than 350 passengers will be powered by four Pratt & Whitney JT9D turbofan engines, each weighing 8,339 pounds. Each engine of the superjet will weigh nearly as much as a fully-loaded Fokker F-7 which made Pan American's inaugural flight between Key West and Havana on October 28, 1927. The F-7's maximum gross takeoff weight was 9,700 pounds.

New York and Buenos Aires are linked in about 10½ nonstop flying hours today by the Jet Clippers of Pan American World Airways, compared to a 7-day, 40-stop journey when Pan Am first began flying to Buenos Aires nearly 40 years ago.

Each one of the over 350 passenger Boeing 747 Superjets which Pan American will begin flying in 1969 will cost in the neighborhood of $21 million. For this amount, the airline could have bought a fleet of 465 Fokker F-7 trimotor planes with which Pan Am inaugurated U.S. flag international air service 40 years ago, on October 28, 1927. Pan Am has ordered 25 of the giant superjets.

An airlift of about 40 million revenue passenger-miles a day currently is being flown by the round-the-world jet Clippers of Pan Am. This represents more passenger-miles each day than Pan Am flew during the first 4 years of its existence.

Mr. President, again I salute and congratulate Pan American, its devoted employees, and its remarkable chairman and chief executive officer, Mr. Juan Trippe. I wish them every success during the next four decades of growth in the field of air transportation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, for placing in the RECORD the remarkable history of our first international air carrier of passengers and freight. I think that company has done a splendid job. I should like to be associated with the remarks of the Senator.

Mr. President, the State of Florida has felt peculiarly close to this carrier. The Senator from Oklahoma has mentioned the fact that the first international flight of Pan Am originated in Key West, Fla., and went to an airport in Cuba some miles outside the city of Havana about 40 years ago.

The Senator from Florida was not able to take part in that flight. I did, however, take part in the flight 20 years later that commemorated that flight and that was the subject of ceremonies both at Key West and at the Havana Airport. That flight was recognized by the then friendly government in Cuba as being a commemoration of a very great service rendered to them, as well as to us.

The Pan American company, its officers and employees have been good citizens of Miami. I think their first great headquarters for international carriage was there. We value them, and they have been real contributors to the growth of that area as well as to the advancement of aviation and air travel and air passenger service. And above and beyond that, I think in the whole Pan American area they have been a force for the making of better relations and kind understandings between our Latin American friends and ourselves.

Through their subordinate companies they have erected hotels in various Latin American countries, and those hotels are recognized with great pride by those countries as being among their finest places of hospitality. So far as I am concerned, I think this company has been a great force in the building of good will toward our Nation throughout this hemisphere, and I am sure that is true elsewhere. However, I happen to know about it in this hemisphere.

I am glad that we can place this commendation and recognition of a fine record of a fine organization in the RECORD of the Senate of the United States.

I thank my distinguished colleague for his service and for yielding to me.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for his comments.

I covered aviation during its early, fledgling days while I was a newspaper reporter. Some 35 years ago, I went to Florida to see if it was possible for a plane to come over the ocean from a distant continent.

My wife and I waited patiently for an hour or two at the then marine terminus of the line from South America, and while we waited, the sky was brilliantly sunlit as it always is in that part of the country, and we saw a speck appear at a great distance away in the sky. As that speck drew nearer, it looked like two planes flying together. It turned out to be a huge flying boat with a capacity of perhaps less than 10 passengers, coming from South America.

I was awed by the space which the plane had captured on a regular, routine basis. I have felt ever since that the great day in transportation will always be in the air and that the progress we can make today with our subsonic jets and jumbo jets and giant cargo planes is only the beginning and that we will continue to shrink this globe so that continents such as Australia, when we have a supersonic transport, will be as close to us as California is today; and the Far East, which seems so far, will be moved 10,000 miles closer by the great speed which our magnificent, vast-ranging, long-distance, supersonic planes will soon be able to achieve on the air routes of the world.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR PEACE WITH FREEDOM IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of the Senate to a development in respect of a very powerful controversy regarding Vietnam which has been raging in this country.

The morning news, in my judgment, is featured by the policy statement of the Citizens Committee for Peace With Freedom in Vietnam, to which former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman adhere, and of which the cochairmen are former Senator Douglas, of Illinois, and Gen. Omar Bradley, a great American hero of World War II.

Mr. President, it seems to me, first speaking of the affirmative, that the moderates in this Chamber, who have traditionally been in and of the mainstream of our national life, should very much welcome the formation of this committee.

I, for one, like very much their policy

statement, and it certainly has a most distinguished group of subscribers from almost every State in the Union.

I ask unanimous consent that the policy statement, together with a list of its subscribers, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I said that I would speak of the positive first, because the center or moderate position in this country has fared badly in recent months, particularly on the issue of Vietnam. We have witnessed a progressive escalation of bitterness and extremist rhetoric and even some civil disobedience. Unhappily, as we saw in Washington and in other places, including college campuses and draft headquarters throughout the United States, peaceful demonstrations turned at times to ugly violence. For this reason, it is particularly important that a most distinguished group of private citizens has come to the rescue of moderation and has given voice to the feelings and beliefs of the great centrist body of opinion in the United States. The policy statement of the citizens committee gave much needed articulation to the fundamental principles and attitudes which grow out of the very conscience of our people.

Mr. President, the committee made it clear that it was going to be "supporters of the office of the Presidency," and it said:

> We are not supporters of a President or of an administration.

I hope the committee will persevere in that view, because if it does, I believe it can be very helpful. But if it becomes an apologist for the administration, it will lose its influence. It is for that reason that I wish to point out what the policy statement did not cover.

It was silent, in fact, on the crucial issues which most trouble the American people with regard to Vietnam. The statement's color, its climate, its general thrust are excellent. But the committee must come to grips, if it is really to serve the American people with the questions that are deeply troubling the American people, and these questions are the following:

First. Bombing policy. Question: Is it worthwhile to establish an unconditional cessation of bombing, and will that actually bring on the beginning of negotiation?

Second. What is the role of the United Nations and the Geneva accords in the search for a Vietnam settlement? The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], yesterday introduced a resolution urging our Government to put this matter before the U.N.; and the resolution has the backing of 55 Members of the Senate.

Third. The committee's policy statement is silent on the crucial issue of establishing a relationship, a criterion, between self-help by the South Vietnamese—their Government, their people, and their army, now that they have a legitimately elected government—and how long we stand there and how much we sacrifice. What the American people want to know is, Is this our war or their war? Originally, it started as their war, and to many of us it appears that it is now becoming our war, and we are trying to stop that trend.

Fourth. The statement is rather quiet about the responsibility of the Presidency, as an office, in inspiring the confidence and faith of the American people so that this leadership may be relied upon in a war—and the country is involved in a war.

These issues, upon which the statement is silent, I have no doubt, will receive clarification and attention by the committee in the days ahead, so that they can do the most good for the American people and deal with the most immediately vexing problems.

I, too, could subscribe to the statement, and perhaps most Senators in the Chamber could do so without any problem. But it still would not answer the basic questions I have raised. It is important that we answer these questions for the American people now.

This past summer marked a great shift in public attitude about the Vietnam war. Despite the murkiness, the obscurity, and the ambiguity of many aspects of our commitment and our role in the Vietnam struggle, the great moderate and centrist majority in this country and in this Chamber for years conceded the benefit of the doubt to the administration so far as our involvement in Vietnam is concerned. This was a traditional and vital American act of faith, one of the seldom-spoken-of basic assumptions and premises of our system. In time of war, in time of crisis, we close ranks; and we want to give and are accustomed to giving the benefit of any doubt to the President and to his senior advisers. But this act of faith, with which we are very familiar, has been put in question with regard to Vietnam. This has brought to the fore the basic issue regarding the office of the Presidency, to which even the committee—though it was not dealing with that subject—had to give some attention in its statement.

No issue is of greater importance to the security and well-being of our Nation than is this one. Let us make it plain, once again, that the integrity of the Office of the President is not and should not be a partisan issue. On the contrary, the erosion of prestige in that office is a matter of vital concern for the loyal opposition, the Republicans, as well.

Mr. President, the real problem in this situation is posed exactly there: I consider it to be the proper role or responsible Republicans to tell the President not to wait for the next campaign, but to tell the President now—as I have tried to do, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], who is in the Chamber, has tried to do, as other Senators have tried to do—what we think about his course, how we think it can be corrected, in order to preserve that prestige, that integrity, in the office of the Presidency which it is to the interest of every American, without regard to party, to preserve. I do not believe any responsible Member of the Senate, regardless of party, would want to detract one iota from the prestige of the Presidential office in such trying times. But it is the President, himself, who has all those abundant powers of his office. It is his to act. It is the President himself who can do the most either to enhance the prestige of his office or to diminish it. No one else has the command of the media and the attention of the American people.

The real difficulty in this situation is that the American people have become worried about whether the situation in Vietnam is really being handled in terms of the prestige and faith which they place in the authority of the Presidency.

The committee can be very valuable to all of us in that regard. I have given my views before on why we should submit this issue to the U.N. I hope we will submit to the U.N. I hope we will implement an unconditioned cessation of bombing when there is a proper diplomatic framework for it—a framework which I am confident could be established by aggressive diplomacy—which will bring about peace negotiations.

Beyond everything else, and beyond the fact that we must condition our continuing in Vietnam on what the Vietnamese do for themselves, we must not take over this war and make it our war as if Vietnam were a colony.

But the main point today is not that. The most important question is what the committee can do. I think it can do a great deal if it really wishes to help the country. I hope very much that it will not consider itself to be—and it says it will not be—an apologist for the President, for a President, or for an administration. Instead, I hope it will do its utmost to uphold the office of the Presidency and address itself promptly to the nettling and vexing questions which I have described.

I do not know what the committee's answers will be, but I believe it would render valuable service to the country if it gave answers, whatever they may be, because it is so eminent and well starred a group.

Mr. President, another point of view was also reflected in this morning's press. That is the idea that maybe we should have a declaration of war, and that maybe this would have an effect upon curbing demonstrators and others who might disagree on the question of Vietnam.

The citizens committee is of enormous potential help in that its policy statement specifically affirms and supports the right of opponents of our national policy to criticize our efforts and to offer alternatives consistent with our national interest.

Mr. President, it might be distasteful, but Americans do have the right to object. It is deplorable to assume that patriotism requires that one always agree with our policies. I would be the first vigorously to uphold law and order and insist that dissenters respect duly constituted authority and follow the channels established in law for expression of dissent. But dissent itself I would not wish to shut off.

I thoroughly disagree with any suggestion of a declaration of war. I hope we do not do it. It would guarantee an escalation of the situation to a realm far beyond where it is—or is otherwise likely to go.

The important thing is to speak out now, as this committee is speaking out, for the moderate position of assuring dissent and discussion, and not being apologists for any position, even the position of the President, while respecting the Presidency.

I hope very much we will not have a declaration of war, that we will not have a suppression of dissent, and that we will not equate dissent with treason or other conduct against the security of the United States, provided it is lawful dissent.

I hope the citizens committee will help the American people in some of these vexing and highly controversial questions which the American people have to decide. The Nation needs and wants the advice and the views of so eminent and distinguished a group as is gathered under the banner of the Citizens Committee for Peace With Freedom in Vietnam.

EXHIBIT 1

TEXT OF A POLICY STATEMENT ISSUED TODAY BY THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR PEACE WITH FREEDOM IN VIETNAM

We are a group of concerned citizens who seek peace with freedom in Vietnam.

We do so in the conviction that our own vital national interests are at stake in that troubled land. We are not ashamed to admit that our primary motivation is self-interest—the self-interest of our own country in this shrinking world. America cannot afford to let naked aggression or the suppression of freedom go unchallanged. To Americans, peace and freedom are inseparable.

Our committee is national and nonpartisan—it is composed of Democrats, Republicans and independents, and of "liberals," "moderates" and "conservatives" drawn from all sections and all sectors of our country.

CONCERN WITH PRINCIPLE

We believe in the great American principle of civilian control and a civilian Commander in Chief. And we strongly support our commitment in Vietnam and the policy of noncompromising, although limited, resistance to aggression. All four of the post-World War II American Presidents—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson—have proclaimed America's basic purpose of defending freedom. We are not supporters of a President or of an Administration; we are supporters of the office of the Presidency.

As a committee, we shall strive to stay above partisan politics, political personalities and transitory opinion polls. Our concern is not with politics or popularity, but with principle.

We are opposed to surrender, however camouflaged. Yet nothing we advocate can be interpreted as unnecessarily risking a general war in Asia or a nuclear war in the world. We favor a sensible road between capitulation and the indiscriminate use of raw power.

A SMALL COUNTRY

We believe that, in this, we speak for the great "silent center" of American life, the understanding, independent and responsible men and women who have consistently opposed rewarding international aggressors from Adolf Hitler to Mao Tse-tung. And we believe that the "silent center" should now be heard.

A great test is taking place in Vietnam—that test is whether or not the rulers of one territory can cheaply and safely impose a government and a political system upon their neighbors by internal subversion, insurrection, infiltration and invasion. These are the tactics of the Communist "wars of liberation," which depend for success upon achieving their goals at an endurable price and a bearable risk.

Our objective in Vietnam is to make the price too high and the risk too great for the aggressor. This is why we fight.

Vietnam is a small country and we Americans had little contact with it until after World War II. It still seems isolated and remote to many of us, although all of our Presidents for 30 years have had to concern themselves with our national interests in East Asia. For better perspective, we must turn our sights to the edge of East Asia, that enormous area of peninsulas and islands from Korea and Japan south to Taiwan and the Philippines, then west across Southeast Asia to Burma, then southeast to Malaysia, Indonesia, Australia and New Zealand.

That area contains 370 million people—approximately twice the population of the United States. Each of these nations is different from the others but they have one thing in common—all of them are free from external domination. Will this be true if we abandon Vietnam? Or will Peking and Hanoi, flushed with success, continue their expansionist policy through many other "wars of liberation," each conducted at a price which they can endure and a risk which they can bear? We believe they would.

LOUD AND CLEAR

Never in over a century has there been as much loud and violent opposition expressed in America to a conflict in which our fighting men are heavily and heroically engaged. However, we are concerned that voices of dissent have, thus far, received attention far out of proportion to their actual numbers. Our committee specifically affirms and supports the right of opponents of our national policy to criticize that effort and to offer alternatives consistent with our national interest and security.

Our objective as a committee is not to suppress the voices of such opposition. Our objective is to make sure that the majority voice of America is heard—loud and clear—so that Peking and Hanoi will not mistake the strident voices of some dissenters for American discouragement and a weakening of will. And, at the same time, we want to give renewed assurance to our fighting men that their sacrifices are neither in vain nor unappreciated—or unwanted—by the great bulk of their fellow citizens.

We want the aggressors to know that there is a solid, stubborn, dedicated, bipartisan majority of private citizens in America who approve our country's policy of patient, responsible, determined resistance which is dependent for its success on having the enemy realize that we shall keep the pressure on and not back down, that the peace we insist upon is a peace with freedom and, thus, with honor.

Today, America is a great world power, shedding its blood and expending its treasure in a distant country for the simple privilege of withdrawing in peace as soon as that country is guaranteed the effective right of self-determination. We ask nothing for ourselves and insist upon nothing for South Vietnam except that it be free to chart its own future, no matter what course it may choose. Surely this is a noble and worthy objective consistent with all that is best in American life and tradition.

Our committee has been formed to rally and articulate the support of the concerned, independent thinking, responsible citizens in America who favor our nation's fundamental commitment to peace with freedom.

Will you join with us?

LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR PEACE WITH FREEDOM IN VIETNAM

Truman, Harry S.—33d President of the United States.

Eisenhower, Dwight D.—34th President of the United States.

Acheson, Dean—Former Secretary of State.

Alexander, Holmes—Syndicated columnist.

Arnold, Thurman—Former Assistant Attorney General in charge of Antitrust Division.

Bandler, Ned—Business executive.

Barnett, Frank R.—President, National Strategy Information Center, Inc.

Baron, Murray—Industrial consultant.

Beirne, Joseph W.—President, Communications Workers of America.

Bradley, General of the Army Omar N.—Former chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Breit, Dr. Gregory—Donner Professor of Physics, Yale University.

Brown, Dr. J. Douglas—Professor of Economics, Princeton University. Former dean of the faculty.

Brown, Edmund G.—Former Governor of California.

Burns, Dr. James MacGregor—James Phinney Baster Professor of History and Public Affairs and chairman, Department of Political Science, Williams College.

Byrnes, James F.—Former Secretary of State.

Cabot, Thomas D.—Chairman of the Board, Cabot Corporation, Boston. Former director, Office of International Security Affairs, Department of State.

Cherne, Leo—Executive director, the Research Institute of America, Inc.

Clay, Gen. Lucius D.—Senior partner, Lehman Brothers.

Conant, Dr. James B.—Former president, Harvard University. Former Ambassador to Germany.

Connelly, Marc—Playwright.

Darden, Colgate—Former president, University of Virginia.

Davis, Thurston N., S.J.—Editor in chief, America.

Douglas, Paul H.—Former Senator from Illinois.

Draper, Gen. William H.—Partner, Draper, Gaither & Anderson.

Drummond, Roscoe—Syndicated columnist.

Ellison, Ralph—Author.

Emmett, Christopher—Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

Engel, Irving M.—Attorney-at-law. Past president, American Jewish Committee.

Farland, Joseph S.—Former ambassador to the Dominican Republic and to the Republic of Panama.

Farrell, James T.—Author.

Fisher, John M.—President, American Research Foundation, Chicago.

Gaston, A. G.—President, Booker T. Washington Insurance Company, Birmingham.

Gates, Thomas S.—Chairman, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, former Secretary of Defense.

Gideonse, Dr. Harry D.—Chancellor, New School for Social Research.

Gullion, Dr. Edmund A.—Dean, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University.

Gunderson, Mrs. Robert—Former Civil Service Commissioner.

Hacker, Louis M.—Historian and professor of economics, Columbia University.

Handlin, Dr. Oscar—Director, Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History, Harvard University.

Hanes, John W. Jr.—Investment banker, Former Assistant Secretary of State.

Harris, Dr. Huntington—Business executive.

Hecht, Rabbi Abraham B.—President, Rabbinical Alliance of America.

Hoffer, Eric—Author and longshoreman.

Jones, Dr. Frank—Physician and surgeon.

Keeler, W. W.—President, Phillips Petroleum Company.

Keggi, Dr. Kristaps J.—Assistant professor of orthopedic surgery, Yale University.

King, Wilson—Farmer.

Lapp, Dr. Ralph E.—Nuclear physicist and author.

Liebman, Morris I.—Attorney-at-law, Chicago.

De Lima, Oscar—Business executive, Chairman, executive committee, United Nations Association.

Lindsay, Howard—Playwright, producer and actor.

Locke, Edwin Allen Jr.—President, Modern Homes Construction Company.

Lodge, George C.—University official, Former Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Loomis, Henry—Former director, Voice of America.

Lord, Mrs. Oswald B.—Former United States representative on Human Rights Commission, United Nations.

Lucey, Archbishop Robert E.—San Antonio prelate.

McCaleb, Claude B.—Book company executive.

McDougal, Myres C.—Sterling Professor of Law, Yale University.

McGill, Ralph—Syndicated columnist.

Marshall, Brig. Gen. S. L. A.—Military historian.

Martin, C. V.—President, Carson Pirie Scott & Co.

Meany, George—President, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Michael, Franz—Associate director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University.

Nash, Dr. Phillfo—Consulting anthropologist. Former Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Nevins, Allan—Historian.

Newman, Ralph G.—Author, publisher and columnist.

Randall, Mrs. Ann Hagen—Television producer and former foreign correspondent.

Reid, Whitelaw—Business executive.

Robinson, Prof. James A.—Director, Mershon Center for Education in National Security, Ohio State University.

Roosevelt, Kermit—President, Kermit Roosevelt & Associates.

Rose, Dr. Frank—President, University of Alabama.

Rowe, James H. Jr.—Former assistant to President Roosevelt and former Assistant Attorney General.

Rubin, Rabbi Schulen—New York City.

Sacks, Prof. I. Milton—Dean of the undergraduate school, Brandeis University.

Saltonstall, Leverett—Former Senator from Massachusetts.

Saltzman, Charles E.—Investment banker, Former Under Secretary of State.

Scalapino, Robert A.—Professor of political science, University of California.

Seabury, Dr. Paul—Professor of political science, University of California.

Seiztz, Dr. Frederick—President, National Academy of Sciences.

Shuster, Dr. George N.—President emeritus, Hunter College.

Smith, Howard K.—News analyst, commentator and author.

Smithies, Dr. Arthur—Nathaniel Ropes Professor of Political Economy, Harvard University.

De Sola Pool, Dr. Ithiel—Professor of political science, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Sonne, H. Christian—Chairman, National Planning Association.

Stephens, Charles J.—Student, University of California, Berkeley.

Stout, Rex—Author.

Strauss, Miss Anna Lord—Former president, League of Women Voters of the United States.

Strauss, Lewis L.—Former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Stulberg, Louis—President, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

Swearingen, Rodger—Professor of international relations, University of Southern California.

Swig, Benjamin H.—Chairman of the board, Fairmont Hotel Company.

Tatum, E. L. Dr.—Nobel laureate in medicine and physio-Professor, Rockefeller University.

Taylor, Prof. George E.—Director, Far Eastern and Russian Institute, University of Washington.

Thacher, James—Attorney-at-law.

Trager, Frank N.—Professor of international affairs, New York University.

Tyroler, Charles 2d—President, Quadri-Science, Inc.

Urey, Dr. Harold C.—Nobel laureate in chemistry. Professor of chemistry at large, University of California.

Van Dusen, Dr. Henry P.—Clergyman, educator and author. Chairman, Foundation for Theological Education in Southeast Asia.

Washburn, Abbott—Former deputy director, United States Information Agency.

White, Robert P.—Student, University of Oklahoma.

Whitney, John Hay—Former ambassador to Britain.

Wigner, Eugene P.—Nobel laureate in physics. Professor of physics, Princeton University.

Williams, T. Harry—Boyd Professor of History, Louisiana State University.

Wilson, Joseph C.—Chairman of the board, Xerox Corporation.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New York. In his customary eloquent and articulate way he has summed up the case. I share his view about the formation of this committee. I may not be in agreement with them, but I think it is a great thing for our country and it offers a great opportunity. I think the Senator from New York has put the question in a proper perspective.

Mr. President, I trust the remarks which the Senator from New York made so eloquently will be brought home to the people of our beloved country.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my colleague for his enormous and legendary experience in this field. I feel tremendously fortified by his approval.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4903) to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the further report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the further report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in its issue of yesterday, October 25, the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., one of our leading newspapers, there is published an editorial which I think is well worthy of consideration.

The editorial relates to the use by a relatively small number of Communists as participators of such peace demonstrations, so-called, and antidraft demonstrations as have been going on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial entitled "It Is Time To Clamp Down" be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It Is Time To Clamp Down

There is an utterly incomprehensible indifference, indeed blindness, displayed in national political circles toward Communist use of the so-called "peace" demonstrations.

This blindness is more than irritating. It is dangerous.

Some attribute the phenomenon to the fact that political liberals in many instances still retain a fear of "red baiting" as part of the nation's hangover from McCarthyism. But this is ridiculous in the extreme

It would be patently absurd to ignore forever afterward the existence of a disease called typhoid fever because several cases of some other malady were wrongly diagnosed as typhoid. Every bit as absurd is the tendency now not to see Communist influence when it is as apparent as Castro's beard.

The American people have been asked over the years to swallow a lot of incredible contentions, but Dr. Benjamin Spock's "guess" that in the throng of people who perpetrated the demonstration and violence in Washington, D.C. over the weekend "there were a couple dozen Communists" strains belief beyond reason.

"I don't feel we are being used by the Communists," said the baby doctor who spends much of his time demonstrating against the Vietnam War.

About two weeks before the demonstration, The Worker, official organ of the Communist Party in the United States, carried a story headlined "Support Zooming for Peace March in Washington."

The story in The Worker, read primarily by Communists, gave detailed information on special transportation arrangements from New York City to Washington for the rally.

For weeks the paper urged its readers to participate in the demonstration.

All of this to place "a couple of dozen Communists" in a throng of some 50,000? Nonsense!

Like it or not, the United States of America is in a war in Southeast Asia and America's young men are dying from artillery shells, missiles, bullets and land mines made in Russia and China.

This is no time for permissiveness and just plain lethargy on the home front toward those domestic Communists who are attempting to foment rioting here at home in order to give the Reds a political victory they cannot win in the field and to mock the sacrifice made by the members of the U.S. Armed Forces.

The right of peaceful dissent is vital to

> democracy and must be preserved. Those who don't approve of the war have every right to speak out. But mob violence and Red subversion must be stopped.
>
> America has investigative resources to ferret out the Communists in the peace movement and separate them from those whose motive may be sincere opposition to the war.
>
> It is doubtful that America has the legal machinery to do an effective job of prosecuting the Communists and there has been no strong expression from the administration of the will to crack down and crack down hard.
>
> Congress must provide this legal machinery quickly and it appears that it is left to the Congress to provide leadership to steps which will put a stop to this mockery of freedom.
>
> While on the subject, Congress should also take strong steps to curb the latest announced intention of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.
>
> Leaders of the movement have said it will turn from demonstrations as a tactic to active resistance through confrontations with the government by sit-ins and civil disobedience.
>
> This is simply not to be tolerated. We have had enough. The contrast between some bearded lout blocking the door to an induction center and a young American Marine waiting for the next artillery round to drop upon Con Thien is too great to be borne.
>
> This situation is a national disgrace.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to read just a few paragraphs from this editorial to which I have referred:

> There is an utterly incomprehensible indifference, indeed blindness, displayed in national political circles toward Communist use of the so-called peace demonstrations.
>
> This blindness is more than irritating. It is dangerous.

Mr. President, I am calling this matter particularly to the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary. After appealing to the Congress to take action, this editorial concludes as follows:

> Congress must provide this legal machinery quickly and it appears that it is left to the Congress to provide leadership to steps which will put a stop to this mockery of freedom.
>
> While on the subject, Congress should also take strong steps to curb the latest announced intention of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.
>
> Leaders of the movement have said it will turn from demonstrations as a tactic to active resistance through confrontations with the government by sit-ins and civil disobedience.
>
> This is simply not to be tolerated. We have had enough. The contrast between some bearded lout blocking the door to an induction center and a young American Marine waiting for the next artillery round to drop upon Con Thien is too great to be borne.
>
> This situation is a national disgrace.

Mr. President, I respectfully call the editorial and its subject matter to the attention of our able Committee on the Judiciary with the strong request that appropriate legislation be considered and brought out quickly for action by Congress.

CONGRESS WILL NOT BE INTIMIDATED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, following the demonstrators' march on the Pentagon, Dr. Martin Luther King was quoted in the press as declaring that the time may come for staging a massive camp-in to disrupt the Nation's Capital if Congress does not act soon on programs for the poor. To prod Congress, he said, more than 1-day demonstrations may be needed.

To quote Dr. King from the press reports, he said:

> Just camp here and stay here by the thousands and thousands . . . and make it clear that the city will not function. The civil rights movement has a responsibility to "pressure" Congress so that it can "no longer elude our demands."

Mr. President, if the only way the supporters of a cause can impress the Congress is by threats to disrupt the National Government, then it would appear to me that their cause does not have much merit. Leaders who can think of nothing else than demonstrations, who insist on thinking and acting negatively instead of constructively, are dangerously close to a bankruptcy of ideas.

Dr. King's threats do not impress me, and I do not believe they will impress many other Members of the Senate and House. The effect, instead, I think, will be to alienate both the Congress and the public. I, for one, think we have enough of this kind of demonstration.

In this connection, the Washington Post in its editorial entitled "King's Camp-In" today makes the excellent point that a minority should be heard, but not at the expense and exclusion of the millions of other citizens who do not join in its demands.

The editorial states:

> Those who conjure up mobs to force the suspension of Government itself are talking about revolution—even if they call it "passive resistance" or "civil disobedience."

I agree with its conclusion that Congress may have its faults, but Dr. King must know that its Members are not so pusillanimous as to be intimidated by any threat he may make of a camp-in to bring the Government to a halt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the Washington Post printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KING'S CAMP-IN

It is to be hoped that Dr. Martin Luther King will, on reflection, change his mind about his vague proposal for a massive "camp-in" in Washington to disrupt the Government and compel Congress to act on some programs he wishes to have passed.

A demonstration aimed at the mind and conscience of the country and which incidentally discommodes the operations of Government is one thing. A massive invasion and sit-down that is deliberately contrived and intended to cause the suspension of Government operations is something else. Any real democracy should put up with the inconvenience of the former; and any ordinary government must resist the latter. The first situation constitutes a request that the Government listen to a minority; the second represents a demand that the Government comply with and respond to the dictates of a minority alone. The first is a resort to democracy: the second an appeal to anarchy.

The citizens who have a dissent to voice or a complaint to make have a right to articulate grievances through assembly, demonstration and petition. But they have no right to demand that Government suspend operations until it yields to their importunate demands. The people who take to the streets should be heard; but they should not be heard to the exclusion of the millions of citizens who do not join the mob in the streets. Those who conjure up mobs to force the suspension of Government itself are talking about revolution—even if they call it "passive resistance" or "civil disobedience."

Congress may have its faults, but Dr. King has good reason to know that its members are not so pusillanimous that they can be intimidated into action. To attempt that sort of intimidation is to invite, instead, a reaction even from those broadly sympathetic to Dr. King's larger purposes.

DETROIT'S MAYOR CAVANAGH FORESAW THE DISTURBANCES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the other body has recently reported to the floor a bill to continue the war on poverty for the remainder of this fiscal year. It is anticipated that the bill will come to the floor for debate within the next few weeks.

There has appeared to be in the other body some disenchantment with the poverty program which, in my opinion, does not reflect either the facts of the matter or the opinion of a majority of the American people.

For some time, I have been accumulating evidence to support what I have just said and in a few moments I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD, along with a few comments, the various data dealing with the subject.

The first is a comment by the very able and distinguished mayor of Detroit, Jerome Cavanagh, having reference to the unfortunate riots of last summer in his great city.

Mr. President, over and over again in recent months, newspapers and magazines have started feature articles with such phrases as "Detroit was the city they said it couldn't happen in" and "No one believed it could ever happen in New Haven."

But it did happen in Detroit and in New Haven, and in more than 40 other cities across the country.

Gone today and, I believe, gone forever are the smugness and complacency we wrapped ourselves in before the summer winds of hate and fury blew through our cities. Smugness and complacency have been replaced by soul searching and sober realism.

But long before this summer's holocausts we did have prophets, men of vision and understanding, among our city officials. They saw the ominous signs and portents and warned the American people; but for the most part their warnings were ignored. We see now that we did not want to confront the consequences of our collective neglect, apathy, and inertia. We have paid—this summer—a tragic price for that refusal to face realities. I hope that we will not pay that price again. I hope that the other body will see to it that we do not.

Ironically, one of the prophets to whom we did not listen, and should have, was the mayor of Detroit, the highly competent and farsighted Jerome Cavanagh. Mayor Cavanagh indulged in no wishful thinking; he refused to see the world only through rose-colored glasses. With penetrating insight, Mayor Cavanagh saw clearly that it could happen in Detroit and that it could happen in other cities.

If we had listened to our prophets, to Mayor Cavanagh and the others who sounded the alarms, we might have avoided much of the devastation, bloodshed, and pillage that raged through our communities in this fateful summer.

Mr. President, in this connection, I recently received an illuminating letter from Mayor Cavanagh which I would like to share with Members of this Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Thank you for sending me your statement on "Civil Disorders in American Cities," as published in the August 2 Congressional Record.
>
> This has been a trying time for us all.
>
> As you know, a year ago, I told the Ribicoff Committee, "We must make sure that everyone in this nation begins to think about the larger questions—begins to realize that the warfare on our city streets is as important to our national destiny as some consider the warfare in Southeast Asia."
>
> This same theme was echoed in my presidential address to the National League of Cities last November.
>
> In 1963, I warned the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials at their national convention that cities face a tragic situation that is nothing less than a national shame.
>
> Last November, I told the Conference of National Organizations that "our treatment of the Negro has been a national disgrace. Our laws, our customs and our attitudes are changing now. I only hope they change fast enough to match the impatience of so many forgotten Americans."
>
> And, again in April before the National Institute of Public Affairs, I warned that everything in this nation is not going to be all right. My words that night were, "I do not mean to preach blood and thunder here tonight. But there is a good deal of thunder that can be heard and blood has already spilled."
>
> Since that night in April, much more blood has spilled—a large portion of it in Detroit.
>
> As I told the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Detroit has done all the textbook things and, according to all available scales, has run one of the most successful Wars on Poverty in the nation while generally moving the city forward.
>
> But this apparently is not enough. We knew this before the riot but now have had our convictions confirmed by the violence directed at society by those forced to live in the ghettoes. These people have shared the experience of slum living—the overall conditions of degradation, disorganization and poverty in which the young grow up without hope of legitimately sharing in the supposed fruits of the affluent society—that affluent society within their sight but beyond their reach.
>
> Now we must go beyond the textbook and create new ways to meet these problems. I agree with you that these new methods must be undertaken, of course, in the spirit of justice, but primarily in the spirit of compassion and cooperation.
>
> We are making a new start in Detroit. We are looking to Washington for assistance.
>
> It is not enough to learn how to control and put down civil disorders. We must eliminate the causes for civil disorders.
>
> Your help and good wishes are much appreciated.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Jerome P. Cavanagh,
> *Mayor.*

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the mayor was responding to a statement entitled "Civil Disorders in American Cities" as published in the August 2 Congressional Record which I had sent to him. He points out the testimony he gave before the Ribicoff committee over a year before his letter was sent to me, in which he indicated the necessity to begin to think about the larger questions, that warfare on our city streets is as important to our national destiny as the war in Southeast Asia.

He points out that he warned the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials at their national convention in 1963 that our cities faced a tragic situation, and that such a tragic situation was nothing less than a national shame. He made similar comments in April 1966, and again in November 1966. But his warnings went unheeded. The riots hit Detroit and 30 other cities.

He also points out that we must now go beyond reading about matters of this sort in textbooks, that we must create new ways to meet these problems in the spirit of justice, and also in the spirit of compassion and cooperation. He ends his letter by saying:

> It is not enough to learn how to control and put down civil disorders. We must eliminate the causes for civil disorders.

OEO BACKED BY INDUSTRY, BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is an impression abroad that the war on poverty bill, the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967, approved by the Senate, is legislation principally supported by the administration and by liberals and labor, a notion that has been given currency by editorial comment in a number of conservative newspapers and magazines.

But the truth is that the bill passed by the Senate which, in many ways, is very different from the bill recommended by the OEO, enjoys the confidence and support of a wide spectrum of the business community. This was emphasized recently when the Urban Coalition announced its vigorous support of the Emergency Employment Act which, I regret, was rejected on the floor of the Senate "as a significant step toward an urgently needed national emergency program to provide at last 1 million jobs."

Prominent among members of the steering committee of the urban coalition are such representatives of big business and industry as Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Co.; David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank; Gerald L. Phillippe, chairman of the board, General Electric; J. Irwin Miller, chairman, Cummins Engine Co.; Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the board, Time, Inc.; and Theodore Schlesinger, president, Allied Stores Corp.

More recently, Mr. President, we were given fresh evidence that thoughtful members of the business community view the Office of Economic Opportunity as an operation that deserves respect and support. Large display advertisements have appeared in the New York Times and the Washington Post strongly endorsing the OEO and its various programs and stating with heavy emphasis:

> The OEO must be preserved as the single responsible agency for the conduct and management of the many and diverse activities of the economic opportunity program.

The theme of this timely published statement is "A Hand Up—Not a Handout. That's What OEO Is All About."

I ask unanimous consent that the impressive text of what the businessmen and industrialists have to say about OEO and its work may be printed in full in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> We believe that businessmen, professional, legislators, indeed all citizens should understand and support the Office of Economic Opportunity. For what it does, as well as for how it does it.
>
> OEO's programs have always made sense. But this summer's tragic events in numerous cities, we are convinced, make OEO's programs imperative. In city after city, these programs have prevented or reduced community conflict. They provided hope where there had been only despair, dialogue where there had been only division, skills where there had been none.
>
> What does the OEO do? We look at it this way: The OEO and its programs give people a hand up, not a handout . . . get people off relief rolls and onto payrolls. Private payrolls. It helps pepole move up the economic ladder; equips them through education and training to become productive and constructive members of society. The way we see it, the OEO turns out workers and consumers.
>
> Now, how does the OEO operate? It's set up and run like any efficient organization should be. A central management governing and administering a variety of diverse programs in 1100 communities in all 50 states, plus 120 Job Corps Centers. The OEO runs tightly, cleanly, economically. And it does this largely because of the way it's organized.
>
> Operationally, the OEO follows the proven management concept of single responsibility. We practice this principle within our own organizations. And therefore, it's only natural for us to believe that *the OEO must be preserved as the single responsible agency for the conduct and management of the many and diverse activities of the economic opportunity program.*
>
> It is the best way to get a vital job done.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, that statement is certainly an unequivocal declaration of approval and advocacy of what the OEO is and what it does. As evidence of the wide range of this business and industry approval, I would like to cite some of the executives who signed the statement.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of these executives may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Robert S. Benjamin, Chairman of the Board, United Artists Corporation.

Ralph M. Besse, President, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.

Cabell Brand, President, Ortho-Vent Shoe Company.

George R. Brown, President, Brown & Root, Inc.

Holmes Brown, Vice President, American Airlines, Inc.

Carter Burgess, Chairman of the Board, American Machine & Foundry.

Richard H. Carter, President, Fostoria Corporation.

Walker L. Cisler, Chairman, The Detroit Edison Company.

Donald C. Cook, President, American Electric Power Co., Inc.

Richard Cudah, President, Patrick Cudahy, Inc.

C. Malcolm Davis, President, Fidelity Union Trust Co.

John D. deButts, Vice Chairman, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Dr. A. G. Gaston, President, Booker T. Washington Insurance Co.

James M. Gavin, Chairman of the Board, Arthur D. Little, Inc.

Harold S. Geneen, Chairman, International Telephone and Telegraph Corp.

Carl A. Gerstacker, Chairman of the Board, The Dow Chemical Company.

Eli Goldston, President, Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates.

Jerold C. Hoffberger, President, National Brewing Company.

Harding Lawrence, President, Braniff International.

Frederick Lee, Vice President, Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corporation.

C. Virgil Martin, President, Carson Pirie Scott & Company.

James McCormack, Chairman, Communications Satellite Corporation.

William Patrick, Assistant General Counsel, Michigan Bell Telephone Co.

Harvey Russell, Vice President, Pepsi-Cola Company.

Charles E. Scripps, Chairman of the Board, Scripps-Howard Newspapers.

Olcott Smith, Chairman, Aetna Life Insurance Company.

Roger P. Sonnabend, President, Hotel Corporation of America.

W. H. Wheeler, Chairman of the Board, Pitney-Bowes, Inc.

URBAN COALITION IN 50-CITY CAMPAIGN

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on the same general subject, nearly 2 months ago a new national organization known as the Urban Coalition held its first convocation in Washington. Approximately 1,200 leaders of business, labor, civil rights, religion, and Government formed a unique alliance organized to launch "a broad public-private attack on the problems of American cities."

Andrew Haiskell, chairman of the board of Time, Inc., and of Urban America, Inc., and A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, were named cochairmen. Elected to the steering committee were such noted and prestigious Americans as: Mayor John V. Lindsay, of New York; David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank; Gerald L. Phillippe, chairman of the board, General Electric; Henry Ford II, chairman, Ford Motor Co.; George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO; Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers; the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; Roy Wilkins, executive director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Whitney Young, executive director, National Urban League; Mayor James H. J. Tate, of Philadelphia; Mayor Joseph M. Barr, of Pittsburgh; and Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh, of Detroit.

As its initial action, the Urban Coalition adopted a statement of principles, goals and commitments that has been widely publicized and warmly praised. The statement advanced a comprehensive program, but the proposals that captured the greatest attention were those calling for the creation of 1 million jobs and 1 million housing units for low-income families.

Important as this national effort is to the eradication of mass unemployment and municipal blight, even more valuable and necessary are the same kind of broad alliances on local levels. Urban Coalition programs are planned for 50 cities with some of the cities, like New York, concentrating at first on jobs and job-training for unemployed men and women in the city's minority communities. The New York coalition has extremely capable leadership with Christian Herter, Jr., son of the former Governor of Massachusetts and Secretary of State of the United States, serving as chairman and with such outstanding members as General Electric Chairman Phillippe, and President Joseph Curran, of the National Maritime Union, AFL-CIO.

The New York Coalition was given an enthusiastic sendoff by the New York Times. Because the Urban Coalition idea is scheduled to spread to 50 cities, and perhaps more, I feel sure the New York Time's excellent editorial will be of interest to all Members of Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to include the New York Times editorial, "Getting Off the Ground," of October 12, in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Getting Off the Ground

The concern of the Urban Coalition, expressed so strongly late last summer by public-spirited citizens during an emergency post-riot convocation in Washington, is beginning to find rootholds where it counts—in the front-line cities of America.

Mobilization of the nation's public and private resources for a vigorous attack on that urban hydra—unemployment, slum housing and aimless education—is getting off the ground. Leaders in some fifty cities will meet in Chicago next week to establish local action groups that can enlist the resources and energies of business, labor, religious, academic and community organizations. In this city, a New York Coalition has just started to translate the lofty policy language of the national steering committee into local terms.

High-mindedness, of course, will not be enough. Hard-core unemployment will take hard-core solutions. Lobbying of superhuman proportions will be required in the business and labor communities to break down traditional attitudes.

The Federal Government is in the forefront of action. For this reason the first step of the local Coalition is to discuss the inclusion of New York City in the pilot program, recently announced by the President, to engage the private sector in the attack on unemployment. But the true effectiveness of the Urban Coalition, the New York Coalition and those to come in other cities will be measured by more than simply seeking increased assistance from Washington.

Municipalities with archaic laws and practices that have effectively barred the poor and disadvantaged from job and housing gains will have to be persuaded to change their customs. Certain industries that have blocked Negroes from full opportunities will have to be re-educated. Certain unions which have denied membership on racial grounds will have to reform their practices.

By enlisting the community-action groups—the spokesmen for the jobless and ill-housed—the New York Coalition is getting to the core of center city's problems.

ANTIPOVERTY WORKERS PRAISED FOR CALMING RIOT SITUATIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, again I speak about the splendid record of antipoverty workers who did so much to calm riot situations in our cities this summer. More and more evidence is accumulating that the country's long, hot summer would have been much hotter and much longer had it not been for the superb work of antipoverty fighters across the country.

In city after city and town after town, mayors and police officials have gone on record praising antipoverty workers for their successful efforts which either prevented violence, arson, and looting or greatly helped diminish them after disturbances broke out.

There were more than 30,000 Community Action employees throughout the country while the riots were in progress, but only 16 were arrested and none convicted. But in 15 cities it has been proved that Community Action agencies calmed down bad situations, and in 14 cities municipal police departments and Community Action agencies had joint programs to prevent riots. And in eight cities the juvenile arrest rate went down this summer as the result of more summer jobs.

Mr. President, there will never be any way of calculating how many lives were saved this summer, how many homes and businesses were preserved from destruction, and how many jobs were safeguarded as a result of the devoted and hazardous labors of such groups as the Neighborhood Youth Corps. We who know the handicaps and disadvantages under which they work are proud of these antipoverty warriors and their accomplishments.

Mr. President, one of the most comprehensive yet concise appraisals of the role played by the antipoverty workers in this summer's upheavals was published recently by the Christian Science Monitor. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 21, 1967]

OEO Cools Riot Cities, Probe Hints

(By William C. Selover)

Washington.—The Office of Economic Opportunity has been under siege for weeks.

Every since rioting first erupted, the antipoverty agency, in the words of one top official, has been "trying to put out fires."

At the same time, the OEO has been the target of repeated accusations.

Most frequent was the charge that antipoverty workers were involved in the burning and looting.

The agency's public-relations men immediately issued denials. But they winced with each new outbreak, not knowing for sure what might happen next. And they couldn't be completely certain that in the 28 cities where riots occurred, there might not be some (or even quite a few) of their antipoverty workers involved. In those cities alone, they knew there are over 12,000 employees being paid by the OEO.

INVESTIGATIONS URGED

The OEO's director, R. Sargent Shriver, had to know the facts quickly.

Sen. John L. McClellan (D) of Arkansas was convinced that the charges were true. So were other lawmakers. Many called for full-scale investigations.

However, on the basis of early soundings, Mr. Shriver reported to the House Committee on Education and Labor that the charges were groundless.

"In Detroit alone," he said, "3,783 persons were arrested. There are 1,547 paid antipoverty workers in that city but not a single one is under arrest."

He also pointed out, that of the nearly 500 OEO offices in these cities, "not a single one was burned. Not a single one was looted."

"Why? Because . . . these facilities were among the few places where they [the Negroes] could find refuge and aid."

DETAILS SOUGHT

And out of the some 6,700 arrested in the 28 cities, the OEO pointed out, only seven were paid poverty workers.

Mr. Shriver had called on his chief of inpsections, former newspaperman Ed May, to dig out the facts. Mr. May sent investigators out to make reports. He needed the facts for his boss.

Other top Shriver aides in charge of program planning, needed to know as well—to guide them in modifying programs that may have gone wrong.

The reports, made available to this newspaper, tell the good and the bad. They point to occasional indiscretion and poor judgment on the part of antipoverty workers in a few cities.

For example, in Dayton, Ohio, OEO investigators reported that the director of one OEO-funded program had his picture taken with H. (Rap) Brown at the airport and introduced him at a meeting afterward. The disturbance started after this meeting. OEO inspectors felt this was bad judgment, but they found "no evidence of wrongdoing . . . just a lack of tact and common sense."

And in Rochester, N.Y., inspectors found that some antipoverty officials had "verbally attacked city officials" at a meeting called supposedly to quell tension. The effect was the opposite.

And in many cities poverty workers have appeared as witnesses against the police.

But the major, untold story of the riots is quite different and deeply impressive. It is a story of a constructive response to emergencies by antipoverty workers in community after community.

In report after report, instance after instance of the courageous role played by these people in the midst of racial chaos remains a singularly bright light in an otherwise dismal picture.

INCIDENTS LISTED

Here are some examples from the investigator's reports:

Detroit: "Neighborhood workers and community organizers circulated through the riot areas, ascertaining what help was needed with regard to shelter, food, and clothing."

"Some 30 Neighborhood Youth Corps youths, serving as police cadets, worked around the clock, in 12-hour shifts at police precincts, manning in-put telephone switchboards, handling all calls requesting general information."

Tampa, Fla.: Two neighborhood antipoverty centers served as headquarters for a group of young Negroes "assigned to go into the riot area to talk with teen-agers," to cool them off.

Minneapolis: Some 15 employees of an OEO program "went out on the streets in an attempt to calm rebellious teen-agers. . . ." And the Minneapolis Tribune reported that one antipoverty center "has been acknowledged by police as a key factor in limiting the violence."

Toledo, Ohio: 25 poverty workers here "maintained the only communication with teen-age rioters. . . ." The poverty workers called most of the youths to a meeting to air their grievances and all-night telephone grievance service was started "for ghetto residents with gripes."

CROWD INTERCEPTED

Grand Rapids, Mich.: The local antipoverty agency "placed on the street a task force of street workers who sought to help the police prevent looting." The Grand Rapids press praised their work calling them "a group of young Negroes bent on trying to keep Grand Rapids cool."

Plainfield, N.J.: "Before and during the riot, 10 of 12 staff members were on the street, trying to calm the people."

Pontiac, Mich.: "Some 20 neighborhood organizers were utilized to talk to the wayward youth in their areas in attempts to cool things down. . . ."

Saginaw, Mich.: Antipoverty officials were credited with preventing violence July 25, when they intercepted a crowd marching on City Hall. They convinced the crowd that their grievances could be presented to the Mayor by two spokesmen.

Des Moines: This city has a "night patrol" set up by the antipoverty program "to keep things cool." The 30 youths in the patrol go to a disturbance "to encourage people on the streets to go to their homes and stay there."

CADETS PRAISED

Atlanta: During a disturbance in the Dixie Hills section of this city, the anti-poverty office was the only facility in the area open. It served as a meeting place for city and state officials with local residents.

Youngstown, Ohio: The Youngstown Vindicator, praising the efforts of the 26 OEO-funded police cadets said: "They calm down a hothead spoiling for a fight or mingle in a crowd urging excited youngsters to go home."

Waterbury, Conn.: The local Community Action Program (CAP) agency "acted as a communications link between the radical elements in the Negro neighborhoods and the white power structure of the city. . . ."

The inspector's reports admitted that in some cities the local antipoverty programs played little or no role. In Boston's Roxbury section, they reported, "ABCD apparently did not play much of a role in the Roxbury riots, either positively or negatively." And they reported that the Cairo, Ill., CAP "did very little during the trouble."

Similarly, CAPs played little or no part, one way or another, in Lansing, Mich., Waterloo, Iowa, or in Cambridge, Md.

CENTERS CRITICIZED

And the Rochester CAP program came in for some criticism: "The CAP neighborhood centers have not reached the teenagers. In fact, two of the centers don't have a youth worker and the other just recently hired one, even though the money has been appropriated over a year."

Many of these 28 cities have now redoubled their efforts to set up peace-keeping machinery—and the experience with the use of antipoverty workers has encouraged increase reliance on them.

Probably even more significant is the effort being made by antipoverty workers to keep calm the cities where no rioting occurred.

OEO inspectors investigated the considerable role OEO-funded agencies are playing in cooling eleven other nonriot cities, including these: Elizabeth, N.J., Baton Rouge, La., Oklahoma City, St. Louis, New York, Lowell, Mass., Trenton, N.J., Philadelphia, Charlotte, N.C., Columbus, Ohio, and Dallas.

QUESTIONS REMAIN

While the specific "cool-off" roles of the antipoverty agencies in these cities were spelled out in detail in the reports, in general, it can be said that the primary emphasis of these efforts is to keep avenues of communication open between the Negroes and the city officials.

"Community Action agencies often offer the only communications link between the ghetto and the power structure that is able to function in times of crisis," the investigators concluded.

While all the questions of the involvement of poverty workers in the rioting is by no means settled by the OEO inspection reports, and congressional investigators are still looking into the charges, one thing is certain:

Antipoverty agencies often have served as a vital "hot line" to the Negro community deep in the throes of a struggle for economic and social advantages enjoyed by the other 90 percent of this country's population.

The effect of such communication in quelling riots is difficult to estimate.

But, in the words of Providence Mayor Joseph A. Doorley Jr., talking to a group of volunteer OEO workers: "As far as I'm concerned, there is no telling how bad this might have been if it hadn't been for you guys."

PHILADELPHIA'S POVERTY FUNDS INSURE ITS CHILDREN'S FUTURE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, again I turn to my own city of Philadelphia. I believe our country is learning an all-important lesson taught by the Founding Fathers, a lesson concerning the responsibility of one generation for those that follow.

Thomas Paine put it this way:

> The declaration which says that God visits the sins of the fathers upon the children is contrary to every principle of moral justice.

Because of men like Paine and Jefferson, we have abandoned the superstition that human beings are predestined to their lots, that because a father is impoverished the children too are doomed to penury.

Today we believe not only that children born to poverty-stricken parents do not need to grow up in deprivation; we believe, on the contrary, that they should not.

Our generation more than any other generation of Americans is capable of turning the footsteps of our young people away from the dead-end streets of poverty, hunger, crime and disease. Today we can send them along new pathways of hope, fulfillment and social usefulness.

One means of doing these things is the war on poverty, making available to young people the resources, the benefits, the unprecedented advantages of the antipoverty programs. That is the story of what is happening today in Philadelphia, a city that believes more and more that its children are its most important possession.

For that reason Philadelphia has devoted most of the Federal money it has received for the war on poverty to programs benefiting its young people. How this has been done is detailed in the following impressive newsstory which appeared in a recent Philadelphia Inquirer article.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that newsstory may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the newsstory was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Poverty Grants Aided Children Most, PAAC Informs Tate

Children from Philadelphia's slum and ghetto areas have benefited to the greatest extent from the $28.1 million provided by the Federal Government, an interim report to Mayor James J. H. Tate by the Philadelphia Anti-Poverty Action Committee showed Tuesday.

Children's programs totaled 24, more than half of the 40 financed by the Federal Government, the report indicated. The largest single outlay of the Government grants was $9.3 million for prekindergarten services to 5500 youngsters.

The second largest expenditure was for $4.7 million to provide vocational training through the Rev. Leon Sullivan's Opportunities Industrialization Center. Temple University Neighborhood Health Center received the third top allocation of $3.5 million.

The report showed 760,000 children have received recreational opportunity services that involved operations of 24 agencies.

The PAAC report said that since April, 1965, the organization has found jobs for 7,000 persons from poverty areas. Additional services provided by the organization included legal counsel and assistance, low-income housing and social activities.

At the present time, PAAC, according to the report, has been waiting for review of 11 programs by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

THE WAR ON POVERTY AS AN ANTIDOTE TO RIOTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I turn now to the suggestion, with which I am in complete accord, that the war on poverty is an antidote to riots.

Two of the most perceptive and probing examinations of the growing importance of the war on poverty to American cities have been written by columnist Roscoe Drummond, whose columns appear in the Philadelphia Inquirer and other newspapers.

Mr. Drummond has taken a long, realistic look at the role of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its various antipoverty programs in terms of the bloody and destructive upheavals that struck so many American cities this summer.

After studying the evidence offered by OEO and other sources, Mr. Drummond reaches such significant and solid conclusions as these:

First:

> The testimony of the Mayors—

He has reference to the testimony given before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, of which I have the honor to be chairman, during the period we were considering the war on poverty amendments for this year:

> The testimony of the Mayors shows that without the anti-poverty programs there would have been more violence, little communication with the slum Negroes, and no significant beginnings of hope and assistance for the urban poor.

Second:

> The knowledgeable testimony of the Mayors is that the poverty programs help convert militancy into responsibility and offer an alternative to violence.

Mr. President, because I believe that Mr. Drummond's two studies have important meaning for Members of Congress and for all Americans, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article entitled "Poverty Programs Are Vital for Cities," written by Roscoe Drummond and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 14, 1967, and the article entitled "Jobs Will Eliminate Rioting in the Cities," written by Roscoe Drummond and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of October 9, 1967.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Sept. 14, 1967]

Poverty Programs Are Vital for Cities

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—The people who know the most about race riots and what to do about them are the people who run the cities—the Mayors. Their views deserve the most responsive attention—by Congress and the country.

A nation-wide survey in 64 cities, half of which had riots this summer and half of which didn't shows that the Mayors are overwhelmingly agreed on what does most to cause riots and what can help most to prevent them.

The causes they cite most frequently are two: Lack of jobs and lack of trusted communication between Negroes and local officials.

As to cures, they know better than most that there is no single solution, no instant panacea, but the Mayors—Democratic and Republican—of these 64 cities are unanimous in their conviction that the antipoverty programs are crucial and constructive forces which need to be continued.

This survey shows conclusively that both the OEO programs and its workers played a major role in keeping scores of cities cool this summer and helped hold rioting down when it wasn't averted.

Because the survey was carried out by the OEO, some might dismiss it as self-serving. But after reading pages of direct quotations by the Mayors themselves, I am convinced its findings are authentic. The message is this:

Whatever else Congress may do to help solve the urban crisis, the one thing not to do is to tear up the antipoverty administration and programs.

They are needed and nobody knows it better than the American Mayors who have endured the riots and who have seen the programs at work in their communities.

In the Senate the outlook for the antipoverty bill is good. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee, by a vote of 12 to 3, indorsed a bill to continue and somewhat expand the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity for two years.

But there are ominous storm clouds in the House. There are still some Republicans and Southern Democrats who want to dismember the OEO and distribute the programs to other agencies whether the agencies want them or not.

Critics of the war on poverty have seized on headlines about the one or two incidents where poverty workers were charged with helping create a riot-causing climate.

The testimony of the Mayors show that without the antipoverty programs there would have been more violence, little communication with the slum Negroes, and no significant beginnings of hope and assistance for the urban poor.

As to poverty workers abetting riots, some communities undertake high-risk experiments involving some of the most disaffected and alienated youth. Young men who six months ago were on the streets and in trouble are carefully and cautiously given responsibility, trained to leadership and learn to feel it is just as manly to lead a work program as to lead a gang.

A few proved unreliable. But out of 30,000 community action employes, only 16 were arrested, none convicted. And the poverty program has 244 buildings in the heart of the riot areas; none was burned or destroyed.

In 15 cities local community action agencies calmed down bad situations.

In 13 cities they patrolled trouble spots and served as communication posts between the police and slum areas.

In 14 cities the police and community action agencies had joint programs to prevent riots.

In eight cities the juvenile arrest rate dropped this summer and there is good evidence this was caused by more summer jobs.

The knowledgeable testimony of the Mayors is that the poverty programs help convert militancy into responsibility and offer an alternative to violence.

Their testimony is practical and nonsentimental. It deserves to be heeded.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 9, 1967]

Jobs Will Eliminate Rioting in the Cities

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—Is the major cause of the riots as much in doubt as many suggest? I believe it is not. The doubt arises because in Detroit, for example, most of the militants who generated the rioting were found to have jobs at good wages.

Does this mean that lack of jobs, with the poverty and long unemployment which come in its wake, is not a principal factor in this summer's violence? No.

What it does mean is that the small minority of extremists want riots for their own sake even though most of them are employed.

It means that the best way to disarm the riot-minded extremists is to provide jobs for the unemployed Negroes and whites in the slums who otherwise can be persuaded by the militants that resort to violence is desirable and necessary.

This is what sociologist Daniel P. Moynihan means when he says that the need is to deprive the Negro destructionists of the "Negro underclass which is the source of their present strength."

This is why concerted private enterprise-government determination to do whatever is necessary to provide training and jobs for the ghetto unemployed is the urgent and practicable place to begin.

Nothing conceals the nature of the unemployment problem among the slum poor so much as the remarkable record of the job-creating prosperity which the U.S. has experienced during the past decade. There has been sustained economic growth. Unemployment has dropped below 4 percent.

But despite sustained prosperity and high economic growth there remains a hard core of unemployed which has not been reduced. It perseveres and it is inordinately high among Negroes. While the average unemployment among Negroes is 7 to 8 percent. Among all young people the average unemployment is 12 to 13 percent; the average among Negroes, 25 percent.

This means that the Nation's hard-core unemployment must be tackled as a special problem and that the twice-as-high unemployment among Negroes must be tackled as an extra-special problem brought about mainly by the long denial of equal opportunity in both education and jobs.

The best information is that if 125,000

new jobs can be created in the slum areas in ten cities unemployment there can be cut to the national low of 3.8 percent; 250,000 such jobs could do the same thing in 100 cities; 320,000 such jobs could reduce the total Negro unemployment of 8 percent to the national average of 3.8 percent.

Surely this is a meaningful and attainable objective. It is meaningful because it would make a significant, perhaps a decisive, contribution to social stability in the harassed cities. It can be seen as an attainable objective when you consider that a million and a half jobs are being created yearly, mostly by private business but also through Government programs.

This is a central objective of the Administration today and it seems to me it is headed in the right direction. The Administration is taking two valuable steps. It is constructively enlisting the resources of private industry to provide jobs and, with Government aid, to provide special training so that the hard-core unemployed can fill the jobs. This gears specific training for specific jobs and this is the kind of job-training which can make the maximum appeal and do the most good.

The second thing the Administration is doing is providing a single, central point in the vast, disjointed, overlapping spectrum of the Federal bureaucracy where private business can tap everything the Federal Government is in a position to do to help. How long, oh, how long it has taken!

I am not suggesting that jobs are the sole answer to racial animus and racial injustice. They aren't. But they are the best guarantor of social stability.

AMERICA'S FORGOTTEN CHILDREN

Mr. CLARK. I turn now, Mr. President, to the impact of the war on poverty on America's forgotten children.

Gradually the Nation has become aroused to the plight of millions of American families living in the squalor of urban slums, and we have become awakened, also, to the horrible living conditions to which we have doomed millions of slum children.

Various Federal war on poverty programs and the work of State, municipal, and private agencies are moving toward alleviation of the worst conditions victimizing the slum children and there is reason to hope that this work will be accelerated.

There is, however, a large group of youngsters—who could be called the forgotten children—for whom very little is being done. Nearly a quarter million children are members of migratory farm workers' families, and in many ways their plight—based largely on the rootlessness of the families—is worse than that of the inner city children.

Recently the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Nation's labor press have spotlighted the appalling conditions under which these migratory children must live and grow.

Press Associates, a national news and feature service for the Nation's labor publications, has done an excellent job of reporting an Agriculture Department study of migrant families and the desperate poverty and deprivation in which they live.

We should not permit these forgotten children to be forgotten any longer. The Nation's migratory farm workers' families should be reached and aided by our antipoverty programs and the children, especially, should be helped to escape from impoverishment, hunger and inadequate education.

The antipoverty bill passed by the Senate several weeks ago does make a significant contribution to this goal.

I ask unanimous consent that the Press Associates report on these forgotten children be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Holland in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nearly a Quarter Million Kids Lead Migrant's Life

Nearly a quarter million young U.S. children under fourteen years lead the rootless life of the migrant farm worker.

The children are members of farm migratory households who travel with their parents as they follow the picking seasons across the nation.

A government report, issued by the U.S. Agriculture Department, describes the make-up of the migratory farm work force for 1965 and shows that about 140,000 children in this group have fewer educational opportunities "and a lower educational attainment than any other group of American children."

In all, there are about 237,000 children under fourteen in migratory farm work households. Spanish-American and other white families are most likely to take their children with them.

The children are removed from school in the spring when the seasonal farm labor demand is on the rise. They do not return to their home county until two or three months after the regular school term has begun.

They lose time in schools in their home county and attend schools only irregularly on the road. "Local school authorities," says the report, "may be reluctant to enforce school attendance laws for migrant children."

The migrant family's life is one of grinding poverty. About half the migratory workers lived in families where the annual income was below $3,000 in 1965. The average farm wage rate was $9.70 per day and the average migrant worker was employed only 82 days at farmwork during 1965.

The combination of a short work year and low wages brings a pitifully low income to the migrant. According to the USDA report, migrants employed exclusively at farm labor earned about $1,000 a year while those who worked in other jobs earned $1,700; an average of $500 from farm work and $1,200 from nonfarm jobs.

The work season of the average migrant worker was only four months long in 1965 and almost half held nonfarm jobs during the year. Those who could get other work averaged about 7½ months employment; those who only did farm work reported 5 months' work.

Other aspects of the report show that about 466,000 persons were migratory farm workers in 1965, about 15 percent of the entire farm work force. Of these, about 80 percent were white; 70 percent were men and 50 percent were under 25 years old.

The report shows the migrant worker to be poor, uneducated and without the legal protections that those who stay in one area usually enjoy. The farm worker's drive for a minimum wage and collective bargaining rights could change all that.

THE DEPRESSION NEVER ENDED FOR RESIDENTS OF THE SLUMS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the depression has never ended for residents of the slums. This makes the Federal interest in the war on poverty all the more important, and indeed vital. The civil disturbances that exploded in more than a hundred American communities last summer have provoked a great deal of soul searching, and rightly so.

Two questions above all others dominate the reflections of communities and private citizens: First, why did the riots happen; and second, what must we do to prevent their recurrence?

To answer these questions a national examination of the causes and consequences of the riots is now underway by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, and scores of other studies have been undertaken by municipalities, private research organizations, labor, and religious groups.

By the time these investigations are completed and correlated, we should know a great deal more than we do now about the economic and social conditions that trigger wholesale destruction and bloodshed and what action must be taken, nationally and locally, to eliminate those conditions.

However, Mr. President, one major cause of the uprisings is already indisputably clear: the depression has never ended for the slum Negro. This is proved by the fact that living conditions in the urban slums have not improved since the depression years—in fact, in many places they have deteriorated horribly since then—and also that the unemployment rate among nonwhite slum residents is two, three, and even four times higher—depending upon age levels—than the national average.

One of the most thoughtful and penetrating analyses of the breeding grounds of riots appears in the current issue of Nation's Cities, the authoritative journal published by the highly respected National League of Cities. This editorial deserves a careful and reflecting reading by Members of Congress and all citizens who are concerned with eradicating joblessness, penury, ignorance, and other causes of civil eruptions.

For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "A Way To Attack Rioting's Roots," published in Nation's Cities for October 1967 be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Way To Attack Rioting's Roots

"Those terrible days in July—the sudden appearance, as from the bosom of the earth, of a most infuriated and degraded mob; the helplessness of property owners and the better classes; the boom of cannon and rattle of musketry in our streets; the sky lurid with conflagrations; the inconceivable barbarity and ferocity of the crowd . . . the immense destruction of property were the first dreadful revelations to many of our people of the existence among us of a great, ignorant, irresponsible class who were growing up without any permanent interest in the welfare of the community, of the success of the government . . . of the gradual formation of this class and the dangers to be feared from it, the agents of this society have incessantly warned the public for the past 11 years."

This description of whites rioting in New York in 1863 could be of Newark or Detroit or of a dozen other American cities in which rioting erupted this past summer. Daniel P. Moynihan, who is director of the MIT-Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies, states that the rioting in Detroit and other cities was begun and probably largely continued by young persons who could be described as "urban underclass." They happen in this case to be Negro. And yet, in its first annual report, dated 1854, the Children's Aid Society of New York had predicted the formation of such a class among the white immigrants of the city:

"It should be remembered that there are no dangers to the value of property or to the permanency of our institutions so great as those from the existence of such a class of vagabond, ignorant, and ungoverned children. This dangerous class has not begun to show itself as it will in eight or 10 years when these boys and girls are matured. Those who were too negligent or too selfish to notice them as children will be fully aware of them as men. They will poison society. They will perhaps be embittered at the wealth and the luxuries they never share. Then let society beware, when the outcast, vicious, reckless multitude of New York boys, swarming now in every foul alley and low street come to know their power and use it."

A decade or so ago, Moynihan says, we began to see the formation of a Negro version of this class growing up in our northern cities. We did little or nothing about it.

Moynihan points out that the basic conditions that would appear necessary for the formation of such a class have clearly existed in our cities for a generation now. "First and uppermost," he says, "is unemployment. The Depression has never ended for the slum Negro.

"To unemployment add low wages, add miserable housing, add vicious and pervasive forms of racial discrimination, compound it all with an essentially destructive welfare system, and a social scientist would have every ground on which to predict violence in this violent country."

The "destructive welfare system" he refers to is primarily the miserable Federal Aid to Dependent Children program, which has at some time supported something like six out of every 10 Negro youths reaching 18. This probably accounts for the steady deterioration of family structure in low-income neighborhoods. Probably not more than a third of the children of low-income Negro families now 18 years old have lived all their lives with both parents.

"Breakdown in family relations among poor persons is a pretty good clue that an underclass is forming," according to Moynihan. With something like one New York City child in five living on welfare, Dr. Mitchell Ginsberg of the Lindsay administration this summer declared the system "bankrupt."

The Social Security Act is right now in the process of being overhauled by the U.S. Congress, not by its Labor and Public Welfare Committees, but by its tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee. It retains the old welfare concept of Aid to Dependent Children, which encourages the break-up of families—if the father leaves the household, the mother then becomes eligible for relief for the children. Too many people, including members of Congress, seem to associate the Social Security Act exclusively with insurance taxes for old age pensions and Medicare. Actually the Act has many other titles which have profound influence on our welfare programs, including the out-moded Aid to Dependent Children concept.

The opposite approach should be taken in this country to encourage permanent family formation among the poor, whose children should have the advantage of the experience of family discipline. Moynihan believes the best known way to do this is through a family (or children's) allowance and points out that the United States is the only industrial democracy in the world that does not have such a system of automatic payments to families who are raising minor children. These payments would have the advantage that everyone would get them, not just a special segment artificially defined as below a certain income level. It has worked well all over the world, including Canada. It needs serious consideration in America.

THE UNITED NATIONS SHOULD RESOLVE THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, yesterday I joined with 55 of my colleagues in cosponsoring a Senate resolution requesting that the President consider a new U.S. initiative which would seek to place the question of Vietnam before the United Nations Security Council.

This resolution was suggested by the majority leader, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, and, having the support of a substantial majority of Senators should be speedily enacted.

Almost 2 years ago Ambassador Goldberg, on instructions from the President, requested the calling of an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the situation in Vietnam. This item has remained dormant on the calendar ever since, never having been assigned a specific agenda date.

It is imperative that we once again push for consideration of Vietnam by the Security Council, since much might be gained and nothing is to be lost in a sustained attempt to gain such consideration. At worst, an open defeat of specific moves in this direction by us can hardly be more damaging than rumors and allegations that the United States is preventing negotiations.

I believe that we must make this move if for no other reason than to make it clear that we are willing to lay our position on Vietnam formally on the line. It is high time to clarify by a recorded vote in the U.N. Security Council who is willing and who is not willing to bring the United Nations into the effort to restore peace in Vietnam.

The 56 Senators sponsoring this resolution hold varying views concerning Vietnam. But we share a deep concern and a deep desire for the prompt restoration of peace and a belief that the time is right to resume the U.S. initiative on placing the Vietnam issue before the Security Council.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "RESEARCH IN THE SERVICE OF MAN: BIOMEDICAL KNOWLEDGE, DEVELOPMENT, AND USE"

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit an original resolution, unanimously approved by the committee, and ask that the same be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 181) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations one thousand additional copies of its committee print entitled "Research in the Service of Man: Biomedical Knowledge, Development, and Use."

AMENDMENT NO. 400—SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to report to the Senate increasing support around the country for certain amendments which I have previously filed in the Senate and caused to be printed, which I intend to offer, on behalf of myself and other Senators as cosponsors, to H.R. 12080, the social security bill now pending before the Committee on Finance.

Recently I received a letter dated October 24, 1967, from the Family and Child Services of Washington, D.C., in which it is stated:

> Your ideas are so close to our own that I though you would be interested in the enclosed memorandum received today from the Social Work Assistants which this agency has employed under grant from the Bureau of Works Program on contract from our local United Planning Organization.

The letter is signed by John G. Theban, executive secretary of that fine organization. I ask unanimous consent that his letter, together with the attached memorandum which is referred to in the letter—all of which relate to my amendment No. 400, to provide for the establishment of community service aides and social service volunteers in the social welfare program of each of the States—be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY AND CHILD SERVICES,
OF WASHINGTON, D.C.,
Washington, D.C., October 24, 1967.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was delighted to find in a recent edition of the Washington Post excerpts from your speech in the Senate relative to the employment of subprofessionals in public welfare departments. Your ideas are so close to our own that I thought you would be interested in the enclosed memorandum received today from the Social Work Assistants which this agency has employed under grant from the Bureau of Works Program on contract from our local United Planning Organization.

I need not say that this agency has developed conviction that, with the discipline of good training, effective service can be given by people who have been close to the difficulties of those they seek to help. The agency is also closely identified with its trainees and plans to do everything possible to see them incorporated into permanent jobs. This must come not only within the limited scope of voluntary agencies such as Family and Child Services but, more importantly, within the staffs of the public services. In this we need all the support we can get for there must be substantial changes in the staffing patterns of the public services before there is an opportunity for the trainees to demonstrate their skills in other settings.

Our Board will be meeting with our Social Work Assistants as they have asked. We will be canvassing not only our own capabilities but will also be planning to enlarge the use of assistants by others. I did wonder, since we are all in Washington, whether you might not find it interesting to meet face to face with our Social Work Assistants, a group of men and women who obviously have much invested in the future of subprofessional service. I know that they would be both encouraged and interested in meeting with you to share their thoughts.

Very truly yours,
JOHN G. THEBAN,
Executive Secretary.

Enclosure.

FAMILY AND CHILD SERVICES
OF WASHINGTON, D.C.,
Washington, D.C.

Re Request for meeting with board of trustees to discuss employment of social work assistants.

To: Family and Child Services board of trustees.

From: Family and Child Services social work assistants.

Date: Monday, October 23, 1967.

During the past month, the Social Work Assistants of Family and Child Services have become increasingly concerned with the problem of future employment. It is because of this concern that we hereby request a meeting with the Board at its earliest convenience. We are confident that dialogue of this type will offer concrete answers to the question—"What, after training?"

Throughout the Nation there are hundreds of job training programs which have come into existence through federal legislation as a commitment to fight the War on Poverty. The Neighborhood Services Project of Family and Child Services is one result of this commitment. For many months Social Work Assistants and other trainees have been content with the mere fact that we are being trained. Now that training has developed employable skills in the human service field, we are now faced with the task of finding permanent jobs. Unfortunately, the labor market is not ready or equipped to accept us. We, and many others like us, have been given an opportunity to train and develop social work skills which thereby makes us an available resource to lessen the shortage of professional workers. No one can argue that the need for our skills is desperately needed, yet permanent jobs are virtually non-existent for us in both private and public industry. It seems totally inconceivable that this War on Poverty has not included in its intricate operation of training a preparation for that step beyond—which necessarily means the opening of private and public labor markets. Logically, termination of training must offer permanent jobs, whereby developed skills can be used. The dilemma of our plight is without reason.

We, the Social Work Assistants of Family and Child Services, are committed to the tasks before us. As individuals we cannot effectively alter the establishments which bar our employment, but as a unified body and with the Board of Trustees before us, the establishments can and will be altered. We cannot sit back and complain, we must act now! Intellectual and philosophical discourse is not the answer. We are looking for implementation of this discourse, which means jobs. We see ourselves as moving toward an inevitable "dead-end" if change does not occur. Since others have apparently overlooked this fact, we are prepared to demonstrate the realities of our situation. We are hopeful that you will assist in this demonstration.

By June, 1968 (which is the end of our contract period) twelve Social Work Assistants will have been employed for 2 years 3 months by Family and Child Services in its Neighborhood Services Project. Eight Assistants will have accrued two years of employment by the above date. Nine Assistants will be moving toward a three year celebration of employment in the human service field. Eighteen will be receiving top salaries of $5150 in accordance with the present merit increases. If refunding through the Labor Department continues, it can be anticipated that a significant number of Assistants will be forced to find other employment in order to make slots available for new trainees. It is also conceivable that refunding may be strongly influenced by the number of Social Work Assistants who have found permanent jobs. Such a demonstration would strongly justify the merits of Neighboring Services Project training and facilitate its continuation. With this idea in mind, coupled with the closed labor market, we look to Family and Child Services as a beginning point where a representative number of our group can secure permanent employment. Since Family and Child Services has trained our group, it seems logical that our agency should offer jobs and thereby demonstrate to the total community that its commitment to the War on Poverty does not end at training, but goes that forgotten "step beyond." We must have a chance to prove to others, what we know we can do, but we must have a place to begin. If Family and Child Services can be that place, then our completion of training need not be "dead end."

We shall look forward to your prompt reply.

SIMCHAT TORAH

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, 3 million Russian Jews today are celebrating the Simchat Torah. But the celebration is marred because it is taking place in an atmosphere of intense spiritual persecution.

They are 3 million in number—yet their synagogues number only a bare 60.

The Communist leaders of the Soviet Union have prohibited training of Jewish religious teachers and secular teachers. They have shut down Jewish schools. They have denied nearly 3 million people the religious and cultural facilities which are basic to any government serving its people.

Despite these hardships, the Jews of Russia—indeed, of the world—have faith in their hearts that their cause of religious freedom will prevail.

I join with countless others in the prayerful hope that religious freedom will soon come to all the people of the Soviet Union.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a comparative tabulation showing the estimates of the amounts approved in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968, H.R. 12474 (H. REPT. 569, AUG. 18, 1967, PASSED HOUSE, AUG. 22, 1967; S. REPT. 579, OCT. 3, 1967 PASSED SENATE, OCT. 6, 1967)—COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED IN THE BILL FOR 1968

Item	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	Authorization (Public Law 90-67)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
							Budget estimate	Authorization (Public Law 90-67)	House allowance	Senate allowance
Research and development	$4,245,000,000	$4,352,000,000	$4,147,565,000	$3,899,500,000	$3,995,500,000	$3,925,000,000	−$427,000,000	−$222,565,000	+$25,500,000	−$70,500,000
Construction of facilities	83,000,000	76,700,000	69,980,000	35,900,000	55,400,000	35,900,000	−40,800,000	−34,080,000		−19,500,000
Administrative operations	640,000,000	671,300,000	648,206,000	648,000,000	628,000,000	628,000,000	−43,300,000	−20,206,000	−20,000,000	
Total appropriations	4,968,000,000	5,100,000,000	4,865,751,000	4,583,400,000	4,678,900,000	4,588,900,000	−511,100,000	−276,851,000	+5,500,000	−90,000,000

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. As I understand the end result of the meeting of the conferees from the House and the Senate, the House receded on the item of $10 million for tracking and data acquisition, and they also allowed a $15.5 million item for the Apollo applications program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Am I correct in my understanding that they completely disallowed any amount whatever for the Voyager?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Nevada has been deeply interested in this matter and, I think, rightly so.

The Senate, of course, felt that the nuclear rocket program under research—and development, namely NERVA II and the NERVA I program—should continue because we feel that this is one of the most important phases of the whole space program.

If we can develop a nuclear propulsion system, we would of course make a great breakthrough, not only scientifically but also in many other respects, appropriationwise and every other way, in our quest for knowledge of the space and the world.

With respect to the appropriations for Voyager, the consensus, I believe, of all the conferees, House and Senate, was that no program under research and development should be killed. The conference report language would allow the Administrator of the NASA to come to the respective committees in the Congress, the Space Committees and the Appropriations Committees, after he has an opportunity to review and reprogram these items out of funds provided in this appropriation bill.

The conferees finally agreed to add $25.5 million in the research and development part of the bill over the House allowance, and suggested that the Administrator then come before the committees within a reasonable time with a new list of priorities for reprograming.

It is believed that if the Administrator feels that the Voyager should continue—NERVA I and NERVA II—he will present that matter to us, and he will have the authority as outlined in the conference report, to make transfers from within the research and development amount which was a total of $3,925,000,000, providing the appropriate committees in Congress agree.

The Administrator would then come to us and explain the matter, and if he had a priority on reprograming, he would be able to furnish the amount of money that he felt necessary for NERVA I, the callback program, and NERVA II, and so forth. We put language in the report which I am sure will interest the Senator from Nevada:

> RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
>
> Amendment No. 1: appropriates $3,925,000,000 for "Research and development" instead of $3,899,500,000 as proposed by the House and $3,995,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference has added $10,000,000 for tracking and data acquisition, and $15,500,000 over the amount proposed by the House for the Apollo applications program, with the understanding that the Administrator may reprogram funds in research and development for purposes he determines to be of higher priority and in the best interests of the United States, with approval of the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the explanation of the senior Senator from Washington. I want it to be clear that the language that was added in the report of the managers on the part of the House, which the Senator has just read, makes it possible for the administrator to transfer x number of dollars from one line item to another, so long as it is for research and development, even in connection with NERVA. I understand that the conference report also eliminates the construction item for this project.

But in addition to the Apollo applications and the Voyager items, my great concern, as I expressed it on the floor of the Senate at the time the Senate committee returned in disagreement, is this: The NERVA I program now has $46.5 million. My understanding is that if they are to retain their present capability, their present skills, the present fine group of men working on the research and development in connection with NERVA I and NERVA II, an additional $7 to $8 million will be needed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator's understanding is correct to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. BIBLE. If I understand the language in the report, it is still possible for the Administrator to reprogram those funds in such a way as to retain this capability.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is our understanding. It would have to come to the appropriate committees—the two space committees and the two Appropriations Committees in the House and Senate. I believe his presentation would be to the legislative committees first. He would present a program with the new priorities and within the research and development funds of $3,925,000,000. He could say, "We think this program should go forward," and make those transfers necessary to provide proper funding.

Mr. BIBLE. It occurs to me that there is sufficient in the overall NASA appropriation to do this if, in the sound judgment of the Administrator and with the concurrence of the appropriate committees—and I am not clear as to whether it would be the Appropriations Committee or the authorizing Space Committee——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Both.

Mr. BIBLE. Of both Houses?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. BIBLE. Then he could go forward with a transfer of the required number of dollars in order to retain the capability.

Mr. MAGNUSON. He could. In addition, under existing law, he can transfer amounts up to 5 percent from research and development to construction, or vice versa—if he decides to reprogram and reestablish some other priorities.

Mr. BIBLE. I am convinced that the NERVA I program, to be followed by NERVA II, is very important in the world in which we live, if we are to keep pace with the Soviets. I believe it fair to say that they are ahead of us in this field—at least, that seems to be the indication of recent developments and historical events that have occurred within the past several weeks.

In addition, we must consider emerging Communist China. This has been commented on in our hearings. I believe that here, also, we have a potential threat in the fight to gain supremacy in space. So I believe it is essential that this language be written in.

It was with regret that I learned that the conferees were unable to retain the dollars to fully fund this program, but I also recognize many of the difficulties we face in our appropriation situation at this time.

I commend the Senator from Washington for his very fine efforts.

Mr. President, a vital part of this Nation's program to match the strides of other nations in space research and technology was lost today when House conferees deleted the NERVA development project from the NASA appropriation bill.

I am confident I am not alone when I say this was a regrettable decision and one which may be agonized over in the years ahead; for the action today will have the effect of slowing down even more our efforts in this all-important area.

Since 1957, when Russia launched Sputnik I, the United States has been involved in a deadly serious race to master the mysteries of the universe. We have enjoyed considerable success. Our achievements have been of critical importance, not only because they demonstrated to the world our immense resources in research and technology, but also because we are well aware that the nation which one day controls space will be able to control the destinies of those on earth.

As I said, we have been successful. But the time has come to examine honestly our position in relation to other nations involved in the quest for space. And a candid appraisal will reveal we are in danger of falling far behind.

The competence of the Soviet Union has been all too forcibly reemphasized within the past few days. Indeed, American scientists quoted by United Press International have admitted the "soft" landing on Venus by the Russians leaves us 6 years behind in planetary exploration.

A new threat to our position has emerged in Communist China, which is making rapid advances in research and development of nuclear weapons and space activity. A few short years ago we would have been amused by the idea of nuclear rocket propulsion in the hands of the Chinese. Today it is a fact.

Now we come to the NERVA program. The NERVA II engine has been hailed as a sure means of uprating our giant Saturn V booster, thus making it possible to stay abreast of the Soviets, who reportedly may fly a larger booster in 1968.

There is every reason to believe the Russians are also deeply involved in developing nuclear rocket engines.

How important is NERVA? Let us instantly acknowledge that chemical propulsion of space vehicles is a dead-end proposition. At the present time, nuclear propulsion is the only promising alternative. It would be folly to fail to see the consequences which surely must follow in the next two decades if we do not capitalize on our investment and capability in this area.

While the conferees eliminated $29.5 million for development of the NERVA II engine, they did authorize the NASA Administrator to reevaluate his research and development programs and make a decision on whether sufficient funds might be transferred from other activities to retain the capability of NERVA.

I strongly urge him to take this course of action. Surely, there is sufficient money in the $4.5 billion-plus NASA appropriation to sustain NERVA until such time as Congress feels revenues are available to fully fund the program.

I sincerely believe there is an excellent possibility that Congress, in the near future, will determine that NERVA is vitally needed. But in the meanwhile, we cannot afford to lose the expertise of brilliant technicians who over the years have developed the capability of this important program.

The commitment to date for NERVA has exceeded $1 billion. We would add to this expense substantially if we first lost the services of the first scientific people involved and then had to regroup and retrain them in the near future, along with the sophisticated equipment they operate.

If, because of tight fiscal pressures, the NERVA program cannot be funded this year, let us not totally abandon a concept that has proved its merit in the all-important race for the stars. Let us agree that NERVA has proved its worth. It was needed before. It is needed now. It will be needed in the years ahead.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Nevada.

I see in the Chamber the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who is a member of the conference committee.

I say to the Senator from Nevada that we did our best under the circumstances.

I believe that research in connection with nuclear rockets is one of the most important undertakings of the entire program. I hope that the reprograming will be such that we will not lose what has been accomplished, and that we can proceed in a reasonable way to try to achieve this great breakthrough in the space program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I wish to assure the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and others who have special interests in various parts of this program that the Senator from Washington, as chairman of the conference committee, was extremely loyal not only to the Senate bill but also to every feature of the matter, including NERVA II, the Voyager, the Apollo applications, and all other controversial features.

In his effort to prevail in accordance with the wishes of the Senate as expressed here, the chairman of the conference committee had the complete support, without any deviation, of every other member of the conference. I believe the best was done that could be done. It appeared that the House conferees had more interest, as did some of the Senate conferees, in the Apollo applications, and it was easier to get a small increase in that respect. In fact, that seemed to be the only instance in which we could get an increase, along with the expression to which the Senator has referred, to the effect that what it amounts to is that none of us, as laymen, can possibly know what are the true priorities in these very complex matters; that we are perfectly willing to hear the Administrator make recommendations for reprograming; and that the reprograming can apply to NERVA II, the Voyager, or to other phases of the entire budgeted program.

That recommendation, if it comes from the Administrator, must be one that he can sell to the authorizing committees, the legislative committees of the two bodies, as well as to the Appropriations Committee. I do not believe there will be any unwillingness on the part of any member of the authorizing committees, of which I happen to be one, and of the Appropriations Committee, of which I also am a member, to study with complete fairness any recommendations that come from the Administrator, and to admit that he is bound to know, with the assistance of his scientists, much more about the necessary priorities than any of us can know. We have done the best we can.

I believe no reference has been made today—there was no necessity for making it, in fact—that the House yielded to us on the reduction of the administrative budget which was agreed to in the earlier conference on this bill, in the amount of $20 million. So that the entire conference, taking the two together—the most recent one and the earlier one—shows a mutuality, a giving, in both directions, which is always necessary in a very complicated and expensive program of this nature.

I assure the Senator from Nevada that not the slightest prejudice was evident, that the Senator from Florida was able to see, against the course of action which has been so ably described by the chairman of the committee. I am sure that it will permit—if the scientific facts justify it—going on with any phase of the entire program, including NERVA II, the Voyager, the Apollo applications, and the other phases of the program that can be shown to be of immediate and of prior importance in connection with the further advancement of this program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might point out to both distinguished Senators from Nevada how solid the Senate was with respect to this matter. This appropriate conference report language was actually suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] who felt so strongly about this program that he worked out this language, and it was with some difficulty that we were able to include the language in the report.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the view expressed. I know that this was a fine group of conferees. They fought extremely well and they did a remarkable job under the climate in which they worked.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished committee for the fine work they did.

I am deeply disappointed in the decision of the conferees which essentially receded to the position held by the House on funding for the nuclear rocket engine program.

I share the concern to economize in all Federal activities during the current fiscal crisis and I also know that most of the conferees on the Senate side shared my appreciation for the deserved priority position which NERVA had won for itself.

While I cannot support the conferees in their final decision, I note with some optimism that the final decision on NERVA is to be left to the discretion of Mr. Webb, the Director of NASA. I feel confident that Mr. Webb will wisely minimize political consideration and make his decision solely on the basis of what is necessary and advantageous for the future of the space program. I feel sure that he will recognize that the Nation already has invested $1 billion in the development of the nuclear rocket engine during a period of many years and with outstanding success.

As a consistent supporter of NERVA and as a member of the Senate Space Committee since 1959 I would like to point out that the committee has—from the inception of this program—supported it without reservation and unanimously. Mr. Webb and his experts now will have to weigh the relative priorities and distinguish between what President Johnson called the things we would like to do and the things that are necessary. I am confident that in such a decision the nuclear rocket engine on its own merits would command the highest priority. The NERVA program offers the only practical means within the next decade of closing the propulsion gap which has given the U.S.S.R. predominance in space propulsion and which will continue to confound our efforts to close that gap and forge ahead.

I was pleased to note that the conferees included a statement in their report which outlines their clear understanding that the Administrator may reprogram funds in research and development for purposes he determines to be of higher priority and in the best interests of the United States, with approval of the appropriate committees of the Congress. As a member of the Senate Space Committee I look forward to the appearance of Mr. Webb and his response to this request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, even though the two Senators from Nevada do have an interest in the matter because so much of the work is done in that area, I think that the entire Senate will agree with me, that research for nuclear rockets is one of the most important things we can do in the space program.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as one who has followed the entire space program this year in the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Committee on Appropriations, even though I was not one of the conferees, I highly commend all of those who worked so diligently and so hard on the subject. I know, too, that over the years there has not been a stronger group of friends for the space program than those who are in the Senate.

I extend my thanks especially to the Senator from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] who has worked on both the authorization and the appropriation. There are many others.

This year I had the opportunity to come in closer contact with the work of the chairman of this subcommittee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], not only in this bill but in connection with other bills. I already knew that he was a valuable Member of this Chamber, but I found him to be an increasingly valuable Member. He is valuable to his State, but he is also valuable to the entire Senate, and he is highly valuable to the Nation. He has the finest kind of knowledge. I am familiar with much of his work, and I have no reservation in saying that he is one of the most valuable Senators we have and he deals with many highly important and difficult matters very effectively.

I appreciate the efforts of all conferees, including the chairman, in working to get this language.

It seems to me that it would be a tragedy if we should stop at the end of the Apollo program and come to a dead stop. It must not happen. There is this $15.5 million which is applicable to the post-Apollo program. There is the authority with proper congressional supervision with respect to Voyager and NERVA II, and some of that money could go into Apollo. I think this program must continue.

(At this point, Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair.)

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator for his generous remarks. All of us on the Committee on Appropriations try to do the best job we know how. We work hard on all of these items and try to be as economical as we can, consistent with the needs of a great nation.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished and able chairman of the committee at this time.

In the necessary absence of the ranking minority member of the Space Appropriations Subcommittee [Mr. ALLOTT] and at his request, I wish to make the following statement:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT READ BY SENATOR SMITH

Mr. President, the House and Senate conferees could not agree during their first conference on the NASA appropriations bill on figures for research and development and construction of facilities. The Senate conferees insisted that funds should be included for the Voyager program and for both research and development and construction of a testing station for the NERVA II program.

At the second conference, agreement was reached to add $15,500,000 to research and development over the House figure with the following statement to be included in the conference report: "with the understanding that the Administrator may reprogram funds in research and development for purposes he determines to be of higher priority and in the best interests of the United States, with approval of the appropriate committees of the Congress."

Mr. President, I believe, and I know some of the conferees share this belief, that this country must move ahead now in research and development leading to interplanetary exploration. It is for this reason that the conferees agreed to include this language which would leave it to the NASA Administrator and the President to determine the proper order of priorities that will best serve the national interest among the various space programs and projects.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine.

I share the view of the Senator from Mississippi that on this program it is somewhat difficult for lay people to understand the complexities of these matters. I know of no one on the Committee on Appropriations who contributes more, so that we will hopefully make the correct decisions, than the Senator from Maine. She is to be complimented. It is pleasant to have a fine lady in the conference with us. The Senator from Maine does a marvelous job.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the Senator for his comments. It is because of his leadership that we have been able to bring about this agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The conference report was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 58, 59, and 67 to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a comparative table showing estimates of the amount approved by the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968, H.R. 9960

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR 1968

[House Report No. 259, May 12, 1967; Passed House, May 17, 1967; Senate Report No. 548, August 29, 1967; Passed Senate, September 21, 1967]

Item	Appropriations, 1967 [1]	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I								
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT								
National Aeronautics and Space Council								
Salaries and expenses	$525,000	$524,000	$524,000	$524,000	$524,000			
Office of Emergency Planning								
Salaries and expenses	4,700,000	4,780,000	4,700,000	4,740,000	4,700,000	−$80,000		−$40,000
Salaries and expenses, telecommunications	1,600,000	2,245,000	1,945,000	1,945,000	1,945,000	−300,000		
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies	4,000,000	[2] (3,688,000)	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+3,000,000		
Total, Office of Emergency Planning	10,300,000	7,025,000	9,645,000	9,685,000	9,645,000	2,620,000		−40,000

See footnotes at end of speech.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968, H.R. 9960—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR 1968—Continued

[House Report No. 259, May 12, 1967; Passed House, May 17, 1967; Senate Report No. 548, August 29, 1967; Passed Senate, September 21, 1967]

Item	Appropriations, 1967[1]	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I								
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Con.								
Office of Science and Technology								
Salaries and expenses	$1,200,000	$1,837,000	$1,450,000	$1,650,000	$1,550,000	−$287,000	+$100,000	−$100,000
Total, Executive Office of the President	12,025,000	9,386,000	11,619,000	11,859,000	11,719,000	+2,333,000	+100,000	−140,000
President's Commission on Postal Organization								
Salaries and expenses		[3] 1,500,000		1,500,000	1,000,000	−500,000	+1,000,000	−500,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT								
Disaster relief	24,550,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000	−5,000,000
Alaska mortgage indemnity grants	2,600,000							
INDEPENDENT OFFICES								
Civil Aeronautics Board								
Salaries and expenses	12,200,000	9,066,000	8,900,000	9,066,000	8,983,000	−83,000	+83,000	−83,000
Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization)	63,500,000	54,000,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	−1,500,000		
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board	75,700,000	63,066,000	61,400,000	61,566,000	61,483,000	−1,583,000	+83,000	−83,000
Civil Service Commission								
Salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation	22,900,000	[4] 38,033,000	23,000,000	38,033,000	36,000,000	−2,033,000	+13,000,000	−2,033,000
By transfer	(6,431,000)	(6,129,000)	(6,100,000)	(6,100,000)	(6,100,000)	(−29,000)		
Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations	600,000							
Annuities under special acts	1,430,000	1,336,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	−36,000		
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits	36,644,000		40,748,000	40,748,000	40,748,000	+40,748,000		
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund	73,000,000		71,000,000	71,000,000	71,000,000	+71,000,000		
Payments to trust funds		111,748,000				−111,748,000		
Total, Civil Service Commission	134,574,000	151,117,000	136,048,000	151,081,000	149,048,000	−2,069,000	+13,000,000	−2,033,000
Commission on the Political Activity of Government Personnel								
Salaries and expenses	175,000			25,000	25,000	+25,000	+25,000	
Federal Communications Commission								
Salaries and expenses	17,852,300	[5] 19,221,000	19,000,000	19,100,000	19,100,000	−121,000	+100,000	
Federal Power Commission								
Salaries and expenses	14,220,000	[5] 14,830,000	14,220,000	14,445,000	14,220,000	−610,000		−225,000
Federal Trade Commission								
Salaries and expenses	14,378,000	15,225,000	15,000,000	15,150,000	15,150,000	−75,000	+150,000	
General Services Administration								
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	244,091,000	262,152,000	260,000,000	261,000,000	260,500,000	−1,652,000	+500,000	−500,000
Repair and improvement of public buildings	80,000,000	89,800,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	−9,800,000		
Construction, public buildings projects	125,318,000	62,545,700	54,511,900	70,641,900	63,757,900	+1,212,200	+9,246,000	−6,884,000
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	14,132,000	15,276,000	20,285,000	21,074,000	20,285,000	+5,009,000		−789,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	6,746,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000			
Expenses, U.S. court facilities	1,500,000	1,640,000	1,175,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	−640,000	−175,000	
Additional court facilities	6,000,000							
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	65,000,000	70,508,000	67,500,000	69,500,000	68,500,000	−2,008,000	+1,000,000	−1,000,000
Salaries and expenses, automatic data processing coordination	500,000							
Automatic data processing fund		10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000			
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	17,121,000	17,610,000	17,580,000	17,580,000	17,580,000	−30,000		
National historical publications grants	350,000	500,000	350,000	500,000	350,000	−150,000		−150,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service	5,900,000	6,000,000	5,880,000	5,880,000	5,880,000	−120,000		
Operating expenses, property management and disposal service (indefinite appropriation of receipts)		(27,440,000)	(27,300,000)	(27,300,000)	(27,300,000)	(−140,000)		
Operating expenses Utilization and Disposal Service (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(9,000,000)							
Strategic and critical materials (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(20,091,000)							
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	1,747,000	1,823,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	−76,000		
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000			
Administrative operations fund (limitation)	(16,716,000)	(16,699,000)	(16,650,000)	(16,650,000)	(16,650,000)	(−49,000)		
Working capital fund	100,000	100,000		100,000		−100,000		−100,000
General supply fund	45,000,000							
Total, General Services Administration	613,740,000	540,539,700	521,613,900	541,607,900	532,184,900	−8,354,800	+10,571,000	−9,423,000
Interstate Commerce Commission								
Salaries and expenses	28,479,000	23,784,000	23,400,000	23,530,000	23,460,000	−324,000	+60,000	−70,000
Payment of loan guarantees	17,400,000							

See footnotes at end of speech.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968, H.R. 9960—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR 1968—Continued

[House Report No. 259, May 12, 1967; Passed House, May 17, 1967; Senate Report No. 548, August 29, 1967; Passed Senate, September 21, 1967]

Item	Appropriations, 1967 [1]	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—Continued								
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued								
National Capital Housing Authority								
Operation and maintenance of properties	$37,000							
National Science Foundation								
Salaries and expenses	479,999,000	$526,000,000	$495,000,000	$505,000,000	$495,000,000	−$31,000,000		−$10,000,000
Renegotiation Board								
Salaries and expenses	2,537,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000			
Securities and Exchange Commission								
Salaries and expenses	17,550,000	17,445,000	17,350,000	17,445,000	17,350,000	−95,000		−95,000
Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration								
Salaries and expenses	800,000							
Selective Service System								
Salaries and expenses	58,940,000	57,455,000	57,455,000	57,455,000	57,455,000			
Veterans' Administration								
General operating expenses	182,437,000	184,342,000	183,221,000	183,221,000	183,221,000	−1,121,000		
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	14,312,000	14,300,000	13,650,000	14,300,000	13,975,000	−325,000	+$325,000	−325,000
Medical and prosthetic research	44,258,000	46,458,000	45,250,000	46,458,000	45,850,000	−608,000	+600,000	−608,000
Medical care	1,292,875,000	1,357,293,000	1,357,293,000	1,357,293,000	1,357,293,000			
Compensation and pensions	4,474,000,000	4,558,000,000	4,558,000,000	4,458,000,000	4,558,000,000			
Readjustment benefits	369,400,000	427,200,000	427,200,000	427,200,000	427,200,000			
Veterans insurance and indemnities	3,500,000	5,150,000	5,150,000	5,150,000	5,150,000			
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	1,136,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000			
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	52,125,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	52,600,000	52,600,000	+600,000	+600,000	
Grants for construction of State nursing homes	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000			
Participation sales authorization	(260,000,000)	(850,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(850,000,000)	(850,000,000)		(+550,000)	
Payment of sales insufficiencies		[6]946,000	333,882	946,000	665,000	−281,000	+331,118	−281,000
Loan guarantee revolving fund (limitation on obligations)	(401,750,000)	Language	(386,046,000)	(386,046,000)	(386,046,000)	(+386,046,000)		
Total, Veterans' Administration	6,438,043,000	6,651,014,000	6,647,422,882	6,650,493,000	6,649,279,000	−1,735,000	+1,856,118	−1,214,000
Total, Independent Offices	7,914,424,300	8,082,296,700	8,010,509,782	8,059,497,900	8,036,354,900	−45,941,800	+25,845,118	−23,143,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE								
Civil Defense								
Operation and maintenance	66,100,000	73,100,000	66,100,000	66,100,000	66,100,000	−7,000,000		
Research, shelter survey and marking	35,000,000	37,900,000	20,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	−17,900,000		−5,000,000
Total, Civil Defense, Department of Defense	101,100,000	111,000,000	86,100,000	91,100,000	86,100,000	−24,900,000		−5,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE								
Public Health Service								
Emergency health activities	10,000,000	12,500,000	9,000,000	9,426,000	9,000,000	−3,500,000		−426,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT								
Renewal and Housing Assistance								
Alaska housing		1,000,000		1,000,000		−1,000,000		−1,000,000
Grants for neighborhood facilities	17,000,000	42,000,000	27,000,000	42,000,000	30,000,000	−12,000,000	+3,000,000	−12,000,000
Salaries and expenses		32,773,000	31,950,000	32,773,000	31,950,000	−823,000		−823,000
Urban renewal programs:								
Grants, fiscal year 1968	750,000,000							
Grants, fiscal year 1969		750,000,000	750,000,000	750,000,000	750,000,000			
Administrative expenses	15,395,000							
Rehabilitation loan fund	1,396,000							
Low-rent public housing annual contributions	255,000,000	290,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	−15,000,000		
Administrative expenses, public housing programs	18,950,000							
Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund	80,000,000	80,000,000	20,000,000	40,000,000	25,000,000	−55,000,000	+5,000,000	−15,000,000
Total, renewal and housing assistance	1,137,741,000	1,195,773,000	1,103,950,000	1,140,773,000	1,111,950,000	−83,823,000	+8,000,000	−28,823,000
Metropolitan Development								
Urban planning grants	33,000,000	50,000,000	40,000,000	50,000,000	45,000,000	−5,000,000	+5,000,000	−5,000,000
Metropolitan development incentive grants		30,000,000				−30,000,000		
Open space land programs	55,000,000	125,000,000	75,000,000	100,000,000	75,000,000	−50,000,000		−25,000,000
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities	100,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000			
Salaries and expenses		6,430,000	6,100,000	6,250,000	6,100,000	−330,000		−150,000
Urban transportation activities:								
Urban mass transportation grants, fiscal year 1968	125,000,000							
Urban mass transportation grants, fiscal year 1969		230,000,000	175,000,000	205,000,000	175,000,000	−55,000,000		−30,000,000
Administrative expenses, urban transportation activities	735,000							
Total, metropolitan development	313,735,000	606,430,000	461,100,000	526,250,000	466,100,000	−140,330,000	+5,000,000	−60,150,000

See footnotes at end of speech.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968, H.R. 9960—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR 1968—Continued

[House Report No. 259, May 12, 1967; Passed House, May 17, 1967; Senate Report No. 548, August 29, 1967; Passed Senate, September 21, 1967]

Item	Appropriations, 1967 [1]	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with— Budget estimate	Conference action compared with— House bill	Conference action compared with— Senate bill
TITLE I—Continued								
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—Continued								
Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations								
Model cities programs	$11,000,000	[7] $662,000,000	$237,000,000	$537,000,000	$312,000,000	−$350,000,000	+$75,000,000	−$225,000,000
Urban information and technical assistance		6,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,200,000	−3,800,000	+200,000	−800,000
Community development training programs		5,000,000	2,500,000	4,500,000	3,000,000	−2,000,000	+500,000	−1,500,000
Fellowship for city planning and urban studies	[8] (500,000)	500,000		500,000	500,000		+500,000	
Urban studies and housing research	500,000							
Urban research and technology		20,000,000	5,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	−10,000,000	+5,000,000	−5,000,000
Low-income housing demonstration programs	1,575,000	2,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	−500,000		
Housing and building codes, zoning, tax policies, and development standards	1,500,000							
Salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation		3,350,000	1,850,000	2,200,000	1,850,000	−1,500,000		−350,000
By transfer		(2,500,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)		(+500,000)	
Total, demonstrations and intergovernmental relations	14,575,000	699,350,000	250,350,000	564,200,000	331,550,000	−367,800,000	+81,200,000	−232,650,000
Mortgage Credit								
Rent supplement program:								
Annual contract authorization	(20,000,000)	(40,000,000)		(40,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(−30,000,000)	(+10,000,000)	(−30,000,000)
Appropriation for payments	2,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000			
Administrative expenses	900,000	1,150,000	1,000,000	1,150,000	1,100,000	−50,000	+100,000	−50,000
Total, mortgage credit	2,900,000	6,150,000	6,000,000	6,150,000	6,100,000	−50,000	+100,000	−50,000
Departmental Management								
General administration		4,510,000	3,950,000	4,230,000	4,000,000	−510,000	+50,000	−230,000
Regional management and services		5,563,000	5,300,000	5,430,000	5,300,000	−263,000		−130,000
Office building equipment and furnishings:								
Appropriation	575,000							
By transfer	(125,000)							
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary	8,574,000							
Participation sales authorizations	(1,420,000,000)	(2,385,000,000)	(581,000,000)	(2,385,00,000)	(2,385,000,000)		(+1,804,000,000)	
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies	[6] 8,200,000	[5] 42,115,000	23,000,000	42,115,000	23,000,000	−19,115,000		−19,115,000
Working capital fund		1,500,000	[8] (1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	−1,500,000		
Total, departmental management	17,349,000	53,688,000	32,250,000	51,775,000	32,300,000	−21,388,000	+50,000	−19,475,000
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	1,486,300,000	2,561,391,000	1,853,650,000	2,289,148,000	1,948,000,000	−613,391,000	+94,350,000	−341,148,000
Total appropriations	9,550,999,300	10,793,073,700	9,985,878,782	10,487,530,900	10,112,173,900	−680,899,800	+126,295,118	−375,357,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts (proceeds of sales)	29,091,000	27,440,000	27,300,000	27,300,000	27,300,000	−140,000		
Grand total	9,580,090,300	10,820,513,700	10,013,178,782	10,514,830,900	10,139,473,900	−681,039,800	+126,295,118	−375,357,000

---

[1] Includes amounts contained in the 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1967.

[2] Included in budgets of individual departments and agencies.

[3] Contained in S. Doc. 40.

[4] Budget amendment in S. Doc. 36 increases by $14,614,000 for interagency boards, and decreases by $664,000 for investigations.

[5] Includes budget amendment in H. Doc. 114.

[6] Estimated amount of indefinite appropriation.

[7] Additional contract authority, beginning July 1, 1967, on urban renewal projects within comprehensive city programs, authorized by sec. 113.

[8] By transfer.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitation on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

[House Report No. 259, May 12, 1967; Passed House, May 17, 1967; Senate Report No. 548, August 29, 1967; Passed Senate, September 21, 1967]

Corporation or agency	Appropriations, 1967 [1]	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with— Budget estimate	Conference action compared with— House bill	Conference action compared with— Senate bill
TITLE II								
CORPORATIONS								
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:								
Administrative expenses	($4,410,000)	($4,540,000)	($4,540,000)	($4,540,000)	($4,540,000)			
Nonadministrative expenses	(13,465,000)	(13,650,000)	(13,650,000)	(13,650,000)	(13,650,000)			
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	(285,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)			
Department of Housing and Urban Development:								
College housing loans	(2,089,000)	(2,270,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(−$70,000)		
Housing for the elderly or handicapped	(1,232,000)	(1,242,000)	(1,232,000)	(1,232,000)	(1,232,000)	(−10,000)		
Public facility loans	(1,205,000)	(1,187,000)	(1,187,000)	(1,187,000)	(1,187,000)			
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)	(110,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)			
Federal Housing Administration:								
Administrative expenses	(10,650,000)	(11,125,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(−125,000)		
Nonadministrative expenses	(85,000,000)	(88,500,000)	(87,000,000)	(87,000,000)	(87,000,000)	(−1,500,000)		
Federal National Mortgage Association	(9,931,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)			
Total, administrative expenses	(128,377,000)	(132,512,000)	(130,807,000)	(130,807,000)	(130,807,000)	(−1,705,000)		

---

[1] Includes amounts contained in the 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1967.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I wish to query the distinguished chairman of the committee about one item in the bill. How much money is involved in the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The total bill on independent offices is $10,139,473,900.

Mr. BARTLETT. My interest, of course, does not center exclusively about the one subject which I desire to talk about now. However, I must admit I was disappointed and deeply hurt upon learning that the conferees had failed to accept the Senate figure of $1 million which would have been used for the launching of an Alaska native housing program.

Last year, Congress passed and the President signed a bill to provide for such a program amounting to $10 million. The Budget Bureau this year asked that the program be initiated with an appropriation of $1 million. The House Appropriations Committee, and the House subsequently, denied that request. As I recall, the reason assigned by the House Appropriations Committee was that the State of Alaska had not yet presented its program.

When hearings were held before the Senate Appropriations Committee, such a presentation was made. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] were instrumental in calling upon the State officials to pay for all of the administrative costs under the program. The State subsequently agreed to do that, and I think it was a move in the right direction.

Mr. President, I was not a conferee on the bill, but I heard from Senators who were on the conference committee that the Senator from Washington fought hard and fought valiantly for this $1 million item which was for people. I know it was through no fault of his that the figure of $1 million was not accepted.

No other program, save for the limited exception of the Farmers Home Administration program, fits the circumstances which surround housing for Alaskan Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts in the remote villages of my State.

In the fall of 1965, Mrs. Mary McGuire, then the Public Housing Administrator, toured a good many of the Indian villages. She said that she had never visited a slum in the United States where living conditions were so squalid, so deplorable, and so much of a shame to our country as in Alaska.

I want to thank my friend from Washington now, and likewise the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], for having done their very best to have this program adopted. I trust that the administration will again ask for an appropriation next January and that Congress will approve it, because if ever there was a need for something to be done for people, this is it.

I reiterate, praise has been heaped upon the Senator from Washington here today—and justly so—for accomplishments which relate to things. Here, he sought to do something for people. The natives of Alaska who are so deeply disturbed by the failure of the program, will not forget the efforts he has made in their behalf.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska. I do not know of any one item in the bill that the Senate could not prevail on, which disappointed me—as well as the Senator from Colorado—so much as this comparatively small item to begin some decent and well-thought-out housing for the natives of Alaska. Actually, it was a health program, when we come right down to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator brought that out, because all the conferees stood back of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Colorado, both of whom made it clear that the prevalence of tuberculosis in such a great degree among those impoverished and not properly housed aborigines—for that is what they are—was something that should be corrected. If stronger arguments could have been made, I do not see how they could have been made, or if a more unified position had been taken on the part of the Senate conferees, I do not see how that could have been done.

However, the situation existing right now in connection with the economy is almost indescribable. There are many who regarded the program as not economical. This, to me, appears to be false economy. This program is certainly not uneconomical. I think it was the unanimous attitude of the conferees, unless we wanted to have no bill, that it was one of the several items which had to be eliminated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The point was made that this is a new program and might lead to the expenditure of a large sum of money, even though the bill, which had been passed practically unanimously, put a ceiling on the authorization for a period of time. Of course, it is pennywise and pound foolish, because if those people are to continue to have a health problem—as they certainly will under the present kind of housing they must endure—the Indian Service, the NIH, or others will have to take care of it anyway.

This program is the way to provide them with some decent habitation. It would not even really be decent housing, the way we think of it, but it certainly would be better housing than now exists, so that these people would not be so susceptible to tuberculosis, which is now spreading among them like wildfire. We acted on that basis.

I think, however, that there was a question of timing. The House did not have the proper testimony early enough. There was a failure on the part of the State government to clearly outline their participation. Although I do not criticize its motives. The timing was bad, when the State government wanted Congress to take care of the whole program and not take care of the administrative costs themselves under the Alaskan Housing Authority.

Finally, after a lot of prodding from Congress and others, they did. This proposal was brought in. By that time, the House had planted its feet in concrete and would not do anything about it.

I am not criticizing the motives of anybody, but there was a question of timing. This program is the best way, the cheapest way, the low-cost way of solving a problem that will have to be taken care of some day soon.

I can remember the Senator from Alaska discussing the problem with me at one time. Employment in that region is sporadic, depending on the fish run. If the fish run is good, the people are able to supplement their earnings and make a living. Otherwise they are unemployed.

It was necessary for Congress to appropriate a large sum of money at the time of the earthquake disaster in Alaska. We continually take such action. This is the way to do it.

I think the action that was taken by the conference as to this program was shortsighted, because it is a program to enable people to help themselves. When they built their houses according to the health specifications, they are to receive credit for the amount of time and work they devote to the actual construction. They do not have the materials; it is necessary that they be sent to them.

This is a well-thought-out program. The action taken by the conferees, however, is something I cannot understand. In agreeing with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I think that some of the actions taken in the last few days have been pennywise and pound foolish, in the name of economy. All of us are for economy, but there are some things that the Nation can afford for the needs of the people, and the Alaskan natives are citizens of the United States. They have a rough, rugged time of living. I am disappointed in the action that has been taken.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Washington has given a most adequate description of the situation. I thank him for his observations. He has described the situation better than I have ever heard it expressed by anyone previously. The Senator is ever so correct in stating that the Alaskan natives housing program would have as one of its chief purposes the betterment of public health.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. If this amount had been in the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have no doubt that it would have been approved. Yet here we were trying to start a program in a much less costly way to achieve a health goal that is absolutely necessary by providing adequate housing.

Mr. BARTLETT. My recollection is that the rate of infant mortality in the lower Yukon River Valley is something like 25 times that of the remainder of the country. It is not intended that mansions should be built there. A maximum limit was set.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The housing proposed to be built in Alaska would have been considered anywhere else as a very bare minimum.

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course; but it represented an improvement only by way of what the natives have now. It would be a grant and loan program. The maximum amount that could be spent on any one house would be $7,500.

I wish to thank all the Senate conferees for the strong effort they made in behalf of this program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No one did more to push the program than did the Senator from Alaska, and rightly so. But the action taken by the conference was very disappointing, when we consider the area, the people, and what the Government is doing all over the rest of the United States for its other citizens. I do not think the program is wrong. I am not making comparisons, but to have the conference single out this fine program and say, "We are not going to do anything about it," is most disappointing.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to say, first, that I know, personally, how hard the Senator from Washington fought for the two programs. Incidentally, are we discussing the model cities program now?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I realize how hard the Senator from Washington fought for the two programs as they passed the Senate. I saw him in committee. Although I did not sit in conference, I have had a blow-by-blow description of everything he did.

I would like to make it clear, first, that whatever has resulted in conference is due to him. So whatever I say is in no way attached to the diligence, the good faith, and the effort of the Senator from Washington. He certainly did everything he could.

What I would like to make clear is this. Here we are again with what is definitely a wrong sense of priorities when we have a deep and pressing problem which is before us as the No. 1 problem; namely, the problem of the cities.

The tremendous population shift which has taken place to the cities and is going on now has not yet been remotely recognized in legislation which has matured here in the Congress. Here in the model cities program was the really first comprehensive, businesssense idea of how to mobilize the full resources of government upon a given target, with the greatest possible coordinated result, and we have the worst fight made that has been made on almost any program, and the fight originates in the other body, which is referred to as the people's Representatives, because they are supposedly closer to the people, and the amount is cut from $262 million to $237 million.

With respect to the rent supplements, again the same thing. Only 25 percent of what was requested within the budget is granted in the final conference compromise.

I could not let these items go by without calling the sharpest attention to the completely wrong end of the telescope view which is represented by cutting these two programs, which promised much for the cities, but which yet were cut to ribbons, even after the most Herculian efforts by the Senator from Washington, before they could become law and have appropriations provided for them.

Also, I think a bad mistake was made, and I protest it, in striking out the provision relating to metropolitan expediters. I think the systems management idea on both sides, that of the receiver and the giver, is critically important to the success of a coordinated program in the big cities, in which every Member must know I have a great deal of experience.

So, more in sorrow than in anger, I say we are not as yet showing the understanding of the priorities which the national interest requires. It is most deplorable and regrettable that such tremendous cutting, and in my judgment in a discriminatory way, should have taken place with respect to these programs which are so peculiarly adjusted to the problems of our cities, namely the model cities and the rent supplements programs.

I am grateful to my Senate colleagues on the conference committee for preserving what they have. I know nothing would be here for those programs if they had not done what they did, led by the Senator from Washington. I can only pledge to my constituents, and to the millions of others who live in the cities, which face such intolerable situations, the indefatigable and continuing effort to get within the schedule of the Nation's priorities such programs to meet those problems, of which these deserve the highest priorities and are really deserved by the American people in view of the situations which they face in the slums and ghettos in America.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry to say my distinguished friend, and the distinguished friend of the Senator from New York, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], was called away on an emergency matter and asked me to complete this matter.

When the Senator from New York referred to the indefatigable way in which the Senator from Washington handled this matter for the model cities and for the rent supplements, both in conference and prior thereto, he was exactly correct. I want the RECORD to show and Senators to know that all Senate conferees supported him in those matters, in spite of the fact that those two items are controversial and that in the conference there were Members of the Senate who have different ideas as to the merit of those programs. But that did not make any difference. The Senate had spoken, and the conference committee stood loyally and completely behind the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Washington. I do not know how he could have made any greater efforts. As a matter of fact, I must say to my distinguished friend that he got more than had been expected to be given by the conferees on the other side when we began the conference.

I know that my friend will not desist in his efforts. My suggestion is that anyone who may be interested in either of these programs, including, of course, himself, should make sure that this program for this year be as successful and demonstrate as much quality for doing the things which it is hoped to be done by these programs as possible. I think unless there is a clear demonstration of their value, we are apt to run into this same trouble again. This is not the first time we have run into it, as the Senator knows; we ran into it in connection with the supplemental bills of last year. I would only state that the conference committee stood by him and the verdict of the Senate.

Second, I would hope the character of these two programs will be well demonstrated and well shown by the use of the funds supplied by this bill in the year that lies ahead of us.

Mr. JAVITS. I certainly assure the Senator that anything I can do in that regard will be done; but I repeat that the deep feeling of the people of the cities on the subject is that this reflects a completely inverted view of national priorities, and that a great deal more should have been done about it in this Congress, considering the inflammatory and dangerous situation we face in the slums and ghettos of our great cities.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I see present the Senator from Rhode Island, who made such a gallant fight for both of these programs, not only in the conference but heretofore, and I shall be happy to yield to him if he has anything he wishes to add.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator yield to me first? I humbly apologize to Senator PASTORE; he is very senior and very influential, and a great friend of these programs, and I would certainly wish to join him in everything I said about the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. I have nothing to add, except simply to reiterate everything that has been said, and to state, with bloody but unbowed head, that we did the best we could under the circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 19, 1967, pp. 29382–29385, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a great deal has been spoken and written regarding this legislation. Therefore, it is not my intention to burden this record with an extensive statement. I merely will repeat what I said before.

Radio and television broadcasting are forces of staggering importance in our society. Approximately one and a half billion man-hours per week are spent with these media by the people of this country. Television viewing alone occupies nearly one-fourth of the waking hours of the average American. The airwaves themselves over which programs are broadcast are public property. Developing this natural resource in the best interests of society as a whole has been the subject of previous congressional action. In 1962 concern for this development prompted the Commerce Committee to urge passage of Public Law 87–447, an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, to hasten the construction of ETV stations. The intent of S. 1160, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, is to improve the facilities and program quality of the Nation's educational broadcasting stations so that this natural resource may be used to its fullest for the betterment of individual and community life.

The conferees, in resolving the differences, have attempted to create broad guidelines that would permit experimentation and innovation in all forms of programing.

I commend my colleagues and the Members of the House who participated in the conference for the fair and efficient manner in which the differences were resolved.

I submit for the RECORD at this time the statement on the part of the conferees which was prepared jointly by the House and the Senate and sets forth in detail the areas of agreement, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement of the conferees was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the conference substitute are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and minor and clarifying changes.

EDITORIALIZING

The House amendment contains provisions which would prohibit any noncommercial educational broadcast station from engaging in editorializng or supplyng or opposing any candidate for political office. The Senate bill contains no comparable provisions.

The managers on the part of the Senate accepted the House provision when it was explained that the prohibition against editorializing was limited to providing that no noncommercial educational broadcast station may broadcast editorials representing the opinion of the management of such station. It should be emphasized that these provisions are not intended to preclude balanced, fair, and objective presentations of controversial issues by noncommercial educational broadcast stations.

These provisions are consistent with the requirements of section 396(g) (1) (A) of the Communications Act of 1934 (which would be added by the conference substitute) which require that programs or series of programs of a controversial nature which are made available by the Public Broadcasting Corporation must adhere strictly to objectivity and balance.

DEFINITION OF "EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION OR RADIO PROGRAMS"

The House amendment defines "educational television or radio programs" to mean "programs which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes". The Senate bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference substitute includes a definition of the term which is the same as the House version but for the deletion of the words "and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes".

OBJECTIVITY AND BALANCE OF CORPORATION PROGRAMS

Under both the Senate bill and the House amendment the Public Broadcasting Corporation is authorized to "facilitate the full development of educational broadcasting in which programs of high quality, obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to noncommercial educational television and radio broadcast stations". The House amendment provides, in addition, that in the case of programs of a controversial nature there must be strict adherence to objectivity and balance. The conference substitute adopts these provisions of the House amendment with a modification so as to make the requirement more flexible. As so modified, each program in a series need not meet the test of objectivity and balance, but the series, when considered as a whole, must.

ARRANGEMENT BY CORPORATION FOR INTERCONNECTIONS

Under the Senate bill and the House amendment, the Public Broadcasting Corporation is authorized to "arrange, by grant or contract . . . for interconnection facilities suitable for distribution and transmission of educational television or radio programs to noncommercial educational broadcast stations". Under the House amendment, however, the Corporation could only make such arrangements with those appropriate private agencies, organizations, or institutions which were *nonprofit*. This would have required the Corporation to make arrangements for interconnection facilities through nonprofit intermediaries and would, consequently, have delayed and complicated the Corporation's operations. This requirement has been omitted in the conference substitute.

The managers on the part of the House feel that the Corporation needs this flexibility, not to establish a fixed-schedule network operation, but in order to take advantage of special or unusual opportunities that warrant the Corporation directly contracting for interconnection facilities. Even under these circumstances, however, it should be made clear that the decision to broadcast any program for which interconnection is provided by the Corporation remains entirely within the discretion of the local station. In addition, it should be pointed out that this change does not mean that others—such as a group of noncommercial educational broadcast stations or a noncommercial educational radio or television network—could not also arrange for interconnection and receive financial assistance for it in the form of a grant or contract from the Corporation. The conference substitute would permit this to be done.

Further, the conferees wish to make it clear that the limitation contained in proposed section 396(k) (2) of the Communications Act of 1934 should not and is not intended to apply with respect to interconnection costs.

SYSTEMS OF INTERCONNECTION

The House amendment provides the Public Broadcasting Corporation with authority to assist in the establishment and development of *a system* of interconnection to be used for the distribution of educational television or radio programs. The Senate version authorized the Corporation to assist in the establishment and development of *one or more systems* of interconnection for the same purpose. The conference substitute is the same in this respect as the Senate version.

DEFINITION OF "INTERCONNECTION"

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contain definitions of the term "interconnection". The only difference in the two versions is that in the House amendment "airborne systems" were specifically included in the definition. The words "airborne systems" have been deleted from the definition in the conference substitute as unnecessary since "interconnection" is defined to include "other apparatus or equipment for the transmission and distribution of television or radio programs to noncommercial educational television or radio stations".

ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON THE CORPORATION

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment prohibit the Public Broadcasting Corporation from owning or operating any television or radio broadcast station, system, or network, or interconnection or program production facility. In addition, the Senate bill prohibits the Corporation from owning or operating any community antenna television system. The conference substitute is the same in this respect as the Senate bill.

RECORDS AND AUDIT

The House amendment contains provisions requiring an annual audit of the accounts of the Public Broadcasting Corporation by independent certified or licensed public accountants; and, for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of the Corporation's operations provides that "the financial transactions of the Corporation shall be subject to an audit by the General Accounting Office". The Senate bill contains no provisions with respect to records and audit.

The conference substitute is the same as the House version with two minor changes in order to make it clear that for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of the Corporation's operations the General Accounting Office is authorized, but not required, to audit the financial transactions of the Corporation. Thus, the following language from the House report on H.R. 6736 (the House companion bill to S. 1160) is an apt description of the provisions of the conference substitute relating to records and audit:

"Provision for a GAO audit was not originally included in H.R. 6736 because it was felt that such audits carry with them the power of the Comptroller General to settle and adjust the books being examined and that this authority would be contrary to the desired insulation of the Corporation from Government control. The Committee is also sensitive to the importance of having the Corporation free from Government control. However, the bill does not provide authority for the settlement of accounts. The provision is similar to that included in the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) with the exception that the audits are not required to be performed annually. It is expected that the GAO audits will be performed at such times as believed necessary by the Comptroller General or Congress in order to supplement the audits of the independent public accountants.

"The audits are to be performed in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and, in the case of GAO audits, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States."

STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL BROADCASTING

The House amendment authorizes a study of instructional television, including its relationship to educational television broadcasting and such other aspects thereof as may assist in determining *whether* Federal aid should be provided therefor and the form that such aid should take. Under the House version the study would be submitted to the President for transmission to the Congress on or before January 1, 1969.

The Senate bill authorizes a comprehensive study of instructional television *and radio* their relationship to each other and to instructional materials, and to such other aspects thereof as may be of assistance in determining *what* Federal aid should be provided for instructional radio and television and the form that aid should take. Under the Senate bill the study would be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before June 30, 1969.

Both versions authorize not to exceed $500,000 for the study.

The conference substitute is the same in this respect as the Senate bill, except that the study must also be addressed to the question of *whether* Federal aid should be provided for instructional radio and television.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as a minority member of the committee of conference, and ex officio a member of the subcommittee dealing with communications, I am familiar with this measure. I simply wish to say for the record that, through the years, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has been an authority upon, and has done yeoman service for, the creation, the advancement, and the protection of educational television.

This measure is, in my opinion, very important, and will prove highly beneficial. I wish to say that much of the credit for the work in preparation of this bill, and its consideration and passage, should go to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island; and when I say that, I am sure I am voicing the sentiments of every member of his subcommittee and the full committee, each of whom is familiar with his achievements in this field.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, but I emphasize that this was a bipartisan effort. All of the members of the committee, whether it was in the Subcommittee on Communications or the full Committee on Commerce, Republicans as well as Democrats, worked generously for one objective, and I believe that objective was accomplished. I think the credit belongs to all the members of the committee, but I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his kindness.

Mr. President, I am ready for the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just been informed by the secretary for the minority that our late distinguished and beloved colleague, Alexander Wiley, a former Senator from the State of Wisconsin, passed away this afternoon. I wish to take this occasion to express my own deep regrets and the regrets of my family.

I think of Alex Wiley as a man of jollity, of profundity, and of wisdom. I had the honor to serve under him in 1953, when I first came to the Senate and he was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was Senator Wiley, as chairman of that committee, who designated me to go to Vietnam in 1954; and in that way he helped develop my interest in Southeast Asia.

It is with sadness that I note his passing. It was with regret that I heard the news. I extend, on behalf of all of us, my deep sympathy to Mrs. Wiley, and express the hope that his soul may rest in peace.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I, too, hear with great sorrow this sad news. Senator Wiley's office adjoined my office for many years; and if anybody ever had a friendly, sociable neighbor, he was that to me and to the employees in my office. I shall always remember his kindly face when he would come into our office bearing a much appreciated gift of the fine cheese that is produced in the great State of Wisconsin, and laughingly tell us he was sharing his latest gift from Wisconsin with us.

He was just that kind of fellow—hospitable, warmhearted, friendly, charitable—and I deplore his passing. I extend, for myself and Mrs. Holland, our affectionate sympathy to Mrs. Wiley.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have just learned the sad news of the untimely death of former Senator Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin, who passed away at High Oaks Christian Science Sanitarium in Germantown, Md., early this afternoon.

The only information I have about the burial is that it will be at Chippewa Falls, Wis. As far as I know, the time of burial has not been announced.

The news saddens all of us who served with Senator Wiley for many years and who loved and respected him. Many of us will have some further things to say regarding our affection and admiration for former Senator Wiley at a future time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to say a word, too, in memory of Alex Wiley, former Senator from Wisconsin, who was at one time the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

He was a very distinguished, very sweet, and very special human being with a heart as big as his body. He served his Nation according to his lights in a great exemplary way.

We shall miss him. I join my colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa, in honoring former Senator Wiley, a man who served his country magnificently and who warrants the appreciation and warmest gratitude of the Nation.

We extend our deepest condolences to his family.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the death of former Senator Alexander Wiley this afternoon is a deep personal shock to me.

Senator Wiley was the senior Senator from Wisconsin when I was first elected to this body. He and his charming wife Dorothy were sensitive and gracious hosts to my wife and me from the moment we arrived in Washington.

Senator Wiley's humor and his warm friendliness were characteristics I shall never forget.

Senator Wiley served our State longer than any other Senator in history. His four full terms were characterized by a devotion to the interests of our Nation throughout the world as well as to Wisconsin.

It was Senator Wiley who fought on year after year for the St. Lawrence Seaway until he finally won the battle that had seemed virtually impossible to win over the opposition of powerful economic and political forces.

In many ways, the greatest contribution Senator Wiley made to America and all mankind was as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator Wiley assumed the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee at a time when isolationist forces opposed to foreign aid and our involvement with the United Nations were strong in the Middle West and especially strong in Wisconsin. It would have been easy and politically advantageous for the Senator to exploit these sentiments for political advantage.

But Senator Wiley in a decision of courage and conviction, risked his career by using the great office of chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to advance America's responsibility both in the United Nations and in helping countries throughout the world.

When he ran for reelection in 1956 Senator Wiley paid the price when he faced the most vigorous kind of opposition in the Republican primary in Wisconsin. He was opposed by an extraordinarily able opponent. He lost the endorsement of his party. He had to fight for renomination alone against the entire Republican organization in Wisconsin. He won and went on to a landslide general election victory.

Mr. President, the country has lost a fine and decent man. Wisconsin has lost a son of which it can be proud.

TRIBUTE TO MOHAMMAD REZA SHAH PAHLAVI ON THE OCCASION OF HIS CORONATION AS KING OF IRAN

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I call attention to a very unusual event that is taking place in Iran today—the coronation of a monarch 26 years after he ascended the throne and to the particular significance of this delay.

Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi declined to be crowned when he came to the throne in 1941. He declared at that time that it was no honor for him to reign over a nation in which a large portion of the people were destitute. The young Shah immediately dedicated himself to the task of improving the social and economic condition of the citizens of his country. Behind the pageantry and festivities that will accompany the coronation ceremonies in Iran today lies a quarter of a century of solid economic and social progress.

The Shah has proven to be a true revolutionary leader and, under his guidance, the economic and social face of Iran is being changed.

Iran's progress is also of special interest for it provides a heartening example of the contribution that our AID programs can make in a developing area when accompanied by political stability and enlightened local leadership. Our AID assistance to Iran is now coming to an end because the country has achieved the economic momentum to move forward on its own. We are terminating our economic assistance to Iran because the goals of our AID program have been largely achieved. This has been possible because the Iranian Government has made good use of the assistance that it has received from us and others, and because it has been ready and willing to undertake the sacrifices necessary for economic development.

Much of the credit for Iran's successful utilization of American economic assistance goes to the determination and efforts of Iranian leadership to provide economic and social progress for the people of Iran. We are all too aware that this is not always the case in countries that are the beneficiaries of large amounts of American AID.

The United States has provided Iran a total of $886,600,000 in economic assistance since 1951. As a result of this large expenditure of U.S. funds—over a period during which the country faced a number of severe political and economic crises—Iran is today a stable, prospering, independent land and a firm member of the family of free nations.

In his determination to develop his nation economically and socially, the Shah has not been satisfied merely to seek foreign assistance. Rather, under the Shah's personal leadership, Iran has devoted an ever increasing amount of its own resources to development programs. At present some 80 percent of the nation's substantial revenue from oil production is being used for development projects. During the period 1955 to 1962, U.S. economic assistance to Iran amounted to some $566 million. During this same period, Iranian investment in development totaled $1.2 billion, a ratio of almost 3 to 1. In the latest period, 1963–66, the ratio of Iranian expenditures for development to U.S. economic assistance was better than 10 to 1. Iran spent $1.5 billion on development projects during these years compared to a total of $136 million received in American assistance.

In recent years American corporations have shown increasing interest in investment in Iran, attracted both by the continuing economic growth of the country and the political stability that it enjoys. The flow of private American investment capital into Iran has now replaced U.S. Government assistance funds, and the rate of American investments in Iran is steadily increasing as new opportunities in the expanding economy develop.

Today, Iran is a billion-dollar import market, and the United States is Iran's second largest supplier, having supplied almost 20 percent of Iran's total imports last year. The size of this market is expected to double over the next 5 years, offering another billion-dollar opportunity for trade growth.

These are a few of the positive results that have sprung from the Shah's successful revolution. The coronation today will climax the first phase of this revolution. But the revolution in Iran is continuing and the country and its citizens can look forward to even greater advances.

I think that we would all wish to join in offering the Shah our congratulations on this occasion and to extend our best wishes to him and to his people.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS FOLLOWING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE TODAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills presented to him today, even following the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 27, 1967, at 11 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 26, 1967:

U.S. Circuit Judge

Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Under Secretary of Commerce

Howard J. Samuels, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1967

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Reverend R. L. Miller, Greater Institutional A.M.E. Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, the might of all who trust in Thee, look with mercy upon us as a nation and with concern upon these our legislative fathers who hold the responsibility of her public peace, law, and order, and the togetherness of her citizens of varied races and nationalities. May they never forget their answerableness to the people whom they serve, and to that people's God; nor ever lose their patriotism in partisanship, their ministry of social responsibility in material servility, their vision of truth in the stigmatism of petty considerations. Direct their counsels, strengthen their hands to honesty of purpose, that the life of our people, guided by wise policies, may be a nation pleasing in Thy sight, thus we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 445. An act for the relief of Rosemarie Gauch Neth; and

S. 1108. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol and wife, Lucia J. Caballol.

The message also announced that the Vice President appointed the following Senators to attend the Interparliamentary Union meeting to be held in Rome December 3 to 9, 1967: Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Holllings, Mr. Allott, and Mr. Jordan of Idaho.

THE REVEREND R. L. MILLER

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we have one of the outstanding citizens of the city of Chicago who gave the invocation at the opening of the session of the House of Representatives, the Reverend R. L. Miller, minister and executive director of schools of the Greater Institutional A.M.E. Church of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Miller is one of the outstanding clergymen of the city of Chicago.

As an alderman in the city of Chicago for many years, it was my pleasure to have the church which Reverend Miller represents in my ward and later in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent. However, today that church is now located in the congressional district which the Honorable William L. Dawson represents.

Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Miller was one of the outstanding men involved in the city life and the community action programs of our area.

It is with great honor today that I am happy he gave the invocation at the opening of this session of the House.

LOOPHOLES IN OUR TAX LAWS

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that the only two things we have to worry about for certain are death and taxes. Well, the major oil companies in America can devote all their time worrying about death because when it comes to taxes, they have it made.

The loopholes in our tax laws, most specifically the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance, have put these companies in a position of rolling in profits while the rest of the American people pay their way. Last year the 20 major oil companies in America had a net clear profit of over $4¾ billion and yet paid taxes to their country of only 8½ percent. How many of our hard-working low- or high-paid constituents are in an 8½-percent tax bracket?

To attempt to rectify this gross injustice and unfair burden on the American people, I have just filed a discharge petition, which is at the Clerk's desk, to discharge the bill, H.R. 655, which will reduce the oil depletion allowance and invite the oil companies into the mainstream of Amercan taxation along with the rest of us. I urge my colleagues, who feel that their constituents should not be forced to dig 10 percent deeper into their pockets for a tax increase until the oil companies pay their fair share, to join with me in signing this discharge petition.

THE CONGRESSIONAL NIGHT BEFORE CHRISTMAS

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, with the firm expectation of being designated poet laureate of the 90th Congress, I offer the following poem which I have composed. Like all great bards, I will be available for public readings if the demand is audible, however faint. My poem follows:

THE CONGRESSIONAL NIGHT BEFORE CHRISTMAS

'Twas the night before Christmas, and all through the House,
They still were in session, and the Members did grouse.
Piled high in the cloakroom, suitcases stood by,
In the hope that proceedings would end sine die.
The business at hand was the Bow amendment.
Across-the-board slashes of ninety per cent.
Pucinski, Klucyznski, Derwinski were there.
Rodino, Paul Fino, Hébert and Adair.
Kelly and Pelly, O'Hara and Zion.
Chairman Bill Colmer with pal William Ryan.
Dawson and Clausen and Broomfield and Brock.
Pirnie and Gurney and Pickle and Zwach.
Blatnik and Resnick, Van Deerlin and Morse.
Johnson and Olsen and Joelson, of course.
Robert Mathias, so manly and strong.
Schadeberg, Schwengel, and Dingell and Long.
Whalen, Cohelan, Gonzalez, and Yates.
And Patman deploring those high interest rates.
Irwin and Kirwan, McCulloch, McClure.
And Mink from Hawaii, petite and demure.
Rooney and Tunney and Green, White, and Gray
A Wolff known as Lester, a Steed with a Bray.
As the session continued, the moon's mellow rays
Shone on reticent Gross and on mild-mannered Hays.
And pounding the gavel, McCormack then roared,
"On Albert, on Hale Boggs." "On Arends," cried Ford.
They held a brief huddle, considered and then
Announced that they'd meet on tomorrow at ten.
And I heard Fishbait say as he locked the doors tight,
"Happy Christmas to all and to all a good-night."

RIGHTS OF MINORITY DEFENDED

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Gallup poll this morning reports that more people in the United States are against the U.S. involvement in Vietnam than are in favor of it, and I think that it is important for those of us in the majority to insist that the views of the minority who favor this war be respected.

Just because Vice President Humphrey, Secretary Rusk, Congressman Ford, Senator Dirksen, and Gov. Ronald Reagan represent the views of a dwindling minority does not mean that they should be vilified or their patriotism questioned.

We in the majority should remind one another that free speech is basic to the good health of our Nation. Let the minority have their say. Let them demonstrate. Let them march. Should this minority decide to march to the Pentagon, I am confident that their actions will be peaceful, nonviolent, and that they will clean up their litter.

GALLUP VIETNAM POLL

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thought that I was literate and I read the Gallup poll report, but I did not read it the same way the gentleman from California read it. I read it as saying that an additional group of people had thought it was a mistake to have gotten involved in Vietnam but that a majority were still in favor of our position.

I know anybody ought to know that hindsight is better than foresight and I suppose nearly anyone might say maybe we never should have gotten involved there, but the point is that we are involved there. I believe it is pretty significant that a poll taken by a labor organization that had over 5,000 replies, of which 37 percent said we should increase or accelerate what we were doing in Vietnam, 42 percent said we should remain at the same level, 7 percent said we should decelerate, and 7 percent said we should not be there at all, we should pull out.

I believe the majority are still backing the policy of the United States and I believe that the majority are not led by the creeps and the beatniks and the dirty, filthy people who were evident and obvious on TV in the demonstration at the Pentagon. One of the soldiers said a good many of them acted like Tarzan, looked like Jane, and smelled like Cheetah.

MARIHUANA, YES—TOBACCO, NO

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am completely astounded at the attitude of officials in different bureaus within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and elsewhere in the executive branch.

For some 3 years now, the Public Health Service under the leadership of former Surgeon General Dr. Luther Terry and his successor the present Surgeon General, Dr. William H. Stewart, has waged unrelenting warfare against cigarette smoking. At their insistence, Congress acted to require that each package of cigarettes be labeled with the statement: "Warning, cigarette smoking may be hazardous to health." They sought much harsher measures which would have required similar statements to be contained in all cigarette advertising.

The Federal Communications Commission took up the cry, and under the "fairness doctrine" required radio and television broadcasters to provide free time to those who believe cigarette smoking is dangerous to health to "answer" paid advertising.

Now, Dr. James Goddard, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, has publicly stated that he believes penalties provided for those convicted of the sale and use of marihuana are too harsh and that he believes our society can tolerate legalized use of marihuana as well as it does the legal use of alcohol.

Can any knowledgeable person possibly doubt that the use of marihuana tends to promote irresponsible conduct; that it can cause loss of motor ability and result in automobile accidents and similarly dangerous situations? That persons "high" on marihuana have been known to jump out of windows under the impression that they could fly? That it reduces inhibitions and promotes promiscuity? Or that it is often the first step toward experimentation with other drugs like LSD and heroin?

It goes without saying that when the Federal Government is waging an all-out battle against something as mild as cigarettes which bring in millions of dollars of legitimate tax revenues and provide a livelihood for hundreds of thousands of people, something is badly out of kilter when out of the other side of its mouth, it talks about legalizing marihuana.

THE GREAT DETROIT SMOG CAPER

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, next week may mark a significant milestone in public affairs. When Senate bill 780, the Air Quality Act, comes to the floor, House Members will have a chance to prove that no segment of private industry is bigger than the people of the United States.

For far too long, the automobile industry, swaggering through our House office buildings with highhanded lobbyists—some of them paid up to $100 an hour—has sought to impose auto management's selfish interests over the judgment of the American public.

Last year we saw a campaign first to prevent, then to weaken, auto safety legislation. This arrogant campaign was marked by efforts to destroy the character of a man who had done most to call public attention to unsafe cars.

More recently, the swarm from Detroit has zeroed in on the Clean Air Act, as that bill faces up to a prime cause of pollution—the toxic emissions that pour from nearly 100 million automobiles.

Detroit wants a bill that will reduce controls to a minimum. And just as Detroit's carpetbaggers sought to destroy Ralph Nader, they now seek to smash the police powers of the States in a vital field of health and safety.

I invite colleagues to join in rolling back the pall of smog these slick operators have sought to spread through this legislative Hall—to prove with their votes next week that Detroit is not the capital of the United States.

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL RICKOVER

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my thanks and appreciation for the fact that Admiral Rickover has agreed to stay on active duty for another 2 years.

I do not know and I do not suppose many other people know of all the lucrative offers that he has received and by which he has been tempted to enter private industry.

It is because of Admiral Rickover's constant devotion to duty, Mr. Speaker, that nuclear propulsion for the fleet of submarines that we have now, both attack and Polaris, is a reality; and because of his extreme devotion to duty we are now beginning to get nuclear propulsion for more of our surface navy.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation is indeed lucky that this dedicated American will wear the uniform for another 2 years.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from South Carolina in congratulating our Navy for keeping Admiral Rickover on duty. I think that Admiral Rickover is one of the greatest Americans of this century and he certainly has made one of the greatest contributions to get for this country a nuclear-powered Navy.

I hope that Admiral Rickover serves for many, many years longer. We need more men like that in the Navy.

Fifteen years ago I spent the night aboard the *Nautilus* and shared the same cabin with Admiral Rickover. He talked until late that night about the possibility of firing missiles from submerged submarines—a system that later became Polaris. Admiral Rickover is unquestionably the father of the Polaris. In my opinion had it not been for Admiral Rickover we would have no Polaris system today. The Polaris system is unquestionably the finest deterrent that we have.

Admiral Rickover is a great American and is no doubt making a great personal and financial sacrifice to continue serving in the Navy. This is further evidence of his devoted, unselfish service to his country.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in paying tribute to Admiral Rickover. I understand that the admiral has decided to serve for 2 more years. I congratulate him and wish him the very best.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, this country will never be able to thank this man enough for the fight that he is making today to get a surface nuclear Navy for this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, patriotic and sound-thinking Americans can but applaud and demand the continuation of Vice Adm. Hyman George Rickover, U.S. Navy, on active service as head of the Navy's nuclear power directorate.

Almost 10 years ago a photograph accompanying an article published in the New York Times showed the then Rear Admiral Rickover standing in a civilian suit of clothes, with his vision fixed on some distant point, with a painting of a naval ship in the background, and with two telephones a handgrasp away on a desk in the foreground. The article itself helped to explain these elements of the photographic composition. It stated that the admiral "has been driven to greatness and controversy by a consuming personal philosophy that 'the more you sweat in peace the less you bleed in war.' " It pointed out that "in peace and war, the admiral stands forth as a leader in this country—and in the world—in harnessing nuclear energy. More than any other man, he was responsible for two epochal achievements"—the first atomic-powered submarine, followed by a growing fleet of sister ships and atomic-powered surface ships, and the world's "first large-scale, all-civilian atomic powerplant" at Shippingport, Pa. The article also observed that "his disdain for established procedures almost cut short his naval career before he could score his atomic triumphs."

Ten years ago the Nation, due in no small measure to congressional insistence, was indeed fortunate and blessed to have Admiral Rickover still on active duty. Today the Congress should and must express its conviction that Admiral Rickover should and must continue "on the job."

It is not that the admiral is irreplaceable. After all, who really is? The point, rather, is that the kind of service that Admiral Rickover has performed for the Nation and the Navy is of vital importance so long as he is willing and able to render it.

Last January, in the course of accepting the Franklin Medal for Distinguished Service, an honor bestowed on him by the Printing Industries of Metropolitan New York, the admiral affirmed that "what seems to me of utmost importance is that we never for a moment forget that a free society centers on man." Public service based on such an attitude and conviction is the kind of service of which the Nation and the Navy must avail themselves for so long as they can.

Admiral Rickover, whether he be speaking out on nuclear propulsion, education in the present era of science and technology, campaign costs as a factor in democratic elections, or the pitfalls of dehumanized national defense decision-making, contributes to the national defense and the well-being of national life, generally the kind of perspicacity and moral courage without which the United States of America cannot endure peacefully, purposefully, and honorably.

AMERICAN FISHING BOAT FIRED ON AND SEIZED ON THE HIGH SEAS

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of this House should know that another American tuna fishing boat, 70 miles off the coast of Ecuador, was fired on and taken into custody by an Ecuadorian patrol boat on Friday, October 20.

According to information furnished me by our Department of State, the vessel, *Puritan*, legally fishing on the high seas, was first subjected to small arms fire and then seized. Fortunately, no American was killed in this latest act of piracy by Ecuador, although the vessel suffered bullet damage in the hull. The *Puritan* was taken into port and not released until 26 hours later.

Mr. Speaker, I have urged and introduced legislation to provide Coast Guard protection for fishing vessels flying the American flag off South America, but our Government would rather pay ransom.

No wonder the United States is losing respect throughout the world.

GUIDING DIRECTION IN LETTERS REGARDING OEO PROGRAMS

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to share an experience with me and see if they draw the same conclusion that I have.

Back in August and September I began receiving letters in praise of the Office of Economic Opportunity. You will note that these letters all come on the same size paper, apparently all from the same pad, many of them apparently written with the same ball point pen.

One of the letters started:

> Hon. Congressman Roger Zion: In response to the request of the Office of Economic Opportunity; I am writing you this letter.

More recently I have received letters that apparently were mimeographed. Very few constituents in my small towns are equipped with mimeograph machines. Now I am getting king-sized letters, with the watermark of the U.S. Government apparently on the paper.

I would like to call attention to title 18, section 913, of the United States Code, specifying:

> No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, if a violation of law has occurred, I want the Justice Department to evaluate this. I am going to send the material to them. I think it is reprehensible if fine, decent people who have a real need for an effective poverty program are being misused in this manner.

BYWAY BEAUTNIK CORPS ON CAPE COD

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, any friend of Cape Cod knows that its best season is not summer, when beaches are jammed, roads clogged, and shops crowded with souvenir seekers. Real Cape Codders know that the best time to be on Cape Cod is the fall—the so-called Indian summer—when full foliage colors the trees, crisp breezes invigorate spirits, and near-deserted beaches beckon the solitary stroller or beachcomber.

This year, Mr. Speaker, the traditional enticements of Cape Cod are enhanced by the opportunity to join in a massive, organized litter campaign. The Byway Beautnik Corps, conceived by Emil A. Hanslin, of New Seabury on Cape Cod, will strew millions of wildflower seeds along the roads of Cape Cod.

This highway beautification plan, which entails no cost to the taxpayer, is a unique example of old yankee do-it-yourself tradition—a sharp and agreeable contrast to the all too prevalent let-the-government-do-it attitude. When millions of wildflowers turn Cape Cod into a flower garden, that other brand of litterbug might be less inclined to chuck beer cans and candy wrappers from car windows.

Mr. Speaker, as a corporal in the Byway Beautnik Corps, I am inviting my colleagues to enlist. There are no dues, no rules, no ranks. Each corporal is issued a free packet of wildflower seeds, a knatty yellow and black badge, and a certificate suitable for framing. He is authorized and encouraged to strew wildflower seeds wherever he wishes.

Mr. Speaker, membership in the Byway Beautnik Corps offers unparalleled opportunities for unrestricted littering, as well as an unbeatable excuse to visit Cape Cod in its prime season. I anticipate encountering many of my Washington-weary colleagues along the dunes of Cape Cod, sporting a Beautnik badge and littering with license.

FAILURE OF CONFEREES ON FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION TO REACH AGREEMENT OR REPORT BACK IN DISAGREEMENT

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to commend briefly on the continuing failure of the conferees on the foreign aid authorization to reach agreement—or to report back in disagreement on certain issues. A friend of mine asked me recently if this was a stall or a stalemate—and I was not able to answer him. Certainly if this session of Congress is to adjourn it would seem necessary for the conference committee to reach some compromise, or at least for the House conferees to seek advice from our colleagues regarding our failure to reach final agreement.

The conference committee, consisting of 11 members of the other body and seven of us from the Foreign Affairs Committee, first met on September 14, 6 weeks ago today. Our task was—and still is—to discuss no less than 89 differences between the bills passed by the House and the other body. Agreement has been reached as to many of these differences, but important issues still remain unresolved.

I am calling attention to this situation, Mr. Speaker, because in the 6 weeks since discussions first began there have been no meetings at all of the conference committee for 3 of those weeks. The first week wasted came about because of the absence of two conferees from the other body. For reasons of their own they were not in Washington the last week in September.

Even more regrettable, there have been no meetings of the conference committee since October 12. Nothing has been done either this week or last because of the absence from the Nation's Capital of one conferee from the other body. Even if it was felt that no final agreement could be reached because of the absence of a single individual, it is unfortunate that the 10 other conferees could not meet and discuss with the House conferees the differences which still need resolution.

PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL IN NOVEMBER PLAYBOY

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, no matter how strong this country considers itself to be, it cannot withstand the continued massive injections of pornographic material that are flooding the mails and reaching our youngsters. No better example of this can be found than an article in the November 1967 issue of Playboy magazine at page 154 purportedly discussing "Stag Movies" but utterly without redeeming social or intellectual value. With photographs this article is pure pornographic pruriency.

If Supreme Court decisions are considered to make lawful the distribution of this sort of material then it is a tragedy of misinterpretation. I do not believe even the present U.S. Supreme Court would fail to hold this obscene.

More important is the question of precisely whom it was within the staff of Playboy itself who first, of course, had to see this material in draft and then approve and direct its distribution throughout America. This person ought to be tarred and feathered.

Mr. Speaker, the use of the mails should be denied to pornography of this type. The U.S. Attorney General should act to protect the families of this Nation from material that is plainly designed to demoralize our Nation and particularly its very young.

The Government should act to stop this smut and the Supreme Court should help not hinder the effort.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 823)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments Nos. 1 and 2 of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) "making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,925,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.,
DAVID PRYOR,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
BURT L. TALCOTT,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GORDON ALLOTT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Research and development

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $3,925,000,000 for "Research and development" instead of $3,899,500,000 as proposed by the House and $3,995,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference has added $10,000,000 for tracking and data acquisition, and $15,500,000 over the amount proposed by the House for the Apollo applications program, with the understanding that the Administrator may reprogram funds in research and development for purposes he determines to be of higher priority and in the best interests of the United States, with approval of the appropriate Committees of the Congress.

Construction of facilities

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $35,900,000 for "Construction of facilities" as proposed by the House instead of $55,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.,
DAVID PRYOR,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
BURT L. TALCOTT,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we bring back to the House today two conference reports, one for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and one for the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations for 1968.

These matters have been thoroughly debated earlier this week. There have been record votes and issues are well known.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Members that the House has won both conferences. The bills provide appropriations of $14,728,373,900. This is a 6.3-percent reduction for independent offices and HUD appropriations, and a 10-percent reduction on the appropriations for NASA, making a total cut in the two bills of $1,192,139,800 below the budget estimates.

These two bills have always gone together, but they were separated this year because of a delay in the passage of the authorization bill for NASA.

This cut is almost $1.2 billion.

The other body yielded on $465 million, whereas the House yielded on only $131 million. This was a 78-percent reduction on the part of the Senate.

We feel that the House won this conference decisively, with the Senate yielding on most of the major points.

In regard to the specific programs in NASA, the Senate added $35 million for the Apollo applications program to the $300 million the House had provided previously. They added $36 million for the Voyager program. The House had not approved any funds for that program.

The other two items in this further conference relate to the nuclear rocket program. The Senate had added $10 million for research and $19,500,000 for construction. The other body has yielded on both of these items.

Total dollar differences between the two bodies in this conference was $100,500,000. They have yielded to the extent of $85 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House has yielded with reference to the sum of $10 million on the tracking facilities. This has to do with commitments and contracts with foreign governments for the operation of the tracking facilities which are vital to the safety of our astronauts.

In the conference just completed we have added $15.5 million to Apollo applications.

Mr. Speaker, there are 20 items in research and development. We did not fund any specific amount for the Voyager or for the NERVA programs but we have language in the statement of the managers which states, in effect, that if the Administrator feels that other projects in research and development are of a higher priority and of greater interest to the United States, he then may ask for reprograming by the appropriate committees of the Congress. This means that any reprograming will be reviewed by the space committee of the House and the space committee of the other body, as well as the Committees on Appropriations. We would again have an opportunity to look at any reprograming problem.

Mr. Speaker, in our opinion, we feel we have brought back for the consideration of the House a good conference report. All legislation, of course, represents compromise. We must, however, get on with the business of the Congress. We hope the conference report on the NASA appropriation bill will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks I include the following comparative statement on the bill as finally approved:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968, COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriation, 1967	Budget estimate, 1968	Passed House, 1968	Passed Senate, 1968	Conference action, 1968	Conference compared with— Appropriation, 1967	Conference compared with— Budget, 1968	Conference compared with— House, 1968	Conference compared with— Senate, 1968
Research and development	4,245,000	4,352,000	3,899,500	3,995,500	3,925,000	−320,000	−427,000	+25,500	−70,500
Construction of facilities	83,000	76,700	35,900	55,400	35,900	−47,100	−40,800		−19,500
Administrative operations	640,000	671,300	648,000	628,000	628,000	−12,000	−43,300	−20,000	
Total	4,968,000	5,100,000	4,583,400	4,678,900	4,588,900	−379,100	−511,100	+5,500	−90,000

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Of course I am delighted to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work which has been done by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations as well as the other members of the committee of conference on the part of the House, who brought back this conference report.

I compliment them upon carrying out the will of this body.

However, insofar as reprograming is concerned, do I understand that there must exist an emergency situation or, in other words, a "must" situation before the Administrator reprograms any of these funds in any one fiscal year? In other words, that we must seek the approval and the permission of the appropriate committees of both the House of Representatives and the other body, before undertaking this reprograming?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Missouri is entirely correct in his former premise that he must submit reprograming items to both the House of Representatives and to the other body and these must be approved by the appropriate committees of both bodies.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, this is not one of those questions of a veto in reverse, wherein if the House of Representatives does not take action within so many days upon the reprograming request that then it will take effect?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Not at all.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I have one final question: Would this reprograming be undertaken upon a line item appropriation basis?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes. The Administrator may reprogram for any matter that he deems is of higher priority and in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Of course; I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] whether, since he has discussed both conference reports, he intends to consider them together? It is my understanding that we would consider the report on NASA first, dispose of it, and then consider the housing report separately.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman from North Carolina is entirely correct. I gave some overall totals for the two bills to indicate the total reductions of $1.2 billion. Then I tried to go particularly to the items in disagreement because we have recently concluded our recommendations thereon.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to make it perfectly clear to the Members of the House that we shall be voting, first, upon the NASA conference report; after which the other bill will be considered, the report on the housing section, or that portion of the independent offices appropriation bill which deals with model cities and rent supplements.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I concur in the view expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I would also comment to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall], in response to his inquiry addressed to the gentleman from Tenneessee, that in addition to the requirement that reprograming has to be approved by the appropriate committees of the Congress—and these committees are the two authorizing committees and the two Committees on Appropriations—any reprograming will have to be done within the total dollar limitation of the appropriation. So, it is a matter of reprograming within the present program, rather than going outside of the program.

Mr. Speaker, just for the record, I would like to point out and to remind the Members of the House who are present here today that, with reference to the NASA funding item, we started out with a budget request of $5,100 million.

The conference report before you today is $511,100,000 below the budget; it is $379,100,000 below the appropriation for 1967; it is $90 million below the Senate-passed bill; and it is $5.5 million above the House-passed bill.

The Senate-passed bill was $95.5 million above the House, and as I said, the conference report contemplates an appropriation which will be only $5.5 million above the House, and $90 million below the Senate.

This amounts to a cut under the budget of approximately 10 percent. We have been talking a lot recently about 5-percent cuts, and this one is double that, or 10 percent. Yet in the opinion of the members of the subcommittee who have heard the testimony and now agree in conference, the bill is adequate to take care of the needs of NASA during the next year, in view of the fiscal situation of our country. It is substantially lower than last year's appropriation; it is a substantial reduction under the budget; yet it nevertheless is a substantial appropriation—$4,588,900,000.

The conference report outlines the actions taken in conference and I join the gentleman from Tennessee in recommending its approval by the House.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Charles H. Wilson].

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to compliment the conferees on what I know has been a difficult task. However, I want to express my personal opposition to the cuts that have been made in the NASA program. I believe the time will probably come when we are going to be faced with the same situation we were faced with when the Russian Sputnik first went up, and then we are going to be wondering why we did not go ahead with many of these very important space programs.

I recognize that restraint in spending is necessary. However, I do want to express my opposition to these cuts in the space program.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman. These are important programs but it is necessary at this time to make some difficult decisions. We believe that some of the space programs must therefore be deferred for later consideration.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to find that the conferees on H.R. 12474, making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, have emphasized research and development for the science and space program.

The conferees also have emphasized the importance of reprograming available funds by NASA under this budget. In fact, the statement of legislative intent specifically states the "understanding" that the Administrator may reprogram funds in "Research and development" for purposes he determines to be of higher priority and in the best interests of the United States, with approval of the appropriate committees of the Congress."

These interested committees are the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and the respective appropriation committees of the House and Senate.

This is a direct invitation and really a request by the Congress that James Webb as Administrator of NASA take this responsibility of reprograming and making his recommendations to the Congress according to current priorities as established by the President.

I firmly believe that it is in the U.S. national interest and of the highest priority in the U.S. space research and development program to proceed at once with the 200,000-pound-thrust NERVA II nuclear rocket engine development program. It is also of the highest priority that the United States continue in the U.S. planetary exploration program during the 1970 decade. This means that the Voyager Mars program must likewise be funded in this fiscal year by NASA in order to have the spacecraft ready for flight during favorable conjunctions of Mars and Earth in 1973 and 1975. These two programs are "musts" for U.S. preeminence, or even eminence, in future space explorations.

I have said repeatedly that since 1958 there has been a space propulsion gap between the U.S.S.R. and the United States. This gap is not yet closed and, in my judgment, is widening.

By July of 1968, I predict we will be sending congratulations to Russia for launching a rocket bigger than the U.S. Saturn V. Russia recognizes the importance of work on big boosters and high energy fuels and it is a tragic mistake for this country to drop out of the advanced propulsion program now. I have emphasized the importance of high energy fuel research in the United States on boron and fluorine base fuels for second stage rocket flight. Likewise, solid fuel rockets could be an important workhorse for U.S. space boosters which could help close the propulsion gap.

Today, Chinese research and development is directed toward competing with a space and nuclear rocket program of Chinese origin. Chinese work on advanced rocket technology will, sooner than most people think, see the beginning of a Chinese space program starting with a satellite by next January and their military rockets will soon become a threat to the entire Pacific area of the world. With China in the race for domination of space and the United States slowing its effort, we will move to a third position with tragic consequences.

Administrator Webb's forthcoming reprograming testimony before Congress may be the most significant he will ever give if he emphasizes research and development programs rather than insisting on spending money for the manufacture and fabrication of existing rocket booster designs. If he wants to assure that the maximum options are available to the United States in the next decade, he will place greater emphasis on allocating funds to programs that will give us needed flexibility in space.

Specifically, the Voyager and NERVA II programs should be funded this fiscal year. Voyager is the only major planetary exploration program this Nation will have in the 1970's. If this program is abandoned, we will be abdicating our responsibilities for planetary exploration. This is particularly significant following the recent Russian Venus IV soft landing on the planet Venus.

The NERVA II program to develop a 200,000-pound-thrust nuclear rocket engine is NASA's only new engine development program which can significantly uprate the Saturn V rocket. Failure to provide funds for this program in fiscal 1968 will force the United States to continue flying outdated, obsolete, and more expensive liquid fuel upper stages in the 1970's and 1980's. Funds should also be made available to at least start early phases of the construction of two nuclear rocket test stands at the nuclear rocket development station in Nevada. This facility is required to test the advanced NERVA II engine.

Although insufficient funds have been made available to NASA for all the activities they want to support, NASA can take either or both of two alternatives to find money to support really essential programs. First, NASA can take steps to make necessary funds available by more efficient management of production of Saturn V vehicles.

Rescheduling of proposed production of Saturn V vehicles from the present plan of two per year in 1971 and 1972 and four per year in 1973 and 1974 by going to the more economical rate of six per year would mean production of 12 Saturn vehicles over 2 years rather than 4 years, could mean a savings of a half-billion dollars which could be made available for other programs which need money now. In addition, NASA could make additional funds available through more efficient use of Saturn IB vehicles which are in storage or in the process of being completed. NASA now has six of these expensive vehicles in storage and two more in the final stages of checkout. Yet, in spite of the tight money situation, NASA is going right ahead to spend money on long-lead-time items for more Saturn I vehicles. I have challenged NASA to submit a more economical reschedule of rocket procurements and have not yet heard what action they plan to take. Perhaps when Administrator Webb testifies before Congress as requested in the conference report, we can hear more about how he plans to economize and still conduct the necessary parts of a growing space program.

Second, Congress has always been receptive to requests for deficiency appropriations from NASA when such requests become necessary due to changing conditions. If reprograming fails to take care of all necessary program requirements and a deficiency exists, NASA can come back to Congress at a later time and make its needs known.

It is important for NASA to realize that Congress continues to support a strong space effort and, in spite of a tight money situation, we on the respective House and Senate Space Committees and the conference committee for NASA's fiscal year 1968 appropriation are confident that reprograming of funds for research and development by the Administrator, to meet high priority demands, can be successfully accomplished in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the addition of funds in the report of the conference for the Apollo applications program. I regret the total could not be more. This is a vital part of our Nation's space effort because funds invested in this work assure the maximum benefits of the Apollo program and the continuation of the manned space flight program beyond the current schedule.

The recent Soviet achievement in the Venus exploration points up the need for our Nation to devote more effort to our own space program. I believe we should and must remain in the space competition not only for the enormous technological benefits which our own industry and people realize from the spinoff of these scientific endeavors but because of the prestige value of making clear our accomplishments of our society.

For this reason I regret the limited funding for the important post-Apollo programs such as the Voyager interplanetary exploration and the investigation of more efficient means of propulsion such as nuclear rockets.

It is some encouragement to note the statement of the House conferees regarding research and development funds:

> The Administrator may reprogram funds in research and development for purposes he determines to be of higher priority and in the best interest of the United States, with the approval of the appropriate Committees of the Congress.

I am only too well aware of the austere budgetary situation facing this Nation today. But, I am also aware of the vast needs for increased investment in our country's future through the space exploration and scientific achievement.

It is essential that this program be continued to support the challenge and the promise in an orderly and productive manner.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the conference report, and that I may include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 822)

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments Nos. 58, 59, and 67 of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) "making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$312,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$10,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Joe L. Evins,
Edward P. Boland,
George E. Shipley,
Robert N. Giaimo,
John O. Marsh, Jr.,
David Pryor,
George Mahon,
Charles R. Jonas,
William E. Minshall,
Louis C. Wyman,
Burt L. Talcott,
Frank T. Bow,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Warren G. Magnuson,
Allen J. Ellender,
Richard B. Russell,
Spessard L. Holland,
John O. Pastore,
Gordon Allott,
Margaret Chase Smith,
Roman L. Hruska,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at a further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 58: Authorizes $100,000,000 for grants for urban renewal projects within model cities instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House and $125,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates $312,000,000 for Model Cities Programs instead of $237,000,000 as proposed by the House and $537,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The total includes $12,000,000 for planning grants, $200,000,000 for model cities supplemental grants, and $100,000,000 for urban renewal projects that are part of model cities programs.

Amendment No. 67: Deletes House language and inserts language as proposed by the Senate and authorizes $10,000,000 contract authority for rent supplement payments instead of no amount as proposed by the House and $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Joe L. Evins,
Edward P. Boland,
George E. Shipley,
Robert N. Giaimo,
John O. Marsh, Jr.,
David Pryor,
George Mahon,
Charles R. Jonas,
William E. Minshall,
Louis C. Wyman,
Burt L. Talcott,
Frank T. Bow,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this conference report relates only to two items still in disagreement. These were debated and voted on just 2 days ago. These two are the only items in disagreement—one is the model cities program and the other is the rent supplement item of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for 1968.

All of the other items have been resolved and we went back to further conference on the two items to which I have referred.

There was very strong desire in the other body to insist on the full amount in the budget. We pointed out that the House had sustained the position taken by the House earlier. However, I think that we all recognized that we must finish this matter and get on with the business of the Congress and a final settlement was reached. We feel that it is a good settlement.

Mr. Speaker, the conference total for this bill is $10,139,473,000 for some 20 independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The conference total is $681,039,800 below the budget estimates.

The cuts and reductions are almost $700 million, which is a 6.3-percent cut below the budget.

Items numbered 58 and 59 both relate to the model cities program. Item 58 has to do with urban renewal projects within the model cities.

The House had provided $75 million for this purpose and the other body $125 million.

Your conferees felt that an increase for urban renewal was justified in view of the fact that the urban renewal features of the model cities program will probably move forward right away. The cities have long experience with urban renewal programs which they certainly will apply to parts of the model cities program.

In relation to planning grants, both the House and the Senate bills provide identical amounts. We are in agreement in providing $12 million.

For model cities grants the budget amount was $400 million. Your conferees have agreed to $200 million instead of the $150 million proposed by the House and the amount of $400 million proposed by the Senate. The other body has therefore yielded to 80 percent of the difference and we have yielded only to 20 percent.

The conference report therefore includes $12 million for planning grants, $200 million for model cities supplementary grants, and $100 million for urban renewal projects that are parts of model cities programs, or a total of $312 million for all three parts of the model cities program.

The full budget amount, as you will recall, for these items was $662,000,000. The conferees bring back to you the amount of $312,000,000.

The only other item of difference between the two bodies is the amount of contract authority to be provided with respect to the rent supplement program. Last year the Congress provided $20,000,000. This year, as you will recall, the House did not provide any funds, although the Committee on Appropriations had recommended $10,000,000. The Senate insisted on the amount of $40,000,000.

While I have supported the position of the House, it is clear that some funding must be provided if we are to have a bill. A compromise must be reached. All legislation is a compromise, Mr. Speaker, and we have reached a compromise at what I believe to be the minimum and very lowest figure.

The Congress is going to have to face up to the problems of the cities in the future. Only a month ago the life insurance companies, as you will recall, pledged $1 billion for investment to improve housing conditions in slum areas and the ghettos of this Nation.

This is a very significant step forward. The industry is to be commended. However, the rent supplement program is crucial if the life insurance companies are to fulfill their commitment and make this private investment. This is the private enterprise approach to solving the problem of decent housing for people in low-income areas. It must receive the support of the Congress.

In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, and so as to take advantage of the pledge and commitment made by the insurance companies—and to encourage other industries to help solve the problems of the slums in our cities in a realistic way through the private enterprise approach—we have agreed to this minimum amount for rent supplements. This will keep this new and experimental program going and alive so it can be further considered next year.

Mr. Speaker, these are the key items in this conference report for these independent offices and agencies and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The other body has yielded on about 75 percent of the differences and the House has yielded to only about 25 percent.

The bill is more than $681 million below the budget. The other body receded to the extent of more than $375 million. I feel that the conferees have done a good job and that the House has prevailed. We think that the conference report should be adopted.

I shall include a summary table on the bill in my remarks at this point and then, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina such time as he may require:

SUMMARY TABULATION, INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968 (H.R. 9960)

	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference actions compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I									
National Aeronautics and Space Council	$525,000	$524,000	$524,000	$524,000	$524,000	−$1,000			
Office of Emergency Planning	10,300,000	7,025,000	9,645,000	9,685,000	9,645,000	−655,000	+$2,620,000		−$40,000
Office of Science and Technology	1,200,000	1,837,000	1,450,000	1,650,000	1,550,000	+350,000	−287,000	+$100,000	−100,000
President's Commission on Postal Organization		1,500,000		1,500,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	−500,000	+1,000,000	−500,000
Disaster relief	24,550,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	−4,550,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000	−5,000,000
Civil Aeronautics Board	75,700,000	63,066,000	61,400,000	61,566,000	61,483,000	−14,217,000	−1,583,000	+83,000	−83,000
Civil Service Commission	134,574,000	151,117,000	136,048,000	151,081,000	149,048,000	+14,474,000	−2,069,000	+13,000,000	−2,033,000
Commission on the Political Activity of Government Personnel	175,000			25,000	25,000	−150,000	+25,000	+25,000	
Federal Communications Commission	17,852,300	19,221,000	19,000,000	19,100,000	19,100,000	+1,247,700	−121,000	+100,000	
Federal Power Commission	14,220,000	14,830,000	14,220,000	14,445,000	14,220,000		−610,000		−225,000
Federal Trade Commission	14,378,000	15,225,000	15,000,000	15,150,000	15,150,000	+772,000	−75,000	+150,000	
General Services Administration	642,831,000	567,979,700	548,913,900	568,907,900	559,484,900	−83,346,100	−8,494,800	+10,571,000	−9,423,000
Interstate Commerce Commission	28,479,000	23,784,000	23,400,000	23,530,000	23,460,000	−5,019,000	−324,000	+60,000	−70,000
National Science Foundation	479,999,000	526,000,000	495,000,000	505,000,000	495,000,000	+15,001,000	−31,000,000		−10,000,000
Renegotiation Board	2,537,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	+63,000			
Securities and Exchange Commission	17,550,000	17,445,000	17,350,000	17,445,000	17,350,000	−200,000	−95,000		−95,000
Selective Service System	58,940,000	57,455,000	57,455,000	57,455,000	57,455,000	−1,485,000			
Total, Veterans' Administration	6,438,043,000	6,651,014,000	6,647,422,882	6,650,493,000	6,649,279,000	+211,236,000	−1,735,000	+1,856,118	−1,214,000
Civil Defense (DOD)	101,100,000	111,000,000	86,100,000	91,100,000	86,100,000	−15,000,000	−24,900,000		−5,000,000
Emergency health activities (HEW)	10,000,000	12,500,000	9,000,000	9,426,000	9,000,000	−1,000,000	−3,500,000		−426,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development	1,486,300,000	2,561,391,000	1,853,650,000	2,289,148,000	1,948,000,000	+461,700,000	−613,391,000	+94,350,000	−341,148,000
TITLE II									
CORPORATIONS									
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	(17,875,000)	(18,190,000)	(18,190,000)	(18,190,000)	(18,190,000)	(+315,000)			
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	(285,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(+13,000)			
Federal Housing Administration	(95,650,000)	(99,625,000)	(98,000,000)	(98,000,000)	(98,000,000)	(+2,350,000)	(−1,625,000)		
Federal National Mortgage Association	(9,931,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(−331,000)			
Total appropriations	[1] 9,580,090,300	10,820,513,700	10,013,178,782	10,514,830,900	10,139,473,900	+559,383,600	−681,039,800	+126,295,118	−375,357,000

[1] Includes $20,837,000 not in itemization above.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I think it should be kept in mind that we are not here today discussing an original bill. We are discussing a report that came out of conference. The conference report results from long and hard debate with the Members of the other body.

I have been around here a few years now, and if I have learned one thing it is that no one Member of this House, and neither House, can have its own way. We are part of the legislative branch of the Government which consists of two coordinate branches of equal dignity and responsibility.

We had some rollcalls in the House; the other body had some rollcalls also. When we went back to conference for the second time, we did so after two rollcall votes taken here the day before yesterday, which I would remind the Members did not specify that the House managers should adhere to the original House figures. Those votes were to reject the figures of the other body, and we succeeded in doing that in the conference.

The report we bring back to you indicates, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, that the House conferees won more points in this conference than our opposite numbers did, and I think that is quite clear from the record.

Let me remind you now that with respect to model cities, we started off considering a budget estimate of $662 million. The House committee recommended, and the House approved, $237 million. The other body finally came out with a bill, adopted there on successive rollcalls over these key issues, which provided $537 million—$300 million higher than the House-passed bill.

The conference report includes $312 million.

This means that the conference report is $75 million above the original House bill but it is $225 million below the bill passed in the other body. And even more significantly, I remind the Members here today, it is $350 million below the budget.

When we sit down around the conference table with an opposite number or a friendly adversary to work out differences between two bills, it is just as if two people were sitting down together, a prospective purchaser and a prospective seller, to talk about a piece of property, and they are trying to get together at somewhere between what the seller proposes to take and the prospective buyer says he is willing to pay. That is exactly what we had to do in the conference.

I think the figures I have previously stated for the RECORD will indicate that as a result of this conference, while we did not win all points and we did not sustain the original position of the House in toto, we are much closer to that position than the conference figures are to the figures adopted in the other body.

I am not entirely satisfied with this compromise, but I signed the conference report because I think it is the best compromise we could get. I think it is as close to the House figures as we could get in conference with the other body. The conferees on the other side were adamant and were prepared to spend more time in this conference than I think we can afford to spend because of the fact that we are now here in the closing days of October.

Something has to give. We have to move forward and make some progress or a stalemate will result. The fact that we are $350 million in this one item below the budget, I think, is the significant point. I ask those who are for any reason not entirely satisfied with this conference report to remember that, because that is the significant point.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman very appropriately emphasizes the reductions which the conference committee has made, and I think it is most worthy to point out that the full cuts are almost $1,200,000,000. These are some of the biggest cuts that have been made in any appropriation bills this year. The 80-percent recision which the Senate has made indicates we have won substantial concessions from the other body, and they are to be commended for this in the current budgetary situation. The Senate has yielded to many of the House decisions.

Mr. JONAS. That is true. I concur in the view expressed by my friend from Tennessee.

I would like to comment now briefly on another part of this conference report we are now considering, and that is the rent supplements section, unless the gentleman from Missouri has a question about the demonstration or model cities.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I did have just one question. I appreciate, as I said before, the action of the managers on the part of the House in bringing this conference report back. My question, however, pertains to the gentleman's last statement before he goes to the rent supplement program.

Is it not true that in spite of what the gentleman states about the significant part being the dollar savings on the part of the managers for the House, the truly significant thing is that the oft pared and/or voted down and disapproved programs of a model demonstration cities and of rent supplements respectively still persist, albeit by a tenuous string, if we pass this conference report?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my friend from Missouri the model cities program has never been voted down in the House. We had a rollcall on that in the original House-passed bill, but the position of the committee was sustained at $237 million. That program has never, to my recollection, been rejected by the House. There has always been a question of how much money would be used to fund it.

May I say, before I leave the subject of model cities, I do not think this item, regardless of the amount, will have any impact on spending during the current fiscal year. This is all program grant money and they will not even be ready to allocate it until late next spring. It will probably be in the next fiscal year before any of this money will actually be disbursed, except the $12 million that is in here for planning.

Now I believe I should make a few comments on the other part of this bill, which is the rent supplement provision. May I remind those who are present today that here again we need to remember what we started off considering.

First let me say that we already have a rent supplement program. It has already been funded at the rate of $32 million. The Congress put $12 million in the program in fiscal year 1966 to begin it. Last year the Congress put $20 million in this program.

This year the administration asked for $40 million, or to double the program. The conference report calls for $10 million, which is one-half of the amount appropriated last year and one-fourth of the amount requested. So the cut in this particular item is not 5 percent; it is a cut of 75 percent below the budget.

May I remind my colleagues also that when we got to conference we were faced with conferees from the other body who had instructions to insist on $40 million of contract authority. We started off with zero.

There had to be a meeting of the minds somewhere between zero and $40 million. One branch of the Congress cannot have its way when there are two coordinate branches. I believe we won the conference, since the funds recommended are 75 percent of these requested. The other body yielded three-fourths of its position and we yielded only one-fourth of ours.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman. The gentleman's point of view did win the conference and the funds for this program were cut drastically. As the gentleman pointed out to the House, the conferees agreed upon a cut in rent supplements of 75 percent below what was requested by the administration. Is that correct?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct. That is the reason why I have no difficulty supporting the conference report, although I have opposed this program, as is well known.

I wear two hats in a conference. Under one I proclaim my individual views. Under the other I am supposed to be working toward a compromise, trying to work out a settlement which is as close as possible to the House figure.

I believe we came as close to the House position as was possible. It is for this reason I support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, will my friend yield me another minute or two?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes, and thereafter I am going to move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I believe I should point out also that in the rent supplement settlement there are some restrictive provisions which were never before in this program, and which I believe will keep it from running away.

There is a provision inserted in the report of the other body which requires sponsors to put up 5 percent. I can assure the Members, from the mail I have received, many prospective sponsors do not like the idea of putting up any part of the cost.

It was the view of the conferees that any sponsor who wants to promote this program should have some equity in it, some of its own money involved. We think this will give some assurance that the program will be operated efficiently, economically, and satisfactorily.

Mr. Speaker, there is another restrictive provision in the House report. I have reference to the requirement that this program be strictly financed through the private sector and without the use of the FNMA special assistance program. If they were permitted to use the special FNMA assistance program, it would be entirely Government financed. We think it ought to be handled and financed through the private sector.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank my friend, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and in so doing want to express my commendation to our ranking minority member, the distinguished and capable gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], who at considerable personal sacrifice successfully fought the good fight for reasonable balance in this appropriation. I also wish to express admiration and regard for the efficient and expeditious handling of a complicated conference on the part of the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

In this conference report, we have settled on $312 million for model cities and special urban renewal therein, and $10 million for rent supplements. This compares with Senate recommendations of $537 million and $40 million. It is a good compromise and involves better than a 50-percent reduction in budget requests for the former and 75 percent for the latter.

I supported the model cities program in the initial House debates and do so again at this time because I believe this program is worth a try. Planning money in the requested amount of $12 million was not in conference, having been agreed upon by both Houses. It will be a while before plans are completed, and HUD is ready to expend the funding for special urban renewal and supplementary grants within the model cities program. But this is 2-year money, and there will be a sufficient leadtime so that the money in the amount appropriated in this conference report can be adequately programed and carefully expended.

There is no question about the need to do something within certain areas of our troubled cities. I am hopeful that the proposals will be effective. HUD will again appear before our Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee within the next 6 months with requests for funding for fiscal year 1969. At that time, it will be possible to review with somewhat greater detail the proposals and progress within this program. In this situation, I heartily recommend a favorable vote on this conference report.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I signed the conference report and urge approval by the House. Because I have opposed the rent subsidy and demonstration cities programs in the past, some explanation is necessary.

As a conferee of the House, I understand my responsibility to try to maintain the position of the House. I did this, but a deadlock with the other body ensued and it was necessary to resolve the differences. In a spirit of conscientiously trying to resolve differences of opinion, honestly held, I agreed with the other conferees to adjust certain line items throughout this important bill. More than 60 items in disagreement had to be resolved. I believe we have resolved them satisfactorily for now. Nevertheless, many of the items require continued study and evaluation and regular review in future appropriations and legislative committee hearings.

The rent subsidy program, in my opinion, is one of the least meritorious programs of this administration. It is deleterious to the American dream of homeownership.

Admittedly, we need to improve the housing in the United States, especially the housing of the poor. But it should not be forgotten that housing in America is the envy of the world. No country in the history of mankind has been housed as well as in the United States. The poor of our country are housed better than the elite of most other countries.

The unique superior housing situation in the United States has been due almost entirely to individual effort, personal pride, family ambition, free enterprise, and the dream of homeownership—not to bureaucracy and not to Federal assistance.

Areas where the homes are owned excel areas where homes are rented in every good aspect of community living. Delinquency, crime, squalor, disease, and costs of government service are greater in districts of home tenancy than in districts of homeownership. There is a real and sociological correlation.

We in the Federal Government should be promoting homeownership and not home tenancy. The Federal programs for homeownership have been far more successful and less expensive. Every program of Federal tenancy has failed or is failing.

Every penny we put into a Federal subsidy for tenancy is money lost to another program doomed to failure, a program counterproductive to the American dream, and a deferment—financially and philosophically—of a program of homeownership.

I have watched and studied the rental subsidy program from the beginnings. I served on the legislative committee and observed the administration force the program through the committee and the Congress without adequate consideration, without considering the consequences—just to have another political ornament to try to impress the poor and to develop another Federal bureaucracy.

Rent subsidies was simply a misappelation to attract favorable and sympathetic attention—and votes. It was not primarily a housing program—as I have said, American housing, even for the poor, was, and is, preeminent. There were other better housing programs and ideas.

Rent subsidies is still not a housing program—its principal objective is integration, not housing. Social, economic, and racial integration is the basic aim.

If housing were the objective, the program would be placed under the jurisdiction or management of housing experts. Almost the exact opposite is the case. Churches and labor unions are to be the operators of the rent subsidy programs. Churches have demonstrated practically no ability to operate housing developments. Their expertise is in other important sociological fields, but not housing. The history of labor union management of housing has been one of insolvency or mismanagement. Labor unions have vast sums of surplus moneys to invest. Housing would be a proper place for investment, but housing management is not their forte.

Housing, especially housing for the poor and for large families, requires a special expertise which the churches and unions do not have. They would not survive in this field without subsidization of their inefficiencies, waste, and mismanagement—for 40 years—by the Federal taxpayer.

Housing should be left to housing experts. If the Federal taxpayer is to subsidize any group, it should not be the churches or the unions. Most churches and unions recognize and admit this shortly after their first venture into the low rental housing business.

There are many better programs for housing. Rent certificates are better in every aspect. So long as we continue to force rent supplements there will be little chance for rent certificates or homeownership programs.

I trust that my agreement with the conferees regarding a $15 million appropriation for rent subsidies will not be construed as accepting the tenancy subsidy program as the final answer. We have an obligation to the poor, to those inadequately housed, and to the taxpayer to do better. We must develop a superior program. We must emphasize homeownership and not tenancy. We must not expect a housing program to accomplish the social, economic, and racial goals of integration.

The demonstration cities is a more honest program. Its objectives to improve the American city are admirable. The Federal Government has a very real and considerable obligation in this field.

But again the program was hastily concocted, politically conceived, inadequately studied, carelessly planned, misrepresented, and simply wrong in many aspects.

I oppose the basic idea of Federal cities. I believe most cities can manage themselves better than the Secretary of the Federal Housing and Urban Development Department. But this is not the real issue here.

We have already appropriated more money to HUD than HUD can spend. Not a single plan has been selected for which planning money can be granted as yet. I have favored the appropriation of planning money consistently. No new idea has ever originated from HUD, but some planning money could probably be used beneficially by the cities.

There is an even more basic consideration that HUD and the Congress is overlooking, which I want to reiterate.

The theory of demonstration cities is that Federal money poured into our deteriorating cities, and managed from Washington, can cure the ills that beset our cities. It is preached to us, that without Federal money and Federal programs we will have riots, juvenile delinquency, crime, disease, unemployment, ignorance, and racial prejudice. We may be deluding ourselves at great cost.

I am agreeing to appropriate funds to a project which has not proved itself to give it a chance. Perhaps we can learn from this experiment. I hope so.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, however, that the principal reason for the riots, looting, arson, sniping, and anarchy is not unemployment, ignorance, poor housing, or racial prejudice. If by some great miracle, the greatest ever—ignorance, poverty, racial prejudice, unemployment, and poor housing—could be eliminated in one fell swoop overnight, we would still have the riots and city problems.

We are overlooking another important cause of the breakdown of our cities, even though I do not suggest that programs for housing, education, training, and citizenship should not be pursued by all segments of our society.

City or community management is a tough business requiring extraordinary expertise, experience, dedication, and cooperation by every individual in the city, neighborhood, or community.

It is easier to manage a business of 10,000 employees than a community of 10,000 souls. Good and bad communities and towns do not just happen by accident. For a city to be good, its citizens must contribute more than they take out or consume.

The success and progress of a city, large or small, or of a neighborhood, does not depend solely upon the mayor or city council. Good city management requires good officials, good city employees, good volunteer officials and workers, good institutions, good citizens. All must have a special competence and a dedicated concern.

The major trouble with our riot-torn, and our riot-prone, cities is that the competent and concerned citizens have moved to the suburbs, leaving the incompetent and the unconcerned to manage the cities and the neighborhoods.

Washington, D.C., is not untypical. The truly competent and concerned people have moved to the suburbs of Maryland and Virginia. Those who have the ability, training, and experience necessary for leadership in government, business, industry, voluntary charities, and public service have moved out. The ordinary citizen with the interest and concern to be a good contributing, productive citizen—the citizen who will manage his family, keep up his yard, take pride in his schools and streets—has moved out in droves.

The people who once built Washington into a beautiful, progressive city were no longer willing to carry the burden for many who were unwilling to contribute their share.

With the exodus of the competent and concerned leaders and citizens, the core areas were left with residents mostly incompetent, inexperienced, untrained, and unconcerned with city or community affairs and management. These people are unable to manage their families, their homes, their jobs or businesses, and, especially, not able to manage a community.

Additionally, into the core areas of our great cities have poured many persons from rural areas who are even less competent, experienced, or concerned with community affairs—and almost totally unable to assume positions of leadership in any sphere of community or city life and, regrettably, unable and unwilling to even contribute their share as ordinary citizens.

Education is probably the most crucial unfilled need, the most urgent unachieved national goal, today. Demonstration cities does not reach either of these two basic troubles of our deteriorating cities. We are being fooled and misled if we buy this expensive, unproductive program without thorough scrutiny, review, and revision.

I hope I have made myself clear. That we should do something to help our cities out of their deterioration. Federal proposals may not be the final answer to all the city problems. Federal money is not a cureall. The demonstration cities program has serious deficiencies and is misdirected. We must improve the Federal role. We can. This will require cooperation by every Member.

The proposed conference report can be adopted, the appropriations for rent subsidies and demonstration cities can be approved to maintain such a spirit of cooperation and to permit other important, successful, ongoing Federal programs to continue without interruption.

Each of us, opponents and proponents, have an obligation to carefully scrutinize these new programs, to improve them and to try to accomplish their admirable objectives in the best possible way. By approving this conference report we are not abandoning our search for better ways to provide better housing and to improve our cities—we are demonstrating a willingness to cooperate.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this conference report deals with the two items that were in disagreement between the House and Senate conferees. Those items are the model cities program and the rent supplement program. In the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Appropriations Committee, I supported the full budget request submitted by the President and concurred in by the Bureau of the Budget and the Housing and Urban Development Department. That amounted to $662 million—$12 million for planning grants, $200 million for add-on urban renewal projects in model cities areas and $400 million for supplementary grants in the model cities program. My position did not prevail and the committee's recommendation of $237 million was adopted by the House for the model cities program. The Senate voted $537 million for this program. The conferees finally agreed to $312 million.

Mr. Speaker, my own judgment on this action is that the cities have been shortchanged. With all of the promise that the model cities program offers to lift the crushing burdens from the core cities of this Nation—together with a real opportunity for these cities to develop some new and challenging programs in the ghettos of the Nation's cities, by this drastic reduction in funding the program, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we are offering "pie in the sky" but little solid food on the table.

However, Mr. Speaker, I have served on enough conferences to know that constant disagreement creates a stalemate and the entire program in which one deeply believes and supports becomes endangered. In order to get a bill at all, it was necessary to come to some adjustment. I do not like the agreement and I did offer suggestions in the conference that would have greatly increased the amount that was brought back to the House. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report. The funds provided will enable the Housing and Urban Development Department to advance beyond the planning stage in model cities program.

Mr. Speaker, on the amendment affecting the rent supplement, I, too, supported the original budget request of $40 million. In our own House subcommittee, the majority favored $10 million but this item was deleted when the bill came to the floor of the House. The Senate restored the entire amount of $40 million. Efforts were made at my suggestion in the conference to come to an agreement of $20 million. No agreement could be reached on this amount and finally a compromise of $10 million was struck. On this basis, I favor the recommendation of the conferees.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the model cities program is one of the most important programs yet conceived to meet the problems of bad housing, slum neighborhoods, unemployment, and all of the things that go into the cloud of hopelessness which hangs over slum areas. At last we have a program designed to put into effect the long-sought goal of a comprehensive attack on the problems of low-income families. Controversial as it is today, I believe that the logic of this approach will prove itself and this kind of coordination of programs will become the pattern, not the exception, of future legislation.

The urgent question before the House today is whether or not we will make a start on this new approach. Every Member of this House is deeply aware of the problems confronting our towns and cities of every size. It is deeply regrettable that we cannot get the full dollar authorization provided in the 1966 act but the important thing right now is to appropriate these funds and make a start on this critically needed new approach to urban problems.

Mr. Speaker, may I also say that the conferees deserve the highest commendation for their hard and sincere work on the many difficult and important provisions in this appropriation bill. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I know the complications and controversy involved in our programs and of course this bill deals with many other programs as well.

It is vital that we support the provision authorizing an additional $10 million in rent supplement contract authority to maintain the momentum of that most promising program. Those of us who have always supported this program deeply regret that we cannot attain the full $40 million requested in the budget. However, it would be a tragedy if we were to lose even the modest amount proposed here. It would be deeply discouraging to the many nonprofit sponsors who are now developing this kind of housing and most importantly, it would be a bitter disappointment to the low-income families who need this housing. To these impoverished people, it would mean that this great House of Representatives has turned its back on their needs and condemned them to continue living in slum housing.

It is deeply satisfying to note that some who originally opposed the concept of privately sponsored, privately operated, privately financed housing for low-income families have studied it further and swung around to favor it. The true measure of a man is his willingness to consider facts in depth and be willing to change his mind when he feels that is the proper course. We welcome their vitally needed support and I hope that the House will approve this provision today by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring my views on the model cities and rent supplement programs now presented as amendments to the Department of House and Urban Development appropriation bill before this committee.

Surely, no Member on either side of the House can say that urban problems of decent housing and city planning are not problems which deserve the attention of the Congress. The problems of this Nation's poor in both urban and rural areas are problems which can be solved with vision and planning expressed in programs of permanent and long-range benefit.

The administration has tried to prove that it can fight a large-scale war, continue foreign aid, and at the same time advance the Great Society. The impending $29 billion deficit and the request for a 10-percent surtax is stark admission that this plan was overly ambitious and has failed. The simple truth is that we cannot afford to be everything at once.

The programs of rent subsidy and model cities are experimental ventures which will require larger sums from now on, if adopted. I am not against experiment, but we must face the fact that we cannot now afford it. For these reasons I will vote to recommit the bill to bring it back to its original cost level as passed by the House, and I will vote against its final passage in its present inflated state.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this House is being asked to fund the rent supplement program with a sum of money that is ridiculous. The $10 million approved by the conferees will not even scratch the surface of the problem—decent housing for all people.

I have no alternative but to support this appropriation, but I do so knowing full well that this is not enough. Our colleagues in the Senate approved $40 million for the program and we all know that even that is not enough to make a real difference. The Full Opportunity Act which I recently introduced would provide $250 million per year for rent supplements. This amount would furnish funds for a meaningful effort. I wish that we could stand today and be counted in favor of such a significant effort to abolish substandard housing. Instead, we are in the unenviable position of fighting just to keep this program alive.

Why, Mr. Speaker, are we denying this program adequate funds? Why, are we denying the needy, the elderly, the handicapped, the opportunity to live decently? Why are we denying private sponsors, builders, and lending institutions the chance to help their neighbors?

At the present time there is a backlog of applications for 15,352 rent supplement units. The amount needed just to cover these applications is $13.5 million. Are we so callous that we can turn our backs on the families that will not be able to live decently because we would not fund this program adequately?

Is there any among us who can turn to these in the slums, the ghettos, the tenements, the shacks, and say I would not help you? Are there those here who care only for the affluent?

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that our friends in the Senate have a good deal more foresight. For the Members of that august body remember Newark and Detroit, Plainfield and Cambridge, Watts and Harlem—and they, in adequately funding the rent supplement program, were looking ahead to the day that one of the burning problems in those cities, and in cities everywhere, would be solved; namely, decent housing for all Americans.

Rent supplements provide the hope and encouragement to people that is needed for them to better their own lives. The program expresses the aspirations that we as a people have for all our fellow men.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will soon have another opportunity to fulfill our deep responsibility to all the people of this Nation. Congress must not keep its back turned on needy Americans.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on the conference report at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. FINO. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FINO moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 9960 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 67.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, is the vote on the motion to recommit, with instructions, concerned with amendment No. 67 and the position of the House with reference to the rent supplement program? It is my opinion that the Members of the House have a right to know upon what they are voting.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri in response to his parliamentary inquiry that the gentleman will have to refer to the conference report in answer to his parliamentary inquiry.

The question was taken.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 198, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

YEAS—184

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Findley
Fino
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Galifianakis
Gardner
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Harrison
Harsha
Henderson
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
Mailliard
Mathias, Calif.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Montgomery
Moore
Myers
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pettis
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tunney
Waggonner
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wydler
Wylie
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—198

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ayres
Barrett
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Casey
Celler
Clark
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dent
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Flood
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
McDonald, Mich.
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Marsh
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Shipley
Shriver
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Watts
Whalen
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—50

Ashmore
Aspinall
Bell
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Carey
Cohelan
Corman
Dawson
Dickinson
Diggs
Everett
Farbstein
Feighan
Fisher
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fuqua
Gray
Halpern
Hanna
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Jones, Mo.
Kirwan
Kyl
Long, La.
McCarthy
McFall
Madden
Martin
Miller, Calif.
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
Pollock
Rarick
Resnick
Ruppe
St. Onge
Sandman
Stuckey
Tenzer
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. St. Onge against.
Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Boggs against.
Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Feighan against.
Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Miller of California against.
Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Halpern against.
Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Tenzer against.
Mr. Ashmore for, with Mr. Carey against.
Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.
Mr. Everett for, with Mr. Hanna against.
Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Diggs against.
Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Cohelan against.
Mr. Stuckey for, with Mr. Farbstein against.
Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
Mr. Sandman for, with Mr. Resnick against.
Mr. Foley for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Madden with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Gray with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Willis with Mr. William D. Ford.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 297, nays 88, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

YEAS—297

Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Berry
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Gallahger
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gude
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
Satterfield
Saylor
Scheuer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Tiernan
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Whalen
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—88

Abbitt
Abernethy
Ashbrook
Baring
Bennett
Betts
Bray
Brock
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Chamberlain
Clancy
Colmer
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Gardner
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harrison
Henderson
Hutchinson
Jones, N.C.
King, N.Y.
Kuykendall
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McMillan
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Montgomery
Myers
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pool
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Sikes
Skubitz
Snyder
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Winn
Zion

NOT VOTING—47

Ashmore
Aspinall
Bell
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Cohelan
Corman
Dawson
Dickinson
Diggs
Downing
Everett
Fisher
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gray
Halpern
Hanna
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Jones, Mo.
Kyl
Long, La.
McFall
Martin
Miller, Calif.
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
Pollock
Rarick
Ruppe
Sandman
St. Onge
Stuckey
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tuck
Udall
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Ashmore.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Fisher
Mr. Udall with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Everett.
Mr. Olsen with Hawkins.
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Downing.

Messrs. BRAY and HUTCHINSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE ACT PROVIDING FOR THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4903) to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$17,500,000".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman would explain the bill and the Senate amendment to the House.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I believe the House is familiar with the bill. It passed the House under suspension of the rules about 2 weeks ago. The Senate amendment reduces the authorization from $25 million to $17.5 million, a reduction of $7.5 million.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would further ask the gentleman to explain to the House, if he will, and comment as he sees fit, on the fact that the bill was passed in the House on two, if not three, different occasions, and this is the first time we have had action on the part of the other body on this bill. Also, that this will relieve the current underdeveloped utility, power, and developmental situation in the Ryukyu Islands.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman is correct. This bill passed the House in the previous Congress. It was approved by the Committee on Armed Services by a unanimous vote, and it passed the House by a great majority, but it was not considered in the Senate. This year the bill was again approved by the Committee on Armed Services by a unanimous vote, and it has now been acted on by the Senate. However, with a reduction in the authorization by $7.5 million.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that I take it the bill was not considered in the other body under suspension of the rules, so that Members of the Senate had an opportunity to amend the bill, and practice a little economy on this giveaway to the Ryukyus.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The bill was amended in the Senate committee, and passed in the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Whatever the procedure, they were not called upon to deal with a bill under suspension of the rules, therefore anyone interested in economy could get at this bill. That was the situation, was it not?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. It passed by unanimous consent of the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea as to whether there was any discussion—and I am pleased that the other body has become the economy body in this instance—but was there a discussion in the Senate with regard to this bill as to the buildup of capital improvements that may within the foreseeable future be taken over by the Japanese if and when the Ryukyu Islands revert to Japanese domination?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. This particular bill is not related to any capital improvements of the nature the gentleman has been talking about.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the day and the remainder of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the next order of business will be the military pay bill that the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina is ready to call up now. We will follow that with a conference report on the HEW appropriation bill which, I understand, has been agreed to. That will be followed by a conference report on the redistricting bill.

As far as I know that is all the business for today, and I have no announcement to make beyond what has already been programed with reference to tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, we have the joint session with the President of the Republic of Mexico for tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

With reference to the conference report on HEW, I believe the minority leader would like to know that we expect that will take only a few minutes under the circumstances of the agreement.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. From what I hear the House should applaud the fine action of the conferees on behalf of the HEW and Labor appropriation bill.

Mr. FLOOD. They did an excellent job.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I clarify one other thing? It is my understanding that the bill on extra-long-staple cotton, which we did not conclude yesterday, will be put over until next week?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. It will be put over until next week.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that I do not believe there will be a great deal of controversy on the conference report on HEW because the conference report carries out the instructions that were given to the conferees by the full House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am still unclear as to when the conference report on HEW may be expected. Today or tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. Today. We expect it will be ready by the time the military pay bill is disposed of; if not, then some time later this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

UNIFORMED SERVICE PAY ACT OF 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13510) to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 13510, with Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, on October 17, 1967, all 40 members of the Committee on Armed Services unanimously approved a proposed pay increase for our uniformed services personnel.

The pay proposal embodied in H.R. 13510 as reported by the committee implements the recommendations of the President of the United States as provided the Congress on April 5, 1967.

As the Members of this body will recall, the President emphasized the necessity for an immediate adjustment in the compensation of the men and women of our uniformed services so as to "assure them and their families that they will be compensated for their service on a scale which is comparable to that of their 2.5 million civilian coworkers."

The President's message also raised the specter of inflation and therefore urged restraint in all sectors of our economy in establishing wage adjustments.

In view of these circumstances, the committee accepted the President's recommendation for a 5-percent increase in the compensation of our uniformed services personnel effective October 1, 1967.

Lest I be misunderstood, the endorsement of this 4.5-percent increase in military compensation should not be construed as precluding the necessity for further adjustments in military pay in the near future.

The 4.5-percent increase in military pay recommended in this legislation, in a very true sense, simply insures that the "real" pay of our service personnel will not slip behind the level of pay provided them in July of last year.

As you will recall, the Congress provided our service personnel with their last pay adjustment on July 1 of last year. However, since that date the Consumer Price Index has increased approximately 4.2 index points, or 3.7 percent of the July 1966 base. Therefore, you can see that this increase of 4.5 percent being recommended today simply permits these service families to keep even with the board. It certainly does not provide them with any significant increase in their pay.

In approving this pay increase for our service personnel, the committee was not unmindful of the fact that Federal employees are scheduled to receive additional automatic increases in their pay on July 1, 1968, and April 1, 1969.

Therefore, since the committee is determined that pay of our service personnel will continue its present relationship to that of their classified Federal contemporaries, there has been included in this bill a provision that, in the event these second- and third-stage increases for Federal employees actually become effective, there will be—in the absence of intervening action by the Congress—comparable automatic increases for our service personnel.

Simple equity demands that we take such action. I am certain that every Member of this body wholeheartedly endorses this principle.

I will now briefly review each of the eight significant changes in the law proposed in this bill.

1. BASIC PAY INCREASE

As I had previously indicated, this bill increases the rates of basic monthly pay of our uniformed services personnel to provide a net 4.5-percent increase in their regular compensation.

Since "regular military compensation" includes basic pay, quarters, and subsistence allowances, either in cash or in kind, and the tax advantage thereon, it equates to the gross salaries payable to Federal employees under the Classification Act. Therefore, because regular military compensation includes elements other than basic pay, a 4.5-percent increase in "regular compensation" translates into a 5.6-percent increase in basic pay.

The manner in which this increase is computed is set out in considerable detail in the committee report.

2. DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT INCREASES

The bill increases the financial assistance allowances provided enlisted personnel with dependents in the lowest pay grades—that is, pay grades E–1 through E–4 with less than 4 years of service—recruit through corporal-petty officer third class. The proposed increases which would affect an estimated 270,000 personnel in the lowest four enlisted grades provide a monthly dollar increase of $5 to $7.50 per eligible member.

3. BACHELOR ALLOWANCES

The bill provides authority to permit the payment of basic allowances for quarters and the dislocation allowance to career bachelor personnel—without dependents—during a permanent change of station. This change would eliminate an inequity in existing law which now flatly denies these personnel entitlement to allowances which are primarily designed to reimburse personnel for expenses experienced upon permanent change of station.

4. SENIOR NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER POSITION

The bill provides a special basic pay rate for the senior noncommissioned officer position of each military service of $844.20 per month. This is $150 per month more than the highest enlisted basic pay otherwise proposed.

The cost is negligible—only four of these positions exist.

5. CONTINUATION PAY

The bill provides new authority to the departments for the payment of so-called continuation pay. This pay would be utilized in the form of a bonus and as a management tool to insure the retention of physicians and dentists of the uniformed services beyond their obligated periods of service.

The legislation authorizes a maximum continuation-pay bonus calculated by multiplying the number of years of estimated additional service times a multiple of 1 to 4 months' basic pay. This management tool is completely permissive in nature and will be offered only to those physicians and dentists who are in critical skill categories.

6. RETIRED PAY ADJUSTMENT FORMULA

The bill also includes a departmental recommendation for refining the existing statutory formula which provides automatic retired pay increases based upon changes in the Consumer Price Index. The formula refinement is admittedly quite technical, but stated as simply as possible, it will tie the annuities of all retired personnel to the same base date for all future CPI adjustments and thus assure equitable treatment for all retirees with respect to CPI movements, regardless of when they retire.

Included in this change is a one-time catchup adjustment for individuals retired subsequent to November 30, 1966, and before October 1, 1967, the proposed effective date of this bill.

This one-time CPI adjustment of 3.7 percent to retired pay would affect an estimated 55,000 retirees with an initial estimated cost of $6.5 million in fiscal year 1968. This cost will decline each year thereafter as mortality reduces the numbers in this group of retirees.

7. PERSONNEL RETIRED PRIOR TO OCTOBER 1, 1949

The bill also would eliminate an unintentional inequity in respect to a group of military retirees who retired prior to the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. In enacting the Career Compensation Act of 1949 the Congress apparently inadvertently failed to permit a small group of retirees the right extended to their contemporaries who retired after October 1, 1949, to include inactive reserve service in their retirement multiple. This omission will be corrected by this legislation.

The Department advises that it supports this change but in view of the small number of personnel affected does not believe that this change will result in any significant increase in retired pay appropriations.

8. FUTURE ADJUSTMENTS IN UNIFORMED SERVICE PAY

As I had previously mentioned, the committee added another provision to this legislation relating to possible future adjustments in uniformed services pay. This provision, which appears as section 9 of the bill, is explained in great detail in the committee report.

This provision is simply "insurance" that service pay will continue to remain comparable to that provided our Federal classified employees. Failure of the committee to include such language would seriously endanger the comparability principle.

This provision, as contained in section 9 of the bill, may or may not cost any money. It all depends on what action Congress finally takes in respect to the second- and third-stage increases planned for classified employees. In the event classified employees receive a second stage increase of 4.4 percent on July 1, 1968, and a third-stage increase of 7.4 percent on April 1, 1969, there will occur an equivalent increase in service pay. This equivalent increase in service pay in fiscal year 1970—July 1, 1969, to June 30, 1970—will cost $2.7 billion.

On the other hand, if the second- and third-stage increases for classified employees do not materialize, section 9 of the bill will not result in any additional increases in service pay and therefore will not result in any increased costs.

SUMMARY

Enactment of this proposal together with the adjustments previously made to the ration allowance of service personnel—increased from $1.13 to $1.30 per day—represents a net increase in compensation for uniformed services personnel for fiscal year 1968 of approximately $633 million—Department of Defense revised figure.

I am advised that the Department of Defense budget for fiscal year 1968 has already included $77.2 million of this cost. Thus, there remains a net unfunded cost of approximately $555 million, which will require a supplementary appropriation.

I am also advised that although the President's fiscal year 1968 budget did include a specific allowance of $1 billion for a civilian and military pay increase, this total allowance was not identified as to particular programs or executive departments and has not appeared in any individual department's budget request to Congress for fiscal year 1968.

Stated another way, the proposed service pay increase will utilize approximately half of the budgetary amount included by the President in his fiscal year 1968 budget for Federal salary increases and will be the subject of a supplemental appropriation request to the Congress for fiscal year 1968.

That completes my summary of the bill and I would be delighted to attempt to answer any questions which might occur to the Members at this time.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. First, I wish to commend the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] for their leadership, and all the members of the committee for their hard work in presenting this acceptable bill to the Committee and to the Congress.

I have had some concern personally, and I am sure many other Members have had concern, about the lack of adequate provision for widows of armed services personnel.

It is my understanding, I say to the gentleman, that under sections 410 and 411 of title 38 of the Veterans Benefit Code, some 10 years ago it was provided that the formula would be based on an amount of $120 a month plus 12 percent of the service member's basic pay.

With the increments which are going to the servicemen, properly based upon the increase in cost of living and the change in the dollar value, it does seem to me that all we are doing for the widows in this particular bill is giving them 12 percent of a 5.6-percent increase. This it seems to me does not provide for the widows of the armed services personnel the necessary funds to take care of themselves in this day and age of increased costs.

Recognizing as I do the concern which the gentleman in the well always has not only for armed services personnel but also for their families, I wonder if he can tell me what if anything has been done by this committee or by any other committee for the purpose of considering an adequate increase, a cost-of-living increase based upon the inflation we are experiencing today for widows and dependents of armed services personnel.

Mr. RIVERS. Let me answer as quickly as I can. First, I agree with the gentleman. I do not believe it is adequate.

That jurisdiction comes under the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] assured me he will have hearings on it. He will begin on Tuesday. I spoke with him today.

I agree with the gentleman. I have run a little test on what the gentleman just said. This roughly comes out a little over 1 percent, so they do not get a sufficient increase. They get a very little bit, about $6 a month for some. I do not believe it is adequate.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is an authority on this. I should like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and let him give a better answer than I have been able to give.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and I, approximately 10 years ago, conducted an intensive study leading to legislation in this very field. I do not know of any bill that was more complicated upon which I have worked than that particular legislation and the problems with which we were faced at that time. It still persists to a degree today. That is the problem that the committees having jurisdiction—instead of just being one committee such as the Committee on Armed Services—at that time the jurisdiction was reposed in at least five different committees.

We did, however, at that time completely revise the survivor benefit package for armed services personnel in a bill which was called the survivor's benefits bill. This bill which was enacted as Public Law 881 of the 84th Congress, gave an increase in benefits to the widows of these veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I wish therefore to say to the gentleman that the statement made by the chairman is essentially correct. As he had indicated primarily jurisdiction of this matter reposes in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Moreover, as the gentleman knows, members of the armed services are entitled to social security benefits and survivor benefit protection afforded by that law. Therefore, the Committee on Ways and Means does have jurisdiction in that respect.

In addition to this, any man who is on active duty may, prior to his retirement, make an election to receive a reduced amount of monthly retired pay and thus provide additional survivor benefit protection for his loved ones.

So it is that if we change one element of survivor benefit protection for the armed services the Congress of the United States must necessarily address itself at the same time, to the other elements if it is to get at the heart of the problem. However, the basic premise as posed by the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina yield?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, as well as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], for a very satisfactory explanation of this matter insofar as I am concerned at least, not only with reference to a very pressing problem, but as to the intention of the committee with reference to this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to conclude my remarks by saying to them, among other things, that it does seem to me that an increase in this particular allotment for a widow would certainly represent an encouragement to, perhaps, develop more enlistments of career personnel in the armed services.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I wish to again commend the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] as well as all of the members of the Committee on Armed Services for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House today for its action. Further, I wish to say that you are legislating in this case upon a matter which is not a simple one in order to insure that the widow and the dependents are adequately protected.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to section 9(a) of the bill which appears at page 14 and which states as follows:

> Effective January 1, 1968, and unless otherwise provided by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, whenever the General Schedule of compensation for Federal classified employees as contained in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, is adjusted upwards, there shall immediately be placed into effect a comparable upward adjustment in the monthly basic pay authorized members of the uniformed services by section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code.

Would the gentleman from South Carolina be so kind as to explain this section?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That is, for the benefit of myself and for the benefit of the other members of the Committee?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if these other increments which are contained in the bill now pending before the other body on behalf of classified employees, go into effect automatically, a similar pay increase will go into effect upon the same date for the military, and in another year, the same would be true.

Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to know the estimated cost of this proposed legislation? If the gentleman does, I shall be happy to tell him, if he wants to know.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. It will cost a lot of money, about $2.7 billion.

Mr. GROSS. The other bill for the classified employees carries an estimated cost of $2.6 billion for classified and postal workers.

Mr. RIVERS. I will tell you what we did. The simple fact of the matter is that it reminds me of a poem which I heard the other day which went like this:

Oh Lord, as I go my own way,
Help me to remember that somewhere out there,
Someone died for me today.

I am sure that I know about which the gentleman from Iowa is speaking. These fellows are just names insofar as many people are concerned, but we have no apology or have no compunction for including this provision in the bill. I am sure, however, that we will have the backing of the Committee.

Mr. GROSS. I do not doubt that the gentleman from South Carolina will have the backing of the Committee.

Mr. RIVERS. If so, it will be the first time that the gentleman from Iowa has not backed the military. You are just kidding me. I know all about you.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me ask this question:

Is the first installment of the pay increase dependent upon the enactment of pay increases for Classification Act and other Federal workers?

Mr. RIVERS. No, sir; this initial 4.5-percent increase will be effected whether or not the other bill passes. But should the contingencies occur which are contained in the other bill, then these second- and third-stage increases will also be given the uniformed services.

Mr. GROSS. I would just like to say that I believe that any pay bill that comes to the House should be supported by the proponents on the basis of merit.

Mr. RIVERS. That is right. This pay increase is primarily based on the cost-of-living adjustment. The gentleman could have voted against the other bill, and still be consistent by voting for this one.

Mr. GROSS. I do not see how I can.

Mr. RIVERS. This is nothing but a pay increase based on the cost of living.

Mr. GROSS. That is what was said about the other pay bill.

Mr. RIVERS. I will say to the gentleman these people are committed to die for you.

Let me read this little poem that someone sent to me, written by Grantland Rice. It goes like this:

Two Sides of War

All wars are planned by older men
In council rooms apart.
They call for greater armament
And map the battle chart.

But out along the shattered fields
Where golden dreams turned gray
How very young their faces were
Where all the dead men lay.

Portly and solemn in their pride
The elders cast their vote
For this or that or something else
And sound the warlike note.

But where their sightless eyes stare out,
Beyond life's vanished joys,
I've noticed nearly all the dead
Were hardly more than boys.

These are they for whom we speak out.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman that despite all the poetry I have an idea——

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman want to hear some more?

Mr. GROSS. No. I could give the gentleman a little poetry, but I do not want to spend all afternoon in that way.

Mr. RIVERS. I think this is pretty good, do you not?

Mr. GROSS. It is all right.

Let me say to the gentleman that with or without a pay increase, I have confidence that the men who compose the U.S. military forces will fight for this country.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course they have, and they will.

The gentleman knows that they do not have a lobby.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe we have to worry——

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman knows that one cannot buy dedication or motivation in sacrificing one's life for their country, and their willingness to die for it. These men do not have a lobby like some of the other people have. The only lobby they have is the Committee on Armed Services, and the gentleman from Iowa, and I am sure he will support this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I know something about pay. My first pay in the Army was $15 a month—in gold.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I join with the others of my colleagues who have complimented the gentleman from South Carolina and his committee for your fine work in bringing this bill out at this time under arduous and difficult conditions. I know I speak the truth when I say that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has earned the undying gratitude of hundreds of thousands of men in uniform who look forward to his leadership.

The pay represented here is meager enough. Our men in uniform are dying in the service of this country and that can hardly be measured by money.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to raise a question at this time and I do not know that it can be answered at this time. But there is quite a bit of interest in this matter in my particular district. It has to do with recomputation and comparability pay and as to when you hope that there may be some action on this matter.

Mr. RIVERS. That was resolved on May 12, 1960, when the House passed H.R. 11318 which authorized recomputation. However, we could not get to first base with the Senate. It was passed by the House, and you will remember I had a fight with my own chairman and with Members of the other body to try to complete congressional action—but could not get it done. I might as well be honest with you. As much as I think it was justified then on the basis of a Government contract, we could not get it. I simply could not see any hope for it now. I may just as well be realistic in answering the gentleman.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I know the gentleman did everything he could.

Mr. RIVERS. If it were possible, I sure would have tried to get it.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank all of your colleagues on the committee.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNEY. I want to compliment the gentleman and his committee for bringing this pay bill before the House.

Some of those boys who just got back on the U.S.S. *Forrestal* were wielding hoses when the fire broke out.

If any Member here thinks that $90.45 a month is worth wielding that hose when the bombs are going off all around, then I say that those men do need some lobbyists in this House.

I hope that this bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. RIVERS. I am sure that it will. I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa who thought I was being facetious with him—you do not compare this military pay with civilians. The two are different things altogether.

Our service people are dying for our country, and I am willing to pay them without any apology.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for the many things he has done for our men in uniform, and the chairman of the subcommittee that made a special investigation on the M–16 rifle.

Mr. RIVERS. I wrote to the gentleman about that today.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I was impressed by the thoroughness of this report and the fact that they called for added testing of the rifle and the ammunition. I will be glad when the gentleman can report something to the House as to their findings in the effort to make sure that our men in battle have the very best weapons that our technology is capable of producing.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say the sole source of procurement was a mistake. We told the Secretary of Defense that he made a great mistake by using a sole source also in the procurement of the ammunition.

The subcommittee which looked into that under the distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Ichord] and other members of that distinguished subcommittee pointed this out. We have written to the GAO and also written to the Secretary of Defense demanding that we be kept advised because that rifle is vital to the defense of this country.

I thank the gentleman for the assistance that he has given us.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman. Can he tell us if the testing that has been recommended by the Ichord subcommittee is now underway?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes; I think it is.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to express support not only for the bill, H.R. 13510, as to its general provisions, but specifically for section 9(a) on page 14 of the bill which, if I understand it correctly will assure that our military pay differential will not get worse in 1968 and 1969, if there is an increase for classified employees in accordance with the bills that are presently pending before the Congress.

I am one of those who believes, with the chairman of this committee, that if there is a comparability gap in the pay of people who serve the U.S. Government, there is more of a gap in the case of the pay for our military people in the Armed Forces than there is in the case of any other employee in our Federal service.

Mr. RIVERS. I agree with the gentleman.

Our committee has tried to keep that gap from getting any wider than it is now.

This bill for the first time automatically insures that should these second- and third-stage pay increases to which I referred in my colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa go into effect, the military will also be given an equivalent increase.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to be counted as one Member who says I think the committee has done the wise thing in this particular instance and I certainly commend the gentleman and his committee and they have my wholehearted support.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I would not wish this opportunity to pass without paying a tribute to the gentleman in the well, the great chairman of our Committee on Armed Services [Mr. Rivers].

I do not know of any man that I have ever known who has shown a deeper heartfelt interest in our service people than the gentleman now in the well.

Today, at noontime, something happened. Our guest chaplain today is an oldtime friend of mine. He is one of the great outstanding leaders of the African Methodist Church. He was born in South Carolina. When he had finished the prayer offering, the gentleman in the well [Mr. RIVERS], a native of South Carolina, a great son of South Carolina, went up and greeted our guest chaplain with warmth and cordiality.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman from South Carolina is doing a great job. He is an honor to his State; he is an honor to the United States of America.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has consumed 34 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13510, the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967.

As we approach this bill, we are taking one further step along the road to bring the pay of our servicemen more into line with the pay of others in our country. Some say we should not compare—yet military should not suffer by comparison.

As our technology grows, it takes longer not only to build new weapons systems, but also longer to teach our servicemen how to use the new weapons and how to keep them in service. The complexities of our missile systems, our new airplanes, our radars, and our sonars are readily apparent to all who have had any opportunity to examine them even most cursorily.

With the heart of our defense effort centered on this kind of technical equipment, it becomes even more important to maintain the cadre of our services, and to try to minimize the turnover in our forces. When a veteran leaves the service to be replaced by a new man, there is a loss of invaluable experience, and there is an added cost of training. The security of our Nation will be enhanced if we can decrease the turnover in our services.

Certainly we cannot expect those who make the armed services their life's career to subsidize the security of the Nation through substandard pay. Since we must maintain a group of full-time career personnel available to use the latest technologies in our defense, it is incumbent on us to see that they do not suffer financially through this decision.

At the present time, the indications are that we are not maintaining this group. For instance, the overall reenlistment rate at the end of the first term for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1967 has dropped to 18.8 percent from 23.2 percent in 1966. The Army dropped to 23.7 from 28 percent; the Navy dropped to 18.9 from 23.7 percent; the Marine Corps dropped to 10.6 from 16.3 percent; and the Air Force dropped to 16.8 from 18.9 percent. Thus we have fewer deciding to make the services their lifetime career to begin with.

There is a further decline in the reenlistment rate for second and subsequent reenlistments. Thus, in the Department of Defense, the overall drop was to 81.1 from 87.7 percent. In the Army the drop has been to 74.2 from 83.4 percent; in the Navy, the drop is to 80.9 from 89.6 percent; in the Marine Corps it is 77.9 from 88.6 percent and in the Air Force the drop has been to 88 from 89.7 percent.

So far I have been talking about enlisted men only. Now let me turn to officers. There are two groups of officers on whom statistics are readily available—the ROTC officers and the Academy graduates.

With respect to the ROTC, the number staying on after the obligated service in the Army dropped to 14.8 percent in fiscal year 1967 from 19.8 percent in fiscal year 1966. In the Air Force the number dropped to 46.3 from 48.4 percent. In the Marine Corps, the number dropped to 36 from 49 percent. No figure was available from the Navy.

For the graduates from the service academies, the numbers of those continuing on past the 5 years after commissioning has showed a drop. In the Army the drop was to 75 from 81 percent. In the Navy, the drop was to 82.9 from 86.1 percent. The Marine Corps dropped to 76 from 81 percent. The last figures available for the Air Force are with respect to fiscal years 1965 and 1966. These too show a drop to 77.8 from 84.8 percent.

In general, compared to fiscal year 1966, there are 5 percent fewer enlisted men staying on after the end of their first term, 5 percent fewer enlisted men reenlisting after the second and later terms, 5 percent fewer ROTC officers staying on after their obligated service, and 5 percent fewer Academy graduates staying on after 5 years after their commissioning.

These figures clearly pinpoint the need to provide additional incentives to make the military service a career.

The Armed Services Committee has been trying to bring the pay of the military personnel into line with other pay for a number of years. We believe we are making progress, but much still needs to be done.

In 1963 and in 1965 we made efforts to bring the military pay more into line with what the civilian employees of the Government are receiving. At the same time efforts were made by the Congress more properly to aline the civilian pay with the pay outside of Government.

Thus in 1963 we reported to the House:

> In summary, abundant evidence was developed from witnesses of the Department of Defense that the critical enlisted retention problem in all the services is associated with retaining individuals in most of the technical occupations upon completion of their initial term of service.
>
> It is obvious to the Committee on Armed Services that we are not now retaining or attracting a sufficient number of the types of individuals so vital to our national security. This situation is becoming steadily more acute in the face of increased competition not only from private industry, but from within the Government itself.

Again in 1965 we reported:

> The failure of military pay levels to keep pace with wage adjustments provided Federal civilian employees and workers in the private sector of our economy has contributed significantly to the inability of the military departments to attract and retain adequate numbers of qualified career personnel. This fact is evident in that among the various reasons given by personnel who elect not to continue their military careers is, invariably, the inadequacy of military compensation.
>
> The inability to attract and retain adequate numbers of highly qualified career personnel is shared by all the military departments. While the problem is particularly acute in the Department of the Navy, as evidenced publicly by the recent plea made by the Secretary of the Navy in which he requested both enlisted and officer personnel who had completed their obligated service to voluntarily extend their period of service so as to enable the Navy to properly meet its operational commitments, it is nevertheless a problem faced by all the services.

This year the efforts are being continued. The President has requested an increase for the civilian employees in order to bring them more into line with outside employment, and an increase for our military, who are still behind. Thus the President recommended a 4.5-percent increase for the civilian employees of the Federal Government in order to "take the final step this year to achieve full comparability with private industry." It was to achieve this parity that the House has already passed the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967.

Now we are to take one more step in bringing the military pay along with the civilian pay. The President has recommended a 4.5-percent increase in the military pay in order to maintain the present comparability. The military pay, however, is not solely the salary as it is with civilian employees. There are additional benefits. No increase was made in the additional benefits. In order to provide the proper increase, then, the base pay only of the military personnel was increased and this was increased 5.6 percent in order to equate it with the overall 4.5-percent increase recommended by the President.

We also want to look to the future for the military personnel. There are already pay increases scheduled for July 1, 1968, and April 1, 1969. As insurance, in case the Congress should fail to do anything further about the military pay, it is provided that any increase given to the civilians would automatically create a comparable increase for the military. Let me hasten to assure you, however, that the Committee on Armed Services does not expect to sit back and do nothing further with respect to the military pay. We expect to continue our efforts to bring the military pay more into line with the civilian pay, and we expect actively to study and suggest further general and special accommodations as may be needed.

This bill is fair and equitable. It should receive the full endorsement of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

No matter how it is explained, there is forward pricing in this bill, as there was in the Class Act bill and the postal pay increase bill, is that correct?

Mr. BATES. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Some of us were violently opposed to that. I do not see how those of us who opposed the two-stage increase in those bills could possibly support this bill with a two-stage increase in it, establishing a pay increase in the unknown future. We do not have the slightest idea what the situation will be in 18 months, or even 12 months from now. I do not see how we can accept a bill of this kind with the forward pricing in it any more than we could accept the pay bill which passed the House.

Moreover, would there have been a military pay bill before the House had Congress seen fit to reject the pay increase for Class Act workers? It was much heralded around here that there would be no increase for the military, that it was predicated upon the Class Act bill.

I like to believe that pay for any segment of the employees of this Government, whether military or civilian, ought to be based upon merit.

Mr. BATES. I want to say very clearly to the gentleman from Iowa that this pay bill—and the pay bill for the military in January will be the same—is clearly based on merit. I make no apology for that.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to say for the RECORD that irrespective of the bill in the other body, a pay bill for the military would have been forthcoming this year. The only difference was in amount.

I want the gentleman from Iowa to hear this. This bill is not contingent. The only thing which connects it with the bill in the other body is that if the two incremental increases go into effect they will go into effect for the military. Otherwise this bill is totally independent of the other. It is based upon the question of the cost of living.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that this bill was approved in the committee and then held in committee for a considerable period of time before being reported out?

Mr. BATES. The bill was held in the committee for a week or two.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and it was brought out only after the other pay bill was passed; was it not?

Mr. BATES. That is correct. However, I will tell the gentleman from Iowa quite frankly that this was done because we were not going to give to the military anything less than we gave to the civilians. So, our position this year has been clearly consistent.

Furthermore, we cannot say to the veteran or to the military personnel fighting for us that we are not going to grant to them the same as that which we grant to others. In other words, we say that we are going to give to them exactly what we give to the others in our civilian employment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to state that I believe I have supported every military bill during the 19 years I have been in Congress. But, I do not see how I can support this bill, having voted against the other pay raise bill.

Mr. Chairman, one of the principal reasons for this is the two-stage increase that would automatically increase pay as much as 18 months hence.

How can I be expected to now determine the uncertain future and approve a pay bill for the military based upon these uncertainties?

Mr. BATES. I do not believe that this will become operative because I believe there will be a new pay bill based on the Department of Defense studies which will go into effect on or after the first of the year. But, everyone has to live with his own conscience. I want to make certain, however, that the military receives the same treatment as the civilian employees of this Government receive.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I find myself in somewhat the same position as does the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], having voted with the gentleman on the postal and classified employees pay bill, my objection being the step increases.

Frankly, I would much rather be in the position today of taking your original percentage of increase than taking the two incremental increases in one lump sum, if that could be offered.

Is there any suggestion or any evidence to the effect that this 4.5-percent increase is actually adequate or is an attempt to only conform to the bill that was passed providing increases for our postal employees and for our classified workers?

Mr. BATES. I do not believe it is adequate. This is a stopgap piece of legislation going back to the first of October. However, after the first of the year, we will get a pay bill which is being thoroughly prepared. We will not necessarily follow the recommendations of the Department of Defense. However, we shall hold extensive hearings upon it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in this first increment it is designed to conform with the President's budgetary proposal?

Mr. BATES. This is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. So it is in the budget?

Mr. BATES. Yes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the second and third incremental increases, has there been any estimated cost of them in dollars and cents?

Mr. BATES. This bill which is pending before us, if the gentleman will look on page 4 of the report, calls only for 9 months this fiscal year at an estimated cost of $626 million. The full year the estimated cost is $810 million. However, an adjustment in cost has taken place since the report was prepared. The present estimated cost is $555 million for 9 months of this particular year.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman agree—again going back to the original part of my question—does the gentleman have any estimate as to the cost of the second and third incremental steps of the proposed increase?

Mr. BATES. Yes. If the information which has been made available to me is correct the second and third steps if they should go into effect, would come to an estimated cost of about $2.7 billion.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer the gentleman from Illinois to page 15 of the report.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I can understand the attitude of many people here today about any pay bill. However, it so happens that the very objections that were raised or mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] when we had the postal rate and pay bill pending before us, were dealt with in a motion to recommit.

When that motion to recommit came on for a vote, I voted for it. However, it did not prevail. As a matter of fact the margin of the vote was but by a small percentage. However, when we came to the final passage, when we voted for the increases contained in the bill, without the motion to recommit, or you voted for no bill.

So now anyone can place his money and take his choice on that.

I do not believe it is a matter of sitting around in the Committee on Armed Services waiting for some other committee to act. As a matter of fact, we worked very diligently and very carefully, and we have come up with these figures.

Now, I agree with the gentleman completely. In my opinion, it would be unconscionable—it would be unconscionable to give to the people in the military service less than we give to the civilian employees. As a matter of fact, I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that a great many people in this body, and we have seen a recent publicity announcement about it lately, favor increasing the pay by tremendous amounts with the intent to move in the direction of a volunteer army. So I can understand that viewpoint. But obviously we cannot do that now.

This country is at war, whether we like it or not. We are at war, and we have a lot of people who are having to make sacrifices, as American boys through all history had to make such sacrifices. So it seems to me that whatever one may have thought about that other pay bill for civilian employees, this bill represents the absolute least that we can do for our boys who are really carrying the burden.

Mr. BATES. I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for his comments. I agree with him fully and, like the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Iowa, I voted for the motion to recommit, but we did not win. We did not prevail. And this other bill went into effect. So we are living with the situation, not the one we had hoped to have, but a situation that other Members voted to have enacted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but some of us—and I happen to be the one who offered the motion to recommit, and did so for the purpose, among others, of trying to stop the two-step increase. Then I voted against the bill because I felt that it violated my financial responsibility as a Member of the House of Representatives for how can I today look into the unknown future insofar as the cost of these automatic increases and the ability of the taxpayers to pay the bills.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I would say——

Mr. GROSS. I still feel that way, and I do not see how I can possibly compromise my position. Take the automatic provision out of the bill and I will vote for it, but I cannot vote for it as it now stands.

Mr. BATES. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I voted for the gentleman's motion to recommit, I followed him that time, and I hope he follows us today.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further on that?

Mr. BATES. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have learned here many times the hard way that we do not always have our own way. I have been here, voting on some measures involving pay increases for people in the Government when I believe at one time I was one of 37 out of 435—and I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts who is now in the well was with me at that time.

But a pattern has been set here. I do not care whether one says that the Committee on Armed Services is following along with another committee or not, because we did not follow anybody, except in timing. But we have now a situation where this House of Representatives—and I finally voted for the civilian pay bill, I want to make that clear, but I did vote for the motion to recommit, because it was based on our own thinking, that they were entitled to some raise—but now the House of Representatives has voted and the question now is do we treat the boys in the military like we treat the other people, the other people in the civilian service? As far as I am concerned, that is not a tough decision.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the gentleman from Indiana has fairly stated the case. I am not going to get emotional about this situation, but there is plenty that we can get emotional about. I have been out at the Andrews Air Force Base when they brought the boys back from Vietnam. I have been out to Walter Reed Hospital. No one can be unaffected by such experiences.

I also want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that never once in my office have I ever had the doors knocked down by anybody in the military, and I want to say, to the contrary, that when the civilian pay bill came up there was not enough room in my office to take care of those who wanted me to vote as they saw fit.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with everything the gentleman from Massachusetts has said.

Mr. BATES. I hope the gentleman then joins us in voting for this.

Mr. GROSS. But with reference to the last remarks made by the gentleman concerning the vote on the motion to recommit, and the fact that it failed, I wish to say that when it failed I then voted against the civilian pay bill. I cannot compromise my position in voting against that bill by voting the pending legislation.

Mr. BATES. I do not intend to compromise the position of the people in the military. The gentleman from Iowa will have to make up his own mind.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATES. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly right. The gentleman from Iowa will have to do whatever he believes is right. He has indicated that he is disgruntled. However, I happen to believe that a pattern has been set. It was not set by my vote, but it has been set because of the majority prevailing, and I am not going to discriminate against the people in the armed services.

Mr. BATES. I think we have covered the issue.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is fair and it is equitable and it should receive the full endorsement of the House today.

Mr. RIVERS. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK].

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, although I am reluctant to support any increase in expenditures owing to the conditions now existing in this country, it is, nevertheless, my purpose to vote for and support H.R. 13510, the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967. The House of Representatives a few weeks ago passed the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 (H.R. 7977). I voted against the latter bill because I did not, and do not now, believe that the national economy is such as to justify any increase in the pay of anyone serving the country in any capacity or at any level. However, since this civilian pay increase has passed the House, it is only fair and proper to vote for a pay increase for the servicemen who are making such a sacrifice for the salvation of our country and the preservation of our way of life.

It is not proper to raise the pay of any Government employees when the Government is laboring under a public debt of more than $336 billion. The annual interest alone on the national debt is in excess of $14 billion, approximately one-third more than was spent for all governmental purposes, including interest, by the Roosevelt administration in 1940, and no one has ever accused Mr. Roosevelt of being parsimonious when it came to spending the taxpayers' money. Under these conditions, I wonder where we will find the money with which to pay for these increases.

In proposing legislation to increase expenditures, the proponents of the same should be required to point out in the legislation the means by which the increases are to be financed. In this case, nothing is mentioned of the method of financing, and all that we know is that it will add to the annual deficit and to the national debt, and thus bring further inflation and devaluation of our currency. We have nothing in the Treasury with which to pay these increases, and all we can do is add another item on the cuff.

We all know that Moses was the meekest man, Solomon the wisest, and Samson the strongest, but neither or all of them, acting in concert, could pay out a cent if he did not have it, and that is just about the condition we are in here today.

This wild orgy of spending must come to an end. The day of reckoning is here. The people are unable and unwilling to pay any more in taxes, and it is unsafe for us to embark on a limitless sea of indebtedness. This, I believe, is now clear to all, and the people of the country are at last aroused and are determined to do something about it. If the present Congress is unwilling to curb spending, the people in the next election will send a Congress here determined to do so.

We hear much in the Congress and read in the press of late with respect to certain cuts taking place here in the House of Representatives. There are few, if any, reductions in present or previous spending programs. The reductions have been made in the budget, and the budget is nothing more than a request by the executive departments for increased spending. Thus, a reduction in the budget, unless it goes beyond present spending, is really no reduction at all. It is a misnomer and serves to mislead the people of the country into believing that the House of Representatives is reducing expenditures when they are doing no such thing. I hope it can be made plain to the people at home that this is the situation.

It is natural for us to wish to increase salaries of our Government employees, and particularly the men and women who are serving in our Armed Forces. I would remind you, however, of the admonishment that comes down to us through the ages from the Gospel according to St. Matthew wherein it is said:

> For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?

The sacrifice of our servicemen would mean less than nothing if they defeated the enemy, or even the whole world of enemies, and then lost their own country and their own souls. In such a case, all that we have struggled for and gained, and all that we hope to be, would be toppled over into the abyss of lost liberty.

It is incumbent upon us as representatives of the people of America, as well as these servicemen, to be as faithful and as patriotic, as diligent and determined, in defending our fighting forces on the homefront as it is their duty to defend us in the foreign fields.

Let me say in conclusion that the servicemen have no lobbyists and are not asking for anything. They belong to no union, save the Union of the United States of America, for which they have spilled their blood on the battleseas and battlefields of the world. They deserve and must have the best that there is in America.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, my chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], our distinguished ranking minority member, have explained this bill in some detail and I believe it is pretty well understood by all Members.

I would like to direct my comments to some other matters of concern in our committee.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention first to what occurred last week in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, last weekend Washington witnessed a tremendous gathering of vulgar, nondescript creatures bent on destroying our very Nation. But we observed with pride that the situation was handled neatly and effectively by the handful of dedicated servicemen and Federal officials to whom the task was assigned. Their forbearance and restraint in the face of untold provocation deserve the highest praise. In addition, their appearance and conduct were in startling contrast to the mawkish miserable masses confronting them as the maliciousness of the latter's demonstration unfolded for all to see.

According to today's paper, that demonstration cost the American taxpayers more than $1 million. Perhaps in the future, we would be well advised, as a condition precedent to the issuing of an assembly or parade permit, to require the posting of a cash bond in a sum sufficient to pay for all expenses, including damage caused and the cost of cleanup.

We must, of course, be careful not to let what has happened lead to steps which would in any way foreclose proper dissent. No matter how vigorous or unpopular. But I know of nothing in our constitutional guarantee of freedom of assembly or speech which requires this Government to permit, condone, or tolerate actions of individuals or groups whose purpose is the violent overthrow of this Government. Nor do I know, Mr. Chairman, of any right which any American or alien has to use mob techniques to impede or impair the ability of officials of this Government to perform their statutory responsibilities.

Understandably, there is much disagreement about our foreign policy and the conduct of the war in Vietnam. For myself, however, I completely support the President's policies for Vietnam, and I am sure that he is seeking every possible way to end the war honorably. But support for the President does not lessen your responsibilities and mine—and not just our constitutional responsibilities to raise and support the necessary military forces and to provide them with the best of equipment. We have the responsibility, also, to make constructive suggestions.

This is my duty—not only a a Member of Congress, but also as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on National Defense Posture, which Chairman RIVERS appointed on August 1, to conduct a full and thorough inquiry into various phases of our national security. The other members of the subcommittee are Messrs. HÉBERT, STRATTON, HALLECK, and DICKINSON. Mr. RIVERS and Mr. BATES are ex officio members.

Our task, in the broadest terms, is twofold: First, to determine the military obligations, both actual and potential, imposed on us by our worldwide commitments and foreign policy objectives, and second, to assess the capability of our Armed Forces to meet these obligations. Within this framework, we have been directed, among other things, to determine the status of plans, including contingency plans, for achieving a victory in Southeast Asia and the personnel and equipment required to get the job done.

In order to make the undertaking more manageable, we intend to concentrate on one geographical area at a time. We have, of course, selected Southeast Asia for our takeoff point.

Because of the security classification of the testimony, information, and documents we must consider, all of our work up to now has been in executive session. The decision was also made that the work of the subcommittee could best proceed—and the national interest best be served—by conducting our inquiry with minimum publicity. Therefore, we have issued no press releases and have made no announcements of our activities and plans.

However, I feel that you will want to know that we have heard preliminarily from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Department of State. The information and data which we are assembling in this manner will help establish the foundation for the more detailed inquiry to follow, including an intensive field examination.

Although we are some weeks from findings and conclusions, I can report that the picture in Vietnam is brighter than I had expected to find it.

However, it is becoming increasingly evident that, if we are to get on with the job and bring this war to a speedy and successful conclusion, some significant improvements in the Defense Department's military decisionmaking process are in order.

Basically, we all have a common duty—a duty to country. Not a selfish or self-serving duty, but an interlocking, combined effort of all parts of our Nation and Government for the common good.

Under the Constitution, it is the solemn responsibility of the Congress to provide for the common defense by raising and supporting military forces which are adequate to insure our national security. And it is the unquestioned responsibility of the President to be the Commander in Chief of those forces.

It is upon this principle of coequal constitutional functions that our national security depends—Congress provides the sword which is wielded by the President. The National Security Act of 1947, as amended, states that the Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the national defense. He, therefore, becomes the President's agent in furnishing the Congress with factual information in order that the Congress can provide for the common defense. I emphasize "provide for the common defense," for these are the words that constitute our mandate.

Congress has underscored the close cooperation which should exist between the military and the legislative branch by stating in the National Security Act:

> No provision of this act shall be so construed as to prevent a secretary of a military department or a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from presenting to the Congress, on his own initiative, after first informing the Secretary of Defense, any recommendation relating to the Department of Defense that he may deem proper.

Unfortunately, the existing procedures in the Department of Defense are producing some serious roadblocks in our obtaining this information. Instead of supporting the team effort that is called for, there is more of a tendency to make that Department a one-man show. There is also evidence to indicate that the Secretary of Defense, in reaching his decisions on purely military matters, may be giving undue weight to the recommendations of his civilian staff planners as opposed to those of the heads of the military services and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

One thing is certain. The secretaries of the military departments and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not beating a path to the doors of Congress with recommendations, as contemplated by law.

However, there has been a manifestation of interest on the part of some of the secretaries in how we are doing our work.

The law also specifically provides that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are the principal military advisers to the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense. I can say with some assurance that the Secretary of Defense seldom seeks advice from the Joint Chiefs. Our information is that he does meet with them each Monday, with many others also present, and he does most of the talking.

I can add with even more assurance that the Joint Chiefs seldom directly advise either the President or the National Security Council.

The aim of the Armed Services Committee, and the main effort of the Subcommittee on National Defense Posture, is to promote the national security and improve our military posture. As I indicated earlier, we have a duty to uphold our responsibilities as a member of the national defense team.

We are not engaged in any witch hunt. We have no preconceived conclusions. Nor should it be assumed that the subcommittee has any desire to embarrass anyone in the Department of Defense. We are making every effort to do this job as objectively as it can be done. Indeed, the very nature of the inquiry demands this. We are concerned with national survival and Mr. McNamara should welcome our help, just as we welcome his.

Many of the present membership were serving in this Chamber when the National Security Act was enacted and later amended to grant broad powers to the Secretary of Defense in recognition of the burdens of his office. At no time, however—and I cannot emphasize this too strongly—at no time did we act to disturb the constitutional mandate to the Congress as expressed in article I, section 8.

We had hoped that in vesting the Secretary of Defense with these broad powers we were not disturbing the right of Congress to call on representatives of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines for frank discussions on the state of our defenses and our ability to preserve our national security.

My concern is simply this—the Congress is powerless to carry out its mandate and discharge its constitutional duties unless accurate, candid, and timely information is provided by officials and officers of the Defense Establishment. We cannot meet our obligation if the information we receive has been run through a screening process to filter out elements of divergent opinion and factors which may suggest that Pentagon decisions are sometimes less than perfect. We are entitled—indeed it is essential—to have officers of the services speak freely, and we must have the best, most professional advice available if we are to provide our fighting forces the basic necessities and arms that should be second to none.

Certain procedures and policies of the Department of Defense, in effect, constitute an impediment to the constitutional process. As Members of Congress, our time is severely limited and there simply is not time in a 24-hour period for us to devote full time to one committee, one pending law, or the voluminous correspondence piled high on our desks. It seems completely unnecessary that we spend endless hours to elicit the needed information from reluctant witnesses who are gagged and hamstrung in advance. In order to reach sound conclusions, our people in uniform must be able to speak freely and candidly, and not be limited to presenting predigested statements which contain only what the Secretary wishes us to know.

Because of the frequent apparent lack of candor or full responsiveness to congressional inquiries, it can be reasonably concluded that the Department of Defense does not understand that congressional involvement in our national defense posture stems from more than idle curiosity—that Congress is not merely an interested observer in military affairs, but a very active participant. This congressional participation is a fact of life and an inseparable part of the constitutional process. Unless this is accepted, we will have a house divided.

Gen. Omar Bradley understood these processes, and I would like to quote that distinguished American. Speaking before the House Appropriations Committee in 1948, he said:

> Under our form of government, the military policy of the United States is shaped by the Congress, not by the Armed Forces . . . because of the fact that Congress controls the appropriations which in the final analysis do control military policy, the size of forces, and so forth.

The uneasiness that pervades the Nation today is born of unanswered questions. The work of the Congress can result in meaningful legislation only if the Department of Defense adopts a cooperative policy. Unless the Congress is included in the huddle, the signals of the Commander in Chief will never be understood by vital members of the team.

Lately we have been hearing about a credibility gap. The credibility gap that concerns me most is the one between the Congress and the Defense Department which has widened over the years. This ought not to be. It will be a tragedy indeed if, at this late hour, the President's conduct of the war becomes increasingly regarded as a mishmash of dissent, confusion, and skepticism because of the Department's failure to understand and accept the true role of Congress in our national defense.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this bill and believe it is a substantial step toward something we all desire—the establishment of a career military which hopefully can some day make the draft obsolete and unnecessary.

This bill is a very favorable reflection of the able leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking Republican on the committee.

I do have a couple of minor reservations which I recognize must succumb to the practical situation of the moment. I expressed reservations in the committee to section 9 which, for this time at least, establishes a prospective pay increase based upon what has been done for civil service and postal field service employees.

I know that throughout this debate it has been made amply clear that this is not intended to be a precedent for the future. But in an abundance of caution, and to tie it down in simple words once more, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if I am correct when I make the statement that tying a future pay increase to what is done for postal and civil service employees, as is done in section 9, is only a temporary situation to meet a temporary problem, and in no way constitutes a precedent for the future establishment of military pay?

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman is correct. Neither does it make us committed to this. Furthermore, there is a study going on now in the Department of Defense which may change the entire philosophy of how we pay the military. We may junk all of this in the future, and a lot of what has been done in the past, if we accept it. We do not know what we will do.

We say this, "If you pay these people in the future, give the military comparable consideration."

That is it.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman. Those words are very reassuring to me.

I do have one other pang of conscience about this bill. Again, I recognize that the practical situation of the moment deems we cannot do anything about it.

I refer to the question of recomputation of retired military pay. For more than 100 years, retired military pay was based upon current active-duty pay. Every time there was a change in active-duty pay the retiree was entitled to recompute his retired pay on the basis of the current active-duty pay. For 100 years that was the case. It was a moral right and it was a legal right of every person who retired from military service.

In 1958, Congress did an about-face and said that in the future a retiree could only have his retired pay increased in accordance with the cost of living or the consumer price index.

We did not repeal the law which called for recomputation. In fact, 5 years elapsed before we repealed that law.

Then in 1963 we did repeal the law, and we did pass another pay bill, and we corrected the injustice which was done to those retired prior to June 1, 1958, by allowing them to recompute on the basis both of the 1958 act and of the 1963 act. Then recomputation was cut off for the future.

It is my contention that we have a moral and a legal obligation to all of those who retired prior to June 1, 1958, to make good on the bargain which we made with them, because they retired under circumstances where they had a legal right to recompute.

Although Congress served notice to all those who retired after June 1, 1958, and acted in good faith to that extent—even though I may not have agreed with it—the Congress did not act in good faith with respect to those who retired prior to June 1, 1958.

I recognize we are confronted with a tight, perilous fiscal situation, and to talk about adding still another $30 million, or perhaps as much as $117 million, to this bill is not practical in this time of crisis. However, I cannot let this moment pass without merely reiterating what I have always believed, that Congress has broken faith with those who retired prior to June 1, 1958. I hope someday to see that breach of faith corrected.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I speak on this bill with some trepidation. In May I spoke on a bill out of the Armed Services Committee on the subject of student deferments, and I got some 41 Members to vote with me. Then in August I spoke on a bill regarding military construction. I got one other Member to vote with me.

The tide is not running my way. I just hope that my speaking on behalf of this bill does not jeopardize its chances of passage. I thank the distinguished chairman for taking that chance.

I merely would like to say, although I was dubious about the conditions of the draft bill and I may have questioned the conditions under which our military people participate in their involuntary servitude, I am not going to combine that with slave wages also.

This bill did pass the Armed Services Committee unanimously. I do not see, really, how any Member of the House of

Representatives can vote against it. I guarantee I cannot.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I should like to point out, as just stated by my colleague from New York, after a lot of consideration this bill was reported unanimously.

I believe that result came about because of our hard-working chairman and ranking minority Member working together, with all of us on the committee, in these times which we face.

Whether the Members may agree with our policy in Vietnam or not, we are there by virtue of the acts of our Commander in Chief. Whether Members agree or not, we should show overwhelming support of our men who have made our freedom possible, have made our freedom of speech real, and have made it possible for those who want to speak out to so speak today.

Unfortunately, this does lead some people in other sections of the world to not understand the basic principles of our Constitution, and how we can permit that, yet have the determination to carry out our commitments to the world.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a brief, but deserved statement of gratitude to the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina. I know that I speak for the members of the committee and our colleagues here in the House when I say that it is with the most profound admiration that we recognize the fine and courageous leadership, hard work, and tremendous ability of the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we are presently considering H.R. 13510, the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967, and we meet in a time of conflict. Those in the uniformed services of the United States are Federal employees. They are engaged in that most basic function of the Federal Government—the provision for the common defense.

Who among us could fail to grasp the need for the maintenance of a capable, well-paid group of men in the uniformed services of the Nation? This measure has nothing to do with support for or opposition to the struggle in Southeast Asia. It is a simple matter of equity—fair treatment for those engaged in the service of the American public.

During recent weeks we have passed favorably upon pay raises for both Federal classified employees and postal workers. The former received a 4.5-percent pay increase this year, and the latter, a raise of 6 percent. This bill provides for a 5.6-percent increase in the uniformed services' pay. It will allow this particular group of people in the Federal service to keep pace with their counterparts in the various agencies and Federal departments.

Our committee took care to make a specific point that the pay increases outlined in this legislation be automatic. As our report points out, the new language in section 9 of the bill clarifies the measure sufficiently to avoid misconstructions of the law regarding Presidential discretion in the establishment of future pay increases for uniformed services personnel.

If the President has any changes to suggest, he may submit them to the Congress and we will consider them in the traditional manner. But if such recommendations are not forthcoming, or if they do not meet the approval of the Congress, our uniformed service employees will not be left in the lurch. They will retain the benefits of H.R. 7977, which guarantees the relative comparability of their pay with that of their Federal classified colleagues.

There are those who might say that servicemen are not paid in accordance with their real responsibilities, and that military pay in some categories ought to be sharply raised. There are others who would probably like to see a relative gain on the part of those who now sit at the bottom of the military pay structure. The committee has heard all these views, and it is my belief that there is truth on both these sides. For this reason, the bill we recommend here today allows the uniformed services to keep up with the rising cost of living with an immediate across-the-board raise. There is no limitation on the traditional prerogatives of the Congress. We may change any of the components of the rate structure as we deem fit.

The legislation has eight basic points:

First, a basic monthly pay increase of 4.5 percent in "regular compensation."

Second, increased allowances provided under the Dependents Assistance Act for enlisted personnel in the lowest pay grades; E–1 through E–4, with less than 4 years of military service.

Third, provides authority to pay the basic allowance for quarters and the dislocation allowance to certain bachelor personnel.

Fourth, provides a special basic pay rate for the senior noncommissioned officer position of each military service.

Fifth, provides authority for the payment of "continuation pay" to physicians and dentists in the uniformed service, as an inducement to extending their periods of service beyond the obligated time.

Sixth, most importantly, it provides a refinement in the formula for computing future increases in the retired pay of uniformed services personnel responsive to changes in the Consumer Price Index.

Seventh, eliminates an inequity in the computation of retired pay for personnel who left the service prior to the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

Eighth, provides language which will insure that uniformed services personnel will, in the future, be given increases in the level of their compensation comparable to that enjoyed by their civilian contemporaries in the Federal Government.

With respect to the American commitment to South Vietnam let me say the following: First, not all Americans have asked to fight there, many have been asked to go. Second, they serve with a very strong sense of duty. In the minds of those among us who support the President's policy goals, these fighting men are heroes, and it is not our purpose here on this occasion to engage in a debate regarding our Vietnamese commitment. We are here to assure our uniformed service men and women equity in pay and benefits, so that when they serve this country—whether it be in peace or war, at home or far away—they may be sure in the knowledge that America is aware of their dedication and appreciative of their sacrifices. To oppose this bill on grounds of opposition to our foreign policy would be an exercise in futile and irresponsible discrimination against men and women dedicated to the public service.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that as a conscientious member of the Committee on Armed Services, this legislation has been given the most careful scrutiny of the committee. It is a responsible and well-reasoned measure designed to give the members of our uniformed services equitable treatment on the matter of compensation. If we desire to uphold the quality of the American services, let us insure that they receive adequate pay. If we desire to do right by those whose daily task is to defend us all, let us pass this bill.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I intend to support H.R. 13510, the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967.

There are 40 members of the Committee on Armed Services and on October 17, less than 10 days ago, every one of those members were present and unanimously approved the proposed pay increase for our uniformed service personnel. The matter was considered thoroughly. There were differences in viewpoint and considerable discussion and debate as to proper wording and phraseology, but when the time came for approval, there was not a single dissent. The bill was unanimously approved.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide adjustments in the regular compensation of members of the uniformed services, both active and retired, which are necessary because of increases in the cost of living.

Last April the President, in a message to Congress, underscored the necessity for an adjustment in compensation for our men and women in uniform. He suggested then that their compensation should be comparable to the civilian Government workers. In that same message he pointed to the need for pay increases if we expect to retain skilled manpower which is so vital to the maintenance of our national security. The President recommended in his message a 4.5-percent increase in what is described as "regular compensation." It is noteworthy the committee has accepted the present recommendation and it has not enlarged upon it. However, to avoid any misinformation, it should be recalled that military compensation includes elements other than basic pay which means that the 4.5-percent increase in regular compensation translates into a 5.6-percent increase in basic pay.

There are some eight important changes in the old law, including authority for the payment of continuation pay to physicians and dentists to insure their retention beyond their obligated periods of service. There are increases for allowances under the Dependents Assistance Act which will affect 270,000 personnel in the lowest four enlisted grades. This will provide a monthly dollar increase from $5 to $7.50 per eligible member. Among other provisions is the elimination of inequity in the computation of retired pay.

One of the most important provisions of the bill is section 9, which was rewritten under a committee amendment designed to insure uniformed services personnel increases in the level of their compensation comparable to the increases of their civilian contemporaries in the Federal Government. The committee amendment set out in italic rephrases the original language and in effect substitutes a new section for old section 9.

The intent of this new language is to make clear that follow-on pay increases for the uniformed services will be equivalent to the second and third stage increases scheduled for Federal classified employees on June 1, 1968, and April 1, 1969, and will be automatic. The old section may have left some doubt as to Presidential discretion covering these future pay increases, but the new language removes any possible construction for Presidential discretion. There is a comprehensive compensation study being conducted by the Department of Defense and if this reaches Congress in a timely fashion, Congress may act on these Presidential recommendations and set aside the provisions embodied in section 9. If no recommendations are forthcoming, or if such are received and are not acted upon by the Congress and meanwhile the pay of Federal classified employees is increased in stages provided in H.R. 7977 as passed by the House on October 11, then under this new section 9, uniformed personnel will retain their relative comparability with that of their Federal classified coworkers.

This provision was regarded by the committee as a form of insurance that service pay will continue to remain comparable to that provided classified employees. If we had failed to include such language we would have failed to provide for the comparability principle.

There is no doubt that the enactment of this bill will be costly. It is estimated it will cost over $630 million for the 9-month balance of fiscal year 1968, or from October 1 to June 30. One full year would cost approximately one-quarter more or about $810 million.

If there is any part of this bill that is in any way to be questioned or raised as a possible controversy, it would have to be section 9 with its provision for automatic future increases in pay for the uniformed services. But the House acted affirmatively in providing such second- and third-stage increases for our civil servants and our postal employees.

There may be some Members who do not favor future increases for our service personnel but if we are to put the matter in perspective we must recognize we are facing a condition and no longer a theory. The House has already acted to approve second and third stage increases for Federal classified employees. If we do not approve this bill today, including section 9 providing for stage increases for military personnel we will find ourselves in the position of discriminating against those in the uniformed services. For myself—I cannot see that happen. I am sure most Members do not wish to be placed in that position.

Repeating, the committee accepted the President's recommendation of 4.5 percent pay increase. Our only departure was the addition of provisions for fair and equitable future increases comparable to civilian contemporaries.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation deserves to be approved.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I favor the pending bill. It conforms with the action previously taken by the House with respect to a pay raise for Government employees. In this respect there can be no valid reason why pay raise for the military should not be comparable.

This bill was thoroughly considered by the House Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member. It was reported out unanimously. It is anticipated that the measure will be readily approved here today. While I will of necessity be absent when the vote is taken—because of a prior commitment in my district this evening—I want the record to show that if I were present I would vote in favor of passage of H.R. 13510.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, on this day when we are considering a very important piece of military legislation, I would like to take special note of a very important event which occurred earlier this month. I am referring to the announcement that Admiral Rickover is scheduled to continue on active duty for an additional 2 years. As many of you know, he reached the mandatory retirement age of 64 on January 27, 1964. Because of his great contributions to the security of our Nation, he was asked to continue on active duty for an additional 2 years. Upon the expiration of this first 2-year period beyond the mandatory retirement age, arrangements were fortunately made for continuation of Admiral Rickover on active duty for an additional 2 years. Since this second 2-year extension expires in January 1968, special arrangements had to be made to continue Admiral Rickover on duty beyond January 1968. If we can believe press reports that appeared earlier this month, strong force was exerted in certain quarters to end Admiral Rickover's career as an active officer. I believe the Nation as a whole should rejoice that these forces did not accomplish their objective, and that Admiral Rickover has been asked and has agreed to continue on active duty for an additional 2 years.

I want to express to Admiral Rickover my thanks and my relief that he will continue to work for the national security of our Nation. I am sure many of my colleagues in this Chamber join me in offering our assistance in any way that we can in order to help him in his work. Admiral Rickover has made it possible for us to be first in the field of naval nuclear propulsion. I am sure we can look to him for maintenance of this leadership.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this measure. Despite my conservative fiscal approach to matters in the present serious financial situation of the country I believe that this measure is a just and a proper bill to enact.

Financing our Government and the war effort in Vietnam continues to be a most difficult problem. The situation can be summarized by a few figures. The national debt is now $340 billion. The interest on the national debt each year is approximately $14 billion, the largest single item after national defense. The deficit this year is estimated to be approximately $30 billion. The costs of the war in South Vietnam are increasing and now run around $2 billion each month.

In an effort to keep costs down, I voted against the pay raise bill for postal and classified Federal employees. I voted against the bill because I thought it was excessive in light of the present fiscal situation of our country, and also because it provided, improperly I thought, for procedures for a congressional pay raise. I would have happily voted for the employee pay raise suggested by the President in amount of 4.5 percent, but the pay raises involved in that legislation will within 2 years reach in the case of postal employees 12.8 percent and in the case of classified employees 17.2 percent. Further it is obvious that this country cannot in good conscience fail to make the comparable raise in pay for soldiers who are fighting for us in South Vietnam. When the military personnel are finally included in this pay raise situation, the total additional cost of this pay raise legislation will amount to an annual increase of $5.1 billion. In my opinion that is excessive and not in the best interest of our country. But we cannot begin our economizing with those who risk their lives for our country.

Economists are unanimous in warning of inflationary trends, and it has been my firm conviction that we should keep down the costs of Government at this particular time, should close all inequitable loopholes in the tax laws, and we should try to do these things before we pass a tax increase. The dangers and inequities of inflation are so grievous that I am not pledging myself to refuse all tax increases until these other good objectives are achieved. It may well be that your Congressman may have to vote for a tax increase in order to fight inflation, if Congress as a whole will not bring about the fiscal reforms which I am supporting.

The following figures given to me by the Treasury Department are revealing as to the relative hurt coming to middle-income families from inflation as compared with a tax increase. An average American family with two children and income of $7,500 paid an income tax in in 1966 of about $686. The President's 10 percent surtax proposal would add $70 to their tax bill, or about $5.83 per month. Leading economists believe that without the surtax, prices will raise 4 percent more than they otherwise would have. This will mean that $100 of consumer purchases—food, clothes, appliances—will cost $104. If our average family spends one-third of its $7,500 income, or some $2,500 for purchases of consumer goods, it would cost them $2,600 with the 4 percent increase in prices. This means an additional monthly cost to our average family of $8.33, compared with the added cost I referred to earlier of $5.83 per month which would result from the surtax. The surtax would save the family money—about $30 a year—if you compare the cost of inflation. In any event we should pass the bill now before us.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I support the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967.

Substantial benefits will result from the enactment of H.R. 13510. The members of the Armed Forces will receive increased pay, which will compensate for recent cost-of-living increases. This House has passed legislation increasing the pay of civilian Federal employees; certainly we can do no less for our military men and women who serve around the globe.

The legislation before the Congress, if enacted, will increase the regular military compensation by 4.5 percent. This translates into a 5.6-percent increase in base pay. Equally important, the bill will increase the allowances, under the Dependents Assistance Act, of enlisted dependents in the lowest pay grades, from E-1 to E-4, with less than 4 years of military service.

The compensation of personnel in the junior ratings has always been too low, in my opinion, especially when those members have families to support.

The Armed Forces must be able to continue to attract qualified, highly motivated, and competent personnel as career officers and noncommissioned officers. Unless the pay scale is continually adjusted to compare favorably with civilian Federal pay, the military will surely lose many of its most talented and highly trained personnel to the civilian sector. I do not have to remind the Congress that never before has there been a greater need for professional performance in the Armed Forces.

This legislation does not solve all the problems of military pay inequities. It does accomplish part of the task, and therefore should be passed. The half-million men in Vietnam, of course, are giving the greatest measure of service to country, but there are also millions of other men and women, scattered throughout all the nations, who have left family and friends and home to serve their country in these difficult days. Their compensation must be adjusted to reflect the changing economic conditions of the day; every consideration given their civilian counterparts must be accorded them as well.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I very strongly favor and support this bill to increased the pay of our uniformed services.

This measure is sound, fair, well-drawn and does substantial justice to members of the armed services and their dependents.

The bill increases the regular military pay generally 4.5 percent, increases allowances under the Dependent Assistance Act for enlisted men in the lowest grades.

It also provides certain quarters and dislocation allowances, and provides a special pay rate for senior noncommissioned officers of all the military services.

It also provides "continuation pay" for doctors and dentists to insure or encourage their retention on active duty beyond their period of obligated service.

It proves a practical legal mechanism for automatically raising military pay when civilian pay is raised under the Consumer Price Index.

It permits computation of retired pay for limited classes of personnel retired prior to the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

It provides for a comparability principle in equating military and civilian Federal pay raises, under some conditions.

Certainly, we cannot allow military pay and allowances for those in our armed services, who are giving so much, and sacrificing so much for the country, to fall behind the rate increases for Federal civilian employees. This principle is so obvious that it needs no argument. The justification for this bill is virtually self-evident.

I urge that the House approve this bill by unanimous vote and I hope the provisions of the bill will become effective at an early date.

This is legislation that is a must, and it will be overwhelmingly approved by the people and the country.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice to those who support the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967, which is before this House today. Its enactment is essential to express the commitment of the country to those serving in our armed services.

The serviceman lives a life with a purpose as noble as any and more noble than most. It is time that we begin to recognize the responsibilities, duties, and sacrifices that he makes. One of the ways that this can be done, and I am first to admit that this is a very minimal way, but one essential, nevertheless, is to begin to pay him commensurate to what he gives.

In economic terms, the need for this legislation is compelling. A drafted private first class in combat makes $170 a month, while a civilian warehouseman in Saigon earns $1,000 a month. A GI clerk-typist earns $170; a civilian secretary in Saigon, $600. An Engineer Corps battalion commander makes $958 while a civilian construction boss makes $2,222 a month.

In substantive terms, the increases provided are very minimal. A recruit now receives $90.60 a month. His pay would be raised $5.10 a month.

A man just out of basic training receives $100.50. His pay would go up $6.40 a month.

A general with more than 30 years in the service now receives $2,001.60 a month. His pay would be increased to $2,113.80 a month.

Overall the increase will be 4.5 percent and over the next year and a half increases in pay for the military will be similar to increases for civilians working for the Government.

I wish that the legislation would reward the serviceman more richly—now and in the future—although to reward him as richly as he deserves would be impossible.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that this House, after due consideration, will overwhelmingly approve this bill before us, H.R. 13510, designed to make equitable adjustments in certain allowances and to sensibly increase the basic pay of the members of the armed services of the United States.

The basic objective of this legislation is to effect necessary, realistic, upward adjustments in the pay scales of members of the uniformed services and to insure that they will, in the future, be given increases at the level of their compensation comparable to that granted their civilian contemporaries in the Federal Government.

It would seem very difficult, indeed, to justify any great disagreement with the fundamental purposes of this bill. Although all of us here are, as we should be, vitally concerned, especially in this critical period, with eliminating and suspending all nonessential Government spending, the expenditures here involved would certainly approach the top of any priority listing of unquestionably prudent investments of tax money in the public interest.

Our Defense Department officials and other authorities have submitted the most persuasive testimony showing that a disturbing number of promising career men are leaving the service because the compensation is not sufficient, under present economic conditions and demands, to enable them to properly provide for themselves and their families.

It is quite obvious to anyone that the highly specialized training and skill required for effective operation of the technical equipment necessary for modern military security makes it urgent for us to encourage career personnel in our military organizations to offset the high percentage of extravagantly expensive replacements being required because of the increasing numbers of nonreenlistments for financial reasons.

There is little need for me or anyone else to emphasize the fact that the efficiency of a military unit is no better than the spirit that exists among its individual members, and that individual spirit substantially depends upon the high morale existing in their own families, whether they are with them or whether they are forced to be away from them.

Therefore, assurances to military personnel and their families of reasonable rates of compensation, in accord with modern realities, that will enable them to live and to serve without extraordinary economic fears and anxieties is truly a major factor in the maintenance of high spirit and morale among the members of our military services and legislative action in creating such assurance is decidedly in the best national interest.

Let us, therefore, approve this measure without any unnecessary delay.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 203(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are set forth in the following tables:

"COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205				
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
0-10[1]	$1,503.90	$1,557.00	$1,557.00	$1,557.00	$1,557.00
0-9	1,332.90	1,367.70	1,397.40	1,397.40	1,397.40
0-8	1,207.20	1,243.50	1,272.90	1,272.90	1,272.90
0-7	1,002.90	1,071.60	1,071.60	1,071.60	1,119.30
0-6	743.10	816.90	870.30	870.30	870.30
0-5	594.30	698.40	746.10	746.10	746.10
0-4	501.60	610.20	651.30	651.30	663.00
0-3[2]	466.20	520.80	556.20	615.90	645.30
0-2[2]	373.50	443.70	532.80	550.50	562.20
0-1[2]	321.00	355.20	443.70	443.70	443.70

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205				
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
0-10[1]	$1,616.40	$1,616.40	$1,740.60	$1,740.60	$1,865.10
0-9	1,432.50	1,432.50	1,491.90	1,491.90	1,616.40
0-8	1,367.70	1,367.70	1,432.50	1,432.50	1,491.90
0-7	1,119.30	1,184.10	1,184.10	1,243.50	1,367.70
0-6	870.30	870.30	870.30	900.00	1,041.90
0-5	746.10	769.50	810.60	864.60	929.40
0-4	692.70	739.80	781.20	816.90	852.60
0-3[2]	668.70	704.70	739.80	757.80	757.80
0-2[2]	562.20	562.20	562.20	562.20	562.20
0-1[2]	443.70	443.70	443.70	443.70	443.70

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205				
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
0-10[1]	$1,865.10	$1,989.30	$1,989.30	$2,113.80	$2,113.80
0-9	1,616.40	1,740.60	1,740.60	1,865.10	1,865.10
0-8	1,557.00	1,616.40	1,681.50	1,681.50	1,681.50
0-7	1,462.20	1,462.20	1,462.20	1,462.20	1,462.20
0-6	1,095.30	1,119.30	1,184.10	1,284.60	1,284.60
0-5	982.80	1,012.20	1,047.90	1,047.90	1,047.90
0-4	876.30	876.30	876.30	876.30	876.30
0-3[2]	757.80	757.80	757.80	757.80	757.80
0-2[2]	562.20	562.20	562.20	562.20	562.20
0-1[2]	443.70	443.70	443.70	443.70	443.70

"COMMISSIONED OFFICERS WHO HAVE BEEN CREDITED WITH OVER 4 YEARS' ACTIVE SERVICE AS ENLISTED MEMBERS

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205					
	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14
0-3	$615.90	$645.30	$668.70	$704.70	$739.80	$769.50
0-2	550.50	562.20	580.20	610.20	633.60	651.30
0-1	443.70	473.70	491.40	509.10	526.80	550.50

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205					
	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
0-3	$769.50	$769.50	$769.50	$769.50	$769.50	$769.50
0-2	651.30	651.30	651.30	651.30	651.30	651.30
0-1	550.50	550.50	550.50	550.50	550.50	550.50

"WARRANT OFFICERS

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205						
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10
W-4	$474.60	$509.10	$509.10	$520.80	$544.50	$568.20	$591.90
W-3	431.40	468.00	468.00	473.70	479.70	514.80	544.50
W-2	377.70	408.60	408.60	420.30	443.70	468.00	485.70
W-1	315.00	361.20	361.20	390.90	408.60	426.30	443.70

"Pay Grade	Years of service computed under section 205							
	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	$633.60	$663.00	$686.70	$704.70	$728.10	$752.10	$810.60	$810.60
W-3	562.20	580.20	597.60	615.90	639.60	663.00	686.70	686.70
W-2	503.10	520.80	538.80	556.20	573.90	597.60	597.60	597.60
W-1	462.00	479.70	497.40	514.80	532.80	532.80	532.80	532.80

"ENLISTED MEMBERS

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205						
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10
E-9[3]	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	$539.10
E-8	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	$452.40	465.00
E-7	$284.40	$340.80	$353.40	$366.00	$378.30	390.30	402.60
E-6	245.10	297.60	309.90	322.50	335.10	347.10	359.70
E-5	211.50	260.70	273.00	285.00	303.90	316.20	328.50
E-4	177.90	223.20	235.50	254.10	266.70	266.70	266.70
E-3	128.70	179.70	192.30	204.60	204.60	204.60	204.60
E-2	106.20	148.80	148.08	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80
E-1	102.30	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20
E-1 (under 4 months)	95.70	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205							
	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9[3]	$551.40	$564.30	$576.60	$589.20	$601.20	$632.70	$694.20	$694.20
E-8	477.30	489.90	502.20	514.50	527.10	558.30	620.10	620.10
E-7	415.50	434.10	446.40	458.70	465.00	496.20	558.30	558.30
E-6	378.30	390.30	402.60	409.20	409.20	409.20	409.20	409.20
E-5	340.80	347.10	347.10	347.10	347.10	347.10	347.10	347.10
E-4	266.70	366.70	266.70	266.70	266.70	266.70	266.70	266.70
E-3	204.60	204.60	204.60	204.60	204.60	204.60	204.60	204.60
E-2	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80
E-1	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20

"[1] While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is $2,332.20 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title.

"[2] Does not apply to commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as enlisted members.

"[3] While serving as Sergeant Major of the Army, Senior Enlisted Adviser of the Navy, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force ,or Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is $844.20 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title."

(2) Chapter 5 is amended as follows:

(A) By adding the following new section:

"§ 311. Special pay: continuation pay for physicians and dentists who extend their service on active duty

"(a) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as appropriate, an officer of the Army or Navy in the Medical Corps, an officer of the Air Force who is designated as a medical officer or dental officer, or a medical or dental officer of the Public Health Service who—

"(1) is serving on active duty in a critical specialty designated by the Secretary;

"(2) has completed any other definitive active duty obligation that he has under law or regulation; and

"(3) executes a written agreement to remain on active duty for at least one additional year; may be paid not more than four months basic pay at the rate applicable to him when he executes that agreement for each additional year that he agrees to remain on active duty. Pay under this section shall be paid in equal yearly installments in each additional year covered by an agreement to remain on active duty. However, in meritorious cases, the pay may be paid in fewer installments if the Secretary determines it to be in the best interest of the officer.

"(b) An officer who does not serve on active duty for the entire period for which he was paid under this section shall refund that percentage of the payment that the unserved part of the period is of the total period for which the payment was made."

(B) By inserting the following item in the analysis:

"311. Special pay: continuation pay for physicians and dentists who extend their service on active duty."

(3) Section 403(f) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) A member of a uniformed service without dependents who is in pay grade E-4 (four or more years' service), or above, is entitled to a basic allowance for quarters while he is in a travel or leave status between permanent duty stations, including time granted as delay en route or proceed time, when he is not assigned to quarters of the United States."

(4) Section 407(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as provided by subsections (b) and (c) of this section, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, a member of a uniformed service—

"(1) whose dependents make an authorized move in connection with his change of permanent station;

"(2) whose dependents are covered by section 405a(a) of this title; or

"(3) without dependents, who is transferred to a permanent station where he is not assigned to quarters of the United States;

is entitled to a dislocation allowance equal to his basic allowance for quarters for one month as provided for a member of his pay grade and dependency status in section 403 of this title. For the purposes of this subsection, a member whose dependents may not make an authorized move in connection with a change of permanent station is considered a member without dependents."

SEC. 2 (a) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The text of section 1401a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Unless otherwise specifically provided by law, the retired pay or retainer pay of a member or former member of an armed force may not be recomputed to reflect any increase in the rates of basic pay for members of the armed forces. In this section, 'Index' means the Consumer Price Index (all items, United States city average) published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall determine monthly the percent by which the index has increased over that used as the basis (base index) for the most recent adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay under this subsection. If the Secretary determines that, for three consecutive months, the amount of the increase is at least 3 percent over the base index, the retired pay and retainer pay of members and former members of the armed forces who became entitled to that pay before the first day of the third calendar month beginning after the end of those three months shall, except as provided in subsection (c), be increased, effective on that day, by the highest percent of increase in the index during those months, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent.

"(c) Notwithstanding subsection (b), if a member or former member of an armed force becomes entitled to retired pay or retainer pay based on rates of monthly basic pay prescribed by section 203 of title 37 that became effective after the last day of the month of the base index, his retired pay or retainer pay shall be increased on the effective date of the next adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay under subsection (b) only by the percent (adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent) that the new base index exceeds the index for the calendar month immediately before that in which the rates of monthly basic pay on which his retired pay or retainer pay is based became effective.

"(d) If a member or former member of an armed force becomes entitled to retired pay or retainer pay on or after the effective date of an adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay under subsection (b) but before the effective date of the next increase in the rates of monthly basic pay prescribed by section 203 of title 37, his retired pay or retainer pay shall be increased, effective on the date he becomes entitled to that pay, by the percent (adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent) that the base index exceeds the index for the calendar month immediately before that in which the rates of monthly basic pay on which his retired pay or retainer pay is based became effective."

(2) Section 1402 is amended—

(A) by inserting "increased by any applicable adjustments in that pay under section 1401a of this title after he initially became entitled to that pay," after "retired," in subsection (d); and

(B) by adding the following subsection:

"(e) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a member covered by that subsection may elect, upon his release from active duty, to have his retired pay or retainer pay—

"(1) computed according to the formula set forth in subsection (a) but using the rate of basic pay under which his retired pay or retainer pay was computed when he entered on active duty; and

"(2) increased by any applicable adjustments in that pay under section 1401a of this title after he initially became entitled to that pay."

(3) The first sentence of section 1436(a) is amended by inserting "but without regard to any increase in that pay to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index" after "that pay" and before the period.

(b) Notwithstanding section 1401a(d) of title 10, United States Code, a person who is a member or former member of an armed force on the date of enactment of this Act and who became, or hereafter becomes, entitled to retired pay or retainer pay after November 30, 1966, but before the effective date of the next increase after July 1, 1966, in the rates of monthly basic pay prescribed by section 203 of title 37, United States Code, is entitled to have his retired pay or retainer pay increased by 3.7 percent, effective as of the date of his entitlement to that pay.

SEC. 3. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1401 is amended by adding to footnote 4 of the table therein a sentence to read as follows: "For an enlisted person who has served as sergeant major of the Army, senior enlisted advisor of the Navy, chief master sergeant of the Air Force, or sergeant major of the Marine Corps, compute at the highest rate of basic pay applicable to him while he so served, if that rate is higher than the rate authorized by the table."

(2) Section 3991 is amended by amending footnote 3 of the table therein to read as follows: "[3] Compute at rates applicable on date of retirement, or if the member has served as sergeant major of the Army, compute at the highest basic pay applicable to him while he so served, if such basic pay is greater."

(3) Clause (2) of section 6326(c) is amended to read as follows: "(2) unless otherwise entitled to higher pay, is entitled to retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the basic pay of the pay grade in which he was serving on the day before retirement, or if he has served as senior enlisted advisor of the Navy or as sergeant major of the Marine Corps, he shall be entitled to retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the highest basic pay to which he was entitled while so serving, if that rate is higher."

(4) The first sentence of section 6330(c) is amended to read as follows: "Each member who is transferred to the Fleet Reserve or the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve under this section is entitled when not on active duty, to retainer pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the basic pay that he received at the time of transfer multiplied by the number of years of active service in the armed forces, except that in the case of a member who has served as senior enlisted advisor of the Navy or sergeant major of the Marine Corps, retainer pay shall be computed on the basis of the highest basic pay to which he was entitled while so serving, if that basic pay is higher than the basic pay received at the time of transfer."

(5) Section 8991 is amended by amending footnote 3 of the table therein to read as follows: "[3] Compute at rates applicable on date of retirement, or if the member has served as chief master sergeant of the Air Force, compute at the highest basic pay applicable to him while he so served, if such basic pay is greater."

SEC. 4. Section 3 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (50 App. U.S.C. 2203) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. For the duration of this Act, section 403(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out that part of the table which prescribes monthly basic allowances for quarters for enlisted members in pay grades E–1, E–2, E–3, and E–4 (four years' or less service) and inserting in place thereof the following new table:

"'Pay grade	Without dependents	1 dependent	2 dependents	3 or more dependents
E–4 (4 years or less service)	$60.00	$90.60	$90.60	$105.00
E–3	60.00	60.00	90.60	105.00
E–2	60.00	60.00	90.60	105.00
E–1	60.00	60.00	90.60	105.00'".

SEC. 5 (a) Section 511 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (66 Stat. 80; 70 Stat. 114), is amended by adding the following new sentences at the end thereof: "Any officer who was retired for age or length of service under laws in effect prior to October 1, 1949, and who was entitled, under those laws, to count inactive service in the computation of his retired or retirement pay shall hereafter be entitled to count such inactive service in the computation of his retired or retirement pay to the same extent as if he had been retired after October 1, 1949, but prior to June 1, 1958. However, the preceding sentence does not apply to an officer whose retired pay is computed under paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (ch. 413, 56 Stat. 368) or under the third proviso of section 5 of the Act of July 31, 1935 (ch. 422, 49 Stat. 507), as amended by section 3 of the Act of June 13, 1940 (ch. 344, 54 Stat. 380)."

(b) To accrue rights, under this section, a person who is entitled to retired pay on the effective date of this Act must file an application with the Secretary of the military department concerned.

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member of an armed force who is entitled to pay and allowances under any of the following provisions of law on September 30, 1967, shall continue to receive the pay and allowances to which he was entitled on that day plus an increase of 4.5 per centum in the total of his pay and allowances:

(1) The Act of March 23, 1946, chapter 112 (60 Stat. 59).

(2) The Act of June 26, 1948, chapter 677 (62 Stat. 1052).

(3) The Act of September 18, 1950, chapter 952 (64 Stat. A224).

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member or former member of a uniformed service who initially becomes entitled to retired pay or retainer pay on October 1, 1967, shall be entitled to have that pay computed using the rates of basic pay prescribed by the first section of this Act.

SEC. 8. This Act becomes effective as of October 1, 1967. However, a member, except as provided in section 7 of this Act, is not entitled to any increases in his pay and allowances under section 1 or section 4 for any period before the date of enactment of this Act unless he is on active duty on the date of enactment of this Act. In addition, a member of the National Guard or a member of a Reserve Component of a uniformed service who is in a drill pay status on the effective date of this Act is entitled to have any compensation to which he has become entitled under section 206 of title 37, United States Code, after September 30, 1967, computed under the rates of basic pay prescribed by section 1(1) of this Act.

SEC. 9. (a) Effective January 1, 1968, and unless otherwise provided by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, whenever the General Schedule of compensation for Federal classified employees as contained in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, is adjusted upwards, the President shall be required to concurrently direct and place into effect a comparable upward adjustment in the monthly basic pay authorized members of the uniformed services by section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code.

(b) Adjustments in the various tables establishing the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services as authorized by the preceding section shall be made in such manner as the President directs and shall have the force and effect of statute, provided that such adjustments shall:

(1) provide personnel of the uniformed services with an overall average increase in regular compensation which equates to that provided General Schedule employees, and

(2) carry the same effective date as that applying to the compensation adjustments provided General Schedule employees.

(c) For the purposes of this section, "regular compensation" means basic pay, quarters and subsistence allowances (either in cash or in kind), and the tax advantage on those allowances.

Mr. RIVERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On pages 13 and 14, delete section 9 in its entirety and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. (a) Effective January 1, 1968, and unless otherwise provided by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, whenever the General Schedule of compensation for Federal classified employees as contained in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, is adjusted upward, there shall immediately be placed into effect a comparable upward adjustment in the monthly basic pay authorized members of the uniformed services by section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code.

"(b) Adjustments in the various tables establishing the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services as required by the preceding paragraph shall have the force and effect of statute, and such adjustments shall:

"(1) provide all personnel of the uniformed services with an overall average increase in regular compensation which equates to that provided General Schedule employees, and

"(2) carry the same effective date as that applying to the compensation adjustments provided General Schedule employees.

"(c) For the purposes of his section, 'regular compensation' means basic pay, quarters and subsistence allowances (either in cash or in kind), and the tax advantage on those allowances."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIVERS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS: On page 3, line 8, after the word "Medical" insert the words "or dental".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. Do I understand that this bill adopts the 4.5-percent increase provided for class act employees in the recently approved pay legislation?

Mr. BATES. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Not the 6 percent for postal employees?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. It is 4.5 percent, not 6 percent?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman is correct. It is 4.5 on his overall pay, which actually is 5.6 percent of his base pay.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I must oppose this bill for the reasons I have previously stated. I am absolutely opposed to the two automatic increases that are provided in this bill, just as I was opposed to the two automatic increases provided in the bill now pending before the other body with respect to class act and postal employees. I cannot support a pay bill that places a huge mortgage on the unknown economic future of this country.

It has been my hope that somewhere along the line this Congress would come to its senses in the matter of spending. I warn that this will be another contribution to inflation. There are 89 Members of the House who took this into consideration in their votes against the civilian pay increase bill.

Mr. Chairman, the sacred sacrifices of the honored dead are used here as the reason for this legislation. It might be well to note that some 14,000 American fighting men in Vietnam made the service a "lifelong" career—only because their lives ended there in the service of our country.

To these men, and to those who at this hour give their lives in war, a pay raise is of little consequence.

So let us reason this issue here today in terms of the living, for all of them and all of us share in the fiscal realities and future of this deeply indebted Nation.

It would be grotesque gratitude to pay our debt to our fighting men by providing that for those who return it will be to a land of galloping inflation.

There is no reason, in poetry or prose, that will excuse abandoning our fiscal responsibilities to emotionalism.

I say once again, and in conclusion, that it is the height of financial irresponsibility to provide an immediate pay raise for civilian Federal employees and the military, and then, without regard to economic and fiscal conditions, provide for two additional and automatic increases in the next 2 years.

Congress will meet next year and it will meet again in 1969. Let us then determine whether there should be pay increases for the Government's civilian employees and its military forces.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa: On page 15, after line 6, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. Section 410 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection.

"(c) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and by the Secretary of Transportation (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy), a member of an armed force who, upon completion of a tour of duty in an area described in section 310(a)(2) of this title, is authorized to use leave accrued to him under section 701 of title 10, is entitled to be transported at the expense of the United States to his home of record for the purposes of that leave and thence to his assigned duty station. However, no member is entitled to transportation at the expense of the United States under this section for travel outside the United States unless he is a bona fide resident of the place outside the United States that is selected by him under this section."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend very sincerely the members of this committee and especially the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services because they have been stalwarts on behalf of the servicemen of this country.

When I introduced a bill on this subject matter, the chairman very promptly was sympathetic and referred the bill to a subcommittee and the committee spent some time on it.

I also know that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] has worked faithfully and diligently on this but they were not able to properly analyze the bill and arrive at an agreement for the amendment before the bill now under consideration was reported out of the committee. But I think the subject covered by my amendment is something that needs to be taken to conference and I believe it is something very worthwhile and very meritorious.

The purpose of the amendment is clear on its face. The amendment would, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, provide service personnel returning to the United States upon completion of a tour of duty in an area in which they were entitled to the receipt of hostile-fire pay, the right to receive transportation at the expense of the United States to their home and thence to their new duty station.

The language of the amendment does not apply to service personnel returning from Vietnam who are scheduled for immediate separation from active duty, because such personnel are already entitled to transportation to their home upon separation from active service.

Service personnel returning from Vietnam all wish to go home to see their families. Personnel being separated from service have this entitlement, whereas service personnel scheduled to continue in an active-duty status do not receive Government transportation in order to permit them to visit their families.

The amendment would authorize transportation for an estimated 400,000 service personnel per year, at an estimated annual cost of $40 million.

I do not think we are doing nearly enough for the one-fourth of 1 percent of Americans who are in Vietnam. When only one out of 400 is in Vietnam, surely the other 399 can at least provide them with their transportation to their home after they return. I especially have in mind those in the lower ranks who simply are unable to save any money on the low salaries that they receive. Those in the lower grades also are denied transportation funds for their families when they are in the United States. Air Force regulations provide as follows:

> Personnel of all the uniformed services in pay grade E-4 (AIC) with less than four years' service and lower pay grades are not entitled to transportation of dependents at Government expense. The reason for denying transportation of dependents and household goods of these members is the limited amount of money made available by Congress.

In other words, if there is a shortage of money, the attitude is, take it off of the lower grades.

The only way we can be sure that the services will use some of their funds to help provide transportation for the one out of 400 of us in Vietnam is to provide it in this bill. We provide a trip home each year for the members in the Peace Corps and for the Job Corps members; surely we can do the same thing for those returning from Vietnam.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. To begin with, Mr. Chairman, we are going to accept the gentleman's amendment.

I understand that these men who come from a hostile-fire area who are not being separated, have to pay for the trip back home before they are assigned to the next tour of duty.

Mr. Chairman, we are willing to accept this amendment and to try to work out something in conference.

I understand the intendment of the gentleman and the committee wants to work with him. But as I say, Mr. Chairman, so far as we are concerned, we accept the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I appreciate the gentleman's support very much.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that I never saw this amendment until a few minutes ago. Therefore, I have not had an opportunity to analyze it. I do not know who would be eligible nor what the leave status would have to be or how much transportation would be provided.

Did I understand, from hearing the amendment read, that the amendment would only have application to payment of transportation to the veteran's home?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is true. That change was suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I think it is a good change.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, I have not had a chance to study the amendment. Certainly, anyone who is exposed to hostile fire should be entitled to have his transportation to his home paid for by the Government.

I am willing to go along with the chairman of the committee in accepting the amendment at this time, but I would like to study it and analyze it before we go to conference.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and urge support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13510) to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 952, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 386, nays 2, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—386

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—2

Davis, Wis.
Gross

NOT VOTING—44

Ashmore
Aspinall
Bell
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Cohelan
Corman
Dawson
Dickinson
Diggs
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fisher
Fountain
Fuqua
Hanna
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Holifield
Jones, Mo.
Kyl
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McFall
Madden
Martin
Miller, Calif.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
O'Hara, Mich.
Pollock
Rarick
Riegle
Ruppe
St. Onge
Stuckey
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wright

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Lipscomb for, with Mr. Martin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Riegle.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Stuckey.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Wright.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Rarick with Mr. Fuqua.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was not present in the House when my name was called. I therefore cannot qualify. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 888, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888), making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Mahon, Kirwan, Whitten, Rooney of New York, Boland, Natcher, Bow, Jonas, and Laird.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE FOR 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FLOOD submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 10196) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 831)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10196) "making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 59, 60, 67, 68, and 71.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 15, 16, 26, 53, 62, 63, 65, 66, 70, and 72, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,677,907,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$82,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$79,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools shall be available to carry out the provisions of legislation for this purpose enacted after June 30, 1967".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$13,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$63,937,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$164,663,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "including $35,000,000 for dental facilities as authorized by subsections (2) and (3) of said section"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,942,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$41,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$54,234,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$63,230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$58,814,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$53,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,168,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,912,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 18, 35, 52, 55, 56, 61, 64, and 69.

Daniel J. Flood,
William H. Natcher,
Neal Smith,
W. R. Hull, Jr.,
Bob Casey,
George Mahon,
Melvin R. Laird,
Robert H. Michel,
Garner E. Shriver,
Frank T. Bow,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Lister Hill,
Richard B. Russell,
Warren G. Magnuson,
John Stennis,
Alan Bible,
Robert C. Byrd,
Jacob K. Javits,
Norris Cotton,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10196) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower administration

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $385,497,000 for "Manpower development and training activities," as proposed by the Senate instead of $394,997,000 as proposed by the House. It was not the intention of the conferees, in agreeing to the lower figure, to ban the use of this appropriation for the training of prison inmates. The conferees are agreed that health services for trainees under section 202(k) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, should be furnished under the regular Vocational Rehabilitation Program. Vocational Rehabilitation appropriations should be used for providing these services to all MDT Trainees. This is the most efficient way of providing for the whole group including those who would otherwise qualify for VR services.

Wage and labor standards

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: Appropriate $4,429,000 for "Bureau of Labor Standards, salaries and expenses," as proposed by the House instead of $4,467,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that $500,000 of the appropriation be for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped as proposed by the Senate instead of $462,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $66,000,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of $66,225,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Inserts language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate pertaining to the location of a laboratory.

Office of Education

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10: Appropriate $1,677,907,000 for "Elementary and secondary educational activities" instead of $1,645,707,000 as proposed by the House and $1,696,707,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that $208,750,000 of the appropriation be for supplementary educational centers and services as proposed by the House instead of $213,750,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that $82,200,000 of the appropriation be for grants to States and loans to nonprofit private schools for equipment and minor remodeling under title III of the National Defense Education Act instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the House and $96,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that allotments under sections 302(a) and 305 for equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of $79,200,000 for grants to States instead of $47,000,000 as proposed by the House and $88,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and strike language proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 11, 12, and 13: Appropriate $439,137,000 for "School assistance in federally affected areas" as proposed by the House instead of $472,937,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that $416,200,000 of the appropriation shall be for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the act of September 30, 1950, as amended, as proposed by the House instead of $450,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and insert language proposed by the Senate with a technical amendment which will exempt the purposes of carrying out section 7 of the Act of September 30, 1950 from the limitation imposed by the language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $13,500,000 for the Teacher Corps instead of $18,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Appropriate $156,500,000 for "Libraries and community services" as proposed by the Senate instead of $155,500,000 as proposed by the House, and provide that $5,000,000 of the appropriation shall be for transfer to the Librarian of Congress for the acquisition and cataloging of library materials as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $53,400,000 for "Educational improvement for the handicapped" as proposed by the House instead of $58,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides that funds made available in the 1967 "Salaries and expenses" appropriation for a comprehensive study of training programs financed in whole or in part with Federal funds shall remain available until June 30, 1968.

Amendment No. 19: Authorizes $100,000,000 for "Participation sales authorizations" and appropriates $925,000 for "Payment of participation sales insufficiencies" as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Vocational Rehabilitation Administration

Amendments Nos. 20 through 26: Appropriate $311,550,000 for "Grants for rehabilitation services and facilities" as proposed by the House instead of $312,550,000 as proposed by the Senate; delete the earmarking of $1,000,000 for State planning for the development of comprehensive vocational rehabilitation programs proposed by the Senate; and provide that $3,850,000 of the appropriation is for grants with respect to workshops and rehabilitation facilities under section 12 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as proposed by the House instead of $4,850,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that planning for a research and training center in the Chicago area should not be delayed and will expect that not to exceed $200,000 of these funds be utilized for that purpose.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $63,937,000 for "Research and training" instead of $62,440,000 as proposed by the House and $65,484,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $5,319,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of $5,469,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $164,663,000 for "Health manpower education and utilization" instead of $164,163,000 as proposed by the House and $164,913,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Provides that $35,000,000 of the appropriation for "Construction of health educational facilities" shall be for construction and modernization of teaching facilities for the training of dentists as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $27,942,000 for "Chronic diseases" instead of $27,504,000 as proposed by the House and $32,692,000 as proposed by the Senate. In general, the conferees are agreed on the desirability of the purposes of the Senate increase but are also agreed that a large part of the activities for which the increase of over $5,000,000 was earmarked is so closely related to activities financed under "Regional medical programs" that they would more properly be administered by the National Institutes of Health under that appropriation. With this in mind, the managers on the part of the House agreed to $4,500,000 of the Senate increase for "Regional medical programs". It will be expected that the activities for which the Senate increase for "Chronic diseases" was earmarked be performed under the appropriation "Regional medical programs" to the maximum extent determined to be feasible by the National Institutes of Health.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $41,750,000 for "Urban and industrial health" instead of $41,594,000 as proposed by the House and $42,194,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $156,000 over the amount proposed by the House is earmarked for the Arctic Health Research Center.

Amendments Nos. 33 and 34: Appropriate $54,234,000 for "Community health services" instead of $51,234,000 as proposed by the House and $61,234,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that $18,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for grants for facilities pursuant to part C of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides language authorizing transfers of funds to the appropriation "Community health services" from the appropriation "Community mental health resource support" pursuant to section 202(c) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $63,230,000 for "Hospitals and medical care" instead of $62,830,000 as proposed by the House and $63,633,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $183,356,000 for the National Cancer Institute as proposed by the House instead of $192,356,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $167,954,000 for the National Heart Institute as proposed by the House instead of $177,954,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $30,307,000 for the National Institute of Dental Research as proposed by the House instead of $32,307,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $143,954,000 for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases as proposed by the House instead of $147,204,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $128,633,000 for the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness as proposed by the House instead of $135,633,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $94,422,000 for the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases as proposed by the House instead of $98,922,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $160,284,000 for the National Institute of General Medical Sciences as proposed by the House instead of $164,284,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $68,621,000 for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development as proposed by the House instead of $74,621,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Appropriate $58,814,000 for "Regional medical programs" instead of $54,314,000 as proposed by the House and $64,314,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that $53,900,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1969, instead of $49,400,000 as proposed by the House and $59,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $17,289,000 for "Environmental health sciences" as proposed by the House instead of $20,615,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates $81,141,000 for "General research and services, National Institutes of Health," as proposed by the House instead of $84,641,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $35,000,000 for "Grants for construction of health research facilities" as proposed by the House instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Provides for the transfer to "General research support grants" of $61,700,000 of appropriations available to the National Institutes of Health as proposed by the House instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates $500,000 for the John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences as proposed by the House instead of $725,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which proposes language to make the funds appropriated to the John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences available until December 31, 1968.

Amendments Nos. 53 and 54: Update citation to enabling legislation as proposed by the Senate, and appropriate $100,168,000 for "Community mental health resource support" instead of $50,168,000 as proposed by the House and $110,168,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will earmark $45,000,000, instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, for construction to remain available until June 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 56: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides language authorizing transfers of funds to "Community mental health resource support" from "Community health services" pursuant to section 132(c) of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act.

Amendments Nos. 57 and 58: Appropriate $19,912,000 for National Library of Medicine instead of $18,662,000 as proposed by the House and $21,162,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provides that $5,250,000 of the amount appropriated shall remain available until June 30, 1969, instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $6,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates $10,715,000 for "Buildings and facilities" as proposed by the House instead of $15,075,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds for the Appalachian Health Field Station were not agreed to. However, this action was without prejudice to the project; in fact, it is recognized as a No. 1 priority item for the 1969 budget, and, if firm assurances can be given that the architectural-engineering plans for the Government facility on leased land will be finished prior to June 1968, the conferees are agreed that a supplemental request for 1968 will be given favorable consideration.

Amendment No. 60: Restores "Participation sales authorization" of $15,000,000 and appropriation of $250,000 for "Payment of sales insufficiencies" as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides technical language determined to be necessary for the effective use of the revolving funds "Health professions education fund" and the "Nurse training fund" under which student loans are made.

Welfare administration

Amendments Nos. 62 and 63: Appropriate $525,000 for "Assistance for repatriated U.S. nationals" as proposed by the Senate instead of $432,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 64: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which strikes language proposed by the House and inserts similar language proposed by the Senate regarding payments to States under certain titles of the Social Security Act.

Administration on aging

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates $18,450,000 for "Coordination and development of programs for the aging" as proposed by the Senate.

Special institutions

Amendment No. 66: Corrects printing error.

Amendment No. 67: Appropriates $2,878,000 for "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of $2,948,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates $2,196,000 for "Gallaudet College, construction" as proposed by the House instead of $2,312,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 69: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will have the effect of appropriating $7,139,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,739,000 as proposed by the House, and including language providing for a comprehensive study of all authorized Federal programs that have to do with educational activities aimed at improved international understanding and cooperation, with the objective of determining the extent of adjustment and consolidation of these programs that is desirable in order that their objectives may be more efficiently and expeditiously accomplished.

Amendment No. 70: Appropriates $2,209,000 for "Office of Field Coordination, salaries and expenses," as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates $15,700,000 for "Foreign language training and area programs" as proposed by the House instead of $16,300,000 as proposed by the Senate and deletes authorization for carrying out the purposes of Public Law 89–698, the International Education Act of 1966. The conferees will expect that the cost of administering the other programs provided for by this appropriation be borne, as it has in the past, by the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Office of Education."

General provisions

There has been fear on the part of some that the variable cost sharing required of research grantees under the Department's application of section 203 might result in the allocation of these funds on some standard other than the competence and distinction of the research scholar or scientist concerned, and the adequacy of facilities available to him and his coworkers for a proposed project, all weighed solely in relation to the potential benefit of the research to the American people. The House and Senate Committees on Appropriations have been assured that variable cost sharing has not resulted in any other standard, and all information on the subject available to the committees confirms these assurances. However, there is a potential danger that the conferees caution the Department to be vigilant in avoiding.

TITLE VII—U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

The bill as it passed both the House and Senate provides the sum of $90,000 for a revision of the current master plan of the U.S. Soldiers' Home. It has come to the conferees' attention that the National Capital Planning Commission's "Proposed Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital," dated February 1967, would take two parcels of land from the U.S. Soldiers' Home.

It is the view of the conferees that no land should be taken from the Soldiers' Home pending completion and study of the revision of the U.S. Soldiers' Home master plan provided for in the bill.

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 72: Inserts language proposed by the Senate in lieu of similar language proposed by the House.

Daniel J. Flood,
William H. Natcher,
Neal Smith,
W. R. Hull, Jr.,
Bob Casey,
George Mahon,
Melvin R. Laird,
Robert H. Michel,
Garner E. Shriver,
Frank T. Bow,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous-consent request granted by the House on yesterday, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10196) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of today.)

Mr. FLOOD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, not having had an opportunity to see the conference report, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to advise me whether or not this 50-mile rider, the so-called Laird rider, has been agreed to by the committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I know whereof the gentleman speaks, but this is a conference report, and that was not before the conference, and it was not to be considered at this time.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was amendment No. 2 that would deal with the question of the appropriation of money for planning funds. Are those appropriations still in this report?

Mr. FLOOD. Appropriations for what?

Mr. MACHEN. For planning money for laboratory No. 2, and I believe that was amendment No. 2.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, may I say

to the gentleman from Maryland, we are here under a mandate of the House. We were told what to do by the House when this bill was recommitted, and the managers did exactly what the House told us to do—no more and no less, thank God—to insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments which exceeded the budget requests therefor. There were 13 such amendments. The problem to which the gentleman refers was not included among the sacred 13, so we acted as the House ordered on those 13 amendments.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this conference report that the committee has submitted will have funds provided for planning laboratory No. 2 that must be built more than 50 miles from the District of Columbia. Is that correct?

Mr. FLOOD. There will be funds. I should not go on, because that was not subject to change by this conference, but I want to be gracious and courteous to my friend. He knows that is a rhetorical question, and he has the answer himself. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. MACHEN. I thank the gentleman. I am not certain on that. I have not had the opportunity to see the conference report.

Mr. FLOOD. It will be in the RECORD, and the gentleman can spend the rest of the evening on it.

Mr. MACHEN. That will have been acted on by then.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct; but I can do nothing about it.

Mr. MACHEN. Hindsight is better than foresight.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not always agree with that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned the "Laird rider." Would the gentleman be good enough to tell us what he means?

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a provision in this bill that prohibits the building or planning for construction of the Pure Food and Drug Laboratory within a 50-mile radius of Washington.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield again, I thought perhaps he was alluding to the Laird proposal which provides $40 million for the alleged extermination of rats.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not want this to be a monolog. Of course, every Member of the House is quite aware of the situation.

Your managers have been in conference with the Senate conferees from early this morning until about 2 hours ago. We were there under your guns. You told us what to do.

I am very proud and happy to report we did exactly what you told us to do. We stood by our guns.

Believe it or not, on a bill for Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, with 13 amendments you sent back in disagreement, the Senate receded on every single one of the 13 amendments. They total over $20 billion below what was in the conference report that was recommitted.

Mr. Speaker, your managers would wish to emphasize that this bill is now about $170 million under the budget.

The debate took place when we were here with the first conference report. I see no particular reason for me to gild the lily.

Mr. Speaker, the following table summarizes the action on this bill at each stage, as well as the 1967 appropriation and budget request for 1968, with pertinent comparisons:

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF 2D CONFERENCE REPORT

[In thousands]

	Appropriation, 1967	Budget, 1968	House act, 1968	Senate act, 1968	1st conference report, Oct. 3, 1967[1]	Pending conference report	Pending conference report compared with—				
							1967	Budget	House	Senate	1st conference
Department of Labor	$638, 220	$652, 973	$635, 024	$625, 562	$625, 524	$625, 524	−$12, 696	−$27, 449	−$9, 500	−$38	....
Department of Health, Education. and Welfare:											
Office of Education	3, 890, 003	3, 944, 466	3, 834, 115	3, 942, 090	3, 882, 815	3, 880, 815	−9, 188	−63, 651	+46, 700	−61, 275	−$2, 000
NIH	1, 123, 162	1, 187, 750	1, 174, 424	1, 252, 225	1, 197, 399	1, 178, 924	+55, 762	−28, 124	+4, 500	−73, 301	−18, 475
Other HEW	7, 307, 522	7, 579, 074	7, 434, 092	7, 541, 950	7, 510, 446	7, 510, 260	+202, 738	−49, 516	+76, 168	−31, 690	−186
Total, HEW	12, 320, 687	12, 711, 290	12, 442, 631	12, 736, 265	12, 590, 660	12, 569, 999	+249, 311	−141, 291	+127, 368	−166, 266	−20, 661
Related agencies	57, 657	59, 883	59, 833	59, 833	59, 833	59, 833	+2, 176	−50	....	....	....
Total, Labor-HEW bill	13, 016, 564	13, 424, 146	13, 137, 488	13, 421, 660	13, 276, 017	13, 255, 356	+238, 791	−168, 790	+117, 868	−166, 304	−20, 661

[1] Recommitted by the House Oct. 4 with instructions to the managers on the part of the House "To insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments that exceed the budget request therefor."

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my strong right arm, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the House conferees bring back to this House today a conference report that is in accordance in every detail to the instructions given to us on Wednesday, October 4. Although your conferees did not vote for these instructions but supported the original conference report, we felt dutybound to present the House position in the House-Senate conference this morning. The Senate realizing the problem and the seriousness in holding up this appropriation bill any longer, receded and agreed to the instructions given to the House conference members.

This conference report was agreed to unanimously by all House and Senate conferees with no exceptions being taken.

In view of the criticism I have received from some quarters regarding added cost to the Food and Drug Administration by requiring that their new laboratory not be built within a 50-mile radius of Washington, I would merely state that this amendment has been accepted by all conferees. The statements that in requiring this to be built in Madison, Wis., we are incurring an additional cost of $5 million are simply not true. In view of these false reports and also a committee report of the House Government Operations Committee dated last week, the chairman of the conference committee, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] asked the Assistant Secretary and Comptroller of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for an up-to-date report. This report, dated today, is as follows:

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: This is in response to your request for clarification of the cost differential associated with the construction of the Food and Drug Administration Laboratory Building No. 2 in Madison, Wisconsin, rather than in Beltsville, Maryland.

As you know this is a matter which was explored by the House Committee on Government Operations. They have just issued a report on the subject which is critical of the cost estimates which were prepared by the Food and Drug Administration. They make reference to an earlier estimate which indicated that a location in the mid-west would increase cost by $5.4 million and a later estimate which indicated the additional cost of locating the laboratory in Madison, Wisconsin, would be about $1 million.

We have reviewed these estimates and have concluded that the original estimate of $5.4 million is not supportable for the activities and plans presently proposed for lab no. 2, wherever it is located. I can find no precise estimate or breakdown of the $1 million estimate prepared by FDA.

The elements which affect the initial cost of this facility as we see it are:

(1) *Construction cost.* The Boeckh construction cost index shows a slightly lower cost per square foot in Madison, Wisconsin, than the comparable figure for the Washington, D.C., area.

(2) *Size of facility.* The facility will house the same program and operation. Provision will have to be made for a limited amount of service and support space for a facility located on an independent site as distinguished from a site containing other FDA operations

such as Beltsville. It is estimated that this additional space would not exceed a net increase of one percent.

(3) *Moving personnel.* An initial cost for relocating personnel from the Washington area to Madison, Wisconsin, will have to be provided for. The extent of this cost is difficult to estimate because of the unpredictable nature of the problem. At best you can only guess at the number of staff that will move and the number that will be recruited locally. We have been provided with estimates ranging from $338,000 to $500,000 but have not endeavored to evaluate them.

We would conclude, therefore, that there is only a small net difference in construction between Madison and Beltsville which could be anywhere from zero to a one percent differential, plus or minus. There will be a limited initial cost associated with the transfer of staff. It is clear, therefore, that a $5.4 million estimate is a gross overstatement, and it would appear that an estimate as high as $1 million is certainly an outside figure. It is not possible at this stage of project development to supply more precise cost estimates. We are, of course, assuming that there will be no cost associated with land acquisition at either site.

If you have any further question, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ JAMES F. KELLY,
Assistant Secretary, Comptroller.

Mr. Speaker, this report should lay to rest the question of the Laird rider for once and for all. I express my deep appreciation to the House and to all members of the Senate conference committee for their support.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 10196 making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1968 is a good conference report. Conferees spent more time on this HEW conference committee than on any previous HEW conference in my memory.

No one is totally happy with all of the details of this $13.2 billion appropriation bill but, I think, under the circumstances, the best possible compromise was worked out and I urge all my colleagues to support the conference report.

The distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has ably outlined for you the details of the conference report. For my part I would like to take a little time to discuss in particular the National Institutes of Health which in August of this year celebrated its 80th anniversary in providing leadership in the fields of medical research.

Before discussing this, let me say that the Federal investment in medical research is one of the best investments this Congress makes in the future of our Nation and I am happy that this report contains no reductions from the NIH requests. I would rather see more emphasis placed on medical research than on the much touted moonshot because we have a lot of problems to clean up here on Earth before we start looking for added responsibilities on the Moon.

In medicine, Mr. Speaker, there are basically two major ways to combat disease: you can treat it when it occurs through what we might call custodial care, or you can try to prevent its occurrence in the first place through medical research in preventive medicine.

In my view, Federal priorities should be placed on medical research. By shifting the emphasis away from space research and concentrating more heavily on human research, Federal dollars will be far better spent.

One of the critical factors to take into consideration in this is the fact that providing enough beds and enough doctors could turn out to be a losing battle with our rapidly increasing population unless the primary allocation of Federal dollars goes into medical research.

Mr. Speaker, today we have doctor and nurse shortages with our present population. The problem will obviously be severely intensified in the future if we do not vigorously attack causes. Medical research gave us the Salk polio vaccine. Thanks to this amazing medical research triumph, polio in this country is fast becoming a rare disease. We have seen what the heart pump is capable of doing and we can speculate that additional research money provided in this bill will lead, in a few short years, to an artificial heart that can permanently be used to replace a diseased human heart.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the very great emphasis that I think should be placed on medical research, I would like to pay a special tribute to the leadership in this field that has been provided through the past eight decades by the National Institutes of Health and I would like to briefly outline some of the achievements of the National Institutes of Health during its long service to the country.

August 1967 marked the 80th year of service of the National Institutes of Health to the health and welfare of this Nation. Tracing its origin back to a one-room laboratory in the Marine hospital service, the history of NIH is the history of America's struggles with and triumphs over disease and disability.

I first joined the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee in 1953, and as a member of that subcommittee, it has been my privilege over the past 14 years to learn firsthand of many exciting advances in medicine which constituted important victories over today's major health problems.

Our Nation owes a debt it can never repay for the invaluable contributions made over the past eight decades by Federal scientists—often at great personal risk. These achievements—and many others made by non-Federal scientists working with NIH grant funds—have helped add 23 years to the average lifespan in this country since the beginning of the century.

Today, NIH provides 55 percent of all Federal support for medical research, and 36 percent of the Nation's total expenditure for medical research.

This vital role of NIH is in part due to the wholehearted support given it by Congress over the years. Key leaders in this support by Congress have been the late Frank Keefe from my State of Wisconsin and the late John Fogarty, of Rhode Island.

NIH, of course, owes much to the great scientists and scientist-administrators whose accomplishments are important milestones in modern medical history:

Dr. Joseph J. Kinyoun, the young Marine hospital service officer who in 1887 established his small laboratory on Staten Island for cholera research and which is now viewed in retrospect as the embryo National Institutes of Health;

Dr. Joseph Goldberger, whose recognition of pellagra as a dietary deficiency disease opened a new door to the modern science of nutrition;

Dr. Charles Armstrong, whose invaluable contributions to research in the infectious diseases covered 46 years;

Drs. Rolla E. Dyer, William H. Sebrell, Jr., and James A. Shannon, the Directors of NIH during the great postwar expansion, whose expert guidance helped NIH emerge from its role as a small Federal laboratory into the greatest single institution dedicated to advancing medical progress in the world today.

It is because of all these men and many others that our Nation has come out from under the shadow of European medicine in a few short decades into a position of undisputed world leadership in health. I can think of no other investment that this Nation has made that has paid off so handsomely in concrete accomplishments that have benefited so many. NIH—with a budget of little more than a billion dollars certainly is a billion-dollar success story.

NIH's earliest concerns, when it was still called the Hygenic Laboratory, were with the infectious diseases—afflictions which, we may be indeed thankful, we and our children need little fear. Along with the great wave of American immigration came the threat of deadly invasion from cholera, yellow fever, typhus, plague, and smallpox—names which are seldom spoken today in this country. The Laboratory made important contributions to developing means for protecting against, and finally ridding our Nation of, these terrible afflictions.

With the epidemic diseases largely under control, NIH turned its attention to the chronic ailments: heart disease, cancer, arthritis, blindness—the countless disorders which man is particularly heir to if he manages to survive through young adulthood. In these diseases, progress is seldom as dramatic as that made in combatting the infectious disorders. There is seldom an easily identifiable cause for which a vaccine can be developed. Such causes as there may be are usually highly elusive and subtle and may interact to produce the disease. Such problems must be approached on many different levels and through many different scientific disciplines. Sophisticated equipment and highly trained specialists—not only in the traditional biomedical fields, but in the physical and theoretical sciences as well—are essential if there is to be continued progress.

Mysteries as deep as the secret of life itself undoubtedly lie at the heart of many of the chronic ailments. Seeking ways to prevent and treat these disorders, NIH found itself rapidly growing, needing greatly expanded facilities, funds, and staff. Sophisticated management methods were instituted, replacing the easy informality of the Hygienic Laboratory.

A large number of supportive services,

including animal production and holding, the manufacture of specialized laboratory equipment, computer installations, elaborate safety procedures, specialized maintenance, and hundreds of other essential operations also contributed to the rapid postwar expansion of the NIH plant. The burgeoning grants operation, which today accounts for four-fifths of the NIH expenditure, required increasing numbers of persons for award handling, review, and management.

With such rapid expansion it is much to the credit of good leadership and administration that little inefficiency has characterized the NIH operations. Numerous investigations have generally wound up praising the agency and admiring its judicious use of a sizable portion of the public funds. And the Commission on Research of the American Medical Association recently recommended that the programs of NIH be recognized "for their contribution to the national biomedical research effort."

Among these contributions in the past decade have been the following discoveries:

In 1956, NIH scientists Drs. Herman M. Kalckar, Elizabeth P. Anderson, and Kurt J. Isselbacher announced their discovery of the cause of an often fatal metabolic disease of children called galactosemia. The disease, characterized by the inability of the child to tolerate milk in any form, can be treated simply by placing the child on a milk-free diet. However, early diagnosis is crucial. The discovery of an enzyme in normal persons which is lacking in galactosemia victims enabled the scientists to develop an accurate, simple diagnostic test for the disease.

In 1957, Drs. John Bozicevich, Jules Freund, and Joseph Bunim developed a rapid diagnostic test for rheumatoid arthritis. This painful joint disease can result in deformity and complete disability if not treated early. The new test shortens the diagnostic procedure from several days to a few minutes. The test makes use of a colloidal clay called Bentonite which seeks out a "rheumatoid factor" in the blood sample. If the Bentonite particles form microscopic clumps, the test is positive.

Transmission of monkey malaria to man through the bite of an infected mosquito was reported by Drs. Don E. Eyles, G. Robert Coatney, and Morton E. Getz in 1960, after Dr. Eyles and an assistant became accidentally infected during a routine innoculation of monkeys who had primate malaria. This finding upset the previously accepted theory that animal malaria could not be transmitted to man in the laboratory. The scientists predicted that further studies would prove that monkey malaria also could be transmitted to man in nature through mosquitoes. This prediction was borne out in 1965 when the same parasite that causes malaria in monkeys was found as the cause of malaria in a man hospitalized at NIH who had traveled in Malaya that summer.

Drs. Marshall W. Nirenberg and J. Heinrich Matthaei announced the partial cracking of the genetic code in 1961. The code, basic to the systematic reproduction of all living matter, provides the means for storing and transmitting genetic information. The NIH scientists were able to illuminate the way information is coded into the cellular nucleic acids and used to direct the incorporation of specific amino acids into proteins. This discovery represented the first experimental demonstration of how protein is synthesized in the living cell.

In work announced this year the Nirenberg research team added convincing evidence to support that universality of the genetic code by demonstrating that the genetic transfer substance from a mammal, an amphibian, and a bacterium are all basically the same in their action to direct the manufacture of specific proteins.

The year 1966 was highlighted by the development of a promising experimental vaccine against rubella, commonly known as German measles, by Drs. Harry M. Meyer, Jr., and Paul D. Parkman. The major hazard of rubella is to unborn children whose mothers may be infected during pregnancy. Such children may be born mentally retarded, blind, deaf, or with congenital heart disease. And at the same time, these same investigators devised tests to determine immunity to this disease in pregnant women.

These are accomplishments of which NIH can indeed be proud, but this bureau has never been one to rest on its past achievements. NIH leadership has always felt that, as impressive as past victories have been, many great and difficult problems remain unsolved. Under dynamic and innovative leadership we have seen—and are seeing—many evidences of creative federalism at its best.

This is indeed fortunate, for today, especially, there is a tremendous amount of popular expectation and demand for medical miracles that will rival our spectacular accomplishments in outer space. Our news media have made much of experiments with artificial hearts, organ transplantation, new genetic discoveries, and numerous so-called cures for cancer, heart disease, and other major diseases which now constitute the leading causes of death and disability in America. Many persons are vocally dissatisfied with the pace of research breakthroughs in medicine, because they are unaware of the complexities of modern biomedical research.

NIH, I think, is well aware of these expectations. Its goals for the immediate future reflect a definite concern with the solution of health problems important to all Americans.

It is important, however, that we as laymen realize that further medical progress may be slower than we would like. Unlike the physical sciences, there is no general unified body of knowledge that encompasses the phenomena of life and the nature of disease and health.

Progress in the medical sciences is thus very much predicated upon the advance of fundamental knowledge and the development of broad theoretical concepts. Current biomedical research efforts, although conducted in a space age environment, rely to a great extent upon empiricism, much as did research in physics in its earlier stages. Major advances, therefore, often emerge uncontrollably and unpredictably.

Still, in a number of important areas, enough of this basic knowledge has been gained to make feasible research projects oriented toward specific problems. The planners at NIH, assisted by outside advisers, have devoted much effort in recent years to identifying these areas and to initiating national programs for their exploitation.

These areas include:

The search for drugs effective against leukemia, breast cancer, and other solid tumors;

The final proof for a viral link to human cancer—certain studies being conducted at the University of Wisconsin are aiding in this process;

Vaccines against an array of infectious diseases;

The control of kidney disease and the improvement of artificial kidneys;

The exploration of heart attack and the development of heart assist devices and total replacement by artificial hearts;

Control of hypertension;

The extension of organ transplant capability and the control of the associated immunologic rejection phenomena.

Additionally, NIH will in the future be expanding general research in areas considered critical to the achievement of national health objectives. These include: aging, human development, and mental retardation; environmental health; visual disorders; fertility control and population dynamics; pharmacology and toxicology; and biomedical engineering and computer research and technology.

Mr. Speaker, through its regional medical programs, now underway, NIH is also contributing to activities that will speed application of research findings for direct benefit of patients.

There are other problems of great interest which our conference committee decided should be the concern of the regional medical program. Members are fully aware of the fact that this legislative authority includes diseases related to heart, cancer, and stroke.

Chronic respiratory diseases, emphysema, chronic bronchitis, and others clearly meet this criteria. The problem of emphysema particularly is really alarming. Disability payments from OASDI funds to persons incapacitated by emphysema total $90 million per year and are increasing rapidly. We are late now but we must begin immediately to control this health problem. The regional medical program must devote between $1 and $2 million this year to initiate a program of medical education in medical schools. Just as it is required that a member of the National Advisory Council of Regional Medical Program be competent in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of each of the diseases of reference, heart disease, cancer, and stroke, one should be added to provide expert information to the Council on emphysema. And most certainly cooperative arrangements with appropriate voluntary health organizations are expected.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of debate on the original conference report on this bill on October 4, there was agreement that $438,000 in the Public Health Service Chronic Disease Center could be used for a program of pediatric pulmonary centers and there was similar agreement in the framework of the Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases on a $500,000 collaborative program on immunal therapy—skin cancer. It is my understanding that this agreement still prevails and that both these programs could be funded within the moneys now agreed on in this revised conference report.

For the coming year, this bill provides funds for the planning of an international conference center at NIH—a project long a dream of John E. Fogarty. As you know, I was determined that this dream should not pass with our esteemed colleague and was gratified by the support given my proposal for the planning of the center that will bear John Fogarty's name.

In passing H.R. 10196 the Members of the Congress—Republicans and Democrats alike—will once again demonstrate their grasp of opportunities in medical research and will have attempted to realize their vision of a better tomorrow through added funding of budget requests in the field of vital medical research.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress and indeed all Americans can be justly proud of the National Institutes of Health. Its direct contributions to research progress and its indirect achievements—through the support of the training of thousands of research scientists and the construction of millions of dollars worth of research facilities—are, in the final analysis, evidence of the soundness of the American people's investment in their own health and well-being.

And the successes of the past 80 years are only a prolog to things to come. The exciting promise of what medicine holds in store for our children and grandchildren leads me to speculate that tomorrow's most exciting headlines are less likely to concern the barren soil of the moon than they are to concern the gradual freeing of our people from the suffering and devastation of disability and disease.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain].

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to make an appeal to this House to restore the full funds needed to support the commitment made by the Congress to the school districts across the land in the form of Public Laws 874 and 815.

This legislation was enacted in response to the burden imposed upon our school districts by the presence of Federal installations. While Federal activities create additional school enrollments, Federal properties do not contribute property tax revenues to the areas in which they are located. Thus, the Federal Government, under Public Laws 874 and 815, recognized its responsibility to these impacted areas and made provisions to compensate these school districts.

When this body considered the appropriation bill encompassing the 874–815 programs, $416 million was appropriated, which is $44 million less than what is needed to support all entitlements for fiscal year 1968 under this legislation.

I offered amendments to the supplemental appropriation bill to provide $48 million of additional funds in support of Public Law 815 entitlement and $20 million for entitlements under Public Law 874. These amendments would have enabled the Congress to fully meet its commitments to our burdened school districts but, unfortunately, they were rejected.

When the other body considered this matter it appropriated $450 million which, though it exceeded the House appropriation by $34 million, was, nevertheless, $10 million less than what is needed to meet all entitlements.

In conference, the amount agreed upon was $416 million which, as I stated previously, falls short of the mark by $44 million.

If this figure is accepted, we will in effect be telling the school districts that we refuse to fully live up to our commitment and that they will have to water down their educational programs accordingly.

I regard this as a disgrace and a tragedy—a disgrace because we, the Congress, have failed to live up to our commitment; and a tragedy because our schoolchildren shall have to pay for our irresponsibility in the form of watered down programs.

Gentleman, I appeal to each and every one of you to avoid bringing such disgrace upon this esteemed body. I ask that the full appropriation of $460 million be restored and sent to the Senate for approval.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper].

Mr. PEPPER. Will the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania tell me what cuts, if any, have been made in the research and development funds for the National Institutes of Health?

Mr. FLOOD. Well, there was no cut made by this committee in any of the National Institutes. There were small cuts for two related programs—regional medical programs, and environmental health sciences—but we allowed the full budget request for every one of the National Institutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, there is a 7-percent increase over the budget of last year for the Institutes in this conference report. However, the add-ons of the other body were denied by this report as submitted. The 1968 budget as submitted and as approved by the House provides for a 7-percent increase for NIH, with the exception of two items, and the report as submitted to the House by this committee of conference is in conformity with the budget requested by the President.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania yield further?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; I yield further to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in respect to the research items for NIH, the budget has been left intact?

Mr. FLOOD. I respond to the distinguished gentleman from Florida by saying "Yes."

Mr. PEPPER. I commend the able gentleman for that.

Mr. FLOOD. Further, Mr. Speaker, I might say to the Members of the House, concerning the distinguished gentleman from Florida, when the gentleman served in the other body and during the time during which he has served in this House of Representatives, I consider him to be one of our greatest extemporaneous speakers whom it has been my pleasure to hear either in the House or in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman and his lovely wife are very much interested in one of the programs involved in the activities which are carried on by the National Institutes of Health. I had the pleasure of being their guest at a national meeting which was sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Florida and his lovely wife.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I must confess surprise at the letter from HEW Comptroller James F. Kelly to Senator Hill concerning the proposed FDA Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 which was placed in the Record by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] in connection with the conference report on the Labor-HEW appropriation. However, I suppose that it should not have been unexpected, since this is simply another example of how FDA and HEW officials have repeatedly talked out of both sides of their mouths on this project in an attempt to play one congressional committee off against another. This history is amply documented by House Report No. 801, "FDA Procedures for the Selection of Laboratory Sites," which was prepared by the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, and adopted by the Committee on Government Operations without a dissenting vote.

Nevertheless, in order to set the record straight, I feel obligated to point out that the Office of the HEW Comptroller had provided the subcommittee information which was quite different from that provided to Senator Hill. The information provided to the subcommittee also contained relevant facts which were omitted in the letter to the Senator.

In the latter document, Mr. Kelly concluded that there would be only a small net difference in the construction costs for this facility between Beltsville, Md., and Madison, Wis., "which could be anywhere from zero to a 1-percent differential, plus or minus." In substantiation of this conclusion, he cites the Boeckh construction cost index, which he says "shows a slightly lower cost per square foot in Madison, Wis., than the comparable figure for the Washington, D.C., area." This same publication is cited in a letter of July 31, 1967, to a member of my subcommittee staff from Mr. Kelly's deputy, Mr. James B. Cardwell, to show "general construction costs at Madison as being about 1 percent lower than those for the Washington, D.C., area." However, Mr. Cardwell went on to say that:

> The index in question relates only to general non-Federal office and commercial construction and not to specialized laboratories of the type at issue. At this time, we are not able to furnish you with an accurate estimate of what all of the cost differentials might be. Clearly, the Boeckh index is not in itself sufficient for this purpose.

Obviously, this is quite different from the impression created by Mr. Kelly in his letter to Senator HILL.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the July 31 letter from Mr. Cardwell be included in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

Furthermore a memorandum supplied to the subcommittee by Mr. Cardwell and dated August 15, 1967, contains the following statement concerning the cost of construction of Laboratory No. 2 in the Midwest:

> Current rough cost indices (the Boeckh Appraisal Manual and the DOD Construction Cost Index) are so broad in their scope that there is no sound basis on which to estimate that an actual cost differential exists between the Beltsville site and the alternate site at Madison. The Boeckh index shows that it would be about three percent cheaper to construct the same brick and concrete building in Madison than in Washington. The Department of Defense Construction Cost Index shows construction in the State of Wisconsin to be ten percent higher than in Washington, D.C. Both of these cost indexes fail to make any adjustment for geographic differentials that may exist for the purchase and installation of fixed laboratory equipment. Since the cost index figures that are available do not agree in their conclusion and since specialized laboratory equipment is a major part of the total construction cost we are unable to reach any firm conclusion on construction cost differentials between the two geographic areas in question.

Again, this is quite different from the impression created by Mr. Kelly in his letter to Senator HILL. I think it is also significant that Mr. Kelly failed to make any mention of the fact that the Department of Defense Construction Cost Index showed construction in the State of Wisconsin to be 10 percent higher than in Washington, D.C.

There are other instances in which Mr. Kelly's letter to the Senator is not in accordance with information previously supplied to our subcommittee by his office. For example, his letter states that for the initial cost of relocating personnel from Washington to Madison, "We have been provided with estimates ranging from $338,000 to $500,000, but have not endeavored to evaluate them." On this same point, however, the August 15 memo to our subcommittee states that because of the passage of the Administrative Expenses Act, it would appear that the 1966 estimate of $500,000 is a minimum.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the foregoing facts are sufficient to show that HEW, and particularly the Office of the Comptroller, have been playing games with the committees of the Congress. However, there is one other matter in connection with this proposed laboratory about which I feel some obligation to set the record straight.

In the RECORD for October 25, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] made a statement alleging that the report of the Government Operations Committee "is completely inaccurate with respect to the cost estimates for the proposed Madison, Wis., site for the Food and Drug Administration Laboratory No. 2."

Mr. Speaker, the report makes it quite clear that the estimates referred to are not the committee's but were in fact prepared by FDA for the House Appropriations Committee.

Moreover, the report states that the committee is not necessarily endorsing the accuracy of FDA's original estimate that it would cost $5.4 million more to construct this facility in the Midwest than in the Washington area or a later revision of that estimate reducing the differential to $1 million.

I believe the following quote from the findings of the report makes this point quite clearly:

> The Committee wishes to emphasize that it is citing FDA's cost estimate only to illustrate the inconsistency of FDA's position and its apparent lack of concern for economy and efficiency. In so doing, the Committee is not endorsing the accuracy of the estimate. In fact, since the Subcommittee's hearings, FDA has changed its original estimate and now maintains that the initial cost differential between Beltsville and the alternative site at Madison, Wis., would be about $1 million rather than $5,400,000. However, for the reasons previously cited in this report, the Committee finds no basis for placing any more reliance on the second estimate than in the first.

Mr. Speaker, there were other points in the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] with which I cannot agree. However, I do not believe it is necessary for me to make a point-by-point rebuttal. The report is impartial, objective, and based on sound, documented facts, and can speak for itself.

The report finds that the study which FDA has made is inadequate and recommends that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare require FDA to do the study over.

Some of the specific inadequacies of the study cited in the report are:

First, FDA did not comply with the HEW regulations on site selection which require, among other things, the establishment of a site selection board and the preparation of a report reflecting the potential sites considered, the points considered in their comparative evaluation, and the reasons for the choice made.

Second, a list of 47 institutions supposedly meeting FDA's basic criteria for eligibility was incomplete and was reduced to six institutions on the basis of the personal opinions of one individual who did not visit any of the 47, and made no record of the basis for his actions.

Third, the final selection was made without any site visits by individuals scientifically qualified to evaluate the potential contributions the institutions might make to FDA's research program.

Fourth, the study was made in such a hasty manner that adequate evaluation of all potential sites was impossible.

Fifth, there was an almost total absence of documentary support for the selection made.

Sixth, FDA officials were totally unaware of and did not apply the Bureau of the Budget and HEW criteria for determining whether a given facility is or is not susceptible to decentralization from the Washington area.

So far as I am concerned, the enactment of the 50-mile limitation in the appropriations act, simply means that the new study must begin at least 50 miles outside of Washington.

The letter from Mr. Cardwell follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1967.

Mr. W. DONALD GRAY,
Senior Investigator, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee on the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: This will confirm our telephone conversation of this date.

The Food and Drug Administration advises:

1. They have made no new analysis or study of cost differentials between Beltsville and Madison, Wisconsin, or between Beltsville and other sites. The last analysis they made was contained in the report to the Committee on Appropriations, which was made a part of the sub-committee's hearing record.

2. They have no record of the University of Wisconsin having applied for consideration as an alternate site for Laboratory Building No. 2. They state that at no time did they invite the University of Wisconsin, or any other institution, to apply for consideration. However, following FDA's visit to the University of Wisconsin on March 2 and 3, 1967, representatives from the University did visit FDA, they received two visits. Mr. C. A. Engman, Vice President for Administration, visited FDA on March 16, 1967, and Dr. Robert M. Bock, Dean of the University's Graduate School, visited FDA on March 17, 1967.

3. They have not received any form of written statement from the University of Wisconsin indicating that land and/or utilities would be available at no cost to the Government.

With respect to your question of whether the Department has prepared a cost analysis which shows that the facility in question could be constructed at less cost at Madison or some other location away from the Washington, D.C., area, the answer is no.

I have verified my earlier statement to you to the effect that neither Mr. Kelly nor anyone else in the Office of the Secretary has issued information indicating that the facility could be constructed at Madison with a savings of as much as $400,000.

As I told you, we did ask the Food and Drug Administration to obtain information about variations in the general construction cost index between Beltsville and Madison. We asked the Food and Drug Administration to do this several days ago in response to a specific request received from the Senate Committee, based on information relayed to us by FDA and obtained from GSA, that the Boeckh Construction Appraisal Manual currently shows general construction costs at Madison as being about 1 percent lower than those for the Washington, D.C., area. In relaying these data to the Committee on Ap-

propriations, we advised them, as we would advise you, that the index in question relates only to general non-Federal office and commercial construction and not to specialized laboratories of the type at issue. At this time, we are not able to furnish you with an accurate estimate of what all of the cost differentials might be. Clearly, the Boeckh index is not in itself sufficient for this purpose. However, if you like, we will be glad to ask the General Services Administration to prepare a special estimate for this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES B. CARDWELL,
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Budget.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: On page 21, line 14, insert the following: ": *Provided,* That the sum made available in the "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1967" for transfer to the "Office of Secretary, salaries and expenses" for a comprehensive study of training programs financed in whole or in part with Federal funds shall remain available until June 30, 1968."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: On page 31, line 11, insert the following: : *Provided further,* That there may be transferred to this appropriation from "Community mental health resource support" an amount not to exceed the sum of the allotment adjustment made by the Secretary pursuant to section 202(c) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offered a motion, and I might say to the Members of the House that these are all only technical amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: On page 36, line 18, insert the following: ", to remain available until December 31, 1968."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 55: On page 37, line 17, insert the following: ", of which $50,000,000 for construction shall remain available until June 30, 1969".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said Amendment, insert "45,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: On page 37, line 18, insert the following: ": *Provided,* That there may be transferred to this appropriation from "Community health services" an amount not to exceed the sum of the allotment adjustments made by the Secretary pursuant to section 132(c) of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 61: On page 40, line 18, insert the following:

"HEALTH EDUCATION LOANS

"The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available in the following revolving funds, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitation as provided by section 104 of the Government Cooperation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the 'Health Professions Education Fund' and the 'Nurse Training Fund'."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "Cooperation" and insert in lieu thereof "Corporation".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64: On page 46, line 11, insert the following:

"Grants to States, payments after April 30: For making, after April 30 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under titles I, IV, V, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the last two months of the current fiscal year and for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be charged to the subsequent appropriation therefor for the current or succeeding fiscal year."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 69: On page 51, line 5, strike out "$6,739,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,139,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said Amendment, insert the following: "$7,139,000, to include also provision for a comprehensive study of all currently authorized programs of the Federal Government that have to do with educational activities aimed at improved international understanding, and cooperation, with the objective of determining the extent of adjustment and consolidation of these programs that is desirable in order that their objectives may be more efficiently and expeditiously accomplished."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE DANIEL J. FLOOD

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want my distinguished friend, the able gentleman from Pennsylvania, to take his seat without thanking him for his most generous reference to me of a moment ago. The gentleman's own famed eloquence is well known by his colleagues, and is exceeded only by his magnanimity to his friends.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 795)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the eighteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "In each State entitled in the Ninety-first Congress and the Ninety-second Congress to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled 'An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives' (46 Stat. 26), as amended, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative (except that the States of Hawaii and New Mexico may continue to elect their Representatives at Large). No State shall be required to redistrict prior to the 19th Federal decennial census unless the results of a special Federal census conducted pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 1013; 71 Stat. 481; 13 U.S.C. 8), are available for use therein. Nor shall any State prior to the 19th Federal decennial census be required to elect its Representatives at Large."

And agree to the same.

EMANUEL CELLER,
HERBERT TENZER,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate passed the House bill after amending it by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting its own provisions. The Senate insisted upon its amendment and requested a conference; the House then agreed to the conference.

Resolution of the disagreement between the Senate and the House has been difficult, and has required seven meetings between June 22, 1967, and October 18, 1967. On June 27, 1967, the conferees submitted a report, House Report No. 435. By unanimous consent of the House, that report on June 28, 1967, was recommitted to the committee of conference (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 17739).

The conference report recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment to the bill and agree to the same with an amendment, the amendment being to insert, in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, the matter agreed to by the conferees.

The conference report provides standards for use during the 91st Congress and the 92d Congress. The conferees were unable to resolve their disagreement as to the provisions for permanent standards for the establishment of congressional districts.

The conference report does not contain provisions that apply to the establishment of congressional districts for the 93d and subsequent Congresses.

Temporary standards for use during the 91st Congress and the 92d Congress were contained in section 2 of the bill as it passed the House. The conference report retains the first sentence of section 2 as it passed the House. This provision requires that, in each State entitled in the 91st Congress and in the 92d Congress to more than one Representative, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of authorized Representatives. Representatives shall be elected only from such districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative, except the States of Hawaii and New Mexico may continue to elect their Representatives at Large.

The second sentence of the conference report provides that no State shall be required to redistrict prior to the 19th Federal decennial census unless the results of a special Federal census conducted pursuant to the act of August 26, 1954, as amended, are available for use.

The conferees included this sentence in order to avoid the errors that necessarily must result from use of outdated social statistics obtained in the 18th decennial census conducted in 1960. Changes that have occurred in the structure of the U.S. population since 1960 are too vast in many instances to permit any reasonable degree of accuracy in establishing district lines on the basis of 1960 census data.

The expense and effort involved in congressional redistricting should not be devoted to an enterprise that necessarily in many States must be so inaccurate as to be unreasonable when based on 1960 census data. It is preferable to wait until the 19th decennial data is available if updated special census data is not available.

It is to be emphasized that nothing in the conference report prohibits a State from redistricting prior to the 93d Congress if it so elects. The State, however, shall not be required to redistrict unless current census data is available.

The third sentence of the conference report provides that no State prior to the 19th Federal decennial census shall be required to elect its Representatives-at-large. This provision underscores the intent of the conferees that Representatives shall be elected from districts and that until the results of the 19th Federal decennial census are available no State shall be required to elect its Representatives at Large.

EMANUEL CELLER,
HERBERT TENZER,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, to be a conferee on a bill, particularly a major item of legislation such as H.R. 2508, the congressional districting bill, is a great honor and privilege. Unfortunately, I find that I must dissent from the report of my fellow House conferees and instead report to the House my dissenting views.

FAILURE TO FULFILL CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO SET STANDARDS FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTING

Both the House and Senate versions of this bill were attempts to fulfill Congress responsibility to set standards for the drawing of congressional district boundaries. Article I, section 4, of the Constitution instructs Congress to be the ultimate overseer of the "times, places and manner" of holding elections for U.S. Representative. In Chairman CELLER's words during House debate on April 27 the House was setting guidelines which the courts "must take most seriously into consideration."

For example, the House bill established a maximum permissible variation in the population of congressional districts for the 1968 and 1970 elections of 30 percent. The Senate instead provided for a maximum of 10 percent. The conference bill, however, does not attempt to fashion a compromise between those two standards. In fact, it does not provide any standards for the courts to follow in implementing the one-man, one-vote decision for the next two elections but instead it in effect tells the courts to not implement that decision and not to enforce those constitutional rights for those two elections. The conference report does not provide guidelines for the courts to "most seriously" take into consideration, but instead provides that—

> No State shall be required to redistrict until census data is available from the 1970 census or a special Federal census (which must be requested by the States and in most cases would take 12 months to compile).

Let no one state that Congress is establishing a policy that it would be inadvisable and inequitable to use 1960 census data in the drawing of congressional districts. One could at least argue that would be an attempt to fulfill Congress' responsibility to set standards. However, one must point out that both the House and Senate versions of the bill provided that 1960 data would be appropriate in drawing congressional districts, even this late in the decennial period. But the conference bill does not really say that since it allows State legislatures to use 1960 data.

The statement of the majority of the House managers states:

> It is to be emphasized that nothing in the conference report prohibits a State from redistricting prior to the 93d Congress if it so elects.

The managers' statement attempts to have us believe that the changes in the Nation's populations since 1960 have been too great for the courts to use them in drawing congressional district boundaries, but that they are quite appropriate for use by State legislatures.

If 1960 data is not appropriate for drawing congressional districts, and would in the managers' words result in districts "so inaccurate as to be unreasonable," then Congress should not allow legislatures to use them. Since the conference report finds that 1960 data is good enough for legislatures then they are surely good enough for the courts, which have at least as good a reputation for being fair, reasonable, and impartial arbiters of political matters as do State legislatures.

The fact that the conference report takes the unreasonable and contradictory position of allowing State legislatures to use 1960 data but not allowing the courts to review that use, demonstrates that the true purpose of this bill is to prevent the courts from enforcing the constitutional right to have one man's vote count as much as any other's. In effect this bill would suspend the one-man, one-vote decision until the 1972 congressional elections.

In three States, California—with a 95-percent population disparity—New Jersey, and Indiana, the Federal courts have already determined that the current congressional districts violate the Constitution. Those determinations, and any possible future determinations, were and would be based on what the Constitution requires. Congress cannot by legislative act change the requirements of the Constitution.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

There are many other troubling aspects of this bill that I can only touch briefly. What would be the effect of the bill in those five States where court suits regarding congressional districts are pending, most of them before the Supreme Court in this term—Texas, Missouri, Ohio, New York, and Florida? Presumably this bill is designed to tell the Supreme Court it cannot require remedies for any constitutional inequities it may finally determine exist in those States.

Also there is no doubt that many other individual citizens will attempt to enforce their constitutional rights to equal representation on the House of Representative by bringing Federal court suits. Is Congress attempting to say in this bill that the Federal judiciary, which since 1964 has been providing relief for such violations of the Constitution, must now suspend for the next 5 years the enforcement of the U.S. Constitution?

Many States such as Mississippi, Alabama, and my own State of Michigan, have redistricted in the last few years only as a result of Federal court orders, and now have plans which vary no more than 10 percent in the population of their districts.

What would stop the legislatures in those States from drawing new congressional districting plans which could vary by as much as 30, 100 or even the 257 percent which Michigan used to have. A suit in Federal court could not afford relief for such a development since the court could not, under the terms of this bill, require any new redistricting until after the 1970 census data was available. Special Federal censuses must be requested by State legislatures which presumably would not do so in these cases.

THE ENTIRE BILL IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND MIGHT POSSIBLY RESULT IN AT-LARGE ELECTIONS

A bill which is illogical, violative of constitutional rights, and designed to suspend the power of the Federal courts to enforce a constitutional right would seem to be doomed to itself being declared unconstitutional. Unfortunately this bill contains no separability clause—as did the first conference report which was recommitted to conference on June 27—so the chances are that this entire bill would be declared unconstitutional.

This would be most unfortunate since that would also wipe out the first sentence of this three-sentence bill which prohibits at-large elections in 1968 and 1970—except in New Mexico and Hawaii. No member of the conference committee favored at-large elections for Members of the House of Representatives but that could certainly result from this bill.

Further delay and litigation would undoubtedly result from passage of this measure. The Supreme Court could easily not finally pass on this question until the spring of 1968. That is so late in the electoral process that in many States where the courts would find unconstitutional districtings, the Federal courts in those States might feel constrained to require all members in a State delegation to run at large.

CONCLUSION

It is my view that representatives of the two Houses of Congress could meet even now and fashion a compromise between the House and Senate versions which would satisfy the constitutional requirements for congressional districts to be drawn in a fair and reasonable manner.

I also feel that such a compromise could be fashioned so as to effect this desired goal with the least amount of confusion, litigation, and instability of congressional districts. Prohibition of at-large elections included in such a bill would be effective since a bill drafted in that manner would be secure against court attack and districting plans drawn in accordance with such a bill would likewise be secure against being declared void.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this conference report rather than pass a bill which will be declared unconstitutional. Only if we vote down this conference report, and act now to pass a bill setting forth reasonable and constitutional standards, will the Congress have an opportunity to guide both legislatures and the courts in their drawing of congressional district boundaries.

Mr. CELLER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the statement of the managers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, your conferees have been diligent and anxious to bring forth a proper solution to a very vexatious problem.

The attempt to get an agreement was difficult—as difficult as trying to shave an egg—and that is rather difficult.

There was no lack of diligence and effort. We labored from June onward. We had eight conferences. Debate was vigorous and keen.

You will remember that a previous report and agreement was presented and by unanimous consent was withdrawn. This impasse was due to the unusual situation in Indiana. We were disappointed with the withdrawal but it did not make us too unhappy. But we overcame our disappointment and again addressed ourselves to our labors.

In the meantime, the pressures and importunities from many sources mounted.

I will take some time to tell you about our difficulties—you will forgive me if I do.

It became apparent that to satisfy all 50 States, a bill with 50 sections in it would be essential—each section benefiting each State.

We met frequently, and as frequently we found ourselves at loggerheads. There were as many points of view as a centipede has legs. We got nowhere. It was like walking up a descending escalator. The longer we debated, the deeper we plunged into the quicksands of frustration. It became apparent that further discussion would be as useless as an empty bucket in an empty well.

We agreed to disregard all areas of disagreement and bring forth the slight areas of agreement. You have before you these slight areas of agreement.

They are as follows:

First. There can be no Members elected at large for the 91st and 92d Congresses except in the States of New Mexico and Hawaii.

Second. No State shall be compelled to redistrict for 91st and 92d Congresses without the benefit of up-to-date current census figures.

We left for future Congresses all other items including guidelines as to the matter of fair degree of equality of population, contiguity of district and compactness of districts.

Now I am going to read you some questions and answers—questions which might be asked of me by my colleagues and I will give you the answers. I hope in this question and answer form that this sort of dialog may make clear to you the purposes and nuances of this conference report.

Question: What is the principal objective of the conference report?

Answer: First, to ban elections of Representatives at large except in the States of Hawaii and New Mexico.

Second, to provide guidance to the courts that it is the sense of the Congress that States shall not be required to redistrict unless current data is available.

Third, to provide guidelines to the courts that it is the sense of the Congress that until the Nineteenth Federal Decennial Census is completed, no State shall be required to elect its Representatives at large.

Question: Are there any States other than Hawaii and New Mexico that have Representatives at large?

Answer: No.

Question: Does the conference report prohibit a State from redistricting prior to the 93d Congress?

Answer: No; a State may voluntarily redistrict if it so elects. If it does elect to redistrict, it may use population figures from sources other than a special Federal census.

Question: Does the word "require" in the last two sentences of the conference report have a special meaning?

Answer: Yes; the word "require" was used by the conferees to mean that a court should not order a State to be redistricted prior to the Nineteenth Decennial Census or order delegates to run at large prior to the Nineteenth Decennial Census.

Question: Who pays for a Federal special census, if one is to be undertaken?

Answer: The State requesting the census pays for it. The cost is approximately 25 cents per person and will take approximately a year to complete a special census in the larger States like California, New York, and Illinois. But in smaller States it would take a much shorter period of time.

Question: What is wrong with the 1960 figures for redistricting purposes—and this is very important, gentlemen—

Answer: They are out of date. They are all askew. Vast changes have occurred throughout the United States that render the 1960 data completely unreasonable in terms of accuracy for redistricting purposes. Using 1960 figures for present-day conditions would be like trying to level a steep hill with a shovel instead of a bulldozer.

In the famous case in Maryland, Citizens Committee against Tawes, decided by Chief Justice Sobeloff in the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, that judge had this to say about the 1960 census, which clearly indicates beyond peradventure of a doubt that you should use the 1960 census if you want to have any reasonable assurance that you are going to satisfy the principle of one man, one vote. The 1960 census is outmoded, antiquated, and there have been so many shifts in population. The judge said this, and mark ye well:

> Even if a district plan initially comports with the one-to-one formula, discrepancies may be expected to arise with changing conditions. Such discrepancies are unavoidable and must be tolerated for a time until the next census. But in initial districting, the aim should be to come as closely as possible to a one-to-one ratio.
>
> A difficulty encountered by anyone who undertakes in 1966—

This case was decided in 1966—

> to draw district lines with a view to achieving substantial population equality is that the only accurate figures available are those from the 1960 census. The dilemma presents two possible choices: to accept the 1960 census figures, which are not up to date, or attempt to make estimates of changes in population figures since that date. Neither choice is a happy one, but we have concluded—

He is speaking for the court—

> we have concluded that it is better to adhere to the census figures than to engage in speculative estimates or projections which vary widely with the estimators and the manner in which they handle the figures available to them from various sources. The alternative we have rejected would indeed lead into a mathematical thicket.

He said in essence that the 1960 census is not good. He with his colleagues drew the lines reluctantly with the 1960 census figures, as bad as they were.

In other words, he concluded with the famous words of Shakespeare:

> Rather bear the ills we have than fly to those we know not of.

That is what we are doing in this conference report. We say that you need a new census. The 1960 census is outmoded. It is unfair. Therefore, no State should be required to redistrict unless there are current figures, unless the figures are up to date. You can only get them up to date by a special census. We asked the Bureau of Census whether or not there were any other estimates that would fairly or accurately reflect the numbers of persons or the populations of various districts.

Answer: There are no population estimates that the census would rely upon for redistricting purposes.

Question: How is the conference report intended to affect court cases where districts are challenged?

Answer: The conference report provides guidance to the courts. It is anticipated that the courts would follow the conference report and require the results of a special census to be available before it would order a State to be redistricted. If, however, a court found that existing districts in fact were contrary to the Constitution, the court of its own order could draw new district lines. They have in a number of cases drawn new district lines. In event districts were found to be unconstitutional, the conference report intends that the court could draw new district lines and not order representatives to run at large.

Question: Have the courts actually drawn district lines rather than rely upon State legislatures to draw district lines?

Answer: Yes; the courts have drawn district lines in Arizona, Illinois, Maryland, and Montana.

Question: Does the conference report prohibit redistricting even though present districts are found by the court to be unconstitutional?

Answer: No. The conference report only provides that a court will not order a State legislature to establish new districts unless the results of a special Federal census are available. The court may draw new lines if it finds it necessary for compliance with the requirements of the Constitution. But remember, the court cannot compel redistricting save with the benefit of new and current figures.

Question: Is the conference report constitutional?

Answer: That is a rather sticky question. My answer is this. If the conference report is enacted into law, it will be presumed to be constitutional. In any event, it will be constitutional until the court rules otherwise. I personally—and my colleagues in the majority on the conference—deemed this report to be constitutional.

Question: In some States, such as Indiana, the existing districts have been declared to be unconstitutional and the court has ordered new districts to be established. What is the effect of the conference report in such cases?

Answer: The conference report, if enacted into law, would express the intent of Congress that no State shall be required to be redistricted prior to the Nineteenth Decennial Census unless the results of a special Federal census are available. It would be in order for the parties, I think, in such a case to move the court to reconsider its order in the light of the new law contained in the conference report, but in no event would Members from that State of Indiana be elected at large.

Question: Which States currently are under court order to redistrict?

Answer: At the present time the Legislatures of California, Indiana, and New Jersey are under court order to redistrict.

Question: In what States are cases pending challenging the validity of district lines?

Answer: Texas, Missouri, Ohio, New York, and Florida.

Question: Are there any States where the districts are subject to challenge under constitutional standards but in which no cases have as yet been instituted?

Answer: I understand there are eight such States: Georgia, where the largest district exceeds the smallest by 38.2 percent; Iowa, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 25.3 percent; Louisiana, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 25 percent; Minnesota, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 28.6 percent; Nebraska, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 31.1 percent; Pennsylvania, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 35.1 percent; Washington, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 26 percent; and West Virginia, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 39.2 percent.

That, in question and answer form, I hope gives considerable information to the Members of the House, and might illuminate in their minds exactly what we are driving at with reference to the conference report.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I have several questions to propound to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the meaning and the interpretation of some of the language in the conference report before us.

My questions stem in large measure from the circumstances in the State of Indiana, which are as follows:

A Federal court has ruled unconstitutional the Indiana State statute of 1965 which established the congressional districts from which the present Members of the House of Representatives from Indiana were elected.

The Indiana General Assembly which met earlier this year adjourned without having reached agreement on a new statute providing for congressional districting in Indiana.

The Indiana General Assembly does not meet again in regular session until 1969, that is to say, after the congressional election of 1968.

Mr. Speaker, let us assume for purposes of my question that the Indiana General Assembly is unable in any Special Session which may be called prior to the 1968 congressional election to reach agreement on a congressional districting statute:

First. My first question therefore pertains to the following language in H.R. 2508, as reported by the committee of the conference:

> In each State entitled in the Ninety-first Congress and the Ninety-second Congress to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled "An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives" (46 Stat. 26), as amended, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative (except that the States of Hawaii and New Mexico may continue to elect their Representatives at Large.)

Does this language mean that in Indiana, if the general assembly does not, in a special session, establish congressional districts in time to hold the 1968 congressional nominations and elections, a court of appropriate jurisdiction would be able to establish the Congressional districts from which the 1968 congressional nominations and elections must be conducted?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, my answer to that question is in the affirmative, that the Congress could not take away the jurisdiction of the court to decide such an issue. Further, if the State failed or refused, under the circumstances indicated, to redistrict, the court would have the power to draw those lines, and the court has done so in several instances.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, under the circumstances which, as I have indicated, exist in Indiana, would it not be reasonable to assume that the court would draw the lines?

Mr. CELLER. This conference report requires that district lines cannot be required to be drawn unless based upon current census figures. Lines should not be drawn based upon the 1960 census unless these are the only figures the court finds acceptable. Conceivably, the court would follow the admonition of the Congress and would seek to obtain data which is more current before it draws its lines.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to complete my questioning of the distinguished chairman before the distinguished chairman yields to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, let me state the following question, as in the question I heretofore raised, but in more general terms as follows: In a State in which the congressional districts existing at the time of passage of this act are unconstitutionally apportioned, or in which the State legislature has not established congressional districts in time for the 1968 congressional nominations and elections, excepting the States of Hawaii and New Mexico, does this language allow a court of appropriate jurisdiction to establish congressional districts from which the 1968 congressional nominations and elections must be conducted?

Mr. CELLER. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, my next question follows: Does the language of H.R. 2508 prevent a court from ordering the conduct of elections at large in States other than Hawaii and New Mexico?

Mr. CELLER. There is a definite prohibition contained in the conference report against the election of Representatives at large. The courts would follow that admonition.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, my other question deals with the second sentence of the conference report, which reads as follows:

> No State shall be required to redistrict prior to the 19th Federal Decennial Census unless the results of a special Federal census conducted pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 1013; 71 Stat. 481; 13 U.S.C. 8), are available for use therein.

In a State in which existing districts have been found unconstitutional, does this provision allow a court of appropriate jurisdiction to establish congressional districts on the basis of the 1960 census and order the 1968 congressional nominations and elections to be conducted from such districts?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. The conference report permits the court to establish congressional districts as are necessary to comply with the requirements of the Constitution. The districts could be based on such population figures as the court determines to be adequate, including 1960 census figures, if the court wanted to.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, my final question is this: Is the language of H.R. 2508 severable for purposes of judicial interpretation?

Mr. CELLER. The court would have the power to separate its rulings, since there are two distinct subjects involved in the conference report. One subject involves redistricting and the other subject involves banning the election of Representatives at Large. Therefore, since there are two distinct subjects involved, the court would have the power to separate them and to rule thereon.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and commend the gentleman for his work in this field.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this conference report is agreed to.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, you mentioned the Redistricting Act that was passed in the State of Maryland in 1966, and you spoke of our very eminent judge, Simon Soboloff, whom I hold in very high esteem.

I would like to know whether you are referring to the fact that he did in fact use in his decision the 1960 census?

Mr. CELLER. Judge Simon Soboloff said that he had to use the 1960 census figures, because he had no other choice, but further stated that he had rather not use them, because they were outmoded figures.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Therefore, the question of the redistricting of the State of Maryland in fact was based upon the 1960 census?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; and the court drew the lines itself.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee this: In the series of questions and answers which he propounded a moment ago he asked the question in the event there was no special census "could a court compel a State to redistrict its lines?" and the answer he gave to that question was "No." But my recollection was that the chairman also said that even in such a case the court itself might still redistrict the lines?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. STRATTON. Then let me ask the distinguished chairman this: The precise wording of the conference report is that "no State shall be required to redistrict in the event that this special census is not available." Would not a decision of the court saying to the people of that State that "you shall have your Congressman run from the following new districts," be itself a requirement that that State redistrict itself, which the conference report prohibits?

Mr. CELLER. I would say that it is a requirement. I would say that it is a sort of admonition, it is a very strong, powerful, potent force that the court would follow. But we cannot dictate to a court of competent jurisdiction what they shall do under circumstances where they have declared lines to be unconstitutionally drawn, we cannot interfere.

Mr. STRATTON. But is it still the gentleman's impression, as the gentleman responded to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], that even in such a case the court would in practice probably carry out the will of the Congress?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I am quite sure it would.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say when the Supreme Court got into what was termed the political thicket the facts developed indicated that there were many reasons why the Congress perhaps should take action itself. At that time I introduced two resolutions, one for the Court's findings, calling it to the attention of the House of Representatives, and the other calling for an act of Congress. We all realize the Court has no money to pay itself, or to enforce its decrees except as the legislative branch may cooperate in. The point I wish to make is that by passing this legislation, and my State at the moment does not seem to be involved one way or another—we are not acknowledging that the Court has the right to determine or to step in to prevent the House or the Congress from exercising its right under the Constitution to be the sole judges of the qualifications of its Members—we are not yielding in that regard in your opinion?

Mr. CELLER. No, sir; none whatsoever. And may I interject, the gentleman remembers the famous statement of President Jackson when he said:

> The Supreme Court has made its decision. Now let them try to enforce it—

Mr. WHITTEN. I do—

Mr. CELLER (continuing):

> The Court has no battalions, no soldiers, they cannot enforce their decrees.

Mr. WHITTEN. And no money to pay themselves.

So I believe that I can agree with the gentleman that the Court can decide anything, and it is up to the Congress to decide whether we wish to follow it or not insofar as the qualifications for the Members in line with the Constitution.

Mr. CELLER. In addition, we have a specific authority under the Constitution which I will read, section 4, article 1:

> The Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations—

With reference to the election of Congressmen—

> except as to the places of chusing Senators.

I will read the whole section:

> The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the places of chusing Senators.

Mr. WHITTEN. I just wanted to be sure that by passing an act here that we are in no way agreeing that the Court has any power to interfere with the exercise of our own right to determine the qualifications of the Members.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

This is a very sticky proposition, and I hope the Members will bear with me. It is rather difficult to answer all of these questions that are being fired at me, I am doing the best I can.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. The question I am going to propose, of course, affects the State of New York, of which State the able gentleman [Mr. CELLER], of course, is a Representative in the Congress.

The question is this: If the court has ordered a redistricting because it has found that the present lines are unconstitutional under the one-man, one-vote rule, although it has ordered the redistricting and it has drawn the lines—

Mr. CELLER. That is the case in New York now.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. That is exactly right.

Mr. CELLER. The case is on appeal to the Supreme Court.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. That is correct.

In the event the Supreme Court of the United States does not reverse the statutory court, may the court then draw the lines disregarding the alleged or supposed admonition or recommendation of the Congress?

Mr. CELLER. The court can do it. But as I know the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and knowing the manner of men and type of judges who occupy the high judicial office in that court, I doubt very much whether they would disregard the solemn proclamation and admonition—and I use that word again—of this Congress.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. But it may disregard the admonition?

Mr. CELLER. It could—yes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. In other words, it may disregard the admonition, because it is a question of your interpretation against theirs. It is a question of whether or not they feel that the lines which were erroneously drawn should be redrawn in keeping with the finding of the court under the one-man, one-vote rule.

Mr. CELLER. I am willing to pit my judgment against theirs any day.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Except that you cannot enforce your judgment, whereas they can.

Mr. CELLER. When it comes to that question, I would say I have more power than they have in the sense that I, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, am making certain recommendations which I hope the House of Representatives will adopt and follow.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. The House may adopt the recommendations but there is no requirement that the recommendations must be followed—there is only an admonition.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. From reading the conference report and the response of the distinguished chairman of the committee to questions that have been propounded to him, it would leave this Member to believe that the following is the fact, and I would like to have the chairman confirm my understanding.

With the exception of the State of Hawaii and New Mexico, as I understand the ban against State at-large elections for Members, it also carries with it implicitly the banning of multi-Member elections.

Mr. CELLER. Yes, sir; that is correct. You cannot have more than one Congressman from one district.

Mr. BURTON of California. That is my understanding and I am glad that the chairman's view with respect to this squares with my own understanding.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE], a member of the committee.

Mr. HUNGATE. I should like to speak briefly in opposition to this, if I might have 5 minutes of time.

Mr. CELLER. I will yield time to the gentleman later.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the State of New Jersey the court has ordered that we redistrict and there was a redistricting by the State legislature. The redistricting was contested and the court upon challenge found that those districts were invalid.

However, because of the time question, the courts permitted us to run in districts which were invalid, but only for the 1966 elections. They mandated that we not be able to run in those invalid districts in 1968.

My question is, Would this legislation, first of all, prohibit the courts from ordering that we redistrict in order to apportion validly?

Mr. CELLER. No; it would not.

Mr. RODINO. It would not?

Mr. CELLER. No. The State itself could also redistrict under those circumstances.

Mr. RODINO. In view of the fact that there is one exception here, and that is that the States of Hawaii and Alaska may be permitted to run at large, but that no other States may run at large, then if the courts ordered that we be redistricted, could the courts order that we run at large?

Mr. CELLER. No; the court cannot. There is an absolute prohibition against a State being compelled to permit at-large elections.

Mr. RODINO. In other words, as I understand the chairman's interpretation of this legislation, this would not prevent the legislature from redistricting and the court from ordering it, but the court could not order us to run at large?

Mr. CELLER. Correct.

Mr. RODINO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that same point for one question?

Mr. CELLER. I have only 1 hour, and many Members have asked for time. Will the gentleman permit me to allow some of the other Members to have time before I answer any more questions?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on April 27 of this year the House passed H.R. 2508, providing Federal standards for congressional redistricting. There were two important sections to that bill. The first section provided for standards in the post-1970 census period. The second section provided for interim standards applicable to the next two Congresses.

Let me address myself first to the section 1 provisions covering the post-1970 census period.

The House-passed bill was approved by the conferees without change, and was recommended to this House for adoption without change on June 27. The provisions for the post-1970 census period, which you are now asked to abandon, were as follows:

First. When a State is entitled to more than one Representative, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of authorized Representatives.

Second. Representatives shall be elected only from such districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative. Existing provisions for a Representative at large are eliminated.

Third. Each district shall be composed of contiguous territory, in as reasonably a compact form as the State finds practicable.

Fourth. The district with the largest population shall not exceed by more than 10 percent the district with the smallest population in number of persons.

Fifth. Population shall be based on the then most recent decennial census, but if a State redistricts more than 2 years after a decennial census, the population figures to be used must be those of a statewide Federal special census.

Sixth. Unless the particular State constitution requires otherwise, there shall not be more than one districting between decennial censuses.

The conference report from which I have just quoted, report No. 435, adopted verbatim the provisions as passed by the House of Representatives for the post-1970 census period.

You will remember, ladies and gentlemen, that on June 28 the distinguished chairman of our committee appeared in the well and asked unanimous consent to return to conference the June 27 agreement, and for one reason only: The conferees had not made adequate protection against at-large races in the interim period before the 1970 census figures became available.

We went back to conference and I thought we would talk about that temporary problem. To my amazement last week I found the conferees were about to recommend a new conference report—one which abandoned the post-1970 census provisions that the House passed in April, and which the conferees agreed to in June—without explanation.

If recognized, I will move to recommit the report to the conference with instructions to reinstate the permanent provisions that I have outlined.

Also, so as to make sure that under the rules of the House I am recognized to offer the motion to recommit, my recommittal motion will also deal with the question of how we might do what Mr. Celler wanted to do when he appeared in the well of the House on June 28 and asked for the report to be recommitted to conference. My motion will provide for the interim period:

> There shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative.

The essential recommittal provisions therefore will be these:

First. Single-Member districts from now until we have a 1970 census.

Second. After we have the 1970 census, the provisions which the House passed in April, and to which the conferees agreed on June 27, will be applicable.

I have circularized a letter to each Member of this body indicating my intention to move to reinstate the permanent provisions which the conferees would now have us abandon.

Since, then, for parliamentary purposes, I have made one modest modification in my motion, and that is to conform to the move now afoot in the other body to outlaw at-large contests between now and the time we have the results of the 1970 census figures.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the gentleman's motion to recommit, the gentleman will reaffirm the action which was taken unanimously in the House and what was in the conference report at that time, so if we vote for the gentleman's motion to recommit, we will be in effect approving the action we took, with corrective measures?

Mr. MacGREGOR. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We will be saying we want to stick to the House provisions on the permanent standards for the makeup of congressional districts.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Minnesota for his position. As the principal plaintiff in the key redistricting lawsuit in Federal court in Texas, I plead for districts which were not only reasonably close in population but which would be reasonably compact and certainly contiguous. It is essential that we have some language which will protect the people against gerrymandering. I hope the gentleman's position will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Steiger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance that I rise to oppose the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 2508.

I believe the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] is correct in his belief that a motion to recommit is essential.

The conference's failure to adopt standards for congressional districts after the 1970 census is a step backward.

In the other body the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], has termed this bill a "nondistricting proposal" and with that I agree.

The report of the conference committee is unacceptable and should be defeated.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a travesty.

First, it abandons all pretense in its effort to nullify the basic principle reflected in the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision.

Second, it abandons any sincere effort to meet the constitutional mandate that the Congress set its standards, an effort endorsed by this body when H.R. 2508 passed this house several months ago.

Third, it perpetrates for at least four intolerable years the inequities of the past, without even token expression of interest in the basic immorality involved.

Fourth, in essence this bill represents nothing more nor less than a total and complete abdication of the House's responsibility to the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, I resent this bill and all it implies.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to state that the motion to recommit, if carried, will put us exactly where we were 5 months ago. It provides for guidelines. I was one of the foremost of all the conferees who fought for guidelines, and I could not get them. I could not get the Senate conferees to agree to these guidelines.

If we try to recommit and insist upon guidelines, we will get nowhere. We will be just exactly where we were when we started these conferences last June. It would be an exercise of utter inutility.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I think we have to admit there is the depressing atmosphere of a funeral service about this debate today. But I think every corpse should be decently interred. On these occasions some human understanding and empathy is in order. I think we can take comfort in our hope for the future, and I do not think there is any point at all in flailing around in anguish and frustration. That is nearly the situation that we must face candidly today.

I might report to the House that the death in this case was caused from wounds received from others and not from the Members of the House.

It is no secret that the House conferees had agreed to accept the House interim provisions and the Senate permanent provisions for congressional districts. This would have been an honest compromise. I included these provisions in H.R. 13691, which I have introduced and for which I solicit support.

But this is all prolog. What are the merits of the case before us?

There are benefits to be salvaged from this report—though they are meager, and I am the first to say so, but they are better than nothing.

One man, one vote is certainly an important principle in the conduct of representative government. I yield to the prior claim of the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, as the first leader in the fight for fair congressional districts. He has been leading that fight for a long time, but I claim to have been in the fight with him as vigorously and as actively as any other Member of this House. One man, one vote should, of course, be one of the guiding principles in representative government.

It is not, however, the only principle. It is not the only thing that we have to consider when we are talking about representative government. There are other things of importance if we are to have successful representative government.

The stability of political institutions has something to do with this. The familiarity of the voters and the people with the voting districts and the familiarities of the voters and the people with the candidates who are running have something to do with it. All these things are important also. They have to be considered.

I would say, moreover, that one-man, one-vote depends on the availability of reliable statistics. A witness to this need is the judicial opinion already referred to by the distinguished gentleman from New York, Judge Sobelof's opinion in *Maryland Citizens Committee* v. *Tawes* (253 F. Supp. 731 (1966)), in which he said that to deviate from regular census figures was to enter a mathematical thicket.

I quote from page 734 of his opinion:

> A difficulty encountered by anyone who undertakes in 1966 to draw district lines with a view to achieving substantial population equality, is that the only accurate figures available are those from the 1960 census. The dilemma presents two possible choices: to accept the 1960 census figures which are not up to date, or to attempt to make estimates of changes in population figures since that date. Neither choice is a happy one, but we have concluded that it is better to adhere to the census figures than to engage in speculative estimates or projections which vary widely with the estimators and the manner in which they handle the figures available to them from various sources. The alternative we have rejected would indeed lead into a mathematical thicket.

Mr. Speaker, the 1960 census figures are archaic and outgrown. There are no reliable statistics presently available.

If we reject this conference report, we invite the courts to rummage through the file cabinets of the Nation for attractive figures that might help to direct their progress through the political thickets of congressional redistricting.

Since we have knowledge of the situation in Indiana, where an at Large congressional election is now imminent, I believe we would acquiesce by silence to such an at-large race there or elsewhere if we reject this report. What could be more contrary to the principle of one man, one vote than to condone at-large races in great and populous States like Indiana?

Our choices are limited.

First, we can recommit this bill. In my opinion that will return it to a committee which probably will never meet to reconsider it.

Second, we can adopt the report. Then one of two things will happen.

It will go to the other body, where a new look can be given it, and new instructions may be given to the conferees there, and we may finally observe a case of reviving the corpse.

At the very least, we will prevent new kinds of inequities and new kinds of injustice which might result from new panaceas that would be applied in the absence of reliable statistics and under the pressure of continued congressional silence.

The prudent course and the right course, I believe, is to adopt this report. That is the responsible course, in my judgment, in the interest of representative government. That is why I am urging a vote against the motion to recommit and a vote for the adoption of the report.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Will the gentleman please talk for a half minute to the subject of compactness and contiguity insofar as the conference report is written?

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Obviously there are not any provisions on compactness and contiguity here.

If the gentleman is interested in those subjects, the thing to do is to send the report back to the other body as written, to let the other body give instructions to its conferees, because that is where the trouble is on those questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maryand has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE].

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to be advised when I have 10 seconds remaining, so that the only other member of the committee against this bill in the first place, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], may have some time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the committee for yielding and permitting me to say something about this conference report.

Six months ago on April 27 when the House first considered the question of congressional districting, it was with the intent of establishing standards which would both uphold the constitutional right for one man's vote to count as much as any other's and also to set clear and reasonable standards for enforcing this recently established interpretation of the U.S. Constitution. In fact that goal was to fulfill the high constitutional responsibility of the Congress under article I, section 4, of the U.S. Constitution to be the ultimate overseer of "the times, places, and manner of holding elections" for U.S. Representative.

On that day we had heated debate over the propriety, constitutionality, and wisdom of the standards set forth by the original version of the bill. Members disputed as to whether some of the provisions actually fulfilled the constitutional principle of one-man, one-vote. But at least all would admit that the original version did establish some standards. Then the Senate rejected the House's version and substituted a bill which was designed to eliminate all doubts as to the constitutionality of the House's version and to fully guarantee the fair drawing of the sizes and shapes of congressional districts.

But this conference report is not a compromise and adjustment between these two different versions. The conference committee has actually thrown out both the House and Senate versions and has written a totally new bill. Let me give you just one of many examples.

The House bill established a maximum permissible variation in the population of congressional districts for the 1968 and 1970 elections of 30 percent. The Senate provided a maximum of 10 percent. The conference bill does not, as one would expect, provide a compromise between those two figures. Amazingly enough it is actually drafted to prevent any redistricting at all for the 1968 and 1970 elections, even in States which have far above the House's standards of 30 percent.

The conference report's justification for this language is that 1960 census data is quite out of date and that States should wait until 1970 census data is available. The only exception for waiting for the 1970 data is the use of special statewide censuses. But such data is only available if the State requests it and pays millions of dollars for it.

Most State legislatures will not meet again until 1969 and in most States it would take more than a year for the data to be available from the time the State requested it. The result would be that probably even for the 1970 election new data would not be available. The net result of these census data provisions is to prevent the Federal courts from requiring any new redistricting before the 1972 elections.

Now a court might take the unprecedented steps of ordering a State Governor to call a special session of the legislature, and also order the legislature to both request a special census and appropriate the millions of dollars necessary to pay for it. But in almost every State even such a procedure would not result in the new data being available in time to use in drawing districts for 1968 since the data would take at least 12 months to compile.

THE ENTIRE CONFERENCE BILL IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The truth of the matter is that this bill is not a statement of policy under the Congress article I, section 4 responsibility to establish the manner for electing Representatives. Instead, this bill attempts to prohibit the courts from enforcing constitutional rights of American citizens for the next two congressional elections. Mr. Speaker, my main reason for opposing this conference report is that this proposal is a default by Congress on its constitutional responsibilities and a vain and irresponsible attempt to interfere with the Federal judiciary's fulfillment of their separate constitutional responsibilities.

Three and a half years ago the Supreme Court construed the requirement of article I, section 2 of the Constitution that Representatives shall be chosen "by the people of the several States" to mean that "as nearly as practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's." *Wesberry v. Sanders* 376 U.S. 1, 8 (1964). There are only two ways that this constitutional mandate can be given effect in a State whose current congressional districts vary in population beyond reasonable limits and so have been found to be unconstitutional.

Congressional districts may be established as nearly equal in population as practical from each of which one Representative is to be elected. Or all the State's representatives can be elected at large.

This bill is designed to take from the courts both of these weapons for enforcing the Constitution. The bill prohibits the courts from requiring that new districts be established since, as I explained previously, even a special census would not provide new data in time for the next congressional elections. Also the bill prohibits the courts from using its other weapons since it would prohibit at-large elections.

This bill is really an attempt to undermine the Wesberry decision where the Supreme Court first decided that the drawing of congressional districts was a proper subject for judicial consideration. We are actually dealing with a cleverly designed attempt to state that while the courts may consider the issue justiciable, Congress is prohibiting the Court for the next two elections from using the only available means for enforcing decisions under that doctrine.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply an attempt by Congress to prohibit the courts from enforcing the U.S. Constitution which, under our system of separation of powers among the three branches of the Government, it can never do.

Let no one attempt to defend this bill by stating that Congress is not interfering with the Court's enforcement of the Constitution, but merely establishing guidelines for all to use in drawing congressional district boundaries. For this conference bill does not establish a general policy that it would be inadvisable and inequitable to use 7-year-old data in the drawing of congressional districts. That statement of the majority of the House managers argues that 1960 data is not appropriate for courts to require to be used in drawing congressional districts since they would result in districts "so inaccurate as to be unreasonable." But then they specifically state that State legislatures may voluntarily use such data in the following words:

> It is to be emphasized that nothing in the conference report prohibits a State from redistricting prior to the 93rd Congress if it so elects.

I submit that such a double standard is no standard at all. This double standard further illustrates that the purpose of this bill is to prevent the courts from taking action for the next two elections regarding the proper drawing of congressional districts. The purpose of this conference bill is to suspend the one-man, one-vote constitutional right of every American until the 1972 congressional elections.

THE CONFERENCE BILL INCREASES THE POSSIBILITY OF AT-LARGE ELECTIONS

The conference bill does include a provision which I think almost every Member of this House supports—that at-large elections should be prohibited. Unfortunately the prohibition against at-large elections is inseparably related to the central purpose of this bill which is to prevent court enforcement of the one-man, one-vote decision.

For example the bill's first sentence prohibits at-large elections and then, repeats the prohibition by stating:

> Nor shall any State prior to the 19th Federal decennial census be required to elect its Representatives at large.

There is certainly something peculiar about requiring new decennial census data before a State may be required to elect its Representatives at Large. Why do you need census data, if there are to be no districts? You only need a prohibition against requiring members to run at large between now and 1972 if you want to guarantee that the courts have no remedy to assure a one-man, one-vote situation. Since the prohibition of at-large elections is designed not as a statement of public policy, but as a second means of prohibiting the court from enforcing the Constitution, I fear that the courts will just declare the entire bill unconstitutional. This possibility is heightened by the fact that the bill does not contain the usual separability clause, which even the first conference report of last June contained.

A second reason I fear that this bill will result in at-large elections is that the only definite result of passage of this bill is additional litigation in the courts on this question. By the time the Supreme Court acts on the basic question and then the district courts implement that decision in each separate jurisdiction we will probably be far into the spring of 1968. That is so late in the political schedule for nominations to Congress in many States that there would not be adequate time for even court-drawn districts to be built into the State's election procedures. Also many district courts have stated their strong inclination against drawing political boundaries. And the spring of 1968 would certainly be far too late to allow for the time-consuming process of State legislatures drawing congressional districts.

A likely result of these considerations would be for the courts to select the other and easier method of enforcing the one-man, one-vote doctrine by requiring at-large elections.

ONE SURE WAY OF PROHIBITING AT-LARGE ELECTIONS

Mr. Speaker, there is one sure and constitutional way of prohibiting at-large elections.

I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this body the announced plan of a Member of the Senate, who is going to offer an amendment to a pending House-passed bill on the Senate calendar, that would prohibit at-large elections.

On October 24, Senator Baker, as is indicated on page 29815 of the Congressional Record, indicated that he is going to offer an amendment that would insure that no Members would have to run at large.

That amendment, which would come over as a rider, would allow everyone who is deeply disturbed about the possibility of Members having to run at large an opportunity to pass a bill to prohibit just that. Such a bill would be constitutional since it would not be an attempt to prohibit court enforcement of the one-man, one-vote rule. Such a procedure would still allow the courts full powers to enforce the Constitution by requiring the drawing of new congressional district boundaries.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to vote against this conference report since it is unconstitutional and demeans the dignity of this House. As I mentioned we can assure the prohibition of at-large elections without getting us into the disturbing problems raised by this bill. And we can still go forward and pass a districting bill which will be constitutional and a honorable fulfillment of our responsibilities.

It is my view that representatives of the two Houses of Congress could meet even now and fashion a compromise between the House and Senate versions which would satisfy the constitutional requirements for congressional districts to be drawn in a fair and reasonable manner.

I also feel that such a compromise could be fashioned so as to effect this desired goal with the least amount of confusion, litigation, and instability of congressional districts. Districting plans drawn in accordance with such a bill would likewise be secure against being declared void.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this conference report rather than pass a bill which will be declared unconstitutional. Only if we vote down this conference report, and act now to pass a bill setting forth reasonable and constitutional standards, will the Congress have an opportunity to guide both legislatures and the courts in their drawing of congressional district boundaries.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has 10 seconds remaining.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I urge that the conference report be voted down.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, it must be obvious to the Members of the House that we cannot adequately handle this legislation in the time allotted. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am shocked at the conference report and shall oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, this House unanimously approved the last conference report which contained permanent standards. After the vote and after the conference report was published, it then appeared that because of a technicality, the bill would permit general elections at large. For this reason and this reason only the report was recommitted to conference with the understanding that the only subject to be dealt with was the election of at-large Representatives. Now we find that this conference report has been completely and totally changed so that it now would eliminate all permanent standards references and would prohibit Federal courts from requiring States to reapportion until the next decennial census.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this legislation is patently unconstitutional.

This legislation dramatically illustrates, Mr. Speaker, the need to implement rule X of the House rules within the spirit and purpose of the rule. Under this rule, the Speaker shall appoint all conference committees and I concede that his discretion is absolute. We cannot tell him whom to appoint and it is, of course, common practice for the Speaker to appoint the managers from the committees that reported the bill. But members of the committees, the House managers, are supposed to be chosen to represent the attitude of the House—V. Hines 6369. As a matter of fact, the precedents of the House clearly indicate that the Speaker has passed over the ranking member of a committee in order to achieve a proper representation of House views—VIII. Cannon 3223.

In my judgment, therefore, the Speaker of the House of Representatives should appoint managers who will represent the attitude of the House. How can a Member who opposes legislation and votes against it be expected after passage to support it in conference? Certainly, the majority, at least, of the managers should be selected from the membership that voted in favor of the measure passed by the House. In the instant case, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the House has been completely ignored. The conference report is political expediency at its worst. If no agreement could be reached, the conferees should have reported back to that effect. To try and pass the conference report as a proper and worthwhile compromise is most regrettable. I hope the membership will oppose this conference report.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman [Mr. Wylie].

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

I rise in support of the conference report and urge that it be adopted. I concur in the statement of the distinguished chairman [Mr. Celler] that the 1960 Federal census is out of date. Congress has been wrestling with the problem of congressional redistricting almost since the beginning of our country, but up until 1964 this problem was left to Congress and the courts have meticulously kept hands off.

In 1964 in the case of Wesberry against Sanders, the Supreme Court of the United States adopted the so called one-man, one-vote doctrine and advised the States to comply with their decision or face court redistricting.

In 1964 the 1960 Federal census was already almost 4 years old. The Supreme Court did not say that the 1960 Federal census must be adhered to but only that districts must be composed as nearly as practicable of equal numbers of people.

Many States, including Ohio, went about conscientiously attempting to comply with the decision of the Supreme Court. As a matter of fact, the State Legislature in Ohio formed an Interim Study Commission immediately after the release of the Federal census in 1960 and before the Supreme Court decision in Wesberry against Sanders to study the problem of congressional redistricting in Ohio. I was a member of that commission.

We presented several plans to the State legislature which, for various reasons were rejected. In 1963 a committee of the State legislature was formed to try again without success. In 1964 came the Wesberry against Sanders decision. I think no one in the State legislature or on the committees to study congressional redistricting disagreed with the Supreme Court decision. The problem was to properly implement it and carry it out. In 1965, a committee was again formed to prepare a bill for congressional redistricting to present to the State legislature. The Supreme Court said that each district should contain as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants. When we examined the 1960 population figures, we found that already by 1965 the census figures were outdated, outmoded, and could not be used to determine the number of inhabitants living in some of the districts. For instance, the 12th Congressional District, with the Honorable Samuel L. Devine as Representative, had a population of 682,962 based on the Federal census of 1960. When we started to reduce the number of inhabitants living in his district to the 404,000 figure, which was the optimum figure for the number of people living in Ohio districts, we found we would not do it based on the 1960 census. We could see, for instance, that one tract which was listed as having some 200 inhabitants now, in 1965, had over 5,000 inhabitants. We could see that the area in which I live was no longer farmland but was a community of 1,000 people. You did not have to take a census, you did not have to guess—you could see them. Houses had been built and people were living there. Well, obviously, to put one census tract down as having 200 people and the other as 0 would not be accurate and we felt would not comply with the mandate of the Supreme Court that districts were to be composed of people and not cows and chickens. So, we went about trying to determine on our own the actual population of the districts based on the latest available figures.

For example, the Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce maintains population estimates composed of factors such as the number of building permits, the number of new postal addresses, the number of births, the number of deaths, water and sewer permits, and so forth. Based on these factors, the Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce is able to project population estimates within one-tenth of 1 percent of the Federal census, and did in 1960.

Using these factors, our committee found that the population of Franklin County was not 682,962 according to the 1960 Federal census but was over 786,000, an increase of 100,000 persons in less than 5 years. So we decided to divide Franklin County into two districts—which would mean that the 12th District would now have almost 400,000 and the 15th District, or the other half of Franklin County would have almost 400,000—within any recognizable guideline of the Supreme Court decisions as to population variation.

If we had used the 1960 Federal census figures, the 12th District was about 18 percent too small. If we used actual head count figures, the population was just about right. We redistricted on the basis present population where it could be proved as in Franklin County. The redistricting proposal in the State of Ohio was taken to the Federal District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, and was upheld based on the showing that there was sufficient evidence that the redistricting complied with the one-man one-vote doctrine as nearly as practicable.

I point this out to show one State's conscientious efforts were made before the Supreme Court decision and again after to redistrict on a fair basis. The same may be said for other States. It seems to me that it is desirable to allow the matter to settle until we have up-to-date Federal census figures. It seems to me that there is something to be said for continuity in this area since it has only been 3 years since the now famous Wesberry against Sanders decision and the problem has not been solved to everyone's satisfaction for over 100 years before that.

In 1970, the Federal census will be watched with one eye to the Wesberry against Sanders decision and another eye on congressional redistricting. I support the conference report as a solution until the 1970 Federal census which can be the basis for the formation of meaningful, exact, and succinct population guidelines.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Wylie] for the timely example which so clearly indicates the need for the adoption of the conference committee report.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Members of the House that which the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has already said, the conference committee had eight meetings. We struggled diligently and to the best of our ability to obtain an agreement in accordance with the bill as it passed this House of Representatives in the first instance. The result of our work is before the House.

Now, there were two or three questions asked the chairman of the committee, one by my distinguished colleague from New York, as to what would happen to an order of the court in the State of New York ordering redistricting which order has been appealed to a higher court, I presume the Supreme Court of the United States.

If this conference report is adopted in the House and in the Senate, and becomes law, that order of court is neutralized. And I cite Chief Justice Marshall, of the United States, to support that statement.

In 1801 he said in *United States* v. *Schooner "Peggy"*, 1 Cranch 13, in determining just such a question:

> But if subsequent to the judgment and before the decision of the Appellate Court, a law intervenes and positively changes the rule which governors, the law must be obeyed, or its obligation denied. If the law be constitutional. . . . I know of no court which can contest its obligation.

This is simply the same principle of law that has caused so much concern in the area of criminal law. After the Supreme Court handed down its new interpretation of the fourth amendment in Mapp against Ohio, it held, in Linkletter against Walker, that the State and Federal Courts have to apply the new rule of law to any cases still pending on appeal. And after the Supreme Court handed down its new fifth amendment interpretation in Griffin against California, it held in Tehan against Schoot, that the new rule must likewise be applied to all cases pending on appeal. Thus, many courts were forced to reverse decisions of inferior courts, even though these decisions were correct when rendered The analogy to the present case is clear. The Schooner *Peggy* doctrine dictates that pending court orders would have to be abated.

H.R. 2508 has been much misunderstood by several of its critics. Lest confusion spread among us, the conference report should be explained.

The scope of the conference report is limited to the next two congressional elections. The report is silent as to what happens thereafter. No permanent standards are established. That task lies ahead.

For the next two elections, the bill accomplishes two things: First, it prevents at-large elections—Hawaii and New Mexico excepted, and second, it prevents court-ordered redistricting where no recent official census figures are available.

It does not prevent a legislature from redistricting on its own motion because the legislatures of the States are capable of making their own up-to-date head count which may be used as a legitimate basis for redistricting. The courts, under the report, could still prevent, by injunction, bad faith redistricting by a legislature. But they could not initiate the redisricting process.

It is argued by some that this moratorium on court redistricting is unconstitutional. However, that challenge misconceives the thrust of the report as well as it misses the import of *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1 (1964).

The Constitution does not require the ceremony of redistricting but rather that districts be as equal in population as is practicable. Now, at the present time when the facts of how many live where are not known to us, how can we make the districts equal. If we use the 1960 census figures, will we be moving toward or away from equality of districts?

We do not know. We cannot know. We can only speculate. This bill says that we should wait until we get the facts. That is only commonsense. The ceremony of redistricting in itself has no constitutional merit; it gains merit only when reliable figures are available.

No useful purpose is served by applying a rule when the facts are in doubt.

That doubt can only be officially removed by a Federal census. If a legislature wishes to redistrict on the belief that it can produce its own reliable figures, it may do so—subject to court review as to its faith.

It is perhaps appropriate at this time to recall that in Johnson against New Jersey the Supreme Court said that the constitutional mandates of Miranda and Escobedo were not to be applied retrospectively even to cases on direct appeal because the application of those principles in such a manner would have mischievous results in the administration of the States' criminal laws. The precedent goes much further than H.R. 2508 does, for in Johnson, the Court suspended the Constitution in order to prevent chaos; whereas, H.R. 2508 simply withholds the application of a constitutional principle only until the necessary facts may be determined. If the Supreme Court decision in Johnson does not violate the Constitution, then a fortiori, neither does H.R. 2508.

In summary, the managers well understood the desire of the Members for a report that would bring stability to the area of concern. It is charged that the report would produce chaos because it is unconstitutional. We have carefully examined that problem. Commonsense is not unconstitutional.

There is no effective bill devisable in this area that a clever person cannot attack as unconstitutional. Do not be lured by the suggestion that some report can be devised which is both more effective and less imbued with doubt. It does not exist.

I recommend the conference committee report to all my colleagues.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. CAHILL. The question is this: That in the State of New Jersey, as the gentleman has said, the Supreme Court has held that the districts under which we have been elected are unconstitutional. The legislature has not redistricted us. If this bill is passed, in my judgment we cannot run at large, so how will New Jersey elect its Representatives?

Mr. McCULLOCH. The legislature may redistrict the State.

Mr. CAHILL. But they have not done it, and they decline to do it.

Mr. McCULLOCH. That is my answer to the question, Mr. Speaker. The legislature is not prevented from redistricting the State of New Jersey pursuant to the unreversed order of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. CAHILL. Yes, but what if they do not?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that in fairness I should point out my main reluctance to the conference report, is the fact that this bill would prevent the court from passing upon redistricting suits between now and 1970 in effect. Also I believe that passage of this bill would do exactly the reverse, of what concerns so many Members here today; namely, forcing members to run at large.

We cannot eliminate at-large contests by this kind of conference report.

So in the last minutes of this debate I would urge my colleagues to vote down this report so we can finally pass a districting bill which is constitutional.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 2508 was first brought to the floor of this House, I was compelled to vote against it. Its proposed population standards departed markedly from several significant court decisions and, indeed, it raised doubts as to the jurisdiction of Federal courts in redistricting cases.

The conference report offered today for approval represents an undisguised attempt to oust the Federal courts of all jurisdiction over congressional redistricting for a period which could exceed 5 years. The report is devoid of any population standards. It fails to require compactness in the formulation of congressional districts. The report fails even to preserve the worst elements of a House bill which left a great deal to be desired when its passage was secured.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this report is totally unacceptable to those of us who believe that the U.S. Constitution guarantees to the American people the full application of the concept of "one man, one vote." There is little, in my judgment, that can be said in defense of this attempt to subvert our constitutional guarantees. It is my hope that the Members of this body will put principle above short-term political gain and defeat this proposal today.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state unequivocally my opposition to the congressional redistricting conference report which is now up for our consideration after a 5-month delay. I feel that the conference report is a giant step backward and raises very serious constitutional questions.

I think that we have had enough time to carry out the mandate of the Constitution—as well as the several Supreme Court rulings of the past 5 years—to provide equal representation in the House of Representatives for all the people. This conference report is considerably less desirable then the original House measure and little resembles the Senate version.

We in the Congress have a responsibility to the citizens of this country to protect and insure their rights and privileges as guaranteed by the Constitution. We owe to our constituents an equal voice in choosing their representative in Congress. This conference report does not live up to this high ideal. It violates the spirit and intent of the Constitution and it completely ignores the great responsibility we bear to enact an equitable and reasonable bill.

Although time grows short, Mr. Speaker, it is not too late to go back to conference and report out a fair and logical compromise. We can do no less than this.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference committee report, and to point out as has been emphasized by the chairman of the committee and by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] that from time to time we had meetings to try to resolve the issues. At one time we did bring in a report which then went back to conference again.

The only reason we did not draw standards to apply from now until 1972 or censuses thereafter is because the conferees could not agree on that one little phrase "as determined by the State." After many meetings it was agreed that we could not arrive at a determination.

But there is a necessity for the Congress to take some action, first, to see that the congressional districts are divided within the State except the two States of Hawaii and New Mexico. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is that the 1960 census is not realistic. The only thing we are saying here is to get an up-to-date census if you are going to reapportion in the State.

There have been questions raised as to constitutionality. May I say that the Constitution itself provides that the apportionment shall be made to the State.

There is nothing in this report and nothing in the answers as given by the gentleman from New York which would in any manner attack a court that determines a reapportionment on a constitutional situation. There is nothing in this conference report that will do it and there is no attempt to violate the one-man, one-vote rule.

The thing we are saying is that we are trying to give a guideline to meet an issue that has plagued us since the Supreme Court announced the so-called one-man, one-vote theory or rule. The purpose of this is to still continue within that guideline and with that in view we hope that you will adopt this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is opposed to the conference report?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MacGregor moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2508) to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on substituting (for the matter set forth in such report) the matter which was contained in the first section of the previous conference report (H. Rept. No. 435) submitted on the bill plus a provision substantially as follows:

"In each State entitled in the Ninety-First Congress and the Ninety-Second Congress to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled 'An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives' (46 Stat. 26), as amended, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 82, nays 283, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—82

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Battin
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Brock
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Bush
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Chamberlain
Cleveland
Collier
Cowger
Cunningham
Curtis
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Gardner
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hall
Heckler, Mass.
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jonas
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Kleppe
Kuykendall
McEwen
MacGregor
Mailliard
Mayne
Meskill
Moore
Morse, Mass.
Morton
O'Konski
Patten
Pike
Price, Tex.
Reuss
Riegel
Robison
Roth
Rumsfeld
St Germain
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schwengel
Snyder
Stafford
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Vander Jagt
Wampler
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wydler
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—283

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cramer
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Purcell
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tuck
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Walker
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Williams, Pa.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wylie
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—67

Abbitt
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bell
Boggs
Bray
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Cohelan
Corbett
Corman
Dawson
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Downing
Edwards, La.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Fisher
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hanna
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Hosmer
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kluczynski
Kyl
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McFall
Martin
Miller, Calif.
Moss
Pollock
Pryor
Quie
Quillen
Rarick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roudebush
Ruppe
St. Onge
Staggers
Stuckey
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Ullman
Utt
Vigorito
Waldie
Watkins
Watts
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. Hammerschmidt for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. William D. Ford for, with Mr. Hathaway against.

Mr. Thompson of Georgia for, with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona against.

Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Pollock against.

Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Bray against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Staggers.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Fuqua.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Evins of Tennessee.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Cohelan.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Downing.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Pryor.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Karsten.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Tenzer.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Martin.

Mr. BOLAND, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. OTTINGER, and Mr. SCHEUER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GROVER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 241, nays 106, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

YEAS—241

Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Belcher
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blanton
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brinkley
Brooks
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Cramer
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Dulski
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Henderson
Holifield
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Madden
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Purcell
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Satterfield
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taft
Taylor
Tuck
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—106

Adams
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Battin
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brasco
Brock
Bush
Cahill
Carey
Cleveland
Conte
Conyers
Cowger
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daniels
Dellenback
Denney
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Esch
Farbstein
Feighan
Fraser
Gallagher
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Halpern
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Hunt
Joelson
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Kleppe
Kupferman
Kuykendall
McCarthy
McDonald, Mich.
MacGregor
Mailliard
Mayne
Minish
Moore
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Nedzi
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Pettis
Pike
Price, Tex.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Riegle
Robison
Rodino
Rosenthal
Roth
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schwengel
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Sullivan
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Vander Jagt
Widnall
Wiggins
Wolff
Wydler
Yates
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—85

Abbitt
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bell
Berry
Blackburn
Boggs
Bray
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Cohelan
Corbett
Corman
Dawson
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Downing
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fino
Fisher
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hanna
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Hosmer
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kyl
Landrum
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McEwen
McFall
Mahon
Martin
Miller, Calif.
Moss
Nelsen
Pollock
Pryor
Quie
Quillen
Rarick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roudebush
Ruppe
St. Onge
Saylor
Staggers
Stephens
Stuckey
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Ullman
Utt
Vigorito
Waldie
Watkins
Watts
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Mr. Hathaway for, with Mr. William D. Ford against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Hammerschmidt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Fino.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Berry
Mr. Karsten with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Pryor.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Everett.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Mahon.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Downing.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Fuqua.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Hicks.

Mr. DANIELS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the conference report accompanying the bill, H.R. 2508, which was just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America;

H.R. 5894. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi;

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion; and

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10345) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) entitled "An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the only business for tomorrow is the joint meeting of the Congress to hear the address of our distinguished visitor, the president of Mexico.

The business for next week is as follows:

On Monday: H.R. 10915, reduction of extra-long-staple cotton quota, on which consideration will be continued.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 12144, Federal Meat Inspection Act Amendments. This will be taken up under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

S. 1985, National Flood Insurance Act of 1967. This will be brought up under an open rule with 2 hours of debate, waiving points of order.

H.R. 5754, relating to interstate shipments of intoxicating liquors, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

S. 780, Air Quality Act of 1967, open rule, 2 hours of debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for purpose of amendment.

H.R. 12603, National Visitor Center Facilities Act of 1967, which is subject to a rule being granted.

This announcement is made, of course, subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, could the majority leader give us any guidance—I know it is difficult—on the continuing resolution?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader and with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I can advise the Members that that matter will not be on the floor before Monday next. Members may be assured of that fact.

ORDER TO ADJOURN OVER FROM TOMORROW TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 30

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

VISIT OF MARION LADY CHESHAM

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, next week Washington will be visited by an old and beloved friend, the gracious American-born lady Congresswoman from Tanzania, Marion Lady Chesham, now a distinguished and eloquent member of the National Assembly of Tanzania. I count Lady Marion as one of my close friends as she is that of many of my colleagues, especially on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Lady Marion will be entertained at a morning coffee and I do hope the arrangement of legislative business at the time will permit a large attendance from the membership of the House. All Members are cordially invited. Early next week during the 1-minute speech session I will make announcement of the place and hour.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following news article from the New York Times of October 22, 1967:

TANZANIAN HERE TO EXPLAIN POLICY

(By Edward C. Burks)

She is chic, witty, urbane and of a wealthy Philadelphia background, so it is a little surprising to learn that in Tanzania she is widely known as "Mama."

In fact she is a Tanzanian citizen, a member of the National Assembly, a prime mover in self-help programs there, and presently on a goodwill mission to this country "to explain current Tanzanian policies."

She is Marion Lady Chesham, the former Marion Donoghue of the Chestnut Hill section of Philadelphia, who first went to the East African country in 1938 as the wife of a British baron.

Now in her sixties, she is a proponent of President Julius K. Nyerere's announced policy of national "self-reliance." But she does not hesitate to criticize "our mistakes."

"Tanzania seems to have got the reputation through some American press accounts of being Communist," she said during an interview last week at the Cosmopolitan Club, 122 East 66th Street.

She sees her current six-week mission to this country as primarily to explain that Tanzania, a nation of 10 million, is not leaning to the Communist bloc and is not anti-American despite some misunderstandings. She is also seeking funds for a community development program that she heads and for a campaign to increase adult literacy.

A gray-haired woman who lightly sprinkles "damns" and "dears" through her conversation, she said matter of factly: "England is a damned sight more Socialist than Tanzania, but ours is a form of socialism that befits a new country." Banks and some major industries have been nationalized.

She compares Tanzania's policy of no strings on aid and no foreign entanglements with the attitude that the young United States had in George Washington's time against getting involved with European powers.

American Peace Corps workers in Tanzania have been criticized by President Nyerere and sharply denounced by the Youth League of the President's party, the Tanzania African National Union.

Commenting on the Youth League action, Lady Chesham said, "It was a silly resolution against the Peace Corps, but the youth leader ended up in jail, and the President's brother is now in charge."

There is no longer a need for Peace Corps teachers in the growing primary school system—"they don't know enough Swahili"—but "we need them in agricultural and health programs," she said.

Lady Chesham and her husband settled permanently in what was then called Tanganyika in 1946 on a 1,400-acre farm and ranch near Iringa in the south, more than 400 miles from the capital at Dar es Salaam. After her husband died in 1952, she stayed on in the country, which she found so friendly, and got interested in politics.

Tribesmen and villagers of her area gave her a name meaning "friend from far away," later, after she turned over her estate to the workers and gave her sprawling home as a training center for community development programs, she became widely known as "Mama."

Backed by Mr. Nyerere she ran for the colonial Legislature in 1958 when Tanganyika was still a British colony and promptly lost her American citizenship on taking the oath of allegiance to Queen Elizabeth. Explaining to the American consul her decision to run for election and to vote, she said, "Sweetie, I can't do things in a half-baked way."

She was re-elected in 1960, the year before independence, and in the 1965 elections she returned to the Assembly as one of the 10 representatives at large that the President may nominate.

More than half of the funds for her community self-help program come from the United States, the bulk from the Community Development Foundation. Major programs of her trust fund include setting up community centers, digging wells and providing emergency assistance and high school scholarships for students.

SPEECH BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Monday evening I was privileged to have attended a dinner at the Sherman House Hotel in Chicago honoring a fine American, the Honorable Paul H. Douglas. Senator Douglas received the Excellence in Politics Award from the Committee on Illinois Government, who sponsored the affair.

The main speaker was the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, of New York, who delivered what has been described as a "sparkling speech, one of his finest oratorial efforts," by Irv Kupcinet, of the Chicago Sun-Times.

I endorse Kup's opinion of the Senator from New York, who is proving to be a young man of great vision. The speech is worthy of our attention, and I insert it at this point in my remarks:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY, OF NEW YORK, AT A DINNER IN HONOR OF SENATOR PAUL DOUGLAS, GIVEN BY THE COMMITTEE ON ILLINOIS GOVERNMENT, CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 23, 1967

Scarcely a week goes by, in these United States, without a dinner in someone's honor. Once in a great while, perhaps a few times in each generation, such a dinner is given in the name of a man who is not as much honored by the tribute, as his choice honors those who gather to praise him.

Such a man is Paul Douglas. What we say tonight will add no luster to his name; for his work through a lifetime of public service, sets the standard of excellence for the rest of us to follow in years to come.

So nothing could give me more pleasure than to join in this dinner; an honor greater because of the Committee of Illinois Government. This is, I believe, the most vital and necessary of institutions. For it is often hard, in the absence of immediate danger, to maintain our attention, to renew our energy and determination to meet the critical and complex challenges of modern American life. But this Committee at once symbolizes the ability of the American people to meet the challenges, and spurs our efforts to do so. President Kennedy once observed to a dinner of Nobel Prize winners that never had so much talent been present at a White House function—except perhaps when Thomas Jefferson dined alone. Tonight I have no hesitation in saying that seldom has such a collection of energy and ability been committed to the cure of our domestic ills as is present in this Committee—except perhaps when Paul Douglas stood and fought alone.

As a freshman Senator, he once expressed a wish to mark out "the moments where . . . the arc of our lives meets the tangent of eternity". That he did, in many times and places.

Paul Douglas exemplifies at once the oldest virtues and the most modern thought of the nation he has served so well. Therefore, let us all thank *him*, for the opportunity to do honor to ourselves by rendering him this award.

But more than this, we can and must thank him in another way—by committing ourselves to the fulfillment of the goal for which he has so courageously and consistently fought: building a community of justice, decency, and excellence throughout the United States.

This is no easy matter, no immediate vision turned into the next day's fact. For seldom have our historic goals and ideals seemed more difficult of achievement. We have passed civil rights legislation of a reach and detail unknown since the Civil War; yet never has there been a greater sense of alienation or more open hostility between the races. We have found material wealth, and government programs, far beyond our dreams of a few years ago; yet perhaps we count the wrong things, for the forms of the new wealth seem to destroy as many pleasures as they bring to us—and the new programs seem irrelevant, even hostile, to many of the purposes they were designed to achieve.

Most dangerous of all, millions of Americans—who can say how many—have lost confidence in each other, and in their ability to shape their own fate, their community's development, or their nation's course. Everywhere I go in this country I find people groping for the answers to questions we barely understand: searching for purpose in the midst of baffling change, confusion and danger. We are losing many of our most active and committed young to extreme movements or public indifference. We are losing members of the older generation, who are turning to the past in order at least to protect what they have. The Minutemen, and the Revolutionary Armed Movement, agree only on one thing—that they have the right to use guns and violence against fellow-citizens with whom they disagree. More and more, debate is not an interchange of views but a dialogue of the deaf, often serving to demonstrate differences but not to reconcile them. We confront even those with whom we sympathize across barriers of hostility and mistrust.

Of all these divisions, none is more fateful and dangerous than the deepening division between white and black America. This division has bred riot and repression, sending violence and fear across the country, leaving death and devastation behind. The weather now is cool. But we know that if action is not taken in the leisure and calm of winter, the next turning of the seasons may become a grotesque spiral of greater violence and even greater vengeance, threatening the well-being and liberties of every citizens.

What are the sources of this terribly division? It begins in a failure of understanding and communication.

We live in different worlds and gaze out over a different landscape. Through the eyes of the white man, the Negro world is one of steady and continuous progress. In a few years, he has seen the entire structure of discriminatory legislation torn down. He has heard Presidents become spokesmen for racial justice, while Negro Americans enter the Cabinet and the Supreme Court. The white American has paid taxes for poverty and education programs, and watched his children risk their lives to register voters in Mississippi. Seeing this, he asks, what cause can there be for violent insurrection, or dissatisfaction with present progress?

But if we try to look through the eyes of the young slum-dweller—the Negro, and the Puerto Rican, and the Mexican-American—the world is a dark and hopeless place indeed.

Let us look for a moment.

The chances are he was born into a family without a father—often as a result of welfare laws which require a broken home as a condition of help. His chance of dying in the first year of life is twice that of children born outside the ghetto; his chances of being mentally retarded are seven times the community average. He may spend his childhood crowded with adults into one or two rooms, without adequate plumbing or heat, with rats his companions of the night.

He goes to a school which teaches little that helps him in an alien world. His chances are 3 out of 10 of graduating from high school—and if he does graduate, there is only a 50–50 chance that he will have even the equivalent of an 8th-grade education. A young college graduate who taught in a ghetto school sums it up this way: "The books are junk, the paint peels, the cellar stinks, the teachers call you nigger, the window falls in on your head."

Worst of all, the people of the ghetto and the barrio live today with an unemployment rate far worse than the rest of the nation knew during the depth of the Great Depression. If the unemployment of the Depression was a national emergency—and it was—our cities today therefore envelop dozens of more severe emergencies. The official statistics tell us that unemployment in the ghettoes of poverty is over three times the national rate. But these figures do not count the full extent of the problem, because the whole apparatus of government cannot even find from one-fifth to one-third of the adult men of the ghetto. These men are unknown, have no fixed address, no job. They drift about the city, separated from their families, as if they were of no greater concern to their fellows than so many sparrows or spent matches. When these lost battalions are taken into account, as well as those men who have lost hope and stopped looking for work, the true unemployment rate in the typical ghetto is not ten percent, or fifteen percent, but over forty percent. If that were the rate of unemployment nationwide, there would be 30 million people out of work today instead of 3 million. And of those men of the ghetto who do have jobs, over a fourth earn less than $60 a week—earn less, that is, than is required for each member of a family of four to eat 70 cents worth of food a day; less than what a family of that size receives on welfare in many cities.

And the 1967 Manpower Report, states flatly that "economic and social conditions are getting worse, not better, in slum areas"; the Labor Department has explained that the youth of the slums "just don't have the connections."

There are, of course, connections they can make. For a few blocks away or on a television set, the young man can watch the multiplying marvels of white America: new cars and new homes, air conditioners and outdoor barbecues. Every day television commercials tell him that life is impossible without the latest products of our consumer society. But he cannot buy them. He is told that the Negro is making progress. But what does that mean to him? He cannot experience the progress of others, nor should we seriously expect him to feel grateful because he is no longer a slave, or because he can vote or eat at some lunch counters. For he compares his condition not with the past, but with the life of other Americans. He and his brothers, as Daniel O'Connell said of the Irish, "have been made more thirsty for liberty by the drop that has fallen on their parched lips." Now as ever, it is when submission gives way to expectation, when despair is touched with the awareness of possibility, that the forces of human desire and the passion for justice are unloosed.

How overwhelming must the frustration of this young man—this young American—who, desperately wanting to believe and half believing, finds himself locked in the slums, his education second-rate, unable to get a job, confronted by the open prejudice and subtle hostilities of a white world, and seemingly powerless to change his condition or shape his future. Others tell him to work his way up as other minorities have done; and so he must. For he knows, and we know, that only by his own efforts and his own labor will he come to full equality. But how is he to work? The jobs have fled to the suburbs, or been replaced by machines, or have moved beyond the reach of those with limited education and skills.

He feels denied membership in that American society to which by birth and natural allegiance he belongs. And it is precisely among the most vital and determined young men that frustration is greatest. Here, and not in the frantic charade of revolutionary oratory, is the breeding ground of black nationalism and "reverse racism." The violent youth of the ghetto is not simply protesting his condition, but trying to assert his worth and dignity as a human being—to tell us that though we may scorn his contribution, we must still respect his power.

But this is the most destructive and self-defeating of attempts. This is not revolution. The word means to seize power, but the advocates of violence are not going to overthrow the American government; when Rap Brown threatens "to burn America down," he is not a revolutionary, he is an anarchist. The end is not a better life for Negroes, but a devastated America: as William Pfaff has said, "a program for death, not life." So it has already proven, all over the face of America.

We cannot abandon the young Negro to this kind of leadership, or let the voice of his protest turn into such despair. We must act—and the fact is that we can.

For Americans are not cruel or unjust or indifferent to suffering. The whole chronicle of our nation records the ultimate triumph of compassion and the spread of opportunity. Those are, and they remain, the basic instincts of the American people. What we must do is to build new bridges of trust and cooperation in a mutual commitment to justice. We can begin with a dialogue—between black and white Americans—which will reveal the misery of the one and liberate the fundamental decency of the other.

But dialogue requires more than words, and more than sentiments of brotherhood. We must demonstrate good faith with forceful action. The tasks before us—the opportunities to improve the lot of the poor and the life of the nation—are almost endless: we need to learn to build an educational system, far different in quality and kind, able to meet the specific needs of educational poverty; a national system of hospital clinics and insurance, to guarantee that all American children have the chance to grow straight and strong; the development of basic housing at costs within the budgets of all; a police system with the confidence of all the people of the community because it protects and defends them all with firm efficiency and respect. There are many new ideas, to be assessed and debated and tested. But most of all, there are things we can—and must do—immediately.

The first is an impact project designed to put men to work and to restore hope to the young and to give the unemployed resident of the city slum some sense of dignity and promise. We should begin immediate programs of needed public tasks and works—providing jobs to build schools and roads, to restore parks and erect clinics. and to staff the schools and clinics and neighborhood centers when they are built. Our communities need these jobs done, and the men of the ghetto need jobs. By matching the two we can return hope while meeting the most urgent needs of the nation. A broad program in this direction was narrowly defeated in the Senate a few weeks ago—and never have we more sharply missed the leadership that Paul Douglas once gave us there.

Second, we must turn the power and resources of our private enterprise system to the underdeveloped nation within our midst. This should be done by bringing into the ghettoes themselves productive and profitable private industry—creating dignified jobs, not welfare handouts, for the men and youth who now languish in idleness. To do this, private enterprise will require incentives—credits, accelerated depreciation, and extra deductions—as effective and comprehensive as those we now offer for the production of oil or the building of grain storage facilities or the supersonc transport.

I have introduced two bills to this end, which would create the necessary system of tax incentives for investment in the ghetto. They are not the complete answer; they may well not be the best answer. But what is far beyond doubt is that the resources and abilities of private industry, and not just the federal treasury and bureaucracy, must be engaged in this great task.

What we have done to enhance the interests of the powerful—we can and must do to preserve the power of the nation.

Third, all the efforts of Washington will come to little without the leadership that can only be provided in communities all across the nations—creating and energizing the programs, building the housing and industry, teaching the children, above all rebuilding our sense of community—our willingness to meet and touch across the gaps which divide us. Here in Chicago, you are fortunate to have one element of that leadership in Mayor Daley. But it requires more than one man. It requires vigorous and courageous leadership in every place where decisions are made and debate carried on—in every legislature and school board and business council—leadership which dares to speak out before it tests the shifting wind of popular anger and confusion; that leadership which prefers facts to illusions, action to sullen withdrawal, sacrifice and effort to indulgence and ease. For when the enemy is at the gates, who will reward the messenger that comforts the people?

And there is, after all, no alternative. History has placed us all, black and white, rich and poor, within a common border and under a common law. All of us, from the wealthiest to the young children I have seen bloated by starvation—we all share one precious possession: the name "American". It is not easy to know what that means. But in part to be an American means to have been an outcast and a stranger, to have come to the exiles' country, and to know that he who denies the outcast and stranger still among us, at that moment also denies America.

That Paul Douglas has never done. For those of us who gather in his name tonight, there could be no higher purpose, no greater tribute, than to take from his example the determination to call on the best in our people to perform our duty with courage and conviction, to enrich the lives of all our citizens. This has been our tradition. We shall follow it again, because it is right. And to that kind of commitment, we know the American people will respond.

A COMMONSENSE APPROACH TO OUR WATER POLLUTION PROBLEM

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced two bills to stop pollution in the Great Lakes, but they affect other navigable waters as well. My principal reason for sponsoring these bills is to attempt to bring a commonsense approach to the problem. I have studied with growing concern how my own Lake Michigan is being daily flooded with domestic and industrial wastes, with acids and oil, with detergents and debris, and with the discharge from large ships and pleasure boats. My bills would stop pollution from lake ports, Federal installations, vessels of all kinds, detergents, and from the dumping of oil.

Practically every important water resource in this country is already polluted to some extent or seriously threatened. Some of our rivers are little better than open sewers. Some of our lakes—notably Lake Erie—are threatened with extinction from pollution. It has taken many years of neglect for the water problems of the Great Lakes region to attain the present state of crisis. As in other areas of normally sufficient precipitation, the superb water resources of the Great Lakes were taken for granted, and a general feeling of public apathy prevailed with respect to water resources. Many people were shocked, therefore, when in 1961, the U.S. Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, on the basis of a study, concluded that the western Great Lakes Basin would be a water deficit area by the end of the 20th century. This result was projected because man is using and abusing the available water at an ever-increasing rate, and his uses will have outstripped the new water supplies arising in the basin by the end of the century. The most critical of the water problems in the Great Lakes is pollution, stemming from the increasing use of waterways for waste disposal.

Thirty-six years ago, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said:

> A river is more than an amenity, it is a treasure.

We are just beginning to realize the truth of his words and I wonder what superlatives he would have supplied had his utterance been directed to an evaluation of the Great Lakes.

When a river becomes polluted, it is possible to bring it back to its former degree of purity because of the constant flow of water. When a lake becomes polluted, since it is a stationary body of water with very little current to flush the pollution away, the damage is thought to be irretrievable. Every day of continued emptying of pollution into the Great Lakes reduces forever a portion of that degree of purity which the lake had when the early settlers first arrived upon its shores.

I spoke of a commonsense approach to the problem. This is to stop—and to stop immediately—any further violation of these greatest of our natural resources. My approach exactly is to turn off the valves that are pouring ruin into the lakes.

The lakes have been a dumping ground for so long that it is inconceivable to many that such a course is possible, but Mr. Speaker, this is really the only answer. On the shores of Lake Michigan, there are some 42 major ports which have been dumping sewage, which was less than adequately treated, into the lake waters for more than 100 years. The sewage systems of many of these cities are largely to blame. Even in cities where sewage treatment plants have been constructed, the antiquity of the sewer system allows any runoff from a storm to wash raw untreated sewage into the lake.

In Green Bay, Wis., they are pumping drinking water from 35 miles out in the lake because the waters adjacent to the shore are fouled beyond any level of potability. I would like to ask these cities to close down their sewer outlets right now, but I know that is impossible. What is possible, however, is to have every one of these cities put in adequate sewage treatment plants, and adequate storm drainage systems.

As of now, 30 percent of the municipalities in this country have primary sewer treatment plants. This primary plant merely screens debris and separates solids in a settling tank. It removes approximately 35 percent of organic pollutants from sewage water. Today 50 percent of the municipalities have secondary treatment plants. The secondary treatment plant destroys organic wastes through bacteriological action and a coarse stone filter. The effluent from this secondary treatment is then treated with chlorine and discharged. This treatment removes up to 90 percent of organic pollutants from sewage water. In this country there are 7,500 communities which have sewage treatment plants. Four thousand more are desperately needed.

Success in the sewer and sewer treatment process area would contribute significantly to the control of algae in the Great Lakes. The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 authorized, for the first time, direct Federal assistance for research in this field. The authorization was $20 million a year for 3 years. Another research and demonstration program, started under the Water Quality Act of 1965 and continued by the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, attempts to find practicable means of dealing with the immensely difficult problem of combined sewers, those that carry both sewage and storm water runoff. A breakthrough in this area would shorten the water cleanup task by years and save billions of dollars that would otherwise be spent in separating combined sewers.

Advanced waste treatment is very definitely a research area of significant and growing importance. We know enough already to produce better water out of municipal wastes than is coming out of the taps in many communities. As a case in point, in Santee, Calif., an area not known for an abundance of water, the effluent from a highly sophisticated filter plant has been used to create a large fresh-water lake. The lake abounds in fish and provides boating and swimming facilities for the community. I cite this to show that sewage treatment can be perfected to even those high standards.

One of my bills provides for this stoppage of sewage and gives a 60-day period for accomplishing the improvement in sewage treatment.

Throughout the country and throughout the Great Lakes, there are a number of Government-owned and Government-operated installations, which, like the cities mentioned, are using the lakes to empty their sewage. We may not be able to have instant cooperation from city governments but we have effective and immediate control over our Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Federal Government. If, in fact, Federal installations are contributing to the destruction of the lakes, it should not be tolerated for even 1 more day. This bill would provide for the prohibition against Federal dumping of untreated sewage if that condition has not been corrected. It would also provide for the immediate cessation of dredging by Government employees in the Great Lakes.

Not only do cities and Federal installations contribute to the worsening situation but the shipping and boat traffic on the lakes has increased tremendously in the last decade. The magnitude of the problem posed by ships and boats is that a yearly average of 40,000 foreign and domestic vessels of all sizes ply the Great Lakes. The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway opened the lakes up to deep-draft vessels. In all the waters of the United States, there are 8 million recreational craft. It is estimated that over a million are in use on the Great Lakes. Each vessel or pleasure boat contributes its share of raw sewage to the Great Lakes. It is estimated that the discharge of all vessels in the United States for 1 day would equal the untreated discharge from a city the size of Buffalo or Cincinnati.

The discharge is not limited to sewage but boats and ships are expelling large quantities of oil and grease and bulk garbage and trash. In recent weeks, Lake Michigan has been covered with a massive oil slick which has caused considerable damage to beaches as well as to pleasure craft.

In order to demonstrate what trouble oil discharge can mean, one has only to recall the discharge from the sunken tanker *Torrey Canyon* on the coast of England. It fouled the beaches, killed marine life, and threatened the whole economy of beach resorts. In this country, oil slicks off the coast of New York and New England have taken a heavy toll of waterfowl.

In order to control the discharge from boats and ships, my bill would place responsibility upon the Secretary of the Interior to issue appropriate regulations.

The primary control of this source of pollution lies in the retention of all such oil, sewage, and refuse aboard such vessels until it can be safely discharged at a port facility providing for such disposition. The Coast Guard would be assigned the task of enforcing and implementing these regulations.

As supplementary to the command to stop pollution, my proposed tax bill seeks ways of not only preventing the inflow of pollutants, but also to study methods for the removal of pollution. This is an important provision because it is an attempt to regain the purity of the lake water, which, unlike the reclamation of a river, is thought to be impossible. Pollution comes from overfertilization in the water, which causes excessive growth of vegetation, which, in turn, removes the dissolved oxygen from the water. If some way can be found to control and remove the excessive growth of vegetation, the balance of oxygen content will start to return to normal. It is the loss of oxygen that determines whether water is polluted or not. It is the opinion of ichthyologists that the alewives that have been washed up on Lake Michigan's shores in large numbers this past summer were the victims of the oxygen deficiency and from consuming toxic vegetation.

Another source contributing greatly to the pollution of the Great Lakes is the synthetic detergent. Every housewife in the country who can be reached by radio and television is a user of some form of detergent. Such detergents cause trouble in their indestructibility. They resist breakdown under sewage treatment processes and this lack of decomposability can be seen in foaming septic fields and the froth-covered rivers into which they pour. The synthetic detergent pollutes both surface and ground waters, is toxic to fish and plants, and accelerates the growth of algae.

The soap and detergent industry in 1963, announced plans to convert from hard to soft synthetic detergents. This conversion was completed by July 1965. Although this change eliminated the suds problem, it did not eliminate phosphate content in these detergents. The increase in the introduction of phosphates into our waters has increased manifold since World War II. We are using in our homes today detergents which were only used commercially before World War II. These detergents contain as much as 50 percent phosphate. We are using annually 4 billion pounds of phosphate in this form. Water filtration and treatment plants are largely ineffective in removing this pollutant.

My bill would provide for the setting up of a committee of industrial chemists to look into methods and recommend minimum standards for decomposability of commercially marketed detergents. The bill also will provide for a study financed through Federal loans and grants to develop detergents which are free from phosphate. When and if a product is developed or when a minimum standard of phosphate content is defined which is within the capability of the majority of manufacturers, the Secretary of the Interior shall issue the necessary regulations to keep nonconforming products off the market.

Another main source of pollution in the Great Lakes lies in the oil spilled from ships and boats, from terminal facilities, and from steel companies and refineries. The legislation covering this area; namely, the Oil Pollution Act of 1924, leaves much to be desired in the means of enforcement. That act, as written, applies to only "grossly negligent or willful spilling" of oil. It is now practically impossible to convict under this act because proof of gross negligence and willfulness in this type of activity depends upon microscopically close surveillance and the probing of subjective thought processes. The point that is of importance is not in establishing some less difficult burden of proof for law enforcement officials but in keeping the oil out of the water. My bill would make the spilling of oil an absolute liability on the person so handling. If it is spilled by accident the person would be liable for a fine. Under my bill, a jail sentence could only be imposed in the case of negligence or an intentional violation.

One of the great complaints in cases of accidental or other discharges of oil is the property damage to lakeside residents and to pleasure boats. In addition to criminal sanctions against oil spillage, I have included a provision for treble damages in a civil action by the damaged party against a person convicted under this act. The conviction would constitute a prima facie presumption that the damage was in fact, caused by the convicted party.

Finally, in order to induce businesses to do that which rightly should be done, a companion bill provides a tax incentive for the development of water pollution control facilities. A credit against tax to the extent of 15 percent of the cost of such facility would be allowed for the taxable year. This credit would be mutually exclusive of the investment credit and could be carried back 3 years and forward 7 years to the extent not used.

The type of facility for which a credit of this kind would be allowed would be any type of depreciable property which would prevent the introduction of nutrients into the water and or any kind that could be used to purify or reestablish the oxygen content in the water.

Provision is made for certification of the facility appropriate State and Federal agencies to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

These approaches cover the main abuses committed against the Great Lakes and their future use by many generations of Americans. If we can make this start, or to put it more exactly, if we can make this stop to these sources of pollution, we will have taken the most important step in saving material assets more valuable to man than any of us can calculate.

THE PROTESTERS AND THE HEROES

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, unless and until Congress declares this Nation to be in a state of war with North Vietnam, protests against our involvement are entirely legal. Honest dissent must not be equated with treason.

The conduct of many of those who participated in the weekend's demonstrations against the Pentagon was, however, nothing less than mutiny and leaves a mark of shame on the Nation's history. Why the Military District of Washington should solicitously deny that it has used tear gas is not clear, for it would have been justified in resorting to far more drastic measures to protect the troops from contact with the mangy individuals that dared to defy the lines of trespass. Fumigants as well as tear gas would have been appropriate equipage for the occasion.

To the half million men and boys who are performing their duty under Old Glory in Vietnam, the occasion was all the more deplorable. Thankfully, the loathsome derelicts who challenged the troops at the Pentagon are but a minute proportion of our youth, a vast majority of whom are ready to serve their country regardless of their personal views on our international policy.

As the forces of rebellious filth rendezvoused for their attack against lawful government on Saturday, readers of the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat were becoming acquainted with one young man who accepted the billet assigned him by the Pentagon. Charles P. Savage, Jr., of Hastings, Pa., is the subject of an article by Gary W. Graham entitled "A Hero Though Not Old Enough To Drink or Vote."

After the deplorable experiences in Washington over the weekend, the story of the hero from Hastings is particularly welcome and refreshing reading. Charles Savage lost part of a leg in Vietnam, but he will always walk tall and straight in the admiring eyes of his fellow Americans.

There is still another hero in the Graham article. When this young man's brother recently received his preinduction notice, a brave and dedicated mother said:

> I guess Richy will be next. We'd rather not have to go through with this again, but if Richy has to go, then he'll go.

God bless the Savage family. They reinforce a faith that no "beachnik" or "dippie" can ever destroy.

The article from the Tribune-Democrat follows:

A HERO THOUGH NOT OLD ENOUGH TO DRINK OR VOTE

(By Gary W. Graham)

HASTINGS, PA.—His GI buddies called him "the human mine sweeper" because he had been blown out of three trucks while making supply runs to line outfits along the northeastern coast of South Vietnam.

Now, several months later—and minus the lower part of his right leg—he's back home. His civvies are a little baggy because of the weight he lost while in hospitals in South Vietnam, the Philippines, Japan and the States. He doesn't smoke anymore; he stopped a two-pack-a-day habit for some reason after a land mine explosion had hurled him out of his truck for the third time.

"Home feels nice," he says through a tight smile. "I guess I'm damn lucky to be here. But they say I'll have to learn to walk all over again. It'll probably be easier this time." That tight smile again.

ON CONVALESCENT LEAVE

Home is on Hastings R.D. 1, and glad to be there is Spec. 4 Charles P. Savage Jr., better known as Chuck. Chuck is on a 30-day convalescent leave from the Valley Forge Military Hospital. "That's where I have to go to get my new leg."

Chuck, the oldest of four children, was born in Spangler. His father, Charles Sr., is a woodsman, self-employed. His mother is a small woman who worries a lot about her boys, the three of them.

Chuck was graduated from Cambria Heights High School, Patton; got a job with a construction company in Barnesboro; then changed jobs, and began driving bulldozer for a Johnstown wrecking company. Then he was drafted.

MEMBER OF 31ST INFANTRY

Mid-February 1967 found Chuck a private first class and a member of the 196th Light Brigade, 4th Battalion, 31st Infantry.

The province of Tay Ninh, just north of Saigon, "looked just like something out of a comic book; the ox carts and rice fields and all that," Chuck recalled.

He then was transferred to a sand-bagged hole called Chu Lai, more than 500 miles north of Saigon. There, he was assigned as a truck driver.

Chuck's principal duty was to deliver supplies and water to perimeter positions and line companies. This almost-daily chore took him over the same dusty, bush-lined, one-lane road, with a gun Jeep as an escort and usually a buddy riding shotgun.

STRIKES BOOBYTRAP

On May 3 at 10 a.m., Chuck and his shotgun rider were traveling that dusty road when the 2½-ton truck struck a Viet Cong boobytrap—a 105mm howitzer artillery shell embedded nose-down in the road, and rigged with a pressure fuse detonator.

Chuck and his "shotgun" were blown out of the truck.

Although knocked unconscious, the two soldiers escaped serious injury. "We just got scratched up," Chuck said. The truck, No. 13 assigned to Headquarters & Headquarters Company, was a complete loss.

THE SECOND TIME

Eighteen days later, on another morning run, almost the exact thing happened. It was 11 o'clock, 200 yards from where the first mine had caught Chuck's truck. The occupants again were blown out of the truck, and escaped serious injury.

"After I got it the second time, my CO (commanding officer) must have pitied me, because he assigned me to work at the motor pool. But after two or three days I got bored and asked to start driving again.

"I had it pretty good for a while after that," Chuck said. "I didn't hit another mine for a couple of months."

ALONE IN TRUCK

On the morning of July 24 Chuck was driving his supply truck along that same red-dirt road. He was alone in the truck, but a Jeep armed with a recoilless rifle was up

front. The trip up to the outposts was uneventful; the trip back, not so.

"All I can remember is hearing an explosion and feeling the truck lift up. Then I felt myself being shot straight up, like out of a cannon. I musta blacked out, because the next thing I remembered is lying on the hood of my truck. I tried to jump down to run for cover. But when I hit the ground, I buckled. Both my ankles were broken, the right one real bad."

Chuck was evacuated to the Chu Lai aid station by helicopter. He later was taken to a hospital in the Philippines, then on to Japan.

It was in Japan that the Army doctors told Chuck they would have to amputate his lower right leg boot-high. "I figured it would be okay for them to cut it off," Chuck said, "because they said I probably would never be able to walk on it again.

"I remember," Chuck smiled, "we used to wave our stumps at the Japanese civilians when they walked by the hospital. Really shook 'em up."

Chuck is due to get out of the service next September, but he'll probably be discharged much sooner because of his injuries.

He says he feels great now, and hopes to be back driving a bulldozer again. He loves motorcycles, and has owned three at one time.

"I only have one bike now, and I'm going to get back on it as soon as I can. I'd like to run cycles in a few races; I really dig motorcycle racing."

The only way Chuck has changed mentally, he says, is that he has developed a fear of the number 13. All of the trucks that were blown out from beneath him were numbered 13.

"It's crazy, I guess, but I just don't like that number. Then again, I guess it isn't too bad. I didn't get killed."

Chuck's brother, Richard, is 19 and just got his pre-induction notice.

"I guess Richy will be next," said Mrs. Savage. "We'd rather not have to go through this again, but if Richy has to go, then he'll go."

Chuck's tour of duty in South Vietnam brought him the following awards: A Purple Heart for each time he got blown out of his truck, with a first and second Oak Leaf Cluster for the second and third times. He was awarded the Bronze Star by this country, and the Bronze Star with the Cross of Gallantry by the South Vietnamese government, the highest award given to servicemen of foreign nations by the South Vietnamese.

Also, Chuck's battalion commander has put him in for a Silver Star.

And he's not old enough to drink beer or to vote.

SBA, GUARDIAN OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI**. Mr. Speaker, a complaint many of us frequently hear is that government is often far removed from the people, impersonal, bureaucratic, and so involved with theory that it seldom gets down to the level of practical affairs.

I must say that anyone who has long been in government must admit some truth to this charge.

But anyone who has had experience, either in business or government, knows well that bureaucracy and seeming lack of concern for the individual, are an unfortunate function of bigness, rather than the result of malevolent design.

The truth is that big business, no less than big government, is constantly engaged in a battle to keep close to the needs and desires of the people.

One of the great advantages of small business is that the owner and proprietor is in his shop every day, meeting customers, hearing complaints, and making sure that the work his business performs comes up to his own high standards of excellence and is performed efficiently and without delay.

It is only natural that this advantage which the small businessman enjoys over his big competitor would have a parallel in government.

A small Government agency, decentralized in its operations, and with offices in many communities, is much more responsible to the people, and much more effective, than a large bureaucracy centered in Washington. In my own experience, I have seen the truth of this, time, and time again.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in Urban Areas, I am well acquainted with the plight of urban small business.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that in my own hometown of Chicago, which I think we could refer to as an urban area with a great many small business problems, I feel the SBA has done a splendid job in carrying out the functions assigned by the Congress.

Now it seems that we are going to have to fight, once more, a problem which I thought we had firmly settled once and for all. I refer to section 406 of title IV of the poverty bill passed by the Senate, and already reported by our own Committee on Education and Labor.

Two years ago there was a move afoot to transfer the independent SBA to the big-business-oriented Department of Commerce. At that time, a letter was sent to the President, signed by our distinguished chairman, Representative Joe L. Evins, and by virtually the entire membership of the Select Committee on Small Business, including myself. It stated, in effect, that it was the intention of the signatories that SBA not be so subordinated. I believe there were also many sense-of-Congress resolutions introduced saying the same thing.

And now it appears that we must fight this same problem, Mr. Speaker. Section 406 of title IV, if passed into law, would accomplish, through a backdoor approach, that which it has not been possible to accomplish openly; namely, it would transfer to the Department of Commerce certain vital functions currently being carried out by SBA. I am at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to understand why this matter keeps cropping up, especially since the Congress expressly provided in section 4A of the SBA Act that the agency "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government." The way I see it, transferring SBA's functions to another agency would be about the same as transferring the agency itself.

And so that is why I raise my voice today in defense of a small Government agency—very small as Federal Government establishments go—the Small Business Administration.

Here is an agency that is accustomed to getting things done. It has no cumbersome bureauracy to strangle its effectiveness or dull its impact. It translates legislative demands and authorizations into action within a few hours.

In personal terms, what does this mean? It means that if we, the Members of the Congress, give the Small Business Administration the go-ahead signal on a certain program, the impact, the benefits, of this program will be felt by the man in the street almost immediately.

There is no lost motion, no cumbersome and expensive and delaying levels of expertise to be penetrated and placated and put in line.

The Small Business Administrator has but to give the order and in 73 offices in major cities throughout the Nation it will be carried into action.

These SBA offices have full authority to act on their own, in concert, to carry out a national objective, and they have sufficient leeway to fit the national objectives to the needs of the people whom they serve every day.

I cannot urge too strongly that we now act in the best interests of the people whom we serve by preserving, unimpaired, the effective authority that this agency, the Small Business Administration, now has.

In the words of our distinguished chairman, in his remarks of last week to the House of Representatives:

> Let us not return to inefficiency and divided authority in the small business assistance program.

SERVICES OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. **PIRNIE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PIRNIE**. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I met with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Mr. Robert C. Moot, to conclude an agreement under which the SBA, at my request, will establish a new service for the people of Herkimer County, N.Y. Briefly, I wish to bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues because it is my thought that others may wish to avail themselves of an opportunity to bring a Government service closer to the people they represent.

As one who has long supported and followed with interest the various assistance programs under the jurisdiction of the Small Business Administration, I have endeavored to cooperate fully with the SBA regional office in Syracuse, N.Y., in disseminating information to my constituents about this agency. Thanks to the splendid help of the director of the regional office, Mr. J. Wilson Harrison, and his very capable and hard-working staff, many struggling small business enterprises in my district have received the guidance and financial aid required to continue and expand their operations.

Not all of those who have turned to SBA for assistance have had their requests approved; there are, of course, limitations on what can be done. However, I do know that the SBA representatives who service my area have been most courteous and helpful.

Many times I have personally arranged an appointment for one of my constituents to sit down with an SBA representative at Syracuse to discuss his needs and, if appropriate, to make application for assistance. Although this has worked out very well, there has been room for improvement. Particularly have I been concerned that a number of Herkimer County residents were finding it difficult to travel to Syracuse—sometimes as much as 200 miles round trip—just to inquire about a program. This was a problem, especially, for the individual operator without a staff to take care of things while he was away.

The solution to the problem became very simple because Mr. Moot and Mr. Harrison were responsive, and Mr. John Ladd, executive director of the Mohawk Valley Economic Development District, was willing to cooperate.

At my request, SBA, through a constructive and imaginative approach it designates "Outreach," will send, on the first Wednesday of each month, starting November 1, 1967, a representative from its Syracuse office to Herkimer County for the purpose of meeting and discussing with area residents the various SBA programs. Mr. Ladd's office in Mohawk, N.Y., will be the local SBA headquarters.

I am always glad to be able to play a part in bringing a Government service closer to the people, and I am confident that this new SBA venture in Herkimer County will benefit all concerned.

A BILL CONCERNING THE INSPECTION AND REGISTRATION OF DRUG MANUFACTURING FIRMS

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, there exists in this country today a flourishing business in black-market medicine—a business that is fast becoming rich supplying inferior and counterfeit drugs to persons sorely in need of proper medication.

How is this possible? It is possible mainly because our Food and Drug Administration does not have the staff and legal means to prevent it.

Recently, Miss Margaret Kreig appeared before the Legal and Monetary Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee. After more than 2 years of undercover work alongside agents of the FDA, she has written a book entitled "Black Market Medicine." In her book, Miss Kreig documents the many ways inferior and counterfeit drugs get onto the shelves of nearly every pharmacy in the land. These inferior pharmaceuticals reach the shelves of our local drugstores mainly because the agency charged with administering this type of manufacturing does not have the legal means to prevent it. The only requirement for obtaining a drug manufacturing registration number is to merely apply for it. FDA is not empowered, at this time, to refuse a request for registry. Under the present procedure, it might be a year or more before FDA inspectors are able to personally visit this new "laboratory."

During this period, drugs by the millions could have been manufactured and sold legally with no real control over procedures and quality.

Consider the consumer who attempts to purchase a needed pharmaceutical. The label describes the contents and even bears a Federal registry number. The consumer, noting the apparent Government approval of the drug and its manufacturer, buys the item. That item may have come from one of the better drug firms, or it may well have come from one of the numerous illicit operators. How can the buyer be sure? He cannot. The only guide he has to go by is the Federal Government registration number; and, under present law, that Government registry number does not give him one bit of protection. The consumer is lulled into a false sense of security.

According to the U.S. Treasury records, there are 1,600 firms in the drug industry category, some with assets of up to $250 million. There are 300 such firms with assets in excess of $1 million. Nearly half their products are sold through 1,500 wholesale druggists and 900 jobbers. Drugs are legally sold, dispensed, or handled by more than 50,000 retail drugstores, 7,000 hospitals, 330,000 medical doctors and medical researchers, more than 100,000 dentists, 20,000 veterinarians, and a half-million professional nurses. This leaves a vast area of distribution that is almost impossible to police effectively.

A shocking disclosure was the fact that hoodlums and gangsters with long criminal records are operating a number of these pharmaceutical firms. An example of this type of operation is that of a man in a New York suburb who, when finally apprehended, was found to have more than a million dollars worth of inferior and counterfeit drugs hidden in a secret room carved out of the hillside adjacent to his garage. In this man's possession were punches stolen from a well-known drug manufacturer—punches that had been used to turn out countless millions of counterfeit drugs, drugs that may well have claimed the lives of numerous desperately ill patients whose very existence depended on properly compounded drugs.

And there are numerous other cases, all documented by the files of the Food and Drug Administration. If all the Nation's drug firms were required to not only register with the FDA before initiating the manufacturing of drugs, but to be subject to an onsite inspection before being granted a registration number, I believe the bulk of this illicit drug manufacturing would be forced into deserved bankruptcy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like, at this time, to introduce an amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act designed to offer protection to the consumer. This bill provides for an onsite inspection of all new pharmaceutical firms within 30 days of their filing for a Federal registry number.

Under this legislation, an application for registration could be denied if the firm: First, does not conform with current good manufacturing practices; second, fails to maintain adequate records and controls; and, third, does not operate in compliance with Federal, State, and local requirements.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of sustaining this registration and inspection system would be borne by funds received from registration fees.

I find it appalling that the production of dog and cat food is closely watched by Federal inspectors, while the production of drugs for human consumption is subject to such illicit acts as I have already noted. Why should we not assure similar protection to humans?

It is hoped that this action will go a long way toward providing our citizens with at least some measure of protection against those unscrupulous individuals who would prey on the ills of our citizens.

HONOLULU SOCIAL SECURITY EMPLOYEES COMMENDED BY CONGRESSMAN MATSUNAGA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, recently I became aware of an excellent example of the high quality of public service provided by some of our Federal employees. We hear too little about the many Federal employees who are doing a good job and quite a lot about the few who are doing a poor job. It is my desire, therefore, to inform my colleagues about what the employees of the Social Security district office in Honolulu have done to acquaint the residents of my State with their rights under the medicare program.

We all know how complicated these provisions are and the difficulty many older people have in understanding this law. In my State this problem is perhaps even more complicated than it is anywhere else in the country. Many of our residents do not have the proficiency in English that is needed to understand the pamphlets which are so useful on the mainland in explaining the program. In recognition of this peculiar situation, the manager of the office, Mr. Harold S. Burr, a long-time resident of the islands, active in civic affairs and a retired captain in the Naval Reserve, and the employees of the Honolulu district office prepared, printed, and distributed three pamphlets on medicare. These pamphlets explain in the languages—Chinese, Japanese, and Ilocano—understood by many of the people of our Island State, the intricate mechanics of how the medicare benefits are paid and how much of the hospital and medical care benefits are covered. Mr. Burr and his staff have, on their own initiative, performed a necessary and valuable service for the people of Hawaii. As Hawaii's Representative to Congress I take this means of commending Mr. Burr and his associates.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE SUPPORTS THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967, S. 780

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican policy committee supports the Air Quality Act of 1967, S. 780. This bill would encourage the solution of air pollution problems on a regional basis in accordance with air quality standards and enforcement plans developed by the States. It would provide $362.3 million over a 3-year period for air control research, studies, planning, and grants to States and air pollution agencies. Air pollution is no longer just a threat—it is a present menace to the health and well-being of the American people. Under this legislation, reasonable standards can be established and the States and regions will be empowered to develop plans and programs to combat and reduce air pollution.

Approximately 130 million tons of pollutants are discharged annually into the Nation's atmosphere, an average of 1,400 pounds for each American. This pollution is a byproduct of our highly developed economy. It stems from the rising number of motor vehicles, and from the trend toward urbanization which concentrates the highest levels of pollution in the most populated areas. Economic and mechanical progress has meant the deterioration of our precious air supply. Smog, damage to health and property, and even death have resulted from the pollution of our air.

Steps must be taken to improve this Nation's knowledge of and technical capability to meet the air pollution problem. In his 1955 state of the Union address, President Eisenhower urged the enactment of air pollution legislation. With the support of Republicans of both Houses of Congress, the first legislation in this field was enacted by the 84th Congress. S. 780 would materially strengthen and improve this basic legislation. We urge its adoption.

"TERRORIST INCURSIONS FROM ZAMBIA": STATEMENTS FROM RHODESIA

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of Members a statement by the Prime Minister of Rhodesia, the Honorable Ian Smith, recounting terrorist activities against this nation and communication of this information on this activity to an uninterested British Government.

Value lies not only in the comments on terror against Rhodesia—terror which certainly appears to be backed and directed by Communist forces which are ever ready to take advantage of such folly as U.S. and U.N. sanctions—but also indications that Rhodesians, black and white, are united against instrusions from without.

Included with the Prime Minister's remarks are those of other Members of the Rhodesian Parliament. For the sake of showing the unity, I point out that three of the Members who spoke following the Prime Minister are African Members. I think one particular statement by one of these Members, Mr. Rubatika, is worth emphasis. He states:

> As far as we are concerned we might have differences, as members of a family, but we are one in the maintenance of law and order, we are one as a nation of Rhodesia.

We, as outsiders, would do well to listen to this statement and heed.

Also included is the note to which Mr. Smith refers, which was conveyed to the British Government concerning terrorist campaigns.

The statements are as follows:

Terrorist Incursions From Zambia

(Statement by the Prime Minister, the Honorable I. D. Smith, and other proceedings of the Rhodesian Parliament, Aug. 30, 1967)

PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT IN THE RHODESIAN PARLIAMENT

With the leave of the House, I wish to make a statement. I lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Note* of 28th August, 1967, which the Rhodesia Government handed to the British Government yesterday in London drawing to the attention of the British Government the recent spate of terrorist incursions into Rhodesia, pointing out to them the encouragement and assistance given to these terrorists by the Zambian Government and, more important, emphasizing the fact that the British Government cannot escape its share of responsibility for these developments.

The British Government has rejected this Note. The head of the Rhodesian Residual Mission in London was informed that the Commonwealth Office had examined the document and had declared that it could not be accepted because Her Majesty's Government do not recognize the Rhodesian Government and cannot therefore accept any diplomatic Note emanating from them in that capacity.

I think this action by the British Government clearly expresses their disregard for the well-being of Rhodesia, in spite of their protests that they are opposed to violence and disorder. This attitude is in strange contrast to the military and police support which Rhodesia and Rhodesian forces have willingly given to the Commonwealth in the past.

I will not deal with the period of the last great war—the part played by Rhodesia throughout this epic struggle is too well known to warrant repetition.

Confining myself to the post-war era, let me remind Britain that in 1951 Rhodesia provided two fighter squadrons as a contribution to Commonwealth defense. For a further post-war period Rhodesia became the home of a Royal Air Force training group and the Rhodesian Government contributed towards its upkeep. From 1958 to 1963, on nine different occasions, Rhodesian Vampire and Canberra squadrons were detached to Aden and Cyprus respectively and while there were under British command. In 1961 Rhodesian transport aircraft provided notable assistance to the Royal Air Force during the Kuwait crisis when Royal Rhodesian Air Force Canadairs transported British troops in the Middle East. Later in the same year Rhodesian Dakotas transported and dropped food to flood-stricken tribesmen in Somalia at the request of the British Government.

As for the Rhodesian Army: in late 1950 a squadron of 100 European volunteers with regular officers and non-commissioned officers was raised as part of the Rhodesian contribution to Commonwealth defense and went to Malaya to fight communist terrorists—the very type of trained men who are attempting to infiltrate Rhodesia today. The squadron served in Malaya from April, 1951, to March, 1953, where it operated as a separate entity—"C" Squadron of the 22nd Special Air Service Regiment. In July, 1962, the present "C" Squadron of the Special Air Service went to Aden for training and operated against terrorists and, again, as part of the 22nd Special Air Service Regiment. Today this same unit is in our front lines operating against the infiltrating communist terrorists.

In 1952 the First Battalion of the Rhodesian African Rifles served in the Suez Canal zone in the Middle East. This was followed by a tour of duty in Malaya from April, 1956, to February, 1958, fighting communist terrorists.

The British South Africa Police have given extensive postwar assistance to the British Government in Bechuanaland, Nyasaland, Kenya and Northern Rhodesia as they were then known, four different contingents varying from one officer and 75 members to two officers and 118 men were made available to Bechuanaland in 1950, 1951 and 1952. A large contingent of officers and members was sent to Nyasaland in 1953. Two officers and 52 men were lent to Northern Rhodesia in September/October, 1956. Northern Rhodesia, as it was then, Zambia as it is known today, I remind hon. members, is the country which is aiding and abetting the present terrorist incursion into Rhodesia. Finally, three officers and 250 members were sent to the assistance of British authorities in Nyasaland from February to March, 1959.

In January, 1965, I personally made representations to the British Prime Minister about the training of saboteurs and the harbouring of terrorists in Zambia and Tanzania. The British Prime Minister was unable to give me an entirely satisfactory reply. He took the opportunity of talking about the matter with the Zambian President and accepted the latter's denial that they were allowing Zambia to become a springboard for activites against Rhodesia. President Kaunda said that although his Government could not refuse entry to other Africans, they were exercising careful control over those claiming to be refugees and that they had put restrictions on the activities of political groups. In the light of present day events the value of such assurances can be seen for what they are—a hollow and deceitful mockery of the truth.

In June, 1965, I followed this up by sending Mr. Wilson a full account of the activities and training of Rhodesian subversive elements in Tanzania and Ghana and again the reply we received was unsatisfactory; Mr. Wilson saying that he would study carefully the information which the Rhodesian authorities had made available to him through his intelligence channels.

---

*See Appendix to this article.

However, this latest case, which I have drawn to your attention today, is the most blatant example of Britain assisting and indeed encouraging the actions of terrorists against friendly countries. I do not wish to exaggerate the present encounter for there is no doubt that our security forces are managing to deal with the terrorist invaders in a most adequate manner, but it is a fact that there has been a resurgence of terrorist activity recently, and most of these people have been effectively indoctrinated with Chinese communism and are dedicated to committing the most atrocious acts of terrorism. Moreover, I think it should be placed on record that the great majority of this gang are members of the South African African National Congress, hoping to pass through Rhodesia in order to practice their deadly trade south of the Limpopo. All Governments, including the British Government, must be aware of a joint press release issued in Lusaka on the 19th of this month signed by the Deputy Presidents of the Zimbabwe African People's Union, a Rhodesian organization, and the South African African National Congress, a South African organization, in which they declared that "the fighting presently going on in the Wankie area is indeed being carried out by a combined force of the Zimbabwe African People's Union and the South African African National Congress which is marching on a common route, each bound to its destination, fighting the common settlers enemy to the finish."

On previous occasions when I have taken up the case of the British Government condoning and even supporting the infiltration of terrorists from Zambia, Mr. Wilson did at least reply, although evading the issue. But in this particular case his answer is that he cannot even consider my representations because they come from an illegal Government. Putting it in a nutshell, Mr. Wilson is prepared to deal with me and indeed meet me and talk to me, when it suits him personally and when he hopes to extricate himself from the hook of sanctions on which he is so firmly entangled, but when the lives of poor, decent, innocent people are involved, both black and white, Mr. Wilson has the nerve to say that he cannot accept my communication, because it comes from an illegal Government. This must take the "Oscar" for the greatest piece of hypocrisy of all time. I repeat, that when he thought I might be able to assist him to extricate his head from the sanctions noose, he was prepared, not only to receive a communication from me, but to dine and wine me on board one of his battleships.

This story will surely fill a memorable, but nevertheless shameful page in the history of the present British Labour Party Government and if by chance some unfortunate mishap should befall any innocent Rhodesian, or, for that matter, any inhabitant of Africa south of the Zambezi, then we all know upon whose shoulders a large portion of this blame will fall.

SPEECHES BY MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITION AND OTHER MEMBERS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BEHANE. I wish to comment on certain activities taking place in my part of the country. I am making this comment due to the fact that the Prime Minister made a statement to this House this afternoon concerning the same matters.

I must say that sitting in this House, I represent the people of Matabeleland North, which is the area within which western Matabeleland falls. I cannot but say that I have the interests of those people at heart, and I would be failing in my duty as a member in Parliament representing that area if I did not comment on the matters that are taking place in that part of the country.

It is very well known to this House, and indeed to the country at large, that I have always stood firmly against terrorism and that I always do. I believe that what is being done by our Forces in that part of the country is worth all the praise that this House can give. Apart from the security of the whole country these dedicated men are fighting to preserve peace among the people living in western Matabeleland, people who do not take any interest in what is happening; in fact they do not know what communism is and they do not even know what these infiltrators are trying to bring about. So, for the security of the country and in particular for the security of the people in that part of the country where these minor skirmishes are taking place at this moment, I believe our Forces are worthy of the praise that can emanate from this House. Not only so; reading in the papers we find that several members of our Forces and of the Police Force have lost their lives. They have done that in the belief that Rhodesia is a country whose standards are worthy of being preserved, a country where I still believe there is a chance for all the races to come together and settle their differences.

I will never accept any foreign doctrines as a substitute for our doctrines here. I will never believe that Russian communism or communist Chinese are the people who have the solutions for our problems in this country. If I did believe in that I would just as well believe that there is peace in the Congo to-day and that these forces have been able to resolve or bring about peace in the countries that have been destroyed to their lowest stage of economy where people have no peace.—[Mr. Majongwe: And thousands of lives lost.]—I have sometimes said that these terrorists outside the country have done nothing to bring about peace, or indeed to improve the lot of the African in his country. All they have done is they have brought despondency. If they were really interested in the welfare of this country I challenge the hon. gentleman who signed this document as attached to come down to Rhodesia themselves and do the fighting themselves. If they do not want to expose their skills to the bullets of our Forces then they at least should come down and solve issues in Rhodesia because our issues, I believe, will have to be solved in Rhodesia or never at all.

I have said the welfare of these people in western Matabeleland is in danger and it is our Forces who are gallantly trying to preserve peace in that part of the country. I may, in short, try and bring before this House the aims of these infiltrators. First of all, I would like to know where they have had the training, where they have had the arms and the ammunition—from people who would like to see this country destroyed. It is from people who would like to impose a worse type of government in this country, a worse type of persecution of the lower races by their own members because they have not got enough room in their own countries and they would like to find room in Rhodesia.—[Mr. Chigogo: In Africa as a whole.]—I say again praise to our Forces who are trying to preserve law and order, who are fighting, who are losing their lives and who are facing difficulties to try and maintain law and order in this country.

I speak as a family man; I have love for my family; I believe it is the same with every one of us here and apart from anything else I would love to see my children grow up happily and because I am involved in politics is no reason why my family should suffer from injustices. I believe indeed that if it is a sin that I am a politician then those sins must grossly come upon me and never upon my children because I made my choice and I will let my children grow up and make their choices. I believe it is the duty of everyone, every citizen of Rhodesia at this time when we are faced with foreign doctrines, to stand together, to forget politics and to strive never to bring politics into matters of national importance. I believe it is the duty of every citizen in this country to fight to preserve peace. It is the duty of every citizen to take up arms and defend this country from foreign infiltrators, indeed to defend this country from communism. I believe that our Forces at this moment need both moral and physical support, and this is one institution where such feelings should be voiced.

In conclusion, I would like to confirm and redirect the words of the reverend gentleman, the Dean of Bulawayo, who said that terrorism is lawless and must be condemned by all sections of this country, by all spheres, because it knows no law. We know that when these people have had the chance of infiltrating into this country they have killed at random people they had nothing against. They have killed for the sake of killing, for the sake of demonstrating that they can kill, and they have robbed not people like myself who can defend themselves but they have robbed elderly poor people, say, in the Mrewa District, elderly poor people who cannot defend themselves, and they have forced them to give them money. Why should such actions be condoned? Why should that be mistaken for politics? I believe that is not politics, it is only because a few people who are keeping themselves very safe in another country are satisfied to send their own brothers to come and die here in order that they may enjoy the fruits of life wherever they are.—[Mr. Majongwe: They will not enjoy them for long.]

Mr. RUBATIKA. It is a privilege for me to have the opportunity to comment on this motion on the adjournment. In fact, I am bewildered at times when I see men holding responsible positions paying lip service to the principle of the maintenance of law and order in this country. When it is to their convenience they uphold law and order but when it is not to their convenience they do not uphold law and order. I have seen men some time ago who have gone almost weeping to the Minister of Law and Order asking for protection, but today those are the people who are giving the Minister of Law and Order a hard time because he has brought tranquillity to this country. They have one foot among the terrorists and another foot among the decent people for fear that should the terrorists win they will be accepted as having championed their cause.

Today there are some who are being intimidated because of these people. I am surprised that some of these people are still moving around and yet some of them are being paid by Government in certain institutions of Government. Wherever we move we are told that we are the people who support—I am sorry to use unparliamentary language—"I support Smith and Lardner-Burke". We have plainly told them that as far as we are concerned we might have differences, as members of a family, but we are one in the maintenance of law and order, we are one as a nation of Rhodesia.

I must register my strongest protest to Britain for lack of foresight. Let us say that these terrorists were given the Migs to land in Zambia and the communists bombed our territory, what does Britain think would happen? The Rhodesian Air Force would start bombing the bases from which those Migs came. Would this not escalate? We expect Britain, since it says it has responsibility over us up to date, to act as the Prime Minister stated, by exercising his influence on Zambia to stop terrorism and at least to register a protest on behalf of the African people whom it is stating it is championing. We do not want any loss of blood.

As far as my electoral district is concerned and all the electoral districts, all of us hate the chaos and disorder which happened some time ago. We stand in admiration of Government's stand on bringing about law and order. If by any eventuality the white man should fall we must pay the price and I am prepared to tell them to shoot me because I am dedicated to a cause and I shall live and die by it.

Mr. **CHIGOGO**. I must heartily thank the hon. member for Matabeleland North (Mr. Behane) whose electoral district adjoins mine and, as he has said, these troubles are really taking place in his electoral district and equally the same in the Gokwe area. All I have to say here is not much, because a multitude of words is not going to help us at all. I will ask the Prime Minister to ask the Prime Minister of Great Britain whether this is a trick by which Britain would like to arm itself against Rhodesia to say people are fighting and there is chaos. If not, could the Prime Minister of Great Britain tell us where these people are being trained, whether he has any alliances with those training camps where the Rhodesian people are being trained to come and disturb the lives of the innocent Tribal Trust Land people and the innocent farmers who are feeding the 4,000,000 Africans and the 200,000 Europeans in this country?

These are the only questions I would like the Prime Minister to convey to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Let us know if he is doing any good to those crying for freedom as such, whether the situation that he has been experiencing not only in the Congo, but in Nigeria, Tanzania and Ghana. One needs to mention all of these. Is that what Britain would like to see? May I know again through our Prime Minister whether Great Britain is going to honour Ghana and Nigeria to sit on the Prime Minister's Conference? Those people not only took their freedom but killed their own Prime Ministers; for what reason? I would like to know these answers if the Prime Minister would convey them.

Mr. **NEWINGTON**. As a back-bencher, may I say how grateful we are on this side of the House to see honest courageous and determined men opposite, men who have the same purpose at heart as we do on this side of the House, and that is the safety and security of Rhodesia. I would like to give them my wholehearted congratulations and my appreciation for their courage. I feel though, at the same time, the finger should be placed firmly and fairly on the guilty and evil men.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the hon. member for Matabeleland North (Mr. Behane) on bringing this matter up and the other members who have joined in this small debate on the adjournment. It is indeed very refreshing to find that in times of national emergency when we are challenged as a country, that we can have people on both sides of the House taking the stand that we have, over the last 20 minutes, witnessed.

I believe that this attitude that has been portrayed here this evening is the attitude which goes throughout the length and breadth of this country. This is, in the main, the feeling of the broad mass of Rhodesians. There are exceptions of course, as there are exceptions in this House, Mr. Speaker, and this was quite evident earlier this afternoon but I am pleased to say that this is confined to a few people. I believe the majority concur with the views that have been expressed here.

How right it was to point out, Sir, what good have these people done to anybody in Rhodesia when they have come here killing people indiscriminately, black and white. Who can they claim to be assisting? The hon. member for Matabeleland North (Mr. Behane) put his finger very firmly on the spot when he said these are agents of communism, and I believe particularly the yellow communist, and that they would love to have this country for themselves. If they did ever get to this stage, then, Mr. Speaker, God help all Rhodesians, not one section or another section. I go along all the way with him and the other hon. members who supported him when they said that whatever problems we have in Rhodesia can only be solved by Rhodesians. This should be a golden rule.

I have no idea what Mr. Wilson is after. I am sorry, I cannot make a constructive reply to the question put to me by the hon. member for Gokwe (Mr. Chigogo).

I have tried to get him to face up to his responsibilities on a number of occasions and he has failed to do so. I do not think any useful purpose will be served by going on flogging a dead horse. Let us make up our minds that we here have got to produce the right solution for Rhodesia. Let us enjoy the system of democracy whereby we can argue and criticize one another; this is healthy. Opposition is part and parcel of our Government and we must have in. But when it comes to infiltration of people from outside bringing in outside views and outside doctrines, this will only be to the detriment of everybody in Rhodesia because Rhodesia will be divided and people from outside, Mr. Speaker, I believe will ultimately come in and win the day and reap the benefits. There is room for all of us in Rhodesia, in this wonderful country which is the envy of so many other parts of the world. They are green with envy and this is why I believe so many of them are waging the war against us; they would love to have what we have.

So, as long as we can keep together and as long as we can have the sort of constructive debates which we have seen in this short adjournment, then I believe they will never succeed. I once again would like to compliment the responsible hon. members of the Opposition benches for their contribution.—[Hon. members: Hear, hear.]

APPENDIX

NOTE TO THE UNITED KINGDOM GOVERNMENT FROM THE RHODESIAN GOVERNMENT, AUGUST 28, 1967

1. The Rhodesia Government wishes to draw urgently to the attention of the British Government the following situation in Rhodesia.

2. Leaders of the two banned Rhodesian African Nationalist Organizations, the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) are now firmly established in Zambia and it is from Lusaka that these people plan subversive operations directed against the Government of Rhodesia, including the infiltration of armed terrorists and offensive materials into this country.

3. At one time the President of Zambia, through his security forces, tried to control the movement of terrorists and offensive materials through his country. From about the middle of 1966, however, when Rhodesian terrorist activities commenced to increase, all vestige of control appears to have vanished and the Zambian Government has since progressed from a policy of ignoring or condoning such activities to one of offering direct encouragement.

4. Rhodesian terrorists receive training in a number of communist countries, including Russia, Red China, Cuba and Algeria, and also at three or more camps in Tanzania. Irrespective of their place of training, terrorists invariably move from Tanzania to Zambia where they are billetted in specially constructed holding camps, established in the vicinity of Lusaka and within easy striking distance of Rhodesia.

5. In Zambia there are also a number of centres used by subversive organizations for the storage of arms, ammunition and other offensive materials used in the equipping of terrorist groups. At their respective holding camps ZAPU and ZANU Party officials indoctrinate the terrorists in Communist and Party Ideology, particularly in the context of the part they are to play in creating a sense of fear and uncertainty in Rhodesia.

6. Groups for terrorist incursions into Rhodesia are issued with arms and equipment and conveyed, quite openly, in ZAPU or ZANU vehicles along one or other of the Zambian road complexes to the Rhodesian border, where they are finally instructed on methods of infiltration and briefed on their targets in Rhodesia. During the hours of darkness they are expected to infiltrate across the Zambezi River into this country.

7. Not only does the Zambian Government condone the activities of Rhodesian terrorists in that country, but it is known that on occasions Zambian Government officials actually assist these people in passing through the border between Zambia and Tanzania.

8. The main supplier of arms and other offensive materials used by Rhodesian terrorists is the African Liberation Committee (A.L.C.) of the Organization of African Unity (O.A.U.) in Dar es Salaam. Here the material is received from a number of Communist countries and is stored by the Tanzanian Government, which is responsible for the control and subsequent issue of this material to various Nationalist movements.

9. Although there is no proof of direct co-operation between the Governments of Tanzania and Zambia in respect of the movement of offensive material, it is known that the former Government has already suggested to the latter that it adopts some method of control. It is extremely unlikely that the Zambian Government is ignorant of the movement and storage of terrorist arms in Zambia.

10. Since terrorist activity against Rhodesia was intensified about the middle of last year, an ever-increasing number of armed men, of both the ZAPU and ZANU factions, have been infiltrated into this country from Zambia. Initially, only small groups of terrorists entered across the Zambezi River from Zambia. In recent months larger bands—comprising up to thirty or more terrorists—have crossed into Rhodesia. Little credence can therefore be given to any denial by the Zambian Government that it is unaware of the movement of such large numbers of men and quantities of material.

11. The current security operation being waged against the large band of mixed South African African National Congress (SAANC) and ZAPU terrorists in Western Matabeleland shows without any doubt the Zambian authorities are not only prepared to condone terrorist activities directed against Rhodesia, but are also willing to allow their country to be used as a rallying point for terrorists bent on a campaign of violence against South Africa.

12. The recent threat issued by the Organization of African Unity to Rhodesian nationalists that they can expect no further financial support unless they can produce proof of militant action against Rhodesia has had a two-fold effect. It has influenced both ZAPU and ZANU to intensify the infiltration of terrorists from Zambia across the Zambezi River, and has stimulated ZAPU to abduct over two hundred Rhodesian Africans, in legitimate employment in Zambia, for terrorist training in Tanzania. Thus the Zambian Government has become further implicated by permitting these activities with little or no intervention.

13. On the 19th August in Lusaka, James Robert Chikerema, Vice President of ZAPU, and Oliver Tambo, Deputy President of the SAANC, issued a joint Press release extolling the activities of their combined terrorist groups presently operating in Western Matabeleland.

14. The aim of these terrorist bands is to carry out indiscriminate killing, burning and looting in rural and urban areas. The Rhodesian Government will adopt the most

vigorous measures to protect the people and their property and to seek out and destroy these terrorist bands and individual gunmen.

15. The British Government cannot escape its share of responsibility for these developments. There has been a complete absence of any protest by the British Government to the Zambian Government about the passage of arms and offensive material, the reception and harbouring of communist trained terrorists and the use of Zambia as a base for offensive operations against Rhodesia.

16. Here is a case where a Government of one Commonwealth country is lending itself to a policy of violence against another Commonwealth country which has committed no aggression and desires to be friendly and cooperative. The Rhodesian Government considers that Britain continues to have obligations in Zambia to influence that Government towards a policy of moderation and the discouragement of violence against Rhodesia. The Rhodesia Government accordingly lodges a strong protest against the British Government's lack of action in this respect and against its connivance of the hostile attitude of the Zambian Government towards peace and good government in Rhodesia.

EATING YOUR HEAD OFF

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the New York Welfare Department is finding itself in quite a predicament. It seems that people are literally and figuratively taking advantage of it and the services it provides. All is said to be legal, but the welfare department is also said to be headed for bankruptcy at the hands of welfare recipients who are planning just that.

I will include for the RECORD a news item, first of a series, published in the New York Daily News, explaining how a "small but determined army of welfare recipients" are attempting to kill welfare with the end in mind of substituting a guaranteed annual wage.

And, as if most welfare and poverty programs were not in bad enough shape, there are attempts to make them worse. This is the face of congressional action from various quarters to improve existing programs.

The Daily News did contain a paragraph which I believe sums up a gigantic flaw in these long-range plans. It is:

> This increased cost, officials argue, will surely harden John Q. Public's attitudes against present liberal welfare policies. With an antiwelfare public, chances would be nil for enactment of such a super-liberal program as a guaranteed annual income, the officials say.

It all reminds me of an advertisement paid for by the Warner & Swasey Co., of Cleveland. The ad appeared in July 1956, but is still thought provoking. Here it is:

THERE IS SUCH A THING AS "EATING YOUR HEAD OFF"

Once upon a time, there was a cow who thought. (Not very well, but she thought.)

And she thought her farmer was making too much profit on her milk. He provided a comfortable barn and stall, and hay and grain, but she wanted more.

So one day she held back her milk. Painful, but she was determined to have her rights. The farmer, in desperation, tried throwing in some more hay and grain, and she gave her milk again. No more milk, to pay for the added feed—just the same amount . . . where the money came from to pay for the added feed was the farmer's worry.

She liked this taste of power, so pretty soon went on strike again. And the farmer, in desperation, increased her feed.

Still no increase in the milk.

The farmer needed some roof repairs on the barn and new milk pails, but practically every cent he got for milk was now going into feed.

Power was now so pleasant to the cow that she went on strike at regular intervals. If she could have thought of some fringe benefits in addition to the greater pay, she would have demanded them, too.

Finally the milk wouldn't pay the feed bills. So the cow became hamburger, and the farmer, discouraged by cows who think but don't think straight, went into another business.

The New York Daily News article follows:

[From the New York Daily News, Oct. 25, 1967]

RELIEF ON THE ROCKS?—GROUP'S GOAL: KILL WELFARE FOR GUARANTEED PAY

(By Michael Clendenin and Donald Singleton)

A small but determined army of welfare recipients has opened a campaign designed to bankrupt, confuse and destroy the New York Welfare Department by overloading the city's relief rolls and overdrawing its bank account. Worried city and state officials say that this group has won the opening skirmishes and is dangerously close to all-out victory.

The army marches under the banner of the Poverty/Rights Action Program, a nationwide amalgam of local and state welfare "client" groups fighting for adoption of a federal guaranteed annual income law. They figure that the best way to develop public pressure for this is to make a shambles out of present welfare programs—to prove they don't work.

In recent months, this national army has aimed its heaviest artillery at its biggest, richest target—New York City, which has a coast-to-coast reputation for having the most liberal welfare programs in the country.

With the opening shots spent, the city is reeling under these statistics:

Relief rolls are leaping upward in recent months at the unprecedented rate of 29.8% per year, compared with a normal increase of between 11% and 15%. In August, 1966, 572,251 persons were on relief. Last August, the number had jumped to 742,953.

Costs are skyrocketing at an even faster pace and have been estimated at nearly 40% above last year. In August, 1966, $33 million was handed out in public assistance. Last August, $45.7 million was given out, up 37.2% in a single year.

A special study prepared by the Teamsters Union has predicted that the city's welfare budget will jump from $913 million in 1967–68 to "at least $1.5 billion" in the next fiscal year.

The legal staffs of the state and city welfare departments are bogged down under an avalanche of appeals aimed at increasing the amounts of reliefers' semi-monthly checks. Last year, officials conducted an average of five such appeals, called "fair hearings," per month; right now, the hearing schedule is 50 a day, and still the backlog is growing.

Welfare officials are the first to admit that there are many things wrong with even the best welfare programs—that the victims of poverty often have many legitimate grievances.

Their objection to the welfare rights movement is that it seems bent on tearing the programs apart without really providing practical alternatives. In their view, the real losers will be the very welfare recipients who are supposed to be helped.

HANDBOOK SPECIFIES STANDARD OF ASSISTANCE

Ironically, the welfare action leaders are using as their chief weapons the very sections of the welfare law which have been designed to solve some of the core problems of welfare.

Relief recipients are, under state law, entitled to be brought "up to standard" when they are accepted as welfare cases.

This means that each welfare recipient deserves to have specified amounts and kinds of clothing, furniture and other items, all of them carefully specified and catalogued in a 3-inch-thick Welfare Department document called "Handbook for Case Units in Public Assistance."

In the past, only welfare caseworkers knew the deep mysteries of the handbook. But the client groups put their experts to reading the book and it was discovered that only about 2% of all welfare recipients were completely at standard levels.

This fact has resulted in the "tea-strainer-potato-masher" approach. Such items as tea strainers, potato mashers and fruit reamers are listed in the book of standards, and client groups have set out to make sure that every reliefer has one of each, whether he needs it or not.

The results can be viewed in dollar signs. In June 1965, for example, special clothing grants to bring recipients up to standard totaled $540,131. Grants for household furnishings totaled $671,179.

Last June, as the result of the recipients' groups campaign were beginning to be felt, clothing grants totaled $1,272,678, a two-year increase of 75%. The grants for furnishings totaled $1,893,179, a two-year hike of 103%.

FIFTY PERCENT OF WELFARE ELIGIBLES NEVER APPLY

In the area of the already bulging caseload, even Welfare Commissioner Mitchell I. Ginsberg has reported that for every person now on welfare in New York City, there probably is one other person who is eligible to receive assistance but who never has applied for help because he is unaware of his eligibility.

However, the Welfare Department doesn't hunt for welfare recipients and the client organizations make it one of their biggest functions. "I am sure that these client groups have been responsible for a significant portion of this increased caseload," Ginsberg said.

In the matter of fair hearings for clients, the law was designed to protect welfare recipients from being cheated by the system—a system which was designed to lean in the recipients' favor.

Early this month, one attorney associated with the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law said that legal applications for fair hearings in the previous two weeks alone had resulted in $300,000 in extra funds paid to welfare cases.

"I can't be sure of the total figure," said the lawyer, David Gilman, "but I do know that by Sept. 25, more than $150,000 had been paid out to clients in Brooklyn alone."

LOGIC OF THE CAMPAIGN IS QUESTIONED

All perfectly legal, both sides agree. But welfare officials have questioned the logic of the groups' frontal attack on the New York system, the most generous in the nation. The attack, officials believe, is almost certain to drive the cost of the welfare program through the ceiling.

This increased cost, officials argue, will surely harden John Q. Public's attitudes against present liberal welfare policies. With an anti-welfare public, chances would be nil for enactment of such a super-liberal program as a guaranteed annual income, the officials say.

Under a guaranteed annual income, each needy person who had no income would receive a "paycheck" from Uncle Sam. And nobody would tell the "recipient" how to spend the money. Those who earned some money, but less than the guaranteed minimum, would be partially subsidized by the government.

"If these groups really are out to get relief recipients the things they deserve, if that is their real purpose, then they are performing a good," Ginsberg said. "It's not for me to question their motives anyway. The law tells me what I must do."

Asked if he thinks the state's law is a good one, Ginsberg said "yes." But he did admit "it undoubtedly is too complicated."

The leaders of the welfare rights movement, however, provide better clues to the purposes of their organizations.

CAMPAIGN LAUNCHED BY CHEMISTRY PROFESSOR

The man who originated the welfare rights program nearly two years ago is George Alvin Wiley, 37, a tall-soft-spoken organic chemistry professor at Syracuse University.

Wiley, who interrupted his teaching in 1964 to serve one year as associate national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, is director of the Poverty/Rights Action Center in Washington.

Wiley, who believes the welfare movement is "the most important development among low-income people since Rosa Parks refused to move to the back of a bus in Montgomery," prefers not to engage in tough talk. But he says his organization is willing to act tough.

"There is no substitute for organized political power," he said. "That's the only kind of power this system understands."

Wiley said the guaranteed annual income is the only way to wipe out poverty in America. "You ought to give more money to poor people—certainly at least the $4,000 a year which the federal government calls the poverty line. And you ought to put a lot less strings on the money, too."

ATTACK IS LED BY SOCIAL WORK PROFESSOR

The man who is described as "the brains of the whole movement," however, is not so reticent as Wiley.

He is Richard A. Cloward, a professor at the Columbia University School of Social Work, who first called for loading the welfare rolls in the summer of 1966, when he said:

"Widespread campaigns to register the eligible poor for welfare aid, aid to help existing recipients to obtain their full benefits, would produce bureaucratic disruption in welfare agencies and fiscal disruption in local and state governments.

"These disruptions would generate severe political strains and deepen existing divisions among elements in the big-city coalition: the remaining white middle class, the white working class ethnic groups and the growing minority poor."

Such a division, Cloward concludes, would force elected officials in Washington to "advance a federal solution" to the problem.

This "federal solution," he believes, would be the guaranteed annual income program.

In his more recent statements, Cloward leaves even less to the imagination:

"Recipients want to bring the welfare system to its knees, here and now," he said in an article he co-authored with Mrs. Frances Fox Piven, also a professor at the Columbia School of Social Work, in a recent issue of "The Nation" magazine.

"Campaigns to get benefits will produce perversive and persistent turmoil," the article continued, "bureaucratic turmoil because cumbersome (and unconstitutional) procedures for review and surveillance will break down; fiscal turmoil, as welfare costs rise in localities where existing sources of tax revenue are already overburdened; and political turmoil . . ."

How does all of this affect the individual on welfare, and how does it affect the caseworker in the field?

AHEPA URGES CONTINUED AID TO GREECE

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a number of well-meaning people are deeply concerned over the present government in Greece, and sincere differences of opinion exist over the situation in that country. In particular, some persons, including 52 Members of this body, have questioned the advisability of continuing economic and military aid to Greece.

The Order of AHEPA—American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—which has for the past 45 years expressed the thinking of most Americans of Greek descent, recently issued a statement urging the United States to continue its military and economic aid to Greece. The Supreme President of the Order of AHEPA, Andrew Fasseas, makes the following cogent observation in his statement:

> If a European came to the United States and told the American people what type of government we should have, or whom to elect as our President, we would rightfully reject it as an unwarranted interference with our internal politics.

Rather, our chief concern should be whether the Government of Greece will meet all of its responsibilities to our NATO defense structure. The growing Soviet foothold in the Arab world heightens the strategic location of Greece as our ally in the struggle to resist communism. The AHEPA statement correctly points out that continuation of our aid to Greece is in the best interest of the United States, Greece, and the free world.

I place the AHEPA statement urging continued aid to Greece in the RECORD at this point:

AHEPA URGES UNITED STATES CONTINUE MILITARY AND ECONOMIC AID AND ASSISTANCE TO GREECE

CHICAGO, ILL.—Andrew Fasseas of Chicago, Ill., Supreme President of the Order of Ahepa (American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association) today issued the following statement:

"The Order of AHEPA is composed, in great part, of Americans of Greek descent. It is non-sectarian in religion and non-partisan in politics.

"Ahepa's members are proud and happy that our country and Greece always have been allies and friends. As an historic fact, there were many Americans, including Samuel Gridley Howe, George Jarvis, and many others who fought in the Greek War of Independence of 1821. The United States, by Presidential action and Congressional Resolution, wholeheartedly supported the people of Greece in that great struggle.

"During World War I, the United States and Greece fought side by side.

"In World War II, Greece was again a valued and fruitful ally of our country. In that war its small but brave little army won the first victories against the Axis powers.

"After World War II, while other peoples and nations were busy rebuilding and recovering from war's devastation, the Greek people were called upon to fight yet another enemy—Communism.

"With American help, under the great Truman Doctrine, the people of Greece were the first nation that stopped the communist aggression. It is noteworthy that not a single American soldier shed his blood or lost his life in that great struggle of the Greek people.

"Since World War II, Greece has been a faithful ally of the United States. She is a valued and loyal member of NATO. Greece supplies the bases in the Middle East for the United States 6th Fleet and other American forces required in that part of the world in order to contain Communism.

"The best interests of our country require that Greece become and remain economically sound, and militarily strong.

"In the recent Israel-Arab war, Turkey, the other leg of the eastern anchor of NATO, declared that she would not allow the United States to use the NATO bases in Turkey. That left Greece as the only base of the United States in the Eastern Mediterranean. That proved once more that Greece is, as she has always been, a loyal and reliable friend and ally of our country.

"The Order of Ahepa therefore urges that the United States continue its military and economic aid and assistance to Greece.

"Many of our officers and members have recently visited Greece. They have found that law and order prevail and that conditions for visitors and tourists are most pleasant.

"If a European came to the United States and told the American people what type of government we should have, or whom to elect as our President, we would rightfully reject it as an unwarranted interference with our internal politics.

"The members of the Order of Ahepa feel that the type of government in Greece is a matter that concerns the Greek people only.

"As Americans, our only concern is that whatever Greek government Greece has should keep Greece as a member of NATO and a faithful ally of the United States."

SCHOLARLY JOURNALIST TO HEAD 20TH CENTURY FUND

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thorough economic scholars on the New York Times editorial board, Murray J. Rossant, has been elected director of the 20th Century Fund, New York City.

Mr. Rossant's departure from the New York Times is a loss that this Nation can ill afford at a time when honest, courageous, frank discussions such as he has shared with his readers are so seriously needed by the people of this country, and especially by their Government. His weekly Wednesday morning column gave him an opportunity to act as a watchdog on the financial problems and opportunities confronting this country both at home and abroad. His many economic, political, and social editorials, although unsigned, were extensively quoted by Members of Congress of both parties and in both Houses including certainly myself.

Although at various times I have not agreed with Mr. Rossant's conclusions, I have found during my service in the Congress that his writings, first in Business Week magazine and the London Economist and later in the New York Times, added constructively to the dialog which is so often missing concerning how we can emphasize what is best and solve that which is less good.

The board of trustees of the 20th Century Fund have now given Murray Rossant an opportunity to supervise studies on economic and social problems, and I feel confident that he will pioneer some new approaches in a number of economic situations which are not being even studied or discussed by congressional committees or the executive branch of the Government.

Although Mr. Arthur Ochs Sulzburger and Mr. John B. Oakes have for the time being lost one of their most promising senior editors, it is really we in the Government and thoughtful people in business, labor, and the universities who will miss most the clear analyses which Mr. Rossant has shared with us for many years.

Text of the New York Times article of September 21 about Mr. Rossant appointment follows:

ROSSANT NAMED HEAD OF 20TH CENTURY FUND

Adolf A. Berle Jr., chairman of the board of trustees of the 20th Century Fund, announced yesterday that Murray J. Rossant, a member of the editorial board of The New York Times, would become director of the fund on Oct. 2.

Mr. Rossant, who has resigned from The Times, succeeds August Heckscher, who left as fund director last March to become the city's Parks Commissioner.

The fund is a nonprofit foundation that specializes in research and public education on the vital issues of the day, especially on economic and social problems. It was founded in 1919 by Edward A. Filene, Boston merchant.

Mr. Rossant, who has been with The Times since 1962, had been senior editor of Business Week and a correspondent for The Economist.

Mr. Berle also announced the appointment of John E. Booth as associate director of the fund. He has served with the State Department and the Economic Cooperation Administration in London and Paris.

A REAFFIRMATION OF U.S. INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC GOALS NEEDED

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today's important legislative business made necessary the cancellation of a speech I had scheduled this evening in St. Louis before the St. Louis Mortgage Bankers Association. The subject of my remarks was to be the increasingly restrictive trade measures now being discussed and the need to reaffirm the principles of the market place that underlie our international trade policy.

Because of the need to consider this matter openly and fully, I am taking this opportunity to insert my prepared remarks in the RECORD at this point:

AMERICAN FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY CHALLENGED

It is a great pleasure to speak to a group that represents a blending of my own deep interests. We have a community of interest in part because of my long association with a St. Louis financial institution. On another level we have a community of interest because of my congressional work involving our Federal financial institutions and monetary policy in relation to the Nation's economy. This work of course involves the whole range of the rather complex Federal monetary policy apparatus.

I was recently provided an opportunity to apply my banking interests to a practical problem when I discovered what I consider an inequity in the taxation of our private agricultural lending institutions. When the Federal land banks were created in 1916 they were granted exemption from all taxation. At that time the composition of the Nation's agricultural economy and the character of the financial institutions which served it were vastly different from what they are today. The tax exemption was probably justified.

But in 1947 Federal funds were retired from the Federal land bank system. Since then the land banks have operated as private organizations, and as private lenders they have been free to compete with other private lenders for the agricultural loan business. They have done so most effectively. In 1940 the percentage of the total dollar volume of the farm mortgages held by the land banks was only 8.3%. By 1965 the untaxed land banks' share of this business had climbed to 24%, while the share of their competitors, which are required to pay taxes, narrowed.

The issue here is certainly not some mere prejudice against agricultural lending. Neither is it a desire to get the land banks out of banking. My interest is instead tax equity and maintenance of a fair competitive situation in the field of agricultural financing. To me it does not seem equitable to tax some lending institutions while not taxing others. So in this case the issue is to state simply and clearly, and to apply equally, the rules of the competitive road, in the hope that the interests of the agricultural borrower and lender both will be served.

This case sets the context for my observations in the field of international economics, a subject which I consider of overwhelming importance to the national economy.

Many of you are no doubt aware that in the past several months—notably since the end of the Kennedy Round of international tariff and trade negotiations on June 30 this year—there has been an ever-swelling tide of bills that would provide special trade measures for individual commodities. There are now at least 15 such bills—it is difficult to be precise because the number grows steadily. The commodities covered range from insignificant to major. For example, special quota limitations are requested for all textile products, for steel, and for lead and zinc, but they are also requested for honey, prepared strawberries and olives.

The amount of import trade covered by these various import restriction measures has been estimated at $12 billion dollars, out of about $26 billion of total U.S. imports in 1966. This is a tremendous volume of trade and, of course, as you would expect in foreign countries, the threat that the Congress could suddenly enact legislation affecting that amount of their own exports has caused great consternation. So concerned are these countries that they have told our State Department that they would have to retaliate against U.S. exports to them. Part of their reasoning is that their own domestic producers would rise up in arms to threaten them were they not to do so. Our own poultry producers in 1963 demanded that our government take action against the European Common Market when it adjusted its border restrictions to exclude American poultry exports.

Thus the current situation in Congress is serious for several reasons. One is that there are a number of quota bills which may well be brought to the floor of the Senate and be attached to an insignificant tariff measure already passed by the House. It is quite conceivable that the Senate could pass these bills, even though they have received quite cursory examination by the Senate Finance Committee, which is considering them.

Another is that special import action could be taken on behalf of certain individual industries when the real, underlying causes of their problems may not be imports at all, or when in fact the import problem is just part of a much broader problem that needs action on several fronts.

The possibility that Congress could act rashly in this field is worrisome to me for at least four reasons.

First, I believe that the proper function of Congress is to take up an issue in one of its appropriate Committees, call in the knowledgeable experts and laymen in the society to contribute their judgments and knowledge to the study of the problem, and then to make an informed decision.

There is certainly doubt that the Senate Finance Committee is capable of performing this study and deliberative function for the wide variety of very complex economic issues that confront it in each one of the numerous quota bills it is considering.

Second, I am deeply disturbed that the quota is the device being advanced to provide the barrier between the international marketplace and our domestic marketplace. I have very often expressed my conviction that in cases in which governments decide they must measure differentials in costs of production or means of marketing, such as subsidies and unfair trade practices, they should do so by means of a tariff, which is expressed as law and is applicable to everyone. A quota, on the other hand, requires administrative discretion and decision. It promotes government by men rather than by law. I believe that a quota is an entirely improper device to use to curtail trade flows.

Third, I am concerned by the possible Senate Finance Committee action because it is clearly contrary to the economic principles that have made the national economy strong, principles which by and large we have tried to promote in our international economic relationships.

I want to repeat these principles because they are so very important to the continued national economic well-being, both domestic and international: first, the market should determine what to produce and how much should be produced; second, profit should both reward successful business performances and continue to act as incentive for the development of new, profitable companies and industries; third, the best form of business organization is the broadly held stock corporation that mobilizes its capital through stock issues; fourth, it is better to go out and develop new and ever expanding markets than to defend old ones.

In these four principles rest the secret of a dynamic, innovative, greatly productive economy. I can only ask that those industries that might seek to make imports the scapegoat for their more real problems take these principles to heart, just as I would ask the Congress to study seriously and thoroughly the real problems of these industries in order to take proper corrective action, even if that might finally be to control imports.

My fourth concern is again the issue of equity. How can one set of competitive rules be created for one group of industries and yet be denied to others? The economy is too closely interrelated to prevent a special measure for one industry or one company from affecting another industry or company.

To summarize, the quota bills in the Senate concern me for these reasons:

1. They have received only the slightest real study.
2. They use the dangerous quota device.
3. They would damage the economic philosophy of the marketplace that is so important to maintaining a sound economy in the long term.
4. They would create special favors for some industries at the expense of other, possibly more efficient industries.

The present legislative situation and the threats posed lead me to urge that we reaffirm the principles of the marketplace that underlie our trade policy, principles that have been lost sight of both by certain elements of the American business community and by those who are responsible for the administration of our foreign economic policy in the government.

In fact, trade restrictionism can be thought of as a two-pronged attack by: U.S. import quotas legislated by Congress on a multitude of industrial and agricultural products, and, international agreements negotiated by the Executive branch which have the effect of controlling trade artificially, both by quotas and by other means.

I have discussed the first "prong" of the restrictionist "attack". But the second, United States policy with regard to internationally traded commodities, must be rethought and reshaped.

For example, it was the Administration under the leadership of a former Under Secretary of State, that made the decision to press for the first true U.S. quota system, the comprehensive quota system that has been in effect for imports of cotton textiles since 1961. I believe it is no exaggeration that, in the numerous quota bills now before Congress we are witnessing the legacy of that fateful decision to resort to the quota as a device to control trade.

It was the Administration that set out to negotiate the present International Coffee Agreement, and the Administration that has tried to negotiate an international cocoa agreement. The Administration during the recently completed round of international tariff and trade negotiations pursued a policy of international commodity agreements for meat, dairy products, and wheat. These agreements were perhaps attempts to deal pragmatically with the real problems of world trade in those commodities, but they did not deal with the deeper problems, which are often rooted in the government-dominated farm programs most countries maintain.

Instead of trying merely to adjust international trade to take into account the differences in nationally controlled farm programs, the farm policy of this Nation should be to bring domestic U.S. farm programs into harmony with U.S. foreign trade objectives to reestablish marketplace conditions in both areas. U.S. farmers must achieve competitive pricing in the world market in the context of fair trade. The objectives should be to sell commodities for export at prices that are determined by the marketplace. This is the theory that underlies H.R. 7326, a bill I introduced on March 16, 1967 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 6921–6922) to allow the market to function more completely and allow returns to farmers to be maximized by removing government price supports from U.S. wheat and feed grain production.

Thus my concern is that we reaffirm the principles of the marketplace in our foreign economic policies—this is the best offense against hastily-considered Congressional quota bills as well as against Administration-sponsored trade restrictive measures.

I have the following suggestions for constructive action in the present situation:

First, Congress should strengthen its study and deliberative processes in the foreign trade field. The Joint Economic Committee should study each year the entire foreign economic policy field in public hearings based on a comprehensive report by the Executive branch. In addition, the Congress should take steps to bring about coordinated consideration of foreign economic policy issues, which are now scattered throughout at least ten of the committees of the House and as many in the Senate.

Second, the quota bills now pending in the Senate should be considered in their proper legislative framework by being brought before the Ways and Means Committee for full hearings and study, and this should be done in the context of Committee study of the Administration's trade bill.

Third, there should probably be a rethinking of the means provided in the laws for giving trade adjustment relief from unusual import problems facing American industries. This is a complicated problem and I do not want to dwell on it at length. But there are clearly areas in which international trade flows may be unusually distorted or upset by world economic factors, or the particular practices of certain countries. The wholesale dumping of a commodity at distress prices in another country's market is one of those cases, and we do have an anti-dumping law and procedures to deal with such cases. Another clear example is the countervailing duty provision of U.S. tariff law, which provides that a product imported here at a subsidized low price can be restrained by a "countervailing" additional duty charge.

Perhaps there are other problems that should be taken into account in trade adjustment measures. For example, what about a case of a particular industry in a certain country that seems blindly intent on pursuing a policy of export expansion even at unremunerative (though not artificial) prices? Steel seems to be such a case. Here the Japanese, through continuing, probably injudicious, expansion of their steel capacity, have managed to increase their share of the U.S. market and to disrupt the European market by challenging European exporters to our market and creating strong price competition with the European industry.

Scholars of the subject describe the international steel market as a chaotic one, and my own findings, which I reported to Congress on May 1, 1967, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 11320–11337, confirm that such a disruptive situation exists.

Now, perhaps we might want to consider what means we can make available to prevent our steel market to be the dumping ground for a lot of excess capacity in Japan. By this I do not mean that I want to isolate the American steel market from the international market. But I do want to ask whether there may be grounds for defining the present world over-capacity situation as extraordinary and in a sense "unfair" to the domestic steel industry.

Finally, I would like to suggest another experimental idea. Perhaps we should rethink the institutional framework for our judgments about the problems of certain industries. Perhaps the role of the independent Tariff Commission should be strengthened to allow it to make quicker decisions about the provision of relief for certain "distressed" industries by means of a tariff adjudgment mechanism, some sort of temporary relief measure that could be put in force pending the Tariff Commission's final decision about the economic merits or demerits of the case at hand.

These are ideas for consideration and discussion. They may not prove suitable, or even needed. But they might add to the dialogue on an issue that increasingly requires intelligent discussion, deep study, and careful Congressional decision-making.

BRITISH FROGMEN AID UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the recent wave of criticism leveled against our allies and their attitude toward Vietnam, it was interesting and refreshing to note Moscow's radio comment on this issue, citing British activities that aid the American effort.

As the chairman of the House Republican Committee on Western Alliances I am pleased at this evidence of cooperation among the free nations of the world.

Text of radio comment from Moscow to the United Kingdom as monitored October 24, follows:

BRITISH FROGMEN AID UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM WAR

British sailors are taking part in the hostilities in South Vietnam. A special team of frogmen from the British base in Hong Kong is being used in South Vietnam by the U.S. Command to clear the coast of deep mines positioned by the guerrillas to prevent the passage of U.S. warships. This has been reported by the London Evening Standard. The paper says the men are demolition experts and are blowing up the mines. They are thereby promoting the U.S. war.

Britain, our observer points out, is one of the two cochairmen of the 1950 Geneva conference and is called upon to insure that the international agreements on establishing peace in Indochina adopted by the conference are observed.

EXEMPT CERTAIN FARM VEHICLES FROM THE HIGHWAY USE TAX

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, without question the economic plight of the American farmer is growing steadily worse. He is struggling against record-breaking production costs, recordbreaking farm debt and recordbreaking agricultural imports that compete with the commodities he produces. He has very little hope that present inadequate farm prices will show any improvement in the near future. He knows full well that his plight is reflected in the farm parity ratio which is now at the lowest point since the depression years of the 1930's. The future of the family farm in America has never been in more danger than it is today.

During these trying times of ever-increasing farm costs and depressed farm produce prices, it is essential that the farmer's cost of producing his products be kept at a bare minimum and that every means that Government has at its disposal to help reduce these costs should be employed.

Therefore, today I am introducing a bill that would exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax. Under the provisions of this bill a vehicle would be treated as a farm vehicle for the taxable period if 90 percent or more of its use on the public highways consists of hauling agricultural products or equipment owned and produced by or for the owner of such vehicle to a point not more than 100 miles from the farm on which such products are produced, or hauling farm supplies to the farm of the owner of such vehicle from a point not more than 100 miles from such farm, or any combination of both of these situations.

I believe this bill would help reduce the farmers' cost of production. It is my hope that the Congress will favorably consider this legislation.

TAKE PRIDE IN FALLSINGTON

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIESTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the October 19 issue of the Bucks County Courier Times. It is most gratifying to observe what fine results such unusual community initiative and dedication can achieve. I commend to my colleagues in the House, and to all who read the RECORD, the following editorial:

TAKE PRIDE IN FALLSINGTON

Normally, and as a matter of journalistic principle, we don't like anyone suggesting what we should write. We make this rare exception.

At an abnormal breakfast meeting the other morning, Frank Wood, the fellow who has a finger in more Bucks County affairs than anyone we know, suggested we say something about Historic Fallsington, Inc.

Now since that was the only breakfast meeting (for two) we ever attended we may have been a bit vulnerable. Yet since, we have found such vulnerability perhaps very, very wise. Plus the fact we like Historic Fallsington, Inc. So, here's what we say.

In this day and age when so many of our people (including a lot of our Delaware Valley Protective Association and Upper Bucks County people) are asking for some sort of Federal handout for everything they aspire to do, it's infinitely refreshing to note that Historic Fallsington, Inc., has been doing during the past 14 years an almost impossible job of restoring an historic village of immeasurable significance with nothing but private funds.

This restoration movement has been a dramatic thing, capturing the fancy and the admiration of folks in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Delaware. It's been especially dramatic because the very large achievement has been done with funds contributed from the pocketbooks of interested people plus, of course, a bit of help from the Grundy Foundation.

Historic Fallsington, Inc., has been getting most astonishing results during its relatively brief period of existence. The astonishment must be attributed, to be sure, to the fact that yearning of a few dedicated people is being finally realized because of the generosity and understanding of a lot of other people of the truly historic and humanistic values involved.

We're sure that Fallsington Village, located as a charming island in this Lower Bucks County region of community, business and industrial progress, will become ultimately a community for historic pilgrimage from across the land.

We are also sure that the Fallsington Village, once restored, will not be a monument to federal government largess. Rather it will be the brightest of statues to a great number of individuals who cared enough about community and history and Americana to reach into their pockets and do something about the preservation of the precious all.

CZECHOSLOVAK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 29, some of my constituents will join in a celebration of Czechoslovak Independence Day.

While the administration insists there is a modification of communism in East Europe and courts increased trade with the governments of East Europe, those whose loved ones remain in those countries are well aware that they are still in captivity. Communication with them is difficult—even impossible in some cases. There is extensive poverty, propaganda, and pathos.

Not long ago a visitor to Czechoslovakia wrote, when safely returned to a free country:

> Czechoslovakia is truly a satellite of the Soviet Union and in awful disrepair. The buildings are neglected, dirty, unpainted. On the main street, some buildings are being "fixed" for the benefit of tourists. . . . The people are depressed, for they have lost a tremendous amount of motivation. I found no one who said anything good about the regime.

This was in August of 1967.

In mid-October the press reported that the Czech Government had issued stringent new controls affecting the economy, religion, and literature. For years the country has been drained of consumer goods by Moscow. Creativity is discouraged. Recently writers, seeking wider range of expression, have been imprisoned.

Even the church is under strict Government control, and the youth of the nation are turning to drink and crime in large numbers, for what future can they expect under such a regime?

Yet the craving for liberty persists. Writers continue to write, smuggling manuscripts to the West, and releasing mimeographed copies on the black market. The clamor for more and better quality consumer goods continues. People remind the Communist machine of promises unfulfilled after 19 years. Every month some courageous souls continue to "vote with their feet"—and many succeed in escaping to freedom.

To those who live under such great difficulty, restraint, and pressure, we owe encouragement and ever firm, upright example. I salute those in Cleveland who are keeping alive the memory of brighter days in the land of their birth and renewing their hope for the return of freedom to that country in the near future.

ANTI-VIETNAM WAR RALLY

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, on October 21, I personally witnessed the anti-Vietnam war rally in Washington which was, at one and the same time, a demonstration to the world of the rights and privileges enjoyed under our system of Government—and a demonstration of abuses of those rights and privileges.

I approve of the decision of our Government to allow the rally to take place. But I thoroughly disapprove the decision allowing the protesters to then march to the Pentagon with the intent of disrupting the war effort. The march did not add one iota to the case made at the mass meeting at the Lincoln Memorial.

At the Memorial, a crowd estimated at 55,000 had assembled. They were in an almost festive mood. Most were of college age, and many were notable for their obvious boycott of barber shops and beauty salons, and for their apparent aversion to soap and water.

Quite a few carried posters bearing various slogans, some of them unspeakably obscene. Some carried pictures of the late Cuban Communist revolutionary, Che Guevara, and others carried Vietcong flags—clearly displaying their pro-Communist leanings.

Although many things happened at the Lincoln Memorial that made one's blood boil—such as a moment of silence in honor of Guevara—this was the part of the protest which, in my opinion, was legal exercise in free speech—a constitutional right of all Americans.

I believe the march to the Pentagon and the demonstration at the Pentagon itself—where manifestly the protesters had no right to be—all with the approval of the General Services Administration, infringed on the rights of area residents and constituted a shameful abdication of responsibility by this administration—at a cost to the taxpayers of over a million dollars.

At the Pentagon, the carnival mood

disappeared and an ugly mood set in. Writing in the Washington Post of October 22, Jimmy Breslin, a Post staff writer, put it this way:

> Taste and decency had left the scene a long time before. All that remained were these lines of troops and packs of nondescript kids who taunted the soldiers. They turned the demonstration for peace—these drifters in raggedy clothes—into a sickening, club-swinging mess. At the end of the day, the only concern anybody could have was for the soldiers who were taking the abuse.

The troops involved were splendid. Well disciplined, admirably self-restrained, they were a credit to themselves, their service and their country.

After spending several hours with the misfits, the dropouts from society, the Communist sympathizers and the out-and-out Communists, the actions of these fine young men in uniform were reassuring, to say the least.

And, thankfully, it is they—and not the protesters who comprise just a minuscule fraction of our young people—who will be our leaders of tomorrow. I am sure our future will be in good hands.

FREE SPEECH AND THE RIGHT OF DISSENT

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, those familiar with my record know full well that I have always been a stanch advocate of free speech and the right of dissent. I have done some dissenting from time to time myself.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is well established in this Nation that freedom of speech does not carry with it the privilege of shouting "fire" in a crowded theater.

Nor does the right to dissent carry with it the right to preach sedition, anarchy, or treason. Yet in the district I have the honor of representing, I must sadly report that an English instructor at the University of Northern Iowa has been permitted to do exactly these things.

The teacher, one Edward Hoffmans, was allowed a full page in the student newspaper of this State-supported university to publish a vicious attack on the U.S. Government—an attack which included repeated exhortations to mass resistance to the draft, mass draft card burnings, and mass civil disobedience.

Hoffmans, in his rantings, goes on to tell the young men and women of the university that—and I quote him:

> Anti-war strategy must move beyond dissent to offer the hawks a choice between foreign war and domestic anarchy or treason.

This man is clearly, openly, and aggressively advocating the overthrow of the U.S. Government if that Government does not knuckle under to his way of thinking.

He says piously that most Americans—meaning the millions of law-abiding men and women of this country—"misunderstand civil disobedience and so will misinterpret it as anarchy or treason or both."

Well, Mr. Speaker, let it be clear that this Member of Congress does not misunderstand and does not misinterpret.

I understand very clearly what this English instructor is teaching: Anarchy and treason.

I do not know what position the Governor of Iowa has or will take with respect to this firebrand on the State payroll. Nor do I know how many times the president of the university intends to allow this man to yell "fire" before he invokes the rule of responsibility that goes hand in hand with the right of free speech.

But I do know that this man, according to the newspapers, turned in his draft card to a Federal marshal this month, thereby breaking the law he has urged others to break.

If he is so filled with hatred and disgust for this country, as he apparently is, I shall be happy to contribute my fair share toward a one-way ticket to North Vietnam or any other Communist country so this man may learn firsthand just how free the speech is there.

Mr. Speaker, I include two excellent articles on this subject by Bill Severin, columnist for the Waterloo, Iowa, Daily Courier:

UNI SHOULD FIRE HOFFMANS

It is gratifying to know that the rantings of Ed Hoffmans, English instructor at the University of Northern Iowa, in the Northern Iowan, quasi official publication of the school, do not represent the thinking of any substantial part of the faculty or student body.

The people responsible for the college publication saw fit to permit Mr. Hoffmans to use a full page to make the most vicious attack upon the President of the United States I have ever seen in print, to advocate insurrection and anarchy and to urge impressionable young students to violate the draft laws.

Hoffmans, to give a general idea, says:

"Mass civil disobedience toward the draft should be made the focus of anti-war strategy: Registrants should publicly mutilate, destroy or turn in their draft cards, refuse induction, halt the operation of induction centers, and disrupt preinduction physicals by refusing to obey orders."

He says further:

". . . anti-war strategy must move beyond dissent to offer the hawks a choice between foreign war and domestic anarchy or treason."

This latest example of bad judgment on the part of those responsible for the college publication has moved some of the most distinguished members of the University faculty to protest.

In a letter addressed "To the Students" and submitted for publication in the campus newspaper these faculty members have this to say:

"Ed Hoffmans, instructor of English, published a tirade against the government in the Oct. 10 issue of the Northern Iowan.

"We believe Mr. Hoffmans' recommendations to young men to deliberately break the law are contrary to the best interests of the students, the faculty, and the future of the University of Northern Iowa.

"We believe in freedom of speech but we do not believe it is proper for a state subsidized university newspaper to be used to encourage university students to break the law. Consequently, we will take any legal means at our disposal to see that this type of material is discontinued.

"We do not believe that 'mass civil disobedience' is the best way to effect change. Consequently we urge you to think carefully before committing yourself to Mr. Hoffmans' radical recommendations. It has been our belief that the law should be respected until such time as it is changed. We believe Mr. Hoffmans' attitude to be more immature than most students."

This letter, at the time I saw it, had been signed by 16 members of the faculty.

At the present time there appears to be no responsible individual accountable for the content of the college publication. Bernard C. DeHoff, a highly competent journalist, is a member of the faculty and listed as the faculty adviser. But DeHoff says he has no authority or power to exercise any authority other than to check editorial copy for possible libelous material. He reports that he was given no opportunity under existing rules to read the article before publication.

Now I am going to offer a bit of gratuitous advice to Dr. J. W. Maucker, president of the University.

1. Give Mr. DeHoff the authority he requires to properly supervise tax-subsidized publications.

2. Suspend Mr. Hoffmans immediately from teaching responsibilities and follow this with any steps necessary under the rules of the American Association of University Professors to remove him from the payroll of this state institution. It is my understanding Mr. Hoffmans does not have tenure, which should simplify the problem of dispensing with his services.

HAZARD TO GENERAL WELFARE

The philosophy of civil disobedience or selective compliance with the laws of this state and nation being advocated by University of Northern Iowa English instructor Edward Hoffmans is one carrying with it no little hazard to the general welfare of the people of this country.

For example, there was a bearded senior law student at the University of Iowa in my office the other day who purported to be (and probably was) a spokesman for Mr. Hoffmans.

I asked this young man if he, as a student of the law, could support the philosophy of selective compliance with the law. "I believe in civil disobedience in the field of civil rights," he said.

This, I believe, illustrates the danger inherent in the philosophy of civil disobedience. The young law student felt he could justify violating the law in the field of civil rights. Mr. Hoffmans believes he is right in violating the draft laws and not long ago there was another citizen who advocated violation of the federal income tax laws.

And so it becomes abundantly clear that if constituted authority permits selective obedience to law then before long we will have no law at all. If this should happen we will have chaos and anarchy and we will all lose the civil rights and liberties which Dr. J. W. Maucker, president of UNI, is now holding up as a shield to protect the erring Mr. Hoffmans.

Dr. Maucker insists that "intellectual freedom" must be maintained at the University so that anyone may feel free to express any new idea, no matter how radical that idea may seem to others.

Well, Mr. Hoffmans or anyone else may express any idea that occurs to them either orally or by printed word without receiving any objection from me.

But Mr. Hoffmans was not expressing an idea in his full page essay in the University newspaper. He advocated in the "free space" provided partly by the taxpayers of this state and in his paid ad an illegal course of action to the young people who are expected to look to him and other members of the faculty for instruction and guidance. In so doing he disqualified himself for the position he presently holds as an instructor in a tax supported school.

Hoffmans, and those who support his position, fondly try and compare his actions to those of our forefathers who rebelled against British rule and founded this great democracy. Hoffmans, himself, likes to compare his conduct with those colonists who participated in the Boston Tea Party.

No such analogy is valid. These colonial people were revolting against taxation without representation; against laws in which they had no voice in making.

In our democracy today the people have a voice, through their elected representatives, in making the laws under which we all must live. If a majority of the people conclude that any law is bad they can and do change it by due process of law.

It is not a speedy process. Socrates said more than 2,000 years ago "The state is a great and noble horse who is rather sluggish . . ."

The first president of the United States, George Washington, said in 1796 "The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government."

And more than 100 years later another great American, William Jennings Bryan said: "I believe every citizen should support the government when final action is taken, whether he approves of the action or not."

What do you say today, Mr. Hoffman?

TRIBUTE TO THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, October 27 marks the 109th birthday of one of America's finest statesmen and Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt. Fortune smiled on the Brotzman family when our son, Chip, was born on his birthday. The achievements of "Teddy" Roosevelt are numerous, but those of us from the West remember him first as a conservationist.

More than 100 million acres of land became national forests because of his continual encouragement and urging. It was during his administration as President of the United States that 26 million acres of public land was withheld for development as national parks, national forests, and irrigation projects. My own State of Colorado contains one of the five national parks organized and developed under the auspices of Theodore Roosevelt—Mesa Verde National Park.

It is probable that Roosevelt did more to organize Federal involvement in constructive forestry than any other one individual. Roosevelt National Forest—which was named for him—lies partly in my district. This forest contains 784,051 acres of the most awe inspiring scenery available in Colorado. We in the Second District of Colorado take pride in having a national forest with such an appropriate name. I thank you for the opportunity to convey my admiration and respect for Theodore Roosevelt.

WAR AND PEACE

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend, Col. Earl "Red" Blaik, of Army and Dartmouth football coaching fame, writes a syndicated column the proceeds from which go into scholarships for deserving college students with gridiron ability. Recently Colonel Blaik wrote an article which I think carries a message for all Americans, particularly in reference to the so-called peace demonstration staged at the Pentagon last October 21. In simple yet moving language, Colonel Blaik puts the question of war and peace in proper perspective at the same time that he pays tribute to one of this Nation's Vietnam war heroes, the late Maj. Don Hollender. I urge all Members of the House to read Colonel Blaik's column, which follows at this point.

COL. RED BLAIK'S SYNDICATED FOOTBALL SERIES

(By Col. Earl (Red) Blaik)

Last week I read where Washington witnessed the march of 70,000 peace demonstrators whose object was to "confront the war makers in Washington and to surround the Pentagon as the symbol of evil."

What these demonstrators failed to comprehend is that the career soldier does not commit this country to war—war is the judgment of our civilian leaders elected and appointed. The Pentagon implements this judgment and the career soldier is the one whose duty it is to answer the call of his country—not to question why. These men, in going to war, leave youngsters and wives with a smile, but more often with heavy hearts as they realize there may be no return. For demonstrators to suggest that the men of the regular military service want war and the Pentagon is a symbol of evil is to forget that Sherman said "War Is Hell" and that MacArthur eloquently stated in taking the Japanese surrender on the U.S.S. Missouri, "it is my earnest hope and indeed the hope of all mankind that from this solemn occasion a better world shall emerge out of the blood and carnage of the past—a world founded upon faith and understanding—a world dedicated to the dignity of man and the fullfillment of his most cherished wish—freedom, tolerance, justice."

Military men abhor war as they know it in the raw and to them the action of the belligerent demonstrator is incomprehensible.

I am greatly saddened by the news that Major Don Holleder of Army football fame, has been killed in Viet Nam. Holly, like so many fine young Americans, made the *supreme* sacrifice in terrain better suited to wallowing barnyard stock. War, to Holly, meant leaving a lovely wife, four children and a devoted mother.

Last December, in accepting the Gold Medal Award of The National Football Foundation, I referred directly to only one former Army player and that reference was to Holleder. You will better understand this brave young officer and his dedication to duty from those remarks which follow.

Axiom—Good fellows are a dime a dozen, but an aggressive leader is priceless. The 1955 season was most trying for me as we had a lean squad and no quarterback. A coach has never known trouble unless he has the senseless temerity to change an All America End into a "T" quarterback in one season. There was hardly an officer or cadet at West Point who didn't believe this switch was a colossal error. Even my friends of the Press called the move "Blaik's Folly."

Sunday afternoon after the Michigan defeat the Superintendent, my former football teammate, came to my office and inquired as to whether I was aware of the local sentiment about our quarterback. I told him that the team was aware, the staff was aware, and I was aware, but far more important they all believed as I did that our only chance to defeat the Navy was with Holleder at quarterback.

A few minutes after the Superintendent left, Holleder came to see me. As he entered the office I got up, placed my hand on his shoulder, and said, "Holly, you played a good game yesterday and I am proud of you. You're making fine progress as our quarterback." With moisture in his eyes, Holly replied, "I know what the cadets are saying, I have heard the officers talk, and I came fully prepared to get my old number back, but I want you to know I prayed all the way here that you would not give up on me."

Now, it is many weeks later. It is the night before the Navy game. As was usual, I took the squad for a bedtime walk on the golf course which ended with a few words about the big game. I recall saying: "Three times this season I took the long walk across muddy fields to congratulate first Benny Oosterbaan, then Ben Schwartzwalder, and then Jordan Olivar. It has been a trying season and I am a bit weary from those walks. Tomorrow before 100,000 spectators and fifty million television viewers I want you men to know it would be the longest walk of my coaching career if I cross the field to congratulate the Navy coach."

There was silence for a moment—then a voice spoke out with resolution. It was Holleder. "Colonel, you're not taking that walk tomorrow."

The Cadets won an upset victory over the Navy. The Press stated it was Holly's vindication. It wasn't—it wasn't at all. It was an unforgettable demonstration that an aggressive leader is priceless.

This priceless leader is now the late Major Don Holleder.

WHY NOT A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS ON THE EVE OF THE "50TH'S"?

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the recent issues of the RECORD show—and these by examples only—the popular demand for the creation of a Special Committee of the Captive Nations still is strong and persistent. The successful 1967 Captive Nations Week observance underscored extensively the urgent need for such a committee. Shortly, there will be many other Captive Nations Week examples stressing the vital importance of such a committee at this time.

THE "50TH'S" AND THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

We are in the eve of not one but a number of 50th anniversary celebrations. Beyond the 50th anniversary celebration of the Russian Bolshevik revolution are the "50ths" of the genuine, patriotic national revolutions of Ukraine, Lithuania, Estonia, Byelorussia, Armenia, Georgia, and others. These non-Russian revolutions for national independence are of the same essence as our own American Revolution—national independence, the success of a foreign imperio-colonialism—in this case Russian—and the development of independent, democratic institutions. There is no better occasion than this to create the Special Committee on Captive Nations, with particular attention drawn to the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. itself.

On this theme, Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce into the RECORD the proclamation of Captive Nations Week by Gov. Spiro T. Agnew, of Maryland, and the article and book review, respectively, by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "Russia, Ukraine, and the World—50 Years of Conflict," and on "The Changing Strategic Military Balance, U.S.A. Versus U.S.S.R.," as appear in the autumn issue of the authoritative East European and Asian journal, the Ukrainian Quarterly:

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION, CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK JULY 16–22, 1967

Whereas, Silenced but unconquered, the enslaved peoples of East-Central Europe have never ceased their fight for a free life; and

Whereas, The people of the United States possess a warm understanding and sympathy for these subjected nations; and

Whereas, The cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

Whereas, At a time when anti-colonialism and recognition of the right of freedom for small nations is sweeping the world, a movement which the Communists are trying to turn against the West, it is vital for the United States to combine sincere support of independence for the new nations with the demand for the restoration of independence in the old nations of Eastern Europe; and

Whereas, It is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Spiro T. Agnew, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim July 16–22, 1967, as Captive Nations Week in Maryland, and I urge my fellow citizens to offer prayers in their churches and synagogues for the peaceful liberation of these countries so they may once more stand with the free nations of the world.

Given Under My Hand and the Great Seal of the State of Maryland, at the City of Annapolis, this 6th Day of July, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred Sixty Seven.

By the Governor.

SPIRO T. AGNEW,

——— ———,
Secretary of State.

RUSSIA, UKRAINE, AND THE WORLD—50 YEARS OF CONFLICT

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

The 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution isn't the only "50th" to be celebrated in this period of 1967–68. As a wholesome offset, and counteracting the basic fraudulence of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, numerous celebrations in the Free World will mark the 50th Anniversary of the non-Russian Revolutions for National Independence. From the celebration of Ukraine's Independence in January to Latvia's Independence in November, the year 1968 will be highlighted with many ceremonial expressions of what was fundamentally the general non-Russian Revolution of Independence in the Russian Empire in 1917–18.

While captive White Ruthenians, Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, Lithuanians, Estonians and other non-Russian nationals are forced to join in the celebration of the "national holiday," dated November 7, really the day of tragedy for their independent national existences, free citizens in the Free World will observe the genuine revolution that occurred in 1917–18. Doubtless, while many unthinking Americans will participate in the Russian Bolshevik festivities, totally oblivious of what the tragic day of November 7, 1917 meant in time for the dozen and more independent non-Russian nations in the former Tsarist Russian Empire, the more informed and morally responsible will support the "50ths" of the non-Russian nations now in the Soviet Union.

There is a crucial difference in essence between the Russian Bolshevik revolution and the non-Russian Revolutions for National Independence. Despite its fraudulent promises and objectives, the former was in essence a socio-economic revolution, aimed to eliminate autocratic Tsarist oppression, economic injustices, and sacrifices borne in war. It was to usher a new era of "proletarian democracy," "socialist economics," and "peace." On the other hand, the non-Russian Revolutions for National Independence, as staged in Lithuania, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan and elsewhere in the Russian Empire, had one consummate objective, namely the end of Russian colonialism and independent national statehood. In short, then, it was this revolution that partook of the same essence as our own American Revolution—surcease of colonialism, the attainment of national independence, and the pursuit of free, national development.

Unfortunately, to this day, the non-Russian Revolutions for National Independence have not been clearly understood and certainly not appreciated by the democracies of the West. It is no exaggeration that the turbulent period of 1917–23, when these revolutions were in vogue against the new Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, has been a blind spot in general Western knowledge of East European and Central Asian affairs. The persistence of this blind spot constitutes one of the grave disadvantages of the Western democracies in their present Cold War contest with the Soviet Russian totalitarians. About this, there can be no doubt.

THE FRAUDULENT RUSSIAN BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION

By way of general observations on the celebrations of the "50ths" for the year ahead, it would be a terrible fallacy for any of our leaders to equate the fraudulent Russian Bolshevik revolution with our American Revolution, and because of a protracted ignorance on the subject, the prospect for this is not entirely negative. As Congressman Edward J. Derwinski has well pointed out, there are four determining factors about the Russian Bolshevik revolution.[1] "First, the Russian Bolshevik revolution was the source and incubator of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism." The early destruction of the independent states of Georgia, Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaijan and others substantiates this well. "Second," as he puts it, "The second colossal fraud of the Bolshevik revolution was Lenin's promise of 'land, bread, and peace.' This promise has been so negated, even to the extent of importing wheat from the capitalist countries in our day, that the fraud is glaring, to say the least." "The third prominent fraud," states Derwinski, "is Moscow's 'peaceful coexistence.'" Moscow's involvements in Viet Nam, the Dominican Republic, the Middle East, North Korea and other places demonstrate how "peaceful" the coexistence is. And the "fourth fraud," he declares, "is communism itself, which has no objective existence and is entirely a deceptive ideological tool of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism." The myth of communism is yet to be fully exposed.

During the celebrations of the "50ths" these four determining factors should be pondered well by all free men. They embrace almost categorically a vast amount of detailed knowledge and data in the scope of what is called "Soviet history." Much too often we lose sight of the forest because of the trees. And this failing is Moscow's asset for further adventures and further aggressions under the banners of "peaceful coexistence" and "wars of national liberation."

FIFTY YEARS OF CONFLICT

If insight is to be reflected during this period, the "50ths" represent and symbolize above all 50 years of continuous conflict between those who support the results of the Russian Bolshevik revolution and those who side with the aims and aspirations of the non-Russian Revolution for National Independence. This is no oversimplification. For example, the record of Russian-Ukrainian conflict is quite clear. One need only recount the following highlights: the first international war between the Ukrainian National Republic and Soviet Russia, the upsurge of Ukrainian nationalism in the 20's, the stubborn resistence to Stalin's Russification program in the 30's, the gallant and heroic fight of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) against both the Nazi German imperialists and the Soviet Russian imperio-colonialists in the 40's, and the many manifestations of psycho-political resistance against Russian colonialism in the 50's to present date.

Anyone familiar with this record—and it is only one of the non-Russian records within the USSR these past 50 years—cannot but arrive at the firm conclusion that the USSR has never been a monolith. On the occasion of these "50ths," with clear perception and a firm grasp of the dominant factors, one can even advance certain clear working formulae on this issue. One is that the USSR—Ukraine (the largest non-Russian nation both in Eastern Europe and the USSR) = 0. If perception and vision prevail, we can derive a more general formula from this, namely Red Empire—Ukraine = 0, since the entire Red Empire is really based on ultimate USSR strength and power. The logic of these formulae are indisputable, given the record of so-called "Soviet history."

But logic is not enough. It must be supplemented by a genetical perspective of how all this came to be what it is. Such a perspective must begin with the period of 1917–23, when the first wave of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism involved the conquests of neighboring, independent non-Russian states. The forcible annexation of Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine and the others into the USSR was the stepping-stone for further Russian expansion in power and control from the 40's to the present. Genetically, Russian involvement in Vietnam, the Middle East, Cuba and elsewhere are by no means irrelevant to that first wave of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. By perspective, they are really founded on this early historical basis.

THOUGHTS FOR THE 50TH'S

Now, turning to the very present, one can raise again these appropriate questions in this period of the "50th's." "What about Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia?" "What about Ukraine, Byelorussia, Armenia, and Georgia?" "Indeed, what about Poland, Hungary, Cuba and others that are not situated within the Soviet Union, the imperium in imperio?" Apparently for the first time, these were some of the questions raised by a few editors and commentators, like Huntley and Brinkley, after having heard on June 20 the hypocritical address delivered by Premier Kosygin to the U.N. General Assembly.

---

[1] "The Fraudulent Russian Bolshevik Revolution—The Vulnerable Russians," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 10, 1967, pp. 22286–22287.

"In the course of its 50-year history," declared the Russian dictator, "the Soviet Union has regarded all peoples, large or small, with respect. Every people enjoys the right to establish an independent state of its own. This constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union." This statement alone fully measures the degree to which the United Nations forum has been prostituted by Moscow and its Red Syndicate puppets and associates to advance their propaganda and diplomatic goals. What's even worse is that such statements, purposely repeated over and over again, go largely unchallenged and in time appear as "truths" to the uninformed, the unwary, and the uncritical.

Lying through his teeth, Kosygin well knows in his mind that the Soviet Union hasn't been in existence for 50 years. The establishment of the Soviet Union is not coincidental with the tragic Russian Bolshevik revolution. The USSR came into being in 1922–23 only after Kosygin's Soviet Russia had conquered and destroyed over a half-dozen non-Russian states, such as Byelorussia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Idel-Ural and others now held captive in the USSR. This first wave of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism he would seek to bury under the myth of the USSR's creation in 1917.

Also, Kosygin knows all too well that he sharply contradicts Khrushchev's famous admissions in 1956 of the rampant genocide, Russification, and politico-economic oppressions waged against the captive non-Russian nations, "large or small," under Stalin's rule. Ukrainians as well as the Chechen-Ingush, deported Lithuanians as well as the Crimean Tartars, Turkestani as well as the Bashkiri, all, large and small, have been severely ravaged by Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. With far greater subtlety and less barbaric crudeness these Stalinist policies have continued to this day, but the dour-faced premier of an empire unto itself would also have the facts buried by his shameless contradictions.

TIME FOR DEBATE DURING THE "50TH'S"

These cynical representatives of the world's worst imperio-colonialist system lose no opportunity in potemkinizing, i.e., in staging false appearances, as apostles of national self-determination and independence, not to mention "peace." The lengths to which they will go to conceal their own political crimes and at the same time firmly fortify their big lies were further shown in the United Nations this past spring. For example, the Russian mouthpiece, Pavel F. Shakov, insisted that Puerto Rico is a "colonial territory" and urged the U.N.'s colonialism committee to investigate this case of "American imperialism." Repeated enough with propaganda skill and cunning, such fabrications cannot but receive some credence in the minds of uncounted millions, particularly when our own representatives are found constantly on the defensive and oftentimes mute.

Clearly, the time is now to debate the fundamental issue of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. In fact, it is long overdue. As far back as September, 1961 President John F. Kennedy himself sensed the urgent need for it when in his United Nations address he declared, "Let us have debate on colonialism in full—and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscite in every corner of the globe." This fitting challenge virtually paralyzed Khrushchev who, like Kosygin, ranted at the time about the USSR's defense of national independence and our furtherance of imperialism and colonialism. Two months later, our Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai E. Stevneson, unmistakably directed this challenge against the widespread Russian imperio-colonialism within the Soviet Union itself.

The Stevenson memorandum of November 25, 1961 represents the best and most intelligent statement yet made on this basic subject by any of our ambassadors to the U.N. But in this world conflict where, with truths or with propaganda distortions and respectively for better or for worse, the minds and passions of men are shaped and moved, it is scarcely effective policy to deprive the truth and facts the impact of sustaining repetition and forceful elaboration. Over these years the Stevenson lead should have been expanded, developed, and detailed so that the spotlight of world opinion, study, and concern would be fixed on the imperio-colonialist network present in the USSR itself. After all, this is the determining power based in the Red Empire; it is the fundamental source of colonialist exploitation propelling Red designs and aggressions in Vietnam, Cuba and Latin America, Algeria and Africa, and in the Middle East; it is the resource reservoir of Moscow's frantic, technological push for space and military superiority, with all its blackmail implications.

In the U.N. debate on the Middle East crisis it wasn't exactly instructive or inspiring for any free man to view the acquiescent silence of the U.S. Ambassador on this subject while the Federenkos, Kosygins, and Gromykos hammered away on "American imperialism," "American aggression in Vietnam" and other propaganda themes. To stop these boys in their tracks, all Mr. Goldberg had to do was to re-issue the Stevenson memo. Nor is it anything but another sign of weakness, especially after the Russians triggered the Middle East crisis, for our Secretary of State to say "We will continue to do our full share to try to improve relations with the Soviet Union and other Communist nations," as though the Soviet Union is a "nation" or any "nation" in the Red Empire, in conceptual contrast to a "state," is communist. Ostrich-like and befuddled diplomatic behavior cannot erase the stark reality of the captive nations, primarily those in the USSR.

TENTH CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1968

Because the undying aspirations of the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR for independence and freedom constitute a major lever, if not the key, for deterrence to further Red aggressions in the Free World, the avoidance of a hot global war, and Cold War victory in the cause of indivisible freedom, the Tenth Observance of Captive Nations Week in July, 1968 and during the "50ths" will highlight as one of its chief themes this necessary United Nations debate on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism within the USSR. A debate of this nature would encourage psycho-political forces within that substrate empire that colonialist Moscow would be compelled to reassess very carefully its stepped-up aid to totalitarian Hanoi, its rearming of extremist Arab factions in the Middle East, its back-up to North Korean guerrilla excursions into Free Korea, its support of Cuba and subversive operations in Latin America and, in general, its Cold War strategy and tactics toward the West. In this, genuine peace would be served, not further undermined as at present.

For those who have grasped the meaning and significance of the Captive Nations Week Resolution (Public Law 86–90) and the annual observance, it is not at all surprising that at the Glassboro summit Kosygin was very anxious to learn whether the President would issue a Captive Nations Week Proclamation in July, 1967. Suggesting politic-moral surrender, the Russian dictator indicated that to do so would not improve U.S.-USSR relations. The President is reported to have replied, "If one is issued, the name Soviet Union would not be mentioned."

Since Congress passed the resolution in 1959, Khrushchev, Suslov, and numerous other Russian totalitarians have vehemently denounced the resolution, and have sought its abrogation in the name of "improved relations," whatever that, in tangible deed, means. In 1966, in a tactical switch, Moscow egged its minions on to execute the task of public denunciation while it concentrated on backstage diplomacy, such as Kosygin's at Glassboro, to have the Week eliminated. For example, Latvia's *Radio Riga* blurted, "The announcement that the so-called Captive Nations Week has been proclaimed, reaches us from the USA like a demagogical ghost. . . . It cannot be fully ignored because such manifestations have become an important part of the U.S. political attitude" (July 17, 1966).

Another interesting switch was the attempt to associate the captive nations movement with anti-Semitism. For instance, the fall 1966 issue of *Political Affairs*, a Communist periodical, featured an article on "Anti-Semitism In The USA" which refers to "criminals who are active in the organizations of the so-called captive nations . . . have their own press and conduct war-inciting activities through demonstrations, picket lines, etc." This makes as much sense as the Russian genocidists in the U.N. recently accusing the Israelis of being "Hitlerite aggressors." But, as shown by the article, the Reds are apparently concerned that the "captive nations organizations are often connected with similar organizations in other countries in Europe and Latin America." And indeed they should be, for Captive Nations Week is now not only observed in the United States but also in over a dozen other nations.

The book *Captive Nations Week: Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope* (U.S. GPO, 1966) vividly describes in 310 pages the expansion of the Week both here and abroad. The 1966 observance was the best on record up to that year, the 1967 one surpassed it, and the Tenth Captive Nations Week Observance, that will be held during the period of the "50ths," will undoubtedly top them all. In addition to the President, thirty-seven Governors and fifty-three Mayors have issued proclamations regularly each year. As usual, Congress has led the observances with far-seeing addresses, and thirty-eight local Captive Nations Committees have conducted observances from Boston to Miami, Philadelphia to Spokane, New York to Chicago to Los Angeles. All major cities participated, and new ones have been joining for the first time.

What seems to disquiet Moscow and the Red Syndicate has been the addition of nations to the international observance of the Week. Argentina, Australia, Ceylon, and India have now joined South Korea, Japan, Free China, the Philippines, Turkey, Malta, West Germany, France, Great Britain, and Sweden in the annual event. President J. Onganin of Argentina has issued a proclamation that was prominently expressive of our Congressional resolution. Groups in Canada, Spain, Italy, Denmark, and Brazil have participated in the 1967 Week, and thus the list grows.

In a real sense, though the Week is observed every third week of July, it is not limited in activities to that week. The Week serves as a community and national forum to crystallize the issues and themes of the observance, but the participants devote themselves to actualizing them the rest of the year. The 1967 Week stressed the fraudulence of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, and this message has been carried well beyond the Week. The objective of a U.N. debate on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism is but one major end requiring continuous action in the period ahead, during the "50ths" and well before the "10th," i.e., the Tenth Observance of Captive Nations Week next July. While the Middle East debate continues in the U.N., the known genocidal treatment of Moslems in Turkestan should be of interest to those Arabs playing with colonialist Russian fire.

Other equally important themes in this eventful period of the "50ths," are: (2) unprecedented Congressional hearings on U.S. policy toward the USSR, (3) the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, (4) on the basis of the Dirksen-State Department agreement, a "Nyets Campaign against the establishment of Russian consulates" in our port-cities, (5) victory in Vietnam through psycho-political liberation of 17 million captive North Vietnamese, and (6) the full exposure of the fraudulent 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution which, as the writer shows in his current book *The Vulnerable Russians,* incubated the real force of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism that has produced the stark reality of captive nations and today threatens our security and world peace.

Each of these themes is a story in and of itself. Well before the "10th" Week, each will be advanced by constructive action based on the conviction that we can never afford the avowed enemy psycho-political sanctuary in his captive empire. Those who delude themselves with the achievements of paper agreements might well take a leaf from Karl Marx—"Russia only throws out so many notes to the Western diplomats, like bones to dogs, in order to set them at an innocent amusement, while she reaps the advantages of further gaining time."

THE CHANGING STRATEGIC MILITARY BALANCE, U.S.A. VERSUS U.S.S.R.

(By a special subcommittee of the National Strategy Committee, American Security Council, Chicago, Ill., 1967, pp. 103.)

(Reviewed by Lev E. Dobriansky)

One of the most important and constructive works prepared by the American Security Council is this careful and systematic analysis of the really changing strategic military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. The study was done at the behest of the Armed Services Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives. It was undertaken by a special subcommittee made up of distinguished members of the American Security Council's National Strategy Committee, all with vast experience in military strategy and technology. General Bernard A. Schriever, General Curtis E. Le May, Admiral Felix B. Stump, Dr. Edward Teller, Professor Stefan T. Possony, and General Albert C. Wedemeyer are only a few of the well-known names gracing the special subcommittee.

Regardless of one's political persuasion, this study is *must reading* for every alert American leader and every thoughtful American citizen who treasures the blessings of national freedom and personal liberty. Several Members of the House Armed Services Committee have already expressed themselves in complete agreement with the findings of the study. One deliberative legislator on that committee now regards this studied work as his "bible." And indeed it can be so regarded, for it strives toward maximum objectivity, achieves an unusual clarity of expression, and presents in a most telling way the facts of the comparative nuclear picture between the United States and its prime, avowed enemy. In short, the picture is horrifying for us, if present development and policies are permitted to continue. Notwithstanding this, the picture is drawn in this study with unemotional description and analysis, with a sound scholarly approach and hard-core reason.

A rapid succession of chief points in the work will alone reveal the superlative nature of this study. As pointed out clearly in the foreword, the work is based on "unclassified sources only." However, judging the backgrounds of the members of ASC's subcommittee, one needn't think twice about the perspectives and insights that guided this study on the basis of "unclassified sources only." Quite pointedly, reference is also made to the fact that the Russian installation of missiles in Cuba "came as a complete surprise to official Washington despite the massive preparations which had extended over several months." A few of the subcommittee members were in active duty then and at the highest echelon of our Government. The foreword is explicit, too, in defining the bases of the study. For one, the strategic weapons systems "are considered to be forces designed to carry out long-range strategic missions and to carry the main burden of battle in a general nuclear war." Second, like kinds of weapons—ICBM's with ICBM's, strategic bombers for strategic bombers, etc.—are used for the U.S.–USSR comparison, and not only the numbers are involved but also the yield of nuclear warheads.

The authors of the study also adopt the measurement provided by Mr. McNamara, namely the payloads of the missiles and not just their numbers. In other words, the comparative megatonnage of the delivery vehicle, the missile itself. They also make the striking point that Secretary McNamara omits from his estimate of comparative megatonnage the USSR's 900-odd Badgers, which are comparable to our phased-out B–47's and have an intercontinental range with in-flight refueling, and about 750 IRBM's based in what they call "western Russia." This plus other factors, according to the authors, tip the scale of overall nuclearity in favor of the USSR.

It is somewhat regrettable that this excellent study is marred by a recurring misconception of the USSR. "Russia" is used indiscriminately, as though the strategic, military posture of the USSR cannot be affected by stimulated politico-economic pressures within that peculiar state. There is no question that Moscow seeks victory over the United States, whether in the Cold War or a hot global war in which it would try for a knockout nuclear first strike. In the event of the latter we, too, would seek victory, and the non-Russian nationals in the USSR would be a crucial force for us to consider. We should be considering it now for Cold War victory. Thus the major criticism of the study is this basic and unfortunate misconception that precludes any possibility for outweighing to some extent Moscow's growing nuclear superiority. A few nuclear strikes in the territory of the USSR would produce such chaos that the latent non-Russian force would inevitably come into full bloom.

Of course, our military strategy should effectively aim at the avoidance of a nuclear outbreak. Only complete nuclear superiority can guarantee such stability in the relative strategic picture, and we should strive for it regardless of what Moscow does. Our current policy of mere deterrence and equality will fail to provide this guarantee. It is essentially non-innovative, stagnant, and perilous. We should be applying the same principles of technologic innovation in this field of military technology as our economic system does for every other conceivable sphere of cultural activity. A basic cultural discrepancy exists here, and increases the chances of a global holocaust. To afford the enemy the opportunity of a first nuclear strike, to refrain from an innovative pursuit of complete superiority in all essential fields, such as ICBM's, IRBM's, long-range bombers, military-space technology, and hydronuclear development, and to expose ourselves to further "surprises," which is the stock in trade of typical Russian cunning and deceit, scarcely constitute a true cost-effective policy, founded on vision, experience with the Russians, and long-range wisdom.

In addition to the statistical tables justifying the prime finding of this study, the reader will acquire much food for thought in the many perspective and insights surrounding the issue. One, for example, is the well supported observation that "The Soviet Union has a goal of strategic superiority designed to *win* a nuclear war than merely *deter* one." Another is that "Soviet ABM tests in 1961 and 1962 provided the knowledge which has permitted the U.S.S.R. to rush ahead with its ABM development and outstrip the United States." The Nuclear Test Ban treaty has already placed us at a distinct disadvantage in this vital respect. In short, the study is packed with incisive observations and judgments. Its contribution to inevitable changes in policy is incalculable.

CZECHOSLOVAK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe it important to point out to the House that Saturday, October 28, is the 49th anniversary of Czechoslovak Independence Day, when after World War I Czechoslovakia was formed as a new nation.

We all understand the tragedy that befell the peoples of Czechoslovakia as a result of misguided World War II diplomacy, when along with many other peoples of Eastern Europe they were literally handed over by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill to the Soviet Union. The Soviets thoroughly eliminated democracy in Czechoslovakia and the country remains controlled by a Soviet-imposed Communist dictatorship.

As we have said to others, Mr. Speaker, we must not accept the permanence of Communist control in Czechoslovakia and Eastern Europe. We must realize that peace in the world will remain threatened as long as the peoples of captive nations remain under Communist rule.

SLOVENIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, October 28, is the anniversary of a very significant, but too often overlooked, page of European history and represents the Slovenian proclamation of independence after the fall of the Austro-Hungarian empire. Slovenia was incorporated into the kingdom of Yugoslavia and the Slovenes now suffer under the dictatorship of the Communist Tito regime.

The Slovenes and the other peoples of Yugoslavia had hopes for the development of a legitimate democratic government after World War II, but since then have found themselevs captives of a Communist dictatorship which continues to deprive all the people of Yugoslavia of their basic rights.

It is important for us to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Communist dictatorship in Yugoslavia has been anti-Israel in policy and is supporting the aggression of North against South Vietnam. Despite aid originated under the Truman administration, on key issues Yugoslavia has alined itself against the United States and free world nations.

History demonstrates the legitimate interest of the people of Slovenia for self-determination and the independence that Slovenia sought after World War I is still denied them. Hopefully, we can develop a world of true peace and freedom in which the people of Slovenia will finally enjoy a proper government of their own.

DEMONSTRATIONS AT THE PENTAGON

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to prohibit demonstrations at the Pentagon because I feel strongly that this is not a proper place for mass protest.

I cherish as much as anyone the right to dissent. But it is inexcusable and unacceptable to use that right to disrupt the orderly functions of government, without which the right to dissent cannot exist.

No U.S. court or government has ever suggested that freedom to dissent is freedom unchecked. Yet, the rash of antiwar and antidraft protests occurring throughout the country, in violation of court injunction, in disregard of the rights of personal safety, is being allowed to approach that unchecked freedom.

The conduct of these antiwar demonstrators at the Pentagon last weekend was disgraceful beyond description. They shouted complete disrespect and disregard of our Government, its leaders, and our fightingmen in Vietnam. They spread litter and trash wherever they were. They defaced the Pentagon with painted obscenities.

It cost the U.S. Government and hence the taxpayers over $1 million to handle the mob and clean up after it.

It is way past time that our Government had proper tools to take care of this dire threat to law and order—yes, even a serious threat to our kind of society.

There can be no doubt that this antiwar march gave the Communist enemy great courage and sustenance. The Premier of North Vietnam broadcast thanks before the march began to their "friends in America and wished them great success in their mounting movement."

The Nation cannot permit demonstrations at the Pentagon during a time when we are fighting one of the major wars in all our history.

Without the very costly bringing in of troops to protect the building and the people who work there, the conduct of the business of the Department of Defense could have been seriously interrupted. Our fightingmen in Southeast Asia could have been jeopardized.

My bill will prevent recurrence of any other demonstrations of this sort. I hope the House will pass it quickly.

THE REALITIES OF VIETNAM: AN ALTERNATIVE FOR REPUBLICANS

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Button] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the extremely well thought out research paper of the Ripon Society entitled "The Realities of Vietnam: An Alternative For Republicans." This paper, inserted in the Congressional Record, October 4, 1967, on page 27916, by the esteemed Senator from Oregon, Mark Hatfield, proposes a responsible and feasible alternative to the dangerous military escalation being pursued by the Johnson administration.

I hope very much that my colleagues in the House will give careful consideration to the highly persuasive proposals in the Ripon document. The Ripon paper demonstrates convincingly the failure of the Johnson administration to develop any realistic political approach to a Vietnamese society interlaced with intricate religious, ethnic and regional rivalries. Blindly insisting upon a centralized nation-building course, the Johnson administration has supported the suppression by Saigon of many local non-Communist groups. This misconceived policy has frustrated the creation of any broad-based non-Communist coalition in rural Vietnam. Moreover, the destruction by Saigon of local non-Communist leadership has abetted recruitment efforts of the Vietcong.

The response of the Johnson administration to the failure of its political strategy in Vietnam has been a monotonous but dangerous military escalation. Hundreds of thousands of American fighting men have been sent to South Vietnam and millions of pounds of American bombs have been dropped in both North and South Vietnam. Yet today the military rulers in Saigon enjoy little public enthusiasm. Meanwhile, anti-American sentiment among non-Communist South Vietnamese is rising to unprecedented levels.

Something must be drastically wrong with a policy which has incurred the enmity of the South Vietnamese intelligentsia, has devasted much of rural South Vietnam, has created millions of refugees, has cost thousands of lives and billions of dollars. Yet all we hear from the White House is a clamor for more of the same—more American troops or more bombing of the North.

If the Republican Party is to be true to the American people and to our national tradition, it must offer a choice not an echo to the counterproductive and dangerous Vietnam war policy of the Johnson administration. The Ripon proposals would substitute a highly realistic political approach for the almost exclusive military tactics of the present administration.

Under the Ripon approach a decentralization of rule in South Vietnam would give local ethnic and religious groups a much greater incentive to cooperate in a non-Communist coalition. Meanwhile successful piecemeal negotiations with Vietcong cadres would tend to drain away the Vietcong recruitment base. By offering the Vietcong village cadres an opportunity to continue to hold their social roles as village organizers as long as they cease insurgency, this approach would wean away many war weary Vietcong. Today under the Chieu Hoy program these Vietcong cadres must give up their entire social status and enter distant defector camps.

The Ripon confederal approach would also set the stage for an eventual negotiated settlement with the National Liberation Front. The success of piecemeal negotiations with the Vietcong cadres could then reassure the NLF hierarchy that they could lay down their arms without fearing extermination by the South Vietnamese Army. In view of the widely publicized slaughter of Indonesian Communists by the army, it is extremely likely that strong assurances of physical survival would be necessary in order to reach a negotiated settlement with the NLF.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record press comment and statements of public officials concerning the Ripon research paper:

Governor Romney's Statement on the Ripon Society's Vietnam Paper

The Ripon Society should be commended for its penetrating study on the course of development in Vietnam. "The Realities of Vietnam" is a highly perceptive job and contains several creative ideas about elements necessary to any true solution of the conflict. I have long held the view that our limited objectives make impossible a purely military solution and that a satisfactory outcome must be based on fundamental effort within the South Vietnamese Society itself and on finding a way to deal with the Viet Cong infrastructure. An alternative to present policies is clearly necessary, and the Ripon paper not only identifies, through its sharp and impartial analysis, the need, but also proposes for examination some of the possibilities for an alternative.

General Gavin's Statement

A brilliant analysis. One of the best things I have read on Vietnam. I intend to discuss the Ripon paper thoroughly with General Westmoreland when I visit Vietnam next month.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 7, 1967]

War Negotiations at a Cadre Level?

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

President Johnson's persistent question of "what would you do?" has finally produced an answer. Admittedly, the chances of its adoption are remote, both in Washington and Saigon. Quite probably resistance to such a scheme from Hanoi would be great. In short, it is a longshot, but it is a new idea.

The idea is basically to turn the whole theory of negotiations upside down. Instead of talking about negotiations between Washington and Hanoi or even Saigon and Hanoi, begin instead at the lowest level inside South Vietnam.

The proposal was put forward first by Robert Shaplen, the *New Yorker* magazine's experienced and incisive correspondent in Vietnam, in *Foreign Affairs*, the journal of the American foreign policy Establishment.

Now essentially the same idea has been offered by the Ripon Society, a miniscule liberal Republican group which, though it has no political clout, has gained a grudging respect because it does some intelligent thinking.

Central to both the Shaplen and Ripon presentations is the idea that the political cadres of the Vietcong in South Vietnam are not the totally subservient creatures of the government in Hanoi which the American Government generally pictures them to be.

The Ripon pamphlet declares that the VC cadres "assigned below the provincial or district level are not usually ideologically motivated." Many low-level cadres "seem to have learned and applied new political methods to take over their native villages without necessarily liking the Communists who trained them." Some cadres from middle-class backgrounds, so Ripon says, "may even become inwardly hostile to the Vietcong command because it mechanically gives preferential promotions to their lower-class rivals."

Shaplen is more cautious. He writes that "many if not most of them have been well-disciplined Communists" although "a good number" of them "have been disillusioned" and their "lives have been deeply disrupted by the ever-increasing violence of the war." And he adds that "there seems little doubt that the Southern cadres, no matter how thoroughly indoctrinated with communism they have been, and how well disciplined, still resent being ordered about in the execution of their revolutionary duties by Northern political and military officers."

Both Shaplen and Ripon stress the feeling of Southern separatism among much of the population, including the VC cadres. And both accept the cadres as the key to who rules the bulk of the South no matter what American forces may do against North Vietnamese troops.

The Ripon idea is to "abandon the goal of extirpating" the VC cadres from the villages, "allow them to hold their social function, while neutralizing their military threat." The way to do this, to sum up an overly intricate presentation by Ripon, is to make local bargains which give the more malleable of the VC cadres a part in local life and a chance for the future under a non-Communist Saigon regime.

Shaplen writes of "the chance to be 'legal' at the low levels and to compete more openly than clandestinely with Saigon's representatives"; in short, and "opening to the left" by the Saigon regime.

Each of these proposals sees such a step as the basis for later moves further up the political power ladder. Both say it will take a long time. And both say it will require certain risk-taking by both the United States and the government in Saigon.

The Ripon pamphlet is a political document at heart. It lambasts the President for his "style of secrecy and silence," makes many unsubstantial charges such as "many leading policymakers" (unnamed) "believe in the inevitability of a war with China" and says that Washington is likely to give its proposals a cold shoulder. It has hardly offered a soft-sell.

Shaplen, on the other hand, declares his support of a continuing United States involvement in Southeast Asia affairs though he terms today's commitment "confused and undefined." In such a situation he argues for working for a political solution "with the best elements among the Vietnamese we can find."

Either fashion of presenting the idea quickly summons a host of objections, beginning with a bureaucratic unwillingness in Washington to shift gears so violently and a seeming determination of the military regime in Saigon to consolidate rather than to disperse its power.

Still, the President has been asking that question with little response in the realm of reality. Neither Shaplen nor Ripon can claim they have discovered a foolproof answer, but at least they are offering thoughtful answers.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1967]

GOP GROUP ASKS DISPERSAL POLICY ON SAIGON POWER

(By David S. Broder)

The Ripon Society proposed yesterday a "new look" Republican policy for Vietnam keyed to dispersal of powers from Saigon to the provinces and local "'piecemeal" negotiations with the Vietcong.

The liberal Republican research organization offered the "confederal" strategy in a 30,000-word paper as its answer to the long-sought "responsible alternative" for the GOP on Vietnam.

The report was hailed as "highly perceptive" by Gov. George Romney of Michigan and as "a brilliant analysis" by retired Lt. Gen. James Gavin, both prospective candidates for the Republican presidential nomination and critics of Administration policy on the war.

The study was written by two 26-year-old doctoral candidates, J. Lee Auspitz of Harvard and Christopher W. Beal of Tufts University.

Accusing the Johnson Administration of a "prideful commitment to a misconceived policy," the Ripon paper called for de-escalation of the bombing of North Vietnam but held out little hope of an over-all negotiated settlement this year. It warned that continuation of the present strategy risks war with Communist China and might eventually involve two million allied troops in Vietnam.

Key to the proposed counter-strategy is the contention that the Johnson Administration's "attempts to set up a centralized government in Saigon . . . are doomed to failure because of the strong local, ethnic and religious differences" among the non-Communist forces in South Vietnam.

The Ripon study argued that "the loyalty of these groups could be assured by conceding political powers to local leaders, instead of the Saigon-appointed administrators who now hold sway."

In the first stage of the effort, which the study said could begin immediately, provincial and district elections would be held in non-Vietcong areas and the elected leaders given control of taxes, police and militia, land reform, schools and U.S. aid programs.

In the second stage, the same autonomy would be offered to areas—estimated in the report at half of rural South Vietnam—"where the Vietcong and non-communist leadership coexists" in an informal truce.

"Piecemeal negotiations," the report contended, could wean local Vietcong cadres away from their terrorist tactics and anti-government activities in return for "a recognition of their legal function as village organizers." This in turn, it argued, "would permit a substantial reduction in the number of allied troops required for pacification programs."

In the third and final stage, bargaining would be extended to hard-core Vietcong areas, where their local autonomy might be conceded in return for a national settlement with Hanoi.

Such a strategy, it argued, would "reduce the American commitment in installments, much as the present policy is destined to escalate it by installments."

[From CBS News, Walter Cronkite News, Oct. 5, 1967]

REMARKS BY ERIC SEVAREID

Liberal Republicans continue to make the running in the pressures on the Johnson Administration for a change in its Vietnam war policy. What it seems to amount to is an early phase in an undirected, piecemeal search for a coherent opposite party position on the Asian dilemma. But some of the latest moves at least have a tinge of originality about them.

Illinois' Senator Percy, with some Democratic support, today introduced a Resolution telling the President in effect to get tougher with some of our Asian allies who declare that the fight in Vietnam is essential to their security but whose own people do none, or very little, of the dying.

This move happens to come on the day when American dead and wounded passed the hundred thousand mark, not including those dead and incapacitated by accidents and disease. The Koreans have nearly fifty thousand men in Vietnam, paid for by us; the Australians have about six thousand; no one doubts the fighting qualities of either force but neither force has seen much sustained heavy combat. The Thais have now gotten around to sending a couple of thousand fighting men; the Philippines have sent in about two thousand construction troops. The Chinese Nationalist on Formosa, whose foreign minister told the UN today that Red China is out to conquer the globe entire, have no troops in Vietnam, but that is because Washington doesn't want them there, for obvious political reasons.

Early speculation today that the administration welcomes this Senate Resolution in order to give the President more leverage on the Asian allies, seems doubtful. There seems to be, some worry in the Administration that the Resolution could upset what may be promising negotiations for considerably more fighting men from one or two of those countries.

The other new approach this week comes from the group of young, liberal Republicans called the Ripon Society; this is a broad, long-range proposal to change our military and political strategy right around; to reduce the commitment by installments; they think this could be done by giving up the effort to build a unified South Vietnam nation with a centralized government; by accepting the country as the decentralized, regionalized mosaic it is; by turning back political powers to localities, district by district, including local elections and local negotiations with the Viet Cong.

It is a bold blueprint, almost the total opposite to the one we are now trying to follow in Vietnam.

[From the Boston Globe, Oct. 7, 1967]

THE WASHINGTON CIRCUIT

(By James Doyle)

Last Tuesday three young men from Tufts, Harvard and MIT held a news conference here to unveil one of the most thorough and scholarly proposals yet injected into the Vietnam debate.

In 30,000 well-chosen words the three doctoral candidates, who are members of the egghead Republican Ripon Society, drew a picture of Vietnam government as it really is, a dispersal of power across the countryside, residing in the hands of village chiefs and Vietcong cadre leaders.

Their suggestion: That the Americans force the Saigon government to recognize this by dispersing its military power and its aid in a similar manner, driving wedges where possible between Hanoi and the local cadre leaders. They called for piecemeal negotiations with the little VC over local matters, hopefully weaning them away from their Hanoi allegiances, and setting the stage for Hanoi-Saigon negotiations eventually.

The news conference was carried in the next day's New York Times in a two-paragraph shirttail to the dramatic story of Everett Dirksen and William Fulbright debating the tired Vietnam arguments on the Senate floor.

The networks ignored the event completely, in favor of more blood-and-guts film from the war zones.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) News, Oct. 4, 1967]

Brickbats for L. B. J.—Ripon Society Offers Plan to Split Ranks of Vietcong

(By Peter Lisagor)

Washington.—A group of young Republican graduate students and professional men says the Johnson policy in Vietnam is based upon the "fiction" of a centralized democracy that ignores the fragmented character of South Vietnamese society.

The group known as the Ripon Society calls for a program of recognizing the strong local ethnic and religious differences in Vietnam and of dealing directly with the non-Communist elements on a province and district level.

In a subtle stage-by-stage proposal, which it describes as a "confederal strategy," the society also would sanction a relationship with local Viet Cong cadres, as distinguished from the Viet Cong hierarchy, on a "live-and-let-live" basis in an effort to split the enemy ranks.

The group contends that the VC cadres play a vital role in the village social structure in three-fourths of the rural population of South Vietnam, and a way must be found to let them maintain this social function while neutralizing them as a terrorist or military threat.

In a 30,000-word report titled "The Realities of Vietnam," and subtitled, "An Alternative for Republicans," the Ripon researchers flatly dispute the administration's contention that the VC are dominated and controlled by Hanoi.

Under their plan of co-existence in the contested village, the "cadres who are not ideological Communists and are not dependent on the North for supplies would perceive differing interests from those trapped in the Communist hierarchy."

The Ripon group joins the currently intense congressional debate over the bombing of North Vietnam by asserting that "punitive bombing North of the 18.5 parallel simply does not save American lives" and risks a greater loss of both American and civilian Vietnamese lives.

U.S. policy today is described as doomed to failure because the non-Communist forces consists of many "jealous groups that cannot be ruled from Saigon."

Only by conceding power to local leaders instead of Saigon-appointed administrators can the loyalty of these diverse factions be assured, the study says, adding that these leaders "hate the . . . army of Saigon just as much as they hate the Communists."

Lee W. Huebner, president of the Ripon Society, and the two co-authors of the detailed report, J. Lee Auspitz and Christopher W. Beal, affirmed their right to offer an alternative as members of the generation of men fighting the war.

[From the Providence Journal, Oct. 5, 1967]

Vietnam Alternative

A "responsible Republican alternative to President Johnson's war policies" in Vietnam has been proposed by the Ripon Society, an unofficial GOP study and research group. Termed a "confederal strategy," the plan is keyed to political decentralization in South Vietnam, and it warrants the closest study and reasoned debate by concerned Americans.

The society argues that the Johnson administration's effort to create a strong, centralized government in Saigon flies in the face of the simple fact that South Vietnamese society is deeply fragmented on ethnic, religious, and political lines. Centralization may be possible but only at great cost in lives and men.

The society would recognize the existing pattern of diverse elements by extending political authority to accepted local leaders. the all-important figures in national life, instead of maintaining the system of appointing outsiders from Saigon. A large measure of autonomy, including authority in handling some American foreign aid, would be lodged in the local leaders.

The proposed system would be put to work, first, in pacified areas but as it took root it would be extended into areas of disputed control and even eventually into areas where the Viet Cong now run things by virtue of their control over local leaders. Inroads on the Viet Cong could be made by granting local control on land tenure regulations, for instance.

As for the war itself, the society would halt punitive bombing in North Vietnam while maintaining interdictory bombing as necessary in the south to cut infiltration and troop buildup. As the new system of political decentralization took hold, the society believes that the American presence could be reduced in time for total withdrawal.

The society makes a good case. It has taken years for South Vietnam to get as far as it has in building a viable central democratic government. It will take still more time for the new government to get on its feet, learn the machinery of democracy, and make it work. Meanwhile, as things now stand, the fighting appears sure to continue for years.

The society believes that the Republican Party could be returned to power in 1968 if it adopted the proposed alternative to the Johnson policies. The society argues that a Republican President in 1968 could bring about a resolution of the Vietnam War just as President Eisenhower is credited with inducing a settlement of the Korean War when he assumed office.

Politics apart, the society's proposal offers a divided and concerned nation a significantly different and soundly reasoned alternative to policies which got us into Vietnam and which, so far, offer little hope for a final resolution of the war without the spending of more billions of dollars and the loss of more American lives.

The proposal ought to be brought into the current debate in Congress on the course of the war; it warrants thorough public hearing by the appropriate House and Senate committees. The society's proposal is like a fresh wind blowing through a smoke-filled room; it may not be the final answer but it is a heartening start on a new search for that answer.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 4, 1967]

Ripon Society Urges Vietnam Confederation

(By Paul Hope)

Calling President Johnson's Vietnam policy a "fiasco," the liberal Republican Ripon Society has proposed a new strategy aimed at producing a loose confederation of groups in South Vietnam instead of a centralized government.

The society, composed largely of scholars and headquartered at Harvard University, said its "confederal strategy" could become the "long sought responsible Republican alternative to President Johnson's war policies."

The Ripon Society, perhaps the most articulate voice on the Republican left, made its proposals as criticism of the administration's policies continued to escalate and as Republican leaders began to find themselves in wide disagreement on what should be done in Vietnam.

In the past few days, several Republicans in the Senate have called for de-escalation of the war but none has come up with a concrete plan.

The Ripon Society believes it has found the plan which the Republican party should put forth as it goes into the 1968 presidential election.

BOMBING HALT ASKED

It would halt the bombing in the North and begin a program of negotiating with local leaders to pacify the countryside.

Lee W. Huebner, Ripon president, characterized the program as something between a "hawk" and a "dove" stand, in that it would not be a withdrawal but would de-escalate the fighting.

The lengthy Ripon document said that non-Communist forces in South Vietnam are fragmented into many jealous groups that cannot be ruled from Saigon. It said the Johnson administration attempt to set up a centralized government in Saigon "is doomed to failure because of the strong local, ethnic and religious differences."

"The loyalty of these groups could be assured by conceding political powers to local leaders instead of the Saigon-appointed administrators who now hold sway," Ripon said.

The society proposed three phases in its "confederal" program:

LOCAL AUTONOMY

First, guarantees of local autonomy would be offered to non-Communist groups who report infiltrators. There would be provincial and district elections, direct access to U.S. aid, local administration of land reform, local taxing powers, local control of police and militia and use of ethnic languages in primary schools.

Second, the same framework would be offered to villages where Communist Viet Cong and non-Communist leadership coexists. Ripon says that studies show that many Communist village officials "are more concerned with their village role than with the ultimate Communist aim of winning the entire country."

"A confederal strategy would promote factionalism in the Viet Cong and unity among non-Communists; the present policy does the reverse," Ripon said.

The third phase would extend confederal bargaining to hard-core Viet Cong areas. This would offer Viet Cong leaders control of their enclaves as part of a national settlement.

TALKS HELD UNLIKELY

Huebner said that because of the U.S. election, he sees no chance of North Vietnamese officials coming to the negotiating table during the next year whether the bombing of North Vietnam is stopped or intensified.

The society accused Johnson of "secrecy and silence" on Vietnam and of relying on a "contrived atmosphere of crisis" and of blitzing Congress with questions, "the answers to which are predetermined by carefully controlled briefing."

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, Oct. 4, 1967]

Report Offers Alternative in Vietnam—Republican Group Urges Autonomy of Villages, Districts

(By George R. Packard, 3d)

Washington.—The Ripon Society, a liberal Republican group based in Boston, published yesterday a proposal on Vietnam which it called "the long sought responsible Republican alternative to President Johnson's war policies."

In a 30,000-word research paper compiled by two graduate students, it called for a "confederal strategy" by which local villages and districts would be dealt with individually by the Saigon government and U.S. officials.

Calling the present government in Saigon a "fiction of centralized democracy that is doomed to failure," it said that dissident Vietnamese religious, ethnic and local groups could be won over by "conceding political powers to local leaders."

TWO AUTHORS

The Ripon Society, a research group which is not party-sponsored, describes itself as composed of young moderate or progressive Republicans. It was formed after the 1962 election and named after Ripon, Wis., which claims to be the party's birthplace.

Neither of the two authors of the Ripon report has been to Vietnam.

One of them, Christopher W. Beal, 26, is a Ph. D. candidate at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in Medford, Mass. The other, J. Lee Auspitz, 26, is a Ph. D. candidate in history at Harvard.

TAUGHT IN FRANCE

Auspitz is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Herman Auspitz of 6752 N. 13th st., Philadelphia, and a 1959 honor graduate of Central High School. In his summers while in Harvard he taught at a camp for underprivileged children in southern France and worked for the Jerusalem Post in Israel. He studied at Oxford University, then worked on a newspaper in Liberia and was press adviser to the government in Nigeria.

Auspitz and his wife, the former Katherine Holahan, of Livingston, N.J., also studied at the University of Vienna, Austria. They have a three-month-old child, Rachel Berthe.

GUARANTEES OF AUTONOMY

In the first phase of the Ripon report's "confederal strategy" for Vietnam, guarantees of local autonomy would be offered to local non-Communist leadership group in South Vietnam who maintain internal order and report infiltrators.

Such groups would hold their own elections, have direct access to U.S. aid (now channeled through Saigon), use their own ethnic languages in primary schools, and carry out their own land reform, tax and police functions.

Provincial and district officials now are appointed by the central regime in Saigon.

In the second phase, which might begin after a year, the same offer would be made to villages where Viet Cong and non-Communist leaderships coexist. Such an offer, the report says, would "divide the loyalty of many Viet Cong cadres from the Communist hierarchy."

OFFER TO VIETCONG

In a third phase, the reoprt continues, "confederal bargaining would be extended to hardcore Viet Cong areas." It would offer Viet Cong leaders control of their enclaves in the countryside in return for the cessation of terrorism and an end to their attempt to overthrow the Saigon government.

Under this strategy, bombing of North Vietnam could be stopped and some American troops withdrawn, according to the authors.

The plan rejects either escalation or withdrawal. The report appeared in the September issue of the Ripon Forum, the society's monthly publication that reaches about 1,400 subscribers in Boston, Los Angeles, New York, New Haven and elsewhere.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 5, 1967]

Republicans Suggest Viet Policy

Washington.—The Ripon Society, an unofficial Republican research group, has proposed that the United States adopt a decentralized political approach in Vietnam keyed to conceding political powers to local leaders.

It described its proposal as a "confederal strategy" in contrast to attempts to set up a centralized government in Saigon.

"It is the conclusion of the Ripon Society that the present structure of policy is built on an expensive fiction about what South Vietnam is and what it can become," said a study released by the society.

"Against the concept of a centralized democracy," it said, "is the reality that non-Communist forces in South Vietnam are fragmented into many jealous groups, with strong local, ethnic and religious differences, that cannot be ruled from Saigon.

"Inherent in the present policies in Vietnam," the society said, "are the dangers of: wasting American men and resources; turning South Vietnam into a nation of thieves and beggars; drifting toward war with China and the Soviet Union."

In advancing its proposals, the society expressed hope they could become "the long-sought responsible Republican alternative to President Johnson's war policies."

STEPS TO AUTONOMY

Local leaders would receive guarantees of autonomy in the following ways:

Control over local police and militia.

Election of provincial and district officials who now are centrally appointed.

Government officials of local origin.

Local rule in formulation of land tenure regulations and reform.

Redrawing of provincial boundaries "to correspond to the realities of political control."

Cultural guarantees to ethnic minorities.

The right to collect local taxes, supplemented where necessary by direct access to United States aid.

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Enterprise, Oct. 4, 1967]

GOP Group Seeks Talks With Vietcong

Washington.—A group of young Republicans proposed yesterday that the United States negotiate immediately with the Viet Cong as a step toward peace talks with Hanoi after the 1968 U.S. elections.

In a 30,000-word policy statement, the Ripon Society also accused President Johnson of sponsoring a "misconceived" Vietnam policy through a "contrived atmosphere of crises."

Composed of young Republicans from the business, professional and academic communities, the society charged there was insufficient civilian control over the Defense Department and that Johnson uses "secrecy and silence" to stifle congressional dissent on the war.

The study said there was little hope for meaningful peace negotiations until after next year's elections and called instead for "piecemeal" negotiations with the Viet Cong.

The Ripon plan called for peace in three stages.

The first stage would guarantee local autonomy to non-Communist areas of South Vietnam, including free elections and direct U.S. aid which is now channeled through Saigon, local taxing powers and local control of the police and militia.

The second stage would make the same guarantees to areas where the Viet Cong and non-Communist governments coexist. In exchange for the guarantees, the local Viet Cong leaders would have to agree to end their antigovernment activities.

The third stage would deal with areas under Viet Cong control. It would offer the guerrillas control of their enclaves in the countryside as part of a national settlement.

Ripon President Lee Huebner, a Harvard University graduate student, said the strategy would split the Communists, splitting the Viet Cong from the Hanoi government.

Huebner said the proposal has received favorable reaction from retired Gen. James Gavin, a strong critic of the administration's Vietnam policy, and Sens. Thruston Morton, R-Ky., and Mark Hatfield, R-Ore., leading GOP "doves."

[From the Boston Globe, Oct. 4, 1967]

GOP Offers Vietnam Peace Plan

Washington.—The Ripon Society proposed on Tuesday a Republican policy for Vietnam keyed to dispersal of power from Saigon to the provinces and local "piecemeal" negotiations with the Viet Cong.

The liberal Republican research organization offered the "confederal" strategy in a 30,000-word paper as its answer to the long-sought "responsible alternative" for the G.O.P. on Vietnam.

Key to the proposed counter-strategy is the contention that the Johnson administration's "attempts to set up a centralized government in Saigon . . . are doomed to failure because of the strong local, ethnic and religious differences" among the non-communist South Vietnamese.

In the first stage of the effort, which the study said could begin immediately, provincial and district elections would be held in non-Viet Cong areas and the elected leaders given control of taxes, police and militia, land reform, schools and U.S. aid programs.

In the second stage, the same autonomy would be offered to areas "where the Viet Cong and non-Communist leadership coexists" in an informal truce.

"Piecemeal negotiations," the report contended, could wean local Viet Cong cadres away from their terrorist tactics and antigovernment activities in return for a recognition of their legal function as village organizers.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 4, 1967]

Washington, October 3.—A group of young Republicans proposed today that the United States negotiate immediately with the Vietcong as a step toward peace talks with Hanoi after the 1968 elections.

The Republicans said there was little hope for meaningful peace negotiations until after next year's elections. It called instead for "peacemeal" negotiations with the Vietcong "to provide a basis for ultimate national negotiations."

In a 30,000-word policy statement, the Ripon Society also accused President Johnson of sponsoring a "misconceived" Vietnam policy through a "contrived atmosphere of crises."

Composed of young Republicans from the business, professional and academic communities, the society charged there was insufficient civilian control over the Defense Department and that Mr. Johnson used "secrecy and silence" to stifle Congressional dissent on the war.

[From the Harvard Crimson, Oct. 4, 1967]

Saigon Advised by Ripon Society To Relax Reins

(By John A. Herfort)

Non-Communist groups in South Vietnam should be given considerable autonomy by the central government in Saigon as a positive step toward limiting future U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war, the Ripon Society proposed yesterday.

In a Washington press conference, the Cambridge-based group of young, moderate Republicans alleged that "instead of seeking to foster a political system built upon grass roots support, American policy has been occupied with a dream of centralized democracy radiating out from Saigon.

The Saigon regime is unable to attract much popular support in the provinces as long as it monopolizes government activities, Ripon said.

The group said local authorities should have control over police, local militia, and tax collection. In addition, there should be election of provincial and local officials now appointed by Saigon.

According to Ripon, this would be a "confederal policy"—one that would set up a loose anti-Communist coalition of many Southern groups by delegating some of the central government's duties to local groups to make it worthwhile for them to oppose a Vietcong takeover.

The Ripon proposals are a sharp departure from most criticisms of the Johnson Administration's policy.

They did not, for example, focus on the Administration's failure to stop bombing North Vietnam and its inability to get peace negotiations with Hanoi. Instead, the thrust of Ripon's argument was that the Administration did not predicate its policies on the political and social realities of South Vietnam.

If their proposals—already implemented successfully in one province, could be repeated throughout the country. Ripon said, U.S. and South Vietnamese forces would spend less time on comparatively ineffective search-and-destroy operations. Then they could concentrate on protecting newly secured areas from main-force Communist invasions.

Their proposals appear to come down on the "dove" side of the opposition to the Administration. For they ask "that steps be taken to reduce the drain on American resources."

The report also proposed:

That the bombing of Hanoi, Haiphong, and other cities of the North be ended.

That remaining U.S. air raids should aim to cut infiltration and North Vietnamese troop buildups, and be held close to the 17th parallel.

That hard-core Viet Cong areas might ultimately be brought into a confederated framework by offering them the same kind of autonomy other areas would receive.

That the problem of land reform be left to local government.

In any case, the Ripon report, for all its novelty, is sure to be replaced with considerable bitterness by the military junta in charge of the Saigon government.

[From the Yale Daily News, Oct. 23, 1967]

RIPON OFFERS VIETNAM PLAN

The Ripon Society's Vietnam "peace" proposal was lauded last night by political science professor H. Bradford Westerfield as a sound addition to a Republican presidential campaign.

The 30-page Ripon document offering an alternative to the present Vietnam policy was evaluated at a Ripon Society meeting featuring Westerfield, history prof. Harry S. Benda, and J. Lee Auspitz, one of the study's authors.

Westerfield, a "hawk" on the Vietnam controversy, said: "The study could be useful to a Republican presidential hopeful who wants to look a little bit more dove than Johnson, but not too much.

TWO REALITIES

Auspitz, also an editor of the Ripon Forum, gave an outline of the Ripon plan to open the discussion. He said that two realities must be confronted in Vietnam before a workable solution could be reached.

The first, according to Auspitz, is the fragmentation of domestic political groups. The second is the role of the Viet Cong as "the closest thing to a central administration that South Vietnam has ever had."

Professor Benda, a war "dove", said that these two points are the most revolutionary and the most laudable parts of the report.

The Ripon plan, according to Auspitz, would be based on "confederal" strategy progressing in stages. In the first stage, local autonomy would be given to non-Communist areas.

In the final stage, the Viet Cong would be reached. Auspitz said: "There would be piecemeal negotiations, offering Viet Cong leaders local autonomy in return for neutralization."

Benda noted that the United States would have to stay in Vietnam to negotiate the many local governments and hold them in the "confederal" system. He said, "It is a dangerous proposition to think that the U.S. is the best, the kindest, the ablest, and the wisest arbiter to put together the framework."

Westerfield said success would be possible only after a substantial number of years. He said: "What reason have we to suppose that the Viet Cong will accept the plan unless we put them under more pressure in the places where they are entrenched."

Westerfield said his enthusiasm over the Ripon proposal was based on its inherent aim of de-escalation. He said while the plan might not immediately reduce troops, it would eventually have to, if successful.

Commenting on the prospective Republican candidates who could use the Ripon proposal, he mentioned Rockefeller and Percy, but ruled out Romney.

"Romney's the only one who praised it," Auspitz said.

"He's been brainwashed again," Benda said.

KEEP SBA INDEPENDENT OF COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, once again it appears that an effort is being made to reorganize the Small Business Administration and to transfer some of its more important functions to the Department of Commerce. Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, I view this latest effort to strip the Small Business Administration of its effectiveness with concern. The problem we face now is not new, for, from its very inception there have been those who have said that the SBA should fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. However, the Congress, for very good reasons, wrote into the original Small Business Act in 1953 assurances of this agency's continued independence.

Section 4A of that Act states that the SBA "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government." This provision was written into the law because it had been amply demonstrated that the small-business segment of our economy needed its own agency geared to provide one-stop service without becoming another fragment in the diffuse organization of the Department of Commerce.

We now find that section 406 of title IV of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, passed by the Senate and reported by the House Education and Labor Committee, contains provisions to transfer vital procurement and management assistance functions from the SBA to the Department of Commerce.

Section 406 vests in the Secretary of Commerce virtually all procurement and management assistance functions and more so. As a matter of fact, it vests in the Secretary of Commerce more powers, and provides him with more authority than the SBA's procurement and management assistance program ever had.

If section 406 were to be accepted by the House of Representatives, the Small Business Administration's rightful functions would be scrambled into a confusing process which would sharply limit the effectiveness of the effort. Both the SBA and the Department of Commerce would clearly work at cross-purposes, often in overlapping activities, and in different directions. Why it is necessary to vest authority in a second agency to do what the SBA can and is successfully doing, is difficult to understand. By enactment of section 406, nothing would be added to enable the Government to carry out the congressional intent. By its enactment, we would achieve a full measure of confusion, wasted motion, and wasted Government funds.

Should section 406 remain in the bill, the Small Business Administration, which for 14 years has carried on with distinction its mission of assisting the interests of small business, would be burdened with an unnecessary partner.

I hasten to say this is not intended to reflect on the nature, the character or the efficiency of any other agency or program. This is entirely another question and not relevant to the issue here.

Certainly, the SBA has had its problems of survival over the years of its existence. Through most of its life, nevertheless, this agency has performed its mission well.

SBA has distilled the experience gained through many years of effective activity. I am not opposed to this combined effort because I do not wish the SBA to cooperate with other branches of Government. On the contrary, the SBA has repeatedly worked with other departments and agencies to be certain that whatever the program, no possible assistance should be omitted for the small enterprises of the Nation. This effort should continue.

In the present instance, however, the plan envisioned in the new bill would serve only to attach relatively inexperienced personnel to decisionmaking positions affecting assistance to small businessmen. By so doing, I am convinced the total effort of the SBA will seriously suffer.

In the interest of maintaining a vigorous Small Business Administration focused upon the important role it has been assigned, I urge the Members of the House to carefully study what is being proposed here prior to the formal debate on the OEO bill and be appraised of the dangers which are involved in this portion of the legislation.

AIR QUALITY CONTROL

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **REINECKE**. Mr. Speaker, in its report on the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce states:

> The bill is intended primarily to pave the way for control of air pollution problems on a regional basis in accordance with air quality standards and enforcement plans developed by the *States*.

I agree with this statement. I strongly believe that it is a State's right to determine and achieve that air quality which is deemed best for the health of its people, and which its industry, its business community and its citizens can afford.

For many years, long before the Federal Government recognized the problem, the State of California has been faced with the urgent task to remedy a rapidly deteriorating air pollution situation. This problem was brought about by an unusual combination of topography and climatic conditions, and great population density in its urban areas. Over 100 State laws promulgated to date have resulted in an effect program of air pollution control and abatement which today serves as a model for the entire Nation. This program is tailored to the needs of the State of California by responding to its unique and specific air pollution problems; its standards take into account the technological and financial capability of its citizens to meet them. And this is the secret of its success.

Abatement of automobile exhaust pollution is not necessarily dependent on factory installed equipment, although the Detroit manufacturers would have us believe so. It was California which originally motivated the development of add-on "afterburner" type controls. Improvements to this approach continue to be made, and cost-effectiveness may well prove equal to the factory equipment in the near future. Thus, no State or region should have to be tied forever to the technology of Detroit. It is not difficult to see why the primary manufacturers want to retain control over their product. But this scheme may not be the best for achieving cleaner air.

The right of a State to impose stricter standards than "minimal" nationwide ones must not be preempted. The Senate, in its Air Quality Act of 1967, has recognized this by instructing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to waive Federal preemption for States with stricter air pollution abatement standards on their books than those prescribed by the Federal Government. This exemption applies only to California. As written, there is no possibility that other States could qualify to result in 50 different standards as the automobile industry implies. But this clause is vitally important to the State in the Union with the largest population.

This clause was deleted in the House committee for the benefit of the automotive industry, but in clear violation of the concept of State rights, and in open disregard of the health and welfare of 20 million people.

I urge all the Members of the House to familiarize themselves with this issue which is to come before the House next week, and to insist on reinstating the waiver clause in section 208(b) of the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967.

CENSUS BUREAU BOONDOGGLE

Mr. **ZION**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DEVINE**. Mr. Speaker, during these days when the House finally is beginning to respond to the wishes of the people out across America, and voting for some economies in the operation of the Federal Government, I find the bureaucrats still have not received the message.

In a release from the U.S. Department of Commerce, dated October 20, 1967, there is another example of intervention of the Federal Government into the private lives of all Americans, wasting thousands of dollars, on the subject of "Marriage Stability."

Apparently the Census Bureau has nothing better to do with their time and countless employees than to research the habits of the people, and then offer "advice for young unmarried." The Members of this Congress know the Bureau of the Census was created to count people, and it was never intended to make studies of the age, educational background, and migratory habits for the purpose of relating it to marriage stability.

The big brother image of this administration seems to be taking a turn in the direction of what appears to be a gigantic, federally subsidized "advice to the lovelorn" project.

While we are looking for areas to reduce Government spending, regulation, and control, it seems to me this is one of many places to blow the whistle and not only eliminate prying into private lives, but paying people with taxpayers' funds for projects never intended or needed.

ARMS SALES TO UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS

Mr. **ZION**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MORSE** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days there have been many statements and articles critical of the possible sale of American F–5 aircraft to certain Latin American countries. Most of these remarks appear to be conditioned reflexes more than reasoned judgments. The question of arms sales to underdeveloped nations is a very difficult one which usually presents itself in the form of unattractive alternatives. Which alternative is the lesser evil will depend not on doctrinal attitude but upon a closer view of the particular question at hand.

A careful and objective analysis of the problem was presented recently by the distinguished columnist, Carl Rowan. His comments should be read by all of us who serve in this body. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Rowan's column at this point in the RECORD:

CRITICS HIT STRAW MEN ON LATIN ARMS

(By Carl T. Rowan)

"Beggars can't be choosey."

That is the substance of what Senator Wayne Morse and like-thinking Americans keep urging the State Department to say to Peru and other Latin American countries.

And it is precisely this insulting nonsense, growing out of ill-considered notions of liberalism, that is going to plunge the United States into deeper and deeper trouble in Latin America.

I am referring specifically to the weeks of haggling over whether or not the United States ought to sell Northrop F–5A fighter planes to Peru, Brazil and other Latin countries.

Morse and some of his colleagues constantly fulminate about an "arms race" in Latin America. They imply that the selfish oligarchies in these countries are taking milk out of the mouths of babes by squandering the continent's resources on military toys for over-powerful armies and air forces.

Critical as I am, on some counts, of the Latin American oligarchy and the military rulers, the truth is that Morse and his colleagues are mostly shadow-boxing at straw men.

Sol M. Linowitz, himself a distinguished liberal and U.S. envoy to the Organization of American States, said this to the Inter-American Press Association last Thursday:

"Latin America spends less on arms than any other part of the world. Approximately 90 percent of its military expenditures is for upkeep of military and defense establishments and only 10 percent is for acquisition of new military equipment. In fact, in the past 20 years defense budgets as a proportion of total expenditures have dropped 50 percent."

The second error the Morse crowd makes is that it shows a lack of knowledge of human nature. It is absurd to think any Latin country is going to be without a military machine—surely not after the Cuban experience. And civilian leaders are going to have to keep the military leaders reasonably pacified in order to maintain civilian control and move steadily away from the pathetic old days of military coups and countercoups. And no military leader is going to stay pacified if his forces are limited to horses and buggies while the rest of the world flies supersonic jets.

Thus, it is the most reasonable thing in the world for Peruvian leaders to try to buy the F–5, a more-or-less supersonic fighter, to replace their obsolete, dangerous aircraft.

But Morse and other congressmen have urged the United States to adopt a policy of denial of such aircraft to countries like Peru and Brazil.

The argument, noble on its face, is that people are hungry in all these countries, so it is sinful to waste meager resources on planes and other arms.

The trouble is that it is the United States that is the big waster of resources on tools of death and destruction. And the United States has more impoverished people than any country in the hemisphere with the probable exceptions of Brazil and Mexico.

So it was a case of Big Daddy Uncle Sam saying to the little Latinos: "Don't do as I do, do as I say."

Any Latino audacious enough to mention this aloud was to be quickly told: "The difference, you see, is that we are wasting our own money. We aren't asking for foreign aid from anyone."

And that is just an arrogant, not-terribly-diplomatic way of saying, "beggars can't be choosey."

The State Department is to be commended for facing a troublesome reality and authorizing belatedly the F-5 sales despite certain knowledge that it would produce another scream from Morse.

Characteristically, the Oregon Democrat noted that had State not done so the Peruvians might have bought costlier, faster Mirage V aircraft from France.

"What we should have said," Morse argued, "is 'go and buy them from France and get your aid from France, too.' "

When we have a supposedly liberal, enlightened senator who thinks the State Department ought to be constantly reminding people that they are taking handouts from Uncle Sam, and warning them that this obligates them to tailor their policies to our bidding, there can be little wonder that we are occasionally held in contempt by people who really wish to be our friends.

FAITH IN THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE REAFFIRMED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, while the youth of America face a cruel and ruthless enemy, while the shells of Communist guns from North Vietnam shower their death and destruction on these young men defending a nation from invasion, here in America a minority of individuals loudly proclaim their disloyalty to these men. Parading in the streets of this Nation's Capital, they defy their Government's decision to protect the freedom of South Vietnam and in so doing give the Communist enemy of this country the will to continue to fight, hoping for victory over our own fighting men. Each protest, each demonstration, each word of encouragement to the enemy, adds another list of dead and wounded Americans to the toll of Vietnam.

In the midst of this unpatriotic outburst, I have had the pleasure of visiting with a man who reaffirmed my faith in the American way of life and this government by the people. This man knows what it means to answer the call to duty of his country, for he became a symbol of the willingness of the men of this Nation to stand up for that which is right.

This man is James Gordon of the Blue Ridge Mountain country of Virginia. He remembers the horrors of World War I in the Argonne Forest of France because he was there. He was there because his country had a draft lottery, because a blindfolded Government official pulled a number from an oversized fishbowl and because that number was his.

Just a little over 50 years ago on July 20, 1917, the Secretary of War walked into room 226 of the Senate Office Building and, at 9:49 a.m. reached into the 14-inch opening of the fishbowl containing 10,500 small capsules, each of which contained a registration number.

He broke open the capsule and the number—written in red ink—was announced as "258." For James Gordon and others holding "258" in draft precincts throughout the country, this signaled their call to active duty.

For James Gordon, the draft ceremony in the Senate Office Building, and even Washington itself, were a long way from his Madison County, Va., farm. So were the trenches of France. But within 11 days the Madison County Selective Service Board sent him a draft notice. He reported 6 days later and a month after that, on September 5, 1917, he was inducted at Madison County Courthouse.

This Saturday, October 28, James Gordon will be 77 years old. He has no regrets about serving his country—in fact, just the opposite, for he views his induction into the Army as voluntary even though he was drafted. He remembers that as a farmer he could have claimed an exemption and been excused from active duty.

While visiting with Mr. and Mrs. Gordon at their ranch home several weeks ago I remember his saying:

> I could have got out of it, but it was a good thing to fight for your country. We had a nice, free country here. It's a little different now, but if I was a young man, I'd do the same thing again.

After 50 years, this man who is typical of the Americans who have made this Nation strong and free, still feels the same devotion to our country as he did when he was 27.

With Congressmen spending most of their time nowadays in session throughout the year, we become engrossed in the maze of the Washington scene, and reading the newspapers and listening to newscasts, we know that the world is in constant turmoil. We view with apprehension dissent of our own people against our Government, we view with alarm young men openingly defying the laws of this country by burning their draft cards and sympathizing with the enemy, we are shocked by the riots and rebellion of certain groups who destroy a part of their own country by their actions.

To visit with the Gordons was like returning to a "little bit of heaven" that used to symbolize the American home. Living serenely among the peaceful farms surrounding them, the Gordons reflect the strength that is America. Their attitudes of loyalty, this willingness to sacrifice in order that America might be perpetuated for future generations, came as a refreshing breeze amidst the turmoil and confusion of the headlines dealing out the thoughts from the tangled minds of hippies, peaceniks, Communists, and racists.

When you visit in this area you see America as it really is. You see a people, full of faith, whose basic philosophy is reflected in the plaque which hangs near their front door, "With God all things are possible."

That philosophy is carried out in both actions and words. Mr. Gordon told me that he supported the President—not because he was President Johnson—but because he was President. He said he believed that 9 out of 10 people these days did not realize what a great country this is, and that was one of the problems which was causing people to dissent. He said people were not "thankful" for this country, that they had been misled into believing all of this was free for the taking without any responsibility on their part.

While sitting there, looking out at the grandeur that is part of Blue Ridge Mountain country, I realized that it was the convictions of the people like the Gordons, scattered throughout our country in the cities and on the farms, that had made this Nation continue its existence.

When loyalty ceases to be a virtue, when patriotism and love of country is defiled by both young and old, when our Constitution and the laws of the land are openingly disobeyed in thought and deed, we shall have ceased to be a nation. When the actions of some of our people tend to torpedo our national commitment, and we tolerate this and refuse to stand out against such ruinous disloyalty, we have through negligence aided and abetted this cause of destruction.

Silence and indifference, while the American way of life is ridiculed and belittled, is the sin of omission. We, too, will be responsible if we but shrug our shoulders or look the other way.

Involvement is a part of our heritage. While no one would wish to deny anyone the right peacefully to disagree, we have the responsibility of doing as much or more than the dissenters, in persuading and encouraging just the opposite of their dangerous creed.

I am convinced that if more Americans had spoken out, there would be no demonstrations. And, if there had been no demonstrations, the war in Vietnam would be over. The loss of American lives would have ceased, and peace would have been returned to the world. South Vietnam would be insured of its freedom, and North Vietnam allowed to choose the yoke of communism if it so desired.

I was reminded of the words of former President Harry S. Truman who pointed to his desk and said:

> This is where the buck stops.

Mr. Gordon echoed the words of Secretary of State Dean Rusk when he said:

> Only the guy in the White House knows all the situation.

He then continued:

> Never before in our history have the American people turned their back on the man in the White House. I am with the United States Government all the way, and President Johnson represents the Government and the people in his decisions. He is the only one who has access to all the information, and I know, as President, he is acting for the good of this country.

If the gentlemen of this House sometime feel as confused as I about the people who join in opposing the Nation's policies, imagine what the majority of Americans throughout the country feel when they read in the papers of a giant protest march in Washington. Not only did Mr. Gordon answer his Nation's call to duty, he has reared a family of three sons and six daughters, and all three sons have served in the armed services. Two sons answered the Nation's call in World War II and another served in Korea. Two of his sons were wounded in action. The

Gordons have 18 grandchildren and though they have the same love and feeling for these lovely children as any grandparents, they would be shocked if one of them refused to serve his country in time of need.

Mr. Gordon remembers his duty in France during World War I with nostalgia. He does not view it as a time of glory, but he remembers it with pride for he purchased a part of his American birthright with this active duty. He was one of four who went in the first draft from Madison County. Only two returned, and today he is the only survivor of that first group. He remembers that he served with the 80th Division, which was called into action three times in the Argonne front. He remembers his discharge on June 5, 1919. But what is most important is that he remembers and continues to feel the same toward his country as he did when he first answered the call to duty.

As I talked with Mr. and Mrs. Gordon I realized that freedom was truly a tangible thing. That it was almost something you could touch and see. That somewhere along the road since World War II we had failed to make all Americans see and feel that freedom was a very precious commodity, enjoyed by only a few million people as compared with the billions who inhabit the earth. But, like any precious commodity, it must be guarded, protected, fought for, and defended. This freedom was a many splendored thing, but like a faith in God, it required a jealous devotion. Through misuse or abuse it could vanish. We preached freedom, but this preaching was taken up by those who would exploit its privilege without accepting the responsibility that went with the freedom. It was not a freedom that was guaranteed forever unless it was protected forever. We accepted the freedom that was handed down by our forefathers, but we failed to instill their high regard for this freedom. We degraded this gift by telling only of its advantages and nothing of the responsibilities inherent in our accepting it as a gift.

As a result, some of our people have accepted this freedom, interpreting it only as a right to disagree. There is also the responsibility of agreement. This Nation—this democracy—this Republic finds its strength in the people. There is a time for discussion, for disagreement, for compromise—but when the die is cast and the decision made, then we must rally behind our leaders.

I am sure that Mr. and Mrs. Gordon deplore the fact that American youths must fight, and some die, in Vietnam. They are not "for the war" just because it is a war.

They are for this Government and its President who leads it. They realize that the freedom which they enjoy along with 200 million other Americans is not dependent upon a group of people marching through our streets decrying the actions of war. They know this freedom is being protected along with the human rights of a small nation invaded by hostile Communist forces from the north.

I believe that Secretary of State Rusk clarified the situation in his recent press conference, but perhaps that clarification should have been made a long time ago. Perhaps the real enemy to world peace and our own freedom should have been spelled out as Communist China many months back. Diplomacy is a necessity in world affairs, but it is also important that our own people be made aware of the imminence of the danger of any nation which would threaten the tranquillity of the world and the United States.

An editorial in the Herald American, an outstanding newspaper in my home district of Syracuse, commented aptly on Secretary Rusk's conference. It said:

> The President and the experts around him obviously are the only ones who have all the information and know the full score on our foreign involvement. The sooner we get back to the American business of giving our patriotic support to them, the sooner we can expect just and honorable solutions.

Voicing some sentiments along this same line, Joseph A. Scerra, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States speaking at Redfield, S. Dak., on October 11 said:

> It is high time some of the amateur diplomats, professional politicians, armchair generals and would-be Presidents in our Nation be reminded that their continuing harsh and distorted criticism of America's continuing stand against aggression in Viet-Nam is harmful to the success of our mission and to the security of our Nation. It may not be their intention, but these self-appointed experts of international military and political strategy are providing false hope and misleading comfort to the enemy. They—no less, and perhaps even more than the so-called anti-war demonstrators—are actually helping to prolong the war rather than to shorten it, as they so zealously claim is their objective.

Commander Scerra concluded his address with a plea to the lawmakers of this land. He said:

> I therefore, personally call upon our Senators and Representatives to support the Administration in fulfilling its pledge to support our fighting men in Viet-Nam and to work for a just and honorable peace.

I feel that Commander Scerra has voiced the opinion of the great bulk of loyal Americans—and I know that representative of this feeling is James Gordon—who typifies the true spirit of Americanism.

I join these and other Americans who are concerned about our country. I hope that when James Gordon celebrates his 77th birthday Saturday that it will not only be a joyous occasion, but that he can look forward to a free America for which he fought—not only for himself but for his children and grandchildren.

President Kennedy stated the situation very clearly. He said:

> The cost of freedom is always high but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission. The path to a just peace is the one where we present a united front to the enemy, so that he will not fail to recognize the futility of his aggressive course of action.

I call on the Members of this body, upon the Members of the Senate, upon all loyal Americans to unite behind the President as he leads us to victory and world peace where aggression will never be dared because it will be known that America will join as one man to defeat the aggressor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for the excellent statement he has made here today. His constituents have every right to be very proud of the manner in which he has presented our great commitment to Vietnam in its proper perspective, and in his call for support for the President and the boys in Vietnam.

When the full history of America's story is written, when the day comes when President Johnson is proven to be right in refusing to yield to expediency and to heed the counsel of those misguided people who do not understand the stakes involved in Vietnam; when the day of the full glory of our victory in Vietnam comes—yes—and when the full story of freedom's victory is written, the gentleman's words will take on new and penetrating meaning.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague. I think he has performed a notable public service and it is my hope that every member of his constituency—yes, and every American may have the opportunity to read his remarks because he has placed in proper perspective the logical reason of why we must remain resolute in Vietnam.

I hope that there will be many, many more people to join him.

My own feeling is that the tide has turned in America. President Johnson has quietly and stubbornly stuck to his position defending the institutions of freedom in Vietnam. Finally, the world is beginning to realize what this brave man is doing. Our own country is beginning to realize better our aims, and I have every reason to believe that the various popularity polls which have become such an institution in our society will start reflecting a notable shift toward support of our President and the ideals that he is defending in Vietnam. It seems that all of a sudden the world is beginning to realize, as the President said the other day, that America is the first major power in the history of the world that has committed all of her strength and all of her resources and her reputation in defense of a small and helpless nation.

Last night I said at Catholic University:

> When the United Nations were founded there were 51 nations. Today there are 127 nations. These are all small nations that have emerged in the last two decades out of colonialism and out of slavery and have now attained the dignity of free people.
>
> These small nations all over the world are now beginning to see what this great President of ours is doing and what our soldiers in Vietnam are fighting for. They are not fighting for any territorial gains for America. They are fighting for a standard of human dignity for South Vietnam which has become infectious all over the world. When the small nations of the world finally realize the degree of our commitment to freedom, I'm sure these nations will become our most effective allies and the road to lasting peace shall have been carved by those brave Americans who gave their lives in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague for taking the time today to put all of this in proper perspective. He is right when he says that Mr. Gordon is the kind of American who reflects the real spirit of America.

The 30,000 to 40,000 misguided individuals who stormed the Pentagon last week do not reflect the real spirit of America.

I say to my colleague in the well that he has performed a notable service indeed. There will be more and more people who will understand and realize the true spirit of America that he has reflected here. I say that the people of this country indeed are going to answer his clarion call to support our President, because we are winning in Vietnam. More important, we are establishing a concept of unity, as the President said the other day, when the day will come that people all over this world will look back at what is happening in Vietnam today and say that this was the great turning point of man's struggle for freedom.

I have every reason to believe that when the war in Vietnam is concluded, as it will be, we are going to see a long era of peace and those who would destroy man's desire and ability to be free will have to take a back seat.

It has been a privilege to sit in this Chamber listening to my colleague, the gentleman from New York. In his very well-prepared speech, he has put our struggle for freedom, and the great devotion of our President to achieve that goal, in proper perspective.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the speech that he has made today.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] for his kind remarks. The message that my colleague has conveyed in his remarks certainly add to the message that I have attempted to convey here today. I express my gratitude to you.

TOTAL FLUORIDE INGESTION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in recent months on the subject of fluoride. Today, I would like to place in the RECORD an article by Elise Jerard that gives a deep and authoritative insight on the subject. This article appeared in the Journal of the Soil Association, and is being reprinted in Australia and New Zealand. I commend my colleagues to read this article as they will find it extremely informative.

The article referred to follows:

TOTAL FLUORIDE INGESTION

(By Elise Jerard)

We are living in the Morning After the blind love affair with science-and-technology. It should be evident that Alfred North Whitehead was right: "specialized thinking is thinking in a groove. The danger is that in our time specialized thinking has been mated with progress . . . while everywhere there is a weakened sense of direction . . . and relation." We race with time in urgent need of a relevant philosophy which, acknowledging the limits of science, establishes as our guiding principle the knowledge that all our truths are partial; and that we must consider all parts in their relation to the other parts involved; and the relation of the parts to the whole; which in turn is part of larger and larger wholes, so that awareness of the scope and intricacy humbles us to a protective caution.

With respect to the problem of environmental fluorides, the concept of a "fluoride deficiency" is quite illusory. There is more or less fluoride in soils, often augmented nowadays by phosphate and other fertilizers. There are fluorides in a number of pesticides, as well as in some pharmaceuticals, either as intentional ingredients or incidental, classified by researchers as "occult" fluoride. There is generally fluoride in the atmosphere, always to some extent in cities where there are massive combustions, and to excess where there is fluoride air pollution caused by industrial emissions. Some fifty industries contribute to such contamination, notably steel, aluminum, copper and zinc plants, brick, tile, ceramics and glass factories, refiners of oil and uranium, processors of phosphate fertilizers and some of the chemical industries.

It is rather rarely understood that airborne fluorides can enter the bodies of food plants grown in the vicinity of fluoride-emanating factories—but not necessarily in the immediate neighborhood. Leafy vegetables grown nine miles away from a steel mill in Fontana, California, contained 212 p.p.m. of fluoride. In the Bay Area, indeed, fluoride air pollution is measured by the effect upon fruit leaves. A test of apricot leaves in Santa Clara Valley in 1961 revealed, startingly, that 532 p.p.m. of fluoride had been absorbed by the foliage. *Toxicology of Fluoride*, a volume emanating from an international conference of researchers in Berne, Switzerland, in 1964, lists among the more usual effects of airborne fluorides on American food plants: peaches up to 5 p.p.m. of fluoride; apples up to 4; carrots up to 5; spinach as much as 21; milk up to 2.3; celery leaves up to 135 p.p.m. The government's official figures for fluoride content of foods makes no allowance for such contamination.

Some plants can be damaged by as little as one part per *billion* of airborne fluoride. Substantial amounts can cause grave injuries. Recently spectacular damage to crops, livestock and human health were reported at Garrison, Montana, after the opening of a fluoride-emitting factory. A Congressional hearing was sought by citizens of Florida who suffered repeated damage to the citrus crop, around Tampa, in the vicinity of a fertilizer plant and other fluoride air-polluting industries. Animals were seriously fluorosed. Together with inhaled fluoride, deposits on pastures and contamination of the feed have caused intense suffering among the herds. Not only bones, joints, teeth and gums have been affected but, as revealed by autopsy, soft tissues of vital organs, including in some animals destined for human food.

Yet at a recent U.S. fluoridation hearing a doctor with the Public Health Service, who wished to fluoridate the water supply of a city in Santa Clara County which is exposed to fluoride air pollution from, among other sources, three brick and tile factories and an atomic energy plant, testified that these conditions were irrelevant because people "do not eat the atmosphere." His professional studies had omitted the fact that inhaled fluoride is conveyed to the bloodstream. Other witnesses who stated that fluoride has never been known to invade the soft tissues of human beings were refuted by a study made in Provo, Utah, in which one of the witnesses participated.

FOOD FOR REFLECTION

Fluoride ingested with foods is a subject with many unknowns, although it is often discussed on a note of deceptive finality. Many foods, of course, naturally contain some fluoride. In a section of Samoa, where the water was fluoride-free and the atmosphere innocent of such contamination, tested persons consistently eliminated fluoride which could have derived only from food. Incidentally, the natives had excellent teeth until exposed to the diet of "developed" countries.

In our own diet, tea is high in fluoride content. Some coffees and wines contain quite large amounts. Many fish are fluoride-rich, as is most geletin and other food items derived from bone. The sum of trace amounts in larger quantities of fluoride consumed naturally in foods varies, of course, with dietary patterns, both of individuals and cultures.

THE FLUORIDE CIRCUIT

In April, 1967, the International Society for Research on Nutrition and Vital Substances and the Diseases of Civilization published Resolution 39 which urges officials *to refrain from fluoridating public drinking water supplies*. Among the diverse reasons given was that "fluoridation sets up a *fluorine circuit* which affects fruits, vegetables and other consumables." Watering and irrigation are but two phases of this ill-probed problem.

Studies by McClure of the U.S. Public Health Service failed to take into consideration the changes in the fluoride content of food which must follow water fluoridation. Martin in 1951 showed that home cooking of vegetable products in fluoridated water increased their fluoride concentration. Cholak, in 1960, Krepkogorsky in 1963, and Waldbott in 1963 raised the question of total fluoride ingestion. Bratton, also Weir, demonstrated the effect of fluoridated water used in specific commercial food processes e.g. wet milling of corn and the preparation of yeast cultures. Inevitable fluctuations of the fluoride content in fluoridated water further complicate the problem. Concentration of fluoride is heightened by boiling and other heat and pressure processes.

THE SHARP INCREASE IN COMMERCIAL FOODS AND BEVERAGES

In the *Journal of Food Science*, the issue of Nov.-Dec., 1966, Marier and Rose of the Canadian Research Council published an arresting study which, like their previous study of the effects of fluoridating *soft* water, has not been followed by due research and caution.

The Marier-Rose study found that when commercial foods and beverages were prepared with fluoridated water the result was not only an increase of two to five-fold in fluoride content, but that *healthy indoor workers* in a temperate climate consumed from these sources 2 to 5 mg. a day. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has repeatedly recommended 2 to 3 mg. at most for total fluoride intake. Krepkogorsky sets a similar limit. Accordingly, the amount consumed by individuals in the Marier-Rose study was in the *admittedly toxic range*.

As more and more cities and sections of the world are persuaded, pressured or compelled to fluoridate their water supplies, more and more processing plants will produce foods and beverages with an augmented fluoride content. Who will consume how much of these foods? What will it add up to? No one knows. Despite denials by fluoridation partisans, the medical literature has clearly established that some persons are allergic to fluoride, some tolerate it badly, many excrete inadequately a substance known to be toxic in low concentrations.

The Marier-Rose article concludes: "Our data suggest that some healthy individuals will ingest up to 5 mg. a day under normal indoor vocational occupations. Laborers exposed to outdoor summer conditions will undoubtedly ingest still more, as will individuals subject to chronic polydipsia (the abnormal thirst of illness.) (Adams and Jowsey, 1965; Sauerbrunn et al., 1965"; also Waldbott; Shea et al., 1967).

"A need is clearly indicated for more extensive data. The total fluoride intake of individuals in a fluoridated community should therefore be monitored and its medical significance carefully considered."

There is, to the best of our knowledge, no monitoring of fluoride in food and beverages; no more than there is suitable monitoring of airborne fluoride. Almost no hospitals have the equipment to evaluate fluoride toxicity. Instead, despite competent evidence, there is denial that any such problems exist.

ONE OF A NUMBER OF CONSEQUENCES OF THE FLOURIDE CIRCUIT

A nurse with a severe kidney ailment was treated by hemodialysis (washing with an artificial kidney) in the fluoridated city of Rochester. After each of 14 treatments her condition worsened; after the 14th dialysate bath she went into convulsions and expired. This case was reported, unprecedentedly, in two different medical journals by two separate teams of authors: the first was published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (184, 1963), the second in *Archives of Internal Medicine* (115, 1965.) Only a part of the facts appeared in each of these articles. In the *Journal of the American Medical Association* classic symptoms of fluoride poisoning were described, such as twitching, calcium changes and others, no mention, however, was made of the fluoridated water employed in these treatments. The report in *Archives of Internal Medicine* contained rather inconspicuous warning: "It would seem prudent to use nonfluoridated dialysate baths for long-term hemodialysis . . . the question of fluoride retention in patients with kidney disease has not been resolved." At autopsy, the nurse's vertebral bones contained 5500 p.p.m. of fluoride.

ANOTHER POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCE

A baby who died 16 hours after birth showed, on autopsy, besides abnormal calcium deposits in vital organs, an extraordinarily high fluoride concentration (the normal being zero) in the aorta, the lungs, the thymus gland, the kidneys and the heart. (Journal of the American Medical Association, 188, 1964.) In consultation, the physicians agreed that absorption of fluoride from the mother's system, through the placental barrier, must have been responsible for this fatal pathology.

Five cases, reported in *Rozhal-Chirurgie*, the Czechoslovakian medical journal described newborn babies with intestinal hemorrhages and high concentrations of fluoride, attributed to fetal absorption from mothers who had worked in fluoride air-polluting industries.

ADDITIONAL ASPECTS OF TOTAL EXPOSURE

When the "permissible tolerance" for fluorides in water supplies was established by the U.S. Public Health Service at 1 p.p.m. and subsequently 1.2 p.p.m., industries were thereby assured that they could use the public waters for the disposal of their fluoride wastes, provided only that the rate of discharge did not exceed the legal limit.

With increased installations of devices for reduction of air pollution has come an increase in the quantities of fluoride wastes disposed of by other methods. The result has been more fluoride water pollution. The dimensions of this problem were suggested by Dr. Helen MacDonald, biologist, before the California Public Utilities Commission when citizens of San Jose resisted an attempt to impose water fluoridation.

F. E. Gartrell describes in *Water Pollution Potential Of Air Pollution Control Devices* current processes for liquifying gaseous fluoride wastes in a phosphate plant at Orister, Florida. The liquid, retrieved by neoprene, rubber-lined scrubbers is treated so as to reduce the fluoride concentration to the legally permitted level, after which the wastes are metered into the Alafia River. People in this region draw water from the river, including, in some cases, drinking water.

Another example: the atomic energy plant at Fernold, Ohio, produces uranium and thorium metal. Hydrogen fluoride is employed in the process. Soluble fluorides are discharged into the Miami (Ohio) River at a level of 1.2 p.p.m. An average of 15,000 lbs. of fluorides per months has been thus liberated into this waterway. Downstream from Fernold, people use the water. The most obviously hazardous uses of such waters are for drinking, cooking, commercial processing of edibles, fishing for food and swimming.

The U.S. Steel Corporation plant at Provo, Utah, after $9,000,000 worth of settlements of lawsuits, has developed a saner solution of this problem. Electrostatic devices recover about 90% of the fluoride, which is solidified, hauled off and buried with great care at a dry pit in a protected area. Such cautious fluoride graveyards may constitute a useful response to the environmental hazard of quantities of highly toxic fluoride by-products.

To date, however, the favored disposal measures of industries with fluoride wastes are twofold: to utilize the legal level for fluoride in water by discharging, at a controlled rate but persistently, vast amounts of residues into the public waterways; and, second, to sell quantities of fluoride by-products for fluoridation of supplies of drinking water.

REQUISITES

The fixed tendency to avert the eyes from a total environmental problem is a critical challenge of our time and of a societal system where control in the general human interest is weak and shortsighted special interests are strong.

Max Planck has observed that we need "Verstand" — grasp, understanding — and above all, that we need "Vernunft"—judgment, wisdom; which is not at all the same thing. Only a less limited "Verstand" and adequate guiding "Vernunft" can keep us from fouling our future and complexly committing suicide. The question is: Can we mobilize what it takes?

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing so much about cost reduction these days and, while I am certain that some agencies are more conscientious in this effort and others less, I would like to discuss one area which has come to my attention where "cost reduction" appears to be as meaningful and compelling as a phrase in a foreign tongue.

I am wondering whether anyone's attention has been drawn, as mine has been, to the apparent waste that goes on almost around the clock at—to echo its own proud boast, the largest printing operation in the world—the Government Printing Office.

Recently I have heard disgruntled complaints from several avenues regarding the GPO operation.

At this moment, GPO is conducting a training seminar in editorial planning for about 165 editors, copyhandlers, and information people from various Federal Government agencies. By way of orientation the Public Printer has told them that GPO wants to give them the best service in the quickest possible time at the cheapest cost. That is an admirable objective, but let us look at the record.

I might point out here that the GPO state of affairs was brought to my attention by one agency, but I have since checked with other agencies and I find that the original agency's disappointment is not an isolated case.

It is a distasteful note that more and more of our Federal agencies seem to be shying away from the GPO for the simple reason that the service is "fifth rate." One or more of those purported "best, quickest, cheapest" constants in the GPO service formula too often become variables.

"Best" varies from flawless perfection to slipshod margins, off-register inkings, and glaring typos. "Quickest" varies with disturbing frequency from prompt service to extensions on extensions of delivery dates. And "cheapest" has increasingly been found to vary to mean "surcharge" or "overtime pay"—at 50 percent extra—to get the job done a day or two earlier than the extended delivery date.

It appears to be a fact of life that a GPO job for a smaller agency is often of mediocre quality, unless it is multicolored work for one of the larger agencies. But come the smaller agencies—with their correspondingly small appropriations—and GPO is said to be so overburdened with work that the powers-that-be send work out to field plants. Seeing the work from some of these plants, I cannot help but think it would be better to employ some of the junior high school printshops in my congressional district. The prize-winning publications produced by some of these schoolboy shops compare favorably with some of the field plant work I have seen. Without more than a moment's passing thought several junior and senior high schools in Pennsylvania school districts come to mind—Whitehall, Allen, Dieruff, Bethlehem, Catasauqua, Easton, and the Pocono Mountain schools. They and a number of others have won honors for their publications in professionally judged competitions in recent years and, I might add, deservedly.

In this climate of cost-consciousness in which we are working these days, too often when an agency editor or information officer seeks to get a printing job done in what he considers a reasonable time of, say, a month or two, he is urged by GPO people to authorize a surcharge to assure delivery within his deadline.

But I can assure you that paying a surcharge, or what I consider a penalty, will not get the work done very much sooner. And it certainly does not appear to improve on the overall appearance of the product which carries the GPO tag.

Complaints bring answers, but what kind? One complaint about the poor quality of a job, to my knowledge, brought the answer:

> You know, we have a tough time getting competent help.

One very good answer, of course, would be to get the job done on a competitive bid by an "outside" shop but this action must first be approved at GPO in the plush silence of imposing offices far removed from desk pounding that goes on at the "customer" agencies over late deliveries from the largest publisher in the world.

I must say also that I view with no little awe two abilities of GPO—its seeming ability to put itself above the rules that bind other agencies and its apparent clairvoyance.

The seminars meeting at GPO now have been told that Members of Congress do not like to see pictures of agency heads in agency publications because this gives the appearance of an attempt at "personal aggrandizement" by the person pictured. In addition to that, the classes have been told, there is another good reason. In the event the person pictured should suddenly die, the publication would just as suddenly become obsolete.

However, one of the pieces of literature distributed at these seminars is a booklet on GPO operations containing a spate of personal pictures and biographical sketches of Printing Office officials. As a matter of fact there are two individual pictures each of the Public Printer, his deputy and his administrative assistant within six pages of each other. It appears that GPO is above the rules it applies to its customers and somehow knows that its booklet will not suddenly become obsolete.

There is one exception for pictures of agency heads, GPO representatives have explained. That is when the agency person's picture is one that has been taken "with the man over in the White House. You can't keep that out."

And, if I might digress a moment, inferences such as that are another sore point with me. I for one am tired of listening to inferences like this which would make the White House the scapegoat.

There is another side to the GPO coin—a very bright one. The Government Printing Office produces some outstanding work—work that is not matched anywhere else in the world. You have all seen these products; publications of the Departments of the Army, Navy, Defense, Agriculture, and other large agencies. They are paying a price for the service, of course—fast, quality service may rightly command premium praise—but there are no finer looking publications. Why, however, does that same quality not show up in the work done for agencies which are smaller but, proportionately, not lesser?

That much of GPO's work is without peer is only proof that it can do work of the highest quality routinely. Why then does it not?

BETHLEHEM VFW POST LAUNCHES MAIL-FROM-HOME PROJECT FOR AMERICAN SERVICEMEN IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud and happy to be able to announce today a project which is being conducted in my congressional district to support members of the U.S. Armed Forces serving in Southeast Asia.

The project is a mail-from-home campaign which has been initiated by Bethlehem, Pa., Post 855, Veterans of Foreign Wars, to develop and maintain a steady flow of mail to all service men and women serving our country in Southeast Asia. Mail from home is the idea of Commander Wilbur F. H. Raidline, a man who has had a very successful past experience in boosting morale of American servicemen when, during the Korean war, he personally conducted a similar mail campaign which produced 35,000 letters and 560 packages for American forces in Korea.

Commander Raidline's new project has won endorsement of the Department of Defense and the White House, as his earlier project did in the 1950's. I personally wish him and VFW Post 855 every possible success because, in this small way, we as individual citizens can say "thanks" to the brave Americans who wear our Nation's military uniforms.

All Americans want our young men and women serving in Vietnam and in support capacities elsewhere in that region of the world to know that we at home do care and do appreciate what they are doing in defense of freedom and in quest of permanent peace.

Through newspapers published in Southeast Asia, Commander Raidline and VFW Post 855 will invite servicemen who would like to receive mail from home to send their complete mailing addresses and a brief description of themselves and their interests to Mail From Home, Bethlehem Post 855, VFW, Bethlehem, Pa. 18017.

At the same time, individuals across the country are invited to write letters and forward them along with postage to the Bethlehem VFW Post to be sent to individual servicemen overseas. Persons who wish to send packages may contact the Bethlehem VFW post by mail to receive the name and address of a serviceman who has requested a package.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the members of our Armed Forces who will spend the forthcoming holiday season many thousands of miles from home, I would like to invite all Americans to assist Commander Raidline and post 855 in this effort by writing warm, friendly letters from home. And I extend this same invitation to all of my colleagues in Congress as well as to the individual staff members of congressional offices and offices of the executive and judicial branches.

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE NATIONS ISSUED BY ISRAEL'S CHIEF RABBIS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted into the Record a press account of an appeal to the conscience of humanity by Israel's chief rabbi on the subject of the persecution of Jewish minorities in Arab countries.

I now have a full text of that appeal, which I would like to place in the Record.

This statement provides compelling evidence of Arab cruelty. I might note that while independent observation confirms the barbarity of Arab treatment of Jewish minorities, independent observation also confirms that Israel has been treating its Arab minority with kindness, decency, and respect. This statement points up the ludicrousness of Arab complaints of Israel injustice.

I urge my colleagues to read this statement, to judge for themselves which side in the current conflict in the Middle East has conducted itself in a civilized manner.

An Appeal to the Conscience of the Nations Issued by Israel's Chief Rabbis

With the onset of the High Holy Days in this year of destiny for the House of Israel, we, the Chief Rabbis of the State of Israel, appeal with all earnestness to the conscience of the Nations to act vigorously and without delay to alleviate the plight of thousands of innocent Jews against whom the governments of some Arab states have vented their anger and wrought their vengeance after failing in their aggressive design to extinguish the reborn Jewish State.

While the attention of the world has been focused so intently on the political problems besetting our region, and the clamour of Arab slander against Israel mounts in intensity, supported by the unprincipled policy of certain other governments, the plight of the Jewish communities in several of the Arab states where a reign of black terror has been unleashed against them, approaches total catastrophe.

Hundreds of Jews are being subjected to daily torture, beatings and humiliations, while imprisoned in inhuman conditions and indeed in some cases in the custody of Nazis who have found haven and hospitality in Egypt.

All this is being done by several Arab governments to their Jewish citizens and residents as well as stateless Jews, absolutely innocent of any action hostile to the state, only because they are Jews, and as such defenseless, held political hostage, and the victims of the Arabs' thwarted grand design to annihilate the State of Israel.

Attempts by international and humanitarian bodies have met with stubborn refusal on the part of Egypt, Syria and Iraq to discuss the plight of their Jewish communities, and all humanitarian approaches to rescue these communities from the inhuman totalitarian oppression they are undergoing have been rudely rejected by the Arab governments concerned.

In Egypt, which has committed the bestial obscenity of using Nazi gaolers camouflaged with Egyptian names, for Jewish prisoners—an act deepy repugnant to civilized humanity in the light of recent history—the property of the Jews of Cairo has been confiscated, harsh restrictions are imposed against those Jews not held in unspeakably grim prisons, those imprisoned have been beaten, their hands and ribs broken, their hair shaven, their eye-brows pulled out; they have been denied food and water for long hours. When water has been provided, it has been in minute quantities and crude methods. The Chief Rabbi of Alexandria is in prison, the Chief Rabbi of Cairo is under house arrest as is the president of the Ashkenazi Jewish Community in the Egyptian capital, and those few Jews expelled from Egypt after imprisonment have been deprived of all their possessions and belongings.

In Syria, which has never treated its Jewish minority humanely, the Jews live in ghetto conditions, suffering persecutions endless extortions; Jewish quarters have been attacked by mobs, curfews have been imposed, Jewish ghettos are threatened with starvation, all the Jewish teachers were expelled from schools and were replaced by Moslem teachers. In Damascus Jews were thrown out of their homes which were given to Palestinians. The public is instructed not to buy from Jews.

In Iraq, unbridled incitement against the Jews abounds in the government press, radio and television. Jewish business has been prohibited, dozens of Jews arrested on trumped-up charges of "spying for Israel", police and other government personnel have extorted money from Jews. The secret police have begun, lately, to threaten the Jews with murder and expropriation. A Jewish girl was arrested, put into gaol with criminals and only freed after she had been raped.

In Egypt, Syria and Iraq, the Jews have suffered intensely since the tension started in this area early this year sustaining severe losses in life, liberty and property, as a result of direct governmental responsibility for their persecution. Almost all the Jewish men in Egypt have been imprisoned, including those seriously ill from heart and other ailments. Synagogues have been seized, prayers proscribed. Iraqi legislation against Jews has been rigidly enforced, professions have been closed to Jews in that country, the government refuses to issue passports to Jews wishing to leave.

This shocking catalogue of crimes by Arab governments against their helpless Jewish minorities has been largely overlooked in recent months by public opinion in the enlightened world.

The attempts made by international agencies to halt or at least modify the reign of terror have been ineffectual and contemptuously rebuffed by the Arab governments concerned.

We therefore direct this passionate appeal from Jerusalem, the sacred shrine of Judaism and the focus of intense religious feeling for the great religions, to the conscience of all mankind to raise its voice and demand instant action to stamp out this inhuman, cruel and uncivilized wave of oppression directed against our people by governments which give lip service to the United Nations Charter.

May the Rock of Israel in His infinite wisdom and mercy bring about the salvation of the hostages of Israel as the Book of Judgment is once more opened to weigh right and wrong in these High Holy Days.

NEW YORK POLL SHOWS THE REAL STRENGTH OF L. B. J.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, some Republicans are spreading the word that Lyndon Johnson will be easy to beat in 1968.

We know the Republicans are experts at whistling in the dark. And few Democrats are taking them seriously. For while the President's popularity is down a year before the election, much can happen to alter the trend of the popularity polls.

I would also remind the Republicans of a less-publicized, but significant fact: A poll conducted by a Princeton firm shows the President winning decisively against every Republican candidate put against him.

Commenting on this poll, Roscoe Drummond writes:

> While the decisiveness of LBJ's lead in New York State runs counter to those who take his defeat next year almost for granted, it supports others who believe that, when the test is at hand, the odds will favor the President.

The poll shows President Johnson running ahead of Nixon, Romney, Reagan, and Senator Percy by margins of 22 to 27 percent.

He beats them all in traditionally Republican upstate New York by 9 to 13 percent; and he demolishes them in New York City by 36 percent.

Mr. Drummond notes that the poll was conducted by a veteran and highly respected polltaker.

> I have consulted with an expert student of polls—

He writes—

> and his judgment is that the questions were properly framed.

What does this poll mean?

It means that Republican talk notwithstanding, Lyndon B. Johnson will be a tough candidate to beat in 1968. The difficulty the Republicans face is that they are up against a President who has compiled an unprecedented record of achievement for the American people.

And as New York is going—so will go the Nation.

I insert into the Record Roscoe Drummond's article appearing in the Wichita Eagle:

IS JOHNSON DOWN OR UP?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Is LBJ down or up?

A series of Gallup and Harris nationwide surveys shows President Johnson massively unpopular.

But an in-depth New York state poll shows President Johnson massively popular.

The fact that a political opinion survey runs sharply counter to the mainstream of polling is no reason it can be safely dismissed.

When the polls show opposite results, it is a little unsettling. Consider this:

Nationwide Gallup and Harris polls show Romney and Rockefeller, when pitted against Johnson in trial heats, each winning by a few percentage points.

But in New York state a poll just completed by Political Surveys and Analyses, Inc. of Princeton, shows the President winning decisively against every Republican candidate put against him.

The margin of LBJ's political ascendancy in New York state can hardly be overemphasized.

He runs ahead of Nixon, Romney, Reagan, and Percy by a range of 22 to 27 per cent.

He leads them all in substantially conservative, traditionally Republican upstate New York by a range of 9 to 13 per cent.

He crushes his Republican opponents in New York City by 36 per cent.

Against Nixon, who does better in this New York poll than the other Republicans, Johnson takes 70 per cent of the Negro vote, 81 per cent of the Jewish vote, and a substantial majority of the Catholic and Protestant vote.

The President takes 25 per cent of the Republican vote while Nixon wins only 12 per cent of the Democratic vote. He leads comfortably among independents.

Here are the precise figures on how Johnson does against four GOP opponents in New York state:

Candidates:	*Percent*
Nixon	31
Johnson	53
Percy	28
Johnson	51
Reagan	29
Johnson	56
Romney	30
Johnson	52

(The average undecided vote was 14 per cent. The average vote for other candidates, 3½ per cent. Rockefeller's name was not polled.)

Was this a competent survey? There is no evidence to the contrary. It was supervised by Archibald Crossley, a veteran polltaker and widely respected as both professional and objective. I have consulted with an expert student of polls and his judgment is that the questions were properly framed.

It is on the unexpectedly large Johnson lead that the Crossley poll conflicts with the national results of the Gallup and Harris polls. Romney is the only Republican in the Crossley poll who has run ahead of Johnson in a nationwide Gallup poll. Nixon, Reagan, and Percy have never led the President in any nationwide trial heat.

While the decisiveness of LBJ's lead in New York state runs counter to those who take his defeat next year almost for granted, it supports others who believe that, when the test is at hand next fall, the odds will favor the President.

MRS. BOLTON PRAISES THE JOB CORPS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the fight over the war on poverty which is looming before the House will, obviously, be a bitter and difficult one. One of the few satisfactions the Nation can take from this struggle is that it has transcended purely partisan boundaries. Both the friends and the foes of the war on poverty can be found on both sides of the aisle, and the desire to do what is best for the Nation will, I am confident, overcome the natural desire to do what is best for a Member's own party.

The able gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] recently visited a woman

Job Corps center in Cleveland, and came away with the kind of straightforward and penetrating analysis which her colleagues, Republican and Democratic, have learned to expect from the ranking lady of the House.

The Cleveland Congresswoman—

According to the Cleveland Plain Dealer—

advocated Job Corps tours for Congressional critics of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I insert newspaper articles from the September 8 editions of the Plain Dealer and the Cleveland Press, describing Mrs. Bolton's tour and her comments, at this point in the Record:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Sept. 8, 1967]

Congresswoman Bolton Lauds Girls' Center Here

Cong. Frances Bolton (R-Cleveland) said a tour of the Women's Job Corps Center here has won her enthusiastic approval of the program regarded as the most costly and most criticized of national anti-poverty efforts.

The center at 1588 Ansel Rd. has an enrollment of about 330 girls and has cost about $2,500,000 a year to operate in addition to about $300,000 in cash allowances for the trainees. This amounts to about $8000 a year for each trainee.

But Cong. Bolton said these costs are justified by the success of the center and urged that more money be provided for the program.

"This is the essence of what Americans want to do to help people," she said of the center where girls from poverty families live while they receive schooling and job training.

Mrs. Bolton added that she feels Congress was wrong in restricting the policy by which girls and youths are flown to and from centers far from their homes for this training. The center here has girls from Hawaii, California, Texas, Alabama, New York and other states.

Having trainees from all parts of the nation living together is a way of helping to build America, she said.

Dr. Zelma George, the center director who was highly praised by Cong. Bolton, contended that there is less temptation for trainees to drop out of the program when they are remote from their homes.

An aide said that more than 75% of the center's graduates are being placed in jobs.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Sept. 8, 1967]

Representative Bolton Tours Facility: City Job Corps Center Praised

(By Alma Kaufman)

Rep. Frances P. Bolton, R-22, had high praise for the Cleveland Job Corps for Women after spending yesterday there and said Job Corps should get a larger share of antipoverty money.

"This was one of the most wonderful days I ever had," said Mrs. Bolton.

"You see Hawaii living with Texas . . . Washington with Alabama; you get the sense that this is the way we're building America as we can't build it any other way."

The Cleveland congresswoman advocated Job Corps tours for congressional critics of the program.

"I know that what I needed was to come here and spend the day," she said. "My sense of the Job Corps is very different from what it was yesterday."

Mrs. Bolton said the program should have enough money to provide job security for center staffs and continuity of service. At present, centers are funded for a year at a time and employes cannot be hired for a longer period. The people of Cleveland should make some provision for continuity, Mrs. Bolton said.

She also said the Cleveland center should be moved from Ansel Road to a better location, but probably not into the suburbs.

"Young people should be within walking distance of recreation," she explained. "They tell us we're all going to be urbanites very soon, so we should be ready."

Mrs. Bolton praised the center director, Dr. Zelma George, as the person responsible for its good impression.

"A short time ago this was a disgraceful place."

PEACENIKS' SHOW IS A FLOP

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Patten] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the world were alerted to the demonstration in Washington this past weekend by our news media, both before and after the event. While this demonstration is now complete—we can now draw our own conclusions as to the real effectiveness of this event when we compare it to the numerous cities that had millions of Americans display the support which our Nation has in fulfilling our commitment in Vietnam.

I would like to call attention to an appropriate editorial which appeared in the Evening News, Perth Amboy, N.J., presenting an analysis of this past weekend. This distinguished newspaper, in the opinion of the people in the field of journalism, is outstanding in its coverage of national and international news. Only recently, the editor, Mr. Kenneth W. Michael, made a tour of the Mideast and wrote a series of articles on his observations.

The demonstrations held in my district this past weekend clearly indicate that patriotism is not dead.

Peaceniks' Show Is a Flop

The numbers game of how many peaceniks demonstrated in Washington over the weekend goes on but no matter whether the figure is 50,000 or 150,000—as claimed by some—the fact is that untold thousands more supported rallies in favor of the United States commitment in Vietnam and its fighting forces.

Over 400 so-called peaceful demonstrators in the capital got out of hand and had to be arrested. There was brief success in one attempt to enter the Pentagon but the half-dozen intruders were carried out.

On any basis of comparison, the anti-war demonstration was a flop. It was, instead, a sad spectacle.

One of the more sickening aspects of the rally was Dr. Benjamin Spock's description of the President of the United States as the "enemy."

Typical of the shocking attitudes of the vocal minority was one of the signs on display: "LBJ the Butcher."

Contrasted with the antics of the peaceniks, far-leftists, Communist sympathizers and scores of hippies out on the town, were the many parades in "Support of Our Boys in Vietnam."

Charles W. Wiley of Sayreville, national chairman of the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism, said the loyalty marches were "the real protest movement in America."

Millions of Americans subscribe to Wiley's observation that, "The overwhelming majority of the American people showed with dignity in quiet vigil or in massive parades throughout the country that they were disgusted with lawlessness and with those who are dishonoring our nation, and they have quietly said 'Stop it, we've had enough.'"

HOUSE OUT OF CONTROL

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Patten] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues to whom it may be appropriate, that the subsequent editorial of the New York Times appears to indicate that a self-analysis and accounting is in order pursuant to the past statements that were made at the commencement of this session of Congress.

House Out of Control

What ever happened to the so-called new breed of responsible, constructive, modern-minded Republicans in the House? Representative Ford of Michigan, the minority leader, and his colleagues started off the year bravely enough, presenting their alternative proposals to those contained in the State of the Union message and assuring everyone that the obstructionist alliance with the Southern Democrats was a thing of the past.

In recent weeks, however, negativism and arid partisanship have prevailed. Responsible legislators in both parties know perfectly well that no budget can be reduced by picking a figure out of the air and arbitrarily asserting that total spending is to be cut by that amount. A budget is an expression of programs that Congress has already established. The only useful approach is to analyze those programs, one by one, and decide which of them can be reduced, postponed or eliminated.

Such decisions can be debated on their merits and in a factual framework. The same cannot be said for the rider which Republicans and Southern Democrats joined in attaching to the routine resolution extending the spending authority of those departments whose money bills have not yet been approved. It may sound good to say that the House has ordered the Administration to slash spending by $8 billion, but everyone who understands budgeting knows that this is just playing to the gallery.

If the resolution was demagogic, the adamant opposition among House Republicans to rent subsidies and model cities expresses a disquieting refusal to think through urban needs and to act upon them. The meager compromise patched up yesterday by House-Senate conferees will, if approved, permit these two programs to go limping forward, but it underscores the rural-and-suburban bias of most House Republicans, who are only too eager to turn their back upon the cities.

Not all of the irresponsibility is confined to the House or to the G.O.P. But the significant development in Congress is a House of Representatives out of control. In fleeful but shortsighted partisanship, most House Republicans have joined with the reactionary backwoodsmen among the Southern Democrats and are rampaging against any and all domestic programs. Before rushing any fur-

ther in this direction, Representative Ford and other House Republican leaders need to remember their predecessors who followed that same dead-end street and met with repudiation from the voters.

CONTINUATION OF GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the guaranteed student loan program has been in effect since November 8, 1965, when President Johnson signed it into law. In the first full fiscal year of its operation, 392,000 students have received loans totaling more than $247 million.

This unique program is an example of creative federalism carried to its widest meaning. It brings together a diversity of institutions in our economy: from our private citizens to our universities, from our banking and credit institutions to the State and Federal Governments.

Mr. Speaker, the continuation of this program is now under consideration. I feel it constitutes a necessary element in our total program of financial aid to the students in this country. With the constantly increasing costs of higher education, it is not only the lower income family which cannot afford to send its child to school, but also the middle-income parents.

From costs of $1,230 per year in a public institution and $1,760 in a private school in 1957, these costs have risen to $1,600 in the former and $2,500 in the latter. It is estimated that by 1972–73 these costs will have risen still further to $1,940 and $2,940, a rise of 18 and 14 percent respectively over the 1966–67 figures. This means that approximately 20 percent of a family's income—if it falls between $10,000 and $15,000—would be needed to pay for 1 year of a child's education. When one considers that many families have more than one child in college at the same time, it could become a question of from 40 to 60 percent.

This is the only program for which the middle-income child is eligible. All others have a need restriction which their families cannot meet. Yet these students may well be "needy" too in the sense that their parents cannot provide such a large part of their yearly income for one expense.

The guaranteed student loan program makes it possible for the student to borrow up to $1,000 per year as an undergraduate or vocational student and $1,500 as a graduate to help meet his expenses. On this money he need pay no interest for the period of time that he is in school nor, if we enact one of the proposed amendments, during any period he may serve in a service organization such as the military, VISTA, or the Peace Corps if his family income is under $15,000. Thus, he is freed from the financial burden while in school. When he does begin paying the loan back, he need pay only 3-percent interest on the balance, the Federal Government paying the remaining interest. Thus, the money is of low cost to him.

It is estimated by the Office of Education that by 1972, 2.2 million students will be taking advantage of this program. This means that approximately that many students will be in college who might otherwise not be there. We, as a nation, have recognized that education is a good investment. No other has the promise of as great returns, not only to the individual, but also to our society as a whole. It means increased productivity on the part of the individual, better services to the public, and a more informed populace, better able to cope with the increasing complexity of the world.

SOVIETS STRENGTHEN NAVY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take specific note of the fact that one of the salaries that will be paid out of the military pay bill before us, today, is that of one of our most distinguished Americans, Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, U.S. Navy. Every Member of the Congress knows the outstanding job Admiral Rickover is doing as head of the naval nuclear propulsion program. We are reminded of the importance of this program every day. Just this morning, the Washington Post carried an article on the expansion of the Soviet Navy which cites the growing force of Soviet nuclear submarines.

I think all of you know that the U.S. fleet of 41 nuclear-powered Polaris missile-firing submarines is our Nation's greatest deterrents to nuclear war. Our nuclear-powered attack submarines provide one of the best weapons to counter the Soviet submarine threat discussed in the Post this morning.

Our nuclear-powered surface warships have proved their mettle by establishing record after record in the war in Vietnam.

I congratulate the executive branch for, again, reappointing Admiral Rickover to continue in his present job as head of the naval nuclear propulsion program, at least until 1970.

I will insert the Post article I refer to in the Record at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 26, 1967]

Soviets Strengthen Navy—Fleet of Nuclear Submarines, Missile Craft Noted in New Edition of Jane's Fighting Ships

London, October 25.—The Soviet navy has increased its nuclear submarine strength, is stepping up production of missile-carrying warships and is thinking of building its first aircraft carrier, the 70th annual edition of Jane's Fighting Ships reported today.

A table in the 1967–1968 edition of Jane's, the standard reference book on the world's navies, showed that the Soviet Union now has 50 nuclear submarines and 350 other subs, compared with 80 nuclear submarines and 127 others in the U.S. Navy.

Raymond V. B. Blackman, editor of the authoritative publication for the past 19 years, noted in a foreword to the new edition that the Soviets have greatly strengthened their submarine fleet in recent years by retiring obsolescent craft and adding new, rocket-firing submarines. He said some of the nuclear submarines carry six missile launchers, and the latest ones carry eight.

DETAILS OF DESTROYER

Blackman gave details of the new, Kresta-class guided-missile destroyers being built by the Soviet navy. The first of the 6000-ton ships—equipped with twin launchers for surface missiles, launchers for antiaircraft missiles, plus torpedo tubes, four 57-mm guns and a helicopter—made its sea trails early this year. Blackman said more of the fast, versatile ships are soon to follow.

"It is evident that the Soviet navy will for years to come be a force to be reckoned with, deployed on a worldwide scale, on the move as never before, and capable of exerting a strong maritime influence on universal affairs," he wrote.

Interest in missile-carrying warships has been heightened since Israel claimed that Soviet missiles were used by an Egyptian naval craft last Saturday to sink the destroyer Eilat off the Sinai coast. Israeli officials said the attack was launched from a Soviet-built, Komar-class missile patrol boat in Port Said's harbor.

FIFTY-FOUR CARRIERS

Present emphasis in the U.S. Navy is on aircraft carriers headed by the 85,000-ton nuclear-powered Enterprise, Jane's Fighting Ships reported, with three more carriers of this class under construction or scheduled to be built.

It said the U.S. Navy's target of 15 supercarriers may be increased to 17. The United States presently has 34 large aircraft carriers plus 20 "baby flattops" for escort, helicopter and assault duty, Jane's said.

[The commanders of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes and Vice Adm. Willima E. Ellis said last Sunday that the Soviets are building an initial aircraft carrier that will be relatively small, but with long-range cruising capabilities.]

The publication also reported the U.S. Navy is planning what could be classed as an amphibious capital ship, a vessel of about 40,000 tons which would combine the duties of a helicopter carrier and a ship for carrying assault troops.

The new edition also took note of Britain's growing nuclear-powered submarine fleet, armed with Polaris missiles, and the development by France of nuclear submarines equipped with missiles. The first of these French submarines, Le Redoutable, has already been launched.

JAPAN TOPS WORLD IN BUILDING SHIPS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Addabbo] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, to further point up how our great Nation has slipped in the shipbuilding world, I commend to the attention of the House an article which appeared in the October 25 edition of the Washington Evening Star under dateline "London AP." The article reported on shipbuilding throughout the world and the United States did not even receive honorable mention.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

JAPAN TOPS WORLD IN BUILDING SHIPS

LONDON (AP).—Japan heads the world's shipbuilders with a greater tonnage under construction than the next four countries put together, Lloyd's reported today.

World shipbuilding orders continue on an upward trend, said Lloyd's register of shipbuilding returns for the quarter ended Sept. 30.

Orders total another record figure of 39,550,636 tons, which is 4,203,383 tons more than the previous quarter. "Almost every country shows an increase in its order book," said Lloyds.

Japan leads in percentage of world tonnage of merchant ships under construction with 401 ships, 4,240,161 tons gross—31.65 per cent of the total.

Then come:

Britain, 137 ships, 1,339,364 tons gross—10 percent. West Germany, 141 ships, 1,012,862 tons gross—7.56 percent. Sweden, 44 ships, 771,884 tons gross—5.76 percent. Italy, 95 ships, 755,865 tons gross—5.64 percent. France, 40 ships, 687,569 tons gross—5.13 percent.

On order at the end of September this year British industry had 1967 ships of 1,682,000 tons gross with an estimated value of $624.4 million (excluding naval work).

The total order book at the end of September 1966, covered 318 ships, of 2,592,000 gross tons.

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION ADDRESS—LORAS COLLEGE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, I had the honor to participate in ceremonies in Dubuque inaugurating the Right Reverend Monsignor Justin A. Driscoll the 19th president of Loras College, the oldest college in Iowa.

Since its founding in 1839, Loras has become known and respected in church and academic circles alike as an outstanding institution for the education of young men in the liberal arts.

I have had the opportunity to work closely with Monsignor Driscoll over the past 3 years, in his capacity as archdiocesan superintendent of schools, and I have the greatest admiration for him as priest, educator, and administrator.

He brings to Loras courage and imagination, a strong commitment to educational excellence, and broad experience not only in the Catholic schools, but in the development of communication and mutually beneficial relationships between public and private schools as well.

I am confident that under his direction Loras will continue the proud record so ably advanced by his immediate predecessor, Msgr. Dorance D. Foley, and will add new dimensions of leadership in education in our State and the Midwest.

In his inaugural address, Monsignor Driscoll cited the vital role of the private college and emphasized the need for developing sound methods of assisting and encouraging such schools, in the interests of maintaining the diversity which is the genius of our educational system.

I think that Monsignor Driscoll's remarks are particularly relevant to our task in the Congress of determining the appropriate role of the Federal Government in the field of education.

I would therefore like to bring his inaugural address to the attention of my colleagues in the House, include it at this point in the RECORD:

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION ADDRESS—LORAS COLLEGE

(By Rt. Rev. Msgr. Justin A. Driscoll, Ph. D., Oct. 20, 1967)

Your Excellencies, distinguished members of the Board of Regents of Loras College; candidates for the honorary degrees of Loras College; representatives of the colleges and universities; superintendents of schools, local, State and National; representatives of local, State, and Federal governments; members of the faculty, student body, and employees of Loras College; my family, relatives, and friends.

In recent years the college president has been variously regarded. To many students, the president is a kind of invisible man; to the faculty he is a source of constant threat. To the academic world, he is a patient hovering between life and death, sustained only by the props of the public relations office, the business and endowment office, and the Board of Regents. To the general public he is a figure that appears in glory at every after-dinner introduction which pays little attention to truth.[1]

Yet, he finds himself alone each morning before his God as he rises to say his prayers and is reminded of the words of the Book of *Sirach:* "Blessed is the man who is found blameless and who does not go after gold (Sirach 31:8)." But the college president does have an important task. He is the leader of an academic community seeking *Truth.*

The fundamental rationale of a Catholic College is the "discovery, transmission, and synthesis of truth." Its primary commitment is to truth.

Today in an academic and religious setting we formalize the beginning of the task of being the 19th president of Loras College in its search for truth, but not a search behind the paper walls of impersonality. Rather, a search with a concern for man and a realistic love of persons, regardless of race, color, or creed.

With gratitude I thank my associates of the colleges and universities for coming; also my good friends, the Catholic Superintendents with whom I have worked these many years; especially the Bishops, religious, and educational, professional, business, and labor representatives; my relatives and friends; the students, faculty, and employees of this institution; all of you who have honored Iowa's first college by your presence. I am deeply grateful for your coming this day.

In addition, I wish to express a very sincere word of thanks, in my own name and for the entire community of Loras, to my predecessor, Monsignor Dorance V. Foley, for all he did to advance this institution. Likewise, the name of Mr. Harry W. Wahlert, our great benefactor and friend, cannot go unmentioned.

Many people tell us today that we are in an age of crisis.

The crisis of war: How much blood may a human being shed for justice' sake?

The crisis of race: Where dare a human being draw the color line?

The crisis of sex: What may two human beings do in the name of love?

The crisis of poverty: How long must two fifths of the world go hungry?

The crisis of religion: At what point does worship become heresy or idolatry?[2]

These are vital issues indeed. But at this moment in history there is a concern more crucial and more basic than any of these. The most critical issue of all is not bombs, not skin, not morals, not food, not even the church. It is the crisis of God. How does the man of today touch his God? How does God touch him?[3]

It seems appropriate then, to explore the contributions of a religiously committed college in a pluralistic society.

It is my thesis this morning that colleges like Loras have a unique contribution to make to modern society: to the welfare of this state, this nation, and to all mankind. This is done:

By exercising man's highest faculty, his intellect; and

By extending the horizons of learning in the pursuit of truth.

Such schools as Loras are not anachronisms. They are special assets, and we should encourage their presence. And it is the primary duty of the president, I believe, to lead such an institution toward that fulfillment.

A religiously committed college does not stunt man's growth, nor blind his vision. On the contrary, such a college expands growth and vision:

By widening the base of learning;

By strengthening man to face the moral crisis of his time;

By probing the depths of man's commitment that lie beneath all denominational or secular allegiance.

Loras College has a commitment to its faith. This it can neither deny nor evade. But faith does not destroy truth; it reveals it. Faith does not lower learning; it opens it to new possibilities. It directs man's mind to the world of God as well as to the world of man.

It is a serious responsibility of such an institution to illumine and reaffirm the great God-created values of man: the ideals of truth and beauty, freedom and justice, mercy and love, the centrality of the *spiritual life.* This college must ever interpret to her students, as no institution can, the meaning of sin, suffering, destructive hate, and redemptive love.

The exclusion of such values in education, in my judgment, is fatal. Is not all education at once an intellectual, moral, and sacred enterprise? Is not every effort to fulfill the individual a sanctified or sacred effort as well as a humane one? Are not the words of the *Pastoral Constitution on The Church in the Modern World* applicable: "Whoever follows Christ, the perfect man, becomes himself more a man." (n. 41)?

And here I emphasize that I am not unmindful of the obvious issue of separation of Church and State. I firmly believe in that principle. But in the words of the distinguished president of St. Olaf's College, Northfield, Dr. Sidney A. Rand, while I believe in "institutional separation of Church and State," I likewise believe in "operational interaction of these two institutions." This outlook was the prevailing view of the Congress of the United States in passing the Elementary, Secondary, and Higher Education Acts. And I believe the passage of these acts has gone a long way to prevent what Dr. Rand calls the "growth of a new religion (the religion of the state) as the chief fact of life," or on the other hand [of allowing] the assumption that all religion is unimportant and should fade from prominence in public life. "In either case," he concludes, "it could be said that anything like the traditional debate about Church-State relationships is passe and better forgotten." [4]

---

[1] Cf. William C. McInnes, S.J. "The Religious University in a Pluralistic Society," *Presidential Address, Fairfield University,* October 24, 1964.

[2] Walter J. Burghardt, S.J. "The Future of Theology." *Guide,* August-September 1967.

[3] *Ibidem.*

We need diversity in education, whether it be at the elementary, secondary, or higher levels. Diversity has made this nation great. We see it everywhere around us: in the dress people wear, in the hair styles they keep, in the political parties they promote (here on the state), in the life of students and faculty themselves. Certainly, we need diversity and freedom in educational organization if we are to maintain the liberties and values of this nation. For by way of contrast we see what has happened in Iron Curtain countries of the Soviet Union and East Germany. To look for a nonpublic school in either nation is to invite suspicion or amusement.

But diversity is a value in education only if different schools exist and flourish, only if they are encouraged and assisted. When a church-related college is hampered or is closed for financial reasons, there is real danger of the loss of diversity.

People of diverse educational backgrounds have worked together to make strong our America; and today I most earnestly invite the leaders of public and nonpublic education to engage in more discussion and dialogue on these problems, to be open and to probe every aspect of the issue. I suggest we give serious consideration to the 1967 recommendations of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, when it proposed that: Universities and educational associations should sponsor symposiums to explore the advantages, appropriate procedures, and possible pitfalls of establishing educational competition.

The distinguished U.S. Chamber of Commerce also recommended that: Local, state and federal governments should consider legislation which would enable communities to adopt programs establishing a public-private option for all children.[5]

The twenty-four non-state colleges of Iowa had an enrollment last year of approximately 38,000 students as compared to 40,000 enrolled in the three state colleges.

I submit that Iowa will be a greater state if somehow it finds the way to assist the students of these twenty-four colleges, in twenty-four different communities they serve, than if it continues to ignore them and make it economically and educationally impossible for the students to attend these institutions.

The graduates of these schools have assisted mightily toward the building up of this state, and just as the federal government has found the way to assist the students of these institutions, I maintain that the people of Iowa, through their legislators, should also be assisting them in a similar manner.

A society can expect acceptable behavior from neither youth nor adults if morals and ultimate values are not somehow linked to the educational process. College personnel know all too well "that knowledge is power and that all power carries a fuse for explosion."

A religiously committed college although not guaranteeing responsible student behavior, offers an insight into the basic grounds of responsibility. A religiously dedicated institution, for example, should be able to reply forthrightly to the nine o'clock rally that is heralded by the shrill cry: *"We want booze!"*

What Howard Mumford Jones, Harvard Professor of the Humanities, said on the occasion of the inauguration of the president of Wellesley College is particularly applicable to religiously oriented colleges:

"The college should be in the world but not of it. It is a vantage point, not a billboard, a house of intellect through whose wide windows the turmoil and the violence of even this violent age can be appraised on principles more lasting than the shifting passions of the hour."

Admission [to college] is a privilege to be granted, not a right to be demanded.[6]

This does not imply a lessening of the student's rights. Rather, it means that the admitted student acquires *new rights* and *new responsibilities*.

His principal right, says Professor Jones, is that he be treated gravely. "To maintain the college as a fortress against anarchy to keep it a place where the great tradition of learning can be glimpsed and in some sense mastered even by beginners—this is the high and difficult task of a college president in a world of propaganda and polemic." [7]

The president knows it is difficult to motivate students today. They often shun commitment. They play it "cool." We dare not ask them to give up a meal, least of all, a weekend. Yet, they do respond to ideals they grasp, and they will dedicate themselves to causes in which they can become involved.

I realize that students cannot be forced to be divine; they cannot even be forced to be human. But they must be both. The college, though not a church, must open new paths to God and man. A religiously oriented college in no way supplants a church. But it does afford a new opportunity to express basic love and commitment through theological reflection.

It is prayer and reflection that makes students human and leads them to the divine. Reflection extends the students far beyond themselves, and a singular work of Loras College is to engage the students in reflection on the meaning of history: to summon them to search for the meaning of the events in which they are engaged; in brief, to find new depths to their existence.

In face of such responsibility and mystique, the inauguration of a president of this renowned college becomes a community celebration and not a coronation.

We celebrate the extension of God rather than the pretension of man. We have no pride, only gratitude to God. We dedicate ourselves in the motto of this college, *Pro Deo et Patria*.

The dedication that I would like to proclaim in behalf of the students and faculty of Loras College is:

Loras College is dedicated to truth. It seeks to widen the horizons of man and the beauty of the universe. It claims no monopoly on truth, but it has a vital interest in all truth: in the world's dust as well as in man's destiny; in man's reason as well as in God's mystery.[8]

This college declares anew its religious commitment. It is certain that it can make its greatest contribution to the city of man and the city of God by unfolding the mystery of faith rather than by denying it.

Wholeheartedly I state that Loras College accepts this role in the community of man. It seeks not to be a privileged institution: only to be a major contributor. It has a gift to give, the gift of intellect.

Loras College pledges that gift to preserve what is best of its past, and to explore what is most needed for the future. In doing so, I pray that the wind of the Holy Spirit will continue to blow across the Loras we love. God bless you.

"EDUCATION FOR THE WORLD OF TOMORROW"—ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN C. CULVER

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Special Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee, I am particularly concerned with the problem of providing quality education for young Americans. Nothing can be more important to our future strength and progress as a nation, and the Congress has recognized its obligation in this field in passing innovative legislation to aid in the education of elementary, secondary, and college students and to help in the construction of additional academic facilities.

Because the Congress appropriately does have an expanded role today in education, it is critical that we give increased attention to the question of where education should be directed best to meet the challenges of the future.

Last weekend, the oldest college in the State of Iowa, Loras College in Dubuque, inaugurated its 19th president, Msgr. Justin A. Driscoll. At that time, our distinguished colleague from Iowa, Congressman John Culver, was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree "in recognition of his dedication to Iowa and to the Nation, and of his qualities of integrity and statesmanship."

On that same occasion, Congressman Culver participated in an academic symposium, where he delivered a speech on "Education for the World of Tomorrow." Mr. Culver is well qualified to address himself to this subject, having been educated in the Iowa public schools, Harvard College, Emanuel College in Cambridge, England, and the Harvard Law School.

His remarks are both provocative and relevant to our consideration of the question in the committee and on the floor. I would therefore like to bring his address to the attention of the House, and ask unanimous consent that it be included at this point in the Record:

Education for the World of Tomorrow

(An address by Congressman John C. Culver at Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa, October 20, 1967)

Archbishop Byrne, Monsignor Driscoll, Reverend fathers, sisters, distinguished platform guests, faculty, students, and guests of Loras College, to participate in the ceremonies inaugurating your president and to receive recognition from Loras College is a very great honor. To be invited to join this symposium is an added pleasure, though I bring to it less of the scholarly and spiritual competencies of Dr. Littell and Father Greeley.

As one who only a few years ago completed his own program of formal education at law school, I must applaud the generous reversal of academic procedure at this college. I received my degree—apparently without conditions—this morning. I am only asked to take this oral examination in the afternoon. It is the first time I have encountered such liberality in academic administration. Needless to say I am grateful to become an accredited member of the Loras community in so accelerated and painless a fashion. I hope my remarks will not place me in any probationary status.

---

[4] Dr. Sidney A. Rand, "Ways Through the Wall," *Address at Wartburg Academy*, Dubuque, Iowa, July, 1967.

[5] Report of U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 1967.

[6] Howard Mumford Jones, "The College and The World," *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, November 12, 1966.

[7] *Ibidem*

[8] McInnes, *op. cit.*

I have been asked to explore a promethean theme—"education for the world of tomorrow". In approaching this formidable task I shall try to heed the caution of a great philosopher, "nothing is so firmly believed as what we least know." What credentials I possess as an educator spring very largely from the perspective I have had as a member of Congress at a time when it has enacted the most significant legislative programs for education in all our history.

Never has there been such a cumulative and concentrated attention by elected politicians to the broad spectrum of educational needs than there has been during the immediate past.

During the two Congresses in which I have served education has had a dominant place. And there will probably be few Congresses in the years ahead when this will not be true.

For nearly a century after the path-breaking establishment of the land grant college system in the Morrill Act of 1862, Federal laws directly affecting education were a rarity. During World War One, Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act to help states in programs of vocational education. The aftermath of World War II saw the enactment of the G.I. Bill of Rights which greatly enlarged individual opportunity for higher education. In the searching analysis of national needs and deficiencies that followed Sputnik, the National Defense Education Act sought to improve the quality of training and the range of opportunity in critical areas of science, language, and specialized areas of research. To be sure, defense and atomic research and development, as well as new institutions such as the National Science Foundations, influenced education—but these were heavily concentrated in a small number of large institutions of higher learning.

What has happened in the 1960's is wholly different by any measurement and by any perspective—Federal, State, local, or private—education has come to play a role which is much more than marginally or incrementally different from all that came before. There has been a genuine revolution whose end is not yet in sight.

If we look back less than seven years to 1960, and ahead less than eight years to 1975, we can easily see the magnitude of the change in numbers:

Since 1960 pre-school enrollment has almost doubled: by 1975 it will almost have tripled at seven million.

Elementary school population, which is the steadiest, will still have increased five million in 15 years.

Secondary school enrollment will rise to 17 million in 1975, whereas it was 9.6. million in 1960 and is 13.7 million today.

Attendance in institutions of higher education rises most steeply—from 4 million in 1960 to 6.5 million today to almost 11 million only 8 years hence.

Our Nation today has more than 57 million students, more than 2½ million teachers, more than 125,000 separate institutions, more than 200,000 educational administrators.

These statistics tell but part of the story. About 5 years ago we reached another divide: For the first time there were more people employed in serving rather than manufacturing jobs. The white collar superceded the blue collar. With a greatly accelerated rate of knowledge and technology and with the shortening of time between discovery and actual production of a new product or process we can anticipate that by 1975 ¾ of our working population will be producing goods and services that have not yet been developed.

Indeed, we can go still further. Since 1960 we have had a larger education than labor force, if we calculate all those engaged in full or part time education or labor re-training or significant adult and employee training. Though one cannot be absolutely precise, there was a rough equivalence between the labor and learning forces in 1960; in 1975 the learning force will be more than 50% the larger.

All expenditures for education—public and private—now just exceed 52 billion. This approaches 7% of our gross national product. In dollar terms this is almost a five fold increase in 15 years and double in the percentage of the gross national product.

These are inescapable and irreversible trends. As Daniel Bell has pointed out, "the ganglion of our society is knowledge". We are the first nation in human history in which more than half of the employed population is not involved in the production of food, clothing, houses, automobiles, or tangible goods. We are the first society in which professional and technical employment exceeds 10% and will rise to 15% in but ten years.

And ours is the country in all history which has most responded and prospered from the spur of innovation, of widely diffused, and anticipated change. The place which the university has as a central institution for setting goals, channeling change, and training in this setting is perfectly evident. The resilience and creative adaptions which our colleges and universities have made is a remarkable part of this story. Loras has shared in this adventure.

But for this college and for most others the next decade will become even more demanding and place an even greater strain on your qualities of leadership and human ingenuity.

For education is no longer confined to the ivy covered buildings of the college campuses—but has expanded into every aspect of American life.

Students no longer study social causes and changes from text books alone—they are an active agent in those causes and those changes.

They no longer sit in only the classrooms and learn about political history—they march in Alabama and register voters in Mississippi.

They are no longer content with the established regulations and received traditions alone, they wish to test their validity and have a voice in their adoption to present circumstance.

As the student examines his society from this new perspective, he becomes more aware of its failures, and the failure of traditional text book concepts to come to grips with the problems which he sees.

And at the same time that these frustrations are building, he is being administered what John Gardner the secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has penetratingly described as "the anti-leadership vaccine".

At the very point in our history when we most need imaginative, creative leadership, we are too often immunizing many of our most gifted young people against any disposition to assume leadership.

"The young person today", says Mr. Gardner, "is acutely aware of the fact that he is an anonymous member of a mass society, an individual lost among millions of others. The processes by which leadership is exercised are not visible to him, and he is bound to believe that they are exceedingly intricate. Very little in his experience encourages him to think that he might someday exercise a role of leadership."

But instead of overcoming this undertow away from leadership, a college education may only reenforce it.

The more a young person is indoctrinated into the settled attitude and frozen techniques of his chosen profession or life study, the less he is directed to the larger and emergent problems with which a true leader must be concerned, and the less interested he becomes in leadership as such. He develops skills—as a scholar, a scientist, or a professional person—which make him more capable of leadership only in the very narrowest sense—superior skill within his own limited field.

As a result, Mr. Gardner says, "the academic world appears to be approaching a point at which everyone will want to educate the technical expert who advises the leader, or the intellectual who stands off and criticizes the leader, but no one will want to educate the leader himself."

The college must guard against the trend of educating too many experts to advise and criticize and too few leaders to lead and mobilize.

The result too often is a disaffection from the established institutions of our society, a retreat to the politics of protest instead of action, alienation and withdrawal rather than involvement—a contagious escapism.

I do not intend to suggest that colleges are the principal culprits or the principal cures for our national failures. They are but one of the vital agencies for social change and human betterment.

Nor do I believe that student protest has an unerring instinct for either truth or reform. Some of it is frivolous: some of it is imitative: some of it is shallow in its perceptions.

Nor do I ask that colleges be responsive to every gust of change, to each headline in the morning paper, to every cry of alarm from either the politician or the expert. Learning for its own sake, detached judgement, and continuity are still values to be prized in our colleges.

But I do say that our leading colleges and universities must give their students and communities an appreciation for the contour lines of social change and for the mainsprings of danger and need.

There is little doubt that the highest need we have now—and will continue to have—is a better understanding of our urban society. We need to know more about its tensions, the quality of life within cities, the ways in which cities, large and small, can better absorb and guide the inevitable changes of this decade and the next ones.

Yet, as Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, the archbishop of Washington pointed out in a pastoral letter this summer:

"As Christians, our efforts . . . have been feeble. Our support of desperately needed programs . . . has been far less than adequate. Our education system throughout the Nation moves at a snail's pace in its faltering effort to readjust to the rapidly changing situation in our crowded urban centers."

Congress must assume its share of the blame for the present situation. It would be bad enough if we had done nothing at all. But to start programs like the War on Poverty, the Teachers Corps, or Rent Supplements, and then to refuse to fund them adequately once we have aroused expectations, only further intensifies very legitimate frustrations. And this represents the real crisis—fear which breeds resentment, a resentment which feeds even greater hostility, a failure of understanding and communication.

How did it happen, in a Nation built on traditions of justice and opportunity?

From the point of view of the average American, the Negro has seen steady and continuous progress. In a relatively short period of time, the entire structure of discriminatory legislation has been torn down. Negro Americans have entered the professions, the Cabinet, and now the Supreme Court. And the taxpayer himself has paid for poverty programs, education, job training, and urban renewal.

He asks himself then, what reason can there be for violence, or frustration, or dissatisfaction with present progress. But, for the young man in the ghetto, that progress is not very significant.

He is no longer in servitude, but he has only about one chance out of three of getting a job that pays as much as $60 a week.

He can vote, but even if he has been able to stay in high school and earn his diploma, he very likely has only the equivalent of an eighth grade education in Dubuque.

He can eat at the same lunch counter as a white man, but he probably has only 70¢ a day to spend on food.

Somehow, if progress is to have meaning, we must bridge the communication gap between the inner city and the suburbs, between rural and urban America, so as to develop public understanding and compassion which can be translated into positive action. It is in this task that the college is an indispensable link and can play a crucial mediating role.

I am not just talking about training priests or social workers—although it is essential that they have this understanding and compassion.

I am talking about developing these attitudes in the engineers, the chemists, the doctors, the accountants who will be the voters and taxpayers and opinion makers upon whom our progress as a nation will depend.

I contend that we have no more to fear from the hippies and the protest marchers, who have assessed the problems of our society and have withdrawn, or gone into sterile rebellion, than we do from upstanding young men and women who are abiding by the rules, learning their physics, or business administration, or mechanical drawing, and going out to assume their roles in society with *no personal concern* about the problems of their less advantaged fellow Americans and about the cities in which they work.

Without abandoning or distorting its search for excellence, or its independence, the college and university can contribute importantly in this search. It can teach the students to be challenged and stimulated by the ambiguity of our society, not, in David Reisman's phrase, "threatened with complexity." Progress depends on compromise and students must be lead to the ability to cope with problems for which there are no wholly satisfactory solutions in the short-run.

It can re-direct itself toward the development of generalists in an age of specialization. More than anything else, our society needs today the man who can be the skilled professional, yet is not imprisoned by his subjects or calling. A sense of relevance, a capacity to observe trends and needs outside one's special field, a vision of larger issues need not be the casualties of our specialized age. And finally, colleges and universities must critically evaluate their resources and capacities for meeting the growing pressures of an urban civilization. No one college can span the whole panorama of urban crisis, but there is hardly any which cannot make a distinctive contribution if it seeks to. Each college must discover where ITS strength lies, what IT can do, where IT can stimulate creative responses, where IT can be relevant.

But equally colleges can no longer be isolated, either from their communities or from each other. Whenever possible colleges must develop productive associations: in common access to university facilities, in arrangements which permit interchange of students in special fields, in consortia which will make feasible graduate or special training beyond the resources of a single college, in common systems of information retrieval and storage when this becomes economical and available not many years from now.

In turn, our private colleges have a right to look to business for greater support in the years ahead. Corporate help to the private college has not reached its potential, especially in smaller and newer universities in the city. The frontier of the city is critical for business. Both self-interest and public interest should lead business to a greater support of independent colleges.

The Federal Government, in its turn, will continue to give an important but not commanding share of support to higher education in various ways. But it, too, must be vigilantly self-critical so that a balance is maintained in our patterns of education and that inertia and habit do not become the sole arbitrators. There is all too great a tendency for assistance to flow to a few institutions, in a few regions, in a few fields. Defense, space, and atomic energy, for example, absorb more that ⅔ of all the trained people available for the exploration of our scientific and technological frontiers. In contrast there are but a few persons directing their energies to finding better technologies for low cost housing, to the economics of poverty, to the aesthetics and amenities of city life.

A Congressman can offer to a college only the advice of the amateur. He is somewhat in the situation of the old football coach whose system was described as "punt and pray." But the student and the teacher in the university or college have the opportunity to think reflectively and deeply about the decisive questions of our age. It is here that the first impulses for change and responsible action most commonly are aroused. It is here that knowledge is unified and complexity subdued.

That is why the American people expect so much from their insitutions of learning. That is why it looks to them for relivency and initiative. That is why we value their unwavering commitment to truth.

If there is any certainty about the world of tomorrow, it is that this reliance will grow.

ADDRESS BY PAUL C. WARNKE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS—ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Nedzi] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, recently, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Paul C. Warnke, appeared before the Advocates Club of Detroit and delivered an extremely penetrating address on a topic of most serious concern to all the world, the antiballistic missile. Secretary Warnke, in lucid and logical terms, outlined and reviewed the reasons behind the decisions of our Government in this regard and made it obvious that we continue to seek an understanding with the Soviet Union in order to avoid ascending to another level in a mutually costly arms race. While this new weapons system is oriented toward a Chinese threat, he also expressed our desires for an understanding with the Chinese in this horribly vexatious area.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this excellent statement for the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

Remarks of Paul C. Warnke, Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs, Before the Advocates Club, Detroit, Mich., October 6, 1967

At the start, I'd like to express appreciation and apology. Appreciation, of course, for the opportunity to be with you tonight and to share in your fellowship. Apology, for the fact that, inescapably, I'm cast as the skeleton at the feast.

But this is the risk that any group accepts when it invites a speaker from the Department of Defense. We deal necessarily with the implements of death. And today the implements of death are no longer reasonably selective but instead are the frighteningly impersonal instruments of mass destruction.

In recent talks in Washington a high official of an Asian country observed that: "The world is governed by the logic of deterrence." This got me to thinking. And I concluded that the statement, like so many oriental axioms, had a great deal of merit.

As has already been explained, my training and background is that of a lawyer. Accordingly, I have had day-to-day experience with the fact that adherence to the laws that are essential to the preservation of an ordered society turns largely on two kinds of motivation. One is the voluntary recognition by responsible members of society that its ability to function depends on conformity to the rules that protect both person and property. But responsible individuals never make up the totality of any population. Other elements can be compelled to comply with the basic laws only because they are deterred from anti-social conduct. Deterrence exists in the likelihood that deviation from society's rules will lead to punishment. And the surer that punishment, obviously, the stronger the deterrent becomes. As the likelihood of punishment diminishes, the likelihood that the laws will be flouted by irresponsible individuals obviously will increase. This inverse ratio is what has stimulated the lively debate as to whether our courts have gone too far in seeking to assure the Constitutional rights of those accused of crime. Concern about individual liberties admittedly detracts from the certainty that the guilty will be punished. But it also protects those mistakenly charged with crime and prevents the distortion of our free society into a police state.

Without getting further into a debate outside my present field, I would note that fear of punishment can never deter all criminal conduct. There is, in any population, a residuum of individuals who cannot be expected to adhere to the rules of organized society either from innate responsibility or from apprehension that departure from them will result in punishment. There are individuals who, because of mental incapacity or a desperate conviction that they have nothing to lose, will stumble into criminal behavior or will seek determinedly to tear at the fabric of the society in which they find no place. This last phenomenon—of which you in this city have special knowledge—underlies the riots that have troubled our internal serenity during the past few years. Other crimes of course result when normally law-abiding persons are prey to panic or passion that overcomes both their normal responsibility and the fear of punishment.

Tonight I would like to discuss with you the implications of these universal principles to the field of international security. Because, as I see it, the logic of deterrence that permits any particular society to function applies as well in the sphere of international relations.

In the world community, the generality of nations conduct themselves responsibly because they recognize that their mutual interest is served by the responsible conduct of world affairs. A few, regrettably, may have to be deterred from aggressive efforts to better their own position at the expense of their neighbors. Today, we possess a deterrent force that permits certain response in sudden, sure and shattering strength. By all the logic of deterrence, therefore, fear of reprisal should be sufficient to make us safe from nuclear attack from any source.

Yet, as you know, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara announced last month that the United States had decided to deploy a system of anti-ballistic missiles designed to protect against the possible Chinese threat.

This decision, of course, has very substantial implications for the area of my responsibility as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. I would like therefore to consider with you this evening the likely impact of our deployment on international security.

In particular, I want to talk about the likely impact of this deployment upon our efforts to maintain the security of Asia.

In addition, I will discuss its bearing on our efforts to negotiate a treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and to secure an agreement on the limitation of offensive and defensive strategic systems with the Soviet Union.

I would like to stress that, contrary to the charges of some critics, this decision to deploy resulted solely from a careful consideration of the security interests of the United States and its allies. Outside and unrelated pressures were not a consideration. The positive advantages of the deployment, which I will discuss in a moment, seemed to us to make the decision to proceed a prudent, though close, choice.

Secretary McNamara has made clear his strong opposition to attempting to deploy an ABM system designed to protect our cities against a large Soviet attack. He is opposed, not because he does not want to protect our cities, but because of his belief, which I share completely, that this is not possible, that the Soviets would respond to our deployment in ways which would leave our cities still exposed. The deployment thus would not increase our security.

Secretary McNamara's consistent and determined public opposition to a Soviet-oriented ABM system has led to the misconception that he has been opposed to any ABM deployment. In fact, the Defense Department has been giving close consideration to the question of a Chinese-oriented ABM deployment for some time. Let me just remind you briefly about what we have said previously on this question.

Secretary McNamara first noted the need to consider the possibility of a small nuclear attack on the United States by a nation other than the Soviet Union in February 1965. In his posture statement to the Congress for the coming fiscal year, he identified the risk of such attack as emanating from Communist China. However, he stated that the "lead time for that nation to develop and deploy an effective ballistic missile system capable of reaching the United States is greater than we require to deploy the defense."

The following year, in Mr. McNamara's posture statement to Congress in February 1966, reflected his encouragement at the technical progress being made in the development of the ABM subsystem, particularly the long-range interceptor missiles. It also recorded his judgment that the system could be effective against the foreseeable Chinese threat. I quote him:

"Initially, the deployment concept for NIKE X contemplated the point defense of only a relatively small number of the larger cities against a heavy Soviet attack. Subsequently, as I described last year, it became feasible to consider extending protection to smaller cities by modifying certain NIKE X subsystems and using less extensive and sophisticated deployments. Even this concept, however, still left most of the country vulnerable to great damage even from a small attack deliberately designed to avoid our defended cities.

"This situation has now been changed significantly by the emergence of the possibility of developing an area missile defense based upon the use of long-range interceptor missiles which I mentioned previously. Against a relatively light attack, such as the Chinese Communists may be able to mount in the mid-to-late 1970's, an area defense might be very effective, offering the possibility of avoiding any substantial damage."

However, a production decision was not then deemed necessary. At background briefings and press conferences in November and December 1966, following the Chinese explosion of a nuclear weapon in a missile, Mr. McNamara maintained his position on the timing of a decision to deploy an ABM system to defend against the Communist Chinese threat.

We have delayed any decision until now, because one was not needed until now. During the interim, research and development on the Chinese-oriented system continued and the system has been greatly improved. However, the point in time has now been reached when we had to make the decision to deploy if we were to have a system in the field by the time the Chinese could begin to deploy ICBM's. The Chinese could test an ICBM as early as this year and they could have an ICBM capability of some significance by the mid-1970's. Since it will take us five years to deploy our defensive system, we need to begin now if we are to have our defense ready before the Chinese are capable of an attack against the United States.

I have frequently been asked, over the last several weeks, whether our deployment of an ABM system oriented against mainland China does not represent a step backward from our stated desire to try and build bridges to China. Some have suggested that the decision represents an exaggerated view of the actual threat which China poses to the United States and our friends and allies in Asia. I believe that close examination of our motivation in deploying a Chinese-oriented ABM system shows these views to be incorrect. A basic element in our approach to relations with the people of mainland China remains that stated in the President's State-of-the-Union Message. There he said:

"We shall continue to hope for a reconciliation between the people of mainland China and the world community—including cooperation in all the tasks of arms control, security, and progress on which the fate of the Chinese people, like the rest of us, depends.

"We would be the first to welcome a China which had decided to respect her neighbors' rights. We would be the first to applaud were she to concentrate her great energies and intelligence on improving the welfare of her own people. And we have no intention of trying to deny her legitimate needs for security and friendly relations with neighboring countries."

Our ABM deployment will in no way interfere with these efforts. We continue to hope that China will evolve in a way which will make better relations with the leaders in Peking possible, not only on arms control matters but on a broad range of issues.

While hoping for changes in Chinese behavior, we have sought to analyze Peking's current views and attitudes which might affect their use of their developing nuclear capability. We see no reason to conclude that the Chinese are any less cautious than the rulers of other nations that have nuclear weapons. Nor do we believe that Peking is at all ignorant of the effects of nuclear weapons. On the contrary, we believe that the Chinese leaders understand the devastation which the use of nuclear weapons by China could bring to the mainland of China itself. Indeed the Chinese have shown a disposition to act cautiously, and to avoid any military clash with the United States that could lead to nuclear war.

In light of this view of China, then, why did we conclude that a Chinese-oriented ABM system makes sense?

I think one way to approach this question is to consider a hypothetical world without the Soviet Union. In that case, I believe that few would think our decision required much in the way of explanation. Hostile action by China is, unfortunately, not totally inconceivable; and nations have always deployed those defensive systems which could blunt an offensive attack from a possible enemy. If we can create, for a sum well within our means, a system which will greatly reduce if not eliminate the casualties we might receive from a Chinese attack, logic and prudence require that we do so.

Of course the Soviet nuclear force does exist; and, as Mr. McNamara pointed out in San Francisco, one of our major concerns in proceeding with this deployment was that it not trigger an acceleration of the strategic arms race with the Soviet Union. Because of this possible danger—which I wish to return to briefly at the end of my talk—we might well have concluded not to proceed with the deployment without some more specific reason to believe that it would enhance our own security and that of our friends and allies in Asia.

What then is the specific reason that led us to go ahead?

My answer to this question might begin by reemphasis that the cornerstone of our efforts to maintain the security of Asia is our ability to deter aggression. Our fundamental strategy remains deterrence and I want to make it clear that our decision to deploy a China-oriented ABM system is wholly consonant with this strategy. The obligations of the United States in Asia stem most specifically and most importantly from our treaty commitments with a number of Asian nations. In addition, at the time of the first Chinese nuclear detonation in 1963, President Johnson declared that: "Nations that do not seek national nuclear weapons can be sure that, if they need our strong support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it."

I have no doubt that the United States would honor these assurances, whether or not we deployed an ABM system. Our European allies have come to understand that the United States has both the will and the capability to deter Soviet aggression in Europe, even though the United States cannot achieve a credible first-strike capability that would prevent Soviet response, and even though American society—but not US strategic forces—would be destroyed in a Soviet attack. Against the much reduced Chinese capability, there should be no doubt as to the credibility of our deterrent.

But despite this, some speculation had developed in Asia, and perhaps also in Peking, as to whether, when Chinese ICBM's were targeted on American cities, the United States would shirk its responsibilities in Asia. Some asked, for example, if the United States would really be willing to risk Detroit to save a small Asian nation. Similar questions had been asked by our European allies as the Soviet nuclear delivery capability grew. As we have learned in Europe, we must be prepared to run risks if our assurances are to have any credibility. But doubts did exist and we concluded that a Chinese-oriented ABM system could serve a valuable role in removing these doubts. In deploying this system, we seek to emphasize the present unique disparity in strategic nuclear capability and technology between the US and China and to extend well into the future the credibility of our option for a nuclear response.

Our deployment will substantially reduce the Chinese Communist capability to threaten American cities and should leave, neither Asia in general nor the Chinese in particular, with any uncertainty as to whether or not the United States would act to prevent the Chinese from gaining any political or military advantage from their nuclear forces. We recognize that this deployment by itself would not be sufficient. The United States will continue to need to act in ways which make clear the credibility of our deterrent. And both we and Asian nations have to continue to maintain the necessary conventional forces to deal with lesser threats. But we believe our ABM deployment is an important, useful step. Hopefully the China-oriented ABM system will also help buy the time within which other political, economic, and social forces can be at work to bring China into responsible participation in an international community. We fully intend to help these forces do their work.

This, then, is how we believe the deployment of the Chinese-oriented ABM system will impact upon our efforts to maintain the security of Asia. What about the physical security of the United States itself?

Secretary McNamara referred, in his speech, to the possibility of Chinese miscalculation, and in a later interview with Life Magazine he made clear that his concern is with the situation in which there is the danger of a pre-emptive attack. Let me explain briefly what our concern is. In a crisis which they had brought on, if the Chinese came to believe that the United States might attack, they might be tempted to launch a pre-emptive strike, hoping to bring down at least a part of the American house in the face of the total destruction, or even only the destruction of their nuclear forces, which at the moment of crisis they feared we were about to wreak upon them. No matter how miscalculating or irrational such an act might seem—and I did say earlier we believe the Chinese leaders to be no less cautious than the rulers of other nations that possess nuclear weapons—under the current circumstances it is not impossible. This danger will pass when China develops, as the Soviets have done, a secure second strike capability. In the interim, we decided that as long as it was within our technical capability to provide an effective defense against this danger, prudence seemed to dictate that we deploy that defense which would further deter the Chinese from pre-empting, and eliminate or greatly reduce our casualties should they engage in such an act.

I am sometimes asked whether China could not nullify our defense by smuggling a bomb into the United States in a suitcase, or blowing up a junk off the California coast. Such activity is, unfortunately, technically feasible, although the magnitude of the potential destruction is not comparable to a missile attack. Moreover, we believe such action is extremely unlikely. As I have suggested, we do not view the Chinese as basically irrational. The suitcase bomb would require the Chinese, in the absence of an immediate crisis, to decide in advance that they wish to destroy an American city, knowing full well the retaliation which would follow. Such behavior seems to us totally unlikely. What our defense is directed toward, as I have said, is the possibility that at the height of a crisis the Chinese leadership might panic and press the button. Our ABM deployment will guard against that contingency, improbable though it too may be.

Of all the possible implications of our ABM deployment, none concerned me more than its impact on our efforts to negotiate a nonproliferation treaty—or NPT—designed to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. We analyzed very carefully the likely impact of a deployment on the on-going negotiations relating to the NPT. We came to the conclusion that our Chinese-oriented ABM deployment should make it easier, and not harder, for countries in Asia to sign the NPT. The increased credibility of the United States deterrent, which we expect to result from our deployment, should make even clearer the lack of any need for independent national nuclear forces in Asia. If any country in the area has been tempted to develop a nuclear capability because of a fear that we would cease to deter China, our actions should have removed these uncertainties.

One concern in regard to the NPT has related to the question of equality in obligation. The non-nuclear nations have been asserting, quite understandably, that the United States and the Soviet Union should demonstrate a willingness to move toward nuclear disarmament if they are asking the other nations of the world to forego the manufacture of nuclear weapons. Both we and the Soviets have accepted this obligation, and the language of the draft treaty reflects that commitment. However, that commitment does not mean, and I do not believe that other countries would want it to mean, that the United States would refrain from taking all steps that might improve our deterrent against China until China, herself, is prepared to enter into satisfactory arms limitation agreements. I believe our Chinese-oriented ABM deployment meets this criteria.

An additional cardinal point is that this ABM deployment does not signify in any way a change in our attitude toward the Soviet Union. Our view of that relation can be briefly summarized.

The relationship between any two great powers whose interests and activities are as far-reaching as those of the United States and the Soviet Union must necessarily be complex, a mixture of cooperation and conflict. During the first decade after World War II, the U.S.-Soviet relationship was primarily one of conflict. But in recent years, despite areas of deep disagreement—Vietnam and Germany are some examples—the necessity of co-existing in a highly armed world has led us to cooperate where we have interests in common.

Most important of these common interests is the need to prevent nuclear war. Each of us now has the ability to destroy the other's society. This is the most awesome power that men have ever possessed. We do not fear that the present leaders in the Kremlin, or any foreseeable successors, will employ recklessly or irresponsibly the vast resources of destructive capability which they possess. Similarly, we think that we have given them ample evidence that they need fear no such behavior on our part. The costs of nuclear irresponsibility would be too great.

For this reason, another interest we share with them is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. This interest is not wholly altruistic: we are concerned not only that new possessors of nuclear weapons may employ them against each other, or against a non-nuclear state; we see an even greater danger in the possibility that the use of nuclear weapons by a third country could precipitate a war which would end in a nuclear exchange between the two so-called Superpowers. In our view, and I would think in that of the Soviet Union as well, each additional nuclear power increases the possibility of nuclear war, by design, by miscalculation, or even by accident.

The U.S. and the USSR have a third related interest: that of reducing the vast amounts of resources which each of us now devotes to military forces and to military hardware. That other and more rewarding uses can be made of these resources is so self-evident, despite the over-all prosperity of American society, that it demands no elaboration. The same is true, to an even greater degree, in the Soviet Union. Similarly, for the health of the world we inhabit, both we and the Russians should be devoting more of our national wealth to improving conditions of life within the less-developed countries.

Our decision to deploy a Chinese-oriented ABM system reflects no lack of concern about what Secretary McNamara called the "mad momentum" of the nuclear arms race. But because our proposed deployment poses no possible threat to the Soviet deterrent, it need lead to no acceleration of the Soviet-American strategic arms race.

We will continue to seek cooperation and agreement with the Soviets whenever our interests converge. In particular, we will continue to hope that by parallel actions, or by formal agreement, the two countries can undertake to limit their strategic offensive and defensive forces. There is no reason to believe that our deployment decision makes them any less willing to enter into talks, or to take parallel actions. In fact, although we cannot be sure, the contrary may well be the case. Moreover, should these talks occur, we hope to avoid bogging down in the perennially difficult issue of international inspection.

Since the end of the second world war, the United States has sought an international agreement to end, or at least slow down, the nuclear arms race. The United States has always insisted, and will continue to insist, on adequate verification of any arms control agreement with our potential adversaries. In deciding whether we need an agreed international inspection system, we assess very carefully the capability of our own unilateral verification systems. As you know, the United States agreed to the three environment test ban treaty, with the full concurrence of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the consent of the United States Senate, despite the lack of provisions for international inspection. We did so because we were confident, and remain confident, that we can detect any violations of the treaty by the Soviet Union or any other signer. We have, in fact, accurately detected Chinese and French atmospheric nuclear tests.

In considering any possible agreement with the Soviet Union to level off or reduce strategic offensive and defensive systems, or even the possibility for parallel action on the part of the two countries, we may have to depend on our own unilateral capability for verification. We believe a number of possibilities for parallel action and even for formal agreement with the Soviets would permit our reliance on unilateral means of verification. Other more far-reaching agreements, particularly any involving substantial reductions, would require agreed international inspection. You may be sure that we would not accept any agreement unless we had high confidence in our ability to monitor Soviet compliance, either by unilateral means or by agreed inspection procedures. But you may be sure, also, that we will pursue, with diligence and determination, our efforts to bring the nuclear arms race under control.

For we do not believe that continuation of that nuclear competition is without risk, and that risk lies only in seeking agreement with our potential enemies. We now have lived with danger throughout most or all of our adult years. We recognize that all courses have risks and that it is folly, not prudence, to continue on the path that the world has been following without seeking a better way. The U.S. is fully prepared for an end to the nuclear arms race. For the sake of our own and future generations, we can only hope that neither the attitudes of our adversaries nor the gulf of suspicion which separates us will prevent attainment of the objective which is in our common interest.

It is my belief that the decision to go ahead with an ABM system directed against potential Chinese threat will not retard, but rather will advance our progress toward that objective.

NEW 7-YEAR NOTES BRING HIGHEST INTEREST RATES SINCE 1921

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the U.S. Government, with the world's strongest economy offered to pay 5¾ percent on a 7-year note of $1.5 billion.

This is the highest interest rate offered on a Government security in 46 years—since 1921 in the administration of Warren G. Harding.

Mr. Speaker, this fantastically high interest rate—5¾ percent—is being paid on a brandnew type of Government security—a 7-year note. As my colleagues remember, the House voted on June 21 to change the definition of a Treasury note from 5 years to 7 years. At the time, many of us argued that the lengthening of the definition of a note would lead only to one result—higher interest rates.

Now we have reaped the high cost results of giving the Treasury authority to market 7-year notes.

Obviously, the results of this first sale plainly tells us that the 7-year notes are to be another vehicle for high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for a great Nation like this to pay 5¾ percent on securities fully backed by the credit of our Government. This is just unnecessary gouging of the American taxpayer.

Contrary to some published reports that accompanied the news of this 5¾-percent interest rate, the Federal Reserve System is not meeting its responsibilities in holding down interest rates. The Federal Reserve, if it wanted to operate in the public interest, could support the Government bond market and force down these interest rates. They, of course, are doing the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, when the House considered the debt ceiling legislation in June, we were assured that the approval of the 7-year note would have no effect on interest rates. In other words, the House was led to believe that it could authorize these new notes—which bear no interest ceiling—without requiring the American taxpayers to pay more interest to finance Government borrowings. Mr. Speaker, I quote from page 9 of the Report on the Public Debt Limit, H.R. 10867, as filed by the Ways and Means Committee on June 16, 1967:

> The extension of the definition of U.S. notes to those debt instruments with a maturity of not over 7 years by itself will not have any effect on interest rates, but it will afford the Secretary of the Treasury aid in preventing still further shortening of the maturity of the debt.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the first sale of these notes established the highest interest rates in Government securities in 46 years. I must respectfully suggest that the 7-year note did indeed have effect on interest rates—a pretty tragic effect for the taxpayer who must foot this additional interest cost.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to put an end to this interest rate nonsense. We have already budgeted $14.2 billion for interest payments on the national debt in this fiscal year. This sum, of course, was calculated before we learned that the Treasury would be financing huge chunks of its debt at 5¾ percent interest.

The interest costs are the largest item in the Federal budget outside of expenditures for defense. Mr. Speaker, we must take the action necessary to require the Federal Reserve to lower interest rates and thus lighten the tremendous burden on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the Record an article in this morning's New York Times detailing the Treasury's offering of the 7-year notes:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 26, 1967]

Cost of U.S. Loan Highest Since 1921—Treasury Offering Payment of 5¾ Percent To Sell Notes To Help Cover Deficit

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Washington, October 25.—The Treasury offered today to pay the highest interest rate on a Government security in 46 years—5¾ per cent—to sell a seven-year note to help cover the big deficit in the budget.

The offer of $1.5-billion of the new notes was accompanied by an offer of $10.7-billion of 15-month notes bearing a 5⅝ per cent annual interest rate.

Proceeds from the combined sale of $12.2-billion will be used to pay off $10.2-billion of maturing securities and raise $2-billion cash to meet the Treasury's needs.

The last time a Treasury issue carried an interest rate as high as 5¾ per cent was in an offering of $311-million in June, 1921.

Rates in the money markets have been rising steadily, reflecting a mammoth demand for borrowed funds, including the big demand from the Treasury itself.

MONETARY POLICY EASY

The high rates have not reflected, as in many past periods, a tight money policy by the Federal Reserve Board. To the contrary, monetary policy has been aggressively easy for months, but it has not achieved lower interest rates because of the huge demand for credit.

The $2-billion in new cash to be raised by the offering announced today will bring the total of the Treasury's cash borrowing to more than $16-billion since June 30, apart from replacement of maturing issues.

Frederick L. Deming, Treasury Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, said this would be the last cash offering in this calendar year, but he projected on a "rough" basis the need for an additional $5-billion in the first quarter of 1968. This figure, he said, assumed passage this year of the Administration's proposed tax increase, and it would be larger without the tax increase.

Some of the huge borrowing since mid-year reflects the Treasury's normal seasonal need, which varies with the timing of tax collection. But much of it also stems from the large budget deficit, which will exceed $12-billion even if the tax bill is passed.

TAX RISE HELD VITAL

Although there will be no more new issues by the Treasury this calendar year, Mr. Deming said, the Government does plan to issue $1-billion to $1.5-billion of "participation certificates" before the end of the year. These are shares in pools of Government loans and have the technical effect of reducing recorded expenditures and the deficit in the budget.

Mr. Deming said that without a tax increase the Treasury would have to borrow $20-billion to $22-billion in the current fiscal year, in contrast to no net borrowing at all in the last fiscal year.

This $20-billion to $22-billion, he said, would be piled on top of a credit market that normally supplies only about $70-billion a year to all types of borrowers—from businesses to home buyers.

Thus without the tax increase he said, the Treasury's financing task "could become pretty difficult." He emphasized, however, that the Treasury would always be able to raise what it needed, and that other borrowers would be the sufferers.

The maturing securities involved in today's offering are a 4⅞ per cent note issued in May of last year and a 3½ per cent bond issued in March, 1961.

Of the total maturing of $10.2-billion, all but $2.6-billion are held by the Federal Reserve or other Government investment accounts.

Today's issue will be sold Monday, with payment due Nov. 15. Individuals and financial institutions will put in subscriptions, which are certain to exceed the $12.2-billion offering. Then the Treasury will "allot" subscriptions according to the amount of the excess.

An individual can put in a subscription through his bank or broker, with the smallest denomination of the new securities being $1,000. These small subscriptions are usually allotted in full.

An individual can also wait until the issue has been sold and then purchase the new securities in the market. In that event, he might have to pay a small "premium"—say a total of $1,010 for a $1,000 bond—which would have the effect of reducing his effective interest rate.

DRAFT DODGERS IN WASHINGTON

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the "Protest the War" gathering in Washington on October 21 and 22 has attracted much attention, both in this country and abroad. It has also been widely publicized. My own information about it is derived from this publicity, since I saw no part of it.

What I have seen and read is all in quite close agreement. I am led by this general consistency to believe that both the press and the broadcasters have attempted to be as constrained and accurate as possible, and I want to commend them on this attitude, and to say that they have performed a useful public service.

The picture I get is a gathering of some 50,000 or more people from every section of the Nation. In the main, the whole consisted of two widely differing groups. One group, by far the larger part of the whole, was made up of people whose appearance and conduct offered little ground for criticism, however much one might disagree with their motives. They had a right to be in Washington and have their say.

The other group separated itself from the main body late on the afternoon of October 21, and moved from the Lincoln Memorial across the river to the Pentagon. It consisted of not more than 5,000 individuals—I hesitate to use any more complimentary word. Their appearance and dress are described as disreputable beyond belief in a civilized society. Their language is described as too vile and vicious for any slum gutter. Their behavior made a mockery of their purported "Peace" mission.

The police force needed to restrain this second group had a difficult—and dangerous—task. The pictures and the descriptions available to me indicate that the police used great restraint. There are those who regret this moderation, and I would not be inclined to quarrel with them.

One aspect of this "protest," if that is what it was, may need some careful scrutiny. And that is: Who paid the bill to get this mob into Washington and keep them there approximately 2 days?

The well-dressed group apparently were sufficiently affluent to take care of their own expenses. Many of these were believed to be college students. If they traveled from faraway points, their expenses were undoubtedly heavy. But we may wonder what their parents were thinking of, or if these same parents are disposed to bewail the necessary cost of educating their children. One mother, it is reported, had come with her daughter, and took the trouble to explain what a noble movement the whole affair was. It is reasonable to assume that some, perhaps many, of the college students went along for the lark. That may be the parents' business, and not ours, though it may raise some questions as to the compulsory support of public education.

But as to the other crowd, a far more serious question arises. It is not reasonable to believe that many of them could have assembled the where-withal for a bus ticket to some nearby city. Who paid the toll? Was it some benevolent philanthropist who wanted to see the boys have a good time? Is there some peace organization in this country which collects funds to support movements which may be as illegal as they are disloyal? Or does the money come from the enemies of this Nation whose normal procedures include subversion and disruption?

It is time, in my opinion, to set on foot some investigations which we could depend on to get at the truth by means which the people could trust. I do not know what those means might be. But I do know that such disorders do not subside of themselves. Nor can they be charged to circumstances which involve discrimination. Those who engage in them do not mean well to this Nation, and the attitude of the Government toward them should be neither to ignore them nor to tolerate them.

OIL AND GAS DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the support of our colleagues for the discharge petition filed by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD], to bring his bill to reduce the oil and gas depletion allowance to the floor of the House.

As the sponsor of legislation on this important issue, I feel strongly that Congress has a clear duty to act promptly to close this and other notorious loopholes in our tax structure. On August 10, I wrote Chairman MILLS, proposing that the question of tax reforms be considered by the Ways and Means Committee in conjunction with the forthcoming hearings on the surtax. I pointed out that it was very difficult to convince a citizen of the equality and justice of a system that wrings the last cent of tax from his wages or salary while certain privileged groups evade their proportionate share by various devices which, however justified originally, are now rightly termed "loopholes." There is little risk in today's economy in capital invested in large business enterprises, and the favoritism shown various businesses and industries can no longer be tolerated in our tax structure.

Irrespective of our fiscal conditions, justice and equity would demand that these flagrant inequities be corrected. Our present difficult situation makes such action imperative. Surely it is the better part of wisdom to make each segment of the economy pay its fair share toward keeping our Nation strong and solvent rather than to cut back already inadequate programs dealing with our urban crisis.

The new study of the middle-income family by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveals that, despite the tremendous growth in our economy and better wages and salaries, factory and white-collar workers are finding it increasingly difficult to maintain, let alone raise, their standard of living in our vaunted affluent society. Taxes take a sizable portion of their hard-earned income whereas, in comparison, oil and gas companies still enjoy a tax allowance granted 50 years ago when drilling was a costly venture involving great risk. Ever since, despite the fact that this country has developed enough oil to last for hundreds of years, the gas and oil giants have been able to deduct 27½ percent of their income before they even begin to think about taxes. The plain fact is that there is now very little risk involved in the oil industry. The figures in Dunn's Review show that oil has almost the lowest rate of failure of any industry in the United States. Furthermore, the depletion allowance does not, as it was originally intended to, stimulate the exploration and discovery of new wells—most of it goes to those who are doing very little or no high-risk exploration.

Mr. Speaker, in 1965, 20 major oil companies paid corporate taxes at a rate of 6.3 percent. In contrast, the average American corporation pays a Federal tax of 48 percent. Several other companies skipped paying any taxes at all that year, despite large profits. And a lucky few actually got tax refunds on their profitable enterprises. Even the poorest individual taxpayer contributes at a rate nearly four times higher than most oil producers.

Our able colleague's discharge petition offers the membership an opportunity to demonstrate our belief in a tax system based on equality of sacrifice and ability to pay. Tightening this and other loopholes would bring substantial revenues to the Treasury, ease the burden on the average taxpayer, and strengthen the national will and resolve to meet the critical challenges at home and abroad.

REV. BERNARD A. PETERS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and pleasure to attend a testimonial dinner in honor of the Reverend Bernard A. Peters, OSB, the pastor of St. Joseph's Parish, Maplewood, N.J., at the Military Park Hotel in Newark, N.J., on Sunday, October 22, 1967. The occasion commemorated the 40th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood and was a manifestation of the affection and esteem in which Father Bernard is so deeply held by his parishioners and other friends of all creeds and walks of life. As pastor of St. Joseph's Parish for the past 24 years, Father Bernard has been a true shepherd to his flock, but he has also looked beyond the confines of his parish to encompass all members of the community in his kindly and understanding concern.

The unflagging zeal, remarkable ability, and selfless devotion to duty, which have characterized Father Bernard's priestly labors are reflected in the groundbreaking ceremonies for a new church on Sunday.

In recognition of his dedicated service to God and man, the township of Maplewood adopted a resolution honoring Father Bernard which I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD. I should also like to include an article about this truly noble man that appeared in the Newark Evening News of October 19, 1967:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, in the year 1967, Rev. Bernard A. Peters, O.S.B. celebrates the Anniversary of his fortieth year as a Priest and Monk of the Order of St. Benedict; and

Whereas, almost a quarter of a century of his life has been devoted to St. Joseph's Parish in Maplewood; and

Whereas, on October 22nd, 1967 the Clergy, parishioners and many friends will join in this celebration honoring this humble man of God; and

Whereas, upon this day, a long cherished dream and ambition will be marked by the ground-breaking for a new Church at St. Joseph's.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Township Committee of the Township of Maplewood, County of Essex, State of New Jersey, assembled this seventeenth day of October in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven, that this governing body, for itself and on behalf of the citizens of this community, do hereby proclaim this memorable October 22nd, 1967, as Rev. Bernard A. Peters, O.S.B., Day in Maplewood and invite all citizens to pause and reflect upon the Godly work of this man and his dedicated interest in all facets of life in Maplewood and join with his many friends in thanks for this continued generous help.

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be suitably engrossed and presented to Rev. Bernard A. Peters, O.S.B.

EDMUND T. HUME,
Mayor.
W. MELBOURNE KNOX, Jr.,
Township Clerk.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Oct. 19, 1967]

FATHER BERNARD PRIEST 40 YEARS

St. Joseph's Parish, Maplewood, will break ground for a new church Sunday as it celebrates the 40th anniversary of the ordination of its pastor, Rev. Bernard A. Peters, OSB.

Father Bernard, who started his 25th year as pastor in August, will turn over the first spadeful of earth in ground-breaking ceremonies immediately after the 12:30 p.m. Jubilee Mass. Mayor Edmund T. Hume and other municipal officials will be present.

The new church will be located on the present parking lot at Prospect Street and Hilton Avenue. The million-dollar construction program will include replacement of the present rectory, which is an old frame building, and demolition of the parish hall.

Built in 1922, eight years after the founding of the parish, the parish hall was St. Joseph's first church. As the parish grew and the school was built in the 1930s, Masses were offered in the school auditorium, which was later converted into a chapel. This space will revert to school use.

Sunday evening Father Bernard will be honored at a testimonial dinner at the Hotel Military Park, Newark. Guests will include Archbishop Thomas A. Boland, Bishops Joseph A. Costello and Martin W. Stanton and Abbot Martin J. Burne, OSB, head of the Benedictine community in this area.

Born in Newark, Father Bernard attended St. Benedict's Preparatory School here and St. Anselm's College and Abbey in Manchester, N.H. He was professed a Benedictine in 1921 at St. Vincent's Archabbey, Latrobe, Pa., and was ordained a priest in St. Joseph's Cathedral, Manchester, in 1927.

Father Bernard's first assignment was as a teacher of German and history at St. Benedict's Preparatory School, where he served 11 years. He began his parish work at St. Elizabeth's in Linden and later was stationed at Blessed Sacrament in Elizabeth. He went to Maplewood in 1943, succeeding the late Rev. Richard E. Studer, OSB.

Eugene Gergely is general chairman of the testimonial dinner committee. Rev. Malachy M. McPadden, OSB, assistant pastor, is adviser.

EXTENSION OF ADMIRAL RICKOVER IS GOOD NEWS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is a blessing to this country that Admiral Rickover has agreed to continue to serve as the head of naval nuclear propulsion and in his related capacities for an additional 2 years. It is my understanding that he did this at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission and the administration.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the past two decades I know of no one who has contributed more to the security of the United States than has Admiral Rickover. His brilliant and totally dedicated services are still urgently needed as we move into an even more tense and dangerous era when the Soviet Union is building up its sea power and deploying it globally and Red China is becoming an increasing threat.

Our Nation is fortunate, Mr. Speaker, and I commend Admiral Rickover for again heeding the call to serve.

TWELVE-MONTH SESSION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is difficult for those of us here in the Congress to see the forest for the trees. We are too close to the situation to see a satisfactory solution to many of our problems. For this reason, I depend a great deal on the many fine newspaper editors in my State who give careful study to congressional activities. Most of us would like to get back home as soon as possible to get around and see our constituents and get the feel of the issues from that end.

My good friend Roswell Falkenberry, of the Selma Times-Journal, thinks we might make some changes in our legislative sessions and has borrowed some ideas from one of our colleagues from California [Mr. BROWN]. I would ask that this editorial from the October 24 Selma Times-Journal be entered in the RECORD for all of our colleagues to read:

TWELVE-MONTH SESSION

By their own rules, the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives must adjourn by July 31 each year, except in time of war or national emergency.

But what Congress proposes it can easily dispose of by passing a resolution extending a session, which it has done as a matter of course for, lo, these many years.

Law also requires that appropriation bills be completed by July 1, the beginning of the fiscal year.

More than three months after that deadline, the present Congress has acted on only a handful of them. Many agencies and departments are struggling along on the basis of continuing resolutions, which authorize them to operate from month to month on stopgap funds provided on the same level as their spending during the previous year.

Older solons have fond memories of intersession vacations of four to six months, when a lot of fences could be mended back home. The present Congress has been in session for nine months, and if this were an election year, it would certainly be under attack as the "Do-Nothing Congress of 1967."

Of course, if this were an election year, that rattling you would have heard along about Labor Day would have been congressmen stirring their legislative bones like mad.

Since in these hectic times there is no likelihood of a return to the leisurely ways of the past, why don't congressmen face reality and plan on regular 12-month sessions, with perhaps a modest adjournment in the summer?

A number of them think it may be a good idea. Among them is Rep. George E. Brown Jr., Democrat of California.

He points out that paperwork continues in a congressman's office the year around, anyway, whether Congress is in session or not. Even when congressmen take time off to rub elbows with—and have arms twisted by—the folks back home, the legislative process plods along at a fairly steady pace.

There is no real reason why all legislation must either be rammed through in the early months of the year, he says, or, as it usually turns out, be hastily passed in the last ones. A slower pace could be conducive to more deliberative and higher quality legislation.

He adds that a longer session should mean better scheduling so that legislation involving a time factor could be enacted at an appropriate time. Unfortunately, this has not been the case.

The stopgap method of funding may be all right for an established bureaucracy that is conducting business as usual, "but it creates untold misery on programs such as our aid to education, antipoverty efforts and the like."

Not knowing whether they are going to get more, less or the same money as the year before, administrators are reduced to guesswork and hope in their planning.

"One would think," says Brown, "that with year-round sessions, Congress could solve some of these problems."

Or perhaps one may not think so. But year-round sessions would at least save Congress the trouble of having to pass an extension resolution every July.

"AGE OF EDUCATION" PROGRESSES SLOWLY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe most Americans are aware of the progress we are making as a nation to provide an adequate education for all of our citizens. As President Johnson observes, this period in our history may become known as the age of education.

But I doubt that most Americans are aware of how little opportunity for education exists in other parts of the world. One-third of the world's children who are of school age have no school to go to. More than 700 million people over the age of 15 cannot read or write.

An editorial published recently by the Hartford Courant calls attention to this serious world problem. It points out that inadequate resources for education in other countries may produce peoples whose aspirations turn to disillusion and perhaps revolt.

Mr. Speaker, I insert that editorial for the RECORD:

"AGE OF EDUCATION" PROGRESSES SLOWLY

President Johnson recently expressed the hope that American historians would call this the "age of education." To support his aim he noted that 12 per cent more poor children attended college during the past six years. High school drop-outs declined from 25 to 18 per cent. College students getting federal grants will increase from 500,000 in 1965 to 1.2 million in 1968. Federal spending for both education and health has risen from four to 12 billion dollars.

A few days after Mr. Johnson listed the advances, a five-day international session opened in Williamsburg, Va., to review educational opportunities in other parts of the world. The kind of news the 170 educators from 52 countries heard was reflected in the conference title, "World Crisis in Education." Some of the challenges to be met are discouraging, to say the least. For instance, one-third of the world's school-age children have no school to go to. There are still more than 700 million illiterates over the age of 15. Developing nations which do have schools are not using them to full advantage. Children of the working classes, or residing in rural areas, or unlucky enough to be born girls, have less chance for schooling than the rich, the city child or those lucky enough to be born boys.

Rene Maheu, director general of the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, outlined the facts at the sessions' opening. He noted that "of all inequalities none is more . . . intolerable to men's feelings . . . than inequality of children's access to the light of the mind."

Through "tremendous efforts" many developing nations have reached their numerical enrollment targets. But these can only be maintained through other nations' help to the tune of two billion dollars in the next three years, Mr. Maheu said.

In a 14-page statement reviewing their findings, the delegates ask more than that. They want "even a 10 per cent" re-allocation from the $150 billion nations spend annually on defense, a statistic dubbed "a dismal commentary on the world's priorities." They also suggest the creation of an international consortium to distribute school aid, and an international education year to "mobilize energies and inspire world-wide initiative."

The experts fear "inadequate resources" may produce a "populace whose aspirations have turned to disillusion," and perhaps revolt.

If the richer countries rally forth to help the poorer in greater measure, perhaps President Johnson will get more than his wish. Historians one day may call this the age of education in a worldwide sense. But the U.S. surely must be among "those who have" to help the "have-nots."

VICE ADM. HYMAN G. RICKOVER

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Secretary of the Navy, Paul R. Ignatius, announced that Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover was being asked to continue on active duty for an additional 2 years. This extension is of vital importance to the security of our Nation. The commanding worldwide lead in naval nuclear propulsion which this Nation has enjoyed and I am confident will continue to enjoy is attributable in very large part to Admiral Rickover. The recent announcement concerning his continuation on active duty, I am sure, will help assure the maintenance of our position of primacy in this vital field of national security.

Admiral Rickover reached the mandatory age of retirement on January 27, 1964. The Secretary then announced that Admiral Rickover's contribution to the Navy and the Nation would be needed "for so long as he is willing and able to serve his country." The Secretary of the Navy then recalled him to active duty for 2 additional years.

This first 2-year extension was fortunately followed by another extension in 1965. This latest 2-year extension will permit Admiral Rickover to go on with his vital work concerning our national security.

I wish Admiral Rickover continued success in his work. I think it is appropriate to quote from the opening remarks of a talk the present chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, made at the launching of the U.S.S. *Narwhal* on September 9, 1967. The *Narwhal* is one of our newest submarines. It was also developed under Admiral Rickover's direction. Senator PASTORE, addressing Admiral Rickover, said on the occasion of the *Narwhal* launching:

> I appreciate beyond measure of words the memento that comes to me today from your very hand. Through your inspiration, your vigor, and your determination, America today maintains primacy in nuclear ship propulsion, and I think that I bespeak the sentiments of the people of this great nation when I say that we owe you a deep debt of gratitude, and the best way that I can explain it is to say we thank God for Admiral Rickover.

We still maintain a lead in the world in the field of naval nuclear propulsion. As I have stated before, this lead is attributable to Admiral Rickover. In view of the emphasis the Soviets are placing on improving their nuclear submarine fleet which includes both missile-launching types and attack submarines, it is very important that we intensify our efforts to maintain our lead. The growth in the Soviet's nuclear navy was reported on in an article this morning in the Washington Post. This article summarizes the 70th annual edition of Jane's Fighting Ships which, according to the article, states the Soviets are stepping up production of warships.

In closing I would like to reiterate the sentiments expressed by Senator PASTORE last month at the launching of the *Narwhal,* which I quoted above.

We owe Admiral Rickover a deep debt of gratitude, and the best way that I can explain it is to say we thank God for Admiral Rickover.

VICE ADM. HYMAN G. RICKOVER

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in the sentiments that have been expressed about the extension of Vice Admiral Rickover's service.

The Congress has received a tremendous amount of inspired assistance from Admiral Rickover in its efforts to establish both a submarine and surface nuclear Navy.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Armed Services Committee, I want to say that it is always a pleasure to hear the testimony of the admiral for his statements and opinions are always given honestly, forthrightly, and in deep concern for the security of our Nation.

It is a pleasure to add my voice to those who are expressing appreciation for the work of the admiral. No man is more deserving of the recognition being given to him here today.

The Nation profits much in the wise decision to extend the admiral's active duty service. America's supremacy in nuclear propulsion of naval ships is due to his genius. We owe him a deep debt of gratitude.

AGWAY, INC., THIRD ANNUAL MEETING

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on October 19–20, Agway, Inc., held its third annual meeting at the Onondaga County War Memorial, Syracuse, N.Y.

Agway, Inc., is a taxpaying cooperative owned and directed by 99,000 farmers in 12 Northeastern States: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Vermont. Agway's principal objectives are to help its members farm more efficiently and profitably and to assist them in the marketing of many of their agricultural products.

Agway was formed in 1964, and its headquarters are located in Syracuse, N.Y. At the third annual meeting, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture came to Syracuse to address the gathering of Agway members to outline the general state of American agriculture today. I would like to join with Mr. Jonathan Davis, Agway's president; Mr. Harold G. Soper, its chairman of the board; and Mr. Edmund H. Fallon, executive vice president and general manager, and with all of the employees and members of Agway in extending to the Secretary of Agriculture our sincere appreciation for his taking the time to pay tribute to Agway by his attendance.

The Secretary noted that Agway is the Nation's biggest cooperative and it provides a broad range of diversified services to its farmer-members. To quote from the Secretary's address:

> I am impressed by the size of your organization, by the diversity of your interests—stretching from the traditional marketing and farm supply sector to supermarkets, canning, insurance and transportation—and by the interest of your membership, as evidenced by this crowd here today.
>
> I only wish there were cooperatives like yours, for American agriculture desperately needs the skilled management, economic power, and farmer-control represented here.

In addition to the great benefits which Agway presents to its farmer-members who live in Onondaga County, the location of its headquarters in my district has done much to stimulate economic and social progress in my district. I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to acknowledge the nearly 800 Agway employees who live and work in Onondaga County and to congratulate them from being a part of this "now" organization.

As I have said before, Agway is dedicated to making farming a more efficient, more profitable way of life for its members. An organization that is moving rapidly into every aspect of farming economy, and doing it effectively, is the kind of instrumentality which is needed today to counter all of the adverse forces which are driving farmers from the land in record numbers.

During the course of the annual meeting, Mr. Davis, Agway's president, and Mr. Fallon, the executive vice president and general manager, related the state of Agway and its progress after 3 years in operation. Its sales for the third year were up $22 million to $393 million, making it No. 170 on Fortune's list of the 500 largest industrial corporations.

To quote Mr. Davis' report:

> Agway's diversified services are having a warm reception. The building program, as an example, is becoming very popular because of Agway's farm-oriented background, and the demand for silos surpassed our ability to produce them. The supply centers, with their variety of products and services, have exceeded their volume goals in most cases. Petroleum distribution had a good year.

Secretary Freeman pointed to the importance of strong and diversified cooperatives when he noted that—

> In a time when almost everything the farmer buys costs him more each year, I think it is significant that where cooperatives are strong, prices of supplies have risen less—and in some cases have declined—as other supply prices have risen drastically.

Those of us here in the House whose districts are principally urban and metropolitan in nature, with a small farming population, are aware of the flight that is taking place from the land. I must assume that the main reason a man abandons his land is because he cannot make it a going operation any longer.

Secretary Freeman devoted most of his address to the efforts the Government was making to see that farm prices and farm income would be sufficient to support the agricultural community as we know it today. The efforts of organizations of farmers, like Agway, to keep the costs of farming at a feasible level through the free enterprise system are commendable. I know that I am in tune with many of my colleagues when I extend to Agway and to its farmer-members my congratulations on their efforts and my hope that the growth and the progress they are making will continue to the benefit of themselves, and through them, for all Americans. I share the hope of Agway's president when he said:

> I picture Agway as a huge grain combine, more modern and sophisticated than any other yet produced. The parts were delivered from the three factories represented by our three predecessor cooperatives. After three years of assembly and laboratory testing, it has proven to be field-worthy. All that it needs now is some minor field adjustments to bring it to top performance. With your help, these are rapidly being made. I am sure that this year we will cut a swath that we are all proud of.

THE MASSACHUSETTS STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to say that my home State, Massachusetts, has the oldest guaranteed loan program for students in the Nation. And I am proud of its success. It has helped many students obtain desired higher education and promises to help many more. Since the inception of the program in 1956, 54,900 loans totaling $36,814,389 have been made. The demand for these loans has been growing at an increasing rate. During the last fiscal year, July 1966 through June 1967, approximately 14,000 loans were made. In the first month of the new fiscal year alone, almost 2,000 additional loans were obtained. Massachusetts is successfully making college financially feasible for thousands of young people.

This year, Massachusetts has also made these loans available to vocational students for the first time. Under the provisions of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act, Massachusetts received $48,155 in Federal "seed" money specifically earmarked for vocational and technical students. Since its availability in March 1967, a short 7 months ago, an estimated 890 loans totaling $910,000 have already been made. As more potential vocational students become aware of the loans, this program will gain momentum too.

The Massachusetts program also attests to the fact that the American student is a good credit risk. The Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corp. guaranteed $15,932,000 in loans to students from its start in 1957 through February 1966 and has paid only $108,000 in claims for a remarkably low loss ratio of sixty-eight one-hundredths of 1 percent. Recovery effort in the Massachusetts program has thus far resulted in $14,000 collected, so that an ultimate net loss ratio of about one-half of 1 percent seems indicated.

Mr. Speaker, some indication of the demand and the probable success of guaranteed loans can be obtained from a look at the Massachusetts program. On a nationwide scale these loans probably have the greatest potential for aiding students in overcoming financial barriers to higher education of all present aid programs.

With the growing numbers of students in college, the growing need of a higher education and the growing cost of this education, we can expect the demand for these loans to continue to go up geometrically. Whereas the NDEA student loan program made loans to 854,000 students totaling about $610 million during its first 7 years, from 1958 through June 1965, the guaranteed student loan program made almost half that number in its first fiscal year of operation alone.

From July 1, 1966, through June 30, 1967, 328,943 loans totaling $248 million were made. What the unmet demand for loans of this nature and what the potential demand for them is cannot be completely assessed. However, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, has estimated that some 2 million students will want to make use of this program nationwide in 1972. To insure that the supply of guarantee funds will meet the demand for loans the program needs our support now.

YORKTOWN DAY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tuck] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, 1967, I attended ceremonies in commemoration of the 186th anniversary of the victory at Yorktown, Va. On that occasion we were privileged to hear a splendid address by Brig. Gen. Bernard W. Rogers, U.S. Army, Commandant of Cadets, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y. General Rogers was graduated from the Military Academy in 1943; is a Rhodes scholar; and has just recently returned from duty with the 1st Infantry Division in Vietnam.

General Rogers was introduced by Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner, U.S. Air Force, retired, a distinguished resident of Gloucester County, Va.

The address of General Rogers contains historical information of much value and considerable interest. I am pleased and privileged to include it in the Record at this point and commend its reading to all patriotic Americans. The text of General Rogers' address follows:

> General Tunner, Mr. Goddin, Members of the Yorktown Day Association, distinguished guests, fellow patriots:
>
> It is a personal pleasure for Mrs. Rogers and me to be with you on this occasion commemorating the 186th anniversary of the American and French victory over the British forces at this historic site. The last time Mrs. Rogers and I had the opportunity of visiting Yorktown was 16 years ago while assigned as Aide-de-Camp to General Mark Clark at nearby Fort Monroe. So for us it is good to be back.
>
> Having just returned from duty with the First Infantry Division in Vietnam where I was privileged to serve with some of the finest soldiers in the world, I find it gratifying that celebration such as this are being conducted to memorialize the deeds of American arms and pay tribute to the valor of the American soldier. Particularly is such a celebration fitting and timely in this period when a negative attitude against commemorations of the achievements which form our heritage exists

among an extremely active and vocal minority of our populace. It is victories such as we celebrate here which have played a significant role in the development of our nation and, as a consequence, should not be forgotten. Thanks to your organization, this one never shall.

As I was preparing for this visit, I was interested to review the ties which connect the Military Academy at West Point to Yorktown. As you know, in the early days of our country, the Hudson River was a link of strategic importance connecting Canada and the colonies. Dominating this avenue of approach were the Hudson Highlands, which cut across the river about 45 miles above New York City. An important terrain feature in the Highlands was West Point, a point of land which seemed to thrust itself into the river. We find that key figures in the Continental Army played significant roles both at West Point and here at Yorktown. Foremost among them was Washington's chief engineer, Louis DuPortail, who made a useful contribution to the defenses at West Point and who later directed the siege operations on this battlefield. Also Washington's commander at West Point was Henry Knox, who commanded the artillery for the Yorktown campaign. It is also interesting to note that the Continental Army arrived here from the Hudson Highlands to engage Cornwallis, and after the battle most of the Army moved back to those Highlands. At West Point, as here, you will find the air of history and great events pervading the atmosphere.

On Yorktown Day this year we are not just celebrating the end of British domination of our young nation, not just the combined victory of American and French forces over the forces of Lord Cornwallis, but we are also giving recognition to the important role played by the Continental Army in defeating a supposedly more effectively-trained British force. It was a Continental Army which by 1781 had, in Washington's words, become "a respectable Army" and was as effective as those Armies of Continental Europe; it was in fact the forerunner of our modern Army. But the achievement of this level of professionalism by 1781 by Washington's troops had not been easy.

You will recall that prior to the creation of the Continental Army the colonists had depended upon the militia for their military needs. Under this militia system, every able-bodied man in the township was required to arm and equip himself, participate in a varying amount of drill and training, and be ready for action on short notice, usually to defend his family, home, and friends. Officers in the militia were relatively ignorant in things military and were selected by the men; the rank of general often was conferred by virtue of birth; enlistments were short-term; and control was by state. Since militia were primarily geared toward local defense, they had no system of organized supply.

The many deficiencies of the colonialist militia were well known to George Washington when he was appointed in June, 1775, by the Continental Congress "to command all the Continental Forces." He had written that:

"Men just dragged from the tender scenes of domestick life; unaccustomed to the din of arms; totally unacquainted with every kind of military skill, . . . when opposed to troops regularly train'd, disciplined, and appointed, superior in knowledge, and superior in arms, makes them timid, and ready to fly from their own shadows. . . . Again, men accustomed to unbounded freedom, and not controul, cannot brook the restraint which is indispensably necessary to the good order and Government of an Army . . . To bring men to a proper degree of subordination, is not the work of a day, a month or even a year."

By the end of 1776 Washington's disenchantment with the militia as he knew it led him to conclude that he hoped:

"That no reliance, except such as may arise from necessity, should ever be had in them again."

From then on he persisted in the belief:

"Let us have a respectable Army, and such as will be competent to every exigency."

Recognizing the need for a trained Regular Army was one thing; achieveing it was another. From the time he assumed command of the Continental Army until the victory won here at Yorktown, Washington faced the tremendous undertaking of raising, equipping and training such a force. At one stage even he, imperturbable as he usually was in the face of difficulties, was led to state:

"Could I have forseen what I have, and am likely to experience, no consideration upon earth should have induced me to accept this command."

Washington and his command experienced the dark days of the defeats in the New York and Long Island campaigns, the retreat across Jersey. They also rejoiced at the victories at Trenton and at Princeton, although, as one historian stated:

"This feat had been accomplished by an army of . . . ragged, shoeless, ill-fed, poorly equipped, often defeated amateur soldiers. . . ."

But victories born of grit, determination, and belief in a cause were not enough to ensure success. Defeats were sustained at Brandywine, Germantown, and Philadelphia; the winter of 1777–78 was spent at Valley Forge. Discouragement ran high and professionalism was lacking in the Continental Army; but help was on its way from across the Atlantic.

This assistance came in the form of foreign professional soldiers such as Von Steuben, Kosciusko, Pulaski, Lafayette and DuPortail who agreed, inter alia, to train our Army, to instill a much-needed discipline into the ranks, and to develop an organized supply system. In addition as you know, the French government sent ships, soldiers and funds to aid our cause.

With this help from foreigners, progress was made until on 15 July, 1779 the Continental Army came of age. On that night General Anthony Wayne's light infantry brigade, in a brilliantly planned and executed attack, captured the heavily fortified position at Stony Point, New York, and proved, not only to the British, but to the world, that the Continental Army was a force with which to reckon.

Now the scene was set for the final campaigns in 1780 and '87 which led to victory. The Continental Army left its base in the Hudson Highlands in June of '81 and eventually joined with its French allies under General Rochambeau, and by October had laid siege to Cornwallis on this battlefield. As you can see from the magnificent displays the National Park has prepared to explain this battle to us, this siege was a thoroughly professional job—a fitting testimonial to the skill, training, and discipline achieved by our first professional army. But just at the time that the achievement of a regular, professional army had been realized, it was almost immediately dismembered.

Peace was proclaimed to the Army in April, 1783, and disbandment began. In December of that year Washington resigned his commission and by the end of the year the Continental Army had been reduced to a single regiment of infantry and a few companies of artillery. Without a history of military obedience to civil authority (as we know it today), the fears of the people concerning large, regular armies led Congress in June, 1784, to declare that:

"Standing armies in time of peace are inconsistent with the principles of republican government, dangerous to the liberties of a free people, and generally converted into destructive engines for establishing despotism."

Congress therefore directed that the entire army be disbanded except about a hundred officers and men to guard material stored at West Point and Fort Pitt. One unit which was preserved was Alexander Hamilton's old company of artillery which now exists as Battery "D," 5th United States Field Artillery, the only link of the present Regular Army with the Continental Army. I might add that "D" Battery of the 5th Field is performing magnificently today in Vietnam, based at Phuoc Vinh as an element of the First Infantry Division Artillery.

Although Washington, Hamilton, Knox, Von Steuben and many other wartime leaders wished to retain a regular professional army, Washington recognized that the fear of a standing army and the costs associated with maintaining it made such a goal unattainable. He was led to declare that:

"The jealousies of a standing Army, and the evils to be apprehended from one are remote; and in my judgment, situated and circumstanced as we are, not at all to be dreaded; but the consequences of wanting one, according to my ideas—is certain, and inevitable ruin."

Thus Washington moved in the direction of a small standing army to serve as a constabulary on the Indian frontier, with a portion of the militia being grouped together and trained in time of peace in such a manner as to permit their prompt mobilization as a Continental Army; therein we find the basis for the manner in which we have maintained our readiness for emergencies since that time. But as an integral part of his plan was Washington's insistence that there be established a full-fledged military academy where warmaking could be the subject of very careful schooling. Reflecting on the war just finished, Washington said:

"Of so great importance is it to preserve the knowledge which has been acquired thro' the various stages of a long and arduous service, that I cannot conclude without repeating the necessity of the proposed institution, unless we intend to let the science (of war) become extinct, and to depend entirely upon the foreigners for their friendly aid, if ever we should again be involved in hostility."

Alexander Hamilton also continued to urge Congress to establish military institutions to perpetuate the art of war and to furnish: "the means for forming a new and enlarged army, fit for service in the shortest time possible."

Later, President Jefferson, acknowledging that if the Regular Army were to be very small it ought at the same time to be very good, was instrumental in founding the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1802.

Starting modestly with only 10 cadets who were attached to the Corps of Engineers, the Military Academy has now grown to over 3,300 cadets undergoing training. This number will increase to 4,400 by 1972.

A further tracing of the evolution of our modern Army from the end of the 18th Century would reveal that, just as was the fate of the Continental Army, following all wars—or threats of wars—well-trained, well-organized, disciplined, professional military forces have been demobilized as the conflict or threat subsided. But our review would also show that growing out of the experience of the Army which was fielded at Yorktown 186 years ago (and reinforced by our experiences in subsequent conflicts) was the continuing need for an institution charged with producing those regular officers who in turn could mold the civilians from a "nation at arms" into an effective fighting force. Thus we have the link of the United States Military Academy to this battlefield at Yorktown.

Subsequent events have led our country

to realize the need for such academies to deal with the science of war as conducted by our various type naval forces and air forces. It is these academies (along with our other sources of regular officers) which provide the trained professionals who can assist this country in the transition from peace to war and develop the Regular Armed Forces foreseen as necessary by those leaders serving their country when the professionals of the Continental Army fought on these grounds.

That the Military Academy at West Point has perpetuated the professional heritage of the Continental Army may be attested to by those persons who have been associated with our Army fighting in Vietnam. (I know that the same may be said of the other service academies but I restrict my remarks to the service with whom I fought.) Our Army in Vietnam is one of which General Washington would indeed have been proud. It is the most highly professional Army the United States has ever fielded. Our soldiers are selected with care, rigorously trained, superbly-equipped, and placed in Regular units commanded by highly competent officers. As with the Continental Army at Yorktown, today's soldiers in Vietnam are highly-motivated and dedicated to the cause for which they are fighting. In short, they are professionals, just as were the Continental soldiers who fought here. Nor should we forget the outstanding assistance being rendered by our military advisors in Vietnam, comparable to the help given our fledgling Continental Army by foreign professional soldiers. And, just as we remember with great pride those soldiers of the Continental Army of nearly two centuries ago, so should every citizen of this nation be proud of our servicemen fighting for us today on the fringes of liberty in Southeast Asia.

And who is this American soldier in Vietnam? He is a boy, about 19 years of age, armed and in uniform, who did not choose to be there. He would have preferred to remain at home; comfortable; enjoying the many attractions and conveniences available to Americans; secure in the company of his family, his friends, his sweetheart. Thoughts of those persons at home creep into his mind, even at times when he is trying to force himself to concentrate on the battle at hand. And in the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam, this smooth-checked, bright-eyed, enthusiastic boy becomes a man. He lives with fear, he lives with carnage, he lives with death. Burned forever into his memory are ugly sights and awesome sorrows which at times are almost too much for a boy, just turned man, to bear. He kills the enemy but questions the waste and folly of war. He sees his buddy killed beside him and asks why? Why was it his turn to go today and not mine? He exults in the victories won by his outfit, but he weeps with grief while attending the memorial services for his buddies who fell in the fight. He understands the cause for which he is fighting; his enthusiasm, dedication and motivation are contagious. He looks with disgust at reports of those back home who question his being and fighting in the far-off place. He dismisses such reports with a shrug, remarking "Those guys back home just don't know what it's all about."

You will see your soldier in Vietnam digging his defensive fighting position in a driving monsoon rain, up to his waist in water and mud, stopping occasionally to bail out the position with his helmet. Or you will find him combating the heat and misery of the jungle floor. But whatever the conditions, he will greet you with a big smile and reassure you: "Don't worry about this position; we'll be ready; the Viet Cong will never take it."

That's your soldier in Vietnam today, a man, who knowing he has 12 months to serve in that country, has resolved to do an outstanding job for that period. To match his spirit, his courage, his determination, enthusiasm and devotion with a comparable level of decisiveness, judgment, imagination and know-how is a challenge to every leader in Vietnam.

Today your soldier fights for you; tomorrow he may die for you, and thus never return to enjoy those things at home which run through his thoughts as he beats his way through the hot and damp jungle searching for our enemy.

So I say again, be proud of this soldier who represents you and me in Vietnam, be proud as we are of his predecessor, another professional of another fight, the soldier of the Continental Army who fought on this ground.

Thank you for permitting me to participate in your activities today, and please accept the best wishes of all of us at the United States Military Academy for many memorable celebrations in the future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Hanna (at the request of Mr. Albert), for the rest of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. Fountain (at the request of Mr. Albert), for an indefinite period, on account of his attendance at the 22d General Assembly of the United Nations as an official member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Tenzer.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee and to include a table in connection with his remarks on the conference report.

Mr. Flood and to include a table on the conference report on HEW.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Zion) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Bates.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Foley) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Donahue.

Mr. Nix.

Mr. Karth.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9960. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12474. An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 445. An act for the relief of Rosemarie Gauch Neth; and

S. 1108. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code; and

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the United States Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 27, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1178. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the following plans for works of improvement: Rancho Viejo, Tex.; Spring-Bull, S. Dak.; Main Street Canyon, Calif.; Big Running Water Ditch, Ark., involving a structure which provides not more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity, pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 1005; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1179. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the following plans for works of improvement: Lower Black Bear Creek, Okla.; Dumpling-Beaver Creek, Okla.; Mill Creek, Tex.; Mountain Run, Va. (supplemental work plan); Richland Creek, Miss.; Pond Creek, Fla.; Yellowjacket Creek, Ga.; Cotton-Coon-Mission Creek, Okla. and Kans.; pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 1005; to the Committee on Public Works.

1180. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13541. A bill to prohibit unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 824). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "Coast Guard Examination of Foreign Passenger Vessels—Progress Report on Increased Passenger Safety" (11th report by the committee) (Rept. No. 829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "Evaluation of Allegations of Painting Deficiencies Involving Federal Facilities in the Washington Area" (12th report by the committee) (Rept. No. 830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD: Committee of conference. H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 831). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "Search and Rescue Operations for U.S. Private Pilots Missing in Foreign Areas" (13th report by the committee) (Rept. No. 832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. Report (pursuant to 63 Stat. 377) (Rept. No. 864). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3031. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christos Photinos-Svoronos (Rept. No. 825). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3032. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Karen Wood Davila; with amendment (Rept. No. 826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 287. An act for the relief of Wen Shi Yu (Rept. No. 827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 36. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendments (Rept No. 828). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 155. An act for the relief of Arthur Jerome Olinger, a minor, by his next friend, his father, George Henry Olinger, and George Henry Olinger, individually; with amendment (Rept. No. 833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 233. An act for the relief of Chester E. Davis (Rept. No. 834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 234. An act for the relief of James W. Adams and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 294. An act for the relief of Eloy C. Navarro; with amendment (Rept. No. 836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SANDMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 910. An act for the relief of the estate of Patrick E. Eagan; with amendment (Rept. No. 837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1580. An act for the relief of John W. Rogers (Rept. No. 838). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1705. A bill for the relief of Sophie Stathacopulos; with amendments (Rept. No. 839). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2281. A bill for the relief of Dwayne C. Cox and William D. Martin; with amendment (Rept. No. 840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Franklin; with amendments (Rept. No. 841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2688. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Beaury; with amendment (Rept. No. 842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2760. A bill for the relief of Sondra D. Shaw (Rept. No. 843). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4818. A bill for the relief of O. P. Becken; with amendment (Rept. No. 844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4819. A bill for the relief of Ralph W. Heneman; with amendment (Rept. No. 845). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4820. A bill for the relief of Syvan H. Miller; with amendment (Rept. No. 846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4821. A bill for the relief of Arnold E. Remmen; with amendment (Rept. 847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4936. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes (Rept. No. 848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5853. A bill for the relief of Raymond E. Grail (Rept. No. 849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6305. A bill for the relief of Claud Ferguson; with amendment (Rept. 850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6890. A bill for the relief of Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein; with amendment (Rept. 851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7431. A bill for the relief of Barney Elrod Construction Co., Inc.; with amendments (Rept. No. 852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7882. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at certain U.S. naval stations in Florida; with amendments (Rept. No. 853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8096. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.; with amendments (Rept. No. 854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8481. A bill for the relief of Richard Belk; with amendments (Rept. No. 855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9568. A bill for the relief of Lucien A. Murzyn; with amendment (Rept. No. 856). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9574. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Wojcik; with amendments (Rept. No. 857). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10003. A bill for the relief of John M. Stevens; with amendment (Rept. No. 858). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10199. A bill for the relief of Lloyd W. Corbisier (Rept. No. 359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10058. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther D. Bordi; with amendment (Rept. No. 860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10449. A bill for the relief of Camille Anita Dobson (Rept. No. 861). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11381. A bill for the relief of E. L. Townley; with amendment (Rept. No. 862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12119. A bill for the relief of Joseph M. Hepworth; with amendment (Rept. No. 863). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 13702. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to prohibit the broadcasting of any advertising of alcoholic beverages between certain hours; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 13703. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 13704. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 13705. A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 13706. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13707. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 13708. A bill to abate the pollution of the Great Lakes and other navigable waters of the United States from sewage, wastes, oils, and detergents and to encourage water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13709. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax of 15 percent of amounts paid or incurred for construction or installation of certain water pollution control facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13710. A bill to protect the public health from the distribution of drugs manufactured in establishments not meeting current good manufacturing practices by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 13711. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13712. A bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 13713. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit demonstrations at the Pentagon relating to the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13714. A bill to repeal percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 13715. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 13716. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the amortization of reorganization expenditures of railroad corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN (for himself, and Mr. Nelsen):

H.R. 13717. A bill to make certain technical amendments to the District of Columbia Public Education Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. Multer, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Bingham and Mr. Halpern):

H.R. 13718. A bill to authorize the establishment and to provide for the regulation of Federal savings institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 13719. A bill to authorize the loan of one naval destroyer vessel to the State of Israel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13720. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to modify requirements necessary to establish entitlement to incentive pay for members of submarine operational command staffs serving on submarines during underway operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 13721. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13722. A bill to deem remuneration received by certain Polish employees of the U.S. Army in France to constitute remuneration for employment for purposes of the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.J. Res. 911. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 912. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. Con. Res. 559. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the Great Lakes Basin Compact and the Great Lakes Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. Con. Res. 560. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. Res. 960. Resolution to authorize the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of production of foreign-made goods competing with domestically produced goods and of the operation of elementary and secondary schools by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 13723. A bill for the relief of Ivo Harbert Christopher Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 13724. A bill for the relief of Giuseppi Felice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 13725. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Perez Camarena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13726. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Spoletini, his wife, Maria Spoletini, and their children, Tommas Spoletini and Marco Spoletini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 13727. A bill for the relief of Georgios Christakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 13728. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chandra Prabha Lal; her husband, Daya N. Lal, and two minor children, Padma Lal and Ashis K. Lal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 13729. A bill for the relief of Paolo Cassarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 13730. A bill for the relief of Mr. Vincenzo Cuppari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13731. A bill for the relief of Luigi F. Marotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 13732. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Khorodik Chirinian (Shirinian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 13733. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Salvatore Amato and Maria Margarucci Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause I of rule XXII,

191. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Township of Randolph, N.J., relative to the selection and retirement of members of the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Republicans Unfit and Unwilling to Help Urban America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party in the House of Representatives has often been accused of blind obstructionism.

Yesterday that accusation was proven beyond any shadow of a doubt.

The Republicans have elevated the word "no" into a political philosophy.

The almost unanimous Republican vote to cripple model cities appropriations and kill the rent supplement program is a measure of Republican cynicism and distrust of our cities.

No Republican can dare go before the voters saying he really cares about what happens to the city dweller.

No Republican can now go before the voter saying he cares about the poor, the older citizen, the ghetto resident, the city man without skills, the schoolchild without proper education.

The Republican vote against model cities and rent supplements is clearly a vote to keep cities down in urban decay, wallowing in despair, riot and worse. What a miserable Republican response to the conditions which caused last summer's riots.

Where were those Republican Governors—Romney and Rockefeller—those apostles of the cities when these Republican votes were cast?

Instead of leading their Republican delegations to vote for model cities and rent supplements, these two presidential hopefuls were out on political walking tours or off attending to much less important business.

I hope and pray the American voter remembers this reactionary Republican vote on the cities.

I hope the American voter remembers the total lack of concern by Republican Governors for one of the finest urban programs in recent history.

I hope the voter remembers Mr. Romney and Mr. Rockefeller when they come around crying they are friends of the poor and friends of the city.

The Republican Party—in the Congress and in the States—has shown us all that it is not fit by temperament, personality, or philosophy to do anything to improve urban America.

That is the lesson of yesterday's vote.

Alleged Violations by the Soviet Union of the Limited Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, now that it has been revealed by the administration that questions have arisen concerning possible violation of the Limited Test Ban Treaty by the Soviet Union, and that our notes concerning same have not been satisfactorily answered, I am free to reveal certain additional details concerning the subject. I have today issued to the news media the following release:

SOVIET TEST BAN TREATY VIOLATIONS

Recommendations for a "simple and straightforward handling" of alleged Soviet violations of the Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTB) made by the Ranking House Republican member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have been "ignored" by the Johnson Administration, it was charged today.

Congressman Craig Hosmer said he was free to talk about the delicate subject discussed "on more than one occasion" with State Department and Atomic Energy Commission officials "behind the Joint Committee's closed, security guarded doors" because the Administration revealed yesterday that two notes had been sent to the Soviets asking for explanations. In both cases, the Administration spokesman admitted that the Russians had failed to give satisfactory responses.

Hosmer listed three instances in which radiation from USSR underground tests had been detected outside Soviet borders.

(1) From an underground test in January, 1965, radiation was detected in Japan. At the time the Soviets admitted some accidental leakage from the test but claimed it was "so insignificant" that it did not violate the Treaty.

(2) A similar underground test on October 27, 1966, vented radioactive material into the atmosphere which caused slight fallout in other countries.

(3) The same thing occurred again from a December 18, 1966, Soviet underground explosion.

Hosmer said the events had been reported to the Joint Atomic Committee, as well as the U.S. notes and the Soviet replies. During the discussions Hosmer says he:

"Strongly urged U.S. officials to write the Russians a letter telling them their venting had been detected in each instance, advising them of the exact amount of radiation monitored, and stating that it is our official position no violation of the treaty occurred."

Hosmer charged that U.S. underground nuclear tests are made "much more expensive, much more difficult and much less effective by our own self-imposed interpretation that the Treaty prohibits absolutely no venting whatsoever."

"It is obvious the Russians are not interpreting the treaty that way and are giving themselves considerably more leeway in the conduct of their tests underground.

"It is stupid and self-defeating for us to persist in handcuffing our researchers by a one-sided overly strict interpretation of the Treaty's ban against release of even minor amounts of radiation beyond national boundaries," Hosmer added.

His view is that it is technically infeasible and practically unnecessary to prevent minor radiation releases below levels harmful to life or health. He feels that the more liberal interpretation he recommends and the Soviets are following anyway will permit the Plowshare program to go ahead and utilize nuclear explosives for peaceful uses of benefit to man.

Hosmer cites the digging of "a new Panama Canal" as one of the prime candidates for Plowshare techniques. He also suggests Plowshare can be helpful in bringing water to arid areas of the world, such as the Midwest, "where wars are spawned because lack of water causes poverty and hunger."

"The Administration's persistent adherence to unrealism in interperting the treaties it signs not only weakens the treaties themselves, but denies us equality with other signers and puts roadblocks in front of technological advances which can be turned away from man's destruction to his benefit," Hosmer concluded.

Russian Discrimination Against Jewry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1967

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, soon the Soviet Union celebrates their 50th anniversary. Regardless of what they claim, it is certain they cannot claim, fair and impartial treatment of all citizens of their country as they would have the world believe.

The record of their discrimination against Jewry is nothing short of unbelievable. Recently they have again demonstrated this gross discrimination by resorting to inhumane beatings. Recently, too, it has been reported that a rabbi has been killed. They have and continue to disallow Jews from even practicing many of their meaningful religious customs.

Indeed this attitude of the Soviet Union has been magnified since the Israel-Arab war, a war which may well have "saved the bacon" for our own Nation in the Near East. Yesterday morning I read in the Washington Post that the United States will make available to certain Arab countries, the sale of military weapons. This I submit, is a policy I fail to understand—especially since the reason given is because they will buy the armaments elsewhere if we refuse to sell.

Is this the criteria by which we decide the validity of arms sales to those who have publicly stated their hatred for us? I say that regardless of circumstances we should not make armaments available to them. Certainly they must prefer our arms to those of the Soviets or they would buy from their friends. To me that indicates our arms are more effective, more destructive—of greater military value—than any other. Who will they be used on to destroy? Obviously, our friends the Israelis. Mr. Speaker, let us not be ridiculous. Let us not feed the hand that bites. If we must become involved at all, for goodness sake let us support, supply, and defend our friends and our friends only.

The Plight of Soviet Jewry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1967

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, October 25 completed the season of the annual Jewish holiday period—the eve of Simchat Torah, the day which for hundreds of years has marked "the rejoicing over the law."

But it was not a day of rejoicing for the approximately 3,000,000 Jews in the Soviet Union, because long-promised lifting of the cultural and religious suppressions affecting Soviet Jews has failed to materialize. Instead, we have seen an intensification of Russian vilification of Israel.

> History demonstrates that the treatment of minorities is a barometer by which to measure the moral health of a society—

Said President Johnson 2 years ago on the occasion of kindling by the American Jewish community of an Eternal Light for Soviet Jewry. Russia's maltreatment of its Jewish citizens points up, as the President said, the "fundamental contradictions between the stated principles and actual practices of the Soviet system."

That is something we should keep in mind in all matters where the world's leader of communism is concerned. It is further emphasized by the statements and actions of the Russians in connection with the current struggles in both the Mid-East and Asia.

We hear the Soviet spokesmen demanding the end of the Arab-Israel hostilities and those in Vietnam—yet it is Russian fighting machines and military counsel which keeps both of these conflicts alive. The Mideast crisis would never have errupted, or even now be threatened with renewed ferocity, if the Russians had not so fully armed the Egyptians and other Arabs and thereby encouraged their confrontation with the Jewish State of Israel.

Similarly, Ho Chi Minh would not be continuing to wage his aggression against the South Vietnamese without the extensive supplies he continues to receive from the Soviet Union.

I cannot help but feel that if anyone has any doubts about what Communist domination of our world would mean, all of these facts should lessen those doubts.

While the Russian Government has at times indicated it would be less anti-Semitic, it has continued to keep its

Jewish citizens from enjoying the religious and cultural participation allowed to other Soviet minorities. The Israel-Arab war, of course, has worsened the situation, with the Soviet Union seemingly blaming the Jews in Russia for the defeat the Jews of Israel inflicted on their Arab neighbors.

As the Soviet Union marks the 50th anniversary of the revolution which brought it to power, indeed one of the major steps it might take toward better understanding among other nations would be to grant to its Jewish citizens at least the same rights afforded other religious and nationality groups in Russia.

Simple Justice Demands That the Soviet Union Cease Their Persecution of Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 26, 1967

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, indeed, to join with our colleagues here in calling attention to and protesting against the harsh and unjust discrimination being visited upon members of the Jewish faith in the Soviet Union.

The protest is timely because yesterday was the eve of the Jewish holiday, Simchath Torah—meaning "rejoice in the law." Unfortunately, there is no justice in the Soviet law as applied to the treatment of Jews there, and consequently, there will be no cause or even opportunity for the Jews to rejoice there.

On the contrary, there is overwhelming evidence of religious and cultural discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union. For example, there is not now a single Yiddish school or class there, although Soviet law permits the organization of such classes at the request of 10 parents.

The irony is that Soviet ideology, practices, and their Constitution itself all encourage nationalities to perpetuate their group's existence through cultural, educational and religious institutions in their own language. The further contradiction is that Jews are legally defined by Russian authority as a nationality.

The Government order limiting and restricting the number of publications in the Hebrew language is undoubtedly a deliberate harassment of the Jews. The extraordinarily harsh punishment visited upon Jews in the Soviet Republic for the most minor offenses bears the blemish of intended racial discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, the natural desire of Russian Jews to be Jewish is certainly no threat to the Soviet might. It is, therefore, most difficult to understand why Soviet Jews should be deprived of, and denied, the rights granted to other religious and ethnic groups.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that under these circumstances, we here have a duty and obligation to speak out and protest against the continuation of this injustice and discrimination, tantamount to persecution, that is being persistently imposed upon Jews in the U.S.S.R.

We are, of course, restricted in what we can concretely do to help these victims of Soviet anti-Semitism; however, as free people in a free society, we can at least raise our voices in condemnation of this grave injustice being visited upon so many innocent people, and we can urge our own Government officials, here and in the United Nations, to encourage and strengthen discussions in that body concerning the religious and cultural persecution of Jews in Russia. Through persevering protests and action, let us hope we may influence the Soviet authorities to speedily end their tragic treatment of a people possessed only of good will, and who wish only to live in comparable freedom among their fellow citizens.

Edwards Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BUCHANAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 26, 1967

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague Jack Edwards this week is sending an interesting report to his constituents in the First Congressional District of Alabama.

I present it here in the Record in the general interest:

A Difficult Vote

Sometimes in Congress a complicated bill presents a real difficulty when it comes up for a vote. It includes both good and bad parts in big measures. Yet we are not allowed to vote on the various parts separately, and we can't vote "maybe": it's got to be either *yes* or *no* on the whole package.

A bill like that came up in mid-October. It provides for pay increases for postal workers and other federal employees, and for a series of postage rate increases. It also carries a special provision for setting government salaries at the executive level. Although the bill passed, I voted against it, and I think you should know why.

Postal employees and federal civil service people are among the finest, hardest-working, and most loyal of all Americans. They need more adequate salaries, and their families deserve it. The bill provides raises for some 3,000,000 employees over a period of three years. But as much as I favor adequate salaries for our federal employees my vote was determined by other provisions which concern the basic fabric of our government.

First, a little-known section of the bill says that a special commission will recommend to the President, every four years, the pay levels and expense allowances for executive level employees of the government, including Department heads, Senators and Congressmen, and federal judges. The President would have authority to put these recommendations into effect unless Congress takes special action to reject them.

This will give the President new and greater influence over the whole scope of the federal government. It is another deep erosion of the Constitutional doctrine of separation of powers: I just couldn't buy it. The President already has too much power over the Supreme Court. He already wields too much influence over Congress when his political party controls the entire Congressional machinery. Should we give him the power of the purse as well?

It is not hard to imagine the political jungle which this plan will create. I don't want to see our federal judges and members of Congress lobbying with the President for more pay—our current President or any future President. Judicial decisions could be influenced, executive branch policies could be altered, and undue pressures could be brought to bear on Congress if powers like this were abused by the President.

The second objection relates to postage rates. The bill increases first class mail rates from 5 to 6 cents, and air mail rates from 8 to 10 cents. But these kinds of mail already pay their own way: the rate increase is hard to justify. The bill also raises the rates for third class, or "junk" mail, but not nearly enough to cover the cost of that service. In other words, when we send first class mail or air mail we are helping to subsidize the delivery of unsolicited third class mail.

A third objection to the bill is another little-known provision transferring authority from Congress to the White House for setting the specific rates of pay increases in 1968 and 1969. No Congressional approval will be needed. Unfortunately this is typical of what is happening in government today—a yielding up of responsibility by the Congress, and the taking of ever-increasing power by the executive branch of the government.

A fourth objection was the cost of the bill: almost $3 billion. Let's face it. This country is broke. We are being saddled with a budget deficit which may well reach $30 billion for this year, a situation which staggers the imagination. Every effort to postpone increased expenditures will lessen the need for a tax increase, and will help hold down inflation in the long run.

DISTRICT TOUR CURTAILED

I am having to cancel my plans for making a Traveling Office tour of the First Congressional District after the adjournment of Congress this Fall. The reason is that adjournment is not likely to come before Thanksgiving, or perhaps considerably later.

Under ordinary conditions Congress is expected to complete its work by Labor Day, allowing plenty of time for a tour of the District. My Traveling Office has proven to be a good way for citizens to meet with their Congressman in their own home community.

When the work of Congress is finally done for the year I plan to visit each county of the District. But there will not be time for the full trailer trip.

THE SYSTEM BREAKS DOWN

One of the reasons Congress is staying in session so long this year, relative to the amount of legislation which is actually being produced, is the breakdown in relations between Congress and the White House. The system envisioned by the writers of the Constitution is simply not working. The House of Representatives has, in effect, voted a lack of confidence in the President. And in the words of one leading newsman, "President Johnson is defensively, almost desperately, trying to regain control."

To find a similar situation you have to go back to 1948. But then, democratic President Harry Truman was defied by a Republican Congress. Today's impasse is between a President and a Congress of the same political party. The essence of true leadership, in domestic as well as international affairs, is missing. Regardless of party labels, Congressmen resent the sense of ownership which the President and those around him seem to have towards the country and towards the Congress. And they feel that the Administration generally fails totally to comprehend the depth and meaning of public unhappiness (even anger) over government affairs.

PUTTING THE LID ON SPENDING

Differences between the President and Congress were sharpened when Mr. Johnson in early August asked Congress to approve a tax increase. Since then people all over the country have sent floods of mail to their Congressmen opposing the tax increase without making some real cuts in federal spending at the same time.

With a staggering $30 billion budget deficit on the horizon, the President's only moves to cut spending have been transparent attempts to avoid the issue. Then on Oct. 18 the House rebelled and voted to force LBJ to hold spending down to $5 billion more during this year than last: that's about $7 billion less than he wants.

The action included specific directives to hold foreign aid spending down to $2 billion for the year, and War on Poverty spending down to $1.2 billion. But as this is being written the Senate has knocked out the spending cuts approved by the House. This is disappointing and hard to understand.

AIDING THE DOPE TRAFFIC

With the nation's traffic in illegal narcotics increasing at an alarming rate the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration said recently that he thinks marijuana should be legalized. And who said this country is not in deep trouble?

House Resolution on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, this week 23 Members of the House of Representatives joined in sponsoring a sense of Congress resolution (H. Con. Res. 536, 539, 555, and 556) expressing the view that "the President should request" the United Nations Security Council or General Assembly to "support an immediate cessation of hostilities by all parties" in the Vietnam war and adopt "appropriate measures, such as the convening of an international peace conference, for reaching a permanent settlement which will assure a lasting peace for Southeast Asia."

Those Members of the House of Representatives sponsoring the House resolution are: Hon. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, of New York; Hon. WILLIAM A. BARRETT, of Pennsylvania; Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., of California; Hon. PHILLIP BURTON, of California; Hon. JEFFERY COHELAN, of California; Hon. JOHN CONYERS, JR., of Michigan; Hon. DON EDWARDS, of California; Hon. JOSHUA EILBERG, of Pennsylvania; Hon. DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota; Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, of Maryland; Hon. JACOB H. GILBERT, of New York; Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; Hon. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, of Washington; Hon. KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia; Hon. HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey; Hon. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin; Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT, of California; Hon. PATSY T. MINK, of Hawaii; Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania; Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York; Hon. EDWARD R. ROYBAL, of California; Hon. JAMES H. SCHEUER, of New York; and Hon. HERBERT TENZER, of New York.

Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of Members of the House, I place in the RECORD at this point the text of House Concurrent Resolution 556:

H. CON. RES. 556

Whereas the primary purpose of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security and to take collective measures to remove threats to world peace;

Whereas in satisfying the charter of the United Nations the United States undertook a solemn treaty commitment to settle international disputes by peaceful means; and

Whereas under the charter the Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace, which devolves to the General Assembly when the Council is unable to act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that:

1. The President should request an emergency meeting of the United Nations Security Council to consider all aspects of the conflict in Vietnam and to act to end the conflict in accordance with article 25 of the charter.

2. If the Security Council is unable to act, the United States should take all steps necessary to assure action on the issue by the General Assembly.

3. The United States objectives in the United Nations should be to obtain—

(a) support for an immediate cessation of hostilities by all parties, and

(b) recommendations for appropriate measures, such as the convening of an international conference, for reaching a permanent settlement which will assure a lasting peace, for Southeast Asia.

The Speaker, the Secretary of State and our Ambassador to the United Nations have in the past expressed themselves in support of United Nations action in connection with the Vietnam conflict. Now the Congress has an opportunity to express itself so that a coordinated effort may be made to achieve the desired result—an honorable settlement of the Vietnam war.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations began hearings October 26, 1967, on similar resolutions. Fifty-five U.S. Senators have sponsored a sense of the Senate resolution expressing the view that the President consider taking the Vietnam issue to the U.N. Security Council.

Because of the support for the House resolution—which includes a request that the Vietnam issue be brought to the General Assembly, failing Security Council action, I urge my colleagues in the House to review the text of House Concurrent Resolution 556. So that a majority of the House may also express its views on this resolution, I urge my colleagues to join in a broad, bipartisan effort to express the sense of Congress on the Vietnam war and the appropriate role of the United Nations in bringing the conflict to the conference table.

Oppression of Jews Continues in Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union have just concluded the observance of Simchat Torah, the end of the Jewish holy season.

And, once again the eyes of the world are on the oppression of the Jews in the Soviet Union. The Soviet leaders claim that their people have freedom and equality, but Jews are not allowed contact with their own people abroad, as are other minority groups in the Soviet Union.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the number of synagogues has decreased to less than 70 in the last 12 years. In 1956, there were 380 synagogues in Russia.

I join the millions throughout the world in calling upon the leaders of the Soviet Union to end their discriminatory practices against the Jewish people and to return to them their freedom of education and instruction in their own cultural and linguistic heritage.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hear my prayer, O Lord, give ear to my supplications: in Thy faithfulness answer me and in Thy righteousness. Psalm 143:1

Breathe on us, breath of God, as in this moment we bow at the altar of prayer and offer unto Thee the devotion of our hearts. Thou hast bound us together with our neighbors in a struggle for liberty and a striving for peace. Grant unto us the insight and the inspiration that we may continue on the path of freedom and together maintain peace, promote justice, and increase our fellowship with each other.

So rule our hearts and prosper our endeavors that law and order, faith and good will may prevail between us forever. Thus may we be one in spirit as we face the events and the experiences of this day. In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8580. An act to convey certain land to the Squaxin Island Tribe of Indians.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1160) entitled "An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10196) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendments to the Senate amendments numbered 55, 61, and 69.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the President pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the seat at the left of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to conduct the President of the United Mexican States into the Chamber the gentleman from Texas, Mr. MAHON; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. ZABLOCKI; the gentlewoman from Ohio, Mrs. BOLTON; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. YOUNG; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ; the gentleman from California, Mr. ROYBAL; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. DE LA GARZA; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BUSH; and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PRICE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to accompany the President of the United Mexican States into the Chamber the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. LONG; the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN; the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE; the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD; the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. YOUNG; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER; and the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. MUNDT.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United Mexican States.

The President of the United Mexican States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great privilege, and I deem it a high honor and pleasure, to present to you a distinguished representative of his people, for whom we hold feelings of high regard and warm friendship, His Excellency Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, the President of the United Mexican States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

President GUSTAVO DIAZ ORDAZ. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President pro tempore of the Senate, Members of the Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, I deeply appreciate the great honor bestowed upon me—the opportunity of addressing the people of this great Nation, from its highest rostrum.

I can assure you that the applause that we have just heard at this very moment is moving the hearts of millions of Mexicans, and I can also assure you that no other diplomatic gesture could do more to bring together our two peoples.

To the friendly and noble people of the United States of America the cordial greetings and loyal friendship of the Mexicans.

Mexico evolves under a revolution that did not begin yesterday. It began in 1910 and it is now in its institutional stage, the essence of which is the conjugation of social justice with individual freedom.

In the bosom of our community coexist, in freedom, a diversity of opinions, ideologies, and creeds; however, most of us, coinciding in fundamental principles and high common aims, have made one solid national unity with a vast popular basis, which allows us to continue developing under the law, and that has made it feasible for the country to enjoy a firm stability, as well as a great flexibility, to face the changing obstacles of the present world.

We struggle eagerly so that those who have much share with the lower income groups and assist in the solution of the country's problems.

Our production, it is true, has grown, but not enough to give full satisfaction to all. Deficiencies are great and we have no reason to hide them, neither at home nor abroad.

We have achieved deep and permanent reforms with the purpose of widening the opportunities for Mexicans to reach well-being up to what our own limitations permit at this time.

We have drawn deeply and will follow on that course, obeying the unchangeable mandate of our own historical-political evolution. There are still many things to be done and to be corrected and improved; but, because we continue reforming peacefully and according to law, we believe that we are a people among whom there is no pending revolution—rather a revolution in action.

We know that the progress of the country is based mainly on our effort, but in order to accelerate development, we call upon outside financing. We enjoy good international credit based upon the strict fulfillment of our obligations and on an absolute respect to a limit we have set ourselves; never to go beyond our payment capacity.

In other countries, direct foreign investment enjoys privileges over national investment. We are convinced that, when the interests of the foreign investor go against those of the nation where he invests, all guarantees granted will be worthless—the actual incompatibility of interests will fatally determine the cancellation of apparent advantages.

The conditions we have established are fair and solid, because they operate both ways—in favor of Mexico and of the investor. The concordance of interests make them lasting and worthy of trust.

Mexico and the United States find themselves bound by close economic ties. Traditionally, we have been one of your major consumers of goods and services. The value of what we paid for in these two items in 1966 was $1,466,700,000.

In your trade with Latin America we always occupy first place as buyers and third as sellers; in world trade we have rated between second and fifth. Only Canada has been above us every year and, at present, also Japan. The Federal German Republic and the United Kingdom—third and fourth places—annually handle a volume slightly higher than ours.

Our purchases in the American market are equivalent to half of the sum of the rest of Latin America and twice that of the South Pacific.

Those of the Middle East countries represent 69 percent of what Mexico buys from the United States. Those of the whole African continent, 91 percent.

Trade of United States cities on the border with Mexico depends, in a vital proportion, on Mexican buyers.

Tourism constitutes a principal item between the two countries, both because of expenditures by North Americans in Mexico, as well as because of what is spent by Mexicans in this country.

No restriction, no limitation to expenditures abroad, do we impose on Mexican travelers.

We are, therefore, in many ways, one of the most important clients of the United States and it is a rule of international trade that to keep a client one must be, in turn, a good client. It is logical that the less you buy from us or the less you spend in Mexico, the less we can buy from you.

And so we are concerned not only by the disparity of prices between the raw materials we export and the capital goods, which are our main import, but also by the limitations to buy in Mexico fixed on American visitors—which we hope will be lifted for the two bordering countries, Canada and Mexico—and by the barriers or restrictions of another kind that stop or hinder the participation in the American market of numerous manufactured goods, highly competitive in price and quality.

The United States is a great and powerful nation. We cannot conceive that at this stage of development it would require protection for new industries, since industries of the United States are now well developed.

I have mentioned only the trade aspects of greater entity; I deem it necessary that we should study them together, conscientiously, in order to reach decisions favorable to both countries.

When one part benefits and the other is harmed, trade relations cannot last; when business favors both parts, then it is permanent. From lack of equity stemmed the prejudice that business is an inevitable factor of international friction. One begins trading, and if it is a just trade, one continues with friendship, and there is nothing more valuable in this world than friendship.

Geography made us neighbors, economy has kept us the best of clients, and the decided will of our peoples, overcoming at times the relentless course of history, has made us cordial and respectful friends. Our deals must always have these characteristics: of neighbors, good neighbors; of clients, magnificent clients; of friends, loyal friends.

I have not been authorized by the nations of Latin America to speak in their name; but it would be petty on my part and I would fail continental solidarity and the deeply felt Indo-American fraternity, if I spoke only in the name of my country.

It is imperative for public opinion in the United States, and particularly that of the groups of greater economic and political influence, to clearly understand, that to insist on the difficulties of economic and political development of Latin America, is not a desire to annoy or an eagerness to formulate complaints, but the expression of urgent necessities afflicting millions of human beings that find adequate shelter in the noble purposes that inspired the idea of the Alliance for Progress.

Underdevelopment is not just one more name for the "folklore" of remote countries: it involves a human drama of incalculable consequences, for what it implies in natural resources that are not used, sterile loss of lives, waste of creative energy, talents that never manage to flourish.

For Latin America the decisive economic problem is the same I already pointed out in the case of Mexico; that of prices of raw materials in the world market. As long as they remain low, or, what is even worse they lower, we can hardly aspire to a process of sustained development. Any other exterior effort, such as technical assistance or financial cooperation, might temporarily alleviate the situation, but never solve it.

You are sovereign to resolve your own matters and to decide on your own problems. However, before you take decisions that may affect millions of people outside of your borders, it might be well to stop and consider just what these effects may be in the rest of the world.

> Suppose that in 1966 the exports of the less developed countries, instead of declining as a proportion of world trade, last year had been able to maintain the same modest position that they had occupied 5 years earlier. On that supposition, the less-developed countries would have had a 1-percent larger share of world exports—and that 1 percent would have earned them well over a billion dollars more of foreign exchange than their exports actually did earn in 1966.
>
> If a one percent adjustment in shares of world export trade would bring about a billion-dollar improvement in the fortunes of the poor, then surely the matter is worth consideration and action. Price stabilization for selected primary products is a closely related subject similarily entitled to consideration, even though it admittedly presents difficult problems. If the less developed countries are encouraged—and permitted—to improve their export earnings, many problems will become more manageable: External debt crises will be fewer, the need for aid will diminish, the attraction for private capital will increase.

These thoughts are not mine, nor do they belong to a passionate Latin American, they were expressed by George D. Woods, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, on September 25, of this year, in Rio de Janeiro.

We reiterate this problem before the people of the United States, and I do it now in this Congress that represents it, not only because North America has a decisive weight on the fluctuations of international markets, but also because what is said here has a worldwide resonance.

The world must replace the idea that considers the achievement of the highest profits in the shortest time as the goal of excellence, for one that considers general efficiency of socially minded investments as preferable.

We have observed that the most powerful business concerns of the United States, following the advice of distinguished North American economists, among them some who support the aforementioned thesis, and of their executives with greater experience, are already deliberately limiting prices, and consequently their profits, to avoid a serious economic crisis through taking up excessive amounts of money.

The thesis is valid for one or for a group of business firms, as well as for a nation or a group of nations.

Mankind must decide whether it is fairer and more convenient to live in opulence surrounded by poor, or among prosperous nations, even if we never reach excessive wealth.

The most dangerous agitators are fear, and ill health, and lack of food, of shelter, of dress, and of schooling.

The lack of enough capital and the deterioration of foreign trade is not, for our peoples, a problem of good or bad business, but a matter of life and death for millions of Latin American men, women, old aged, and children.

An idealist of our revolution said one must go through the terrible pains of death in order to give birth to a new life. We have gone through those pains so that Mexico might be born to independence, political freedom, and social justice.

Mexicans know from long experience—all their history—that what they do not do for themselves no one else will do for them, and that which is worthwhile is not easily obtained. All we have achieved has been difficult: from having our own territory and ruling over it to selecting in sovereignty the ways of life that are peculiar to us. Thus, we do not expect that others do what we must do ourselves.

I am well aware that no one bears exclusive responsibility for the plight of millions of people. I do not put the blame on any country. All have a share in it. It is, in fact, a common responsibility, because we have been unable to find effective formulas for the harmonious coexistence of all men.

What I want to say is that if we wish to survive and obtain peace there must be a true revolution of the mind that may allow all of us to construct a world where justice prevails.

And in such world, let each nation gain its prosperity through its own merits and the efforts of its children.

Our poor world cannot continue to live between one and another war, that engenders evil for many, and desperation for millions. Today, the worse suffering is fear. There is no country on the face of the earth that does not long to enter the path of hope and security.

The eventual risks of peace are infinitely less than the positive evils of war. The problems, difficulties, the mutual tolerance that peace demands are amply justified if we only think of the consequences of war, knowing that, in this matter, fantasy stops short at the horrors of fact.

Even more so now that we find ourselves in the most dangerous of crossroads. History shows how empires, civilizations, and cultures have vanished; but not until today do we know that, through man's own action, mankind can disappear.

I should like to quote words said, under unfortunate circumstances for the North American Nation, by the great revolutionary, Abraham Lincoln:

> The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew.

Indeed, we must think and act with a new spirit, if we wish to solve the multiple and complex problems that afflict us.

As a matter of principle, we must make compatible through common aims, that which by nature and essence is varied and different. We must embrace multiple diversity, respecting and conciliating peculiar characteristics of autonomous groups, to build a world in accordance with the plurality which forms it.

To understand it so is to begin to solve the problems. To attempt to standardize, and to believe that all groups are equal in institutions and habits, would be a serious mistake.

Each country has the right to select the path it considers adequate, following its own idiosyncracies, to seek freedom and happiness for its people; but each one has the obligation to see that diversity does not turn into conflict.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President pro tempore of the Senate, Members of the Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, I have tried to present to you briefly an image of modern Mexico. I have mentioned some aspects of our bilateral relations. I have spoken of matters that have a great interest for Latin America. And I have exposed my thoughts on the great problems of the world.

I go back now to the essential reasons of my visit in Washington and of my presence in this Congress: to accept with pleasure the friendly invitation made to me by the President of the United States and thus to correspond cordially to the visit to Mexico which he made in April of 1966. To talk with President Johnson, as old friends, of the diverse questions that affect our countries; and, with my presence here before Congress, to confirm in the public solemnity of this joint session, the loyal friendship of the Mexican people to the noble people of the United States.

Neighbors by geography, the way to reach this friendship that now unites us has not been easy.

Not always do our points of view coincide, nor have they coincided in the past; but we have learned to respect them.

From the sacred respect we have for ourselves, is born the respect we profess to other nations, which, in turn, serves as a strong support to demand respect from others.

This is the basis of friendship that allows the common enjoyment of affinities and the tolerance of differences, for understanding generates affection.

I finish by quoting thoughts by two eminent men of the past: one, a solid jurist and untiring fighter, the other a profound thinker and inspired poet. Their expressions are dissimilar: one, a political formula, the other a beautiful vision; but if we dare unite them—as a dream and a fact—they let us confirm the road that with great foresight had been found by our elders.

The great Mexican Benito Juarez said:

> Democracy is the fate of future mankind; freedom, its indestructible weapon; possible perfection its goal.

The great North American Henry David Thoreau said:

> Goodness is the only investment that never fails.

Let us do whatever is necessary to go through life heeding the deep voice of our peoples, to obey and serve them, which is the essence of democracy; jealously watching over and increasing freedom for all; struggling to attain social justice; untiringly pursuing the ideal of becoming better every day. And let us always use goodness, which is the noblest of sentiments, in the fulfillment of this great mission.

Just one last word: Permit me to send to each and every one of you my warm salutation, and my deep-felt gratitude for your generosity and your attention. I know that precedents are being broken in permitting concurrent translation of my words.

I see here in this Chamber many old friends—old friends of mine and old friends of my country.

Finally, to make this session perfect for me, just one thing was lacking, but did take place, the presence here of brothers from Latin America, Congressmen from Guatemala who, I have been advised, are present to do me the honor of listening to me.

Thank you all very much.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m., the President of the United Mexican States, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order: The members of the President's Cabinet; the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

KICKING OUR FRIENDS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ZION] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, even as a boy I learned that it did not make much sense to kick one's friends around. It is not very good politics either—especially when done on an international scale. Since coming to Congress in January I have had quite a bit to say about the fallacy of handing out treats to our enemies. I have strongly deplored governmental policies that have permitted trade dealings with the very nations who are helping our enemies in Vietnam. It just has not seemed reasonable to ship materials and scientific instruments and a host of other industrial and agricultural commodities to Communist-bloc nations which in turn utilize these to support North Vietnam and the Vietcong in their war of aggression against the free peoples of Southeast Asia. I will continue to oppose such trade.

And now I have become increasingly alarmed with the attitude of our Government toward a friend. Back in January, I was hard put to understand the thinking behind Executive Order No. 11322, ordering American observance of United Nations economic sanctions against Rhodesia.

I have given a lot of study and thought to this situation before speaking out. A lot of people in my own district are concerned about our support of these sanctions and they have gone to the effort to let me know how they feel. In a way it is surprising that an area in the heart of the Midwest would be this concerned about our Nation's dealings with a small nation in the heart of Africa. But these folks have a real sense of fairplay and they have seen it flagrantly violated. They have seen our Government rush to the support of a score of newly emerging African nations that are soon bathed in a morass of internal intrigue and instability. They have read about Communist influence determining the policies and direction that these new states have taken. They have watched the United States pour all manner of economic and military aid into these new states and have watched this aid plummet down the drain as alleged constitutional government is replaced by chaos and anarchy.

And then they observe Rhodesia—one of the models of stable government on the African continent. Rhodesia—with an outstanding system of public education. Rhodesia—possessing one of the highest standards of living for all of its citizens of any African nation. Rhodesia—a courageous government with an absolute opposition to communism in any form.

And to top it off, Rhodesia has offered to support this Nation's involvement in Vietnam by sending troops and contributing of her material wealth. In the face of Rhodesia's own record of progress, her international policies, and her friendship and support for our own country, how can Americans demonstrate sympathy for the administration's ratification of U.N. sanctions? Let us talk dollars alone, if the morality of this situation is not sufficiently evident.

Our major source of high-grade chrome was Rhodesia. We stopped importing it in line with the sanction policy. Now we have real problems in obtaining a high-grade supply. Russia was quick to move in and latch on to much of the Rhodesian output. Even England herself, in a somewhat unusual deal, has cadged Rhodesian chrome. The same facts apply to a host of other commodities. Commonsense has lost all sway, and people are beginning to question the policies of an administration which behaves thus.

The original U.N. actions are questionable and perhaps in violation of its own charter. We supported these actions in spite of our own tradition of respecting freedom and the internal integrity of other nations—just as we once asked the same respect for our own newly emerging state.

I believe it is time that this policy was reexamined in the light of our own best interest as well as that of the free people of the world. Rhodesia has been the victim of this nonsense long enough.

POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Gude] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the States of the Potomac River Basin—Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia—with the District of Columbia through the official representatives of their respective governments, have taken an important step toward the solution of the problems of the Potomac River. The Potomac River Basin Advisory Committee has drafted a proposed Federal-interstate compact of the member States which will bind the jurisdictions of the area to a cooperative effort to clean up the Potomac and to assure the fullest utilization of its water and to retain its scenic attributes for the lasting benefit of all the people living in the basin.

The preliminary draft of the proposed compact has been publicly presented by the Advisory Committee for review and discussion by the public and interested parties of the member States. More detailed discussion of the compact is taking place today at a symposium sponsored by the Intertsate Commission on the Potomac River Basin and the Potomac River Basin Advisory Committee at Cacapon State Park Lodge, Berkley Springs, W. Va.

In recent years there have been many serious proposals for the preservation and protection of the Potomac Basin, including the current undertakings of the Presidential Task Force on the Potomac.

Today probably the most valuable natural asset of the entire valley aside from the river itself is the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. The Federal Government has owned the canal since 1927, but only in recent years has the Government even begun to develop its potential. We can proceed toward the goals of the Potomac Task Force or of any other group with similar purposes by using the tools at hand. Specifically, I refer to the recreational potential of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal and the protection of its historic and scenic features. These goals can be achieved through enactment of the legislation originally introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] H.R. 7201, and which I have likewise sponsored along with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Morton], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

This legislation would authorize the establishment and development of a Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park. Through it the canal would be opened up, cleaned up, and rewatered where feasible. Its scenery and wildlife would be better protected. This legislation would be a beginning step toward our overall objectives.

While, in the case of the proposed compact, the difficulties of blending the interest of the several jurisdictions into agreement can be great, the stakes are so tremendous for the future of this most vital natural asset, the Potomac, that these efforts deserve our concern and careful attention. I wish to commend to your attention the following remarks of James J. O'Donnell, chairman, Potomac River Basin Advisory Committee:

REMARKS BY MR. O'DONNELL

The Potomac River Basin Advisory Committee was created in the Spring of 1965. The Governors of the basin states—Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia and Pennsylvania and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, recognizing the need for some device to solve mutual problems related to the Potomac, each appointed three representatives to serve on the Advisory Committee. Numerous studies of the Potomac had been conducted but there was no means for carrying out any of the recommendations made following these studies. The Governors charged the Advisory Committee with the task of finding some mechanism for planning, developing and managing the water resources of the Potomac River Basin. The Committee's principal function was to study the various alternatives and recommend to the Governors and the D.C. Commissioners the best possible kind of permanent regional organization to provide the comprehensive action needed on the Potomac.

This morning's gathering is the culmination of our efforts in carrying out the instructions of the Governors. We are formally announcing our recommendations today in releasing the Preliminary Draft of the federal-interstate Potomac River Compact.

The compact concept has proved eminently successful as a workable device for states to solve mutual problems cooperatively. In fact, the Constitution of the United States is itself a compact ratified by the states. Interstate compact agencies in many fields, but best known to the public through such immense operations as the New York and Philadelphia Port Authorities, have been very successful as devices through which states have solved common problems.

The proposed Potomac River Basin Commission which the compact would create would be a corporate and political entity. Its members would be the Governors of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or their representatives and an appointee of the President of the United States. Each member would have an alternate empowered to act in his place. The Commission would be authorized to appoint advisors to the respective Commissioners, as well as to create advisory committees of experts.

The Commission would arrange for intergovernmental cooperation at all levels in order to achieve coordinated planning, conservation, utilization, development, management and control of the water resources of the Potomac River Basin.

The Commission would be required to adopt and keep current a comprehensive water resources plan.

It would be responsible for the general management of water resources and be obliged to insure the observance of the water resources plan. It could acquire, construct, operate and control needed projects and facilities for the purposes of water supply maintenance, water quality management and control, flood protection, watershed management and recreation.

It would be able to provide for the development and preservation of esthetic, scenic and historic values of the basin, including parks and parkways, open spaces, recreation, historical and natural areas and wetlands.

It would adopt annually capital and current expense budgets. Its funds would come from both government and private sources. It could issue revenue bonds for the construction of its facilities.

One noteworthy characteristic would be that the new Commission will not replace nor duplicate existing agencies. Agencies which now have responsibilities in regard to the river will continue to have those responsibilities. The Commission will coordinate the activities of existing federal, state and local agencies in carrying out the comprehensive water resources plan.

The terms of the compact provide for safeguards in the exercise of Commission authority.

FREEMAN PROGRAMS DESERVE "NEW ERROR," NOT "NEW ERA" LABEL

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today billed his proposal to divert 30 million feed grain acres from production in 1968 as another important step under what he called "our New Era farm program."

It could be more appropriately described as the "New Error farm program." What the 1968 feed grain plan really represents is just another uncertain step in the administration's stop-and-start, trial-and-error tinkering with the agricultural economy. The miserable but completely predictable results of the New Error planning efforts have been to push farm prices ever lower, while farm production expenses have skyrocketed to the highest levels in history. You have to go back to the depression days to find a farm parity ratio comparable with today's anemic 73.

In announcing the 1968 feed grains program, Mr. Freeman said:

> We are doing what the New Era farm programs enacted in 1965 were designed to do—tailor supply to demand in order to increase farm prices and prevent costly surpluses.

With new crop corn selling at 85 to 90 cents a bushel, and even lower in many instances, farmers will wonder if the Secretary was misquoted. He was not.

A few short months ago, the Secretary was boasting that administration farm programs had eliminated grain surpluses. In fact, he called for increased production of feed grains, soybeans, and wheat to avert shortages. Now, suddenly, we have surpluses again, he says. Cut production, he urges. And, all this in the face of a mounting world famine crisis.

Secretary Freeman calls this "the most attractive program we have ever had in feed grains." Attractive is hardly the word. It is wasteful, unrealistic, and ineffective to a fantastic degree.

Not only farmers, but consumers as well, should be alarmed that national food planning goals are in such uncertain hands. The New Error farm program has got to go, and the sooner the better.

Congress should review the Feed Grain Act this year, and not wait until this costly and ineffective program expires.

IMPORT QUOTAS—A THREAT TO 30 YEARS OF TRADE POLICY PROGRESS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHALEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last several days we have heard and read a good deal of commentary by those who claim to seek protection for American industries from foreign competition.

These forces have come out strongly for the imposition of restrictions in the form of import quotas.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the quotas and have gone on record before on this point.

Further, despite the impressions that may have been conveyed during the current development of this controversy, American industry has not joined ranks behind this regressive movement toward protectionism.

As evidence of this, I would like to insert in the RECORD the text of a telegram from the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, Inc., to Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. The U.S. council, whose membership includes over 300 major American firms, is opposed to import quotas and states its position quite candidly.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the points made in this telegram and also to the distinguished American companies represented among the signatories:

U.S. COUNCIL REGISTERS OPPOSITION TO IMPORT QUOTAS LEGISLATION

(Telegram from the executive committee of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce to Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, chairman, Senate Committee for Finance, October 18, 1967)

U.S. Council of International Chamber of Commerce strongly opposed to import quota legislation now before your committee. At deliberations today undersigned members of executive committee unanimously agreed this legislation could serve only to reverse thirty years trade policy progress.

Our country now stands to lose incalculable benefits of enlightened bi-partisan efforts to modernize world's commercial structure. Imposition of quotas will lead to retaliation from other countries. They would have no choice but to follow our example with worldwide restrictive chain reaction bound to result.

This neither U.S. nor world can afford. Export earnings vital to balance of payments would be in jeopardy. Higher costs induced by quotas would add to inflationary pressures. The sacrifice of jobs generated by trade would deepen unemployment problems. Damaging effect of proposed quotas on overall policy position would be enormous.

In terms of our national interest dangers are overwhelming. Major U.S. stake in world production structure would be imperiled.

We have consistently urged upon other nations the benefits of free competition We must practice it ourselves.

SIGNERS

James A. Linen, Time, Inc. (chairman, executive committee).

William Blackie, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

Max E. Gevers, Bankers Trust Co.

Patrick E. Haggerty, Texas Instruments Inc.

H. J. Heinz II, H. J. Heinz Co.

Walter Hochschild, American Metal Climax, Inc.

Amory Houghton, Corning Glass Works.

Antonie T. Knoppers, Merck Sharp & Dohme International.

Warren Lee Pierson, All America Cable & Radio, Inc.

Philip D. Reed, former chairman, General Electric Co.

Ralph T. Reed, former chairman, American Express.

Hoyt P. Steele, General Electric Co.

Arthur K. Watson, International Business Machines Corp.

Leo D. Welch, former chairman, Standard Oil Company (N.J.).

Walter Wriston, First National City Bank.

OEO SHOULD SPEND LESS MONEY ON ADVERTISING ITSELF

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a radio news broadcaster yesterday evening told a sad story about how the Office of Economic Opportunity stopped the presses, in the middle of a printing job, because it had run out of ink and the Congress had given it no funds with which to buy more.

I am not at all surprised that the OEO has run out of ink. A few days ago an indignant constituent sent me a handsome magazine of 30 or more pages, printed on slick paper, published by the OEO to extol its own virtues. I have asked for a justification.

In 1 day's mail this week I received four communications from OEO, some with enclosures, two of them from Mr. Shriver, explaining to me that OEO deserves a new lease on life.

I have observed that State and regional units of OEO are also great publishers of newspapers and press releases.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if OEO spent less of its money on paper and ink advertising itself and lobbying for its own programs it might have sufficient funds even now to establish the community action centers and the Neighborhood Youth Corps units that some of our communities desire.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I sent 43,000 questionnaires to people living in six communities in Illinois' 14th District, which I am privileged to represent. I asked questions about the war in Vietnam which were similar to those asked during the past year by the Gallup poll, and about 6,100 persons responded.

The returns are, it seems to me, somewhat more toward the "dove" attitude than those of 18 months ago when I last polled the people of my district about this unpopular war; but there was one point about which the answer was loud and clear.

When asked whether the United States should continue the bombing of North Vietnam, those who responded said "yes" more than 4 to 1.

The questions and the poll results follow:

THE 14TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, ILLINOIS, POLL ON VIETNAM, SEPTEMBER 1967

[In percent]

Do you believe you have a clear idea of what the Vietnam War is all about—that is, why we are fighting there?

Yes (4,293)	70
No (1,717)	28
No opinion (123)	2

Do you think our part in the war in Vietnam is morally justified, or not?

Yes (3,618)	59
No (2,204)	36
No opinion (312)	5

Do you think our part in the Vietnam War is politically justified, or not? That is, have we gained or lost stature among the family of nations by our stand?

Gained (1,533)	25
Lost (4,110)	67
No opinion (491)	8

Do you approve or disapprove of the way President Johnson is handling the situation in Vietnam?

Approve (1,045)	17
Disapprove (4,844)	79
No opinion (245)	4

In view of developments since we entered the fighting in Vietnam, do you think the U.S. made a mistake by sending troops to fight in Vietnam?

A mistake (3,007)	49
Not a mistake (2,884)	47
No opinion (243)	4

Some people say we should go all-out to win a military victory in Vietnam, using atomic bombs and atomic weapons. Do you agree or disagree with this view?

Agree (1,779)	29
Disagree (4,050)	66
No opinion (305)	5

Some people say we should withdraw our troops from Vietnam and have no more to do with it. Do you agree or disagree with this view?

Agree (1,471)	24
Disagree (4,359)	71
No opinion (304)	5

If peace terms can be arranged in Vietnam and U.S. troops are withdrawn, do you think the government of South Vietnam would be strong enough to withstand Communist pressures?

Yes (1,113)	18
No (4,278)	70
No opinion (723)	12

Looking ahead the next few years, which country do you regard as the greater threat to world peace, Russia or Communist China?

Russia (982)	16
China (4,787)	78
No opinion (364)	6

Just your impression: Do you think the United States and its allies are making progress in Vietnam? Or standing still? Or going backward?

Progressing (1,893)	31
Standing (3,391)	55
Backward (774)	13
No opinion (76)	1

At this time, how worried are you about the situation in Vietnam?

Very worried (2,968)	48
Fairly worried (2,325)	38
Not worried (718)	12
No opinion (123)	2

At this time, how worried are you about getting into a World War?

Very worried (1,162)	19
Fairly worried (2,076)	34
Not worried (2,774)	45
No opinion (119)	2

Do you believe it is likely that the war in Vietnam will be settled within the next year?

Yes (868)	14
No (5,013)	82
No opinion (248)	4

Some people believe the United States did the right thing in sending troops to Vietnam to try to prevent Communist expansion. Others believe the United States should not become involved in the internal affairs of other nations. With which do you agree?

Did right (3,316)	54
Did wrong (2,457)	40
No opinion (361)	6

In your opinion, should the United States continue bombing North Vietnam?

Yes (4,738)	77
No (1,108)	18
No opinion (188)	5

Do you think the Johnson administration is or is not telling the people all they should know about the Vietnam War?

Is (784)	13
Is not (5,099)	83
No opinion (251)	4

WIDNALL PROPOSES SOLUTION TO HOUSE-SENATE IMPASSE ON ARMS CREDIT SALES AUTHORITY

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the question of arms credit sales is the sole remaining issue between the House and Senate conferees on the foreign aid authorization bill, and that failure to resolve differences on this issue threaten to delay, if not kill chances for enactment of a foreign aid authorization bill during this session of the 90th Congress.

It is the purpose of my brief remarks today to suggest a course of action to the Democratic leadership of the House aimed at resolving this impasse in a manner that will reflect the majority will of the Members of this House

As I have made clear on several occasions, I am vigorously opposed to continuation of the so-called country X device of supplying sophisticated weapons to underdeveloped nations through the mechanism of a Pentagon revolving fund guaranteeing Export-Import Bank credits. I am opposed to this procedure because it was conceived to achieve secrecy in arms credit sales, with disclosure of actual sales being made to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations only after delivery of the weapons. It is a system that has enabled the United States to become the world's leading supplier of arms to developing countries; a system whereby the United States has doubled its sale of arms to underdeveloped countries over the past 6 years, rising to nearly $900 million in the last fiscal year—several hundred million more than the amount sold by the Soviet Union during the same period.

On the other hand, as I have indicated to officials of the Johnson administration, I realize U.S. military sales policy cannot operate in a vacuum, oblivious to the aggressive military sales program of other countries such as the Soviet Union and France. There are times when arms credit sales can be justified. But there is absolutely no reason why the Export-Import Bank should be involved. If need be, Congress can authorize through the regular appropriations process a special, emergency credit fund for use by the Pentagon for such purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the House already has spoken on the issue of arms credit sales. On August 25, during House consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967, by a record vote of 236 to 157 the House approved my amendment removing from existing law arms credit sales authority.

If the foreign aid conferees still are in doubt as to the sentiment of the House on this issue, why not schedule the Export-Import Bank bill—H.R. 6649—for floor consideration and let the House work its will on the question of Eximbank arms credits to underdeveloped countries. I am ready to offer an amendment prohibiting such credits, and I am confident of the outcome. This bill was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency on May 11. There is no reason why a rule has not been granted by the Committee on Rules. In days gone by, such delay would have been called obstructionist.

Mr. Speaker, the House should be permitted to act on the issue of arms credit sales, notwithstanding the adamant position of the Johnson administration in support of continuing on an unlimited and secret basis such activities.

AUTHORITY FOR CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED AND TRULY ENROLLED UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CRAMER RENEWS DEMAND FOR RESUMPTION OF JOINT HOUSE-SENATE HEARINGS ON ADVERSE EFFECTS OF PROPOSED HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION CUTBACK BY PRESIDENTIAL ORDER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, 1967, Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd wired all Governors that the Johnson administration was contemplating a possible 50 percent, $2.2 billion cutback in highway construction apparently under the guise that it would assist in easing the money squeeze and giving the impression that it might affect the impending $29 billion 1968 fiscal year deficit.

Obviously, withholding temporarily this year as was done last year, some of the contract letting and expenditures from the highway trust fund has no effect on the administrative budget or on the size of the deficit.

Thus, again, the Johnson administration is threatening the Congress and every State with another year of up and down, valley and peak yo-yo highway financing, in the life-saving, economy supporting, and user-financed highway construction program that Congress intended should be inviolate from such stop-and-go monetary manipulation.

I placed in the RECORD, on October 11, page 28687, an analysis of the effect of such a cutback and an exposure of the fact that this cut in highway construction does not affect the deficit. It does give the administration, however, the chance to misleadingly argue that a cut here makes cuts elsewhere in the favorite Great Society programs—such as model cities, Teachers Corps, highway beautification, rent subsidies and antipoverty—unnecessary.

I understand that 43 of the 50 States have answered Mr. Boyd's wire and that the opposition to such a massive 50-percent cut is unanimous and evidence of the adverse effects on the economy and highway building programs is evident in every State.

The following States had not replied as of today—South Carolina, Kansas, Oklahoma, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Hawaii.

In view of the unanimous opposition to this cutback, the obvious adverse economic impact that will result, the lack of an effect on the deficit and the escalating cost of construction that results from such ups and downs, I renew my request that the Joint House-Senate Public Works Committee's recessed session of last year on the subject of cutbacks be immediately reconvened.

It is essential that Congress be fully informed and that the opponents be given a chance to be heard before a cutback order is made, an order that is threatened on or about November 1 according to Mr. Boyd's wire. I would hope that such a hearing could be held before any such order is entered. I call upon the President to reconsider the cutback, to delay a final decision until after these point hearings are held, and all facts are exposed.

After attending the hearings before which the Johnson administration witnesses appeared concerning the 1966 cutback, I am thoroughly convinced they do not understand and have not fully evaluated the aftereffects of such a meat-ax cut any more this year than last.

I appeal to Senator Randolph and Congressman Fallon, respective chairmen of the Senate and House Public Works Committees, to reconvene immediately the recessed joint hearings before it is too late.

"COST OF OPERATIONS" OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, who ever heard of sound and repayable loans being grouped with personnel costs and reported as "cost of operations?" Yet that appears to be what they do regularly in reporting the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture.

An article carried in the press announcing the signing of the 1968 Agriculture appropriations contained the following statement:

> There was a dispute between Congress and the Administration over precisely how much money was appropriated for the Agriculture Department for this 12-month period. The White House said it was $5.6 billion while Congress maintained it was $4.9 billion. Whatever the final expenditure will be, the White House contended that Congress voted $88 million more than the President asked. Congress said it voted $69 million less than the President asked.

Mr. Speaker, this statement is inaccurate and the record should be set straight on this matter. With all of its other problems, American agriculture—the finest food production industry ever known to man—should not be singled out for this type of unfortunate and unreasonable treatment by the administration, the press, any other organization or individual.

I have reviewed the facts and figures involved and find that the $5.6 billion figure attributed to the White House contains two items which to my knowledge never before have been included in appropriation totals quoted for the Department of Agriculture. The first is $314 million of funds provided by permanent law which should not be included since they do not require annual congressional action.

The second is $434 million for REA and RTA loans, the inclusion of which is entirely inconsistent with the handling of FHA loan funds which are not included. Further, the REA loan authorizations represent a congressional limitation on the use of loan funds which the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make available to the Secretary of Agriculture by basic law. The pertinent provision of the law—7 U.S.C. 903—reads as follows:

> The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.

It is important to remember that these loans are not Government expenditures in the usual sense, since they are fully repaid with interest. In fiscal year 1967 such repayments totaled about $250 million. Losses on repayments have been virtually zero for these programs and repayments made ahead of schedule now exceed $300 million.

The reported claim that "Congress voted $88 million more than the President asked" cannot be supported on any fair or reasonable basis. Both the House and the Senate reported a reduction of $68 million in appropriations. This figure is accurate and will be included in all official documents of Congress.

Apparently the press statement quoted above is based on a Bureau of the Budget analysis of the effect of congressional action on "new obligational authority"—NOA—which is a concept frequently used by the administration in lieu of regular appropriations figures. A glance at this analysis immediately reveals that Congress is given no credit for its reduction of $52.2 million in the advance authorization for the cropland adjustment program, even though it will save this amount in fiscal year 1968 and as much as $260 million over the 5-year life of most of the contracts.

Also, this analysis fails to take into account the fact that financing the food stamp program by direct appropriation in fiscal year 1968 will result in the return of this amount of unused section 32 funds to the Treasury.

If fair and reasonable credit is given for these two factors, the actual reduction in NOA by Congress is $159 million, as compared to the $68 million earlier reported for appropriation cuts.

It is unfortunate that these discrepancies in the figures used by the executive and legislative branches for agricultural appropriations continue to exist. I call upon the administration, the press, and others to take a fair and reasonable approach to this matter and use figures which present a realistic picture of the budget and congressional action thereon.

A LONG-OVERDUE LETTER TO U.S. SERVICEMEN IN VIETNAM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rostenkowski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, after the deplorable experiences in Washington last weekend, and the manner in which some of the so-called "peaceniks" conducted themselves, by their savagelike conduct at the Pentagon in seeking to disrupt the war effort, it is time to reflect the true sentiment of real Americans, who believe in defending the principles of democracy.

Last Friday, October 20, an unusual full page advertisement appeared in the Chicago Tribune. Placed in the newspaper by Wally Phillips of WGN radio, and more than 3,500 citizens of Chicago and the Midwest who contributed dollars to pay for it, it is an open letter to American servicemen in Vietnam from what the advertisement calls "the Silent Millions back home in America."

Mr. Phillips said:

> What we're doing in this letter is simple. We who took the ad are telling our men in Vietnam, on behalf of untold millions of Americans who have no way of making their sentiments heard, that we do NOT agree with the protesters, that we are behind our men and their action in Vietnam 100 per cent.

I am proud to associate myself with this group and endorse their sentiments as expressed in the contents of the ad, which I am pleased to insert in the Record at this point:

A Long-Overdue Letter to U.S. Servicemen in Vietnam—From the Silent Millions Back Home in America

> Today must be a sad day in Vietnam—
>
> Because today, we are ashamed to admit, some of your own countrymen are marching on Washington.
>
> The marchers' sponsoring group has announced:
>
> "We will shut down the Pentagon. We will fill the hallways and block the entrances. Thousands of people will disrupt the center of the American war machine."

It must be a little discomforting for you fellows ducking sniper bullets in the rice paddies to learn that some of your "fellow Americans" are trying to foul things up at your headquarters.

You must wonder what the folks back home really think.

This letter is to let you know that most of us are with you—100%.

We want you to know that you are *not* the forgotten men.

You are in our thoughts every day.

You may not realize this, because normally we don't spout our feeelings. In fact, we are typical of the Silent Millions of non-demonstrators—those who back you with quiet concern and prayerful pride. We are painfully aware of the personal sacrifices you are making for the cause of liberty.

For a long time we've been meaning to write to you—but haven't. Finally, this march on Washington did it. We've decided we could no longer remain silently on the sidelines.

Those who are marching in protest, those who desecrate our flag, those who burn draft cards—all make a lot of noise. They also make the headlines. And they present to the world a distorted picture of America. But, thank God, they are *not* typical.

At best, they are a misguided minority whom we'll just have to ask you to defend along with the rest of us. Granted, the motives of some of these people may be pure. But they seem to think they have a unique right to protest in any way they take a notion—with faint respect for fellow citizens or servicemen, for their country's laws, for their elected authorities, or even for others' opinions.

There is room for honest differences and doubts, but when demonstrations stir up sabotage, vandalism, and violence parading under the banner of rightful dissent, they threaten to tear our country apart.

These protesters act as if they're the *only* ones who possess any morality. But we *all* have a conscience. And it might not be too surprising to find that some of us ordinary guys have even a little more conscience than some of the sign bearers.

Let's face it: Nobody we know *wants* war.

Everybody we know *hates* war.

Everybody we know wishes this war were over.

Everybody we know wants you home as soon as possible.

We can't think of *one* person who enjoys war.

We don't.

Our friends don't.

Obviously, the protesters don't.

You don't, that's for sure. Yet—some of these people call you names like "murderers" and "hired killers," implying that you're having a sadistic field day.

Government officials don't enjoy war either. So it's ridiculous for anyone to chant vulgarities like: "Hey, hey, LBJ—how many kids did you kill today?"

But there's one thing that all of us *do* enjoy.

That's the freedom of the most fortunate land in the world. It is a historic privilege to be a free citizen of America. This freedom is part of the heritage we cherish and for which we have and always will pay any price, including our lives.

Despite our country's admitted shortcomings, most of us appreciate the opportunity of living here. Most of us wouldn't trade places—or systems—with the people of *any* other country.

Most of us are grateful to the brave men of other generations who have fought and died to preserve this priceless freedom.

Most of us today are humbly indebted to you and to our sons and brothers and husbands and fathers who are fighting—and dying—in Viet Nam for freedom. And for us.

Yes, the majority of Americans love America and the American way.

Even the protesters enjoy their unearned freedom—although they might not admit it. They're too busy shouting about the virtues of "the other side."

But no one knows better than you about "the other side."

You know—and we do, too—that international communism is determined to obliterate us and enslave the world. Communism *must* be contained. This is vital to our world, our lives, our future, and our children.

You know—and we do, too—that Hanoi's blind hunger for the subjugation of the free people of Viet Nam has made peace negotiations impossible to date, even with several bombing pauses.

You know—and we do, too—that "the other side" has *deliberately* assassinated and tortured many, many more innocent civilians in the South than our air raids have accidently killed near military targets in the North.

You know—and we do, too—that if you and your companions were to leave Viet Nam today, the iron hand of communism would clamp dawn *tomorrow*. And South Viet Nam would become another East Germany—another cowed Cuba.

You know—and we do, too—that your presence in South Viet Nam is a guarantee to freedom-loving people everywhere that they will not be forsaken. And so a remarkable number of you have voluntarily reenlisted to return to Viet Nam.

You know—and we do, too—that a strong stand in Viet Nam by the champions of human rights reduces the chances of a larger war. And it is holding off communist takeovers of other nations in southeast Asia.

You know—and we do, too—that appeasement has never worked and never will.

We hope that all who read this letter over here and feel the way we feel will do three things:

1. We hope they'll tear out this page—and airmail it to you, maybe with a letter of their own—to give you a bit of moral encouragement.

2. We hope they'll write letters—and express their points of view to their Government officials, to their friends and relatives, and to all the news media.

3. We hope they'll speak up—and quit apologizing for how much they love this country. Get off the defensive. On to the offensive.

We believe that when sound-thinking people want to say something they should *say* it. When they want to do something, they should *do* it.

If more solid citizens would speak out to the protesters, perhaps we could even set *them* straight.

We believe the time is here for the voice of responsible patriotism to be heard.

The sooner this is done and the sooner we present a united front, the sooner you'll be coming home from a peaceful Viet Nam.

Wally Phillips,
WGN Radio, Chicago.

(In behalf of the Silent Millions, and over 3,500 citizens of Chicago and the Midwest who contributed to the cost of this letter.)

INTERLOCKS AMONG BALTIMORE'S MAJOR FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS—AN EXAMPLE OF COURAGEOUS TV JOURNALISM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a TV channel in Baltimore, Md., WJZ–TV, has recently produced a very unusual and courageous series of reports on the interlocks that exist among Baltimore's major financial institutions, including commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and insurance companies. This six-part series, based on a staff report of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee issued last July, effectively exposed to the public a very serious problem which had hitherto received little attention.

It pointed out, for example, that there are 53 corporate interlocks between Baltimore's five largest commercial banks, and four major insurance companies and four mutual savings banks. In addition, through trust department holdings, substantial blocks of stock of competitor banks were held by four of the five largest banks. This, of course, raises serious questions as to the effectiveness of competition among financial institutions and the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few.

The Domestic Finance Subcommittee report studied similar situations in nine other major banking centers in the country, so that the situation in Baltimore is certainly not unique. But I do feel that special credit of spotlighting the findings of the report on a television news program over a period of an entire week of news broadcasts is the kind of imaginative and courageous journalism that deserves special commendation.

I include the transcript of these reports in the Record at this point:

Special Report by Eyewitness News WJZ–TV, Baltimore, Md.

PART I

High finance has always seemed to have maintained a special kind of mystique that keeps the common man at a cold distance, giving him the usually vague impression of massive transactions taking place in quiet, almost secretive oak-paneled board rooms. This impression has persisted even though we are living in an increasingly credit conscious society where high finance reaches down to affect the houses we live in, the cars we drive and the housewife's weekly budget. That commercial banks have tremendously increased their power and influence in recent years, is an indisputable fact, but it is one that a congressional committee is taking a very hard look at. Under the chairmanship of the veteran Texas Congressman, Wright Patman, the staff of the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance, is making a study of the power of banks. The study is not completed yet, but results so far are significantly important enough to demand immediate public attention and concern. I learned from Washington sources close to the committee that the banking industry had made strong attempts to prevent the study getting underway, but were finally unsuccessful. Until today, there has been no detailed public exposure of the investigation results, results which directly affect almost every segment of our economy. Congressman Patman discussed with me some of the aspects of the study, stressing the use of corporate interlocks, which in this case are defined as meaning a director or officer of a commercial bank who also serves in a similar capacity with a mutual savings bank, a savings and loan association, an insurance company, or another commercial bank.

TRANSCRIPT OF CONGRESSMAN PATMAN"S REMARKS

"An example of the startling interlocking relationships among commercial banks and other competing financial institutions revealed by the study is the fact that in our survey of 48 commercial banks in 10 major cities, including Baltimore, we discovered over 570 interlocks between these banks and other financial institutions.

"The study is replete with similar examples leading to the inescapable conclusion that the Congress, the bank supervisory agencies, and the State banking agencies have failed miserably in either preventing or calling attention to superconcentration among financial institutions."

There are 28 commercial banks in the Baltimore region, but of these, just five contain 88.3 percent of all the deposits, a higher concentration of power than in many other cities of comparable total deposit size. The five are Maryland National Bank, First National Bank of Maryland, Equitable Trust, Union Trust and Mercantile Safe Deposit and Trust. Of the approximate 150 directors of these banks, no fewer than 53 have interlocking relationships with other competing financial institutions in the Baltimore area.

PART II

Where extensive interlocking relationships exist between competing financial institutions it can only be concluded, according to the committee report, that effective competition is seriously diminished, if not altogether destroyed. Of the five major banks in the Baltimore area, in which are concentrated 88.3 percent of the total deposits in the 28 banks in the region, there exists 42 corporate interlocks among major financial institutions. As an example of these interlocks, the first chart shows their extent between four of the five banks and three major insurance companies. Mercantile has the largest number of interlocks, five of them being with U.S. Fidelity and Guarantee Company. Mercantile's representation on the 20 man board of directors of the U.S.F. & G., is an influential 25 percent. The second chart shows the interlocking relationships between the same five banks and four major Baltimore mutual savings banks. The largest concentration of interlocks here exists with the First National Bank and four of the savings banks. There are as many as five interlocks between First National and the Provident Savings Bank of Baltimore. In one way or another, all of these financial institutions compete. Some bankers argue that insurance companies are an entirely different kettle of fish, but then they have tremendous amounts of investments to make and the committee study contends that an interlocking relationship with a bank must have real influence on where those investments are made. The committee also noted that insurance companies compete with banks for people's savings.

According to the committee's detailed report, though, the most potentially dangerous type of interlock is one which exists between two competing commercial banks. There is at least one such interlock in Baltimore, in the form of Francis X. Gallagher. A law partner of Senator Tydings, legal counsel to the Catholic archdiocese of Baltimore and one of the most influential members of Maryland's democratic party, Mr. Gallagher is a director of the Equitable Trust Company, a commercial bank. He is also a director of the Mercantile Safe Deposit and Trust Company, a competing commercial bank. Mr. Gallagher told me, he did not maintain both roles for personal advancement but because of the archdiocese deposits in both banks. He did agree, however, that interlocks between financial institutions increase their economic power. "Let's face it," he said, "the banks make this town tick". Federal anti-trust laws forbid this kind of interlock between competing commercial and industrial enterprises, but because of a loophole in the laws, such an interlock between these banks is not illegal.

The committee's report expressed concern at the heavy concentration in commercial banking in Baltimore and *stressed* that the interests of many of the major financial institutions are intimately intertwined with each other. Particularly dominant positions seem to be held, the report noted, by U.S.F. & G. and Mercantile Safe Deposit and Trust.

PART III

Control of companies through ownership of stock is a rather nebulous thing in terms of just what percentage represents strong influence or actual control. Some companies have reported that effective control can be achieved through as little as 10 percent. In banking, there are thousands of shareholders but the average shareholder usually has only a small fraction of a percent of the number of shares outstanding in the bank. Therefore, someone or a corporation, who controls only one percent of the shares often has more than 100 times as many shares as the average stockholder and obviously would receive more attention from the bank's management. Using this form of reasoning, the committee suggests that a five percent share can sometimes even control a bank or at least exert a very strong influence. Four of the five major Baltimore banks have direct stockholder links with each other. According to the committee's survey, Maryland National, First National, Equitable Trust and Mercantile Safe Deposit and Trust, all have a percentage of shares in each other as well as in Union Trust.

The largest amount of shares is Mercantile's 78,060 in First National, giving Mercantile a 7.4 percent shareholding interest in one of its competitors. These figures include the holdings of trust departments and bank nominees. Mercantile's overall holdings of stock through its trust department in the four other competing banks therefore shows a dominant interest. U.S. Fidelity and Guarantee Company, which has many corporate interlocks with the city's banks including five with Mercantile, has made deposits and investments of about 140 million dollars of its one billion dollar assets in banks, insurance companies and savings and loan institutions. In fact, U.S.F. & G. owns substantial stock in all five of the major banks with as much as 5.12 percent of Union Trust and almost two and a half percent of First National Bank. As brought out earlier in these reports, one of the main items of concern in bank power of the study committee, is the interlocking relationships between banks and other financial institutions. There are 53 such interlocks among the approximate 150 directors of Baltimore's five major banks. As an example, the presidents of Maryland National, First National, Equitable Trust and Mercantile Safe Deposit and Trust, are all directors of either competing mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations or insurance companies.

PART IV

Bankers, unlike politicians, are usually reluctant to step into the public limelight. Their very business is bounded by discretion, away from prying eyes. In fact, very rarely do the behind the scenes aspects of banking bear the impact of public scrutiny. Over the years, bankers, perhaps unconsciously, have taken upon themselves the image of being above reproach. So, it was not really too surprising that Baltimore bankers declined to publicly react to the contents of this series of reports and the critical implications in the study made by the staff of the congressional Subcommittee on Domestic Finance. The banks involved in this report are Baltimore's five major ones, Maryland National, First National, Equitable Trust, Union Trust and Mercantile Safe Deposit and Trust. I tried to find someone who would represent the banking community as a whole, or even an individual bank. But, a spokesman for the Maryland Bankers Association told me he was unable to find anyone from the five banks who was immediately willing to discuss the issues in a filmed interview. Nor, would the bankers offer a formal written statement outlining their views of the interlocking relationships and stockholder links between the competing banks and other competing financial institutions.

He also said he believed the bankers would be placed in a defensive position if they were to react to the report. Primarily, though, the association spokesman insisted that reaction was difficult to obtain because the bankers felt they needed more time in which to digest the report's contents. However, I did visit Maryland's newly appointed bank commissioner, William Graham. Mr. Graham, a former Director of Commercial Credit and a former, large stockholder in the Union Trust Bank, expressed interest in the report but also declined to participate in a filmed interview saying he had only been in his new position for three months and felt he needed more time to study the report. He did say, though, that he has "serious reservations" about the interlocking relationships. "I have serious reservations about them," he said, "but I have not reached any conclusions yet." Mr. Graham also expressed doubt that his agency has the actual authority to look into such matters. According to State law, and I quote the Maryland manual, the bank commissioner has general supervision over all banking institutions in the State other than national banks. The manual does not define the meaning of general supervision other than to stress the Commissioner's role in making sure the banks remain solvent.

PART V

The head of the congressional Subcommittee on Domestic Finance which is studying the extent of banking power in 10 major cities across the Nation, including Baltimore, is Congressman Wright Patman. With 39 years in the United States Congress, Representative Patman is the third senior Member of the House, but there has never been any love lost between him and bankers, many of whom charge him with being irresponsible and vindictive. But, be that as it may, the detailed reports prepared by the subcommittee's staff of lawyers and special investigators are based primarily on factual findings supplied by the bankers themselves, either voluntarily or through subpoenas, thus, the bankers can hardly argue with much of the information in the report. In its look into the Baltimore banking situation the subcommittee's staff found 53 corporate interlocks among the city's five major banks, four insurance companies and four mutual savings banks. All of these institutions compete with each other in varying degrees. The major banks also have stockholding links with each other, varying from a fraction of a percent to more than seven percent, which reveals considerable potential influence. Bankers, so far, have declined to react to the report's findings but that report is very clear in the implications it makes about the intimate relationships.

The only conclusion, it insists, is that effective competition is seriously diminished if not destroyed. The commercial banks' direct ties with nonbanking institutions such as insurance companies and mutual savings banks, run counter to the principle that the business of banking should be kept separate from other enterprises, according to the staff study. This principle is plainly reflected in Federal statutes, but there is a loophole in the Clayton Anti-trust Act which forbids a corporate interlock between two Federal Reserve member banks in the same city. It does not forbid such an interlock between two State chartered banks, as, for example, exists in Baltimore between Equitable Trust and Mercantile Safe Deposit and Trust. The sub-committee's study is considered a vital step in its efforts to thoroughly analyze the control of commercial banks and their impact on the economy, a basic bread and butter impact which could affect everyone. Congressman Patman said that his staff's studies so far already have raised very grave policy questions both for the Congress and the administrative agencies. He went on to say that when these studies are completed he hopes the Congress will act to eliminate what he called the serious abuses that now exist from the superconcentration of economic power in the hands of a few. On a more local level though, Maryland legislators have expressed alarm to me over the contents of this series of reports, alarm which they indicate may well lead to a legislative investigation in Annapolis.

PART VI

Why do so many of the directors of Baltimore's five major banks also sit as directors of other competing financial institutions in town? Why do these five banks hold substantial stock in each other? The congressional Sub-committee on Domestic Finance which made a study of the situation suggested or, rather implied, that it is an attempt to concentrate economic power in the hands of a few and reduce what could sometimes be expensive competition. That these close relationships exist is now a matter of public record, a result of these series of reports. But Baltimore bankers have not directly reacted to the findings, let alone indicated why they think such arrangements as corporate interlocks and stockholding links are necessary in the often complex world of banking. The questions of banking inter-relationships and their serious implications are to be examined and perhaps answered in Annapolis. Delegate Harry Nice of Baltimore County, a member of the House Insurance and Banking Committee, and a former officer of one of the major banks involved in the report, pointed toward a legislative inquiry and expressed his feelings about the reticence of the Baltimore Banking Community.

SYNOPSIS OF REMARKS MADE BY DELEGATE HARRY NICE OF THE MARYLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. Nice in his interview with me described the existence of corporate interlocks as "highly objectionable" and that the stockholding links also raised serious questions. He said the situation demands a legislative investigation in Annapolis and added that he intends, regardless of that inquiry, to submit "corrective" legislation during the next session of the Maryland General Assembly.

There are also some serious questions to be raised about the State's role in Baltimore's banking industry.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Pettis), for 10 minutes, on October 31, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Pettis) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Scherle.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Gonzalez) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dorn.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; and

H.R. 10345. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands;

H.R. 9960. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10345. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12474. An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 30, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "Control and Use of Excess Property and Related Foreign Assistance Problems Following U.S. Military Exclusion From France—1966-67 (14th report by the committee) (Rept. No. 865). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. S. 2388. An act to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 866). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. de la GARZA:

H.R. 13734. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with a loan and grant to the Hidalgo and Willacy Counties Water Control and Improvement District No. 1, Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 13735. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 13736. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 13737. A bill to amend section 10(b) of the act of June 26, 1884, to allow a seaman to allot a portion of his wages to a checking account; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. Blatnik, Mr. Holifield, and Mr. Reuss):

H.R. 13738. A bill to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H. Con. Res. 561. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should seek the creation of a United Nations Fact-Finding Commission for Peace in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13739. A bill for the relief of Hernan Pavon Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13740. A bill for the relief of Solomon Erick Newman Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13741. A bill for the relief of Samuel I. Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13742. A bill for the relief of Carlos S. Adolfo Pavon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Friday, October 27, 1967

The Senate met at 11 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, surrounded as we are by the symbols of the power and the glory of our beloved country, we remember before Thee the disorder and distress of so many in Thy human family.

We lift hands of prayer for our tortured world. The creation which Thy didst pronounce good is marred by man's inhumanity to man. The blood of brother slain by brother cries unto Thee from the ground. And Thy rebuke troubles the conscience of sensitive souls throughout the earth.

In this day of balanced terror and unbalanced judgment be Thou our stay: steady our minds, strengthen our wills. Restrain those who loose wild tongues that have not Thee in awe. Make strong the hands of those who seek peace and pursue it.

Make us, we pray, conscientious projectors, driven by an awakened conscience to support those many noble projects already underway for the peace of the world. Sustain, O Lord, those many leaders among us who pray and labor for the good of their fellow men; and bring in that Kingdom without frontiers of which Thy prophets have dreamed across the long generations. In His name we ask it. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10196) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 35, 52, 56, and 64 to the bill, and concurred therein; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 55, 61, and 69 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Mahon, Mr. Kirwan, Mr. Whitten, Mr. Rooney of New York, Mr. Boland, Mr. Natcher, Mr. Bow, Mr. Jonas, and Mr. Laird were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 9960. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12474. An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 26, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING USINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NORTHWEST REGIONAL SERVICES CORPORATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 672, S. 1602.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1602) to create a Northwest Regional Services Corporation to provide a central location for various training centers and programs, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments, on page 2, at the beginning of line 6, strike out "The Corporation shall have perpetual succession unless dissolved by Acts of Congress." and insert "The Corporation shall have existence through December 31, 1972, unless sooner dissolved by Act of Congress."; in line 15, after the word "Force" strike out the word "base." and insert "base, except combat-mission-oriented equipment and supplies."; at the beginning of line 23, strike out "directed" and insert "encouraged"; in the same line, after the word "within", strike out "the" and insert "any"; on page 3, after the word "programs", insert "insofar, except for clause (19), as such training centers and programs are authorized under Federal law:"; after line 16, strike out:

(4) a senior citizen rehabilitation and training center designed to help train and orient older citizens for less active work and retirement activities;

At the beginning of line 20 strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 1, strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)"; at the beginning of line 3, strike out "(7)" and insert "(6)"; at the beginning of line 6, strike out "(8)" and insert "(7)"; at the beginning of line 9, strike out "(9)" an insert "(8)"; at the beginning of line 13, strike out "(10)" and insert "(9)"; at the beginning of line 16, strike out "(11)" and insert "(10)"; at the beginning of line 18, strike out "(12)" and insert "(11)"; at the beginning of line 20, strike out "(13)" and insert "(12)"; at the beginning of line 24, strike out "(14)" and insert "(13)"; on page 5, at the beginning of line 1, strike out "(15)" and insert "(14)"; at the beginning of line 3, strike out "(16)" and insert "(15)"; at the beginning of line 5, strike out "(17)" and insert "(16)" at the beginning of line 11, strike out "(18)" and insert "(17)"; at the beginning of line 15, strike out "(19)" and insert "(18)"; at the beginning of line 16, strike out "(20)" and insert "(19)"; at the beginning of line 20, strike out "(21)" and insert "(20)"; at the beginning of line 25, strike out "(22)" and insert "(21)"; on page 6, at the beginning of line 3, strike out "(23)" and insert "(22)"; in line 12, after the word "programs.", strike out:

Any such agreement shall be in accordance with the particular Act authorizing the training center or program, except that the training centers and programs under section 5(a) of this Act are to be considered as additional authorizations without any requirement for providing matching funds.

In line 22, after "(a)" strike out "(23)" and insert "(19)"; at the top of page 7, insert:

(d) If necessary to achieve the purposes of such program under section 5(a)(19) of this Act, the Corporation is authorized to sell, at the fair market value existing at the time of the sale, property (real, personal, and mixed) located within an industrial complex established under such section.

In line 10, after the word "Senate", strike out "on the basis of distinguished public service"; on page 8, after line 5, strike out:

(c) Each member of the board shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5311 of title 5, United States Code.

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

(a) Each member of the board who is appointed from private life shall receive $100 per diem for each day (including travel time) during which he is engaged in the actual performance of his duties as a member of the board. A member of the board who is in the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the United States Government shall serve without additional compensation. All members of the board shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

On page 9, after line 18, insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 9. The Corporation is authorized to issue such notes, debentures, or other obligations as it determines to be necessary to finance training centers and programs under section 5 of this Act. Obligations issued hereunder shall not exceed $25,000,000 outstanding at any one time; shall be issued at such times, have such maturities, and bear such rate or rates of interest as may be determined by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; and shall be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in the obligations. Such obligations shall not be obligations of, nor shall payment of the principal thereof or interest thereon be guaranteed by, the United States, and such obligations shall clearly so indicate. The Corporation is authorized to purchase in the open market any of its obligations outstanding under this section at any time and any price.

On page 10, at the beginning of line 11, change the section number from "9" to "10"; on page 11 after the word "purposes" strike out the comma and "except that any disposition of personal property shall be made in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended."

On page 13, after line 2, insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 11. All contracts negotiated without advertising pursuant to authority contained in this Act shall include a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall until the expiration of three years after final payment have access to and the right to examine any directly pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts.

At the beginning of line 13, change the section number from "10" to "13"; in line 16, change the section number from "11" to "13"; in line 18, after the word "by", insert "the United States or"; in line 20, change the section number from "12" to "14"; on page 14, line 7, change the section number from "13" to "15"; on page 15, after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 16. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597), as amended (31 U.S.C. 846), is amended by inserting "Northwest Regional Services Corporation;" after "Panama Canal Company;".

(a) The Corporation shall to the greatest extent possible cooperate and coordinate with appropriate State and local governments and agencies in developing and carrying out its activities under this Act.

(b) The Corporation shall from time to time, not less than once a year, report to the President and to the Congress on activities undertaken, and proposed to be undertaken, and copies of such reports shall be furnished to the Governor of any State in which the activities of the Corporation are carried out.

On page 15, after line 16, insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 17. Any sums appropriated pursuant to section 18 of this Act, and any revenues raised and receipts from the training centers and programs authorized by this Act, shall be deposited in a revolving fund which is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States. Moneys in the fund shall be available to the board in the exercise of its powers under this Act. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations shall be invested in bonds or other obligations of, or guaranteed by, the United States.

On page 16, after line 2, insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 18. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated at any time after its enactment not to exceed $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

(b) Any amounts appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended, and any amounts authorized for any fiscal year under this section but not appropriated may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year commencing prior to July 1, 1970.

And, after line 13, strike out:

Sec. 14. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Corporation such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

So as to make the bill read:

S. 1602

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Northwest Regional Services Act".

Sec. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to provide a central location for various training centers and programs which will enhance the social, cultural, and economic well-being of all the people of the United States, in particular the Northwest region of the United States, thereby contributing to the national interest and improving and strengthening the commonweal.

Sec. 3. There is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the Northwest Regional Services Corporation (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Corporation"). The Corporation shall have existence through December 31, 1972, unless sooner dissolved by Act of Congress.

Sec. 4. (a) Upon determination of the Secretary of Defense that Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana, is no longer needed for military purposes, he is authorized and directed to transfer to the Corporation all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property (real, personal, and mixed) of such Air Force base, except combat-mission-oriented equipment and supplies.

(b) Prior to the transfer of the property provided for in subsection (a) of this section, the Corporation shall establish plans to carry out the provisions of this Act. Upon completion of such transfer, the Corporation shall proceed to implement such plans as soon as practicable.

Sec. 5. (a) The Corporation is hereby authorized and encouraged to establish, within any area transferred to the jurisdiction of the Corporation pursuant to section 4 and using the facilities presently established within such area to the extent possible, the following training centers and programs insofar, except for clause (19), as such training centers and programs are authorized under Federal law:

(1) a manpower development and training center for programs similar to those authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, particularly emphasizing training which is not financially feasible at a local level including, but not limited to, training for pilots, mechanics, practical nurses, medical technicians, and related fields;

(2) an industry training and job training center for employable individuals, including Indians;

(3) a center for training workers in relevant automatic data processing techniques, including, but not limited to, repair installation, and programing;

(4) a residential vocational-technical institution at the secondary and postsecondary school level which would provide education and training for individuals, including education and training for individuals from the Canadian Provinces upon assessment of appropriate charges;

(5) a center for training adults to become teaching aids;

(6) a center for training medical teams in giving rural and emergency helicopter and aircraft-type medical services;

(7) an experimental center for educational research on the handicapped, underprivileged, and economically deprived;

(8) an educational television instruction center with special emphasis on developing instructional programs and techniques for the economically deprived and handicapped;

(9) a family training center for Indians who are ready and willing to leave the reservation and who appear to be able to adjust to environmental change;

(10) a law enforcement and crime prevention institute, including research and training facilities;

(11) a family rehabilitation and retraining center for alcoholics and narcotic addicts;

(12) an institute to train local, State, and Federal officers and employees in various programs designed to improve intergovernmental relations and programs administration;

(13) a Department of Transportation safety research testing, development, and standards center;

(14) an air and water research and testing facility;

(15) a supersonic transport and instrumented sonic boom testing range;

(16) a jet aircraft noise abatement test, research and standards development center, jointly sponsored by the Department of Transportation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, Department of Defense, and the aerospace industry;

(17) an airport testing facility using cold and hot weather construction techniques and standards and other programs using available environmental factors to attain national standards;

(18) a supersonic transport training center;

(19) an industrial complex in which private industry shall be encouraged to locate not only to provide employment for persons in the region but also to supply needed goods and services;

(20) an educational research and demonstration facility, eligible for grants under section 4 of the Cooperative Research Act, which would specialize in vocational and technical education and other resident education;

(21) a national center for human resources development, including a comprehensive occupational education facility; and

(22) any other programs which are within the purposes of any Federal law and are carried out in cooperation with the department or agency of the United States administering such law.

(b) The Corporation is authorized and directed to enter into agreements with departments and agencies of the United States to provide the training centers and programs authorized by section 5(a) of this Act to the extent particular Acts authorize such departments and agencies to conduct such training centers and programs.

(c) The Corporation may enter into agreements with private individuals, associations, corporations, foundations and other organizations, and Federal, local, and State governments to execute the program provided for in section 5(a)(19) of this Act. The Corporation is authorized to assess appropriate charges and other costs for the use of property or other facilities and services provided in carrying out such program.

(d) If necessary to achieve the purposes of such program under section 5(a)(19) of this Act, the Corporation is authorized to sell, at the fair market value existing at the time of the sale, property (real, personal, and mixed) located with an industrial complex established under such section.

Sec. 6. (a) The Corporation shall have a board of directors (hereafter referred to as the "board") consisting of three members who are citizens of the United States. The members shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and without regard to political affiliation. In appointing the members of the board, the President shall designate the chairman.

(b) The board of directors shall exercise all powers necessary to carry out the functions of the Corporation.

(c) The term of office of each member shall be five years except that—

(1) the terms of the members first taking office shall expire as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one for a term of one year, one for a term of three years, and one for a term of five years; and

(2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall serve for the remainder of such term.

(d) Vacancies in the board, so long as there are two members in office, shall not impair the powers of the board to execute the functions of the Corporation, and two of the members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the board.

(e) Each member of the board who is appointed from private life shall receive $100 per diem for each day (including travel time) during which he is engaged in the actual performance of his duties as a member of the board. A member of the board who is in the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the United States Government shall serve without additional compensation. All members of the board shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 7. The Corporation shall have a general manager who shall be the chief executive officer of the Corporation and who shall discharge such duties as the board shall direct. The general manager shall be appointed by the board without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and he shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the board of directors, without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but such compensation shall not be in excess of the maximum rate for GS–18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 8. The general manager shall, in accordance with such policies as the board shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such appointments shall be without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and such compensation shall be without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but no individual so appointed shall receive compensation in excess of the maximum rate prescribed for GS–17 in the General Schedule of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 9. The Corporation is authorized to issue such notes, debentures, or other obligations as it determines to be necessary to finance training centers and programs under section 5 of this Act. Obligations issued hereunder shall not exceed $25,000,000 outstanding at any one time; shall be issued at such times, have such maturities and bear such rate or rates of interest as may be determined by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; and shall be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in the obligations. Such obligations shall not be obligations of, nor shall payment of the principal thereof or interest thereon be guaranteed by, the United States, and such obligations shall clearly so indicate. The Corporation is authorized to purchase in the open market any of its obligations outstanding under this section at any time and any price.

SEC. 10. The Corporation shall have the following powers:

(1) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal;

(2) to adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner of its operations, organization, and personnel, and the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law;

(3) to sue and be sued in its corporate name, except that nothing herein shall be construed to exempt the Corporation from the application of sections 517, 547, and 2679 of title 28, United States Code;

(4) to have the priority of the United States with respect to the payment of debts out of bankrupt, insolvent, or decedent's estates;

(5) to acquire by purchase, lease, condemnation, or in any other lawful manner, any personal property, tangible or intangible, or any interest therein; to hold, maintain, use, and operate the same; to provide services in connection therewith, and to to charge therefor; and to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of the same at such time, in such manner, and to the extent deemed necessary or appropriate by the board for the conduct of the business of the Corporation and to carry out the corporate purposes;

(6) to construct, operate, lease, and maintain buildings, facilities, and other improvements, on the property transferred to it pursuant to section 4, as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act, and to charge for the use of the foregoing;

(7) to accept gifts or donations of services or personal property, tangible or intangible, in aid of any of the purposes of the Corporations;

(8) to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem;

(9) to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, with State and local governments, any agency or department of the United States, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation, and such contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, may be entered into without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5);

(10) to determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures, and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to the provisions of this Act and other provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations;

(11) to make advance, progress, and other payments which the board deems necessary under this Act without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529);

(12) to execute, in accordance with its bylaws, rules, and regulations, all instruments necessary or appropriate in the exercise of any of its powers;

(13) to settle and adjust claims held by the Corporation against other persons or parties and claims by other persons or parties against the Corporation; and

(14) to take such action as may be necessary to carry out the powers conferred upon the Corporation.

SEC. 11. All contracts negotiated without advertising pursuant to authority contained in this Act shall include a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall until the expiration of three years after final payment have access to and the right to examine any directly pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts.

SEC. 12. For purposes of venue in civil actions, the Corporation shall be deemed a resident of the judicial district of Montana.

SEC. 13. The Corporation, its property, franchises, and income are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by the United States or any State, county, or municipality, or any subdivision thereof.

SEC. 14. (a) The board shall have the power to make and amend such reasonable rules and regulations as it deems necessary, in the interest of safety or to carry out the purposes of this Act, governing the protection of property and the conduct of persons on any area within the jurisdiction of the Corporation.

(b) Whoever knowingly and willfully violates any rule or regulation prescribed under subsection (a) of this section shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

SEC. 15. (a) Any employee of the Corporation appointed to protect life and property on any area within the jurisdiction of the Corporation is authorized and empowered—

(1) to arrest under a warrant within the limits of the jurisdiction of the Corporation any person accused of having committed any offense against the laws of the United States, or against any rule or regulation prescribed pursuant to this Act, within such jurisdiction;

(2) to arrest without a warrant any person committing any such offense within the jurisdiction of the Corporation in his presence; and

(3) to arrest without a warrant, within the jurisdiction of the Corporation, any person he has reasonable grounds to believe has committed a felony within the jurisdiction of the Corporation.

(b) Any employee having the power of arrest as provided in subsection (a) of this section may carry firearms and such other weapons as the board may direct or by regulation prescribe.

SEC. 16. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597), as amended (31 U.S.C. 846), is amended by inserting "Northwest Regional Services Corporation;" after "Panama Canal Company;".

(a) The Corporation shall to the greatest extent possible cooperate and coordinate with appropriate State and local governments and agencies in developing and carrying out its activities under this Act.

(b) The Corporation shall from time to time, not less than once a year, report to the President and to the Congress on activities undertaken, and proposed to be undertaken, and copies of such reports shall be furnished to the Governor of any State in which the activities of the Corporation are carried out.

SEC. 17. Any sums appropriated pursuant to section 18 of this Act, and any revenues raised and receipts from the training centers and programs authorized by this Act, shall be deposited in a revolving fund which is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States. Moneys in the fund shall be available to the board in the exercise of its powers under this Act. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations shall be invested in bonds or other obligations of, or guaranteed by, the United States.

SEC. 18. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated at any time after its enactment not to exceed $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

(b) Any amounts appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended, and any amounts authorized for any fiscal year under this section but not appropriated may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year commencing prior to July 1, 1970.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, this bill has been considered very carefully.

I wish to pay special tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and to two other members of the committee who submitted amendments which have made this a much better bill—the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I know that my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], also will pay tribute to them.

I also wish to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], who attended the hearings and whose interrogation and searching questions brought out some of the best points in support of this measure.

This is landmark legislation, Mr. President. I believe that it will be in the public interest and a great investment in America to have a laboratory for flying which probably will be unique in the development of the entire industry in the years ahead.

Mr. President, therefore this legislation has been refined in the democratic crucible of our legislative process. Deliberate, comprehensive hearings have been held. In committee sessions, searching questions and thoughtful bipartisan suggestions have been considered. This legislation offers a real opportunity to achieve national goals, to serve the public and save dollars by continuing the use of a massive defense resource no longer needed for defense purposes. S. 1602 is a realistic approach to the use of a national asset.

The unanimous report of the Senate Committee on Government Operations underscores the need for this legislative action. This prototype bill will be of value to the entire Nation.

This legislation establishes a Northwest Regional Services Corporation which will make it possible to convert the defense system of Glasgow Air Force Base to a more pervasive war—the war on ignorance and unemployment. This legislation will help the Nation to combine the best elements of the private sector with the public resources now available. Through the wise, imaginative use of this existing resource, thousands of people throughout the land will be served.

Tennessee Valley Authority was an experiment in marshaling the natural resources of an entire river basin for the benefit of all who lived there. It was also a yardstick that blazed a trail for all the Nation.

The bill, S. 1602, is a similarly imaginative approach. It would use rather than waste a manmade resource. It would convert the tools of destruction into methods of instruction. Literally, guns into plowshares.

We are convinced that to continue to dispose of surplus and excess defense property in the customary manner will continue to mean lost opportunities to convert such resources to immediate humanitarian civilian needs.

My distinguished colleague, the majority leader, and I are basically conservationists. We believe this legislation will help make wise use of our most precious resources—human resources. We expect, with the cooperation of the Congress and the executive branch, to avoid the usual dispersal of valuable resources. This bill will make it possible for the Northwest Services Corp., a combination of private and Government persons, to draw on the best resources of both sectors.

Throughout the Nation, there is growing recognition of urgent national needs for training workers, young and old alike, and providing decent housing for the less fortunate, to give entire families an opportunity to learn new and marketable skills.

This is not the first military base to be closed, nor will it be the last. In the case of Glasgow Air Force Base, there are definitive factors that require this legislation.

This 7,000 acre defense complex is a totally self-contained $125 million community including schools, church, recreation and housing for both individuals and families. It offers aviation training facilities including shops, hangars, warehouses, roads, water systems, and other utilities and services.

This base is one of the newest and most modern in the entire defense establishment. It is not "new tarpaper" over old buildings. In fact, the entire base consists of modern and permanent buildings that can be put to maximum use with minimum cost for maintenance and repair.

Mr. President, with bold and resourceful planning, we can convert this base to a valuable national asset. Consultation with local, county, State, regional, and national leaders of industry, Government, and education convinced us that there are a variety of worthwhile uses for the base. Among these are:

A national education laboratory and demonstration center for testing and researching teaching methods, materials and training aids in the rapidly changing vocational technical field;

A residential vocational-technical school and 2-year technical institute;

Adult education and entire family rehabilitation, education and retraining;

Training programs in health professions and related careers;

A training institute for local, county, and State officials;

A Federal crime prevention training center;

Indian training and employment;

An air cargo center;

A foreign trade zone;

A supersonic transport training center;

An aircraft noise and sonic boom research facility;

Aviation training—pilot, mechanic, electronic technician;

A transportation safety research, testing and experimentation center; and

An industrial development complex attracting new industry.

These illustrate the uses that can be made of Glasgow Air Force Base. These programs are not made mandatory by S. 1602. The bill makes them possible by retaining the facilities intact, until the best combination of private sector and public resources can be blended for the benefit of the entire Nation.

Senator MANSFIELD and I believe that by consolidated effort, effective planning and imaginative approaches, the Congress, by the enactment of S. 1602, will offer to the taxpayers of the Nation a rate of return far in excess of the amount of human talent and money invested.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD, documents supporting the provisions of S. 1602.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY IDE K. BOLTZ, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL AEROSPACE EDUCATION COUNCIL, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a pleasure to present this statement in support of S. 1602 for the consideration of the committee. I am Ide K. Boltz, superintendent of Poudre R-1 Schools, Fort Collins, Colorado, and president of the National Aerospace Education Council (NAEC). NAEC is an independent, private, non-profit organization composed chiefly of educators interested in the inclusion of aviation and space concepts in the curricula of our schools.

I would like to emphasize especially Sec. 5(a)(1): ". . . emphasizing training which is not financially feasible at a local level including, but not limited to, training for pilots, mechanics, . . . and related fields; . . ." Harold Howe II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, suggested before this Committee on July 20th that the facilities of this surplus Air Force base could be used for a residential vocational training center, functioning as a demonstration education institution. The facilities of Glasgow Air Force Base are ideally suited for such a purpose—especially in aviation and related fields. The need for aviation vocational training is a pressing one. So is the need for an education facility which would be set up to demonstrate the most modern teaching techniques to prepare individuals for aviation careers—and to disseminate this information to public and private aviation schools throughout the nation. The combined facilities of all of our present public and private aviation schools will be hard pressed to fill the future needs of aviation.

Recently the Arizona State University, in cooperation with the industry, concluded an aviation training center feasibility study. Their figures showed that the Federal Aviation Administration's "Project Long Look" presented a conservative picture of the manpower requirements of the civil aviation industry. I would like to present some of the statistical high points of this feasibility study, as well as some additional figures.

A. U.S. CIVIL AIR CARRIER INDUSTRY

1. The U.S. civil air carrier fleet is expected to grow from 2,200 aircraft in 1965 to about 3,200 aircraft in 1980. The airlines now have

on order about 90 stretched jets, about 100 high-capacity 747s, some 185 SSTs, and more than 800 other jets. These represent an investment of some $12 billion—and this is probably just the beginning.

2. Revenue passenger-miles of operation have been projected from 85 billion passenger-miles in 1965 to 315 billion passenger-miles in 1980.

3. The revenue ton-miles of operation are expected to grow from approximately 3 billion ton-miles in 1965 to about 38 billion ton-miles in 1980. This includes only cargo carried by cargo aircraft.

4. In 1965 there were 22,972 air carrier pilots; the projected need is for 43,665 by the end of 1980. Traditionally, the applicant to acceptance ratio for pilots has been 10 to 1, or greater, in the air carrier industry. Thus approximately 430,000 pilots with the presently-normal training will be needed if the traditional ratio remains constant. Or the quality of our present pilot training programs must be improved to meet the future needs.

5. The air carrier industry employed 43,667 mechanics in 1965; by the end of 1980, 80,224 will be needed.

6. The need is a current one, as well as one projected in the future. The Air Transport Association has estimated that some 4,300 new pilots and 6,800 new aviation mechanics will be hired during 1967.

7. Total airline payrolls increased from $1.7 billion in 1965 to $1.9 billion in 1966. The average annual airline salary was $7,910 in 1966.

B. GENERAL AVIATION

1. Approximately one-half of all civil aviation mechanics and more than one-half of all pilots with professional skills are engaged in general aviation activities. General aviation, as you know, includes all civil aviation except the certificated air carriers.

2. At the end of 1965 there were 95,442 general aviation aircraft in the United States; it is estimated that this total will grow to 315,000 at the end of 1980.

3. General aviation aircraft flew a total of 16.7 million hours in 1965; the forecast is a total of 63 million flight hours in 1980.

4. General aviation employed approximately 48,760 commercial pilots in 1965; it is estimated that 182,000 pilots with commercial licenses will be required by the end of 1980. These figures do not include any requirement for pilots flying personal aircraft.

5. General aviation mechanic employment has been estimated at 40,000 in 1965; approximately 138,000 aviation mechanics will be needed by 1980.

6. Considerable avocational interest in flying is indicated by the 3.8 million personal flying hours flown in 1964. It is estimated that this will increase to 7.6 million hours in 1975. An additional indication is the number of youthful pilots. Of the 479,770 active pilots in the U.S., 15 per cent (or 71,689) are between the ages of 16 and 24. Among student pilots who are learning to fly, the under-25 age group accounts for an even larger portion of the total—37 per cent. Teenagers alone make up 12 per cent of the nation's student pilots—even though they may not fly solo in a private plane before their 16th birthday.

C. The areospace industry today is the nation's largest industrial employer accounting for in excess of 1,250,000 jobs (the estimate for 1967 is 1,384,000); it is the nation's largest manufacturing exporter, in excess of $1.5 billion (estimated $1.7 billion in 1967); and it employs more than one-fifth of the nation's privately employed scientists and engineers.

This is an era of change and of mobility. Aviation is a necessity for business and for pleasure. Public acceptance of flying is such that even for vacations, flying is considered a necessity. Aviation is expanding dramatically on all fronts—commercial, cargo, and private. It is a fact that we are going to have more air travel of all kinds.

If we are to meet the growing demands for public mobility, safety, and employment requirements in an economical manner, we must utilize our existing resources. Glasgow Air Force Base is an existing resource which can be used profitably to solve some of our problems. A fringe benefit of converting its use to aviation pursuits is the fact that this modern aviation facility would be available for military needs in an emergency—even though it is being declared surplus today.

We, therefore, support S. 1602, which proposes to create a Northwest Regional Services Corporation to transform Glasgow Air Force Base into a demonstration training center to prepare both the youth and adults of our nation for careers in aviation and related fields. We recommend pasage of this bill by this Committee and by the Senate.

Thank you for this opportunity to present our views.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 13, 1967]

Demographic Collision

A little-noticed speech by Secretary Freeman the other day to the National League of Cities contains what may well prove to be, in the long reach of our national evolution, the wisest words yet spoken on our current malaise. Mr. Freeman sees the violence of recent weeks as a collision of man with his environment. Its origin runs back at least 50 years when millions of young men in rural America were uprooted by World War I. They began what Mr. Freeman calls "the 50-year march to the cities" which has now produced so much misery, disillusionment and violence.

While this great migration has been taking place the country has given far too little thought to it. Nearly 600,000 persons a year have been flowing into the cities, most of them displaced from the countryside, as Secretary Freeman acknowledges, by the revolution in agricultural technology. They have gone to the cities in search of a better life, but what they have usually found has been poverty, slums and only the dregs of urban living. In a very real sense they are refugees from a rapidly changing economy.

The result is that 70 per cent of our people are jammed into 1 per cent of our land—the 1 per cent that is largely covered by macadam, houses, factories and places of business. Many have found jobs but largely of the low-income varieties because the newcomers usually lack the skills that most industrial employment requires. So the glamor of the city that once lured them fades into the sodden dullness of ghettos, smog and social decay.

For some years the country has been vaguely aware of this demographic revolution but has done very little about it. Further concentration of people has seemed inevitable. But what will happen if this trend is allowed to run its course until the turn of the century when the country will have another 100 million persons to house and to absorb into its social structure? Will they, too, be crowded into our five vast strip cities?

It is this prospect of "an airless, waterless, joyless—and perhaps hopeless—existence" in a metamegalopolis of the year 2000 that frightens Secretary Freeman. And so he has pointedly raised the basic question: "Should we try to check the accelerated movement of people from country to city?"

Six members of the Cabinet are sponsoring a symposium designed to bring together "the best minds in the world" to discuss this problem in Washington next December. As for Mr. Freeman, he has already committed himself to pursuit of an urban-rural balance that will save the cities from destroying themselves. He is not of course recommending that the rural refugees be sent back to the farm where they have been displaced by machinery. But he does see a brighter future for these rootless millions in towns and small cities where industrial jobs can be provided without the high costs, the congestion and the social overheating that have become so common in the large cities.

The Secretary suggests giving "a high investment priority to building up opportunity in rural America" and points to what some small cities have accomplished. But the chief significance of his speech does not lie in any specific recommendations. Rather, it is to be found in his impressive call for a change of direction. It is not necessary for this rich, resourceful and powerful country to strangle itself in its own congestion. The warning signals that have been sounded in one large city after another should set the whole country to thinking about ways and means of getting off this collision course with our environment.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 13, 1967]

Freeman Concocts a Cure—Agriculture Secretary Links City Problems With Those of Country Cousins

(By Eric Wentworth)

Among the physicians prescribing salves, ointments, lotions or pills to ease America's outbreak of angry urban sores is Orville L. Freeman, the irrepressible Secretary of Agriculture.

Freeman, by the nature of his job, is a specialist and seeks equal billing for his specialty in whatever treatments are undertaken.

"The ills of the city," he argues in the wake of violence in Newark, Detroit and other urban areas, "can never be cured in the city alone. It will take action in both rural America and the cities."

The Freeman diagnosis takes note of two linked problems which he describes, in jargon befitting the medical professional, as "rural depopulation and urban impaction."

He says that between 500,000 and 600,000 people are quitting the countryside each year and moving to the cities. They add to the burdens on municipal services and many incur new burdens and frustrations of their own.

To Freeman, it's "a tragic waste of human lives and of land" that more than seven of every ten Americans are jammed onto only one per cent of the Nation's real estate.

The country-to-city migration has been going on for decades, and the results are visible not only in crowded urban slums but in countless rural communities that are gradually becoming ghost towns with stores boarded up and grass growing through neglected sidewalks.

Probably the main cause is lack of opportunity in the countryside, both for those who can find no jobs and those for whom the available jobs prove unrewarding.

Not only the rural poor, many of them Southern Negroes, are moving to the cities; better-off young people, potential community leaders, also join the parade in quest of greater challenge.

Farming's technological revolution, which the Federal Government has helped foster, is forcing millions off the land. For example, cotton pickers and other machines have slashed the need for harvest labor on Mississippi Delta farms from 750,000 man-days to 95,000 man-days in a mere six years, Freeman reports. (Production cutbacks to work down a huge cotton surplus presumably figures here, too.)

The President's National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber recently reckoned that only one farm boy in ten can hope to become a commercial farmer. The Commission added that no matter how much food the Nation's farms are called on to produce, farm labor needs will decline by another one third by 1980.

Meanwhile, rural America is lagging on other fronts: roads, schools, housing, health care.

While much has been written about the plights of Indians, Mississippi's hungry sharecroppers and Appalachia's jobless ex-coal miners, rarely if ever do the afflictions of rural America approach the drama of recent ghetto violence. But there are real problems nevertheless.

The National Farmers Organization staged a milk strike earlier this year to call attention to the dairy farmers' profit pinch.

In June, a band of Spanish-Americans raided a county courthouse in northern New Mexico. Those who peered behind the incident glimpsed sorry living conditions in that area's remote mountain hamlets.

Though Freeman repeatedly calls attention to the needs of country folk—and sometimes is criticized for failing to do more for them—rural America has relatively few champions in Washington and is gradually losing whatever political clout it once enjoyed on Capitol Hill.

A study by Congressional Quarterly showed 212 "rural" (by one definition) House seats out of a total 435 in the 1961–62 Congress, trimmed by redistricting to 203 seats in the Congress that followed. Continuing shrinkage is in the cards.

The human tide flowing into the cities cannot be reversed, but if Freeman has his way it can at least be slowed.

His prescription for urban sickness involves a "national policy of urban-rural balance." It's a vague concept at best, but Freeman uses it to stress the links between depressing conditions in the countryside and the frustrating and at times traumatic results when millions of ex-rural dwellers "pile up" in crowded cities.

He has announced, to promote this idea, a December symposium of planners, sociologists, economists and other experts in Washington as "a first infant step toward charting a national course for our people and their land."

To be sure, rural problems have been studied and restudied over the years. Development plans have been drawn and redrawn.

Washington has managed to produce (by one count) 197 programs that promise aid to rural areas. And yet, funding falls far short of needs.

While there have been "rural renaissance" success stories in some communities where local leaders pitch in and have a knack for Federal "grantsmanship," there have also been confusion and disappointment elsewhere when hoped-for Government dollars weren't forthcoming.

The Freeman prescription calls for setting a higher national priority on Government investments in rural areas, to improve public services and facilities, to help create more jobs and generally to make the countryside a more inviting alternative to city life.

CRISIS IN OUR CITIES: WHAT RURAL AMERICA CAN DO ABOUT IT

Since its early days, our nation has periodically faced a crisis in its cities.

And, since the early days, the root cause has been the same . . . people flocking to the cities in search of something better . . . people leaving areas of little opportunity in search of fulfillment for themselves and their children.

In earlier times, the people came from overseas. Nearly all of them came from the land which no longer provided them with a living.

Today the people who fill our cities in search of a better life . . . nearly 600,000 of them a year . . . come from our own countryside, nearly all of them from the land which no longer offers them a living.

The fact is, as Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and other informed government officials have noted, that 70% of our nation's population is crowded into one percent of our land . . . many of them crowded into space covered by brick and mortar and macadam, over-laden with smog-filled air . . . treeless, flowerless, hopeless.

They are the victims of a quiet revolution in agriculture which no longer needs the labor of large numbers of human beings to produce the vast quantities of food and fiber we provide for the world. They are today's landless immigrants who formed our city ghettoes and slums of generations past.

The people of rural America, and America's rural electrics, believe this view of the past and of the present contains the seeds of our future . . . a brighter, more productive future for the people of the cities and the people in the rural areas.

We believe it is time we use one of our nation's greatest assets . . . our uncrowded countryside . . . to help solve the problem which concerns us all.

Rural America boasts more than space. It has fresh air and sun and sky and water. It has room for kids to run barefoot through grass covered with early morning dew, hills covered with clean snow for sleds and skis, fields for people and dogs to romp in.

And it has more.

In the towns and villages of rural America there are uncrowded streets and sidewalks. There is electric power and transportation. There are good roads to bring the productr of hard-working people to the great market places.

What rural America lacks are job opportunities. Of the nearly 14 million new jobs created in our country in the past 15 years, few were created in rural areas. Yet polls say half our population would like to live and work in rural areas.

We believe that unless we bend our efforts to the development of rural America, we will fail to solve the problems of our cities. Unless we stem the tide of migration from the country to the city that puts more and more people into less and less space, we will have ignored our greatest asset in meeting one of our gravest problems.

We must start now to develop job opportunities, adequate hospitals and medical facilities, better schools and theaters and libraries, better water and sewer systems, and improved public services and facilities for industry in our rural areas. With them, rural America *can* meet the job hunger of its own people. It *can* provide the space and living room city people so desperately seek.

The nation's rural electrics view with optimism the efforts of our nation's leaders to restore the balance between rural and urban America. We pledge our support and the continuation of our unstinting effort. We invite the participation and cooperation of all people concerned about the future of our country, regardless of where they live.

There is, after all, only one nation, and we are all part of it.

(National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009).

(NOTE.—This is a copy of an advertisement the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is running in a number of newspapers around the country.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Government Operations Committee and the many Senators but most especially my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who participated in drafting S. 1602 for the thoroughness of their work and the excellence of the final product.

The bill to create a Northwest Regional Services Corporation represents an imaginative attempt to salvage a multimillion dollar facility for the taxpayers of the Nation. Depending on whose figures you want to use, the replacement cost of Glasgow Air Force Base is between $125 million and $200 million. Its loss will be nearly total if productive uses are not found for it before the scheduled closing date of June 30, 1968.

This magnificent installation consists of several hundred permanent, heated buildings which can accommodate upwards of 9,000 people. All of the structures are less than 10 years old; most of them are less than 6. Thoroughly modern aircraft facilities and a 13,500-foot runway enhance its value for aviation. The base is a self-contained community with its own extensive water system, a 50-bed hospital, and elementary schooling facilities for almost 1,000 students—to mention just a few items.

Since its size militates against full utilization by the local community, the State, or a single private industry, the responsibility must fall to the Federal Government. The Defense Department admits that it is the most difficult closure case they have encountered.

The truth is, Mr. President, that only two alternatives are left open to us: authorize the Federal Government to assume its rightful responsibility, or let this huge national investment turn into a 20th-century ghost town. I submit that in an age of increasing emphasis on attacking the root causes of our social ills, we cannot afford not to use this ready-made laboratory. S. 1602 will provide the means to accomplish this.

I wish to commend the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] for the splendid initiative he and his staff have shown in developing this legislation. Special recognition goes to Senator MCCLELLAN, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, for his unfailing cooperation and courtesy, as well as to our good friend and colleague from South Dakota, Senator MUNDT, the ranking Republican member. Their contributions, along with the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], and others, insure that S. 1602 represents a truly bipartisan attempt to salvage a costly national asset. The trail is long, but a good beginning has certainly been made. I urge the Senate to accept the unanimous recommendation of the committee and speed this measure on to the House and the second leg of its journey toward enactment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Government Operations, and I had something to do with the complete redrafting of this bill in committee.

I believe the record should show, in all fairness, that we may very well be dealing with a pilot plan operation for situations where the Government proposes to abandon a major installation. This is a real innovation. All of us, including myself, have had experience with the abandonment of major installations in our States. In no other case of which I am aware has the provision in this bill been made—that is, a fund established, in this case $1 million a year for 3 years—for a

Government corporation to seek to work out a situation which in other circumstances has been worked out, if it ever was, locally or by the State involved.

This is an experiment. Frankly, we recognized it as such in the committee. The record should show that it is an experiment, and may very well demonstrate it is confined to this case, but not necessarily so. In any case, I believe it should be clearly designated for what it is, because it gave us in the committee very great concern.

I must say that the ingenuity of the proposal was interesting, and even that compelled attention. We considerably changed the entire concept which came to us originally as a permanent corporation with, first, an open-end appropriation and then very large appropriations. But all this was worked out with the concurrence and splendid cooperation of the Senators from Montana; and I must say that the good faith and high character of both Senators from Montana had much to do with how we felt about the bill, with the concurrence of all members of the committee, and that is the reason why it comes to the Senate unanimously.

I rose, Mr. President, not to delay in any way the passage of the bill, as we have completed our work on it and are convinced that it is the right approach, but to point out that this is an experiment that may very well have general applicability. In any case, it is an experiment, and we have done our utmost to tailor it to the situation which faces this State, with its sparse population and other problems—a situation which may well face other States, and has faced them, although we have not yet done what is being done in this case. It may help to indicate the way we should proceed in matters of this magnitude and this impact upon the local communities and the individual States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

I point out that Glasgow Air Force Base was placed in Montana at the instigation only of the Department of Defense, under a previous administration; that it cost approximately $150 million; that it is the most up-to-date base in the country; that it is being cut off next July with no provision, so far as we can learn, for its continued use; and that because of the action taken by the Department of Defense an economic crisis in Montana is in the making.

The area chosen by the Department of Defense for the Glasgow base was a most sparsely populated area of Montana; with the growth of the base, the surrounding area grew but the growth was dependent entirely upon the existence of the base. It is the unanimous determination of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and I hope shortly of the Senate, that the selection, as well as the closing of the Glasgow base being a decision entirely of the Government, generates a responsibility for the Government for these decisions. We think, and this bill helps to prove that point, that the Government does have a vital and overriding interest in seeing to it that a project it brought into being, and which it is now in the process of liquidating, should not generate hardship without an effort to alleviate the problem created. That is the reason in part for this particular proposal which is small in nature but important in content, and which may be applicable to other situations which arise in various parts of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 689), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would authorize the establishment of a Federal Corporation, to be known as the Northwest Regional Services Corporation, which would have a three-man board of directors appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Secretary of Defense would be required, upon determination that Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont., is no longer needed for military purposes, to transfer to the Corporation all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property of such Air Force Base. The Corporation would be authorized to establish a number of training centers and programs designed to enhance the social, cultural, and economic well-being of the people of the United States, to use such facilities for encouraging and promoting commercial and economic development of the area and to minimize unemployment when the base is closed.

The Corporation would be authorized to enter into agreements with departments and agencies of the U.S. Government having statutory authority to conduct such training centers and programs. The agreements would be in accordance with the statutory authorization of each department or agency. In accomplishing its purpose, the Corporation would also be authorized to enter into agreements with private individuals, associations, corporations, foundations and other organizations and with State and local governments and to assess appropriate charges for the use of property and for the services provided.

The closure of Glasgow Air Force Base poses a unique problem. The Department of Defense confirms that this base closure is one of the most difficult they have dealt with. The Bureau of the Budget admits that closure of a $100 million facility constitutes a national problem that most certainly cannot be solved at the State or local level.

In view of exhaustive attempts to find alternative civil uses for Glasgow Air Force Base and the inability of the local community to assume the cost of maintaining such a huge complex, the committee is of the opinion that if this base closure continues to be treated in the usual and customary manner by following the normal disposal procedure of the General Services Administration, the taxpayers' investment in this tremendous facility will be lost.

This legislation not only offers a workable solution to the problems normally attendant to a base closing, but in addition, it does so in a manner that will protect the taxpayers' interest and provide for greater benefits than the minuscule 6 to 8 percent return realized through the normal surplus property disposal process.

The committee realizes there are many urgent national needs that must be met in a way which will yield maximum benefits to the public with minimum burden on the taxpayer. It is our desire that the executive branch and elements of the private sector take advantage of the huge and already capitalized resource at Glasgow Air Force Base to help meet some of these needs in such areas as rehabilitation, housing, training and education.

The public, the legislative branch, and the Executive are currently interested in reducing Federal expenditures wherever possible. This legislative proposal challenges the Nation to realize national goals and programs in a fiscally responsible and humanitarian way.

The committee feels the executive branch has an innovative opportunity to both serve and save by using Glasgow's vast resources including runways, air navigation facilities, medical, training, housing, recreational, transportation, and safety research potential along with rehabilitation resources. The committee believes that successful completion of this legislation will be a substantial aid in solving similar problems when other military installations are closed especially when there is no immediate demand by private interests, or where the local community was solely dependent on the base operation.

BACKGROUND

Glasgow is a small, isolated community of some 4,600 people, located in the sparsely populated northeast section of Montana. It is the largest city within a radius of 150 miles and 700 miles from the nearest metropolitan area (Minneapolis-St. Paul). Its economy is based on service to the Air Force base and Valley County (population 17,000) ranchers. The airbase is located 18 miles north of Glasgow on a 6,700-acre site. Erected at a cost in excess of $100 million, the base has a current population of 7,037, including dependents. The State of Montana has concluded it has no capability to support effective use of the base.

Glasgow Air Force Base was initially established by the Air Defense Command in 1955. Shortly thereafter it was enlarged to accommodate B–52 aircraft and in 1963 was expanded to support the 91st Bombardment Wing (SAC) and the 13th Fighter Interceptor Squadron.

The base is approximately 18 miles north of the city of Glasgow, Mont., and 50 miles south of the Canadian border. It contains about 6,700 acres of rangeland on which are located all of the facilities to support and maintain a large military airbase.

In November 1964, before the construction of the buildings was completed, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara reported that Glasgow Air Force Base would be phased out and closed on June 30, 1968.

It was reported to the Committee on Government Operations that more than $100 million has been expended by the Government in the development and outfitting the buildings and physical facilities at the base. It is estimated that if the buildings together with the utilities, equipment, furniture, fixtures, and other support facilities could be retained in their present status until a comprehensive plan is developed and utilized for civilan training purposes, that more than 8,000 people might be accommodated on the base.

When S. 1602 was introduced in the Senate, Senator Lee Metcalf, cosponsor of the bill, made the following statement:

"My distinguished colleague, the majority leader, and I are basically conservationists. We introduce this legislation to help make wise use of our most precious resource—human resources. We hope, with the cooperation of the Congress and the executive branch, to establish the Nation's first National Center for Human Resources Development—a comprehensive occupational education facility. This legislation will permit the wise use of a military base for civil purposes. It will avoid the customary cannibalization of valuable resources. It will make possible a combination of cooperative efforts of management and operations, using the best possible mixing of resources of all levels of government with the private sector of our economy.

"What we seek is an experimental approach to the use of one component of the Nation's arsenal of destruction. Can the tools and systems of destruction be converted to goals and methods of instruction? Should we continue to dispose of surplus and excess defense property in the customary manner, losing opportunities to convert such resources to immediate humanitarian civilian needs?

* * * * *

"This legislation which we propose will establish the Northwest Regional Services Corporation, which will make it possible to convert defense systems, now obsolete, to a much more pervasive war—the war of ignorance and unemployment. This legislation will help the Nation to combine the best elements of the private sector with the public resources now available. We will be able to serve thousands of people throughout the land. We will make wise use of existing resources."

Since the announced closure, repeated requests to review the base closure decision by Montana's congressional delegation have been directed to the Secretary of Defense. The latest request was sent by Senator Mike Mansfield to the Secretary on August 7, 1967. On August 19, Secretary McNamara's office responded that the decision to close the base on June 30, 1968, remained unchanged.

Glasgow Air Force Base is a modern, hardened complex. Family housing on the base could accommodate more than 8,000 persons. There are all the conveniences of a modern city including schools, a theater, recreation facilities, a chapel, hospital and dental clinic, service stations, post office, library, and banking facilities. Additionally there are hangars, nose dock facilities, warehouses, aircraft shops, a control tower which contains the latest up-to-date navigational equipment, and a 13,500-foot-long runway which can accommodate any plane now operational in addition to the SST and other planes of the future.

On February 8, 1967, Senators Mansfield and Metcalf and Representatives Arnold Olsen and James Battin, of Montana, sent to Tim Babcock, Governor of the State of Montana, a joint letter offering their assistance and requested the Governor to join them in solving the problems created by the announced closure of the base. The Governor, on June 8, 1967, in a letter directed to Senator Metcalf for inclusion in the hearing record, responded:

"* * * if it again be determined the base is not required from a military standpoint, your committee might then wish to consider action, as presented in S. 1602, at which time I would wholeheartedly join with Senator Metcalf and Senator Mansfield in proposing utilization of this base for the purpose set out in Senate bill 1602."

HEARING AND EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Government Operations held hearings on June 12, July 21 and 22, 1967, on S. 1602 with a view to determining how Glasgow Air Force Base could be converted for civilian use. Oral testimony was received from 20 witnesses, and 48 statements or communications were submitted to the committee for use in determining how the base could be converted and utilized by the local community.

The hearing brought to light these important facts which should be considered with reference to the bill:

1. To date the "formal procedure" for the disposal of surplus defense installations through the Office of Economic Adjustment has not been successful.

2. The Department of Defense admits that this base closure is the most difficult facing the Office of Economic Adjustment.

3. A $100 million facility will be lost to the taxpayers of this Nation and people in need, unless a constructive use is found for the facility.

4. There exists great and immediate need in the aerospace and aviation industry today and in the years immediately ahead for a facility such as Glasgow Air Force Base for training, research and development.

5. One of the rarest commodities in the Nation is "open air space" which exists in abundance at Glasgow Air Force Base.

6. A training center such as is proposed in the legislation would be challenging, unique and of value in testing and demonstrating new techniques in vocational and technical education. The experience gained at Glasgow may be helpful in converting other defense bases scheduled for closure.

7. This bill, S. 1602, has the bipartisan support of the Montana congressional delegation and the Montana State administration.

Agency comments and recommendations were requested from all of the major departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government, and in response thereto most of the agencies reported unfavorably.

For the most part the objections submitted by the Bureau of the Budget and other officials of the executive branch of the Government were based on the contention that the mandatory requirement for the Corporation to establish certain specified manpower development and training centers was too broad, and do not appear to be feasible or compatible with the site and facilities located at Glasgow Air Force Base.

The Bureau was concerned about placing such programs in what it termed a "remote location." It stated that grant-in-aid programs are normally carried out by State and local governments rather than by private organizations; therefore, the arrangement proposed in S. 1602 would not be consistent with the Federal-State-local relations implicit in the grant-in-aid system. Additional objection was raised regarding the mandatory requirement that certain Federal programs now conducted directly or by contract, such as research and testing, would be required to be transferred to a new location. The Budget Bureau also questioned the use of a corporate form of organization to carry out all of the programs enumerated in the bill.

The Bureau recommended that the problems associated with base closures be dealt with through the "normal procedures" which the Department of Defense has established for that purpose. Under this procedure the Department would notify the General Services Administration that the property is surplus to its needs, the employees would be terminated, some of the equipment and fixtures would be removed, and other Federal agencies would be invited to inspect and indicate whether they need or can use the base. In the meantime the Office of Economic Adjustment, in the Department of Defense and the Economic Development Corporation would attempt to obtain transfer of the employees, arrange for civilian utilization of the base facilities, and minimize the sudden economic change in the community when the base is closed. This procedure may well be appropriate when a military installation is located in or near a large city where the labor market is flexible due to the proximity of other commercial firms, or where the base can be leased or sold to a large industrial or commercial organization. However, such facilities or potential users do not exist at Glasgow. Therefore the "normal procedure" of the Department of Defense is neither practicable nor feasible in this particular installation.

The committee concluded that combat-mission-oriented equipment and related supplies should not be separated from the military command. The committee therefore agreed to amend section 4(a) of the bill to specifically exclude this type of equipment, spare parts, and supporting supplies so that they could be removed when the base is closed. In this connection it should be remembered that the original draft of the bill was intended to make possible an orderly transfer of the real and common-use personal property from the military to the new Corporation, rather than to have the movable parts such as furnishings, fixtures, and other personal property removed from the buildings before transfer to the Northwest Regional Services Corporation.

The Department reported that there are 200 units of relocatable family housing at the Glasgow Air Force Base for which authority to remove was specifically obtained in section 506 of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-188), and 960 family housing units constructed under the Capehart act which are subject to a mortgage debt of $13,219,259.

When the Assistant Secretary of Defense appeared before the committee to testify on S. 1602 he indicated that legislation was now being sought to authorize the sale of this type of housing at one base in order that the proceeds could be used at another installation to pay off the mortgage debt or to supply financial assistance in another area where the real estate market may be depressed due to base closing. It would appear that the establishment of a revolving fund or other similar arrangement on a national scale may provide the legal authority and financial resources needed to help solve this type of housing problem for other military posts and stations scheduled to be closed during the next few years.

S. 1602 has been amended to provide in section 4 that combat-mission-oriented equipment may be removed from the base when it is no longer needed as a defense support facility. This amendment is in accordance with recommendations of the Assistant Secretary of Defense and other witnesses who appeared and testified before the committee.

Section 5(a) was revised by changing the word "directed," on line 20, page 2, to "encouraged." This amendment changes from mandatory to permissive installation of manpower and training centers at the base. This section was further amended by deleting the need for establishing "a senior citizen rehabilitation and training center designed to help train and orient older citizens for less active work and retirement activities," because it was believed that this type of center may not be needed or utilized as extensively as originally anticipated.

The new section 17 will establish a revolving fund which will be credited with the receipts and revenue from rents, commissions, fees or other sources, and made available to the board of directors for payment of the normal operating expenses, with a specific stipulation that such funds which are not needed shall be invested in bonds or other similar obligations guaranteed by the United States.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1602) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 667, and that the rest of the calendar be considered in sequence.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

FISHING IN U.S. TERRITORIAL WATERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1752) to amend the act prohibiting fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by vessels other than vessels of the United States and by persons in charge of such vessels.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 1 strike out lines 9 and 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1752) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1752

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by vessels other than vessels of the United States and by persons in charge of such vessels," approved May 20, 1964 (78 Stat. 194), is amended by replacing the first sentence of section 1 with the following:

"That it is unlawful for any vessel, except a vessel of the United States, or for any master or other person in charge of such a vessel, to engage in the fisheries within the territorial waters of the United States, its territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or within any waters in which the United States has the same rights in respect to fisheries as it has in its territorial waters or in such waters to engage in activities in support of a foreign fishery fleet or to engage in the taking of any Continental Shelf fishery resource which appertains to the United States except as provided in this Act or as expressly provided by an international agreement to which the United States is a party."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 684), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed bill is to amend section 1 of the act approved May 20, 1964 (78 Stat. 194), so as to make it unlawful for any vessel except a vessel of the United States, or for any master or other person in charge of such a vessel "to engage in activities in support of a foreign fishery fleet" within the territorial waters of the United States, or within any waters to which the United States has the same rights in respect to fisheries as it has in its territorial waters; i.e., the 9-mile contiguous fishing zone. Exception would be made for rights accorded by international agreement.

BACKGROUND AND NEED

The United States already has two agreements, one with Japan (TIAS 6287) and one with the U.S.S.R. (TIAS 6218) which designate limited areas within the contiguous zone in which vessels of the Soviet Union and Japan would conduct loading operations. The explicit assertion in the bill of authority over fishing support operations in this sense would, therefore, be in accord with developing international practice.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The committee found no objection from agencies, departments, or industry to S. 1752.

Some agencies of Government are of the opinion that existing law now provides for the additional authority in the contiguous zone as provided in S. 1752, but all favor the clarification and strengthening of the original act.

AMENDMENT OF THE FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT OF 1956

The bill (S. 1798) to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1798

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1121), as amended (16 U.S.C. 742c), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, under such rules and regulations and under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to make loans to any fishermen's cooperative association meeting the requirements of the Act of June 25, 1934 (48 Stat. 1213), as amended (15 U.S.C. 521–522), and existing as of the date of enactment of this subsection, for the following purposes: (1) to finance the purchase of fish and shellfish or products thereof and the cost of storing fish and shellfish and the products thereof in cold storage or other storage facilities owned, leased, or used by such association; (2) to provide operating capital needed to supplement the capital funds of such association; and (3) to finance or refinance the acquisition by purchase or lease of land, buildings, and equipment and the construction or reconstruction of buildings or other improvements used by such association in connection with activities related solely to the storage, processing, preparation for market, handling, or marketing of fish and shellfish or the products thereof. No loan shall be made under this subjection if, in the judgment of the Secretary, the loan will increase the production of any fish or shellfish which is commonly produced in excess of annual marketing requirements, or will materially contribute to the depletion of any fish or shellfish species contrary to sound conservation practices. There is authorized to be appropriated to the fisheries loan fund the sum of $5,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this section, in addition to any sums authorized by subsection (c) of this section."

Sec. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 4(b)(4) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "and to fishermen's cooperative associations."

(b) Section 4(b)(5) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting "or to enable it, in the case of a fishermen's cooperative association, to operate and manage the association efficiently and effectively for the mutual benefit of the members thereof."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 685), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COMMITTEE COMMENT

Based on the hearings held over a 3-day period and on a significant number of communications received, none of which opposed the proposed bill, your committee feels that there is vital need for a source of finance for the Nation's fishermen's cooperatives.

There are about 105 fishery cooperative associations in the United States today and their membership numbers more than 10,000. Directly, and indirectly, they account for from one-fifth to one-fourth of the total dollar value of domestic fish and shellfish produced today. Besides processing and marketing the fishermen-member catches, they also provide supplies, equipment and other items used by the fishermen at substantial and needed savings. Some even underwrite their own marine insurance.

Geographically, they are found in nearly every coastal fishery area, and in the inland U.S. fishery waters as well.

These fishery cooperatives need dependable credit facilities. They have been often handicapped in securing loans and financing due to their peculiar organizations and operating principles—inherent in cooperatives.

As Mr. Crowther, Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, U.S. Department of Interior, testified before the committee in hearings:

"Fishermen are often at an economic disadvantage when competing in the market. Sometimes a fisherman must take whatever price is being paid when he reaches port due to the highly perishable nature of his produce. He is in no position to shop from buyer to buyer to obtain the best price. He has no facilities for unloading and putting his catch in cold storage until he can find a suitable market. Thus, any assistance to help set up improved marketing facilities will improve his economic position * * *"

It is your committee's judgment that the domestic fishermen are in need for the best possible assistance that they may better harvest the adjacent resources of the United States, whether they be offshore or in the inland waters. The Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, which this bill would amend, sets forth clearly the policy of the United States under section 2:

"The Congress hereby declares that the fish, shellfish, and wildlife resources of the Nation make a material contribution to our national economy and food supply, as well as a material contribution to the health, recreation, and well-being of our citizens; that such resources are a living, renewable form of national wealth that is capable of being maintained and greatly increased with proper management * * *

"Protection of opportunity—maintenance of an economic atmosphere in which domestic production and processing can prosper; protection from subsidized competing products; protection of opportunity to fish on the high seas in accordance with international law * * *"

In order to properly provide facilities to handle and market the catch of members of the cooperatives there is need for capital beyond that which the fishermen can provide. Local lending institutions are often reluctant to loan money to fishery cooperatives because they have little experience in dealing with this type of enterprise. As a result, it is very difficult for most to secure loan funds from conventional sources. The establishment of the credit facilities proposed in S. 1798 would fill this gap.

The present provisions of the fisheries loan fund regulations are of very limited value in assisting cooperatives, as the money can be used only for that part of their activity which relates to vessel operation. The fishery loan fund cannot now be used to finance activities generally considered as "marketing" which is the primary function of cooperatives.

The Small Business Administration, in

some cases, considers fishery cooperatives ineligible under its definition of a "small business" and in other cases because they do not have complete control of the entire production of members. Banks, as mentioned, usually have more desirable, less risky choices for loan applications.

The bill is patterned after the farmer's cooperative banks which have been very successful, although in order to effect needed economy the program would be operated under the present fishery loan fund thus avoiding additional administrative expense.

In addition to favorable communications received, two witnesses, representing fishery cooperatives, appeared before your committee at hearings and made persuasive statements on the need for S. 1798.

For example, Mr. Donald E. Reinhardt, general manager, Halibut Producers Cooperative, Seattle, Wash., testified in part:

"* * * With Senate bill 1798, fishermen's organizations would have the benefit of the experience and understanding of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries on a much closer relationship. The Kennedy round of tariffs has increased the difficulty for the U.S. fishing industry to compete in American markets for the future. A fact that many fishery cooperatives have been established shows the need for the American fishermen to obtain the last dollar of value from his product. Many bankers do not understand marketing cooperatives and impose a higher than normal interest rate plus other restrictions on their loans to cooperatives. These facts place fishery cooperatives at a competitive disadvantage."

Another industry witness appearing at hearings before your committee indicated similar problems on the Atlantic Coast in the financing difficulties of fishery cooperatives. Mr. Jacob Dykstra, president of the Point Judith Fishermen's Cooperative, Point Judith, R.I., an organization of 50 medium and small offshore draggers, told the committee:

"* * * our fishermen support this bill and urge its enactment. The need for the establishment of credit facilities for fisheries cooperatives has long been recognized, and several attempts have been made to secure passage of legislation in this end over the years. S. 1798 is the most simply worded and easily administered bill proposed to date.

"Our co-op has been in business for 20 years buying, selling, processing, and handling fish for its members, and providing them with gear and supplies. We can testify from firsthand experience that one of the most difficult problems facing a fishery co-op is obtaining adequate financing to conduct its operations and provide funds for construction and improvement of physical facilities. Improved financing would greatly contribute to the orderly marketing of our fish and thus enable the fishermen to produce a better product and realize increased income."

BACKGROUND AND NEED

This bill, S. 1798, attempts to borrow a page from the history of Federal aid to solve the credit problems of farmer cooperatives. This aid has led to a self-help program whereby such cooperatives are now gradually repaying the Federal investment in the banks for cooperatives and assuming complete ownership of the various regional banks. Although such would be ideal for fishermen, S. 1798 provides only for the increase of the present fishery loan fund, thus reducing cost.

With the rapid pace of technological development in processing and distributing fishery products, sophisticated equipment requiring heavy investment of capital is necessary. This has increased greatly the long-term credit needs of doing business. Most fishery cooperatives and their members do not have the resources to provide such capital on short notice when such needs arise.

COST

The bill would authorize the appropriation to the fisheries loan fund the sum of $5 million to carry out the provisions of the act.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN FISHING VESSELS FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF CERTAIN LAWS

The bill (S. 2047) to exempt certain vessels engaged in the fishing industry from the requirements of certain laws was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2047

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 404) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "As used herein, the phrase 'engaged in fishing as a regular business' includes cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons which are engaged exclusively in (1) the carriage of cargo to or from vessels in the fishery or a facility used or to be used in the processing or assembling of fishery products, or (2) the transportation of cannery or fishing personnel to or from operating locations."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 27, 1935 (46 U.S.C. 88), is amended by designating the existing section as subsection (a) and by adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) All cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons except those constructed after the effective date of this subsection or those converted to either of such services after five years from the effective date of this subsection are exempt from the requirements of this Act."

SEC. 3. The first proviso of section 1 of the Act of June 20, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 367), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "As used herein, the phrase 'any vessel engaged in the fishing, oystering, clamming, crabbing, or any other branch of the fishery or kelp or sponge industries' includes cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons which are engaged exclusively in (1) the carriage of cargo to or from vessels in the fishery or a facility used or to be used in the processing or assembling of fishery products, or (2) the transportation of cannery or fishing personnel to or from operating locations."

SEC. 4. The first subparagraph of section 4417a of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 391a(1)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "Notwithstanding the first sentence hereof, cannery tenders, fishing tenders or fishing vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons when engaged exclusively in the fishing industry shall be allowed to have on board inflammable or combustible cargo in bulk to the extent and upon conditions as may be required by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating."

SEC. 5. This Act is effective upon enactment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 686), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

S. 2047 is designed to clarify the ambiguous statutes enacted many years ago without apparent consideration of possible application to the unique mode of operation that prevails in the salmon fishing industry of Alaska. That mode of operation is imposed by the geography of Alaska and the peculiarities of salmon. It is the only way this industry can operate, and upon it depends the livelihood and existence of many Alaskans who reside in remote fishing communities.

The heart of the Alaska salmon industry is the 160 or more service vessels, commonly referred to as cannery tender or fishing tender vessels. They range in size from 25 feet to over 300 gross tons. They operate, normally, from Puget Sound in the State of Washington to Alaska and the coastal waters and ports of Alaska. As the salmon season, particularly in some areas, is a short one, some of these vessels then participate in other fisheries.

At the beginning of the salmon season, cannery tenders, when proceeding to processing facilities, carry cargoes of supplies of all kinds, including fuel, to the isolated operating locations in Alaska where salmon fishing and processing are conducted. These supplies are for both the native fishermen living year round in these isolated communities, and also for use in the processing of the fish. Quite often these are the only supplies received by native fishermen, including fuel, clothing, and the very necessities of life. The supplies of cans, salt, fuel, etc., to the canneries are essential to their operation.

Because there is no other available transportation to many of these remote locations, these vessels also, by necessity, transport fishing and cannery personnel.

It should be emphasized, however, that these vessels do not transport the canned salmon to the market, nor are cargo or personnel carried outside the fishing industry, and there is no competition with established common carriers.

These same vessels very often take supplies, including fuel, out to the actual fishing or "catching" vessels on the fishing grounds. Often then, they return to the cannery with the caught fish for processing. As the only means of transportation available, again they may carry fishing and other personnel between cannery and the fishing fleet.

In the judgment of your committee, without this service fleet or with hampering restrictions the Alaska canned salmon industry would quickly cease to exist.

For many years the administration of the inspection laws by the Coast Guard and its predecessor, the Steamboat Inspection Service, deemed cannery tender and fishing tender vessels to be the same as fishing vessels. Fishing vessels, by statutory requirements, are exempted from the inspection laws.

About 5 years ago, however, the Coast Guard announced an intention to reverse the longstanding administrative treatment of fishing tender and cannery tender vessels and to require their inspection. S. 2047 would return these essential vessels to their previous status.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The committee, as stated, feels that this legislation is essential to the continuation of the Alaska salmon industry. Although there is no geographical restriction to the language of the bill, the committee knows of no other area where the unusual peculiarities described exist, other than in the North Pacific. No need was felt, therefore, for geographical amendment.

Although the Coast Guard, in testimony before the committee, has indicated a desire for a 5-year limitation to the exemption, records in the committee files indicate that the matter has been under consideration and review for some 20 years. There appears therefore, no need for further study.

Upon request of the committee, the Coast Guard was able to provide some comparison between casualty and loss of life relationships between pleasure craft and commercial fishing vessels, but no records are presently available as to such problems associated with North Pacific cannery tenders. It is the committee's belief, however, that the record, when available, will show that their function and operation will rank high in safety in relationship with other waterborne craft.

The North Pacific salmon industry is beset with many problems. The wide variation in catch makes the operation for both fisherman and canner a hazardous one. As Mr. Jay S. Gage, superintendent, New England Fish Co., Seattle, Wash., testified to your committee the 1967 season in parts of Alaska was the poorest in 70 years. He told the committee that at the company's cannery in Ketchikan, Alaska, where they have operated continuously since 1907, the pack this year was 2,205 cases compared to about 220,000 cases last year.

The emphasis is not upon decline, but merely demonstrates the need for regulatory status quo and the crippling effect new regulations might have, particularly in light of the fact that your committee believes there is not a safety problem involved.

COSTS

No additional Federal funds are involved in the enactment of this legislation.

AMENDMENT OF THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ACT OF 1950

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1260) to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (Public Law 81–845) which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 1, after line 4, strike out:

(a) By inserting the words "or mammal" after the word "fish" in section 2(g).

(b) By deleting the words "outside of the United States" in section 4(b).

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

(a) By changing the period in section 2(a) of the Act to a comma and adding the following words: "and amendments including the 1961 declaration of understanding and the 1963 protocol, as well as the convention signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949."

(b) By inserting the words, "or mammal" after the word "fish" in section 2(g).

(c) By adding a new subsection (h) in section 2 of the Act to read as follows:

"(h) Fish: The word 'fish' means any species of fish, mollusks, crustaceans, including lobsters, and all forms of marine animal life covered by the convention."

(d) By deleting the words "outside of the United States" in section 4(b).

So as to make the bill read:

S. 1260

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1067; 16 U.S.C. 981–991) is amended as follows:

(a) By changing the period in section 2(a) of the Act to a comma and adding the following words: "and amendments including the 1961 declaration of understanding and the 1963 protocol, as well as the convention signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949."

(b) By inserting the words "or mammal" after the word "fish" in section 2(g).

(c) By adding a new subsection (h) in section 2 of the Act to read as follows:

"(h) Fish: The word 'fish' means any species of fish, mollusks, crustaceans, including lobsters, and all forms of marine animal life covered by the convention."

(d) By deleting the words "outside of the United States" in section 4(b).

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (Public Law 81-845)."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 670), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 is the implementing legislation for the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, which entered into force July 3, 1950. Fourteen governments are now parties to this convention.

In 1961 the Commission adopted a resolution to bring harp and hood seals under the provisions of the convention. A protocol to the convention was drafted in 1963. In July 1964 the United States deposited its ratification. In April 1966, with the formal adherence and ratification of all members party to the convention, the protocol entered into force and was proclaimed by the President on May 23, 1966. The bill, S. 1260, as amended will implement the protocol.

Although U.S. citizens do not participate in the hunting of harp and hood seals at present, the committee feels that this Government should be in a position to enforce such measures for conservation as required.

In addition, the original act provides for payment of expenses of not more than five members of the industry advisory committee to the U.S. Commissioners on the Commission to attend meetings outside the United States. There appears to be an ambiguity in the language, which presently restricts any such payment for meetings held in the United States. The bill, S. 1260, is designed to correct this.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The committee found no objection to the proposed amendments as provided in S. 1260, either from industry or Government, although there were amendments offered by several agencies, which were accepted by the committee.

Although the bill provides only for the insertion of the words "or mammal" after the word "fish" in section 2(g), the committee accepted the suggestions by agencies and departments that a new subsection (h) be added to section 2, as follows: "Fish: The word 'fish' means any species of fish, mollusks, crustaceans, including lobsters, and all forms of marine animal or plant life covered by the Convention."

The question of compensation to Commission advisers appears properly covered in S. 1260, but the committee recommends a further amendment as suggested by agencies as follows: Amend the definition of "Convention" in section 2(a) to make clear it includes amendments such as the 1961 declaration of understanding and the 1963 protocol, as well as the convention "signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949."

Also, the committee recommends the amendment of reference to Public Law "845–81," in the title of the bill, be changed to "81–845."

SURVEY OF COASTAL AND FRESH WATER COMMERCIAL FISHERY RESOURCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a survey of the coastal and fresh water commercial fishery resources of the United States, its territories and possessions which have been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment on page 2, at the beginning of line 3, strike out:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a survey utilizing extant data sources of the character, extent, and condition of the coastal and freshwater commercial and recreational fishery resources, including both those resources now being utilized by United States and foreign fishermen and those potential resources which are latent and unused, of the United States, its territories and possessions, including coastal and distant water fishery resources in which the United States has an interest or right.

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a survey utilizing extant data sources of the character, extent, and condition of the coastal and fresh water commercial and recreational fishery resources (including lobsters) adjacent to the United States, including resources within the territorial waters of the Great Lakes, the territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Such survey shall pertain to both those resources now being utilized by United States and foreign fishermen and those potential resources which are latent and unused and shall include coastal and distant water fishery resources in which the United States has an interest or right.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

S.J. RES. 103

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a survey utilizing extant data sources of the character, extent, and condition of the coastal and fresh water commercial and recreational fishery resources (including lobsters) adjacent to the United States, including resources within the territorial waters of the Great Lakes, the territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Such survey shall pertain to both those resources now being utilized by United States and foreign fishermen and those potential resources which are latent and unused and shall include coastal and distant water fishery resources in which the United States has an interest or right.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to submit through the President a report to the Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than January 1, 1969, concerning the results of the survey authorized and directed in the preceding section.

SEC. 3. For those potential or underutilized resources for which extant information is considered wholly inadequate to characterize the distribution and extent of the stocks, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is authorized to initiate additional studies to more satisfactorily delineate their magnitude and distribution.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such funds as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, but not to exceed $600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a survey of the coastal and fresh-water commercial and recreational fishery resources adjacent to the United States, including the resources within the territorial waters of the Great Lakes, the territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and to make available to the public and Congress information gained from such survey."

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 688), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

The intent of Senate Joint Resolution 103, as amended, is to direct the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the coastal and fresh-water commercial and recreational fishery resources adjacent to the United States, and including the Great Lakes, U.S. territories, possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and to make available to the public and Congress such information gained from the investigations.

Senate Joint Resolution 103 will help the United States fulfill its responsibilities as provided under the Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas, adopted at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1958, and ratified by the United States. The convention came into force on March 20, 1966. This convention provides that all signatory nations have an obligation to adopt high seas conservation measures "if necessary" when two or more nations are involved, and to negotiate conservation regulations when two or more nations are involved. The latter two regulations apply to other states subsequently fishing the same area unless new regulations are negotiated.

Further, the aforementioned convention recognizes the right of the coastal state to maintain productivity of adjacent high seas fishery resources and to take part in conservation research and regulation even though its nationals do not fish there. It also provides for the negotiation with any state whose nationals fish adjacent seas and whose conservation practices may oppose those of the coastal state.

There are additional provisions, but Senate Joint Resolution 103 would provide funding and emphasis from the Congress to effect the needed data that the United States might not only fulfill its basic commitment as a signatory to the convention, but further have the knowledge necessary to demand proper conservation methods by those nations now fishing off our shores, regardless of whether or not the United States is participating in the harvest.

Arthur Dean, chairman of the U.S. delegation at the 1958 Geneva Law of the Sea Conference, referred to this convention as "one of the most striking accomplishments" of the Conference.

In its report to the President recommending submission of the convention to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification, the Department of State said:

"The convention on fisheries conservation lays down rules of law based on sound conservation principles which should do much to assure the preservation and increase of an important source of the world's food."

In the recent bilateral agreements, and those yet to be negotiated with Japan and the Soviet Union in particular, it has been obvious that in too many instances the foreign nation had better data and material concerning these vast coastal marine resources than did our own negotiators.

The recreational fisheries have also expanded greatly since such a survey was made following adoption of a similar resolution enacted May 11, 1944, which resulted in Senate Document No. 51 of the 79th Congress. Not only in the coastal resources but in the resources of the Great Lakes are we faced with indecision due to lack of knowledge. Field hearings by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee in the Great Lakes area have produced a wide variance in estimates as to relative populations of species, particularly in Lake Michigan, where massive die-offs of alewives have resulted from an ecological imbalance.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Your committee was impressed by the wide range of support for Senate Joint Resolution 103, including industry witnesses who appeared at hearings in Washington, D.C., September 20–22, 1967.

The National Canners Association, in a statement filed with the committee, said regarding Senate Joint Resolution 103:

"A survey such as the one proposed in your resolution is long overdue. The last overall study of this country's commercial fishery resources was carried out more than 20 years ago. The commercial fishing industry in the country is severely handicapped by a lack of accurate, up-to-date scientific knowledge of U.S. fishery resources now being utilized and those underutilized resources which hold great potential for the future * * *. Each year, foreign fleets reap a greater share of our coastal fishery resources and each year a larger share of the U.S. market for fishery products goes by default, to foreign imports * * * for these reasons, the U.S. fish canning industry deems it imperative that a comprehensive survey of our fishery resources be undertaken at the earliest possible date, and that sufficient funds be made available for a meaningful study * * *".

The Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission—an interstate agency of California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington—urged passage and included the following comments:

"Waters off the coasts of the United States are being invaded by large foreign fleets, and the fishery resources are being reduced in abundance in some instances even before U.S. fisheries become established on the resources * * *. The numbers of U.S. fishermen, fishing vessels, and shore workers are decreasing although they are strategic assets in time of war or emergency. We cannot reverse this trend without information with which to stimulate and plan greater use of the fishery resources in or adjacent to the United States and in the world's oceans * * *."

Although the Department of the Interior in its official comment, as well as in the hearing testimony of Mr. Harold E. Crowther, Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, indicated that the Department feels it already has the necessary authority, the committee feels that the importance of the survey and report, as provided for in Senate Joint Resolution 103, is such that a direct emphasis from the Congress is essential so that the United States will no longer be placed at a disadvantage in planning its programs without necessary knowledge.

The fact that the last such report on the Nation's fishery resources was made available in the 79th Congress appears to the committee to be just cause for emphasis of need and authorization of funds to carry out the purposes of the resolution.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a petition signed by Harold W. Smith, Sr., and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, relating to the giving of aid in any form to our Communist enemies, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2593. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ray L. Walter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S. 2594. A bill to declare that certain mineral interests are held by the United States in trust for the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN:

S. 2595. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HANSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2596. A bill for the relief of Shankar Annarao Yelaja, his wife, Sujata S. Yelaja, and their two children, Priti S. Yelaja and Adhir S. Yelaja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION OF SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would authorize the sale of certain lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

Since assuming office in January of this year, several instances have been brought to my attention where owners of land adjoining national forest lands have made substantial improvements on those lands, believing in all good faith that they were the true owners. In subsequent resurveys by the Bureau of Land Management portions of these lands have been shown to be included in national forest territory.

Some remedy should certainly be available to these landholders who in good faith have made improvements on lands which they thought to be theirs.

The bill I introduce today would allow them to purchase, for fair market value, the land, up to 120 acres, upon which improvements have been made by an adjacent landowner under the mistaken belief that he was the owner thereof at the time such improvements were made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2595) to authorized the sale of certain lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, introduced by Mr. HANSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUTHORIZATION OF ESTABLISHMENT OF REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 426

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. STENNIS, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 2515) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table. It will be presented at a proper time when S. 2515 is being considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the effect of my amendment would be to delete the authority to trade redwood lands under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service for private lands. This provision was approved by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the bill establishing the Redwood National Park, S. 2515.

First let me say that the committee bill, introduced by Senator JACKSON, defines a park which I wholeheartedly support. Chairman JACKSON and Senator KUCHEL have done a commendable job with a very difficult problem.

I am deeply concerned, however, with the committee amendment to authorize the conveyance of national forest land in the northern redwood purchase unit in exchange for lands to be acquired as a part of the park. The federally owned property in the northern redwood purchase unit was made national forest land by the terms of the Weeks Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), under which it was acquired. It has always been and should continue to be treated just as all other national forests.

The question of using federally owned timberland to trade off for timberlands needed for other unrelated Federal purposes has been raised and rejected time after time. If it continues to be raised, I hope it will be rejected each time.

I am concerned that regardless of the efforts to distinguish the creation of a Redwood National Park from other Federal projects we will not successfully keep down the pressures to use national forest lands as trading stock for other Federal projects whose sponsors will claim that they are also uniquely significant.

The northern redwood purchase unit, like other national forest land, is being administered for specific purposes, which have proven their worth.

The timber on the national forest land in the northern redwood purchase unit is being managed under a sustained-yield basis. The allowable cut is being harvested and is presently available to a number of operators. To provide for it to be conveyed to operators who will convey their lands for inclusion in the national park will single these grantors out to make them whole at the expense of others who are now dependent on the purchase unit as a source of part of their supply of logs. This is a kind of "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

The harvesting of the timber from this national forest land is presently supporting its full contingent of jobs. No new jobs will be created by putting this land into private ownership.

The national forest land in the northern redwood purchase unit is the only federally owned redwood stand available for the valuable research on the management of redwoods. This research has been going on now for some 25 years. It still needs to be continued even after a Redwood National Park is established. We can ill afford to throw away the future value of this quarter of a century of effort.

My feeling of concern over these matters is such that I am unalterably opposed to the inclusion of this provision to trade off these national forest lands. Therefore I offer my amendment and urge my colleagues to support it.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 180) seeking U.S. initiative to assure United Nations Security Council consideration of Vietnam conflict, which I believe brings the number of cosponsors to 57 or 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

Statement by Senator JAVITS relating to golden anniversary of the Play Schools Association.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

LATEST PRICE RISE NO REASON FOR TAX INCREASE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the administration's reaction to the latest increase in the consumer price index is as predictable as Pavlov's dog. The index increased two-tenths of 1 percent last month, so the administration has argued this confirms the basis for their plea for a tax increase.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Once again, a careful and thoughtful analysis of the nature of the price increase should confirm precisely the opposite.

Consider the facts:

The consumer price index increased in September—up 0.2 percent from August, and 2.6 percent from September 1966. Food prices declined 0.6 percent, which is a major decline, while prices of all items less food increased 0.5 percent, which is a large increase. Substantial price increases occurred for apparel, 1.1 percent, and for medical care, 0.7 percent.

The preliminary wholesale price index in October was at the same level as in August and down slightly from October 1966. Prices of industrial commodities increased 0.2 percent in both September and October, and in October they were 1.3 percent above a year ago. By stage of processing, price developments have been diverse. Crude material prices in September were down 0.5 percent from August, 4 percent from June, and 7.2 percent from September 1966. On the other hand, September prices of finished goods were up 0.2 percent from August and 0.6 percent from a year ago.

Obviously, the reason is this difference in the enormous increase in costs that is going on. There is no excess in demand over capacity of our planning and manpower to supply that demand. Costs are pushing prices up and the tax increase would add to those costs.

Price increases continue to be a major economic problem even though manufacturing output as a percent of capacity utilization fell even further in the third quarter to 83.8 percent—down from 84.7 percent in the second quarter of this year, and substantially below the 90.6 percent level in the third quarter of 1966.

These are very significant statistics. The degree of utilization of capacity has been falling quarter after quarter.

The total output of the economy in the third quarter was only about 2½ percent above its level of a year earlier. Moreover, the overall unemployment rate in September rose to 4.1 percent—its highest level since November 1965. The average weekly hours of all private production and nonsupervisory workers in September was half an hour below the level of a year ago.

EXPLANATION

The explanation for the continuation in the general price advance is complex—having its roots in the past, in anticipation about the future, and in long-term structural changes in consumer demand, particularly toward more medical care and services.

After a long period of relative stability, wholesale prices rose 3.8 percent from August 1965 to August 1966, and consumer prices rose 3.5 percent. We are now experiencing the effects of that acceleration in the form of higher labor costs and higher prices of intermediate and final goods.

In regard to the future, many firms believe that demand is strengthening and that now is strategically the time to raise prices in an attempt to recover their previously higher margins. This development has probably been spurred by the frequent and dire predictions by the administration that prices will rise 2½ to 3 percent in the year ahead at best, and 4 to 6 percent if the surcharge is not enacted.

Prices of consumer services, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, rose 4.2 percent between September 1966 and September 1967. This accounted for more than half of the increase in the total consumer price index. Medical care service prices were up 8.7 percent. Demand pressures, spurred by medicare and medicaid, have been very great and promise to continue for the indefinite future.

The proposed tax increase will not slow this down. The need for more man and woman power in the health field is a long-term, immense need that will not be effected significantly by a 10-percent increase in taxes.

There is a shortage of doctors, nurses, and hospital beds which will take years and years and not a few months to correct. We are going to have this crisis in the health field regardless of how we act on the tax increase.

But the administration's analysis has been especially faulty in dealing with the increase in consumer durables. Here they say is precisely where a tax increase would have its most telling effect in stemming demand and holding down prices.

But the fact is, Mr. President, that demand is right now deficient, not excessive, in consumer durables. Our factories are operating much further below capacity than they were before prices started to rise. In relation to the capacity of our manpower and productive facilities to meet it, demand has been falling.

Hours per week of work are still low—close to the lowest in 6 years. Unemployment is still relatively high. And production in relation to capacity—the crucial measure—is steadily and relentlessly falling quarter after quarter. Furthermore, the stimulation anticipated from the Vietnam war has not developed in the latter half of 1967 as I will show in a separate analysis this morning and it is unlikely to develop.

Altogether, Mr. President, the call for a tax increase cannot be said to be supported by the latest consumer price data. The economic case is weakening, not strengthening, as time passes. The Congress has been right in not passing the tax increase. Had we acted to make the tax increase effective last July 1, as the administration requested at the beginning of the year, the country would be suffering today from at least a mild recession.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis by the Department of Labor and one table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICES IN SEPTEMBER 1967

PRELIMINARY OCTOBER TRENDS

Prices increased in September at both retail and wholesale levels, the United States Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. The Consumer Price Index went up 0.2 percent despite lower food prices. At 117.1 (1957–59=100), the index stood 2.6 percent above a year ago.

The Wholesale Price Index showed a 0.1 percent increase, although farm products continued to drop. Processed food and feeds were higher, and industrial commodities, especially lumber and metals, increased significantly. The wholesale Price Index stood at 106.2 (1957–59=100), which was still 0.6 percent below a year ago primarily because of a drop in farm product and food prices over the year. Delayed harvests of vegetables flooded the markets and caused prices to drop sharply. Hogs, chickens, oilseeds, and leaf tobacco also declined.

Preliminary data for October indicate a decline of 0.1 percent in the Wholesale Price Index because of lower farm and food prices. A further rise of 0.2 percent in average prices of industrial commodities is indicated, with many products moving up, and only gasoline and lumber declining seasonally.

CONSUMER PRODUCTS

A further boost in apparel prices on the introduction of new fall and winter lines was a major cause of the rise in average prices of consumer products. Womens' and girls' apparel, in particular, bore 2 percent higher price tags reflecting about twice the usual seasonal advance in September. With sales running well ahead of a year ago and some increase in production and marketing costs, these prices have gone up by an average of 4½ percent over the past year, and the increase for men's and boys' apparel has been only slightly less.

Retail gasoline prices averaged 1 percent higher last month when increases were posted in several large cities despite the beginning of seasonal reductions at wholesale. Used car prices also continued to climb, and tires were raised further. Seasonal increases took place for coal and fuel oil, and there were additional advances in prices of furniture and appliances. New car prices dropped somewhat more than usual for September, as 1967 models were cleared out. (1968 model prices will be reflected first in the October indexes.)

Food prices averaged lower because of a belated seasonal drop for nearly all fresh vegetables as abundant supplies finally reached the market. Apple and grape prices also fell, but citrus fruits were generally higher. Meats averaged about unchanged as an advance in beef prices was nearly offset by lower pork prices. Eggs showed a contra-seasonal decline.

CONSUMER SERVICES

Charges for medical services continued upward, with increases in doctors' and dentists' fees and hospital service charges. Home repairs and maintenance cost more, and residential property taxes and insurance were raised. Widespread increases also took place in residential rents, and in hotel and motel room rates.

Electric rate increases went into effect in several cities. Golf and bowling fees were raised, automobile insurance and parking lot rates went up, and charges for film developing and printing increased.

INDUSTRIAL MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

Prices were raised in September on 87 out of 225 classes of industrial products. They declined for 38 and averaged unchanged for 100 classes. The most important increases were for lumber, plywood, and steel. Some textile, rubber, and copper products, as well as motor trucks also showed higher prices. The principal price declines were for Gulf coast gasoline and such chemical products as plastic resins and pesticides.

While demand for softwood lumber and plywood was stimulated by the continued rise in homebuilding activity, supplies of Western softwoods, in particular, were curtailed by a temporary closing of forests to logging operations in the Northwest. As a result, softwood plywood prices jumped nearly 10 percent and softwood lumber 3½ percent. In October, however, both lumber and plywood have begun their seasonal decline.

Previously announced price increases for a number of semi-finished and finished steel products went into effect in September. Over the past year, prices have been raised on products accounting for about 36 percent of total steel shipments, causing steel mill products to average 1.1 percent higher than a year ago. Prices of several copper products were raised in September, when manufacturers had to pay higher prices in the secondary or import markets because of the domestic copper strike. Several rubber products, including conveyor belting, industrial hose, and rubber sheet, also were marked up in price as an aftermath of the recent wage increase in the rubber industry.

Motor truck prices rose almost 1 percent last month on 1967 models. Prices of the 1968 models of new passenger cars and trucks will not show up in the price indexes until the October indexes are available.

COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS

About 85,000 workers will receive pay increases as a result of the rise in the national Consumer Price Index between June and September. For 67,000 the increase will be 2 cents an hour; these include 36,000 aerospace workers and 13,000 employees of the Greyhound Corporation. About 2800 chemical workers will receive 1 cent an hour and 14,500 in various industries will receive 3 cents.

TABLE 1.—PERCENT CHANGE IN PRICES FOR SELECTED GROUPS IN THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX AND THE WHOLESALE PRICE INDEX

[Seasonally adjusted except where indicated]

	August to September 1967		June to September 1967		March to June 1967		December 1966 to March 1967		September to December 1966		September 1966 to September 1967	
	CPI	WPI	CPI	WPI	CPI	WPI	CPI	WPI	CPI	WPI	CPI [1]	WPI [1]
All items [1]	0.2	0.1	0.9	−0.1	0.9	0.6	0.3	−0.2	0.5	−0.8	2.6	−0.6
Consumer products	.1	.1	.6	.2	.6	1.1	−.1	−.6	.3	−1.2	1.4	−.5
Nondurable	.1	.1	.4	−.1	.9	1.7	−.2	−.8	.2	−1.7	1.3	−1.0
Food and beverages at home	−.3	.1	.1	−.8	.8	2.6	−1.1	−2.4	−.5	−2.8	−.7	−3.5
Apparel and accessories	.6	.3	.8	.4	1.0	.3	1.4	.7	.8	.3	4.0	1.7
Household furnishings and supplies	.2	.1	.6	.6	1.2	1.7	.6	1.2	.3	.3	2.7	3.9
Gasoline and motor oil	1.1	−1.0	.4	1.9	1.0	−2.0	1.2	3.5	.9	−1.8	3.4	1.5
Other nondurables	.7	0	2.1	.1	−.2	1.9	.3	−.1	.3	.1	2.5	2.0
Durable	.1	0	.6	.5	.3	−.2	0	.2	.5	1.4	1.4	1.9
New passenger cars	−.3	0	.7	.2	.2	−.1	−.6	−.4	1.6	2.0	1.8	1.7
Appliances	−.1	.1	.4	.6	−.2	−.8	−.7	.2	−.1	.3	−.7	.3
Furniture and floor coverings	.7	.4	1.1	.5	.5	−.1	.3	−.3	.9	1.0	2.7	1.1
Other durables [1]	.3	.3	.6	2.0	.4	.1	.4	.9	.5	1.0	1.8	3.9

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 1.—PERCENT CHANGE IN PRICES FOR SELECTED GROUPS IN THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX AND THE WHOLESALE PRICE INDEX—Continued

[Seasonally adjusted except where indicated]

	August to September 1967		June to September 1967		March to June 1967		December 1966 to March 1967		September to December 1966		September 1966 to September 1967	
	CPI	WPI	CPI	WPI	CPI	WPI	CPI	WPI	CPI	WPI	CPI[1]	WPI[1]
Consumer services[1]	.4	-------	1.0	-------	.9	-------	.9	-------	1.4	-------	4.2	-------
Insurance and finance[1]	.2	-------	.8	-------	.7	-------	.3	-------	2.1	-------	4.0	-------
Rent[1]	.2	-------	.5	-------	.4	-------	.4	-------	.5	-------	1.9	-------
Utilities and public transportation[1]	.3	-------	.6	-------	.3	-------	.3	-------	.1	-------	1.3	-------
Housekeeping and home maintenance services[1]	.7	-------	1.6	-------	1.3	-------	1.5	-------	1.7	-------	6.2	-------
Medical care services[1]	.9	-------	1.9	-------	1.6	-------	2.5	-------	2.3	-------	8.7	-------
Personal care services[1]	.3	-------	1.2	-------	.8	-------	1.0	-------	.9	-------	3.9	-------
Other services[1]	.5	-------	.9	-------	1.2	-------	.7	-------	1.1	-------	4.2	-------
Wholesale prices:												
Type of product:												
Farm products	-------	−1.2	-------	−6.0	-------	4.6	-------	−3.6	-------	−4.5	-------	−9.5
Processed foods and feeds	-------	.2	-------	−.4	-------	1.7	-------	−1.6	-------	−2.1	-------	−2.4
Industrial commodities[1]	-------	.2	-------	.5	-------	0	-------	.5	-------	.3	-------	1.2
Industrial materials and equipment:												
Chemicals and allied products	-------	−.2	-------	−.5	-------	.3	-------	.2	-------	−.1	-------	−.1
Rubber and rubber products	-------	.6	-------	2.8	-------	−.3	-------	1.1	-------	.1	-------	3.7
Lumber and wood products	-------	2.7	-------	4.2	-------	.6	-------	−.5	-------	−1.6	-------	2.6
Pulp, paper and allied products	-------	.2	-------	.5	-------	.3	-------	.4	-------	−.2	-------	1.0
Metals and metal products[1]	-------	.4	-------	.6	-------	−.5	-------	.4	-------	.6	-------	1.1
Machinery and equipment	-------	.1	-------	.4	-------	.1	-------	.8	-------	1.4	-------	2.8
Stage of processing at wholesale:												
Finished goods	-------	.2	-------	0	-------	1.1	-------	−.4	-------	−.2	-------	.6
Consumer	-------	.4	-------	−.1	-------	1.4	-------	−.6	-------	−.9	-------	−.2
Producer	-------	.3	-------	.5	-------	.5	-------	.5	-------	1.4	-------	3.0
Intermediate materials, supplies and components	-------	.2	-------	.3	-------	−.2	-------	.2	-------	−.2	-------	.1
Crude materials	-------	−.5	-------	−4.0	-------	2.6	-------	−2.2	-------	−3.7	-------	−7.2

[1] Based on data unadjusted for seasonal variations.

Note: The price changes shown for consumer products and components are for roughly comparable classes of finished consumer products from the CPI and WPI. A brief description of the classes of items contained in each group is included at the end of this report. Complete listings of inclusions in the CPI and WPI groupings will be furnished on request.

DEFENSE INDICATORS CONTINUE TO SHOW NO INFLATIONARY PRESSURES FROM VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most important factors in causing inflation may be an increase in military contract awards. We learned this last year when a $10 billion jump in such contracts spearheaded an inflationary surge throughout the economy. We have learned that any substantial increase in the award of military contracts stimulates a chain of accompanying increase in other sectors of the economy. And if they occur when the economy is operating at relatively high employment, they give rise to overheating of the economy.

But, Mr. President, this is not the situation at the present time. As I pointed out last month, the selected economic indicators for the defense sector show comparative stability in the award of contracts. The third quarter figures, which were just made available yesterday, show the total of contract awards on a seasonally adjusted basis to be slightly under $11 billion for the quarter. This figure is about $250 million above the third quarter of last year—a very small rate of increase in so large a total. This series of data on contract awards and other significant Defense Department indicators is published once a month by the Department of Defense at the request of the Joint Economic Committee. I might say that the committee was shocked by the fact that the actual military budget last year was so much higher than the budget figure supplied to the Congress. The Congress was not apprised of the fact that the military budget was undergoing a sharp rise until long after the movement had started. We are deeply impressed with the great importance of obtaining accurate and up-to-date figures on defense contracts as a prerequisite to having any accurate understanding of the state of the economy. For this reason, the committee attaches high importance to the defense indicators.

I ask unanimous consent that the September report of the Department of Defense on selected economic indicators be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: SELECTED ECONOMIC INDICATORS

The attached table shows selected financial and employment data related to the impact of Defense programs on the economy. The data reflected in the table cover seven major subject areas, beginning with the first quarter of calendar year 1966 and continuing through the latest month for which information is availavle. Explanations of the terms used are also attached.

EXPLANATIONS OF THE TERMS USED

I. *Military Prime Contract Award.* A legally binding instrument executed by a military department or Department of Defense Agency (DOD component) to obtain equipment, supplies, research and development, services or construction. Both new instruments and modifications or cancellations of instruments are included; however, modifications of less than $10,000 each are not included.

The series includes awards made by DOD components on behalf of other Federal agencies (e.g., National Aeronautics and Space Administration), and on behalf of foreign governments under both military assistance grant aid and sales arrangements. It also includes orders written by DOD components requesting a non-Defense Federal agency to furnish supplies or services from its stocks (e.g., General Services Administration stores depots), from in-house manufacturing facilities (e.g., Atomic Energy Commission), or from contracts executed by that federal agency.

The series does not include awards paid from post exchange or similar non-appropriated funds, nor does it include contracts for civil functions, such as flood control or river and harbors work performed by the Army Corps of Engineers. Project orders issued to Defense owned-and-operated establishments, such as shipyards and arsenals, are not included, but contracts executed by such establishments are.

The distribution by broad commodity group includes only contracts which are to be performed within the United States or its possessions. Each commodity group includes not only the indicated end item, but also associated components and spare parts, research and development, and maintenance or rebuild work. Electronics and Communications includes only such equipment and supplies as are separately procured by DOD components. Electronics procured by an aircraft prime contractor is reported as Aircraft. Other Hard Goods contains tank-automotive, transportation, production, medical and dental, photographic, materials handling, and miscellaneous equipment and supplies. Soft Goods includes fuels, subsistence, textiles and clothing. All other contains services (e.g., transportation) and all new contracts or purchase orders of less than $10,000 each. Commodity identification is not available for these small purchases.

Work done outside the United States refers to the location where the work will be physically performed. About 55–60% of this work is awarded to U.S. business firms, but a lesser percentage of the contract dollars in this category directly impacts on the U.S. economy.

II. *Gross Obligations Incured.* Total amounts recorded in official accounting records of the military departments and Defense Agencies from source documents such as signed contracts or any instrument which legally binds the government to payment of funds. Present coverage extends only to general fund accounts; obligations incurred in revolving funds are excluded. Included, and double-counted, are obligations which are recorded first when an order is placed by one appropriation upon another appropriation, and second when the latter appropriation executes an obligation for material or services with a private supplier. This duplication averages about 8% of gross obligations.

a. *Operations.* The Military Personnel appropriation and Operation and Maintenance appropriation of the Department of Defense.

b. *Procurement.* The Procurement appropriation.

c. *Other.* The RDT&E, Military Construction, Family Housing, Civil Defense, and Military Assistance appropriations.

III. *Gross Unpaid Obligations Outstanding.* Obligations incurred by the Department of Defense for which it has not yet expended funds. Present coverage extends only to general fund accounts; obligations in revolving funds are excluded.

IV. *Net Expenditures.* Gross payments less collections by the military departments and Defense Agencies, including revolving funds and Military Assistance. Payments represent checks issued.

V. *DOD Personal Compensation.* Wages and salaries earned by personnel employed by the Department of Defense. Military compensation represents pay and allowances to active duty personnel; reserve pay and retired pay are excluded. Civilian compensation represents gross pay and includes lump sum payments for final annual leave. Both figures are inclusive of individual contributions to retirement and social insurance funds, but are exclusive of any employer contributions to these funds.

VI. *Outstanding Payments.* Payments to contractors by the military departments and Defense Agencies made before the goods or services contracted for are completed and delivered.

a. *Advance Payments.* Payments to contractors in advance of performance of a contract.

b. *Progress Payments.* Payments to contractors as work progresses on a contract. These payments serve to reimburse the contractor for a major portion of the costs incurred to date.

VII. *Strength.* The number of persons on active duty with the Department of Defense at the end of the period.

a. *Military.* Men and women on continuous or extended active duty. Excludes reserves on temporary active duty for reserve training.

b. *Civilian.* Direct hire personnel.

SELECTED DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ECONOMIC INDICATORS

[Dollars in millions; manpower in thousands; quarters by calendar year]

	1966				1967								
	I	II	III	IV	I	April	May	June	II	July	August	September	III
I. Military prime contract awards:													
Aircraft	$1,945	$2,989	$2,696	$2,262	$2,102	$432	$1,240	$1,377	$3,049	$394	$636	$1,483	$2,513
Missile and space systems	1,040	987	1,314	861	1,230	300	260	606	1,166	535	521	524	1,580
Ships	355	491	876	239	679	72	129	206	407	178	104	135	417
Weapons and ammunition	555	1,486	692	940	818	279	518	972	1,769	92	415	597	1,104
Electric and communications equipment	918	1,574	666	915	971	480	338	1,030	1,848	169	364	283	816
Other hard goods	843	1,842	660	1,029	915	298	362	904	1,564	202	355	228	785
Soft goods	709	922	1,078	989	638	171	199	282	652	588	280	188	1,056
Construction	207	392	198	150	232	126	160	340	626	56	100	76	232
All other	1,406	1,963	2,356	1,639	1,605	517	507	963	1,987	1,194	568	573	2,335
Total (exclusive of work outside United States)	7,978	12,646	10,536	9,024	9,190	2,675	3,713	6,680	13,068	3,408	3,343	4,087	10,838
Total, seasonally adjusted	8,703	10,144	10,716	10,149	10,171	2,920	4,121	3,626	10,667	3,610	3,686	3,665	10,961
Work outside United States	521	1,195	856	672	453	227	228	379	834	314	382	195	891
II. Gross obligations incurred:													
Operations	8,326	9,604	10,426	9,702	10,229	3,664	3,531	4,239	11,435	3,700	--------	--------	--------
Procurement	4,374	8,539	5,368	5,276	5,113	1,801	2,485	4,663	8,948	1,045	--------	--------	--------
Other	2,429	3,470	3,453	2,230	2,519	726	1,130	1,653	3,510	1,246	--------	--------	--------
Total	15,129	21,613	19,247	17,208	17,861	6,191	7,146	10,555	23,893	5,991	--------	--------	--------
III. Gross unpaid obligations outstanding:													
Operations	3,828	3,777	4,792	5,024	4,644	4,761	4,765	4,513	4,513	--------	--------	--------	--------
Procurement	18,023	22,119	22,736	23,173	22,780	22,613	22,947	25,248	25,248	--------	--------	--------	--------
Other	5,747	7,392	8,179	7,888	7,626	7,453	7,628	8,270	8,270	--------	--------	--------	--------
Total	27,598	33,288	35,707	36,085	35,050	34,827	35,340	38,031	38,031	--------	--------	--------	--------
IV. Net expenditures:													
Operations	7,689	9,076	8,968	9,087	10,002	3,416	3,335	3,980	10,731	2,898	3,722	3,382	10,002
Procurement	3,651	3,886	4,392	4,264	5,074	1,783	1,850	1,649	5,282	2,037	1,982	2,041	6,060
Other	2,757	2,647	2,484	3,092	3,179	918	749	334	2,001	1,231	882	930	3,044
Total	14,097	15,609	15,844	16,443	18,255	6,117	5,934	5,963	18,014	6,166	6,586	6,353	19,106
V. DOD personal compensation:													
Military	3,181	3,249	3,551	3,606	3,624	1,230	1,196	1,220	3,646	1,310	1,260	--------	--------
Civilian	1,937	2,015	2,105	2,135	2,163	700	776	772	2,248	729	[1]786	[1]723	[1]2,238
Total	5,118	5,264	5,656	5,741	5,787	1,930	1,972	1,992	5,894	2,039	[1]2,046	--------	--------
VI. Outstanding payments:													
Advance payments	66	79	90	83	92	--------	--------	--------	80	--------	--------	--------	--------
Progress payments	4,402	4,346	4,750	5,461	5,981	--------	--------	--------	6,765	--------	--------	--------	--------
Total	4,468	4,425	4,840	5,544	6,073	--------	--------	--------	6,845	--------	--------	--------	--------
VII. Strength (manpower):													
Military	2,969	3,094	3,229	3,334	3,371	3,371	3,368	3,377	3,377	3,382	3,393	[1]3,407	[1]3,407
Civilian	1,088	1,138	1,184	1,230	1,268	1,273	1,274	1,303	1,303	1,311	1,306	[1]1,274	[1]1,274

[1] Preliminary.

Note: Blank spaces for indicators other than No. VI indicate information not available at time of publication. Indicator No. VI information available only on a quarterly basis.

SITE SELECTION OF FDA LABORATORY NO. 2 IN MADISON, WIS., INSTEAD OF BELTSVILLE, MD.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed in the morning hour for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield to no one in my respect and admiration for the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is the chairman of the conferees for the Senate on the Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

The distinguished Senator from Alabama and his Senate colleagues met no less than 10 times with the managers on the part of the other body in an effort to work out a satisfactory conference report on the HEW appropriation, they worked long and hard, and without surcease.

Unfortunately, on one issue, which is tremendously important to me and to my constituents in Maryland, the House managers refused to yield.

I refer to the rider affecting the FDA appropriation for a new laboratory which, as Senators know, was originally to be located in Beltsville, Md.

The FDA originally maintained that the location in Beltsville was the most desirable from the standpoint of economy and efficiency. The Senate Appropriations Committee confirmed that the facility should not be forced out of the Washington area and restricted to Madison, Wis., as required, in effect, by the Laird rider. The FDA clearly stated that the location of the facility outside the Washington area would result in substantial added cost.

Despite this evidence, Commissioner Goddard later, obviously under considerable pressure, told the House Appropriations Committee that location of the facility outside Washington would be acceptable. That committee then inserted a rider in the bill, in effect prohibiting location of the lab at Beltsville. I strongly protested against the rider and the Senate committee struck it from the bill. The House conferees were adamant, however, and the conferees reported the bill with the rider. But the House, on October 4, recommitted the bill to conference asking additional cuts in it.

Mr. President, substantial new evidence against this rider was provided last Friday in a special report of the House Committee on Government Operations. That report severely criticized the FDA for a serious lack of concern for economy and efficiency in selecting the site for this laboratory facility. This House committee report cited inconsistencies in the FDA recommendations, its failure to rely upon adequate studies, and its failure to comply with HEW site selection regulations.

In addition, the committee states that the FDA cost study, which showed that construction in Beltsville would be $5.4 million less costly to the taxpayers of the United States, was later revised to show a lesser differential on the basis of a study—and here I quote the report—"of poor quality and doubtful validity."

The committee reports that FDA not only disregarded HEW site selection regulations, but also was not even aware of the existence of other regulations bearing on site selection. The House Government Operations Committee points out that final selection of the alternative site by FDA was made without a single inspection visit by qualified inspectors to any proposed alternative site.

The committee report states that the alternative site was selected in a "hasty manner" with "an almost total absence of documentary support."

Among its recommendations, the committee "strongly" asks that HEW require the FDA to conduct a thorough, objective and careful study to select the most desirable site for Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 and that this study be carried out in strict compliance with HEW regulations, and with due regard for efficiency and economy.

I strongly agree with these recommendations and findings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the findings and conclusions, and the recommendations from pages 13 to 15 of the 10th report of the Committee on Government Operations, House Report No. 801, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the findings, conclusions, and recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The Food and Drug Administration has demonstrated a serious lack of concern for economy and efficiency in selecting sites for laboratory facilities.

In one of the two situations it examined in detail, the committee found that FDA has a substantial part of its laboratory activities—which might better be located outside downtown Washington—housed in a costly new building (Federal Building No. 8) near the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at the foot of Capitol Hill. At the same time, administrative and regulatory personnel, who have frequent dealings with HEW officials and the Congress, are located in rented quarters in Arlington, Va.

In the other situation, the committee found that FDA had selected an alternative site for its Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 without an adequate study and without complying with HEW site selection regulations.

The circumstances leading to location of FDA laboratories in Federal Building No. 8 date back a number of years, and it was not always possible to determine exactly what happened. However, it appears that lack of foresight on the part of FDA and failure of the agency to adjust its plans promptly to meet changes in its overall responsibilities and workload is at least partially responsible for the present situation.

2. During hearings on FDA's appropriation for fiscal year 1968, FDA witnesses did not mention the disadvantages the agency had previously stated would result from location of Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 in the Midwest. In fact, the attitude expressed by FDA was completely inconsistent with its previously stated position. In reports, letters, and statements, FDA has maintained that Beltsville is the most desirable location from the standpoint of economy and efficiency. It has taken the position that location of this facility outside Washington (except in the Southeastern United States) would result in substantial added costs and could present additional problems resulting in decreased efficiency.

Yet, when Commissioner Goddard was asked in his appearance before the House Appropriations Subcommittee what his reaction would be to a limitation requiring Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 to be located outside the Washington area, he replied, "It wouldn't bother me" and proceeded to suggest an alternative site. No mention was made of FDA's own estimate that the alternative site would substantially increase initial and operating costs.

The committee wishes to emphasize that it is citing FDA's cost estimate only to illustrate the inconsistency of FDA's position and its apparent lack of concern for economy and efficiency. In so doing, the committee is not endorsing the accuracy of the estimate. In fact, since the subcommittee's hearings, FDA has changed its original estimate and now maintains that the initial cost differential between Beltsville and the alternative site at Madison, Wis., would be about $1 million rather than $5,400,000. However, for the reasons previously cited in this report, the committee finds no basis for placing any more reliance on the second estimate than on the first.

3. The committee's study has shown that both the original FDA cost study which showed a $5,400,000 differential in favor of a Washington location, and a recent revision of it, reducing the differential to $1 million, are of poor quality and doubtful validity.

4. The committee found that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not have adequate administrative practices to insure that its constituent agencies are complying with the Department's site selection regulations including those relating to decentralization of activities.

HEW's site selection regulations, which appear to be reasonably adequate, were not followed in the selection of the alternative site for Headquarters Laboratory No. 2.

The regulations require establishment and utilization of a site selection board or team for major projects, but this was not done.

The regulations also require preparation of a report reflecting sites considered, the points considered in the evaluation or comparison, the reasons for the choice made, and other pertinent items. No such report was prepared.

Testimony at subcommittee hearings disclosed that FDA officials not only disregarded the above departmental regulations, but were not even aware of the existence of others bearing on site selection policies.

5. The committee found that procedures used by FDA in selecting an alternative site for Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 were completely inadequate. An adequate and properly conducted study might or might not arrive at the same conclusion. However, the inadequacy of the study that was made is shown by the following:

The list of 47 institutions supposedly meeting FDA's basic criteria—and therefore regarded as eligible for consideration—was incomplete.

The list of 47 institutions supposedly under consideration was reduced to six on the basis of the personal opinions of one individual, who made no record of the basis for his actions and did not visit any of the 47 institutions.

Final selection of an alternative site was made by FDA without a single site visit to any institution by anyone possessing the necessary scientific qualifications to evaluate the potential contributions each institution might make to FDA's research program.

Because of the hasty manner in which an alternative site was selected, an adequate evaluation of all potentially desirable sites was impossible.

There was an almost total absence of documentary support for the selection made.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The committee recommends that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare take prompt and effective steps to insure that the Food and Drug Administration complies with HEW site selection regulations and the Government-wide policies for decentralization and real property utilization set forth in Bureau of the Budget Circulars A-60 and A-2 revised.

2. The committee strongly recommends that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare require the Food and Drug Administration to conduct a thorough, objective, and careful study to select the most desirable site for Headquarters Laboratory No. 2. The Department should take appropriate steps to insure that the study is carried out in strict compliance with HEW regulations and with due regard for economy and efficiency.

The committee wishes to emphasize again that it is taking no position as to where Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 should be located; its concern is solely that the location be determined in a proper manner and that there be adequate documentation justifying both the selection and the manner in which it is made.

3. The committee recommends that the Bureau of the Budget review the practices being followed by Federal departments and agencies with a view to determining whether they have appropriate site selection regulations and whether such regulations are being carried out effectively.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the fact is that the Beltsville site is the most economical one. The original FDA cost study showed that it would be at least $5.4 million cheaper to build it at Beltsville. It is no secret that the pressure behind the House Appropriations Committee action to force location of the facility at the more costly site in Wisconsin is a minority member of that committee from Wisconsin.

As I think is clear to all, this minority member on the one hand claims to be fighting for economy in Government, but, on the other hand, he uses his position in the Appropriations Committee to force location of the FDA laboratory in his State at an unnecessarily greater cost to the taxpayers. One wonders where the credibility gap is, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the actions of HEW and FDA officials in this matter bear further scrutiny.

The House committee report states that during the hearings on the FDA appropriation in this matter:

> FDA witnesses did not mention the disadvantages the agency had previously stated would result from location of Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 in the Midwest.

It went on to state:

> In fact the attitude expressed by FDA was completely inconsistent with its previously stated position.

The report further states:

> No mention was made of FDA's own estimate that the alternative site would substantially increase initial and operating costs.

Mr. President, on yesterday, the minority member in the House of Representatives, on page 30234 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, inserted another strange element in the remarkable history of this matter. He inserted a letter addressed to the distinguished chairman of the Senate conferees, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], signed by Assistant Secretary, Comptroller James F. Kelly. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: This is in response to your request for clarification of the cost differential associated with the construction of the Food and Drug Administration Laboratory Building No. 2 in Madison, Wisconsin, rather than in Beltsville, Maryland.

As you know this is a matter which was explored by the House Committee on Government Operations. They have just issued a report on the subject which is critical of the cost estimates which were prepared by the Food and Drug Administration. They make reference to an earlier estimate which indicated that a location in the mid-west would increase cost by $5.4 million and a later estimate which indicated the additional cost of locating the laboratory in Madison, Wisconsin, would be about $1 million.

We have reviewed these estimates and have concluded that the original estimate of $5.4 million is not supportable for the activities and plans presently proposed for lab no. 2, wherever it is located. I can find no precise estimate or breakdown of the $1 million estimate prepared by FDA.

The elements which affect the initial cost of this facilitiy as we see it are:

(1) *Construction cost.* The Boeckh construction cost index shows a slightly lower cost per square foot in Madison, Wisconsin, than the comparable figure for the Washington, D.C., area.

(2) *Size of facility.* The facility will house the same program and operation. Provision will have to be made for a limited amount of service and support space for a facility located on an independent site as distinguished from a site containing other FDA operations such as Beltsville. It is estimated that this additional space would not exceed a net increase of one percent.

(3) *Moving personnel.* An initial cost for relocating personnel from the Washington area to Madison, Wisconsin, will have to be provided for. The extent of this cost is difficult to estimate because of the unpredictable nature of the problem. At best you can only guess at the number of staff that will move and the number that will be recruited locally. We have been provided with estimates ranging from $338,000 to $500,000 but have not endeavored to evaluate them.

We would conclude, therefore, that there is only a small-net difference in construction between Madison and Beltsville which could be anywhere from zero to a one percent differential, plus or minus. There will be a limited initial cost associated with the transfer of staff. It is clear, therefore, that a $5.4 million estimate is a gross overstatement, and it would appear that an estimate as high as $1 million is certainly an outside figure. It is not possible at this stage of project development to supply more precise cost estimates. We are, of course, assuming that there will be no cost associated with land acquisition at either site.

If you have any further question, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
/s/ JAMES F. KELLY,
Assistant Secretary, Comptroller.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in the letter which the Representative from Wisconsin inserted in the RECORD, Assistant Secretary Kelly disputes the $5.4 million figure as a "gross overstatement."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. In lieu thereof, he refers to a figure of $1 million as being "certainly an outside figure."

Well, Mr. President, I do not agree with the obviously self-serving declaration of Assistant Secretary Kelly of HEW that $1 million is the outside figure.

The fact is, the actions of HEW officials do not add up to a proper way of reaching a decision, especially at a time when this country is under such great fiscal stress.

As I have said before, this decision should be made on the basis of economy and efficiency, but it has not been so made.

Therefore, Mr. President, despite my great esteem for the distinguished Chairman of the Senate conferees, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who has worked so long and hard on this bill, I feel compelled to ask unanimous consent that in the event there is not a yea-and-nay vote on the conference report, my vote be cast in the negative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed in the morning hour for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I want the Senate to know that the Senate supported the position taken by the Senator from Maryland. We did our best in the conference with the conferees of the House to get them to agree to the Senate position.

As the Senator from Maryland has stated, 10 meetings of that conference were held, which is unprecedented so far as I can recall in all my years of service to House and Senate, but the House conferees simply would not agree.

I regret that they did not agree.

I will say this, that the distinguished Senator from Maryland does have many activities of the Public Health Service of the Department of HEW in his great State of Maryland. All the National Institutes of Health are located in Maryland. Not too many months ago, the Office of the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, and the headquarters of the U.S. Public Health Service and all its employees were transferred out of Washington to Bethesda, Md. Thus, there are many activities of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare now in the State of Maryland which were not dreamed of a few years ago.

I think that I should read the letter I received from Assistant Secretary of HEW, and also Comptroller James F. Kelly regarding this matter.

He states:

> DEAR SENATOR HILL: This is in response to your request for clarification of the cost differential associated with the construction of the Food and Drug Administration Laboratory Building No. 2 in Madison, Wisconsin, rather than in Beltsville, Maryland.
>
> As you know this is a matter which was explored by the House Committee on Government Operations. They have just issued a report on the subject which is critical of the cost estimates which were prepared by the Food and Drug Administration. They make reference to an earlier estimate which indicated that a location in the mid-west would increase cost by $5.4 million and a later estimate which indicated the additional cost of locating the laboratory in Madison, Wisconsin, would be about $1 million.
>
> We have reviewed these estimates and have concluded that the original estimate of $5.4 million is not supportable for the activities and plans presently proposed for lab no. 2—

That is the laboratory we are talking about—

> wherever it is located. I can find no precise estimate or breakdown of the $1 million estimate prepared by FDA.
>
> The elements which affect the initial cost of this facility as we see it are:
>
> (1) *Construction cost.* The Boeckh construction cost index shows a slightly lower cost per square foot in Madison, Wisconsin, than the comparable figure for the Washington, D.C., area.
>
> (2) *Size of facility.* The facility will house the same program and operation. Provision will have to be made for a limited amount of service and support space for a facility located from a site containing other FDA operations such as Beltsville. It is estimated that this additional space would not exceed a net increase of one percent.
>
> (3) *Moving personnel.* An initial cost for relocating personnel from the Washington area to Madison, Wisconsin, will have to be provided for. The extent of this cost is difficult to estimate because of the unpredictable nature of the problem. At best you can only guess at the number of staff that will move and the number that will be recruited locally. We have been provided with estimates ranging from $338,000 to $500,000 but have not endeavored to evaluate them.
>
> We would conclude, therefore, that there is only a small net difference in construction between Madison and Beltsville which could be anywhere from zero to a one percent differential, plus or minus. There will be a limited initial cost associated with the transfer of staff. It is clear, therefore, that a $5.4 million estimate is a gross overstatement, and it would appear that an estimate as high

as $1 million is certainly an outside figure. It is not possible at this stage of project development to supply more precise cost estimates. We are, of course, assuming that there will be no cost associated with land acquisition at either site.

If you have any further questions, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ JAMES F. KELLY,
Assistant Secretary, Comptroller.

I might say that the language in the bill now does not pick the site at Madison, Wis.; it just says the plant shall be located beyond 50 miles of the District of Columbia. It could go to West Virginia. It could go to New York. It could go to any place that might be 50 miles beyond the city of Washington.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not wish to engage in a dialog with the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I recognize the tremendous job and efforts in which he engaged as chairman of the conference. I know he fought long and hard for the Senate position. I respect him and respect the work he has done in this field. May I suggest, however, that despite the seemingly half-neutral, but anti-Maryland language of the rider, everyone clearly understands the intent and effect which is to place the lab in Madison.

Now, my comment on the letter from Mr. Kelly is that he fails to answer any of the three charges of the House Committee on Government Operations. He does not set forth any evidence or even argument to modify the House committee's charge that the site selection regulations required by HEW were not utilized——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. In his letter, Mr. Kelly does not answer the allegations of a respected House committee that no one from HEW had even visited the proposed site in Madison, Wis. Nor does he satisfactorily answer the question as to why FDA took the position 2 years ago that it would cost $5.4 million more to move or change the site and now takes the position, arbitrarily, that it will cost only $1 million more.

My position is just that this entire procedure is completely wrong. As I say again, I recognize the efforts made and the position that the distinguished Senator from Alabama and the Senate conferees took. Ten times they went back. I think that is the largest number of conference meetings on this type of measure perhaps in the history of the Senate. I have only admiration for the Senator from Alabama and for his conferees.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator. We did our very best in the conferences. As the Senator said, we met 10 different times. In all my service both in the Senate and in the House—and I came into the House of Representatives as a "baby" Member of it; I have been here a long time—I have never sat on so many conferences that took so much time and took so many meetings before we reached an agreement. We finally had to come forward with a bill. Many of the departments within HEW were suffering. They could not obtain isotopes that were needed for carrying on the battle against cancer. So we had to get the bill passed.

We did our best to stand by the Senate position and the position of the Senator from Maryland. Nothing would have made me happier than to have won this victory for the Senator from Maryland, but it was an impossible situation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I want to express my deep gratitude to the Senator from Alabama for the position he has taken in this matter. I realize that in accepting the conference report he changed his mind and took a position that was not his original, but I think what the Senator from Alabama has done this morning is to present the case comprehensively and sensibly. He has discussed the pertinent elements that go into the full cost, pointing out that the Kelly estimate for Madison, Wis., shows a lower—I repeat—lower construction cost, a slightly higher cost in necessary size, and a relatively small additional cost for moving people from Washington to the new site; overall, the cost difference on the basis of the most recent and most authoritative estimates would seem to be insignificant.

Mr. Kelly, in his letter, went into each of these elements meticulously.

I am sure the Senator from Alabama will agree that there is an advantage to the Government in dispersing the immense concentration of Federal Government employment and bricks and mortar we have immediately in and around Washington. This Government belongs to and is paid for by all American citizens in all the 50 States. Here we have in Wisconsin a State with virtually no Federal facilities at all—none. Except a very modest Federal forest products laboratory. We have a great university, the University of Wisconsin, which has taken part—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The University of Wisconsin has taken part with the National Institutes of Health on an extensive and very constructive basis on Federal health research, but we have no Federal agencies established in Wisconsin—in fact, no Federal offices of any kind except the Forest Products Laboratory, which employs a couple of hundred people in Madison. I think dispersal is healthy for our economy and for the Government. I think the presentation made by the Senator from Alabama this morning, pointing out in detail that this new site will cost the Federal Government no significant additional amount, is valid. I congratulate him. He made a fine fight.

Earlier, Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] criticized the Congressman from the Seventh District of Wisconsin, Mr. LAIRD, though not by name, for fighting for the location of this facility in Wisconsin. The Senator from Maryland implied inconsistency on the part of Congressman LAIRD indicating that the location of the site in Madison would be costly, and that Mr. LAIRD advocates economy.

Mr. President, I vigorously disagree with the Senator from Maryland. Congressman LAIRD is 100 percent right. The Kelly letter as interpreted by Senator HILL confirms the rightness and the consistency of Congressman LAIRD. The Madison site will not cost significantly more. The record clearly vindicates Congressman LAIRD's position.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 10196, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report. I might say that the report is signed by all conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 26, 1967, p. 30231, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. It is proper to comment at this point that the conferees initially filed a report on October 3, 1967. But the bill was recommitted to the committee of conference by a vote of 226 to 173 with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments which exceeded the budget request therefor. The conferees had agreed to 13 items in excess of the budget estimates by $20,661,000. This conference report before the Senate now has revised the allowance for each of these 13 items to allow not in excess of the estimate, the same as approved by the House. I ask that there be printed at this point in my remarks a table showing the appropriation history for these 13 items.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITEMS IN LABOR-HEW BILL, H.R. 10196, OVER THE BUDGET ESTIMATES

Amendment No.	Account	Budget estimate, 1968	House allowance	Senate allowance	Initial agreement	Amount over budget estimate	Final agreement
17	Educational improvement for the handicapped	$53,400,000	$53,400,000	$58,400,000	$55,400,000	$2,000,000	$53,400,090
37	Cancer	183,356,000	183,356,000	192,356,000	186,056,000	2,700,000	183,356,000
38	Heart	167,954,000	167,954,000	177,954,000	172,454,000	4,500,000	167,954,000
39	Dental	30,307,000	30,307,000	32,307,000	31,607,000	1,300,000	30,307,000
40	Arthritis	143,954,000	143,954,000	147,204,000	144,954,000	1,000,000	143,954,000
41	Neurology	128,633,000	128,633,000	135,633,000	129,633,000	1,000,000	128,633,000
42	Allergy	94,422,000	94,422,000	98,922,000	96,422,000	2,000,000	94,422,000
43	General medical sciences	160,284,000	160,284,000	164,284,000	162,284,000	2,000,000	160,284,000
44	Child health	68,621,000	68,621,000	74,621,000	70,621,000	2,000,000	68,621,000
48	General research and services, NIH	81,141,000	81,141,000	84,641,000	82,891,000	1,750,000	81,141,000
51	Fogarty Center	500,000	500,000	725,000	725,000	225,000	500,000
67	Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses	2,878,000	2,878,000	2,948,000	2,948,000	70,000	2,878,000
68	Gallaudet College, construction	2,196,000	2,196,000	2,312,000	2,312,000	116,000	2,196,000
	Total	1,117,646,000	1,117,646,000	1,172,307,000	1,138,307,000	20,661,000	1,117,646,000

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill as approved by the committee of conference provides total appropriations of $13,255,356,000, a decrease of $168,790,000 from the budget estimates, a decrease of $166,304,000 from the amounts allowed by the Senate, but an increase of $117,868,000 over the amounts allowed by the House. The principal items in the increase over the House allowances are those for which the budget estimates were not considered by the House inasmuch as there was no authorization for the appropriations at the time the House acted—the Teacher Corps, $13,500,000; community mental health resource support, $50,000,000; assistance for repatriated U.S. nationals, $93,000; and the Administration on Aging, $18,450,000; for a total of $82,043,000.

For the Department of Labor the total appropriation approved is $625,524,000, a reduction of $38,000 from the Senate allowance, a reduction of $9,500,000 from the House allowance, and a reduction of $27,449,000 from the budget estimates. The conferees approved the action of the Senate providing $38,000 additional for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, to be derived from the appropriation allowed by the House for the Bureau of Labor Standards, rather than adding the money as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agreed to the $9,500,000 reduction proposed by the Senate in connection with the enlarged program for the training of prison inmates, but it was not the intention of the conferees in agreeing to the lower figure to ban the use of this appropriation for the training programs already underway.

For the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the total appropriation approved by the conferees is $12,569,999,000, a reduction of $166,206,000 from the amounts allowed by the Senate, an increase of $127,370,000 over the House allowance, and a decrease of $141,391,000 from the budget estimates for fiscal year 1968.

The Senate voted a small reduction of $225,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Food and Drug Administration." The conferees approved the Senate allowance.

The Senate in the item for "Buildings and facilities, Food and Drug Administration" deleted the proviso to require the location of the laboratory more than 50 miles from the District of Columbia. The Senate conferees receded from the amendment.

For "Elementary and secondary educational activities" the Senate added $51 million, including $41 million for grants to States under title III of NDEA for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling, $5 million for title III for additional supplementary centers, and $5 million for strengthening supervisory services and administration under title III(b) of NDEA. The conferees approved only $32,200,000 for grants to States for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling to allow a total of $79.2 million for the purpose, the same amount as was available in fiscal year 1967.

The Senate added $33.8 million to allow a total of $450 million for payments to school districts for maintenance and operation under Public Law 874. This amendment was rejected in conference. A Senate amendment limiting the availability of Public Law 874 funds was adopted with clarifying language to confine the limitation to Public Law 874 funds alone. This clarification will permit the use of such funds for disaster relief as provided by law.

For the Teacher Corps the conferees allowed $13,500,000 in lieu of $18,100,000 approved by the Senate, and nothing by the House, and $11,323,700 appropriated for fiscal year 1967.

The $1 million added by the Senate for "Libraries and community service" for transfer to the Library of Congress for acquisition and cataloging of foreign books and materials as authorized by title II–C of the Higher Education Act, was approved by the conferees.

The $5 million added by the Senate for "Educational improvement for the handicapped" was rejected by the conferees.

The Senate deleted the $100 million for participation sales and the $925,000 appropriated for payment of participation sales insufficiencies for partial financing of the higher education construction loan program, and the $15 million for participation sales with a $250,000 appropriation for sales insufficiencies to promote the use of private capital for the student loan programs in the Public Health Service. The Senate conferees receded on these amendments.

The conferees approved increases for the Public Health Service voted by the Senate as follows: $500,000 of the Senate increase of $750,000 for "Health manpower education and utilization" for grants to schools of public health, allowing a total of $4 million, an increase of $250,000 over the amount provided for 1967; $438,000 of the increase of $5,188,000 for "Chronic diseases" making a total of $27,942,000, the full amount of the budget estimate; $156,000 of the Senate increase of $600,000 for "Urban and industrial health" which will provide 15 positions above the 72 requested for the Arctic Health Research Center and further accelerate and strengthen the intramural research program in the new facilities at College, Alaska; $3,000,000 of the $10,000,000 increase for "Community health services" to make available $18 million for construction grants under part C of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act, an increase of $3 million over the amount provided for 1967; $400,000 for "Hospitals and medical care" in lieu of the Senate increase of $803,000 for emergency health services; $50 million of the Senate increase of $60 million for "Community mental health resource support" with $45 million for construction of community mental health centers and $5 million for grants to staff existing centers; $1,250,000 of the $2,500,000 increase for the "National Library of Medicine" making a total of $3,750,000 available for grants for construction of health science libraries.

The Senate added $4,360,000 to "Buildings and facilities, Public Health Service" of which $100,000 was for preliminary planning of a Public Health Service headquarters building, and $4,260,000 for construction of the Appalachian health field station adjacent to West Virginia University in Morgantown, W. Va. As neither of the projects was included in the budget, the conferees deleted the increases without prejudice, and recognized construction funds for the Appalachian Health Field Station as a first priority item for the 1969 budget and further felt that if firm assurances can be given that the architectural-engineering plans for the Government facility on leased land can be completed prior to June 1968, a supplemental request for 1968 will be afforded favorable consideration.

Of the total Senate increase of $77,801,000 for the National Institutes of Health, the conferees approved only $4,500,000, and that was for the "Regional medical programs." The remainder of the Senate increase was rejected in view of the fact that it was in excess of the budget estimates for fiscal year 1968. The Senate was forced to recede on its recommended increase of $15 million for "Grants for construction of health research facilities" notwithstanding the fact that at the end of fiscal year 1967 there was approved but unfunded applications in the amount of $61 million, and $3,326,000 to provide the full budget estimate for "Environmental health sciences."

Mr. President, during the consideration of the conference report in the House, first on October 4, 1967, and again on yesterday, there was agreement among the managers on the part of the House that $438,000 added by the Senate to the item for "Chronic diseases, Public Health Service" could be used for a program of pediatric pulmonary centers, and similar agreement in the framework of the Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases on a $500,000 collaborative program on immunotherapy on skin cancer. I concur in the understanding expressed by the conferees in the House, that this agreement still prevails and that both these programs can be funded within the funds now agreed on in this revised conference report.

The conferees accepted the Senate increases of $93,000 for "Assistance for repatriated U.S. nationals" and $18,450,000 for the Administration on Aging. These two items were not considered by the House as the authorizing legislation was passed late in June.

The increases proposed by the Senate for Gallaudet College, $70,000 to permit the rental of an up-to-date computer and the hiring of an instructor in computer programing in order to improve student training, and $116,000 for construction of an extension to the student cafeteria were rejected by the conferees in view of the fact that the proposed increases were in excess of the budget estimates.

The conference approved the Senate increase of $400,000 for the "Office of Secretary, salaries and expenses" and $209,000 for the "Office of Field Coordination, salaries and expenses" and added bill language to provide for a comprehensive study of all authorized Federal programs that have to do with educational activities aimed at improved international understanding and cooperation, with the objective of determining the extent of adjustment and consolidation of these programs that is desirable in order that their objectives may be more efficiently and expeditiously accomplished.

The Senate was forced to recede on its increase of $600,000 for "Foreign language training and area programs" of which $300,000 was for administrative expenses of the existing programs and $300,000 to initiate the provisions of the International Education Act.

The House adopted a provision that none of the funds appropriated under this act shall be used to provide payments, assistance, or services with respect to any individual who acts or facilitates in the incitement, promotion, encouragement, or carrying on of a riot or other civil disturbance. The Senate rewrote the provision to apply only to those persons convicted of the offenses cited. The conferees accepted the Senate language.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am the ranking minority member of the subcommittee on this particular appropriation. I have been in many conferences with the other body. I never saw a more difficult one than this. It was deadlocked for weeks on end, due to many provisions in the measure adopted by the Senate and the House, including this one, to which my colleagues from Maryland and Wisconsin have addressed themselves.

This deadlock was broken only by an enormous range of compromises effected through the extraordinary leadership, tact, and wisdom of the Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the Senate conferees.

This particular laboratory proved to be a major sticking point, concerning which we spent literally hours of debate and discussion. The issue never was resolved in any manner until finally we found that the Government agencies involved, which are so important to the health of the Nation, were suffering, and we just had to conclude, almost summarily from the point where we were, with the remaining issues which had been unresolved, resolved the best way we could at that given moment.

But this was the end point, not the beginning, of a long series of compromises on many issues. We tried to compromise in several ways on this issue, but both positions proved to be inflexible.

I can testify to the devotion and the steadfastness with which the Senator from Alabama led the Senate conferees in standing by the Senate position. I wish that we could have come to a more equitable conclusion, which would have barred no part of the country, not even within 50 miles of the Capitol; but it was absolutely impossible. I join with Senator Hill in pointing out that even in the State of Maryland there are plenty of places that are more than 50 miles from the Capitol, so that State is not barred from participation. There is no State completely encompassed within 50 miles of the Capitol except the District of Columbia.

I considered it to be our duty as members of the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with this matter to see that everybody has a fair crack at what is finally done, and that it should not be taken for granted, though of course Wisconsin has a completely legitimate right to contend with might and main for it, that it will necessarily go to Wisconsin.

So I join my chairman in his statements with respect to this particular matter, which was so vexing to us, and was one of the last items on which action was concluded with respect to this conference report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York not only for his very kind and generous words, but for his great assistance and the important part he played in this conference.

As has been stated, this was an awfully tough conference. We had 10 different meetings of the conferees. I have never seen any other which even approached it. The Senator from New York was present at all the meetings, participated most capably, and was helpful in every way. He contributed greatly to finally resolving this bill and bringing about the final agreement of the conferees on the matter. I take this opportunity to express my thanks and appreciation to him for the great service and help he rendered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, since I have the highest respect for the Senator from Alabama, I appreciate all the more the nice things he has said about me; but I certify to the Senate that without him, nothing would ever have happened. We were mighty lucky to have him as our chairman.

Mr. HILL. Again I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments in disagreement.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$45,000,000."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "Cooperation" and insert in lieu thereof "Corporation".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$7,139,000, to include also provision for a comprehensive study of all currently authorized programs of the Federal Government that have to do with educational activities aimed at improved international understanding, and cooperation, with the objective of determining the extent of adjustment and consolidation of these programs that is desirable in order that their objectives may be more efficiently and expeditiously accomplished."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 55, 61, and 69.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator and the members of the committee, and, though I was not a conferee, I should like the Record to show at this point the overall saving in this bill as now reported by the able chairman of the conferees as compared with the budget figures for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HILL. It was $168 million under the budget estimate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I again warmly congratulate the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I believe that his personal efforts were largely responsible for that saving, and that it is in line with the economy effort which we are all pursuing, and I believe the Senator is due the congratulations and thanks of all Senators.

Mr. HILL. I might say the exact figure is $168,790,000 under the budget estimates.

I deeply appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Florida, and thank him for them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation setting forth the appropriations for fiscal year 1957, the budget estimates for 1968, the House allowances, the Senate allowances, and the conference agreement for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1968, H.R. 10196

Item	Appropriation, fiscal year 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
Manpower development and training activities	$390,044,000	$401,854,000	$394,997,000	$385,497,000	$385,497,000
Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses	30,997,000	36,779,000	30,696,000	30,696,000	30,696,000
Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses	8,259,000	8,416,000	8,267,000	8,267,000	8,267,000
Grants to States	(524,000,000)	(557,107,000)	(556,932,000)	(556,932,000)	(556,932,000)
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen	76,476,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000
Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses	2,750,000	2,720,000	2,630,000	2,630,000	2,630,000
Trust fund transfer	(18,167,000)	(18,328,000)	(17,990,000)	(17,990,000)	(17,990,000)
Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries and expenses	8,578,000	8,683,000	8,533,000	8,533,000	8,533,000
Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses	22,737,000	25,424,000	24,166,000	24,166,000	24,166,000
Bureau of Labor Standards, salaries and expenses	3,434,000	4,645,000	4,429,000	4,467,000	4,429,000
Women's Bureau, salaries and expenses	911,000	912,000	912,000	912,000	912,000
Employees' compensation claims and expenses	56,571,000	56,061,000	56,061,000	56,061,000	56,061,000
Bureau of Employees' Compensation, salaries and expenses	4,848,000	5,508,000	5,408,000	5,408,000	5,408,000
Trust fund transfer	(67,000)	(68,000)	(68,000)	(68,000)	(68,000)
Bureau of Labor Statistics	20,593,000	23,054,000	20,933,000	20,933,000	20,933,000
Bureau of International Labor Affairs	1,250,000	1,463,000	1,348,000	1,348,000	1,348,000
Special foreign currency program	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Office of the Solicitor	5,591,000	5,741,000	5,741,000	5,741,000	5,741,000
Trust fund transfer	(144,000)	(144,000)	(144,000)	(144,000)	(144,000)
Office of the Secretary	3,685,000	4,946,000	4,388,000	4,388,000	4,388,000
Trust fund transfer	(140,000)	(538,000)	(538,000)	(538,000)	(538,000)
Federal contract compliance and civil rights program	1,103,000	1,355,000	1,103,000	1,103,000	1,103,000
President's Committee on Consumer Interests, salaries and expenses	327,000	337,000	337,000	337,000	337,000
Total appropriations, Department of Labor	638,220,000	652,973,000	635,024,000	625,562,000	625,524,000
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	61,685,000	66,749,000	66,225,000	66,000,000	66,000,000
Buildings and facilities	3,130,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000
Total, Food and Drug Administration	64,815,000	67,899,000	67,375,000	67,150,000	67,150,000
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary educational activities	1,342,410,000	1,681,207,000	1,645,707,000	1,696,707,000	1,677,907,000
		(10,793,000)	(1)	(1)	(1)
School assistance in federally affected areas	416,200,000	439,137,000	439,137,000	472,937,000	439,137,000
Assistance for school construction	22,937,000				
Teacher Corps	11,323,700	33,000,000		18,100,000	13,500,000
Higher educational activities	413,900,000	1,173,194,000	1,158,194,000	1,158,194,000	1,158,194,000
Higher educational facilities construction	722,744,000				
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts	11,950,000				
Expansion and improvement of vocational education	278,016,000	252,900,000	252,900,000	252,900,000	252,900,000
		[1] (7,000,000)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Libraries and community services	76,000,000	165,950,000	155,500,000	156,500,000	156,500.000
Educational improvement for the handicapped	35,075,000	53,400,000	53,400,000	58,400,000	53,400,000
Research and training	70,000,000	99,900,000	90,967,000	90,967,000	90,967,000
Educational research and training (special foreign currency program)	1,000,000	4,600,000			
Salaries and expenses	35,890,000	40,253,000	37,385,000	37,385,000	37,385,000
Defense educational activities	446,357,000				
Foreign language training and area studies	3,000,000				
Student loan insurance fund	3,200,000				
Participation sales authorization		(200,000,000)	(100,000,000)		(100,000,000)
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies		925,000	925,000		925,000
Total, Office of Education	3,890,002,700	3,944,466,000	3,834,115,000	3,942,090,000	3,880,815,000
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION					
Grants for rehabilitation services and facilities	258,560,000	311,550,000	311,550,000	312,550,000	311,550,000
Research and training	60,325,000	65,484,000	62,440,000	65,484,000	63,937,000
Research and training (special foreign currency program)	3,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Grants for correctional rehabilitation study	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Salaries and expenses	4,869,000	5,621,000	5,319,000	5,469,000	5,319,000
Trust and transfer	(299,000)	(336,000)	(336,000)	(336,000)	(336,000)
Total, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration	327,554,000	388,455,000	385,109,000	389,303,000	386,606,000
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
Health manpower education and utilization	750,000	170,413,000	164,163,000	164,913,000	164,663,000
Health professions education fund	10,000,000				
Nurse training fund	2,000,000				
Construction of health educational facilities	160,727,000	203,000,000	203,000,000	203,000,000	203,000,000
Dental services and resources	9,693,000				
Nursing services and resources	25,623,000				
Chronic diseases	91,614,000	27,942,000	27,504,000	32,692,000	27,942,000
Communicable diseases	44,220,000	72,272,000	72,109,000	72,109,000	72,109,000
Air pollution	39,225,000	64,185,000	64,185,000	64,185,000	64,185,000
Urban and industrial health	21,963,000	42,594,000	41,594,000	42,194,000	41,750,000
Radiological health	20,895,000	15,687,000	15,687,000	15,687,000	15,687,000
Injury control	5,759,000				
Control of tuberculosis	21,597,000				
Control of venereal diseases	10,593,000				
Occupational health	6,592,000				
Foreign quarantine activities	8,210,000				
Community health services	128,280,000	54,448,000	51,234,000	61,234,000	54,234,000
		[1] (10,000,000)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Trust fund transfer		(4,075,000)	(4,075,000)	(4,075,000)	(4,075,000)
Hospitals and medical care	64,121,000	63,851,000	62,830,000	63,633,000	63,230,000
Hospital construction activities	313,525,000	293,357,000	293,357,000	293,357,000	293,357,000
		[1] (15,000,000)	(1)	(1)	(1)

See footnote at end of table.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1968, H.R. 10196—Continued

Item	Appropriation, fiscal year 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Con.					
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—Continued					
Medical care services	$10,385,000				
Trust fund transfer	(3,512,000)				
National Institutes of Health: Biologics standards	7,904,000	$8,649,000	$8,649,000	$8,649,000	$8,649,000
National Cancer Institute	175,656,000	183,356,000	183,356,000	192,356,000	183,356,000
National Heart Institute	164,770,000	167,954,000	167,954,000	177,954,000	167,954,000
National Institute of Dental Research	28,308,000	30,307,000	30,307,000	32,307,000	30,307,000
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases	135,687,000	143,954,000	143,954,000	147,204,000	143,954,000
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness	116,296,000	128,633,000	128,633,000	135,633,000	128,633,000
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	90,670,000	94,422,000	94,422,000	92,922,000	94,422,000
National Institute of General Medical Sciences	145,113,000	160,284,000	160,284,000	164,284,000	160,284,000
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	64,922,000	68,621,000	68,621,000	74,621,000	68,621,000
Regional medical programs	45,004,000	64,314,000	54,314,000	64,314,000	58,814,000
Environmental health sciences	24,298,000	20,615,000	17,289,000	20,615,000	17,289,000
General research and services	68,534,000	81,141,000	81,141,000	84,641,000	81,141,000
Grants for construction of health research facilities	56,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	50,000,000	35,000,000
John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences		500,000	500,000	725,000	500,000
Subtotal, National Institutes of Health	1,123,162,000	1,187,750,000	1,174,424,000	1,252,225,000	1,178,924,000
Mental health research and services	265,619,000	246,741,000	246,741,000	246,741,000	246,741,000
Community mental health resource support	50,000,000	100,168,000	50,168,000	110,168,000	100,168,000
National health statistics	9,312,000	9,767,000	8,317,000	8,317,000	8,317,000
National Library of Medicine	20,192,000	21,162,000	18,662,000	21,162,000	19,912,000
Buildings and facilities	18,279,000	10,715,000	10,715,000	15,075,000	10,715,000
Scientific activities overseas (special foreign currency program)	10,000,000	18,685,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Retired pay of commissioned officers (indefinite)	(10,743,000)	(13,391,000)	(13,391,000)	(13,391,000)	(13,391,000)
Comprehensive health planning and services	4,250,000	143,628,000	140,676,000	140,676,000	140,676,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Surgeon General	7,858,000	9,087,000	8,358,000	8,358,000	8,358,000
Participation sales authorizations		(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)		(15,000,000)
Payment of sales insufficiencies		250,000	250,000		250,000
Total, Public Health Service	2,504,444,000	2,755,702,000	2,668,974,000	2,830,726,000	2,729,218,000
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL					
Salaries and expenses	(9,860,000)	(9,044,000)	(9,028,000)	(9,028,000)	(9,028,000)
Buildings and facilities	2,298,000	1,237,000	1,237,000	1,237,000	1,237,000
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital	2,298,000	1,237,000	1,237,000	1,237,000	1,237,000
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
Limitation on salaries and expenses	(600,459,000)	(635,260,000)	(631,500,000)	(631,500,000)	(631,500,000)
Limitation on construction	(43,189,000)	(634,000)			
Payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged	924,050,000	906,631,000	906,631,000	906,631,000	906,631,000
Payment for military service credits	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000
Total, Social Security Administration	1,029,050,000	1,011,631,000	1,011,631,000	1,011,631,000	1,011,631,000
WELFARE ADMINISTRATION					
Grants to States for public assistance	4,170,000,000	4,124,300,000	4,124,300,000	4,124,300,000	4,124,300,000
		[1] (115,700,000)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Assistance for repatriated U.S. nationals	460,000	525,000	432,000	525,000	525,000
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Family Services	7,890,000	8,589,000	8,225,000	8,225,000	8,225,000
Grants for maternal and child welfare	228,900,000	239,320,000	235,600,000	235,600,000	235,600,000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau	5,331,000	6,485,000	6,151,000	6,151,000	6,151,000
Juvenile delinquency and youth offenses	8,207,000				
Cooperative research or demonstration projects	3,150,000	4,170,000	3,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000
Research and training (special foreign currency program)	1,500,000	1,500,000			
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner	1,522,000	1,888,000	1,685,000	1,685,000	1,685,000
Total, Welfare Administration	4,426,960,000	4,386,777,000	4,379,543,000	4,379,636,000	4,379,636,000
ADMINISTRATION ON AGING					
Coordination and development of programs for the aging	10,275,000	18,450,000		18,450,000	18,450,000
SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS					
American Printing House for the Blind, education of the blind	1,027,500	1,225,000	1,225,000	1,225,000	1,225,000
National Technical Institute for the Deaf	491,000	2,615,000	2,615,000	2,615,000	2,615,000
Model secondary school for the deaf, salaries and expenses		425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000
Model secondary school for the deaf, construction		275,000	275,000	275,000	275,000
Salaries and expenses, Gallaudet College	2,542,000	2,878,000	2,878,000	2,948,000	2,878,000
Construction, Gallaudet College	70,000	2,196,000	2,196,000	2,312,000	2,196,000
Salaries and expenses, Howard University	13,534,000	15,300,000	15,300,000	15,300,000	15,300,000
Construction, Howard University	3,342,000	23,111,000	3,926,000	3,926,000	3,926,000
Salaries and expenses, Freedmen's Hospital	6,639,000	6,700,000	6,700,000	6,700,000	6,700,000
Total, special institutions	27,645,500	54,725,000	35,540,000	35,726,000	35,540,000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary	7,513,000	8,088,000	6,739,000	7,139,000	7,139,000)
Transfer from trust funds	(1,272,000)	(1,211,000)	(1,211,000)	(1,211,000)	(1,211,000
Office of Field Coordination, salaries and expenses	2,052,000	2,418,000	2,000,000	2,209,000	2,209,000)
Transfers	(1,805,000)	(2,095,000)	(1,815,000)	(1,815,000)	(1,815,000
Office of Comptroller, salaries and expenses	4,572,000	6,842,000	6,768,000	6,768,000	6,768,000
Transfer from trust funds	(688,000)	(991,000)	(991,000)	(991,000)	(991,000)
Office of Administration, salaries and expenses		2,547,000	2,427,000	2,427,000	2,427,000
Transfer from trust funds		(271,000)	(271,000)	(271,000)	(271,000)
Surplus property utilization	1,123,000	1,119,000	1,119,000	1,119,000	1,119,000
Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses	1,780,000	1,974,000	1,935,000	1,935,000	1,935,000
Transfers	(1,330,000)	(1,373,000)	(1,373,000)	(1,373,000)	(1,373,000)
Higher education for international understanding		20,350,000			
Foreign language training and area programs		16,175,000	15,700,000	16,300,000	15,700,000
Educational television facilities	(3,304,000)	[1] (304,000)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Total, Office of the Secretary	17,040,000	59,513,000	36,688,000	37,897,000	37,297,000
Total, direct appropriations, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	12,300,084,200	12,688,855,000	12,420,212,000	12,713,846,000	12,547,580,000
Indefinite appropriations	20,603,000	22,435,000	22,419,000	22,419,000	22,419,000
Total, direct and indirect appropriations, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	12,320,687,200	12,711,290,000	12,442,631,000	12,736,265,000	12,569,999,000

See footnote at end of table.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1968, H.R. 10196—Continued

Item	Appropriation, fiscal year 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
RELATED AGENCIES					
TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	$31,030,000	$32,288,000	$32,288,000	$32,288,000	$32,288,000
TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	2,085,000	2,150,000	2,150,000	2,150,000	2,150,000
TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD					
Limitation on salaries and expenses	(12,975,000)	(12,850,000)	(12,850,000)	(12,850,000)	(12,850,000)
Payment for military service credits	17,201,000	17,839,000	17,839,000	17,839,000	17,839,000
TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE					
Salaries and expenses	7,210,000	7,475,000	7,425,000	7,425,000	7,425,000
TITLE VII—U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME					
Limitation on operation and maintenance	(7,685,000)	(8,024,000)	(8,024,000)	(8,024,000)	(8,024,000)
Limitation on capital outlay	(3,575,000)	(305,000)	(305,000)	(305,000)	(305,000)
TITLE VIII—FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL					
Salaries and expenses	131,000	131,000	131,000	131,000	131,000
Grand total	13,016,564,200	13,424,146,000	13,137,488,000	13,421,660,000	13,255,356,000
Consisting of:					
Direct appropriations	12,995,961,200	13,401,711,000	13,115,069,000	13,399,241,000	13,232,937,000
Indefinite appropriations	20,603,000	22,435,000	22,419,000	22,419,000	22,419,000

[1] These appropriations lack authorization for fiscal year 1968. Action has been deferred pending such authorization.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have already stated my view as to the inestimable service to the country and the Senate rendered by the Senator from Alabama.

This is probably the largest appropriation bill among those marked "administratively controllable appropriations." It deals with matters of the greatest sensitivity to the Nation in terms of health, education, welfare, and related subjects.

A very careful reading of the work which was accomplished is necessary. For example, we were engaged in a very urgent compromise with the other body. We omitted any provision for international education, a particular measure which has been passed and enacted, and for which an appropriation is authorized. We nonetheless contemplated the likelihood of planning going forward in the Office of the Secretary against the day when Congress could fund the program, and made reasonable provisions with the Department so that the necessary people might be put on that job.

In respect to the Teachers Corps, as to which a very hard fought compromise was arrived at, the conference finally allowed $13.5 million. That compromise was carefully tailored to criteria as to the number of personnel who are now being trained, those who would be trained, and those who could be absorbed, based upon surveys made by the department. It is our belief—it is my belief, as I had a good deal to do with the subject—that the program can be carried on, not nearly in the way that the legislation intended, or even as the budget request intended, because the amount has been cut, I am unhappy to say, far below the budget request. Nonetheless, a viable program can be carried on. I would appeal to the agency to make certain that every last dollar of that $13.5 million is well spent and reflects great credit upon the continuance of the program.

That leads me to what I would like to say in this respect to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Many of the items in the bill were hard fought. The Department is familiar with them.

Mr. President, many of the items were extremely hard fought, and the amounts were materially reduced in some cases. This was attributable to the pressures under which we found ourselves. Of course, this is not the place or the time to argue priorities, whether they are justified or unjustified. However, I think this particular bill is entitled to the very highest priority, considering what it means to the country, when compared with many other programs, such as the space program, which could very well take second place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I did not realize that we were operating under a time limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still in the period for the transaction of morning business.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for another 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think that this particular appropriation is entitled to the highest priority, because it deals with the great difficulties experienced in the cities and the problems of all our people with respect to health and education and poverty and jobs. However, the important thing that I should like to emphasize to the Department is that in these items which were very hard fought and highly controversial, is performance. I refer to such items as the Teacher Corps, International Education, Community Health, and other similar items which I shall list, so that the Department will have no doubt about them, since the question will be before us certainly next year. I hope that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] will be here for many years.

I address the most urgent plea to the Department to bear in mind that they will prosper depending upon their performance in these highly controversial programs. If they give the programs loving care and devoted attention and make every dollar go twice as far as it normally would and if they provide great efficiency and fine results from the money that is appropriated, I think they will find our road and their road very much easier in the next fiscal year than it proved to be in this fiscal year.

I hope very much that they will pay most serious attention to what I say because I am really trying to give them a lead on what will do them and the country the most good in terms of their particular activity.

I pay tribute to all of our fellow conferees, those from the Senate as well as those from the House. We certainly disagreed very strongly in many things with some of our colleagues from the other body.

Mr. President, there is no question about the sincerity of good faith or anxiety of all members of the conference committee to serve the people of our country as they saw the best needs of our people, balancing financial and substantive considerations in this very large appropriation bill.

I pay a special tribute to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who yielded to me so as to allow me to have one subcommittee upon which I am the ranking minority member. As I am also the ranking minority member on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, this is a very important arrangement, so far as I am concerned. Notwithstanding the fact that the Senator from New Hampshire did yield to me so that, in spite of his seniority, I would be ranking minority member on this particular subcommittee, he was indefatigable in his attendance at the conferences. The Senator was there, I think, every time that I was there and any time there was need for any Senator from our side of the aisle to be present. He was an active, wise, and vigorous participant and fought a tremendous battle for something he believed in very deeply—facilities which were to be made available in school districts as provided in a particular section of NDEA contained in the bill. In every way the Senator from New Hampshire was a most cooperative and most splendid colleague in respect to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I pay tribute also to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], who attended a number of the conferences and participated with us in a most able and cooperative way as a Senate conferee.

Mr. President, I have never seen a conference that was superior to this in cooperation among the Senate conferees.

I have already testified to the excellence of the leadership of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] and to the tremendous contributions made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I join the Senator from New York in the tribute he has paid to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd].

The Senator from New Hampshire has been a member of this committee for quite a number of years. He has always been tremendously helpful and has always been present and done more than his part.

Certainly the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] this year helped in many ways, as he has always done in the past.

The conferees really and truly stood steadfast. They worked, and they did their deadlevel best. I am grateful to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am most grateful to the Senator from New York and the Senator from Alabama for their kind words. This is one of the most difficult and challenging sections of the budget to deal with.

I have fought side by side with the Senator from Alabama for these many years, and I have never gone through as grueling an experience as this one.

Like the Senator from New York, I hope for more efficient spending and more careful spending, and hope at the same time that we may have some success in the future for those causes to which the Senator from Alabama and the rest of us are dedicated—the fight against disease and the work that we have done and have to do in research, which is certainly one of the most vital and essential of all the activities of the Federal Government.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from New York spoke about appropriations for International Health.

I cite as an example of how important it is to continue to press forward on these matters, that the House has three times turned down the application for these funds. The House turned it down last fall in the supplemental bill and this spring in the supplemental bill. They have turned it down now, as the Senator has said, in the pending bill.

If these funds are to be obtained, the battle must continue.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I join with other Senators who have paid tribute this morning to the distinguished chairman of the Senate conferees, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill].

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee was most patient. He was most persistent and most tenacious in his efforts to sustain the Senate position.

I think this can also be said of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], and other conferees on the Senate side.

I was a Senate conferee. I was not able to attend the conference often, but whenever I did attend, I always found the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from New York, and other Senate conferees present. They tried hard to maintain the Senate position.

I congratulate them. As they have said, this was one of the most difficult of conferences.

I have not participated in very many conferences, relatively speaking, not having been a Member of the Senate as long as some of the other conferees, but this was the most difficult, the most trying, and the most challenging conference in which I have ever participated.

So I do congratulate the conferees.

I also wish to express appreciation to our very fine clerk, Mr. Herman Downey, for the excellent work he continues to do in this effort.

May I express appreciation to the other conferees, also, for their standing with me in insisting that something be written into the conference report which would indicate the priority that should be given to the Appalachian Health Field Station in Morgantown.

I am pleased that the conferees agreed that the action in striking out this money in conference was without prejudice to the project. The report states very clearly that the item is of high priority status; that if the plans are completed prior to June 1968, the conferees on both sides agreed that a supplemental request for 1968 would be given favorable consideration.

This is a very important project, both to West Virginia and the Nation, and I thank my colleagues once again for standing with me in securing the language in the report, which does protect and give to this item its very high priority status.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from West Virginia is correct about the Appalachian Health Field Station. The report states that the action was without prejudice to the project. The report states, further:

> In fact, it is recognized as a No. 1 priority item for the 1969 budget, and, if firm assurances can be given that the architectural-engineering plans for the Government facility on leased land will be finished prior to June 1968, the conferees are agreed that a supplemental request for 1968 will be given favorable consideration.

The hard work of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia on behalf of this project, I believe, resulted in his reward, and a very just reward, in the language assuring that these funds will be forthcoming for the station.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the chairman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to add my word of thanks to Mr. Downey, whose help was invaluable in guiding me and my staff through the labyrinth we had to tread. I am grateful for his being with us.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am a member of the subcommittee. I was not a member of the conference committee. However, it is my understanding that there was some question which would wear out first, the fiscal year or the conferees.

Mr. President, the Senate added to the bill the sum of $600,000 for the Arctic Health Research Laboratory located at the University of Alaska. The House conferees would not agree to that figure. Rumor has it that the House conferees would have preferred that none of the Senate increase be permitted. However, the conference report before the Senate provides for $156,000 additional, which will allow the employment of 15 additional persons.

This Laboratory was opened only last summer. It is a magnificent new building. It has a vital function to perform. After having said that, I will admit that the United States would not collapse if this Laboratory had never been built, if the research had not been launched; but there are interested persons in the northern latitudes who believe this Laboratory is extremely important. There is no point in having a new building, new facilities, new equipment, first class in every way, without having researchers there.

So I desire to express the thanks of the people of Alaska to every member of the Senate conference committee for insisting that some of this money be retained—to Senator Javits, to Senator Cotton, to Senator Byrd of West Virginia. I particularly wish to pay tribute in this instance, as in so many others, to that great man from Alabama, who has performed services over the years in the field of health and health research, incredible accomplishments, invaluable to the health of this Nation, and the health of the world. His deeds are not as well known now, I suggest, as they will be in the generations to come.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Alaska is correct about Senator Hill's role, which did not stop at the mainland United States of America, but extended his solicitude also to the people of a very valued though somewhat faraway State.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his kind and generous words, which I deeply appreciate. It was his great interest and his compelling presentation of the case that made it possible for us to finally get the House to agree to the $156,000 for the Arctic Health Research Laboratory.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleagues, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

HIGH COST OF DROPOUTS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Friday, October 27, issue of the Washington Post carries an article by Eve Edstrom under the heading "Report on High Costs Gives Support to Critics Seeking Job Corps Slash."

The pertinent part of the article, which I should like to call to the attention of Senators, deals with the report of the General Accounting Office covering the period from January 20, 1965, to December 31, 1966, when the average enrollee cost per year at Parks Job Corps Center rose to $11,000. It cost $11,000 a year to train and take care of a dropout.

It is shocking to be informed, by what is supposed to be an objective study of the condition that prevailed in this project of the Office of Economic Opportunity, that it cost $11,000 for one year to train a dropout. If that is what it costs to train a dropout, it probably should cost $50,000 a year to train a boy at Harvard or Ohio State or Michigan or any one of our other institutions of higher learning.

The officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity contend, according to the article, that the cost has dropped from $11,000 a year to $6,500. That is nothing to boast about. In Ohio, the average cost of sending a student to an institution of higher learning is approximately $2,600.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REPORT ON HIGH COSTS GIVES SUPPORT TO CRITICS SEEKING JOB CORPS SLASH

(By Eve Edstrom)

A "confidential" Government report focusing on the high costs of a California Job Corps center is providing some new ammunition for congressional critics seeking to curtail Job Corps spending.

The draft report by the General Accounting Office surfaced this week on Capitol Hill. It shows that the estimated cost of the Parks Job Corps Center spiraled from $12.8 million to $25.5 million after two years of operation.

Officials of the War on Poverty declared the report's chief findings are no longer valid, saying they are based on data at least 14 months old.

The GAO report covers the period from Jan. 20, 1965, to Dec. 31, 1966, when the average enrollee cost per year at Parks rose to $11,000 a year. But Job Corps officials said yesterday that the cost was brought down to $6500 long before Congress set a $7500 limitation.

ADDITIONS ARE NOTED

They further declared that more than $9 million of the $12.7 million in additional costs was accounted for by additions to the initial program, such as psychiatric, placement and processing services, and not by faulty cost estimates.

Parks is operated by Litton Systems, Inc. Its fixed fee went up from $600,000 to $683,000 when the operating cost at Parks rose to $25.5 million. In addition, Litton reportedly purchased $347,000 in educational materials from a division of its enterprises. Job Corps officials say "no intra-corporate profit" was realized.

Job Corps Director William P. Kelly stated that numerous copies of the GAO report were distributed to members of Congress but that "responsible Congressmen realized that this is an outdated draft report that has never been officially issued by the GAO."

A GAO spokesman said such drafts are "unreliable" until updated by policy review committees. The Parks report is now undergoing such a review, he said.

A few months ago, during hearings on the antipoverty bill before the House Education and Labor Committee, Rep. Edith Green (D-Ore.) referred to the report and attempted to have it made public.

REPLY FORWARDED

She was informed that GAO was waiting for Office of Economic Opportunity officials to reply to the findings. That reply was forwarded July 20 and also is being reviewed by GAO.

"I don't think it is proper for an agency to delay its comments to the point that it prevents a congressional committee from access to all the information," Mrs. Green said yesterday.

In a related matter, Mrs. Green yesterday wrote to House Education Committee Chairman Carl D. Perkins (D-Ky.) demanding that OEO be required to make public another critical report.

This latter survey, a series of six studies of OEO management procedures, reportedly found "low morale and general dissatisfaction" among regional antipoverty workers.

The survey cost OEO about $250,000 and was prepared by McKinsey & Co., Inc. OEO Director Sargent Shriver has claimed "executive privilege" in refusing to make it public.

ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL H. NITZE, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, BEFORE THE INVESTMENT BANKERS' ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on October 23, 1967, the Honorable Paul H. Nitze, Deputy Secretary of Defense, made a very interesting speech before the Investment Bankers' Association of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL H. NITZE, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, BEFORE THE INVESTMENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, OCTOBER 23, 1967

Mr. Gardiner, Ladies and Gentlemen:

As an alumnus of the Investment Bankers Association, it is a particular pleasure to meet with you tonight.

I spent more than a decade in investment banking, before entering government service: a long enough time, I think, to experience both the headiness of the challenges, and the headaches of the complexities.

I am not sure that the public at large appreciates the challenges and complexities of banking much better than they do the challenges and complexities of the federal bureaucracy.

The fact is that the popular concepts of both banking and bureaucracy are often bogged down in a kind of semantic swampland.

I have long been amused, for example, at the phrase "banker's hours"—a euphemism which seems to suggest to many a kind of Olympian life of leisure.

It is a phrase everyone uses—except bankers.

I don't know any profession busier than investment banking—or one in which leisure is more coveted, but less captured.

Investment bankers who aren't busy simply aren't successful investment bankers.

But the same holds true for bureaucrats, as well.

Bureaucracy has become a kind of bad word—and, paradoxically, a bad word, especially with bankers. It smacks of endless tangles of red tape, and a kind of Olympian life of indifference to the taxpayer's dollar.

Just as I wouldn't recommend "banker's hours" to anyone looking for leisure, I wouldn't recommend the federal bureaucracy for anyone specializing in red tape.

Red tape is to modern government what red ink is to modern banking. It just doesn't pay. And it's getting increasingly hard to find.

What, unfortunately, is not so hard to find are the mutual myths that businessmen and bureaucrats continue to believe about one another.

The Defense Department is a good vantage point from which to view the unreality of these myths.

Our budget, for example, in the Department this fiscal year is some $70 billion. Even in a banker's eyes, that is a substantial sum of money.

And yet the absolute figure—even to bankers—could be misleading.

For the fact is that the $70 billion represents 9 per cent of the Gross National Product: a smaller percentage of the GNP—even including the costs of our current commitment in South Vietnam—than defense expenditures for *any* fiscal year from 1952 through 1959.

Now, how is this possible?

First of all, there has of course been the spectacular growth in the GNP. It has grown a full 49 per cent in six years: an average gain—in constant prices—of 5½ per cent a year.

Now, what has the nation done with its gigantic increase in GNP in these past six years? It is true that government purchases of goods and services have increased. But gross private domestic investment has increased more. And by far the greatest increase of all has been in personal consumption.

So, though the Defense Department's budget since 1961 has increased, it has *not* increased as a percentage of the GNP; nor has it halted the spectacular rise in per capital disposable income, nor in actual personal consumption spending.

I believe the Defense Department's efficiency record has been remarkable. I think any banker looking at the record would call it remarkable.

And this—mind you—in the face of the fact that obviously the Department's prime objective and mandate is not simply to cut costs, and increase internal efficiency.

Our first and overriding reason for existence clearly is to provide this nation with the combat readiness that will guarantee our national security—and give us the military strength to safeguard and sustain our international commitments.

We are not primarily in the business of saving the nation's money. We are primarily in the business of saving the nation's life: its bedrock security, and its ultimate survival.

That cost comes high in a tense and turbulent world. And neither President Kennedy, nor President Johnson, has believed that that cost can be arbitrarily limited to any pre-planned percentage of the federal budget.

But what both President Kennedy and President Johnson have instructed Secretary McNamara is that he should procure and support whatever forces are necessary to guarantee our security—but to do so at the lowest practical cost.

The Secretary initiated in 1962 a five-year Cost Reduction Program. His three fundamental principles were that the Department should buy only what it really needed; that it should buy what it needed at the lowest sound price; and that it should reduce operating costs.

For example, we have relied less on Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee contracts; have increased our competitive procurement; and have initiated, with Congressional approval, multi-year contracts, which substantially reduce unit production cost.

Another significant category of trimming operating costs has been the closing of obsolete or inefficient installations. Since 1961 we have initiated actions to consolidate, reduce, or close over 950 Defense installations or activities involving property that had become surplus to foreseeable peacetime and wartime needs. When completed these actions will result in recurring annual savings of $1½ billion.

From the beginning, we have recognized that base closures, though beneficial to the nation as a whole, could have serious adverse effects on local communities, and on our own Defense employees. Over the years we have developed two programs to help solve these difficulties.

One program is designed to help local communities find productive uses for the land and facilities made available as a result of base closures. Property released in recent years is now being used for airports, schools and universities, community recreation and development, and commercial operations.

In the past year alone, the Department's Office of Economic Adjustment, whose services become available to a community as soon as a base-closure decision is announced, worked closely with 31 communities in 25 states to plan new uses for properties which we are relinquishing.

The point is that the Cost Reduction program is beneficial not merely to the taxpayer, but to the economy as a whole. Our goal in FY 1967 was to save $872 million. We actually saved $914 million. And these FY 1967 decisions will produce total savings of $1.5 billion in the three-year period FY 1967–69.

It requires a creative, resourceful, and relentless effort in government to cut costs intelligently—precisely as it does in business—but it can be done in government, and it is being done.

As I say, the Defense Department's prime responsibility is security, not cost reduction. That is true in peacetime. It is even more obviously true in wartime.

Now this nation is engaged in a conflict in South Vietnam which is, in some respects, paradoxical. It is probably the most publicized war that the United States—or indeed any other country—has ever fought. And yet, despite the coverage—and perhaps to a degree even because of the sheer overwhelming volume of the coverage—it remains for many a confusing and unfamiliar kind of conflict.

That is understandable. We have never fought an insurgent, guerrilla war quite like this one. It is intensely complex in its sociopolitical ramifications, and it simply cannot be understood in terms of earlier, more conventional conflicts.

Our objectives are carefully limited; and the means we employ to secure those objectives must necessarily be carefully and rationally controlled.

In every complex matter, the besetting temptation of the human mind is to oversimplify.

There are no simple solutions to the struggle in Vietnam as long as Hanoi persists in attempting to deny by force the right of the people of the South to determine freely their own future.

We do not wish to widen the war. We wish to end the war on just and reasonable terms. That is going to require patience and persistence. Hanoi clearly has come to respect our firepower. It continues to doubt our staying power.

Hanoi is well aware it cannot defeat us. Its hope is to outlast us.

Since the struggle is so complex, there are many aspects we might discuss here. But as your Association represents much of the keenest economic talent in the nation, I would like to draw attention to certain economic ramifications of the conflict.

To comprehend the impact of our present commitment in Southeast Asia on the American economy it is, I believe, useful to make a comparison with our last major military engagement—the Korean war.

If we compare the first full calendar year of combat in Korea—1951—with the first full calendar year of combat in South Vietnam—1966—the economic data is revealing.

In 1951, the GNP—in constant 1958 dollars—increased by $28.2 billion. But defense expenditures in that year absorbed almost the entire increase: a full $23 billion. Consumer purchases increased by a spare $2.6 billion.

But in 1966, which was the first full year of combat in Vietnam, our GNP—in the same 1858 constant dollars—increased by $33.3 billion, and our defense expenditures increased by only $6.5 billion. What is even more striking, our consumer expenditures increased by $19.3 billion.

If we take the full Korean conflict period—comparing 1953 with 1950—increased defense expenditures consumed about one half of the GNP increment; whereas, in Vietnam—comparing 1967 with 1965—increased defense expenditures have required less than one fifth of our GNP growth.

The plain fact of the matter is that never in our nation's history—or indeed in the history of any other nation—has so rapid and massive a military buildup been achieved as in Vietnam—and this in order to meet an urgent emergency—with so little strain on the national economy.

Had we not done what in fact we did militarily in 1965, South Vietnam would simply have been defeated by the communists. That is clear.

What is less well understood is that we accomplished a massive deployment of more than 200,000 troops in twelve months, and supplied them with more than a million different items of logistical support at the end of a 10,000 mile long pipeline. Further, that pipeline terminated in an underdeveloped Asian country, equipped at the time with only one deepwater port, and with neither roads nor rail lines available to move supplies from that single port to our forces upcountry.

Yet, despite these difficulties, the increase in defense expenditures, measured in constant dollars, has been about one-third as great during the Vietnamese war as it was during the Korean war.

Now, what does all this prove?

To begin with, it proves that this nation was immensely better prepared—in terms of security and combat readiness—for the Vietnam emergency in 1965, than we were for the Korean emergency in 1950.

When the Korean emergency occurred, we virtually had to rebuild our entire defense posture.

When the Vietnam emergency occurred, we were substantially combat ready.

But the two comparable situations tell us even more.

The Korean emergency occurred at a time of economic recession.

The Vietnam emergency occurred at a time when we had enjoyed four years of steady economic expansion.

But the Korean buildup dislocated our economy, and required wartime economic controls.

While the Vietnam buildup has not only not dislocated our economy, it has been achieved *without* wartime mobilization; *without* calling up the reserve forces; *without* controls being imposed on wages, prices, or profits; and indeed *without* any significant restrictions being placed on the civilian economy whatsoever.

On the other hand, we in the Defense Department are fully aware that in any budget as large as $70 billion there are bound to be some expenditures of lesser priority.

As the President mentioned in his Tax Message to the Congress, he has asked Secretary McNamara to make still another searching review of *every* defense expenditure—and to defer any that are not essential just now for national security.

We have given the President that assurance, and we are taking that action. We are not going to give ground in the war on waste anymore than we are going to give ground on the battlefield.

In this context, the President's tax proposal makes eminent sense—particularly in the circumstances of an unprecedented national prosperity that is now in its eightieth uninterrupted month.

If Americans today still paid taxes at the rates which were in effect when the President took office, nearly four years ago, they would be paying this year over $23 billion more than they are paying now.

What the President is requesting now is the temporary recision of a portion—substantially less than half—of the tax cuts that he recommended, and that Congress overwhelmingly passed, in the past three years.

The tax surcharge gives us the best assurance that the price of our security is paid rationally and equitably. Pay for our security we must. The question is only how.

If we refuse to face up to the tax surcharge the President has recommended, we will pay for our security through inflation, or through shortages and controls. We would sacrifice price stability for an intensified pressure toward wage-price spiraling that in turn can only aggravate the balance of payments problem.

Every other war in which we have been engaged in this century has brought on wage and price controls. We don't want them this time. And we don't have to have them this time.

What the President is proposing is to meet the budget deficit by a rational mix of some increase in taxes; borrowing moderately; and cutting sensibly such Federal expenditures—both defense and non-defense—that are not going to postpone the solution of problems that simply cannot wait.

The power and prosperity of this country is abundant beyond belief.

We are not in a *Guns versus Butter* situation.

Guns mean combat readiness. And we have never had more or better combat readiness.

Butter means prosperity. And we have never had more of that either.

Last year real wages were the highest in history—and unemployment reached the lowest point in 13 years.

Corporate profits after taxes climbed to an all-time peak, up 9 per cent.

Net income per farm also increased more than 9 per cent, even after adjusting for the higher prices that farmers paid.

And our GNP, valued in constant prices, advanced 5.8 per cent.

We *have* guns. We *have* butter. And we can keep on having both.

Not only are we not in a *Guns versus Butter* situation. More importantly, we are not in a *Guns versus Betterment* situation.

There are those who say that we cannot deal simultaneously with both our defense and domestic problems—that we cannot curb communist aggression abroad, and move to cure city ills at home at the same time.

But that is a defeatism unworthy of this great and powerful nation.

We have the means. We need only the agreement and the resolve to use those means.

Our defense expenditures today are a lesser percentage of the GNP than they were a decade ago. Thus, our security requirements are clearly not preventing us from meeting other needs in our society.

Our urban problems are admittedly tangled and thorny—and they do require action. And that is why the President has sent up to the Congress creative and concrete proposals to meet those problems.

It is *not* a case of *Guns versus Butter*.

It is *not* a case of *Guns versus Betterment*.

And it is certainly not a case of *Guns versus Banking*. Business expenditures for new plants and equipment rose by no less than 16½ per cent last year!

If we have any one root problem in this country, it is simply the old human weakness of finding it difficult to agree on the means to the desired end.

We *can* do what absolutely needs doing.

We can do *all* those things that absolutely need doing.

We can even do *more* than all those things that absolutely need doing.

We are a great nation.

You gentlemen know that. You have helped make it a great nation. You have helped keep it a great nation.

Now is no time for any of us to give up on that job.

Thank you, and good evening.

NOTED COLUMNIST PRAISES PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, during this period of fluidity in world affairs, a noted analyst, Howard K. Smith, demonstrates that America's foreign policy under President Johnson has been infinitely more successful than that of the other major powers.

Russia is berated both by militant nations who reject their "revisionism" and by moderate nations who consider them too revolutionary.

In the Middle East, the Arabs, in Latin America, the Cubans, and in Southeast Asia, the North Vietnamese, are a grave drain on Russia's resources—with little prospect of success by any in their aggressive ventures.

Mr. Smith notes that China's foreign policy failures—if possible—have been even more disastrous than Russia's.

Their visions of a Chinese manifest destiny in Asia have crumbled before their eyes—South Vietnam is beyond reach, Maoist-inspired terrorism in Thailand is withering, and dreams of a Communist Indonesia have vanished along with Sukarno's power.

Moreover, they have suffered a dramatic loss of influence in the developing world—which has learned that China is more interested in subverting their independence than in aiding their development.

While Russian and Chinese foreign policy have met rough waters, the U.S. ship of state has maintained a firm but flexible course.

As Mr. Smith describes, we have blocked major Communist powergrabs in Vietnam and Santo Domingo and have spurred regional groupings—which offer the best hope for world harmony and national development. Bridges of understanding have been built to the East and South America is treated with the dignity it has always deserved—but not always received.

As Mr. Smith concludes, the Johnson administration has "done a good job in hard circumstances."

Russia and China would do well to emulate President Johnson's efforts to achieve world peace rather than attempt to promote international strife—they might find their foreign policy endeavors rewarded with less bitter fruit.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record Howard K. Smith's article appearing in the Houston Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States Doing Well—Time of Transition

(By Howard K. Smith)

In a famous phrase, Winston Churchill called democracy the worst form of government except for all the others. In this gloomy passage of events, the same might be said of United States foreign policy. It is certainly in the worst condition except for everybody else's foreign policy.

It is no solace in our travail that the erstwhile rulers of the world have virtually no foreign influence left. Britain has none at all. Except in the imagination of De Gaulle, neither has Continental Europe.

In the Middle East, the horizons on which Russia—usually our chief competitor—looks are bleak. While we still have freedom of maneuver, Russia is stuck with the Arabs. All the guns and trainers Russia can deliver will not make the Arabs a militarily viable people for 10 years at the least. The Arabs can mount a guerrilla war in Israeli-occupied areas, and that will be a bloody nuisance, but it won't win anything or reduce the costs for Russia. Likewise Russia is stuck with Cuba and a mangy clutch of guerrilla wars in Latin America—another drain without promise.

North Vietnam is yet another drain on Russia without hope of results. The North Vietnamese strategy is clearly to hold on and see Johnson defeated in the American elections of 1968. Well, Johnson may be defeated, but as was the case with Truman in 1952, the chances are overwhelming that if he does he will be replaced by someone just as determined to hold on. Russia and Ho will then face the awful prospect of four more years of being beaten without issue.

The decline of China's foreign influence has been one of the most dramatic developments of the past two years. When on July 28, 1965, President Johnson made the decision for a massive entry into a land war in South Vietnam, everything was moving China's way. South Vietnam was about to fall. Foreign Minister Chen Yi had announced the opening of a campaign to take Thailand. China was pouring arms into Indonesia with the aim of seizing that government of the fifth largest country in the world. There was every hope that China and her friends would soon outflank India and bring about the disintegration of the subcontinent.

Every item in that agenda is now dead. South Vietnam is beyond reach. The Thailand campaign is barely keeping alive. The Communist grab for Indonesia in September, 1965, failed, and the Communists have been destroyed. Moreover, the men on whom China placed hopes in Africa—Ben Bella and Nkrumah above all—have been overthrown.

A later and less impassioned time will see the present as an unusually difficult transition in world affairs. The last of old Europe's power has been dissolved. The grip of both the United States and Russia on large blocs of nations has been loosened. In the vacuums half a hundred new nations came into existence, most with only the vaguest notions about how to survive. The most brilliant statesmen history ever saw would have had a devilish hard time maintaining some kind of control of the situation.

The United States has in fact handled the situation well, blocking the chief grabs and slowly building up regional groupings of the new nations in Asia and in Latin America so that, in the far future, they can prosper and defend themselves without outside help. With all manner of illiberal liberals and non-intellectual intellectuals yapping at their heels, the American leadership has nevertheless done a good job in hard circumstances.

OUR POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Representative Bolling, of Missouri, has captured the spirit of our policy in Vietnam in an article which he has written for the National Catholic Reporter. Mr. Bolling states that opponents of the war have so completely won the attention of the broadcasting and publishing outlets that "a reasoned position in support of our current policy finds itself continually jostled from prominence." He continues:

> Much is made about the violence of war in South Vietnam. American television cameras are recording violence to which they have access. But these cameras were unable to record, during 1964, for example, the murder of 436 hamlet chiefs and government officials in South Vietnam by the Vietcong, the murder of 1350 civilians, the kidnapping of 1131 hamlet chiefs and other government representatives and the kidnapping of 8400 other civilians.

I think Mr. Bolling's article deserves the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Article by Representative Richard Bolling, Democrat, of Missouri, October 1967

In the midst of a hellish war for survival, Winston Churchill went to Harvard College in 1943 and advised the American people:

"One can not rise to be in many ways the leading community in the civilized world without being *involved* in its problems, without being *convulsed* by its agonies and *inspired* by its causes."

Twenty-five years later there is displayed each evening in our living rooms on televised news programs the pain, hardship and anguish of combat in Viet Nam and the suffering civilians—that is, the *involvement* and *convulsions* of which Churchill spoke.

Inspiration does seem to be in short supply, however. Perhaps this is because no other war, in which we of the United States have been engaged, has been so inadequately understood, in my judgment. For all the learned talk to the effect that an "establishment" controls our domestic and foreign affairs, opponents of the war have so captured attention of broadcasting and publishing outlets that a reasoned position in support of our current policy finds itself continually jostled from prominence.

Of course, the Viet Nam war quite properly occupies center stage. Between 100 and 250 American servicemen are being killed weekly in Viet Nam. War-related casualties among South Vietnamese civilians are running at a minimum annual rate of 50,000. Reason enough for provoking strongly held, conflicting views among us Americans. However, the difficulty of communicating is difficult enough without infusing discussions with garnish hyperboles and highly speculative, distempered attacks as to individual motivation. The issue is too important to be debated on tip-toe, but let's stack our staffs at the door. A right-to-dissent is a noble and, quite properly, a constitutionally protected concept. A right-to-reply deserves equivalent treatment.

I neither scheme with the Strangeloves nor coo with the doves. At the outset let me state that I will rub together a few facts and state the ensuing judgments that have led me to support the broad outlines of present American policy in Viet Nam specifically and Southeast Asia in general—despite fluctuations of public opinion polls and any uncertainties as to my political fortune in the congressional election in 1968.

The issue in its broadest sense, is not *peace* or *war*. This misstates the issue.

President Roosevelt understood the issue during the gathering storms in the 1930s. President Truman understood it in respect to Greece and Korea and Berlin. Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy understood it in respect to Southeast Asia. President Johnson understands it today. The issue is the containment of aggression—when it is *seminal* in nature, *strategic* as to location, and *substantively harmful* to our country's permanent interests. The shooting script varies—territorial "revisionism" in Europe, "reunification" in Korea and "wars of liberation" in Southeast Asia.

Chairman Khrushchev once spoke about the hinge of history swinging in favor of the Communist world. Our policy is an effort to keep that hinge in place.

Communism, a diplomat has remarked, lies not *to the left* but *to the East*. Since 1948, six Communist-led revolutions have been launched in Asia—in addition to the one achieved in China. The Huk rebellion in the Philippines, the North Korean onslaught against South Korea, the Malayan insurgency and the Pathet Lao effort in northern Laotian provinces are sufficiently illustrative.

Therefore, it is not just a "dirty little war" in Viet Nam. Instead, this is one of a series of direct and indirect Communist efforts to put Asian nations through the Marxist wringer.

Yes, I have carefully read and listened to opponents both within and without the Congress. I, too, wish that we could match our achievements in *space* and in *medicine* and in *economic abundance* with an effective system of *orderly international relations* in place of the bloody, brawling, back-alley assaults that now too often characterize the scene. Furthermore, I do not believe our Viet Nam policy is omniscient or omnipotent There is justification for debate as to a bombing strategy for North Viet Nam as contrasted to alternative strategy of pacification and ground military action in South Viet Nam. Our strategies have not been without fault; our tactics have sometimes worsened our situation. I do not admire *Diemocracy*, although I am not inclined to believe that Diem's oppressive yokes made the revolutionary omelette. I do not regard President-elect Thieu and Vice President-elect Ky (note: take office October 30) as the George Washingtons of South Viet Nam, although Uncle Ho may be properly held accountable for the deaths of thousands of his subjects in connection with his agricultural policies in the middle 1950s. There is, indeed, a historical hostility toward the Chinese by the Vietnamese people. Every State Department policy announcement is not infallible, although conversely it is also fairly easy to quote Jean Lacouture against Jean Lacouture and policy alternatives posed by critics seem highly vulnerable or murky or both. I do not regard each pronouncement of a President as flawless, although, whatever my criticisms may be, they do not compel me in despair to support for President a segregationist, border-state Senator. I am aware that, in terms of state-craft, Communism is no longer monolithic. And finally, there is an arguable case for reviewing our far-flung commitments and for exercising more caution in the future.

With all this in mind, the many facets of many problems in a complex world setting that confront our Government suggests an appreciable different situation than is portrayed in the *New York Review of Books*, magazines such as *Ramparts* and *The Minority of One*, that abominable play MacBird, and other showcases of the war's opponents. Those of us who believe we have repaired to a wise and just standard hold to the following:

In conflict is a horseshoe-shaped perimeter, more than 7200 miles in length—extending from Korea to India—plus the additions of Australia, Indonesia, and New Zealand. Involved are more than 800 million people in a land mass nearly the size of the United States.

These peoples, most of whom live in fragile countries, are striving to secure economic, political and social sufficiency. China, for example, by economic and military excursions, would have these peoples develop by totalitarian routes. The United States, displaying an array of occasionally conflicting self-interests, solicits and supports democratic avenues and democratic vistas.

Viet Nam, one of these countries, is a legacy of other than ourselves. A restrictive French colonial administration denied it and other components of Indo-China both development and self-determination. For 20 years, hostile forces have pillaged its villages and assassinated its leaders. Small miracle Viet Nam even exists for us to dispute over. A *democratic possibility*, entrusted to non-Communist nationalists, exists in South Viet Nam. This is worth defending rather than relinquishing the country to *totalitarian tendencies*.

Our Government has fought a limited war in Viet Nam, yet has maintained restraint in respect to the war in the Middle East that erupted last June, and the secessionist civil war in Nigeria.

While maintaining a strong military establishment, our Government has also recently negotiated a non-proliferation nuclear treaty at Geneva and signed an international space treaty.

Trade in strategic commodities with Communist countries is prohibited by our Government yet development of East-West trade in other commodities and services, as well as cultural exchanges, is encouraged. Special consideration has been given the unorthodox Communist regime in Yugoslavia in respect to our foreign assistance program.

While maintaining diplomatic relations with the Republic of South Africa, our Government voted last fall in the United Nations to terminate that country's destructive mandate over South-West Africa.

Our Government sent troops to the Dominican Republic in April, 1965, yet showed firm skill, without similar military intervention, during the harrowing missile crisis in Cuba two and one-half years earlier.

Armed forces are landed in Lebanon and financial sponsorship is assumed for the mammoth Volta hydroelectric dam and related aluminum smelter in Ghana.

There is the unsheathed sword where necessary, but there also exists our $400-million-a-year commodity program in South Viet Nam, the Asian Development Bank, our Alliance-for-Progress in Latin America, our Peace Corps, and our foreign-aid program that over a period of 20 years totals more than $100-billion in loans-and-grants.

So I would, and do, argue that our response overall to the diverse power-systems of the Communist nations and their client-states, as evidenced in Viet Nam and elsewhere around the world, has been flexible and fruitful. Admittedly, it is a desperate juggling act, unevenly orchestrated, amid the storms of international savagery. Nevertheless, the men of Washington are compiling a creditable and defensible record—positive in spirit and constructive in consequence.

The war in Viet Nam can simply not be discussed without constant reference to the broader world canvass. Otherwise, tunnel vision, a deformation of perspective, results. In sum, without further belaboring this aspect, matters are somewhat more complicated than are made out and should serve to contain the galloping abstractions that are running about our country. It is untrue, for example, to insist that a President, any President, prefers to preside over a Nation at war than at peace. A President, in the most selfish of political terms, always prefers the *arts of peace* to the *skills of war*.

Unfortunately, prominent traits of opponents of the war is a low tolerance for complexities and ambiguities and an affection for the single-issue. As these are evidenced within religious communities, it is particularly astonishing because therein historically has been the locus of subtle and unresolved discussions as to the nature of man, his terrestrial duties and responsibilities and his relationship to a Supreme Being.

In this respect, Father John Courtney Murray, S.J., in an essay on the topic of war as a moral problem, has spoken in relevant terms. He cautioned about *moral simplism* on the one hand and *moral skepticism* on the other, wherein "it can not be a question of locating on our side of the rupture those who are virtuous and intelligent, and, over against us, those who are evil and morally blind. In contrast, it can not be a question of maintaining that both East and West are so full of moral ambiguities that the line of rupture between them either does not exist or is impossible to discern." My position is that the "moral ambiguities" in Viet Nam may be resolved in our favor.

Another relevancy should govern—the concept of the "just war," both in its classical form, as defined by St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, and its reconstructed form as enunciated by Pius XII and the "pastoral constitution" of the Second Vatican Council. Required elements are:

(1) *Proportion.*—measured military response.

(2) *Discrimination.*—effort to avoid direct and savage reprisals upon civilian population.

(3) *Advance Probability of Success.*

As one who is not a theologian, I, nevertheless, take the position that our conduct of the war in Viet Nam conforms.

Pius XII has stated that a defensive war to repress injustice is morally admissible both as to principle and as to fact—"the absolute necessity of self-defense against a very grave injustice that touches the community, that can not be impeded by other means, that nevertheless must be impeded on pain of giving free field in international relations to brutal violence and lack of conscience."

The *pastoral constitution,* referred to earlier, states that "as long as the danger of war remains and there is no competent and sufficiently powerful authority at the international level, governments can not be denied the right to legitimate defense once every means of peaceful settlement has been exhausted."

The Geneva Acoords of 1954 created a new territorial order in Viet Nam—a *provisional* military demarcation line at the 17th parallel and a demilitarized buffer zone on each side of the parallel. The Accords also prohibited introduction of troop reinforcements and new military equipment or the use of the demilitarized zone of either North or South Viet Nam for resumption of fighting. Established as monitor was the International Control Commission (ICC) consisting of Canada, India and Poland.

Allegations of violations have not been restricted to either North or South Viet Nam, but one ICC finding is worth quoting.

In 1962, the ICC issued a report in response to complaints by South Viet Nam that North Viet Nam was conducting a campaign of murder, kidnapping and terror. The ICC report stated:

"Having examined the complaints and the supporting materials sent by the South Vietnamese Mission, the Legal Committee (a unit of the ICC) has come to the conclusion that in specific instances there is evidence to show that armed and unarmed personnel, arms, munitions and other supplies have been sent from the Zone in the North to the Zone in the South with the object of supporting, organizing and carrying out hostile activities, including armed attacks, directed against the Armed Forces and Administration of the Zone in the South. These acts are in violation of Articles 10, 19, 24 and 27 of the Agreement of the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet Nam.

"In examining the complaints and the supporting material, in particular documentary material sent by the South Vietnamese Mission, the Committee has come to the further conclusion that there is evidence to show that the PAVN (People's Army of Viet Nam) has allowed the Zone in the North to be used for inciting, encouraging and supporting hostile activities in the Zone in the South, aimed at the overthrow of the Administration in the South. The use of the Zone in the North for such activities is in violation of Articles 19, 24 and 27 of the Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities in Viet Nam."

". . . The Commission accepts the conclusion reached by the Legal Committee that there is sufficient evidence to show beyond reasonable doubt that the PAVN has violated Articles 10, 19, 24 and 27 in specific instances."

It is also instructive to quote the North Vietnamese against themselves.

On October 31, 1956, General Giap, Minister of Defense in North Viet Nam, addressed a Communist Party Congress in Hanoi. He conceded:

"We made too many deviations and executed too many honest people. We attacked on too large a front, and, seeing enemies everywhere, resorted to terror, which became far too widespread." (Presumably a reference to the land rent reduction and land reform campaigns between 1953 and 1956 which resulted in killings in the magnitude of about 100,000 persons and severe privation for perhaps another 500,000—this in a country of an estimated 16 million persons.)

"Whilst carrying out our Land Reform program we failed to respect the principles of freedom of faith and worship in many areas."

"In regions inhabited by minority tribes we have attacked tribal chiefs too strongly, thus injuring, instead of respecting, local customs and manners."

"When reorganizing the Party, we paid too much importance to the notion of social class instead of adhering firmly to political qualifications alone. Instead of recognizing education to be the first essential, we resorted exclusively to organizational measures such as disciplinary punishments, expulsion from the Party, executions, dissolution of party branches and cells. Worse still, torture came to be regarded as a normal practice during Party reorganization."

Much is made about the violence of war in South Viet Nam.

American television cameras are recording violence to which they have access. But these cameras were unable to record, during 1964, for example, the murder of 436 hamlet chiefs and government officials in South Viet Nam by the Viet Cong, the murders of 1350 civilians, the kidnaping of 1131 hamlet chiefs and other government representatives, and the kidnaping of 8400 other civilians. It is certainly justifiable to despair about nation's brutality to nation but the moral equation should be comprehensive.

Furthermore, peoples whose lands over the centuries have been door-mats for conquerors are more readily comprehending of the issue than are some of us in the United States, 6000 miles and more away.

After a trip around the Southeast Asian rim, a New York Times correspondent reported in June, 1966:

"Despite some misgivings, non-Communist leaders from Tokyo to Tehran largely support United States policies in South and Southeast Asia."

It is impressive to me that the closer a nation is located to Viet Nam, the greater the likelihood it welcomes our presence there. Six countries in the region are participating as our allies in Viet Nam—Thailand, the Philippine Republic, Taiwan, Australia, New Zealand and the Republic of South Korea. Surely, these countries, plus Burma, Laos and India (Pandit Nehru: if the United States stumbles, the world falls with it) would feel properly insecure if, having committed ourselves as we have, we now withdrew without adequate security arrangements. Concomitantly, the effect on Japan and our European allies would be measurably unfavorable.

An analysis, compiled not by our policy makers but by President Bourguiba of independent-minded Tunisia, is worth quoting extensively. Two months ago (August 23, 1967) he spoke to the Tunisian Student Association. The Tunisian Embassy newsletter carried an English translation.

Referring to proxy wars, Bourguiba is reported as saying, ". . . China entered the scene and in pressuring Hanoi to maintain its intransigent stand, she seeks nothing else but to confound the Soviet Union and to prove that guerrilla warfare can defeat the American armies . . . China's hopes could then be fulfilled and nothing would prevent the outpour (cq) of its multitudes over Viet Nam, Asia and even Russia . . . It is in the light of these considerations that we ought to understand the oft-repeated demand by Hanoi's leaders that: 'The aggressor should leave first, then peace, freedom and unification would then set in by themselves.' This is a precondition which has never been set forth by any people struggling for their liberation even in colonial wars. During the Algerian war, neither did the Algerian Provisional Government, nor Ben Bella, nor Boumedienne, ever insist that the French Forces withdraw before any negotiations could begin. A close analysis of the events leads indeed to the conclusion that the Viet Nam war is being fought behind the scenes by the United States and China. Considering that the world balance of powers hovers in the midst of such a conflict, it seems unlikely that the United States would give up in these conditions . . . .

"Now everyone knows that the United States are (cq) willing to close their military bases abroad. In the case of Viet Nam, they simply want to make sure that once their forces are withdrawn, appropriate conventions would insure complete self-determination for the Vietnamese people, that is their ability to elect the regime of their choice and the men of their choice. I fear that should the United States withdraw without prior agreement specifying such a guarantee, Viet Nam might not be reunified, and neither would it become free nor independent. History and the specific weight of China somehow seem to point toward such an eventuality which would without fail bring mankind to the brink of a third World War. . . .

"I do not seek to spare or please any country when I maintain that the world would be in danger if, in the event of a movement of public opinion, the United States were to return to their former isolationism. One could contend that Viet Nam means little to them after all, and that the Chinese are, at the moment, in no position to threaten them, but, granted a U.S. unilateral withdrawal from Viet Nam, China would most certainly submerge all the countries of the region and pull away from Moscow the leadership of the communist world, thus jeopardizing world peace. Viet Nam would be the first country to be overrun, then would come the turn of India, which already experienced Chinese aggression, then Outer Mongolia, whose position is believed to be threatened . . . Given the facts of geography the specific weight of China, and her insistence to cling to Stalin's ideology, one could not but conclude that Viet Nam would experience a fate similar to the one which had befallen the countries of Eastern Europe in the days of Stalin."

Bourguiba's analysis is a sobering one.

As a major power with complex legitimate interests in the world, we in the United States have assumed a role in Viet Nam—just as we had a role to perform in Europe vis-a-vis Nazi Germany and, after that, the Soviet Union. It is quaint to assert otherwise in a supersonic world of the H-bomb and the inter-continental ballistic missile (ICBM). A gazetteer lists the distance between Kansas City and Moscow as approximately 4900 miles. In today's world of ICBM's, the distance is approximately 15 minutes.

May it not also be usefully argued that if we had presented ourselves in Europe in the 1930s, there might not have been an Ethiopia, or a Munich—or the gas ovens?

We have presented ourselves in Viet Nam. Yes, if only our undertaking there were accomplished, in order that *more time* and *more attention* and *more money* may be spent on our domestic needs. Our water and air needs cleaning; our ghettoes decent housing and its people, bread and justice.

However, can it be successfully argued that American soldiers are the only ones with fingers on triggers? Or the first? Can it be successfully argued that the United States may now unilaterally end the war without assurances it has put a brave people to hostage and to captivity? Of course not.

What do we do?

I state it in the following words:

Devise a formula that would bring the war to an acceptable closing—in the meantime, control the conflict in acceptable scale.

I believe that the Administration has repeatedly attempted to assemble such a formula. For example, Assistant Secretary of

State William Bundy recently suggested that the newly elected government at Saigon seek political contacts with the Viet Cong.

This prime formula is elusive. It is easy to become discouraged.

We of the United States have a responsibility to sustain, where feasible, trends and probabilities toward national independence. We may succeed if we display the courage, commitment, determination and, most important, patience to persist in this master task on behalf of ourselves and our posterity.

When France fell to the Nazis in 1940, a Frenchman commented:

"We wanted to *have* more than we wanted to *give*. We *spared effort* and *met disaster*."

Because we acknowledge the disaster that struck down the France of a quarter century ago, we invest efforts in the Viet Nams of today.

AN OUTSIDE VIEWPOINT ON "PEACE" DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is enlightening and often refreshing, I think, to get the viewpoint of those removed from the Washington scene on events that occur here. It helps us to put things in better perspective.

This past Wednesday, October 25, 1967, the Moorefield Examiner, one of West Virginia's excellent weekly newspapers, published an editorial that dealt with the recent "peace" demonstrations in the Nation's Capital. Entitled "Sporting Event," it expressed a fresh and rather unique point of view.

Moorefield is in Hardy County, in the beautiful South Branch Valley of the Potomac River, not far from Washington. But the detached rural viewpoint of the Examiner, which is published by Mr. Ralph E. Fisher, is in marked contrast to what we often read in newspapers in metropolitan areas.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Sporting Event

We suppose our reaction to the so-called draft protesters is about the same as most of the citizens in our rural section of West Virginia. One of disbelief and wonder. The feeling of "What's going on with the people today?" pops up and you get to thinking that they know something you don't. We look at them on the tv and it is pretty obvious that they are a bunch of kooks and beatniks off on a two day binge. What they say doesn't make sense. They say they want peace but they offer no sensible alternative to the action our government is taking.

We put part of the blame on the publicity. We get the feeling that the television industry had a big part in drumming up the whole affair by advertising it so industriously so that they would have something to show pictures of on the newscasts.

Out of two hundred million people there is bound to be a certain percentage of nuts. Twenty per cent of all Americans are supposed to have mental trouble in some degree and that makes forty million nuts to contend with. Some are in institutions but there are still millions still running loose. We aren't saying that everyone in that so-called peace demonstration is insane but certainly some are in a degree. Most of them are there with tongue in cheek. Some place to go, something to do, some excitement over the week end.

The Communists took immediate advantage of the situation. At least one of the leaders admitted that there were twenty known Communists in the group and you can bet that they were the trained agitators, well versed in mob psychology and using that training effectively. Their job is to foment unrest, uncertainty and discontent even up to and including treason.

We aren't too impressed with the 100,000 "demonstrators" that descended on Washington. We'll wager even money that if we could have the same publicity we could get 100,000 people to a chicken fight in Washington. Cock fighting is illegal and with the sure knowledge that the tv cameras would be trained on the spectacle 100,000 would be piddlin'. Communication is so rapid and transportation is so good and cheap it is relatively easy to collect a mob on any excuse. The gals go to meet the boys and the boys go to meet the gals.

We can't see that anything has been accomplished. Certainly the results weren't worth the effort. The soldiers and the marshals and the police weren't taking it very seriously or they would really have used clubs and tear gas and fire hose. A good wetting down would have cooled the ardor of most of the demonstrators. Even the arrests weren't taken seriously for they were turned loose for the most part.

The only thing we could see that amused us was that it was a mistake for the hippies with their long hair to get close to the action. That long hair makes a perfect handle to drag those kooks to the paddy wagon. One thing is certain, the weather is getting to the season where those outdoor sports will be curtailed until next summer.

ALSOP'S FINDINGS VINDICATE OUR PERSEVERANCE IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, after a lengthy and extensive tour of South Vietnam, Joseph Alsop, one of America's foremost reporters, has concluded that the United States "has the other side over a barrel."

Vietcong bases in the countryside cannot survive without the close support of big units—chiefly manned by North Vietnamese regulars.

However, the United States has ended the big-unit phase of North Vietnam's aggression through a series of victorious encounters. As the large units of North Vietnamese crumble, the hold of the Vietcong over the people melts.

When these large units are decimated by Allied firepower, Alsop reports that American units are freed to intensify pressure against the enemy in other corps areas.

Successful repetition of this cycle in scores of instances has led Alsop to conclude that "there is no stalemate" in Vietnam.

Mr. Alsop's report, along with similar observations from other experts, vindicates the President's perseverance in the face of pressure, to see the conflict through to an honorable solution.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's article, published in the Washington Post, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post Oct. 23, 1967]

Westmoreland Forces Have Vietcong All but Over a Barrel

Saigon.—After a month spent in a dozen different provinces and three of the four corps areas of South Vietnam, one leaves really bewildered by the defeatism that seems to prevail at home. There is no stalemate here. And by any rational test, Gen. William C. Westmoreland at last has the other side over a barrel.

The barrel consists of a basic contradiction. On the one hand, every observable sign—in the field, in the POW and defector interrogation, and in ton upon ton of captured documents—points to a central conclusion about the VC guerrilla base in the countryside and their control of the population.

The conclusion is that this VC base in its instruments of control cannot long survive without the active, fairly close-in support of the big units—the enemy's "main force" divisions, regiments and battalions, which are now chiefly North Vietnamese in three-quarters of the country.

On the other hand, every observable sign—again in both the field and the documents—points to an equally important conclusion about the "big unit war," as it is called here. This first phase of the war, which has endured since the American intervention, has in fact come to en end. The reason is that the North Vietnamese cannot pay the immense manpower bill for supporting the ambitious troop structure of big units they have deployed in South Vietnam.

That does not mean that there will be no more big units—for the Hanoi war-planners quite certainly dare not go as far as a complete return to classical, small unit guerrilla fighting. The effort to pin down American forces along the miscalled Demilitarized Zone may well be continued, to relieve pressure farther south.

In addition, the effort to keep in being some sort of big units—perhaps battalions instead of regiments and divisions—will certainly be continued in a good many areas, where this support is essential to the survival of the VC base in important and populous provinces. Yet the barrel will still be there, as can be seen by a glance at II Corps, for instance.

In II Corps, as recently as six months ago, there were supposed to be two full enemy divisions on the western border, in the Cambodian sanctuary. This was already a bit of an overestimate, yet the North Vietnamese troops of this "B-3 Front" were still fighting aggressively and continuously at that time. An entire U.S. Division, the Fourth Infantry, was engaged against them.

Only a few days ago, in contrast, Gen. Westmoreland returned from an inspection of the border with the conviction that the remaining regiments of the B-3 Front had been "degraded (as our army now so strangely says) to replacement depots." Obviously, this kind of diminution of the Cambodian sanctuary's threat will also diminish the U.S. troop requirement there.

Suppose, then, that only one U.S. brigade is needed to keep the border guard. That will free two more brigades for use in the populous and important coastal provinces of II Corps. And here the other side is already in dreadful shape.

On the coast, the Third and Fifth North Vietnamese have long since been torn to rags and tatters. But precisely because they are desperately needed to support the VC base in populous provinces (a need the documents show), these two unhappy divisions now have complete replacement priority. Even this replacement priority has failed to bring them back to effective life, however.

Increase the pressure here still further, as Gen. Westmoreland can so easily do if the big unit threat diminishes elsewhere, then the remnant of the big unit threat in the coastal province can also be eliminated. Whereupon the VC base and the VC population control will ravel away, for want of big unit support. And the coastal provinces will then be largely cleared.

This is, of course, far too schematic a description of what is necessarily a very complex process. As experince in vital Binhdinh Province shows for instance, the raveling away of the VC base goes by stages. It is very fast at first, when the VC majority are killed or captured or defect. It slows down after that, when none but the ultra-hardcore minority of VC activists are left to be scooped up.

There are differences, too, from province to province, and from corps area to corps area. In III Corps, for instance, the famous Ninth VC Division may well be kept in being; while the two other divisions are broken down or wither away. Yet there is still that barrel, always at work.

If the big unit threat ends or even drops off at Point X, in other words, Gen. Westmoreland can intensify the pressure at Point Y—primarily in the most populous provinces, where the big units are harder to keep up to strength, too, than they are on the remote borders. If the pressure is increased enough at Point Y, the second stage of raveling away is reached. Point Z will then key in to feel more pressure. And so it must continue, with the same contradiction always bedeviling the enemy.

SMALL BUSINESS AND OEO

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, economy is today, more than ever, a vital element of good government. To that end it is necessary to avoid duplication of services and of authority. The overlapping of jurisdictions is one of the surest ways of hamstringing effective and efficient administration.

It is likewise the rule in good government that where an agency does a good job, where it develops sound programs and acquires the practical experience to make those programs work, the same agency be used to provide revised and increased services as deemed necessary by Congress in the same field.

These factors are almost certainly behind the mounting wave of alarm now expressing itself in many quarters over the features of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 that apply to small business.

If these amendments are going to injure or fragment what the Small Business Administration is doing—and there is a growing consensus that they will—then I think it behooves all of us in Congress to take another hard look at the bill.

The concern, as expressed to me by various colleagues in the other body, by a chorus of small businessmen, and by the representatives of the small business trade associations in Washington, and the concern that I now share, focuses principally on sections 404 and 406.

It is quite clear that these provisions would have the net result of vesting in the Secretary of Commerce full control of the small business poverty loan program. Specifically, they would empower the Secretary to provide assistance without limitation for—

Planning and research, including market research, in connection with the making of antipoverty business loans.

The identification and development of new business opportunities.

The furnishing of centralized services with regard to public services and Government programs, including the antipoverty program.

The establishment and strengthening of business service agencies, including trade associations and cooperatives.

The encouragement of the placement of subcontracts by major businesses with small business concerns located in congested urban areas.

The furnishing of business counseling, management training and legal and other related services, with special emphasis on management training programs.

In addition, the Secretary of Commerce would be empowered to set up its own small business procurement operation to assist small business in obtaining Government contracts.

Here, in detail, is a crass duplication of the activity now being carried on, effectively and in all parts of the country, by the Small Business Administration.

But this is not all. The Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 would also strip from the Small Business Administration the authority which was given to the SBA only last year to control the making of antipoverty loans. The proposed amendment would revert to the old, highly unsatisfactory method of divided authority in deciding eligibility for these loans.

SBA is a small agency, to be sure. But to me this is one key to its effectiveness. If it were to be swallowed up by one of the larger Government departments, as has been proposed, its effectiveness would be effectively muted, if not strangled and destroyed. Mr. President, this body well knows my position on an SBA-Commerce merger. I led the successful effort in 1965 among my Senate colleages to prevent such a merger. It was not wise to weaken SBA then. It is even less wise now.

As a small, independent agency, responsive to the needs of the people, it can act, and has acted, with speed and efficiency to carry into effect the programs delegated to it by Congress. I think that all who are acquainted with the Small Business Administration, and with its vigorous Administrator, the Honorable Robert C. Moot, will agree that it is doing an effective job to help strengthen the small businesses of this Nation.

I cannot emphasize too strongly how important it is that the Federal Government work with the small business community through a single agency. Small businessmen throughout the land freely express to me their worries about government. The concern I hear from them as often as any is their concern over the proliferation of agencies.

In SBA we have an agency that has earned their confidence. They are comfortable dealing and working with SBA.

This rapport is not something just any agency can pluck from the air. Nor is it something the Congress can confer upon a particular agency by legislative act. It comes from years of experience, and from a carefully developed posture. Only SBA has this experience and this posture.

It is my firmest conviction that we will only harm this confidence and trust, on the part of small business interests—and in the process hurt the national interest—if we again try to spread and fragment our services to small business among three agencies. I thought we had already learned our lesson in this regard.

SBA has earned the confidence of small business by its deeds.

More and more taxpayers appreciate the fact that this is an agency that largely pays its own way. Its annual costs of operation are now more than offset by the interest it receives on the sales of its participation loans.

Far more important, its services are paying huge dividends in the economy.

A prime example is the success of the SBA borrowers. Mr. Moot, the Administrator of SBA, recently testified before my Small Business Subcommittee on Financing and Investment the results of a very recent study of 22,000 SBA loans show SBA borrowers are making an annual gain in profits more than twice the gain for all U.S. corporations. For a 7-year period, these 22,000 borrowers showed an annual profit growth of 14 percent, as compared with 6½ percent for all corporations.

SBA programs are now generating new investment, public and private, at the rate of $1 billion a year. In terms of employment, this means at least 150,000 new jobs a year.

This agency has climbed to this level of achievement and impact in the short space of 14 years.

This is not the time for Congress to be duplicating this work in other agencies, or diverting this strength into new channels. I as much as any man in Congress want to see us fashion new tools to help small business. The strides I have just cited suggest the wisdom of going still farther in this direction.

But those tools must be kept in the hands of SBA.

However, the hour is late. The Senate has approved these provisions and the House is scheduled to act upon them very soon.

I therefore appeal now to my colleagues in the House to consider well the warnings that those among them who are acquainted with the work of the Small Business Administration are now giving.

I urge that, when these proposed amendments are put to a final House vote, the Members of that body will amend sections 404 and 406 to put the tools we have talked about where they belong, which is in the hands of SBA.

I earnestly believe that such a change will strengthen small business in every aspect. I voted against this bill when it was before the Senate. Its one serious flaw, which is the focus of a gathering storm among small business interests, can easily be corrected by the House, and should be. The SBA has a wealth of expertise to contribute to all levels of the small business sector, and I think Congress must be certain that it is making full use of this important resource, and at the same time avoiding injury to a dynamic and indispensable agency.

DE FACTO SEGREGATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial, entitled "De Facto Segregation Ruling Removes Basis for Busing Agitation," which appeared in the October 26, 1967, edition of the Wheeling, W. Va., Intelligencer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARIFIED: DE FACTO SEGREGATION RULING REMOVES BASIS FOR BUSING AGITATION

The results of what the Supreme Court refuses to do, while attracting less attention, may be as significant in their influence on the lives of the American people as what the tribunal proclaims in positive decisions.

A recent Cincinnati case illustrates the point. In declining to hear an appeal from a Sixth Circuit Court's refusal to direct the Cincinnati School Board to provide for the cross busing of school children to eliminate de facto segregation, the high Court left standing this declaration of the lower tribunal:

"There is no constitutional duty on the part of the Board to bus Negro or white children out of their neighborhoods or to transfer classes for the sole purpose of alleviating racial imbalance that it did not cause, nor is there a like duty to select new school sites solely in furtherance of such a purpose."

The effect of the Supreme Court's action is to make what the Sixth Circuit Court said the law of the land, just as the positive statement in the original desegregation decision that the maintenance of separate if equal school facilities for white and Negro children no longer satisfied the constitutional requirement of equality of treatment became the law.

The Cincinnati decision, which makes common sense and is fully in line with the original desegregation ruling should, but probably will not, bring the controversy over de facto segregation to an end. But it does make clear that in the eyes of the highest legal authority we have discrimination is constitutionally intolerable no matter which way it cuts.

The clear purpose of the several Supreme Court decisions in the area of school policy is to prevent racial discrimination, not to accomplish a uniform racial mix. Thus it should stiffen the backbones of school authorities, some of whom have been reluctant to take a firm stand on this issue.

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, yesterday, we were all saddened by the death of Senator Alexander Wiley, who had served the people of Wisconsin in this Chamber from 1939 to 1963.

He was born in Chippewa Falls, Wis., and attended Augsburg College in Minneapolis and the University of Michigan. He had initially studied for the ministry and later switched to law, receiving his law degree at the University of Wisconsin Law School.

Prior to his service in the U.S. Senate, he was a district attorney and a banker and operated a dairy farm.

Alex Wiley was one of the grand old men of Wisconsin politics. In his 24 years in the Senate, he rose to become the senior member of his party and chairman of both the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on the Judiciary.

He became intimately acquainted with many of the world's great leaders, at home and abroad, and served his State and Nation through critical times.

He will be best remembered for his contributions toward establishing the St. Lawrence Seaway and for his enlightened internationalist approach to world affairs, which he adopted in the face of strong pressures from within his own party.

Above all, Alex Wiley was always known as a kindly, generous, and friendly gentleman, who always conducted his political activities on a high personal level. He will be long remembered and sorely missed.

KOREA: A SPIRITED LAND ON THE MOVE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, America's deepening involment in Vietnam has focused increasing attention on another front in Asia—Korea—where free world forces still confront the Communist adversary across an uneasy truce line. How is South Korea, saved from brutal Communist aggression, faring today?

Korea is on the way—

Reports George Chaplin, editor of the Honolulu Advertiser, who recently visited the once war-torn country.

One senses it these days in the countryside, where a fresh spirit of confidence and hope blows like a strong wind over the jagged mountains and down the ancient cultivated valleys. One sees it in the towns and cities. And one recognizes it in the mood and policies of the government.

Mr. Chaplin's perceptive, firsthand observations have been printed in a series of articles in the Honolulu Advertiser. A sample of his informative, objective reporting was the first article in the series, dated October 1, 1967, and titled "Korea: A Spirited Land on the Move."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I commend Mr. Chaplin's article because of the lessons we can draw from his report on the Korean experience. Like Vietnam, Korea is a divided country which the Communists attempted to unify by armed aggression. In 1949 and early 1950, the Communist regime in North Korea created disorder south of the 38th parallel by frequent raids and through propaganda, sabotage, guerrilla action, and terrorism by Communist agents.

Failing in this campaign to topple South Korea, the Communist leaders then launched direct action to try to bring about the unification of Korea under their control. Only the timely, courageous action of South Korean, American, and other allied forces under United Nations aegis prevented the enemy from overrunning the entire peninsula.

If the free world forces had failed to intervene or, having intervened, failed to persevere under adverse circumstances, serious consequences would have resulted, not only to our own national security but to the safety of friendly and neutral nations in the Asian and Pacific world. The U.S. position would have been deeply shaken in our relations with Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and the many other countries forming our outer defense line. Under the pressure of an expanding, aggressive Communist threat, these countries would have faced an extremely difficult and dangerous future. Their very survival might have been at stake.

In Vietnam today, the Communists are attempting to "unify" the north and the south by force, just as they tried to do in Korea. They are employing the same two-pronged tactics; guerrilla and terrorist action to harass civilians, and direct action by trained combat troops from the north.

Once again the United States has come to the defense of a country under severe attack from a Communist neighbor. To honor our commitment, the United States is supporting South Vietnam, just as we did when the enemy attacked South Korea.

By intervening in Vietnam, as we did in South Korea, the United States demonstrated that whether we go to war depends not on the race of the people involved but on the commitment we have to a nation. We honor our commitments to Asians just as we honor our commitments to non-Asians.

The freedom and integrity of an Asian ally are as much a concern to the United States as those of a non-Asian ally.

Without America's vital intervention, South Vietnam would probably be under Communist rule today—the same fate that would have overtaken South Korea if the United States had not come to her aid and thwarted the Communist takeover.

Not only did American intervention stop Communist aggression in South Korea but it also made possible the recovery and rebuilding of the country afterward. Although almost completely devastated in the war, South Korea rose from the ashes to establish a constitutional government, a burgeoning economy, and a stable society. With American assistance and despite numerous frustrating difficulties, South Korea represents a genuine success story of a nation saved from Communist domination.

Politically, the Republic of Korea faced enormous obstacles in establishing a constitutional government. Its tribulations before, during, and after the armistice in 1953 attest to these ordeals. A military junta assumed control in 1961. Maj. Gen. Chung Hee Park's regime brought order after a period of corruption in Government, violent student demonstrations, and a stagnant economy.

In the 1963 national election, President Park emerged victorious by a small margin of 156,026 votes. Earlier this year, President Park won an impressive vote of confidence, gaining reelection by a majority of more than 1 million votes.

Korea's diplomatic progress and success in this decade has been remarkable. In 1965 she ratified a normalization treaty with Japan, providing for $800 million in Japanese grants, loans, and commercial credits. That same year she became one of the signers of an agreement to establish the Asian Development

Bank. Last year the Republic of Korea was host to the 10-nation meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Asian and Pacific Council—ASPAC—the first and largest diplomatic congress in Asia since the end of World War II.

South Korea's economic transformation has been equally impressive. Her growth rate of 8 percent a year is one of the highest in the world. Commodity exports have grown from $41 million in 1961 to an estimated $250 million in 1966. Foreign exchange earnings were almost five times greater in 1966 than in 1961. Inflation is under better control. The rate of population growth has declined.

Even more impressive than the advancement in self-government, diplomacy, and economy is South Korea's response to the call for help from South Vietnam. In 1965 South Korea began sending crack combat troops to South Vietnam, maintaining the second largest allied military force there. She now has 45,000 troops in South Vietnam and may augment that number soon.

Rescued from Communist aggression and conquest less than two decades ago, South Korea is today helping save an Asian neighbor from the same threat. She symbolizes the new Asia which the United States is striving earnestly to build in partnership with other peace-loving nations.

EXHIBIT 1

KOREA: A SPIRITED LAND ON THE MOVE

(By George Chaplin)

Korea is on the way.

One senses it these days in the countryside, where a fresh spirit of confidence and hope blows like a strong wind over the jagged mountains and down the ancient cultivated valleys.

One sees it in the towns and cities, with their rising buildings and rising expectations, and in the glistening machinery of young industrial plants.

And one recognizes it in the mood and policies of the government, a one-time military junta which President Chung Hee Park thus far is moving down the long road—with some vexing detours—toward a democracy the people have never really known.

A Korean cabinet officer put it to me this way: "We say, 'Instead of lying idle, stand up.' Then we say, 'Instead of standing still move forward.' "

A high-ranking American official said, "The transformation, especially in the last three years, has been extraordinary."

PRODUCTION AND EXPORTS UP

Here are some indices:

The gross national product (after adjustment for price changes) has been rising since 1963 at 9 percent a year—one of the most impressive rates in Asia—and last year reach 13.4 percent.

Agricultural production has climbed 46 percent in five years. And during the same period, while Korea is still basically a farming country, industrial output has almost doubled.

Exports have more than tripled since 1962, to $250.3 million last year. Also significantly, manufactured items now represent more than 60 per cent of exports, compared with 12 per cent six years ago.

As one U.S. bank report observes, "Koreans take pride (that) they are now exporting ski sweaters to Sweden, transistor radios to Japan, guitars to the U.S., and sewing machines to Germany."

But for all this progress and more to come, Korea is still a desperately poor nation, with its people scrabbling for a living. Per capita income is still extremely low—about $110 a year. (Some say less). During each of the last four years it has moved up an average of 6.2 per cent, but from a very meager base.

In the packing-crate shacks so evident around the capital of Seoul—with almost 3.8 million people the 13th largest city in the world, just behind Chicago and ahead of Manila, Paris and Berlin—there is still considerable misery. I was told that five or six abandoned babies are found daily.

UNEMPLOYMENT IS STILL HIGH

Throughout Korea there is still heavy unemployment and underemployment. Of the country's 30 million population 42.3 per cent is under 14, 55 per cent under 19—a lot of people to be coming into the labor force.

Housing remains in short supply and even the better houses are small. Since most lack a living room, it's customary to invite friends to a public teahouse, for a cup and music (sometimes played by a disc jockey).

But Korea's problems are relative. A Western diplomat with experience in India said, "What strikes me is that the children here have shoes. Children here have no distended bellies, no sharply etched ribs and no hopeless, despairing faces. Kids here in wintertime are clothed in sweaters and in solid pants, carrying their books in bags or briefcases."

Less than 14 years ago a war never officially ended left Korea divided and devasted. Divided it still remains—like Berlin and Vietnam—with the Communists in control of the north.

COUNTRY'S INFLUENCE WIDENS

Great opposing armies continue to stand at the ready. But behind the military shield, here in the overcrowded south the people of the Republic of Korea are beginning to write an exciting and impressive Asian success story.

Some of the early "chapters":

Korea in December, 1965 ratified a normalization treaty with Japan, a traditional enemy, providing for $800 million in Japanese grants, loans and commercial credits.

Also in December, 1965 Korea was one of the signers of the agreement to set up the Asian Development Bank and pledged a $30 million subscription.

The country has become increasingly active in international conferences. "You might think Seoul was the end of the line," but in the last couple of years it has hosted a long list of important conferences. In June of last year it stimulated a 10-nation meeting of foreign ministers which formed the Asian and Pacific Council (ASPAC) for regional cooperation.

In 1950–53 Korea needed the armed assistance of the U.S. and other U.N. nations to thwart Communist aggression. In 1965 this once-helpless land proudly began sending crack combat units to the aid of South Vietnam—and now has 45,000 troops there.

Korea's progression from wartime rubble to reconstruction to rapid new growth was fueled by $6 billion in U.S. aid, more than half of it economic. But it is now starting to function effectively with a lower level of assistance. (In 1964, 36.7 per cent of the government budget was supported by U.S. aid. Last year the figure had dropped to 23.4.)

SHARP CHANGE IN ATTITUDES

I asked a knowledgeable American official, who travels a great deal in the countryside, about the Korean reaction to some of these recent developments.

He replied there's been a dramatic change in attitudes. Not so long ago he used to be asked two questions. One was, "Why is the U.S. abandoning us to the Japanese?"—an emotional if outdated response to the new treaty with Japan, which had harshly occupied Korea for the 36 years from 1910 through the end of World War II, and left a legacy of bitter memories. The other question: "Why is the U.S. cutting down on aid?"

"These questions got so boring," the official said. "But now I travel and people have an entirely different outlook. They say, 'Come and see what we are doing.' 'Come to my factory and see what I'll export next year.' Or, 'Come see our land reclamation project.' "

Two and a half years ago, the U.S. shipped Korea 200,000 fewer tons of grain than the year before. "Everybody," the American recalled to me, "said it's a terrible thing, cutting aid. We said, 'Look, you ought to say it's wonderful; Korea is more than self-sufficient.' "

The next year another 200,000 tons were trimmed and the Park government put out a statement that the cut was a tribute to the Korean farmer. "Now, they're boasting about food production—and hope to be self-sufficient in two or three years."

A NEW SPIRIT OF CONFIDENCE

Clearly, the Koreans are in a hurry, so much so that I sensed a concern in some quarters that they may be trying to do too much too fast, over-extending themselves domestically.

But the over-riding "plus" is that their outlook and actions have changed from those of the mendicant to those of the confident man. This self-esteem has been evolving over six or seven years but has become really noticeable in the last three or four years. And it should be of great satisfaction to the U.S.

As one U.S. expert said:

"We've put in a lot of money. Many times it looked hopeless. Many called it 'an open hole.' But it's working and with good luck and judgment it should continue to work.

"Ideas are just as important as money. These people are not afraid of ideas. There's also a good rapport. We can suggest good ideas without their feeling they're being patronized. Americans and Koreans enjoy each other. After all, we fought together; we established a partnership."

A Western economist expanded on this:

Korea "has the best climate of any Asian country for acceptability of American programs and the initiative for self-help. The people work hard, they take responsibility, they have pride in their country.

"Next to Taiwan, Korea is probably the best example of American government investment paying off. There's more mature perception in politics and about social and economic matters—like the tax program to curb inflation, and the raising of interest rates to stimulate savings."

BASE IS LAID FOR PROGRESS

Inflation is still a big problem, but its rate is declining. In 1963 the overall price increase over the previous year was 25 per cent. The 1965 increase over 1964 was only seven per cent and that for 1966 over '65 remained under 10 per cent.

"The economy," I was told, "is so much freer these days, that the politicians don't have too much to play around with. One doesn't have to buy export licenses. There's a greater volume of savings, more credit to distribute and less chance for favoritism. Also there's a highly critical press."

In the recent presidential election, charges of corruption were hurled by General Park's opponent, and at his inaugural Park himself took note of this problem. An informed source I asked about it said: "There is the usual corruption of low-paid civil servants and big businessmen. The 'kickbacks' on contracts is almost a routine thing and bribery to obtain favored treatment on imports is fairly common. However, the situation is no worse or more extensive than in the other nations of the region."

He switched to a more positive note: "It's fair to say the foundation has been laid for steady continued progress, and the potential for it exists.

"There's a reasonable degree of stability. Whether it keeps up depends on what the Koreans do and on what we do, barring bad harvests or war.

"The harvests have been wonderful. There's more available land through bench terracing, the scientific approach. Presently 25 per cent of the land is arable. They expect to add one-fourth more through reclamation in the next four years."

THERE'S HOPE OF BETTER LIFE

To the Korean plodding down the country road with the shoulder-strapped A-frame on his back piled high with a heavy load this means gradually achieving a better life, starting with electricity in his home. He's already buying a radio and in time will be able to afford a bicycle.

Several years ago, the Korean Deputy Prime Minister Ki-yong Chang likened his country to a leaky ship, with a plugged hole below the waterline, with little freeboard and some help needed for sails.

Recently, in briefing a U.S. Congressional committee, this same official updated the image. The Korean economy, he said, "is like an airplane which has just taken off. The no-smoking sign is out, but the fasten-seat-belt sign is still on."

CONGRESS MUST DEVELOP A RATIONAL SYSTEM OF BUDGETING PRIORITIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as debate continues on the subject of controls of the Federal budget, there seems to be a widespread recognition of the need for restrictions on unlimited and inefficient spending; the problem for Congress has been where and what to cut.

Our traditional budgeting system just does not provide Congress with information that could be applied in establishing some classification of program priorities. The result: vulnerable—but very vital—programs get slashed, while less beneficial but well-established areas are barely touched. Finally, Congress ends up spending even more because it has to remedy damage received in the vital programs.

For example, significant savings could have been achieved if Congress had more carefully analyzed public works appropriations. Current Government policy in cost-benefit studies employed for most public works projects usually employs a low-discount rate. The lower the interest rate used in such analysis, the smaller are the benefits required for justifying Government investment in the project.

But according to witnesses who testified at the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee's Economy in Government Subcommittee held last month on planning-programing-budgeting—PPB—systems, the low discount rate based on the historical coupon rate at issue of long-term Government securities is a grossly wasteful measure. Today, the Government pays almost 5 percent when it borrows money at the same time it goes into projects which return just over 3 percent. Indeed, testimony revealed that the relevant rate the Government should use is the expected rate of return to private sector investments, and that rate now stands at a minimum of 10 percent and, in many cases, ranges from 15 to 20 percent.

If the lowest probable expected rate of private sector return is applied to pending public works projects, a good number of these projects would show negative present value; that is, if we utilize a 10-percent discount rate rather than a 3¼-percent discount, the costs of a project would be higher than expected benefits. Here are some examples:

Project	Current benefit-to-cost ratio	Cost	Revised benefit-to-cost ratio
Cross-Florida Barge Canal	1.7	$145,300,000	0.36
Kaskaskia River navigation	1.2	68,000,000	.48
Overton-Red River Waterway, La	1.01	135,000,000	.34
Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, Mo	1.2	196,000,000	.37
R. D. Bailey (Justice) Lake, W. Va	1.1	76,600,000	.31

Mr. President, these five projects will cost taxpayers more than half a billion dollars; yet for each tax dollar invested, the return is never more than 50 cents. Such projects must be eliminated. The "pork barrel" title really fits, because what we see here is truly excess fat.

Besides these projects not giving positive returns, they also create inflationary pressures and lower potential economic growth. Congress must insist that the administration employ alternative discount rates for public works and other spending requests. And Congress must use these analysis techniques to develop for itself some rational system of budgeting priorities. I repeat: The alternative to such systems is continuing chaos.

PRIME MINISTER LEE, OF SINGAPORE, SAYS ONLY U.S. DETERMINATION IS KEY TO VIETNAM SOLUTION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the independent, articulate, and peppery Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew, is a man whose views on Asian affairs should be listened to.

On his recent trip to the United States he told a university audience that only America's determination to remain in Vietnam will bring Hanoi to the negotiating table.

He said Americans "must meet force with counterforce and let the political situation jell behind the protective military shield."

Prime Minister Lee also said something which fanatic doves and hawks ought to weigh carefully: There is no short, easy way to solve the Vietnam dilemma, and we must face this bitter reality resolutely and with patience.

Prime Minister Lee is not a man who uses words lightly. He is an Asian leader who is personally worried about wars of liberation breaking out across Southeast Asia—should the United States quit in Vietnam.

Here is an independent leader of a small free Asian nation clearly telling us that President Johnson's perseverance in Vietnam is the proper course of action.

I, too, believe that firmness by the United States in Vietnam will pay off in a negotiated settlement. Any other course would lead—it seems to me—to disaster, both politically and militarily.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Boston Globe, October 21, reporting Prime Minister Lee's meeting with students at Harvard University.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRMNESS SEEN KEY TO PEACE TALKS

(By Ken O. Botwright)

Singapore's prime minister, Lee Kuan Yew, told Harvard undergraduates Friday that Hanoi will come to the negotiating table if the government and people of the United States demonstrate their determination to remain in Vietnam until they win.

But he warned that antiwar demonstrations in this country are strengthening the resolve of the North Vietnamese, who have been fighting for 25 years.

He said they realize they can't win by firepower, but are encouraged when they see "an angry American people watching itself get bogged down in a war and tied up in knots, like Gulliver."

The outspoken pro-Western prime minister of the little Southeast Asian state, on a 10-day U.S. tour, paid a short visit to Harvard and M.I.T.

He spoke to students at Harvard's Dunster House, devoting most of his talk to Vietnam.

Lee explained he had "no right to meddle in this (Vietnam) dispute, to advise you to bomb or not to bomb, or to pack it all up and go home."

He added with humorous irony that he had come to the U.S. "to sample public opinion which will help me make contingency plans."

He said the U.S. had inherited a South Vietnamese problem and "it's up to you to solve it." If different decision had been made, the situation in Vietnam "need never have been thus . . . the bus stopped several times, and you could have gotten off before it headed down the present slippery slope, but you chose to go on."

"Is there a way out?" he continued. "Yes I think there is. The same thing that happened in Singapore and Malaya, before they achieved independence from the British, could happen in South Vietnam."

He said the Americans must "meet force with counter-force and let the political situation jell behind the protective military shield."

"You must let the leadership of South Vietnam emerge," he insisted. "Surely you can find a group of men to lead the country. Offer them jobs with Ford if they live, and offer to look after their families if they die, but tell them to run the country honestly."

Lee said Americans should realize there is no short, easy way to solve the Vietnam dilemma, and they should face this bitter reality resolutely and with patience.

He stressed that because of the Vietnam war, "the American government, your way of life and the mettle of your people are on trial" between now and the 1968 presidential election.

When a student asked the premier how long after the 1968 election U.S. forces would have to remain in Vietnam, Lee replied:

"I'm no prophet, but if you demonstrate that you have the patience and determination to stick out this Vietnam war, to see it through—to the end of time, if necessary—then, say, 'My God, let's sit down and talk.'"

He said the North Vietnamese are an intelligent, rational people and they want to survive as a nation.

"After all, there are only 15 million or 17 million of them and more than 200 million of you."

"What will happen if Vietnam goes down the drain?" the premier asked.

"It will prove to Southeast Asia that the East Wind is stronger than the West Wind, that wars of national liberation cannot be won by great imperialist armies, that superpowers with their missiles are paper tigers."

Then, he predicted, "a wave of insurrection" would sweep through Southeast Asia because the "great mass" of people there would want to "be on the winning side."

Lee told a questioner that he would be willing "to take my chances" if the U.S. pulled out of Vietnam.

"I did not come here as a lackey to seek support or protection," he asserted. "If I have to die, by God, I'll die fighting."

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, we are all saddened by the death of Senator Wiley. Our hearts go out to his wife, Dorothy, his daughters and son, to whom we extend our sympathy.

Senator Wiley's friendliness and his cheerful spirit were a joy wherever he went. His optimism and hope, his patriotism and integrity, gave strength to his work—and refreshed also those who who worked with him. He was a true friend.

When I first came to the Senate and was assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary in 1947, Senator Wiley was chairman of the committee. I shall never forget the interest that he showed in the new members. His wise counsel and example, and the opportunities he gave for constructive work, were of great value to me—and I know to many others.

It is uncommon to serve as chairman of two great committees of the Senate—as he did on the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Foreign Relations. In both of those important assignments, Senator Wiley demonstrated the character of his leadership—and always his deep belief in our country and its ideals.

Underlying his public life and his personal life was a quality of Senator Wiley which meant a great deal to me, and I am sure to other members of the Senate. That quality was one of deep religious interest and spiritual convictions, communicated to all of us on many occasions. Manifest in all he did was this Christian spirit—kind, good, humane, and true.

Senator Wiley will be remembered not only as an able and effective representative of his State and his country, but as a man of encompassing goodness and warmth.

He was loved and respected by all who knew him—and we miss Alex Wiley today.

THE SEED BROTHERS—DOWN ON THE FARM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in its Sunday pictorial section on October 1, 1967, the Milwaukee Journal printed an article about two of the finest farmers in Wisconsin—the Seed brothers of Polk County, who have spent their lives on a farm just 25 miles from my own hometown of Clear Lake, Wis.

Alexander "Sandy" Seed, 93, and his younger brother John, 91, have lived on their present farmland all of their lives and had at one time owned and operated a 1,300-acre spread. Their father originally settled the Seed homestead in the 1850's. One hundred years later, while I was serving as Governor of Wisconsin, I was honored to designate the farm as a "century farm."

The Seed brothers have seen the transition in agriculture from horse and man to machine and man. They have been on the front line of the tremendous technological revolution that has changed American agriculture so dramatically in the last half century. Theirs has been a life of family farming rarely matched in today's society.

As the Journal commented:

> The land has been good to the Seed Brothers and they, in turn, have treated their land with the respect that is due to an old friend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Oct. 1, 1967]

THEY LIKE IT DOWN ON THE FARM

When the Seed brothers say: "We like it here" there should be no question that they mean it. Alexander (Sandy) Seed has rounded out 93 years and his sprightly brother, John, 91, on the farm where they were born near the Polk county village of Centuria.

Except for occasional farm-hands, the bachelors handle their own work, both in the fields and in the kitchen. After a lifetime partnership, solutions have just naturally evolved to most problems.

Asked who cooks, for instance, Sandy replied quickly: "Whoever gets hungry first."

The Seed farm goes back almost as far as Wisconsin's statehood. The first land was acquired by their father, James Seed, who migrated here from New Brunswick with his wife, Eliza, in 1850.

The frame house was built 10 years later and still is a comfortable home. The elder Seeds had two other sons and two daughters, now all dead.

Marriage bypassed Alexander and John, what with a mother ailing for many years and the father an invalid from a paralytic stroke for 35 years. They did have a housekeeper for awhile.

Proud of their Scottish-Irish heritage, the Seeds have a file of old pictures and also letters written by members of the family in New Brunswick in the 1850s. The letters were folded to form envelopes and bore no stamps. They probably were sent by personal carrier.

The Seeds' father, who died at 89, left 80 acres of land, for which he paid $4 an acre. John and Sandy have "just accumulated" acreage ever since, buying up adjoining farms as available until they had 1,300 acres. Recently they sold 200 acres to Elmer Anderson, former governor of Minnesota, and they also sold the 160 acre space for a wildlife farm on highway 8.

"We never went in debt much," said Sandy, revealing his Scottish background. "We'd sell 50 or 100 head of cattle and buy a piece."

For years, the Seeds kept 200 to 300 cattle, including a milking herd. But they made a concession to their age some months ago and disposed of their herd. Now the livestock consists of 20 to 25 head of saddle horses and ponies. Sandy still tosses a leg over one when he has a mind to.

Years ago, they used to show horses at the fairs, competed in trotting and pacing events and won with a mare at the Polk county fair.

"Lots of fun," said Sandy.

Except for 80 acres of corn, the Seeds' fields now are in hay, which they bale and sell. They also "make" wood to fire up the kitchen and living room stoves. In fact, they just bought a new chain saw.

Although neither completed the eighth grade, in an old school a mile away, the brothers like to read the Sunday papers. Sandy still manages without glasses, but John needs them. They both enjoy television—especially wrestling. John drives a Rambler, Sandy a pickup truck.

There is not the usual inclination of oldsters to cluck about the foibles of today's youth. Sandy points out, however, that "we had nothing but a lot of hard work and chores, before school and after . . . that's the sports we had."

An old piano which their sister used to play still stands in the living room. On it is a citation by former Gov. Gaylord Nelson to the Seeds for their "century farm," the land having been in the family 100 years. Mementos around the house include an oil candle mold, in which their mother used to make tapers of beef tallow.

It's quiet at the Seed place, on a country road, and with not much action but the chirping of birds in the tall trees—which the brothers planted.

"People say, 'Why don't you go someplace?' but this is home," explained Sandy.

"Somebody is dropping in all the time and everybody is real good to us. In fact, one of the ladies just fetched us over a gallon of soup."

FORMER SOLICITOR GENERAL COX OPPOSES SMATHERS LABOR COURT BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on October 19, 1967, I indicated my opposition to Senator Smathers' bill, S. 176, to establish a Court of Labor-Management Relations to settle national emergency disputes. As I noted in my speech, the experience of the Labor Committee should be brought to bear on this problem since in fact it is a radical change in our entire national labor policy.

Since the hearings before Senator Tydings' subcommittee were cut short, a statement on the subject by former Solicitor General Archibald Cox, one of the outstanding labor experts in the United States, did not receive the notice it deserves. In the statement, Professor Cox, on behalf of Prof. Derek Bok, John Dunlop, and himself indicates the grave dangers he foresees if legislation of the type proposed by Senator Smathers is enacted.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Cox's letter to Senator Tydings be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OCTOBER 11, 1967.

JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Subcommitte on Improvements in Judiciary Machinery, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I appreciate your invitation to testify during the hearings on S. 176 to be held on October 17 and 18, 1967, before a Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. Since several of my Law School classes are regularly scheduled for Tuesdays and Wednesdays, I cannot be in Washington on either of the hearing dates.

In my opinion S. 176 is a thoroughly unsound measure which would have at least four damaging consequences:

1. Its enactment would seriously damage collective bargaining and labor-management relations.

2. It would, in the long run, impose destructive rigidities upon our industrial economy.

3. It would impair confidence in our legal system.

4. It would create a body charged with formulating basic wage policies which was not under the control of either the President or Congress, but separate from the agencies governing such other basic elements of economic policy as taxes, spending, and credit.

The basic reason for these fears is that in a vast diverse and complex economy with strong labor unions, one cannot mix judicial determination of wages and conditions of employment with free collective bargaining.

1. Enactment of S. 176 would injure collective bargaining because the provision of a tribunal with wide jurisdiction to render final and binding decisions on wages and other conditions of employment is incompatible with free negotiations. In any difficult labor negotiations the parties' willingness to compromise hinges largely on the absence of acceptable alternatives. If there is any other recourse—if there is a way to buy time or evade responsibility for making a concession—there is great pressure to choose the alternative. This would be true of any provision for the final and binding settlement of any labor dispute.

Under S. 176 the tendency would be greater both because of the judicial quality which the bill apparently intends to impart to the judgments of the proposed court and because of the breadth of its proposed jurisdiction. There will apparently be many disputes that satisfy the jurisdictional standards. This inference is confirmed by the provision for a full-time chief judge and four associate judges. Because it is to be a continuing body and also because it is to be a court of law, the tribunal would inevitably establish a uniform pattern of decisions; indeed, any obvious lack of uniformity would quickly destroy it. No employer nor union supposing itself to be within the court's jurisdiction would agree to any settlement upon the terms less favorable than the court impose; it would simply refuse to agree with the opposing party and take the case to the court for an award. Or, if the parties did agree to what would be the inevitable judgment, the agreement would not be the result of their own negotiations.

2. Litigation is essentially a non-creative process in labor relations. It tends to freeze existing practices and past relations. I discussed the results at some length in an address before the National Academy of Arbitrators, which is reproduced in the Reports of the Proceedings published by BNA under the title of "Labor Arbitration—Perspectives and Problems" 225–265.

These consequences of permanent dispute machinery became very apparent during World War II under the War Labor Board. Of course, they would be greatly accentuated by the judicial character of the proposed tribunal. Furthermore, while they did not render the machinery intolerable during a comparative brief period, the mounting effect of the rigidities would intensify, however, over a longer period of time.

The resulting drag upon the mobility and fluidity of industry would be damaging to the economy.

3. I am particularly disturbed by the damage which I believe the enactment of S. 176 would do to our courts and legal system.

(a) Although a few unusually skilled individuals can combine the roles of mediator and arbitrator or mediator and fact finder on special occasions, the processes of mediation and conciliation, on the one hand, and judicial adjudication, on the other hand, cannot be mixed over any substantial period without substantial injury to both. The approach of the mediator is necessarily different from that of judge. The mediator is seeking to suggest *some* basis for agreement. He is particularly concerned with finding the points at which compromise is most likely. He must seek to appraise relative power of the parties rather than find an objectively fair and equitable decision. What he does as mediator and especially what he learns as mediator may rise to plague him as judge. Conversely, either his own or the parties' knowledge of the precedent and other limitations which will circumscribe him as judge will impair his effectiveness as a mediator. S. 176, Section 5(d) apparently contemplates that the judges of the proposed court will try to combine this dual role. The confusion will rub off upon the entire judicial process.

(b) It would be a grave mistake to suppose that the orders of the proposed court would command complete voluntary compliance from the members of labor unions. Our own strikes by government employees, defiance of the War Labor Board and experience with compulsory arbitration in Australia all suggest that they would not. Drawing the federal judiciary into a highly-controversial area in which no one can honestly pretend that objective legal principles govern the decisions is bound to weaken the whole notion of law, even if the decisions do command voluntary compliance. If they do not, the difficulty of securing a compliance for the controversial decrees of other courts will be increased.

4. It seems inevitable that the proposed court would come to make basic wage policies, such as that illustrated by the recent executive yardsticks. I am satisfied that a government which is responsible for the state of the economy and controls monetary and fiscal policy cannot permanently sit on the sidelines and allow private institutions to set wage and price policies uninfluenced by government. Devising appropriate mechanisms if bringing government influence to bear without unduly curtailing economic liberty will be one of the major challenges of the next decade. Whatever the answer may turn out to be, surely it is not the establishment of entirely separate judicial machinery charged with formulating such policies in the manner of a court. Creation of judicial machinery would hamper the development of national economic policy even more than a complete bar against executive influence.

Because S. 176 seems fundamentally unsound, I have not directed my attention to details. It seems clear, however, that there are a number of significant shortcomings such as the mandate that proceedings be conducted with the rules of evidence and the failure to define the manner in which the Supreme Court would exercise appellate jurisdiction (assuming that such jurisdiction is not beyond the judicial power).

Professor Bok has read this letter and subscribes to its substance. I have had no opportunity to show it to Professor Dunlop, but he is strongly opposed to the enactment of S. 176.

I hope this will prove helpful to the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

ARCHIBALD COX.

U.S. ROLE IN WORLD AFFAIRS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President during the debate which has been conducted recently in this body about the international situation, and, in particular, the critical remarks about the war in Vietnam, a great deal of history has been either forgotten or ignored. Our attitude toward other free nations has been questioned. Our presence in Vietnam has been criticized. Our programs for future assistance to our friends have come under fire. At the same time, the motives and objectives of our international alliances have been distorted and vilified to a greater extent than ever before by representatives of the Soviet Union and its cohorts. All of this, Mr. President, has occurred with little or no reference to the history of the past two decades, during which this Nation voluntarily spent billions of dollars to help reestablish a free economy in nations willing to cooperate in achieving this goal. Perhaps, therefore, a brief review of our past foreign aid program and its effects might help bring a little better perspective to our present efforts in Vietnam and other areas, and consequently I respectfully submit for the consideration of this body an article published in the September 3, 1967, edition of the Los Angeles Times, entitled "A European's View: What Would We Have Done Without the United States of America?" The article was written by Dr. Anton Mohr, a former professor of history at the Bergen University in Norway, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A EUROPEAN'S VIEW: WHAT WOULD WE HAVE DONE WITHOUT THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA?

(By Anton Mohr)

(NOTE.—Dr. Mohr, a history professor at Bergen University in Norway until his recent retirement, is the author of numerous articles and books on colonial politics and economic-geographical topics. His article was written for Oslo's Aftenposten.)

It must be a bitter feeling for Americans to be reminded, again and again, of the truth in the old saying that the world always hates he who gives.

The Americans are, to the best of my knowledge, the only people in the history of the world who time and again voluntarily have sacrificed prodigal quantities of their blood and their resources to help other people less fortunate than themselves.

Where would we Europeans be today but for the Americans? In the two world wars, it was without question *their* voluntary contributions which finally tipped the scales in favor of the West. Without the active participation of the United States, these wars would at best have lasted much longer than they did, with increased suffering and destruction for the peoples of Europe.

At worst, we would all have become provinces of Hitler's German Reich. Those who today shout the loudest about American imperialism and brutality are exactly the persons who would have had the best chances of spending their last days in a German concentration camp.

OPPOSED COLONIALISM

And what, may I ask, is the nature of this alleged American imperialism? As far as I have been able to find out, it has been the Americans who most actively have opposed colonialism, and who have enthusiastically supported the principle of freedom and independence for all nations. The United States for more than half a century has been the most powerful country on the earth. In spite of this fact, America today does not possess one single colony. The same cannot be said for certain other world powers.

Then, what about Vietnam? Is not this situation a good example of American imperialism? If they win the war, would the Americans depart from a territory which has cost so much of their blood and their money?

The answer is that the Americans came

to Vietnam at the request of the legitimate government of that country, which asked for help in combating the Communist infiltration from the North.

(If the United States at that time had anticipated the cost in time and blood which has resulted, they might not have responded to the request. But that is another story.)

Nothing suggests that the Americans have different intentions in Vietnam following the conclusion of that war, than what they did following the Korean war, or in Japan following the second World War. Besides, it must not be forgotten that the United States is not the only white power fighting in Vietnam.

OTHER ALLIES IN VIETNAM

Australia and New Zealand both have contingents of their armed forces actively engaged there, and neither of these two powers can reasonably be accused of imperialistic intentions. Both share the American apprehension that all of Southeast Asia could become submerged under Communist dictatorship and tyranny.

In the spring of 1947, all of Europe was on the verge of physical and psychological collapse. Industrial production in Germany was down to 27% of the prewar level. The situation in Austria, Italy and Greece was not much better. Our native Norway had lost almost 50% of its merchant marine, while industrial production was down to about 40% of the level before the war. Even worse was the feeling of desperate hoplessness, which had affected large segments of the people on our continent.

With the wartime hate and bitterness still vividly in mind, the people of Europe had no comprehension of the great possibilities for Europe inherent in united efforts and mutual understanding. One did not seem to realize that the high import duties, and the barriers at all national boundaries, were in fact the principal obstacle to technological developments, and the expansion of commercial markets.

Against this background of hopelessness, hunger and misery, one must look at the Marshall Plan. On June 5, 1947, the then secretary of state, Gen. Marshall, gave his famous speech at Harvard University. In this speech he offered to all the countries of Europe the financial and material assistance of the United States to rebuild the productive capacity of our continent. As far as is known, this is the first time that a responsible statesman anywhere expounded the idea of Europe as a whole economic entity.

The Marshall Plan was greeted with enthusiasm in Western Europe, but was rejected by the Soviet Union. The objective of the Kremlin, then as now, is a Communistic world order, not the reestablishment of a free economy.

KEY PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECT

The Marshall Plan became an outstanding success, the effect being a "psychological blood transfusion," in the words of Paul Hoffman, head of the American organization. The psychological effect was actually the most important. The Europeans did have the technological know-how, the willingness to work, the marketing organizations, and an enormous demand for all kinds of goods. What they lacked was financial resources to exploit their own abilities and the possibilities offered.

America gave them the needed financial resources, and thereby new hope and faith in the future. Reconstruction and rehabilitation now took place at an almost explosive rate. In 1947, the total industrial production in these countries was still only 85% of the prewar level. Four years later this had increased to 136% of prewar, and it has steadily increased ever since.

It was a whole continent—our own—which at that time was rescued from despair and worse, through the magnanimous help of one single nation.

We Europeans often accuse the Americans of only being interested in money and material things. They have, we say, no real culture. It could of course be mentioned that during the 20 years 1946–1965, the United States had 51 Nobel prize winners while the Soviets had nine, and China two.

It could also be pointed out that the United States since 1948 has financed 74% of the cost of aid to the refugees displaced by wars. This, while the population of the United States constitutes only 6% of the world's population, while Soviet Russia has 7%, and China 22%.

What would we have done without the U.S.A.?

THE NEW LOOK OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, there has been a recent rash of criticism against the Federal Housing Administration. These critics claim that the FHA is unable to administer effectively housing programs geared to the center city and the lower income families. There have been accusations that the leadership of the FHA is really not interested in the implementation of these programs and that the Agency is too committed to the middle class and the suburbs to understand the plight of the inner city.

I do not feel that these charges are wholly true. The FHA and the Administration have made vast improvements in the past year to change the Agency into a responsive, dynamic tool for urban development. The Federal Housing Administration is now holding a conference in which the local office directors and chief underwriters are participating. Phil Brownstein, Commissioner of the FHA, delivered an address to this group on Monday in which he outlines the improvements that have been made in the past few months. He cites: the advancements in rehabilitation sponsored by the FHA, the accelerated processing time in multifamily unit applications for insurance, and the successful implementation of the rent supplement program. These are just a few examples that serve as evidence that the FHA can turn its talents to the center city and to providing additional housing units for the low and moderate income families.

More important than these advancements, however, is the sense of direction that Commissioner Brownstein mentions. He states:

> The principle reason for the existence of the FHA in 1967 is to enlist and encourage private enterprise to play a leading role in providing decent housing for families of low and moderate income, and in providing housing and related human conditions in the inner city—especially in the slums and blighted portions of the inner city.

This is a firm refutation to those who claim that there is no interest in the center city on the part of the FHA. It is a clear mandate to the local employees to get busy in the cities and it is a commitment at the national level to back up local personnel when they take the additional risks involved with providing more and better housing in the cities.

Commissioner Brownstein gives an honest appraisal of the problems that the FHA presently confronts. He is the first to admit that there are delays in processing time within the FHA. However, he calls for a dynamic approach on the part of the local FHA people to eliminate the "negativism and the torturous slowness of our processing of multifamily applications." In addition, Commissioner Brownstein indicates that the FHA can no longer react to applications, but rather it must go out and seek applications involving the inner city, rehabilitation, below market interest rate programs, and rent supplement programs.

Mr. President, I feel that Commissioner Brownstein has given his personnel the mandate to involve themselves with the needs of the inner city and the poor urban family. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks to the Directors Conference, entitled "FHA's Job Today," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FHA's JOB TODAY

(Remarks of P. N. Brownstein Assistant Secretary-Commissioner, at Directors' Conference, October 23, 1967)

We meet at a critical moment in the history of our country, and at an equally critical time in the life of FHA.

The trouble in our cities—the riots, looting and sniper fire; the dramatic disparity between the living conditions of the poor and discriminated against and the material affluence of middle class America; the crimes and the lawlessness—all these things have revealed with chilling clarity the enormous and explosive problems that ferment in the slums and ghettos of our cities.

This country is fighting a guerrilla war in far off Viet Nam. Something similar and equally deadly is threatened in our cities—and in too many places it actually has happened. Few people doubt that, unless major measures are taken, the trouble in our cities can prove to be as great a threat to our national security as the fighting in Viet Nam.

This, I am sure, is not news to you. You have only to open any newspaper, or any magazine, to confirm all that I have said, and much more that I have not said.

Responsible people throughout the country are groping for a better understanding of the causes of these ominous outbursts of urban violence. But no thoughtful person seriously believes there is any instant answer, any easy panacea. Because the causes are deep-seated and have developed over time, the solutions must be basic ones which remove the sources of discontent, deprivation, and despair. Perhaps we can identify the long term solutions best by asking ourselves what much of the protest is about. People want recognition, opportunity and hope, people want status and dignity. They want to join the mainstream of American society. They want to participate in its unparalleled abundance. They want an end to the discrimination that has denied them these things. In particular, they want better education, better jobs, and better housing. They want a chance. They want to know they have a chance. They want evidence that the nation cares and is willing to make this chance available. America must begin to respond to these needs quickly and visibly.

By now you may be wondering if this is not a rather strange introduction for a kick-off speech of a HUD Assistant Secretary in charge of FHA operations to a Washington meeting of FHA Directors and Chief Underwriters. If those questions are running through your mind, it's a good thing you came to this meeting. Because I am going to tell you how these grave matters relate directly to you and your jobs. The reason is as simple as it is fundamental.

As the unit of the Department of Housing and Urban Development with principal responsibility for administering private housing programs, it is our job to enlist and encourage private enterprise to play a leading role in providing decent housing for families of low- and moderate-income, and in improving housing and related human conditions in the inner city—especially in the slums and blighted portions of the inner city. This is one of the principal reasons the Department was created; it is one of the major objectives the Secretary has announced again and again. It is what the American people, the Congress and the President expect of us. It is the greatest and most urgent responsibility of FHA—its principal reason for existence in the year of 1967.

You may be thinking that this is a new and strange job for FHA. It is new; but it is not strange. Every government organization must use its programs to deal with today's problems. Every organization must change as the needs of the country change. It will do us no good to look wistfully back at the days when FHA's principal role, and its proudest achievement, was the establishment of the long term, low downpayment mortgage as a revolutionary device for increasing the number of Americans who could afford a good house in the suburbs, or a decent apartment. As an organization, we have a right to reflect with pride on this great accomplishment. But we must also recognize that we have done this job so well that FHA insured mortgages now are needed and used for only a tiny portion of suburban new construction.

It will do no good to look wistfully back to the 1940's and early 1950's when FHA's principal job was to help provide housing for war workers and, later to provide privately built dwelling units in great abundance for returning servicemen and to overcome the critical post-war housing shortage. This job, too, has been done, with considerable distinction if not without controversy.

In the face of today's urgent, high priority job of enlisting private enterprise to provide housing for low- and moderate-income families, and to rebuild and restore inner city slums and blighted areas, the only justification we have for looking backward is to regain the organizational drive, dedication, sense of urgency, and speed of action for which FHA was noted in those earlier times. The job we are entrusted with today will require every ounce of energy, every pound of thrust, every spark of evangelism that we brought to those earlier accomplishments—and more besides. In today's urgent job we cannot afford to fail.

I suppose it has come to your attention that there are some who say FHA cannot do this new job. There are those who believe FHA is too wedded to the split level house for middle class residents of suburban subdivision to be interested in, or capable of, mounting a massive effort to help private enterprise house families of low- and moderate-income. It is also believed that FHA has no interest in the inner city—that we, like most private lenders, redline large segments of the central city—where the housing needs are greatest and the problems most pressing. There are others who say that FHA has lost its drive, that it is too cautious and too bogged down in inflexible rules, immovable procedures and tortuous red tape to mobilize itself and private enterprise to do the job which must be done. All of these things and more have been said, not merely by disappointed builders whose projects were rejected, but by people of deep sincerity—responsible people. There are people today who are urging that this job be taken away from FHA and be given to a new organization in the department or somewhere else.

I do not agree with these sentiments, and I will tell you why.

First, FHA personnel have the skills to do the job that must be done. We have the experience, and the organization, already in being, it would take time and be difficult to create a substitute of the same size and competence. All we need is the will.

Second, contrary to the myths which still abound, FHA has already gone some distance in the direction of turning its programs and its talents to the inner city and to providing housing for low- and moderate-income families. It is not generally recognized, but over 51 percent of FHA's business for existing homes under Section 203 was in the central city, and 20 percent in what could be described as blighted area. Over 67 prcent of our 221(d)(2) existing home business was in the inner city.

Also, FHA has shown that it can and will work with profit and nonprofit sponsors to produce 221(d)(3) BMIR housing. In a year and a half, FHA launched a brand new, and quite difficult rent supplement program. All available funds have been allocated and many more rent supplement proposals are in the pipeline awaiting more contract authority from the congress.

In recent years, FHA has done more pioneering in residential rehabilitation in blighted and slum areas than has ever before been attempted by anyone.

I do not think these are the actions of an organization without heart, without drive, and without interest in the housing problems of low and moderate income families.

Third, I have faith that FHA, as an organization, can make the additional changes in attitude and action needed to accelerate the job we have already begun.

To some extent, our problem is to make our public image catch up with our actions. The only way to counter bad and unfair publicity, is to let people and newspapers know the facts. This we intend to do, but it can only be done by your support and actions.

I want you to send in immediately any newspaper story that is critical of FHA, or distorts the facts. We want to know about these things immediately, not receive them routinely several weeks later.

Also, if a critical problem develops in your jurisdiction, I want to know about it immediately by telephone. Far too often we have learned about this kind of problem by reading about it in the newspaper when it is too late to counter the unfavorable impression it creates.

But the problem is not entirely that we are misunderstood. While we have done much more than we receive credit for, we are still not doing enough, and we are not doing it fast enough.

Here are the things that must be done. Here are FHA's goals for 1967 and the years ahead. Here are the things we should measure our actions against. Here are the things against which we will be judged.

1) Everyone of our employees, from the director down to the receptionist and secretaries, must understand that our job is to serve the public. This we must do positively, cheerfully, and courteously, our job is not to make it hard and frustrating for people to deal with us, but to make it easy, pleasant and rewarding. I am not saying you should say yes to everybody. I am saying that whatever you say should be said courteously and quickly.

2) We must do all that we can to be sure that everyone of our programs is administered in a way which assures there is truly nondiscrimination and that equal opportunity is a reality. This means that every allegation of discriminatory practices must be dealt with speedily and affirmatively. We cannot and will not condone a practice or pattern of different treatment for persons seeking to take advantage of our program.

The housing counseling service, which now is in effect in 15 cities, and will continue to be expanded, affords an excellent tool for helping us make certain that all prospective buyers or renters are given equal treatment. But to take advantage of this resource, we must emphasize to those being counseled the importance of reporting back on the results of their visits. This I know will be the subject of detailed discussion during this conference.

In the sale or rental of our acquired properties it is critical that we maintain policies and practices which assure equal opportunity. And all brokers, sales agents, management firms as well as our own personnel cannot have the slightest doubt about our position and must follow it to letter. There simply is no way and it is your job to see that this policy is carried out in clear, unequivocal and positive terms. And the same holds true in assuring equal employment opportunity and your responsibility to see that this is affirmatively achieved.

3. We have to recognize that stimulating a flow of mortgage funds into the inner city, yes even into the slums, for the transfer of houses, for rehabilitation, and for new construction, is an FHA mission of the highest priority. No longer can we afford to wait until an applicant comes in and bludgeons us into this kind of activity.

I want you to go looking for applications. I want you to take the leadership in seeing that FHA programs are used to accomplish these priority objectives. I want you to know that applications involving the inner city, rehabilitation, BMIR and rent supplements are the first things your staff should work on, not the last.

We have developed a new manual for processing multifamily rehabilitation projects which you'll hear more about later. This manual, which contains some far reaching policy and procedural shifts, is designed to make it possible for you to process and *promote* sound rehabilitation projects in your jurisdictions, both in and out of urban renewal areas.

You will also hear more discussion of my recent field letter eliminating the requirement for a finding of economic soundness in riot or riot-prone areas of the city. This has the effect of making our programs available everywhere in the city.

I am speaking now of priorities. I do not mean that we do not have a responsibility to continue to administer effectively all of the programs the Congress has given us. For we also have a responsibility for increasing the general supply of housing. This will support and reinforce our efforts to help those of low- and moderate-income. Also, a good project for low- and moderate-income families located in the suburbs can be a significant achievement in broadening housing choices.

4. There is another important, yes indispensable, thing we must do. "We must eliminate the negativism, and the tortuous slowness of our processing of multifamily applications. This is our real achilles heel—and it has got to go.

It is not easy to counter the charges against FHA when you are confronted as often as I am with case after case in which we took an inexcusably long time to reach a decision. I know there are frequently mitigating circumstances.

But these are never very convincing when you are trying to explain long delays.

Extensive massaging of these applications won't make you any righter when you finally have to make a decision. What it will do is make everybody mad, give them good grounds for criticising us, and incidentally, perhaps lose the market for which the project was initially intended. When I look at our loss record on many of our multifamily programs, I am even more baffled to understand why we take so much time. The record does not show that our long and profound agonizing over multifamily proposals has improved our judgment.

You will hear more about what has been done and what will be done to wipe the cobwebs off our multifamily processing, particularly for BMIR, rent supplement, and 220 projects. But procedures and processes are not the vital ingredient. The vital ingredient is a will and determination to get the job done quickly—a true sense of urgency—a willingness to establish deadlines and to meet them—a continuous pressure from the director to bring things to a head or know why. It is, I think, basically an administrative and leadership problem.

We intend to do our part, to establish deadlines, to keep the pressure on to get decisions made quickly. For this, I am looking to the Assistant Commissioner for Operations, the Regional Administrators, and to the Regional Operations Commissioners.

But the final responsibility for leadership, in each individual office, rests with YOU, the directors and their chief underwriters, and the assistant regional administrators for FHA.

5. We must be willing to take the risks necessary to accomplish the urgent job of assisting and encouraging private enterprise to house low- and moderate-income families, and to revive the inner city. It is highly likely that there are more risks inherent in achieving this kind of urgent social purpose, than in the insurance of loans on suburban subdivision.

There has been an attitude on the part of some, that FHA's principal job is to avoid making mistakes, and to preserve the sanctity of its insurance reserves. And it is indeed important that holders of FHA-insured mortgages know their investments are safe.

I take the view that risks are inherent in an insurance program (otherwise there would be no justification or need for insurance); that since the vast majority of the Congress as well as the executive branch expect us to carry out the mission, then they must expect us willingly to take the risks inherent in such a mission.

This does not by any means require the elimination of prudence and common sense. So long as we have a public responsibility, we can never do that. It does mean that we should be prepared to take the risks that are justified and prudent in the light of the urgent social objectives to be achieved.

Since nobody has ever invested extensively in reviving and rebuilding the inner city and since there has been little private experience in providing housing for low- and moderate-income families, I do not believe anyone is prepared to say exactly how much risk is involved.

In the long run, if all our efforts are successful, the risks may be far less than some anticipate.

I want us to develop and support projects which give reasonable promise of success, which give reasonable promise of improving the housing conditions of low- and moderate-income families, and improving the inner city.

A project should be rejected if it does not appear to give reasonable promise of accomplishing these objectives. It should not be rejected simply because it involves poor people, or because it is in a portion of the city you have been accustomed to rejecting or red-lining for old-fashioned, arbitrary reasons.

If you apply this standard to each project you approve, I believe no one can fault you. If you apply this standard to each project you approve, you will be fully backed by me and have the full support of the Department.

Let me repeat and summarize, I am asking you and every employee of FHA to enter into a new crusade—to see that our programs are used to the fullest extent possible to improve housing conditions for low- and moderate-income families and to revive the inner city.

This means making our home programs available for the purchase, sale and improvement of properties throughout the inner city. It means encouraging rehabilitation and new construction in the inner city. It means developing good BMIR and rent supplement project both in the inner city and in outlying areas, for we have to disperse the poor and discriminated against to all parts of this city as well as improve their housing conditions in the inner city where most of them now live.

To be successful in this vital undertaking everyone should carry away from here (and transmit to everyone working under you) a new commitment to this objective, a sense of urgency which recognizes the importance of the job before us, and a determination to take the steps, reach decisions, and make the sacrifices necessary. I want you to put the highest possible priority on promoting the use of our various programs which can contribute to this objective.

I want you in the multifamily area, to slash through red tape, indecision, and pussyfooting, to set rigid time goals and see that they are met—in exactly the same way that, in the past few years, we have performed a miraculous speed-up in the processing of home mortgage applications, I want you to be prudent as well as urgent, but I want you to be prepared to take the risks necessary to accomplish the job and to know that you will be fully supported in the decisions you make.

The job I am asking you to undertake is one of the most urgent the nation faces. The President knows it, the Secretary knows it, most Members of the Congress know it, private businessmen know it. In the months ahead, all these eyes will be watching us.

I believe we are capable of doing the job, or I wouldn't be saying these things to you. But let us keep one thing in mind.

Just as sure as you are sitting here today, if FHA fails to respond effectively and affirmatively to this challenge, if FHA fails to produce the results needed, then no longer will FHA be looked at as our nation's housing agency and the need and justification for its continuation may very well be the central theme. Undoubtedly alternative organizations will be developed because the need is too great and too critical to leave a void.

I have given a number of reasons why I believe FHA must mount a major effort to accelerate and expand use of those of our programs which can serve families of low- and moderate-income and revive and rebuild the inner city. Let me give you one more reason. You should work at this task as though your job depended on it—because it may!

SAD 22D ANNIVERSARY FOR UNITED NATIONS BECAUSE OF SENATE WALKOUT ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this weeks marks the 22d anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

Every American President in office since 1945 has unequivocally affirmed his belief that the United Nations is indispensable to this Nation's dedicated efforts to achieve a world based upon freedom and maintained in peace.

Ambassador Arthur Goldberg probably spoke for most thoughtful American citizens recently when he said:

> The United Nations, that great center for harmonizing the action of nations, has served the world community through twenty-two turbulent years. Admidst the troubles and dangers that still prevail, we pause to pledge anew our dedication to the United Nations' great aims of peace.
>
> The United Nations was founded not in the belief that it would guarantee permanent freedom from conflict and disagreement, but in the belief that the basic hopes of man are for peace rather than war, for rule of law rather than rule by violence, and for economic and social progress rather than disorder and stagnation.
>
> In working toward these goals, the United Nations will not always succeed. When its members are not sufficiently faithful to its purposes, it may fail. But as long as cooperation and mutual tolerance are essential to our survival, its members will have no choice but to try again.

Today the whole world is looking toward the United Nations for its help in resolving the two great conflicts which confront us: Vietnam and the Middle East. The very fact that after only 22 years of life the United Nations is looked to for answers and guidance is, itself, a high tribute to this world organization.

The United Nations has been neither an unqualified success nor a tragic failure. In 22 years, the U.N. has had both great moments and severe setbacks.

But the U.S. Senate, which ratified the U.N. Charter by a vote of 89 to 2 in 1945, has dealt the United Nations one of the unkindest cuts of all.

After 22 years the Senate has failed to ratify a single human rights convention. The Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery are still largely ignored and unnoticed by us.

Let the Senate make the 22d anniversary of the United Nations a cause for real celebration by giving its advice and consent to all the human rights conventions during the first session of the 90th Congress.

TAX CREDITS FOR TRAINING WORKERS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on September 19 I introduced S. 2429, the "human investment tax credit" bill whose intent is to spur the efforts of the private sector of industry in training or upgrading skills in on-the-job training.

An editorial in the Indianapolis Star commented editorially on that proposal as a commendable approach to a difficult problem. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Toward More Job Training," from the September 26 issue of the Star, may appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD MORE JOB TRAINING

> One of the better ways to accomplish the training or retraining of workers is to get it done by private industry, partly or wholly on the job. We hope Congress will take a thoughtful and receptive look at a proposal to encourage industry to do this.
>
> Introduced by Senator R. Vance Hartke (D-Ind.), the measure would provide tax credits to an employer for a portion of the cost of on-the-job training of persons previously unemployed or being upgraded to higher skills. This is a beginning on a sound approach to the needs for job training both to reduce problem areas of unemployment and to help low-skilled workers to advance themselves.

We do suggest that it's only a beginning. We think Senator Hartke was viewing the matter rather superficially when he said, "Industry has neither the patience nor the willingness to invest its own resources in the training process on the scale necessary without the tax credit I propose."

Many industrial firms already operate such training programs. To bring about private investment in the process on a significantly larger scale involves more than just patience and willingness. It also involves availability of resources and competitive position in both the product market and the labor market. This is so in the case of smaller business and industry, toward which the proposal is particularly aimed, at least as much as for larger firms.

The total tax burden, beyond such relief as might be provided by tax incentives, has much to do with the ability of employers to invest in training programs. The trend in general labor costs affects the amount of resources which can be allocated to training. The prudent employer must think twice about a training program if it duplicates what government is doing at the expense of taxpayers, including himself.

Tax incentives to employers for job training programs would be fine. To be of greatest usefulness, they need to be part of a general government philosophy of looking to business and industry to carry on appropriate training, and of holding to a minimum the tax burdens under which business and industry operate.

CANDOR IS APPRECIATED

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in addressing college and university audiences, as I often do, I have found that the most appreciated virtue on the campus is candor. At least, it is appreciated from speakers. The gaps we so often hear about—the generation gap and the credibility gap—reflect a lack of candor, I believe. They reflect our unwillingness to discuss our policies as a Nation in the harsh terms of reality.

It is with candor we should approach the people, Mr. President. This I have tried to do, particularly when speaking to students and their faculties. I ask unanimous consent that one of those speeches, delivered last spring at the Midwest Conference on World Affairs in Kearney, Nebr., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN PERSPECTIVE

(Remarks of U.S. Senator GALE McGEE, Democrat from Wyoming, at the Midwest Conference on World Affairs, Plenary, April 18, 1967, Kearney, Nebr.)

Whatever else, I've resolved to be candid today; and being candid, I can say to you that a third of a century ago, on an afternoon like this, I wouldn't even have been inside a building like this. I would have been outside, where you ought to be right now, drinking up that sunshine, and kind of wiggling the dandelions between your toes!

It is a real thrill to get to be back here in Kearney, and it's kind of like old home week. You know, back in those days, Loraine was a teacher over at Holdrege, Nebraska, until I rescued her from her plight. We started out life together right here over in the College Courts. So we were just over there a few minutes ago reminiscing. The old house still looks pretty good. We left it in good condition, and I was talking to some of my former cronies down here who used to pose as teachers in the school system. We decided that the kids we had in school turned out surprisingly well. Our only fear in those days was that those students might try to do some of the things that we were already doing as faculty members, and we got them headed off in time so that the world is surviving their impact even though it still quakes from ours!

But we are yet torn by what happened to me politically. My politics are a sore point in lots of places. Most of all, in my own family. I brought the Republican National Committee with me today—my mother, my brother, and everybody else in my family. They're all here. I'm the only derelict. We used to have a lot of fun over that. Mother still takes a lot of kidding because I flipped the way I did. You ought to know—at least there were some good roots back there. When I went to Wayne, for college, my freshman year we organized a political club; and I was the first President of the Young Republicans on the campus at Wayne. People asked Mother what happened to me since, and she just shrugs her shoulders and says, "I suppose he learned to read."

But I'm really not here to reminisce or to politic but to talk to you about the foreign policy of the United States. And I want to talk about it less in particular terms and more in larger and broader ones—in short, to have a look at "the big picture."

To begin with, a word about the so-called Generation Gap, or the credibility gap. Very frankly, I believe the gap reflects the lack of candor and straight-forwardness in the use of the English language with people who are genuinely interested in the world while trying to understand what it's all about. Too often we have tended to talk about Vietnam, about military advisors, about freedom, about democracy, and all those things, while at the same time we have been hesitant, if not reluctant, to discuss our policies in the harsh terms of reality. The price we now pay for our lack of straightforwardness is the doubt and distrust of a generation which doesn't believe it has been dealt with in honest terms.

The time has come in this great country of ours to talk bluntly, unequivocally, about the world questions which disturb us deeply and even threaten to engulf us if we fail to act wisely. First, to assess what is happening to us in Asia, we must start by measuring the emotional consequences of waging our first conflict on a TV screen; Vietnam is the first war we've ever waged in the quiet of our homes, the first time that most of our people have seen blood spilled—figuratively—on the living room rug. It is necessary, too, to remind ourselves constantly that the story from Vietnam has an additional peculiarity. It is photographed, reported, exaggerated, all on one side. TV camera crews are conspicuously absent from the Hanoi side of combat.

And so, in the face of these experiences we're trying to grow up, to mature as a Nation, saddled by the forces of history with the terrifying responsibilities of world leadership. If we are to succeed, however, we must judge our deeds and measure our role in proper perspective. Someday, for example, we're going to be reading about Vietnam on the pages of new history books. I am certain that when we do, we will be struck by how readily it will fit into a pattern and a course of things—all quite in contrast to its frightening and frustrating dimensions which now seem to characterize it from newscast to newscast—day to day. In short, what I'm saying is that on the TV screen we have gotten so close to Vietnam, so immersed with each day's battles, with each thrust of daily bombing sorties, with each act of terrorism, that I fear we have lost sight of the big picture.

For our purposes today, therefore, I should like to try to set the foreign policy of the United States today against the backdrop of history, and then to reduce the story of Vietnam to the two or three pages of a history book it may some day fill. In short, I propose to sketch the position of the United States in the world in general and then to project the Far Eastern policy of the United States in particular.

First, from whence have we come? Let me put it this way—that in a civilized world, in which we marvel at the tremendous strides that we have taken in medical science, in technology, in the science of living, in an affluent society, we have made almost no significant strides in the science of the international politics of living together. If Napoleon Bonaparte were to return to the earth today, he would find the world around him a strangely familiar thing in terms of the relations among nations. If Kaiser Wilhelm could return from the First World War, I'm sure he would have the same reaction—or Adolf Hitler from the Second World War. The point is that, while we have scored high marks in science and technology and affluent living, we've flunked most of our tests in achieving international order and stability.

And so as perhaps the major victor of World War II, our nation was compelled to accommodate to the hard facts of international life; namely, a world where there is no law—no established order, no power of sanction, little stability. What's more, we quickly had to face the brutal fact that the only substitute for war that so-called civilized man had yet worked out is what the political scientist calls the "balance of power." Adlai Stevenson described it thusly (and he was no great conservative or reactionary or isolationist in the philosophy of the world): "As I see it, after World War II, there had to be drawn a fine line between the realistic poles of power in the world; and until such a line is drawn, it is useless to believe that we can take any meaningful strides forward into a better world." And this precisely is what has been happening. It is the main characteristic of what both the Soviets and the Americans describe as the Cold War.

What it has involved has been the almost constant maneuvering and the jousting by great powers; the ebbing and the flowing of power politics in testing and challenging the capability and determination of your chief rival. Let me hasten to inject at this point that nobody that I know of proposes the balance of power as the solution to our world problems. Rather, it more properly becomes only the starting place—not the stopping place. It achieves the temporary stability around which calculated steps forward can be undertaken. This, then, is the philosophy of the politics of the world around us in which I believe. In other words, *we have to start where we are;* not where we ought to have been, not where we might have been, not where we someday will be, but where we are—now.

In hindsight, the last twenty years record a remarkable series of successes approaching stability between the two principal world powers—the Soviet Union and the United States. All around us it is now possible to measure in real terms the improvement of the atmosphere, the change in the climate of East-West tensions. Suffice it to say that, if for a moment we could place a globe of the world in front of us, and with a piece of white chalk in hand, we could start up near the northwest corner of the Soviet Union in Finland, and begin to draw a clearly defined white line down across eastern Europe, turning east above the borders of Greece and Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Afghanistan, on above Pakistan and India, almost to the China Sea, and thereby we would have sketched that fine line to which Adlai Stevenson made reference. That imaginary line, though fine, is so firmly drawn, that neither side dares to breech it with impugnity or irresponsibility. This reflects the rebalancing of the world.

To be specific, one can point to the western part of the world today—Europe—and discover again the measured improvement of relations between East and West.

But what we also discovered in the wake of World War II, may I add, was that the world is round. You know, we used to believe that everything happened in Europe. In our history books the affairs of the globe were generally settled in Vienna or Versailles or at The Hague. And when we taught the history of civilization, our starting point at best was the eastern Mediterranean and then moved west. And we seemed openly to defy the theory of Christopher Columbus for so long. The war in the Pacific, however, quickly taught us that the world in all truth was round; that no longer could the balance of the world be redressed solely by reshaping the politics of Europe.

Let us consider next, then, what happened in Asia as a result of World War II. The war against Japan was largely an American show. The United States almost unilaterally was responsible for the total discombobulation of the old Colonialist's Asia, Japan was destroyed. The British, left so strapped by the war in Europe, withdrew from the East. We helped to force the Dutch out of the South Pacific, and ultimately contributed to the withdrawal of the French. And so what happened in Eastern Asia was more—far more—violent, far more chaotic even than what happened in Europe with the defeat of Hitler and Mussolini. For not only was all of the old infrastructure of the East torn to shreds by the war and its aftermath, but the largest, single, national complex in Asia—namely China—was torn by convulsive changes which still go on today, and the dimensions of which we can't yet understand completely.

As the principal victor in the East, it is my argument that the United States of America has an international, even an historically moral, obligation to be responsible for putting the pieces back together again, in as helpful and meaningful a way as possible. One of the greatest temptations facing us, of course, is to go home, to forget about it. After all, what does China mean to us? Why be concerned with Japan? Why worry about Vietnam—11,000 miles away? Well, such questions carry me back down memory lane to earlier days here in Kearney thirty years ago. Those questions possess an echoing, haunting ring, because they sound so much like the questions my generation was then raising about Europe—3,000 miles away. And it all leaves one with the strange feeling that this is where I came in a generation ago.

Each generation has to come to grips with this harsh kind of decision. And those in the thirties who thought we could hide, could bury our heads, could pretend it wasn't there in the hopes Hitler would go away, have been replaced by an upgraded group, who now, grudgingly, are willing to believe that the three-mile limit off the coast of the United States ought to be extended to Western Europe. But they're as ardently isolationist as those of the thirties were. Only this current generation proudly boast of their enlightenment. They've caught up with the changing world, they say, because they extend the boundaries of our interests another 3,000 miles to Europe. The tragedy of those people who think this way, of course, is that, while they're catching up with the *last world war*, they remain blind to a new world in the East, a world teetering dangerously on the brink of an even greater conflict. Just as my generation ridiculed the need to worry about events in "tiny Austria," or "little Poland," so today's generation asks, "Why Vietnam, or why Thailand?" Yet, the parallel is valid, and the issue is critical. The importance of the right decision is still as desperate as 1941. And this is what we seek to come to grips with at the present moment.

So I'd like to submit now what I consider to be the hard base of the Far Eastern policy of the United States.

First of all, it rests upon the conviction that no one nation ought ever to be in the position to dominate the Far East. This is as important in Eastern Asia as it was important in Western Europe at the end of World War II. Parenthetically, it is as important to the Soviet Union that this precept be adhered to as it is to the United States or to India or to Indonesia.

In these difficult days of the 1960's the great question mark of China hangs heavily over the capitals of so many parts of the world, and we in the U.S.A. find ourselves cast in the role of that nation which is compelled to do something about it. So our first task, our first premise, our first base of policy is to make sure that no one nation achieves a position where it can dominate the Eastern hemisphere. Mainland China is the cause of worry—and in most parts of Asia—even fear. Now I'm mindful of all the reservations we have because of the uncertainties of Peking. We can't know for sure what is going on in there. Yet, I suspect that in some respects we may know more about what's going on in China than the Chinese in Peking do, for lots of very real reasons at the present moment. And you can never be sure in history of the motivation of any group at any given time.

But at least, we can learn from the past; and we can be cautious about the implications of the present. Let us not forget that, historically, the small countries on the rim of China have been uneasy about a whole succession of regimes in China if for no other reason than the vast difference in sheer size. Chinese economic aggressiveness, moreover, is a foreboding fact of life to most Southeast Asians. The overseas Chinese remain a matter of grave concern among a lot of the people in Eastern Asia.

The first time I traveled the countries located on the rim of China was in 1959. I returned again in 1962 and then, just a few months ago, I made a third trip there. On each trip the governments which stretched all the way from Pakistan and India around to Korea and Japan expressed their fear of China. As the Premier of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew, has said, it is fear of China that dominates all small nations in Asia. The Tunku of Malaysia says, "China remains the heart of the problem in Asia. But for a long time most leaders there thought there was nothing they could do." As the President of the Legislature of the Philippines said to me in 1962, "We don't like the Chinese. We don't want any part of them, but there's nothing we can do about them." He said, "They say they're the 'wave of the future'; we have no reason to doubt it. We're going to have to try to live with them and come under their domination, if necessary, because we have no alternative. None of us are strong enough to stop them." Until the war in Vietnam, this feeling was typical.

As for the United States, the perplexing problem of the two Chinas directly involved us. Whatever else we should or should not have done in the late 1940's, suffice it to say that what we have done since is to seal off the expansionist proclivities of the Peking Government. This has been achieved successfully in several ways, first in the Straits of Formosa; then later in Korea, where a temporary line was drawn. This, in fact, had resulted from a temporary agreement at the end of World War II in order to facilitate the demobilization of Japanese troops at the end of the conflict; to keep Russian and American troops from stepping on each other's toes in the process; and, finally, to keep the Koreans from cutting each others' throats. But after the demobilization was completed, the "temporary" division of Korea along the 38th Parallel became more and more permanent. The issue in the Korean War was that of respecting the integrity of that line—however temporary it started out to be. In the Korean War all we were saying was that no government should be permitted to change that line by force of arms.

Likewise, the line represented by the American Seventh Fleet in the Formosa Straits had been firmly drawn. That Fleet not only protected our wartime ally, Chiang Kai-shek, on Taiwan, it also prevented him from attacking the Mainland. Stability—not violence—was the key to American policy.

The same applies to India. Twice the great republic that was inspired by the example of Mahatma Gandhi's non-violence was threatened by direct assault on its common frontiers with Mainland China. Suffice it to remind ourselves that today, that pacifist society that once was India, now has a half-million highly trained troops along the frontiers of China. Its purpose is to contain China.

I remember a very revealing conversation I had in 1959 with Prime Minister Nehru in his office. We were discussing this very matter of India's modern non-violence arrayed against the backdrop of a violent world. To this great leader of modern India I confessed my hope, born of World War II, that India might assume the role of keeper of the balance of Asia, particularly by containing and restraining China. Mr. Nehru's reply was, "My people aren't ready for that. We may have to be attacked first, as you were." He said, "I've read American history, and I know how slow you Americans were to rise to the threat of Hitler. You rose to that threat of Hitler only after the Japanese attacked you at Pearl Harbor." (He had remembered his history well.) Then continuing, he said, "We in India may have to go through that same kind of an experience. We may have to be shocked into doing what we should have been doing all along." A prophetic statement, as it turned out. Only after India was attacked by the Chinese through Tibet in 1961–62, did she begin to respond in ways predicted by the Prime Minister. Her resistance was quickly aided by American-supplied aircraft and supplies.

This joint effort by India and the United States closed some of the gap which had long separated the two in world politics. But more than that, it illustrated another phase of the Far Eastern policy of the United States; namely, that of deterring Chinese expansion. It was to be a phase tested very soon again in Laos in 1961–62 when the pressures from Peking threatened a total collapse of that strife-torn kingdom. Again, the landing of several thousand Marines through Thailand cooled off the crisis and hastened a Geneva Conference.

It is only in the wake of the foregoing episodes that one can understand the correct dimension of Vietnam. What they collectively reveal is that for nearly twenty years since the Chinese Communists expelled Chiang Kai-shek in 1949, there has been a consistent and firm thread running through American foreign policy in Asia. Its usefulness—even its successfulness—can be measured in terms of the growing stability and the emerging economic viability of much of Eastern Asia. Its center thrust has been the containment of China, whether in Korea, or Tibet, or Laos—or more lately, in Vietnam.

A second base upon which our Far Eastern policy rests is cut from a larger piece of cloth than the foregoing. It derives from the power-political requisites of the world balance of power. Historically, the balance of power does not always conform to preconceived boundaries, nationalistic lines of separation, or geographical conveniences. Thus, since World War II, we have learned to live with two Germanys, two Berlins, two Koreas, two Chinas, and—hopefully—two Vietnams.

A divided world could hardly be anyone's ideal international society. But we have to begin where we are. Again, as the late Adlai Stevenson also observed for a nuclear age, "A divided world is better than no world."

Starting with that fact of international life, the United States has insisted—both in Europe and Asia—that those lines dividing the world not be changed by force or intimidation. Not that we hold them out as the final solution to the world, rather, our policy accepts them as the necessary stabilizing point from which we can then work toward something better as we win more time. This really was what was at stake in Berlin. And as the great British wartime statesman, Winston Churchill said, Berlin made the difference in Europe. In his words, "If you Americans hadn't stood firmly in Berlin, Russia would be on the Atlantic Coast of Europe today."

The consequence of our policy stance in Europe is an easing of the tensions there; also a new economic viability; and a diplomatic detente which together offer new hope in the Western World. It became possible in part because we were willing to begin the rebuilding of post-war Europe with a divided nation and a divided people in a divided city.

In Asia, moreover, a similar set of events developed, only there the great testing ground was to be Korea. And subsequently, Formosa, and Vietnam. We didn't want Korea. We didn't think anybody else should have North Korea. We did insist that the North respect the South, and vice versa.

In Vietnam our insistence is only one—that the North leave the South alone. Nobody wants Hanoi; nobody wants to change Hanoi; nobody wants to remove from the scene a single person in Hanoi. We simply say, Leave South Vietnam's fate to those who are there. They've got plenty problems of their own without the North interposing its troops. The future of politics and economics and society in general are uncertain at best, even without meddling or violence forced by the North. And the limited but firm objective of the United States in all the East remains constant and consistent. It has involved guaranteeing the integrity of the 38th Parallel in Korea, later of the Straits of Formosa separating the two Chinas, and now of the 17th Parallel between the two Vietnams.

Thus, this principle of America's Far Eastern policy is very elementary. It says that our policy is not anti-communist. It's anti-force and anti-violence. More importantly, it is pro-stability; pro-peaceful change. For our guarantee of the 38th Parallel in Korea, for example, not only protects South Korea and its prospering, new government, but it equally guarantees that line as a line of integrity marking the southern borders of North Korea against whatever predatory missions might someday take root in the South. And I suspect, moreover, that we've all lived long enough now to realize the presence of the Seventh Fleet in the Formosa Strait not only is to protect the troops of Chiang Kai-shek on Taiwan—I think we have an historical obligation on that score—but it's likewise to make sure that there are no reckless expeditions launched from Taiwan back to the Mainland that might inflame the old sores between the Nationalist Chinese and the Mao Tse-Tung gang which might ignite the whole continent of Asia.

Our presence in Vietnam, likewise, is not only to try to cut off the North from going south—it contains the equal pledge to prevent the South from going north by violence or by force of arms. This, in sum, reflects the basis of the Far Eastern policy of the United States. It is not a policy of anti-communism as much as it is one of anti-violence which seeks to achieve stability. This, then, is the setting, as I see it, of the American presence in Asia. This, also, is why we're in Vietnam.

To understand Vietnam is to understand, first of all, that the issue is not Vietnam. We can be so obsessed with what is going on in Vietnam—what Ky said or what the Generals in the North tried to do, or what the Buddhists thought—that we lose sight of what it is all about. The issue is not Vietnam. What is taking place there might have happened in the Philippines. It might have happened in Cambodia or Thailand or Burma. It only happened to happen in Vietnam. Vietnam, therefore, is but an incidental event in a much larger panorama of international power politics.

The fact that the United States is in Vietnam has already made a measurable difference. There are some of the critics, you know, who continue to say, "What's the matter with us? The United States stands alone. Nobody supports us. Nobody believes as we do." This is not true. The people to whom it makes a difference, for example, believe as we do. One evening last December I had an interesting discussion with an Indian journalist. He said, "I've just gotten back from Southeast Asia with a group of my editors and some members of the Indian Government, and I just want you to know that, in our group of eighteen, all speaking from responsible positions, representing their particular interest group, there wasn't a one but what understands the need for the American presence in Eastern Asia."

On yet another occasion I said to a member of the Indian Government, "You fellows talk a strange line for someone who tells me, as you have been here in our little luncheon, that you understand why we're in Vietnam. Why don't you act like it?" And he said, "Well, Sir, you've got to understand one thing. We have an election coming up in February, and I understand that in your country that ought to have some meaning for you! We all say things during an election year that we find it difficult to stand on following the casting of the votes. And what I want you to know," he says, "is that I'm telling you what any number of my colleagues would tell you." And they did later on, when I had a chance to spend some time with them. "We know why you're there. And because you're there," he concluded, "we have a chance—we have a chance." The Foreign Minister of Thailand, Mr. Thanat Khoman, put it especially well last Thursday in an interview with the *New York Times* when he said, "You know, if the United States prevails in Vietnam, there will be no second 'Vietnams,' and no third 'Vietnams.' "

The Prime Minister of Singapore, often a harsh critic of the United States, said recently that, "If you Americans withdraw, we are through." Now that was especially meaningful language coming from him. He was interviewed just a day or two ago by the New York Times, and he's gone further than that! He said, "I want to say to the people of Southeast Asia now that because the Americans have stood in Vietnam, Asia is much closer to stability than at any time in the last generation." President Marcos, when he was over here from the Philippines, told us in the Senate, "You know, we didn't know where you stood for a long time; and because we didn't know, we didn't dare take a chance." But he said, "We know where you stand now, and the Philippines are committed with you. We believe in you." As our friends in Thailand will tell you, just two years ago this winter, they were earmarked as "next." Peking made no bones about it. The Chinese had already put a thousand cadres of Hanoi-trained guerrillas in the five northeastern provinces of Thailand to begin the same kind of movement there that was so characteristic of the first stages of conflict in South Vietnam. One year ago last month I visited those provinces. I can report that, while some of those cadres are still there, they haven't made much headway—*only* because the Americans have cut them off from their sources of supply in North Vietnam. Those guerrillas are in effect withering on the vine. The decision of the United States to stand in Vietnam made the difference.

Last December I visited other parts of Thailand, too—especially in the Northwest. The Thai Government is taking positive and constructive steps to improve conditions which heretofore served as breeding grounds for the National Liberation Front. Across the border in Cambodia, Prince Sihanouk, hardly an American "friendly," told the *New York Times* that, if the Communists win in North Vietnam, "I know what it means for me. I'll be destroyed. My government will be seized, and we'll be finished." But he says, "You have to understand that we're weak, and rather than be destroyed, we'd like to survive; and that's why we have to wait until we have alternatives on which we can count." Well, this is by way of saying a great deal—that in that part of the world, where the necks of people happen to be laid on the line, they know what it's all about.

In Japan one issue in the election was the friendliness of the Sato government with the American position in Vietnam, and they survived the test of the election. If the Sato regime had been defeated in those elections, I can guarantee you that every newspaper in America would have had a front-page banner headline, "Japan repudiates America in Southeast Asia." But when Prime Minister Sato won, you had to turn to a back page in the *New York Times* to find a mention of this point! That's how the press sometimes slants Asian events.

In Australia the central issue in their elections was the closeness of the government to the policy of the United States in Vietnam and yet Prime Minister Holt carried the election hands down.

Next time you're in a Vietnam discussion, don't let the critics run you out of the room with only half truths. For in East Asia, the people not only know why we're there, they're saying to us "If you leave, we're in deeper trouble."

An interesting conversation in Jakarta in December with a civilian leader in Indonesia's new government produced a significant point. According to this man, Indonesia's overthrow of the Chinese-oriented PKI party and Sukarno was capable of such complete success because of the Americans in Vietnam. As the leader explained it, without the United States in Asia, there existed no force capable of offsetting the one-sided power of Peking. Therefore, he said, millions of Indonesians were fearful of taking a chance of participating in the coup. But because these Americans stood firmly in Vietnam, he said, the Indonesian people were emboldened to take a chance on overthrowing Sukarno. A dozen or so of the senior political leaders of Indonesia said to me with all candor when I was there in December, "We lucked out. The revolution went our way because you were in Vietnam." When I said, "How come? Why?" They would say, "The great middle group of our people weren't sure of you at first. They wanted to go with the winner and having read about the 'wave of the future' that rolled out of Peking, they were hesitant. But with you there in Vietnam, these people dared to stand up and go against the tides of China." So what these several illustrations say, my friends, is that we have a reason for being in Vietnam. We should have been there from the very beginning. We'll likely be in that part of the world for a long time to come. Just how long, no one can say for sure, but hopefully, at least, until that day when the Asians themselves will have become stable enough and sophisticated enough and strong enough and economically developed enough to maintain their own balance of power; to erect the new infrastructure of their own new stability.

What we seek to win is time and the chance for that to happen—that's all. We've been in Korea almost seventeen years, but on quite a different level, with a considerably different tempo than during the first years of the hot war in Korea. And I suspect that we will have a sort of presence in Vietnam somewhat in those dimensions for a number of years to come.

But surely we learned from thirty years ago with both Germany and Japan, if not *how* to do it, at least how *not* to do it. You don't stop an aggressor by telling him, "Watch out or we'll meet you somewhere else." If he gets by with the first bite, his appetite has been whetted, his gall has been stimulated, his brazenness has been emboldened and his bullying techniques have been rewarded.

It's always interesting to speculate historically. What would have happened if only we'd had the wisdom to stop the Japanese in Manchuria in 1931 and 1932? And to have pressed and cajoled our European friends to stop Hitler at the Rhine in 1936. To have done so then—rather than later—could have changed the whole course of history.

The cheapest place to stop an aggressor is at the start. There is never a less costly spot further down the road. And in a nuclear age where the only kinds of wars we dare to risk are the limited wars on the periphery of the political sphere, it can only be the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. No longer does any nation have the prerogative with sanity of picking the right cause for which to go to war in the right place at the right time. Those days are long gone down the nuclear drain.

Since World War II the competing forces of balance have drawn their acceptable lines of stability all the way across Europe and the Middle East, almost to the China Sea. We are closer to the end of what has been a long and costly and sometimes bloody path of policy than some of our people may realize. It would be a sheer dastardly breach of responsibility to stop now, to falter or hesitate or give up this near the end of the line. We waged World War II not to win peace but only to *win the chance* to wage peace. The price we've already paid for that chance ought to haunt us every night and what we do with it will determine the course of the history of our time.

THE FUEL OIL CRISIS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have today joined with other east coast Senators in addressing a letter to the Secretary of the Interior calling on him to take the earliest possible steps to assure an adequate supply of home heating oil for our constituents.

The essential points of this letter are that we face the most serious shortage of home heating oil in 15 years and that there has been, as a result, a drastic effort in forcing up the price of heating fuel for the consumer.

This situation results from the hidebound attitude of the Federal bureaucracy which so often seems to regard itself as the protector, and the guardian of the welfare of the domestic oil industry, rather than the protector of the average citizen and consumer.

I speak from unhappy experience in this regard, having supported a similar battle, which I am happy to say we, the consumers, won, to force the bureaucracy to yield in its control of imports of residual fuel oil for institutional heating. We also have been fighting a similar battle regarding the importation of asphalt.

The situation is even more urgent in the case of No. 2 fuel oil. We who represent Northern States—where the thermometer is already dipping below the freezing point and where it will stay below the freezing range for many weeks on end in the months to come—cannot sit idly by and allow many of our constituents to be pressed close to the point of financial distress because of an artificially stimulated price structure in a basic commodity, particularly when they are being confronted with severe general price inflation and the likelihood of a tax increase.

We simply cannot permit the Oil Imports Appeal Board to dawdle along in its comfortable complacency, preserving an enclave of protection for the domestic oil industry, particularly when there is increasing evidence that the domestic industry is less and less interested in producing the fuel needed.

The fact is that consumption of home heating oil has increased by almost 30 percent in recent years while the import allocations, which are based on the experience of "historical importers" have remained rigidly fixed at a static level of 76,000 barrels a day. And the fact is that No. 2 fuel oil, having a low sulphur content, has become more and more desirable in order to reduce and curtail air pollution.

In spite of these facts, the Government persists in imposing artificial import controls designed originally to perserve the strength of domestic producers. As of the middle of this month, fuel oil supplies, were down 6.7 million barrels below last year and there was a shortage of 400,000 in 1 week.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it is high time to end this bureaucratic nonsense and make the oil import program responsive to the needs of the citizens who ought to be the ultimate beneficiaries. We who signed the letter to the Secretary today have suggested a reasonable and practical plan for liberalizing the import program to increase the number of importers and to provide a flexible scale of allocations, which should double the volume of imports and provide the price relief which our constituents need. I urge the executive branch to respond effectively and promptly. We simply cannot permit further delay.

JEWS IN THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the half century that has passed since the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has been marked many times by failure of the Russians to reconcile idea and deed. This has especially been true in the Soviet relations with other countries.

There remains, however, one extreme case of such false dealing with some 3 million people who exist in the Soviet Union. I speak, of course, of the Jewish people remaining in the U.S.S.R.

They are denied the language which half a million of them call mother tongue. Their religion, their culture, their theater, their books, their magazines, their newspapers, their educational institutions are precious few, if any. The tree of Judaism, while not killed outright and swiftly, is being slowly starved with lack of nourishment.

The official government policy in Russia identifies persons whose parents were Jews as Jews by nationality. The matter of a Jew by religion is up to the individual.

Yet, the Jewish religion is not even accorded the meager privileges of others. The Jewish religion is denied contact with coreligionists in other countries. A central body to coordinate and exchange information and ideas is banned. There is no seminary operating to train rabbis. Volunteer rabbis from other countries are forbidden. Articles for ritual are banned from manufacture from prayer shawls to matzohs.

As a nationality, Jews are the 11th in size in the Soviet Union. In fact, only a small difference separates seventh through 11th among the nationalities. While other nationalities are encouraged to use their language, to perpetuate group existence through publications, schools, and culture, this is denied to Jews.

Jews throughout the world have this week marked a holy day known as Rejoicing in the Law or Simchat Torah. As those of the Jewish faith renew their devotion and dedication to the Mosaic Code—the basic noble base for all civilized law—it is an appropriate time for all of us to pause and reflect, especially those of us who are the lawmakers.

Let us, in the name of those whose ancestors gave civilization the original Bible and its legal code, call out to the governmental leaders of the Soviet Union for justice and equity for Jews—as a religion and as a national entity within that country. Surely, a state which has attained the age of 50 can afford at least this honesty with itself and its citizens.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business in concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously agreed to, I ask that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, and that it reconvene at the conclusion of the speech by our distinguished guest, the President of Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Francis R. Valeo) and its Sergeant at Arms (Robert G. Dunphy), proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address delivered by His Excellency Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, President of Mexico.

(For the address delivered by the President of Mexico, see today's proceedings in the House of Representatives, pp. 30304–30306.)

At 1 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m., the Senate, having returned to its Chamber, reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair).

HOW LONG CAN WE SUBSIDIZE THE WORLD?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear the remarks of the President of Mexico today. As one Member of Congress, I am grateful that the President of that great country showed us the courtesy and the interest to call on the Congress of the United States. He made a warm and moving address, which all of us present appreciated.

However, I do think it only fair, Mr. President, to point out one or two points as to which the speech of the President of Mexico seemed to indicate that perhaps he had been misled, as have a great number of Americans, by press reports concerning trade legislation pending in Congress.

The President of Mexico pointed out that we do not need a protective tariff for infant industries in the United States. That, of course, is completely correct. We are not seeking to establish new industries to produce new commodities, nor to attempt to exclude others who presently produce such commodities from those areas.

What we are confronted with, Mr. President, is a somewhat different problem. In seeking to advance the sort of program toward which the President of Mexico directed his remarks, this country has spent its money in helping other nations develop themselves economically until we now have a real problem with regard, not to our infant industries, but our old, established, and even prestige industries.

For example, Mr. President, with our foreign aid money, we have helped build steel mills in 30-odd nations around this planet. We have helped the Japanese as well as the French recover from the devastation of World War II. Because those countries have lower wage levels than we, even with the American equipment they have acquired, we find that the wage differential alone permits them to undersell us in our own market. That poses a very serious problem to us. Having done what no other nation on earth would do, that is, help other nations develop to the point where they have taken our foreign markets from us, are we now going to permit them to take our domestic markets as well? Are we going to let them run out of business our own proud domestic industries, that we have built up over a period of so many years; industries which, moreover, have actually carried the tax burden of helping develop the economies of those friends of ours?

Mr. President, I would not wish to diminish the popularity of the President of Mexico, nor cause him to lose any votes in his own country, because he appears to be a very good friend of the United States. But he made no reference, in his speech, to the fact that not only have we not discriminated against Mexico, we have discriminated in favor of that great nation, and we propose to continue to do so. We have bought and will continue to buy sugar from Mexico substantially above the world market price. The President of the United States has said that he is in favor of continuing that program, and that is what we intend to do.

It was my privilege to vote in favor of the coffee agreement, and I have continued to support it, by which we have helped to raise the world price, to help less-developed nations, including Mexico, receive more than they would receive otherwise when we buy coffee from them.

Further, with respect to Mexico even when we have found it necessary to take steps to preserve a domestic industry in this Nation, our own oil and gas producers, we said nevertheless that the Mexicans and the Canadians could get special treatment provided they delivered their oil to us overland, and provided that oil was produced in those countries.

In Mexico, they have taken advantage of that arrangement even to the extent of putting oil in tankers, sailing the tankers to Brownsville, Texas, and from there trucking it across the river to Matamoras, Mexico, and then back again to Brownsville, Tex., thus actually delivering it by land, though it has been on land for a distance of less than a mile before it finally crosses the border into the United States. Moreover, Mexico can buy oil at the world market price of $1.50 a barrel, laid down in Mexico, to replace the oil it sells to us at a price that approaches $3 a barrel. The Canadians can do the same thing. They buy on the world market at about half the price at which they sell to us.

Thus, Mr. President, we have favored our neighbors highly in our international trade. We do not regret having done so. We are proud, as neighbors, to have been able to do it. The border between the United States and Mexico has no fortifications, and needs none, because we are good neighbors and intend to remain that way.

But, Mr. President, not specifically with regard to problems between the United States and Mexico, but with regard to problems between the United States and other more highly developed nations, which, in many instances, we have helped develop, eventually we are going to have to answer this $64 question: "What are we to do when those nations begin to take advantage of the fact that we have put them in a position where, because of lower wage costs or other reasons, they are able to displace and eventually put out of business proud American industries that have made America great, and have paid the taxes that made it possible for this country to carry the very burdens of subsidizing those nations?" Industries, for example, such as our oil and gas industry and our petrochemical industry, which is related to it, or such as our iron and steel industry, or our textile industry. Those three come immediately to mind. There will be more and more as time goes on.

To what extent can we continue trading away jobs that pay $4, $5, $6 or $8 an hour for jobs that pay less than a dollar an hour? We have to begin to think of such things in relation to our own national welfare. There is thus far no important conflict, so far as I can see, concerning our relations with Mexico. There is no special reason why Mexico should be adversely affected. But I think it well that some of our friends around the world begin to recognize that we have gone about as far as we can go at the expense of the American businessman and the American taxpayer, in doing things that no one else, anywhere on the face of the earth, would think of doing for anyone else under any conditions.

And we now have to begin to think in terms of what industries we care to keep in business in this country and to what extent we care of retain them.

If we do not do something about it this year, the need will be more pressing next year, and if we do not do something about it next year, the need will be still more pressing in the years to come.

CONGRESS SWINGS WILD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Swings Wild," written by Victor Riesel, and published in the Syracuse Post-Standard of this morning, in which Mr. Riesel pleads for adequate funds for the Federal Conciliation and Mediation Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SWINGS WILD

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—At 12:01 a.m., Oct. 11, the big federal ordnance plant in grimy Scranton, Pa., stopped hatching its special brand of eggs—175 mm shells. This harassed the Pentagon far more than the impending stampede of mass picnicking and picketing due 10 days later.

Those 175s are destined for the Vietnamese front. The shells must flow steadily into the pipeline. For reasons which the Pentagon should explain to the public, the Scranton installation run by the Chamberlain Co., is the sole producer of 175s. Furthermore, it whips out some mighty important 155s, as well—that is, when it is producing.

It went dead on Oct. 11 when 1,100 machinists went out on strike. The Pentagon production and supply brass burned up the wires.

They said, in effect, U.S. military forces in Vietnam just could not take that single, local strike for two weeks. But the lines held fast. The work forces stayed "on the bricks." Then the government's specialist in reason, William Simkin, director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, "invited" the belligerents to his headquarters here.

That was on Tuesday, Oct. 17. In three days of the most professional persuasiveness Simkin and his colleagues got a settlement. Ratification by the militant machinists, whose local 847, like so many others, is virtually autonomous, came two days later on Sunday. By the morning of Monday, Oct. 23, the big "eggs" began rolling into the pipeline again. Otherwise there would have been a shell shortage over there.

That's the Scranton story. Virtually no one but the home town folks—and a lot of U.S. artillery men—generally take notice. But between 50 and 75 times a year, the same script is reenacted—different characters, different locale, but same hairline escape from danger on some front near the "DMZ."

And each time, Bill Simkin the Quaker, gentle but with a whim of iron when it comes to pumping that pipeline, gets the men off the bricks, the licensed producer off the dime and the military material moving again.

Simkin is no wizard of odds. He sweats it out, but not alone. With him across the land are 250 Mediation Service specialists. Mostly they, as he, work anonymously. Almost always at the final minute the last hurrah goes to some outside specialist.

Now comes an economy tidal wave from Congress. An across-the-board budget cut has been ordered in all agencies all the way from the Dept. of Interior's Wild Life Division to Mediation. Simkin's agency is budgeted at a puny $7 million annually. That's about what it costs to send up one rain spotting satellite. That's about what it costs to keep a 35-man delegation living luxuriously for several years for marathon debates on esoteric matters in Geneva, Paris or Rome.

Yet the Mediation Service, which keeps that Vietnam pipeline filled, as the Pentagon will testify, now faces a slash even in its tight mini-budget.

This proposed slash would slice at least 50, and probably 60, skilled mediators from Simkin's staff. This cut could cripple the Service.

Apparently Congress has forgotten that the Pentagon, to save hundreds of millions of dollars, has taken a calculated risk on the military production front. Right now a thousand wartime items are needed which would be junked if peace broke out in Southeast Asia. Therefore, few civilian manufacturers rush in to revamp their facilities to make shells, or mini seven pound rapid fire guns, or special engines. Therefore, the Defense Dept. has had to set production of key items in a single source plant.

This is the case with special engines for troop carrying helicopters now being made in Avco's Lycoming Division plant, Stratford, Conn. This is the case with special dive bombers' speed control unit, also made only at Stratford. This is the case with the Colt Industries' M–16 rifle. This is true in production of special radar parts, naval torpedoes, air-to-air missiles and special gun ball powder.

Yet each of these "items" has been struck during this war. And each time, Bill Simkin and his men patiently reopened the pipeline.

What price economy now?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, William Simkin, the Director of that Federal Service is a truly great public servant. He has no peer among mediators. He and his staff save the American taxpayers hundred of millions of dollars a year through the successful mediation work of the Federal Conciliation and Mediation Service.

Additional funds, rather than congressional cuts in budgets of this agency, should be granted by Congress. It is a waste of taxpayer's money to cut the budget of this agency.

I agree with every comment set forth in the Riesel column to which I have referred.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; and

H.R. 10345. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

COMMISSION ON BALANCED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 659, Senate Joint Resolution 64.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "geographic" insert "and population"; on page 2, line 7, after the word "commerce" insert "and the movement of population"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 10 insert "physical environmental"; and in line 11, after the word "industry" insert "and the movement of population"; so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds and declares that there is a need for more information and understanding concerning the means for achieving a better geographic and population balance in the economic development of the Nation. With a view to providing such information and understanding, it is the purpose of this joint resolution to establish a bipartisan commission to undertake a thorough study and analysis of current geographic trends in the economic development of the Nation, the causative factors, influencing the same, the implications thereof in terms of the distribution of population, the effect of governmental actions in shaping such trends, and the factors, private and public, influencing the geographic location of industry and commerce and the movement of population as an aid in the formulation of policy at all levels of government.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Balanced Economic Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of twenty members to be appointed by the President as follows:

(1) Four members to be appointed from among residents of cities in the United States with a population of at least one million persons.

(2) Four members to be appointed from among residents of cities in the United States with a population of less than one million persons, but not less than one hundred thousand persons.

(3) Four members to be appointed from among residents of cities in the United States with a population of less than one hundred thousand persons, but not less than ten thousand persons.

(4) Four members to be appointed from among residents of towns, villages, and communities in the United States with a population of less than ten thousand persons.

(5) Four members to be appointed without regard to residence or political affiliation from among citizens of the United States who are specially qualified by training, experience, or knowledge in any field pertinent to the subject matter to be studied by the Commission.

(c) In the case of each class of four members described in clauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (b), not more than half shall be members of the same political party.

(d) For the purposes of clauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (b), the population of any city, town, village, or community in the United States shall be determined upon the basis of data contained in the current decennial census of population taken in the United States.

(e) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(f) Eleven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(g) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. The Commission shall undertake a thorough and objective study and investigation in furtherance of the purposes set forth in section 1. Such study and investigation shall include, without being limited to—

(1) an analysis and evaluation of the economic physical environmental, social, and political factors which affect the geographic location of industry and the movement of population;

(2) an analysis and evaluation of the economic, social, and political factors which are necessary in order for industries to operate efficiently outside the large urban centers or to operate and expand within the large urban centers without the creation of new economic and social problems;

(3) a consideration of the ways and means whereby the Federal Government might effectively encourage a more balanced industrial and economic growth throughout the Nation;

(4) an analysis and evaluation of the limits imposed upon population density in order for municipalities, or other political subdivisions, to provide necessary public services in the most efficient and effective manner;

(5) an analysis and evaluation of the effect on governmental efficiency generally of differing patterns and intensities of population concentration;

(6) an analysis and evaluation of the extent to which a better geographic balance in the economic development of the Nation serves the public interest;

(7) an analysis and evaluation of the role which State and local governments can and should play in promoting geographic balance in the economic development of a State or region; and

(8) an analysis and evaluation of practicable ways in which Federal expenditures can and should be managed so as to encourage a greater geographic balance in the economic development of the Nation.

(b) The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress a report with respect to its findings and recommendations not later than two years after the effective date of this joint resolution.

POWERS AND ADMINISTRATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission, subcommittee, or member deems advisable. Any member authorized by the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission, or any subcommittee or member thereof.

(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this joint resolution.

(c) The Commission may appoint such staff personnel as it deems necessary in accordance with the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall fix the compensation of such personnel in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(d) The Commission may procure such temporary and intermittent services as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $100 a day for individuals.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 5. (a) Any member of the Commission who is appointed from the executive or legislative branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in his regular employment, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission, other than those referred to in subsection (a), shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall cease to exist ninety days after the submission of its report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 64 is one of these happy resolutions which has strong bipartisan support. Twenty-three or twenty-four Senators have joined me in cosponsoring the joint resolution. They happen to be about equally divided between Republicans and Democrats.

The joint resolution was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

I reported the joint resolution on October 24, and I believe the joint resolution is the first step in solving one of our Nation's greatest dilemmas because of its importance. I am convinced that it is one of the basic reasons why no opposition has developed to it here in the Senate. I refer to Senate Joint Resolution 64.

The pending joint resolution deals with a problem which has taken a lot of the time of Congress and will require a lot of our time in the Congresses ahead.

How can a country, that is fabulously rich and yet for many shockingly poor, that is strong in potential and yet, to a certain extent weak in results, that has unexhausted resources and yet for some is exhausted in opportunities, that finds its citizens living in overpopulated areas, and yet has vast unpopulated lands—but which above all is a free and democratic society—achieve its millennium, the best possible development of its economy which, as a natural and concurrent result, would bring the best possible life for its citizens? It is the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 64 to help find constructive and effective answers to these questions.

As a nation we are newly faced with this dilemma. We were blessed with a large and bountiful land. While other countries struggled with inadequate resources in past generations and centuries, and, more importantly, a limited potential as far as land was concerned, we prospered and grew as only a young nation with unlimited opportunities can grow. We opened new frontiers. Our population pushed westward. We began to develop and exploit resources which, up to that time, had not been tapped. But the honeymoon is over; we can no longer afford the luxury of uninformed growth. From here on in, we must make the ultimate use of our resources and our land. In addition, we must take steps to lift from the shoulders of the unintentionally poor the burden that they bear.

We can do this by harnessing our rich potential to help all our citizens, including the poor, by bringing prosperous opportunities to all who seek them and to those who have lost hope and those who are losing hope, by moving to increase economic opportunities in rural areas and in our city ghettos and by alleviating the increased congestion of urban areas. In short, by bringing about a balanced economic development in our great and growing United States of America.

Mr. President, as an illustration of the need for an overall review of our present population trends which I believe have caused many of the problems we are facing in Congress today, we need only to look at our legislative calendar.

During this 90th Congress there have been numerous bills introduced by my colleagues proposing alternative methods to alleviate substandard living conditions in the congested urban areas, to encourage industries to locate in urban ghetto areas where unemployment flourishes, to encourage industries to locate in rural areas from which the people are fleeing to join the unemployed in the cities, and lest we forget, to impose a surtax upon this supposedly affluent society. Other significant proposals would attempt to assure to our citizens in our overcrowded cities the safety of their streets and their lives, to provide loans for housing for those with inadequate income, to establish a National Commission on Public Management, to encourage industry, through tax incentives to invest in that most basic and irreplaceable of all our resources, a human being.

There are other legislative proposals before the Congress requesting more money to fight poverty, to develop and acquire recreation land and facilities, to assure equal opportunity for employment of all regardless of social conditions or status or color, to give tax relief to State and local governments through tax-sharing, and one could go on and on. But all of these legislative approaches which I have mentioned are devoted to trying to find solutions to the problems which are dealt with specifically on an overall thoroughgoing basis by Senate Joint Resolution 64.

Mr. President, these proposals have one element in common. They seek to guarantee to each citizen equal rights and opportunities in their everyday associations, whether in a person's social environment, in economic opportunity, in political action, or for his own general welfare as an individual and as a member of society. These are worthy goals, admirable goals which to us have always meant the American way of life. They are fine goals, such as we have just listened to the President of Mexico describe in his eloquent address before the joint session of Congress a few minutes ago.

I have enthusiastically supported or cosponsored some of these proposals. I have done so, Mr. President, because I believe that part of a pie is a little better than no pie at all. It is possible that, were time running with us, we could some day attain a more adequate social and economic balance across this Nation with a fragmentary approach such as we have followed to date. However, this could take a decade or two—or maybe three—and my experience and study, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, gives me cause to have grave concern over such a prolonged timetable.

Frankly, I am convinced we do not have the luxury of 10, 20, or perhaps 30 years to investigate and start to correct economic and social problems, and their solutions, on a piecemeal basis.

I do not believe the present patchwork procedure will meet the problems in time or that it will meet them effectively, and because of that belief, I have suggested the approach incorporated in Senate Joint Resolution 64.

Expert testimony given before our committee by witnesses testifying on this bill confirmed this conviction. Time is rapidly running against us. The problems are acute. The time element is crucial and critical. American patience is running low. It is time to get America going again.

As significant and worthwhile as some of these legislative proposals are, they, unfortunately, do not provide for coordination of their specific ends into a significant and systematic program for a national goal. Mr. President, we have reached a decisive crossroads in the 20th century that demands a sober, honest look at the causes of the social and economic illnesses besetting America, what our future should be, and how best to obtain these goals. We must draw together, in a concrete way, the many aspects of the social, economic, and political factors that come into play in the everyday lives of all our citizens and affect their tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow—their security, their dignity as individuals, and, above all, their opportunities to live a tranquil and productive life, with a decent American standard of living.

To do this, I believe it falls within our purview to reassess the impact and the roles of local, State, and Federal governmental entities, singularly, in their interrelationship, and collectively. We must also reassess the role of the private sector of our economy—this powerful demonstration of our economic freedom—and offer suggestions to that sector to the end that its strength and full potential can be utilized and coordinated with the efforts of our governmental entities in bringing about the social and economic gains necessary to perpetuate our inherent rights and enable this great Nation of ours to move forward.

None of the legislation introduced in these areas that I mentioned earlier specifically provides that upon ultimate enactment the programs would be fitted into a national pattern of life that will systematically seek a social, economic, and population balance and improvement across the broad landscape of these United States. Senate Joint Resolution 64, which is now before us, after having been closely scrutinized by the Committee on Government Operations, after having long, interesting, and informative hearings, and after being reported by a unanimous vote of that committee, takes all these factors into consideration, in an effort to produce a coordinated attack on the problems plaguing this country.

It does this by establishing a National Commission on Balanced Economic Development. This Commission, comprised of 16 public-spirited individuals from a cross section of rural and urban communities throughout the United States, plus four members who are to be selected by the President from among the most "qualified by training, experience, or knowledge in the fields pertinent to the Commission's subject matter," will have a lifespan of 2 years. This is, in itself, important. We are not saddling ourselves with another self-perpetuating bureaucracy, but rather a commission that will do its job and dissolve in not more than 2 years.

During these 2 years it will collect data and analyze such information as the social, economic, and political factors which determine the geographic location of industry; the factors necessary for industrial expansion in densely populated areas—because this is something we must accept and recognize in our country as here to stay—without causing or creating new economic and social problems; the factors that must be present in a rural community in order that a more balanced economy may be guaranteed through incentives to industry to attract them permanently to rural areas and to our smaller cities and communities. This is something we must strive for in our country.

Finally, the Commission will evaluate all the data it has analyzed in a report to the President and Congress. This report would, I believe, serve both the legislative and executive branches of Government in defining the Nation's social and economic goals as a single national effort by stating clearly the relationships that do and should exist between all aspects of our society, by encompassing all levels of government, the community organizations, educational institutions, and, most important, the free enterprise system, so that their separate and collective responsibilities can be defined in relation to all others.

Mr. President, few would deny that the two Herbert Hoover Commissions, in their inquiries into the need for reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, served an invaluable post-World War II purpose when our Nation was in the throes of redirecting the national effort from a wartime economy and society toward what we had hoped would be a peaceful world. This prestigious body studied what the role of the Federal Government ought to be toward and with respect to the private enterprise segment of the Nation. It attempted to pull together the many fragmented activities of the Federal agencies and departments into meaningful and understandable administrative units in order to carry out the function of public service as determined by congressional authorization. The Hoover Commissions will go down in history as a remarkable institution that was able to bring a bipartisan approach and businesslike methods to bear upon a Federal colossus and, through systematic investigation and evaluation, arrived at reasonable approaches to the problems of efficient, effective Government and the impact of the role of Government in our everyday lives in our democratic society.

Now, with over a decade of experience in the ever-growing world of science and technology, we have reached another crisis. This time our Armageddon is reassessment as well as redirection. Again, the Government-sponsored programs and activities are expanding with no coordinated direction by leaps and bounds, hit and miss. Understandably, each is oriented toward its own agency's mission.

A proposal for a defense contract in one region of the United States may offer the possibility of bringing millions of dollars into a community and the offer of hundreds of new jobs. At the same time, it is possible that the Department of Housing and Urban Development—HUD—already has spent thousands of dollars on a study of that particular area's lack of housing only to find that additional adequate housing is not feasible. Economic Development Administration—EDA—may have a large project underway in the same area, teaching the unemployed a trade unrelated to those required by that defense industry, but which would offer employment only in another area of the United States where certain skills are scarce. Singularly, each Federal agency would be making a worthwhile effort to assist in overcoming the economic and social problems that existed in that community; but in reality—because of lack of coordinated efforts and each unknowingly working against the success of the other—it is more than likely that the result would be a continued unstable economic and unsatisfactory social environment in the community. No permanent solution has been made.

I can cite one further example—that which exists in Appalachia. The regional commission has spent large sums of money attempting to get people to remain in the rural areas and live on their small farms by trying to find natural resources in the area that could be turned to profitmaking for each individual. On the other hand, another Federal agency is spending thousands of dollars to convince the people that they should move into other communities so they can have better water supply, sewage disposal, and health facilities. Thus, the economic and social factors necessary to each citizen's livelihood and happiness are working against him rather than for him. The result is obvious: the citizen is confused and unsettled, and is gaining neither economic nor sociological security.

Mr. President, it is imperative that we have the necessary information coordinated and collected in one spot so that we can get an overall view of the patterns that make for or deter economic and social stability in either urban or rural areas. And further, with the advent of the nuclear era of warfare, science and technology in space exploration, as well as its application to the betterment of living standards of all our citizens, decisionmaking in all areas of our society has become complicated. Even more important is the fact that decisions must be immediate—there is no room for second-guessing. They must be based on an accurate analysis of all the available facts. And it becomes obvious that our highly concentrated industrial complex must be dispersed so as to offer a less vulnerable target for atomic attack, as a security measure, should the unhappy eventuality of war occur.

I envision the Commission on Balanced Economic Development as the vehicle to do a concentrated and comprehensive study of such things as geographic distribution of Government grants and contracts, trends in the movement of population from rural to urban areas, urban and rural transportation problems. These significant problems can then be evaluated in terms of their impact on the social and economic problems of communities or States or regions within the United States, with the hope that a reasonable formula for a balanced national economy can be spelled out and then implemented.

As as example, the Commission may want to begin its investigations by asking industry, government at all levels, community leaders, and representatives of the institutions of higher education what their respective roles and needs, as they see them, should or ought to be in such things as basic scientific research, applied research, and technological transfer; their respective roles in financing and maintaining the social and cultural environment in a community, such as fine arts activities, recreation; their respective roles in contributing to the social needs of a community, such as adequate police and fire protection, educational opportunities, public libraries, public services, health facilities, water pollution control, transportation, sewage disposal, air pollution control.

On the basis of such reliable information, the Commission on Balanced Economic Development could make sound recommendations to the President and Congress as to the feasibility of improving this modern society and outlining the obligations of each—the Government, the communities, and industry—by such proposed methods as tax sharing, tax incentives to industry, and redistribution of research and development grants as determined by each segment of this great Nation in counsel and concert with each other, for the fullest utilization of our most basic and irreplaceable resource—each citizen of our Nation.

Mr. President, the need for such a commission has been pointed out time and time again both by representatives of the private sector and by Government officials. Amazingly, however, this country has never had the benefit of such an analysis and study.

In the past 2 months, editorials appearing in the Washington Post and the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser endorsed a study of this type.

On August 13, the Post asked this question:

> For some years the country has been vaguely aware of this demographic revolution but has done very little about it. Further concentration of people has seemed inevitable. But what will happen if this trend is allowed to run its course until the turn of the century when the country will have another 100 million person to house and to absorb into its social structure? Will they, too, be crowded into our five vast strip cities?

The Post then answered its own rhetorical question with this closing statement:

> It is not necessary for this rich, resourceful and powerful country to strangle itself in its own congestion. The warning signals that have been sounded in one large city after another should set the whole country to thinking about ways and means of getting off this collision course with our environment.

Later, in an October 10 editorial, in discussing among other things, this legislation and the initial but limited investigation being made on twin problems of urban and rural poverty, the Post said:

> This is a hopeful trend of thought. The inescapable logic behind it ought to enlist the support of more thoughtful and reflective people.

Similarly, the Huntington Advertiser, on September 28, 1967, in calling for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 64 said:

> Through such benefits of planned and speeded economic growth the sponsors of the resolution and the commission it established could become the architects for rebuilding the nation into a balanced new pattern that would assure all its people a fairer share of its great riches and would stand as a shining example of justice and wise management throughout the world.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was very pleased to note that the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota made reference to one of the leading newspapers in West Virginia, the Huntington Advertiser, and I was pleased to note the support by that newspaper of this legislation. Particularly in view of this, I would like to ask the distinguished Senator if I might be added as a cosponsor of the measure.

Mr. MUNDT. I am most happy to add the name of the Senator from West Virginia as a cosponsor.

Mr. President, I ask that the name of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. It is good to be associated with the Senator on the same side of an issue.

For the benefit of the Senator from West Virginia, I should add that we have also had evidence of active interest in the bill by Representatives from the State of West Virginia and, for the information of the Senate, over 20 Representatives have either sponsored the same companion bill or sponsored companion bills individually. There is a great reservoir of support in the House, and I am confident that soon after we pass this legislation in the Senate it will be enacted in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have cited these two newspapers, although there are several others, because they illustrate wide backing, from various areas for such a program. The Washington Post represents the cities, knows the problems of the cities, and yet it recognizes the interrelationship of their problems with those of the depopulated rural areas. Conversely, the Advertiser represents the rural areas, has observed what is happening to these areas, and it also recognized that their problems are tied to and contributing to the problems of the cities.

It is in the greatest tradition of journalism that these two newspapers call for a productive solution by recognition of this interrelationship, by a departure from our unplanned policies of the past, and an acceptance of new ideas that can best be provided by an independent study such as that envisioned in Senate Joint Resolution 64, one from a newspaper in the great metropolitan city of Washington, D.C., with its population of over a million people, including the hard-core city and its environs, and the other the typical small American city of Huntington, W. Va., where there is published the newspaper of which the distinguished acting majority leader has just spoken in glowing terms. I have spoken a number of times in Huntington, W. Va., and I share with the Senator from West Virginia his high regard for the patriotic and enterprising people of that community. I am sure that the Huntington Advertiser reflects the fine spirit of Americanism that prevails in that area.

The newspapers do not stand alone, however, in calling for this new approach. Last summer, Prof. Joseph P. Lyford, University of California at Berkeley, a consultant to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, told the Government Operations Subcommittee exploring the Federal role in urban affairs that the Government should consider an approach we have not yet tried. He said:

> But even with an adequate public housing program, we cannot avoid the necessity of breaking out of the circle of the city proper. I would like to see us recolonize the United States.
>
> There are many ways of reconstituting some of our rural areas, of attracting all sorts of job-giving enterprises which would underwrite these new communities. The dispersion of industry because of technological advantages makes it possible to disperse and rearrange population.
>
> Our Federal agencies have a great responsibility to take action to influence the character of population movements in this country, not by arbitrary methods or legislation which require the involuntary submission of our people, but by policies which will encourage this dispersion of population.
>
> . . . one of the weaknesses in current discussions of the problems of the city is the assumption that the crisis of the city is somehow unrelated to the crisis of our rural areas. It should be obvious that we cannot begin to deal effectively with the problems of the inter-city in education, housing, employment, health, and welfare, unless we also deal with the rotting and dying areas which are the sources of the apparently inevitable migration to the city. I do not see why this massive, unbalanced migration should be inevitable. I do not see why it is not possible for Federal and State governments, and the private sector, to do things which will encourage a change in the trend of our population movements.

President Johnson expressed the same conviction in a speech delivered in Pennsylvania last summer. So we are assured of Presidential support. He said:

> Modern industry and modern technology and modern transportation can bring jobs to the countryside rather than people to the cities. And modern government could also help.

In a report released during the last month by the Economic Development Administration, a section of the Department of Commerce, these conclusions were reached:

> Our experience indicates the potential value of economic projections as a tool for coordinating plans and programs among various Federal agencies and at different levels of government. "Studies are needed to investigate the extent to which the Federal Government should take account of existing migration patterns or industry location patterns in its programs to eliminate high concentrations of unemployment in particular places.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has reached this same conclusion. In a speech of January 30, 1967, he said:

> An unplanned policy of exporting rural problems to the city has drawn urban America into the rural crisis. For the affluent of the city, the unchecked migration means more crowding, higher taxes, more hours consumed in commuting, as urban sprawl continues unabated. For migrants already in the teeming ghettos, further immigration means less opportunity and rising despair.

Even more recently, Secretary Freeman called for a symposium composed of the same type of experts this Commission would employ, to study in his own words "a national policy of urban-rural balance." In his speech to the National League of Cities this summer, the Secretary went on to describe the symposium as "a first infant step toward charting a national course for our people and their land."

It would be that. An infant step, however, is not what is required or desired. In all due deference to the Secretary, whom I salute for his recognition of the problem and desire to achieve a solution to it.

However, an infant step is simply not enough as we meet the problems of this colossal size. We do not have the time for halfway measures.

Therefore, Mr. President, in my opinion, enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 64 will start us on an all-out effort to get America going again in every area of the country and through the coordinated use of our best expertise and a full set of pertinent facts and recommendations for constructive action.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) was passed.

VIETNAM—THE NEED FOR FIRM AND RESOLUTE POLICIES AND ACTIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, columnist Roscoe Drummond, writing in the Washington Post of October 7, has advanced some very cogent arguments in opposition to prevailing speculations regarding 1968.

He ably sets out the reason why the Republican Party cannot hope to win next year on an—as he puts it—"desert-Vietnam platform."

Mr. Drummond asserts that such an inclusion in the platform would mean a reversal of the "strong, historic GOP stand behind resisting Communist aggression." He adds that such a step would "mean repudiating the foreign policy of the only successful Republican presidential nominee in 36 years."

I feel Mr. Drummond's argument is quite persuasive. It also supports what I said on the Senate floor on August 23:

> A Republican Party offer of the disaster of pulling out before achieving our objectives would be fraught with peril to this country's future and to the future of the free world; and it would be perilous to the future of the Republican Party. It might be attempted in the name of a Republican Peace Party, but these would be false colors because it would be a "peace-at-any-price" party. It would repudiate a basic principle of the Republican Party, which characterized 8 years of peace during the Eisenhower administration—that the only way to meet the dangers of Communist aggression is through firm and resolute—not belligerent—policies and actions, the kind which have not, I regret to say, characterized the administration since 1960, except for a brief period at the time of the Cuban missile crisis.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Drummond's column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

JOHNSON WILL RUN IN 1968 DESPITE TALK OF HIS RETIRING

(By Roscoe Drummond)

This is the dissenting opinion of a Washington columnist on the three mounting political speculations:

That President Johnson will probably retire because his re-election is hopeless.

That, if he does run, the President will campaign as a peace candidate by going to the conference table on Ho Chi Minh's terms.

That the Republican Party will move steadily to the dovish side of the Vietnam war and its presidential nominee will do the same.

These current speculations among politicians and correspondents are intriguing; they are arguable but, on the basis of the best information and judgment which came my way, they are wrong.

Will LBJ step down? No one could rationally say that the answer is a thousand times no. He has told nobody that he will not run—unless it be Lady Bird. But I venture that the odds greatly favor his running.

The counter theory is that, being a proud man, he couldn't stand to be defeated.

The reasons for believing he will run are more solid and more persuasive.

Being a proud man, Mr. Johnson would far prefer to put his case to the voters and to accept their verdict by fighting for what he believes—than to run out.

He is by no means convinced that he will lose nor that the opinion polls which are adverse today will be adverse a year from now. Most objective politicians believe that Mr. Johnson will be a formidable candidate.

Finally, LBJ does not intend to turn the Democratic Party over to Sen. Robert Kennedy.

Will the President find the pressures so great that in a frantic effort to win reelection he will substantially reverse his position on Vietnam?

My answer is an unqualified no.

Those who think so do not know Lyndon Johnson.

The record shows that he is quite prepared to wheel and deal on a variety of domestic political issues, even some important ones. But when it comes to a course he believes involves the national interest and safety, the record shows that he will not let politics enter the equation.

He has decided that the defense of South Vietnam is vital to the United States and he is not going to throw away that conviction and desert the objective of halting Communist expansion-by-force at the Vietnam gate.

Before he committed large forces to Vietnam, Mr. Johnson knew what happened to public opinion during the Korean War. It didn't keep him from doing it. He knew that at one stage the polls showed that 67 per cent of the country wanted to withdraw our troops from Korea. He knew what happened to President Truman's popularity during the Korean War.

Mr. Johnson did not decide to defend South Vietnam to win anyone's favor. He decided because after weighing every alternative, he concluded that the future peace and security of the United States were at stake.

This is why, even if he drops to 2 per cent in the polls, the President will stay the course and will not be a peace-at-any-price candidate in order to win in 1968.

Will the temptation to win next year on a desert-Vietnam platform succeed with the Republicans when it is not going to succeed with the Democrats? I doubt it.

The reason I doubt it is that it would mean reversing the strong, historic GOP stand behind resisting Communist aggression; it would mean repudiating the foreign policy of the only successful Republican presidential nominee in 36 years; it would mean throwing over the leadership of Sen. Dirksen, of Rep. Gerald Ford, of Gen. Eisenhower, Nixon, Rockefeller and Reagan.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and that the President pro tempore or Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate until October 30, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"OUTDOORS, U.S.A."; SPRUCE KNOB-SENECA ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the 1967 edition of the Yearbook of Agriculture is entitled "Outdoors, U.S.A." and contains a number of fine articles about our Nation's outdoor heritage and what is being done to preserve it.

I found one article of particular interest, not only because it concerns my own State of West Virginia, but also because it discusses a project with which I have been intimately concerned, the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area established by legislation introduced by me and cosponsored by my colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The article, written by Mr. Theodore C. Fearnow, a dedicated conservationist, gives a brief, but complete, summary of the value of this new recreation area, both to West Virginia and to the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRUCE KNOB-SENECA ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

(By Theodore C. Fearnow)

The Potomac, which flows past the Nation's Capital, carries water collected by faraway Appalachian coves and canyons extending deep into the highlands of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia. Some of the most beautiful of these remote watersheds are situated in the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks area of West Virginia. Here, at the highest elevations in the Potomac Basin, clear cold mountain streams begin their journey down to the sea.

To the millions of Americans who live in and around the Potomac Basin, this high country is a natural for outdoors fun and exploration. With the creation of the national recreation area here, at the head of America's "National River," more and more families from all parts of the country are seeing at firsthand its scenery, wildlife, and its many other natural wonders.

Some of the remote valleys and mountains along the upper Potomac remain practically unchanged from conditions which existed when early settlers arrived on these shores centuries ago. But most of them have had forests cut over and the land placed under cultivation only to revert to the wild as families moved to lands better suited for agriculture. In our century, after 40 years and more of protection by the U.S. Forest Service against soil erosion, insect damage, and forest fires, many of these restored areas are so much like the original cover that modern-day visitors tend to think of them as virgin wilderness.

As its name implies, the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area contains two separate units of land—although the two have been within the protection boundary of the Monongahela National Forest since 1920.

Men like John Kimball, who lives at the upper end of the Smoke Hole in the South Branch of the Potomac, worked with foresters and surveyors during the early days of the national forest when land was being purchased from private owners, then remained as a part of the forest protection organization.

Many other local residents have helped to protect and develop these lands and waters over the years, and their children and grandchildren now play an important role in maintaining the scenic and natural resources for increased use by outdoor recreation seekers.

The Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks area is one of many outdoor recreation units which are part of the 806,000-acre Monongahela National Forest. The name represents a new designation, provided by Congress, for an area within a national forest where the scenic and recreational values will be heavily emphasized. While all its resources will be developed and used under the national forest multiple use principle, the national recreation area will direct its management activities strongly toward the enhancement of outdoor recreation—hiking, fishing, hunting, picnicking, camping, nature study, and related forms of outdoor enjoyment.

Joe Tekel, ranger for the Potomac district of the Monongahela National Forest, who mingles with his many guests at Forest Service campgrounds in the woods and along the streams at the head of the Potomac, recently interviewed a visiting family from Philadelphia who camped for a week at the Smoke Hole campground. This group of four (mother, father, and two children, David and Judy) showed by the glow on their faces and the tone of their voices that their visit to the national recreation area was not only health promoting, but highly enjoyable as well.

The peaceful countryside, the rugged mountains, and the music of the Potomac as it flows through the narrow gorge at the upper end of the Smoke Hole provided a striking change from big city living. Visits to Dolly Sods, Germany Valley, and Eagle Rock, and other scenic points provided a new experience for each day of their vacation.

The name Smoke Hole is generally believed to have originated from smokes escaping from caves where the Indians cured their meat over fires. Another explanation is that warm moist air escaping from the caverns meets colder outside air where it creates a smokelike vapor. Still another explanation is that early day "moonshiners" distilled their product in the caves and the escaping smoke curling skyward gave to this remote upper Potomac region the name "Smoke Hole."

All the explanations seem reasonably plausible, and possibly all of them are in some degree true.

Seneca Rocks towers above the North Fork of the South Branch of the Potomac at the point where Seneca Creek empties. This is very popular fishing water. Seneca Creek rises in the high country of the Monongahela National Forest. It is fed by many springs and where it cascades out of the mountains across rock ledges, beautiful waterfalls and deep, cool trout pools have been formed.

The North Branch, after it is joined by Seneca Creek, becomes a fast flowing stream with sufficient water to attract many white water canoeists during the spring freshets.

It has been the scene of white water canoe races in the stretch between Mouth of Seneca and Royal Glen. But by vacation time the flow has usually diminished to the point where canoeing gives way to more leisurely wading or floating by fishermen who want to work over carefully each pool and riffle.

Spruce Knob, the highest point in West Virginia, is not a symmetrical dome of the Mount Hood or Mount Rainier type. It is part of a high ridge which gradually slopes upward as one travels south on Spruce Mountain. At its highest elevation it reaches 4,862 feet, and then slopes away to the pass, which the eastern approach road goes through.

Until recently, the summit was accessible only by foot trail with a hike of a mile or so. In 1961, the Forest Service built a scenic automobile road up the west side of the mountain, terminating at a parking area a short walk from the summit. But the summit still remains a boulder strewn, sparsely vegetated area. The few native red spruce trees branch mainly toward the east—the result of a relentless pressure by the prevailing winds out of the west.

Looking to the north or south the view is limited by other nearby peaks that are only a few feet lower than Spruce Knob. But to the east one looks across the great Allegheny Range to the Blue Ridge in Virginia. When you look to the west the undulating Appalachian Mountains extend as far as your eye can see.

VEGETATION OF INTEREST

The present approaches to Spruce Knob are country-type roads that must be traversed with care. Indeed the national recreation area is itself a recent creation. Those who visit it at this stage of development have an unusual opportunity to see the patterns of use which developed as an interested public "discovered" this portion of the Appalachian Highlands.

The high country's vegetation is of special interest to the visitor. Mountain ash, red spruce, and sugar maple, usually found in northern forests, are at home on the higher elevations.

Rhododendron, wild bleeding heart, trillium, and a vast array of colorful blossoms create a natural flower garden.

The history of the high country at the head of the South Branch of the Potomac is directly intertwined with the development of a young nation. First of all, it was known to colonial era adventurers as a vast hunting ground which was accessible only on foot or on horseback.

LOGGED IN 1900

Most of the upper Potomac was logged around 1900, and the more inaccessible timber in the Spruce Knob area was harvested during and immediately following World War I. Brian Van Deventer who lives on Spruce Mountain saw the last trainload of logs leave the mountain in 1925. The steel rails were removed later, and many of the mountaintop roads have been built on grades originally established for the logging railroad. The apple trees which now provide fruit for deer grew from seeds thrown from the log trains by woods workers who ate from lunch pails as they rode the old narrow gage flatcars to and from the loading decks on the mountain.

In this Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area the American people have a priceless gem, deeply set in the Appalachian Highlands. The story of its early settlement, use, and restoration is predictive of the measures which may ultimately bring millions of acres of the Appalachian Highlands to renewed attractiveness and productivity. The management principle behind the program has been *conservation through wise use.*

Forests, wildlife, and forage have been managed under sound, long-range plans which treat renewable natural resources as crops which need to be kept up in a thrifty, growing condition.

Under this type of stewardship, millions of acres of Appalachian forest can produce wood, water, wildlife, and forage for public use and enjoyment—while at the same time retaining the necessary environment for a lot of good outdoor fun and sport, providing recreational outlet for the heavily populated regions which surround these vast wooded areas.

The Monongahela National Forest has been one of the great success stories of West Virginia.

And the national recreation area plan is an extension of the very policies which have made this area such a favorite spot for persons seeking outdoor recreation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INFLATION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, along with many others, I have been concerned for a long time about increased inflation as it affects the buying power of the consumer as well as the other disturbing influences it has on the economy.

The Washington Evening Star has published a very timely article on yesterday, written by David Lawrence, entitled "Family Budget a Distress Signal."

The article, as I say, is timely and, as usual, contains wise comments by the author, Mr. Lawrence, which will be of value to all Senators and to the American people.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 26, 1967]

FAMILY BUDGET A DISTRESS SIGNAL

Many people do not seem to know the true meaning of the word "inflation." But they are certainly feeling the effects of it. The latest figures released by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics tell a story that has a far-reaching significance.

The "average city family of four," for instance, now needs an income of at least $9,191 a year to maintain a moderate standard of living. The figure varies in the 39 metropolitan areas surveyed. Thus, in New York City, the sum necessary for a family of four is $10,293 a year, while in Austin, Texas, it amounts to $8,088. The study accentuates the fact that family expenses in general have gone up 40 percent since 1951 and approximately 16 percent since 1959 as a result of price increases alone.

The rising cost of living extends not only to costs of food, housing, transportation, clothing and personal care but to other items in the budget of a family of four.

How did this happen? Most people have been unaware of the economic forces that have steadily pushed prices higher. Labor unions have been demanding increases in income for members. Employers agree to new wage scales—or undergo costly strikes—and to offset the added expenditures, they feel compelled to raise prices. In some instances, this means a decrease in demand and reduction in profits, especially for marginal producers who do not have more money to spend to market their products.

On the whole, the national economy has been pressed on all sides for several years now. The cost of living has steadily risen, as wages and prices have broken previous records.

Unfortunately, politics has had much to do with the failure to restrain inflation. Administrations have been tempted to attract votes by increasing expenditures for special projects throughout the country. But not enough tax money has been collected to prevent the huge deficits. While the Vietnam War has substantially increased the federal budget, some inflation would have occurred even without the expenses of the war in Southeast Asia. This is because the deficits were considerable in size even before the Vietnam War was expanded.

The economic history of the United States shows that, in periods of recession or depression, prices have fallen and unemployment has been widespread. So long as government spending continues on a larger and larger scale, it has been assumed that a depression could be avoided. But as the deficits in the federal treasury have mounted to unprecedented peacetime heights, fears of an economic setback have been repeatedly expressed by observers who are familiar with what happened in the 1920's and 1930's, when the economic mechanism of the country steadily weakened and a loss of confidence resulted.

The depreciation in the purchasing power of the dollar has produced many changes in the wage scales. Auto workers today, as well as steel workers, are getting around $10,000 a year, including "fringe" benefits paid by employers. While this has been regarded heretofore as a high wage, the new government study indicates that it is not as much out of line as many people had believed. In the unorganized fields of employment, wage rates have not been increased to any such extent, and this is where the hardship is heaviest. Retired groups, too, feel the pinch of inflation.

The latest figures on the cost of living of a "family of four" will not come as a surprise to the many millions in that category or to people generally. The big question is whether the situation can be remedied, particularly by governmental action. It is politically unpopular to enact wage and price-control laws, but in previous war periods this method has finally become necessary.

Sooner or later, the facts about the family budget may cause both houses of congress to see that the only way to avoid a serious recession is to pass wage and price-control laws to stabilize the economy. This might well have been done two years ago.

ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on yesterday, there was published in the Washington Evening Star an article written by the noted columnist, Ralph McGill, entitled "Fanatics Defeat Idealists' Protest."

The article has to do with the demonstrations against the war in Vietnam, the fanatical behavior toward the American flag, and those who burn their draft cards.

I think that there is a great deal of logic, wisdom, and truth in what Mr. McGill has written which will be of value to all Senators and to the reading public at large in this great Nation.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 26, 1967]

FANATICS DEFEAT IDEALISTS' PROTEST

In retrospect nothing diminishes the sadness and complexity of the meaning involved in the recent march on the Pentagon by perhaps 35,000 Americans. Most of them were young. A heavy proportion of them were idealists, but nothing can dissipate the fact that several hundred of them hate their country so fanatically that they openly carried Viet Cong flags or war symbols of North Vietnam on their jackets. (There also were older men of equal fanaticism.)

Nor will the soldiers who behaved so admirably in the face of extreme provocation ever forget what they saw and heard. They were not merely cursed and reviled with the most vulgar language; they were spat upon and dared to respond with their weapons.

There is no theory about these people. They are the same minority that managed to take over the recent Chicago convention of "New Politics." They are the Progressive Labor Party, one of the oldest Communist groups in America. It originally was Trotskyite, but at least ten years ago it abandoned the long dead Trotsky for Mao Tse-tung. There were the self-identified members of the Communist DuBois Clubs which are organized on some campuses and in university and college communities, and some of the far-left organizations not well known. These groups do not in any sense conceal the fact that they want to see the United States defeated in Vietnam. Their hatred of this country is intense. Their resentment against the war grows because the Viet Cong forces in Hanoi are not winning it.

The real danger was apparent on Sunday. As one went across the bridges towards the Pentagon he found them littered with the urgly debris of torn newspapers, discarded propaganda literature, old food packages and the like. Only a few of the bearded, shabby, dirty looking young men and women were strolling about. Most of them were walking toward Washington bus stations or to places where they might hitchhike home. One wondered if the young idealist who came realized that the hardcore group which carries the Viet Cong flag and which quite openly seeks this country's defeat, had used the great national concern about the war to associate itself with a lot of otherwise decent young people of all ages.

In the late afternoon only this hard core of perhaps 500 remained. They were not attractive to see. Their fanaticism of hatred and screaming insistence that this country is fascist and must be destroyed was still in their faces.

The government and the troops acted with much restraint. President Johnson himself had ordered that the protesters be allowed to reach the Pentagon where the troops would stop them. There was very little bloodshed even though some of those committed to the Viet Cong flung themselves at the troopers.

One cannot avoid thinking of the future. Already the extremists of the left, whose loyalty is to the enemy, are beginning to say what they intend to do. They are through, some of their spokesmen have said, with protest demonstrations. From now on they are turning to violence. Much of it will be clandestine. Some of it will be acts of sabotage as recommended by the Progressive Labor Party, the DuBois Clubs, and the present leaders of what is left of SNCC. This could mean the sabotaging of buildings and bridges and other acts of equal violence.

What we now should know without any doubt is that: 1.) These demonstrations are delaying any possible end to the war in Vietnam, 2.) The idealist and those who have honest doubts should by now know that they too are being used by the hard core who have loyalty outside their own country.

It will be more and more difficult to defend the Bill of Rights, though this must be done. Honest dissent will find the future more and more hostile. Troops may not always take obscene insults and tauntings from those who hate the meaning of the uniform worn by those troops. Those who do not want freedom to be really freedom will be the only gainers of a protest which was a defeat for everyone.

On Monday, crews were at work cleaning up the debris of filth discarded by demonstrators and scrubbing up after those who had urinated and defecated about the Pentagon walls. The future must consider what it will do.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY A DELEGATION FROM THE CONGRESS OF GUATEMALA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, we are favored today with the visit of Parliamentarians from the nation of Guatemala. With us today are the following distinguished guests:

Gonzalo Lopez Cifuentes.

Luis Jorge Campollo y Campollo.

German Ovidio Castaneda y Castaneda.

Luis Humberto Chinchilla Salazar.

Oscar Guillermo Herrera Calderon.

Victor Manuel Marroquin Gomez.

Mauro Gilberto Monterroso.

Juan Francisco Quintana de Leon.

They are all members of the Parliament.

Gentlemen, we welcome you here. We know of the struggle of the people of Guatemala in wanting to preserve freedom. We know of the troubles that Castro is causing you in your efforts to remain among the free people of the world.

We welcome you to the United States. We wish you triumph in your fight to preserve freedom. I feel quite certain that our Government recognizes the valiant effort you are making.

Mr. President, I am glad to present these Members of the Parliament of Guatemala to the Members of the Senate. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRESS WILL NOT BOW TO AGITATORS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am glad to note that some forthright newspapers are vigorously denouncing, as I have already denounced, the contemptuous threats of Dr. Martin Luther King to bring American cities to their knees unless Congress bows to his wishes and demands.

It is outrageous effrontery for this man, or any other "leader" or spokesman of any group, or any special interest, to announce that unless $20 billion is appropriated by Congress each year for poverty—or for any other purpose—or unless this or that or something else is done by Congress, he wil make it impossible for the Nation's Capital City to function or operate.

In a mature nation it is unthinkable that government-by-intimidation should seriously be proposed as a replacement for normal democratic processes.

The Members of Congress have been elected by the citizens of the United States to represent them and to legislate for the best interests of all. They were not sent to Washington to bow and scrape to Martin Luther King or Stokely Carmichael or Rap Brown or the leader of any other so-called cause.

I concur heartily in the sentiments expressed in an editorial in the Wheeling News-Register of Wheeling, W. Va., for October 25, written by the paper's editor Harry Hamm, entitled "Why Does Congress Bow to Agitators?" I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why Does Congress Bow to Agitators?

Why must the Congress and other Federal commissions allow themselves to become sounding boards for those agitators who advocate disobedience of the law and massive demonstrations designed to disrupt the orderly processes of government?

That is the question which must bother most Americans when they read where Dr. Martin Luther King was called to Washington to testify before a closed session of the President's Special Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

As soon as Dr. King finished his testimony he stepped out and called for a prolonged, city-paralyzing demonstration in Washington to prod Congress into adopting a 20-billion-dollar-a-year anti-poverty program. He wants Congress to appropriate $20 billion a year for the next 20 years to fight poverty conditions.

"The time has come," he said, "to camp here in Washington and stay here by the thousands and thousands until the Federal government and the Congress will do something about the problems."

He said, "We have to make it clear that the city will not function. We're going to have to have an act of civil disobedience to get this."

It is an insult to the intelligence of the American people for the President's Special Advisory Commission on Civil Disobedience to call Dr. King before that body studying the cause of riots in the nation's cities last year. After all, Dr. King long has been the No. 1 advocate of civil disobedience which led this Nation down the road to violence and rioting. Why then hear from him again on this subject? Why give him a platform to preach more mass demonstrations?

The wave of civil disobedience and demonstrations which swept over this country during the last few years and promoted by persons such as Dr. King laid the foundation for today's violence and riots. Laws were broken, court orders were flaunted, towns were overrun, and police were made helpless. And now all we hear is that these conditions are the result of poverty. As someone has said, if poverty were an excuse for rioting, Abraham Lincoln would have been the Stokely Carmichael of his day and Booker T. Washington would have been the Floyd McKissick of his time.

It has been more than three years since the President signed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Several billions of dollars have been spent on a number of programs conceived to help the 33 million poor Americans. Most of these programs have been dismal failures. We have found that it is not enough simply to identify those persons whose incomes fall below a certain dollar figure, and then work out on paper some programs which theoretically will enable them to succeed in overcoming all the elements in their background which have resulted in their poverty status.

One phase of the Federal government's anti-poverty drive has been the community action programs set up throughout the country. In most instances these efforts have been taken over by extremists and activists and Federal funds have been used to support activities not in the least related to constructive anti-poverty efforts. In Syracuse for example, poverty funds have been used by the Syracuse Community Development Association to support demonstrations against the city administration and to provide bail for arrested demonstrators. In Cleveland, a group receiving anti-poverty money piled rats and trash on city hall steps to dramatize the conditions under which slum dwellers are forced to live. In Washington, D.C. anti-poverty workers have organized persons on welfare to picket the Welfare Department, to stage sit-ins there, and have also organized demonstrations at police precinct houses. In New York City an OEO supported group organized rent strikes and school boycotts.

Picketing, demonstrations, rent strikes and sit-ins are not activities which will provide poor people with the education, training, or jobs they need. It may be fun for the activists to engage in this type of program but it does little to help the poor.

Why then should Congress shell out another $20 billion to be poured into such ridiculous programs? If democracy means anything at all, it means that the taxpayers' money shall be spent only in accordance with the laws and policies determined by the people's representatives. And if democracy means anything at all, it means that such laws and policies are formulated and adopted only through a process whereby the people's representatives are persuaded to support them by rational arguments presented in democratic debate. Threatening civil disobedience and mass demonstrations is not the way to persuade Congress to follow a certain course. It is time Congress and the Federal commissions stopped inviting the Dr. Kings to Washington to advocate more of the rampant disorder which has raged in the streets of our cities.

CROWD ESTIMATORS A COMMITTED LOT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the United States of America is a vast and growing Nation. As of 8 o'clock this morning, its population was estimated by the Bureau of the Census to be 199,879,983. This is only a few thousand less than 200 million.

When one thinks of that many people, it must become immediately obvious that the crowds of demonstrators taking part in such activities as the so-called peace march on the Pentagon last week represent only a tiny fraction of our total citizenry.

The pictures of the massed mobs one sees on TV and in the newspapers may look impressive—and frightening. But it is time, I think, to put the overall picture in better focus. Even the crowd estimates we get from reports of the rallies and demonstrations are likely to be inaccurate.

It should be reiterated, I think, that millions and millions more Americans are patriotic, sensible citizens. The few thousand rabble-rousers who make such a splash in the news are so vastly outnumbered that the influence they have been permitted to wield is out of all proportion to their numbers.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by David Braaten, published in the Washington Evening Star for October 26, dealing with the esoteric art of crowd estimating, be inserted in the Record. It is entitled "Crowd Estimators a Committed Lot."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Crowd Estimators a Committed Lot

(By David Braaten)

To professional neutrals, like newspapermen, last week-end's non-peaceful anti-violence demonstration at the Pentagon was confirmation of the old Disraelian dictum, "There are three kinds of lies: lies, damned lies and crowd estimates."

It is unusual for neutral observers to be blessed with crowd-estimate partisans as deeply committed—and as diametrically opposed—as those in charge of the weekend head count. Normal practice is for the sponsors of the parade, or demonstration, or prayer meeting or whatever, to announce their tally first.

The traditional next step is for the neutral newsman to seek out a supposedly disinterested police captain, get his supposedly professional estimate of the crowd size, and split the difference. Just why a police captain should be able to estimate crowds better than the nearest waitress or insurance salesman has never been made clear—if he is doing his job, the captain should have better things to do than count the house.

In practice, even this hallowed method doesn't always work. I remember an occasion, several years ago, when a religious convocation of some kind was being held in the main park of a certain fog-shrouded West Coast city.

At 1:45 p.m., if memory serves, a reporter on the spot besought a crowd estimate from the ranking police official, a lieutenant whose church affiliation, if any, was not that of the modest throng assembling. The lieutenant was a good sport, though, and guessed there night be 50,000 in attendance. The reporter relayed this to his paper.

Ten minutes later the deputy police chief arrived and took over crowd-estimating duties. He was a devout, or at least clearly identifiable, member of the church sponsoring the event. The reporter asked for his estimate of the crowd. Without batting an eye, the deputy chief replied: 750,000. When he recovered the power of speech, the reporter dutifully phoned in the revised estimate—which of course was printed, since the editors knew which side of town their paper was peddled on.

All of which shows the difficulties you get into when the crowd estimators have convictions about the situation. And this brings us to last Saturday's peace march, when the professional neutrals found, to their dismay, that there wasn't a disinterested estimator to be found.

The protest leaders started it by predicting a turnout of 100,000. This made it only a matter of time before they announced this figure—which they did at 12:15, leading to the conclusion that they guessed the crowd was as big as it was going to get.

It was next reported that the police were estimating the crowd at 37,000. But a call to headquarters drew an indignant denial: nobody there had estimated more than 25,000. The cops' traditional disinterest had been torpedoed by the anti-law-and-order flavor of the demonstration speeches, so the police weren't about to do the marchers any favors, estimate-wise.

Next up with a crowd figure was the deeply committed Pentagon, represented by that familiar horseback estimator of Credibility Gap, the anonymous spokesman. With his usual straight face, he announced: 22,000.

Reporters took the Pentagon figure in the spirit with which it was offered, and chuckled appreciatively. But the march leaders were enraged, and promptly escalated their crowd estimate to 200,000.

The Pentagon reacted more slowly. It wasn't until tear gas was used and a handful of demonstrators broke through the Pentagon's perimeter defenses that the military realized what a hopeless position they had estimated themselves into.

If, as the Pentagon claimed, the demonstrators themselves had set off the tear gas after swiping it from the Army, the conclusion was inescapable: A rabble of 22,000 unarmed peace creeps had not only broken through a crack force of 10,000 professional soldiers armed to the teeth, but had actually succeeded in disarming some of them!

After mulling this over a while, the Pentagon announced that study of aerial photographs had led to a revision of the crowd estimate to 30,000 or even 35,000.

Somewhat modified, the march leaders de-escalated to 150,000. And the police, obviously pleased that the demonstrators had waited till they were in the Army's jurisdiction before misbehaving, revised their estimate up to 55,000.

With such evidence of sweet reasonableness on all sides, it seems not too much to hope that everyone involved—peace marchers, Pentagon and police—will sit down at the conference table one day soon and hammer out a crowd estimate we all can live with.

A CHAPLAIN'S CHALLENGE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it would be naive for anyone who thinks that the young men and women who marched on Washington in hordes last week did so because of spontaneous decisions suddenly reached at a multitude of locations around the country.

As I pointed out in statements prior to the demonstration, the decision to defile our American heritage, encourage the enemy, and disrupt the orderly processes of Government, was part of a plan carefully formulated over a long period of time.

I believe many of those men and women probably lacked the wisdom and maturity to see how their march on the Nation's Capital could comfort the enemy and prolong the war, meaning their brothers would shed more blood in the jungles of Vietnam. I believe that many of those young people were egged on by adults who were fully aware of the consequences.

Those adults—some of them misguided, others well meaning, but others deliberately working for total Communist domination over the free world—have openly exhorted the young men to harass their Government and to refuse to register for the draft or serve in the Armed Forces.

Under the Selective Service Act, Mr. President, it is a criminal offense for any person to counsel or help another to dodge the draft. The penalty upon conviction under title 50, appendix, United States Code, section 462(a), is up to 5 years in prison and/or a fine of up to $10,000.

An editorial in last night's Washington Star pointed out that Yale University Chaplain William Sloan Coffin, Jr., has publicly defied the Justice Department concerning this law. I quote, in part, from that editorial:

> Mr. Coffin, accompanied by several writers, professors and other ministers, went to the Department of Justice on Friday, and tried to hand over a large number of rejected draft cards . . .
>
> (Mr. Coffin) said that he and his associates had come to defy "in a dignified manner" a section of the Selective Service Act which makes it a criminal offense to aid or assist anyone to evade registration. He went on to say that "we hereby publicly counsel these young men to continue in their refusal to serve in the armed forces as long as the war in Vietnam continues . . ."
>
> In short, Chaplain Coffin, asserting his readiness to accept the consequences, declared himself in violation of the law and defied the attorney general to prosecute him.

Mr. President, the Star said it would be a sorry day for law enforcement in this country if we prosecute youngsters for destroying draft cards but blink our eyes at the kind of defiance displayed by Chaplain Coffin and others.

I urge the FBI and the Justice Department to move with utmost dispatch to investigate such cases of blatant disregard for the laws of this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Star editorial to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 26, 1967]

A CHAPLAIN'S CHALLENGE

Attorney General Ramsey Clark has been confronted with a challenge and a difficult decision.

Anti-war demonstrators last week were dumping their draft cards by the hundreds in the laps of federal officials, and this despite the fact that most of the latter refused to receive them. On Friday, the attorney general said the FBI will investigate each card-dumping case to determine whether the Selective Service Act was violated. And then he added: "The law will be enforced. Persons whose draft cards are discarded and who have no valid card in their possession face an accelerated induction or a criminal prosecution."

This is somewhat equivocal, since an accelerated induction is not the same thing as a criminal prosecution. But let us assume for the moment that it is a violation of law to discard, burn or for some other reason not to be in possession of a draft card.

There is some question about it. In one of our federal judicial circuits a draft-card burner was convicted of violating the law and the Supreme Court refused to review the case. The effect was to leave standing the conviction. In another federal circuit, however, the burning of a draft card has been held to be a symbolic expression of free speech, and therefore not punishable as a violation of law. The Supreme Court has agreed to review this case, and its decision presumably will be announced during this term.

The net result is that the attorney general, for the time being, can plead some small doubt as to whether it is illegal to burn or otherwise discard a draft card. But there can be no doubt about the challenge which he faces from the Rev. William Sloan Coffin, Jr., chaplain of Yale University.

Mr. Coffin, accompanied by several writers, professors and other ministers, went to the Department of Justice on Friday, and tried to hand over a large number of rejected draft cards to a Clark assistant, who refused them. But Mr. Coffin was not to be put off.

He said that he and his associates had come to defy "in a dignified manner" a section of the Selective Service Act which makes it a criminal offense to aid or assist anyone to evade registration. He went on to say that "we hereby publicly counsel these young men to continue in their refusal to serve in the armed forces as long as the war in Vietnam continues. . . ."

In short, Chaplain Coffin, asserting his readiness to accept the consequences, declared himself in violation of the law and defied the attorney general to prosecute him. Since then some 18 other clergymen attending a meeting in Detroit have taken virtually the same position.

What will Ramsey Clark do? It will be a sorry day for law enforcement in this country if some immature youngster is prosecuted as a criminal for destroying or throwing away his draft card while the attorney general blinks the defiance of Yale's chaplain and the other ministers. It is a hard decision. But we do not see how the attorney general can escape it.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 30, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Golden Anniversary of the Play Schools Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27, 1967

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, 1967 marks the golden anniversary of Play Schools Association, a voluntary, nonprofit agency which has been concerned for half a century with the enrichment of children's lives through play, after school in winter, all day in summer. Pioneers in giving normal children a chance to play, it now reaches out to all children—of all ethnic groups and regardless of handicap.

Today play is considered an essential and powerful force in the lives of children.

It is a force which helps children to learn while they are developing emotional and social maturity. The development of every individual to his highest capacity must be one of our greatest concerns.

During the past 50 years, Play Schools has promoted and established recreation programs for school-age children throughout the United States and most effectively in New York City, the association's headquarters. In cooperation with the New York City Board of Education and the Departments of Health and Social Services, it has established laboratory centers for training of recreation specialists and has sponsored play programs not only in public schools throughout the year, but in housing developments, children's institutions, hospitals and community centers. Together with its 52 affiliated agencies it carried out a city-wide program for over 12,500 children in poverty areas during the summer of 1967.

As the New York Times stated recently in an article about Play Schools Association:

> For a child the art of play is really the art of living. Play fills about 3,500 of the 8,760 hours in a year. To deny him the right of play leaves almost half his life in a vacuum. It must never be forgotten that children must be encouraged to learn as they experiment, as they question, as they imitate. Play is the area in which children practice life's skills.

The next half century will bring even greater changes than the last. We will see the growth of the megalopolis—vast urban areas extending for hundreds of miles—one city running indistinguishably into the next.

Just as we will see revolutionary new concepts of living—in design of housing, hospitals, schools, industrial complexes—so Play Schools must grow and change too. The long thread joining Play Schools' first and second half centuries will be the philosophy of working with parents as well as teachers, strengthening family living through the knowledge that the family that plays and has fun together grows healthy and productive adults.

Congratulations to the Play Schools Association on its 50 years of dedication to children's birthright of play and their recognition that children learn and grow as they play.

Art Younger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, during my 19 years in Congress it has been my privilege to serve with many outstanding Americans.

I served in this House with two Members who later became President of the United States, one who became Vice President and many who have been candidates for the Presidency. It was my great pleasure also to serve here under Speaker Sam Rayburn. Mr. Speaker, Art Younger was one of the greatest men ever to serve here. He was genteel, always kind and had time for a quiet word of encouragement. He radiated enthusiasm, understanding, and confidence.

Art Younger was a Christian who believed in and lived the oldtime principles of Christian faith upon which our Nation was founded. Art Younger became associated with the House Christian breakfast group during the 83d Congress. In the history of this group Art stands out with the late Percy Priest of Tennessee and Brooks Hays of Arkansas—great and good men who left their mark on this Congress and on this Nation.

Art Younger was an effective legislator, a credit and an asset to the Congress—a good image that we all might emulate. His vision was as broad as the distance of his district from Washington. He loved this Nation. America and even the free world are better because of his distinguished service in the Congress.

Art was a man of great courage and deep faith. He was a family man, devoted to his lovely wife.

Mrs. Dorn joins with me in extending to Mrs. Younger our deepest sympathy and in wishing for her the very best always.

Right and Responsibility of Dissent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1967

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, under the guise of freedom to dissent, somewhere between 40,000 and 50,000 demonstrators brought shame and dishonor to our Nation in Washington, D.C., last week.

A mass migration of beatniks, hippies, black nationalists, professional agitators, and naive students attempted to close down the Pentagon, which is the nerve center of the military defense of this Nation.

They came here from all parts of the country, by car, by bus, by train, and by plane. A legitimate question "Who paid for their transportation?"

The right to dissent is guaranteed by our Constitution. It is fundamental to maintain liberty and freedom. However, coupled with this "right" of dissent is a corresponding "responsibility."

Last Sunday night I went to the Pentagon to see the protest activities "firsthand." What I found was a mixture of misguided humanity. This conclusion was not drawn solely by their physical appearance.

The night was cold and bonfires were burning on the steps and grounds of the fortified building. Not only were these fires used for warmth but for the burning of draft cards and dollar bills. There were numerous protesters seated and sprawled on the steps of the Pentagon. Circling this group were U.S. soldiers and Federal marshals. Floating up from this gruesome sea of humanity was the scent of drugs.

Within this motley group was a large portable loudspeaker. The protesters would take turns speaking—their remarks were unbelievable. The so-called free speech was salted with vulgarity directed toward the troops. Anti-American phrases advocating violent revolution were common. Filthy signs were displayed while others exercised their "dissent" by painting obscene remarks and figures on the walls of the Pentagon.

The restraint shown by the military and the Federal marshals to the taunts and the face-to-face confrontation with the demonstrators was remarkable. They swallowed humiliation and never once lost their composure.

As I mingled amongst the dissenters I have never seen such a group of confused, selfish, and malicious young people. They were a real dedicated bunch of draft dodgers.

After leaving this disgusting scene I talked to bushy-haired Jerry Rubin, a codirector for the march and Peking-oriented leader of the Progressive Labor Party. Rubin, who has been active in violent protest demonstrations throughout the country, told me that a "revolution has begun and no power can stop it."

I witnessed the military warn the protesters that the agreed time for the march to end had arrived. The protesters, who had previously agreed to the terms of the march, refused to leave. It was necessary to carry them bodily from the steps to awaiting police vans to be arrested.

The entire group represented a real waste of humanity—young derelicts with no purpose or direction—a ship without a rudder.

While we as a free people, and as a government, will continue to jealously guard and protect the right of every American to dissent—the fact remains that these misled young followers have provided incriminating propaganda to Communist countries. Their demonstrations are not patriotic, nor do they provide the morale needed in Vietnam. Instead it is aiding and abetting the enemy. Make no mistake how the Communists will interpret this demonstration. They see it as a weakening of America's attitude toward the war.

It behooves us as citizens of our country to act immediately to correct a condition that may very well give seed to our own destruction as a free country.

The financial cost of handling this pro-Vietcong rally held last week was estimated at over $1 million. This does not include the value of the large amount of planning and staff time by the Government that went into preparing for the 2-day demonstration, nor does it include the cost, estimated at $350,000, of the military man-days of the Federal troops that defended the Pentagon.

The cost of this demonstration to our Nation's security is indeterminable.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Benedetto Pascale, pastor, Silver Lake Baptist Church, Belleville, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, Creator of heaven and earth, from whom all blessings flow, and in whom we live, move, and have our being: we give Thee thanks for Thy goodness, love, and truth revealed to us. Grant us clear vision of our task and deep devotion to service. No one can flee from Thy presence or escape from personal responsibility. Thou livest in our midst and within us all. We seek Thy discipline, Thy correction, and Thy guidance. Thou hast been our guide in ages past, and Thou art our hope for years to come. Thee we acknowledge and call for help in this perplexed hour in which we live.

Bless the Members of this august Senate; give each one divine inspiration, wisdom, and steadfastness; for whatever is legislated here affects the individual citizen, the Nation, and the world.

Bless our Nation, O God, and help us to bear each other's burdens; giving a helping hand rather than pointing a finger. Our fathers trusted in Thee and were rewarded. Help us to value so great a heritage entrusted to us, that we may bring it to greater heights of glory.

We pray for peace on earth and good will among all men. In Jesus' name. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 13510) to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 13510) to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 27, 1967, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HARRIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the transaction of routine morning business, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 27, 1967,

The Secretary of the Senate, on October 27, 1967, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the

300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America;

H.R. 5894. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi;

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion;

H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT UNDER PROVISIONS OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement which have been prepared under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; (with accompanying papers) to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO MAKE SPECIAL STUDIES, PROVIDE SERVICES, ENGAGE IN JOINT PRACTICES, ET CETERA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF ACT TO PROVIDE BETTER FACILITIES FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amount authorized to be expended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

ANNUAL REPORT OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

A letter from the commander, Civil Air Patrol, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Civil Air Patrol for the calendar year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT UNDER WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement which have been prepared under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Tustin, Calif., remonstrating, against the principle of Federal tax sharing; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Inter-American Federation for Democracy in Greece, New York City, N.Y., relating to the restoration of democracy and freedom in Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of San Bernardino County, Calif., praying for action by the Congress to take action to clarify the intent of the Congress relating to the Common Varities Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2597. A bill for the promotion of the progress of useful arts by the general revision of the Patent Laws, titles 35 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 2598. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, making changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROMOTION OF THE PROGRESS OF THE USEFUL ARTS BY THE GENERAL REVISION OF THE PATENT LAWS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the promotion of the progress of the useful arts by the general revision of the patent laws—that is title 35 of the United States Code—and for other purposes.

This bill updates and renovates our patent laws while preserving essential features of the U.S. patent system which provide incentives to individuals and to businesses, large and small, to promote the progress of the useful arts. Underlying our patent system is the equitable principle that a patent should be granted to the person who first makes the invention as distinguished from the expedient used in most foreign countries of granting the patent to the first person who files an application. A second, and interrelated, feature of the U.S. patent system is the period of 1 year which is accorded an inventor to apply for a patent after public use or publication of the invention. Together, these two unique features of the U.S. patent system permit and encourage many desirable activities to take place before filing the patent application, including:

First. Inventors may exchange information with others;

Second. Inventions may be published;

Third. Development of inventions may be completed;

Fourth. Inventors may obtain advice on technical, marketing, and other problems;

Fifth. The invention may be publicly tested;

Sixth. The invention may be exploited commercially; and

Seventh. Patent applications may be carefully and completely prepared for those inventions which are considered worth while.

Unlike most foreign countries, the vast majority of the patents issued in the United States are issued to citizens of this country, and it is the interests of our citizens which are paramount in any consideration of revision of the patent laws.

This bill preserves the unique features of the American patent system which enable individuals and small businesses to compete with international industrial giants in developing and exploiting inventions according to the basic American tradition of free enterprise. At the same time, this bill revises the patent laws in a manner to improve and strengthen the U.S. patent system.

To improve the quality and reliability of patents, this bill eliminates some of the uncertainties concerning patents by defining more precisely the "prior art" against which the patentability of an invention must be measure. Also, before a patent is issued, any interested person may present evidence affecting the patentability of the invention, thereby reducing the possibility that a patent may subsequently be found to be invalid. Uniform interpretation of the standards of patentability will result from the consolidation of all review of Patent Office decisions in the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

Many provisions of this bill streamline rigid and technical requirements of the present law to reduce the time and expense of issuing patents. So the Patent Office may more expeditiously ascertain the "prior art" pertinent to an application for patent, this bill provides for a research program to improve and expedite storage and retrieval of patents and other scientific and technical information. Strict provisions of the present statute are relaxed to permit owners, as well as inventors, to file applications. Provisions concerning joint inventors have been liberalized. Signatory requirement for certain related applications are eliminated.

Computation of the term of a patent from its filing date rather than its issue date will encourage applicants to act promptly; any dilatory practice by an applicant will, in effect, curtail the life of the patent. Interferences between pending patent applications are eliminated, as are civil actions based upon Patent Office decisions in inter partes cases. Unnecessary examination of many applications will be avoided by provision for voluntary publication and abandonment of applications without loss of effective filing dates or other rights.

In *Sperry* v. *State of Florida*, 373 U.S. 388, 83 S. Ct. 1322 (1963), the Supreme Court reiterated its earlier holding that the preparation and prosecution of patent applications before the Patent Office involves the practice of law in its most intricate and complex sense. But the Court also found that the Congress, by the present patent statute, has authorized nonlawyers to engage in such legal practice before the Patent Office, so the States cannot interfere with what would otherwise be the unauthorized practice of law. To correct this undesirable situation, this bill will limit practice before the Patent Office to members of the bar, with appropriate safeguards for nonlawyers who have already been admitted to practice before the Patent Office.

Without affecting the security of the United States in any way, some rigid requirements with respect to licenses for filing in foreign countries have been relaxed and provisions for granting retroactive licenses liberalized; courts are given the power to grant retroactive licenses or declare patents invalid for failure to comply with the licensing provisions.

To avoid different interpretations by a variety of courts of the application of antitrust laws to the use of patent property, this bill defines certain activities in which a patent owner may engage without jeopardizing his patent rights. Provision is made for preventing the importation of products made abroad by a process patented in the United States and for recovery of damages for unauthorized use of an invention after the patent application is published. Uncertainties resulting from the issuance of two or more patents on related inventions can be eliminated where the patents expire on the same date rather than risk the present inequitable situation where both patents may be held invalid.

In conjunction with the enlargement of the jurisdiction of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, provision is made for the employment of additional judges, at least some of whom are to be qualified in patent law. Such appointments will provide a nucleus of experienced patent judges who will be available, upon request, to assist other courts in handling the heavy load of complex and frequently protracted patent cases. Rather than propose legislation especially applicable to the trial of patent cases, it is believed the time and expense necessary for the trial of patent cases will likely be reduced as a result of the continuing review and revision of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the continuing development of pretrial techniques in the Federal courts.

In summary, this bill is offered as a compromise between S. 1042 and S. 1691 of the 90th Congress, because it modernizes our patent laws without destroying the proven principles upon which the U.S. patent system is based solely for the sake of international standardization of inferior patent systems used in other countries.

Mr. President, this is a very considerable revision of our patent code. It has the approval of the American Bar Association, and, very particularly, the patent section of the association. I think it would be in the public interest if the bill were set out in full in the RECORD, because lawyers all over the country will be saved the trouble of sending to the document room for a copy, when it is available in the RECORD in their local libraries. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2597) for the promotion of the progress of the useful arts by the general revision of the patent laws, title 35 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2597

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 35 of the United States Code, entitled "Patents", is hereby amended in its entirety to read as follows:

"TITLE 35—PATENTS

"Part	Sec.
"I. Patent Office	1
"II. Patentability of Inventions and Grant of Patents	100
"III. Patents and Protection of Patent Rights	251

"PART I—PATENT OFFICE

"CHAPTER	
"1. Establishment, Officers Functions	1
"2. Proceedings in the Patent Office	21
"3. Practice Before the Patent Office	31
"4. Patent Fees	41

"CHAPTER 1.—ESTABLISHMENT, OFFICERS, FUNCTIONS

"Sec.
"1. Establishment.
"2. Seal.
"3. Officers and employees.
"4. Restrictions on officers and employees as to interest in patents.
"5. Bond of Commissioner and other officers.
"6. Duties of Commissioner.
"7. Board of Appeals.
"8. Library.
"9. Classification of patents.
"10. Certified copies of records.
"11. Publications.
"12. Research and studies.

"§ 1. Establishment

"The Patent Office shall be an Office in the Department of Commerce, where records, books, drawings, specifications, and other papers and things pertaining to patents and to trademark registrations shall be kept and preserved, except as otherwise provided by law.

"§ 2. Seal

"The Patent Office shall have a seal with which letters patent, certificates of trademark registrations, and papers issued from the Office shall be authenticated.

"§ 3. Officers and employees

"(a) A Commissioner of Patents, one first assistant commissioner, two other assistant commissioners, and not more than twenty-four examiners-in-chief shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The assistant commissioners shall perform the duties pertaining to the office of Commissioner assigned to them or by the Commissioner. The first assistant commissioner, or, in the event of a vacancy in that office, the assistant commissioner senior in date of appointment, shall fill the office of Commissioner during a vacancy in that office until a Commissioner is appointed and takes office. The Secretary of Commerce, upon the nomination of the Commissioner in accordance with law, shall appoint all other officers and employees.

"(b) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to fix the per annum rate of basic compensation of each examiner-in-chief in the Patent Office at not in excess of the maximum scheduled rate provided for positions in grade 17 of the General Schedule of positions referred to in section 5104 of title 5, United States Code, and of the assistant commissioners at not in excess of the rate provided for positions in grade 18.

"§ 4. Restriction on officers and employees as to interest in patents

"Officers and employees of the Patent Office shall be incapable, during the period of their appointments and for one year thereafter, of applying for a patent and of acquiring, directly or indirectly, except by inheritance or bequest, any patent or any right or interest in any patent, issued or to be issued by the Office. In patents applied for thereafter, they shall not be entitled to any priority date earlier than one year after the termination of their appointment.

"§ 5. Bond of Commissioner and other officers

"The Commissioners and such other officers as he designates, before entering upon their duties, shall severally give bond, with sureties, the former in the sum of $10,000, and the latter in sums prescribed by the Commissioner, conditioned for the faithful discharge of their respective duties and that they shall render to the proper officers of the Treasury a true account of all money received by virtue of their offices.

"§6. Duties of Commissioner

"The Commissioner, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, shall superintend or perform all duties required by law respecting the granting and issuing of patents and the registration of trademarks; and he shall have charge of property belonging to the Patent Office. He may establish regulations, not inconsistent with law, for the conduct of proceedings in the Patent Office.

"§ 7. Board of Appeals

"(a) The Commissioner, the assistant commissioners, and the examiners-in-chief shall consttiute a Board of Appeals in the Patent Office. The examiners-in-chief shall be persons of competent legal knowledge and scientific ability.

"(b) The Board of Appeals shall:

"(1) Review adverse decisions of the examiners upon applications for patents as provided in section 134 of this title.

"(2) Review or consider actions arising under sections 136 and 137 of this title in accordance with regulations established for such purpose.

"(3) Perform the functions specified as being performed by a Board of Patent Interferences in Public Law 593, Eighty-second Congress (ch. 950, 66 Stat. 792, section 1), and in other Acts of Congress and when performing said function shall constitute a Board of Patent Interferences.

"(c) Each appeal or other action shall be heard or considered by at least three members of the Board of Appeals. The Board of Appeals has sole power to grant rehearings.

"(d) Whenever the Commissioner considers it necessary to maintain the work of the Board of Appeals current, he may designate any patent examiner of the primary examiner grade or higher having the requisite ability, to serve as acting examiner-in-chief for periods not exceeding six months each. An examiner so designated shall be qualified to act as a member of the Board of Appeals. Not more than one acting examiner-in-chief shall be a member of the Board of Appeals hearing an appeal or considering a case. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to fix the per annum rate of basic compensation of each acting examiner-in-chief in the Patent Office at not in excess of the maximum scheduled rate provided for positions in grade 16 of the General Schedule of positions referred to in section 5104 of title 5, United States Code. The per annum rate of basic compensation of each acting examiner-in-chief shall be adjusted, at the close of the period for which he was designated to act as examiner-in-chief, to the per annum rate of basic compensation which he would have been receiving at the close of such period if such designation had not been made.

"§ 8. Library

"The Commissioner shall maintain a library of scientific and other works and periodicals, both foreign and domestic, in the Patent Office to aid the officers in the discharge of their duties.

"§ 9. Classification of patents

"The Commissioner shall maintain a classification by subject matter of published specifications of United States patents and applications and of such other patents and applications and other scientific and technical information as may be necessary or practicable, for the purpose of determining with readiness and accuracy the novelty of inventions for which applications for patent are filed.

"§ 10. Certified copies of record

"The Commissioner may, upon payment of the prescribed fee, furnish certified copies of records of the Patent Office to persons entitled thereto.

"§ 11. Publications

"(a) The Commissioner may publish, or cause to be published, in such format as he shall determine to be suitable under applicable laws and regulations, the following:

"(1) Patent applications and parts thereof, subject to the provisions of this title, patent abstracts and patents, including specifications and drawings, together with copies of the same.

"(2) Certificates of trademark registrations, including statements and drawings, together with copies of the same.

"(3) The Official Gazette of the United States Patent Office.

"(4) Annual indices of patents and patentees, published applications and applicants, and of trademarks and registrants.

"(5) Annual volumes of decisions in patent and trademark cases.

"(6) Classification manuals and indices of the classifications of patents.

"(7) Pamphlet copies of the patent laws and rules of practice, laws and rules relating to trademarks and circulars or other publications relating to the business of the Office.

"(b) The Patent Office may print the headings of the drawings for patents for the purpose of photolithography.

"§ 12. Research and studies

"(a) The Commissioner shall conduct a program of research and development to improve and expedite the handling, classification, storage and retrieval of patents and other scientific and technical information.

"(b) The Commissioner shall conduct and sponsor studies to aid in analyzing the contemporary needs of the patent system and in evaluating the effectiveness of the patent system in serving the public interest.

"CHAPTER 2.—PROCEEDINGS IN THE PATENT OFFICE

"Sec.
"21. Day for taking action falling on Saturday, Sunday, or holiday.
"22. Printing of papers filed.
"23. Testimony in Patent Office cases.
"24. Subpenas, witnesses.
"25. Oath; declaration in lieu of oath.
"26. Effect of defective execution.

"§ 21. Day for taking action falling on Saturday, Sunday, or holiday

"When the day, or the last day, for taking any action or paying any fee in the United States Patent Office falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday within the District of Columbia, the action may be taken, or the fee paid, on the next succeeding secular or business day.

"§ 22. Printing of papers filed

"The Commissioner may by regulation prescribe the form, and manner of reproduction, of papers filed in the Patent Office.

"§ 23. Testimony in Patent Office cases

"The Commissioner may establish rules for taking affidavits and depositions required in cases in the Patent Office. Any officer authorized by law to take depositions to be used in the courts of the United States, or of the State where he resides, may take such affidavits and depositions.

"§ 24. Subpenas, witnesses

"The clerk of any United States court for the district wherein testimony is to be taken for use in any contested case in the Patent Office, shall, upon the application of any party thereto, issue a subpena for any witness residing or being within such district, commanding him to appear and testify before an officer in such district authorized to take depositions and affidavits, at the time and place stated in the subpena. The provisions of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure relating to the attendance of the witnesses and to the production of documents and things shall apply to contested cases in the Patent Office.

"Every witness subpenaed and in attendance shall be allowed the fees and traveling expenses allowed to witnesses attending the United States district courts.

"A judge of a court whose clerk issued a subpena may enforce obedience to the process or punish disobedience as in other like cases, on proof that a witness, served with such subpena, neglected or refused to appear or to testify. No witness shall be deemed guilty of contempt for disobeying such subpena unless his fees and traveling expenses in going to, and returning from, and one day's attendance at the place of examination, are paid or tendered to him at the time of the service of the subpena; nor for refusing to disclose any secret matter except upon appropriate order of the court which issued the subpena.

"§ 25. Oath; declaration in lieu of oath

"(a) An oath to be filed in the Patent Office may be made before any person within the United States authorized by law to administer oaths, or, when made in a foreign country, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States authorized to administer oaths, or before any officer authorized to administer oaths in the foreign country in which the applicant may be, whose authority shall be proved by certificate of a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, and such oath shall be valid if it complies with the laws of the state or country where made.

"(b) The Commissioner may by rule prescribe that any document to be filed in the Patent Office and which is required by any law, rule, or other regulation to be under oath may be subscribed to by a written declaration in such form as the Commissioner may prescribe, such declaration to be in lieu of the oath otherwise required.

"(c) Whenever such written declaration is used, the document must warn the declarant that willful false statements and the like are subject to punishment including fine or imprisonment, or both.

"§ 26. Effect of defective execution

"Any document to be filed in the Patent Office and which is required by any law, rule, or other regulation to be executed in a specified manner may be provisionally accepted by the Commissioner despite a defective execution, provided a properly executed document is submitted within such time as may be prescribed.

"CHAPTER 3.—PRACTICE BEFORE PATENT OFFICE

"Sec.
"31. Regulations for agents and attorneys.
"32. Suspension or exclusion from practice.
"33. Unauthorized representation as practitioner.

"§ 31. Regulations for agents and attorneys

"The Commissioner may prescribe regulations governing the recognition and conduct of agents, attorneys, or other persons representing applicants or other parties before the Patent Office, and may require them, before being recognized as representatives of applicants or other persons, to show that they are of good moral character and reputation and are possessed of the necessary qualifications to render to applicants or other persons valuable service, advice, and assistance in the presentation or prosecution of their applications or other business before the Office. Only members of the bar of a State, Territory, District, Commonwealth or Possession of the United States may be recognized as representatives of applicants, or practice before the Patent Office, except those representatives recognized prior to the effective date of this Act.

"§ 32. Suspension or exclusion from practice

"The Commissioner may, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, suspend or exclude, either generally or in any particular case, from further practice before the Patent Office, any person, agent, or attorney shown to be incompetent or disreputable, or guilty of gross misconduct, or who does not comply with the regulations established under section 31 of this title, or who shall, by word, circular, letter, or advertising, with intent to defraud in any manner, deceive, mislead, or threaten any applicant or prospective applicant, or other person having immediate or prospective business before the Office. The reasons for any such suspension or exclusion shall be duly recorded. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, under such conditions and upon such proceedings as it by its rules determines, may review the action of the Commissioner upon the petition of the person so suspended or excluded.

"§ 33. Unauthorized representation as practitioner

"Whoever, not being recognized to practice before the Patent Office, holds himself out or permits himself to be held out as so recognized, or as being qualified to prepare or prosecute applications for patent, shall be fined not more than $1,000 for each offense.

"CHAPTER 4.—PATENT FEES

"Sec.
"41. Patent fees.
"42. Payment of patent fees; return of excess amounts.

"§ 41. Patent fees

"(a) The Commissoner shall charge the following fees:

"(1) On filing each application for an original patent, except in design cases, $65; in addition, of filing or on presentation at any other time, $10 for each claim in independent form which is in excess of one, and $2 for each claim (whether independent or dependent) which is in excess of ten. Errors in payment of the additional fees may be rectified in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner.

"(2) For publishing under section 123 of this title each application for an original or reissue patent, $50; in addition, $10 for each page or portion thereof) of specification as printed, and $2 for each sheet of drawing.

"(3) For publishing under section 151 of this title each application for an original or reissue patent which was not previously published under section 123 of this title, $50; in addition, $10 for each page (or portion thereof) of specification as printed, and $2 for each sheet of drawing.

"(4) For publishing under section 151 of this title any changes in an application previously published under section 123 of this title, $10 for each page (or portion thereof) of changed specification as printed, and $2 for each sheet of changed drawing.

"(5) For issuing each original or reissue patent, except in design cases, $50.

"(6) In design cases:

"a. On filing each design application, $20.

"b. On issuing each design patent: For three years and six months, $10; for seven years, $20; and for fourteen years, $30.

"(7) On filing each application for the reissue of a patent, $65; in addition, on filing or on presentation at any other time, $10 for each claim in independent form which is in excess of the number of independent claims of the original patent, and $2 for each claim (whether independent or dependent) which is in excess of ten and also in excess of the number of claims of the original patent. Errors in payment of the additional fees may be rectified in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner.

"(8) On filing each disclaimer, $15.

"(9) On appeal for the first time from the examiner to the Board of Appeals, $50; in addition, on filing a brief in support of the appeal, $50.

"(10) On filing each petition for the revival of an abandoned application for a patent or for the delayed payment of the fee for issuing each patent, $15.

"(11) For certificate under section 255 or under section 256 of this title, $15.

"(12) As available and if in print: For uncertified printed copies of specifications and drawings of published applications and patents (except design patents), 50 cents per copy; for design patents, 20 cents per copy; the Commissioner may establish a charge not to exceed $1 per copy for published applications and patents in excess of twenty-five pages of drawings and specifications and for plant patents printed in color; special rates for public libraries in the United States which maintain copies of patents for use of the public, $50 for patents issued in one year. The Commissioner may, without charge, provide applicants with copies of specifications and drawings of published applications and patents when referred to in a notice under section 132.

"(13) For recording every assignment, agreement, or other paper relating to the property in a patent or application, $20; where the document relates to more than one patent or application, $3 for each additional item.

"(14) For each certificate, $1.

"(15) For delayed payment pursuant to section 151(d) of this title, $25.

"(b) The Commissioner may establish charges for copies of records, publications, or services furnished by the Patent Office, not specified above.

"(c) The fees prescribed by or under this section shall apply to any other Government department or agency, or officer thereof, except that the Commissioner may waive the payment of any fee for services or materials in cases of occasional or incidental requests by a Government department or agency, or officer thereof.

"(d) The Commissioner shall prescribe by regulations, consistent with the provisions of this title, the time for payment of the fees to be paid under this title. If payment of the fees in connection with the examination, publication or issuance of a patent application are not timely made, the application shall be regarded as abandoned. An applicant shall be given at least thirty days following notice of a fee due pursuant to section 123 or 151 of this title in which to pay the fee.

"(e) The Commissioner may prescribe by regulations when copies of Patent Office records and publications may be provided without charge or in exchange for records or publications of foreign countries.

"§ 42. Payment of fees; return of excess amounts

"All fees shall be paid to the Commissioner, who shall deposit the same in the Treasury of the United States in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury directs, and the Commissioner may refund any sum paid by mistake or in excess of the fee required.

"PART II—PATENTABILITY OF INVENTIONS AND GRANT OF PATENTS

"Chapter Sec.
"10. Patentability of Inventions........ 100
"11. Application for Patent............ 111
"12. Examination of Applications...... 131
"13. Review of Patent Office Decisions... 141
"14. Issue of Patent.................. 151
"15. Plant Patents.................... 161
"16. Designs 171
"17. Secrecy of Certain Inventions and Filing Applications Abroad...... 181

"CHAPTER 10.—PATENTABILITY OF INVENTIONS

"Sec.
"100. Definitions.
"101. Right to patent: inventions patentable.
"102. Conditions for patentability; novelty and loss of right to patent.
"103. Conditions for patentability; non-obvious subject matter.
"104. Invention made abroad.
"107. Abandonment of invention.

"§ 100. Definitions

"When used in this title unless the context otherwise indicates—

"(a) The term "invention" means invention or discovery.

"(b) The term "process" means process, art or method and includes a new use of a known process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter, or material.

"(c) The terms "United States" and "this country" means the United States of America, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(d)) The term "applicant" means any person who has filed or who owns an application for patent as provided in this title.

"(e) The term "patentee" includes not only the person to whom the patent was issued but also the successors in title to such person.

"(f) The term "effective filing date," when used in reference to an application for patent, includes the filing date to which such application, or the subject matter of any claim thereof, may be entitled under the provisions of section 119 or 120 of this title. An application or the resulting patent may contain separate claims for subject matter having different effective filing dates.

"(g) The term "useful" shall include, but shall not be limited to, utility in agriculture, commerce, industry, health, or research.

"(h) The term "prior art" means:

"(1) A published United States patent application or United States patent of another which has an actual filing date in the United States before the invention thereof by the inventor named in the applicant's application; or

"(2) Subject matter known or used by others in this country before the invention thereof by the inventor named in the applicant's application; or

"(3) A patent or publication in this or a foreign country reasonably available before the invention by the inventor named in the applicant's application, or more than one year prior to the effective filing date of the application for patent in the United States; or

"(4) Subject matter sold or in public use in this country more than one year prior to the effective filing date of the application for patent in the United States.

"§ 101. Right to patent: inventions patentable

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, or his successor in title, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

"§ 102. Conditions for patentability; novelty and loss of right to patent

"An applicant shall be entitled to a patent unless:

"(a) The invention sought to be patented is identically disclosed or described by the prior art; or

"(b) The applicant has abandoned the invention; or

"(c) The invention was first patented or caused to be patented by the applicant or his legal representatives or assigns in a foreign country prior to the date of the application for patent in this country on an application filed more than twelve months before the filing of the application in the United States; or

"(d) The inventor named in the applicant's application did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented; or

"(e) Before the invention thereof by the inventor named in the applicant's application, the invention was made in this country by another who had not abandoned, suppressed, or concealed it. In determining priority of invention, there shall be considered not only the respective dates of conception and reduction to practice of the invention, but also the reasonable diligence of one who was first to conceive and last to reduce to practice, from a time prior to conception by the other.

"§ 103. Conditions for patentability; non-obvious subject matter

"A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described in the prior art if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that said subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made, or more than one year prior to the effective filing date of the application, to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

"§ 104. Invention made abroad

"In proceedings in the Patent Office and in the courts, an applicant for a patent, or a patentee, may not establish a date of invention by reference to knowledge or use thereof, or other activity with respect thereto, in a foreign country, except as provided in section 119 of this title. Where an invention was made by a person, civil or military, while domiciled in the United States and serving in a foreign country in connection with operations by or on behalf of the United States, he shall be entitled to the same rights of priority with respect to such invention as if the same had been made in the United States.

"§ 107. Abandonment of invention

"(a) Abandonment of an application for patent does not of itself establish abandonment of an invention disclosed therein.

"(b) Publication of an application under the provisions of section 123 or 151 of this title refutes any inference that an invention disclosed therein was abandoned after the effective filing date thereof.

CHAPTER 11.—APPLICATION FOR PATENT

"Sec.
"111. Application for patent.
"112. Specification.
"113. Drawings.
"114. Models, specimens.
"115. Oath of applicant.
"116. Joint inventors.
"117. Death or incapacity of inventor.
"119. Benefit of earlier filing date in foreign country; right of priority.
"120. Benefit of earlier filing date in the United States.
"121. Divisional applications.
"122. Confidential status of application.
"123. Publication.

"§ 111. Application for patent

"(a) An application for patent may be filed by either the inventor or the owner of the invention sought to be patented. The application shall be made in writing to the Commissioner, shall be signed by the applicant and shall include or be amended to include the name of each person believed to have made an inventive contribution, and shall be accompanied by the prescribed fee. An application filed by a person not the inventor shall include, at the time of filing, a statement of the facts supporting the allegation of ownership of the invention, which statement may be amended.

"(b) For purposes of filing a patent application and securing a filing date, an application may be signed by an agent of the inventor or owner provided the application is ratified by the signature of the inventor or owner within six months thereafter.

"(c) When the application is signed by the owner or his agent, the owner, within ten days after filing an application for patent, shall serve a copy of the application on the inventor; service may be effected by mailing a copy of the application, first class mail, to the last known address of the inventor.

"(d) An application for patent shall include:

"(1) A specification as prescribed by section 112 of this title;

"(2) A drawing as prescribed by section 113 of this title; and

"(3) An oath prescribed by section 115 of this title.

"(e) In an application, omission of an inventor's name or inclusion of the name of one not an inventor, without deceptive intent, may be corrected at any time, in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner.

"(f) When the Commissioner requires or publishes an abstract of the technical disclosure of an application, such abstract shall not be used either in the Patent Office or after the issuance of a patent to determine or interpret the scope of the invention claimed.

"§ 112. Specification

"(a) The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the applicant of carrying out the invention. The specification shall also indicate the use of said invention.

"(b) The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant desires to secure by letters patent. A claim may be written in independent or dependent form, and if in dependent form, it shall be construed to include all the limitations of the claim incorporated by reference into the dependent claim.

"(c) An element in a claim for a combination may be expressed as a means or step for performing a specified function without the recital of structure, material, or acts in support thereof, and such claim shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof.

"§ 113. Drawings

"When the nature of the case admits, the applicant shall furnish a drawing.

"§ 114. Models, specimens

"The Commissioner may require the applicant to furnish a model or specimen of convenient size to exhibit advantageously the several parts of his invention.

"When the invention is related to a composition of matter, the Commissioner may require the applicant to furnish specimens or ingredients for the purpose of inspection or experiment.

"§ 115. Oath of applicant

"(a) The applicant, if he is the inventor, shall make oath that he believes himself to be the original and first inventor of the subject matter sought to be patented and shall state of what country he is a citizen.

"(b) The applicant, if he is not the inventor, shall make an oath that he believes the named inventor to be the original and first inventor of the subject matter sought to be patented and shall state of what country the named inventor is a citizen; such oath shall verify the statement of facts supporting the allegation of ownership of the invention.

"(c) The applicant of an application filed pursuant to section 117 of this title may make the oath required by subsection (b) of this section, so varied in form that it can be made by him.

"§ 116. Joint inventors

"(a) When two or more persons have made inventive contributions to subject matter claimed in an application, they shall apply for a patent jointly and each sign the application and make required oath, or, if the application is filed by some other person having the right to do so, they shall be named as the inventors.

"(b) In an application for patent for a joint invention, it shall not be necessary for each person named as joint inventor to be a joint inventor of the invention asserted in each claim.

"(c) If a joint inventor refuses to join in an application for patent or cannot be found or reached after diligent effort, the application may be made by the other inventor on behalf of himself and the omitted inventor. The Commissioner, on proof of the pertinent facts and after such notice to the omitted inventor as he prescribes, may publish the application and grant a patent to the inventor making the application, subject to the same rights which the omitted inventor would have had if he had been joined. The omitted inventor may subsequently join in the application.

"§ 117. Death or incapacity of inventor

"Legal representatives of deceased inventors and of those under legal incapacity may make application for patent upon compliance with the requirements and on the same terms and conditions applicable to the inventor.

"§ 119. Benefit of earlier filing date in foreign country; right of priority

"(a) An application for patent for an invention filed in this country by any person who has, or whose predecessor or successor in title has, previously regularly filed an application for a patent for the same invention by the same inventor in a foreign country which affords similar privileges in the case of applications filed in the United States or to citizens of the United States, shall have the same effect as the same application would have if filed in the United States on the date on which the application for patent for the same invention was first filed in any such foreign country, if the application in this country is filed within twelve months from the earliest date on which such foreign application was filed.

"(b) No application shall be entitled to a right of priority under this section, unless the applicant makes a claim therefor at the time the application is filed and complies with such requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulations; amendment of such claim may be made during examination or reexamination of the application as provided in Chapter 12 of this title.

"(c) In like manner and subject to the same conditions and requirements, the right provided in this section may be based upon a subsequent regularly filed application in the same foreign country instead of the first filed foreign application, provided that any foreign application filed prior to such subsequent application has been withdrawn, abandoned, or otherwise disposed of, without having been laid open to public inspection and without leaving any rights outstanding, and has not served, nor thereafter shall serve, as a basis for claiming a right of priority.

"§ 120. Benefit of earlier filing date in the United States

"(a) An application for patent for an invention shall have the same effect as to such invention as though filed on the date a prior application was filed, or the date to which a prior application is directly or indirectly entitled under this subsection (a) or under section 119 of this title, if:

"(1) The two applications have the same applicant;

"(2) The invention is disclosed in the prior application in the manner provided by the first paragraph of section 112 of this title;

"(3) The later application is filed before the abandonment of, or the issuance of a patent on, the prior application, and

"(4) The applicant specifically claims the benefit of such date for subject matter claimed in the later application at the time of filing the later application, or by amendment thereof.

"(b) The Commissioner may by regulation dispense with signing and execution in the case of an application directed solely to subject matter described in a prior application of the same applicant.

"§ 121. Divisional applications

"(a) If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application, the Commissioner may require the application to be restricted to one of them. A requirement for an election of species is a requirement for restriction and, in the event of such requirement, each separate species shall be considered a separate and distinct invention.

"(b) The validity of a patent may not be questioned for failure of the Commissioner to require the application to be restricted under subsection (a) of this section, nor may the validity of either of two or more patents resulting from and in accordance with a requirement under said subsection (a) be questioned solely because of the existence of several patents, if the subsequent application is filed in accordance with the provisions of section 120 of this chapter.

"§ 122. Confidential status of applications

"Applications for patents shall be kept in confidence by the Patent Office and no information concerning the same given without authority of the applicant or owner unless necessary to carry out the provisions of any Act of Congress or in such special circumstances as may be determined by the Commissioner.

"§ 123. Publication

"(a) An applicant may, upon the payment of the prescribed fee, request publication of his pending application and publication of the pending application shall occur as soon as practicable after the request.

"(b) Before publication of an application under this section, the applicant may be required, subject to sections 132 and 133 of this title, to place the application in proper form for publication.

"CHAPTER 12.—EXAMINATION OF APPLICATION

"Sec.
"131. Examination of application.
"132. Notice of rejection; reexamination.
"133. Time for prosecuting application.
"134. Appeal to the Board of Appeals.
"136. Reexamination after publication.
"137. Priority of invention.

"§ 131. Examination of application

"The Commissioner shall cause an examination to be made of the application and the alleged new invention; and if on such examination it is determined that the applicant is entitled to a patent under the law, the Commissioner shall issue a patent therefor as hereinafter provided. The granting of a patent shall not be refused solely on the ground that if it occurred there would then exist more than one patent for the same invention where the patents will expire on the same date as a result of filing on the same date or as a result of a terminal disclaimer pursuant to section 253 of this title, so long as the right to sue for infringement of said patents is in the same legal entity. Insofar as reasonably feasible, the examination shall be in the order of the application's earliest effective filing date.

"§ 132. Notice of rejection; reexamination

"Whenever, on examination, any claim of an application is rejected, or any objection or requirement made, the Commissioner shall notify the applicant thereof, stating the reasons therefor, together with such information and references as may be useful in judging the propriety of continuing the prosecution of the application; and if after receiving such notice, the applicant requests reexamination, with or without amendment, the application shall be reexamined. No amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention.

"§ 133. Time for prosecuting application

"Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

"§ 134. Appeal to the Board of Appeals

"An applicant for a patent, any of whose claims has been finally or twice rejected, may appeal from the decision of the primary examiner to the Board of Appeals, having once paid the fee for such appeal.

"§ 136. Reexamination after publication

"(a) Any person may notify the Commissioner of patents or publications which may have a bearing on the patentability of a published application, and the Commissioner may cause the application to be examined or reexamined in the light thereof.

"(b) If such notification explains in writing the pertinency of the patents or publications cited and is received within three months, or within such longer time as the Commissioner appoints but not more than six months, after publication of the application under section 151 of this title, the citations shall be considered by the Patent Office; such consideration shall be an examination in accordance with sections 131 and 132 hereof.

"(c) The identity of the person making the citations under subsection (a) or (b) of this section shall be kept in confidence by the Patent Office, and no information concerning the same shall be given without the authority of such person, unless necessary to carry out the provisions of an Act of Congress or in such special circumstances as may be determined by the Commissioner.

"(d) Any person may notify the Commissioner within such time as the Commissioner appoints, not less than three months nor more than six months after publication of an application under section 151 of this title, that:

"(1) Subject matter had been sold or was in public use in the United States which disclosed the invention claimed in such application more than one year prior to the effective filing date of the application; or

"(2) The inventor named in such application did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented; or

"(3) Before the invention thereof by the inventor named in the application, the invention was made in this country by another who had not abandoned, suppressed or concealed it.

If such person within the time specified above makes a prima facie showing and offers to present evidence in support of such showing, the matter shall be determined in such proceedings as the Commissioner shall establish by regulations. Such regulations shall require consideration or review by the Board of Appeals and shall prescribe for matters under subsections (d)(2) and (d)(3) of this section the same kind of proceeding.

"(e) A refusal of the Commissioner to reject any claim of an application on the basis of a notification under this section shall not be subject to direct judicial review, except that an applicant claiming the same subject matter as that involved in a proceeding under subsection (d)(2) or (d)(3) of this section may include such refusal on appeal under section 134 of this title and when seeking review under Chapter 13 of this title.

"(f) Whether or not any person chooses to proceed in accordance with the provisions of this section, he shall not be foreclosed or in any way prejudiced with respect to asserting comparable grounds in defense of an infringement suit or as a basis of affirmative relief under declaratory judgment proceedings.

"§ 137. Priority of invention

"(a) Whenever a claim of an otherwise allowable application is for the same invention as a claim of an issued patent, or for the substance thereof, and the applicant makes a prima facie showing that before the effective filing date of the application for said patent, the inventor named in the said application made the invention in the United States and has not abandoned, suppressed or concealed it, and the applicant offers to present evidence in support of such showing, the matter of priority of invention under section 102(e) of this title shall be determined in such proceedings as the Commissioner shall establish by regulation pursuant to section 136(d) of this Chapter.

"(b) A claim for the same subject matter as a claim of an issued patent, or for the substance thereof, may not be made in any application unless such claim is made prior to six months after the date on which the patent was granted.

"CHAPTER 13.—REVIEW OF PATENT OFFICE DECISIONS

"Sec.
"141. Appeal to Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.
"142. Notice of appeal.
"143. Proceedings on appeal.
"144. Decision on appeal.
"145. Civil action.

"§ 141. Appeal to Court of Customs and Patent Appeals

"(a) An applicant, or his successor in title, dissatisfied with the decision of the Board of Appeals refusing a patent or any claim, may appeal to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, thereby waiving his right to proceed under section 145 of this title.

"(b) An applicant, or his successor in title, dissatisfied with the decision of the Board of Appeals in a proceeding involving another applicant under section 136(d)(2), 136(d)(3), or 137 of this title, may appeal to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

"§ 142. Notice of appeal

"When an appeal is taken to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the appellant shall file in the Patent Office a written notice of appeal directed to the Commissioner, within such time after the date of the decision appealed from, not less than sixty days, as the Commissioner appoints.

"§ 143. Proceedings on appeal

"The Patent Office shall transmit to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals certified copies of all the necessary papers and evidence designated by the appellant and any additional papers and evidence designated by the Commissioner or the appellee. The court shall, before hearing an appeal, give notice of the time and place of the hearing to the Commissioner and the parties thereto.

"§ 144. Decision on appeal

"The United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall hear and determine such appeal on the evidence produced before the Patent Office and transmitted to the court under the provisions of section 143 of this title. Upon its determination, the court shall return to the Commissioner a certificate of its proceedings and decision, which shall be entered of record in the Patent Office and govern the further proceedings in the case.

"§ 145. Civil action

"An applicant, or his successor in title, dissatisfied with the decision of the Board of Appeals refusing a patent or any claim, may, unless appeal has been taken to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals under section 141 of this title, have remedy by civil action against the Commissioner in the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals if commenced within such time after such decision, not less than sixty days, as the Commissioner appoints. The court may adjudge that such applicant is entitled to receive a patent for his invention, as specified in any of his claims involved in the decision of the Board of Appeals, as the facts in the case may appear, and such adjudication shall be entered of record in the Patent Office and govern further proceedings in the case.

"CHAPTER 14—ISSUE OF PATENT

"Sec.
"151. Publication and issue of patents.
"153. How issued.
"154. Contents and term of patent.

"§ 151. Publication and issue of patent

"(a) If it is determined that an applicant is entitled to a patent under the law, a written notice of allowance of the application shall be given or mailed to the applicant. The notice shall specify a publication fee and an issue fee; upon payment of the publication fee within the time established, the application shall be published.

"(b) Applications which have been published under section 123 of this title need not be published in full under this section, but in lieu thereof a notice that the application has been allowed together with any changes may be published.

"(c) If no action under section 136 of this title has been taken, and provided the fee prescribed for issuance of a patent has been paid within the time established, the Commissioner shall issue the patent. If an action under section 136 of this title has been commenced, the patent shall be issued after the conclusion of the proceedings if then warranted.

"(d) If any payment required by this section is not timely made, but is submitted with the fee for delayed payment within three months after the due date and sufficient cause is shown for the late payment, it may be accepted by the Commissioner as though no abandonment or lapse had ever occurred.

"§ 153. How issued

"Patents shall be issued in the name of the United States of America, under the seal of the Patent Office, and shall be signed by the Commissioner or have his signature placed thereon, and shall be recorded in the Patent Office.

"§ 154. Contents and term of patent

"(a) Every patent shall contain a grant to the applicant, his heirs or assigns, of the right, during the term of the patent to exclude others from making, using, or selling the invention throughout the United States, referring to the specification for the particulars thereof. A copy of the specification and drawings shall be annexed to the patent and be a part thereof.

"(b) The term of a patent shall expire twenty years from the date of filing the application in the United States or, if the benefit of the filing date in the United States of a prior application is claimed, from the earliest such prior date claimed. In determining the term of the patent, the date of filing any application in a foreign country which may be claimed by the applicant shall not be taken into consideration.

"CHAPTER 15.—PLANT PATENTS

"Sec.
"161. Patents for plants.
"162. Description, claim.
"163. Grant.

"164. Assistance of Department of Agriculture.

"§ 161. Patents for plants

"(a) Whoever invents or discovers and asexually reproduces any distinct and new variety of plant including cultivated sports, mutants, hybrids, and newly found seedlings, other than a tuber propagated plant or a plant found in an uncultivated state, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

"(b) The provisions of this title relating to patents for inventions shall apply to patents for plants, except as otherwise provided.

"(c) The provisions of this title relating to any publication of applications under sections 123 and 151 shall not apply to applications for patents for plants.

"§ 162. Description, claim

"No plant patent shall be declared invalid for noncompliance with section 112 of this title if the description is as complete as is reasonably possible.

"The claim in the specification shall be in formal terms to the plant shown and described.

"§ 163. Grant

"In the case of a plant patent the grant shall be of the right to exclude others from asexually reproducing the plant or selling or using the plant so reproduced.

"§ 164. Assistance of Department of Agriculture

"The President may by Executive Order direct the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with the requests of the Commissioner, for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this title with respect to plants (1) to furnish available information of the Department of Agriculture, (2) to conduct through the appropriate bureau or division of the Department research upon special problems, or (3) to detail to the Commissioner officers and employees of the Department.

"CHAPTER 16.—DESIGNS

"Sec.
"171. Patents for designs.
"172. Right of priority.
"173. Term of design patent.

"§ 171. Patents for designs

"(a) Whoever invents any new, original and ornamental design for an article of manufacture may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

"(b) The provisions of this title relating to patents for inventions shall apply to patents for designs, except as otherwise provided.

"(c) The provisions of this title relating to any publication of applications under sections 123 and 151 shall not apply to applications for patents for designs.

"§ 172. Right of priority

"The right of priority provided for by section 119 of this title, and the time specified in section 102(c) of this title shall be six months in the case of designs.

"§ 173. Term of design patent

"Patents for designs may be granted for a term measured from the date of issue of three years and six months, or of seven years, or of fourteen years, as the applicant, in his application, elects.

"CHAPTER 17.—SECRECY OF CERTAIN INVENTIONS AND FILING APPLICATIONS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

"Sec.
"181. Secrecy of certain inventions and withholding of patent.
"182. Abandonment of invention for unauthorized disclosure.
"183. Right of compensation.
"184. Filing of application in foreign country.
"185. Patent barred for filing without license.
"186. Penalty.
"187. Nonapplicability to certain persons.
"188. Rules and regulations, delegation of power.

"§ 181. Secrecy of certain inventions and withholding of patent

"(a) Whenever publication or disclosure of an invention in which the Government has a property interest might, in the opinion of the head of an interested Government agency, be detrimental to the national security, the Commissioner upon being so notified shall order that the invention be kept secret and shall withhold publication thereof and the grant of a patent under the condition set forth hereinafter.

"(b) Whenever the publication or disclosure of an invention in which the Government does not have a property interest, might, in the opinion of the Commissioner, be detrimental to the national security, he shall make the application for patent in which such invention is disclosed available for inspection to the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of Defense, and the chief officer of any other department or agency of the Government designated by the President as a defense agency of the United States.

"(c) Each individual to whom the application is disclosed shall sign a dated acknowledgment thereof, which acknowledgment shall be entered in the file of the application. If, in the opinion of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of a Defense Department, or the chief officer of another department or agency so designated, the publication or disclosure of the invention would be detrimental to the national security, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of a Defense Department, or such other chief officer shall notify the Commissioner and the Commissioner shall order that the invention be kept secret and shall withhold publication and the grant of a patent for such period as the national interest requires, and notify the applicant thereof. Upon proper showing by the head of the department or agency who caused the secrecy order to be issued that the examination of the application might jeopardize the national interest, the Commissioner shall thereupon maintain the application in a sealed condition and notify the applicant thereof. The applicant whose application has been placed under a secrecy order shall have a right to appeal from the order to the Secretary of Commerce under rules prescribed by him.

"(d) An invention shall not be ordered kept secret and publication withheld for a period of more than a year. The Commissioner shall renew the order at the end thereof, or at the end of any renewal period, for additional periods of one year upon notification by the head of the department or the chief officer of the agency who caused the order to be issued that an affirmative determination has been made that the national interest continues so to require. An order in effect, or issued, during a time when the United States is at war shall remain in effect for the duration of hostilities and one year following cessation of hostilities. An order in effect, or issued, during a national emergency declared by the President shall remain in effect for the duration of the national emergency and six months thereafter. The Commissioner may rescind any order upon notification by the heads of the departments and the chief officers of the agencies who caused the order to be issued that the publication or disclosure of the invention is no longer deemed detrimental to the national security.

"§ 182. Abandonment of invention for unauthorized disclosure

"The invention disclosed in an application for patent subject to an order made pursuant to section 181 of this title may be held abandoned upon its being established by the Commissioner that in violation of said order the invention has been published or disclosed or that an application for a patent therefor has been filed in a foreign country by the inventor, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, or anyone in privity with him or them, without the consent of the Commissioner. The abandonment shall be held to have occurred as of the time of violation. The consent of the Commissioner shall not be given without the concurrence of the heads of the departments and the chief officers of the agencies who caused the order to be issued. A holding of abandonment shall constitute forfeiture by the applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, or anyone in privity with him or them, of all claims against the United States based upon such invention.

"§ 183. Right to compensation

"An applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, whose patent is withheld as herein provided, shall have the right, beginning at the date the applicant is notified that, except for such order, his application is otherwise in condition for allowance, or February 1, 1952, whichever is later, and ending six years after a patent is issued thereon, to apply to the head of any department or agency who caused the order to be issued for compensation for the damage caused by the order of secrecy and/or for the use of the invention by the Government, resulting from his disclosure. The right to compensation for use shall begin on the date of the first use of the invention by the Government. The head of the department or agency is authorized, upon the presentation of a claim, to enter into an agreement with the applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, in full settlement for the damage and/or use. This settlement agreement shall be conclusive for all purposes notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary. If full settlement of the claim cannot be effected, the head of the department or agency may award and pay to such applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, a sum not exceeding 75 per centum of the sum which the head of the department or agency considers just compensation for the damage and/or use. A claimant may bring suit against the United States in the Court of Claims or in the District Court of the United States for the district in which such claimant is a resident for an amount which when added to the award shall constitute just compensation for the damage and/or use of the invention by the Government. The owner of any patent issued upon an application that was subject to a secrecy order issued pursuant to section 181 of this title, who did not apply for compensation as above provided, shall have the right, after the date of issuance of such patent, to bring suit in the Court of Claims for just compensation for the damage caused by reason of the order of secrecy and/or use by the Government of the invention resulting from his disclosure. The right to compensation for use shall begin on the date of the first use of the invention by the Government. In a suit under the provisions of this section the United States may avail itself of all defenses it may plead in an action under section 1498 of title 28. This section shall not confer a right of action on anyone or his successors, assigns, or legal representatives who, while in the full-time employment or service of the United States, discovered, invented, or developed the invention on which the claim is based.

"§ 184. Filing of application in foreign country

"(a) Except when authorized by a license obtained from, or a general license established by, the Commissioner, a person shall not file or cause or authorize to be filed in any foreign country an application for patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design or model in respect of an invention made in this country prior to six months after filing an application for patent on the same invention under section 111 of this title, or prior to four months after filing an application for patent on the same ornamental design under section 171 of this title. The Patent Office is hereby established as the sole governmental agency to grant a license or establish a general license. A license shall not be granted with respect to an invention subject to an order issued by the Commissioner pursuant to section 181 of this title without the concurrence of the heads of the departments and the chief officers of the agencies who caused the order to be issued. Upon compliance with regulations established by the Commissioner, a license shall be granted retroactively where an application has been filed abroad and the application does not disclose an invention within the scope of section 181 of this title.

"(b) The term 'application' when used in this Chapter includes applications and any modifications, amendments, or supplements thereto, or divisions thereof.

"(c) No license shall be required subsequent to the filing of a foreign application for any modifications, amendments or supplements to that foreign application, or divisions thereof, which do not alter the nature of the invention originally disclosed, which are within the scope of the invention originally disclosed, and where the filing of the foreign application originally complied with the provisions of this section.

"(d) A retroactive license may be granted at any time notwithstanding the fact that a corresponding United States application has matured into a patent. Such license shall have the same force and effect as if granted during the pendency of the application.

"§ 185. Patent barred for filing without license

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of law any person, and his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, shall not receive a United States patent for an invention if that person, or his successors, assigns, or legal representatives shall, without procuring the license prescribed in section 184 of this title, have made, or consented to or assisted another's making, application in a foreign country for a patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of the invention. A United States patent issued to such person, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives may be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, or such court may order the issuance of a retroactive license under section 184 of this title.

"§ 186. Penalty

"Whoever, during the period or periods of time an invention has been ordered to be kept secret and the grant of a patent thereon withheld pursuant to section 181 of this title, shall, with knowledge of such order and without due authorization, wilfully publish or disclose or authorize or cause to be published or disclosed the invention, or material information with respect thereto, or whoever, in violation of the provisions of section 184 of this title, shall file or cause or authorize to be filed in any foreign country an application for patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of any invention made in the United States, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"§ 187. Nonapplicability to certain persons

"The prohibitions and penalties of this Chapter shall not apply to any officer or agent of the United States acting within the scope of his authority, nor to any person acting upon his written instructions or permission.

"§ 188. Rules and regulations, delegation of power

"The Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of a Defense Department, the chief officer of any other department or agency of the Government designated by the President as a defense agency of the United States, and the Secretary of Commerce, may separately issue rules and regulations to enable the respective department or agency to carry out the provisions of this Chapter, and may delegate any power conferred by this Chapter.

"PART III—PATENTS AND PROTECTION OF PATENT RIGHTS

"Chapter	Sec.
"25. Amendment and correction of Patents	251
"26. Ownership and Assignment	261
"27. Government Interests in Patents	266
"28. Infringement of Patents	271
"29. Remedies for Infringement of Patent and Other Actions	281

"CHAPTER 25.—AMENDMENT AND CORRECTION OF PATENTS

"Sec.
"251. Reissue of defective patents.
"252. Effect of reissue.
"253. Disclaimer.
"254. Certificate of correction of Patent Office mistake.
"255. Certificate of correction of applicant's mistake.
"256. Correction of named inventor.

"§ 251. Reissue of defective patents

"(a) Whenever any patent is, through error without any deceptive intention, deemed wholly or partly inoperative or invalid, by reason of a defective specification or drawing, or by reason of the patentee claiming more or less than he had a right to claim in the patent, the Commissioner shall, on the surrender of such patent and the payment of the fee required by law, reissue the patent for the invention disclosed in the original patent, and in accordance with a new and amended application, for the unexpired part of the term of the original patent. No new matter shall be introduced into the application for reissue.

"(b) The provisions of Chapters 12, 13 and 14 of this title relating to applications for patent shall be applicable to applications for reissue of a patent.

"(c) No reissued patent shall be granted enlarging the scope of the claims of the original patent, unless applied for within one year from the grant of the original patent, except to claim the same subject matter as a claim of an issued patent pursuant to section 137 of this title.

"§ 252. Effect of reissue

"(a) The surrender of the original patent shall take effect upon the issue of the reissued patent, and every reissued patent shall have the same effect and operation in law, on the trial of actions for causes thereafter arising, as if the same had been originally granted in such amended form, but insofar as the claims of the original and reissued patents are identical, such surrender shall not affect any action then pending nor abate any cause of action then existing, and the reissued patent, to the extent that its claims are identical with the original patent, shall constitute a continuation thereof and have effect continuously from the date of the original patent.

"(b) No reissued patent shall abridge or affect the right of any person or his successors in business who made, purchased or used prior to the grant of a reissue anything patented by the reissued patent, to continue the use of, or to sell to others to be used or sold, the specific thing so made, purchased or used, unless the making, using or selling of such thing infringes a valid claim of the reissued patent which was in the original patent. The court before which such matter is in question may provide for the continued manufacture, use or sale of the thing made, purchased or used as specified, or for the manufacture, use or sale of which substantial preparation was made before the grant of the reissue, and it may also provide for the continued practice of any process patented by the reissue, practiced, or for the practice of which substantial preparation was made, prior to the grant of the reissue, to the extent and under such terms as the court deems equitable for the protection of investments made or business commenced before the grant of the reissue.

"§ 253. Disclaimer

"(a) Whenever, without any deceptive intention, a claim of a patent is invalid the remaining claims shall not thereby be rendered invalid. A patentee, whether of the whole or any sectional interest therein, may, on payment of the fee required by law, make disclaimer of any complete claim, stating therein the extent of his interest in such patent. Such disclaimer shall be in writing and recorded in the Patent Office; and it shall thereafter be considered as part of the original patent to the extent of the interest possessed by the disclaimant and by those claiming under him.

"(b) In like manner any patentee or applicant may disclaim or dedicate to the public the entire term, or any terminal part of the term, of the patent granted or to be granted.

"§ 254. Certificate of correction of Patent Office mistake

"Whenever a mistake in a patent, incurred through the fault of the Patent Office, is clearly disclosed by the records of the Office, the Commissioner may issue a certificate of correction stating the fact and nature of such mistake, under seal, without charge, to be recorded in the records of patents. A printed copy thereof shall be attached to each printed copy of the patent, and such certificate shall be considered as part of the original patent. Every such patent, together with such certificate, shall have the same effect and operation in law on the trial of actions for causes thereafter arising as if the same had been originally issued in such corrected form. The Commissioner may issue a corrected patent without charge in lieu of and with like effect as a certificate of correction.

"§ 255. Certificate of correction of applicant's mistake

"Whenever a mistake of a clerical or typographical nature, or of minor character, which was not the fault of the Patent Office, appears in a patent and a showing has been made that such mistake occurred in good faith, the Commissioner may, upon payment of the required fee, issue a certificate of correction, if the correction does not involve such changes in the patent as would require reexamination. Such patent, together with the certificate, shall have the same effect and operation in law on the trial of actions of causes thereafter arising as if the same had been originally issued in such corrected form.

"§ 256. Correction of named inventor

"Omission of an inventor's name or inclusion of the name of a person not an inventor, without deceptive intent shall not affect validity of a patent, and may be corrected at any time by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations established by him or upon order of a Federal court before which the matter is called in question. Upon such correction the Commissioner shall issue a certificate accordingly.

"CHAPTER 26.—OWNERSHIP AND ASSIGNMENT

"Sec.
"261. Ownership; assignment.
"262. Joint owners.
"263. Transferable nature of patent rights.

"§ 261. Ownership; assignment

"(a) Subject to the provisions of this title, patents shall have the attributes of personal property.

"(b) Applications for patent, patents, or any interest therein, shall be assignable in law by an instrument in writing. The applicant, patentee, or his assigns or legal representatives may in like manner grant and convey an exclusive right under his application for patent, or patents, to the whole or any specified part of the United States.

"(c) A certificate of acknowledgment under the hand and official seal of a person authorized to administer oaths within the United States, or, in a foreign country, of a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States or an officer authorized to administer oaths whose authority is proved by a certificate of a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, shall be prima facie evidence of the execution of an assignment, grant or conveyance of a patent or application for patent.

"(d) An assignment, grant or conveyance shall be void as against any subsequent purchaser or mortgagee for a valuable consideration, without notice, unless it is recorded in the Patent Office within three months from its date or prior to the date of such subsequent purchase or mortgage.

"§ 262. Joint owners

"In the absence of any agreement to the contrary, each of the joint owners of a patent may make, use or sell the patented invention without the consent of and without accounting to the other owners.

"§ 263. Transferable nature of patent rights

"(a) Applications for patent, patents, or any interests therein may be licensed in any specified territory, in the whole, or in any specified part, of the field of use to which the subject matter of the claims of the patent are directly applicable, and

"(b) A patent owner shall not be deemed guilty of patent misuse because he agreed to contractual provisions or imposed conditions on a licensee or an assignee which have:

"(1) A direct relation to the disclosure and claims of the patent, and

"(2) The performance of which is reasonable under the circumstances to secure to the patent owner the full benefit of his invention and patent grant.

"(c) In determining the reasonableness of such provisions or conditions under this section, the courts shall, in each case, consider all factors involved in the exploitation of the patented invention and the economic effect of such provisions or conditions.

"CHAPTER 27.—GOVERNMENT INTEREST IN PATENTS

"Sec.
"267. Time for taking action in Government applications.

"§ 267. Time for taking action in Government applications

"Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 133 and 151 of this title, the Commissioner may extend the time for taking any action to three years, when an application has become the property of the United States and the head of the appropriate department or agency of the Government has certified to the Commissioner that the invention disclosed therein is important to the armament of defense of the United States.

"CHAPTER 28.—INFRINGEMENT OF PATENTS

"Sec.
"271. Infringement of patent.
"272. Temporary presence in the United States.

"§ 271. Infringement of patent

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, whoever without authority makes, uses or sells any patented invention, within the United States during the term of the patent therefor, infringes the patent.

"(b) Whoever, without authority of the patentee, imports into the United States a product made in another country by a process patented in the United States shall be liable as an infringer.

"(c) Whoever actively induces infringement of a patent shall be liable as an infringer.

"(d) Whoever sells a component of a patented machine, manufacture, combination or composition, or a material or apparatus for use in practicing a patented process, constituting a material part of the invention, knowing the same to be especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement of such patent, and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use, shall be liable as a contributory infringer.

"(e) No patent owner otherwise entitled to relief for infringement or contributory infringement of a patent shall be denied relief or deemed guilty of misuse or illegal extension of the patent right by reason of his having done one or more of the following: (1) derived revenue from acts which if performed by another without his consent would constitute contributory infringement of the patent; (2) licensed or authorized another to perform acts which if performed without his consent would constitute contributory infringement of the patent; (3) sought to enforce his patent rights against infringement or contributory infringement.

"(f) Whoever, during the interim period after publication of an application and before grant of a patent, performs an act which would make him liable for infringement of a valid claim of the patent shall be liable as an infringer if a like claim appears in the application for the patent.

"§ 272. Temporary presence in the United States

"The use of any invention in any vessel, aircraft or vehicle of any country which affords similar privileges to vessels, aircraft or vehicles of the United States, entering the United States temporarily or accidentally, shall not constitute infringement of any patent, if the invention is used exclusively for the needs of the vessel, aircraft or vehicle and is not sold in or used for the manufacture of anything to be sold in or exported from the United States.

"CHAPTER 29.—REMEDIES FOR INFRINGEMENT OF PATENT AND OTHER ACTIONS

"Sec.
"281. Remedy for infringement of patent.
"282. Presumption of validity; defenses.
"283. Injunction.
"284. Damages.
"285. Attorney fees.
"286. Time limitation on damages.
"287. Limitation on damages; marking and notice.
"288. Action for infringement of a patent containing an invalid claim.
"289. Additional remedy for infringement of design patent.
"290. Notice of patent suits.
"292. False marking.
"293. Nonresident patentee, service and notice.

"§ 281. Remedy for infringement of patent

"A patentee shall have remedy by civil action for infringement of his patent.

"§ 282. Presumption of validity; defenses

"(a) A patent shall be presumed valid. Each claim of a patent (whether in independent or dependent form) shall be presumed valid independently of the validity of other claims; dependent claims shall be presumed valid even though dependent upon an invalid claim. The burden of establishing invalidity of a patent or any claim thereof shall rest on the party asserting it.

"(b) The following shall be defenses in any action involving the validity or infringement of a patent and shall be pleaded:

"(1) Noninfringement, absence of liability for infringement, or unenforceability.

"(2) Invalidity of the patent or any claim in suit on any ground specified in Part II of this title as a condition for patentability, provided, however, that the validity of a patent may not be questioned solely because of the existence of two or more patents where said patents will expire on the same date as a result of filing on the same date or as a result of a terminal disclaimer pursuant to section 253 of this title so long as the right to sue for infringement of said patents is maintained in the same legal entity.

"(3) Invalidity of the patent or any claim in suit for failure to comply with any requirement of section 112 or 251 of this title.

"(4) Any other fact or act made a defense by this title.

"(c) In actions involving the validity or infringement of a patent, the party asserting invalidity or noninfringement shall give notice in the pleadings or otherwise in writing to the adverse party at least thirty days before the trial, of the country, number, date, and name of the patentee of any patent, the title, date, and page numbers of any publication to be relied upon as anticipation of the patent in suit or, except in actions in the United States Court of Claims, as showing the state of the art, and the name and address of any person who may be relied upon as the prior inventor or as having prior knowledge of or as having previously used or sold the invention of the patent in suit. In the absence of such notice, proof of the said matters may not be made at the trial except on such terms as the court requires.

"§ 283. Injunction

"(a) The several courts having jurisdiction of cases under this title may grant injunctions in accordance with the principles of equity to prevent the violation of any right secured by patent, on such terms as the court deems reasonable.

"(b) No injunction shall be granted with respect to subsequent use or sale of machines, manufactures, or compositions of matter made prior to grant of the patent and for which damages are awarded under section 284(b) of this title.

"§ 284. Damages

"(a) Upon finding for the claimant, the court shall award the claimant damages adequate to compensate for the infringement but in no event less than the infringer's profits attributable to the infringement, or less than a reasonable royalty for the use made of the invention by the infringer, whichever shall be greater, together with interest and costs as fixed by the court.

"(b) Damages for acts set forth in section 271(f) of this title shall be awarded only for acts occurring after actual notice to the infringer stating how his acts are considered to infringe a claim of a published application and shall be limited to royalties reasonable in the circumstances.

"(c) When the damages are not found by a jury, the court shall assess them. In either event the court may increase the damages up to three times the amount found or assessed.

"(d) The court may receive expert testimony as an aid to the determination of damages or of what royalty would be reasonable under the circumstances.

"§ 285. Attorney fees

"The court in exceptional cases may award reasonable attorney fees to the prevailing party.

"§ 286. Time limitation on damages

"(a) Except as otherwise provided by law, no recovery shall be had for any infringement committed more than six years prior to the filing of the complaint or counterclaim for infringement in the action.

"(b) In the case of claims against the United States Government for use of a patented invention, the period before bringing suit, up to six years, between the date of receipt of a written claim for compensation by the department or agency of the Government having authority to settle such claim, and the date of mailing by the Government of a notice to the claimant that his claim has been denied shall not be counted as part of the period referred to in the preceding paragraph.

"§ 287. Limitation on damages; marking and notice

"Patentees, and persons making or selling any patented article for or under them, may give notice to the public that the same is patented, either by fixing thereon the word "patent" or the abbreviation "pat.", together with the number of the patent, or when, from the character of the article, this cannot be done, by fixing to it, or to the package wherein one or more of them is contained, a label containing a like notice. In the event of failure so to mark, no damages shall be recovered by the patentee in any action for infringement, except on proof that the infringer was notified of the infringement and continued to infringe thereafter, in which event damages may be recovered only for infringement occurring after such notice. Filing of an action for infringement shall constitute such notice.

"§ 288. Action for infringement of a patent containing an invalid claim

"Whenever, without deceptive intention, a claim of a patent is invalid, an action may be maintained for the infringement of a claim of the patent which may be valid. The patentee shall recover no costs unless a disclaimer of the invalid claim has been entered at the Patent Office before the commencement of the suit.

"§ 289. Additional remedy for infringement of a design patent

"(a) Whoever during the term of a patent for a design, without license of the owner, (1) applies the patented design, or any colorable imitation thereof, to any article of manufacture for the purpose of sale, or (2) sells or exposes for sale any article of manufacture to which such design or colorable imitation has been applied shall be liable to the owner to the extent of his total profit, but not less than $250, recoverable in any United States district court having jurisdiction of the parties.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall prevent, lessen, or impeach any other remedy which an owner of an infringed patent has under the provisions of this title, but he shall not twice recover the profit made from the infringement.

"§ 290. Notice of patent suits

"The clerks of the courts of the United States, within one month after the filing of an action under this title, shall give notice thereof in writing to the Commissioner, setting forth so far as known the names and addresses of the parties, name of the inventor, and the designating number of the patent upon which the action has been brought. If any other patent is subsequently included in the action he shall give like notice thereof. Within one month after the decision is rendered or a judgment issued the clerk of the court shall give notice thereof to the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall, on receipt of such notices, enter the same in the file of such patent.

"§ 292. False marking

"(a) Whoever, without the consent of the patentee, marks upon, or affixes to, or uses in advertising in connection with anything made, used, or sold by him, the name or any imitation of the name of the patentee, the patent number, or the words 'patent,' 'patentee,' or the like, with the intent of counterfeiting or imitating the mark of the patentee, or of deceiving the public and inducing them to believe that the thing was made or sold by or with the consent of the patentee; or

"Whoever marks upon, or affixes to, or uses in advertising in connection with any unpatented article, the word 'patent' or any word or number importing that the same is patented, for the purpose of deceiving the public; or

"Whoever marks upon, or affixes to, or uses in advertising in connection with any article, the words 'patent applied for,' 'patent pending,' or any word importing that an application for patent has been made, when no application for patent has been made, or if made, is not pending, for the purpose of deceiving the public—

"Shall be fined not more than $500 for every such offense.

"(b) Any person may sue for the penalty, in which event one-half shall go to the person suing and the other to the use of the United States.

"§ 293. Nonresident patentee; service and notice

"Every patentee not residing in the United States may file in the Patent Office a written designation stating the name and address of a person residing within the United States on whom may be served process or notice of proceedings affecting the patent or rights thereunder. If the person designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, or if no person has been designated, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction and summons shall be served by publication or otherwise as the court directs. The court shall have the same jurisdiction to take any action respecting the patent or rights thereunder that it would have if the patentee were personally within the jurisdiction of the court."

TRANSITIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTARY PROVISIONS

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 9 of title 28, United States Code, Judicial Code and Judiciary, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 9.—COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

"Sec.
"211. Appointment and number of judges.
"212. Duties of chief judge; precedence of judges.
"213. Tenure and salaries of judges.
"214. Sessions.
"215. Divisions; powers and assignments.
"216. Publication of decisions.

"§ 211. Appointment and number of judges

"The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a chief judge and eight associate judges who shall constitute a court of record known as the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. At least six judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall be specially qualified in the law of patents. Such court is hereby declared to be a court established under Article III of the Constitution of the United States.

"§ 212. Duties of chief judge; precedence of judges

"The chief judge of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, with the approval of the court, shall supervise the fiscal affairs and clerical force of the court. The chief judge shall assign or reassign, under rules of the court, any case for trial, hearing, or determination; and promulgate dockets.

"The chief judge shall have precedence and preside at any session of the court which he attends. If he is temporarily unable to perform his duties as such, they shall be performed by the judge in active service, who is present, able and qualified to act, and next in precedence.

"The associate judges shall have precedence and preside according to the seniority of their commissions. Judges whose commissions bear the same date shall have precedence according to seniority in age.

"§ 213. Tenure and salaries of judges

"Judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall hold office during good behavior; each shall receive a salary of $33,000 a year.

"§ 214. Sessions

"The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals may hold court at such times and places as it may fix by rule.

"§ 215. Divisions; powers and assignments

"(a) Judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall sit on the court and its divisions in such order and at such times as the court directs.

"(b) The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall have an appellate part to hear and determine matters within the appellate jurisdiction of the court; in such appellate part, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals may authorize the hearing and determination of cases and controversies by separate divisions, each consisting of three judges. A hearing or rehearing of any matter within the appellate jurisdiction of the court may be ordered by a majority of the judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in regular, active service. The court en banc shall consist of the judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in regular, active service. A judge of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals who has retired from regular service shall also be competent to sit as a judge of the court en banc in the rehearing of a matter if he sat on the court or division at the original hearing thereof.

"(c) The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall have a trial part to hear and determine matters within the original jurisdiction of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals; business of the trial part of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall be divided among the judges as provided by the rules and orders of the court. The chief judge shall be responsible for the observance of such rules and orders, and shall divide the business and assign the cases so far as such rules and orders do not otherwise prescribe.

"(d) The chief judge may sit in any division of the appellate part or as a judge of the trial part. He may, when necessary, assign other judges to any division of the appellate part or to sit as a judge of the trial part.

"§ 216. Publication of decisions

"All decisions of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall be preserved and open to inspection. The Court shall forward copies of each decision to the Commissioner of Patents who shall publish weekly such decisions as he or the court may designate and abstracts of all other decisions."

(b) Section 832 of title 28, United States Code, Judicial Code and Judiciary, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 832. Marshal

"The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals may appoint a marshal and deputy marshals, who shall serve within the District of Columbia and shall be subject to removal by the court.

"The marshal and his deputies shall attend the court at its sessions, and shall serve and execute all processes and orders issuing from it, and exercise the powers and perform the duties concerning all matters within such court's jurisdiction assigned to them by the court. The marshal shall purchase books and supplies, supervise the library and perform such other duties as the court may direct. Under regulations prescribed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the marshal shall pay the salaries of judges, officers, and employees of the court and disburse funds appropriated for the expenses of the court.

"United States marshals for other districts where sessions of the court are held shall serve as marshals of the court."

(c) Section 833 of title 28, United States Code, Judicial Code and Judiciary, is amended by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof:

"(d) The court shall appoint one or more court reporters to attend at each session of the trial part of the court. The number and qualifications and all other matters concerning such court reporters shall be determined in accordance with section 753 of this title."

(d) Section 1256 of title 28, United States Code, Judicial Code and Judiciary, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1256. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals; certiorari; certified questions

"Cases in the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by the following methods:

"(1) By writ of certiorari;

"(2) By certification of any question of law by the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in any case as to which instructions are desired, and upon such certification the Supreme Court may give binding instructions on such questions."

(e) Section 1338 of title 28, United States Code, Judicial Code and Judiciary, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1338. Patents, copyrights, trade-marks and unfair competition

"(a) Except as provided in Chapter 93 hereof, the district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, copyright and trade-marks. Such jurisdiction shall be exclusive of the courts of the states in patent and copyright cases.

"(b) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action asserting a claim of unfair competition when joined with a substantial and related claim under the copyright, patent or trade-marks laws."

(f) Chapter 93 of title 28, United States Code, Judicial Code and Judiciary, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 93.—COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

"Sec.
"1541. Powers generally.
"1542. Customs Court decisions.
"1543. Patent Office decisions.
"1544. Tariff Commission decisions.

"§ 1541. Powers generally

"The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and each judge thereof shall possess all the powers of a district court of the United States for preserving order, compelling the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence.

"§ 1542. Customs Court decisions

"The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall have jurisdiction to review by appeal final decisions of the Customs Court in all cases as to the construction of the law and the facts respecting the classification of merchandise, the rate of duty imposed thereon under such classifications, and the fees and charges connected therewith, and all appealable questions as to the jurisdiction of the Customs Court and as to the laws and regulations governing the collection of the customs revenues.

"§ 1543. Patent Office decisions

"(a) The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under section 145 of title 35. Such jurisdiction shall be known as the trial jurisdiction of the court.

"(b) The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall have jurisdiction of:

"(1) Appeals from all final decisions of the trial part of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals;

"(2) Appeals from decisions of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office as to patent applications and patents as provided in Chapter 13 of title 35, Patents, United States Code;

"(3) Appeals from decisions of the Commissioner of Patents and the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board as to trademark applications and proceedings as provided in section 1071 of title 15.

"§ 1544. Tariff Commission decisions

"The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall have jurisdiction to review, by appeal on questions of law only, the findings of the United States Tariff Commission as to unfair practices in import trade, made under section 1337 of title 19."

(g) Title 28, United States Code, Judicial Code and Judiciary, is amended by adding new section 2603, reading as follows:

"§ 2603. Patent Office cases

"Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States district courts shall govern the procedure in all cases within the trial jurisdiction of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals arising under section 145 of title 35."

(h) The section analysis of Chapter 167—Court of Customs and Patent Appeals Procedure, of title 28, United States Code, Judicial Code and Judiciary, preceding section 2601 is amended by adding the following line:

"2603. Patent Office cases."

SEC. 3. If any provision of title 35 Patents, United States Code, as amended by this Act, or any other provision of this Act, is declared unconstitutional or is held invalid, the validity of the remaining provisions shall not be affected.

SEC. 4. (a) This Act shall take effect on the day six months after enactment.

(b) Applications for patent actually filed in the United States prior to the effective date of this Act shall continue to be governed by the provisions of title 35 in effect immediately prior to the effective date, except that any such application may be published by the Commissioner in accordance with the provisions of section 123 of title 35 as enacted by this Act.

(c) Applications for patent actually filed in the United States within one year after the effective date of this Act and not relying on a prior application shall continue to be governed by the provisions of Chapter 10 and by the provisions relating to interferences in Chapters 12 and 13, of title 35 in effect immediately prior to the effective date.

(d) The amendment of title 35, United States Code, by this Act, shall not affect any rights or liabilities existing under title 35 in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 5. This Act may be cited as "The Patent Act of 1967."

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, for 2 consecutive years the House of Representatives has overwhelmingly approved a bill amending the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. The bill would make changes in four basic areas:

First, it would give added force to the Foundation's basic missions and give statutory authority to several of the reorganization plans affecting the Foundation;

Second, it would strengthen the National Science Board, the governing body of the Foundation, and add several functions to it;

Third, it would unify and supplement the operating authority of the Director of the National Science Foundation; and

Fourth, it would modify and modernize the structure and organization of the Foundation.

At the conclusion of my remarks today, I will introduce a bill somewhat similar to H.R. 5404, the bill which passed the House on April 12, 1967, by a 391-to-22 record vote. The bill I will introduce adopts certain changes in H.R. 5404 suggested by the various Federal departments and agencies, and it is my hope that it will stimulate a wide-ranging discussion of the reasons for the differences.

Also, I am happy to announce that on Wednesday, November 1, and Thursday, November 2, a subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will hold hearings on these two bills. I have the honor of being the chairman of the subcommittee holding these hearings. Serving with me on the subcommittee are the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

As witnesses, we will, of course, hear from the Director of the National Science Foundation, Dr. Leland J. Haworth, and the Chairman of the National Science Board, Dr. Philip Handler. We have extended invitations as well to Senator FRED HARRIS, the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Government Research, and Congressman EMILIO DADDARIO, the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. Both of these distinguished legislators have done much to advance the cause of a coherent national policy for federally aided scientific research, and I look forward to hearing their views and recommendations.

We have also invited the Director of the Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President, Dr. Donald F. Hornig, and the President of the National Academy of Sciences, Dr. Frederick Seitz. Dr. Harvey Brooks, a member of the National Science Board, will also appear.

I am confident that these witnesses will give the subcommittee a full range of opinion on the various suggested amendments to the National Science Foundation Act.

The National Science Foundation has a proud and distinguished history. Dr. Vannevar Bush, the Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development during World War II, submitted a report to President Truman in 1945 titled "Science, the Endless Frontier." The report was originally requested by President Roosevelt, who was concerned that the unrivaled scientific research organizations developed in World War II would be dissipated without some strong Federal effort to preserve them.

The principal recommendation of the report was that a new agency, to be called the National Research Foundation, be organized to carry out the scientific advances begun under Dr. Bush's leadership during the war.

As finally passed and approved in 1950, the legislation established a National Science Board, with broad autonomy for determining research policies, and a National Science Foundation, to actually carry out these policies. Both the members of the Board and the Director of the Foundation are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The National Science Foundation Act sets out eight separate functions to be performed by the Foundation. These eight items can, I think, be reduced to a single phrase: a national program for enhancing the health of basic American science and science education. In carrying out its responsibilities, the National Science Foundation has had a profound impact upon this country's scientific and engineering community, whether it be in government, on campus, or in industry. It is important, I think, that its support for the sciences has extended to all parts of the country, to all aspects of industry, and to all forms of higher education.

There are five principal mechanisms through which the National Science Foundation supports the sciences.

First, through basic research. The National Science Foundation supports individual scientists who are pursuing basic research projects, and in fiscal 1967 awarded 3,647 separate grants totaling over $173 million. About 50 percent of this research takes place in universities; the remainder in industrial, nonprofit or Federal laboratories. The National Science Foundation also supports national research programs, usually through consortiums of varying types. An example would be the ocean sediment coring program. Finally, the National Science Foundation supports national research facilities, such as the Kitt Peak National Observatory in Arizona, which is operated by an independent, nonprofit corporation composed of a number of universities.

Second, through science education. Support of basic research assures the health of U.S. science, while support of science education assures a continuing supply of topflight scientists. This science education support takes three forms: to assist qualified individuals to pursue their scientific training, to improve the quality of teaching materials and methods, and to improve the teachers of science. Included among the specific activities are fellowships and traineeships, teacher training, course improvement, research participation, and instructional equipment. In fiscal 1967, the National Science Foundation allocated $121.6 million for support of science education.

Third, through institutional development. Under this program, the National Science Foundation carries out two complementary efforts: assisting institutions of higher learning to upgrade their scientific research programs and science education capabilities; and assisting other institutions to maintain their strength in the sciences where it already exists. The National Science Foundation obligated $111.7 million for institutional development in fiscal 1967.

Fourth, through science information. Progress in science depends in part on a prompt and effective information exchange, as this avoids duplicative efforts and stimulates more rapid pursuit of research projects. The National Science Foundation has sponsored pioneering research into the process of information transfer, methods of abstracting, electronic compilation of statistical material, and so forth. It has committed $10.8 million for this science information function in fiscal 1967.

Fifth, through a number of other activities, including the National Sea Grant College program, planning and policy studies, and international scientific cooperation activities. Obligations in fiscal 1967 totaled about $4.6 million for these three National Science Foundation functions.

In sum, these activities give the National Science Foundation a primary role in support of the basic sciences in the United States. It is a primary role, however, not because of the funds appropriated to the National Science Foundation, but because of how the funds are directed. To illustrate, more than 40 agencies of the Government support scientific education and research, and this support in fiscal 1966 totaled about $9.7 billion. Of this amount, only $480 million, or 5 percent, was appropriated to the National Science Foundation. Federal funds for the conduct of basic research totaled $1.9 billion in fiscal 1966, of which $250 million, or 13 percent, was appropriated to the National Science Foundation.

Consequently, it is not the aggregate of funds which makes the National Science Foundation so important. Rather, it is because these funds are directed to the very heart of the science development process: science education improvement and science research project support. There is not, and never will be, any substitute for this support if the United States is to continue its technological advance.

The amendments to the National Science Foundation Act which the House bill and the bill I introduce today would make are needed to strengthen the activities of the Foundation. There has been, since the Foundation was established in 1950, no thorough examination by both Houses of Congress of the basic legislation, and that is why I consider Senate action this session so important.

There are a number of questions raised by the two bills, which the hearings must help us resolve. Among these questions are the authorization of applied research, the relationship between the NSF and the Department of State in international science activities, and the role of the National Science Board in policymaking.

Let me conclude by reaffirming my support for the important role the National Science Foundation has played in the advancement of science in this country. There are some who criticize a few of the specific projects supported by the NSF. To those, let me say that a scientific breakthrough such as a cancer cure, a laser, a communications satellite, a chemical synthesis, or any of thousands more—each breakthrough is like a jigsaw puzzle, made up of many pieces. The omission of one piece is sufficient to prevent completion of the puzzle.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, and I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2598) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, making changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2598

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be known as the "National Science Foundation Act Amendments of 1967."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"FUNCTIONS OF THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed

"(1) to initiate and support basic scientific research and programs to strengthen scientific research potential in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, social, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) to support such scientific activities and to appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and upon the general welfare;

"(2) to award, as provided in section 10, scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, social, and other sciences;

"(3) to foster the interchange of scientific informaton among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

"(4) to evaluate the status and needs of the various sciences as evidenced by programs, projects, and studies undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government, by individuals, and by public and private research groups, employing by grant or contract such consulting services as it may deem necessary for the purpose of such evaluations; and to take into consideration the results of such evaluations in correlating the research and educational programs undertaken or supported by the Foundation with programs, projects, and studies undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government, by individuals, and by public and private research groups;

"(5) to maintain a current register of scientific and technical personnel, and in other ways to provide a central clearinghouse for the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data on the availability of, and the current and projected need for, scientific and technical resources in the United States, and to provide a source of information for policy formulation by other agencies of the Federal Government; and

"(6) to initiate and maintain a program for the determination of the total amount of money for scientific research, including money allocated for the construction of the facilities wherein such research is conducted, received by each educational institution and appropriate nonprofit organization in the United States, by grant, contract, or other arrangement from agencies of the Federal Government, and to report annually thereon to the President and the Congress.

"(b) When requested by the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense, the Foundation is authorized to initiate and support specific scientific activities in connection with matters relating to international cooperation or national security by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific activities.

"(c) In addition to the authority contained in subsection (a) and (b), the Foundation is authorized to initiate and support scientific research, including applied research, at academic and other nonprofit institutions. When so directed by the President, the Foundation is further authorized to support, through other appropriate organizations, applied scientific research relevant to national problems involving the public interest. In exercising the authority contained in this subsection, the Foundation may employ by grant or contract such consulting services as it deems necessary, and shall coordinate and correlate its activities with respect to any such problem with other agencies of the Federal Government undertaking similar programs in that field.

"(d) The Board and the Director shall recommend and encourage the pursuit of national policies for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences.

"(e) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in the foregoing subsections, it shall be one of the objectives of the Foundation to strengthen research and education in the sciences, including independent research by individuals, throughout the United States, and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education.

"(f) The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the 15th day of January of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Such report shall include information as to the acquisition and disposition by the Foundation of any patents and patent rights."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

"SEC. 4. (a) The Board shall consist of twenty-four members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and of the Director ex officio. In addition to any powers and functions otherwise granted to it by this Act, the Board shall establish policies to guide the Foundation.

"(b) The Board shall have an Executive Committee as provided in section 6, and may delegate to it or to the Director or both such of the powers and functions granted to the Board by this Act as it deems appropriate.

"(c) The persons nominated for appointment as members of the Board (1) shall be eminent in the fields of the basic, medical, or social sciences, engineering, agriculture, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

"(d) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be six years; except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Any person, other than the Director, who has been a member of the Board for twelve consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the two-year period following the expiration of such twelfth year.

"(e) The Board shall meet annually on the third Monday in May unless, prior to May 10 in any year, the Chairman has set the annual meeting for a day in May other than the third Monday, and at such other times as the Chairman may determine, but he shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the members so request in writing. A majority of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail or certified mail mailed to his last known address of record not less than fifteen days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

"(f) The election of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board shall take place at each annual meeting occurring in an even-numbered year. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Board shall elect a member to fill such vacancy.

"(g) The Board shall render an annual report to the President, for submission on or before the 31st day of January of each year to the Congress, on the status and health of science and its various disciplines. Such report shall include an assessment of such matters as national scientific resources and trained manpower, progress in selected areas of basic scientific research, and an indication of those aspects of such progress which might be applied to the needs of American society. The report may include such recommendations as the Board may deem timely and appropriate.

"(h) The Board is authorized to establish such special commissions as it may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this Act.

"(i) The Board is so authorized to appoint from among its members such committees as it deems necessary, and to assign to committees so appointed such survey and advisory functions as the Board deems appropriate to assist it in exercising its powers and functions under this Act."

SEC. 4. Section 5 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"DIRECTOR OF THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 5. (a) The Director of the Foundation (referred to in this Act as the 'Director') shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Before any person is appointed as Director, the President shall afford the Board an opportunity to make recommendations to him with respect to such appointment. The Director shall receive basic pay at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title V, United States Code.

"(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act (1) the Director shall exercise all of the authority granted to the Foundation by this Act (including any powers and functions which may be delegated to him by the Board), and (2) all actions taken by the Director pursuant to the provisions of this Act (or pursuant to the terms of a delegation from the Board) shall be final and binding upon the Foundation.

"(c) The Director may from time to time make such provisions as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, agency, or employee of the Foundation of any of his functions under this Act, including functions delegated to him by the Board; except that the Director may not redelegate policymaking functions delegated to him by the Board.

"(d) The formulation of programs in conformance with the policies of the Foundation shall be carried out by the Director in consultation with the Board.

"(e) The Director shall not make or revoke any contract, grant, or other arrangement pursuant to section 11(c) without the prior approval of the Board, if, in his opinion, such action involves a policy determination of the nature reserved to the Board.

"(f) The Director, in his capacity as ex-officio member of the Board, shall, except with respect to compensation and tenure, be coordinate with the other members of the Board. He shall be a voting member of the Board and shall be eligible for election by the Board as Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Board."

SEC. 5. The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is further amended by striking out section 8, by redesignating sections 6 and 7 as sections 7 and 8, respectively, and by inserting after section 5 the following new section:

"DEPUTY DIRECTOR AND ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

"SEC. 6. (a) There shall be a Deputy Director of the Foundation (referred to in this Act as the 'Deputy Director'), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Before any person is appointed as Deputy Director, the President shall afford the Board and the Director an opportunity to make recommendations to him with respect to such appointment. The Deputy Director shall receive basic pay at the rate provided for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, and shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Director may prescribe. The Deputy Director shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Director.

"(b) There shall be four Assistant Directors of the Foundation (each referred to in this Act as an 'Assistant Director'). Each Assistant Director shall receive basic pay at the rate provided for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, and shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Director may prescribe."

SEC. 6. The section of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 redesignated as section 7 by section 5 of this Act is amended to read as follows:

"EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

"SEC. 7. (a) There shall be an Executive Committee of the Board (referred to in this Act as the 'Executive Committee'), which shall be composed of five members and shall exercise such powers and functions as may be delegated to it by the Board. Four of the members shall be elected as provided in subsection (b), and the Director ex officio shall be the fifth member and the chairman of the Executive Committee.

"(b) At each of its annual meetings the Board shall elect two of its members as members of the Executive Committee, and the Executive Committee members so elected shall hold office for two years from the date of their election. Any person, other than the Director, who has been a member of the Executive Committee for six consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for service as a member thereof during the two-year period following the expiration of such sixth year. For the purposes of this subsection the period between any two consecutive annual meetings of the Board shall be deemed to be one year.

"(c) Any person elected as a member of the Executive Committee to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected shall be elected for the remainder of such term.

"(d) The Executive Committee shall render an annual report to the Board, and such other reports as it may deem necessary, summarizing its activities and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Executive Committee shall be included in such reports."

SEC. 7. The section of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 redesignated as section 8 by section 5 of this Act is amended to read as follows:

"DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 8. There shall be within the Foundation such Divisions as the Director, in consultation with the Board, may from time to time determine."

SEC. 8. Section 9(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "section 3(a)(7)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4(h)".

Sec. 9. Section 10 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended.

(1) by striking out "section 17" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 16";

(2) by inserting "social," after "engineering,"; and

(3) by striking out "among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "throughout the United States".

Sec. 10. (a) Section 11(c) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended

(1) by striking out "basic";

(2) by striking out "research" each place it appears;

(3) by inserting "Secretary of State or" before Secretary of Defense"; and

(4) by striking out "the national defense" and inserting in lieu thereof "international cooperation or national security".

(b) Section 11(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "research" and inserting in lieu thereof "activities".

(c) Section 11(h) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 5703 of title 5, United States Code,".

(d) Section 11 of such Act is further amended by the addition of a new subsection (j) as follows:

"(j) to arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of any activity which the Foundation is authorized to conduct."

Sec. 11. Section 13(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended

(1) by striking out ", with the approval of the Board, "; and

(2) by striking out "section 16(d)(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 15(d)(2)".

Sec. 12. Section 14 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is repealed.

Sec. 13. (a) Section 15 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is redesignated as section 14 and is amended to read as follows:

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Sec. 14. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Board shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Except as provided in section 4(h), such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates: *Provided,* That the Director may, in accordance with such policies as the Board shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel and fix their compensation, without regard to such provisions, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this Act. The members of the special commissions shall be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

"(b) Neither the Director, the Deputy Director, nor any Assistant Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while serving in such position; nor shall the Director, the Deputy Director, or any Assistant Director, except with the approval of the Board, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any grant, contract, or other arrangement under this Act.

"(c) The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

"(d) The members of the Board and the members of each special commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

"(e) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of special commissions, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such offices.

"(f) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals in the United States or foreign countries, including Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the United States, (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which, if aided, will advance scientific research, and (4) encouraging independent scientific research by individuals.

"(g) Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made.

"(h) For purposes of this Act, the term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense means the States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and all territories and possessions of the United States."

Sec. 14. Sections 16 and 17 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 are redesignated as sections 15 and 16, respectively. Subsection (a) of the section redesignated as section 15 is amended by striking out "1946" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1954". Subsection (b) of the section redesignated as section 15 is amended by striking out "section 15(h)" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 14(g)".

Sec. 15. (a)(1) Section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(19) Director of the National Science Foundation."

(2) Section 5314 of such title is amended by striking out paragraph 40, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraph:

"(40) Deputy Director, National Science Foundation."

(3) Section 5316 of such title is amended by striking out paragraph (66), and by inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraph:

"(66) Assistant Directors, National Science Foundation (4)."

(4) The amendments made by this subsection (and the amendments made by sections 3 and 4 of this Act insofar as they relate to rates of basic pay) shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month which begins on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Section 902(c) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100".

Sec. 16. Except as otherwise specifically provided therein, the amendments made by this Act are intended to continue in effect under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 the existing offices, procedures, and organization of the National Science Foundation as provided by such Act, part II of Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1962, and Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1965. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, part II of Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1962, and Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1965, shall be of no force or effect; but nothing in this Act shall alter or affect any transfers of functions made by part I of such Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1962.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 989) to provide improved judicial machinery for the selection of Federal juries, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2410) to provide a program of economic incentives to assist and encourage industry to assume its responsibility for abating and preventing the pollution of the atmosphere by wastes from industrial sources, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 30, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio, and for other purposes.

HEARING ON TAX COURT BILL—S. 2041

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce a hearing for the consideration of S. 2041. This bill would remove the Tax Court from the executive branch of the Government and make it an article III court.

The hearing will be held at 10 a.m.

on Thursday, November 9, 1967, in the District of Columbia hearing room, 6226 New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

CHARLIE HASLET'S 43 YEARS OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, tomorrow the Kansas congressional delegation will lose one of its most respected and effective members of the press, when Charles C. Haslet retires after 43 years of distinguished service with the Associated Press. He is probably one of the few men who have ever served that long with AP.

Charlie was born in Wellington, Kans., and had his first newspaper job with the Wellington Daily News. He joined AP in 1924 in Chicago. Shortly after that he was transferred to Oklahoma City and covered the Oklahoma State Legislature until March of 1937, when he was sent to Washington, D.C., where he has served ever since.

I was a comparatively new Member of the House of Representatives when Charlie was transferred here to cover news involving Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri. I shall never forget the first day he called on me and introduced himself. I was getting ready to go to a baseball game and invited Charlie to go along. He laughingly said he had never seen a major league baseball game, but he had too much work to do to go. I picked up the telephone and called the AP desk downtown and told them that if they expected Charlie to cover me that day, he would have to go to the baseball game. Permission was naturally granted, and Charlie and I have been the best of friends ever since.

I am sure that few people in Kansas realize it, but Charlie Haslet is the one person who has reliably kept them advised on happenings in Washington for the past 30 years. He has probably written more words on this subject than anyone else.

I could not have hoped for a better relationship with the press than I have had all these years with Charlie Haslet. Nothing has ever been too small or too big for him to cover. His word is his bond, and never has he violated a release date or my confidence in any way.

I will personally miss Charlie Haslet very much, and it will seem quite strange to deal with his replacement. However, I take this opportunity to wish Charlie and Mrs. Haslet many years of happiness and contentment. I do hope, however, that he will come into Washington from his nearby Virginia residence every now and then to see his many friends on the Hill.

THE TRUTH FROM OUR FIGHTING MEN IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, recently at the White House, Secretary Rusk proudly read a letter he received from a GI fighting in Vietnam who wrote he had "never met a single U.S. soldier who said 'get out of Vietnam.'" Neither President Johnson nor our warhawk Secretary of State Rusk chose to refer to another letter from an Ohio GI fighting in Vietnam. The letter of this youngster, an Akron boy, was recently published in the Akron Beacon Journal, one of the great newspapers of my State of Ohio. Portions of this letter are as follows:

> DEAR MOM AND DAD: Today we went on a mission and I'm not very proud of myself, my friends, or my country. We burned every hut in sight. It was a small rural network of villages and the people were incredibly poor. My unit burned and plundered their meager possessions. The huts are thatched palm leaves. Each one has a dried mud bunker inside. These bunkers are to protect the families. Kind of like air raid shelters. My unit commanders, however, chose to think that these bunkers are offensive. So every hut we find that has a bunker we are ordered to burn to the ground.
>
> When the ten helicopters landed this morning, in the midst of these huts, and six men jumped out of each "chopper," we were firing the moment we hit the ground. We fired into all the huts we could. It is then that we burn these huts and take all men old enough to carry a weapon. And the "choppers" come and get them (they take them to a collection point a few miles away for interrogation). The families don't understand this. The Viet Cong fill their minds with tales saying the GI's kill all their men.
>
> So, everyone is crying, begging, and praying that we don't separate them and their husbands and fathers, sons and grandfathers. The women wail and moan. Then they watch in terror as we burn their homes, personal possessions and food. Yes, we burn all rice and shoot all livestock.
>
> Some of the guys are so careless. Today a buddy of mine called "La dai" (come here) into a hut and an old man came out of the bomb shelter. My buddy told the old man to get away from the hut and since we have to move quickly on a sweep, just threw a hand grenade into the shelter.
>
> As he pulled the pin, the old man got excited and started jabbering and running toward my buddy and the hut. A GI, not understanding, stopped the old man with a football tackle just as my buddy threw the grenade into the shelter. (There is a 4-second delay on a hand grenade.)
>
> After he threw it, and was running for cover (during this 4-second delay) we all heard a baby crying from inside the shelter. There was nothing we could do.
>
> After the explosion we found the mother, two children, and an almost newborn baby. That is what the old man was trying to tell us. The shelter was small and narrow. They were all huddled together. The three of us dragged out the bodies onto the floor of the hut. It was horrible. The children's fragile bodies were torn apart, literally mutilated. We looked at each other and burned the hut. The old man was just whimpering in disbelief outside the burning hut. We walked away and left him there. Well, Dad, you wanted to know what it's like here. Does this give you an idea?
>
> YOUR SON.

Mr. President, while at the White House Secretary Rusk could also have read the views of Dan Burdekin, a 25-year-old Army veteran who served as an artillery officer in Vietnam and is now a student in social welfare at Ohio State University. In the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, a member of the Scripps-Howard chain and a great newspaper in Ohio, there appeared on October 19 an article entitled "How One GI Lost Faith in Vietnam War." Portions of this article are as follows:

> "When I went over in August, 1966, I had the position America, right or wrong," Burdekin said.
>
> "It wasn't until I was there quite a while that I started coming to some definite conclusions in the other direction, and it really shook me up."
>
> Burdekin began to have doubts, he said, when he heard about artillery units dropping rounds into villages and about American soldiers burning down villages in the fight against Viet Cong infiltrators. He said he began to wonder if he were doing the Vietnamese people more harm than good.
>
> "The average person there has no more than the land he was raised on and if he loses that he loses everything," Burdekin said.
>
> "I think it's wrong for us to go over there and say that we're going to win the war for you, but if we have to kill you all in the process, that's all right too.
>
> "That's what really set me off. It's not an overt attitude, but it's in everything we do."
>
> Burdekin says American shelling, bombing and defoliating schemes are leveling Vietnam, destroying forests and farm lands.
>
> And after talking to Viet Cong prisoners and South Vietnamese villagers, he wonders what the point of it is.
>
> "I hate to hear American mothers say their sons died fighting communism in Vietnam, because they really didn't," Burdekin said.
>
> The North Vietnamese are Socialists and the Viet Cong leaders are Communist, but they're both more interested in nationalism.
>
> In addition, Burdekin said most South Vietnamese would rather be governed by the Hanoi government than continue the war.
>
> "There's a growing resentment against Americans because to the Vietnamese people our presence means continuation of the war," he said.
>
> He said a lot of South Vietnamese he talked to throughout the country would rather be governed by Ho Chi Minh than by the Saigon government anyway.

Mr. President, it is evident that our Secretary of State is beginning to believe his own propaganda, to believe only what he wants to believe. I—and I am sure all Senators—receive many letters from GI's, sailors, and airmen deploring our involvement in the civil war in Vietnam, our continuing destruction of that little country, and the killing and maiming of thousands of civilian men, women, and children both north and south of the 17th parallel.

It is obvious that the Secretary of State heeds the advice and counsel only of those who agree with his warhawk policies. He scornfully disregards his critics and the belief of the majority of Americans who—according to all reliable polls—now feel that it was a tragic mistake for our Nation to have become involved in an ugly civil war in Vietnam, a nation of no strategic or economic importance to the defense of the United States.

In the many speeches and statements regarding Vietnam made by Secretary of State Dean Rusk in recent years he invariably denounces "aggression from the north" using that phrase many, many times, untruthfully ignoring the fact that there has been a civil war in South Vietnam for more than 10 years between the Vietcong, or forces of the National Liberation Front, and the Saigon regime of generals who fought on the side of the French colonial oppressors from 1946 to Dienbienphu in 1954.

Also Secretary Rusk ignores the fact that historically for thousands of years there never was a North Vietnam and a South Vietnam. And the Geneva accords recognized this fact by terming the division at the 17th parallel as a temporary demarcation line and not a national boundary. Also he is prone to denounce the Vietcong for "contemptible sneak attacks in the darkness of night." Did George Washington perpetrate a sneak attack crossing the Delaware in the darkness of night on Christmas night 1776, marching his small force in silence on the Hessian mercenaries at Trenton killing and capturing 2,000?

Mr. President, it is crystal clear that for many months now Secretary of State Rusk has been unable to be objective regarding the administration's Vietnam policies which I fear he has advised and plotted, and which our President unfortunately has followed. His ludicrous issuance of one loophole-ridden justification after another for these aggressive policies has resulted in causing heads of state of many countries to regard the United States as an aggressor nation. If he continues his present policies and his peculiar views and if his unsound and utterly fallacious arguments are persuasive to President Johnson, the Secretary may well lead this Nation into a third world war. His resignation would be welcomed at home and abroad. I refer particularly to heads of state of the United Kingdom, France, Japan, Pakistan, India, the Philippine Republic, and Indonesia, to name a few nations.

DISCRIMINATION IN INTEREST RATES

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, last week the Johnson administration established another new record by pushing interest rates to another 46-year high. This week the Treasury Department in financing the Federal debt is being forced to pay 5¾ percent interest on bonds with 7-year maturity. This 5¾ percent being paid to the bankers compares to the 4¼ percent which they pay to the small investors in the series E bonds. This practice of discriminating against the small investor is earning for the administration the title of "the bankers' best friend."

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mr. Lee M. Cohn, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Friday, October 27, 1967, entitled "Forty-six Year High Hit in Cost of Treasury Borrowing" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Forty-six-Year High Hit in Cost of Treasury Borrowing

(By Lee M. Cohn)

The spiraling cost of credit is forcing the Treasury to pay 5¾ percent interest—the highest comparable rate in 46 years—to borrow money.

Furthermore, financial analysts warned today, interest rates probably will climb much higher unless Congress raises taxes to curb inflation and hold down the federal budget deficit.

The Treasury announced yesterday plans to borrow about $12.2 billion by selling $1.5 billion of 7-year notes paying 5¾ percent interest, and $10.7 billion of 15-month notes paying 5⅝ percent.

Not since 1921 has the Treasury paid as much as 5¾ percent on securities outside the bill area. The rate rose to 6.32 percent on an issue of 6-month bills during last year's credit squeeze.

Notes, bonds and certificates—known as coupon securities—pay interest periodically. Bills have shorter maturities and are sold at discounts from their redemption values, instead of paying interest.

After a brief period of relief earlier this year, interest rates have soared on debt securities sold by the Treasury, other federal agencies, corporations and municipalities, basically because the federal budget deficit is expected to be the largest since World War II.

The big deficit will require a huge volume of Treasury borrowing, and threatens to cause an inflationary boom in industry by overstimulating the economy.

With the Treasury borrowing heavily and a boom spurring business borrowing for expansion, the demand for credit is expected to strain the supply of loanable money.

When borrowers have to scramble for funds, they bid up the price of credit—interest rates.

Besides the overwhelming demand for credit, there is a real prospect that the Federal Reserve may restrict the supply by tightening monetary policy to fight inflation.

The threat of extremely high interest rates is a major reason why President Johnson has recommended tax increases—to limit the size of the deficit and thus the amount of Treasury borrowing, and to minimize the need for anti-inflationary action by the "Fed."

Congress has balked at raising taxes, and financial markets have reacted by pushing interest rates up. Borrowers are rushing to get their money before interest rates climb still higher, and lenders are holding out for the higher rates they expect later.

Each 3-month delay in raising taxes increases the government's borrowing requirements by $1.8 billion to $2 billion, Treasury Undersecretary Frederick L. Deming told a news conference yesterday.

If taxes are not raised, he said, the government may have to borrow about $21 billion this fiscal year. Adding this to non-federal borrowing, he said, total demand for credit might total $87 billion—exceeding the anticipated supply of $70 billion.

The Treasury and big borrowers would get the credit they need, he said, but other worthy borrowers would be shoved aside, even if they were willing to pay high interest rates.

Of the $12.2 billion to be borrowed, Deming said, $10.2 billion will be used to pay off that amount of bonds and notes maturing Nov. 15.

The $2 billion balance should take care of the Treasury's requirements for new cash to finance the deficit through December, he said. The Treasury has borrowed $14 billion of new cash so far during the second half of calendar 1967.

Investors may subscribe for the new notes at the Treasury or Federal Reserve banks, or through securities dealers, only next Monday. Since subscriptions normally exceed the amount offered, investors generally will be allotted only a fraction of the notes they ask for.

The notes will be delivered and must be paid for Nov. 15.

Only about $4.6 billion of the notes will be sold to the public. The Federal Reserve and government trust accounts are expected to buy at least $7.6 billion to replace their holdings of the maturing securities.

This is the first time in recent history that the Treasury has sold any securities with maturities longer than five years at an interest rate above 4¼ percent.

Congress earlier this year relaxed the legal 4¼ percent ceiling, allowing the Treasury to exceed that rate on securities with maturities up to seven years. The limit had been five years.

VIETNAM: HOW NOT TO UTILIZE AIRPOWER—V

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. Mr. President, with respect to the utilization of airpower in Vietnam—and this is the fifth summary I have made on this subject in recent days—I ask unanimous consent that additional testimony contained as part of the interrogation of Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers by counsel for the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, having to do with the fact that authorized targets were lost if not hit within a certain time period, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lost Targets If Not Hit in Specified Time Frame

(Testimony by Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, USAF, retired, before Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, August 29, 1967)

Mr. **Kendall**. If you did not fly them within that period, what happened to them?

General **Meyers**. Well, we lost them.

Mr. **Kendall**. You lost them?

General **Meyers**. Right.

Mr. **Kendall**. So I assume that——

General **Meyers**. The same thing was true of the targets. If we did not hit them within the specified [deleted] series, we lost them.

Many times they were rescheduled in a subsequent [deleted] series, but we did not have automatic approval to keep going.

Mr. **Kendall**. So if you got a target—one a week and later on, I believe, it was three every 2 weeks—and if you did not hit that target within that period, then it became not valid for strike?

General **Meyers**. That is correct.

Senator **Symington**. That is one of the most incredible aspects of all these rules and regulations laid down from Washington.

Senator **Thurmond**. Asinine.

Mr. **Kendall**. It would seem to me as a layman that that would generate a great deal of pressure on your people to get that target during that particular period even though you might have to fly through questionable weather and things of that nature to do it; would that be accurate?

General **Meyers**. That is correct. We used larger numbers of sorties to attack these targets than we thought was militarily advisable, based on the defenses that existed. This was done so we would not lose sorties in the next allocation of [deleted] series.

Mr. **Kendall**. Were you ever given an explanation for this type of control, either on the number of sorties or the target being valid only for a particular period?

General **Meyers**. No, but it goes back again to the philosophy of the graduated pressure.

In conformance with the policy, they apparently did not want to put too many sorties over North Vietnam at a given point in time. They wanted to increase the air effort gradually, which, in turn, increased the pressure on the enemy.

THE BRINK OF CHAOS

Mr. **YOUNG** of Ohio. Mr. President, two highly respected newspapers in Ohio, both with large circulations in their respective areas, the Daily News of Port Clinton, a city on Lake Erie, and the Daily Herald of Delphos, a city in the westerly section of Ohio, recently expressed editorially their complete disagreement with the administration position and recent remarks of President Johnson concerning the war in Vietnam. In a letter addressed to Mr. Whitney Shoemaker, assistant to President Johnson, Murray Cohen, publisher of the Port Clinton Daily News and the Delphos Daily Herald, expressed his regret that he must continue to disagree with statements made by President Johnson seeking to defend turning a civil war in Vietnam into an American ground war.

Murray Cohen, an extremely knowledgeable and well-known publisher and journalist in Ohio, stated in his letter:

> I and an increasingly larger number of people who believe they are acting out of dedication to what this nation stands for, are becoming more and more alarmed over the carnage in Viet Nam and the potential for future carnage as the escalation grows. We are, by and large, the group that held silent in hopes that our silence would produce a settlement that would end the killing. Now, it seems almost too late.
>
> Surely the views of nearly the entire rest of the world, including those who traditionally have been our closest allies cannot be so totally ignored?
>
> President Johnson must attempt to use protracted deescalation as the path to peace, or he must be replaced, just as President Eisenhower succeeded a Democrat in office.
>
> One more word. The editorial, which appeared in two newspapers, did not result in a single critical response from any person in the two Ohio communities. Considering the number of armed forces personnel from our areas now in Viet Nam, the response should have been strongly negative by many people if there were not a widespread feeling that our course is immoral, dangerous and harmful to this nation.
>
> I would give everything if only the present course were right, but I know now it is not.

Mr. President, at the time I first read this editorial, I was startled to read the official report from Saigon dated October 26:

> U.S. casualties in the Vietnam war last week rose slightly and were more than double those of the South Vietnamese forces for the same period, the U.S. Command reported today.
>
> Spokesmen said 193 Americans were killed in action, while 81 South Vietnamese were killed and approximately 400 wounded.
>
> Of the 949 Americans wounded, 573 required hospital treatment.

It is with a feeling of sadness, Mr. President, that I report this continuing sacrifice of the lives of the young Americans in a civil war in which we should never have become involved, and which we have now turned into an American ground and air war.

These most recent casualty figures speak louder than words of the urgency for deescalating the ground war and stopping the bombing of North Vietnam in the hope that this will lead to negotiations and a cease-fire and an armistice. The editorial which appeared in the Port Clinton Daily News and the Delphos Herald clearly and concisely points out the sound logic for doing so. I ask unanimous consent that the fine editorial, "The Brink of Chaos," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRINK OF CHAOS

> Most of the critics of the Johnson Vietnam policy would cease their criticism immediately, as the President asked Friday night, if they thought their silence would contribute to the defeat of the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong, a shortening of the war, a lessening of the injury and killing of American soldiers, the advancement of democratic principles, or a reduction in the chances for a nuclear World War III. Indeed, the vast majority of those who view the Johnson policy with increasing alarm would never have joined the rank of those who have opposed the administration in its escalation if they had not felt that we are headed for the brink of disaster.
>
> Friday night's speech by President Johnson went wrong for most of the critics when he referred to the Vietnam conflict as being caused by foreigners. The truth about the war in Vietnam that is now becoming known to an increasing number of people in the United States is that it is in virtually every respect a civil war. One of the groups of "foreigners" involved is the group of generals from North Vietnam who fought with the French in the war of independence and now have taken over South Vietnam. If this isn't a civil war, there never was one in the history of the world.
>
> Many of the critics involved, including this newspaper, held their silence in hopes that the "united front" would somehow produce results. Instead, the situation continued to deteriorate.
>
> United States troops switched to take the lead on the battlefield and the numbers grew from 100,000 to 200,000 and then 300,000, again, 400,000, a half a million. When American bombers attack targets daily that are within one minute of China, when the familiar arguments begin to sound for invading North Vietnam—a step that will, at the minimum, require a doubling or quadrupling of U. S. troop commitments—and when the weaponry on both sides heads closer to nuclear disaster, there doesn't seem to be much point in further silence. The right direction seems to be deescalation, a cessation of the bombing, rather than further escalation.
>
> Meanwhile, the most humanitarian nation in the world, the nation that is the symbol and the hope of this world in its actions and preachments, continues to descend to the level of a barbaric Asiatic civilization. The United States loses a portion of its moral position before the world every day the bombing continues.
>
> As for the Johnson quotations from the Asiatic nations in support of staying in Vietnam, let them put up with economic and troop commitments what their speeches indicate they will do. By and large, they have not done so to date.
>
> The question is not withdrawal. The question is deescalation or escalation. The President has deliberately confused deescalation with abandonment.
>
> Increasing the fury of this horrible war and slowing the pace both have their risks. The increasing number of critics, including our closest allies, favor taking the risk of deescalation as the road to peace.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business?

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **DOMINICK**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL NOMINEES

Mr. **DOMINICK**. Mr. President, on Friday, October 20, 1967, the Senate District of Columbia Committee conducted hearings on the nominations for Chairman, Vice Chairman, and members of the District of Columbia Council.

At that time I raised certain questions with respect to possible conflicts of interest and conflict of duties as far as two nominees were concerned. I also raised questions with respect to the American Bar Association Canons of Ethics and their effect on one nominee, Mr. Thompson. Because of the nature of my questions and the considerable attention which they have received, I want to make my position clear prior to consideration of the nominations by the Senate.

First, let me emphasize that I do not question the qualifications of Mr. Thompson. I have been most favorably impressed with his background, education, and experience, and in my contact with him since his appointment. He has been at all times very cooperative.

However, during his testimony before the committee Mr. Thompson stated his intention to continue his partnership with the other members of his law firm during his service as a member of the Council. Certainly, it is not improper for him to do so, but the potentiality for possible conflicts of interest is obvious unless certain safeguards are met.

I am deeply concerned that our first Council under the newly reorganized government for the District of Columbia get off to a start with a clean bill of health.

To this end I have endeavored, while at the hearings and during this past week, to explore thoroughly and bring to the forefront items which in my mind should be fully aired now and not later. Since Mr. Thompson is a well-qualified attorney and member of the American Bar Associaton who is seeking public office, the canons of ethics of that association seem to me to be legitimate matters for public inquiry.

Mr. President, I do not view the Senate District of Columbia Committee or the Department of Justice as judge of what is proper under the canons of ethics of the American Bar Association. Indeed, I would resist any attempt by either to assume such a role. Procedures are available to Mr. Thompson and the members of his firm, if they feel it necessary, to seek out an opinion on any potential conflicts from the Standing Committee on Professional Ethics of the American Bar Association.

But the Senate District of Columbia Committee or any Senate committee with the responsibility for reviewing nominations and making recommendations for or against confirmation has a duty, in my judgment, not only to study the nominee's qualifications but to fully disclose matters in which the interest of the public is a part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] may be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The time lapse which it has taken to look into the ethics issue should not be construed to mean the committee felt a definite conflict existed. Nor should a favorable report on the Thompson nomination by the committee be construed to mean potential future conflicts have been precluded.

Mr. President, with the caution that the canons and ethics opinions of bar associations are subject to interpretation, I would like to make some legislative history as to the reasons for my concern.

I have previously made available to Mr. Thompson the citations to the opinions which have troubled me.

One opinion of the Colorado Bar Association is particularly illustrative. In ethics opinion 18, the Colorado Bar Association held that neither a city councilman nor members of his firm could represent a client before any administrative departments or agencies of the city. I hasten to add, of course, that that opinion is not applicable to Mr. Thompson since he is not a member of that association.

I have examined a number of opinions, both formal and informal, of the American Bar Association to which he does belong. To the best of my knowledge, but not surprisingly, there has been no decision directly in point. Three opinions in particular caught my eye.

In formal opinion 192 one of the issues was to what extent it was proper for a firm, one of the members of which had accepted public office, to accept professional employment requiring dealings with the employer of the firm member.

The decision held:

> There is no objection to his retaining his membership in a law firm or in sharing the earnings of the law firm, provided such firm does not represent interests adverse to the employer. . . .

In formal opinion 306 the ABA Ethics Committee decided to permit members of a law firm to appear before legislative committees even though a member of the firm is also a member of the legislature.

I might say at this point, Mr. President, that this is a change from ethics rulings which had previously been issued by the American Bar Association Ethics Committee. Prior to this particular ruling, the ABA committee had held that it was not ethical for any member of a firm to appear before a legislative committee or a legislative body on behalf of a client, where a member or an associate of that firm was a member of the legislative body. This was true even though the member of the legislative body had said that he would not share in the profits of his law firm while he was holding such position.

So this formal opinion No. 306 is a change, and it indicates, once again, the difficulty of the Senate District of Columbia Committee trying to interpose itself as a judge in this type of situation. Even ethics committee rulings change from time to time.

Opinion No. 306 went on to say that such appearances are authorized whenever there are constitutional, statutory, or legislative provisions which expressly or by necessary implication recognize such action as proper, or where a provision permits a member of the legislature to disclose his conflict and withhold his vote on the matter. It may be that the Federal conflict of interest law, in particular, 18 United States Code 207, is the type of consent contemplated by this opinion.

Finally, I would call the attention of the Senate to formal opinion No. 315. Decided in 1965, this opinion involved, among other issues, the nature of business which a firm could conduct after one of its members was elected Governor of the State and remained a partner of the firm. The ethics committee referred to formal opinions Nos. 192 and 306, and in its conclusions cautioned:

> The firm must be extremely careful to avoid any representation which involves even the appearance of a conflict with the governor's duties.

Mr. President, the four opinions which I have just mentioned—Colorado Bar Association Opinion No. 18 and ABA Opinions Nos. 192, 306, and 315—are important, and I feel it is in the public interest that these as well as three others—ABA Informal Opinions Nos. 691, 700, and 855—receive widespread distribution. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOMINICK. In order that the record may be complete, I would merely mention that other opinions which have been considered as possibly having some relation to the problem are: ABA Formal Opinions Nos. 16, 30, 34, 49, 128, 135, 186, 262, and 278, and ABA Informal Opinions Nos. 564, 620, 674, and 772.

Prior to Senator BIBLE's departure from Washington, I asked the staff and the chairman if it would be possible for us to obtain a letter from Mr. Thompson's firm with respect to these issues, indicating specifically what they would and what they would not be willing to do. Such a letter was received. In general, Mr. Thompson has said that he would not represent any client against the District, that his firm would not represent any client before an administrative agency over which the council has jurisdiction, and that he would not, of course, act adversely to the interests of the District in any situation that might arise.

I believe this is an indication of the high quality of Mr. Thompson and his ethical considerations, and I am deeply appreciative of his cooperation and the effort that he has made to resolve these possible conflicts.

There is one other question which I would like to take up, and that is as to another nominee, Mr. Anderson. He is a highly qualified man also, and a very fine person. However, at the time he was nominated to the Council for the District of Columbia, he was a GS–13 working for the District of Columbia in the Recreation Department. That created an impossible situation as to him, because his Recreation Department job provided him with more personal funding than the Council job, and he would, as a Council member, have had jurisdiction over the very role that he was playing as a salaried employee.

All of a sudden, the administration came up with a new job for Mr. Anderson. If his nomination is confirmed by the Senate, he will be employed by HEW in the Children's Bureau as Youth Services Adviser. I am not sure whether his salary range will be any different, but it seems to me we still have the same problem in a slightly different context. No longer will he have jurisdiction over his own job, as he would had he remained with the District of Columbia Recreation Department, but he does have a situation where he is being given a job in the Children's Bureau, an area in which the administration claims his services are badly needed. Yet at the same time he will promptly be given an enormous amount of time off to start out on District of Columbia council work. A broad question in my mind is whether any Federal employee, at least initially, should serve on a city council, when we know that the work of the council is going to take so much time that the Federal employee would very patently not be able to spend the amount of time that has heretofore been considered necessary in the Federal job in which he has been employed or to which he is being appointed.

I believe this should be a matter of serious concern to all of us. What we can do about it I do not know. There is no law against it, as far as I am able to determine, at the present time. We do have a personnel problem, it seems to me, of major importance; and I should like to discuss the matter at greater length at a later time.

I do wish to say publicly, as I have said before to the staff and to the committee members, that I do not intend to oppose any of these nominees, but I do wish to bring the questions out, so that Senators can look at the problems and determine what they want to do, in the interests of future policy.

In concluding I would like to express my appreciation and extend my compliments to the staff of the District of Columbia Committee, particularly to Mr. Chet Smith, staff director, for the work which has been done since our hearings. Chet has been in daily contact with my own staff in an effort to resolve all of my questions regarding the nominees, and I would just like the Record to reflect my own high regard for the quality of the materials which I have received as a result.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for giving me this time.

Exhibit 1

[Colorado Bar Association]

Opinion No. 18, Adopted January 20, 1961

SYLLABUS

It is improper for an attorney who is also a city councilman (a) to appear on behalf of a defendant who is charged with violation of a city ordinance in the municipal court of that city; and (b) to represent a client before administrative departments or agencies of that city. It is also improper for a member or associate of the law firm of which the city councilman is a member to act as an attorney in either of the above situations.

FACTS

An attorney in the private practice of law is also a member of the city council. The city council does not appoint municipal judges or administrative department or agency heads, but does appoint the members of the board of adjustment which hears zoning and building appeals. The limits of the salaries of municipal judges are established by city charter but the council has authority to fix the salary within such limits. The council approves the budget of the municipal court and appropriates funds for the operation of that court as well as all city departments and agencies.

OPINION

In Opinion No. 14 this Committee concluded that in a situation where the city council hired the municipal judge and fixed his salary it was improper for an attorney-councilman to practice in the municipal court on behalf of defendants charged with violations of city ordinances. The practice there condemned is equally improper where the council, although not directly appointing the judge, must approve the court's budget and appropriate funds for its operation.

The same conclusion must be reached with respect to the representation of a client by an attorney-councilman before an administrative department or agency of the city. Even though the conduct of both the department and the attorney is scrupulously correct, it is likely that an individual client, or the public, will believe that an attorney-councilman would receive a more favorable reception from a municipal department or agency than would a noncouncilman. An attorney who is also a public officer has an obligation to avoid any appearance of possible impropriety resulting from his dual position.

The pertinent rule regarding the appearance before municipal courts, departments or agencies of other members of the firm of which the attorney-councilman is a member has been stated as follows:

"The relations of partners in a law firm are such that neither the firm, nor any member or associate thereof, may accept any professional employment which any member of the firm cannot properly accept." Opinions 49 and 72 of the Committee on Professional Ethics of the American Bar Association. To the same effect are Opinions 33 and 103 of the same committee.

The foregoing rule is frequently harsh in its application, particularly where, as here, an entire firm is precluded from a substantial area of private practice because one firm member, often at a financial sacrifice, serves part time in a public or political position. The rule, and the policy considerations upon which it is based, are nevertheless too firmly established to permit of modification at this time.

American Bar Association Formal Opinion 192 (February 18, 1939)

A firm member who accepts permanent full-time employment with a private employer or government agency may continue to serve the firm and the firm may continue to use his name; however, if he remains a firm member or the firm retains his name, then the firm may not represent interests adverse to those of the member's employer.

If a firm member accepts temporary full-time employment with a private employer or government agency and retains his membership in the firm, then the firm may represent parties adverse to the firm member's employer only after such employment ceases and only in connection with matters arising subsequent to the termination of employment.

A firm member who accepts full-time employment with a private employer or government agency should not habitually recommend the employment of his former firm.

CANONS INTERPRETED: PROFESSIONAL ETHICS 6, 27, 33, 36

A member of the Association presents the following inquiries:

(1) Is it ethical or professionally proper for an attorney, after accepting public office or full-time employment, whether by local, state or federal governments, to continue to be a member of a private law firm or to allow his name to be used as a part of the name of the law firm?

(2) Is it ethical or professionally proper for an attorney who individually and personally accepts full-time private employment, especially from an institution such as a bank, railroad, insurance company, utility, to remain a member of a law firm or to allow his name to continue to be a part of the firm name?

(3) To what extent is it ethical or professionally proper for the firm, a member of which has accepted such employment as is described in (1) and (2), to accept professional employment which requires dealings with the employer of the firm member or former firm member?

(4) Is the situation in any way changed if the attorney who accepts public or private employment such as that described ceases to be a member of the firm but allows his name to be retained as a part of the firm name? What is the duty of the member of the firm and of the firm in case the employment is temporary rather than permanent?

(5) Is it ethical or professionally proper for one who has accepted public or private employment of the kind hereinbefore described, to habitually recommend to those with whom he comes in contact in his new employment that they employ the same firm of which he is still a member, or the firm name which still contains his name? Is the situation changed if he withdraws from the firm and the firm name is changed so as to exclude his name therefrom?

The opinion of the committee was stated by Mr. Haughton, Messrs. Arant, Phillips, Miller, Brown, Jones and Evans concurring.

The foregoing questions involve considerations of Canons:

6. Relating to adverse influences and conflicting interests,

27. Relating to advertising, either direct or indirect,

33. Relating to partnerships, and

36. Relating to conduct of attorneys on retirement from public employment.

Many opinions have been written by this committee applying each of these Canons. *Opinions 16, 30, 34, 77, 118* and *134* relate to *Canon 6*, and pass on questions concerning the propriety of the conduct of an attorney who is a public officer, in representing private interests adverse to those of the public body which he represents. The principle applied in those opinions is that an attorney holding public office should avoid all conduct which might lead the layman to conclude that the attorney is utilizing his public position to further his professional success or personal interests.

In general, when an attorney accepts employment, either public or private, his name may properly be carried by his firm. If the conditions of his employment require that he sever all other connections, he can no longer remain a member of the firm, and in such case should not permit his name to be used by the firm. In the absence of such conditions or of a law requiring the attorney to refrain from private practice, "there is no objection to his retaining his membership in a law firm or in sharing the earnings of the law firm, provided such firm does not represent interests adverse to the employer," and the public is not misled.

Questions (1) and (2) may be considered together. The only difference between them is that in (1) the lawyer is employed by a governmental agency, and in (2) by a private agency. The question is whether if he accepts full-time employment, by either governmental or private agency, he may continue to be a member of a law firm, or allow his name to be used in the firm name. In the absence of legislation forbidding this, there is no impropriety in his continuing to be a member of the firm so long as the firm refrains from representing interests adverse to the employer. In such case there is no conflicting interest and no chance for any conflict of interests. If, however, the firm is to represent interests adverse to the employer, it is otherwise. There may be instances in which there is no conflict, but we think that if there is a conflict, or even if there is apt to be a conflict, the attorney should withdraw from the firm, and the firm should no longer carry his name.

Question (3). We assume that the inquiry here is whether the firm may accept professional employment which is adverse to the employer of the firm member, or former firm member. The answer to this is indicated by what has been said previously. Such employment may be accepted only if the former firm member has severed all connections with the firm and is no longer a member of it; then there is and can be no possibility of a conflict between the interests represented by the attorney and his former firm.

Question (4). The situation is not changed if the attorney ceases to be a member of the firm and allows his name to be retained as a part of the firm name. So long as his name is retained by the firm, such firm should not represent interests adverse to the employer, either public or private, of the firm member. If the employment of the member of the firm is merely temporary, when such employment ceases, the firm may again represent interests adverse to the former employer, arising subsequent to the termination of the employment, and in no wise related to such employment. *Canon 36.* Departments or divisions are here regarded as the employer—not the government as a whole.

Question (5). A former member of a firm who later accepts public or private employment should not recommend habitually the employment of his former firm. This approaches touting. Upon inquiry he may recommend the retainer of his former firm in matters not adverse to his employer.

Formal Opinion 306 (May 26, 1962)

Wherever under constitutional or statutory provisions or legislative rules consent has been given, expressly or by necessary implication, a lawyer may properly engage in lobbying on behalf of a client before a legislative committee or otherwise where a member of his firm or associate is a member of the legislature.

CANON INTERPRETED: PROFESSIONAL ETHICS 6

This Committee said in formal Opinion 296, dated August 1, 1959, in effect, that there was a necessary conflict of interest where a partner or associate of a law firm was in the legislature, for another representative of the firm to appear before the legislature and sponsor or oppose legislation in the interest of one of the clients of the firm; and since the public was involved, consent to the dual representation could not be given, so as to meet the requirements of Canon 6, wherein it is provided (in part) that it is unprofessional to represent conflicting interests except by express consent of all concerned given after a full disclosure of the facts.

We have been advised that in some states, particularly some of the smaller states, our ruling has had the effect of cutting down on the number of lawyers in the legislature, and has deterred many able young lawyers employed by law firms from standing for positions in the legislature; and as requested by some members of the Bar from certain of these states, we have given consideration to Opinion 296. While we adhere to the basic principles of that opinion, we have concluded that it should be modified and supplemented as hereinafter set out.

We have concluded that if in any particular state there are constitutional or statutory provisions or legislative rules which expressly or by necessary implication recognize the propriety of a lawyer appearing before legislative committees, or otherwise lobbying in the legislature for a client where a member of his firm or associate was at the time a member of the legislature or where provision has been made permitting a member of the legislature to disqualify himself from voting on or participating in the discussion of the matter involved, consent has been given resolving the conflict of interest questions, either by the people through the constitution or by the Legislature speaking for the state.

Section 22 of the Article III of the Constitution of the State of Texas reads as follows:

"A member who has a personal or private interest in any measure or bill, proposed, or pending before the Legislature, shall disclose the fact to the House of which he is a member, and shall not vote thereon."

While no effort has been made to check the constitutions of all the states, such check as the Committee has made discloses that several other states have provisions substantially the same as that contained in the Texas Consitution but that so such provisions appear in the constitutions of a number of other states.

Such provisions have been construed as not disqualifying a legislator whose interest is merely that which is common to large segments of the public (such as a bill dealing with veterans of wars). While such provisions were probably never intended to apply to the situation we now have under discussion, such provisions are very broad and it seems to the Committee they might appropriately be considered as applicable to a legislator-lawyer whose firm was employed by a client to lobby for or against certain legislation. As a member or associate of the law firm he has a "personal and private interest" in the activities of the firm in behalf of the client. Accordingly, it is the opinion of the Committee that in states having a constitutional provision of this kind, the public in its basic law has consented to appearances by lawyers under such circumstances and has removed the question of conflict by providing that the legislator in question should disclose the interest and not vote upon the measure.

Even in States which do not have such constitutional provisions (assuming no conflict with existing constitutional provisions) the Committee is of the opinion that Consent of the public may properly be given by an act of the legislature or legislative rule substantially to the effect of the aforesaid constitutional provisions, or in any other manner recognizing the possible conflict of interest and either expressly or by necessary implication permitting it under prescribed circumstances.

Without such constitutional or statutory provisions or legislative rules the mere disclosure by the lawyer-legislator of the conflict of interest and a voluntary disqualification on his part to participate in the legislation involving such conflict is not sufficient to meet the requirements of Canon 6, as interpreted by this Committee. This would seem to involve, in part at least, the abdication of the functions for which the legislator was elected, without constitutional or legislative permission therefor. With such constitutional or legislative provisions the public policy of the state has been declared.

A number of states have adopted so-called lobbyists registration statutes, generally providing (in substance) that anyone acting in a representative capacity who appears before a legislative committee or contacts any member of the legislature for or against any pending legislation shall file with the legislative body a statement showing the name of his client and giving the measure or general subject matter in which the client is interested. It has been suggested to our Committee that compliance with such lobbyist registration statutes is sufficient to take the case out from under our *Opinion 296*, and resolve the question of conflict of interest. We do not so hold. Such statutes are designed to give the legislature and the public notice of the client or person represented and of the legislation which it advocates or opposes through its representative. While such statutes are of general application, they do not purport to deal with the question of conflict of interest. Accordingly, we hold that they are not sufficient to give an implied consent by the public, resolving the question of conflict of interest, where a law firm appears before a legislature committee or otherwise contacts members of the legislature on behalf of a client for or against a pending measure, and where at the same time a partner or associate in said firm is a member of the legislature.

To the extent herein provided, formal *Opinion 296* is modified and qualified; but otherwise said *Opinion 296* is adhered to.

Formal Opinion 315 (December 11, 1965)

As long as the laws of the state do not forbid it, there is nothing ethically improper in continuing in the firm name and carrying on the firm's letterhead the name of a partner who has been elected to the office of governor of the state, providing the following conditions are met; (1) he must continue to be responsible and liable as a partner to avoid possible deception; (2) the firm must be extremely careful to avoid any representation which involves even the appearance of a conflict with the governor's duties.

The same principles apply to listings in law directories, where his name may be followed by the words "on leave," but without showing the public office held.

CANONS INTERPRETED: PROFESSIONAL ETHICS
6, 33

The opinion of the Committee has been requested as to the propriety of a law firm continuing in the firm name the name of a member of the firm who has been elected to the office of governor of a state, when he intends to return to the law firm at the expiration of his term or terms of office. It is stated that by reason of the duties and burdens of his office, the officeholder will not be able to practice law during his incumbency as governor and, therefore, will not participate in fees earned by the firm while he is in office. It is also proposed that the name of the officeholder be shown in the list of individual lawyers named on the letterhead, with the notation "on leave." It is further proposed to carry the name of the officeholder in the various legal directories wherein the firm is listed, showing the public office held and the notation "on leave."

The Committee has also been asked if it would be improper to add to an announcement being sent out by the firm, in the customary manner showing the name of a new member of the firm, an announcement to the effect that the public officeholder had withdrawn from the firm during the term of his public office.

Canon 33, entitled "Partnerships—Names" holds, in part:

"In the formation of partnerships and the use of partnership names care should be taken not to violate any law, custom, or rule of court locally applicable. . . . The continued use of the name of a deceased or former partner, when permissible by local custom, is not unethical, but care should be taken that no imposition or deception is practiced through this use."

In *Opinion 192* the Committee was asked the question:

"Is it ethical or professionally proper for an attorney, after accepting public office or full-time employment, whether by local, state or federal governments, to continue to be a member of a private law firm or to allow his name to be used as a part of the name of the law firm?"

With respect to this inquiry, the Committee held:

"The question is whether if he [the lawyer] accepts full-time employment, by either governmental or private agency, he may continue to be a member of a law firm, or allow his name to be used in the firm name. In the absence of legislation forbidding this, there is no impropriety in his continuing to be a member of the firm so long as the firm refrains from representing interests adverse to the employer. . . . If, however . . . there is a conflict, or even if there is apt to be a conflict, the attorney should withdraw from the firm, and the firm should no longer carry his name."

Opinion 296 of this Committee held that a law firm may not accept employment to appear before legislative committees while a member of the firm is serving in the legislature, even though full disclosure is made to the committee and even though the member of the firm serving in the legislature does not share in any fees received thereby.

Opinion 306, while adhering to the basic principles of *Opinion 296*, modified that opinion by stating:

"We have concluded that if in any particular state there are constitutional or statutory provisions or legislative rules which expressly or by necessary implication recognize the propriety of a lawyer appearing before legislative committees, or otherwise lobbying in the legislature for a client where a member of his firm or associate was at the time a member of the legislature, or where provision has been made permitting a member of the legislature to disqualify himself from voting on or participating in the discussion of the matter involved, consent has been given resolving the conflict of interest questions, either by the people through the constitution or by the legislature speaking for the state."

Assuming that the conditions of the acceptance of the office of governor do not legally require the successful candidate to sever any or all of his other connections, in general his name may properly be continued in the firm name and carried on the firm letterhead if there is no statute opposing it. However, if a state statute exists prohibiting the governor from practicing law, then his name should be taken out of the firm name. The same principles would apply to listing the name of the governor in the various legal directories wherein the firm is listed, with the notation "on leave" after his name in the list of individual lawyers, but without showing the public office held.

In the event the officeholder's name is so continued in the firm name, whether or not he receives compensation from the firm, he must be responsible as a partner of the firm and liable as such in order to avoid possible deception.

If the name of the officeholder is retained in the firm name, then the firm must be extremely careful to avoid any representation which will or might appear to be in conflict with the duties of the governor where there might be any possible statutory or ethical conflict. At any time when it appears that such conflict might appear, the firm must disqualify itself.

Canon 27 prohibits all forms of advertising, direct or indirect, or solicitation or self-laudation, and it has been argued that the continued use in a firm name of the name of a holder of high public office, especially of a governor, not actually practicing with the firm during the term of his public office, would result in attracting clients, either because of the official's fame and stature, or, because of a feeling that the firm might have special influence in high places.

A majority of the Committee, however, are of the opinion that the general public would know of their governor's law office connection when he ran for office and that continuing his name on the firm letterhead in the manner here proposed would have no additional effect in connection with attracting new clients.

In conclusion, therefore, it is the opinion of the majority that if the safeguards and conditions set forth above are observed, it would not be unethical for a governor's name to be retained in the firm name under the circumstances stated.

Answering the second part of the inquiry, in *Opinion 301* it was held proper for announcement cards by lawyers entering or returning to private practice from governmental service to contain a brief and dignified reference to the position occupied with the government immediately prior to such entry or return. In view of the reasoning in that opinion, it would not be improper for the public officeholder's firm to send out, in the customary manner, an announcement showing the name of a new member of the firm together with an announcement to the effect that the public officeholder had withdrawn from the firm during the term of his public office.

This opinion affirms formal *Opinions 192* and *296* (modified by *Opinion 306*) as they apply to the questions covered herein. Any informal opinions inconsistent with the reasoning and conclusions in this *Opinion 315* are hereby overruled.

The opinion of the Committee is concurred in by Messrs. Benton E. Gates, Samuel P. Myers, E. B. Smith, Lewis H. Van Dusen, Jr., and Walter P. Armstrong.

Mr. Joiner concurred in the majority opinion but would add the following language to it:

"I believe that a firm which contains the name of an officeholder, in addition to being extremely careful to avoid representation which will or might appear to be in conflict with the duties of the officeholder, such as representing a client against the government of which the officeholder is a part, where their might be a conflict of interest, is also bound not to represent clients before courts or administrative agencies containing members appointed or subject to appointment by the man who is listed as a partner in the firm. In such cases the firm should disqualify itself."

Messrs. Carson and Johnston disagree with *Opinion 315* as approved by the majority and have filed this minority opinion for the purpose of expressing their reasons and setting forth their views.

Opinion 192, February 18, 1939, is summarized in its following paragraph:

"In general, when an attorney accepts employment, either public or private, his name may properly be carried by his firm. *If the conditions of his employment require that he sever all other connections, he can no longer remain a member of the firm, and in such case should not permit his name to be used by the firm.* In the absence of such conditions or of a law requiring the attorney to refrain from private practice, there is no objection to his retaining his membership in a law firm, provided such firm does not represent interests adverse to the employer, and the public is not misled." [Emphasis added.]

Opinion 286, August 1, 1959, and *Opinion 306,* May 26, 1962, which modified *Opinion 286,* together are to the effect that if a member or associate of a law firm is a member of a legislature, neither the firm nor any of its members or associates may appear before any committee of that legislature or otherwise lobby before it for a client, unless either (a) the propriety of such activity is recognized expressly or by necessary implication by statutory provisions or by legislative rules, or (b) provision has been so made for the lawyer-legislator to disqualify himself from voting on or participating in discussion of the particular matter and he has so disqualified himself and acts accordingly. These two opinions related principally to *Canon 36* and *Canon 32.* Neither *Canon 77* nor *Canon 33* was mentioned or discussed or involved in either opinion.

In its *Informal Decision 120,* date unknown, the Committee held, according to the summary on page 633 of the published opinions of the Committee (1957 bound volume), that a lawyer's letterhead should not state that he is a member of a stated bar association, or a senator or governor, or a member of Congress. This would apply tc the letterhead of a law firm as well, and *120* apparently has not been overruled or superseded. It is not referred to in the majority's *Opinion 315.*

Informal Decision C–620, March 13, 1963, was concerned with the propriety of continuing to use in the firm name the name of the incumbent of a high local office, described as being equivalent to the office of mayor of a major city, which as a practical matter would preclude the lawyer from practicing law because of the burdens of the office, although there was no legal prohibition against his doing so. In that decision (*C–620*), the Committee quoted *120,* implying approval of it in 1963, and also quoted formal *Opinion 192* and in discussing it said:

"Where members of the legal profession are elected to the United States Senate, to the House of Representatives, and to state and local offices, it is not uncommon for them to continue the use of their names in the firms of which they are members. Doubtless this practice has been established because these positions were at least originally considered part-time only. In recent years, of course, a United States Senator or Representative is in fact pretty well occupied full time in Washington, except for a limited vacation period."

We believe that such discussion *clearly implies serious doubt on the part* of the Committee in 1963 as *to the propriety of continuing the use in a firm* name of the *name of the incumbent of high public office,* even if he is not by law required to "sever all connections," *if, as a practical matter because of* the demands of the office, he simply *does not have time to engage in* the practice of law. The Committee, in *C–620* in 1963, also quoted the following from *Informal Decision C–403,* date unknown, having to do specifically with the office of governor:

"'The position of Chief Executive of a State is of such importance that it requires a member of the law firm to sever all relations with his firm during his term of office. The retention of his name, even with the addition of qualifying words, would create the impression that the firm has influence with the Governor that other law firms would not have. *The advertising of such relationship in the firm name would be improper.*" [Emphasis added.]

It was felt by some members of the Committee at the time *C–620* was issued that the reasoning and principles of *C–403* were also applicable to the local office under consideration, but the conclusion of the majority was that, while a borderline case, it would not be improper to continue using the name of the incumbent of the local office if certain measures were taken to avoid a partnership name which was either "misleading" or the use of which would amount to "deception" in violation of *Canon 33.* The majority was of the opinion that the use of the officeholder's name would be "misleading"

". . . *unless it was shown that he was no longer a member of the firm,* since otherwise there might be some implied representation that he was engaged in practice with the firm when in fact he is not in a position to [do so]. Accordingly . . . [if his name] is retained in the firm it should be indicated where his individual name appears on the side of the letterhead, either that he is retired from the firm in 1962 [apparently the year of incumbency], or that he is on 'leave of absence.'" [Emphasis and words in brackets added.]

Informal Decision C–414, February 24, 1961, as summarized on page 55 of the 1963-1964 supplement to the 1957 bound volume of the opinions, held that it was proper for a law firm and a firm member "leaving" to accept an important government position to make announcements warranted by former relationships, to avoid inference that there has been a split in the firm.

Formal Opinion 301, November 27, 1961, held that it was permissible for a lawyer "upon return to private practice" to send to persons concerned announcements explaining the "absence from private practice" by a dignified reference to the immediate past position with the government, so long as the guidelines and restrictions regarding the character of the announcements and the persons to whom they were sent were observed.

We concur with the majority in holding that in any case the lawyer-incumbent of the office of governor and his firm must adhere strictly to the principles of *Canon 6, Canon 26, and Canon 32.*

We believe, however, that the majority has not given proper construction or sufficient consideration to the language and principles of *Canon 33* or *Canon 27.*

Canon 33 provides in part as follows:

". . . *In the selection and use of a firm name, no false, misleading, assumed or trade name should be used.* The continued use of of the name of a deceased or former partner, when permissible by local custom, is not unethical, but care should be taken that no imposition or deception is practiced through this use. *When a member of the firm, on becoming a judge, is precluded from practicing law, his name should not be continued in the firm name.*" [Emphasis added.]

The sentences in italics were omitted from the quotation from *Canon 33* contained in the majority opinion. We deem them to be of crucial importance.

Canon 27 states that it is unprofessional to solicit professional employment in any way and that indirect advertising, such as inspiring newspaper comments in connection with the importance of the lawyer's position, and all other like self-laudation offend the traditions and lower the tone of the legal profession and are reprehensible.

We are of the opinion that *Canon 33* prohibits the continuation in the firm name of any partner who has ceased to practice law actively with the firm, except in the case of a deceased or former partner when this is permitted by local custom.

In the case of a judge who is "precluded from practicing law," the prohibition of *Canon 33* is specific. We believe that the same principle is applicable to any high national or state office if the incumbent, either by statute or rule of court or by reason of the duties and nature of office, is precluded from engaging in the private practice of law.

The only exception in *Canon 33* is the name of a deceased or former partner when permitted by local custom. We read "former" to mean a former partner who is retired, and not a former partner who in full vigor has ceased practicing only because he has become a high public official and is unable to practice. The Committee in 1939, in *Opinion 192,* quoted above, condoned the continued use of the name of a public official but not with specific reference to the office of governor. Subsequently, in *Informal Decision C–403,* the Committee specifically disapproved of the use of the name of a governor of a state in the name of a law firm. In 1963, in *Informal Decision C–620,* the Committee, with some difficulty and not unanimously, was able to distinguish between the high office of governor and an important local office, but did not disapprove *C–403.*

We agree with the majority that if, as a condition of acceptance of office a public official must cease to engage in the private practice of law and sever all former connections, his name may not be used in the firm name while he is in such office. Reluctantly, we concur with *Formal Opinion 192* and *Informal Decision C–620* insofar as they relate to local offices only, but we do not believe their principles should be extended to offices as high as that of governor of a state.

To use in the firm name the name of a public official who, by reason of his office, has ceased to practice law in our opinion is misleading and is in the nature of an assumed or trade name because the official in fact is not practicing with the firm, and thus contravenes the spirit of *Canon 33*. The exception for the names of deceased or retired partners is not approved wholeheartedly by the profession as a whole, and it should not be extended to permit the use of names of high state and federal officials. An explanatory note on the firm letterhead that the official is not truly an active partner does not cure the vice of a misleading firm name, as the explanation is not likely to be received by a prospective client, but only by those who in fact have become clients.

Canon 27 also is applicable. Its prohibition of all forms of advertising or solicitation or self-laudation to bring in prospective clients applies with equal force to law firms as well as individual lawyers. Continued use in a firm name of the name of a high public official not actually practicing with the firm can only result in exploitation of the probabilities that, because of his name and connection with the firm, prospective clients will recognize his name and thereby be attracted to the firm, either because of the official's fame and stature or, even worse, because of a feeling that the firm might have special influence in high places.

The vice is especially apparent in the case of high federal offices, such as President or Vice President, or governors of states, whose terms are usually at least two years and often more. While the same possibilities may exist with respect to local and lesser state offices, the danger is not as great because of the nature of such offices and the nature of the duties and prominence of the incumbents.

American Bar Association, Standing Committee on Professional Ethics

Re: Informal Opinion No. 691, October 14, 1963: Private Practice by City Solicitor.

You have requested answers from us to questions you have asked growing out of the following state of facts:

As *City Solicitor* for the City of (——), you spend *two days each week* strictly on City business and exercise an over-all supervision of the conduct of the City Solicitor's office for the balance of the week. You have *two assistants*, each of whom *spends a day-and-a-half each week* in the City office, and each of whom is generally available at other times for the City's work. Each of you is a member of your own individual law firm.

The questions you ask are:

1. "Is it proper for a *partner* or associate of the City Solicitor to represent a property owner *in an appeal before* the *City's Zoning Board of Adjustment?*

2. "Is it proper for the City Solicitor or his *associate* in private practice to represent a property owner *in connection with entering into a Developer's agreement with the City?*

3. "Is it proper for an *associate or partner* of the City Solicitor *to file suit against the City* on behalf of a client who has either a claim against the City, based on the City's alleged negligence, or a Court appeal from Decision of Zoning Board?"

Canon 6 of the Canons of Professional Ethics of the Association is involved and provides (in part) that:

"It is unprofessional to represent conflicting interests, except by express consent of all concerned given after a full disclosure of the facts. Within the meaning of this Canon, a lawyer represents conflicting interests when, in behalf of one client, it is his duty to contend for that which duty to another client requires him to oppose."

The materiality of certain of the facts should first be determined. That you as City Solicitor and the two assistants *are only part-time employees* of the City is *not material.*

The Comprehensive Formal Opinion of this Committee, No. 28 (March 15, 1935), considered the position of a part-time employee of a code authority and found that in considering whether there was a conflict of interests *no distinction* is to be made *between a part-time and full-time employee.*

The Opinions of the Committee in the field of conflict of interests, make no distinction between an associate in a law firm and a partner in a law firm. This Committee's Opinion in considering a conflict-of-interests question in Formal Opinion No. 306 (May 26, 1962) in two places refers to a member of the firm and to an associate as being in the same category. Both are attorneys acting for and engaged in carrying on the practice of the firm and no distinction can be made in this consideration as between a partner and an associate.

It is *not material* that the property owner or claimant is a *client of a member of the firm who is not emloyed by the City.* We quote from Formal Opinion No. 128 (March 15, 1935):

"In Opinions 33, 49, 50, 72, and 103, we held in substance that a *partnership could not undertake any professional relationships which any one of the partners, because of adverse influence and conflicting interests, could not ethically undertake.*"

This statement you have given to us does not present the element of consent to representation of conflicting interests, but we mention that in a series of Opinions this Committee has held that the consent which may make representation of conflicting interests unobjectionable cannot be utilized by a person standing in an official position. (Formal Opinions 16, 34, 71, 77, and 192.)

We assume from the statement you have given and the questions you have asked, that under your procedure you, as City Attorney, will represent the City in an appeal before the City Zoning Board of Adjustment. Therefore, you could not represent a property owner and neither can one of your partners nor an associate represent a property owner in an appeal before the Zoning Board. The answer to question No. 1 is, "No".

We assume also that it may be your duty as City Solicitor to see that the City is properly protected by the Developer's Agreement with the City. You therefore, could not properly represent the property owner and neither can your associate who is in private practice represent the property owner when you are representing the City. The answer to question No. 2 is, "No".

It must follow from what has been said that the answer to question No. 3 is "No".

For your information and the record, we mention that in the preparation of this Informal Opinion (in addition to the Opinions already mentioned in this letter, which are Formal Opinions), we have considered the following Informal Opinions: No. 518, Conflict of Interests—Borough Attorneys; No. 564—Conflict of Interest; No. 647, Former Deputy City Attorneys—Conflict of Interests; No. 674, Firm Representing Client in Claim Against State Where Associate is Part-time Assistant Attorney-General.

American Bar Association, Standing Committee on Professional Ethics

Re: Informal Decision No. C 700—March 13, 1964: Conflict of Interest in Negligence Case.

You have given us the following facts:

Claimant C sustained serious injuries in a motor vehicle accident involving the negligence of three persons, D–1, D–2, D–3. C retained the services of lawyer L–2. L–2 presented claims against D–1 and D–2, telling C that he did not wish to handle the claim against D–3 and if C wished to pursue it he would have to seek other counsel. L–2 then settled the claims against D–1 and D–2. At that time L–1 was an associate of a law firm who represented D–2. There is no legal relationship between D–3 and the other defendants. The question is whether or not it is proper for L–1 to represent C in his claim against D–3 after having been actively engaged in the defense of D–2.

Canon 7 of the Canons of Professional Ethics provides:

"It is the duty of a lawyer at the time of retainer to disclose to the client all the circumstances of his relations to the parties, and any interest in or connection with the controversy, which might influence the client in the selection of counsel.

"It is unprofessional to represent conflicting interests, except by express consent of all concerned given after a full disclosure of the facts. Within the meaning of this canon, a lawyer represents conflicting interests when, in behalf of one client, it is his duty to contend for that which duty to another client requires him to oppose.

"The obligation to represent the client with undivided fidelity and not to divulge his secrets or confidences forbids also the subsequent acceptance of retainers or employment from others in matters adversely affecting any interest of the client with respect to which confidence has been reposed."

The answer to your question would depend on the circumstances. If during his representation of D–2, L–1 received any confidential communication regarding the accident from D–3, directly or indirectly, he could not accept the case. Should there be any doubt it must be resolved in favor of D–3.

If, as seems to be the case here, no claim was pursued against D–3 and L–1 had no communication of a confiential nature with D–3 there is no reason why he should not accept the case.

You have asked an opinion on a second question, i.e., when an attorney is retained by a town and takes an active part at all meetings of the Town Board and the Board of Appeals, is it proper for another member of his law firm to represent an applicant appearing before one of those boards seeking a variance in the zoning laws.

We call your attention to the second paragraph of Canon 6 above.

In Opinion 16 this Committee held that where the public is concerned it cannot consent. This opinion also held that a member of a firm could not represent a defendant when it was the duty of another member of the firm to prosecute the defendant.

The Committee believes that opinion is

sound. Should a member of a law firm be retained by a town to take an active part in meetings of the Town Board and Board of Appeals, none of his partners should represent an applicant seeking a variance in a zoning matter.

American Bar Association, Standing Committee on Professional Ethics

Re: Informal Opinion No. 855—May 31, 1965: Conflicts of Interest.

Your letters of December 17, 1964 and December 21, 1964 to this Committee present questions of ethics concerned primarily with Canon 6 relating to actual and possible conflicts of interests, and Canon 37 on the duties of a lawyer to preserve the confidence of a client, as well as the obligations of a lawyer in public office.

You present a situation in which many attorneys hold municipal offices in (City) either elective or appointed by the Mayor substantially as follows:

1. City Judge, full time, elected;
2. Acting City Judge, two year term, part time, appointed by Mayor;
3. Corporation Counsel, part time, at will, appointed by Mayor;
4. Counsel for Urban Renewal Board, at will, appointed by Mayor;
5. Counsel for Commissioner of Public Works, at will, appointed by Mayor;
6. Counsel for Director of Civil Defense, at will, appointed by Mayor;
7. Member of City Zoning Board, five years, appointed by Mayor;
8. Attorney's Secretary for Police Commissioner, appointed by Mayor;
9. Attorney for Housing Authority, appointed by authority;
10. Attorney for Police Benevolent Association;
11. Attorney for Board of Education, appointed by elected Board.

As you are perhaps aware, Canon 6 provides in part as follows:

"It is unprofessional to represent conflicting interests, except by express consent of all concerned given after a full disclosure of the facts. Within the meaning of this Canon, a lawyer represents conflicting interests when, in behalf of one client, it is his duty to contend for that which duty to another client requires him to oppose.

"The obligation to represent the client with undivided fidelity and not to divulge his secrets or confidences forbids also the subsequent acceptance of retainers or employment from others in matters adversely affecting any interest of the client with respect to which confidence has been reposed."

Canon 37 provides in part as follows:

"It is the duty of a lawyer to preserve his client's confidences. This duty outlasts the lawyer's employment, and extends as well to his employees; and neither of them should accept employment which involves or may involve the disclosure or use of these confidences, either for private advantage of the lawyer or his employees or to the disadvantage of the client, without his knowledge and consent, and even though there are other available sources of such information. A lawyer should not continue employment when he discovers that this obligation prevents the performance of his full duty to his former or to his new client."

Generally speaking, any persons in public offices, including attorneys, have as their primary duty that of performing the functions of the office in a wholly honest, impartial, and ethical manner.

Under both the foregoing Canons the duties and considerations of possible conflicts are such that what a lawyer cannot do because of these ethical precepts relating to other parties neither his partner, his associate, nor one with whom he shares offices, may do.

If there is no conflict of interest nor violation of confidence, an attorney who happens to be an appointee of a Mayor in one capacity may properly appear before other appointees or appointed bodies of the same Mayor in other related boards, or offices, or courts, and may likewise make claims against the city in fields which are not related to his office in the city.

It is improper for an attorney who is associated with or shares office space with the Acting City Judge to appear before such Judge in any capacity as an attorney for anyone.

On the matter of the practice of the Acting City Judge in his capacity as an attorney we believe it would be improper for him to appear on behalf of clients before the City Judge.

In Formal Opinion 242 it was held that a City Police Judge whose jurisdiction is limited to trials of misdemeanors and examination on felony cases, may not ethically represent criminal defendants in the Circuit Court. Whether or not your Acting City Judge has a relationship to the functions of the City Judge would depend upon the jurisdiction of each. It has been said that a Judge should not practice in a Court over which he occasionally presides, and neither should a partner nor associate practice in the Court over which such Judge occasionally presides. However, it would appear that there is a matter of degree involved, in that it has been held that one who occasionally sits as a special or pro tem Judge when the regular Judge of the Court cannot sit, receives only temporary compensation, and is engaged primarily in the practice of the law, may properly practice in such Court, if he scrupulously refrains from acting in any matters where there might be even the slightest conflict of interest.

It would not be unethical per se for the Board of Education member lawyer to practice before either the elected City Judge, the appointed part time Acting City Judge, or any other municipal boards.

It would be improper and unethical for an attorney sharing space or associated with the Attorney for the Board of Education, to represent claimants against the Board of Education, regardless of whether or not the Board was insured on its liability on such claims. However, it would not be improper per se for another attorney holding an appointive office of some character under the Mayor, or his associates, to handle claims aaginst other boards or departments of the city, merely because those other boards were also appointed by the Mayor.

Not knowing the duties or powers of your Police Benevolent Association and its attorney, nor those of the attorney who is Secretary to the Police Commissioner, it is difficult to say whether there would be any ethical improprieties in their being associated with each other in the practice of law or sharing office space. These relationships again should be considered under the spirit and the letter of the Canons of Ethics, having regard to the nature of the positions, the duties, and powers.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN BILLS AND RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate until noon tomorrow, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and from the House of Representatives, and that the President pro tempore or the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Baker] be recognized for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRESSIONAL REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on Thursday the House of Representatives accepted by a vote of 241 to 105 the report of a Senate-House conference which, in my judgment, attempts to delay fair redistricting of congressional seats for 5 years.

The vote, nevertheless, was encouraging to those of us who are hopeful that the Senate will adhere to its previous position on this legislation and soundly reject the report when it comes up for our consideration this week.

I am encouraged because the House debate shows increased awareness in the Congress of the disturbing effects of such legislation. It also demonstrates the development within the past few months of truly bipartisan opposition to it.

When the same basic issue was raised earlier this session in the House, on April 27, that body approved antidistricting legislation by an overwhelming vote of 289 to 63.

By last Thursday, the proponents of one-man, one-vote had attracted a net increase of 42 Members. That the opposition to this mischievous legislation was equally based in both parties was shown by the fact that, of the negative votes, 53 came from the Republican side, and 52 from the Democratic side.

The debate on the floor of the House confirmed the serious questions many of us have asked about the constitutionality of this legislation. It further confirmed that this proposal, which has never been subjected to the scrutiny of public hearings, simply cannot stand the light of day.

When properly examined, its provision that no State be required to redistrict until a time-consuming, expensive, and unnecessary special Federal census is available is nothing more than an attempt to set back in 18 States efforts to achieve fair districting that permits each man's vote to count as much as the next man's.

On June 8, the Senate passed by a convincing margin, 55 to 28, legislation that would set definite legislative standards implementing and fully consistent with the Federal Constitution's one-man, one-vote requirement. That legislation would have banned gerrymandering and would have permitted only a 10-percent variance between the largest and the smallest congressional districts in a State.

Neither of these latter provisions are in this new conference report. Because the report ignores the clear mandate of the full Senate, I think it is imperative, and I further think the prospects are reasonably good, that a majority of the members of the Republican Party, as well as a majority of the members of the Democratic Party, join to reject the report.

The House debate indicates that the proponents of the report had a difficult time establishing both its propriety and its constitutionality. One advocate of the report admitted that there "is the depressing atmosphere of a funeral service about this debate today." I fully agree and my only regret is that the majority of the House did not see fit to complete the funeral ceremony and reject and bury this proposed legislation which is not worthy of either body of the Congress.

The debate reflected considerable confusion about whether the special census provision is constitutional. The distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the leading proponent of the measure, seemed to admit that the special census provision was unconstitutional and therefore could only be regarded as an "admonition" to the courts, although the chairman further stated that he was "quite sure" the courts would accept the admonition, presumably thereby overruling themselves.

I do not propose at this time to detail again why I think the legislation proposed by the report is unconstitutional.

The Record of October 19, 1967, at page 29507, contains an elaboration of the remarks made at that time. A very excellent exposition of the constitutional questions presented by Mr. Conyers during the House debate on Thursday, October 26, 1967, appears at page 30246.

However, I would like to reiterate two points. First, it will not be necessary for those Senators who wish to abolish at-large elections for Congressmen to vote for the Senate-House report. The report does contain such a prohibition, but that is an inseparable part of the entire package, another part of which—the census provision—is clearly unconstitutional. Thus, when the census provision is declared unconstitutional, the at-large elections prohibition will be, too. If the legislation were to be ruled unconstitutional sometime next spring, some courts might find it necessary at that late date to require Congressmen in several States to run at large. Therefore, it is fair to say that a vote for the conference report heightens the possibility of at-large elections. From this point of view, it would be better if there were no bill at all.

The best circumstances, of course, would be to pass separate legislation, unclouded by doubts of constitutionality, that immediately and finally bans at-large elections in all States. I have stated before, and I want to reiterate, that I intend to attach to some pending business in the Senate an amendment that will accomplish this purpose. I feel that both bodies of Congress will accept it. This is the most effective way to deal with the at-large election issue.

Finally, I would like to comment briefly on the delay and expense that will be caused if the special census provision is enacted. There are 18 States which are under a court order to redistrict, or which are involved in pending court challenges to their district lines; or which have district lines which do not conform to the Supreme Court requirements. The Census Bureau has said that if as many as 10 of these States requests a special census, it will take the Bureau about 8 months to complete the work in the smaller States and about 15 or 16 months to complete the work in the larger States.

This would delay redistricting well into 1969 and 1970 for most of these 18 States which are now electing their total of 259 Congressmen on the basis of lines which are constitutionally vulnerable.

And the expense of this elaborate and unnecessary procedure should not be minimized. If a State elects to voluntarily redistrict and avoid the expense of a special census—as the report would permit—that might require the expense of a special session of the legislature. If all of the States elect or are required to conduct a special census, the total cost would be about $35 million. And I might remind my colleagues that most of our financially hard-pressed States will not be enthusiastic about appropriating up to $6 million—which would be the approximate cost in the largest States—New York and California—for such a census.

The onerous expense is more difficult to justify when one considers that the proponents of the conference report are saying that 1960 census data is good in some instances, and not good in some others. For example, under the conference proposal, if a State voluntarily elects to redistrict, it may use 1960 data. If a State is required to redistrict, 1960 census data may not be used. And the latest inconsistency appeared in the House debate on Thursday, when the chairman of the Judiciary Committee suggested that if a court decree decides to draw the district lines, it may elect to use 1960 census data.

If the justification for the special census provision is that the 1960 census data is outdated, then the proponents of the conference report ought to explain to the Senate why they have decided the data is good in some instances but not good in some others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record for the benefit of my colleagues the estimated cost of the special Federal census in those 18 States where there should be redistricting. The estimated cost is computed by multiplying the 1960 population of the State by 33 cents, which is the approximate method of computing this cost suggested to me by the Census Bureau.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

States with unconstitutional district lines—Estimated State cost of special Federal census

(Computed on basis of 33 cents × 1960 population)

California	$5, 186, 677. 32
Indiana	1, 538, 624. 34
New Jersey	2, 002, 038. 06
Texas	3, 161, 293. 41
Missouri	1, 425, 538. 29
Ohio	3, 203, 111. 01
New York	5, 538, 160. 32
Florida	1, 634, 014. 80
Colorado	578, 022. 51
Connecticut	836, 627. 22
Georgia	1, 301, 228. 28
Iowa	909, 987. 21
Louisiana	1, 074, 817. 26
Minnesota	1, 126, 575. 12
Nebraska	465, 738. 90
Pennsylvania	3, 735, 390. 78
Washington	941, 560. 62
West Virginia	613, 938. 93
Total	35, 273, 344. 38

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"AMERICA CAN BE BEAUTIFUL"—ADDRESS BY MILTON J. SHAPP

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of our outstanding Pennsylvania Democrats is Milton J. Shapp, our candidate for Governor of the Commonwealth in 1966.

Mr. Shapp, despite his defeat—from my way of thinking, his unfortunate defeat—by the present incumbent of the Governor's chair in Harrisburg, is continuing his active interest in public affairs and in the economy and environment of Pennsylvania.

On October 18, at LaSalle College in Philadelphia, Pa., Mr. Shapp made a most interesting address entitled "America Can Be Beautiful—It's All a Matter of Priorities."

Mr. President, I find myself in substantial agreement with the points made by Mr. Shapp in this stimulating address.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the address by Milton J. Shapp.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

America Can Be Beautiful—It's All a Matter of Priorities

(Address by Milton J. Shapp, October 18, 1967, LaSalle College, Philadelphia, Pa.)

You have asked me to speak here today on the problems of our City in relation to taxes and constitutional revision. This I shall do, but it is important first to put these issues in proper perspective. Neither the City of Philadelphia nor the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania exist in a vacuum. Both are entities within the U.S.A., and their welfare is influenced more by national policies and priorities than by actions taken by local leaders.

To present the overall picture, it is necessary first to portray the national scene and then superimpose the state and local issues on this larger canvas.

We are reaching the end of our era in the development of our American social structure. Unfortunately, too many political leaders with their eyes glued to the Far East fail to understand the nature of the internal revolution gripping this nation; too large a majority of our affluent citizens wish the problems would simply go away and not interfere with golf dates, business as usual, or even with their consciences.

The riots in our cities last summer reflect the surfacing of the massive change that is taking place in America. We have yet to feel the major thrust of the revolution. The advent of cooler weather is of no benefit unless we use the time gained to institute programs that will bring measurable change. Anything less will increase the likelihood that there will be more intensive explosions next year—a "longer, hotter summer" and even longer, hotter ones that will follow.

We have reached the moment of truth. Either we believe in our constitution that claims all citizens shall have equal rights or we do not. If we believe this strongly, then in our own cities, as in Saigon, we will resolve that no problems are too expensive or difficult to overcome.

We must find the way to eliminate ghetto slum life in our cities. Failure will result in cataclysm.

Against this backdrop of realism, let us consider our course of action. Importantly, we must recognize that the myriad of present government and private programs dealing with poverty, housing, education, health, welfare, etc., merely add fuel to the fires of discontent because they are accompanied by press releases that whet the appetites of the poor for a better life way out of proportion to any benefits that can be obtained even if present programs were fully and properly implemented.

However, because of lack of imagination at the planning levels; lack of desire on the part of many officials at the operating levels; and lack of adequate funds at the "people" levels, these programs have created frustration and bitterness in the minds of those who have been promised too much and received too little too slowly.

Basic changes in attitudes and methods are required if we are to be successful in averting chaos.

The first change in attitude requires recognition that high government priorities must be set to achieve *this* goal. Such attitudes do not exist at this time in Washington. In fact, the opposite views are held.

National priorities are being set today by a handful of generals and political leaders who feel it is of greater urgency to conduct the war in Asia than to build for peace in America. I am not a member of the group that cries for peace at any price in Viet Nam; but I disagree strongly with those who want victory at any cost. I believe emphatically that first things must come first. I have grave doubts about what we will really win even if or when we win the war in Viet Nam, but I know precisely what we will lose if we fail to win the battle here in our cities. We will lose our American way of life, and with it the civil freedoms that have made this nation great.

I am greatly disturbed by Washington's present schedule of priorities that stresses greater action 10,000 miles from our shores than without our cities.

This year, the Viet Nam price tag to force Ho Chi Minh to the peace table along with other Defense Department expenditures will total in excess of $75 billion. Other major items in our national budget include $14 billion for interest charges (chiefly resulting from the costs of this and previous wars), an additional $5 billion for veterans' benefits; $9 billion for federal salaries; $3.2 billion for space and $1 billion for the "postal deficit resulting from third-class mail subsidies."

The total costs of aid to education, national health programs, school lunches, housing, urban redevelopment, food stamps, aid-to-families with dependent children, anti-poverty programs and food for the hungry of the underdeveloped nations is about $13 billion. Yet, it is here that Congress would cut $5 billion.

I consider it sheer folly for our government to spend $5 billion on the first stages of a thin anti-missile system to protect our cities from a mythical attack from Red China while Congress demands a $5 billion cut in the programs that would improve life within our cities.

Most of you were either unborn or mere infants when World War II began. But history tells how France was afflicted with a Maginot Line and a Maginot Line philosophy based upon static defense. Today, our turn seems to have arrived. Apparently, we have failed to learn that for every static defense there is specially designed mobile offense. Neither moats, nor Chinese walls, nor minefields, nor electronic fences have prevailed. And, as the Israeli Air Force recently proved, even a radar screen is penetrable.

Further, the building of this Maginot "Air Line," combined with our complete dedication to affairs in the Far East, is putting a great strain on the dollar and contributing to a recession in Britain, which itself is going to extremes to save the pound. It will help little for us to win a doubtful military victory if in the process our closest ally is forced into third-class nationhood. The Communist world wants nothing more than to see America bled dry on foreign battlefields, weakened through internal upheaval and its friends cast adrift.

To put $5 billion into the start of an anti-missile system to protect us from Mao while admitting that it is impossible to build a similar system to protect us against Soviet missiles indicates the low level of intellectual thought and the high level of emotion upon which major decisions are being reached today in our Nation's capitol.

When Congress voted recently not only to prevent feeding poison to rats, but also to reduce funds for feeding nutritious food to hungry children; when on the same day last month a House Agriculture Committee defeated a $75 million appropriation to combat starvation in the United States, and the Senate approved an appropriation of $142.5 million to subsidize the construction of a new huge supersonic plane, it again revealed the sickness of our era.

That supersonic plane, when built, will probably be unuseable anywhere near our cities because the supersonic boom will deafen its inhabitants and damage buildings. Additional billions will be required for construction of these planes before the first one flies. When built, the plane will reduce air travel time between New York and Los Angeles by an estimated two hours. Since local traffic congestion will probably have increased by that time, it will probably take two additional hours to reach Manhattan and Hollywood from the distant airports required to land the new giant aircraft.

Meanwhile, because the stress upon military, aircraft and space ventures takes increasing priority in our national scheme, our city dwellers breathe air that becomes increasingly polluted; live in houses that become more unfit; attend schools that fall farther and farther behind meeting the educational needs of our youth; walk in greater fear along streets that breed violence.

Taxes rise to meet increased costs for police protection; for caring for the mentally and physically ill, for welfare and unemployment compensation; and yes, for building new prisons and detention homes.

It is to be hoped that some day soon our national leaders will recognize that building a Great Society here in America cannot be accomplished unless the major resources of this nation are massed for this project. Only then can our states and cities receive the monetary support and national direction needed to overcome the decades of neglect that has brought the nation to its present internal plight.

Now let me turn to the state and local actions required to relieve pressures in our cities.

In December, delegates will gather in Harrisburg to rewrite Pennsylvania's ancient Constitution. Testimony recently presented to a Senate Committee in Harrisburg indicates there is greater danger that the efforts of the convention will result in our present 1873 Constitution being rewritten to conform more to the needs of 1838 than to those of 1968 and 1978.

Spokesmen for too many potent state organizations (particularly those representing the Pennsylvania Bar Association) have urged that we retreat into the past instead of striking out for higher ground.

If Pennsylvania is to make progress it is imperative that our constitution eliminate the present million dollar constitutional debt limit. It must remove restrictions on the state's ability to loan money to lower government units, and remove limitations on the amount of money that cities, townships and other local governments may borrow to meet needs. Option should be granted to voters to eliminate inefficient and overlapping governmental structures.

In the metropolitan area of Philadelphia there are over 800 separate governmental agencies, each with its own elected officials. Under these circumstances, there is no efficient plannnig for common water, sewerage and transportation systems; for proper local use and effective control of air and water pollution. Costs for police and fire protection are higher than need be. Fragmented school districts perpetuate expensive, inflexible educational programs. Suburbia sprawls over the countryside.

The township form of government, originally conceived by our great, great, great grandfathers as a way to conduct the affairs of rural, scarcely populated areas, operates in the now densely populated sections of the metropolitan area with all the verve of 18th century efficiency. Tax collectors and justices of the peace still ply their trades and are compensated by a percentage of their take.

The central city of Philadelphia suffers greatly from the obsolescence of the methods of government operation in its suburbs. The city is the area's center of culture with its museums, libraries, theatres and academies. The City maintains the airport, Zoo, port and other facilities used by all in the region. Suburban dwellers by the hundreds of thousands work in Philadelphia but live and pay real estate taxes in the suburbs.

Suburban dwellers want no part of the city's problems. They prefer to drive to work along the expressways and park drives and to bypass the slum areas. It is their cars that jam the downtown streets within the city and create the parking crisis.

Suburbanites don't want to see the ghettos into which the slum dwellers are crowded, nor share the school and hospital problems with these people.

They live only a few miles away, but are worlds apart.

Because of Pennsylvania's Sterling Act that prevents a municipality from taxing anything taxed by the Commonwealth, Philadelphia depends primarily upon real estate and wage taxes to support its needs. The suburban dwellers resist paying a share of the wage tax to the city to support the city services they receive and the institutions they use. Attempts are now being made in the State Legislature to prevent the city from collecting these revenues.

The retreat of the affluent to suburbia has weakened the city's major tax base—real estate—while leaving the city with the hard-core problems of poverty and discrimination; under-education, bad housing and urban blight.

These are the problems. What are the solutions?

First and foremost is the establishment of national priorities that recognize we can neither sustain economic growth in this nation now achieve internal peace unless we make our cities livable from every standpoint. Neither our states nor cities have sufficient money or expertise to solve these complex problems by themselves. Only the federal government, by turning its attention away from Saigon and Hanoi and directing constructive programs in Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Detroit, Newark, Cleveland and all of our major centers, can set the stage for rebuilding our cities and with it the fabric of richer American life.

The state and cities must pick up the challenge from here.

Our State Legislature, dominated as it has been for two centuries by rural districts. must be altered to represent the interests of urbanites who today represent over three-fourths of the population.

Our State Constitution must be streamlined to permit greater efficiency and flexibility in government and to introduce modern investment principles into its financial operation. Our Legislature should be empowered to authorize revenue bonds in any amounts where it can be shown that the use of these funds will increase the economic growth rate of the Commonwealth at a pace sufficient to meet interest and debt repayment schedules out of tax revenues without increasing tax rates.

For example, in the field of housing, it is not difficult to estimate accurately the rent returns that can be generated directly by the utilization of funds used to build low and medium cost projects desperately needed today by the slum dwellers. We are already obeying this principle in the state by applying the collection of gasoline taxes to support highway construction.

In the field of education, it is obvious to anyone who has studied the problem that we cannot possibly expand our schools to meet the needs of our children—and adults too—by financing the needed programs on an on-going basis—out of tax collections. This is particularly true in Philadelphia where the major revenue to support education is derived from real estate taxation.

There is absolutely no relationship whatsoever between the assessed value of a house or factory and the value of our children's education. This is creating a situation where many of those being taxed, not being direct beneficiaries of the programs for which this money is being used, are in political revolt against any increase in their taxes.

In 1776 our great revolution flared over the issue of "taxation without representation." Under today's circumstances of taxation without relationship, it is political suicide for an elected official to urge a real estate tax increase to meet the expanded costs of education.

As one example of the gravity of the problem, analyze the recent record regarding the needs of Philadelphia schools. Last winter a special Blue Ribbon Committee estimated that to provide quality education, our schools should require a minimum of $350 million annual budget. When the new superintendent, Dr. Mark R. Shedd assumed his post this past spring, he declared Philadelphia schools needed $400 million a year to fulfill its proper mission. He declared that a minimum of $20 to $30 million increase was necessary each year for the next decade to overcome past neglect. Yet, when this year's budget was finally submitted, it called for only $212 million, which required only $8.5 million in new taxes. Despite this tremendous cut in requirements, and the relatively low amount of new taxes required, so far authorization for even this new tax money has not been forthcoming from the political leaders in Harrisburg.

Yet, what are we to do—throw up our hands and permit the deterioration of our schools and with it the scuttling of our educational system? Are we to fail our youth by not providing them with the quality education required to obtain and hold good paying jobs in our modern technological society?

Are we to permit the present educational imbalance between white and colored youth that virtually locks the Negroes into low paying jobs and second class citizenship and generates the seeds of the slum revolution that is engulfing our cities?

The answer to all these questions must be a resounding no. The solution to our fiscal problems here in Pennsylvania is twofold.

First we need to plug all the many existing loopholes in our tax laws that permit large corporations to escape paying their fair share of taxes both to the state and local communities. Hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars are skimmed away from the public each year through these gaping loopholes.

Second, we need a simple constitutional change that will allow all capital expenditures—including those for education—to be separated from operating budgets at both state and local levels.

First let's take a look at some of the unholy tax loopholes that allow wealthy corporations to escape paying their fair share of taxes and thereby impose a heavy hardship upon those who cannot afford to support lobbyists to look out for their special interests in Harrisburg.

Foremost is the utility company real estate exemption. Pennsylvania, alone among the fifty states, allows the privately owned public utilities—the electric, telephone, water, gas and railroad companies—to avoid payment of any real estate taxes on operating properties. No house owner, ordinary business firm or farmer rides such a magnificent gravy train. It is estimated that between $135 and $200 million per year are not paid into Pennsylvania's municipal and school taxing districts because of this loophole, which has existed since 1828. It is impossible to calculate the many billions of dollars that haven't been available to finance government projects in the Commonwealth because of this tax loophole.

Then there are the sales tax benefactors—that group of companies which are granted the privilege of not paying 5 percent extra for products they buy. Included in this group again are the utility companies, large manufacturers and (soon-to-be) processors of materials. A farmer pays 5 percent into the coffers of the state if he buys a tractor to pull a plow in his fields. A utility company pays no sales tax if it buys a similar tractor to pull a plow for digging a cable trench.

A student here at LaSalle pays 5 percent at the time he buys a typewriter, but a large manufacturer pays no sales tax on a typewriter he buys unless he determines—after the purchase—that the typewriter is not used for manufacturing purposes, and reports this transaction and his decision to the Commonwealth at a later date.

Now, under a new bill approved by the Senate the same day it passed the new five cent tax increase on cigarettes, any company engaged in processing (and whatever that will ultimately include is unknown) will be exempt from paying the sales tax on purchases of equipment.

Another gaping tax loophole gives a special privilege to Sun Ship Yard in Chester. They are not required to pay a sales tax on any material they purchase. In this respect they're not like you and me, but after all, it isn't every company that can afford to keep a private lobbyist on its payroll in Harrisburg to look out for its interests.

Then there's the manufacturer's exemption tax that prevents local real estate assessors from levying taxes on machinery. This allows untold millions of dollars worth of valuable property to go unscathed, and deprives many communities and school districts from collecting a fair share of taxes from the big companies who often are or should be the main sources of revenue to support local needs.

A steel company for example simply by calling the roof of its plant a lid to support a moving crane used in the manufacturing of its product, and by using similar tax avoidance methods, greatly reduces its tax assessments. If the new bill which exempts processors from paying the state sales tax passes the House and is signed into law by the Governor and the definition of processor contained in this bill is then used at the local level to permit real estate taxes from being imposed upon processing equipment, many millions of dollars of exemptions will result, depriving communities and school districts of desperately needed revenues.

Pennsylvania must plug up these unfair and unjustified exemptions. It's not fair to those who pay their fair share of taxes; it deprives the state and communities of too many needed dollars.

Now let me turn to the second requirement to help finance our local and state obligations—a constitutional change to permit the sale of revenue bonds to finance expenditures for all levels of education.

We should treat all educational expenditures as an investment—an investment in the income-producing potential of our most important asset—people.

We should sell bonds to the investing public to finance this investment. These bonds will be repaid many times over without increasing existing tax rates by the increased tax collections resulting from economic growth generated in our communities and within the Commonwealth by a better educated, better trained work force that will earn more money for themselves and attract many new industries to the state.

Last year when I suggested such a bond program during the gubernatorial campaign, my opponent called me fiscally irresponsible. Since then, the State of Illinois has passed legislation similar to that which I have suggested and the City of Chicago has sold $76 million worth of bonds to substantial investment houses to meet the ongoing costs of education. In the meantime, the present governor who called me fiscally irresponsible when I made the proposals has done nothing to help solve the financial plight of our schools, or to meet his campaign pledge that the state would pick up at least 50 percent of Philadelphia's school cost burden.

It's going to take "ground breaking" action to resolve the problems that beset our nation. It's time we start to break ground here in Pennsylvania during the forthcoming Constitutional Convention and lay the foundation for an era of growth.

In summary, if we are to resolve the grave problems of our urban centers, and these are the severest tests facing our nation today, we must focus attention on Detroit, Newark, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Milwaukee and our major cities and devote less of our national monetary physical and manpower resources attempting to solve the age old problems of Asia. Viet Nam has become a curse—not a course of action. It is imperative to back up our boys in the service by making sure they have decent homes in peaceful surroundings, good educational facilities and important job opportunities to come home to.

If we were to take but a minor fraction of what the Viet Nam war is costing and put these funds into major programs to eliminate slums, build and staff schools and health centers, feed our children, care for our senior citizens, create modern transportation facilities, purify our streams and the air we breathe, and to encourage the development of cultural forms—art, music, literature, drama, dance—then we would eliminate the causes of friction in our cities and make the American dream a reality.

We have the capital, productive capacity, resources and above all, the skilled people to accomplish this goal. All it takes is the willingness to be bold and the will to do so, and the job can be done.

America can be beautiful. It's all a matter of priorities.

VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, despite the efforts of many well-meaning people to "cool it off" the debate on Vietnam continues without relaxation. My views are well known and I shall not undertake to reiterate them at this time.

However, an extremely able individual, and a good friend of mine, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., one of our leading American historians, has recently sent me a statement he made entitled "Vietnam and the 1968 Elections" under date of October 8. To my way of thinking, this is one of the most thoughtful and soundly argued arguments in support of a substantial change in our present policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Schlesinger be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM AND THE 1968 ELECTIONS

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., at the National Assembly for Negotiation Now, Washington, D.C., October 8, 1967)

Thirty-two months ago, in February 1965, the American government embarked on a new course in Vietnam—a course marked, first by the bombing of North Vietnam, and second, by the commitment of American combat units to the war in South Vietnam. These two and two-thirds years have seen a steady increase in both efforts—an increase which, in the melancholy jargon of our age, designed to hold horror at one remove and make it schematic and technical, has won the name "escalation."

Our planes, originally bombing North Vietnam under careful rules and limitations, now roam across the country, dropping more explosives than we used to drop on Nazi Germany, striking the major cities, striking within a few miles of the Chinese border, on occasion invading Chinese air space itself. Our ground troops, originally sent to stiffen and supplement South Vietnamese resistance, have now taken over almost all the fighting. We have over half a million soldiers in Vietnam today—more than we had in Korea at the height of the Korean War; more than we have had in the field in any war in our history, except for the Civil War and the two World Wars.

Since February 1965 the administration has operated on the assumption that the steady intensification of military pressure would end the war and force Hanoi to the negotiation table—that widening the war would prove the best way to shorten it. For most of this period, the escalation policy has commanded the backing of a sizable majority of the American people. But recent weeks and months have shown a visible and widespread increase in doubt and disquietude over this policy. The Harris poll of October 2 reported a sharp decline since July in support of the war, a sharp increase in the opposition to the bombing of North Vietnam, a sharp increase in the number of Americans who want to get out of South Vietnam as quickly as possible, a decline in the number who favor the pursuit of total military victory. Less than a third now express confidence in President Johnson's handling of the war.

The Democratic Party has long been divided on the Vietnam policy. It is increasingly evident today that the divisions are equally deep in the Republican Party. More and more newspapers criticize the bombing of the North. Here in Washington, the *Star*, long a supporter of the war, has proposed a halt to the bombing. There are even signs the *Post* is entertaining second thoughts after its long and able defense of escalation. Such meager support as escalation has ever had abroad is ebbing away. In the United Nations our European allies urge an end to the bombing. On October 1, the *London Sunday Times*, an unimpeachably conservative paper, declared in a lead editorial:

"The time has come for the Americans unconditionally, and for an indefinite period, to stop bombing North Vietnam . . . The argument for stopping the bombing has become so strong that to withstand it any longer is going to make it far harder for the friends and allies of the U.S. to understand and support her case."

The reasons for both the initial support and the spreading disenchantment are not too mysterious. Vietnam has always been a highly complicated problem. The proper line of policy was not clear and self-evident. No one could be sure in February 1965 what would be the best course for the United States to follow. Given the murkiness of the situation, the administration, after earnest and conscientious consideration, made a choice and settled upon a certain hypothesis. This hypothesis was based on a number of premises which, when the escalation policy began, may have had—for many thoughtful people, did have—a strong *prima facie* plausibility. What has happened in the last 32 months has been the testing of these premises—the testing under fire.

How do the assumptions behind the escalation policy stand up after this period of trial? Let us cast a balance on the seven basic propositions on which this policy has been based:

1. *That escalation would break the will of North Vietnam and bring Hanoi to the conference table.* "The objective of our air campaign," said General Taylor two years ago, "is to change the will of the enemy leadership." After 32 months what has been the result? Newspapermen and others who have visited Hanoi are almost unanimous in testifying that the effect of the bombing has been, not to break, but to harden the will of North Vietnam. The Secretary of Defense recently said: "There is no basis to believe that any bombing campaign, short of one which had population as its target, would by itself force Ho Chi Minh's regime into submission." To those who say that we just haven't bombed the North Vietnamese enough, Mr. McNamara replies:

"As to breaking their will, I have seen no evidence in any of the many intelligence reports that would lead me to believe that a less selective bombing campaign would change the resolve of N.V.N.'s leaders or deprive them of the support of the North Vietnamese people."

Moreover, far from bringing the Hanoi regime to the negotiating chamber, our bombing of the North is at present the insuperable obstacle to having any negotiation at all. The Hanoi regime has made it abundantly clear that, so long as the bombing continues, it will not come near the conference table. In short, experience has plainly disproved the first premises of the escalation policy.

2. *That escalation would reduce the infiltration of supplies and men from North to South Vietnam.* Again this proposition had a certain initial plausibility. But does it stand up after 32 months of testing? Though our bombing has certainly increased the cost of infiltration, it has at the same time increased the quantity of men and the quality of arms infiltrated. The reason for this is that our escalation has invariably stimulated counter-escalation on the part of our enemy.

The administration has always assumed that, while we escalate, the other side would sit still; and that we would therefore improve our relative position. This has been the reasoning behind every step of escalation. It has always proved wrong. The other side, instead of obliging us and sitting still, has escalated too. Far from achieving a clear margin of superiority, all we have done is to make the stalemate more bloody and explosive.

Thus, in March 1965, after the bombing had started, the Hanoi regime, according to our own Department of Defense, had only 400 regular troops in South Vietnam. Today it has 50,000. In March 1965 our adversaries in South Vietnam were fighting with small arms and mortars. In the months since, with each new escalation on our part, that weaponry has grown more sophisticated and effective. As for stopping infiltration, Secretary McNamara has pointed out that "the quantity of externally supplied material other than food required to support the VC-NVN forces in South Vietnam at about their current level of combat activity is very, very small—significantly under 100 tons a day—a quantity that could be transported by only a few trucks." Nor does he see any reason to suppose that even wider bombing could miraculously achieve what the present very wide bombing has failed to achieve. "No improvements and refinements," Mr. McNamara has told us, "can be expected to accomplish much more than to continue to put a high price tag on NVN's continued aggression." So, too, the second proposition falls by the wayside.

3. *That escalation would lessen American casualties in the war.* This is the argument for the ever wider bombing of North Vietnam which has had the greatest influence with the American people. On occasion, this argument has even taken the contemptible form of suggesting that those who oppose the widening of the war are responsible for the deaths of young Americans. If this is the level on which our leaders desire to conduct the debate, they should consult their own statistics.

These statistics show that more than half the Americans killed in the whole length of the Vietnam war, from 1961 to the present, were killed since the beginning of this year—killed, in short, during the period of the most intense escalation. The statistics also show that the number of American deaths declined during the bombing pause last February. The statistics, in short, strongly suggest that the way to increase casualties is to escalate the war—and that the way to reduce casualties is to slow down the war. And, of course, the way to end casualties is to end the war. So, after 32 months and 13,000 deaths, one more premise of the escalation policy has been condemned by events.

4. *That escalation would strengthen the government and will of South Vietnam.* This was one of the three reasons cited by President Johnson in April 1965 when he explained the decision to start bombing North Vietnam; and there is reason to believe that it may in fact have been the major reason. How does this argument look 32 months later?

On the political side, it is true that South Vietnam has had an election and now boasts a "constitutional" government. It is only coincidental, no doubt, that the new government consists of essentially the same faces as the military junta which preceded it. But the presidential election took place after the disqualification of the two most formidable opposition candidates, Au Truong Thanh and General Big Minh, both of whom were advocates of a negotiated solution—an action which meant that the election was rigged long before the voting took place. As for the voting itself, though given the seal of approval by President Johnson's team of Innocents Abroad, it was regarded with less enthusiasm by the Special Election Committee of South Vietnam's Constituent Assembly, which voted 16–2 to invalidate the results. In the end, the Assembly itself was induced to confirm the results only by a vote of 58–43.

Moreover, the winner, General Thieu, and the escalation policy received only 34.8 per cent of the vote; while the next three candidates, all of whom were for peace, received together 38 per cent. As for "constitutional" government, the Saigon police since the election have detained Truong Dinh Dzu, who ran second in the election, as well as Au Truong Thanh; and, though the constitution expressly forbids press censorship, the Saigon government has suspended four Vietnamese-language dailies in the last month. All this hardly suggests that the escalation policy has strengthened the commitment of the people of South Vietnam to their government or to the war.

The sharper test, of course, is the Army of South Vietnam. There are nearly 700,000 troops—certainly an impressive number for a small country. But the soldiers are miserably paid and miserably led. They have no faith in their officers; indeed, of the officers of the rank of lieutenant colonel or higher, only two fought against the French in the war for Vietnamese independence. They have no faith in their government or their cause. Naturally many of them go over the hill whenever they can.

They don't fight at night. They don't fight on weekends. "Most of the troops," Peter Arnett of AP recently reported from Vietnam, "insisted on a 5½ day week, taking Saturdays and Sundays off, while their allies and the Viet Cong go on fighting." According to the *National Observer* of September 25, "Collecting tales about the incredible inefficiency, slovenliness and laziness of South Vietnam's Army is perhaps the easiest work in all of the country. The Army is the No. 1 scandal of the war, and it is the No. 1 failure of the American military command."

Our escalation of the war, far from strengthening the government and will of South Vietnam, has had precisely the opposite effect. The more we do, the less they do; and, in consequence, the less they do, the more we do. In some months more Americans are killed than South Vietnamese are drafted. We have taken over the fighting. We are taking over the management of the economy. We are beginning to take over pacification. And, in the meantime, the weight of our presence crushes the frail fabric of Vietnamese society; our money degrades and debauches the people we are trying to save. We leave in our trail, not rising purpose and commitment, but deepening corruption and contempt. So, after 32 months, still another proposition turns out wrong.

5. *That we are holding the line against general communist aggression*. This, of course, has been the fundamental defense of the escalation policy. If this were simply a local war in Vietnam, no one would dream of sending half a million American soldiers there. But from the start the administration has conceived this conflict in loftier terms. Expounding the escalation policy in April 1965, the President said:

"There are great stakes in the balance. Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to the conflict. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another. The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied. To withdraw from one battlefield means only to prepare for the next."

He repeated this theme the other day in San Antonio, calling Southeast Asia "the arena where communist expansionism is most aggressively at work in the world today" and concluding, "I would rather stand in Vietnam, in our time, and by meeting this danger now, and facing up to it, thereby reduce the danger for our children and for our grandchildren."

The President's words deserve the most careful attention. What does he mean when he talks about "communist expansionism"? Though on occasion he likes to compare Ho Chi Minh to Jack Dempsey, he cannot seriously believe that Ho and his ragged bands present America and the world with a threat comparable to that presented by Hitler in the thirties or by Stalin in the forties. If his statement makes any sense at all, it can only be on the assumption that communism is still some sort of coordinated, unified, centrally controlled world movement, that nothing important has happened to communism since the days of Stalin, that polycentrism is a delusion and national communism a fraud and that Hanoi and the Viet Cong are the spearhead of a Chinese program of aggression in East Asia.

The proposition that Hanoi and the Viet Cong are the obedient instrumentalities of Chinese expansionism is absolutely crucial to the President's San Antonio argument. Otherwise the speech makes no sense at all. Yet the administration has at no point produced convincing evidence to sustain this proposition. Nor is there any reason to suppose that North Vietnam has been, is or will be a puppet of Peking's. If communist North Korea, which would not even exist had it not been for Chinese intervention in the Korean War, now declares its independence of Peking, why should anyone suppose that North Vietnam, whose whole history has been shaped by resistance to China, would become a compliant adjunct to the Red Guard? As good a probability—and for a long time in the past a much better probability—is that North Vietnam, with its vast Russian support, would resist Mao's pressure and Chinese expansionism—and do so a good deal more effectively than the parade of gimcrack regimes we have sponsored in Saigon. The long-run bulwark against China in Asia will be, not white intervention from across the seas, but local nationalism, even if that nationalism sometimes assumes a communist form.

In Cambodia, for example, that inveterate and wily neutralist Prince Sihanouk has begun a purge of Chinese influence in his government and his society. The State Department no doubt thinks this is the consequence of our presence in Vietnam. But Sihanouk doesn't. In the midst of his campaign against the Chinese, he continues to urge us to pull out of Vietnam: "If the American government . . . one day took such a decision, the whole world, including Cambodia, would cheer America. For once America would be popular."

Our escalation policy in the last 32 months, far from discouraging North Vietnam from serving as an instrument of Chinese aggression, has had precisely the opposite effect: it has increased North Vietnam's dependence on China, increased the number of Chinese in North Vietnam, driven the two states closer together than they ever were before. Again, a basic premise of the administration argument has been refuted by events.

6. *That escalation proves we will keep our commitments everywhere*. This has been another fundamental thesis in the administration's case for widening the war. We are in Vietnam, the Secretary of State said in 1966, "because we made a promise. We have made other promises in other parts of the world. If Moscow or Peking ever discovers that the promises of the United States do not mean what they say, then this world goes up in smoke."

How does this piety stand up under the test of events? Has our deepening involvement in Vietnam persuaded anyone that we will involve ourselves equally elsewhere in new cases of aggression? Quite the contrary: on this point, let us consult the hawkiest hawk in the nation, Richard M. Nixon. (At least he has been the hawkiest hawk up to now: as he studies the public opinion polls, we may confidently expect that our flexible former Vice President will, in due course, stop screaming and start cooing—and I trust that you will continue to give his views on world matters the respect they deserve). Mr. Nixon puts it this way:

"One of the legacies of Vietnam almost certainly will be a deep reluctance on the part of the United States to become involved once again in a similar intervention on a similar basis . . . If another friendly country should be faced with an extremely supported communist insurrection—whether in Asia or in Africa or even Latin America—there is serious question whether the American public or the American Congress would now support a unilateral American intervention, even at the request of the host government."

The storm of senatorial criticism when we sent three innocuous Air Force jet transports to the Congo last July proves Mr. Nixon's point.

Escalation has thus gravely damaged our national credibility as a keeper of promises politically. It has also done so militarily. For, if our assistance were sought today in some other part of the world, what in fact *could* we do—with 40 per cent of our combat-ready divisions, more than 50 per cent of our air power and more than a third of our naval power tied down in a small country 10,000 miles from the United States? Moreover, if the United States, with its fantastic military strength, cannot defeat the guerrillas of Vietnam, and, if in the attempt it wrecks the country it is trying to protect, why should any rational nation ever seek our protection again?

The administration denounces its critics as isolationists. But the real isolationists are surely those who, in their dedication to the escalation policy, have isolated the United States from its traditional allies and from the people of the world. At San Antonio the President went through the litany of the Asian leaders who have given our policy verbal support. But words are cheap. Except for our client state, South Korea, no nation in the world has sent us the support which counts—that is, a combat detachment of any size in Vietnam. We are going it alone as a nation in a way we have not done for thirty years.

More than this, the escalation policy has set in motion through our land a basic questioning of the whole idea of overseas commitments. Not in our time has there been such doubt about our military, economic and political ties with other nations. The lesson of Vietnam is not, as the administration keeps saying, that America will meet its commitments everywhere on earth.

The lesson of Vietnam, as read not only by the American Congress and people but by our friends and enemies around the world, is: "No more Vietnams." The escalation policy, after 32 months of trial, far from proving that we will keep our promises elsewhere, has had precisely the opposite effect: it has been the greatest stimulus and boon to American isolationism in the last thirty years. So one more proposition must be struck off the list.

7. *That military men know how to win*

wars. We have embarked on the escalation policy because the Joint Chiefs of Staff have told the President that this is the way to win the war. In recent months the military has boldly escalated its own campaign with Congress and the public. Admiral Sharp has said that a bombing pause would be "a disaster for the United States." General Wheeler has promised that the war could be ended in a "relatively short time" if we bombed the port of Haiphong and all lines of transport from South China. General Greene has had the presumption to tell the American people that the war in Vietnam is more important than the crisis of the American city.

Let us not make the mistake of condemning all military men. Such generals as James M. Gavin, Matthew Ridgway, David M. Shoup have offered searching criticism of the escalation policy. Within the Defense Department itself, Secretary McNamara has evidently—though with decreasing success in recent months—stood against the program of insensate escalation. Nor can one condemn the present Joint Chiefs of Staff for their insistence on a military solution. That is their business. The fault lies not with those who give such advice but with those who take it. There is nothing infallible about the JCS. I know what they recommended during great crises of the Kennedy Administration—the Bay of Pigs, the Berlin crisis of 1961, the missile crisis of 1962, the test ban debate of 1963—and in each case their recommendations were plainly wrong. President Kennedy took their advice on his great decisions once—before the Bay of Pigs. He did not make that mistake again. I know of no reason to suppose that the present Chiefs are wiser than their predecessors.

This sudden worship of the military is not in the American tradition. When General MacArthur carried his campaign for the escalation of the Korean War to Congress and the public, President Truman fired him. When Union generals in the Civil War showed that they could not succeed, President Lincoln fired them, one after another. Judging by the record, the present military leadership in South Vietnam is as disastrous as any we have had in the life of our nation. With over 500,000 American troops, better equipped than any troops in history, with 700,000 South Vietnamese, with 50,000 South Koreans, with total command of the air, with total command of the sea and, until recently, with total monopoly of heavy artillery, we have been fought to a standstill by 280,000 characters in black pajamas mostly armed, until recently, with rifles and mortars. In the last month, at Con Thien, our generals, in their wisdom, placed a group of gallant Marines in—and I quote that superhawk Joseph Alsop—"just about the only position in the entire country where the North Vietnamese can hope to attain relative parity in heavy weapons when battle is engaged." Because, as General Westmoreland has elegantly put it, "There is more firepower concentrated in that area than on any single piece of real estate in the history of warfare," we have evidently staved off the assault; but the question remains whether the strategy of putting the men in this terribly exposed position made sense.

The inescapable conclusion is that our military leadership has grossly misjudged and misconceived the character of the war. The foremost authority in the west on counter-insurgency and the leading British expert on Vietnam, where he headed the British Advisory Mission for three and a half years, is Sir Robert Thompson, who organized the defeat of the guerrilla uprising in Malaya. Sir Robert recently pointed out that General Giap's strategy "has one main aim, to keep the American combat forces fully occupied on 'search and destroy' type operations in the Demilitarised Zone and in the spinal column of the Annamite mountain chain as far south as Zone D. . . . These are areas where he can most easily deploy his main units and where American forces can achieve, in comparatively unpopulated mountain and jungle, no permanent gains." The costs of this strategy for North Vietnam, Sir Robert says, are quite acceptable. If they lost twice as many troops per year as we claim they are losing, "it would still be less than half one annual age group (and there is an enormous reserve of these age groups between 18 and 30)." And American strategy, Sir Robert points out, is exactly what General Giap wants. It plays exactly into his hands. And the result? As Rowland Evans reported from Vietnam a few days ago, "The US position here in the critical northern provinces of South Vietnam is deteriorating as the communists press their remorseless campaign of attack, parry and retreat."

Let us liberate ourselves from the illusion of the infallibility of generals. Stewart Alsop, the wiser brother, recently wrote in the *Saturday Evening Post,* after citing the historical record, "Almost all generals are almost always wrong about all wars. Generals should be listened to with skeptical respect, but never with reverent credulity." If the experience of the last 32 months proves anything, it proves that the administration's 7th assumption is as wrong as all the rest.

In February 1965 it was permissible to suppose that some, or all, of the administration's assumptions might be right. No one then could be certain whether or not the escalation policy would work. But now, for 32 long, terrible months, war has put to trial the validity of the propositions on which this policy is based. What may have seemed plausible in the abstract in February 1965 has received the laboratory test. It is no longer a question of speculation but of verification. The evidence is concrete. It is overwhelming. It is irrefutable.

History is the great executioner; and, in these months and years, as the basic assumptions, one after another, have run the gantlet of experience, none has survived. We are a pragmatic people. We believe in the process of trial and error, of experimentation. But we also believe in heeding the results of experiment. As Franklin Roosevelt once said, "it is common sense to take a method and try it. If it fails, admit it frankly and try another."

That is the way most Americans think—and this, I submit, is why there has been in recent months so marked a disillusion with the escalation policy. Some of us may have known from the start that the policy would not work. But let us be charitable to those who preferred to suspend judgment until the results were in. Let us unite now in the determination to slow down this ghastly war and move as speedily as possible toward a negotiated settlement.

This is the way most Americans are coming to think. But is it the way the American government is coming to think? So far as one can tell, our leaders remain stubbornly unimpressed by the collapse of their case for escalation. They continue to reiterate the proposition which experience has so cruelly disapproved. Lashed to their own past policies, they seem incapable of admitting error or changing direction.

And so their only response to the failure of escalation is more escalation—like a doctor, when the medicine fails to cure, doubles the dose.

Their only response to the misconceptions of our generals is to capitulate more and more to their demands.

Their only response to frustration and stalemate is to issue ever more fatuous statements about turning the corner of the war, turning the tide, the beginning of the end, victory in sight and so on.

It is difficult to see how serious men can, year after year, with the straight face, repeat the same optimistic predictions and do so, very often, in the identical words. Nor should we forget that herald angel of the hawks, Joseph Alsop, in this connection. *The Washington Post* on October 4 adorned his most recent effusion with the encouraging headline: "Vast Gains in Vietnam War Evident in Last Few Months." Hark how this herald angel has sung through the years. Thus February 1964, "In Communist North Vietnam . . . the situation is close to desperate"; in September 1965, "The whole pattern of the war has been utterly changed. . . . At last there is light at the end of the tunnel"; in October 1965, "Final defeat is beginning to be expected, even in the ranks of Viet Cong hard-core units"; in February 1966, "The enemy's backbone of regulars can even be broken this year. And when and if that happens, this war will be effectively won"; in April 1966, "The Vietnamese and American forces are now imposing a rate of loss on the Viet Cong which the enemy cannot indefinitely withstand"; in October 1966, "Within six, eight, ten or twelve months—before the end of 1967 at any rate—the chances are good that the Vietnamese war will look successful." Now in October 1967, just at the time when this last gorgeous prophecy is due for fulfillment, Mr. Alsop finds improvement so great that "the contrast between then and now is all but incredible." One is compelled to conclude that it is not the contrast but the columnist who is incredible. How consistently silly can an intelligent man be?

How do our leaders explain the failure of the escalation policy to produce the results so glowingly promised at such regular intervals? For some time, of course, they have been building their alibi. We all know what it is: that dissent in the United States is responsible for frustration in Vietnam. This is a familiar reflex of military disaster. One need only remember the *Dolchstegosslegende*—the stab-in-the-back myth concocted by the German generals to account for their defeat in the First World War.

The argument, like the escalation theory itself, has a certain initial plausibility. But let us consider what it really means—and the best way to do that is simply to invert it. If it means anything, it must mean that, if only everybody in the United States would shut up and rally behind their President, then Ho Chi Minh and his friends would stop doing what they are doing, and the war would be over. Simply to state this proposition is to demonstrate its absurdity. Serious leaders base their military decisions on the actual battlefield balance of force, will and opportunity, not on speculations about anti-war protests on the other side of the world. Our adversaries are fighting not because they count on protest at home but because they believe fanatically in their cause and because they have not been beaten in the field of battle. They would fight just as hard if everyone in America thought the escalation policy was perfect.

The rise of the Great Alibi has been paralleled by a curious sense of persecution within the administration as if it were some sort of beleaguered and impotent minority. A good example of this cry-baby reaction is the speech that Ambassador Gronouski gave this August at the University of Wisconsin. "Those charged with the conduct of foreign policy," the Ambassador said in his long wail of self-pity, ". . . find it difficult to maintain an attitude of rapport with a group (the intellectual community) which incessantly challenges their motives and morality."

Let us be clear about this. We are not questioning the motives and morality of the makers of policy; we are questioning their judgment, which is a very different matter. I know a good many of the men who have sponsored the escalation policy. They are not evil men. They are, as I suggested earlier, earnest and conscientious men. They are doing what they are doing because they profoundly believe it serves the interests of American security and world peace. They are doing their best for their country according to their lights. But it may justly be said, I think, that, in certain cases at least, their lights are dim. Historians have sometimes noted that the most underrated factor in the conduct of public affairs is stupidity.

Fortified by this sense of persecution, exonerated by their Great Alibi, deluded by their own propaganda and prophecy, still convinced that escalation is the road to peace, our leaders persist in their course. And, as they do so, another political year approaches. The 1968 election will provide, I believe, a test of the adequacy of our political process. For, given the size and intensity of dissent in our land, if this election does not offer the country a clear choice on the question of Vietnam, then something will have gone badly wrong with our political system. Now no political system works automatically. People make it work—and they may make it work well, or they make it work badly. It is up to us, and people like us through the country, to do our best to make sure that our system meets its responsibilities.

Our objective is to bring the war in Vietnam to the end. We must not be under any illusions about the ease of a negotiated solution. While I have little doubt that an unconditional halt of the bombing of the north would soon lead to talks with Hanoi and the Viet Cong, I have considerable doubt that these talks would lead very soon to a mutually acceptable solution. So far as one can tell at present, each side continues to insist on terms which would mean, in effect, the defeat and humilitation of the other side. So long as this remains the case, no settlement will be possible. What both sides must come to in the end, I believe, is agreement on the creation of a structure in South Vietnam within which contending forces, including the communists, may compete by peaceful means for political representation and control. Such a structure would require some form of international supervision for a stated period in order to guarantee against reversion to terrorism and guerrilla warfare. It will take time—perhaps a long time—for such a solution to win mutual acceptance.

How do we move in this direction? The first necessity obviously is to slow down the war—to stop the bombing of the north, to reduce the fighting in the south, to do everything we can to lessen the killing.

The next necessity is to make it clear that we will keep an American military presence in South Vietnam until a negotiated settlement can be achieved. Let us have no confusion here. There will be no chance of negotiation if the other side thinks it is going to win; therefore a military stalemate is a self-evident precondition to negotiation. The advocates of a political solution and the advocates of unilateral withdrawal agree on the indispensibility of slowing down the war; but, after this point, it seems to me, their paths diverge and their policies become incompatible. One cannot, of course, wholly exclude the possibility of unilateral withdrawal; it would not be America's finest hour, but it would obviously be greatly preferable to a policy of unlimited escalation. But the option of withdrawal is always open to us. It would be foolish to rush at once to that extreme without exhausting the possibilities of negotiation. It need hardly be said that, up to this point, we have not, despite fine words, pursued negotiation with a fraction of the zeal, ingenuity and preservance with which we have pursued war.

This leads to the third necessity: we will not have a negotiated solution until we have a leadership which desires a negotiated solution—which has freed itself from the obsession with the idea of a military victory, or at least of a spectacular and favorable reversal of the present military balance: the obsession which evidently continues to possess the present administration. If our present leadership can think of nothing better than persistence in the policies which, after full and fair trial, for 32 bitter months, have proved a dismal failure, then this country, if it is to save itself, requires new leadership.

How do we make sure that the 1968 election offers an alternative? Let us be clear about another thing: the idea of a third party is an illusion. A third party based on the Vietnam war would get nowhere in the elections; it would run well behind George Wallace in the electoral college; and the only result would be drastically to understate the size of the opposition to the escalation policy and thereby to discredit the cause of peace. The serious issue must remain within the major parties. This means, I think, that the Republicans among us must work for anti-escalation candidates in their party—and that all of us must work for delegates to the party conventions pledged to an anti-escalation platform. As we do this, we may all be encouraged by the expectation that disenchantment with the war is bound to grow in the weeks and months ahead.

It is bound to grow so long as the present leadership remains frozen in its ideas, locked into its system of error, unable to think of anything to do but more of the same. How much more proof will they require before they recognize that the escalation policy has been a disaster? They began that policy in February 1965. Today, after 32 months, after the death of more than 13,000 American soldiers and of countless Vietnamese, after the expenditure of nearly $90 billion, after our increasing isolation in the world, after the irresponsible and dangerous neglect of the urgent problems of our national community—to which President Johnson's Great Society was so prominently dedicated—after all the blood and killing and waste and degradation, are we any closer to a solution than we were when we began? Are we nearer to winning the war? to establishing a healthy society in South Vietnam? to pacifying the countryside? to winning world confidence in American purpose and American sense? Are we not ever more deeply and hopelessly mired in the quicksand?

I say again: how much longer do our leaders insist on reinforcing error and dragging us down this dirty and hopeless road? Can nothing demonstrate to them the futility and folly of their course? "My bretheren," said Cromwell, "I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible that you may be mistaken." If this administration lacks the moral or the intellectual courage to conceive the possibility that it may be wrong, then the American people, I hope and believe, will turn next year to leadership determined to meet this tragic problem with the realism, the rationality and the high idealism that have marked the finest moments of our history.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is interesting that Mr. Schlesinger, in discussing the assumptions which are behind the escalation policy, casts a balance sheet of the seven basic propositions on which this policy has been based and then undertakes to show how each of those assumptions has turned out in history to be wrong.

The first assumption is that escalation would break the will of North Vietnam and bring Hanoi to the conference table. This, so far at least, has turned out to be entirely false.

The second assumption is that escalation would reduce the infiltration of supplies and men from North to South Vietnam. As Mr. Schlesinger points out, the fact is quite to the contrary. Infiltration, according to the best information we can get, continues at whatever rate the North Vietnamese wish to infiltrate. I believe it is beyond question that Ho Chi Minh has 15 well-trained divisions in North Vietnam which he has not committed as yet to the struggle in South Vietnam.

The third assumption is that escalation would lessen American casualties in the war. We all know how false that is with over 13,000 American dead, most of them in the last couple of years, and I believe over 100,000 wounded, although it is true that many of the wounded are not hospitalized and are returned reasonably quickly to action.

The fourth assumption is that escalation would strengthen the Government and will of South Vietnam. This would appear to be far from the facts, as Mr. Schlesinger ably points out.

The fifth assumption is that we are holding the line against general Communist aggression. In my opinion, his argument demolishing this assumption is most persuasive.

The sixth assumption is that escalation proves we will keep our commitments everywhere. Again I leave to Mr. Schlesinger the annihilation of this particular premise, which I believe to be quite unsound.

The seventh premise is that the military men know how to win wars. I think that Mr. Schlesinger makes pretty clear that this sudden worship of the military is not in the American tradition. It just is not true and has been proven untrue from the Civil War down to the present time, although we have been fortunate, indeed, in many of our outstanding generals, some of whom have gone on to become President of the United States.

Nevertheless, Mr. Schlesinger deplores the worship of the military which seems to be a part of our present thinking in this country.

In this connection there is no greater worshiper of the military than the well-known columnist Joseph Alsop, and in the style of what I am afraid I must refer to as his usual petulance, arrogance, and bad temper, he has a column this morning taking to task practically everybody in the United States except the military and Mr. Alsop. His column is entitled "Nation's Plunge Into Nonsense or This Is Where We Came In." Mr. Alsop takes on quite a wide variety of Americans of all generations, going back to the early days of the depression, in his disapproval of the point of view of what I believe to be a majority of our fellow countrymen. Mr. Alsop, of course, has been telling us for a long, long time that we are winning the war in Vietnam. As his predictions are increasingly unmasked as untrue, he becomes more and more petulant and more and more arrogant.

In this connection, Mr. Schlesinger in his article referring to Stewart Alsop—I think correctly—as the wiser brother, quotes Stewart as saying:

> Almost all generals are almost always wrong about all wars. Generals should be listened to with skeptical respect but never with reverent credulity.

I believe that Stewart is the younger of the two brothers. I regret that he went to Yale while Joe went to Harvard. But

I do think, in this instance, that Cambridge could learn something from New Haven.

Mr. Schlesinger points out in his article, which I have had inserted in the Record, it is difficult to see how serious men can, year after year, repeat the same optimistic predictions with a straight face and do so very often in identical words.

He suggests that we should not forget that the herald angel of the hawks is Mr. Alsop. He goes on to point out how often Mr. Joseph Alsop has been wrong in his predictions of upcoming military victories in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the quotations from Mr. Alsop in Mr. Schlesinger's article beginning with 1964 and continuing on down to the present column, which have consistently been at variance with the facts as they were developed; together with Mr. Alsop's article of today to which I have earlier referred.

There being no objection, the excerpts and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Washington Post on October 4 adorned his most recent effusion with the encouraging headline: "Vast Gains in Vietnam War Evident in Last Few Months." Hark how this herald angel has sung through the years. Thus February 1964, "In Communist North Vietnam . . . the situation is close to desperate"; in September 1965, "The whole pattern of the war has been utterly changed. . . . At last there is light at the end of the tunnel"; in October 1965, "Final defeat is beginning to be expected, even in the ranks of Viet Cong hard-core units"; in February 1966, "The enemy's backbone of regulars can even be broken this year. And when and if that happens, this war will be effectively won"; in April 1966, "The Vietnamese and American forces are now imposing a rate of loss on the Viet Cong which the enemy cannot indefinitely withstand"; In October 1966, "Within six, eight, ten or twelve months—before the end of 1967 at any rate—the chances are good that the Vietnamese war will look successful." Now in October 1967, just at the time when this last gorgeous prophecy is due for fulfillment, Mr. Alsop finds improvements so great that "the contrast between then and now is all but incredible." One is compelled to conclude that it is not the contrast but the columnist who is incredible. How consistently silly can an intelligent man be?

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 30, 1967]

NATION'S PLUNGE INTO NONSENSE OR THIS IS WHERE WE CAME IN!

(By Joseph Alsop)

"This is where we came in, for God's sake." Any traveler returning to the United States at this juncture, who is also old enough to remember the nonsense-ridden '30s, cannot easily repress the foregoing horrified exclamation.

In the '30s, the younger generation of Americans, and all those older men who hankered to be "in the movement," had briskly rejected the whole experience of the past. The result was driveling nonsense about the Communist Party; nonsense about the Soviet Union, then bathed in innocent blood; nonsense about the causes of wars, resulting in the idiotic Nye Neutrality Act, and nonsense in general about the role of power in history.

The same sort of plunge into nonsense clearly threatens in America today, if it has not occurred already. The younger generation are easily forgivable, for they do not even remember what happened in Korea. But the older men, still prancing along "in the movement," mouthing the new slogans, are very much less forgivable today than they were in the '30s.

Take the scores of eminent anti-Johnson Democrats—historians and college professors, journalists and Senators, all remorsely articulate—who were already active in the era of President Harry S. Truman. Not a one of them that you can think of failed to support President Truman's decision to intervene in Korea. Just about all of them have gone on, ever since, rightly praising President Truman's wisdom and courage on that occasion.

(One of the more celebrated journalists, to be sure, had an article ready—written to the effect that we could not and must not intervene in Korea. But the news of intervention came that afternoon, and the article was rewritten to support the President.)

If these distinguished liberal Democrats, who supported Truman and now vilify President Johnson, can make any distinction at all between the Korean and Vietnamese wars, they have yet to say what it is. In Korea, we were fighting on the Asian mainland, as we are today; and in Korea, too, mainly because of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, we had to meet Chinese as well as North Korean manpower.

In Korea again, there were two primary stakes that the United States was engaged to deferd. First, there was the American position as a Pacific power. In the second World War, blood and treasure had been lavishly poured out to defend and strengthen this American position. It was, and is, of cardinal importance.

President Truman rightly recognized that the whole Pacific position would be irrevocably compromised if the Korean challenge were not met. In play was not Korea alone, but the future alignment of Japan and the Philippines, the eventual tendency of Southeast Asia, and, in fact, the direction of the bandwagon of history in the whole of Asia.

On the same subject, just 15 years later, Gen. Maxwell Taylor accurately told President Johnson that he had the choice between meeting the challenge in Vietnam or being thrown "back to Hawaii." And surely this first stake, this American position in the Pacific, when Taylor gave this advice, deserved even greater consideration since we had already fought a second major war in its defense.

As for stake number two, it was, and is, quite simply the credibility of American commitments, such as our pledges to the South Vietnamese, the Thais and a good many other people in the present instance. This stake was far less important in Korea, which we had publicly put on its own, than it was in Vietnam. But either way, the great power that enters into pledges and then chooses to ignore them has taken a road that may at first seem smooth, but will always turn cruelly rocky and downhill in the end.

There is a third stake, too, in the Vietnamese war that was really invisible in the Korean war. The Pacific, in brief, now promises to become another "world lake" quite as important as the Atlantic, if not more important. But this vast process, so greatly enhancing the significance of stakes I and II, requires a further, more detailed report.

How then can these distinguished liberal Democrats talk out of one side of their mouths about Korea, and out of the other side about Vietnam? None has tackled that question with sober honesty, with the sole, highly, honorable exception of Richard Rovere in "The New Yorker" and Rovere's attempt to offer an answer would satisfy no one searching for a serious national policy.

Meanwhile, it must also be noted that there is the widest imaginable difference between our last round of nonsense and the present one. In the 1930s, the U.S. was a strictly perhipheral power, without a serious foreign policy, even lacking serious foreign relations. In the '30s, therefore, the conversation of a majority to a nonsense-view of the rest of the world had hardly any lasting effects.

Now, however, the U.S. is the central, giant power. And if the U.S. takes the final plunge into nonsense in this quite new situation, the sure and certain consequence will be a third world war.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, an extremely perceptive and, to my way of thinking, sound article was published in the Saturday Review under date of October 21, 1967, is written by Theodore C. Sorensen, the one individual who was probably closer to President John F. Kennedy than any other in the White House.

The article is entitled "The War in Vietnam—How We Can End It."

I find Mr. Sorensen's article most persuasive and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Saturday Review, Oct. 21, 1967]

THE WAR IN VIETNAM—HOW WE CAN END IT

(By Theodore C. Sorensen, former Special Counsel to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, is an Saturday Review editor-at-large)

I have not previously spoken out publicly against our course in Vietnam. My years in the White House made me more conscious than most private citizens of the burdens our President bears, more aware of his unique access to information, and more unwilling to add fuel to the fires of dissension within my party and country. But I believe that the President's friends and supporters today can best serve him as well as the country by speaking out: Not by offering over-simplified solutions or personal criticisms; not by questioning anyone's motives or credibility; not by reflecting on the skill and courage of our fighting forces; but by helping to seek before it is too late a reasonable, feasible course in Vietnam that offers some hope of achieving an early peaceful settlement—a course with costs and risks more proportionate to America's interests than this present avenue of expanding escalation and slaughter.

"Your government should understand," a Russian diplomat said to me as we lunched last August in Moscow, "that we are obligated to do for the North Vietnamese whatever they ask us to do. If they ask us to send bombers, we will send bombers. If they ask us to send men, we will send men." This was not delivered as a threat nor was it surprisingly new. But it helped point up for me the urgency of our stopping World War III now before it starts.

I realize that it is difficult for a great power to alter its course—but the Soviet Union pulled its missiles out of Cuba (and received world praise for doing so). I realize that it is difficult for our proud nation to acknowledge error instead of compounding it—but we did exactly that at the Bay of Pigs.

I do not say that we have wholly erred in Vietnam or that we should precipitously pull out our troops. Nor am I concerned here with many of the other disputes surrounding that war. The Senate will long debate the legal basis for our involvement, the alleged choices between Europe and Asia, and the effect of the war on our prestige, politics, and priorities. Historians will long debate over how and why we got into Vietnam, who first breached the Geneva Agreement, whether it was originally a civil war, whether another President would have acted differently, whether Congress was consulted adequately, and whether the various past precedents cited—from Munich to Malaya—are meaningful. What concerns me now is not the past but the future.

What concerns me now is the prospect of an endless war in which the original issues (to say nothing of the Vietnamese people) will have long been forgotten, in which each gradation of American escalation will continue to be offset by more troops from the North and less help from the South. What concerns me is the prospect of a frustrated, aggravated, bitterly divided America, irritated at its increasing isolation from the world, unable to accept its inability to bring this upstart to heel, under growing pressure from a growing military establishment, consequently pouring in more men, bombing out more targets, and finally, in desperation, mining or blockading the Haiphong harbor or even invading the North by means of a permanent excursion across the demilitarized zone or an "Inchon-type" landing behind that front line. Then the entry of Chinese and possibly Russian "volunteers" will be a very real threat and possibly—even without our destroying North Vietnamese dikes, bombing MIG bases in China, or occupying Hanoi—an inevitable fact, as inevitable as the fact that their entry will lead eventually to a world-wide nuclear war. The tragic irony of it is that all this could happen without our advancing one single step nearer to our original goal of a terror-free South Vietnam.

We have already moved in recent years from limited counterinsurgency to all-out combat, from 15,000 advisers to 500,000 troops, from a war fought largely by South Vietnamese forces in the South to a war fought largely by American forces both North and South. Each stage of escalation has brought a response from the other side requiring more escalation, bringing a further response from the other side requiring still more escalation. When two doses of penicillin failed to help the patient, we gave him four, then six, now eight. It is high time we realized that penicillin is not what this patient needs, and more can only poison him.

To be sure, we cannot now lose the war. We have prevented the kind of large-scale North Vietnamese assaults that might have destroyed all hope for self-determination and survival in the South. There is no prospect now that the Communists can push our forces into the sea or impose their rule by conquest. Nor is there any prospect now that we will abandon to slaughter those South Vietnamese who stood up against a Communist military takeover. But this country has to face the unaccustomed and uncomfortable fact that, despite all the brilliance and valor of our fighting forces, their lives are being given for a war which—in terms of achieving our *total* objectives, political and moral as well as military, in all Asia as well as Vietnam—we are not "winning" in the traditional sense and cannot ever expect to "win."

We are not "containing" the Red Chinese when we create a vacuum on their borders into which they will inexorably move unless we stay forever—when we increase North Vietnam's dependence on Chinese imports—or when we erode South Vietnam's institutions, traditions, economy, independence, and spirit.

We are not "winning the war for men's minds" among the South Vietnamese people, much less "pacifying" their country, when we level their villages, burn their crops, dominate and prolong their war, work primarily with the privileged few entrenched in both their military and government, and place half a million free-spending Americans into that tiny, impoverished, and now inflation-ridden country.

We are not demonstrating the futility of Communist "wars of liberation" to any army that soon returns to rule by night those areas from which we have temporarily driven it; nor are we deterring similar attacks in Thailand or elsewhere when we stretch our forces thin in Vietnam.

We are not "defending our national interest" when we endlessly divert more than two billion tax dollars a month away from our cities and schools and overseas friends for a war that, much as we dislike the word, is producing at best only a stalemate.

I read all the predictions that victory is just around the escalation corner—but I heard those same predictions three and four and even five years ago. I read all the rosy statistics on how many Communists we have killed and captured and induced to defect—but still their number keeps growing. I read all the claims on our bombing successes in the North—but still the infiltration southward continues. I read all the statements that this is a joint effort with South Vietnam and others—but still we are doing more and more of the fighting and dying. And, finally, I read all the assurances that neither the Russians nor the Chinese will intervene—but at the same time Washington experts acknowledge that neither Peking nor Moscow could tolerate a North Vietnamese defeat.

General Westmoreland calls it a war of attrition. That it is—a war of attrition pitting American youth on the Asian mainland against an Asian foe which has not yet begun to tap its immense manpower reserves. Most of the time that foe is a Vietnamese guerrilla—a tough, cunning, elusive warrior who knows every hiding place in his native land, who is fed and shielded by the people we are supposedly there to defend, and who believes that someday his children will push out the Americans just as his elders pushed out the French.

Even if the old-fashioned kind of military victory in Vietnam were possible, it would require an indefinite occupation of that country by American troops under constant attack from such guerrillas. But such a victory is not possible against an enemy that keeps coming and fighting, as it has for twenty years and as it seemingly can for twenty more, suffering heavy casualties but also inflicting them, hiding in the hills or brush, disappearing literally underground or by mingling with civilians, eluding our "search and destroy" missions and then returning, controlling or terrorizing virtually as many villages and roads, and assassinating or kidnaping virtually as many South Vietnamese local leaders, as it did before we arrived.

If countering this kind of guerrilla warfare requires, as the Pentagon has said, that our forces outnumber theirs by a lopsided ratio of 3 or 4 or even 10 to 1—and if, in addition, we must take over the immense and unfamiliar task of nonmilitary "pacification," and do it without a nonpartisan civil service, without the goodwill of the people, without effective land distribution or respect for the South Vietnamese troops or cooperation from their intellectuals—then where do we obtain the manpower to offset the gradual tapping of Communist reserves? Not from our Asian and Pacific allies who have, on the whole, shown very little enthusiasm for propping up with their own forces what we have warned could be the first of the falling dominoes. Nor are there unlimited reserves still available to the South Vietnamese army, whose brave but poorly paid and dispirited soldiers are still too often led by corrupt and politically controlled officers more imitative of the Vietcong in brutally interrogating civilians and prisoners than in risking their own comfort in combat.

It is small wonder, then, that one American military leader has said that 2,000,000 U.S. troops will be required to root out the terrorists in the South, village by village. But if the other side keeps growing through recruitment and reinfiltration, despite escalated bombings and electronic barriers, even 2,000,000 may not be enough. And what would an American commitment of 2,000,000 men do to our force levels at home and around the world? What, finally, would it do to the South Vietnamese themselves?

"In the final analysis," said President Kennedy in the fall of 1963, "it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it . . . the people of Vietnam." But as we pour in more troops, destroying in the process their economic stability more effectively than the Communists have ever done, it has become *our* war. We have the largest fighting force. We suffer the largest fatalities. The South Vietnamese people, weary after twenty years of warriors and foreigners, divided by rival sects and provincial politics, seem simultaneously to resent and prefer our taking over their battle. Many of the young leaders and scholars upon whom the country's liberation must ultimately depend are reported openly cynical and skeptical of the American presence. The present military government with which we are identified—now popularly elected but still far from universally accepted—seems incapable of understanding any real opposition or dissent, and incapable of undertaking any serious land reforms or serious peace negotiations.

A more viable, representative, and reform-minded civilian government, possessing real strength in the grassroots as well as the cities, rallying the people after the fashion of the Philippines' Magsaysay, and offering true amnesty and amity to the Vietcong and true reconciliation to the North Vietnamese, might have at least been able to increase the rate of Communist defectors to a level exceeding South Vietnamese desertions. That has not happened, nor will it. But the strength, the morale, and the legitimacy of the present government in Saigon are at least sufficient now to permit our own country to pursue a different course.

I wrote in my book *Kennedy* that that Administration's objective in Vietnam was to gain time—time for the South Vietnamese, with our help and protection, to achieve a society sufficiently cohesive politically and militarily to negotiate a balanced settlement. There is no reason now for us to refrain from concluding that such time is finally near at hand. The South Vietnamese have expressed through their elections a longing for peace and the beginning of constitutional rule. The Communists have reason to know that they cannot win a final military victory. The Red Chinese, beset by internal strife and external setbacks, may be less able to interfere with negotiations. The Soviets prefer peace to a widening war. The National Liberation Front has dropped its resistance to the inclusion of other South Vietnamese in a postwar government; and the North Vietnamese, at least in the view of some, may again be indicating a genuine willingness to talk peace.

Their willingness, to be sure, has been conditioned upon our suspending indefinitely and unconditionally the bombing of the North. If that bombing had been clearly curtailing Communist infiltration and operations within the South, one could more readily accept our refusal on the ground that such attacks were a more effective way of saving American lives than attempting to interdict North Vietnamese lines in the South. But in fact, despite our constant expansion of targets to include all those of genuine military importance. Secretary of Defense McNamara has acknowledged that the infiltration of North Vietnamese forces has continued to grow—infiltrating over countless routes, by boat and truck and bicycle and foot, under cover of jungle or darkness. In the South they live off the land whenever their supply trains are delayed. In the North, they obtain replacements overland through China whenever their supply depots are destroyed. On balance, the continued bombing, by increasing an embittered militancy in the North and thus prolonging the war, appears to be costing more American lives in the long run than it actually saves.

Heavy bombing has never been wholly decisive in any war. No one promised that it would be in this one. But let us leave aside the various inconsistencies in the various statements explaining our original reasons for bombing. The overwhelming weight of the evidence still fails to indicate that pounding that largely primitive peasant economy with more bombs than we unloaded on all of Europe in World War II has brought us a single day closer to the hour of peaceful settlement. The overwhelming weight of the evidence still fails to indicate that the North Vietnamese resolves to resist has been weakened instead of hardened by these massive attacks on their homeland. The overwhelming weight of the evidence still fails to indicate that any feasible amount of bombing can ever prevent the North Vietnamese from infiltrating into the South all the men, arms, and food needed to sustain a low-level guerrilla war indefinitely.

To be sure, the bombing is not without effect. It not only boosts the morale of the Saigon government—a somewhat dubious justification—but punishes and pressures and pains the North Vietnamese. It makes their maintenance of reserves and supply lines, and particularly their transportation of large cadres and heavy artillery pieces, more difficult and more costly. It makes life harder and poorer for their citizens and their soldiers. But their life has always been hard and poor. They have never depended on cities or industries. They have known very little but war against the Japanese, the French, and the Americans during most of their lives. A still lower standard of living now, an inconvenient mobilization of manpower to repair bridges and railroads, an increase in shortages and terrors and casualties, do not add up to grounds for surrender, now that they have endured this much this long and have so little to lose but their lives.

There seems little to be gained, then, by our insisting upon a continuance of the bombing in the North. Suspending it will not produce a Communist military victory in the South, nor will it bring the collapse of any Saigon government worthy of our attention. But suspending it will, possibly with the aid of the new electronic "fence," confine the war to the South, where it must be won anyway. It will end the strain on U.S. aircraft crews badly needed for air support in the South, while reducing the costly loss of our aircraft and the humiliation of our captured pilots. It will limit the area our dollars must surely rebuild when the war is over. It will end the toll of North Vietnamese civilian casualties which embarrassingly but unavoidably grows as the list of our targets is expanded. And it will eliminate the single largest barrier to world support for our position and the single largest barrier to negotiations with Hanoi.

Bombing, we have now learned, cannot force negotiations but it may well be preventing them. There is no possibility of the North Vietnamese engaging in talks while their homeland is being bombed. Inasmuch as the bombing can no longer be regarded as an indispensable means for securing our forces and objectives in the South, the time has come for us to suspend indefinitely and unconditionally our bombing of the North in order to test Hanoi's sincerity and see how it will reciprocate.

Accompanying such a suspension with conditions and deadlines will not work. The North Vietnamese will not respond to an ultimatum. Nor will they respond to our demand or even "expectation" that in exchange they stop sending men and supplies to South Vietnam—in effect stop fighting the war altogether—while we continue to fight. Naturally, no American is going to like it if and when the North's flow of troops and supplies to the South increases during such a suspension. We did not like it when fighting continued in Korea during the truce talks; but had we refused to talk, the loss of American lives there would surely have been higher. Today we must face the facts that prolonging the bombing cannot end the war or even the infiltration and that this impasse is costing us more lives than the bombing saves. Let us also face the fact that someday we will stop it—and the longer we put it off, the more difficult it will be for both sides to negotiate a reasonable settlement.

Indeed, there is already a danger that we have passed the point of no return beyond which neither the Hanoi regime nor the Administration in Washington could reach an accommodation with the other without the risk of being turned out of office. Bitterness and distrust are rapidly rising in both camps. Militants and military chieftains are gaining influence in both capitals. Each side is fearful that a cease-fire will cause a loss of momentum and morale, that negotiations will be only a cover for reinforcements. Each side believes that the other should pay the price of aggression, accept the blame, and make the first concession. Each side would prefer to postpone negotiations until he is clearly winning (at which time, of course, the other side would not negotiate).

Perhaps even now the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front are not interested in serious negotiations. Their recent public statements about peace talks have been largely bellicose, rude, and inconsistent. They appear convinced of their ability to outlast us, meanwhile bleeding us white. They do not wish to offend their largest neighbor, protector, and potential supplier, Red China, which would obviously prefer to see us hopelessly bogged down in Vietnam without risking one Chinese casualty, and which might well threaten the North Vietnamese with a disastrous interruption of supplies if they even talk with the Americans. The pro-Chinese faction in the Hanoi government is already said by some to be on the ascendency.

But even if Hanoi is not now ready to negotiate, we can—instead of continuing the present treadmill into ever more dangerous, divisive, and self-destructive escalation—prudently de-escalate our war effort without harming our interests and with some hope that Hanoi will de-escalate also. Limiting our military commitments, objectives, investment, and assaults, meanwhile consolidating our position in the most populous areas of the South, would cost us fewer lives, less money, no territory, and no "face," while better enabling us to wait until outside events—such as divisions in the Communist camp—make negotiations more possible. Certainly our present course is not dividing the Vietcong from Hanoi or Hanoi from Peking, and indeed may end up helping to unite China for Mao or even Peking with Moscow.

But in fact we do not know with any certainty whether Hanoi and the Vietcong—together or separately—are now ready to negotiate. We have not stopped the bombing indefinitely to find out. We have not since one thirty-seven-day pause nearly two years ago accompanied our talk of negotiations with real deeds of de-escalation demonstrating our earnest good faith. We have not given to the pursuit of peace the same effort, ingenuity, and relentless consistency we have given to prosecuting the war. We have not prevented the Saigon regime from torpedoing the rise of civilian neutralist forces in the South capable of negotiating with the North and the National Liberation Front. We have not left those voices in Hanoi who might once have been concerned about their economy with much reason now to justify a cease-fire. We have not, to the best of my knowledge, adopted a concrete, mutually acceptable plan for negotiations—as distinguished from admirable but vague statements of principle—and communicated that plan to the North. Publicly, at least, we have not offered any of the concessions and compromises required by the military and practical situation for a realistic settlement, frequently implying instead only that we stand ready to negotiate the surrender of the Vietcong.

Most serious of all, we have not been sufficiently forthright or forthcoming in response to what may have been actual opportunities to start or explore negotiations. Perhaps we were looking for a different kind of "signal" and missed the one they sent. Perhaps we were plagued by poor translations, poor communications, or poor coordination on both sides. But whatever the reasons and whoever is to blame—and assessing it now will not help—we must in the future take more care not to spurn or ignore potential opportunities for negotiation, much less deny their existence or escalate in response to them.

Such a posture would involve no weakening of our resolve or responsibility. President Johnson has called "the path of peaceful settlement . . . the only path for reasonable men." President Kennedy obtained withdrawal of the Soviet missiles from Cuba by giving attention to the olive branch as well as the arrows—by adopting a carefully measured combination of defense, diplomacy, and dialogue. Perhaps his ploy in that crisis of interpreting a Communist demand in his own terms, his response thus necessitating their reply, could be used now to initiate negotiations with Hanoi. Perhaps the good offices of U Thant, a resolution by the U.N. General Assembly, or a reconvening of the Geneva Conference could initiate talks without either side worrying about protocol or precedent. Perhaps we could invite the other side to the President's next summit meeting with our Asian allies. It would be more realistic, in my view, to seek a secret conference, with no mediator, arbitrator, or press releases, thus alleviating potential Chinese and other pressures. But the essential step is to bring together the combatants—and that necessarily means all the combatants, including the Vietcong.

Such talks are not doomed to end in disagreement and disappointment. After all, *both* sides are pledged to work:

First, for a return to the Geneva Agreement of 1954;

Second, for an end to hostilities and the withdrawal of all foreign troops and bases;

Third, for a neutral, peaceful, independent South Vietnam, free to determine in new elections its own political, economic, and social system, and its relationship or reunification with the North;

Fourth, for a government—if necessary (though neither Saigon nor the NLF has squarely faced this), a coalition government composed of all parties, as in the Laotian settlement of 1962—acting on behalf of all South Vietnamese citizens in accordance with the principles of universal suffrage, free speech, free worship, and meaningful land redistribution.

Agreement on the interpretation and implementation of these principles will not be reached quickly or easily. Such words as "freedom," "independence," and "neutrality" mean very different things to the two sides. Some form of international guarantees and supervision will be essential at least at the outset. But agreement should not be impossible.

Such an ending, while restoring South Vietnamese self-determination and preventing its conquest, would not leave the United States and its allies with any better position militarily than they had before the war began—but neither did the ending of the Cuban crisis or the Berlin crisis or even the Korean war. Such a settlement would also involve grave risks. It would endure only if both sides felt as a matter of practical self-interest that this kind of peace was preferable to war. Even then there would be no way of assuring the American people of the elimination of terrorists from the South, of the early departure of all American troops from Asia, or of the nonparticipation in the

South Vietnamese government of one variety or another of Communists. Indeed, there is *no* negotiated solution possible that would not lend itself to bitter attacks in the Congress and pose continuing dangers for the future.

Thus, whatever quantities of national courage, understanding, and unity are required on our part today to fight and accept the war in Vietnam, they will be needed in twice those amounts to find and accept the peace. But find it we must. While we cannot overlook any dangers, neither can we overlook any opportunities. A new opportunity may now be approaching in the holiday season. We have been able to arrange in recent years a Christmas cease-fire in Vietnam. If we plan and work for it now, we can be prepared this Christmas to have the firing cease forever.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business?

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PAY SCALE OF DEPUTY U.S. MARSHALS

Mr. **MONDALE**. Mr. President, the Senate will soon have before it for consideration legislation dealing with Federal pay increases. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is planning to submit an amendment that will make adjustments in the pay scale for deputy U.S. marshals.

Recently Mr. Robert L. Allie, executive vice president of the National Association of Deputy U.S. Marshals, furnished me with an informational sheet on the dangers inherent in the role of deputy marshal. I ask unanimous consent that this very short statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, DEPUTY U.S. MARSHALS,
October 25, 1967.

Deputies from the State of Minnesota were on duty in 1962 at Oxford, Mississippi during the "Ole Miss" riot and have participated in numerous other "special duty details" around the country since. The most recent being the anti-war demonstration which were held all over the country last week.

The deputy marshal has been the mainstay in all racial crises (Little Rock, Montgomery, Oxford, etc.) and the recent trial in Mississippi where history was made with the conviction of the perpetrators of a heinous crime.

In 1965 a deputy marshal was critically wounded in Minneapolis while making an arrest and after an eight hour operation to sew up the bullet holes and two weeks in the hospital was back on duty, within a short time, and has made numerous arrests since.

In 1966 a deputy mashall from St. Paul was assaulted with a gun, disarmed and kidnapped. After a long ride in the country north of St. Paul in the deputies car he got a chance to jump the man and after a bitter fight, during which the gun was discharged into the deputies car, he made the arrest.

In 1966 a deputy was running after a narcotic suspect when suddenly the man turned and fired three times at close range at the deputy. The deputy shot the suspect and he and other officers then effected the arrest.

In 1966 a deputy marshal in Minneapolis was shot in the right foot by a sniper who was never found. The deputy has since quit the department to take a local police job which pays more money.

There are many more incidents in which this small force of seven deputy United States Marshals have faced danger. Only one out of this group has not either been shot or shot at in the last two and one half years and this man was almost run over by a narcotic suspect's car two weeks ago.

Deputy marshals' lives are in danger every day in upholding law and order in the United States.

ROBERT L. ALLIE,
Executive Vice President.

THE REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK BILL

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Tuesday the Senate will take up the Redwood National Park bill, S. 2515. I have received a number of communications from people in my State of Oregon, and elsewhere, expressing divergent views on this legislative proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, in particular, I call attention to a comprehensive letter dated October 25 from Mr. Wendell B. Barnes, executive vice president of the Western Wood Products Association, of Portland, Oreg., Mr. Barnes, who served very effectively as Small Business Administrator several years ago, is a respected and able spokesman for his association. He has asked 11 cogent questions which I have submitted to the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It is my hope these will be answered as the bill is discussed in the Senate.

Other important communications from industry representatives, either opposing or expressing reservations concerning S. 2515, are included in the materials I am inserting in the RECORD today. Among them are letters from the Gilchrist Timber Co., Gilchrist, Oreg., the Simpson Timber Co., the Miller-Rellim Redwood Co., and the National Forest Products Association.

The views of conservationists concerning this legislative proposal are well expressed in communications I have inserted in the RECORD, brought to my attention by the Sierra Club; the American Forestry Association; the Izaak Walton League; the National Wildlife Federation; the North American Wildlife Foundation, and the Wildlife Management Institute. Letters and telegrams from Oregon conservationists, including Dr. George Selke, who has devoted scores of years of outstanding work in the cause of conservation, are also included in the materials I have inserted today. All of these items deserves serious consideration by my Senate colleagues.

EXHIBIT 1

WESTERN WOOD PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg., October 25, 1967.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: There may be some who would consider that those of us in Oregon might have no direct concern with legislative proposals involving redwood or California but this is certainly not the case. Three of the landowners affected are also Oregon taxpayers and employers, and as you know, we have 10,000 acres of redwood forest in Oregon. Since Oregon is the largest single producer of timber products among the fifty states, we must concern ourselves with any legislation which appears to be inimical to the best interests of the industry, the timber grower, the forest dependent communities, the taxpayers or the consumers.

S. 2515 is a new redwood park bill approved by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It might fall into that inimical category unless carefully studied and amended.

One concern is whether the authorization of $100 million for a redwood national park, having what is considered by proponents of the park to be an emergency priority, will supersede in priority appropriations for federal parks, seashores and recreation areas in Oregon and other states in various parts of the country where need for public recreation is more immediate. It is my understanding that bills have already passed both the Senate and the House authorizing parks which cost $400 million but that appropriations for all these projects are slow in forthcoming. This would mean delays in acquisition of these land areas in other states if the $100 million for the redwood park is moved to the top of the list.

Specifically, with respect to the Committee Report supporting S. 2515, there are questions which need answering before the bill is brought to the Senate floor for action:

1. S. 2515 presents a wholly new park proposal, parts of which have not been the subject of hearings. Shouldn't there have been appropriate opportunity for consideration of the views of local citizens, the companies affected, the State of California or officials of government agencies and local communities where jobs, schools and economic well-being are involved?

2. Has adequate consideration been given in the Report to the fact that 141,719 acres of coast redwoods (more than 200 square miles) are already in park and reserve status in the State of California? Won't many people receive the impression that there is an emergency endangering the last of the redwoods? This is simply not the fact, and legislation should not be hurriedly passed on that assumption.

3. What is the basis for the statement in the Report that "The Committee believes that no company which has a genuine interest in staying in the redwood timber business will be obliged to cease operations as a result of the enactment of S. 2515?" Apparently at least one company will have to cease operations there and others will be damaged.

4. Does the Committee have evidence to substantiate the Report's contention that "any initial adverse impact of the creation of the park on the local economy will be temporary?" I've heard some 600 jobs would be eliminated and service industries also affected. This is a fact which can and should be determined from officials in the communities directly affected.

5. Is it relevant with respect to S. 2515 to cite in the Report correspondence from the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Governor of California, and the Secretary of the Interior when all the letters in

question dealt specifically with earlier and much different national redwood park bills? Their opinions of this bill, S. 2515, should be available to the Senate.

6. Does the fact that the Report ignored months of negotiations between Federal and State officials, reported in the press, with respect to land exchanges mean that such agreements as had been reached will not be applicable under the park proposal in S. 2515? Isn't this a slap at the California State Administration which cannot be justified on the basis of fair and equitable dealing in relations between the Federal and State governments?

7. What are the actual figures with respect to quantities and values of redwood timber being cut or available for cutting on the Northern Purchase Unit? There is a variation between the statements by the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Forest Service as cited in the Report and published elsewhere.

8. Since S. 2515 takes almost double the estimated volume of timber out of useful production as compared with S. 1370, does not the Report fail to justify its assumption that "the impact of land acquisition will not materialize under the bill reported by the Committee?"

9. Since the Report indicates that federal acquisition of the key state parks is not necessary and that the Committee "does not feel it appropriate to condition the creation of the Redwood National Park on that event", and since all testimony of qualified witnesses leads to the conclusion that the private lands proposed for the park fail to meet the established criteria of quality for a national park, does not S. 2515 violate the legislative intent and policies of the National Park Service and the National Park Act (H.R. 15522, 64 Cong. 1 Sess. Stat. 39)?

10. Are the cost estimates of $100 million for acquisition of the park realistic and demonstrably true? Responsible estimates are more than twice that amount.

11. Does the Federal government plan any method of restitution to the displaced workers and their families, numbering as many as thousands, who will be deprived of their livelihoods on the Oregon border and will tend to gravitate to the nearest major centers in Oregon for job opportunities?

Although neither our Association nor I have any direct interest or responsibility for the management of redwood lands, I am most earnest in raising these questions, because I know you and other Senators are fully conscious of the direct correlation between productive land and timber resources, community stability, the deteriorating tax base or areas where private lands are withdrawn for exclusive recreational use, and the needs of our citizens and industry in the Pacific Northwest. These issues are briefly discussed by me in the editorial in the current issue of "Progress Round Up," our Association trade magazine.

As one of our leading Northwest citizens declared some years ago, "Recreation can supplement the economy, but it cannot become the economy." It would appear this truism is not reflected in the redwood park proposal approved by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Sincerely,

WENDELL B. BARNES,
Executive Vice President.

GILCHRIST TIMBER CO.,
Gilchrist, Oreg., October 26, 1967.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My telegram, which was sent to you on October 18th, concerning the Redwood Park Bill S. 2515 mainly requested a postponement until further study was done. Your reply requested special objections, which I will try to list. I am sorry for the delay in replying but I do hope this letter reaches you prior to October 31st.

Any action on the bill should be postponed so the effects of the bill, which is a brand new one, can be studied. Final action also should await recommendations from industry, the forest-dependent communities which are affected, counties and the state. We believe that employment and prosperity in the local communities will be seriously affected.

The cost of parks for recreation during the current budget review of civilian items should be carefully scrutinized.

The bill substantially shrinks the raw material base for the forest products industry at great public expense while demands for forest products for the nation's housing will constantly increase in the future.

Basically, this bill is not needed. The fact is that virtually all the truly park-like redwoods are already preserved. There are more than a million and a half trees of more than 8 feet in diameter on more than 115,000 acres of state parks. These are in the finest groves there are, and are enough huge trees to make a row from San Francisco to New York City. These are in 30 California state parks, and regional and district parks in the area contain another 14,688 acres with redwood stands.

There are a few park-like groves not already in parks, but these are being held by the industry and other private land owners for park acquisition. It is puzzling that proponents of a national redwoods park are not even urging the inclusion of these choice private groves. Private lands proposed for park status in the current bill do not contain the kind of stands which give the redwoods their fame.

The bill proposes expenditures of federal money to buy commercial timberland clearly not needed for park purposes.

As you know, some 43.5 percent of the land in the 12 Western states—52 percent in Oregon and 44 percent in California—is now in federal ownership. It is extremely doubtful that this percentage needs to be increased.

I personally do not believe we need S–2555, the bill which you introduced, which provides for a study by the Secretary of Interior of the Cascades in Oregon, ranging from Crater Lake to the Columbia River, to determine their potential as a national park or some other administrative unit of the National Park Service. I believe these lands are being competently managed by the Department of Agriculture through the United States Forest Service under the Multiple Use concept.

Yours very truly,

FRANK A. GILCHRIST,
President.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
October, 27, 1967.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

S. 2515 authorizes a Redwood National Park at an estimated cost of $100 million.

Contrary to the Interior Committee report this proposal will force Arcata Redwood Company out of business and have additional adverse effect on other companies and dependent communities. The cost will be at least double the authorization.

The proposed park boundary includes several thousand acres of young growth Redwood managed for sustained operations by Simpson Timber Company. This young growth is essential to support major long-term investments in the area and is of minor value to a redwood park.

There are alternative plans that would create a significant Redwood National Park and not severely damage the jobholders, communities, and investors in the area.

We strongly urge that you request S. 2515 be modified to achieve a good park at a reasonable cost to the taxpayer and still maintain industry and jobs in this rural area.

STARR W. REED,
Vice President, Timberlands, Simpson Timber Co.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
October 26, 1967.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I understand that at long last a sensible bill for a Redwood National Park (S. 2515) has come to the floor of the Senate, one which will incorporate and protect the finest groves. I also understand that a compromise has been worked out with the lumber companies which calls for an exchange of the so-called Northern Redwood Purchase Unit of 14,000 acres, and that the Forest Service is opposing this exchange. Since this tract is currently being logged, I see no reason for its remaining under forest service management other than bureaucratic self-protection.

I certainly hope that the bill will pass the Senate, and given the fact of adequate compensation having been arranged for the private companies involved, I trust it will receive your support.

Yours sincerely,

T. PRICE ZIMMERMANN.

LAW OFFICES, RAGAN & MASON,
Washington, D.C., October 25, 1967.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As Counsel for the Miller-Rellim Redwood Company we have heretofore corresponded with you in connection with the proposed Redwood National Park.

A bill has now been reported by the Senate Interior Committee. It is a considerable improvement over the previous bill, although too much land is taken from private interests. With the continued inclusion in the bill of an exchange of the 14,000 acre Redwood Northern Purchase Unit in Del Norte County, California, presently under custodial control of the Forest Service for the private lands taken, the Miller-Rellim Redwood Company can stay in business. As you know, the previous bill was fatal to their continuation.

Without going into other specifics of the bill it is the purpose of this letter to urge your support for the continuation of the exchange provision in this proposed legislation. We have briefly set forth below the arguments that have been made against the exchange and the arguments retaliatory thereto. We sincerely believe that the arguments against the exchange are specious.

1. The Purchase Unit has, in fact, been logged since 1954. The Secretary of Agriculture has, himself, stated the Unit is not park-like quality. Since the Redwood Park has become an issue no contracts have been let for logging in the Purchase Unit. Thus, the Unit is not suitable for park purposes and is allegedly only good for commercial use and is not being so utilized.

2. Without the Purchase Unit included not one but two companies may well have to close their doors.

3. Both the Sierra Club and Save-the-Redwoods League support the exchange provision.

4. The Forest Service states that if the exchange provision stays in public forest lands will be deprived from multiple-use management. The redwood companies are the leading multiple-use proponents in the Nation's forest industry and presently have over 365,000 acres so dedicated.

5. The Forest Service claims that it would eliminate valuable research and demonstration capabilities. The research heretofore

taken place has been limited to old-growth and continuation of virgin trees. If the bill passes as presently written this research would no longer be required.

6. The Forest Service claims the exchange provision would hurt the operators who have used the Purchase Unit. The fact of the matter is, the Purchase Unit has been closed for bidding since the issue of the Redwood Park was presented to Congress.

7. The Forest Service points out that the Purchase Unit is on a sustained yield basis. In private hands it would have to continue on a sustained yield basis.

8. Lastly, the Forest Service points out the exchange of lands, would be a dangerous precedent. It would be a dangerous precedent not to exchange the lands. The precedent involved is that never before has a National Park been superimposed over and to the destruction of an industry and jobs. Without the exchange provision this will be the result. Clearly, if we are to preserve our national resources, we have the same obligation to our people.

The Forest Service maintains over 186,000,000 acres of land. The 14,000 acres here involved constitutes less than one one-hundredth of this total. Yet in the State of California forty-eight percent (48%) of the land is now federally owned—twenty-two million acres alone by the Department of Interior.

The 14,000 acres is *de minimis* to these totals, but it is not *de minimis* to the people of Del Norte County, who must survive economically. Del Norte County is seventy-three percent (73%) owned by the Federal Government. If this 14,000 acres makes a difference of economic security to the people of that County the support of this exchange is mandatory and the exchange does make that difference.

I would be very pleased to discuss or substantiate any points set out above with you or any member of your staff with or without representatives of the Forest Service present.

Very truly yours,

RAGAN & MASON,
WILLIAM F. RAGAN.

[News from the National Forest Products Association, Washington, D.C.]

INDUSTRY ESTIMATES NEW SENATE REDWOOD PARK BILL WILL ACTUALLY COST DOUBLE AMOUNT IT AUTHORIZES

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 27.—Actual costs of a newly proposed redwood national park in Northern California will be more than double the $100 million authorized by the Senate Interior Committee and would be considerably more if the proposal to exchange federal lands is rejected.

This estimate was announced here today by Mortimer B. Doyle, Executive Vice President of National Forest Products Association, for the five redwood timber companies whose land would be taken under the new 66,384-acre park plan. He termed the bill's $100 million authorization ceiling "totally unrealistic."

S. 2515 calls for a two-unit park in Humboldt and Del Norte Counties. It was approved earlier this month by the Senate Interior Committee after consideration of three differing park proposals. Floor action is expected next week.

Doyle stated that current value of the 32,989 acres of private land to be acquired is "well over $100 million." Since one of the companies involved has publicly announced that the park would force it out of business, he asserted, resulting damages to a permanent operation would bring private property acquisition costs to more than double the $100 million authorized.

The industry's cost figure reflects the bill's recommendation that the 14,567-acre federal Northern Purchase Unit near the Klamath River be exchanged with private land owners to ease the adverse economic impact locally.

Without the exchange provision, Doyle warned, a second large redwood manufacturing company would be crippled and costs of the park would "rise tremendously."

He valued the Purchase Unit somewhere between the $60 million estimate given by a Senator sponsoring the bill and the $10 million value set by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Doyle listed other federal costs totalling $66.4 million that have been linked with the national park by the Bureau of the Budget in both Senate and House Interior Committee testimony:

Development, $30 million: companion grants-in-aid, $15.4 million; accelerated road-building in Six Rivers National Forest to aid local timber operators, $11 million; new park road between the two units, $6 million; accelerated National Forest recreational facility development, $3 million; coastal parkway right-of-way acquisition, $1 million.

To the costs of S. 2515, now up above the $300 million range, Doyle said, must be added such hidden costs as increased financial aid to the economically depressed areas, loss of tax income at all levels of government and serious local economic side effects. He warned of the harmful aspects of underestimating the costs to the people of the area and cited the original $14 million authorization for nearby Point Reyes National Seashore, which five years later is now estimated to be in excess of $60 million.

"No one but the people directly involved has yet considered in dollars the crippling effects on the families, companies and the communities that will lose a substantial part of their timber economy base," Doyle asserted.

"The excessive loss of producing forest lands embodied in S. 2515 means even more personal and economic hardship in an area that is already classified as a depressed area," he added.

He emphasized that the present Senate bill makes no provision for in lieu payment of tax losses in Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, where the federal government already has large holdings. An in-lieu clause, designed by the Administration to ease local impact of the park, was stricken from the new Senate bill.

"The industrial timber growers whose properties are taken for a park will receive a fair payment under constitutional provisions," Doyle said. "But the thousands of people in the two areas dependent on the redwood industry will receive nothing when their livelihoods are taken away by this bill."

Doyle held that the industry's preliminary estimates of potential costs of the park may be conservative because many of the details are not yet available to the companies.

SIERRA CLUB,
Mills Tower, San Francisco,
October 20, 1967.

Hon. WAYNE LYMAN MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As I am sure you know, few opportunities remain anymore in America to create classic national parks. Most have already been set aside. For over a century, however, there has been a notable omission: California's coastal redwoods.

For three years now debate has focused on the remaining opportunities to rescue some of the surviving redwoods for a Redwood National Park. We have advocated a national park centered on Redwood Creek, while others have pointed to other areas. Recently, the Senate Interior Committee reported out a bill that attempts to resolve the differences through a composite plan. While it is not optimum, the bill does as good a job as probably can be done at present in extending protection to superb and endangered redwood forests. We believe, however, that the ceiling on authorized size should be raised to 70,000 acres (from 64,000 acres) to permit flexibility in fleshing out the boundaries in certain areas of Redwood Creek. We believe this can be done within the leeway implicit in the authorized price of $100 million.

The key to the financing of the compromise bill of the Committee is use of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit, which the federal government now owns, on an exchange basis to acquire needed parkland. This 14,000 acre tract north of the Klamath River was purchased in the early 1940's by the Forest Service as part of a now defunct program to acquire enough lands for a Redwood National Forest of 863,000 acres. Because of a failure to gain necessary monies, this unit stands as a lone remnant of an admirable but abortive effort. However, the value of the unit has appreciated from the $440,000 paid to between $30–$75 million today. These Forest Service redwoods are being logged, with the timber sold to private concerns, and the receipts remitted to the federal treasury. The unit itself does not lend itself to park management. The Committee felt, and we agree, that it makes good sense to phase out this abortive redwood program to enable the National Park program to succeed. No adverse precedent is intended as these lands are not regular national forest lands and have never served their intended purpose.

We understand that a vote may come on this bill in early November. We would welcome the opportunity to talk this matter over with you and your staff. Our Conservation Director, Michael McCloskey, will be in Washington soon and will call upon you.

Sincerely yours,

EDGAR WAYBURN, M.D.,
President.

[Copy of telegram]

OCTOBER 27, 1967.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

We support a Redwoods National Park and are looking to you to uphold the outstanding conservation record of your administration as well as long established policy that National Forest lands of this country not be used as trading stock in support of unrelated Federal programs. Specifically, we are opposed to provisions in the current Redwood National Park Bill which would exchange National Forest lands for private timber lands. We can see no purpose in subordinating the broad public interest to the pressures of some California interests.

American Forestry Association, Kenneth Pomeroy, Chief Forester; Boone and Crockett Club, John E. Rhea, Conservation Committee Chairman; Izaak Walton League of America, Joseph W. Penfold, Conservation Director; National Rifle Association of America, Frank C. Daniel, Secretary; National Wildlife Federation, Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Director; North American Wildlife Foundation. C. R. Gutermuth, Secretary; Sport Fishing Institute, Philip A. Douglas, Executive Secretary; Wildlife Management Institute, Ira N. Gabrielson, President.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
October 9, 1967.

Mr. PHILIP R. GEORGE,
Care of Senator Morse's Office,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. GEORGE: May I please prevail upon you to convey the following information to Senator Morse as promptly as possible:

It has come to my attention that efforts are being made by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to have the Committee endorse the proposition espoused by Governor Reagan of California to approve the exchange of National Forest lands in California for privately owned lands which would be included in a proposed redwoods national park. Opposition to this proposal has been expressed by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Chief of the Forest Service.

It is my opinion that the proposal of Senator Jackson is indeed very unwise and would set a most dangerous precedent for future similar actions. It would mean that every time a federal agency would find it necessary to acquire private lands for any project whatsoever, it would merely recommend that lands in National Forests, the Bureau of Land Management, or any federal lands wherever located, could be transferred in exchange for the privately owned lands desired. This would mean that such new projects would not need to justify their actual outlays.

All of us recall the recent incident which involved BLM lands in the Stoddard-Getty episode. The tendency in such exchanges is usually in favor of those who "have" and not in favor of the general public, especially those who "have not". The general public, as you know, was strongly opposed to such action.

I thank you for your willingness to bring my point of view to the immediate attention of Senator Morse. I am sending you this message in my capacity as a private citizen.

Sincerely yours,

George A. Selke.

The American Forestry Association,
Washington, D.C., October 26, 1967.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: We are concerned about a provision in the Redwood National Park bill, S. 2515, to use national forest land in the Redwood Purchase Unit as payment in kind for private lands desired for park purposes.

This Federal land was acquired by the Forest Service under the Weeks Act of March 1, 1911 for the practice of multiple use, sustained yield forestry. It is being managed efficiently for this purpose. Trading this land for other land to be used as a park will defeat the purpose for which national forests are established.

The annual harvests of timber from the Redwood Purchase Unit supports ten small lumber companies and their employees. One-quarter of the receipts from timber sales, a substantial sum, goes to Del Norte County in lieu of taxes. This 25 percent fund exceeds the amount of taxes received from comparable land in private ownership.

Therefore, it is clear that giving four large landowners this Forest Service land will not benefit the local economy. It merely aids four large companies at the expense of ten small companies.

Neither will such an exchange improve the tax base of Del Norte County.

Of even greater concern is the precedent to be established by such action. It will open the flood gates to demands by all sorts of special interests and land grabbers. Some of these already have appeared.

Consequently, we urge you to delete all references to the Redwood Purchase Unit from S. 2515 and to preserve this tract for the purposes for which it was acquired.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth B. Pomeroy,
Chief Forester.

Department of Agriculture,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, October 20, 1967.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Morse: You will shortly be considering S. 2515, a new bill to establish a Redwood National Park. The Department of Agriculture actively supports the establishment of such a Park.

However, this Department vigorously and strongly objects to the feature of S. 2515 which would use National Forest land as trading stock to obtain land for the Park. This commandeering of the National Forest land in the Redwood Purchase Unit is not necessary in order for the Nation to have a Redwood Park.

Using National Forest land for trading stock in this important case endangers land administered by the Forest Service all over the country. It threatens the integrity of the National Forests, a principle of long-standing.

It would open the floodgates. Right now, and repeatedly in the past, there have been made demands in other parts of the country that National Forest lands be used to pay for parks, or for reservoirs, or for highway rights-of-way. Any and every instance of such a taking of National Forest land makes the later pressures that much harder to resist.

This is why past actions of Congress have resoundingly rejected use of National Forest land for this kind of trade-off.

There are other reasons for not appropriating these National Forest lands to pay for Parks:

1. Savings derived from trading off the National Forest land would be a small part of the total cost of the proposed Park. On an acre-for-acre basis, the value of the National Forest land in the Purchase Unit, estimated at $25 million, falls far short of the value of the old-growth groves proposed for inclusion in the Park. This is a very small sum to endanger a very basic principle of conservation.

2. The four main companies involved do not need the limited acreage of land that could be made available to them in order to continue operating for a significant number of years. The company that would experience the greatest impact could continue at its present rate of operation for 15 years or longer.

3. A move to make these companies partially whole would be at the cost of withdrawing supplies now used by smaller operators who buy the stumpage that would be transferred to the four larger, stronger companies. In recent years, 10 operators in the area have used the timber that this action would turn over to only four large companies. Thus, a trade-off of land would not create any new jobs. It would favor four large companies at the expense of 10 smaller ones.

A Redwood National Park is in the national interest. The USDA supports strongly that objective. But a raid on the National Forests and the establishment of a dangerous precedent in violation of long-standing, sound conservation principles is neither necessary nor wise.

Sincerely yours,

Orville L. Freeman.

Portland, Oreg.,
October 26, 1967.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing to urge you to support S. 2515—with, hopefully, an increase in acreage to at least 70,000. Also, although I see some reason to object to the purchase unit trade feature of the bill I hope that you will not oppose this too strenuously if such opposition might seriously damage the chances for passage. It seems to me to be already very late for the establishment of a Redwood National Park.

Sincerely,

J. B. Roberts.

Corvallis, Oreg.,
October 28, 1967.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage of Redwood National Park bill S. 2515 including proposed Redwood National Forest Timberland Exchange. Bill is in best public interest except park should be larger.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Frenkell.

Bend, Oreg.,
October 28, 1967.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We sincerely hope that when it reaches the Senate floor you will support S. 2515 as reported by Senate Interior Committee including the purchase unit exchange, but hopefully with the Redwook Creek unit increased by a minimum of 10,000 acres to include the Emerald Mile and other desirable contiguous areas.

Phil and Jo Chase.

Hood River, Oreg.,
October 26, 1967.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your support of bill S. 2515. We believe the exchange clause of bill should be maintained but that size of park should be increased to 70,000 acres.

Dr. and Mrs. D. L. Coyier,
Mr. and Mrs. L. R. Steeves.

Corvallis, Oreg.,
October 28, 1967.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The new bill to establish the Redwood Park S. 2515 is worthy of your support. However, at least 70,000 acres should be added to the proposal including the emerald mile and the Lower Redwood Creek area. Also the purchase unit from the forest service must be kept in the bill.

Thomas Will.
Diana Dietz.

Eugene, Oreg.,
October 26, 1967.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing to lend my support to two conservation measures that will soon be before you. One, the Redwoods of Northern California need saving and I believe Senate Bill 2515 is a reasonable compromise. Even though some land will need to be either traded for or purchased, I believe it is to the public good that this be done.

The other bill I am particularly interested in concerns the North Cascades National Park in Washington. I am familiar with this area and it is extremely rugged and beautiful. Fortunately little timber is involved for so much of it is near or above the timber line. I am convinced that it could be developed as a park so that many could enjoy it and I know of few natural areas that deserve to be saved.

Sincerely,

Ewart M. Baldwin.

Mount Angel College,
Mount Angel, Oreg., October 25, 1967.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Please support the general plan outlined by the Senate Interior Committee regarding the Redwood National Park (S. 2515), but, if possible, try to increase the size to the least 70,000 acres. We urge you, also, to vote to keep the Exchange of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit in the plan.

We feel that conservation of our few remaining natural resources, especially those of such beauty and grandeur as the redwoods, is of vital importance to our country, and we urge you to support conservationists in every way possible.

Once again we want to express our appreciation for your stand against the Johnson war policies.

Sincerely,

Leland and Amelda John.

Silverton, Oreg.

Portland, Oreg.,
October 26, 1967.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We urge your support of S. 2515 and modifying it to increase the size to at least 70,000 acres. It seems to us important to keep the Purchase Unit in the plan. We hope this will at long last secure a Redwood National Park.

Respectfully yours,
Carroll S. Higgins.
Lucile H. Higgins.

October 23, 1967.

Subject: Redwoods National Park.
Hon. Henry M. Jackson,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Board of Directors of the Izaak Walton League, which represents the Nation-wide membership, held its regular fall meeting over the past weekend. The Board discussed the Redwoods National Park proposal and your Committee bill S. 2515, one of the key conservation issues of the 90th Congress. Copies of the bill and the Committee Report had previously been distributed.

The Board was highly commendatory of the Committee for working its way through all the complexities of the issue and reaching agreement on a workable plan for a worthwhile National Park.

The Board unanimously agreed on the following points:

1. To support the Committee's recommended two-unit Park;
2. To support full funding for acquisition of lands for the Park;
3. To oppose use of the Northern Redwoods Purchase Unit as trading stick for lands to be acquired.

The League over the years has supported and now supports land exchanges when that serves to block upholdings, to achieve more effective and efficient administration and management or to eliminate undesirable inholdings. The League as consistently has opposed proposals to use national forest lands as payment in kind when Federal acquisition is necessary for other projects of broad public interest. The League does not believe that the choice lies between a national park on one hand and national forest lands on the other—both are needed. Rather, the League believes that the Country can afford to acquire directly the lands necessary to establish the National Park approved by your Committee.

The League's opposition to one provision of S. 2515 in no way detracts from our evaluation of the Committee's accomplishment in reporting out this important measure.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. Penfold,
Conservation Director IWLA.

Salem, Oreg.,
October 26, 1967.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support acquisition of Redwood National Park by purchase rather than exchanging national forest lands.

Oregon State Rifle Association.

Portland, Oreg.,
October 26, 1967.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge enthusiastic support of S. 2515. Modify to increase Redwood National Park to at least 70,000 acres. For instance, increase protection of stream side area with wider buffer zone. National redwood purchase unit exchange important for partial funding of park and should be supported.

Leslie Squier.
Anne Squier.

Portland, Oreg.,
October 26, 1967.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support S. 2515. Urge expansion to 70,000 acres purchase unit exchange seems wise.

William Blosser.

Portland, Oreg.,
October 25, 1967.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your strong support S. 2515 Redwood National Park. Would recommend increase to 70,000 acres plus retention purchase unit exchange Forest Service land to preserve more Lower Redwood Creek and Emerald Mile Area.

James W. Gamwell.

Portland, Oreg.,
October 25, 1967.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We favor the Redwood National Park concept; are opposed to the exchange of our National Forest land for this accomplishment.

Richard L. Hubbard,
President, Oregon Division, Izaak Walton League of America.

Corvallis, Oreg.,
October 25, 1967.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I encourage you to support the new Interior Committee Redwood Park bill, S. 2515, with the modifications advocated by the Sierra Club to increase the size of the park to a minimum of 70,000 acres.

Sincerely,
Richard B. Norgaard.

DISSENT ON VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Columnist Howard K. Smith pointed to the unilateral escalation of America's domestic critics in his Sunday offering in the Washington Star. His column, in fact, makes a good point: that the dissenters in our own country have been so carried away with their own arguments that they have convinced themselves, that they tailor facts to fit their preconceived notions, that their dissent feeds on itself to grow ever larger in its irrationality. They have caused a general degeneration of the so-called debate over U.S. policy, Mr. President, and seem to be debating, not the administration, but a bogey man of their own making.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Howard K. Smith's column, "The Unfair War Dissenters," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Unfair War Dissenters

(By Howard K. Smith)

The impression is being cultivated that both sides in the Vietnam "debate" have now escalated their arguments beyond the level of fairness and that together they threaten the nation's moral fabric. Both, says James Reston, should now "elevate them guns a little lower."

In fact, equating the two is a false exercise. It is the dissenters alone who have departed from reason and fairness. It is the baby doctor from Ohio and the preacher from Yale who have encouraged young people to stop thinking and break the law—not their opponents. Consider the great contrast between the quality of the two demonstrations of last weekend—Doctor Spock's in Washington and that in New York by the Committee for Responsible Patriotism. Guess which of the two got the most television coverage?

Administration supporters have said that the hysterical dissenters are encouraging Ho Chi Minh to pile higher the mound of lives on which to build his ideological empire. Hanoi promptly confirmed it and set up a committee for liaison with its American sympathizers.

Secretary Rusk made the unoriginal point that China has made herself the essential enemy, a fact confirmed daily by Peking. Marshal Lin Piao, Mao's heir-designate, said in his party line-setting treatise that "the colossus of U.S. imperialism can be split up" and "destroyed" by methods invented and supplied by Peking.

If their success has been limited so far, intimidation may become more forceful when China soon gets her stock of nuclear weapons. Mr. Reston finds that "silly" and has dredged up the Kaiser's old racist and demagogic cry of "Yellow Peril" to discredit Mr. Rusk, perhaps the least race-minded of U.S. officials. The two arguments are not equal. One is fair and the other is not.

The quality of dissent attains a kind of peak in Walter Lippmann's arguments. Mr. Lippmann has published an essay proposing that we get out of Asia and put our forward base in Australia instead. The thought is attractive and I vote for it. But first I want some minimal reasoning to show that we won't, because of such a move, have to fight a much worse war a little later.

Mr. L. doesn't provide any such reasoning, and the thinking he does on the way to his conclusion is not convincing. He says, for example, that Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy kept us out of a big war in Vietnam, and that it was Mr. Johnson who violated the American tradition (by the way, what tradition?) and got us into it. That is about as sound as praising Presidents Coolidge and Hoover for keeping us out of World War II and criticizing President Roosevelt for breaking with tradition and getting us into it.

He says "it has always been axiomatic that we must exert our power offshore and must never allow ourselves to get sucked deeply onto the mainland." Where does this piece of history come from? U.S. forces brought the decision in World War I, but there is no record that they remained in boats afloat in the North Sea. Did the D-Day invasion of 1944 really not happen? Were the Greeks and the South Koreans stimulated to keep their independence by armies of Americans cheering from offshore? This is a world of dreams fashioned to fit a thesis; not a thesis designed to fit the world.

Mr. L. says that we are fighting a "war to exchange casualties with the inexhaustible masses of the Asian continent." By my count we are a nation of nearly 200 million people and we are fighting a nation of 17 million people with its quarter-million recruits in the South. It may be that Lippmann has predicted China would come into the war so often that he has persuaded himself that it is a fact.

The degeneration of the "debate" on Vietnam is a unilateral act. The irrational little mob who assaulted the Pentagon (fewer, by the way, than the number of young Americans who volunteered for the armed services in the same month) and those respectable pundits who provide them with a theoretical justification, have to de-escalate. Nobody else has escalated.

THE BUTTER SUBSIDY BILL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., one of the largest processors of dairy products in the world, has given strong support to S. 2527, which I introduced a short time ago in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial, contained in their October 1967 publication Smoke Signals be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Land O'Lakes Supports Butter Subsidy Bill

Land O'Lakes Creameries came out with strong support for the bill introduced today by Senator Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.). The bill would empower the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage the movement of surplus butter into commercial domestic consumption instead of into government storage by effecting a reduction in prices to consumers by payment made to processors of butterfat used in butter.

Lank O'Lakes supports the Mondale bill, according to D. H. Henry, General Manager, because they believe that dairy farm income could better be strengthened by providing payments to processors, which would make possible a decrease in the consumer price of butter—actually a "consumer subsidy".

Land O'Lakes believes that the Senator's bill will prevent butter from piling up in government hands and enable butter to move in domestic markets.

Under Mondale's bill the existing dairy price support would be continued with the Secretary of Agriculture announcing the price support level per hundred weight of milk to the dairy farmer in the same manner that he does with the current price support program.

But this bill adds a new feature. If commercial butter markets become sluggish, this legislation would enable the Secretary to take remedial action. But, instead of purchasing butter in the market to support the price as he does currently, he could reduce the retail price to encourage the purchase of all butter production by consumers. Consumers would accordingly have the benefit of lower retail prices.

There would be no government purchases or storage except to the extent that the Secretary might wish butter to fill government program requirements.

Mondale called attention to the fact that during World War II a similar program maintained milk production to meet wartime needs. Prices to plants and consumers were fixed at relatively low levels and payments were made through plants to encourage dairy farmers to maintain their production.

In 1945, while this program was in effect, the per capita consumption of butter was nearly 11 pounds. At present prices and competitive conditions commercial consumption of butter is scarcely 5.5 pounds.

One of the oldest economic concepts of the dairy industry is that butter is the economic balance wheel. A strong butter market is necessary for the maintenance of the prices of fluid milk and other dairy commodities for all dairy farmers. A surplus of milk-fat above immediate market requirements for other products is manufactured into butter.

Land O'Lakes spokesmen note that figures show that as the spread between the price of substitutes and butter widens, butter consumption drops.

In calling for the passage of the Mondale bill, Land O'Lakes notes that the main problem of the dairy industry is butterfat. They believe that Senator Mondale's bill will move butter into the domestic consumer market, benefiting the farmer with a greater income and the consumer with a lower retail price for butter.

A similar program of direct consumer subsidy on butter in Canada has been very successful in increasing the per capita consumption of butter over the past few years.

ALEXANDER WILEY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it was with sorrow that I learned of the death last week of Alexander Wiley, a good friend, a colleague of many years, and former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I knew Alexander Wiley, who was chairman of the committee from 1953 to 1955, as a hard-working, conscientious, and fair leader. He enjoyed hard struggle in support of his beliefs, but he never stooped to unfair or dishonest tactics. His willingness to give fair treatment and hearing to those who espoused positions contrary to his own was one of his most admirable qualities.

Alex Wiley was a man of warmth and deep affection. He loved his family, his Senate, and his country.

His bouncy step, often heard in the corridors of the Senate even after departure, will be missed.

I offer my condolences to his wife, Dorothy, and the members of his family.

"PASSING UP THE PORK"—A SENSIBLE APPROACH TO BUDGET CUTTING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recent congressional moves tend to strengthen the feelings of those of us who say that public economic policy is the key to current economic ills. More people—lawmakers and constituents alike—are coming upon the dichotomy between what is happening in the Government sector and what is going on in the private sector. They see Government continuing to undertake expensive but low-return projects, at the same time that predictions multiply of an impending inflationary spiral accompanied by low-capacity utilization and rising unemployment levels.

The present economic dilemma is often simplified as a guns and butter trade off. But, we can have both—if returns to investments justify the commitment. Government policies which misallocate resources by employing unrealistic investment evaluations must be eliminated.

One area in which Government policies have created significant dislocations is the huge and expensive public works program. Government cost-benefit analysis has employed what economists term an unrealistically low discount rate. The result has been gross overinvestment in public works projects as well as increasing inflationary pressures—because these low-return projects compete for scarce resources with many other higher return investments—and lower economic growth.

However, the picture seems to be changing. Given a choice between a tax increase and lower public works expenditures, the public would opt for spending cuts. The slats of the pork barrel are falling off; the long-used argument of political suicide by advocating public works budget slashes is proving untrue.

According to an article in last Friday's Wall Street Journal:

> The old fashioned pork barrel seems to be suffering a decline in relative esteem.

The voter is realizing the need for some sort of Government spending priorities. Budget cuts cannot be indiscriminate. There must be some system to show relative payoffs of alternative proposals. Congress must act as soon as possible to rectify policies which justify wasteful investments. And Congress must also establish a rational and realistic ordering of budget needs.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article entitled "Passing Up the Pork," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Passing Up the Pork: Legislators, Home Folk Quietly Accept Freeze on Public Works Plans—Many Agree the Pet Projects Should Yield to Economy—School Aid Is Still Sought—But Some Continue To Fight

(By Arlen J. Large)

Washington.—A $368,000 contract for an anti-erosion job on a beach at Hunting Island, S.C., is on the list of public works ordered "frozen" by President Johnson in the Government's current budget squeeze.

"Local interest is high," warns the Army Corps of Engineers in its confidential inventory of the frozen projects. "Efforts have extended over several years with local money now available. Considerable public criticism anticipated."

Yet South Carolina's two Senators so far have heard no cries of outrage from the area, and neither has the Congressman from that district, Democrat Mendel Rivers. "The people down there are willing to take their medicine," says Mr. Rivers.

The largest project on the Engineers' freeze list is an $8.2 million contract for construction of the Rend Lake Dam in southern Illinois. The home folks aren't in revolt, reports Democratic Rep. Kenneth Gray, "because I've assured them that it's only temporary; the President doesn't intend to stop the project."

Both Reps. Rivers and Gray are quick to stress the great worth of these vital projects, and both think the freeze is a bad mistake. But their relatively docile response points up a significant shift in Congressional and public attitudes toward the supposedly alluring morsels in the traditional "pork barrel."

NEW FASHIONS IN SPENDING

Dams, watershed projects, river dredging, new Federal buildings and the like have historically been symbols of a lawmaker's influence in Washington, and they still are. But in recent years new fashions in Federal spending have boosted the relative glitter of cash for schools and colleges, aid in fighting water pollution and more generous benefits for veterans and the elderly.

Until lately, Uncle Sam has bestowed the old and new kinds of Federal bacon with roughly equal generosity. But both Congress and the public now face hard choices about Government spending priorities, and the old-fashioned pork barrel seems to be suffering a decline in relative esteem.

Democratic Sen. Jennings Randolph of West Virginia, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, says he has heard only scattered grumbling from colleagues about the $66 million in frozen Corps of Engineers projects. In contrast, "nearly every Senator" has beefed to him about the Administration's threatened stretch-out of highway construction funds, he says.

"A dam that helps prevent a flood can be vital," observers Sen. Randolph, "but there's a detachment about that kind of project that you don't get with money for highways or schools. Those things are more personal to people than regular public works."

UNPUBLICIZED CUTBACKS

The idea that people have become disenchanted with old-style pork can surely be overdrawn; the Corps of Engineers hasn't widely circulated its list of frozen projects, and the lack of protest may be due partly to ignorance. But consider the experience of Democratic Rep. Richard Fulton with his celebrated Federal courthouse annex in Nashville, which comprises the bulk of his district.

Early this month Mr. Fulton asked the Budget Bureau to deter construction of the $8 million annex "in the interest of economy and the economic health of the nation." The gesture was hailed for its novelty on a national TV news show, and Mr. Fulton received praise in newspaper editorials across the land. He also is receiving a freshet of favorable mail from Nashville and elsewhere.

Wrote a Federal employe who works in the existing cramped courthouse: "I would much rather continue working in this building than to see this money being spent at a time when we sorely need to economize."

"Please let me know when you need some campaign money from a Republican source," offered a man in Bronxville, N.Y. A Kingsport, Tenn., lawyer sent a $1 contribution toward a "Richard H. Fulton memorial statue "

AN ORDER OF PRIORITIES

Mr. Fulton says he hasn't received a single complaint about delay of the courthouse annex. He makes clear his own priorities for economizing: "It doesn't include the things that affect the health and welfare of the individual." He says he never would have suggested a cutback in school-aid money for his district or lower outlays for the heart-cancer-stroke research center in Nashville.

Some other lawmakers are also showing untraditional restraint on certain public works projects for their home districts.

Each year the Administration sends Congress a list of Corps of Engineers rivers and harbors projects for which money is needed. The mark of a successful lawmaker is to get his own pet unbudgeted projects added to the final appropriations bill. Last July Democratic Sen. John Pastore of Rhode Island wrote a note to Chairman Allen Ellender of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee on public works asking him to insert $80,000 for an "essential study" of repairs to the Cliff Walk, a scenic seaside footpath near Newport threatened with wave erosion. Sen. Ellender, a Louisiana Democrat, obliged.

By the time the public works appropriations bill reached the Senate floor this month, however, the atmosphere had changed. The President's request for a tax increase had been rebuffed; lawmakers had worked themselves into an economy lather, at least in their speeches. Republican Sen. John Williams of Delaware moved to delete from the bill unbudgeted funds for the 41 projects that various Representatives and Senators had added. Voting with Mr. Williams, and thus against the "essential" Cliff Walk project, was Sen. Pastore.

Sen. Pastore says that because of the budget situation, "We should set an example by eliminating all projects that may be desirable but not essential." He is insisting, though, that the Cliff Walk money shouldn't be taken out of the bill unless the other unbudgeted projects are removed. "I don't want to be discriminated against," he says. "After all, that $80,000 isn't going to balance the budget."

Another liberal Democrat, Sen. Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, also voted for the Williams amendment, though it would chop a small project in his state. It's a question of priorities, he told the Senate, urging higher outlays against urban poverty and crime: "To me that should have a higher priority than any public works project," he declared.

Still, the more reserved Congressional attitude toward the pork barrel is far from a wholesale reversal. In fact, only nine other Senators voted with Sens. Williams, Proxmire and Clark for cutting out the unbudgeted projects. And of the 41 other projects then in the bill, 19 have since survived a House-Senate conference on the measure; included is the Cliff Wall project.

Long-standing proposals for some projects have almost assumed a political life of their own, which lawmakers can't ignore; Sen. Carl Hayden fights in peace and war for his beloved central Arizona water supply project; Maine's Congressional delegation is ready to bleed for the hotly disputed Dickey-Lincoln School power dam; Republican Sen. Hiram Fong of Hawaii laments denial of funds to put more sand on Waikiki Beach and vows to try again next year.

COMPLAINTS MAY MOUNT

Though there has been little squawking so far about the President's freeze of nearly $66 million on contracts for Corps of Engineers projects, complaints may mount as the suspension of work continues. "We've not had too much repercussion," reports a corps official. "A delay of only a couple of weeks can't make much difference. But it will start hitting harder as time goes on." Warns the tolerant Rep. Gray, discussing the frozen contract for Rend Lake Dam in Illinois: "If Congress adjourns and then comes back in January to find the freeze still on, it will be a different story."

When the newer, more glamorous varieties of "pork" are threatened, the howls can be lusty. The new Federal program for fighting water pollution—a popular cause with the voters—consists mainly of grants for local sewage treatment plants. The Senate increased the Administration's $203 million appropriation request for this year by 10%, and lawmakers accusing the President of stinginess already are talking about an extra appropriation early in the next session.

Neither of California's Senators has complained about the freezing of some small old-fashioned levee and flood control projects in their state. But both exploded when West Virginia's Sen. Randolph and his coal-state colleagues proposed a cut in nuclear reactor research money. The cut would have set back the new nuclear-powered ocean water desalting plant scheduled for construction south of Los Angeles. The successful plea of liberal Republican Thomas Kuchel and conservative Republican George Murphy: Cut something else.

JUSTIFYING PROJECTS

The current budget pinch has encouraged a louder assault on the Corps of Engineers' traditional method of justifying rivers-and-harbors projects: The cost-benefit ratio. For a 50-year period, a project must show a return of more than $1 in benefits for every $1 spent or face rejection. Such critics as Democratic Sen. William Proxmire of Wisconsin contend the benefits often are inflated and costs are minimized in computing cost-benefit ratios.

Yet the corps' own figures helped doom a famous symbol of pork-barrel enterprises—the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River canal, also known as "Mike Kirwan's Ditch." Pushed for years by Youngstown's Democratic Rep. Michael Kirwan, the $1 billion-plus project originally carried a rather impressive 3-to-1 cost-benefit ratio. But the engineers revised estimates downward, and the canal's many foes in Ohio and Pennsylvania contended the latest ratio of 1.2-to-1 was too low. Mr. Kirwan sadly dropped the project this year when Gov. Raymond Shafer of Pennsylvania formally notified the corps he wouldn't cooperate on the project.

A low cost-benefit ratio isn't always fatal. The current public works appropriation bill provides an unbudgeted $150,000 for planning the control of natural salt pollution in the Wichita River in Texas. The project strongly backed by local officials, has a cost-benefit ratio of 1.1 to 1.

Nor is a high ratio a guarantee of success. The corps calculates Sen. Fong's Waikiki Beach project would bring benefits of $15.90 for every $1 spent on spreading more sand and building erosion-control devices. That, says the frustrated Senator, is one of the highest ratios for any proposed project. The high benefits are attributed to more tourist business for nearby hotels if the famous beach is enlarged.

BUTTER LEGISLATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Dairy Record, the No. 1 trade magazine for the dairy industry, in its October 18, 1967, issue editorialized on S. 2527, the so-called butter legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that this very favorable editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDS INDUSTRY SUPPORT

The bill introduced by Senator Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota to subsidize the price of butterfat used in butter, which would make it possible to reduce the retail price to encourage its use by consumers, is one that should receive the dairy industry's full support and endorsement.

The measure, in effect, is a consumer subsidy and it is legislation that every major dairy organization throughout the country has endorsed.

While, at this writing, we have not seen a copy of the Mondale bill, the salient points of it are that it empowers the Secretary of Agriculture to move surplus butter into commercial domestic consumption rather than into government storage by effecting a reduction in price to consumers by payments made to processors of butterfat used in butter.

Another feature of the bill is that the existing dairy price support program would be continued with the Secretary of Agriculture announcing the price support level per hundredweight of milk to the dairy farmer, as under the present support program.

However, something additional has been added in the Mondale bill. If commercial butter markets drag, the secretary, instead of buying butter in the market to support price, could reduce the retail price to encourage butter purchases by consumers. There would be no actual butter purchases or storage, except that which is needed to fill the requirements of the government programs.

It will be recalled that during World War II, prices of butter were rolled back and a subsidy was paid to dairy farmers through the plants. At that time, the dairy industry was critical of the Roosevelt Administration because of the rollback in butter prices, because consumers came to regard the rollback prices as what the real price of butter should be. Consumers, of course, did not take into account that a subsidy was being paid.

The situation then and now, however, is very much different. Even during rationing in 1945 while the program was in effect, the per capita consumption of butter was almost 11 pounds. At today's prices and competitive conditions, commercial consumption is about 5.5 pounds per capita.

The butter industry, during and immediately after World War II, was in a much healthier condition. Today it is in a surplus situation because of an unfortunate series of incidents, such as the cholesterol theory jag, the diet craze, the encouragement that the government has given to the oleomargarine industry and also the government's stubborn refusal to do something about imports until this country became a dumping ground for subsidized foreign dairy products.

LAW OF THE SEA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in June of this year a Second Annual Summer Conference of the Law of the Sea Institute was staged at the University of Rhode Island. Among the participants was William C. Herrington, former Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Fisheries and Wildlife.

Mr. President, I found the paper delivered to the conference by Mr. Herrington to be extraordinarily informative. Even though I have become reasonably familiar with the Geneva Convention on Fishing and the Conservation of the Living Resources of the Sea, as chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, I found reading Mr. Herrington's paper to be so educational that I would like others to have the same opportunity. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Herrington's paper, entitled "The Future of the Geneva Convention on Fishing and the Conservation of the Living Resources of the Sea," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE OF THE GENEVA CONVENTION ON FISHING AND THE CONSERVATION OF THE LIVING RESOURCES OF THE SEA

(By William C. Herrington)

Last year at the first Rhode Island Law of the Sea Conference, at the end of my paper on the "1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation of Living Resources" I commented as follows:

"Now, eight years since the Geneva Fisheries Convention was negotiated, we must admit that much of the world has not yet caught up with its provisions, in practice at least. With this in mind the U.S. has recently begun to talk up a proposal that the FAO convene a World Fishery Conference that would consider, among other fishery matters, how the convention could be most effectively implemented and encourage more ratifications. Such a conference could also consider auxiliary procedures, such as the development of joint enforcement measures, which would make the provisions of the Geneva Convention more effective."

I understand that the informal reaction to this sounding out from fisheries people of other countries has been something less than enthusiastic. You should keep this reaction in mind in connection with some of my later comments on the possibility of improving the convention.

I have been asked to discuss at this Conference the future of the Geneva fisheries convention. I propose to approach the subject by first considering what countries have ratified the convention, speculate on the reasons behind their action, and then discuss the possibilities of further accessions and the likely motivating considerations. This will point up some of the strengths and limitations of the convention and the modifications needed to make it more effective. It will also provide a background for evaluating the possibility of achieving these modifications and, failing this, the possible alternatives.

WHO HAS ACCEPTED THE CONVENTION

As of June 1, 1967, the following countries were parties to the Geneva Fisheries Convention: Australia, Cambodia, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Finland, Haiti, Jamaica, Malagasy Republic, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Switzerland, Tobago, Trinidad, Uganda, U.K., U.S.A., Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The combined catches of these countries in 1965 made up about 14% of the World total. Three of the countries accounted for more than ⅔ of this 14%, the next four accounted for about ⅕, while the remaining 18 produced about ⅛. The average catch of the 18 was about 50,000 m.t. each. Only the first three countries, together accounting for about 10% of the World total, generally would be classed as major fishing countries.

Why have these countries become parties to the Convention? I expect mostly because they favor the development of an international fishery regime based on law and order and consider the Fisheries Convention, while not fully satisfactory, is an improvement over the existing situation. Few of them will have their current problems substantially helped or hindered by the Convention in its present form. The majority I expect made no sophisticated analysis of the impact of the Convention on their long range fishery interests.

NOW LET US CONSIDER THE NONMEMBERS

The reasons why these countries have not become parties to the Convention are more varied and perhaps in many cases more deep seated than the reasons for most ratifications.

One group led by the USSR presumably favors most of the provisions of the Convention. However, the members of this group will not accept the requirements for obligatory settlement of differences concerning the conclusions to be drawn from scientific data bearing on the need for and nature of conservation measures. (Yet without this provision each country if it desires to prevent or delay action on regulations, is free to bicker as long as it wishes regarding the conclusions that should be reached concerning conservation requirements.)

There is another group of countries made up largerly of coastal states which would like to have broad jurisdiction over the fishery resources in waters adjacent to their coasts. They do not join primarily because they fear that such accession would handicap their efforts to develop such broad jurisdiction.

A third group is made up of conservatives, mostly sophisticated European fishing countries (and Japan), which hold back official recognition of any special rights of the coastal states for fear it will adversely affect their overseas fishing operations. However, some of this group with substantial coast lines (and coastal fisheries) of their own may be experiencing growing internal conflicts as their long range fishing operations are increasingly and effectively challenged by competition from relative newcomers to long range high seas fishing, and their coastal fisheries suffer increasingly from the aggressive operations of these same newcomers. If the position of such countries should change, it probably would be to support measures that would give substantially more protection to established inshore fisheries than does the present convention.

There is still a fourth group which is made up of countries that generally favor the provisions of the Convention but are not at present involved in any serious fishing controversy or, if they are, do not see that the Convention would provide any near time help in solution of their current problems. Since the Convention has not been accepted (and is not likely to be) by an overriding majority of countries, including most of the substantial fishing countries, its provisions do not have the force of international law. They apply only to those who are members of the Convention and this group does not include most of the parties to current major fishing disputes. In such disputes the Convention at best serves as a guide or precedent. For this reason the party to the dispute whose position is most at odds with the general provisions of the Convention, is less than ever inclined to join up for fear of strengthening the position of the other party. Meanwhile this other party can see little to be gained from joining since the provisions of the Convention would not be binding on the non-member.

Countries not involved in fishing disputes generally lack urgent and practical incentives for accession. In such situations we often find action on accession rather low on the priority lists of their Foreign Offices where it must compete for attention with more pressing and in their view more practical matters.

If fishery disputes could be taken to the World Court for settlement in fact as well as in theory, some countries would have a substantially greater incentive to accede to the Convention, for the greater the membership the more influence its provisions would have on the Court. However, such disputes rarely reach the Court for one party or the other which is dubious of the soundness of its case under international law (as influenced by the 1958 Law of the Sea Conference and resulting Convention), refuses to make use of the services of the Court.

To substantially alter this membership situation would require some new development that would provide a practical incentive for immediate action (such as the discovery of gas and oil in the European continental shelf did for the Continental Shelf Convention). At the moment I do not see such a development on the near horizon and therefore conclude that we are not likely to soon see any substantial number of new accessions, certainly not enough to give the Convention the force of international law.

For these reasons the principal effect of the Convention will continue to be its moral and technical influence. By and large countries will continue to seek solutions to their fishery problems through bilateral and multilateral agreements which from time to time may borrow provisions from the Geneva Convention. For example, the setting up of an independent committee of experts in population dynamics by the International Whaling Commission, which played a key role in initiating a realistic conservation program for the Antarctic whale stocks, could not have been engineered except for the precedent of the 1958 Geneva Fishing Convention. (Progress on this program has been seriously handicapped by enforcement problems.) Furthermore, because of the status of the Convention, deriving from its origin in a Law of the Sea Conference convened by the UN and the strong support it received at that Conference, most responsible fishing countries involved in fishery controversies will seek to develop positions which are not inconsistent with the general provisions of the Convention.

LIMITATIONS ON EFFECTIVENESS

The primary limitation on the effectiveness of the Convention stems from the limited membership I have just discussed. However, even should this limitation be removed by a flood of ratifications, other serious limitations would remain.

One of the most serious is the lack of provision to handle the problems generated by large numbers of fishing vessels operating together in fleets. Such fleets have the capacity to rapidly concentrate tremendous fishing power on one area or stock of fish, and just as rapidly to shift this power successively to other areas at distant or intermediate points. Where the fish stock is relatively limited in numbers such a concentration can rapidly reduce the availability of fish to a level indicating severe and at least localized and temporary overfishing. If this stock is relatively independent of the stocks in other areas it may take years to recover. If there is considerable intermigration between this stock and those in nearby areas, it will recover more rapidly, provided adequate conservation measures are adopted and the other stocks are not similarly reduced. The mobile fleet of large vessels is not particularly handicapped in this situation for it can move to other areas (provided massed fishing intensity has not similarly over-fished these areas). However, the smaller, short range coastal vessels may be severely affected, for they must continue to make their living from the nearby fishing grounds. Under this system the massive long range fishing fleets presently would dominate the coastal fisheries even though they may not provide the best means for harvesting the resources, either economically or socially.

This is a relatively new problem, at least in the Western Hemisphere, and the Fisheries Convention provides no remedy. It cannot be argued in defense of this new fishing method, at least when the coastal fishery already is making full use of the resource, that large boat fleet fishing will add to the World food supply, nor can it generally be argued per se that such long range fishing is more economic than coastal fishing. Unless effective provisions can be developed and applied which will prevent long range fishing operations from destroying or seriously damaging coastal fisheries, many countries will look to other vehicles than the Fisheries Convention for a solution to their problems for I do not believe that the countries of the world will allow the general destruction of coastal fisheries by fleet fishing. For those interested in securing full utilization of the World's fishery resources to feed a hungry World the problem will be to secure a solution that gives adequate protection to coastal fisheries without resulting in extensive under utilization of the coastal resources.

A second major shortcoming of the Fisheries Convention is the lack of enforcement provisions. Under the present convention even when countries through painstaking research, long drawn out discussion, and painful and sometimes debilitating compromise, finally reach unanimous agreement, there is no machinery for assuring the enforcement of the measures agreed upon. This defect is becoming increasingly important as long range fishing operations increase and fishing vessels operate at long distances from their own coasts and the fishery enforcement vessels of their own country. Efforts to secure agreement on joint enforcement measures, which would increase immeasurably the prospects for effective enforcement, have been unsuccessful except in the case of a few specialized fisheries (North Pacific Fur Seal Convention and the International North Pacific Convention in cases involving abstention. Under these conventions arrests for violation can be made by any Party, but prosecution takes place in the flag country.) The U.S. delegation to the 1958 Geneva Conference on Law of the Sea sounded out the prospects for including provisions for joint enforcement in the Fisheries Convention but encountered such strong opposition that no formal proposal was made. About the most that can be said of efforts since the 1958 Conference to secure agreement on joint enforcement provisions is that in some instances there has been partial agreement in principle, but none in practice. (Very recently efforts in the North Atlantic seem to be making limited progress.) In the absence of agreement on measures for international enforcement, joint enforcement, or at least effective international observers, the world must depend on the honor system. By and large international honor systems have left much to be desired. Furthermore, even when the will is present, it generally is impossible for a country to control in detail the activities of its fishermen when they operate thousands of miles away off the coasts of other countries.

A third limitation on the effectiveness of the Fisheries Convention stems from delays in getting agreement on and implementation of needed and effective conservation measures, particularly when one or more of the parties wishes to prevent or delay any restriction on the operations of its fishermen. This limitation is similar in kind but substantially less in degree than that in most present international fishery agreements. The drafters of the Fisheries Convention strove mightily to resolve this problem, and they did so up to a point. There are many ways of stalling. Perhaps the most sophisticated is to require an absoluteness of supporting evidence which as a practical matter is impossible to achieve or which requires such a span of time and expenditure of scientific skill and financing that excessive damage is done to the resource before agreement is reached and implemented. The Antarctic whale resource is a striking example. The groundfish of the NW Atlantic may be another.

The Geneva Fisheries Convention pioneered a number of measures designed to resolve this problem. Time limits are set for reaching agreement on necessary conservation measures and provision is made for referral of the question to a special commission of experts when the time limits are not met. Furthermore, in urgent situations in coastal waters, the Coastal State is authorized to regulate unilaterally pending a determination by the special commission. These provisions of the Fisheries Convention are a great advance over preceding fishery agreements and probably would assure a speed of decision-making generally adequate for fishery developments of ten years ago. However, the tempo of fishery development and exploitation has accelerated since then, and with increasing attention being directed to utilization of the ocean's resources the acceleration is likely to continue.

Now to sum up the limitations on the effectiveness of the Convention: First of all and most important, the parties to the Convention are not at present adequate in number and makeup to give it the status of international law. Consequently its provisions for determining conservation measures and expediting action can be applied only among those party to the Convention. They make up a relatively small club which does not include both or all of the participants in most of the current and urgent international fishing problems. Unless this shortcoming can be remedied, then other modifications to make the Convention more effective will have no very great impact.

Correction of the other principal shortcomings—control of the impact of massive long range fleet fishing on developed coastal fisheries, international enforcement provisions, and speeding up action on needed conservation measures, all require modifications which would make the Convention less acceptable than at present to some countries. Thus efforts to strengthen the provisions of the Convention to a substantial extent operate at cross purposes with efforts to increase membership. If time were available as in the past to laboriously work toward these improvements they might in time be accepted. However, the rapidly growing world population with its pressure for more food and other raw materials which the sea can supply (at a price) is not likely to grant time as in the past for the slow evolution of international fishery procedures.

As science and engineering develop economic means to make use of the ocean's resources pressures will increase to establish a legal system that will make such use practicable. We are seeing how rapidly this is taking place with resources of the continental shelf once the family of nations settled the jurisidction problem in a way that made it practical and attractive for investors to commit large sums of money and brains to exploration and development of the latent resources of the sea bed. The problems of development, management, and control of the ocean's resources increase rapidly in complexity as we move from mineral resources, to immobile living resources (example: pearl oysters), to living resources which move in constant contact with the sea bed (king crab), to living resources which swim but within a relatively restricted area (flounders), to those which roam over great areas of the high seas (skipjack). Neverthless, I have no doubt that man will learn to develop and manage these resources with suitable allowance for their intermingling stocks and overlapping ranges in such a manner as to maximize the overall yield. Where actual "sea farming" is possible (increasing the productivity of a stock of fish, invertebrates, or sea weed, through improved breeding, feeding conditions, environment, etc.) experience teaches us that the responsible individual or organization must have control of the operation and of the harvest if the project is to realize its potential. If we are to succeed to any major degree in realizing the great potential of the oceans about which so much now is being said. I would judge that both international law and domestic law must evolve toward a greater degree of individual or group ownership, or at least control. The longer and more bitterly the overseas fishing countries (those who fish principally off the coasts of other countries) resist this development the more extreme and arbitrary the final solution is likely to be.

The World appears to be ready, in a scientific and technical sense, for a major advance in fuller utilization of the resources of the oceans. Perhaps the principal remaining legal (or political) question regarding jurisdiction is: will this problem be resolved "de facto" or "de jure"?

JUDGE ADVOCATE SERVICE AND ADMISSION ON MOTION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the October 1967, issue of the American Bar Association Journal contains an article entitled "Does Judge Advocate Service Qualify for Admission on Motion?" written by H. Thomas Howell, of the Maryland bar, a young attorney who was graduated from Princeton University with an A.B. in 1959 and from the Yale Law School with a LL. B. in 1962.

Mr. Howell's thesis is that State bar admission rules permitting the admission on motion of attorneys admitted in other States who have practiced in good standing for a specific term, but precluding inclusion of military legal experience in the computation of the specified term, are based upon the erroneous and unreasonable preconceptions that military legal experience is of little value and is not professionally the equal civilian legal experience.

I commend this article to my fellow Senators most strongly, not only because Mr. Howell is a promising attorney, who has served both as law clerk to Judge Simon E. Sobeloff, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and as a member of the Army Judge Advocate General's Corps, but because he states the case for abolition of this discrimination against military lawyers most persuasively. I heartily endorse the arguments Mr. Howell propounds, and invite Senators to read his excellent support brief.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Howell's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Does Judge Advocate Service Qualify for Admission on Motion?

(By H. Thomas Howell)

The professional career of William H. Babcock began in typical fashion: success on the Maine bar examination, admission to practice and long hours as a fledgling attorney. Then came the Korean conflict, and his private practice was curtailed by a summons to active duty. Determined to pursue his calling as a lawyer, he accepted a commission in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Air Force. During the next ten years he performed legal assignments at military bases in the United States, Norway and Morocco. In 1962, deciding to resume civilian practice, Babcock resigned from the Air Force and departed with his family for Sitka, Alaska, where he promptly moved for admission to the Bar.

Like thirty-eight sister states and the District of Columbia, Alaska does not require a written examination of attorneys licensed elsewhere who have actively practiced for specified period of years[1] and who comply with standards as to residence, age, education and character. No constitutional mandate compels a state to make this concession.[2] Whether authorized by statute or by rule of court, admission on motion is a matter of comity—a principle by which one jurisdiction confers the privilege upon a practitioner licensed in another. Professional fitness is measured in terms of actual experience instead of by formal examination.[3]

In contrast, a minority of eleven states[4] continues to impose written examinations upon all out-of-state applicants, irrespective of demonstrated competence. The ostensible purpose is to promote high standards protective of the public, but a cynic might wonder if the public shield does not conceal a sword against unwanted competition.[5] It may or may not enable the local Bar to "gain a momentary respite from the pressure of events by the simple expedient of shutting its gates to the outside world".[6]

But even though Alaska officially recognizes comity, its gates remained shut when Babcock applied. The Board of Law Examiners rejected his petition and an appeal to the Supreme Court of Alaska met with this response:

> We do not believe that it can be reasonably said of a lawyer in the military service, even though he be assigned to do work only of a legal nature, that he is engaged in the business or profession of practicing law. His business or profession while in the Armed Forces, as we see it, is that of being a soldier, a man in the service of his country.[7]

As far as his chosen profession was concerned, Babcock might as well have been piloting jets or requisitioning supplies. What he did in fact is outlined in the court's own opinion:

> His practice of law in the Air Force was a full-time assignment as a Judge Advocate and encompassed a wide range of legal endeavor. He participated in almost a thousand trials, as either prosecutor, defense counsel, or law officer (judge). He acted as legal advisor to staff agencies and took part in contract negotiations, tax matters and administrative hearings.[8]

If a record as comprehensive as Babcock's falls short of "practice of law", then it surely follows from the court's pronouncement that many lawyers in military service are wasting their careers. This could be said of any one of the 3,000 judge advocates in the Army and Air Force and legal specialists in the Navy who fully constitute 1 per cent of the entire profession and who regard themselves, now and forever, as an integral part of it; or of bygone gentlemen (Major Henry Wheaton, Brigadier General Hugh S. Johnson, Major Henry L. Stimson, Lieutenant Colonel Patrick Hurley) and scholars (Colonel John H. Wigmore, Major John Chipman Gray, Colonel Edmund P. Morgan) who, as lawyers in uniform, were assuredly lawyers in fact; [9] or even perhaps of Major Felix Frankfurter, the reserve judge advocate with a healthy contempt for "pipsqueak colonels".[10] The indictment is conceivably broad enough to embrace a Deputy Judge Advocate General who later became Chief Justice of the United States, although his biographer assures us that "Valley Forge was a better training for Marshall's peculiar abilities than Oxford or Cambridge might have been."[11]

The military segment of the profession deserves greater consideration than the *Babcock* decision accords to it. Only a few months earlier, the Supreme Court of New Mexico had no qualms in holding, under a rule similar to the Alaska statute, that a career judge advocate had "actively and continuously practiced law" in the Army.[12] The Alaska court was aware of the latter ruling and actually cited it in its own opinion. Nonetheless, it fastened its own independent value judgment upon the comity statute and wound up "finding no reasonable basis for enlarging the words 'practice of law' as used in the proviso to include the performance of legal work assigned by the Judge Advocate General . . .".[13]

The Alaska legislature has since responded with an amendment which pointedly includes "legal duties as a member of one of the Armed Services" within the statutory definition of "practice of law."[14] While the sting of the *Babcock* decision is gone, the value judgment may yet linger to cloud the interpretation of comity rules in other jurisdictions.

In fairness to the Supreme Court of Alaska and those inclined to its viewpoint, it may be said that military service has not always been conducive to bona fide practice. Fighting men have been slow to realize why anyone should "appear before a general Court Martial to interrogate, to except, to plead, to teaze [*sic*], perplex and embarrass by legal subtilities [*sic*] and abstract sophistical distinctions".[15] We need not go far back into history to find hideous examples of drumroll travesties, duly presided over by judge advocates. Within the legal profession itself there is persistent doubt and speculation whether the Uniform Code of Military Justice, for all of its paper reforms, really amounts to much in practice.[16] Even lawyers with charitable dispositions are prone to conceive the function of judge advocates solely in terms of the court martial.

Downgrading the defense establishment and scorn for the military mind have become so traditional that few among us are prepared to swallow whole the notion that law practice can actually thrive in such other-wordly conditions.[17] The less this branch of practice is understood, the easier it is to indulge in abstract criticism of lawyers engaged in it. This article does not urge the admission on motion of every military applicant who tenders the fee. Nor is it directly concerned with the droves who enter the Judge Advocate General's Corp to discharge minimum service obligations[18] and then flee back to civilian life at the first opportunity.[19] Rather, the suggestion here is that lawyers who devote their prime years and talents to military practice and contribute to its development should not be penalized without consideration of the realities of such practice. If the benefits of comity are to be withheld from lawyers in uniform, it at least seems incumbent upon the decision-makers to eschew preconceived value judgments and to acquaint themselves with the facts of legal life in the Armed Services.

---

[1] Usually five years of prior practice. Two years are required in Montana; three years in Arkansas, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, Utah and Vermont; seven years in New Mexico and Texas; eight years in Pennsylvania; ten years in Rhode Island.

[2] Admission to the Bar of one state confers no reciprocal right to practice in another. *Petition of Avery,* 44 Haw. 597, 358 P. 2d 709 (1961); *In re Rodgers,* 194 Pa. 141, 46 Atl. 668 (1900); *Application of Stone,* 77 Wyo. 1, 305 P. 2d 777, *cert. denied* 352 U.S. 1026 (1957). It is not regarded as a constitutional "privilege or immunity". *Bradwell* v. *Illinois,* 16 Wall. 130 (1873).

[3] *Petition of Jackson and Shields,* 95 R.I. 393, 187 A. 2d 536, 539 (1963).

[4] Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Louisiana, Nevada and New Jersey. Attorney's examinations are required in California, Oregon and Washington.

[5] Dalton & Williamson, *State Barriers Against Migrant Lawyers,* 25 U. Kan. City L. Rev. 144 (1957); Note, 98 U. Pa. L. Rev. 710 (1950). See also, Note, *Attorneys, Interstate and Federal Practice,* 80 Harv. L. Rev. 1711 (1967).

[6] *Edwards* v. *California,* 314 U.S. 160, 173 (1940).

[7] *Application of Babcock,* 387 P. 2d 694, 697–698 (Alaska, 1963).

[8] *Id.,* 694–695.

[9] Fratcher, *History of the Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army,* 4 Mil. L. Rev. 89 (1959).

[10] Phillips, Felix Frankfurter Reminisces 114–115 (1960). Frankfurter attributed to a former Judge Advocate General "one of the best professional brains I've encountered in life". *Id.,* 59.

[11] 1 Beveridge, The Life of John Marshall 119 (1916).

[12] *Lanning* v. *State Board of Bar Examiners,* 72 N.M. 332, 383 P. 2d 578. (1963), noted 49 A.B.A.J. 1015 (1963). See also *Warren* v. *Board of Bar Examiners,* 409 P. 2d 263 (N.M. 1966) (attorney for the Atomic Energy Commission with prior experience as a judge advocate).

[13] *Application of Babcock, supra* note 7, at 698.

[14] Alaska Stat. § 08.08.245(4) (1966 Supp.). See *In re Payne,* 36 Law Week 2078 (Alaska, 1967) (legal service as attorney for United States Army Corps of Engineers constituted "active practice of law" for purposes of admission on motion to Alaska Bar).

[15] General James Wilkinson, speaking in 1809 as Army Chief of Staff. Wiener, *Courts Martial and the Bill of Rights: The Original Practice,* 72 Harv. L. Rev. 1, 28 (1958). Such attitudes find no favor in the military hierarchy today. Hamlett, *A Commanders' View of the Judge Advocate,* 50 A.B.A.J. 533 (1964).

[16] Compare, Keefe & Moskin, *Codified Military Injustice,* 35 Cornell L.Q. 151 (1949) with Ward, *UCMJ—Does It Work?* 6 Vand. L. Rev. 186 (1953), and White, *The Uniform Code of Military Justice—Its Promise and Performance,* 35 St. John's L. Rev. 197 (1961).

[17] *E.g., Washington ex rel. Laughlin* v. *Washington State Bar Association,* 26 Wash. 2d 914, 176 P. 2d 301, 311 (1947) (Army legal career "interesting" but incompatible with "practice of law").

[18] Nearly 80 per cent of all newly commissioned judge advocates resign after a single tour of duty and therefore lack the requisite years of practice for admission on motion. See note 1, *supra.*

[19] Often in fear that they would be missing the "real" practice by remaining in uniform. For conflicting viewpoints of young judge advocates over the nature of military practice, see letters appearing in 53 A.B.A.J. 204, 507, 508 (1967). These fears are heightened by knowledge that civilian jurisdictions do not always recognize military practice in their comity rules. This accounts in part for the mass exodus from the Armed Services of many of its promising lawyers and is cause for constant soul-searching on the part of those who do remain.

Excellent literature is available on the subject to anyone willing to consult it.[20] Suffice it to say that all judge advocates are lawyers, selected because they are lawyers and entrusted with assignments that only lawyers can handle. To qualify for a commission today, a candidate must compile a superior record in an approved law school and be admitted to practice before his state's highest court. Competition is intense; three out of four who qualify must be turned away.[21]

Once commissioned, the military lawyer accumulates practical experience at the same rate as his civilian brethren. At some point in service he may participate in courts martial but will more often than not be deeply involved in civil-oriented fields of law. Depending upon his particular assignment, a judge advocate may be called upon to draft wills, contracts and leases for service personnel and their families; to advise them in state and federal tax matters, commercial transactions of all kinds, voting and civil rights, and the whole gamut of divorce, adoption and naturalization proceedings;[22] to analyze patents; to supervise the award and preparation of multimillion-dollar procurement contracts; to render advice as to union representation and labor disputes on government installations; to instruct commanding officers and staff agencies as to their statutory duties; to settle claims by and against the government; to prepare litigation briefs; to represent the Armed Services before civilian boards and commissions; to interpret treaties and apply precepts of international or domestic foreign law to the myriad situations arising from our far-flung global commitments.[23] No one judge advocate does all of these things, of course, but many of these challenges do occur in the course of extensive service.

In short, opportunities to cultivate a well-rounded legal background or to perfect a specialty do exist in fact. It would be an overstatement to say that all make the most of these opportunities. The military segment of the profession has its share of time-servers and dilettantes who manage somehow to survive annual efficiency reports and periodic reductions in force. At the same time, no civilian Bar is immune from parasites or more diligent in its efforts to weed them out. Practice in a military environment is neither a badge of incompetence nor an absolute guarantee of qualification for admission on motion. It does provide a suitable basis for inquiring on a case-by-case basis into what the applicant has actually accomplished.

In some states, comity admission is denied if the applicant lacks trial experience.[24] Judge advocates rarely argue cases in *civilian* courts, conduct of Armed Services litigation being vested in the Department of Justice.[25] It is usually a judge advocate who puts the case together for trial or who drafts the brief; he may sit at the counsel table as a trial consultant. Some Navy lawyers do appear before admiralty tribunals, and, now and then, a judge advocate is court-appointed to represent an indigent accused in a civilian proceeding.[26] However, the general court martial is still the primary forum for the art of advocacy. It remains a unique institution, but one which has matured so rapidly as to constitute a major achievement of the modern legal profession. No fair-minded observer would deny that the safeguards afforded the accused, the procedural steps from arrest to final review, and the range and vigor displayed by counsel on either side compare favorably with any state or federal prosecution.[27] (Surely the scores of civilian attorneys who have participated would resent any inference that *they* were not practicing law while so engaged!)

Even assuming for agrument's sake that court-martial practice falls short of trial experience, should a lawyer in uniform—or any lawyer, for that matter—be precluded from demonstrating that his over-all proficiency renders him eligible for comity admission? Few would disagree that trial participation is a reliable gauge of professional worth. But there are many other ways to measure up as a lawyer. It is as true now as it was thirty years ago that:

> Court litigation constitutes but a small fraction of the work of the legal profession today. It would, I believe, amaze even us, the members of the legal profession, if we could obtain a reasonably accurate appraisal of the volume of court litigation as compared to the volume of general legal business, to find out how small a part it plays in the practice of law today.[28]

Many able practitioners seldom, if ever, engage in trial work.[29] As we regret the declining pre-eminence of the trial lawyer,[30] we tend to venerate the ideal. Yet, for all our nostalgia, we "suspect that the romantic vision of the old-fashioned barrister as a knight in shining armor, ready to try any lance offered to him, was never quite so true in the United States, as we like to think".[31] Formal distinctions between barristers and solicitors vanished long ago from our jurisprudence.[32] Why conjure up ghosts for the sake of comity admissions?

A more serious impediment to military lawyers is the rule enforced in several jurisdictions calling for actual practice in the state of admission. Frequent assignment changes and widely scattered tours of duty make it impossible for judge advocates to sink roots in any one spot, much less the state of original admission. After prolonged absence, contacts there may be more sentimental than real.

Construed literally, the single-state test could be used to exclude lifelong practitioners, military or otherwise.[33] Viewed in broader perspective, it is but a sensible maxim that lawyers performing under the vigilance of local judges and fellow attorneys are usually better risks for admission on motion than will-o'-the-wisp migrants. All that is intended, one court has said, "is to have the applicant put to the test of the reputation which he would acquire in five years in one locality".[34]

Without sacrificing this purpose, comity among states is also capable of being applied to the federal system and to those who practice in it. As a practical matter, the Armed Services constitute a self-contained jurisdiction important both in terms of population and territory.[35] For lawyers practicing within it, professional reputation is at once a subject of constant scrutiny and a matter of official record. Choice of assignments, promotion and retention depend upon it. A judge advocate may be sent from place to place, but a thoroughly documented file goes with him, and so do the studied opinions of his associates. He does not fit the description of "the unsuccessful lawyer, who, having failed to make good in one jurisdiction, determines to try his luck in another".[36] Why, then, should he be casually lumped together with the drifters, the misfits, the disbarred and the other flotsam and jetsam against which the comity rules were purposely designed?

Gone is the era when the likes of Colonel Winthrop could arrive at a new duty station and be admitted to the local Bar a few weeks later.[37] Nor are we likely to witness another spate of legislation such as followed World War II, when fourteen states waived bar examinations for all veterans and fifteen granted comity solely on the basis of military service—*any* kind of service.[38] The present generation of lawyers in uniform has sought neither concessions nor waivers but simply forthright recognition as professional equals.

---

[20] Murray, *The Military Practice*, 50 A.B.A.J. 938 (1964); Walsh, *Can the Military Cope with Thirteen Books?*, 50 A.B.A.J. 67 (1964); Davis & Wiley, *The Life and Work of an Army Judge Advocate*, 7 STUDENT LAW, J. 6 (1962); Hodson, *The Judge Advocate Lawyer*, 34 BAR EXAM. 56 (1965); Bracken, *Remarks*, 29 BAR EXAM. 43 (1960).

[21] Murray, *supra* note 20, at 939.

[22] The legal assistance program, cosponsored by the American Bar Association, has at present an annual caseload of 1,000,000 in the Army alone. Winkler, *Legal Assistance for the Armed Forces*, 50 A.B.A.J. 451 (1964).

[23] See, *e.g.*, Auerbach, *The Military Lawyer in the Republic of Vietnam*, 53 A.B.A.J. 63 (1967).

[24] "Actual practice in the highest court of original jurisdiction provides a crucible for testing legal knowledge and its practical application in behalf of clients." *Application of Plantamura*, 149 Conn. 111, 176 A. 2d 61, 62 (1961), *cert. denied* 369 U.S. 872 (1962) (trial work an absolute prerequisite to admission on motion). But *see In re Hunt*, 230 A. 2d 432 (Conn. Sup. Ct. 1967) (salaried corporate house counsel eligible for admission on motion). Maryland recently abandoned such a trial-work requirement. See text accompanying note 48, *infra*.

[25] 5 U.S.C. § 306 *et seq.*

[26] Counsel for petitioner in *Escobedo* v. *Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478 (1964), was an Army judge advocate at the time of his appointment. Hodson, *supra* note 20, at 59.

[27] See generally, Warren, *The Bill of Rights and the Military*, 37 N.Y.U.L. REV. 181 (1962); Note, *Constitutional Rights of Servicemen Before Courts-Martial*, 64 COLUM. L. REV. 127 (1964); Wiener, *The Army's Field Judiciary System: A Notable Advance*, 46 A.B.A.J. 1178 (1960); Melnick, *The Defendant's Right To Obtain Evidence*, 29 MIL. L. REV. 1 (1965); Christensen, *Pretrial Right to Counsel*, 23 MIL. L. REV. 1 (1964); Maguire, *The Warning Requirement of Article 31*(b), 2 MIL. L. REV. 1 (1958).

[28] Clark, *Limitation of Admission to the Bar*, 23 A.B.A.J. 48 (1937).

[29] "Under the growing problems and complexities confronting clients today, many outstanding lawyers devote themselves exclusively to office work, and refer court matters to counsel experienced in this field of the law." *Application of Plantamura*, 22 Conn. Sup. Ct. 213, 166 A. 2d 859, 862 (1960) (patent lawyer nonetheless held ineligible for admission on motion; *In re Hunt*, 230 A. 2d 432) Conn. Sup. Ct. (1967) (corporate house counsel eligible).

[30] Rhoads, *The Lawyer's Image*, 51 A.B.A.J. 621 (1965); Kaufman, *The Trial Lawyer: The Legal Profession's Greatest Asset*, 50 A.B.A.J. 25 (1964).

[31] Rostow, *The Lawyer and His Client*, 48 A.B.A.J. 25, 27 (1962).

[32] *Id.*, 28. "No valid distinction can be drawn between the part of the work of the lawyer which involves appearance in court and the part which involves advice and the drafting of instruments." *State Bar Association* v. *Connecticut Bank & Trust Co.*, 145 Conn. 234, 140 A. 2d 863, 870 (1958).

[33] This at present is the state of affairs in four jurisdictions. See note 50, *infra*. The rule in Rhode Island also require practice in the state of admission, but this requirement has been waived in the case of qualified military lawyers. *In re Shields' Petition*, 192 A. 2d 430 (R.I. 1963), noted 49 A.B.A.J. 1014 (1963).

[34] *Edmonds* v. *Webb*, 182 Md. 60, 32 A. 2d 702, 703 (1943) (interpretation of former Maryland rule). See also, *In re Hunt*, 230 A. 2d 432, 434 (Conn. Sup. Ct. 1967) ("continuity of exposure").

[35] *Lanning* v. *State Board of Bar Examiners*, *supra* note 12 (legal assignments at various military bases constitute practice of law within a single jurisdiction).

[36] Riordan, *The Itinerant Attorney With a Past*, 23 A.B.A.J. 15, 17 (1937).

[37] The esteemed military scholar was admitted on motion by the Supreme Court of California in 1883. Prugh, *Colonel William Winthrop: The Tradition of the Military Lawyer*, 42 A.B.A.J. 126, 129 (1956).

To achieve this end, the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association adopted the following resolution in 1959:

Whereas, The American Bar Association is advised that many lawyers, who have completed their service with the Armed Forces of the United States during which they were primarily, if not exclusively, engaged in the general practice of the profession of law and who are already admitted to practice before the bar of one state, have been denied admission to practice before the bars of certain states under existing reciprocity agreements of admission on the theory that they are not entitled to cumulate, for length-of-practice purposes, the time spent practicing as a military lawyer with the time spent practicing as a civilian lawyer;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, That the American Bar Association urges that the appropriate authority of the several states, in determining the length-of-practice under reciprocity agreements on admission, give credit for the practice of the profession while in the Armed Forces by those lawyers who otherwise meet the requirements for admission under reciprocity agreements.[39]

Behind the energetic leadership of John P. Bracken [40] and its present chairman, Frank B. Gary, the Standing Committee of Lawyers and Legal Services in the Defense Establishment has endeavored to carry out this noteworthy commitment.[41] The success of this committee—composed of civilians—is mirrored in the wide-scale response to its unflagging efforts.

It is always easier to define an issue than to solve it. For all the committee work, the resolution would have become a dead letter [42] without the voluntary intervention of bar examiners, lawmakers and judicial bodies at state and local levels. From a mere handful, the number of states granting some form of recognition to military lawyers has grown steadily. It now represents a clear-cut majority (thirty-one in all), according to a recent informal poll of bar admissions officials in the thirty-nine comity states. Eight of them [43] have adopted rules or statutes which expressly authorize admission on motion upon certificate by The Judge Advocate General as to the nature, quality and extent of legal work actually performed by the applicant. In three others,[44] which have no special military rule, such a certificate will usually be accepted as *prima facie* compliance with existing "active practice of law" standards. Authorities in seventeen states,[45] without committing themselves to a fixed interpretation of rules, have indicated that circumstances of military practice are entitled to full consideration on a case-by-case basis. In three states,[46] prior practice requirements have been waived in favor of judge advocates.

And the returns are still coming in. Within the last several months, Kansas, Maine, Tennessee and Vermont for the first time admitted lawyers whose professional experience consisted entirely of legal work in the Armed Services. Last May, Oklahoma bar examiners entertained seven comity petitions and rejected all but one. The successful applicant was a law professor who had just retired from the Army after serving on the staff and faculty of the Judge Advocate General's School at Charlottesville, Virginia.

Full-time active service as a judge advocate will henceforth be considered as the practice of law for admissions purposes, according to a statutory amendment passed by the Michigan legislature last May.[47] In Maryland a rules amendment went into effect on January 1, 1967, which eliminated a test of "active and responsible participation in the trial of cases", which had been construed to render ineligible most military lawyers. The amended version adopted by the Court of Appeals of Maryland now permits consideration of the nature and extent of professional duties performed by a lawyer while a member of the Armed Services.[48] From Mississippi it is reported that the State Bar is taking a second look at a blanket prohibition against comity admission of "attorneys working for governmental agencies".[49]

Gaining the understanding and confidence of civilian decision-makers has not been an overnight proposition. Pockets of resistance still abound. No fewer than nineteen states either officially discourage military applicants [50] or else have no comity arrangements whatsoever.[51] It is one thing to lock the door to all outsiders and quite another to label it "civilians only". Barriers of the latter kind are seldom designed as such. Nor are they necessary to the preservation of professional standards, if we accept the expressions of policy now in force in a majority of states. While the present trend is encouraging, it remains incomplete. Only when the entire legal fraternity accords rightful status to its military members in good standing will there be cause for genuine satisfaction.

---

[38] Gerhart, *Admission to the Bar: Survey of Present Requirements in the States,* 33 A.B.A.J. 995 (1947). The author "concluded that these relaxations in favor of veterans have not resulted in any wholesale reduction of admission standards". *Id.,* 1000. Arkansas still waives practice requirements if the applicant is unable to comply by reason of military service.

[39] 84 A.B.A. Rep. 511–512 (1959).

[40] Former chairman of the standing committee that sponsored the American Bar Association resolution.

[41] Particular responsibility is vested in a comity subcommittee of which Rignal W. Baldwin is the chairman.

[42] Formalistic barriers were proving "almost unscalable" at the time of its adoption. Dalton & Williamson, *supra* note 5, at 145.

[43] Alaska (1965), Colorado (1962), Iowa (1965), Michigan (1967), Missouri (1964), South Carolina (1962) and West Virginia (1956). A 1966 Wisconsin statute more comprehensively recognizes "actual legal service in any department of the United States government". A local rule in the District of Columbia is to the same effect. Clark & Smith, *Bar Admission Requirements and the Military Lawyer,* 3 JAG BULL. 16, 18 (1961).

[44] Illinois, Kentucky and New Hampshire. The Illinois policy toward judge advocates is outlined in Smith, *Remarks on What Constitutes Practice,* 34 BAR EXAM. 54, 55 (1965).

[45] Delaware, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia and Wyoming.

[46] Arkansas (by express rule) and Rhode Island (by judicial decision: *In re Shields' Petition, supra* note 33). Graduates of accredited law schools, including virtually all judge advocates, are exempt from the bar examination in Nebraska.

[47] MICH. LAWS § 600.946(3) (1967).

[48] Rule 14, Rules of the Court of Appeals. Pursuant to the amended rule, the Court of Appeals of Maryland recently admitted on motion a former Navy captain with twenty years' continuous military legal service.

[49] Rule IV § 1 (e), Rules of Mississippi Board of Bar Admissions. The Executive Director of the Mississippi State Bar informs the writer that a proposal is being considered to credit judge advocate service in connection with the five-year practice requirement.

[50] Connecticut and Pennsylvania rules literally contemplate trial work in civilian courts. New York, North Dakota, South Dakota and Utah require practice in the state of admission. See, *e.g., Application of Waller,* 278 N.Y.S. 2d 949 (App. Div. N.Y. 1967). Mississippi and North Carolina do not currently equate military legal experience with practice of law. But see note 49, *supra.*

[51] See note 4, *supra.*

UNITED STATES, THE UNITED NATIONS, AND THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. **PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, last week the 22d anniversary of the United Nations was observed throughout the world. Even the most partisan supporter of the United Nations would be hard pressed to celebrate jubilantly the 22d anniversary of the U.N.

The saga of the U.N. has been both success and failure. The very fact that the world has been free of total war since 1945 stands as a tribute to the existence and effectiveness.

In order to evaluate the United Nations as it attains its majority, I think it is beneficial to recall the words of the American businessman and economist, Beardsley Ruml, who wrote in 1945:

> At the end of five years you'll think the U.N. is the greatest vision ever realized by man. At the end of fifteen years, you'll believe the U.N. cannot succeed. You'll be certain that all the odds are against its ultimate life and success.
>
> It will only be when the United Nations is 21 years old that you will revere and laud the dedication of those who devoted their energies to it through its turbulent course, for you then will know that the U.N. is the only alternative to the demolition of the world.

The U.N. is still new. But the hope and dream which inspired the creation of the U.N.—the quest for peace with justice—is as old as man.

The successes of the United Nations have been almost directly proportional to the willingness of nations to reject the discredited doctrine of absolute sovereignty. The failures of the U.N. can almost all be traced to nations' unwillingness to sacrifice an iota of that same absolute sovereignty.

The Human Rights Conventions are a perfect example in point. These conventions were initiated and adopted as living evidence of the belief that human dignity is universal and that the individual human is soverign.

No government, no regime, has the inherent right, either divine or secular, to impose forced labor upon its citizens. No government properly exercises its authority by depriving half its citizenry equal participation in the nation's political life.

Yet, the United States has shrunk from this bold new challenge. The United States has yet to become a partner in the worldwide effort to establish universal standards of human dignity. The United States is not a party to a single Human Rights Convention.

I once again urge the Senate to reverse this pointless policy of indifference by our Nation and to give its advice and consent to the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

THE UNITED STATES—NOW AND IN THE THIRTIES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as one who can well remember the nonsense-ridden thirties and who has come from that period to this with an appreciation of the role of power in history, I cannot help but second the thoughts expressed today by Joseph Alsop in his column, printed in the Washington Post. The Nation, he writes, is threatened with a new period of nonsense which rejects the lessons of the past and, in particular, the appreciation of power.

There is a wide difference between the nonsense-ridden thirties and today, however, as Mr. Alsop points up. It boils down to the fact that in the thirties the United States was but a peripheral power. Today the United States is the central, giant power on the globe. History, certainly, will judge our Nation severely if it descends again to the nonsense level and precipitates a third world war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Alsop's column from the Washington Post for October 30 printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION'S PLUNGE INTO NONSENSE OR THIS IS WHERE WE CAME IN!

"This is where we came in, for God's sake." Any traveler returning to the United States at this juncture, who is also old enough to remember the nonsense-ridden '30s, cannot easily repress the foregoing horrified exclamation.

In the '30s, the younger generation of Americans, and all those older men who hankered to be "in the movement," had brisky rejected the whole experience of the past. The result was driveling nonsense about the Communist Party; nonsense about the Soviet Union, then bathed in innocent blood; nonsense about the causes of wars, resulting in the idiotic Nye Neutrality Act, and nonsense in general about the role of power in history.

The same sort of plunge into nonsense clearly threatens in America today, if it has not occurred already. The younger generation are easily forgivable, for they do not even remember what happened in Korea. But the older men, still prancing along "in the movement," mouthing the new slogans, are very much less forgivable today than they were in the '30s.

Take the scores of eminent anti-Johnson Democrats—historians and college professors, journalists and Senators, all remorselessly articulate—who were already active in the era of President Harry S. Truman. Not a one of them that you can think of failed to support President Truman's decision to intervene in Korea. Just about all of them have gone on, ever since, rightly praising President Truman's wisdom and courage on that occasion.

(One of the more celebrated journalists, to be sure, had an article ready—written to the effect that we could not and must not intervene in Korea. But the news of intervention came that afternoon, and the article was rewritten to support the President.)

If these distinguished liberal Democrats, who supported Truman and now vilify President Johnson, can make any distinction at all between the Korean and Vietnamese wars, they have yet to say what it is. In Korea, we were fighting on the Asian mainland, as we are today; and in Korea, too, mainly because of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, we had to meet Chinese as well as North Korean manpower.

In Korea again, there were two primary stakes that the United States was engaged to defend. First, there was the American position as a Pacific power. In the second World War, blood and treasure had been lavishly poured out to defend and strengthen this American position. It was, and is, of cardinal importance.

President Truman rightly recognized that the whole Pacific position would be irrevocably compromised if the Korean challenge were not met. In play was not Korea alone, but the future alignment of Japan and the Philippines, the eventual tendency of Southeast Asia, and, in fact, the direction of the bandwagon of history in the whole of Asia.

On the same subject, just 15 years later, Gen. Maxwell Taylor accurately told President Johnson that he had the choice between meeting the challenge in Vietnam or being thrown "back to Hawaii." And surely this first stake, this American position in the Pacific, when Taylor gave this advice, deserved even greater consideration since we had already fought a second major war in its defense.

As for stake number two, it was, and is, quite simply the credibility of American commitments, such as our pledges to the South Vietnamese, the Thais and a good many other people in the present instance. This stake was far less important in Korea, which we had publicly put on its own, than it was in Vietnam. But either way, the great power that enters into pledges and then chooses to ignore them has taken a road that may at first seem smooth, but will always turn cruelly rocky and downhill in the end.

There is a third stake, too, in the Vietnamese war that was really invisible in the Korean war. The Pacific, in brief, now promises to become another "world lake" quite as important as the Atlantic, if not more important. But this vast process, so greatly enhancing the significance of stakes I and II, requires a further, more detailed report.

How then can these distinguished liberal Democrats talk out of one side of their mouths about Korea, and out of the other side about Vietnam? None has tackled that question with sober honesty, with the sole, highly honorable exception of Richard Rovere in the New Yorker; and Rovere's attempt to offer an answer would satisfy no one searching for a serious national policy.

Meanwhile, it must also be noted that there is the widest imaginable difference between our last round of nonsense and the present one. In the 1930s, the U.S. was a strictly peripheral power, without a serious foreign policy, even lacking serious foreign relations. In the '30s therefore, the conversation of a majority to a nonsense-view of the rest of the world had hardly any lasting effects.

Now, however, the U.S. is the central, giant power. And if the U.S. takes the final plunge into nonsense in this quite new situation, the sure and certain consequence will be a third world war.

CORDIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN PEASE AIR FORCE BASE, PORTSMOUTH, N.H., AND SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have taken considerable pride throughout the years in the excellent relations which consistently have existed between Pease Air Force Base at Portsmouth, N.H., and the surrounding communities. Each successive commander of this great SAC installation has made it his business, not only to avoid friction with the base's civilian neighbors, but to affirmatively cultivate a harmonious working relationship. In this, the military has been dramatically successful. It goes without saying, of course, that equal credit should be given the fine people of New Hampshire's seacoast area who have done so much in extending the hand of friendship. The Exeter, N.H., News-Letter for Thursday, October 5, contains an excellent report on this subject by its publisher, Mr. James P. Lynch, a keen observer of national and local affairs. I ask unanimous consent that his column, entitled "Down in Our Corner," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the new commander of the 817th Air Division at Pease, Brig. Gen. Morgan S. Tyler, Jr., evidently feels as strongly as did his predecessors about the necessity for establishing and maintaining good public relations. I have every confidence that General Tyler will continue in the same fine constructive spirit of give and take that has characterized military contacts with the civilian population and made Pease a welcome addition to our State. As Mr. Lynch points out, it is noteworthy that so many of those who are assigned to New Hampshire for duty decide to remain with us permanently upon retirement. This is tangible proof of the congenial and cordial relations which prevail.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN IN OUR CORNER

(By James R. Lynch)

"It's not a one-way street," assured Brigadier General Morgan S. Tyler Jr. at a get-acquainted luncheon the other day. The new commander of the 817th Air Division at Pease Air Force Base emphasized the strong mutual respect personnel at this installation has for their neighbors in the area.

In lauding the public for the cooperative spirit which exists, General Tyler stated: "Pease is noted for its outstanding relationship between military and civilian personnel on the base and in the surrounding communities."

He mentioned the high respect that military leaders such as General Joseph Nazzaro, commander-in-chief of the Strategic Air Command, and others hold toward the people in this section of the country.

General Tyler is new at Pease but he has been quick to establish good public relations. He fully realizes the value of friendship.

Prior to his assignment at Pease, General Tyler was stationed in Okinawa. He was considered an outstanding ambassador for this country while in that area.

It is not difficult for him to make friends for he likes people. He knows that one of our greatest assets is to exemplify goodwill toward our fellow man.

It is not always easy on military personnel to go into a strange territory and make new friends. Yet, because of their desire to assist communities in various projects, they are wholeheartedly accepted.

QUITE REWARDING

It was not always this way as many can testify. Thus it was rewarding the other day for civilians within the area to hear General Tyler speak words of praise about the people in the various communities.

General Tyler wasn't doing this to gain quick support, for the support is already there. He gained his knowledge from the experience of others who served at Pease.

PREVIOUS NEW ENGLAND ASSIGNMENT

Although never stationed at Pease, the general did at one time serve at another installation in New England. Several years ago he was stationed at Loring Air Force Base, Maine.

Like his predecessors he wants Pease to continue as an outstanding base. To this he is dedicated. He knows that when military leaders such as General Nazarro make it a point to praise this installation, then it is living up to its reputation as "the world's greatest."

CLOSE WATCH

General Nazarro has had a close eye on Pease for a number of years. Back when he was at Eighth Air Force at Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts, he was a frequent visitor to this base. Since becoming commander-in-chief at Strategic Air Command headquarters in Nebraska this close relationship has continued.

WELL BALANCED

When General Tyler assumed command at Pease in August no major problems confronted him at Pease. He found an outstanding organization under the command of Colonel Madison M. McBrayer, 509th Bomb Wing commander.

Colonel McBrayer has been at Pease since early in the year when he replaced Col. James O. Frankosky who was transferred to a new assignment at the Pentagon.

RECORD TIME

Whenever a change is made there is always the uncertainty of the public relations image. Colonel McBrayer soon erased any doubts and he won friends in record time.

Mild-mannered in appearance, he is known for getting things done. Not only quickly, but also thoroughly. He strives to cooperate and has done much to build lasting friendship between military and civilians.

Colonel McBrayer undoubtedly takes the position that we are all in this together and let's join forces.

PROUD OF AIR FORCE

He likes to give the public a chance to see the job the Air Force is doing for the country and the world. Just a couple of months ago he illustrated this by having the internationally famous Air Force Thunderbirds appear at Pease for one of their outstanding air shows.

At the same time the public had an opportunity to see the various other aircraft fly over Pease. Some of these are assigned to Pease while others came from various bases.

RENEWED FAITH

The public left that afternoon more convinced than ever that the United States has exceptional military strength. They had the opportunity to see aircraft similar to that which makes the headlines daily in the conflict in Southeast Asia.

Because of the mission of the Strategic Air Command, access to Pease is not easy for the general public. Thus, when there is an open house the people quickly grasp the opportunity to visit and see the various aircraft.

PROUD OF STRENGTH

To some extent at the last open house they were bewildered by the size of the planes even though they have often heard them passing overhead. They departed somewhat proud and more enriched in the knowledge of our Air Force might and determination.

No one can accuse Colonel McBrayer of being loquacious, but he is not at a loss for words when it comes to cooperating with the public. To him it is more than a gesture. It is in a sense a responsibility.

OF NO HELP

When he arrived at Pease from a southern base the weatherman was not very cooperative. Nevertheless, the 509th Bomb Wing commander knew that eventually the snow would go and ideal conditions would prevail.

He found, too, that there were plenty of warm hearts around the area that helped the McBrayers forget the extremeties outside.

GOOD ADVISER

It is more than likely that Colonel McBrayer briefed General Tyler on the cordiality of the public in the surrounding communities.

Furthermore, it is quite probable that the division commander was rather pleased with the similarity of General Nazarro's opinion and that of Colonel McBrayer.

This enriched and rewarding relationship did not come overnight. Nor was it one-sided.

MORE EMPHATIC

General Tyler in his remarks last week emphasized, "It's not a one-way street." To those who have been around Pease down through the years they are in hearty agreement with General Tyler although they probably would be more emphatic.

The military had made it a two-way thoroughfare quicker than many expected. Not only did they accomplish this, but they made certain that it continued down through the years.

QUITE HELPFUL

They have helped in various civilian projects. Their children attend schools in the areas. Parents are quick to participate in Parent-Teacher Association and other worthwhile endeavors.

In times of emergency the men willingly give their time aiding emergency crews in fighting fires, rescue work or assisting at nearby hospitals.

They do not seek recognition, for they figure they derive full satisfaction in helping their fellow man.

WORKING TOGETHER

General Tyler called it an "outstanding relationship." His men as well as the majority of civilians are in agreement, although they may add that it is a primary rule of good citizenship. True Americanism is displayed at its fullest when all factions work together.

This progress of walking and working together is not always evident in various sections of the country. Even in the early days of planning to build the Pease installation, there was much confusion and, in some quarters, considerable animosity.

GREAT HEALER

Time, though, seemed to accomplish many wonderful and extremely important victories. The opposition which appeared to be insurmountable in the early stages of planning, finally gave way to a more cooperative understanding.

The credit goes not to one or a few individuals but to the many thousands who have down through the years worked together for a common goal. The young airmen, who display the conduct of a real gentleman, are equally as impressive as the commanders in promoting a good public image for Pease.

VARIOUS PROBLEMS

Back in the early days of Pease there were many problems to be ironed out between the military and the civilian communities. Some critics were unnecessarily harsh with the treatment they accorded the military.

Instead of getting riled up over the matter, the military endeavored to show that they were quite interested in the various cities and towns.

A GOOD LESSON

At first this did not make any real impression among their adversaries. Nevertheless, they wanted to prove their point and refused to give up easily. In time they won their battle. It was a good lesson in perseverance.

In fact when the early commanders stressed that they wanted to be part and parcel of the area, they were not giving just a sales pitch. They were quite sincere as most people eventually found out.

LONG BEFORE

The first base commander came to the area long before any buildings were erected or any flightline was visualized. He arrived on the scene without any welcoming committee, but this did not bother him.

He knew that in due time he would be able to build a friendship regardless of the various foes who were quite vocal in their opposition at the time.

Certain ones looked on him as a temporary resident. He purchased a home in Portsmouth, but even this did not influence their thinking.

DID COME BACK

At the time, he was a lieutenant colonel. The longer he stayed in the area the more he liked the community. When he departed from Pease as a full colonel, Andreas A. Andreae said he would be back. He kept his word. Now retired from military duties, he is engaged in the automotive field in Portsmouth and lives in Rye.

RETURNING HERE

Even the first division commander at Pease, Major General Walter E. Arnold, showed a fondness for the area that continues right up to the present time. He is scheduled to retire later this year, and more than likely will settle in one of the nearby communities.

These are only a couple of the many military families who somehow or other got to like the spirit that prevails in this area.

Just a few weeks ago another former division commander, Lieutenant General Jack J. Catton came "home" to Pease to address a kickoff dinner of the Air Force Association. Catton was high in his tribute to the various military in discussing the area.

MADE HIS MARK

General Catton did much to promote a close relationship between civilians and military. When he departed from Pease, he left behind a part of his heart. He will always be remembered for his desire to promote a mutual attachment between the military and the civilians.

His men held him in high esteem. To them he was an outstanding commander. To the public he was an exceptional leader.

Since his departure he has held several assignments, yet he still looks back to the days at Pease and the many friends he and his family made.

Others followed General Catton and they, too, contributed to establishing a close and lasting understanding between the base and the various communities.

It all boils down to recognizing your fellow man's mission in life and trying to work together toward a common goal of goodwill.

STRONGER ADAPTATION

General Tyler's words, "It's not a one-way street," does not only apply to the relationship between Pease personnel and civilians. It should be the guiding light on all our endeavors throughout life.

Working together requires a two-way street. It is the American way. It strengthens rather than weakens this country's image.

SET THE PATTERN

While leaders like General Tyler and Colonel McBrayer express deep satisfaction over the cooperative spirit that prevails between military and civilian, the fact remains that this has been accomplished because the military set the pattern.

Colonel McBrayer, since coming to Pease, has exemplified the real meaning of leadership by the way he has carried out his duties as commander. Although his task is primarily military, he has not overlooked the need for working in close harmony with many civilians.

GOOD TEACHERS

As a matter of fact, these military leaders could teach some of the politicians the art of creating a better image. Not that we expect to see General Tyler or Colonel McBrayer invade the political field.

They draw the line at getting involved in such subjects. Their forte is strictly military and they have no desire to invade anyone else's ballfield.

Not that they couldn't quickly adapt themselves to the change. Assuredly they would be able to win votes if they followed this route.

Nevertheless, they prefer the life of a military man. Fortunately for this nation we have men of their caliber commanding our forces.

MANY INTERESTED

On various occasions military officers after retiring have invaded the field of politics. Some have been very successful, while others went down to defeat.

Former President Dwight Eisenhower was an example of success. While in uniform, he was groomed as a Presidential candidate. Upon his return to the country he doffed the uniform of a general and donned campaign togs. His success story has been the envy of most politicians, even those who were close to him.

NOT SO SUCCESSFUL

But another general, the late Douglas MacArthur, never was able to achieve political success. Some say he never really tried, yet this is not quite accurate. MacArthur definitely wanted political recognition.

The attempt to win the Republican nomination in the 1952 convention in Chicago was good evidence. It also proved MacArthur was taking the advice from has-been leaders.

As a commander, he should have readily seen their ineffectiveness long before the call of the convention. This would have saved him much embarrassment.

OUT OF FOCUS

MacArthur was never quite able to get a political image in focus even though he was desirous of such recognition. Possibly he would have been more successful if he had surrounded himself with more astute political chieftains who were abreast of the times.

Already another general is being groomed for Presidential recognition. There is a movement on in behalf of General Curtis E. LeMay, former chief of staff of the U.S. Air Force.

LeMay, who at one time served as commander-in-chief of the Strategic Air Command, has not made any outright move in this direction. However, there has been considerable discussion concerning the possibility of entering his name in several primary campaigns throughout the country.

NO CERTAINTY

Whether his forces will be able to get a campaign on his behalf off the ground is problematical at this time. They seem to be groping rather than grasping in their quest for support.

LeMay should not be caught in the same position as MacArthur. If he has a strong desire to be a candidate, then he should start moving in that direction. Surely at this point not too many of the nation's political leaders are looking in his direction.

LIKED BY PUBLIC

But this does not mean he would be overlooked by the electorate, if he waged a fight for the post. LeMay has had an illustrious image for years. Although he was chief of staff, more people will remember him for his brilliant leadership as commander-in-chief of SAC.

Regardless of whether he succeeds in the political arena, the candidates should heed his statements. He does not talk just to be heard. His voice is a warning that should not go astray.

NOT SO WILLING

Republicans are jubilant when he speaks out against the administration, but they are not so willing to give him recognition for fear he will endanger such candidates as former Vice President Richard Nixon, Governor George Romney, Senator Charles Percy or Governor Ronald Reagan. Anyone of them would like to have him as a supporter and not an opponent.

Actually the Republicans would profit by recognizing LeMay. His astute leadership in the military field would renew the confidence of the American public in regard to the conflict in Southeast Asia and other dangerous spots throughout the world.

GOOD FIGHTER

LeMay pulls no punches. He is no appeaser. He is proud of his country, and does not desire to see it relinquish its number one position as world leader. He helped personally to attain the top position, and thus has no desire to yield.

Whether LeMay makes any headway is a matter of conjecture. Nevertheless, his valuable knowledge of world conditions should not be overlooked. The Republicans would be quite lax if they ignored him during the campaign.

HAS AN INTEREST

General James Gavin is another military leader who is much in the news these days. He, too, has plenty of supporters who would like to see him in the White House. They seem rather confused, though, on what ticket would be more attractive.

Gavin at one time was a key member on a Democratic organization. He resigned when he was at odds with the administration concerning certain policy.

He would be unable to cope with the political atmosphere that is part and parcel of a convention. When the professional politicians swing into operation, the weaker candidates find it rather difficult to keep attuned to the proceedings.

HAD HOPES

Here in this state last year there was quite a drive on behalf of a bridgadier general in the Air Force who retired to seek the post of U.S. senator. Without any previous political experience, Harry Thyng, decided to run for the office held by U.S. Senator Tom McIntyre.

The primary battle had Thyng pitted against some who were considered strong political leaders. Among them were former governors.

AS EXPECTED

The Thyng forces figured that the other candidates would split the votes among them and he would emerge the victor. That is exactly what happened.

Once he won the nomination the Republicans began boasting about the new blood within their organization. They forgot about some of the other candidates and started placing the emphasis on Thyng.

At the end this was costly even to Thyng. He went down to defeat as well as the GOP gubernatorial hopeful, former Governor Hugh Gregg.

AT A STANDSTILL

What seems rather surprising to many people is the fact that no effort has been made in recent months to keep the road open for possible political ventures of the former general. Surely his staunch supporters are not now writing him off the books as a liability.

Just a year ago he was being groomed as the greatest asset the Republicans have had in recent years. He was supposedly unbeatable, although the electorate proved otherwise.

RATHER QUIET

It seems utterly fantastic that he is now relegated to the mothball status. There is a strong possibility that this is being done deliberately in order to spring him as a candidate for high office next year.

If this is the plan, the only opening seems to be the gubernatorial post. It would be highly unlikely that he would attempt to oppose U.S. Senator Norris Cotton. Thus, the only opportunity seems to be a candidate against Governor John King.

He would most likely have to face plenty of opposition, but he has done this before and succeeded. Another battle wouldn't bother him too much.

There is a possibility he would be more acceptable than many of the often-mentioned prospects. He will be interesting to watch in the months ahead.

REPORT ON KOREA BY GEORGE CHAPLIN, EDITOR, HONOLULU ADVERTISER

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, George Chaplin, editor of the Honolulu Advertiser and one of Hiawaii's most distinguished editors and writers, recently returned from an extensive visit to Korea which ranged from Panmunjom at the DMZ to Pusan, the key port of the south.

Because of Mr. Chaplin's extensive knowledge of the Far East, I am confident that his report will be of great interest to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that his eight-part series of articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA

(NOTE.—While the war rages in Vietnam, what of Korea, where Free World and Communist troops continue to face each other across a shaky truce line? To get the answers, the writer flew to the Far East on a Pan Am jet for a firsthand look from Panmunjom, at the DMZ, to Pusan, the key port in the South. This is the first of his reports.)

(By George Chaplin)

Korea is on the way.

One senses it these days in the countryside, where a fresh spirit of confidence and hope blows like a strong wind over the jagged mountains and down the ancient cultivated valleys.

One sees it in the towns and cities, with their rising buildings and rising expectations, and in the glistening machinery of young industrial plants.

And one recognizes it in the mood and policies of the government, a one-time military junta which President Chung Hee Park thus far is moving down the long road—with some vexing detours—toward a democracy the people have never really known.

A Korean cabinet officer put it to me this way: "We say, 'Instead of lying idle, stand up.' Then we say, "Instead of standing still, move forward.'"

A high-ranking American official said, "The transformation, especially in the last three years, has been extraordinary."

PRODUCTION AND EXPORTS UP

Here are some indices:

The gross national product (after adjustment for price changes) has been rising since 1963 at 9 percent a year—one of the most impressive rates in Asia—and last year reached 13.4 per cent.

Agricultural production has climbed 46 per cent in five years. And during the same period, while Korea is still basically a farming country, industrial output has almost doubled.

Exports have more than tripled since 1962, to $205.3 million last year. Also significantly, manufactured items now represent more than 60 per cent of exports, compared with 12 per cent six years ago.

As one U.S. bank report observes, "Koreans take pride (that) they are now exporting ski sweaters to Sweden, transistor radios to Japan, guitars to the U.S. and sewing machines to Germany."

But for all this progress and more to come, Korea is still a desperately poor nation, with its people scrabbling for a living. Per capita income is still extremely low—about $110 a year. (Some say less.) During each of the last four years it has moved up an average of 6.2 per cent, but from a very meager base.

In the packing-crate shacks so evident around the capital of Seoul—with almost 3.8 million people the 13th largest city in the world, just behind Chicago and ahead of Manila, Paris and Berlin—there is still considerable misery. I was told that five or six abandoned babies are found daily.

UNEMPLOYMENT IS STILL HIGH

Throughout Korea there is still very heavy unemployment and underemployment. Of the country's 30 million population 42.3 per cent is under 14, 55 percent under 19—a lot of people to be coming into the labor force.

Housing remains in short supply and even the better houses are small. Since most lack a living room, it's customary to invite friends to a public teahouse, for a cup and music (sometimes played by a disc jockey).

But Korea's problems are relative. A western diplomat with experience in India said, "What strikes me is that the children here have shoes. Children have no distended bellies, no sharply etched ribs and no hopeless, despairing faces. Kids here in winter-time are clothed in sweaters and in solid pants, carrying their books in bags or briefcases."

Less than 14 years ago a war never officially ended left Korea divided and devastated. Divided it still remains—like Berlin and Vietnam—with the Communist in control of the north.

COUNTRY'S INFLUENCE WIDENS

Great opposing armies continue to stand at the ready. But behind the military shield, here in the overcrowded south the people of the Republic of Korea are beginning to write an exciting and impressive Asian success story.

Some of the early "chapters":

Korea in December, 1965 ratified a normalization treaty with Japan, a traditional enemy, providing for $800 million in Japanese grants, loans and commercial credits.

Also in December, 1965 Korea was one of the signers of the agreement to set up the Asian Development Bank and pledged a $30 million subscription.

The country has become increasingly active in international conferences. "You might think Seoul was the end of the line," but in the last couple of years it has hosted a long list of important conferences. In June of last year it stimulated a 10-nation meeting of foreign ministers which formed the Asian and Pacific Council (ASPAC) for regional cooperation.

In 1950–53 Korea needed the armed assistance of the U.S. and other U.N. nations to thwart Communist aggression. In 1965 this once-helpless land proudly began sending crack combat units to the aid of South Vietnam—and now has 45,000 troops there.

Korea's progression from wartime rubble to reconstruction to rapid new growth was fueled by $6 billion in U.S. aid, more than half of it economic. But it is now starting to function effectively with a lower level of assistance. (In 1964, 36.7 per cent of the government budget was supported by U.S. aid. Last year the figure had dropped to 23.4).

SHARP CHANGE IN ATTITUDES

I asked a knowledgeable American official, who travels a great deal in the countryside, about the Korean reaction to some of these recent developments.

He replied there's been a dramatic change in attitudes. Not so long ago he used to be asked two questions. One was, "Why is the U.S. abandoning us to the Japanese?"—an emotional if outdated response to the new treaty with Japan, which had harshly occupied Korea for the 36 years from 1910 through the end of World War II, and left a legacy of bitter memories. The other question, "Why is the U.S. cutting down on aid?"

"These questions got so boring," the official said. "But now I travel and people have an entirely different outlook. They say, 'Come and see what we are doing.' 'Come to my factory and see what I'll export next year.' Or, 'Come see our land reclamation project.' "

Two and a half years ago, the U.S. shipped Korea 200,000 fewer tons of grain than the year before. "Everybody," the American recalled to me, "said it's a terrible thing, cutting aid. We said, 'Look, you ought to say it's wonderful; Korea is more self-sufficient.' "

The next year another 200,000 tons were trimmed and the Park government put out a statement that the cut was a tribute to the Korean farmer. "Now they're boasting about food production—and hope to be self-sufficient in two or three years."

A NEW SPIRIT OF CONFIDENCE

Clearly, the Koreans are in a hurry, so much so that I sensed a concern in some quarters that they may be trying to do too much too fast, over-extending themselves domestically.

But the over-riding "plus" is that their outlook and actions have changed from those of the mendicant to those of the confident man. This self-esteem has been evolving over six or seven years but has become really noticeable in the last three or four years. And it should be of great satisfaction to the U.S.

As one U.S. expert said:

"We've put in a lot of money. Many times it looked hopeless. Many called it 'an open hole.' But it's working and with good luck and judgment it should continue to work.

"Ideas are just as important as money. These people are not afraid of ideas. There's also a good rapport. We can suggest good ideas without their feeling they're being patronized. Americans and Koreans enjoy each other. After all, we fought together; we established a partnership."

A Western economist expanded on this:

Korea "has the best climate of any Asian country for acceptability of American programs and the initiative for self-help. The people work hard, they take responsibility, they have pride in their country.

"Next to Taiwan, Korea is probably the best example of American government investment paying off. There's more mature perception in politics and about social and economic matters—like the tax program to curb inflation, and the raising of interest rates to stimulate savings."

BASE IS LAID FOR PROGRESS

Inflation is still a big problem, but its rate is declining. In 1963 the overall price increase over the previous year 25 per cent. The 1965 increase over 1964 was only seven per cent and that for 1966 over '65 remained under 10 per cent.

"The economy," I was told, "is so much freer these days that the politicians don't have too much to play around with. One doesn't have to buy export licenses. There's a greater volume of savings, more credit to distribute and less chance for favoritism. Also there's a highly critical press."

In the recent presidential election, charges of corruption were hurled by General Park's opponent, and at his inaugural Park himself took note of this problem. An informed source I asked about it said: "There is the usual corruption of low-paid civil servants and big businessmen. The 'kickbacks' on contracts is almost a routine thing and bribery to obtain favored treatment on imports is fairly common. However, the situation is no worse or more extensive than in the other nations of the region."

He switched to a more positive note: "It's fair to say the foundation has been laid for steady continued progress, and the potential for it exists.

"There's a reasonable degree of stability. Whether it keeps up depends on what the Koreans do and on what we do, barring bad harvests or war.

"The harvests have been wonderful. There's more available land through bench terracing, the scientific approach. Presently 25 per cent of the land is arable. They expect to add one-fourth more through reclamation in the next four years."

THERE'S HOPE OF BETTER LIFE

To the Korean plodding down the country road with the shoulder-strapped A-frame on his back piled high with a heavy load this means gradually achieving a better life, starting with electricity in his home. He's already buying a radio and in time will be able to afford a bicycle.

Several years ago, the Korean Deputy Prime Minister Ki-yong Change likened his country to a leaky ship, with a plugged hole below the waterline, with little freeboard and some help needed for sails.

Recently, in briefing a U.S. Congressional committee, this same official updated the image. The Korean economy, he said, "is like an airplane which has just taken off. The no-smoking sign is out, but the fasten-seat-belt sign is still on."

Korea Plans Big: Means To Make Good

(By George Chaplin)

The hottest word in the Korean language nowadays is not "kimchi"—the world's spiciest concoction of cabbage and turnips—but "planning."

It has Number One priority. The most telling clue is that the official in charge of planning, Deputy Premier Ki-yong Chang, is also in charge of the national budget.

Last Dec. 31 Korea finished its first five-year plan and the very next morning launched its second with all the expectancy and excitement of a rocket takeoff.

"We're thinking young and acting young," one official commented to me. "Our top people are pretty young." President Park, recently reelected, is 49 and the average age of his cabinet is in the mid-40's.

Before I went to Korea some of the government literature I'd read about economic planning seemed heavily propagandistic in tone. I wondered how much was conversation and how much was achievement.

But on the scene, I was deeply impressed by the quality of the Korean planners, by the high regard in which they are held by American planners, by their record to date and the apparently realistic goals they've set for the new plan now in effect.

BASIC FACILITIES STRESSED

The first five-year plan foresaw an annual average growth of 7.1 per cent. Despite bad weather and poor crops in the early period (1961–62) it finished up at 9 per cent. The prediction for the new five-year plan is 10 per cent growth each year.

"We have to build basic facilities—ports, highways, railroads, power," one of the country's top planners told me. "Our emphasis has to be on the infrastructure, the basic foundation."

There are several reasons:

The Korean War did $3 billion in damage to what was at best a weak economy. Then the division of the country compounded the problem. Most of the land, most of the iron and coal, most of the heavy industry and 70 per cent of the electric power capacity was in the north, to which the Communists gained control.

So the south—the Republic of Korea—has had to move forward from a base of multiple handicaps: meager resources, over-population, a shortage of managerial and technical skills, and the necessary burden of maintaining the fourth largest army in the world. (The military cost alone takes one-third of the national budget, with some relief from U.S. aid.)

But the Koreans are a tough, tenacious people, eager and quick to learn, and deeply determined to build a modern society. The once "Hermit Kingdom" is pulsing with ambition and considerable economic progress.

MORE POWER, BETTER TRAINS

I asked the government planner I was interviewing about electricity. He, three of his colleagues and I sat around a coffee table piled high with reports and charts. But except for an occasional double-check, his figures flowed easily.

"In 1961 our average power outpost was 300,000 kilowatts. Industrial development was held back. We had to ration power to factories. And city dwellers received a limited supply—from sunset to 9 or 10 a.m. Now we have peak capacity of 770,000 kilowatts and no rationing." The 1971 goal (with eight new plants) is 17 million kilowatts.

It's the same story with the railroads.

"We've been using coal-shovel locomotives. By the end of this year all of our locomotives should be completely dieselized."

The U.S. has provided $15 million in "diesel loans" for the conversion, will be supplying another $12 million to buy 62 new locomotives to add to the present 188.

Track construction is also expanding. A double track from Seoul to the port of Inchon was opened in 1965. There's now a six-hour express train from Seoul to Pusan, over 300 miles. And more lines are fanning out to help move basic commodities.

"Before," the planner explained, "for lack of transport we couldn't properly exploit the coal which we have in the east coast mountains. So the coal price would go up.

"Before, we used to import $60 million in chemical fertilizer, mainly through (the port of) Pusan. We would get it to Pusan on time, but not to the west coast farms on time. So the rice price would go up.

"We have overcome this problem, not only as to movement, but as to supply. We have built five new fertilizer plants. The last three—two at Ulsan (a new industrial center near Pusan) and one in Chinhae (a southern port)—were completed early this year and are now beginning production."

That at Chinhae is a joint venture of the Republic of Korea and Gulf Oil with $10 million from each, plus a $25 million loan from AID, the Agency for International Development.

Once the three new plants are fully operating, Korea will have a surplus rather than a deficit of fertilizer.

The country is also nearing self-sufficiency in cement. The level reached a year ago was adequate, but higher use and export of 100,000 tons to Vietnam caused a shortage. Now there are discussions on building the largest cement plant in Asia, with Japanese finance.

The near future should also bring Korea's first integrated steel mill—processing ore all the way from the blast furnace to finished steel—with a starting capacity of 500,000 tons.

Deputy Premier Chang said financing would be by a consortium of U.S., British, Italian and West German firms, with a possible inclusion of French and Japanese interests.

The government is also interested in developing petrochemicals to provide a raw material base. There's already one oil refinery, managed and one-quarter financed by Gulf Oil, and two others are planned.

FARMING SHOWS PROMISE, TOO

Less dramatic than the industrial development but greatly heartening is the advance in Korea's problem-ridden agriculture, still the backbone of the country.

Fertilizer is more scientifically used, double-cropping has increased, there's been progress in irrigation and flood control, and new land is being developed.

Bench terracing has enabled the effective use of 335,000 acres of previously unproductive upland, with another 500,000 acres to be reclaimed between now and '71.

Improved seed is yielding better crops and more rural people are raising pigs and chickens, creating cash income. This is important because most Korean land-holdings are uneconomically small and densely populated.

The census in October of last year showed 48.8 per cent of the population as farming and 51.2 as non-farming, although some of the latter live in the countryside. Since two years ago more than 50 per cent of the people were in agriculture, the urban movement is evident.

The city lights beckon, but often falsely, with neither jobs nor housing for many of the newcomers. Population has been growing at 2.7 per cent annually but the birth control program is seeking to reduce this to 2 per cent.

MAIN CROPS: RICE, BARLEY

The government's aim is for Korea to grow enough to feed itself four years from now.

The prime crop, domestically and for export, is still rice. And any number of Koreans made it a point to tell me it's the best in the world, that even Japan has to get rice from Korea since "good sushi requires our rice." One man proudly recalled that during the occupation by the Japanese, the Emporer used to get his rice from near Kimpo (the site and name of the Seoul airport).

Barley is the second major crop, others being wheat, potatoes, vegetables and fruits (from garlic to melons, from red pepper to pears), ginseng (for herb medicine popular in the Orient), and tobacco. There are five tobacco factories and the newest one at Sintanjin can turn out nine billion cigarettes a year.

Farming, forestries and fishing (annual catch of about a half-million tons, from shrimp to tuna) now provide about one-third of Korea's gross national product. Manufacturing and construction add another one-fifth. Services make up the rest.

The planners' eyes and studies roam restlessly over this whole spectrum. They're sometimes under criticism, in the press and in the universities, over the fact the country hasn't yet developed substantial heavy industry. The major emphasis is still on transport and power, but with a strong tendency toward balance—which for some makes the evidence of economic growth hard to see.

I asked a knowledgeable American in Seoul for his estimate of the quality of Korean planning. He said:

"Projections are now honest and reasonably accurate—against a feeling that certain past statistics were not. The government's Economic Planning Board works closely with USOM (United States Operations Mission), which considers the goals attainable.

"There are a number of very capable Korean administrators qualified in economics, all top people who have studied abroad, including many in the U.S. There's a considerable level of expertise in this economic planning."

He summed up: "This country is moving."

PUSAN AND PROBLEMS

In Korea, the planning fever is not only national, but municipal.

Seoul has an estimated 3.8 million people but sees a total of 5 million in another five years. The mayor envisions a brand new city in 20 years.

Downtown Seoul is building pedestrian overpasses and underpasses. Zoning is in the works, and I was told that a U.S. city planner, Oswald Nagler, is involved in this.

The country's second city, Pusan, is also planning-minded. As recently as three years ago it had the appearance of an oversized slum, going nowhere. Today it's modernizing and no longer has as much of the grimy, sleazy look.

Pusan now has 1,460,000 people. But when the original city plan was adopted in 1936 it had only 180,000 with a projection for this year of 500,000.

The current master plan stresses the building of streets, expanding the water supply, and developing the suburbs under zoning. Because Pusan is hemmed in by water on one side and mountains on another, it's not easy.

The hardest problem is the expansion of the narrow streets and roads to up to six lanes plus sidewalks. Downtown this has been helped by relocating a railroad station which had occupied the heart of the business area.

As Korea's major port, development of Pusan is essential. Seventy per cent of Korea's 1966 exports of $255 million were shipped through this port and $55 million of those originated in Pusan. A City Hall official said: "We used to be consumers only; now we're also producers."

I was told that Pusan's industrial production is greater than Seoul's, turning out 40 per cent of the country's steel products and supplying 20 per cent of its electricity. Pusan has a surplus of power because it augments its steam plants with a diesel generator ship which I saw "parked" at the downtown wharf.

New factories—including a synthetic fiber plant with a $3 million AID loan—are in the works and the job picture is becoming brighter. But there's still a lot to do and City Hall is the first to concede it.

Of 260,000 Pusan households, 80,000 live in slum conditions. The city is developing land, selling it to individuals on a house loan program. It is also putting up some low-cost units, but so far only 700 a year. "Small, but a start," the Mayor's office said.

Water continues a problem. In 1945 the supply was 40,000 tons a day. Today it is 135,000 tons, but the demand is for 200,000. For the end of next year the target is to produce 250,000 tons daily—"level with the demand" then foreseen.

Eighty-four per cent of Pusan's people are connected to the municipal water supply. The other 16 per cent rely on wells, with the city providing sterilizing chemicals without charge. I was told that the per capita water consumption is 32 gallons a day compared to the worldwide figure of 50 and Chicago's average of 100.

Korean Industry: Exports Up Sharply

(By George Chaplin)

Ulsan, a seaside community 186 miles south of Seoul, used to be known for two things. It had some excellent whalers, with a fleet of 25 to 35 boats. And the farms behind the town grew the best peas in the country.

Today, Ulsan is on the way to becoming the "little Pittsburgh" of Korea.

In a newly created industrial area, 14 plants are operating or under construction, with 50 seen by 1981. The population, 80,000 five years ago, is now close to 120,000 and is expected to grow to 300,000.

Petroleum, fertlizer, synthetic fibers and caustic soda are among the present products, with steel and aluminum soon to join them.

Investment in Ulsan is about $130 million from domestic sources and $140 million from foreign, including heavy sums from Japan as a result of the new normalization treaty. The Korean government is spending millions for roads, water and harbor improvements.

Ulsan has a good natural harbor on the Sea of Japan—being developed to take 40,000-

ton ships—and a good water supply. The southwest winds blow the industrial smoke to sea.

REFINERY HAS LARGE IMPACT

I stopped in there at the country's first refinery for a chat with manager Claude Booth, a veteran of the Gulf refinery in Philadelphia.

He explained that Gulf had put in 25 per cent, the Republic of Korea 75 per cent. The three-year-old refinery was designed for a capacity of 35,000 barrels a day but this past spring was expanded to produce 55,000 (distributed in Korea-made drums).

Booth said they're turning out 13 products—gasoline, jet fuel, everything from propane to asphalt. But with the need three years from now put at 170,000 to 200,000 barrels a day, two more refineries are being scheduled, one due for completion within 18 months.

I asked Booth about the impact of his operation.

"It's the keystone of development, this refinery, directly related to industries. When I came in August, 1963, cars and taxis were scarce. Now Seoul is jammed with cars and they're building overpasses and underpasses.

"We make heavy fuel for power plants and heavy industry. They're building three fertilizer plants (to raise production five-fold). They need naphtha to make ammonia and naphtha comes from the refinery."

Booth termed the Koreans "the world's hardest-working people." The refinery employs 608, about 40 of them college graduates. Until recently, he said, Korea had graduate chemical engineers for whom no jobs existed.

In Ulsan when I talked with Booth were 177 foreigners, 65 of them Americans, the other 112 being Japanese engineers for a new fertilizer plant, the country's fifth.

A VISIT TO RADIO-TV FIRM

Forty miles south of Ulsam is the port of Pusan and I visited several industries there, beginning with the Gold Star Co., Ltd., which typifies Korea's recent industrial expansion.

Gold Star last year made 240,000 radios, 140,000 of these for export (all other companies made just over 600,000). This year's Gold Star goal is 300,000, with most being shipped to the U.S. (Eight years ago, Korea made only 40 per cent of its own radios; today it makes 85 per cent.)

Gold Star is also Korea's only TV manufacturer, turning out its first batch of 30,000 sets last year (with picture tubes made in Japan) and projecting 36,000 this year, in the $200 to $250 range. Presently there are only 100,000 sets in the country.

Other Gold Star products:

Refrigerators, 5,000 a year; electric fans, 60,000 this year; telephones, 55,000 a year; automatic switchboards, 42,000; motors, 11,000; Watt-meters, 250,000. Gold Star is also affiliated wth companies making products ranging from chemicals to toothpaste and soap to cable and wire.

The firm was established in 1958 and built in 1963 on the 16-acre site I visited. It has 3,800 workers—up 1,600 in a year. Of these, 1,600 are women and girls, mostly on the assembly line, working with equipment bought with a $1.25 million loan from West Germany.

Gold Star began exporting four years ago, reached $1.5 million last year, mostly in radios. A New York general merchandise company is its biggest buyer, but it also has customers in Canada, Panama, Southeast Asia and Africa (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania).

The company has top engineers but needs skilled labor, so it runs its own technical school, partly financed by the government. Graduates immediately get 50 to 60 per cent more pay than unskilled workers.

For those who wish them, the company provides houses and dormitories.

SAWMILL NOW BIG ENTERPRISE

After Gold Star, I went through the Tong Myung Timber Co., which was founded as a small sawmill in 1925, began making veneer plywood after World War II and started exporting in 1961.

Tong Myung employs 2,200—30 per cent of them single women about 19 or 20—and expects this total to go to 3,500 when a second plant is completed this year.

At that time it will be the largest hardwood plywood producer in the Orient, turning out 80 million square feet of one-eighth-inch-thick plywood each month. Its final products range up to an inch in thickness and are used for furniture, packing, boats and housing.

The two-square-million-foot-plant operates around the clock, sometimes seven days a week. Most of its logs (120 million board feet a year) come from the Philippines and Borneo.

The firm has been supplying the U.S. Army in Korea for a decade but in 1965 exported to the U.S. for the first time and last year began supplying the U.S. military installations in Vietnam.

Tong Myung exports 85 per cent of its output (about $20 million this year, from $2 million in 1963). Also this year it will begin shipping finished instead of unfinished plywood. U.S. shipments go to Tacoma, Los Angeles, Longview, Calif., Houston, Norfolk.

PRODUCER OF BARGAIN GOODS

Korea is still running a trade deficit—its imports last year of $716.4 million ($253.7 million from U.S.) ran far ahead of its $250.3 million in exports—so it is urgent that the country sharply step up its overseas sales.

(But the foreign earnings picture—$454 million last year—has been greatly helped by remittances from the 45,000 Korean troops and 10,000 civilian workers in Vietnam. Through purchase of supplies, the Vietnam war, in fact, is giving the Korean economy the same kind of boost the Korean War gave Japan during 1950–53).

In years past, Japan and Hong Kong were the places where American and other western buyers went for bargain-basement merchandise. Today, it's increasingly becoming Korea.

A reporter visiting Seoul for The Daily News Record, one of the Fairchild business papers in New York, recently called South Korea "the last frontier where the current generation of economic missionaries can still find the required formula of an abundant low-wage, literate, easily-trained labor force under a government that combines stability with an eagerness to attract foreign capital."

In the lobby of the Bando Hotel in Seoul I chatted with two New Yorkers who were in Korea to buy cheap beaded sweaters. They said a local operator could hang out a sign for 600 unskilled women and train them well enough in two weeks for them to make acceptable sweaters in their own homes. (A latter-day version of New York's East Side "piece work" thousands of miles removed!)

The Daily News Record listed these wage scales: Assembly-line girls, $10 to $15 a month (which usually include 25 workdays); men laborers, $21 a month; women, $15; semiskilled men, $33; women, $23; skilled men, $44; women, $30. Not only considerably lower than Hong Kong and Japan but about 15 to 20 per cent under Taiwan.

The Bank of Korea lists the following as the average daily cash wages by industry: machinery, 61 cents a day; textiles, 65; leather products, 65; rubber products, 74; paper, 78; metal products, 78; chemicals, 79 cents; petroleum and coal, 84; electronics, 88; stone, glass and clay products, 89; food processing, 91; beverages, $1.02 a day; wood products, $1.06; printing, $1.11; and basic metals, $1.14.

U.S. FIRMS LOOK TO FUTURE

Despite the low-wage level, a program has begun for inspection of outgoing merchandise, in an effort for quality control. More and more of even the larger American firms are buying in Korea—among them, R. H. Macy & Co., May Department Stores, Woolworth's.

It's further encouraging that several major U.S. financial institutions have opened branches: Bank of America, First National City Bank of New York and Chase Manhattan.

Several months ago, Chase Manhattan Bank put out an economic survey of the country. To finance economic development under the present five-year plan, it says, "$2.2 billion of investment is scheduled to come from Korean taxes and domestic savings over a five-year period, much more than in any previous period.

"To accomplish this, the Koreans will have to save a third of the anticipated increase in their earnings. In addition, the plan looks for $1.4 billion of public and private capital from abroad, an increase of one-sixth over the amount Korea attracted in the last five years.

"To succeed, government officials recognize the need to pursue fiscal and monetary policies that keep the stepped-up volume of investment in line with the nation's overall resources. Only in this way can they preserve the nation's recent gains in financial stability.

"This is a big order, but not impossible. The government is doing its part by restraining its spending and reducing the government deficit. This has made it easier for Korea's monetary authorities to curb credit expansion. As a result, the private sector has been encouraged to increase savings, investments and export sales."

Last March former Undersecretary of State George W. Ball, now with Lehman Brothers International, headed a U.S. industrial investment mission to Korea. Of the 23 firms represented, 18 decided to follow up with further investigation of investment possibilities.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT SPURRED

As one aid to foreign investment, a Korean law has been revised to permit an unlimited takeout of profits. Before the limit was 20 per cent of the capital base.

Other main features of the amended law: foreign-invested enterprise can have a five-year tax holiday, then three years at 50 per cent of the rate; and machinery and raw materials can be imported duty-free until an enterprise is established. (If a firm is 100 per cent in the export business then the duty-free aspect is on a permanent basis).

While many countries at Korea's present stage of development are ultra-nationalistic, Korea does not insist on joint venture or on any maximum or minimum equity by foreigners. Outsiders can come in and give technical knowledge or they can come in and own 100 per cent.

Korea has set up an investment promotion office but wants to make sure the climate is "right" before putting out its calling card by having offices overseas. At present, I was told, there's enough interest to keep the main office busy without any heavy promotion. However, the Korea Trade Promotion Corporation (KOTRA) has 11 offices overseas.

TOURISM SHOWS A REAL POTENTIAL BUT GETS LITTLE OFFICIAL SUPPORT

Tourism is one of Korea's real potentials—but thus far it's had a rather low priority in terms of official support.

A government agency does exist, however—the Korea Tourist Service, Inc. (KTS), the stock 100 per cent owned by the Finance Ministry and its operations controlled by the Transportation Ministry. Its head is named by the President of Korea and the directors by the Transportation Ministry.

KTS, which tries to operate as if it were in free enterprise, owns and manages a number of hotels and tourist attractions. These include the Bando Hotel (111 rooms), the best in Seoul; the nearby Walker Hill resort (265 rooms); and the Bando-Chosun arcade, which is lined with fascinating little shops stocking everything from jewels to neckties. The Chosun was closed in July and is being demolished. It will be replaced by an $11 million 500-room hotel to be built and operated by American Airlines and Korean government.

KTS also operates a travel agency and foreign commissaries in several cities, which sell canned foods, liquors, cigaret. and other items tax-free to foreigners, on display of passports. To cap it, KTS runs a taxi service which caters to U.S. and U.N troops.

KTS represents Korea in international tourism, being a member of the Pacific Area Travel Assn. and a charter member of the East Asia Travel Assn., which it helped organize in Tokyo along with Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, the Philippines and Thailand.

It's soon obvious to a visitor that Korea is short on tourist facilities and will be for a long time, unless there's more outside financing. The government regards tourism's profitability as low compared with other industries. Those in tourism cite its value in producing foreign exchange and in contributing to economic development.

"Each hotel room in Korea produces two to three jobs," I was told. "Each tourism dollar turns over 3.4 times, since it flows out to the laundries, to feed people, to mechanics and others."

Despite inadequate accommodations visitors last year totaled 67,965, up 100 per cent over 1965. This was primarily due to the new regulation that you can travel to Hong Kong or Bangkok by way of Seoul without extra air fare.

Korea's School Needs Outrun Funds

(By George Chaplin)

Koreans, one of them said to me, are "big in the head, but not so big in the stomach."

It was his way of saying that interest in higher education has outrun the ability of the economy to absorb graduates.

"Of every 1,000 population, we now have 6.7 students at the university level," I was told. "This makes Korea rank fourth, just after Canada, Japan and the United States. We hope to cut this to 5.5 per thousand. As an example, a quota has been placed on law students."

Since about 30 per cent of high school graduates go on to higher learning, Korea now has 140,000 students—"more than England"—in 117 colleges and universities. Some of the schools are first-rate, some just diploma mills.

These 117 include six national universities, six national and two other public colleges 56 private universities and colleges; 47 junior colleges, 13 of them specializing in education. (Almost three-quarters of the students are in private institutions). Overall, 17 kinds of bachelor's and master's and 11 kinds of doctoral degrees are offered.

(By contrast, at the end of World War II, there was only one university, Keijo Imperial University, and 19 junior colleges established during the Japanese occupation).

"Today, 60 to 65 per cent of the graduates of a top university can get jobs at once—but the other 35 cannot, at least not on a level one associates with a degree."

The educator who said this added that part of the pressure is taken off by the fact some are drafted into military service the year they graduate.

TOO MANY STUDY CLASSICS

The surplus of graduates is but one part of the problem. The other is that too many of the graduates are in the liberal arts, while Korea's need is for more scientific skills.

Traditionally, the Confucianist influence built respect for classical studies. Technical training lacked status and was something reserved for the lowly members of society.

"Everyone respects the white collar," it was explained, "but in recent years the government has been stressing the blue collar."

Despite the prestige hurdle, the program is gradually catching on, partly because it pays off economically.

"There used to be emphasis on, say, political science. Now the cream of the high schools goes into chemistry, civil engineering, bio-chemistry and such. It's easier for them to get jobs."

With one five-year plan completed and the second underway, Korea is feverishly seeking to build an industrial base—and in part this is dependent upon having the right talent in the right numbers.

TECHNICAL JOBS UP SHARPLY

Sang-kun Chun, an official of the Economic Planning Board, sees the employment of scientific and technical workers increasing at an annual average rate of 10.1 per cent as against 3.6 per cent for total employment.

The greatest annual increase between now and 1971 is expected in construction (18.8 per cent), followed by electrical, plumbing and sanitation work (14.8), with manufacturing jobs third (12.8).

This trend had produced a growing emphasis on vocational training below the full college level.

Throughout the country vocational education—agricultural, commercial, technical—is offered by 205 public and 107 private high schools, with 172,436 pupils. There are also eight technical colleges—four public, four private—with the average college graduate 20 years old. Those drafted at 21 put in three years of service, during which they may continue technical training at army depots.

In Seoul I visited Kyunggi Technical College, which is a daytime junior college for 600 youths and doubles at night as a technical high school for 780.

The junior college is entered at the 10th grade and provides three years of senior high and two of college.

Kyunggi has been operating for only three years. The first year it graduated 62, found jobs for all. Last year it graduated and placed 40. This past February it again turned out 62, with assured employment.

EQUIPMENT IS ANTIQUATED

At Kyunggi there are four departments: mechanical engineering, civil engineering, architecture and industrial arts. The rooms are drab and drafty and the workshop equipment is old, having been donated by UNKRA—the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency—10 years ago, after the Korean War.

A mimeographed sheet handed me as I toured the school said: "We cannot replace these old things because of our financial situation. As you know well, our national expense go almost to the national defense. We are not able to spend much money in education. We are doing our best under the circumstances."

Korea spends about 16 per cent of its budget for education, with 69 per cent of the funds going to elementary instruction. The backlog of needs is so massive and the school population growth so great that facilities and equipment are highly inadequate.

There's a current shortage of 16,000 classrooms and of 10,000 elementary, 15,000 middle school and 10,000 high school teachers. (Even so, teaching standards have risen. Until six years ago, normal school graduates were regarded as qualified to teach the elementary grades. Now, a two-year teachers' college course is required).

The country really had to start its school system almost from scratch after the Korean War, in which half the classrooms and most of the libraries and labs were destroyed and thousands of teachers killed or wounded.

Schools had to be rebuilt, teachers recruited and trained, books written and printed, vocational education expanded and the campaign against literacy widened.

LITERACY LEVEL MUCH HIGHER

Literacy in 1945 was estimated at only 22 per cent. The claim now is 90 per cent (of those over six), achieved through compulsory education and adult classes in the villages, often conducted by volunteers.

One is officially literate if he can write the 24-letter "hangul" alphabet, which has come down from the 15th century. But since this can be learned in several hours, the standard of literacy is still low.

Perhaps the most impressive aspect of Korean education is the dramatic increase in student totals. Since the end of World War II, the general population has risen from 20 million to 30. But elementary enrollment has tripled and that at secondary and college levels has jumped 20 times.

The latest elementary education figures I saw were of five million pupils. They are instructed by 79,164 teachers (three-quarters of them men) in 5,125 schools—with the high pupil-teacher ratio of 62.3 to 1.

Yearly pupil increases of 300,000 are seen until at least 1971. Attendance is compulsory through the sixth grade and the Ministry of Education hopes to extend this through the ninth grade in the next 10 to 15 years.

Tuition is free, but textbooks and school supplies are not, although the government assists families too poor to afford these.

In the secondary schools—middle schools for grades 7 through 9; high schools for grades 10 through 12—admission is by competitive examination, and an entrance fee and modest tuition are charged.

There are some 695 public and 513 private middle schools with 751,341 students and 19,067 teachers; and 365 public and 316 private high schools with 426,531 students and 14,108 teachers. I gather that almost 90 per cent of the teachers have a higher student ratio than the standard of 50 to 1.

PARENTS EXPECT TOO MUCH

An article in the Korea Journal by Tal-se Chung, Secretary-General of the Korean Federation of Education Associations, says, "Considering the fact that the teacher and the parent share the child's day, a teacher can be compared to parents who have 60 to 70 children.

"Yet parents expect teachers to take care of their children with the same loving understanding they themselves give. We (teachers) cannot look on unconcerned while the size of classes continues to increase.

"The teaching load is certainly too heavy for teachers to fulfill their mission of educating youth. The teacher becomes a mere machine for cramming facts and figures in immature heads. . . Most teachers work at least 13 hours in addition to their 44-hour week."

The article also pleads for higher teacher's pay, pointing out that while the average married male teacher supports a family of 4.25 persons, he's only paid $22 U.S. monthly in primary schools and about $33 in high schools.

The school year in Korea starts in March, ends in February, with 40 days of vacation in summer, 30 in winter. The youngsters go to school six days a week.

The classroom and teacher scarcity in primary schools requires a two-shift system (8 a.m. to noon and 1 p.m. to 5), even three shifts in certain densely populated areas for lower grades.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

One major weakness of the system is its inflexibility, making for a lack of rapport between student and teacher. There are strong points, too. One is in the teaching of English from the 7th grade up, which, I was told, is done more effectively than in Japan.

At the university level there is often not enough interchange between departments. Again, too much rigidity. There also has been a history of strong faculties and weak presidents, but I gather the quality of administrative leadership has improved.

I visited only one university—Ewha Woman's University in Seoul, the largest women's institution of higher learning in Asia and the ninth largest in the world. On its 100-

acre campus, 8,000 students pursue four-year programs leading to B.A. degrees. It also has graduate schools offering masters' and doctors' degrees.

Interestingly, Ewha was started as a primary school, with four pupils, in 1886, by Mrs. Mary F. Scranton, the first woman Methodist Episcopal missionary to Korea.

In 1904 it was expanded to include a high school and in 1910 a college, with a freshman class of five. (Korea's first college, Soong Sil, had opened three years earlier in Pyongyang). In 1945, after liberation from Japan, Ewha became a university.

When the Communists occupied Seoul in 1950, the school moved south to Pusan, called itself a "campus in exile" and went on operating. After the truce it moved back to Seoul, with 2,000 enrolled.

Of today's 8,000 students, only 800 live in dorms, the rest commuting. The faculty is 500, of whom 300 are full time.

EMPLOYMENT IS HARD TO GET

Ewha's freshmen, mostly 18, have finished 12 years of schooling—six primary grades, three in middle school, three in high. Admission is by exam and three times as many apply as can be absorbed—6,000 for 2,000 openings. Five per cent of the students get Ewha scholarships and some others are helped by government.

Courses leading to degrees include liberal arts and sciences (about half the graduates are in liberal arts), education, music, fine arts, physical education, law and political science, medicine, pharmacy and home economics. Of the some 2,000 receiving degrees each year, fewer than 200 go to graduate school.

Ewha's graduates mostly become teachers, social workers and office personnel. Jobs are not easy to get except for the teachers; these prefer to stay in Seoul rather than going into the countryside, where a heavy need for them also exists. (Nationally, to attract more teachers quickly, three-to-six month special training is being offered in such subjects as music and physical education to liberal arts graduates who have not majored in education).

Ewha still has strong U.S. Methodist backing; also support from the United Church of Canada. One official at the university said, "We look for Christian leaders from women. We try to prepare these. We put emphasis on religion and there is chapel every day."

MANY KOREANS STUDY ABROAD

Quite a few Koreans prefer overseas study and they range over 30 countries, from Taiwan (97 Korean students) to Switzerland (38), but most come to the U.S. (presently 4,000 to 5,000 in undergraduate and graduate fields and some 600 Ph.D.'s, largely working for universities or the Federal government).

To help attract them back to Korea and stop the "brain drain," there's a new civil service act providing that scientists be paid as well as, if not better than, administrators.

Related to this is a new Korean Institute for Science and Technology, for which the U.S. is providing $150 million. Ground formally was broken just after President Johnson's visit last fall and 45 scientists now abroad will return as staff.

In sum, Korea is making substantial progress in education but its needs are formidable and its ability to pay the bill is highly limited. The story is the same as in all the developing countries.

KOREA'S HISTORY IS ONE OF WAR AND WOE

(By George Chaplin)

Korea is a land that wanted to be left alone—but never was for long.

It is largely a victim of its geography—a peninsula jutting 600 miles south from China's Manchuria and the Soviet Union's Maritime Provinces and yet so close to Japan that Japanese TV programs are clearly received in the Korean port of Pusan.

For centuries, as even today, Korea has borne the brunt of big-power rivalries. Kublai Khan, the Mongol leader, used Korea to launch assaults on Japan in 1274 and 1281. And in 1592 the Japanese shogun Hideyoshi landed thousands of troops in Korea in an invasion directed at China.

Korea knew no peace. Its description as the Land of the Morning Calm was pleasant, but rhetorical. When it was not the Mongols occupying, it was the Manchus or the Japanese. Official envoys extracted concessions. Foreign pirates plagued the coasts.

Through most of its early history, Korea held a sort of junior status to China, at some times more willingly than at others. The result was a heavy Chinese impact on Korean culture, philosophy and government structure.

HAD WELL-ADVANCED CULTURE

By the 15th century, well before Gutenberg, Koreans were printing from movable metal type. They built great pagodas and opened a royal college of literature. Their scholarly pursuits ranged from geology to astronomy.

But too much of their energies and resources were diverted to resisting outsiders. They yearned to seal themselves off from the world, to be the Hermit Kingdom, and their efforts were fairly successful through the 17th and 18th centuries.

Internally, the almost 500-year-old Yi Dynasty began to crumble before the feuding of political cliques and the growing separation of the court and academicians from the Korean people. Externally, Japan and Russia and the West were all contesting for Pacific power and trade.

Korea was about to be "opened up", but not without showing its displeasure.

In 1866 a grounded American trading schooner, the General Sherman, was burned and its crew murdered. And nine European Catholic priests who had been quietly seeking converts were also killed.

In 1871 the U.S. Minister to China, Frederick F. Low, was sent to Korea with five American naval vessels to negotiate both a trade treaty and a shipwreck convention. The ships ran into shore battery fire, retaliated and withdrew.

UNITED STATES SIGNED TREATY IN 1882

In 1876 Japan maneuvered a diplomatic pact with Korea and in 1879 sent its first minister to Seoul. In 1882, the U.S. was able to conclude the first Western treaty ("of peace, amity, commerce and navigation") with Korea, whose king had first obtained the consent of the Chinese government.

Our first minister, Lucius H. Foote, presented his credentials in May and that August two Korean ministers came to the U.S. to study our customs and postal services, public schools and fortifications.

By spring of 1886 Korea had also signed treaties with Russia and France. But the "open door" brought no peace. In 1894 a revolt attracted troops of first China, then Japan—and the two countries began a war on Korean soil.

China was quickly defeated, ceded Formosa to Japan and recognized Korea's independence. Japan then forced a pro-Japanese cabinet on the Korean king, but he fled to the Russian legation and tried to rule from there.

Relations between Japan and Russia worsened—over both Korea and Manchuria—and in 1904 Japan declared war. Japanese troops landed in Korea to use it as a base. The Korean ruler, who wanted to be neutral, was forced to become a Japanese ally, to hand over control of the mail, telephone and telegraph systems, and to accept Japanese advisors throughout government.

Like China a decade before, Russia was defeated and recognized—as did the U.S. and Britain—that Japan had paramount interest in Korea.

JAPAN TAKES OVER KOREA

The Korean emperor (he'd upgraded his title from king) reluctantly signed a treaty giving Japan control of Korea's foreign affairs—and from Tokyo Prince Ito Hirobumi came in 1906 as the first resident-general.

The U.S. legation in Seoul and the Korea legation in Washington were closed, and representatives withdrawn. In 1907 the Korean emperor was forced to abdicate in favor of a retarded son who approved annexation to Japan on August 29, 1910.

The first governor-general, Count Terauchi, stated as Japan's aim: "The transformation of a decayed kingdom into a prosperous and rich country and the gift of good administration and peace to the new subjects of the empire."

For years there was Armed Korean resistance (70 incidents in the first 36 months), but it was called the work of "brigands" and put down by force. Tight political control was maintained—posts down to the level of magistrate and village leader being filled by Japanese, with Koreans confined to clerical jobs. Japan set out to develop the country while methodically seeking to Japanize the culture.

The country's finances were improved. Japanese industrial capital poured in. Excellent hydroelectric systems were built in the north. New railways, roads and harbors were constructed. (A deluxe train ran from Pusan to Paris, via Siberia).

Fishing and forestry were expanded—often with the use of immigrants from Japan. (Most of the industrial development was in the north, later tying in with Manchuria; the south remained largely agricultural).

THINK AND ACT JAPANESE

But the economic gains were at the expense of the Korean culture. The school system and curriculum were revamped and more primary schools opened to make the Koreans "good and loyal subjects of the Empire." The Japanese language was stressed and soon became dominant in the classroom and newspapers. (Between 10 and 15 per cent of the people—those over 35—can still speak Japanese).

People were supposed to think and act Japanese, and heavy military and police forces were on hand to back up official policy, and break any resistance.

But Korean leaders, never daunted, sought a way to dramatize their resentment. The time was March 1, 1919. It was a time when Woodrow Wilson's doctrine of self-determination was stirring nationalistic pride around the world. It was also a time when impending burial ceremonies for the Korean king who had abdicated in 1907 enabled people to gather in Seoul without undue suspicion.

Thirty-three distinguished Koreans—including clergymen of Buddhist and Christian faiths and the nationalistic Chondokyo sect—signed a proclamation of independence drawn up by a noted author, Choe Namson. Then 30 of them met in Pagoda Park in the center of Seoul, dispatched their declaration to the Japanese governor-general, called the police and waited to be arrested.

Their imprisonment—and the prearranged reading of the proclamation throughout Korea—set off a vast wave of demonstrations, mostly peaceful. The Japanese harshly retaliated, but when details leaked to the world despite a tight censorship, the pressure of opinion forced an easing of occupation policies.

STUDENT RIOTS PROVE FUTILE

The freedom movement had carried the slogan, "May Korea be free for 10,000 years"—dai han tongnip mansei—but this soon became called just "mansei", the Korean equivalent of banzai, and is still referred to in that way.

In the 1920's there were several student riots, but they achieved little. Beginning in 1931, when the Japanese moved into Manchuria, controls in Korea again were tightened. They remained so as Japan went to war in China proper in 1937—using Korea as a staging area—and then moved to World War II.

Korea became a part of the Japanese war machine and in 1942 was made a part of Japan proper, and placed under a domestic ministry.

The next year, at the Cairo Conference of December, 1943, the U.S., Great Britain and China declared that "the aforesaid three great powers, mindful of the enslavement of the people of Korea, are determined that in due course Korea shall become free and independent."

Russia, which subsequently affirmed this, began to figure in Allied deliberations on Korea, both at Yalta in February, 1945 and Potsdam in July, 1945. At Yalta, President Roosevelt was eager for Russia to enter the war against Japan. Stalin, no easy bargainer, wanted acknowledgement that Korea fell within the Soviet sphere of influence.

Russia finally went to war against Japan, only a week before the latter's surrender, on Aug. 14, 1945. And beginning the day before—on Aug. 13—close to a quarter-million Russians crossed into Korea. The Americans, fewer than 80,000, did not start landing at Inchon, the port for Seoul, until Sept. 8, almost a month later.

COUNTRY SPLIT AT THE 38TH

The 38th Parallel, which was supposed to have divided the zones for Russian and American military efforts against the Japanese, now became something else. The Russians were to accept the surrender of the Japanese north of the 38th, the Americans to handle it in the south.

Historian Alexander De Conde says, "If there had been no division along the 38th Parallel, the Soviets probably could have over-run the country before the Americans arrived. Since the line limited the area of Communist control, it favored the U.S."

The 38th soon became frozen into a barrier—as efforts to unify Korea failed because neither the U.S. nor the Soviet Union would permit an agreement that gave the other a dominant role. (An agreement between the U.S. and Russia for a four-power trusteeship for up to five years stirred violent resistance in a Korea hungry for independence).

The U.S. carried the problem in late 1947 to the United Nations, which named a commission to seek unification and elections.

When the Russians refused to let the commission enter the north, the Republic of Korea was established in the south (succeeding our military government) and Syngman Rhee was elected president in mid-1948. In the north, the Russians at first ruled through Korean People's Committees—well trained in Moscow—then set up the "Democratic People's Republic of Korea", with the capital in Pyongyang.

WAR ERUPTS, U.N. SENDS HELP

Russian troops pulled out of Korea in 1948, the Americans in 1949. The next year—June 25, 1950—the north, heavily armed and supplied by the Russians, attacked the south.

The U.S. Security Council—with the Russians fortuitously absent and unable to vote—voted to help the south. Sixteen nations sent troops, seven others provided medical and other help.

The war seesawed up and down the peninsula, at a staggering cost. The U.S. lost 33,000 dead, 107,000 wounded and missing, and spent $15 billion. The South Koreans lost 250,000 killed in battle and suffered another two million civilian casualties.

In mid-1951, with battle lines largely stabilized at the 38th Parallel, truce talks began and two years later led to the shaky agreement which still obtains.

With the truce, Korea remained divided, as it does even now, 14 years later. Unification is still the much-discussed dream of the Koreans, but its achievement, if ever, lies in the vague future.

AT PANMUNJOM: KOREAN WAR IS STILL ON

(By George Chaplin)

A U.N. patrol is ambushed by Communist infiltrators.

South Korean ships and North Korean shore batteries exchange shellfire.

North Korean grenades blow up two U.S. Army huts.

In 1967, the Korean War still goes on—sometimes in armed clashes along the truce line, then in heated words in a quonset at Panmunjom, where a military commission supervises the longest armistice in modern history.

I rode the 35 miles from Seoul to Panmunjom in a U.S. Army car, over an inhospitable landscape socked in at times by a smoky gray haze which cancelled my plans to fly in by helicopter.

On the way, I saw a kaleidoscope of contemporary rural Korea—villagers in the fields; women walking alongside the road gracefully balanced loads on their heads; men pushing handcarts with cabbage for kim-chi or carrying towering cargoes on shoulder-strapped A-frames resting on their backs; 2½-ton trucks and jeeps unrolling dust clouds; kids playing and shouting and running; quonsets and camouflage and uniforms everywhere; the omnipresent rocky hills, with gun emplacements and bunkers on those near the border.

A REMINDER OF BERLIN WALL

In Korea, the heavy military presence is an accepted part of the scenery and a Cold War fact of life. In the north the Communists have 350,000 soldiers, equipped by the Russians, trained by the Chinese. In the south are 50,000 U.S. troops and 560,000 Koreans, the Free World's third largest force.

The vast majority of the Korean troops are in the army, with 26,000 in the air force, 24,000 in the marine corps, 17,000 in the navy. Other than Americans, the Thais are the only other foreign combat troops—350 stationed with the U.S. 7th Division. Turkey pulled out last summer, except for a token honor guard.

As the car moved along, I suddenly saw barbed wire on both sides of the road and signs warning of land mines in the surrounding countryside. I was almost at the DMZ, the demilitarized zone which divides and serves as buffer between the north and south. (I began to feel as I had when I first saw Checkpoint Charlie and the Berlin Wall).

This was the front line on which the Free World and Communist forces faced each other when a truce was signed on July 27, 1953. Negotiations had begun on July 10, 1951 in a teahouse at Kaesong, in North Korean territory, but Admiral C. Turner Joy, the senior U.S. spokesman, was so harassed there that he insisted upon changing the site to Panmunjom, then a devastated village.

SOME 18 MILLION WORDS LATER

At first the meetings were held in tents by representatives of the U.N. on one side, of the Korean People's Army (KPA) and Chinese People's Volunteers (CPV) on the other.

Two years and 17 days, 225 meetings and 18 million words later, the 18 copies of the armistice agreement were signed and opposing negotiators walked out without speaking. The Republic of Korea (ROK), having had an observer status, did not sign the pact but abides by it.

The agreement provided for a political conference on unification and withdrawal of foreign troops, and one was held in Geneva in April, 1954. But the Communists, under China's Chou En-lai, scuttled it.

Thirteen years later, the uneasy northbound boundary remains the DMZ, marching 151 miles across the Korean peninsula. It is two and a half miles deep and along its center runs the MDL, the military demarcation line, studded with 1,292 warning markers inscribed in Korean and Chinese on the north side, Korean and English on the south.

It is here where up to 1,000 personnel—the agreed maximum—patrol for each side. (The 1,000 in the southern part of the DMZ consist of 300 U.S. and 700 ROK troops). It is here where patrols sometimes clash, usually at night.

And it is also here at Panmunjom—in a circular "Joint Security Area" a half-mile wide—where the Military Armistice Commission meets on the complaint of either side. Since 1953 more than 200 meetings have been held.

HOW ARMISTICE SUPERVISED

The armistice commission has five members selected by each side. The top U.N. representative is an American major general or rear admiral, with the post rotated every six months among the U.S. Army, Air Force, Navy and Marines. Serving with him are representatives of the Republic of Korea and of the U.N. Command Advisory Group.

The other side is represented by four North Korean army officers, one of whom is also the senior member, and a Communist Chinese.

As U.N. observers there are Swiss and Swedish delegations on our side, Czech and Polish on the other. Each has eight to nine members, including three general officers and a colonel, and they meet in a building next to the armistice commission's.

I gathered that the Poles and Czechs dislike their duty since they are "virtual prisoners" of the North Koreans, who suspect them as "revisionists" and highly restrict their movements.

At Panmunjom, the U.S.'s four buildings are painted blue, the Communists' four are green. I was told the Communists has pigeons called "peace doves" which are trained to mess up the blue buildings—skipping the green—as a way of showing disdain for the U.N. representatives.

COMPETITION HAS GRIM MOOD

This tactic of trying to demean the opposition is old and standard stuff with the Communists. Admiral Joy has recalled that back at his first Kaesong meeting in 1951, he "almost sank out of sight. The Communists had provided a chair for me which was considerably shorter than a standard chair.

"Across the table . . . General Nam Il (of North Korea) protruded a good foot above my cagily diminished stature. This had been accomplished by providing stumpy Nam Il with a chair about four inches higher than usual . . ."

At first at Panmunjom there was a contest as to who would fly the higher flag. Each side tried to outdo the other, but it got so ridiculous, this field was finally yielded to the Communists.

On the main conference table where the armistice commission holds its official discussions, the miniature green flag of the Communists flies a quarter-inch higher than ours and is just a bit larger.

This would all seem rather juvenile were it not in an atmosphere of grimness and tension where implacable enemies stare icily through each other and fire official insults, sometimes for hours on end.

(Small things loom large here. The Communists once convened a meeting to bitterly complain that an American MP had thrown a snowball at a North Korean soldier.)

AVERAGE SESSION 4 HOURS

The demarcation line bisects the armistice commission's four-foot-wide table, so that the Communists are sitting in North Korea, the U.N. delegates in South Korea. (Outside, where visitors are reasonably free to wander about within the Joint Security Area, this is the only place where an American or South Korean can stand on North Korean soil without being shot or arrested.)

The average armistice commission meetings last four hours. The shortest has been under an hour, the longest 10 hours. Once the main representatives sit down at the table—their staffs behind them—they remain without a recess until the meeting ends, whatever its length.

I was told that they prepare like athletes for these sessions. The day before they dehydrate themselves since there are no restroom breaks. Such are the distorted symbols of the Cold War that for anyone on either side to leave the table, for whatever reason, would be a sign of weakness. No place for weak wills or weak bladders.

The side whose allegation of armistice violations has brought the meeting opens up first, with translations in English, Korean and Chinese blaring out in the room, in other buildings and on the outside as well, through a loudspeaker system.

Once charges are voiced, they are met with counter-charges and the battle of psychology and propaganda is joined.

EASY TO LOSE PATIENCE

The top U.N. commander when I visited was Major General Richard G. Ciccolella, who had come from a Strike Command post at McDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida. I asked him about the patience level in his job.

"It's easy to lose your patience," Ciccolella said. "They regard themselves as being at war with us. They're completely hostile. They come prepared with a sheaf of propaganda and rarely address themselves to the issue at hand."

The meeting I witnessed, looking through windows and listening to the PA system, had been called by the Communists to complain of an alleged infringement of a North Korean waterway.

Ciccolella noted the charges and said he would investigate. But first he demanded to know why the Communists had not responded to his earlier complaint over the killing of six American soldiers and one South Korean during a night patrol.

Ciccolella's tone was cold and measured. He used phrases such as "vicious bloodthirsty killers," which are mild compared to the Communists' language.

(Arthur H. Dean, who was the key U.N. and U.S. negotiator at post-armistice talks at Pammunjom, recently recalled in a New York Times Sunday magazine article that he'd habitually been called "a capitalistic crook, a rapist, thief, robber of widows, stealer of pennies from the eyes of the dead, mongrel of uncertain origin . . . a murderer lying in the gutter with filthy garbage . . .").

TALK BETTER THAN GUNFIRE

Ciccolella knew he would get nowhere—the Communists have admitted to only two of more than 5,000 alleged violations, and this very early in the game.

But the monologues are part of the Cold War ritual. And talking is preferable to big-scale shooting. The U.N. Command has admitted about 90 of more than 42,000 Communists charges, most of which are brought for propaganda rather than substance.

(In April, to counter claims by the North Korean senior delegate that the U.S. is an enemy of the Korean people, Ciccolella showed a film of Seoul's thunderous welcome to President Johnson last fall. The North Koreans walked out—the lesser aides reluctantly—but in 10 minutes some of the staff returned. Ciccolella complained of the "illegal disruption.")

Each side at Panmunjom apparently feels that it picks up points by permitting visitors. From the Free World last year came some 30,000 visitors, compared to 18,000 in 1965. From the north came about 500, down from 1,100 in 1965.

In winter, the temperature on the truce line drops to 10, sometimes 20, below zero, because of the chill blasts from Manchuria. I was there on a mild day, but still needed woolen pants and shirt, a sweater, a corduroy jacket and topcoat.

After watching the stern commission proceedings for a while, I went to the duty officer's building. The arguments followed me over the loudspeaker system.

COMMIES WARY OF DEFECTION

In this office two duty officers, an American and a North Korean, meet each noon, except on Sundays and holidays, to convey messages to their seniors and discuss such routine matters as arrival and departure of military personnel.

(The conference area is policed by both U.S. and North Korean soldiers, with no more than 35 allowed for either side at one time. I had been told that some 90 per cent of the North Koreans in uniform at Panmunjom are Communist Party members. "They never walk by themselves because the government is wary of defection").

Over a cup of coffee, I chatted with the U.N. duty officer, Lt. Cmdr. Philip A. Barnes, a Sacramento native. He has been in Hawaii several times dating back to 1950 and said he might retire in the Islands.

In one end of the office was a bookcase, with highly varied contents: paperbacks such as "The Story of Jazz" and "The Last of the Mohicans," the current issue of Army Digest, a hardcover book, "Korea Moves Ahead" and then—donated by Polish and Czech observers—"Contemporary Art in Czechoslovakia," a concise Statistical Yearbook of Poland, 1964" and issues in English of two Life-sized magazines, "Life in Poland" and "Czechoslovak Life."

I moved outside again and saw "Freedom House," a temple like building put up in September, 1965 by the Republic of Korea and given to the U.N. commission. Inside are exhibits of art and industry. Nearby, I saw the "peace pagodas" erected by the Communists.

As I continued walking, I couldn't help but notice the Communists' buildings were heavily curtained and built on a more permanent basis than ours. Presumably, they expect the talks to go on for a long, long time.

PLANNING ARMED HAMLETS

Meanwhile, the propaganda battle even extends to two villages permitted in the area. One in ROK territory is "Freedom Village," with a population of 221, in 37 families.

It is self-governing and the people pay taxes to their own little government and not to the Republic of Korea. Medical care and other help are provided by the U.S. Army. A man can bring a bride back to the village, but a woman can't bring a groom.

From the village, propaganda is broadcast across the line to a Communist "Freedom Village," which claims 2,000 population. However, intelligence sources say there are only about 100 caretakers there, with windows painted on empty shacks and with no farming of any consequence.

Currently, the Republic of Korea is planning to establish a system of 100-family "reconstruction hamlets" immediately south of the DMZ, in an area previously barred to regular farming. Two pilot projects will be set up this year, with 200 families; the goal for 1968 is 2,000 families, for 1971 some 13,000 families.

One objective is to raise needed grain. But another is to provide a defense system modeled after Israel's kibbutzim along the Arab borders, where farmers can use a gun as well as a plow. To protect themselves against Communist infiltrators from the north, the Korean farmers will receive military training and equipment and each hamlet will be commanded by a former soldier.

Thus continues the Korean War, a war now essentially of words, occasionally of bullets and increasingly of frustration.

A VISIT TO A ROK LOOKOUT

After visiting Panmunjom, I traveled in an armed jeep to a mountain-top observation post of the 25th ROK Division.

I was met by Colonel Tae Hyong Pak, the chief of staff, and escorted through a sandbagged entrance to a parapet which gave an unobstructed view of opposing territory, valleys and mountains, for many miles.

A large table held a model of the terrain, appropriately marked. I checked one point on the model, then aiming binoculars through the lookout slots located the actual place a long way ahead of the OP.

When I asked about several smoke plumes out forward, the colonel explained these had been set by U.N. forces to prepare clearer fields of fire. This was an important OP because the area was one used by agents infiltrating into the south. The OP's job was to spot such movements. Needless to say, such a visit reminded that these people are on a no-nonsense war footing.

On the return to Seoul, threading through the rocky hills, it was easy to envision what fighting in such terrain was like and how such names as Bloody Ridge, Old Baldy, the Punchbowl, Pork Chop Hill and Heartbreak Ridge became part of our geography lesson.

The current scene was more like that associated with maneuvers, except the installations looked more permanent. A company nestled here, a signal corps detachment there, a battery just down the road. And everywhere, especially in U.S. areas, the three flags—ROK, U.S. and UN Command.

Korean youngsters who've known nothing else think it's this way every place.

Red Teams Trying To Subvert South Korea

(By George Chaplin)

North Korea, in addition to its raids on DMZ outposts, seeks through subversion, infiltration and propaganda to build an underground organization and create unrest in South Korea.

The Seoul government reported in mid-June that 30 well-armed North Korean guerrillas had managed to infiltrate into the southeast, presumably to raid and sabotage.

An operation of this size is exceptional. Usually, one knowledgeable source said, the Communists work in much smaller units, such as three-man teams.

There are probably 250 North Korean agents in the south at any one time, I was told. They're well supplied with three currencies—green money (meaning U.S. dollars) Japanese yen and South Korean won.

"One of the team is a hard-liner assigned to make sure none of them is taken alive. Some of them do get caught or killed trying to cross the border from the north; (South Korean) soldiers receive a bonus for getting infiltrators. But a lot of them get through safely."

TRYING TO DISRUPT SOUTH

At the ROK Defense Ministry I was told that the Communist operations are primarily psychological warfare:

"They try to undermine, to create dissension, to make people wonder if we can really spare troops for South Vietnam or whether the internal threat here is so real as to make it better to keep the troops at home.

"North Korea is not happy with the progress made in the south. The Communists know that our stability of power depends upon the stability of the economy.

"So," the spokesman continued, "they want to slow the pace in the economic area by breeding disquiet in the social structure and by trying to create doubts internationally about our stability and thus inhibit investments.

"But we feel we have the situation under control."

The south matches the Communist propaganda with its own broadcasts to the north. There is, I was told, this difference—people in the south can listen to the north, but in the north it's a jailable offense to listen to the south.

NORTH PUMPS IN PROPAGANDA

"There's plenty of reason for vigilance here," an American with extensive duty in Korea said.

"This country lives on the border of communism. It has fought against communism. And it has more adults who have lived under communism and fled than any other place in the world.

"Some were refugees from the Russians (who occupied the north) in 1945. There was a steady flow in the rest of the 1940's and then, during the Korean War (1950–53), a big upsurge.

"A million came down at one time with our army during the retreat from the Yalu.

"But the young people in the south have had no direct experience with communism. This propaganda from the north sweeps into them. The kids wonder why north and south can't unify."

This frustration is just what North Korean Premier Il Sung Kim wants. He dare not again take on U.S. and South Korean forces in conventional combat. Instead, he hopes to overthrow the South Korean government through disruption and unrest.

Kim has said at (Communist) Workers' Party congresses: To win "against imperialism and feudalism, it is necessary for the South Korean people to take Marxism-Leninism as guidance and have a revolutionary party which represents the interests of the workers, farmers and general public broadly."

SEEKS A COMMUNIZED SOUTH

He has also said that "after the unification . . . it is our duty to carry out a democratic reform in South Korea, including land reform and nationalization of important industries.

"The achievement of the democratic revolution will be followed by socialist building and after that our country will gradually become a Communist state. We can say that we have fulfilled the mission assigned to us in world revolution when we have carried out all of these successfully."

So to Kim "peaceful unification" and communizing the south are the same.

The question is on the United Nations agenda each year. (The U.N. regards the Republic of Korea as the only legitimate government on the peninsula.) The so-called Stevenson Plan voices the U.S. and South Korean position that unification should be achieved as soon as possible by free elections under U.N. supervision.

The Communists want a resolution condemning the U.S. and the Republic of Korea, want U.S. troops removed forthwith and say they can achieve unification by South and North Korea getting together with the help of Asian nations.

NATIONALISM RUNS STRONG

Last December, the U.S. came out as well numerically in the U.N. vote against North Korea as in the past. Washington didn't altogether oppose seating North Korea delegates to discuss the issue, but wanted them first to recognize the legitimacy of the U.N. and its presence in Korea. South Korea's government went along—but the north predictably refused to.

It must be remembered that on reunification, the Koreans are genuinely nationalistic.

"Look at their history," one Western student of the country observed. "This little band of ethnically unique people have preserved this integrity for 4,000 to 5,000 years with the Japanese, Chinese and Mongols pressing them.

"One Korean was asked if he'd ever heard of the Koreans being described as 'the Irish of the Orient'. No. he said, but he had heard of the Irish as 'the Koreans of Europe.' "

In short, they're proud of their national identity and want reunification. But in the south they don't want it on Communist terms.

The North Koreans have picked up some propaganda points by offering postal exchanges. And there is some feeling that the south should present a less rigid posture about at least exploring such modest possibilities.

PART OF A LARGER PICTURE

A basic impression I got during my visit is that President Park is trying to build an economy, then move politically toward unification. But any meaningful action is years off—for Korea is part of the larger contest between the Free and Communist worlds.

As one substantial American military figure said to me:

"Sometimes people look toward Korea, Southeast Asia, India separately. This is a mistake. Our position in Korea is a major element of our deterrent to Communist China."

"Our position, unless attacked, is defensive. Our strength here is pretty real. There is a full and ample deterrent against North Korea and they're aware of this. If the Chinese Communists joined up with them again, we would have to use additional strength—but we have it in pocket.

"From the Chinese Communist point of view, this is a hunk of land on the Asian continent which defends Japan. From their view, this is close to Peking and close to 75 per cent of Chinese heavy industry—including the small military industry in the old Manchurian industrial crescent involving Harbin and Mukden.

"In terms of power politics, this is a local area which the Chinese do not disregard when they think of military advance in Asia, particularly Southeast Asia."

He leaned back in his chair and continued.

"The U.S. in 10 years has produced a good ROK army, navy and air force. Some hotheads even say they wish North Korea would start something. But Park is trying to move the country along.

MILITARY EDUCATES KOREANS

"The U.S. military has helped considerably—by training soldiers, by sending thousands of Korean officers and non-coms back to the States. The people who have been to Benning and Leavenworth were exposed to the meaning of American democracy. There's been 10 years of osmosis.

"In Korean military camps we have helped teach the soldiers electronics and technical skills and in the process began to inculcate the idea of the military man serving his country rather than himself.

"Kids from all over Korea have been given a reasonably good several-year science education, with a leavening of social studies and economics. They learn about 'duty, honor, country.' There's now a pretty widespread military conception of duty-above-self.

"It's had a good impact on the younger generation."

He said a combination of three things has changed Korea, in the sense of a nation coming of age in the modern world:

The first is the beginning of an economic upswing.

The second is the contribution to the defense of the Free World.

"It warms the heart to hear them say, 'You came and fought for us, now we are the only ones in Asia to fight for the Vietnamese defense of freedom.'

"The Koreans in Viet Nam are our best propagandists. They tell the Vietnamese, 'Don't talk about Americans like they were French. We know. They saved our country and they don't want anything for it.'

"They're really effective in Vietnam. The Koreans are proud, they're standing tall—not like the inferiority complex of a decade ago."

RAPPORT THIN, BUT THERE

The third thing, he said, which has changed Korea is the very genuine beginning of being an important political force. They generated ASPAC—the Asian and Pacific Council. They're gung ho. Before the Manila conference (in late '66), Asian countries talked about Asia; Korea shifted it to the Pacific.

"In Korea, we've begun to establish a mutuality of understanding with a genuinely Asian country on a sound basis. The rapport is only one layer deep, but it's there."

KOREAN DEMOCRACY IS YOUNG, FRAGILE

(By George Chaplin)

Korea's hopes continue to ride on a small, wiry, taciturn farmer's son who came to power in a military coup, then went on to win two national elections, the second one last May.

President Chung Hee Park is small in size—five feet four inches; about 130 pounds—and stony-faced. He's neither baby-kisser, nor handshaker, and he probably was appalled at the way President Johnson "worked" the Seoul crowds last fall.

But Park is tall in his sense of mission, in the feeling that his role in history is to draw Korea up out of the morass and make something of it. With his own brand of political magic, he effectively conveys this to most of the Korean public.

"The growth of Korean confidence, from a mendicant status to real gung ho, is almost frightening," one authoritative American observer said to me. "Park is responsible for much of this. He himself has grown a great deal."

"It's been fascinating to watch him—a soldier who came to power in 1961 knowing only the military—adapt himself to the political environment. Now he'll listen to an economist for three hours, take notes, then ask embarrassing questions of his own advisors."

HE HAS SUCCESS STORIES

Were it not for Park, there probably would have been no settlement of long-time differences between Korea and Japan. There probably would be no South Korean troops in Vietnam, and inflation likely would be worse.

Three years ago student-and-professor demonstrations and rioting against the Korea-Japan treaty threatened the country with crisis. An American there at the time told me that "only about 150 to 200 started the whole thing."

He quoted Park that, "I think students have the right to study and professors have a right to teach and I intend to protect that right."

"Park closed the local Ivy League for some months. Later some of the professors and students involved were reinstated—and the treaty is a fact of life which is good for Korea.

When Park's junta first took control, it began with an extremely authoritarian government—which has been transformed into an elected civilian administration.

In the 1963 election, Park got 43 per cent of the votes for president, only 156,000 more than his nearest rival, former president Po Sun Yun. His party received only 34 per cent in the subsequent National Assembly elections. Park, who comes from Taegu, did well in the southern area but failed to carry Seoul, the capital, and the northern countryside.

I was told that "the election was fair enough, but some people resented the junta."

WON BY CONSIDERABLE MARGIN

Park worked hard to improve the economy and broaden Korean influence in Asian affairs. His success in both paid off in his reelection this past May 3 when he drew more than 50 percent of the votes.

Eighty-two percent of the eligible voters turned out—11.5 million. Park got close to six million ballots, with his only serious contender, again Po Sun Yun, receiving under five million. Five minor rivals split the rest.

Park once more lost Seoul to Yun, but only by 80,000, as against 430,000 last time.

The election was monitored by the U.N. Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, which spot-checked polls and tallying centers.

Its members, foreign observers and American newsmen generally agreed with Park's claim that it was the "fairest and freest" election in Korea's exposure to democratic procedures.

DEMOCRACY STILL NEW IDEA

That exposure, it should be remembered, covers only 20 years, and even that period was interrupted by war and chaos. Before then, the Japanese occupied Korea for 35 years and there was no way to learn democracy. A long-time student of the Korean political scene put it to me this way:

"In more than 4,000 years, democracy is something the Koreans never had. Nowadays, the educated understand it. As yet, the vast majority don't.

"Lots of Koreans, through missionaries, had an American education. At certain levels there is a strong feeling for democracy, but no real training for it among the rest.

"Even so, Korea has the institutions of democracy in the elected President and National Assembly, which criticizes and modifies legislative proposals by the administration. The government has to take the assembly into account. It can crack the whip but it's no dictatorship.

"A bipartisan policy is as yet unknown. The opposition's idea is to oppose, flat out. The emphasis is on personal power and prestige and not on the issues. But remember that the democratic process is a very young and fragile thing here."

INTIMIDATION IN JUNE VOTE

This was borne out on June 8, just a month after Park's re-election, when balloting was conducted for the 175-seat unicameral National Assembly.

The Democratic Republican Party, which held 110 seats, faced possible inroads from the New Democratic Party—and this led to the discouraging use of muscle by pro-administration elements.

Opposition voters and election watchers were intimidated by boisterous groups, newsmen were manhandled and at least one election official was stabbed.

The violence caused Dr. Chin-o Yu, the leader of the New Democratic Party, which won 44 seats while the DRP rose to 130, to exclaim, "This is not an election, but a war."

There'd been vote-buying on both sides, but Korean students and the press felt the actions of the government and the Democratic Republican Party to be the more reprehensible because of their abuse of power.

Thousands of students clashed with police and as the rock-throwing protests continued, Seoul National University and more than 20 others, as well as many high schools, suspended classes.

SITUATION NOW IN STALEMATE

Interestingly, despite President Park's limited campaigning for his party's assembly candidates, most lost by wide margins in major cities, including some where he had piled up a landslide vote a few weeks before.

He instructed the prosecutor's office to act on some 1,200 charges of election law violations—but the vast majority of these were against opposition party backers.

The political scene is now in deadlock. The opposition has refused to enter the National Assembly and is insisting that President Park must:

1. Apologize to the people and admit that the elections were totally rigged;
2. Arrange for new national elections;
3. Dismiss the high officials responsible for the election rigging;
4. Guarantee that constitutional measures will be taken to ensure no repetition of election irregularities.

For its part, the government and the Democratic Republican Party maintain that they have done all they legally can to correct the situation.

President Park, unwilling and possibly legally unable to meet all of the demands, insists that the opposition should seek redress for its grievances through the courts and by taking part in the Assembly.

Until four days ago the government and Democratic Republican Party were unwilling to operate the Assembly unilaterally. But with the budget pending, something had to give, and they decided to convene the Assembly despite the opposition boycott.

HISTORY ONE OF RESTRICTION

This all adds up to the fact that it will take time for Korea to work itself away from the tradition of authoritarian governments and rigged elections. Most of its experience has been sadly restrictive.

After the Japanese surrender at the end of World War II, U.S. forces ran a military government for three years. When efforts to unify Korea failed, the Republic of Korea was established in the south, elections were held in the summer of 1948 under U.N. supervision and Syngman Rhee became president.

Rhee had been in exile much of his adult life because of his views against the monarchy and later the occupying Japanese. He had pleaded the cause of Korean independence in the U.S. and before the League of Nations. When he returned to Korea in 1945 he was already an old man of 70.

That he deeply loved his country and was a rallying point in resistance to communism is beyond question. But he was excessively self-centered, often harsh and repressive, and increasingly out of touch. Many close to him exploited the relationship, with resultant graft and corruption.

BRUTALITY, RIOTS AND EXILE

Political opposition to Rhee was actively discouraged—with methods ranging to the extreme—and he won several re-elections. But his fourth—in March, 1960—occurred in an atmosphere of rigged balloting, growing violence and intolerable police brutality, especially against students.

When police shot more than 100 youths during a Seoul protest march, the explosion point was reached. Full-scale rioting began—with the military in accord—and on April 27, Rhee resigned and fled to his final exile in Hawaii.

That August of 1960 Po Sun Yun was elected president and John Myun Chang became prime minister.

Their party was democratic, with true local autonomy, but it had inherited a mess which it was unable to clean up. Corruption, blackmarketing, inflation rocked the country.

The following May the military took over and after some junta in-fighting General Park emerged as the chairman. His nephew-in-law, Chong Pil Kim, then head of Korea's extremely potent Central Intelligence Agency and the architect of the revolutionary coup, ranked second.

Yun continued as a presidential figurehead, but quit in March, 1962. Park took over as acting president, then resigned his army commission as a general and won popular election in 1963—running for the new Democratic Republican Party which Chong Pil Kim had organized after resigning from the C.I.A. and the junta.

AN INTERVIEW WITH KIM

Next to Park, Kim continues as probably the most powerful man in Korea, as chairman of the ruling party. He is also a member of the National Assembly.

In an hour-long interview at party headquarters, Kim talked articulately and persuasively about progress and stability, about Park's record. Korea, he said, is a "cardinal example of how much competent leadership can achieve in a country so unstable in the past." It was, he observed, a good example for other developing nations.

Kim cited the Korea-Japan treaty "after 300 years of hostility"; the sending of Korean troops to Vietnam; the fact that "we no longer have hunger and starvation—Korea has been brought to a point where famine is eliminated."

He said his country "cannot forget the positive part played by the United States. We have begun to repay (commercial) debts and obligations (to the U.S.) and have started making contributions to the Asian Community. If we continue this pace for a few more years we will be able to lay a firm foundation for the country."

Kim and President Park are very close politically, with Kim's marriage to Park's niece representing a highly important relationship because of the close Korean family traditions. But in a sense it inhibits Kim as the junior member of the relationship.

This is difficult for Kim, for his ability is matched by his ambition. He has been characterized as "the Bobby Kennedy of Korea," with the strongest aspirations for the Presidency.

POLITICALLY, WHAT LIES AHEAD?

Park cannot run in 1971 without a constitutional amendment permitting a third term. This would require a two-thirds approval in the National Assembly, plus a majority vote in a national referendum.

Park has stated he does not intend to seek a third-term amendment. Should he change his mind, opposition from all sides, including some ambitious persons within his own party, would be such that Park would have to use extremely forceful measures.

Even so, he could not be certain that the army would tolerate the flouting of public will.

As against a possible third-term provision, there is speculation that perhaps an effort might be made to lengthen Park's second term. But knowledgeable observers regard this as highly unlikely.

One of them said to me, "Instead of asking about a change in presidential terms, a more realistic question would be about prospects for dictatorship." He added he was not suggesting an apprehension, but a possibility.

The only certainty on the political scene is that whatever happens in the next few years will tell how near to democracy—or how far from it—the Korea of our time really is.

VOCAL PRESS LARGELY FREE

The press in Korea is as free as any in the Far East excepting Japan, Hong Kong and the Philippines.

It's extremely vocal and, traditionally, has been predominantly in opposition to government. The government controls the newsprint supply and could cut it off in reprisal, but this has not kept the press from taking the administration to task.

In the summer of 1964 the government tried to ramrod through a so-called press ethics law. The newspapers violently objected and although the government was able to pass the law, it has not implemented it.

The press then formed its own ethics commission to keep an eye on newspaper performance. A number of incidents have been reviewed.

There has been one example of what most journalists regard as a grossly improper use of the press. This concerned B. C. Lee, a tycoon who not only has a powerful press combine but is in many other businesses.

When an executive of a fertilizer company dominated by Lee was involved in the smuggling of saccharine, Lee and his operations were defended by his own journalistic empire. The rest of the press took a dim view of this.

Some things the press can't do. Most importantly, it can't violate the anti-Communism law, which is an extremely broad statute. I was told, as an example, that a local dealer handling a Time or Newsweek issue containing "pretty pictures" of North Korea or China had better rip them out or expect a ban on distribution.

Highly blatant or exceedingly reckless criticism of the government is almost sure to bring action. Example: a magazine editor was jailed for falsely calling the President the mastermind of a smuggling ring.

Too often, several sources observed to me, some Korean newspapers will print rumors without checking them out. Since advertising revenue is small, most papers depend on circulation income and tend toward sensationalism in news treatment.

U.S. AID NOW CAN CUT BACK

U.S. aid to Korea has taken two forms—money and advice. Both have been of great help.

From 1957 until 1966, the U.S. put in $200 to $250 million a year in direct economic aid—on top of the substantial military aid (exclusive of our own military costs there).

Now, direct economic grant aid has dropped to $45 million a year and is declining annually. Military aid has dropped some, but still enables Korea to support 28 divisions. Korea has thus made up many millions a year that used to come from America.

(In 1956-60, for example, the country exported only $24 to $32 million annually, mostly such primary items as tungsten and other materials, seaweed and fish. Last year exports reached $250 million, with more than half in manufactured goods).

U.S. economic aid has been going through several phases, similar to the program in Taiwan, which phased out two years ago this July.

The first step involves grants for the "foundation"—harbors, railroads, power, agriculture.

Next come "soft loans"—that is, long-term, extremely low-interest loans, both to government and private enterprise. Gradually, as private investment grows, loans get "harder," shorter terms and higher interest rates. At some point, the local government and industry can do just as well obtaining money elsewhere.

(When Taiwan phased out, its credit rating was such that it could go to the World Bank or other world financing sources for loans).

Presently, Korea is still in the "soft loan" stage, but it's clear the loans will get "harder."

A few years from now, one high Korean official said to me, the half-billion dollars in foreign aid on which they used to depend will gradually be cut to zero.

"President Park has urged the people to find their own way. The people and government must work together."

For a population of Korea's size, there are many competent technical people for government service.

At the same time, the Korean administrators have been eager for U.S. counsel, much of which they have put to good use.

Four years ago each government department had its own set of statistics. The U.S. suggested one set and they went to it. People in different departments working on the same problems met, in many cases, for the first time, and this broke down, agency walls.

The office of National Taxation has been assisted by U.S. tax advisors. A new accounting system was installed for railroads. With U.S. advice, Korea liberalized its exchange rate and reorganized its credit system. In agriculture, the latest U.S. techniques have been demonstrated in soil testing and fertilizing use and vocational training.

In short, the Koreans have taken U.S. ideas and modified them to fit local circumstances. Most have worked.

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an eloquent editorial on the career of the late Senator Alexander Wiley, who died last week, published in the Milwaukee Journal, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALEXANDER WILEY

The distinction that Wisconsin voters accorded to Alexander Wiley, who died Thursday in his 84th year, was to keep him in the United States senate longer than any other senator in the history of the state—four full terms, 24 years. The Senators La Follette, sr. and jr., served 19½ and 22 years.

Seniority thus made the proudly self-styled country boy from Chippewa Falls the highest ranking senator Wisconsin ever had. He was the longtime ranking Republican on both the judiciary and the foreign relations committees of the senate and chaired each one at a different time of party ascendancy—the latter in the important early years of the Eisenhower administration.

Sen. Wiley won two splendid distinctions for himself. He became a convert to high principled internationalist views that served his country well in the postwar era. And he became officially a father of the St. Lawrence seaway, a great boon to his home state, by assuming the leadership for it at the time of ripening. His name is perpetuated in one of the seaway works, the Wiley-Dondero canal.

After a warmup run for governor in 1936, Wiley became a party hero two years later by recapturing a senate seat from the New Deal, defeating F. Ryan Duffy, sr. Three terms later, in 1956, he was the central figure in one of Wisconsin's most memorable political dramas, from which he came out bruised but triumphant.

In a bitter irony, he was the intended victim of his own loyalty to the first Republican national administration in 20 years. The party still had its Eisenhower and Taft wings, and Taftites were in command of a strong Wisconsin machine. Shabbily and cruelly they set out to get rid of Alex Wiley for his "betrayal" of isolationism and his independence of bossism. An apparently doomed, almost pathetic figure, he found a majority of Republican primary voters still with him; they turned aside the grab for his seat by the organization man, Congressman Glenn Davis.

When he tried for still another term in 1962 he was overtaken by his irascible old age and by Gaylord Nelson. Wisconsin knew him no more; he lived out his last years a recluse in Washington.

Sen. Wiley made up for a lack of intellectual pretensions with wisdom to be a learner and with courage of conviction. World War II shook him completely out of his instinctive rural midwestern isolationism. As a disciple of the great Sen. Vandenberg he came to give both Presidents Truman and Eisenhower valiant and valuable backing in all manifestations of America's world role—Marshall plan, Atlantic treaty and all—very nearly earning the name of statesman in that work.

He was a warm hearted, high spirited, jovial man, yet a sturdy battler on occasion. He was a decent and honorable man. A pleasant story of him is how he once could have blocked an appointment of the man who had just been his election opponent, Thomas E. Fairchild. He cordially endorsed the appointment instead.

His state owes him an affectionate memory; his party and historians of the Eisenhower administration would rightly acknowledge substantial debts to Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin.

FOREIGN MEDICAL PERSONNEL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Mr. Richard D. Lyons wrote an excellent article on the brain drain involving foreign medical personnel.

The situation Mr. Lyons outlines would be serious indeed if the only ramifications were on the quality and competence of medical care in the United States. But it involves far more than that. Each one of the foreign doctors who comes to the United States and remains here constitutes the loss of an extremely valuable resource to his native country. It is a loss, not only in terms of health services and standards in his country, but also a loss of a potential leader to a developing nation, which desperately needs every bit of its talent and leadership working for national development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this well-documented article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN PHYSICIANS, MANY UNQUALIFIED, FILL VACUUM IN UNITED STATES

(By Richard D. Lyons)

The national shortage of doctors and the rising demand for health services has led to the immigration of thousands of foreign physicians, many of doubtful ability who may arrive to practice in American medical institutions sight unseen and quality untested.

The influx of doctors from overseas has become so great in the last 20 years that as many foreign-trained physicians enter the health care system of the United States each year as are graduated from American medical schools.

About 45,000 doctors who were trained in foreign medical schools now reside in this country, and the number is increasing at the rate of 10 per cent a year.

Many of the foreign doctors, possibly as many as 5,000, have been unable to pass tests of basic medical knowledge and are practicing medicine without licenses, sometimes because of loopholes in state certification rules and sometimes with the knowledge of the hospitals in which they work.

Interviews with medical educators, hospital executives and public officials showed that some American hospitals were so short-staffed that they were advertising for doctors overseas and paying their travel expenses to come here, ostensibly for post-graduate study but often for use as cheap help.

MORE FROM POOR NATIONS

The paradox of the migrant doctor problem is that the countries with the better medical schools and standards of health care have far fewer physicians migrating to the United States than those nations whose levels of medical education and services are poor.

England, France, Japan and the Scandinavian nations enjoy higher longevity and lower infant mortality rates than the United States, a reflection of national systems of health care at least as good if not better, but relatively few doctors from there come to this country.

A much larger number enter from such underdeveloped nations as India, Iran and the Dominican Republic, countries with lower standards of health care and a doctor shortage of their own, and these physicians may have only the sketchiest knowledge of both English and medicine.

"This is a major national scandal and there has been no policing of foreign doctors because no central organization is responsible for them," said Dr. Harold Margulies of Washington, assistant director of the American Medical Association's Division of Socio-Economic Activities.

Dr. Margulies, who has studied the problem for six years, estimated that from 2,000 to 5,000 foreign-trained doctors were practicing medicine in the United States without licenses.

SUBSTANDARD CARE SEEN

"I have personally seen unlicensed foreign medical graduates working in hospitals," he said. "We have been meeting our manpower shortage in the United States with substandard people who are offering substandard care in our institutions."

While some of the foreign doctors practicing medicine without licenses do so in violation of state laws, the shortage of physicians has been so acute that many regulatory groups have not moved against them. Penalties vary widely between jurisdictions.

Some hospital officials said that the employment of foreign medical graduates was dictated through necessity as the demands increased for the staffing of emergency rooms, hospital wards and psychiatric institutions.

"Patients in many state hospitals have no hope of getting out and many doctors are uninterested in drab surroundings and uninteresting work," said one hospital executive in Chicago, who added bluntly: "So why not bring in doctors who have 'read' medicine for only six months?"

Dr. Edwin L. Crosby, director of the American Hospital Association in Chicago, attributed the influx of foreign-trained physicians to the increased demand for medical services that opened "thousands of more internship and residency posts in American hospitals, along with the desire "of many foreign graduates for training in the United States."

Dr. Crosby stressed, however, that the hospital association "does not believe that the presence of the vacancies and the need for physician coverage should be used to permit the employment of inadequately trained physicians or those with a substantial language barrier."

An official of the American Medical Association in Chicago said that according to association records almost 7,000 foreign doctors enter the United States every year, yet only half had passed a formal test of medical knowledge prepared by the Educational Council for Foreign Medical Graduates in Philadelphia.

Without certification that he has passed this test, a foreign doctor cannot enter a post-graduate training program in a good hospital, which was probably what attracted him to the United States in the first place.

MAY BE LISTED AS ORDERLIES

"We feel that a lot of these guys end up by working in state institutions and marginal hospitals," the A. M. A. official said. "They may be on the books as broom handlers and orderlies even though they may be actually practicing medicine."

Several medical educators agreed, however, that the instruction foreign doctors receive in this country produces many fine physicians who practice high-quality medicine whether they choose to remain here or return home. But no one knows how many do eventually leave the United States.

According to A.M.A. records, there are 45,749 graduates of foreign medical schools residing in the United States. The figure includes 5,722 graduates of Canadian schools, whose standards are as high as American institutions. The countries of origin and numbers of others are: the Philippines, 5,055; Germany, 4,150; Italy, 2,811; Switzerland, 2,313; the United Kingdom, 2,110; India, 1,833; Mexico, 1,201; Korea, 1,060, and Iran, 1,000.

Federal surveys have shown that last year 3,000 foreign medical graduates entered the United States, while 4,500 more came here on exchange visas. In addition, 500 United States citizens returned home after receiving doctorates of medicine at foreign schools. Thus, a total of 7,500 foreign medical graduates entered the United States last year while American medical schools graduated 7,574.

The drain on medical manpower has become so acute in India that this month she refused to allow physicians to take an examination that would qualify them for practice in the United States.

As one Pennsylvania medical educator said: "This country is simply stealing talent and stealing it from countries that can least afford it."

The doctors coming here, he said, "are not being educated—they're being used" by hospitals that cannot "afford to hire competent doctors."

A study by the Association of American Medical Colleges seemed to bear him out. One-quarter of the positions open to interns and residents in American hospitals were being filled by foreign medical graduates, but most of the foreign doctors were not going to the best institutions.

"Most of those who do not have licenses disappear to state hospitals and some states grant special licenses to practice medicine only in that state and only in that institution," he said.

According to a list of state licensing requirements printed in the Journal of the American Medical Association, 20 states have limited licensing arrangements allowing physicians to practice medicine even though they have not been licensed to do so.

But half of the 3,000 foreign medical graduates who take state licensing examinations every year fail the tests, according to the Association of American Medical Colleges. And passing the examinations may not be a true indication of a doctor's proficiency.

NONE FAILED IN THREE STATES

Dr. Robert C. Derbyshire, past president of the Federation of State Medical Boards and Secretary of New Mexico's Board of Medical Examiners, conducted a study of state licensing procedures between 1955 and 1965.

During that period, he said, the boards in Oklahoma, Idaho and Tennessee "did not fail a single candidate" for a license to practice medicine. In addition, Kentucky, Wyoming, Michigan, Minnesota, Alabama and South Carolina failed only 14 applicants. "The nine states with the lowest failure rates examined 10,455 candidates, with a failure rate of less than 0.14 percent," he said.

Armand L. Bird, executive secretary of the Idaho Board of Medical Examiners, said that the failure rate was low because "applicants for licensure are screened well in advance of the test" to see if they are competent. But Mr. Bird declined to estimate how many applicants had been turned down before the formal test was given.

The Oklahoma Board of Medical Examiners reported that 20 applicants failed in the last two years, and that some failed in previous years, but that the statistics had become garbled.

The administrative assistant to the Tennessee board, Mrs. Gertrude Moore, said that 13 applicants had failed since 1964 but that they were not listed as "failures." She said that the 13 were given a second chance to pass the test and that most did.

Dr. G. Halsey Hunt, executive director of the Educational Council for Foreign Medical Graduates, said that "the licensing each year of close to 1,500 graduates of foreign schools is not a good thing for the United States."

"If these doctors stay in this country," Dr. Hunt said, "they drain something out of the economy of their homeland. They come here because it looks like greener pastures with interns making $400 a month and residents $600, even though the American graduates get the good jobs and the foreign medical graduate gets what's left."

Council statistics showed a high failure rate among those foreign doctors taking the council's test, which is given at United States embassies and consulates. About 60 per cent of those taking the test for the first time overseas fail. Dr. Hunt said, although 98 per cent of Americans would pass it.

But Dr. Hunt pointed out that many of those who failed took the examination again and that 65 per cent eventually passed. "Anyone who has passed the ECFMG is a person who has a degree of medical knowledge comparable to 98 per cent of American medical graduates," he said.

The council's test is a one-day examination containing 360 questions taken from the National Board of Medical Examiners tests that many American medical students take in place of state licensing tests. The passing score is 75. Yet only 12 per cent of foreigners score above 80, as opposed to 80 per cent of Americans.

"The ECFMG examination is a meaningless, watered down test," said Dr. Margulies of the A.M.A. He contended that while the questions were taken from the national board tests, "the most difficult questions are eliminated to allow a larger percentage to pass."

The council's annual report for 1965 says: "It must not be assumed, however, that passing the ECFMG examinations means the same as passing National Board Examinations. Questions that have been judged to be very difficult for American graduates have not been included in the ECFMG examinations."

"To use 75 as a passing grade for this exam would be okay if those who came here returned home again after specialized training," Dr. Margulies said. "But giving them patient responsibility is simply unsatisfactory."

Failure rates for graduates of foreign medical schools vary widely depending on the institution. Last year graduates of the University of Santo Tomas in Manila passed 170 state licensing examinations and failed 110. Istanbul University graduates took 158 tests and failed more than half. University of Bologna graduates passed 48 tests and failed 44. Graduates of British and Scandinavian medical schools passed 100 examinations and failed only nine.

"We are pretending that every medical degree is the same," one medical educator said. In many overseas medical schools, he added, students attend lectures for four years "and never see a patient until they come to the United States to serve as internes."

The curriculum of American medical schools devotes the first two years to instruction in the basic medical sciences, while the second two are used for clinical teaching in which the students work with patients under the tutelage of experienced physicians.

Most foreign-trained doctors entering this country are tested to determine minimum competence, but there has apparently been only one attempt to rate their over-all performance as doctors.

Dr. Erwin Hirsch, director of medical education at the Princeton (N.J.) Hospital, has been giving the same test of basic medical knowledge to American-trained doctors and physicians trained overseas for more than a year.

"The test does not pretend to prove that a man is a good doctor because you can't rate a doctor by an exam alone," Dr. Hirsch said. "But it is a devilishly clever test and the best gauge we have of measuring clinical competence. The test takes a full day and comes pretty close to judging the art of being a doctor. Actual cases and their management are presented, including motion pictures of patients."

Thus far 60 Americans and 129 foreign doctors have taken the test, which has been given at the beginning and end of their internships. Dr. Hirsch said that there was only one American failure both times. One-third of the foreign graduates passed the test the first time, he said, but after internship two-thirds of them passed.

Dr. Hirsch said that hospitals were using a variety of "recruiting drives" for foreign medical graduates. A director of medical education in a nearby state said he received monthly letters from travel agencies in New York offering to arrange delivery of foreign medical graduates. One of these agencies is the Korea Travel Service in Manhattan, directed by Peter Ohm.

"Business is booming," Mr. Ohm told a recent visitor. He estimated that in the last three years he had placed 120 graduates of South Korean medical schools in American hospitals.

Mr. Ohm said that South Korean doctors who want to come to the United States get in touch with his office in Seoul "and we contact the hospitals here." The American hospitals advance the money for tickets to his travel agency, he said, and the Seoul office gives the tickets to the Korean doctors.

"Today if I call a hospital and say I have a doctor for them they would pay me immediately," Mr. Ohm said.

Mr. Ohm said that internship "used to be slavery, but it's not any more." He explained that some small hospitals will give the air fare to the doctor as a bonus, as well as furnishing him with an apartment and a salary of $600 a month.

He said that the Korean doctors seemed to be satisfied with their new jobs. "Most don't go back home once they get here," he said, even though the Government in Seoul has been trying to persuade them to return.

Attempts to limit the influx of foreign doctors have failed in part because of changes in the immigration regulations.

At one time ECFMG certification was almost mandatory. Then the regulations were relaxed to let foreign doctors enter the country without certification if they had a medical degree and had practiced for at least two years in their own countries. This year the law was changed again to allow in any graduate of a medical school.

"Something should be done about it," Dr. Hunt of the educational council said.

Something is being done about it—in Canada. Medical licensure boards there are studying means of developing uniform requirements for medical licenses that would apply in all 10 provinces, said Dr. J. C. C. Dawson, registrar of the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Dr. Dawson said that Canada's foreign doctor problem was more acute than America's because "when your immigration people tell them [the foreign doctors] to move on they come here."

But Dr. Dawson, like his American colleagues, did not envision any quick solution because of the difficulties of getting 10 provincial or 50 state boards to agree on uniform standards.

Many American private health groups are seeking to involve the Federal Government, not only in the foreign doctor problem but also in the whole range of troubles of the American system of health care, including the financing of medical schools.

One panel of leading medical educators estimated in a report to the Federal Government that the cost of expanding medical schools to the point that they could start to produce as many new American doctors each year as are entering from overseas could be as high as $1 billion. Yet many American medical schools are on the verge of bankruptcy.

WALTER REUTHER SUPPORTS A PROGRAM OF SALES HOUSING FOR THE LOWER INCOME FAMILY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, at this session the Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency has devoted much of its energy to the problem of developing a broad program for homeownership for the lower income family. Until last year this was one of the major missing links in our housing policy. Representative SULLIVAN established the first such program with the 221(h) program which is now being implemented in St. Louis, Milwaukee, Philadelphia, and other cities.

However, this is a small program, tied to rehabilitation and requiring the use of FNMA special assistance funds. There is still the need for a larger program. There has been a recognition of this need as exemplified by the large number of proposals for homeownership which were introduced this session. The Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee held over 2 weeks of hearings this session, and the vast majority of the testimony was about homeownership. The conclusion of this testimony is that a program of homeownership for the lower income family is a useful supplement to our existing housing legislation. It will offer one more alternative to the lower income family as it tries to better its housing condition.

Upon completion of the hearings the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], submitted a plan for sales housing to the subcommittee which will be the basis for the final bill reported from the subcommittee. However, the chairman also suggested that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] and I develop modifications that would reflect our two positions. Such a compromise has been developed, and it is my hope that this compromise, along with the chairman's ideas, will be the basis for a bill to be reported at this session.

Mr. President, this morning I received a telegram from Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, which supports this compromise and recommends the inclusion of it in the 1967 omnibus housing bill. Mr. Reuther has been a leader in developing and supporting proposals to benefit America's poor. He is truly one of America's leading citizens. It is indeed a compliment to this proposal that Mr. Reuther has seen fit to endorse and support it. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the telegram from Walter Reuther be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT, MICH.,
October 27, 1967.

Senator MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Through the cooperation and support of Chairman Sparkman, a viable compromise provision to establish sales housing program for the less advantaged based on proposals by Senators Mondale and Percy can be included in the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act. On behalf of the United Automobile Workers, I urge support for this provision in the Banking and Currency Committee.

WALTER P. REUTHER.

MILWAUKEE SENTINEL SUPPORTS PROPOSED NEW BUDGET

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a recent editorial the Milwaukee Sentinel writes:

> Difficult as the budget reform task is said to be, every effort ought to be made to put the single-budget concept into effect as soon as possible.
>
> The prospect of bringing the federal budget under control, making it structurally sound as well as financially sound, ought to be started at least with the budget President Johnson is to submit next January.

This forthright support for prompt use of the new budget comes from a paper which has been consistently critical of the administration's fiscal policies and has a deep concern for economy.

If the President is to propose his financial plans next January in the new budget form—and I join the Sentinel in hoping that he does—then Congress has a great deal of homework ahead of it.

This is why the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee which will be underway shortly can be so useful to Congress in winning an understanding in detail of the new budget proposals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Milwaukee Sentinel editorial supporting the single-budget idea be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SINGLE BUDGET

Combining the federal government's three budgets into one budget would seem so eminently sensible that one might think it should be done forthwith.

Unfortunately, as logical and desirable as the president's budget study commission recommendation is, it is no simple and easy task to make the changeover. Consequently, it is believed highly unlikely that the reform can be instituted by next January, when the next budget is to be submitted. There just isn't enough time, we're being told.

As is all too well known, the federal budget is out of control two ways. One of the ways is fiscally. The long spell of spending beyond our means has reached a point where the budget is practically meaningless, with soaring deficits making a mockery of spending estimates.

The other way the federal budget is out of control is structurally. Through many administrations, the budgetary system has grown more and more complicated, until it has become a virtual shell game with the spending pea lost to even the sharpest eyes during the shuffling of the shells of the administrative budget, the consolidated cash budget and the national income accounts budget.

Combining these three budgets into one clearer package, it is important to note, will not automatically bring the budget under control fiscally. The only way this can be done is to quit spending more than is taken in year after year.

But consolidating three budgets into one will go a long way toward bringing the federal budget under control structurally. This, in turn, could help bring the budget under control fiscally by giving the public a clearer understanding of Washington's spending policies. To put it the other way around, it would be harder for an administration to sell the public the notion that the nation can eat its cake and have it, too.

Therefore, difficult as the budget reform task is said to be, every effort ought to be made to put the single budget concept into effect as soon as possible.

The process of bringing the federal budget under control, making it structurally sound as well a financially sound, ought to be started, at least, with the budget President Johnson is to submit next January.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON OPENS NEW CHAPTER IN AMERICAN-MEXICAN FRIENDSHIP

Mr. MONTOYA. President Johnson and Mexican President Diaz Ordaz opened a new era of American-Mexican friendship by writing the final chapter to the century-old Chamizal land dispute.

Since a southward change of course in the Rio Grande altered our common boundary 105 years ago, the controversy over ownership of the Chamizal has aggravated United States-Mexican relations.

Every American President since 1925 has been deeply embroiled in the dispute, but not until the Kennedy-Johnson administration was an honorable solution negotiated. Courage was required and Presidents Kennedy and Johnson acted courageously to return the Chamizal to its rightful owners—the Mexican people.

President Johnson's transfer of the territory to Mexico transforms the Chamizal from a division of friction into a borderline of friendship. What for 100 years has symbolized disagreement now—in the President's words—"has become—for both of our peoples—an inspiring symbol of friendship and mutual respect."

The proud people of Mexico now have back what a quirk of nature took away. They also have—thanks to the vision of Presidents Johnson and Diaz Ordaz—a closer, warmer relationship with their neighbors to the north than at any time in recent history.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the purpose of laying down the pending business for tomorrow, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 624, S. 2515, the Redwood National Park.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. S. 2515, to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 31, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 30, 1967:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officers to be permanent commissioned officers of the Coast Guard in the grade of commander:

Frank M. Sperry
Robert P. Harmon
Eugene G. Verrett
Glenn N. Parsons
Harold W. Woolley
James A. Kearney
Harris A. Pledger, Jr.
Laurence O. Bates
Edward Nelson, Jr.
William B. Clark
Nathaniel C. Spadafora
Jack A. Howell
Russell P. Combs
William E. Heath
Richard A. Bauman
Arthur Solvang
Arthur W. Gove
George J. Weidner
Raymond W. Bernhardt
Edward F. Davis, Jr.
Robert C. Pittman
Calvin E. Crouch
Harry J. Oldford, Jr.
William E. Smith
Rudolph V. Cassani
Marshall K. Phillips
Kenneth M. Lumsden
Thomas H. Rutledge
Ernest L. Murdock
Paul Nichiporuk
Eugene P. Baumann
Louis H. Mense
Walter E. Goldhammer
William P. Kozlovsky
Edwin L. Parker
Paul E. Schroeder
Ralph W. Judd
William T. Sheppard
James C. Morrow
James I. Doughty
Richard G. Kerr
John M. Culbertson
John N. Wilkinson
William J. Tillo
Gerald J. Budridge
Dwight T. Ramsay
Charles L. Clark
James L. Howard
Francis H. Molin
Kenneth A. Long
Alfred F. Bridgman, Jr.
George T. Seaman
John R. Kirkland
Henry Lohmann
Milton Y. Suzich
Carlton W. Swickley
Arthur E. Ladley, Jr.
Jack E. Coulter
Richard T. Brower
Raymond J. Copin
Guy W. Mizell
Clyde E. Robbins
Verne E. Cox
Robert B. Bacon
Philip J. Danahy
Joseph A. McDonough, Jr.
William C. Nolan
Clyde T. Lusk, Jr.
George H. Wagner
Billy E. Richardson
Thomas R. Tyler
Albert C. Tingley, Jr.
James A. Wilson
Charles F. Hahn
Beverly V. Billingslea
Nelson G. Emory
Richard K. Simonds
Joseph P. Dawley
Leigh A. Wentworth
Daniel S. Bishop
Jack E. Buttermore
Albert E. Reif, Jr.
Rex R. Morgan
Victor R. Robillard
Arnold M. Danielsen
James L. Fear
Robert T. Getman
Norman E. Fernald
Eugene L. Davis
Dewey F. Barfield
Robert R. Houvener
Frank J. Diersen
Henry N. Helgesen
Sidney O. Tharrington, Jr.
Gordon D. Hall
Robert F. Mercier
Robert L. Sullins
James C. Knight
Norman A. Toon
Alfred E. Spori
Maynard J. Fontaine
Harold W. Doan
Edgar S. Hutchinson
Merrill K. Wood
George F. Merritt
David B. Flanagan
Henry Haugen
David L. Green
Martin J. Kaiser
Alban Landry
Charles B. Glass
William N. Spence
Ira L. Krams
Kenneth W. Forslund
Irwin W. Lindemuth
James E. Ferguson
Joseph L. Coburn, Jr.
Richard Nielsen, Jr.
Richard Rounsevelle
Leon T. Dankiewicz
Robert L. Cook
Carmen J. Blondin
Bobby F. Hollingsworth
Leo Jordan
Charles A. Biondo
Howard M. Veillette
Arthur E. Gerken
Charles F. McFadden
Howard B. Thorsen
Robert E. Larsen
Charles A. Millradt
Charles Leddy
Edward W. Murphy
Thomas C. Lutton
John J. Dirschel, Jr.
George E. Walton
William J. Bickford
Henry Suski
Richard L. Brown
Frederick F. Herzberg, Jr.
Herbert H. H. Kothe

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers of the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant:

Jack C. Rittichier
William J. Minor
Joseph T. Lersch
Jerome T. Wallace
John W. Lockwood
Marion T. Tilghman
Martin F. Heatherman
Dennis G. McDaniel
Charles A. Carleon
Roderick Martin III
Warren A. Baker
William H. Solley, Jr.
Karl A. Luck
William R. Wilkins
Theodore H. Hofer

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers of the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

William J. Loefstedt
John A. McCullough

IN THE ARMY

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army, by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of 10 U.S.C., sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be first lieutenant

Baggett, John A., OF100762.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of 10 U.S.C., sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Boudinot, Burton S., O1937947.
Carter, Leonard E., O4020996.
Casteel, Raymond K., O4009324.
Miller, George W., O1933639.
Steverson, James R., O4023564.
Tate, Clyde J., O4005952.
Trapp, Turner J., O2002954.

To be captains

Ault, John W., Jr., O4074355.
Benson, J. D., O5322361.
Boone, Howard, O5201111.
Butler, Lyle W., Jr., O5208790.
Byrd, Melvin L., O5205253.
Catlett, Richard W., O5307188.
Conforti, Gilbert, O5307318.
Cotton, Thomas B., O4035427.
Dantzler, William D., Jr., O5302308.
Ferriani, Robert P., O5005629.
Fitzpatrick, James J., Jr., O5209687.
Gray, Robert O., O5434352.
Guarino, Harold B., O5208154.
Hagan, Joe P., O5404219.
Henderickson, Richard E., O5307348.
Langrehr, Michael J., O5405291.
Mackintosh, Hartley B., O5505714.
Monzingo, Harold L., O5704001.
Moody, Rosser L., Jr., O4069657.
Myers, Ernest L., O5307255.
Naylor, Robert H., II, O5320713.
Perham, John E., O2296621.
Pratt, Robert H., O4031420.
Roberson, Clayton S., O5403089.
Scanlan, Walter G., O5000164.
Searcy, James W., O5307528.
Showalter, Robert A., O5207001.
Tebo, Robert J., O5206313.
Todd, Jackson E., O5875147.
Torsani, Joseph A., Jr., O4021051.
Vickery, Ellison B., Jr., O5310835.
Wainwright, Oliver O., O5207048.
Wheeler, Philip A., O5208690.
Witt, Billy J., O5703995.
Woodle, Kenneth J., O4071264.

To be first lieutenants

Arnold, Richard L., O5406411.
Arter, Jerome S., O5504147.
Bacon, Douglass P., O5314392.
Bawell, Walter A., O5222674.
Behr, Steven, O5018039.
Bianco, Charles, O5017100.
Booth, Clinton A., O5017108.

Brafford, Robert, O2293743.
Buford, William C., O2288435.
Burr, Jacky A., O5322361.
Burrell, Victor F., O5321053.
Butler, Perry C., O5216093.
Campbell, William H., O5516493.
Chien, Kenneth, O5222599.
Coniglio, James V., O5227819.
Counts, Edward T., O2317184.
Cowgill, Perry B., O5415958.
Crawford, William R., O5407888.
Crigger, Donald E., O5215834.
Czerwonka, August E., O5322372.
Daniel, Eugene L., O5415362.
Dean, David E., O5013869.
Deckett, Paul E., O5320418.
Dibble, George B., Jr., O5313172.
Ellington, Jimmy R., O5412882.
Fischer, Donald C., Jr., O5218508.
Foye, David M., O5320940.
Frazier, Robert D., O5318176.
Fullerton, Robert J., O5321658.
Hakola, John A., O5316104.
Hardy, Robert S., Jr., O5221833.
Hawkins, Spencer E., O5709756.
Houdyshell, Walter L., O5709682.
Hunt, Robin R., O5706871.
Jones, Philip R., O5513161.
Keefer, Marvin E., O2314567.
Kreinik, Herbert, O5227779.
Lazzari, Joseph D., O5222188.
Lee, Stephen H., O5311567.
Long, William P., O5739380.
Mailki, Donald B., O5222893.
Masi, Herbert C., O5709423.
McLaughlin, Joseph P., Jr., O5221891.
McLeskey, Frank R., O5317190.
Miller, Donald W., O5206805.
Morris, Hollis L., O5219442.
Mycock, James S., O5320203.
Needham, James P., O5214933.
Quamo, George, O5307391.
Quigley, George, O5320218.
Ritter, James W., O5220724.
Robinson, Dwight K., O5508463.
Sands, Thomas J., O5209761.
Scheer, Robert O., O5514958.
Schwartz, Wayne E., O5322014.
Seybold, Calvin C., O5223136.
Singhaus, Robert L., O5436696.
Slagle, Benny L., O5900090.
Smith, Clarence R., O5004966.
Spoonemore, Bobby B., O5409375.
Strassburger, Gustav A., O5519480.
Supinski, Richard E., O5218802.
Tillman, Samuel J., O5405868.
Tragesser, John N., II, O5405640.
Velezis, James A., O5018028.
Vencill, Carleton P., O5534194.
Voelz, James H., O5532255.
Walburn, Richard L., O2300239.
Zick, Robert E., O5214611.

To be second lieutenants

Adams, Melville W., O5328324.
Blaylock, Norman R., O5328267.
De Frain, Dennis A., O5536163.
De Vaughn, Kermit L., O5324532.
Douglass, David G., O5326393.
Fitzpatrick, Joseph W., Jr., O5233402.
Griffin, Linwood, O5418551.
Hall, Charles W., O5420227.
Hink, William M., O5228734.
Holmes, Edward A., O5424930.
Hookness, Robert S., O5325577.
Howard, Thomas A., O5236961.
Kelliher, John J., O5023067.
Krantz, Kenneth A., O5228426.
Laubecher, Ralph G., O5326269.
Leet, James L., Jr., O5534237.
Mann, Thomas R., O5324355.
Mattioli, Ronald B., O5323646.
Maughan, Franklin D., Jr., O5711232.
McCullough, David D., Jr., O5229028.
Owens, John M., III, O5324606.
Senninger, Theodore J., O5419230.
Sims, Benjamin A., O2305859.
Snow, Glen L., O2320828.
Thornton, Harold E., O2324581.
Voisine, Victor K., O2322399.
Wagner, Joseph B., O5423893.

Wagner, Robert L., O5519943.
Whitt, Walter F., III, O5328435.
Wiedenfeld, Kenneth W., O5418503.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and branches specified, under the provisions of 10 U.S.C., sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311:

To be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps

Jensen, Robert T., O964251.

To be major, Medical Service Corps

Campbell, William A., O4006109.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Bauman, Jerome H., MN805844.
Beckman, Ronald, J., MN902680.
Burton, Robert W., MN2295003.
Clayton, Sanford A., MN2301071.
Collins, Neal W., MN2300879.
Fladeland, Donovan L., MN2304524.
Gonzales, Luis J., MN2296500.
Hart, John B., MN2293571.
Harvey, John J., Jr., MN2300097.
Hauck, Leonard N., MN2291977.
Martin, Melvin M., MN2297651.
Maziarski, Frank T., MN902664.
Newton, Donald H., MN2304165.
Smith, Roy D., MN2287133.
Stepulis, John J., MN2300143.
Storey, Billy M., MN2294004.
Zitzelberger, John J., MN5501799.

To be captains, chaplain

Beck, Frank S., O2302325.
Cochran, Keric J., O5036661.
Gibbs, Charles R., III, O1885247.
Rivers, William H., O4045083.
Shannon, Sylvester L., O4044988.
Starnes, William B., O2297216.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Everett, Gaither B.,
Klonaris, Nick S., O5330493.
Parmer, Dennis E., O5408307.
Politowicz, Edward P., O5220530.
Welsch, Stephen L., O5306895.

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Suarez, Philip M., O5007963.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Allen, Frank H., O5238781.
Brown, Samuel A., O5021563.
Dearnbarger, Norman E., O5540660.
Giddens, Warren W., O4041742.
Golembiewski, Richard S., O5519195.
Graven, Richard M., O5712093.
Leslie, James R., O5540378.
Manning, John J., O5325954.
O'Kieffe, Donald A., Jr., O5540031.
O'Regan, Thomas J., O5519753.
Padgett, Robert A., O5325959.
Parker, David N., O5325909.
Peter, Peter R., O5021502.
Slaughter, William G., O5326034.
Smith, Robert D., O5401917.
Stamps, Phil., O2316613.

To be captain, Women's Army Corps

Gibson, Gwen, L5306587.

To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Evans, Ida S., R5411433.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Bouleau, Paul J., MN2316656.
Christner, John K., MN5417273.
Churchill, Frank E., Jr., MN5422027.
Diez, Sarah G., N5417261.
Holder, Richard A., MN2326616.
Johnson, Tony B., MN5417391.
McDowell, Boyce N., MN2312710.
Michel, George H., MN902508.
Sauter, Joseph G., Jr., MN2322891.
Stanfield, John C., MN5417449.
Tiers, Sharon M., N2323867.
Umphenour, Jo H., N5411343.
Weddell, Rose M., N234588.
Westmoreland, Carolyn A., N5417260.
Wolf, Jo Ellen, N5417217.

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Cooke, James P., O2317103.
Hunt, Henry L., O5312951.

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

McCoy, Clark H., O5423370.

To be first lieutenant, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Wilson, George E., O5011060.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Almquist, Howard T., O2325756.
Ammel, Theodore J., O5540541.
Babcock, William S., O5519651.
Bell, Thomas D., O2321056.
Bollman, Charles S., O2325868.
Brannon, Julian W., O2325516.
Bridenbaugh, Robert H., O5711996.
De Villez, Richard L., O2321059.
Larson, Arthur W., Jr., O2321141.
Leman, Milton H., Jr., O5417533.
Lovelace, Dallas W. III, O5317247.
Mahakian, Charles G., O5232170.
Martin, Carroll M., Jr., O2321880.
Maybee, David A., O2320826.
McManus, Lawrence F., O2325796.
Shuger, Richard D., O5205074.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Crissey, Melvin P., Jr., O5322873.
Jorlett, Joel, O5322112.
McCauley, Charles L., O5219642.
McClinton, Gaylon M., O5415423.
Parsons, Ray E., O2307921.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Lyon, Wendell K., O2325726.
Wofford, Donald R., O5320028.

To be second lieutenants, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Cronin, Martha A., R5422074.
Dishongh, Sharron J., J5422054.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Berry, Richard L., MN2320095.
Christenson, Larry D., MN5520412.
Huntington, Theodore L., MN5417500.
Reed, Richard T., MN5422118.

The following-named distinguished military and scholarship students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of 10 U.S.C., sections 2106, 2107, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Austin, Henry III.
Goldammer, Robert M.
Nakayama, Harvey K.

To be second lieutenants

Amox, Ronald L.
Aoyagi, Gordon A.
Arnold, John W.
Asher, Samuel E.
Askwig, Glenn W., Jr.
Baker, Jon F.
Barrett, William J.
Bauman, Stephen A.
Bay, Thomas R.
Black, Ronald L.
Bowers, Larry E.
Boyd, Richard S.
Bray, David R.
Brown, Willie, III
Brunson, Eliehue
Burns, James C.
Burton, James M.
Bustamante, Arturo
Carlson, John A.
Carr, William L., III
Collings, Laurence K.
Cunningham, Jesse M.
Dahl, Gary A.
Darrow, Arthur C., III
Davis, John F.
Davis, William E.
Denmark, Robert A.
Donahue, John L.
Douglas, John W., Jr.
Dunham, Dale L.
Edmonds, James T., III
Estey, Allan E.
Ferezan, Daniel M.
Fleming, Weldon G., Jr.
Ford, Curtis M.
Fredine, Richard E.
Gardenhire, Gary W.
Geoghegan, William C.
Glass, Stephen S.
Glover, Donald H.
Godwin, Carroll M.
Guthrie, Paul J.
Haggar, Michael J.
Hamilton, James N.
Harbor, John D.
Hess, James M.
Hobdy, Harrell H.
Hollywood, John H.
Horne, William L., Jr.
Howell, Clifford N.
Hull, Scott W.
Hutson, Thomas M., III
Jones, Michael G.
Kaiser, Charles A.
Kamerath, David E.
King, Dennis R.
Kirk, Joseph S., Jr.

Korb, Kenneth W.
Kroon, Jerry D.
Lamborn, George, L.
Lay, Russell
Lee, M. Clark
Luckett, James S., II
Main, Roger L.
Malone, Dennis A.
Marty, Edward J.
Mealing, Robert A.
Mills, James I., Jr.
Moore, Earl E., Jr.
Morris, Joe S.
O'Connor, Terry A.
Olson, John D., Jr.
Owens, Gerald B.
Parker, David L.
Peltier, Kenneth N.
Perkins, Thomas H., III
Pew, Larry, G.
Pilotte, Robert E.
Reinaas, Phillip K.
Robinson, Donald L.
Russell, Robert G., III
Sakaki, Carl H.
Sakamoto, Richard Y.
Schaden, Richard T.
Sepic, Joseph
Simmons, Ronald J.
Simpson, Michael J.
Smith, Nelson F., Jr.
Snyder, Robert G.
Stephens, Thomas C.
Tripp, Peter L.
Turner, Randy V.
Uranker, Gerald A.
Vick, Charles E.
Watson, Albert J.
Wattawa, Thomas J.
Westmark, Ronald A.
Wood, Clifford M., Jr.
Wulf, Timothy B.
Wymore, William R.

◆

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our soul waiteth for the Lord: He is our help and our shield.—Psalm 33: 20.

Eternal God, the sustainer of life and the Father of all men, in Thy presence we pause in silence knowing that with Thee all our labor is worthwhile. We pray that our lives and the life of our Nation may be built upon the rock of eternal truth and invincible good will. So we dedicate ourselves anew to Thee who art the way, the truth, and the life.

We thank Thee for our country, for our glorious heritage, for this challenging hour, and for the faith with which we can meet the days that lie ahead. Bless Thou our President—give him wisdom as he leads our people through these troubled times. Bless these Representatives and help them ever to look to Thee who art the fountain of wisdom and the source of all good. Bless our men and women in Vietnam—strengthen them in every noble endeavor and hasten the day when war shall cease and peace rule in the hearts of men and of nations.

May Thy mighty spirit surging through us and our people translate our principles into practices and our dedication to Thee into a greater devotion to truth and freedom. In the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 27, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1260. An act to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (Public Law 81–845);

S. 1602. An act to create a Northwest Regional Services Corporation to provide a central location for various training centers and programs, and for other purposes;

S. 1752. An act to amend the act prohibiting fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by vessels other than vessels of the United States and by persons in charge of such vessels;

S. 1798. An act to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended;

S. 2047. An act to exempt certain vessels engaged in the fishing industry from the requirements of certain laws;

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development; and

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a survey of the coastal and freshwater commercial and recreational fishery resources adjacent to the United States, including the resources within the territorial waters of the Great Lakes, the territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and to make available to the public and Congress information gained from such survey.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Friday, October 27, 1967, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bills of the House:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America;

H.R. 5894. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi;

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion;

H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

JOHN McCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **SIKES**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SIKES**. Mr. Speaker, it is most disappointing to note that questions have been raised about the Democratic leadership in the House. JOHN MCCORMACK is Speaker and rightfully so, and Speaker he will remain. He is Speaker because the House trusts him, because he understands the problems of its Members, because he is tolerant, because he believes in democratic principles of Government, because by experience and ability he is the best man for the job. I am certain that if there were an election today, the Florida delegation and the House would vote solidly for him, just as it did on the day he was first elected Speaker. His is proven leadership.

FOWL PLAY IN ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Speaker, there was a little item which appeared in last week's New York Times which puts into perspective the dispute over whether to allocate minimal or subminimal funds for the eradication of poverty and other critical domestic ills.

The Times noted on October 25, and I quote:

> SPENDING ON PETS EXCEEDS OUTLAY BY UNITED STATES FOR THE POOR
>
> PORTLAND, OREG.—Dr. Richard T. Frost, a political science professor at Reed College, contends that Americans spend $3-billion yearly on house pets, but only $1.7-billion on the Federal war on poverty.
>
> Dr. Frost asserted that Americans also spent $55-million on the care and feeding of migrant birds, but only $40-million on aid to migrant workers.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will keep these figures in mind before embarking upon another round of budget cuts.

A NEED TO OVERHAUL THE FEDERAL PENAL SYSTEM

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, last Friday two policemen were murdered when they attempted to interrupt a bank robbery in Northlake, Ill.

These two brave policemen fell victims to a gun battle which ensued between themselves and three bank robbers, two of whom were recently released from the Federal maximum security prison at Marion, Ill. Both of these men had served time in the Federal prison for earlier robberies.

The two former Federal prisoners are still at large and a mass manhunt is in progress to assure their capture.

Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the Federal Bureau of Prisons for a report on what steps are being taken by the Federal Government to reduce the alarming rate of recidivism among those incarcerated both in Federal and State prisons.

Nothing will bring back these two Northlake policemen who were brutally and savagely slain when they interrupted the bank robbery. But I think their wanton murder should serve as a clarion call for the entire American community to inquire why so many of those we incarcerate in our prisons return to crime almost immediately upon their release.

It should be a matter of concern to all of us that a recent report on recidivism showed that the overwhelming percentage of prisoners released from prison for all types of crimes are back in prison in less than 3 years.

The brutal assassination of these two policemen is an indictment of our whole penal system. Obviously, it is not doing the job of rehabilitating prisoners and the time is long past due when the public and we in Congress should sit idly by and witness this savage attack against our citizens.

I hope that the murder of these policemen will shake the conscience of this Nation and lead to meaningful reforms which will make our prisons significant institutions for rehabilitation.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES TO AID SHOULD BE CUT BECAUSE OF FAILURE TO ANSWER CONGRESSIONAL MAIL

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, 5 weeks ago I wrote a letter to the AID agency asking for certain information. They have failed to answer my letter, even after several telephone calls were made.

This only proves the utter contempt that many bureaucrats have for Congressmen.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to offer an amendment to the foreign aid bill to cut their administrative expenses considerably for failure to answer congressional mail.

I hope that those Members of the House who have had the same experience I have had will support my amendment. There is only one way to teach these bureaucrats that they should answer congressional mail, and that is to clip their administrative expenses.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week I was called from the House because of a family emergency, and had to leave. While I was gone from the floor a vote was taken on the military pay measure, and therefore I was unable to record my vote on that issue.

I would like to say now that had I been able to be here I would have voted "yea" on that bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 348]

Abernethy
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Berry
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Button
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Cleveland
Colmer
Conable
Cowger
Cunningham
Curtis
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Dowdy
Esch
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Goodell
Green, Pa.
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanna
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hull
Ichord
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Keith
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Laird
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCulloch
McDonald, Mich.
McFall
Mathias, Md.
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moss
Multer
Nedzi
Nix
Passman
Pirnie
Pool
Quie
Rarick
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Ronan
Rostenkowski
St. Onge
Steed
Stephens
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Ullman
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
Whitten
Widnall
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REDUCTION OF EXTRA-LONG-STAPLE COTTON QUOTA

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 10915) to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 10915, with Mr. PUCINSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Wednesday, October 25, 1967, the Clerk had concluded the reading of the bill.

Are there further amendments to be offered?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOLEY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLEY: Beginning on page 1, strike out line 5 and all thereafter and substitute:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, raw, semi-processed, or processed extra long staple cotton, as described in section 347(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which is the product of a country with respect to which diplomatic relations with the United States have been broken during the one-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this legislation shall not constitute any portion of the quota of such extra long staple cotton set forth in subsection (a) of this section until these diplomatic relations have been resumed and the President finds that it is not contrary to the interest of the United States to permit such extra long staple cotton to constitute a part of this quota. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall give domestic producers the opportunity to produce an amount of such extra long staple cotton equal to any estimated reduction in supply which may result from the enactment of this subsection."

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which has just been read has a very simple purpose. It is designed to do everything that the committee bill would do with respect to denying the United Arab Republic and the Sudan of participating in the extra-long-staple cotton quota in so long as domestic relations between those countries and the United States are severed. However, if adopted, the amendment would permit the President of the United States to resume participation on the part of those countries in the quota, if—and only if—diplomatic relations are restored and second, only if the President found it to be in the national interest to resume those quotas.

Now, the difference between this bill and the committee bill is also very simple. The committee bill's purpose has never been disguised, it is to reduce the world cotton quota by the amount produced by the United Arab Republic and the Sudan, and give those cotton quotas to southwestern cotton farmers permanently. It has no other purpose.

The amendment that has just been offered and has just been read does everything that the committee bill does with respect to punishing the United Arab Republic and the Sudan while diplomatic relations are broken, but the amendment offers the President the opportunity to restore participation in these cotton quotas to Egypt and the Sudan if a favorable regime should come to power in those countries, or the two nations otherwise resume relations with the United States.

Now, no one in this House is any more concerned than I, with the conduct of the United Arab Republic and with the outrageous acts it has committed against the independence and the security of the State of Israel, but those who are concerned about peace in the Middle East and about restoring stable relationships between the countries of the Middle East should know that under my amendment it would be possible for the President to restore quotas of the policy if these nations change, or if new regimes that may come to power in those nations. Under the proposal of the committee there would be literally a permanent deprivation of those quotas, and nothing could be done by the President if we should have a change in policy or a new regime in those countries.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for this amendment. I believe it to be a very acceptable amendment. I believe the gentleman has taken the proper view, and exhibited a fine sense of responsibility on how peace can be restored in the Middle East, and a stabilized peace. Therefore I support the amendment offered by the gentleman and urge all my colleagues to also support this amendment.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from New York, who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also join in commending the gentleman for offering this amendment. I wonder if the gentleman would be willing to accept a certain change in language that I would be prepared to offer as an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman? I am sorry that I have not had the chance to discuss this with the gentleman, but I believe it will strengthen the purpose the gentleman has in mind, and that would be to add, after the words that it is not contrary to the interest of the United States, the words "and that it is in the interest of peace in the Middle East."

Mr. FOLEY. I would be happy to accept the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am grateful to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. That is exactly the purpose of my amendment to the bill. The gentleman has stated it very succintly, and I would urge the committee to support his amendment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I join my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] for sponsoring the amendment which will immeasurably improve the legislation before us. H.R. 10915 is basically an ill-advised proposal.

The committee bill, if adopted, will cancel the extra-long-staple cotton quotas for Egypt and Sudan indefinitely into the future, until legislative action would repeal the ban provision.

I submit that this is no way to promote peace in the Middle East. The amendment of the gentleman from Washington, as he has so ably explained, will remedy this diplomatic blunder.

Therefore I want again to congratulate him.

Mr. FOLEY. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that I, too, can see no other way that these quotas can be restored to these countries in the future except by the House and the Congress acting again to establish such quotas, and since by that time they will have been passed on to the producers of this cotton in the Southwestern States, I can see no practical way for that to happen.

I thank the gentleman for his comments. He is a distinguished authority on foreign affairs and his comments are most important.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 10915 which has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

I do so out of the deep conviction that the permanent ban on imports of extra-long-staple cotton from Egypt and the Sudan is not in our national interest.

Unfortunately the basic issue involved here is too likely to be obscured by the emotions which have been generated by the recent Israel-Arab war and the frequent clashes which have followed the technical cease-fire.

Because Israel was the underdog, because it was attacked, because it has long and friendly ties with the United States, Israel and its cause has been championed—and rightly so—by the great majority of Americans.

At the same time, the principal interest of our Nation in the Middle East is the establishment of a just and lasting peace in which the nations of the area respect and cooperate with each other.

To help effect such a peace, the United States must retain the maximum amount of leverage in the countries involved. In a very real sense, extra-long-staple cotton represents leverage.

The bill before this body today would prevent the United States from ever again permitting the importation of extra-long-staple cotton from Egypt and Sudan.

To further the interests of a few domestic cotton growers, therefore, this bill would damage American foreign policy in the Middle East and provide the Soviet Union with even greater opportunities to extend its influence into that area.

As you may know, Mr. Chairman, Sir John Bagot Glubb, the British former commander of the Arab Legion, is currently visiting in the United States. In an interview in the New York Times of October 29 he vigorously opposed the permanent ban being considered here today.

His reasons should give pause even to those who are most eager to see the ban imposed. Sir John is quoted:

> That is a very stinging slap in the face. It means that never again do you want to be on speaking terms with those people. The Russians will wind up buying—and possibly reselling—that cotton.

Never, Mr. Chairman, is a long, long time. Yet that is what H.R. 10915 proposes—extra-long-staple cotton could never again be imported from Egypt or the Sudan, regardless of any changes which time might bring.

Even if new governments should come to power which would be interested in a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, trade in this commodity could not be re-established.

This kind of ban is at odds with traditional American diplomatic and trade practice. Our Nation has never before acted so severely because of a break in diplomatic relations. Even after we have been at war with a country, we have gradually restored trade after the hostilities have ceased.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10915 as it stands is an exercise in diplomatic irresponsibility and harmful to our national interests.

I therefore urge that the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], be adopted in order that the ban can be rescinded by the President upon resumption of diplomatic relations with Egypt and the Sudan, if he believes such action to be warranted.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and to help to clarify some of the things that have been stated in favor of this amendment.

There has been an attempt to try to link this to peace in the Middle East as concerning the Arab-Israel war. This has nothing whatsoever to do with that and I do not think it should be confused with it.

I think also it should be made clear, and I cannot understand the naiveness of a lot of Members of this House, who stand here and say that this is permanent legislation and that you cannot come back and change it.

I will be very frank and say, as I said the other day, that this should have been done a long time ago—and it should have been done to Mr. Nasser.

I have never disagreed with the principle of allowing the President the prerogative of acting in matters of this sort. But there is always an exception and this is an exception so far as I am concerned because the State Department will advise the President on this matter. The State Department has consistently, in my opinion, been wrong.

Here is what I am trying to bring about. If this money were to go to the people of Egypt to buy bread and to buy clothes, I would not have any objection to it. But it goes to Mr. Nasser and to his government to buy napalm bombs and to buy poison gas that he uses against his brother Arabs in Yemen. All of us know that Nasser has a puppet regime in the country of Yemen which is a little country, and he is using poison gas to this day and using napalm to kill his brother Arabs and my brother Arabs in the country of Yemen to keep them from having a government of their own choosing.

The same people in the State Department, who in my opinion acted precipitously in advocating the recognition of this puppet regime in Yemen, will continue in their ways and not admit their mistake.

So we should act here today to act to allow the House the prerogative to act in this legislation, when and if, it should be allowed to return to the present law.

But as I say again, this money will not go to the people of Egypt, if they sell this cotton, it will not buy one more loaf of bread for them, it will not buy a pound of wheat for them. It will not buy another dress or another shirt for them, but it will buy poison gas. It will buy napalm. And not to use against Israel. They have taken care of their side pretty well. But it will be used against other Arabs—his brothers and our brethren in the smaller countries, the Arab countries that cannot defend themselves.

This is why I stand here in front of you and say that it is well, and ordinarily it would be well—and I have so voted in the past—to allow the President the prerogative as soon as we continue or resume our relations to go back and continue our economic relations with another country. But the President will receive advice of the State Department about this. You will remember that a while back the State Department came here saying that we should continue to send wheat to Egypt and at the same time Mr. Nasser was condoning the bombing and the burning of our libraries and the bombing of our Embassy.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot stand here as a citizen of the United States—and I do not speak for anyone but myself—but I cannot stand here and do anything that will be helpful in any way to Nasser when he kills my brothers with poison gas and napalm in Yemen.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. de la GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. Will any farmer under this amendment be induced or encouraged to lay in fertilizer and seed and to make preparations for his crop next year? Or would he be worried that suddenly, or precipitously, as the gentleman has said, that the quota would be cut off and that he would be left stranded?

Mr. de la GARZA. He would not have any assurance of what he could rely on. You would not be helping any American cotton growers. This amendment would help nobody except Nasser.

Mr. WHITE. Is not this similar to the principle upon which this very House last year, I believe, or the year before enacted a 3-year program for farmers so that they could make their long range plans rather than chancing being cut off after each crop year.

Mr. de la GARZA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, before I yield the floor, let me again say to you that there is a question of a quota here—yes—and it is true that American farmers will grow this cotton, with the exception of a little bit in Peru. But I cannot stand here in the well of the House to do anything like that proposed. Regardless of what the Committee on Foreign Affairs says, regardless of what any other Member of this House says, I have my responsibility that I must share with no one but myself and my conscience, and I cannot do anything to help one tyrant in this world to kill his brethren with poison gas and with napalm when nobody else—not the United Nations, not the United States, not any other country in the world—looks out for these defenseless people in the small country of Yemen, my brothers, who have no armaments, nothing but their bodies to shield them from the poison gas and the napalm. That is what this bill is all about, and that is why I favor it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BINGHAM TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOLEY

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bingham to the amendment offered by Mr. Foley: After the words "That it is not contrary to the interest of the United States" insert "and that it is in the interest of peace in the area concerned".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, as I said briefly earlier, that the purpose of this amendment would be to make perfectly clear that the withholding or the restoration of the quota concerned could be used as leverage by the President of the United States to further peace in the Middle East. My feeling is that this is very important leverage for him to have, and that the bill as it is presently drawn removes this leverage from him.

It is most important that we look ahead to a day when perhaps Nasser will not be the President of the United Arab Republic, to a day when we may have a government in Egypt that would be amenable to some sort of reason, to some sort of persuasion. We are all hopeful of a day—and Israel is hopeful of a day—when all those countries there can work together. But if the bill passes in its present form, the opportunity to use this leverage will be lost and we will have missed an opportunity to restore reasonable trade relations with Egypt when and if it adopts a peaceful policy.

I understand perfectly well why our colleagues from those areas where long-staple cotton is grown want to seize this opportunity to try to have the Egyptian quota eliminated permanently. But I suggest to the rest of the House, whose constituents are not interested in directly helping the expansion of the domestic growth of long-staple cotton, that they should consider the long-range interests of the United States, of the State of Israel, and the possibilities of permanent peace in the Middle East in voting on this amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. As I understand the force of the amendment before the Committee at the present time, it will permit the suspension of the long-staple cotton quotas during the time that relationships between the Sudan and the United Arab Republic and the United States are broken, and that at such time as those relationships are restored again, the Foley amendment would give the President the power to restore it. The committee bill would eliminate the quota entirely. Is that correct?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is my understanding, but I think the gentleman from Washington should comment on his amendment.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. I think the gentleman from Illinois correctly stated the situation. I commend the gentleman from New York in offering his amendment to my amendment, which I think strengthens the bill and makes clear that the thrust of the bill is to allow the President to have the flexibility that will enable him to use the good offices of the United States to bring more stable and peaceful relations among the nations of the East, which I think is of paramount interest to the cause of peace, and, with all respect to the gentleman who spoke in opposition to the amendment, of greater importance to the American people than the additional production of domestic long-staple cotton which might accrue under the bill.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman from New York. His amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington is a good one, and I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will in turn be adopted. I think that this is a very unfortunate bill as it now reads.

I think it is taking advantage of the very troubled situation in the Middle East to gain particular advantages for the vested interests of the cotton growers. While I can understand the gentleman's interest in the matter, if the United States were to conduct its foreign policy on that basis, it would soon be in a shamble. I just want to say I support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bingham] to the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley], and I hope they are both adopted.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, before I yield again, I would like to explain again the purpose of my amendment. The Foley amendment reads that before the quota can be restored, first of all, diplomatic relations must have been resumed, and then the President must find it is not contrary to the interest of the United States to permit restoration of the quota. My amendment would add that, before the quota can be restored, the President must also find that it is in the interest of peace in the area, before the quota can be restored. He must make that positive finding.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, it would seem this would reduce it by 161,000 to 70,000, thereby crippling the long-staple cotton farmers. Would it not be just as well for the executive department to say in negotiations with Egypt or other countries that we will recommend to the other countries that they restore the status quo, as it was prior to this argument, and we could have control and use our commonsense in the area, rather than leave it to the State Department, which has already evidenced its attitude, which has been against the cotton growers of this country?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, knowing how well the gentleman represents the interests of his constituents who grow this cotton, I would not want to take that chance. I think for us to come back at some future time and persuade Congress to restore a quota that had been eliminated would be just about impossible, and I am sure the gentleman would be here fighting against it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many Members have seen the printed hearings that were held over 2 days by the Committee on Agriculture. For some reason unknown to me, these hearings are not generally available. I should like to call attention to the fact that the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Eugene Rostow, did testify in strong opposition to this bill. Before we make a final decision as to how to vote, I would simply like to call attention to some of the reasons why he did so.

On page 5 of the hearings, he points out that this bill "raises important issues of policy concerning the future of our relations with all the States in the Middle East which have chosen to break diplomatic relations with us in the wake of the recent hostilities between Israel and its neighbors."

He further points out that:

> Only the United Arab Republic and Sudan export long-staple cotton to the United States. But what we do in this instance will be closely watched by all the countries of the Middle East and North Africa as a signal of our policy. If we take economic reprisals against two of those countries with regard to one commodity, it will be assumed that we are embarking on a general policy of economic warfare against all of them.

On economic warfare, he then goes on in very strong language and points out, on page 7, from which I quote:

> Its enactment would also do damage to our foreign economic policy interests. The obvious initial impact of H.R. 10915 would be a reduction in our imports of extra-long-stable cotton. However, its potential adverse effect on our exports and foreign investments should not be overlooked. Trade is a two-way street; and a country can hardly be expected to maintain purchases from us if we refuse to buy from it.

He goes on to point out that in 1966 our exports to the United Arab Republic and the Sudan totaled $202.9 million, while our imports from the same two countries were valued at only $24.2 million, leaving a net balance of trade in our favor of $178.7 million.

In other words, there would be serious and long-range effects if we should engage in this kind of economic reprisal, and particularly if we should do so on a permanent basis.

While I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to quote from a letter from one of the leading users of this kind of cotton in the United States. It was written by Vice President P. J. Hardy, of Coats & Clark, Inc., of Fairlawn, N.J. He says in part—and the letter is a long one:

> We are opposed to the bill and, in fact, to any such bill that limits or eliminates the source of supply of as vital a commodity as extra-long-staple cotton.
>
> The thread manufacturers have long been the principal users of E.L.S. cottons including those grown in Peru and Sudan, as well as Egypt and our own American Southwest. As one of the largest users of this premium cotton, we believe that any restriction, such as is proposed by this bill, would seriously hamper our efforts to procure the best quality for an equitable price. We would, in effect, be made compulsory customers of one supplier, the SuPima Association of America. We do not, by any means, imply that we do not, or will not, buy and use American SuPima cotton. On the contrary, we use as much of this machine-picked domestic variety as we do the hand-picked Egyptian, but the latter growth, when used in conjunction with SuPima, provides a combination that is the nearest to ideal from the viewpoints of thread strength, lustre, and sewability. An important extra advantage is that by combining the domestic and foreign cottons as we do, we are able to maintain a raw material cost below that which would prevail if we used the more expensive SuPima alone.

He continues:

> Despite the relatively higher cost of SuPima that we have been faced with over the years, we have always bought and supported this important product of the cotton growing industry and plan to continue to do so. Eliminating the amount that may be imported from an alternative source, however, would work an undeserved hardship on us, both price and quality-wise, since Peruvian cotton has proved inadequate for the high standards demanded by our thread customers.

He goes on to point out he is not opposed to an increase of this kind of cotton domestically. He says, and I quote again:

> On the other side of the coin, we are as much in favor of another pending bill as we are opposed to H.R. 10915. We refer to the so-called SuPima Subsidy Bill which would provide for a nominal payment per pound to E.L.S. cotton producers, such as is now done for Upland cotton, thus making the SuPima cotton competitive pricewise with contemporary similar growths.
>
> If this Subsidy Bill were to become law, the question of expanding acreage and production of SuPima would take care of itself without penalizing either foreign suppliers or those who use their cotton. If SuPima is to be priced realistically, the use would be increased radically with consequent benefits to all.
>
> This, in our estimation, is the way to help the farmer, not by the passage of as controversial and potentially harmful a bill as H.R. 10915.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Foley amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a district which has 66,000 acres of cotton, and I have long been in favor of seeing cotton acreage allotments expanded in California as well as throughout the Southwest. The farmers in my district can sell their cotton. They should be allowed to produce what they can sell. I also have been consistently opposed to the Arab desire to push the State of Israel into the sea.

I said long before June 6, 1967, that I thought it was terribly important for the United States to defend the sovereign integrity of the State of Israel.

I mention these things to show and to prove to the House that I am not pro-Arab and anti-Israel, and I am not pro-foreign import of cotton and anti-domestic production of cotton.

The thing which bothers me about this particular bill before the House, the committee bill, is that it would permanently cut off any importation of cotton from Egypt, no matter what the government is and no matter how the government changes its policy.

I believe there probably are only two justifications for doing this.

One would be that we feel it is necessary to punish the Egyptians permanently for past actions.

The second would be to get a greater increase in the production of long-staple cotton in the southwestern part of the United States.

On the first point, to try to permanently punish Egypt, in my mind that is silly in the extreme and highly dangerous. We know of the inflammable situation in the Middle East. It is in our national interest to have that situation quiet down and to have the Arabs recognize the State of Israel as a sovereign nation.

So I would hope that no one would feel we should single out the State of Egypt for such permanent punishment, a punishment that we have given no other nation in the history of our country.

We did not do it to Japan during World War II, we did not do it to Germany during World War II, and there is no reason why we should permanently exclude all imports of cotton from Egypt today.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUNNEY. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. The statement of the gentleman from California is truly extraordinary and commendable. For a Member who represents an extensive cotton-producing district to speak in a way that might be interpreted by some as being contrary to the interests of his home district, I think it is really noteworthy, and I do commend him for it.

Mr. TUNNEY. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

I would like to get to the other point, which is the question of trying to increase our domestic production as opposed to drastically reducing our import quotas. It seems to me that the United States' traditional policy has been expanded world trade. We have over $30 billion in exports and only $25 billion in imports in the last year. We have been able to mass produce on a scale where we can sell abroad a lot more than we import from overseas. It is not now the time to start an isolationist policy. Even if you discard these various factors, at least let the punishment fit the crime. The United Arab Republic has broken diplomatic relations with the United States. All right. Let us assume that we should cut off imports from the United Arab Republic as long as those diplomatic relations are suspended. I think this would be appropriate, and that is why I am supporting the Foley amendment. But let us not let the punishment last indefinitely into the future.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUNNEY. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that we had previously a production of 151 thousand bales in the United States and presently it is only 76 thousand bales? Also is it not a fact that instead of punishing a foreign country, this amendment is a punishment of a domestic industry, and it is not a fact that it is just as important to have a strong domestic industry as good foreign relations?

Mr. TUNNEY. I think it is very important to have a strong domestic industry. I think our domestic industry should be able to produce and to sell on the open market. But what you are suggesting is that we put a quota, a restrictive quota, of 47,000 bales on imports, which is a drastic reduction from the 82,000-bale quota that we now have.

Mr. WHITE. What happens to the farmers? Certainly we are concerned about foreign countries, but what happens to our farmers?

Mr. TUNNEY. We are talking in terms of $16 million. I would much rather give a direct subsidy to the farmers of the Southwest rather than have drastic restrictions such as we have in this legislation which by their permanency would impair our foreign policy interests in the Middle East.

Mr. WHITE. You talk about the balance of trade. Is it not a fact that this goes to other industries at the same time as the cotton industry is going down? Therefore, why should we sacrifice the cotton farmers for the advantage of others?

Mr. TUNNEY. I do not want to sacrifice the cotton farmers. They can now produce long-staple cotton and sell it on the market in the United States. They should continue to be able to do so in the future. But what I do not want to sacrifice is our foreign policy interests in the Middle East. I would like to remind the House that we were not one of the belligerents in the Arab-Israel war although we were morally obligated to defend Israel from conquest and extermination. In the coming months I want the United States to be able to play a role in bringing the belligerents together. I want us to have leverage with Egypt. I want us to have negotiating flexibility. I cannot think of any way of isolating the United States from the Arab world more successfully than to single Egypt out for the kind of permanent punishment that is contemplated in the committee bill. I want to reduce tensions in the Middle East, not intensify them. I do not want to make Egypt a satellite of Russia if it can be avoided. I do not want to totally and forever throw away whatever little chance we have of influencing events in this area of the world. Conscience and reason dictate adoption of the Foley amendment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that I would not find it necessary to get into this discussion, but I think it is clear that there is widespread misunderstanding as to what this Foley amendment does. There has been a good deal of talk here asking: "Why don't you accept this amendment to at least give the farmers who produce this extra-long-staple cotton the opportunity to produce it for even a short time?"

Frankly, the amendment which is now pending would not give the farmers of any American State the opportunity to produce any extra-long-staple cotton that they do not now have the opportunity to produce not even for 1 year—much less for a period for which they could afford the necessary investment.

The reason for that is the wording of the amendment. In the bill presented by the committee there is provision under which the total quota will be reduced by the average annual amount of extra-long-staple cotton received from any such country during the 5 years immediately preceding the severance of diplomatic relations. Now, the Foley amendment does not reduce the total quota at all. And, consequently, there is not anything in the Foley amendment which, if adopted, would enable domestic producers to pick up any production.

Mr. Chairman, the last sentence of both the Foley amendment and of the bill are in the same words. They both state:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall give domestic producers the opportunity to produce an amount of such extra-long-staple cotton equal to any estimated reduction in supply which may result from the enaction of this subsection.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there will not be any reduction in supply if we transfer the quota which is presently enjoyed by the United Arab Republic to the other foreign producers.

Mr. Chairman, what the Foley amendment would do, if I understand it clearly, is that it would, in effect, transfer the entire foreign quota to Peru, because Peru is the only other country in the world which exports to us any substantial amount of extra-long-staple cotton.

Mr. Chairman, representatives of the Peruvian Government came before our committee, and they recognized this fact. They asked the committee to make the change which the Members will find on page 2, substituting "5 quota years immediately preceding the quota year in which such severance of diplomatic relations occurs" in lieu of the words: "1964–1965 quota years."

The representatives of the Peruvian Government pointed out the fact that it was more equitable to them that under the language in the bill. In other words, you do not have any rescinding of the quota in the Foley amendment. Consequently, all of the quota is available to any foreign countries, except the U.A.R. and the Sudan. For practical purposes their quota goes to Peru, and any other minor countries that might be able to supply this extra staple cotton. There is, therefore, no reduction in supply which can ever go to the American producer.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman from Texas is entirely correct. Not a bale, not a new bale, of American cotton would be authorized for growth if the Foley amendment is agreed to; is that not correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. I say this, because the Foley amendment, if adopted, instead of wiping out the quota, says that those who have broken relations with the United States in this period shall not constitute any portion of such quota of extra-long-staple cotton. It does not reduce the total quota by any amount, but simply says that the Egyptian portion of such quota would not constitute any part of the quota. But the total quota remains the same. The one country of Peru can supply every bale of that quota under this amendment, and if it does, no American farmer will get an extra bale.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, will this not be what will happen: If we can get a friendly regime of the kind we want in Egypt and if we do restore relations with Egypt, we then could not go back upon our commitments to Peru? In other words, they will continue delivering the 60,000 bales and we will have to go beyond this quota and provide for an enlarged world quota if we are to then give any quota at all to Egypt?

Mr. POAGE. Of course, that would happen. Just as the distinguished gentleman from Arizona has pointed out, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for this country to later give Egypt another quota, because just as the gentleman correctly said, the southwestern producers of this type of cotton would object to it if they had secured any quota, and the Peruvians would undoubtedly object to it if they had received an increased quota.

Unfortunately, the Peruvian voice or any foreign voice seems louder in this Congress than the voice of our southwestern producers of long-staple cotton.

Mr. Chairman the foreigners already have a louder voice right here than the producers of American products. It is my opinion that that approach is dead wrong.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. POAGE was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. I yield further to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Is it not true, as the distinguished gentleman has pointed out, that the extra-long-staple cotton quota is not specifically apportioned by countries?

Mr. POAGE. It is not specifically apportioned by countries, but the point is that this proposed amendment does not reduce the total foreign quota, which quota remains just what it has been. The only difference is that it will temporarily be available to other foreign countries. Under the committee bill the total foreign quota is reduced by what Egypt and the Sudan have been sending to us and the domestic quota is increased by exactly that amount.

I beg your pardon?

Mr. FOLEY. Is it not the purpose of the gentleman in offering the amendment to move that portion of the world's quota from Egypt and the Sudan permanently to the southwestern States of the United States?

Mr. POAGE. The original bill?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Yes, that is the purpose; I have said that time and time again.

Mr. FOLEY. Why did the gentleman not offer this amendment before this time, then?

Mr. POAGE. What amendment? I do not propose to offer an amendment.

Mr. FOLEY. Why is the bill coming out at this time?

Mr. POAGE. I am not proposing to offer any amendment.

Mr. FOLEY. I am sorry. I misspoke myself.

Why is the bill being reported at this time?

Mr. POAGE. Why is the bill being reported at this time?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. In the hopes that we can pass it and correct an injustice that has existed for some 20 years.

Mr. FOLEY. It is because of the disturbance in the Middle East; is that not correct?

Mr. POAGE. We are trying to get all the American people to realize what an injustice has been done to certain American people for a long, long time, and we hope that any ancillary activities may focus attention on that injustice.

The gentleman has not heard me mention anything in connection with anybody's war anywhere, has he? The gentleman did not hear that mentioned here, nor did he hear it mentioned in the committee, did he?

Mr. FOLEY. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. I have based this upon the justice of the cause of the American producers. I believe it is a sound cause. I have not made any kind of racial appeal.

Mr. FOLEY. Is it true that the bill does not apportion the loss between Peru and the United Arab Republic, or the Sudan?

Mr. POAGE. It does not what?

Mr. FOLEY. It guarantees the participation of Peru, does it not?

Mr. POAGE. It does.

Mr. FOLEY. The committee bill does not hurt in any way the State of Peru, but it permanently deprives the United Arab Republic and the Sudan?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. And I believe if the gentleman wants to go into those prejudicial matters that there are very good precedents and very good reasons for giving American States a share in a special market which we do not give to Middle Eastern states. We do that with a great many things. We have reciprocity with a great many of the Western countries. And I believe it is entirely clear that we can very well justify giving to the states in the Western Hemisphere an opportunity to share in a special market instead of giving it to certain states in the Middle East. And that is exactly what the committee bill does.

Mr. FOLEY. But insofar as these quotas are concerned, the people in the States in the Southwest would have the opportunity to participate in them, but Egypt and the Sudan would not even though diplomatic relations might be restored, and a favorable regime might come into existence in those countries.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Texas does not believe we should give any quotas to the Arab Republic, nor to the Sudan, under any circumstances, so far as I can see at this time. If such circumstances were to arise there is just the same opportunity for this House to give new quotas to those countries, if new circumstances would require it, as there ever has been. There is nothing in this bill which would deny it, and there is nothing in this bill which freezes the quotas forever. On the contrary, it leaves this completely in the hands of this Congress, the right to make that determination any time that it might see fit. I cannot foresee any time when it should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am really sorry that we got into this kind of a hassle. Part of it might even have been saved by the fact that last week when the gentleman from Washington offered his amendment I suggested at that time that with a few deletions from it I might be able to accept it. The gentleman did not see fit to confer with me from that time until today, and never has furnished me with a copy of his amendment.

Now, the problem here is that the committee bill would cancel the quota of Egypt forever unless it was reenacted by the Congress. I believe that this is a bad thing. I would have been agreeable to working out some way that the President of the United States might have reinstated it, but the change that the gentleman has brought here absolutely cancels the committee bill and serves no purpose whatsoever as far as the cotton farmers of America are concerned.

Before we get too worried about the gentleman overseas who told us to take our wheat and go to hades with it, let us just for a minute consider the plight of the long-staple cotton growers of this country.

In 1963 their production was 161,200 bales. Today it is 71,200 bales.

In other words, the cotton farmers of America have been reduced by 90,000 bales.

This bill only reduces Egypt by about 55,000 bales, which means the American farmer has already suffered twice the reduction that today we are taking away from Egypt.

In my opinion, there is no reason to get excited about taking half as much away from Nassar as we are taking away from our American farmers.

One of the things that I have never been able to understand about our foreign policy is this—that we absolutely insist on doing business with our enemies at the cost of and to the detriment of the American producers.

I have not been able to understand why this policy exists, but it exists as to the production of automobiles and it exists with reference to the production of everything in this country.

I do not know very much about foreign policy, but I heard a Member a while ago congratulated because he was more worried about Nasser than he was about his own farmers. I hope to Heavens that no Member of this House of Representatives ever says that I am more interested in Nasser and not interested in taking care of my own people.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TUNNEY. I never indicated that I am more concerned about Nasser than I am about my own farmers. I have fought for my farmers in the past and will continue to do so. They need the help. What I stated was I felt the U.S. foreign policy objectives were going to be hurt and materially affected by this bill. Unless we have some bargaining power and unless we have some leverage in the Middle East it is possible a new war will break out. I am in favor of doing whatever is reasonable to bring peace to this area. We will not bring peace to the Middle East by isolating ourselves for all time from the Arab world and driving them into the hands of the Soviet Union.

Mr. BELCHER. In order to save the foreign policy of the United States, you are willing to sacrifice the production of your farmers; is that correct?

Mr. TUNNEY. Of course not. I feel that the foreign policy interests of the United States and the interests of my farmers are best served by bringing about peace in the Middle East.

Mr. BELCHER. I do not claim to be a foreign policy expert, but that is exactly the procedure throughout this entire Government—foreign policy comes first. But for Heaven's sake, do not take it out of the pockets of the American producers.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. In the recent disturbance in the Middle East where beside the losses on both sides, the Israel and Egyptian forces, 57 or 58 Americans were lost just for being caught in a tragic accident of that war. I think those were worth far more than $16 million dollars.

Mr. BELCHER. A whole lot of American boys died by materials that we furnished to those foreign countries through foreign aid too.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the enactment of H.R. 10915 will show that this Congress has more desire to help cotton producers of southern New Mexico, west

Texas, Arizona, and California, than it does to help Nasser.

Some people are beginning to doubt that Congress is the one place where the needs and desires of all citizens can find a voice loud enough to be heard above the noise generated by the special interests.

We have at hand a bill, the passage of which will show that the people do have a voice, and that we in Congress can make it heard.

The opponents of this bill say we will alienate the Sudanese and the Arabs if we take away the guaranteed American market for extra-long-staple cotton. It should be recalled that these nations broke diplomatic relations with the United States, and in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, lied to the world about this Nation. We can no longer afford to have Nasser as a friend.

We have been giving Nasser assistance since his regime has been in power. Some of that help has been in the form of American dollars in exchange for extra-long staple cotton which this Nation's cottongrowers could easily have produced.

Some would make much of the fact that H.R. 10915 does not give the executive branch the authority or discretion to reinstate the quotas if the nations involved reinstate diplomatic relations. Congress can consider the matter anew if that occurs.

We have never successfully bought a friend. We are renting quite a few, but have no guarantee from payment to payment whether we have still got a friend. We must keep up the payments, or face the truth. The truth is that we must base our international relations on mutual respect.

International relationships based upon anything else tend to become sour within a short period.

There are some who say this bill calls for action which is far too drastic.

I do not agree. We are simply reacting in what can only be described as a normal manner to provocations.

Some say that by this action we will be driving Nasser into the camp of the Communists. I say that any nation which gets $2 billion worth of arms and equipment from the Soviet Union may be accurately described as having more than a passing acquaintanceship with the U.S.S.R.

If this legislation brings an end to the Nasser government 1 day sooner than would otherwise occur, then it is good legislation. Perhaps the passage of this bill will start a trend. We can start at this point to treat our enemies as if they were enemies.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, any time I have to come up with a policy to sacrifice the interest of nearly 600,000 people who sent me here in order not to pick a fuss with Nasser, I will string along with the people who sent me here.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a very important question we are considering here today, much more important than just the substance of the bill.

Of course, I agree that foreign policy is involved and, frankly, sometimes I wonder if we should not have an American desk at the State Department that would change a little bit of our foreign policy. I cannot see anything wrong with saying to nations who tell lies about us and accuse us of doing everything under the sun that we did not do, and who say to you that, as far as they are concerned you and your government and your people can go and drink the waters of the sea—I cannot see anything wrong with taking away a trade concession that we have with them and offering it to the domestic producers of this Nation.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman has had an opportunity to study my amendment, he will have noted that it will have precisely the same effect as the committee bill is depriving the United Arab Republic and the Sudan of participating in the extra-long staple cotton quota so long as diplomatic relations with those countries are terminated and until the President of the United States deems it in the national interest to resume those relations. I do not think the gentleman means to misinterpret my amendment, and I do not think he would want to do that. I think he will have to admit that, as far as any punishment is concerned, the committee bill does not punish the United Arab Republic or the Sudan any more than the amendment does. The only thing the committee bill does is to make it impossible to deal effectively with a hopefully new and more liberal regime in those countries.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I want to ask a question of my friend from Washington. As I understand his amendment—I hope he will answer me—does the amendment change the global quota of extra-long-staple cotton?

Mr. FOLEY. No.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Does the amendment give any guarantee whatsoever that the quota in effect, and that would be temporarily taken away under your amendment, would be offered to the domestic procedures of this country?

Mr. FOLEY. No; no guarantee whatsoever.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. This is precisely the point. The cold fact of the matter is that Egypt has severed relations, and they have been sending here 56,000 bales of cotton. That cotton will not be sent as long as relations are broken. The question is, does this production, this 56,000 bales, which is two-thirds of the American production, in the interim will it go to Peru and Latin American countries or will it in the interim go to the American producers? The gentleman from Washington's amendment would simply give to another foreign country what could be produced in the interim by the Southwest cotton producers, who have been carrying our foreign policy on their backs. They would not get any relief in this temporary situation?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. The gentleman from Arizona interprets the amendment exactly as I understood it and, I think, as the gentleman from Washington interprets it. It does not give the domestic producer anything.

Mr. FOLEY. I think the difference between us, if I can say this to the gentleman from New Mexico, is that my amendment is not designed to tamper with the world cotton quota in extra-long-staple cotton. We have had this quota for a generation. Now the committee comes and offers this bill to diminish the world cotton quota for the simple purpose of taking advantage of a tense and emotional situation to increase the world cotton quota application in the Southwest.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Timing is most important in any legislation or anything else, and, of course, we have picked this time to bring the legislation to the floor. You always pick a time when you think it is favorable to pass legislation. That is certainly an elementary subject that everyone knows. Of course, we would not have had a chance to bring this legislation to the floor of the House if it had not been for the conduct of the Egyptian Government. The only saving and good thing that I can see about the amendment of the gentleman from Washington is the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, because that would at least say that we ought to use this as a tool to help bring peace in the Middle East and to discourage the Egyptian Government from attacking their neighbors. That is the only good thing that I can see about the proposed amendment that has any merit, and I hope the Committee will overwhelmingly turn it down.

Reducing the import quota by approximately 56,127 bales—5-year average of Egyptian imports, USDA testimony, House Agriculture Committee Hearings, July 12 and 13, 1967—would decrease our outflow of hard currency and improve our balance of payments by some $14 million—$250 per bale.

If our farmers were permitted to grow an additional 56,127 bales, it would mean an increase in production income of some $16 million—lint plus seed at $300 per bale. Considering that this would be "new wealth" added to our economy, the total effect to country would be several times this figure.

These bales can and would be produced by our own American farmers. The farms in the four States of Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas now account for 70,500 acres allotted to extra-long-staple cotton. This acreage is less than one-half the acreage permitted in 1963, only 4 years ago. This represents a production loss of 89,786 bales on a basis of 1962–65 production yields. These 89,786 bales would mean an additional $26 million—$300 per bale—added to the economy of our country.

In this debate, certain facts should be kept in mind:

First, in the 4 months since the break in official ties between the United Arab Republic and this country, we have permitted the importation of more than 12,000 bales of Egyptian extra-long-staple cotton, or about $3 million worth;

Second, 1,090,781 square yards of Egyptian textiles were imported in July, and

3,408,312 were imported in August—a 350-percent increase in 1 month;

Third, in the year ending in August, $2,921,106 in textile imports came into the United States, up from $1.2 million from 1966;

Fourth, since 1961, the United States has given and "sold" the United Arab Republic—for its currency which remains in that country—more than $800 million in surplus grain and other food;

Fifth, the United States is wholly self-sufficient in extra-long-staple cotton—we have a stockpile of 232,000 bales of the cotton, and our domestic consumption is approximately 150,000 bales per year; and

Sixth, under the trade agreement, extended until December 31, 1967, Nasser has been able to unload his cotton in this country at a few cents under the Government's support price. Since 1959 he has exported more than $200 million of this cotton to the United States. Last year, Egyptian cotton shipments exceeded 44,000 bales, and imports this year are already over 30,000.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the so-called Foley amendment. I feel it takes the guts out of the committee bill, and, contrary to being in the national interest, I am convinced the opposite is the case. I believe this amendment is ill advised. It is ill timed. It is ill conceived.

When countries such as the United Arab Republic or the Sudan feel quite at liberty to spurn diplomatic contact with our nation, to attempt to dishonor our Government before international forums, then it is incumbent upon us to demonstrate that these actions cannot be taken without impunity. In the face of repeated generosity and understanding on our part in the past, as befitting a large, prosperous, mature nation confronted by an unstable and impoverished one, we have been repaid with insults and treachery. Our patience has justifiably been exhausted; I believe most of us would agree that appropriate measures ought to be taken.

The merits or flaws in the Foley amendment relate to the type of measure which would be considered appropriate and effective. For us to deny these countries access to our markets under the lenient proviso that our decision would be reversed the moment diplomatic relations are restored would, I strongly believe, not accomplish our objective.

We would be issuing an open invitation to all countries to freely engage in diplomatic and political attacks on this Nation whenever it suited their purposes, secure in the knowledge that any reprisals on our part would be temporary, and reversible at any time they found convenient. Such measures would hardly act as a very strong deterrent.

I cannot agree that it is in the national interest to have our diplomatic responses appear hesitant and ineffectual, our reprisals harmless and not to be feared.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Foley amendment, and urge that it be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman. I think he has stated the case exactly, once again. I am a southwesterner, but neither the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] nor I have one bale of long staple cotton in our districts. The bill will not help our farmers or us a bit. Here again is a chance to do something for our American farmers, in direct opposition to our avowed enemies. I see no reason why Congress should not do it.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Foley amendment, because I am convinced that it is in the national interest.

First, let us look at some of the fundamentals here. There is no question about an adequate supply of this type of cotton. The gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, in response to a question the other day, said we have in his opinion four times as much of this type of cotton on hand as we reasonably need. So we can put that consideration out of our minds.

Next, I should like to say I have demonstrated in my voting record in the years past that I believe in an adequate protection of American farmers and American industry. But, my colleagues, this takes nothing from the American farmers that they now have. They will have the same right to produce cotton as now exists. On the other hand, if this proposal should become law without the amendment, we are, in effect, saying to the people of the UAR and of the Sudan that so far as one can see into the future—and the chairman of the committee was very frank and forthright upon this matter, and I admire him for it—they will not have any right to export long-staple cotton to the United States.

Anyone who looks at a map of the world, and particularly of the Middle East, is aware of the importance that geography places upon Egypt. Furthermore, anyone who is aware of the designs of Russia, as she increasingly moves into the Middle East, as she puts more fleet units into the Mediterranean, knows how much we now need friends in that part of the world, and how much that need will increase in the future.

Everyone in this hall is anxious for a permanent, lasting, and just peace in the Middle East. In my opinion, one way to achieve that is to say to the United Arab Republic: When you do get a decent government willing to agree to a peaceful settlement of problems in the Middle East, when Mr. Nasser and his ilk have passed from the scene, then you may have some hope of finding a market for your principal product, long-staple cotton, in the United States.

Without that hope, I think no one expects that there can be a permanent peace in the Middle East. So I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that in my considered opinion, as we try to build for peace in that troubled part of the world, as we try to look forward to a time when we can push back the Russians, who have moved increasingly into that part of the world since the termination of hostilities last June, a reasonable attitude with respect to our foreign policy is not to close irrevocably the door to the sale of Egyptian cotton.

It has been said here, and correctly, that this law could of course be overturned by another law. But who within the sound of my voice believes that would easily or soon be done?

The time for the protection of our best national interests might long since have passed where we got around to the point of passing a law to correct what we may be doing here today.

So I would urge the members of the Committee seeking to act in the best interests of our beloved country, if we are going to adopt this bill—although perhaps the best fate it could meet would be to have the whole thing defeated—then by all means add this amendment, which does give some hope of preserving the future interests of our Nation and the future peace of the Middle East.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and also of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington, because I share the belief that they are important to retain a flexibility in relation to our foreign policy in the Middle East.

It is too simple a position to say that the State Department, or those who advocate flexibility in this situation, are on one side and that the farmers and producers are on the other. It is not as simple as that.

First, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] has said, we are not taking anything away from those who are producing at the present time.

Second, in the belief that we should maintain a flexibility in our policy in looking to the future, we are acting in the essential and basic and vital interests of these very same producers. Certainly if we were able to prevent a war, if we were able to stimulate and bring into being a moderate Government in the United Arab Republic, this would be vastly more in the interests of these producers than whatever small amount of production might be allocated to them under this legislation or any other legislation.

I should like to give an illustration in respect to a point which has already been made, but one which I believe is vitally important. Many of those who have spoken have been fighting against Nasser, saying what a terrible man he is, what a force for evil, and what destruction he has wrought. No one would disagree with that.

There is a point to remember, though, and I believe it is an essential point in this whole discussion. It is the fact that Nasser is not going to be there forever. We have had similar difficulties with Nkrumah. We have had similar and perhaps even greater controversy with Sukarno. Yet today we are helping those who have come to power in Indonesia in the conviction that is in the best interests of the United States, of all the people, including these very cotton producers.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to commend the gentleman for his statement and to point out also, in his discussion of future relationships with these countries, particularly the Sudan and the United Arab Republic, an indication of their importance to our own industry is evidenced by the fact that in 1966 our exports to them were over eight times as great as our imports from those two countries.

So, if we should make a decision which would make it impossible for them to import at such time as diplomatic relations are resumed, we can anticipate a drastic reduction in our own exports. So this would be, I think, a very obvious example of biting off our nose to spite our face. We would not be doing ourselves any good if we should have a permanent provision such as is suggested in this bill.

Mr. MONAGAN. I think the point the gentleman makes is a very significant one. I would like to say also I am not one who believes every decision of the State Department is Holy Scripture. I happen to come from a very highly industrialized district. I can assure you we have many complicated problems relating to manufacturing imports competing with products of our district. I do not say that we should agree with every decision nor that we should not assert the interests of our own districts, but I do think that the flexibility which I suggest that would be provided by the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] is vitally important.

I point out also that in the report the committee seems to suggest that is not a decision on a foreign policy question, but it seems to me it is very much so, because even though we are not experts in agriculture and do not pretend to go into the question of the amounts or the distribution, nevertheless it does have concern in this broad area of our national security and world peace.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has made a very cogent argument as to the necessity of flexibility and has criticized the rigidity of the committee bill. I believe the gentleman recognizes the rigidity of which he speaks relates to the fact that he feels it would be difficult once the American farmers are producing this cotton to get this House or the Congress to take it away from them and give it back to the United Arab Republic. Under the Foley amendment, this cotton is given to other foreign countries and not American producers. The words "to other foreign countries" at the present time means Peru, because Peru is the only other country in the world which is presently growing enough of this cotton to meet these demands. Does not the gentleman recognize that Peruvian growers would make exactly the same kind of objections if the President under the terms of the Foley amendment were to take the cotton away from Peru?

Mr. MONAGAN. I think they might make some objection. I do not share the misgivings that the gentleman has previously expressed about our inability to act with relation to the interests of our own producers.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman point out any example in recent history where we have taken away from some foreign country a privilege which we had given to them so as to give it to another foreign country?

Mr. MONAGAN. Well, I am not prepared to do that, but I do think——

Mr. POAGE. That is what you would be doing under the Foley amendment; is it not?

Mr. MONAGAN. I do not think——

Mr. POAGE. That is what the Foley amendment would require; is it not?

Mr. MONAGAN. Well——

Mr. POAGE. Let us get back to what the amendment really does, instead of something else.

What does the gentleman think about the impact of the Foley amendment, if adopted?

Does not the Foley amendment, in effect, require that you obtain a release from the growers of such cotton in Peru?

Mr. MONAGAN. As I understand the language of the Foley amendment, it would not require a release. It would involve Executive action to restore.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, how else are you going to satisfy the State Department?

Mr. MONAGAN. It is not a question of the State Department; it is a question of a Presidential discretion, which is or is not satisfied, and not that of the State Department.

Mr. POAGE. Which for this purpose is, in fact, the State Department; is it not?

Mr. MONAGAN. No.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman does not think the State Department is interested in this legislation?

Mr. MONAGAN. I believe that the Department is interested, but I certainly would be in favor of giving any President who happened to be in office at the time the benefit of the doubt as to his capacity to exercise his own discretion with reference to matters of this nature.

I have found, to my own pain, that a President sometimes has exercised such discretionary power contrary to the manner in which I have felt it should have been exercised.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to prolong this debate, but it is my opinion that there are two or three points that need to be cleared up.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is absolutely correct when he says that my amendment does not transfer the United Arab Republic and the Sudanese quotas to American farmers. It is not the purpose of my amendment, to permanently transfer these quotas to American farmers.

As the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico said, the bill would not get out of committee and it would not be on the floor of the House today for consideration if it were not for the times, the emotional times, in which we find ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, let us understand what we are being asked to do by this bill. This bill represents an attempt to increase extra long staple cotton production in the States that several gentleman represent at the expense of the world quota, but more particularly at the expense of Egypt and the Sudan. Because of the emotional feelings of the House and of the country a committee bill has been reported which otherwise would never have the slightest chance of passage. The bill has no merit.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation has hoped for and has worked for peace in the Middle East. The United States has expended billions of dollars, as well as lives, in protecting the interest of a stable and peaceful Middle East.

Today we are asked to take the most shortsighted action which I can imagine that this House could take for the benefit of the interest of only 1 percent of the cotton farmers of the United States. When we weigh this limited interest in the balance against the billions of dollars represented by our efforts directed toward peace in the Middle East as the lives of our soldiers and sailors, the danger of further attacks on independent states and the threat of further world involvement it weighs little in comparison.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the most questionable action to attempt to aid a segment of agriculture by this means. The interest of all Americans, lies in a wise foreign policy. In the interest of that foreign policy and in the interest of all Americans we should not prevent the President from furthering peace and stability in a very troubled area of the world. The cost of this bill may be very high. Higher than any reasonable assistance to cotton agriculture can justify.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that as a Member representing one of these States involved in this problem, and since the great State of California does produce long-staple cotton—I wish to aline myself with the statements which have been made by the gentleman in the well and in support of his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time in my opinion to enact an expedient and opportunistic piece of legislation and to put it on the books, when the world is in turmoil such as it is today in the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, there was a question asked a moment ago about taking quotas away from certain countries. Of course, as all the members of the committee will recall we took certain sugar quotas away from Cuba and placed them around the world in the hands of other certain sugar producers.

However, if this quota is not used which we take away from the United Arab Republic and if it is assigned to Peru upon a 2-year basis or upon a 1-year period of time, it could be taken away by the President of the United States. In other words, it does not need to be made permanent. If we selfishly put into law, something like the bill which the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has offered, we shall live to rue the day that we did so.

Mr. Chairman, it is time, I think, that we rise above some of these very small items which are involved and look at this thing in the nature of a threat to the peace of the world. And certainly this is connected with foreign affairs, and this does have an effect upon our relations with other nations of the world.

Mr. FOLEY. I agree with every word the gentleman has spoken.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Much of what the gentleman has said appeals to me, and I was tempted to follow his arguments and support his amendment, but the thing that troubles me—and I would hope that we can perhaps reach some middle ground—we do not take this cotton that Egypt and the Sudan will not be able to send here, and give it to the American producers to produce in the domestic market, we give it to South American, or Peruvian farmers. Would the gentleman be amenable to a further amendment that would give authority to the President to give this cotton quota to the American producers until such time as he finds the international situation requires him to restore these quotas?

Mr. FOLEY. We have had these cotton quotas on extra-long-staple cotton for many years, and they have been satisfactory as far as this House is concerned for over a generation. What is wrong with the suggestion that we deprive the United Arab Republic and the Sudan of the quota and give it to the U.S. American cotton farmers?

The answer is that there would be two evils involved. First, the gentleman's suggestion tends to give the impression to American cotton farmers that they are receiving an actual increase in cotton acreage, and then when the time comes to restore these cotton quotas back to the United Arab Republic and to the Sudan the increases will be withdrawn.

Second, when we do come to the point when the President believes we can restore these cotton quotas back to Egypt and Sudan it will be politically very difficult for any President of the United States to restore such cotton participation to Egypt and the Sudan, even though it might be in the interest of peace in the Middle East. The purpose of this bill is to get these cotton quotas to the American producers so that they never can be taken out of the control of those producers. Even if it was in the interest of the whole Nation to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that foreign policy got into this debate. It does not belong, but it is here, so let us talk about it.

I do not suppose there is anybody in the Chamber today who does not believe that the interests of world peace would be served if Gamal Nasser, who is now dictator in Egypt, were to be deposed.

I imagine most of us feel also that whoever might be in control of the Government of Sudan at present is not exactly for world peace. The present Governments of Egypt and the Sudan are not particularly friends of ours. They broke diplomatic relations with us, and are doing everything they can to show they do not value our friendship at all.

Now, the debate here has taken rather a strange turn, if you listen to it. It is assumed that we are not now trading with Egypt and the Sudan in extra-long-staple cotton. Well, that is not true. We are right now buying cotton from Egypt and the Sudan, long staple cotton.

So what we are actually saying to the people of Egypt and the Sudan is not that we would like to be their friends and resume diplomatic relations. What we are saying is "You go ahead and keep in power this dictator who broke diplomatic relations with the United States, keep in power the dictator who led you into a disastrous war in the Middle East. We are still going to buy long staple cotton from you for the foreseeable future."

That is the situation that we are faced with here today.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No; not at this time.

That is the situation we are faced with here today, we are buying cotton from Egypt and the Sudan. This bill would change that. It would change it in such a manner that maybe the people of the world would understand that at least the Congress of the United States intends to adopt a foreign policy which takes into consideration the realities of the world. We will not indulge in the type of wishful thinking adopted by many people in the State Department concerning our world relationships.

At least the Congress adverts to the fact that we have an enemy as dictator of Egypt today. We tell the people of Egypt, "We have nothing against you whatsoever, but we have plenty against your Government, and until you change your Government, until you establish a government which is in the interest of peace among all the people of the world, and until you establish a government with which we can maintain diplomatic relations, we do not intend to buy any more Egyptian long-staple cotton."

This is what Congress is telling them. By adopting this bill, anyone who believes that this House would be so shortsighted as not to restore a cotton quota to Egypt and the Sudan, if they once again become the historic friends which they once were, is selling short the combined wisdom of the Members of this House.

I do not think there is any doubt but that Members of this House would vote to restore a quota under proper conditions.

Let us be sensible about the type of diplomacy we must pursue. As of now we are saying to the Egyptians and Sudanese, "Go ahead and bite my hand again, it did not hurt very bad the first time." I say that this type of diplomacy is just not believable. It has brought us neither peace nor respect—nor will it.

As I have said before on this floor, I have done the very best I can ever since I have been in the Congress to do something for the long-staple cotton farmers as far as quotas and tariffs are concerned.

This bill was not brought up here necessarily because of the situation in the Middle East. It should have been brought up a long time ago, because for a long time the long-staple cotton farmer has suffered under very unfair treatment.

I am sorry that it is necessary for the Congress to pass bills like this. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] said that perhaps we should have an American desk in the State Department. I think we should too. You see if we had that, then it would not be necessary for the Congress to worry about quotas like this because as soon as diplomatic relations were broken off, then the State Department would act on its own to terminate the quotas which would be bolstering the very government which is so unfriendly to the United States of America as to have broken off relations.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope the Foley amendment will be defeated and I hope that the House will then proceed to pass this very important bill.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. Would not the gentleman agree that under my amendment, there is precisely the same retaliatory action taken toward Egypt and the Sudan as the committee bill as long as diplomatic relations are broken?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington would provide for the President to restore the quotas.

Mr. FOLEY. Only after diplomatic relations are restored; is that not correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. And only if he makes the finding that it is in the best interest of our country.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman had had to argue with the State Department as long as I have about long staple cotton, he would understand my feeling; and I do not believe it will ever happen that way.

Mr. FOLEY. Under the amendment of the gentleman from New York, and under my amendment, the President would have to make a finding that it was in the interest of peace in that area.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes and the gentleman's amendment will emasculate the bill. I say with all due respect to the gentleman, and he is a good friend of mine, but his amendment is completely antithetical to the type of bill we have before us, and which we need. We are trying to help the American farmers, not necessarily the Peruvian farmers although I do not want to hurt the Peruvian farmer either. We want to deal with friendly nations. The present governments of Egypt and the Sudan do not qualify. I think the gentleman's amendment is not in our best interest.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I size up the debate, under the committee bill the quotas that would normally be given to Egypt and the Sudan would be able to be placed in the United States.

Under the Foley amendment, there would not be any reduction of the quotas and the net effect of it would be that the acreage would then go to Peru or to some other nation.

I do not think anybody would want the United States to continue trading with Egypt under the present conditions when she has severed relationship.

But I personally feel that the bill that has come out of the committee has mischief in it. I think it could cause our country more trouble in the years ahead than we might count on now.

But I think the gentleman from New Mexico may have put his finger on an important point just a few minutes ago, if these quotas are changed and if they were taken from Egypt and the Sudan at this time.

Does the gentleman have any language that he could offer where these quotas at the present time could go to domestic producers and then the discretion left to the President at a future date for the restoration of the same quotas, and yet at the same time would give some quota protection to local producers?

It seems to me we ought to take away the production from Egypt and those areas now but surely we ought not to bind the hands of the United States so much that we could not, as the language says, at any future date restore this trade—and that is too harsh in my opinion.

I am from a district that grows a great deal of cotton. Does the gentleman have any language which would say to the domestic user, "You can grow until such time as the President will change these quotas at a later date, giving protection to domestic growers"?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I have been trying to work out some kind of compromise. I am never surprised in changes of position around here, but I am a little surprised to see some of those who came to the defense of Nasser today and who not too many weeks ago were shouting that we should come to the aid of Israel against Nasser. Apart from that, it has seemed to me that the great defect of the Foley amendment is that the additional American consumption we are going to have, instead of giving it to American producers, it would go to South American or other foreign producers.

I drafted language here, which I will not offer at this time because I have tried to follow the leadership of the Agriculture Committee. I have tried to work with my colleague from Arizona over the years on behalf of our cotton producers. They feel with some justification that they have been carrying on their backs a big foreign policy load they should not have to carry. If the Foley amendment were to be voted down, the gentleman from Texas could very well offer a substitute or an amendment of the kind we have been working on here which would do precisely what he has outlined.

Mr. PICKLE. I would be interested in looking at the proposal. It would seem to me that would be a fair and reasonable compromise. It would allow our producers to get in the business, but at a future date we would not tie the hands of the President. The committee bill I think is too harsh. I want to see the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we are in a little bad timing on this bill. It is not quite close enough to Christmas. You know, they always used to cut up a sugar plum in Mr. Cooley's office a couple or three weeks before Christmas. I think the precedent set there was one that got this cotton ball out today; it is a kind of Christmas tree ornament, too.

I cannot see why anyone would say, No. 1, that anyone who is for the Foley amendment—and I am for it—is for Nasser. That is ridiculous on the face of it.

No. 2, I do not see why the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] would want to pick the ruler of Egypt as his target. He says anything we might get instead of Nasser would be better. That is not a foregone conclusion. It could be worse. Nobody knows about that. We picked Nasser when Farouk was overthrown. He was our boy. Some of the things that went on turned him sour. Secretary of State Dulles promised him the Aswan Dam, which he could not deliver because Congress had not appropriated the money, and then he took it away from him, something he did not have. That made Nasser angry.

I cannot see how anyone can stand here and say that if we see a change in rulers in a couple of years that is what we need.

I do not know and I probably have heard more testimony on the subject than most.

Another thing that bothers me a little bit is the statement that we have not done anything for the American cotton farmer. Let me tell you something. If it were not for the taxpayers' dollars to build irrigation projects and dams, there would not be any long-staple cotton grown in this country. It is grown out there in the deserts in which the U.S. taxpayers have built the necessary dams and ditches and what-have-you to put the water in to grow the cotton.

Nobody has done that for any of the farmers in my district. I do not hear them crying around about it.

I might be sympathetic to something like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] talked about, if someone can work out the language. But I certainly agree with his position that if you summarily take this quota away from Egypt and the Sudan and give it to the American cotton farmer, you are not going to take it away from the cotton farmer and give it back to anybody, whether you get a ruler out there that you like or whether you get one you do not like or whether you get one in between.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. That is precisely the point. The gentleman has had more experience in foreign affairs than I have had. The question is, Are you going to have more difficulty taking it back from the American farmer, or are you going to have more difficulty taking it back from the Peruvian farmer? It will go one place or the other.

Mr. HAYS. I do not know. I would say probably, with the Agricutlure Committee being composed as it is, and the history of legislation they have brought out around here, I would say you would probably have more difficulty taking it away from the American cotton farmer, because he is represented here. Peru does not have any representative in the Congress. They do not have any constituency that votes for them. I think that question is almost self-answering.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TUNNEY. Is it not true that this cotton quota is assigned on a competitive basis, that it is not given to anyone, that farmers have to grow the cotton and be able to sell it competitively?

Mr. HAYS. That is correct. They can only sell so much. If it is not good, they cannot sell any.

Mr. TUNNNEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. HAYS. That is true. The Foley amendment should certainly be supported if, as someone—the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] or someone else—has said, if we are going to pass this bill at all, probably the best thing would be to throw the whole bill out.

As I said, we should wait until we are closer to Christmas, and see if then if we can do something for them.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that, being on the committee, I have to disagree with my chairman, whom I respect for his knowledge of agriculture. I have paid a lot of attention to his wisdom on many, many occasions, but today I have to disagree with him on the Foley amendment. I am in favor of the Foley amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at this time in our world history, foreign policy is the No. 1 problem facing this Nation. We should not subvert that policy for $16 million worth of cotton. Foreign trade is a two-way street. We export $5 to $6 billion of goods more than we import. If we start whittling away at this, we will find we are going to get the short end of the stick.

People trade because it is beneficial to both parties. They do not trade because one gets the short end and someone else gets the long end. As far as agricultural exports are concerned, the American farmer gets the long end of the stick, because we export more than $2 billion of agricultural products more than we import. Thus, this is $2 billion worth of foreign exchange that the American farmer earns for the American economy.

Do Members know what the Soviet Union is up to in the Middle East and Near East? Nothing less than the eventual communization of all that area. That area is ripe for communization, because 5 percent of the population owns practically all of the wealth. Our foreign policy in the Mediterranean would take a tremendous setback if we drive the Egyptians all the way into the arms of the Soviet Union.

What would happen if the Egyptians give the Soviet Union naval and air bases on the northern coast of Africa? Our foreign policy and the military situation would deteriorate very rapidly.

I hate Nasser. If he would drop dead right now, believe me, I would not shed a tear for him, but the Egyptian people have been here for thousands of years before Nasser came on the scene, and I am sure they will be here thousands of years after Nasser is gone.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VIGORITO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would say $16 million is rather insignificant in dealing with Nasser, when we have given him $995 million under Public Law 480, and we have given him several hundred million more under foreign aid, and we have sold him $250 million worth of wheat with the intention he pay for that, but when he fell out with us and told us to go to hell, he even refused to pay for the $250 million of wheat actually sold to him.

So I can see $16 million is a pretty insignificant amount for us to be arguing about here today.

The gentleman from California, my neighbor in the Rayburn Building, said a while ago we would rue the day when we pass this bill. Well, I have rued the day that we spent all this money in such an unstable spot as Nasser's country, and, when we did not fulfill giving him a dam in addition to all the other things we gave him, he got mad at us. How do we know if we keep on buying Egyptian cotton he will not get mad at us, too.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of buying cotton from Egypt when Nasser breaks off diplomatic relations, but I do not believe we should have foreign policy decided here.

Our foreign policy is much more important than that.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VIGORITO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I should like to point out to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he has his timetable a little bit reversed. The dam came first and the sale of wheat second.

I should like to further point out to the gentleman, that was under Public Law 480, which came out of the Committee on Agriculture. We sold the wheat to Egypt for Egyptian pounds, which is what you fellows wanted. We have stacks of them, that would fill this room. If they are not worth much, do not blame the Committee on Foreign Affairs, because this was another episode of the Committee on Agriculture, under Mr. Cooley, operating in the foreign affairs field.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture. I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

There are no cottongrowers in the Fifth District of Maryland, right across the District line. There are no manufacturers. So I am not concerned about the dollars and cents.

I am concerned about the fact that we are in a shooting war and it is time that we in the Congress served notice that we will not continue to aid countries which have policies of anti-Americanism and aid our enemies.

In the Middle East it took the little country of Israel to get us off the hook by decisively defeating the United Arab Republic.

What is our foreign policy in the Middle East? What has it accomplished? What is happening right now in the Middle East? Russia is restocking the Egyptians, to take care of the airplanes and tanks and everything else they lost to Israel.

What is happening in the Far East? Are we supposed to continue to turn our backs and to trade with and aid these people who are helping the people shooting at our men?

When are we going to get hard-nosed about foreign policy? When are we going to stop playing "cops and robbers" with our youngsters, who are preserving the liberty of the world?

I believe in foreign policy, but I believe in a realistic foreign policy which is going to serve some notice and start drawing the line.

I am not concerned about the texture of the California cotton or the Arizona cotton. I am not concerned about the manufacturers. I am not concerned as to whether Peru is going to get this cotton quota.

This bill is a vehicle to notify the world that we are going to stop pussyfooting with foreign policy.

I have heard a lot of procrastination about the saving of lives. How are we going to save lives until we serve such notice?

That is a part of our problem in the Far East today. The Communists believe we are going to pull back. I know we will not. Most Members do. We have a bipartisan support for our effort.

Defeating this amendment will not wreck our foreign policy, but it will serve notice on those countries that the Congress is going to stop fooling around and that we will meet force with force. We will serve notice on all of these other people, who seem to think they can bargain with us as to who is going to give away the most.

I say it is time for us to reevaluate our position.

I hope the amendment will be defeated and be defeated overwhelmingly, and I hope the bill will be passed without it.

I will be among the first, when and if it is over, to help get the quotas back. But only Congress should control it. Let us demonstrate that we are going to meet our responsibilities to the world and not always say, "Let us wait. Let us wait. Let us wait. A permanent peace will come by negotiation."

We are spending $2½ billion a month in a shooting war today.

And we have been spending $3 billion a year on foreign aid.

Let us get a little hard nosed on the situation of our foreign aid. Let us recognize and take action on behalf of the people and nations who do want to help themselves, the people who do want to cooperate in the finding of a lasting solution and the obtaining of a lasting and permanent peace. It is with these countries that we can provide foreign aid that will be meaningful to the world and to the promotion of peace.

When some countries use us to further their own selfish aims; such as the United Arab Republic, and those countries are whipping up massive anti-American sentiment to bolster dictatorships and war, we can serve notice we are not going to appease them any more by telling them: "We are not going to give you any help."

I think when we give that message loud and clear to the world we will get peace and get it a whole lot quicker.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and the amendment to the amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to sound a note of optimism. I think that peace in the Near East is close at hand.

I have watched during the years the efforts of Israel in giving of her small means help to other countries in the Near East and in Africa. I have seen her helping the Arabs, when there was opportunity and receptibility. I think that Israel's investment of good will is about to pay off in large dividends.

I clearly vision the dawning of a new and happier era when grudges and hatreds will be replaced with the spirit of the cooperative friendship of nations and races laboring together to achieve the highest measure of prosperity and contentment for all the Near East and all Africa. I do not want to slam the door on this vista of the promised land.

I do not want my country to take the position of a man who will not forgive when true penance has come to his former enemy.

I am strongly supporting the Foley amendment because I want to leave the door wide open for a truly penitent Egypt and Sudan to return to the society of good neighbors striving with us to make this a better world for everyone. To say to Egypt and the Sudan that they are permanently off our list, forever, and forever and forever, is to strengthen the present governments of those countries that have so grievously offended us. It could only serve to discourage the reform forces and persons in Egypt and the Sudan that are seeking to bring their homelands into the world of today and far, far from the age-long slavery to grudges and hatreds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Kleppe].

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Foley amendment and in support of the committee bill.

I want to make mention of an allusion that was made to the Members of this House by the gentleman from Ohio about the Committee on Agriculture. I think every member on this Committee on Agriculture is striving and has striven to do the best job that they can on the legislation that comes before them. In spite of any thoughts he may have to the contrary, these are the efforts that have been put forth in this legislation and in other legislation.

I want to bring out only one more point here. I wonder how far we can go in asking the producers of this country to make foreign policy for us or to make national policy or whatever policy it might be. Why are we big and strong enough to need a policy in any area of our lives? It is because the producers of this country have done their job. They pay the taxes and support this Government and make it necessary for all of us to hold up our heads and say we are Americans. I just wonder how long we can ask them to carry this burden.

With those thoughts in my mind, my sentiment is heavy along the lines of opposing the Foley amendment and supporting the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pickle].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, at the committee desk we are working on an amendment that some of us feel might be a reasonable compromise on the problems facing the House today. In view of the time limitation at this moment, I do not intend to offer a substitute at this point, but pending the outcome of the Foley amendment, I merely wish to state that I will offer a substitute amendment at a later time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] to close debate.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite evident that, if we really want to give any help to American producers, this is the opportunity to do it. You have a choice here between Americans and foreigners, and the Foley amendment accentuates that choice. You have to make the choice this afternoon. Whether you adopt the committee bill or the Foley amendment, you are going to take this quota at least temporarily and place it in the hands of somebody who does not have it now.

Now, the question is, Do you want it in the hands of American producers or do you want it in the hands of some of these foreign producers? Now, that is the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bingham] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley], as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Foley) there were—ayes 56, noes 67.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Foley and Mr. Poage.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 76, noes 109.

So the amendment, as amended, was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PICKLE

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Pickle:

On page 2, line 3, after the words "shall not", strike out the words "at any future time"; and on page 2, line 4, before the word "constitute" insert the words "as long as such countries are not in diplomatic relations with the United States"; and on page 2, line 10, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "until such time as the President finds that it is contrary to the national interest of the United States and such action is not conducive toward the establishment of peaceful relations in the Middle East to permit such cotton to constitute a portion of such quota."

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in the hope that it might bring the House a little nearer to what I believe is the intent of our Government, that is that we do not wish to carry on trade with Nasser and Egypt and the Sudan under present conditions. But at the same time that such quotas as might be taken from that area would be given to the domestic producers in the United States and with the proviso that we remove the phrase "at any future time" which I have a dislike for, and then permit the President to make two findings—one that it is in the interest of the United States and that it is also conducive toward peace.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one question about his amendment?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I notice that the gentleman does not say "and when the President" but says "until." I just wonder if that does not have the legal effect of providing that whenever the President should decide to restore these quotas, he could do so even though we still do not have diplomatic relations with Egypt?

Mr. PICKLE. I would say to the Chairman that in one form of the amendment we had the language on line 10, page 2, after the word "occurs"—"and."

That was the intent and if I could by unanimous consent, I would want to change that word to strike out "until" and say "and." That is my intent.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may so correct his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CORRECTED AMENDMENT OF MR. PICKLE

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as corrected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Pickle: On page 2, line 3, after the words "Shall not," strike out the words "at any future time" and on page 2, line 4, before the word "constitute" insert the words "as long as such countries are not in diplomatic relations with the United States," and page 2, line 10, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and such time as the President finds that it is contrary to the national interest of the United States and such action is not conducive toward the establishment of peaceful relations in the Middle East to permit such cotton to constitute a portion of such quota."

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, the only thing then that has been changed on line 10, page 2, is that we strike out the word "until" and add the word "and."

The intent is pure and simple, to say that we will not allow these quotas to be kept in Egypt and the Sudan under present conditions but instead that they would be given to domestic producers as outlined which give the President the leeway that I think he needs.

There is a great temptation to whack Nasser; I can understand that. But I do think we should put it in terms of the national interest of the United States.

When we have removed the phrase "at a future time" this does give the domestic producers a chance to get in business and give the President the two criteria that I think would safeguard our interest in this country.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. Is it the purpose of the gentleman's amendment to state that the President would have the authority to restore the participation in the extra-long-staple cotton quota to Egypt and the Sudan assuming that we had restored relations with them and that it was in the President's judgment in the interest of the United States and peace in the Middle East—and by that action, alone, restore those cotton quotas?

Mr. PICKLE. My intent is that it would be able to be restored by the President and by an Executive order.

Mr. FOLEY. Is it the gentleman's intention to put on notice the American farmer that he may be in the meantime utilizing temporary cotton quotas and it is the intention of the President to act and restore these quotas when specified conditions exist.

Mr. PICKLE. I would say to the gentleman that it would certainly put our domestic producers on notice, but I would want to make this doubly sure also. I am sure the President in his discretion would not take such action that would be precipitous and do damage to the local producers. That is something that in commonsense and good judgment we would have to work out.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman assumes that the President would take the action contemplated only if he felt that peace would be advanced in the Middle East and our relations with Egypt and Sudan reestablished. Does the gentleman assume that in the amendment?

Mr. PICKLE. Yes; I would assume that. I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment is a vast improvement over the amendment which was just voted down. I think that it would achieve an end that some of the Members might want to achieve. Frankly, I tried to help the gentleman from Texas get language which would do that. I believe his amendment does that. If any amendment is to be adopted, I want it to be a clearly worded amendment. I believe the gentleman from Texas has brought us such an amendment.

But I believe that, even so, the amendment is unfair to American producers and unfair to the Congress of the United States. It is plain why it would also be unfair to the American producers.

You cannot prepare to grow a cotton crop for only a few months. You cannot put in the investment necessary to make a cotton crop without some assurance that you will be able to stay in the business for at least several years.

This amendment gives no assurance. The sword of Damocles would hang over the cotton growers all the time during the term of this amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. What the gentleman is saying, of course, has considerable merit. In my judgment, a question of balance is involved here. There is the question of the future of America's foreign relations. No President would use this legislation in a manner which would upset the operations of a group of American farmers.

It seems to me that this is a logical choice between the position in the bill and the position of the gentleman from Washington. I go along, as the gentleman knows, with helping the American farmer, but I am also interested in preserving the authority of this country to act in the national interest in dealing with other nations.

Mr. POAGE. The proposal is a much better one than that offered by the gentleman from Washington. I have tried to make that plain. But I think the facts of life are that no one engages in cotton production these days—certainly not in the southwestern deserts where water is so necessary and so expensive—without the ability to finance a crop, and that means to get a line of credit. There are no banks that I know of, including the production credit associations, which will lend money to make a crop in the face of the uncertainties which this amendment would place in the making of a cotton crop.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. In my opinion, he is absolutely correct. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] has an amendment which is certainly closer to the situation which the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], and I both desire. At the same time I feel very strongly that it would put the American farmer in a position where he would really not be able to do a good job of growing long-staple cotton. Anyway, I think the gentleman from Texas agrees with me. It might be well for this situation to be left under the control of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly the point I next wanted to make. I said that this is unfair to Congress. By that I mean the Congress, in my judgment, should retain in its own hands the right to make the determination as to the time that we would transfer a quota from American producers to foreign producers, rather than leave it to any president to make a decision by Presidential order. It comes to the proposition that we have to make the decision here right now as to whether you believe the Congress or the President should make these decisions.

Personally I am still a believer in democracy, and I believe the Congress should make the decision.

Second, you must make the decision as to whether you want to give Americans the opportunity to make a crop or if you only want theoretical relief for our farmers. Back in the days when we produced cotton with a team of mares and a cultivator, this proposition might have been very reasonable. But you cannot make a cotton crop that way these days.

When farmers have to get long-term financing—and they have to do it if they are going to make a crop of extra-long-staple cotton, this is an impractical illusionary promise to the farmers that will bring about absolutely no benefit to them. We have to make the decision right now whether we want a profitable relief or an impractical illusionary situation.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] on his amendment. I think it is a statesmanlike attempt to bring some consensus to a very difficult choice that no one in this House likes to make, a choice between some aid to a certain class of American producers and some real concern that the action proposed by the committee bill will seriously hamper the foreign policy and foreign relations of the United States, an interest in which we all have a deep and abiding stake.

I did not favor this amendment. I favored my own amendment, but in view of the situation, I think it is infinitely preferable to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] and transfer these allotments or quotas that are not used by the United Arab Republic and the Sudan, as long as they are not used, to the American producers.

I think, in all fairness, we are giving the American producers notice that if the foreign relations situation between the United States and Egypt and the Sudan are improved, are restored, and if it is in the interest of the United States and peace in the Middle East, these Egyptian and Sudanese quotas may be restored. In the meantime, the American farmer has an opportunity to use whatever quotas there are. I do not think that is unfair to the long staple cotton American producers, and it retains flexibility on the part of the President to act in support of a more liberal and moderate regime in the Middle East, which is vitally necessary to preserve peace in the Middle East and is in the interest of every American.

I hope every Member will support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a great deal of discussion in the House Chamber in recent weeks in protest to delegating power to the President and the executive branch of the Government. Here today, under the terms of the pending amendment, we would be handing still another grant of power to the President to do, at his pleasure, what I believe a majority of the House does not want done. I have listened carefully to all the debate this afternoon, and I have heard no one mention the textiles that have been imported into this country from Egypt before, during, and since the period of upheaval in the Middle East. The President could have taken action under the Trade Agreements Act to cut off the import of textiles into this country if he wanted to do so.

This amendment giving delegated power to the President to intervene to deprive the producers of this country, if he determines to do so, is not in the interests of the people of this country.

This is the kind of legislation that ought to be stopped and this amendment ought to be rejected out of hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POAGE) there were—ayes 56, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

I take this time, as we approach the hour of voting on this bill, to explain that if the parliamentary situation made it possible, an effort would be made to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions to strike out the words "July 15, 1967," as adopted in the Committee of the Whole on last Wednesday and to substitute therefor the original date in the Brasco amendment, which would make the cutoff date September 15, 1967. The parliamentary situation will not make that possible, so we cannot force a vote on the Brasco amendment.

I am appealing to the conferees who will be representing this House in a conference with the other body, if similar legislation passes there, to agree to the September 15 cutoff date, because the sole purpose is to prevent adverse results flowing to American businessmen who in good faith have entered into contracts prior to September 15, 1967 for the purchase of Egyptian cotton.

I happen to have some experience in this field. I have a friend who is a cotton broker and who provides cotton for a large number of textile plants. He once owned a plantation in the delta and raised long-staple cotton. He buys a lot of delta cotton today. He buys a lot of cotton from Arizona and from California. He buys all the domestically produced long-staple cotton that his mill's customers will take. But there are a few mills which, for one reason or another, require Egyptian cotton. He has been buying over the years a relatively small amount of cotton produced in Egypt.

This broker does not deal with Egyptian producers or Egyptian sellers. He deals through a third party in Switzerland, and his contracts are with a Swiss concern.

I know a textile mill that on September 3, 1967, bought 800 bales of Egyptian cotton. The owners and managers of this mill are honorable, patriotic, reputable citizens. They do not live in my district. This mill is not in my district. But I know the management. I am informed they entered into this contract in good faith—not with an Egyptian concern, not with the Egyptian Government, but with an importer in New York. It is the importer in New York who holds the contract of this North Carolina company to purchase 800 bales of cotton.

I am sure some language can be adopted which will make a September 15, 1967, cutoff date effective only in protection of people and business concerns who are acting in good faith and who over the years have been engaged in a practice of importing relatively small quantities of Egyptian cotton, and who are today bound legally on legitimate contracts entered into prior to September 15, 1967 and who have sold goods to their own customers against that cotton.

This is not in derogation of any of the rights of domestic producers. I have already said that there are only a relatively few mills that use any Egyptian cotton at all. I just do not think that the Congress ought to make it possible for these concerns to be subjected to lawsuits for the enforcement of contracts that cannot be completed by them because of legislation. I cannot see that any harm would result to anybody if the escape date should be moved just 60 days ahead, from July 15 to September 15, 1967. I am appealing to those who will be on the conference representing this body to take such action as may be necessary to provide this kind of protection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I join in the expressions just made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina and trust when this bill is in conference the conferees take into consideration the remarks the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] has made about the reputable people and the character of the people involved in these dealings in considering this extension for 60 days. I wish it were possible in the parliamentary situation to offer an amendment such as the gentleman has in mind, but I understand that it is not.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] pointed out a very serious problem in connection with this bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] pointed out another problem in it, and so did the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY]. I am sure there is a great desire on the part of this body to protect access to our markets by future governments in Egypt and the Sudan that are legitimate, responsible, and decent. If a straight motion to recommit is offered, I hope that the Members will support it and thus enable the Agriculture Committee to do some more work on it. That is the responsible way to deal with the problem. It is obvious to all of us that many of its delicate foreign policy aspects have not been thoroughly explored.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PUCINSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10915) to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, pursuant to House Resolution 827, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of California moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 10915, to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 101, nays 244, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

YEAS—101

Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Ashley
Bingham
Boland
Bolton
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Celler
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Culver
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Dellenback
Derwinski
Dow
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Eilberg
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Foley
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Hungate
Irwin
Joelson
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kirwan
Leggett
Long, Md.
McClory
MacGregor
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Meeds
Mink
Mize
Monagan
Morgan
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Price, Ill.
Railsback
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Whalen
Wyatt
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—244

Abbitt
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Bow
Brasco
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Utah

Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Cramer
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Denney
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McCarthy
McClure
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Moore
Morris, N. Mex.
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, Pa.
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Udall
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watson
White
Whitener
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Winn
Wolff
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—87

Abernethy
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Berry
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Button
Cahill
Carey
Cleveland
Colmer
Conable
Cowger
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Esch
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gathings
Giaimo
Green, Pa.
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanna
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hull
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kupferman
Laird
Long, La.
Lukens
McCulloch
McDonald, Mich.
Mathias, Md.
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moss
Multer
Nix
Pirnie
Quie
Rarick
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Ronan
Rostenkowski
St. Onge
Scott
Slack
Stephens
Stuckey
Sullivan
Ullman
Utt
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
Whitten
Widnall
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jacobs for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Moorhead for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. Edwards of California for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Boggs against.

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee against.

Mr. Button for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Kupferman against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Hull against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Willis against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Wright with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Karsten with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Cabell.

Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Young with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.

Mr. Hamilton with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Gallagher with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Wydler.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Cowger.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Miller of California.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Ullman.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Rarick.

Messrs. HAYS and DULSKI changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 276, nays 63, not voting 93, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

YEAS—276

Abbitt
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Boland
Bow
Brasco
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Denney
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Hechler, W. Va.
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pike
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Ruppe
St Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watson
White
Whitener
Wiggins
Winn
Wolff
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—63

Adair
Adams
Anderson, Ill.
Ashley
Bolton
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Culver
Dellenback
Derwinski
Dow
Eckhardt
Findley
Foley
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Griffiths
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hicks
Holifield
Hungate
Irwin
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Long, Md.
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Meeds
Mink
Morgan
Morse, Mass.
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
O'Hara, Mich.
Ottinger
Pickle
Price, Ill.
Railsback
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Taft
Tunney
Whalen
Wyatt
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—93

Abernethy
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Berry
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Button
Cahill
Carey
Cleveland

Colmer
Conable
Cowger
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Esch
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Ford,
  William D.
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gathings
Giaimo
Green, Pa.
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanna
Hawkins
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Holland
Hull
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Karsten
Kupferman
Laird
Leggett
Long, La.
Lukens
McCulloch
McDonald,
  Mich.
Mathias, Md.
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moss
Multer
Nix
Passman
Pirnie
Quie
Rarick
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Ronan
Rostenkowski
St. Onge
Slack
Stephens
Stuckey
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
Whitten
Widnall
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Jacobs against.

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Moorhead against.

Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Edwards of California against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Nix against.

Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Button against.

Mr. Kupferman for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Holland against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carey with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Conable.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Karsten with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Cowger.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Giaimo.

Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Helstoski.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Stuckey.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Young.

Mrs. KELLY changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mrs. BOLTON and Mr. CONTE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on H.R. 10915, and to include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE MEXICAN AMERICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I was honored last week to be among the congressional delegation to accompany President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and President and Mrs. Gustavo Diaz Ordaz to El Paso, the ceremonies at the Chamizal, and also a visit to the Mexican-American Conference which was also being held there.

President Johnson's remarks at the Conference should be of interest to all of us, and I hereby respectfully enclose them for the RECORD:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

Distinguished delegates to the Mexican American Conference:

I am here on a mission that fills me with pride and deep satisfaction.

The Chamizal is now Mexican territory. The United States of America and the United States of Mexico have solved a political problem of 100 years standing.

So the Fiesta you are enjoying today serves a dual purpose: to celebrate the Chamizal, and to concentrate our attention on the achievement, and the concerns, of America's Mexican American people.

This is the first time, to my knowledge, that the Federal Government has sent five of its top Cabinet officers to search for new ways to fulfill the fundamental hopes of Spanish-speaking Americans—for good jobs, good education, good wages, good health, and good housing.

This is home country for me, as you know.

When I talk with you about the problems and potential of the Mexican American I am talking about people I have known all my life and care about deeply—a proud and strong people who are older in history than the United States itself.

What a change there has been in your lives—in all our lives—since I taught Mexican American children in a Cotulla, Texas school nearly 40 years ago. Most people in Texas then—Mexican American included, lived on the farm and made their living in the fields.

Few Mexican Americans had moved into better jobs, where they could offer their families some of the comforts of life.

There has been a good deal of upward movement since then. It is not enough, but it is encouraging:

Tens of thousands of Spanish-speaking Americans entering professional and technical occupations; Becoming managers, executives, and proprietors; Working as key employees in the great new industries of the Southwest.

For too many years. your government paid too little heed to the status and hopes of the Mexican-American community.

For too many years Americans who were poor remained invisible.

But in the 1960's, we decided that an era of neglect must come to an end.

With the help of a great Congress, we wrote into law more measures to train, to educate, to heal, and to house more Americans than had ever been written in our history.

We also wrote into law two landmark civil rights acts, to guarantee that no American would be deprived of opportunity by the prejudice of other Americans.

We did all this amidst a sea of controversy. That was to be expected. So far as I can determine, no President has ever done anything worthwhile without controversy.

The effort and the controversy were worth it. For the first time, we had the tools to work with each minority in a way that met its particular needs—that provided help, without regimentation or conformity.

For the Spanish-speaking citizen, there was a "New Focus on Opportunity."

He gained a powerful voice in the highest councils of Government, the voice of a distinguished public servant—Vicente T. Ximenes.

He found programs that answered his special needs—in language, education, and economic development.

And those programs respected his rich and unique cultural traditions.

In the last four years, your Government has trained tens of thousands of Mexican-Americans in the Rio Grande Valley and throughout the Southwest, for useful and rewarding jobs.

And we have reached into the smallest town and the largest city to do this.

And just as fundamental as jobs is education.

In four years we have passed 36 landmark education bills. We have tripled the money invested in these programs from $4.7 billion to $12.4 billion.

These are not just statistics. They represent children being prepared to take part in America's prosperity.

Let me tell the story of a young Mexican-American named Frank (Pancho) Mansera who came to visit me at the White House not long ago.

Pancho Mansera got off to a rough start in life. He was sickly. His parents were poor. When he came to the Head Start program he could hardly talk or walk, even though he was five years old.

But after medical treatment and the stimulus of people who cared about his education, Pancho moved ahead like the wind. He became cheerful, active, alert, healthier. He wanted to learn. He was a bright child. He just needed a chance. Head Start gave him that chance.

There are 2 million Pancho Manseras who have gotten a new educational head start.

And if I have my way, there will be many, many more—and they will return to this country much more than they have received.

We are moving forward, too, to set up additional community health centers for needy families.

Forty-one areas in our country now have such Neighborhood Health Centers. But we need more.

We are ready to launch a Neighborhood Health Center for San Luis, Colorado and Taos County, New Mexico. It could help more than 7,000 Spanish-speaking citizens in a remote area that has only two doctors and limited health facilities.

So we are moving forward. But nobody knows better than you how far there is to go.

Nobody can know, who has not experienced it, what it's like to be turned away at the personnel office because you have a strange accent. Nobody can know from the outside what it's like to have your children stumbling over words in a schoolbook, because a teacher hasn't taken the extra time to help them learn. Nobody can know, but those who have lived it, how a man wonders whether he will ever break free of the old cycle of following the crops, and give his son a better chance.

A lesser people might have despaired and given up a long time ago. But your people didn't; they believed they were full-fledged citizens of the greatest nation on earth, even if others didn't always treat them as such.

And today, their time has come. With the help of their government—but far more importantly, by their own hard work and with high good humor—they are entering into their rightful heritage as Americans. They are contributing to their country's welfare here, and to their country's security abroad.

I can tell you that nothing I have seen since those days long ago at Cotulla has given me greater happiness.

I hope that in my time of leadership I have helped to make it happen. I know that in the time that remains, I will do all I can to make the promise of these years multiply among the Mexican American people. You can be certain of that.

THE ANTIGUN BILL IS AN INVITATION FOR BURGEONING BUREAUCRACY

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the continuing attempt to place law-abiding Americans and legitimate sportsmen who own weapons in a sinister light while holding out the pious hope that passage of antigun legislation would stop crime in the United States was played up again Sunday night in a nationally televised broadcast. The discussion was conducted in a pro-gun-law atmosphere where the principal applause was given to a young man for questioning the practice of hunting.

In the debate the spectators were informed the Hruska bill is not worth the paper it is written on. The Hruska bill is a moderate approach designed to help prevent weapons from getting into the hands of criminal or irresponsible elements. This no doubt will come as something of a surprise to more than 30 Senators who have cosponsored the Hruska bill. It would be somewhat difficult, in light of this evaluation to assess the true worth of administration bill. Since it is sponsored by only a handful of Senators, it would appear to have even less value than a scrap of paper—or to be more dangerous to constitutional guarantees—at least in the minds of the Senators themselves.

It is hard to understand this continual harping on the need for antigun legislation. It should be perfectly clear that what is needed is law enforcement and not new laws. There are laws on the statute books to deal with just about any crime problem which confronts the Nation, if only the laws were upheld and criminals punished.

Even so, there is little disposition in Congress to oppose weapons control bills as such. The average Congressman is willing to accept controls in moderation where these clearly are designed to curb the criminal use of weapons. However, the principal vehicle which is supported by the antigun group is the Dodd bill, which is primarily a gun registration law and its effect will be to keep weapons out of the hands of law-abiding citizens while affording the criminal element the same access to weapons it always has enjoyed. The proponents of antigun legislation continue to claim that the riots last summer show a need for gun control measures. I think the facts are clear that looting which took place during the riots was the principal source of weapons in the hands of rioters. Antigun laws will not cure this problem.

It appears there are some who want to legislate a new kind of prohibition with the same frustration, the same invitation for racketeering, and a built-in opportunity for burgeoning bureaucracy.

CARING FOR VIETNAM'S ORPHANS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include related matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following article from Our Sunday Visitor:

WE'RE TOO BUSY TO MARCH: WE'VE GOT AN ORPHANAGE

(By Glenn A. McCurdy)

Hawks and doves. Peace marchers and counter marchers. Escalation and the credibility gap. Draft card burning and Martin Luther King. These are the stories which surround the most controversial war in the history of the United States.

On every level of communications the conflict in Vietnam continues in a fog of proposals and accusations, the heavy-handed drama of big headlines. News, almost by definition, is bad news. But on a much more modest level this unhappy confrontation between East and West can produce an active involvement that holds some hope for the future of mankind on this planet. When people are working to help other people there is hope, but few headlines.

Last spring the undergraduates of St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia, through the efforts of an alumnus now stationed with the Air Force in Vietnam, became involved in the war in the most positive way possible, they worked to diminish pain and increase hope. In short, they quietly adopted an orphanage.

For over a month virtually every organization on the St. Joseph's campus (1,800 strong) raised money to support their new ward, the Stella Maris (Star of the Sea) orphanage in Da Nang. After two dances, a car wash, special movies, and selling chances on a date with Miss Pennsylvania, they presented "Tony's Tots" (the established Stella Maris fund) with a check for $1,500, with more to come.

Project Vietnam came to St. Joseph's through the letters of an alumnus, Lt. James L. Tobin, class of 1964, who was then on a tour of duty as a civic actions officer with the 620th Tactical Control Squadron near Da Nang.

"Some men spend their free time here watching the days fall from the calendar," said Lt. Tobin, "while others read, watch endless movies or take correspondence courses to kill the time. I like to believe I spend some of my time trying to help as much as possible."

During his first months of duty he spent his off-duty hours teaching English in Vietnamese schools or supplying hospitals in Da Nang with drugs and medical supplies or arranging informal athletic programs between the people of this war-ravaged country and the GIs.

"But my deepest concern has always been for the homeless children who are innocent victims of this tragedy," said Lt. Tobin.

He outlined these feelings in a long letter to his former campus commander at St. Joseph's, Lt. Col. Daniel J. Boyle, director of Aerospace Studies. Lt. Tobin's initial request was for the support of the Air Force detachment on campus, but the story of Stella Maris quickly spread throughout the college.

Lt. Tobin describes his meeting with the nuns of Stella Maris as follows:

"We were approached by two tiny Vietnamese nuns who indicated they were looking for garbage to feed their 'pigs'. We watched them scavenging through the garbage pails behind our mess hall. Nothing escaped their hunting eyes and everything edible to man or beast was stuffed into the small bags they carried. It soon became apparent that these scraps weren't meant only for these mysterious 'pigs' for the Sisters were especially looking for dry cream products. A young airman fluent in French spoke with them and we invited them into the Commander's (Lt. Col. Fred Faupel) office. Everyone began to offer help."

The story of the orphanage, a crude building comparable only to perhaps American livestock shelters is a simple one and it is the story of a saint. Sister Angela, mother superior of Stella Maris, fled from Hanoi with three other nuns and crossed miles of mountainous jungles until they reached Da Nang and the sea. They owned only the clothes they wore, but brick by brick they constructed a small haven for the lost children of their world. They planted the seeds for what could someday be an orphanage. As word of their presence spread to nearby villages, their mission of love was fulfilled in the pitiful form of an undernourished and maimed child left in the clearing outside their shelter. Three days later this child died. The only hope they could give him was their love.

Today the nuns of Stella Maris are caring for 96 children of all faiths. Through the efforts of the 620th Squadron they are able to feed, clothe and provide medical treatment for this entire family. The goals of the present are being met, but the future is always uncertain.

"Theirs is a big project for people with big hearts," wrote Lt. Tobin. "They must be able to save for tomorrow. Drugs, medicine and vitamins are the things we need most. Last spring 36 children died because of a measles epidemic. I hope this letter will help."

It did. New York City was the center for a "March for Peace" several months ago. The students at St. Joseph's couldn't attend; they had to take care of an orphanage.

CALUMET PARK IN ILLINOIS AIDS ORPHANAGES IN VIETNAM

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include related matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Calumet Citizen is published in Calumet City in the district in Illinois that I have the honor to represent. I am extending my remarks to include a letter in the current issue of the Citizen from a serviceman from Calumet City in Vietnam, as follows:

Local Serviceman Issues Appeal

The following letter can best describe the ideas and wishes of the young writer who has issued a poignant appeal to the people of his hometown—Calumet Park:

"San Francisco, Calif.,
October 19, 1967.

"Mr. Harry Gorman,
"*c/o The Citizen:*

"First let me say thanks again for sending the Citizen to me while I am over here. It means a lot to get your hometown paper when home means so much to you.

"One reason that I am writing to you is that I would like you to print a plea from the 616th Sq., to which I am attached to over here, to the people of Calumet Park. Our squadron, little as it is, supports an orphanage of War refugee children over here. As of this date, our squadron is just about the main support for these poor and helpless kids. These children have known nothing but the tortures of war and most of them have seen their parents killed for not helping the VC. A lot of these kids have been mistreated since birth and some have been beaten by the VC for what their parents have done. What I am asking the people of Calumet Park to do is, out of the kindness of their hearts, give these kids a chance to enjoy life a little. I am not asking for money, although it will be welcomed, but for any old clothes they may have and also for soap, baby food and diapers. The Catholic nuns that run the orphanage depend on the squadron almost entirely for the support of it. I know the people of my hometown will not let these poor kids down. If anyone is interested in sending anything, please keep the weight to five pounds. That way it will be sent Air Mail instead of by boat. It is surprising what a little item such as a piece of candy means to these kids. Thanks again.

"Sincerely

"A2c. George Evans."

George is a former Calumet Park Volunteer Fireman and has turned to Calumet Park residents to help these unfortunate children of a war-torn nation.

Villagers have come to the front many times when the need has been great. This young serviceman has the complete support of The Citizen and its staff in the generous undertaking of the 616th Squadron.

All donations may be mailed directly to A 2/c George Evans, care of the 616 M.A.S.S. Sq. C-FLT, APO 96307 RVN., San Francisco, California.

THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment today to discuss briefly my feeling on the Air Quality Act of 1967, on which the House apparently will take up debate in the next few days.

We should no longer have to be made aware of the need for such legislation, Mr. Speaker. As President Johnson said in his message to Congress on January 30, 1967:

> We are not even controlling today's level of pollution. Ten years from now, when industrial production and waste disposal have increased and the number of automobiles on our streets and highways exceeds 110 million, we shall have lost the battle for clean air—unless we strengthen our regulatory and research efforts now.

The dangers of air pollution to our health have been documented in testimony presented by the Surgeon General when he appeared before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The committee report lists four principal types of evidence linking air pollution and injury to human health:

First, direct association between air pollution and death during periods of unusually severe pollution; during the London smog of 1962, 4,000 more deaths were recorded in that city than normally would be expected in a comparable period with less acute smog conditions;

Second, statistical and epidemiological studies show significant correlation between air pollution levels and a number of other conditions, including emphysema, chronic bronchitis, and the common cold.

Third, clinical research derived from studies of human individuals; and

Fourth, laboratory evidence based on animal studies.

All of this, as the committee report states, serves to refute the false impression that air pollution is a health hazard only when unusual weather conditions conspire to produce localized disasters.

In 1963 the Congress responded to the air pollution problem with the enactment of the Clean Air Act and in 1965 and 1966 by passage of strengthening amendments to the act.

But the problem is still a long way from being solved, and facing us is the probability that air pollution will become more severe in the future. As the committee points out:

> There is not a single major metropolitan area in the United States that does not have an air pollution problem. There are few places, if any, where control efforts are adequate to deal with the problems that already exist, let alone the much greater problems that lie ahead. All the trends that contribute to growth of the air pollution problem are rising.

Mr. Speaker, the area which I represent is in one of the fastest growing sections of the United States. With its expansion in industrial activity and population has come expansion of its pollution problem. So I have a direct regional concern in the pollution problem. I regard the passage of this bill as vital.

ADDRESS IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON BY RABBI BARUCH KORFF, AUTHOR OF "FLIGHT FROM FEAR"

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a very inspiring message delivered by the well-known scholar and outstanding clergyman, Rabbi Baruch Korff, who is the rabbi of the regional Congregation Agudath Achim of Taunton, Mass. Rabbi Baruch Korff, I might say, is and has been a good friend of mine for many years. He is chaplain of the department of mental health of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the author of "Flight From Fear" and other books and learned dissertations. His lectures have received the praise of educators from the United States and in foreign countries. In addition, Rabbi Korff was formerly adviser to the War Refugee Board. He has been praised by Members of Congress for his keen insight into the domestic and international problems confronting our country, and for his rescue missions in Europe. Rabbi Korff is currently engaged in a study of education in the Middle East, which study he began 4 years ago. I seriously commend Rabbi Korff's brilliant discussion of the problems which we face in Vietnam.

Address of Rabbi Baruch Korff

This is the first Pulpit with the resumption of the weekly News for the 1967–68 season, and there being no issue of local, state, or national concern to rival my topic of the day, I am prayerful that you will heed my indignation.

I wrestled with our dilemma in Vietnam during Yom Kippur, and this is the consummation of an inner search for the truth in light of the most sacred day in the Hebrew calendar. Some of you may recall that during my intonation of the prayer for the President of the United States, I paused in meditation.

My pause may have appeared to you like an eternity, for during those moments my heart went out to the President, who charts America's course in the best tradition of the Prophets' legacy. I thought of the agonizing decisions he is called upon to make in Vietnam and the inhuman harassment he endures from both the "Hawks" and the "Doves" and the malcontents and behold, insignificant as my opinion may be and its influence on the tidal waves of protest, I saw him as the greatest President of the twentieth century. A lesser man would have succumbed to the anarchy that is stalking America. I saw him unbowed in the cloak of our founding fathers grappling with a crisis not of his making, one he could neither abandon nor deny.

It would appear that this nation's policy revolves on the Domino Theory—that if one country falls, in this instance South Vietnam, others will follow. This is why our stand is so crucial to the balance of power in Southeast Asia. The Communists, on the other hand, uphold the Gopher Theory—all it takes is one gopher to ruin an entire lawn; you keep filling in the holes, occasionally hitting the gopher mildly on the head when he surfaces, but he just tunnels underground and comes up somewhere else. What critics call American escalation is an attempt to overcome the Gopher Theory and insulate the vulnerable soil.

I have traveled extensively during the past four years in the Middle East. I was in Cairo when an American billet in Saigon was blown up by terrorists, and I recall Soviet sponsored jubilation. I was in Damascus when terrorists raided an American base on the outskirts of Saigon where men and material were incinerated, and I witnessed the Baathist ecstasy over Ho Chi Minh's triumph.

From all available evidence it must be clear even to the most dovish of Doves that any retreat from our commitment not alone to Saigon but to ourselves is a victory for North Vietnam, and the demise of freedom in the South, and a blow of incalculable dimension to the United States. It would encourage Peking to greater risks in Southeast Asia and drive our allies into the arms of the enemy, stifling America and its blueprint for freedom.

Not only is the fate of Southeast Asia at stake but also the fate of the Middle East, of Africa, and even of Latin America.

Che Guevara may be dead in Bolivia, but our failure in Southeast Asia would whet the appetites of Castro and the Communist revolutionaries in South America. I daresay, with a minimum knowledge of world history, that our freedom at home and that of our allies abroad would be so compromised that generations of Americans not yet born would curse our withdrawal from a challenge we neither fostered nor provoked.

Moreover, the genesis of our involvement in Vietnam, just as it might have been at the time, is not at issue. The Talmud has a discourse on man, which goes something like this: "It would have been better for man not to have been born than to have been born." Hypothetical? So is the question of our genesis in Vietnam. The fact is man was born and has to grapple with his existence, and the fact is we are in Vietnam and have to grapple with our existence.

Yes, I paused in my prayer for President Johnson because on this Day of Atonement, I had to atone not only for my own deeds and attitudes, but for those of my fellow man. Since our prayers are in the plural, I atoned, too, for the professional peaceniks, political opportunists, reality-unrelated academicians, and even the benign critics who are exploited in a gigantic conspiracy to sabotage the image of our President and downgrade this nation.

I paused, too, to reflect on the naked brutality of civil rights leaders against a man who sponsored and aided their cause more than the eighteen of his predecessors since Lincoln.

I paused, too, to reflect in sorrow on the clay champions of the anti-poverty program, housing and education, who burned Johnson in effigy—a man who did more for the cause of the downtrodden than any President before him. What ingrates!

What we are risking is more than the survival of the man in the White House. What we are risking is the exalted office of the Presidency. The Presidency has weathered many storms and endured crisis after crisis except the crisis of national decay. If, God forbid, the hundred-pound barbarian presiding in Hanoi and the handful of his American provocateurs are allowed to extend their influence in our midst and affect the Presidency itself, we will need more than one Day of Atonement to account for our suicidal sins.

The Gopher Theory must not be permitted to work, and this is why the policy of "resolution and restraint" pursued by our Commander-in-Chief is so vital to the free world and indispensable to our survival.

God bless the President of the United States and this nation.

THE ANGUISH OF VIETNAM

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, amid continued discussion of costs, purposes, the necessity of dissent in an open society, and our apparent general commitment to defense of South Vietnam, the following letter—reprinted in Mr. Clayton Fritchey's article—deserves our attention and our thought.

I am not given to handwringing and public display of private emotion. Yet this letter has the ring of sterling, the truth of anguish from a man called upon to witness and commit acts of inhumanity that seem far distant from his accustomed moral imperatives, far removed from the enhancement of human dignity that must be the plinth of the American ideal. Its eloquence forbids my further comment.

It reads:

Vietnam Letter With a Different Ring

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Secretary of State Dean Rusk was so impressed by a letter he received this week from a Vietnam GI that he sent it to the President. The GI wrote that he had never met a single U.S. soldier who said, "Get out of Vietnam."

Perhaps Secretary Rusk would also like to call the President's attention to a letter which was sent to the Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal by the father of another soldier. The father said, "My son enlisted in the army, asked to be sent to Vietnam, and backed the government's strong policy toward the war in Vietnam—at least he did when he left this country last November . . . here are portions of a letter from him":

Dear Mom and Dad—Today we went on a mission and I'm not very proud of myself, my friends, or my country. We burned every hut in sight. It was a small rural network of villages and the people were incredibly poor. My unit burned and plundered their meager possessions. The huts are thatched palm leaves. Each one has a dried mud bunker inside. These bunkers are to protect the families. Kind of like air raid shelters. My unit commanders, however, chose to think that these bunkers are offensive. So every hut we find that has a bunker we are ordered to burn to the ground.

When the ten helicopters landed this morning, in the midst of these huts, and six men jumped out of each "chopper," we were firing the moment we hit the ground. We fired into all the huts we could. It is then that we burn these huts and take all men old enough to carry a weapon. And the "choppers" come and get them (they take them to a collection point a few miles away for interrogation). The families don't understand this. The Viet Cong fill their minds with tales saying the GIs kill all their men.

So, everyone is crying, begging, and praying that we don't separate them and their husbands and fathers, sons and grandfathers. The women wail and moan. Then they watch in terror as we burn their homes, personal possessions and food. Yes, we burn all rice and shoot all livestock.

Some of the guys are so careless. Today a buddy of mine called "La dai" ("Come here") into a hut and an old man came out of the bomb shelter. My buddy told the old man to get away from the hut and since we have to move quickly on a sweep, just threw a hand grenade into the shelter.

As he pulled the pin, the old man got excited and started jabbering and running toward my buddy and the hut. A GI, not understanding, stopped the old man with a football tackle just as my buddy threw the grenade into the shelter. (There is a 4-second delay on a hand grenade.)

After he threw it, and was running for cover (during this 4-second delay) we all heard a baby crying from inside the shelter. There was nothing we could do.

After the explosion we found the mother, two children, and an almost newborn baby. That is what the old man was trying to tell us. The shelter was small and narrow. They were all huddled together. The three of us dragged out the bodies onto the floor of the hut. It was horrible. The children's fragile bodies were torn apart, literally mutilated. We looked at each other and burned the hut. The old man was just whimpering in disbelief outside the burning hut. We walked away and left him there.

Well, Dad, you wanted to know what it's like here. Does this give you an idea? . . Your Son.

Secretary Rusk said he "drew much inspiration" from the letter he got this week, but the father of the Akron boy sadly observed that "The American people should understand what they mean when they advocate a continuation of our war effort in Vietnam."

FOREIGN STEEL QUOTAS NEEDED NOW

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, instead of demanding a tax increase, is it not time for the administration to adopt a pro-American trade policy that would enable steel and other industries victimized by foreign competition to absorb a large ratio of current welfare recipients and turn them into taxpayers?

Quotas on foreign steel are urgently needed now, and they are going to be needed all the more when hostilities in Vietnam are concluded. If, as the Labor Department has boasted, 1 million new jobs were created by escalation of military activity in the past year, where will these workers go when the conflict ends? Furthermore, thousands of military personnel will hopefully be released from the service, and they are hardly asking too much in expecting to be able to find work when they get home.

It would be highly ironic for these men, having risked their lives in a war halfway around the globe, to discover that there are no jobs available because the U.S. Government prefers to keep domestic markets open to producers in foreign countries, not one of which assisted in our war effort, and many of which actually helped to supply enemy forces.

The State Department's opposition to import quotas is a continuation of a policy of failure in which the domestic economy is disregarded on the theory that free trade into this country will buy friends abroad. The program has resulted in permanent unemployment in industrial areas and is one reason for the high cost of the poverty program.

Just a few years ago, my "buy American" amendment in the mass transit bill was enacted into law. But then the administration leaders, upon insistence by the State Department to placate foreign producers, had the provision deleted in the following year's appropriation bill. I repeat—over and over again—we must have an American desk in the State Department to protect American interests. Otherwise, our domestic policies will continue to be regulated in foreign interests solely.

Neither steel nor any other industry should be exposed to competition in which the workers in this country receive an average pay of $4.50 per hour, as compared with $1.10 for their counterparts in Japan and $2.75 in Europe. Unless reasonable protective measures are adopted, unemployment will continue to plague the Nation—only to be compounded when the guns are still in Vietnam.

GARDNER-WEBB COLLEGE GROWS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Gardner-Webb College at Boiling Springs, N.C., is one of the finest and fastest growing institutions of higher learning in the Southeast. While it is a Baptist institution, it has the support and appreciation of people of all religious faiths in the area in which it is located.

This support and appreciation was apparent to all of us who had the pleasure of being present at the Founders Day and homecoming exercises held at the college on Saturday, October 28. At a luncheon meeting in the Charles I. Dover Campus Center three new residence halls at the college were dedicated and given the names of three of the prominent families in North Carolina who have contributed heavily in a financial way to the progress of the institution. These three residence halls will house 240 students and were constructed at a total cost of $721,000.

Mauney Residence Hall, which will house 112 men students, was named in honor of Mr. and Mrs. W. K. Mauney, Sr., and in memory of Mr. and Mrs. D. C. Mauney. The Mauney families have for many years been residents of the Kings Mountain, N.C., area and have been leaders in many worthwhile activities.

The A. G. Myers Residence Hall is named in honor of Mr. Albert Gallatin Myers, Sr., of Gastonia, N.C. This hall will house 64 men students.

The C. P. and Irene Nanney Residence Hall, which will house 64 women students, was named in honor of Mr. and Mrs. C. P. Nanney of Gastonia, N.C.

At the luncheon the printed program gave brief statements on the life and works of the honorees. I make those statements a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

MAUNEY

Major advancements in higher Christian Education have been made in North Carolina through the interest and support given it by the Mauney families of Kings Mountain. Gardner-Webb and Lenoir Rhyne colleges have been the main benefactors from the gifts given through the family which today continues to carry out the philosophies upon which their textile dynasty was built.

The Mauney Residence Hall for men is named in honor of Mr. and Mrs. W. K. Mauney, Sr. and in memory of Mr. and Mrs. D. C. Mauney. These men are two of five sons of Jacob S. Mauney, who with his brother, William Andrew Mauney, were pioneer industrialists in the Kings Mountain area, founding the Kings Mountain Manufacturing Co.

W. K. Mauney is a 1910 graduate of Lenoir Rhyne College and is now over 78 years of age and resides in Kings Mountain with his wife. His brother, D. C. Mauney, was a graduate of Roanoke College in 1902. He died in 1956 at the age of 75. His wife is also deceased.

There are two buildings at Lenoir-Rhyne College in Hickory named for the Mauney families. The W. K. Mauney family named the new music building there in 1960 and a dormitory there is named for the Jacob S. Mauney family.

A grandson of D. C. Mauney, Charles Mauney of Kings Mountain, headed up the Gardner-Webb College campaign in the Kings Mountain area. It was through his tremendously successful leadership that the goal of $25,000 was quadrupled with over $100,000 raised. Mauney was cited as the Kings Mountain Jaycees "Man of the Year" on the strength of this and of his work as chairman of the United Fund Drive and other civic activities.

The Mauney family, as a whole, has been interested in the civic, religious and industrial life of North Carolina. The family built a Lutheran Church at Hendersonville along with contributing greatly to the local Lutheran church. A library was given to the City of Kings Mountain and the Boy Scout movement receives their wholehearted support. The list of those assisted by the family would be far too long for space here. They have not only given financial support to these causes but in the Lutheran Church, Boy Scouts, and civic clubs like the Jaycees, Kiwanis, Lions, and others have given freely of their time and talents.

MYERS

If, from the hundreds of young men who will occupy the A. G. Myers Residence Hall, there could be only one to match his towering ability and community spirit—the purpose of the building would be fulfilled.

Called the "Elder Statesman" of the textiles world, Albert Gallatin Myers, Sr., at 87, is officially retired but retains a keen interest in the textile-banking industry he developed. From 25 cents a day to one of the nation's best known industrialists is a long route, but A. G. Myers, Sr. managed it through successful and ethical administrative talents—plus long hours of hard work.

He has not only been the driving force behind Textiles-Incorporated, Threads Inc. and the Citizens National Bank, but in 1907 helped organize Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Co. of Greensboro and remains on its board of directors. Though retired, he retains his directorships in the Piedmont and Northern Railway and the N.C. Textile Foundation, Inc.

A project of which he is very proud is the "Albert G. Myers Scholarship" administered by Textiles-Incorporated and Threads-Incorporated through Myers-Textiles Foundation, Inc. Thousands of dollars have been awarded to deserving students of children of plant employees through this foundation He has been a staunch supporter of Gardner-Webb College for many years.

Born in Chesterfield County, S.C., on a one-bale-to-five-acres cotton farm in 1880, Mr. Myers has made almost legendary attainments in the business world while never forgetting how to be of service to his fellow man. His honors are rarely mentioned by Mr. Myers, but he has been in "Who's Who" for 28 years, has served as chairman of the N.C. Transportation Advisory Board, served with distinction on the War Production Board in 1942, was for eight years a member of the State Ports Authority, serving as chairman from 1949–53 when the ports were actually under construction.

N.C. State University at Raleigh awarded him the honorary degree of Doctor of Textile Science in 1949 and Duke University's Chapter of ODK awarded him honorary membership in 1953. Belmont Abbey College conferred the Doctor of Law degree in 1957 and in recognition of the love and respect held by the people of Gastonia for him, the Civitan Club in 1962 honored him as "Citizen of the Year."

NANNEY

Helping lay the foundation for happy homes has been a major interest of Mr. and Mrs. C. P. Nanney of Gastonia.

It is fitting then that a home away from home for young women at Gardner-Webb college should bear the name of this unassuming and generous couple.

The C. P. and Irene Nanney Residence Hall is a permanent and beautiful reminder of how much they have done—not only for the college young people at Gardner-Webb—but for youth throughout this state and in other parts of the world.

Through the Salvation Army, Boys Club and the Gastonia YMCA, Mr. Nanney has expressed his love and confidence in the youth of this area. So much so that he was named "Man of the Year" in 1961–62 by the Salvation Army Boys Club, and was presented the Boys Club Bronze Keystone for "long and devoted" service to boys over a 19-year period.

Mrs. Nanney, as the superintendent of the Young People's Department at the Gastonia First Church for five years, as a former teacher in public schools, and in many other civic and religious activities, has worked with young people. She is even well known among the members of the Rome, Italy, Baptist Student Union through the gift to them of a station wagon for church use.

Mr. Charles Pinckney Nanney is today President of the Sun Drop-Double Cola Bottling Co. in Gastonia. Born in Rutherford County he attended public schools and the Round Hill Academy and in 1917 moved to Gastonia with his wife, the former Irene Bridges of Boiling Springs. They entered the civic and religious "mainstream" of Gastonia and the area. Mr. Nanney has served Gardner-Webb as an Advisor and on the Board of Trustees, the Salvation Army as an Advisory Board member and on the Boys Club Advisory Council, the Gastonia YMCA as a Board of Directors member, the Gaston Community Hospital as a Board member and as an active member of the Optimist Club. Mr. Nanney stays busy keeping his business firm up to date and loves to work around the plant shop helping to up-date old machinery and build new ones. Mr. Nanney is a staunch supporter of the free enterprise system and of increased teaching of patriotism in the classroom.

His wife has served as president of the Gastonia Woman's Club and was once honored as the "Woman of the Year" in the club. Mrs. Nanney has been president of the Opti-Mrs. Club, has taught an adult Sunday School class for 27 years, served as president of the WMU in her church and on many WMU committees including important Associational WMU posts. Mrs. Nanney enjoys working in her yard, relaxing with a crossword puzzle, and taking vacation trips.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to appear on the program to briefly express to these outstanding personages my own appreciation for their financial generosity and their leadership in the worthwhile activities of North Carolina. The biographical data which I have made a part of these remarks tells only a part of the story of the dedication of the Mauney, Myers, and Nanney families to the religious, educational, and economic progress of North Carolina. Their many contributions to worthwhile causes will never be completely enumerated because of their reticence regarding the publicizing of their good works.

Gardner-Webb College is now planning to move into the senior college program of education. Under the leadership of Dr. Eugene Poston, the brilliant young president of the institution, and with the support and cooperation of the leading families in the area this college will move on to greater service to the youth of our country. Already many of our leading citizens have made their contribution to this progressive institution and have had their names honored in various ways by the college. The addition of the names of Mauney, Myers, and Nanney adds to the luster of the campus of Gardner-Webb College.

COURAGEOUS LETTER FROM MARINE OFFICER UNDERSCORES M-16 PROBLEM

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the courageous letter printed in the October 29 Washington Post from Marine 1st Lt. M. P. Chervenak, about problems American fighting men in Vietnam are having with the M-16 rifle, underscores the inescapable conclusion that the United States must limit further troop commitments and also restrict combat and maneuver assignments until M-16 problems are cleared up. If we allow the lackadasical attitude which has surrounded M-16 development, procurement, and supply to prevail in the future, the sad result will be more Americans unnecessarily killed or wounded.

This letter demonstrates that our full technological and manufacturing ability must be brought to bear quickly on the problem of supplying effective weapons to our fighting forces.

The text of the letter follows:

The M-16 in Combat

South Vietnam.

I am a Marine first lieutenant and have been serving in a rifle company in Vietnam since the 15th of May. Ever since my arrival, immediately following the battle of Hill 881, one controversy has loomed above all else—that of the M-16 rifle. I feel that it is my duty and responsibility to report the truth about this rifle as I have seen it. My conscience will not let me rest any longer.

The idea of a lightweight, automatic weapon is a fine idea and I do not categorically reject the M-16 rifle as being useless. I do believe, however, that there is a basic mechanical deficiency within the weapon which causes a failure to extract. This failure to extract a spent casing from the chamber allows another round to be fed in behind the unextracted casing causing the rifle to jam. When this occurs, a cleaning rod and precious seconds are needed to clear the chamber. A Marine in a firefight does not have those precious seconds.

We are constantly told that improper cleaning and unfamiliarity with the weapon cause any malfunction which may occur. Any rifle that requires cleaning to the degree they speak of has no place as a combat weapon.

I believe that the cold, hard facts about the M-16 are clouded over by a fabrication of the truth for political and financial considerations. I have seen too many Marines hiding behind a paddy dike trying to clear their rifles to accept these explanations any longer.

Our battalion has fired these rifles on numerous occasions, aboard the ship and in the field, to try and find a solution for this problem. All rifles were cleaned and inspected prior to these tests. Having supervised several of these tests, I will swear to the fact that at least 25 to 40 per cent of the rifles malfunctioned at least once under these optimum conditions.

During a recent firefight on the 21st of July, no fewer than 40 men in my company reported to me that their rifles had malfunctioned because of failures to extract. Because of these inoperative rifles, we were severely hampered in our efforts to extract a platoon which had been pinned down. Lack of sufficient firepower also caused us great difficulty in getting our casualties out. Having 40 rifles malfunction in any rifle company is a serious matter, and in an understrengthed company such as ours, the gravity of the situation is greatly increased.

This problem is increasing in its seriousness and I know that it is the major morale problem in the company. Unfortunately, all our complaints and the results of our tests never seem to reach willing ears. I do not mean for this letter to be a slap at my battalion, the Marine Corps, the Colt Manufacturing Co., the Defense Department or anyone else concerned. It is written out of concern for the safety of the men in my company and of the great morale problem that the M-16 causes. I will stand and stake my reputation on the fact that we have had men wounded and perhaps killed because of inoperative rifles. The men in the company have absolutely no confidence in the weapon they carry, and yet, they will be asked to go on another operation in the very near future carrying this very same weapon. Word will come down from higher up, however, stating that no one will take a negative attitude about the M-16, nor will they speak of the weapon in a derogatory manner to any newsman.

I can only hope that men such as yourself, who are in a position to do something, will do something. The search for truth is paramount in all of us and I ask you to look into this problem and search for the truth there. I will stand behind every word that I have written. I think that this problem has been overlooked too long and too many attempts have been made to gloss over a situation that endangers the lives of men.

M. P. Chervenak.

THE PROBLEM OF ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most urgent and critical problems facing the American people today is that of a steadily mounting national crime rate. The problem of crime will never be adequately attacked until the American people are sufficiently aroused to its seriousness. In that light, I call the attention of the House to a speech given recently by Representative Richard H. Poff, Republican, of Virginia, chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Crime. In that speech Mr. Poff spells out how the lives of our average citizens are affected by organized crime, and how organized crime and street crime are related. He further points up the need for the carefully circumscribed use of wiretapping in an attack on organized crime. I think the speech that follows below is well worth the reading time of every House Member:

Speech of Congressman Richard H. Poff, Sixth District of Virginia, Before the Association of Federal Investigators, September 29, 1967, Washington, D.C.

May I define my mission today? First, let me say what it is not. I am not here to lecture this audience; you are more knowledgeable and more experienced in my subject than I. I am not here to criticize this audience but to commend it. I am not here to proselyte; in the doctrine of law enforcement I believe we are of the same faith. I am not here to preach partisan dogma; this is because the subject is nonpartisan, and if it were otherwise, I would be hopelessly outnumbered here.

My mission is none of these. It is simply and earnestly to enlist your experience, your skills and your talents in an educational program. All of us who are alert to the danger must unite to educate the people of this country to the nature and scope or organized crime, its kinship to street crime and the threat both pose to our society.

My good friend, Lewis F. Powell, a former President of the American Bar Association and one of the members of the President's Crime Commission, said recently and I quote:

"Despite Congressional investigations and much talk, the public generally has only the vaguest conception of organized crime, what it is and what it does. The term evokes, for the average person of our generation, an image of gang warfare (largely in Chicago) and perhaps of Al Capone being sent to jail for income tax evasion because the law was too bumbling to convict him of murder and extortion."

Parenthetically, it is not only the "average person" whose conception of organized crime is vague. There appears to be a profound misconception in the highest echelons of Government. The Attorney General of the U.S. referred to organized crime as a "tiny part" of the total crime picture. Some of the most influential organs of the press echoed his sentiments and described it as a part of the periphery of the problem. President Johnson does not agree. Last year, following a meeting with former Attorney General Katzenbach, the President said that organized crime "constitutes nothing less than a guerrilla war against society." Perhaps the most concise and most penetrating assessment of the dimensions of the problem is a sentence which I quote back to you from your own Association's statement issued recently:

"Our people see its effects daily in the death masks of its victims and the squalor and poverty it perpetuates through its activities in gambling, loan-sharking, drug trafficking, extortion, prostitution, and the moral degeneration and official corruption that results therefrom."

Regrettably, laymen and even some experts and practitioners tend to divide crime into two arbitrary categories and treat the two as if they existed individually and independently and with no correlation. Category one is "organized crime"; category two is "street crime". As Mr. Powell indicated, organized crime is regarded as remote, detached and unconnected with the life of the average citizen. The President's Crime Commission said that "organized crime affects the lives of millions of Americans but because it desperately preserves its invisibility, many, perhaps most, Americans are not aware how they are affected or even that they are affected at all."

The central thrust of our education program must be to dispel that false notion and to spell out precisely in what way the average citizen is affected. Obviously, the average citizen who lives in one of the communities which has been captured and controlled by the mob is affected. The most humble citizen of Youngstown, Ohio, suffered no illusion about that when that unfortunate city was known as "Murder town—USA". No one needs to educate the average citizens who lived in Newport, Kentucky, or Reading, Pennsylvania, when those communities were corrupted by racketeers. A month ago the average citizen in New Orleans was much like the average citizen everywhere else; he had no idea that organized crime was affecting his daily life. Then came the *Life* magazine articles which exposed the surface of the crime iceberg; then the dispute between *Life* and the Governor of Louisiana; and now today we find in our newspapers an AP story which reads in pertinent part as follows:

"Gov. John J. McKeithen of Louisiana, said tonight that *Life* magazine had supplied him with "information we did not have" about organized crime in his State, and "with that information we are going to clean Louisiana up."

Undoubtedly, the average citizen of New Orleans knows today that organized crime affects his life and yet he still doesn't know exactly how or why. In passing, I cannot help but wonder why this information about organized crime is not in the files of the Justice Department. If it is there, I wonder why it was not delivered to the authorities in Louisiana. The fact that one man, a magazine reporter, a man without official portfolio, could all alone discover and expose the base of the iceberg, is something of a commentary on the manner in which the Attorney General is conducting the fight against organized crime. And it illustrates the urgency of the educational mission which is ours.

That mission I say, is to educate the average citizen as to how he is affected by organized crime. And to be affected, it is not necessary that he live in Youngstown or Newport or Reading or New Orleans. In any of at least six roles, he is a potential victim.

(1) *Mr. Average Citizen is affected by organized crime if he is a businessman.* Organized crime affects the businessman in a variety of ways. When the syndicate commits arson, it raises the insurance rates the businessman pays. Fraudulent bankruptcy, pre-planned and cleverly executed, costs the businessman millions of dollars a year in bad debt losses.

But in a larger sense, organized crime is a threat to the entire American free enterprise system. Trafficking in vice and greed and all the ignoble human frailties, syndicated crime has a gigantic earning power. This earning power has filled a reservoir of wealth unmatched by any legitimate financial institution in the nation. The Cosa Nostra has tapped this reservoir and invested its funds in wholly legitimate business activity. With resources practically unlimited, the crime syndicate has the power not only to acquire and control an individual business establishment, but, by massive purchases and sales on the stock market, to manipulate capital values and influence price structures. By careful, methodical, clandestine infiltration of several segments of a particular industry, organized crime can create monopolies and, by coercive methods, restrain commerce among the states and with foreign nations.

Clearly, the investment in a legitimate business of funds illegally acquired or funds legally acquired but unreported for tax purposes constitutes an act of unfair competition and an unconscionable trade practice against others engaged in that business. Legislation has been introduced to activate the criminal clauses of the anti-trust laws in a more effective way in such cases.

(2) *Mr. Average Citizen is affected by organized crime if he is a wage-earner.* By intimidation or infiltration of honest labor unions, hoodlums contrive to control the labor supply, frustrate unionization of some industries, promote sweetheart contracts to cheat the rank and file, extort money as the purchase price of labor peace, and gain access to mammoth union pension funds.

(3) *Mr. Average Citizen is affected by organized crime if he is a consumer.* Although the housewife may not know it, the price of a loaf of bread may go up 1¢, as a direct result of an organized crime conspiracy. The housewife didn't know it until she read the *Life* Magazine articles, but the inferior detergent she bought at the local A&P store was peddled by one Gerry Catena who pushed his products unwanted upon the food chain. When A&P resisted, five stores were bombed and two store managers were killed.

The consumer most brutally affected by organized crime is the man who depends upon drugs. I am talking not only about the traffic in LSD and other hallucegins. I am talking about counterfeit and spurious drugs palmed off on sick people by organized criminals.

(4) *Mr. Average Citizen is affected by organized crime if he is a taxpayer.* The classic example is the revenue loss in untaxed liquor which the honest taxpayer must make up. More recently, the typical problem is the untaxed cigarette. Governor Rockefeller says that his state loses $50 million a year to cigarette bootleggers.

Two years ago the Internal Revenue Commissioner testified that his office had recommended over a four year period assessments against organized crime operations totalling $219 million. How much more was not discovered and not assessed can only be imagined. If organized criminals paid income tax on the profit involved in the syndicate's gross take (estimated at up to $50 billion a year), there would be little need for the 10% surtax the President has requested.

(5) *Mr. Average Citizen is affected by organized crime if he is a victim of poverty.* For fiscal year 1968, the President asked Congress for a little over $2 billion to fund the War on Poverty. Organized crime's profit from illegal gambling is about $7 billion a year, possibly half of which comes from the numbers racket. Much of the money involved in the numbers racket is extracted not from the affluent but from poor people who look upon it as their only real chance to escape from the ghetto. The urban poverty program will never work so long as the mob is skimming off 50% more money in gambling profits than the taxpayers are contributing.

Organized crime derives some $350 million a year from illegal narcotics traffic; that is precisely what we are spending on Project Head Start. Under the Poverty War program, the Small Business Administration makes loans totalling some $50 million a year to small businessmen who are not otherwise eligible for credit. The loan sharks in organized crime make a profit of 7 times that much.

(6) *Mr. Average Citizen is affected by organized crime if he is a victim of street crime.* In the first place, unknown to many, much local crime is the direct result of organized criminal conspiracies. Arson practiced by organized crime destroys real property owned by innocent landlords. Car theft rings are skillfully organized and operate interstate. Burglary and jewel thefts reportedly are completely organized in Miami today. The occasional crook must obtain prior permission from the mob before he can make a "score". The mob acts as a fence. The mob always gets its cut. Even, however, when local crime is not organized, there is a direct relationship between organized crime and street crime. Indeed, in a very real sense, organized crime is the seed-bed of street crime. The classic illustration is narcotics traffic. A high percentage of the crime committed against persons and their property are the result of the compulsive passion of the addict to acquire the money necessary to feed his loathesome habit. One District Attorney estimated the figure as high as 50%.

F.B.I. uniform crime reports show that much of the crime in our cities and suburbs is committed by juveniles operating in neighborhood gangs. The hero of these gangs, the man who inspires them in their misconduct, is the hoodlum or racketeer who controls the neighborhood. His life of affluence and security seems to be a better way of life than that their parents have given them.

In still another way, organized crime has a measurable impact upon street crime. The syndicate thrives and survives only where it succeeds in corrupting local law enforcement. The corrupt cop who takes a bribe and closes his eyes to the numbers racket and the dope traffic is all too likely to be blind to other forms of crime as well.

In summary, any person who operates a business, earns a wage, keeps house, pays taxes, suffers poverty, or falls victim to street crime, is also directly or indirectly a victim of organized crime. And whatever victory is won in the war on organized crime is also a victory for the average citizen of America.

That war will involve many battles. Not the least of these will be those against the socio-economic and environmental causes of the crime problem. These must be won. We must also attack recidivism, by developing enlightened techniques of probation, parole, institutional reform and prisoner rehabilitation.

But victories in these battles are long range in their impact; and the problem is immediate and critical. Accordingly, we must fight first battles first and devise strategy and tactics which will have a more immediate impact. We urgently need new legislative tools—a consolidated, comprehensive witness immunity statute, an obstruction of investigation law, different rules of evidence in perjury prosecutions, appellate review of suppression orders, extended sentences for convictions of organized crime overlords, precise definitions and procedures in the field of interrogation, arrest and indictment. All of these new tools are important, but no matter how sharp they may be, they will be useless in the absence of the proper tools of investigation. As you may have guessed, I am talking about electronic surveillance.

What is involved here are two basic values. One is the right of privacy of the individual. The other is the right of safety of society. Any legislation which ignores either is faulty. Any legislation which fails to strike a proper balance between the two is itself unbalanced and dangerous. In company with a number of Members of the House and Senate of both political parties, I have introduced legislation which I earnestly and honestly think strikes that balance. On the one hand, it completely outlaws all forms of wiretapping and bugging practiced by private citizens and imposes heavy criminal penalties. On the other hand, it authorizes limited electronic surveillance in specific criminal investigations by law enforcement officers acting under a court order. In the absence of a court order or when the limitations of the court order are violated, the legislation imposes not only substantial criminal penalties against the officer but civil sanctions as well.

I am pleased to report that this legislation enjoys the most respectable support both in public opinion polls and in every echelon of government, federal, state and local. In addition to the support of the Association of Federal Investigators, it has the support of the National Association of District Attorneys, the National Association of Attorneys General, a majority of the members of the President's Crime Commission, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and three former Attorneys General of the United States. It is a matter of sorrow to me that the present Attorney General stands almost alone in opposition to this distinguished company. Moreover, he stands muscle bound, inflexible and unyielding. No statistic, no fact, no circumstance, no crisis seems sufficient to move him. Such a posture is impossible to explain until he proves that every soldier in the war against crime is out of step but the general.

If the Attorney General rests his position on the experience he has had in the investigation of organized crime, he rests on a minimum foundation. Experience or inexperience not withstanding, the Attorney General still has access to a large library of tape recordings, log entries and internal communications compiled in a four year investigation of organized crime throughout the nation. That library contains by chapter and verse the sordid story of the vice and violence of nearly every major Costa Nostra figure in the U.S. It is impossible to believe that any person could be aware of the content of this library and the background data which make it relevant and still make a public pronouncement that wiretapping is not effective in the fight against organized crime. In the face of that pronouncement, and in light of the Attorney General's stubborn opposition to legislation approved by nearly everybody else, my charitable instincts require me to assume that he has not had time during his short tenure of office to examine this library.

I implore him to do so. Having done so, he will learn how "tiny" organized crime is not and how effective court-regulated electronic surveillance can be. And if he is, as I believe he is, big enough to change his mind, he will be applauded. If not, the Congress one day soon will lay a bill on the President's desk and give the Attorney General an opportunity to recommend a veto.

I do not want to wave the flag and I do not want to sound like a politician. However, I think that the first function of government is to serve the individual and the society of which he is a part by preserving law and order. You and I, as a part of government, have a sobering responsibility to see that that function is fulfilled. To return to the place I began, our responsibility is an educational mission. We must preach without patronizing. We must dramatize without exaggerating. We must lay the predicate for citizen dialogue. We must focus public attention upon the alternatives. And then, we must help to translate the public will into action in the legislative halls, the executive mansions and the courtrooms.

THE GREAT DOLLAR THROW-AWAY—CONTINUED

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to call to the attention of the Congress the first installments of an intriguing series, "The Great Dollar Throwaway," by Mr. Jerry Cartledge, of the Baltimore News American.

I would like to make available to my colleagues today the fourth and fifth articles in this series, which focus on the need for close scrutiny of the operations of the Department of Defense and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The articles appeared in the News American on October 25 and 26, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Oct. 25, 1967]

GREAT DOLLAR THROWAWAY—IV: DEFENSE WASTE MOST DIFFICULT TO SMOKE OUT

(By Jerry Cartledge)

The so-called "Hawks" and "Doves" in the United States Congress are often separated more distinctly by economic reasons than by ideological differences concerning the conduct or existence of the Vietnam War.

The Doves jealously eye the $75.5 billion initially earmarked for defense spending during fiscal 1968. The figure represents more than half of the $135 billion executive budget for the year, and the Doves would rather see that money spent on domestic programs.

The Hawks, on the other hand, zealously guard all of their defense appropriations, both for hardcore defense projects and for those many programs and projects that lie in that fuzzy perimeter surrounding the nation's overall defense effort.

Those who question the nearly $2 billion a month spent to fight the war in Vietnam meet with the fiercest resistance, and they, themselves, even find it hard to question money spent to arm, feed, supply and provide the best medical care for the American GI engaged in this constantly mushrooming struggle.

In a moment of anger during a House discussion of spending recently, Minority Leader Gerald Ford directed a stinging blow at Lady Bird Johnson's "America the Beautiful" spending programs with the statement:

"I'm talking about millions of dollars spent on beautifying America while the number of GI's killed or wounded passes the 50,000 mark . . ."

Ford, a major supporter of Maryland Congressman Charles McC. Mathias' bill to establish a third Hoover Commission to oversee programs and spending in the executive branch of government, is an outspoken critic of runaway government spending of taxpayer dollars and gross mismanagement and inefficiency in federal programs and projects.

Another Congressman, conscious of the spiraling defense budget and the many efforts to cut it back, said, "Almost everyone you talk with—in Congress or in the government agencies—will say the place to look for waste is in the Department of Defense.

"With some $75.5 billion, more than half of the executive budget, going into defense this seems understandable. However, it is also the most difficult area to smoke out evidence of waste."

Still, congressional committees, certain agencies and unusual circumstances often serve to find clear-cut evidence of bungling and inefficiency which cost the American taxpayer millions of dollars yearly.

The General Accounting Office, while conducting a special analysis of U.S. Army procurement and spending recently came up with a high-blown goof by the military which resulted in the loss of more than one million dollars to American taxpayers.

The Army had spent $1 million to • • • ship a dozen locomotives to Thailand. Only, somebody goofed, and the wrong kind of engines were bought and shipped.

When the Army learned that its 12 locomotives were not suited to Thailand's needs, it went out and bought a dozen more of the right type, which were subsequently shipped to Thailand. The cost of correcting the error was $2.3 million.

As one West Coast Democratic congressman put it, "The original, unsuitable locomotives are now probably gathering rust in some jungle clearing in Thailand, or possibly serving as curiosities for the native children on their way to American-built schools, libraries and clinics in that foreign country."

A national magazine recently reported, "Congressional committees devote endless hours going over defense spending, yet their members agree discouragingly this is an almost impossible task. Size, security and the inevitable confusion arising from the Vietnam war make the Pentagon almost opaque."

If the Army's locomotion problems give the Navy any cause for humor, they need only to look toward Bainbridge, Maryland, to have the smiles wiped from their faces.

A WAVE barracks, costing $1.2 million, was recently completed at Bainbridge. It is a sturdy and modern structure, started in late 1965—the same time it was decided to move the entire WAVE facility from Maryland to new headquarters at Orlando, Fla.

The money to construct the facility had been appropriated well in advance of any target building date and became part of an estimated $600 million in deferred military spending over which Congress has lost all control. This is money for projects approved in one year, but not necessarily started until several years later.

The Bainbridge debacle was at first denied by Herbert Roback, staff administrator of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations.

The mixup was finally admitted by Roback in a two-page letter filled with government-type language which serves more to confuse than to enlighten.

But, if it is any consolation to the taxpayers who must foot the bill for the WAVE-less WAVE barracks in Maryland, Roback hastens to assure that the Navy will use the barracks "for other activities."

Occasionally an individual congressman or a committee of some government agency will get hold of a piece of information regarding some costly bureaucratic inefficiency or administrative foul-up, but the occasions are rare and the facts unearthed are usually over and done with and past any hope of correction.

In one instance, it took a stunning national tragedy and the deaths of three heroic astronauts on the launch pad at Cape Kennedy last Jan. 27 to bring to light many shocking revelations about the National Aeronautics and Space Agency and its gross mismanagement of the Apollo space project.

Perhaps Lt. Col. Virgil I. Grissom, Lt. Col. Edward H. White 2nd, and Lt. Comdr. Roger B. Chaffee did not die in vain, because their deaths did focus the attention of Congress on NASA programs which were costing the taxpayers billions of dollars for wasteful management, duplication, unchecked and sometimes unnecessary research projects, failure to provide needed safety precautions, and a host of other gross inefficiencies.

Such a group as the third Hoover Commission, proposed by Congressman Mathias, would have had the authority to conduct a continuing investigation into NASA operations and would have been able to both prevent and correct inefficient operations as they came to light.

Of necessity, says Congressman Donald Rumsfeld of Illinois, "Congressional review has often been piecemeal and after the fact. For example, the recent congressional hearing concerning the tragic Apollo spacecraft fire unearth a shocking amount of information about NASA's operations which should have been reported to Congress long ago.

"Until now, NASA has exercised too much discretion in determining what it should and what it should not tell Congress.

"Legislation has been proposed to correct this," Rumsfeld continued, "and, hopefully, the provisions in the House version of the NASA authorization bill (now in House-Senate conference) will be accepted and thereby require NASA to keep Congress 'fully and currently informed' and to create an independent safety advisory panel."

While he said he was convinced such action was necessary with respect to NASA, Rumsfeld added his support to the Mathias bill calling for another Hoover Commission to keep tabs on all government programs and spending.

"I am equally convinced," Rumsfeld said, "that, if the operations of the executive branch are studied and reviewed for organizational deficiencies and economy of operation, there would be far less need to wage battles on the floor of Congress on a piecemeal, hit-or-miss basis."

Congressional committees and subcommittees during long weeks of tedious hearings sometimes are able to come up with evidence of hard-core inefficiency or down-right mismanagement within particular agencies.

Pushing aside the millions of dollars worth of brochures, booklets, pamphlets, public relations handouts and other publications and program analyses used as window dressing by government agencies, the congressmen summon department, bureau and agency chiefs to answer direct questions concerning the operation of their own bureaucratic bailiwicks.

After months of hearings, a report by the Joint Economic Committee on July 30 accused the executive branch of wasting billions of tax dollars by loose management of the government's vast operations.

The report was highly critical of procurement policies within the Defense Department, especially.

The committee said that despite continual prodding by Congress, the defense agency had made insufficient use of competitive bidding in all lines of department purchasing.

The Defense Department was further charged with allowing itself to be overcharged on negotiated contracts by failing to get accurate cost data.

The committee pointed out that a 1962 law requires that all government contracting officers obtain accurate, current and complete cost data. "But," said the committee, "in the Defense Department there has been a serious and comprehensive lack of compliance with it."

Careless inventory control and management of government stores held by contractors was termed "shocking" by the committee, which added, "Poor inventory control is not only wasteful, but it makes the achievement of an efficient national supply system impossible."

In a closing statement, which might constitute some of the best ammunition yet for Congressman Mathias in his appeal for a new Hoover Commission, the committee said:

"Even more disturbing is the evidence that without surveillance internal management in the executive branch is such that it would not itself have revealed these deficiencies for years to come."

While the evidence of inefficiency within the defense establishment is undeniable, it took a young congressman from California, Ed Reinecke, to put in their place all those who would trace the cancer of giant federal spending to the doorstep of the Defense Department.

Reinecke readily admits that the defense budget has risen 34 percent in the past seven years, but he quickly points out that the increase has been at a much lower rate than the rise in budgetary allotments for seven other Cabinet departments:

Commerce went up 70 percent in the same time.

Interior rose 91 percent.

The Justice Department increased 58 percent.

The Post Office has a 43 percent increase in its annual deficit.

State Department costs went up 64 percent.

The Treasury budget jumped 41 percent.

Health, Education and Welfare shot up a whooping 200 percent.

"Some may argue," Reinecke said, "that increases in the size and cost of the federal government are due to the increase in the nation's population and an increase in the services which the people demand.

"However, in the past seven years we have had an 8.4 percent increase in population, but during the same period the cost of the federal bureaucracy has spiraled upward by 38.4 percent.

"The inefficiency of the federal bureaucracy is legendary. Our founding fathers had no idea that the simple outline of government which they created in the Constitution would serve as the skeleton for a fat, sloppy, overlapping, clumsy giant like the federal bureaucracy."

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Oct. 26, 1967]

THE GREAT DOLLAR THROWAWAY—V: FAT OEO, GROWING FATTER, KNOWS SECRETS OF SIPHONING

(By Jerry Cartledge)

The Office of Economic Opportunity, often called a "bureaucratic ivory tower," but better known to Congressional critics as the "fuddle factory," wants to spend $2.06 billion to fight poverty in the United States this year.

OEO leaders, some of the top paid in the nation, would have the American taxpayer believe that the much-demanded $2.06 billion constitutes the total national commitment against "poverty in a land of affluence and plenty."

But the OEO requests has run into several snags in Congressional appropriations hearings this year, amid loud charges of gross mismanagement, inefficiency, boondoggling, self-interest, ill-conceived policy and downright waste of taxpayer dollars.

New York Congressman Charles Goodell, a proponent of an "Economic Crusade" against poverty, but an arch foe of the administration "bureaucratic and wasteful" war on poverty, recently shattered the myth of a $2.06 billion planned OEO budget with the revelation that the government is currently spending about $40 billion in poverty-related programs and projects . . . more than $37 billion above what the American people are being told they are spending in the overall poverty war.

The additional billions are being pumped into programs which are supposed to benefit the poor in the fields of education, health and the senseless but ever-growing program of public welfare. They are being spent to rehabilitate and re-educate and relocate farmers; they are being used in programs of manpower development and redevelopment; they are being spread around to provide make-work jobs in almost every area of federal, state and local government.

Such programs too often are packed with the built-in inefficiency of duplication, overlapping control and procedure, mismanagement, lack of reasonable goals. In short, they are victims of bad policy and planning from the outset.

These programs spider-web and criss-cross back and forth among such agencies as OEO, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Labor Department, Agriculture Department, Interior Department and Housing and Urban Development.

Despite the proliferation, says Congressman Charles McC. Mathias of Maryland, most Americans are so confused that they do not know or cannot find out how to take advantage of the programs—programs which become a vast wasteland that fails to meet the needs of the people and serves only its own insatiable hunger for tax dollars.

The big wheels at OEO don't have much use for Mathias who although a liberal, has been calling for a commission to study the entire operation and structure of the Executive Branch of the government . . . in the face of the policy which founded OEO and allows it to continue despite the mounting scandal which accompanies its operation.

Leading the list of people OEO doesn't like are Congressmen Goodell and Albert H. Quie of Minnesota, the two most vocal spokesmen for the growing number of Congressmen who have been turning up the waste and inefficiency in a program which they have labeled in print "The War on Poverty—An American Tragedy."

They have publicly stated that ". . . all Americans are entitled to a complete statement on the competence of the anti-poverty stewardship" and are working ". . . to ensure that deprived Americans are receiving 100 percent benefit from every dollar spent in the fight against poverty."

They have employed a fully staffed team, headed by a former FBI agent, to document the most flagrant examples of waste, inefficiency, political patronage and, according to Goodell, "just plain bureaucratic stupidity" foisted on the American taxpayer.

One of the latest bombs to fall in the so-called poverty war was hurled by Glenn Westbrook, chairman of the Administrative Advisory Committee of the Cumberland Valley Opportunity Council (which with OEO is supposed to wage war on poverty in eight hard-hit counties in Kentucky).

Westbrook charged before a Senate Subcommittee proving "An Examination of the War on Poverty that the Office of Economic Opportunity in its war on poverty has refused in many instances to help alleviate poverty . . . that in one instance they have set up their own power structure in a dictator-type of situation not subject to the vote of the citizens, but answerable only to the OEO staff in Washington . . .

". . . instead of taking steps to help poor people become employable, OEO workers, sent in by OEO, channeled their energies toward types of agitation which serve only to cause bitterness, viciousness, distrust of local state and federal government and the preaching of class hatred, which was unknown in this area prior to OEO."

In more serious charges before the Senatorial group, Westbrook said, "To OEO, progress is civil disturbances, marches on Frankfort (the Kentucky capital) and Washington."

If the Senate was shocked by revelations in Kentucky, it at least got a shameful chuckle from the "Li'l Abner and the Creatures from Drop Out Space" comic book donated to OEO at an estimated $150,000 to $200,000 by the famous artist, Al Capp, in 1965.

It cost OEO $25,000 to print the 501,000 copies, and some even got distributed before a policy change in July of that same year relegated the comic-book approach to the war on poverty to the warehouse. Since then, the American taxpayer has been footing a $125-a-month storage bill for the 435,000 books that didn't get distributed.

Application cards for the Job Corps were to be included in the book, which resulted in some strong feeling at OEO against pressuring youths into Job Corps enrollment via this method.

According to a joint minority report in the Congress, "some sages at OEO felt that the story portrayed in the comic book was controversial and the characters did not fit OEO's image. Besides, how were they going to code, screen and mail to employment offices all the card applications? Nobody in the Great Dogpatch on the Potomac—OEO—had thought of that before they printed half a million books."

A new Hoover Commission, such as proposed by Maryland Congressman Mathias, would certainly recommend a closer relationship between OEO's policy and action areas which could have vented such a continuing waste of tax dollars as the poverty comic book.

Such a commission could have averted much of what Sen. Everett M. Dirksen predicted in the Senate on Aug. 19, 1965. He recently said that "the erratic, costly and misdirected course the program was then threatening to take has been confirmed." The program results, he said, "have now confirmed in every detail the most ominous of my predictions where the genuine welfare of the poor and the dreadful costs to the American taxpayer were concerned."

While most of the criticism comes from the Republicans in Congress, more and more Democrats are breaking with the administration and speaking out loudly against the present poverty program.

Among the moderate critics is Democratic Sen. Albert Gore of Tennessee. According to the Senator, "The office of Economic opportunity is a grossly disorganized affair, and while I hope some order will be brought out of current chaos, I become more doubtful daily."

Democrat Hugh Carey of New York touched a raw nerve when he charged, "The fact is that a lot of bleeding-heart Ph.Ds and professional poor people have succeeded in superimposing themselves on what are supposed to be action programs and are converting them into grandiose sociological studies and anti-social protest movements."

Singling out New York City, Carey said, "There is a riot and a runaway of ineffective programs proliferating all over the city, but not an effective attack upon the basic problem of poverty."

Democrat James Scheuer echoed his fellow Congressman when he charged that, "New York City has had a disastrous experience thus far in the poverty program."

Speaking of the dismal outlook with regard to Minnesota and the OEO, Democratic Sen. Walter F. Mondale said, "There was nothing in writing. No guidelines for expenses were established. It is no surprise that Minnesotans working for anti-poverty are often frustrated."

Maryland Democrat Clarence D. Long says he just votes for every poverty proposal that comes along in the vague hope that maybe something useful will be accomplished.

Democrat Augustus Hawkins of California told a Los Angeles audience, "The community development program as adopted by Congress is not functioning as it was set up. What is being done to this program is a crime."

Democrat Robert E. Sweeny of Cleveland labeled the Job Corps "a fantastically expensive failure. It is costing taxpayers $11,252 a year per enrollee."

Congressman Sweeny's cost figure varies with Congressional leaders in many states. The Republican "poverty watchdogs" place the cost per Job Corps enrollee as between $9,120 and $13,000. This is merely the cost per "enrollee."

"When expenses are evaluated on the basis of cost per 'graduate,'" the Republicans claim, "the results are even more astounding. For example, the St. Petersburg, Fla., Woman's Job Corps Center, after one year of operation produced 42 graduates at a cost of $39,205 per graduate."

The war on poverty provides some grand victories for certain individuals and groups, according to Congressman Quie. He cites as one example the case of the Women's Job Corps Center in Charleston, W. Va.

Quie charged that OEO failed to follow competitive bidding policies when it leased the "rundown" Kanawha Hotel for $9,800 yearly in the spring of 1965. The hotel was currently assessed at $250,000, but was in such condition that it required $345,000 to renovate.

When questioned about the . . . transaction, a highly placed OEO spokesman said Quie's figures were inaccurate and that the other four hotels in Charleston had been surveyed by the General Services Administration.

Further investigation revealed that only one of the other hotel owners was ever contacted in relation to the women's center. She recalled that a representative of Pakard Bell Electronics Corp., contractor for OEO, had spent about five minutes with her, during which she said she would sell but not lease the Holley Hotel.

It was also found that, in addition to the profitable leasing arrangement, the federal government pays $4800 a year for the storage of old Kanawha Hotel property.

About a year later, Quie noted "a somewhat older but comparable hotel in Charleston, with more land and a more valuable location, sold for $200,000."

The owner of one of the other hotels in the city—a six-story building with basement and penthouse which includes about 170 bedrooms—said he would have been more than willing to lease his hotel to OEO for far less than $94,800.

At present, he leases his hotel to a Detroit firm which returns him 17 percent of the gross income. In 1965, he received a total of $21,000. Under terms of his lease, he pays taxes and insurance on the building and its furniture—not the taxpayer, as is the case with the Kanawha Hotel.

In what the probers call the "Silver-Salaried Job Corps," they cited the case of the Camp Gary Men's Job Corps Center in San Marcos, Tex. At that camp the 208 staff personnel who make $9,000 a year or more received an average of 57 percent salary increase when they were employed by the center.

Some examples of personnel pay benefits at Gary include the manager of personnel who got a $5,000 raise to sign on with the camp for $10,000 a year and a "math chairman" who left a job paying $4,730 to join the camp for $10,080. A "citizenship teacher" left a $4,800 job for $10,080 at the camp. A "chairman of commercial skills" was earning $4,650 but came to Gary for $10,080, and a welding instructor who was making $3,200 now gets $9,780 with OEO as his boss.

The report noted that 154 of the 208 staffers involved came directly to Gary from school jobs. Then they asked: "What school board can compete with their rich Uncle Sam, who apparently has money to burn?"

In an angry speech before the House of Representatives last year, Congressman William H. Ayres of Ohio said that, based on the 1967 budget, it would take 6,484 permanent federal employees "to run Sargent Shriver's burgeoning bureaucracy—a poverty empire costing $53,489,000 in salaries alone.

"The word has gotten around among civil servants in Washington that 'the big money is in poverty.' Few know how big it is.

"At least 1,557 permanent federal poverty employees will make $10,619 or more; another 1,032 'Community action' workers will be paid $10,000 or more each from federal funds; an undetermined number of contract employees in 15 privately run Jobs Corps establishments will be paid over $10,000 each."

Ayres said that there were 2,350 permanent federal employees in the so-called "palace guard" of the OEO, which maintains its central headquarters and a regional office only several blocks away from each other in Washington.

According to Ayres, 1,006—or nearly half—the palace guard will get $10,619 or more; at least 521 will be paid over $14,600; at least 54 will get more than $19,600; 24 get more than $25,000, and six will get between $26,000 and $30,000.

"Outside of this inner circle at poverty headquarters," Ayres said, "there are 4,134 other permanent federal employees budgeted at $31,750,000. They are to do the hard work farmed out to other federal agencies, such as running the Job Corps camps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the adult education program, agricultural loans and so forth."

The Congressman noted that only 551 "outer circle" employees would be paid more than $10,500 a year, but that at least 112 of them will get $14,600.

However, Ayres pointed out, "not all the high salaries in poverty are accounted for by permanent federal employees or employees of private contractors working on a cost-plus-fee basis. Federal funds also pay for the salaries of employees of local anti-poverty agencies . . . and 1,032 of these employees now make $10,000 or more a year. At least 200 of them make $15,000 or more a year.

"It is a scandal," Ayres continued, "and a scandal which Sargent Shriver defended before the Education and Labor Committee with the bland boast that his department was only one-fiftieth the size of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

"So I compared one part of HEW—the U.S. Office of Education—with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

"The Office of Education is budgeted for $3.478 billion in fiscal 1967, compared to $1.724 billion for OEO, yet the Office of Education will need only 2,861 permanent employees compared with OEO's 6,484.

"If the Office of Education were administered like OEO, it would require 12,968 employes to spend its allocation, or four and a half times the number presently budgeted.

"And," the Congressman continued, "five individuals in OEO are paid more than the $26,000 annual salary of the U.S. Commissioner of Education."

According to one of the top public relations officials at OEO, "Operation Headstart is one of the least understood programs we offer."

According to Congressman Goodell, "Operation Headstart is one of the least understood programs of OEO."

Both men seem to be saying the same thing, but they are worlds apart on what they mean.

Actually, most of the American taxpayers don't really know about the Headstart program into which $201 million was pumped in 1966 and $352 million more was pushed in the fiscal year which ended in June.

While most Americans think of Headstart as an educational program for pre-school youngsters, the OEO official explains that the program actually aims at full family participation. The child enrolled at a Headstart class is only a means of reaching into a home to "involve the mother and possibly the father in the Community Action war on poverty."

Hopefully, OEO will get a child or children to come to Headstart, then bring the mother along to be paid for helping to cook and serve hot lunches and serving as monitor while the children are napping or the assigned teacher is doing something else.

Hopefully, OEO will get the father to drive a bus to pick the children up and take them home each day—for which he will be paid.

Goodell says Headstart "is not only a child day care center, but a family day care center where the kids can fingerpaint and play with clay while their parents sort of hang around, get a free meal and pick up a few extra bucks on the side."

Some Headstart programs work well, but an overwhelming majority of dedicated teachers who joined the program thinking it was intended to provide basic education to underprivileged youngsters have been left with a feeling of frustration and despair.

One Brooklyn, N.Y., mother, whose husband earns about $8,000 a year, said she was delighted to have her five-year-old son attend a Headstart class sponsored by a local Catholic parochial school. "It's like having a free babysitter," she said.

The Washington OEO Public Relations

man explained that this was not an unusual case. He said, "A certain percentage—a third or a fifth, I forget—of the children are supposed to come from well-to-do homes. This gives the poor children a chance to mingle with them socially and learn many things from them."

Asked why Congress appropriated the money for such programs, Goodell answered that a Harris Poll in 1964 showed that between 63 and 70 percent of the American people were strongly in favor of a war on poverty. "Congress responded," said Goodell, "and passed pretty much of anything that came before it in the name of fighting poverty and ignorance."

He added that a recent Harris Poll showed that the same number of Americans—between 63 and 70 percent—are disillusioned, fed up and angry with the present war on poverty, and are demanding that changes be made.

Another OEO official in Washington, asked how the poverty programs were evaluated in terms of success or failure, was obviously upset by the question and fell silent for several moments. Finally, he admitted that there were no regular provisions for determining whether a specific program was a success.

Then he added, "What we do is evaluate the program before it starts. If a proposed program meets certain OEO specifications and rules, it is funded and put into operation."

This, he said, is how OEO determines whether it is actually accomplishing anything in its national war on poverty.

It is ironic that in the one program where OEO makes demands and really evaluates the efforts of the people involved, it is meeting with its greatest tangible success.

The program, known in OEO circles as "The Happy Pappy Project" has been in operation for more than a year in the hardest-hit poverty areas of Kentucky and West Virginia.

Under the project, the father of a family living on welfare, usually in a backwoods hollow, is contacted by one of OEO's VISTA volunteers and offered a make-work job paying decent wages . . . providing he does two things.

First, he must go to work, at something like painting community buildings, clearing streams, planting brush for erosion control, etc.

Second, and just as important, he must see to it that his children are properly clothed and go to school each day. If the children fail to go to school, except for legitimate reasons, the father loses his job.

The program shows common sense planning and incentive. It is aimed at the next generation. These backwoods children didn't attend school before. They had no chance for an education . . . no chance to learn that there was something better in the world. Without an education, they could never hope to break the cycle of poverty which had surrounded their lives.

At the same time, the father is earning back his self respect through productive work, the wife now has more money to provide better food and clothing, and the entire family has a new sense of dignity and security.

Unfortunately, OEO doesn't learn by its successes either. A key spokesman for the poverty people in Washington said he wonders whether OEO really has the right to demand that the children go to school as a condition of the father's employment.

AN INDICATION OF WEAKNESS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a different perspective is always valuable. Since we have heard and seen and read so much about the recent demonstrations at the Pentagon, I think there is value in noting the reactions to this parade of hysterics from one whose torturers they often serve.

I refer to an article by Chicago Tribune Columnist Willard Edwards, in which he relates the reaction of Miss Annie Samuelli, a Romanian who was held 12 years in Communist prisons, tortured, and subjected to many of the diabolical methods common to nations whose leaders are now gloriously celebrating 50 years of enslavement of formerly free peoples.

The fact that she was "bought out of prison" parallels the situation of the well-known witness against communism, Rev. Richard Wurmbrand, who also was "bought" out of prison in the Communist East-West trade market which deals in human beings.

I submit the article as an example of the views of one who has been on both sides of an important issue which some still refuse to see clearly:

CAPITOL VIEWS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, October 27.—Talking to Miss Annie Samuelli, you could sense her bewilderment about the strange country she was visiting. She was a fugitive from communist terror, and it was difficult for her to understand that a mass assault by thousands upon the Pentagon was not an intolerable defiance of law and order but a legitimate exercise of the right to assemble peaceably.

This small, middle-aged woman with bright, smiling eyes is an extraordinary person. In her native land, Romania, she was convicted of high treason and espionage by the communist regime in 1949. She served 12 years of a 20-year sentence at hard labor before she was released on payment of a $4,000 ransom to a communist official. She has since become a British citizen.

"I was never quite sure why I was called a spy," she confessed. "I think it was because I worked in the British information office in Bucharest and anybody connected with 'information' in those days was suspected of espionage. Information was a bad word."

Twelve years in a communist prison have left their mark but not subdued her spirit. It was a revelation to view the United States thru her eyes.

She was here last week-end when 35,000 anti-war demonstrators swarmed around the Pentagon, taunting a thin line of troops with obscenities, making occasional rushes that were repulsed with a few cracked heads on both sides. Altho nearly 700 persons were arrested, most were hastily released with small fines and suspended sentences. It cost the American taxpayers an estimated $1,000,000 to cope with the outburst.

LIKE A REVOLT REHEARSED

Miss Samuelli was puzzled that this display of violence, accompanied by vilification of the President, the government, and the flag, had been licensed by a federal agency. She could appreciate the American zeal for permitting dissent, she said, but the rest of the world would find such tolerance of lawbreaking and violence an indication of weakness in the authorities. It looked to her like a rehearsal for revolution.

"Didn't all those people, so many of them young, know that they were giving the Communists a propaganda victory to advertise around the world?" she asked.

"I wish I could have talked to some of them and let them know what life under communism is like and the war in Viet Nam is being fought to prevent it from spreading to free countries. I wonder if they truly realize the blessings they enjoy in this land?"

She was equally mystified about a policy of limited warfare in Viet Nam. It seemed "a mockery" to her that the United States, with 500,000 troops engaged in bloody warfare, has never declared war against the North Vietnamese enemy. Communists are not impressed by caution and restraint, she remarked. They mistake it for timidity.

Miss Samuelli was in Washington for two purposes, to attend the publication of a book, "The Wall Between," [Robert B. Luce] about her prison experiences, and to visit a senator whom she esteems as a great American leader in the battle against communism. Her wonderment about Americans increased when she found the senator, Thomas J. Dodd [D., Conn.], hospitalized from exhaustion and suffering from the stigma of official Senate censure. Anti-communism in the United States seemed to have its hazards, she noted, thoughtfully.

TRIUMPH OF HUMAN SPIRIT

Her book is not the ordinary recital of iron curtain prison horrors but an account of how the human spirit can triumph over brutality, no matter how prolonged. She learned how to survive ruthless interrogation, solitary confinement, and nauseating food, to communicate by Morse code taps with her fellow sufferers.

Deprived of reading or writing materials, forbidden ever to speak above a whisper, she defied the apathy or madness this treatment was designed to produce and emerged after 12 long years with body and mind unscathed. Not a "religious person" when she entered the prison, she came to have a deep faith in the workings of a divine providence. Her release, when she had expected to serve eight more years, seemed a miracle from heaven.

Her story, if it somehow could have been communicated to them, might possibly have opened the eyes of at least some of the thousands of well-fed, tenderly nurtured college-age youths, flower children, hippies, and many others old enough to know better, whose antics at the Pentagon gave comfort to Communists killing young Americans in Viet Nam.

A SICKENING CONTRAST

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer of October 29 carried a heartening account of just how much our servicemen in Vietnam appreciate the expressions of support from those back home. Last September, Gov. Raymond P. Shafer, of Pennsylvania, sent a message of support and appreciation to the troops in Vietnam via Armed Forces radio. Responses to the Governor's message from Pennsylvania servicemen are still being received at the capitol in Harrisburg. Typical of the sentiments expressed by servicemen is this excerpt from one letter:

> We, the fighting men from Pennsylvania, are proud to be here, halting communism for our America in this troubled part of the world.

Another boy wrote:

I feel great to know that all our work is being appreciated at home in Pennsylvania. Knowing my fellow Pennsylvanians care makes me care—and all I do, I do with the best I have for all of you at home.

These are just two of the comments of young Americans who are continuing this Nation's tradition of sacrifice in the the Inquirer entitled: Believe Viet War Is Vital: Pennsylvania GI's Seek "Encouraging News."

BELIEVE VIET WAR IS VITAL: PENNSYLVANIA GIs SEEK "ENCOURAGING NEWS"

HARRISBURG, October 28.—Pennsylvania servicemen fighting in Vietnam are hungry for encouraging news from home that will let them know "people care," and they are firmly convinced that despite peace demonstrators and draft-card burnings, the job they are doing is vital not only for Southeast Asia but for America as well.

Virtually all of them carry with them an intense pride in the Commonwealth as a State to represent and to which they can return.

These are the sentiments expressed in letters addressed to Gov. Raymond P. Shafer in response to a message sent by him to the 225,000 Pennsylvania servicemen in Vietnam

BEGAN IN JUNE

It all began in June when, at the request of the USO, the Governor recorded a message to the Armed Forces.

"Although I am sure there are many times when you feel as though the folks back home have forgotten you, this is not the case," the Governor said in part.

"We all know of the sacrifices you are making and the tremendous job you are doing, not only for Pennsylvania and for the United States, but for the entire free world . . .

SENT TO TROOPS

"On behalf of all the citizens of Pennsylvania, I want to say thank you for your devotion to duty and your valiant actions. We all pray for your safe return."

Broadcast to the troops over Armed Forces Radio late in September, mail generated by the brief tribute still is arriving at the Capitol.

"Our job over here sometimes becomes very trying," wrote SP 4 Samuel R. Morrison, of 3507 Kirwyn place, Philadelphia. "With your words of interest, faith and respect, it gives us encouragement to go on . . . .

OPINION OFFERED

"Feel free to show this to the people of Pennsylvania. We have heard your opinion, and they should hear ours, as soon as possible. Just as we needed yours, they need ours."

Twenty-year-old Francis J. Rydel, of Conshohocken, asked Shafer to call him Frank, and said he entered the Army just a few days after the Governor's election in Nov., 1966.

"To be honest, sir, I don't like it here; who would?" Rydel writes. "But I figure I am doing my part and that is the least I can do. I'm not going to complain about anything."

REPLIES SOUGHT

Rydel, a private first class, noted that the radio voice which presented Shafer suggested the troops drop him a line in response to the message.

"I figured why not write," he said. "I never wrote to a Governor before, and I thought it would be cool."

A2 C. H. D. Shuler, of Scranton, admitted frankly that his job is far from the most important in the Air Force.

"But I feel as though I am doing the best I can," he said.

Robert E. Scott, a sailor from Drexel Hill, brought tears to Shafer's eyes when he wrote:

PROUD OF ROLE

We, the fighting men from Pennsylvania, are proud to be here, halting Communism for our America in this troubled part of the world.

"Some occasional good word from home offers great moral support for all of us over here, you can be sure."

Each fighting man who writes to Shafer is sent a letter in return. One man said his favorite brand of cigarets are in short supply, and the Governor promised he would do what he could. Others ask Shafer to call their loved ones. He does.

But if the Chief Executive is touched by the letters, the GIs likewise were touched by his recording.

NEARLY CRIED

Back home, I heard your voice many times," wrote PFC James Bittner, of Glassport. But on Sept. 27, I almost started to cry like a little kid . . . another boy from Pittsburgh did cry, he was so touched by your message. It really seemed that for those short couple of minutes, we were home listening to you.

"Please take care of our State until we Quakers get back and help you out."

Pfc. Edward G. Weiss, of Erie, said he was watching the sky being lit by flares and listening to the bark of mortars when, at 2:30 A.M., Shafer came on the air.

SEEMED CLOSER

"Suddenly, home seemed closer—Pennsylvania not so far away after all. I am proud to say I felt a certain pride flow up inside, knowing that I was doing a job for my country and knowing that people care."

Sgt. Pat Clouney, who heard the broadcast in Saigon, said he attended a South Philadelphia rally for Shafer during the 1966 campaign. He accompanied his brother-in-law, whom he identified as "Joseph Daley, a Republican committeeman from 18th and Callowhill Sts."

M. Sgt. John J. Ennaorato, of Chester, wrote:

"It sure made me feel good to know that we were not forgotten. I am sure your voice was heard by thousands of Pennsylvanians throughout Vietnam."

One of the most poignant comments came from Pfc. William J. Edmond, of Levittown, Bucks county.

". . . I feel great to know that all our work is being appreciated at home in Pennsylvania," the soldier wrote "Knowing my fellow Pennsylvanians care makes me care—and all I do, I do with the best I have for all of you at home."

Now, contrast this encouraging example of fine American youth with that of college students on several campuses, as reported by the New York Times of October 19:

Police used tear gas and nightsticks to break up an antiwar demonstration today by hundreds of students on the University of Wisconsin campus.

More than 2,500 chanting, singing antiwar demonstrators picketed the Northern California Draft Induction Center here today, the third day of a locally organized stop-the-draft week. The police arrested 58 protestors who attempted to keep 250 inductees from entering the building, bringing the number of arrests since Monday to 209.

It must be stressed that a student's right to disagree with our policy in Vietnam is not the issue involved. When students knowingly detain a Navy recruiting officer in his car for 4 hours, or when police officers are required to bring order to a demonstration, then the right of dissent becomes illegal behavior.

The Chicago Tribune of October 28 listed several cases of student demonstrations which overstepped the limits of dissent.

I insert the article, "Trap Two Navy Recruiters at Ohio College," in the RECORD at this point:

TRAP TWO NAVY RECRUITERS AT OHIO COLLEGE

Anti-war demonstrations continued yesterday against navy recruiters interviewing students on the campus of Oberlin college in Ohio.

Seventy students staged a sit-in in front of the door to a college placement office.

Two navy recruiters were trapped in the office until noon, four hours after the sit-in began.

However, students wishing to see the recruiters were allowed to enter and leave the office. The interviewed students had to step between the demonstrators to reach the door.

INTERVIEWED 16 STUDENTS

Lt. Comdr. C. R. Smith of Gross Ile, Mich., and Lt. [j.g.] Phillip McCaffrey, of Cleveland, said they interviewed 16 students during the morning session.

The recruiters went to lunch at noon and were permitted to reenter the office some 90 minutes later. The demonstrators took their lunches in shifts in order to keep the sit-in going.

Thursday, fire hoses and tear gas were used to disperse more than 300 Oberlin students who had trapped Smith in his auto near the campus and refused to let him move for over four hours. Two other recruiters had entered the campus unnoticed and interviewed a dozen students.

MONDAY CLASSES CANCELED

After police broke up the demonstration Thursday, leaders said they would call for a class boycott. However, this was called-off when college administrators announced that all classes would be canceled Monday. The faculty council announced that it will hold an all-college discussion on the recruiting issue that day.

Yesterday was the last day of the two-day recruiting program being conducted by the navy at Oberlin.

In Champaign, Ill., officials of the University of Illinois announced yesterday that 11 students have been referred to a student committee for disciplinary action as a result of their participation in an anti-war demonstration earlier this week.

TIED TO VIET WAR

The 11 were among some 175 persons who staged a sit-in demonstration in a campus building where Dow Chemical Company interviews were being conducted Wednesday. The anti-war demonstrators were protesting because Dow makes napalm for use by troops in Viet Nam.

The committee has the power to expel the demonstrators.

In Milwaukee, the Wisconsin Chamber of Commerce called on University of Wisconsin officials to deal firmly with campus protests. The group noted that the state legislature had given the school officials authority to deal with the protection of property and with the conduct of students and faculty.

Altho not mentioned directly, the resolution obviously referred to a protest Oct. 18 on the Madison campus. More than 70 persons were injured when students and police clashed during a sit-in against Dow Chemical Company interviewers.

A CONSERVATION PIONEER

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be present on October 27 at the annual meeting of the Republican Valley Conservation Association in McCook, Nebr. The principal speaker on this occasion was the very able Senator from Nebraska, the Honorable Carl T. Curtis.

Senator Curtis has for many years pioneered conservation and flood control projects, not only in his State, but throughout the High Plains area. The great strides made in creation of flood protection measures and establishment of many multipurpose works have resulted in no small measure from his untiring work.

Mr. Speaker, I place the speech of Senator Curtis in the Record at this point:

Speech of Senator Carl T. Curtis Before the Republican Valley Conservation Association at McCook, Nebr., October 27, 1967

Once more, it is my good pleasure to attend the Republican Valley Conservation Association's annual meeting. Last year, I was unable to be present. My records are not complete, but I am quite sure that that was the only annual meeting that I missed. At least, I have never missed very many.

The conservation work in the Republican Valley will for many years stand out as a milestone in conservation. When this Association was formed, the need for flood control and irrigation was great, but the obstacles were greater. All these things move slowly and about the time that a program would ordinarily have started here in the Republican Valley, World War II came along. The Valley is narrow and the total acres to be irrigated were proportionally small. The flood control features were expensive. There were problems existing between the upper basin and the lower basin.

Also, back at that time, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineers had not developed the pattern for cooperative planning and development which is now so common. The Department of Agriculture was just coming into its own in the way of conservation of water and soil, both by the individual farmer and for a larger area. The hope of accomplishment for something for the Republican Valley was dim and the problems were monumental, yet it did come to pass. The development in this area is a monument to the individuals, leaders and followers who started out on the task and never looked back. It is a milestone in cooperation among government agencies and it is a milestone of accomplishment in having communities pull together, even though a particular community had to wait a long time to be reached.

No plan of development will ever afford 100 percent protection from a damaging flood. Life isn't that way. Many of the flood problems can be anticipated. Some cannot. We can't turn the entire country into reservoirs and so there will always be some risk. The fact remains, however, that the Republican Valley, for the most part, has proceeded past the point where the residents of the Valley need fear a devastating and ruinous flood will be upon them as they retire for the night.

The construction of Enders Dam, the Bonny Dam, the Culbertson Dam, the Cambridge Dam, the Red Willow Dam, and the Harlan County Dam is a nearly complete answer to the first objective of this wonderful organization which is now more than a quarter of a century old.

There will always be problems of maintenance, repair, channel control, elimination of trees, and drainage. These are more or less annual problems and have to be met as such.

There is one area of the Republican Valley Basin that has not had any flood control and I refer to Beaver Valley. I want to say at the same time there is no area in the State in which I am more interested in having flood control and water conservation become a reality than in Beaver Valley. As most of you know, there have been many studies on the Beaver Creek, but as yet there has been no plan submitted to the Congress that met the standards of feasibility. I have refused to take such replies as final and so long as I am privileged to serve this State in the Congress, we are not going to forget this area where the need is so great even though it is a small part of our State. There is a related problem in the Valley that is of concern to the Harlan County people and to all fishermen and sportsmen in a wide area in both Nebraska and Kansas. I refer to the water level of the conservation pool at the Harlan County Reservoir. In order to have a reservoir empty to the point where it can catch and hold flood waters sometimes there is a lack of water for recreation and other similar purposes. Such is the case of the Harlan County Dam. The water level is too low for the boating and other recreation taking place there and it is too low for the establishment on a dependable basis of docks and other facilities at the upper end of the reservoir. In recent years, the promotion of recreation has become a national policy. I feel strongly that the Harlan County Reservoir should be utilized more for recreation and that a way should be found to raise the water level of the conservation pool without taking a risk that the Reservoir could not hold back the necessary flood waters.

Over the years, we have asked the Army Engineers to study this matter. It goes back at least 15 or 20 years. It has received attention in the highest places, but the answer has been that the water level could not be raised.

Within the last year or so, I have given it a new approach. The last Resolution for restudy that I filed called for more than just a review of past findings. My Resolution requested the Army Engineers to study the area west of the Harlan County Dam to see what additional storage could be constructed above Harlan County in order to make it safe to raise the conservation pool. The area that I have had in mind where the additional storage facility should be built is the Beaver Valley. In other words, can the need for flood control in the Beaver Valley and the need to raise the water level in the conservation pool at the Harlan County Reservoir be viewed as one problem and an economically feasible answer be worked out? I am not an engineer, but I believe that it can be done. I certainly hope it can be done and that is what I am urging. Just this week, I dispatched a letter to the Honorable Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and an identical letter to Lt. General William F. Cassidy, Chief of the Army Engineers, in which I said:

"I am writing to you concerning the Republican River in Nebraska. We are faced with two problems for which feasible answers have not yet been reached. I believe that by considering the two problems together there might be a greater chance of working out a feasible solution. I hope that there can be conferences at the highest level, as well as at the working level, between the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation on these problems.

"The first problem relates to the desire of the local people extending over many, many years to have the conservation pool level raised in the Harlan County Reservoir. The United States Government is giving much more attention to and spending more money on recreation than at the time of the planning of the Harlan County Dam. In view of the great potential for recreation at the Harlan County Dam, I believe that it would be in accord with established policy to see what can be done to raise this water level by making due allowance for the recreational benefits.

"The second problem is Beaver Creek, one of the tributaries, which continues to suffer from the ravages of floods. Up to now, no dam or other structure has been proposed which has been recommended to the Congress as feasible. The need is very great. We want something accomplished for the Beaver Valley.

"My thought is this: If storage capacity can be built in the Beaver Valley would not that additional storage capacity make it possible to raise the water level in the Harlan County Dam?

"Both of these problems have been with us a long time. I do not request nor expect an answer forthwith. Rather, my request is that in the coming months both agencies consider these two problems together and see what might be worked out which would make them both feasible.

"I will appreciate this very much and I assure you that, if any of the Nebraskans in or out of office can be of assistance to you, we shall be glad to do so."

It is my information that the Bureau of Reclamation in their general appropriation which has been approved has sufficient money for their feasibility study of Beaver Creek and the Nelson Buck Unit at the present time. It was not what we call a line item in the appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, but is part of their general funds for studies. Since the Army Engineers built the Harlan County Dam, they are responsible for its operation as a flood control unit and must have an important role in this combined problem. I not only introduced a Resolution which the Senate Public Works Committee passed requesting them to carry on this study, but I am glad to report to you that $15,000 has been made available for this purpose. The Budget did not recommend it and it was not in the appropriation bill as it passed the House. It was added in the Senate and I am happy to report to you that it was retained in the conference. I expect to resist being diverted from the problem of Beaver Creek and the water level of the Harlan County Dam until we get a satisfactory answer.

Speaking of appropriations, I am glad to report to you that the House and Senate have completed their conference on the Public Works appropriation bill. There will be $405,000 for the Bostwick Division, $500,000 for Frenchman-Cambridge, and $56,000 for the Almena Unit in Kansas, in addition to the unmarked study portions to which I have referred.

In closing, let me thank you for inviting me here. I again congratulate the people who have their shoulders to the wheel in this fine undertaking and I revere the memory of those who served so long and who are no longer with us. The Congress is still in session and I am happy to bring to you the personal greetings of my colleague in the Senate, Senator Roman Hruska, and of my Congressman and your Congressman, Dave Martin.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR RESPONSIBLE PATRIOTISM DESERVES THANKS OF ALL TRUE AMERICANS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on October 21, a massive demonstration against U.S. participation in the Vietnam war by peaceniks, Vietniks, beatniks, hippies, and self-confessed Communists was staged in Washington, D.C. The protest, which desecrated the very memory of one of America's greatest presidents, Abraham Lincoln, by hurling anti-American slogans at the site of the monument built in his honor, then proceeded to the Pentagon. There, soldiers and U.S. marshals had to forcibly restrain the mob lest it overrun the interior of the Defense Department itself.

If not for the efforts of the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism, the world could have easily but erroneously, concluded that the vast majority of American people are not in support of our men in Vietnam.

The counterdemonstration sponsored by the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism dramatically illustrated to the world that the Vietniks do not represent the thinking of the majority of American citizens. In New York City alone, over 100,000 patriotic Americans marched in peaceful support of our men in Vietnam on the same day the bearded members of the New Left were attempting to get less than half that number to protest the war by demonstrating in Washington. And New York was only one of many cities where Americans of all ages came out in support of our fighting men in Vietnam. Cities of all sizes throughout the breadth of this great Nation witnessed loyal Americans marching peacefully in determined support of our brave men in Vietnam.

In addition, the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism also had a "headlights-on" campaign on that same day to allow motorists to show their support for our men in Vietnam. This, too, proved to be an overwhelming success.

I am herewith inserting into the Record a newspaper report which appeared in the October 22, 1967, issue of the St. Petersburg Times of the peaceful march in support of our men which took place in St. Petersburg, Fla. I am also inserting a copy of a proclamation signed by the mayor of Hialeah, Fla., the Honorable Henry Milander, giving due recognition to the efforts of the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism and which proclaimed October 21–22 as "Operation Gratitude" as a way of expressing support for our men and women in the Armed Forces of the United States:

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Oct. 22, 1967]

One Hundred Twenty-five Participate in March Backing War in Vietnam

War veterans and a small number of placard-carrying high school and college students marched down St. Petersburg's Central Avenue yesterday morning in a "U.S. Day Parade" in support of American soldiers fighting in Vietman.

The parade began at 16th Street and ended at Williams Park where a ceremony was held, including brief speeches by leaders of several veterans organizations.

"America is not represented by blocking the Pentagon or burning draft cards but by demonstrations like this," Ross Hudson, a Stetson law student and chairman of the event, told about 300 applauding spectators.

The parade was organized to counter the massive anti-war demonstrations in Washington and other cities this week.

Of the 125 participating in the local parade, nearly half consisted of two contingents of the Young Marines from St. Petersburg and Clearwater.

One car in the caravan carried the family of 19-year-old James Trushaw, a U.S. Marine from St. Petersburg killed in action last month. Mr. and Mrs. Charles E. Trushaw, 923 Brookwood Court S, and two daughters, Barbara Jean and Julie Ann, were introduced later at the Williams Park ceremonies.

The students, from St. Petersburg Junior College and several senior high schools, carried signs saying:

"Show them you care," "Better Dead than Red," "Defoliate the Flower People," "Drop it (the bomb)."

A junior from Clearwater Central Catholic wore an arm band, "Bomb Hanoi."

The Young Americans for Freedom also were represented.

As the parade moved toward the downtown, a young man carrying an attention flag beckoned spectators: "Join the parade."

Conspicuously absent were any anti-war demonstrators.

At Williams Park, the St. Petersburg group the Sing Out presented a brief concert. A spokesman told The Times that the group is neither pro-war nor anti-war.

Proclamation by Mayor of Hialeah, Fla.

Whereas, The National Committee for Responsible Patriotism was formed by those who organized the Support Our Men in Vietnam Parade last May; and

Whereas, it is our purpose to help the morale of the men fighting in Vietnam; and

Whereas, all Hialeahans are called upon to respect law and support the men and women in our Armed Forces;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the power invested in me as Mayor of the City of Hialeah, I, Henry Milander, due hereby proclaim Oct. 21–22 as "Operation Gratitude," and urge the citizens of this community to express and be cognizant of their gratitude to the men and women serving our nation so gallantly.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the City of Hialeah to be affixed, this 19th day of October, A.D., 1967.

Henry Milander,
Mayor.

SBA NOT AFFECTED BY TITLE IV OF OEO AMENDMENTS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Steiger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to set straight the record and to explain a misunderstanding that exists and is being promoted by those who are overly concerned with title IV of the Economic Opportunity Amendments, S. 2388.

Those who have spoken and written about this title would have us believe that "It appears that another effort is being made to dismember the Small Business Administration and transfer its functions to the big-business-oriented Department of Commerce."

Let me make it very clear that I am and have always been a supporter of the Small Business Administration. I think they do an excellent job and one that is desperately needed. The transfer of SBA to the Commerce Department or any amendment that would lead to such a transfer I would not support. The SBA should remain an independent agency.

Regrettably, those who support SBA are incorrectly assessing the impact of title IV as proposed. For example, William Reddig, Jr., wrote in last Thursday's Washington Evening Star:

> Tucked away in the $2.06 billion poverty war bill headed for House floor action is a provision allowing the Department of Commerce to take over many of the functions of the now independent Small Business Administration.

In addition, Mike Causey wrote in this morning's Washington Post:

> The rumor mill on Capitol Hill again reports there will be an attempt to shift SBA to the Commerce Department.

Nothing could be further from the truth and it is not the intent of the title IV amendment which I offered to the bill.

However, SBA is not equipped to handle the kind of program outlined by title IV of S. 2388. SBA is an agency designed to promote and aid small businesses where it is logical for them to succeed. The low incidence of failure for SBA fostered companies is proof of their expertise at this function. They grant their loans on the same basis as most banks and in some cases have been much more demanding than banks.

The effect of new title IV would not be to shift or give the Commerce Department any authority which is now lodged in the Small Business Administration. What is now proposed in title IV is the creation of an entirely new program, a program not currently in existence. If we agree that the program should be created, and there has not been an argument advanced to the contrary, then the discussion must center around which agency is best equipped to handle the proposed program. It is my belief that the Commerce Department is and thus my support for the current language in title IV.

I believe that the goals of the title IV program must be clarified. This should not be a program whose success is measured in the number of long-term unemployed who are hired. A struggling small business is the kind of operation which can least tolerate employing the hard-core unemployed. Larger businesses with a greater margin of stability must be brought in to accomplish that purpose and for that purpose we need a broadly conceived urban economic development program, not a small business loan program. The goal of the title IV program must be the promotion of viable small business located in slum areas or owned and managed by residents of those areas.

Second, we need a concentrated approach. The loan program should be, of course, available on a national basis. At the same time, however, some substantial part of its resources should be channeled into limited numbers of big city slums in order to produce a noticeable psychological effect and a visible impact.

And, most important, much more emphasis must be given to providing an expanded range of technical and management services to the small businessman. The resources of established firms must be used to develop intensive forms of business education and training. On-the-job training programs should be developed for businessmen.

In addition, the assistance rendered should not be limited simply to management training, but should include a variety of more sophisticated technical aids including market research, feasibility studies, and the organization of trade associations and cooperatives.

The provisions of intensive technical and management assistance is absolutely crucial. It makes little sense to put a slum dweller or low-income person into business without taking the necessary steps to insure that he will be able to compete successfully.

What is outlined in title IV, an amendment I offered in the Committee on Education and Labor, is the expansion of the opportunities for a stake in community economic life for low-income persons. This amendment will allow us to focus in on areas of high employment with a totally new program of industry building, a totally new program of providing jobs for the unemployed.

Title IV focuses upon small business concerns, first, located in urban or rural areas of high proportion of unemployed or low-income individuals; or second, owned by low-income individuals—section 401. Title IV permits a different definition of low income for this part than for other titles of the Economic Opportunity Act, so that a somewhat higher income level can be served. To assure that the loans will be well used, title IV requires that special attention be given to the development of management training and counseling programs in which borrowers may be required to participate.

The responsibility for providing technical assistance and management training as assigned to the Secretary of Commerce, who is expected to designate this responsibility to the Economic Development Administration. The Secretary would be authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private organizations, which in turn would assist small businesses. Eligible activities would include planning and research, identification and development of new business opportunities, stimulation of new private capital resources, furnishing of centralized services, establishment and strengthening of businesses with small concerns located in poverty areas or owned by low-income individuals, and furnishing business counseling, management training, legal and related services. Management training and counseling programs would receive particular attention.

In order for us to better understand title IV, it is important to review some of its history.

Title IV of the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act consisted of a program designed "to assist in the establishment, preservation, and strengthening of small business concerns and improve the managerial skills employed in such enterprises." That program had two parts: Economic Opportunity loans, which were handled by the Small Business Administration, the small business development centers, which were sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The small business development centers—SBDC's—were organized on the local level by community action agencies. Generally located in the poverty areas, the functions of the SBDC's included identification of applicants for training and/or loans; recommending specific loans for SBA approval; and organizing and providing management counseling and training to loan recipients and others. The SBA made final determination on award of loans, and it reviewed loans to insure compliance with statutory and loan provisions.

In the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966 the entire program was transferred to SBA. SBA subsequently announced that the SBDC's would be closed and the program handled directly by SBA offices. The reasons given by OEO for abandoning the economic opportunity loan program were that there was no money to set up more SBDC's, that other programs had a higher priority, and that the whole program could be better handled by SBA. At the same time, in Philadelphia, Chicago, New York and a number of other localities, the program succeeded in reaching out to a number of small business applicants and attracted considerable community support.

From January 1965 to November 1966, the economic opportunity loans were made through the SBDC's. During that period, 2,678 loans were made at a total cost of $26 million. In December 1966, SBA assumed full control of the program and shifted to a nationwide program designed to serve other cities, suburbs, and small communities. From that date through June 1967, 2,222 loans were made, totaling $25 million.

The original loan program was narrow in focus. It concentrated on persons at or near the poverty level, many of whom did not have the preparation to succeed in a business venture. The later emphasis on creating jobs for the unemployed exposed struggling small businesses to an additional source of instability. The SBDC's in many communities provided useful services, but their participation in loan processing was a needless extra step.

In the process of shifting to a nationwide program, the proportion of minority group businessmen assisted was sharply reduced, although it is among this group that the need for both financial and advisory assistance is greatest.

An important priority of the antipoverty effort must be to expand the opportunities for a stake in community economic life for low-income persons. That goal is the basis of title IV. It is a goal for which we must strive and I urge my colleagues to assess carefully this need and join with me in support of title IV of the EOA amendments contained in S. 2388.

DR. GODDARD'S STAND ON MARIHUANA

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the untimely and wholly irresponsible statement by the Director of the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. James L. Goddard, last week regarding the use of marihuana has been widely condemned.

Dr. Goddard, while admitting that he does not even know what the long-term effects of marihuana might be, has practically endorsed the use of this illegal narcotic before a group of our college students.

Some have called the Director's remarks "stupid." Some have asked the President to disavow the remarks of his appointee, while others have called for Dr. Goddard's resignation. That an administration official can advocate violation of statutory law in public is, in my judgment, appalling but not very unusual these days.

This incident seems to fit a growing and rather disturbing pattern of the Great Society and another example of administration spokesmen offering "something for everybody." Similar statements, you will recall, were once made about people taking their grievances into the streets, and there followed a series of the most devastating urban riots in our long history. Then there were some accommodating remarks made about the draft, and we have all seen the exodus to Canada and the demonstrations against the draft which followed.

As this Nation seethes in war and is beset by problems and unrest here at home, I can only wonder what prophetic words of "wisdom" are to follow from our national leaders.

Quite frankly, I think most Americans could care less what Dr. Goddard would permit his daughter to do, but I am convinced they do not want him or anyone else deciding what is good for their own sons and daughters. Parents today are having a hard enough time trying to raise decent children without the "help" of Dr. Goddard.

The fact, as expressed by Dr. Goddard, that his Department does not know what the long-range effects of marihuana are yet, should be the problem to which he addresses himself in the future. Solving old problems, rather than creating new ones, is a rather thorny issue with this administration that the people of this country appear to understand better than does Dr. Goddard.

GREAT BRITAIN AND THE NORDIC COUNTRIES EXPRESS CONCERN OVER THE POSSIBLE RESURGENCE OF AMERICAN PROTECTIONISM

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHALEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday both Houses of Congress heard President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz of Mexico discuss the danger posed for his country and other small nations should the United States regress and reembrace protectionism.

Mr. Ordaz' fears by no means apply only to Mexico. A number of nations already have indicated similar concerns, Mr. Speaker, and I hope they have not gone unnoticed.

Two position statements particularly have caught my attention. They are those made on October 18, 1967, by the Nordic countries—Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden—and Great Britain.

I believe these statements are frank assessments which we would do well to review before embarking on the course of protectionism advocated by some Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I herewith insert in the RECORD the two statements mentioned above:

The Ambassadors of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden called upon the Deputy Under Secretary of State, Mr. Foy D. Kohler, on Wednesday, October 18, and delivered the following note:

"The Governments of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden are deeply concerned by the large number of legislative initiatives aiming at new protectionistic measures which have lately come forward in the United States Congress shortly after the successful conclusion of the Kennedy Round.

"The aforesaid Governments particularly regret that the initiatives in question generally aim at restricting imports to the United States, inter alia, through an increased use of quantitative restrictions and raising of tariffs. They are also aware of the fact that the goods to be affected by the various measures proposed are of considerable importance to international trade and of substantial interest to the economy of many countries. Such measures if enacted, would therefore have undesirable repercussions on the trade between the United States and the Nordic countries and on world trade in general.

"They might further, in the view of our Governments, endanger the agreements recently concluded in Geneva in the framework of the Kennedy Round. The initiative taken by the United States Administration on the basis of the Trade Expansion Act enabled at that occasion the contracting parties to the GATT to negotiate the most far-reaching tariff reductions so far achieved. It would certainly be unfortunate if new protectionist measures were to be introduced at a moment when the countries concerned, which took part in the elaboration of the final solutions, are preparing the legislation for the entry into force of the agreements reached in the Kennedy Round.

"Such development might also have negative effects on the future of the GATT and other international organizations; these organizations have worked for the gradual freeing of international trade and thus have been important factors in the enhancing of prosperity among nations."

TEXT OF UNITED KINGDOM NOTE OF OCTOBER 18

Her Majesty's Government wish to express their serious concern at the many proposals now being put forward in the United States that the United States Government should restrict imports of various commodities on protectionist grounds, including some of major importance in the export trade of the United Kingdom.

The specific proposals under consideration would, it is understood, affect almost one third of the dutiable imports into the United States, and some of the more general measures which are being advocated would have still more widespread effects. The imposition of restrictions on this scale would have the most serious repercussions on the interests of the United States' trading partners. Protectionist measures in the United States cannot fail to generate strong pressure on other Governments to take similar action. In the United Kingdom there have long been pressures to limit imports from the United States, including in some parts of the agricultural sector which could be supplied from domestic sources. If the access of British exports to the United States were to be impaired as a result of the introduction of new import restrictions Her Majesty's Government would find it difficult to resist the redoubled and extended pressures with which it would undoubtedly be confronted.

Moreover the United States take so high a proportion of the exports of the world that any significant limitation of their imports must seriously affect the earning power of many countries, including developing countries in particular, and so force them to consider limiting their own imports to protect their balance of payments.

Her Majesty's Government fear that the accumulation of these measures and inevitable counter-measures could well lead the world back to the beggar-my-neighbour policies of the thirties, when nations, by trying to build a wall round their own prosperity, succeeded only in sharing the common depression. It would be a disaster if, less than four months after the conclusion of the Kennedy Round, the United States were to set in train such a process—which, once started, might be almost irreversible.

Her Majesty's Government hope that the United States Government will do everything in their power to preserve the liberal trade policies which for twenty years have contributed so much to economic progress throughout the world, including the United States. They have no wish to resort to restrictive measures themselves. But if the United States were to take measures which impaired the benefits enjoyed by British trade in the United States, Her Majesty's Government, in common with many other Governments, would feel bound to seek the remedies open to them in such a situation under the G.A.T.T. Her Majesty's Government note that the United States Government at present have no powers to negotiate compensating tariff concessions and it would therefore appear that other countries would be driven to seek compensation by means which would inevitably inflict damage on U.S. interests.

Her Majesty's Government trust that due regard will be paid to the foregoing considerations in the formulation of United States law and policy.

U.S.-AIDED PLANT FAILS IN INDIA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is now revealed that in putting together the scheme that allowed a Minneapolis firm—Napco Industries—to unload its wornout, obsolete gear manufacturing plant at the expense of the American taxpayers—the AID agency allowed this firm the unbelievable privilege of naming the inspector who was to look at this machinery before shipment overseas.

It will be recalled that Napco set up a corporation in India to buy its debt-ridden gear plant in Detroit, then got the AID people to put up $2.3 million for what the General Accounting Office later discovered was "junk."

It will also be recalled that one of the central figures in this wheeler-dealer operation was Max M. Kampelman, the longtime intimate friend and associate of then Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY who, in turn, was the longtime friend of Napco Industries' president.

But, Mr. Speaker, given even these close political ties enjoyed by Napco Industries, it is shocking and outrageous that a Government agency would permit Napco to name the inspector who was to insure that the machinery involved was in good condition.

There is even more involved in this sorry manipulation than most people know, and I include here, for the RECORD, the latest chapter, in the form of a report appearing in the Washington Post:

REPORT IMPLICATES NAPCO: U.S.-AIDED PLANT FAILS IN INDIA

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

NEW DELHI.—Some American businessmen and their Indian partners have deprived this nation of needed parts for trucks, tractors and jeeps, according to a report filed with the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) here.

Napco Industries of Minneapolis is blamed for selling the Indians nearly worthless tools for several million dollars, in a deal financed by AID. The local collaborators are charged with milking their plant to profit other interests, putting numerous relatives on the payroll and wasting funds on comfortable rent-free lodgings.

This is the balance shed on Napco Bevel Gear of India, Ltd., according to AID officials. The deal has attracted attention because the American firm's lawyer is Max Kampelman, prominent Washington Democrat. President Johnson chose Kampelman as chairman of Washington's new City Council but Kampelman declined when he learned he would have to give up his private practice.

Kampelman represented Napco to obtain a $2.3 million loan from AID in 1962, officials say.

[Kampelman himself says the negotiations for the loan were handled by a Washington engineering firm which he retained for Napco.]

NATION LOSES

AID records show that Kampelman also came here in 1961 to conclude arrangements with local officials and businessmen.

The big losers, officials here say, are the Indian people, who several years ago should have had a plant producing gears, axles and other parts for vehicle motors. The plant should be saving India's scarce foreign exchange, that now must be spent for these parts.

Instead, the country has inherited a factory in Faradibad, 20 miles south of New Delhi, a trickle of production and several lawsuits. The plant has been shut down since last April.

Experts from AID say that a useful asset can still be salvaged. When the law suits are settled and if more money can be found, they say a profitable plant will be in production.

"A BILL OF GOODS"

The story, put together by AID and the report of their private engineer consultant, Harry H. Whittingham, goes like this:

A local Coca-Cola distributor, P. L. Kapoor, went to the United States in search of a manufacturing partner. He found Kampelman's Napco and, in the words of the Whittingham Report, was "sold a bill of goods."

He agreed to buy Napco's gear-making machines, which were to be reconditioned or rebuilt for early use. AID dollars were loaned to Kapoor to pay Napco.

The Whittingham Report says Napco kept the best machines for its American plant and failed to recondition properly any of the tools shipped to India.

Only 10 to 15 per cent of these machines will ever service the Indian plant, the report estimates. It calls the appraisal made of the worth "a fantastic overstatement of value" and says "someone should answer for this useless and flagrant waste of money which has destroyed" the Indian concern.

COSTLY REPAIRS

Napco of India was forced to recondition its equipment here, where parts are short and good mechanics scarce. This ate up time and money and prevented the firm from meeting the demand from local vehicle producers. AID poured in another $1.6 million, this time in rupees. Indian banks, money lenders and suppliers also gave substantial credits.

The Whittingham Report says that Napco's Indian partners realized "they had made a bad deal," so they "resorted to schemes to get their money back."

The document says the Indians set up dummy firms that overcharged the plant, built a guest house with servants and a car for their rent-free use, and padded the payroll with friends and relations. AID officials claim that all this, plus the handsome salaries drawn by the local directors, covered their investment five times over.

RUPEE LOANS LOST

AID has lost its rupee loan. Its $2.3 million loan was guaranteed by the State of Punjab, so this money can be recovered for American taxpayers.

Last April AID called in its loan because Napco was not meeting its payments. The plant's meager output was shut off.

The company is now embroiled in at least four separate suits involving the American partners, the Indian businessmen, the Punjab National Bank, the Punjab government and AID.

But AID officials are confident that Indian courts will eventually deliver a favorable decision. Then, they believe, the Punjab State or some other government agency can take over the plant and make it work. AID experts here insist that they are now protected against another deal like Napco. They are armed with mechanical engineers who can inspect equipment before it is delivered, marketing specialists who can determine the demand for a project's goods and supervisors to insure that Indian businessmen are fulfilling their pledges. Most important, the Napco affair has taught AID not to release at once the entire sum it is lending, but to dole out dollars piecemeal as each step of a project is completed.

NAPCO OFFERS TO REOPEN PLANT IN INDIA

A spokesman for Napco in Minneapolis said in a telephone interview yesterday that the firm "has dealt openly and in good faith throughout . . . and has lived up to every one of its commitments."

The company spokesman added that "the economic failure of the project was not related in the condition of the machinery." Napco, he said, "has always been and is willing to cooperate with AID and any reputable Indian manufacturer to reopen the Indian plant."

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that Congress get to the very bottom of this mess. The AID agency has been in business for 20 years, and yet it has no more sense of responsibility than to allow a company to appoint its own inspectors. This deal smacks of incompetence, fraud, or both, and every single person involved in it should be hauled on the carpet and made to explain his role in it.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I had the opportunity to speak to a luncheon group in Quincy, Ill., and after my remarks, which inevitably dealt with the Vietnam war, one of the women present stood up and asked me what I was doing about the war. I responded, saying that I did not want to seem discouraged or partisan, but that I doubted much would change in respect to war policy until we have another Presidential inauguration. Her response to that was:

> That is not good enough. I have a son in Vietnam and Presidential inauguration day in 1969 is too far off for both of us.

In my opinion, this lady was quite within her rights in challenging her Congressman to state what he was doing about the Vietnam war, because it touched so intimately her life, and, of course, the war resulted entirely from Federal policy. In a word, the 56 House Members who have joined me up to the present time in support of House Concurrent Resolution 508 are taking this means of doing something themselves about the Vietnam war.

If the present casualty rate continues, at least 13,000 Americans will be killed and 100,000 others injured between now and the inaugural ceremony in January, 1969.

Our men in Vietnam cannot adjourn the war—and I do not think the Congress should adjourn until it has dealt squarely with the question of war policy.

This bipartisan resolution calls on Congress to decide if further legislative action is desirable in regard to U.S. policy in Southeast Asia. Through it the Congress could hear and debate present policy and alternatives to it.

Now and then I hear it said that there is no realistic alternative to what we are now doing in Vietnam. On the contrary, ideas on how to resolve the Vietnam dilemma are plentiful. I have with me a list of 27 separate alternatives to present policy, or parts thereof. To the best of my knowledge each is entirely different from anything tried by the administration. None corresponds directly to any of the 28 separate peace plans which the Secretary of State says the United States has supported.

Most of these ideas originated on Capitol Hill. They could form the appropriate starting point for Congress great debate on what to do about Vietnam. In response to my request, 66 House Members—49 Republicans and 17 Democrats—forwarded their ideas.

In my view the Congress must not adjourn until it has dealt directly with this fundamental question. The country is literally torn and tormented over the war. And, reflecting on the events here a week ago, we really should not be too surprised when some people who feel strongly about the war conclude that they must take matters into their own hands. All too few in positions of responsibility are seriously considering alternatives to current policy. All too many seem to be waiting for the next election.

This is not to condone the violence or the tactics of anti-Vietnam demonstrations. Rather, it is to say that Congress has a responsibility—one which it has not yet met—to discuss and decide basic policy.

In all candor, the Congress itself must assume much of the blame for the uneasiness over the war. We have not done our duty. We have let things drift. We have not made a fundamental decision on war policy. And because of this neglect, the country has been denied a powerful unifying influence.

Better late than never.

Here are the 27 summarized alternatives:

ALTERNATIVES TO PRESENT VIETNAM POLICY

1. Transfer of military operations to the South Vietnamese, use of U.S. forces to secure easily-defensible areas, gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops, cessation of bombing of North Vietnam, economic development program for Southeast Asia, meeting of Geneva Powers to discuss settlement based on unified Vietnam with free and open elections. Sponsor: Rep. Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.)

2. "Take all military measures involving the use of nonatomic weapons as are necessary to secure a complete and rapid military victory in the struggle in Vietnam." (H. Con. Res. 527) Sponsor: Rep. Olin Teague (D-Tex.)

3. "The United States should withdraw all its armed forces and war materiel from South Vietnam as rapidly as possible after due notice to our allies similarly engaged, leaving only advisory personnel." (H. Con. Res. 528) Sponsor: Rep. Olin Teague (D-Tex.) (Mr. Teague also introduced H. Con. Res. 526: "The United States should continue its present conduct of the struggle in Vietnam, including the selective bombing of sites in North Vietnam intended to minimize the strength of the offensive from North Vietnam.")

4. The G.R.I.D. plan for a U.S. initiative toward the mutual de-escalation of the conflict through reciprocal steps leading to the end of North Vietnamese or Viet Cong military activities. Sponsor: Rep. F. Bradford Morse (R-Mass.) and eight House colleagues.

5. A confederal strategy, under which the U.S. would negotiate directly with village leaders, recognizing decentralized traditions in South Vietnam in order to reduce insurgency. Sponsor: The Ripon Society, Cambridge, Mass.

6. Refer legal issues in the war to the International Court of Justice for adjudication; if other parties do not assent, ask U.N. General Assembly for advisory opinion on legal issues. (H. Con. Res. 586) Sponsor: Rep. Paul Findley (R-Ill.)

7. A complete and total cessation of all U.S. bombing of North Vietnam. Sponsor: Sen. John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.) and many others.

8. An additional pause in the bombing of North Vietnam as an initiative toward negotiations or de-escalation. Sponsor: Life Magazine and many others.

9. Concentration of the bombing of North Vietnam against the infiltration routes in the southern region of that country as an

initiative toward negotiations or de-escalation. Sponsor: Gov. George Romney (R-Mich.)

10. A heavier concentration of U.S. airpower against significant military targets in North Vietnam. Sponsor: Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich.) and many others.

11. Reduction in the flow of supplies to the port at Haiphong through bombing, mining, or quarantine. Sponsor: The Joint Chiefs of Staff; the National Republican Coordinating Committee; and many others.

12. An economic embargo against North Vietnam with potential sanctions against any government which permits trade with Hanoi. (H. Con. Res. 286) Sponsor: Rep. Albert W. Watson (R-S.C.)

13. A pause in all U.S. military action in North and South Vietnam to test North Vietnamese interest in a cease-fire—after which, if rejected by Hanoi the U.S. would be free to take any military action necessary to end the war. Sponsor: Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.)

14. An indefinite cessation of all offensive military action by the U.S. including bombing in North Vietnam and search and destroy operations in South Vietnam. Sponsor: Sen. Thruston B. Morton (R-Ky.)

15. The concentration and limitation of U.S. military activities in South Vietnam to efforts necessary to establish and secure enclaves within which South Vietnamese stability can be maintained. Sponsor: Lt. General James M. Gavin, USA (ret.)

16. A unilateral cease-fire by United States forces, with orders to fire only if fired upon, combined with an appeal for the reconvening of the Geneva Powers. Sponsor: Rep. George E. Brown, Jr. (D-Calif.)

17. No further American troops to Vietnam until South Vietnam has proved its willingness to undertake a larger share of its own defense. Sponsor: Sen. Edward W. Brooke (R-Mass.)

18. A massive program of economic and social reforms by the South Vietnamese. Sponsor: Rep. Brock Adams (D-Wash.), Rep. Theodore R. Kupferman (R-N.Y.), and many others.

19. Willingness to negotiate with the National Liberation Front and to accept their participation in a coalition government in South Vietnam. Sponsor: Sen. Robert F. Kennedy (D-N.Y.) and many others.

20. An offer of peace with amnesty to the Vietcong. Sponsor: Gov. George Romney (R-Mich.)

21. The concept of neutralization of Southeast Asia as an ultimate objective of U.S. policy. Sponsor: Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.)

22. A U.S. initiative to define a time and a place when and where an allied representative would be prepared to start negotiations, accompanied by a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam—after which, if Hanoi did not cooperate, all previous U.S. restraints in the exercise of the war could be reviewed. Sponsor: Rep. Paul Findley (R-Ill.), Rep. James Gardner (R-N.C.), and others.

23. Regional solution to regional problems. Sponsor: Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.) and many others.

24. Concerted U.S. efforts to convince the United Nations to encourage or define a settlement. Sponsors: Sen. Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.), Rep. Herbert Tenzer (D-N.Y.) and others.

25. Seal off DMZ by means of nuclear land mines. Sponsor: Rep. Craig Hosmer (R-Calif.)

26. No further expansion of trade and education and cultural exchanges with Soviet bloc governments unless they end support for North Vietnam. (H. Con. Res. 210). Sponsor: Rep. Melvin R. Laird.

I am gratified that today there are a number of distinguished Members of this body who are spending some additional time on the floor today, after a busy legislative day, to deal with this question of Vietnam policy and the role of the Congress in regard to it. I know several Members have timetables. They have to catch planes, so I will be glad to give precedence to such Members if they would like to have time at this point.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for taking this special order to point up the purpose behind this resolution, which I did cosponsor.

I should like to point out something else in line with this, being the ranking Republican on the select committee appointed to consider the organization of the Congress. This committee held two hearings, for almost 2 years, and reported back a bill.

One of the subjects we did not develop very much—and I wanted to see it developed a great deal more—was on the power of Congress to declare war. I felt that a great many of the problems this Nation faced in the Korean war lay in the failure of the Congress to assume the responsibilities I believe the Constitution places on the Congress in respect to the power of declaring war.

There was same testimony before the committee. One of our colleagues who joined in this resolution, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD], did some excellent work on this area of the question of the responsibility of the Congress to declare war.

The distinction between the power to wage war and the power to declare war is an important one. Most of the people who wrote the Constitution had personal experience, and somewhat bitter, as to the attempt to wage a war through a committee, the Continental Congress. There was unanimity in the Constitutional Convention, as nearly as we can reconstruct it, that the power to wage war should be vested in the Executive.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me our forefathers very carefully distinguished between the power to wage war and the power to decide the fundamental question of whether to go to war.

Mr. CURTIS. Exactly. This was what I was seeking to develop by bringing out this point.

They created the President, and among other responsibilities they gave him that of being Commander in Chief, so that it would not be a committee waging war if we ever had to engage in war again. But they were just as careful, if not more careful, to vest in the Congress of the United States, the representatives of the people, the power to declare war.

I would argue that the present Executive, far from seeking to help the Congress assume these necessary responsibilities in respect to declaring war, has presented matters to this Congress over a period of years in a way designed so that Congress would not exercise its power, or in a way to limit or discourage the Congress from assuming this responsibility.

The situation now is much like that of the Korean war, so far as our citizens are concerned. The gentleman mentioned a lady in his district. This has happened, I daresay, to all of us. Certainly it has happened to me.

In the Korean war people were wondering what we were fighting about. Even our soldiers in Korea were asking this question.

One reason, of course, was there had never been a national debate on the subject. A dialog had never been developed.

This is one of the functions of Congress, the study and deliberative body in the society. Congress must perform it. We do this in public hearings, and hopefully the news media will report what these deliberations constitute.

We did not do that in the Korean war, and here I believe we are finding the same problem, as the gentleman points out, in regard to Vietnam.

Mr. FINDLEY. We have a problem before us today which I daresay our forefathers did not anticipate; that is, what is the proper role of the Congress in the event the country finds itself in a war without any prior fundamental decision made by the Congress. In such an event, what is the proper constitutional thing for us to do?

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], on October 10, offered a series of three concurrent resolutions.

He did so without any publicity, so far as I know, but in my view he made a very extraordinary and useful contribution to our problem in solving the Vietnam dilemma. He presented to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs three different legislative proposals. Each of them proposed a different course of action to deal with Vietnam. Of course, I should not speak for the gentleman from Texas. He is here and will speak for himself, but I daresay that he had somewhat the same feeling that I have had these past 6 or 8 months or year; namely, that because the Congress never faced up to the fundamental question of what to do with regard to Vietnam, the country therefore has been denied a powerful, unifying influence which would help to clarify the national will and purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield to me on that?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes. I should be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I certainly agree with your expression of what the gentleman from Texas intended. I am one who, on the basis of all the homework I have been able to do, thinks we are right in standing firm against Communist aggression in Vietnam. The tragedy, though, is we have not engaged in the public dialog in the Congress for the benefit of ourselves and for the people whom we represent.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas and really appreciate his being here today to take part in what I think is a very important discussion.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like for the RECORD to show what my three resolutions say:

H. CON. RES. 526

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should continue its present conduct of the struggle in Vietnam, including the selective bombing of sites in North Vietnam intended to minimize the strength of the offensive from North Vietnam.

H. CON. RES. 527

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should take all military measures involving the use of nonatomic weapons as are necessary to secure a complete and rapid military victory in the struggle in Vietnam.

H. CON. RES. 528

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should withdraw all its armed forces and war materiel from South Vietnam as rapidly as possible after due notice to our allies similarly engaged, leaving only advisory personnel.

It seems to me that our Government has three choices, and it seems to me that those are the three choices. Further, it seems to me that our so-called great debate or dialog should have taken place on the Tonkin resolution. We passed this resolution in Congress, and the executive branch interprets it as giving the President the power to do what he has done. Very frankly, it is easy to be a quarterback on Monday morning, but if we have done this and given the President this authority, then I introduced these resolutions to give any man in Congress who wants to send his constituents something so that they can know where he stands—I introduced these so he can do just that. I would like to have the RECORD show where I stand on them. I am for the resolution that says it is the sense of Congress that the United States should take all military measures involving the use of nonatomic weapons as are necessary to secure a complete and rapid military victory in the struggle in Vietnam.

That is exactly my position on Vietnam. Certainly I believe in this. I certainly believe, as the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars said in South Dakota recently, in Redfield, that what we need to try now is to keep away from irresponsible dissent to demonstrate our strength of purpose and spirit. I do not consider this irresponsible dissent, but I consider what happened in Washington the other weekend certainly as irresponsible dissent.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would the gentleman say in the event the Congress saw fit to pass his middle-of-the-road resolution, if I may use that term, the one which approves present policy, would the gentleman feel this action by the Congress, even though not exactly what the gentleman would prefer, would still have a salutary effect on the Nation and strengthen the President's hand?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes, I think it would. I am not a lawyer, first of all, and certainly I am not a constitutional lawyer, but since the executive branch and the Commander in Chief have determined that the Tonkin resolution gave him this power, it seems Congress is very late in speaking up and wanting to change its mind on what should be done or not be done in Vietnam.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] very much and I appreciate his staying here for the purpose of engaging in this colloquy.

I am sure that all of us are aware of the fact that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] spoke out just recently with his own viewpoints with reference to Vietnam, viewpoints which were widely publicized and which have evoked a great deal of discussion not only at the Capitol but throughout the United States.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am more than pleased to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], for the purpose of his taking part in this discussion.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] and my other colleagues who are participating today in this discussion of our Nation's policy in Southeast Asia. Many constructive suggestions have been made concerning our military involvement there. Some I consider unwise; others impractical. But all are important and deserve attention.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for the Congress to reassert its historic role in the foreign affairs of this country. We live today in the age of the strong Executive, the initiator and innovator, the doer, the free agent, the architect of grand international designs. That we have made of the Presidency something more than the passive figure of Woodrow Wilson's schooldays is good, and the country is better for the change. But that the Congress has been transformed into an entity only slightly less passive than Rutherford B. Hayes is a turn of events neither helpful to the Executive nor in the best interests of the country. As far as foreign affairs are concerned I feel strongly that the Congress plays a too passive role today, and I believe the country is the worse for it.

The bipartisan resolution to consider the possibility of further congressional action with respect to Southeast Asia is one which deserves serious consideration, and it might afford an opportunity for the Congress to demonstrate once again that it has more than a rubber-stamp function to perform in foreign affairs.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, the Congress is involved in foreign affairs only after actions have been taken, commitments made, obligations assumed. The membership of neither house is consulted more than superficially in advance of great decisions. The congressional function in all too many cases has been reduced to ceremonial blessing of accomplished facts.

Through adoption of the bipartisan resolution and subsequent consideration of the many proposals being discussed today I believe the Congress might well help the President find a way out of our dilemma in Vietnam and an avenue to more secure peace in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, we shall be called upon either during this session of Congress or during the early part of the next session of Congress to appropriate additional funds for the conduct of the war in Vietnam through, perhaps, a supplemental appropriation bill. Those who are opposed, in part, to the further costs which are involved and for which appropriations will be made have a choice of either voting "yes" or "no" thereon. Therefore, if one votes "no" on the appropriation request you will be saying something which I do not believe you will want to say; that is, when our country has drafted young men and has sent them to Vietnam to fight, or when our country is and has been using career troops, shall we deny them the very best in ammunition, helicopters, and the other of the various military equipment?

In other words, if one votes for it, some people will interpret that vote as saying that you approve everything that has been done with reference to the conduct of the war in Vietnam. It is as though a doctor were called to look at a patient and to vote whether in his opinion the patient is sick or completely well. So, there is a great difference existing between being sick and well, and this is the point of the discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I will say the time has come, as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] has suggested, for the Congress to reassert its role in the conduct of the foreign affairs of our country, but not in such a manner as to take away any power that the President presently has.

Mr. Speaker, we live today in the age of the strong Executive, one who initiates and innovates. We have made the Presidency something more than it was when Woodrow Wilson complained some 50 years ago about the fact of the President being shorn of power and of that power residing in the Congress.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been lacking in this field, a field that has very much power and importance, and a field in which I would like to see it play a far more important part.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would the distinguished gentleman from Arizona agree with me that the Congress is asserting a smaller role than was prescribed for it by the Constitution?

Mr. UDALL. Precisely. That is why I say that this is a healthy step which is being taken here today, a step taken in a bipartisan manner, to develop what our role should be. Further, it is my opinion that if we could have a debate here on the various resolutions—and if there are opportunities for Members to offer amendments to any of the resolutions, because I personally do not accept any one of the three as indicated, but I could accept one of them with some appropriate amendments. Thereby at least then the country would know that the Congress of the United States had debated this question and had taken a position thereon. In my opinion this approach would help to unify the country and it would lay to rest some of the unhappy thoughts that the people of the United States feel with reference to this situation.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Arizona feel that this fundamental, decisionmaking by the Congress is of such magnitude today that we should deal with it before we adjourn this session of the Congress?

Mr. UDALL. Oh, I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Illinois. I think it is long overdue. I think we should have dealt with this question long months ago.

Here we spent all day today on a bill on extra-long-staple cotton. While cotton intimately involves the lives and fortunes of a fraction of our population, the war in Vietnam involves not only the lives of our young men and the fortunes of everyone, but the future course of our Nation and perhaps the world.

It is the overriding issue of today. It is the overriding issue that one meets in the gentleman's district and in my own district, and in every State, and yet I cannot recall hearing more than 15, 20, or 30 minutes' of speaking in the House Chamber in the last month, although we do get 1-minute speeches at times in the early part of the day wherein some of the Members express their particular points of view. But there has never been a dialog or discussion or attempt to resolve and define the position of the House of Representatives on this war.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will be glad to.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe it is very important that a debate conducted in the well of the House, whether it is in the Committee of the Whole, or however, must be preceded by committee hearings where people who have different viewpoints are permitted to present them under cross-examination. Hopefully the news media would report the cross-examination along with the original prepared document which usually has a press release accompanying it, whether it is an administrative official who makes the presentation, or it is someone from the public. But certainly to have a meaningful dialog the appropriate committees of the Congress should be conducting these public hearings.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would that not be the proper way in which various points of view could be presented, discussed, debated, and disposed of?

Mr. CURTIS. Exactly. That is our duty. The nature of the Congress, as I have often said, is that of a study and deliberative body designed to gather the knowledge and wisdom that exists in the society and to apply this to its problems in order to make the decisions. We need to engage in this activity a lot more that we have.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman I am sure has noted that a committee of citizens, including former President Eisenhower, and former Senator Douglas, and others, is being formed for the purpose of studying alternatives to present policies in Vietnam. And here, if they would use the legislative procedure that we have, these people could be brought before the appropriate subcommittee or committees, and their ideas explored thoroughly, just as the ideas of other Members of this body could be explored.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I would like to be the devil's advocate for a moment.

I have read the figures of the administration published by Under Secretary of State Mr. Katzenbach, and perhaps others appearing in the other body, who have taken a position that the Congress believes the Gulf of Tonkin resolution of 1964 was adequate. Otherwise the appropriate committees of the Congress would be considering rescinding the Gulf of Tonkin resolution and replacing it with another.

I am wondering if, in the light of the comments of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], we might have some discussion here today, because I happen to agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] that such is vitally necessary in the Congress, that we might have some discussion of the method by which we might deal with the relevancy of the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin resolution to the situation we find ourselves in in October and early November of 1967.

Mr. FINDLEY. A lot of lengthy and worthwhile debate could occur on this very point. I believe reasonable people could come to different conclusions as to the scope of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. But for my part I interpret it as consisting of two items, one dealing with repulsion of an attack on two U.S. naval vessels, a repulsion that had already been completed at the time the Congress discussed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

Mr. MACGREGOR. If the gentleman will yield further on that point, it was a ratification of an act in retaliation ordered by the Commander in Chief.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman has stated it correctly.

The other part dealt with the broader idea, based on the terms of the SEATO Treaty, in the event of an armed attack on any member nation or protocol state. The SEATO Treaty provides very clearly that constitutional process shall be followed. The legislative history of the SEATO Treaty shows clearly also that "constitutional process" was intended to mean actual formal consultation between the Executive and the Congress.

The Secretary of State said that in the event consultation was needed, the Congress would be called back into session. In other words, it would not simply be a matter of calling up the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs or a couple of other key people in the Congress. Congress would be called into session.

Also, this part of the Tonkin resolution, based as it was on the SEATO Treaty, had the requirement that a finding of armed attack must be made before consultation occurs on what military measures may be used.

The finding of armed attack from the north against the south was not made until 6 or 7 months after the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. So I think it is reasonable that people might conclude that this resolution did not give adequate authority to carry forward with military policies as they have been carried forward by the President.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to congratulate my colleague for taking this time.

I am glad to see Members in this Chamber discussing our commitment in Vietnam. But I would have to respectfully dissent from the statement made by my good colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, whom I respect very highly.

There has been a great deal of discussion with reference to this country's participation and commitment to Vietnam.

The very subject of discussion now, the Tonkin Bay resolution, was thoroughly debated here in the House and approved by a unanimous vote, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. FINDLEY. I must say to the gentleman that almost every word of testimony dealing with the Gulf of Tonkin resolution dealt with the attack against two U.S. naval vessels and almost nothing with the other part of the resolution.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman will recall that the Tonkin Bay resolution very clearly mandated or instructed the President of the United States to use all resources including armed force to protect our interest and the interest of our allies in Vietnam.

Mr. FINDLEY. But the same sentence to which the gentleman refers in his comments just made also included reference to the SEATO Treaty which, in turn, required constitutional process, process which was not completely fulfilled. So there was a flaw in the procedure and because of this flaw Congress has never squarely faced the question of going into South Vietnam with combat forces and getting on with the war.

Mr. PUCINSKI. On that point I just want to make it clear that not only was the Tonkin Bay resolution unanimously adopted by this Chamber but there were only two dissenting votes in the other body.

We have had since then a tremendous dialog here on Vietnam, on the various military appropriation bills, on the military authorization bills and there has been a great deal of discussion here.

The gentleman from Arizona said:

> Well, with the exception of a few 1-minute speeches, we have not had any significant debate on Vietnam.

I have to dissent from that statement. I think the RECORD will show that there have been countless hours of discussion not only on actual bills before the House and on the rules on those bills, and on authorization bills and appropriation bills in general debate and under the 5-minute rule, but I would also invite my colleagues to examine and read the special orders where Members have spoken on this subject.

It is unfortunate that those of us who do support the President in Vietnam and do bring these discussions to the floor by addressing the House under special orders that there are not more Members here who could either support our views or challenge our views.

But every Member in this Chamber sets his own pace and his own course and I am not about to tell any other Member of the Congress how they ought to spend their time.

I merely take this opportunity to say that it would be inconsistent with the facts to suggest here in this Chamber now that somehow we are committed to Vietnam and that the President is doing everything he can to win this war in Vietnam without sufficient debate by the Congress. Surely, this has been a subject of intensive discussion on both sides of the aisle ever since we have been committed to the cause of freedom in Vietnam.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I see several of my colleagues on their feet seeking recognition and at this time instead of responding to the statement just made by my colleague with which I disagree, I will yield first to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and then to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE], my colleague in this enterprise, and then the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] and then the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER]. I hope that that is an agreeable arrangement.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those who call for a repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, but I would ask the gentleman from Illinois who just spoke if he would recall for us how much debate there was on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in 1964.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If my memory serves me correctly, I believe that was a privileged resolution and, under the rule, was entitled to 1 hour of debate.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. That is precisely correct. There was 1 hour of debate on what seems to me to be one of the most vital issues that has ever been before this House.

Mr. PUCINSKI. So that the record does not show there was no other consideration than the 1 hour of debate, I believe there was extensive testimony before the committee. Every Member of Congress had an opportunity to appear before that committee. So far as I know, no Member was foreclosed from appearing before the committee and making all the statements and all the allegations for or against the resolution that he wanted to.

So I would not want the gentleman to construe the parliamentary rules of this Chamber as in some way constituting a limitation on the fact that the Congress of the United States did not consider the Gulf of Tonkin resolution with both eyes open, fully aware of its content.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Nor would I want the gentleman to suggest that the debate that might take place on an appropriation measure is the kind of debate that is necessary in the formulation of national policy in connection with this most serious problem that faces us as a nation.

I would also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that times and circumstances have changed considerably in the past 3 years. I would remind the gentleman that at the time the Gulf of Tonkin resolution came before this body there were in the field in Vietnam something in the vicinity of 16,000 American troops. Now we have almost six times as many casualties in Vietnam as there were men in the field in August 1964.

I would also remind the gentleman that at the present time there are 123 Members serving in this 90th Congress who have never had an opportunity formally to pass upon a resolution such as that under which the President operates.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I have the floor. Other Members would like to have an opportunity to speak. After I have yielded to them, I will return to you at the earliest moment.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I might make another point, if I may?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. The attitude of the gentleman from Illinois and others of us who are speaking today is not one of criticizing the administration; it is not one of endorsing the administration's posture. It is merely to remind the Members of this body and the Members of the other body that the Congress of the United States has a significant role and a great responsibility in the formulation of national policy. As the gentleman from Missouri pointed out earlier, it is a constitutional responsibility. Almost 60 Members of this body recognize that perhaps some further congressional action might be in order.

In view of that fact, it would be appropriate for the leadership on the majority side—and I am pleased to see the distinguished Speaker of the House in attendance at this time, and there is no greater American than he—to recognize the deep concern many of us have in discharging the responsibilities which we have as a body and as individual Members of this body.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE].

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am one of the 100 Members who was not a Member at the time the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was agreed to. I am one of those who do not regard that method of procedure as an appropriate method constitutionally for committing in excess of 500,000 men and $3 billion a month to Vietnam. I would say the commitment of perhaps 50,000 men and a $1 million or so a month might be necessary in some instances, for I recognize there are certain scale emergencies that must be hastily dealt with. But it seems to me that when we reach the scope of the present operation, the Congress should be called into play again.

The Rules of the House have been referred to. Under the appropriations procedure, if I understand correctly—and I hope I will be corrected; I am sure I will be if I am wrong—in the consideration of an appropriations measure it is out of order to put legislation into an appropriation bill. So I do not see how we can get any legislative history or support out of an appropriation measure. It would force you to vote against activities that you might not be against. If you oppose any phase of the operation, you would be voting against funds for the armed services in every part of the globe. I think there are few Members, as the record would indicate, who would want ported that.

Others have urged that we have voted on a draft bill since that resolution was before the Congress. Some of us supported that.

That would indicate support of that proposition. I think nothing of the kind. I think our armed services and the policy of maintaining a strong America is an entirely separate one from the incidental conflicts in which we find ourselves.

I would hate to say support of an appropriation measure or a draft bill would be an indication of supporting the war in Vietnam, any more than supporting funds for safe streets and a crime bill would represent support of occasional police brutality. I think they are not related. They are separate issues.

One of the greatest problems facing our country today—and I see some experts on our fiscal situation here—is the deficit we face, said to be approximately $29 billion, and the problem of the tax increase said to be facing this Congress. To me they are inextricably wrapped up in our situation in Vietnam. It is said we are spending perhaps $3 billion a month in Vietnam. That would be $36 billion a year in Vietnam. If we take that out, we do not have a deficit, and the other problems become a great deal simpler.

So I think it is essential we discuss this problem that is so interrelated and so fundamental to the solution of the other problems we are facing.

On the other hand, I would like to see the depth of support or lack of support in America for our position in Vietnam. Present policy is that if a marine is wounded three times in Vietnam, he is automatically entitled to a transfer. On the other hand, we have people who are opposing a 10-percent tax increase. My mail is that way—I could say almost unanimously. As I tried to indicate before, to me these things are intertwined and unavoidably intermingled. I cannot understand how one man's share in this war in Vietnam is three wounds, if he is still lucky enough to be alive, and someone else will not be contributing anything—even in the way of a tax increase.

If our people do not want this involvement, this is the body where we should find it out, and we should find out the depth of our commitment. I have great confidence when voices on this side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle finally work out a problem. Perhaps it will be something not of my choice and perhaps not that of the gentleman in the well, but that way it will be the American way, and the whole people will feel much better satisfied.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I promised to yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], and to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], and to the list I will add the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I say first of all, before we start off on that, I think it would be very helpful if Members would say what they are for and what they are against. So far, I am not sure I know where anybody stands. We are in a war, whether we like it or not. What we do in the future is important. I think Members should state where they stand.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

That is important. In connection with this special order, I have appended to it a listing on which I have placed in capsule form 27 different ideas about how to deal with the Vietnam problem. I happen to be the author of several of them, so naturally, those are the courses I prefer. But we have represented here today other ideas, including ideas from the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], to whom I now yield.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, others want to be heard, so I will be brief. Let me make three or four quick points.

The gentleman puts his finger on one of the interesting aspects of this situation as contrasted with other wars. In the Korean war we voted, in a period of about 2 years, $14 billion worth of tax increases. They went sailing through, with hardly any opposition. In terms of today's gross national product and our present production, it would take $36 billion of tax increases to have the same impact on the American economy.

Can anyone conceive of this Congress considering—let alone voting—a tax increase like that?

This suggests a feeling of frustration on the part of the American public and what the American public thinks of this war—at least on its present level.

Mr. Speaker, I may have misled my friend from Illinois in suggesting that this war is not discussed here. It is, all the time. However, I am not talking about just conversation. I am talking about a debate that leads to a vote that would indicate whether a Member supports the policy, whether he wants a different policy, or a tougher policy, or some other kind of policy. This is the kind of debate, the absence of which I deplore. This is the kind of debate we should be facing in the respective committees and in the House.

The gentleman from Massachusetts made most of the points I wanted to make about the difference between 1964 and 1967. I was here. I voted for this. But was there a Member in the Chamber at that time who thought he was voting for 500,000 troops and $30 billion a year, when we had something like 15,000 or 16,000 troops there at that time? That was not in contemplation by anyone.

Finally, we have had about seven crossroads in Vietnam. We had a crossroad with the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. We had a crossroad when President Kennedy first sent advisers there. We had a crossroad when President Johnson first changed to 100,000 troops, and then to 300,000. We are having another big crossroad this year, trying to decide whether we should add another big segment of troops.

I do not believe the President ought to have to run up here every day for permission to conduct additional bombing or to move a set of troops there.

But when we come to the major crossroads, about changing the level, or the tempo, or the character of the war, then at that point we ought to have another debate.

Mr. FINDLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] brought this discussion into focus.

The gentleman from Illinois spoke of having conversation with constituents at home, rather than going to Vietnam to ask what to do about it. I believe there was some kind of discussion as to how we got in there.

The fact is, we are in. We are in. The question is, How are we going to get out? That requires our dedicated discussion and the best this country's brains have to give.

Mr. FINDLEY. May I ask the gentleman what role he sees the Congress assuming in dealing with that very vexing problem?

Mr. HOSMER. I will get to that in just a moment.

Let us see what the issue is as to what to do. I believe again it was synthesized by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] who posed three alternatives in his resolutions:

First. Pull out.

Second. Go along as is.

Third. Escalate up to but not including nuclear weapons.

Somebody might add a fourth, using nuclear weapons. I should like to discuss that in just a moment.

We are at this point deciding these three main questions, and we are not doing as the gentleman from Arizona indicated, that we should be trying to decide how to run a war, sending more troops or fewer troops, more airplanes, or what kind of bombing to engage in.

In the Congress we have to get behind one of these three courses and then go all out for it.

Again I say to the gentleman from Arizona, I believe he is making a vast mistake when he conjures up the thought that the lack of enthusiasm for a tax increase has anything to do with a general feeling about the war. I believe that most of us who have been talking with our constituencies or listening to our constituencies lately have decided that the lack of enthusiasm about the tax increase is concomitant with a lack of enthusiasm about some of the wild spending programs at home, and not related particularly to the war.

If the Congress wants to take the course of recommending, after a long debate, pulling out of this thing, of course that simply will mean the United States lays down, rolls over, and plays dead and is no longer a great power. By example the United States might renege on any other commitment it has made to anybody else any place in the world.

I believe we then would have just about exactly the amount of power, prestige, and influence in the world that we would deserve, if that kind of course is taken.

Now, what about going along as is, slowly escalating, carrying on a vast ground war, bombing things which may or may not be meaningful?

The people downtown—by that I mean the State Department and the White House—have kept telling us that the reason we were moving in on the north with the bombing was, first, to cut down the supplies coming south and, second, to make them miserable enough up there so that they would decide that carrying on their aggressions would be too high a price to pay in relation to what was being done to them for carrying them on.

Well, thus far dropping iron bombs has not either slowed down very much the flow of men and supplies to the south nor has it done much about breaking the will of the north to continue its aggression. That gets us into thinking that if we continue as is, maybe we are using the wrong kind of ammunition or, at least, not mixing in some other kinds of ammunition that could be mixed in.

That gets into the psychological warfare area. As Western people we fail totally to realize the psychology of the Eastern people. As a consequence we have neglected almost entirely a number of psychological warfare weapons which could be employed and might be so effective that they would put the price up so high that these aggressions would cease. This is just a minor discussion, but what about the matter of escalating up to nuclear weapons? The constant argument against that is you will bring in China and the Soviet Union. There has been a certain amount of escalation so far, and neither China nor the Soviet Union have been brought in.

Let us take China first. China is a country that is older than any country on the face of the earth as a cohesive force. It does not bend to external forces. You could do almost anything in the world and the Chinese would not come into the war. You could do almost nothing and, if they decided it was the proper thing for them to do, they would come into the war. So we are not affecting the Chinese choice one way or another. So forget about them when it comes to escalation.

What about the Soviet Union? If we say bombing the port of Haiphong will cause the men in the Kremlin to go down to the button for their ICBM's pushing them off.

I do not believe anybody thinks that is true from any evidence that the Soviet Union has given so far as to their intentions in this war. Also, if anybody reads and listens to the speeches Mr. McNamara gives about the Soviet intentions and how they say they responded to our acts of self-denial, and so forth, then I think you have another reason to say that they would not come in.

That makes the course that the gentleman from Texas recommends look fairly attractive for ending this war in a reasonable length of time. It does not mean you have to go in and bomb Haiphong. There are a lot of ways to go in and close that port without bombing.

One way is this: The port of Haiphong has a long channel, 10 or 11 miles long, which it is necessary to traverse to get into the port. This channel has to be constantly dredged in order to keep enough bottom in it to let ships in and out of the place. Without going into Haiphong at all except to take out the two dredges that have to come alongside the sides of the channel to clean it, take them out, then the channel will fill up and you will have the port closed without touching a Russian ship or any other ship in the harbor and without harming anyone except possibly someone who might be on these North Vietnamese dredges that you are knocking out.

If you start to examine the gentleman from Texas' recommendation, it commences to make some sense. It might satisfy that lady over in Illinois who does not want to see her son over in Vietnam and then, if he comes back have his son after him go there in an endless war. Some of these things have to be brought to a conclusion at some time. Certainly I think the amount of courage that has been displayed by this Nation so far shows that we have the courage and the will to do to carry through. The question then arises do we lack the wisdom to do it? That gets us into the tactics that I have just been discussing. It gets us into these crazy things like happened 3 or 4 weeks ago when Mr. McNamara came back from a meeting of the NATO special group in Turkey and was asked about the Turkish suggestion that nuclear land mines be placed on the Turkish border with the Soviet Union.

And, Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense McNamara's general reply was, "Well, certainly, they are not provocative; they are purely defensive weapons." So, he did not think this to be a wild suggestion. So, then you ask, so what? If they are so nonprovocative on the Soviet border with Turkey, why are they provocative in the DMZ, between North and South Vietnam?

Mr. Speaker, I pose the question: Is the administration intending, on the basis of Mr. McNamara's announcement, to go into some kind of nuclear warfare of a defensive type over there or is it not?

Well, we have not received any reply. It is that argument which raises these unknowns about which the people have to worry and speculate, just like the fact that we have tried to meet our objectives by lying down, rolling over, and playing dead, if we had done so the United States of America, as a major world power, would end.

I hope that our debate and discussion here will proceed along such lines as these which have been proposed here today.

Furthermore, this whole question of Vietnam cannot be discussed rationally without also attempting some speculation on the question:

After Vietnam, what?

Surely we will continue to be dragged into, or stumble into, more situations like Vietnam unless we better define our overseas commitments and our overseas interests than they are today. And let me say, that I, for one, do not believe that every piece of real estate all over the world is vital to U.S. national security.

We should make up our minds what our national interests are, what our basic minimum security needs are, and then tailor our military commitments to them. Since World War II our commitments have been tailored rather to hopes, expectations, aspirations, and even our prayers, rather than to the world as it is and our survival in it. As a consequence we are still pinned down with troops in Germany, we fought a war in Korea and have troops pinned down there, we are fighting in Vietnam and may have to keep troops there indefinitely. This cannot be allowed to happen again and again and again. Yet us give thought to Vietnam. Let us give thought to after Vietnam, too.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I promised to yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] next and I do so now. Then I shall yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me. Also, I wish to commend the gentleman for bringing about this discussion which in my opinion is in the public interest. Also for the implication, if not the suggestion as contained in his remarks, that if Congress chooses to act in a way different to the policy of our country at the present time, that we act in somewhat of a formal manner in order to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how anyone can question the authority of our Government in conducting the war as it is presently being conducted.

First, of course, we have the constitutional powers of the Presidency which have been exercised in more than 100 instances in the history of our country. A close parallel to the action which is now being conducted was carried out by former President Harry Truman who initiated an effort comparable to this in Korea and which for some months at least was carried on by President Eisenhower, without any formal declaration of war on the part of the Congress of the United States or to bring about other than the type of role that the administration has to perform at the present time.

Presently, Mr. Speaker, we have the SEATO Treaty. All of us are familiar with the provisions of that treaty which it is said gives the Government the authority to carry on the operations, to carry out our responsibilities as contained in that treaty. After the adoption of the treaty, there was a special protocol adopted which specifically precluded South Vietnam, which came within the protection of the SEATO Treaty and, third, we have the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that we did not envisage, perhaps, at the time we adopted this treaty and the Gulf of Tonkin Treaty the consequences that might flow from the authority that we clearly granted. But, nevertheless, the words speak for themselves, and they are certainly large enough and broad enough to encompass everything that the Government is doing today.

Mr. Speaker, it places us in a bit of an embarrassing position of saying that we do not know the meaning of the words and the protocol which we adopted here in a free council of this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if there were nothing else, ample authority and approval and ratification occurs and concurs in what our Government is doing in the fact that every act that is being done by the Government of this country is being done under the authority of the Constitution of the United States and of the laws enacted by the Congress. Also, that every dollar that is being expended in this effort is appropriated by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no formal action taken by the Congress inconsistent with the course that our Government is following today.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of debate, especially in the other body, if I may refer to it in that manner, and it is my opinion that pursuant to the authority of the President under the Constitution and under the resolution of the Congress, as well as under the treaty ratified by this Congress and this country, that under the authority granted by the Constitution or by the statutes of this Congress, enacted by this country, enacted by this Congress, and under the appropriations made by the Congress of the United States there is no other course to follow.

Now, it seems to me we all recognize the principle of ratification in the law of agency. I may not authorize an agent to do a certain act, but if he does it on my behalf, and I later ratify it, it is just as binding on me as if I authorized it in the first instance.

If the Congress wishes to choose a different course from that being followed by our Government it may do so. All we have to do is introduce the appropriate resolution or bill, as the case may be, consider it in the appropriate manner, vote on it, and it becomes the action of this Congress.

It has been rather unfortunate that those abroad have tended to construe individual speeches made by individual Members of the Congress as representing the view of the Congress of the United States. We act by resolutions of formal character in this body before we act on anything, other actions are by individual Members.

Mr. FINDLEY. Let me say to the gentleman that I hope he will regard what I have said here today and previously in support of this resolution which is before the gentleman's committee, the distinguished Committee on Rules, that I do not speak in criticism of the President. Whatever criticism is involved in my remarks is directed at the Congress. I am one of the Members of the Congress, and I readily confess my sins of omission in failing to bring this up earlier, and perhaps with greater effect, so I do not criticize the President. I believe there is great genius in our constitutional system, and to the extent that we have departed from it in the decisionmaking in regard to Vietnam, symbolized by neglect on the part of Congress, we have weakened the hand of the President in carrying forward that policy.

So I do appreciate the comments made by the gentleman.

I have been so engrossed with the comments of the various Members here today that I did not realize that our distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], has been attending this discussion. I would like to thank our distinguished Speaker for being with us today, and I would, of course, gladly yield at this time, or any other time, if he would care to make any remarks.

The Speaker has been very considerate always in regard to my service in this House, and I do appreciate his leadership.

Mr. PEPPER. I defer, of course, to our distinguished Speaker, but may I just conclude with this—and again I thank the able gentleman from Illinois, and commend him.

I would say that there can be no possible criticism directed by any Member at any Member who makes the proper inquiry or resolution which is within the scope and the authority of this House. And that is the way we should act.

If we do not like what our Government is doing, if we have given it the authority which should be withdrawn, then instead of getting up and making speeches about it, if I may say so, with due deference to anyone who has a contrary view who would feel strongly enough about it, all we have to do is to draw the appropriate resolution or bill, let it then go through the proper channels, and if it becomes a proper act of this Congress then the Congress has taken a course contrary to that being taken by the Government.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

I must say at this point that I have been tempted to comment on almost all of the statements made here today, but I have restrained myself because I want each to have time to speak. If I had answered each statement, a dialog such as we have had here would have been impossible.

I promised to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois be given an additional 30 minutes on his special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Gonzalez). I should like to advise the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] will have consumed his 1 hour, and his allotted time is up, and there are two other special orders pending.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent that the gentleman be given an additional half hour for his special order. Is there some technical reason why this cannot be done?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, under the rules of the House, the gentleman from Illinois has a special order for 1 hour, and he was recognized for 1 hour at the time he took the floor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Is there any rule of the House that prohibits or precludes a unanimous-consent request so long as the other two Members having special orders do not object and when no one else objects? Is there some rule of the House that precludes a unanimous-consent request that the gentleman be given an additional 30 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules of the House, the gentleman cannot be recognized for more than 1 hour.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 30 minutes under a special order following the conclusion of all other special orders this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, how much time does the gentleman in the well now have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments. It would be rude of me not to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow], but may I ask that it be only for 1 or 2 minutes.

Mr. DOW. Indeed, it will be less than that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I may be able to shed a little light on this parliamentary problem because I have a special order for 30 minutes following the special order of the gentleman from Illinois and it is my purpose to continue the same debate because I have a couple of observations of my own. I shall not take nearly all of the time allotted to me under the special order and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, to either one of the gentlemen from Illinois, so that perhaps they can use some of that time to pursue their thoughts on this subject.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is very kind of the gentleman and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I would like to thank the gentleman for taking this issue up, and I wish the time was sufficient to hear some of the thoughts perhaps of some of the new Members of the Congress regarding this deep subject.

I have been concerned about it, as many of you have. Having been a veteran, a jet pilot in the Korean war, I have some theories and some ideas that I would like to expand on regarding the war in Vietnam; and how it is that we can allow China to continue bringing in the goods and munitions that she is shipping in there and how they go down the Ho Chi Minh trail. As I say, I wish we did have the time and I hope we can continue this tomorrow to discuss this most vital issue that is facing us and facing this Nation today.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I would just like to make reference to some of the comments that the distinguished gentleman from Florida made.

As he pointed out, the proper way that this House should act is in a formal way, by acting on a resolution proposed to the entire body and voted on by the entire body.

I agree entirely that that is precisely what the gentlemen who have joined with the gentleman from Illinois propose, that we do take formal action because it has been 3 years since this body has taken formal action directly on the question.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Illinois referred to me as being in the Chamber during his remarks. I do not want to have the Record stand so that anybody reading it might think the gentleman from Illinois was hurling a challenge at me, which I know he was not; is that not correct?

Mr. FINDLEY. Indeed not, Mr. Speaker, and it was not intended in that way. I mentioned your presence only as a courtesy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then I will ask the gentleman a few questions for the Record.

As I understand the gentleman from Illinois, he does not believe in withdrawing our troops from South Vietnam; is that correct?

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct. That would be a mistake. You have put it very simply, of course, but I assume that you are suggesting a formula such as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague] had in one of his resolutions—and I would not recommend that course of action.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman favor our cessation of bombing of military targets in the north?

Mr. FINDLEY. As to that, the one note of caution that I would give is in respect to the bombing of a rail line which loops between two Chinese Provinces and which forms almost the only line of communication between the Provinces, it would seem to me prudent on our part not to aggravate internal Chinese problems by bombing that rail loop. This is considerably north of Hanoi.

Mr. McCORMACK. So the gentleman does not favor cessation of bombing, with the exception of what he has just stated; that is, broadly speaking?

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct. I must say to the Speaker that I do not pose as a military expert.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am trying to see how much of a disagreement there is. I find very little disagreement on the gentleman's part. He refers to some railroad. But if the military commanders in the field thought action against them was necessary, would the gentleman still adhere to his position?

Mr. FINDLEY. Well, I would want to hear that thoroughly discussed in the hearings before reaching a conclusion, because on the face of it, it does seem to have considerable consequence.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows that you cannot conduct an armed conflict with directions that result from hearings that are going on at the same time?

Mr. FINDLEY. I think the question of bombing rail lines could very well be explored in the executive sessions of congressional committees, and I am sure the Speaker knows that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should like to point out for the RECORD that the Gulf of Tonkin resolution is very clear and explicit. Every Member who voted on that resolution either knew what he was voting on or should have known. If he did not know, that was his own fault. I knew what I was voting on.

Furthermore, many people in good faith misunderstand the relationship under the Constitution of the President of the United States as the Chief Executive of our country and the President as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. I know my friend from Illinois has that distinction clearly in mind. Is that correct?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, I do; indeed.

Mr. McCORMACK. When an emergency or extreme tension confronts our country, the President has extraordinary reserve powers which come into operation in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. FINDLEY. There is no question about that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Lincoln issued the Proclamation of Emancipation without an act of Congress under his emergency powers as Commander in Chief. Lincoln also suspended the writ of habeas corpus under his reserve powers as Commander in Chief. Many other Presidents have done the same thing. You are aware of that, are you not?

Mr. FINDLEY. Of course.

Mr. McCORMACK. So you are not questioning the powers of the President as Commander in Chief in the exercise of his reserve powers when he deems an emergency or a severe situation exists in relation to our country?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, but I believe that reasonable people will disagree as to whether the reserve powers would provide adequate authority, in the absence of other legislation or resolutions of Congress, to proceed as far as he has in Vietnam.

I realize that the President has not based his claim for authority upon the Tonkin resolution. In a press conference he said, if I recall his words correctly, that he could have done what he did without a Tonkin resolution. Indeed, he based his action on the SEATO Treaty, and it is my contention that the SEATO Treaty does require congressional process.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was present at the time. In fact, the President did not need the Tonkin resolution to act if he felt under his reserve powers as Commander in Chief that he had the authority, no more than President Eisenhower needed the Middle East resolution. Eisenhower could have acted in the Middle East without the resolution, but the resolution would show solidarity to the world between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government. So we passed the Middle East resolution. The Middle East resolution is still in existence, is it not?

Mr. FINDLEY. I assume it is.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is. I knew what I was voting for when I voted for the Middle East resolution. I knew what I was voting for when I voted for the Tonkin resolution. In fact, we showed to the whole world that the legislative and executive branches were together in connection with the situations in both cases, one in the Far East and the other in the Middle East.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. (Mr. GONZALEZ). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXERCISE OF CAUTION IN VIETNAM

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOW], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the concern of this Congress for the problem in Vietnam is certainly admirable, and I salute the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] for taking the lead in this debate. The fact that it represents a great concern of a number of Congressman is immensely helpful to prospects for settling the war.

There is one ominous matter, and that is the slow but advancing escalation of the conflict in Vietnam. It is very clear that our Nation is becoming more and more perceptive of the need to modify our policy in Vietnam in the direction of a solution other than by force, and in the direction of reducing the level of the war. I am sure that if this movement is left to itself—I do not know whether it will take 6 months or 1 year, whether it will be occurring before the election in 1968 or after the election in 1968, but the movement is certainly in progress and if left to itself I think we can expect a peaceful cure. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the time may not be provided, because the escalation continues its slow but implacable advance.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri for just a short remark.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up the point of the extraordinary emergency powers of the President. The gentleman's remarks about the inexorableness of the escalation brought it to mind. I think the gentleman will agree with me, no one will question the President's acting in an emergency, but I think we might debate at length whether a sufficient emergency existed in Vietnam.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, indeed we can debate so many aspects of this problem, I would say to my colleague, but I think we should address ourselves at this moment principally to the escalation, because that is the critical danger.

We have all observed that very recently the U.S. Air Force and Navy have been bombing the last Mig airfields in the northern part of Vietnam. Now there are practically no sanctuaries there. Sooner or later it will be impossible, perhaps, for the Mig's to harbor there, and they will stay upon airfields within the borders of China. Possibly they will rise from there to attack our planes.

When that time comes, our officers will have to make the decision then whether to exercise the right of hot pursuit. Then I would say the danger will be greatest.

Also, the bombing continues closer to the waterfront in Haiphong day after day, and sooner or later there may be a strike on a Soviet vessel in the harbor there. There is always this danger of an accident, and such an accident may put the honor of Russia and China in the scales. I am sure they do not want it there, but indeed it may happen.

When the honor of these countries is sufficiently weighted in the scales, they will have to take the position of a great power to resist what they may think is a derogation from their honor brought on by the escalation.

There must have been a reason for the caution that guided American restraint in the past in attacking these airfields and in attacking these harbors. I am sure that that caution was due to the danger of involvement with the other great powers. But now, apparently, in some kind of eagerness to bring off a quick solution, we have thrown this caution to the winds, and we are doing so more and more. The caution is being eroded.

I know our military men have been given the responsibility to win, and we cannot expect them, when they are faced with the question whether to observe the doctrine of hot pursuit, to arrive at the cool decision, to forgo this traditional option open to soldiers in the heat of battle.

Instead, the responsibility rests with the executive department of this Government, and certainly Congress has the responsibility here in advising caution in the great danger that faces us through escalation.

I salute the admirable efforts of the gentlemen who have spoken today in favor of a reduction of our activities. I have spoken in the same vein myself in the past, and perhaps in a vein even more directed toward a specific solution in Vietnam than most others in the House. Not long ago I had a hand in drafting a letter signed by 30 Congressmen and sent to the President containing a caution against escalation.

But in order to enjoy the luxury of continued debate during the gradual evolution of American public opinion in the direction of peace, which we all wish, we must prevent the catastrophic occurrence that may, like classic tragedy, intervene and prevent the realization of our hopes.

The first order of business is not terms of a settlement in Vietnam. It is not negotiations. It is not brilliant ideas of statecraft.

The first order of business in the world today is to turn the course of American military activity immediately from the escalation to deescalation of the military effort. There is the danger. There is the source of defeat for all our efforts toward peace that we have in mind throughout this debate today. And very possibly this is the source of a great conflagration that might extend across the world.

I and many others are ready to follow the many avenues open for a settlement of the conflict. I hope all Members will recognize where the critical danger lies, and how explosive it is, and also will address their efforts first to the cessation of escalation. This will set the stage and provide the security which is needed for development of the admirable plans and efforts being offered by many conscientious Congressmen on all sides.

If any resolutions or conclusions result from our deliberations, the first should be one to suspend escalation of our military advances. Positive deescalation would be even better yet.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to listen to any comments, and I encourage any of the other Members to add their thoughts at this point if they wish to do so.

I should like at this time to yield to the gentleman from California, if he is willing to have me do so.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very willing. I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words.

First I should like to express my own appreciation to the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois for making possible this debate on what many have referred to as the most vital issue facing the country today. Debate is extremely necessary. It is extremely healthy. I do not know of anyone who has denied this on the floor today. I do not believe anyone would.

There has been, however, an unfortunate tendency on the part of many people who are in support of our present military policies in Vietnam to have the best of all possible worlds. The statement is repeated many times that we are at war and the concomitant powers which go with a declaration of war have been cited. Many have claimed that this should put certain restrictions upon dissent. In some cases some have expressed the view that all this debate and discussion is not necessary.

Let me say, very frankly, one cannot have it both ways. We are not at war, because the Constitution says that the Congress shall declare war and the Congress has not declared war.

Many authorizing powers have been stated. They were stated only this afternoon by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who mentioned the SEATO Treaty, the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, and various acts taken by the Congress. These are all true.

Congress has to take the full responsibility for where we are today, and there is no question about it, because Congress could have stopped it at any point in time. Each one of the so-called authorizations contains within itself the power to cease what we are doing.

The Tonkin resolution, for example, states that it shall cease its effect when an action by both Houses of Congress is taken. Certainly this must imply that both Houses of Congress will at some appropriate point enter into a debate or a discussion as to whether its authorizing powers should be terminated. The SEATO Treaty makes exactly the same statement, that is, that the constitutional processes of the various countries should be involved. The constitutional processes of this country involve debate and decision by the Congress of the United States. The appropriation and authorization acts we have taken—and this Congress has probably been more exuberant than the Executive in pursuing this war by means of that process—but at any time one of these measures comes before this body they can act by simply voting against it. So I say to you that you cannot have a state of war without a declaration of war, which precludes debate when everything I have cited authorizing this predicament we are in provides for action by the Congress in order to review that situation.

Now, I want to commend the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois for making this process possible. I hope they will continue it, because in the very brief time that we have had this afternoon here and in the absence of a formal motion or resolution to vote on, we cannot begin to exhaust all of the points that need to be considered.

May I briefly cite some of the points that need to be considered? First of all, how far does the Congress wish to go in authorizing the Executive to declare war contrary to our Constitution? At what point do we wish to say that the Congress will have powers in accordance with the Constitution? Is there any point? Does it need to be debated? I think it does. What about the commitments that we have heard so much about? I have seen them discussed many times over and have seen a very excellent staff study which was done by the Republican policy committee in the Senate.

It was never duly adopted by that body, but it certainly was made. It points out that none of the commitments referred to today so avidly by the present supporters of the war are actually commitments for the war that we are actually engaged in today. They were not commitments to send a half a million American boys to the mainland of Asia but were commitments to give aid as required by the situation if certain conditions were met. So what is the nature of these commitments, and how many times have we made them and how many times have we changed these commitments? We made commitments to Indonesia, and when their government changed we canceled these commitments. When the government changed again we put them back in again. We made commitments to Egypt. We just made a commitment on the floor of the House today with respect to Egypt to revoke a commitment with regard to the importation of long-staple cotton. Those are the kinds of commitments we have made and changed. Is this a commitment in Vietnam that we cannot even review or change?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman is absolutely correct. This Chamber had ample opportunity to rescind the Tonkin Bay resolution approved on August 7, 1964, in this Chamber by a unanimous vote. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Any Member of Congress, if he feels that what we are doing in Vietnam is not the right thing, can move to rescind the Tonkin resolution.

Mr. BROWN of California. That is what we are laying the groundwork for here today.

Mr. PUCINSKI. And the gentleman will agree with me there is even a procedure in the House that if the appropriate committees of the Congress do not act on such resolution to rescind the Tonkin Bay resolution as expeditiously as is desired, if anybody wants to or anybody wants to issue such a petition, they can do so by means of a discharge petition. Every Member has an opportunity to do this. For myself, I will stand behind the President, but I hear people talking about how the Tonkin resolution is this or that or what-not. Why do not these people who have been criticizing the President and our position in Vietnam and our effort in Vietnam—why do they not put this to a vote and exercise the parliamentary rights they have in this Chamber and let us see where the Chamber stands on the issue? I will tell you this: I am willing to make a prediction that if such a resolution to rescind Tonkin Bay ever comes to a vote, the vote will not be very different from what it was when we originally voted unanimously in support of the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

Every Member knew full well what he was voting for when he approved the Tonkin Bay resolution. Every Member knew he was committing American troops to Vietnam. But it was an election year and no one wanted to be marked as soft on communism so the vote was unanimous.

No war is ever popular. George Washington was criticized for the American Revolution. President Lincoln was threatened with impeachment for continuing the Civil War. Wilson was crushed for World War I.

We hear those same voices today. Some would want us to reconsider Tonkin Bay so they can get off the hook. This is no way to run a country. Every Member of this House knew full well what he was doing when he voted in 1964. There can be no retreat now because there is some criticism of the war. We are committed and we shall stay until we win.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for those comments. I know he is not one of those who objects to a debate on this subject because this is obviously the way in which the Congress makes up its mind.

Mr. Speaker, let me cite two or three other things that need to be debated. I have already mentioned the matter of the power of Congress to declare war. Are we going to observe this part of the Constitution, and, if so, to what point, or what will be the nature of the commitments we have made, commitments which have been made to the point which have never been thoroughly discussed and one of which primarily involves the question of aggression, which is constantly brought up.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost assumed that when the State Department says that we are faced with aggression, we must repel it. Yet, authority after authority states that the major part of this war is revolution, or a war for independence as was our Revolutionary War, and that in no other way could the initiative of the people be considered.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to ignore the fact that most of the people assume that they are fighting a war as we did in our country in the Revolutionary War in 1776, or are we going to assume that it is a gigantic smokescreen emanating from Moscow?

Mr. Speaker, do we have a solution to the conclusion of this war other than unconditional surrender? There is nothing which the administration has said that would indicate otherwise. In other words, our position is that there is a Communist aggression from the north, and only that, and that to do other than to follow our present course would amount to unconditional surrender insofar as the people we are fighting are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, this question needs to be debated.

Mr. Speaker, behind all of these things are two even more fundamental points which deserve our discussion.

First of all, is the basic problem toward China. Are we going to continue to ignore the existence of China for the next 18 years as we have ignored its existence for the past 18 years? Are we going to assume that by keeping 2.5 million armed troops around the periphery of China, either American troops or foreign troops or other troops, that this is going to build a better relationship with China? Are we going to have another arrow in our quiver other than maintaining the maximum amount of military pressure on this country?

What is going to be our response to this approach around the world?

Mr. Speaker, more and more it is becoming clear that the basic problem is a problem between the "have-not nations" and the nations which have. We are building bridges to the "have nations," but we have got to have a better strategy in reaching the "have-not nations," or this country is going down the drain.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this question needs to be debated. I encourage the gentlemen who have started this debate to continue.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, permit me to thank the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and say that I regard the gentleman as one of the most courageous Members of the House of Representatives, because even in the darkest days when the public views were in favor of continuing and escalating the war, which is certainly not the case today, but in those dark days, the gentleman from California was one of the first who stood his ground and maintained that independence of thought which I think is a hallmark of the highest traditions of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a comment of my own and that is, in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, I myself have never demanded a resolution in Congress that would settle this thing once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion, as the gentleman suggests, that if the matter were put to Congress to a vote, up or down, the vote would be disastrous.

I think that it is, perhaps, fortunate for the world that the resolution of this problem has not come to a decision in the Congress of the United States, but that the issue has had to evolve by itself to the point where the people of the country may influence the decision in a specific direction.

We have to work at deescalation so that we have a little time left in which to save this grave situation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that my good colleague from New York misunderstood what I had said. I had said—and the RECORD will bear this out—that if we were to present another resolution before this Congress whether it is a resolution similar to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, or any other resolution, that would put the question on whether or not we should continue our defense of Southeast Asia and Vietnam against Communist aggression, or whether we should not, I say to the gentleman that in my humble opinion the final vote on that resolution would not differ much from the vote that was cast on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. In other words, I say that this Congress would again overwhelmingly support President Johnson in the course that he has charted for the defense of freedom in Southeast Asia and let there be no question on that.

Mr. DOW. I can only say to the gentleman from Illinois that if it is true that Congress would reiterate its earlier commitment, then I do not believe the Congress would very nearly represent the views of the people of this country.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his foresight and service to the country in taking time to debate this subject, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], likewise, and those others here who are participating in what I believe can be a very useful discussion on one of our most troublesome national problems.

For my part, I should like to say that I do not see that this proposed debate on the resolution necessarily constitutes any criticism of the President. I believe it constitutes the filling of a legislative vacuum.

I am one of those hundred or more Members of this body who, from the time when the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was adopted, has not regarded it as the constitutional intent of the Congress.

It may well be when such an event would happen, and the resolution were put before the House—and I do not believe it would be a unanimous vote, as I understand it was put—but it might well be a strong endorsement of the administrative policy, and if that be the will of this body, so be it.

But in doing something and recommending that this is what the House would do if it had the chance to discuss the matter, and we have discussed the matter about whether or not we ought to know what programs should be recommended, and what should be done in Vietnam, but spelling out in the process what it would do differently.

Well, I find myself in this position, and I suggest that many others in this body do also—I come in here and vote on the space issue, I come in here and vote on tax measures, and I came in here today and voted on the extra-long-staple cotton. I would not want to write any treatise on extra-long-staple cotton—but I find that I come into this body many times when a bill is introduced, and I rely on the discussion and the dialogue that develops on the floor of this House from men who are expert in the various subjects, and I thus can form an opinion by listening to the words of those who are informed in depth.

And I would believe that this would happen in this area.

Earlier the gentleman from California had mentioned that he thought the public strongly supported this, even though it was not related to the raising of taxes, that they would want to hold or delay or curtail certain programs. And along that line there are some programs I would curtail. You could curtail and abolish foreign aid. I understand that is at a figure of $3 billion. You might abolish or curtail the poverty program, and that is set at $2 billion, but that is only $5 billion out of a deficit of $29 billion.

So the problem of the deficit, it would seem to me, again and again, is a problem that is entangled with Vietnam.

I believe it would be helpful to work out here the definite commitment of this country through the representatives who are closer to the people than any others in our Nation to see what they wish to do. I say if that could be done then the sacrifices involved in that struggle should not be confined to the 18 or the 26; it would be for everyone in the country to agree to sacrifices in the same way.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DOW. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that our involvement in Vietnam was a mistake—a colossal mistake.

Experience teaches us that when we have made a mistake, particularly a big mistake, that there is no easy way to ease our way out of it by continuing the course that mistake implies. It seems to me a mistake has to be corrected by a reversal.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the war in Vietnam involves only Vietnam. If the whole war in Vietnam was directed at that part, and at that part only, I would have to agree with the gentleman that one would have to weigh very carefully whether or not the lives of 14,000 American soldiers and all the other sacrifices made by people in Vietnam and outside of Vietnam justify the end.

But I hope that my colleague will read President Johnson's speech of a week ago Monday, in which he put in proper perspective what this whole effort in Vietnam is all about.

The President quite properly called attention to the fact that this is the first time a major power such as the United States has committed itself totally and unequivocally to the defense of a small and helpless nation. You cannot lay that kind of a guideline down for World War II or World War I or any of the other wars. Here is the first time in the history of man that a major power has put all of its chips on the survival of a small and helpless nation like South Vietnam.

The President went on to point out that this is the first time that we are creating a spirit of and enunciating a doctrine of community among nations. Every small nation in this world, whether my colleague will admit it or not, is looking today to see what happens in Vietnam.

When we founded the United Nations 20 years ago there were only 51 nations in that body. Today there are 127 nations. Some 70 new nations have carved out for themselves freedom, human dignity, sovereignty, and identity. Everyone of these small nations—and some of them are smaller than some of our larger States in the United States—are nations, nations that have thrown off colonialism; they are nations that have thrown off serfdom; they are nations that have thrown off slavery.

These nations are now wondering and watching to see what is going to happen.

I can tell my colleague when we win this conflict in Vietnam—and make no mistake because we are winning it and we are winning it big—when we win this conflict, we will assure for the people of South Vietnam the kind of freedom and human dignity that every individual in this world hopes for and craves for and yearns for. When we get this message to these small nations—and the great conflict in the world today is the struggle for the minds of men because this world is divided between our concept of human freedom and dignity and the concept of communism which does not regard the individual as entitled to any freedom—when we get this message to the small nations that we stand for freedom, they will prove our most effective allies.

This is the great conflict in the world—in every corner of the world—the conflict between these two ideologies— freedom versus slavery.

Let the gentleman make no mistake about it. I do not know of any people in any Communist country that are a free people. So I say the balance of power will rest with 70 nations of Africa, and the newly emerging nations in Asia like South Vietnam. Yes, and the nations of South America. All small nations—all watching the outcome of Vietnam.

So what is happening in Vietnam and the result of what happens there when we win this war and secure for the people of South Vietnam a place in the family of free nations, I tell the gentleman, will be the impetus for all the small nations that are now sitting by and wondering which way they shall throw their lot, they will say, "Our future lies with America—our future lies with the people of the United States because they stood with South Vietnam. They stood for the freedom of a small nation."

How easy it would be for our President today to walk away from Vietnam and find some pretext, like the French did, and—walk away from them and leave those people to Communist aggression and subversion.

His popularity ratings would go up in some quarters.

But this great President, risking his own personal stature as a President and seeing his own popularity going down and down, has stood behind this principle of freedom for our helpless small allies.

I tell you what is happening in Vietnam today is beginning to capture the imagination of most of the world. It has been rough sledding but President Johnson will emerge as the great architect of a new social order under freedom for the small nations of the world. He is the real creator of a dogged determination that only by recognizing the sovereignty of these small nations can there be lasting peace.

That is what Vietnam is all about and the world is beginning to see this more and more to the consternation of the Communists who know they are losing their struggle for world conquest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, continuing, then, the statement we have been making earlier—and I want to thank my colleague from New York for his courtesy in yielding—the real effect of Vietnam cannot be measured today. It may not be measured tomorrow. It may not be measured next year. But as this world evolves, and as these small nations take their places in the whole family of nations, we are then going to see communism in retreat. We are now laying the groundwork in Vietnam for a real, genuine, lasting peace. Those are the issues.

So when my colleague from New York said that Vietnam was a mistake, I am not sure that that can be proven. I think that time will prove President Johnson, President Kennedy, and President Eisenhower right in drawing the line against communism in Vietnam. Because of that decision, my children and the children of America will grow up under freedom, and they will put to the lie Mr. Khrushchev's arrogant boast that our grandchildren will grow up under communism.

Communism is in retreat in Southeast Asia only because we have had the courage to stand up and be counted.

I would like to call my colleague's attention to a speech I made on this floor some time ago when I spelled out in great detail the blueprint for Communist aggression which was formulated in Havana, Cuba, in January 1966.

At that time, 600 top Communists from Asia, Africa, and South America assembled and organized the Tricontinental Congress. Those people pledged there and then that if they succeeded with their new concept of aggression through terrorism and subversion, which they are testing in South Vietnam, if they succeeded with this new technique in South Vietnam, they had 73 countries on three continents—Asia, Africa, and South America—all ready for similar so-called wars of liberation.

Those are the stakes in Vietnam.

I think that we make a mistake if we try to measure our contribution and sacrifice in South Vietnam only in terms of a piece of real estate within the immediate borders of South Vietnam.

It is only when you look at the global effect of what we are doing in South Vietnam that you realize what a monumental contribution this brave and great President is making for the restoration of a lasting peace and an order by which men can resolve their differences at the negotiating table, at the United Nations, and at the World Court, instead of on the battlefield where men are killed.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOW. I thank the gentleman for his very sincere remarks. I think that he is correct in one statement that he made, and that is that none of this can really be proved mathematically by a process of geometry. It is the test of statesmanship always to deal with imponderables, and every judgment must be weighed, you might say, in the pragmatic scale of whether or not it works.

But I must say that I disagree with all the other observations the gentleman has made. At the outset, I believe he has misread the situation in Vietnam—the views of the people in Vietnam, what kind of people they are. Vietnam consists of about 30 million people of whom half are in North Vietnam, and very obviously they do not want the intervention of the United States to determine their future.

It is pretty clear that a fraction, perhaps as much as half the people in South Vietnam, are of the same mind. Further, of the remaining half that are supposedly of a like mind with us, we find such a slight dedication, we find such a failure of all groups in that fragmented society to fight at the barricades, we find such a lack of unity, and we know of the corruption. Out of all this, how can we conclude that we are waging a crusade that will fulfill the shining aspirations of those people?

My own view of those aspirations is that, in the first place, it is beyond our power to say what those aspirations are; and, in the second place, I do not see that anything we are doing there by our massive weight of involvement, by the destruction, and by the creation of so many refugees, and by all of the other actions will realize any kind of hope for anybody whatsoever.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by my colleague from New York—and I know he is sincere in his views, just as I am in mine—I will say I was in Vietnam last year, and I had occasion to talk to many, many people in the villages, and I looked at the pacification program which in some places was working and in others was not. I talked to many people, and I was impressed by the fact that regardless of what my good colleague may say, these Vietnamese have been fighting now, at tremendous personal sacrifices, for more than two decades just to get a place in the sun as free people. They have endured fantastic hardship.

The fact remains that a candidate, who had promised in the most recent elections in South Vietnam a complete peace platform and withdrawal of all troops, and everything else, was not elected. Instead an administration was elected which promised to try to bring this conflict to a successful conclusion, with the aid of the military effort.

I do not want to get into a dialog with my friend. Instead I would prefer to read from an Evening Star article of October 28. Let us get to the core of this and see what a young Marine had to say, who was writing from Vietnam. I could stand here all day debating these points, but I would like to read this letter from the Marine, which is apropos of our remarks here.

The letter reads:

> SIR: I know many letters must have been received just like this. I am writing this not for any kind of publicity, I am only trying to express my opinion to you, because as I read the papers, I and many other men are deeply discouraged by some of the things certain people are either advising or demanding. The subject I would like to cover is the proposed halt of bombing of North Vietnam.
>
> I have been just south of the DMZ, and, although I have never seen the results of bombing of the north, I have seen a lot of it here at the DMZ.
>
> To put it very simply, and this is only my opinion, if we ever stop it (the bombing) the Communists would and could inflict many more casualties. Just this past month, Con Thien was really taking a beating, as everyone knows. Our outfit was up there for a while, we got off lucky. Other units have been badly hurt by the artillery. Then when the United States stepped up the bombing, there is actual proof, as you know, that the NVA suffered heavily and even pulled out some of their positions and went back north.
>
> The war can and will never be won if the bombing stops. It looks to me like anyone could see that. Everyone knows when we have ceased it before they poured thousands of supplies and men south. It is so damn simple, it should not be hard to understand that.
>
> If certain politicians do not believe this, let them come up here for awhile and I am certain they will become believers shortly. Most of the VIP's who come to Vietnam never get this far north. So, it will be a sorry thing for us if they decide to stop the bombing.
>
> Death is not pretty, but there will be a lot of men killed for nothing if someone does not open his eyes to the real facts, not just talk.
>
> By the way, we are all proud to be serving our country and feel we are doing the right thing in being here. We also appreciate the support the people at home are giving us.
>
> RUFUS H. CRITES,
> *3rd Marine Division (Rein),*
> *FMF, Vietnam.*

We can sit here and debate this all we want, but the people who have been carrying out a new concept of freedom in Vietnam are making a great contribution.

Tomorrow we will be able to see the first significant sign of the wisdom of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution which, incidentally, was debated by 28 Members. Earlier this afternoon someone suggested there was very little debate on the resolution.

The gentleman from California or some other Member raised some question about the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. It was debated by 28 Members, and they were all for it.

The Gulf of Tonkin resolution clearly spells out what our obligations are and what powers we gave to the President. The President is not proceeding now under reserve powers. He is proceeding under powers given by the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, by a unanimous vote in the House and with only two dissenting votes in the Senate.

Tomorrow we will see the first significant results of the wisdom of this Gulf of Tonkin resolution, when a democratically elected, constitutionally elected government takes over the helm in South Vietnam.

Never before, so far as I know, has a free government been formed under the trying conditions of warfare that exist in South Vietnam today.

Thousands upon thousands of South Vietnamese went to the polls and cast their votes for a government even though they were threatened with all sorts of horrible and savage reprisals by the Vietcong if they participated in the election. These South Vietnamese people voted.

Tomorrow a free government will be sworn in to lead this country, hopefully on the road to peace.

Those facts, in my judgment, are the greatest vindication we ever needed as to whether we belong in Vietnam.

Fourteen thousand American boys gave their lives for tomorrow, because this has been the basic policy of the United States, to assure the people of South Vietnam the right to choose their own government. That has been done.

If those who want to question the validity of our effort in South Vietnam are concerned, let them look to tomorrow, and let them see this government sworn in. Then let them see the reaction of governments all over the world, which, up to now, have treated us with caution and suspicion. I refer to the small nations, that will someday constitute the balance of power in this world. These are the nations that tomorrow are going to be impressed by the fact that this big and huge America was willing to risk all to assure the safety and freedom of this small nation.

These are the stakes in South Vietnam.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD should reflect the fact that we are now on the special order of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for purpose of continuity of the RECORD I have requested the printing of my special order following that of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOW].

Mr. BROWN of California. I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois on the exposition which he has made of the merit of our position in South Vietnam. Obviously this is the position which our Government has tried to convince the American people of the validity of. The gentleman from Illinois has presented it most convincingly and most cogently.

In fact, if his statement conformed to reality I would be the first to join in calling for a victory in Vietnam, which he is doing. I believe it would be only appropriate that we do so.

But does his statement conform to reality? This is the basic position which needs to be examined today.

The gentleman has stated that this is a war solely for the purpose of achieving peace, that it will produce peace in the world as a result of its impact upon the small nations of the world. He says we are fighting for freedom for a small defenseless Asiatic country.

I should like to go back, if I may, to refresh the memory of the gentleman from Illinois on the history leading up to the present involvement. Specifically I refer to the Geneva Accords of 1954.

Is it true that we have here a small, independent nation fighting for its freedom with the assistance of the United States? What did the Geneva Accords say? They said that no separate nation was created by that agreement. They said that there would be an election in 1956 to establish a form of government for all of Vietnam.

Neither the delegation from North Vietnam headed by Ho Chi Minh nor the delegation from South Vietnam or what is called South Vietnam today, at that time headed by Bao Dai, made any contention that there was such a thing as two Vietnams. Both of them claimed there was only one Vietnam. How does it happen we have two Vietnams today? Purely for one reason only.

This country decided it would have a separate country of South Vietnam. It established Premier Diem and subsequently encouraged him to become president and encouraged him to violate the provisions calling for an election in 1956. Why? The reason is very succinctly put forth. It was well known to this Government that an election conducted in Vietnam at that time would result in the election of Ho Chi Minh. It was stated by President Eisenhower. At that point in our history we refused to consider the possibility of allowing a further expansion of a Communist-led government even if it were done by election. There is no questions about that.

Now, what the gentleman from Illinois is saying is this: We saw fit to set up an action which we calculated was in accordance with the desires of 80 percent of the people—and it is still about the same number, I would suspect—and we are going to defend the right of 20 percent of the people to have the kind of government that we want. Essentially that is what we are doing in defending the freedom of this poor, innocent, Asiatic country, as he claims we are doing.

I do not ask that he accept this. I understand that the rationale which exists—and incidentally it is not, as far as the State Department is concerned, a statement that this is a separate country but that this is an international boundary which has been violated. Regardless of the status of South Vietnam as a country, their boundary has been violated. So be it. The reason why that has been is because there has been no political settlement in Vietnam in accordance with the last international convention of 1954 with respect to this country and the failure to achieve the political settlement has been the cause of the situation which confronts us today. We thought we were right in undermining that agreement. We thought it was wrong to have Ho Chi Minh rule all of South Vietnam or all of Vietnam. Most of us probably still think it is wrong to have a Communist ruling South Vietnam even if he is elected.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me on that one point?

Mr. BROWN of California. Yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think my very distinguished colleague from California makes a stranger of the facts. He would have this RECORD show that somehow or other, we, the United States, were the conspirators. The gentleman completely ignores the fact that there were other major powers involved in the setting up of a North Vietnam and a South Vietnam and drawing up the demilitarized zone and drawing up the demarcation line. My colleague would make orphans of all of these facts.

The fact of the matter is these are historical facts. I have sat in on these Vietnam teach-ins and sit-ins, and invariably when you get into a debate on Vietnam those who disagree with our position in Vietnam reach way back into the whole of the Geneva Convention and the other forces that were at play in Southeast Asia at the time. The facts are as were stated here on the floor a little while ago. The Vietnamese asked us to be there. Nine successive regimes of Vietnamese asked us to be there. We are not there by force. When the debate on the Tonkin Gulf resolution got underway, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] asked, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 14, page 18543, some questions. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] said:

> Does this resolution give positive powers to the President to act with respect to our responsibilities as a member of SEATO?

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], who, I believe, is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, said:

> It does so within the framework that the gentleman has described, and the Constitution of the United States.

And, my friend's position is respected by me and I certainly do not wish to quarrel with him. I know what he is saying, he is saying with sincerity. But these are historical facts. They are consistent with reality.

Mr. Speaker, we are in South Vietnam because Vietnam was established as a nation by the Geneva Convention and the government of South Vietnam asked us to help them.

Mr. BROWN of California. That is not completely so.

Mr. PUCINSKI. And, when they proceeded to prepare for the election of a representative government, Ho Chi Minh turned loose his terrorists and his subversives from the north, and this was done before the ink was dry on the document. This is the document about which we are speaking.

So, Mr. Speaker, the United States, after the French cowered and withdrew from their obligations, the United States said, "This country of ours cannot let this nation of South Vietnam fall into the Communist orbit."

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that what we are doing in Vietnam today is nothing more than continuing the 20-year struggle which started in 1947 when the Communists moved against Greece and this is what this whole struggle is all about.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Let me say that there is obviously a clear-cut misunderstanding of the facts either on my part or on the part of the gentleman from Illinois. I know of no authority who claims that the Geneva Convention created two separate countries. I know of no authority, not one to that effect, and I have studied all of them. If it were true that it created two countries, then we would be justified in defending this country.

What happened was that this country created two countries, but it created them before the settlement of certain political problems were disposed of in that country, problems which we ourselves—and I believe the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] used the word "conspirators"—gradually, though the CIA overthrew the Diem regime and laid the strategy to invalidate that election.

I say to the gentleman from Illinois it is true that we were the conspirators and that we were supporting this action, and that this Congress and those who had any voice in it knew about it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the CIA handpicked all nine governments to handle this problem? Each of the governments of South Vietnam asked us to stay and help them in their struggle. Does the gentleman from California say that the CIA has carefully checked each one of these administrations, some of which were very hostile to many of our proposals and positions, but still did not ask us to leave?

In other words, is the gentleman from California putting this into the lap of the CIA?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I have no access to the confidential files of the CIA. I know only what I read in the press. However, everyone of the generals, with one exception, who is now in control of South Vietnam was a French-created general and two-thirds of them were selected during the period of time when they were younger officers and were brought to this country and trained in this country.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is that bad?

Mr. BROWN of California. No; that is not bad.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Does this make them wicked or something?

Mr. BROWN of California. No; not at all. However, it indicates that they were selected on the ground that this country wanted to make sure that they were dedicated insofar as their indoctrination was concerned as to the proper political course to follow and that was, perhaps, the course of the U.S. policy.

Mr. PUCINSKI. What will be my colleague's position, if after tomorrow's swearing-in ceremony the new President, President Thieu, asks the United States to suspend its bombing of North Vietnam and decides that he is going to try to work this problem out with the North Vietnamese, with Ho Chi Minh? Will my colleague continue to raise suspicions about the integrity of these people?

Mr. BROWN of California. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that if the gentleman who will be sworn in as President of South Vietnam is successful in bringing about negotiations to end the war, he would finally recognize the fact that his country which is now 25-percent destroyed will probably be 100-percent destroyed if the war continues. Does not that require that he take that action?

It will not be a reflection on his integrity. I believe that it is a recognition of his ability to cope with reality.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman in just a moment, but I must say in the light of this last response that I believe, with all due regard to my colleague from California, this really tops the ingenuity and the imagination of those who have been criticizing the U.S. position in Vietnam. I have heard many, many original and unique responses, and I congratulate my colleague from California for his real initiative here and the originality of that response.

Of course, I do not agree with his response.

If President Thieu does move toward some sort of a discussion with Ho Chi Minh for a resolution of the problem of Vietnam, I believe this will be another great victory, and a great credit to the good judgment of this Congress; and the President of the United States in standing firm in Vietnam against great odds, and against great costs.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOW. Of course, to answer the gentleman from Illinois I believe we would all salute any measure that looks as if it would open the door to a peaceful solution, and we would be more than happy if any negotiations instituted by the new Premier will come to a resolution.

But I believe that, in all of these arguments about Vietnam, we tend to wander and to argue about details of what's happening in Vietnam. The old phrase is "Who shot John?" Perhaps we ought to look beyond somewhat.

We should realize that in this world today there is a revolution of rising expectations. There are two billion people all over the world in many continents involved in this, and Vietnam is just one aspect, just one little country where this is happening.

The real question is this: Is the United States going to be a policeman who goes about the world putting down every rebellion and every effort that is made by these people to better themselves? Are American boys going to be sent over there to fight poor, miserable people who just want three squares a day?

I believe this is the question we have to answer, and let us not exaggerate this Communist involvement. We are always using the excuse of communism because some communism becomes involved with these people in this revolution of rising expectations. And so we say that because there is a trace or a suggestion or a whiff of communism that we must be the policeman that goes around the world putting down the aspirations of the people that are doing the very same thing our forefathers were doing in 1776.

Mr. PUCINSKI. And the answer to the gentleman is a categorical "No." As a matter of fact, I would like to recall to the gentleman the statement made by Secretary of Defense McNamara when he clearly, succinctly and unequivocally stated that the United States does not have a mandate to police every troubled spot in the world.

Mr. DOW. That is wonderful.

Mr. PUCINSKI. And we have used good judgment. There are, as a matter of fact, about some 83 significant spots of trouble or would-be trouble, or near trouble in this world, and you do not see the President or the Secretary of State committing our troops or committing our country to these trouble spots.

One of the gentlemen mentioned a moment ago about the fact that there are these newly emerging countries in the world. These are new countries, some of them not even 6 years old. They are new to the whole experience of self government. Some day they are going to be very worthwhile allies of ours. And those countries are looking to see what is going to be the attitude of the United States and the attitude of the Soviet Union toward small countries, and they are getting their answers in South Vietnam. They are getting their answers from the President of the United States who says the attitude of the United States toward these smaller countries is to protect them whenever their sovereignty and freedom are threatened. Contrast that to the Soviet Union which is sending in saboteurs and terrorists to undermine local government of these newly emerging nations and destroy their freedom.

So the answers to the question the gentleman has raised are being made today on the battlefield of Vietnam in a most glorious manner by these American boys, who know well that one Communist victory begets another. They know that if South Vietnam falls to communism, the Communists will be looking for new victims and before long the whole world will be at war.

Mr. DOW. I would not detract from the glory of our boys, but I do question the policies under which they are operating over there, and I hold some of our statesmen responsible for it, including the Congress, even though I am not disagreeing with everyone in the Congress, fortunately.

Mr. BROWN of California. I think this debate has been extremely valuable.

I want to compliment the gentleman again for his sponsorship of it. I think it reveals certain differences and misunderstandings that exist not only here in the Congress, and perhaps it would not be so important if that were the case, but they exist throughout the United States and exist in the minds of all the people in this country.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would my colleague just permit me this one final observation because I see the time is almost running out, and it is significant to those of us who have been here discussing this matter from all sides, and we do not always agree—but at least we are probing for answers and solutions to make our country more effective.

It is rather significant that our good friends on the other side who started this discussion and who began raising some questions about whether or not the President was correct in his judgment, that when the overwhelming facts in support of the President's good judgment began pouring in, I notice that the Chamber is empty of those Members from the minority side who started this discussion.

It is obvious to me that they do not want to be confused by the facts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, let me conclude the statement that I was making before.

If it were in fact true that all of the newly developing countries in the world were looking to the United States to see what is happening in cases where we had made a commitment, obviously, I would be inclined to agree with many of the points made by the gentleman.

But what these countries are saying, and this is clear in all the countries of the world, is that we made a commitment and that we have staked our reputation and we have put $100 billion and a half million men into a country of which we instigated the creation and leadership and that we are all out for that country. But at the same time, I think this very properly raises in their mind the question, Would we really go all out for a country which was legally and properly constituted under the legal precedents or whatever other conditions exist in the world today.

If the answer turns out to be this—that the United States if it creates a country and picks its leadership will go all out for it, but that there is no assurance that it will for really and truly independent countries, then I say that the United States may be in danger around the world because these countries will say, We are not safe and we will not be protected in our freedom and in our democracy and they will say they are not going to be safe in this world today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, before my friend, the gentleman from California leaves, I would simply comment that I think in the discussion of the CIA, I am afraid he overemphasized the efficiency of that organization in nine consecutive regimes.

I would say that the letter from a Marine which the gentleman from Illinois read is a most impressive document. To me, however, it is a proof of a matter that requires no proof—and that is the willingness of the American people to make any sacrifice that their Government calls for in the cause of freedom and justice.

But I think that that would not permit us to avoid or evade our responsibility to make certain that the sacrifice is one that is properly called for and one that is borne equitably by all our citizens.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for 1 minute and the special order of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] for 3 minutes be included in the RECORD under the one special order for the purpose of continuity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY TOMORROW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, little public notice has been taken of the extremely important official self-examination in the North Atlantic community which is now in progress. Its recommendations will be presented to the NATO ministerial meeting in December. The purpose of the study, pursued under the authority of the NATO Council, is to examine the future political role of the alliance—to determine in what way the military nature of the NATO organization can be supplemented through creative multilateral diplomacy.

At long last, in other words, the nations of NATO are collectively examining in depth the question of whether the alliance can be more than a purely defensive military vehicle. The examination may have the most profound impact, not just on the future of American foreign policy, but on the future of each and every country in the North Atlantic community.

I would like to discuss today a number of aspects of that reexamination and several innovations in the structure and purposes of NATO which should be considered. I am proud that 20 of our colleagues are joining me in these comments. The cosponsors of these recommendations include Representative Marvin L. Esch, Representative Paul Findley, Representative Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, Representative F. Bradford Morse, Representative Herman T. Schneebeli, Representative Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Representative Daniel E. Button, Representative Silvio O. Conte, Representative Gilbert Gude, Representative Seymour Halpern, Representative Frank Horton, Representative Hastings Keith, Representative Joseph M. McDade, Representative William S. Mailliard, Representative Rogers C. B. Morton, Representative Charles A. Mosher, Representative Ogden R. Reid, Representative Howard W. Robison, Representative Fred Schwengel, and Representative Robert Taft, Jr.

While the NATO self-study is not expected to treat strictly military matters such as force levels and strategic doctrine, its latitude is sufficient to sanction the most penetrating analysis of potential political and economic change in the North Atlantic and Europe ever attempted under official auspices:

Committee No. 1 is empowered to deal with the German question and East-West relations.

Committee No. 2 is authorized to treat the subject of interallied relations, including recommendations for the most appropriate form of government-to-government consultation in advance of specific policy formulation.

Committee No. 3 is charged with study of the defense policy of the Alliance, particularly as it relates to nontechnical areas in which military and political judgments converge.

Committee No. 4 is directed to treat the subject of NATO's collective responsibilities to other areas of the world—in the military, economic, and political realms.

The NATO self-study promises a possible rebirth of the Alliance in terms suited to the problems and opportunities of the 1960's and 1970's. This should have been the goal of all of the Alliance nations, including the United States, for many years. The failure to get on with the job does not rest with the United States alone, but there have been, nonetheless, eight broad shortcomings of U.S. policy attitudes toward Europe which have contributed to delay in the constructive evolution of NATO.

The first obstacle posed by U.S. policy to a meaningful rebirth of NATO has been the American tendency, both in public and in private, to imply that all of NATO's problems are the result of France and General de Gaulle. No matter how complex, individualistic, and stubborn the general might be, in a very real sense he has seen, far better than many U.S. policymakers, the need for an evolutionary policy in Europe—a policy no longer based on the power structure of the 1940's. As the late Philip Graham wrote shortly before his death:

> Paradox plays a vital role in human life. The paradox of Anglo-American blindness about De Gaulle lies in our refusal to learn from our errors. Again and again we have misjudged this man. Our diplomats and journalists call his purposes old-fashioned, unreal, and even evil . . .
>
> What is De Gaulle's destiny? It may be that this old man will have enough youth to prevent Western Europe's becoming insecure and unsure of herself as a partial American satellite. It may be De Gaulle's destiny to drain away the latent and dangerous militarism of Germany into a continental polity having some of the melting-pot checks and balances of America. It may be De Gaulle's role to foster a European strength which is essential to counter communism's expansion.

It is not necessary to agree with every De Gaulle thesis or proposal to recognize that his views are not unique in Europe, either to himself or to France. By allowing a fixation on De Gaulle to shape U.S. policy within NATO the United States has tended to divide Europe rather than to unite it and to deny the relevance of everything he has said, even when much of it has been very relevant indeed. It is well worth remembering that, although he may in the future, De Gaulle has not yet removed France from NATO; he has only ended French participation in the military aspects of NATO—which in retrospect serves as an interesting prelude to the current study of whether NATO should expand its nonmilitary aspects.

The second U.S. policy shortcoming which has worked against a progressive rebirth of NATO is the tendency of the American Government to deal with crises only as they arise—and then with only stop-gap measures. So quick is the pace of contemporary international relations that the administration has found it impossible to anticipate events effectively or develop creative new long-term approaches which are compatible with changing conditions. Rather the administration has waited until each crisis has come over the edge of the desk when it can no longer be ignored—and then the answer of U.S. policy has generally been to find some "solution" which may reduce the immediacy of the crisis but not the crisis itself.

The proposal for a multilateral nuclear force is a case in point. Faced with a presumed imminent European demand for an effective share in the control of nuclear weapons for the defense of Europe, the administration "solution" was a gimmick—which required time to study, but in the end proved unsatisfactory to everybody since it met neither the hopes nor the fears of the Europeans.

The third shortcoming of U.S. policy toward Europe is reflected in its obvious preference for bilateral negotiations and agreement with the Soviet Union rather than multilateral consideration with its allies of potential avenues of agreement as a prelude to exploration with the Soviet bloc. It is, of course, tempting to think that meaningful United States-Soviet agreement can quickly resolve many of the basic differences which are symptomatic of the cold war. But bilateral United States-Soviet negotiations have seldom produced such agreement; rather they have encouraged, by example, the other NATO nations to undertake their own bilateral negotiations behind the Iron Curtain—thereby serving a fundamental Communist goal of destroying the unity of the North Atlantic community. And bilateral United States-Soviet negotiations have also, quite understandably, undermined European confidence in U.S. sincerity and leadership.

The fourth shortcoming of U.S. policy in Europe, in the last 6 years, has been its essential sterility on the German question—a shortcoming shared by most of the Western European allies, including West Germany herself. This is not to say that there is any significant evidence that the Soviet Union today is any more likely to participate in a substantive multilateral discussion leading toward the reunification of the two Germanys than it has been in the past. But it is to suggest that without evidence of renewed Western interest and flexibility in pursuing the objective of German reunification, the German people must inevitably conclude that the Western nations, while they may be willing to mouth the goal of reunification, do not really believe in or want it. This, in turn, is bound to result in internal changes in German domestic politics—producing on the one hand a rejection of German political leaders who have tied the goal of reunification to maintenance of a strong alliance with the West, and on the other an acceptance of political leaders who may call for either greater German belligerence or greater German neutrality but certainly greater German independence. No careful observer of domestic German politics could deny the steady growth of political forces which could quickly lead to fundamental changes in German foreign policy.

The fifth obstacle to a rebirth of NATO which is presented by U.S. foreign policy is its extraordinary ambivalence between the goals of nuclear sharing within the alliance and the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. It has apparently failed to establish an order of priority between these two courses.

The sixth obstacle posed by U.S. policy to the meaningful evolution of NATO from a purely defensive alliance to a positive political force is the tendency of the administration to talk of the relations with the Soviet bloc in unreal terms. Whatever the merits of expanded East-West trade, for example, they have precious little to do with the "bridge-building" theme of the administration.

By and large the Europeans do not view trade with Communist countries in this light, and neither should we. The proportionately greater trade that Western Europe enjoys with the Soviet bloc as compared with our own comes primarily from the Western European belief that the trade can provide them significant economic value while providing the Soviets insignificant strategic value. If the list of nonstrategic items which could be safely traded to Soviet bloc countries were expanded in each Western nation, including the United States, and if trade were undertaken solely from the standpoint of potential economic benefit, North Atlantic trade policies could be brought into accord and no Western government would suffer.

It is neither impossible nor improper to tie some political questions into East-West trade agreements, as the West German Government has demonstrated in its trade arrangement with the East German regime. But it is largely irrelevant to talk about East-West trade only from the standpoint of "building bridges" as if somehow that phrase had an economic or political meaning. Without a shift in the administration vocabulary U.S. policy on East-West trade, even that policy proposed by the administration, will be out of touch with the hard-headed commercial trade policies of Western Europe.

The seventh shortcoming of U.S. policy toward Europe has been its inclination to view article II of the NATO Treaty as only window dressing. This article of the treaty was designed to give the Alliance an opportunity to expand its functions from the purely military realm into the economic and political arenas. Despite the dramatic and real progress in economic relations with the six of the Common Market through the Kennedy round, for all intents and purposes article II of the NATO Treaty has been unused for 20 years. The NATO self-study now underway is the first serious effort to explore the evolution of NATO under article II into the realm of multilateral political and economic diplomacy.

We have been slow to see the need and the opportunity largely because we have continued to think of Europe in the terms which were relevant when NATO was first born—when the need for collective military security was pre-eminent and the tasks of postwar reconstruction provided no opportunity for a progressive European policy toward the rest of the world. But those days are long past, largely as a result of an extraordinarily successful U.S. policy which helped restore the economic stability and political vitality of Western Europe. And the day has also passed when the evolution of NATO into an effective political and economic force should have been begun.

Having allowed economically and politically stable Western European nations the luxury of independent policies the rebirth of NATO will be made all the more difficult, even though the opportunity for change has always been present within the provisions of the alliance charter.

The final and most current obstacle posed by U.S. policy to the progressive evolution of NATO has been and is our commitment in Vietnam and our preoccupation with it. One of the highest prices paid for the war in Vietnam has been the lack of attention given in U.S. foreign policy to the pressing needs for change in other areas of the world.

Along with others, Europe and her problems have been placed on the back burner. But in addition to lack of attention, the U.S. commitment in Vietnam undermines U.S. policy in Europe in other ways. It has apparently resulted in a reduction by this administration of U.S. troop levels in Europe—and thus has made all the more difficult the necessary NATO discussions of the appropriate magnitude of the future U.S. troop commitment in Germany.

Similarly, it has imbued U.S. policy and U.S. policymakers with the continuing, if vain, hope that we can procure active support in Vietnam from European governments who do not share our commitment to or our perspective toward that war. And, finally, it has led Europeans and their governments to question whether our motives in Europe are primarily to seek the evolution of a stable peace in that part of the world or to involve our NATO allies in our commitments in another and far distant part of the world.

In summary it might be said that American foreign policy toward Europe in the 1960's has ignored the hard but important lessons of history. The international order created at the end of one war, if not sufficiently flexible to change with the times, can become more a cause of instability than stability.

In the modern history of the nation-state, time and again the machinery to keep peace constructed at the end of one war has come in time to haunt men. This is not because the peace settlements were wrong at the time when they were devised; it is because they alone were expected to safeguard the peace even when they were no longer relevant.

The holy alliance after the Congress of Vienna in 1815 was hardly ample to keep the peace a generation later when the monarchies which it represented were the objects of the people's belligerence.

The balance-of-power alliances which maintained the peace in Europe in the last part of the 19th century failed to do so in 1914 largely because they were too rigid to accept change—because they committed their members to an inevitable chain of events which had little or no relevance to the relatively minor event which began the chain. It is conceivable that World War II could have been avoided if the League of Nations and the international order which it represented were as relevant to the generation of leaders in the 1930's as they had been to those who created the League at Versailles.

The conclusion of history is inescapable. Maintenance of the peace relies not upon the wisdom of past generations to anticipate the future, but upon the wisdom of today's generation to understand the present. The international order forged in the aftermath of World War II was based on a clear understanding of realities at that time. But those realities have changed, and if the institutions created then are not changed to meet the new realities they can become more a cause of instability than a cause of stability.

In whatever direction you turn in today's world the inadequacies of our international institutions appear obvious.

The goals of the United Nations are as relevant as ever, but it is painfully clear that the organization is unable to cope with major crises—and its unwillingness to act over Vietnam is evident for all to see. There is a danger that the U.N. is becoming primarily only an institution in which the "have-nots" can quixotically challenge the "haves."

The Organization of American States, without truly meaningful change in 20 years, seems increasingly to be to the Latin Americans the principal evidence of the patriarchal relationship between the United States and the rest of its hemisphere. Rather than a catalyst for stability the OAS is in danger of being reduced merely to a symbol of the cleavage between the Latin Americans and the "colossus of the North."

SEATO, as is evident, is surely an unrealistic entity today.

The purpose of this depressing catalog is not to encourage pessimism. It is merely to emphasize what commonsense would tell us if we were listening: In this age of rapid change it is unrealistic to expect the institutions of one generation automatically to serve well the interests of the next—and when the potential price of failure is nuclear war, the attention of statesmen to the flexibility and evolution of the international order is all the more important.

This is the magnitude of the choices now before NATO—for it too was designed in the 1940's to meet the problems of the 1940's; it too faces vastly different conditions today; it too, with redirection and reemphasis, has a new and even more important role to play in the 1960's and 1970's; and it too, unless change and rebirth occur, can prove to be more a source of instability than of stability.

It would be dangerous to assume that the military threat to Western Europe is no longer real. But the economic and political vigor of the nations of Western Europe has posed a new problem—the potential emergence of 15 truly independent and divergent foreign policies within the North Atlantic community. At its origin NATO could maintain unity in the North Atlantic community by serving as its major source of strength, although as a purely defensive military alliance. That is no longer true today, and if we expect the NATO of the 1940's to provide in the 1960's the unity of the 1940's, the North Atlantic community may come to an end as a constructive force in world politics.

We hope, therefore, that the NATO self-study will not prove to be merely a cursory or academic exercise. We hope that its participants will see their roles as no less important than those of their predecessors in postwar Europe who forged an international order which, despite—or perhaps because of—great danger, has been remarkably successful in keeping the peace. We hope that the participants will not shy away from even the most controversial of issues in order merely to avoid difficult negotiations. We hope that this agenda will include:

A comprehensive Western trading policy toward the East: Before there can be any significant expansion of East-West trade every effort should be made to forge a comprehensive agreement among the Western allies on the terms of trade to be offered, the nature of goods in which trade might afford strategic value to the East, the model provisions of multilateral or bilateral trading agreements, regulations covering the transfer of technology from the United States to the Soviet bloc through Western European traders, and the political issues, if any, which should be tied formally or informally to the expansion of trade.

It may not be possible or desirable to negotiate a single pact-to-pact trading agreement, but negotiations on bilateral trading agreements should proceed from a standard set of guidelines agreed to in advance by the NATO allies—ideally in the form of a draft trading agreement formulated in the NATO self-study. It would be inappropriate for the Western nations to follow 15 independent trading policies which would merely increase competition between them and in the long run affect their political relations.

Perhaps the most important trade matter at the present time is the extension of long-term credit. We hope that Committee No. 1 of the NATO self-study, building on the basis provided by the discussions at the OECD, can reach a consensus on appropriate credit terms to be offered by any NATO member.

The NATO study can serve also to remove some of the irrelevant emotionalism with which East-West trade is discussed. No one has proposed trading strategic goods to the Communist states. No one has proposed a one-way trading agreement which favors Moscow but not the West. No one has proposed terms of trade which are so liberal that they amount to foreign aid to the Soviet Government.

The U.S. and Western nonstrategic trading policies toward the Soviet bloc should reflect the attitudes of the hardheaded American traders of the 19th century, whose clipper ships roamed the seven seas as living proof of the prosperity of a self-confident free enterprise system. They did not fear that international commerce would somehow subvert their belief in freedom—and neither should we. They did not deal unless the deal was to their benefits—and neither should we. They did not doubt the superiority of their economic system—and neither should we.

They secured respect for the American economy, awe for the American industry, and economic gain for the American people. With similar self-confidence and similar toughness the Western economies have a new opportunity today to prove their superiority and benefit their people.

Major new proposals to end the division of Germany: For the purpose of maintaining stability in domestic German politics and in order to test the sincerity of Soviet desires, if any, for detente it would be valuable now for the Western nations to offer a new initiative which might lead toward German reunification—perhaps including Western willingness to accept adjustments of the boundaries of a unified Germany. The proposal should not be made with any expectation of a positive Communist response. But, nonetheless, the step would inject into the East-West relationship a willingness to explore old problems anew, from which progress might emerge. It would also demonstrate to the German people the genuine nature of the Western commitment to reunification and thereby help to check extreme German political factions who advocate radical change in German foreign policy.

And finally, a new collective NATO initiative on German reunification would lessen any inclination on the part of individual NATO states to push their own unilateral ideas in bilateral East-West negotiations to end the partition of Germany.

A progressive negotiating package to be offered to the Warsaw Pact nations for discussion, on a pact-to-pact basis, for the resolution of Europe's divisive problems: Such a package might well include proposals relating to East-West trade and German reunification—but they might also include: the deliberate expansion of diplomatic and cultural contacts; programs to encourage unlimited citizen travel throughout Europe and the North Atlantic community; proposals for reciprocal troop reductions and conceivably for limited forms of military disengagement; proposals for joint scientific research and exploration; proposals for a multilateral institution to promote East-West development aid to foster economic stability and vitality in the southern half of the globe.

Almost as important as the content of the negotiating package and the likelihood of its acceptance is the initiative which it would represent. It has become commonplace to suggest that Europe is on the verge of major new political decisions which would end many areas of cold war stalemate. But this progress is not likely to happen without the advent of creative diplomacy on both sides and a demonstration by both sides of a willingness to be flexible.

Some critics may consider the pact-to-pact negotiating process unnecessarily cumbersome and slow—that bilateral United States-Soviet discussions, other bilateral talks, or great power meetings might be more productive. But this view reflects the unfortunate trends of NATO in recent years by which the internal unity of the North Atlantic community has been allowed to dissipate. Collective security and collective defense rely in great measure on collective diplomacy. They cannot withstand the unilateral or disjointed pursuit of a single nation's vision of the future.

Pact-to-pact negotiations would require a collective NATO position, agreed upon in advance; they would impose a discipline of time as well as substance upon all the North Atlantic nations, a development which augurs well for the future; and they promise the kind of feasible discussions which can lead to a comprehensive European settlement which is acceptable to all nations involved.

A permanent North Atlantic parliamentary body: Whether under the title of the Atlantic Assembly, or some other name, it would be valuable to establish a permanent and working NATO parliamentary body. In order to do so, the periodic interparliamentary unions of today should be given some permanent form, perhaps with permanent national representatives chosen by the legislatures of each NATO state.

The body could be charged with the responsibility of promoting for consideration by the NATO Council new ideas for the evolution of NATO both in terms of relations among its members and NATO's relations with the rest of the world. It obviously is premature to form a true legislative body for the Atlantic area, but it is not premature to expand the nature of NATO to include not just formal relations between official diplomatic representatives but also less formal relations between parliamentary counterparts.

Genuine consultative institutions and procedures pointing toward a common North Atlantic foreign policy: The goal of NATO solidarity cannot be served when any nation—the United States, France, or anybody else—forms its policy first and consults its allies second. Too often in the past the United States has viewed the consultative processes in NATO merely as the channels by which American blueprints are accepted. The strength of NATO in its multilateral diplomatic efforts will reflect the degree of success NATO members have in collectively forging a common policy. This requires not so much a change in institutions as a change of attitude.

Of course, it is necessary for the U.S. representatives to have a clear idea of what they believe an ideal NATO policy should be; but it is also necessary for the United States to be willing to accommodate the demands of other NATO nations when their national interests are deeply engaged. This is not to advocate subordinating the U.S. interests to those of Europe on all occasions; it is merely to suggest that one NATO foreign policy is far superior to 15 NATO foreign policies.

Specific exploratory steps to test the thesis of North Atlantic political integration: While it would be undesirable and wrong to impose radical political change upon a community of peoples and nations who do not uniformly desire that magnitude of change, it would be equally undesirable to dismiss the concept of significant political change out of hand.

Real political integration among the nations of the North Atlantic community may seem very unrealistic and far away today, but so too in the 1940's did the concept of a workable European Common Market seem unrealistic and visionary. Political progress like everything else in this modern age of science has quickened its pace.

It is not too early to set in motion the exploratory steps which must be taken before the North Atlantic nations are in a position to judge whether political integration would be possible or impossible—whether it would be wise or unwise. The creation of a permanent North Atlantic parliamentary body and of genuine consultative institutions and procedures for a common NATO foreign policy are surely positive steps in this direction. But other steps can also be taken:

The NATO Council could authorize a commission of NATO member representatives to explore in detail a variety of proposals for degrees of political integration and to make recommendations both to the Council and to the new NATO parliamentary body; the Council could authorize and subsidize specific independent academic research into the compatibility of the political systems within NATO and the variety of gradual steps which might be employed in the process of integration; the Council could request that each member government set in motion a number of public conferences among its citizens to discuss and debate the desirability of and potential avenues toward closer political federation or confederation; the Council could recommend to each member government a uniform public survey to test popular attitudes toward increased integration and the variety of means by which it could be achieved.

A multilateral North Atlantic development aid program toward nations in the southern half of the globe: Quite aside from any effort to devise an East-West joint development aid program, it is incumbent upon the nations of NATO to devise a more successful means of collaboration among themselves in fostering economic and political stability in the developing nations.

Development aid is not a burden which should be carried by any particular nation; it is a burden imposed commonly on all those peoples whose history has blessed them with abundance. Efforts to date within the OECD and the Development Assistance Group, while promising, have generally been bereft of enthusiasm, creativity, and conviction.

This is not to say that many European nations are not contributing meaningfully to the development process; it is to say that there is no collective North Atlantic policy which successfully meshes the development aid programs of the NATO allies—either in terms of goals, methods, or recipients. This is both a promising opportunity and a pressing obligation before a new NATO. The internal effort to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of U.S. foreign aid is inseparable from a NATO effort to forge an efficient and effective multilateral program.

We recognize that these tasks are enormous—and that they are made all the more difficult precisely because the dangers do not appear anywhere near as imminent today as they did at the close of World War II. But this world can no longer afford to fight a war in order to learn the importance of true statesmanship. The NATO self-study underway today may be as important an event in man's history as any peace conference ever held.

THE STATUS OF JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the fact that within a period of approximately 2 weeks there is being celebrated two events of strikingly contrasting significance provides us with an important opportunity to consider the tragic fate of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union.

On October 25 and 26, Jews throughout the world celebrate the holiday of Simchat Torah which for hundreds of years has commemorated the "rejoicing in the law" by the ancient Jews of Palestine. This joyous occasion marks the completion of the Jewish high holy days and celebrates the privilege of completing the reading of the Five Books.

In recent years, however, this holiday has come to have a special meaning to the Jews of Soviet Russia, especially the younger members of the Jewish community for whom it has become the occasion to reassert their Jewish identities even in the face of the systematic repression by the state of all things Jewish. In the relatively few remaining synagogues and on the streets outside, Soviet Jews demonstrate their consciousness of their identity and their heritage and express their deep yearning for a meaningful Jewish existence—an existence which the Communist government has systematically denied them despite the express commitments contained in the law and Constitution of the Soviet Union.

Only days later, on November 7, the Soviet Government will celebrate its 50th anniversary and will recall the great hopes and promises of the November revolution. It is more than ironic that among those promises were the constitutional assurances of religious freedom and equality and support for the cultural and educational perpetuation of nationalities. It is a tragic fact that to a greater extent than any other religion or nationality in the Soviet Union, Jews and Judaism have been denied their rights and their freedom—a fact which exposes the basic weakness of Soviet society, the refusal to grant to its citizens the most fundamental human rights.

The record of repression is clear. Though the 3 million Soviet Jews constitute the second largest Jewish community in the world and 11th in size among the 108 nationality groups in the U.S.S.R., Soviet policy has been designed to isolate and atomize its Jewish citizens, forcing them to live in fear and insecurity and threatening them with cultural and spiritual extinction.

Once officially recognized as a national language in the Soviet Union, Yiddish is on the verge of extermination. There is not a single Yiddish school or a single Yiddish class anywhere in the country, nor any means of enabling Jews to learn of Jewish history, culture, or literature. Stalin's destruction of Yiddish publishing and the Yiddish theater has never been rectified.

Unlike other recognized religious bodies, Judaism is not permitted any semblance of a central or coordinating structure. Each of the remaining congregations is cut off from the others. Judaism cannot publish periodicals and devotional literature. It cannot produce devotional articles. It cannot have formal contacts with coreligionists abroad. The one remaining Yeshiva, or seminary, is not allowed to function. The handful of aging rabbis and other religious functionaries cannot be replaced. Synagogues have been shut down systematically, and less than 70 of the 450 which existed in 1956 are left. Restrictions on the public baking and sale of the unleavened bread for Passover are still severe.

Although Soviet ideology condemns anti-Semitism, it is virulent and increasing, especially since the Arab-Israeli conflict. Jews have been made scapegoats for economic practices common to the entire nation. Jews are denied advancement in key areas of government service and subjected to a disadvantageous quota system in higher education.

The fate of the Jews in the Soviet Union, Mr. Speaker, is a responsibility no free man can shirk. Repression and descrimination must be condemned—again and again, until Soviet policy is reversed. We must remind Soviet leaders that the pledges of 50 years ago have been violated. We must help arouse the free world to concerted protests against policies of repression, for Soviet Jews ask for nothing but the rights guaranteed them by Soviet law.

More specifically, Mr. Speaker, our own State Department should be urged to press the case in behalf of Soviet Jews with Soviet officials at every level. And the Voice of America can contribute significantly by increasing its coverage of Jewish affairs for Soviet Jewish listeners, by showing the realities of Jewish life in America, and by projecting the rich diversity of the American Jewish community.

There are obvious limits to our ability to influence Soviet policy, but within those limits we must speak and set effectively and persistently for the cause of the Jews of Soviet Russia is the cause of free men everywhere.

KANSAS SELLS ITS FRESH AIR

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, scheduled on the agenda for the House this week is the Air Quality Act of 1967. This legislation is intended primarily to pave the way for control of air pollution problems on a regional basis in accordance with air quality standards and enforcement plans developed by the States.

As emphasized in the report on the bill:

There can be no doubt that air pollution is a threat to the health and well-being of the American people. Air pollution in the United States is responsible, wholly or in substantial part, for some deaths and for a great deal of unnecessary disability and discomfort. Moreover, this problem, which is already serious, is worsening in direct proportion to the Nation's economic and urban population growth and its continuing technological progress.

The people of Kansas who breathe air fresher and purer than that of most States have as much interest in the adoption of this legislation as the most "besmogged" urban center in the land. As we look at the figures on air pollution, we Kansans count our blessings and are forever grateful to those pioneers who staked out the boundaries of our State in such a favorable location.

Just what this natural air-conditioning means to the health-minded people of the Jayhawk State is clearly amplified in an editorial published in the October 22 edition of the Topeka, Kans. Sunday Capital-Journal. I commend this editorial, "Kansas Sells Its Fresh Air," to my colleagues with smarting eyes, twitching noses, dry throats, and befouled lungs:

Kansas Sells Its Fresh Air

Kansas is conducting a national advertising campaign stressing a product every state wishes it had but few do: Fresh air.

With smog fouling the atmosphere of thousands of American communities, Kansas' fresh air campaign is a telling one.

It points out that Kansans live longer, happier lives because their lungs are not laden with impurities as are those of residents in many states.

Television viewers who watched "Barry Goldwater's Arizona" recently heard the 1964 GOP presidential nominee admit that smog was a major problem in Phoenix. This is surprising, for this booming city is located on a desert, where one would imagine pure air is abundant.

The truth is, however, that smog plagues some 7,300 American communities but hasn't invaded Kansas to any noticeable degree.

Anyone who has visited Los Angeles in recent years has experienced smarting eyes and a disagreeable stench in their nostrils. Smog, the word and the condition, was born in Los Angeles, which like Phoenix, is located in what once was a desert.

As the Los Angeles Times recently admitted, "The two things that are abundant in Los Angeles are sunlight and exhaust gases from automobiles. For 16 years scientists have known that automobiles played a key role in the production of smog. Automobiles now account for 90 per cent of the gray-brown shroud of aerial garbage that obscures scenic views, damages flowers, vegetables and trees, and irritates eyes, nose and throat."

So far, Los Angeles—or any other city—has been unable to solve the smog problem.

It was less than a year ago that an air pollution alert went into effect in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut over the Thanksgiving weekend. Drivers and businesses were urged to curtail the use of motor vehicles and owners of buildings and homes to cut down the amount of fuel burned.

In Kansas, the situation is different.

In one of Kansas' fresh air advertisements, the Kansas Department of Economic Development points out:

"In Kansas you can breathe deep and see a mile almost every day of the year. This natural resource is caused by the constant circulation of clean air pushed across Kansas by shepherding southwesterly winds from the Gulf of Mexico.

"It's a circulation system that sweeps the sky clear of pollution, protecting Kansans and their possessions from disagreeable odors, irritants, deterioration and damage.

"Kansans can still enjoy the delicate scent of honeysuckle on a front porch trellis; live in a white painted house that will stay white; and get a breath of clean fresh air by opening a window.

"More importantly, our air-conditioned state provides a healthy, energetic, productive citizenry to build economic progress. Kansans are among the healthiest people in our nation. We used to take our natural Kansas air conditioning for granted. But no longer. We're sure it has a lot to do with the vitality of our people.

"If the fact that Kansas is 'clean air' country and centrally located midway to all major markets is interesting to you, ask your own industrial location specialist more about Kansas."

Backing up these advertisements is a KDED pamphlet entitled, "Kansas, the Land of Clean Air and Clear Heads."

Its message: "When your eyes begin to burn from polluted air, that's the time to get a burning desire for Kansas.

"Kansas is the geographical center of the continental United States and is sheltered from the pollution problem by the Rocky Mountains and moist gulf breezes. Physical features of the nation's geography coupled with nature's wind patterns have made Kansas a state not to be deposited in the 'smog bank.'

"Active air forces in Kansas coming from the gulf winds have carved a niche in the smog shroud starting to move across the U.S. This clean air channel stretches from Kansas through Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota and into Canada.

"It is this system of breezes that clean and circulate Kansas' air, leaving fresh, invigorating air for healthful living. Clear eyes, unfogged scenery and peace of mind make Kansas a healthier, more productive state.

"Dust and chemical saturated air create no excessive death rates or hazards for those with heart and lung ailments—if they are in Kansas! National statistics show that Kansas ranks among the top 10 states in the nation for long life expectancy."

There's more along the same line, but this much tells the story.

Kansas is a good place to live for many reasons, not the least of which is that it has an abundance of that rare commodity, fresh air.

THE SALAZAR OUTLOOK

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Sunday Star featured an article by columnist James J. Kilpatrick, based on a recent interview he had with Prime Minister Salazar of Portugal. This was one of the most objective, frank, and penetrating articles quoting a head of state that I have encountered in some time. In view of the historic friendship between the United States and Portugal, that nation's membership in NATO, and the controversy over its overseas territories in Africa the article assumes great significance. Therefore, I ask that it be placed in the RECORD as a continuation of my remarks:

To Salazar the Outlook Is Gloomy But Not Hopeless

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

LISBON.—Portugal's aging Prime Minister Antonio de Oliveira Salazar, dean of the world's statesmen, offered a quiet bit of advice a few days ago to a civilization that he fears is bent on self-destruction. His warning came to this: Slow down; it's later than you think.

In a wide-ranging interview, the Prime Minister called for wholesale reform or abandonment of the United Nations, defended Portuguese policies in Africa, and tossed a few shafts in the direction of the U.S. policy makers. But he spoke up stoutly in support of the U.S. effort in Vietnam, and renewed his steadfast hostility to communism in any of its forms.

Salazar looks like a successful country banker who is too shrewd to sell out to the city boys. He was 78 in April. He has been the effective head of Portugal's government since 1926, its prime minister since 1932. He has outlived Roosevelt, Churchill, Adenauer. He has been in power longer than Franco, much longer than De Gaulle. In the face of hard pressure from the United Nations, where Portugal five years ago was on the short end of a 90-2 vote. Salazar has serenely resisted the liquidation of his ancient empire. He is a man of character, this one. You don't meet them every day.

In his earlier years, Salazar was well known for a freezing temper and for a sardonic impatience with slow-witted men. He has mellowed with age. He still lives the unpretentious life he has pursued since his student days, but he is gentler now. If he is pessimistic about the future, he is surely not despondent. When he remarks that civilization is likely to destroy itself, because of man's unwillingness to think upon his own most precious values, he might be remarking that dinner likely will be late because cook has burned the roast. This may be no more than the traditional fatalism of the Portuguese—they are an essentially melancholy people—but Salazar's pessimism has no trace of bitterness. This is the world as he sees it.

SUMMER FORT

We met a few days ago in the "summer fort" at Estoril, 15 miles up the coast from Lisbon, where Salazar resides from May through October. The structure is indeed a fortress, built by the Portuguese nearly four centuries ago as part of the coastal defenses of Lisbon. Its massive walls house beds of carnations now; a four-lane highway runs outside the gate. A government chauffeur threaded a three-year-old Chevrolet through a stone archway and across an ancient courtyard; an interpreter led the way up a flight of steps; and there was Salazar himself. It was as simple as that.

He bears his years with astonishing grace: a man of middle height; bay-windowed, white-haired, brown-eyed. It was 5:30, and he was dressed for the evening—immaculate blue suit, starched linen, his legendary high-topped shoes fairly gleaming. We mounted a flight of steps to a small second-story study: bare walls, painted bone white; a worn rug, a glass-fronted bookcase, a carved desk and chair; off to one side, an over-stuffed old sofa and two bulky chairs.

We exchanged pleasantries. I remarked upon how well he looked—and I meant it. He had climbed the stairs as effortlessly as a jetliner taking off; there wasn't a tremor in his eloquent hands. I told him I wanted to ask the oldest question in a cub reporter's handbook: To what, Dr. Salazar, do you attribute your long life?

He entered into the joke. First of all, he said solemnly, laying a judicious finger by his nose, he had taken pains to be born of parents with a reputation for longevity. Segundo—and here he grinned a grin that broke up the seams of his face—he had never married. Indeed, he had tried never to place any strains upon his nervous system—no smoking; no drinking, no partying, no golf. For exercise he walks a little in the garden and turns a great many pages of books. He puts in a 15-hour day, seven days a week.

It seemed a dull routine. No, he said, for sometimes his grandchildren by his two adopted daughters were there, and they "refresh the day." Besides, and now he was turning serious, the life of the mind is never dull. Too many persons, he thought, fail to recognize the joys of thinking. They rush through life as if they were about to miss the last train.

TWENTIETH CENTURY STRAINS

"Man is not biologically prepared for the kind of life this century has pressed him into," Salazar said. "The human body evolves very slowly. It adapts, but adaptation takes time. And look what civilization is imposing on the body—air pollution, water pollution, the sudden time changes of international travel, the tensions of traffic, the strains of instantaneous decisions. And noise!"

He had been reading some sobering material about "noise pollution" and the risk presented not only to hearing but to the nervous system generally. Here at Estoril, the only sound through the French doors was the sound of surf outside. Salazar spoke of the sound of cities—Paris, London, New York. True enough, he himself stays at home; but he reads reports. Was it correct, he wondered, that half of all adults in the United States suffer to some extent from neurological or mental illness? He had read that. It was the speed of life.

The topic absorbed him; he spoke in a torrent of Portuguese. Television without doubt was a marvelous development in the art of communications, but the art was abused. Educational TV, he thought, might teach children to read, but not to reason. He had been reading some reports on the subject. He hoped that Portugal would take its time before leaping into this form of instruction.

"Rich countries, like your United States, can afford to make experiments. We smaller countries must wait to follow along, benefiting from the experiments that give good results. But one of the troubles of contemporary civilization, I believe, is an unwillingness to admit that a particular experiment does not give good results. The innovation is first accepted, then enlarged, and soon it is too late to undo what has been done."

CHANGE AND PROGRESS

Salazar was saying, as philosophers have said for centuries, that one must distinguish between change and progress. Could he give specific examples of changes that seemed to him anti-progress?

He waved an expressive hand at the battlements outside, rose-wine in the setting sun. Once men fought with cannons, now they threaten with hydrogen bombs. Change, certainly; but progress? He was inclined to doubt it. He had been reading of the race to build a super-sonic airplane. Operated efficiently, such an airplane would leave a sonic boom behind, adversely affecting millions of persons on the ground in order to convenience a few passengers in the sky. These passengers would save two hours flying from here to there. And what would they do with these two hours? Waste them. Everyone knew this as a fact of human nature. Why, then, was the United States investing so heavily in this machine? Because its competitor nations might build the aircraft first. The effort would represent change; but progress?

He did not mean to say, of course, that modern science had not also greatly enriched the lives of men. Some of the marvels of this century were a tribute to the wonderful mind of man. He doubted, nonetheless, that every manifestation of this creative explosion would promote the happiness of human beings.

Governments, he added, had a high responsibility to try to regulate the pace of change. He wished it were possible to summon a conference of all the governments of all the world, at which agreement in principle could be reached on a pause in this putative "progress". Let us stop to catch up! But this was idle dreaming. Competitive industry could not pause; governments also were rushing for the train.

"Maybe my own function," he said, "has been to serve as a brake against so much acceleration. It is not an unworthy role."

ORDER VERSUS FREEDOM

Salazar's critics have assailed him over the years for applying too much brake. Mainland Portugal suffered until recently from the highest illiteracy and the lowest per capita income in Europe. Strict press censorship still obtains. Labor unions are little more than social organizations, forbidden to strike. Portugal lags in cultural and intellectual development. In Africa prior to 1961, efforts to bring the natives into the mainstream of Western life were pathetically weak. Portugal is acclaimed, I suggested to Dr. Salazar, as one of the most stable and orderly nations on earth. But had order been achieved at the sacrifice of certain personal freedoms inherent in Western philosophy?

I had submitted this question, in writing, in advance. In his written answer, Salazar met it head on. Certainly, he conceded, a few freedoms had been abridged in Portugal, but the phenomenon is not specifically Portuguese. It is universal.

"There cannot be absolute freedom in any field without anarchy" Salazar observed. "As part of society, men are obliged to give up their freedoms to some extent in order to preserve the order which is essential to life."

He went on to talk of freedom of the press. The U.S. Constitution guarantees it; a recent statute of Congress establishes freedom of information as official policy of the U.S. government. But in practice, how well has the policy worked? Various pressures and interests combine, he said, and these fix the limits of any government's disclosures. Everywhere, direct and indirect restrictions continue to exist. Portugal relies upon prior censorship: other nations rely upon seizure of publications: still others impose penal responsibility. Financial groups and powerful economic interests also tend to supress news.

"Freedoms are and will always be relative," Salazar said, "when they are compared to values which are reputed to be absolute, or at least greater than they are. It is impossible to find a point of equilibrium when as in our case, government interference is confined to what is absolutely essential, because the notion of what is essential varies from mind to mind. Each of us would like to define it in his own way. No matter how much one ponders upon this, there is no way out."

DEMOCRACY A FICTION

What of other Western values? I asked him. In an interview on his 70th birthday, eight years ago, he had said: "I believe democracy is a fiction. I do not believe in universal suffrage. I do not believe in equality among men, but in hierarchy." Were these still his views?

His eyes flashed with a touch of the old cold fire. He leaned forward in the heavy chair and wagged an emphatic finger. Events since that time, he said had served only to strengthen his view. The United States, for example, had tried to impose democratic forms of government repeatedly in Africa, but the forms had no substance. They were fiction.

Salazar went on to make it clear that he regards the United Nations as engaging in fantasies also. I had submitted a question arising from his vehement criticism of the U.N. in 1961, when it failed to intervene in India's armed occupation of the Portuguese province of Goa. His opinions had not changed.

"What interests does the U.N. stand for?" he asked. "What law does it observe? When the delegation from the Indian Union, the self-ordained preachers of pacifism to the world, declared right in the Security Council that with the Charter or without the Charter, with the Council or without the Council, Goa would be taken by armed force; and when at the same session of the Security Council the Russian veto saved the Indian Union from having to withdraw its troops in order to obtain a peaceful solution of this aggression, the men responsible must have realized that there was no law in the organization and no justice in its resolutions."

PETTY POLITICS

"The small nations," said Salazar, "can find no defense from the United Nations unless their interests happen to be integrated in the interests of great powers. Not, even the U.N.'s technical bodies and specialized agencies are immune from the petty politics which corrupt the U.N. as a whole. The overwhelming majority of the U.N. are pure demagogues, quivering with emotion; they do not have to pay for the wars they provoke, nor for the damage done by the votes they cast."

"Such an institution should be entirely reformed." If not, "it should cease to exist."

I recalled that the late Adlai Stevenson had done his best at the time of the Goan crisis to protect Portugal's interest and to push for U.N. intervention. Stevenson had failed, and subsequently the United States had tended to follow an anti-Portugal line in reference to the African provinces of Angola and Mozambique. On these issues the U.S. has taken a position against colonialism and in favor of African self-determination.

PART OF PORTUGAL

The attitude of the United States, and of the United Nations, Salazar remarked, is based upon a failure to master elementary history. The Portuguese claimed their African provinces more than four centuries ago, as integral parts of the Portuguese nation, at a time when the African lands were empty or sparsely populated. Today the residents of Angola and Mozambique, of whatever race, are equally citizens of Portugal, protected by Portuguese law, and voting in Portuguese elections. Portugal will remain indifferent to the U.N.'s baseless resolutions. Portugal has not the slightest intention of following the poor example of other European nations in Africa.

"Western Europe, tired as a result of World War II, and, it would seem, finding it impossible to resist pressure exerted upon her, successively granted independence to the African territories under her sovereignty, which she should not have done. It was not possible to turn an aggregate of sometimes hostile tribes into structured nations. The majority of these creations lacked the economic basis for an administration of their own, even though not very advanced. No heed was paid to the fact that there had not yet been formed a political, administrative and economic elite, capable of managing the collective interest of which, incidentally, in most cases not the slightest awareness existed."

Our conversation turned to U.S. policies generally, and to world leadership in foreign affairs. Salazar did not want to be presumptuous: he asked to be forgiven for speaking out. Everyone accepts the fact, he said, that economic, financial, and military power have made the United States the leader of the Western world. It could not be otherwise. These powers and skills doubtless suffice for management of internal affairs.

"But when the United States undertakes

to direct a world policy in the name of a group of States, or even of a civilization, the power, the strength, the wealth, and the technical skills are not enough. What is indispensable is the kind of long preparation that Britain exhibited in the old days, before its sad decline. Such preparation demands experience before anything else. It also requires the formulation of political policies that are not confused by vague ideologies or rendered unstable by oscillations of opinion and by votes at election time."

Maturity in foreign policy, Salazar went on to say, demands a realistic definition of the aims of international life, and of the correct choice among the means available to achieve them. I recalled that in an interview five years ago, Salazar had charged both the U.S. and Russia with ideological interference in the affairs of others, with supplying arms, extending financial support, and even with training subversive groups. The criticism holds true today, he indicated, and the U.S. "cannot therefore be surprised at the dissatisfaction and criticism which its attitudes sometimes provoke among its friends and allies." Unlimited generosity does not necessarily produce impeccable foreign policies.

VIETNAM VIEWS

What of U.S. involvement in Vietnam? He acknowledged the "terrible burden" this places upon President Johnson and upon the American people. Success in the undertaking is bound to be difficult, but it seemed to him imperative that the U.S. continue to make the effort to contain communism in Southeast Asia. There could be no doubt, in his view, that American withdrawal would be followed at once by the spread of Communist power throughout the area.

I had submitted a question dealing with the spread of communism generally. In his answer, Salazar made the point that Communist successes have not resulted from a doctrinaire insistence upon acceptance of communism as such. Soviet statesmen, pursuing a determined policy of world sovereignty, have been able to take shrewd advantage of circumstances as they came along.

"When one considers the course taken in World War II, especially in its last phase and in the events that followed it, one is bound to realize that, unfortunately, Russia alone knew exactly what she wanted."

Western minds, Salazar recalled, were obsessed by the Hitler image and with the aim of destroying it. The intelligence and will of the Russian leaders had other pretensions; and these became evident through the German partition and the handing over to communism of the whole of Eastern Europe. Churchill's intervention saved Greece; all the rest was lost. The shocked Western powers, seeing the emergence of their former ally as a potential enemy, plunged into the NATO alliance. Portugal was a founding member.

NEW SOVIET AIMS

Times have changed, Salazar said. It seems unlikely today that the Soviet Union has any thought of a military invasion of what remains of Europe. An alternative procedure holds greater promise: It is the disintegration of everything in the world that bears a Western label.

This process can be seen most clearly, he said, in Africa. The Russians have not been able to establish any out-and-out Communist regimes or Soviet colonies, but this is not their way. What they can seek to do is to detach the whole of Africa from the West. By making common cause with Africans and Arabs against Europe, the Soviet Union can achieve its prime purpose. The Russians are anti-Negro racists; the Africans fear them; but the process of disintegration goes on.

"We are struggling to save for Western civilization the southern part of Africa," Salazar said. "It is the most promising and best endowed of the African continent. There we are opposing Communist forces that are directly hostile to Western influence. And we have the right to be surprised that in this field, the very ones we seek to help to defend themselves should support the Soviets so strongly."

The light was fading outside Salazar's small study. I asked if I might get a photograph of him before it got too dark, and he agreeably arose and led the way. An evening breeze flowed briskly along the battlement, making puppet dancers of some ministerial laundry still hanging on a line. In the distance, a small flotilla of fishing boats bobbed and bowed. The 17th century cannon had long ago disappeared from the parapets, but the fortress still spoke eloquently of the eternal hostilities of men and nations. I had asked the Prime Minister to comment generally upon today's perils.

He tended to take an optimistic view of the most familiar ones. The time is still far distant, he thought, when the population explosion will threaten man with famine. Vast and untouched areas, suitable for food production, still exist in Africa, Asia and the Americas; technical improvements will continue to come along. Neither was he inclined to see any realistic probability of an atomic war, even with the emergence of Red China as a nuclear power. The more serious danger from China will come, he thought, when its expanding population needs additional living room.

What, I asked, of the decline of individual freedoms in an increasingly regimented world? Salazar, who so often has been accused of dictatorial suppression of individual freedoms, made a thoughtful reply. Yes, he said, this is truly a cause for concern. But the trouble is that the yearning for freedom that perturbs our world is hindered by the evolutionary slowness of that same world. Economic liberalism exists nowhere in the purity of its principles. Liberal democracy has not shown itself capable of defending and sustaining human progress. As a consequence, individuals engaged in economic and political life tend to enjoy fewer freedoms than those heralded by the French Revolution.

It was growing late. We came inside, to the lamplit study, and I asked Salazar to return to the timeless theme of man in a changing world. He suggested gently that perhaps too much attention is directed to the changing world, and not enough to man.

HISTORY REPEATED

"For man, who is the material with which those who govern have to work, does not appear to change very much. When I reread Thuycidides and Cicero, I see how much alike are the preoccupations of the politicians and the reactions of the multitudes. Throughout history we see experiments repeated in the domestic domain—monarchies, republics, empires, and then again, empires, republics and monarchies. In the foreign realm we recall the federations, the confederations, the unions and the commonwealths. 'There is nothing new under the sun,' said Solomon."

Salazar again acknowledged the material benefits that have come with expanding science. But he regretted the obsession with newness that seems to have led politicians and philosophers into believing in the possibility of a new human race—a race composed of geniuses and angels, made completely happy through the brilliance of the sages.

"I doubt that this dream will materialize," said Salazar. "I rather believe that man will continue to be what he always has been. And I ask myself whether the focussing of human aspirations upon the possession and enjoyment of material wealth ever will suffice to make men happy. Only kindness and justice can reduce the suffering and unhappiness of individuals and nations."

Salazar spread his strong hands flat upon the arms of the bulky chair. The man who is known as "dean of the dictators" was as serenely contented as any grandfather. The interview was over. Salazar led the way to the courtyard, and bade farewell with the stiff, choppy wave of a man beginning to feel the sea mist in his bones.

He had remarked philosophically, in the course of our talk, that he well realized he has only a few more years to go. Both in Portugal and in the provinces, speculation on his successor is a 24-hour occupation. No one knows who the man will be, and Salazar is giving no hints, but this much is agreed: The man who takes his place will do nothing to upset the basic policies fixed by the peasant-professor who walks among the carnations on the battlements of Estoril.

MARTINO ANSWERS STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the editor of Freedom & Union magazine, Mr. Clarence K. Streit, who has devoted nearly all his life to the advancement of greater unity of the nations of the North Atlantic Community, in the October issue of his monthly periodical included the text of a significant letter written to him on April 1, 1966, by former Foreign Minister of Italy, Mr. Gaetano Martino. Because the letter was written as a personal communication, Mr. Streit withheld publication of it until Mr. Martino's death earlier this year. Here is the comment by Mr. Streit and the text of the significant letter by this great statesman of yesterday in Italy:

[From Freedom and Union magazine, October 1967]

MARTINO'S ANSWER TO STATE DEPARTMENT ON ATLANTIC UNION BILL

The death of Gaetano Martino, former Italian Foreign Minister and chairman of the "Three Wise Men" to whom NATO in 1956 turned for advice on strengthening the alliance, permits me to reveal now one of his great services to Atlantic Union—a service which, it will be seen, still continues, and will until the State Department reverses its present Atlantic policy.

This service was his powerful reply to the only grounds on which the State Department based its opposition to the Atlantic Union Delegation resolution at the Senate hearing on March 23, 1966, and still upholds. This proposal, which was re-introduced in both Houses this Spring, would authorize a delegation of 18 eminent citizens to organize and participate in a convention with such other NATO nations as desired to take part. Its aim would be to explore "the possibility of agreement on—a) a declaration that the eventual goal of their states is to transform the Atlantic alliance into a federal union, b) a tentative timetable for the transition to this goal" and c) machinery to expedite the stages. The Department's objections to this were stated at the above hearing by John M. Leddy, Assistant Secretary of State in these words:

"The simple but decisive fact is that our Atlantic allies do not now wish to move toward any type of federal political relationship with the United States. * * * The fundamental reason why there is little European interest in federal union with us at this time is evident. It is that Europe fears that it would be swallowed by a more powerful U.S.A. * * *

"Therefore, to conclude . . . the disparity in power between the U.S.A. and European countries which have not yet achieved their own unity makes proposals seeking far-reaching political action with our allies to achieve these ends impractical. Only after Europe has attained sufficient unity to consider itself a de facto peer of the U.S. could such an undertaking have hope of success."

A few days later I sent these views of the Department to European statesmen I knew in several nations and asked for their comment. They included Signor Martino who I thought could speak with special authority, as he was one of the most active European Union leaders. All those to whom I wrote disagreed sharply with the State Department's view—none more strongly than Signor Martino. Since their letters were personal, I felt I could do no more publicly than quote excerpts—which I did in May 1966 *Freedom & Union**—without identifying their authors.

In his letter, Signor Martino pointed out that the effort at European unification followed the failure of the U.S.A. to offer to federate with the Europeans. Speaking from personal experience, he blamed Washington's resistance for the failure to implement the recommendations of NATO's "Three Wise Men" whom he chaired, and develop a "true Atlantic Community." The full text of his letter—which he wrote in English—follows.

CLARENCE STREIT.

ROME,
April 1, 1967.

DEAR MR. STREIT: I am very glad, indeed, to answer your kind letter of March 28. Your initiative is, in my opinion, of the greatest importance in this moment when international life is crossed by events that are tending to modify the balance on which it has been based up to now.

Unification at the European level and at the larger Atlantic level cannot be regarded as two distinct processes: When we pause to reflect on the values and ideals that underlie each of these apparently separate processes, we must conclude that they are two different aspects or moments of a single political process which represents the outcome of a complex historical development. Therefore every crisis, as every step forward in each of the two processes, cannot remain without effects on the other.

It is true that our efforts have been directed here mainly towards the unification of Europe, considered like a first step as essential to unification in the Atlantic area as the part is to the whole. But one must not forget that America has never concretely and actually proposed to Europe a real federation [with it]. On the contrary, efforts made in the past by European members of the Atlantic Council in order to foster the development and the gradual transformation of the alliance into a true community of peoples have met resistance on the part of the U.S.A.

When I was Foreign Minister of Italy, I had several times the opportunity to underline during the sessions in the Atlantic Council the necessity to transform the Alliance into a true Community; and it is also as a result of my efforts, that the Committee of the "Three Wise Men" was created in 1956. Unfortunately, the suggestions made by this Committee, in order to attain a stronger political solidarity of the Allies, have not been rightly implemented; and we must not forget that this is partly due to the resistance opposed at that time by the American government to the concept of transfer of sovereignty.

I am convinced that the Alliance cannot escape the law of motion. We must acknowledge that, when it was formed and began to produce results, the situation in Europe and in the world was quite different from now and that it is impossible for the Atlantic Alliance not to adapt itself to the changed circumstances. But I am also convinced that the Atlantic Alliance is an institution destined to develop and grow on itself and that inasmuch as America and Europe will be capable of ensuring a stable association between themselves, such as represented by the Atlantic Community, the present controversies over the NATO and the Alliance will dwindle away.

I believe that public opinion in Europe is now prepared to regard the Atlantic Community not so much as a shield to protect our ideals and common way of life, but as a living program of action into which can be channelled the boldest exploits in the history of free men.

Believe me to be
Yours sincerely
GAETANO MARTINO.

---

*See: "Canada Left in Limbo by U.S.A." Reprint may be had free on request.—*Mgr.*

FOLEY AMENDMENT WOULD HAVE IMPROVED H.R. 10915

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as I stated on the floor earlier this afternoon, I believe that H.R. 10915 would have been greatly improved by the adoption of the Foley amendment, as amended, by the additional language which I proposed, for the reasons stated by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] and myself and others during the debate.

I was gratified by the adoption of my amendment, but regretted the defeat of the Foley amendment as amended. I also regretted the defeat of the compromise amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] which would have to a certain extent given the President the same opportunity as the Foley amendment to use restoration of the quotas to the United Arab Republic and the Sudan at some time in the future as leverage to achieve a better situation in the Middle East.

The motion to recommit the bill to committee, if adopted, would have given the Committee on Agriculture the opportunity to make the kind of changes in the bill which would have achieved the objectives I had in mind. Accordingly, I voted in favor of the motion to recommit.

When that motion was defeated, however, I voted in favor of passage of the bill itself. Defeat of the bill would have been construed, I believe, in the Middle East as a victory for President Nasser, and I did not want to be a party to any such implication.

Although H.R. 10915 as passed by the House does not recognize the possibilities of change in the future, I hope that if the time comes when the Governments of Egypt and the Sudan are ready to cooperate in a program for the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East, this House and the Congress will act swiftly to restore the cotton quotas to those countries.

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, later this week we will be considering the Air Quality Act of 1967, a bill pertaining to the control and prevention of air pollution. I firmly believe that this bill is an appropriate answer to citizens throughout the Nation who are demanding that we, as their Representatives, do everything possible to eliminate the threat of polluted air to life and property. My constituents in the Bronx, which is one of the most severely polluted areas in the country, have been especially vocal in their concern—and rightly so. I would like to quote in particular Mr. David Z. Shefrin, director of Citizens for Clean Air, Inc., who testified before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on August 23, 1967.

> The Public Health Service has just declared New York to have the dirtiest, most dangerous air in the country. It was not really news to those of us who live there. The greenish-gray haze outdoors tells the story. It has meant, for instance, a 700% increase in the city's emphysema deaths during the last fifteen years.

Mr. Speaker, air pollution does not belong only to New York. Nor is it solely an urban problem. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has estimated that 60 percent of all Americans live in areas of persistent air pollution. From California to New Jersey agricultural products have been seriously damaged by the poisons in the air. The problem is serious in every region in the Nation.

Recognizing the danger, the public is asking for immediate and meaningful action to deal with air pollution. The Air Quality Act of 1967 makes it possible for all levels of government and the private sector to participate in the battle for clean air.

AIRLINE FARE STRUCTURE AND FUTURE EARNING POWER

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, over the past months I have endeavored to share with my colleagues views expressed by Mr. Richard W. Klabzuba concerning airline fare structure. I am pleased to call attention to Mr. Klabzuba's most recent address delivered before the Society of Airline Analysts on October 11, 1967.

The text follows:

AIRLINE FARE STRUCTURE AND FUTURE EARNING POWER

(Address of Richard W. Klabzuba before the Society of Airline Analysts)

It is indeed a pleasure to be with you today to discuss the airlines' fare structure and its impact upon airline earnings.

As you may already know, I have been devoting my time recently to a rather exciting project—changing the basis for constructing airline fares from a mileage to an hourly rate. Unfortunately, because most of my previous discussion has been primarily with the expertizes, by dialogue concerning the proposal has been limited principally to the technical issues such as the statutory requirements of just and reasonableness, and the pricing concepts of cost and value of service.

Today, however, I address myself to the ultimate criterion of any economic proposal: *earnings*.

Quite frankly, it was my inability to accurately project future earnings which initially created my interest in the problem. I understand that some of you have had the same experience recently. According to a report in the September 18th issue of *Aviation Week*, some "Investment analysts tended to overestimate 1967 airline earnings. . . ."[1] I sympathize with you, and I will try to explain today why this could happen, and how we can avoid such a calamity again in the future.

First, however, if you will indulge me for a moment, I would like to explore with you again briefly the fundamental reasons why earnings are so significant—regardless of whether the company is only a small family firm like Ransome Air, a large public corporation such as United Air Lines, or a wholly state-owned enterprise like B.O.A.C.

Fundamentally, it is the future earning power of a firm which supports the market price of its securities and the safety of its indebtedness. It is the earnings which enable an enterprise to remit periodic dividends to the owners as well as generate internally all or part of the cash funds required to finance its future operations.

In a broader sense, however, it is the proven earning power and the future earning potential, as opposed to the book value, which ultimately determines the feasibility of a company's capital structure, its commercial value, and its borrowing power.

This is not to say increased sales and increased volume of business are not important, rather that such increases are valueless unless they enhance earnings. Neither do I wish to imply that adequate collateral, a proper debt; equity ratio, and other tests of financial soundness are not decisive factors, but rather that the significance of these tests are inversely proportional to earnings potential.

In one degree or another, investors are primarily interested in safety, value, and appreciation. To verify or vitiate various projections as to future earnings prospects, investors rely upon you, the financial analysts, to make a careful study of all the available facts, to draw conclusions therefrom, and to make recommendations on the basis of established principles and sound logic.

In the case of investment grade bonds, equipment trust certificates, and bank notes, as an example, the objective is to make certain that fixed charges can be met without any difficulty or doubt. Prime stress is laid upon protecting the investment against unfavorable events.

The generally accepted principle is to require an adequate margin of safety, or coverage factor, for the stipulated interest and sinking fund payments. The ratio of fixed charges to proven *earnings* must be sufficient to give assurance the firm can successfully weather the degree of adversity it is likely to meet. For this reason, companies subject to wider fluctuations in earnings are required to have a larger coverage factor than similar firms with more stable earnings, even though both enterprises may have the same collateral assets and book value.

Likewise, the relationship of common stock *earnings* per share to market value is a matter of prime interest to those who purchase common stock. Regrettably, there is no precise yardstick by which to determine whether the prevailing market price or any particular security is reasonable. Such a determination depends on a wide range of factors because market value is not a quality intrinsic in either a firm or its securities.

Instead, it is a state of mind concerning them. It is a condition. An enterprise has no intrinsic value except what the disposal value would be if you liquidated its assets. And even then, the commercial value of the disposed assets would still depend upon their productive potential which would eventually have to be expressed in terms of future earnings or scrap value.

What we commonly refer to by the terms intrinsic value, indicated value, nominal value, reasonable value, fair value, justified selling price, appraised value, investment value or market value is, generally speaking, that value which is largely justified by the facts.

These facts encompass not only the enterprise's balance sheet, sales, and potential dilution in earnings, but also such diverse matters as the idiosyncrasies of management, dividend and expansion policies, accounting procedures, and definite future prospects. However, the most important factor in determining value is now generally held to be the firm's future earning power.

Findings as to *earning* capacity of an enterprise are also essential to a determination of its legal value. The United States Supreme Court has held in condemnation proceedings that, "The value of property, generally speaking, is determined by its productiveness—the profits which its use brings to the owners. The value, therefore, is not determined by mere cost of construction, but more by what the completed structure brings in the way of earnings to the owners."[2]

As a result, even though the fairness of rates, and the reasonableness of the income of a public utility (such as an airline) may be established according to some rate-base related to original or reproduction costs—the economic and legal value of a firm is still determined by its present and future earning power.

The ultimate test of the investor and the court is the adequacy of earnings, not book value. The degree of risk is dependent upon the probabilities of attaining sufficient revenues to cover all costs and provide a fair return, not the collateral value of the assets per share. In final analysis it is what the airlines will bring in the way of earnings which remains the key determinant. The simple fact is investor's and lender's money tends to flow to those firms that perform better.

But what do we mean by earnings? The rate-of-return and profit margin are measurements of earnings, not definitions. According to Mr. Webster, earnings are "the balance of revenue for a specific period that remains after deducting related costs and expenses." Profits are "the excess of returns over expenditures . . ." Net income, "the balance of gross income remaining after deducting related costs and expenses."

Earnings, profit, and net income are all determined, by definition, according to their relationship to costs. Hence, to determine the future earnings potential and borrowing power of any enterprise or industry, it is first necessary to make a careful study of its cost structure, then its fare structure, and finally, its markets . . . in that sequence.

From a cost standpoint, investors have been accustomed to comparing airline units costs on a mileage basis; to anticipating a declining rate per mile as distance increases. As an illustration, the over-all operating costs of a typical 4-engine jet might be displayed as $52 an aircraft-mile for a 200 mile trip; $32 a mile for 700 miles; and $28 a mile at 1,400 miles.

Given these facts, it appears that airline prices should vary uniformly with distance, too, by a similar amount. That a rate of $65 an aircraft-mile at 200 miles and $40 a mile at 700 miles, etc., would be sufficient to assure a reasonable return.

Truly, if these were all the facts, pricing of airline services could be a relatively simple task. Earnings would vary principally with traffic volume. Investment analysts could concentrate all their efforts primarily on forecasting business, relying on past performance to provide at least a rough guide to future economic performance.

But, of course, these are not all the available facts. A number of other factors must be also taken into consideration, such as "block speed" (the overall speed of the aircraft from the time it leaves the boarding gate at one terminal until it arrives at the deplaning gate at the next terminal).

Block speed varies wtih distance. Only whereas mileage costs decrease with distance, block speed increases. As a matter of fact, the increase in block speed is inversely proportional to the decrease in mileage costs. This relationship is not accidental. It results from the fact that another element—the level of hourly costs—is relatively stable.

Aircraft operating costs vary only slightly in a wave-like pattern with flight-time. Such costs are not materially affected by changes in the duration or distance of a flight. Since approximately 80% of over-all costs are variable, airlines are primarily a constant cost, as opposed to a decreasing cost, industry. There is no significant differential in unit costs (per block hour) between long- and short-haul services. As a result, block-hours afford a safe, reliable yardstick by which to gauge future performance.

On the other hand, because aircraft do not always travel at the same speed between terminals, expenses incurred by the flight-hour cannot at all times be reasonably, uniformly, nor consistently converted into reasonably reliable mileage costs. Air carrier costs which are proportional to block-time cannot be reasonably related to mileage. For this reason, the value of mileage costs in projecting future airline earning power is questionable.

Although costs are not proportional to distance, the present domestic fare structure is rather uniformly related to mileage. On July 14, 1943, five U.S. air carriers (American, Eastern, TWA, United, and Western) adopted the uniform passenger-mile ratemaking formula.

The domestic fare structure was subsequently altered on April 9, 1952 to incorporate an arbitrary or terminal charge. As a consequence, since World War II the general fare policy of the airlines has been to simply mechanically construct fares by mathematically multiplying a base rate by route mileage, and adding a fixed terminal charge.

While the rate per mile of such a tapered fare structure should generally decline with distance in a manner similar to mileage costs, the reduction is not always uniform nor proportional. First, the ratemaking mileage used to construct fares is calculated by the certificated route, rather than the route actually flown. This circuitry tends to inflate the actual yield as distance increases. Second, the arbitrary is just that, an arbitrary amount having no direct relationship to block speed nor the changing cost per mile.

---

[1] "Airline Observer" *Aviation Week*, New York (September 18, 1967) p. 50.

[2] Monongahela Navigation Co. vs. United States, 148 U.S. 312, 328 (1893).

As a result, the yield per hour varies too. It tends to increase with distance because the taper does not compensate sufficiently for the changes in block speed. In the case of jets, the present yield begins to decline appreciably at a range of around 800 miles. Below this range the yield drops rather quickly; beyond this point the yield rises at a slower rate.

In air transportation, a key determinant of whether or not the balance of revenue will or will not be in excess of costs is generally considered to be the "break-even load factor" (the ratio at which revenues just equal total costs).

Up until now the general feeling has been that the break-even load factor fluctuated principally with costs. However, as we have previously noted, airline costs tend to be relatively stable and not materially affected by changes in distance or load carrier. This fact tends to imply that it is really the other element—the revenue yield—which primarily determines the break-even load factor.

When the passenger yield and aircraft costs are compared on an hourly basis, the break-even load factor declines with distance by an amount which is inversely proportional to the increase in the yield. To illustrate, the coach yield and break-even load factor might be $20 an hour and 57% at 300 miles; $23.30 per hour and 49% at 600 miles; and $25 per hour and 45% at 900 miles.

Unlike the mileage base, hourly figures indicate clearly that the fluctuation in the break-even load factor is attributable to the varying revenue yield, not the relatively stable costs. In fact, a short-haul carrier can even have a slightly lower level of costs per hour and a higher rate per mile, and still have a higher break-even load factor than a long-haul carrier due to a much lower revenue yield.

Consequently, regardless of traffic potential, regardless of book value, regardless of economies and efficiencies in operations, the basic fact remains: under the present fare structure long-haul carriers are more valuable and have a greater borrowing power than short-haul carriers simply because they have a fundamentally higher yield and greater potential earning power per seat, per hour . . . per diem . . . per annum

The present problem with airline earnings is the fare structure, not the level of costs *per se*.

The third element in the earnings equation is the market. Where is the action?

Undeniably, airline service becomes more valuable in comparison to surface travel as distance increases. The time savings becomes increasingly more favorable. A fortiori, the argument goes, long-haul services are more valuable than short-haul services.

However, what about a comparison between a long-haul and short-haul *air* services. Which of these is more valuable to the public: a one or two hour flight, or a five hour flight?

Businessmen and others who fly for nonpleasure reasons still represent the predominate portion of the total market. Since almost all time intransit is nonproductive, the biggest cost of a business trip is usually the executive's time. The value of airline service to a businessman is related to time, not distance.

A $100,000 contract signed at the end of a 5 hour flight is not intrinsically more valuable than one involving only a hour flight, or even no flight at all. The ability to go and return the same day is far more valuable to a businessman than having to lay over one or two nights.

For these reasons, among others, all other factors being relatively equal, a shorter flight appears to be worth more to a businessman. As a consequence, with this viewpoint in mind, it is not surprising to find that in 1965 (the last full year before the big strike of 1966) only about one-fourth of all domestic passengers flew a distance greater than 1,000 miles.

Most of the traffic—68%—flew less than 800 miles, the point at which the yield for jets begins to decline appreciably. 57% flew fewer than 600 miles; 43% less than 400 miles.

Only a little more than 3% of all passengers traveled more than 2,400 miles, which is the transcontinental market. And remember, that between 1962 and 1965 the average annual growth rate was about 16%. In other words, after four years of phenomenal growth, the short-haul market still represented the principal source of traffic—still represented the markets with the highest value-of-service to the consumers.

Of course, it might be justifiably pointed out that one transcontinental passenger produces about 12 times as many passenger-miles as a New York-Washington passenger, and that on this basis the transcontinental market represents a greater portion of the total market.

However, it should also be noted the flight-time between New York and the west coast has been declining too. It has dropped from 14 hours to 8 hours to 5 hours, and may be reduced to 4½ hours next year, and possibly even less than 2 hours in the 1970's—whereas the New York-Washington trip still takes about the same time, or even longer in some cases.

On an hourly basis, the transcontinental passenger produces only about 5 times as many passenger-hours as the New York-Washington passenger, and even this differential will be eventually reduced. Air travel has always been, and most likely will continue to be, primarily a short-time-haul business, because that is where the value of the service lies.

Having made a careful study of costs, revenue, and the over-all market, we should have a more complete picture as to how these elements affect airline earnings.

On a mileage basis the revenue rate, the level of costs, the break-even load factor, and business potential all appear to increase rather uniformly (although not proportionally) with reductions in distance. It is a nice, neat, orderly arrangement.

On an hourly basis, the situation is entirely different. There is nothing logical about the arrangement. Whereas the business potential tends to increase as distance diminishes, and the cost level remains relatively stable, the yield begins to decline appreciably. On this basis the break-even load factor and earnings, the balance of revenue remaining after deducting related costs, tend to vary with distance because the yield varies with flight-time.

Since market prices are fundamentally established by future earning power, a significant portion of the investment analysis and advice proffered in the financial district rest upon future business and earnings prospects. Market predictions generally assume that if business improves, the security prices will advance; but if sales decline, market prices will fall, that if the outlook favors increased business, the issue should be purchased in anticipation of higher market prices when larger earnings are subsequently reported.

Higher potential earnings, in addition, increase the coverage factor and, therefore, also raise the firm's present borrowing power.

For these reasons, the annual ritual of projecting future earnings has become an essential part of the investment business. Since this requires a prediction as to what will occur in the future—an estimate (as distinguished from a mathematical certitude) is all that can be made. Nevertheless, that estimate must be made on an informed judgment which embraces all the facts relevant to future earning capacity, and therefore present worth, because—right or wrong —these earnings estimates have a substantial influence on the investment community.

Normally in preparing these projections it is a working assumption that the past record of a company or industry affords at least a rough guide to future performance. Past performance is generally considered a useful (although not infallible) indication of future earning power.

However, any meaningful estimate rests ultimately on the value of the inputs, which must be eventually translated into a revenue yield and cost level. The more questionable the inputs and assumptions, the more vitiating the conclusions regarding safety, value, and appreciation.

Now because airline operating costs are relatively proportional to block-flight-time and aircraft do not always travel between terminals at the same speed, it appears that whereas the value of mileage costs in estimating future performance is debatable, block-hours do afford a relatively safe, reliable guide to future operating costs.

Revenue, however, presents an entirely different problem. Without going into great detail, the problem can be summarized by simply stating under the present fare structure, unlike costs, nothing is constant, everything is variable—the rate per mile, the yield per hour, and the block speed. More important, to make matters worse, none of these factors varies uniformly nor consistently with each other, or time, or distance.

The present fare structure is not amicable to analytical analysis nor statistical forecasting on a system-wide basis. There are just too many questionable input factors. The ratio of revenues to costs is fluctuating constantly. For example, the basic jet coach yield between Los Angeles-Chicago is $31.50 per hour, as opposed to $29.00 between New York-Los Angeles.

With this background, I believe we can now explain why 1967 airlines earnings could be overestimated. When any new faster type of equipment is placed into service, the yield per hour increases. A surcharge or more direct routing will increase the yield further; and since the new equipment will normally be assigned first to the more lucrative longer routes and then the medium-haul services, before finally being placed on the short-haul routes, some time passes before the yield per hour begins to fall appreciably.

Part of the increased yield is, of course, usually off-set by a higher level of costs. However, due to subsequent efficiencies resulting from the "learning curve", the new cost level tends to decline slightly before it finally stabilizes. As a consequence, even though the yield declines slowly as the new equipment is assigned to shorter medium-haul routes, the level of costs slips too, causing earnings to remain relatively constant or even improve slightly.

On a mileage basis, the rate per mile appears to increase slightly while the cost per mile remains the same or declines triflingly. Past mileage performance seems to proffer a useful, and even conservative, guide to future earnings performance.

Beyond this point, however, costs begin to stabilize. As the new aircraft are assigned to shorter and shorter flights under 800 miles, the yield begins to drop appreciably, and earnings quickly disappear due to the leverage factor.

On a mileage basis, past performance no longer affords a rough guide to future earnings. Costs appear to rise more rapidly than revenues. High costs, rather than low revenue, is viewed as the culprit. Does that sound rather familiar?

Given these circumstances, is it any wonder that airline officials have not always been as confident as you that their cost and earnings estimate would materialize. They have learned the hard way not to place too much reliance upon such forecasts.

Nevertheless, two facts remain: airline operating expenses are proportional to flight-time, and earnings are the balance of revenues that remains after deducting related costs. As a consequence, regardless of how airline fares are constructed, it is essential to the *safety* and *value* of the investment that fares be established in such a manner that the total yield exceeds the rather stable hourly operating costs by an amount sufficient to assure adequate earnings.

Recognizing this situation, a new fare structure has been proposed. One which would more closely relate fares to block-flight-time. One which would liberalize routings and improve the service. One which would improve the productiveness of jets, thereby increasing their earnings potential and enhancing their value.

As part of this proposal it has also been suggested that passenger- and ton-hour statistics be employed in conjunction with passenger- and ton-mile statistics. The passenger-hour would provide a more accurate unit measurement of the amount of service rendered, the costs incurred and revenue yield obtained. It would proffer a more useful indicator of future earning power.

The passenger-hour fare structure will not provide a panacea for all airline problems, for even though fares are constructed on an hourly basis, individual fares will still be a fixed amount. Changes in block speed, routing, weather, direction, and airport congestion will still have an influence on the yield, but to a lesser extent.

Under the hourly fare structure, airline officials will be better informed and better able to anticipate such changes in advance. Both the yield and the ratio of over-all revenues to expenses should be much more stable. Past revenue performance will provide a relatively reliable yardstick to future revenues.

In addition, since the passenger-hour fare structure eliminates the inherent need for linear routings required by a mileage fare structure, the airlines will be able to offer more liberal routings. More liberal routings, in turn, will enable the airlines to use their equipment more productively.

For example, last month Alaska Airlines began routing all of its passengers to Western Alaska in a round-robin pattern. The new routing saved Alaska about 35 minutes in block flying time and 2 landings per day, besides making the aircraft available for another service 2 hours and 20 minutes earlier. This relatively small time savings added about $100,000 to Alaska's annual earnings. Flexible routings make jets more productive, and enhance their value.

In this regard, I might mention I am hoping the airlines will be eventually able to chop about 75,000 hours—primarily DC–3's and Convairs—from their schedule through the greater use of hub-point routings. Such a reduction could conceivably produce a $10 to $20-million savings in operating costs, including a $5.5 to $8-million reduction in federal subsidies.

The savings in subsidy alone could be sufficient enough to pay the salaries of the 800 additional air traffic controllers and 100 flight-standard supervisors President Johnson recently requested.

Since the real interest of investors centers on earnings, it is the future earnings potential and the opportunity to participate in such earnings which attracts capital. Although it is not practical to compare here the future earnings potential of various airlines, I do believe you can get a "feel" for future earning power by comparing the relative requirements of various types of equipment.

Using about a 20% profit margin, it appears that whereas the old venerable DC–3 needs about $200 an hour in revenue to produce a reasonable return, a two-engine prop-jet requires $450–$500 per hour, a two-engine jet $800 an hour, a three-engine jet $1,200 per hour, and a four-engine jet-$1,600 an hour. The 747 will require around $3,000 an hour in revenue, as compared to $7,000 for the SST.

The revenue required per passenger-hour or ton-hour to attain these or similar levels will vary, depending upon the differences in operating philosophies between companies, seating configuration, characteristics of the cargo, density of traffic, load factor, and of course, the value of the service.

However, don't let that SST figure scare you; it appears to be a very efficient airplane. Its large capacity and high speed make a rate of under $50 a passenger-hour economically feasible. This means that if the sonic boom problem can be licked, the SST has truly large money making possibilities—especially when you consider that on high density routes, value-of-service considerations will necessitate a surcharge and the actual yield will probably exceed $50 an hour. But I must emphasize, the sonic boom must be licked; its present impact upon the community is totally unacceptable. I speak from personal experience.

On the other hand, the earnings requirements of the 747 and SST indicate clearly the need for a fail-safe all weather landing system. There is a considerable difference in the cost of diverting a DC–3 capable of earning less than $200 an hour (under normal conditons) and a $3,000 an hour plus 747 to another airport, not to mention the thought of stacking a $7,000 an hour SST in the holding pattern over Kennedy for one hour.

Thus, because it is the fundamental earning power of an airline which ultimately supports its securities—and the balance of revenues that remains after deducting related airline costs is ultimately determined by yield per hour—it is essential to the safety, value and appreciation of the investment that the total hourly yield of an airline exceed its rather stable hourly aircraft costs, regardless of how fares are constructed.

Generally speaking, voluminous evidence indicates that a sound fare structure requires that the respective fares increase with block-flight-time because costs increase with block-flight-time, and that a departure from this principle (except for considerations of value-of-service) will tend to lessen the revenues of the carriers, weaken their economic and financial position, and impair their capacity to render adequate, economical and efficient service.

Expanding sales are one thing, profits are another. The airlines still have a strong traffic growth characteristic. Many shorter haul markets offer truly large money making opportunities. Demand in these markets appears to be more price inelastic than longer-haul markets due to a higher value-of-service to the businessman. In addition, many smaller short-haul markets proffer an opportunity to reduce operating costs through greater use of hub-point routings.

To develop these opportunities, the airlines need a rate structure related to the passenger-hour and ton-hour. The industry badly needs a new fare structure if it is to resume the earnings growth that has perceptibly slowed down this year due principally to the declining yield per hour.

Dilution of earnings due to conversion of bonds, investment tax credits, debt:equity ratios, block holdings, and accounting procedures are all important in determining market value . . . but first you have to have earnings . . . first you have to have an adequate yield per hour.

One final thought before I close. What I have said today about the effect of speed on airline revenues and earnings is also applicable to a lesser (but growing) extent to the other modes of transport.

The president of American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, Mr. A. Theodore DeSmedt recently declared it would be economically unfeasible to have a $25-million containership capable of 25 knots proceeding up and down the Great Lakes Seaway at 5 to 9 knots.[3] Mr. DeSmedt is right. Slowing down such a ship would seriously reduce its productivity, the company's earning power, and its market value.

Similarly, the high-speed trains and superhighways are going to improve the productivity of the railroads, the truck-lines and the bus-lines. To what extent these increases can be translated into earnings rest primarily upon the shoulders of management, the union and the regulatory agencies. Nevertheless, it would not hurt these officials to begin taking elapsed-time into greater consideration *now* as a principal factor in determining revenue and earnings potential, as well as costs. Eventually, the passenger-hour and ton-hour may become the standard yardstick by which all transportation services are measured.

Gentlemen, everything I have said today can be wrapped-up in less than 10 words: "The passenger-hour and ton-hour measure earning power."

TABLE 1.—DISTRIBUTION OF U.S. SCHEDULED AIRLINE PASSENGER BY LENGTH OF HAUL, ALL CLASSES OF SERVICE, CALENDAR YEAR 1965

Length of passenger trip (miles)	Passengers	Percent of market	Overall percent of market
0 to 199	9, 792, 680	14. 9	14. 9
200 to 399	18, 463, 790	28. 2	43. 1
400 to 599	9, 425, 110	14. 4	57. 5
600 to 799	7, 011, 800	10. 7	68. 2
800 to 999	5, 007, 540	7. 6	75. 8
1,000 to 1,199	5, 108, 950	7. 8	83. 6
1,200 to 1,399	2, 041, 360	3. 1	86. 7
1,400 to 1,599	1, 590, 600	2. 4	89. 1
1,600 to 1,799	1, 657, 290	2. 5	91. 6
1,800 to 1,999	1, 298, 290	2. 0	93. 6
2,000 to 2,199	910, 090	1. 4	95. 0
2,200 to 2,399	1, 016, 280	1. 6	96. 6
2,400 to 2,599	2, 109, 690	3. 2	99. 8
2,600 to 2,799	149, 970	. 2	100. 0

Source: Domestic Origin-Destination Survey of Airline Passenger Traffic, 1965, vol. VI, table 3, "Summary Length of Passenger Trip (10 Percent Sample From Jan. 1 Through Dec. 31, 1965; Multiplied by 10) All Classes of Service."

TABLE 2.—*Relative revenue requirement for various type of aircraft equipment per aircraft-hour flow (U.S. domestic services)*

Equipment types:	*Yield required per aircraft-hour*
DC–3	$200
2-engine jet	450–500
2-engine jet	800
3-engine jet	1, 200
4-engine jet	1, 600
B–747	3, 000
SST (B–2707)	7, 000

ALEXANDER WILEY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the passing of former Senator Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin. For 24 years, he represented Wisconsin in the U.S. Senate. His four terms in the Senate were the longest period of service in that body for any Wisconsin Senator.

---

[3] Bamberger, Warner, "U.S. Asked to End Aid to Lake Route", *New York Times*, New York (Saturday, August 12, 1967) p. 40M.

He served, with great distinction, first as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1947–48, and then as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1953–54. Senator Wiley was a strong advocate of a bipartisan foreign policy, as well as an original supporter of the ratification of the United Nations Charter. During his senatorial career, he attended numerous international peace conferences. He was also prominent in winning Senate approval for the St. Lawrence Seaway.

In my early days in the House, Senator Wiley often took time to give me advice, and I will always remember not only his insight and counsel, but also, the warm and generous spirit that motivated him. He was a warm, good-natured man, well liked, and well respected by all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues on October 28, 1967, Washington Post editorial which recalls Alexander Wiley's political courage and his years of faithful service to his country.

Alexander Wiley

> Former Sen. Alexander Wiley will be remembered as a small-town banker, lawyer and farmer who made a national career out of backslapping, Wisconsin cheese and a high degree of courage. During his 24 years in the Senate he rose to the chairmanship of that body's Judiciary Committee and later its Foreign Relations Committee, but he never lost his homespun qualities. His appeal was direct to the people in the style that he learned as a Kiwanis governor. Yet he maintained a large degree of independence and the capacity to change his mind in response to changing circumstances.
>
> It was not easy for this conservative country businessman of Norwegian stock to abandon the isolationism that became so ingrained in Wisconsin after World War I. But his close association with Sen. Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan convinced him, after the United States was deeply involved in World War II, that a changing world demanded a fresh view of international policy. He became a stout advocate of the United Nations, foreign aid and American cooperation with other countries of the free world.
>
> The Wisconsin Republican organization censured him in 1953 for his opposition to the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution designed to curtail the President's treaty-making power. Three years later he was denied renomination by the party hierarchy, at the behest of his junior colleague, Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy, who was at the height of his hysterical anti-Communist crusade. With characteristic courage, however, Mr. Wiley defied his party, won the senatorial primary and was subsequently reelected.
>
> Though he is not likely to be ranked among the greatest senatorial leaders in either foreign or domestic affairs, he will have an honored place among the large number of unpretentious legislators of sound instincts who have served their country faithfully.

THE REPUBLICAN "NEW DIRECTION"

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I happened to miss reading the funny papers, but I got my morning chuckle anyway, since I was lucky to come across a copy of a new Republican National Committee newsletter. The newsletter is published by the committee's minorities division and is titled "New Directions."

A feature entitled "Spotlight on the Hill" caught my eye. It discusses the recently enacted rat control amendment to H.R. 6418, the partnership for health legislation. This newsletter is designed to show Republican leadership in legislation to help minorities, which translates. of course, into the poor urban minorities.

Discussing the vote on the rat control amendment, "New Directions" proudly announces "68 Republicans for." It neglects to reveal the GOP vote against the amendment. It is true—68 Republicans did vote for the amendment, but 110 voted against the amendment. If we follow the inferences of "New Directions," this was 110 Republican votes against minorities.

It may be helpful to complete, for my Republican friends and "New Directions," the Republican votes on other urban issues this session.

The Republicans demonstrated their solicitude for the problems of urban poor when 141 of them voted to slash funds for model cities; they showed deep concern when 163 Republicans voted to delete funds for rent supplements, while only 12 Republicans voted for the supplement funds.

On July 20, 148 Republicans voted against the rule to permit the House to consider the original rat control bill, while only 22 Republicans voted to let the House consider it. "New Directions" should print the Republican comment on the rat control bill rule. I am certain urban minorities would appreciate reading some knee-slapping humor about rats.

Let me say I was at first encouraged by the name of this Republican National Committee publication.

However, its contents belie its title. The GOP elephant is still going the same old direction—backward.

DANGERS OF CONGRESSIONAL INACTION ON PRESIDENT'S SURTAX CITED

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson proposed the temporary 10-percent surtax in August, he warned us of the costs of failure to act.

Governments at all levels, businesses, and the people of the United States are already paying the costs of our inaction.

The Federal Government is losing $20 million a day in badly needed revenues.

Higher interest rates and rising prices are cutting deeply into America's pocketbooks. The costs of Federal and municipal borrowing are up dramatically over a few months ago—as much as 1¼ percent higher. Corporate bond and mortgage interest rates have all risen to the detriment of the economy and the public.

Price rises have been equally predatory. In the 7-month period from October 1966 to May 1967 the consumer price index rose less than it has in the 3-month period from May to August—already 1.1 percent.

Without the surtax, prices will soar by as much as 5 percent in 1968, inflicting hardship most cruelly on those least able to protect themselves—families on fixed incomes, the old, and the poor.

Few of us seem willing to face the fact that higher interest rates and prices will consume more of the consumer's dollar than the proposed tax increase.

The surcharge will cost the Nation far less than the results of congressional inaction. These results will be measured in a huge deficit, roaring inflation, unstable economic growth, a wage-price spiral, and in the crushed hopes of millions of American families.

I urge swift passage of the President's proposal.

SUPPRESSION OF SOVIET JEWS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, early next month the Soviet Union will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. But there will be little cause for celebration by Russia's 3 million Jews. For them, the Soviet regime has brought only limited freedom. Mistreatment and discrimination persist. Anti-Semitism, while officially banned by the Soviet Government, nevertheless remains a grim fact of life for these 3 million people.

An American rabbi, Shelomo ben-Israel, writing of his travels through Russia earlier this year, reached this gloomy conclusion in a series of articles published as a booklet called "Russian Sketches":

> There is no exaggerating the peril in which Jewish faith and tradition stand in the Soviet Union today. The Russians are determined to obliterate, by repression and attrition, our age-old religion and culture.
>
> Let us not make the mistake of thinking it cannot be done.

At the same time, according to a recent newspaper report, there are "new and heartening" signs that many young Jews in Russia—so-called voluntary Jews who choose to designate their nationality as Jewish—are clinging to their heritage. Just a few days ago on October 25, thousands of Russian Jews joined in the celebration of Sinchat Torah, an ancient observance that has become, to them, as a symbol of desire for a full and meaningful religious life.

The newspaper report appeared in the July 12 Christian Science Monitor under the headline, "Reds Spar With Jews in Russia." The author was Paul Wohl, who has lived, worked, and traveled in Russia, most recently last December. His account of the current status of Soviet Jews is balanced and objective. The full report follows:

REDS SPAR WITH JEWS IN RUSSIA

A cloud hangs over the Soviet Union's 3 million Jews. Tel Aviv's broadcasts are jammed. The sleek cars of the Israeli Embassy with the star of David have disappeared. The few score Jews with emigration visas for Israel cannot leave.

In the hour of its military triumph, Israel for Soviet Jews has become a hostile country. To express sympathy for Israel would be betraying the Soviet fatherland, says the press. What does it mean to express sympathy for Israel? No one knows for certain. A word may be sufficient, a letter to a friend. . . .

Solomon B. Dolnik, a retired geodesic engineer and a Jew who in February was sentenced to be shot as a traitor for having "disseminated anti-Soviet as well as Zionist pamphlets," may still be executed.

Surely Soviet Jews have grounds for worry, but they have not demeaned themselves. More than one month after the outbreak of the Israeli-Arab war, Soviet officials still have not been able to produce a declaration of rabbis and Jewish intellectuals condemning Israel.

The pressure was great. Beginning in March, officials of the few remaining synagogues were urged by state security organs to start a letter-writing campaign denouncing Israel. By the end of June the campaign had not come off.

ONLY ONE PROTEST

Only in Dushambe, Tadjikistan, did a Jewish congregation—a congregation without a rabbi—issue an anti-Israel statement. The large Jewish communities of Moscow (285,000), Leningrad (165,000), Kiev (220,000) and Odessa (250,000) remained silent.

Organized religious communities in the Soviet Union are supposed to support the policies of party and state. Ever since the war, in matters of foreign policy, the Russian Orthodox Church and the Kremlin have been one. Soviet Baptists and Lutherans consistently declare their Soviet patriotism.

The Soviet Union's religious Jews consisting mostly of pensioners, are one of the smallest, poorest, and least favored of organized religious communities. That they, together with the many prominent Jewish artists, scholars, and writers should have remained silent so long, is a sign that something has changed in the condition of Soviet Jews.

Either the Kremlin has not used its enormous powers or Soviet Jews have gained a measure of self-respect which is something new in the history of the complex relations between the Jews and Russian and Soviet society.

Like the Armenians, of whom there are only a few hundred thousand more in the Soviet Union, the Jews are at the same time a religious community and a nationality. Like Soviet Armenians, the great majority of Soviet Jews, especially the Communist-educated younger and middle generations, are not religious. But unlike the Armenians, they neither have a national republic nor a common language.

Fewer than 10 percent of the inhabitants of the Jewish autonomous province of Birobidzhan in the Far Eastern region are Jews.

Were it not for the ancient Russian legislation according to which everyone must register as a member of one of the more than a hundred different ethnic groups of the empire, the Jews as a national might have disappeared.

NATIONALITY OPTIONAL

There was much intermarriage in the first decades of Soviet power. At the age of 16, children from mixed marriages could, and still can, opt for the nationality of either parent. Because of surviving anti-Semitism the party expected that virtually all children of mixed marriages would choose non-Jewish nationality.

It did not work out that way. The number of mixed marriages declined sharply. And more and more children of these marriages registered as Jews, even though they knew neither Yiddish nor Hebrew and were almost totally ignorant of Jewish history and cultural traditions.

Quite a few American Jews visiting the Soviet Union were astonished to meet blond, barrel-chested Russian sailors who had the word "Yevrei," meaning Hebrew or Jew, written on their identification papers or internal passports, which are compulsory for all Soviet citizens just as they were under the czars.

Case after case has become known in the United States of half-Jewish relatives in the Soviet-Union , who as grown men and women requested the authorities to change their nationality from, say, Russian or Latvian into Jewish.

Almost none of these young "voluntary Jews" belongs to a Jewish religious congregation, but on joyous Jewish feast days many of them go to the synagogue and sing and dance in the yard or on the surrounding streets; among them young men in Army uniform with military decorations.

A Russian-speaking American, Rabbi Shelomo ben-Israel, recently returned from the Soviet Union. He has told in a series of articles published under the title "Russian Sketches" by the American Jewish Committee, how he asked one such boy why he went to the synagogue on Simchat Torah, the feast celebrated after completion of the annual reading of the books of Moses.

"I don't know how to explain it," said the boy, "I'm Jewish. I feel Jewish. I can't recite the prayers and I can't read Yiddish or Hebrew. So I go to the synagogue to be with other Jewish people and have a good time with my friends. Once a year I want to show everyone I'm Jewish, so I dance and sing with all the others."

For anyone acquainted with the condition of the Jews in czarist days this is new and heartening. Although the Jews under the czar had a Jewish cultural life with books, newspapers, and schools of their own, they frequently suffered violence and persecution.

In their great majority the Jews were limited to the pale and forbidden to live in such cities as Moscow and St. Petersburg (now Leningrad). Hence the ordinary Jews among gentile Russians were withdrawn and anxious. Nothing would have been more foreign to a young Jew under the czar than the present-day easy-going joyous public demonstration of Jewishness in metropolitan cities.

Even party members are proud of their Jewishness. When this writer questioned a Soviet biologist, an acquaintance of long standing, about his knowledge of the Bible, he disclosed that he was a Jew. As a youngster before the revolution he had gone to a Jewish school, was fluent in Yiddish and had studied classical Hebrew. An Army officer with a fine record during the war, he was a long-time party member.

His daughters, who married Jewish Communist Army officers, also studied Hebrew. As loyal party members they reject Zionism.

PECULIAR PHILOSOPHY

How did this Soviet scholar explain his attachment to Jewish nationality? Could there be a Jewish national culture without a separate language and a land?

The explanation seems to lie in the peculiar Russian and Soviet philosophy according to which everyone must have an ethnical identity, in other words belong to a nation or tribe. To be a citizen of the state is not enough. Citizenship per se to Russians is an abstract concept.

Although Soviet Communists do not criticize their party in front of non-Communists, it is evident that my friend would have welcomed more leeway for Jewish cultural activities.

Today there is not a single daily Jewish newspaper in the Soviet Union. Only seven books in Yiddish were published in the past five years. A Yiddish magazine, "Sovietish Heimland," appears more or less regularly every month in a limited edition. Only two books in Yiddish were published last year with more copies sold abroad than in the Soviet Union.

There are no Jewish schools. Hebrew is taught at Moscow University but until last year only four students were assigned to the Hebrew course; all non-Jews. Moscow used to have a famous Jewish theater; there was a Jewish theater in Kiev. Now there are only a few itinerant theater groups performing in Yiddish.

In the spring of last year one Josip Chornobilsky was arrested for collecting signatures on a petition asking for the establishment of a Jewish national theater in Kiev.

TWO REASONS FOR POLICY

There are two reasons for this restrictive policy. One is Soviet anti-Zionism, the other is the fear that Jewish cultural activities might revive the Jewish religion.

Both reasons are ambivalent. The Soviet Union as a member of the Security Council of the United Nations cosponsored the establishment of the state of Israel 20 years ago. The Kremlin's present policy toward Israel is related to Moscow's wooing of the Arab states and to the fact that Israel firmly sides with the West.

As a capitalist country, depending financially largely on the United States, the Soviets have come to regard Israel as an American bastion in a Middle East which they would like to turn into their sphere of influence. Yet, Soviet Premier Alexei N. Kosygin has stated at the United Nations, that the Soviets, unlike the Arabs, are not opposed to Israel's existence.

Even if the Soviets were able to reach an agreement with Washington about collaboration in the Middle East, they are unlikely to establish close relations with Israel, because it might lead to a mass exodus of Soviet Jews.

Once Jews are allowed to emigrate in large numbers, a demand for the right to emigrate might spread to other nationalities. The "closed society" of Soviet communism would have to open and the Soviet state would cease to be a centrally governed citadel.

Soviet concern about a revival of Jewish cultural activities also has two sides. Jewish culture is permeated with religious tradition. A revival of Jewish religious life in the Soviet Union might strengthen all religions, especially the smaller groups, where religious life is most intense and therefore most challenging to communism.

In the case of the Jews, the Soviets also distrust Judaism's many international associations. This may explain why Jewish rabbis, alone among the representatives of recognized religions in the Soviet Union, never have been allowed to attend international congresses.

Behind these rational considerations there are the age-old popular prejudices against the Jews, which the party officially fights. Anti-Semitism is a crime according to Soviet law. But anti-Semitism still permeates the thinking of many party and state officials in the provinces up to the middle echelon. Some of the top leaders have bowed to these prejudices.

This explains why former Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev chided Yevgheni Yevtushenko for his poem, Babiy Yar, which evoked the tragedy of the 200,000 Jews of Kiev—slaughtered by the Nazis, and deplored the survival of anti-Semitism among Russians. Mr. Khrushchev was not alone. General Secretary Leonid I. Brezhnev in Kiev on Oct. 23, 1965, spoke of "the mass murder of Soviet citizens . . . in Babiy Yar" without once mentioning the martyrdom of the Jews.

Also related to these prejudicies is the poor representation of the Jews in the Soviet political structure. Thus there are only 13 Jews among the 5,761 members of the supreme soviets or Legislatures of the 15 Soviet republics and only 11 Jews among the 2,842 members of the supreme soviets of autonomous republics. It is the same thing in the local soviets. The local soviets, according to the monthly of the central statistical administration (No. 3 of 1967) had 2,010,540 members and only 8,124 were Jews, a little more than one third of 1 percent. The total number of Jews in the Soviet population is close to 1½ percent.

HIGH PROFESSIONAL RATIO

It is different in the professions. The numbers of Jews among artists, mathematicians, physicists, economists, philosophers, sociologists, writers, and journalists is several times their share in the population.

There are few Jews, however, among high Soviet officials and none among responsible party leaders. Deputy Premier Venyamin E. Dymshits, whom Premier Kosygin mentioned at his recent press conference at the United Nations, is an exception.

Like everything in the Soviet Union today, the condition of the Jews is in flux. Premier Kosygin on December 3, in Paris said that the Soviets would do "everything possible" to facilitate a reunification of Jewish families and, "if some of them want to leave us, to open the road. This does not raise any problem of principle, and will not raise any."

The Premier's promise was promptly published in Izvestia and Komsomolskaya Pravda; only the words "everything possible" were missing. In practice, opposition cropped up very soon.

The Kremlin is aware of the enthusiasm with which visiting Israeli artists were received last year and did not like it.

Soviet authorities are very concerned about popular Jewish response to visiting Israeli artists. Three persons arrested in Riga last July for obstructing the police when the Jews jammed the street in front of the theater where Israeli artists were performing, were given two-year prison sentences.

Although it is by no means certain that the majority of Soviet Jews would prefer to live in Israel rather than in the Soviet Union, the cultural attraction of Israel worries the suspicious Soviets. But, intent on seeking a modus vivendi with the West, the Kremlin neither wants to give further cause to those Western Communists and Communist-sympathizers who have publicly accused the Soviet Union of anti-Semitism nor does it want to exasperate its already stirred up Jews.

This may explain why the pressure on Soviet Jews to come out against Israel was not so strong as to break every resistance, as would have been the case in former years.

A LAST LOOK AT EXPO

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as the successful Canadian Expo 67 prepares to join the long history of world fairs—many less well remembered—we can pause to add a few thoughts on the overly criticized, overly praised U.S. pavilion and exhibit.

Bill Bantey, in a recent article in a Montreal paper, has explored the current demand, by would-be purchasers, for the pavilion and has looked anew at the exhibit within it.

The column points out that while not emphasizing technology, the exhibit managed to portray a sophisticated gaiety that represents, perhaps, a step forward for Americans who have long been rightfully criticized for an overindulgence in technological bragging. As. Mr. Bantey phrases it:

> The notable absence of flag-waving and chest-thumping alone is praiseworthy, especially since Americans are involved.

Mr. Bantey adds:

> There is, if you will pardon the expression, a freedom about the pavilion and an absence of heavy-handedness that lets you breathe.

This is, indeed, a high compliment to our efforts at Expo.

I would like to call your attention to Mr. Bantey's remarks by including them in the Record at this point:

Expo 67: Now and Later

(By Bill Bantey)

You'd be amazed at the use would-be purchasers want to make of the United States pavilion after Expo 67 closes down. There is the company, for example, that wants to convert the geodesic dome into a motel. Another firm sees it as a supermarket without walls. A third proposal is to convert it into a year-round sports centre, while a fourth would make it an international congress headquarters.

The offers, in other words, are pouring in—nearly two score different proposals to date—but it's all in vain, apparently. The pavilion was offered to the city, accepted in principle and, in fact, its ultimate future seems to have been decided even now. The project: A conservatory for the bird and plant life of the world.

American sources say a U.S. expert was asked about the feasibility of such a project by Mayor Drapeau and the authority's answer was yes, indeed. In fact, the quote attributed to the expert by American officials is: "I've been in this business all my life but it took a mayor to come up with an idea for a closed-in 'park'!"

INTEREST PLEASES PLANNERS

All the interest—official and private—now being showered on the pavilion obviously is pleasing to its planners, especially since it was subjected to rather heavy criticism in the early days of Expo and still is, in some circles, including part of U.S. officialdom.

Some anti-Americans have sneered at it as "the empty brain" but, in reality, the display is among the most sophisticated of Expo.

It isn't if you go looking for technological muscle-flexing and that may be why so many Americans hate it. There is no effort to show that the Americans can make refrigerators or TV sets or supersonic aircraft. A North American audience already knows the Americans are capable of that. The Americans are so much at home in this country—fortunately or unfortunately, depending on your political outlook—that they have no need to prove prowess.

The achievement of the American pavilion lies in the mood it creates. There is a gaiety, a creativity, a sense of humor which is truly refreshing. There is, if you will pardon the expression, a freedom about the pavilion and an absence of heavy-handedness that lets you breathe.

TYPICAL OF THE AMERICANS

Critics may laugh at the collection of headgear. But then, what is more typical of an American than his fetish for hats?

The pop art, the snippets of film in the Camp category, the pop artist guitars—all these and other exhibit elements are part of the American mainstream, like it or not.

The American and the British, for that matter, are prepared to see themselves as they are, idiosyncrasies and all. And each of these countries, in adapting its exhibition technique the way it has, has made a breakthrough.

Even countries which delight in criticizing the U.S. are taking a second look these days at what the Americans have on show.

The notable absence of flag-waving and chest-thumping alone is praiseworthy, especially since Americans are involved.

AIR POLLUTION DETRIMENT TO GOOD HEALTH

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, most of us have become accustomed to reading accounts in our daily newspapers concerning the perils to health due to breathing gases and particles that are constantly released into the air from motor vehicles, factories, and powerplants, and the damages that these pollutants bring to vegetation and materials. I am sure that I speak for everyone when I say that the manifold effects of filthy air on health and property are a matter of profound concern and alarm for all of us.

Last January 30, in recommending that we adopt the Air Quality Act of 1967, President Johnson described the extent of our national air pollution problem in these words:

> Ordinary air . . . in most large cities is filled with tons of pollutants: carbon monoxide from gasoline, diesel, and jet engines, sulfur oxides from factories, apartment houses, and powerplants; nitrogen oxides, hydrocarbons, and a broad variety of other compounds. These poisons . . . steadily, insidiously, damage virtually everything that exists.
>
> They aggravate respiratory problems in man—asthma, bronchitis, lung cancer, and emphysema. Emphysema, a lung disease, is one of the fastest growing causes of death in the United States today. And it forces more than a thousand workers into early retirement every month.
>
> Polluted air corrodes machinery. It defaces buildings. It may shorten the life of whatever it touches—and it touches everything.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the fundamental human right to live and work in a healthful environment is one of the most cogent and forceful reasons for undertaking purposeful steps toward achievement of more scientific and rational control of the problem of air pollution.

Dr. William H. Stewart, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, has on many occasions testified before the Congress regarding the evidence which links air pollution to specific health detriment.

Evidence from various air-pollution episodes shows that many excess deaths and thousands of cases of increased illness occurred among those already afflicted with respiratory troubles or heart disease. Many otherwise well persons have suffered from an assortment of ills such as throat irritation, hoarseness, cough, breathlessness, chest constriction, headache, burning sensation of the eyes, nasal discharge, and nausea.

President Johnson, in concluding his special message to the Congress on air pollution, effectively summed up the need for abating this problem by saying:

> Clearly, it is an absolute necessity for the health of the American people.

I earnestly trust that my fellow Members feel as I do, that with the wholehearted and speedy approval of the legislation before us this week, we will be clearing the way for the Federal Government, in unique partnership with industry and State and local governments, to broaden the approach and instill renewed vigor into the national efforts to combat the fearful menace which constantly threatens the health of all living Americans.

PERSECUTION OF SOVIET JEWRY MUST STOP

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years the press, American Jewish organizations, and Members of the American Congress have given widespread publicity to a new wave of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

It is distressing to read the details of this persecution. True, it is not on the Hitlerian dimension: Jews are not being subjected to the type of wholesale massacres that had occurred during that most dismal of periods for humanity.

But Soviet Jews are being persecuted; they are being denied the most elementary rights of citizens in any land, namely, to be allowed to live a life in peace and security and where they are permitted a reasonable range of personal choice. Religious Jews are denied materials to carry on their religious observances. The education of rabbis for the future is drastically curtailed. In the secular realm, Jews are denied many important freedoms. Discrimination in the economic sector deprives them of access to the higher echelons of Soviet life. In the cultural realm Jewish individual expression has been drastically curtailed.

Only recently has there been any signs of improvement. Presumably this has come about because of pressure of criticism from abroad and also because of a greater awareness of younger Soviet Jews of their ancient cultural heritage, a phenomenon that has developed under the pressure of persecution.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to those other Members of this legislative body in protest against the persecution of Soviet Jewry and urge the Soviet Government, for the sake of humanity, to abandon this gross treatment of a people who in this generation have suffered more than any other and who deserve the freedom of expression that will allow their native genius to flourish for the good of all mankind.

VICTIMS OF WAR

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to share with the Members of the House, a recent editorial which appeared in the Washington Post, entitled "Victims of War."

Earlier this year, I delivered a speech that dealt with the sacrifices being made by our servicemen and the American citizenry, as a consequence of U.S. involvement in the war in Vietnam. There is daily testiment to these sacrifices in the various media. To many, the statistics have become ritualistically bland, as well as painful and sad. More will be expected of us.

But what of the others who are involved in this protracted and bloody conflict in Southeast Asia? True, we are well versed on enemy casualties by our statisticians on the spot, even to the point of their digging up enemy gravesites to determine whether they have come across "fresh" kills. Albeit, we hear little of the civilian casualties, except for an occasional report about a bomb which went off target and hit a civilian center, or, how a terrorist attack killed or maimed a number of innocent civilians.

Everyone should realize that the war has dislocated and disrupted the Vietnamese society to a drastic degree, almost beyond belief. As the editors of the Washington Post reported, civilian casualties are running at upward of 100,000 a year. Some 50,000 new refugees a month are being generated and the estimate of the refugee total is 4 million—a full quarter of the country's population.

Certainly one cannot but harbor depression and sympathy for the tragic waste, desolation, and widespread destruction that will remain once the war has ended—and I see no indications that this will come about in the near future.

So, Mr. Speaker, the bloody fighting continues, the casualties—both military and civilian—mount, and the people of Vietnam await their "freedom and independence," promised to them, ironically, from all parties to the bitter conflict.

The editorial follows:

VICTIMS OF WAR

The medical team sent by the Administration to survey the care available to civilians in Vietnam has returned with a bitter and distressing report. As the experts forthrightly told Senator Edward Kennedy's Refugee Subcommittee, the war is creating casualties—and refugees—at a rate far faster than they can be treated and given relief.

More civilians have lost limbs than the total of American soldiers who lost limbs in World War II. Civilian casualties are running at upwards of 100,000 a year. None of the 43 provincial hospitals approaches adequacy. Some 50,000 new refugees a month are being generated and the estimate of the refugee total is 4 million—a full quarter of the country's population.

Witnesses stated, nonetheless, that the United States will spend less this year than last on civilian medical care; the annual amount is half of one day's military budget. The reasons given for this surprising decline were economy and the relatively low priority of civilian medical service. The South Vietnamese government's own performance in this field has been, the American team found, abysmal. Said one doctor: "The medical program and civilian casualties have been put at the lowest and dirtiest end of the stick."

This is intolerable. No conceivable political purpose can explain away the need for the United States to respond to the civilian population's plight. Arguments about which side or what military tactic causes the suffering are irrelevant. It is patently clear that the "other war," the struggle for the allegiance of the people, has too long been submerged by the military exigencies of the day.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO START HEARINGS ON BANK CREDIT CARDS ABUSES NOVEMBER 8

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 8 the Committee on Banking and Currency will begin public hearings on my bill, H.R. 12646, and similar bills to curb loose bank credit card practices.

The purpose of this legislation is to prevent continuation of abuses by those commercial banks which have been sending out literally millions of unsolicited bank credit cards. This is clearly an unsafe and unsound banking practice, but the Federal banking supervisors have failed to do their duty to stop it. Under the circumstances, therefore, congressional action is necessary at this time.

Our witnesses will be Miss Betty Furness, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, and representatives of the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency.

It is anticipated that outside witnesses will be heard subsequently.

THE MEMORY OF MR. SAM

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great treasures within the State of Texas is Mr. Sam's library at Bonham, where serious scholars and historically minded Americans alike pay tribute to a great statesman, Speaker Sam Rayburn.

The following article in the Washington Sunday Star, October 29, 1967, describes United Press staff writer Preston McGraw's vivid impressions of this significant and unique library, which continues to serve the country Mr. Sam loved, and now keeps the vigil in his memory for this and future generations:

TEXAS GUARDS MR. SAM'S MEMORY

(By Preston McGraw)

BONHAM, TEX.—When students in Bonham schools want to write papers about Congress they can go down to Mr. Sam's library and read original copies of the Congressional Record from the first one printed in 1789.

H. G. Dulaney, director of the Sam Rayburn Library, says he believes the complete set of Congressional Records is available only in one other place—the Library of Congress.

Rep. Sam Rayburn of Bonham, who served as speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any other man, left the library as a legacy to his friends and neighbors, who called him "Mr. Sam," and to history and government scholars.

Rayburn, who died of cancer in November, 1961, won a $10,000 Collier's magazine award in 1948 and used the money to buy a little more than four acres in Bonham. Additional money was donated by the public to complete a $500,000 Georgia marble building in 1957.

Since then, additional money has been contributed so that interest from it should keep the building staffed, in repair and in new books as long as it stands.

AUTOGRAPHED BOOKS

Tourists walk through the building—part of it is like a museum—every day. The showpieces in the walnut paneled reading room on the first floor are the congressional directories and 300 or 400 books personally autographed by such authors as Winston Churchill, Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy.

But the most valuable things in the library are in a locked, 20-by-20-foot room in the basement that the public never sees. These are a roomful of Rayburn's personal files kept in metal filing cabinets.

The papers in the cabinets are what the scholars come to see.

"We make sure they are scholars before we even let them in and we make sure they don't take anything out," Dulaney says.

Part of Rayburn's files, including some from the 1930s, were lost when he became speaker in 1940 and moved from the House Office Building to the Capitol. They may be some of the most valuable, since they covered part of the New Deal years.

THE FIRST ISSUE

Dulaney says examination of the files has done nothing to spoil the image of "Mr. Sam" who was fond of saying: "If you always tell the truth, you never have to remember what you said."

Dulaney says the Library of Congress helped with some of the earlier Congressional Records and Rayburn bought some. Having been in Congress since 1913, he also had a considerable collection he had saved himself.

The first issue of the Congressional Record (then called "Annals of Congress") reported on the first page that when the Senate tried to convene March 4, 1789, only eight members were present.

Since that was not a quorum, the eight members adjourned and after a week wrote the absent members and urged them to hurry. It was April 6, 1789, before enough senators finally were present to hold a meeting.

The Rayburn Library contains records of Continental Congresses back to 1774 but they are not as valuable as the later Congressional Records because they are reprints.

There are 80 of Mr. Sam's gavels around in cases and on desks, and, on the first floor, complete to the rug he used in Washington, is a reproduction of the speaker's office. Rayburn shipped the red leather chairs and mahogany desk he used in Washington to Bonham and replaced them. A 100-year-old chandelier that used to hang in the White House hangs in the office.

Two months after Rayburn went to Congress from the Texas Fourth District, he made his first speech—on May 6, 1913.

The last paragraph is framed and hung on the wall in the basement near the room where his files are. It says:

"I have always dreamed of a country, which I believe this should be and will be, and that is one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion and prejudice, and a country that shall know no east, no west, no north, no south, but inhabited by a people liberty-loving, patriotic, happy and prosperous, with its lawmakers having no other purpose than to write just such laws as shall in the years to come be of service to human kind yet unborn."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON, THE CHAMIZAL, AND MEXICAN FRIENDSHIP

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in Juarez, Mexico last week, President Johnson and Mexican President Diaz Ordaz marked the peaceful conclusion of a raging border dispute which defied settlement for 105 years.

In 1852, a southward shift in the course of the Rio Grande River carved the El Chamizal area out of Mexico and placed it in Texas. At El Paso, President Johnson formerly transferred the Chamizal back to its rightful owners—the people of Mexico.

The Chamizal ceremony was more than the simple conveyance from one nation to another of legal title to a 437-acre tract of land.

It marked the beginning of a new and happier era in American-Mexican border relations and symbolized the increasingly close friendship between our two countries.

As President Johnson said in his remarks at the Chamizal Monument:

> For almost a century, the word "Chamizal" stood for dispute and disagreement between the United States and Mexico. Now it has become—for both our peoples—an inspiring symbol of friendship and mutual respect. An old argument has ended. More importantly, a lasting bond has been forged between our two countries. This is a proud achievement.

President Johnson by heritage, geography, and background has a uniquely deep understanding and love for Mexico—its customs, its traditions, and its people on both sides of our common border.

During the Johnson years, relations between our two sister states have been marked with a cordiality and warmth based on mutual respect and admiration.

Where there was enmity—there is now peaceful cooperation for mutual development. Where there was condescension there is now cooperation between equals. And where there was bitterness there is now awareness of common bonds.

When President Johnson transferred the Chamizal back to Mexico he extended the welcome hand of friendship to a great nation and a proud people—as he has so often done during his Presidency.

We can only hope that relations between our two countries will continue to be as cordial, as frank, and as mutually beneficial as they have been under President Johnson.

With unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the President's eloquent remarks at the Chamizal ceremony:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE CHAMIZAL MONUMENT, OCTOBER 28, 1967

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: For almost a century, the word "Chamizal" stood for dispute and disagreement between the United States and Mexico.

Yet in the last four years, it has become —for both our peoples—an inspiring symbol of friendship and mutual respect. An old argument has ended. More importantly, a lasting bond has been forged between our two countries. This is a proud achievement.

Let this monument, and this place, stand as testimony to the world of what two nations, working together, can accomplish.

Too many times the world has seen disputed boundaries changed through force. El Chamizal stands as a shining example of how such matters should be settled.

For the last half century, each President of the United States has faced the moral issue of America's commitment to the Chamizal Convention of 1910. In that treaty, we agreed that the decision of the arbitral commission "shall be final and conclusive upon both governments, and without appeal."

I do not propose to review all the legal history that has transpired since then. But I do want to say that I am proud that the plain language of the Convention of 1910 has become a reality in this Administration.

On other occasions I have said that it is important to the peace of the world that both our friends and our enemies believe that we in the United States mean what we say. Here in El Chamizal we have honored our pledged word. And we will continue to honor all our other commitments.

The great Mexican patriot, Benito Juarez, said: "Respect for the rights of others is peace." That principle is the foundation stone of our hemispheric relations.

A generation ago, fascism threatened that principle. Today it is another alien doctrine. We see it at work in the subversion and concealed aggression in Bolivia, Venezuela, and other countries. The challenge has confronted the American States with hard choices. And we know that the American States must stand together if we are to assure that the weak are protected, that might does not make right, that our peoples are to have the privilege of democratic choice.

Our concern and our commitments are not always easy to uphold. But we cannot abandon them simply because the price is high or the going is rough.

If Abraham Lincoln had done so, the United States, as we know it today, would not exist.

If Benito Juarez had done so, Mexico would not be Mexico.

But we have been true to our principles. Though we have followed our separate stars, we meet here today as two neighbors strong and prosperous, at peace with one another.

This is the final act of a long drama. It is a fulfillment possible only to those who respect the rights of others, and so insure their own.

That is the real message of El Chamizal.

It is a great privilege, and an occasion of great happiness for me, to take part in this ceremony on behalf of the United States.

COMMODITY FUTURES MARKETS SUBSTANTIALLY IMPROVED BY REGULATION

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, since regulation of the commodity futures exchanges was inaugurated by legislation enacted in 1922 and amended in 1936 the practices on these markets have shown significant improvement.

With the obvious improvements and benefits which are in the record it is puzzling to account for the resistance from some quarters to present steps toward continuing a program of moderate regulation under the needed amendments to the Commodity Exchange Act provided in H.R. 11930.

Prior to the era of regulation there was a history of powerful interests exacting tribute from unwary persons who found themselves in positions where they were unable to fulfill their market commitments. Essentially these were battles between equally avaricious interests on a "devil take the hindmost" basis. While it may be that neither side merited much sympathy as a matter of ethics these economic slugfests disrupted normal operations of the markets. Such operations are now less frequent and less severe. Indeed, in recent years market disturbances have often been of such moderate proportions as to make it difficult or impossible to legally establish whether a violation has occurred.

In addition to curtailing the more obvious "cornering" or "overreaching" operations regulation has brought an end to other abusive practices. These include:

First. The limitation of excessively large operations by any one interest which would be likely to cause unwarranted price fluctuations.

Second. The safeguarding of customers' funds by requiring brokerage firms to treat and deal with such funds as belonging to the customers.

Third. The stopping of a fictitious bookkeeping procedure which was systematically used to evade income tax.

Fourth. The stopping of a similar fictitious accounting procedure used to temporarily deceive uninformed traders into believing they had a profit when in fact their trading had resulted in substantial losses.

Fifth. The elimination of trading in a device known as "privileges" or "bids and offers" under which one could get into the futures market for as little as $5.50. This type of operation required no more economic responsibility than today's numbers game.

In addition to the broad general reforms effected under authority of the law there have been some 150 administrative and criminal actions brought in specific cases. These disciplinary proceedings have tended to make sharp practices less attractive.

All of these improvements in the operations of the futures markets have tended to enhance their usefulness in the marketing of the actual commodities and also have increased the confidence of the public in the integrity of the markets.

It is reasonable to assume that futures trading would never have reached its present all-time level of prosperity and volume and public participation in the atmosphere of unrestrained buccaneering which dominated it in the preregulation era.

It would seem that enlightened self-interest would prompt the commodity exchanges to welcome continuation and improvement of the regulatory program which has been demonstrated to be beneficial to them. These improvements have also been beneficial to all users of the markets and to the brokerage houses who have prospered from the flow of commissions.

THE NAME OF THE REPUBLICAN GAME IS "CHUTZPAH"

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the House minority leader in a speech today attempted to blame the tragic riots of last summer on the Johnson administration.

There is a word—a Yiddish word—to describe this attempt, and the word is "chutzpah."

The simplest way to define "chutzpah" is the case of the boy who shot his mother and father and then pleaded for mercy because he was an orphan. Freely translated, "chutzpah" means colossal gall or nerve. And in the case of the minority leader's ridiculous assertion, even "chutzpah" seems to be an understatement.

For here is the leader of the House Republicans—the man who has led the fight against model cities, rent supplement, rat control, and the war on poverty—trying to blame President Johnson who has done more for the urban poor than any President in history.

They have tried to shoot down these programs and are now trying to plead a case against the administration.

I think it is fair to say that the ghetto dweller must not only fight against illiteracy, discrimination and neglect if he is to achieve progress, but against the cruel indifference of the Republican Party as well.

The game the Republicans are trying to play with the crisis in our cities is transparent. They are trying to make political capital out of widespread unrest and anger. But this game will not work.

And the reason it is doomed, Mr. Speaker, is that Americans—of all races, creeds and denominations—recognize sheer "chutzpah" when they hear it, even if they do not know the word itself.

The people know the Republicans for what they have proven themselves to be—the party of indifference and obstruction.

And it will take more than political speeches to amend this dismal record, Mr. Speaker. It will take some responsible votes.

THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that Congress will give swift approval to the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967. An increasing number of air pollution tragedies—such as the air pollution emergency along the Atlantic coast last Thanksgiving—demands that we acknowledge the seriousness of this problem. Congress should pass this legislation and then we must be sure that we provide adequate funds during the next few years for the program which it authorizes.

During the decade ahead, the sources of air pollution will multiply at a rapid rate. The number of motor vehicles will increase by a third. Industrial production will more than double as will the amount of electric power we generate.

These developments will occur while the population of our urban area rises by 30 percent.

Mr. Speaker, figures like these should make it clear that the time for Congress to act imaginatively and aggressively is now. For there is a grave danger that if we wait, we will be overwhelmed by air pollution within a decade.

Mr. Speaker, 10 years represent a very short period within which to complete all the work that must be done to develop a genuine effective attack on pollution of the air. There is no more reasonable way to begin than for Congress to authorize a comprehensive and systematic plan of action—as embodied in the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967.

In January of this year, President Johnson, in his message to Congress on protecting our natural heritage, called for an accelerated national effort to rid the air of its mounting burden of pollution.

The Harris survey has provided dramatic evidence that there is greater public support for increased Federal pollution control efforts than for any other domestic program.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 by this Congress would demonstrate clearly to the American people our awareness as their representatives that action to control the pollution of the air they breathe can no longer be postponed.

MEAT INSPECTION ACT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will begin consideration tomorrow of legislation to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

The Des Moines Register of October 29 and 30 carried articles regarding the pending legislation and I would like to call these to the attention of my colleagues.

As the October 30 article points out, a large number of plants are presently without either Federal or State meat inspection. This is further evidence of the need for a strong and effective meat inspection bill.

I would also like to call attention to a statement by Miss Betty Furness, special assistant to the President for consumer affairs, supporting an amendment which will be offered to strengthen the meat inspection bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

Miss Furness' statement is a strong endorsement by the administration of the provision of H.R. 12145, a bill which I have introduced with the support of several other Members.

I believe that provisions of this bill are needed and amendments to do this will be offered when the bill comes before the House tomorrow.

The articles from the Des Moines Register and Miss Furness' statement are as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, Oct. 29, 1967]

SEE PARTISAN IOWA VOTE ON TWO MEAT BILLS

(By Nick Kotz)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Iowa's seven congressmen probably will split on party lines in deciding the meat inspection issue with the two Democrats favoring expanded federal inspection and the five Republicans opposing it.

Of the Republicans, only Representative Fred Schwengel indicated that he possibly might support Democratic Representative Neal Smith in his bill to expand federal inspection to cover 4,000 large packing plants now exempt because they do not sell across state lines.

DECISION TUESDAY

The House will decide Tuesday whether to cope with improper conditions in some non-federally inspected plants by expanding federal inspection or by offering federal aid to states willing to initiate or improve their own inspection systems.

The committee bill would provide up to 50 per cent federal aid to states willing to bring their inspection up to federal standards. States would not have to participate.

At present, 26 states, including Iowa, require mandatory inspection, 13 permit voluntary inspection, and 10 make no provision for inspection of meat packing plants. Few states meet federal inspection standards.

Republican Representatives William Scherle, John Kyl, Wiley Mayne all have indicated that they will support the committee bill. Republican H. R. Gross said that he is studying the issue. Considering his ultra-conservative philosophy, it seems unlikely that Gross would favor expanded federal inspection.

WOEFULLY UNPREPARED

Smith contends that states are woefully unprepared to cope with the unsanitary conditions discovered in two Agriculture Department investigations of hundreds of meat packing plants throughout the country, including some in Iowa.

He doubts that many states will come up to federal standards, mainly because they lack funds for the job, even with federal aid.

Democrat John Culver could not be reached for comment, but informed sources report that Culver will support the Smith-Foley bill, which would expand federal inspection to cover 97 per cent of the meat supply. At present, 15 per cent of meat slaughtering and 25 per cent of meat-processing is exempt from federal inspection.

Schwengel said that he intends to support the committee bill, mainly because he has found conditions in order in the two meat packing plants in his district.

SCHWENGEL STAND

Schwengel said that he is hopeful that the reapportionment of state legislatures will produce state governments "that will do a better job" on meat inspection.

But leaving the way open to vote for the Smith-Foley bill, Schwengel said: "If I think this (committee bill) isn't going to serve the public interest quickly enough or adequately, I will then vote accordingly. My mind could be changed by the debate."

Kyl said that he would spend this weekend inspecting meat packing plants in his south-central Iowa district, including two cited for improper conditions in the Agriculture Department reports. He said that the reports were inaccurate and that conditions were proper in the plants.

Kyl said that he is inclined to support the committee bill, but wants to listen to the debate to find out what other states are doing about the problem.

KYL'S CONTENTION

"If you have adequate state inspection, I don't know why the federal government should take over," said Kyl. "The federal government will force a lot of family operations out of business.

"The committee bill will do something about bad conditions if the states are willing. People in the states should have a little responsibility left to them."

Kyl said that he is concerned about the problem, noting:

"I know enough about animal diseases to know that there is always a danger. You have to be as careful with meat as with milk. You've got to be awfully careful."

Kyl said he had noted improper conditions in a packing plant in his district, but said that these conditions have been corrected since state meat inspection was established last year.

FOR STATE CONTROL

Scherle said he is leaning toward the committee bill and added:

"I think this is up to the jurisdiction of the states. Those 25 state legislatures (in states without inspection) should provide for it. I like state control. I like to keep things closer to the states if I can, rather than have the federal government come in."

Scherle said that the new Iowa meat inspection law has resulted in cleaning up a number of plants in his southwest Iowa district.

"I noticed in campaigning through my 19-county district that they really cleaned them up," said Scherle.

MAYNE'S VIEWS

Mayne, the only Iowan serving on the Agriculture Committee which considered the bill, voted in committee against the Smith-Foley plan but for the committee bill.

Mayne has said that the issue is one which should be handled by the states.

[From the Des Moines Register, Oct. 30, 1967]

SOME 9,277 PACKERS UNINSPECTED: USDA BARES FIGURES ON MEAT PLANTS—VOTE TUESDAY ON STIFFER LAW

(By Nick Kotz)

More than 9000 meat packing plants in the United States are not supervised by either Federal or state meat inspection, a Federal study has revealed.

The Agriculture Department (USDA) has estimated there are 14,832 packing plants which are now exempt from Federal inspection because they do not sell products across the state lines. Of this total 5555 are under state inspection and 9277 are not.

Representatives Neal Smith and Thomas Foley said Sunday that these statistics further emphasize the need for their legislation to bring larger intrastate plants under Federal inspection.

SHOWDOWN TUESDAY

The House of Representatives will decide Tuesday between the Smith-Foley plan and the Committee bill which would seek to eliminate improper conditions in some non-federally inspected plants by providing Federal aid to states willing to meet Federal standards. States would not have to participate in this program.

Congress is considering the legislation because two Agriculture Department surveys have revealed unsanitary or improper conditions in hundreds of plants throughout the country.

The Agriculture Department has just completed another study which supplies considerable new information about the status of inspection in plants exempt from Federal regulation. It has been known previously that only 26 states (including Iowa) provide for mandatory meat inspection, that 13 states have voluntary programs and that the other states (including Minnesota and South Dakota) make no provision for state inspection.

NEW DATA

The new data supplied Foley by Deputy Assistant Secretary Rodney Leonard shows that about ⅔ of the plants exempt from Federal inspection are not operating under state inspection either. An undetermined number of these plants receive some form of municipal inspection.

Furthermore, the study shows that many states with mandatory inspection laws still do not inspect substantial numbers of plants.

Of an estimated 800 packing plants in Iowa exempt from Federal regulation, the Department says, 471 are under state inspection.

Of 841 Minnesota plants exempt from Federal inspection, none are state inspected.

The Department study shows that 15.9%, or 5.2 billion pounds, of U.S. meat was slaughtered in 1966 without Federal inspection.

About 26%, or 8 billion pounds, of U.S. meats was processed without Federal inspection.

The Department study estimated that the Smith-Foley bill would bring 98% of meat slaughtering and 97% of meat processing under Federal inspection.

SMITH PROPOSAL

The Department estimated that the Smith-Foley bill (requiring Federal inspection of all intrastate plants grossing more than $250,000 annually) would bring an estimated 5856 new plants under Federal inspection. The Department said it would need 3295 new inspectors to handle this job.

The Department estimates that the states need to hire 1440 new inspectors if they want to participate in Federal-state cooperation and bring the 9876 plants exempt from the Smith-Foley bill up to Federal standards.

The small plant program would cost $13.6 million, the Department said. The Smith-Foley bill and Committee bill would both close the loopholes in the present Federal law and provide Federal aid to states willing to bring their own inspection up to Federal standards.

The bills differ in that the Smith-Foley bill would automatically bring the 5856 largest plants under Federal inspection. Under the Committee bill there would be no expansion of Federal inspection.

According to an Agriculture Department study, the Smith-Foley bill would bring 350 Minnesota plants, an estimated 350 Iowa plants, 40 North Dakota plants, 90 South Dakota plants, 275 Wisconsin plants and an estimated 125 Nebraska plants under Federal inspection.

Several hundred plants in both Minnesota and Iowa would still be exempt from Federal inspection because the plants do less than $250,000 annual business.

DIFFER ON ISSUES

Supporters and opponents of the Smith-Foley bill disagree on several fundamental issues.

Smith and Foley contend that states have shown they neither have the money nor the will to inspect adequately the larger plants now exempt from Federal inspection. Opponents say states will improve their system with Federal aid.

Smith and Foley say the states could do a better job if they had fewer plants to inspect. The meat industry and other opponents of the Smith-Foley bill argue that expansion of Federal inspection would destroy state inspection. They contend that the states would then lose incentive to inspect the remainder of the plants under their jurisdiction.

Supporters of the Smith-Foley bill and most opponents in the meat industry are in full agreement on at least one point. All agree that some government action must be taken to eliminate improper conditions that exist in at least a small segment of the industry not now under Federal inspection.

STATEMENT BY BETTY FURNESS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR CONSUMER AFFAIRS, ON MEAT INSPECTION BILL, OCTOBER 30, 1967

Most American housewives believe that the meat they put on the family dinner table is safe and wholesome. They assume that all meat is federally inspected.

The facts are that almost nine billion pounds of meat are sold each year—enough to feed 30 million Americans—without any form of Federal inspection. This is the meat that is processed and sold within the same State.

As I have opened my daily mail, it has become evident that American housewives are shocked to learn these facts. They are shocked to discover that they have to buy meat processed in another State to be assured of its wholesomeness and quality.

This is intolerable in a modern nation.

Tomorrow, the House of Representatives has an opportunity to do something about it.

The broad support for the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967—reported out by the House Agriculture Committee—is proof that the Congress is determined to act. That bill represents the first major improvement in our meat inspection laws in more than half a century.

But I believe it can be strengthened further.

Over half the States have no meat inspection laws whatsoever. And many of the others have laws that are inadequate.

Tomorrow an amendment will be offered to the Wholesome Meat Act which will give the American housewife the added protection she demands and deserves. This amendment would require—for the first time—Federal inspection of all slaughtering and processing plants doing an annual business of more than $250,000. It affects over 6,000 meat plants now exempt from Federal inspection because their products are sold within a single State.

The Administration has supported this additional Federal meat inspection since 1965. It continues to do so.

Thousands of cases of intestinal disease are reported each year which are traceable to unwholesome meat. Thousands of other cases are never reported at all.

It is clear that the health of our citizens can no longer depend on where the meat is processed and sold. The Congress has already established that a firm with an annual business of more than $250,000 must be protected by Federal Minimum Wage Laws—regardless of where it does its business. It is ironic that the customers of these firms—who buy and eat their products—are not protected by Federal meat inspection laws.

I hope that the House tomorrow will correct this inconsistency. I urge the House to safeguard the housewife and her family by approving the strengthening amendment to the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, as Representatives of the people of the United States, we have pledged ourselves to protect the health and well-being of every American citizen. How can we then reconcile this pledge with the fact that air pollution currently constitutes a major threat to the health and well-being of most Americans? Dr. William H. Stewart, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, states unequivocally that there is an abundance of compelling evidence that air pollution is connected with increased sickness and death, and that its menace is growing. Studies clearly demonstrate relationships between air pollution and such respiratory diseases as lung cancer, emphysema, chronic bronchitis, and the common cold. Moreover air pollution attacks and destroys even the most durable of materials, it reduces visibility, and it destroys vegetation of all kinds.

Mr. Speaker, we will have before us later this week legislation under which we can cope with the menace of air pollution. The Air Quality Act of 1967 provides funds for research in the field of air pollution and calls for State and regional standards to control the problem now. It includes emergency measures and long-range plans, and calls upon all levels of government, as well as the private sector, to cooperate in the attack on the problem. It stresses immediacy of action in the framework of cooperative effort.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the facts I have presented, I think it is imperative in the interest of the health of the American people to enact this bill.

CHAIRMAN PATMAN ONCE AGAIN COMES TO THE AID OF NATION'S CREDIT UNIONS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, has long been known as "Mr. Credit Union" on Capitol Hill.

Recently, Chairman PATMAN once again showed why he has earned that title. It was mainly through his efforts that the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions withdrew a ruling that misinterpreted the intent of Public Law 90–44 and worked a great hardship on many Federal credit unions.

The October issue of the Federal Credit Union Observer, a publication of the department of legislation and governmental affairs of CUNA International, goes behind the scenes in outlining the roles that Chairman PATMAN, J. Deane Gannon, Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, and Evert S. Thomas, director of the Washington office of CUNA International, played in resolving this problem.

I am including two articles from the issue of the publication which explain in detail the problem, and how it was solved. These articles should be of extreme interest to the millions of members of Federal credit unions across the United States:

BUREAU MODIFIES RULES ON OFFICER BORROWING—BOARD CAN NOW DELEGATE APPROVAL POWER ON THOSE LOANS FULLY SECURED BY SHARES

The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions has clarified and simplified its interpretive rulings on the new officer borrowing bill, Public Law 90–44, after a thorough review of the legislative history of the measure.

Bureau director J. Deane Gannon announced in a letter to all Federal credit unions, October 5, that the Bureau has determined the board of directors of a Federal credit union may by resolution set criteria for approval of officials' loans which are fully secured by shares. If the board wishes it may delegate its authority to approve such loans to the credit committee, which in turn may further delegate it to a loan officer.

Originally the Bureau had held share-secured loans could only be passed on by the board and credit committee, as with officer loans secured by other forms of collateral. However, Rep. Wright Patman, chairman of the House Banking and Currency committee, later informed the Bureau that this was not the intent of his committee.

PATMAN TELLS INTENT

In a statement published in the October 2 Congressional Record, Chairman Patman emphasized that it was never the committee's intention that "loans fully secured by the officer-borrower's shares be subject to board approval, unless the individual credit union felt such approval was necessary. It was felt that such loans could be approved by the normal approval standards of most credit unions," he declared.

Director Gannon wrote all Federal credit unions explaining the Bureau's revised position on share-secured officer loans and furnishing standard resolutions which may be adopted by the board and/or the credit committee.

In the same letter, Gannon affirmed an earlier ruling, made at the request of CUNA International, dealing with the law's requirement that an officer borrower submit a "detailed current financial statement." The Bureau stated that the criteria for such a statement is adequately met by the standard loan application (Form FCU 200) or any other suitable application containing as a minimum the equivalent information.

LOANS OVER $5,000

Still another troublesome area in the new law, that dealing with loans in excess of $5,000, is under study by the Bureau, according to Chairman Patman's statement in the Congressional Record. The Bureau has ruled that such loans to an officer-borrower must be secured in their entirety by pledged shares.

Patman contends it was the view of the committee that loans in excess of $5,000 be collateralized by pledged shares only for that amount in excess of $5,000. The portion under $5,000 could be secured by any lawful collateral acceptable to the credit union. CUNA's Washington Office is hopeful a solution can be worked out as has been done with other obscure areas in the statute.

What Happened on Officer Loan Bill—How Three Reasonable Men Resolved Some of Its Snags

Public Law 90-44—the officer borrowing amendment to the Federal Credit Union Act—upon passage last summer was hailed with enthusiasm throughout the credit union movement. The first major achievement of CUNA International's 1967 legislative program, it was a significant stride toward attaining borrowing privileges for directors and committeemen comparable to those of other members, but with built-in safeguards to protect the credit union.

Then dissatisfaction dampened the enthusiasm as certain provisions of the new officer borrowing law were implemented. Criticism flooded in to CUNA International; to the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions; and even to members of Congress.

While acknowledging the real gain of a $5,000 loan limit without the necessity of pledging shares, many Federal credit union officers complained that the law as implemented was unrealistic in its controls on officer loans and created a heavy administrative burden.

WORKED TOGETHER

But there are few problems that men of reason and goodwill cannot solve when they work together. And that is what has happened to resolve the apparent "bugs" in the officer borrowing amendment.

Three men of reason and goodwill have come together to solve the problems and complaints raised by Federal credit unions on the new officer borrowing rules and procedures. Those three men are:

Rep. Wright Patman, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, where the legislation was written in detail, and a "godfather" of the credit union movement.

J. Deane Gannon, director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, who is charged with administration of the Federal Credit Union Act.

Evert S. Thomas, Jr., director, Washington Office, CUNA International, whose concern is the federal legislative program and liaison for credit unions with Federal government agencies.

These three men, all dedicated to the interests of the credit union movement, have gradually worked out solutions to most of the many problems posed by credit unions regarding the officer borrowing amendment.

HOW QUIRKS DEVELOPED

Just how did the officer borrowing amendment develop so many quirks and problems areas, is a question repeatedly asked. It is true that the original bill introduced in both the House and the Senate at CUNA's request merely would have permitted officers to borrow up to the unsecured loan limit ($750) plus their own unencumbered pledged shares and those of a cosigner.

Then during the hearings, when the credit union borrowing amendment was being considered along with an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act on bank officer borrowing, the question was raised as to why credit union officers shouldn't be able to borrow up to $5,000 as the bank officers were being authorized to do. No one foresaw any objections, and the Bureau and CUNA approved the idea. So the loan limit was upped in the Senate committee bill and passed.

In the House, some Banking and Currency committee members had honest doubts and reservations about the new limit. They feared that a few credit union officers would take undue advantage of the higher ceiling; would monopolize their credit union's loan portfolio; and would be given to self-serving practices. The question of share insurance was raised, and with it the security of credit union funds. With no share insurance, some congressmen reasoned, the officer borrowing privilege must be clearly spelled out and restricted.

DECIDED IN CLOSED SESSION

So in closed executive session, the House Banking and Currency committee, at the insistence of some members who had honest concerns, re-wrote the officer borrowing amendment. In went such controls as: Officer loans could not exceed 20% of the unimpaired capital and surplus of the credit union. The requirement for favorable action by the credit committee and the board of directors after submission to them of a detailed financial statement. The rule that an officer would not sit on a committee during the time his application was being considered; and the requirement that an officer-borrower not receive more favorable terms than any other member.

The committee reported the bill to the House, and it was promptly passed. Neither the Bureau nor CUNA had a chance to comment on the added committee provisions.

FCC'S ASK QUESTIONS

As the individual Federal credit unions changed their by-laws to conform to the Federal credit union act amendment on officer borrowing, problems and questions began to arise. What constituted a detailed financial statement? Why couldn't the old provisions on officer borrowing be retained if the credit union preferred to do so?

These and other questions arose, some posing serious problems unless a prompt and workable solution could be found.

CUNA BEGINS DISCUSSIONS

As the criticisms of the officer borrowing amendment increased, CUNA's Washington Office director, Evert Thomas, began discussions with Rep. Patman and Bureau Director Gannon to seek their views and suggestions on overcoming the difficulties. Gannon pointed out that his office had to interpret the law and implement it as it was written. Rep. Patman was convinced that the members of Congress did not intend to increase the problems of officer borrowing.

Thomas negotiated between the two, and the final result was a letter from Rep. Patman to Gannon outlining the intent of Congress on the legislation. With this information and support, Gannon was able to modify some administrative rulings and institute many revisions of procedures.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Helstoski (at the request of Mr. Pucinski), for October 30 and 31, on account of official business.

Mr. Stuckey (at the request of Mr. Landrum), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. Dorn (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Quie (at the request of Mr. Arends), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Dow, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Mathias of Maryland (at the request of Mr. Brown of Ohio), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Brown of Ohio), for 10 minutes, on November 1; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Saylor (at the request of Mr. Brown of Ohio), for 15 minutes, on October 31; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Zablocki and to include pertinent extraneous matter.

Mr. Roybal.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Brown of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Pucinski) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Moorhead.

Mr. Dow.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1260. An act to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (Public Law 81–845); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1602. An act to create a Northwest Regional Services Corporation to provide a central location for various training centers and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1752. An act to amend the act prohibiting fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by vessels other than vessels of the United States and by persons in charge of such vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1798. An act to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2047. An act to exempt certain vessels engaged in the fishing industry from the requirements of certain laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a survey of the coastal and fresh water commercial and recreational fishery resources adjacent to the United States, including the resources within the territorial waters of the Great Lakes, the territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and to make available to the public and Congress information gained from such survey; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the exploration of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America;

H.R. 5894. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi;

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion;

H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1160. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 27, 1967 present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America;

H.R. 5894. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi;

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion;

H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 31, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1181. A letter from the national quartermaster, Veterans of World War I, transmitting the audit of financial transactions, as of September 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–530; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1182. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases, as of August 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82–554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1183. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1184. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 2, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Dunkirk Harbor, N.Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 17, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

1185. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 11, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Tijuana River, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 7, 1961, no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been authorized by Public Law 89–640, adopted October 10, 1966; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "Better Management of Research Equipment Procurement and Utilization in Federal Laboratories" (15th report by the committee) (Rept. No. 867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8547. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to simplify laws relating to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7210. A bill for the relief of the Rochester Iron & Metal Co. (Rept. No. 869). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 13743. A bill to provide certain essential assistance to the U.S. fisheries industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13744. A bill to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 13745. A bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 13746. A bill to provide for a flat fee for services performed in connection with the arrival in, or departure from, the United States of a private aircraft or private vessel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13747. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, to permit the free entry of citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 13748. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1954 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 13749. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 13750. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize planning grants to air pollution control agencies, expand research provisions relating to fuels and vehicles; provide for interstate air pollution control agencies or commissions, authorize the establishment of air quality standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 13751. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 13752. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 13753. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use in commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 13754. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 13755. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.J. Res. 913. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.J. Res. 914. Joint resolution to provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive plan for the U.S. Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H. Con. Res. 562. Concurrent resolution expressing sense of Congress relative to the 50th anniversary of Finland independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13756. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Mirasola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13757. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Piazza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13758. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Berardinelli and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13759. A bill for the relief of Michele Galante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13760. A bill for the relief of Elio Lauria, his wife, Miniello Lauria, and their child, Eduardo Lauria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 13761. A bill for the relief of Lu-Yin Chen, Julie Chen, Edward Chen, and Susie Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13762. A bill for the relief of Ciro Lala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 13763. A bill for the relief of Fortunato Indomenico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 13764. A bill for the relief of Demetre Parhas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13765. A bill for the relief of Domenico Figlia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 13766. A bill for the relief of Arsine Berberyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 13767. A bill for the relief of Nicanor Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

192. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Yonkers, N.Y., relative to the continuation of beneficial programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

193. Also, petition of the Western States Land Commissioners Association, Pierre, S. Dak., relative to Mineral Leasing Act revenues; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

194. Also, petition of Board of Supervisors, San Bernardino County, Calif., relative to the clarification of the Common Varieties Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

195. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the 14th amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Alexander Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1967

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin and the Nation are deeply mourning the loss of one of our most distinguished and revered citizens.

Alex Wiley devoted 24 years to the service of his country in the Senate, longer than any other Wisconsin Senator, and he was a high-ranking Member of Congress during some of this country's most critical times. His career included chairmanships of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His accomplishments were many and his influence great.

He will be remembered as the "Father of the St. Lawrence Seaway," an accolade he so richly deserves for he never wavered in his steadfast efforts to fulfill his dream of bringing the ships of the world to America's heartland.

In his early career he called himself a "neutralist" in foreign affairs but he was not a man afraid to change his mind and to recognize changing conditions. His interest became global and during the postwar years he repeatedly reminded us that the world was growing smaller with the far corners only hours away by plane, and that we could no longer afford the luxury of ignoring problems in other countries.

He was one of the first to warn of the growing threat of international communism. His warnings 14 years ago about Vietnam sound like they were made yesterday.

He was a deeply religious man. In fact, he had at one time studied for the ministry, and he was the author of a number of religious articles. His constant prayer, which he repeated publicly many times, was for a world in which all men could live in peace and freedom. He once proposed that there should be an executive department of peace with the duty of concentrating on the elimination of sources of friction and misunderstanding between peoples.

Despite rubbing elbows with the famous in Washington and the world, however, he resisted pomposity and sophistication. Many humorous stories are told of his informal treatment of the mighty, such as the time he greeted a monarch with a hearty "Hi there, Queenie."

This prominent son of immigrants never forgot, as he would put it, "the folks back home." He was renowned for his efforts in behalf of his Wisconsin constituency and Wisconsin's products.

I am privileged to have known him and to have worked with him on legislation of mutual interest. I benefited many times from his wise counsel and from his kind and generous friendship.

I shall remember him always and to his wife and to his children, I express my sincere condolences.

Air Quality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the serious challenge that the pollution of our atmosphere poses to our national health, I strongly support the Air Quality Act of 1967.

The Congress recently declared in the "Declaration of Purpose" for Public Law 89-749, the comprehensive health planning amendments, that "fulfillment of our national purpose depends on promoting and assuring the highest level of health attainable for every person, in an environment which contributes positively to healthful individual and family living."

It is this kind of environment toward which we must aspire, an environment not merely safe from hazard but contributing positively to healthful living. In such an environment there is no room for polluted air.

Air pollution in the United States is clearly responsible, wholly or in substantial part, for a number of unnecessary deaths and a very large amount of unnecessary disability and discomfort. As President Johnson said last January in recommending adoption of the Air Quality Act:

> The economic loss from air pollution amounts to several billion dollars each year. But the cost in human suffering and pain is incalculable.

It is imperative, in the interest of the health of the American people, to remove from the air now all the pollution within the range of feasibility.

The Air Quality Act of 1967 strengthens and builds upon the base provided by the Clean Air Act, which we passed and the President signed in 1963, and closes important gaps that have become apparent since the passage of that act in 1963. This bill is most timely, and would permit the development of appropriate, effective, and urgently needed new ways to move toward national air pollution control.

I strongly urge each and every one of my distinguished colleagues to join with me in voting "yea" on this critically needed legislation.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I try to keep my constituents informed of events concerning my work as their U.S. Representative in Congress. I am reporting to them some of the thoughts I have in mind which concern my official responsibilities, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

DEAR FRIENDS: I am happy and proud to report to you that the House of Representatives has approved my amendment to the Postal bill which provides a means for stopping the flow of obscene advertising materials through the wall.

It is a victory for American parents because it deals with advertisements sent through the mails to sell materials which are erotically arousing or sexually provocative. Under the bill any person receiving a "pandering advertisement" of an obscene nature may request the Postmaster General to advise the mailer to remove his name or the name of his minor child from the mailing list. The Postmaster General then is required to issue a stop order to the mailer. Failure of the sender to take the complainant's name off of the list is punishable by law.

These filthy advertisements have been an ever-increasing problem. During the past year the Post Office Department has received over 250,000 complaints from people everywhere, including Nebraska, bitterly complaining about receiving offensive, sex-oriented advertising matter in the mail. Most of the complaints were from parents whose minor children had received such advertisements.

The passage of this bill is a step forward, and it will serve to discourage those who would try to make a profit by corrupting our children.

My sincerest thanks to you for your many letters of encouragement during my long fight against filth in the mails. This same legislation which I sponsored passed the House of Representatives overwhelmingly on two previous occasions, but the Senate did not act on it. Now by attaching it to the Postal Rate bill, *they will have to consider it and I hope favorably.*

There is another section of the Postal Rate bill which is outrageous. I call it the "Great Mail Robbery of 1967." Most of us have read editorials in the newspaper telling about the subsidies many industries receive from the Federal Government, *but I've never noticed an editorial complaining about the huge newspaper mail subsidy which they receive.*

The newspaper and magazine subsidy is one of the reasons for the huge Postal Department deficit and costs taxpayers an estimated 250 million dollars a year or more. *This huge subsidy to newspapers and magazines is paid for with your tax dollars.*

Official U.S. Post Office figures indicate that letter writers are paying 123.3 percent of the cost of handling and delivering first class letter mail . . . third class mail users (seed catalogues and other business advertising mail) pays 100 percent of this cost of delivery. *But newspapers and magazines* (second class mail) *are paying only 29 percent of the cost of handling their mail.*

In addition, the *newspapers are receiving a further subsidy by what is called "Red Tag Treatment."* This means that they receive the same or better handling as the average first class letter but pay only ¼ as much. Public relations or not . . . the red tag practice is not fair to the rest of the mail users or the nation's taxpayers.

I fought hard *to raise the mailing rates for newspapers and magazines* in the Committee and later when the legislation was debated in the House of Representatives, I was successful in getting a small adjustment in these laws *to cut down on the newspaper-magazine government subsidized rates.* But the fact remains that "holier than thou" newspapers are still being heavily subsidized when sent through the mails. *Newspapers and magazines are against everyone's subsidy but their own.*

WHO IS POLLUTING THE RIVERS?

Here is another item under the "Do as I say and not as I do category." I dislike river pollution as much as the next man. When I was Mayor of Omaha we inaugurated the first step in halting pollution. I was shocked to learn recently that one of the largest contributors to pollution on the Potomac River which runs past the Capital of the United States is the U.S. Government itself.

In a recent survey of eleven Federal installations in the Potomac Basin, it was revealed that all eleven Federal installations made a major contribution to water pollution. Federal agencies in Washington were not original in their reactions to the news they were themselves polluting the Potomac. Thier answers ranged from, "We are making a study" to "Corrective action is being implemented" (whatever that means).

I think that Omahans should be hopping mad about the executive branch's casual approach to river pollution when it involves its own agencies. After all, didn't the Federal Government recently threaten to "take action" unless the City of Omaha made significant progress in reducing Missouri River pollution? Now we see that Omaha has spent and is committed to spend millions of dollars to fight pollution while the Federal Government is just starting to "make a study" of its own pollution sources. It seems they never will be able to see the forest for the trees.

FLOOD CONTROL DISCUSSION

I met recently here in Washington with Brigadier General C. Craig Cannon, the new head of the Army Corps of Engineers in Omaha. During the meeting which was attended by Senators Roman Hruska and Carl Curtis, Representative Robert Denney and myself, we discussed the proposed Papillion Basin Flood Control Project. I told General Cannon that in my opinion the Papillion Basin Project should have the very highest priority because of the high potential for heavy loss of life during a flash flood.

I have obtained a *limited supply of maps of Vietnam* and the Asian Continent for distribution to interested families in my Congressional District. This map is in short supply so I hope you will understand if I am not able to send everyone a copy. Your requests for these maps will be filled on a *"first come, first serve basis."*

I read an article the other day which I believe is worth passing along. History usually has a way of repeating itself. The article follows:

"In ancient Greece, Pericles inauguarated the nursing of people out of the public treasury. A hundred years later Plato found that he had so completely debauched the Athenians that they were reduced to pauperism.

"*Instead of working,* they hung around the marketplace gossiping, and their characters were so weakened *that the state was forced* to hire barbarians to defend it from invasion.

"A paternalistic government *is bound to destroy the self-reliance and self-respect of the people.* When these attributes go, everything goes. Those are the virtues which have made our country great, and those virtues alone will keep us great."

Dingell Amendment to Clean Air Act Would Undermine California's Fight Against Critical Smog Health Hazard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I think it is vitally important that the Members of this House understand the full implications of the so-called Dingell amendment to the Clean Air Act, when that legislation comes up for a vote on the floor later this week.

In particular, I believe they should realize that this auto industry-inspired provision would undermine the efforts of California officials to protect the health of that State's 20 million citizens against the increasing threat of deadly car exhaust fumes polluting the atmosphere of California's major metropolitan areas.

For that reason, I have sent a short letter explaining the adverse effects of the Dingell amendment to each of my colleagues in the House, and include the text of that letter in the RECORD at this point.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 31, 1967.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: With all the recent discussion about the effect of the so-called Dingell Amendment to S. 780, the Air Quality Act of 1967, I believe it is important to set the record straight.

Here is a short summary of what this is all about:

(1) California, and particularly Los Angeles, undeniably has a very pressing need to reduce emissions from motor vehicles. The President of the Los Angeles County Medical Association, speaking for 10,000 physicians, terms the pollution from motor vehicles a critical hazard to the health of the people of that community.

(2) To meet this need, California enacted the Nation's first standards for motor vehicle emissions. Cars sold in California in 1966 and 1967 have been equipped to meet these standards. California also has set more stringent standards to become effective with the 1970 models. It should be noted carefully that industry spokesmen have said they are prepared to meet these standards.

(3) The Federal Government enacted auto emission standards applicable to the 1968 models sold throughout the Nation, and cars sold anywhere in the country after December 31, 1967 will be equipped to comply. These standards are the same as those which have been in effect in California since 1966. Thus, in 1968 and 1969, California and the rest of the country will have uniform standards.

(4) The enactment of Federal standards raised the question of pre-emption. Would the fact that the Federal Government legislated in the same field nullify the more rigorous standards that California had set for 1970? This matter was considered by the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution when S. 780 was being drafted.

(5) When the Committee held hearings in California, they were told that the preemption problem should be solved in one of two ways: either the National standard should be set to meet the problem of the area with the most acute pollution condition, i.e. Los Angeles; or, the State of California should be allowed to set its own standards.

(6) In response, Senator Murphy offered an amendment which was passed by the Senate 88–0, that attempted to supply the second alternative: that is, it would allow California to set its own standards. Under Murphy's amendment, the Secretary of Health, Education & Welfare *must* waive the National standards and allow California to set its own standards, unless he finds that California does not have a need. The burden is on the Secretary to make a clear finding that California *does not need* special standards, and this would be difficult to do in the face of the strong testimony that the medical community of that state has presented.

(7) Representative Dingell's amendment shifts to California the burden of proving affirmatively that it has an overwhelming need for special standards, and then the Secretary may, or may not, himself set the standards for California at any level that he chooses, *and that he determines technology and economics allow*. There is no question that it would be much more difficult for California to reduce automotive emissions under the procedures of the Dingell Amendment than under the Murphy Amendment.

(8) When the present standards were set in California, it was recognized that they would not be adequate, and that is why the 1970 standards were established at a much lower level. The industry now has had several years to prepare to meet the 1970 requirements, and spokesmen for the industry have said they are prepared to comply. There has been adequate "lead time" for the industry to meet and readily satisfy California's 1970 requirements. All of this will now be upset if the Federal Government pre-empts under the Dingell Amendment, and the industry will again plead the necessity for several more years of lead time.

Referring to the automobile industry, the largest industry in his State, Representative Dingell has repeatedly made statements such as "*We* can't operate *our* production lines to meet fifty different standards."

Of course, we are not presented with a proposal for fifty different standards. All that the industry will have to do is exactly what it has been doing for the past two years: that is, make one type of car for California and another for all the rest of the States. This is two standards, and not fifty.

It is interesting that nowhere has Represenative Dingell ever proposed that the standards for the Nation be set at the level required in California. I am sure that he won't.

Whatever Mr. Dingell's intent, the effect of his amendment will be to obstruct progress in reducing smog in California. It should be defeated, and California should retain the power to protect the health of its citizens.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
Member of Congress.

Veterans (Armistice) Day Observances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, a number of communities in my 27th Congressional District of New York are considering Veterans (Armistice) Day ceremonies to support our boys in Vietnam. This represents a very deep concern of affection and admiration for our men.

Yet I am a little troubled that the ceremonies may extend, perhaps without intention, to express support for the mistaken policies in Vietnam that we as a nation have chosen to follow.

In order to make the distinction between the sincere tribute owed individually to our fighting men, and the ill-conceived national policy, I have sent a letter to all news media in my district.

A copy of the letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 25, 1967.

To the EDITOR:

DEAR SIR: This letter is intended to be helpful to the citizens in valuing the great issue presented by American involvement in Vietnam.

We have just observed the demonstrations at the Pentagon. The conduct of the demonstrators was in many cases shameful and repulsive. Draft card burning and the like is just as shameful. In a very natural reaction against these performances, I note that loyalty parades are being planned by some groups in communities in my Congressional District on or near Armistice Day, November 11.

The theme of these parades is going to be "support our boys in Vietnam." It is understandable that thousands of Americans should want to express this kind of feeling.

However, I wonder if the real issues about Vietnam are really getting through to all of us. These issues concern the whole political situation throughout the world. For example, in this world of hungry people, years and years of rebellions lie ahead. Are we going to send our American boys to fight poor men in many places who may be struggling to make their own world a little better?

Another question is whether we want to become involved in a nuclear war with Russia and China. It is all very well to say that we are not afraid of them. I am sure we are not, and we shouldn't be. But we ought to ask whether our very questionable stake in Vietnam is worth the danger of blowing our world to pieces.

While we have our pride about our position yet the pride of other great powers will become involved if we continue to escalate the war and push it further. As matters stand, they will continue to supply North Vietnam just as long as we continue our military campaign. It is a very dangerous stalemate, unless a way better than bombs is found to deal with this problem of the pride of the great powers.

Let's consider our relations with China. By our bases and our bombing, we are seriously irritating and antagonizing China, but not settling the problem of living in the same world with her. We should first try to get along with her at the negotiating table before we take hostile steps.

Also, many Americans question whether we are really doing any good in Vietnam. The Vietnamese have just conducted a presidential election. There were ten candidates and the winner received only one-third of the vote. The runner-up has now been sentenced to prison. How long will it take to teach democracy in Vietnam?

If we are having so much trouble to deal with thirty million Vietnamese on one beachhead in Asia, how can we ever exert influence on the two billion backed up behind them on that vast continent?

Does anybody know how to "win" in Vietnam? Sometimes I wonder if it is fair to urge the boys on when we don't have any clear notion of what the task is, whether it can be done or where it will lead our boys and the thousands who may follow.

As your Congressman, it is my duty to think out these issues as best I can and to tell you honestly and fairly how it seems to me.

We should carry out the Armistice Day ceremonies in honor and remembrance of our men who have fought in other wars and those now in Vietnam. Their individual sacrifice deserves every tribute we can pay. But individual actions are separate from our national action. I seriously wonder whether the ceremonies ought to express favor for the Nation's very questionable policy of making war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. DOW,
U.S. Congressman.

Continuity in United States-Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, after a long period of silence, a man who has been an important part of two administrations has spoken out on Vietnam. I am referring to Mr. Theodore Sorensen who, in a recent Saturday Review article, has made some suggestions on bringing the Vietnam war to a speedy conclusion.

What he says deserves careful consideration, but consideration in the light of changed circumstances since he was a responsible part of the White House staff.

In his book, Kennedy, as Mr. Sorensen himself points out in the Saturday Review article, set forth the policies pursued during the Kennedy administration on Vietnam:

> The Administration's objective was to gain time—time for the South Vietnamese with our help and protection to achieve a society sufficiently cohesive both politically and militarily to negotiate a balanced settlement.

In my estimation, this policy has not been changed. These objectives remain as constant as ever, although the administration has changed.

Mr. Sorensen observes that the "time is finally near at hand" to negotiate, and to reach this objective we should consider cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam. This is not a new suggestion. It has been made before and much thoughtful atention has been given it both inside and outside the Government. It is my belief that the United States has been forthright and eager in its response to stop the bombing and to explore negotiations.

But the simple fact remains that it takes two to negotiate and thus far Hanoi has shown no willingness to talk.

The Secretary of State in his October 13, 1967, press conference stated that:

> The problem is that dozens and dozens of suggestions have been made to Hanoi through all sorts of channels, through all sorts of formula, and that Hanoi has categorically rejected all of them.

The Secretary also stated:

> I have yet to hear anyone tell us that if we did stop the bombing they could definitely deliver Hanoi to the conference table. I have asked a number of governments, "all right, if we stop the bombing, what can you deliver?" I get no response. Hanoi has not yet indicated it was in any way ready to pursue a "balanced settlement."

The President, most recently in San Antonio, has spoken on the subject of bombing cessation both strongly and clearly:

> The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussions. We, of course, assume that while discussions proceed, North Vietnam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation.

What began as a small guerrilla war was expanded by the introduction of regular North Vietnamese troops, infiltrating in greater and greater numbers into the South in late 1964 and continuing to this very day. This has introduced a profound change in the nature of the war since 1964—a change which many observers have not taken fully into account.

In other words, what might have been adequate in 1963 or 1964 as an American response to Communist aggression, would be inadequate at this time. Pacification—the importance of which no one underestimates—was made a more difficult task by the large-scale invasion from the North.

We are attempting, in a sense, to build a house during a hurricane. We are helping to build a new political, social, and economic order in Vietnam while a war ranges around. In spite of the difficulties, there have been notable successes.

We have met the challenge of inflation, benefiting from our experience during the Korean war.

We have not been forced to dominate the war, as some have charged. The Province Chief still governs his province. The ARVN commander still commands his own forces. The newly elected government truly represents the electorate.

We have been able to assist in the establishment of basic democratic forms in a country which has lacked them for many years. It is a development which hopefully presages a true social revolution in South Vietnam, one benefiting the people.

This is the kind of victory we are looking for in Vietnam. Some may sneer that such victories are small. Such statements betray an ignorance of the nature of guerrilla warfare. Small victories are the essential victories.

It was a victory to hold a successful national election despite widespread Vietcong opposition and terrorist tactics.

It was a victory to see national and provincial leaders emerging, bolstered by an election, responsive to—responsible to—the public.

We do not seek total military victory. We do not wish to bomb North Vietnam back to the stone age. We do not believe that the war can be won only by force of arms.

The conflict in Vietnam is one which ebbs and flows. Yet the course we set during the Eisenhower administration is still unchanged. President Johnson does not seek objectives which are any different from those administrations which preceded his—although circumstances have changed in many important ways.

The United States remains committed to a balanced settlement, one which will respect the rights of all parties involved. To that end we shall continue to pursue the real accomplishments, the small victories which are so important to a solution in Vietnam.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father John S. Danilak, St. Gregory's Nyssa Byzantine Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty and Eternal Father, sovereign King of the universe, look favorably on these Your servants who have accepted the sacred trust of civic leadership. Direct them in bringing to a rightful conclusion the problems and issues confronting them and aid them in fostering unity of purpose for the common good of the citizens who have bestowed upon them the responsible role in the destinies of men.

Sustain the Members of this Congress with courage and integrity and inspire them with wisdom, understanding, and justice, so that, in all their deliberations and actions, they may remember that You are the divine and supreme lawmaker and thus may be inspired to have as their common goal the juridical, social, cultural, and religious betterment of the citizens of this great Nation.

Assist them in their deliberations, shield them from all contention, enlighten and guide them by Your saving grace and blessings, through the merits of Your Divine Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and Your lifegiving spirit, now and ever and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SOUTH VIETNAMESE BUILDING SOLID FOUNDATION FOR DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of the South Vietnamese to build for themselves a solid foundation for democratic government, while still defending themselves against foreign supported aggression, has evoked the sympathy and admiration of the American people.

I doubt if history has recorded a previous instance of a people, while engaged in a struggle for their very existence, taking the time and trouble to simultaneously build the governmental machinery they will need to exercise and safeguard the rights and liberty they are striving to win. No one could have justly condemned them for waiting until the war is won. It is to their great credit and honor that they have dedicated themselves to fight for their freedom on the broadest front.

Today marks a significant step forward in their effort to achieve and build a secure future. I wish to extend the very best of good wishes and congratulations to the Vietnamese people and to President Nguyen Van Thieu, whose inauguration takes place today.

This new government faces monumental tasks which would be formidable to solve, even in a country at peace. Quite apart from the urgent military situation, President Thieu and Vice President Ky face major political, social, and economic problems. It is encouraging to note their understanding of their country's needs and their evident determination to meet them as best they can.

We wish them success in all their efforts and, with them, look forward to the time when the aggressors to the north leave them alone, free to work out their own destiny. It is my earnest hope that the event taking place in Vietnam today will hasten the day when our boys may come home.

INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT NGUYEN VAN THIEU

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished chairman, Dr. MORGAN, in expressing congratulations to President Nguyen Van Thieu on the occasion of his inauguration.

For the past several years, the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, which I have the honor to chair, has looked forward to the day when the people of South Vietnam would have the opportunity to pursue their national destiny with the help of a government freely elected by them.

Although conditions of war and Vietcong terrorism still prevail in many areas of South Vietnam, the people of that country went to the polls twice during the past 2 months to select their representatives and their leaders.

These elections, observed at the invitation of the South Vietnamese Government by many foreign dignitaries, constituted a very important step along the road to peaceful national existence and self-determination for the people of South Vietnam.

In congratulating President Thieu on his inauguration, we are doing much more than simply marking the accomplishments of a single individual. In a larger sense, we are congratulating the people of South Vietnam upon their singular achievement of a free national election.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has repeatedly pledged its readiness to remove even the last American soldier from the South Vietnamese soil as soon as the people of that country are allowed by their neighbors to the north to lead their lives without interference from the outside.

I hope and pray that the elections which took place this fall in South Vietnam, and President Thieu's inauguration, signal the approach of that day. Nothing would be more welcome to the American people—and to the people of South Vietnam.

PRESIDENT-ELECT NGUYEN VAN THIEU

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today marks a historic milestone in the life of the Republic of Vietnam—the inauguration of its President-elect Nguyen Van Thieu. Despite the ravages of war brought to the Republic by Communist forces from the north and their subversive allies in the south of that divided country, the Vietnamese have pushed ahead with the establishment of a popularly elected government. Even in less troubled times such an event would present deep problems. Given the conditions that presently exist in Vietnam, it is a mark of courage of the highest order.

The United States will watch with more than passing interest the efforts of the President of Vietnam and his supporters to develop the instruments of government that will be responsive to the aspirations of the Vietnamese people while, at the same time, it proceeds to push ahead with social and economic reforms. The initiative and the courage of the President in these troubled times will determine for many years to come the destiny of his country.

I know that all of us who understand something, at least, of the workings of the democratic process wish him well as he assumes the responsibilities of his new office.

PRESIDENT-ELECT NGUYEN VAN THIEU

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, we are all of the conviction that a freely elected form of government is the best instrument for human advancement. Hence, I join with my colleagues in congratulating the newly inaugurated President of Vietnam, Nguyen Van Thieu, as he assumes the responsibilities of his office. Within the past 2 months the country has elected members of the two houses that make up that legislative body. Within the framework of a constitution adopted earlier this year the executive and the legislative bodies are ready to begin work.

These are significant steps on the road to democratic government that merit our endorsement even though at times the results may test our patience. In no two nations does democracy take the same form nor proceed at the same pace. As in our own country democracy is a government of trial and error that must be responsive to the desires of those who chose it.

I need not note that popular government in Vietnam is a relatively untested instrument. Its establishment in times of internal disorders only multiplies its problems. Internal security must be maintained at the same time that pressing economic and social problems engage its efforts. We should measure its success as much by the spirit in which it approaches these difficult problems as in the results that may be achieved.

Understanding and tolerance between all elements of the national government and cooperation and compromise with the Provincial governments can only serve the best interests of Vietnam.

I take this occasion to laud the people of South Vietnam and to express my best wishes to their President on this memorable occasion.

INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT NGUYEN VAN THIEU MARKS HISTORIC DAY FOR FREEDOM

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], and the ranking Member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], for their remarks today about the significance of the new administration in South Vietnam.

This is a historic day.

This is a great day for all of those who respect and believe in freedom.

This is a day of special honor to the 14,000 young Americans who gave their lives and for countless others from South Vietnam and all of our allies who have been fighting a very bitter battle that freedom may survive against Communist terror and subversion.

There is no question that the war in Vietnam is one of the most difficult wars we have ever been engaged in. But this war is a most significant war, and the events happening in South Vietnam today are also significant. With a new government being sworn in, a government elected by the people under the most difficult of circumstances, this marks a historic date for freedom.

I do not know of any other incident in history where a government was elected by the people in a free election under the difficult war conditions that now exist in Vietnam.

What is happening in Vietnam today is a tribute to the good judgment of President Eisenhower and of President Kennedy; and, yes, of President Johnson, who had enunciated the policy of keeping our commitment to our SEATO obligation.

What is happening in Vietnam today is a culmination of a firm and unyielding determination by President Johnson that freedom shall prevail in South Vietnam.

We are witnessing in South Vietnam today the inauguration of an administration to lead a free people. But the important thing to remember about this historic day is that this is the first time, as President Johnson said so eloquently a week ago yesterday, that a major power has committed all of its resources to the protection of freedom of a small and helpless nation.

As we said on this floor yesterday, what is happening in South Vietnam today, is the first step in the process of self-determination and self-rule for the small and helpless nations of the world. Indeed, we hope it is going to be a meaningful step toward peace not only in Vietnam but throughout the world. As the small nations, the newly emerging nations, see the degree to which the United States, is willing to fight and sacrifice for freedom, we will see these nations now rallying behind us in ever-increasing numbers.

Twenty-two nations were represented today in observing the inauguration in South Vietnam. More will follow.

More important, I believe it is significant that President Thieu has said he is going to try to work out a peaceful solution. We wish him success in trying to bring this war to an end. I am sure the prayers of all Americans go out to the people of South Vietnam that their new constitutionally elected government will be able to bring peace to this troubled land.

I say, Mr. Speaker, this is a historic date not only in Vietnam but throughout the world. It is the first significant step toward lasting peace in our time.

CHARLES C. HASLET

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today is the final day of service in the House Press Gallery for one of Washington's most distinguished, respected, and trusted newsmen. Charles C. Haslet has served for 30 years here in Washington with the Associated Press covering congressional activities. For 43 years of his life he has been a trusted reporter with the Associated Press, the world's largest news-gathering organization.

On October 23 the entire Oklahoma congressional delegation joined in a luncheon as a tribute to this outstanding newsman. Tributes from all members of our delegation were unanimous, I think, in expressing this thought: that in a day when many standards were unstable or uncertain it was a refreshing thing to salute a newspaperman who had lived and worked in the highest traditions of a great profession, a man who talked straight, who wrote straight, and who did not attempt to slant or tilt the story but told the facts as he found them with courage and with integrity. That has been the record of Charles Haslet, and he will be missed in this Nation's Capitol.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically join my colleague in what he said about the Associated Press reporter, Charles C. Haslet, who has covered the Capitol for many years and before that covered the State capitol in Oklahoma. Charles Haslet, as a newspaperman, is one of the greatest I have ever seen and, as a gentleman, one of the finest who has ever lived. In his work, which has been of the highest professional quality, he has always been active, always thorough, and always fair. He has made a great contribution to his profession as he has chronicled the events of our time. He has a host of friends who shall always cherish his friendship. Here, Mr. Speaker, is a man.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, as one from south of the Red River, I would like to suggest that we, too, look upon Charlie Haslet as one of the finest representatives of his profession who ever served this House and this Congress. He is highly respected in our area. Although he worked only occasionally in contact with our people, we learned to respect him and learned to rely on him and learned to know that he was a great reporter and a fine and worthy citizen.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement concerning Charlie Haslet and join in the comments he made.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the completion of a long and distinguished career with the Associated Press for a respected friend of mine and the entire Kansas congressional delegation. Charles C. Haslet, a native of Wellington, Kans., will file his final story in the House Press Gallery for AP, climaxing 43 years of excellent service to his bureau.

Charlie Haslet has been covering the Congress, and particularly the Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri delegations, since March of 1937. He has proved to be an astute, knowledgeable, accurate, and probing newsman. He has done an excellent job of keeping the people of the Fourth Congressional District and Kansas informed of my activities and views.

Charlie Haslet always has been frank, honest, and cooperative with me when he was seeking information for his stories. I have felt confident that my responses and information were in very capable and good hands.

We have heard much in recent years about "freedom of information" and the "public's right to know" in relation to each of the branches of our Government. Responsible and dedicated men, such as Charlie Haslet, have done much to advance this needed effort to give the people better understanding of their Government's operations and policies.

I shall miss Charlie Haslet's presence in the House Press Gallery, and many of my colleagues who have worked with him and known him through the years share my feelings of regret that today he ends his long career with Associated Press. We wish for him continued happiness and the best of health.

Knowing Charlie Haslet as I do, I am sure he will be visiting Capitol Hill frequently to talk about politics, defense, the wheat crop in Kansas, and petroleum—all subjects which he knows well. And he will be around to be of help to other newsmen and to Members of Congress.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I have known Charlie Haslet for over 30 years. He is one of the fairest, most honest, conscientious newspaper reporters that it has ever been my privilege to meet. Charlie is really a credit to the newspaper profession. He was not only a great reporter, but he was a great American. I am certainly going to miss Charlie personally. As far as I am concerned, he has been here ever since I have been a Member of Congress, and this House will not be the same without Charlie Haslet.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the departure from the Hill of one of the most beloved and respected members of the press it has been my privilege to know during my short tenure as a Member of the House.

Charles C. Haslet is retiring after more than 40 years of service with the Associated Press. His reporting has always been thorough and objective. He has never been too busy to lend a helping hand or to take the time to call on members of the Kansas congressional delegation on happenings in their districts and the State.

Charlie, a native Kansan, was the first member of the fourth estate based in Washington to greet me upon my arrival in the Nation's Capital nearly 7 years ago to offer his assistance and cooperation.

From this first meeting, a friendship developed which I value greatly, and it it is with a sense of regret that I view his departure. I do not, however, begrudge Charlie the retirement he so richly deserves. Certainly all who have come to know him as I do join me in wishing him a most enjoyable and rewarding retirement.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks made today on the occasion of the retirement of Mr. Charles C. Haslet, of the Associated Press Washington staff, after having reached the AP's mandatory retirement age of 65.

I have known Charlie Haslet since I came to Washington as the bride of Congressman John Berchmans Sullivan in 1941. He covered my husband's office during all the time that John served in the House, and he has covered my office for the Associated Press ever since I took my seat in 1953. He is a gentleman—a gracious, honest, and friendly person. He is an excellent reporter.

The House Press Gallery will not be the same without Charlie Haslet diligently pounding away at a typewriter preparing one of his straightforward and accurate reports for the newspapers of Missouri and adjoining States which he has represented so ably here in Washington for more than 30 years.

Every Member of the House and Senate who has represented a district or a State where the newspapers have depended upon Charlie Haslet for regional press coverage in Washington has learned to respect not only his ability but his integrity as a newspaperman. And most of us have been lucky enough to acquire his friendship as well. This has brought us no favors from Charlie Haslet the reporter, but much pleasure in our association with Charlie Haslet, friend and gentleman.

I am sure this excellent newspaperman will find many outlets for his experience and knowledge and skill as he begins a new chapter in his career after so many years with AP. I wish him every enjoyment of this opportunity to take things a bit easier now that he has retired from AP.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISAGREEMENT AMONG THE CONFEREES ON THE FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by way of information to the Members of the House, I would like to say that an article which appeared in the Washington Post this morning relative to the conferees on foreign aid was not exactly factual. I do not particularly blame the Post.

Normally, Mr. Speaker, I do not disclose what goes on in a conference committee. However, when a news story carries a quotation which is blatantly not consistent with the facts, I feel that I ought to tell the House of Representatives what did happen.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate conferees made a proposal to the House conferees, and we the House conferees then adjourned to another room and caucused. After caucusing, we made a counterproposal in which we accepted two of the four amendments that the Senate proposed. On the third one, which was that all credit sales end on June 30, 1968, we proposed we would accept it, if they would change the date to June 30, 1969.

However, Mr. Speaker, when Senator FULBRIGHT, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body heard this, he said he refused to accept it, "and that is that."

When he said that, I said, "If that is the way the chairman feels, we are wasting our time here." Thereupon, the House conferees got up and left the chamber. We did not present to the conferees of the other body an ultimatum. There was nothing about an ultimatum. As a matter of fact, we were prepared to negotiate on the difference in the proposals.

CLOSING TAX LOOPHOLES

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last week I filed a discharge petition on the bill H.R. 655, a bill to reduce the depletion allowance for oil and gas. I would hope that most of my colleagues will agree with me that the oil companies, with a net profit last year of close to $5 billion, ought to be paying taxes at a rate higher than the 8.5 percent they now pay.

Mr. Speaker, another interesting aspect as to where the money goes from the oil companies is the fact that all of the royalties which they pay to foreign countries are deductible, dollar for dollar, from their net income tax.

So, we are in the position of having the Treasury of the United States losing out on every dollar that the oil companies send to the Arab countries. For instance, Standard Oil of New Jersey, which last year had a net profit of over $1 billion, paid only $116 million, or 6.3 percent to the Treasury of the United States. However, they sent over $624 million overseas and in paying State taxes at a time when we are undertaking to get Egypt to negotiate in the Middle East and at a time when we find they are having difficulty because the Suez Canal is closed.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these circumstances it is discomforting to find that Saudi Arabia is giving to Egypt $200 million a year. Therefore, Egypt need not care whether the Suez Canal is reopened or not.

I would hate to think that tax dollars which rightfully ought to be channeled into the Treasury of the United States are being routed to Eygpt through Standard Oil and through many other oil companies in the United States.

I hope that the Members of the House will sign my discharge petition.

THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add a few thoughts to those expressed by other Members in support of the passage of the Air Quality Act of 1967.

As we all know air pollution threatens the health of the American people. It is clearly responsible wholly or in substantial part for unnecessary death and for unnecessary disability and discomfort. Just last Thanksgiving in New York City the winds stopped blowing for 4 days and the air became stagnant with pollution. Thousands of persons with respiratory diseases lived out those 4 days in suffering and pain while many people failed to survive.

Such occurrences are dramatic and tragic, and thus far they have, fortunately been rare. But this should not create the false impression that air pollution is only rarely a hazard. In most of the places where we live and work we are frequently exposed to levels of air pollution which have been associated with adverse effects on health and property.

I would like to quote President Johnson, from his January 30 message to the Congress in which he proposed adoption of the Clean Air Act of 1967. The President said:

> Ten years from now, when industrial production and waste disposal have increased and the number of automobiles on our streets and highways exceeds 110 million, we shall have lost the battle for clean air—unless we strengthen our regulatory and research efforts now.

The Air Quality Act of 1967 will provide us with the needed weapons for strengthening our efforts. I urge you to pass this vital legislation.

CONGRESS SHOULD PROMPTLY EXPRESS THE THANKS AND APPRECIATION OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO COL. FRANCIS S. GABRESKI, U.S. AIR FORCE, OUR GREATEST LIVING AIR ACE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, today there will retire from the military service of this great Nation an outstanding officer, an outstanding American, in fact the greatest living American Air Force "ace," Col. Francis S. Gabreski, after 27 years of distinguished active service in the Nation's Armed Forces.

Colonel Gabreski is credited with 37.5 kills—31 in World War II, and 6.5 in Korea. He is one of the three top American air aces of all time.

Mr. Speaker, because of this important occasion I am today introducing legislation in the House to formally express the thanks and appreciation of the American people to Colonel Gabreski for his outstanding services. I might point out that the form of this resolution is almost identical with one adopted in 1961 expressing the thanks and appreciation of this Congress and of the American people to the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when some people are burning draft cards, other people are trying to stop the Selective Service System, and still other people are defiling and defacing the headquarters of our Defense Establishment, I believe strongly that this House should take this opportunity to reaffirm its faith in a great, courageous American patriot, and to the whole idea of patriotism when the enemies of freedom are again challenging our will and determination in Southeast Asia.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] for introducing the resolution. I am proud and happy to cosponsor the concurrent resolution with the gentleman giving recognition to Col. Francis S. Gabreski, U.S. Air Force ace. Public commendation and appreciation for his courageous and devoted service in the Nation's Armed Forces is long overdue. I join my colleague in urging speedy approval of the resolution expressing our Nation's thanks to a great American.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERAL PAYMENT AND BORROWING AUTHORITY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McMILLAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8718) to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 957 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 957

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12144) to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 351]

Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Baring
Berry
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Celler
Diggs
Everett
Fountain
Giaimo
Hamilton
Hansen, Idaho
Hébert
Helstoski
Laird
Long, La.
McCulloch
Mathias, Md.
Miller, Calif.
Moss
Pool
Railsback
Rarick
Reuss
Rivers
Roybal
St. Onge
Steed
Stuckey
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Widnall
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 395 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution which was read prior to the quorum call makes it clear that this is an open rule providing for 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I recall no objections being raised to the rule during its consideration by the Committee on Rules. However, there seems to be considerable controversy over the bill itself, the Federal Meat Inspection Act. It is my further understanding that there will be substitute amendments and other amendments offered. However, since there is no opposition to the rule, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statements which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING]. There was absolutely no opposition to this rule when it was presented before the Committee on Rules. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] indicated, there will be a somewhat controversial amendment offered to the bill which, if adopted, would change the inspection concept of this bill considerably.

I might say at the outset of my remarks that everyone wants clean, pure, wholesome quality meat. It is just a question of how best to obtain it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12144 is a very comprehensive bill and it could very easily become all inclusive. This bill provides for payments to the various States of up to 50 percent of their meat inspection cost, providing they come under the Federal standards. Since all States these days are in search of revenues, a person would have to be pretty naive not to believe that all 50 States would quickly come under the provisions of this bill in order to obtain 50 percent of their meat inspection costs and, along with it, the Federal meat standards.

This prospect caused me to raise a couple of questions about the bill at the time it was presented by the very able gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] before the Committee on Rules.

I wondered what effect this bill would have on the little rural locker plants that we have around the country? Every rural community has one. We have several of them in my district. They butcher animals for farmers primarily, do it every day, in small plants that are now regulated by State standards, which are considerably different than Federal standards.

These little plants, in addition to slaughtering animals for farmers, also sell a few dollars worth of meat to the general public. As I understand the provisions of this bill, if the States do accept their 50-percent payments and come under the provisions of this bill, these small locker plans would likewise be covered if they sell $1 worth of meat to the general public. Now, this is going to cause a tremendous burden to these small locker plants, particularly in the rural areas. Their volume is not sufficient to justify on-the-spot Federal inspection. Most of them are not physically equipped to come under Federal meat inspection standards, but they would be required to do so to sell meat if this bill passes in its present form.

I would certainly hope that the House would give some thought to the problems of these thousands upon thousands of small locker plants across the country during the debate on this bill.

I can remember a couple of years ago when Secretary Freeman, just before the agricultural appropriation bill was to come before the House, started transferring Federal meat inspectors from plant to plant around the country due to a sudden shortage of Federal meat inspectors. We had these meat inspectors withdrawn from plants in my district, and I am certain other Members suffered the same treatment.

Now, if this bill becomes law we are going to need many more meat inspectors almost immediately. In discussing this matter with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], I learned that this Congress has already authorized and appropriated money for over 100 Federal meat inspectors, that they do not now have. Why? Because they have not found qualified inspectors to fill the vacancies. However, we seem to be getting the cart before the horse as we are about to pass a piece of legislation that is going to require thousands of additional meat inspectors at a time when we have been unable to fill these hundred or so vacancies that already exist.

I point these two things out, Mr. Speaker, as I am for this bill and I want to see proper preparations made now for effective administration of the act after it becomes effective.

As I indicated at the outset, this legislation is going to be far reaching, it could affect every pound of meat sold in the country, it will affect every pound of meat that is butchered in this country, and it could affect every plant in this country that processes meat.

Briefly, the purposes of this bill are: First, it would broaden the present meat inspection program by establishing a Federal-State cooperative meat inspection arrangement under which the Federal Government would provide both personnel and financial assistance to State agencies in order to improve the quality of State meat inspection services; second, it would rewrite and modernize present meat inspection statutes as a single Federal Meat Inspection Act designed to provide the appropriate means for achieving the purposes of the program; third, it would give the Department of Agriculture new legislative authority to eliminate numerous opportunities now present to defraud consumers and endanger the public health.

About 15 percent of commercially slaughtered animals is not prepared for distribution in interstate or foreign commerce and, therefore, under present law is subject to State and not to Federal inspection at the time of slaughter. Approximately 25 percent of commercially processed meat food products is prepared without Federal inspection and to a significant degree is not subject to adequate State or local inspection.

H.R. 12144 would completely rewrite the act of March 4, 1907, the Horsemeat Act and the Imported Meat Act into a single new statute to be known as the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

Title I would both revise and incorporate various provisions of law now found in the act of March 4, 1907, the Horse Meat Act, and the Imported Meat Act.

Title II deals with the Secretary's authority over unwholesome meat products.

Title III deals with the establishment and administration of the Federal-State cooperative meat inspection program.

Title IV contains auxiliary provisions to further implement the new Federal Meat Inspection Act.

The proposed legislation would enhance the role of the State by providing for Federal cooperation with appropriate State agencies in developing and administering State meat inspection programs. To qualify, a State must have a meat inspection law imposing mandatory inspection and sanitation requirements for intrastate operators that are consistent with Federal requirements. Cooperation would include furnishing advisory assistance in planning and developing a meat inspection program, furnishing technical and laboratory assistance, and aid in the training of inspection personnel. Up to 50 percent of the estimated total cost of the cooperative program would be furnished by the Federal Government.

Second, enforcement tools would be overhauled by the proposed legislation to deal more effectively with unwholesome and adulterated meat product. Presently, there are many opportunities for illegitimate operators to introduce into human food channels meat derived from dead, dying, disabled, and diseased animals—commonly referred to as "4–D's."

The legislation would extend jurisdiction to those who handle products which are "capable" of use as human food rather than being limited to those who prepare products "intended" for human consumption as is now the case. It would establish controls over persons handling such meat, including renderers, animal food manufacturers, and those who buy, sell, transport, pack, freeze, and import such meat products in or for commerce. Further, all persons engaged in business, in or for commerce, as meatbrokers, wholesalers, and public warehousemen, as well as persons engaged in buying, selling, transporting, or importing "4–D" meat would have to be registered with the Secretary. Access to records, inventories, and facilities would be authorized.

The legislation would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to deny inspection service to such individuals who by their past actions have demonstrated that they are unfit to engage in a business requiring a high degree of public responsibility. The Secretary would also be given specific authority to prescribe the size and style of type used for labeling; the size and form of containers; standards of identity, and standards of fill of containers. These would be consistent with provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Third, H.R. 12144 would grant specific authority to prevent the counterfeiting or unauthorized use of inspection marks and marking devices. Unauthorized manufacture and possession of brands and marking devices would be prohibited.

H.R. 12144 is a bill which reflects the changes made in H.R. 6168 by the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee.

The estimated additional Federal cost of this legislation would be $4½ million during the first year with an eventual additional annual cost of from $10 million to $15 million.

The committee feels that it has developed a good bill which will adequately protect consumers, the legitimate operators in the affected industries, and others associated with the meat business.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] have a different approach to this problem. They, I understand, will offer an amendment to provide an exemption for all of these small plants now operating in intrastate commerce when their sales do not exceed $250,000 annually.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman mentioned my name with respect to the substitute. I must differ with him when he states that the substitute exempts any plants from adequate inspection.

Mr. LATTA. Let me correct the gentleman before he goes on. I did not say that it exempts them from adequate inspection.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman is suggesting that plants under $250,000 are exempted from Federal inspection, he is also in error.

If, in fact, they are in interstate commerce, they come under Federal jurisdiction because of that fact. If they are not now in interstate commerce by reason of selling meat, they are not covered at all.

The Smith-Foley bill does extend Federal inspection in addition to those in interstate commerce to those that substantially affect interstate commerce. That is defined as in those plants having over $250,000 gross a year.

Mr. LATTA. If I may again stop the gentleman at this point, I thank the gentleman for his comment, but apparently the gentleman was not listening when I made my statement as I emphasized and I repeated intrastate commerce twice. I was not referring to interstate Federal inspection.

Now the gentleman may proceed further if he wishes.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman will suggest to me how this bill that is before the House is any different from the Smith-Foley bill except that we extend Federal meat inspection, I would be grateful to him. Every word in the committee bill that has been reported here and which will be considered on the floor of the House today is in the Smith-Foley version, with the additional fact that plants over $250,000 are placed under Federal inspection.

Mr. LATTA. I would emphasize further that I did not indicate there was any change other than this one exemption of $250,000 for those plants to be operating in intrastate commerce.

As the gentleman indicated, in all other respects the bill would remain the same.

I urge the adoption of the rule and the passage of the bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture without the Smith-Foley amendment.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a Clean Meat Act for the people of the country. Tomorrow, if we get to it, and if not the next day, we are going to consider the Air Pollution Act of 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time because I want to show to the Members who are present a graphic situation that exists in California.

There will be an amendment offered at the proper time by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] which will, in effect, put back into the bill an amendment which was deleted by the committee but which was accepted in the other body by an almost unanimous vote. The vote of the other body was 88 to 0. The amendment in the other body was presented by the junior Senator from California, the Honorable GEORGE MURPHY, in committee and it was accepted in recognition of California's unique problem of air pollution.

Most of you have received a letter from the dean of our delegation, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], the ranking Member on the minority side. In making this plea to the Members of the House for support of the amendment which we shall offer, we are not asking for a diminution of Federal standards. What we are asking for is to be allowed to go beyond the Federal standards provided in the act and take care of the situation which we have in California.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to display to the Members a picture that I hold in my hand. Two of my colleagues will also display pictures. The one I hold is a picture of the city hall in downtown Los Angeles on a clear day. We do have those clear days even now. The reason that we have smog on certain days of the year is that a temperature inversion results from cold air coming in from the ocean which acts as a lid over the metropolitan area of Los Angeles, holding down the emissions from automobiles and industrial chimney stacks.

I now call on my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. Reinecke] to show you a picture that was taken of the same city hall at 8 o'clock in the morning with a temperature inversion of cold air above and the smog collecting at a lower level in the early hour of the morning.

Then I am going to ask my colleague from San Diego [Mr. Van Deerlin] to show you a picture of that same city hall at 12:45 p.m.

If those three pictures do not convince you that we have a severe problem in California that is not present in any other part of the Nation that I know of, although smog exists in many other cities, I do not know what can convince you. We shall have about 12 pictures similar to these pictures—pictures of automobiles driving at 8:30 in the morning with their lights on so that their drivers can see, workers going to work.

At this time in California 7.8 million cars are equipped with one kind or another of smog-reduction devices. The automobile companies have agreed for the 1969 buses and the 1970 automobiles, to also accept even more stringent requirements for California. Those requirements would not apply to visitors or to the people of any other States, but only the cars that are sold or registered permanently in the State of California.

The automobile manufacturers have agreed already to stricter standards for the State of California, and the people of California are willing to pay all the way from $10 to $55 for the additional devices which are on these cars. They are paying for them. We are not asking the Federal Government to pay for them.

I say that if a State will take care of an urgent problem which is threatening, and actually affecting the health of its people, going beyond the Federal standards that might be adequate in any other part of the Nation, then I say that you who believe that a State should be allowed to use its police powers should think about applying national standards which would preclude the possibility of a State applying its own standards unless we go through the bureaucratic jungle and subject ourselves to the Administrative Procedure Act.

In California we have been working on smog control for 20 years. We have developed the greatest army of experts and the finest technology of control. All we are asking is that when the bill providing for clean air in the United States is considered in the House, that California be allowed to use its own money and its own police powers to protect the health of our citizens.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12144) to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12144, with Mr. Delaney in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Belcher] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all recognize that every Member of this House is trying to give us legislation which will provide clean and wholesome meat. We know we are getting in very large part the finest meat and the most wholesome meat of any nation of the world. We believe the amendments that are provided in the committee bill will take care of whatever defects there may be in the existing law and will do it in a practical way: In a way which can become law and which can be effective legislation, when passed. The bill does this in an orderly and constitutional manner without destroying the rights or the responsibilities of any of the States of the Union. I am one of those who believe that we should, so far as possible, work through our State, rather than to ignore and circumscribe the States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to turn over to the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this legislation so objectively and so patiently the further consideration of this bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell] will hereafter handle the disposition of the time. At this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell] 15 minutes.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us here today would accomplish three major purposes:

First, it would broaden the present meat inspection program by establishing a Federal-State cooperative meat inspection arrangement under which the Federal Government would provide both personnel and financial assistance to State agencies in order to improve the quality of State meat inspection services.

Second, it would rewrite and modernize present meat inspection statutes as a single Federal Meat Inspection Act designed to provide the appropriate means for achieving the purposes of the program.

Third, it would give the Department of Agriculture new legislative authority to eliminate numerous opportunities now present to defraud consumers and endanger the public health.

Although our present national meat inspection system exists through passage of more than one Federal law, our existing primary law on meat inspection (21 U.S.C. 71–91) came into existence over 60 years ago, a rider to an appropriations bill. Since that time, it has only been amended once.

The system that has developed from this legislation has been, basically, a good one, and has come to be recognized as the model for the world. Refinements are constantly being made by the Department of Agriculture within the legal boundaries established by Congress. Yet the system, as it is presently being administered, has several flaws which the bill before us seeks to remedy.

Today, about 15 percent of commercially slaughtered animals, and 25 percent of commercially processed meat food products in the United States, are prepared without Federal inspection, and thus is produced and processed according to the standards in effect within the various States where they are prepared for consumption.

An examination of the overall situation in the States with regard to the status of meat inspection laws is both illuminating and frightening. Presently there are 28 States with mandatory inspection of animals before and after slaughter. Twenty-six of these provide for mandatory inspection of meat processing. This type of inspection is most comparable to our present Federal system of inspection, in terms of protection to the consumer.

Twelve States have laws providing for voluntary inspection of animals before and after slaughter. Most of these also have similar legislation regarding the processing of meat.

As of September 15, 1967, there were 10 States which had no meat inspection law on a statewide basis, although all of them do have general food or sanitation statutes.

However, the problem was more than one of statistics. On closer examination of the intrastate problem, it was readily obvious that many of the States simply were not doing the job in protecting their citizens from unhealthy or unwholesome practices within their domestic meatpacking, or processing industries. It would be accurate to say that I, as well as the members of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains of the Committee on Agriculture, was shocked by the instances of unsafe practices in some States that were called to our attention.

It is obvious that something had to be done about this situation, and the Committee on Agriculture examined three separate approaches toward solving the problem of intrastate meat inspection prior to formulating title III of this bill.

One approach that was advanced was simply to limit the proposed effect of the legislation to the Federal interstate meat inspection programs only. The argument in favor of this proposal was based, in part, on the attempts that nearly all of the States have made to regulate their own industries, without Federal assistance.

While recognizing that most States had been making attempts to promote safe standards for their domestic consumers, it was undeniable that the job had not been getting done. The first approach was, therefore, rejected, because it was no solution to the problem which confronted us.

An alternate approach to the problem of intrastate meat, was an approach which would have, in effect, federalized the entire meat industry, by providing for Federal inspection of virtually all meat produced within the Nation today.

It cannot be defined that the Federal Government, through the Department of Agriculture, has done an excellent job in providing that the majority of meat consumed in America today, is wholesome and nutritious, and is produced through the strictest health controls. However, even proponents of federalization realized that the Department of Agriculture had not the personnel to consistently maintain the same high quality of inspection, as it would be applied to the States. Therefore, an approach to provde for Federal inspection down to a dollar volume of $250,000 per year was rejected, not only due to considerations of difficulty of administration, but also because of the high cost, and the undesirable side effects of Federal preemption of the regulation of State industries.

The approach that was finally adopted, and is present in the bill before us, was the same approach as that recommended by the President in his special consumer message of February 16, 1967, recommending a Federal-State cooperative inspection program, wherein the Federal Government would assist, while neither ignoring nor usurping, State efforts to meet their responsibilities to provide a high quality of meat inspection. This is the approach that is written into the provisions of this bill. Federal-State cooperation is structured in this legislation in a way that will do the job that needs to be done without the Federal Government preempting the jurisdiction of the States over intrastate commerce.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman in the well and his subcommittee for the job they have done on this bill.

I would like to ask him one question; namely, whether or not you have had an opportunity to get to the question I raised with the gentleman concerning locker plants when he was before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. PURCELL. Yes. I have presented that to the Department of Agriculture. There is a letter I have today from the Department, and the gentlewoman from Washington has a copy of it. We would be glad to go over it with you at this time or at some future period.

Mr. LATTA. I wonder if we could have that letter read.

Mr. PURCELL. I will yield to the gentlewoman from Washington for that purpose.

Mrs. MAY. Yes. May I tell the gentleman from Ohio that the chairman of the subcommittee and I have been concerned about this. Unfortunately, during the hearings on this bill those representing the locker plants, who had particular problems that might come as a result of this legislation, did not ask for the opportunity to testify. Since that time members of our committee have heard from representatives of the locker plant industry. We certainly recognize unfairness to them might result if this section is not properly administered. However, I will tell the gentleman that we have been reluctant at this time to exempt any area where there is the possibility that meat, not fit for human consumption, could get into retail sales. So instead of trying to write a blanket exemption in this bill, the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL], has been in touch with the Department and is in receipt of this letter on yesterday, and if the gentleman will yield further, I will read it:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PURCELL: With respect to Section 11 of H.R. 12144, amending Section 23 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act on "exemption" * * * We plan to provide that for a three-year period from the enactment of the bill—currently "exempt" plants could, on application for Federal inspection, operate under Federal inspection on the basis of their approval as "exempt" premises. In other words, "exempt" operators will, in practical terms, have three years to meet existing Federal inspections facility requirements.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Mr. LATTA. I want to thank the gentleman and the gentlewoman from Washington for moving on this problem as rapidly as they did, because I believe everybody in this chamber certainly is for wholesome, clean meat. I would not want to see any type of meat that is not clean sold in any restaurants, and so forth. However, I think that the locker plants, as I pointed out earlier, performed and are performing a tremendous service to the rural areas of America. Because of their size they cannot readily comply with the requirements as far as buildings, and so forth, are concerned. This 3-year period may give them an opportunity to do so.

I want to thank you for bringing this to the attention of the Secretary.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WAMPLER. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and commend not only him but the members of the subcommittee for bringing this bill to the floor.

For the purpose of legislative history, I would like to pursue further the subject of the colloquy about which the gentleman from Ohio and the gentlewoman from Washington just spoke. As I understand it, there are today some 530-odd establishments that hold this certificate of exemption. Is that correct?

Mr. PURCELL. I am not positive as to the number, but I believe that is in the neighborhood of being correct and, therefore, I assume that would be true with reference to that type of operator.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I pose a hypothetical question or a factual situation, if the gentleman from Texas would be kind enough to give me his interpretation of the letter which was just read by the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

There is a very reputable processor of Virginia country hams located in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent. He carries an inventory of between $90,000 and $100,000 of hams which he cures and sells in interstate commerce. In other words, he procures these hams from federally inspected facilities in the State of Indiana but because of the uniqueness of Virginia country ham, and because of the type of operation which he conducts, it requires a curing process which ranges anywhere from 8 to 18 months.

Would he be covered by this? As I understand his situation, if this legislation becomes law, then he would have as much as 3 years during which to comply fully with the Federal inspections provisions of the law.

Mr. PURCELL. This is my understanding, assuming the situation you are describing comes under the situation that this letter refers to, he would have the 3 years and it is my further understanding that under the amendment the letter would apply to your constituent.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, referring to the letter from the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, on page 11 of the committee report, and particularly referring to paragraph 4, it seems to me here that, if adopted, it plans to provide an 18-month period for these operators to present drawings showing the layout of their facilities and would grant to them additional time during which to bring about the needed improvements to their plant facilities.

So, would not that add further weight to the statement which has just been made by the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY]?

Mr. PURCELL. Yes, it would, in my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such additional time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like, if I might, to proceed with the prepared remarks that I have, and I would particularly hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and from every political persuasion and from every part of the country might give attention to the explanation that I am going to try to give in regard to the relationship of the bill adopted by the committee as it relates to the proposals that are made by two of my dear friends and colleagues that have a different view on this matter.

But to continue, despite the Federal-State cooperative provisions, however, it was felt that there must be additional Federal protection down to the lowest level of intrastate commerce to protect against unwholesome meat products. Accordingly, under this bill the Federal Government is given the power to regulate the so-called 4–D animals.

This category embraces those livestock that are dead, dying, diseased, or disabled. Regulation of this class of animals is necessary to prevent their being used as human food or food products. Other changes in the present law governing meat inspection were also deemed necessary. Authority is provided to the Secretary to regulate an absolutely unclean situation which he discovers if the State is unwilling to, or unable to, regulate the subject plant. The Secretary also has the authority to deny Federal inspection in appropriate cases. Likewise, under this bill the Secretary can regulate the sale of "4–D" animals in order to provide meaningful restrictions to prevent their sale as food sources. The Secretary can also require the denaturing of articles prior to their introduction into intrastate commerce. Moreover, the authority of the Secretary is clarified in order that he may limit the entry of meat into federally inspected plants.

Additionally, this bill would make some additional changes in present Federal law in order to provide for amendments of a "housekeeping" nature. The various statutes and laws regulating meat inspection would all be brought together under this new act. Thus, for example, the Horse Meat Act, and the Imported Meat Act would be incorporated into a single new statute known as the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

Mr. Chairman, the need of the Nation to update our present national system of meat inspection is urgent. Despite the attempts of the States to enact consumer protection legislation and meaningful programs on their own, they have not generally been able to accomplish this momentous task. The primary reason for this is, and has been consistently, lack of money to finance these State programs. Meat inspection requires full-time personnel with adequate facilities to accomplish a safe protection. There can be no "spot checking" as there is in testing compliance under other regulatory activities. The need for consumer protection in those States who have not as yet enacted mandatory ante and post mortem inspection systems comparable to the system now administered by the Federal Government must be answered by us here today. The consumers need protection, the States need money and guidance to provide this for their citizens.

Evidence of the value of this bill and particularly the Federal-State cooperative program it seeks to establish can be found in the support that has been accorded this approach by those most aware of the true problems facing this critical industry today.

The President supported this concept in his consumer message of February 14 this year. The strong support given this bill by the Department of Agriculture is evidence of its acceptability as the proper solution to a most complex problem. Moreover, the bill has the support of nearly every statehouse in the Nation. It is strongly supported by the meat industry, and all those who champion a program of meaningful cooperation between Federal and State government.

The estimated Federal cost of this legislation would be approximately $4½ million during the first year with an eventual additional cost of from $10 to $15 million as the States enact their own programs consistent with that of the Federal Government. This is cheap indeed for the protection that would be provided by the provisions of this act.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It is closely examined and closely formulated legislation, and all who desired to be heard, both consumer protection groups, industries, and administrative officials, were consulted, and their comments noted.

We must act, and act now to give impetus to the concept of a truly integrated, truly cooperative, and truly effective national meat inspection program. This bill accomplishes this. I sincerely urge its favorable consideration here today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. I have one further question to ask the gentleman and that is the question of the Federal training for meat inspectors. Is there any provision in this bill for training meat inspectors or is there any money allocated for this purpose?

Mr. PURCELL. There is no provision in this bill that would set aside a separate amount of money under this bill for training meat inspectors now. Of course, almost the entire amount of money required to run a meat inspection program is for the training of meat inspectors. That is what meat inspection amounts to other than the administration of it or keeping it up.

In this connection I would feel that with the difficulty that we know exists, that when the States are given the opportunity, and with the help that this bill provides for them to get, that with 50 States looking for and helping to train inspectors, it would be a much more logical and sensible approach toward obtaining the necessary inspectors, be they Federal, State, or otherwise, because what we need are the well-trained inspectors.

I think it is totally immaterial who gives them their check. I believe that with the assurance that would result with the passage of this bill, with every State looking for their own inspectors, we could expect a much better supply of inspectors who could be found and trained under the provisions of this bill than for the Federal Government just continuing to look for inspectors which is very difficult to do.

Mr. LATTA. Then what the gentleman is saying is that it is going to be up to the States to find their own meat inspectors and train them and that part of the money they get from the Federal Government would be used for that purpose?

Mr. PURCELL. Yes, sir. Under this bill, for those States that pass a mandatory inspection bill with the necessary requirements in the bill, the Federal Government would pay each State up to half the cost of inspection. This will give an incentive to the States and a big part of the money to those States to get inspectors. But it will be up to the States; yes.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12144, a bill to clarify and amend the Meat Inspection Act. I believe that this bill, as approved and recommended by the House Agriculture Committee, will be effective in strengthening and improving our Nation's meat inspection services.

This legislation has one basic and fundamental objective—to insure the wholesomeness and cleanliness of the entire meat supply in these United States. It is imperative that our meat inspection laws in this country be strong enough to guarantee that not even 1 pound of unclean or unwholesome meat can enter into channels of human consumption.

In my opinion, the bill before us today, H.R. 12144, will provide the means necessary to achieve this objective.

This measure is designed to strengthen our Nation's meat inspection services in three major ways:

First, it would establish a Federal-State cooperative meat inspection effort through which the Federal Government would provide assistance to State agencies in order to improve the quality of State meat inspection services. The Federal assistance would include financial aid up to 50 percent of the total cost of the State program. Testimony received before our House Agriculture Committee indicated that cost is an important factor in the inability of some States to enact sound, mandatory meat inspection laws. The cost-sharing program provided in H.R. 12144, we believe, will be a catalyst, providing the ingredient needed to stimulate more State movement in the direction of solid, effective, meat inspection laws.

State interest in this issue is not lacking. In testimony before the House Agriculture Committee, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Rodney E. Leonard stressed the need for stronger, more effective, and more uniform State inspection programs, and noted that in the past couple of years there has been a tremendous upsurge among the States to initiate or improve existing programs. Eighteen States actively considered meat inspection legislation during the past year—eight of whom are among these without any present meat inspection law. The other 10 were attempting to upgrade and strengthen existing statutes.

Even as our committee was considering this bill, the neighboring States of Maryland and Virginia took new initiatives toward more satisfactory laws.

The most important feature of the Federal-State cooperative program provided by H.R. 12144 is the fact that it would provide an instrument through which every meat plant in the United States, large and small, could be required to live up to standards which will insure that not even 1 pound of dirty or unwholesome meat will find its way into an American kitchen. All plants, no matter what their size, or level of production, can, under this legislation, be required to meet federally approved meat inspection standards.

The second major way in which this measure is designed to strengthen our Nation's meat inspection services is through the rewriting and modernization of several existing meat inspection laws into a single Federal Meat Inspection Act. This involves the revision and incorporation of various provisions of law found in the act of March 4, 1907, the Horse Meat Act, and the Imported Meat Act.

Third, H.R. 12144 would provide the Department of Agriculture new legislative authority to eliminate numerous opportunities now present to defraud consumers and endanger the public health.

As was pointed out in our Agriculture Committee hearings by a representative of the Department of Agriculture, there presently exist numerous opportunities for illegitimate operators to introduce into human food channels meat derived from dead, dying, disabled, and diseased animals—commonly referred to as "4-D's." New and stronger controls over persons handling such meat would be established by this bill, H.R. 12144.

Even meat operators whose sales are made only intrastate—in one State—would be subject to Federal prohibitions in this area if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the State does not have or is not exercising comparable authority.

This tightening up of controls on the movement of the 4-D meat is vital, because much of what little dirty or unwholesome meat that does go into channels of human consumption in this country comes from this source.

There is no question about the need for stronger, more effective meat inspection programs in this country. I am sure all of us here today agree completely that the issue has never been how much dirty meat is to be allowed, rather, it has always been what is the best way to assure the wholesomeness and cleanliness of all meat.

It is important, however, that this fundamental issue be seen in clear and proper perspective, and not distorted by sensationalism or alarmist techniques which only serve to divert attention from the basic problem, and contribute nothing to intelligent debate on how to solve it.

It is erroneous and misleading, for example, to imply that all meat not slaughtered and processed under Federal inspection is suspect with regard to sanitation and wholesomeness. While it is true that 26 percent of the meat in the United States is processed outside the Federal meat inspection system, this fact, in itself, does not provide sufficient reason for an assumption that the meat may have been processed under less than adequate standards. Almost all processed meat in the United States is subject to some kind of Federal, State, municipal, or local standards of sanitation and wholesomeness. Some of these standards, of course, are good and some are not, but to imply that all are lacking is to paint with far too broad a brush, and it is an injustice to the many State, municipal, and local meat inspection systems which are working well.

In summary, of all the alternative approaches which have been suggested to meet the task of improving our Nation's meat inspection program, I believe the House Agriculture Committee approach in H.R. 12144 is by far the best. Extension of the Federal program to all meat plants over $250,000 gross annual sales, as recommended by some, would only create more problems than it would solve. Not only would it fail to reach the heart of the dirty meat problem, but it would also tend to weaken and erode the State, municipal, and local inspection systems which would be left with the ultimate responsibility of dealing with that dirty meat.

This proposal to extend Federal inspection would also result in some unusual and unfair competitive advantages to certain meat plants. In addition to this, it would mean a much higher cost to the Federal Government. Of course, if it were simply a question of spending more to insure a wholesome and clean meat supply, the higher cost would be well worth it. The committee bill, however, will do a better job in the long run, and will be less expensive besides.

Finally, I want to emphasize again the need for adequate and effective inspection of all meat at all levels in the United States—Federal, State, municipal, and local. There is, in my opinion, one way to satisfactorily meet this need, and that is through enactment of H.R. 12144.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The time of the gentlewoman from Washington has expired.

Mrs. MAY. Will the gentleman yield me 2 more minutes?

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentlewoman spoke of the efforts of the States to revise and to perfect their systems of meat inspection. Does the gentlewoman feel that the State of Washington has done a good job in that area? We both represent that State.

Mrs. MAY. Was the question, Do they do a good job in Washington?

Mr. FOLEY. Is it a good system of meat inspection in the State of Washington, in the gentlewoman's opinion. We both represent the State.

Mrs. MAY. I do not believe it goes far enough. It could be a better system.

Mr. FOLEY. Yet the gentlewoman knows they have just finished a major revision in the State of Washington.

Mrs. MAY. Yes. I have a pledge from our director of agriculture, and the backing of the State government, that if the Federal Government under this bill believes it needs further tightening up they will back me in urging the legislature to take those steps.

Mr. FOLEY. Has the gentlewoman seen the September 1967 report of the Department of Agriculture on the State inspection of plants?

Mrs. MAY. Yes, I have.

Mr. FOLEY. Does the gentlewoman consider that shocking?

Mrs. MAY. I have not personally seen the plants named in this report, because I just got the plant report. Any time there are proven conditions of lack of sanitation in any plant, I do consider that shocking.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentlewoman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MIZE. There is nothing in this bill regarding imported meat?

Mrs. MAY. Yes.

Mr. MIZE. There is?

Mrs. MAY. In the bill we require that carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat imported into this country from other countries must be subject to the same standards of Federal inspection as our American plants now under Federal inspection.

Mr. MIZE. How can that be enforced?

Mrs. MAY. We have inspectors right now abroad doing inspections, though not requiring these high standards. It will mean that the Department will have to add new inspectors to these plants.

Mr. MIZE. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. I want to commend the gentlewoman for the leadership she has shown in this field and for her continuing interest in seeing that the housewife has proper meat on her table when she serves her family. The gentlewoman has shown once again that she has a genuine interest in people, and that she is always protecting the quality of the food that we eat. All of the consuming public is deeply indebted to her.

Likewise I want to pay tribute to the American meat industry, which, in my opinion, has done a tremendous job, in fact the greatest job in the world, in supplying our tables with the highest quality and finest types of meat. No country on earth has a comparable industry so completely dedicated to giving its people quality meat at all times.

While we debate this bill, we ought to keep this fact in mind. Here is an industry which is daily performing an outstanding service to the American housewife and her family. It is deserving of our thanks and merits all of the plaudits which will be given it here today.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. I have tried to make the point that in attempting to provide proper inspection for around 4 or 5 percent of the meat consumed in this Nation—the amount that concerns us—we should not downgrade unfairly the great job which is being done by the great majority of the meat industry supplying good, clean meat.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the committee bill today, and for one big compelling reason: I believe that in the long run the committee bill will do more to guarantee proper handling of meat products than would the alternative proposals which have been offered. There are additional valid considerations, but the compelling one is my desire to present to consumers, the most wholesome food products possible. This is a conclusion of logic, not emotion.

There has been an abundance of the latter. We have been informed, largely through the press, that some Washington agencies inspected plants across the Nation in 1962, and then reviewed some of the deplorable conditions more recently, finding, allegedly, the same conditions as before. I have not surveyed all the plants named in the documents. I have inspected some. In these instances, the Government representatives have overstated their case.

For instance there was one identified plant where poor sanitation was alleged. A specific complaint indicated that some of the floors were made of wood. The final connoted condemnation, a grossly unfair allegation, was that the plant was "believed to slaughter cripples and downers at times." I repeat, it was "believed" to slaughter cripples and downers at times.

This plant does not now have, nor did it ever have any wooden floors. It was constructed on a single large slab of concrete. I am not a sanitation engineer, but I think I can spot filth or the opportunity for filth. There was no such evidence present. Further, the owners and operators are willing to swear that they have never slaughtered cripples or downers—except for an occasional animal which had a leg broken, in a loading chute for instance, and of course this does not technically make a "cripple." Finally, these operators since opening the plant, have paid for both ante mortem and post mortem inspection of the animals, out of their own pockets, even before the State passed its inspection law. There is a State program now, and it is obvious the plant operates in complete compliance with the law.

I cite these specifics only to indicate that some of the selling techniques used in our prefloor debate, have been grossly misleading. We are interested today in health and in consumer protection. Our decision should be based on facts.

There are about 80 animal diseases transmissible to humans, but it is a gross error to say that all are transmitted through meat handling or consumption. Similarly, some of the figures in the report can be challenged because they suggest that every case of undulant fever reported, for instance, came from uninspected meat. This just is not true. Incidence of undulant fever from handling hogs has apparently increased. But some authorities have suggested that this is due to home handling of pork, rather than packer handling. Furthermore, the solution to brucellosis is not primarily through inspection, but through eradication of the disease through testing and vaccination.

For general lay purposes we might divide the problem areas as follows: First there is the virus which is exemplified by encephalomyelitis, or rabies and these are not primary to the present discussion.

Then there are the bacterial factors, such as the previously mentioned brucellosis. Mastitus in cattle includes a wide spectrum of bacteria, including probably streptococcus epidemicus which is at least similar to the human sore throat infectant.

A third category is the parasite, such as the microscopic roundworm which causes tricinosis, and which is killed by proper cooking.

A fourth category is the mycotic fungus which causes actinomycosis, a disease of great concern to humans but easily detectable on inspection.

Food poisonings must be included. This suggests inspection of canning and other preserving processes. Salmonella can exist when foods are kept in a warm state for protracted periods. Staphylococcus aureus produces a toxicity in chicken salad under certain conditions. A clean chicken, properly cooked, can still cause the toxin when left too long on the picnic table. The botulinus group including the especially dangerous clostridium botulinus which grows when oxygen is absent, is of extreme importance. This is a special danger in home canning.

There are some other factors which contaminate. By inspecting the heart, a veterinarian can normally detect a condition known as traumatic pericarditis. Cows eat lots of things other than grass, including at times, nails, wire, and so forth. Frequently these foreign bodies lodge in the second stomach where breathing, digestive action, or calving gradually force the object into the liver or more usually into the heart. A pyotic condition results and the matter formed by the infection contaminates the area.

But the important thing to remember is that appropriate inspection, ante mortem and post mortem, finds these factors without much difficulty. A wholesome product can be guaranteed. The consumer can be assured that meat products offer no greater risk than is involved in any other category of food products. Almost without exception, our meat supply is good, clean, wholesome, and very beneficial. The committee bill assures that we can remove the exception so far as processing is concerned.

But we will still need programs to eradicate certain diseases of meat animals. There are members who assume that when the Federal Government asks for funds to eradicate bovine tuberculosis or brucellosis for instance, it is the farmer who is being helped at the expense of the nonfarmer. Actually, the real thrust is to guarantee a proper food supply for humans wherever they live.

Similarly, meat inspection itself is funded from the Agriculture Department appropriation. A nonfarmer, looking at that appropriation is sometimes led to the conclusion that all agriculture funds go to farmers. Meat inspection is an example of the obvious fact that this is consumer protection rather than farmer promotion.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 352]

Adams
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Baring
Battin
Berry
Blackburn
Boggs
Broomfield
Button
Cederberg
Celler
Conte
Diggs
Downing
Everett
Fountain
Fraser
Giaimo
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Hébert
Helstoski
Herlong
Holland
Irwin
Laird
Long, La.
McCulloch
McEwen
Mathias, Md.
Moss
Ottinger
Rarick
Resnick
St. Onge
Stuckey
Widnall
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wright

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 12144, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 388 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee, the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. PURCELL and Mr. POAGE], for holding these hearings and getting this bill out this year. I first introduced legislation along this line 7 years ago and had begun to think it would never see the floor of the House. However, they did hold hearings this year and considerable progress has been made.

I am for the committee bill, but I do not think it goes far enough. I want to say that there has been a lot of misinformation put out about this bill in the last couple of days. Some people innocently have repeated the comments that have been made by the meat industry which are very inaccurate. I first introduced this legislation several years ago designed to tighten up inspection of those that are already under Federal inspection and also to cover imported meat and expand the inspection to medium- and large-sized plants that were not under Federal inspection and also to provide for Federal-State cooperation. The committee adopted all of these provisions but one. They have copied the provision for Federal-State cooperation. They have adopted the provisions to tighten up on those already covered and are for tightening up on imported meat, but they did not extend the jurisdiction to some large- and medium-sized plants doing the greatest share of mischief at this time. I will propose an amendment at the proper time to place these plants under Federal inspection.

Let me explain further: At the present time about 75 percent of the meat products in the United States that are processed is under Federal jurisdiction and 25 percent is not. About 85 percent of the meat slaughtered is under Federal inspection, but 15 percent is not. If my amendment passes, about 97 percent of the meat by volume will be processed and slaughtered under Federal jurisdiction. If the committee bill passes, there will not be any more under Federal inspection than there is now. There will just be better services to those that are already covered.

Mr. Chairman, how does this come about? It comes about because we have a very, very peculiar definition of interstate commerce in this meat inspection law. The definition is with reference to who sells across State lines, no matter if the cattle come from 1,000 miles away, and across 10 States, if the meat is sold in the same State where it is slaughtered, it is not subject to Federal inspection. This is true regardless of how large the plant is.

In other words, the buyer can have the largest chain of stores and supermarkets in the world but they can still sell meat that does not come under the Federal inspection law.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very peculiar definition that does not exist in any other major Federal law.

However, Mr. Chairman, after the hearings, the opponents, those who oppose any kind of inspection, including some of those who now support the committee bill, decided that they must do a little flip-flop. They finally decided that if they could get by with the committee bill, they would be lucky. The same people who were adamantly opposed to it in the first place, are willing to take this much in order to keep some of their big plants uninspected.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the members of the Committee that this is a very serious problem, because the human eye cannot tell the difference after that meat is dressed, between the inspected and uninspected meat. An example of this is a hog that has tuberculosis. If an inspector is not there on the line when that hog is slaughtered, the carcass will not necessarily reveal the fact that that hog had tuberculosis. In other words, one can go to the meat market and not be able to tell when one looks at the pork chops or the pork sausage, whether those products came from a hog that had tuberculosis. And, one cannot do it under the inadequate State inspection procedure, where they have a veterinarian in the morning and observe the animal prior to its being slaughtered, and then later look at the carcass of that same animal but does not witness the butchering process. In other words, if the intestines and the lymph glands are not with the carcass, one simply cannot tell the type of disease with which the animal suffered.

Mr. Chairman, this in my opinion does not represent adequate inspection.

Mr. Chairman, an example is one which involves a large plant—I am not talking about a $250,000 plant; I am talking a plant which does a business of over $1 million—which buys boars and mixes the boar meat with cow meat and sells it for hamburger. Boar meat is kind of strong and red, like beef. It also has a strong odor, but they can put chemicals in with it, mix it and one can hardly tell the difference. Unless the housewife is very unusually experienced in the operations of the meat industry, she would be unaware of the real composition of the product.

Mr. Chairman, another example is sausage such as, for instance, large baloney. You cannot tell with the naked eye whether that baloney contains hog hides, blood, and an excessive amount of flour, as is the case with reference to many sources of these products which are not federally inspected. One cannot tell about these products when they are lying side by side in the meat counter, whether some of these products are labeled "all meat" or whether they are deceptively labeled. If they are labeled properly, then the chances are they come under Federal inspection.

Mr. Chairman, as one can readily see, the problem involved in this industry is so large that it just naturally makes unfair competition for those who want to operate legitimately. Those who do not wish to deal in sick and maimed animals as often occurs out in the uninspected plant, have difficulty competing.

Mr. Chairman, a farmer, from an economic standpoint, if he has 40 head of steers and if one is sick, would not wish to send the sick one to the inspected plant. If he does so, he will probably only receive $3 for it. However, at an uninspected plant he may receive anywhere from $100 to $200 for it.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman explain these factors as he has related them to the fact that under his proposal there would only be left for inspection by the State the very small plants?

Now, then, it just stands to reason, as far as my reasoning is concerned, that if all the States have the honor of inspecting is the very small plant, that their per-unit cost of inspecting these plants will be much higher than averaging them in with all other intrastate plants.

The very point that the gentleman is trying to make now, it seems to me, is more strongly solved by the committee bill when we are sure that the States will inspect every pound of meat, and it does not leave just the dog-and-cat operations, and I use the name "dog-and-cat" operations to mean very small operations.

Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I believe it is very clear what is important to the States is not the per-unit cost, it is how many dollars they are willing to spend. If the Federal Government will take responsibility for some of the large- and medium-sized ones, then they would not have so many plants left that they would have to be responsible for, and I believe this will be more efficient, and they will do a better job on them.

Mr. PURCELL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. PURCELL. Under the proposal offered by the gentleman, the gentleman is allowing 5 years to any company which is above the $250,000 level in order to comply with the requirements?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. They would have 5 years, during which time they have to meet grading standards, but not inspection standards, on facilities only. That means they have to have a sanitary facility, but that the door does not necessarily have to be 5 feet wide, it might be 4 feet wide.

Mr. PURCELL. Then, taking any plant that was just under $250,000, and assuming that plant wanted Federal inspection so they could go into interstate commerce, then under the proposal they would have to comply with the architectural requirements right now in order to have their request granted, and before they were permitted to operate?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. PURCELL. But the gentleman would give the larger plants 5 years within which to comply.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. And the smaller plants would not have to compete with the inferior products that are being slaughtered in the larger plants, they would not have that kind of condition to deal with.

Mr. PURCELL. Under this bill all meat will be inspected, and there will no longer be any requirement for taking any further advantage or disadvantage from now on.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Let me say that I do not believe so, but for one thing there will be a better job done under our bill because we do not exempt anybody as under your bill, we make sure they are all covered.

Mr. PURCELL. But you give the larger ones 5 years in which to comply, but the little ones must comply immediately.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The 5 years is on facility specifications but if the gentleman objects to the number of years that are proposed, and if the gentleman will agree to strike that out and agree to the substitute without that, I will be glad to accept an amendment to produce that effect.

Mr. PURCELL. Of course, I will not agree to striking that out, and agreeing to the gentleman's proposal, but I did want to clear up what the gentleman's attitude was.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I know that we should be reasonable, even though the meat industry representatives have not been reasonable, and we are willing to give them 5 years in order to meet these requirements and get their facilities in better shape, but in the meantime they have got to meet the requirements of grading, which means they have to have sanitary buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MAYNE].

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 12144, the committee bill, is a good bill which will do much to improve meat inspection throughout the United States. Moreover, it will permit State and local governments to perform a necessary role in this important function which is so vital to the health of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I do not happen to be one of those who feel that all functions of government should be turned over to the Federal bureaucracy because they think State and local governments cannot be trusted to cope with any of the problems of our complex, modern civilization.

I believe there is a proper role for the State governments and local governments under our Federal system and that inspection of meat is a function which properly falls within their jurisdiction. Intrastate meat can and should be inspected locally and by the States wherever feasible.

Unfortunately, there has been a great deal of exaggeration and downright misrepresentation about the quality and cleanliness of meat presently sold in this country. This has been carried on in an attempt to frighten people into thinking that Federal inspection is the only answer.

We were first told in the subcommittee that the Department of Agriculture conducted a survey which showed such shocking and substandard conditions throughout the country and that those conditions were so bad that it would be best not to inquire into them at all, but that we should rush into action, assuming that those conditions were as bad as stated to us.

But when we insisted on seeing those reports, Members of the House, we found they were 5 years old. We were being asked to rush into legislation on the basis of reports dated from a survey conducted in 1962.

Many States, including my own State of Iowa, did not have a mandatory inspection law at that time. The Iowa law was not passed until 1965.

A great deal of progress has been made in our State and other States since 1962. While some of the States do not yet have mandatory inspection, this bill would encourage them to do so and will encourage other States to improve inspection programs already underway.

When in the subcommittee we pointed out the unfairness of using a 5-year-old report, those opposed to the cooperative approach of helping the States to improve their systems, asked the Department of Agriculture to go out and make some up-to-date inspections in August of this year in a further effort to discredit State and local inspection.

The results were announced with great fanfare in the press. Again the impression was given that conditions were much worse than they really are.

In Iowa, it was stated that four plants were visited and it was inferred that shocking abuses and unsanitary conditions existed in Iowa on a widespread basis.

I have checked the August report on these Iowa plants and I have checked their findings and I am satisfied that they are greatly exaggerated. None of those plants is filthy as was suggested nor do they slaughter diseased cattle as one of the reports alleged.

The wording of a report about a bologna manufacturer was "Believed to slaughter cripples and downers at times." Cripples and downers were then described as animals which cannot walk because of disease or injury. The owners of that plant categorically denied this hearsay accusation against them.

But we are being asked to legislate by those who oppose this committee bill on the basis of that hearsay. We are being asked to junk State and local inspection as being of no value.

So far as the State of Iowa is concerned, both the 1962 survey and the August 1967 survey have proved to be extremely misleading and exaggerated. And now at the last minute we are told of an additional survey which is purported to have been conducted very recently, and each of you received a copy of this yesterday, October 30, of that portion of the survey that is supposed to affect your State. Yesterday is incidentally the first time that it was furnished to Members of the livestock and grain subcommittee which conducted the hearings on this bill. It was released the day before yesterday to the press so that it appeared in the press with sensational headlines charging that thousands of plants in the country are not subject to any inspection at all; and purporting to show that meat that comes out of those plants is filthy and contaminated.

Now this latest ploy to stampede public opinion and this House against State inspection has been very cleverly timed. Obviously, there is not much time, with this purported report being received yesterday, to check the accuracy of this latest report and to answer this barrage of publicity before the bill is before you today.

We did have time at the hearings to check the 1962 survey, and after the hearings to check the August survey, but not this one. I have tried in the limited time available to do some checking on the Iowa figures. I have phoned out to Iowa. I find that the secretary of agriculture of Iowa, L. B. Libby, is recorded in the press out there as denying categorically the accusations made against the State of Iowa inspection system in this report which was distributed to the Members yesterday.

I read in the report that Iowa was alleged to have 800 meat packing plants which are not federally inspected. However, I find that the secretary of agriculture of Iowa has denied this and said that the figure is actually 684. He also denies that 329 plants are not subject to any kind of inspection at all, as this report states.

He states—and Dr. McNellis, State director of meat and poultry inspection also stated in the same press account—that all plants in Iowa are receiving some kind of inspection, and that this latest purported survey is very misleading, exaggerated, and inaccurate. These gentlemen stated the true facts to be that eight large plants have full-time State inspectors on the premises. These are in addition to those which are federally inspected, which handle the vast majority of meat sold in the State.

But in addition to these eight intrastate plants that have full-time State inspectors on the premises, 60 to 70 more plants which do more than $200,000 of business annually, are inspected on a daily basis by State veterinarians, and all the remaining plants, those doing less than $200,000 a year, are inspected by visiting State inspectors at least every 10 days to 2 weeks.

It is most unfortunate that more time does not exist to verify who is telling the truth. I, myself, do not accept this last-minute effort to discredit our State inspection system and that of other States and to endanger the committee bill. I accept the word of our duly elected State secretary of agriculture and of Dr. McNellis. I do not believe that dirty, uninspected meat is being sold in Iowa, as has been charged.

Under its new inspection statute Iowa is doing a good job of meat inspection. It can do better, and I want it to do better. I believe Iowa and the other States can and will do better if given an opportunity to avail themselves of the cooperative features of the committee bill. I resist—and ask all Members of the House to resist—the Smith-Foley amendment which would turn meat inspection over to the Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, there can be no question of the importance of protecting all of the people in this country from the dangers of consuming diseased or unsanitary meat.

There is on the books today a Federal meat inspection law which protects against the dangers of unhealthy meat by providing Federal standards and inspection for all meat sold across State lines. But this law is 61 years old and is in need of modernization.

We have before us today two proposals which would update the Federal meat inspection law. The committee bill and the Smith-Foley amendment differ only in the scope of the meat handling they would regulate.

The stronger, and in my view by far the better, approach is included in the Smith-Foley amendment. The Smith-Foley amendment would require Federal inspection not only for meat handlers selling meat across State lines, but would require Federal inspection of intrastate sellers with meat sales in excess of $250,000. Under this bill 98 percent of all meat slaughtered and 97.5 percent of all meat processed in this country would be subject to Federal standards and inspection.

Without this bill 5.3 billion pounds of meat and 7.6 billion pounds of meat products will be sold without Federal inspection.

The absence of Federal inspection does not mean the total absence of inspection. Twenty-six States do have mandatory meat inspection laws. But this still leaves 11 States which have no meat inspection laws and 13 States with only voluntary controls.

As the supplemental views of the Agriculture Committee report point out:

> Both a 1962 and a "current" Department of Agriculture survey depict a shocking situation in many packing and processing facilities operating outside the purview of the Federal meat inspection law.

The best means of curing this situation is to extend the coverage of the Federal meat inspection law. For this additional safety and protection, the estimated increase of $31 million in inspection costs is a small price to pay.

Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to support the added health protection the Smith-Foley provisions will supply.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey].

IS VIETNAM AMERICA'S "GREAT ADVENTURE"?

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Harvey was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, it was with the greatest dismay that I read in today's edition of the Washington Daily News that our Vice President, Hubert H. Humphrey, believes the Vietnam war would go down as America's "great adventure."

In the news report, filed by United Press International, the Vice President is later quoted as saying:

> This is our great adventure—and a wonderful one it is.

Permit me to quote Mr. Humphrey further. He is reported to have said, and I quote him:

> Our business is to make history. I've said from many a platform that it's all right to study it—and I did. It's all right to teach it—and I have. But it's wonderful to make it, make history in your own way and your own time.

I suggest to our Vice President that he better go back to school. How anyone can call the war in Vietnam a "great adventure" is beyond my thinking. With nearly 14,000 Americans dead and nearly 100,000 wounded, plus thousands of South Vietnamese, I can never call war a "great adventure."

War has been, is, and will always remain, in my judgment, simply hell. It is a tragedy, to say the least. And not by the wildest thoughts or imagination would I believe that any responsible Government official would describe it as a "great adventure."

I would further suggest that President Johnson immediately contact Vice President Humphrey and order him to listen to the GI's. Our Vice President has been quite a spokesman for the Great Society—but he will never be able to convince Americans on the "great adventure" in South Vietnam.

It is shameful that our Nation's principal representative at the inaugural of the new South Vietnam Government writes off our country's sincere and costly commitment to the freedom of South Vietnam as an exercise and opportunity so that we can "make history in your own way and your own time."

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 31, 1967]

HHH: "GREAT ADVENTURE"—VICE PRESIDENT SEES PROGRESS IN VIETNAM

> SAIGON, October 31.—Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, who once taught history in college, delivered a quick lecture on the subject today and said the Vietnam war would go down as America's "great adventure."
>
> Speaking forcefully to several hundred U.S. Embassy staff members, Mr. Humphrey threw away his prepared speech and cited some of the most striking chapters of history to defend President Johnson's policy in Vietnam.
>
> He mentioned Dunkirk and the British resolve; Franklin Roosevelt, Pearl Harbor and its voices of doom; Abraham Lincoln and the trying days of 1864; Woodrow Wilson and the draft revolt before World War I; George Washington and Army deserters at Valley Forge; Harry S. Truman and the near-defeat of the Korean war; Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, and such traitors as Benedict Arnold and Aaron Burr.
>
> The U.S. mission staffers listened intently as Mr. Humphrey spoke from an out-of-doors podium in the tree-shaded rear courtyard of the new $6.8 million American Embassy in downtown Saigon.
>
> At one point, the Vice President threw his arm out and declared: "This is our great adventure—and a wonderful one it is.
>
> "Our business is to make history," he added. "I've said from many a platform that it's all right to study it—and I did. It's all right to teach it—and I have. But it's wonderful to make it, make history in your own way and your own time."

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, the Federal meat inspection bill as reported out of committee is a good bill. It will strengthen our meat inspection services by broadening existing inspection authority and establishing a new program of Federal-State cooperation in inspection programs.

This legislation will rewrite and modernize present Federal meat inspection statutes which have existed virtually without change for 61 years.

It is almost unbelievable that the health of our citizens is controlled by such an archaic law. Basically, H.R. 12144 will update the Federal Meat Inspection Act to provide Federal inspectors more authority to meet modern problems, will provide for Federal funding up to 50 percent of the cost of State programs and will encourage States to enact programs consistent with the Federal inspection system.

I fully support the much-needed changes, however, H.R. 12144 falls to deal with the most significant hazard in the meat industry. This bill does not extend coverage of Federal meat inspection to the large uninspected and State inspected plants marketing solely in intrastate commerce. Sixteen percent, or 5.3 billion pounds, of all meat slaughtered in the United States and 26 percent, or 7.6 billion pounds, of meat processed into products are not covered by Federal inspection, thus billions of pounds of meat are sold each year without undergoing Federal inspection.

H.R. 12144 will not provide for inspection of these billions of pounds of meat.

Many States do not have adequate inspection programs. Only 26 States compel mandatory inspection of animals before and after slaughter and of meat processing. Thirteen States have laws providing only for voluntary inspection of animals before and after slaughter and of meat processing. Nine States have no meat inspection statutes. Two States have only a licensing requirement.

A current Department of Agriculture survey of packing and processing facilities in non-Federal inspected meat plants shows the existence of appalling conditions. For example, the report shows that contaminated meat, meat from diseased animals, hides, carcasses, animal entrails, flies, and other absolutely unsanitary and thoroughly disgusting items find their way into processed meats. The existence of such conditions is deplorable. The passage of legislation that will not eliminate all the unsanitary conditions and assure the public the highest quality of products is not meeting our full responsibility.

Therefore, I urge the approval of H.R. 12145 as an amendment to H.R. 12144. The people of our country deserve wholesome meat and meat products. H.R. 12145, which I have introduced with several of my colleagues, would give the American consumer the protection that he needs. It would prevent meat spoilage and human diseases caused by unwholesome meat by guaranteeing a pure product.

H.R. 12145 includes all of the provisions of the committee's bill, H.R. 12144, but it would extend Federal inspection to all meat plants which have more than $250,000 gross annual sales. Newly inspected plants would be allowed 5 years to meet Federal standards. The effect of this amendment would be Federal inspection of 97 percent of all meat slaughtered. I urge adoption of the amendment when offered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] such time as he may consume.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith] and the very able gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley]. I would like to commend them for their concern about the food which comes to our tables.

While I agree that the provisions of H.R. 12144 are excellent and represent a step forward, I think that there is no reason to go part of the way when we can go much further. I think that the clean bill, H.R. 12145, will go much further and for this reason it has my support and I urge all of my colleagues to join with me in supporting this bill which has been offered as a substitute for the committee bill.

If we adopt the committee version, some 6,000 large and medium sized slaughtering and processing plants will still be able to avoid Federal inspection. These plants produce annually not less than 8.7 billion pounds of meat products and slaughter 19 million head of livestock, and in many States, happily New Jersey to its credit is not one, with no State or local inspection at all.

Mr. Chairman, I am vitally concerned with providing wholesome food and I think that the Smith-Foley substitute is the best vehicle for us to accomplish this end. I urge every Member of this House to join in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, the issue before us this afternoon is a classic example of why we need a Department of Consumer Affairs. We are considering today several alternate proposals for updating a 60-year-old Federal meat inspection law.

The present law is wholly inadequate today as a consumer protective device and I suspect that it was inadequate in 1907 as well. From its inception, this law has protected the industry and not the consumer. No existing Federal agency within the last 60 years has shown the leadership needed to make this law work to protect consumers. A Department of Consumer Affairs whose leaders would have been committed to the cause of consumer protection would surely not have allowed such an ineffective old law to sit on the books.

The fact that such dedication has been shown by no existing agency appalls me. Why must we wait 60 years for a meat inspection system to be updated?

Clearly the Federal meat inspection program is in urgent need of major repairs. While I endorsed H.R. 12144 as a crucial first step, I strongly prefer the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] who have offered a far better bill. Their persuasive evidence compels me to agree that their stronger measure is necessary in order to guarantee that American consumers eat meat of unquestionable quality.

Both the present Federal meat inspection law and H.R. 12144 limit Federal inspection jurisdiction to those processing plants involved in interstate and foreign commerce. Meat products that do not cross State lines are exempted from Federal inspection.

If individual State inspection systems could be shown to regulate such meats effectively, I would have no complaints. But half of our States offer no mandatory inspection systems, and eight States have no inspection law at all.

Because of this gaping omission H.R. 12144 would continue a situation under which one-sixth of all meat slaughtered and one-quarter of all meats processed within the United States cannot be regulated at minimum Federal standards.

The report of the Committee on Agriculture on H.R. 12144, the proposed Federal Meat Inspection Act, makes grisly reading for all of us who are concerned about shielding Americans against deception and disease. What kinds of hazards exist today that would go uncorrected under H.R. 12144? Recent surveys, cited by the committee report and made by the Department of Agriculture, include the following practices:

First. Allowing edible portions of carcasses to come in contact with manure, pus, and other sources of contamination during the dressing operations.

Second. Allowing meat food products during preparation to become contaminated with filth from improperly cleaned equipment and facilities.

Third. Use of chemical additives and preservatives that would not have been permitted under Federal meat inspection.

Fourth. Failing to use procedures to detect or control parasites transmissible to man that would lead to diseases, such as trichinosis and cysticercosis.

Fifth. Use of inspection and operating controls that were not sufficient to prevent possible adulteration of meat food products during their preparation, with substances such as water, gum, cereals, or sodium caseinate.

Sixth. The use of false or deceptive labels and packaging materials.

Seventh. Failing to supervise destruction of obviously diseased tissues and spoiled, putrid, or filthy materials.

Eighth. Working without any inspector, or with unqualified and poorly trained inspectors, without adequate supervision.

The report also indicates that in some plants, meat from sick or unfit animals is set aside for use in preparing human food.

Opponents of H.R. 12145, the Wholesome Meat Act, express concern about the hypothetical costs of these improvements. It is not at all clear that additional costs would result from our adoption of H.R. 12145, and the problem of cost must in any case be seen as secondary to the pressing, immediate need to establish effective meat inspection standards. We are told that State inspection programs are improving, but the pace of any such progress is far too slow to keep up with the rapid growth of meat adulteration techniques and their perpetrators. The health of American consumers cannot abide such glacial progress as may be apparent to some.

Mr. Chairman, we are dutybound by the very words of the Constitution we have sworn to uphold to "promote the general welfare." It is my earnest conviction that this general welfare can be best promoted by adopting H.R. 12145, the Wholesome Meat Act. Like most American consumers, I, too, would like to face my hamburgers with equanimity, no matter where they originate.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, some 10 years ago, the House enacted legislation to require the Federal inspection of poultry. I had the honor of sponsoring legislation for this much needed consumer legislation. The bill was H.R. 11800 introduced June 18, 1956.

The bill which was passed by the House was not all I wanted. It did not provide as much coverage as I had sought. But it did bring about the mandatory Federal inspection of poultry and poultry products for the first time in history.

After that campaign, I periodically urged the House to increase the coverage of Federal meat inspection. I called attention to the large amounts of uninspected and badly inspected meat which unwitting consumers were being sold.

As early as 1962, I introduced legislation to increase the scope of Federal meat inspection. My bill took a different approach than the one sponsored today by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY]. But its objectives and its end results were the same.

I am, therefore, very happy to join with the two gentlemen in urging the House to approve the amendment. I believe its enactment is absolutely necessary.

Mr. Chairman, the American housewife believes that all meat is inspected for wholesomeness and cleanliness. The meat industry, the retail industry, and the Federal Government have made so much hoopla about Federal inspection—about its production—that consumers truly believe it covers all meats.

Of course, it does not.

Some 5.3 billion pounds of meat are slaughtered each year without Federal inspection. And some 7.6 billion pounds are processed into sausages and meat products without this consumer protection.

Think of it. Billions and billions and billions of pounds each year.

We are told by the supporters of the committee bill that the States will take care of this problem, that they will assure consumers of clean and wholesome meat if H.R. 12144 is enacted. That is just not facing reality.

What have the States done in the 61 years of Federal inspection?

Some 24 have not even bothered to enact mandatory inspection programs.

And of the other 26, most of their programs do not even deserve the name of inspection. Some are farces. Some are pure frauds upon the consumer.

Whole parts of States are often exempted.

Little money is appropriated for inspection.

An inspector comes into the plant only periodically instead of providing continuous inspection during slaughter and processing, as is the case under Federal inspection.

And if an inspector should have the temerity to crack down, then political pressures, and wheeling and dealing in many of the programs, will prevent any real consumer-protective actions.

These are facts. I shall shortly give you some of the results of State inspection or the lack thereof.

I shall read to you some reports from

the U.S. Department of Agriculture survey of State-inspected and uninspected plants. I give this early warning in case some of you have weak stomachs and would like to get out of earshot now.

But it is foolishness to expect consumer protection by the way of the committee bill.

The political pressures in a legislature or a State house will hardly abate because we have acted in good faith here. The unwillingness of State government to appropriate money for this consumer-protective function will change little by our agreeing to pay half of the State costs.

No, the committee bill will not solve the problem of sausages being produced in filth and containing parts of rodents, roaches, flies, and vermin. Nor will it solve the problem of your constituents getting meat which comes from sick and diseased cattle.

If we are really to solve these problems, let us enact the substitute proposed by the gentleman from Iowa. It would increase the coverage of Federal meat inspection.

Federal meat inspection has operated for 61 years. It is hardly a new, untried endeavor.

The meat industry has greatly prospered under it. It is hardly a radical or antibusiness operation.

In fact, when the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee held its hearings earlier this year, every witness praised the Federal meat inspection program.

And that includes all the meat industry witnesses—the representatives of the very organizations which have been lobbying so hard to prevent the American housewife from getting the best protection possible.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand why the meat industry trade associations are fighting the Smith-Foley bill. I am happy to say that the St. Louis meatpackers support the extension of Federal inspection. So do many other packers to whom I have talked.

But the trade associations of the industry oppose the legislation.

Why?

I can only conclude it is the trade association's death wish for the industry which is responsible.

When meat inspection legislation was first enacted, many packers were in violent opposition even though this legislation had already been proved overwhelmingly to be in the public interest.

In the late fifties, we in Congress were treated to the fantastic spectacle of the meatpacking trade associations bitterly fighting humane slaughter legislation even though such bills were shown to be needed, in the public interest and legislatively inevitable.

Today, we have another spectacle of the meatpacking trade associations doing their darndest to deny the American housewife the assurance of clean and wholesome meat which she must have.

Apparently, the meat industry trade associations have a policy of putting their worst foot forward.

But against what conditions are we passing legislation?

What is happening right now that we are attempting to stop?

What are the conditions which the committee bill would not prevent but the Smith-Foley bill would?

In 1962, the U.S. Department of Agriculture conducted a survey of uninspected and State-inspected plants throughout the United States. The results were absolutely sickening.

In late July of this year, the Department sent its personnel throughout the Nation on another such survey to discover whether conditions had changed.

To prepare myself for this debate, I have read the 1967 reports. It was not pleasant reading. I shall read a few excerpts from the reports.

Here is a description of a slaughterhouse in a Western State which has not bothered to enact a meat inspection law:

> There were pools of rancid water, blood and manure on the floor. In the fabricating room, they were breaking beef, grinding and cutting steaks. The band saw had not been cleaned for several days and the bone dust in the bottom of the saw was filled with maggots.
>
> In the assembly room, I noticed rat droppings and tracks on boxes and wrapping paper and in the sawdust on the floor.

Or consider the situation in a Texas plant, a State which has only a voluntary program, hired and paid for by the meatpacker:

> Edible meat drums were dirty, contaminated with rust . . . Hair, bruises and kill dirt was also noticed on these carcasses. Flies were swarming on the back dock. Spitting on the floor by employees was noted.

Or a plant in a southwestern State, which also has a voluntary program:

> Review of the plant was revolting. Stagnant water stood in bloody puddles all over the place. The walls were covered with grime, grease and mold. One beef carcass had an infected brisket and another had a large knee joint which appeared to be arthritic. A butcher was boning out a beef round which had sour bone and the meat near the bone was greenish colored.

My own State of Missouri, I am sorry to say, also has its problems. Here is a short rendition from one packing plant there:

> In one area, several employees were seen reworking fat trimmings. The odor from the trimmings, which were sour, was noticeable from several feet away. When I questioned one of the employees about their use, he said they were just about right for the product.

Wisconsin has a mandatory State inspection program. This program is under the direction of the head of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, an organization which together with the meatpacking trade associations, is bitterly fighting the Smith-Foley bill. Here are some excerpts from the USDA's Wisconsin report.

One plant "had been the prime recipient of cancer eye and diseased cattle shipped from Montana. These diseased cattle had been approved for interstate movement to approved slaughtering establishments by Montana authorities, but had been 'shortstopped' by an enterprising cattle dealer and diverted to a more lucrative market."

In another Wisconsin situation, the USDA inspector reported that—

> Packers operating within small communities demand inspection from local authorities to lend that aura of respectability to their products. These inspectors are responsible to the packer.

In a Western State, which also allegedly has mandatory inspection, the USDA man reported:

> I visited the subject plant at 10:00 A.M., Monday morning, July 31. The walls were splattered with emulsion from grinders and stuffers. There was water ankle deep on the floor and employees were wading around like it was a normal condition. The lighting was poor and the ceilings were dirty.

Pennsylvania's Governor recently sent the State's congressional delegation a telegram urging the enactment of the committee bill, so that State action may be preserved. But the State government has consistently refused, over the years, to improve upon the 1915 voluntary and meaningless State inspection program.

The following report comes to light from Pennsylvania:

> This is one of the most deplorable plants I ever saw. Not a clean area in the building. Live animals are penned in the same area as the slaughtering and processing. In fact, the entire operation is done in one large room. A large door with no screen was open to the street, through which pass all live and dressed animals. Rusty metal and dirty wooden barrels are used for both edible and inedible meats and offal. The flies were so numerous it was next to impossible to carry on a conversation with the operator.

Here is the situation in a plant in a north-central State. The plant had State inspection:

> The hind quarters were very slimey and fluid was running down over the carcass onto the front quarters which were not condemned. . . . I went to see the veterinarian and he said he thought that carcass had been destroyed. I must point out here that due to no constant inspection, a carcass could very easily be utilized for food. The Vet promised to go to the plant as soon as possible and destroy the carcass.

In another State-inspected plant under a Western State's mandatory system, the USDA survey found—

> Condemned, stamped carcass in the cooler not decharacterized. Calf carcasses in the cooler very dirty . . . No doors on tank room from killing floor. Sour, musty smell throughout plant. Sanitation very poor. Meat gondolas and tubs broken, rusty.

Actual trickery also exists. From a Midwestern State which has a mandatory inspection program comes the following report:

> Ham loaf rarely includes ham. Pork trimmings and veal with appropriate amounts of cereal would be more likely.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on. The total survey forms a stack of papers several inches thick.

I recommend the reports to those of you who have the stomach to read them.

I regret that each Member of the House had not read them. For if he had, the Smith-Foley substitute would pass unanimously.

I can only say to you these reports prove conclusively that the States have not and cannot do the job. I say to you that these reports prove that only the Federal inspection program can truly give the assurance of clean and wholesome meat which your constituents and mine want and need.

Let us, therefore, do the right thing for consumers. Let us substitute the Smith-Foley bill for the committee measure which needs to be strengthened.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MAYNE] stated from the well a few minutes ago that there has been a great deal of misrepresentation about the issues of this bill. I agree with that. I only disagree on which side the misrepresentation is taking place.

I have in my hand a circular distributed to every Member of this House by the American Meat Institute, which contains a shocking misstatement of fact as to the character of the so-called Smith-Foley amendment. This deliberate misrepresentation—I will have to assume it is deliberate since the American Meat Institute has followed this legislation consistently—says that under our amendment every plant under $250,000 of volume a year could be exempted from Federal inspection. That is claptrap. Any plant in interstate commerce that sells a pound of meat across the border is under Federal jurisdiction in the Smith amendment, as well as in the committee bill, and as it has been for 60 years.

The additional requirement of the Smith amendment is to place every plant over $250,000 volume under Federal inspection regardless of whether it is selling meat across the State border. Such plants would be treated under this proposed bill as substantially affecting interstate commerce.

Misconceptions about the Smith amendment have been reflected in the press. As great a newspaper as the Washington Post this morning published an editorial unfortunately based on an error of fact—not an error of opinion alone, but an error of fact. The Washington Post says the Smith-Foley substitute is a substitute for "this section," meaning the State and local cooperation section of the committee bill.

Anyone who takes 10 minutes to look at the substitute bill will know that every line and every word and every paragraph, every "i" and "t" in the committee bill is represented in the substitute. It adds; it does not subtract.

The suggestion has been made all over this country by State departments of agriculture officials, by members of the American Meat Institute, and by their friends that the Smith-Foley bill would not reach as many people or as many plants as the bill reported by this committee. That is not true. It is false.

There are two proposals before this body. One would encourage the States to do something about a shocking condition of lack of inspection by giving them up to 50 percent of the costs of reaching a Federal program. The committee proposes that, and the Smith-Foley amendment also proposes that.

The second proposal, the Smith amendment, would, in addition, place all plants over $250,000 of volume a year directly under Federal inspection, so that whatever the States choose to do or not to do, the great bulk of the slaughtering and processing plants of the country will be adequately inspected and the public will be protected accordingly.

We offer that substitute because there is a record of 60 years which should disturb even the greatest champion of States rights—a record of apathy and inaction on the part of the States in failing to protect the public with adequate meat inspection.

The gentleman from Iowa talked about reports. I have a report from the U.S. Department of Agriculture which I received this morning, on my own State of Washington.

This report is dated September 1967. I will readjust a few of the things it says under "Sanitation of equipment and facilities."

These are comments about the State inspection system, and the plants it supervises:

> This appears to be the weakest area of this program.

Sanitation is said to be the weakest part of our State program.

> Some of the inspectors have a moderate concern for sanitation but appear reluctant to become too involved.

Also:

> Too often, sanitation is placed secondary to production.

Further:

> The sanitation standards are low in most cases.

And:

> Loading chutes, pens, alleys and knocking boxes are generally not sufficiently cleaned. Inadequate to barely passable cleanup is often seen. Unclean tables, belts, grinders, mixers, saws and floors—have often been observed. Hand washing facilities are observed to be minimal at best in the operating areas. Numerous string wrapped knife and cleaver handles have been observed. Fly control is inadequate and a real problem. A real effort to control flies at some plants appears to have produced some results, however, numerous flies are almost universally observed.

I ask attention for the last line:

> Rodent control appears to be minimal.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. I should like to comment. I absolutely agree with the gentleman that there has been, in certain statements and in newspapers, the implication given that the substitute the gentleman is proposing somehow would not contain the same provisions for Federal-State cooperation.

Mr. FOLEY. Does the gentlewoman agree with the Washington Post editorial?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FOLEY. Will the gentleman yield me 3 additional minutes?

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. MAY. I think that editorial did not clarify this point. Having been subjected myself to very erroneous statements in a column carried by this newspaper, I know how aggrieved the gentleman feels. I am sorry about it. I had nothing to do with the editorial in the Washington Post.

Mr. FOLEY. I do not feel a personal concern. My concern is that the Washington Post, a great newspaper, which has always reflected a concern for consumers, has made a gross error of fact. This gross error leads them into a conclusion that is erroneous.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentlewoman will yield me some time, I will be glad to yield.

Mrs. MAY. I am glad to yield the gentleman 1 minute from our side.

In the interests of the State we are both proud to represent, the report the gentleman referred to did not hit my desk until this morning.

Mr. FOLEY. It hit my desk this morning.

Mrs. MAY. I do not know who made this alleged inspection. I do not know what plants they inspected in the State of Washington. I have not had an opportunity to talk with our director of agriculture to verify these conditions.

Before I could agree with the gentleman that everything in that report is true about meatpacking plants in the State of Washington I would like to get further facts. In our State we have a mandatory inspection law. This law was strengthened by the last legislature. I should like to have an opportunity to come back, and state for the record, based on proven fact, just how much of a need there is in the State of Washington for further improvement. Find out where the problem is, and where the inspection is breaking down, if it really is.

Again I reiterate what I said earlier. Wherever there is one condition in any State, as pointed out in the report the gentleman received from the State of Washington, I am against it. The gentleman and I are sincere in our effort to correct those situations. We just have an entirely different concept as to how it should be done.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I want to congratulate the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from Iowa. After listening to both gentlemen, I believe the American Meat Institute should adopt as a slogan, "One man's meat is another man's poison."

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

I will say, finally, that we have before the House today an opportunity in the Smith amendment to place at least most of the plants of the country under a system of inspection that will guarantee wholesome meat. I would suggest to any Member who has any doubt about this bill, before or after passage, that he should take the time to visit a federally inspected plant. I believe he will have no further doubts about the superiority of and need for Federal inspection.

Here is a photograph, which is blown

up a little bit, which shows you a part of a carcass condemned at a federally inspected plant.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Goodling].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12144 is a good bill. The proposed Smith-Foley amendment would further erode the functions of State and local governments. It would impose additional Federal restrictions and inspections on American business and agriculture. Both are already overburdened by Federal regulations.

H.R. 12144 will greatly strengthen meat inspection in this country by establishing Federal-State cooperative arrangements under which the Federal Government would provide both personnel and financial assistance to State inspection services.

This bill uses the carrot-on-the-stick approach rather than club-over-the-head method suggested by the proposed substitute. The majority of the Committee on Agriculture believes that molasses still attracts more flies than vinegar. It believes we will gain more by cooperating rather than by mandating.

H.R. 12144 will broaden the present meat inspection service by establishing a Federal-State cooperative meat inspection program. It will provide the Department of Agriculture with authority to eliminate practices that could defraud consumers and endanger the public health.

At the present time, 28 States have laws providing for mandatory inspection of animals before and after slaughter. Twelve States provide a system of voluntary inspection. Eight States do not have a meat inspection statute and two States have very limited statutes regulating meat packing.

H.R. 12144 would establish a cooperative Federal-State inspection system under which the Federal Government would assist the States in meeting their responsibilities to provide high quality meat inspection. Federal cooperation and assistance to the States would include program planning and technical and laboratory assistance as well as financial aid up to 50 percent of the total cost of the State program.

The prohibition against counterfeiting, forgery and other unauthorized use of official certificates, labels, and marking devices would be clarified. The authority of the Department of Agriculture to regulate the marking, labeling, and packaging of carcasses, meats, and meat food products would be clearly defined. This legislation also would extend to imported meat, the same standards that would apply to meat and meat products produced and processed within the United States.

This legislation does not preempt the jurisdiction of the States over intrastate commerce. By a vote of 29 to 5, the House Agriculture Committee rejected an amendment that would have virtually eliminated State inspection programs and assigned the responsibility of State and local health protection, at an additional annual cost of $31.2 million, to the Federal Government.

Under the provisions of H.R. 12144, a viable Federal-State cooperative meat inspection program would be established. New protection will be afforded to the consumer. By encouraging the confidence of today's homemaker in the integrity of our meat supply, this legislation strengthens and improves a meat packing and processing industry that has $16 billion in annual gross sales and that provides $13 billion in yearly sales of livestock to the American farmer.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read some letters on this subject:

Harrisburg, Pa.,
October 25, 1967.

Hon. George A. Goodling,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge your support of Purcell bill, H.R. 12144, scheduled for action next week which provides for mandatory meat inspection and will enable cooperative Federal-State programs to be established. My administration has endorsed a similar bill for Pennsylvania.

Raymond P. Shafer,
Governor of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania Meat
Packers Association,
Drexel Hill, Pa., October 28, 1967.

Re H.R. 12144 Purcell bill.
Hon. George A. Goodling,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: With so much pressure from officialdom, consumers, and critics, there is bound to be an extension of mandatory inspection of meat. Our members favor the Purcell bill, together with the corresponding bill H. 1566 now before legislature in Harrisburg. So do all legitimate packers, even those that do no sell across State lines.

Our members with Federal, State, or no present inspection have worked for more than 30 years to create and maintain quality standards for meat in Pennsylvania.

Now, with the Purcell bill, there is an opportunity to participate in a Federal-State program, leaving local firms under State control, where it should be.

We urge you to support the Purcell bill as it stands because it is reasonable, workable legislation.

Very truly yours,
Emerson W. Graver,
Executive Secretary.

Western States Meat Packers
Association, Inc.
Washington, D.C., October 28, 1967.

Hon. George A. Goodling,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Goodling: As you know, the Purcell Bill on Meat Inspection, HR 12144, has been granted an open rule with 2 hours debate.

Western States Meat Packers Association would like to take this opportunity to point out some major differences between the Purcell bill and the proposed Smith-Foley amendments (H.R. 12145).

The Purcell Bill will bring about good state inspection programs in all states, with the aid of livestock and meat industry, farm organizations, consumer groups, and without adding to the federal power.

The Smith-Foley bill would provide for exemptions from federal inspection those plants doing a sales volume under $250,000 annually. This exemption would exclude about 50% of the meat slaughtering plants and about 45 percent of the processing plants. (U.S. Department of Commerce figures)

Good, effective state meat inspection services are essential in every state to supervise these smaller companies. The Purcell Bill is needed to strengthen the State meat inspection programs.

Cost of federal meat inspection will skyrocket if the Smith-Foley bill is adopted. From the current federal meat inspection cost of $45 million per year, it would jump to an estimated $75 million. The additional $30 million per year—now largely borne by the States—will be shifted unnecessarily to the federal government.

It is not in the public interest to shift additional authority from the states to the federal government.

The Purcell Bill is a logical answer to the updating of the original meat inspection laws. It provides for both the state and federal government to operate on a cooperative basis.

The implication that meat not federally inspected is not good meat is an exaggeration of facts. The U.S. meat supply is the safest in the world and increasing attention is being given to make improvements in those states where improvement is still needed.

Passing the Purcell Bill, without the Smith-Foley amendment, offers the best opportunity to reach our complete goal to absolutely assure that all livestock for human consumption throughout the United States will have: ante-mortem inspection (while the animal is alive), post-mortem inspection of the carcass and organs, sanitary handling of the meat in every packing and processing plant.

The Purcell Bill, supported by the House Agriculture Committee, the US Department of Agriculture and the livestock and meat industry is the best answer for fully effective meat inspection. The people supporting the Purcell bill know the problems relating to meat inspection and how best to find solutions to these problems.

Therefore we urge you to vote for the Purcell Bill, HR 12144, and oppose the Smith-Foley amendment (HR 12145).

We appreciate this opportunity to present this information.

Sincerely,
L. Blaine Liljenquist,
President and General Manager.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Gude].

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill and also in support of the amendments which will extend the coverage of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have long been concerned about the fact that in my State of Maryland we have no meat inspection law. However, Governor Agnew has thrown his support behind the enactment of such legislation at the next session of the general assembly. Hopefully, such legislation will be a companion piece to the bill which we will pass here today.

Mr. Chairman, 61 years ago, a great and dynamic Republican leader, Theodore Roosevelt, provided the Nation with its first comprehensive Federal meat inspection law. Today it is more than evident that this act is in need of modernization. We have made technological advances in meat processing and packaging and scientific progress in the detection of diseased and defective meat. Such knowledge can and must be incorporated into our meat inspection laws and firmly enforced.

Mr. Chairman, in the days of Teddy Roosevelt and Upton Sinclair's "Jungle," enactment of a Federal meat inspection law was directed toward protection of meat purchased by the housewife and her family. Today we are again legislating for the housewife, who in many instances incorrectly, though quite naturally, assumes that all meat is federally inspected; but we are also legislating for the millions of our Nation's travelers who are not protected from the 8.7 billion pounds—enough to feed 30 million—of meat sold annually intrastate without Federal inspection.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute bill of which I am one of the cosponsors, which will be offered as an amendment, if adopted, would provide such protection to our highly mobile society.

Mr. Chairman, the tremendous annual travel of our citizens provides a most sound reason for denying that this is a local or State concern. We are all interested in legislating for the welfare of our own constituents. So, we should keep in mind the fact that today's citizens are ones who are traveling over the country, in States which do not have adequate inspection or no inspection at all.

Mr. Chairman, these citizens are entitled to as much protection from poor quality meat, wherever they maye be in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, in building a strong State-Federal system of government in the United States we must choose carefully as to the structure which will best accomplish any particular purpose we wish to achieve. For example, in the national anticrime bill which we have passed, the vital needs of local-State participation in planning were guaranteed on the floor of this House. In other words, localities and States must plan to attack the problem of crime in a manner best suited to their governments' structures and frameworks. But the technology of meat inspection is the same no matter where you are. The technique of the detection of bad meat is the same in any State of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. Dent). The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GUDE. Furthermore, in extending the Federal meat inspecting system to those intrastate plants doing a gross annual business in excess of $250,000—as covered in the amendment to be offered—I do not think we can sincerely conjure up a specter of a great Federal octopus spreading its tentacles across the land—this amendment, if adopted, will extend a phase of the operations of the Department of Agriculture in which our citizens rightfully have much faith.

In my own State of Maryland, packinghouses are governed by Federal labor laws, but 74.1 percent of the animals slaughtered in the State are not under the Federal Meat Inspection Act. And with no State law, the meat also avoids any State inspection. Clearly, if we allow Federal labor laws to regulate our packinghouses, we should not object to coverage of these same plants by Federal meat inspection laws.

Mr. Chairman, under this amendment which will be offered, 58 Maryland meatpacking plants will be included for the first time under the Federal inspection system and thereby further guarantee wholesome meat to the citizenry of my State.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly urge the passage of this bill and the adoption of the amendment which will be proposed.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUDE. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. May I tell the distinguished gentleman from Maryland that during the hearings before our committee we had some very fine witnesses who appeared before the committee representing the junior chamber of commerce from the gentleman's State. They are working now to present to your legislature a very fine State meat inspection bill, and are working with representatives of the Department of Agriculture in an effort to work out comparable State standards of inspection in order to ensure wholesome and sanitary meat products for your State.

Should the committee bill be passed——

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. Dent). The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Maryland 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that should the committee bill prevail and this State inspection law for Maryland be presented at the next legislature that we could depend upon the Congressman to join us in urging that the people in the State of Maryland pass it, because it would be a very good State law for all intrastate plants in the State of Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks, and hopefully, if these amendments are adopted, the law which will be enacted at Annapolis could work with these amendments as well as it could work if the bill passes as it is. However, I do hope that these amendments are adopted.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Eilberg].

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to present my statement in strong support of the Smith-Foley bill, H.R. 12145. This is a good bill; it is greatly needed; and I am in complete accord with the proposed improvements it would effect in the presently inadequate Meat Inspection Act. As further evidence of my strong support, I was pleased also to introduce a similar bill in early September of this year.

It would be difficult to overstress the importance of meat. Here in America meat is one of our most desired foods, and food is the very essence of life and euphoria. Unless our foods are properly protected, our health and our lives are endangered.

Most meat consumers believe that they are fully protected under existing legislation. They believe that the sanitation and wholesomeness of all the meat and meat products they buy is assured by Federal inspection practices now in effect. Unfortunately, this is not true.

Some 84 percent of meat slaughtered and/ 74 percent of meat processed into sausage and other products is inspected by the Federal Government. But the remainder—some 5.3 billion pounds slaughtered and 7.6 billion pounds processed annually—is outside this protective framework.

The purpose of this bill, H.R. 12145, is to correct the weaknesses and to plug the loopholes in the Federal Meat Inspection Act of 1906. This original act was passed 61 years ago. It has served well, but under today's conditions it has become outdated.

The Federal program is limited in coverage because it has authority only over plants shipping across State lines.

Some State inspection programs exist. But most of these have lax standards, weak enforcement, or their programs are underfinanced and undermanned. In fact, 23 States have no mandatory meat inspection programs at all.

A 1962 Department of Agriculture survey showed unspeakable conditions of filth and bad meat in many uninspected and even some State-inspected plants. Experts say the situation has not improved much since the survey.

Another problem with the 1906 Meat Inspection Act is that some of its provisions are outdated. It does not give the Federal meat inspection service sufficient authority to deal with such factors as pesticide residue, radioactivity, convenience foods, modern transportation and business practices—simply because these factors were not known 61 years ago.

Under the provisions of this bill, 97 percent of the meat slaughtered in the United States would be federally inspected. It would both increase the coverage of Federal inspection and modernize the program. It will give the American meat consumer better protection than he has ever had before. Therefore, for these and other reasons, it seems urgent to me that we should, for the protection of the American public, enact H.R. 12145.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Mayne].

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this additional time for the purpose of addressing a question to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith].

I would like to ask the gentleman if the gentleman did not testify before the Committee on Livestock and Grain in June of this year, that this bill, H.R. 12144, which at that time had a different number, H.R. 6168—does take a considerable step in the right direction, and provides a great deal of protection in the area where it is most badly needed?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I say that again today, that I believe it is a considerable step, but it does not go far enough, and that we ought to do the whole job while we are at it that really needs to be done.

Mr. MAYNE. The gentleman does recall that testimony before the subcommittee, does he not?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I have consistently said that the committee bill does a good job as far as it goes, it just does not do enough.

Mr. MAYNE. Did not the gentleman further testify at that time that the bill is very much needed to help the States with the problem that they have?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I still agree, in fact, the committee bill, as the gentleman knows, is almost word for word as one bill I have introduced.

Mr. MAYNE. If this bill was such an excellent bill in June, I would like to inquire of the gentleman as to what has taken place or happened in the meantime to change the gentleman's mind so that he is now seeking to give the impression to the House that the committee bill, H.R. 12144, is now a very inadequate bill?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I was of that opinion in June, as I still am. It is still an inadequate bill, but I would much rather have it than to have nothing. Also I am a realist, and I did not believe the Smith-Foley bill could have come out of that committee this year. In fact, I did not believe the committee bill would come out, and it would not have come out if it had not been for the revelation of some of these situations.

Mr. MAYNE. Does the gentleman wish to indicate to the committee that he supported the bill H.R. 12144, giving the impression that he was genuinely interested in that bill, and did want to encourage cooperation between the State and Federal Governments, but that actually his purpose was to get the bill to the floor of the House for the sole purpose of amending it?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I believe that it is being a practical legislator to take what can be gotten, but I also was in favor of H.R. 1314, and testified to that effect, and have always been.

Mr. MAYNE. I will say further to the gentleman that the members of the subcommittee accepted the gentleman's arguments in good faith at the time they were made.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would make them again today.

Mr. MAYNE. And we did vote for that bill, assuming that the gentleman was also sincere in his testimony, and would not turn upon the bill as the gentleman has done today.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I have not turned upon the bill; I have completely supported and endorsed the bill today. I have simply said that it should go further and should take in the provisions of H.R. 1314, as I have said for 7 years.

Mr. MAYNE. Did not the gentleman also testify in June that there are not enough Federal inspectors available to carry out inspections which his amendments contemplate?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There are not. They have to be trained. Another 3,000 of them will have to be trained. I do find now, however, that I was in error before as to the time required to train them; it only takes a few months to get them and it does not take 2 or 3 years as I was previously informed.

Mr. MAYNE. But it would require how many additional inspectors?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It would require 3,000.

Mr. MAYNE. In other words, that is 3,000 inspectors to be added to the Federal payroll?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is their estimate. Two years ago they estimated 1,400. But I do not care if it requires 10,000. I think we should have protection against them selling bad meat.

Mr. MAYNE. You are not interested in the cost of this program I take it from that answer?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Even if 3,000 are required to do this inspecting, the cost will be less than the cost of a hamburger for each person per year in the United States and that amounts to less than one-quarter of a cent per pound. I think that is the cheapest Federal protection we could ever have in the United States.

Mr. MAYNE. Of course, you are not interested in the cost even though it has been shown in the testimony that the State inspection services are less expensive than the Federal?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is because they are less adequate, including the one in the State of Iowa which is woefully weak in comparison with the Federal inspections, as the gentleman himself knows.

Mr. MAYNE. Did not the gentleman also testify—and this is the last quotation from his testimony that I will refer to in this colloquy—but is it not true that the gentleman from Iowa testified and I quote:

> I regret to admit if my bill, H.R. 1314—

Which is the substitute which is now called the Smith-Foley bill—if it were passed—

> it would be almost impossible for the Department to extend the jurisdiction as far as that bill would provide within the next two or three years. There just are not that many inspectors.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That bill would have gone down to $50,000. We are going down to $250,000 in the substitute. It does not take as many inspectors, for our substitute.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MAYNE] seems to misunderstand the position that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] and I have taken on this bill. We are not opposed to doing what the committee bill does. In fact, I voted for the committee bill, as he knows.

The committee bill does not reach a very serious problem with sufficient emphasis and we feel it is important that the bill be amended to reach that problem; namely, that 15 percent of fresh meat and slaughtered meat and 25 percent of processed meat is not federally inspected and is now subjected to a haphazard kind of State and local inspection or none at all. Such inspection does not exist in a mandatory way in half of the States of the Union.

You cannot cover up the bald fact that the States have failed for the past 60 years to do any kind of adequate job in meat inspection.

The gentleman from Iowa knows that and nothing can change that fact. Nobody is going to stand up here and say that there is one State in the Union that equals Federal inspection in its competency and in its thoroughness and in its effectiveness.

I would challenge any Member of this body to say that his own State inspection system is just as good as Federal inspection.

Beyond that point we should have an interest in the welfare of the many millions of people who travel around the country. I think every American should be able to go in any State of the Union and be assured that the meat he eats in a restaurant or the meat that he buys in a store is just as wholesome as he hopes it is in his own State.

So it is not any excuse to say that if the people of a State do not want adequate meat inspection and do not want to pay for it, they should not be forced to have it.

The basic reason why some operators do not want to have Federal inspection is purely economic. There is no other reason. They can do certain things when under Federal inspection—they can sell meat across the State line—to the Army or a federally assisted school system, or to a veterans' hospital. The only reason operators are going to give up these opportunities and to sell meat is because it is cheaper not to be federally inspected.

It does not cost anything for the inspection. That is paid for by the Government. What costs money are sanitation standards and healthy animals.

I want to show you what the Federal inspectors have rejected in Federal plants. First, an animal which has about a gallon of yellow pus in a joint. That animal was rejected by a Federal inspector in a Federal plant. Here is a cow with a cancerous eye that was rejected in a federally inspected plant. It is enough to turn your stomach. What happens in a nonfederally inspected plant? Who knows? But we do know, and anybody who is honest will admit it: that the major channel of filthy meat in this country, such as it exists, goes through noninspected plants, nonfederally inspected plants.

There is no State in the Union that has a system that is up to Federal standards now. California comes closest, but most States are far behind.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Under the gentleman's amendment, what is the number of plants that would be exempted under this $250,000 limitation?

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is suggesting a misconception about our amendment.

Mr. MICHEL. I have no right to do that. You have an exemption in the amendment. I am asking you how many plants would be exempted under the gentleman's amendment. Those that are engaged in intrastate business are exempted up to a certain amount.

You made a big to-do about the fact that those under the limitation——

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman only for a question.

Mr. MICHEL. Do not assume that I do not know what I am talking about.

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman for a question; but not for a harangue.

Mr. MICHEL. I raise a legitimate question.

Mr. FOLEY. Let me answer it then. I will answer the gentleman by saying that under the committee bill all plants that are in interstate commerce that sell meat will continue under Federal inspection. All plants that are not in interstate commerce directly are exempted from Federal inspection under the committee bill.

Under the Smith-Foley substitute all plants that are in interstate commerce are included under Federal inspection, as they have always been, plus all plants, intrastate or otherwise, that have over $250,000 volume of meat or meat products sold each year.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate that.

Mr. FOLEY. The fact of the matter is that both the committee bill and the Smith-Foley substitute leave to the States the inspection of meat that is in intrastate commerce if it is less than $250,000 in gross business. If there is any plant in intrastate commerce over $250,000, the committee version also leaves it to the States.

Mr. MICHEL. I ask the question, how many plants does that involve in your amendment?

Mr. FOLEY. I think it will involve in the country about 7,000 or 8,000 plants which will be left to the States.

Mr. MICHEL. Is it not conceivable that in these 7,000 or 8,000 plants what the gentleman is really trying to get at by way of disclosure he makes here could more aptly be going on in those 7,000 or 8,000 plants?

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman wants us to strike the $250,000 limitation and include every plant, we will be glad to do so. We are trying to leave some responsibility to the States, I will tell the gentleman, and leave the States some opportunity to do the job.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. The gentleman is certainly not implying in the two pictures he shows this House that if those animals had come before a State inspector they would have been passed for human consumption?

Mr. FOLEY. I am telling the gentlewoman that if they came before a State inspector, I assume that that kind of grave condition would be handled. But the gentlewoman knows that half the States in the Union do not have mandatory inspection systems, so there would not even be a State inspector to look at those animals.

Second, in those States that do not have ante mortem inspection there would not be an opportunity to see them.

Mrs. MAY. I think the gentleman does not want to leave the impression that there are States that do not have pure food and drug protection, health protection, including municipal inspection and State inspection.

Mr. FOLEY. It is not a question of the State inspector looking at something like that and doing nothing about it. It is a question of whether the State inspector even sees it, because only a few States attempt to have every pound of meat inspected.

If an inspector comes in in the morning and then does not come back until the next day, a lot of meat goes through the plant in the meantime, including perhaps animals like that.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, my purpose is not to argue with the gentleman, but I think again we have to get back to the facts involved here. If an animal, we will say a cow, has a cancerous eye and that cancer has not metastasized to the parotid gland or to other glands, that entire carcass is not rejected in Federal plants.

Mr. FOLEY. If the ailment does not extend to the remainder of the animal, part of the animal can be condemned, that is correct.

Mr. KYL. That is what I am trying to to get at. There are many things that look bad and sound bad, that create a lot of furor, which, in fact, may not be that bad.

Mr. FOLEY. On the other hand, would the gentleman agree that many things which appear acceptable to the untrained person could be very dangerous indeed?

Mr. KYL. There are a lot of things such as trichinosis that would not be apparent to meat inspectors without minute microscopic investigation.

Mr. FOLEY. Is it not true that anthrax only appears as a salmon color in certain glands that otherwise are white, and only a trained inspector can detect it?

Mr. KYL. The gentleman should go back to the fact that this is not only a matter of inspection in plants. Frequently we have money funded for meat inspection, which it is said goes to the farmers. It does not. It goes to the consumer.

We have programs for brucellosis control, and for bovine tuberculosis control, and for anthrax control. This has nothing to do with packing plants and processing, because control has to be accomplished through testing and vaccinations. These are for consumer protection.

Mr. FOLEY. May I ask the gentleman—he is a straightforward exponent of his point of view—does the gentleman think 85 percent inspection by Federal inspectors and 75 percent inspection by State inspectors represents some guarantee to the consumer of wholesomeness? Is the gentleman in favor of Federal inspection where it exists?

Mr. KYL. I am in favor of State and Federal inspection.

Mr. FOLEY. Would the gentleman challenge someone to state there is as good State inspection as Federal inspection?

Mr. KYL. As the gentleman knows, this depends to a great extent on the competence of the people doing the inspection. We have people working for States and localities who have the same know-how as do people in the Federal plants.

Mr. FOLEY. Is it the gentleman's suggestion that the State inspection system in Iowa is fully the equal of the Federal system?

Mr. KYL. I am saying the State inspection system in Iowa, as it exists under the law, and as it is carried out under that law, is adequate.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman raises a critical question. If the Iowa State inspection is less extensive than Federal inspection as it is, I would seriously question that it is adequate.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman from Washington one thing that has not been made entirely clear. The Smith-Foley bill will take in those people dealing strictly in intrastate commerce above $250,000?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BELCHER. Of course, both bills take in all the interstate?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BELCHER. The Smith-Foley bill does not do a thing for those plants that sell less than $250,000.

Mr. FOLEY. It does everything that the committee does, and if the gentleman says it does not do anything, he means that the committee bill does not do anything.

Mr. BELCHER. No. The committee bill will cooperate with the State to the extent of 50 percent of cost, plus a lot of other things to help the State cooperate to put out a program for those plants below $250,000, and the gentleman's bill does not do a thing.

Mr. FOLEY. May I answer that question?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes.

Mr. FOLEY. I would like to say this is probably the most important question raised in this debate, and I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for raising it.

Apparently the gentleman from Oklahoma is under the misconception, as the Washington Post is under the misconception, and as the Republican policy committee is under the misconception, that the Federal-State program of inspection which is in the committee bill is excluded in the Foley bill. That is not true. There is no exclusion at all of anything the committee bill does to encourage payments to the State or to encourage cooperation with the State.

Mr. BELCHER. I am certainly glad to know the Washington Post and the Republican policy committee and the members of the committee do not know as much as the gentleman knows about this bill.

I am indebted, on behalf of the House of Representatives as well as the people of America, that the gentleman actually appeared here today.

Mr. FOLEY. I am sure if the gentleman will look at the bill, H.R. 12145, of which I am a cosponsor, he will read for himself it is there. It is not a matter of opinion. It is a matter of fact. This is not the first time people have not read proposed legislation.

Mr. BELCHER. The gentleman contends that the Smith-Foley proposal does cooperate with the States in any type of program they want, above or below $250,000?

Mr. FOLEY. I have in my hand a copy of the bill, H.R. 12145, cosponsored by myself, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] and others. On page 30 of that bill the gentleman will find title III, Federal and State cooperation, which includes every word that is in the committee bill verbatim.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this legislation we must consider, as I see it, both the objectives and the methods.

The objective of all of the Members is to secure the best possible food for the American people, pure and wholesome meat. How we secure that objective is of course a question of considerable disagreement and considerable argument.

It is true, as I understand it, that the Smith-Foley substitute, which is yet to be offered, is identical with the existing bill with certain additions extending its scope. Those additions will attempt to have the Federal Government enter into the inspection of strictly intrastate operations provided those intrastate operations involve a specific amount of money, actually a quarter of a million dollars per year.

Of course, when most of us went to law school it was perfectly clear that the Federal Government would have no right in the world to interfere with these intrastate operations. That was one of those things the States could do for themselves. As I see it, the States can still do it for themselves. The States are doing it for themselves. Most of the States are doing a very good job of it today. The committee bill will help those States which need help in doing a better job.

It seems to me that it makes little sense to say that we are going to infringe upon the rights of the State down to a certain point, but that we are going to leave all the sticky business to the States. That is hardly calculated to get the needed cooperation from the States.

Last year the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] wanted to go a good deal further down, five times as far, down to $50,000. Now he feels it is wrong to have the State inspect the plant if it involves a business of more than $250,000, but right to let the State inspect it if it is $100,000 or $50,000.

It seems to me that there just is not any sense in that sort of thing. Either the Federal Government ought to inspect every piece of meat or it ought to stay out of the States' business.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I was somewhat convinced reluctantly, perhaps, we ought to adopt the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, which I understand the gentleman voted for. When that was adopted, it used the very provision on jurisdiction which I support today. The Taft-Hartley law went further than any other law to expand Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. POAGE. The Taft-Hartley law sought to except as much as it could from Federal control. The gentleman from Iowa is trying to put as much as he can under Federal control.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It preempted jurisdiction.

Mr. POAGE. I am suggesting it does not make much sense to put a part of the State's business under Federal control. If in fact this intrastate business is something the Federal Government should be supervising then the Federal Government should be supervising it down to the smallest slaughterer in the land.

The Federal Government should then be inspecting the slaughter of every old cow, because most of these horror stories arise in the very small plants. It is perfectly true some States use the spot inspection system, that is, they do not inspect every animal that comes through. The committee bill attempts to provide a remedy for that by giving to the States a way to get the funds to carry on a complete inspection system. The committee bill does not—I repeat—does not move into the field of State operation and it does not violate the rights or assume the obligations of the States but simply enables the States to try to do a better job than some of them have been able to do in the past. The proposed substitute would on the other hand, move the Federal Government directly into the local affairs of every State.

I believe if we will allow those States to have the right to control all of the intrastate businesses within their borders, you have a much better chance of having real effective inspection by those States than you have under the Smith-Foley bill where you have the States inspecting only a few of the smallest plants.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this debate today, in my judgment, has been like so many of our debates in recent times. Soon forgotten. There has been misunderstanding not only on this floor today but in reports of what has been going on in the public's mind. Regardless of what has been said and regardless of what amount of time has passed—and there have been 60 years that have passed since the provisions we are now operating under were first enacted into law—the fact remains that we here today have the responsibility of doing what our own individual minds dictates to us is the best thing to do for the American people.

Under the Smith-Foley provision—and I think I understand that provision—there would be some 8,000 plants in this country that are not treated any differently under the Smith-Foley version as they would be treated under the committee bill. By that I mean when you put the cutoff at $250,000 there are still some 8,000-odd plants that are still strictly in intrastate commerce and would not then have Federal inspection. These plants are numerous but very small in total output of meats. Try to compare this approach with that of the committee bill. It has been said and resaid here today that the committee bill—as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the chairman of our committee, has said and as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], the ranking minority member of our committee, has said—tries to leave to the States the full opportunity, and tries to give them full responsibility of inspecting and adequately inspecting the meat which comes out of the plants that are strictly intrastate commerce plants. Now, does it not stand to reason that at least in today's thinking of this Congress and the thinking of the State officials, if each individual State has the full responsibility and full opportunity to show that the meat from the plants in their State is just as good as the meat from plants in any other State, that they will accept this responsibility?

We have the unanimous approval of the State departments of agriculture. Further, every indication is, regardless of whether this has not happened before, we now know that there will be laws enacted that will comply with the Federal standards of cleanliness and wholesomeness and thereby genuinely create a type of cooperation between the Federal and the State governments. This will provide that every pound of meat that the American public consumes will be adequately inspected, the same kind of inspection which would be provided at a Federal plant, insofar as wholesomeness and cleanliness is concerned. This is what we all say we want.

But, is it not more practical and more realistic to allow the States to participate and then require them to carry their full share of the responsibility? We do that by allowing them to receive up to 50 percent of this expenditure. Every indication from every State commissioner of agriculture to whom I have spoken, tells me that the trouble has been the lack of money. It is the lack of money here that causes us here in Congress some trouble, too.

Mr. Chairman, the committee bill will provide for the first year an expenditure of about $4.5 million, going up to its ultimate cost of about $10 million or $15 million. However, the Smith-Foley application or approach would require the expenditure of an estimated $31.2 million during the first year of its operations, as I believe the figures show.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would explain to us whether or not it is his understanding that the amendment which is about to be offered would cover the 8,000 small plants to which the gentleman has referred under the Federal-State cooperative plan, or whether the proposed amendment would eliminate those 8,000 plants completely from either Federal or State supervision?

Mr. PURCELL. No. I feel absolutely sure that the proposed amendment would leave these plants under the Federal-State cooperative plan. I have worked for months in this area. The Smith-Foley approach would leave the smallest, most difficult plants to inspect out from under the coverage of their bill.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in favor of H.R. 12145, the

Smith-Foley substitute, which, for reasons I will outline here, I consider a most effective bill.

The measure includes all of the provisions of the committee's bill, but adds the following two:

First. All meat plants which have more than $250,000 gross annual sales would be inspected under the Federal program.

Second. Newly inspected plants would be allowed to meet construction requirements of the Federal meat grading program for the first 5 years. Then the construction standards of the Federal inspection would have to be followed.

Mr. Chairman, for half a century, the American people have felt as if they were being protected by the Pure Food and Drug Act, and particularly by the Meat Inspection Act. This act is so basic to the general welfare and public health so as to appear to be totally beyond question.

Indeed, it is hard to remember that these proposals were hotly debated and widely contested in their day, and that they and the public interest were opposed by the meatpacking and processing interests, which claimed that "self-regulation" was best. However, it had already failed. They claimed that Federal regulation would be the death knell of the industry—but it has since prospered. They claimed that it would destroy initiative and stifle competition—when in fact, it has equalized and intensified it. All the arguments then marshaled against effective inspection have been refuted.

Why, then, bother with new legislation at all? Because, some 16 percent, or 5.3 billion pounds, of the meat slaughtered annually in this country and some 26 percent of meat processed into meat products do not fall under the U.S. Department of Agriculture's meat inspection system. This is because the present law—originally passed in 1906—provides the Government with the authority to inspect only plants whose products cross State lines.

In almost every other activity of the Federal Government participation in interstate commerce is said to exist not only in cases where business across jurisdictional lines is overt, but also in cases where the sheer size of the operation is indicative of their involvement. You may be assured that a meatpacking plant, slaughterhouse, retail store, or any other establishment is inextricably bound up in interstate commerce once it reaches a certain size. In some areas, $500,000 is seen as the breaking point, in others, $250,000. The substitute for which I speak uses the $250,000 figure. It is my belief that this affords a maximum protection to the consumer, while adhering to the proven system of Federal meat inspection.

This brings us to one of the criticisms of the substitute voiced by supporters of H.R. 12144. It is true that the Smith-Foley bill, H.R. 12145, will not cover all meat slaughtered and processed in the United States. The result of this bill would be Federal inspection of approximately 97 percent of the meat slaughtered. Opponents say that H.R. 12144 would cover 100 percent. Let us set the record straight.

H.R. 12144 is an attempt to buy the States into enacting programs which are, as it is vaguely phrased, "consistent with" the Federal inspection system. It would pay 50 percent of the cost of the State programs. The words "consistent with," the heart of the measure's criterion of comparison between the State and Federal inspection regulations, are undefined in the bill. In addition, it does not absolutely provide for the inspection of all meat, nor does it require the inspection of even 50 percent of the now uninspected commerce in meat and meat products. It requires nothing, but only "facilitates" further inspection. The legislation is dependent entirely on State initiative, which, in fact, has been sorely lacking in the past, creating the very problems which have given impetus to the legislation we are considering today.

Indeed, H.R. 12145 provides for a steady, fair and thorough extension of the already successful Federal system along well-defined lines of "interstate commerce." While no one would say that it is a perfect measure, it is the more effective of the two. It will guarantee, I repeat, "guarantee" that—according to present figures—97 percent of the meat slaughtered in the United States will be effectively inspected. It is the gap between the 97 percent and absolute coverage which could best be bridged with other approaches, such as that being used by my own State, Maryland.

Maryland still has no meat inspection personnel either full or part time, and 74.1 percent of the animals slaughtered in our State are not inspected by anyone. Maryland, though, is finally moving.

We are all pleased that in my State, Governor Agnew has appointed a legislative committee to draft legislation on the subject. I would certainly urge this type of conscientious approach for all the States, so that State and Federal Government can work hand in hand to insure the purity and safety of all meat products.

Let us go back to the essence of the committee bill's approach: Reliance on States' initiative and their departments for coverage which could be easily extended by the Federal system. What of the record of the States? Some State inspection programs exist, but few provide any real safeguards to the public. Some 23 States, or almost half, have no inspection systems at all.

How are conditions in noninspected plants? Have we raised a false alarm? Conditions found in some of the noninspected plants around the country are shocking. According to a report made to the Department of Agriculture, unsanitary conditions were commonplace, there were cases where diseased cattle and animals which had died from cancer, tuberculosis, and other human infecting illnesses were butchered and sent to the stores to be purchased by housewives. Where the taste was impaired by the animal's disease, the packers have used chemicals to restore the proper flavor. Where the meat color was affected, dyes were injected to achieve the appearance of a healthy color.

This is but a short list of the heavily documented catalog of abuses. It excludes all the ordinary cases of fraud which have continually cheated the consumers by the adulteration of foods. The things which I listed above still persist. They pose a menace to the public health. There is no argument against an effective inspection system, and the Smith-Foley bill is the better of the measures before us today.

But what of its cost? There would be a manpower requirement of more than 3,000 inspectors. I should like to point out that this number would be needed whether inspection is to be done by States—as under H.R. 12144, or under the more effective, Smith-Foley measure. These inspectors will cover some 6,000 additional plants, including 1,900 slaughterhouses for a cost of $19 million and 4,100 meat processors, for a cost of $12 million.

The total cost will be some $31 million in addition to the $46 million now being spent. But what do these figures mean in real terms? An additional cost of approximately seven one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound of meat—a modest price, indeed for people to be secure in the meat products they consume.

The time needed to train 3,000 inspectors I understand to be estimated at 6 to 8 months, with full implementation of the plan within a year of institution. If we were to use the approach embodied in H.R. 12144, the cost would be higher—if implemented—and the time for drawing up 50 State plans would be tremendously longer.

Let us eliminate the variations in State standards. Let us rely on an inspection system which has been proved fair and worthy of reliance. They are experienced in the field of effective enforcement. Let us pass H.R. 12145, and build a solid foundation for a rational system of comprehensive meat inspection for the safety of all the people of the United States.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, after having listened to debate this afternoon, after having talked to State officials in Iowa and with a number of people in the meatpacking industry, and with many consumers in my district in Iowa, I have decided to support H.R. 12144.

The bill is based on a sound principle. The principle of Federal-State cooperation. It encourages primary responsibility for meat inspection in the States. This is the way it should be.

By making it possible for greater cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in the area of meat inspection, the Congress will have moved to give a high degree of protection to the consumer.

Mr. Chairman, it is my conviction that as we move into the future that the one-man, one-vote principle will make the State legislatures more responsive to the needs of the people than the Congress will be in the future. Therefore the Agriculture Committee's bill, in my opinion, holds more long-range promise for adequate and inclusive meat inspection than does the Smith-Foley amendment. By strengthening State inspection, all plants within a State, not just those grossing over $250,000, would be inspected.

This morning an excellent editorial appeared in the Washington Post on "The Clean Meat Bill." It supports the position I have taken even though it is mistaken in one instance. I do commend it to the House, as follows:

The Clean Meat Bill

> The House will have an opportunity today to modernize the outmoded Federal meat inspection law which has been on the books with little change for 60 years. It is a task made urgent by revolutionary changes in the meat-handling industry. The slaughter of livestock is no longer concentrated in Chicago and a few other large centers. In recent years the slaughterhouses have moved close to livestock feeding areas and are much more numerous than they once were. At the same time processing plants turning out meat products tend to be located near the large consumer markets. With their sophisticated techniques, they produce many products that require little home preparation, thus greatly increasing opportunities on the part of a few unscrupulous producers for adulteration, the use of "extenders" and deceptive labeling.
>
> The weakest point in the present inspection system is the absence of cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and the states. Federal inspection is limited to meat moving in interstate and foreign commerce, and only about one-half of the states provide mandatory inspection of meat and meat products that move within state boundaries. Eight states, including Maryland, have no meat inspection law whatever.
>
> Representative Purcell's bill approved by the Department of Agriculture, the House Agriculture Committee and the livestock industry would meet this problem by creating a joint Federal-state inspection system. The Department of Agriculture would provide counsel, manpower and financial aid to help the states set up complete intrastate inspection consistent with Federal standards.
>
> As the bill goes to the floor, this appears to be its most controversial provision. A substitute for this section known as the Smith-Foley amendment would offer additional protection against unfit meat by extending Federal inspection. But this would cover only plants having gross sales in excess of $250,000 annually, leaving about one-half of the plants now uninspected still free to turn out dirty meat. Most of the trouble in the past has come, not from the larger plants which have a reputation to uphold, but from small unstable enterprises—the kind that would remain uninspected under the Smith-Foley amendment.
>
> In our view, there are two major objectives to be sought: (1) The elimination of every pound of unclean or unwholesome meat from the market; (2) Accomplishment of this objective within the framework of our Federal system, which often calls for Federal aid to help the states perform their local functions instead of mere absorption of those functions by an overextended Federal bureaucracy. Since the Purcell bill would make it possible to accomplish both purposes and the Smith-Foley amendment would not accomplish either, the bill as approved by the Agriculture Committee 31 to 3 seems clearly preferable.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the amendments to the Meat Inspection Act recommended by the House Committee on Agriculture are necessary and I am hopeful they will be approved without any weakening additions from the floor.

Not since the first Federal meat inspection law was passed in 1906 have there been any major revisions in the program. Anyone who has followed the committee hearings and has looked into the situation knows that action to improve and strengthen the law has been too long delayed.

An editorial in this morning's Washington Post stated clearly what I believe is the mission before us. In referring to the type of legislation needed, the editorial said:

> In our view, there are two major objectives to be sought: (1) The elimination of every pound of unclean or unwholesome meat from the market; (2) Accomplishment of this objective within the framework of our Federal system, which often calls for Federal aid to help the states perform their local functions instead of mere absorption of those functions by an overextended Federal bureaucracy.

My own State of New York has a meaningful meat inspection program, and has had it for some time; however, there are several States without such a program. In these States, the consumer has no guarantee whatsoever that any meat products processed, packed, and distributed solely within the borders of a State are wholesome and meet certain minimum health and quality requirements. This meat is not subject to Federal inspection because it is not involved in interstate commerce.

The solution to the problem, in my view, is not for the Federal Government to take over all meat inspection, permitting the States to abandon their responsibilities in this area. Nor should we turn our backs to the matter and let the States fend for themselves. The answer lies somewhere in the middle.

As the committee suggests, let us establish a Federal-State partnership. We hear so frequently the term "creative federalism" let us test its practicality in this regard. By working with the States and agreeing to share the cost and assist in the development of programs on the local level—programs with teeth in them—we will at once make significant progress toward the eventual attainment of the worthy goals outlined in the Post editorial.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this legislation, it is regrettable that no effort was made to provide compulsory grading of meat so that a consumer can know what he is buying after it is inspected in compliance with this provision.

Why must the issue of grading be determined so extensively by the industry which produces the meat? Is there no need for limiting the water content, the quality standards in meat?

Is this legislation complete if it fails to cover mandatory grading standards? Is not the consumer entitled to know whether beef is Prime, Choice, Good, commercial, or ungraded?

The year before last, when bacon prices soared beyond the horizon, I was shocked to learn that there were no minimum standards to determine what constitutes bacon and how it can be distinguished from compressed smoked fat and water.

The only standards I could discover with respect to bacon were those which applied to the Federal Government's own procurement which provide that the fat content in bacon shall not exceed 68 percent, the salt content shall not exceed 2½ percent, while the moisture content shall not exceed 24.2 percent. Thus, the Federal purchase standards provide for no less than 5.3 percent lean meat in bacon.

If water can be pumped into bacon to provide weight and lush profits to the processor, what, if anything, is there about this law that prevents pumping water into every pound of meat we buy?

This bill is merely a beginning. My hope is that the committee will now undertake establishing Federal standards of meat quality before the American people are watered to death.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the House Republican policy committee supports legislation to revise and update the act of March 4, 1907, the Horsemeat Act and the Imported Meat Act into a single new statute. H.R. 12144 would broaden the present meat inspection service by establishing a Federal-State cooperative meat inspection program. It would provide the Department of Agriculture with authority to eliminate practices that could defraud consumers and endanger the public health.

At the present time, only 28 States have laws providing for mandatory inspection of animals before and after slaughter. Twelve States provide a system of voluntary inspection. Eight States do not have a meat inspection statute and two States have very limited statutes regulating meatpacking.

H.R. 12144 would establish a cooperative Federal-State inspection system under which the Federal Government would assist the States in meeting their responsibilities to provide high quality meat inspection. Federal cooperation and assistance to the States would include program planning and technical and laboratory assistance as well as financial aid up to 50 percent of the total cost of the State program.

The prohibition against counterfeiting, forgery, and other unauthorized use of official certificates, labels, and marking devices would be clarified. The authority of the Department of Agriculture to regulate the marking, labeling, and packaging of carcasses, meats, and meatfood products would be clearly defined. This legislation also would extend to imported meat, the same standards that would apply to meat and meat products produced and processed within the United States.

This legislation does not preempt the jurisdiction of the States over intrastate commerce. By a vote of 29 to 5, the House Agriculture Committee rejected an amendment that would have virtually eliminated State inspection programs and assigned the responsibility of State and local health protection, at an additional annual cost of $31.2 million, to the Federal Government.

Under the provisions of H.R. 12144, a viable Federal-State cooperative meat inspection program would be established. New protection will be afforded to the consumer. By encouraging the confidence of today's homemaker in the integrity of our meat supply, this legislation strengthens and improves a meatpacking and processing industry that has $16 billion in annual gross sales and that provides $13 billion in yearly sales of livestock to the American farmer.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, in responsive concern for, and protection of, the health and well-being of all our American meat consumers and particularly those in the lowest income groups, I most earnestly urge and hope that this Committee, with the adoption of any strengthening amendments deemed necessary for the purpose, will speedily approve the bill before us, H.R. 12144, the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967.

I think it should be emphasized that we now have a long-delayed opportunity today to modernize the antiquated Federal meat inspection procedures which have been on the books, with minute change, for some 60 years, during which the meat handling and distributing industry has been practically revolutionized.

It has been revealed that currently about 25 percent of the country's commercially processed meat producers and some 15 percent of the commercially slaughtered animals—19 million head a year—are not now covered by Federal inspection standards because they travel only in intrastate commerce. It is significant to note that only 25 of our 50 States presently require State meat inspection and Agriculture experts have testified that virtually none of the State regulations match the Federal standards of meat inspection to insure that the animals are not dead, dying or decayed before they are slaughtered.

Mr. Chairman, while no legislator has any desire to interfere with, or unduly intrude upon, the fair and legitimate service operations of any segment of industry in this country, we, nevertheless, do have the obligation to reasonably protect the health and safety of our citizens, and very especially the poorer citizens and families, against the poisonous selfishness of the unscrupulous few.

From all the expert information and testimony available, it seems quite clear there is urgent need to strengthen the current inspection standards applied to the great majority of slaughterhouses throughout the country and I again urge the House to overwhelmingly accept this opportunity to do so because of the great and serious public interest that is involved.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, no one who has read the reports of conditions in meat plants operating without Federal inspection can doubt the need for vigorous action by Congress to assure stringent inspection of the very large quantities of meat processed in such facilities.

Horrible conditions which pose a threat to health have been permitted to exist in meat plants in my own State of Wisconsin, as well as other States. Wisconsin has enacted a statute providing for mandatory inspection which will go into effect on January 1, 1968. However conditions as bad as those in States without inspection laws have been found in some States with mandatory inspection statutes. I hope that the Wisconsin law and its enforcement would be fully adequate to protect the health of our people. But I believe that Congress has an obligation to assure that inspections standards equal to those of the Federal system are applied to all plants which produce a significant volume of meat and meat products.

This objective is unlikely to be reached by the bill before us today, indeed, one of the arguments which has been presented to me by advocates of H.R. 12144 is that extension of the Federal meat inspection system to plants with a gross business of over $250,000 a year would be impractical or uneconomic and would "strain" the Federal inspection system.

But this implies the continuance of precisely the sort of double standard—allowing less than adequate inspection for plants now exempt from the Federal system—which we should agree to abolish here today. Congress has it within its power to see that the Federal inspection system has the manpower and money to do the job without "strain." It would be a tiny price to pay for the health benefits derived.

Accordingly I shall support the amendments offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley].

I include hereafter reports of conditions found at nonfederally inspected meat plants in Wisconsin. Each of these reports was made by Dr. J. E. Klein, assistant inspector in charge, or R. A. Baumgart, compliance officer, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Meat Inspection Division in Milwaukee.

The names of the plants inspected in the 1967 report were deleted and I have accordingly eliminated the names in the 1962 reports.

The reports follow:

July 2[illegible], 1967.

Recently enacted legislation has provided a State of Wisconsin meat inspection program. Though initial portions of the program are scheduled for implementation January 1, 1968, effects are already apparent.

In 1963, I had been requested by the Inspector in Charge at Milwaukee, Wisconsin to survey sanitary conditions and processing controls at the nonfederally inspected plants throughout Wisconsin. The 1963 survey revealed deplorable sanitary conditions and an almost lack of processing controls. Excessive use of cereal extenders, substitution of meat by products for meat ingredients, minimal or no control over restricted additives, deceptive labeling, rotted wooden equipment, rusted containers, frequent and direct contamination of product, token cleanup methods, all were generally accepted and commonplace.

Subsequent surveys of exempted establishments and sausage manufacturers supplying the exempted establishments has revealed gradual improvement. Within the past 18 months this improvement has been accelerated and has become startling. Undoubtedly apprehension over requirements of the impending state program has been largely responsible. Many local meat packers speak of "going federal" and accordingly modify processing methods, obtain new equipment and improve existing structures.

Events such as the Brownville incident in which 38 people became ill with trichinosis and the case with which ——— et al. could move undeterred about the state fostered a general awareness that some governmental sanction was vital and necessary to provide and mirror a favorable meat production image in Wisconsin.

Current surveys still reveal many discrepancies at variance with U.S. requirements. Page after page would be required to enumerate specific examples in specific plants. Common discrepancies generalized to most plants include excessive use of wood not susceptible of adequate sanitation, rusty galvanized equipment, direct contamination of product from overhead structures and ineffective cleanups. Little control exists over formulation and ingredients.

City of Milwaukee ordinances do not require continuous inspection of calves and lamb. Plant #1, operating under City of Milwaukee Health Department regulations, slaughters approximately 1,000 calves per week. No inspector is present during slaughtering operations. Each morning a nonveterinarian employee of the City of Milwaukee examines and stamps calf and lamb carcasses slaughtered the previous day so each carcass, though having received neither ante mortem nor post mortem inspection, proudly bears Milwaukee Health Department marks of inspection.

Plant #2, operating under City of Milwaukee Inspection, had been a prime recipient of cancer eye and diseased cattle shipped from Montana. These diseased cattle had been approved for interstate movement to approved slaughtering establishments by Montana authorities but had been "short-stopped" by an enterprising cattle dealer and diverted to a more lucrative market—often ———.

Present requirements within the state include only token surveys at six month intervals. Utilization of by products as a substitute for meat ingredients in comminuted products is still commonplace. Ham loaf rarely includes ham; pork trimmings and veal with appropriate amounts of cereal would be more likely. Trichina controls have been voluntarily subscribed to by many sausage manufacturers out of fear that a "Brownsville incident" will ruin their business. The old die hard German sausage maker still remains outside this mainstream of nebulous compliance. He still contends frozen pork or heating to 137 deg. F "ist nicht gut für die worst" and very difficult to convince otherwise.

Packers operating within small communities such as ——— demand inspection from local authorities to lend that aura of respectability to their products. These inspectors are responsible to the packer. As an example, the inspector, a layman, assigned to ——— conducts swine and cattle post mortem inspection without ever having had training for disposition determination. Sausage, ham, and bacon produced by the company bears the marks of city inspection yet the inspector has no knowledge of restricted additives, formulations, processing etc. and admittedly exercise no control over comminuted product production.

Startling improvements in sanitation have occurred within recent months. Much still remains undone. Certainly the steady hand and influence of some impartial government agency is mandatory if realistic and meaningful sanitation and product control is to become effective and replace haphazard and nebulous current inspectional systems.

Reuben A. Baumgart.

Sheboygan, Wis., September 17, 1962

This establishment processes approximately 35,000 pounds of sausage per week.

Inspection at this establishment is conducted by a branch of the City of Sheboygan Health Department and consists of infrequent visits by a part-time employee. No control is exercised over processing and formulation. Adulteration of product by use of excessive water, cereal and nonfat dry milk is not checked. No control is exercised over excessive use of harmful chemicals such as sodium nitrite and sodium nitrate. No control to protect the public against trichinae was observed in the processing of sausage items. Laboratory facilities are not utilized by either the establishment or by the City of Sheboygan for the sampling of product. A substance to impart false red meat color was observed being added to sausage items.

Product on workup tables was slid over rusted, corroded metal. Particles of this rust and corrosion was observed on the product. Condensation from rusted, corroded overhead metal equipment was observed dropping directly onto edible product. Metal containers used for holding edible product were not properly cleaned and this edible product was in direct contact with such filth and decomposed meat particles imbedded in crevices of the containers. Equipment being used in fabricating edible product was not properly cleaned. General sanitation was not satisfactory. Much of the wooden equipment was in poor condition and not susceptible of being properly cleaned.

Fifty percent of the meat used in fabrication of product is federally inspected; the balance originates from sources receiving local or no inspection.

WEYAUWEGA, WIS., SEPTEMBER 19, 1962

Inspection is under the jurisdiction of the town of Hortonia, Wisconsin.

Ante-mortem and post-mortem is performed by a local veterinarian. Plant sanitation and product control is by an occasional visit by a lay inspector.

Slaughter operations had ceased early on the day of our visit. Cattle in the cooler from the day's kill showed a lack of supervision. They were grossly contaminated with manure, hair and hide. Hogs were poorly dressed and filthy with hair, ingesta and scurf.

Meat items were being boned on filthy, splintered, blood-soaked tables. Contaminations were noted on the boned meats. Meat products were stored and conveyed within the plant in rusty, dirty containers. Products were being processed in encrusted, filthy smoke houses and cooking vats coated with rust and greasy meat residues.

There is no protection against the excessive addition of adulterants or harmful chemical, either by the inspector or by laboratory control.

Weekly production totals approximately 20,000 pounds smoked meats—35,000 pounds of sausage—250 cattle—250 hogs—and 25 calves.

MANITOWOC, WIS., SEPTEMBER 18, 1962

Inspection is under the jurisdiction of the town of Manitowoc, Wisconsin.

A local veterinarian is assigned to the plant during slaughter operations. The plants slaughtered about two days per week. There is no inspection during the other days of operations. No slaughter operations were carried on the day of our visit.

The cattle in the cooler were filthy; large pieces of hide were seen on a good percentage of the carcasses. Animals were grossly contaminated with ingesta, manure and hair. An abscessed kidney was noted in one of the cow carcasses. Swarms of flies were outside the plant and dead flies were noticed on carcasses in the cooler. Flakes of paint were on the boning table and equipment. Particles of paint and dirt were noted on the boned meat.

Weekly production is approximately 60 cattle—20 calves.

SHEBOYGAN, WIS., SEPTEMBER 17, 1962

This establishment processes approximately 20,000 pounds of sausage per week.

Inspection at this plant is conducted by a branch of the City of Sheboygan Health Department and consists of a part-time employee making visits once every few months. No control is exercised over processing and formulation. Adulteration of product by use of excessive water, cereal and nonfat dry milk is not checked. No control is exercised over excessive uses of harmful chemicals such as sodium nitrate and sodium nitrite. No control to protect the public against trichinae was observed in the processing of sausage items. Laboratory facilities are not utilized either by the City of Sheboygan or by the establishment for sampling of product.

Product in cooler was observed placed on racks. We observed product dragging on a dirt encrusted floor. Fresh meat was placed on deteriorated, partially decomposed wooden boards and flecks of the decomposed wood was noted on the meat. Condensation from dirty, rusted, corroded overhead metal equipment was dripping on exposed product. Equipment coming in direct contact with edible product was not adequately cleaned and partially decomposed particles of meat lodged in crevices was in direct contact with product being fabricated. General sanitation was fair in the newer portion of the plant. In the older structure, moldy, saturated wood and encrusted, rusty metal made satisfactory sanitation impossible.

Ninety percent of the meat used in the fabrication of product is derived from federally inspected sources. The balance originates from sources receiving local or no inspection.

MANITOWOC, WIS., SEPTEMBER 18, 1962

This establishment cures and smokes approximately 3,000 pounds of smoked meats and processes approximately 25,000 pounds of sausage per week.

Inspection at this plant is conducted by the City of Manitowoc and consists of a part-time inspector with visits approximately once every two weeks. No control is exercised over processing and formulation. Adulteration of product by use of excessive water, cereal and nonfat dry milk is not checked. No control is exercised over excessive usage of harmful chemicals such as sodium nitrate and sodium nitrite. No control to protect the public against trichinae was observed, either in the processing of smoked meats or in the processing of sausage. Laboratory facilities are not utilized for sampling of product, either by the establishment or by the City of Manitowoc.

Sanitation in general approached minimum requirements of the Federal Meat Inspection Division. However, cockroaches were observed in the smokehouse area in which exposed meat products were being handled. Condensation from overhead equipment, contaminated with dirt and rust, was dropping directly on exposed product. Ninety percent of the meat used in fabrication of product originates from federally inspected establishments; the balance is derived from sources receiving local or no inspection.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., SEPTEMBER 21, 1962

This company cures and smokes approximately 1,000 pounds of smoked meats and processes approximately 20,000 pounds of sausage per week.

Inspection at this plant is conducted by the City of Milwaukee and consists of a visit by the city inspector once a month. No control is exercised over processing and formulation. Adulteration of product by use of excessive water, cereal and nonfat dry milk is not checked. No control is exercised over processing and formulation. Adulteration of product by use of excessive water, cereal and nonfat dry milk is not checked. No control is exercised over excessive use of harmful chemicals, such as sodium nitrate and sodium nitrite. No control to protect the public against trichinae was observed either in processing smoked meats or in processing sausage.

The ceiling in the shipping room was deteriorated, crumbling, and falling on product. Particles of decomposed plaster was observed on the meat. Metal equipment was rusted and corroded. Employees lacked adequate hand washing facilities and were observed handling the rusted equipment and then handling meat products without having removed the rust from their hands. The toilet room for male employees lacked hand washing facilities. These male employees were observed coming directly from the toilet to the work table where they handled meat without washing their hands. Equipment coming in direct contact with meat product was contaminated with dirt and decomposed meat particles. General sanitation was very poor.

Ninety percent of the meat used in fabrication of product is federally inspected; the balance originates from sources receiving local or no inspection.

JEFFERSON, WIS., SEPTEMBER 24, 1962

This company cures and smokes approximately 20,000 pounds of smoked meats and processes approximately 100,000 pounds of sausage per week.

Inspection at this plant is conducted by the City of Jefferson and consists of a veterinarian devoting full time to the slaughtering operations and little or no time to the processing phases of production. No direct control is exercised over processing. Adulteration of product by the use of excessive water, cereal and nonfat dry milk is not checked. No direct control is exercised over excessive uses of harmful chemicals, such as sodium nitrite or sodium nitrate. No inspection control to protect the public against trichinae was observed, either in processing smoked meats or in processing sausage. Laboratory facilities are not utilized for sampling of product, either by the establishment or by the City of Jefferson. Phosphates, though not permitted ingredients of federally inspected sausage, were observed being formulated into sausage products at this establishment.

Product in boning room was observed passing over saturated, decomposed, cracked wooden boards. Perspiring employees were observed handling meat products by placing unclean, perspiring hands and arms directly into ground meat. Condensation from rusted, corroded overhead equipment was observed falling directly onto meat products. Equipment used in fabricating product was rusty and not properly cleaned. Product was coming into direct contact with this rust and corrosion. Sanitation was inadequate to prevent direct contamination of product.

Ninety-five percent of the meat used in fabrication of product is non-federally inspected and originates from their own slaughtering facilities.

EAU CLAIRE, WIS., SEPTEMBER 27, 1962

This company processes approximately 140,000 pounds of sausage per week.

Inspection at this plant is conducted by the City of Eau Claire and consists of a visit by an employee of the City Health Department once a week. No control is exercised over processing and formulation. Adulteration of product by use of excessive amounts of water, cereal and nonfat dry milk is not checked. No control is exercised over excessive uses of harmful chemicals such as sodium nitrite and sodium nitrate. No control to protect the public against trichinae was observed in processing sausage. Laboratory facilities are not utilized for sampling of product either by the establishment or by the City of Eau Claire. Nonfat dry milk was observed being formulated into product which did not bear this ingredient on the labeling material. Phosphates not permitted in sausage products by Federal Meat Inspection Regulations, were being formulated into sausage at this establishment. Use of such chemical was not stated on labeling material.

Fresh, edible meat to be utilized in sausage production was observed in open containers placed below filthy creosote encrusted smoke trees dripping filth and creosote upon this fresh meat. A mixture of machine grease and condensation was observed dripping from the maze of overhead machinery upon sausage work tables and edible sausage. Ground meat to be included in sausage was placed in rusty, corroded metal trucks, such meat coming in direct contact with this rust and corrosion.

Ninety per cent of the meat used in fabrication of product is derived from federally inspected sources; the balance originates from the sources receiving local or no inspection.

New London, Wis., September 19, 1962

Inspection is performed under the jurisdiction of the town of Hortonia, Wisconsin.

Ante-mortem inspection was not being performed during my visit. Inspection is by a local Veterinarian. An official of the plant replied to one of our queries—"we sometimes slaughter before the Veterinarian arrives, but we do not push animals into the cooler before he arrives." This type of inspection would allow an unethical packer to slaughter seriously crippled, diseased, or even animals in a dying condition. This would be difficult for an experienced, qualified inspector to detect.

Carcasses that were being boned for sale and sausage making were contaminated with manure and hair. The meat was further contaminated with condensation from dirty overhead structures and by perspiration from the workers. Meats were observed in dirty, blood-encrusted boxes and rusty, dirty containers.

Inspection in these edible departments were performed by an occasional visit by a layman. No control of the finished product for adulterants or the addition of harmful chemicals is exercised. We were told that the inspector never took samples for laboratory analyses.

Weekly production is approximately 400 cattle, 1,000 hogs, 50,000 pounds of sausage and 60,000 pounds of smoked meats.

Milwaukee, Wis., September 24, 1967

Inspection is performed under the jurisdiction of the City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Ante-mortem was not being performed on animals. Holding pens were teeming with flies and the floors were steeped in manure. Swarms of flies were entering from these pens to the edible departments and were observed on edible meats and carcasses.

Post-mortem is not performed during the day of slaughter. Only the carcasses are inspected the day after slaughter. This type of inspection could allow evidence of diseases, such as pneumonia, cancer of the internal organs, etc., to be disposed of and the carcasses passed for food.

Carcasses in the cooler were contaminated with manure, wood and hair. Some of these carcasses were being loaded in a dirty, dust-laden truck to be delivered to the markets.

Weekly production is approximately 350 sheep and 450 calves.

Milwaukee, Wis., September 24, 1962

Inspection is under the jurisdiction of the City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Ante-mortem and post-mortem was being conducted by a layman. A city employed veterinarian was reported to be subject to call.

Animals are received throughout the day. During my visit animals were received and slaughtered without ante-mortem inspection. The holding pens for ante-mortem inspection were poorly lighted. These pens were inadequately drained and the gates, fences and floors were covered with rotted manure and were teeming with flies. These flies entered the plant with the animals, and were numerous on the edible products and the carcasses.

Post-mortem was being performed in a lackadaisical manner by hacking at only part of the necessary lymph nodes required to detect communicable diseases, as Tuberculosis. The proper cutting and observation of muscle tissues to detect beef tapeworm cysts that are transmittible to man was not accomplished. I observed one abscessed liver in the cooler that had been passed for food.

Adequate facilities or room were not provided for a thorough washing of carcasses. Carcasses were passed for food that were contaminated with hair, ingests and manure.

Weekly production is approximately 100 cattle.

Kenosha, Wis., September 14, 1962

This company cures and smokes approximately 5,000 pounds of smoked meats and processes approximately 3,000 pounds of sausage per week.

Inspection at this plant is conducted by the City of Kenosha and consists of a visit by a city inspector once a month. No control is exercised over processing and formulation. Adulteration of product by use of excessive water, cereal and nonfat dry milk is not checked. No control is exercised over excessive uses of harmful chemicals such as sodium nitrate and sodium nitrite. No control to protect the public against trichinae was observed either in processing smoked meats or sausage. Laboratory facilities are not utilized for sampling of product either by the establishment or by the City of Kenosha.

Product in curing cooler was observed piled against a wall of crumbling plaster with particles of the deteriorated, crumbled plaster spread liberally over the fresh meat. Employees were observed in the processing room without head coverings and smoking cigarettes. Product in processing room was in contact with rotted, saturated, disintegrating wood. Bits of this material was observed on the product. Particles of partly decomposed meat were scattered along the walls and behind equipment. Equipment being used in fabricating edible product was not properly cleaned. General sanitation was not satisfactory.

Fifty per cent of the meat used in fabrication of product is federally inspected, the balance originates from sources receiving local or no inspection.

Milwaukee, Wis., September 21, 1962

This company cures and smokes approximately 1,000 pounds of smoked meats and processes approximately 10,000 pounds of sausage per week.

Inspection at this plant is conducted by the City of Milwaukee and consists of a visit by a city inspector once a month. No control is exercised over excessive use of harmful chemicals, such as sodium nitrate and sodium nitrite. No control to protect the public against trichinae was observed in the processing of either smoked meats or sausage. I observed vegetable gum adulterants, prohibited for inclusion in sausage formulations by the federal meat inspection division, being formulated into sausage in this plant.

I noted product placed in curing containers being covered with saturated, rotted wood coverings picked off the floor, and such deteriorated wooden coverings were placed in direct contact with meat being cured. Chips of this decomposed wood and other filth was observed on the product. Metal equipment was rusted, corroded and not properly cleaned. Employees were observed handling this rusted, corroded, unclean equipment and, without washing their hands, resumed handling product with the rust and filth from this equipment being transferred directly to the meat. Equipment being used in fabrication of edible product was not properly cleaned. Sanitation was not satisfactory.

Ninety percent of the meat used in fabrication of product is federally inspected; the balance originates from sources receiving local or no inspection.

La Crosse, Wis., September 27, 1962

This company processes approximately 35,000 pounds of sausage per week. They also process approximately 1,000 pounds of portion control items such as patties, hamburger etc. per week.

Inspection at this point is conducted by the City of La Crosse and consists of a visit by an employee of the La Crosse Health Department once every few weeks. No control is exercised over processing and formulation. Adulteration of product by excessive amounts of water, cereal or nonfat dry milk is not checked. No control is exercised over excessive uses of harmful chemicals such as sodium nitrate and sodium nitrite. No control to protect the public against trichinae was observed in the processing of sausage. Laboratory facilities are not utilized for sampling of product either by the City of La Crosse or by the establishment. Packaged sausage items in the shipping cooler bore labeling material indicating the name of the product but bore no statement of ingredients.

Condensation from unclean overhead structures was observed dripping on exposed edible product. The employee operating the chopcut machine was covered from head to foot (including eyebrows) with a fine white powder much the same as an employee of a flour mill. A mechanic was observed burrowing his way through hanging edible sausage. It was impossible to determine whether or not his clothing was of washable material since they were so completely encrusted with a dark, dull substance reeking of perspiration, machine grease, decayed meat and miscellaneous grime. Edible product was observed in direct contact with filthy, saturated wood. Rusty corroded metal equipment was not properly cleaned. General sanitation was not satisfactory.

Eighty per cent of the meat used in fabrication of product is derived from federally inspected sources; the balance originates from sources receiving local or no inspection.

Employees handling this equipment transferred from such duties to direct handling of product without washing their contaminated hands. Product in processing rooms was in direct contact with rotted, decomposed wooden equipment and particles of this decomposed, rotted wood were observed on the edible meat.

None of the meat used in fabricating product is derived from federally inspected sources.

Waterloo, Wis., September 20, 1962

This establishment slaughters approximately 150 cattle, 25 calves, 10 sheep and 250 hogs per week. Inspection of slaughtering operations provided by the City of Waterloo and is conducted by a lay inspector with a veterinarian available on call. During our visit cattle were being slaughtered and the inspector remained standing with his back turned to the slaughtering operations. No attempt was made by this inspector to observe carcasses, much less incise glands or inspect vital organs. Flies were prevalent on the killing floor and on the slaughtered carcasses. Carcasses in the cooler were filthy, contaminated with manure, dead flies and a heavy grease and rust mixture originating from employees' unwashed hands.

This establishment also cures and smokes approximately 40,000 pounds of smoked meats and processes approximately 60,000 pounds of sausage per week. Inspectional responsibility for processing is provided by a part-time inspector.

No control is exercised over processing and formulation. Adulteration of product by use of excessive water, cereal and nonfat dry milk is not checked. No control is exercised over excessive use of harmful chemicals, such as sodium nitrite or sodium nitrate. No control to protect the public against trichinae was observed, either in the processing of smoked meats or in the processing of sausage. Laboratory facilities are not utilized for sampling of product, either by the establishment or by the inspector of the City of Waterloo. An adulterant, sodium caseinate, not permitted inclusion in sausage products by the federal meat inspection division, was observed being added to sausage formulations at this establishment under the City of Waterloo inspection department. Fabricated product was observed being placed in containers without proper labeling.

Product in cooler was observed hanging on painted wooden rails. Flecks of paint were detected on the fresh meat. Filthy, blood-encrusted wooden boxes were used as receptacles for fresh meat. These boxes were placed on the floor and frequently piled on top of each other. Particles of scum and filth from the floor adhered to the bottoms of these boxes and was observed sticking to the top layer of meat after one of the boxes had been removed from the stack. Rusted, corroded metal equipment was improperly cleaned.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee bill (H.R. 12144), while it is useful as far as it goes, is deficient in a most critical respect: it fails to provide mandatory Federal inspection of intrastate establishments. The Committee on Agriculture findings and the positively nauseating surveys of the Department of Agriculture point to a serious need for inspection in this area. Yet the bill only provides for incentive grants and Federal-State cooperation. This, in itself, will not accomplish the task. Anyone with political experience should be aware that it is not only for lack of funds and technical expertise that States fail to enact adequate consumer-protection legislation. If the political climate in a State favors interests which would defraud the consumer, no amount of grants and technical assistance will move it to do otherwise.

I do not know how any Member who has read the Department of Agriculture survey reports can fail to endorse uniform Federal inspection. Sixteen percent of the meat slaughtered and 26 percent of the meat processed in the United States is outside the scope of Federal inspection.

Many of the revolting descriptions excerpted from the USDA reports are from States with mandatory State inspection. As one report from the 1962 USDA survey notes:

> Chicago authorities do not consider the State program acceptable and do not permit the sale of State-inspected products within the city of Chicago.

This is hardly testimony to the efficacy of State-inspection programs, which the committee bill proposes to expand.

Members of Congress recently received a letter from one industry association advocating the committee bill, on the grounds that it provides more "fully effective meat inspection." This is the first instance in my recollection where an industry group has pressed for tougher Federal regulation. Perhaps it is a historic first of industry responsibility.

The letter warns that the Smith-Foley amendment, through its exemption of plants doing a sales volume under $250,000 annually, would exclude about 50 percent of meat slaughtering plants and about 45 percent of processing plants. What the letter fails to point out is that the exempted plants, taken as a whole, account for only about 3 percent of the meat production in the United States. To be sure, the remaining 3 percent ought to be covered as well, for they are likely to be unstable and unsanitary. However the Smith-Foley amendment which extends Federal coverage from 75 percent to 97 percent, is preferable to the committee bill which fails to extend it at all.

Mr. Chairman, if States with inspection programs can tolerate conditions such as those described in the Department of Agriculture reports, then the States have already demonstrated their failure. Twenty-four States have no mandatory inspection programs. Those that do tend to be well below Federal standards. Instead of promoting more of these inadequate State inspection programs, with no clear statutory definition of minimum standards, we should concentrate on bringing more meat under Federal standards.

The Smith-Foley amendment is addressed to a glaring deficiency and should be adopted.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, unless we take some positive action to improve and strengthen our meat inspection regulations, we are failing to protect the American traveler and the American housewife. I rise in support of H.R. 12145 because it is a fundamental first step in protecting ourselves against unwholesome meat.

According to a survey conducted by the Minnesota Tribune's Minnesota Poll, almost nine out of 10 Minnesotans—87 percent—favor expanded Federal inspection of meatpacking plants. Housewives across the country have rallied to the support of this all-important crusade to improve meat inspection programs.

The Federal assistance to State meat inspection programs authorized under the Smith-Foley bill will strengthen State programs throughout the United States. The basic health protection of our citizens calls for action in this vital program and I am proud to rise in support of it.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for H.R. 12144, but I had preferred and supported H.R. 12145, the Smith-Foley substitute which would have extended Federal meat inspection to all packing and processing establishments doing intrastate business whose gross annual sales exceeded $250,000. The Smith-Foley bill would have provided meaningful protection to the health and welfare of consumers. I felt we needed a stronger meat inspection bill, one that would have provided Federal inspection of 97 percent of the meat slaughtered and processed. At the present time, 5.3 billion pounds of meat and 706 billion pounds of meat products are processed annually without Federal inspection.

The committee bill, H.R. 12144, is going to protect consumers of meat crossing State lines, but what about the housewife who purchases meat and meat products packed and processed in her own State? Under the committee bill, 6,000 large and medium slaughtering and processing plants with more than $250,000 gross annual sales will continue to avoid Federal inspection, a loophole which I felt should be closed. The Department of Agriculture surveys have pointed out the need to close this loophole. Sixteen percent of meat slaughtered and 26 percent of that processed in the United States is not covered by Federal inspection.

We should have legislation that will eliminate every pound of uncleaned and unsanitary meat—meat from diseased animals, processed products containing lungs, chopped hides, excessive chemicals, and inferior materials, must be kept off the market.

I am hopeful the Senate will strengthen this legislation by adopting the provisions of the Smith-Foley bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12144

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Wholesome Meat Act and that the provisions appearing under the subheading "FOR MEAT INSPECTION:" under the heading "BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY" in the Act approved March 4, 1967, entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and eight" (34 Stat. 1260–1265, as amended; 21 U.S.C. 71–91), are hereby designated as the "Federal Meat Inspection Act"; the first twenty paragraphs thereof are hereby designated, respectively, as sections 3 through 22, and the twenty-first and twenty-second paragraphs thereof as section 23; and said sections 3 through 23 are hereby designated as "TITLE I—INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS; ADULTERATION AND MISBRANDING".

SEC. 2. The Federal Meat Inspection Act is hereby amended by adding, in title I, new sections 1 and 2 reading, respectively, as follows:

"SECTION 1. As used in this Act, except as otherwise specified, the following terms shall have the meanings stated below:

"(a) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States or his delegatee.

"(b) The term 'firm' means any partnership, association, or other unincorporated business organization.

"(c) The term 'meat broker' means any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of buying or selling carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat, or meat food products of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines on commission or otherwise negotiating purchases or sales of such articles other than for his own account or as an employee of another person, firm, or corporation.

"(d) The term 'renderer' means any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of rendering carcasses, or parts or products of the carcasses, of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, except rendering conducted under inspection or exemption under title I of this Act.

"(e) The term 'animal food manufacturer' means any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of manufacturing or processing animal food derived wholly or in part from carcasses, or parts or products of the carcasses, of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines.

"(f) The term 'State' means any State of the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(g) The term 'territory' means Guam, the Virgin Islands of the United States, American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the United States, excluding the Canal Zone.

"(h) The term 'commerce' means commerce between any State, any territory, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or within any territory not organized with a legislative body, or the District of Columbia.

"(i) The term 'United States' means the States, the District of Columbia, and the territories of the United States.

"(j) The term 'meat food product' means any product capable of use as human food which is made wholly or in part from any meat or other portion of the carcass of any cattle, sheep, swine, or goats, excepting products which contain meat or other portions of such carcasses only in a relatively small proportion or historically have not been considered by consumers as products of the meat food industry, and which are exempted from definition as a meat food product by the Secretary under such conditions as he may prescribe to assure that the meat or other portions of such carcasses contained in such product are not adulterated and that such products are not represented as meat food products. This term as applied to food products of equines shall have a meaning comparable to that provided in this paragraph with respect to cattle, sheep, swine, and goats.

"(k) The term 'capable of use as human food' shall apply to any carcass, or part or product of a carcass, of any animal, unless it is denatured or otherwise identified as required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary to deter its use as human food, or it is naturally inedible by humans.

"(l) The term 'prepared' means slaughtered, canned, salted, rendered, boned, cut up, or otherwise manufactured or processed.

"(m) The term 'adulterated' shall apply to any carcass, part thereof, meat or meat food product under one or more of the following circumstances:

"(1) if it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to health; but in case the substance is not an added substance, such article shall not be considered adulterated under this clause if the quantity of such substance in or on such article does not ordinarily render it injurious to health;

"(2) (A) if it bears or contains (by reason of administration of any substance to the live animal or otherwise) any added poisonous or added deleterious substance (other than one which is (i) a pesticide chemical in or on a raw agricultural commodity; (ii) a food additive ; or (iii) a color additive) which may, in the judgment of the Secretary, make such article unfit for human food;

"(B) if it is, in whole or in part, a raw agricultural commodity and such commodity bears or contains a pesticide chemical which is unsafe within the meaning of section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,

"(C) if it bears or contains any food additive which is unsafe within the meaning of section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,

"(D) if it bears or contains any color additive which is unsafe within the meaning of section 706 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: *Provided*, That an article which is not adulterated under clause (B), (C), or (D) shall nevertheless be deemed adulterated if use of the pesticide chemical, food additive, or color additive in or on such article is prohibited by regulations of the Secretary in establishments at which inspection is maintained under title I of this Act;

"(3) if it consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance or is for any other reason unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food;

"(4) if it has been prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth, or whereby it may have been rendered injurious to health;

"(5) if it is, in whole or in part, the product of an animal which has died otherwise than by slaughter;

"(6) if its container is composed, in whole or in part, of any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render the contents injurious to health;

"(7) if it has been intentionally subjected to radiation, unless the use of the radiation was in conformity with a regulation or exemption in effect pursuant to section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act:

"(8) if any valuable constituent has been in whole or in part omitted or abstracted therefrom; or if any substance has been substituted, wholly or in part therefor; or if damage or inferiority has been concealed in any manner; or if any substance has been added thereto or mixed or packed therewith so as to increase its bulk or weight, or reduce its quality or strength, or make it appear better or of greater value than it is; or

"(9) if it is margarine containing animal fat and any of the raw material used therein consisted in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance.

"(n) The term 'misbranded' shall apply to any carcass, part thereof, meat or meat food product under one or more of the following circumstances:

"(1) if its labeling is false or misleading in any particular;

"(2) if it is offered for sale under the name of another food;

"(3) if it is an imitation of another food, unless its label bears, in type of uniform size and prominence, the word 'imitation' and immediately thereafter, the name of the food imitated;

"(4) if its container is so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading;

"(5) if in a package or other container unless it bears a label showing (A) the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; and (B) an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count: *Provided*, That under clause (B) of this subparagraph (5), reasonable variations may be permitted, and exemptions as to small packages may be established, by regulations prescribed by the Secretary;

"(6) if any word, statement, or other information required by or under authority of this Act to appear on the label or other labeling is not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use;

"(7) if it purports to be or is represented as a food for which a definition and standard of identity or composition has been prescribed by regulations of the Secretary under section 7 of this Act unless (A) it conforms to such definition and standard, and (B) its label bears the name of the food specified in the definition and standard and, insofar as may be required by such regulations, the common names of optional ingredients (other than spices, flavoring, and coloring) present in such food;

"(8) if it purports to be or is represented as a food for which a standard or standards of fill of container have been prescribed by regulations of the Secretary under section 7 of this Act, and it falls below the standard of fill of container applicable thereto, unless its label bears, in such manner and form as such regulations specify, a statement that it falls below such standard;

"(9) if it is not subject to the provisions of subparagraph (7), unless its label bears (A) the common or usual name of the food, if any there be, and (B) in case it is fabricated from two or more ingredients, the common or usual name of each such ingredient; except that spices, flavorings, and colorings may, when authorized by the Secretary, be designated as spices, flavorings, and colorings without naming each: *Provided*, That, to the extent that compliance with the requirements of clause (B) of this subparagraph (9) is impracticable, or results in deception or unfair competition, exemptions shall be established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary;

"(10) if it purports to be or is represented for special dietary uses, unless its label bears such information concerning its vitamin, mineral, and other dietary properties as the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, determines to be, and by regulations prescribes as, necessary in order fully to inform purchasers as to its value for such uses;

"(11) if it bears or contains any artificial flavoring, artificial coloring, or chemical preservative, unless it bears labeling stating that fact: *Provided*, That, to the extent that compliance with the requirements of this subparagraph (11) is impracticable, exemptions shall be established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary; or

"(12) if it fails to bear, directly thereon or on its container, as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe, the inspection legend and, unrestricted by any of the foregoing, such other information as the Secretary may require in such regulations to assure that it will not have false or misleading labeling and that the public will be informed of the manner of handling required to maintain the article in a wholesome condition.

"(o) The term 'label' means a display or written, printed, or graphic matter upon the immediate container (not including package liners) of any article.

"(p) The term 'labeling' means all labels and other written, printed, or graphic matter (1) upon any article or any of its containers or wrappers, or (2) accompanying such article.

"(q) The term 'Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act' means the Act so entitled, approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1040), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

"(r) The term 'pesticide chemical', 'food additive', 'color additive', and 'raw agricultural commodity' shall have the same meanings for purposes of this Act as under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

"(s) The term 'official mark' means the official inspection legend or any other symbol prescribed by regulations of the Secretary to identify the status of any article or animal under this Act.

"(t) The term 'official inspection legend' means any symbol prescribed by regulations of the Secretary showing that an article was inspected and passed in accordance with this Act.

"(u) The term 'official certificate' means any certificate prescribed by regulations of the Secretary for issuance by an inspector or other person performing official functions under this Act.

"SEC. 2. Meat and meat food products are an important source of the Nation's total supply of food. They are consumed throughout the Nation and the major portion thereof moves in interstate or foreign commerce. It is essential in the public interest that the health and welfare of consumers be protected by assuring that meat and meat food products distributed to them are wholesome, not adulterated, and properly marked, labeled, and packaged. Unwholesome, adulterated, or misbranded meat or meat food products impair the effective regulation of meat and meat food products in interstate or foreign commerce, are injurious to the public welfare, destroy markets for wholesome, not adulterated, and properly labeled and packaged meat and meat food products, and result in sundry losses to livestock producers and processors of meat and meat food products, as well as injury to consumers. The unwholesome, adulterated, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged articles can be sold at lower prices and compete unfairly with the wholesome, not adulterated, and properly labeled and packaged articles, to the detriment of consumers and the public generally. It is hereby found that all articles and animals which are regulated under this Act are either in interstate or foreign commerce or substantially affect such commerce, and that regulation by the Secretary and cooperation by the States and other jurisdictions as contemplated by this Act are appropriate to prevent and eliminate burdens upon such commerce, to effectively regulate such commerce, and to protect the health and welfare of consumers."

Sec. 3. Said Act is hereby further amended by—

(a) deleting the phrase "interstate or foreign" wherever it appears in sections 3 through 23 of title I of said Act; and

(b) deleting in section 3 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 71) the phrase "the Secretary of Agriculture, at his discretion, may" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the Secretary shall" and deleting the words "of Agriculture" wherever they appear after the word "Secretary" thereafter in title I of the Act.

Sec. 4. Section 4 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 72) is hereby amended by deleting the phrases "for human consumption" and "for transportation or sale", and by inserting after the word "commerce" the phrase "which are capable of use as human food".

Sec. 5. Section 5 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 73) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary may limit the entry of carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat and meat food products, and other materials into any establishment at which inspection under this title is maintained, under such conditions as he may prescribe to assure that allowing the entry of such articles into such inspected establishments will be consistent with the purposes of this Act."

Sec. 6. Section 7 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 75) is hereby amended by—

(a) deleting the provisions thereof reading as follows: ", and no such meat or meat food products shall be sold or offered for sale by any person, firm, or corporation in interstate or foreign commerce under any false or deceptive name; but established trade name or names which are usual to such products and which are not false and deceptive and which shall be approved by the Secretary are permitted";

(b) designating the remaining provisions as paragraph (a); and

(c) adding at the end of said section the following provisions as paragraphs (b) through (e), respectively: "(b) All carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat and meat food products inspected at any establishment under the authority of this title and found to be not adulterated, shall at the time they leave the establishment bear, in distinctly legible form, directly thereon or on their containers, as the Secretary may require, the information required under paragraph (n) of section 1 of this Act.

"(c) The Secretary, whenever he determines such action is necessary for the protection of the public, may prescribe (1) the styles and sizes of type to be used with respect to material required to be incorporated in labeling to avoid false or misleading labeling in marking and labeling any articles or animals subject to this title or title II of this Act; and (2) definitions and standards of identity or composition for articles subject to this title and standards of fill of container for such articles not inconsistent with any such standards established under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and there shall be consultation between the Secretary and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare prior to the issuance of such standards under either Act relating to articles subject to this Act to avoid inconsistency in such standards and possible impairment of the coordinated effective administration of these Acts. There shall also be consultation between the Secretary and an appropriate advisory committee provided for in section 301 of this Act, prior to the issuance of such standards under this Act, to avoid, insofar as feasible, inconsistency between Federal and State standards.

"(d) No article subject to this title shall be sold or offered for sale by any person, firm, or corporation, in commerce, under any name or other marking or labeling which is false or misleading, or in any container of a misleading form or size, but established trade names and other marking and labeling and containers which are not false or misleading and which are approved by the Secretary are permitted.

"(e) If the Secretary has reason to believe that any marking or labeling or the size or form of any container in use or proposed for use with respect to any article subject to this title is false or misleading in any particular, he may direct that such use be withheld unless the marking, labeling, or container is modified in such manner as he may prescribe so that it will not be false or misleading. If the person, firm, or corporation using or proposing to use the marking, labeling or container does not accept the determination of the Secretary, such person, firm, or corporation may request a hearing, but the use of the marking, labeling, or container shall, if the Secretary so directs, be withheld pending hearing and final determination by the Secretary. Any such determination by the Secretary shall be conclusive unless, within thirty days after receipt of notice of such final determination, the person, firm, or corporation adversely affected thereby appeals to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such person, firm, or corporation has its principal place of business or to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The provisions of section 204 of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 162, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 194), shall be applicable to appeals taken under this section."

Sec. 7. Section 10 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 78) is hereby amended to read:

"Sec. 10. No person, firm, or corporation shall, with respect to any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or any carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat or meat food products of any such animals—

"(a) slaughter any such animals or prepare any such articles which are capable of use as human food, at any establishment preparing any such articles for commerce, except in compliance with the requirements of this Act;

"(b) sell, transport, offer for sale or transportation, or receive for transportation, in commerce, (1) any such articles which (A) are capable of use as human food, and (B) are adulterated or misbranded at the time of such sale, transportation, offer for sale or transportation, or receipt for transportation; or (2) any articles required to be inspected under this title unless they have been so inspected and passed;

"(c) do, with respect to any such articles which are capable of use as human food, and act while they are being transported in commerce or held for sale after such transportation, which is intended to cause or has the effect of causing such articles to be adulterated or misbranded."

Sec. 8. Section 11 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 79) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. (a) No brand manufacturer, printer, or other person, firm, or corporation shall cast, print, lithograph, or otherwise make any device containing any official mark or simulation thereof, or any label bearing any such mark or simulation, or any form of official certificate or simulation thereof, except as authorized by the Secretary.

"(b) No person, firm, or corporation shall—

"(1) forge any official device, mark, or certificate;

"(2) without authorization from the Secretary use any official device, mark, or certificate, or simulation thereof, or alter detach, deface, or destroy any official device, mark, or certificate;

"(3) contrary to the regulations prescribed by the Secretary fail to use, or to detach, deface, or destroy any official device, mark, or certificate;

"(4) knowingly possess, without promptly notifying the Secretary or his representative, any official device or any counterfeit, simulated, forged, or improperly altered official certificate or any device or label or any carcass of any animal, or part or product thereof, bearing any counterfeit, simulated, forged, or improperly altered official mark;

"(5) knowingly make any false statement in any shipper's certification or other nonofficial or official certificate provided for in the regulations prescribed by the Secretary; or

"(6) knowingly represent that any article has been inspected and passed, or exempted, under this Act when, in fact, it has, respectively, not been so inspected and passed, or exempted."

Sec. 9. The present provisions of section 19 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 87) are hereby deleted and the following new provisions are substituted therefor:

"Sec. 19. No person, firm, or corporation shall sell, transport, offer for sale or transportation, or receive for transportation, in commerce, any carcasses of horses, mules, or other equines or parts of such carcasses, or the meat or meat food products thereof, unless they are plainly and conspicuously marked or labeled or otherwise identified as required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary to show the kinds of animals from which they were derived. When required by the Secretary, with respect to establishment at which inspection is maintained under this title, such animals and their carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products shall be prepared in establishments separate from those in which cattle, sheep, swine, or goats are slaughtered or their carcasses, parts thereof, meat or meat food products are prepared."

Sec. 10. The present provisions of section 20 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 88) are hereby deleted and the following new provisions are substituted therefor:

"Sec. 20. (a) No carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat or meat food products of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines which are capable of use as human food, shall be imported into the United States if such articles are adulterated or misbranded and unless they comply with all the inspection, building construction standards, and all other provisions of this Act and regulations issued thereunder applicable to such articles in commerce within the United States. All such imported articles shall, upon entry into the United States, be deemed and treated as domestic articles subject to the other provisions of this Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: *Provided*, That they shall be marked and labeled as required by such regulations for imported articles.

"(b) The Secretary may prescribe the

terms and conditions for the destruction of all such articles which are imported contrary to this section, unless (1) they are exported by the consignee within the time fixed therefor by the Secretary, or (2) in the case of articles which are not in compliance with the Act solely because of misbranding, such articles are brought into compliance with the Act under supervision of authorized representatives of the Secretary.

"(c) All charges for storage, cartage, and labor with respect to any article which is imported contrary to this section shall be paid by the owner or consignee, and in default of such payment shall constitute a lien against such article and any other article thereafter imported under this Act by or for such owner or consignee.

"(d) The knowing importation of any article contrary to this section is prohibited."

Sec. 11. Section 23 of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 23. (a) The provisions of this title requiring inspection of the slaughter of animals and the preparation of the carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products at establishments conducting such operations for commerce shall not apply to the slaughtering by any person of animals of his own raising, and the preparation by him and transportation in commerce of the carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products of such animals exclusively for use by him and members of his household and his non-paying guests and employees; nor to the custom slaughter by any person, firm, or corporation of cattle, sheep, swine, or goats delivered by the owner thereof for such slaughter, and the preparation by such slaughterer and transportation in commerce of the carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products of such animals, exclusively for use, in the household of such owner, by him and members of his household and his nonpaying guests and employees: *Provided*, That such custom slaughterer does not engage in the business of buying or selling any carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat or meat food products of any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, or equines, capable of use as human food.

"(b) The Secretary may, under such sanitary conditions as he may by regulations prescribe, exempt from the inspection requirements of this title the slaughter of animals, and the preparation of carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products, by any person, firm, or corporation in any territory or the District of Columbia solely for distribution within such jurisdiction when the Secretary determines that it is impracticable to provide such inspection within the limits of funds appropriated for administration of this Act and that such exemption will otherwise facilitate enforcement of this Act. The Secretary may refuse, withdraw, or modify any exemption under this paragraph (b) in his discretion whenever he determines such action is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"(c) The adulteration and misbranding provisions of this title, other than the requirement of the inspection legend, shall apply to articles which are exempted from inspection or not required to be inspected under this section."

Sec. 12. Said Act is hereby further amended by:

(a) deleting the phrase "cattle, sheep, swine, and goats" and the phrase "cattle, sheep, swine, or goats" wherever they appear in title I of the Act and substituting therefor, respectively, the phrase "cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, and other equines" and the phrase "cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines";

(b) in sections 3 and 4 (21 U.S.C. 71, 72), deleting the phrase "unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the word "adulterated";

(c) in section 4 (21 U.S.C. 72), deleting the phrase "sound, healthful, wholesome, and fit for human food" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "not adulterated";

(d) in section 4 (21 U.S.C. 72), deleting the phrase "unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or in any way unfit for human food" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "adulterated";

(e) in section 6 (21 U.S.C. 74), deleting the phrase "sound, healthful, and wholesome, and which contains no dyes, chemicals, preservatives, or ingredients which render such meat or meat food products unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "not adulterated", and deleting the phrase "unsound, unhealthful, and unwholesome, or which contain dyes, chemical, preservatives, or ingredients which render such meat or meat food products unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "adulterated";

(f) in section 8 (21 U.S.C. 76), deleting the phrase "unclean, unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "adulterated";

(g) in section 17 (21 U.S.C. 85), deleting the phrase "or goat meat, being the meat of animals killed after the passage of this Act, or except as hereinbefore provided" and substituting therefor the phrase "goat or equine meat";

(h) in section 18 (21 U.S.C. 86), deleting the phrase "sound and wholesome."; and

(i) in section 21 (21 U.S.C. 89), deleting the phrase "sound, healthful, wholesome, and fit for human food, and to contain no dyes, chemicals, preservatives, or ingredients which render such meat food product unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food; and to have been prepared under proper sanitary conditions, hereinbefore provided for" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "not adulterated".

Sec. 13. Said Act is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section in title I:

"Sec. 24. The Secretary may by regulations prescribe conditions under which carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat, and meat food products of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, capable of use as human food, shall be stored or otherwise handled by any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of buying, selling, freezing, storing, or transporting, in or for commerce, or importing, such articles, whenever the Secretary deems such action necessary to assure that such articles will not be adulterated or misbranded when delivered to the consumer. Violation of any such regulation is prohibited. However, such regulations shall not apply to the storage or handling of such articles at any retail store or other establishment that would be subject to this section only because of purchases in commerce, if the storage and handling of such articles at such establishment is regulated under the laws of the State or territory or the District of Columbia in which such establishment is located, in a manner which the Secretary after consultation with the appropriate advisory committee provided for in section 301 of this Act, determines is adequate to effectuate the purposes of this section."

Sec. 14. Said Act is hereby further amended by adding after title I thereof, the following new sections as:

"TITLE II—MEAT PROCESSORS AND RELATED INDUSTRIES

"Sec. 201. Inspection shall not be provided under title I of this Act at any establishment for the slaughter of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or the preparation of any carcasses or parts or products of such animals, which are not intended for use as human food, but such articles shall, prior to their offer for sale or transportation in commerce, unless naturally inedible by humans, be denatured or otherwise identified as prescribed by regulations of the Secretary to deter their use for human food. No person, firm, or corporation shall buy, sell, transport, or offer for sale or transportation, or receive for transportation, in commerce, or import, any carcasses, parts thereof, meat or meat food products of any such animals, which are not intended for use as human food unless they are denatured or otherwise identified as required by the regulations of the Secretary or are naturally inedible by humans.

"Sec. 202. (a) The following classes of persons, firms, and corporations shall keep such records as will fully and correctly disclose all transactions involved in their businesses; and all persons, firms, and corporations subject to such requirements shall, at all reasonable times, upon notice by a duly authorized representative of the Secretary, afford such representative access to their places of business and opportunity to examine the facilities, inventory, and records thereof, to copy all such records, and to take reasonable samples of their inventory upon payment of the fair market value therefor—

"(1) Any persons, firms, or corporations that engage, for commerce, in the business of slaughtering any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or preparing, freezing, packaging, or labeling any carcasses, or parts or products of carcasses, of any such animals, for use as human food or animal food;

"(2) Any persons, firms, or corporations that engage in the business of buying or selling (as meat brokers, wholesalers, or otherwise), or transporting, in commerce, or storing in or for commerce, or importing, any carcasses, or parts or products of carcasses, of any such animals;

"(3) Any persons, firms, or corporations that engage in business, in or for commerce, as renderers, or engage in the business of buying, selling, or transporting, in commerce, or importing, any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or parts of the carcasses of any such animals that died otherwise than by slaughter.

"(b) Any record required to be maintained by this section shall be maintained for such period of time as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe.

"Sec. 203. No person, firm, or corporation shall engage in business, in or for commerce, as a meat broker, renderer, or animal food manufacturer, or engage in business in commerce as a wholesaler of any carcasses, or parts or products of the carcasses, of any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, whether intended for human food or other purposes, or engage in business as a public warehouseman storing any such articles in or for commerce, or engage in the business of buying, selling, or transporting in commerce, or importing, any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased animals of the specified kinds, or parts of the carcasses of any such animals that died otherwise than by slaughter, unless, when required by regulations of the Secretary, he has registered with the Secretary his name, and the address of each place of business at which, and all trade names under which, he conducts such business.

"Sec. 204. No person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of buying, selling, or transporting in commerce, or importing, dead, dying, disabled, or diseased animals, or any parts of the carcasses of any animals that died otherwise than by slaughter, shall buy, sell, transport, offer for sale or transportation, or receive for transportation, in commerce, or import, any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules or other equines, or parts of the carcasses of any such animals that died otherwise than by slaughter, unless such transaction, transportation, or importation is made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe to assure that such animals, or the unwholesome parts or products thereof, will be prevented from being used for human food purposes.

"SEC. 205. The authority conferred on the Secretary by section 202, 203, or 204 of this title with respect to persons, firms, and corporations engaged in the specified kinds of business in or for commerce may be exercised with respect to persons, firms, or corporations engaged, in any State or territory or the District of Columbia, in such kinds of business but not in or for commerce, whenever the Secretary determines, after consultation with an appropriate advisory committee provided for in section 301 of this Act, that the State, territory, or District does not have comparable authority under its laws or such authority is not exercised in a manner to effectuate the purposes of this Act; and in such case the provisions of section 202, 203, or 204, respectively, shall apply to such persons, firms, and corporations to the same extent and in the same manner as if they were engaged in such business in or for commerce and the transactions involved were in commerce."

SEC. 15. Said Act is hereby further amended by adding after title II thereof, the following new section as:

"TITLE III—FEDERAL AND STATE COOPERATION

"SEC. 301. (a) It is the policy of the Congress to protect the consuming public from meat and meat food products that are adulterated or misbranded and to assist in efforts by State and other Government agencies to accomplish this objective. In furtherance of this policy—

"(1) The Secretary is authorized, whenever he determines that it would effectuate the purposes of this Act, to cooperate with the appropriate State agency in developing and administering a State meat inspection program in any State which has enacted a State meat inspection law that imposes mandatory ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements that are consistent with those under title I of this Act, with respect to all or certain classes of persons engaged in the State in slaughtering cattle, sheep, swine, goats, or equines, or preparing the carcasses, parts thereof, meat or meat food products, of any such animals for use as human food solely for distribution within such State.

"(2) The Secretary is further authorized, whenever he determines that it would effectuate the purposes of this Act, to cooperate with appropriate State agencies in developing and administering State programs under State laws containing authorities comparable to those provided in title II of this Act; and to cooperate with other agencies of the United States in carrying out any provisions of this Act.

"(3) Cooperation with State agencies under this section may include furnishing to the appropriate State agency (i) advisory assistance in planning and otherwise developing an adequate State program under the State law; and (ii) technical and laboratory assistance and training (including necessary curricular and instructional materials and equipment), and financial and other aid for administration of such a program. The amount to be contributed to any State by the Secretary under this section from Federal funds for any year shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated total cost of the cooperative program; and the Federal funds shall be allocated among the States desiring to cooperate on an equitable basis. Such cooperation and payment shall be contingent at all times upon the administration of the State program in a manner which the Secretary, in consultation with the appropriate advisory committee appointed under paragraph (4), deems adequate to effectuate the purposes of this section.

"(4) The Secretary may appoint advisory committees consisting of such representatives of appropriate State agencies as the Secretary and the State agencies may designate to consult with him concerning State and Federal programs with respect to meat inspection and other matters within the scope of this Act, including evaluating State programs for purposes of this Act and obtaining better coordination and more uniformity among the State programs and between the Federal and State programs and adequate protection of consumers.

"(b) The appropriate State agency with which the Secretary may cooperate under this Act shall be a single agency in the State which is primarily responsible for the coordination of the State programs having objectives similar to those under this Act. When the State program includes performance of certain functions by a municipality or other subordinate governmental unit, such unit shall be deemed to be a part of the State agency for purposes of this section.

"(c) As used in this section, the term 'State' means any State (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) or territory or as defined in section 1 of this Act; or the District of Columbia."

SEC. 16. Said Act is hereby further amended by adding after title III thereof, the following new sections as:

"TITLE IV—AUXILIARY PROVISIONS

"SEC. 401. The Secretary may (for such period, or indefinitely, as he deems necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act) refuse to provide, or withdraw, inspection service under title I of this Act with respect to any establishment if he determines, after opportunity for a hearing is accorded to the applicant for, or recipient of, such service, that such applicant or recipient is unfit to engage in any business requiring inspection under title I because the applicant or recipient, or anyone responsibly connected with the applicant or recipient, has been convicted, in any Federal or State court, of (1) any felony, or (2) more than one violation of any law, other than a felony, based upon the acquiring, handling, or distributing of unwholesome, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged food or upon fraud in connection with transactions in food. This section shall not affect in any way other provisions of this Act for withdrawal of inspection services under title I from establishments failing to maintain sanitary conditions or to destroy condemned carcasses, parts, meat or meat food products.

"For the purpose of this section a person shall be deemed to be responsibly connected with the business if he was a partner, officer, director, holder, or owner of 10 per centum or more of its voting stock or employee in a managerial or executive capacity.

"SEC. 402. Whenever any carcass, part of a carcass, meat or meat food product of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or any product exempted from the definition of a meat food product, or any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased cattle, sheep, swine, goat, or equine is found by any authorized representative of the Secretary upon any premises where it is held for purposes of, or during or after distribution in, commerce or otherwise subject to title I or II of this Act, and there is reason to believe that any such article is adulterated or misbranded and is capable of use as human food, or that it has not been inspected, in violation of the provisions of title I of this Act or of any other Federal law or the laws of any State or territory, or the District of Columbia, or that such article or animal has been or is intended to be, distributed in violation of any such provisions, it may be detained by such representative for a period not to exceed twenty days, pending action under section 403 of this Act or notification of any Federal, State, or other governmental authorities having jurisdiction over such article or animal, and shall not be moved by any person, firm, or corporation from the place at which it is located when so detained, until released by such representative. All official marks may be required by such representative to be removed from such article or animal before it is released unless it appears to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the article or animal is eligible to retain such marks.

"SEC. 403. (a) Any carcass, part of a carcass, meat or meat food product of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased cattle, sheep, swine, goat, or equine, that is being transported in commerce or otherwise subject to title I or II of this Act, or is held for sale in the United States after such transportation, and that (1) is or has been prepared, sold, transported, or otherwise distributed or offered or received for distribution in violation of this Act, or (2) is capable of use as human food and is adulterated or misbranded, or (3) in any other way is in violation of this Act, shall be liable to be proceeded against and seized and condemned, at any time, on a libel of information in any United States district court or other proper court as provided in section 404 of this Act within the jurisdiction of which the article or animal is found. If the article or animal is condemned it shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may direct and the proceeds, if sold, less the court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, but the article or animals shall not be sold contrary to the provisions of this Act, or the laws of the jurisdiction in which it is sold: *Provided*, That upon the execution and delivery of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that the article or animal shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to the provisions of this Act, or the laws of the jurisdiction in which disposal is made, the court may direct that such article or animal be delivered to the owner thereof subject to such supervision by authorized representatives of the Secretary as is necessary to insure compliance with the applicable laws. When a decree of condemnation is entered against the article or animal and it is released under bond, or destroyed, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the article or animal. The proceedings in such libel cases shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the proceedings in admiralty, except that either party may demand trial by jury of any issue of fact joined in any case, and all such proceedings shall be at the suit of and in the name of the United States.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall in no way derogate from authority for condemnation or seizure conferred by other provisions of this Act, or other laws.

"SEC. 404. The United States district courts, the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the highest court of American Samoa, and the United States courts of the other territories, are vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce, and to prevent and restrain violations of, this Act, and shall have jurisdiction in all other kinds of cases arising under this Act, except as provided in section 7(e) of this Act.

"SEC. 405. Any person who forcibly assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with any person while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties under this Act shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both. Whoever, in the commission of any such acts, uses a deadly or dangerous weapon, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both. Whoever kills any person while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties under this Act shall be punished as provided under section 1111 and 1114 of title 18, United States Code.

"Sec. 406. (a) Any person, firm, or corporation who violates any provision of this Act for which no other criminal penalty is provided by this Act shall upon conviction be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year, or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both such imprisonment and fine; but if such violation involves intent to defraud, or any distribution or attempted distribution of an article that is adulterated (except as defined in section 1(m)(8) of this Act), such person, firm, or corporation shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than three years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both: *Provided,* That no person, firm, or corporation, shall be subject to penalties under this section for receiving for transportation any article or animal in violation of this Act if such receipt was made in good faith, unless such person, firm, or corporation refuses to furnish on request of a representative of the Secretary the name and address of the person from whom he received such article or animal, and copies of all documents, if any there be, pertaining to the delivery of the article or animal to him.

"(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as requiring the Secretary to report for prosecution or for the institution of libel or injunction proceedings, minor violations of this Act whenever he believes that the public interest will be adequately served by a suitable written notice of warning.

"Sec. 407. For the efficient administration and enforcement of this Act, the provisions (including penalties) of section 6, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act entitled 'An Act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes', approved September 26, 1914 (38 Stat. 721–723, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 46, 48, 49, and 50) (except paragraphs (c) through (h) of section 6 and the last paragraph of section 9), and the provisions of subsection 409(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1096, as amended; 47 U.S.C. 409(1)), are made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary in administering and enforcing the provisions of this Act and to any person, firm, or corporation with respect to whom such authority is exercised. The Secretary, in person or by such agents as he may designate, may prosecute any inquiry necessary to his duties under this Act in any part of the United States, and the powers conferred by said sections 9 and 10 of the Act of September 26, 1914, as amended, on the district courts of the United States may be exercised for the purposes of this Act by any court designated in section 404 of this Act.

"Sec. 408. Requirements within the scope of this Act with respect to premises, facilities and operations of any establishment at which inspection is provided under title I of this Act, which are in addition to, or different than those made under this Act may not be imposed by any State or territory or the District of Columbia, except that any such jurisdiction may impose recordkeeping and other requirements within the scope of section 202 of this Act, if consistent therewith, with respect to any such establishment. Marking, labeling, packaging, or ingredient requirements in addition to, or different than, those made under this Act may not be imposed by any State or territory or the District of Columbia with respect to articles prepared at any establishment under inspection in accordance with the requirements under title I of this Act, but any State or territory or the District of Columbia may, consistent with the requirements under this Act, exercise concurrent jurisdiction with the Secretary over articles required to be inspected under said title, for the purpose of preventing the distribution for human food purposes of any such articles which are adulterated or misbranded and are outside of such an establishment, or, in the case of imported articles which are not at such an establishment, after their entry into the United States. This Act shall not preclude any State or territory or the District of Columbia from making requirement or taking other action, consistent with this Act, with respect to any other matters regulated under this Act.

"Sec. 409. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, including section 902(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 392(a)), the provisions of this Act shall not derogate from any authority conferred by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prior to enactment hereof.

"(b) The detainer authority conferred by section 402 of this Act shall apply to any authorized representative of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for purposes of the enforcement of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to any carcass, part thereof, meat, or meat food product of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, or equines that is outside any premises at which inspection is being maintained under this Act, and for such purposes the first reference to the Secretary in section 402 shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"Sec. 410. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Sec. 17. The Secretary of Agriculture shall annually report to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate on the operations and effectiveness of this Act.

Sec. 18. The provisions relating to equine meat and meat food products beginning with the phrase "And, hereafter," under the heading "Bureau of Animal Industry" and the subheading "meat inspection, bureau of animal industry:" in the Act approved July 24, 1919, entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and twenty" (41 Stat. 241; 21 U.S.C. 96), and paragraph (b) of section 306 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 689, as amended; 19 U.S.C. 1306(b)) are hereby repealed.

Sec. 19. If any provision of this Act or of the amendments made hereby or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and the remaining amendments and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 20. This Act shall become effective upon enactment except as provided in paragraphs (a) through (d):

(a) The provisions of paragraph (b)(1) and (c) of section 10 and the provisions of section 20 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended by sections 7 and 10 of this Act, and the provisions of section 17 of this Act repealing paragraph (b) of section 306 of the Tariff Act of 1930, shall become effective upon the expiration of sixty days after enactment hereof.

(b) The provisions of title I of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended by this Act, shall become effective with respect to equines (other than horses) and their carcasses and parts thereof, meat, and meat food products thereof upon the expiration of sixty days after enactment hereof.

(c) Section 11 of this Act, amending section 23 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, shall become effective sixty days after enactment hereof.

(d) Section 204 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as added by section 14 of this Act, shall become effective upon the expiration of sixty days after enactment hereof.

Mr. PURCELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be read and considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 13, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory".

Page 3, line 18, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory".

Page 3, line 19, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory."

Page 3, line 22, strike the word "territories" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territories".

Page 10, line 19, strike the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "of".

Page 20, line 13, strike the period and insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That nothing in this section shall apply to any individual who purchases meat or meat products outside the United States for his own consumption except that the total amount of such meat or meat products shall not exceed fifty pounds."

Page 22, line 9, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory".

Page 25, line 19, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory."

Page 29, line 18, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory".

Page 32, line 21, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory".

Page 34, line 5, insert the following:

"The determination and order of the Secretary with respect thereto under this section shall be final and conclusive unless the affected applicant for, or recipent of, inspection service files application for judicial review within thirty days after the effective date of such order in the appropriate court as provided in section 404. Judicial review of any such order shall be upon the record upon which the determination and order are based."

Page 34, line 19, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory".

Page 37, line 4, strike the word "territories" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territories".

Page 39, line 21, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory".

Page 40, line 2, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory".

Page 40, line 5, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory".

Page 40, line 14, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. PURCELL

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer two additional amendments that are technical in nature, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Purcell: On page 29, line 14, strike the word "territory" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Territory".

On page 42, line 18, strike "17" and insert in lieu thereof "18".

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell].

The amendments were agreed to.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Smith of Iowa: Strike out all after the enacting clause of H.R. 12144 and insert:

"That this Act may be cited as the Wholesome Meat Act and that the provisions appearing under the subheading 'FOR MEAT INSPECTION:' under the heading 'BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY' in the Act approved March 4, 1907, entitled 'An Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and eight' (34 Stat. 1260–1265, as amended; 21 U.S.C. 71–91), are hereby designated as the 'Federal Meat Inspection Act'; the first twenty paragraphs thereof are hereby designated, respectively, as section 3 through 22, and the twenty-first and twenty-second paragraphs thereof as section 23; and said sections 3 through 23 are hereby designated as 'TITLE I—INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS; ADULTERATION AND MISBRANDING'.

"Sec. 2. The Federal Meat Inspection Act is hereby amended by adding, in title I new sections 1 and 2 reading, respectively, as follows:

"'Section 1. As used in this Act, except as otherwise specified, the following terms shall have the meanings stated below:

"'(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States or his delegatee.

"'(b) The term "firm" means any partnership, association, or other unincorporated business organization.

"'(c) The term "meat broker" means any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of buying or selling carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat, or meat food products of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines on commission, or otherwise negotiating purchases or sales of such articles other than for his own account or as an employee of another person, firm, or corporation,

"'(d) The term "rendered" means any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of rendering carcasses, or parts or products of the carcasses, of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, except rendering conducted under inspection or exemption under title I of this Act.

"'(e) The term "animal food manufacturer" means any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of manufacturing or processing animal food derived wholly or in part from carcasses, or parts or products of the carcasses, of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines.

"'(f) The term "State" means any State of the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"'(g) The term "Territory" means Guam, the Virgin Islands of the United States, American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the United States, excluding the Canal Zone.

"'(h)(1) The term "commerce" means commerce between any State, any Territory, or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof, or within any territory not organized with a legislative body, or the District of Columbia.

"'(h)(2) The term "commerce" shall also mean commerce within any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia which has a substantial effect upon commerce between any State, any Territory, or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof.

"'The operations, activities, or enterprise of any person, firm, or establishment which does not sell meats or meat products that move across State lines shall be deemed to have a substantial effect upon commerce when such operations, activities, and enterprise from rendering, slaughtering, processing and handling meat and meat food products capable of use as human food shall have an annual gross volume of sales in excess of $250,000 exclusive of excise or sales taxes which are separately stated.

"'(i) The term "United States" means the States, the District of Columbia, and the territories of the United States.

"'(j) The term "meat food product" means any product capable of use as human food which is made wholly or in part from any meat or other portion of the carcass of any cattle, sheep, swine, or goats, excepting products which contain meat or other portions of such carcasses only in a relatively small proportion or historically have not been considered by consumers as products of the meat food industry, and which are exempted from definition as a meat food product by the Secretary under such conditions as he may prescribe to assure that the meat or other portions of such carcasses contained in such product are not adulterated and that such products are not represented as meat food products. This term as applied to food products of equines shall have a meaning comparable to that provided in this paragraph with respect to cattle, sheep, swine, and goats.

"'(k) The term "capable of use as human food" shall apply to any carcass, or part or product of a carcass, of any animal, unless it is denatured or otherwise identified as required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary to deter its use as human food, or it is naturally inedible by humans.

"'(l) The term "prepared" means slaughtered, canned, salted, rendered, boned, cut up, or otherwise manufactured or processed.

"'(m) The term "adulterated" shall apply to any carcass, part thereof, meat or meat food product under one or more of the following circumstances:

"'(1) if it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to health; but in case the substance is not an added substance, such article shall not be considered adulterated under this clause if the quantity of such substance in or on such article does not ordinarily render it injurious to health;

"'(2)(A) if it bears or contains (by reason of administration of any substance to the live animal or otherwise) any added poisonous or added deleterious substance (other than one which is (i) a pesticide chemical in or on a raw agricultural commodity; (ii) a food additive; or (iii) a color additive) which may, in the judgment of the Secretary, make such article unfit for human food;

"'(B) if it is, in whole or in part, a raw agricultural commodity and such commodity bears or contains a pesticide chemical which is unsafe within the meaning of section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,

"'(C) if it bears or contains any food additive which is unsafe within the meaning of section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,

"'(D) if it bears or contains any color additive which is unsafe within the meaning of section 706 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: *Provided,* That an article which is not adulterated under clause (B), (C), or (D) shall nevertheless be deemed adulterated if use of the pesticide chemical, food additive, or color additive in or on such article is prohibited by regulations of the Secretary in establishments at which inspection is maintained under title I of this Act;

"'(3) if it consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance or is for any other reason unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food;

"'(4) if it has been prepared, packed, or held under unsanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth, or whereby it may have been rendered injurious to health;

"'(5) if it is, in whole or in part, the product of an animal which has died otherwise than by slaughter;

"'(6) if its container is composed, in whole or in part, of any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render the contents injurious to health;

"'(7) if it has been intentionally subjected to radiation, unless the use of the radiation was in conformity with a regulation or exemption in effect pursuant to section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

"'(8) if any valuable constituent has been in whole or in part omitted or abstracted therefrom; or if any substance has been substituted, wholly or in part therefor; or if damage or inferiority has been concealed in any manner; or if any substance has been added thereto or mixed or packed therewith so as to increase its bulk or weight, or reduce its quality or strength, or make it appear better or of greater value than it is; or

"'(9) if in margarine containing animal fat and any of the raw material used therein consisted in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance.

"'(n) The term "misbranded" shall apply to any carcass, part thereof, meat or meat food product under one or more of the following circumstances:

"'(1) if its labeling is false or misleading in any particular;

"'(2) if it is offered for sale under the name of another food;

"'(3) if it is an imitation of another food, unless its label bears, in type of uniform size and prominence, the word "imitation" and immediately thereafter, the name of the food imitated;

"'(4) if its container is so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading;

"'(5) if in a package or other container unless it bears a label showing (A) the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; and (B) an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count: *Provided,* That under clause (B) of this subparagraph (5), reasonable variations may be permitted, and exemptions as to small packages may be established, by regulations prescribed by the Secretary;

"'(6) if any word, statement, or other information required by or under authority of this Act to appear on the label or other labeling is not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use;

" '(7) if it purports to be or is represented as a food for which a definition and standard of identity or composition has been prescribed by regulations of the Secretary under section 7 of this Act unless (A) it conforms to such definition and standard, and (B) its label bears the name of the food specified in the definition and standard and, insofar as may be required by such regulations, the common names of optional ingredients (other than spices, flavoring, and coloring) present in such food;

" '(8) if it purports to be or is represented as a food for which a standard or standards of fill of container have been prescribed by regulations of the Secretary under section 7 of this Act, and it falls below the standard of fill of container applicable thereto, unless its label bears, in such manner and form as such regulations specify, a statement that it falls below such standard;

" '(9) if it is not subject to the provisions of subparagraph (7), unless its label bears (A) the common or usual name of the food, if any there be, and (B) in case it is fabricated from two or more ingredients, the common or usual name of each such ingredient; except that spices, flavorings, and colorings may, when authorized by the Secretary, be designated as spices, flavorings, and colorings without naming each: *Provided,* That, to the extent that compliance with the requirements of clause (B) of this subparagraph (9) is impracticable, or results in deception or unfair competition, exemptions shall be established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary;

" '(10) if it purports to be or is represented for special dietary uses, unless its label bears such information concerning its vitamin, mineral, and other dietary properties as the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, determines to be, and by regulations prescribes as, necessary in order fully to inform purchasers as to its value for such uses;

" '(11) if it bears or contains any artificial flavoring, artificial coloring, or chemical preservative, unless it bears labeling stating that fact: *Provided,* That, to the extent that compliance with the requirements of this subparagraph (11) is impracticable, exemptions shall be established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary; or

" '(12) if it fails to bear, directly thereon or on its container, as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe, the inspection legend and, unrestricted by any of the foregoing, such other information as the Secretary may require in such regulations to assure that it will not have false or misleading labeling and that the public will be informed of the manner of handling required to maintain the article in a wholesome condition.

" '(o) The term "label" means a display of written, printed, or graphic matter upon the immediate container (not including package liners) of any article.

" '(p) The term "labeling" means all labels and other written, printed, or graphic matter (1) upon any article or any of its containers or wrappers, or (2) accompanying such article.

" '(q) The term "Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act" means the Act so entitled, approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1040), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

" '(r) The terms "pesticide chemical", "food additive", "color additive", and "raw agricultural commodity" shall have the same meanings for purposes of this Act as under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

" '(s) The term "official mark" means the official inspection legend or any other symbol prescribed by regulations of the Secretary to identify the status of any article or animal under this Act.

" '(t) The term "official inspection legend" means any symbol prescribed by regulations of the Secretary showing that an article was inspected and passed in accordance with this Act.

" '(u) The term "official certificate" means any certificate prescribed by regulations of the Secretary for issuance by an inspector or other person performing official functions under this Act.

"Sec. 2. Meat and meat food products are an important source of the Nation's total supply of food. They are consumed throughout the Nation and the major portion thereof moves in interstate or foreign commerce. It is essential in the public interest that the health and welfare of consumers be protected by assuring that meat and meat food products distribtued to them are wholesome, not adulterated, and properly marked, labeled, and packaged. Unwholesome, adulterated, or misbranded meat or meat food products impair the effective regulation of meat and meat food products in interstate or foreign commerce, are injurious to the public welfare, destroy markets for wholesome, not adulterated, and properly labeled and packaged meat and meat food products, and result in sundry losses to livestock producers and processors of meat and meat food products, as well as injury to consumers. The unwholesome, adulterated, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged articles can be sold at lower prices and compete unfairly with the wholesome, not adulterated, and properly labeled and packaged articles, to the detriment of consumers and the public generally. It is hereby found that all articles and animals which are regulated under this Act are either in interstate or foreign commerce or substantially affect such commerce, and that regulation by the Secretary and cooperation by the States and other jurisdictions as contemplated by this Act are appropriate to prevent and eliminate burdens upon such commerce, to effectively regulate such commerce, and to protect the health and welfare of consumers.'

"Sec. 3. Said Act is hereby further amended by—

"(a) deleting the phrase 'interstate or foreign' wherever it appears in sections 3 through 23 of title I of said Act; and

"(b) deleting in section 3 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 71) the phrase 'the Secretary of Agriculture, at his discretion, may' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'the Secretary shall' and deleting the words 'of Agriculture' wherever they appear after the word 'Secretary' thereafter in title I of the Act.

"Sec. 4. Section 4 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 72) is hereby amended by deleting the phrases 'for human consumption' and 'for transportation or sale', and by inserting after the word 'commerce' the phrase 'which are capable of use as human food'.

"Sec. 5. Section 5 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 73) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The Secretary may limit the entry of carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat and meat food products, and other materials into any establishment at which inspection under this title is maintained, under such conditions as he may prescribe to assure that allowing the entry of such articles into such inspected establishments will be consistent with the purposes of this Act.'

"Sec. 6. Section 7 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 75) is hereby amended by—

"(a) deleting the provisions thereof reading as follows: ', and no such meat or meat food products shall be sold or offered for sale by any person, firm, or corporation in interstate or foreign commerce under any false or deceptive name; but established trade name or names which are usual to such products and which are not false and deceptive and which shall be approved by the Secretary are permitted';

"(b) designating the remaining provisions as paragraph (a); and

"(c) adding at the end of said section the following provisions as paragraphs (b) through (e), respectively:

" '(b) All carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat and meat food products inspected at any establishment under the authority of this title and found to be not adulterated, shall at the time they leave the establishment bear, in distinctly legible form, directly thereon or on their containers, as the Secretary may require, the information required under paragraph (n) of section 1 of this Act.

" '(c) The Secretary, whenever he determines such action is necessary for the protection of the public, may prescribe (1) the styles and sizes of type to be used with respect to material required to be incorporated in labeling to avoid false or misleading labeling in marking and labeling any articles or animals subject to this title or title II of this Act; and (2) definitions and standards of identity or composition for articles subject to this title and standards of fill of container for such articles not inconsistent with any such standards established under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and there shall be consultation between the Secretary and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare prior to the issuance of such standards under either Act relating to articles subject to this Act to avoid inconsistency in such standards and possible impairment of the coordinated effective administration of these Acts. There shall also be consultation between the Secretary and an appropriate advisory committee provided for in section 301 of this Act, prior to the issuance of such standards under this Act, to avoid, insofar as feasible, inconsistency between Federal and State standards.

" '(d) No article subject to this title shall be sold or offered for sale by any person, firm, or corporation, in commerce, under any name or other marking or labeling which is false or misleading, or in any container of a misleading form or size, but established trade names and other marking and labeling and containers which are not false or misleading and which are approved by the Secretary are permitted.

" '(e) If the Secretary has reason to believe that any marking or labeling or the size or form of any container in use or proposed for use with respect to any article subject to this title is false or misleading in any particular, he may direct that such use be withheld unless the marking, labeling, or container is modified in such manner as he may prescribe so that it will not be false or misleading. If the person, firm, or corporation using or proposing to use the marking, labeling, or container does not accept the determination of the Secretary, such person, firm, or corporation may request a hearing, but the use of the marking, labeling, or container shall, if the Secretary so directs, be withheld pending hearing and final determination by the Secretary. Any such determination by the Secretary shall be conclusive unless, within thirty days after receipt of notice of such final determination the person, firm, or corporation adversely affected thereby appeals to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such person, firm, or corporation has its principal place of business or to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The provisions of section 204 of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 162, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 194), shall be applicable to appeals taken under this section.'

"Sec. 7. Section 10 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 78) is hereby amended to read:

" 'Sec. 10. No person, firm, or corporation shall, with respect to any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines or any carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat or meat food products of any such animals—

" '(a) slaughter any such animals or prepare any such articles which are capable of use as human food, at any establishment preparing any such articles for commerce, except in compliance with the requirements of this Act;

"'(b) sell, transport, offer for sale or transportation, or receive for transportation, in commerce, (1) any such articles which (A) are capable of use as human food and (B) are adulterated or misbranded at the time of such sale, transportation, offer for sale or transportation, or receipt for transportation; or (2) any articles required to be inspected under this title unless they have been so inspected and passed;

"'(c) do, with respect to any such articles which are capable of use as human food, any act while they are being transported in commerce or held for sale after such transportation which is intended to cause or has the effect of causing such articles to be adulterated or misbranded.'

"SEC. 8. Section 11 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 79) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 11. (a) No brand manufacturer, printer, or other person, firm, or corporation shall cast, print, lithograph, or otherwise make any device containing any official mark or simulation thereof, or any label bearing any such mark or simulation, or any form of official certificate or simulation thereof, except as authorized by the Secretary.

"'(b) No person, firm, or corporation shall—

"'(1) forge any official device, mark, or certificate;

"'(2) without authorization from the Secretary use any official device, mark, or certificate, or simulation thereof, or alter, detach, or destroy any official device, mark, or certificate;

"'(3) contrary to the regulations prescribed by the Secretary, fail to use, or to detach, deface, or destroy any official device, mark, or certificate;

"'(4) knowingly possess, without promptly notifying the Secretary or his representative, any official device or any counterfeit, simulated, forged, or improperly altered official certificate or any device or label or any carcass of any animal, or part or product thereof, bearing any counterfeit, simulated, forged, or improperly altered official mark;

"'(5) knowingly make any false statement in any shipper's certificate or other nonofficial or official certificate provided for in the regulations prescribed by the Secretary; or

"'(6) knowingly represent that any article has been inspected and passed, or exempted, under this Act when, in fact, it has, respectively, not been so inspected and passed, or exempted.'

"SEC. 9. The present provisions of section 19 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 87) are hereby deleted and the following new provisions are substituted therefor:

"'SEC. 19. No person, firm, or corporation shall sell, transport, offer for sale or transportation, or receive for transportation, in commerce, any carcasses of horses, mules, or other equines or parts of such carcasses, or the meat or meat food products thereof, unless they are plainly and conspicuously marked or labeled or otherwise identified as required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary to show the kinds of animals from which they were derived. When required by the Secretary, with respect to establishments at which inspection is maintained under this title, such animals and their carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products shall be prepared in establishments separate from those in which cattle, sheep, swine, or goats are slaughtered or their carcasses, parts thereof, meat or meat food products are prepared.'

"SEC. 10. The present provisions of section 20 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 88) are hereby deleted and the following new provisions are substituted therefor:

"'SEC. 20. (a) No carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat or meat food products of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines which are capable of use as human food, shall be imported into the United States if such articles are adulterated or misbranded and unless they comply with all the inspection, building construction standards, and all other provisions of this Act and regulations issued thereunder applicable to such articles in commerce within the United States. All such imported articles shall, upon entry into the United States, be deemed and treated as domestic articles subject to the other provisions of this Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: *Provided*, That they shall be marked and labeled as required by such regulations for imported articles: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall apply to any individual who purchases meat or meat products outside the United States for his own consumption except that the total amount of such meat or meat products shall not exceed fifty pounds.

"'(b) The Secretary may prescribe the terms and conditions for the destruction of all such articles which are imported contrary to this section, unless (1) they are exported by the consignee within the time fixed therefor by the Secretary, or (2) in the case of articles which are not in compliance with the Act solely because of misbranding such articles are brought into compliance with the Act under supervision of authorized representatives of the Secretary.

"'(c) All charges for storage, cartage, and labor with respect to any article which is imported contrary to this section shall be paid by the owner or consignee, and in default of such payment shall constitute a lien against such article and any other article thereafter imported under this Act by or for such owner or consignee.

"'(d) The knowing importation of any article contrary to this section is prohibited.'

"SEC. 11. Section 23 of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 23. (a) The provisions of this title requiring inspection of the slaughter of animals and the preparation of the carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products at establishments conducting such operations for commerce shall not apply to the slaughtering by any person of animals of his own raising, and the preparation by him and transportation in commerce of the carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products of such animals exclusively for use by him and members of his household and his nonpaying guests and employees; nor to the custom slaughter by any person, firm, or corporation of cattle, sheep, swine, or goats, delivered by the owner thereof for such slaughter, and the preparation by such slaughter and transportation in commerce of the carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products of such animals, exclusively for use, in the household of such owner, by him and members of his household and his nonpaying guests and employees: *Provided*, That such custom slaughterer does not engage in the business of buying or selling any carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat or meat food products of any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, or equines, capable of use as human food.

"'(b) The Secretary may, under such sanitary conditions as he may by regulation prescribe, exempt from the inspection requirements of this title the slaughter of animals, and the preparation of carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products, by any person, firm, or corporation in any Territory or the District of Columbia solely for distribution within such jurisdiction when the Secretary determines that it is impracticable to provide such inspection within the limits of funds appropriated for administration of this Act and that such exemption will otherwise facilitate enforcement of this Act. The Secretary may refuse, withdraw, or modify any exemption under this paragraph (b) in his discretion whenever he determines such action is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"'(c) The adulteration and misbranding provisions of this title, other than the requirement of the inspection legend, shall apply to articles which are exempted from inspection or not required to be inspected under this section.'

"SEC. 12. Said Act is hereby further amended by—

"(a) deleting the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, and goats' and the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, or goats' wherever they appear in title I of the Act and substituting therefor, respectively, the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, and other equines' and the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, and other equines';

"(b) in sections 3 and 4 (21 U.S.C. 71, 72), deleting the phrase 'unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food' each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'adulterated';

"(c) in section 4 (21 U.S.C. 72), deleting the phrase 'sound, healthful, wholesome, and fit for human food' and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'not adulterated';

"(d) in section 4 (21 U.S.C. 72), deleting the phrase 'unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or in any way unfit for human food' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'adulterated';

"(e) in section 6 (21 U.S.C. 74), deleting the phrase 'sound, healthful, and wholesome, and which contain no dyes, chemicals, preservatives, or ingredients which render such meat or meat food products unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food' and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'not adulterated', and deleting the phrase 'unsound, unhealthful, and unwholesome, or which contain dyes, chemicals, preservatives, or ingredients which render such meat or meat food products unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'adulterated';

"(f) in section 8 (21 U.S.C. 76), deleting the phrase 'unclean, unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'adulterated';

"(g) in section 17 (21 U.S.C. 85), deleting the phrase 'or goat meat, being the meat of animals killed after the passage of this Act, or except as hereinbefore provided' and substituting therefor the phrase 'goat or equine meat';

"(h) in section 18 (21 U.S.C. 86), deleting the phrase 'sound and wholesome.'; and

"(i) in section 21 (21 U.S.C. 89), deleting the phrase 'sound, healthful, wholesome, and fit for human food, and to contain no dyes, chemicals, preservatives, or ingredients which render such meat food product unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food; and to have been prepared under proper sanitary conditions, hereinbefore provided for' and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'not adulterated'.

"SEC. 13. Said Act is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section in title I:

"'SEC. 24. The Secretary may by regulations prescribe conditions under which carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat, and meat food products of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, capable of use as human food, shall be stored or otherwise handled by any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of buying, selling, freezing, storing, or transporting, in or for commerce, or importing, such articles, whenever the Secretary deems such action necessary to assure that such articles will not be adulterated or misbranded when delivered to the consumer. Violation of any such regulation is prohibited. However, such regulations shall not apply to the storage or handling of such articles at any retail store or other establishment that would be subject to this section only because of purchases in commerce, if the storage and handling of such articles at such establishment is regulated under the laws of the State or Territory or the District of Columbia in which such establishment is located, in a manner which the Secretary, after consultation with the appropriate advisory committee provided for in section 301 of this Act, determines is adequate to effectuate the purposes of this section.'

"Sec. 14. Said Act is hereby further amended by adding after title I thereof the following new sections as:

" 'TITLE II—MEAT PROCESSORS AND RELATED INDUSTRIES

" 'Sec. 201. Inspection shall not be provided under title I of this Act at any establishment for the slaughter of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or the preparation of any carcasses or parts or products of such animals, which are not intended for use as human food, but such articles shall, prior to their offer for sale or transportation in commerce, unless naturally inedible by humans, be denatured or otherwise identified as prescribed by regulations of the Secretary to deter their use for human food. No person, firm, or corporation shall buy, sell, transport, or offer for sale or transportation, or receive for transportation, in commerce, or import, any carcasses, parts thereof, meat or meat food products of any such animals, which are not intended for use as human food unless they are denatured or otherwise identified as required by the regulations of the Secretary or are naturally inedible by humans.

" 'Sec. 202. (a) The following classes of persons, firms, and corporations shall keep such records as will fully and correctly disclose all transactions involved in their businesses; and all persons, firms, and corporations subject to such requirements shall, at all reasonable times, upon notice by a duly authorized representative of the Secretary, afford such representative access to their places of business and opportunity to examine the facilities, inventory, and records thereof, to copy all such records, and to take reasonable samples of their inventory upon payment of the fair market value therefor—

" '(1) Any persons, firms, or corporations that engage, for commerce, in the business of slaughtering any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or preparing, freezing, packaging, or labeling any carcasses, or parts or products of carcasses, of any such animals, for use as human food or animal food;

" '(2) Any persons, firms, or corporations that engage in the business of buying or selling (as meat brokers, wholesalers or otherwise), or transporting, in commerce, or storing in or for commerce, or importing, any carcasses, or parts or products of carcasses, of any such animals;

" '(3) Any persons, firms, or corporations that engage in business, in or for commerce, as renderers, or engage in the business of buying, selling, or transporting, in commerce, or importing, any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or parts of the carcasses of any such animals that died otherwise than by slaughter.

" '(b) Any record required to be maintained by this section shall be maintained for such period of time as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe.

" 'Sec. 203. No person, firm, or corporation shall engage in business, in or for commerce, as a meat broker, renderer, or animal food manufacturer, or engage in business in commerce as a wholesaler of any carcasses, or parts or products of the carcasses, of any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, whether intended for human food or other purposes, or engage in business as a public warehouseman storing any such articles in or for commerce, or engage in the business of buying, selling, or transporting in commerce, or importing, any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased animals of the specified kinds, or parts of the carcasses of any such animals that died otherwise than by slaughter, unless, when required by regulations of the Secretary, he has registered with the Secretary his name, and the address of each place of business at which, and all trade names under which, he conducts such business.

" 'Sec. 204. No person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of buying, selling, or transporting in commerce, or importing, dead, dying, disabled, or diseased animals, or any parts of the carcasses of any animals that died otherwise than by slaughter, shall buy, sell, transport, offer for sale or transportation, or receive for transportation, in commerce, or import, any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or parts of the carcasses of any such animals that died otherwise than by slaughter, unless such transaction, transportation, or importation is made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe to assure that such animals, or the unwholesome parts or products thereof, will be prevented from being used for human food purposes.

" 'Sec. 205. The authority conferred on the Secretary by section 202, 203, or 204 of this title with respect to persons, firms, and corporations engaged in the specified kinds of business in or for commerce may be exercised with respect to persons, firms, or corporations engaged, in any State or territory or the District of Columbia, in such kinds of business but not in or for commerce, whenever the Secretary determines, after consultation with an appropriate advisory committee provided for in section 301 of this Act, that the State, Territory, or District does not have comparable authority under its laws or such authority is not exercised in a manner to effectuate the purposes of this Act; and in such case the provisions of section 202, 203, or 204, respectively, shall apply to such persons, firms, and corporations to the same extent and in the same manner as if they were engaged in such business in or for commerce and the transactions involved were in commerce.'

"Sec. 15. Said Act is hereby further amended by adding after title II thereof the following new section as:

" 'TITLE III—FEDERAL AND STATE COOPERATION

" 'Sec. 301. (a) It is the policy of the Congress to protect the consuming public from meat and meat food products that are adulterated or misbranded and to assist in efforts by State and other Government agencies to accomplish this objective. In furtherance of this policy—

" '(1) The Secretary is authorized, whenever he determines that it would effectuate the purposes of this Act, to cooperate with the appropriate State agency in developing and administering a State meat inspection program in any State which has enacted a State meat inspection law that imposes mandatory ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection and sanitation requirements that are consistent with those under title I of this Act, with respect to all or certain classes of persons engaged in the State in slaughtering cattle, sheep, swine, goats, or equines, or preparing the carcasses, parts thereof, meat or meat food products, of any such animals for the use as human food solely for distribution within such State. During the period ending five years from the effective date of this Act, a State law and the enforcement thereof which qualifies establishments operated thereunder for Federal grading service shall be deemed to meet the requirements under this title relating to the construction, fitting, and equipping of facilities.

" '(2) The Secretary is further authorized, whenever he determines that it would effectuate the purposes of this Act, to cooperate with appropriate State agencies in developing and administering State programs under State laws containing authorities comparable to those provided in title II of this Act; and to cooperate with other agencies of the United States in carrying out any provisions of this Act.

" '(3) Cooperation with State agencies under this section may include furnishing to the appropriate State agency (i) advisory assistance in planning and otherwise developing an adequate State program under the State law; and (ii) technical and laboratory assistance and training (including necessary curricular and instructional materials and equipment), and financial and other aid for administration of such a program. The amount to be contributed to any State by the Secretary under this section from Federal funds for any year shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated total cost of the cooperative program; and the Federal funds shall be allocated among the States desiring to cooperate on an equitable basis. Such cooperation and payment shall be contingent at all times upon the administration of the State program in a manner which the Secretary, in consultation with the appropriate advisory committee appointed under paragraph (4), deems adequate to effectuate the purposes of this section.

" '(4) The Secretary may appoint advisory committees consisting of such representatives of appropriate State agencies as the Secretary and the State agencies may designate to consult with him concerning State and Federal programs with respect to meat inspection and other matters within the scope of this Act, including evaluating State programs for purposes of this Act and obtaining better coordination and more uniformity among the State programs and between the Federal and State programs and adequate protection of consumers.

" '(b) The appropriate State agency with which the Secretary may cooperate under this Act shall be a single agency in the State which is primarily responsible for the coordination of the State programs having objectives similar to those under this Act. When the State program includes performance of certain functions by a municipality or other subordinate governmental unit, such unit shall be deemed to be a part of the State agency for purposes of this section.

" '(c) As used in this section, the term "State" means any State (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) or Territory as defined in section 1 of this Act; or the District of Columbia.'

"Sec. 16. Said Act is hereby further amended by adding after title III thereof, the following new sections as:

" 'TITLE IV—AUXILIARY PROVISIONS

" 'Sec. 401. The Secretary may (for such period, or indefinitely, as he deems necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act) refuse to provide, or withdraw, inspection service under title I of this Act with respect to any establishment if he determines, after opportunity for a hearing is accorded to the applicant for, or recipient of, such service, that such applicant or recipient is unfit to engage in any business requiring inspection under title I because the applicant or recipient, or anyone responsibly connected with the applicant or recipient, has been convicted, in any Federal or State court, of (1) any felony, or (2) more than one violation of any law, other than a felony, based upon the acquiring, handling, or distributing of unwholesome, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged food or upon fraud in connection with transactions in food. This section shall not affect in any way other provisions of this Act for withdrawal of inspection services under title I from establishments failing to maintain sanitary conditions or to destroy condemned carcasses, parts, meat or meat food products.

" 'For the purpose of this section a person shall be deemed to be responsibly connected with the business if he was a partner, officer, director, holder, or owner of 10 per centum or more of its voting stock or employed in a managerial or executive capacity.

" 'The determination and order of the Secretary with respect thereto under this section shall be final and conclusive unless the affected applicant for, or recipient of, inspection service files application for judicial review within thirty days after the effective date of such order in the appropriate court as provided in section 404. Judicial review of any such order shall be upon the record upon which the determination and order are based.

" 'SEC. 402. Whenever any carcass, part of a carcass, meat or meat food product of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or any product exempted from the definition of a meat food product, or any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased cattle, sheep, swine, goat, or equine is found by any authorized representative of the Secretary upon any premises where it is held for purposes of, or during or after distribution in, commerce or otherwise subject to title I or II of this Act, and there is reason to believe that any such article is adulterated or misbranded and is capable of use as human food, or that it has not been inspected, in violation of the provisions of title I of this Act or of any other Federal law or the laws of any State or Territory, or the District of Columbia, or that such article or animal has been or is intended to be, distributed in violation of any such provision, it may be detained by such representative for a period not to exceed twenty days, pending action under section 403 of this Act or notification of any Federal, State, or other governmental authorities having jurisdiction over such article or animal, and shall not be moved by any person, firm, or corporation from the place at which it is located when so detained, until released by such representative. All official marks may be required by such representative to be removed from such article or animal before it is released unless it appears to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the article or animal is eligible to retain such marks.

" 'SEC. 403. (a) Any carcass, part of a carcass, meat or meat food product of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules or other equines, or any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased cattle, sheep, swine, goat, or equine, that is being transported in commerce or otherwise subject to title I or II of this Act, or is held for sale in the United States after such transportation, and that (1) is or has been prepared, sold, transported, or otherwise distributed or offered or received for distribution in violation of this Act, or (2) is capable of use as human food and is adulterated or misbranded, or (3) in any other way is in violation of this Act, shall be liable to be proceeded against and seized and condemned, at any time, on a libel of information in any United States district court or other proper court as provided in section 404 of this Act within the jurisdiction of which the article or animal is found. If the article or animal is condemned it shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may direct and the proceeds, if sold, less the court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, but the article or animal shall not be sold contrary to the provisions of this Act, or the laws of the jurisdiction in which it is sold: *Provided*, That upon the execution and delivery of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that the article or animal shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to the provisions of this Act, or the laws of the jurisdiction in which disposal is made, the court may direct that such article or animal be delivered to the owner thereof subject to such supervision by authorized representatives of the Secretary as is necessary to insure compliance with the applicable laws. When a decree of condemnation is entered against the article or animal and it is released under bond, or destroyed, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the article or animal. The proceedings in such libel cases shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the proceedings in admiralty, except that either party may demand trial by jury of any issue of fact joined in any case, and all such proceedings shall be at the suit of and in the name of the United States.

" '(b) The provisions of this section shall in no way derogate from authority for condemnation or seizure conferred by other provisions of this Act, or other laws.

" 'SEC. 404. The United States district courts, the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the highest court of American Samoa, and the United States courts of the other Territories, are vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce, and to prevent and restrain violations of, this Act, and shall have jurisdiction in all other kinds of cases arising under this Act, except as provided in section 7(e) of this Act.

" 'SEC. 405. Any person who forcibly assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with any person while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties under this Act shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both. Whoever, in the commission of any such acts, uses a deadly or dangerous weapon, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both. Whoever kills any person while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties under this Act shall be punished as provided under sections 1111 and 1114 of title 18, United States Code.

" 'SEC. 406. (a) Any person, firm, or corporation who violates any provision of this Act for which no other criminal penalty is provided by this Act shall upon conviction be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year, or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both such imprisonment and fine; but if such violation involves intent to defraud, or any distribution or attempted distribution of an article that is adulterated, except as defined in section 1(m)(8) of this Act, such person, firm, or corporation shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than three years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both: *Provided*, That no person, firm, or corporation shall be subject to penalties under this section for receiving for transportation any article or animal in violation of this Act if such receipt was made in good faith, unless such person, firm, or corporation refuses to furnish on request of a representative of the Secretary the name and address of the person from which he received such article or animal, and copies of all documents, if any there be, pertaining to the delivery of the article or animal to him.

" '(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as requiring the Secretary to report for prosecution or for the institution of libel or injunction proceedings, minor violations of this Act whenever he believes that the public interest will be adequately served by a suitable written notice of warning.

" 'SEC. 407. For the efficient administration and enforcement of this Act, the provisions (including penalties) of sections 6, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act entitled "An Act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes", approved September 26, 1914 (38 Stat. 721–723, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 46, 48, 49, and 50) (except paragraphs (c) through (h) of section 6 and the last paragraph of section 9), and the provisions of subsection 409(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1096, as amended; 47 U.S.C. 409(1)), are made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary in administering and enforcing the provisions of this Act and to any person, firm, or corporation with respect to whom such authority is exercised. The Secretary, in person or by such agents as he may designate, may prosecute any inquiry necessary to his duties under this Act in any part of the United States, and the powers conferred by said sections 9 and 10 of the Act of September 26, 1914, as amended, on the district courts of the United States may be exercised for the purposes of this Act by any court designated in section 404 of this Act.

" 'SEC. 408. Requirements within the scope of this Act with respect to premises, facilities, and operations of any establishment at which inspection is provided under title I of this Act, which are in addition to, or different than those made under this Act may not be imposed by any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, except that any such jurisdiction may impose recordkeeping and other requirements within the scope of section 202 of this Act, if consistent therewith, with respect to any such establishment. Marking, labeling, packaging, or ingredient requirements in addition to, or different than, those made under this Act may not be imposed by any State or Territory or the District of Columbia with respect to articles prepared at any establishment under inspection in accordance with the requirements under title I of this Act, but any State or Territory or the District of Columbia may, consistent with the requirements under this Act, exercise concurrent jurisdiction with the Secretary over articles required to be inspected under said title, for the purpose of preventing the distribution for human food purposes of any such articles which are adulterated or misbranded and are outside of such an establishment, or, in the case of imported articles which are not at such an establishment, after their entry into the United States. This Act shall not preclude any State or Territory or the District of Columbia from making requirement or taking other action, consistent with this Act, with respect to any other matters regulated under this Act.

" 'During the period ending five years from the effective date of this Act, slaughtering, processing, and fabricating establishments, persons or firms engaged in commerce as described in section 2, subsection 1(h)2 of this Act which meet the existing requirements for recognition for Federal grading service for establishments operated under non-Federal meat inspection systems shall be deemed to meet those requirements of this Act relating to the construction, fitting, and equipping of facilities.

" 'SEC. 409. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, including section 902(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 392(a)), the provisions of this Act shall not derogate from any authority conferred by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prior to enactment hereof.

" '(b) The detainer authority conferred by section 402 of this Act shall apply to any authorized representative of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for purposes of the enforcement of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to any carcass, part thereof, meat, or meat food product of cattle, sheep, swine, goat, or equines that is outside any premises at which inspection is being maintained under this Act, and for such purposes the first reference to the Secretary in section 402 shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

" 'SEC. 410. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.'

"SEC. 17. The Secretary of Agriculture shall annually report to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate on the operations and effectiveness of this Act.

"SEC. 18. The provisions relating to equine meat and meat food products beginning with the phrase 'And, hereafter,' under the heading 'BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY' and the subheading 'MEAT INSPECTION, BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY:' in the Act approved July 24, 1919, entitled 'An Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and twenty' (41 Stat. 241; 21 U.S.C. 96), and paragraph (b) of section 306 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 689, as amended; 19 U.S.C. 1306(b)) are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 19. If any provision of this Act or of the amendments made hereby or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and the remaining amendments and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 20. This act shall become effective upon enactment except as provided in paragraphs (a) through (d):

"(a) The provisions of paragraph (b)(1) and (c) of section 10 and the provisions of section 20 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended by sections 7 and 10 of this Act, and the provisions of section 17 of this Act repealing paragraph (b) of section 306 of the Tariff Act of 1930, shall become effective upon the expiration of sixty days after enactment hereof.

"(b) The provisions of title I of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended by this Act, shall become effective with respect to equines (other than horses) and their carcasses and parts thereof, meat, and meat food products thereof upon the expiration of sixty days after enactment hereof.

"(c) Section 11 of this Act, amending section 23 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, shall become effective sixty days after enactment hereof.

"(d) Section 204 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as added by section 14 of this Act, shall become effective upon the expiration of sixty days after enactment hereof."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, in lieu of reading the full substitute amendment, that just those portions that are different be read, and they are marked and indicated on pages 3, 31, 34, 41, and 43, and that the substitute amendment then be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Ninety-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 353]

Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Baring
Battin
Berry
Blatnik
Boggs
Broomfield
Button
Celler
Diggs
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fountain
Giaimo
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Hébert
Helstoski
Herlong
Holland
Kuykendall
Laird
Long, La.
McCulloch
Mathias, Md.
Moss
Rarick
Resnick
St. Onge
Stuckey
Williams, Miss.
Wright
Wyatt

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 12144, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 394 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want, first of all, to make it crystal clear what the difference is between these two bills. There has been a considerable amount of absolutely false information distributed by the meat industry, and there was a false and misleading editorial in the morning Post.

Mr. Chairman, every word that is contained in the committee bill is contained in this substitute. But in addition to what is contained in the committee bill, the substitute takes in an additional 6,000 plants that do more than $250,000 worth of business per year but which are not now covered in the committee bill. Actually, I introduced both of these bills over a period of years. I think we need the additional coverage. I would rather have the committee bill than nothing. But I think we ought to include more plants.

Mr. Chairman, this comes about as a result of the very peculiar definition of interstate commerce under the existing meat inspection law which is nothing but an amendment on a 1906 appropriation bill.

Under that provision it is considered that only those plants which sell meat across the State line are in interstate commerce. Under no other major Federal law do we have that definition. Under the other laws, like the labor law and the minimum wage law, we determine whether or not a plant is in interstate commerce according to volume.

The committee bill uses the old definition, and exempts 15 percent of all of the slaughterhouses in the United States, and 25 percent of all of the processing plants and exempts 8.7 billion pounds of meat from nonfederally inspected plants; it exempts 14,000 plants.

Our bill takes in 6,000 of those 14,000 plants, and leaves out 8,000 that do a total of 3 percent of the volume of business in the United States.

In other words, our bill, the substitute, takes in 6,000 of the 14,000 the committee bill leaves out. But when measured by volume, it will cover 97 percent of the meat in volume. Some of the big plants that are left out under the committee bill are really very big plants, and it is in the big plants that we have so much unfair advantage in the meat business.

These pictures I have up here are an example of what I am talking about.

I will explain how the substitute will work in this plant. This is a plant in the State of Illinois that is subject to the minimum wage law, but it is not subject to the Federal law on meat inspection, and it will not be federally inspected under the committee bill. It does considerably in excess of $250,000 worth of business a year. It is a boning plant. You will see in the pictures they are boning veal.

I will explain to you some of the difference in the Federal inspection law as compared to the situation that exists there now. Here is a man boning veal. You may notice the wall which, as you can see, is not the kind of material that can be washed with 180° water at least once a day. In fact, it is just soft fiber board of some kind, and it probably has not been washed in 5 years.

He has a knife sticking in this crack here.

Under Federal requirements, they are not permitted to have cracks in the walls, and they cannot stick knives in the wall such as he is doing here. They would have to have a wall that is of such construction that it can be washed with 180° water at least once a day. This is the kind of a wall where diseases and germs could be carried through the meat to human beings.

In addition to that picture, we have over here a picture of a rendering truck backing into the same dock where the meat is loaded and unloaded. These rendering trucks, as everyone knows, are heavily infested with flies and usually covered with filth. They haul spoiled products and even dead animals. In a federally inspected plant, they are not permitted to back a rendering truck into the same dock from which they load and unload meat for human consumption. They would have to have a different dock for that. Rat-infested trash is also near the dock and that would not be permitted under Federal inspection.

Then in the other photo, you will see a number of veal carcasses. The man who is doing the boning is working in very cramped quarters. He does not have enough room, so he has the top part of the carcass on the bench, and the bottom half of the carcass is on the floor. This would not be permitted in a federally inspected plant.

If this bill passes this plant will go out of business unless they correct these conditions, and change their facilities so as to meet the sanitation requirements. Some sanitary plant will handle that business.

In addition to that, this plant, just because it does not sell across State lines, and very carefully avoids that——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Iowa was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, just because they do not sell across State lines, they can sell both uninspected and inspected carcasses.

They buy uninspected because they are cheaper, as long as they can get them perhaps 10 cents per pound cheaper. The carcasses that come from uninspected plants can be sold cheaper because they do not lose as much poundage that is rejected by inspectors. In Federally inspected plants, 7 percent of the carcasses have at least some part rejected by the federal inspectors.

In addition to that, the noninspected plant can buy sick animals which would not go to a federally inspected plant because the seller would fear that they would be rejected. They can handle uninspected carcasses at this plant just because they do not sell sell across the State line. The animals may have come from some place 1,000 miles away, but that does not make any difference at all in determining Federal jurisdiction over inspection either.

They may be sold to a supermarket and many of these are sold through a big supermarket, but that does not result in their being covered by the Federal jurisdiction under this law.

If a housewife goes into a supermarket and in that supermarket she sees a federally inspected and a nonfederally inspected cut of meat side by side, she just cannot really tell the difference unless she looks carefully at the label, which is not always on it.

In addition to that, the processed meat that is sold from nonfederally inspected plants can in many cases be very much mislabeled.

Sometimes the meat products from these plants have a large portion of barley flour in it, a lot of lungs, blood, chopped hides and various kinds of inferior parts, but they in many cases do not show that on the label. Even though it might have a lot of inferior products in it, there is nothing to keep them from doing it because the deceptive labeling requirements of the Federal law do not apply to these large plants which avoid Federal inspection under the existing loophole and in many cases the State laws do not do anything about it either. Sustituting inferior meat for wholesome meat is also against the interest of the producers.

In some States where they have a State law, they do not have an adequate number of inspectors. For instance, in Iowa where even though it is a weak law, they do not have enough inspectors to administer that weak law.

I think if we leave 8,000 of the plants that are uninspected under Federal and State cooperation, that will have more than the States will ever take care of. I do not think most of them are going to handle that much jurisdiction. We may be back here in a couple of years with some other kind of bill. But I say this again, and I want this to be crystal clear, the committee bill leaves 14,000 plants without Federal inspection. Our amendment would place 6,000 of these plants that are the biggest or the medium-sized plants that are doing over $250,000 of business under Federal responsibility and leave the other 8,000 for Federal-State cooperation.

Of these 14,000 plants, 5,000 are not fully inspected by the State, city, or federally, or any level of government. However, they are not necessarily the same 6,000 that we would cover in the substitute.

The State and Federal cooperation provision is word for word the same in the committee bill as it is in the substitute. As a matter of fact, in both it is an adaptation of the Smith-Talmadge bill which was passed 5 years ago but is specifically applied to the meat inspection services in these bills.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I would like to ask the gentleman if his amendment includes the 50-percent exemption.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, it does; except for these provisions, as I said.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman made a statement that there are hardly enough State inspectors to carry on.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There are hardly enough State inspectors. There will have to be a lot of inspectors trained both by the State and Federal Government. It does not take any more inspectors for the Federal system than it does for the State unless the States do a sloppy job. If they do the same job, it will take the same number.

Mr. DENT. It might interest the members of the committee to know that in Pennsylvania we have 1,753 plants to be inspected. We have 500 plants that are covered by Federal inspectors and there are 199 inspectors for the 500 plants. For the 1,253 plants we have a total of 49 in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is no evidence that the States will ever do any more than would be necessary to inspect the plants we have exempted under our substitute bill. Certainly, they will never do nearly as much as they would have to do to fill the responsibility that is exempted from Federal coverage under the committee bill. In addition to the slaughterhouses and the processing plants they should be going to the retail establishments, but very few have hardly touched that area of responsibility and do not propose to do so.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman just said that there was no evidence that the States will do any more than they would be expected to do under the amendment, is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is no evidence that the States will do any more than cover the 8,000 that are left exempt under the substitute.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MAY. I would point out to the gentleman that in our hearings we received testimony as to how various States are now moving in preparing legislation that covers the situations that the gentleman is talking about.

I think it is quite important to remember that every meatpacking organization, farm organization, the national associations, and the directors of agriculture have all pledged to continue their present activities to get a model State law comparable to Federal law passed in their respective States. I feel that the amendment would be an extra burden put on those in the industry. We have attempted to help them overcome their cost problem, and in that respect the committee bill would result in a great improvement.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Iowa was permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if the difference between the committee bill and the bill that you and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] are substituting is that there is no requirement in the committee bill that the States develop the kind of inspection now operated by the Federal Government.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is no requirement whatever in either bill that the States do anything about the smallest 8,000 plants. We already know that many of them will not do it. We would take 6,000 of the 14,000 from their responsibility and if they have a smaller group to work on, they have a better chance to do a better job.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The Smith-Foley substitute would assure Federal inspection for the great bulk of meat now slaughtered and sold intrastate; Federal inspection would be required in all of those plants excepting those doing less than $250,000 in business.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is correct.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. There is little other difference between the two bills, is that not so?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is the main difference.

I would say to the gentlewoman from Washington that I have seen an example of the States not wanting to fulfill responsibility in the State of Iowa. We had a secretary of agriculture who has been referred to here on the floor today—and I would not have mentioned him if he had not been referred to. In 1964 he was opposed to an inspection bill. He was defeated that year and the State legislature then passed a bill. It was a watered-down bill, but they passed one anyhow. Now he is back into office and now embraces that bill, using it as an excuse to say "We do not need a Federal law."

This year, at first he opposed what is now the committee bill. Then after the meat institute abandoned that position, he decided he also would support that instead of something more adequate. Now he is opposed to the Smith-Foley bill and says, "We will live with that other bill." He had to be dragged this far step by step.

This is what they do. When the pressure is on, they talk favorably about fulfilling their responsibilities. As soon as the pressure is off, they forget about it. If this amendment is not passed, you will see the biggest relaxation ever by State secretaries of agriculture and State legislatures.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. If we accept what the gentleman has said, there is no point in passing either bill, because those that would be under the $250,000 limitation would just get worse, and even under this reported bill they would not be taken care of. As the chairman of the committee has said, after weeks of hearings, the bill would be adequate for small plants, where we have most of our trouble. But if the committee bill is not going to do any good, neither would the committee bill as amended.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The committee bill would leave to State inspectors the inspection of bigger plants, rather than concentrating on the little ones where you say all the trouble is. At least the substitute makes sure those over $250,000 in annual sales will be inspected.

Mrs. MAY. If the Smith-Foley substitute is adopted, pressure on the States to enact a complete inspection program for all intrastate plans will really be off. That would include the Governor, the directors of agriculture, and the people who have been demanding this action. You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There has been pressure for 60 years, and eight States have not done a solitary thing. We cannot assume that all that is left undone by this committee bill will be taken care of subsequently.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. A moment ago we were talking about inspectors and numbers of inspectors. The gentleman agrees, does he not, that in many States where we have small plants there is an ante mortem inspection and a post mortem inspection, not only of the carcass, but all the organs which are normally checked by inspectors?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Not all the organs, no.

Mr. KYL. By local officers who are working under the State government?

Let us stop there just before the gentleman gets to that last point. The majority in Iowa, for example, have ante mortem and post mortem inspections, but the inspector is not there when the organs are removed, he does not observe the lymph glands, and there is no identity of the organs with the carcass, and there is no opportunity to see all that could be wrong with the animal. He may arrive later in the day or the next morning for the post mortem, and he saw it standing on the hoof, but in the meantime, in most small plants the inspector does not see anything.

In the plants I inspected in Iowa last week, the organs normally were inspected, which included the head, heart, lungs, and all were marked and identified with the same mark as the carcass.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That must have been one of the larger plants.

Mr. KYL. There were several plants, and the biggest is just under the $250,000 limit, and the others range downward from that.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize we have spoken most of the afternoon about the implications to be drawn from this problem. I do not intend to draw any erroneous conclusions from my very good friend Mr. SMITH's comments here.

I do want to point out that I adhere to the notion that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] intends this body to believe that if the committee bill is adopted, there would be nothing done about the circumstance that he shows and claims to go on in Illinois. I would only point this out. We have no way of knowing whether these are recent pictures, or old, or when or where they were taken.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, they were taken a week ago yesterday.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I guess it does not make much difference whether I yield or not, but I appreciate the added effort.

I would point out, under Mr. SMITH's approach to this problem, the problem right here, that the plants will be given 5 years to correct.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. PURCELL. No, Mr. Chairman, I will not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. PURCELL. The gentleman will say his bill is going to do the same thing as my bill, the committee bill, does. This is my bill. I am proud of it. But the gentleman lets the States take 5 years to comply with the requirements set out here. Then, like the committee bill, his bill requires that plants get cleaned up immediately. The committee bill will not give away any free time to correct this problem, immediately after the legislature in Illinois meets the next time.

I have in my possession a telegram that my office received today, signed by Mr. Robert M. Schneider, director of the Illinois Department of Agriculture. This telegram in part says:

> Illinois having voted in the affirmative for the NASDA proposition of H.R. 12144—

And, let me interject that the NASDA proposition is the unanimous resolve from the State departments of agriculture that the States be given this responsibility given them by H.R. 12144—

> a bill to amend the meat inspection law, further supports H.R. 12144 as an effective way to provide the most wholesome meat to all consumers.

That is signed by the director of the Illinois Department of Agriculture.

I would point out that the Illinois director of the Department of Agriculture reaffirmed the stand taken by his association, mentioning that his State along with other States that belong to this association will proceed—and I cannot help it if they have waited 60 years, they are not waiting longer—to shoulder their share of the responsibility to provide clean and wholesome meat for their people.

Under the Smith-Foley approach, I repeat, in order to correct the building—and that is exactly what they said—they would be given 5 years to comply with the architectural requirements.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. No, not right now. I do not know whether I have enough nerve to ask for extensions two or three times.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have an extension of 5 minutes, so that he will have time to yield.

Mr. PURCELL. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. I will yield to the gentleman in just a minute.

The conclusion seems to be presented to us today that only Federal inspectors will correct the kind of thing we see here in this picture. This situation obviously is not being inspected by anybody who even knows what he is doing.

A Federal inspector, we believe, is very efficient. There was not a scintilla of evidence presented to our committee or on this floor today, to show that under this bill a State inspecting system would be any less effective. In order for the State to participate, with a 50-percent contribution by the Federal Government, the requirement is that the State must meet the Federal requirements, which will, I can assure my colleague, prohibit this from being the case. This will become effective when the legislation is enacted.

To me this is the most significant thing talked about regarding this set of pictures today.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not true, if we expect to get effective State inspection, we have to cooperate with the States to some degree?

Is it not also true that all of the States, by unanimous vote of the Commissioners of agriculture, endorsed the committee bill and not the Smith-Foley bill?

Mr. PURCELL. That is exactly true.

Mr. POAGE. If that is the bill all of the State enforcement agencies have endorsed, is it not reasonable to suppose we would get a good deal more cooperation if we pass that bill than we would if we pass one which they oppose?

Mr. PURCELL. I certainly think so.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not also true that, if we are going to do any good with either bill, the bill must be passed through another body?

Mr. PURCELL. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not much more likely that we can get a bill passed which has the unanimous support of all of the State commissioners of agriculture, and certainly most of the Governors of this country, than to expect that we can get a bill passed if most of these influential groups are opposed to it?

Mr. PURCELL. I could not agree more with the chairman.

Mr. POAGE. It would then seem to me that if we really want an effective bill and not simply to make an issue that we would do well to defeat the substitute and pass the committee bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Is it not true that these same State secretaries of agriculture at first opposed completely, almost, the provisions of this bill which were then in my bill, H.R. 6168, and then when the meat industry jumped, they jumped too? They did not say "Shall we?" They just said, "How far?" History shows that depending upon these State secretaries of agriculture, is like putting the fox in charge of the chicken coop.

Mr. PURCELL. I could not agree less if I had all afternoon to describe it.

I will say that the State departments of agriculture did oppose the bill when they came in and testified. Then, I think they saw the determination and the attitude which the committee had. I met with that organization. I believe they have realized completely how important it is that we have adequate inspection, and they now accept the responsibility of fully participating to every extent they can, up to 50-percent matching assets, and they will provide adequate inspection. They so indicated by their action.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. May I correct something the gentleman said earlier? I am sure he did not intend for it to be an error, but it is an error.

I refer to the fact of these establishments would have 5 years to continue in that condition. Within 60 days after the passage of the bill, they would have to comply with the construction provisions for Federal grading, which will not permit that situations shown in those photos to continue. They require, under the Federal grading, that the walls be of a substance that can be cleaned under 180° Fahrenheit, and various other things. They just may not have to have as wide a door, and things like that, but they would have to be sanitary.

Mr. PURCELL. All I know is, that I believe the gentleman told this body a while ago that they had 5 years to comply with the Federal requirement, that Federal grading does require now a nonporous wall that will take cleaning, and the cleaning is presumed to be 180° Fahrenheit.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. In referring back to the gentleman's statement concerning the willingness of the States, with the help of this legislation, to act on adequate State meat inspection for every State in the Union, I would remind the gentleman that in the committee we heard a statement from Deputy Assistant Secretary of Agriculure Rodney E. Leonard, and I would like to quote him:

> Administrators of State meat inspection programs generally admit that they have neither the money nor the manpower to conduct an intensive, continuous inspection service for both slaughtering and processing operations. State legislators, veterinary association, industry groups, and others have tried repeatedly to obtain meaningful legislation and enforcement.
>
> Nevertheless, the need for stronger, more effective and more uniform State inspection programs is of critical importance. In the past couple of years, there has been a tremendous upsurge among the States to initiate or improve existing programs. Eighteen States actively considered meat inspection legislation during the past year—eight of whom are among these without any present meat inspection law. The other ten were attempting to upgrade and strengthen existing statutes.
>
> These efforts by the States must be fostered and encouraged by the Federal program if this Nation is to achieve adequate, overall protection of the consumer with resulting prosperity for the industry and the producer. By providing legislative authority for meaningful Federal-State cooperation, a uniform framework can be constructed which will provide consumer protection for all citizens, regardless of where their meat originates.

I say to the gentleman that this statement describes what the committee bill does, and that testimony was made in favor of that bill.

Mr. PURCELL. That is very true. I will just add to what the gentlewoman has said that every indication is given that the States are aware of their responsibility. I am not trying to justify the fact that they have been derelict in the past, but everything indicates they will proceed with dispatch and get the proper kind of legislation enacted when we give them the opportunity to do so.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. First I want to say I agree with the gentleman from Texas. One reason why we have had maybe a laxity on the side of the States is the fact that there was not money available. The gentleman pointed out that it does provide a cooperative sharing up to 50 percent.

I also point out that both gentlemen now sponsor the substitute. One gentleman voted for this bill in the committee and the other said on the floor of the House that he supports the Purcell bill.

Lastly I want to say I hope we do not base our judgment on this bill based on one photograph taken somewhere in Illinois. I do not know how many cows are slaughtered each year or in how many places they are slaughtered, but I would say that by and large, with the money and the personnel they have, the States have done a fair job. It can be improved, and I think the gentleman from Texas has the program to do that.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, especially because the State of Illinois has been mentioned here several times. We are very proud of the position of Illinois as one of the principal centers of meatpacking in the country.

Mr. Chairman, as a citizen of Illinois, and as a former member of the Committee on Agriculture, I can say that all of us are anxious to have the best possible standards in effect in our plants.

Mr. Chairman, I have received a lot of mail with reference to this matter. I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell] for reporting the bill which is now being presented to the House for its consideration.

Almost, without exception, my mail has been in support of the committee bill. I have found almost no sentiment in favor of the substitute bill that is being advanced by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith].

Mr. Chairman, I assure the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the photograph which was taken and which has been displayed here is not typical of the meatpacking industry in the great State of Illinois. I daresay that if one searched far enough, one probably could find some undesirable conditions existing in plants subject to Federal inspection. It is possible to find exceptions to every standard. However, at least, the great State of Illinois would not have reached its present position of preeminence in the packing of meat had we been guilty of conditions like that.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell] is a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture. I believe we sat together on most of the hearings that were held on the committee bill. Does the gentleman not recall that in the early part of the hearings on what is now the committee bill, both the American Meat Institute and the National Association of State Directors of Agriculture opposed what the Committee on Agriculture has now reported; is that not correct?

Mr. PURCELL. This is correct. But, I would like to say that instead of maligning these people and these organizations, I am pleased by the fact that the industry itself does now support meaningful meat inspection and that the State departments of agriculture favor such inspection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that in the beginning of the consideration of this measure there was some reluctance on their part in support of the committee version, but when they thought there might be a substitute offered to provide for Federal meat inspection, then there was a change in attitude?

Mr. PURCELL. I do not think so. I think that their support came much earlier, before any thought was given to the fact that there might be a substitute, because the substitute received five votes, I believe in the committee. I do not think they were afraid of the substitute. I think they were made aware of the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

(On request of Mr. Foley, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Purcell was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield further to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Would not the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee agree with me that the attitude of the American Meat Institute and the National Association of State Directors of Agriculture in support of the committee bill was an attitude of supporting the lesser of two evils insofar as these organizations were concerned? They would today, if they could have their wish, have neither bill pending before the House for its consideration. Would he agree that there was no indication that they were going to support the committee bill until the more stringent alternative substitute was in preparation?

Mr. PURCELL. I could not disagree more with the gentleman, referring back to the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa a short while ago. I know that the American Meat Institute, along with the State agriculture associations have taken a very firm and positive stand upon the question of the need of an adequate across-the-board meat inspection, and that their industry and that association now stands in support of the same. Therefore, I have no reason to doubt the veracity or the integrity or the intent of those organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the so-called Smith-Foley substitute and would point out as I have previously that both of the sponsors of this amendment have indicated support for the so-called Purcell bill, H.R. 12144. It should be reemphasized that H.R. 12144 was passed by our committee by a vote of 31 to 3. I would note that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] voted in the affirmative.

The question then is not whether H.R. 12144 is meritorious, but whether the substitute will insure a more effective meat inspection. There have been many emotional statements made, photographs produced, and inflammatory editorials alluded to which would indicate that the American meat consumer has little, if any, protection from unwholesome meat.

Without question, there are shortcomings and there perhaps have been violations of existing State and Federal law, but, in my opinion, we do the meat industry a great disservice by inferring that this industry generally has no concern for the American meat consumer. I would hope that no Member would make a judgment based on irrelevant or misleading statements, photographs, or testimony, whether made or referred to on or off the House floor.

In my opinion, title III of H.R. 12144 will provide the incentive needed for States to adopt sound and effective meat inspection programs. The provisions authorizing grants to States of up to 50 percent of the total cost of any State program is, again, in my opinion, the most important provision of the bill. If there is a failure of Federal-State cooperation, then there is every reason to expect that future Congresses will make the necessary and desirable changes.

In supporting H.R. 12144, I would also endorse what has been said concerning the desirability of a careful review by the Department of Agriculture of its meat inspection system, under this new and large grant of responsibility.

Such a review might be of benefit to all parties concerned as a means of identifying possible places where consumer protection of meat products can be made more efficient in terms of the money available. It will be necessary to phase in new inspectors and work, and possibly some longstanding procedures can be phased out where there may be some duplication with the concurrent responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration or where already inspected meat products are simply being utilized as components of other foods that are themselves fully inspected in their process of manufacture.

Industry asks and deserves to have uniformity without duplication. I urge the Department, therefore, to seek all possible efficiencies in its important work of enhancing consumer protection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, when all is said and done there may not be a single vote in this body against the bill to amend the 60-year-old Meat Inspection Act. The important question is whether to amend it by the method proposed by H.R. 12144 or by H.R. 12145, known as the Smith-Foley substitute.

Without knowing what the parliamentary situation might be and without knowing whether the membership will be able to make their position clear by a rollcall vote, I take this means to state my preference and my support for H.R. 12145, proposed by NEAL SMITH, of Iowa, and TOM FOLEY, of Washington, as the sponsors. I have listened to the debate and I am convinced that this approach includes all of the provisions of the committee bill, and yet would add the requirement that all plants that have more than $250,000 gross annual sales would be inspected by the Federal meat inspection program. It has been determined that such a provision would provide Federal inspection for 97 percent of all meat slaughtered.

It may be that the committee bill is an improvement over the old Federal meat inspection law. It is said that 16 percent of the meat slaughtered annually and 26 percent of the meat processed is outside the scope of the safeguards of Federal meat inspection. The 60-year-old act is deficient because it covers only plants selling across State lines.

In the supplemental views attached to the report are some very shocking revelations. The unspeakable filth that is there described, which subjects edible portions of carcasses to contamination during dressing operations, is bad enough. Worse is the failure to supervise the destruction of diseased tissue, as well as spoiled, filthy and diseased materials. It is bad enough to use false or deceptive labels, but it is much worse to know that there are about 80 animal diseases that may be transmitted to man through meat and thereby constitute a direct threat to human health.

The original Meat Inspection Act came about over 60 years ago because contaminated meat was issued to our troops during the Spanish-American War. Some of the shocking disclosures of the meatpackers' disregard for the health of their customers was revealed by Upton Sinclair in his book, "The Jungle." Yet, today only 26 States have any kind of mandatory meat inspection laws, and some of these have programs which do not adequately protect the consumer. Eight States have no meat inspection law whatsoever.

In the debate, it has been suggested by those who favor the committee bill that to enact the substitute would destroy States rights, and to extend Federal meat inspection would further overextend Federal bureaucracy. It was also said that it would be too costly.

Well, the record of many of us here is well established for protection of States rights, and also there have been some pretty strong expressions recently by record votes on the subject of economy in the operation of the Federal Government.

For my part, and I am sure the feeling is shared by a large part of the membership of this House, in this day when for one reason or another housewives are calling for products that require little or no home preparation, I feel that this greatly increases the opportunities on the part of a few unscrupulous packers.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to the consumption of meat and meat products this becomes a matter of some thought about one's stomach, and even more than that, his very health and wellbeing. It is no time to quibble about States rights or a matter of cost. As a point of information, one estimate of the cost of good consumer protection for meat places this at less than one-sixth of a cent per pound of meat. Every pound of unclean or unwholesome meat must be eliminated from the market. A watered-down measure is not good enough. Contaminated meat, horse meat, and meat from sick animals, not good enough for dog and cat food, must not be sold for human consumption.

Without further description of the unspeakable filth described in the survey of the meatpacking industry by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in 1962 and again this year, for my part I want to be on record as in favor of elimination of these sickening conditions. The best way to protect the public from contaminated and diseased meats is by the adoption of H.R. 12145.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all other amendments close in 10 minutes after the expiration of the gentleman's time. The gentleman from Washington has 5 minutes and that would represent a total of 15 minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debates on this amendment and all other amendments close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith-Foley amendment, better known as H.R. 12145. This amendment is identical to the committee bill except for three paragraphs. It redefines "commerce" to include the substantial effect upon commerce by an enterprise with an annual gross volume of sales in excess of $250,000. Furthermore, it relaxes the requirement for conformance by those firms which would be included under the Meat Inspection Act as dealing in commerce, so that they would have 5 years to meet the new construction standards.

It is my belief that in those few additional paragraphs of the amendment the responsibility of this Congress to the consumer will be met. We have the opportunity to do more than merely offer participation to those States which have no mandatory inspection. H.R. 12145 would give the American consumer substantial protection by raising the ratio of inspection to 97 percent of meat slaughtered.

The need for meat inspection should not be confined to a voluntary system. We have seen the shocking results and the failure of this approach. The advance of modern technology has made a law written in the days of home canning out of date for the time when even school lunch programs are purchasing frozen meats. The average citizen has long assumed that the meat on his table was clean and pure. Recent reports from the Department of Agriculture show that this simply is not so, and that unless a means such as this amendment is adopted to provide the necessary inspection, that it would not be so.

The only yardstick we have to determine willingness on the part of the various States is that 22 States have no mandatory meat inspection law. The committee bill does not correct this serious deficiency, since it cannot require the States to pass good inspection laws. But it will assure Federal inspection of all meat processed in all but the very small plants.

I submit that what would in fact take place if this amendment were adopted is the desired result. The State inspection of meat would not be faced with the enormous task of policing the large companies not previously inspected, but would be enabled to concentrate on the small producer above $250,000 sales who should be inspected also.

The good provisions of the committee bill are not rejected here. The State would be able to receive needed funds to more effectively carry out its meat inspection program and would have less plants to police if the Federal inspectors were working in the large ones.

The estimated additional cost of the amendment is $31 million. I submit that the additional cost is about one-sixth of 1 cent per pound, for better consumer protection with the ensuing reduction of the terrible diseases, trichinosis, salmonellosis, and others, to which people are exposed through lack of faulty meat inspection.

Opponents to the amendment have raised two other objections: the difficulty in finding inspectors, and that the Federal inspection system would be strained by the increased inspection responsibility. The first point has validity in that more men will be needed. But, I would think if more inspectors are needed, as indicated by the reports of the violations and poor conditions in the industry, that Congress should stand ready to set up the machinery to provide them by the amendment, H.R. 12145.

Congress should do more in its first new meat inspection legislation in 61 years than provide for voluntary State programs. The health of the Nation's people is surely one of our primary concerns. The confidence of the consumer in the meat on his table is no less important. Who knows, we may have to become a nation of vegetarians if the American people, knowing the type of meat they are eating or may be eating, have to continue to set the table with uninspected meat?

I feel certain that few Members of this Congress would want that result, nor would the many farmers and meat producers in the industry covered by the legislation now under consideration.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the sponsors of the substitute that the people of my area in the city of New York welcome very much the substitute they have proposed, and appreciate their concern with the problem of proper meat inspection.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the provisions of H.R. 12145—Smith-Foley substitute—now being offered as a substitute to the committee bill in order to extend the coverage of the Federal meat inspection program to packing or processing establishments regardless of whether operated in interstate or intrastate commerce.

The basic legislation, H.R. 12144, offered by the Committee on Agriculture, while otherwise substantially satisfactory, would only protect the housewife when she buys meat and meat products that have traveled across State boundaries. What protection is the same housewife afforded when she purchases meat and meat products packed or processed entirely within her home State? What protection is this housewife and her family afforded when they travel to another State and there eat or purchase meat packed or processed entirely within in that State? Food inspection should know no boundaries.

Today only 28 States, including my own, New York, have mandatory meat inspection laws; but the effectiveness of these laws differs widely from State to State. Twelve States have laws providing for voluntary meat inspection, and, again, these also differ widely. Eight States have no inspection laws, and two States have very limited meatpacking regulations only. The committee bill being offered today would simply encourage the various States to develop effective meat inspection programs through the use of Federal technical and planning assistance to the States. This is not sufficient.

When it comes to the health and safety of my family and the people I represent, I want to do more than merely encourage the States to enact strict laws concerning the sale of unwholesome meat for consumption at the dinner table.

It is unfortunate that all too often congressional passage of consumer protection legislation must be triggered by the occurrence of some horribly dramatic event that finally mobilizes the public into lobbyist-type action. Such as the case in 1937 when it took the deaths of 108 persons caused by a mixture called "elixir sulfanilamide" to assure passage of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Twenty-nine years later the Nation had first to witness the horrible thalidomide tragedies before legislation tightening Federal control over the drug industry was passed.

Today, instead of being spurred to action by hindsight in the form of the occurrence of an unnecessary tragedy, we are being offered the opportunity to exercise foresight by voting for legislation that offers the public the protection they deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this other version to extend the Federal meat inspection program across the board.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN]. The people of my district are very anxious to have legislation of this kind enacted. But they want the broadest and most effective coverage which I am confident the substitute will provide. Hence I vigorously support the substitute and I trust it will be overwhelmingly adopted.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] for yielding. Commendations are due him, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], and to the other Members who have sponsored the substitute bill, H.R. 12145.

Having sat during the entire debate on this legislation I have come to the conclusion that apparently everyone agrees that the Federal system of inspection is more thorough than State inspections.

Representing a district of consumers, the conclusion seems obvious: if our people are to obtain maximum protection against tainted meat products then Federal inspection and regulations are needed.

Moreover, it seems clear that the committee bill, H.R. 12144, meets the problem of unclean meat only halfway. On the other hand, the Smith-Foley substitute would deal with the problem more effectively.

Both bills would exempt the small producer, those grossing under $250,000 annually, while providing for cooperation with State and local officials in inspecting their operations.

In the interests of the consumers of my district and throughout the United States, I strongly support the Smith-Foley substitute and urge its adoption by this body.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which I cosponsored along with the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Washington. I believe it is particularly necessary, especially in my own State where we have 1,263 plants, a large number of which go uninspected.

There are 132 places out of the 1,263 that are now subject to inspection. There are only 54 that are inspected under our voluntary law.

I have received a telegram from the Governor of Pennsylvania urging me to support the committee bill, but the Governor urges me to do so under the presumption that the Pennsylvania State Legislature will act. I do not believe that this is a presumption that we can afford to make, even if the Smith-Foley amendment is adopted.

In Pennsylvania, out of these 1,263 places I spoke of, only 600 will be covered, but if the committee bill goes through we have no guarantee that any more will be covered. So I rise in support of the substitute.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the distinguished cosponsor of the substitute, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith-Foley substitute to the committee bill. I cannot conscientiously support the committee bill when there is an opportunity to support a bill that goes beyond it in protecting the health and well-being of the American consuming public.

Frankly, I find it most difficult to again accept a responsibility on the part the Federal Government, that could have been and should have been accepted and corrected at the State level including my State of Minnesota.

I am sure that many of you today received telegrams from your respective Governors, suggesting that you support one or the other of the two bills now before the House. I have today experienced such contact from the Governor of Minnesota asking me to support the weaker bill. The fact of the matter is, the several States including my own, have turned their backs on the consuming public time and again. Now some of them suggest we not infringe upon States rights involving intrastate commerce, even though they have repeatedly favored the shoddy meatpackers and processors over the health of the consuming public.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience do this.

The consuming public has a right to every health protection they can get—even when the States refuse to do it.

The Smith-Foley substitute does everything the committee bill does in terms of Federal-State cooperation and additionally provides inspection in all packing and processing plants doing an annual business of $250,000 or more even though not necessarily involved in interstate commerce.

This added protection would then cause meat products to be federally inspected in over 98 percent of the Nation's production. To do less is to further jeopardize unnecessarily unsuspecting consumer health and to offer unfair advantages to those processors not covered. Indeed, it is tragic that the lobby of a few should subvert the health requirements of the American people. I hope they shall not succeed again today as they so obviously have succeeded in the Minnesota Legislature this past session.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I merely wish to say that I want to add my voice of appreciation to the gentleman from Washington and to the gentleman from Iowa for offering this very constructive amendment, and to indicate my very strong support of it.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman, and wish to confirm that this amendment being carried in the bill should be good news to the beef-eaters and burghers of the city of New York. I have had discussion with the gentleman and he is well aware through his studious research on this that the city of New York actually is not affected by laws that might be introduced by the State department of agriculture, because the great city of New York, the largest city in the country, is not under State control in its beef inspection; is that correct?

Mr. FOLEY. That is true.

Mr. CAREY. So for the first time we would begin to have the meat eaten in the city of New York come under the same regulations as for the rest of the country, and I believe this is welcome news for New York City.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I will be glad to yield if I have sufficient time left within which to do it.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, is it not also true that the city of New York is treated as a State under this provision of law, and in itself has an inspection system?

Mr. FOLEY. It has an inspection system that is so inadequate that we have had several major scandals on meat inspection in the city of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE.].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I support the substitute bill offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY]. I support it because it is far more effective than the committee bill in accomplishing what everyone in this House who has spoken on the subject says he or she is for—that is, clean and wholesome meat for the American consumer.

Both bills would make long overdue changes and improvements in the laws and regulations dealing with the inspection of meat and meat products in interstate commerce. As far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, this is the kind of authority it needs to close loopholes in its present inspection program and get at the crooks who have invaded this field as bootleggers of diseased and adulterated meat products.

Under present law, the activities of the underworld characters who have been engaging in this vicious and disgusting interstate racket can be punished if and when they are caught. But it is more difficult to catch them than it should be. The basic provisions of both bills before us would strengthen the existing mandatory inspection program for meat and meat products in interstate and foreign commerce.

BIG DIFFERENCE IN TREATMENT OF INTRASTATE MEAT

The big difference between the committee bill and the Smith-Foley substitute lies, of course, in their treatment of meat slaughtered and sold only in intrastate commerce. The committee bill would authorize the expenditure of Federal funds as gifts to the States in the hope that it would encourage or entice the States into eventually setting up effective meat inspection programs of their own. But there is no requirement that the States develop the kind of inspection system now operated by the Federal Government.

The Smith-Foley substitute, on the other hand, would assure that the great bulk of the meat now slaughtered and sold in intrastate commerce was as pure and wholesome as meat sold in interstate commerce, by requiring Federal inspection in all plants except those grossing less than $250,000. The States could still have their own inspection systems, and there is no reason why we should not help the States to develop and operate more effective systems than they have now, but the consumer would be protected whether the States acted effectively or not.

That is the main difference between the two bills.

MANY APPROACHES TO THIS PROBLEM

The Smith-Foley approach is one of several which could be utilized to achieve effective Federal guarantees of wholesomeness of most of the meat now sold in intrastate commerce.

As the sponsor in 1962 of the first bill introduced in the Congress to bring about Federal inspection of meat sold only in intrastate commerce, I have proposed a somewhat different approach from that of the Smith-Foley bill—that is, the establishment by the Secretary of Agriculture of designated major consuming areas, such as metropolitan areas, or even whole States, into which only federally inspected meat could be shipped, whether the meat came from within the same State or not.

This is the very same approach we used 10 years ago in writing the Poultry Products Inspection Act. The Department of Agriculture and the House Committee on Agriculture both supported this idea 10 years ago in the poultry bill, but I have not been able to get either the Department or the committee to aid me in setting up the same approach to meat inspection.

The Smith-Foley bill goes somewhat further than my bill would go by making inspection mandatory in every plant in the country above a certain size. I think this authority is necesary to assure a safe and wholesome meat supply in the outlying areas as well as in cities.

One of the reasons I support the Smith-Foley bill is that, even if my bill were passed, there is no indication that the Department of Agriculture would use its added powers under it. It has never, in 10 long years, used its powers in the Poultry Products Inspection Act to designate a single major consuming area in the country—not one.

Our experience in St. Louis, in trying to have our metropolitan area designated a major consuming area for compulsory Federal inspection of all poultry coming into the city from outstate Missouri, may help explain why the intrastate powers of the Poultry Act have not been used.

Each time we set up a survey to determine whether enough diseased or unwholesome poultry was being shipped into St. Louis from within the State to burden and obstruct interstate commerce, all of this poultry immediately disappeared from St. Louis stores. Only federally inspected poultry came into the city as long as the survey was being conducted.

Where did the other stuff go—the stuff none of us would want to eat? It went elsewhere in Missouri, where there was no danger of precipitating compulsory Federal inspection.

So perhaps the mere existence of this power does some good, even if it is not used. But lots of people in Missouri were and are eating unfit poultry, just as they are unsuspectingly being sold unfit beef and other red meats, because of the absence of effective State inspection or compulsory Federal inspection on intrastate shipments.

The committee bill provides no effective remedy for this problem—only a pious hope. The Smith-Foley bill provides a very effective remedy. I support it wholeheartedly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I wish it were in order for me to amend this act so as to provide for proper labeling of fish and fish products as well as meat and meat products. Especially I would require information in labeling to show where meat or fish or meat products or fish products were produced and imported from a foreign nation.

This would be a step in the direction of protecting the consumer from purchasing an inferior product that had been mislabeled. One example of this is the importation of turbot, or what is called Greenland halibut, which has been sold in packages labeled, simply, halibut.

Mr. Chairman, this is serious because Greenland halibut is not halibut as we know it, but rather, it is turbot, a large flounder which has eight times the fat content and 25 percent less protein than true halibut. To the unsuspecting housewife, the name halibut on a label means a delicious, meaty fish, but mislabeling has constituted a fraud on the American consumer who deserves the protection I would like to see provided.

But, beyond the protection of the consumer, the American fishing industry has suffered because of the importation of Greenland halibut. Crew earnings dropped 40 percent this year over a year ago, and halibut prices were about 11 cents a pound under last year's level.

The consumer certainly has every right to purchase the inferior imported product turbot if they desire, but the consumer also deserves to know that it is an imported product.

Fish of many countries is imported and constitutes more than 60 percent of American fish consumption. It is imported in frozen block and slab form, and when it is marketed, a purchaser should be given information as to whether it is of domestic or foreign origin.

Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, I regret that I am unable to amend this bill so that fish and fish products would be properly labeled.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the proposed Smith-Foley amendment to the Agriculture Committee-approved H.R. 12144 is an example of good intentions gone astray. It would federalize where more federalizing is not needed. It would discourage expansion and efficiency of State meat inspection systems. It would not do the job for the consumer.

The idea of a clean meat bill is to correct present abuses. Enactment of the proposed substitute would allow operators who are today most responsible for unsanitary conditions in the meat industry to go on their way without adequate inspection.

By establishing the $250,000 annual volume limit, and federalizing the large plants above this figure, the Smith-Foley bill fails to get at the crux of the problem. Their measure would penalize the good small plant, but leave in operation free of inspection the small plants which do not maintain adequate sanitation standards.

H.R. 12144, the committee bill, would take a step in the right direction by establishing a Federal-State cooperative meat inspection arrangement. This would broaden the entire field of meat inspection, would provide Federal assistance to State agencies, and would in general improve the quality of State meat inspection services.

I am in principle opposed to the idea that the Congress has to jump into every aspect of American life with restrictive legislation. I do believe, however, as in this case, that when we are dealing with the public health, that we have the responsibility to enact a bill that will get the job done.

The substitute bill would leave 9,000 plants outside the federal system. It would cut back State incentive for more vigorous meat inspection. It would cost $31.2 million more than the committee bill. The Smith-Foley amendment, according to U.S. Department of Commerce figures on meat operation, would exclude about 50 percent of the meat slaughtering plants and 45 percent of processing plants now in business from Federal inspection. It would cost more, do less.

It seems obvious that our aim in going into the clean meat legislation field is to enact a hard-hitting bill that utilizes the resources of the Federal Government, State inspection programs, and which encourages the cooperation of the meat industry, farm organizations, and livestock groups. The more groups we have cooperating, the better the meat inspection system will eventually be.

Federalization is not the answer. Cooperation is. Establishing a Federal Meat Inspection Act is a good move to set up standards. But, setting arbitrary boundaries and classifications which would allow much of today's unsanitary operations to continue would be a disservice to everyone.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the great State of Iowa has some of the finest independent meat packing and meat processing firms in the United States.

In the district I have the honor of representing, we have the Hartman Packing Co. of Plainfield, the Franzenburg Provision Co., of Conrad, Risetter Packing Co. of Jewell, and G. B. Nissen & Son Packing Co., of Webster City. There is no evidence whatever that any of these firms has permitted unclean or unwholesome meat to enter into channels of human consumption.

These firms, along with other members of the Iowa Independent Meat Packers and Processors Association, support H.R. 12144 and oppose the Smith-Foley bill, H.R. 12145. One member of the association, Jack Harker, of Harker's Wholesale Meats, of LeMars, Iowa, expressed his views in a telegram to me in this manner:

> The Congress is being stampeded into passing a meat inspection bill that will probably wipe out 50–60 per cent of my competition. I'm opposed to the Smith-Foley bill, not to inspection. I'm opposed to further encroachment of the federal government into State's rights. I'm opposed to the USDA method of using half-truths and even lies to make themselves more powerful. The State of Iowa and Doctor McNellis (Chief of Meat and Poultry Inspection Division of Iowa) are doing a great job. Our industry has upgraded itself now and is continuing. Please vote for the committee bill on meat inspection.

I am impressed by his comments, just as I am impressed by the arguments advanced by our colleagues, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] and the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] in support of the committee bill, H.R. 12144, and in opposition to the Smith-Foley substitute. Particularly devastating is their contention that the substitute fails to reach the dirty meat problem and could in fact further aggravate, rather than alleviate, the problem of unwholesome or unsanitary meat.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that despite the widespread newspaper publicity given to the Smith-Foley bill in Iowa, publicity which has included rather frightening reports about bad meat, I have yet to receive the first communication from an Iowa consumer in support of that measure.

This, of course, is not surprising, because Iowans know that Iowa meat is clean and wholesome and the best that can be found anywhere in the world.

Mr. Chairman, after studying all available information, I intend to support the committee bill and will oppose the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I shall take time only to relate one of the major cases of violations in regard to meat in the city of New York a year and one-half ago when, in a federally inspected plant, Australian kangaroo and American horsemeat was being sold as hamburger.

I believe that case resulted in the indictment of the Federal inspectors who were involved in that case.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MAYNE].

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that Federal inspection is not necessarily a cure-all and an answer to all problems.

The gentleman from Washington has spoken about scandals in New York. These occurred in federally inspected plants.

Now, I believe that this committee bill, as opposed to the amendment now offered—the committee bill does give the States and localities a chance to carry out this very necessary function of meat inspection. I do not believe it should be surrendered entirely to the Federal Government.

This is an area where our Federal system should be observed and the States given the encouragement that the committee bill does give which will greatly strengthen our meat inspection system in this country, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] a cosponsor of the bill has conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

I would just like to say at this point that I sincerely hope the American consumer does not get the idea from today's debate that presently our Meat Inspection Act is inadequate or that they are being subjected to contaminated meat on all sides.

I would hate to think that, as a result of the debate today, we were going to become a nation of vegetarians. I would point out that right now we have the best meat inspection system in the entire world, and we are spending a great deal of money on it. I am willing, in supporting the committee bill, to spend even more to make this system better. By being better I mean to improve and strengthen the present Federal law and make possible, through the help of the Federal Government, that States and municipalities can assure all consumers of good meat inspection for sanitation and wholesomeness.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I yield to my colleague from Texas [Mr. PURCELL].

Mr. PURCELL. I would just like to ask the gentleman, who is a member of our committee, about the horsemeat scandal in New York City referred to by the gentleman from Washington. Were not all the occurrences, according to the evidence brought before our committee, of horsemeat and decayed meat found in the New York scandal in federally inspected plants?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has mentioned my name. Will he yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. The gentleman is correct. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, I am shocked to hear my colleagues from New York coming here and saying that they serve lousy meat in that fair city. I have been going to New York and enjoying my food tremendously. Now they are talking me out of it. I do not think I will go back.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment and in favor of the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, there are about three questions which we need to ask ourselves. First, how do we want to achieve this result? I think the committee bill clearly achieves it in a constitutional way, whereas the substitute would achieve it by ignoring all of our States rights.

Second, we should want to know just how are we going to get an effective administration of this bill? The committee bill clearly gives an inducement to the State to actually bring about the desired reforms, whereas the substitute would take away that incentive.

Third, we want to know whether we are really trying to pass a bill which will give us something, or as some would say at least a part of something, or whether we are trying to get all of nothing except a show of concern. I think it is clear that the committee bill gives you a very large part of what everyone wants. On the other hand, I think it is rather clear that the substitute will give you exactly all of nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SMITH of Iowa and Mr. PURCELL.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 98, noes 140.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot be recognized. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12144) to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 957, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. PRICE of Texas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 12144 to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 403, nays 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

YEAS—403

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—1

Price, Tex.

NOT VOTING—28

Annunzio
Aspinall
Baring
Berry
Bevill
Boggs
Broomfield
Button
Celler
Diggs
Everett
Fountain
Giaimo
Hall
Hébert
Helstoski
Laird
Long, La.
Mahon
Mathias, Md.
Moss
Rarick
Resnick
St. Onge
Stuckey
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Laird.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Button.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Mahon.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Moss.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Bevill.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Everett.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8718) entitled "An act to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia."

THE FUTILE U.N.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I suggest in all candor that the United States withhold further payments to the United Nations pending a reorganization and reevaluation of the operating procedures and objectives of the agency. If, when the Congress returns in January, there are not more realistic reports in prospect from the operations of the U.N., it is my plan to introduce a resolution calling for a cessation of all payments by the United States.

Payments to the United Nations and its affiliated organizations during the past year were $113,000,000.

Undoubtedly, the futility of U.N. deliberations in recent years has contributed to frustration with world affairs both in the United States and abroad. In its attempts to deal with the explosive Mideast problem, the U.N. obviously is simply seeking to avoid stepping on anyone's toes. It was quick to demand sanctions against one of the few responsible governments in Africa—Rhodesia—but walks past the serious and demanding Vietnamese problem with averted eyes. To make matters worse, the statements of the man who heads the organization, U Thant, gives aid and comfort to the enemy but no encouragement to the peaceseeking efforts of the United States.

The situation has reached the point where a recent conference report on the State Department appropriation bill expressed agreement of the conferees with language in the Senate bill calling for initiation and support of U.S. representatives in the U.N. for economic sanctions against North Vietnam. The Senate language pointed up the fact that our representatives had advocated economic sanctions against Rhodesia, which is a friendly nation, but, by contrast, had made little issue of the fact the United States has suffered 55,888 casualties at the hands of the North Vietnamese through aggressive acts by that nation in the first 9 months of 1967.

The United Nations is virtually certain to ignore this congressional concern, even if our own representatives there have the courage to pursue the matter.

There seems little reason for the United States to continue to pay half the bills for an organization which makes few meaningful contributions toward a peaceful and stable world.

DEMONSTRATORS DISREGARD FACTS

Mr. **MONAGAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MONAGAN**. Mr. Speaker, of all the reports on the recent peace demonstration here, none seems to me to have been more successful in capturing the peculiar and baffling motivation of those attending the event than an article by UPI correspondent, Merriman Smith. One characteristic of the participants which Mr. Smith finds puzzling is what he describes as their "disturbing disregard for fact."

In assaying the significance of the demonstration, this reportage by a distinguished veteran reporter must be weighed against the claims of the participants to represent a substantial and reliable body of public opinion.

I insert in the RECORD the text of Mr. Smith's illuminating article as it appeared in the Waterbury American for October 23, 1967:

REPORTER DISMAYED AT PROTESTERS' UTTER DISREGARD FOR FACT

(By Merriman Smith)

WASHINGTON.—If one personal impression came from rubbing shoulders and sometimes noses with the peace demonstrators here Saturday and Sunday, it was one of dismay at their seemingly disturbing disregard for fact.

President Johnson, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Ambassadors Ellsworth Bunker and Henry Cabot Lodge were "totally" liars, "bloodthirsty warmongers."

Demonstrators lounging on the sunny steps of Lincoln Memorial Sunday insisted that the press was "totally" wrong about the size of the crowd at their rally Saturday, due largely to "hawk" publishers or fear of Johnson. Reporters lied to their offices, then their offices lied even more.

The peace people said it was "official" that the crowd was over 250,000. Police and reporters accustomed to crowds week after week thought 50,000 was generous and this included untold numbers of sightseers and teenyboppers from the Washington area.

"With no provocation at all," scores and, according to some of the more enthusiastic "Hundreds" of peaceful people were brutally clubbed by rifle butts at the Pentagon. "Wave after wave" of peace marchers collapsed under "gas attacks." Uniformed army troops, veterans of Vietnam, threw down their rifles and hurled their helmets aside in shame or disgust to defect to the flower people, but only to be seized by other soldiers, "brutally clubbed and thrown into prison."

Another myth among the hippies, peace marchers and assorted allies was that the press failed to cover the Pentagon after dark Saturday and thus missed seeing the brutality they said raged well into the dark hours of Sunday morning.

One reporter who spent the long, cold night in the Pentagon parking lot with the demonstrators protested.

"I was there the whole damned night, outside with you people, and what you're describing (about the press and defecting troops) is pure fiction—it never happened."

A pretty young girl with autumn flowers in her long golden hair smiled patronizingly and murmured, "we would expect you to say that."

Two girls who said they were from Columbia University in New York took up this theme rather stridently, swearing they had seen the actual defection of troops. But when one of the demonstration leaders called for witnesses to prepare a tape recording for submission to Washington and New York newspapers, the girls demurred. It seems they were looking in other directions at the time but unnamed companions "saw it all."

"But you just said you saw this yourself," a reporter said.

"I know the truth," said one of the young ladies, "more than anything you'll get from those brutes at the Pentagon."

On Saturday afternoon, a well-dressed matron of about 60 chatted with a UPI reporter beside the reflecting pool at the base of the Lincoln Memorial.

"My daughter is here with her high school class and I thought I should do my bit, too, to oppose the war," she said in a cultured voice. "Isn't it inspirational, all these wonderful dedicated young people? And nothing violent or ugly."

Within easy earshot, a barechested man, leader of one of several delegations from New York's hippie community, used a portable public address system to extoll marijuana, Che Guevara, heap incredible obscenities on Johnson and his family—and urge all within his voice to join his group that night for mass fornication.

"We'll start it off with these two couples," he blared through his portable loudspeaker, pointing to four young people lolling on the ground beside the reflecting pool.

I asked the mother to whom I was talking if she had understood what the man said. She said she was paying no attention. I suggested she move over to his group so that she might better appreciate some of her daughter's language when the girl returned home that night.

The woman saw me again about an hour later.

"I think you're hostile," she said, "for paying attention to such bizarre people who certainly do not represent the larger group here today."

In LaFayette Square in front of the White House Sunday afternoon, there were two young couples wearing blue and white badges of the demonstration.

I asked what they thought of the group that earlier had sold North Vietnam flags for $1 each and solicited contributions for the National Liberation Front, political arm of the Viet Cong.

"I'm for anything that will end the war, said a girl.

"How will contributing to the Viet Cong end the war?"

"Well, at least it is money he won't get his hands on," she replied, with a wave toward the White House.

To say that such people were representative of the demonstrations here is, of course, quite open to argument. My feeling is that they were definitely representative of those who spoke to the crowds Saturday. Naturally they did not represent hordes of high school and college boys and girls from the Washington area who seemed more interested in boy-girl relationships and parading their mod clothes than in substantive discussions.

I came away from the week-end feeling depressed by so many attractive young people being caught up in virulent, frequently irrational hatred in the name of love and peace.

URBAN UNREST

Mr. **SCOTT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SCOTT**. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with the House an editorial from a weekly newspaper in my district, the King George News, regarding Federal spending and its effect upon the problems of our cities. It is worthy of note that the editor-publisher, Mr. Paul W. Manns, is also a member of the Virginia State Senate. His statement at the conclusion of the editorial that local leadership must supply the answers, is an indication that local and State governments in my State are willing to assume their rightful share of the responsibility for the problems of the cities. The full editorial follows:

URBAN UNREST

Our cities have many problems. No one will deny that. However, the causes of urban unrest won't be eliminated merely by the appropriation of more and more tax money. Leadership and sound programs at the state and local level are the great need.

Federal funds for metropolitan areas have increased from $3.9 billion in 1960 to an estimated $10.3 billion in fiscal 1968. In fact, federal appropriations for programs in our cities have increased by 165 percent in less than a decade.

For example, in the last five years over $3 billion has been appropriated for urban renewal, over $1 billion for low-rent public housing, over $1½ billion for neighborhood facilities and college housing.

These figures do not include more than $2 billion for the poverty programs and other billions for such programs as highways, education, pollution control, welfare, and other federal programs.

Congress is deluged with pleas to allocate many more billions in an effort to solve the problems of the cities. But it seems that the greater the flow of taxpayers' funds into our metropolitan areas, the more unrest we have, continuing evidence that congressional spending alone will not end the urban problems. Local leadership must supply the answers.

DEMOCRATIC ANTIPOVERTY BILL WOULD WRECK HEADSTART PROGRAM

Mr. **STEIGER** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. **STEIGER** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill reported by our Committee on Education and Labor to amend the Economic Opportunity Act—S. 2388, as amended—would wreck the most successful program in the war on poverty—

the Headstart program for needy preschool children.

It is absolutely incomprehensible to me that the Democratic majority would take such action, but they have. The present law requires, beginning this year, that 20 percent of the cost of all community action programs—including Headstart—be funded with non-Federal funds. However, goods, services, supplies, space, et cetera, provided locally at no cost could be counted against this 20 percent. Although raising these contributions "in kind" was expected to be a problem, it was not thought to be an insurmountable burden.

That burden, however, has been greatly increased by an amendment proposed by Representative Gibbons, Democrat of Florida, and written into the committee bill. It requires that half of this 20 percent contribution be in cash. If allowed to stand, this will wreck the Headstart program. Every Headstart agency will be hard-pressed to raise a 10-percent cash contribution in addition to 10 percent in donated services, and many in the poorest and neediest areas will find it impossible.

The President has budgeted only $335 million for Headstart, which is not separately earmarked in the committee bill. By contrast, the Republican-proposed "Opportunity Crusade," which I cosponsored, would allocate $475 million for Headstart and an "early years" followup program in the elementary grades, and authorize another $100 million for bonus grants to States spending well above their allotted amounts for these purposes. In addition, we would not have required local contributions to be in cash. Our proposal is a measure of our conviction that well planned preschool and early elementary school programs for impoverished children hold out one of the brightest hopes for breaking the cycle of poverty by eliminating many of the causes of later educational failure, school dropouts, and subsequent unemployment and reliance upon welfare.

The comments I have received from responsible personnel of Headstart agencies reinforce my conviction that the Gibbons amendment will cripple this program, and so I call your attention to the following letters I have received regarding this amendment:

St. Peter's Head Start,
Yonkers, N.Y., October 24, 1967.
Hon. William C. Steiger,
Member, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Steiger: It is with deep distress that St. Peter's Head Start Advisory Board takes note of the recommendation of the House Education and Labor Committee to restrict, almost to the point of impotence, the Poverty Program by not only its financial strictures but also its administratively cumbersome machinery for access to federal funds. As citizens, we cannot emphasize too much the success of the Head Start Program with which we are closely aligned. You may hear of some spectacular programs that hit the front page. Our program has thoughtfully, efficiently and somewhat quietly gone about its business of changing a whole neighborhood called the "flats" of Yonkers where our people are gaining new hope and a sense of dignity.

St. Peter's Head Start will undoubtedly have to close up in the face of the amendment proposed by your House Committee. May we beg you to reconsider what it does to hope, self-esteem and a sense of community rebirth to so restrict federal involvement—as is now being proposed. We have not only emphasized aid for children but also for their parents and the entire neighborhood. Changes are being made. The Head Start Program has had no small influence on positively assisting the city in breaking the roadblock to relocation housing. Our children and their families have benefited from the Poverty Program on a very meager budget in this very high cost of living area. We urgently beg you to reconsider the drastic consequences of such cuts—a re-entry into frustration and despair and all the violent children of these two evils.

We request that you reconsider your action of Friday, October 20, and don't kill hope.

Respectfully yours,
Rev. John M. Harrington,
Coordinator, St. Peter's Head Start.
William R. Offutt,
Chairman, St. Peter's Advisory Board.

South Madison Neighborhood Center,
Madison, Wis., October 27, 1967.
Congressman William Steiger,
Representative, Sixth Wisconsin District, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Steiger: I am writing regarding the amendment presently before the House of Representatives which would require the local community to provide 20% of the cost of Project Head Start.

We feel that this would place an untimely burden on the work being done by Head Start. Raising this money (10% in cash) would consume much of the time and energy of the Head Start staff. It will also severely cut down on programs in areas which cannot raise the necessary cash. As you know, it is often in these areas that such a program is most needed.

Project Head Start is operating an afternoon program here at the South Madison Neighborhood Center. This provides a very valuable service to the parents and children of our neighborhood. The loss of this service would be felt throughout our area. However, we feel the blow will come in the future when today's children are parents. Now is the time to educate, so that the future generations may benefit.

We realize that it is very important for the local community to have some stake in this program. At this time, however, we feel that citizen participation is a more feasible means of local support than 10% in cash.

We hope that you will consider this amendment and vote no.

Sincerely,
Betsy Behnke,
Assistant Center Director.

I plan to do everything I can to see this action of the committee majority reversed on the floor of the House of Representatives. In my judgment, the Headstart program should be strengthened in its administration and assured a specific level of funding—preferably more than that budgeted by the President, because funds can be cut from less successful programs—without a crippling requirement such as the Gibbons amendment.

ROGERS INTRODUCES EXTENSION OF SEA-GRANT COLLEGE LEGISLATION

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years this Nation's effort in oceanography and marine science has stepped up notably. Many of us in the Congress saw the field of ocean science as one that held great rewards for the Nation.

For that reason, I introduced in the House last year the sea-grant college bill to provide a source of manpower in anticipation of what we would need. That bill, which was passed into law, was for fiscal years 1967–68, however.

As far as we have gone, we have seen much success and interest in the program.

Today, along with my colleagues Mr. Lennon, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Downing, Mr. Dow, Mr. Karth, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Clark, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Keith, Mr. Reinecke, Mr. Edwards of Alabama, Mr. Schadeberg, Mr. Roth, Mr. Pollock, and Mr. Dellenback, I am introducing an amendment which will continue this sea-grant college program.

Nearly every State in the Union has inquired into sea-grant college programs and more than 400 schools and institutions have informed the Office of Sea-Grant Programs that they were interested in filing proposals.

Mr. Speaker, we presently are far behind in our development of marine science manpower. I urge that we give this bill vital consideration so that this fine program will continue as a strong base for our oceanographic work.

I would also note that the National Science Foundation and the Bureau of the Budget have reviewed this amendment and have no objection.

Senator Pell, of Rhode Island, who exerted leadership last year in the Senate, is also introducing like legislation today in that Chamber.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT NOVEMBER 1 TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 13653

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tomorrow, November 1, to file a report on H.R. 13653, tobacco allotments and lease transfers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

A LETTER FROM ENSIGN WHEELER

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Hansen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a thought-provoking letter from a young constituent who is currently serving our country in the Western Pacific.

My constituent, Ensign Mark W. Wheeler, U.S. Navy, raises valid questions as to what happens at home to the families of men fighting in Vietnam and what, if anything, is being done to curb the actions of radicals who, in the name of civil rights, would destroy our society.

The least our Government can do, Mr. Speaker, is to see to it that the families and property of our fighting men are safe and that we do not allow the sacrifices these brave men are making to be made in vain by allowing the spreaders of sedition to go free and unimpeded.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to include extraneous material, I include the letter to me from Ensign Wheeler:

SOUTH CHINA SEA,
September 27, 1967.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HANSEN: I have been deployed to the Western Pacific for a period of about five months. During this period I have spent extensive periods of time at sea off the coast of South Vietnam in support of the United States policy of assisting the people of South Vietnam in keeping that one possession that all men hold so dear, freedom.

I have read many news releases and have heard news reports of the violence, rioting, and shootings that have been going on in many of our cities. Yesterday I read something that disturbed me very much. The article was written in the Pacific Edition of the Stars and Stripes and stated, in context, that Stokley Carmichael had offered his services to the Hanoi government to assist in the trials of captured American aviators.

If this man is allowed to return to the United States to enjoy the freedoms for which Americans are presently, and have for almost two hundred years, been fighting and dying, it will be an insult to me, to the thousands of American soldiers presently serving their great country, to the countless ones who have offered the supreme sacrifice for freedom, and to all those who have served and died for the United States since that first American fell at Lexington.

It will even be a worse insult to the American people living at home and to the Congress that represents them. You are the ones in whom we who are away from home doing the fighting and dying leave the care and protection of our homes and our loved ones. How can a man properly fight for his country if he lives with the worry that his wife might be raped or killed, his children killed, his home burned to the ground, or his property destroyed simply because some people feel that they have the right to classify burning, raping, and killing under the title "Civil Rights"? If you who are at home do nothing about these conditions, then you have no right to ask us to stay here and leave our loved ones to the mercy of hoodlums!

We must have the support of the people at home!

If Carmichael is allowed to return to the United States and enjoy its freedoms and beauties then I will be deeply ashamed. Ashamed for each day that I must keep my men away from their homes and families while an out and out traitor is allowed to walk the streets of our homeland.

MARK W. WHEELER.

RUPERT, IDAHO.

THE SUN SETS ON A PAPER LION: OR, SOCIALISM FAILS AGAIN

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the sun has apparently set on the once first rate, glorious power that was Great Britain. She is now a fourth-rate power—a friend, yes, but the socialism hailed as the solution to universal problems has sucked the blood from this nation which once was second only to the United States in leadership and prestige throughout the world.

Socialist programs have been attempted. They have been promoted and put into effect, and they have failed. There are labor problems, a "brain-drain," financial crises, and diplomatic blunders such as the self-defeating Rhodesian disgrace, balance-of-payments problems, and a Labor Party which appears to be going down with the failure of its socialism.

Barron's succinctly sums up the plight of the "Paper Lion" in the October 30 issue. This front page article does not pull punches. For example:

> London's once-formidable posture in diplomatic and military affairs has shriveled into impotence. What two world wars and three devaluations of sterling failed to do in half-a-century, the past three years of Socialist misrule have achieved. They have turned Great Britain into a paper lion.

The article provides food for thought for those who are sincerely interested in what socialist-oriented leadership can lead to, and I include it herewith:

PAPER LION—THAT'S WHAT THE LABOUR PARTY HAS MADE OF GREAT BRITAIN

"LONDON, October 24.—Prime Minister Harold Wilson told the House of Commons today he had evidence of a Communist plot to disrupt the British economy this winter. He did not say what the evidence was. Mr. Wilson made the statement in answer to routine questioning in Parliament. His comment came on a day that saw Britain still beset with a lengthy and trade-strangling dock strike; just recovering from a rail stoppage; in the throes of a scattered bus slowdown; and threatened with a slowdown by airline pilots and a bank strike.

"Mr. Wilson said that Minister of Labor Ray Gunter had his full support for Mr. Gunter's statement last week about a Communist plot for a 'winter of disruption in Britain.' Neil Marten, Banbury, a Conservative, then asked whether the prime minister actually had evidence of such a plot. 'Yes,' Mr. Wilson said."

When or whether Number 10 Downing Street chooses to document its extraordinary charge, readers of The Journal of Commerce, which broke the story in the U.S., presumably will be the first to know. Meanwhile, nobody on either side of the Atlantic seems about to raise the hue and cry of McCarthyism. Perhaps a government that regularly swaps goodwill missions with Moscow, and harbors in its Cabinet an avowed ex-Marxist, is deemed to be above suspicion of Red-baiting. Perhaps the newly revived scandals involving the notorious Soviet agents Burgess, Maclean and Philby lend credence to what the U.S. Senate Internal Security subcommittee calls the Communist conspiracy. Or perhaps it's simply that everyone knows—and a recent London Economist points out—that card-carrying party members control quite a few British trade unions.

Tools of the Kremlin, in short, doubtless have done their dirty work. What ails the United Kingdom's economy, however, goes far deeper than a Bolshevik plot. The Labour Government, which recently celebrated (if that is the word) its third year in office, came to power by promising to change the Tory policy of "stop-and-go." Thanks to Harold Wilson, since then it's been strictly no go. Under Labour's misguided policies, which have penalized private initiative for the benefit of the so-called public sector, capital investment has languished, the brain drain has worsened and unemployment has risen to the highest point in 20 years. With massive financial help from the free world, the U.K. has weathered one financial storm after another; nonetheless, the pound today remains in a critical state. East and West of Suez, finally, London's once-formidable posture in diplomatic and military affairs has shriveled into impotence. What two world wars and three devaluations of sterling failed to do in half-a-century, the past three years of Socialist misrule have achieved. They have turned Great Britain into a paper lion.

These days it's a puny-looking beast. Industrial production is running 1% behind last year, employment has declined 4%, while unemployment has shot up by nearly half. Capital investment and corporate profits have fallen by 10% or more. Owing in part to dock strikes, British imports last month exceeded exports by an alarming $145 million; instead of the equilibrium confidently and repeatedly forecast by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the U.K. balance of payments this year will remain in the red. After a flurry of strength in the Spring, the pound once again has sagged uncomfortably close to its official floor. To be sure, not all signs are bleak. In the first quarter of 1967, the tight little island put away nearly 1.5 million bottles of champagne, 10% ahead of the like year-ago period. The ebullient London Stock Exchange, buoyed by whiffs of reflation, takeover bids and a shortage of stock, lately has risen to a postwar high. Whether in London or New York, however, speculative fever is usually a sign of economic weakness, not of strength.

For Britain's woes, Mr. Wilson last week condemned the Communists; if what he said was a Red herring, nobody on either side of Parliament cried foul. In any case, wildcat strikes in such strategic areas as the nation's docks doubtless may be blamed on their machinations. The real trouble, however, is not Communism but its soft philosophic substitute. Under the Fabian Socialism of the Labour Government, private enterprise has suffered one blow after another, from manipulative and punitive taxation to arbitrary price ceilings. Official favor, financial and otherwise, has been lavished on the wasteful public sector, notably the loss-ridden state-owned railroads and coal mines. The newly nationalized steel industry can only become another heavy drain on the public purse. While penalizing productivity, Labour, through proliferating social service outlays, continues to expand a welfare state the cost of which has far outrun the nation's means.

Britain literally is living on borrowed money and borrowed time. Thus, the Exchequer's short- and medium-term obligations to the International Monetary Fund and the U.S. alone apparently exceed the $2.7 billion which it holds in gold and foreign exchange. A few weeks ago Whitehall went hat in hand to a group of Swiss banks, which agreed to lend another $105 million at 5½% for a term of one year, repayable in Swiss francs. London also has enjoyed the financial support of Washington, which has ample reasons to suspect that if the pound is devalued, the dollar won't be far behind. Since the end of April, U.S. holdings of convertible foreign currencies, preponderantly sterling, have shot up by nearly $1 billion. What most of the free world thinks of Britain's financial plight was summed up the other day by the staff of the European Economic Community, which Britain desperately is seeking to join. Pending "re-establishment of a durable equilibrium in Britain's economy and balance of payments," EEC held out scant hope for admission.

In the world of finance, Labour's go-go policies thus have led nowhere. On the diplomatic scene they have gone from bad to worse. Like most socialist regimes, Labour is hostile only to capitalism and freedom. Thus, at the behest of the peace-loving United Nations, Whitehall has done its unsuccessful worst (short of war) to bring down the rebellious government of Rhodesia, which stands as one of the last bastions of civilization on a continent rapidly reverting to savagery. In the face of Communist-inspired aggression elsewhere, the Fabians remain firmly committed to appeasement, retreat and defeat. By announcing that British forces would pull out of Aden next year, they invited the power struggle now raging in the protectorate. Although one provisional government already has been toppled, and the unhappy land seems destined to fall to some revolutionary faction or other, London is washing its hands of the bloody mess. Again, even as the Egyptians were launching a Soviet missile against an Israeli warship, British diplomats were making overtures to the Kremlin's proconsul in Cairo. Time was when nobody could get away with twisting the British lion's tail. Today the poor beast is trained to roll over and play dead.

The bad show plainly has begun to distress even the traditionally stolid Briton. During local balloting last spring, Labour was thrown out of offices, including the London County Council, that it had held for a generation. Last month the party lost a seat in Commons deemed as safe as the Rock of Gibraltar; if general elections were held right now, most observers agree that the Tories would easily win. Britain may never again be a "land fit for heroes to live in," but it can surely do better than wallow in Socialist muck.

DON'T LET THE PANAMA CANAL GO

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, although our attention and our thoughts are understandably concentrated these days on the war in Vietnam, I strongly suggest that we should not neglect or overlook another matter of equal importance to the security of our Nation. I refer to the Panama Canal and the treaties proposed by the United States and Panamanian Governments.

There is not one Member of this body, I daresay, who does not concede the strategic importance of this historic waterway between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. There is not one Member of this body, I would hope, who does not concur that the United States and only the United States can maintain the Panama Canal as an international waterway and a key link in our defense and that of the free world. However, the proposed treaties between this country and Panama would relinquish U.S. sovereignty over the canal. They would set up a complicated check and doublecheck system for the defense of the canal which could delay decisive action in a time of crisis until too late. These treaties, in my opinion, are not in the best interest of the United States and I and several other Congressmen have spoken out strongly against these treaties. My office and others have received considerable mail. I am now pleased to report that a prestigious citizens committee has been formed to keep the American public informed about the Panama Canal and to help provide support for those Members of the Senate and the House who are in opposition to these treaties.

This committee—the American Emergency Committee on the Panama Canal—announced its formation at a news conference on October 5. The committee's spokesmen analyzed the treaties; outlined the purpose and plans of the American Emergency Committee on the Panama Canal, and discussed the role of a special congressional liaison committee on which two of our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND, will serve.

The purpose and the function of the American Emergency Committee on the Panama Canal, cochairmaned by former Ambassador Spruille Braden and former Governor of New Jersey Charles Edison, are admirable and, furthermore, necessary. Although there is little visible activity at present, the Congress must remain on guard and prepare for the day when the administration will formally present the Panama Canal treaties. In preparation for that day and the debate, I recommend to my colleagues the reading of the statements issued at the October 5 news conference of the American Emergency Committee on the Panama Canal, which follow, along with a biographical background:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE SPRUILLE BRADEN

Governor Charles Edison and I are pleased to announce the formation of the American Emergency Committee on the Panama Canal. We, like many other citizens of the United States, including numerous Senators and Congressmen, were alarmed by the Canal Treaties proposed by President Johnson and President Robles of Panama. We hope our Committee, with its several hundred distinguished members, will be the vehicle to express the deep concern of others, as well as ourselves.

As House Concurrent Resolution 391 (June 28, 1967) stated, the "Canal is of vital strategic importance and imperative to the hemispheric defense and to the security of the United States. . . ." I believe the American public is gravely worried about and opposed to the Administration's proposals with regard to the Canal. Public opposition has been partially expressed to date and the purpose of this Committee is to mobilize *maximum* public support for Congressional opponents of the treaties. Toward this goal, we have mailed this week letters and petitions (texts attached) to 100,000 Americans. I wish to emphasize that this is only our *first* mailing. Through these petitions we will document the true extent of national opposition to the treaties. Members of our Congressional Liaison Committee, Senator Strom Thurmond and Congressmen Daniel J. Flood and H. R. Gross will help channel our findings to all members of Congress, and advise us how to be most effective in our operations.

In addition, the American Emergency Committee on the Panama Canal will carry out an educational program of public meetings and forums as well as the circulation of printed matter.

We believe that the Johnson-Robles treaties—as they now stand—would seriously jeopardize the security and defense of our country if they were ratified. We shall bend our every effort to see to it that they are not.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DANIEL J. FLOOD

The recently published proposed three treaties between the United States and Panama mark a new low in the diplomatic history of our country. They would cede sovereignty over the U.S. owned Canal Zone territory to Panama, give that country a voice in Panama Canal management, change the Canal from a non-profit enterprise to a source of revenue for Panama, and eventually give away this priceless utility that represents an investment, including defense, of some $5,000,000 (billion) of United States taxpayers money. Moreover, under the Constitution, such territory and property can be disposed of only by the Congress (House and Senate).

The Congress recently authorized the publication of a selection of my addresses on *Isthmanian Canal Policy Questions* (House Document No. 474, 89th Congress). These addresses cover the most significant aspects of the Canal question and contain a vast amount of documented information. All Members of the Congress have copies available.

A reading of this document will show that experienced engineers and navigators have emphasized that the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing Panama Canal, including the elimination of all locks at Pedro Miguel, is the least expensive means for modernization that is also the least disruptive of Panamanian economy. Besides, such program does not require a new treaty with Panama, which fact is a paramount consideration that should should be conclusive.

The Panama Canal is not only one of the world's greatest transportation centers but one that is vital for hemispheric defense.

Thus, the over-riding issue facing the nation is not U.S. control over the Canal Zone versus Panamanian, but U.S. sovereignty versus Communist control.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR STROM THURMOND

Despite the setbacks which the proposed Panama Canal treaties have received in the Republic of Panama, there is a need for even greater vigilance in the United States.

1. President Marco Robles has told the people of Panama that he is sending the negotiators back to the U.S. to seek changes in the treaties. These treaties have already proposed to give away so much that it is hard to conceive of any further concessions that could be in the American interest. When these negotiators return, the U. S. negotiating team will be under strong pressure to placate Panama in order to salvage as much of the present drafts as possible. It must not be forgotten that after the draft of the 1955 treaty was complete, President Jose Remon came to Washington demanding additional concessions—and got them.

2. As the recent meeting of the Organization of American States shows, the Communists are stepping up their activity in Latin America. Now that the Robles government is in a weak position politically, the Communists and Nationalists in Panama will step up the attack. Day after day for the past month, leading newspapers in the Republic have been calling for the resignation of Panama's Foreign Minister. One well-known columnist has even written that to say the treaties are ready to be signed is treason. In such a volatile situation, it is even more

important that the U.S. maintain direct physical control of the Canal Zone.

3. The exercise of U.S. sovereignty should never be negotiable. The very fact that the President proposed to abrogate this important right even before negotiations for the treaties begin indicates that he is not well informed on the best U.S. interest in the Canal. The canal issue is a hardy perennial. It will return again.

4. Meanwhile, the emphasis should be on exploring ways of improving the present Canal. For the past 25 years, studies have shown that it would be practical to make improvements to guarantee that there would be an ample two-way ship channel in the summit level, with adequate anchorages and lockage facilities at both ends.

I consider it a privilege to serve on the American Emergency Committee for the Panama Canal. My hope is that it can serve to keep the American people informed on the issues relating to the Canal Question, and keep them alert to the unpublicized diplomatic activity that has been endangering the future of the Panama Canal.

STATEMENT OF GEN. THOMAS A. LANE, RETIRED

Treaties recently negotiated for the transfer of sovereignty over the Panama Canal from the United States to Panama constitute a reprehensible abdication of United States responsibility. They are the latest step in a continuing and expanding submission of weak United States leadership to blackmail.

The Panama Canal is a United States Canal. The United States conquered yellow fever and made the isthmus habitable. It solved all engineering problems. It purchased every inch of land in the Zone. It paid Panama and Colombia handsomely for whatever concessions were made. The transfer to the United States in perpetuity of rights of sovereignty within the Zone recognized what all understood: That the United States was accepting a perpetual trusteeship for the whole world in building an isthmian waterway.

In our bipolar world, only the United States can fulfill that trusteeship. The transfer of sovereignty to Panama would make that country the target of irresistible Communist pressures to denounce the treaty and to expel the United States.

When Nasser terminated the Suez Canal Company lease, the United States supported the sovereign right of Egypt to denounce and terminate its agreement. By virtue of the sovereignty accorded to Panama in the proposed treaties, Panama would acquire on the date these treaties take effect the sovereign right to denounce and terminate them. Who can doubt that future governments of Panama would be under massive pressures to do so? Nationalization of the Canal is and will continue to be the aim of Panamanian nationalists and Communists. The Soviet Union would be able to acquire the Canal cheaply by buying a Panama election.

When that time comes, and it will certainly come if these treaties are approved, the United States will be forced to occupy Panama and denounce the treaties. There will be no other way to protect our national security and prevent Soviet control of the Canal. This is the prospect which these treaties would open to the American people.

Let us settle this issue now. Where does Panama stand in this confrontation with the Communist powers? If it is on the side of the Soviet Union, we cannot give up the Canal. If it is on the side of the Free World, it will not want the Canal because it is utterly incapable of defending the Canal.

President Johnson's negotiations of these treaties is an act of downright irresponsibility. The Congress should go on record in such overwhelming opposition to any cession of U.S. sovereignty in the Panama Canal Zone that the President will not dare to submit these treaties for approval.

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

AMBASSADOR SPRUILLE BRADEN

Ambassador Spruille Braden, co-chairman of the American Emergency Committee on the Panama Canal, has served as an ambassador and special representative for U.S. Presidents since 1935. His posts included ambassadorships to Colombia, Argentina and Cuba. In addition, he served as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, 1946–47, and since 1960 has served as President of the Americas Foundation. Ambassador Braden has been honored by numerous foreign countries, including Nicaragua and Guatemala which bestowed upon him the Grand Cross Ruben Dario and the Grand Cross Order of Quetzal, respectively. Among his citations is the Order of Lafayette Freedom award, which was presented to him in 1962.

GOVERNOR CHARLES EDISON

Governor Charles Edison, co-chairman of the American Emergency Committee on the Panama Canal, has been a prominent figure in American government since the 1930's. He is a former regional director of the Federal Housing Administration and served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy from 1937–39; Secretary of Navy, 1939–40, and Governor of New Jersey from 1941–44. Governor Edison retired as Chairman of the Board of the McGraw-Edison Company in 1961. He is presently a trustee of the National Wildlife Foundation.

GEN. THOMAS A. LANE, RETIRED

General Thomas A. Lane, retired, a founding member of the American Emergency Committee on the Panama Canal, is a nationally syndicated columnist on public and military affairs. During his military career, Gen. Lane served as a teacher of Military History at West Point; planner and operator on the staff of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in World War II, and as a teacher at the Air University after World War II. In 1954 he was appointed Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia and served concurrently as a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District and the National Capital Planning Commission. His assignments as a senior officer of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers took him to Central America and Asia, where he gained a practical working knowledge of the economies of the developing countries. Gen. Lane is president of Americans for Constitutional Action.

BUSINESS NEEDS YOU—SYMPOSIA SPONSORED BY AMERICAN GIRL SERVICE

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, within recent years, we have witnessed an important trend, a growing awareness by business of social responsibilities to the communities served. One good illustration of this is the significant national public service program undertaken by a New York-based corporation, American Girl Service, designed to encourage mature women to return to work.

Aware of the tremendous employment needs facing this country, and aware, also, that a great many mature women possess skills which can, but which have not been properly utilized, American Girl Service, a temporary help firm with offices in my district and in 67 cities, undertook a series of symposia in cooperation with leading department stores in various cities, titled "Business Needs You."

This program has already attracted live audiences of nearly 3,000 women, and has resulted in the return to work of many of the participants. American Girl Service, which itself employs 20,000 women annually, has cooperated fully in the development of this program with various Government agencies, including the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor, and has indicated that this significant public service program will be continued throughout 1968.

Recently, in response to many requests, American Girl Service prepared an informational background describing the "Business Needs You" program. I include it with my remarks in the RECORD:

BACKGROUND ON "BUSINESS NEEDS YOU" SYMPOSIUM

There are hundreds of thousands of mature women throughout the country who have important skills and years of prior office experience to offer to business, but who, for a variety of reasons, are reluctant to return to work. In a period of a tightening labor market, business wants and needs these women and is prepared to pay them well for their services.

The problem, up to now, has been how to identify these women and assuage their fears, both real and imaginary, regarding their return to work. American Girl Service, a leading national temporary help firm headquartered in New York City, discovered the answer, and as a result, it has helped thousands of mature women interested in working again and scores of firms seeking skilled and experienced employees.

The American Girl answer was its development and co-sponsorship of a public service symposium, titled "Business Needs You," which was specifically designed to encourage mature women to return to work. The first symposium, featuring a keynote address by Mrs. Mary Dublin Keyserling, director of the U. S. Labor Department's Women's Bureau, was presented in cooperation with Stern Brothers Department Store in New York City on January 25, 1967. This program, which attracted an overflow audience of 1,100 enthusiastic women, was so successful that American Girl Service was urged by government officials, program participants, and representatives of several leading national retail organizations, to present similar symposia in other cities.

As a result of this encouragement, American Girl Service developed a national program of "Business Needs You" symposia, presented in cooperation with leading department stores throughout the country. During 1967, for example, the temporary help firm co-sponsored five highly successful symposia. New programs are being presented throughout 1968.

In addition to the New York City program, 1967 symposia included:

Miami, Florida: A July 18th program co-sponsored by Jordan Marsh and attended by 500 women. Mrs. Keyserling was keynote speaker.

Denver, Colorado: A September 12th program co-sponsored by May D&F and attended by 500 women. Miss Rhobia C. Taylor, Regional Director of the Women's Bureau, was keynote speaker.

Rochester, N.Y.: A September 20th program co-sponsored by McCurdy's and attended by 250 women. Miss Evelyn Harrison, assistant to the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for Federal Women's Programs, was keynote speaker.

Minneapolis, Minn.: An October 3rd program co-sponsored by Donaldson's Golden Rule and attended by 300 women. Miss Mary Manning, Regional Director of the Women's Bureau, was keynote speaker.

A major factor in the program's success is its pragramtic approach to the problems and fears facing women contemplating a return to work. Virtually no area of concern is left untouched. Secondly, although the program is sponsored by a temporary help firm, it is non-commercial in content and discusses all kinds of work and all sources of employment, including government agencies. In fact, the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor has played a major role in the program by providing helpful materials to attendees and by the participation of its key executives as symposium speakers.

The format used in the symposium presented at Stern Brothers, is repeated in each of the other cities where it is presented, with minor changes made to reflect local needs. The keynote speaker is a government official, at the state or national level, and the program moderator is a top executive of American Girl Service, such as its president, Sabatino A. Russo, Jr. Other speakers, all drawn from the area in which the program is presented, include psychologists, financial experts, personnel executives of leading corporations, and local labor authorities.

How is a typical program conducted? On the day of the Stern Brothers program, for example, women began lining up in the corridor outside the store auditorium more than an hour before the 1:00 p.m. starting time. As each woman entered the room, she was handed a kit of materials compiled by American Girl Service from many sources. The kit featured brochures and pamphlets dealing with various facets of employment.

The symposium, which ran until 5:00 p.m., featured such distinguished speakers as Mrs. Keyserling; Mr. Russo; Dr. Rose Franzblau, a noted psychologist and writer; and Mary Feeley, syndicated financial columnist of the Associated Press.

Representatives of leading corporations spoke briefly and participated in a panel discussion. Among the topics discussed were: the job market today; kinds of work available; the modern office; computer equipment; attitudes of companies toward hiring mature workers; finances; and emotional factors. The panelists and speakers also answered scores of questions from the floor. Included in the program was a simulated job interview and a slide showing contrasting the office of yesterday with the office of today. The program concluded with a make-up demonstration and fashion show, specifically aimed at the mature woman returning to work.

A program ingredient, introduced successfully at the Minneapolis Symposium, was a consultation period immediately following the conclusion of the program. Personnel representatives of thirteen local corporations and organizations met with interested audience members individually and answered their questions concerning employment.

An indication of the program's success in stimulating women to return to work can be gleaned from one of the many letters received by American Girl Service following the New York City program. It said, in part, "I must express thanks for the confidence acquired by listening to the many speakers . . . I had given up. Now I am ready to go job hunting again."

ANOTHER LOOK AT RURAL LIFE

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Zwach] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, people throughout the country, people in high places and people in low places, are concerned about the welfare of our rural countryside.

Never has the cost-price ratio been more unfavorable for the family farmer. Farmer after farmer is going out of business. Many of them and their children are leaving the farms for the promise of shorter hours and higher wages in the cities.

But we see what happens when the people from these rural areas go to the already overcrowded urban centers seeking opportunities which they cannot find in the countryside. Many of them, especially those from the more backward areas, become misfits. They do not have the training nor the experience to enable them to be successfully assimilated into the economic and social life of the city. They become charges of the welfare agencies or they crowd into substandard dwelling areas.

On September 25 I introduced H.R. 13102, the Rural Job Development Act which will provide tax incentives for industry to open new plants in the rural countryside. This legislation is vitally needed.

Mr. Speaker, many editorials favoring such legislation have been written by my Minnesota Sixth Congressional District editors. I insert, at this point, one such editorial written by Eugene D. Johnson, editor-publisher of the Olivia Times-Journal:

Another Look at Rural Life

Today, more than ever, the attention in government programs is focused on large city and suburban areas, and rightly so, as the expanding population in these areas has caused some real critical problems. Take our Twin Cities for example. When was the last time you tried moving across town behind the wheel of your car, during the rush hour. It probably took you more than an hour to do it.

Or the suburbs and their ever increasing school systems where from one year to the next they don't know how many hundred more students they are going to have due to the influx of population. Well they have many more problems in sewer systems, police protection, etc.

Now, where are all these people coming from? They must come from some place. You guessed it. From the rural areas where we trained them in good schools in small communities where families and friends have meaning.

Now, I don't always agree with Vice President Humphrey, but in a recent article in Life magazine, written by Hugh Sidey and quoted in the Minneapolis Tribune, he makes a point in which I'm in total agreement.

That is that we need new social structures, new ideas of community living in the agricultural area and that they get top priority and for hard headed reasons. Humphrey went on to say that $1 million spent in the rural areas to upgrade the life there now could save $20 million that would have to be spent later to solve urban complications.

To achieve this he suggests a spreading of industry, an improvement in communication and mobility, an equalizing of social benefits. The young people who leave the rural areas go for many reasons, but the chief among them is their feeling that if they stay, the world passes them by. Every night, said Vice-President, their TV set reminds them they are left behind. But, if there is an IBM plant or a Xerox branch in their town, then they can honestly say they are with the gang.

He thinks that a lot of individual farm life out on the windswept prairies is not what the romantics claim—it is just too lonely for satisfactory existence.

The heart of America has been its small town people who know the art of personal living which goes hand in hand with community responsibility. Let's not give up what we hold to be a good place to raise and educate our families, but rather work to redevelop and reorganize our thinking on rural America.

OREGON GOV. TOM McCALL ADDRESSES STATE LEGISLATORS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Wyatt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Oregon has already this year completed the longest session in its history. While much was accomplished during the regular session, some major legislative problems were unsolved.

Oregon's determined new Governor, Tom McCall, is not one to let urgent problems sit by for a biennium without action. Accordingly, this dynamic leader has called a special session of the 54th Oregon Legislative Assembly in order to work out solutions to those problems still remaining from the regular session.

The special session of the Oregon Legislature was called to order Monday of this week. I present here the opening address to that session by Oregon Gov. Tom McCall:

Message to the Special Session of the 54th Oregon Legislative Assembly by Gov. Tom McCall

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the 54th Legislative Assembly and fellow citizens: This is the second time in 1967 I have tendered you this greeting in this chamber.

It came first from a new governor on Inauguration Day, January 9th—a new governor filled with hope that we together would "devote ourselves, imaginatively and selflessly, to the tasks at hand."

Now it comes today from a considerably more seasoned governor—but one who still cherishes that same hope. Not that we failed in *many* important areas in the regular session. For it was marked by a torrent of accomplishment.

But it also was flawed by an inability to get the job done in constitutional revision, traffic safety and, most notably, in school finance and property tax relief.

I trust that this session will be confined only to the State's major finance problems.

I trust we will attack them directly and vigorously with an absolute minimum of backbiting partisanship and an absolute maximum of courageous cooperation.

I trust, in short, we will do our work as the mature, alert individuals we are—do it promptly and head for home with a sense, not of apology, but of achievement.

It's not going to be easy—nor were things less than difficult in the regular session. But the road is steeper now because, with the economy limping, the effective budget we together fashioned in the spring has swung sharply out of balance.

The condition of the budget today—that alone completely justifies this special session.

To have waited until next year and have found the economy and revenues still declining would doom appropriations to reductions so drastic as to require the decimation of state services.

Even now, the slashing needed to help eliminate the prospective deficit of nearly $32 million is slicing into muscle and sinew and putting the knife close to vital organs.

Indeed, it is a cruel process, a process that goes beyond sensible economizing . . . and I know that those of you who shared the structuring of the budget with my office in the regular session now must share with us a sense of dismay.

It seems to me, however, that this administration and Ways and Means are acting in this unpleasant situation with realism.

Granted, there are numerous areas where the executive and legislative screeners have not reached identical conclusions—but press reports that I was "scalded" and intended to "rebuke Ways and Means are based on assumption, not fact.

Our respective branches of government can disagree on methodology and approaches and figures—and properly so—but can we really afford to differ on essential programs for pollution control and the mentally retarded?

These are the major points which I feel compelled this morning to urge the joint committee to reconsider. Specifically, I am soliciting Ways and Means to reappraise pending decisions to delete nearly all of the $3 million sewer grant fund and the appropriations for remodeling and operating two wards at Eastern Oregon State Hospital.

Local government units in Oregon must construct upward of $70 million worth of sewage collection and treatment facilities—a staggering outlay they cannot possibly manage without State and Federal help.

The $3 million appropriated in the regular session for State matching was puny compared with the magnitude of the assignment—but it was a start and it *did* stimulate efforts in a number of communities to meet the schedules laid down by the State Sanitary Authority.

The fund is a particular boon to such towns as Oakland, Jefferson, and Halfway—the little fellows without financial capacity to do the job on their own.

Halfway's sewage treatment plan actually is under construction, and the loss of State match would necessitate an election for additional bonds.

In fact, denial of the State match would mean that equivalent sums would have to be raised through extra bonding in the affected communities—communities, mostly, that are least able to afford it.

And, hopefully, while the legislature takes a second look at this problem, I also urge it to weight carefully the impact of postponing the Eastern Oregon State Hospital wards.

For years, every legislator and Governor has acknowledged the need to reduce the list of mentally retarded seeking admission to State Institutions.

Conversion of psychiatric space at Eastern Oregon State Hospital to wards for the retarded has markedly reduced the waiting list, which, for a considerable period, numbered in the hundreds.

The question raised here is whether we pull up *so* short of the goal and ensure a waiting list of 85 or 90, or whether we finance the Eastern Oregon Hospital remodeling and cut the list to an irreducible minimum of perhaps 12 or 15.

As serious as Oregon's budget problems are, I am recommending against any new or increased taxes for the support of state government operations.

And one of the reasons is that the overriding issue before us is the search for a source of revenue sufficient to afford our citizens substantial property tax relief.

Figures released by the Speaker of the House indicate that gross property taxes jumped some $57 million just this year. It was my view in January that this should have been prevented—and property taxes actually rolled back—by means of personal and business income tax increases, coupled with a limit on school expenditures.

As we know now, however, the declining economy would probably have thrown this plan out of balance by as much as $70 million in the course of this biennium.

Since the income tax has been my preference, I attempted to structure another plan on a similar basis for the special session. This had to be abanoned, though, on the finding it would have entailed a 55 percent hike, putting Oregon in the ridiculous position of being the highest income tax state in America.

And so, reluctantly, after reviewing all the alternatives, I proposed submitting a 3 percent sales tax to the voters in the May primary.

Combined with it in my recommendations were a 17–18 percent increase in corporate taxes, a simplification of income tax returns and a new, stringent limit on school levies . . . with the package to raise $100 million per year to effect a 28 percent reduction in property taxes, statewide.

Since the program was announced October 16th, we have been discussing it with tax and education experts. We have also been testing it with respect to some of the suggestions received in letters from hundreds of citizens. And we have noted the testimony unfolded last week before the House Taxation Committee.

All this busy analysis has confirmed the need for a number of modifications.

The people showed with a vengeance four years ago this month that they were against an income tax increase, but the sales tax has not been before them for 20 years—and if it reappears next spring, it ought to be presented in the fairest light to all concerned.

The modifications I suggest to meet this standard include:

(1) Freezing of the 3 percent rate and the educational dedication of sales tax proceeds into the Constitution, so that neither the rate nor the purpose may be changed without a vote of the people.

(2) Elimination of the proposed $12 credit from consideration and exemption of food and drugs from the sales tax, for the reason that the credit simply seems to defy understanding.

In related legislation, the following points deserve attention:

(1) Further study indicates that the provision in my Basic School Support bill *requiring* districts to spend $650 per ADM (Average Daily Membership) is punitive. It should be deleted.

(2) We need to evolve a Basic School Support formula other than the existing one and adjust the one I first recommended. Legislators, educators and members of my staff who work on this complicated undertaking should get away from the present grossly unfair distribution system while seeking to define a substitute in terms enabling the people to vote on the measure as understandingly as possible.

(3) My announced intention on October 16th was to avoid any revenue raising in my proposal to use the Federal taxable balance as the basis for computing individual State income tax returns. The State Tax Commission has been instructed to cut rates even further to preclude any increase from this source.

It has been erroneously reported that my program would allow the people to vote down the sales tax and vote in the school limitation—or vice versa.

However, provision is made in the appropriate legislation to prevent the limitation and the proposed corporate tax increase from becoming effective unless the sales tax is approved by the voters. Nor would it be possible for the sales tax to be operative without the limitation or additional business taxes.

In short, every possible effort is being made to give Oregonians a clear and honest opportunity to vote on a soundly-conceived revenue and tax-relief package.

The program is based, of course, on the 3 percent sales tax, with proceeds to be dedicated to substantially property tax relief to be channeled through basic school support.

It is of more than transient interest that a recent highly publicized public opinion poll indicated that, as of a month ago, more than 40 percent of Oregon's voters favored the sales tax. This is a strong showing for any proposed tax, particularly one that would extract $100 million a year from Oregonians and their tourist visitors.

It also is timely to recall the observation on the subject by the president of Americans for Democratic Action, Economist John Kenneth Galbraith.

Dr. Galbraith calls the property tax "rigid and inflexible—poor servant of social balance" . . . and he says that resistance to the sales tax has made "the liberal the opponent of better schools, better communities, better urban communications and, indeed, of even greater economic stability."

As he writes about "remaining stereotypes in the face of change," it brings to mind the objections raised since the sales tax was proposed for Oregon the 16th of this month.

Not one argument against it—or one word of one argument—is any different from the outcry against the sales tax in the 1930's and 1940's.

Yet Oregon is a far different state today—a state of quality services . . . of excellent institutions . . . of superb schools and homes.

All could hang in the balance as this special session is convened today to decide whether, in the wisdom of the legislature, the people are even to be granted the elemental right of *voting* on the sales tax.

That's the question before us—not whether the governor or the legislators personally like or dislike a sales tax . . . not whether there's partisan gain or damage in the issue . . . but whether we have enough faith in the judgment of the voters to let *them* make this decision.

Let us give them the opportunity to tell us how they propose, as taxpayers, to invest in Oregon's future.

In these halls in the next few days, then, we can begin a bold march forward.

I call on you to display the courage, the vision and the fairness to take the firm first step.

NATIONAL UNICEF DAY

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as one always interested in movements to help the world's children, I was particularly glad to read the President's proclamation of Friday last declaring October 31 of this year and in each subsequent year to be National UNICEF Day.

I insert his words in the RECORD:

NATIONAL UNICEF DAY

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) was established by the United Nations in 1946.

UNICEF is dedicated to the welfare of children throughout the world—to eliminating the disease, hunger, and ignorance that afflicts them and their mothers.

UNICEF is one of the most successful international efforts the world has ever known.

The American people have actively and generously supported the work of UNICEF through their private efforts, and through the financial contributions of their Government. American children make their own very significant contribution through their annual Halloween collections for UNICEF.

Yet, despite past efforts, three out of four of all the world's children continue to suffer in the shadow of poverty, hunger, and disease. There is an enormous job still to be done—for the world's future depends on the wholesome, healthy development of today's children.

I hope that the American people, and the peoples of all countries, will continue to support UNICEF to the limits of their ability, both through their private efforts and through their governments.

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, in honor of this great humanitarian enterprise, do hereby proclaim October 31, 1967, and October 31 in each subsequent year, as National UNICEF Day. I call upon all Americans, and particularly upon officials of the Federal and State governments and upon local officials and citizen groups, to engage in appropriate observance of this day in support of UNICEF.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-seventh day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-second.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE EMPLOYMENT INCENTIVE ACT OF 1967

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, since the passage of the Employment Act of 1946, one of the key objectives of Government policy has been to create a climate in which every citizen who is able and willing to work can find a job. The fact that over 96 percent of Americans who want to work do have a job attests to the success of our economic system in meeting the goal of the Employment Act.

But what of the three million Americans who are seeking a job but cannot find it? Obviously many of these individuals are between jobs as a result of free choice, while others are undergoing only a short spell of unemployment that is common in any dynamic economy.

The successes of our system must not blind us, however, to the individuals in genuine need. There are hundreds of thousands of persons who suffer from long-term unemployment or underemployment and for whom the American promise of personal fulfillment and opportunity remains only a rather distant and often unreal dream.

An analysis of our unemployment statistics makes clear that one of the chief obstacles to steady employment—even in a high level economy—is a lack of those skills which are in demand in a dynamic, rapidly changing technological and urban society. When a person lacking needed skills is also a member of a disadvantaged minority group, the chances that he will be unemployed increases.

In 1966, for example, young people between the ages of 16 and 19 had an unemployment rate of over 11 percent—more than three times the rate of adults. Part of this reflects low skills and a part reflects the desire of young people to change jobs frequently as they seek out an attractive career opportunity. Nonwhite teenagers faced an even gloomier situation—over 25 percent of them could not find jobs. Nonwhites as a whole experienced unemployment in 1966 at a rate—7.3 percent—nearly twice that for whites.

The relationship between lack of education and skills and unemployment is indicated by another statistic. Among students who left school in 1964, the unemployment rate in 1966 was almost twice as high for those who dropped out as for those who graduated—33.6 percent as compared to 18.7 percent.

Ironically, Government policies themselves sometimes contribute to high unemployment among the unskilled. There is a wide body of professional opinion which believes that the minimum wage prices many low-skill individuals out of the labor market. As much as I support a basic theory of the minimum wage, this theory has been much abused in our present Federal laws. As a result we cannot overlook the strong evidence that employers simply do not hire—or displace by laborsaving devices—employees whose skills do not merit payment of the minimum wage. The problem is likely to grow even more serious when the current $1.40 minimum rises to $1.60 next February. This is not an argument against the minimum wage as much as it is an appeal to do something specific to mitigate the specific disemployment effects created by rapid and large increases in the minimum.

Numerous empirical studies have been conducted to show that as the minimum wage increases, large numbers of low productivity workers become unable to find steady employment. Even in the boom conditions of late 1966, nearly a half million workers were without jobs for 15 weeks or more.

One recent study by the National Federation of Independent Businesses concluded that, "The increase in the ranks of the Nation's 'hard core unemployables' due to the imposition of the new wage-hour law has apparently already reached 400,000 with the end not yet in sight." Many noted economists, including Prof. Arthur F. Burns, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers during the Eisenhower administration, and Prof. James Tobin, a member of President Kennedy's CEA, have also observed that higher minimum wages hinder the employment of these workers. At the conclusion of my remarks, I will ask unanimous consent to have the summary of these findings included in the Record.

The best solution, of course, is training for productive employment. But employers cannot afford to offer training programs in which employees contribute little to production yet must receive a specified minimum wage.

Government training programs, though important, do not fill the need entirely. They frequently cannot match the benefits of private training for a specific job. William Read, the director of training and personnel development at the Atlantic Refining Co., has pointed out:

> One of the great strengths of on-the-job training lies in the fact that trainees learn their jobs under the same conditions as those that will prevail when their training is completed.

In short, under present conditions, many trainees under Government programs do not receive the type of on-the-job training that many employers consider most beneficial.

A new approach is needed to solve the problem of the unemployment of disadvantaged individuals. We must somehow offset impediments, including Government-erected impediments, to maximum employment. One of these is the minimum wage as presently structured. If private firms could hire workers at a lower wage rate, more of these people could find jobs and acquire the experience and training necessary to launch them in careers of steady employment and personal advancement. Yet to ask these individuals to work at rates below the minimum wage is not the answer.

I am introducing the Employment Incentive Act of 1967 to help meet this specific problem by encouraging the employment and training by private employers of individuals who are presently unemployable due to lack of skills, education and experience. I am pleased to note that Senator Charles H. Percy is introducing the bill in the Senate.

Under the Employment Incentive Act of 1967, a firm may apply for a certificate authorizing it to receive refunds for the employment of individuals certified to be low productivity workers by the local office of the U.S. Employment Service. The Administrator of the Wage and Hours and Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor may issue a certificate to the firm if it fulfills certain conditions including the existence of an on-the-job or formal training program to upgrade the skills and enhance the productivity of certified workers.

The firm will pay the employees the minimum wage, but the Government would return to it a refund equal to 40 percent of the applicable minimum wage for each hour worked by the certified individual. Since the worker's skills and experience will increase during the duration of the certificate, the refund to 20 percent of the minimum wage after the certification period is half expired.

Depending on the type of work performed, the employee certificate would be valid for 6 months or 1 year. No employee certificate may be renewed. The employer certificate, on the other hand, may be renewed repeatedly, barring any violations.

This act, by providing refunds to businesses employing low productivity workers, reduces the effective costs of these workers to the firm to a level more consistent with their economic contribution. It thereby provides the initial impetus for their employment and training.

During the first year of the program, this bill authorizes the employment of up to 100,000 certified workers. The initial gross cost to the Government of the refunds if in full operation will be about $72 million. However, a large part of this money will be returned to the Government in the form of income taxes or saving in unemployment compensation and welfare payments. The best estimates are that the net cost of this proposal during the first year will be less than $50 million. During the second year, the bill provides for up to 200,000 certified workers to be employed. To accomplish this, the act authorizes an appropriation of $144 million. Once again, the net cost will be much less—about $100 million if in full operation.

The Employment Incentive Act of 1967 offers an effective but inexpensive way to enhance employment opportunities for workers of low skills and education. It requires a net Government investment of only about $500 for each worker employed and trained, a negligible amount when compared to the $6,900 average expenditure for each enrollee in the Job Corps.

The Employment Incentive Act makes it economically feasible for private industry to move in combating unemployment among low-skilled individuals. The act creates job opportunities for these workers and, at the same time, encourages industry to train them. With the skills and experience thus acquired, these people are more likely to find steady employment once they leave the program.

Robert A. Burns, vice president of the Schlitz Brewing Co., strongly believes that firms would hire more disadvantaged workers if their wages accurately reflected their economic value to the firm. In a letter to me, he said:

> Many employers would be willing to bring these people into their plants provided they were not required to pay a wage far in excess of the employee's contribution. Employers would be willing to hire the unskilled at appropriate rates and increase that pay as the learning occurred.

The refunds provided by this act would reduce the effective costs of these workers to a level where employers would find it more attractive to hire them.

More important, the refunds would facilitate the training of low skilled workers. On-the-job training requires jobs. This act stimulates employers to provide these jobs, thereby fulfilling an essential prerequisite of training. In addition, the act recognizes the indisputable fact that a trainee produces less than the experienced employee. Reynolds I. Nowell, economist for the Equitable Life Assurance Society, argues that industry would step up its training programs if given a proper incentive:

> The American business man has great ingenuity and resourcefulness. If he is given access to a supply of labor, priced at its true economic value, he will quickly devise ways of using it effectively. He will not only use it but will also train it with skills that will offer increasing opportunities for advancement.

In addition to encouraging independent private training programs, my bill would also improve the implementation of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Today, an employer offering MDTA on-the-job training must still pay his trainees the minimum wage, though the actual costs of training are paid by the Government. As a result, he is still deterred from joining these programs. Under this act, he could pay them a wage more consistent with what they produce. Thus, this program would make MDTA more effective.

It would also help implement the reforms in the aid to families with dependent children program. The House Ways and Means Committee, in its report on the Social Security Amendments of 1967, which were recently passed by the House, noted that one purpose of that act is to give "greater emphasis to getting appropriate members of families drawing AFDC payments into employment." To accomplish this, the amendments provide for expanding programs stressing the development of the work potential of each adult receiving payments.

The committee expressed concern that Federal minimum wage provisions may handicap the establishment of constructive programs in the States. I believe that this concern is justified. The Employment Incentive Act of 1967 will help get more AFDC recipients into employment by increasing job opportunities for them and by eliminating an important disincentive to private training. The act would insure that the Federal minimum wage will not prevent AFDC participants from obtaining jobs and training.

The bill would also help combat urban poverty. At present, of the 56,000 adult men in a typical low income area, of the central cities only 30,600, just 54.7 percent have full-time employment. Many students of urban problems, including Daniel Moynihan, argue that the real need is more jobs for the urban male. This bill helps to provide these jobs as well as essential training, so that even when the refunds cease, the employment is likely to continue. An advantage of this approach is that these jobs are in private industry. As Prof. Milton Friedman has said:

> The two-step minimum wage would be cheaper for taxpayers and better for the worker. Then he has the self-respect and dignity of holding a job, of contributing to his own support.

The Employment Incentive Act of 1967 is not the final answer to our unemployment problem, but it is a constructive approach to employing those individuals who suffer joblessness in the midst of widespread prosperity. It offers jobs and training for those who otherwise would be unemployed. It contributes to the realization of fuller employment, more efficient welfare system, and less urban poverty. I hope that this proposal will stimulate interest in this approach and that ideas and suggestions will be offered to improve the bill which I am introducing today. Our constructive addition would be a mechanism for judicial review, for example.

I include the following in the RECORD: A summary of the analysis used to estimate the costs of this program; a summary of the empirical studies and of the statements of economists corroborating the view that the minimum wage is an impediment to finding jobs for the disadvantaged; articles by Professor Milton Friedman and Mr. Henry Hazlitt, both from Newsweek, a June 27, 1967, release from the National Federation of Independent Businesses documenting the number unemployed due to the most recent increase in the minimum wage; and an article in the Washington Post of August 28, 1967, reporting on the proposal of Mitchell I. Ginsberg, Social Service Commissioner of New York City, to create job subsidies for those on relief.

ESTIMATED COSTS OF THE EMPLOYMENT INCENTIVE ACT OF 1967

The Employment Incentive Act of 1967 is an inexpensive program to enhance employment opportunities for low productivity workers. With a one-year investment by the government of 40% of the minimum wage for each certified worker, the plan provides these workers with job experience and training which will improve their chances for steady employment. By encouraging their employment for one year, it improves their employability permanently.

In calculating the appropriation that must be authorized to employ 100,000 workers the first year, the gross costs of the program to the government must be considered. The equation used to calculate the annual gross cost is: Gross cost = (number of workers covered) × (refunds per hour × hours worked by each worker per year).

The number of workers covered by certificates must be divided according to the type of certificate they hold. 50,000 workers shall hold 6-month certificates: 25,000 during the first 6 months, and 25,000 during the second half year. Likewise, 50,000 workers shall hold 12-month certificates.

The refunds per hour shall equal 40% of the minimum wage during the first half of the duration of a certificate, and 20% thereafter until expiration. In terms of dollars and cents, the refund shall equal 64¢ for the first 3 months of the 6-month certificate and for the first 6 months of the one-year certificate; thereafter until expiration, the refund shall be 32¢ an hour.

In calculating the number of hours worked per year by each certified employee, we have tried to derive an average figure. In doing so, we have assumed a 40 hour week and a 50 week year. The average employee holding a six-month certificate will work 500 hours at a refund rate of 40% and 500 hours at a refund rate of 20%. The average employee holding a one-year certificate will work 1000 hours at a refund rate of 40% and 1000 hours at a rate of 20%.

Plugging this data into the equation used to figure gross cost, we obtain the following result: Gross cost = (50,000 × $.64 × 500) + (50,000 × $.32 × 500) + (50,000 × $.64 × 1000) + (50,000 × $.32 × 1000). This multiplies out to: Gross cost = $16 million + $8 million + $32 million + $16 million. The gross cost of this proposal is $72 million. To employ 100,000 individuals, $72 million must be authorized to be appropriated.

The program is more ambitious in its second year. During the second year, it proposes to encourage the employment of 200,000 workers. This doubles the number of certified employees and will, therefore, exactly double the costs. $144 million must be authorized to be appropriated.

Though Congress would have to appropriate the gross costs of the program in order to initiate it, the actual net costs to the government will be substantially less.

First, a significant part of the $72 million expenditure the first year will be returned to the government in the form of tax receipts. In calculating the tax returns several assumptions must be made. (1) That without these jobs, the certified individuals would have no taxable income, (2) That these workers will earn $1.60 an hour, which will mean that their annual income would be $3,200. (3) That ½ of the certified employees will be single, claiming one exemption, and that ½ will be married, with an average of two children, claiming four exemptions. Under these assumptions, the average tax return to the federal government will be $218. Therefore, the total return from 100,000 certified employees will be $21.8 million. Thus, taking into account the tax returns the net cost of the Employment Opportunity Act of 1967 would be $50.2 million for the first fiscal year.

During the second year, twice as many workers will be employed under this proposal. The tax receipts as well as the gross costs will double. To employ 200,000 workers, the government will have a net expenditure of somewhat less than $100.4 million.

Second, the government would also realize substantial savings in its expenditures for unemployment compensation and welfare. These savings can justifiably be expected since more people will be employed, leaving fewer on the unemployment and welfare relief rolls. Unfortunately, there is no simple measure of the extent of these savings. Nonetheless, we can conclude that, taking these into account, the net costs of this program would be substantially less than $50.2 million during the first fiscal year of its operation.

Summary of estimated costs

Gross costs:	
(1) To employ 100,000	$72,000,000
(2) To employ 200,000	144,000,000
Tax receipts from certified employees:	
(1) From 100,000 employees	21,800,000
(2) From 200,000 employees	43,600,000
Net costs after taxes:	
(1) To employ 100,000	50,200,000
(2) To employ 200,000	100,400,000

OTHER SAVINGS

(1) Expenditures for unemployment compensation and welfare could be reduced.

(2) No exact estimates of these savings are available. However, they would definitely reduce costs below the net after taxes.

A CASE FOR THE EMPLOYMENT INCENTIVE ACT OF 1967

I. MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION IS AN IMPEDIMENT TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF DISADVANTAGED WORKERS

A. *In general, higher minimum wages mean less employment opportunities for workers of low skills and education.*

1. Monthly Labor Review, March 1960, p. 238: "A required increase in minimum wage rates will, in general, decrease somewhat the employment of those affected, as compared with what that volume of employment might otherwise have been. The percentage curtailment in employment, compared with what it might have been otherwise, is not likely to be as great as the percentage increase in the minimum wage rates."

Monthly Labor Review, September 1967, p. 29: "The Agricultural Minimum Wage: A Preliminary Look."

"In view of the declining level of employment in agriculture, the question of whether or not the minimum wage law will cause unemployment is almost irrelevant. The minimum will only speed the process of labor displacement. The more important question centers on the policies that can be used to ease the adjustment of some workers from farm to nonfarm employment and to provide a decent livelihood for the workers remaining in farming."

Wall Street Journal, April 5, 1967: The Journal reported that the Labor Department cut off manpower development and training funds in El Paso because most trainees who finished the program weren't able to get jobs paying $1.40 an hour as required by the Federal minimum wage law.

2. Empirical studies confirm that an increase in the minimum wage is associated with higher unemployment, *ceteris paribus*.

a. John M. Peterson, Professor of Economics at the University of Arkansas, reached the conclusion in his study, "Employment Effects of Minimum Wages, 1938–50," in the *Journal of Political Economy*, October 1957, that "Employment changes will be inversely related to wage increases imposed by a minimum wage among firms making a very similar product for the same market, other things remaining the same."

b. Marshall Coleberg, of Florida State University, studied the effects of minimum wage legislation among low and high wage counties in Florida. His findings were published in "Minimum Wage Effects on Florida's Economic Development," *The Journal of Law and Economics*, October 1960. He found a one-to-one relationship between the relative size of the wage rate increase due to minimum wage increases and the decline in employment. "The counties in which the wage rate was raised by the largest percentage encountered the largest decline in manufacturing employment. A 1% greater increase in the average wage was associated with nearly a 1% greater loss in manhours of employment."

c. *The New York Times* on March 14, 1966, reported that in Puerto Rico, 9,000 manufacturing jobs were lost between 1949 and 1954, and 29,000 were lost between 1954 and 1958 "as a result of wage increases." It quoted Alfredo Nazario, Puerto Rico's Secretary of Labor, as saying that employment in six industries had gone down more than 14% since the minimum wage hikes of 1961.

d. Further quantification of the number of jobs which are lost because of raising the minimum wage is given by Jim Hyatt in an article in the *Wall Street Journal* of April 19, 1967 entitled, "Minimum Wage Can Mean Minimum Jobs." Mr. Hyatt quotes the president of the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation: "At least 6,000 or 7,000 Arkansas families will be hurt by the minimum wage, which covers many farm families for the first time." In one state alone, the minimum wage cost 7,000 families their jobs.

e. A careful analysis of New York State's retail trade minimum wage order of 1957, published under the title, *Effects of Minimum Wage on Employment and Business*, found that many jobs were lost as a result of the higher minimum. "About a quarter of 1 percent of all retail jobs were lost, at least temporarily, because of the new minimum; 951 workers were laid off and 517 were not replaced when they quit."

f. Probably the most comprehensive recent study of the effects of minimum wage laws on employment was done by Professor Colin and Mrs. Rosemary Campbell. Dr. Campbell is Professor of Economics at Dartmouth College. The title of their study, still unpublished, is "Minimum Wage Laws as a Cause of Unemployment." In order to obtain statistically reliable data, they studied the effects of state rather than federal, minimum wage laws. Among their findings are the following:

1. "From January 1960 to May 1965, the weighted average rate of unemployment in areas with state minimum wage laws was higher than in areas without such laws for 32 out of 33 bimonthly reporting dates. The 1960 census also shows higher rates of unemployment in the 28 states with minimum wage laws included in their survey. The weighted rate of unemployment for all workers in such states was 5.3 per cent compared to 4.7 per cent for the other 22 states."

2. "From 1960 to 1965, unemployment fell more rapidly in states without minimum wage laws than in the other states. In the 1960–61 recession, the rate of unemployment in areas with minimum wage laws was approximately 5 to 10 per cent above that in areas without such laws. By 1965, this difference has increased to approximately 35 per cent. When unemployment for the country as a whole is high, the major cause is probably inadequate demand. On the other hand, when the economy is prosperous, minimum wage laws apparently become comparatively more important."

3. "In general, states with the higher minimum wage rates had higher rates of unemployment."

4. "From 1963 to 1965 the rate of unemployment in areas with state minimum wage laws was typically one percentage point above that in areas without such laws. In 1963, a reduction of one per cent in this rate would have reduced the number unemployed . . . by approximately 300,000 persons."

g. The U.S. Department of Labor has admitted that in some, low-wage areas, certain workers will lose their jobs as a result of higher minimum wages. Speaking of the retail trade in Puerto Rico, the Department says: "In these instances the minimum wage requirements may have stimulated or accelerated programs to reduce labor requirements through more efficient operations."

h. Those U.S. Labor Department studies which state that employment has always increased despite raises in the minimum wage suffer from two faults:

1. They make no attempt to hold all other factors constant. They do not compare actual employment with what it might have been had there been no minimum wage hike. Professor Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago made this point in the pamphlet, *The Minimum Wage: Who Pays?* He said: "If the economy is expanding rapidly, as it has been since 1961, then the immediate effect of a relatively small increase in the minimum may not be an absolute rise in unemployment. Rather, its effect may be that employment in the industries hit hardest by the minimum will *grow less rapidly* than would have been the case without the higher minimum."

2. The Department omits all firms going out of business during the survey period, even though such firms probably account for a major part of the disemployment effects.

B. *Workers with inadequate skills, education, and experience suffer most from the unemployment resulting from higher minimum wages.*

1. Marginal jobs, usually filled by these workers, disappear. There are three reasons why marginals jobs are discontinued after an increase in the minimum wage.

a. The new minimum wage may be more than the amount a marginal employee can contribute to the firm's production

1. Minimum wage laws increase the costs, without raising the worth, of these workers. Professor Arthur F. Burns of Columbia University, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors during the Eisenhower Administration, in *The Management of Prosperity*, argues: "The mere raising of the statutory minimum does nothing of itself to improve the productivity of workers, and it therefore also does nothing to enhance their worth to employers. The broad result of the substantial increase of the minimum in recent years therefore has been a curtailment of job opportunities for the less skilled workers."

2. The minimum wage may exceed the economic value of marginal labor. In "A Plan for Youth Employment," *The Disadvantaged Poor: Education and Employment*, Reynold I.

Nowell, economist for Equitable Life Assurance Society, points out that, "Each time the minimum wage rate is raised to a higher level, or its application is extended to cover additional job classification, thousands of people are denied job opportunities. This comes about because the minimum wage rates together with the costs of fringe benefits exceed the true economic value of such marginal labor."

b. According to Professor Campbell, "Minimum wages may cause unemployment (by reducing) the total number of workers that can be hired at a given level of aggregate demand."

1. Even a businessman without training in economics, when forced to cut down his production, will retire the least efficient factors of production.

2. Often, the least efficient factor is the unskilled worker. The *Monthly Labor Review* for March 1960 commented on the meaning of this: "The individual workers whom their employers believe to be least efficient will be the ones whose employment opportunities will be most restricted, as the result of an increased minimum wage. This effect of an increased legal minimum wage poses problems as regards the employment of the members of the labor force who are comparatively less acceptable to employers . . ."

c. Firms are encouraged to mechanize when minimum wage rates are raised.

1. Higher minimum wages encourage automation. A study of the seamless hosiery industry of Western Pennsylvania in the two years after the national minimum wage was imposed in 1938 discovered this effect. It was reported by Professor Yale Brozen. He summarized it in these words: "There was a 30 percent increase in the number of machines used in plants that had been paying an average wage below the new minimum and only a five percent increase in the number of machines used in plants paying wages above the minimum. Also, by the way, plants paying average wages below the minimum suffered a 29 percent decrease in jobs—and this was during a period when employment in general was expanding."

2. This mechanization is most likely to affect the marginal worker. The simple, repetitive tasks of the unskilled laborer are the ones which can most easily be done by a machine.

c. Professor Burns comments on this effect: "With unskilled labor being overpriced, employers have been using relatively more capital or skilled labor and relatively less unskilled labor."

2. Minimum wage legislation causes disemployment among marginal labor. *Minimum Wage and Maximum Hours Standards under the Fair Labor Standards Act,* Report to the Congress by the Secretary of Labor, January 1966, concluded that, "Given present realities . . . if the statutory minimum is too high or the coverage of the Act too broad it will result in the nonemployment of people who would me employed if the rate were lower."

3. These marginal jobs are usually held by workers whose skills, education and work experience are not adequate.

Monthly Labor Review, March 1960: "The members of the labor force who are comparatively less acceptable to employers, such as youths, elderly people, Negroes, etc."

4. Federal minimum wage legislation, therefore is an impediment to the employment of disadvantaged individuals.

a. Many economists who have studied this area testify that the minimum wage impedes the employment of the unskilled, uneducated and inexperienced.

1. Professor Milton Friedman, *Newsweek,* September 26, 1966: "The groups that will be hurt the most are the low-paid and the unskilled. The ones who remain employed will receive higher wage rates, but fewer will be employed."

2. Professor Colin Campbell: "I believe it is reasonable that relatively high minimum wages exclude untrained, inexperienced teenagers from employment opportunities. They are not worth the minimum wage to an employer."

3. Reynolds Nowell, "A Plan for Youth Employment," *The Disadvantaged Poor: Education and Employment:* (Washington, 1966)

a. "A plausible relationship exists between this heavy concentration of unemployment among the unskilled, inexperienced, young members of our work force and our national minimum wage laws."

b. "Much of this idleness of unskilled teenagers then is the conspicuous evidence of faulty wage pricing in our economy."

4. Professor Arthur F. Burns: a. "A further lifting of the minimum wage seems likely to aggravate the serious unemployment problem of our young people and other unskilled groups."

b. "The broad result of the substantial increase in the minimum wage in recent years has therefore been a curtailment of job opportunities for the less skilled workers."

5. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., June 27, 1967: "The victims of the (minimum wage) law are principally teen agers, mentally and physically handicapped, and the unskilled with the least aptitudes, all of whom while capable of a limited production for their sustenance, are not productive enough to justify retaining at the higher legal wage rates."

6. Professor James Tobin of Yale University, formerly a member of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers: "People who lack the capacity to earn a decent living need to be helped, but they will not be helped by minimum wage laws . . . which seek to compel employers to pay them more than their work is worth. The more likely outcome of such regulation is that the intended beneficiaries are not employed at all."

b. Many empirical studies confirm the opinion of these economists that the federal minimum wage impedes the employment of disadvantaged groups.

1. Professor Milton Friedman concluded from his study of the employment effects of the increase in the minimum wage in 1956 that: "The shockingly high rate of unemployment among teen-age Negro boys is largely a result of the present Federal minimum-wage rate. And unemployment will be boosted still higher by the rise just enacted. Before 1956, unemployment among Negro boys aged 14 to 19 was around 8 to 11 per cent, about the same as among white boys. Within two years after the legal minimum was raised from 75 cents to $1 an hour in 1956, unemployment among Negro boys shot up to 24 per cent and among white boys to 14 per cent. Both figures have remained roughly the same ever since. But I am convinced that, when it becomes effective, the $1.60 minimum will increase unemployment among Negro boys to 30 per cent or more."

2. Professor Arthur F. Burns has observed the impact of minimum wage legislation throughout the postwar period. He summarizes his principal findings in these words: a. "During the post-war period, the ratio of the unemployment rate of teenagers to that of male adults was invariably higher during the six months following an increase in the minimum wage than it was in the preceding half year."

b. "According to my equation, it appears that in the absence of any change in the general state of the economy, another increase of 25 cents in the minimum wage would be likely to raise the unemployment rate of nonwhite teenagers by as much as 8 percentage points."

3. A study of the employment effects of the increase in the minimum wage from $1.25 to $1.40 on February 1, 1967 confirms the conclusions of the other studies referred to.

a. During the four months immediately preceding the latest 15 cents increase in the minimum wage, the unemployment rate for teenagers was five times as great as for adult males. During the four months immediately after the increase, the ratio jumped to almost 5⅓ to 1. Unemployment among adult males dropped 2.1% while the unemployment rate for teenagers jumped by 2.7%.

b. Unemployment, apparently, was 4.8% higher among teenagers than it would otherwise have been as a result of an 11% increase in the minimum wage.

c. This strongly suggests that increases in the statutory minimum wage lead to higher unemployment among youths. On the average, 30,000 more teenagers were unemployed after the wage hike than before it.

4. The National Federation of Independent Business, Inc. has also done a study of the employment effects of the most recent increase in the minimum wage. Their findings are startling. "The increase in the ranks of the nation's 'hard core unemployables' due to the imposition of the new wage-hour law has apparently already reached 400,000 with the end not yet in sight."

c. Corporate executives also testify that the federal minimum wage impedes the employment of disadvantaged workers. In letters to Congressman Curtis, they admit that higher minimum wages force them to cut down their labor force.

1. H. W. Beers, Jr. Chairman of the Board, Beers Construction Company.

"It is hopeless for us to attempt to employ these youths at scales of wages which they realistically cannot earn. Were we able to employ them at a scale of wages more commensurate with their worth, there would be innumerable opportunities for this particular classification."

2. George B. Diethelm. Vice President and General Counsel, American Sugar Company.

"In our opinion the high and ever increasing level of wages in the sugar industry is a factor which tends to reduce employment . . . since it provides a further incentive for the introduction of laborsaving equipment."

3. Ralph W. Kittle. Vice President, International Paper Company.

"There is . . . an upward pressure on the entire wage structure every time minimums are increased. Under such circumstances we must not only reduce employment as much as possible but must always strive to employ the best qualified persons for such openings as occur. This . . . necessarily reduces opportunity for the unskilled . . ."

4. Justin Dart. President, Rexall Drug and Chemical Company. "Public policies such as minimum wage . . . are contributing to this very serious problem of unemployment in the unskilled, uneducated, and teenager ranks."

5. W. S. Vaughn. President, Eastman Kodak Company. "An increase in the statutory minimum in effect renders virtually unemployable a further segment of the poorly trained and poorly educated."

6. Robert A. Burns. Vice President—Industrial Relations, Jos. Schlitz Brewing Company. "Certainly the minimum wage . . . will more and more preclude employers from bringing unskilled and uneducated employees into their work forces. Many employers would be willing to bring these people into their plants provided they were not required to pay a wage far in excess of the employee's contribution . . . ."

C. *Federal minimum wage legislation impairs the employability of disadvantaged workers by preventing them from obtaining training.*

1. On-the-job training is the best way to enhance the attractiveness of disadvantaged individuals to employers.

2. The minimum wage discourages employers from offering on-the-job training.

a. Professor Milton Friedman, writing in *Newsweek*, September 26, 1966. asserts that the minimum wage denies training to the unskilled. "Both Negroes and teen-agers are only made worse off by discouraging employers from hiring them. On-the-job training—the main route whereby the unskilled have become skilled—is thus denied them."

b. Professor Yale Brozen of the University of Chicago, in "Why Do We Have an Unemployment Problem?," *Employment and Unemployment: the Problem of the 1960's*, Washington, 1961, contends that it prevents young and unskilled workers from acquiring skills. "Young workers just entering the labor force and older workers lacking skills find their job opportunities narrowed by minimum wage rates set by law . . . . (This) frustrates new entrants to the labor market by preventing them from acquiring the skills which would make them worth employing at or above the minimum wage rates."

c. The American Enterprise Institute in a *Legislative Analysis: Proposed Amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act*, points out that these laws complicate the problems facing federal retraining programs. "Higher minima compound the difficulties of federal training and retraining programs by raising the minimum standards of employment."

d. *Nation's Business*, in October 1962, in an article entitled "Wage Law Boosts Unemployment," comments that, "The minimum wage law is discouraging private businesses from continuing or taking on traditional training and retraining functions."

e. Business executives indicate that they do respond to higher minimum wages by cutting back training programs.

1. The National Federation of Independent Business, in an article inserted in the *Congressional Record* of May 17, 1967, by Representative Anderson of Illinois, quotes a druggist in a New York City suburb as saying: "The minimum wage virtually eliminates apprenticeships as new employees are a detriment to me to pay them while taking up my time teaching them."

2. *Nation's Business*, in October 1962, quotes an employer who quantifies the displacement of training programs by higher minimum wage rates. "When the minimum wage was increased we had to discontinue our training program . . . In other words, the average number of employees that we now have is about 5% lower than before the minimum wage was increased."

3. Professor Yale Brozen, in *The Minimum Wage: Who Pays?* quotes a Detroit jobber who testified before one Congressional committee that the minimum wage has reduced training opportunities by reducing the number of employer training programs. The jobber said that "He used to have about five percent of his work force in apprenticeship jobs but that he had to cut those jobs after the '61 increase in the minimum wage."

4. The *U.S. News & World Report*, in a July 10, 1967 article entitled "Jobs that were Lost when Minimum Wage went up," quoted a bakery owner in Utah. He said: "The minimum wage virtually eliminates apprentices as new employees."

D. *Government training programs are not a satisfactory substitute for private training programs eliminated by increases in the federal minimum wage.*

1. Trainees do not learn their skills under the same conditions that will prevail when their training is completed.

a. This is true of both Manpower Development and Training Programs and of the Job Corps.

b. William M. Read, Director of Training and Personnel Development, The Atlantic Refining Company, testified to this weakness: "One of the great strengths of on-the-job training lies in the fact that trainees learn their jobs under the same conditions as those that will prevail when their training is completed."

c. As a result, these government programs do not sufficiently enhance the attractiveness of the unskilled and inexperienced. *The Washington Post*, July 10, 1967: "The youngsters, talked into joining the Corps by the promise of jobs, come home after several months training to find that they are scarcely more attractive to employers than they were before they went in."

2. Manpower Development and Training Programs are often unable to persuade private firms to join on-the-job training operations. The reason: firms must pay the trainee the minimum wage, which far exceeds the value of his productive contribution.

a. American Enterprise Institute, *Legislative Analysis: Proposed Amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act*, 1966: "Higher minima compound the difficulties of federal training and retraining programs by raising the minimum standards of employment."

b. Thus, though MDTA pays the specific training costs, firms still hesitate to participate in training programs. MDTA alone cannot provide all the on-the-job training we need to combat the unemployment of the disadvantaged.

II. PRESENT EXEMPTIONS TO THE MINIMUM WAGE ARE INADEQUATE

A. *Minimum wage exemptions pursuant to section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act are inadequate.*

1. The groups exempted are too narrow.

a. The following groups are exempted: apprentices, learners, messengers, handicapped persons, handicapped clients in sheltered workshops, student workers.

b. Handicapped clients in sheltered workshops and student workers must, by definition, be employed by institutions other than private industry conducted for profit. Thus, these exemptions do not strike at the problems of the disadvantaged unemployed.

c. The employment of messengers, handicapped persons and apprentices are highly specialized problems. Most of the disadvantaged unemployed do not fit into any of these neat categories. Few are either handicapped, messengers, or being trained for highly skilled employment.

3. The regulations concerning learners are too restrictive to permit a useful program. A druggist in a New York City suburb says of it: "The clause allowing the special permit for this at $1.25 does not help, as it allows only 10 per cent of the employees to work at $1.25 per hour."

4. The effectiveness of these exemptions is impaired by the low wages of the exempted employees. Although a few youth may be willing to work for substantially less than the minimum wage, no unemployed adult is in a position to. Even the unemployed do not want work at $1.05 an hour. They simply will not take jobs under these exemptions.

III. THE EMPLOYMENT INCENTIVE ACT WOULD ENHANCE THE EMPLOYABILITY OF DISADVANTAGED WORKERS

A. *The Employment Incentive Act would multiply job opportunities for disadvantaged individuals.*

1. The National Committee for Children and Youth, in *Guidelines for Consideration of the Dropout and Unemployment Problems of Youth* (Washington, 1962) recommended refunds as a probable solution to the problem of unemployed youth.

"If, as some people think, the shortage of opportunities is due to lack of need in the economy for the labor of young people, then the answer probably lies in some form of public subsidization of opportunities. This step may be needed in any event for those youth who are so inadequately prepared in terms of basic skills, attitudes and motivation as to be unemployable in a competitive environment."

2. Refunds, by effectively eliminating high minimum wage requirements, would fight unemployment among disadvantaged individuals by removing a substantial barrier to their employment. Professor Colin Campbell points out:

"Eliminating minimum wage laws would combat unemployment by removing barriers to employment particularly for young persons, the old, the Negro, and the female worker."

3. Robert A. Burns, Vice President of Schlitz Brewing Company, indicates that the private sector would employ a larger number of marginal workers if they did not have to pay the full minimum wage.

"Many employers would be willing to bring these people into their plants provided they were not required to pay a wage far in excess of the employee's contribution. Employers would be willing to hire the unskilled at appropriate rates and increase that pay as the learning occurred."

4. The evidence is persuasive that a program of refunds to employers of marginal workers would increase their job opportunities, by effectively lowering the minimum wage. According to Professor Arthur F. Burns: "A lower minimum would enable more youngsters to find jobs."

B. *The Employment Incentive Act would encourage private firms to train the unskilled.*

1. The Employment Incentive Act provides jobs, thus fulfilling an essential prerequisite of training.

a. On the job training require jobs. William M. Read, Director of Training and Personnel Development, Atlantic Refining Co.: "I would reemphasize a key point: In order for there to be on-the-job training, there must first be a job."

b. The Employment Incentive Act, as we have seen above, will improve job opportunities for the unskilled.

2. The Employment Incentive Act would give employers an incentive to train low productivity workers.

a. Reynolds I. Nowell, "A Plan for Youth Employment," The Disadvantaged Poor: Education and Employment: "The American businessman has great ingenuity and resourcefulness. If he is given access to a supply of labor, priced at its true economic value, he will quickly devise ways of using it effectively. He will not only use it but he will also train it with skills that will offer increasing opportunities for advancement."

b. "Wage Law Boosts Unemployment," *Nation's Business*, October, 1962: "It would be so much easier to promote training and increase our production if we were given the opportunity to train in new help at, say, 25% below what the minimum wage increase is. This would save the government thousands of dollars in training needs."

c. Arthur F. Burns, *The Management of Prosperity:* "A lower minimum . . . would also give employers more incentive to train them."

IV. THE EMPLOYMENT INCENTIVE ACT OF 1967 MOBILIZES THE RESOURCES OF PRIVATE INDUSTRY TO PURSUE SEVERAL OF OUR HIGHEST PRIORITY GOALS

A. *The Employment Incentive Act seeks to promote fuller employment.*

1. *The Washington Post*, February 8, 1966: "Advocates see a two-level Federal minimum wage as accomplishing a three-fold task. It would make youngsters more attractive to potential employers. It would help reduce teen-age unemployment. And it would relieve labor shortages brought on by Vietnam escalation and a booming economy."

2. We have almost reached full employment for white adult males. Today, the disadvantaged groups suffer from unemployment. High unemployment among these workers constitutes the largest part of our unemployment problem. Helping them find jobs will help promote fuller employment.

B. *The Employment Incentive Act will help implement reforms in the welfare system.*

1. The Report of the House Ways and Means Committee on the Social Security

Amendments of 1967, since passed by the House, urged "greater emphasis to getting appropriate members of families drawing AFDC payments into employment."

2. The Committee expressed concern that minimum wage laws might frustrate this end. They reported: "The committee is aware of the Federal and State minimum wage laws and with an expanded program, as envisioned by this bill, is concerned that these minimum wage provisions not handicap the establishment of constructive programs in the States."

3. The Employment Opportunity Act, by combatting the disemployment effects of the Federal minimum wage, responds to this concern. It would make it easier for AFDC recipients to find employment, thus helping to realize a major goal of these reforms in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program.

C. *The Employment Incentive Act will help combat urban poverty.*

1. The Employment Incentive Act would encourage private firms to provide more jobs and training for these unskilled, uneducated and inexperienced individuals.

a. Professor Milton Friedman, *The Minimum Wage: Who Pays?* "The way to create an environment of opportunity, the first and foremost way, is to reduce restrictions that prevent people from getting jobs in the first place and from getting jobs in areas leading to higher income. (Among) the most important restrictions are government wage-fixing laws. . . ."

b. Professor Milton Friedman: "(A two-step minimum wage) would be cheaper for taxpayers and better for (the individual). Then he has the self-respect and dignity of holding a job, of contributing to his own support."

2. By encouraging more jobs and training for the urban poor, The Employment Incentive Act can contribute to the long-term solution of urban poverty.

L. W. Moore, "Urban Unrest: Whose Problem Is It?" A Commencement address at the Institute for Management, Northwestern University School of Business, August 25, 1967: "The only real long-term solution to the problem is employment; productive employment that will enable men who are now unskilled, unschooled, and unemployed to achieve a sense of dignity. Business must become involved because it is the ultimate source of these jobs, and the process of preparing the unskilled to assume them is one in which it must have a role."

[From Newsweek, Sept. 26, 1966]

MINIMUM-WAGE RATES

(By Milton Friedman)

Congress has just acted to increase unemployment. It did so by raising the legal minimum-wage rate from $1.25 to $1.60 an hour, effective in 1968, and extending its coverage. The result will be and must be to add to the ranks of the unemployed.

Does a merchant increase his sales by raising prices? Does higher pay of domestic servants induce more housewives to hire help? The situation is no different for other employers. The higher wage rate decreed by Congress for low-paid workers will raise the cost of the goods that these workers produce—and must discourage sales. It will also induce employers to replace such workers with other workers—either to do the same work or to produce machinery to do the work.

Some workers who already receive wages well above the legal minimum will benefit—because they will face less competition from the unskilled. That is why many unions are strong supporters of higher minimum-wage rates. Some employers and employees in places where wages are already high will benefit because they will face less competition from businessmen who might otherwise invest capital in areas that have large pools of unskilled labor. That is why Northern manufacturers and unions, particularly in New England, are the principal sources of political pressure for higher legal minimum-wage rates.

IT'S ANTI-NEGRO

The groups that will be hurt the most are the low-paid and the unskilled. The ones who remain employed will receive higher wage rates, but fewer will be employed. As Prof. James Tobin, who was a member of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, recently wrote: "People who lack the capacity to earn a decent living need to be helped, but they will not be helped by minimum-wage laws, trade-union wage pressures or other devices which seek to compel employers to pay them more than their work is worth. The more likely outcome of such regulations is that the intended beneficiaries are not employed at all."

The loss to the unskilled workers will not be offset by gains to others. Smaller total employment will result in a smaller total output. Hence the community as a whole will be worse off.

Women, teen-agers, Negroes and particularly Negro teen-agers will be especially hard hit. I am convinced that the minimum-wage law is the most anti-Negro law on our statute books—in its effect not its intent. It is a tragic but undoubted legacy of the past—and one we must try to correct—that on the average Negroes have lower skills than whites.

Similarly, teen-agers are less skilled than older workers. Both Negroes and teen-agers are only made worse off by discouraging employers from hiring them. On-the-job training—the main route whereby the unskilled have become skilled—is thus denied them.

WHO IS HELPED?

The shockingly high rate of unemployment among teen-age Negro boys is largely a result of the present Federal minimum-wage rate. And unemployment will be boosted still higher by the rise just enacted. Before 1956, unemployment among Negro boys aged 14 to 19 was around 8 to 11 percent, about the same as among white boys. Within two years after the legal minimum was raised from 75 cents to $1 an hour in 1956, unemployment among Negro boys shot up to 24 percent and among white boys to 14 percent. Both figures have remained roughly the same ever since. But I am convinced that, when it becomes effective, the $1.60 minimum will increase unemployment among Negro boys to 30 percent or more.

Many well-meaning people favor legal minimum-wage rates in the mistaken belief that they help the poor. These people confuse wage *rates* with wage *income*. It has always been a mystery to me to understand why a youngster is better off unemployed at $1.60 an hour than employed at $1.25. Moreover, many workers in low wage brackets are supplementary earners—that is, youngsters who are just getting started or elderly folk who are adding to the main source of family income. I favor governmental measures that are designed to set a floor under *family income*. Legal minimum-wage rates only make this task more difficult.

The rise in the legal minimum-wage rate is a monument to the power of superficial thinking.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 11, 1966]

MINIMUM WAGE VERSUS JOBS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

If there is anything that economists of nearly all schools are agreed upon, it is the folly of minimum-wage laws. They hurt most the very people they are designed to "protect." When a law exists that no one is to be paid less than $50 for a 40-hour week, then no one whose services are not worth $50 a week to an employer will be employed at all. We cannot make a man worth a given amount by making it illegal for anyone to offer him less. We merely deprive him of the right to earn the amount that his abilities and opportunities would permit him to earn, while we deprive the community even of the moderate services he is capable of rendering. In brief, for a low wage we substitute unemployment.

Among eminent economists who have recently expressed their opposition to minimum-wage laws are Prof. James Tobin, formerly President Kennedy's economic adviser; Prof. Arthur Burns, former head of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Prof. Gottfried Haberler of Harvard. As Professor Tobin has put it:

"People who lack the capacity to earn a decent living need to be helped, but they will not be helped by minimum-wage laws, trade-union wage pressures or other devices which seek to compel employers to pay them more than their work is worth. The more likely outcome of such regulations is that the intended beneficiaries are not employed at all."

CONTINUAL BOOSTS

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 fixed a minimum wage of 25 cents an hour. This was raised to 30 cents in 1939, to 40 cents in 1945, to 75 cents in January 1950, to $1 in March 1956, to $1.15 in September 1961 and to $1.25 in September 1963.

In an illuminating study published in "The Management of Prosperity" (*Columbia University Press. $3.50*), Professor Burns has found that each time the minimum was raised, it was set at approximately half of the average manufacturing wage. However, the statutory minimum was only 29 per cent of average hourly earnings in manufacturing just before the increase in 1950, while the corresponding figure reached 40 per cent just before the increase of the minimum in 1956, 43 per cent before the increase in 1961 and 47 per cent before the increase in 1963.

Thus, over the years there has been a strong rise in the ratio of the legal minimum to the average wage. The minimum wage rose 67 per cent between early 1956 and 1964, while average hourly earnings in manufacturing rose 34 per cent. Meanwhile, the Federal minimum has become effective over a great range of industry, and many states have likewise raised or expanded the coverage of their minimum wages.

UNSKILLED MOST HURT

The result of all this has been to force up the wages of unskilled labor much more than those of skilled labor. A result of this, in turn, has been that though an increasing shortage has developed in skilled labor, the proportion of unemployment among the unskilled, among teen-agers, females and nonwhites has been growing. The ratio of the unemployment rate of teen-agers to that of male adults, Professor Burns finds, was invariably higher during the six months following an increase of the minimum wage than it was in the preceding year.

"The broad result of the substantial increase of the minimum wage in recent years," Professor Burns concludes, "has therefore been a curtailment of job opportunities for the less skilled workers." And his calculations indicate that "another increase of 25 cents in the minimum wage would be likely to raise the unemployment rate of nonwhite teen-agers by as much as 8 percentage points." Teen-ager employment has improved recently at least in part because the minimum wage has not been raised since September 1963.

Professor Haberler concludes that "Raising the minimum wage would thus be an irresponsible antisocial measure, reducing job opportunities of the poor, promoting inflation and retarding growth."

Yet under pressure from the union leaders, Congress is all set to give another boost to the compulsory minimum wage from its present level of $1.25 an hour to $1.40 next February and $1.60 in February 1968 and to extend the coverage to more than 6 million more workers.

NEWS RELEASE BY NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESSES, INC.

The increase in the ranks of the nation's "hard core unemployables" due to the imposition of the new wage-hour law has apparently already reached 400,000 with the end not yet in sight.

This is tentatively indicated by a special statistical study of data collected by the National Federation of Independent Business from 40,000 independent business firm respondents. If the present rate continues, it is estimated that by year's end a total of 2,000,000 people will be forced to look to relief, welfare, or some other assistance.

Job attrition from this cause started in the first quarter of the year especially when the new law became effective in February, when the continuous survey showed roughy ten per cent of the nation's 4,700,000 independent firms were laying off people, with 17 per cent giving the new wage/hour law as the reason. This jumped to 22 per cent in April and continues to hang close to this level.

Among the 40,000 respondents there has been a total of 17,299 people laid off with an average of 20 percent reporting the new law as the cause, indicating that out of this sample, 3,459 were dismissed for this reason. Projected against the entire total of 4,700,000 independent enterprises this indicates that 400,000 have so far lost employment due to the law.

Additional voluntary comments supplied by the respondent show quite strongly that the victims of the law are principally teenagers, mentally and physically handicapped, and the unskilled with the least aptitudes, all of whom while capable of a limited production for their sustenance, are not productive enough to justify retaining at the higher legal wage rates.

The impact of the law is not showing up predominantly in the big metropolitan area, but looms quite strongly in the rural and small town areas, especially in the Middlewest, the South and the Rocky Mountain states.

The belief that the attrition will continue is based on two factors. One is the failure of the data to show any appreciable drop in dismissals due to the imposition of this law since the initial flurry in February. The other is based on volunteer comments by respondents reporting they are installing equipment to release workers in the near future, plus those who report they are seeking to hold their handicapped workers who have been with them for a long period and are seeking to offset the increased costs by charging their customers more, with customer resistance to higher prices, especially in the depressed farm areas, reported quite strong. Presumably, unless this customer resistance can be overcome, the operators will be faced with the necessity of letting these workers go.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 28, 1967]

JOB SUBSIDIES URGED FOR THOSE ON RELIEF

NEW YORK, August 27.—Mitchell I. Ginsberg, New York Social Services Commissioner, proposed today that government should subsidize private industries that agree to hire welfare recipients.

Ginsberg, who will take over as human resources administrator in November and who has served more than a year as welfare commissioner, said that there is a need for a different type of training program for welfare recipients.

"I think we have to do much more gearing of these training and employment programs to the needs of these private companies," he said on a "New York Report" television program.

However, Ginsberg said, many private industries are hesitant to hire welfare recipients—even trained ones—since in the beginning the reliefers are only about 50 per cent as productive as other workers.

THE JORDAN CASE: WAS IT A POLITICAL ASSASSINATION?

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 months have passed since the mysterious disappearance and death of Charles H. Jordan in Prague, Czechoslovakia. The death of Mr. Jordan, who was executive vice president of the American Joint Distribution Committee, remains shrouded in mystery. The American people still await the full story of how and why this longtime worker in the field of Jewish refugee relief met his death.

Mr. Jordan left his hotel in Prague August 16, telling his wife he was going for a newspaper. He never returned. Four days later his body turned up in Prague's Voltava River some 3 miles from the hotel. Czech authorities have explained that Mr. Jordan died by drowning and that he probably committed suicide. But those close to Mr. Jordan refuse to accept this explanation.

In light of the mysterious circumstances surrounding the Jordan case, I wrote to the Secretary of State on August 22 urging him to press the Czech authorities for a full investigation and explanation. I know that such an investigation may be hard to obtain from the Czech Government, for in the wake of the incident, many informed observers have speculated that Mr. Jordan was murdered for political reasons.

We know that a wave of anti-Jewish and anti-Israel propaganda has been sweeping through the Iron Curtain countries since the Soviet-backed Arab forces lost their 6-day war with Israel in June.

We know that one prime target of this anti-Semitic barrage happens to be the very worthwhile, very humanitarian agency that Mr. Jordan served since 1941—the Joint Distribution Committee.

The lawyer sent to Czechoslovakia by the Joint Distribution Committee to investigate Jordan's death told the Philadelphia Inquirer on August 28 that terrorists might well have assassinated Jordan.

In the Washington Post of October 29, an extended article on the Jordan case appeared, written by United Nations Correspondent Robert H. Estabrook.

I wish to bring these articles from the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Washington Post to the attention of those Members who have not yet seen them. Mr. Speaker, I now include these two articles in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Aug. 28, 1967]

ARAB TERRORISTS ARE BLAMED FOR MYSTERY DEATH IN PRAGUE

WASHINGTON, August 28.—Arab terrorists bent on disrupting an imagined peace mission might be responsible for the mysterious Prague death of Jewish relief worker Charles H. Jordan, the dead man's lawyer asserted Monday.

"I am absolutely sure it was murder," Washington attorney Seymour Rubin said after a weekend return from Czechoslovakia. He investigated the death at the behest of the American Joint Distribution Committee, Jewish welfare group of which Jordan was executive director.

FOUND IN RIVER

Jordan's body was found in a Prague river on Aug. 20, five days after he left his hotel to buy a paper a few blocks distant. The native Philadelphian, 59, was vacationing in Prague with his wife.

Czech police have dismissed the death as a suicide—but the State Department refuses to accept this finding pending further investigation. Officials here share Rubin's suspicions of the Czech verdict, but are saying nothing publicly on it for the moment.

Rubin described his theory about Arab terrorists as "the least implausible of many implausible reasons that could be cited for the murder."

Rubin noted that earlier in his trip Jordan visited Israel. After leaving there he went directly to Rumania, which has been most moderate of any East European nation toward Israel since the June war in the Mideast.

While in Bucharest, the Rumanian capital, Jordan met with officials of the Ministry of Cults, the agency that handles problems of minority groups.

The juxtaposition of these two visits, Rubin theorized, could have led extremists in Prague's sizable Arab community to suspect that Jordan was acting as a "go-between" on a peace mission.

TITO PEACE PLAN

The visit came at the same time that President Tito of Yugoslavia was attempting to work out a peace plan in which the Eastern European nations would take the initiative.

Jordan had worked abroad on Jewish refugee problems since 1941, and Rubin said it was "not inconceivable" that he had agreed to pass messages between Israel officials and the Rumanians.

"Whether he in fact was doing so is not material," Rubin said. "But it is very conceivable that someone could have thought so."

Based on 20 years of acquaintanceship with Jordan, and his conduct the last day he was seen alive, Rubin completely rejected the Czech suicide story.

Jordan and his wife went by the Palace Hotel at about 7 P.M. on Aug. 15, tried to buy an English-language newspaper and were told to come back later.

They walked several blocks to their own hotel, the Esplanade, and Jordan bathed and changed into a sports shirt. He left about 9 P.M., telling Mrs. Jordan he was going for the paper.

Rubin said the kiosk operator in the Palace Hotel told him a man fitting Jordan's description came in and asked for a paper, but all had been sold. Jordan left.

CZECH THEORY

Czech police said a boatman found his body Aug. 20 in the Voltava River in downtown Prague. They said an autopsy showed he was alive when his body entered the water; for that reason they called the death a suicide.

"Charlie Jordan didn't act like a man who was going out to kill himself," Rubin said.

"Nor would he have been likely to walk 20 minutes to the river and accidentally fall in.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 29, 1967]

Reds and Arabs Cast as Villains in Prague Death of an American

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

NEW YORK.—Did the Czechoslovakian secret police kidnap Charles H. Jordan on orders of the Soviet KGB and dump him unconcious into the Voltava River to drown? Was he murdered by Arab extremists who were being taught in clandestine Czech training schools to regard Jewish voluntary agencies, which Jordan represented, as instrumentalities of American and Israeli "aggression" against their countries?

These are two of the more prominent theories that have circulated since the 59-year-old Jordan, executive vice president of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, disappeared in Prague the night of Aug. 16. His badly decomposed body was discovered in the river by a fisherman four days later, creating a major international mystery in which hard evidence remains exceedingly difficult to find.

But if proof is scarce, suspicions are not. Louis Broido, chairman of the Joint Distribution Committee—or "Joint," as it is widely known—has said flatly that Jordan was murdered. In an interview in the Tel Aviv newspaper Maariv Oct. 13, he ruled out the possibility of accident, suicide or criminal attack.

"Someone from one of the Communist or Arab countries murdered Jordan," Broido declared. "There are only three possibilities: the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia or an Arab agent."

A SHORTENED JOURNEY

Jordan had gone with his wife Elizabeth on a vacation trip to the Czech capital, a beautiful city in which even the depressing effect of Communist rule has not obliterated the charm of old buildings and bridges. Actually, he had planned to visit a number of Eastern European countries, including the Soviet Union, but had curtailed his itinerary in order to attend a conference in Israel on behalf of the Joint.

He then flew to Rome to pick up Mrs. Jordan, spent several days in Rumania and arrived at the Hotel Esplanade in Prague on Tuesday, Aug. 15. Wednesday night, Jordan told his wife that he was going out to buy an American newspaper. Because it was a hot night, Jordan was clad in a sport shirt and left his identification papers in his room. Mrs. Jordan never saw him alive again.

Czech authorities tried to persuade Mrs. Jordan even before the body was found that her husband had committed suicide. Subsequently, officials of the Joint requested that two Swiss doctors be permitted to attend the autopsy, only to learn that Czech pathologists had proceeded before their arrival and that several vital organs were missing from Jordan's body.

Following a preliminary verdict of death by drowning, Czech authorities promised to continue the investigation. Some Americans close to the case say, however, that the Czechs have shown a curious reluctance to explore the possibilities of foul play. Meanwhile, other doctors retained by the Joint are completing their own examination of tissue samples which the Czech government says are from the organs removed from Jordan's body.

PLANNING FOR ARABS

Friends of Jordan practically unanimously discard the possibility of suicide. Jordan had worked with the Joint since 1941 in a wide range of rescue, relief and rehabilitation programs for refugees, by no means all of them Jews.

He had been stationed in Hong Kong, had worked with Tibetan refugees and had gone to Vietnam on a U.S. Government civilian refugee mission. At the time of his death, he had been attempting to devise a plan for an Arab refugee settlement.

His friends say that he was an extraordinarily confident, ebullient, outgoing man who was continually making plans for the future. On the day of his disappearance, he had mailed several postcards telling others of his plans. He had intended to fly to Vienna from Prague and then go again to Israel before returning to New York.

Although U.S. Government officials familiar with the case are restrained in discussing possible motives for murder, they also tend to reject the notion of suicide or accidental death. The approaches to the Voltava River are well protected, they say, and it is unlikely that Jordan would have fallen into the river accidentally. Friends add that he did not know how to swim and for that reason would have been extra cautious. Jordan had visited Prague twice before and was generally familiar with the city, although his last visit was in 1948.

Other Jewish sources not connected with the Joint, and with independent channels of information, are far more explicit in attributing Jordan's death to sinister causes. They suggest that the Czech secret police may have seized him—possibly without the knowledge of high officials of the government—with the intention of brainwashing him and then having him "confess" to nefarious activities of the Joint in a new version of the Slansky trial.

AGENCY SINGLED OUT

In 1952, Rudolf Slansky, a former general secretary of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party and Vice Premier in the cabinet, was executed after "confessing" that he had been an agent of the Western powers and an alleged international Zionist conspiracy.

During the trial, the prosecution singled out the Joint as a vehicle through which it said American Jews committed espionage and sabotage and conducted black market operations. Later the Soviet government picked up the cry and charged that the Joint had helped organize the so-called "Doctors' Plot" against Stalin and other Soviet leaders.

When destalinization began in 1956, Nikita Khrushchev formally acknowledged that the "Doctors' Plot" had been a monstrous fabrication. Eventually the Czech hierachs dutifully followed suit and "rehabilitated" Slansky's memory, but the charges against the Joint were never retracted.

In recent months, these Jewish sources say, the Soviet Union has renewed its propaganda campaign against Zionism, possibly because Communist officials really believe it is a conspiracy or possibly because they are seeking to justify their backing of the Arabs against Israel.

An article entitled "What is Zionism?" by Yuri Ivanov, appearing in a dozen Soviet newspapers in August, mentioned the Joint as an agency of "the international Zionist corporation" which serves as "a reliable driving-belt for the U.S.A. state and military apparatus." International Zionism, the article charged, has funds far exceeding those of the "Mafia 'Costa Nostra.'"

As if to indicate central direction in Moscow, almost simultaneously the Polish government addressed a letter to Jordan, received after his death, reportedly ordering the Joint to wind up all activities in Poland at the end of this year. This leaves Rumania as the only Eastern European country in which the Joint still has an open official blessing (it was banned from Czechoslovakia in 1950).

STRONG ARM OF KGB

For many years, the Czech secret police have had a reputation for doing Moscow's dirty work in areas from the Middle East to the Congo. Some Jewish sources believe that the Czech police may have cooperated with the Soviet KGB in a plan to seize Jordan as an agent of the Zionist "Mafia" and put him on trial after brainwashing him.

There was recent evidence of this kind of clandestine cooperation between Moscow and Prague. Only a year ago, a Soviet Aeroflot airliner was diverted from a Moscow-Paris flight to the Czech capital, where police seized Vladimir J. Kazan-Komarek, a Czech-American travel agent who had visited the Soviet Union.

The Czechs accused him of having worked for the Central Intelligence Agency in Czechoslovakia years before. Not until the State Department made the most strenuous representations was Kazan-Komarek released last February after being sentenced to eight years in prison.

Even without direction from Moscow, the Jewish sources continue, the Czech secret police could have had their own reasons for apprehending Jordan. There is evidence of a continuing quarrel between the Stalinists and "liberals" in the Czech hierarchy, as shown by the current crackdown on Communist writers adjudged nonconformists. The Stalinists may have hoped to use a show trial of Jordan as justification for the pro-Arab policy in the Middle East war which the government pursued in the face of what apparently was considerable public opposition.

BUGGING IS PRESUMED

What, then, happened to Jordan? There is every reason to believe that he was under surveillance in Prague. Passports are regularly registered with the police through the hotels and it is generally assumed that hotel rooms are "bugged." Jordan furthermore had an Israeli visa in his passport.

Those who believe that the secret police had a hand in his disappearance point out that if there had been violence, Jordan probably would have struggled and his body might have showed signs of it. But a police squad could have apprehended him, perhaps at gunpoint, without using much if any physical force. It is even conceivable that Jordan went along willingly in an effort to clear up what he thought was a minor technicality.

One theory is that the police placed a chloroform mask over his face in order to capture him without a struggle. Then, it is conjectured, they may have administered "truth" drugs in an effort to make him talk but found that because of allergies or other complications he had sunk into a coma from which he could not be revived.

At this point they may have decided to cast him into the river so that drowning would appear as the cause of death. Examination of the contents of Jordan's stomach, according to one American familiar with the record, showed that his death occurred within three or four hours after he had eaten, or the same night that he disappeared.

SOME DRUGS ELUSIVE

Presumably the presence of drugs in Jordan's body should have been revealed by the autopsy. But Dr. Henry Siegel, New York City's Executive Deputy Chief Medical Examiner who performed a re-autopsy after the body was returned to New York, says it is difficult to rule out all possibility of drugs unless the examiners know specifically what they are looking for. If the Czechs had used a drug unfamiliar to the outside doctors, the examination would not necessarily have disclosed it.

Of course, if the police were intent on mere murder, they would not have had to administer drugs. Jordan could simply have been overpowered and held under water in a tank somewhere, or in the river itself.

Suspicion that the police may have had a part in his death has been aroused by a letter from a leader of the Jewish community in Prague to a Swiss Jewish leader. It spoke of Jordan's "tragic death" and added that "suicide must be excluded." Significantly, he went on to say that "it is possible that murder was committed here, but our own, as well as the Swiss professor, could not detect any traces of violence."

In view of the fact that the letter went through the regular mail, the guarded language is regarded as a between-the-lines hint that the writer believed the death actually was murder. The mention that no traces of violence were found could be a further hint that the secret police had taken pains to hide the circumstances of death.

MANY ARABS THERE

Another highly placed source familiar with the case disputes the theory of police conspiracy as far-fetched. It is much more likely, he believes. that Jordan was assassinated—by Arabs, who are in Prague in large numbers, or by mere hoodlums.

In the course of his own inquiries, this source says, he obtained firm information that at the time Jordan was in the Czech capital, the government was giving secret courses to Arab students. Among other things, they were taught that Jewish voluntary agencies such as the Joint were vehicles for American and Israeli "aggression" against their countries.

Furthermore, according to a foreign student in Prague, the Arab students were told by an official of the 17th of November University that the Czech government could not halt visits by representatives of Jewish voluntary agencies but that students were free to show their disapproval.

Thus, the source speculated, Arab students could have set out deliberately to liquidate Jordan—though how they could have accomplished this without the complicity of the police, who presumably had him under surveillance, is an unanswered question. Certainly an assault would have been difficult in a public place. Jordan was a large, powerful man who undoubtedly would have shouted and put up a fight.

Inquiry also has disclosed, according to the source who speculates about the Arab students, that two other Jordans were registered at the Hotel Esplanade at the time Charles Jordan was there. The source does not know the nationality or business of the others, but there is thus a possibility of mistaken identity.

The one point on which all who have studied the case agree is that the Czech explanations have been unsatisfactory. The police seemed determined to "prove" suicide or accident and uninterested in following up any indications of murder. They even suggested that Jordan had gone out to meet a black market agent after receiving a telephone call—which would have been difficult since there was no telephone in his room.

Two separate sets of police—uniformed Prague police and plainclothesmen—interrogated Mrs. Jordan extensively. Even before the body was recovered, they asked her repeatedly whether she had quarreled with her husband before he left the hotel room.

This she vigorously denied. A hotel maid testified that she had heard loud talk, but even if this were true it could have been accounted for by the fact that Jordan was almost completely deaf in one ear.

At one point in the questioning, the police reportedly asked Mrs. Jordan whether she would be willing to go to Bratislava to identify the body if it should be found there. Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia, is on the Danube River about 200 miles from Prague. This questioning is interpreted by some as indicating that the police already knew that the body would be found in a river.

Mrs. Jordan, who by that time was staying in the American Embassy, replied that she was too frightened to go out of Prague for any reason. She finally left Prague Aug. 23. In New York, she has declined to talk to the press.

Circumstances of the autopsy also were suspicious. Officials of the Joint asked that outside doctors be present and the Joint's health director in Geneva, Dr. Alexander Gonik, and the deputy director of the Legal Medical Institute of Zurich, Dr. Ernest Hardmeyer, flew to Prague. But by the time they arrived, Czech pathologists had already dissected the body and several vital organs had been removed, although Dr. Hardmeyer was given what were purported to be tissue samples of the organs.

A EUROPEAN PRACTICE

After the re-autopsy in the United States by Dr. Siegel and Dr. Russell S. Fisher, the Maryland Chief Medical Examiner, it was concluded that there was no evidence of a fracture or penetrating wound but that "the advanced state of decomposition of the body could have obliterated evidence of superficial trauma such as bruises."

The American doctors say that their final report probably will not change the initial conclusion of death by drowning in undetermined circumstances. They also say they are certain from their tests that the tissue samples given them were actually from Jordan's body.

Medical personnel have been careful not to charge bad faith against the Czech authorities. It is normal practice in parts of Europe, they point out, to retain vital organs after an autopsy. Moreover, the Czech doctors' proceeding with the autopsy before the Joint representatives arrived could be blamed on sheer red tape, inasmuch as the Joint's request to delay the examination did not reach the government until the previous night.

Similarly, some sources acquainted with the case hesitate to single out anything unusual in the questioning of Mrs. Jordan. They contend that it is a police custom in many countries to explore the possibilities of suicide in instances of mysterious disappearance before taking up other theories.

It is, of course, conceivable that there is a reasonable explanation for Jordan's death. Czech authorities may have shown no more than usual furtiveness in dealing with a situation which they found embarrassing because the death occurred in their country. The Communists have a doctrinal disbelief in the possibility of sheer accident as a causal factor in human affairs.

But when every effort is made to extend the benefit of the doubt, the suspicions remain. They are increased by a long chain of circumstantial evidence which indicates that unless the Czech authorities are guilty of incredible inefficiency, they know more than they have told about what happened to Jordan.

The continued Stalinist grip on Czechoslovakia has left a long, sad record of arbitrary arrests, show trials and persecutions since the Communist takeover in 1948. Because of this history, it is possible to assume in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary that Charles Jordan was yet another victim whose fate was sealed behind what is still in many essential respects an Iron Curtain.

"THE GREAT DOLLAR THROWAWAY"—PARTS VI AND VII

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, during the past weekend the Baltimore News American published two additional chapters in Jerry Cartledge's provocative series, "The Great Dollar Throwaway," dramatizing the need for reform of Federal operations. Part VI of this series appeared in the News American for Friday, October 27, and part VII appeared on Sunday, October 29.

I would like to bring these two articles to the attention of the Congress, and include them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Oct. 27, 1967]

THE GREAT DOLLAR THROWAWAY—VI: JOHNSON BLAMED IN FEDERAL WASTE REFORM DELAYS

(By Jerry Cartledge)

Despite mounting pressure for some form of organizational review of the Executive Branch of the government in the Senate and House, the decision on whether there actually will be any study group appointed probably rests squarely on the shoulders of the President of the United States.

A well-informed observer, who is staff administrator for one of the powerful House subcommittees, recently said, "The Congress can talk all it wants about efficiency and economy in government. They can propose all sorts of committees to investigate these matters. But unless President Johnson wants such a committee, you can bet there won't be one.

"And I'm telling you right now that the President doesn't want any such committee . . . and there won't be any in this Congress."

Speaking before the House of Representatives in behalf of his bill to establish a third Hoover Commission to seek solutions to gross inefficiency, duplication and waste in government, Maryland Congressman Charles McC. Mathias Jr. stated:

"Strangely, although such bills have been before the Congress for about two years, and although the White House has professed great interest in streamlining federal operations, the Bureau of the Budget has somehow never found time to submit any report—positive or negative—on this legislation."

It is common knowledge on Capitol Hill that the Budget Bureau acts when the President wants it to. Silence by this powerful agency is taken by many as evidence that the President does not want any type of reorganizational reform legislation at this time.

Even though one of the reform bills has been submitted by Sen. Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, a Democrat closely identified with the administration, many Democratic congressmen believe that all measures aimed at improving efficiency and economy are Republican inspired.

Asked if he believed the Ribicoff bill could be a move to provide a way out for the President, since the bill calls for a partisan study group of nine persons from government and private life, appointed directly by the President, a veteran Democratic congressman said he thinks this is "more than possible."

The Ribicoff bill has been cosponsored by such strong supporters of administration domestic policy as Sens. Brewster and Tydings of Maryland, Javits and Kennedy of New York, Church of Idaho and Long of Missouri.

However, the cold, hard facts cited by the Connecticut Senator in support of his measure may not have set too well with the White House.

Analyzing the current budgetary outlay before the Senate, Ribicoff said, "Although much of the increase has occurred in defense, the largest rate of increase has been in programs affecting the everyday life of the individual citizen.

"Educational expenditures have increased from $377 million in fiscal 1955 to almost $3 billion in fiscal 1968. Spending for health, labor and welfare has increased from $2 billion in 1955 to more than $11 billion in fiscal 1968.

". . . the net result of our efforts often is confusion, frustration and delay . . . We have spent too much time responding to crises and not enough time anticipating them. As a result, we have often acted in great haste—and with great waste."

Appearing before the Senate on the same day, Kansas Republican Sen. James B. Pearson warned that ". . . today there are over 400 grant programs and component parts that are administered by more than 150 departments, agencies and bureaus. In such a confusing welter, the need for coordination and consolidation is obvious. In fact, it is more than obvious, it is of the utmost urgency.

"For while America is a wealthy country," he continued, "it is faced at home and abroad with a number of immediate and expensive challenges. We simply can no longer afford the waste endemic in an unreviewed bureaucratic growth. Neither can we afford to delay further effective treatment of such pressing ills as slum housing, unemployment and poverty.

"To do so would be to invite disaster," he concluded.

To what extent the strong political party lines in the Congress were drawn prior to Aug. 3 was small matter for conjecture. When the President on that date asked Congress to put through a whopping big 10 percent surcharge on all individual and corporation income taxes, there was more than a slight stirring of the ranks.

One of the first to reach the press with a call for a sweeping probe of the entire defense setup and all military expenditures, especially those directly connected with the Vietnam War, was Maryland Congressman Long.

Only a week before, Long doubted the overall good that could result from such a body at a third Hoover Commission. Yet, the very night of the tax-hike proposal, Long was 100 percent in favor of "someone" to take a close look at spending, particularly in military programs.

Long's call for some sort of review came less than a month after Congressman John W. Wydler of New York told the House of Representatives in behalf of the Mathias bill:

"The only thing that now keeps it from becoming a reality is the resistance and reluctance of the administration to back it.

"I confidently predict that if this proposal were to clear the Government Operations Committee and come to the floor of the House," he said, "it would pass both bodies of Congress unanimously. Why we are not moving forward in this matter is more than I can understand."

Speaking before the same body on the same day, Congressman Thomas J. Meskill of Connecticut strongly supported Maryland's Mathias in his personal demand for a "thorough review of the executive branch."

Citing transportation matters, Meskill noted the personal involvement of the Department of Transportation, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Post Office Department, the Justice Department, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Maritime Commission, and such unlikely agencies as the Treasury Department and the Department of Defense.

"The diversity of policymaking authority in this field," the Congressman maintained, "results in the failure to develop any coordinated comprehensive or consistent federal policy toward transportation."

He cited as other examples, air and water pollution services and the administration of educational programs, and emphasized the present open warfare between Housing and Urban Development and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

In the wake of the President's tax increase plans to finance the Vietnam War, individual Democrats in the House were quick to point to the manner with which that body recently defeated a nationwide rat control bill, and blamed Republicans for the lack of votes which would have "shown the ghetto" that Congress was anxious to spend money at home in the war on poverty, rather than on a costly war abroad.

They point to the Vietnam War as the main factor behind the President's proposed tax increase.

Yet, the Republicans are just as quick to point out that Detroit—the Nation's worst riot city, which will cost the taxpayers millions of dollars in repairs—boasted the finest federal rat control program of any city in the country.

Minority Leader Gerald Ford repeated his urgent call for stricter economies, especially for a trimming-down of spending overseas. He re-emphasized a need for efficient spending at home and he reissued a demand for an investigating body to assure efficiency in all agencies, bureaus, departments, etc.

He again offered his support for another Hoover-type commission to oversee government finances, such as the one proposed by Maryland Rep. Mathias in his H.R. 69, calling for a third Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

Others looked closer to home and found downright inefficiency as the principal reason for the President's tax increase.

As Rep. William C. Cramer of Florida put it, "The taxpayers who finance the federal government, and whose lives are in some way or another affected every day by the federal government, have the right to expect the very best.

"To the contrary, however, as any individual, group or representative who has had occasion to deal with the federal government knows, the executive branch presents endless examples of overlapping jurisdiction, duplicated responsibilities, non-coordinated activities and uncooperative efforts."

As the ranking minority member of the House Public Works Committee, Cramer cited various programs which fall under the group's jurisdiction and "which are obvious examples of the need for a searching and thorough review of the organizational problems of the executive branch, looking toward the recommendation of proper and corrective reform measures."

He listed as just some of the programs in which duplication exists with other federal agencies:

Federal-aid highway programs, including investigations thereof;

Rivers and harbors and flood control works of improvement;

Federal public buildings and grounds;

Small watershed and flood prevention program;

Federal water pollution control legislation;

Public works for the benefit of navigation, including bridges and dams;

Oil pollution, and

A multitude of economic development plans.

He concluded that "a new Hoover-type Commission to conduct a review of the operations of the federal executive, with a view toward assessment of the problems of duplication, lack of coordination, red tape and sheer bigness, and to recommend reforms of government operations, is obviously needed."

(With special regard to water pollution: after years within the Public Health Service, the Congress in 1965 elevated the administration of the federal water pollution control program to agency status, creating the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within the ever-growing Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

(Then in the spring of 1966, "without even consulting the congressional leaders responsible for handling water pollution control legislation," the President sent to Congress a plan, which subsequently became Reorganization Plan 2 of 1966, to transfer that new agency to the Department of the Interior.)

As one House Public Works Committee member put it, "This shakeup of the federal program, without advance warning to Congress, resulted in the loss of nearly 60 percent of the personnel in this highly technical and complex field. It was a great loss to the federal effort to control the pollution of our nation's waters. Furthermore, the administration of the sewage treatment plants construction program was set back by administrative turmoil."

As New York City Congressman Theodore R. Kupferman summed it up, "In this technical age we can no longer be receptive to the traditional government approach to solution of problems. The practice of dividing a problem into manageable parts and treating each of them separately makes a comprehensive solution impossible.

"Simply appropriating money and shifting responsibilities to postpone decision will not withstand the pressure of the problems currently facing our nation."

Kupferman is a strong supporter of the Mathias' Hoover Commission bill, which he believes is necessary to combat "the problems of duplication, lack of coordination and red-tape characteristic of the executive branch of the federal government."

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Oct. 29, 1967]

THE GREAT DOLLAR THROWAWAY—VII: UNCLE SAM PAYS PLENTY FOR "NUTS AND BOLTS"—WASTE IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH POINTS OUT NEED FOR A NEW HOOVER COMMISSION

(By Jerry Cartledge)

Fiery Congressman Otis G. Pike (D., N.Y.) last Sept. 27 angrily told the House of Representatives that one of the nation's largest defense contractors, Litton Systems Inc., had refused point-blank to supply the government's General Accounting Office with information concerning what he believes to be tremendous excess profits for an aircraft navigation system.

Pike said that the amount of contracts involved exceeded $3 billion of taxpayer money. The aircraft concerned is the heralded Lockheed F 104 jet, which is used not only by our Air Force but procured under military assistance programs by West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy, Spain, Japan and Canada.

The inability of a permanent government agency such as GAO to get such vital information—especially since Pike had previously turned up evidence of gross excessive profits making by Litton—emphasizes the need for a watchdog "Hoover Commission" as proposed by Maryland Congressman Charles McC. Mathias Jr.—a bi-partisan commission with subpoena powers to guarantee accountability for waste and inefficiency within the government and among its contractors.

This need for an objective review was emphasized by Congressman Pike earlier when he uncovered a series of Air Force purchasing "goofs" involving a Baltimore area company, Bendix Corp. of Towson, whose markups of from 500 to 2,500 percent were paid for items of small hardware bought by Griffiss AFB, Rome, N.Y.

One of the items involved was a "spherical bearing" which the Air Force bought from Bendix for $26.20 each. Investigation showed that Bendix bought the item from Radiation Systems Inc. for $17.25 and added a markup of 52 percent. Further probing showed that Radiation had bought the bearing from Moffett Bearing Co. for $9.23 and added a markup of about 90 percent. The item was originally manufactured by Stevenson Adamson Manufacturing Co. and sold for $5.08 apiece.

Bendix charged the Air Force $2.30 each for "retaining rings" which they bought for $1.50 from Radiation Systems, but which were sold by the original manufacturer, Astral Air Parts, for 43 cents each.

The Baltimore area firm again made a

handsome profit on "hexagonal nuts" which it sold to Griffiss for $1.90 each, but which were originally sold by the Crown Distributing Co. for 22 cents each.

Griffiss paid Bendix $1.55 each for "lock washers" and "flat washers." The lock washers were originally sold by Woodford Hardware Co. for eight cents each. The flat washers were sold by Factory and Yard Supply Co. for six cents each.

"The crying shame," according to Pike, is that all of the items bought from Bendix at such high prices were already in supply in storage bins at the Defense Industrial Supply Center in Memphis, Tenn. Identification and stock numbers were identical on the Bendix items and the ones in government supply.

"Incidentally," Pike added, "not only were all the items in question already in government supply, but the 'flat washers' were in such extensive supply as to be considered disposable excess."

Whether any of the middleman's markup was "unconscionable or not is a matter of judgment," Pike noted, "but there is no question about the lack of wisdom of purchasing items which have passed through at least three middlemen's hands at more than five times what they could have been purchased for."

Wasteful defense spending is nothing new, but, at a time when the national defense budget has spiraled to $74 billion, it is important for the American taxpayer to know exactly how much is actually being spent for his defense and how much is being thrown away on stupid and nonessential spending and on waste and other forms of inefficiency.

Waste in other Executive Branch agencies, while not often as great in amount as defense, is often more shocking. A Congressional newsletter reported last June that the GAO had recently come up with some startling data on the wasteful operations of the Federal Aviation Administration.

Among other things, FAA's Pacific Region spent $106,000 to lease an alarm-sound system (which also provided background music) for its new 10-story headquarters building in Honolulu. GAO auditors found that the Honolulu Fire Department already had installed an alarm system in the building and that the State of Hawaii provides a civil defense system in the vicinity.

The same FAA region purchased 148 clothes dryers for installation in employes' homes on Wake Island at a cost of $17,200 (including $4,700 for shipping). The FAA later found out that the employes' housing was not equipped for installation of the dryers—a job which took another year and cost another $25,000.

The operations of the Pacific FAA obviously aroused the curiosity of the GAO, which checked back to 1964, with some interesting results. In that year, it seems, FAA Pacific found itself with $20,000 unexpended funds from its budget. Unless this money was spent before the end of the fiscal year, it would automatically be returned to the U.S. Treasury (an unmentionable sin in the world of federal bureaucracy).

So FAA hastily set out to buy $20,000 worth of library books. Since there wasn't time to draw up an official list, the agency used the official list of the Alaska Region, and managed to spend $15,600 before the fiscal deadline.

Now an FAA employe or member of his family can spend a relaxing afternoon in the Hawaiian sunshine reading such literary delights as "The Story of Alaska" or "History of Kamchatka and the Kurilski Island," or "Road to Alaska," or dozens of other novels and histories of the land of the frozen north.

While the United States writes in the stranglehold of a fumbling war on poverty that is failing to help the poor, FAA Pacific believes in living it up big for the sake of pomp and ceremony. GAO found that the agency spent $14,000 for the dedication of a leased building in Honolulu, $8,400 for ceremonies at an international flight service station on Guam and $10,400 for similar ceremonies at another station on American Samoa.

Despite FAA plans to abandon its installations on Canton Island in the Pacific, GAO found that the agency never-the-less spent $27,000 for miscellaneous equipment for the island, including $4,300 for aluminum jalousie windows and screens and $8,960 for an ambulance which could not be used because it was designed for well paved city streets, rather than Canton's rugged terrain.

A national magazine reported earlier this year that House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford "was highly disturbed" by reports that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare was getting ready to spend a half-million dollars to develop a dance-theater curriculum under provisions of the federal aid to elementary and high schools act.

Ford later said he was "shocked," and that it was true. HEW, he said, plans to establish "laboratory theaters" in Providence, R.I., and New Orleans, La., to find out "how to use the arts to teach youngsters who can't learn from books."

A spokesman for the Atomic Energy Commission candidly expressed the bureaucratic ideal before a House subcommittee investigating an AEC request for $5.37 million for research on "terrestrial and fresh water ecology."

When asked by the acting chairman, Jamie L. Whitten (D., Miss.) what AEC hoped to accomplish during the five-year study program, the spokesman said:

"By that time we hope to have an appropriation of $20 million."

Last year the Department of Agriculture placed a rush order for 2,900 typewriters, costing $500 each for a total of more than $1,500,000. Because it did not purchase through competitive bidding, the department spent $500,000 more than was necessary.

USDA explained that it had to have the machines immediately because it had to meet a Congressional deadline of Jan. 1, 1967, for reporting payments to farmers.

Had the department merely checked, it would have found that an amendment setting up the Jan. 1 deadline had been defeated and was not law.

While the Israelis were busy wiping up the Arab Legions last June, a Republican Congressional Committee noted, "The U.S. has given $27.6 million to Israel in military aid—designed to discourage attacks from Egypt or Syria. The U.S. has given $66 million in military aid to Jordan, presumably to keep Nasser from taking over that nation. Just as Pakistan and India used U.S.-furnished equipment, the nations of the Mideast are waging war with our foreign aid."

On the same day, Congressman John J. Duncan of Tennessee noted that while U.S. taxpayers get a $600 per year deduction for the cost of feeding, clothing, housing and educating a youngster, the Job Corps figures the cost at $7,000 and the Cuban Refugee Program pays as high as $2,200 if the youngster is in school.

While the whole poverty program merits immediate investigation, a particular grant of $208,741 to improve the jewelry business of the Zuni Indians of the Southwest cries out for a probe. The grant, by the Office of Economic Opportunity, calls for teaching the Zunis how to make Indian jewelry—an art with silver and turquoise in which they have excelled for centuries.

The OEO further plans to have the famous hand-crafted jewelry machine-made, and hopes to set up a cooperative to market $150,000 worth of the "genuine" machine-made Zuni jewelry. OEO failed to find out that private stores are presently snapping up all of the genuine Zuni jewelry they can get their hands on, and business exceeds the $2 million per year mark.

A Congressional report on June 30, 1966, noted that of the $2.3 billion voted for OEO up to that time, $7,788,365 had been spent "on scores of studies, analyses, assessments and surveys—none of which appear to get at the real problems of poverty, such as training the unemployed and finding jobs for them."

Very little is known publicly about this multi-million dollar aspect of OEO operations. OEO officials say nothing about it and reports of these studies are not published.

Congressional leaders trying to check on funds handed out freely by OEO have found some lavish examples. They include $498,773 to the Educational Testing Service (no address given) for "evaluation of Project Head Start"; $262,369 to Lear Siegler Services (no address) to study "Administrative Services and Related Support for Head Start"; $533,256 to the same company for a survey of "Organization and Teaching of Orientation Programs for Head Start Child Development Staff . . ."

Another $58,000 to Wisconsin University for "Study of Head Start Program," and $54,660 to Howard University for "Evaluation and Study of Head Start."

According to a Congressional report, "One ornate report obtained by members of the House Education and Labor Committee, on an $82,000 'Analysis of Alternative Hypothetical Urban Community Action Projects' has left them completely mystified."

An example of their mystification can be found in an excerpt from the analysis' general conclusion:

"The small area model's forecast of employment and the distribution of this employment projection among the occupational classes is certainly one area in which improvement is required. At present, basic employment is taken as exogenous input by the small area model. It then generates the nonbasic employment to provide goods and services to these households and the households to provide these additional employes."

Congress was told that "Of the approximate 50 pages of the report, more than half consist of bewildering hieroglyphics."

If the President keeps his pledge and if the Congress gets a chance to vote for a new Hoover Commission, that body will have its work cut out for it in a thousand times the foulups described above. Additionally, it will have to look into one of the greatest propaganda lies ever perpetrated upon the American people—the myth that Social Security is a sound fund providing for their eventual retirement.

The current issue of Reader's Digest, in a six-page expose of the Social Security hoax, says no more than interested and concerned Congressmen like Mathias of Maryland have been saying for years.

Basically, the truth of Social Security is that it is a tax imposed upon the working people of the United States to pay welfare benefits to the aged and infirm who have not provided for their own welfare in retirement or illness.

"Rather than a deep pool of money invested for your future in a sound fund," Mathias has stated, "Social Security is a flowing river which carries the increasing taxes from your paycheck into the pockets of those currently receiving benefits."

The word "insurance" in connection with Social Security is merely a well thought out public relations gimmick. The Supreme Court in 1960 ruled, according to the magazine, that you have no contract with the government when it deducts Social Security taxes from your pay. You have no guarantee that you will ever collect any benefits from Social Security, or that in the event of your death, your survivors will ever collect.

If future generations of Americans do not continue to contribute to Social Security at an ever increasing rate, chances are that the workers of today will never see a penny of the money they have been "involuntarily" paying into the fundless Social Security fund.

The national magazine was on the newsstands only a few days when Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball got out a hasty "bulletin" to be distributed to the thousands of workers at Social Security's sprawling complex in the Baltimore suburb of Woodlawn. Ball even had his nit-picking bulletin read into the Congressional Record by House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills of Arkansas.

With the exception of a few minor details the bulletin in no way refutes the basic truth of the article.

Ball got touchy about the magazine's claim that even when money paid into Social Security manages to surpass the immediate payout, the federal government snatches it up and issues Social Security an I.O.U. The magazine charges that the I.O.U.s accumulated since the start of Social Security now total about $23 billion—enough to continue paying benefits for about 14 months for about 23 million beneficiaries.

An official at Social Security in Woodlawn frankly admits that it doesn't really matter whether the excess money is taken by the General Fund or put into some special account, since both exist in reality, only on paper.

By any estimate, says Congressman Mathias, Social Security is the poorest, most ill-conceived investment any young worker could possibly make with his money. "But, of course, we should realize that it is not an investment."

Perhaps it is no surprise that Congress studies the Social Security appropriations bill at the same time it weighs the $4,240,000,000 request for public assistance benefits . . . more commonly known as welfare.

LESSONS OF THE REVOLUTION: 50 YEARS LATER

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 1 week from today world Communists will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Russian revolution. On this 50th anniversary we find the major impediment to world peace is the diabolical philosophy of communism and its determination to achieve world domination. Since the Communists are, in a very predictable sense, energetically propagandizing the 50th anniversary of the revolution, I believe it is practical for us to balance the scale with factual commentary. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record at this point as part of my remarks an article by Rev. Denis Dirscherl, entitled "Lessons of the Revolution," from the November 5 edition of Our Sunday Visitor:

Lessons of the Revolution: 50 Years Later

(By Denis Dirscherl, S.J.)

(Note.—Father Dirscherl is editor of a symposium on the U.S.S.R., "The New Russia," to be published soon by Pflaum Press.)

The world still reels from the forces let loose 50 years ago when the Bolsheviks seized power in Petrograd in 1917.

How can the communist philosophy continue to dominate and control the lives of so many millions the world over?

History is the teacher of life. Her chalkboard on the revolution is covered with unanswered questions and comparisons.

Living standards before the revolt in the Soviet Union seemed incredible. The masses lived in ignorance and poverty. The Czarist court remained aloof from the real needs of the people.

The "secular" state was doomed. So was the Church. Superstition was widespread among the peasants. The intellectuals, for the most part, were atheists or agnostics who simply laughed at the idea of God. The Orthodox Church was all too often a prop for the government.

Pre-revolutionary Russia with its chaotic political and social structures provided the void for communism to fill. Lenin stepped into the breach and promised Russia a new Soviet man. He sought to give to the Russian people a new sense of pride and purpose. He pursued the ideal at a cost of thousands of lives and a brutally imposed authority, and betrayed the hopes of many of his own followers. In January 1924, Lenin was dead.

After consolidating his forces, Stalin, the man Lenin hated, took over the communist leadership of both Russia and the communist bloc. The dictator, lacking the intellectual gifts and physical vigor of Lenin, compensated for these inadequacies by a thirst for power.

World War II probably "saved" Stalin and his Soviet State. The Russian people momentarily forgot their plight and fought to save their country from destruction.

In 1949, when Mao Tse-tung's forces pushed Chiang Kai-shek's troops off mainland China, Stalin began hustling Russia's heavy industry at full speed. Within a short time, manpower-wise, the communist empire became the most formidable military threat in history.

Stalin's death in 1953 ended another era. With the succession of Malenkov, Bulganin, and Khrushchev in the premiership, one might say the "leash was let out" in the Soviet Union; a "thaw" of sorts came into being under pressure of the problems both within and outside Russia. More importantly, the monolithic image of communism, which had been so well preserved in the West for so many years, began to crumble. Khrushchev, however, continued the expansionist pattern of his predecessors.

The removal of Khrushchev from power in October 1964 marked another turning point. This event helped to intensify interests in the various problems facing the rulers of Russia. Snags in education, agriculture, and the China question give many anxious moments to the regime of Kosygin and Brezhnev.

In Russia today, all ideas from other countries outside the communist bloc along political and economical lines are still held with suspicion, though with far less hostility than in the past. The Soviets are willing to admit that they can learn a great deal from the West. There is still little flexibility or room for democracy, in our understanding of the terms within the Communist Party itself. The Soviet citizen still must live with an absence of freedom. In this respect life has not changed in Russia for centuries.

Communism's revolutionary doctrine still retains an appeal. Radical leaders in Latin America and Asia see no other way to free their countries from a misery which far exceeds even that of pre-Revolutionary Russia.

Communism is born of despair. If we are to free the world of the threat of communism, we must first strive to eliminate the causes of despair. The great task which faces the Western world is to help the underdeveloped nations of the world achieve the human existence they so long for and demand.

Mr. Speaker, the Communists effectively juggle statistics to paint a picture of accomplishment. Their phony statistics are very effectively analyzed by the noted economist, Henry Hazlitt, in an article in the Tuesday, October 31, Chicago Tribune, which I insert as part of my remarks, as follows:

Would You Believe Russ Phony Statistics?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

On November 7 Russia will celebrate half a century of soviet rule, and the "experts" have been trying to summarize what the Communist revolution has wrought. These summaries have been enlightening not only for what they reveal about Russia but about the changed attitude of many of the "experts" themselves.

Up until 10 or even five years ago many of these western "experts" were swallowing most of the propagandistic Russian production figures and their claims of phenomenal "economic growth" far surpassing that of the capitalist countries. Only the glaring evidence of repeated Russian crop failures in the last few years awakened some of these "specialists" to the suspicion that something might be phony about the official claims.

Meaningful over-all comparisons are very difficult. United States intelligence agencies estimate the Russian gross national product in 1966 at 335 billion dollars, or 45 per cent of the American figure. But how good is this estimate?

We are dealing, for example, with purely arbitrary prices in Russia and a wholly artificial value for the Russian ruble. That value is set at $1.10, an exchange rate rigidly enforced with criminal penalties. Yet on the basis of typical prices the real internal purchasing power of the ruble seems to be barely a third as much as that of the dollar.

Prof. G. Warren Nutter, who has made the most thoro study of the subject by any American economist, estimates that the average soviet rate of growth has been about 3 per cent a year, which does not exceed the long-run performances of the United States. In fact, he pointed out: "Despite unbending efforts to outpace the record of the past, the growth of Russian industry, agriculture, and transportation has been slower in the half-century of soviet rule than in the last half-century of czardom."

CONSUMER GOODS SHORT

What has caused many western observers until recently to accept the soviet economic claims has been the Communist planners' concentration on heavy industry, on armament and on missiles, sputniks and Venus-shots undertaken mainly for their military or propaganda value. But the centralized government planning that has made these achievements possible also has been the very thing that has made it impossible for the Russian leaders to supply their people with thousands of different civilian goods and services in the amounts, proportions, and qualities in which they are wanted.

It may seem, superficially, as if the soviet leaders are on the verge of solving this problem. They have ceased trying to dictate minutely from the center precisely how much shall be made of everything and have introduced a new system of incentives that ties rewards to profits rather than to physical volume of production. They are even paying further unintended homage to capitalism by requiring individual industries to pay rent and interest.

BRINGS PROBLEMS, TOO

This new system of "market socialism" has certainly given more incentive to many individuals and increased some output. But in time it must bring as many problems as it solves, for it refuses to grant the essence of capitalism. The government continues to own the means of production. It continues to dictate the price structure. Under such a system there cannot be meaningful competition among producers or genuine freedom of choice by consumers.

Only a thorogoing capitalism, with free markets, free prices, free competition, and private ownership of the means of production, can solve the overriding problem of economic calculation.

Another point that must be emphasized, Mr. Speaker, is the effective counteractivities taking place against the Communist propaganda machine. I include as part of my remarks the basic text of a pamphlet entitled "November 7, 1917: A Day of Mourning," produced by the Council Against Communist Aggression, whose office is in Hollywood, Fla.:

November 7, 1917: A Day of Mourning

On February 7th this year the Soviet regime will have completed fifty years of its totalitarian existence. Already the global communist apparatus is busy with preparations to make it the most dramatic anniversary celebration in modern times. The world will be filled with extravagant Soviet claims and boasts of "miraculous achievements," as proof that communism is a superior system of life and *our* world of freedom is "doomed."

For the peoples in the communist prison-states the "celebration" will be mandatory. But unfortunately millions of men and women in the free nations, the United States among them, having been drugged by five decades of propaganda, will join in the festivities. The brainwashed portion of our free press will glorify the supposed "success" of communism, while ignoring its staggering crimes, mass homicides, economic failure, and its half-century of subversion, conspiracy and assorted mischiefmaking in the relentless drive for One Communist World.

For the nearly one billion human beings now under the cruel yoke of communism, November 7th is not a day of jubilation but a day of mourning. Mourning for the myriad lives taken by communism—85 million is a moderate estimate for the fifty years, and that does not include the deaths in World War II, touched off by the Hitler-Stalin pact of friendship. Mourning for the incalculable sufferings imposed on country after country, from Russia to Cuba, from Eastern Europe to Red China; for the systematic destruction of moral and spiritual values.

For the non-communist world, too, November 7th is an anniversary—the anniversary of one of the greatest disasters that has befallen mankind. Soviet Russia has been the center of infection, which has spread to a third of the human race. Soviet communism set the pattern for Facism, Nazism, and all the other subsequent brands of totalitarianism. For half a century it has kept the world in a turmoil of civil conflicts, Moscow-made crises, nuclear threats, and armament races. Its hallmark has been utter immoralism at home and abroad. It has made solemn treaties by the score, only to break them at will. With more than a hundred vetoes it has paralyzed the United Nations.

And, despite self-deception on this score by some statesmen and political pundits, the end is not yet. The Cold War is very much with us. The communist techniques for instigating the hot proxy wars which Moscow and Peking call "wars of liberation" have been on view in Korea and Vietnam and the Middle East. In our hemisphere Red Cuba, with Soviet weapons and financing, has half a dozen guerrilla wars going today in Central and South America.

Americans who cherish freedom and human dignity and seek genuine peace should make the week of November 7th the occasion for exposing and indicting the communist crimes and conspiracies—for rededication to human decency and freedom. The Kremlin and its befuddled partisans in our midst must not be allowed to get away with their Big Lies. Individuals and organizations must turn the anniversary into *a time of mourning*. They must speak up for the silenced and intimidated in Soviet Russia, its satellites and all other communist areas.

Moscow has accused our State Department the CIA and others, of planning to "spoil" their glorious "jubilee." Our government truthfully, alas, denies any such intentions. This makes it the more important for private citizens to *plan now* to tell the grim truth about the Soviet half-century—and make clear their sympathy for and solidarity with the victims of communism, past and present.

Mr. Speaker, in the week to come I hope that numerous Members will objectively interpret the barrage of Communist propaganda so that November 7 will be effectively recognized as a day of tragedy rather than progress.

L. B. J. UNINTENTIONALLY AIDING RED CHINESE?

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the continuing debate over our Nation's role in Asia will no doubt dominate our concern for many, many years to come.

Much has been said and much has been written by the so-called hawks and doves about our Vietnamese involvement. A great deal of our attention has been given to the monumental task of feeding India's teeming millions. Admittedly, these are problems so vast in scope that often men tend to feel there is no solution.

Mr. Whitley Austin, editor of the Salina Journal in Salina, Kans., has a candid and commonsense approach with respect to our aims and involvements in Vietnam and Asia. He is no novice to that continent. He has traveled extensively throughout Asia, particularly in India and Japan. His opinion is based largely on firsthand observation, long interest, and study of our relationships with Asian nations.

I know of no one in the field of journalism more qualified to expound on political and economic conditions in this part of the world than Whitley Austin, and for that reason I invite the attention of my colleagues to his editorials which appeared in the Salina Journal on October 24 and October 25:

[From the Salina Journal, Oct. 24, 1967]

L. B. J. Unintentionally Aiding Red Chinese?

The assault on the Pentagon by an unwashed horde last week disgusted most of us. It contributed nothing to a common-sense evaluation of the reasons for the United States fighting a major and deadly war in Vietnam.

But the rising emotions of the nation have helped to clarify the issue. It now is peeled to the nub.

In defense of Johnson policy, the administration has ceased to stress that we are in Vietnam to establish a democratic government, protect natives from invaders, or to respect treaty obligations that upon analysis are vague or non-existent.

The prime purpose, as Dean Rusk now says, is to prevent the domination of Asia by the communist Chinese. Probably this has been the real purpose all along.

If the Chinese do seek to dominate Asia, this is contrary to our national interest. You may debate, of course, whether this is the Chinese intention, whether they are capable of fulfilling it, and, if they are, whether our interests in Asia are worth the price of our sons and our treasure.

Let us assume for the moment, however, that this Yellow Peril is real and that it must be stopped at any cost. Is Vietnam the place to do it?

1. In their long history, the Vietnamese have resisted Chinese imperialism. By attacking their country, we are forcing the Vietnamese to invite the Chinese to come in and take over. We are demolishing what has been an effective barrier to Chinese expansion.

2. The Russians are ancient and present enemies of the Chinese. They have every reason to support the Vietnamese against the Chinese. But our actions are forcing the Russians to become allies of the Chinese and to join them against us. This cannot but endanger our interests in Europe and step up the odds against us elsewhere.

3. The Vietnam war is one of attrition, scored on the daily kill-rate. But those being killed are Americans and Vietnamese, not Chinese, not Russians. The big communist nations are unscathed. Even their dollar cost is less than ours. They are merely holding the coats.

4. It is argued we are proving that communist-inspired wars of "liberation" will not work. But the "lesson" of Korea was not learned. Nor the "lesson" of Indonesia. Do we believe a stalemate in Vietnam, or even a victory, will halt the Chinese or the Russians from trying again in a field of their choosing? After the drain of Vietnam, will we be prepared to fight in Thailand or Burma or India?

5. We are so committed now in Asia that we would be nearly impotent against a major outbreak in Latin America, Europe or Africa.

6. While we are seeking to safeguard the world, we are failing at home to counter inflation, poverty, racial unrest and crime. We are tearing ourselves down without effectively helping others.

It is hard to conclude otherwise than that the Johnson course of action is aiding—not deterring—Red Chinese imperialism. This certainly is not the President's purpose. But it probably is the result.

[From the Salina Journal, Oct. 25, 1967]

Is the United States Neglecting the Anchors of Asia

If Vietnam is the wrong place to "stop" China, as was suggested here yesterday, what is the right place?

Let us make two assumptions. First, that our purpose is not to boss Asia or even to make pals out of the yellows and browns, but rather to create a stable situation, conducive to world peace and commercial intercourse, in which these peoples may develop each in their own way.

Second, that this job may best be done by those directly concerned, by the people who live there and by their nations that are stable and developing. We are not colonists and by now we should have lost our messiah complex.

If you accept these premises, three stable and developing nations immediately come to mind, Australia, Japan and India. They are counterweights to China.

While Australia is not labeled part of Asia, geographically, it is, neighboring as it does Indonesia and Malaysia. Japan has demonstrated strength and growth. India has been a democracy for 20 years, has a population greater than Africa and Latin America combined, and is the only non-communist land route between the West and Asia.

Each of these anchor nations has its own problems and its own ways of thinking, some of which are not ours. But they have the potential for Asian leadership, along with such smaller nations as Thailand, the Philippines, etc.

For Americans, the biggest question in the lot is India. We have been bewildered by its neutralist diplomacy, the shifts in its internal politics and by its problems of poverty and hunger.

Reports of the beggars in Calcutta, the sacred cows in Benares and the Marxists in Kerala state have tended to make us think of India as a hopeless land. Probably we under-rate it.

Granted the troubles, India now is making substantial progress in food production, population control and popular education. The last two years have seen a remarkable change for the better in India's determination to pull itself up by its own bootstraps.

India still needs our aid if it is to become self-sufficient. It also needs our patience, tolerance and understanding because it often is a baffling country with difficult leadership.

As a nation comprising one-sixth of the human race, ruled by a parliamentary democracy that has endured four general elections, and as one so strategically placed, India is worth the effort. Certainly we can help India help itself at a far lower cost than the Vietnam war. If India were to go down the drain, all the blood we have shed in Asia would have been in vain.

Independent, prosperous Asian nations are the key to stable peace for that continent. This is where our emphasis for the Far East belongs. In stumbling into a jungle war for a fragment of Indochina we have missed the point. We have sacrificed our basic objective.

THE CLEAN MEAT BILL

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post included an excellent editorial summarizing the issues in the meat inspection bill. It follows:

The Clean Meat Bill

The House will have an opportunity today to modernize the outmoded Federal meat inspection law which has been on the books with little change for 60 years. It is a task made urgent by revolutionary changes in the meat-handling industry. The slaughter of livestock is no longer concentrated in Chicago and a few other large centers. In recent years the slaughterhouses have moved close to livestock feeding areas and are much more numerous than they once were. At the same time processing plants turning out meat products tend to be located near the large consumer markets. With their sophisticated techniques, they produce many products that require little home preparation, thus greatly increasing opportunities on the part of a few unscrupulous producers for adulteration, the use of "extenders" and deceptive labeling.

The weakest point in the present inspection system is the absence of cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and the states. Federal inspection is limited to meat moving in interstate and foreign commerce, and only about one-half of the states provide mandatory inspection of meat and meat products that move within state boundaries. Eight states, including Maryland, have no meat inspection law whatever.

Representative Purcell's bill approved by the Department of Agriculture, the House Agriculture Committee and the livestock industry would meet this problem by creating a joint Federal-state inspection system. The Department of Agriculture would provide counsel, manpower and financial aid to help the states to set up complete intrastate inspection consistent with Federal standards.

As the bill goes to the floor, this appears to be its most controversial provision. A substitute for this section known as the Smith-Foley amendment would offer additional protection against unfit meat by extending Federal inspection. But this would cover only plants having gross sales in excess of $250,000 annually, leaving about one-half of the plants now uninspected still free to turn out dirty meat. Most of the trouble in the past has come, not from the larger plants which have a reputation to uphold, but from small unstable enterprises—the kind that would remain uninspected under the Smith-Foley amendment.

In our view, there are two major objectives to be sought: (1) The elimination of every pound of unclean or unwholesome meat from the market; (2) accomplishment of this objective within the framework of our Federal system, which often calls for Federal aid to help the states perform their local functions instead of mere absorption of those functions by an overextended Federal bureaucracy. Since the Purcell bill would make it possible to accomplish both purposes and the Smith-Foley amendment would not accomplish either, the bill as approved by the Agriculture Committee 31 to 3 seems clearly preferable.

CENSUS QUESTIONS AND THE NATIONAL DATA CENTER

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Betts] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the more than 120 bits of information which our citizens could be required to give the Census Bureau in 1970 may seem harmless in themselves. If each answer were separated from the respondent's name and the files confidentially maintained in Census Bureau, perhaps personal privacy would not be threatened by this extensive citizen interrogation by our Government. Even today, however, this is not the case with the sale and sharing of so much population and housing data by the Census Bureau. Tomorrow, a national data bank will be the center for consolidated personal factsheets on every American and present protections of privacy may be thrown to the winds.

Congress can bar the indiscriminate collection of personal data and the potential misuse of confidential information in a national data center. I have introduced legislation (H.R. 10952) to protect our citizens from limitless mandatory census questioning. Commenting on my bill as well as the author of an outstanding article on the national data center is Prof. Arthur R. Miller of the Law School at the University of Michigan. In a letter to the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Professor Miller stated:

> In an age in which federal information acquisition and dissemination is at an all time high, an age in which governmental snooping through electronic devices is carried out on a widescale basis, in an age in which national data centers and monolithic information gathering and analyzing techniques are being proposed, it should be the Congress that is in the forefront of protecting individual privacy. The number of people who inevitably will see an individual's answers to the questions proposed for the 1970 census and the possibility that these responses can be computerized and analyzed on an associative basis with information connected by the Internal Revenue Service, the FBI, the Post Office, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and others suggest that the most careful scrutiny must be given to the process of governmental information collecting and processing. Obviously, a balance must be struck between an individual's privacy and governmental recordkeeping and administration. I strongly urge, however, that the imposition of penal sanctions for failure to respond to many of the personal questions that will be asked in connection with the 1970 decennial census cannot be justified no matter how the balance is struck. I support the passage of H.R. 10952 as marking the reasonable limits for the application of criminal sanctions and urge a complete study of the interrelationship and antagonism between census taking and citizen privacy.

The November 1967 issue of the Atlantic magazine contains Professor Miller's article entitled "The National Data Center and Personal Privacy" which I place in the Record at this point:

The National Data Center and Personal Privacy

(By Arthur R. Miller)

(Note.—The computer age is not to be stayed, as anyone knows who has been billed for another citizen's charge account or has wondered what has happened to his paid-up magazine subscription. The computer science is already so advanced that experts envisage a huge National Data Center to speed and simplify the collection of pertinent information about Americans. Properly run, it could be a boon. But any person who has seen an FBI file or been party to a U.S. government "security check" has reason to know how the abuse or misuse of dossiers of unevaluated information can threaten an individual's rights. A professor of law at the University of Michigan here discusses the precautions necessary to protect citizens from "governmental snooping and bureaucratic spinelessness or perfidy." Professor Miller has testified on the subject before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure. On page 58, Bob and Ray show what can happen if the safeguards fail.)

The modern computer is more than a sophisticated indexing or adding machine, or a miniaturized library; it is the keystone for a new communications medium whose capacities and implications we are only beginning to realize. In the foreseeable future, computer systems will be tied together by television, satellites, and lasers, and we will move large quantities of information over vast distances in imperceptible periods of time.

The benefits to be derived from the new technology are many. In one medical center, doctors are already using computers to monitor heart patients in an attempt to isolate the changes in body chemistry that precede a heart attack. The search is for an "early warning system" so that treatment is not delayed until after the heart attack has struck. Elsewhere, plans are being made to establish a data bank in which vast amounts of medical information will be accessible through remote terminals to doctors thousands of miles away. A doctor will then be able to determine the antidote for various poisons or get the latest literature on a disease by dialing a telephone or typing an inquiry on a computer console.

A committee of the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that the federal government set up a National Data Center to compile statistical information on various facets of our society. Certainly the computer can help us simplify record-keeping by assigning everyone a "birth" number that will identify him for tax returns, banking, education, social security, the draft, and other purposes. This number could also serve as a telephone number, which, when used on modern communication mechanisms, would make it possible to reach its holder directly no matter where he might be.

But such a Data Center poses a grave threat to individual freedom and privacy. With its insatiable appetite for information, its inability to forget anything that has been put into it, a central computer might become the heart of a government surveillance system that would lay bare our finances, our associations, or our mental and physical health to government inquisitors or even to casual observers. Computer technology is moving so rapidly that a sharp line between statistical and intelligence systems is bound to be obliterated. Even the most innocuous of centers could provide the "foot in the door" for the development of an individualized computer-based federal snooping system.

Since a National Data Center would be augmented by numerous subsystems or satellites operated by state and local governments or by private organizations, comprehensive national regulation of computer communications, whether of federal or nonfederal origin, ultimately will become imperative.

Moreover, deliberations should not be conducted in terms of computer capability as it exists today. New computer hardware is constantly being spawned, machine storage capacity and speed are increasing geometrically, and costs are declining. Thus at present we cannot imagine what the dimensions, the sophistication, or the snooping ability of the National Data Center will turn out to be ten or twenty years from now. Nor can we predict what new techniques will be developed to pierce any safeguards that Congress may set up in order to protect people against those who manipulate or falsify information they extract from or put into the center.

Of course, it would be foolish to prohibit the use of data-processing technology to carry out important governmental operations simply because it might be abused. However, it is necessary to fashion an adequate legal structure to protect the public against misuse of information handling.

In the past, privacy has been relatively easy to protect for a number of reasons. Large quantities of information about individuals have not been available. Generally decentralized, uncollected, and uncollated, the available information has been relatively superficial, access to it has been difficult to secure, and most people are unable to interpret it. During the hearings held recently by two of the congressional subcommittees investigating invasions of privacy, however, revelations concerning the widespread use of modern electronic and optical snooping devices shocked us.

In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy, Edgar S. Dunn, Jr., a research analyst for Resources for the Future, Incorporated, pointed out that information in the center would not be intelligible to the snooper as are the contents of a manila folder. Computerized data require a machine, a code book, a set of instructions, and a technician in order to be comprehended. Presumably Mr. Dunn's thesis is that if it is difficult or expensive to gain access to and interpret the data in the center, there is little likelihood of anyone's trying to pry; if the snooper's cost for unearthing a unit of dirt increases sufficiently, it will become too expensive for him to try to violate the center's integrity.

Mr. Dunn's logic fails to take into account other factors. First, if all the information gathered about an individual is in one place, the payoff for snooping is sharply enhanced. Thus, although the cost or difficulty of gaining access may be great, the amount of dirt available once access is gained is also great. Second, there is every reason to believe that the art of electronic surveillance will continue to become more efficient and economical. Third, governmental snooping is rarely deterred by cost.

Mr. Dunn also ignores a number of special dangers posed by a computerized National Data Center. Ever since the federal government's entry into the taxation and social welfare spheres, increasing quantities of information have been recorded. Moreover, as recording processes have become mechanized and less cumbersome, there also has been centralization and collation of information. In something akin to Parkinson's Law, the increase in information-handling capacity has created a tendency toward more extensive manipulation and analysis of recorded data, which, in turn, has required the collection of more and more data. The creation of the Data Center with electronic storage and retrieval capacity will accelerate this pattern.

Any increase in the amount of recorded information is certain to increase the risk of errors in reporting and recording and indexing. Information distortion also will be caused by machine malfunctioning. Moreover, people working with the data in Washington or at a distance through remote terminals can misuse the information. As information accumulates, the contents of an individual's computerized dossier will appear more and more impressive and will impart a heightened sense of reliability to the user, which, coupled with the myth of computer infallibility, will make it less likely that the user will try to verify the recorded data. This will be true despite the "softness" or "imprecision" of much of the data. Our success or failure in life ultimately may turn on what other people decide to put into our files and on the programmer's ability, or inability, to evaluate, process, and interrelate information. The great bulk of the information likely to find its way into the center will be gathered and processed by relatively unskilled and unimaginative people who lack discrimination and sensitivity. Furthermore, a computerized file has a certain indelible quality—adversities cannot be overcome simply by the passage of time.

There are further dangers. The very existence of a National Data Center may encourage certain federal officials to engage in questionable surveillance tactics. For example, optical scanners—devices with the capacity to read a variety of type fonts or handwriting at fantastic rates of speed—could be used to monitor our mail. By linking scanners with a computer system, the information drawn in by the scanner would be converted into machine-readable form and transferred into the subject's file in the National Data Center.

Then, with sophisticated programming, the dossiers of all of the surveillance subject's correspondents could be produced at the touch of a button, and an appropriate entry—perhaps "associates with known criminals"—could be added to all of them. As a result, someone who simply exchanges Christmas cards with a person whose mail is being monitored might find himself under surveillance or might be turned down when he applies for a job with the government or requests a government grant or applies for some other governmental benefit. An untested, impersonal, and erroneous computer entry such as "associates with known criminals" has marked him, and he is helpless to rectify the situation. Indeed, it is likely that he would not even be aware that the entry existed.

These tactics, as well as the possibility of coupling wiretapping and computer processing, undoubtedly will be extremely attractive to overzealous law-enforcement officers. Similarly, the ability to transfer into the National Data Center quantities of information maintained in nonfederal files—credit ratings, educational information from schools and universities, local and state tax information, and medical records—will enable governmental snoopers to obtain data that they have no authority to secure on their own.

The compilation of information by unskilled personnel also creates serious problems of accuracy. It is not simply a matter of the truth or falsity of what is recorded. Information can be entirely accurate and sufficient in one context and wholly incomplete and misleading in another. For example, the bare statement of an individual's marital status has entirely different connotations to the selective service, a credit bureau, the Internal Revenue Service, and the social security administration. Consider a computer entry of "divorced" and the different embellishment that would be necessary in each of those contexts to portray an accurate picture of an individual's situation.

The question of context is most graphically illustrated by the unexplained and incomplete arrest record. It is unlikely that a citizen whose file contains an entry "arrested, 6/1/42; convicted felony, 1/6/43; three years, federal penitentiary" would be given federal employment or be accorded the governmental courtesies accorded other citizens. Yet the subject may simply have been a conscientious objector. And what about the entry "arrested, disorderly conduct; sentenced six months Gotham City jail." Without further explanation, who would know that the person involved was a civil rights demonstrator whose conviction was reversed on appeal?

Finally, the risks to privacy created by a National Data Center lie not only in the misuse of the system by those who desire to injure others or who can obtain some personal advantage by doing so. There also is a legitimate concern that government employees in routine clerical positions will have the capacity to inflict damage through negligence, sloppiness, thoughtlessness, or sheer stupidity, by unintentionally rendering a record inaccurate, or losing it, or disseminating its contents to people not authorized to see it.

To ensure freedom from governmental intrusion, Congress must legislate reasonably precise standards regarding the information that can be recorded in the National Data Center. Certain types of information should not be recorded even if it is technically feasible to do so and a legitimate administrative objective exists. For example, it has long been "feasible," and from some vantage points "desirable," to require citizens to carry and display passports when traveling in this country, or to require universal fingerprinting. But we have not done so because these encroachments on our liberties are deemed inconsistent with the philosophical fiber of our society. Likewise, highly personal information, especially medical and psychiatric information, should not be permitted in the center unless human life depends upon recording it.

Legislation sharply limiting the information which federal agencies and officials can extract from private citizens is absolutely essential. To reinforce these limitations, the statute creating the Data Center should prohibit recording any information collected without specific congressional authorization. Until the quality of the center's operations and the nature of its impact on individual privacy can be better perceived, the center's activities should be restricted to the preservation of factual data.

The necessary procedural and technical safeguards seem to fall into two categories: those needed to guarantee the accuracy and integrity of the stored information, and those needed to control its dissemination.

To ensure the accuracy of the center's files, an individual should have an opportunity to correct errors in information concerning him. Perhaps a print-out of his computer file should be sent to him once a year. Admittedly, this process would be expensive; some agencies will argue that the value of certain information will be lost if it is known that the government has it; and there might be squabbles between citizens and the Data Center concerning the accuracy of the file that would entail costly administrative proceedings. Nonetheless, the right of a citizen to be protected against governmental dissemination of misinformation is so important that we must be willing to pay some price to preserve it. Instead of an annual mailing, citizens could be given access to their files on request, perhaps through a network of remote computer terminals situated in government buildings throughout the country. What is necessary is a procedure for periodically determining when data are outmoded or should be removed from the file.

Turning to the question of access, the center's computer hardware and software must be designed to limit access to the information. A medical history given to a government doctor in connection with an application for veteran's benefits should not be available to federal employees not legitimately involved in processing the application. One solution may be to store information according to its sensitivity or its accessibility, or both. Then, governmental officials can be assigned access keys that will let them reach only those portions of the center's files that are relevant to their particular governmental function.

Everyone directing an inquiry to the center or seeking to deposit information in it should be required to identify himself. Finger- or voice-prints ultimately may be the best form of identification. As snooping techniques become more sophisticated, systems may even be needed to counter the possibility of forgery or duplication; perhaps an answer-back system or a combination of finger- and voice-prints will be necessary. In addition, the center should be equipped with protector files to record the identity of inquirers, and these files should be audited to unearth misuse of the system. It probably will also be necessary to audit the programs controlling the manipulation of the files and access to the system to make sure that no one has inserted a secret "door" or a password permitting entry to the data by unauthorized personnel. It is frightening to realize that at present there apparently is no foolproof way to prevent occasional "monitor intrusion" in large data-processing systems. Additional protection against these risks can be achieved by exercising great care in selecting programming personnel.

In the future, sophisticated connections between the center and federal offices throughout the country and between the federal center and numerous state, local, and private centers probably will exist. As a result, information will move into and out of the center over substantial distances by telephone lines or microwave relays. The center's "network" character will require information to be protected against wiretapping and other forms of electronic eavesdropping. Transmission in the clear undoubtedly will have to be proscribed, and data in machine-readable form will have to be scrambled or further encoded so that they can be rendered intelligible only by a decoding process built into the system's authorized terminals. Although it may not be worth the effort or expense to develop completely breakproof codes, sufficient scrambling or coding to make it expensive for an eavesdropper to intercept the center's transmission will be necessary. If information in the center is arranged according to sensitivity or accessibility, the most efficient procedure may be to use codes of different degrees of complexity.

At a minimum, congressional action is necessary to establish the appropriate balance between the needs of the national government in accumulating, processing, and disseminating information and the right of individual privacy. This legislation must be reinforced by statutory civil remedies and penal sanctions.

Testimony before Congress concerning the intrusive activities of the Post Office, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service gives us cause to balk at delegating authority over the Data Center to any of the agencies that have a stake in the content of data collected by the government. Some federal personnel are already involved in mail-cover operations, electronic bugging, wiretapping, and other invasions of privacy, and undoubtedly they would try to crack the security of any Data Center that maintains information on an individual basis. Thus it would be folly to leave the center in the hands of any agency whose employees are known to engage in antiprivacy activities. Similarly, the center must be kept away from government officials who are likely to become so entranced with operating sophisticated machinery and manipulating large masses of data that they will not respect an individual's right to privacy.

The conclusion seems inescapable: control over the center must be lodged outside existing channels. A new, completely independent agency, bureau, or office should be established—perhaps as an adjunct to the Census Bureau or the National Archives—to formulate policy under whatever legislative guidelines are enacted to ensure the privacy of all citizens. The organization would operate the center, regulate the nature of the information that can be recorded and stored, insure its accuracy, and protect the center against breaches of security.

The new agency's ability to avoid becoming a captive of the governmental units using the center would be crucial. Perhaps with proper staffing and well-delineated lines of authority to Congress or the President, the center could achieve the degree of independence needed to protect individuals against governmental or private misuse of information in the center. At the other end of the spectrum, the center cannot become an island unto itself, populated by technocrats whose conduct is shielded by the alleged omniscience of the machines they manage and who are neither responsive nor responsible to anyone.

The proposed agency should be established *before* the center is planned. To date, there has been virtually no meaningful exchange among scientists, technicians, legal experts, and government people on the implications of the center. The center also might consider supporting some of the planned nonfederal computer networks, such as the Interuniversity Communications Council's (EDUCOM) plan to link the major universities together, using them as models or operating laboratories to test procedures and hardware for the federal center.

To satisfy those who argue for the early establishment of a purely statistical Data Center, it might be possible for the proposed agency to set up a modest center in which information which does not invade privacy could be made available to government officials, educators, and private researchers. Other federal agencies might establish satellite centers that would contain information too sensitive to be recorded in the statistical center during that institution's formative period, although the data in satellites ultimately might be transferred to the national center.

The threat to individual privacy posed by the computer comes from the private sector as well as the proposed federal Data Center. Each year state and local governments, educational institutions, trade associations, and industrial firms establish data centers that collect and store quantities of information about individuals. Because the high cost of computer installation forces many organizations to operate on a time-share basis, the nonfederal centers pose a special danger to privacy. Without effective screening and built-in security devices, one participant, accidentally or deliberately, may invade and extract or alter the computer files of another participant. Moreover, because many time-share systems operate over large geographic areas, their transmissions will be vulnerable to tapping or malicious destruction unless they are scrambled or encoded. Right now, a mailing list containing 150 to 170 million names, accompanied by addresses and financial data, is being compiled. The list is so structured that it yields sublists of people in various vocational and avocational categories. Where the necessary information to produce this monster came from and how one gets *off* the list are mysteries.

Currently there are more than two thousand independent credit bureaus in the United States, many of whose files are being computerized. Eventually, these bureaus will make a network of their computers, creating a ready source of detailed information about an individual's finances. The accuracy of these records will become increasingly crucial; an honest dispute between a consumer and a retailer over a bill may produce an unexplained and unexpungeable "no pay" evaluation in the computer and result in considerable damage to the buyer's credit rating.

In testimony before the House subcommittee, the director of the New York State Identification and Intelligence System described a data bank containing files on "known" criminals that ultimately will contain millions of entries. He expressed a willingness to exchange information with police officials in other states as soon as the state systems could be meshed. If this system is tied into the National Data Center or New York's Bureau of Motor Vehicles or welfare agencies, it would permit someone to direct an inquiry to the computer file of "known" criminals, find an entry under the name of his subject, and rely on that entry to the subject's detriment without attempting to verify its accuracy.

Congress should consider the need for legislation setting standards to be met by nonfederal computer organizations in providing information about private persons and restraining federal officers from access to certain types of information from nonfederal data centers. Nonfederal systems should be required to install some protective devices and procedures. This is not to suggest that Congress should necessarily impose the same controls on nonfederal systems that it may choose to impose on the federal center. But a protector file to record the source of inquiries and modest encoding would probably prevent wide-scale abuse, although security needs vary from system to system. Since security may be facilitated by installing protective devices in the computer hardware itself, the possible need for regulation of certain aspects of computer manufacturing also should be taken into account.

The possibility of regulating transmission between federal and nonfederal centers and the interaction among nonfederal centers also should be considered. The specter of a federal agency, such as the Veterans' Administration, reaching into a citizen's medical file in a data center operated by a network of hospitals to augment the federal center's file is a disturbing one. Reguating the security of the transmissions and imposing sanctions for noncompliance and eavesdropping would preserve individual privacy against governmental snooping and bureaucratic spinelessness or perfidy.

A GREAT MOMENT FOR L. B. J. AND AMERICA AT THE CHAMIZAL CEREMONIES

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has returned to Washington following a triumphant visit to El Paso and Juarez, Mexico.

The thousands of wildly enthusiastic Mexicans and Americans who greeted President Johnson and President Diaz Ordaz symbolized the warmth and good will enjoyed and shared by the two nations.

Those of us who were there will long remember the clouds of confetti and the tumultuous reception which greeted the two heads of state.

It was a moment of pride felt by all Americans and all Mexicans. And it must have been a moment of deep satisfaction to President Johnson who has worked long and hard to settle the Chamizal controversy.

As the President said, the Chamizal settlement demonstrates eloquently that the United States keeps its word and honors its commitments.

We can now look forward to a new era of mutual trust and respect between Mexico and the United States, an era free of controversy that has long been a point of friction.

And as the President declared, this agreement can "stand as testimony to the world of what two nations, working together, can accomplish."

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD a newspaper report from the Washington Evening Star that describes a truly historic moment in Mexican-American relations:

CROWDS CHEER JOHNSON IN MEXICO VISIT—TWO PRESIDENTS HAIL TRIUMPH OF REASON IN BORDER DISPUTE

(By Garnett D. Horner)

JUAREZ, MEXICO.—President Johnson hailed realignment of the U.S.-Mexico border in Mexico's favor yesterday as an example of the United States keeping a commitment.

His speech came after a tumultuous reception from thousands of cheering, wildly surging Mexicans as he and Mexican President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz rode in a motorcade through jam-packed Juarez streets.

Johnson did not mention the war in Vietnam.

But he obviously had that in mind when he said:

"On other occasions I have said that it is important to the peace of the world that both our friends and our enemies believe we in the United States mean what we say. Here in El Chamizal we have honored our pledged word. And we will continue to honor all our other commitments.

DIAZ ORDAZ CITES TALKS

Diaz Ordaz may have had the Vietnam war in mind, too, when he said the United States and Mexico "know that international conflict, whatever its magnitude, can be solved when the parties involved sit at the table of reasoned and reasonable discussions.

But the speeches of both Presidents were centered on the century-old Chamizal boundary dispute and its settlement.

Diaz Ordaz said the settlement is "an example of what can be achieved when reason, good will and a sincere desire to maintain friendship between peoples, prevail.

The two Presidents were cheered by thousands of people as they rode in a motorcade through El Paso, Tex., and over the new border through Juarez.

On the American side, the crowds were enthusiastic but orderly. Once across the border, the motorcade route became chaotic.

Clouds of confetti flooded down to cover and nearly fill the open convertible in which Johnson and Diaz Ordaz were riding.

The crowds surged from the sidewalks to run alongside the presidential car and one greeter gripped Johnsons hand so hard the President winced. Many youths hitched rides on the hoods and trunks of cars in the procession. At times, the motorcade was stalled by the crush.

SOLDIERS HOLD BACK CROWD

As the Presidents approached the Chamizal Monument where they spoke, Mexican soldiers lining the street held the crowds in check.

On leaving the El Paso airport, the Presidents stopped at a motel bordering the airport for Johnson to speak to a conference on the problems of Americans of Mexican descent.

Johnson reviewed civil rights, poverty and other programs he hailed as aiding Mexican-Americans as well as other Americans.

"We did all this amidst a sea of controversy," he said. "That was to be expected. So far as I can determine, no president has ever done anything worthwhile without controversy. I would rather be controversial than complacent."

At the Chamizal Monument grounds, a strong breeze blew up and by the time Diaz Ordaz spoke, following Johnson, it was whipping dust from the surrounding desert-like country into the eyes of the audience.

Just a short ride from the monument, the motorcade stopped at the boundary line in the middle of the new Bridge of the Americas.

Johnson raised the American flag and Diaz Ordaz raised the Mexican flag on their respective sides of the line. Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Diaz cut a white ribbon to open the bridge officially.

Using his left hand, Johnson shook hands with several people as the ceremony at the bridge ended. He held his right hand down at his side. Apparently it had been squeezed painfully hard by some of the well-wishers along the earlier motorcade route.

The two Presidents said goodbye at the bridge. The Johnsons sped off over the freeway route to the El Paso airport, avoiding the crowds of downtown Juarez and El Paso.

By 2:47 p.m. (4:47 EDT), the President was in the air in his small Jetstar plane, bound for the LBJ ranch near Johnson City, Tex. He was expected to rest and work there over an extended weekend.

Chamizal is an area that was a part of El Paso, until 2 a.m. EDT yesterday when a new international boundary went into effect.

An 1864 flood caused the Rio Grande, marking the border, to move southward. Mexico laid claim to land north of the new river bed. The United States agreed in 1910 to arbitration of the dispute, giving Mexico a net gain of 437 acres. The Chamizal Treaty was signed in 1963, and in recent years, time has been spent in relocating people, shifting railroads, roads, building new bridges and a new concrete channel for the relocated Rio Grande to keep it from shifting again.

Johnson and President Diaz Ordaz, who had been his guest in Washington for two days, flew here yesterday to celebrate the new boundary and sign formal proclamations.

Johnson recalled that for almost a century the word "Chamizal" stood for dispute and disagreement between the United States and Mexico, in a speech during the ceremony at Mexico's new Chamizal Monument.

"Yet in the last four years," he said, "it has become—for both our peoples—an inspiring symbol of friendship and mutual respect. An old argument has been ended. More importantly, a lasting bond has been forged between our two countries.

"Let this monument, and this place, stand as testimony to the world of what two nations, working together, can accomplish.

"Too many times the world has seen disputed boundaries changed through force. El Chamizal stands as a shining example of how such matters should be settled."

Johnson said an "alien doctrine" (meaning communism) is threatening today the principle of "respect for the rights of others" that is the foundation of peace in the world.

"We see it at work," he said, "in the subversion and concealed aggression in Bolivia, Venezuela and other countries. The challenge has confronted the American states with hard choices."

In words obviously meant to apply to Vietnam as well as the western hemisphere, he added:

"Our concern and our commitments are not always easy to uphold. But we cannot abandon them simply because the price is high or the going is rough.

"If Abraham Lincoln had done so, the United States, as we know it today, would not exist."

HALPERN ASKS FAIRPLAY FOR OLDER WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, while we have given a great deal of attention to other forms of discrimination, we have so far neglected to act on one form which can affect millions of our fellow Americans.

I refer to age discrimination in employment, which has shoved many thousands of skilled, competent people into a backwash of hopelessness and despair. I do not refer to aged or unemployable people, but to those in the bracket we can call "older"—from 45 to 65 years of age.

A number of bills have been introduced during this session to end such discrimination, and to increase the chances of these older workers for fair treatment and economic security. Among these measures is my own bill, H.R. 13283.

We dare not allow legislation of this great importance to be lost in the rush to end this session. I feel that our work for this year will not be done until we have acted to right this wrong.

Nearly a million Americans, who are far from old after the age of 45, are out of work. Many thousands of these men and women are not yet ready for voluntary retirement, but they have been elbowed out of productivity by a youth fixation which ignores their skills and capabilities.

It seems strange to me that as medical science advances in its efforts to make lives longer, healthier, and more productive, commerce and industry seems to push the age ceiling lower and lower.

Not so long ago, a man of 35 was at the portal of middle age. Now, with the brilliant achievements of modern medicine, he is still young. Once, a man of 50 was in his declining years, and could not expect to live much longer. Now, he can be at the creast of his skills and effectiveness. Yet the arbitrary age limit set by many employers discards these capabilities and ignores these skills.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider the fact that involuntary retirement for men and women not ready for it mentally or physically is more than a personal tragedy for the individuals involved. It is also a loss to the Nation, which has need of their knowledge and their capabilities.

Though it is true that almost half the States have enacted laws against age discrimination in employment, many find themselves without sufficient funds and proper facilities to carry out the intent of these laws. An overall Federal umbrella must be set up to assure all of our older people of this kind of protection.

We must have legislation to perform two basic functions: it must prevent arbitrary discrimination because of age alone in employment, in the operations of labor unions, and in the procedures of employment agencies.

It must go beyond that, and touch off broad, deep new studies to seek out the situations in which age bias effects Americans, and to perfect ways of ending it. There must also be legislation to study ways in which the skills and services of older, competent workers can be better utilized, and channels of communication must be worked out for cooperation of Federal agencies with regional, State, local, and other agencies to further the aims of the antidiscrimination legislation.

I urge my colleagues to give immediate thought to this critical need, so that this House can take the necessary action on it as speedily as possible.

A GOOD MORTGAGE IDEA WAS STARTED IN S. 1492

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Practical Builder magazine printed an interesting and useful article about the proposal forwarded by Senators SPARKMAN and TOWER to establish a central mortgage facility. I would like to incorporate it in the RECORD at this time:

A GOOD MORTGAGE IDEA WAS STARTED IN S. 1492

(Editorial by James J. Shapiro)

After a lot of sweat, the NAHB has finally ironed out a plan to create a central mortgage facility and help alleviate cycles of tight housing money. The plan was outlined in Senate Bill 1492 and introduced in Congress by Sen. Sparkman and Sen. Tower.

Basic elements of the proposal are sound. The NAHB plan would expand an existing secondary mortgage organization (FNMA) instead of trying to create one from scratch. The bill would enable Fannie Mae to purchase conventional 80% mortgages in addition to their traditional FHA and VA operations.

FNMA would then sell participation certificates in this mortgage pool to investors. The certificates would have a fixed price, probably $1000 each, but they would be a completely negotiable security.

A new board of directors for FNMA would consist of the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, President of FNMA and Secretary of HUD. With their new responsibilities, these top policy makers would be immediately aware of how their fiscal decisions affect the mortgage market.

Another provision would give the Federal Reserve Board authority to deal in FNMA obligations on a permanent basis instead of its present temporary situation.

Senate bill 1492 is not without controversial proposals. Besides its basic tenet of utilizing a quasi-federal organization as a foundation, the current plan would make the FNMA president a direct appointee of the President, not of HUD. As expected, Sec. Weaver is not enthusiastic. In addition, there is no finalized plan on how the conventional mortgages purchased by FNMA could be inspected to meet standards for government backing.

There's another reason why 1492 is expected to have rough sledding. Several other secondary mortgage plans have been proposed by the financial community—each, of course, with a special interest:

S&L's would like the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to sell a negotiable note covering an S&L mortgage pool. The obligation would be backed by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corp. and payments would take precedence over shareholders.

The American Bankers Association would like to act under a federal charter so that member banks can issue a participating certificate in an ABA mortgage pool.

The Home Manufacturers Association has developed a private secondary mortgage plan backed by Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp. of Milwaukee. Initial capital would be raised from major suppliers of building products.

Although longtime builder ally Sen. Sparkman sponsored 1492, it doesn't look like he will vigorously fight for passage unless there is some kind of meeting of the minds among these other financial interests.

This compromise should not be difficult because each proposal, in the long run, is striving for the same thing. First, is an effort to get Congress to pass secondary mortgage legislation right now, rather than during a time of tight money. It is unlikely that Congress would pass a sound and durable bill during a period of panic and clamor.

Second, is the effort to make the mortgage a more appealing instrument for investors. Pension and trust fund administrators invest only 5% of their total bankroll (almost $90 billion) in the mortgage market compared to 55% in stocks. Participation certificates in a secondary mortgage market give investors the liquidity they seek without having to service the mortgages.

BUT HERE'S THE BIGGEST STUMBLING BLOCK TO A NATIONAL HOUSING BANK

What's been hindering a compromise plan?

The biggest stumbling block to a single plan supported by all elements of the building and mortgage industry is the usual problem of communications. Despite all of the painstaking and detailed work by secondary mortgage planners, we don't seem to be able to agree on a name for what we are talking about.

Although the plans may be very similar in concept, some call it a "mortgage pool," others tag it a "government institution." The NAHB has backhand-named its idea a "Central Mortgage Facility" which is neither explanatory nor appealing.

In the meetings and in the corridors at the recent NAHB Washington Spring Board meeting, I heard the very same plan referred to as "The New Fannie Mae, The Facility Idea and the Federal National Mortgage Plan." Certainly if everyone were talking about the same thing, there might be a better chance of creating it.

To create as descriptive a title as possible, one that's crisp and will have wider appeal to all types of investors, PB proposes the name of: National Housing Bank. No special interests can be interpreted, and it implies federal backing without over involvement.

We could take a tip from the much publicized Sen. Percy housing plan which is quite complex and contains many provisions already on the books under existing FHA programs. But the monicker, "National Home Ownership Foundation," has helped it achieve favorable recognition.

An expanded secondary mortgage market needs wide-spread support both from Congress and the financial community. To achieve this support and to work for a plan which is acceptable to all segments of the housing industry, let's first get on the same frequency with a "National Housing Bank."

NEW YORK AND WISCONSIN CONGRESSMEN CRITICIZE AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR FAILURE TO CONSIDER BUFFALO AND MILWAUKEE IN ITS EXPANSION PLAN

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCARTHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS and Mr. ZABLOCKI], the gentlemen from New York [Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. SMITH], and myself, I am including the following statement at this point in the body of the RECORD:

Although the baseball industry is exempted from anti-trust laws, Congress has so far permitted it to run its own affairs. But this privilege carries with it the corresponding duty to act fairly and responsibly in the public interest. Reported action of the American League in awarding expansion franchises without giving Buffalo, Milwaukee, and other interested cities an opportunity to be heard is most inconsistent with baseball's responsibilities.

We believe the American League should withhold final approval of these franchises until this is corrected and ask that both major leagues give assurances that all interested parties will be given adequate notice and a full opportunity to present their cases at a fair hearing before any expansion franchises are awarded.

Buffalo's plans to build a new stadium to be ready for the 1970 season are well along, with the cost and site study to be completed by the first of December and with both parties behind the effort. The New York signers of this statement assume that the Niagara Frontier, with its population rank, its importance as a major television market, and its great record of support of the AFL Bills and other sports, would receive primary consideration in any expansion move by either league.

BUFFALO AREA POLLS SHOW JOHNSON DROP

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCarthy] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I think our colleagues will be interested in an article that appeared in today's New York Times. It reports on a recent opinion poll and reveals that in my home county, Erie County, N.Y., 63 percent of the people believe that President Johnson is doing either a good or excellent job. This poll confirms my own feeling for the situation. I believe that the President has substantial support in western New York and that most people feel that he is doing a very good job in a difficult situation.

Under unanimous consent, I include the full text of the article at this point in this Record:

Buffalo Area Polls Show Johnson Drop

Two polls in the Buffalo area this year indicate that President Johnson has lost ground on voters opinion on how he is handling the Presidency, but that 63 per cent still believe he is doing a good or excellent job.

A John Kraft poll completed last week found that 11 per cent of 500 voters questioned in Erie County said Mr. Johnson was doing an "excellent" job, while 52 per cent said he was doing a "pretty good" job. A total of 23 per cent answered "not too good" and 12 per cent answered "poor."

A similar poll last May produced these results: 16 per cent, excellent; 59 per cent, pretty good; 16 per cent, not too good; 5 per cent, poor.

Questioned in the most recent poll about the President's policies in Vietnam, 24 per cent said they "agreed" with the President, while 23 per cent said he was not handling the situation well. A total of 43 per cent said they partly agreed with Mr. Johnson's Vietnam policy.

In the May poll, where the question was worded differently, 51 per cent said they favored Mr. Johnson's Vietnam policy and 41 per cent said they opposed it.

PRESIDENTS JOHNSON AND DIAZ ORDAZ END CENTURY-OLD DISPUTE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Johnson and Mexican President Diaz Ordaz formerly ended the 105 year Chamizal dispute between the United States and Mexico.

While a simple stroke of the pen marked the peaceful settlement of this seemingly insoluble controversy, it took acts of great political courage and patient negotiation by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to reach an accord.

The 437-acre tract known as the Chamizal was taken from Mexico by a change in the course of the Rio Grande. It has been returned to Mexico by an important change of course in our policy.

In returning to Mexico what was rightfully hers, President Johnson breathed life into a U.S. commitment to abide by a decision of the 1910 Chamizal Convention.

America's honor and pledge have been kept—and once again the world has been shown that the United States abides by its solemn commitments—even when the price is high.

We have paid the price in the Chamizal settlement—and we have earned the close friendship of a valued neighbor.

I congratulate President Johnson and President Diaz Ordaz and all those responsible for resolving the bitter dispute which has aggravated our relations these many years.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the Record President Johnson's inspiring remarks of last Saturday at the Chamizal Monument:

Text of the Remarks of the President at the Chamizal Monument

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

For almost a century, the word "Chamizal" stood for dispute and disagreement between the United States and Mexico.

Yet in the last four years, it has become—for both our peoples—an inspiring symbol of friendship and mutual respect. An old argument has ended. More importantly, a lasting bond has been forged between our two countries. This is a proud achievement.

Let this monument, and this place stand as testimony to the world of what two nations, working together, can accomplish.

Too many times the world has seen disputed boundaries changed through force. El Chamizal stands as a shining example of how such matters should be settled.

For the last half century, each President of the United States has faced the moral issue of America's commitment to the Chamizal Convention of 1910. In that treaty, we agreed that the decision of the arbitral commission "shall be final and conclusive upon both governments, and without appeal."

I do not propose to review all the legal history that has transpired since then. But I do want to say that I am proud that the plain language of the Convention of 1910 has become a reality in this Administration.

On other occasions I have said that it is important to the peace of the world that both our friends and our enemies believe that we in the United States mean what we say. Here in El Chamizal we have honored our pledged word. And we will continue to honor all our other commitments.

The great Mexican patriot, Benito Juarez, said: "Respect for the rights of others is peace." That principle is the foundation stone of our hemispheric relations.

A generation ago, fascism threatened that principle. Today it is another alien doctrine. We see it at work in the subversion and concealed aggression in Bolivia, Venezuela, and other countries. The challenge has confronted the American States with hard choices. And we know that the American States must stand together if we are to assure that the weak are protected, that might does not make right, that our peoples are to have the privilege of democratic choice.

Our concern and our commitments are not always easy to uphold. But we cannot abandon them simply because the price is high or the going is rough.

If Abraham Lincoln had done so, the United States, as we know it today, would not exist.

If Benito Juarez had done so, Mexico would not be Mexico.

But we have been true to our principles. Though we have followed our separate stars, we meet here today as two neighbors strong and prosperous, at peace with one another.

This is the final act of a long drama. It is a fulfillment possible only to those who respect the rights of others, and so insure their own.

That is the real message of El Chamizal.

It is a great privilege, and an occasion of great happiness for me, to take part in this ceremony on behalf of the United States.

A 10-POINT TAX REFORM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, a companion to a bill introduced earlier by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss], for himself and for the gentlemen from California [Mr. Rees and Mr. Cohelan], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Meeds], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow]. This bill would provide for a 10-point tax reform which could have the effect of providing virtually the same additional revenues as would have been provided by the adoption of the President's proposal for a 10-percent surtax.

I have, Mr. Speaker, no deep-dyed opposition to raising taxes to pay the extraordinary costs of the war. Federal income taxes today are lower than they were during the last Republican administration, and a modest increase may be defensible. But before we try to raise needed revenues by raising the taxes of every wage and salary earner, we ought to close the loopholes and eradicate the "privileged sanctuaries" which selected groups of special interest businessmen have managed to carve out for themselves. Our taxes buy us the most democratic and freest government ever known to man. All in all, it is not a bad bargain. But it would be a better bargain if everyone shared the load more equally.

One of the features of this bill which is particularly dear to my heart is the reduction in the oil depletion allowance from 27½ percent to 15 percent. At a time when the demand is heard on every side that we "cut domestic spending" to pay the costs of the war—domestic spending usually meaning some program which the person making the demand does not immediately benefit from—at a time when everyone is demanding that "someone else" make sacrifices to pay the costs of Vietnam, I think it is time that this unconscionable tax benefit for companies which are among the greatest beneficiaries of "defense spending" be eliminated or at least brought into reasonable proportions. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will take action on this legislation in the very near future.

CLEANUP OF SLUMS BEGINS AT HOME

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said on the floor of this House, and in the newspapers and on radio and television, about what should be done to clean up the slums of our country. Some feel that massive Federal aid is the only answer. Others feel that it is a local problem for local governments to handle.

An editorial in the October 27 issue of the Talladega, Ala., Daily Home has, in my opinion, come up with the only possible answer to the problem. Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

CLEANUP OF SLUMS BEGINS AT HOME

Insurance companies are putting one billion dollars into financing slum clearance projects and the government is pouring no telling how many millions into programs looking toward better living conditions in cities for the so-called under privileged.

However, we should never lose sight of the fact that slums are man-made and mostly by the people who live in them. Therefore, unless the people who reside there do something to keep them neat and clean, the new projects will be just another slum in mighty few years.

Out of the reams of copy pouring across the news desks of newspapers from one end of the country to the other, one phase seems to be sorely neglected. We have yet to see any evidence of the people living in slums making a self-help effort by cleaning up surroundings.

Be it in Harlem, New York, or Chinatown, San Francisco or the Cuban sections of Miami, we'd like to see an organized and voluntary effort on the part of slum-dwellers to get out the scrub buckets, the soap and brushes and do something to help themselves.

Just walk through the halls of a tenement house in a slum area and one sees trash piled into corners, dirt all over the floors. Surely, this could be eliminated with a hunk of "git-up-and-git" on the part of the dwellers.

Tin cans, pop bottles and rubbish could be removed from the yards, surely. Grass could be allowed to grow where now the dirty, bare ground shows.

We're waiting for news that some clean-up projects have been undertaken. Charity begins at home, they say, and with so many of the slum dwellers on government handouts for not working, surely they have the time to make their surroundings more pleasant.

Such a project would cost much, much less than some of the government projects. It would be a start anyway.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT LAUDS FRANCIS LeMAY

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, on October 1 of this year, an outstanding public servant retired from his post with the House Agriculture Committee. Francis LeMay has served the committee, the Congress, and the people of America with great distinction during his years with the committee.

He helped this freshman Congressman find his way around the office building on his first day in Washington. He has helped me to understand the workings of the committee, and has given counsel when I needed it most. Frank LeMay has left his mark on our Nation's agricultural programs, and his contributions will live on long after he goes home to LeMay's Landing, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of articles written about Frank LeMay which tell his story much better than I could. So I would like to have printed in the RECORD an article by Jim Free, the Washington correspondent for the Birmingham News, which appeared in the News on October 1; and a second article, an editorial written by Herve Charest, Jr., editor of the Tallassee Tribune, which appeared in that paper on October 12:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Oct. 1, 1967]

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT LAUDS LEMAY

(By James Free)

WASHINGTON.—"I seem to be in an impossible situation," said Francis LeMay, to the managing editor of the Atlanta Constitution, "I can't get a newspaper reporter's job without experience, and I can't get experience without a job."

The editor whom LeMay had visited many times on this subject agreed. He was sympathetic, but there was no staff opening anyway.

But LeMay had just recently finished working his way through college (Birmingham-Southern and the University of Alabama).

Hire me for a month, he said, "I will sign a note and pay you back the full amount of salary, plus interest."

This was an unusual arrangement, but it got the approval of the late Clark Howell, then publisher of the Constitution. LeMay did repay the loan, and he still has the canceled note and a letter of congratulations from Howell.

From that start LeMay went on to a successful newspaper career in Alabama and in Washington, D.C. In 1953, he became a top staff assistant to the House Agriculture Committee—a post from which he retires today, Oct. 1, to return to his native Alabama to live.

At a reception Thursday night, agriculture officials, headed by Secretary Orville Freeman, lauded LeMay's work, as did House Agriculture Committee Chairman W. R. Poage, D-Tex., Rep. Harold D. Cooley, D-N.C., and several others.

Let us have a look at how young LeMay made the most of his self-paid month of experience as a news reporter.

He wrote letters on Atlanta Constitution letterheads to newspapers in many cities over the country. He said he was working as a reporter on the Constitution, but would like to make a change. All of which was true.

Before the month ended there came a job offer from the Florence Times at $30 a week—a 50 per cent increase over LeMay's book salary in Atlanta.

LeMay, who was 62 last Sept. 5, had to learn to make out without family help at an early age. Born in Leighton, LeMay's first recollections are of Scottsboro, where his father, M. N. LeMay, a jewelry store operator, died when Francis, an only child, was 7.

Francis grew up in the Masonic home in Montgomery, where he was graduated from Sidney Lanier High School. After a summer as an order boy at the Fairfield coke works LeMay went to the University of Alabama in 1923 on a scholarship.

The next summer he worked again at the coke works and in the fall switched to a night job in the accounting office so he could attend classes at Birmingham-Southern College in the daytime.

His junior year saw LeMay back at Tuscaloosa, helped by a loan from the late Coleman Blach of Birmingham. Meanwhile, he was learning to play the trumpet in the "Million-Dollar Band."

Prowess on the trumpet brought him a job with a traveling tent theater company during his final college summer. On the road with this group, he met Marguerite Jeanette Mitchell, then 16, of Russellville, an accomplished piano player who was later to become Mrs. LeMay.

Since the first weeks of his freshman year at the University, LeMay had decided to be a writer. He did so on the advice of an English professor, who particularly liked the opening sentence of LeMay's 3,000-word autobiography, written as an assignment. It read:

"I now take up my pen to betray myself."

Following his graduation with a B.A. degree in 1926, and a couple of temporary jobs, LeMay obtained his first newspaper experience in the manner already related.

A few months after LeMay joined the staff of the Florence Times, its ownership changed.

He went back to Atlanta to work on the "Georgian." In 1928, he moved over to the Associated Press, which shifted him to Washington from Atlanta in 1933.

In the 1936–1941 period, LeMay headed the AP's Alabama bureau in Birmingham. His top associate and successor was Leroy Simms, later to be managing editor of The Birmingham News and publisher of the Huntsville Times.

Reassigned to Washington in 1941, LeMay covered the House side of Congress for the next decade, specializing in economic and agricultural subjects.

He served as House coordinator of information under the late Speaker Sam Rayburn in 1951–53, and transferred to the professional staff of the House Agriculture Committee in 1953.

For the past 20 years, however, the LeMays hearts have been in a 70-acre tract of land near Wheeler Dam on Lake Wilson. He first visited the place after covering the dedication of the dam and going fishing nearby.

The old fishing boat landing is now known as "LeMays Landing, and the LeMays have long planned and worked on what is to be their retirement home—along with their Washington residence three blocks from the capitol.

Mrs. LeMay is giving up her job of 17 years standing as congressional affairs specialist for the general counsel of Sears Roebuck and Co. in Washington, D.C.

What'll he do now? "Well, I've got a motor boat down at the landing," LeMay said, "and I'll do some fishing. And some gardening. And maybe next year I'll devote some partnership time to a little cattle-raising and the five-acre cotton allotment we have on our place.

"For years, I had a wonderful Negro tenant named Stephen Jones, but he's dead now and his wife and oldest son Tom are making the cotton crop—along with some other quota land they are working."

[From the Tallassee (Ala.) Tribune, Oct. 16, 1967]

LEMAY, LATE OF THE AP

A news story out of Washington last week told of the retirement of Francis Lemay from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Maybe Frank got used to that "Francis" handle since he had to circulate among the bureaucrats in Wonderland on the Potomac. But the last time we saw him, many years ago, he had just departed Montgomery for Wonderland and when we called him Francis he squirmed like a scarlet sinner in church.

Frank was actually the first Associated Press man we recall knowing. Since his time there have been a host of others, the better ones being Pete Mahan, Tommy Maynor, Leroy Simms, Rex Thomas, Howard Blakeslee, and a few others.

It's funny what you remember about people. It must have been about thirty years ago. We were just breaking in as editor of The Alabama Farm Bureau News in Montgomery and we had a cub's awe of what we considered a tough and cynical wire service bureau manager. The first few times we saw Lemay he gave us that impression and we looked upon him as somewhat of an oracle.

Anyway, Dr. L. N. Duncan had arranged for Jim Farley and Tom Heflin to break bread together at the President's Mansion after a speech Farley was to make at an assembly of Auburn people. And we were fortunate enough to be included in the guest list.

At that time Big Jim was toying with the notion of trying to get second place on a presidential ticket to be headed by Cactus Jack Garner and he was feeling his way around the South to see how folks would cotton to him. Needless to say, there was a lot of publicity and a passel of pictures of Farley and Heflin devouring barbecued chicken prepared by John Ivy and Robert Duncan.

Following the affair, everyone rode down to the train to see Farley off. We had bummed a ride back to Montgomery with Lemay and his wife and so we were standing by them as the train pulled out. Just at that moment, a young photographer rushed up to Lemay and inquired if he wanted him to take a picture of Farley who was waving to the crowd. "Not unless he falls off the train platform," answered Frank.

They may call him Francis in Wonderland but our guess is that he is the same old Frank who was one of the better AP men to ever come this way. Someday, when our chores lighten up a bit, we're going to take a trip up Florence way and see if we're right or wrong.

AN EXERCISE IN IDIOCY: THE OCTOBER 21 DEMONSTRATION AT THE PENTAGON

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, on October 21 a shocked America witnessed an exercise in idiocy. A mob of misfits and troublemakers dedicated to nihilism and anarchy, amidst a barrage of bottles, cans, and tomatoes charged the Pentagon while staging an antiwar protest.

This mob impressed no fairminded American favorably. Indeed, there was in the United States a reaction of profound disgust to the mob's deplorable manners, to its totalitarian methods, to the savagery of the mob itself. This mob action was endorsed by no one—except the Soviet Union, Red China, and North Vietnam.

On October 20, the day before this disgraceful demonstration, Moscow Tass International Service stated:

> The authorities seem to be scared stiff of the forthcoming anti-war demonstrations in the capital. Units of the National Guard, police officers, and bailiffs will also be called into Washington from neighboring districts to bring the total to over 10,000. As a precautionary measure, the White House will be "closed for repairs" these days.

On October 22, the day after this demonstration, Peking NCNA International Service stated:

> The Johnson administration was scared out of its wits by the American people's steadily mounting struggle against the war of aggression in Vietnam. Just before the demonstration, the U.S. authorities took repressive precautions. They had the U.S. Senate and House hurriedly pass new legislation on 19 October forbidding demonstrations inside the Capitol. . . . Soon after reaching the Pentagon the demonstrators surrounded and charged it. The fascist troops and police hit them with rifle butts and clubs and threw tear gas bombs at them.

Thus it is clear that this sort of mob action can only undermine our efforts in Vietnam and prolong the war.

This mob action was not an exercise in legitimate dissent, nor did it clarify any issues in the Vietnam debate. Abusive language and slogans replaced thoughtful discussion, the screaming and ranting of a surging mob replaced reason. No useful purpose was served at the Pentagon except perhaps an increased awareness on the part of the American people: an awareness of how freedom can be abused and of how far the lunatic fringe will go in disrupting orderly democratic processes.

This demonstration at the Pentagon had nothing to do with the rights of free speech and assembly; in fact, it made a mockery of our constitutional rights to dissent. The legacy of demonstration by mobs such as this is invariably at best one of misunderstanding and confusion and at worst one of hatred and bitterness. Any debate concerning U.S. involvement in Vietnam must be carried on within two guidelines: first, it must be conducted within our constitutional framework of free speech and assembly and with dignity and restraint to insure public order; second, it must be conducted with a constant realization of the implications of dissent in relation to the enemy with whom our troops are engaged at this very moment. Intemperate debate and dissent, including the despicable scene of a mob charging the Pentagon under the banner of a North Vietnamese flag, causes tempers to flare, polarizes issues, and leads to intolerance and the brutalization of everything for which America stands.

The demonstration at the Pentagon is a perfect illustration of how not to conduct national debate. Misfits, troublemakers, advocates of violence have no place in such debate. The mob action at the Pentagon served no useful purpose. Indeed, demonstrations by mobs such as this have never accomplished anything in the United States—and never will. Through its actions, this mob literally screamed "Listen!" A shocked America listened—and heard nothing but shouts of abuse and the crashing of bottles and cans. A shocked America listened to this mob's message of violence and anarchy and resolved to do everything possible to prevent a recurrence of such exercise in idiocy.

THE LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the House will shortly be considering legislation to amend the Economic Opportunity Act. It is probable that at that time certain amendments will be offered relative to the legal services program, which was the subject of an outstanding documentary on the National Broadcasting Co. television network last Friday evening.

The activities of one of the legal services grantees in my State—California Rural Legal Assistance—have become highly controversial and have resulted in what I believe to be an extreme position being taken by the Governor of California and other elective officials, including a member of the other body from my State. These individuals are saying that no grantee under the legal services program should be able to file suit against any agency of government at any level. Mr. Speaker, I wish to disassociate myself from this view in the strongest possible terms. An amendment of this kind would be tantamount to repealing the Bill of Rights and would make a mockery of the American concept of justice.

However, having stated my opposition to restrictions on the right to file suit against government agencies, I must also state my firm and unwavering support for the proposition that in enacting the legal services program, the Congress of the United States did not intend to provide a Federal checkbook to finance legal wars which would pit one group of citizens against another.

Two of the actions instituted by California Rural Legal Assistance involved the welfare of constituents of mine who make their living on the land. One was a suit against the Secretary of Labor relating to the use of foreign labor and the other was against the Madera Unified School District relating to a 3-day closure of the schools to permit high school students to help with the grape harvest.

In both cases, although the ostensible target was a government agency, the real targets were taxpaying farmers struggling to make a living under extremely trying economic conditions.

It would be useful at this point, Mr. Speaker, to point out that there is a widely held misconception that the average farmer in California is a rich man, living in feudal splendor on a vast estate tended by an army of serfs. This is a cruel caricature unrelated to the facts.

According to the 1964 Census of Agriculture published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, there were at that time 11,862 farms in my congressional district. Of those, 10,099 were less than 220 acres in size, and 10,439 were owner-operated. The average grape grower in my district bears no more resemblance to a Montgomery Street farmer than the owner of the mom and pop grocery store does to the president of Safeway Stores.

I lay some stress on this point, Mr. Speaker, because I am satisfied that if California Rural Legal Assistance had been governed by a board of directors of people who really knew and understood the area in which they worked, they would have given more consideration to real issues relating to the intricate and complex questions involved in the relationship between the farm laborer and the small farmer.

In my judgment, there is real doubt that the issues CRLA has chosen to test in court have in fact bettered the lot of the farm laborer—at least in the two cases to which I refer. I cannot see where it helps the farm laborer to bring about the financial ruination of the farmer—the only man who can employ him.

I think all of us recognize that there are not enough tax dollars to do all the things that many Americans feel should be done to give real meaning to our declarations of equal rights for all. We find that we must pick and choose among desirable programs, just as the average citizen must do when picking and choosing where he wishes to spend his hard-earned dollars. This being the case, I think that the specific areas of social litigation to be carried out by federally funded legal services programs must be carefully weighed against the good that could be done with the same amount of money in some other phase of the war on poverty. There must be, in my judgment, some weighing of the policy questions involved. Someone must ask the hard question—whether a given amount of money spent in a given test case filed by a legal services grantee represents the best kind of investment we can make in advancing the standard of living of the poor.

In discussing this with officials of OEO, we have been told that no one can stand in the way of a lawyer representing a client. In advancing this argument, I feel, OEO displays a shocking unwillingness to admit that perhaps there are some ways to invest poverty war dollars that will bring greater return than others. I have suggested that the Director of OEO should review all test cases and class actions to decide whether or not a given cause will really help the poor in a meaningful way, or will it merely give some enterprising attorney the warm glow of inner satisfaction which undoubtedly must follow a major legal victory.

Thus far, OEO has shown no disposition to accept any kind of policy screening responsibility, and I have come to the conclusion that the only way to place some restraints on these programs is to require that they be operated only by local bar associations or local community action agenices. By keeping these programs nearer home, we will be assured that at least there is an awareness of the conditions in the local area.

I am sure that some of the Members will argue that legal services programs cannot be put under the control of such agencies without doing violence to the Canons of Professional Ethics of the American Bar Association. It is my judgment, however, that a close reading of the Canons of Ethics of the ABA and of the opinions written by the ABA's Committee on Professional Ethics and Grievances shows conclusively that the bar recognizes the justification for a policy review procedure in any organization set up to furnish legal aid to the indigent.

As a matter of fact, the ABA Committee on Professional Ethics has said that one proposal for a legal aid organization was turned down because it did not provide for any supervision by a committee of the local bar association. I have been in correspondence on this matter with Mr. John D. Robb, the chairman of the ABA's Committee on Legal Aid and Indigent Defendants. Mr. Robb says that the supervision of legal aid services referred to in the canons and opinions of the ABA was a "general supervision over the policies and operations" of the legal aid programs and not a "veto power over the judgments of individual lawyers in the programs in the handling of particular cases."

He goes on to say—and I think this is an important point:

> I cannot accept the concept that the judgment of individual lawyers should be interfered with in the handling of ordinary individual cases brought by individuals against governmental agencies. I would, however, like to give further thought to the inference which seems to emerge from your letter that perhaps there should be some review made of the individual lawyer's decision before he undertakes a case against governmental agencies which would result in making major changes in legislation, regulations or the like which would have a broad application. An argument could certainly be made that this involves a quasi policy decision which might legitimately be the subject of review by the entire board of directors of the legal services facility.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is ample room to require some sort of policy supervision of legal services programs without the extreme measures advocated by those who would prohibit suits against all Government agencies.

THE POLAND SPRING JOB CORPS CENTER IN MAINE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the State of Maine is proud to host the largest women's Job Corps center in the Nation. Located in one of our State's most picturesque towns, Poland Spring, the center captures some of the atmosphere of a small New England college and is conducive to the well-rounded program offered to young women enrolled there.

As with other Job Corps centers, the Corps members are allowed to remain for 2 years. However, at Poland Spring, the average stay is 9 to 14 months. The center opened in April 1966 with a handful of young women and has received new enrollees monthly since. In early 1967, Poland Spring had its full complement of more than 1,100 students.

The Poland Spring Job Corps Center is ably operated by Economic Systems Corp., a subsidiary of Avco Corp. In March of 1967 the corporation was awarded a contract for another women's center in Moses Lake, Wash., primarily because of the fine record it has achieved in Maine.

The first significant number of graduations occurred as the first anniversary of the center approached in April of this year. To date Poland Spring has graduated more than 325 corpswomen, and graduations are expected to increase to over 100 per month before the end of this year.

The majority of the graduates are being placed in meaningful jobs throughout the country and all reports indicate employers are well pleased. For example, the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. in Boston has hired more than 40 Poland Spring corpswomen and its personnel recruiters return to the center every month to interview more prospective employees. In a recent letter to the center, an official of the insurance company wrote:

> In the short time since Liberty Mutual began employing Job Corps girls to do clerical work in our Boston offices, we have been extremely pleased with the results. As a group, the girls have shown themselves to be highly job-motivated and eager to succeed. We consider this a tribute to the individuals and to the success of the Job Corps program. We hope, and fully expect, that in the future we will be employing more Job Corps girls in our many offices throughout the country.

At Poland Spring the corpswomen may receive training in one of 18 occupational areas, ranging from engineering drafting, electronic assembly and computer keypunch operation, to veterinary assistant, nurse and teacher aide work, and commercial art. In addition to vocational training, the young women at Poland Spring must take academic courses in such fields as mathematics, communicative skills, life sciences and social sciences. The academic portion of the program complements the vocational, giving the student not only the mechanics of a particular skill, but also the background to be flexible within her chosen field.

The student body at Poland Spring is

also extremely active in a host of extracurricular activities and sports. I am very pleased that the center utilizes its activities programs to the greatest extent. For instance, the Poland Spring Gospel Singers, a group which encompasses almost 100 corpswomen, not only provides an outlet for the musically inclined, but performs at clubs, churches, and music festivals throughout the State of Maine and other New England States.

The Corpswomen's Theater, a drama organization, performs on the center for special functions and for colleges, conventions and charities in the community. Earlier this year, the theater group gave benefit performances for the March of Dimes fund drive.

Recently, the center's champion-rated softball team, which plays women's teams throughout Maine, challenged a Portland television station team for the benefit of the well-known Jimmy Fund and raised more than $50.

Corpswomen from the floral design course participate in community activities constantly in such ways as making wreaths for Memorial Day and creating flower beds for several public buildings in the city of Auburn as part of the First Lady's "Beautify America" program.

Students from the center's commercial art classes have entered area art festivals and many of them have won coveted prizes.

The teacher aide course at Poland Spring includes a nursery operated in conjunction with their training to which working mothers from the surrounding towns may bring children in the preschool age bracket.

Corpswomen in the commercial sewing classes prepared Red Cross kit bags for our troops in Vietnam.

The list of the total involvement of the Poland Spring Center in Maine communities is endless and I believe this plays a very important part in each corpswoman's training program. Working and mingling with local citizens teaches these young women responsibility to community living. Such activities do, of course, gain respect for the Job Corps program and the enrollees. This was proved when a corpswoman from the center was awarded the title of "Miss Lewiston-Auburn" in the 1967 Miss America preliminary contest. This same young lady went on to become third runnerup in the statewide "Miss Maine" pageant. The scholarship award she received from the Lewiston-Auburn contest provided this corpswoman with the downpayment for her tuition at a junior college in Boston, where she is now a full-time student.

Perhaps the interest of Maine people in the Poland Spring project was exemplified best in September when more than 5,000 persons visited the center on the occasion of its second annual open house.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the women's Job Corps Center at Poland Spring is another example of the excellent results Job Corps can produce. These young women are learning vocations, talents, good habits, and community living. Increasing numbers of them are leaving the program newly armed with the qualities that will provide for their futures.

For the past several months, I have been watching carefully what newspaper editorial writers in Maine have been publishing about Poland Spring. For the benefit of my colleagues in the House, I would like to have entered in the Congressional Record excerpts from these editorials:

From the Lewiston Daily Sun, Lewiston, Maine, December 28, 1966:

> Thinking in human terms, the Job Corps Center at Poland Spring is providing an opportunity for a chance in life for more than a thousand underprivileged girls. What the training will mean to them in the years ahead cannot be determined in money.
>
> Both from a human and a dollar and cents standpoint, the Job Corps Center at Poland Spring is proving to be a success. It is making a valuable contribution to our area and to the state.

From the Portland Press-Herald, Portland, Maine, March 9, 1967:

> Those in this state and outside it, who have watched the sociological experiment being conducted at Poland Spring under the auspices of the Office of Economic Opportunity will surely applaud the announcement by Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis that it will be continued at least another 18 months.
>
> As a result of a contract between the OEO and Avco Corporation, the famous old resort was acquired about a year ago and renovated into a Job Corps Center for underprivileged young women. . . .
>
> In terms of achievement, we think it has been a success. Foes of the war on poverty have pointed to the cost of rescuing these young women from the kind of unrewarding life which otherwise would have been their fate. But they say nothing about the other cost involved, not all of it in dollars and cents, by any means.
>
> To most of these young women, Poland Spring means hope—hope for the kind of satisfying life they never knew or could have known—and as time goes by we can all wish that Poland Spring will become nationwide a symbol and a testimonial of what guidance and teaching in the society of the poor and deprived can accomplish.

And from the Sanford Tribune-Advocate, Sanford, Maine, September 7, 1967:

> An announcement has reached our desk that an open house has been scheduled at the Poland Spring Job Corps Center for Women on Sunday afternoon, Sept. 17, from 12:30 until 5 p.m.
>
> We would urge anyone interested in learning about this program to take advantage of the opportunity to visit the Center. The editor and society editor of the Tribune toured the Center a few months ago in a special program of the Maine Press, Radio and TV Women, and we found it a most interesting and worthwhile experience.
>
> We were greatly impressed with the Center. The young Corpswoman assigned as our guide was exceptionally intelligent, attractive, ambitious in her expectations for herself, and had unusually fine bearing and manners. We also admired other girls we met.
>
> We were impressed with the excellence and quantity of equipment for the vocational courses. There was also a high school academic program for the more able and ambitious girls. Our guide was about to take her examination for the high school equivalency certificate. Apparently in all the educational programs, a high standard was set and the girls spent a standard length school day in classes, and in the high school course at least had considerable home work to do . . .
>
> We found the briefing given by one of the officials most interesting. He explained that the early weeks of each girl's stay are devoted largely to training in homemaking and personal hygiene, on the theory that this knowledge will be valuable for every girl even if she doesn't stay at the Center for too long a time. The girls are also taught to speak correctly, how to dress, and good grooming. This makes sense because a girl might be capable and well-trained but not be able to get a job if she made a poor impression in her first interview.
>
> Visitors to the Center on Sept. 17 will have tours with Corpswomen as guides. And the program will include some features we didn't have in our visit—selections by the Center Choir and Poland Spring Gospel Singers, and a fashion show.
>
> We guarantee that you will have an interesting day if you attend.

FOR DICKEY DAM, READ BANQUO

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hathaway] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, a leading Massachusetts newspaper, the Boston Globe, has taken considerable interest in the Dickey-Lincoln School project and had the following editorial comment to make on October 30 which I thought would be of interest to the Members. I would like to point out that the Globe has made a slight error with regard to support from southern New England. The Rhode Island delegation, which I presume would be considered southern New England, has supported the project and of course, the project has always been supported by the Vermont and Maine congressional delegations.

The editorial follows:

For Dickey Dam, Read Banquo

> A modest $1.6 million item to complete planning for the Dickey-Lincoln public power project in northern Maine is all that is holding up final enactment in Congress of the $4.7 billion appropriations bill. The House struck out the item. The Senate this week ought to insist once again on its inclusion.
>
> To date, the private power lobby has had its way in trying to kill the project. Operating through Rep. Robert D. Giaimo (D-Conn.) and others, it has jiggered the figures and swung the votes although all government studies have shown the project to be economically feasible, with a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1.
>
> Why? The only conclusion that can be reached is that the power industry in an area with the highest electric rates in the country, and about to profit from the use of nuclear energy which itself was made possible by public funds, does not want a public power yardstick by which to measure those rates.
>
> Two Bay State congressmen, Macdonald and Boland, have stood alone in the Massachusetts delegation for the Dickey Dam project. The others from Massachusetts and southern New England must know in their hearts they are being had.
>
> If, now, the Dickey project is killed, they may rest assured that like Banquo's ghost, it will return to haunt them.

CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL STAIRSTEPS TO THE SEA

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have, for many years, been associated with the Cross-Florida Barge Canal and efforts to acquire the necessary appropriations to carry out this important project. It has taken approximately 30 years for this project to near its completion.

Mr. Speaker, there appeared recently in the Tampa Tribune-Times a series of articles on the history and progress of this important waterway. I would like, at this time, to insert, following my remarks, these articles, which appeared in the October 8, 9, and 10 Tampa Tribune:

[From the Tampa Tribune-Times,
Oct. 8, 1967]

BORN 140 YEARS AGO, CANAL NEARS MATURITY

(By David Watson)

(First of three articles)

Emory H. Close squinted into the central Florida sun, popped an engineer's hard hat on his head and said there were no hitches to speak of.

At least none which another eight and a half million dollars wouldn't cure.

Below him in a pit, some 25 feet under levels of the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico, nearly 100 men toiled in a hole which will become the Eureka lock of the Florida Cross State Barge Canal.

This is the canal with a background of no less than 12 federal surveys and studies authorized by presidents and congress over a period of 140 years. When finished, it will sweep 185 miles through six counties across the state from the Atlantic to the Gulf. It will cost more than $158 million.

When President Lyndon B. Johnson triggered an on-site explosion to start construction in February of 1964, projected time table to completion was 1970. That was moved to 1972 and then to 1974.

Now there is reason to believe the canal will not be finished then, although nothing official is said about it. It's a matter of arithmetic.

Patterns show the canal had a construction timetable of 15 months when discussed in the early 1940's. That went to a schedule of 6.5 years in 1962, and the 1962 table was applied when construction started in 1964.

Shifts in target continued until, within a three-year period, the project had become an 11-year enterprise.

Reason for the stretchout, said Joseph J. Koperski of Jacksonville, is delay while waiting for money. Koperski is chief of the engineering division for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, building the canal.

While waiting for money, said Koperski, costs go up. So the money doesn't accomplish as much when it finally arrives. When it arrives it is less than requested. Then there is further slowdown and the cycle repeats.

It appears, said Koperski, that costs go up about 2.5 per cent a year. But 1967 was the jackpot. He estimated the cost hike up by about five per cent in concert with increases everywhere.

At the same time, the President decided to allow only $11.4 million this fiscal year instead of the $20 million sought by the corps with support of the Canal Authority of the State of Florida (CASF).

This is the $8.5 million "loss" which prudent field engineers such as Emory Close would like to get their hands on. But they acknowledge that questions of finance are problems for the boys "upstairs."

With the $11.4 million already approved by the House and under consideration by the Senate, the engineers would do this:

Start clearing for the Eureka reservoir (named for the community of Eureka on SR-316 east of Ft. McCoy in Marion County); about six miles of excavation between I–75 and SR–484 in the Ocala area; the SR–40 bridge at Dunnellon; railroad bridge at Dunnellon; Inglis dam and spillway near Inglis in Levy and Citrus counties; continuation of work already going on.

From top to bottom as the ranks go, state canal and federal engineers had no doubt the canal will be finished this time around—140 years of false starts notwithstanding.

From an engineering standpoint, the Cross State Barge Canal is not a difficult project, said district engineer R. P. Tabb, an army colonel. It has its peculiar problems, though. From the Atlantic to the Gulf is found swamp, ooze, muck, sand, rock, silt, flatlands, hills—and water.

So far, said Close, no great surprises have been encountered. He is resident engineer for the Eureka lock, dam and reservoir, the St. Johns lock near Palatka, the Rodman dam and spillway and all stretches between.

Taken in stride is work far below local water and sea levels. At the Eureka lock site, for example, the problem is to keep water out until the lock is finished.

Engineers drilled about 1,000 water wells around the area, each capable of pumping 40 gallons a minute. Underground water thus is pumped away from the site to the Oklawaha River.

About 10,000 pilings the size of utility poles were hammered into earth, and on those the lock base will rest. That was necessary because the earth there is sand.

At different locations there are different problems. In one place a contractor had to ring a huge swamp with a ditch and drain it it before he could enter.

In another, water pressure broke through a dam and inundated equipment. In still another, unshored sand spilled into craters as fast as they were dug.

A computer tells engineers when to start digging, when to stop, when to buy supplies, plant the grass, water and cut it. It also keeps tabs on the money spent.

It shows that 14 contracts totaling $34.9 million have been awarded in three and a half years. They cover work on three of five locks, two dams across the Oklawaha, a canal authority building and two major highway bridges. One bridge, costing $1.9 million, opened Sept. 28 on SR–19.

The St. Johns lock near Palatka and the Inglis lock near that town are nearly complete. Rodman dam should be finished by Christmas, and 23 miles of channel have been excavated.

Florida's share of cost should run to about $16 million for rights-of-ways, condemnation and other costs, said Col. Giles Evans of the canal authority.

The canal is not to be a sea-level passage. Watercraft going from east to west will be lifted in locks in three stages of 20 ft. and 15 ft. from river level to the high point in the canal. After cruising about 30 miles at summit level, they will be lowered in two equal steps to Gulf level on the west.

SPANIARDS WERE FIRST TO SEE NEED FOR CANAL

(Second of three articles)

(By David Watson)

About the time its first galleon was sunk on the way from Mexico to St. Augustine with a cargo of treasure aboard, Spain started thinking about a cross-Florida ship canal.

The idea was mulled by the French, too, and for the same reason—dollars and cents.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt got some digging started to make jobs during the depression, but that soon withered.

It wasn't until President Lyndon B. Johnson pushed a button to detonate the first excavation charge in February of 1964 that anything was seriously done.

Now the canal is about 30 per cent complete. Work moves along at rates regulated by the generosity of Congress, the cost of the war in Vietnam and inflation.

Unlike Roosevelt's canal, this one is not a sea level passage. It's a stair-stepped lock canal for barges. Major benefits will lie in cheaper freight rates and shorter water passages from the eastern United States to the Gulf and midwest.

Col. Giles Evans Jr. (Ret.), manager of the Canal Authority of Florida, cited findings of a 1962 economics study. Those findings were applied to studies for start of the canal in 1964. They put estimated annual dollar benefits of the canal at $8,256,000. Included is an estimated $7,016,000 in saved freight costs.

Estimated annual charges for the project, including amortization in 50 years, were $7,039,000. The study gave the canal a ratio of annual benefits to costs of $1.17 to $1.

Contrary to some argument, path of the canal was not arbitrarily chosen. In at least 12 studies, 28 different possible routes were examined. Nine were studied in detail.

The route now uses the St. Johns River from the Atlantic at Jacksonville, follows the river to Palatka, then swings westerly for about 20 miles. From there it follows the Oklawaha River for about 25 miles to Silver Springs, then 30 miles across the high hump of the state separating the Oklawaha and Withlacoochee River basins.

Then the route goes to Dunnellon and the reservoir of the Florida Power Corp., to Inglis and thence seven miles to a channel into the Gulf of Mexico. Eventually it will tie in there with the intracoastal waterway to link 29 states around the Gulf, upper midwest and the Atlantic.

To play with a few more statistics, the canal will be 150 feet wide at the base and 12 feet deep. Anything less than 84 feet wide by 600 feet long can pass the locks. Highway bridges will clear any craft not more than 65 ft. high. Locks will handle up to about 7,000 tons at a time with up to about 36 lock cycles a day.

Evans estimated the average anticipated canal traffic at 2,005,000 to 11 million tons a year. Cargoes should include grains and feeds from the midwest to southeastern seaboard, petroleum from the east and petrochemicals of the west; building materials, coal, ferrous products, wood and paper products, phosphates, lime ores and fertilizers.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, builders of the canal, estimates 85 per cent of traffic will be interstate, although most will either originate or stop in Florida.

Evans said industry executives in mid-continent and along eastern seaboard call with more frequency asking about opening of the canal. Some may move to Florida because of the waterway, he said.

New plants in Tampa and Jacksonville are going there because of canal construction, Evans said. Westinghouse-Tampa, for instance, will use barges extensively.

With all the potential, however, he told Congress the business plums will not drop into community laps without local effort. And that's what the manager is pressing for now.

Consistent zoning and pollution controls are needed for orderly development along the six-county canal route.

There has been resistance to the canal, as records show. Some big land owners have sued to block construction. Others have sued for higher prices on right-of-way land. In one unusual case a group of landowners sued to force the canal authority to take their property at once. They argued that delay would lessen its value.

Evans told a meeting of land brokers that land price inflation hasn't hit the authority. The agency has a policy of paying only the appraisal price or going to court, he said.

By year's end the authority hopes to have 67 per cent of the required 68,000 acres for right-of-way, Evans said. Sizes of parcels range from .1 of an acre to 8,000 acres, and in value from $20 to nearly $1 million.

Canal Triggers Dreams of Recreation—But Wilderness May Be Sacrificed

(Third of three articles)

(By David Watson)

Boosters of the Florida Cross State Barge Canal have big dreams about recreation along the waterway from the Atlantic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico.

They talk in terms of boats and water skis, fishing and camping, riding and the more sedentary sports of sitting and looking at the wonders of nature from scenic overlooks.

They talk in terms of two million visitors a year initially and 10 million eventually. Those who love the out-of-doors are all for it. Yet there is another school of thought.

That one holds that natural resources, balance of wildlife and the pristine beauty of two rivers are to be sacrificed for benefit of the essentially commercial watercourse.

With more than 30 per cent of the canal under contract and some critical portions completed, the issue has not been resolved. Nor is it likely to be within a generation after the canal is finished. Too many of the dissatisfied will "remember when."

Arguments are several. Some go back to days when Congress first authorized a canal study, some 140 years ago.

There has been fear of salt water intrusion into the state fresh water supply; destruction of wildlife habitat; alteration of river currents to the detriment of waterlife; punctured underground water caverns; pollution by vessels and industry attracted by a canal.

All have been debated and cases laid before public officials. The project now moves ahead on grounds that fears are without foundation or that net benefits to more people outweigh relative losses to a few.

To this, concedes state Canal Authority Manager Col. Giles Evans, some will never agree.

Nonetheless, the canal will add 258 miles of shoreline to Florida and about 30,000 acres more of water surface. Reservoirs storing water for canal operation will be naturals for recreation development.

Rodman reservoir, east of Orange Springs in Marion County, should be ready for boating and other recreation in the spring of 1968, Evans noted. It will hold about 10,000 acres of water, and eventually will have access from the St. Johns River via the St. Johns Lock.

Eventually, a 600-acre recreation area including boat launching ramps, picnic tables, water supplies and sanitary facilities will be located on the north and south sides of the canal at the Gulf terminus.

Ard L. Eulenfeld, in charge of the recreation phase of the canal program, outlined these goals. He noted, however, that it isn't a crash project, but one to evolve over years of canal use.

Within those terms, the canal would have 36 recreational sites. They would comprise 30 to about 2,000 acres each. As envisioned now, 11 sites would be in the Rodman reservoir-St. Johns lock section; 10 would be in the Eureka reservoir portion; six would be along the summit of the canal and nine would be in the Inglis-Gulf Coast Zone.

Between I–75 and U.S. 441 in Marion County a scenic parkway with overlooks is planned on both sides of the canal.

In addition, said Eulenfeld the U.S. Forest Service is considering four areas totaling about 15,000 acres as wildlife conservation areas. The service would develop and administer eight recreation sites along the Rodman and Eureka reservoirs.

Parts of seven areas probably would be leased for private operation as concessions, such as those recreation sites now used in the Ocala National Forest. Those would allow development of marinas, boatels, restaurants and the like.

It is estimated that the Forest Service alone may eventually have a recreational investment of $2.5 million or more along the canal.

Sites adjacent to locks and dams are expected to draw most heavily, so development priority is assigned them.

It now appears that filling of Rodman reservoir can start in early spring. Initial depth would be about 16 feet. Limited recreational use could follow removal of debris.

Eureka lock and dam completion is scheduled for December, 1968. It won't be filled, however, until 1970–71.

Dunnellon lock on the west and Bert Dosh lock on the east of the summit section are scheduled for completion in 1972, with the summit section to follow in 1974.

Work was started on each end of the canal for a definite reason. Locks at those points provide immediate control of water while excavation and construction goes on in between. They also provide insurance against water table contamination.

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Helstoski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, shortly the House of Representatives will consider the Air Quality Act of 1967. I believe it is worthwhile to recall what kind of progress we have made in our attack on air pollution since the first major act was passed in 1963. President Johnson, who has given so much support to this attack, said in his message to Congress in January of this year:

> We have proposed and the Congress has enacted three laws since 1963, each representing some forward movement toward cleaner air.
>
> Under these laws, we are spending more than $25 million this year in matching grants to cities and States, and in research and other efforts:
>
> We have helped to create 80 local air pollution programs, and to strengthen 40 others.
>
> We are working in nine areas of the United States—including the New York-New Jersey area—to abate pollution that passes across State lines and is beyond the reach of any single State or city.
>
> We have established a system of national standards for motor vehicles, that will become effective with the 1968 models. These will require sharp reductions in pollution from automobile exhausts.
>
> We have begun by Executive order to control the sources of air pollution on Federal installations throughout the country. The experience we gain in carrying out this order will help us develop more effective ways of controlling pollution elsewhere.
>
> We have intensified our research work on sulfur oxide pollution from coal and oil burning, and on pollution from motor vehicles.

We must do still more, however. The Air Quality Act of 1967 should go a long way to help us begin to reverse the upward trend of air pollution.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 years our national attention has turned more and more to the war in Vietnam. Important as that conflict is to our national life, there are other events going on around the world which are deserving of equal attention and, perhaps, by observing these events we can see more clearly the possible end results of our struggle in Vietnam.

A little more than 2 years ago, the concern of the Nation was focused on the Dominican Republic, where U.S. troops joined with troops from other OAS nations to ward off a threatened violent takeover of authority by elements of dissension spawned by the Communist example in Cuba. There can now be no doubt that without the assistance of the OAS Inter-American peace force the Dominican Republic would have fallen back into the arms of dictatorship or, perhaps worse, into a state of political anarchy followed by gradual takeover by Communist forces, supplied and directed from Cuba. The official U.S. policy "to assist the provisional government * * * in restoring more normal conditions prior to its holding free elections" was fulfilled and affirmed when Joaquin Balaguer won election to the presidency with 50 percent of the popular vote.

During the 17 months since taking office, President Balaguer has labored to provide his country with a smooth transition from dictatorship to democratic government. His accomplishments in the face of extreme hardships have been nothing short of phenomenal, overreaching even the most optimistic hopes of a year ago.

During 1965, U.S. military assistance to the Dominican Republic was called a "grievous mistake" and "sick" by some critics. And, yet, today the Dominican Republic is on the way to becoming a showplace of a working democracy in the Carribean. The Dominican Republic is a nation secure in its boundaries and governed by men capable of bringing the country to full democracy and economic and social progress.

President Johnson stood by his announced policies in the Dominican Republic with conviction that he was right. One cannot help but compare the situation we face in Vietnam with that we experienced in the Dominican Republic—only on a smaller scale both in time and amount of U.S. involvement.

In June of 1966 I accompanied Vice President Humphrey to represent the United States at the inauguration of President Balaguer. Today, Vice President Humphrey is again representing the American people at the inauguration ceremonies for President-elect Thieu in South Vietnam. In both nations free elections have been brought from the heat and confusion of military, social, and political turmoil. I can only view our experience in the Dominican Republic as an indication of the success we are striving for in assisting the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point an article which appeared in the New York Times, by Graham Hovey, and two articles from the Washington Evening Star, by Jeremiah O'Leary, which point to the success and fulfillment in the Dominican Republic.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 30, 1967]

Balaguer: Dominican on a Political Tightrope

(By Graham Hovey)

President Joaquin Balaguer of the Dominican Republic has proved an extraordinary performer on a political tightrope. With luck he may achieve his supreme ambition: to provide his country with safe passage from chaos and civil war to stable democratic government.

In sixteen months as President, this slight man of mild mien, brimming with evident reasonableness, has shown political dexterity and toughness beyond anything hoped for by his stanchest backers. He has divided or disarmed his opposition of left and right and kept a full step ahead of conspirators in the military that form a durable feature of the Dominican landscape.

Balaguer has been lucky, of course: Lucky to survive the fall of Trujillo, whom he served as figurehead President in the last year (1960–61) of the dictatorship; lucky to have as his 1966 opponent Juan Bosch, a man of greater charisma but one hamstrung by Washington's hostility and his own political death-wish.

He was lucky to take office at a time when the United States was eager to aid economic reconstruction massively—in part, to atone for its unilateral military intervention of 1965. In terms of survival, Balaguer was lucky to have inherited from the provisional Government a tough Armed Forces Minister, General Perez y Perez, determined to put the Army out of politics.

Political skill rather than luck has been the chief ingredient of Balageur's performance, however. He defeated Bosch with surprising ease because his campaign for national reconciliation and reconstruction exactly fitted the mood of a country weary of civil strife.

NATIONAL RECONCILIATION AIMS

Balaguer has persevered on that line, starting with a "National Unity" Cabinet that disappointed his expectant Reformist party more than the opposition. If he has appointed many former Trujillistas and rightists to office he has also lured into his administration half a dozen former leaders of Bosch's Dominican Revolutionary party (P.R.D.), several in Cabinet-level jobs.

Under the eye of General Perez, he has given commands to officers once close to General Wessin y Wessin, controversial leader of a "loyalist" faction in the 1965 civil war. Some of these recently appealed to Wessin in exile to reject efforts of a right-wing party to build him up as a Presidential candidate. Balaguer has also done the unprecedented and appointed women governors for all twenty-six Dominican provinces.

The President tells visitors wryly that he has even appointed a man once known as a Communist and he tops a review of his efforts to bring all factions into the fold by asking: "If this isn't national reconciliation, what is?"

Foes charge that Balaguer uses his political skill not for reconstruction but only to survive in office. They say harassment and murder of P.R.D. members and leftists still go on with the President often turning a blind eye. Threats, plots, and sporadic violence would seem, however, to be inevitable legacies of the Trujillo tyranny, the chaos and civil war that followed. The question is whether Balaguer, who admits the country is still "full of hate," has done all he could to curb such tendencies.

SURVIVAL AND REFORM

In any event, it is unfair to charge that the President has used his political skill only to survive. He imposed an austerity program to narrow Dominican budget and balance-of-payment deficits, and made it stick. He has trimmed public payrolls, attacked graft and drastically overhauled inefficient, uncompetitive state enterprises, including the sugar trust.

American officials are gratified at his efficient use of aid funds for highways, irrigation, agrarian reforms, schools and housing. They believe a few economic miracles might be in the making if only political stability can be maintained.

Balaguer has some justification, then, for saying his Government is carrying out "perhaps a more revolutionary program than many had expected," though it is startling to hear a man who loyally served Trujillo identify his goals with the "revolution in liberty" concept of Chile's President Frei.

It is fascinating, too, for a man of this background—who must make periodic public attacks on a splintered Dominican Communist movement and a divided Bosch party—to say that the main threat to his Government comes from the extreme right.

Balaguer is a long way from being home safe, of course. He is only a third of the way through his term in a country that had four dictators rule for 71 of its first 121 years and used up 72 Presidents during the remaining 50 years. But on the basis of his impressive start, many Dominicans are confident not only that Balaguer will serve out his term but will win re-election in 1970. A former ardent Bosch supporter who now regards Balaguer as something of a miracle man told me:

"He's indispensible; we can't bear to think of anyone else."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 27, 1967]

Balaguer's Firm Hand Holds Dominicans, Party Together

(First of two articles)

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

Santo Domingo.—A Dominican detective, trying very hard to look like a student, sits in the U.S. sponsored Abraham Lincoln Library holding a book which he has no intention of reading.

He is there because in recent weeks extremists have placed two bombs in the binational center. The bombs did not go off only because of the inefficiency of the terrorists.

The incident is indicative of the Dominican Republic today, 2½ years after the civil war and the American intervention.

There is some violence; there is dissension below the surface. But things are being held together by President Joaquin Balaguer's strong hand, and by general amounts of U.S. aid.

Balaguer considers himself the leader of a people in transition between the Trujillo era and a new period of democratic order. He has several aces in his hand at the one-third mark in his presidency.

The strongest card is the loyalty of the armed forces, headed by Gen. Enrique Perez y Perez. Another is the proliferation of political parties, which have sprouted like Dominican cane, without much apparent logic but wildly and vigorously.

The effect of the profusion and party splitting tends to strengthen Balaguer's own Partido Reformista, which administered such a thorough licking to Juan Bosch's PRD and the assorted groups of the far left in the June 1966 elections.

PERSONALITIES KEY

Dominican political parties always have been clusters around a personality, rising and falling with the star of their leader. In this perspective, the Reformistas have remained monolithically intact while PRD and other parties have been subdividing like so many amoebas.

Balaguer's popularity will be put to its first real test next May 16 when municipal elections are held in 77 areas including the volatile capital.

PRD, which is led at home by Francisco Pena Gomez, and from Europe by the Yankee-hating Bosch, may boycott the elections, particularly if it appears the Reformistas are sure to win.

For the most important post, mayor of Santo Domingo, Balaguer's party seems to be in a specially good position.

The incumbent is a PRD man, Ramon Baez Acosta, considered by many in the Dominican Republic an inefficient and corrupt mayor who openly uses city funds to support the PRD while trash and garbage remain uncollected, as in the war-torn days of 1965.

Baez complains that he must support several hundred unassimilables who fought on the rebel Constitutionalist side in the civil war.

PENA LIKELY WINNER

The most likely winner is a PRD dissident, Jose Brea Pena. If Balaguer chooses to support Brea, the effect would be to further divide the PRD as well as give Brea the backing of the Reformista organization.

Bosch is now calling from his self-imposed exile in Europe for a Dictatura Popular, a Peoples' Dictatorship. But it is unclear what he means by this. What is clear is that the Balaguer party has remained together while all except the Reformistas have become politically fragments.

Newest element to surface is the Partido Quisqueyana Democrata, not yet registered but clearly a party of the ultra-conservatives and devoted to the cause of Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin.

The general, living in Miami since he led the fight against the rebels and was expelled in a housecleaning of the leading officers of both sides, has not said much about PQD's plans but he is bound to collect a certain amount of support among the officer class.

At the other end of the spectrum, the three Communist parties of the civil war have now become six. Fidelio Despradel heads the youngsters of the Castro-oriented June 14th party; Narciso Isa Conde runs the Moscow-line Dominican Communist party and the brothers Felix Servio and Juan Ducoudray Mansfield are in control of the Socialists, whose political orientation stands somewhere between Moscow's and Havana's.

ALPHABET SOUP

The old MPD Peking-line party is headed by Marino Nazari, Luis (Pin') Montas Gonzalez heads the PCRD, which tries to out-Mao the other Maoists, and Maximo Lopez Molina has started an Orthodox Communist party.

In this alphabet soup one finds the Social Christians of Caonabo Javier; the PLE of Luis Amiama Tio, one of the assassins of Rafael L. Trujillo; the Vanguardia party and a Union Civico Nacional, once the nation's strongest party, under Abel Fernandez Simo.

Beyond the May municipal elections, Balaguer's term is up in 1970 and he is eligible to succeed himself if he chooses.

A prospective challenger to Balaguer or anyone else for the presidency, although he has not said he would run, is Ambassador to Washington Hector Garcia Godoy, who was provisional president during the interregnum.

There are those who believe Garcia Godoy has been bitten by the presidential bug. His major weakness is that he has no political backing.

If he decides to run, Garcia Godoy has ample time to form his own party or to make an alliance with an existing group of moderates. It is unclear whether Balaguer would be willing to step aside and give Garcia Godoy his political blessing. In any case, the diplomat is not yet 50 and can afford to wait.

Meanwhile Balaguer is in the catbird seat and seems likely to remain there so long as he chooses.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 28, 1967]

Three Hundred Twenty Million Dollars in U.S. Aid: Dominican Economy Sprouts

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

Santo Domingo.—President Joaquin Balaguer, with help from the big American AID mission, has done much to improve the Dominican Republic's economy.

An example is the canning industry. Dominicans eat tons of tomato paste a day but have always imported it with a consequent drain on their financial reserves.

Now, the nation grows enough to fill its own needs and is ready to export not only canned tomato paste but tomatoes, fruits and juices.

This is only one of the strides the country has made under U.S. financial assistance that has totaled $320 million in the 2 years following the revolution.

Since the 1965 civil war, the country has become self-sufficient in rice and received a healthy slice of the shortfall in U.S.-supported sugar quotas, enabling it to sell 600,000 tons at 6 cents a pound, versus the world price of 2 cents.

Aid Director Alex Firfer came to the republic while the bullets were still flying and had to make the first loans and grants for pure budget support.

But he has always held to the theory that the Dominican Republic is a potentially rich agricultural country and the future lay in exploiting this field. Teams of agricultural experts poured in to help rejuvenate the economy, diversify production away from the one-crop sugar and preach the wisdom of shipping winter fruits and vegetables to the U.S. and other nations.

ACCORD REACHED

Now an agreement has been made whereby the Dominican Republic will become the virtual breadbasket of nearby Puerto Rico, which is fast switching from agriculture to industry and tourism.

Firfer and his aides are now in the phase of switching to a bootstrap operation like that which took place in Puerto Rico after World War II but with the emphasis on agriculture.

To this end, direct budget support is progressively decreasing in the annual U.S. aid package while the money and talent focuses on development projects.

In fiscal 1967, for example, the U.S. reduced its emergency assistance to $40 million and raised development aid to $18 million. The course charted is for an almost total reversal of how aid money is used.

Balaguer has not overjoyed the Americans with the construction of a few hundred low-cost housing units. Such housing is laudable and needed, but the U.S. has taken a first-things-first attitude and development has priority over housing. Very likely Balaguer considered the apartment units a political necessity but they do not contribute to a bootstrap operation.

MISSION CUTS STAFF

The Dominican Republic, of course, is far from out of the woods but the AID mission already is reducing its staff. Balaguer still has a balance of payments deficit on the order of $60 million a year and has decreed austerity on imports to keep money from flowing out of the country.

Several weeks ago, he closed the border with Haiti, not because of any trouble, but because great amounts of contraband luxuries were flowing across the border.

No one doubts that the frontier will open to admit the annual influx of 20,000 or more Haitian sugar cane cutters who work better and more cheaply at labor that Dominicans do not like to perform at all.

Meanwhile, Balaguer has made real progress toward setting up a university to rival the ancient Autonomous University of Santo Domingo, where Communists dominate both faculty and student body.

The old university with 6,000 students is still the prestige name but the new Universidad Nacional Pedro Hernandez Urena (UNPHU) has increased enrollment from 606 to 1,300 in two years.

Students who would rather learn than demonstrate are beginning to seek out UNPHU and the Catholic university in Santiago instead of the restive autonomous school downtown.

Perhaps the real future of the Dominican Republic lies with the type of educated men and women who come forth to take leading positions in the nation's life.

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, last December the National Conference on Air Pollution gave the Nation an opportunity to see where we stand in the fight against the serious problem of air pollution. There was agreement among the more than 3,500 participants that our accomplishments have fallen short of our needs.

Our accomplishments have been inadequate in two principal areas: First, we still do not know how to control all of the many important sources of air pollution which adversely affect us; and, second, we have not even begun to apply, in anything resembling full measure, the technology which we now have for controlling air pollution.

A month after the conference, the President sent a special message to the Congress recommending new legislation to strengthen the Nation's attack on this problem. The President reiterated the conclusions of the national conference when he said:

> The pollution problem is getting worse. We are not even controlling today's level of pollution. This situation does not exist because it was inevitable, nor because it cannot be controlled. Air pollution is the inevitable consequence of neglect. It can be controlled when that neglect is no longer tolerated.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported a bill which is intended to pave the way for a systematic attack on the Nation's air pollution problem. The objective of the bill is the enhancement of air quality and a reduction of harmful emissions consistent with maximum utilization of an expanding capacity to deal with them effectively.

The proposed Air Quality Act of 1967, therefore, serves notice that no one has the right to use the atmosphere as a garbage dump and that there will be no haven for polluters anywhere in the country.

I want to emphasize that, in all its provisions, the proposed Air Quality Act is a logical and timely extension of what has been the legislative keystone in our fight against air pollution since 1963, the Clean Air Act. I, therefore, urge the prompt passage of this vital piece of legislation.

THE LESSONS OF VIETNAM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Association of Albuquerque, N. Mex., is one of the most effective and vigorous chapters of the national U.N. Association. I was pleased to accept its invitation to address the U.N. Day dinner this year in Albuquerque, which was held on the beautiful campus of the University of New Mexico. I am taking the liberty of inserting the text of my remarks at this dinner in the Congressional Record at this point, so that my colleagues may review them if they so desire:

The Lessons of Vietnam

(Remarks of Congressman George E. Brown, Jr., 1967 United Nations Day Dinner, Albuquerque, N. Mex., October 24, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, Friends of the United Nations, I have chosen to speak to you tonight on the topic "The Lessons of Vietnam". Because there are a multitude of matters which could be covered under this heading, I shall seek to focus particularly on those lessons having relevance to the concept of achieving world order under law, the concept underlying the creation of the United Nations 22 years ago today.

Despite the great achievements of the U.N., and they are legion, it is difficult to deny that it has fallen upon dark days. A major war continues in Southeast Asia, and the U.N. has little or no role in seeking its end. Small wars, such as the Arab-Israel conflict, have occurred despite the best efforts of the U.N., and its deliberations in support of peaceful settlement have appeared to millions to be fruitless. A great catalog could be made of festering political problems which exist all over the world, and the U.N. appears to be impotent to cope with them. Internal problems of organization, financing and voting power continue to beset it, becoming greater with the passing days. Many are asking if the great vision of the Allied Powers in World War II—the vision of an international organization that would free the world from the scourge of war—may not have been as unrealistic as the earlier vision of a League of Nations.

I think not. I have faith, and some confidence, that the cause is not lost. While the days are dark, and the spirit of crisis is upon us, I believe that we have the intelligence and the determination to overcome the obstacles which beset us. For crisis itself compels the minds of increasing millions of our citizens to examine the problems before us, analyze their causes, weigh the solutions, and ultimately to chose a better path for the future. That is why it is imperative that we look at the lessons of Vietnam. That is why we should concern ourselves with more than just the rights and wrongs of Vietnam, or with a strategy for victory, or a strategy for a negotiated disengagement. We must come to understand how and why Vietnam happened—what policies and practices led us into this morass—what concepts of role and function keep us there—what changes must be made in U.S. foreign policy to preserve our own security and achieve our goals for peace and freedom in this troubled world.

It is encouraging for me to note that each week new voices are raised in this search for new policies, and in criticism of the old. Such voices are increasingly coming from the younger leadership of the Republican Party, and I wish to pay tribute to this leadership which holds hope for the future, not only of the Republican Party but for this great country as a whole. Although I am proud of being a Democrat, I am convinced that on the great issues facing this country and mankind the divisions will not come on purely Party lines.

As one example of this new thinking, I would like to quote some excerpts from a study entitled "The Realities Of Vietnam: An Alternative For Republicans" by the Ripon Forum, inserted in the Congressional Record by Senator Hatfield on October 4, 1967.

"But even seasoned observers agree that on the subject of Vietnam rigor mortis has set in. A bureaucratic coalition within the administration has reached a rigid consensus that repels knowledgeable advice. It has set its own terms of discussion, enshrined its own version of the facts and has for the most part succeeded in imposing its internal verities on public debate as a whole.

"Thus, the American people have been asking whether more bombing, more troops, more diplomacy, more refugee relief, better elections, or more economic aid hold the key to our difficulties in Vietnam. And the administration has graciously suffered 'dissent' on these questions. Small wonder, when dissent on tactical issues is easily preempted by bureaucrats who have the power to act; when 'hawks' have the public ear, the administration can intensify military activity; when 'doves' seem ascendant, it can treat them to a flurry of diplomacy. But the basic structure of administration policy remains untouched by these fluctuations. The larger questions of our involvement in Vietnam remain to be asked.

"Why has a conflict which has been repeatedly defined as 'political' and 'essentially Vietnamese' become a largely military, largely American undertaking? Why, after six years of 'limited' war, punctuated by glowing predictions of success, has no upper limit yet been reached on American troops or expenditure? Why, despite American talk about bringing peace and democracy to South Vietnam, has American policy led to the further entrenchment of a regime of generals, who are dependent for their power on the continuation of the war?

"Answers exist to these questions, answers that demand an unflinching reappraisal both of the structure of our Vietnam policy and of the conduct of our foreign affairs as a whole. The Johnson administration is incapable of carrying out this reappraisal. It is motivated, as the President and his advisors assure us, by a sense of commitment. A commitment to a brave little nation? To the cause of freedom and democracy? To the containment of aggressive Communism? No, these broader goals have been obscured behind commitment of a different sort: a prideful commitment to continuing a misconceived policy, an ignoble commitment to covering over mistakes, an imprudent commitment to the unlimited use of American resources and moral energy in a dubious cause.

"The time has come for simple commitment to reality and the national interest. Vietnam is the place to begin. The course of this war may well shape American thinking on foreign policy for a generation to come."

Let us begin now to shape that American thinking by looking at some of the lessons of Vietnam.

Let us start with some elementary lessons, and work up to the more complex.

Lesson Number 1: Big wars, and Vietnam is now a very big war, grow out of little wars.

Herman Kahn calls this escalation. Vietnam is almost the classic example of escalation. It lacks only the last few rungs on the escalation ladder. These are, of course, the nuclear rungs. Today the two superpowers are in unwritten agreement that a direct nuclear exchange between them would be counter-productive. Such an exchange could by no exercise of logic achieve any worthwhile national purpose for either side. Both sides, therefore, follow policies of restraint in their direct relationships. But they are increasingly drawn into proxy wars on the periphery of their spheres of interest and influence. Cuba was such a case. We permitted the CIA to back a fumbling effort to overthrow Castro, pretending that patriotic Cuban exiles were the culprits. The U.S.S.R. retaliated by the emplacement of Medium Range Ballistic Missiles in Cuba. This led to the verge of war just five years ago, only averted because of the direct communication between Kennedy and Khrushchev, and the additional efforts of the U.N. Korea was a similar proxy war between great powers.

The Arab-Israel conflict could easily have become such a proxy war, and in part was.

Vietnam is such a proxy war. And by no coincidence, it was shaped and initiated by the CIA, just as was the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. The CIA had a hand in selecting our first dictator in Vietnam, President Diem. It armed and trained his "police" force, "advised" him on how to control his enemies (and he had few friends), served as a channel for funds to keep his government afloat, and ultimately participated in his assassination by cutting off the funds for his personal palace troops. That it continues carrying out a major role in Vietnam and Southeast Asia is indicated by its increasingly publicized activities in Laos. The October 23 issue of Newsweek describes some of these activities, and I quote a few lines from their story as illustration:

"Spooks: But perhaps the major credit for the government's success should go to the CIA, whose operations in Laos is one of the largest of its kind in the world. 'If you really want to see the invisible government at work', quips one CIA agent in South Vietnam, 'you've got to go to Laos. They practically run the place.' "

What began as a small proxy war in South Vietnam, and is now a big proxy war in all of Indochina, may easily grow into a nuclear war, without the slightest desire on either side for this to happen. After all, the two principals, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., claim that they are only defending peace, freedom and self-determination. Neither desires, it says, to engage in war with the other, or to destroy the proxy combatants.

But this is how it would happen. The U.S. decides on an Inchon-type landing in North Vietnam. China sends a half million troops into North Vietnam to counteract the attack, and the Chinese troops press on past the DMZ and threaten a major U.S. base, as in Korea. U.S. forces use tactical nuclear weapons to defend themselves. The Chinese use part of their small nuclear stockpile to destroy the base, and two or three others for good measure. The U.S. uses nuclear bombs on all of China's main industrial centers. The Chinese sneak nuclear bombs into six major U.S. ports on neutral freighters and blow them up simultaneously. Russia decides to finish the job, since it has been so well started, and destroys all remaining major U.S. cities. The U.S. splits its missiles between the U.S.S.R. and China. Net result—150 million U.S. casualties, 50 million Russian casualties, 200 million Chinese casualties. The U.S. role as a great power has come to a very swift end. The conclusion one must reach is that nuclear wars are best prevented by preventing small wars. This is lesson number one.

Lesson Number 2: Small wars grow out of failure to resolve long-standing political problems.

Again Vietnam is the classic example. Ho Chi Minh began his efforts to resolve the political problems of Indo-China over 50 years ago. He petitioned President Wilson for freedom for Vietnam at the Versailles Conference after World War I. He became a Communist in 1920 in Paris because only the Communists promised to end French Colonialism. Roosevelt, at Yalta, declared himself against any resumption of French influence in Indo-China after World War II, but Truman reversed this policy in 1950 as part of a general strategy of containing the newly triumphant Mao Tse Tung on the mainland of China. When, despite our assistance, France was defeated and negotiated her own withdrawal from Vietnam in 1954, Dulles refused to accept the prospects of one Vietnam under Ho Chi Minh. He contrived the sabotage of The Geneva Agreements, using the CIA, under his brother, Allen Dulles, as the chief vehicle for this sabotage.

For the years after 1954 the most forlorn messages ever recorded in modern diplomacy were the continued pleas of the International Control Commission for a political settlement in Vietnam by means of the election provisions of the Geneva Conference. The silence on the part of the great powers was deafening. So Vietnamese nationalism, festering for all those years of frustration, broke out as a small war—a small war led by Communists, in the absence of any other effective leadership.

The long standing political problems of Vietnam could have been resolved on any number of occasions over the past 20 years by good faith action on the part of France (until 1954), and the U.S. after 1954. The intervention of a strong U.N. could have been a powerful force during the entire period. Such intervention was rejected first by France, then by the U.S., and now by the Communist side. If some high-level "think factory" had deliberately calculated how to best avoid a political settlement and achieve a small war, it could not have evolved a better scenario than Vietnam.

Obviously, unresolved political problems take time to develop into small wars—perhaps 20 to 50 years, as in the case of Vietnam. One need not look far to find many examples of similar unresolved problems. In the Middle East, the Arab-Israel conflict, the refugee problem and other attendant complications have been with us about 20 years. In Europe, the German problem prevents even a reasonable end to World War II, and holds at least the germ of World War III. In Asia, the problem of Formosa is merely a small manifestation of U.S. failure to accept the reality of a new China that has been on the scene now for 18 years. Korea, divided against all the dictates of logic, is a similar problem.

Can any sane person be optimistic about preventing small wars when we neglect to act on the conditions which make them inevitable?

Lesson Number 3: Long-standing political problems involving the Great Powers arise primarily out of the conflict of ideologies, the "Cold War".

While not so directly true in the Middle East, this is the case in Vietnam and most of the other major trouble spots of the world. The U.S. increasingly sees all revolutionary wars in the under-developed world as ideological wars involving Communism versus "freedom". In Vietnam, a major basis for our actions there arose from the Republican campaign pledges of 1952 to "roll back" Communism around the world. The plans to use the CIA in a clandestine effort to subvert the political settlement contained in the Geneva Agreements were generated in the worst days of the McCarthy hysteria in this country. Twelve years later, when that hysteria has largely dissipated—when our national policy is ostensibly one of building bridges to the Communist world—we are still trapped in the morass created by those policies. The vast bureaucracy of the Pentagon and the State Department is still reacting to the conditions of a past generation.

Lesson Number 4: Communist China's absence from the U.N., and our refusal to establish any significant communication with her, have vastly increased the difficulty of reaching a settlement in Vietnam.

Obviously, if we had been willing to accept China into the U.N., and to deal with her as an equal in the family of nations, we probably would not have been motivated to engage in a major war in Vietnam in the first place. Having become so engaged, we now find ourselves with little knowledge or understanding of the forces and conditions within the country to which we attribute the major threat to our security. Should a confrontation develop, we lack the opportunity for direct communication which helped prevent a disaster in the Cuban confrontation. Thus we compound our problems.

No settlement in Vietnam will have long-range significance unless it is coupled with a complete revision of our policy toward China. One of my current nightmares is that President Johnson may order a unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam tomorrow, on the grounds that the war is too expensive. However, instead of resolving the problems underlying the war, he will merely transfer the military forces to Thailand and continue the same blind effort at military containment of China, using puppet Asiatic dictators backed with U.S. troops, technology and money. This response to the needs of the underdeveloped world is a certain recipe for perpetual war.

There are many more lessons, large and small, which could be expounded upon from our experience in Vietnam. Perhaps these will suffice for the present. But I am led to some simple conclusions which I would like to leave with you.

This great country, armed with a mighty force, convinced of its own virtue, has stumbled into a war as evil and immoral as any in history. Forced to examine the reasons for this tragedy, we have an opportunity that comes only once in a generation to correct the course we have taken before it leads to disaster. Now is the time for every thinking citizen to demand of his government that we embark upon a new course.

That course must end the war in Vietnam with an honest political settlement as intended by the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

It must drastically change our policy toward China so as to bring her into the U.N. and accept her as an equal in the family of nations.

It must eliminate the "Cold War" syndrome and recognize that revolutionary changes are required to solve the problems of the underdeveloped world.

It must project a technique for non-violent and democratic revolutions as an answer to the threat of violent and totalitarian revolutions.

It must use all of our efforts to strengthen the role and function of the U.N. in peacekeeping, in economic development, and in creating the structure of world law.

Only if we can use this time of crisis to make those changes in our course will we have profited from the lessons of Vietnam.

A 12-MONTH SESSION FOR CONGRESS?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased recently to see several newspapers from throughout the Nation carry an editorial which quoted from one of my own statements concerning the working year for Congress.

Of course, the whole suggestion for a year-round session is rather a moot point at the moment, when it appears that we are approaching that goal without even planning for it.

Perhaps it would be wise to accept the inevitable and we might be able to pace ourselves in a better manner.

In any event, the problems of the school administrators are problems which I am sure we all recognize and sympathize with unanimously. Hopefully we can eliminate this difficulty so that planning in our educational system can move forward unimpeded by congressional tardiness.

The editorial which appeared in the Racine, Wis., Journal-Times of October 17, 1967, follows:

A 12-MONTH SESSION FOR CONGRESS?

By their own rules, the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives must adjourn by July 31st each year, except in time of war or national emergency.

But what Congress proposes it can easily dispose of by passing a resolution extending a session, which it has done as a matter of course for, lo, these many years.

Law also requires that appropriation bills be completed by July 1, the beginning of the fiscal year.

More than three months after that deadline, the present Congress has acted on only a handful of them. Many agencies and departments are struggling along on the basis of continuing resolutions, which authorize them to operate from month to month on stopgap funds provided on the same level as their spending during the previous year.

Older solons have fond memories of intersession vacations of four to six months, when a lot of fences could be mended back home. The present Congress has been in session for nine months, and if this were an election year, it would certainly be under attack as the "Do-Nothing Congress of 1967."

Of course, if this were an election year, that rattling you would have heard along about Labor Day would have been congressmen stirring their legislative bones like mad.

Since in these hectic times there is no likelihood of a return to the leisurely ways of the past, why don't congressmen face reality and plan on regular 12-month sessions, with perhaps a modest adjournment in the summer?

A number of them think it may be a good idea. Among them is Rep. George E. Brown, Jr., Democrat of California.

He points out that paperwork continues in a congressman's office the year around, anyway, whether Congress is in session or not. Even when congressmen take time off to rub elbows with—and have arms twisted by—the folks back home, the legislative process plods along at a fairly steady pace.

There is no real reason why all legislation must either be rammed through in the early months of the year, he says, or, as it usually turns out, be hastily passed in the last ones. A slower pace could be conducive to more deliberative and higher quality legislation.

He adds that a longer session should mean better scheduling so that legislation involving a time factor could be enacted at an appropriate time. Unfortunately, this has not been the case.

The stopgap method of funding may be all right for an established bureaucracy that is conducting business as usual, "but it creates untold misery on programs such as our aid to education, antipoverty efforts and the like."

Not knowing whether they are going to get more, less or the same money as the year before, administrators are reduced to guesswork and hope in their planning.

"One would think," says Brown, "that with year-round sessions, Congress could solve some of these problems."

Or perhaps one may not think so. But year-round sessions would at least save Congress the trouble of having to pass an extension resolution every July.

AUTHORITY AND INDEPENDENCE OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION MUST NOT BE DILUTED

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration has championed the cause of small business successfully for the past 14 years.

And this support has been well recognized. By increasing the scope and depth of the agency's programs the Johnson administration and the Congress have shown deep consideration for the small businessman's struggle to survive economically in our competitive society.

I see no validity in removing any of these programs or responsibilities from the small businessman's frame of reference. Only the other day I, along with every member of the Select Committee on Small Business, signed a letter directed to the esteemed chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, stating once again our position regarding the continued independence of the SBA and protesting the provisions contained within section 406 of title IV of the poverty bill which is soon to be acted upon by this body.

These provisions, if passed by the House, would transfer from SBA to the Department of Commerce vital functions now being carried out by SBA. Mr. Speaker, I believe this to be only one more attempt to dilute the independence of the Small Business Administration.

Recently I received a letter from a fellow Californian, Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, a business organization with which we are all familiar, I am sure. At this point, I would like to insert Mr. Harder's letter:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., October 27, 1967.
Hon. JAMES CORMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CORMAN: Knowing full well of your interest in, concern for, and achievements in behalf of the small business community of this Nation, I am writing to you today to urge that you lift your voice, as Chairman Evins and other members of the Select Committee on Small Business have already done, in protest over the attempt being made to dilute the authority and independence of the Small Business Administration.

I am referring to the provisions contained within Section 406 of Title IV of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 already passed by the Senate and reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor. As you are no doubt aware, these provisions would transfer certain vital procurement and management assistance functions from the Small Business Administration to the big business oriented Department of Commerce.

For nearly three decades, Congress has been a champion of small business and the most effective way of showing it has been through creation of the Small Business Administration as the one Agency in Government dedicated to help the Nation's prospective and established small businessmen. It works with them, helps them solve their problems and becomes partners with them in developing a strong and effective small sector of our economy.

The SBA has for the past 14 years devoted itself to the task which Congress set for it. Today it is operating at the highest levels and in the most effective way in its history. The staffs of SBA's field offices are taking an ever more aggressive role in seeking out those small firms and people who need SBA's services. They are looking for people with good business potential; they are going into low-income communities—urban and rural alike—to find those who can expand viable businesses, exploit new ideas and help established firms which can have a healthy effect on the community's economy.

The small business community looks to SBA for guidance and help. The SBA is becoming a part of and involving itself with community life—finding out who needs help, what kind of help is needed and then providing the help that's needed or leading the small businessman to other sources of assistance.

The SBA is aware of and recognizes special needs in special areas—guaranteeing leased rental payments of small firms in suitable business locations; helping small firms acquire new or used machine tools to stay competitive; helping people establish themselves in business through franchising; *upgrading businesses in ghetto neighborhoods;* creating job opportunities in rural areas to stop out-migration of young people to urban areas.

The SBA is a modern-day agency with a modern-day approach and modern-day know-how in recognizing the needs and meeting the demands and requirements of the Nation's small firms. It is the one Agency of Government specifically created for and capable of achieving this purpose.

Federal services to small business belong in one place, the proven place, and not scattered and fragmented among various agencies, to breed further confusion and duplication. The place for small business is the Small Business Administration.

Now, Mr. Corman, the National Federation of Independent Business is concerned with the possible loss of SBA's independence, and knows that we can count on you to make every effort to amend Section 406 so as to keep these vital SBA functions within that Agency.

Speaking for our more than 240,000 members, may I express my own personal gratitude, and that of the Federation membership, to you for your attention in this matter, as well as for your continuing concern with the betterment of the small business community of this Nation.

Sincerely yours,
C. WILSON HARDER,
President.

Mr. Speaker, within the SBA framework, financial and management programs are tailored to the needs of the small businessman.

From the title IV provision of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to the Small Business Act Amendments of 1967, SBA's responsibilities have been expanded to meet the needs of the Nation's 5 million small businessmen.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 gave SBA the authority to guarantee lease rental payments that will enable small reputable businessmen lacking capital to locate in prime business areas.

SBA funding has been increased by the Participation Sales Act. Its disaster loan program was broadened in 1965 and again extended in 1966 to include eligibility of privately owned colleges and universities.

The 1967 Small Business Act Amendments raised loan ceilings of all SBA lending programs and increased incentives for small business investment companies.

Financial assistance goes hand in hand with management assistance at SBA. More than 115,100 small business owners have been counseled by SBA management specialists. Small manufacturers have been assisted in obtaining Government contracts.

The Service Corps of Retired Executives has counseled more than 11,000 small businessmen on a volunteer basis. The number of volunteers is now over 3,000.

The Small Business Administration has grassroots interactions with the small businessman. In my opinion all small business programs belong in the Small Business Administration, and in order to keep them there, I urge that section 406 of title IV be amended so as to substitute the words "Small Business Administrator," for "Secretary of Commerce" wherever appropriate.

STUDIES OF PUERTO RICAN CHILDREN IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I am only one of several Members of this House who has introduced legislation to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide special programs to better enable our schools to cope with the special problems faced by the child who speaks English as a second language.

One of those Americans who has taken the lead in improving educational opportunities for the non-English-speaking child is a very distinguished constituent of mine, Dr. Frank Cordasco, of Montclair, N.J., State College.

Dr. Cordasco, who is an educational consultant for the migration service of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and his equally distinguished colleague, Mr. Leonard Covello, have prepared an excellent bibliography on the Puerto Rican child in the American school.

Mr. Speaker, because I think that this compilation of studies is of such great value to Members of Congress, their staffs and all persons who read the RECORD, I am including it in the RECORD following my remarks.

This bibliography will, I am certain, provide a bank of research information for scholars to draw from, and I think that Messrs. Cordasco and Covello deserve the thanks of every American who would like to see equal opportunity provided for all our schoolchildren.

The bibliography follows:

STUDIES OF PUERTO RICAN CHILDREN IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS—A PRELIMINARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Compiled by Frank M. Cordasco, professor of education, Montclair State College, educational consultant, Migration Division, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Leonard Covello, educational consultant, Migration Division, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, former principal, Benjamin Franklin High School, East Harlem, New York City)

INTRODUCTION

A clear need exists for a convenient handlist of studies on Puerto Rican children and their experiences in American mainland schools. The compilers of the present bibliography intend it as a preliminary list and contemplate its continuing up-dating. It is not intended as a complete list of studies, and inevitably some significant studies will have unfortunately been overlooked. We invite suggestions and additions.

We have not attempted a general bibliography on Puerto Ricans in the United States, although we have included a short bibliographical note on those titles which constitute a working list for the over-all study of the migration and experience of Puerto Ricans on the American mainland. Since the bibliography is essentially limited to the Puerto Rican experience in mainland schools, neither annotation (the individual titles are generally a clear indication of concern) nor subject captioning appeared to be practicable or necessary.

Since the Puerto Rican child is usually found in a context of severe socio-economic deprivation, many of the titles on the "disadvantaged child" deal (although very briefly) with Puerto Rican children in the context of poverty. These titles (in a burgeoning literature) we have not attempted to list, but we call attention to the *Catalog of Selected Documents on the Disadvantaged: A Number and Author Index* (OE 37001) and a *Subject Index* (OE 37002), Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, which the Education Research Information Center (U.S. Office of Education) assembled as "a collection of 1740 documents on the special education needs of the disadvantaged) in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P. L. 89–10)." An excellent review of the literature in the field is Harry Miller's *Education for the Disadvantaged* (New York: Free Press, 1967), and good guides to programs for disadvantaged children are Doxey A. Wilkerson, "Programs and Practices For Compensatory Education For Disadvantaged Children," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 35 (December 1965), pp. 426–440; and Edmond W. Gordon and Doxey A. Wilkerson, *Compensatory Education For The Disadvantaged: Programs and Practices: Pre-School Through College* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966).

The *Covello Papers*, which contain a vast amount of material reflecting the experience of the near quarter-century tenure as principal at Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem of Leonard Covello, constitute an invaluable repository of source material on the Puerto Rican experience both in the community and the school and are presently being catalogued.

The problems of Puerto Rican children in American schools are in many ways analogous to those faced by non-English speaking children in other eras; and in this connection, Leonard Covello's recently published study of the Italo-American child[1] presents a broadly analogous tableau of the social deprivation, ethnicity, language handicap and different cultural identity which the child brought to the American school. Nor should the literature on the Mexican-American child and his educational needs be neglected (In five states of the American Southwest there are some 1.75 million schoolchildren with Spanish surnames).[2]

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

The best source on Puerto Rican migration is the Migration Division of the Department of Labor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which maintains a central mainland office in New York City and offices in other United States cities. It also maintains an office in Puerto Rico to carry out a program of orientation for persons who intend to migrate to the states. See Joseph Monserrat, *Puerto Ricans in New York City* (Migration Division, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1967); and *Bibliography on Puerto Ricans in the United States* (*Ibid.*, April 1959). In 1964, the New York City Department of Health placed the Puerto Rican population in New York City at 701,500, representing a 9.3 per cent of the city's population. A projection of this study by the Migration Division of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor estimates the 1966 Puerto Rican population at 762,000.

A vast literature exists on Puerto Rico. Generally, good sociological and anthropological studies are easily available. Among these are Theodore Brameld, *The Remaking of a Culture: Life and Education in Puerto Rico* (New York: Harper, 1959); Melvin M. Tumin and Arnold Feldman, *Social Class and Social Change in Puerto Rico* (Princeton, 1961); Julian H. Steward, ed., *The People of Puerto Rico* (University of Illinois, 1956); 2nd pr., 1966; Kurt W. Back, *Slums, Projects and People: Social, Psychological Problems of Relocation in Puerto Rico* (Duke University, 1962); Gordon K. Lewis, *Puerto Rico: Freedom and Power in the Caribbean* (New York: Monthly Press Review, 1963); James R. Bourne and Dorothy P. Bourne, *Thirty Years of Change in Puerto Rico: A Case Study of Ten Selected Rural Areas* (New York: Praeger, 1966); and E. J. Berbusse, *The United States in Puerto Rico, 1898–1900* (University of North Carolina, 1966).

For Puerto Ricans in the United States, see Dan Wakefield, *Island in The City: Puerto Ricans in New York* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959); Patricia Sexton, *Spanish Harlem: Anatomy of Poverty* (New York: Harper, 1965); Clarence Senior, *The Puerto Ricans: Strangers—Then Neighbors* (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1965); Elena Padilla, *Up From Puerto Rico* (Columbia University, 1958); Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot* (M.I.T.-Harvard, 1963); and Oscar Lewis, *La Vida* (New York; Random House, 1966).

An invaluable source of research studies is Jesse J. Dossick, *Doctoral Research on Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans* (New York University, School of Education, 1967.)

I. Unpublished materials[3]

Baldwin, Clare C., "Education of the Non-English Speaking and Bi-Lingual (Spanish) Pupils in the Junior High Schools of Districts 10 and 11, Manhattan." June, 1952, 131 pp.

"Basic Education Facts of the Puerto Rican Educational System." N.d., 10 pp.

Bureau of Applied Social Research of Columbia University. "Letter to Governor Jesus T. Pinero Summarizing the Principal Findings of the Study of Puerto Rican Migrants in New York City which the Bureau Has Been Conducting since November, 1947." June 15, 1948, 15 pp. In the Covello Papers—Personal Files.

Committee of the Association of Assistant Superintendents. "A Program of Education for Puerto Ricans in New York City." 1947, 107 pp.

"Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Labor, Migration Division. Puerto Rican Migration to the United States." 1 pp.

———. "Puerto Rican Population by States (According to the 1960 Census)." May 20, 1964, 1 pp.

———. "Puerto Rican Population by States and Cities." 8 pp. (Based on 1960 U.S. Census.)

Community Council of Greater New York. Research Department. Bureau of Community Statistical Services. "Population of Puerto Rican Birth or Parentage for New York City, by Borough: 1960." April 13, 1962, 1 pp.

Covello, Leonard. "Recommendations Concerning Puerto Rican Pupils in Our Public Schools." May 1, 1953, 9 pp.

Covello Papers. Files on Puerto Rican Program at Benjamin Franklin High School. [See "Introduction," *supra*]

Covello Papers. Personal Files.

Covian, Sherrill. "The Effect of Unemployment and Underemployment on the Puerto Rican Male in New York City." October 27, 1965, 23 pp.

"Demographic Tables" (for East Harlem). X Appendix. September, 1964. Unpaged.

East Harlem Neighborhood Study Club. "Report of Operations, 1965 Summer Session." 11 pp.

"Educational Background in Puerto Rico." N.d., 28 pp.

"Factors Affecting Pupil Registration: Day Schools—Migration Balance in the Movement of Pupil Population to and from Places Outside New York City—School Years 1953–1954 to 1962–1963 (and) Day Schools—Migration Balance in the Movement of Pupil Population to and from Places Outside New York City, by School Group and Borough—School Year 1962–1963." 1 p. (Statistical)

Fitzpatrick, Reverend Joseph P., S. J. "Delinquency and the Puerto Ricans." Address given to Fordham University School of Business, October 8, 1959. 18 pp.

Kouletsis, Greg. "Guidance Follow-Up Study, Spring, 1964 (Comparative Study—JHS 13 M & JHS 117 M)." Spring, 1964. Unpaged.

Mayar, Frank. "Puerto Rican Pupils in New York City Public Schools: A Comparison of the Effects of Two Methods of Instructional Grouping on English Mastery and Attitudes." A Ph. D. dissertation for Teachers College, Columbia University. 1954, 73 pp.

Mayor's Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs in New York City, Sub-Committee on Education, Recreation and Parks. "Study on Puerto Rican Pupils in Senior and Vocational High Schools." May 1, 1953. Unpaged. [L. Covello, Chairman]

———. "Questionnaire on Puerto Rican Pupils in Our Schools." May 1, 1953, 6 pp.

"Memorandum Re: Day Care Centers." November 30, 1950, 1 p.

"Migration Balance: Day Schools—Migration Balance in the Movement of Pupil Population to and from Places Outside New York City, by Borough and Geographic Area—School Year 1962–1963 (and) Day Schools—Migration Balance in the Movement of Pupil Population to and from Places Outside New York City, by geographic Area—School Years 1953–1954 to 1962–1963." 1 p. (Statistical.)

Morris High School and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Labor, Migration Division. "Study of Puerto Rican Students Who Were Graduated from Morris High School—June 1961." June 21, 1963, 23 pp.

New York City, Department of Welfare, Press and Public Relations. "Statement by the Honorable Raymond M. Hilliard, Welfare Commissioner of the City of New York Upon His Arrival in Puerto Rico, August 21, 1950." 3 pp.

New York University, School of Education. "Proceedings of the Annual Conferences for Puerto Rican Citizens of New York: 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964." Unpaged.

Oliveras, Candido (Secretary of Education of Puerto Rico). "What Are The Educational Needs of Puerto Ricans Who Come to New York?" An address given at the New York University Puerto Rican Conference, January 14, 1961. 11 pp.

Pennisi, Guy V. "Some Suggestions for Helping Non-English Speaking Children, Manual for P.S. 33 Manhattan." Prepared by Guy V. Pennissi (Graduate Student, New York University) under the direction of Principal Morris C. Finkel, P.S. 33. November 23, 1949. Unpaged.

Puerto Rico, Department of Labor, Employment and Migration Bureau. "Progress Report on the Puerto Rican Migrants." April 11, 1950, 10 pp.

———. "Report on Visits to New York City Schools Submitted to Mr. Manuel Cabranes, Director, by Dr. J. J. Osuna, Educational Consultant." 1948, 9 pp.

Rausehenbush, Winifred. "New York and the Puerto Ricans." (Manuscript of Article for *Harpers*) 23 pp.

Sanguinetti, Carmen. "Adapting Science Instruction in New York City Schools to the Needs of Puerto Rican Background Pupils." A Ph. D. dissertation for Teachers College, Columbia University. 1956, 163 pp. [See Dossick, *infra*, generally]

Senior, Clarence. "The Newcomer Speaks Out: What Puerto Ricans Want and Need from Voluntary Agencies and the Public." A paper delivered at the National Conference on Social Welfare, Atlantic City, June 1960. 17 pp.

Shields, Osceola, *et al.* Teachers College Course S 200 FA. "Los Boricuas—Our Newest Neighbors." (Excerpts from a Group Report) 26 pp.

Three hundred eight-one cumulative record sheets of the Graduates of Benjamin Franklin High School, June 1963.

Welfare Council of New York City. "Educational Background in Puerto Rico." 1947, 28 pp.

———. Letter to Dr. Leonard Covello from

---

[1] Leonard Covello, *The Social Background of the Italo-American School Child: A Study of the Southern Italian Mores and Their Effect on the School Situation in Italy and America*, edited and with an Introduction by F. Cordasco (Leiden, The Netherlands, E. J. Brill, 1967) xxxii, 488 pp.

[2] See Herschel H. Manuel, *Spanish Speaking Children of the Southwest: Their Education and the Public Welfare* (Austin, University of Texas Press, 1958); and "Bilingualism and the Bilingual Child: A Symposium," *Modern Language Journal*, vol. 49 (March–April 1965), pp. 143–239.

[3] Most of these materials are in the *Covello Papers*. See "Introduction," *supra*.

Adrian P. Burke, Chairman. Committee on Puerto Ricans, January 8, 1951, 1 p.

———. Letter to Dr. Leonard Covello from Coverly Fischer, President, September 25, 1950, 1 p.

———. Letter to Dr. Leonard Covello from James R. Dumpson, Consultant May 21, 1951, 2 pp.

Welfare Council of New York City, Committee on Puerto Ricans in New York City. "Changes to be Made in Draft of Report." December 17, 1947, 1 p.

———. Sub-Committee to Implement Recommendations. "Summary of Minutes: November 17, 1950," 2 pp.

———. "Puerto Rican Children: Some Aspects of Their Needs and Related Services." June 30, 1949, 12 pp.

———. "Report." Submitted January, 1948, 69 pp.

———. Sub-Committee on Education. "Agenda: May 2, 1947," 2 pp.

———. Sub-Committee on Questionnaire. "Summary of Minutes: March 20, 1951," 2 pp.

———. Letter to Dr. Leonard Covello from James R. Dumpson, Consultant and Secretary, November 2, 1950, 1 p.

———. Sub-Committee on Education. "Summary of Minutes: May 2, 1947," 4 pp.

———. Subcommittee to Evaluate Reports. "Summary of Minutes: November 10, 1950." 4 pp.

———. Sub-Committee to Survey Progress on Puerto Rican Report: "Agenda: March 20, 1951," 13 pp.

———. "Summary of Minutes: Tuesday, November 18, 1947," 5 pp.

———. "Summary of Minutes: Wednesday, December 3, 1947," 2 pp.

———. "Summary of Minutes: November 1, 1950," 3 pp.

II. Published materials

Abrahams, Charles. "How to Remedy Our 'Puerto Rican Problem'," *Commentary,* Vol. XIX, No. 2 (February, 1955), pp. 120–127.

"Activaran La Ensenañza Del Ingles Basico en las communidades Boricuas," *Le Prensa,* February 23, 1952.

Alcala, Roberto de. "Nueva York-Ciudad Hispana," *Temos* (February, 1953), pp. 7–8.

Anastasi, Anne and Fernando A. Cordova. "Some Effects of Bilingualism upon the Intelligence Test Performance of Puerto Rican Children in New York City," *The Journal of Educational Psychology,* Vol. XLIV, No. 1 (January, 1953), pp. 1–17.

Anderson, Virginia. "Teaching English to Puerto Rican Pupils," *High Points* (March, 1964), pp. 51–54.

"Antonio Gonzalez es Nombrado Miembro de La Junta Escolar No. 18," *El Diario De Nueva York,* May 7, 1952.

"Aumentan Los Fondos Para Comedores DeEscuelas Públicas De Puerto Rico," *El Diario De Nueva York,* August 1, 1952, p. 3.

Baldwin, Clare C. "Program Outlined for Puerto Ricans," *The New York Times,* December 5, 1947.

Bell, John. "Puerto Rican Influx Jams Crowded Schools," *New York World Telegram,* May 3, 1947.

Berkowitz, Elaine. "Family Attitudes and Practices of Puerto Rican and Non-Puerto Rican Pupils," *High Points* (March, 1961), pp. 25–34.

Berle, Beatrice B. *Eighty Puerto Rican Families in New York City.* New York, Columbia University Press, 1958.

Biddick, Mildred L. and Esther A. Harrison. "Spanish-American Children Receive Help in Achieving Status," *School Management* (August, 1947).

"Bi-Lingual Problems in Puerto Rican Study," *Curriculum and Materials,* Vol. XI, No. 2 (February, 1948), pp. 1–2.

Blourock, Barbara. "Aspira in the Junior High School," *High Points* (February, 1966), pp. 53–55.

Briggs, Frances M. "As Five Teachers See Themselves," *Educational Forum,* Vol. XXVIII, No. 4 (May, 1964), pp. 389–387. [reprinted by Migration Division, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1965]

Brameld, Theodore. *The Remaking of a Culture.* New York, 1959, 478 pp.

Burma, John. *Spanish Speaking Groups in the United States.* Durham, N.C., Duke University Press, 1954.

Calitri, Charles J. "A Puerto Rican Story," *American Unity,* Vol. XV, No. 1 (September–October, 1956), pp. 19–24.

"Campana De Saneamiento En Harlem," *El Diario De Nueva York,* June 20, 1949, p. 3.

Cannon, Antoinette. "The Puerto Ricans," *Interpreter Releases,* Vol. XXIV, No. 37 (August 28, 1947), pp. 296–304.

Cebollero, Pedro. *A School Language Policy for Puerto Rico.* San Juan, 1945, 133 pp.

"The Challenge in Working with Puerto Rican Families," *Pathways in Child Guidance,* Vol. II, No. 3 (April, 1960), pp. 3–6.

Chenault, Lawrence R. *The Puerto Rican Migrant in New York City.* New York, 1938, 190 pp.

"Children from Puerto Rico," *Curriculum and Materials* (May–June, 1954), 16 pp.

"City College Da Satisfaccion a Maestra Boricua," *El Diario de Nueva York,* July 30, 1952, pp. 1, 17.

Citizens' Committee for Children of New York. *Do You Understand? N–E Program in the New York City Schools.* New York, Citizens' Committee, 1961, 23 pp.

"Civicas Y Culturales: Asociacion de Padres," *El Diario De Nueva York,* June 13, 1952, p. 8.

"Civicas Y Culturales: Centro Cultural Chileno, Inc.," *El Diario de Nueva York,* June 13, 1952, p. 8.

"Civicas Y Culturales: Conferencia Sobre Educacion Escolar," *El Diario de Nueva York,* May 21, 1952, p. 13.

"Civicas Y Culturales: Reunion Civica," *El Diario de Nueva York,* June 2, 1952, p. 5.

"Civicas Y Culturales: Escuela Publica De La Calle 109 (Oeste) Abre su Matricula Para Kindergarten," *El Diario de Nueva York,* May 7, 1952.

Collazo, Francisco, *The Education of Puerto Rican Children in the Schools of New York City.* San Juan, Department of Education Press, 1954, 14 pp.

"Columbia Plans Study of Puerto Rican Migration to N.Y.C.," *PM,* October 14, 1947.

"Comprension Por Conocimiento." (Editorial.) *El Diario de Nueva York,* May 27, 1952, p. 9.

Cordasco, F., and Leonard Covello. "Schools and the Spanish Speaking Community," daily *Congressional Record,* June 12, 1962, pp. A4322–A4323.

Cordasco, F. "Helping the Language Barrier Student," *Instructor,* Vol. 72 (May 1963), p. 20.

———. "Spanish Harlem: The Anatomy of Poverty," *Phylon*: The Atlanta University Review of Race and Culture, Vol. 26 (Summer 1965), pp. 195–196.

———. "The Puerto Rican Child in the American School," *Congressional Record,* vol. 111, pt. 20, pp. 27391–27392.

———. "Florence Nightingale in the Ghetto: Patricia Sexton's *Spanish Harlem,*" *Journal of Human Relations,* Vol. 13 (4th Quarter 1965), pp. 572–574.

———. "Nights in the Gardens of East Harlem: Patricia Sexton's *East Harlem,*" *Journal of Negro Education,* Vol. 34 (Fall 1965), pp. 450–451.

———. "The Puerto Rican Child in the American School," American Sociological Association. *Abstracts of Papers* (61st Annual Meeting), 1966, pp. 23–24.

———. "The Puerto Rican Child in the American School," *Kansas Journal of Sociology,* Vol. II (Spring 1966), pp. 59–65.

———. "Studies in the Disenfranchised: The Puerto Rican Child," *Psychiatric Spectator,* Vol. III (November 1966), pp. 3–4.

———. "The Puerto Rican Family and the Anthropologist: Oscar Lewis, *La Vida,* and The Culture of Poverty," *Urban Education,* Vol. III, No. 1 (1967), pp. 32–38.

———. "Kocking Down the Language Walls," *Commonweal.* October 6, 1967.

Cordasco, F. "The Puerto Rican Child," New Jersey Education Association *Review,* December, 1965.

———. "Puerto Rican Pupils and American Education," *School and Society,* Vol. 95 (February 18, 1967), pp. 116–119.

———. "The Puerto Rican Child in the American School," *Journal of Negro Education,* Vol. 36 (Spring 1967), pp. 181–186.

———. "The Puerto Rican Family and the Anthropologist," *Teachers College Record,* Vol. 68 (May 1967), pp. 672–675.

———. "Educational Programs for Puerto Rican Pupils," *New York Times,* May 30, 1967.

———. "The Non-English Speaking Child in the American School: Continuing Challenge to Education in a Democratic Society." Statement and testimony before the General Education Sub-Committee of the U. S. House of Representatives. June 29, 1967. Washington, 11 pp. (H.R. Bill 9840)

———. "The Puerto Rican Family and the Anthropologist: Oscar Lewis, *La Vida,* and the Culture of Poverty," *Congressional Record,* July 18, 1967, pp. 19331–19332.

———. "The Non-English Speaking Child in the American School: Continuing Challenge to Education in a Democratic Society." Testimony before the Senate Sub-Committee on Bilingual Education, July 21, 1967. Washington, 11 pp. (Senate Bill 428)

———, and Louis Roederer, "Modern Languages and Modern Living," in Joseph S. Roucek, ed., *Changing Aspects of the Foreign Language Teaching* in the United States. New York: Philosophical Library, 1967.

Covello, Leonard, with Guido D'Agostino. *The Heart is the Teacher.* New York, 1958, 275 pp.

"Crearan un Fondo de Becas para los Boricuas Residentes en N.Y.," *El Diario de Nueva York,* December 9, 1951, p. 14.

"Cree Jansen Que El GBno. Federal y El Estatal Deben Ayudar A Boricuas," *La Prensa,* February 1, 1954.

Crozier, Emmet. "Puerto Rico: Frontier of Enterprise," *New York Herald Tribune,* June 10, 1948.

Darcy, Natalie T. "The Performance of Bilingual Puerto Rican Children on Verbal and on Non-Language Tests of Intelligence," *Journal of Educational Research* (March, 1952), pp. 499–506.

"Las Declaraciones de Osuan," *El Diario de Nueva York,* October 29, 1948.

Denny, M. C. "Chicago Meets San Juan," *Instructor,* Vol. 76 (February 1967), pp. 38–39.

Diaz, Eileen. "A Puerto Rican in New York," *Dissent,* Vol. VIII, #3, (Summer 1961), pp. 383–385.

Dossick, Jesse J. *Doctoral Research on Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans.* New York, New York University, School of Education, 1967. ("Education," pp. 12–19).

Dworkis, Martin B. (ed.). *The Impact of Puerto Rican Migration on Governmental Services in New York City.* New York, 1957, 74 pp.

"Educadora Boricua Llevara a las Cortes Al City College de N. Y. Alega es Victima de Discrimen," *El Diario de Nueva York,* April 24, 1952.

Education-in-the-News. A monthly clip sheet for the use of U.S. editors and radio commentators. New York, Puerto Rican Public Relations Committee, Inc., April 1, 1949, 3 pp.

"Education in Puerto Rico." *San Juan Review.* Special Education Issue, Vol. II, No. 5 (June, 1965), 88 pp.

"Education is Sparking Puerto Rico's Industrial Growth," *The New York Times* (Special Section on Puerto Rico), November 7, 1965, p. 18.

"Education of Puerto Rican Children in New York City," *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 4 (December, 1954), pp. 145–192.

"Educación y Orientación en el Plan de Beneficienia Aquí," *La Prensa*, November 28, 1947, pp. 1, 5.

Elam, Sophie E. "Acculturation and Learning Problems of Puerto Rican Children," *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 61 (February 1960), pp. 258–264.

Emery, Helen T. "How the City's Schools Greet Puerto Ricans," *New York World Telegram and Sun*, November 4, 1953.

———. "Schools Here Aid Progress of Migrants," *New York World Telegram and Sun*, June 28, 1956, p. 34.

———. "Schools Weigh Problems of Puerto Ricans," *New York World Telegram and Sun*, February 11, 1953.

———. "Seward HS Makes Americans," *New York World Telegram and Sun*, May 11, 1956, p. 34.

Entman, Frederick. "Our Puerto Rican Children: One School's Approach," *Strengthening Democracy*, May, 1955, pp. 3, 5.

"Un Esfruerzo Encomiable." (Editorial.) *El Diario de Nueva York*, February 18, 1954, p. 13.

"El Espanol en Clinicas de la Ciudad," *El Diario de Nueva York*, February 17, 1954.

"Existe el Proposito de Contratar 500 Maestros Hispanos Más para N.Y.," *El Diario de Nueva York*, February 16, 1954, p. 6.

Feigenbaum, Lawrence. "Teaching English to Puerto Rican Youth," *High Points* (January, 1952), pp. 45–48.

Fernos Isern, Antonio. "The Role of Puerto Rico and Its People in the Americas," *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, Vol. 35 (May 1962) pp. 397–401.

Finocchiaro, Mary. "Puerto Rican Newcomers in Our Schools," *American Unity*, Vol. XIV, No. 3 (January-February, 1956), pp. 12–17.

———. "Our Schools Must Meet the Challenge of a New Migration," *High Points* (March 1953), pp. 29–33.

———. "A Suggested Procedure in the Teaching of English to Puerto Ricans," *High Points* (May, 1949), pp. 60–66.

———. *Teaching English as a Second Language*, New York, 1958, 335 pp.

Fitzpatrick, J. P. "Oscar Lewis and the Puerto Rican Family," *America*, Vol. 115 (December 10, 1966), pp. 778–779.

Flicker, Jeannette. "Classes for Spanish-Speaking Children," *High Points* (November, 1947), pp. 58–62.

Fox, Rosa Rudami. "Puerto Ricans in Your Town," *American Unity* (A monthly educational guide), Vol. XI, No. 5 (May–June, 1953), pp. 3–8.

Galindez, Jesus de. "Cronicas desde Neuva York: Hispano-america en las Universidades Norteamericanas," *El Diario de Neuva York*, August 28, 1951, p. 8.

"$160,000 Gift Here Aids Puerto Ricans," *The New York Times*, August 26, 1953, p. 18.

Glazer, Nathan, and Daniel Moynihan. *Beyond the Melting Pot*. Cambridge, M.I.T. Press, 1964, 360 pp.

Greenberg, Benjamin B. "1955 Puerto Rican Workshop," *Puerto Rico Es Su Casa*, Vol. I, No. 1 (June, 1955), p. 1.

Greenstein, Marvin N. "Puerto Rican Children," *Pathways in Child Guidance*, Vol. II, No. 4 (June, 1960), pp. 1, 3.

Guerra, Emilio L. "Orientacion de los Estudiantes de Puerto Rico in la Ciudad de Nueva York," *El Diario de Nueva York*, March 28, 1949, p. 6.

———. "The Orientation of Puerto Rican Students in New York City," *Modern Language Journal* (October, 1949), pp. 415–420.

———. "The Role of the Teacher of Spanish in the Orientation of Non-English Speaking Pupils." *Hispania*, Vol. XXXII, No. 1, (February, 1949), pp. 59–63.

"Guidance Is Asked for Puerto Ricans," *The New York Times*, October 28, 1947.

Gurren, Louise. "A Special Class for Puerto Rican Students," *High Points* (February, 1948), pp. 77–80.

Handlin, Oscar. *The Newcomers, Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a Changing Metropolis*. New York, Doubleday, 1962, 177 pp.

"Hay 46, 85: Niños de P.R. en Escuelas de New York," *El Diario de Nueva York*, February 19, 1953, p. 4.

"Hay Tres Nuevas Divisiones en Instruccion," *El Mundo* (San Juan, P.R.), July 16, 1947.

"Helping Puerto Rican Pupils to Achieve Status," *Strengthening Democracy*, Vol. V, No. 6 (May, 1953), pp. 4–5.

"El Hogar Y La Escuela." (Editorial.) *El Diario de Nueva York*, November 14, 1951, p. 9.

"Home-School Project Drawn," *New York Sun*, August 6, 1948.

"How to Teach Puerto Ricans," *New York Herald Tribune*, February 13, 1951.

"Incidente Lamentable." (Editorial.) *El Diario de Nueva York*, February 24, 1954.

Ingraham, Leonard W. "Our Puerto Rican Students Must Become a Part of All the Children," *High Points* (February, 1951), pp. 11–17.

El Instituto Profesional de 1948. November, 1948, 2 pp.

"The Integration Movement in Education," *Curriculum and Materials*, Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (Spring, 1964), p. 1.

"Irán a Puerto Rico 20 Trabajadoras Soci Lespor Invitacion del Rector, *El Diario de Nueva York*, May 23, 1952, p. 2.

Jaffe, Abraham J. (ed.). *Puerto Rican Population of New York City: A Series of Papers Delivered Before the New York Area Chapter of the American Statistical Association, October 21, 1953*. Bureau of Applied Social Research. January, 1954, 61 pp.

"Joven Damita Hace Honor a Los Boricuas en el Bronx," *El Diario de Nueva York*, March 5, 1952, p. 7.

Juncal, Hernan Poza. "La Escuela Norteamericana y Nuestros Ninos," *Plus Ultra*, October 10, 1948.

Jusino, Gonzalo. "La Organizacion Civica Puertoriqueña," *El Diario de Nueva York*, April 17, 1952, p. 11.

Kahnheimer, Leah W. "A Program in Social Living for Puerto Rican Pupils," *High Points* (June, 1954), pp. 58–68.

Kaufman, Maurice. *The Effect of Instruction in Reading Spanish on Reading Ability in English of Spanish-Speaking Retarded Readers*. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation. New York University, 1966.

Kelly, Mary. "English in U.S. as 2nd Language," *Christian Science Monitor*. Reprint. October 21, 1963, 3 pp.

Kihss, Peter. "Gains Made by Puerto Ricans Here"; and "City Relief Roll Held Down Despite Job-Hunter Influx." Two articles from *The New York Times*, May 31, 1957 and June 2, 1957. Reprinted by Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Migration Division, Department of Labor, 3 pp.

———. "Puerto Rico and Us." Three articles from *The New York Times*, February 23–25, 1953. Reprinted by Department of Labor of Puerto Rico, Migration Division, 8 pp.

Kleban, Evelyn. "Thanksgiving: An Orientation Project for Newcomers," *Strengthening Democracy*, January 1963, pp. 3, 6.

Klein, Woody, *Let in the Sun*. New York, 1963, 297 pp.

Kosinski, Leonard U. "A New Look at the Bilingual Student," *Senior Scholastic*, Vol. 82 (October 4, 1963), p. 14.

Landy, David. *Tropical Childhood: Cultural Transmission and Learning in a Rural Puerto Rican Village*. New York, Harper, 1965.

"Lawyers Association Exposes Untruths about Puerto Ricans," *The Daily Compass*, March 31, 1952, pp. 2, 13.

Lewis, C. "Some Puerto Rican Viewpoints," *Childhood Education*, Vol. 43 (October 1966), pp. 82–84.

Loretan, Joseph O. "Problems in Improving Educational Opportunities for Puerto Ricans in New York," *High Points* (May 1963), pp. 23–31.

Lorge, Irving and Frank Mayans, Jr. "Vestibule vs. Regular Classes for Puerto Rican Migrant Pupils," *Teachers College Record*, Vol. LV, No. 5 (February, 1954), pp. 231–237.

"Maestra Boricua Hace Llamamiento a Los Padres Hispanos Del Bronx," *El Diario de Nueva York*, April 16, 1952, pp. 6–7.

Massimine, E. Virginia. "The Puerto Rican: Citizen of New York," *The Journal of Pi-Lamda Theta* (New York University) (April, 1950), p. 2.

Mataresi, Felicia. "No Debe Segregarse a Los Estudiantes de Puerto Rico," *El Diario de Nueva York*, January 19, 1954.

Mayor's Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs in New York City, Sub-Committee on Education, Recreation and Parks. *The Puerto Rican Pupils in the Public Schools of New York City: a Survey of Elementary and Junior High Schools*. New York, 1951, 102 pp.

McCuen, John J. "Puerto Rican Survey Seeks Best Methods," *New York World Telegram and Sun*, April 7, 1954, p. 42.

"Meeting the Needs of Puerto Rican Pupils in New York City Public Schools (Facts and Figures)," *Staff Bulletin*. (Special supplement). March 23, 1964, 4 pp.

"Melting Pot Boils in This High School," *The New York Times*, December 14, 1952, p. 45.

Menton, Seymour. "Teaching English to Puerto Rican Students," *High Points* (November, 1952), pp. 67–70.

Messer, Helaine R. *The Puerto Rican Student in the New York City Public Schools: 1945–1965*. Unpublished M.A. Dissertation. Columbia University, 1966.

Miller, Henry. "New York City's Puerto Rican Pupils: A Problem of Acculturation," *School and Society*, Vol. LXXVI, No. 1967 (August 30, 1952), pp. 129–132.

Mills, C. Wright, Clarence Senior, and Rose Kohn Goldsen. *The Puerto Rican Journey*. New York, 1950, 238 pp.

Mirkin, Sydney. "The Puerto Rican Problem," *Daily News*, January 3, 1955, pp. 3, 29.

———. "The Puerto Rican Problem: They Change Her, Island Feels," *Daily News*, January 4, 1955, pp. 3, 24 .

———. "The Puerto Rican Problem: Island Fights for Better Living," *Daily News*, January 5, 1955, pp. 2, 32.

Monserrat, Joseph. *School Integration: A Puerto Rican View*. San Juan, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Labor, Migration Division, 1963, 16 pp.

———. "A Puerto Rican Family," *Natural History* (April 1967). On Lewis's *La Vida*.

Montag, Jennie, and Mary Finocchiaro. "Guidance and Curriculum for Puerto Rican Children," *High Points* (January, 1951), pp. 32–42.

Montes, Marta. "La Primera Escuela Puertoriquena en la Ciudad de Nueva York," *La Prensa*, September 17, 1961.

"More Classes Set for Adults," *New York Sun*, November 25, 1947.

Munoz Marin, Ines Maria Mendoza De. "Identidad Puertoriqueña," *La Presna*, July 30, 1961.

Narvaez, Alfonso. "Beleaguered High School," *New York Herald Tribune*, December 26, 1965, p. 32.

"Need of the Puerto Rican Child," *New York Teacher News*, November 8, 1952, p. 3.

"Nuevo Método Para la Ensenanza de Idiomas," *El Diario de Nueva York*, February 26, 1952, p. 4.

New York City. Board of Education:

A. Unpublished materials:

"Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education." N.d., 4 pp.

"Board of Education Statement on the Decentralization of the New York City School System." June 14, 1965, 7 pp.

Bureau of Curriculum Research. "Puerto Ricans in New York City," 1965, 8 pp.

Bureau of Curriculum Research. "A Resource Unit: Understanding Our Fellow American Citizens, the Puerto Ricans." N.d., 9 pp.

"Comparison of Special Programs, Classes, and Materials for Puerto Rican Students in Eighteen Schools." N.d., 8 pp.

"Curriculum Development: Notes for Discussion at Principals' Inservice Course," New York Board of Education, 1943.

Department of Speech Improvement. "Speech Problems of Puerto Rican Children." A Report of the Committee on Individualization. November, 1948, 13 pp.

Division of Elementary Schools. "Education of the Non-English Speaking Child." New York, 1962, 2 pp.

———. "Highlights of the N-E Program." New York, 1963, 3 pp.

———. "Proposed Revision of Policy on Operation Understanding." New York, 1963, 9 pp.

———. "Record Sheets, Rating Sheets, and Instructional Aids for the Education of the Non-English Speaking Child," 11 pp.

Division of Elementary Schools. "The Substitute Auxiliary Teacher." 1958, 4 pp.

Division of High Schools. "Number of Candidates for Graduation—June, 1962," 5 pp.

———. "Report on Graduates—January 1962," 2 pp.

———. "Non-English Program, Schools Having 25 or More Students Rated as Non-English Speaking in the Census of October 1958, October 1959, October 1962, October 1963," 30 pp.

———. "Some Resources Recommended for Use in the Education of Non-English Speaking Students." May, 1960, 9 pp.

Division of Junior High Schools. "Minutes of a Conference Related to an Educational Program for Puerto Rican Children." February 10, 1953, 3 pp.

———. "The Puerto Rican Bulletin: An Aid to Teachers and Supervisors of Puerto Rican Children." N.d., 30 pp.

———. "Some Facts and Figures about Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans." 1952. Unpaged.

Donavan, Bernard E., and Benjamin J. Stern. "Memorandum of Pupils Whose Native Language Is Not English." March 20, 1953.

Finocchiaro, Mary. "The Role of the Foreign Language Teacher in an Educational Program for Puerto Rican Children." N.d., 6 pp.

In-Service Course, Spring Term 1963, Course C—886." "Practical Techniques for Teachers of Spanish Working with Puerto Rican Pupils, Questions Submitted by Members of the Class," 11 pp.

News Release, July 12, 1965, 2 pp.

———. July 13-14, 1965, 2 pp.

———. July 21, 1965, 3 pp.

The Puerto Rican Study. Announcements, correspondence, minutes. In the Covello Papers—Personal Files.

The Puerto Rican Study. "Follow-Up Study of the Graduating Classes of Two Junior High Schools." A report prepared by Maria Luisa Rodriguez. September 20, 1955, 34 pp.

———. Project for Transitional-Stage Puerto Rican Pupils in the High School, Helping the Transitional Stage Pupil in the Subject Class." May 16, 1956, 6 pp.

———. "The Puerto Rican Study News Exchange," No. 2. November 4, 1954. Unpaged.

———. "The Puerto Rican Study News Exchange," No. 6. April 21, 1955. Unpaged.

———. "A Report on School-Puerto Rican Parent Relations, 1955–6." A report prepared by Frances Low. New York, 1957, 61 pp.

———. "Who are the Puerto Rican Pupils in the New York City Public Schools? Report #1: Educational and Familiar Background. A report prepared by Samuel M. Goodman, New York, 1954, 27 pp.

Sanguimetti, Carmen. "The Puerto Rican School Child in Puerto Rico and in New York City." An address given at in-service course for teachers of Puerto Rican adults. New York, November 17, 1960, 9 pp.

"Special Census of School Population Classification of 'Non-English Speaking' Pupils, October 31, 1963." A report prepared by Bertha Leviton. May, 1964, 13 pp.

"Statistics on Regular Day Schools—Pupils Newly Arrived from Places Outside New York City and Leading Sources of Immigration." 1955, 3 pp.

Union Settlement. "College Readiness Program." 1965, 1 p.

Wolk, Elsie. "A Summary Report of Reading Disabilities of Children Learning English as a Second Language." New York, 1963, 4 pp.

B. *Published materials:*

Bureau of Curriculum Research. *Foreign Language Revision for Secondary Schools, Spanish, Level 5.* 1965, 47 pp.

Division of Elementary Schools. *Handbook, 1963–1964,* 221 pp.

———. *Handbook, 1964–1965,* 268 pp.

———. *Teaching Children of Puerto Rican Background in New York City Schools: Suggested Plans and Procedures.* 1954, 76 pp.

Donavan, Bernard E. *Implementation of Board Policy on Excellence for the City's Schools.* April 28, 1965, 34 pp.

Educating Students for Whom English Is a Second Language. December, 1965, 105 pp.

A Five-Year Crash Program for Quality Education. October 22, 1964, 16 pp.

Hillson, Henry T., and Florence Myers. *The Demonstration Guidance Project, 1957–1962: Pilot Project for Higher Horizons.* 1963, 31 pp.

Interviewing Puerto Rican Parents and Children in Spanish: A Guide for School Personnel. N.d., 10 pp.

Landers, Jacob. *Higher Horizons: Progress Report.* January, 1963, 109 pp.

Portals to the Future, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools. 1959–1960. 78 pp.

Puerto Rican Profiles. Curriculum Bulletin No. 5. 1964–1965 Series. 96 pp.

The Puerto Rican Study, 1953–1957. J. Cayce Morrison, Director. 1958, 265 pp.

The Puerto Rican Study. *Developing a Program for Testing Puerto Rican Pupils in the New York City Public Schools.* 1958, 143 pp.

———. *A Letter to Friends of Puerto Rican Children.* October 1, 1955, 8 pp.

The Puerto Rican Study. *The Future Is Now.* N.d., 32 pp.

———. *Our Children from Puerto Rico, A Report on Their Island Home by the Visiting Puerto Rican Workshop of 1955.* 1957, 72 pp.

———. *Resource Units for Classes with Puerto Rican Pupils in the First Grade.* 1955, 145 pp.

———. *Resource Units for Classes with Puerto Rican Pupils in the Fifth Grade.* 1956, 174 pp.

———. *Resource Units for Classes with Puerto Rican Pupils in the Fourth Grade.* 1955, 143 pp.

———. *Resource Units for Classes with Puerto Rican Pupils in the Second Grade.* 1956, 119 pp.

———. Teaching English to Puerto Rican Pupils in Grades Five and Six. 1957, 274 pp.

———. *Teaching English to Puerto Rican Pupils in Grades Three and Four.* 1957, 216 pp.

———. *Who Are the Puerto Rican Children in the New York City Public Schools?* 1956, 88 pp.

Report of the Joint Planning Committee for More Effective Schools to the Superintendent of Schools. May 15, 1964, 19 pp.

School Districts 11 and 18, Benjamin B. Strumpf, Assistant Superintendent. *Your American Pupil from Puerto Rico . . .* September 1956, 12 pp.

Sixtieth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, City of New York, Statistical Section, School Year 1957–1958. 1959, pp. 69–72.

Toward Greater Opportunity. A Progress Report from the Superintendent of Schools to the Board of Education. Dealing with Implementation of Recommendations of the Commission on Integration. June, 1960. 196 pp.

Working With Pupils of Puerto Rican Background. A Guidance Manual. 1965. 87 pp.

[End of New York City listing.]

New York State Commission for Human Rights. Division of Research. *The Puerto Rican Populations of the New York City Area: Populations of New York State: 1960 Report No. 2.* May, 1962, 22 pp.

"Ninos Boricuas Usaran Aqui Libros Preparados en la Isla," *El Diario de Nueva York,* March 6, 1951, p. 1.

"N. Y. U. Rinde Homenaje a Dos Puertoriquenos." (Editorial.) *El Diario de Nueva York,* April 17, 1952, p. 11.

"New York: World They Never Made." Reprinted from *Time* (June 12, 1950), 2 pp.

"Oportunidad de Estudiar Inglés que Puede Malograrse por Indiferencia." (Editorial.) *La Prensa,* January, 1954.

Osuna, Juan J. *A History of Education in Puerto Rico.* Rio Piedras, P. R., 1949.

Ortiz, Ernesto, *et al.* Letter. "En Defensa de los Niños Puertorriqueños," *El Diario de Nueva York,* April 15, 1954.

Padilla, Elena. *Up From Puerto Rico.* New York, 1958. 317 pp.

"Parents, Children To Attend School," *The New York Times,* June 25, 1949, p. 8.

Passow, Harry A. (ed.) *Education in Depressed Areas.* New York, 1963, 359 pp. [See "Introduction," *supra*]

Perlman, Ruth. "The American School: Cultural Crossroads," *The Elementary School Journal* (November, 1958), pp. 82–86.

La Presna. Suplemento Educativo, September 17, 1961, 8 pp.

Probst, Nathan, and Sophia A. Olmsted. "The Rising Puerto Rican Problem," Bar Bulletin (New York County Lawyers Association), Vol. IX, No. 5 (March, 1952), pp. 5–12.

"Program de Orientacion Educativa para Niños Hispanos," *El Diario de Nueva York,* September 30, 1951, pp. 4, 14.

"Proponen Intensificar la Ensenañza de Inglés," *La Prensa,* January 16, 1961, pp. 3, 9.

"Puerto Rican Adults Taught," *New York Sun,* November 13, 1947.

"Puerto Ricans Bid for More Schools," *New York Times,* August 6, 1967.

"The Puerto Rican Child," *New York Teachers' News,* November 29, 1952, pp. 2, 7.

"The Puerto Rican Child," *Teacher News* (November 29, 1952), p. 227.

"Puerto Rican Children," *New York Teachers' News,* April 3, 1954, p. 4.

"Puerto Rican Committee Reactivated," *Better Times,* Vol. XXXII, No. 10 (December 1, 1950), p. 1.

Puerto Rican Community Development Project: A Proposal for a Self-Help Project to Develop the Community by Strengthening the Family, Opening Opportunities for Youth and Making Full Use of Education. New York, Puerto Rican Forum, 1964.

"Puerto Rican Conference on City Needs," *New York Times,* April 17, 1967.

The Puerto Rican Forum, Inc. *Aspira.* 1965, 4 pp.

Puerto Rican Graduates of Morris High School, June 1961. Migration Division Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1963. 23 pp.

"Puerto Ricans and Inter-American Understanding," *The Journal of Educational Sociology,* Vol. XXXV, No. 9 (May, 1962), pp. 385–440.

"The Puerto Ricans in New York City: Background Information for Teachers," *Curriculum and Materials,* Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (Spring, 1964), pp. 6–7.

"Puerto Rican Migration," *Real Estate News,* March, 1949, 1 p.

"Puerto Ricans Pose Problems in Education," *The Sun,* November 12, 1947, pp. 1–39.

"Puerto Rican Problem Cited," *Daily News,* November 11, 1947.

"Puerto Ricans Seek Better Jobs Here," *The New York Times,* June 16, 1948.

"Puerto Ricans Start Up Labor Ladder," *Business Week*, Reprint. (May 2, 1953), 3 pp.

"Pupils from Puerto Rico," *The Elementary School Journal* (November, 1958), p. 74.

Quintero, Babby. "Del Ambiente Hispano," *La Prensa* (December 4, 1951), p. 3.

Raisner, Arnold. "New Horizons for the Student of Spanish-Speaking Background," *High Points* (February, 1966), pp. 19–23.

Rand, Christopher. *The Puerto Ricans*. New York, 1958, 178 pp.

"Report on Puerto Rico Schools: McCloskey Describes Difficulties and Accomplishments of Island Educators," *New York Sun*, July 24, 1948.

Riessman, Frank. *The Culturally Deprived Child*. New York, 1962, 140 pp.

Rogers, Melvin L. "For Puerto Rican Pupils: Crash Program in Reading," *The Elementary School Journal* (November, 1958), pp. 87–89.

Samuels, Gertrude. "Puerto Rico: Land of Paradox," *The New York Times Magazine*, October 30, 1955, pp. 18, 62, 64, 67.

Sanchez, Jose M. "Mas Maestros Hispanos," *El Diario de Nueva York*, June 15, 1952, p. 7.

Sayers, Raymond S. "New York Teachers in Puerto Rican Schools," *High Points* (November, 1957), 12 pp.

Santolala, Irene Silva. "Los Padres y el Escolar," *El Diario de Nueva York*, June 15, 1952, p. 7.

"Schools to Develop Puerto Rican Programs," *New York World Telegram and Sun*, August 28, 1953, p. 40.

"Se Crea Comite de Padres Hispanos de la Escuela No. 29 de Brooklyn," *El Diario de Nueva York*, June 22, 1952, p. 7.

"Seek Better School Program for NYC Puerto Rican Youth," *New York Teachers' News*, May 31, 1952, p. 4.

"La Semana de la Educacion," *La Prensa*, November 1, 1953.

Senior, Clarence. "Schools, Newcomers and Community," *Problems and Practices in New York City Schools*. 1963 Yearbook of the Society For the Experimental Study of Education. Parts II and III, pp. 107–111. New York: Society For the Experimental Study of Education, 1963.

———. *The Puerto Ricans: Strangers—Then Neighbors*. Quadrangle Edition. Chicago, 1965, 128 pp.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo. *Spanish Harlem: Anatomy of Poverty*. New York, 1965, 208 pp. [See Cordasco, *supra*]

Shaw, Frederick. "A Follow-Up Study of the 1963 High School Graduates," *High Points* (November, 1965), pp. 31–56.

Slotkin, Aaron N. "The Treatment of Minorities in Textbooks: The Issues and the Outlook," *Strengthening Democracy*, Vol. XVI, No. 3 (May, 1964), pp. 1–2, 8.

Smith, Richard C. "This School Solves Its Own Problems," *The Elementary School Journal* (November, 1958), pp. 75–81.

"Spanish Endorsed For U.S. Schools," *New York Times*, July 22, 1967, p .54 (Senate Bill 428).

"Special Study for Migrants: Arts and Crafts Material for Puerto Ricans," *New York Sun*, December 16, 1947.

"Speech Training For Migrants," *New York Sun*, June 23, 1948.

"Sra. Collazo Dice Son Totalmente Falsas Palabras que se le Atribuyen," *El Diario de Nueva York*, July 30, 1952, p. 4.

"Statement of Policy: 'Excellence for the Schools of New York City'," *Staff Bulletin*. (Special Supplement.) May 7, 1965, 4 pp.

"Superintendente Escuelas de N. Y. Pide Más Respeto Para los Boricuas," *El Diario de Nueva York*, January 16, 1961, p. 2.

Taylor, Carol. "A Better Era for Puerto Ricans: Obstacles of Mass Migration Are Disappearing for Our Newest New Yorkers," *New York World Telegram and Sun*, May 23, 1963, Second Section, p. 17.

"Teaching the Puerto Rican Child," *New York Teachers' News*, February 24, 1953, p. 3.

"Teaching Puerto Ricans in New York," *The New York Times*, December 17, 1950.

"10 Maestros para 11,900 Alumnos en Escuelas N.Y.," *El Diario de Nueva York*, April 10, 1952.

Treatman, Paul. "Operation-Understanding for Principals," *K-Six Magazine*, Issue 2 (1963–1964), pp. 19–24.

"Una Noche en P. Rico," *El Diario de Nueva York*, March 2, 1953, p. 6.

Wakefield, Dan. *Island in the City*. Boston, 1959, 278 pp.

Weales, Gerald. "New York's Puerto Rican Dilemma," *The New Leader*, March 7, 1955, pp. 8–10.

Weitzman, Judy. "Reheating the Melting Pot," *The New Leader*, June 28, 1954, pp. 11–12.

Welfare Council of New York City, Committee on Puerto Ricans in New York City. *Puerto Ricans in New York City*. New York, 1948, 60 pp.

White, Trumbull. *Puerto Rico and Its People*. Stokes, 1937.

Wolk, E. "The Teaching of English as a Second Language in the Elementary Schools of New York City," *Hispania*, Vol. 49 (May 1966), pp. 293–296.

Young, Marguerite. "Schools in City Fit Courses to Puerto Ricans." Reprint. *The New York Herald Tribune*, November 16, 1947.

PROTECTION FOR SAVERS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of your Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, has for some time been considering legislation to reform improper and unsafe practices by savings and loan holding companies. This legislation, H.R. 8696, required extensive study and long, hard work. However, I am sorry to report that all the subcommittee's efforts may have come to naught. Last Thursday, October 26, in executive session, an amendment deleted the bill's most vital and important section—a provision calling for agency scrutiny of the debt structure of holding companies controlling savings and loan associations, the accounts of which are insured up to $15,000 by the Federal Government. The solvency and liquidity of holding company operations, mainly in California and Nevada, affect both savings and loan institutions and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Fund.

Therefore, this major surgery on the debt control section of the bill is a hard blow to savers, to consumers, and to the entire thrift industry.

I intend to offer an amendment in full committee on Wednesday, November 1 to restore this provision in the hope that this unfortunate situation can be reversed. The importance of my amendment is clearly set out in the lead editorial in this morning's—October 31—New York Times, and explains my reasons for voting against sending a gutted, skeleton bill to the full committee and to the House floor. The public interest requires a strong savings and loan holding company bill. The editorial follows:

PROTECTION FOR SAVERS

Because of an astonishing defect in law, the Federal Government has no authority to regulate holding companies that control savings and loan associations. For more than three years the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has sought legislation requiring these holding companies to register, file reports and open their books for Federal inspection.

Although savings and loan associations controlled by holding companies represent only one-eighth of the total assets, they provide two-thirds of the regulatory problems in that multi-billion-dollar field. The explanation is easy to find. Many of these holding companies are seriously undercapitalized. They undertake ambitious and complicated financial operations on a thin margin of reserve capital.

To keep solvent these holding companies need a high flow of cash dividends from their savings and loan associations and other subsidiaries. To generate those dividends the associations resort to risky expedients, making too many loans or making them on excessively liberal terms. Other associations, trying to compete, feel the pressure to offer the same kind of loans and easy terms. Thus the infection spreads and, in a recession, could seriously damage the entire savings and loan industry.

A report in this newspaper yesterday told how this process has jumbled the affairs of the First Western Financial Corporation in Las Vegas. Significantly, its financial crisis has not caused depositors to withdraw their funds since the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, a Government agency, insures each deposit to a limit of $15,000. In effect, the absence of regulation enables financiers who are reckless or worse to abuse the confidence created by Government insurance.

The Senate this year passed a bill providing the Home Loan Bank Board with adequate powers to regulate these holding companies, but a House Banking and Currency subcommittee has now gravely weakened it. The subcommittee deprived the board of authority to supervise the debt structure of the parent company.

The effect: a solvent savings and loan association might be endangered because its stock was owned by a holding company that was otherwise over-extended. The Government could take no preventive action; its role would be limited to paying off the depositors when and if the crash occurred. The subcommittee also deprived the board of authority to disapprove acquisitions, with the result that a race track or any other business could still form a holding company and buy a savings and loan association.

Politically influential lawyers and lobbyists have been at work fighting to weaken this bill. The public looks to the House Banking and Currency Committee to repair the damage done in the subcommittee and to provide complete Federal protection for the integrity and independence of the savings and loan associations.

SCARE PROPAGANDA FALSE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the "scare" propaganda that is being widely circulated in New Jersey and other States about the Social Security Amendments of 1967 and the financial soundness of the system is naturally arousing deep apprehension among present and potential future beneficiaries.

The material being distributed in my area falsely charges that future social security benefits, under the 1967 amendments, would be based upon need as determined by an administrator instead of the fixed amounts prescribed under existing law. These unfounded attacks upon this most valuable program are most reprehensible, undermining our citizens' confidence in the strength and integrity of the program that has served them so well over the past 30 years.

It is imperative to expose the fallacy of these attacks, which are evidently based on deeprooted opposition to all social welfare measures, and to make known the true facts to present and potential future beneficiaries.

I have today suggested to the able Commissioner of Social Security that he enclose a brief rebuttal of these canards in the next mailing of payments so as to reassure beneficiaries that the program will continue to be based upon earned right.

My letter to Commissioner Ball follows:

OCTOBER 31, 1967.

Mr. ROBERT M. BALL,
Commissioner, Social Security Administration, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. BALL: I know that you must share my concern about the distorted and inaccurate information on the Social Security Amendments of 1967 and on the financial soundness of the system that is being widely circulated in New Jersey and other states.

As a result of this "scare" propaganda a great number of alarmed inquiries are being received by me and other Members from beneficiaries and from workers. These scurrilous allegations are causing cruel and unnecessary suffering to millions of citizens who must look to Social Security for their independence and security, either now or in the future. Most Americans must depend upon these benefits as their major, if not only, source of retirement income, and they must have confidence in the strength and integrity of the system. To undermine our citizens' confidence in this irresponsible manner is most serious. It is distressing to them individually and also clearly detrimental to our national well being. It is imperative to expose the fallacy of these attacks, which are evidently based on deep rooted opposition to all social welfare measures, and to make known the true facts to present and potential future beneficiaries.

As you are well aware, it is often difficult for the truth to catch up and expose deceit, and meanwhile our Social Security beneficiaries are experiencing deep uneasiness.

In this connection it has occurred to me that the insertion of a brief message on the subject by you with next month's checks would reassure the aged, disabled, widows and children that their benefits are in no wise jeopardized and that the program will continue to function as it has so splendidly over the past 30 years.

Your careful consideration of the issue will be appreciated.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH G. MINISH, M.C.

CULVER POLL OF SECOND DISTRICT OPINION INDICATES GROWING CONCERN ABOUT CRITICAL PROBLEMS, SUPPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, as in the past 2 years, I have again polled my constituents in the Second District of Iowa, to obtain their views on major issues before the Congress and the Nation.

The results of these annual questionnaires have been important to my consideration of legislation in the House of Representatives, because they provide an additional measure of opinion, to supplement the daily mail which I receive on these matters and my discussions with residents when I am in our district.

Each Member of Congress must form his own independent judgment on each issue as to what action will best serve the interests of his district, the State he represents, and the Nation. But he must base that judgment on all of the arguments and opinions available to him and that involves, among other things, the fullest possible understanding of his own constituents' attitudes.

For the first time, in seeking these opinions I have used a data processing card, and I am very pleased by the size of the response, which has already exceeded 11,000 individual returns.

The response reflects the broad spectrum of interests in eastern Iowa, as identified according to age, occupation, and residence. Twenty-five percent of the cards were returned by persons in the age group from 20 to 35, 49 percent between 35 and 60, and 24 percent over the age of 60.

Divided by occupation, 21 percent were businessmen, 13 percent farmers, 24 percent professional persons, 12 percent housewives, 10 percent labor, and 18 percent other occupations and retirees.

Fourteen percent of the respondents lived on farms, 9 percent in communities with a population of less than 2,500, 12 percent in communities from 2,500 to 10,000, 42 percent from the Cedar Rapids-Marion area, 11 percent from Clinton, and 12 percent from Dubuque.

The results of the survey, based on this response, have been tabulated, and they indicate general support of major legislation before the Congress. The House has already acted on two of these measures, and in both cases has reflected the attitude of the Second District.

Legislation to provide assistance to improve law enforcement capabilities of State and local authorities, which passed the House and is now pending in the Senate, was favored by 81 percent of those responding to my poll.

The compromise measure to increase social security benefits by 12½ percent, which the House approved, follows opinions in the Second District, where 55 percent favored a moderate increase, 16 percent a larger raise, and 27 percent no change in benefits at all.

This week, the House is scheduled to consider the National Flood Insurance Act, a measure I introduced early in the present session of Congress, which has the support of 62 percent of my constituents, according to the poll results.

In addition to questions directly related to specific legislation, I asked for opinions on the situation in Vietnam. And while use of the data processing card required over-simplified alternatives which could not discriminate among a number of intermediate possible options, the divided response clearly demonstrates the growing concern and frustration about the continuing conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for the interest and the time of those people who responded to this poll, particularly for those who were kind enough to include additional comments about issues or problems in their response, and I include the complete results of the questionnaire at this point in the RECORD:

[In percent]

1. In Vietnam do you favor:

Immediate U.S. withdrawal	34
Present policy of military and economic aid	20
Expansion of war effort	40
No response	6

2. With regard to Social Security, do you favor:

No change in benefits	27
Moderate increase with no tax raise	55
Larger increase with raise in rates or taxable base	16
No response	2

3. Do you favor legislation to give farmers greater bargaining power in seeking fair prices for their products?

Favor	58
Oppose	23
No response	19

4. Do you favor the Postmaster General's proposal to remove the Post Office Department from the Cabinet and create an independent, nonprofit corporation to operate the mails?

Favor	64
Oppose	19
No response	17

5. Do you favor my bill to remove all postal appointments from political patronage and place them solely on the basis of merit and experience?

Favor	92
Oppose	3
No response	5

6. Do you favor returning part of Federal tax receipts to States and local communities without restrictions on how they may be used?

Favor	48
Oppose	38
No response	14

7. Do you favor my proposal for a national flood insurance program, through private companies, to provide insurance for homeowners in high-risk flood areas?

Favor	62
Oppose	20
No response	18

8. Do you favor truth-in-lending legislation to require full disclosure of the true costs of interest and credit to the borrower?

Favor	92
Oppose	2
No response	6

9. Do you favor a Safe Streets and Crime Control Act to aid States and local communities in improving law enforcement methods?

Favor	81
Oppose	9
No response	10

10. Do you favor a Right of Privacy Act to ban wiretapping and eavesdropping, with Presidential authority to permit certain wiretapping in national security cases?

Favor	64
Oppose	22
No response	14

11. Do you favor my practice of regularly asking constituents their views on major questions of national policy?

Favor	96
Oppose	1
No response	3

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, air pollution is a major national problem. It strikes hardest, and most visibly, at our biggest, most crowded cities; but it affects small towns and rural areas as well. The problem is getting worse as the sources of pollution multiply. By 1980—which is not very far off—the Nation's urban population will increase by a third, the number of motor vehicles by 40 percent, and our demands for energy by 50 percent.

This administration has played a leading role in the attack against air pollution. Back in 1963, President Johnson signed the Clean Air Act, and in 1965 and 1966 he signed the strengthening amendments to that legislative milestone. More recently, in his January message to the Congress on air pollution, he proposed that we adopt the Air Quality Act of 1967, which retains the principal features of the Clean Air Act and adds new features to cover deficiencies discovered in the implementation of the Clean Air Act.

In his message to Congress last January, the President indicated his awareness that our progress against air pollution has been halting and inadequate. He said at that time:

> The pollution problem is getting worse. We are not even controlling today's level of pollution. Ten years from now, when industrial production and waste disposal have increased and the number of automobiles on our streets and highways exceeds 110 million, we shall have lost the battle for clean air unless we strengthen our regulatory and research efforts now.

He also said:

> This situation does not exist because it was inevitable, nor because it cannot be controlled. Air pollution is the inevitable consequence of neglect. It can be controlled when the neglect is no longer tolerated.

Since last January there have been many new signs that the public's tolerance of air pollution is wearing thin. One public opinion survey after another indicates that the majority of Americans consider programs to curb air and water pollution more greatly in need of expansion than other Federal programs. Our urban and suburban population believe that they face substantial air pollution problems where they live, and most of them feel that neither industry nor government at any level is even beginning to attack the problem with the vigor that is required.

Mr. Speaker, a truly comprehensive attack on this complicated and serious problem is clearly necessary. The Air Quality Act of 1967 gives us the ammunition to launch such an attack. I strongly urge that we adopt this vital piece of legislation and show the American people that we have begun to fight air pollution in earnest.

CONTINUING THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, within the next few weeks the House will begin debate on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. During this debate, it has been predicted, some of our colleagues in the Republican Party will offer amendments that would curtail or alter the direction of the war on poverty.

An expression of support for the programs fostered by the Office of Economic Opportunity—and implied opposition to the amendments—was brought to my attention recently. The statement was contained in a telegram earlier this month from the Republican mayors of 22 major American cities to the minority leaders of the House and Senate. The plea of these mayors for the "continuation or expansion" of the OEO's "dynamic and imaginative programs" will be heeded, I hope, by the Republican Members of this body when the issue comes before us.

Following is the text of the telegram and its signers:

> We, the undersigned Mayors and Members of the Republican Party endorse the continuation or expansion of the programs fostered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.
>
> All of us are greatly concerned as we are continually pushing forward those projects in our individual cities which are aimed at improving neighborhoods that can be rehabilitated and to also raise the economic, educational, and social standing of those citizens who are living in poverty. We feel the implementation of our local programs as sponsored by OEO are giving great impetus toward our goal and any slowing up of such program will greatly deter the progress which has been made thus far.
>
> We fully realize that in any new program, such as the War on Poverty, there are bound to be certain imperfections and criticisms from some corners. But in our daily activities of actually seeing these programs administered they are proving to be successful and getting the job done. It is our considered opinion that the programs are a positive force in lessening social tensions in our cities. All of us are confident they will continue to improve and are so meaningful as to give our less fortunate citizens a new hope in life. You can readily see people involved and active. These programs are realities and are no longer in the talking stage. The strong leadership provided by this agency in administering the various projects has been most impressive.
>
> We strongly urge each of you to encourage members of Congress to support the OEO budget so that these dynamic and imaginative programs may be carried on in a successful manner.

SIGNERS OF TELEGRAM

Neal S. Blaisdell, Honolulu, Hawaii.
John S. Ballard, Akron, Ohio.
J. D. Braman, Seattle, Wash.
Stanley A. Cmich, Canton, Ohio.
Frank M. Dulan, Utica, N.Y.
Dave Hall, Dayton, Ohio.
James M. Hewgley, Tulsa, Okla.
Orville L. Hubbard, Dearborn, Mich.
Floyd H. Hyde, Fresno, Calif.
Ronald R. James, San Jose, Calif.
Erik Jonsson, Dallas, Tex.
Lawrence F. Kramer, Jr., Paterson, N.J.
Robert J. Lehnhausen, Peoria, Ill.
John V. Lindsay, New York City, N.Y.
Theodore R. McKeldin, Baltimore, Md.
John W. Potter, Toledo, Ohio.
Kenneth A. Schmeid, Louisville, Ky.
A. V. Sorensen, Omaha, Nebr.
Edwin W. Wade, Long Beach, Calif.
George C. Whitmer, Des Moines, Iowa.
Charles W. Wright, Jr., Topeka, Kans.
Clarence E. Vollmer, Wichita, Kans.

HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS GREET PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN MEXICO AND TEXAS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, another tremendously enthusiastic exchange of visits has taken place between President Johnson and President Diaz Ordaz of Mexico.

The Chamizal question—an issue in dispute for almost 100 years—has been resolved amicably and in a spirit of international cooperation.

Political, economic, and other relations between our two countries have never been better.

The feeling between the American people and the Mexican people has grown in depth and in warmth.

The enthusiastic reception of last weekend given to President Johnson as he visited Juarez and El Paso was something to behold.

Mexicans and Mexican Americans know that President Johnson has a deep personal sympathy for things Mexican.

They know that he has personally lived with the hopes and the frustrations of the Mexican and the Mexican American citizen.

And they know that he respects the proud tradition of the Mexican people, as we all do.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of being a member of the President's party as he attended the formal ceremony ending the Chamizal dispute.

I also had the pleasure of seeing the President attend one of the first Mexican American meetings sponsored by the U.S. Government in El Paso.

It was a magnificent day all around.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD editorials and news stories from prominent newspapers commenting on the enthusiastic reception received by both Presidents in Texas and Mexico this past historic weekend:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 29, 1967]

Johnson and Diaz Formally Settle Boundary Dispute—Two Chiefs Arrive in Juarez and Transfer 437 Acres of Territory to Mexico—Agreement Is Hailed—U.S. President Terms Pact a Shining Example of How To End Border Quarrels

Juarez, Mexico, October 28.—President Johnson and President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz arrived here today to complete the settlement of a 100-year-old border problem.

The Air Force jet that brought the two Presidents from Washington touched down at El Paso International Airport at 10:45 A.M. Under almost cloudless skies, they rode together through El Paso and her sister city, Juarez, to dedicate the 437-acre El Chamizal area as Mexican territory.

The occasion was the formal exchange of land provided for in the Chamizal Treaty of 1963. A hundred years ago a flood forced the Rio Grande from its course, giving birth to a land dispute that has troubled the two countries ever since.

BORDER IS REALIGNED

Now a man-made channel for the river between Juarez and El Paso has realigned the border.

President Johnson, in remarks prepared for the ceremony, hailed the agreement as testimony to what two nations, working together, could accomplish.

The political atmosphere at the border was as balmy as the weather.

President Johnson said that "too many times the world has seen disputed boundaries changed through force."

"El Chamizal," he added, "stands as a shining example of how such matters should be settled."

AN INSPIRING SYMBOL

On both sides of the Rio Grande the crowd gave the Chief Executive a warm welcome.

The 500,000 residents at Juarez, the chief beneficiary of the territorial agreement, took the day off. Many of them witnessed the transfer.

For nearly a century, President Johnson noted, Chamizal "stood for dispute and disagreement between the United States and Mexico."

"Yet," he said, "in the last four years it has become—for both our peoples—an inspiring symbol of friendship and mutual respect. An old argument has ended. More importantly, a lasting bond had been forged between our two countries. This is a proud achievement."

President Diaz Ordaz said much the same. Mexico and the United States, he declared, "know that they can discuss their problems openly and clamly to find their solution within a frame of equity and justice."

"They also know," he added, "that any international conflict, whatever its magnitude, can be solved when the parties involved sit at the table of reasoned and reasonable discussions.

"The Chamizal, an old symbol of differences, is today an expression of comprehension. It has the value of the triumph of law, of reason and of justice. I am sure I am not mistaken in believing it might reach universal significance."

SPOKE AT MONUMENT

The two Presidents spoke at an elaborate marble monument built by Mexico as a memorial to the border agreement.

On the base of the center portion is the sculptured face of the 19th-century Mexican leader Benito Juárez, with a quotation: "The law has always been my sword and my shield."

The Presidents signed a document noting the ceremony and the territorial cession.

RIVER CHANGED COURSE

The land dispute began when the Rio Grande, which separates this city from El Paso, Tex., began to change its course shortly after an 1848 treaty fixed the river as the boundary between the United States and Mexico. Its gradual course southward added some 600 acres of scrub and thicket to El Paso and cast a cloud over relations that was not finally dispelled until today.

The area was called El Chamizal after the Spanish name for the thickets that cover the land. The dispute became an emotional issue in Mexico, which had lost a vast amount of territory to the United States after the war of 1846.

In 1910, the two countries agreed to arbitration by a commission consisting of one member each from the United States, Mexico and Canada. A year later, the commission said that the areas that had been left on the El Paso side when a flood in 1864 receded should rightfully belong to Mexico.

UNITED STATES REJECTED FINDING

Washington rejected this finding, saying that the exact extent of the area before the flood had never been surveyed and that the boundaries should continue to be wherever the river ran in its deepest channel.

For more than half a century, the atmosphere was bitter because the United States had refused to abide by the arbitration. Despite the disputed ownership of the territory, Mexicans built homes, schools, factories and stockyards in it and ran rail lines through.

The first break came when President Adolfo Lopez Mateos raised the issue when President Kennedy visited Mexico City in 1962. They agreed to reach a settlement through negotiation.

In July, 1963, a settlement was reached. It called for a transfer of land between the two sides, with Mexico gaining 437 acres.

ACRES ARE DIVIDED

Cordova Island, a bit of high ground within a loop that the river makes, was divided in half, the northern part of 193 acres going to the United States and a like amount in the southern part going to Mexico. In addition, Mexico got 366 acres on the western side of the Cordova area and 264 on the eastern side.

The Rio Grande has been rerouted to conform to this transfer and its new channel is being lined with concrete to prevent future waywardness.

President Johnson symbolically turned over the land to Mexico in September, 1964, but three years were needed to make the physical arrangements for the effective transfer that took place today. These arrangements are now close to completion.

The United States agreed to reimburse and relocate the 3,700 United States citizens living in what is now Mexican territory. This is believed to have cost about $30 million. The buildings are being bought by a Mexican bank from the United States Government for $4,676,000. The costs of rechanneling the river and of replacing six bridges are being borne equally by the two governments.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 28, 1967]

Good Neighbors—And Frank

The sixth meeting of President Johnson with President Diaz Ordaz of Mexico could almost serve as a model for visits between neighbors who like and respect each other but occasionally disagree on important questions.

At the climax of Mr. Diaz Ordaz's visit today the two Presidents will also furnish the world with an example of how to resolve serious differences. They will fly to the border to participate in the formal transfer to Mexico of 437 acres along the Rio Grande, once in bitter dispute.

Meanwhile, on his first visit to Washington, Mr. Diaz Ordaz has made constructive use of the free speech practiced by both countries. In an appearance before the Organization of American States he criticized the O.A.S. for not always serving "the high ends for which it was created." He also made an indirect plea for coexistence with Cuba and thus a defense of Mexico's diplomatic ties with the Castro regime.

In his speech to Congress, Mr. Diaz Ordaz obviously intended a polite questioning of American policy in Vietnam with his remark: "the eventual risks of peace are infinitely less than the positive perils of war."

Mexico's President could make such a point in Washington in the sure knowledge that he would not damage his Government's relations with the United States or his unusually cordial personal relations with Mr. Johnson. Washington and Mexico City long ago agreed to disagree cordially about Fidel Castro and a few other hemisphere questions and get on with essential cooperation in other areas. The visit of Mr. Diaz Ordaz will bolster that cooperation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 28, 1967]

Good Neighbor

As President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz made clear in his address to yesterday's joint session of Congress, Mexico is unhappy with some aspects of our government's international economic policies. The grievances include the fact that his country must pay higher prices for what it buys than the prices it gets for what it sells in the United States. But this and related problems—including restrictions on American tourist spending—are relatively minor, and they are being dealt with in a friendly spirit that promises mutually satisfactory solutions in due time.

Relations between our two countries have never been better. We have come a far way from those days, not so very long ago, when bitter hostility was about all that the Mexicans and the Yankee gringos had to offer each other. The bright change that has since taken place is strikingly illustrated by the flight Presidents Johnson and Diaz Ordaz have made together today to El Paso. This puts a ceremonial end to a century-old territorial dispute. It also serves as an excellent example of good neighborliness worthy of emulation around the world.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 30, 1967]

Johnson Relishes One Bright Spot—Continued Friendship With Mexico

(By Peter H. Silberman)

San Antonio, Tex., October 29.—As both presidents Johnson and Diaz Ordaz have repeatedly pointed out in the last few days, no major disputes exist between the United States and Mexico. Nor are there likely to be any soon.

Indeed, the entire Johnson Administration has been marked by cordial—one could say intimate—relations between the two countries.

This was reemphasized Saturday by the tumultuous reception Mr. Johnson received in Juarez as he drove through the streets with Diaz Ordaz. It was also clear from the cordial talks held in Washington on Thursday and Friday.

President Johnson enjoys the kind of personal diplomacy such occasions provide and as he pointed out himself, he has held more such talks with foreign statesmen than any of his predecessors.

But, too often lately, the rapport the President relishes and works hard to achieve has been missing. Worse, a few of his visitors have used their stay in Washington to issue thinly veiled criticism of the Administration's Vietnam policy.

The latest was Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore. Others have fired from a distance, making it even more difficult for the President to use his vaunted powers of persuasion.

Therefore, at a time when the Administration's foreign relations are in turmoil, the obviously harmonious ties between the United States and Mexico are doubly important to Mr. Johnson.

One or two unkind critics have suggested that this is the reason for the overly fulsome ceremonies that marked the signing of the Chamizal land transfer. But Mr. Johnson's love affair with the Mexican people and its leaders predates his current troubles. It goes back, as he recalled Saturday, almost 40 years to the days when he taught Mexican-American children in Cotulla, Tex.

It has resulted more recently in frequent exchanges of visits between Mr. Johnson and President Diaz Ordaz. The latter visited Mr. Johnson at the LBJ Ranch while he was still president-elect of Mexico. Mr. Johnson, in return, turned an informal visit to Mexico in April, 1966, into a personal triumph when more than 2 million persons turned out to cheer him in Mexico City.

Mr. Johnson called it the most wonderful reception he had had anywhere in the world.

It can be assumed he was equally pleased with the spontaneous and friendly crowds in Juarez Saturday, although the domestic political rewards are not likely to be great.

The demonstrations of affection across the border could help Mr. Johnson with the large American-Mexican population in the Southwest, although the President's credentials with most of them are already impeccable.

But few politicians can withstand the thrill of the roar of the crowd—even in a foreign country.

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is scheduled to vote on the Air Quality Act of 1967, S. 780.

This bill provides many significant advancements in Federal assistance to local communities in combating air pollution. This Federal assistance, together with the research, control, and enforcement authority given to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, should go a long way toward giving us cleaner air.

The bill as it was reported out of committee has, however, one major and most dangerous flaw—it precludes the States from setting standards controlling emissions from motor vehicles. Instead the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to set nationwide standards which can be varied in specific localities only by special order of the Secretary after going through an elaborate procedure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all recognize that air pollution is a problem which confronts the entire country. But photochemical smog produced mainly by automobile emissions is a problem which in some States, like California, has reached desperate proportions, while in other States there is not a significant automobile emission pollution problem at all. These differences from State to State, or even from county to county, point up the essentially localized nature of the automobile smog problem. An average standard in this case will be one which will not fit anywhere.

It is, of course, easier and cheaper for the American automobile industry to produce just one type of car with just one type of air pollution control device. But the entire air pollution control effort is designed to assure that products used in particular individual environments are safe in that environment. These environments vary from place to place. Automobile usage patterns, geography, climate, and weather conditions vary. If automobile caused air pollution is to be controlled, it will have to be controlled by a locality-by-locality basis.

California must have more stringent standards than the 1966 national standards, for example, or else by 1975, automobile caused smog will render the Los Angeles basin uninhabitable. The cost in lives, discomfort, and displacement would be beyond belief. We must pass a bill which will leave the people of California and of every State to set automobile air pollution standards which are sufficiently stringent to meet their greater-than-national needs as they themselves determine, even if those standards are considerably more stringent than the Federal standards.

The gray-brown pall of smog has been known to visit even the Oakland hills in my district. It must be controlled. The people of California, where the problem is worst, are trying the hardest to solve it, and we should be allowed to continue this lifesaving effort.

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Meeds] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Air Quality Act of 1967, the passage of which I believe to be a matter of the greatest urgency. Four years ago President Johnson signed into law the Clean Air Act, and launched a national attack on air pollution. Since that time, in 1965 and again in 1966, we have amended the Clean Air Act to redouble our efforts. But as President Johnson pointed out to us early this year, we have made no more than a good first step in the right direction. In his January 30 message to the Congress on air pollution, in which he recommended adoption of the Air Quality Act, the President indicated the pressing need for action when he said:

> The economic loss from pollution amounts to several billions each year. But the cost in human suffering and pain is incalculable. The situation does not exist because it was inevitable, nor because it cannot be contolled. Air pollution is the inevitable consequence of neglect. It can be controlled when that neglect is no longer tolerated. It will be controlled when the people of America, through their elected representatives, demand the right to air that they and their children can breathe without fear.

If your mail bears any resemblance to mine, you will agree with me that the people of America are now making that demand.

I do not predicate the advantage of passing the legislation we have before us on the belief that it will work miracles. We are faced with a problem too long neglected, too pervasive, and of too vast proportions to expect that one bold and determined stroke will make it vanish. No. We are faced with a long and gruelling struggle with a problem about which our knowledge is anything but complete. If we are to succeed in the struggle, we must not only attack the problem head on, right away, but we must also delve into its mysteries and master them.

In his message, the President recommended that the funds which had been appropriated under the Clean Air Act for research to solve these mysteries be very substantially increased, and he asked for cooperation in finding the answers from the private sector of the economy. He said:

> An enlightened government will not only encourage private work toward that goal, but join and assist where it can.

He summed up when he said:

> America's air pollution problem emerges from our success as a modern nation. Sources of pollution may be environmental villains—but they are also social and economic necessities. Our task is to determine how to abate the poisons they pour upon the air, without seriously diminishing the benefits they provide. Surely this is not beyond the capacity of a great nation's productive and scientific genius. Clearly, it is an absolute necessity for the health of the American people.

I urge you, my fellow Members, to vote for the Air Quality Act of 1967 and thus help put us on the road toward clean air.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN THOMAS G. MORRIS ON HELIUM CENTENNIAL YEAR

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I am today introducing, on behalf of myself and my colleague in the House from the State of New Mexico [Mr. Walker], a House Joint Resolution 917 designating the year 1968 as "The National Helium Centennial Year," and requesting the President of the United States to issue an appropriate proclamation to this effect.

The year 1968 marks a double anniversary for helium. In the year 1868, an Englishman, Sir Joseph N. Lockyer, first discovered helium as a new element of matter. However, it was not until 50 years later, in 1918, that helium was extracted from natural gas in the United States and Canada in other than laboratory quantities.

I will not take the time to recount the vital uses which have already been made of helium during the intervening years. However, I believe we are standing at the threshold of an era in which this material will make even greater contributions to our national security and welfare, in our nation's nuclear, electronic, space, and underseas technology efforts.

Moreover, an understanding of the story of helium is essential to our understanding of the problems and goals of natural resource conservation and development. Through a combination of public and private institutions working together, we have made great strides in preventing the waste of this extremely valuable natural resource. We must—and can—profit by the example set with helium, in dealing with other pressing conservation problems.

Accordingly, I join with my distinguished colleague in urging prompt enactment of this joint resolution. It is my sincere hope that, following enactment of this resolution, there will be appropriate actions taken by representatives of Government, industry, and others in keeping with the occasion. In particular, I am hopeful that the commemorative celebrations will include events in which our school children can participate in my State and throughout the country. I believe it would be desirable if technical and scientific meetings were sponsored, in this country and abroad, at which the characteristics and importance of helium were reviewed. I further understand that consideration is being given to the erection of one or more monuments and exhibits pertaining to helium, as well as the possible issuance of a commemorative stamp.

I commend these and other efforts in furtherance of this occasion.

FLATHEAD INDIANS LAND CONSOLIDATION

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk of the Clerk a bill to authorize the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., to deal with a problem concerning isolated tracts of tribal land within the reservation. These are small tracts of tribally owned land which are wholly surrounded by non-Indian ownership and at the present time have little use or value to the tribes. The tribes do maintain an aggressive land-consolidation program; and if they were authorized or empowered to trade these lands for lands which fit in the approved land-consolidation program on the reservation, or sell these lands and use the proceeds to purchase lands within the tribal consolidation area, affirmative good to the tribes would result.

The bill identifies the particular tracts with which the tribal council would be authorized to deal. The tribal council feels that specific listing of the tribal tracts authorized for disposition is advisable in order to calm the concern which would be felt by many of the tribal members if blanket authority were given to the tribal council to deal with tribally owned lands.

Under an act of 1904, the Flathead Reservation which theretofore had been held totally in tribal ownership and which was largely devoted to large horse and cattle herds was authorized to be allotted in small parcels to the members of the tribes in severalty and the balance thrown open to non-Indian acquisition. This was disastrous to the Indian community, since no Indian could maintain a herd on a small 80-acre tract. It has taken more than half a century since the reservation was thrown open to non-Indian purchase under a Presidential proclamation in 1910 for the Indians to make their way back to a substantial grazing enterprise. At the present time, Indian stockmen's associations are effectively using tribal lands in building an enterprise of their own. This bill would aid that self-help through making available to the tribes useful lands in place of the present small, isolated tracts which at the present time are substantially valueless.

I endorse the purpose of the Indians of the Flathead Reservation to better themselves in this respect and am happy to introduce the measure on their behalf.

CIVIL LAWLESSNESS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, a lot has been written in the newspapers about the disgusting spectacle staged around the Pentagon recently as a so-called anti-Vietnam protest. It has not escaped everyone's attention that it was promoted by the lunatic fringe of the left-wing and participated in by all the known and suspected Reds, aided by bathless degenerates, deluded juveniles, and even some renegade members of the clergy.

For once, even the liberal press was repelled by the spectacle and so the Nation was afforded a fairly accurate picture of what took place and who took part. The responsible press, of course, did their usual good job of reporting and editorializing.

The Shreveport Journal, for instance, summed it all up with an editorial on "All Civil Lawlessness" on October 23. I would like to present it here for every Member to hear. It strips the issue of illegitimate lawlessness of all its ivory-tower pedantry and what shows as the core of it is revolting to any man who believes in government by sane law rather than individual irresponsibility.

The editorial referred to follows:

Civil Lawlessness

Reprehensible as they were, the organized anti-Vietnam War protests in some 30 cities this past week should have shocked nobody. Tragically, the nation has been conditioned to the flouting of law by civil rights groups and their leaders.

Civil disobedience, first practiced in this country in modern times by the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., has reached dangerous proportions. The longer it is tolerated for any purpose the harder it will be to bring it under control, as it will be inevitably.

Certainly, demonstrators who burn draft cards, desecrators of Old Glory and those who create disturbances at induction centers ought to be punished. But also the persons who inspire antipatriotic acts deserve condemnation even if they violate no law.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has correctly observed: "Those who espouse the theory of civil disobedience and authorities who free guilty violators must share a portion of the blame and responsibility for the turmoil in our streets."

That responsibility extends into the pulpits of many churches, into classrooms and lecture halls of numerous universities and colleges, into the offices of certain privately endowed, tax-exempt foundations and into the federal government. The Johnson Administration and Congress are not free of that responsibility.

A brazen example of an appeal to young men to refuse to accept military service appeared in the form of an advertisement in the Oct. 7, 1967, issue of the New Republic. Entitled "A Call to Resist Illegitimate Authority," the statement asserts that the United States is the aggressor in Vietnam and violates international agreements and treaties as well as the Constitution. A one-world view, presented in this document, holds that the United Nations Charter has the same authority as the Constitution, and that the United States is obligated, by having ratified the Charter, to avoid the use of force in international disputes. Apparently, those who devised this statement would have Americans believe that the United States renounced its sovereignty when it accepted the terms of the UN Charter.

U.S. military forces in Vietnam are accused in this advertisement of destroying crops and livestock, of burning entire villages of civilians, of summary executions of civilians and of killing peasants who dared shake their fists at American helicopters. How pleased the Kremlin and Peking propaganda machines must be to know their material is being used by Americans against Americans.

Boldly the advertisement declares: "We will continue to lend our support to those who undertake resistance to this war. We will raise funds to organize draft resistance unions, to supply legal defense and bail, to support families and otherwise aid resistance to the war in whatever ways may seem appropriate." In the light of the protestors' lack of concern for the American forces who are now assigned to Vietnam, "appropriate" probably means anything the protestors can get by with.

The advertisement concludes with these words: "We call upon all men of good will to join us in this confrontation with immoral authority. Especially we call upon the universities to fulfill their mission of enlightenment and religious organizations to honor their heritage of brotherhood. Now is the time to resist."

This perfidious statement endeavors to furnish moral justification for just such disorders as those at the University of Wisconsin, in which 65 persons were injured, and at the Northern California Induction Center in

Oakland. Since this advertisement charges the United States with atrocities against Vietnamese and totally ignores the savagery of the Viet Cong against civilians and military captives, the reference to "brotherhood" is an insult to the intelligence, a travesty on "good will toward men."

Clergymen—Protestant, Roman Catholic and Jewish—and educators are among the signers of this advertisement. As would be expected, the names include those of the Rev. William Sloane Coffin of Yale University, Bishop James A. Pike of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, the Rev. James Bevel, who used to be field secretary for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and of many other persons prominently identified with liberal causes. These signers are not ignoramuses—in fact, most of them are regarded as intellectuals. Surely they must recognize the difference between dissent and incitement to disorder.

It is inconceivable that mature adults cannot see that civil disobedience is indistinguishable from lawlessness and mob rule. Americans who continue to encourage and abet disorders deserve the contempt of the public.

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in recalling the years of dedicated public service performed by former Senator Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, who died last week at the age of 84.

Alex Wiley was a man with the capacity to grow in the course of his public service, a man with the courage of his convictions, who at the same time stood ready to give a fair hearing to those with opposing views.

He showed his mettle in adhering to a policy of internationalism during the postwar era despite the political peril of this position resulting from opposition within his own party.

Alex Wiley deserves an honored place in our memories for his contributions to the establishment of the St. Lawrence Seaway, which benefits Wisconsin, the Midwest, and the entire Nation. Appropriately, one of the seaway canals bears his name.

I am proud to have served with Alex Wiley and to have known of his good works. I extend my condolences to his wife, Dorothy, and to the members of his family.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK, GREAT SPEAKER AND LEGISLATIVE CAPTAIN

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, many great leaders have served as Speaker of the House of Representatives, but none has surpassed the present occupant of the chair, the Honorable John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, in ability, dedication, and legislative achievements.

Mr. Speaker, we, your friends, recognize you as a great leader, a great captain of our legislative ship of state. You have guided the Congress through many great moments to many momentous decisions. Under your able and distinguished leadership, the 89th Congress established a legislative record unequaled in our history.

Never before has a Congress faced up to the challenges of our Nation to the degree and to the extent that the 89th Congress fulfilled its responsibilities and commitments. This record of the passage of much forward-looking and progressive legislation was established in large part because of your leadership and because of your knowledge and skill and experience.

You showed the way—and the Congress followed.

The great equalizer in this Nation, Mr. Speaker, is the electorate. And the American people have chosen to send to the 90th Congress many Representatives who do not fully share the philosophy of compassion and progress that was the hallmark of the 89th Congress. This Congress is slower to act—harder to move.

This is the basic reason for a slower legislative pace during the current session of Congress. The opposition is larger as conditions have changed. Notwithstanding this situation, you have continued to show great skill in pushing ahead and moving ahead—and the problems we are having are not of your making. You, Mr. Speaker—as our leader—have made great progress in spite of prevailing difficulties.

And so I congratulate you for your achievements, your dedication, and your compassion. You, Mr. Speaker, have a heart as big as the Capitol dome. You are a great American; a great Democrat in the elemental sense of the word; a believer in democracy and progress for our people.

History will record John W. McCormack as one of the greatest congressional leaders of our time—and of all times—and the record of his achievements will be written in the great legislative record of the Congresses which you led as Speaker.

Speaker McCormack is fair, firm, and forceful; a leader of honor, courage, and great ability; a leader with qualities of judgment and reason that defy serious challenge from any source. And so, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and congratulate you and say that the great majority of this House appreciates you, appreciates your great leadership, and appreciates your dedication and devotion to our country.

THE FLAME OF LIFE BURNS IN BETHLEHEM, PA.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the city of Bethlehem, Pa., have earned for themselves an award of national distinction which I feel deserves mention in this Chamber.

The distinction is the coveted Flame of Life Award bestowed upon Bethlehem last week in Chicago by the National Safety Council. Regarded as the Nation's highest award for safety, the Flame of Life was presented for Bethlehem's outstanding record in preventing accidents.

Bethlehem was the only city in the Nation to receive this award for overall safety achievement during 1966. Bethlehem is only the 10th city ever to receive the Flame of Life.

The award was earned by communitywide practice of safety and a safety-consciousness which has been generated in every aspect of community life.

As a citizen of Bethlehem and as the city's Representative in Congress, I am proud that Bethlehem's accident prevention efforts have saved human lives. There is nothing more tragic than a life lost because of an accident.

Local newspapers in my congressional district commented on this achievement editorially within the past week and I include two editorials in the Record at this point:

[From the Bethlehem (Pa.) Globe-Times, Oct. 26, 1967]

Community Triumph

The Flame of life award bestowed upon Bethlehem last night is regarded as the nation's highest safety honor. Every citizen of the city, from housewife to steelworker, is entitled to enjoy the satisfaction of this national tribute.

No single segment of the community earned this citation, but it was the city's collective record that stood out. As Mayor Payrow remarked in accepting the Steuben-designed symbol, "it took all kinds of people of Bethlehem to kindle the flame."

Bethlehem takes safety seriously. Starting with its excellent school programs, which include pedestrian and driver education, the community works at safety in many different ways. It is instilled at Bethlehem Steel where hard hats and safety shoes are a mark of every steelworker. A Bethlehem Steel department of professionals works constantly to keep the practice of safety a science. They have proved long ago by reduction of lost time on the job that this kind of talent pays dividends in many ways besides saving lives or limbs. Safety is also a science with the police and fire departments. Their preventative efforts seldom are dramatic reading but the influence of well-trained firemen and policemen is reflected in the city's traffic and fire record. On top of this, organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce and the Lehigh Valley Safety Council maintain year-around programs which directly and indirectly add to the general safety consciousness of the community.

A torch burns tonight from the Hill-to-Hill bridge in honor of Bethlehem's national triumph. It is a fine way of symbolizing those lives that still live because so many in the community cared. It is a fitting tribute for the city's anniversary year. By setting the highest national standards for safe living, Bethlehemites have reaffirmed an important part of their heritage. They showed again they care not just about themselves, but about one another.

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, Oct. 27, 1967]

Bethlehem: A Safe City

The award Bethlehem received from the National Safety Council is more than a coveted badge of honor. It is very definite recognition that this proud and progressive Lehigh Valley city is one of the safest communities in America in which to live and work.

To win this distinction took years of doing. Good government, including adequate enforcement of reasonable regulations and meaningful city ordinances, helped. So did industrial safety programs, like those long promoted by Bethlehem Steel, and the continuing efforts of many community organizations.

But the record that won this top national award is the combination of what the people of Bethlehem have been doing on their streets, in their homes, at their work benches and while they play. To them safety no longer is simply a collection of tired slogans, warmed over speeches and columns of statistics. It has become the practiced way of staying alive in an age of increasing speed and mechanization.

PROPOSED PANAMA TREATIES AND GARBAGE COLLECTION

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on various occasions, I have emphasized the vital importance of sanitation in the Canal Zone and the terminal cities of Colon and Panama in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal and its subsequent operation. From 1904 to 1955 the Canal Zone Government was responsible for sanitation not only in the zone but also in the two terminal cities; and this service was efficiently performed.

In the 1955 treaty the United States gave up its responsibility for sanitation in those cities to the Republic of Panama. The result has been a dismal failure by Panama in collecting garbage from the streets of the terminal cities; and residents in the isthmus have complained repeatedly concerning not only the accumulations of refuse in the streets but also the increase of rat population that feeds upon it. Yet our Government, in the recently published canal treaties, proposes to surrender U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama, which is unthinkable from the viewpoint of sanitation as well as that of hemispheric defense.

The latest news from the isthmus with respect to the collection of garbage is that the municipal government of Panama City is considering having this important task performed by foreign firms, one Japanese and the other Dutch. Should sovereignty over the Canal Zone be surrendered to Panama, who will perform the function of sanitation?

A news story on this subject from a leading Panamanian newspaper follows:

[From the Panama (Republic of Panama) Star & Herald, Oct. 9, 1967]

Foreign Firm May Collect Garbage Here

Two foreign concerns are reported interested in bidding for the garbage collection service in Panama City under contract with the municipal government. One of these is a Japanese firm and the other a Dutch corporation.

The garbage collection problem has been before the municipal authorities for some time with complaints coming from all sides because of the deficient service being rendered. Several plans have been proposed recently, including the establishment of a special municipal tax to cover the cost of the garbage collection service. However, none of these plans have been considered an effective solution of the problem.

Now that foreign firms are reported interested, the Municipal Council at its last meeting approved a resolution appointing a special committee to make a thorough study of the question with a view to negotiating a possible contract with the foreign firm offering the most favorable conditions.

Serving on this committee will be the chairman of the Municipal Council, the chairman of the Municipal Health Board, the chairman of the Municipal Treasury Committee, the Municipal Auditor and five other councilmen to be appointed by the Council chairman.

According to reports, the foreign firms interested in garbage collection service here are planning to use refuse collected for the production of fertilizers and other industrial purposes.

ELOQUENT SPOKESMAN FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, at the National Press Club on the 24th a great moving address was delivered by the Honorable Abba Eban, Foreign Minister of Israel. Foreign Minister Eban, I believe, is the most eloquent spokesman on the world's stage today; his addresses are reminiscent of Winston Churchill. He not only speaks with moving eloquence but with persuasive logic and convincing sincerity. Today as he articulates the hopes and fears of Israel, whose almost miraculous return to a glorious place in the sisterhood of states, he rises to heights of speech which commands unmeasurable respect and acclaim.

Mr. Speaker, I include Foreign Minister Eban's address at this place in the Record following my remarks for the information and the edification of my colleagues and my countrymen:

Address of Abba Eban, Foreign Minister of Israel, National Press Club, Washington, October 24, 1967

Mr. Leroy. Ladies and gentlemen, greetings and welcome to another luncheon of the National Press Club, to hear an outstanding speaker, and before I present this gentleman, I'd like to present the head table. Thank you.

On my left, a gentleman who spoke here earlier in the year, the distinguished Ambassador of Israel, His Excellency, Avraham Harman. On my right, the Minister of the Embassy of Israel, the Honorable Ephraim Evron. On my left, the President of the Middle East Institute, Ambassador Raymond A. Hare. Ambassador Hare. On my right, of the District Court of General Sessions, Judge Milton S. Kronheim, Jr. On my left, from the United States District Court, Judge Alexander Holtzoff. And, on my right, a member of this club, and the author of many books, including the "The Caine Mutiny", "Marjorie Morningstar" and others, Mr. Herman Wouk. On my left, another member of the club, good friend of the club, the Counselor for Press and Information of the Israeli Embassy, Mr. Dan Pattir.

In the audience, two members of the House, the gentleman technically called Congressman, but often called Senator, which he was for a long time, Mr. Claude Pepper. At the same table, Congressman Michael Feighan. Also, I believe at the same table, although I'm not certain, the President of the Rabbinical Council of Washington, Rabbi Harry Silverstone.

Also, in the audience, the Deputy Assistant Secretary—Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Huntley, that gentleman to your right. Also, from the—also from the State Department, Mr. Rutgers Davies, I believe is in the audience.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you—most of you know, if you've been near a radio or TV set or wire service this morning, ground fighting has broken out on an apparently appreciable scale, at various points along the Suez Canal. A UPI bulletin, of not very long ago, said fighting has broken out between Israeli and Egyptian forces across the Suez Canal. An official army spokesman said today—he said it was continuing. There have been various bulletins during the morning.

Our speaker today has spent, I don't know how long—I think an hour or more, with Under Secretary of State, Nick Katzenbach. He came here direct from that conference. At 5:30 today, according to the AP, he has an appointment with President Johnson.

The first appearance by this gentleman at the club, according to club records, was November 21st, 1950. The State of Israel was new, only two years old.

He made, on November 21, 1950, 17 years ago next month, he made his maiden speech to this club and to the world, in his new role as U.S. Ambassador to Washington. He made it at this club at the specific request of Prime Minister David Ben Gurion. It was a great debate, apparently, in the club, at that time, between the club's officers of that year, because they wanted to be prepared for any eventuality. And the great question was: Would this gentleman speak, in Hebrew or Yiddish? They wanted to be prepared to translate in either. And, of course, the answer was, that he spoke then as he will speak today, in very excellent articulate English.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, the Honorable Abba Eban.

Hon. Abba Eban. Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Leroy has presented me to you in objective terms, with which I am in substantial agreement. I am grateful for this because it is no small matter, for a working politician to emerge unscathed from an encounter with the press. After all, the relationship between pressmen and politicians is at best, a relationship of unilateral belligerency. Our chances of survival are not equal, and there is much more beneath the surface than meets the eye. For example, you are my friends and my hosts, on the other hand, each one of you harbors, in the secret recesses of his heart, the hope that I will commit some sensational and ruinous indiscretion. Let us, therefore, know clearly where we stand, and sustain our friendship in the spirit of realism.

Certainly, your presence here in such large numbers this afternoon bears witness to the deep interest which Israel's struggle for survival and peace, has evoked in the public sentiment of this country and the world. It has been my vocation in recent months, to interpret, to international tribunals and to world opinion, the recent dramatic stages of this struggle. Let us remember with what suddenness and with what drastic speed, the crisis developed. If you had taken a photographic record of our thinking in the early part of May, this year, you would have found us still dedicated to the hope and belief. that the relative stability that had prevailed for 10 years, could continue to exist.

It is true that there was always a fragile impression in Israeli-Arab relations. It is true that none of the normal safeguards of international coexistence had yet been secured by these states of our region. It is true that we had established our life for 10 eventful and dynamic years upon slender political foundation. Yet, the decade that elapsed between 1957, when the Sinai Campaign came to an end, and May 1967, was a decade in which Israel's preoccupation was not concentrated on survival and defense alone, they were years of swift progress in the development of the country's economy, society and culture. They were years during which Israel became deeper and deeper in the affection and trust of the international community.

It was a decade in which beyond our existing relations of friendship with the republics of the American continent and most of the states of Europe, we developed Israel's most modern and significant vocation, that of illustrating for the emerging and developing nations of the world, the processes of accelerated development.

Many small nations throughout the world drew courage from the example, by which a small state proved its capacity to reach a respected level in intellectual, scientific progress and in social innovation. And, thus, we kept a close eye on Arab aggression without being obsessed by it. Resisting it only, when failure to resist would have brought about its intensified renewal. Hoping, that the sheer prolongation of the relative stability of that decade would open the way to more affirmative relationships.

There was every evidence that the avoidance of confrontation with Israel in an out and out attempt to destroy its sovereignty prevailed at certain times in the minds of neighboring statesmen, President Nasser, especially, had shown a capacity to combine rhetorical violence with practical prudence. We heard, of course, from across the frontier, the speeches, by which he announced that at the first opportunity, he would bring about our complete extinction. But, speeches do not always break bones, after all, only once in all human history has a wall crumbled at the sound of a trumpet, and that incident was not to Israel's disadvantage.

The situation became substantially and gravely different when rhetoric was translated into action, when it became plain that the vision of Israel's elimination was not merely a mystic hope, but had suddenly become an element of practical political intention. Thus, in mid-May, the clouds began to gather, thick and fast, and within a period of less than three weeks, our country had passed from the impression of relative security to the deadliest of all the dangers that it has ever confronted, the danger of its physical extinction, and the total and irrevocable elimination of its independence.

Nobody who lived in Israel throughout those dark and turbulent days will ever forget the air of apocalyptic doom. Here were 90,000 Egyptian troops in Sinai, the greatest army ever gathered in that peninsula since the beginning of history. Nine hundred tanks, of which the advanced units were less than two hours from Tel Aviv. Airfields whose commanders had been, as was subsequently revealed to us in documents, instructed precisely in the targets which they were to attack; Israel's pathetically few airfields, and the dense concentrations of population in the coastal plain. Two hundred tanks were poised in the South against the port of Elath. The design was clearly to cut off the Southern Negev from the main body of the state. Forty five thousand Syrian troops, glowered from the hills down upon the Israeli farming villages in Atta, Galilee and the Jordan valley.

The Jordan Government, which on the 30th of May, had concluded a treaty of encirclement with Cairo, had deployed its forces with a capacity to strike swiftly, both against Jerusalem's population and across the entire tortuous and vulnerable coastal front. An illicit blockade had been imposed in Southern waters, cutting Israel off from all maritime contact with two thirds of the world, a lifeline that Israel had constructed for friendship and peace and commerce across the Red Sea to the nations of East Africa and Asia, had been cut and with it, ninety percent of our vital fuels had been prevented from reaching us.

From Algeria to Kuwait. From Saudi Arabia to Morocco. Across the entire Arabic speaking world, contingents were converging upon us, in order to take part either militarily, or at least, symbolically, in this great event, which as President Nasser confessed at the end of May, had beyond all expectation, and in advance of all prediction, come suddenly into the realm of fulfillment.

Now, this was the peril that we faced, and we faced it alone. At least it was obvious that we had nothing between ourselves and the prospect of annihilation, except the sacrifice and the discipline and the defensive resolve of our people.

International commitments were, because of the world power balance, given their most restrictive interpretation. The specific promises of the maritime powers were clearly not going to lead to any effective action, in time to prevent Israel from being encircled and overwhelmed. Some of the maritime powers, as you will remember, disappeared across the horizon in varying degrees of prudence, and rapidity, most of them refusing even to join with a United States proposal, reaffirming the international character of the waterway. Few are still willing to join with you in effective action to bring that commitment to fulfillment.

The United Nations was revealed, unfortunately, at the very lowest depths of incapacity in the Middle East itself; it fled from the arena like a fire brigade running away at the first smell of smoke. At United Nations Headquarters, there took place a debate of such inconclusiveness as to constitute a mockery of our impending disaster. For nothing during those days of discussion was done, and very little was said, which could hope to sustain or even console Israel in the forthcoming ordeal.

Thus, international commitment, maritime promises, United Nations' responsibility, all in the testing hour, proved to be either, fragile, illusory, or far less effective, than could ever have been imagined. The same was true of, what was called, the hope of Arab moderation. By this, we meant the hope that certain regimes, and especially that of Jordan, would refrain from associating itself with President Nasser's sudden reckless design. This hope was frustrated, when on May the 30th, the Jordan monarch concluded a treaty of encirclement with Nasser. And when, on June the 5th, he ignored and rejected one message after another, which offered him the chance of remaining aloof from the conflict then being waged on the Egyptian-Israeli front.

I bring these memories back to your consciousness, not in the spirit of academic research, but because they are the very foundation of Israel's thinking and of Israel's policy today. The public mind in our country is dominated, not only by the memory of military victory, but far more, by memory of the peril and the solitude which preceded it.

Out of this there emerges our steadfast resolve to insure that never, never shall Israel again find itself in such a position of danger and vulnerability. This is the consideration, which in our policy, takes precedence over all others.

I should not, of course, discuss the military solitude, in which we found ourselves, without reference to some elements of solidarity and consolation. Rarely, in all history has world opinion been so agitated and tormented as it was in those weeks by the serious prospect that a state would be destroyed. From New York to Tokyo; from Montevideo to Amsterdam, in the cities of Scandinavia, and in remote parts of Africa, thousands of people stood in silence outside Israel's embassies and legations, expressing a deep, if sometimes impotent identification with us, in the ordeal that had been threatened, for what was at stake was not only the destruction of a state, but of the state, whose name evokes the deepest spiritual memories of mankind, and a state which itself is nothing but the last refuge and sanctuary and consolation of a people which had already lost six million of its sons in the greatest orgy of hatred and violence, which had ever convulsed the spirit of man.

Well, from these dangers Israel emerged in six unforgettable days, from the prospect of disaster to successful and gloriest resistance. We now face the results and the consequences of these transitions, accompanied, as we must always be, by the memory of the peril that went before.

The cease fire agreements were concerted at—by the end of June. For sometime, it has been possible to maintain those agreements intact on some of these fronts. The events of the last 48 or 72 hours, prove how much attention and thought and preoccupation must be given, even to the maintenance of this provisional stability, quite apart from the broader necessity to move toward a more stable and durable peace.

The sinking of the destroyer Elath on the high seas, has carried our indignation to the highest peak, since the cease fire was ratified in early June, for this aggression committed against Israel on the high seas illustrates the urgent need for a radical change in the structure of relations between the Middle Eastern states. Could I suppose have been anticipated, that this success with its heavy toll of life, would continue to inflame the passions of our southern neighbors and impel them to try their luck again, with further firing across the canal. Thus, the first message that I received this morning was one which announced that they were firing across the canal, and that the Egyptian press is full of macabre jubilation about the range and the heavy intensity of the losses in life that Israel has sustained.

It's still my hope that the cease fire situation can be rapidly restored and that the events of the last 48 or 72 hours can be localized and prevented from spreading. But, this very situation shows how urgent it is, not only to deal with the cease fire eruptions, but also to effect a radical change in the structure of relations between the Middle Eastern states. There have been many books and articles written about the events of last June. I sometimes feel that too many books have been written about too little too soon, but certainly, the idea of a six day war requires modification. There has not been a six day war; there is a 19 year old war, that has been in existence and the question is whether it will continue to exist or whether it will be brought to an end by treaties of peace.

Our policy is that the cease fire situation can only be changed by specific public and contractual commitments signed by the parties face to face in conformity with established international tradition. The old Middle Eastern structure, which President Nasser decided to disrupt last May cannot be restored. It has been shattered too violently and too thoroughly. It cannot be rebuilt, it must be replaced, this time by a stable and durable order, to finding the new political, juridical, territorial and security relations between Israel and her neighbors. This, then is our policy. We shall maintain and respect the cease fire situation until it is replaced by a new situation, based on peace treaties, committing and engaging the states of the Middle East to peaceful coexitsence, and to finding the precise term in which that coexistence shall go forward.

There is no other policy. No other enlightened line of contact has been suggested. The only other alternative is that proposed by Prime Minister Kosygin at the recent Emergency Session of the United Nations, and supported by the Arab states. Their formula is that the best way to get peace is to reproduce the precise conditions which led to the war. They seek a return to the situation which prevailed on June the fourth. This we cannot accept. We shall never, never go back to the political and juridical anarchy, or to the strategic and territorial vulnerability from which we have emerged. What must now be done is to build a new structure of relations by the hands of the sovereign countries of the Middle East itself.

We must take seriously the statement signed by Israel and her four neighbors in 1949, that the armistice lines, and I quote, "Dictated by exclusively military considerations are not to be regarded as political or territorial boundaries". We now insist on the agreed determination of the political and territorial boundaries which we have never known. After 20 years, it is time that each state of the Middle East had agreed, secure, permanent frontiers. Until the new peace map is negotiated, the present cease fire map will be fully maintained, for the June the fourth situation with its explicit conditions of irredentism, non recognition, impermanence, one sided belligerency, is gone forever; the times call for constructive innovation, not for patchwork settlements, corroded by belligerency and shattered by Nasser's deliberate violence.

It would be totally irrational to renew any of the conditions which brought Israel to the brink of disaster and which plunged the Middle East in war. Our country lost more dead in six days, proportionately to its population, than has the United States in all its military engagements since 1945. Since we will not dishonor that sacrifice, we cannot accept a settlement which falls short of a stable, contractual and durable peace. The Arab states are asking the world community to pretend that they have neither provoked or conducted nor lost the war, and that the revolutionary lessons of last June can have no consequences.

Now, this irrational idea of restoring the situation, the explosive situation of last June has been rejected by world opinion. It was this idea, which when presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations was emphatically and repeatedly dismissed. World opinion wants to see a new system and a new structure of relations in the Middle East. It does not wish to build a bonfire again, waiting for the next match to ignite it.

In peace negotiations with each Arab state, we shall make viable and reasonable proposals, conducive to the welfare and the honor of each one of the neighboring states, for our mood is not dominated by victory. It is penetrated by the desire to live together in that Middle East, reviving the best traditions of cooperation between the Arab and Israeli nations, which have contributed so much to the Mediterranean adventure and have made such a deep impact upon the thought and the spirit of mankind. This then, is our policy; To maintain and consolidate the cease fire reality, to be vigilantly and actively ready at any time to replace the cease fire situation by a new situation, which we call peace.

The new situation must differ from the previous one in two respects: In the political and juridical respect, and in the security territorial respect. By the political and juridical aspect. I mean that we must have not truces and cease fire agreements or armistices, but peace founded on contractual engagements. I do not, of course, mean yet peace in the emotional sense. It may be some time before past bitternesses can be allayed, although I do hope that if peace in the juridical and political sense that we envisage can be established, it will lead to affirmative cooperation.

Beyond the mere establishment of peaceful relations, I envisage the possibility of intensive economic and social integration between the sovereign states of our region, similar to the most enlightened examples of super-national cooperation that have taken place in the world, and especially within the European community.

Anybody who looks at the map can see an objective vision of Israel and some of her closer neighbors, cooperating, each within the framework of its complete sovereignty in the concerted development of our common region.

I'm sure that this vision, which might now sound utopian is destined to be fulfilled. There is a rational element in the policy of our neighbors to which we appeal. What is to be gained by the maintenance of provisional cease-fire, or truce situations? What has been gained by 20 years of belligerency? Everything has been tried. War has been tried three times, with tragic and sterile results. Intermediate situations between war and peace have been tried—cease-fires, armistices, truces. These have sooner or later erupted into explosion.

One thing alone has not yet been tried. Peace has not yet been tried. We, therefore, submit to our neighbors and to the world the idea of an experiment in peace.

It is—finally I feel that it is not possible to make an absolute distinction between political principles and diplomatic procedures. We cannot condone the idea that the Arab states are entitled to ostracize Israel, while making claims against her; to request Israel's consideration for their proposals while denying Israel's very existence.

That is why direct negotiation is not just a matter of mere procedural form. It is a matter of political and moral principle. It is the refusal to come face to face with Israel's deep roots in the Middle East. This is the origin of this conflict. The pretense that we do not exist, or that if the imagination is sufficiently exerted and stretched, we might somehow disappear—the intellectual unwillingness to understand, whether reluctantly or not, that Israel is deeply rooted in the Middle Eastern reality in its past history, in its present reality, and in its future destiny. The deep and authentic roots of this people in the soil of that land—this is a fact which our neighbors have so far refused to seize.

They have presented us as a provisional and transient phenomenon of history. Nothing could be further than the truth. Of the 122 nations in the international family today, there is one and one alone which speaks the same tongue, lives in the same land, upholds the same faith as it did 3,000 years ago. The refusal to understand the mysterious continuity of this connection, and of its renewal in modern times lies at the root of the Middle Eastern tragedy.

Therefore, to confront each other is essential. After all, they meet us face to face on the field of battle. Let them meet us face to face at the conference table.

If any—if any international representative, or friendly government believes that it can bring the Arab Governments and Israel into direct and unconditional contact, we shall, of course, applaud its efforts. But no peace has ever yet been made between those who refuse to set eyes on each other, because that's—that is why we interpret the refusal to meet as a refusal to make peace. And that is why the existing reality must be maintained until all Middle Eastern states recognize the compulsions of a future to be shared in peace.

I do not believe that the horizon is empty of hope. I believe that a candid analysis of these 19 years of experience will, in due time, bring about a convergence of Arab and Israeli minds towards the necessity of peace, and even regional cooperation.

It might take some time—I hope not too long a time—for these realistic patterns of thought to come to expression. It is here that world opinion has a decisive role to play. It should be brought to bear upon all the states of our region, not in an attempt to dictate the specific conditions of their coexistence, but to urge upon them the imperious historic necessity of changing the old for the new, replacing belligerency by peace, replacing a state of war by neighborly coexistence, replacing the emphasis on armaments with an emphasis on development, replacing the intensive importation of arms with the intensive importation of tractors, and of the instruments and machinery for industrial and agricultural development—above all replacing the mood of rancor, hostility, and nonrecognition by an attempt to probe the common elements, and the common values in the Hebrew and Arab traditions, in order that we may construct on the shores of the Eastern Mediterranean a civilization worthy of its ancient and medieval past.

Thank you.

Mr. LEROY. Thank you, sir. Ladies and gentlemen, a partial prepared text of the Ambassador's remarks will be available at this ballroom door as you go out. Much of what he said was ad lib and it will not—obviously, that text will not be a complete record of what he said. It will be somewhat of an outline. I would ask—I would make one request, however: Because of the extremely large number of people we have, I think close to 500, perhaps a little over in this ballroom, would you please refrain from taking one of those until, quote, "working press", unquote, has had the opportunity to get one, because some of those gentlemen do need them today.

I failed to introduce, inadvertently, one gentlemen who was very helpful on all the arrangements that had to be made today. He's on my right. He's immediate past President of the American Friends of Hebrew University and a long, long, time member of this club, Mr. Dave Berger.

Mr. Ambassador, I have several questions that, at the start, that are in the nature of a sort of status quo question or situations. Would you tell us first, what is the legal base—legal basis for the existence of the Israeli Nation? What importance did the Balfour Agreement have in the formation of Israel?

Mr. EBAN. Well, I interpret that question as an invitation to come here and give an hour's lecture at some future date.

The Balfour Declaration is now 50 years old, and it was the first document which inaugurated recognition of the right of our people to establish a homeland. But, the legal basis for Israel's existence today, is the legal basis for the existence of all the 120—122 nations in the international family, namely that we do exist, that our existence is ratified by our membership of the organized international community; that we are members of the United Nations and of all its specialized agencies; that the vast majority of the sovereign states of the world recognize our statehood and have established diplomatic, economic and cultural links with us. Therefore, the existence of Israel is not a matter of controversy.

I should say that we are right to exist. Our right to exist is independent of their recognition of it. A declaration by them that they recognize our right to exist would, evoke a courteous declaration from us, that we recognize their right to exist.

The recognition of a right to exist is not a negotiable concession. What we ask for, then, is not recognition of right to exist, but the consequences that flow from our statehood, namely action to translate belligerency into non-belligerency; peace into war, and boycott into cooperation.

We believe that the establishment of the new situation to replace the cease fire situation requires not only recognition, but action.

Mr. Leroy. Mr. Minister, would you kindly reiterate for us the population comparisons between the belligerent Arab nations and Israel? In round numbers.

Mr. Eban. Well, the nations with whom we have a contiguous frontier, have a population of some 80 million, or those which actively participated in the hostilities, 80 million against two and a half million.

The community of Arab nations as expressed in their summit meeting, is much larger, it reaches some 100 million. This, of course, is both an important element in the judgment of the situation, and one of the elements in the understanding of our future. It is rather strange to portray this two and a half million people in this small piece of land, as having constituted a threat to a nation which has hundreds and thousands of square miles of territories, and 100 million people. A nation 500 times our size in territory and about 50 times our size in population. But these comparisons also indicate why I said that Israel cannot regard any temporary victory as stable until it has achieved its ultimate aim, namely the establishment of affirmative relations of mutual acceptance and cooperation between Israel and the Arab world.

Mr. Leroy. In view of Soviet assistance to Egypt, can you visualize the situation in which Port Said or Alexandria will become a second Haiphong, that is, a privileged sanctuary from bombing?

Mr. Eban. Well, whenever I hear of analogies between international conflicts, I close myself with that valor, of which discretion is the better part. But, I don't believe that the parallelism exists, I will say only one word about Soviet policy. Certainly, the one sided and unbalanced Soviet policy, both of rearmament and in the uncritical support of Arab policies, played a very vital and disturbing role in the situation that led to the conflict. We could have wished that we had diagnosed, in current Soviet policy, a substantive change; it is not easy to say that this has existed.

First of all, the first Soviet appearance in the Middle East after the conflict, was to give a new lease of life to the arms race. And, secondly, the Soviet Union has not supported any proposal in international tribunals or organizations which show any balanced consideration for the interest of Israel, on the one hand, and the Arab states on the other.

Mr. Leroy. Sir, do you not feel, that world economics dictate, the reopening of the Suez Canal, by force, if need be?

Mr. Eban. I think we shouldn't underestimate the economic importance of the Suez Canal, but we should not, as the question does, exaggerate its importance.

There are alternatives to the Suez Canal. The Suez Canal is simply a technical device for linking the Red Seas to the Mediterranean. Now, the alternatives are, first of all, to use the other routes between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, name the route across the Gulf of Elath, which is open and which I hope will soon become more economically significant through our decision to build a larger pipeline which would enable oil to be exported from the Mediterranean.

Secondly, the construction of large tankers, which in any case, couldn't have navigated the Suez Canal, has made many countries in Europe less dependent upon the Suez oil route than they were, and the Suez Canal was predominantly an oil route. I think that if the Canal remains closed, it will have, perhaps, short term effect on the economies of certain countries, but they would actually be well advised in the light of what has happened in 1967 and in 1956, to make themselves less exclusively dependent upon this single ditch. I think the countries of Northern and Western Europe, to some of whose ministers I spoke, understand, that while they hope for the reopening of the canal, they will never again, make themselves dependent on it, to the extent that they have been so far.

Mr. Leroy. Many people in this country assume that King Hussein is a force for moderation. Do you agree with that analysis?

Mr. Eban. Well, here we have a memory, and we have a reality, and now we have a hope. The memory is of a period when we ourselves, had this definition, and therefore, I must confess that we were both surprised and disillusioned by the events of May the 30th, the treaty in Cairo, and June the 5th, the active and unprovoked participation in the war. Whatever the motives in his mind was for this tragic decision, it certainly shattered a belief, a tenet of policy, which we and many other governments had upheld.

So, the fact is, and let us face it, that the hope that this moderation would express itself has been shattered. There is now the reality. We still do not know what the Jordan Government's policy is on the problem of peace. Will they accept the idea of renegotiating their relationships with Israel, this time on the basis of permanent peace or not? That's a question, which of course, should be addressed there.

We hope that the lessons about the sterility of conflict in the war will have impressed themselves upon the Jordan Government, as with all other governments. They will seriously examine the opportunity to replace the rancors of the past by a new future, and to express their relations with Israel in the form of contractual and fire peace treaties. But, this is a hope, and whether this is their policy, is a matter that can only be elicited from them.

Mr. Leroy. Would Israel agree to talks with the UAR under the chairmanship of the United Nations' officials?

Mr. Eban. We believe that the only way to make a transition to a new future is for direct talks between Israel and each of its neighbors. Now, if the situation is that the United Arab Republic is willing to have talks with us, but would prefer to have the presence of a third party, when that situation arises, I will address myself to this question. But, that is really not the issue, the issue is that so far, they have not accepted any device or technique or modality, which involves a direct confrontation with us.

We are willing to discuss with them, by any agreed procedure, the matters which divide us today, and the necessity to reach peace agreement. The essence of it is that our contacts should be direct. Other matters are technical.

Mr. Leroy. Mr. Minister, did you mean that you would cross that canal when you got there?

Will Israel ever peacefully relinquish control of Jerusalem? Is there any factual basis for British news stories that plans are under way for the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem?

Mr. Eban. Apparently, I've fallen behind in my reading of the British press. I haven't seen such a proposal. There is no such proposal. The Temple in the Jewish theology is a great memory, but it's a plan for any future development.

Our attitude on Jerusalem has been outlined many times before the United Nations, and but, for the benefit of those few of you who don't have television sets, I will bring my views to your attention.

We—first of all, the change that took place on June the 5th, took place because of the decision of Jordan. Jordan had occupied the old city of Jerusalem as a result of a military conquest carried out in June, 1948, against the decisions of the international community, and Jordan's rights in Jerusalem had never been permanently or juridically recognized by any nation, not even by the Arab nations. Nevertheless, the status quo would have continued if he hadn't disrupted it.

As a result of the events in Jerusalem, which were very dramatic in their tragedy and in the volume of bereavement which ensued, the destruction of the institutions of learning and culture; a new situation has developed which differs from the previous situation in three respects: The city instead of being divided is united; instead of being crossed by a military frontier, it is at peace; and instead of being a scene of desecration and religious discrimination, as it was, not one single synogogue was left standing, and access to the oldest of the holy places was not granted; instead of this there is access to the holy places for all. And, a willingness by Israel to accept responsibility by the universal interests concerned for the administration of the holy places. I think the first time that any government in the position of control has offered to exchange the unilateral and exclusive assertion of its authority in the holy place, for agreements with the universal interests concerned.

Therefore, instead of division, there is unity. Instead of war, there is peace. Instead of sacrilege, there is sanctity. I don't see why these are not to be regarded as improvements in the Jerusalem situation. Now, we do not say that nothing remains to be negotiated about Jerusalem, and we still think that the administrative situation that I've described does not preempt the final settlement of the universal interests which is attached to Jerusalem.

And, the formula which your own government used in the Presidential statement of the 19th of June, indicates what our general policy is also, namely that the status of the holy places is a matter to be reached by agreement with those concerned.

Mr. Leroy. Sir, this question has reference to the six-day June war. We had reports of a recorded telephone conversation between Nasser and Hussein, regarding U.S. participation. Is there such a recording in existence, and if so, why is it not given more publicity and attention?

Mr. Eban. There is such a recording in existence, I've listened to it myself. I've listened to it with some experience of listening to those two voices before, and I've no doubts about its authenticity. I'm astonished by the concepts of security which enabled it to take place. It is true that these two heads of state committed themselves very irrationally and recklessly to the idea that there had been United States and British military participation in the fighting.

My question is that this was greeted with skepticism everywhere, and I understand that they themselves have relinquished it. I believe that this was an effort to prove, perhaps to their public opinion, that Israel alone could not have been so successful in resistance. If you asked why isn't it given more attention, it is because I don't think that the thesis about American and British participation in the hostilities is really seriously accepted anywhere.

Mr. Leroy. Sir, tell us what you think of the public and private position of the U.S. State Department, vis-a-vis the Middle East, now and in the past.

Mr. Eban. I think you now understand what I meant by opening remarks. I don't accept the assumption that there is a conflict between public and private positions, but if there are private positions, I don't feel competent to make them public. As for the public position, and this is an important fact, the public position of the United States

Government is embodied in a document of—an unusual document—the President's speech of the 19th of June. And, it has been publicly stated, and privately, that this remains the guiding line of the policy of the United States in the Middle Eastern conflict. That document is formulated on a high level, both of lucidity, and of statesmanship, and its main elements are those which stress the need for innovation, just to recall, what are in the Israeli views, is the most important points, not to go back to the June 4th situation, but to create a better situation.

The next stage should be not truce or armistice, but peace, and the fragile and violated armistice lines should not be superseded and replaced by accepted and permanent secure national frontiers. And, fourthly, the responsibility for building the new Middle Eastern peace, rests primarily on the states of the region, although they could be helped by outside forces.

Those are the three or four main elements in that address, and although no two governments would ever formulate their positions in identical terms, and we, of course, have views on other things there, we believe that these main principles should be the basis of any forward looking international treatment of the Middle Eastern Crisis.

Mr. Leroy. If peace comes to Israel, will Israel send a token task force to help us in Vietnam?

Mr. Eban. Well, the Israeli position on Vietnam was outlined by me in the United Nations General Assembly on the second of October of this year, about this very hypothetical question of, if peace comes to Israel will Israel send a token task force to Vietnam. I hope by the time that peace has come to Israel, peace will have come to Vietnam as well.

Mr. Leroy. Sir, will you kindly tell us, in general of the foreign aid programs that Israel is now operating for the benefit of other countries?

Mr. Eban. We don't call it a foreign aid program, but we call it an international cooperation program, not only for diplomatic reasons, but because it really is cooperation, that is to say, that we think that we gain in many ways as much as we give, and that there is therefore, a reciprocal element in this program, which is however, of unusual scope. And, Israel has assistance programs, technical cooperation programs with some 58 countries in Africa, in parts of the Southeastern Asian area, and increasingly, perhaps, surprisingly, with many of the American republics.

Some, 2,000—I'm sorry, some 12,000 young leaders of the future communities of these countries have had periods of training in Israel's institutions of learning and science, and in special courses. And some 2,500 Israeli experts, doctors, scientists, nurses, teachers, agricultural specialists, irrigation experts, have worked in more than 50 countries, sharing our accumulated experiences of the pioneering decades.

From here, I shall go to Organization of American States, with whom we have agreements, whereby Israel provides experts, usually financed by institutions of the American system, similarly with the economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, and with the African organizations.

We think that in spite of the preoccupations and anxieties which crowd in upon us, we should develop this international vocation. Development is not merely a problem of small countries receiving aid from rich and powerful countries, a great deal can be done by the cooperation of small countries, each with the other; for so many of them have something in experience or in technological capacity which the others lack, and therefore, this unusual appearance of a small developing nation, in the drama of development, is something which does give a new dimension to Israel's policy. And, we are resolved, provided these other countries wish to accept this cooperation, to maintain and to expand it.

Mr. Leroy. Sir, if you'll answer this next question, we'll promise to keep it off the record, just between us. What do you plan to say to President Johnson this evening?

Mr. Eban. Ladies and gentlemen, until your release from here I can't plan anything at all.

Mr. Leroy. Sir, would you comment on the plan of our former AEC Chairman, Mr. Lewis Strauss, which would set up a giant—gigantic atomic powered desalting plant in the Mediterranean, with the view of giving the Middle East plenty of water and thereby, prosperity, in the hopes it would bring peace?

Mr. Eban. The concept of developing irrigation through nuclear distillation as expressed in this plan has been expressed in other plans, and Israel discussed this with the United States in 1964, and this matter was referred to in the joint statement published by President Johnson and Prime Minister Eshkol. It was decided that our governments would investigate together and carry out such agreed projects, as would illustrate the possibility of making water available through desalination, in order to increase the irrigated areas of the Middle East.

Now, that discussion between our governments is still in active consideration, and feasibility studies have been made, and that is the framework within which Israel considers her plans for desalination. But, we are naturally interested in all other proposals that are being made, and I hope to have a chance of discussing with the initiators of this project, the precise terms of intentions that they have in mind.

Mr. Leroy. Sir, before the traditional final question, I would like to present you with a Certificate of Appreciation for this date. I'm sure you have one or two of these, but you can always use a spare.

And, the official silk necktie of the National Press Club, complete with the owl which screams if you ever say, "No comment" while wearing it.

Sir, I have no idea whether we will receive from the Arab nations a request for equal time to answer your statements today, I have no idea whether I will or not. I rather think though, that this following final question rather guarantees that I will have such a request.

Here's the question, Washington delicatessens are now featuring an item called the Nasser Sandwich, half tongue and half chicken. Will this be part of any future technical assistance program you might have for Egypt?

Mr. Eban. You may quote me as saying, no comment.

Mr. Leroy. Thank you very much.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Annunzio (at the request of Mr. Ronan), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. Eshleman, for Wednesday, November 1, and Thursday, November 2, 1967, on account of attendance at graduation ceremonies of eldest son from Parris Island Marine Corps basic training.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Pepper (at the request of Mr. Gonzalez), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Harvey during debate on H.R. 12144 and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Gude) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Horton.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gonzalez) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Corman in two instances.
Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Tuck.
Mr. Nix.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Zablocki.
Mr. Philbin.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1186. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 1, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on the "Great Lakes Harbors Study—Final Report," requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18 and June 27, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 178), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 114. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases (Rept. No. 870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 8718. An act to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 871). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13669. A bill to amend section 2734 of title 10 of the United States Code to permit the use of officers of any of the services on claims commissions, and for other purposes, to amend section 2734a of title 10 to authorize the use of Coast Guard appropriations for certain claims settlements arising out of Coast Guard activities, and to amend section 2736 of title 10 to authorize advance payments in cases covered by sections 2733 and 2734 of title 10 and section 715 of title 32 involving military claims (Rept. No. 872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 423. An act authorizing the use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI: Committee on Public Works. S. 1552. An act to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966; with amendment (Rept. No. 874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 3639. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to consolidate certain provisions assuring the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 6692. A bill declaring a portion of Bayou Lafourche, La., a nonnavigable waterway of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 876). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2138. A bill to amend section 319 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit naturalization for certain employees of U.S. nonprofit organizations engaged in disseminating information which significantly promotes U.S. interest, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 877). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13653. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 13768. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to permit the free entry of certain cellophane membrane; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 13769. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13770. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 13771. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 13772. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 13773. A bill to amend the repayment contract with the Foss Reservoir Master Conservancy District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 13774. A bill to authorize a study to determine the feasibility of deepening the Jacksonville Harbor, Fla., to 45 feet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 13775. A bill to permit persons discharged from the uniformed services before October 1, 1949, for service-connected disabilities of 100 percent to apply for and, if qualified, be awarded retired pay under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 13776. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 13777. A bill to increase employment opportunities for individuals whose lack of skills and education acts as a barrier to their employment at or above the Federal minimum wage and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself and Mr. Steiger of Arizona):

H.R. 13778. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to preserve the integrity of the original agreements and amendments in the area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 13779. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 13780. A bill to provide for sale or exchange of isolated tracts of tribal lands on the Flathead Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (for himself, Mr. Lennon, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Downing, Mr. Dow, Mr. Karth, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Clark, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Keith, Mr. Reinecke, Mr. Edwards of Alabama, Mr. Schadeberg, Mr. Roth, Mr. Pollock, and Mr. Dellenback):

H.R. 13781. A bill to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. St Germain, and Mr. Stephens):

H.R. 13782. A bill to amend section 221(h) of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.J. Res. 915. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.J. Res. 916. Joint resolution in opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS (for himself and Mr. Walker):

H.J. Res. 917. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the year of 1968 as the National Helium Centennial Year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.J. Res. 918. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. Con. Res. 563. Concurrent resolution providing that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should submit a resolution to the United Nations for final and binding improvement of peace in Southeast Asia in accordance with the appropriate article of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STANTON:

H. Con. Res. 564. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H. Res. 961. Resolution to urge the President to release the highway trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 13783. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto Caburian DeVera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 13784. A bill for the relief of Francesco Castello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13785. A bill for the relief of Chester L. Stona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 13786. A bill for the relief of Rafaele Bove; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13787. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cavaliero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 13788. A bill for the relief of Virgilio Lazaro Domingo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13789. A bill for the relief of Hiroyuki Furukawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13790. A bill for the relief of Chuan Chang Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13791. A bill for the relief of Tao Shel Mah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON (for himself, Mr. Pike, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Kluczynski, Mr. Nedzi, Mr. O'Konski, Mr. Pucinski, Mr. Rostenkowski, Mr. Zablocki, Mr. Don H. Clausen, and Mr. McMillan):

H. Con. Res. 565. Concurrent resolution expressing the thanks and appreciation of the Congress and the American people to Col. Francis S. Gabreski, U.S. Air Force, for his courageous services to his country; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 566. Concurrent resolution expressing the appreciation of Congress and the American people to Korean war air ace, Col. Francis S. Gabreski; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

196. Mrs. BOLTON presented a petition of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association stating "Be it resolved that this association, which is charged with responsibility for the preservation of the home of George Washington and dedicated to the perpetuation of his memory, does hereby urge the Congress to retain his birthday, February 22, as a national holiday. This Nation honors him as its First Citizen, preeminent in several roles; not merely as one among many who, by political coincidence, held the same office. To sink the celebration of the birthday of George Washington in a 'President's Day' would destroy the meaning and significance of the day," which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, give us open minds this day to receive Thy guidance. Enlighten dark paths that are before us. Reveal Thy will in the knowledge of new light for this day. Give us the courage to change our minds when that is needed. Make us tolerant of others, for we never know in what voice we may hear Thy voice.

Be with those who suffer and die today because of the evil of war. Keep our ears open, dear Lord, to the clear voice of peace for all men. We pray in the name of Jesus, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of John Harold Fanning, of Pawtucket, R.I., to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10915) to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10915) to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 30, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS HARRIS AND CARLSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] be allowed 30 minutes today, at the conclusion of the transaction of morning business, to engage in colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] on the subject of social security.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S.-ADMINISTERED TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, three recent articles in the Nation's press serve as a timely reminder that all is not well in the U.S.-administered Trust Territory of the Pacific.

Frank McCulloch, with an article in Time magazine, and Robert Trumbull, with two in the New York Times, have painted an accurate picture of the needs of nearly 100,000 people who are dependent upon the largesse of the United States for their well-being. It is a depressing picture—not only for the outward conditions which meet the eye, but also for the history of neglect which reflects harshly on this great Nation.

The authors are two of the most respected reporters in the Pacific area. They tell the story of certain islanders who talk with nostalgia of Japanese rule. They tell of the inhabitants of the islands of Bikini and Eniwetok who were uprooted by our atomic testing program and now live with hunger on tiny islets which cannot support them. They tell of roads which tear vehicles to pieces, and of ship transportation so sporadic that traveling dentists have only time to pull a few teeth before their commercial vessel is loaded and moves on.

It is true that gains have been made, Mr. President. Large numbers of Peace Corpsmen have been introduced. The islands have been given new leadership. There are stirrings of economic activity in the field of tourism. But the basic problems of education, health, transportation, and jobs remain. And they will remain until Congress sees fit to provide the money to do the job.

The administration has requested substantial sums for the development of Micronesia, and the Interior Committees of both Houses of Congress have authorized an adequate program. However, Congress refuses to appropriate the necessary amounts. It is my earnest hope that the administration will include in the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1967 those funds which will be sufficient to do the job and that Congress will treat any such request sympathetically.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles be inserted at this point in the RECORD: "Micronesia," by Frank McCulloch, from the November 3 issue of Time magazine; "Micronesia: 2,141 Islands Forgotten by United States," and "Pacific Islanders Often Go Hungry," by Robert Trumbull, from the October 30 and 31 issues of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time magazine, Nov. 3, 1967]

MICRONESIA

A SPRAWLING TRUST

Micronesia's 2,141 islands are so widely dispersed over 3,000,000 sq. mi. of cobalt-blue Pacific that Magellan sailed through their very midst without sighting a single one. In their glittering lagoons and rain-forested redoubts, the Japanese positioned their power to control all the Pacific in World War II—and the U.S. fight to thwart them made a litany and legacy forever of such unlikely flecks on the map as Kwajalein, Eniwetok, Saipan, Tinian and Peleliu. The *Enola Gay* roared off from Tinian to drop the A-bomb on Hiroshima; years later the shock waves of the world's first H-bomb tests rolled out from Micronesia, denuding the little atolls of Bikini and Eniwetok. Today, Nike X antiballistic missiles zoom up from Kwajalein in test interceptions, and Atlas and Titan missiles from California end their long trial runs with gigantic splashes in the Kwajalein lagoon.

HARSH BUT EFFECTIVE

Almost unnoticed in the vitriolic debate over the Viet Nam war and the U.S. presence on the Asian mainland is the U.S. responsibility for these sprawling islands. Their 95,000 inhabitants range from the brainy and enterprising Palauans of the Carolines chain to the grass-skirted inhabitants of Yap. After the U.S. took over the islands in a military caretakership of the spoils of war, the United Nations in 1947 bequeathed them to the U.S. as a trust territory. Ever since then, the U.S. has been a benign, if a bit abstracted presence in the vital geopolitical center of the Western Pacific. It is not a duty that the U.S. has performed with any notable enthusiasm, particularly in contrast with Micronesia's previous rulers, the Japanese.

Japan took over Micronesia from Germany after World War I and immediately set about seriously developing and colonizing the islands. Japanese methods were often harsh, but they were vigorous and effective. Koror became a miniature Miami Beach for winter-weary Japanese, a sophisticated city of 30,000 replete with fine restaurants, geisha houses and Shinto shrines. Trading vessels from Japan were soon exporting great quantities of fish, pineapple, sugar and pearls from the islands. The Japanese paved roads, built hospitals and ports and laid down a rudimentary infrastructure for economic growth.

LESS THAN THE NAVAJOS

Today, with few exceptions, Micronesia looks—and is—a poorer place than in the heyday of the Japanese, reports Time Correspondent Frank McCulloch after a five week tour of the islands. Occupying U.S. forces leveled much of what the Japanese built that was still intact after the war. Even what survived was seldom maintained, such as the once excellent water system on the island of Dublon, in Truk lagoon, now rusting in disuse, or the jungle-swallowed road on Badelthuap that once enabled outlying copra farmers and fishermen to bring their goods to market.

Micronesia's plight is not the result of malice or considered U.S. policy but of the islands' place far down on any list of Washington priorities. Supplies ordered through the Department of the Interior can take as long as 16 months to reach the islands, and money for Micronesia is hard to come by. This year Washington has budgeted $14 million for the vast territory, a sum that disgruntled local U.S. officials like to point out is only a fifth of that targeted for a single Navajo reservation in the U.S. The Micronesians' copra and fishing trade hardly enables them to do much to help themselves: the entire trust territory has a gross national product of about $12 million.

But the U.S. performance is not altogether bad, and in some areas is looking up sharply. Four short years ago, for example, there was only a single public high school in all Micronesia; today there are eight. In addition, 325 new elementary classrooms have been built, so that some 20,000 Micronesian children are receiving U.S.-sponsored education; another 5,500 are in missionary schools operated by U.S. Catholics and Protestants. Many of the schools are manned by the 600 Peace Corpsmen who work throughout the islands—a massive invasion in per capita terms that was ordered by President Johnson in 1966.

ROLLER SKATING

The missionaries, mainly Jesuit, are among the most effective Americans in Micronesia. "If you want to get 50¢ out of every dollar, let the government do it," says one U.S. trust-territory officer. "If you want to wring $1.10 out of every dollar, let the missionaries do it." Best known of the missionaries is Father Hugh F. Costigan, who runs the Jesuits' Ponape Agricultural and Trade School, training 160 Micronesians at a time in such basic skills as mechanics, construction and animal husbandry. Another hard-driving missionary is the Rev. Edmund Kalau, a Lutheran and onetime Luftwaffe pilot (now a U.S. citizen), who is building a youth center in his home base of Colonia featuring hobby shops, an art studio, handball and tennis courts and Micronesia's first roller-skating rink.

In his own free-enterprising fashion, Kenneth T. Jones, a big affable North Carolinian who came to the Pacific as a Seabee during the war, is as effective as the missionaries. Jones stayed on in the U.S. possession of Guam, amassed a $10 million fortune in supermarkets, department stores, motels, hotels, a construction company and ranching—and is increasingly spreading out into the nearby trust territories. Next week on Saipan he will open Micronesia's first modern hotel, the Royal Taga. Already booked for months in advance, the Taga is certain to bring tourists and money to Saipan; Jones is offering native Micronesians a cut in the profits through $10 shares of stock in the hotel. But his largest investment in Micronesia's future has been carved out of the jungle on Tinian; a cattle ranch of a planned 7,500 acres, 12,000 head of cattle and an equal number of hogs and chickens.

Perhaps the largest official legacy the U.S. is creating for the Micronesians is the fostering of a slow but steady growth of Micronesian political consciousness. At municipal, district and territory-wide levels, the Micronesians have been taught to elect their own officials and legislative bodies, and to begin to establish the appurtenances of self-rule. So far they are only appurtenances, since the word of U.S. High Commissioner William R. Norwood—and ultimately of the U.S. Congress—remains final law.

Last August, at President Johnson's request, Congress shaped a resolution, now under consideration, that would grant the Micronesians a vote on their future by 1972. Few seem interested in complete independence from the U.S., but the debate leading up to such a vote might well have the beneficial effect of placing Micronesia a little higher on the list of U.S. priorities and increasing its share of U.S. aid and know-how. As World War II demonstrated, Micronesia, the Pacific's heartland, is far too important a part of the world to let fall by default into malevolent hands.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 30, 1967]

MICRONESIA: 2,141 ISLANDS FORGOTTEN BY THE UNITED STATES

(By Robert Trumbull)

SAIPAN, MARIANAS ISLANDS.—Leaders among the more than 90,000 Micronesians under United States rule are demonstrating growing disenchantment with the American administration of the United Nations trusteeship.

Peace Corps workers and other Americans—officials as well as visitors—also voice concern at the conditions they find in the great belt of islands in the mid-Pacific.

"Volunteers fresh out of school arrive out here believing in the American dream of the good life and are shocked to find that the dream is far from reality in the Trust Territory," said James Schmitt of Aurora, Ind., director of the Peace Corps in the Palau district of the Western Caroline Islands.

Many in the islands have also expressed fears that stringent economies ordered by President Johnson in all Federal Departments are jeopardizing long-awaited improvement projects and may dissipate the more hopeful atmosphere induced by the appearance of a new High Commissioner, William R. Norwood of Honolulu, and the infusion of hundreds of eager young Peace Corps volunteers.

President Johnson has also urged that a plebiscite be held by 1972 to determine the island's future, and he is supporting legislation to establish a preparatory commission, the Congress of Micronesia. A legislature with limited powers has set up its own study group in the question despite a widespread conviction among islanders that 1972 is far too early for a vote on whether to be associated with the United States or to be independent.

Americans and Micronesians, interviewed in a month-long tour of 4,000 miles to more than two dozen islands in all six administrative districts of the far-flung Trust Territory, believe that there has been too little concern in the United States for an area considered vital to national security.

Older Micronesians compare the United States administration unfavorably with the pre-war Japanese rule. "This is not the American Government that I observed and studied in the United States," said Amata Kabua, the political leader of the Marshall Islands. He was educated in Hawaii and is a member of the Congress of Micronesia.

Micronesia means "small islands." There are 2,141 of them, flecks of green in an azure sea, in a broad belt about 2,400 miles from east to west and more than 1,000 miles northward from the Equator.

Dotting an ocean expanse as big as the continental United States, they add up to only 700 square miles of land, about half the area of Rhode Island. Only 96 are inhabited permanently.

MOST ISLES ARE ATOLLS

Some, like nearly all the Marshall Islands, are typical atolls: flat, sandy outcroppings, covered with palm trees, atop a ring of coral where a volcanic crater, it is believed, has sunk beneath the sea. On most of them, a boy standing on the beach with a baseball bat could hit a fly ball to the opposite shore.

In contrast, the high islands of the Marianas and the Caroline archipelagoes rise a thousand feet or more in volcanic peaks cloaked with dense rain forests.

The islands have been held in turn by Spain, Germany, Japan and the United States. Much of the area was a scene of crucial action in the Pacific phase of World War II.

USED FOR ATOM TESTS

In 1947, at the request of the United States, the United Nations designated Micronesia a strategic trusteeship, the only one in the world.

This means that the administering power is entitled to use the islands for military purposes. The United States has exercised the right with nuclear tests at Bikini and current antimissile operations at Kwajalein, both atolls in the Marshall Islands.

The Central Intelligence Agency used part of Saipan Island from 1953 to 1962 to train Chinese Nationalist guerrillas. The well-built administrative and housing structures, on a secluded height now called Capitol Hill, became Trust Territory headquarters when the agency departed.

In contrast, the district administrative centers, at Saipan for the Marianas, Koror and Yap for the Western Carolines, Truk and Ponape for the Eastern Carolines and Majuro for the Marshall Islands, present depressing vistas of rusting Quonset huts and other dilapidated buildings of corrugated metal, abandoned by the armed forces as they left the scene many years ago.

"The most beautiful scrap heap in the world," said Michael Malm of Rochester, N.Y., an official recently arrived at Koror, in describing his initial reaction to the ramshackle tin towns that disfigure some of the most spectacular island landscape on earth.

American officials acknowledge that another major blotch on the record is the lack of roads, attributed to budget limitations.

"With few exceptions," said Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, whose department is responsible for the islands, "roads in the Trust Territory are generally deplorable, yet our essential programs of education, health and economic development are clearly dependent upon an adequate road system."

Engineers in the Trust Territory have estimated that the cost of resurfacing major roads would be recouped every four years in the saving on vehicle maintenance and replacement.

SEA TRANSPORT SPARSE

In the Yap Islands, usually described as primitive because most villagers prefer their traditional loin cloths or grass skirts to western garb, the rural roads are among the best in the Trust Territory, because the Yapese maintain them themselves with equipment borrowed from the Government.

Sea transportation, in islands dependent upon ships, is so sparse that the Congress of Micronesia petitioned the Government this year to invite a Japanese line to serve the area.

Movements of private commercial ships that run errands for the Trust Territory Government, in return for a subsidy, are heavily influenced by the hard economic necessity of loading and unloading as quickly as possible in island ports. Health services are at the mercy of schedules for loading copra, the dried coconut meat—used in making soap that is Micronesia's principal export.

"The dentists who serve the islands from ships have time only for extractions," said Robert Law, assistant district administrator of the Marshall Islands and a retired naval officer. "Many teeth could have been saved if there had been more time."

Pending a new airline contract now under negotiation, plane travel in the Trust Territory is limited to two DC-4 propeller-driven planes of World War II vintage and two SA-16 Albatross amphibians. The SA-16's are kept in service because only a few of the islands have usable landing strips. Under the Japanese, the area was dotted with military air bases. These have been allowed to revert to jungle.

A German Protestant missionary who was once a pilot in the Luftwaffe plans to institute what may become an airborne medical service.

The Rev. Edmund Kalau, pastor of the Lutheran mission at Yap, is awaiting the delivery of a six-passenger Cessna with a 1,300-mile range that can land and take off on short airstrips. He plans to use it for medical work in the isolated outer islands of the Yap district.

Such private efforts are helpful, but the main problem is money.

Congress had never appropriated more than about $6-million a year until the Kennedy Administration in 1961 authorized $17.5-million. Under President Johnson the figure was increased to $35-million.

But Congress has never appropriated the authorized amount, nor has it funded an Administration program for spending $172-million on capital improvements—roads and other permanent construction—over a five-year period that was to start this year.

The appropriation for the current fiscal year was held to $23.1-million, and President Johnson's freeze order on new construction and hiring in all Federal departments has affected about $8-million of the total budget—"an absolute disaster for planning," said Deputy High Commissioner Martin Mangan.

PEACE CORPS RAISES HOPE

Among the projects listed for postponement under the austerity program are a territorial vocational school. The lack of the school has been criticized by United Nations inspectors and others as a glaring omission in preparing the Micronesians to be more self-reliant.

Other programs presumably delayed are two new hospitals to replace the substandard makeshift institutions at district centers on Ponape Island and Moen Island, Truk.

New power plants and other machinery to replace hand-me-down equipment, in many cases discarded by the military as worn out, may remain unordered.

But the year-old work of the Peace Corps, now 550 strong and soon to reach 700, has brought new hope to the islanders.

"The United States had done nothing on this island before the Peace Corps came," said the head man of Udot Island.

Volunteers are serving on nearly all the permanently inhabited islands, mostly living with—and like—Micronesians.

"They are the only Americans who eat in native restaurants," a touring anthropologist from Seattle said admiringly.

They are also the only Americans who can converse in any of the nine major languages spoken in Micronesia, with the exception of some missionaries and a few dedicated Trust Territory officials, such as Robert Halvorsen, the District Administrator at Ponape, who came to the islands 22 years ago as a naval officer and stayed.

Peace Corps volunteers are involved in virtually every aspect of Micronesian life.

Tom Brunt, a fledgling architect from Philadelphia, has nearly completed a coral-block school complex on Wonei Island, Truk, that is becoming known as the only American building project using local materials in an imaginative way suited to the tropical surroundings.

Donald T. Bliss Jr., who plans to join a Manhattan law firm when his Peace Corps term is up, remarked that "New York will be anticlimatic" after two years of tutoring Micronesian lawyers of Ponape in the application of a Trust Territory legal code.

A couple of miles from the tin-roofed courthouse where the young lawyer works, Mike Ezzell of Austin, Tex., was coaching a volleyball team while his wife, Peggy, taught children from Kapingamarangi, a Polynesian island with a different language, how to speak Ponapean.

PERFORM DOUBLE DUTY

The largest number of Peace Corps volunteers are English language instructors, but they are found working also as nurses, X-ray technicians, civil engineers, radio operators, surveyors, recreation directors, business specialists and in community development activities of all kinds.

Peace Corpsmen who came to the Trust Territory from stations in newly independent countries of Africa and Asia were astonished to find the Micronesians almost totally lacking in the fervent nationalism seen in other peoples brought under colonialism.

We will be ready for a plebiscite on our future status only after the islands have become more developed," said Thomas Remengesau, the Assistant District Administrator in Koror, capital of his native Palau Islands.

"We should remain a trust territory until all six districts decide on a common destiny, which may take 10 or more years," said Petrus Mailo, a hereditary chief and leading politician and businessman of Truk.

Francis Nuuan, who represents his native Yap in the Micronesian Senate, laughed when asked about the general reaction to President Johnson's proposal for a plebiscite by 1972.

"Only the few Micronesians who can read English are even aware of such things," he said.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 31, 1967]

Pacific Islanders Often Go Hungry—Natives, Shifted by United States for Atom Tests, on Tiny Islets

(By Robert Trumbull)

Majuro, Marshall Islands.—Many of the natives of Eniwetok and Bikini, evacuated from their homes for the United States atomic tests two decades ago, are now going hungry for weeks at a time.

Their plight is confirmed by American officials here in Majuro, the administrative center of the Marshall Islands in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, a United Nations trusteeship under United States administration.

"Yes, we are often hungry," Naptali, a native of Eniwetok, said in an interview here. A Government construction worker, he lives with his wife and child in a one-room beach shack made of corrugated metal sheeting.

Nearly 300 people of Eniwetok now dwell on the atoll of Ujelang, which has 32 islets with a total land area of about a third of a square mile, not large enough to feed them.

Eniwetok, the atoll from which they were evicted, has 40 islets with a total area of 2.26 square miles. More important, to people who use coral reefs as marine gardens to produce food, the Ujelang lagoon is only about one-sixteenth the size of the 388-square-mile lagoon that they were forced to leave.

The people forced to leave Bikini by the 1946 atomic tests are even worse off. Their new home, a lonely outcropping in the Pacific wastes called Kili, has no lagoon at all. Rough seas have often prevented ships from landing supplies, or removing produce for as long as four months, according to official reports.

"As soon as the scientists find that there is no more radioactivity at Bikini, we all want to return," the Rev. Josaia, the Protestant pastor on Kili, told an interviewer.

Meanwhile, the 277 Bikinians on Kili augment their sparse income by handicraft, specializing in a bag of finely woven fiber lined with matting.

"Their only hope is to go back to Bikini," said Dr. John A. Tobin, a Trust Territory anthropologist who has spent much time on the island. "They'll never make it on Kili."

The Eniwetok people transplanted to Ujelang are so far off the normal Marshall Islands trade routes that staple food supplies often run out weeks before a ship appears, said Naptali, the Ujelang man now working at Majuro.

"At such times we have had to live on coconuts, fish and arrowroot," he said through an interpreter. "It's no good telling us that our ancestors lived on this kind of diet, for we have been accustomed to imported rice and canned foods in the Marshall Islands for generations," he added.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1391. A bill to cancel certain construction costs and irrigation assessments chargeable against lands of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont. (Rept. No. 691).

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1119. A bill to grant minerals, including oil and gas, on certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 690).

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 5091. An act to amend Public Law 87-752 (76 Stat. 749) to eliminate the requirement of a reservation of certain mineral rights to the United States (Rept. No. 692).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 561. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for Cape Hatteras National Seashore (Rept. No. 694);

H.R. 845. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Nebraska mid-State division, Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 695); and

H.R. 5364. An act to provide for the conveyance of the interest held by the United States in certain real property situated in the State of Georgia (Rept. No. 696).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1946. A bill to amend the repayment contract with the Foss Reservoir Master Conservancy District, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 702).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1321. A bill to establish the North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake National Recreation Area, to designate the Pasayten Wilderness and to modify the Glacier Peak Wilderness, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 700); and

S. 2336. A bill to determine the respective rights and interests of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and the Yakima Tribe of Indians of the Yakima Reservation and their constituent tribal groups in and to a judgment fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 697).

By Mr. HANSEN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 220. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands (Rept. No. 693).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 876. A bill relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education (Rept. No. 703); and

S. 1367. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent terminations of oil and gas leases in cases where there is a nominal deficiency in the rental payment, and to authorize him to reinstate under some conditions oil and gas leases terminated by operation of law for failure to pay rental timely (Rept. No. 698).

By Mr. McGOVERN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 6. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the first stage of the Oahe unit, James division, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 699).

By Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 699. A bill to strengthen intergovernmental cooperation and the administration of grant-in-aid programs, to extend State and local merit systems to additional programs financed by Federal funds, to provide grants for improvement of State and local personnel administration, to authorize Federal assistance in training State and local employees, to provide grants to State and local governments for training of their employees, to authorize interstate compacts for personnel and training activities, to facilitate the interchange of Federal, State, and local personnel, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 701).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence.

AUTHORIZATION FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight Thursday, November 2, 1967, to file its report, together with individual views, on the civil rights bill, H.R. 2516.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON LITTLE DELL PROJECT, SALT LAKE CITY STREAMS, UTAH (S. DOC. NO. 53)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated September 12, 1967, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on Little Dell project, Salt Lake City streams, Utah, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a supplementary convention was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without reservation:

Executive L, 88th Congress, first session, Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery (Ex. Rept. No. 17).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred to as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2599. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto M. Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. Carlson, and Mr. Curtis):

S. 2600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the valuation of a decedent's interest in a closely held business for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Harris when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PERCY (for himself and Mr. Jordan of Idaho):

S. 2601. A bill to increase employment opportunities for individuals whose lack of skills and education acts as a barrier to their employment at or above the Federal minimum wage and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Percy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2602. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to establish the National Law Foundation to promote improvements in judicial administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2603. A bill for the relief of Chun Choi Lam and Tsang Loi Hing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2604. A bill relating to the investment of certain funds appropriated to the State of Hawaii for the support and maintenance of colleges at which agricultural and mechanical arts are taught; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Inouye when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 2605. A bill to provide for the construction by the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, of a high-level bridge over Cowseagan Narrows to connect Wiscasset on the mainland with the northwestern end of the island of Westport, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey;

S. 2606. A bill for the relief of Yung Sun Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2607. A bill to amend Title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pell when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

THE EMPLOYMENT INCENTIVE ACT OF 1967

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in testimony before the Congress late last year, Daniel P. Moynihan, director of the Joint Center for Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard, noted:

> The minimum wage seems to be ominously close to raising the level of unemployment.

At that time, the minimum wage was $1.25 an hour. It has since gone to $1.40 an hour and next February will rise again to $1.60.

The opinion of many economists and the results of numerous empirical studies confirm Dr. Moynihan's concern over the undesirable side effects of rapid increases in the minimum wage. I believe the time has come for Congress to consider the evidence that the minimum wage is contributing to unemployment and underemployment among those most in need of our help. Individuals of low skills, little education, and no job experience are being priced out of the labor market and denied needed and deserved opportunities as a direct result of Government policy. Ironically, this is happening at the very time that the Government is spending billions of dollars to reduce poverty and solve some of the critical needs in America's urban ghettos.

In order to meet this problem and at the same time preserve the minimum wage, I am introducing the Employment Incentive Act of 1967. The bill is being cosponsored by Senator Len B. Jordan, of Idaho, and is being sponsored in the House of Representatives by Representative Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri. Congressman Curtis is also introducing the bill today and including in the Record numerous materials relating to the need for a program of this kind.

We do not claim that this legislation would provide a complete answer to our hard-core unemployment problem. That problem has many causes, and no single solution will respond to all aspects of it. We do believe, however, that selective approaches to meet specific needs can contribute to a solution. This bill represents such a selective approach. It is our hope that the bill will encourage discussion and some thoughtful suggestions for improvements which can be incorporated in the legislation in the next session of Congress.

The Employment Incentive Act of 1967 enlists private industry in the effort to give disadvantaged workers an opportunity to escape the cycle of unemployment and poverty and to begin a new life as productive members of society. It would do this by offering private employers an incentive to hire and train workers of low skill and education at the minimum wage. The incentive would be in the form of a refund to the employer which would approximate the difference between the value of the worker's product to the firm and the minimum wage.

Our estimates show that the gross cost to the Government of employing 100,000 workers for 1 year under this program would be $72 million. Tax receipts from those individuals under the program, as well as reduced Government welfare and unemployment outlays, would bring the net cost to the Government down to about $50 million—or $500 for each individual employed.

This $500 Federal outlay certainly compares favorably with Job Corps expenditures. Last week I visited the Job Corps camp in Chicago operated by the Brunswick Corp. under the able direction of William P. Kelly. While the Job Corps is now much more efficiently managed by such fine American corporations as IBM, Textron, ITT, and Brunswick, and overall are under tighter control than before, nevertheless it is obvious that the cost for each individual in training is still extremely high. In fact, the cost for a Job Corps enrollee is more than 10 times that of the cost for each job under the program I am proposing here today. When you take into account the dropout rate and those who when they complete their training cannot find jobs, the cost ratio is probably closer to 20 times that of the Employee Incentive Act.

In brief, the program would operate as follows:

First. The U.S. Employment Service would certify an individual as eligible to receive an employee certificate for participation in the program if his skill, training, education, or job experience is below that normally required for steady employment at or above the minimum wage. If the individual is unemployed at the time of making application, he or she must have sought employment at or above the minimum wage for at least 5 weeks or longer. Employee certificates shall have a duration of 6 months for unskilled occupations and 1 year for skilled occupations, and they shall be nonrenewable.

Second. Employers shall be certified as eligible to participate in the program by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor. Employers shall be certified if they are covered by the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and if they meet several additional requirements to protect the wages, working conditions, and opportunities for employment of existing and fully qualified workers. The employer must also make available to participants in the program formal or on-the-job training and agree to afford participating employees a full opportunity for employment at or above the minimum wage after the expiration of the employee's certificate. Employer certificates shall be for 1 year, renewable upon finding of continued eligibility by the Administrator.

Third. A certified employer who hires a certified employee shall receive a refund—the minimum wage equivalency refund—from the Federal Government which shall be equal to 40 percent of the minimum wage in effect at that time for the first half of the employee's period of certification. The refund shall drop to 20 percent of the wage during the last half of the period of certification.

Fourth. The act authorizes the appropriation of $72 million for fiscal 1969 for the payment of the refund for the employment of not more than 100,000 certified employees, and of $144 million for fiscal 1970 to provide for the payment of refunds for the employment of not more than 200,000 certified employees.

Fifth. Other provisions of the act guarantee equal opportunity, forbid discrimination of the employment of certified employees, provide for enforcement of the act, and for appropriate reconsideration and review of administrative decisions.

Under the Employment Act of 1946, it is the policy of the U.S. Government that "there be afforded useful employment opportunities for those able, willing and seeking to work." Under this bill, the Government would reduce the effective costs to a firm of low-skill workers to the level of their economic contribution. It thereby would provide the initial impetus for their employment and training. With the skills and experience thus acquired, these individuals would be prepared to stand on their own feet as self-supporting and contributing members of the community. I can think of no objective that is more in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Employment Act or with the needs of our times.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Employment Incentive Act of 1967 be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2601) to increase employment opportunities for individuals whose lack of skills and education acts as a barrier to their employment at or above the Federal minimum wage and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PERCY (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2601

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Employment Incentive Act of 1967."

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to increase employment opportunities for individuals whose lack of skills and adequate education acts as a barrier to employment at or above the Federal minimum wage, and thus to help provide useful employment and training opportunities for individuals who might otherwise be trapped in the cycle of poverty by persistent and recurrent unemployment or underemployment.

MINIMUM WAGE EQUIVALENCY REFUND

SEC. 3. Certified employers who employ certified workers at not less than the minimum wage applicable under section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 shall receive, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, a minimum wage equivalency refund (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "refund") consisting of a portion of the wages paid.

PAYMENT OF REFUND

SEC. 4. (a) The refund shall be paid quarterly to those employers who—

(1) have applied for and been issued employer certificates, as provided in section 8 of this Act;

(2) employ workers holding employee certificates, as provided in section 6 of this Act at least 40 hours per week;

(3) pay certified employees the minimum wage applicable under section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in addition to fringe benefits received by comparable noncertified employees; and

(4) report quarterly to the Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Administrator") on the status, number, and total hours worked of employees holding employee certificates.

(b) The refund shall be an amount equal to—

(1) 40 per centum of the wages paid at the rate referred to in section 4(a)(3) to all employees certified pursuant to sections 5 and 6 for the first half of the period of such certification for each such employee; and

(2) 20 per centum of the wages paid at the rate referred to in section 4(a)(3) to all employees certified pursuant to sections 5 and 6 for the remainder of the period of certification for each such employee.

DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR EMPLOYEE CERTIFICATE

SEC. 5. An individual shall be eligible to receive an employee certificate if—

(1) his skill, training, education, or job experience is below that normally required for steady employment at or above the minimum wage, as determined by his local United States Employment Service Office, and

(2) if unemployed, he or she has sought but has not been able to obtain employment at the minimum wage or above after a period of unemployment of 5 weeks or longer.

EMPLOYEE CERTIFICATE

SEC. 6. Upon application, the appropriate local office of the United States Employment Service may issue an employee certificate to any individual who meets the requirements set forth in section 5. The form of such certificate shall be prescribed by the Director.

DETERMINATION OF EMPLOYER ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTIFICATE

SEC. 7. An employer shall receive a certificate of eligibility to receive the refund for the employment of employees certified under sections 5 and 6 upon application, if the Administrator determines that—

(1) the employer is covered by the provisions of section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938;

(2) the employer applying for a certificate has not raised his hiring requirements following or in expectation of the enactment of this Act;

(3) an adequate supply of qualified workers is not available despite reasonable efforts by the employer to recruit them;

(4) the refund will not have the effect of impairing or depressing the wages, working standards, or opportunities for full employment of existing employees;

(5) abnormal labor conditions, such as a strike, lockout, or similar condition, do not exist at the firm;

(6) the employer will afford certified employees full opportunity for continued employment at the minimum wage or above after the expiration of the employee's certificate; and

(7) the employer has a formal or on-the-job training program to upgrade the skills and enhance the productivity of certified employees.

EMPLOYER CERTIFICATE

SEC. 8. (a) An employer may apply for a certificate as soon as it decides to hire an individual eligible to be a certified employee under this Act. If the employer hires such an individual before its application is accepted, and the application is subsequently accepted, the refund shall be retroactive to the date the employee was placed on the employer's payroll.

(b) An employer certificate, if issued, shall specify—

(1) the number of certified employees authorized to be employed at any one time, which shall not exceed 25 percent of an employer's total labor force; and

(2) the effective date and the expiration date of the certificate.

Such certificate shall be in the form prescribed by the Administrator.

DURATION OF CERTIFICATES

SEC. 9. (a) The duration of employer certificates shall be one year, renewable upon finding of continued eligibility by the Administrator. In the event an employer chooses not to renew a certificate, he shall continue in the program until all employees hired under the previously existing certificate, have completed the duration of their certificates.

(b) There shall be the following two classes of employee certificates:

(1) A six-month certificate for nonskilled occupations.

(2) A one-year certificate for skilled occupations. The local office of the United States Employment Service shall issue a qualified individual a certificate of eligibility prior to his employment. After the certified individual is employed, the local office shall determine on the basis of his occupation whether his certificate shall have a duration of six months or one year.

(c) Not more than one employee certificate shall be issued under this Act to any individual and such certificate shall be nonrenewable.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

SEC. 10. No certified employer shall discriminate on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the employment of certified employees.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 11. (a) The provisions of this Act relating to employer certificates and the distribution of the refund and all regulations pertaining thereto shall be enforced by the Administrator. He shall conduct investigations of possible violations of employer certificates upon—

(1) a complaint by either an employee or an employer under a certificate, or

(2) a complaint by a competitor of a certified employer, or of an experienced worker who claims to have lost employment or to be unable to obtain employment because of competition from certified employees.

(b) The provisions of this Act relating to employee certificates, their issuance, and all regulations adopted under these provisions shall be enforced by the Director of the United States Employment Service (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Director"). He shall conduct investigations of possible violations of employee certificates upon—

(1) a complaint by either a certified employee or employer, or

(2) a complaint by an experienced worker who claims to have lost employment or to be unable to obtain employment because of competition from certified workers.

(c) If after notice and hearing the Administrator or Director finds that there has been a violation of the provision of this Act, or regulations thereunder, the Administrator, in the case of an employer, and the Director, in the case of an employee, shall cancel the certificate issued under this Act, and deny the privilege of obtaining a new certificate for such period as the Administrator or the Director, as the case may be, shall determine.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 12. (a) The Administrator shall administer the provisions of this Act relating to employer certificates and payment of the refund.

(b) The Director shall administer the provisions of this Act relating to employee certificates.

(c) The Administrator and the Director are authorized to establish such rules and regulations as are necessary and appropriate to carry out their respective functions under this Act.

CRIMINAL PENALTY

SEC. 13. A certified employer who knowingly violates the conditions of an employer certificate or the other provisions of this Act shall be deemed to have committed a misdemeanor, and shall be subject to a fine not to exceed $1,000.

RECONSIDERATION AND REVIEW

SEC. 14. (a) (1) Any person aggrieved by the action of an authorized representative of the Administrator in denying or granting an employer certificate may, within 15 days after such action, (A) file a written request for reconsideration thereof with the authorized representative of the Administrator who made the decision in the first instance, or (B) file a written request for review of the decision with the Administrator or an authorized representative who has taken no part in the action which is the subject of review.

(2) Any person aggrieved by the action of an authorized representative of the Administrator in denying a request for reconsideration may, within 15 days thereafter, file with the Administrator a written request for review.

(3) Any person aggrieved by the determination upon reconsideration of an authorized representative of the Administrator may, within 15 days thereafter, file with the Administrator a written request for review.

(b) (1) Any person aggrieved by the action of a local United States Employment Service office in denying or granting an employee certificate may, within 15 days after such action, (A) file a written request for reconsideration thereof by the local United States Employment Service office which made the decision in the first instance, or (B) file a written request for review of the decision by the Director, or (C) file a written request for review of the decision by an authorized representative of the Director who is not attached to the local office making the decision in the first instance.

(2) Any person aggrieved by the action of a local United States Employment Service office, or of an authorized representative of the Director in denying a request for reconsideration may, within 15 days after such determination, file with the Director a written request for review.

(3) Any person aggrieved by the determination upon reconsideration of a local office, or of an authorized representative may, within 15 days thereafter, file with the Director a written request for review.

(c) A request for reconsideration shall be accompanied by a statement of the additional evidence which the applicant believes may materially affect the decision together with a showing that there were reasonable grounds for failure to present such evidence in the original proceedings.

(d) A request for review shall be granted where reasonable grounds for the review are set forth in the request.

(e) If a request for reconsideration or review is granted, the Administrator, the Director, their authorized representative, or a local United States Employment Service officer may, to the extent he deems it appropriate, afford other interested persons an opportunity to present data and views.

SECRETARY'S EVALUATION AND REPORT

SEC. 15. Prior to March 1, 1969 and again prior to March 1, 1970, the Secretary of Labor shall make a report to Congress. Such report shall contain an evaluation of the program authorized in this Act, including the number of persons employed and trained, the employment experience of individuals who have completed the program, the response of employers to the program and recommendations for improvement.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 16. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $72,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for payment of the refund for the employment of not more than 100,000 certified employees; and $144,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, for payment of the refund for the employment of not more than 200,000 certified employees. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for administrative expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. Such sums may be appropriated for each fiscal year thereafter as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I wish to heartily endorse the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Senator CHARLES PERCY, with respect to the proposed legislation entitled "The Employment Incentive Act of 1967." Although, as he mentioned, this bill does not purport to be the answer to all the unemployment problems facing the country, it does, at least, present one means of offsetting what I consider to be the principal shortcoming of the minimum wage law. This shortcoming is I think, that it precludes hiring unskilled, willing laborers by willing employers at less than the minimum wage. This bill will encourage the private business sector to hire the unskilled unemployed and to train them to fill skilled-level jobs. It will provide a means of hope for the jobless to become employable without suffering the indignities and self-disrespect of being on the receiving end of straight Government handouts. In other words, it helps them to help themselves.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate will reflect primarily on the concept of this type of legislation, improve upon this bill and thus help to resolve the serious, double-edged national dilemma of unemployment and public welfare.

INVESTMENT OF CERTAIN FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE STATE OF HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, after Hawaii became a State in 1959, the 86th Congress approved the Omnibus Act—act of July 12, 1960—which authorized the appropriation of $6 million to the State of Hawaii in lieu of a land grant subject to the provisions of the Morrill Act and such funds were subsequently appropriated.

Section 302 of the Morrill Act provides that funds received by the States are to be invested in bonds of the United States or of the States or in some other State bonds, or that the proceeds may be invested by the States having no State bonds in many manner the legislature of such States agree to, provided that the funds yield a fair and reasonable rate of return as designated by such State legislature.

Unfortunately, the provisions of the Morrill Act governing investment of funds do not provide a means whereby the capital may be protected from erosion due to inflationary tendencies or to benefit from increases in economic productivity.

It is a matter of record that most college and university investment portfolios include a combination of both variable and fixed value securities which provide protection against price increases and also offer opportunities to benefit from the growth of the economy.

For this reason, I am introducing a bill to amend section 14(e) of the Omnibus Act to enable the State of Hawaii to invest its grant in corporate equities, including mutual funds.

I should point out that section 5 of the

First Morrill Act specifically protects capital derived from Morrill Act funds from impairment by stipulating that should any portion of the fund which is invested be diminished or lost that it shall be replaced by the State to which it belongs so that the capital of the fund shall remain forever undiminished.

My proposed amendment to the Omnibus Act would not affect this requirement in any way.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2604) relating to the investment of certain funds appropriated to the State of Hawaii for the support and maintenance of colleges at which agricultural and mechanical arts are taught, introduced by Mr. Inouye, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2604

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the second sentence of section 14(e) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and for other purposes", approved July 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 414), is amended by striking out "Amounts" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in the foregoing sentence, amounts".

(b) Such section is further amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence a new sentence as follows: "Amounts appropriated under this subsection shall be invested by the State of Hawaii in bonds of the United States, bonds of the State of Hawaii, or in some other safe bonds, or shall be invested in such other manner as may be authorized by the legislature of such State, subject to the conditions that the legislature of such State shall require that (1) the investment shall yield a fair and reasonable rate of return, fixed by the legislature, and (2) the principal of any such amounts so appropriated shall forever remain unimpaired."

AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to bring to your attention the status of the Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966 which I had the honor to introduce. Its purpose is to speed development of this Nation's marine resources through support of and encouragement to academic institutions, research institutes, and laboratories. The program envisioned by this act has richly lived up to the hopes of us who sponsored its passage through the Congress.

In fact, as the oceanology periodical, Undersea Technology, reported in its September 1967 issue, the sea-grant program has been "a smash hit." More than 400 schools and institutions have informed the Office of Sea Grant Programs of the National Science Foundation that they intend to file proposals. Robert Abel, head of the program, has formed a fine staff which includes Harold Leland Goodwin, formerly with NASA; Robert Wildman, formerly with AEC; and Arthur Alexiou, formerly with the Naval Oceanographic Office. This talented team is moving effectively to implement the broad mandate which the Congress provided, and many excellent program proposals are already under study by the Sea Grant Office and its advisory panel.

Mr. President, the basic act authorized funds for this program for fiscal years 1967–68. It is now necessary that the Congress move to continue this vital program on which such a fine beginning has been made.

In this connection, Mr. President, I introduce on request and send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966. This bill has been submitted by the National Science Foundation and was reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget which stated that it has no objection. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be inserted in the Record, together with a section by section analysis and a letter from Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation, to the Vice President, dated October 18, 1967.

I also intend to introduce tomorrow a bill differing from the administration one in that it substitutes specific figures in lieu of the open end authorizations approved by the administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, analysis and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2607) to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, introduced by Mr. Pell, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2607

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 203(b)(1) of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 is amended by inserting immediately after "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not to exceed the sum of $15,000,000," the following: "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums as may be necessary,".

(2) Section 204(d)(1) of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 is amended by deleting the phrase "in any fiscal year" each time is appears therein.

The section-by-section analysis and letter presented by Mr. Pell are as follows:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

1. Section 203(b)(1) authorizes appropriations for the Sea Grant Programs only for fiscal years 1967 and 1968 leaving further appropriations to be authorized in the future. Since the participants in the Sea Grant Programs are asked to make substantial investments of their own, it is highly desirable to assure continuity of the program in order to attract the right kind of institutions and to induce them to commit adequate resources and personnel of high competence to their projects. Therefore, the proposed amendment of Section 203(b)(1) authorizes appropriations for fiscal years 1969 and 1970.

2. Section 204(d)(1) limits the application of the cost sharing formula to payments made in each fiscal year. This imposes an administrative obstacle to the orderly conduct of program activities. It is to be expected that the contributions by participants will take many different forms which cannot be expected to be consumed at the same rate as the cash flow from the Foundation. For example, suppose a participant's contribution consists entirely of the use of facilities and the salaries of a few permanent staff members and that the Government is requested to provide funds for materials, supplies and the salaries of summer employees. The contribution of the participant being necessarily uniformly spread over the term of the project, it would be purely fortuitous and very unlikely that the requirements for materials, supplies and short term personnel should arise in an amount precisely equal to twice the fixed contribution of the participant during any given time period. This problem would be particularly acute if a contract or grant is awarded late in a fiscal year, in time to purchase substantial quantities of materials and supplies but with little time for the use of facilities and the services of permanent employees. Removal of the requirement that the cost sharing formula be satisfied in each fiscal year would permit the contributions of the Government and the participant to be utilized at their most efficient rates during the entire term of the grant or contract while preserving the intent of Congress that the total cost of the project be shared. This would also make unnecessary the establishment of special accounting procedures and time periods by both the Government and the participant to maintain a current account of their relative contributions.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
Washington, D.C. October 18, 1967.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The National Science Foundation herewith submits proposed legislation to amend Title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 in two respects.

The two proposed changes are of the following nature:

(1) Under the existing Title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, appropriation authorizations terminate with fiscal year 1968. In accordance with policy guidance received from the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, it is recommended that appropriation authorizations be provided for at least the next two fiscal years (1969 and 1970) in order to give impetus and continuity to the program.

(2) The Act now provides that payments in any *fiscal year* from the Government shall not exceed two-thirds of the total cost of the program. This poses a technical difficulty of an administrative nature for which legislative relief is recommended.

These matters are discussed further in the enclosed Explanation of Proposed Amendments to Title II.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Foundation that it has no objection to the submission of this legislation from the viewpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

Leland J. Haworth,
Director.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 427

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the House-passed social security bill has redefined "disability" so that a person could be determined to be disabled only if he is unable to engage in any kind of substantial gainful work which exists in the national economy even though such work does not exist in the general area in which he lives. The House report cites as its reason for its new definition its concern over the way the present definition of disability has been interpreted by the courts and the effects of court decisions on the administration of the disability program. I agree that the definition of disability under present law is in need of revision. However, I do not agree with the form this revision has taken. If we adopt the definition of disability as set forth in section 156 of H.R. 12080 we will be forcing those whom we seek to assist to tear up roots and seek employment in areas removed from family, friends, and associations that have been built over a lifetime.

For these reasons, I am submitting an amendment that redefines the term disability to include an individual only if his physical or mental impairment or impairments are of such severity that he is not only unable to do his previous work but—and now follows the language of my amendment—because of such impairment or impairments is, as a practical matter, unable to obtain in the general area in which he lives any kind of gainful work which—considering his age, education, and work experience—he is able to perform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 427) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT NO. 428

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to H.R. 12080, the omnibus social security and welfare bill now pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

This amendment would correct a long overlooked inequity in the social security laws, and I urge its adoption.

It would provide for the continuation of a mother's benefits if her child were a full-time student in an elementary or secondary school.

Presently, the surviving wife of a deceased worker is entitled to receive a mother's benefit, provided she has in her care a child of the deceased worker who is under age 18 or who was disabled before reaching that age. The mother's payment is equal to 75 percent of the deceased worker's full rate of social security benefit. This benefit terminates when the mother becomes entitled to widows' insurance benefits at age 60, or when the deceased worker's child attains age 18, unless, of course, the child is disabled.

It may occur that a child who is in high school and reaches age 18 before he completes his high school education may very well have to leave school in order to support his mother whose benefits cease on his 18th birthday. Thus, the child is unable to complete his education, particularly where the mother cannot find any work to provide her son and herself with the necessities of life.

This amendment would eliminate this inequity and remove the penalty presently imposed upon a mother and her son or daughter who wishes to complete his education, but finds it impossible to do so. This amendment would permit the mother to continue to receive the social security benefit after her child reaches age 18, provided that her son or daughter is a full-time student in high school or elementary school.

I ask speedy acceptance by the committee and final enactment by the full Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 428) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2530) to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2466) to amend section 704 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] I also ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the following bills, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] be added as a cosponsor:

S. 2589. A bill to provide for the regulation in the District of Columbia of retail installment sales of consumer goods (other than motor vehicles) and services, and for other purposes;

S. 2590. A bill to provide maximum finance and other charges in connection with retail installment credit sales in the District of Columbia;

S. 2591. A bill to provide a right to cancel retail installment sales contracts in the District of Columbia in certain circumstances; and

S. 2592. A bill to amend section 521 of the Act approved March 3, 1901, so as to prohibit the enforcement of a security interest in real property in the District of Columbia except pursuant to court order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2554) to provide for orderly marketing of flat glass imported into the United States by affording foreign supplying nations a fair share of the growth or change in the U.S. flat glass market.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] be added as a cosponsor of the resolution—Senate Resolution 180—seeking U.S. initiative to assure United Nations Security Council consideration of Vietnam conflict.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR TO HOLD HEARINGS ON BILL TO AMEND LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to announce that hearings on S. 2485, my bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to improve its benefits, will begin on Thursday, November 16, 1967.

All persons wishing to testify at these hearings should contact subcommittee counsel, Mr. Robert O. Harris, in room 4230, New Senate Office Building.

POPULATION CRISIS HEARING ON DOMESTIC FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fact that the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures has scheduled a public hearing on S. 1676 and the population crisis for Thursday, November 2. The hearing will be held in room 3302, of the New Senate Office Building, starting at 10 a.m.

The subcommittee is interested in learning more about the domestic family programs which are being funded by the Federal Government.

Witnesses Thursday will include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's newly appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary for Family Planning and Population, Katherine B. Oettinger, and Oscar Harkavy, Ph.D., of the Ford Foundation, who has just completed a study of domestic Federal population for the Department. It is the first time Mrs. Oettinger has testified before a congressional committee in her new capacity as the highest ranking U.S. civil servant charged with the direction of family planning policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of witnesses and the text of a news release about the hearing appear at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITNESSES BEFORE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID EXPENDITURES, HEARINGS ON S. 1676, ROOM 3302, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, NOVEMBER 2, 1967, 10 A.M.

1. *Mrs. Katherin B. Oettinger*, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Family Planning and

Population, Department of Health, Education and Welfare and Director, Children's Bureau, HEW.

2. *Dr. Philip R. Lee,*[*] assistant secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, HEW.

3. *Dr. Gerald LaVeck,* director, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, HEW.

4. *Dr. Joseph English,* Director, Office of Health Affairs, Office of Economic Opportunity.

5. *Dr. Gary London,* Health Division, Office of Economic Opportunity.

6. *Oscar Harkavy,* Ph.D., Program Officer in Charge, Population Office, The Ford Foundation, New York City.

7. *Frederick S. Jaffe,* Vice President for Program Planning and Development, Planned Parenthood-World Population, New York City.

8. *Dr. Samuel M. Wishik,* Director, Division of Program Development and Evaluation, Institute orf Child Health and Human Development International Institute for the Study of Human Reproduction, Columbia University, New York City.

Gruening Senate Subcommittee Asks HEW, OEO To Describe Family Planning Programs in United States at November 2 Hearing

The federal government's financial support of family planning programs may surpass $55 million in Fiscal Year 1968. The Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures would like to know more about how the money is being spent and what is planned. Subcommittee chairman Senator Gruening (D-Alaska) has scheduled a hearing Thursday, November 2, to examine domestic programs, starting at 10 a.m.

Senator Gruening believes U.S. programs should be showcases from which other parts of the nation or other countries can learn. He said the Subcommittee would also look into U.S. family planning expenditures overseas at a subsequent hearing.

Witnesses on November 2 in Room 3302 of the New Senate Office building will include HEW's newly-appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary for Family Planning and Population Katherine B. Oettinger and Dr. Oscar Harkavy of the Ford Foundation who has just completed a study of domestic federal population programs for H.E.W. It is the first time Mrs. Oettinger has testified before a congressional committee in her new capacity as the highest ranking U.S. civil servant charged with the direction on family planning policy. Mrs. Oettinger still heads HEW's Children's Bureau.

The HEW delegation will be headed by Dr. Philip R. Lee, assistant secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs. He will also be accompanied by Dr. William Stewart, Surgeon General of the United States, and representatives of the Office of Education and the Food and Drug Administration.

The Subcommittee will also hear from Office of Economic Opportunity representatives Dr. Joseph English, Director of the Office of the Health Affairs, and Dr. Gary London, a member of his staff.

The Gruening subcommittee held 28 public hearings on the Population Crisis and S. 1676, a bill to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request at home and overseas, during the 89th Congress. The extended public dialogue appears to have been useful in opening up discussion and encouraging government and private programming.

Now the subcommittee wants to determine if the creation of some new jobs and some new programs has created a viable situation or just a growing, headless body without proper direction.

Gruening and the Senate cosponsors of his bill S. 1676 believe there should be offices for population to coordinate domestic and international U.S. family planning programs. Gruening thinks HEW is best equipped and qualified to handle domestic programs while the Department of State could best handle programs overseas. The offices for population they seek would be headed by assistant secretaries, a sufficiently high governmental level to be effective. Identical legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives by several members. Principal House sponsor this Congress and last is Rep. Morris Udall (D-Ariz.).

Less than two years ago the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures called in top level spokesmen from the Departments of State and Health, Education and Welfare and the Agency for International Development to comment on the population problem and S. 1676. The Executive branch spokesmen while not endorsing the bill agreed there was a problem. However, since those sessions in April 1966, important changes have taken place in the family planning programs of the Executive branch and the Congressional interest seems to have helped.

The Department of State now has a special assistant to Secretary Rusk for Population Matters and he has an assistant.

The Agency for International Development has a new War on Hunger Office which contains a Population Service.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has revised its guidelines for family planning and has increased its expenditures in this area through its Community Action programs upon request of the communities.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare after initially opposing the use of titles in its family planning organization has reversed itself and also set up a number of intra-agency committees to work on family planning problems.

This year because more than $30 million will be spent domestically on family planning, the Gruening Subcommittee wants to find out more about the programs and how they are coordinated.

Senator Gruening pointed out that the U.S. National Academy of Sciences and the Royal Society of London this month announced the beginning of their historic, joint scientific study on many aspects of the population problem. When representatives of the Swedish government testified before the Gruening Subcommittee on March 9, 1966, they stressed the need for international coordination in family planning.

90th Congress Senate cosponsors of S. 1676 are: Senators E. L. (Bob) Bartlett (D-Alaska), Robert C. Byrd (D-W. Va.), Joseph Clark (D-Pa.), Peter H. Dominick (R-Colo.), Clifford P. Hansen (R-Wyo.), Mark O. Hatfield (R-Ore.), Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.), Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii), Gale W. McGee (D-Wyo.), George McGovern (D-S. Dak.), Lee Metcalf (D-Mont.), Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.), Frank E. Moss (D-Utah), Joseph D. Tydings (D-Md.), Ralph W. Yarborough (D-Tex.), and Stephen M. Young (D-Ohio).

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

Address by Senator HOLLAND before the 62d Annual Convention, Gulf Intra-Coastal Canal Association, Jacksonville, Fla., October 30, 1967.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMPLOYERS SHOULD NOT BE DENIED INFORMATION CONCERNING ARREST RECORDS OF PROSPECTIVE EMPLOYEES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, an article appeared on the front page of the Washington Post of Friday, October 27, entitled "City Set To Limit Use of Arrest Data." This article was deeply disturbing to me, and I believe it should be of concern to the Congress, to prospective employers and employees, and, for that matter, to the general public. The gist of the article was to the effect that, based upon recommendations of a committee headed by the Corporation Counsel, there would shortly be an administrative edict whereby the police would be forbidden to release arrest records, except in cases which had resulted in convictions, and further, that the practice of employers requesting prospective employees to furnish them with copies of their police arrest records would be discouraged by this limitation and by the charge of a fee for obtaining copies of such police records.

For anyone familiar with the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police arrest records, it is well known that it is the exception, rather than the rule, where a final disposition of an arrest is noted on the police record, and that it takes hours, if not days, to trace through the records of the U.S. Attorney's office and the courts, to determine the final disposition or present status of a particular case. This was established in connection with hearings on crime and court congestion which the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee conducted this past summer incident to its examination of appropriation requests.

Of course, the condition of the police records is a reflection on the whole recordkeeping system of the law enforcement agencies of the city. Without doubt, the establishment of a uniform and coordinated record system should be given the highest priority.

While it is understandable that an applicant might well feel it unfair to have to explain to a prospective employer that he had been acquitted of a particular charge as set forth on his arrest record, or that the charge had been dropped—the other side of the situation, as was also developed at the subcommittee hearings, is this:

First. The average time lapse between the arrest and trial of a serious crime in the District of Columbia is approximately 1 year. Further, it is not uncommon that the same person will be charged with three or four different felonies before ever being tried on the first offense and during this time, he will be on the street on personal recognizance or on low bond, and, accordingly, be eligible to seek employment. In other words, if this regulation were put into effect, the employer could be considering the employment of a person charged with robbery, burglary, and dope addiction, or any other combination of crimes, and such employer would be barred from having access to this information.

---

[*] Accompanied by Dr. Herbert L. Ley, Jr., director of The Bureau of Medicine, Food and Drug Administration, and a representative of the Office of Education.

Second. It also was developed at such hearings that a very substantial percentage of original arrests for felonies were dropped entirely—"no papered" or were reduced to misdemeanors, with the indication that this sometimes was done to relieve the burden on the courts or because the many continuances granted had resulted in complaining witnesses failing to appear in court, or because the person charged had pleaded guilty, for example, to one of five serious charges and the other four were dropped by the Government as a practical expedient.

If the regulation, as proposed by the special committee were put into effect, it seems inevitable that the employer, running the risk of hiring a dangerous criminal, would merely eliminate from consideration anyone whose past record he was unable to fully determine, and thereby defeat the apparent objective of this ill-advised regulation.

Increased efforts should be directed not only toward improving the law-enforcement records system, but also to bringing about the speedy trial of serious criminal charges—rather than to devising procedures whereby information in records indicating involvement in serious crimes would be denied prospective employers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 27, 1967]

CITY SET TO LIMIT USE OF ARREST DATA

(By Carl Bernstein)

A special committee headed by Corporation Counsel Charles T. Duncan has recommended that police release arrest records only in cases that have resulted in convictions. However, the Metropolitan Police Department, which was represented on the committee, has refused to endorse the recommendation.

Despite police opposition, the recommendation is expected to be made District government policy in the near future. The outgoing Commissioners are known to be anxious to implement the new policy as one of their final official acts.

The new city government headed by Mayor Walter Washington is reported to be eager to solve the problem of arrest records if the Commissioners do not have time to act on the issue.

As standard practice, many firms here require prospective employes to provide them with a copy of their police records. The records issued by the Police Department include all arrests, but do not reflect the dispositions of the cases.

Civil rights organizations have long charged that the Department's policy fosters unemployment and presumes the guilt of persons even if they are declared innocent in court.

The Duncan committee's report, which also recommends that no individual's record be released if ten years have elapsed since his last, conviction, was sent to the desk of Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner this week.

The report contains a third recommendation that would require persons seeking arrest records to pay a fee to police. Committee members were reported to have made the fee recommendation as a means of discouraging the use of arrest records by employers.

Sources said the report received the endorsement of all organizations represented on the committee except the Police Department. The committee's membership included representatives of the Board of Trade, the city's Central Labor Council and the Department of Corrections.

As the special committee's views took shape in recent months, sources reported that the Police Department began indicating differences of opinion on both administrative and substantive grounds.

Inspector James J. McAuliffe, the police representative on the committee, was said to object to changing the current system because it would cause the Department extensive administrative difficulty and would require extra staff.

On other occasions, McAuliffe was said to argue that police see no reason why employers cannot accurately interpret arrest records in their present form.

McAuliffe met regularly during the committee's months of deliberations with his superiors in the Department and received guidance on policy matters from them.

During their deliberations, most members of the committee were reported to be swayed by three principal arguments advanced by opponents of existing policy. The critics charged that:

Current arrest records create false impressions of criminality because acquittals and dropped charges are not noted by police.

Such false impressions are most damaging to Negroes from inner-city neighborhoods who are more prone to arrests for minor infractions than are middle-class whites—arrests which very often lead to acquittals and dropped charges.

Ghetto residents are deterred from applying for jobs if they have any arrest records and are sent by prospective employers to get a transcript.

As the city moved to change police policy, a Court of General Session judge yesterday ordered police not to release the record of a defendant in a disorderly conduct case in which the charges were dropped.

"FAMILY FARM WILL SAVE AMERICA"—ARTICLE BY LEONARD KENFIELD

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the issue of the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune of October 22, 1967, published a feature story on Leonard Kenfield, president of the Montana Farmers Union, and his belief that the family farm will save America.

I share his view that we must restore a rural-urban balance in our Nation. As he stated:

> It would cost far less to help people in the rural areas, to help them make a decent living there, than to bring them to the cities and stack them up in tenements on welfare programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY FARMS WILL SAVE AMERICA

(By Carla Beck)

Leonard Kenfield, Montana Farmers Union president, has the capacity to view things in their relationship to other things and in their relative importance, one to the other. In other words, he sees the world in perspective.

For instance, the other day he said that he didn't think solving the farm problems will solve all the problems of the cities. One wonders how the two are related.

Kenfield went on to explain his statement. "Overcrowded conditions in the cities have resulted because the cities are the refuge for rural migrants. The cities, which are already short of schools, water, sewerage plants, housing, health and other facilities, become even more short. The riots—which I cannot explain myself—are indications of disturbance and a very unsatisfactory situation. The Washington Post editorialized some time ago that we were transferring the problems of rural America to the urban centers. It would cost far less to help people in the rural areas, to help them make a decent living there, than to bring them to the cities and stack them up in tenements on welfare programs."

Kenfield calls this movement from farm to city "one of the largest human migrations in history." Facts support his statement. Since 1940, 30 million have migrated out of the rural areas of America. Since 1950, 17 million have left the farm. Montana has contributed. In 1950, Montana had 35,000 farm and ranch operators. In 1964, there were 27,000. It is estimated that today 23,000 commercial operators are still on state farms. Commercial is the term used to differentiate between the serious farmer and the "hobby" farmer.

This movement of farmers off the land is very dangerous, Kenfield believes. "Movement of people off the land is a condition for revolution. When there are revolutions elsewhere in the world, redistribution of the land is an immediate goal. There's a basic yearning for land."

MacArthur's land reform in Japan is the underpinning of that country's amazing recovery from World War II, Kenfield said. The land redistribution there also involved fertilizer grants, organization of cooperatives and making low cost credit available.

United States aid to Venezuela is now being used to buy land from plantation systems—the feudal domains—to divide among the agricultural workers. Kenfield reported a recent edition of World Book Encyclopedia relates how part of the 1.4 billion dollars Uncle Sam has spent in bolstering the economy of Taiwan (Formosa) has gone to reforming agriculture there to establish the family farm.

"Few people know our government is doing this. It seems to me we need such concern for agriculture here. We need to provide such opportunities for our people," Kenfield said.

"Here in the U.S., surplus money from the city is wrecking the rural economy through the land transfers going on now," Kenfield charged.

"The young man going into farming nowadays has to marry a farmer's daughter or have a father ready to retire," Kenfield said. "The land here is going to affluent individuals and corporations interested in a tax savings."

Kenfield says the Farmers Union has an idea worth talking about in this area. It would have to be a voluntary thing. The proposal is this: A farmers' agency—perhaps the Farmers Home Administration—would be authorized to become the transfer agency for farm and ranch lands. When a farmer or rancher wished to retire, he could sell to the agency at an appraised price and take his money either in a lump sum, an annuity or however he wants. A young couple or a young man who wanted to go into farming would have available long term credit at a low rate of interest which would enable them to take over a farm or ranch which is available. As things stand now, it is almost impossible for a young person to go into agriculture on his own

This brought Kenfield to another subject, the average age of today's farmer, which is past 50. "He is farming more areas and handling more livestock and he suffers more heart attacks than any other segment of the population. Is it any wonder? Look at the burden he is working under."

What is worrying Kenfield is the growth of the city-oriented corporation farm movement. "Such corporations, entirely unrelated to farming, are diversifying into agriculture production, not only processing, but planting and harvesting. It will be a sad development if American agriculture is taken over by a few "General Motors" farms. I think this concept of this type of giant farm is a valid one. In my opinion, this vast organization will not serve the needs of the people. It will be out for profit on a scarcity basis. A consumer can expect to pay $1 for a loaf of bread and $3 a pound for steak. With that kind of development, we'll have an utter breakdown of rural communities and rural services, all of which have been damaged too much already."

"In summary," he said, "to save America we must save the family-type farm and ranch or you could say it in another way. The family-type pattern of agriculture will save America."

What does Kenfield define as a family-type farm? It would vary in size and function. But it would be of sufficient size, in production units, to enable the family that furnishes the management and most of the labor to maintain itself in a fair and adequate American standard of living. This would include paying all the costs of production, taxes, wages, returns on investment and a certain enough net income to enable them to keep themselves in "health and happiness."

Basically, the size could be a 160-acre dairy farm, a 2,000-acre wheat farm, a 10,000-acre sheep ranch or 10 acres of berries.

"The main criteria of the family farm is that it would be under the control of the family that works the land, whether they own it wholly or lease part of it. The decision making would be in the hands of the farmer, his wife and family," Kenfield said.

Kenfield echoed the cry that farmers are badly underpaid. He said the parity ratio between what they have to pay for supplies, goods and services and what they get for what they produce has dropped down to 73 per cent. This means they are 27 cents short on every dollar. There's another aspect to this, he said. It means the farmer is subsidizing the rest of society.

"Although it sounds redundant, we must remember the American family spends only 18 per cent of its income for food, the lowest percentage of all nations of the world. This is another testament to the efficiency of family-type agriculture," he reminded.

Kenfield said a reversal of the migration of people from farms to cities must be sought. "We need more farmers because we are facing a serious food shortage. In fact, a number of people, economists and nutritionists, are making dire warnings about the results of the present race between population growth and the means of providing food."

He said the population in the U.S. will pass the 200 million mark sometime this December. "A Senate committee found hunger in almost every one of the 50 states—from serious cases of malnutrition to actual starving in Mississippi."

Kenfield's solution to the food problem in the world is two-fold. First, he sees the need to step up a Food for Peace program as an emergency operation. But no matter how much American agriculture improves, he said it is impossible for America to feed the world.

So, secondly, Kenfield would help farm people in the developed and developing nations help themselves. Sensitive to the feelings of people, Kenfield emphasized that it would be bad to force our specific ways of doing things on to other people, who, after all, have ideas themselves. But he sees technical help, research and techniques as helping to improve food production throughout the world.

"We can do more with food than we can with guns," he said.

This quiet, studious man, whose work is his foremost interest, started his political career as a voter for FDR. He was attracted to the Farmers Union movement by a man—H. D. Rolph, a Joplin farmer who was a member of Montana's House of Representatives in the '20s and '30s—and by the essentially democratic character of Farmers Union meetings he attended. He recognized the movement was one through which the farmers could speak and act to solve their problems. That was in 1935.

A country newspaper editor in Texas, Newt Gresham, had worked with farm people and knew of their plight. They were shortweighted. Transportation charges were excessive. Prices were low. Marketing abuses were rampant. They couldn't get credit. So he and his neighbors came up with the idea that something more enduring than the Populist-type grassroots organization was needed. Besides knowing the techniques of production, farmers must know what was going on in the social, political and economic spheres. That was in 1902.

Three thrusts—cooperation, legislation and education—became the dominant aspects of the Farmers Union, with emphasis on education. Educator Kenfield, a teacher in a family of three generation of homesteaders, had found his niche. Now, 32 years later, cooperation, legislation and education remain the dominant interests of Kenfield and his fellow 10,000 Montana Farmers Union families.

ENDORSEMENT OF JOB CORPS BY NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the National Congress of American Indians, NCAI, recently paid well-deserved tribute to the Job Corps. In a resolution adopted at its convention, NCAI called on its tribal and individual members "to support the program of Job Corps with interest, involvement, and participation." This enthusiastic endorsement of the Job Corps is a measure of the success achieved not only by Indian youth but by all the more than 100,000 corpsmen and corpswomen who have gained new motivation and skills since the program's inception.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the NCAI resolution printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOB CORPS SUPPORT

Whereas the Job Corps was designed under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (with amendments) to help poverty-stricken youth who have been deprived of educational and vocational training opportunity, and does, in fact, provide such opportunity.

Now therefore be it resolved by NCAI in convention assembled in Portland, Oregon, October 2–6, 1967, that its tribal and individual members are urged to support the program of Job Corps with interest, involvement, and participation, and

Be it further resolved that tribes encourage the enrollment of eligible Indian youth in Job Corps, the completion of courses and assignments by those who do enroll, and the utilization of their new skills after enrollees complete their courses.

WENDELL CHINO,
President.
W. E. MCINTOSH,
Resolutions Committee Chairman.

THE CHURCH AND CONSERVATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an editorial in the October 1967 issue of American Forests discusses the moral and theological base of the conservation movement and, especially, the views of Prof. Richard A. Baer, Jr., of Earlham College, as expressed in a recent issue of Conservation Catalyst. This is a thoughtful editorial which I commend to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHURCH AND CONSERVATION

In the current issue of *Conservation Catalyst,* Professor Richard A. Baer, Jr., hazards the prediction that "future generations will sooner judge us by what we have done to the Redwoods, the Northern Cascades or the Hudson River Valley than by our yearly output of autos or electricity."

Perhaps more cheering in this otherwise morose era is the fact that more and more Americans are coming to believe that Professor Baer is 100 percent right—and they are the people who are in a positon to do something about it, not future generations.

Professor Baer's interesting article in *Catalyst*, partly the result of a seminar at Earlham College where he teaches, has to do with the attitude—or rather lack of attitude—of the church in regard to conservation.

In demythologizing nature, Dr. Baer points out, Israel divested nature of all supernatural qualities. Unlike previous cults that regarded nature as divine, Israel accepted the commission of a single god to "rule over nature and subdue it."

This "subdue" nature business has been a source of concern to conservationists for a long time. Moreover, many believe the "subdue" interpretation, which has been used repeatedly by apologists for development, may have been a bit wide of the mark. Among those of this view is Professor Baer.

"The symbol of man as lord over nature is a potentially dangerous one," Dr. Baer writes. "Modern man has accepted freedom from religious bondage to nature" (in other words we do not see the storm at sea, or the earthquake, or drought as divine manifestations that must be appeased), "but in his freedom he has become arrogant and has forgotten how much of a part of nature he really is." In fact, man has gone so far in the opposite direction "he has treated nature as possessing no intrinsic value or rights of its own, and has exploited it in whatever manner he chose."

This point of view did no great harm to nature until comparatively recent years when man's newly-acquired technological know-how enabled him to start subduing nature in earnest. Some compare modern man with a mental pygmy mounted on a monstrous earth-moving machine and imbued with a zeal to "subdue" everything in his path. This is not a pretty picture so far as conservationists are concerned.

But Professor Baer turns the tables on the "subdue" boys as their belief relates to the Bible by pointing out it is not necessarily so when one uses the Bible and Biblical history for his proof. God, he says, took joy in his creation of the Earth and found it good. Nor did he believe that recreation was sinful, either, for did he not form Leviathan, the great sea monster, "to play with?" There is considerable evidence God may have valued nature quite apart from its immediate importance to man. Furthermore, there is evidence that Biblical man himself possessed no strictly utilitarian view of nature. Says Professor Baer, "Modern man's ravaging of his natural environment would have been viewed by the Biblical writers as essentially sacrilegious."

If the church is to become involved in the conservation battle, and one judges Professor Baer is all for it, the time is now, he stresses. Man today has his all-powerful tools to subdue nature. He also has a powerful tendency to inquire, "What good is it?" when a beautiful tree, beautiful river, beautiful mountain, or a beautiful almost anything stands in the path of those tools. This man who asks "what good is it?" is the man to watch and who has to be converted. The church could help.

How? We are all guilty of self interest to a degree. Self interest "also shows itself in more tightly structured forms, such as bureaucratic establishments and businesses. Facts and figures are often distorted to offer economic justification for projects which ignore the broader range of human values, particularly aesthetic values.

"It is in just such situations of conflict that the church could play a significant role," Professor Baer says. Future effective action will, of course, have to be based on scientific know-how of which we have great quantities. The contribution of the church, on the other hand, would be to challenge society to re-examine its values. "Just as Israel demythologized nature and thus helped pave the way for the development of modern science, so the church today needs to dethrone such contemporary gods as the erroneous belief that progress can be measured only in terms of the Gross National Product," Professor Baer sums up. In brief, the church could and should be of immense aid in helping man to develop and define an ethic of land usage.

Professor Baer's statement would be of interest at any time but its timeliness at this particular moment makes it truly significant. There is a wave of conservation sentiment in the land. It is reflected on every side. Small but potent segments of the public are challenging business as usual as regards dams in the Grand Canyon, power lines in historic Pennsylvania, a power plant on Storm King Mountain, the necessity for cutting timber in the Magruder Corridor or remaining virgin redwoods, and pulling the plug on Everglades National Park. These small groups are demanding alternatives to these proposals. They do not say the public should be denied power or whatever or that science is a monster; they *do* ask all possible alternatives to these proposals be explored and in many cases they have not been so explored.

These people are potent but they are few in number. They take it seriously when they read aloud on Sundays the rather terrifying creed of the church that ". . . we have left undone those things we should have done." The conservation movement itself, which thinks it is a lot more important than it actually is, is also too thinly manned. It needs help and it deserves help that must come from a truly converted public. That the church could and should be a powerful force in this conversion process is self evident if it truly comes to grips with the subject on Professor Baer's terms.

While Professor Baer doesn't put it in just these terms, what he is actually saying is that "God is a conservationist." Quite so. When one stops and thinks about it, how could He be otherwise? Just take a look at the fall foliage in your neighborhood and be convinced.

J. B. C.

PROGRAMS FOR THE AGING TO MEET MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an editorial published by the Great Falls Tribune on October 8 calls attention to a manpower problem that is bound to become critical within the next 5 years.

In that length of time, 35,000 lawyers, 3,000 dieticians, 18,000 college professors, 12,000 social workers, 11,000 librarians, 32,000 physicians, 43,000 registered nurses, and many thousands of schoolteachers are going to retire in this country.

The editorial attributes these figures to Allen M. A. Buckingham, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's regional office at Denver.

> While these people retire, all of us in the helping services are crying for more help—

Mr. Buckingham said at a recent conference on social welfare in Butte, Mont.

> Manpower is one of the biggest social problems we face.

He suggested an accelerated program to make use of the talents of older persons, and he recommended planning now to relate the needs of older citizens with the communities in which they live.

The Great Falls Tribune observes that my State of Montana has made a fair start on a program for the aging. I am grateful to have its views and its comment on Mr. Buckingham's speech. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Scrap Metal or Golden Ingots?

Senior citizens are truly golden ingots, according to Allen M. A. Buckingham of Denver, regional representative on aging for the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Mining and bringing resources of senior citizens to the surface is not always easy and some of the nuggets seem to become lost in the smelting processes of our modern society, Buckingham contends.

In a talk, "Scrap Metal or Golden Ingots?" which he presented at the recent Montana Conference on Social Welfare at Butte, Buckingham emphasized there is a great potential in the senior citizens.

During the next five years, the following will retire, he said: 35,000 lawyers, 3,000 dieticians, 18,000 college professors, 12,000 social workers, 11,000 librarians, 32,000 physicians, 43,000 registered nurses and many thousands of school teachers.

"While these people retire, all of us in the helping services are crying for more help," Buckingham said. "Manpower is one of the biggest social problems we face."

Buckingham said there surely are ways of using retired talents on a part-time employed or volunteer basis.

Attitudes toward aging are changing in a positive direction, he said.

Aging is relatively new to our society, Buckingham pointed out. In 1900 the average person could expect 2½ years of retirement; today he can expect 15 years of retirement.

Aging is now regarded as a kind of social disease rather than a disease process as it used to be, he explained.

Complimenting Montana for being conscious of its rich resources in the state's senior citizens, Buckingham called for an accelerated program to take advantage of the talents of older persons. He strongly recommended comprehensive planning to relate the needs of our golden ingots to the total community and its needs.

Montana has made a fair start on a program for the aging. The state can brighten its reputation as the "Treasure State" if it regards its senior citizens as golden ingots rather than as scrap metal.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Editorial Projects for Education, a nonprofit organization associated with the American Alumni Council, has prepared a detailed account of the role and impact that Federal funds have had in higher education. The report is entitled: "America's College and Universities, Recipients of Billions in Federal Funds, Have a New Relationship: Life With Uncle." This report has appeared in various alumni publications as a special insert.

The relationship between higher education and the Federal Government has been growing steadily during the years. The complexity of this relationship and problems which tend to weaken the partnership are openly considered. Since Federal aid to higher education is an accomplished fact, it would seem to me that we should seek to refine and improve our communication in this area. Because of the importance of higher education as it affects the lives of all of us, and the completeness of this report, I call this timely article to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

America's Colleges and Universities, Recipients of Billions in Federal Funds, Have a New Relationship: Life With Uncle

What would happen if all the Federal dollars now going to America's colleges and universities were suddenly withdrawn?

The president of one university pondered the question briefly, then replied: "Well, first, there would be this very loud sucking sound."

Indeed there would. It would be heard from Berkeley's gates to Harvard's yard, from Colby, Maine, to Kilgore, Texas. And in its wake would come shock waves that would rock the entire establishment of American higher education.

No institution of higher learning, regardless of its size or remoteness from Washington, can escape the impact of the Federal government's involvement in higher education. Of the 2,200 institutions of higher learning in the United States, about 1,800 participate in one or more Federally supported or sponsored programs. (Even an institution which receives no Federal dollars is affected—for it must compete for faculty, students, and private dollars with the institutions that do receive Federal funds for such things.)

Hence, although hardly anyone seriously believes that Federal spending on the campus is going to stop or even decrease significantly, the possibility, however remote, is enough to send shivers down the nation's academic backbone. Colleges and universities operate on such tight budgets that even a relatively slight ebb in the flow of Federal funds could be serious. The fiscal belt-tightening in Washington, caused by the war in Vietnam and the threat of inflation, has already brought a financial squeeze to some institutions.

A look at what would happen if all Federal dollars were suddenly withdrawn from colleges and universities may be an exercise in the absurd, but it dramatizes the depth of government involvement:

The nation's undergraduates would lose more than 800,000 scholarships, loans, and work-study grants, amounting to well over $300 million.

Colleges and universities would lose some $2 billion which now supports research on the campuses. Consequently some 50 per cent of America's science faculty members would be without support for their research. They would lose the summer salaries which they have come to depend on—and, in some cases, they would lose part of their salaries for the other nine months, as well.

The big government-owned research laboratories which several universities operate under contract would be closed. Although this might end some management headaches for the universities, it would also deprive thousands of scientists and engineers of employment and the institutions of several million dollars in overhead reimbursements and fees.

The newly established National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities—for which faculties have waited for years—would collapse before its first grants were spent.

Planned or partially constructed college and university buildings, costing roughly $2.5 billion, would be delayed or abandoned altogether.

Many of our most eminent universities and medical schools would find their annual budgets sharply reduced—in some cases by more than 50 per cent. And the 68 land-grant institutions would lose Federal institutional support which they have been receiving since the nineteenth century.

Major parts of the anti-poverty program, the new GI Bill, the Peace Corps, and the many other programs which call for spending on the campuses would founder.

The Federal Government is now the "Big Spender" in the academic world. Last year, Washington spent more money on the nation's campuses than did the 50 state governments combined. The National Institutes of Health alone spent more on educational and research projects than any one state allocated for higher education. The National Science Foundation, also a Federal agency, awarded more funds to colleges and universities than did all the business corporations in America. And the U.S. Office of Education's annual expenditure in higher education of $1.2 billion far exceeded all gifts from private foundations and alumni. The $5 billion or so that the Federal government will spend on campuses this year constitutes more than 25 per cent of higher education's total budget.

About half of the Federal funds now going to academic institutions support research and research-related activities—and, in most cases, the research is in the sciences. Most often an individual scholar, with his institution's blessing, applies directly to a Federal agency for funds to support his work. A professor of chemistry, for example, might apply to the National Science Foundation for funds to pay for salaries (part of his own, his collaborators', and his research technicians'), equipment, graduate-student stipends, travel, and anything else he could justify as essential to his work. A panel of his scholarly peers from colleges and universities, assembled by NSF, meets periodically in Washington to evaluate his and other applications. If the panel members approve, the professor usually receives his grant and his college or university receives a percentage of the total amount to meet its overhead costs. (Under several Federal programs, the institution itself can request funds to help construct buildings and grants to strengthen or initiate research programs.)

The other half of the Federal government's expenditure in higher education is for student aid, for books and equipment, for classroom buildings, laboratories, and dormitories, for overseas projects, and—recently, in modest amounts—for the general strengthening of the institution.

There is almost no Federal agency which does not provide some funds for higher education. And there are few activities on a campus that are not eligible for some kind of government aid.

Clearly our colleges and universities now depend so heavily on Federal funds to help pay for salaries, tuition, research, construction, and operating costs that any significant decline in Federal support would disrupt the whole enterprise of American higher education.

To some educators, this dependence is a threat to the integrity and independence of the colleges and universities. "It is unnerving to know that our system of higher education is highly vulnerable to the whims and fickleness of politics," says a man who has held high positions both in government and on the campus.

Others minimize the hazards. Public institutions, they point out, have always been vulnerable in this sense—yet look how they've flourished. Congressmen, in fact, have been conscientious in their approach to Federal support of higher education; the problem is that standards other than those of the universities and colleges could become the determining factors in the nature and direction of Federal support. In any case, the argument runs, all academic institutions depend on the good will of others to provide the support that insures freedom. McGeorge Bundy, before he left the White House to head the Ford Foundation, said flatly: "American higher education is more and not less free and strong because of Federal funds." Such funds, he argued, actually have enhanced freedom by enlarging the opportunity of institutions to act; they are no more tainted than are dollars from other sources; and the way in which they are allocated is closed to academic tradition than is the case with nearly all other major sources of funds.

The issue of Federal control notwithstanding, Federal support of higher education is taking its place alongside military budgets and farm subsidies as one of the government's essential activities. All evidence indicates that such is the public's will. Education has always had a special worth in this country, and each new generation sets the valuation higher. In a recent Gallup Poll on national goals, Americans listed education as having first priority. Governors, state legislators, and Congressmen, ever sensitive to voter attitudes, are finding that the improvement of education is not only a noble issue on which to stand, but a winning one.

The increased Federal interest and support reflect another fact: the government now relies as heavily on the colleges and universities as the institutions do on the government. President Johnson told an audience at Princeton last year that in "almost every field of concern, from economics to national security, the academic community has become a central instrument of public policy in the United States."

Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education (an organization which often speaks in behalf of higher education), agrees. "Our history attests to the vital role which colleges and universities have played in assuring the nation's security and progress, and our present circumstances magnify rather than diminish the role," he says. "Since the final responsibility for our collective security and welfare can reside only in the Federal government, a close partnership between government and higher education is essential."

The partnership indeed exists. As a report of the American Society of Biological Chemists has said, "the condition of mutual dependence between the Federal government and institutions of higher learning and research is one of the most profound and significant developments of our time."

Directly and indirectly, the partnership has produced enormous benefits. It has played a central role in this country's progress in science and technology—and hence has contributed to our national security, our high standard of living, the lengthening life span, our world leadership. One analysis credits to education 40 per cent of the nation's growth in economic productivity in recent years.

Despite such benefits, some thoughtful observers are concerned about the future development of the government-campus partnership. They are asking how the flood of Federal funds will alter the traditional missions of higher education, the time-honored responsibility of the states, and the flow of private funds to the campuses. They wonder if the give and take between equal partners can continue, when one has the money and the other "only the brains."

Problems already have arisen from the dynamic and complex relationship between Washington and the academic world. How serious and complex such problems can become is illustrated by the current controversy over the concentration of Federal research funds on relatively few campuses and in certain sections of the country.

The problem grew out of World War II, when the government turned to the campuses for desperately needed scientific research. Since many of the best-known and most productive scientists were working in a dozen or so institutions in the Northeast and a few in the Midwest and California, more than half of the Federal research funds were spent there. (Most of the remaining money went to another 50 universities with research and graduate training.)

The wartime emergency obviously justified this concentration of funds. When the war ended, however, the lopsided distribution of Federal research funds did not. In fact, it has continued right up to the present, with 29 institutions receiving more than 50 per cent of Federal research dollars.

To the institutions on the receiving end, the situation seems natural and proper. They are, after all, the strongest and most productive research centers in the nation. The government, they argue, has an obligation to spend the public's money where it will yield the highest return to the nation.

The less-favored institutions recognize this obligation, too. But they maintain that it is equally important to the nation to develop new institutions of high quality—yet, without financial help from Washington, the second- and third-rank institutions will remain just that.

In late 1965 President Johnson, in a memorandum to the heads of Federal departments and agencies, acknowledged the importance of maintaining scientific excellence in the institutions where it now exists. But, he emphasized, Federal research funds should also be used to strengthen and develop new centers of excellence. Last year this "spread the wealth" movement gained momentum, as a number of agencies stepped up their efforts to broaden the distribution of research money. The Department of Defense, for example, one of the bigger purchasers of research, designated $18 million for this academic year to help about 50 widely scattered institutions develop into high-grade research centers. But with economics induced by the war in Vietnam, it is doubtful whether enough money will be available in the near future to end the controversy.

Eventually, Congress may have to act. In so doing, it is almost certain to displease, and perhaps hurt, some institutions. To the pessimist, the situation is a sign of troubled times ahead. To the optimist, it is the democratic process at work.

Recent student demonstrations have dramatized another problem to which the partnership between the government and the campus has contributed: the relative emphasis that is placed on research and on the teaching of undergraduates.

Wisconsin's Representative Henry Reuss conducted a Congressional study of the situation. Subsequently he said: "University teaching has become a sort of poor relation to research. I don't quarrel with the goal of excellence in science, but it is pursued at the expense of another important goal—excellence of teaching. Teaching suffers and is going to suffer more."

The problem is not limited to universities. It is having a pronounced effect on the smaller liberal arts colleges, the women's colleges, and the junior colleges—all of which have as their primary function the teaching of undergraduates. To offer a first-rate education, the colleges must attract and retain a first-rate faculty, which in turn attracts good students and financial support. But undergraduate colleges can rarely compete with Federally supported universities in faculty salaries, fellowship awards, research opportunities, and plant and equipment. The president of one of the best undergraduate colleges says: "When we do get a young scholar who skillfully combines research and teaching abilities, the universities lure him from us with the promise of a high salary, light teaching duties, frequent leaves, and almost anything else he may want."

Leland Haworth, whose National Science Foundation distributes more than $300 million annually for research activities and graduate programs on the campuses, disagrees. "I hold little or no brief," he says, "for the allegation that Federal support of research has detracted seriously from undergraduate teaching. I dispute the contention heard in some quarters that certain of our major universities have become giant research factories concentrating on Federally sponsored research projects to the detriment of their educational functions." Most university scholars would probably support Mr. Haworth's contention that teachers who conduct research are generally better teachers, and that the research enterprise has infused science education with new substance and vitality.

To get perspective on the problem, compare university research today with what it was before World War II. A prominent physicist calls the prewar days "a horse-and-buggy period." In 1930, colleges and universities spent less than $20 million on scientific research, and that came largely from private foundations, corporations, and endowment income. Scholars often built their equipment from ingeniously adapted scraps and spare machine parts. Graduate students considered it compensation enough just to be allowed to participate.

Some three decades and $125 billion later, there is hardly an academic scientist who does not feel pressure to get government funds. The chairman of one leading biology department admits that "if a young scholar doesn't have a grant when he comes here, he had better get one within a year or so or he's out; we have no funds to support his research."

Considering the large amounts of money available for research and graduate training, and recognizing that the publication of research findings is still the primary criterion for academic promotion, it is not surprising that the faculties of most universities spend a substantial part of their energies in those activities.

Federal agencies are looking for ways to ease the problem. The National Science Foundation, for example, has set up a new program which will make grants to undergraduate colleges for the improvement of science instruction.

More help will surely be forthcoming.

The fact that Federal funds have been concentrated in the sciences has also had a pronounced effect on colleges and universities. In many institutions, faculty members in the natural sciences earn more than faculty members in the humanities and social sciences; they have better facilities, more frequent leaves, and generally more influence on the campus.

The government's support of science can also disrupt the academic balance and internal priorities of a college or university. One president explained:

"Our highest-priority construction project was a $3 million building for our humanities departments. Under the Higher Education Facilities Act, we could expect to get a third of this from the Federal government. This would leave $2 million for us to get from private sources.

"But then, under a new government program, the biology and psychology faculty decided to apply to the National Institutes of Health for $1.5 million for new faculty members over a period of five years. These additional faculty people, however, made it necessary for us to go ahead immediately with our plans for a $4 million science building—so we gave *it* the No. 1 priority and moved the humanities building down the list.

"We could finance half the science building's cost with Federal funds. In addition, the scientists pointed out, they could get several training grants which would provide stipends to graduate students and tuition to our institution.

"You see what this meant? Both needs were valid—those of the humanities and those of the sciences. For $2 million of private money, I could either build a $3 million humanities building *or* I could build a $4 million science building, get $1.5 million for additional faculty, and pick up a few hundred thousand dollars in training grants. Either-or, not both."

The president could have added that if the scientists had been denied the privilege of applying to NIH, they might well have gone to another institution, taking their research grants with them. On the other hand, under the conditions of the academic marketplace, it was unlikely that the humanities scholars would be able to exercise a similar mobility.

The case also illustrates why academic administrators sometimes complain that Federal support of an individual faculty member's research projects casts their institution in the ineffectual role of a legal middleman, prompting the faculty member to feel a greater loyalty to a Federal agency than to the college or university.

Congress has moved to lessen the disparity between support of the humanities and social sciences on the one hand and support of the physical and biological sciences on the other. It established the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities—a move which, despite a pitifully small first-year allocation of funds, offers some encouragement. And close observers of the Washington scene predict that the social sciences, which have been receiving some Federal support, are destined to get considerably more in the next few years.

Efforts to cope with such difficult problems must begin with an understanding of the nature and background of the government-campus partnership. But this presents a problem in itself, for one encounters a welter of conflicting statistics, contradictory information, and wide differences of honest opinion. The task is further complicated by the swiftness with which the situation continually changes. And—the ultimate complication—there is almost no uniformity or coordination in the Federal government's numerous programs affecting higher education.

Each of the 50 or so agencies dispensing Federal funds to the colleges and universities is responsible for its own program, and no single Federal agency supervises the entire enterprise. (The creation of the Office of Science and Technology in 1962 represented an attempt to cope with the multiplicity of relationships. But so far there has been little significant improvement.) Even within the two houses of Congress, responsibility for the government's expenditures on the campuses is scattered among several committees.

Not only does the lack of a coordinated Federal program make it difficult to find a clear definition of the government's role in higher education, but it also creates a number of problems both in Washington and on the campuses.

The Bureau of the Budget, for example, has had to wrestle with several uncoordinated, duplicative Federal science budgets and with different accounting systems. Congress, faced with the almost impossible task of keeping informed about the esoteric world of science in order to leigslate intelligently, finds it difficult to control and direct the fast-growing Federal investment in higher education. And the individual government agencies are forced to make policy decisions and to respond to political and other pressures without adequate or consistent guidelines from above.

The colleges and universities, on the other hand, must negotiate the maze of Federal bureaus with consummate skill if they are to get their share of the Federal largesse. If they succeed, they must then cope with mountains of paperwork, disparate systems of accounting, and volumes of regulations that differ from agency to agency. Considering the magnitude of the financial rewards at stake, the institutions have had no choice but to enlarge their administrative staffs accordingly, adding people who can handle the business problems, wrestle with paperwork, manage grants and contracts, and untangle legal snarls. College and university presidents are constantly looking for competent academic administrators to prowl the Federal agencies in search of programs and opportunities in which their institutions can profitably participate.

The latter group of people, whom the press calls "university lobbyists," has been growing in number. At least a dozen institutions now have full-time representatives working in Washington. Many more have members of their administrative and academic staffs shuttling to and from the capital to negotiate Federal grants and contracts, cultivate agency personnel, and try to influence legislation. Still other institutions have enlisted the aid of qualified alumni or trustees who happen to live in Washington.

The lack of a uniform Federal policy prevents the clear statement of national goals that might give direction to the government's investments in higher education. This takes a toll in effectiveness and consistency and tends to produce contradictions and conflicts. The teaching-versus-research controversy is one example.

President Johnson provided another. Last summer, he publicly asked if the country is really getting its money's worth from its support of scientific research. He implied that the time may have come to apply more widely, for the benefit of the nation, the knowledge that Federally sponsored medical research had produced in recent years. A wave of apprehension spread through the medical schools when the President's remarks were reported. The inference to be drawn was that the Federal funds supporting the elaborate research effort, built at the urging of the government, might now be diverted to actual medical care and treatment. Later the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, tried to lay a calming hand on the medical scientists' fevered brows by making a strong reaffirmation of the National Institutes of Health's commitment to basic research. But the apprehensiveness remains.

Other events suggest that the 25-year honeymoon of science and the government may be ending. Connecticut's Congressman Emilio Q. Daddario, a man who is not intimidated by the mystique of modern science, has stepped up his campaign to have a greater part of the National Science Foundation budget spent on applied research. And, despite pleas from scientists and NSF administrators, Congress terminated the costly Mohole project, which was designed to gain more fundamental information about the internal structure of the earth.

Some observers feel that because it permits and often causes such conflicts, the diversity in the government's support of higher education is a basic flaw in the partnership. Others, however, believe this diversity, despite its disadvantages, guarantees a margin of independence to colleges and universities that would be jeopardized in a monolithic "super-bureau."

Good or bad, the diversity was probably essential to the development of the partnership between Washington and the academic world. Charles Kidd, executive secretary of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, puts it bluntly when he points out that the system's pluralism has allowed us to avoid dealing "directly with the ideological problem of what the total relationship of the government and universities should be. If we had had to face these ideological and political pressures head-on over the past few years, the confrontation probably would have wrecked the system."

That confrontation may be coming closer, as Federal allocations to science and education come under sharper scrutiny in Congress and as the partnership enters a new and significant phase.

Federal aid to higher education began with the Ordinance of 1787, which set aside public lands for schools and declared that the "means of education shall forever be encouraged." But the two forces that most shaped American higher education, say many historians, were the land-grant movement of the nineteenth century and the Federal support of scientific research that began in World War II.

The land-grant legislation and related acts of Congress in subsequent years established the American concept of enlisting the resources of higher education to meet pressing national needs. The laws were pragmatic and were designed to improve education and research in the natural sciences, from which agricultural and industrial expansion could proceed. From these laws has evolved the word's greatest system of public higher education.

In this century the Federal involvement grew spasmodically during such periods of crisis as World War I and the depression of the thirties. But it was not until World War II that the relationship began its rapid evolution into the dynamic and intimate partnership that now exists.

Federal agencies and industrial laboratories were ill-prepared in 1940 to supply the research and technology so essential to a full-scale war effort. The government therefore turned to the nation's colleges and universities. Federal funds supported scientific research on the campuses and build huge research facilities to be operated by universities under contract, such as Chicago's Argonne Laboratory and California's laboratory in Los Alamos.

So successful was the new relationship that it continued to flourish after the war. Federal research funds poured onto the campuses from military agencies, the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Science Foundation. The amounts of money increased spectacularly. At the beginning of the war the Federal government spent less than $200 million a year for all research and development. By 1950, the Federal "r & d" expenditure totaled $1 billion.

The Soviet Union's launching of Sputnik jolted the nation and brought a dramatic surge in support of scientific research. President Eisenhower named James R. Killian, Jr., president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, to be Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration was established, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was passed. Federal spending for scientific research and development increased to $5.8 billion. Of this, $400 million went to colleges and universities.

The 1960's brought a new dimension to the relationship between the Federal government and higher education. Until then, Federal aid was almost synonymous with government support of science, and all Federal dollars allocated to campuses were to meet specific national needs.

There were two important exceptions: the GI Bill after World War II, which crowded the colleges and universities with returning servicemen and spent $19 billion on educational benefits, and the National Defense Education Act, which was the broadest legislation of its kind and the first to be based, at least in part, on the premise that support of education itself is as much in the national interest as support which is based on the colleges' contributions to something as specific as the national defense.

The crucial turning-points were reached in the Kennedy-Johnson years. President Kennedy said: "We pledge ourselves to seek a system of higher education where every young American can be educated, not according to his race or his means, but according to his capacity. Never in the life of this country has the pursuit of that goal become more important or more urgent." Here was a clear national commitment to universal higher education, a public acknowledgment that higher education is worthy of support for its own sake. The Kennedy and Johnson administrations produced legislation which authorized:

$1.5 billion in matching funds for new contstruction on the nation's campuses.

$151 million for local communities for the building of junior colleges.

$432 million for new medical and dental schools and for aid to their students.

The first large-scale Federal program of undergraduate scholarships, and the first Federal package combining them with loans and jobs to help individual students.

Grants to strengthen college and university libraries.

Significant amounts of Federal money for "promising institutions," in an effort to lift the entire system of higher education.

The first significant support of the humanities.

In addition, dozens of "Great Society" bills included funds for colleges and universities. And their number is likely to increase in the years ahead.

The full significance of the developments of the past few years will probably not be known for some time. But it is clear that the partnership between the Federal government and higher education has entered a new phase. The question of the Federal government's total relationship to colleges and universities—avoided for so many years—has still not been squarely faced. But a confrontation may be just around the corner.

The major pitfall, around which Presidents and Congressmen have detoured, is the issue of the separation of state and church. The Constitution of the United States says nothing about the Federal government's responsibility for education. So the rationale for Federal involvement, up to now, has been the Constitution's Article I, which grants Congress the power to spend tax money for the common defense and the general welfare of the nation.

So long as Federal support of education was specific in nature and linked to the national defense the religious issue could be skirted. But as the emphasis moved to providing for the national welfare, the legal grounds became less firm, for the First Amendment to the Constitution says, in part, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. . . ."

So far, for practical and obvious reasons, neither the President nor Congress has met the problem head-on. But the battle has been joined, anyway. Some cases challenging grants to church-related colleges are now in the courts. And Congress is being pressed to pass legislation that would permit a citizen to challenge, in the Federal courts, the Congressional acts relating to higher education.

Meanwhile, America's 893 church-related colleges are eligible for funds under most Federal programs supporting higher education, and nearly all have received such funds. Most of these institutions would applaud a decision permitting the support to continue.

Some, however, would not. The Southern Baptists and the Seventh Day Adventists, for instance, have opposed Federal aid to the colleges and universities related to their denominations. Furman University, for example, under pressure from the South Carolina Baptist convention, returned a $612,000 Federal grant that it had applied for and received. Many colleges are awaiting the report of a Southern Baptist study group, due this summer.

Such institutions face an agonizing dilemma: stand fast on the principle of separation of church and state and take the financial consequences, or join the majority of colleges and universities and risk Federal influence. Said one delegate to the Southern Baptist Convention: "Those who say we're going to become second-rate schools unless we take Federal funds see clearly. I'm beginning to see it so clearly it's almost a nightmarish thing. I've moved toward Federal aid reluctantly; I don't like it."

Some colleges and universities, while refusing Federal aid in principle, permit some exceptions. Wheaton College, in Illinois, is a hold-out; but it allows some of its professors to accept National Science Foundation research grants. So does Rockford College, in Illinois. Others shun government money, but let their students accept Federal scholarships and loans. The president of one small church-related college, faced with acute financial problems, says simply: "The basic issue for us is survival."

Recent Federal programs have sharpened the conflict between Washington and the states in fixing the responsibility for education. Traditionally and constitutionally, the responsibility has generally been with the states. But as Federal support has equaled and surpassed the state allocations to higher education, the question of responsibility is less clear.

The great growth in quality and Ph.D. production of many state universities, for instance, is undoubtedly due in large measure to Federal support. Federal dollars pay for most of the scientific research in state universities, make possible higher salaries which attract outstanding scholars, contribute substantially to new buildings, and provide large amounts of student aid. Clark Kerr speaks of the "Federal grant university," and the University of California (which he used to head) is an apt example: nearly half of its total income comes from Washington.

To most governors and state legislators, the Federal grants are a mixed blessing. Although they have helped raise the quality and capabilities of state institutions, the grants have also raised the pressure on state governments to increase their appropriations for higher education, if for no other reason than to fulfill the matching requirement of many Federal awards. But even funds which are not channeled through the state agencies and do not require the state to provide matching funds can give impetus to increased appropriations for higher education. Federal research grants to individual scholars, for example, may make it necessary for the state to provide more faculty members to get the teaching done.

Last year, 38 states and territories joined the Compact for Education, an interstate organization designed to provide "close and continuing consultation among our several states on all matters of education." The operating arm of the Compact will gather information, conduct research, seek to improve standards, propose policies, "and do such things as may be necessary or incidental to the administration of its authority. . . ."

Although not spelled out in the formal language of the document, the Compact is clearly intended to enable the states to present a united front on the future of Federal aid to education.

In typically pragmatic fashion, we Americans want our colleges and universities to serve the public interest. We expect them to train enough doctors, lawyers, and engineers. We expect them to provide answers to immediate problems such as water and air pollution, urban blight, national defense, and disease. As we have done so often in the past, we expect the Federal government to build a creative and democratic system that will accomplish these things.

A faculty planning committee at one university stated in its report: ". . . A university is now regarded as a symbol for our age, the crucible in which—by some mysterious alchemy—man's long-awaited Utopia will at last be forged."

Some think the Federal role in higher education is growing too rapidly.

As early as 1952, the Association of American Universities' commission on financing higher education warned: "We as a nation should call a halt at this time to the introduction of new programs of direct Federal aid to colleges and universities. . . . Higher education at least needs time to digest what it has already undertaken and to evaluate the full impact of what it is already doing under Federal assistance." The recommendation went unheeded.

A year or so ago, Representative Edith Green of Oregon, an active architect of major education legislation, echoed this sentiment. The time has come, she said, "to stop, look, and listen," to evaluate the impact of Congressional action on the educational system. It seems safe to predict that Mrs. Green's warning, like that of the university presidents, will fail to halt the growth of Federal spending on the campus. But the note of caution she sounds will be well-taken by many who are increasingly concerned about the impact of the Federal involvement in higher education.

The more pessimistic observers fear direct Federal control of higher education. With the loyalty-oath conflict in mind, they see peril in the requirement that Federally supported colleges and universities demonstrate compliance with civil rights legislation or lose their Federal support. They express alarm at recent agency anti-conflict-of-interest proposals that would require scholars who receive government support to account for all of their other activities.

For most who are concerned, however, the fear is not so much of direct Federal control as of Federal influence on the conduct of American higher education. Their worry is not that the government will deliberately restrict the freedom of the scholar, or directly change an institution of higher learning. Rather, they are afraid the scholars may be tempted to confine his studies to areas where Federal support is known to be available, and that institutions will be unable to resist the lure of Federal dollars.

Before he became Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner said: "When a government agency with money to spend approaches a university, it can usually purchase almost any service it wants. And many institutions still follow the old practice of looking on funds so received as gifts. They not only do not look a gift horse in the mouth; they do not even pause to note whether it is a horse or a boa constrictor."

The greatest obstacle to the success of the government-campus partnership may lie in the fact that the partners have different objectives.

The Federal government's support of higher education has been essentially pragmatic. The Federal agencies have a mission to fulfill. To the degree that the colleges and universities can help to fulfill that mission, the agencies provide support.

The Atomic Energy Commission, for example, supports research and related activities in nuclear physics; the National Institutes of Health provide funds for medical research; the Agency for International Development finances overseas programs. Even recent programs which tend to recognize higher education as a national resource in itself are basically presented as efforts to cope with pressing national problems.

The Higher Education Facilities Act, for instance, provides matching funds for the construction of academic buildings. But the awards under this program are made on the basis of projected increases in enrollment. In the award of National Defense Graduate Fellowships to institutions, enrollment expansion and the initiation of new graduate programs are the main criteria. Under new programs affecting medical and dental schools, much of the Federal money is intended to increase the number of practitioners. Even the National Humanities Endowment, which is the government's attempt to rectify an academic imbalance aggravated by massive Federal support for the sciences, is curiously and pragmatically oriented to fulfill a specific mission, rather than to support the humanities generally because they are worthy in themselves.

Who can dispute the validity of such objectives? Surely not the institutions of higher learning, for they recognize an obligation to serve society by providing trained manpower and by conducting applied research. But colleges and universities have other traditional missions of at least equal importance. Basic research, though it may have no apparent relevance to society's immediate needs, is a primary (and almost exclusive) function of universities. It needs no other justification than the scholar's curiosity. The department of classics is as important in the college as is the department of physics, even though it does not contribute to the national defense. And enrollment expansion is neither an inherent virtue nor a universal goal in higher education; in fact, some institutions can better fulfill their objectives by remaining relatively small and selective.

Colleges and universities believe, for the most part, that they themselves are the best judges of what they ought to do, where they would like to go, and what their internal academic priorities are. For this reason the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges has advocated that the government increase its institutional (rather than individual project) support in higher education, thus permitting colleges and universities a reasonable latitude in using Federal funds.

Congress, however, considers that it can best determine what the nation's needs are, and how the taxpayer's money ought to be spent. Since there is never enough money to do everything that cries to be done, the choice between allocating Federal funds for cancer research or for classics is not a very difficult one for the nation's political leaders to make.

"The fact is," says one professor, "that we are trying to merge two entirely different systems. The government is the political engine of our democracy and must be responsive to the wishes of the people. But scholarship is not very democratic. You don't vote on the laws of thermodynamics or take a poll on the speed of light. Academic freedom and tenure are not prizes in a popularity contest."

Some observers feel that such a merger cannot be accomplished without causing fundamental changes in colleges and universities. They point to existing academic imbalances, the teaching-versus-research controversy, the changing roles of both professor and student, the growing commitment of colleges and universities of applied research. They fear that the influx of Federal funds into higher education will so transform colleges and universities that the very qualities that made the partnership desirable and productive in the first place will be lost.

The great technological achievements of the past 30 years, for example, would have been impossible without the basic scientific research that preceded them. This research—much of it seemingly irrelevant to society's needs—was conducted in universities, because only there could the scholar find the freedom and support that were essential to his quest. If the growing demand for applied research is met at the expense of basic research, future generations may pay the penalty.

One could argue—and many do—that colleges and universities do not have to accept Federal funds. But, to most of the nation's colleges and universities, the rejection of Federal support is an unacceptable alternative.

For those institutions already dependent upon Federal dollars, it is too late to turn back. Their physical plant, their programs, their personnel are all geared to continuing Federal aid.

And for those institutions which have received only token help from Washington, Federal dollars offer the one real hope of meeting the educational objectives they have set for themselves.

However distasteful the thought may be to those who oppose further Federal involvement in higher education, the fact is that there is no other way of getting the job done—to train the growing numbers of students, to conduct the basic research necessary to continued scientific progress, and to cope with society's most pressing problems.

Tuition, private contributions, and state allocations together fall far short of meeting the toal cost of American higher education. And as costs rise, the gap is likely to widen. Tuition has finally passed the $2,000 mark in several private colleges and universities, and it is rising even in the publicly supported institutions. State governments have increased their appropriations for higher education dramatically, but there are scores of other urgent needs competing for state funds. Gifts from private foundations, corporations, and alumni continue to rise steadily, but the increases are not keeping pace with rising costs.

Hence the continuation and probably the enlargement of the partnership between the Federal government and higher education appears to be inevitable. The real task facing the nation is to make it work.

To that end, colleges and universities may have to become more deeply involved in politics. They will have to determine, more clearly than ever before, just what their objectives are—and what their values are. And they will have to communicate these most effectively to their alumni, their political representatives, and corporate community, the foundations, and the public at large.

If the partnership is to succeed, the Federal government will have to do more than provide funds. Elected officials and administrators face the awesome task of formulating overall educational and research goals, to give direction to the programs of Federal support. They must make more of an effort to understand what makes colleges and universities tick, and to accommodate individual institutional differences.

The taxpaying public, and particularly alumni and alumnae, will play a crucial role in the evolution of the partnership. The degree of their understanding and support will be reflected in future legislation. And, along with private foundations and corporations, alumni and other friends of higher education bear a special responsibility for providing colleges and universities with financial support. The growing role of the Federal government, says the president of a major oil company, makes corporate contributions to higher education more important than ever before; he feels that private support enables colleges and universities to maintain academic balance and to preserve their freedom and independence. The president of a university agrees: "It is essential that the critical core of our colleges and universities be financed with non-Federal funds."

"What is going on here," says McGeorge Bundy, "is a great adventure in the purpose and performance of a free people." The partnership between higher education and the Federal government, he believes, is an experiment in American democracy.

Essentially, it is an effort to combine the forces of our educational and political systems for the common good. And the partnership is distinctly American—boldly built step by step in full public view, inspired by visionaries, tested and tempered by honest skeptics, forged out of practical political compromise.

Does it involve risks? Of course it does. But what great adventure does not? Is it not by risk-taking that free—and intelligent—people progress?

PUBLIC WELFARE PROVISIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, 19 Members of the House of Representatives have voiced their concern to the Finance Committee over the harsh and coercive public welfare provisions of the House-passed social security bill, H.R. 12080. The Finance Committee is currently meeting in executive session on this bill. I ask unanimous consent to have this significant piece of correspondence printed in the RECORD for the benefit of the entire Senate.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1967.

DEAR SENATOR: A number of members of the House of Representatives have been disturbed by some of the unnecessarily harsh public welfare provisions of the Social Security Amendments recently approved by the House.

The enclosed copy of a letter to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee is self-explanatory.

We seek your efforts to eliminate those restrictive amendments and respectfully urge the adoption of a sound, humane welfare program, one that seeks, not to punish, but to improve the lot of those unfortunate members of our society who must rely on public assistance to survive.

Sincerely yours,
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS.

Enclosure.

AUGUST 25, 1967.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the undersigned members of the House of Representatives, strongly oppose the anti-welfare provisions of H.R. 12080, amending the Social Security Act. Since the bill contained improvements in the social security program but was brought before the House under a rule that prevented our offering amendments, we could neither vote against the bill nor amend those parts we believed to be injurious to the poorest people in our society, especially the children in needy families.

The failure of our society to provide decent jobs and adequate social facilities for its people results in many persons becoming unemployed and dependent through no fault of their own. Most of the poor (78%), although legally entitled to public welfare, survive on a hand-to-mouth basis without any public assistance. Of the remaining 22 percent, those who receive welfare, only about half are assisted on programs in which there is Federal matching money and consequently some effort to raise standards.

Of the 7.3 million persons who do receive public welfare, 2.1 million are 65 or older, 700,000 are severely handicapped, 3.5 million are children in needy families, and 1 million are the parents of these children, mostly mothers who need training for themselves and child care for their children if we expect them to seek jobs, if, indeed, they should.

Few persons on relief, therefore, are employable; and if jobs were available, there are millions already in the labor market who are not on welfare and are seeking employment.

H.R. 12080 does not recognize these and similar facts in its anti-welfare provisions. If passed, this bill would (1) freeze the number of children eligible to receive AFDC assistance as of January 1, 1967, (2) compel work assignment without spelling out safeguards, (3) change in purpose the AFDC program from one of protecting children to one of forcing mothers into the labor market without adequate protection for themselves or their children, (4) through its so-called work incentive provision, keep families in poverty in most states which offer low grants, and (5) fail entirely to assure minimum level standards or to provide that states must meet even the minimum needs they fix.

For these reasons we unite our efforts in seeking the cooperation of members of the Senate in rejecting anti-welfare provisions of the House-passed bill; and we further call on public-spirited citizens and organizations to mobilize public opposition to this part of H.R. 12080.

Respectfully yours,
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., JEFFERY COHELAN, JOHN CONYERS, JR., CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., JOHN G. DOW, DON EDWARDS, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, DONALD M. FRASER, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, PATSY T. MINK, ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, JAMES H. SCHEUER, CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

URBAN-GRANT COLLEGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on October 22, 1967, the New York Times published an outstanding article written by Mr. Fred M. Hechinger, entitled "A Call for the Urban-Grant College." Mr. Hechinger's article discusses a proposal made by Dr. Clark Kerr, former president of the University of California, urging the creation of urban-grant universities to be located in the large urban centers of this country in order that they may begin to tackle urban problems similar to the way land-grant universities have tackled rural problems.

As Members of the Senate know, I introduced S. 1999 on June 23, 1967, a bill providing for the establishment of a public land-grant college in the District of Columbia. Should the bill I introduced be approved by Congress, I envision the local land-grant college undertaking some of the programs suggested by Dr. Kerr. I believe that such urban-grant colleges can provide a great opportunity to help rescue American cities from many of the critical and deplorable problems they now face.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the New York Times article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CALL FOR THE URBAN-GRANT COLLEGE

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

The urban crisis is becoming a cliché, and what was intended as a call to action may turn into a slogan to be talked into inaction. At best, crisis talk often leads to the application of old, patchwork remedies to new emergencies.

Last week, Dr. Clark Kerr launched a trial balloon for a program offering a radical cure of the country's worst domestic disease—the city slums. He said: "The United States today needs 67 urban-grant universities to stand beside its 67 land-grant universities." He urged the Federal Government to provide the funds to start creating these institutions—some from scratch, others by converting existing universities. To create one new institution of this kind for 10,000 students, he estimated, would require $100-million.

Dr. Kerr, who had been president of the University of California from 1958 until early this year when he was dismissed because of his objections to Gov. Ronald Reagan's budget cut and tuition proposals, now heads the Carnegie Corporation's Commission on the Future of Higher Education.

THE LAND-GRANT SCHOOLS

Some basic facts about the history of the land-grant universities must be recalled. The Morrill Act, signed by Abraham Lincoln in the the midst of the Civil War in July, 1862, on the same day the President called up 300,000 additional men, transformed American higher education. Through the donation of 17-million acres of Federal land to the states, the means were provided to create colleges "for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts . . . without excluding other scientific and classical studies . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes."

Thus, a break was made with the exclusive tradition that higher education was for the benefit of the professions, the upper classes and the training of the ministry. The land-grant colleges became the tooling-up device for the agricultural and industrial revolution. Their agricultural agents transformed American farming.

Today, Dr. Kerr pointed out, the universities must make their impact on the urban scene. While there is much talk about urban universities and their mission, he warned, many of these institutions "are very uncomfortable in their setting and would prefer to be somewhere else." The majority of them, he charged, have merely done a little urban facelifting if the slums adjoined their campuses. And this was done in self-defense rather than as a major service to the cities.

"Today's urban universities are less involved in urban problems than they were in the 1930's," he said. "They are in the urban setting but not of it." This complaint, he added, can be made of such institutions as Harvard, Columbia, the University of Chicago and even of tuition-free City College of New York.

The urban-grant university, as he projected it, would assume major responsibilities for "the totality of the city's educational system." The medical school would be at least as much involved with the health of the city as the land-grant university was with the health of the farmers' livestock.

They would help run and rebuild the cities, admit as students as many young people who are committed to urban-service careers as possible, many of them from urban slum background, and would send out faculty members and researchers to act as urban agents to show how to run better urban schools, hospitals, welfare and social aid, police departments and so forth. And they would become chief planners of the structural, cultural and human architecture of the cities.

"Urban-grant universities should be developed in each large city of more than 200,000 population, and several in the largest of the cities," Dr. Kerr said. They would share responsibility not only for all levels of education and health, but for equality of opportunity as well.

NEW MODEL NEEDED

He saw the place for such universities "inside Watts" in the center of San Francisco, along the freeways of Los Angeles and in the heart of the slums in New York, Chicago and Newark. They should, he said, rise above railroad tracks and public buildings, and they might be at the center of educational parks, surrounded by elementary and high schools.

"We need a new model," Dr. Kerr said, "None of the existing institutions can be held up as models. The problem is not just one of changing the old a little but of creating something new." He stressed that the basic purpose of such institutions would have to be to salvage the youths of the Negro ghetto—"the only field in which the American promise of equality has failed."

The trial balloon was launched at the centennial meeting of the City College's Phi Beta Kappa chapter, and so the proposal was at once subject to some of the conservative academic doubts which it is sure to encounter in the debate across the country.

Will this create intolerable competition with, and therefore violent opposition from, the existing institutions? Will the urban-grant university lead to a dangerous lowering of academic standards? Will it turn higher education for urban Negroes into just another ghetto? Will the fact that the urban-grant college would have to be in the thick of urban affairs expose it to violent controversy?

The problem of competition with existing universities, public and private—all of them hard-pressed for funds—might be met by giving these institutions the option either of conversion to urban-grant institutions or of establishing branch operations.

The lowering of standards—as a result of opening the doors wider to those whose academic talents are depressed by ghetto deprivation—is a reality to be faced. But those who support the Kerr proposal may point out that the original "aggies" or cow colleges represented a lowering of the then existing—but to many young people irrelevant—academic standards. Yet, from such beginnings have grown such high-quality universities as the University of California.

SKIRMISHES EXPECTED

But Dr. Kerr also warned that if the faculty believes that a problem is of low-quality because it is a local city problem, then the urban-oriented institution is sure to remain either irrelevant or consumed by an inferiority complex. Why, he asked, are grubby, practical issues considered of high priority when they deal with international problems in underdeveloped countries, but of low priority when they are local?

The ghettoization of urban-grant universities would probably be the most difficult objection to answer. The fact is, however, that none of the existing institutions, except possibly a few two-year community colleges, have begun to take in an appreciable number of the underclass minorities of the slums. The academic cream is being skimmed off, but for the great mass there still is no educational escape.

Finally, there is the issue of controversy. There are likely to be serious skirmishes whenever the university steps on the toes of vested interests. The only answer to such clashes with the outside world is a strong non-political board of trustees, acting as a buffer.

Nobody could pretend that implementation of the revolutionary proposal would be easy. In fact, the first effort to establish a land-grant college failed in 1851 and again in 1853. Dr. Kerr admits that the urban problems are more complex than the rural ones were then.

But, he added last week, his own university, a land-grant institution, had been instrumental in releasing atomic power. Should the academic world be afraid to "come in with its shirt-sleeves rolled up" when the great contemporary issue is the rescue of the cities?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MORSE, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I report from the Committee on the District of Columbia, nine nominations, which I ask be placed on the Executive Calendar, as follows:

John Walter Hechinger, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1969; and

Walter E. Fauntroy, of the District of Columbia, to be Vice Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1969.

Terms expiring February 1, 1968: Margaret A. Haywood, of the District of Columbia; J. C. Turner, of the District of Columbia; and Joseph P. Yeldell, of the District of Columbia.

Term expiring February 1, 1969; John A. Nevius, of the District of Columbia.

Terms expiring February 1, 1970: Stanley J. Anderson, of the District of Columbia; William S. Thompson, of the District of Columbia; and Polly Shackleton, of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MORSE, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE "OLD CROWS" WHO KEEP OUR ELECTRONIC WARFARE CAPABILITY AT TOP PERFORMANCE LEVELS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, as the war in Vietnam goes on, there is a tendency to ignore the vital electronic warfare aspect of this struggle. Each day, with little if any fanfare and publicity, electronic warfare as waged by our own and allied forces pits itself against the best equipment produced by the Soviet Union.

It is a well-known but not-often-mentioned fact that our electronic warfare measures and countermeasures are daily saving the lives of American service personnel.

This is an area of research where we dare not fall behind, as the Soviets are devoting consistent and far-reaching efforts aimed at mastery in this field.

In the past we have played a dreary game with this unique sector of endeavor. It has been "feast or famine" for the dedicated workers in this field, which has traditionally been concentrated around White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico.

We have either accelerated our work here when a crisis of a military nature has arisen, or we have allowed our electronic warfare capability to decay.

An organization devoted to fostering and preserving the art of electronic warfare for the benefit of this Nation is "the Old Crows." It also promotes the exchange of ideas and information in this area, and seeks to extend recognition to advances made in this field.

These Americans are further determined to see to it that the "cycle" of all or nothing efforts in electronic warfare by this country is ended. They are hopeful of seeing our efforts here stay at a level consistent with the challenge presented by the Soviets.

The history of the Old Crows is as fascinating as their goals are patriotic and altruistic. Bernie Zettl, president of the Old Crows, and Willie Crawford, their national secretary, have contributed far more to the well-being of America than most of our countrymen will ever know. In fact, it can be said that this type of altruistic behavior is typical of Old Crows everywhere.

I believe that many of the Members

of this body will find the history of the Old Crows rather fascinating reading. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that three articles on the subject be printed in the Record for the enlightenment of the Senate.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The History of Electronic Warfare or When the Old Crow Was a Fledgling

(Foreword.—During the past year, H. F. Smith, Chairman of the Historical Committee has been compiling a history of Electronic Warfare. Information has been gathered from numerous sources and there are still areas which are very scantily represented or not covered at all by the information available. This history needs help and the help required is available through you Crows. Please fill in the details and add to the history in any way you can. Take a few minutes and write down your additions and or corrections and send them to the Association or directly to H. P. Smith, Box B, Pennsauken, New Jersey.)

No one is quite sure when electronic warfare first began. We do know that as far back as May 31, 1916 the Admiral of the fleet, Sir Henry Jackson, employed EW as a preliminary to the battle of Jutland. Sir Henry used evidence of coastal radio direction finders under Admiralty supervision to detect movement of the German fleet. The changes in the apparent directions of arrival of radio signals from the enemy fleet were very slight, but Sir Henry dared to move the opposing British fleet on the basis of this information.

In the early World War II period the British Admiralty and the U.S. Navy worked together as a scientific team. Direction finding techniques in the high frequency band had already been developed to give satisfactory performance prior to World War II. This was prior to the establishment of the National Defense Research Committee in the U.S. Effort in the ECM field on the part of the U.S. Army by the Signal Corps provided the ground based and airborne U.S. Army Air Corps equipment for the very early phases of Electronic Warfare activity both in the European and CBI theatres of operation.

Electronic Warfare (EW) was first recognized as a vital phase of military operations in World War II. In the use of EW, the World War II allies jammed both German and Japanese electronic equipment. Countermeasures saved 450 United States bombers and 4500 American airmen from destruction by radar-controlled German flak, and turned back Japanese torpedo plane attacks in the battle of Leyte Gulf. One of the first leaders in World War II to recognize electronic warfare as a vital phase of military operations was Winston Churchill. In his war memoirs he writes:

"During the human struggle between the British and German Air Forces, between pilot and pilot, between A.A. batteries and aircraft, between ruthless bombing and fortitude of the British people, another conflict was going on, step by step, month by month. This was a secret war, whose battles were lost or won unknown to the public, and only with difficulty comprehended, even now, to those outside the small high scientific circles concerned. Unless British science had proven superior to German, and unless its strange, sinister resources had been effectively brought to bear in the struggle for survival, we might well have been defeated, and defeated, destroyed.

Churchill called this secret war "The Wizard War" and we know it as "EW". In the above paragraph he was specifically referring to activities which occurred during the bombing of Britain by the Luftwaffe. It made an ardent EW supporter of Britain's Prime Minister.

Electronic Countermeasures use was first recorded in the early stages of World War II when communications and radar became necessary parts of the weapons arsenal. Churchill referred to the first employment of Electronic Warfare, at that time called RCM, (Radio Countermeasures) as the "Battle of the Beams". This Battle took place in England during 1940. In order to accomplish their bombing of Britain, the Germans established an extensive series of radio stations (200 Kc–900 Kc) in northern France. These stations were beamed over London. An aircraft equipped with a loop antenna could get on any of these beams and follow it directly over London. Primarily a navigational aid, this system was known as *"Lorens"*.

After considerable study, the British countered Lorenz with a system known as *"Meaconing"* which was designed to actually bend the navigational beams. A meacon (masking beacon) consisted of a receiver and transmitter separated by five to ten miles. The receivers intercepted the navigational beams and relayed them to the transmitters for retransmission. Hence, German bombers attempting to obtain bearings received signals from the Lorenz transmitters and the meacons. This countermeasure was apparently very effective since on several occasions German crews became so completely confused and disoriented that they actually landed at British air bases.

When it became obvious to Germans that Lorenz was being effectively countered, they switched to a new system. Two intercommunicating transmitters were established on the French coast; while one transmitted dots, the other transmitted dashes. Since the two beams were transmitted parallel to one another, an aircraft flying a course directly between the beams received a solid tone and any deviation from the prescribed course resulted in the reception of either dots or dashes. The width of the solid tone was such that it enabled the German bombers to determine their position over the target within approximately 800 yards. This "Knickebein" (curtsey) system was called "Headache" by the British. The British had a choice of two countermeasures to this system.

They could jam the receivers in the bombers, in which case the Germans would most likely immediately abandon Headache, or the British could use deception and actually neutralize the system without the Germans knowing about it. They chose deceptions and, once again with transmitters, strengthened one side of the beam so that it was literally bent. Not so surprising, this countermeasure was called *"Aspirin"*. The British had excellent intelligence concerning the Headache system and were able to put Aspirin into operation the very first time the Germans used Headache. For the next two months the British had the Germans so confused that very few bombs were dropped on the assigned targets. There is a story that during these two months of Headache being dosed with Aspirin, no one had the courage to tell Goering that his beams were being twisted. Special lectures and warnings were delivered to the German Air Force, assuring them that the beams were infallible, and that anyone who cast doubt on them would be eliminated. The German air crews suspected that the beams were being mauled but, naturally enough, did not voice their suspicions.

In the Fall of 1940 the Germans initiated the use of *"Ruffian"*, a propaganda transmitter which operated twenty-four hours a day. Propaganda was normally transmitted from a nondirectional antenna; however, just prior to a raid the transmitters switched to a directional antenna and beamed its transmission over the selected target area. In addition, the German used another narrow beam which crossed the propaganda beam to mark the bomb release point. The discovery of the bombing system can be credited to the people of London. They noticed that if they were listening to the propaganda broadcast and their radios became increasingly louder a raid would then be imminent. The radios of those listening outside London would become weaker prior to a raid. Consistent reports from people in and around London soon revealed Ruffian's primary function. The counter-measure to Ruffian was known as *"Bromide"*. It consisted of retransmission of the propaganda on the same frequency as the navigational aid but with a nondirectional antenna thus making the navigational aid useless. The British also used directional antennas to rebroadcast the beam in such a manner that the bomb loads were dropped in the channel. The British press credited the erratic German bomb drops to evasive action against British Spitfires to keep the Germans in ignorance of the success of Bromide.

At this point in the "Wizard War" the Germans evidently became quite distressed over the effectiveness of the British countermeasures program. They equipped one squadron "Kampf Gruppe 100" with all of the available navigational aids. The various aids were used alternately in order to reach the target. Once these aircraft reached the target they dropped incendiaries to visually mark the target for the following formations. This system was first used on November 14, 1940 to bomb Coventry. The initial countermeasures used by the British consisted of decoy fires called *"Starfish"*. After the KG–100 squadron had dropped its incendiaries large numbers of Starfish were ignited in open spaces about the target, resulting in a dispersal of the bomb load.

One of the last schemes devised by the Germans was called *"Benito"*. At this time frequency modulation was not common, and the Germans assumed that the British would probably not be monitoring f–m. (Sadly enough—they were right.) As a result, portable f–m stations along the bombing route in France and England were established by strategically located agents who actually talked the pilots in over London. To the dissatisfaction of the Germans, however, the British were not outdone and they eventually intercepted the transmission and countered very effectively by using a skilled linguist who transmitted false orders to the German pilots on the original f–m frequency. This countermeasure known as *"Domino"*, was so effective that some of the German pilots became disoriented to such a degree that they were forced to land in England. Benito was used until about June 1941. The success of Domino as a countermeasure is evident from the bitter remarks heard passing between the bombers and their controlling ground stations. The bombing of Dublin on the night of May 30–31, 1941, may have been an unforeseen and unintended result of Domino.

The first case of British jamming of radio channels occurred in the Libyan campaign during November, 1941. The British had not used communications jamming prior to this time because of their fear of retaliation by the Germans. However, a decision was made to jam the German tank communications operating from 27 mc to 33.5 mc. The jamming equipment, compared with modern standards was very crude, but it did the job. If you can imagine tank formations with no means of inter-tank communications, you have a clear picture of the success of this EW operation. However, there was one fault in the British tactics; they neglected to provide fighter protection for the airborne jammers and consequently the jamming was soon brought to an abrupt halt by German fighters.

During this same period, the British were being seriously hampered in moving shipping through the English Channel. The Germans had accurate, radar controlled, coastal guns located on the Continent side of the Channel. This situation led the British to construct ground jammers, which effectively countered these German radars. However, the tables were turned when the Germans thoroughly jammed nearly all British radars and proceeded to move the Scharnhorst successfully from Brest through the Channel to the North Sea. During the classic EW operation, every British radar was completely jammed but one, and the British didn't believe that one. Even though the life of the Scharnhorst was prolonged, the British learned a profitable lesson. The effectiveness of radar jamming was proven and, in addition, the German had tipped their hand as to their capabilities.

Later, German Production jammers were employed extensively to ring the Mediterranean. Allied shipborne metric radars had their scopes completely jammed from the time they entered the Mediterranean until they left. German jammers passed the Allied ships from one CM group to another, keeping the vessels constantly under the devastating effects of the metric jammers.

The Germans also demonstrated their ability to take the offensive in ECM when they intercepted and took control of a group of U.S. radio-controlled boats also in the Mediterranean. On this occasion the boats were sent in tight circles; thus expending their fuel harmlessly. It was a disheartening experience for the Navy to encounter such proficient employment of electronic warfare by the Germans.

The United States had observed with keen interest, this battle between offensive electronic systems and the countermeasures techniques employed to reduce their effectiveness. It had become apparent that future operations would become increasingly dependent upon electronic warning and control systems. Also, it was quite obvious that these systems would be susceptible to electronic warfare action.

EARLY U.S. ORGANIZATIONS

The importance of EW grew as did all electronic activities. Thus, it became necessary to train U.S. Air Force officers in the field of countermeasures.

In an effort to supplement, the already overburdened Army and Navy research programs, OSRD, the Office of Scientific Research and Development, was established by executive order in June 1941. It contained 3 major branches, of which one, NDRC, was in turn divided into 19 divisions. Administrative functions and liaison with the Army and Navy were performed by the headquarters of OSRD.

OSRD was founded for the purpose of carrying on research in support of the Army and Navy on an emergency basis. It was provided with its own funds for financing research contracts with universities and industrial organizations throughout the country to fulfill the urgent wartime requirements of the Army and Navy.

The National Defense Research Committee (NDRC) was the branch of OSRD which was concerned principally with the physical sciences, and it was within the structure of NDRC that the OSRD countermeasures program was carried out. Each of the 19 "divisions" of NDRC was headed by a committee. The Division 15 Committee, under Dr. C. G. Suits, administered the countermeasure program. Division 15 contained several major subdivisions, including an office at Schenectady, New York, responsible for tube contracts with various manufacturers; an office in New York City, which administered contracts for countermeasures; and an office in Cambridge, Massachusetts, responsible for the administration of contracts in the Boston area, including the contract under which RRL, the Radio Research Laboratory at Harvard University, was operated.

The Army and Navy coordinated ECM program was carried out by NDRC in cooperation with the various laboratories and bureaus of the Armed Services. Chief among the agencies representing the Services were the Aircraft Radio Laboratory at Wright Field, Ohio, the Naval Research Laboratory, the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, the Bureau of Ships, the Bureau of Aeronautics, the Office of the Chief Signal Officer, and the Signal Corps Engineering Laboratories at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. Each of the service laboratories involved had its independent program of research and development but coordination among laboratories was maintained. For example, one of the Services might express an operational requirement for a particular type of equipment. The initial investigation might be carried on solely by NDRC or by one of its laboratories in collaboration with the operating Service. Later, development and procurement would be handled by the Service involved. In general, the operational need for particular development was established and expressed by the Service on an informal basis, usually in meetings attended by the personnel of the various laboratories and agencies concerned.

The Spring of 1942 welcomed to England a small number of research personnel from the U. S. who were designated to work with the RAF radiation countermeasures program. From this embryonic organization, a laboratory specifically designed to work on countermeasures design was established in 1943 at Great Malvern, England. The work of these individuals early in 1943 produced the first U. S. designed jammer.

RADIO RESEARCH LABORATORY

Work in the field of radar countermeasures was started prior to the establishment of the Division 15 organization when, in 1942, a small group was set up in Division 14's Radiation Laboratory at M.I.T. under the direction of Dr. F. E. Terman, for the purpose of developing jammers to use against enemy radar and also of developing anti-jamming devices for incorporation in our own radar.

The general problem involved was the development of means whereby the effectiveness of the enemy's radar equipment might be nullified. It became evident in the early days of the war that radar was not only a very useful weapon but that it was useful both for ourselves and for the enemy. It was also evident that it was a very vulnerable weapon. On the one hand it appeared prudent to take steps to make this weapon as useless to the enemy as possible in case he should attempt to use it against us, and on the other hand it seemed practically essential to do something about the vulnerability of our own radar in case the enemy should attempt to jam us.

It soon became clear that the radar countermeasures program was much too extensive to be carried on as a part of radar development activities. Steps were accordingly taken soon after the establishment of the radar countermeasures group to move it to Harvard, where it was established as the Radio Research Laboratory, operated exclusively for Division 15 of NDRC by Harvard University under the direction of Dr. Terman. During its approximately 3½ years of existence, Radio Research Laboratory grew to a peak strength, in August 1944, with some 810 persons.

INITIAL NAVY TACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Following the issuance, in July 1941, of a Presidential order to the U.S. Navy to attack all enemy submarines, the Navy established a complex of shore DF stations with the technical assistance of the NRL. The successful "Wolf Pack" tactics developed by the Germans for the exploitation of their attacks on convoys required that high-frequency communications be employed in making a rendezvous for the pack. The DAJ hf direction-finding equipment was guided into production by NRL engineers and formed the backbone of the Navy's shore DF program. This equipment was produced by the Bureau of Ships in large quantities, based on improved NRL designs. A shipboard counterpart of the shore-based DF was also produced. Improvements in the model DAQ equipment were worked out jointly with the British, and a program was also initiated to train personnel to install and operate this new equipment for the Navy. Unquestionably, these equipments, developed jointly by the Admiralty and NRL, and produced separately, spelled the doom of the "Wolf Pack" tactics of the German submarines, even though their transmissions grew shorter and shorter as time went on. The initial location of the enemy submarine was the most important phase of the antisubmarine warfare success achieved by the Navy. Sonar and radar were brought into play for the kill, but the oceans are large and the small number of antisubmarine warfare units urgently needed clues on where to hunt. These clues were always provided by the hf DF operators.

A major naval effort at the Naval Research Laboratory was concerned with the employment of countermeasures against the Germans' HS–293 glide bomb. Early in the war the use of this bomb offered severe resistance to our naval units in the Mediterranean. This weapon was first used operationally to sink the Italian battleship Roma as she was attempting to escape to join the Allies. It was used also to sink the British ship Warsprite, and it damaged the U.S. Cruiser Savannah. It was a report by the crew of the Savannah that gave the Naval Research Laboratory the clue that indicated that the Navy was faced with a guided weapon. Later one of these HS–293 glide bombs sank in a near miss in shallow water off Libya and was recovered by the British.

Meanwhile NRL engineers were called to work around the clock on the research and development of equipment to counter the threat of this bomb. Experimental equipment, fitted on ships in only six weeks time, was used to intercept, record, and analyze the guided-bomb control signals. It was desired to obtain shipboard recordings, while the ship was under attack, of the radio control signals for complete laboratory analysis. In practice, two of the four control tones employed were above the audible frequency range, and also were above the frequency range of World War II recorders. Only after a series of ingenious maneuvers were these radio frequencies and their associated tones successfully located and accurately analyzed. Soon after the first control signals were analyzed, two destroyer escorts, the U.S.S. Davis and the U.S.S. Jones, were supplied with experimental NRL equipment which so successfully jammed the guided bombs that the effectiveness of the weapon was very nearly neutralized. After this jamming program gained full momentum, no major fleet unit was sunk by the glide bombs.

Following these initial successes by the Navy with the Naval Research Laboratory experimental equipment, Airborne Instruments Laboratories at Mineola, New York, undertook a project for the development of production jammers for use against the German HS–293 glide bomb for the Navy. This equipment, known as the MAS jamming system, involved the development of several types of multiple-channel receivers and manually tuning spot jammers, and some automatic search receiver-spot-jammer combinations. A crash program was also undertaken at RRL at the time when these German glide bombs were first used in the Mediterranean, in March 1944. RRL was asked to produce on a crash basis a quantity of 30 jamming systems for use against the glide bombs. In response to this request, RRL converted a quantity of AN/ARQ–8 transmitter-receivers, which were then in crash production for the Air Force, and made them suitable for the Mediterranean operation. Developments in the theatre of operation, however, changed the operational needs, and none of the equipments saw service in the field.

Airborne Instruments Laboratories also

worked on an airborne jammer (AN/ARQ-11) having a power output of about 1 kw. Ten of these units were delivered to the Air Force as prototypes of a high-power airborne jammer. In the V–T fuze jamming field, the Signal Corps Laboratory, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, developed the AN/TRT-2, a convoy jammer with approximately 100 watts output, swept CW, covering the frequency range 75–200 MC.

The Westinghouse Research Laboratories was responsible for the development of a 10-kw ground-based communication jammer known as "Ground Cigar", for the frequency range from 38 to 42 Mc. Other work in the field of communications countermeasures and communications antijamming was done by the Bell Telephone Laboratories, by the Federal Telephone & Radio Corporation, and by the Radio Corporation of America.

RADIO AND RADAR COUNTERMEASURES

Behind the great battles of wits between Allied and German scientists for leadership in the operational use of radar is a remarkable story of measures and countermeasures designed to jam and confuse the enemy's radio communications and radar warning systems and so create a chaotic muddle in enemy intelligence.

"Mandrel", "Grocer", "Boozer", "Tinsel", "Ground Cigar", "Airborne Cigar" and "Window" were among the code names given to the Allied operations which successfully defeated every enemy attempt to gain ascendancy in the radar battle.

"WINDOW"

"Window" was introduced in a raid on Hamburg on the night of July 24–25, 1943. Seven hundred and ninety-one bombers dropped (in addition to bomb loads) one bundle of 2,000 aluminum foil strips each, every minute—a total of over 2½ million strips weighing 20 tons. To the enemy radar defenses this represented approximately 12,000 aircraft over Hamburg, and the effect on the enemy was devastating. The result, which reduced losses from 5.4% to 1.5%, was a tremendous achievement, and was a spectacular justification for R.A.F. radio countermeasures. After two months of use by the British, the RAF estimated that Chaff had been responsible for saving at least 200 planes and between 1200 and 1500 men.

The first known German use of Chaff was at Bizerte on 6 September 1943 in which less than 50 airplanes were involved. However, the U.S. and British warning reported an excess of 200 aircraft. Result was a dilution of allied fighter effort.

The History of Electronic Warfare, or When the Old Crow was a Fledgling

(NOTE.—This is a continuation of the History of Electronic Warfare article which was started in the Convention Issue of Crow Caws. H. F. Smith, Chairman of the Historical Committee and author of this article, solicits additional information regarding the subject. The classified nature of the Electronic Warfare business makes even past history hard to come by. Scratch a Crow and you will find a story. So, let's get them down on paper for all to see. Send all information to the Association or directly to H. F. Smith, Box B, Pennsauken, N.J.)

U.S. DEVELOPMENTS IN EW

The First Air Force EW school began operations at Boca Raton AFB, Florida in January 1943. Capt. Hugh Winter was the Director, Lt. Jack Prewett an instructor. Of the six hundred officers graduated by this school, approximately two hundred saw field experience. The first class began in January and consisted of four officers and 24 enlisted men.

Two of the graduates of the first class, Lts. Ed Tietz and Bill Praun, performed the first ECM ferret operations against Kiska. Selected members of the first class were sent to Eglin AFB, where they activated Field 9 (now Hurlbert) and formed the 1st Proving Ground Electronics Unit. The 1st PGEU was given responsibility for initial service testing of jammers and after EW equipment being developed. Most of this came from the RRL at Harvard or under its sponsorship.

The first B–17's equipment with ECM were modified at Oklahoma City AMA and were then run through tests at 1st PGEU. They were then sent to the European Theatre for combat use. The problem of selling an all out reconnaissance program to theatre commanders was not difficult, for they were eager to know the extent and location of the enemy electronic activities. Thus, more reconnaissance type B–24's were equipped, manned and placed in the field. More and more EW observers were trained in both reconnaissance and jamming techniques. These first searching aircraft were known as "ferrets" for their specific task was to "ferret-out" any and all information possible about electronic activity in a given area over which they operated.

Ferreting out information concerning enemy electronic systems was the first step in countering these systems. The data obtained from the reconnaissance mission was relayed to evaluation units where it was compiled and collated with information from other sources. Radar coverage charts of many areas were drawn, showing the actual visibility of the enemy networks. These charts along with other information were used to plan active countermeasures tactics for use during bombardment missions. Bombardment aircraft were being equipped with jamming transmitters ("Carpet") and Chaff ("Window") as rapidly as production would permit. Extensive coordination was required to make the electronic countermeasures program function effectively, and due to the tireless efforts of many, it was accomplished in a superlative manner.

The actual tactical use of jamming and deception was of paramount importance in the European theatre since the German development of excellent search and gunlaying radar threatened a successful attack by air and sea. In the Pacific Theatre Electronic Warfare first appeared in the reconnaissance role. A B–24 ferret operating out of China collected large quantities of information concerning Japanese radars on the mainland of China. In Addition, Australian and British Ferrett Aircraft flew out of India to plot the locations and record characteristics of Japanese radars on the Andaman Islands and throughout the length of the Malay Peninsula.

The initial EW activity of the 20th Bomber Command operating out of India in 1944 was that of reconnaissance. A number of B–29 Aircraft in each of the four groups operating out of India were equipped with radar receivers, pulse analysers and direction finding antennas. No special ECM reconnaissance missions were run with the B–29, however, officer ECM operators rode along in the aircraft during bombardment missions and thus collected electronic intelligence data along the route. By the time this organization had joined the remainder of the B–29's forming the 20th Air Force on the Island of Tinian, the Japanese radar inventory and operating techniques had been well catalogued.

During raids out of the Mariana Islands against Japan, it became necessary to shift from the reconnaissance to the radar jamming phase due to high damage rates sustained by attaching B-29's.

At this time virtually all aircraft were equipped with spot jamming type equipment, which was either pre-set on the ground and simply placed in operation by a crew member or operated by ECM officers to accurately spot jam radars. The primary interest was against the gun laying and searchlight controlled radars in the target areas.

In addition, Guardian Angel aircraft were developed to assist in target areas where aircraft were forced to penetrate the major defenses individually rather than in formation. In order to provide these Guardian Angels the bomb-bay was equipped with a platform containing extra inverters and jamming equipment so that a minimum of sixteen jamming transmitters could be operated simultaneously from a single aircraft. The technique for their use was to have a number of Guardian Angel aircraft arrive at the target just ahead of the first penetrating bombardment aircraft and to loiter in the immediate target area until the last bombing aircraft had departed.

The effect of these tactics were startling to say the least. On heavily defended targets where flak damage to aircraft had previously exceeded 60%, this now was reduced to less than 10% and ECM was sold not by talk, but by demonstration of its effectiveness. As a result active jamming was employed by the 20th Air Force until the end of the war.

EFFECTS OF THE PROGRAM

Before the end of the German war, following construction of prototype models, most of the equipment developed by the Joint Army-Navy-NDRC program had been placed in procurement, and nearly every bomber in the 8th Air Force had been equipped with at least one, and in some cases up to four, Carpet jamming transmitters. Results were anxiously awaited. Representatives of Radio Research Laboratory stationed at the Division, 15 British Laboratory ABL–15, at Malvern, England, and at other strategic points in the operational theatres, made operational analyses to determine the effect on the enemy. Soon after the equipment came into full use against the enemy, losses in the 8th Air Force began to drop. While initially it had been expected that an appreciable fraction of our bombers would fail to return from raids over Germany, the percentage of losses was now reduced to a very low figure.

These operational analyses were not conclusive. The Germans had lost much of their antiaircraft equipment in bombing raids, and the Luftwaffe had practically stopped operating. The weather had also changed during the period when statistics were accumulated. It was known that the losses had decreased, but it could not be proved that the countermeasures program had achieved this result, or had even helped.

The History of Electronic Warfare or When the Old Crow Was a Fledgling

(NOTE.—This is the conclusion of the History of Electronic Warfare article which was started in the first issue of CROW CAWS. H. F. Smith, Chairman of the Historical Committee and author of this article earnestly solicits additional information regarding the subject. The classified nature of the Electronic Warfare business makes even past history hard to come by. However, we know there are many facets to this article. So, to borrow a phrase "What did you do in the war, Daddy?" Write it down, and send all information to the Association or directly to H. F. Smith, Box B, Pennsauken, N.J.)

The sum total of the investigations in Germany confirmed the view that the ECM program had been a success. It was true, to a very considerable extent, that the countermeasures gear had been a major factor in the reduction in losses. The entire Nazi radar network, according to the people operating it, had been reduced to about one-fifth of its normal effectiveness. Fairly early in the war the Germans had learned to depend almost entirely on radar for antiaircraft gun control, because it gave a much more accurate range and was reliable in all kinds of weather. When the 8th Air Force began using window and electronic jamming, the German antiaircraft crews had been blinded. Try as they might, they had been unable to determine the location of our flights through the dazzling glare of their radar scopes. Orders had been issued to continue firing in spite of the interference in order not to reveal to us the fact that our countermeasures had been successful. Then, so poor was the record of planes shot down under these conditions, that these orders were replaced with orders not to fire at all unless good visual aim could be obtained—orders equivalent to abandoning radar antiaircraft control entirely.

In the German laboratories, scientists had been at work attempting to lessen the vulnerability of their radar equipment ever since the British had dropped the first window in the raid over Hamburg in 1943. After the German bombing raids on England in 1940, Hitler had thought the war was won and had ordered the demobilization of a great part of the German scientific effort and the induction of the scientists into the Army. With the Hamburg raid, and the capture of one of our advanced airborne radar sets, the Germans had seen the error of this decision and had immediately reconstituted the scientific organization. At the end of the war, the laboratories had been operating at full capacity, and about half the German scientific effort in the field of electronics had been directed against our countermeasures activity. So large a force, in fact, had been engaged in this work, that efforts along other lines of scientific war developments were neglected and it was the opinion of investigators that the countermeasures program had not only nullified the German antiaircraft fire but the entire scientific program in general, through the preoccupation of the German scientific organization with the countermeasures program.

THE LET DOWN

When the Japanese war ended, in August 1945, steps were immediately taken to place in effect plans which had already been worked out for the demobilization of the Radio Research Laboratory. Certain projects for which there was no further need were terminated immediately. Other activities which were near completion and which had continuing values, were completed in order to preserve those values. Certain other projects which evidently could not be completed in the near future, but which had considerable long-range importance, were transferred to laboratories of the Armed Services, such as the Naval Research Laboratory and the Aircraft Radiation Laboratory. All laboratory work at the Radio Research Laboratory was stopped by November 1, 1945. By January 1946 only about 230 persons were left on the RRL payroll, and of these, less than 10 percent were scientific personnel, all of whom were engaged in working on reports.

A limited amount of research and development effort took place at the end of World War II and continued for a year or so thereafter. Many of the personnel in the Armed Services who had been engaged in this effort returned to civilian life, and the greater part of the equipment produced for ECM purposes during World War II was sold on the surplus market.

THE BUILD UP

In the late 1940's, ferrett activities showed that a radar net was being built rapidly around the Iron Curtain. The ECM program was thereupon re-established, starting, on the part of the Navy and Air Force, with a small research and development effort, schools, and continued ferrett activities. World War II equipment was obtained from Warehouses and the surplus market, and the need for newer and better equipment was recognized.

In 1947 a decision was made to reactivate ECM training within the Air Force at Boca Raton, Florida. The reactivation of the Air Force electronic warfare program was to run three phases in sequence: first, the existing; second, the interim; and third, the future. The existing phase required the use of selected items of World War II equipment still available in sufficient quantity to meet immediate needs.

Operationally, this equipment had not proven completely satisfactory because it was originally designed to meet specific needs against World War II enemy electronic equipment. Quantities of this equipment were shipped to Boca Raton, Florida and an enlisted man's training course was established there.

The Electronic Warfare Officers' course was not established within the training command but was organized by the Strategic Air Command at the newly opened Maguire Air Force Base, New Jersey.

Training aircraft consisted of twelve (12) B–29, 6 position Ferrett Aircraft. Thus the emphasis in this early phase was on the reconnaissance side.

The course at Maguire was devised to train Electronic Warfare Officers for the Strategic Air Command, and because of limited facilities classes were small. The first several classes consisted of no more than three to four officers. At this rate it would have taken years to provide a sufficient number of trained officers to provide the other commands. The school was moved from Maguire to Barksdale Air Force Base, La. in 1949 and later to the Air Training Command at Keesler Air Force Base. It remained at Keesler until 1961 and was then moved to Mather Air Force Base where it is located today.

The interim equipment provided in the second phase consisted primarily of updated World War II equipment with all its complexity. The result was that the services were obtaining trained personnel but limited equipment capability.

In 1951 the Strategic Air Command organized the 20th Squadron of the Second Bombardment Wing at Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia, into an ECM Squadron for the purpose of developing the best tactics and techniques for employment of the existing and interim ECM equipment. Within one year this effort had expanded to include the entire Second Bombardment Wing.

Tests were conducted primarily against the Air Proving Ground Command at Eglin Air Force Base and resulted in the modification of each of the existing equipment in order to improve its capability. The results of this effort were so successful that the 376th Bombardment Wing was organized into an ECM Wing with a special Directorate of Electronic Countermeasures Test and Tactics. A part of this directorate was an ECM Laboratory consisting of approximately seventy (70) people who designed either modifications for existing equipment or completely new techniques. Much of the thinking of this early effort is now incorporated in the existing military equipment.

The 376th Bombardment Wing was later augmented by the 301st Bombardment Wing. The two wings were organized as the 801st Air Division and provided the Strategic Air Command with a force of over 90 specially equipped B-47 electronic warfare aircraft for both test and combat. This Air Division was transferred to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, where it continued to function as the mainstay of the Strategic Air Command Electronic Warfare capability until phase three began to take effect and the future electronic warfare equipment began to appear in the inventory in quantity. This phase is not complete as yet, however, much progress has been made.

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE CAMPUS VISITS IN THE VIRGINIAS REVEAL WHOLESOMENESS OF YOUTH THERE—STUDENT EDITOR ASKS HOW LONG ARE WE GOING TO ALLOW LEFTIST INFILTRATION TO MOCK "THIS IS MY OWN, MY NATIVE LAND"?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, recently, I have visited the campuses of West Virginia University, Salem, and Glenville Colleges in our State, and Ferrum Junior College in Virginia.

It was heartening to talk with hundreds of students who are not "off beat" but, instead, are wholesome youth. They are thinking clearly and are diligently at work. They are not interested in channeling their energies and talents into the tearing-down types of activities. It was my observation that they are in the process of building for themselves careers of meaning and service, as well as success.

These young university and college students of whom I speak are not wreckers. They are less confused than we may think or as we would be informed by listening to some sources, and as heralded in some headlined articles.

It was gratifying, Mr. President, to be in the hills of the Virginias and to realize that these young people know why they are in the educational institutions there—why they are studying—and where they wish to go.

And, Mr. President, it was satisfying to read the leading editorial in the October 26, 1967, issue of the Daily Athenaeum, the student newspaper of West Virginia University, Morgantown. Written by editor in chief Martin Coy, the editorial carries the headline, "This Is My Own, My Native Land." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS MY OWN, MY NATIVE LAND

They sit at a table in front of Moore Hall passing out "resistance" material.

They quote Marxist and Socialist military leaders against United States policy.

They reject established law and order and strive to organize civil disobedience.

Admitted Communists and Communist sympathizers hold a number of leadership positions in their National Mobilization Committee.

The left stands up and advocates that all young men burn their draft cards, defect to Canada, plead homosexuality or become conscientious objectors.

The War Resisters League, the Jewish Peace Fellowship, the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, the American Friends Service Committee, Inc., the Catholic Peace Fellowship have material on these subjects available on campus through Students for a Democratic Society.

Too many times is the press accused of printing things out of context. Is this not what the "left" is doing?

They use famous quotes most apropos to their own situations, but there are other quotes apropos to the situation, too.

"I have never advocated war, except as a means of peace," Ulysses S. Grant said.

"If peace cannot be maintained with honor, it is no longer peace," Lord Russell said.

"To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace," George Washington said.

"Swim or sink, live or die, survive or perish with my country was my unalterable determination," John Adams said.

"I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country," Nathan Hale said.

"Every citizen should be a soldier. This was the case with the Greeks and Romans, and must be that of every free state," spoke Thomas Jefferson.

We can't help but wonder if the "left" recalls the words of Abraham Lincoln in his second inaugural address:

"Let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

How long are we going to allow leftist infiltration to mock ". . . this is my own, my native land!"?

FORMER CEA CHAIRMAN NOURSE: HOW TO MAKE PROSPERITY LAST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Wednesday the current period of economic expansion will become the longest in the Nation's history. In recognition of this achievement, United Press International has asked the present and former Chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisers to give their views on how to make this prosperity last. The first article in this series written by Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, the first Chairman of the Council, appears in this morning's Washington Post.

Dr. Nourse, who served as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers from 1946 to 1949, was the person primarily responsible for launching and giving professional status to this new arm of the President. Dr. Nourse has had a long association with the Brookings Institution, and for many years after his service on the Council he was Vice Chairman of the Joint Council on Economic Education. He is truly one of the deans of the economics profession.

True to his belief in the policy set forth in the Employment Act, Dr. Nourse thinks that there is no reason why we cannot have another 81 months of well-sustained prosperity, or, indeed, an indefinite period of economic growth. His article places the new economics in healthy perspective by pointing out that sole reliance on the fine tuning of monetary and fiscal policies is not practical and will not alone sustain prosperity. Quite correctly he notes that such factors as wage-price adjustments in the private sector will be of equal importance. However, he fails to draw the most important conclusion from this observation—that wage-price behavior consistent with sustained prosperity will depend upon the development of an imaginative wage-price policy at the Federal level.

Mr. President, I think this series of articles is a most constructive step in promoting a better understanding of economic policy. I ask unanimous consent that the first article, entitled "How To Make Prosperity Last—I," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO MAKE PROSPERITY LAST—I: NOURSE PREDICTS CONTINUED BOOM

(NOTE.—Edwin G. Nourse says there's "no real reason" why we can't have 81 more months of prosperity.

(Leon H. Keyserling warns that the expansion is falling about $40 billion short of its potential.

(Raymond J. Saulnier attributes the current prosperity "in large part" to Vietnam.

(Walter W. Heller is concerned that "old politics" may discredit "new economics."

(And Gardner Ackley says the "immediate challenge" is to raise taxes and curb spending.

(These men have three things in common. They all have been—one now is—top economic adviser to the President of the United States.

(They all believe that the current economic expansion—which on Wednesday becomes the longest in the Nation's history—can continue, if the Government has the courage to act.

(And all have been asked by United Press International to outline what they would do to make the longest expansion longer.)

(By Edwin G. Nourse)

There is no real reason in the book of economics as I read it—both old and new testaments—why we should not treat ourselves to another 81 months of well-sustained prosperity—or indeed to an indefinitely continuing future of healthy national growth.

We have the productive plant, capital funds, and credit resources, the labor power, administrative talent, and technological know-how.

The unanswered question is: do we have the individual and group morale needed to achieve these capabilities through the structures and practices of our democratic enterprise system, private and public?

When I read the book of politics and the book of individual and mass psychology, my confidence is somewhat shaken. So—back to the economic potentials.

The high priests of the "new economics" proclaim fiscal and monetary policy as the master tools for assuring the full employment and maximum production goals set up in the Employment Act of 1946. Administer doses of Government stimulant at the proper time and in the right amount, and simply reverse this procedure when needed to sustain the ever-normal boom within safe limits of reasonable price stability and dollar value.

This "fine tuning" of the economic mechanism—impeccable as arithmetic—assumes and, for full success, requires unified central control or sensitive and sophisticated coordination of policy and action among the various subordinate centers.

But this concept of "fine tuning" has a rather hollow sound when we look at the realities of executive leadership and congressional implementation, with a dog-fight now going on between proponents of tax increase and those for spending cuts—and the special interest groups, factions, and lobbies behind our national policy—and programmakers.

The new economics has been preoccupied with problems of the public sector. But sustained prosperity depends no less on private sector wage-price adjustments, consumer prices and profit rates, than on public spending and tax adjustments. Paralleling the congressional dog-fight is the collective bargaining dog-fight between the automotive industry and the United Automobile Workers, not to mention the steel haulers' strike and the recent insurrections of school teachers and guardians of the public safety—policemen and firemen.

As I survey the total scene, I am moved to doubt that maintaining aggregate demand for the output of a full-employment use of our resources and our racing scientific technology will be as easy in the next dozen years as it has been from 1960 to 1967—particularly if there is a truce in southeast Asia and disenchantment with projects for manned flights to distant planets and "permanent colonies on the moon."

Even so, it is my personal guess that, thanks to the considerable common sense of the American people and the degree of economic literacy that is being nourished by our universities and research institutes and disseminated through our lively communications media, we shall avoid both the scylla of deep or prolonged recession or the charybdis of runaway inflation.

NATIONAL GRANGE CENTENNIAL

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, during the week of November 13 to 22, members of the National Grange will gather for their annual meeting. This meeting will have special significance because this year will mark the 100th anniversary of the Grange.

Mr. President, those who gather at the centennial session can look back with pride to the accomplishments of this, the oldest farm organization in the United States.

The National Grange led the fight to give Cabinet status to the Department of Agriculture and helped develop the original Farm Credit Act.

It helped to develop the concept of parity and to translate that concept into legislative reality.

It was primarily responsible for the establishment of rural free delivery and our parcel post system, and contributed significantly to the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Its earliest activities paved the way for the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission and, more recently, it helped pass legislation establishing our current system of interstate highways.

It played paramount roles in the development of our cooperative extension service and formation of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

Its efforts on behalf of the school lunch and school milk programs and food for peace are well known, and the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 incorporated a number of longstanding Grange policies.

These are only some of the National Grange's great accomplishments on behalf of American agriculture, but the dedication and progressive commitment which made this record possible means that the centennial session of the National Grange will not simply be a review of past accomplishments, but a renewed dedication to a continuation of yeoman efforts to protect and advance the interests of American agriculture in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I applaud the National Grange in its 100th year, and welcome its continued contributions in the future.

MISSILE ELECTRONIC WARFARE AND THE FUTURE OF OUR COUNTRY

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, electronic warfare poses a challenge that could well determine the future of our Nation and the world. The more I have investigated this area of scientific endeavor, the more convinced I have become that the future military posture and defense of our Nation rests upon a first-rate EW capability.

Soviet research in this field is intense, broad ranging, and well supported. It is also, most of all, consistent. This is a virtue our effort has heretofore lacked.

As usual, we are on a "feast or famine" cycle. When a war situation presents itself to our Nation, we pour money and talent into EW research. The moment the crisis passes, we allow our EW establishment to decay, making our efforts next time around that much more expensive.

Even now as we sit here, American EW specialists and equipment are engaged in a series of mortal encounters with the best the Soviet Union can produce over in Vietnam. Also, our EW capability in Vietnam is saving American lives.

It is important that we realize how much the future of this Nation depends upon EW, which has traditionally centered its activities around the White Sands missile range in my home State of New Mexico. A unique band of Americans dedicated to the preservation and extension of the art of EW in this Nation has long fought for the necessary goals I have described.

Mr. President, I refer to the "Old Crows," headed by Bernie Zettl. This country knows too little of what this band of men have done.

The Old Crows are joining in sponsoring a symposium on EW at the White Sands facility tomorrow. I shall deliver an address there, joining with the people who form the backbone of our EW effort.

It is important to note here that the White Sands missile range is the very heart of our EW research effort. It also is the location where most of the proving out of this research is carried on.

The missile electronic warfare technical area, or MEWTA, at White Sands, under the excellent guidance of Mr. McKinley Jones, has rendered immeasurable service to this Republic.

Today, the value of MEWTA's varied fixed and portable electronic countermeasures-related equipment exceeds $30,000,000. The area has at its disposal the facilities of the White Sands missile range, largest missile range in the continental United States, where more than 2,000 missiles are fired annually.

Without going too far into the intricacies of this facility, it can be said with certainty that White Sands is equipped to do a total and fully effective job for this Nation in EW research and testing.

MEWTA, headed by McKinley Jones, stands ready to do the job I believe must be done, and done on a broad front as swiftly as possible. If we are to maintain our EW effort at the level it has at last reached, we must make use of this facility.

There are, Mr. President, several indications of how dangerous this situation is, and how fast we must act. An article published in Aviation Week and Space Technology deals with how the penetration capacity of our missile systems is eroding.

It points out a clear and growing danger. It highlights the necessity of a heightened effort in EW on our part, and the fact that we must make swift and effective use of facilities such as White Sands and the EW team of MEWTA headed by Mr. Jones. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Penetration Capability Erodes

(By Barry Miller)

Los Angeles.—Superiority of the retaliatory capability of U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles over the defenses of potential adversaries has slowly eroded during the past several years in the face of significant advances in missile-defense technology and the absence of corresponding progress on the offensive side.

This is the gloomy consensus of knowledgeable observers, who not long ago confidently echoed Defense Dept. assurances that American missile strength was years ahead of any potential enemy's missile defense (AW&ST Jan. 20, 1964, p. 72). The threat of a retaliatory strike against an aggressor by this missile force has been the cornerstone of recent American nuclear defense posture.

The ability of American missiles to penetrate to their targets is not so much in question, at least at the moment, as is their capacity to perform the mission without extremely-costly saturation assaults.

The gap between offensive and defensive technology apparently is being closed by a complex, difficult-to-assess combination of factors. These include:

Important known advances in both U.S. and Soviet defense radar technology, particularly the sensor's ability to discriminate and track live warheads, discarding the decoys.

Progress in high-acceleration or longer-range missile interceptors such as the Army's Sprint and Spartan.

Refinement of warheads for exoatmospheric interceptors, using the devastating emission of high-energy X-rays as their principal kill mechanism (AW&ST May 15, p. 22). The Russians are known to have been at work on this concept, as has the Atomic Energy Commission, since 1963.

SOVIET DEPLOYMENT

Also, the deployment by the Russians of an anti-missile system around Moscow (see p. 78) poses a threat of undetermined severity, where none existed previously, to the ability of American ICBMs to penetrate.

In addition, substantial advances in military space technology over the past several years have led to informed speculation that the Soviets have the same ability the U.S. now possesses for detecting missile launches during their boost phases and tracking these from space.

This places an even greater burden on missile penetration aids, those devices and techniques that would assist missiles in reaching their targets by confusing, deceiving or destroying the missile defense systems.

Many of these considerations have converged to push the tasks of penetration aids, once primarily concerned with re-entry into the earth's atmosphere and subsequent descent on target, back through the early phases of mid-course flight and perhaps also into boost.

Now, decoys—those real, flying objects ejected from missiles and intended to resemble actual warheads to confuse an enemy—must, in turn, be disguised by enveloping them in "chaff puffs" to confuse both ground-based radar and space-borne sensors.

Further compounding the situation, American development of penetration aids has butted against serious limitations, in some cases, of fundamental physical nature.

For a number of years, U.S. penetration-aids work was aimed towards reducing radar cross-section of missile re-entry systems, or the areas of the vehicle that effectively return tell-tale echoes to defense radars. Painstaking advances in re-entry body shaping, attitude-control techniques and cooling or quenching body wakes, which otherwise behave as giant reflectors for hostile radars, have reduced the radar target presented by U.S. re-entry vehicles. Smaller wakes have lower ion density, hence offer less reflectivity for searching or tracking radars. This, in turn, has prompted defense technologists to develop radars with longer wavelengths that can pick out reduced cross-section targets.

OTHER DIFFICULTIES

The use of lower frequencies, dipping down into the UHF and even into the VHF regions, poses other difficulties for the offense. The various techniques of reducing radar target size, or radar observability, can go only so far. Certain minimal physical dimensions must be retained if antennas for radar fuzes carried by American missiles are to have a window through the ionized plasma sheath created on re-entry. This accounts for the lessening interest in reducing radar observability found in missile circles today. By going to lower frequencies, radar defense technologists, for the time being, at least, may have gained an upper hand over their adversaries.

The Soviets are known to have operational UHF and possibly VHF missile tracking radars as well. About four years ago, American intelligence agencies identified a 500-ft.-long VHF phased array radar, centered in the 150-200-mc. range, installed and operating at Sary Shagan in the Tyuratam area near the Aral Sea.

At the same time, the use of lower frequency defense radar makes more difficult the job of carrying and deploying the radar-spoofing metal foil known since its introduction in World War 2 as chaff. Since the size of chaff is directly related to the radar wavelength, the longer the wavelength the longer must be the chaff. Carrying and deploying large quantities of six or seven-foot-long metal strips from a missile or decoy in ballistic flight add weight and complexity to the task.

The Air Force's Rome Air Development Center has LTV Electrosystems' Continental Electronics at work building a multi-million-dollar VHF radar as part of the Advanced Ballistic Re-Entry Systems (ABRES) program. With it, Air Force presumably hopes to learn more about effectively countering such a threat.

VEXING CHALLENGE

The continuous updating of a potential enemy's radar threat is one of the most vexing challenges for designers of penetration aids. It has thus far confounded still-undampened U.S. hopes of effectively using electronic counter-measures (ECM) techniques against enemy radar defenses.

Some time ago, Air Force flight tested with partial success an active ECM technique developed by Sperry Gyroscope Co. Using this technique, ECM noise jammers intended to confuse enemy radars with their minute-long high-power bursts of noise are deployed in precursor decoys from a reentry vehicle. Once the knotty problem of supplying high power for available weight and volume was solved and tubes generating the high CW power in the radar band of interest were found, the estimate of the radar threat changed. Furthermore, the 1,500-mi.-range Russian frequency radar, code named Doghouse, could track these decoys for at least 1,000 mi. before their little jammers turned on.

In the face of an ever-more ominous defense environment, a missile warhead today faces a tougher battle for survival than in the past, informed observers point out. And, survival will be more difficult tomorrow.

In this climate, the inclination to adopt a saturation, or "barrage," type of missile re-entry system scheme for assured penetration appears to be gaining greater favor. Many warheads carried on board a single missile carrier statistically increase the chances of penetrating into and striking target areas by overloading or saturating the defense. This approach appeared to be evolving for the Air Force's latest re-entry system, the Mk. 18, which has temporarily been shelved because of budgetary squeezes. In this concept, the Mk. 18 system would carry many small, probably unguided, warheads for sequential ejection from the guided re-entry system during the time of maximum threat. These would descend onto a large "footprint" area.

Such a concept is an outgrowth of earlier studies by Avco Corp. and the General Electric Co., USAF's primary re-entry vehicle sources, in the CRESS program (Combined Re-entry Effort in Small Systems), which also was sponsored by the Atomic Energy Commission.

This program was aimed at coordinating ballistic missile re-entry vehicle and warhead activities in an effort to optimize the design of missile re-entry systems, including the warheads themselves—and particularly to get better use of space in the system (AW&ST Mar. 8, 1965, p. 13). The "barrage" concept also is a logical step beyond the development of the General Electric Mk. 12 re-entry system for the Boeing Minuteman 2, the first operational ICBM system to have multiple warheads.

For the past six years, the U.S. has been spending what is believed to be in excess of $200 million a year on penetration techniques. Through its ABRES program, which is administered for the Defense Dept. by the Air Force, actively aided by the Army and Navy, the Pentagon has spent more than $100 million a year since 1962, or a total of about $0.75 billion over a six-year period.

Another $250 million has been budgeted for Fiscal 1968 and 1969, although budgetary cuts may curtail this. Much of the money, of course, is spent on boosters, range fees and other items needed to support penetration-aids development but not directly related to the development itself.

On the opposite side of the ledger are surprisingly large quantities of money spent by weapon systems offices on operational re-entry systems, more accurate guidance concepts and the purchase of penaids packages.

A large quantity of this annual investment in ABRES is going into flight evaluation of maneuverable re-entry vehicles which offer advantages of evasion and, in one case where the vehicle has aerodynamic glide qualities, extended range or payload as well.

The initial flight of the Boost Glide Reentry Vehicle (BGRV) developed by McDonnell Douglas Corp. probably will take place this month on board a General Dynamics Atlas F ICBM booster from Vandenberg AFB, Calif. BGRV, formerly known as the Aball or 122M Aeroballistic missile, will be fired into a high ballistic path, then refired downward from a high altitude into the earth's atmosphere. It will make a short ascent, revert to a relatively-flat, decaying aerodynamic glide so that it can skip along to a target. It would be hidden by its low altitude flight path within the ground clutter of the defense radar. Gas jets on BGRV execute roll and steering maneuvers.

The flight altitude of BGRV may be so low as to make terrain clearance radar mandatory.

The advantage of such a system is that the pre-programed evasive maneuvering of the vehicle might preclude effective calculation of its trajectory by the defense forces. This would make intercept computation more difficult.

SUSCEPTIBILITY

Because the vehicle glides over greater distances within the earth's atmosphere, it is susceptible to action by defense forces for a relatively-long period. In addition, the longer, more-complicated flight path places greater strains on the vehicle's inertial guidance system, making accuracies comparable to those of conventional nuclear warheads on straight, non-maneuvering ballistic flights more difficult to achieve. This shortcoming might be overcome if any of the terminal ballistic missile guidance schemes now under study materialize. Air Force also is looking at a maneuver-for-accuracy concept which might side-step the problem.

Unlike BGRV, which begins its maneuver long before re-entry, the other maneuvering concepts envision maneuver at the start of re-entry. One of these, the General Electric Maneuvering Ballistic Re-entry Vehicle (MBRV), finally achieved a successful flight this summer after three failures due to power dropout, guidance difficulties and booster failure, in that order.

In the MBRV concept, the vehicle might traverse a shorter-range ballistic trajectory, deceiving the enemy into anticipating assault at a given target. At a pre-determined altitude above the false target area, MBRV would go through a pre-programed pull-up, followed by another ballistic descent on a more-distant target. It might force the enemy to commit his weapons to defense of a given area prematurely, as it feinted toward unintended targets. The MBRV is believed to have complex hydraulic-driven moving surfaces. Perhaps $50–$100 million have been spent on the two efforts.

A third approach, somewhat similar to MBRV in that it is ballistic rather than aerodynamic in nature, is under investigation by McDonnell Douglas. Known as the MARCAS concept, it calls for the injection of fluids into the slipstream and the use of reaction-control gas jets for roll control. Test flights down the inland range are planned.

Critics of the maneuvering re-entry approach cite the great expense involved in these techniques, the extra cost of strengthening the missile boosters and the need for extra equipment such as hydraulics and gas generators that add undesirable weight. In addition, they point to the need for developing nuclear-hardened guidance systems for any maneuvering vehicles.

Since the guidance system must be active and functioning for prolonged periods of time in what would be a nuclear-defense environment, it would have to be hardened against acoustic and nuclear effects. A conventional missile guidance system would be less susceptible because of its essential quiescence after re-entry and the shorter duration of its exposure in the hostile environment.

SABRE SYSTEM

Air Force and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Instrumentation Laboratory have been developing a guidance system specifically designed to withstand high accelerations experienced by maneuvering vehicles and hardened against nuclear effects. The Self-Aligning Boost and Re-entry System (SABRE) might be applicable to other re-entry vehicles, but its expense and complexity may restrict it to maneuvering applications. Two aerospace contractors, General Motors AC Electronics and North American Autonetics, are developing prototype inertial platforms to MIT design and Bendix prints (AW&ST Mar. 23, 1964, p. 82), while Sperry Rand Univac is building the hardened computer.

In Operational Maneuvering Re-entry Vehicle (OMRV) studies, McDonnell and General Electric are looking at a maze of requirements for maneuvering re-entry. They are examining body shapes, the advantages of maneuvering against specific targets, the number of vehicles needed to knock out specific targets, the constraints maneuvering imposes on vehicle and guidance system design.

Another technique for countering missile-defense radars using at least a rudimentary maneuverable re-entry vehicle is under investigation by TRW Systems Group, assisted by Raytheon Co. This program, known as Degradation of Radar Defense Systems (DRADS), began about three years ago, was cut back and then was resumed recently.

DRADS would employ a separate re-entry vehicle, possibly carried piggyback on a ballistic missile for release to radiate jamming signals or to home on hostile radar signals, and having sufficient maneuverability to dive into hostile radiating antennas. In many respects, DRADS would be a ballistic-missile counterpart to the Navy's aerodynamic Shrike anti-radar missile, serving the same countermeasures' function against missile defense radar as Shrike is intended to provide against tactical air-defense radars.

ACTIVE ECM

The possible use of active electronic countermeasures to confuse or spoof missile defenses is regarded as one of the more promising penetration aids-techniques, although it has been beset with severe obstacles. Such an approach is a natural extension to missile warfare of airborne and ground-based ECM techniques, refined in the years since the Korean War.

To date, however, the difficulty has been to secure extremely-rugged transmitting tubes in the microwave bands of interest capable of withstanding severe environments and generating a maximum amount of broadband power with a minimum amount of weight. Suitable sources of kilowatt dc. power having high specific weight and high specific volume first had to be developed to meet these needs.

Air Force has funded several efforts in active ECM in recent years. Philco-Ford's Space and Re-entry Systems Div. developed small jammers that were deployed from re-entry vehicles in parachutes at the time of re-entry. The Sperry system went through tests on board four-stage Atlantic Research Corp. Athena rockets before being backlogged for operational systems should they be desired. The pioneer electronic countermeasures jamming program, conducted by Borders Electronics, advanced through prototype before termination.

SOLID-STATE ADVANCES

Recent advances in solid-state and other avionics technologies have significantly rekindled latent enthusiasm for electronic countermeasures. Advances in solid state microwave bulk-effect generators, like Gunn effect devices, that are capable of generating quantities of CW microwave power could help change the picture.

The latest concept, which USAF recently chose Raytheon to study (AW&ST Sept. 11, p. 106), envisions a package of small mini-jammers, each one tuned to a different frequency band—UHF, L, S, C and X bands—presumably deployed in a precursor decoy. The availability of a group of jammers could simplify the job of thwarting highly-advanced stacked-beam radars where radiation is on widely-separated frequencies, or frequency hop radars, in which frequency randomly changes from pulse to pulse. It also makes counter ECM more difficult to put into effect.

Until now, missile ECM efforts have concentrated on noise jamming, the generation of large bursts of white noise, as essentially the simplest and easiest approach, much as it was in airborne ECM.

There is much current interest, again stimulated by anticipated availability of low power solid-state microwave devices, in the use of deception repeaters as a cheaper, smaller and lighter alternative.

"ACTIVE CHAFF"

In this approach, the so-called "active chaff" would be a small, solid-state repeater, possibly using tunnel diode amplifiers, which could pick up radar signals too weak to be detected by the enemy, delay them for fixed periods, then re-radiate them toward the hostile radar. The enemy might then get a false indication as to the whereabouts of the target.

Meanwhile, USAF is continuing to pursue development of new, high-efficiency, high-CW-power traveling wave tubes suitable for re-entry ECM. Rome Air Development Center is believed to be in the process of letting development contracts for re-entry traveling wave tubes to Hughes Aircraft Co. and Watkins-Johnson Co.

Philco-Ford Corp. also is at work on an exoatmospheric jamming vehicle that would radiate signals from outside the atmosphere during the mid-course phase of ballistic-missile flight.

A sizable portion of penaids activity has concentrated on developing effective decoys to outwit the various sensors—radar, infrared and optical—available to an enemy radar. The long-range, all-weather sensor, is still the prime object of deception, however.

Ideally, decoys should resemble the actual warhead and its behavior from shortly after they are dispensed from the re-entry vehicle until well into the terminal phase of flight. They should fly trajectories similar to those of the warhead they imitate and return deceptive signatures to enemy sensors.

Ever greater degrees of realism are being sought in decoys. Only this summer, the Air Force directed McDonnell Douglas to study a maneuvering decoy (MANDEC) that might more effectively simulate maneuvering reentry systems.

The tendency toward greater realism requires larger and heavier decoys with chaff, small propulsion and guidance systems and protective shields. This leads some critics to argue that decoys are simply no longer worth the expense and weight that might be spent more effectively on additional warheads.

Decoys that might maintain the deceptive ruse, either in the mid-course or terminal phases of flight and perhaps against different sensors, have all been investigated. Those that fulfill their roles for only brief periods still may add to the enemy's confusion at crucial moments, possibly provoking him into firing missile interceptors at harmless objects before his defense complex sorts the real from the fraudulent targets. A mixed assortment of decoys might compound this confusion.

At a briefing last year, Philco representatives pictured two types of exoatmospheric decoys deployed from a missile carrier that have radar signatures similar to those of missile warheads. Shaped like re-entry vehicles, one decoy, called Dixie Cup, was all metallic, while the other was a wire-grid structure. Both would burn up during atmospheric entry (AW&ST Nov. 28, 1966, p. 94).

Through the Advanced Research Projects Agency's Optical Particle Decoy (OPADEC) program, attempts were made to simulate vehicle observability across the infrared, optical and longer wavelengths during atmospheric reentry. Four of seven Hughes-designed OPADEC decoys were flown, and two of these successfully spoofed observers. Another OPADEC contractor is believed to have had even more encouraging results.

Various problems have besieged decoy designers, not the least of which is the manner in which heavier decoys are deployed at low altitudes.

Air Force devotes continuing attention to seeking solutions to its fuzing and arming problems. Currently, Philco is in the midst of building 7-ft.-long, slender cone-shaped vehicles flown as the fourth stages of Athena rockets down the inland range from Green River, Utah, to the White Sands, N.M., Missile Range.

These small vehicles, which weigh 200 lb. with payloads, are used to investigate effects of simulated ballistic-missile re-entry phenomena on fuzing systems. The Air Force-funded program, called Fuzing, Arming, Test and Evaluation (FATE), permits flight tests of promising warhead-fuzing concepts.

FUZING CONSTRAINTS

Ways of evading the constraints of radar fuzing always attract great interest. A radioisotope approach was discarded after early tests. A millimeter wave approach, which could enable electromagnetic signals to penetrate the re-entry plasma sheath at shorter wave-lengths is under study by Raytheon for the Air Force.

In its Re-entry Vehicle Technology and Observables program, USAF is planning to look into many aspects of assuring safe missile re-entry. It may look into several new materials for protection of re-entry vehicles, or combinations of them, suggested by underground nuclear tests, as promising improved resistance to high energy X-rays. It also will explore new techniques for cooling, hardening and shaping re-entry vehicle surfaces and use of attitude stabilization. This activity is an extension of the successful Avco Low Observable Re-entry Vehicle (LORV) program which produced a long, slender vehicle with a low cross section.

Air Force is devoting considerable attention—although not part of the ABRES program—to improving ballistic missile accuracy, which relates directly to penetration tactics. For, as statistical chances of an individual missile striking a target increase, the demand for penetration by every warhead diminishes.

As guidance circular error probabilities decrease, the effects of climatology, geodetic and geophysical anamolies become increasingly more important. Errors in target altitudes, for example, can result in significant warhead shortfall or overfall, especially as guidance systems accuracies improve. Wind shear, gravity anamolies and cross-track errors are of increasing concern. The Air Force has several groups, including Logicon, Inc., and Geodynamics, analyzing these effects. Geodynamics is investigating a technique to compensate for anamolous gravity effects on guidance systems.

Terminal guidance is one obvious method for wiping out the effects of these anomalies and compensating for additional inaccuracies of maneuvering re-entry.

Aerojet's Space General Div. has been investigating ballistic missile terminal guidance techniques for Air Force's Space and Missile Systems Organization under two overlapping contracts. One of these is a fundamental investigation into terminal guidance with a view toward combining sensors, optics, data correlation and control devices.

In the other, the company is seeking to define specific experiments. One optical device pinpointed in these efforts was carried on the heat shield of a National Aeronautics and Space Administration Gemini capsule to explore the possibility of seeing through the reentry plasma sheath.

Concepts under study include microwave radiometry and map matching. Ling Temco Vought has been at work for SAMSO on adapting a map-matching terminal scheme for the ballistic missile application.

Air Force's focus on guidance updating extends well beyond terminal aids. It is considering a number of midcourse aids, including both one and two-start position fixing, as an outgrowth of General Precision Systems' work on the STAFF program, and various radio guidance ideas.

Emerging from these investigations is an advanced missile-guidance concept which envisages use of a basic inertial guidance system plus three methods of inflight updating, including star tracking and radio guidance. In this way, if one or two techniques should fail or are otherwise inoperative, the re-entry system still retains its basic guidance capability.

Through the post-boost control system, under development by North American Autonetics for future Minuteman missiles, Air Force has the opportunity to trim position and velocity of the re-entry system after final boost stage burnout with small liquid engines on the re-entry vehicle (AW&ST Sept. 26, 1966, p. 40). Post boost control offers a wide opportunity for in-space changes, such as selection of targets of opportunity after launch.

The Air Force also is looking into methods of permitting a guidance computer temporarily shutdown or disrupted during exposure to transient radiation bursts from anti-missile warheads to recover by reconstructing what has been lost during the off-air-interval. The use of advanced self-healing software techniques could enable a misdirected missile to get back on trajectory.

Several ways of guiding multiple warheads have been explored, but the shift towards un-guided multiples appears to be gaining the upper hand. The original concepts of independently-targeted multiples, once known as the Multiple Independent Reentry Vehicle (MIRV), required that small warheads be able independently to guide themselves to their targets after mid-course separation.

On the opposite extreme was the small warhead and maneuverable reentry (SWARMS) scheme, in which individual warheads would be separated into terminal trajectories on a more-random or "shotgun" basis. Different combinations of the two ideas still find advocates.

Guidance schemes for individual warheads similarly range from the complex to the elementary. One approach calls for slave guidance units on board the multiples to be initialized before release by a master system aboard the launching vehicle.

A number of systems engineering and software specialty organizations are assisting the military services and APRA in their re-entry and penetrations aids work. Among these are Heliodyne Corp., Van Nuys, Calif., which performs research under contract in reentry physics and runs a data distribution service of field test measurements; GRC, Inc., Santa Barbara, Calif.; Planning Research Corp., Los Angeles, and Logicon, Inc., San Pedro, Calif., which does systems engineering and analytical work in the guidance area.

SENATE FAILURE TO RATIFY HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS AMOUNTS TO U.S. REPUDIATION OF U.N. CHARTER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the recognition of human rights as a subject of proper international concern pervades the United Nations Charter.

In the preamble to the charter, the peoples of the United Nations stated clearly their "faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person," and their resolve "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom."

Article 1 of the charter cites among the main purposes of the U.N. Charter the achievement of international cooperation "in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Article 55 of the charter again emphasizes the duty of the United Nations to promote "universal respect for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

In article 56, all members of the United Nations "pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55."

The Charter of the United Nations was speedily and overwhelmingly ratified by this body 22 years ago. The vote was 89 to 2.

I must reluctantly conclude that the Senate, by its continuing failure to ratify a single human rights convention, has in effect repudiated the United Nations Charter.

The language and provisions of articles 1, 55, and 56 of the charter are unmistakably clear. By ratifying the charter, the Senate pledged our national willingness "to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization to promote" universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

What else does any of us think the human rights conventions are about except "human rights and fundamental freedoms for all"? Freedom from slavery, freedom from forced labor, full political rights of women, freedom of association, and the right to live are all very basic, very fundamental, very human rights.

I urge the Senate to reaffirm our promise made both to ourselves and to the United Nations 22 years ago when we ratified the U.N. Charter by giving advice and consent to all five of the human rights conventions during this session of the 90th Congress.

VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record lead editorials from the Wyoming Eagle of Cheyenne for October 17 and October 25, 1967. They speak for themselves, Mr. President, but in so doing they express thoughts which I know a great many Americans share, notwithstanding the antics of the relatively few but noisy critics of U.S. policy.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Eagle, Oct. 17, 1967]

Clear Pronouncements

In view of the noisy criticism of our efforts and policies in Southeast Asia, both at home and abroad, and in view of protests, non-cooperation and even obstructionism here at home, it is good to see our national leaders come forth with clear and firm statements spelling out our position and our intensions in Vietnam.

President Johnson, himself, set the tone a week ago Saturday, when he said he was firm in his determination to "see it through" in Asia.

He said most of the recommendations he had heard "on how to get out of trouble cheaply and fast . . . come down to this: deny your responsibility."

He said such advice would have the United States behave as if it were "a small nation with a few interests . . . as if the oceans were twice as wide as they are."

"This," he said, "is the voice not of the hawk or dove, but of the ostrich."

Last Thursday, Secretary of State Dean Rusk stepped into the debate over Vietnam with a firm notice that the administration intends to pursue its present war policy no matter what the critics say.

At the same time, he warned the Communist world that any doubts about the United States' determination to honor its commitment in Southeast Asia could lead to World War III.

"Let me say, as solemnly as I can, that those who would place in question the credibility of the pledged word of the United States under our mutual security treaties would subject this nation to mortal danger," Rusk told a news conference.

"If any who would be our adversary should suppose that our treaties are a bluff, or will be abandoned if the going gets tough, the result could be catastrophe for all mankind."

Secretary Rusk said there was "no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Vietnam," nor was there any "serious opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war."

Therefore, he said, Americans are "debating variations on a theme . . . this or that military move, this or that diplomatic step, this or that formulation of what is in effect a common middle position."

He added, "Hanoi should not misunderstand this debate.

"Our commitment is clear and our national interest is real."

Sunday, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey contended that the future of America is at stake in the anti-Communist struggle in Asia.

He said that, should communism win in Vietnam, "it would stimulate the appetite for more aggression and conquest. It would represent a defeat not only for America but for freedom anywhere."

The Vice President declared that if communism swept Southeast Asia "the entire power structure of the world would be destroyed . . . the threat to our security is in Asia and we are fighting there not only for the Vietnamese but for ourselves, for the future of our country."

Humphrey declared that Red China, the center of "militant, aggressive Asian communism," had failed to overrun Southeast Asia because the United States is resisting aggression in Vietnam.

He called for "unity, courage and steadfastness," and warned that the Communists were counting on "our division, our weariness and our uncertainty."

We don't suppose the words of these three top United States officials will do much to quiet the relatively few, but noisy critics.

They seem to have discovered that, by using the freedoms guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States to criticize and protest, they can attract the national limelight. No one likes war, and by criticizing the war in Vietnam, the critics have found they can enjoy a certain degree of temporary popularity.

However, it is to be hoped the Communists will understand the clear pronouncements of the nation's leaders and realize they are fooling only themselves if they expect the United States, which isn't really divided at all, to surrender and pull out.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Eagle, Oct. 25, 1967]

Damage Being Done

Anyone who doubts that damage is being done to our war effort by irresponsible violence connected with Vietnam protest demonstrations here in these United States need only to take a look at statements coming from Communist quarters this week.

For instance, news dispatches from Hong Kong reported that "Communist China gloated Monday about the antiwar demonstrations outside the Pentagon."

Radio Peking was quoted as saying President Johnson was "seized with fear."

The broadcast, quoting the official New China news agency, said:

"The demonstration took place at a time when U.S. imperialism was badly routed by the heroic Vietnamese people on the battlefield in Vietnam."

The broadcast, monitored in Hong Kong and Tokyo, also said the antiwar demonstration "threw the U.S. ruling clique into a panic."

It said troops and other security measures at the Pentagon "fully showed up the Johnson administration's fear of the people and its true colors as a paper tiger."

Remember. These are the kind of distorted reports fed to the people under Communist domination.

These are the kind of propaganda reports that feed the Communists' one remaining great hope—that a divided United States will grow tired of fighting and pull out of South Vietnam, leaving Southeast Asia at the mercy of the Communists.

Perhaps the greatest weapon available in the current American efforts to move the Vietnam war from the battlefields to the conference table is a nationwide display of solidarity and unity behind our position in Vietnam.

Such things as the weekend antiwar violence on the part of a relatively few demonstrators do little to help present a united front to the Communist enemy. Quite the opposite.

Apparent Republican determination to play politics with the Vietnam war—as demonstrated by Republican governors' refusal to support a resolution backing our efforts in Vietnam—doesn't help either.

Indeed, the Republicans, in playing politics with the war, might well give the Communists the impression that if they can hang on until after the 1968 election. President Johnson might be defeated and they might somehow win victory in South Vietnam by default.

We suggest that, if the demonstrators and protesters would put away their torches and the citizens of these United States would leave Vietnam out of partisan politics—if we, the citizens of these United States would make it crystal clear to the Communists that we are united in our determination to stop Communist aggression in South Vietnam—the war might be over a lot sooner.

PRI-RU-TA

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the November issue of the Rural Areas Development Newsletter carries a story entitled "Farmers Beat Flooding Problem—With Help," which points up another achievement of the Pri-Ru-Ta resource, conservation and development project in Wisconsin.

The Pri-Ru-Ta project is one of the first of its kind in the country. The three counties involved in the project got together because they shared common problems and common goals. Their efforts to date have been tremendously successful and the flood control project described in the Rural Areas Development Newsletter is but one of many.

I am firmly convinced that these resource, conservation and development projects are a sound approach to rural development and hope that we will see more of them in the years ahead. Many future projects will look to the Pri-Ru-Ta project in Wisconsin as a model of an enormously successful program.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the November Rural Areas Development Newsletter be printed in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues so that they might see the vast potential of resource, conservation and development projects.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Farmers Beat Flooding Problem—With Help

Farmers in a 25,000-acre area in Dewey and Grow townships, in the Pri-Ru-Ta Resource Conservation and Development Project in *Wisconsin*, were losing crops on good silt loam through flooding caused by inadequate channel capacity.

Local landowners sponsored construction of 35 miles of new channels to remove excess water. They agreed to pay for land easements, rights-of-way, roads, and utilities.

The total installation cost of work completed the first 3 years is estimated at $44,225. Estimated annual benefits are $36,232. Benefits are expected to increase to $150,000 a year when the project is completed.

> Associated land treatment included surface field ditches, terraces, diversions, grassed waterways, contouring, and conservation cropping systems. Similar work is expected to spread to 130 farms and eventually result in total benefits of more than $500,000 a year.
>
> The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service provided cost-sharing to landowners for establishing conservation practices on farm lands. The State Conservation Department provided information and technical assistance. The State Extension Service helped organize and conduct group activities. The Rusk County Highway Committee, and the townships of Dewey and Grow, installed bridges and culverts on road crossings.
>
> The Soil Conservation Service provided technical assistance in planning, design, and construction. The Farmers Home Administration provided association loans, soil and water conservation loans, farm improvement loans, and farm ownership loans.

A SOLDIER RETURNS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, often the Halls of Congress ring with rhetoric praising "our boys in Vietnam"—and rightly so. But as I read this week about one fine young man from Utah who has just returned from the war, I wondered if perhaps we should not pause more often and let our returning soldiers speak for themselves.

An enterprising story in the Salt Lake Tribune on October 23 gives that opportunity to 1st Lt. George M. Bapis, of Salt Lake City, a former student body president at his high school who, at 23, has seen more of life and death than many people ever experience.

Lieutenant Bapis' reminiscences of life as an infantryman in Vietnam should make each of us a little more grateful for the tremendous sacrifices of our men to keep freedom alive in Southeast Asia:

> In less than a year there was a marked increase in supplies and in the advancement of weapons used by the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong. When I arrived there in September of 1966, some were using primitive-type crossbows and bamboo arrows; when I left there were sporting rifles with the latest in scopes.

Lieutenant Bapis, who received several medals, including two Bronze Stars, told of coming upon one enemy tunnel that had 30,000 hand grenades, hundreds of mines and tons of rice, and pictured the difficulty of fighting "Charlie" as he darted into his steel-reinforced "spider holes" during bombing raids and emerged right after to continue fighting.

The young soldier, who was a member of the 1st Battalion, 28th Infantry of the 1st Division, also made some substantive assessments of the war effort in Vietnam.

He said:

> The U.S. sought to bomb the supply points of Hanoi and Haiphong more. As long as the enemy has supplies, it will continue to wage war.

Lieutenant Bapis said that Christmas and New Year truces were truces in name only:

> As soon as the U.S. observed the truce and halted bombing runs, you'd see the roads and trails swarming with Viet Cong supply convoys.

Again, Mr. President, I would just like to observe that such firsthand reports do much to establish a more solid foundation for the unique difficulties facing our men in Vietnam and the need for our unceasing support from home.

I ask unanimous consent to have the news article reprinted at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> [From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Oct. 23, 1967]
>
> ### Lieutenant Back From Jungle—Salt Laker Cites Cong Weaponry, Supply Boost
>
> "In less than a year, there was a marked increase in supplies and in the advancement of weapons used by the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong," a Salt Lake Army lieutenant relates.
>
> "Their soldiers were much better equipped when I left Vietnam last month than they were when I arrived there in September 1966."
>
> These were the major observations of a Salt Lake native back from the jungles of Vietnam, 1st Lt. George M. Bapis.
>
> "They went from primitive-type crossbows and bamboo arrows to rifles sporting the latest in scopes," said the infantryman.
>
> ### UNIVERSITY GRADUATE
>
> Lt. Bapis is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Mike M. Bapis, 4308–575 East. He is a graduate of the University of Utah, where he was commissioned through the Army ROTC program. During his tour in Vietnam, Lt. Bapis received several medals, including two Bronze Stars for meritorious service.
>
> Speaking of casualty reports, the infantryman noted they are not always accurate.
>
> "It's difficult to really tell how many enemy are killed in those jungles, the brush is so thick. You can't see 10 meters in any direction. And you don't know how many men the enemy hauls away after a battle. Sometimes the casualty lists are boosted, but these are isolated cases."
>
> On ending the war, Lt. Bapis noted:
>
> "The U.S. ought to bomb the supply points of Hanoi and Haiphong more. As long as the enemy has supplies, it will continue to wage war.
>
> "Bombing of the field units doesn't really do as much damage as you'd think. They (the Viet Cong) have steel-reinforced 'spider holes' they crawl into during bombing raids. After the raids they come out and fight again. Those holes, or tunnels, have caches of food and ammunition to last for months.
>
> "My unit ran into one tunnel that had 30,000 hand grenades, hundreds of mines and tons of rice. They are really well supplied."
>
> As for truces at Christmas and the New Year, Lt. Bapis said they weren't really truces.
>
> ### HARDLY TRUCES
>
> "As soon as the U.S. observed the truce and halted bombing runs, you'd see the roads and trails swarming with Viet Cong supply convoys."
>
> Lt. Bapis, 23, was a member of the 1st Battalion, 28th Infantry of the First Division. He is not among the critics of the M–16 rifle, used by U.S. troops, and said to jam easily.
>
> "It's a fine weapon . . . but you must keep it clean. I had no trouble with it and none of the men in my platoon complained."
>
> On the charge that GIs use marijuana in Vietnam, the former platoon leader said he did not see or hear of any such usages.

TAP PRYOR: FRONTIERSMAN OF THE SEA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, when it passed a major oceanographic bill last year, the 89th Congress opened the way to our last frontier, the vast world ocean which covers nearly three quarters of the earth's surface.

Public Law 89–454 provides for a comprehensive, longrange, and coordinated national program in marine science. It created a National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and a Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources. Among those appointed to the Commission was a young crusader in oceanography from Hawaii, Taylor A. "Tap" Pryor, founder and head of the Makapuu Oceanic Center.

Life magazine in its current issue features Tap Pryor in a pictorial essay titled "Frontiersman of the Sea." It is an apt title for a Hawaii pioneer who, in his words, envisions "Hawaii as an ocean-oriented community that can serve as a focal point through which the Nation will enter the sea. Once we establish underwater industry—mining, oil, and gas recovery—there will be a need for thousands of people."

Pryor's life-long love of the sea is described in the article as follows:

> When Tap Pryor was 11 he made a diving helmet out of a five-gallon can and a bicycle pump and jumped into Long Island Sound. "I've been in love with the ocean ever since."
>
> Now, having talked his adopted state of Hawaii into becoming a center of oceanographic studies and built its unique Makapuu Oceanic Center, Tap (for Taylor Allderdice Pryor) is trying as a member of the President's Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources to pipe the whole nation into the deep.
>
> "This is our frontier," say the 36-year-old marine biologist. "But it is more than that, it's a whole new world."
>
> Pryor's grandfather developed the Remington Arms Company before World War I; his father, Samuel Pryor Jr., helped develop Pan American World Airways. The idea for a seaside oceanarium and oceanic research institute came to Tap when he was studying sharks off Eniwetok, and he got private industry and the State of Hawaii to invest the money and land to set it up.
>
> He plans next year to make a 162-mile voyage in a two-man glass submersible from Oahu to the island of Hawaii, at a depth of 5,000 feet, and later to go from Oahu to California at 20,000.
>
> "We have to turn to the ocean," he says. "We have no other way of solving our terrestrial problems. It's a matter of survival of the species."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article on Tap Pryor, "An Ocean-Lover on His Favorite Subject," which appeared in the October 27, 1967, issue of Life magazine be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> [From Life magazine, Oct. 27, 1967]
>
> ### An Ocean-Lover on His Favorite Subject
>
> (Note.—*In conversations with Life correspondent Michel Silva, Tap Pryor made the following observations on man's future beneath the ocean.*)
>
> I'm excited at what the President's commission is accomplishing, but I think the failure of this country thus far to invest in an area that promises the greatest return the world has ever known is pathetic.
>
> Besides being earth's last frontier, the sea contains most of the world's remaining mineral resources, the largest existing protein resource and probably most of the oil and gas resources left to us.
>
> Any country has a legal right to expand its

national boundaries into the sea—anywhere in the sea below 200 meters—to invade and conquer the ocean.

It will take the skills of everybody to achieve this—teachers, nurses and mechanics as well as oceanographers, engineers, executives and politicians.

I do think the nation is beginning to rise to the occasion. This is evident not just in the work of the commission, but in the almost daily collaboration between cities, states and regional professional committee groups and in the interest of the aerospace industry. The federal government of course, is already involved, particularly through the military.

No one of these things is going to be totally effective in getting the country going, but I think this interest is setting the nation up to be triggered into the sea.

Our projected trip in the glass submersible is something I've been planning for several years. Man with his naked eye has seen only about 200 square miles of the deep ocean bottom, leaving roughly 146 million square miles, to go. With the almost unlimited visibility of our glass bubble—if we are successful—we will have seen more of the ocean bottom with the naked eye than anyone else in the world.

Our technology will be either a magnificent tool or a monster, depending on whether we parallel our efforts with conservation thinking. We can alter the conditions of the ocean, change the direction of currents, modify the weather, create upwellings that will bring nutrients off the bottom to the top. Anything done in one part of the ocean affects in some way another part of the ocean. Each change alters the system and must be made with care and planning.

Virtually all of the inshore water around the country, and probably around a great many other countries, is less productive today than it was 30 years ago. Many areas are rapidly becoming wastelands because the habitats of their animal life are being wiped out. These areas can be restored, but we need basic information about biological processes that go on offshore. If we knew enough about the bottom of the ocean, we could calculate the excess of any animal population and then with sound ocean harvesting practices take off that excess for our own uses.

I think of myself as a taut geodestic structure—a structure of paradoxes, of science, politics and business all interrelated, all pulling against each other.

In the ocean the lone individual can be as effective as the largest government agency. In one space shot you use all NASA's organized technology to achieve the right orbit, and everything comes to the eye of that needle in the sky. In the ocean, there are millions of needles. Some are better threaded by individuals working off the end of a pier or in a "skunk shop" back in town or living on the bottom somewhere. And, of course, some other projects will require massive efforts.

What accomplishment can we look for toward the end of the century? Desalinization, for one. And food—we have the ability to build pastures out into shallow water, to grub out a mangrove swamp in Southeast Asia, dike it and—with salt water and sun—produce plant crops and fish for a protein source. The tracking and control of marine organisms on the open ocean, producing in effect domesticated fish, are well within possibility by the end of the century.

The human population could turn its attention to things other than survival through work. The next century could be one in which most of our effort could be turned to intellecual or artistic efforts.

Who knows—the development of the oceans may allow us in the next century to pursue that glorious intellectual hobby, the conquering of space.

DO NOT LET THEM USE DDT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am gravely concerned about the increasing pollution of our environment caused by DDT. DDT has enjoyed widespread popularity over the years because it is an inexpensive and effective pesticide.

In recent years, however, a great number of scientific studies have pointed out that DDT is extremely persistent and that it has permeated ecosystems the world over. Scientific evidence is accumulating at a great rate which indicates that DDT is having a very harmful effect on our fish and wildlife.

I am opposed to the widespread, unregulated use of DDT, particularly in those instances where effective, more readily degradable substitutes are available. A good case in point is the Dutch Elm disease problem which is plaguing much of the Midwest. To fight this disease, communities are indiscriminately spraying huge amounts of DDT, yet the spread of the disease has not been slowed. The spraying, however, has succeeded in many areas in driving away or killing most of the songbirds.

Recently, an article appeared in the Badger Sportsman by John Franson called "Don't Let Them Use DDT." Mr. Franson is one of Wisconsin's leading conservationists. His article poignantly describes the enormity of the DDT problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Franson's article be printed in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chilton (Wis.) Badger Sportsman, October issue, 1967]

Don't Let Them Use DDT

(By John L. Franson)

(1) What is DDT? DDT is a chemical compound known as a chlorinated hydrocarbon containing carbon, hydrogen, and chlorine. It was developed during World War II along with other forms of poisons. It was discovered in 1900 by a German chemist in conjunction with research to develop nerve gas.

(2) Why are people becoming alarmed about the use of DDT?

Principally because scientists and technologists feel that the chemical is being misused. Because it was one of the first poisons to be commonly used by the public, we have had an opportunity to study it more than other chemicals and our scientists can identify it and trace it more readily than others.

DDT is a synthetic—a hydrocarbon. For this reason bacteria in living organisms and in the soil cannot readily digest the compound and change its nature as they do other substances and chemicals.

This causes DDT to be known as a "persistent poison" or as what others loosely call "nondegradable." DDT will degrade to DDD or DDE which are two other forms of potent poison.

With successive applications, DDT residue begins to build up in our soils, plants and our bodies. This fact, plus the outright killing of many other life forms other than the "target species" is what is alarming scientists.

(3) Just how poisonous is DDT to wildlife?

This cannot always be readily determined as fatalities may not occur directly or immediately after application. For example, a robin may eat a worm that has accumulated DDT residue in its body from spraying on the soil many months before and the robin may die.

Fish mortality may be a result of successive applications many miles upstream or a fish-eating bird might die many hundreds of miles away after eating one of these fish. There are facts available which indicate the potency of this chemical.

The community of Shorewood suffered losses of 98 perecnt of its robins after application of the chemical. The Conservation Department recognizes that robin mortality usually ranges from 70 per cent to 90 per cent where DDT is used in Dutch elm control. Other birds such as woodpeckers, nuthatchers, brown creepers, chickadees and kinglets are particularly exposed. Reductions in the populations of housewrens, mourning doves, bluejays, catbirds, chirping sparrows, Baltimore orioles, cardinals and scarlet tanagers can also be expected.

Loss of these birds is readily noticed while the mortality in pollinating insects, reptiles, amphibians and predatory insects that prey on other insect pests and the loss of invertebrate animals in the soils and gardens is difficult to determine. It is the unknown loss of these species which makes the common use of DDT the most frightening.

The President's Advisory Committee on Pesticides reports that in New Brunswick an entire year's production of young salmon was nearly eliminated in the Miranicha River after DDT applications of one half pound per acre for control of spruce budworm. Stream insects which furnished the food for the young salmon disappeared for two years. In British Columbia mortality on the coho salmon approach 100 percent in at least four major streams after surrounding forests were sprayed with one pound of DDT for blackheaded budworm. This took place despite measures to keep the chemical out of the waters.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Department reports that one part of DDT in a billion parts of water will kill blue crabs in eight days. (One part per billion is about the relationship of one ounce of chocolate syrup to 1000 tank cars of milk.)

Ten parts of DDT in a trillion parts of water are stored in oysters within 40 days to levels 70,000 times greater than that in the surrounding water. In one recorded case, fish started dying three month's after DDT was applied and death reached downstream nearly 100 miles from the treatment site.

DDT is a killer of life which acts on a broad spectrum. It acts by attacking the structure of living cells. It is carcinogenic—ie: it may induce cancer. It is muteagenic—ie: it induces inherital changes in populations of living animals by attacking the genes. The University of Wisconsin in studying the use of DDT on their campus found that it could affect three generations of robins. They no longer use the chemical.

(4) If DDT has these effects on wildlife, what is the chemical's effects on humans?

There has been little experimentation as yet on the effect of DDT on human beings. This is principally because of the life span, tolerance levels allowed by the federal government for our food, and a lack of experimental research into this particular area.

Like wildlife and other living forms, we do know that we are accumulating residues of the chemical in our fatty tissues just as other living forms are. We have not been able to study its effects for cancer or genetic mutations as we have done in other species.

Before tolerance levels were raised, it was found in a study by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that the DDT residue in mother's milk exceeded that which would be allowed in cow's milk.

A convulsive dose of DDT to a 22 lb. toddler would be about the amount of DDT equal in weight to the glue that remains on your tongue when you lick ten postage stamps.

(5) In what amount is DDT applied for the control of Dutch Elm disease?

The least amount of DDT recommended is two pounds per tree while the most is 4.8 pounds per tree. Remember what was said about the salmon kill in the previous question.

If you had three elm trees per average lot you could then expect a DDT application of 43.5 pounds per acre to 108.6 pounds per acre or 20 to 50 times as great as the highest concentration of DDT recommended for vegetable crops.

(6) Does spraying with DDT eradicate Dutch elm disease?

No, it does not. There is currently no known way of eradicating the disease. DDT can aid in controlling the spread of the disease. It remains on the surface of the elms for long enough periods to kill the bark beetle when it emerges from the tree in spring. But it cannot prevent the spread of the disease from outlying and rural areas.

One of the unusual effects of DDT and other chemicals on insects is that they seem to be capable of building up an immunity to the chemical which is not possible in other species.

Consequently the situation begins to develop where insects more tolerant than birds continue to thrive while birds drop like flies. We have no information whether this is the situation in the case of the elm bark beetle but it seems reasonable to assume that it is.

(7) Can't the wildlife and the community be protected from DDT by restricting its application only to individual elms?

No. Although some methods are better than others for application, it is not possible to concentrate the spray only to the elm. The chemical carries for miles on air currents and, depending upon the number and concentration of elms in your community, the chemical will wash with the rains through the storm sewers and into neighboring lakes and streams.

It is shocking to learn that DDT is now finding its way to the remote corners of the earth. The Wisconsin Conservation Department is appalled by reports of DDT residues in fish in our northern lakes not to mention those in southern Wisconsin. We are told that some of their findings have not even been printed for fear of alarming the tourists.

Residues of DDT have been found in penguins and crab-eater seals in the Antarctica. It has been found in oil of fish that live far from land and those caught off the coast of four continents in concentrations ranging from less than one part of DDT in one million parts of oil to more than 300 PPM. It has been found in virtually every stream in the nation.

(8) Is DDT the only method that can be used in attempting to control the Dutch Elm disease?

No. Alternate methods have been suggested and devised, especially in recent years with the increasing concern over the use of DDT. The Conservation Department and Department of Agriculture have recommended the use of an alternate chemical called Methoxyclor.

After the initial application, this chemical, although nearly as toxic, will "break down" and will not persist in the soil and living organisms. The University of Wisconsin uses Methoxyclor and an injection type poison. They have reduced their losses to less than 2 per cent.

Some communities have reduced Dutch elm disease through a conscientious cleanup program which entails locating diseased trees and immediately destroying them.

(9) Why then do communities persist in using DDT as a method of Dutch Elm disease control?

Communities which are insensitive to the other effects of DDT use it because it is a simple and economic way of combating the disease.

They prefer it to the other chemicals simply because of its deadly and persistent qualities. It has to be applied less often and is less expensive than a clean-up program.

(10) What then is the recommendation of the Fond Du Lac County Conservation Alliance?

1. Discontinuance of the use of DDT. If chemicals must be used, we recommend the use of the alternate chemical Methoxyclor rather than DDT even if it would be more costly.

2. Even more than the application of other chemicals, we urge the community to begin a cleanup program, taking down diseased elm trees where they are the city's responsibility and aiding citizens with equipment when they are the private landowner's responsibility.

3. We urge the city to provide adequate funds to the Park Commission to begin a tree planting program with diverse, resistent species to take the place of the elms which we feel eventually will be lost to the community.

4. The enlisting of the citizens in a program of education and services necessary in the detection of elm diseases and the encouragement of the private owner to manage his trees with the same consideration for the environment and welfare of the community that we hope the city government will display.

Perhaps the words of Rachel Carson, author of "Silent Spring," best reflect the plight of our civilization and its ecology. . . .

"Who has made the decision that sets in motion these chains of poisonings, this ever-widening wave of death that spreads out, like ripples when a pebble is dropped into a still pond? Who has placed in one pan of the scales the leaves that might have been eaten by the beetles and in the other, pitiful heaps of many-hued feathers, the lifeless remains of the birds that fell before the unselective bludgeon of unsecticidal poisons? Who has decided—who has the right to decide—for the countless legions of people who were not consulted that the supreme value is a world without insects, even though it be also a sterile world ungraced by the curving wing of a bird in flight?"

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, during the course of seven sessions of the conferees on congressional redistricting extending from June 22, 1967 to October 18, 1967, it became more and more clear that it was utterly impossible to reach any agreement on the major differences between the House- and Senate-passed congressional redistricting bills.

Every position was stated and restated. Members of the conference committee forcefully and fully explained the reasoning in support of their positions. Compromise after compromise was submitted, discussed and then discarded for lack of agreement. The conferees made every effort to report back to the respective Houses a satisfactory measure. The final version is the one we shall have before us.

The compromise finally agreed upon does not touch upon the issues that separated the conferees. We have left to future days the issue of compactness and contiguity of congressional districts and the issue of permanent standards of population discrepancies between districts.

In view of the efforts that have been made, and the inability to agree upon a solution, it was finally agreed that the best course left open to us was to report a bill, with some provision and language, temporary in nature, which would take care of the redistricting situation until the next Federal decennial census in 1970.

The language of the conference report is simple and direct. It accomplished its objective very well. In short, no State shall be forced to redistrict prior to the 1970 census; however, a State can voluntarily redistrict at any time. It also prohibits at-large elections except for the States of Hawaii and New Mexico. This and nothing more is the intent of the bill.

Although the bill is not as this Senator would prefer it, it was the best that we could get under the circumstances. I would have liked to have seen permanent standards in this bill. I would have also preferred to prohibit at-large elections in all States, including Hawaii and New Mexico. In regard to this last point, I would remind my colleagues that a long-time member of the Judiciary Committee of the other body made very clear reasoning behind this provision. During debate on H.R. 2508, he stated on this point:

> There is a political aspect to this situation. I hate to say this, but there is no doubt about it. I hope that the Democrats will vote against the motion to recommit. The Republicans might as well vote for the motion to recommit, because it has political implications involved there.

To determine whether this measure is needed, let us look at the alternatives. One alternative would be to compel the courts to use 1960 census figures. Such use would constitute and result in distortion. The other alternative is the use of more recent reliable census estimates. However, the courts have generally paid lipservice to this prospect and then determined that the only reliable figures are the 1960 figures.

If a State decides to redistrict voluntarily, this bill does not prevent it from doing so. However, it should not be forced upon them, particularly when one considers that in a few short years we will have a current and sound basis for redistricting in all States. Upon analysis of each of these alternatives, the present conference bill becomes more and more appealing, and is the best solution that could be found at the present time.

I. USE OF 1960 CENSUS FIGURES TO REDISTRICT

An illustration of what would happen under this alternative is best exemplified by my own State of Nebraska. In 1961, the Nebraska Legislature established a plan of redistricting which anticipated that the metropolitan area of Omaha would be growing faster than the rest of the State. Six years later this foresightedness was confirmed. Based upon figures prepared by the Bureau of Business Research, College of Business Administration of the University of Nebraska, the population of the second district, which, according to the 1960 census was the smallest district, had increased by over 80,000. On the other hand, the third district lost about 2,000 individuals, and it is now the smallest district.

If Nebraska were required to redistrict upon the basis of the 1960 census, there would be a greater disparity in the so-called one-man, one-vote concept than there exists as the districts are now constituted. The 1960 census reflects a 31.1-percent population deviation between the largest and smallest district, whereas reliable population estimates indicate that the present deviation is only 16.9 percent.

Although Nebraska is only an example, it is well recognized that the 1960 census figures are unreliable, because of massive population shifts. Any reliance upon such figures to now force redistricting at the present time would be a long stride away from the one-man, one-vote principle. Such a situation has been recognized in New York. In *Wells* v. *Rockefeller*, 66 Civ. 1976 (D.C.S.D.N.Y. 1967), the court specifically pointed out what would happen if 1960 figures were used. It stated:

> However, no court should blind itself to the world of today. To use 1960 figures in many areas would be to enforce the disparity of which plantiffs complain.

THE 1960–67 POPULATION

To lend the specific in terms of people to the foregoing, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, a table showing resident population changes for the period 1960–67 in 16 States in which court proceedings are either pending or imminent.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOTAL RESIDENT POPULATION CHANGES IN SELECTED STATES, 1960–67

[In millions]

State	1960 census (Apr. 1)	1967 estimate (July 1)	Change, 1960–67	
			Number	Percent
California	15.7	19.1	+3.4	+21.9
Colorado	1.754	1.975	+.221	+12.6
Connecticut	2.535	2.925	+.390	+15.4
Florida	4.952	5.996	+1.045	+21.1
Georgia	3.943	4.511	+.568	+14.4
Indiana	4.662	4.999	+.337	+7.2
Iowa	2.758	2.753	−.005	−.2
Minnesota	3.414	3.582	+.168	+4.9
Missouri	4.320	4.605	+.285	+6.6
Nebraska	1.411	1.435	+.024	+1.7
New Jersey	6.067	7.004	+.937	+15.4
New York	16.7	18.3	+1.552	+9.2
Ohio	9.706	10.462	+.756	+7.8
Pennsylvania	11.3	11.6	+.307	+2.7
Washington	2.853	3.089	+.236	+8.3
West Virginia	1.860	1.798	−.063	−3.4

Source: Bureau of Census "Population Estimates" Sept. 5 1967.

II. USE OF ESTIMATES TO DETERMINE PRESENT POPULATION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the courts generally have stated that population statistics, other than the 1960 census, can be used as a basis to redistrict if they are reliable. A recent impression of this doctrine is contained in *Lucas* v. *Rhodes*, civil action No. C 65–264, May, 1967, a decision by a three-judge court in the northern district of Ohio, eastern division. The court stated:

> The use of accurate population data, current at the time of redistricting, is consistent with the equal population requirement, whether the redistricting is done immediately following a federal decennial census or in the interim years as is sought to be done here. However, if such data are to be acceptable, they must substantially approximate in stability and accuracy the data provided by the federal census.

Although reliable estimates of population do exist, for example, in my own State of Nebraska, an expression of the court's view of such estimates is provided in *Maryland Citizens Committee for Fair Congressional Redistricting, Inc.* v. *Tawes*, 253 F. Supp. 731 (1966). The three-judge district court, speaking through Judge Sobeloff, stated:

> A difficulty encountered by anyone who undertakes in 1966 to draw district lines with a view to achieving substantial population equality, is that the only accurate figures available are those from the 1960 census. The dilemma presents two possible choices: to accept the 1960 census figures which are not up to date, or to attempt to make estimates of changes in population figures since that date. Neither choice is a happy one, but we have concluded that it is better to adhere to the census figures than to engage in speculative estimates or projections which vary widely with the estimators and the manner in which they handle the figures available to them from various sources. The alternative we have rejected would indeed lead into mathematical thicket.

We have, by this bill, solved the dilemma voiced by Judge Sobeloff. We have provided that no State shall be required to redistrict unless the results of a special Federal census are available therein. If an individual or group decides that a particular State should redistrict, then it will be up to them to lay the foundation for such action by providing the court with the results of a special Federal census.

III. SUMMARY

Mr. President, the conference committee's bill is merely legislation to give effect to a contingency, that is, that the court must know the facts before it acts. Such facts must be established by the best and most reliable method, a special Federal census.

It has been stated that Congress cannot delay the enforcement of constitutional rights. This bill, however, does not delay the enforcement of any rights. It only establishes a sound, factual basis for determining such rights.

Mr. President, there comes a time when we should make sure that we are not moving away from the concept of one man, one vote. Although this bill is not as I would have it if I were making the decisions, it is the best we could get. It prevents a move backward by not allowing forced redistricting on the basis of 1960 figures, and it allows voluntary redistricting.

Mr. President, we can go back to conference. However, we will cover the same ground, make the same arguments and come up with the same conclusion if we are there 90 days or 900 days. We have worked diligently to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. We should not be so unthinking as to turn this bill down and, in effect, say to those States which may be subject to a redistricting effort, "We shall allow the courts to order your redistricting based upon outmoded figures which will result in court-made malapportionment; and then in a few years, when the 1970 census figures are available, and the true statistics are at hand, you will again be subject to another redistricting." Let us not be so unseeing in our headlong dash for one man, one vote, that we run right past it.

THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, few Americans are not aware nor appreciative of the wonderful contribution the National Guard has made to the peace, freedom, and security of our country. Throughout our history the citizen-soldiers who comprise the National Guard have answered one call after another—whether to defend freedom on a foreign shore, to safeguard the lives and property of Americans or, most recently, to protect law-abiding citizens from the lawless minority. And they have performed their tasks courageously and well, unhesitatingly and indiscriminately.

What do they receive in return? For the most part we treat their efforts with indifference, as though we had the right to expect the help, which most times goes well beyond the citizen-soldier contractual obligation. Other times we are less kind. We indict the entire organization for the real or imagined excesses of a few. We question their bravery and their loyalty. We hold them up to public scorn and ridicule. Yes, rather than being thankful, we are petulant. But still the National Guard does its job—a job that must be done.

Criticism is nothing new to the Guard, any more than it is new to any organization that tries to uphold the law, to protect society from itself. But few charges directed against the Guard have been more unfair than a recent article by William A. McWhirter published in Life magazine. Mr. McWhirter resorted to yellow journalism in his attempt to discredit the Guard, and Life magazine, by publishing the article, gave his charges an undeserved measure of respectability. That a professional reporter could have written the article is shameful, but that a highly regarded and influential news magazine would have published it unchallenged is a blight on journalism generally.

I was glad to see that the matter was brought somewhat into perspective by another journalist, Don Dedera, a highly respected columnist of the Arizona Republic. Mr. Dedera's column will not, of course, be as widely circulated as the article in Life. This I find regrettable, but its influence, because it presents the truth, in time will be far greater. A unique characteristic of a free press is that truth always wins out over mendacity.

Mr. Dedera is uniquely qualified to write about the National Guard, even apart from his reputation as a perceptive and objective reporter. Over the years he has covered the Guard's activities, both in war and peace. He has been with them, reporting their good works, in Vietnam and in countless difficult situations here at home. He has reported the facts as they exist, not as he might want them to be. I suppose that, like most of us, Mr. Dedera knows that the Guard is comprised of both saints and sinners, both heroes and cowards. The men are, after all, a composite of American society, a society that is itself far from perfect. But Mr. Dedera also recognizes, as most fair-minded men do, that there are far more saints and heroes in the National Guard than there are the other types. This is what he has reported. No more and no less.

The National Guard always has had its problems, as Mr. Dedera rightly concedes it does today. But they are problems not of their own making: lack of money, lack of trained men, lack of modern equipment and, most of all, lack of adequate public support and respect. And if Mr. McWhirter were interested in anything other than discrediting and destroying the Guard, he might have at least mentioned the problems, in the hope that changes could be made. Fortunately, however, Mr. Dedera has. I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, Oct. 26, 1967]

McWhirter Gets Even With That Sergeant

To the journalism schools of Arizona, the current issue of Life Magazine is recommended for close analysis this week.

It contains a clinical specimen of atrocious reporting—an extreme example of misuse of freedom of the press—and sobering evidence that judgment can be blind among the nation's most influential editors.

The case study is an article about the National Guard, by William A. McWhirter.

"Favorite Haven for the Comic Soldier," is the lead-off for McWhirter's piece. And then the diatribe progresses from insulting to worse.

To a man, as far as this article is concerned, guardsmen are cry babies, boobs, bigots, buffoons, boots, and Colonel Blimps.

How quaint! to McWhirter, that the guard traces ancestry to the militiamen who won his freedom to write. How snide! McWhirter's discovery of a "captain-salesman," as if the terms were mutually exclusive. How small! the revelation by McWhirter that some officers are bored, and some sergeants are stupid, and there's a lot of horseplay in the rear ranks.

Unforgivable is McWhirter's sneer in the beginning paragraphs, "The guard . . . has sent contingents to every U.S. action except Vietnam."

This warns what kind of research follows. In truth, the guard has graduated battalions of men to the front lines in Vietnam, and for two years an Arizona squadron has been one of 25 from across the nation regularly airlifting high-priority cargo to the war. Maybe the next time an Arizona C97 with a cargo of hand grenades is, by monsoon weather, forced to make a long, low-level, approach to Da Nang across Vietcong country, McWhirter can hitch a ride in the jump seat, and hoot all the way to touchdown.

Of greatest regret, McWhirter might have raised legitimate criticism of the guard.

The outfit is not perfect, and by definition, is unprofessional. It is, at a time when this country has extended its elite forces around the world, the only guard we've got. A system that combines federal bureaucracy with local option and coercive recruitment is open for improvement. The guard was not the only organ of government caught unprepared for this summer's searing riots. Who wasn't?

To be fair, McWhirter might have mentioned some of the guard's current problems, not of its own making: its best equipment recalled for active duty; its recruits for long shut out of basic training centers because regulars have higher priority; the bad public relations inherent in any form of authority in a free, all-but-permissive society.

But no. Like 007 disguised as Pvt. Hargrove, McWhirter manages to infiltrate a few guard arsenals.

Guardsmen hate Negroes. Guardsmen are cowards avoiding battle. Guardsmen are sergeants with bad grammar, and privates who throw obscene gestures, and officers who begin the drill sessions, "This is nonsense."

And of course, the damaging quote almost always is anonymous, like the unidentified but incisive London cabby that Time magazine uses to bridge awkward transitions.

The commanding general of the guard himself is assassinated by the description, "has the beefy shoulders and sandy-colored handlebar mustache that gives him the period look of a bather bouncing from the surf at Atlantic City to wink at the girls on the boardwalk. The general is careful about his image and seems the sort of man who never bypasses a mirror. Are my jaws like iron? Are my eyes like blue ice? Do I look like a major general to you?"

McWhirter might have told us something important, and helpful. But what comes through is his subconscious revulsion to all things military, and the self-exposé is not pretty to behold.

At a time of multiple national crises, the editors of Life have allowed a grown man to smear an entire service in getting even for that day, long, long ago, when the sergeant made him scrub the floor with a toothbrush.

NORTHERN STATES POWER CO. WORKS TO PRESERVE THE ST. CROIX RIVER

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, a most interesting and thought-provoking advertisement appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune on September 24. Entitled "This Land Is Your Land," it tells in words and pictures the story of how Northern States Power Co. has preserved in a natural state some 70 miles of the beautiful St. Croix River.

In this day and age when our beautiful scenic and wild rivers are rapidly dwindling in number, the highly commendable efforts of Northern States to preserve the St. Croix are indeed unique. For over 50 years Northern States has maintained this stretch of the upper St. Croix in a primitive condition and has worked hard to keep the area open and accessible to canoeists and outdoorsmen who want to enjoy this spectacular, unspoiled river.

There are only a few areas left in this country equal to that which Northern States has worked so hard to preserve. For their efforts, they deserve the praise of every American who is concerned with the preservation of our vanishing natural resources.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Northern States advertisement be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This Land Is Your Land

For 50 years NSP has saved 70 miles of Upper St. Croix wilderness for you. Here's how you can enjoy it.

If you board a canoe at Riverside, Wis., you can paddle down 70 miles of one of America's most perfectly preserved wilderness rivers . . . the Upper St. Croix.

You may see a deer or a black bear. Watch an otter, muskrat or a beaver go for a swim. Or take one yourself. Catch a sturgeon or smallmouth bass. Camp in the cradle of virgin pines. If you're lucky you'll see a bald eagle.

For 50 years NSP has owned most of the land on either side of the Upper St. Croix River and has maintained the area in its wild state.

AN OPEN INVITATION

We encourage campers, hunters, fishermen, canoeists and nature lovers to come and enjoy its beauty. If you would like information, write to NSP Conservation Dept., 414 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

Numerous public accesses to the river have been made available by NSP. We've even leased 7,000 acres on the Minnesota side without charge to the U.S. Government, which has assigned its lease to the state of Minnesota. This land is now part of St. Croix State Park.

OUR SURROUNDINGS ARE OUR CONCERN

We at NSP have maintained and will continue to preserve the natural wilderness of this area because we're concerned about the beauty of our surroundings. After all, we live here too.

THE INCREASE IN NUMBER OF BANKRUPTCIES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in these times of generally unprecedented prosperity it is disturbing to note the incredible rate at which bankruptcies have been increasing. A recent Newsweek article reported that in the past decade bankruptcy filings have increased more than 200 percent, to 210,000 in fiscal 1967.

Fortunately, this alarming trend has received considerable congressional attention, notably from the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick]. Our colleague has been in the forefront of a drive to throw new light on the entire problem by proposing in Senate Joint Resolution 100 the establishment of a commission to study our bankruptcy institutions. Most of our present bankruptcy laws were written during the financial crisis of the 1930's. Certainly it is time for us to examine their effectiveness to cope with the financial realities of today.

In his efforts to update the bankruptcy laws our colleague has received the excellent counsel and cooperation of a public minded group of lawyers and businessmen from his hometown of Fargo and throughout the State of North Dakota. These activities were recently recounted in a Fargo Forum article which, along with the Newsweek article, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bankruptcy Law Changes Have Impetus in Fargo

(By Gifford Herron)

An idea born a little more than two years ago among a small group of Fargoans has grown to national significance.

The idea concerns bankruptcy. The increasing number of bankruptcies is causing concern in the field of sociology and economics.

One example of how Fargo is being recognized for the ideas in bankruptcy came in an aside remark during his talk before the National Conference of Referees in Bankruptcy in Washington, when Referee Asa S. Herzog of New York City said:

"I have a strong belief that a humane and workable new federal bankruptcy law is in the not too distant future and it will be known as the Burdick Act."

Sitting in the same banquet room was U.S. Sen. Quentin N. Burdick, D-N. D., a Fargoan to whom Herzog referred.

Burdick addressed the same group that evening, saying among other things, "I know it comes as no surprise to you when I say it appears we are today in the midst of a bankruptcy epidemic."

What is being published in financial periodicals plus a check in the office of Gordon Thompson of Fargo, bankruptcy referee for North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota, indications certainly point to a "bankruptcy epidemic."

From every section of the nation comes the same report: Filings of petitions in bankruptcies are on the increase.

Records in Thompson's office in the federal building show a steady increase in bankruptcy petitions for the last several years. Last year's total already is topped in 1967 with three months to go. From Jan. 1, 1966, to Oct. 1 that year 179 bankruptcies were filed.

From Jan. 1, 1967, until Oct. 1 this year 226 bankruptcies have been filed with Thompson or slightly more than a 26 per cent increase so far this year.

A national periodical by The Associated Press reported that a militant Civil Rights organization has been planning and is about ready to stage a mass march to file petitions for bankruptcy in an attempt to disrupt the economies of larger cities over the nation.

After the banquet in Washington, The Forum called Herzog at his office in New York, where he is one of 14 bankruptcy referees for that city.

Asked his opinion as to whether the North Dakota senator is making progress in overhauling the bankruptcy act in the U.S. Senate, where he is chairman of the bankruptcy subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Herzog snapped:

"You're darn right he is."

"He is a legislator who has made it his business to find out all he can about bankruptcy. He has done his homework well," said Herzog.

"A man who is as interested and as knowledgeable as Burdick and since we are long overdue for some extensive changes in the bankruptcy law, we are going to get them."

"Bankruptcy is in the field of sociology and economics, it is not in the political field that I can see," concluded Herzog.

Herzog is considered among the top bankruptcy referees in the nation.

One of Burdick's principal bills on bankruptcy, which should reach the Senate floor soon, has to do with discharge of debts of a bankrupt.

At present a creditor can charge fraud and bring a bankrupt into a costly action in a state court to prove he did not act fraudulently in his bankruptcy petition.

Under Burdick's proposal, any question on the discharge of debts would be brought back to the bankruptcy referee, who would be acquainted with the case.

Burdick also has introduced a Senate joint resolution, on which the House must act, to create a commission to study the bankruptcy laws of the United States, on which there would be senators, congressmen, bankruptcy referees and others interested.

Then, too, Burdick has proposals designed to upgrade bankruptcy courts.

There are more proposals in Burdick's mind now and in the minds of persons he confers with which haven't come to a head yet.

Burdick said that since he began working on bankruptcy laws, his office in Washington has become something of "a crossroad" stopping place for referees and others interested in bankruptcy proceedings.

The present law is called the Bankruptcy Act of 1898, as amended in 1938 by the Chandler amendment, sponsored by Rep. Walter Chandler of Tennessee.

Since 1938, the United States has gone through World War II, the Korean conflict and now the current war in Vietnam, all leaving effects on the economy.

In addition, Burdick cites the change in living standards, extension of credit—some to the point of "foolishness"—and many other changes which put the bankruptcy act in the "horse and buggy" classification.

Burdick gives much credit to a group of his acquaintances in Cass County for the work they have done in aiding his attempt to bring changes in the law.

"He was on the firing line," said Burdick about R. H. Barry, Fargo business consultant who has been the court-appointed trustee in the Dalco American Enterprises Inc. bankruptcy since June 1965.

In June of 1966, Barry also was named chief executive officer for Smith, Inc. of Fargo which filed under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Act for a reorganization with the debtor-in-possession. Barry since has been elected president of Smith, Inc.

Shortly after Barry took over as trustee in the Dalco bankruptcy, he explained to Burdick the difficulties he was having and difficulties referees in bankruptcy were encountering under the current law.

As a result Burdick wrote to some 200 referees across the nation, receiving replies from about 25 per cent.

In nearly all the replies were complaints from referees that the bankruptcy law is far outdated, that the economy of the nation has changed and the bankruptcy law should be changed in accordance. There were many suggestions of what should be done to come up with a workable law.

Many suggested that inasmuch as referees have many of the powers of a federal judge, or that the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court be increased and not be as now, an appendage of the U.S. District Courts.

Referee Thompson says Burdick is doing outstanding work in Washington, particularly in guiding bankruptcy matters through the ponderously slow field of legislation.

Thompson, who was appointed referee in bankruptcy in November 1965, realizes the work connected with becoming acquainted with the various facets of the Bankruptcy Act.

"I know of the deep gratitude Burdick holds for a group of Fargoans who have done considerable spade-work on potential changes in the bankruptcy law."

A catalyst for the action in attempting to overhaul federal bankruptcy statutes came when Barry was appointed trustee for the Dalco American Enterprises, Inc., bankruptcy. Barry generated interest through a local group of attorneys interested in bankruptcy proceedings.

In March 1965 the bankruptcy committee of the Cass County Bar Association was named at a Fargo meeting.

On the committee are George Soule, Fargo attorney who came to Fargo from Towner, N.D., in 1931 and has worked since with many bankruptcy matters, and attorneys Hermar F. Wegner and David D. DeMars of Fargo.

The Cass County Bar subcommittee met later with Burdick, U.S. District Judge Renald N. Davies of Fargo and with Referee Thompson.

Suggestions coming out of that meeting were to establish bankruptcy court with the same territorial jurisdiction as the present referee, change the name of referee to bankruptcy judge and give the new courts and judges the power of adjudicating all matters pertaining to bankruptcy, such as liens, preferences and the right to punish by contempt.

On June 23, 1960, the North Dakota Bar Association, meeting in Jamestown, adopted a resolution offered by the Cass Bar Association subcommittee on bankruptcy which says, in part:

The number of bankruptcies are increasing more than 1,000 per cent annually in the last 20 years.

That 25 per cent of the referees in bankruptcy have expressed in writing to Burdick a need for changing the Bankruptcy Act.

That there appears to be little understanding by the federal government and the commercial community of the nation in evaluating the need to update the technical aspects of the Bankruptcy Act.

The North Dakota Bar Association recommends that the President of the United States appoint an advisory committee to study the problem of bankruptcy and make recommendations on that matter.

Much of the same language is contained in the Senate Joint Resolution introduced by Sen. Burdick and which has been referred to the Judiciary Committee. The resolution provides an appropriation for a commission to study bankruptcy laws.

[From Newsweek, Sept. 25, 1967]

The Bankruptcy Boom

Ranking congressmen, alarmed by a steep rise in bankruptcies, are campaigning for a thorough overhaul of the nation's bankruptcy laws.

In the past decade, the number of bankruptcies has soared 200 per cent to 210,000 a year. Democratic Sen. Quentin Burdick of North Dakota, for one, calls it "an epidemic."

What particularly worries congressmen and government experts is that bankruptcies of individuals are climbing much faster than those of business firms. (According to one unpublished study, the average bankrupt is in his early 30s and married, with four children.)

Officials hope that passage of the truth-in-lending bill will help remove two root causes—overly easy credit and high-pressure sales tactics.

But what some Congressional leaders want is to revise current bankruptcy laws.

Among the reforms suggested: stronger authority for the courts and a system for preventing bankruptcies by voluntary repayment plans before the cases reach the courts.

MEMBERSHIP PROBLEMS OF LABOR UNIONS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a recent article by columnist Richard Wilson which appeared in the Washington Star, carried some very pertinent and enlightening information regarding the membership problems of the union movement in this country, pointing out the unconscionable collaboration they are receiving from the NLRB. Because the article places this whole problem in such clear perspective, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Unions Find Some Bastions Hard To Crack

(By Richard Wilson)

We tend to think of the country as totally unionized. Auto negotiations dominate the headlines. Teachers strike. We are told that next year will be the worst of all in major labor stoppages.

But when the facts are examined more carefully it is seen that the percentage of the non-agricultural work force in unions has been declining steadily since 1956, and in 1966 reached a low of 28 percent. Something a little less than three out of every four non-agricultural workers are thus outside unions.

This is misleading in that the major industries and many of the services are unionized, and acting in concert, or even in part, these unions could paralyze the major productive facilities of the country. The unions also have political influence disproportionate to their numbers.

But the growing percentage of workers who are outside unions is a matter of the gravest concern in the union movement. There is nothing statistically tricky in this. We have a total work force of about 80 million and about 20 million of them are unionized.

Moreover the political climate is growing increasingly hard for unions. This was reflected in the 1966 congressional election. Union leadership may like the 1968 outcome even less. Organized labor can't get what it wants from Congress, such as repeal of Section 14(B) of the Taft-Hartley Act. The congressional trend is the other way, toward abolishing the National Labor Relations Board and replacing it with a judicial labor court.

The whole problem comes into focus in the J. P. Stevens & Company cases, which are before the U.S. Supreme Court and due soon for some kind of action or non-action. The Stevens textile company is headed by Robert T. Stevens, former secretary of the army, who in that capacity clashed with the late Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy and brought him to political ruin. The mild-mannered Stevens is thus no mean antagonist.

The Stevens cases, highly complicated, boil down to the fact that the textile workers couldn't win elections in Stevens plants and blamed their failure on coercive actions by management against employes. These employes, exceptionally stubborn about unions, stand as a symbol of the inability of the big unions to make a big breakthrough in the new industrial south.

There have been many unbelievably ludicrous developments in this fight which has been going on for several years. At one stage the NLRB solemnly proclaimed that hundreds of witnesses, en masse, were separately and collectively lying on behalf of the Stevens company and all the union witnesses were telling the truth. This conclusion was so obviously open to question that one examiner, Boyd Leedom, tried to justify it in what must go down as a psychological confession of a very confused mind.

The NLRB ordered Stevens company representatives to stand before their assembled employes and shamefacedly admit guilt of violating laws they are morally certain they did not violate, and to declare that they would sin no more. Even the language of the confession was dictated by NLRB in such humiliating terms as to gag Uriah Heep.

Since then, the NLRB, in another case, has backtracked on an even more ignominious requirement, obviously sensing that the Supreme Court would take a dim view of compelling anyone to confess guilt in this manner.

All this has reinforced the growing view in Congress that the NLRB has exceeded all bounds of quasijudicial behavior in so many cases that the courts cannot conceivably correct all the errors and injustices.

One cannot read the record of the Stevens cases without being led toward the conclusion that the NLRB is indulging in far more coercive actions to force unionization than employers are using to avoid it.

But this is not all. Unions and their tame representatives in Congress are trying to get canceled the government contracts of the Stevens company which ran around $70 million in fiscal 1966. The Department of Labor terminated one contract with Stevens for training employes on the job after William Pollock, president of the Textile Workers Union of America, protested the department's allocation of funds to Stevens.

All this because the employes in Stevens plants would not vote in favor of the union—not just once, but in four elections in eight plants.

The record is unbelievable, but then the unions are pretty panicky about the steadily increasing percentage of employes who are staying outside the unions.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures releases its monthly report on Federal employment for September 1967.

I am glad to note that this report shows a reduction in civilian employment by the Federal Government of 78,188 during the month of September.

In July 32,215 employees had been added while in August there was a reduction of 10,545. This gives us a net reduction during the current fiscal year of 56,518.

On September 20, 1966, President Johnson issued an Executive order freezing Federal employment at the July 1, 1966 level; however, instead of complying with that freeze order a total of 206,432 employees were added between September 1966 and June 30, 1967. The reduction of 56,518 employees since July 1, as outlined above, reduces to 149,914 the number of employees now on the payroll in violation of the President's Executive order of September 1966.

I congratulate the administration on the progress it has made in the last 2 months and strongly recommend that it continue this trend until the additional 150,000 employees, which the President himself has stated he does not need, are removed from the taxpayers' backs.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the report as being released today by Congressman MAHON, chairman of the committee, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of September totaling 2,923,641. This was a net decrease of 78,188 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of August, reflecting reduction in regular seasonal employment and temporary summer employment under the President's youth opportunity program.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1968, which began July 1, 1967, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1967	3,012,374	32,215	
August	3,001,829		10,545
September	2,923,641		78,188

Total federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of September was 1,649,446, a decrease of 45,837 as compared with the August total of 1,695,283. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in September was 1,274,195, a decrease of 32,351 as compared with 1,306,546 in August.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger decreases were Post Office Department with 13,809, Agriculture Department with 9,341, Interior Department with 5,124, Treasury Department with 3,729, Commerce Department with 2,891, Veterans Administration with 2,719, HEW Department with 1,759, Transportation Department with 1,403, NASA with 1,315, and General Services Administration with 1,030.

In the Department of Defense the larger decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Army with 14,997, Navy with 8,008, Air Force with 4,842, and Defense Supply Agency with 4,163.

Total employment inside the United States in September was 2,685,174, a decrease of 76,552 as compared with August. Total employment outside the United States in September was 238,467, a decrease of 1,636 as compared with August. Industrial employment by the agencies in September was 597,672, a decrease of 14,880 as compared with August.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,923,641 civilian employees certified to the Committee by federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 120,752 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during September who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in August was 119,630.

REPRESSION IN SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the Government of the Republic of South Africa has recently performed another repressive act designed to stifle dissent and freedom of expression within that country. It has served a notice of deportation on Mr. John Sprack, a native-born citizen of South Africa and the president-elect of NUSAS, the National Union of South Africa Students. Mr. Sprack thus follows a long list of distinguished spokesmen for the best in South African life and tradition, who have been subjected to similar denials of their personal freedom in recent years.

Chief Albert Luthuli, winner of the Nobel Peace prize for his work toward peaceful accommodation of the races in Africa, lived out his last years as an exile within his own country—his countrymen forbidden even to repeat his words.

Alan Paton, winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature, has effectively been banned from participation in political life.

Just in the last year, the president of NUSAS for 1965–66 was banned from public life for inviting me to address the student group; his successor was refused permission to accept a scholarship in the United States, except on pain of forfeiting his citizenship; and the Chairman of the NUSAS Advisory Panel, a renowned teacher of medicine, was removed from his post and banned from public life, despite the strong protests of Mr. Harry Oppenheimer, chancellor of the University of Cape Town.

One of the most serious and shocking examples of this practice was the deportation from South Africa of the Right Reverend Dr. Edward Crowther, until this summer the Anglican bishop of Kimberley and Kuruman. Dr. Crowther, an American citizen, was an outstanding representative of his church and of the United States. In his 3 years as bishop, and now as "bishop-in-exile," of a diocese having 1 million inhabitants, Dr. Crowther has attempted to give succor and hope to the African population of South Africa. Fearlessly and tirelessly, he has worked to better their lives—and also to bring about some first steps toward understanding and cooperation between the races in South Africa.

Massive American business investment in South Africa has heavily identified the United States with the status quo there:

with a government and system in which 3 million white people suppress and exploit 12 million nonwhites, and where even those white people who question the Government are harassed, banned, jailed, and deported. Bishop Crowther has stood for another kind of American identification. In everything he has done—whether by words, or his deeds in behalf of the many poor and starving Africans—he has exemplified the America of justice, compassion, and courage.

Bishop Crowther has now returned to the United States, where we can expect him to resume the contributions he was making to a better America before his departure for South Africa. But our gain is South Africa's loss.

Finally, Bishop Crowther brings us a warning: that if we do not change our one-sided identification with the forces of repression in South Africa, "we will have bought ourselves a vested inflexibility" which will leave us "on the wrong side" of the future. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of an interview with Bishop Crowther shortly after his return to the United States, an article by him on "The Church's Task in South Africa," and a New York Times report of one of his numerous good works and the Government's response to it.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1967]

Ousted Bishop Foresees South African Upheaval—Cleric Asserts Racist Policies Will Soon Ignite Violence—Believes Investments Will Put United States on the Wrong Side

(By Nan Robertson)

Washington, July 14.—The recently-expelled Bishop of the biggest Anglican diocese in South Africa warned today that because of the Government's repressive racist policies, South Africa "will be the next to blow" after Vietnam.

The Right Rev. Clarence Edward Crowther said he was telling officials at the State Department and on Capitol Hill that the "massive conflagration," once ignited, "will make Vietnam look like a kindergarten war."

Moreover, the British-born, naturalized American clergyman expressed his belief that if and when war erupts in South Africa, the United States will find itself "on the wrong side" because of heavy private investment there.

Among those with whom Bishop Crowther has conferred are the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Joseph Palmer 2d, and Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Democrat of New York, who made a special side-trip to see him while visiting South Africa last year.

In an interview today, the Bishop said that if American investments increase, "we will have bought ourselves a vested inflexibility" in South Africa.

Commerce Department figures show that direct investment by private American companies in South Africa was $528 million at the end of 1965, the last year for which statistics are available. United States investments in that country are bigger than in any African nation and have increased steadily in recent years.

The United States Government has no control over private American investment abroad, except in Communist countries.

Bishop Crowther, now "bishop-in-exile" because he refused to resign after his deportation on June 30, said the 15 million South Africans were aware that "storm clouds are gathering." He added that the South African Government had incurred the hostility of the rest of the African continent because of its policy of apartheid, strict separation of races.

The Bishop, who is 38 years old, presided for three years over the Diocese of Kimberley and Kuruman. The population of one million, spread over an area of 200,000 square miles, is overwhelmingly nonwhite. So are the 65,000 Anglican communicants. Bishop Crowther said religion was the only nonsegregated formal activity left in South Africa.

He has denounced apartheid in speeches inside and outside South Africa and has raised thousands of dollars to finance welfare programs for black Africans uprooted and arbitrarily relocated by the Government.

The Bishop described the plight of black South Africans as "totally, absolutely pitiful."

Bishop Crowther said he first came to the United States with his wife and children in 1957. From 1958 to 1964 he was Episcopal chaplain at the University of California at Los Angeles, and was active in a fair housing group. He became a naturalized citizen in 1964. While in Los Angeles, he met the visiting Archbishop of Capetown, Robert Selby, which led to his involvement in South Africa.

[From the Christian Century, July 27, 1966]

The Church's Task in South Africa

Only when the Body of Christ in apartheid land faces up to the biblical doctrine of man will injustice be ended.

(By Edward Crowther)

Africa's southern tip is somewhat like a ballpoint pen; it rolls out what comes to it from the top. The whole continent is seething, and reaction at the lower end reflects the turmoil. Today it is Nigeria that is in ferment, tomorrow maybe it will be Zambia, always it is the Congo—while Angola hangs like a sword of Damocles over the land of Prime Minister H. F. Verwoerd. Here what the world interprets as initiative is in fact reaction to the many ingredients that make up the melting pot of South African policy, as well as to the struggle going on throughout that part of Africa which lies to the north.

Coming from the United States to serve the church in South Africa, I have found this country a strange half-world. One tends to be riddled with an uncreative nostalgia that is dangerous to the living out of the Sacrament of the Present Moment.

WHERE PHYSICAL PROSPECTS DECEIVE

The first impression of South Africa is of a prosperous, well ordered society. You sense among the people an outgoing hospitality that falls between the stools of English insularity and accelerated American friendship. As you look at Cape Town, so like San Francisco in appearance, or see the rising skyline of Johannesburg—the city which claims "a heart of gold"—you can hardly believe that this is part of the "dark continent." This country is booming; new buildings are going up everywhere; if you know where to find them, restaurants and shops compare favorably with those in Britain or the United States. On the surface, everything is just fine. But then you discover that a great "ostrich act" is being performed here; the nonwhite South Africans are not in this splendid picture. And you must fit them in somehow, for they make up over 13 million of the total population of 17 million. Of the 13 million nonwhites, 2 million are the so-called coloreds—the part-whites, hapless products of earlier integration.

The average nonwhite South African's vision of the world is the mere reflection of it that he sees in the shining floor of store and *stoep*, the polishing of which is his daily task. The Group Areas act dictates where he shall live. The Job Reservation act decrees where and how he shall labor. The Immorality act determines not only what its title implies but forbids behavior that would seem inoffensive—for example, a woman's accepting a late night car ride to her home from the white man in whose house she has spent the evening as a baby sitter.

The Immorality Act applies to visitors to the country as well. Americans Dusty Springfield and Adam Faith had their entry permits canceled because they refused to perform for segregated audiences. Even home-produced golf has suffered. Recently a noted South African of East Indian descent, golfer "Papwa" Sewsunker Sewgolum, was refused the permit needed to play in a tournament. There was a protest at that time from his fellow professionals, but not because of the ban on "Papwa"; no, they protested because the financial stakes in the tournament were not high enough.

THE HEART OF THE MATTER

"When you've been here long enough, man, you'll understand." Shades of the U.S. south! When you've been here long enough, man, just what will you understand?

For one thing, you will understand that the Christian church is practically the one voice of organized opposition that remains to challenge the principles of apartheid. This opposition *must* be Christian; otherwise the whole shallow doctrine of expediency will be buttressed for good and all. Here is a tremendous danger for the church. To be sure, at the present time the same danger is imminent in the U.S. and Britain. It is easy—as it is in many cases right—for the church to ally itself with secular organizations headed in the same direction as it is so far as civil rights are concerned. At home—in the U.S.—the thought often struck me that we must realize that the ticket in the civil rights movement won't take us to the end of the line; if the miracle should happen and racial injustice were to vanish overnight, the church's job would be far from finished. Preoccupation with man to the neglect of the doctrine of God tends to drown out the passionate cry for justice. For that doctrine is the heart of the matter.

What can the church do in South Africa? Many of us are acutely conscious of the fact that the world's attention is being increasingly concentrated on this continent. The United Nations constantly holds the Republic of South Africa up to the light of world opinion; as on an X-ray film, the world sees the racist disease spreading. Deep down in the conscience of all of us who are called to work in this portion of the vineyard there are groaning and travailling. We talk, talk, talk—always with an eye on the effect our words will have on the big pledgers, most of whom of course are white. We look at our beautiful cathedrals and parish churches and are often prompted to speak half-truths, for surely the way of life which produced our stately edifices is worth preserving. The Cathedral of St. Cyprian in Kimberley seems to give an affirmative answer to my questions: "Am I doing enough? Is what must be said being said? Is what should be done being done?" The cathedral, lovely lady that she is, gives assent because she survives in all her beauty in the life to which she has become accustomed.

THE EASY WAY: DO NOTHING

What is this way of life to which the cathedral along with the rest of white South Africa, has become accustomed? How dare we assent to the grotesque blasphemy of man's separation from his brother? Whether in South Africa or in the U.S., this separation is wrong—thoroughly, completely wicked. The trouble is, of course, that we are so caught in the crucifixion that we can't experience the resurrection. We put ourselves on the cross and gazing at ourselves, become masochists. "When you've been here long enough, man, you'll understand." You'll understand all right! You'll understand that all you have to do to lose

Christ in any situation is to do nothing. Just sit there wallowing in those pious pronouncements which you hope will pay this year's premium on your policy insuring favorable world opinion, praying that the check doesn't bounce, that the insurance policy will still be honored.

But then you go out into the "locations" where the Africans live and take a long hard look at the children playing in the dust, at the deformed little bodies that if they grow at all will grow into tortured shapes. You see the women who walk to their hard day's work and all the way back to eat their "mealies" in the squalor produced by below-subsistence wages. You look into the eyes of African schoolteachers—many of them well educated, refined—and you realize what it is to be without hope. Eyes that can see no hope, discern no visions—these are the saddest eyes in the world.

THE WAY THAT DEMANDS SACRIFICE

Yes, if you are around long enough you will understand, all right. What you begin to understand is that (as James Baldwin has said) when you treat people like things you become a thing yourself. You look at your hands, the hands Christ longs for you to use. You touch your lips, the lips through which Christ must speak. You look at your feet, the feet that should go where Christ would have them go. Then suddenly you are filled with the joy of being a person in whom Christ dwells. The people around you are people like yourself: they don't like walking without shoes, they sweat in the heat and they cry when they are hungry.

If I read the signs clearly, people in and out of Africa are becoming impatient with high-sounding utterances. They would have the church walk as well as talk. But where do we go? The church's participation in the civil rights movement in the U.S.—although it came late, at least it has come—has a great deal to teach us in South Africa about direct confrontation of wrong, about standing up and being counted. There are of course, fundamental differences between the situation here and that in the U.S. We are many years behind in acceptance of the nonwhite as a person. Until the majority of white South Africans arrive at that basic recognition, any sort of civil rights bill is impossible. A peaceful solution to the enormous problems here—and peaceful the solution must be if the church is to be involved—must begin with a sound theological foundation, with recognition of who Christ is and therefore who man is—a foundation that will not crumble under the demands for self-sacrifice rising out of it. Since South Africa is in the position, perhaps unique in this continent, of having achieved an extremely efficient and Western-like economic stability, there are certainly areas where the pinch of sacrifice would be felt.

Understandably, recent unhappy events in Nigeria, the Congo and elsewhere in Africa have terrified many people here who hitherto had shown liberal inclinations. Is this, they ask, what happens when the black man gains power? Will not this country's industries, its people's material comforts, the "South African way of life" vanish overnight if the one-man-one-vote principle swamps the white man, ends his precariously held power? These sentiments proceed out of the old Boer *lager* (encampment) mentality, the kind of mentality that would deal with the global movement toward freedom as the pioneer Boers met the dangers on their trek into the unsettled wilderness; by drawing their wagons into a circle impregnable to the hostile people outside.

But we can't fight ideas this way. The church's responsibility is to proclaim the doctrine of man made in the image of God, to point out to the frightened that the turmoil in the Congo is the result of the white man's subjecting the native to a tyranny which left him no room to breathe and grow in and which chained him to the earth, so that when the chance came he acted as might reasonably have been anticipated, human nature being what it is.

It would seem that there is only one possible peaceful solution for South Africa: a crash educational program offering equal opportunity for every individual to develop his talents fully. Prerequisite to this solution is a moral revolution. A minimum educational standard applying to both white and nonwhite would enfranchise many nonwhites and exclude many whites from the polls. Such a step would create hope where there is now despair. And the evolution of hope is the only antidote to the violence generated by despair. The Christian doctrine of hope has been long neglected, but perhaps here more than elsewhere the opportunity for its renaissance is at hand. South Africa is a far, far cry from the U.S., where despite the many cracks in its fabric the federal power, defined by the Constitution, stands solidly behind justice to all. Here unjust laws, the taking by Caesar of the things we can never hand over to him, form the conditions under which we live.

Yes, the movement toward justice is going to cause much pain in the Body of Christ in South Africa. Perhaps the biblical concept of Christ as the Suffering Servant is the one which we in this land must take to heart. The problem we face is age-old in the history of the church: What is to be the role of the Body of Christ, the people of God, when all channels for redress of grievances seem to be closing fast? It would indeed be a joyful thing for all Christians to dwell together in unity. But until we can show who our brethren are, that is a joy we in South Africa can never know.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 1, 1966]

SOUTH AFRICANS ASSAIL A BISHOP—SAY HE TRIED TO EMBARRASS REGIME BY FEEDING BLACKS

(By Joseph Lelyveld)

KIMBERLEY, SOUTH AFRICA, December 31.—A young Anglican bishop here, with a record in the civil rights movement in the United States, is being accused of trying to embarrass the Government by distributing food to 1,000 hungry, dispossessed black South Africans.

"It is all so simple," Bishop C. Edward Crowther, a former chaplain at the University of California in Los Angeles, said today. "As a bishop of the church I must seek to feed the hungry and assist the homeless. I am astonished that this could be construed as an attack on South Africa."

The Bishop's conflict with the authorities started two weeks ago when all the residents of a black squatters' settlement called Holpan, 40 miles north of this diamond-mining center, were turned out of the shanties in which many had lived their entire lives and loaded on Government trucks with their possessions.

BACKGROUND OF EXPULSION

The authorities had been trying to get the squatters, most of whom found work as casual labor on nearby farms and diamond diggings, to move to a "location" where housing had been provided for them.

The squatters had resisted because the rent of the Government houses—the equivalent of only $5.60 a month—would take at least a third of what they were able to earn in the best of months.

So the trucks came and carried them 25 miles into the barren veld, where they were dumped at a site devoid of facilities for human habitation.

The site, known as the Mamuthla Reserve, is what the Government euphemistically calls "a Bantu homeland."

But, says a woman who accompanied Bishop Crowther on one of his visits there, "it's right in the middle of absolutely nothing—no houses, no schools, no jobs, no food—nothing!"

When the bishop went to Mamuthla, he found the people living in improvised lean-tos that could not even be described as shanties. Many told him they had been without food for five days.

"I decided then and there that I must start an emergency relief scheme," he said.

On his way back to Kimberley he stopped at a general store on the border of the reserve and ordered a first shipment of maize.

Announcing his fund that same day, he said: "I feel ashamed to be associated by the accident of race with those responsible for this disregard for humanity and ordinary human wants of food and shelter."

The bishop's statement raised a furor. Officials in the Bantu Affairs Department in Pretoria, pressed for comment were reported to have declared that the squatters had "forfeited their right for sympathy" by refusing to be relocated.

"Can you tell me," the Bishop asks, "how old people and children can forfeit their right for sympathy—especially at the Christmas season?"

When the keeper of the general store brought the maize to Mamuthla the next day he was unable to distribute it because, he said, an official told him he had "no right to feed the natives." The Bishop immediately announced that he would return to Mamuthla to distribute the maize himself.

Two carloads of officials were waiting for him when he arrived. The local Bantu Commissioner told him that he had no right to enter the reserve, and that, anyway, no one there needed or wanted food. He offered to let the Bishop come along and satisfy himself that this was so.

BISHOP ADDRESSED CROWD

Two men approached a crowd of about 100. The Bishop spoke.

"I told them I came as their Bishop and they need not be afraid of telling the truth," he recounted. "I asked all those who were without food for themselves or their children to stand. The whole crowd stood."

On Christmas Eve Bishop Crowther returned with three truckloads of food, the result of contributions, many of them anonymous, now amounting to more than $2,500.

"Every family there had a decent Christmas meal," the Bishop says. "By decent, I mean some maize, some biscuits, some candy and some tinned fish."

But by this time the Government and its supporters were expressing their resentment of the publicity the bishop's fund drive had attracted.

"The nasty suspicion arises that the promotion of Christmas goodwill is not his only motive," an Afrikaans newspaper said.

Because the English-born bishop holds a United States passport, he was told that the ordinary exemption clergymen get from the requirement that all white visitors to black reserves must carry permits did not apply to him.

A Government official was reported to have said that he would not get one when he applied. Another official in Pretoria said the bishop's only aim was "to embarass the Government."

While at the University of California, Bishop Crowther, a husky man of 36, with a jaw that juts impressively, took part in fair housing campaigns.

He came to South Africa to serve as deacon here in September, 1964. It was only last month that he was installed as Bishop of Kimberley and Kuruman.

LARRY SULLIVAN'S JOB IS ABOLISHED

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, after 41 years of working on Capitol Hill in various capacities, Larry Sullivan is retiring, all because Congress, in one of its economy moves, abolished the Office of the

Coordinator of Information in the legislative appropriation bill. However, as Larry states so well in the article he wrote for Roll Call:

> But 41 years is a long time on Capitol Hill. Doubtless it is proper to move along.

Larry came to Capitol Hill on November 7, 1926, with Associated Press, where he stayed until 1947, when he joined the House Committee on Government Operations. In 1948 he was appointed to the staff of the Coordinator of Information, and in January of 1953, he was named Coordinator.

I think I can speak for Larry's many friends in the Senate in saying that we shall certainly miss him. He probably knows and calls more of us by our first names than almost anyone else. I have considered him one of my good friends since 1935, when I first came to the House of Representatives. I wish for him many years of well-earned and well-deserved rest.

I ask unanimous consent that the article published in Roll Call be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COORDINATOR SULLIVAN: CAPITOL REMINISCENCES

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

It's a funny feeling, being abolished by Act of Congress!

But 41 years is a long time on Capitol Hill. Doubtless it is proper to move along.

Only two Members of the present Congress were in service when I first marched up the Hill, November 7, 1926, to take my new assignment for the Associated Press in the Senate gallery.

On that day, the Honorable Carl Hayden, of Phoenix, was the House Member from Arizona, since 1912; and the Honorable Emanuel Celler was in the House from the 10th New York since 1922.

Babe Ruth was the King of Swat, and Jack Dempsey was the feared Manassa Mauler; Gertrude Ederle had just conquered the English channel in the name of American womanhood; and William Jennings Bryan had lost spectacularly to Clarence Darrow in the historic Tennessee Monkey Trial!

President Cal Coolidge was thinking of running again, but finally decided, in late 1927, to step out of the way of a whirlwind young comer, Herbert Hoover, of California, the great food and hunger genius of WWI.

Charles Gates Dawes of Illinois—"Hell 'n Maria Dawes," as we used to say—was Vice-president, and Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa, a raging liberal of the day, was president pro tem of the Senate.

In those days the bulbous and flamboyant Tom Heflin of Alabama was wont to enter the Senate lounge about 11:50 A.M. singing in robust gusto, "Alabama casts twenty-four votes for Oscar W. Underwood." (We still hear the melodious echo of those 103 roll calls in the 1924 convention in old Madison Square Garden).

A BUDGET SURPLUS

Cal Coolidge's budget for fiscal 1927 stood at $2.8-billion and showed a cash surplus of $1.1-billion. The defense budget was $792-million for the year.

The Federal debt stood at $18.5 billion and our esteemed Allies owed us $15 billion on war debts. No wonder Silent Cal could enjoy an hour's nap in the office every afternoon. The Federal income tax rate on corporate profits was 12%, against today's 52%, and even prohibition was a debatable success, save possibly in New York, Chicago, Boston, New Orleans, San Francisco, Palm Beach, and Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin.

Indeed, it was a bright and confident world. Eight years ago we had won triumphantly the war to end all wars; and the world now was safe for democracy, perhaps for ever. What's to worry? Our international balance of payments was more than $150-million in our favor for the year.

Speaker Nicholas Longworth of Ohio ruled the House with an iron hand, with a majority of 70 on the roll call. Sam Rayburn of Texas was ranking minority Member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, and John Nance Garner, of Uvalde, now serving his twelfth term in the House was assistant floor leader.

WHO IS STALIN?

There was something moving in Russia vaguely known as Communism. A Little Red Wagon had exploded in Wall Street in September 1919. But Moscow was still quite a mythical city, much like something out of the Arabian Nights. Lenin had expired mysteriously in 1924, and the new head man, Stalin, still was a prime world nobody.

In short, everything was just dandy until October 29, 1929, when the bottom fell out of Wall Street and the Dow Jones Industrial averages started down from $381.7, and never stopped until June 1932, at $41.22, or some 13 points below January 1915.

During the crash week of October 1929, the New York Stock Exchange list lost more than $20-billions in total value, and the decline continued in every market until the total loss on the big-board list, alone, was something like $55-billions.

Never in human history had there been a financial hurricane of such violent sweep and intensity. Thousands simply went nuts.

In November 1928 a special election in Massachusetts sent to Washington the Democratic floor leader of the Commonwealth Senate, John W. McCormack, an energetic genial young lawyer from Dorchester. He was full of lively chit-chat about Calvin Coolidge in the Massachusetts State House in the days of the Boston Police Strike. And across the aisle sat an ambitious young publisher from North Attleboro, Joseph W. Martin, Jr., elected to the House in 1924, and by now a tested Congressional veteran. Martin and McCormack became warm friends.

William Tyler Page of Maryland, author of the immortal American's Creed, was Clerk of the House.

Leaving journalism in November, 1947, I joined the staff of the House Committee on Government Operations. Next year I was appointed to the Coordinator's staff, and in January 1953, named Coordinator. The office was abolished by PL 90–57, effective October 1, 1967.

CONGRESS IN AMERICA

Over the span of 20 successive Congresses, I have known personally some 3,500 Members of the House and Senate. And everyone of them had something to contribute—scholarship, oratory, gaiety, dogged plugging, a wholesome skepticism, even in a few cases, an almost eccentric patriotism.

No one ever can hope to know and understand our American Constitutional system until he knows Capitol Hill for at least a quarter-century.

Capitol Hill makes America tick. As the poet once said—

"Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light!"

God save the Hill!

VIETNAM: A STRAIN ON THE CONSCIENCE OF MANKIND

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, W. Somerset Maugham has written:

> Conscience is the guardian in the individual of the rules which the community has evolved for its own preservation.

The conscience of all mankind is, today, being sorely strained by the ever-increasing U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

Many of the youths of the United States are under a particular strain. For they are convinced that U.S. military involvement in Vietnam is morally and legally unjustifiable. While perfectly willing to fight and, if need be, to protect the security of their Nation, they are in agreement with so many eminent military leaders of the Nation that the security of the United States is in nowise threatened by the conflict in Vietnam—essentially a civil war into which the United States blundered with a massive, military effort, and which indeed its actions helped to precipitate.

There are also many youths, safely deferred because of their full-time attendance at college, who feel they must do more to bring about an end to the horrible fighting in Vietnam. They protest and demonstrate—the vast majority of them peacefully—they write letters and sign petitions to their elected representatives—but to their complete frustration they see the military involvement of the United States in Vietnam steadily escalated.

Those who must counsel these youths are also very sorely troubled.

What shall they advise those youths who face draft calls but who do not believe that the cause of the United States in Southeast Asia is either legally or morally just?

Faced with such a choice, Stanford religion professor, Robert McAfee Brown, has come to the conclusion that:

> Because of Vietnam . . . in conscience, I must break the law . . . one has to oppose evil even if one cannot prevent it.

Writing in the October 31, 1967, issue of Look, Professor Brown states:

> This escalation of military power demands the escalation of moral protest. Those of us who condemn this war, who are repulsed by it and who realize that history is going to judge our nation very harshly for its part in it, must see more and more clearly that it is not enough any longer to sign another advertisement or send another telegram or give another speech—or write another article. The ways of genteel, legal protest have shown themselves to be ineffective.

Professor Brown raises a most crucial point. In our democrative society, the citizen is given recourse to his elected officials to change the course of action of the Federal Government. Appealing to the President and to his elected representatives in the Congress, the citizen sees his protests against the course of action in Vietnam falling upon deaf ears—even though those espousing his point of view grow in numbers daily. What is the citizen to do about a government grown unresponsive to his wishes?

Where can he turn?

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Brown's moving article entitled "Because of Vietnam: In conscience, I must break the law," published in the October 31, 1967, issue of Look, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Because of Vietnam: "In Conscience, I Must Break the Law"

(By Robert McAfee Brown)

"Vietnam? I've got other things to worry about." There was a time when it was easy for me to say that. I was worried about the California battle over Proposition 14, in which the real estate interests were trying to palm off on the California voters legislation designed to discriminate against minority groups, a measure later declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. I was worried about the plight of the migrant workers in the San Joaquin Valley, who were striking for the right to bargain collectively. I was also, if truth be told, worried about other things as well: getting tomorrow's lecture finished, scrounging up the extra dollars I was going to need when state-income-tax time rolled around, finding time to get acquainted with my kids, recouping some of the losses on the writing project on which I was currently so far behind.

In this, I was like many millions of Americans. In addition, also like many millions of Americans, I was probably afraid to face the issue of Vietnam, afraid that if I learned enough about it, I would have to join those radical, far-out types who two or three years ago were saying in such lonely fashion what many middle-class people are saying now: that our policy in Vietnam is wrong, that it is callous and brutalizing to those who must implement it, that it cannot be supported by thinking of humane people and that if one comes to feel this way, he has to engage in the uncomfortable and annoying and possibly threatening posture of putting his body where his words are.

In the interval since I discovered that I couldn't duck Vietnam any longer, I have tried to do my homework, read some history, examine the Administration's position, listen to its critics and come to a stand of my own. I've come to a stand, all right. And I only regret, not just for the sake of my own conscience, but for the sake of the thousands of Americans and the hundreds of thousands of Asians who have died in Vietnam, that I did not come to it with much greater speed. For I have now gone the full route—from unconcern to curiosity, to study, to mild concern, to deep concern, to signing statements, to genteel protest, to marching, to moral outrage, to increasingly vigorous protest, to . . . civil disobedience.

The last step, of course, is the crucial one, the one where I part company with most of my friends in the liberal groups where I politic, with most of my friends in the academic community where I work and with most of my friends in the church where I worship. And since I am a reasonable man, not given to emotive decisions, one who by no stretch of the imagination could be called far-out, one who is not active in the New Left, one who still shaves and wears a necktie—a typical Establishment-type middle-class American WASP—I feel it important to record why it is that such a person as myself finds it impossible to stop merely at the level of vigorous protest of our policy in Vietnam and feels compelled to step over the line into civil disobedience.

My basic reason is also my most judgmental: I have utterly lost confidence in the Johnson Administration. Those who do not share that premise may shrink from the consequences I draw from it. All I can say by way of reply is that I tried for many months to work from the presupposition that the Administration was genuinely seeking peace and that it was trying to conduct foreign policy in honorable terms. But the record now makes patently clear to me that our Government is not willing to negotiate seriously save on terms overwhelmingly favorable to it and that it has refused to respond to many feelers that have come from the other side. I can no longer trust the spokesmen for the Administration when they engage in their customary platitudes about a desire to negotiate. What they do belies what they say, and at the moment they express willingness to talk with Hanoi, they engage in further frantic acts of escalation that bring us closer to the brink of World War III and a nuclear holocaust. I do not believe that they are any longer reachable in terms of modifying their senseless policy of systematically destroying a small nation of dark-skinned people so that American prestige can emerge unscathed. All of us who have written, spoken, marched, petitioned, reasoned and organized must surely see that in the moments when Mr. Johnson is not calling us unpatriotic, he is simply ignoring a mounting chorus of moral horror with benign disdain and proceeding day by day, week by week, month by month, to escalate the war far past the point of no return.

This means that if one believes that what we are doing in Southeast Asia is immoral, he has no effective way of seeking to change such a policy, for the policy, in the face of two or three years of increasing criticism, is only becoming more hard-nosed, more irrational, more insane. The procedures through which change can normally be brought about in a democracy are increasingly futile. Mr. Johnson emasculated Congress in August 1964 with the Gulf of Tonkin agreement, which he now uses to justify air war over China. Public protests are written off as examples of lack of patriotism or lack of fidelity to the Americans now in Vietnam or even, by members of the House Armed Services Committee, as treasonable. With each act of military escalation, the moral horror of the war is escalated. We have been killing women and children all along; now, we kill more of them. We have been destroying the villages of civilians all along; now, we destroy more of them. We have been breaking almost every one of the rules that civilized men have agreed constitute the minimal standards of decency men must maintain even in the indecency of war; now, we break them more often.

This escalation of military power demands the escalation of moral protest. Those of us who condemn this war, who are repulsed by it and who realize that history is going to judge our nation very harshly for its part in it, must see more and more clearly that it is not enough any longer to sign another advertisement or send another telegram or give another speech—or write another article. The ways of genteel, legal protest have shown themselves to be ineffective. During the time of their impact, escalation has not lessened, it has increased. (I leave as a purely academic matter the question of whether escalation would have been worse without the genteel protests. Undoubtedly, it would have been. But it is too easy a rationalization to argue that we might have killed 500,000 Vietnamese, whereas, thanks to the protests, we may have only killed 100,000. Howard Zinn has remarked that World War II furnished us with a very convenient moral calculus: it is not permitted to kill 6,000,000 Jews, but anything short of that number can be justified in comparison.)

Military escalation has become our Government's stock response to every problem, and in its exercise, our leaders have demonstrated themselves incapable of change. Their only response, now no more than a conditioned reflex, is to hit a little harder. They have become prisoners of their own propaganda. Their rationalizations of their policy become more frantic, their attacks on their critics more strident, their defense of their actions more removed from the realm of reality. In justifying the decision to bomb within ten miles of the China border, Mr. Johnson, in a not-untypical burst of omniscience, assured us that he knew the mind of the Peking government and that the Peking government would not interpret our action as a widening of the war. But who, even in Peking, can predict how that government will respond? Such acts and gestures and declarations on our part indicate the awful temptation of using power irresponsibly and the way in which our blithe self-confidence may sow the seeds of our own—and everybody else's—destruction. I do not know which is more terrifying to contemplate: the possibility that Administration leaders really believe the reasons they give to defend their policy or the possibility that behind their public reasons, there lies another set of motivations and justifications that they dare not share with the rest of us. On either count, their right to lead the most powerful nation on earth is faulted.

I have already suggested that history will judge them harshly. But such a statement is a little too smug, however true it may be. History will judge *us* harshly, that is to say, those of us who continue to support our present policy makers, either overtly by echoing their tattered clichés or covertly by our silence. He who is not against them is for them.

In the face of such conclusions, one is counseled, "Work for '68. Wait for '68." I will, of course, work for '68, just as, inevitably, being a child of time, I must wait for it. But I am no longer content to throw all my energies in that direction, and for the following reasons: (1) It seems clear that no Democrat will have either the courage or the power to challenge Mr. Johnson. In the face of his virtually certain nomination, it is important that millions of persons like myself get on record as indicating that under no circumstances whatsoever would we vote for him. (2) There is little indication that the Republican party will offer a real choice. Nixon and Reagan are more hawkish than Johnson, and Romney has displayed an indecisiveness about Vietnam seldom matched in the history of American politics. (3) The vacuum within the two major parties leaves voters opposed to our Vietnam policy with rather bleak alternatives. The decision to cast no vote at all cannot be justified by those who believe in the democratic process. All that is left, then, is to vote for a protest candidate who will not win. Several million voters so acting might serve notice on whoever wins that there is a body of opposition that cannot be discounted. But serving notice is a far cry from influencing policy. (4) All of this remains desperately abstract, however, because 1968 is a full year off. What is not in the least abstract is that in the meantime, men and women and children are dying. They are dying horrible deaths, inflicted not only by the Vietcong but also by our own soldiers. As our casualty rate increases in the next 12 months, the casualty rate of the enemy will increase perhaps ten times as fast. Meanwhile, our escalation will be bringing us closer and closer to war with China and possibly with Russia.

In the face of such facts, an informed conscience does not have the luxury of waiting 12 months to see what the political machinery may or may not produce. Therefore, I find myself forced, by the exclusion of alternatives as well as by an increasing sense of moral imperative, to escalate my own protest to the level of civil disobedience. The war is so wrong, and ways of registering concern about it have become so limited, that civil disobedience seems to me the only honorable route left.

I make this judgment, foreseeing two possible consequences.

First, there is always the remote possibility (on which it is not wise to count too heavily) that civil disobedience might make a significant enough impact on the nation as a whole that the policy makers could not any longer ignore the voice and act of protest. If engaged in by significant enough numbers of people (and significant enough people), it could conceivably shock the nation and the world into a recognition that our actions in Vietnam are so intolerable that a drastic shift in our policy could no longer be avoided. There is the further remote possibility that others, not yet ready to escalate their protest to civil disobedience, might at least escalate somewhere in the spectrum and thus produce a total yield noticeably higher than in the past.

I would like to believe that such things might happen. I see little likelihood that they will. Why, then, protest by breaking the law, if such protest is not going to do any discernible good? Because there comes a time when the issues are so clear and so crucial that a man does not have the choice of waiting until all the possible consequences can be charted. There comes a time when a man must simply say, "Here I stand, I can do no other, God help me." There comes a time when it is important for the future of a nation that it be recorded that in an era of great folly, there were at least some within that nation who recognized the folly for what it was and were willing, at personal cost, to stand against it. There comes a time when, in the words of Father Pius-Raymond Régamey, one has to oppose evil even if one cannot prevent it, when one has to choose to be a victim rather than an accomplice. There comes a time when thinking people must give some indication for their children and their children's children that the national conscience was not totally numbed by Washington rhetoric into supporting a policy that is evil, vicious and morally intolerable.

If such language sounds harsh and judgemental, it is meant precisely to be such. The time is past for gentility, pretty speeches, and coy evasions of blunt truths. Evil deeds must be called evil. Deliberate killing of civilians—by the tens of thousands—must be called murder. Forcible removal of people from their homes must be called inhumane and brutal. A country that permits such things to be done in its name deserves to be condemned, not only by the decent people of other countries but particularly by the decent people who are its citizens, who will call things what they are and who recognize finally and irrevocably that the most evil deed of all is not to do bestial things but to do bestial things and call them humane.

In light of this, I no longer have any choice but to defy those laws of our land that produce such rotten fruits. I believe with Martin Luther King that such civil disobedience as I engage in must be done nonviolently, and that it must be done with a willingness to pay the penalties that society may impose upon me. I recognize the majesty of Law and its impregnable quality as a bulwark of a free society, and it is in the name of Law that I must defy given laws that are an offense against morality, making this witness wherever need be—in the churches, on the streets, in the assembly halls, in the courts, in jails.

Each person who takes this route must find the level at which his own conscience comes into conflict with laws relating to American presence in Vietnam, and the cardinal rule for those engaging in civil disobedience must be a respect for the consciences of those who choose a different point along the spectrum at which to make their witness; words like "chicken" or "rash" must have no place in their lexicon. Some will refuse to pay that portion of their Federal income tax directly supporting the war. Others will engage in "unlawful assembly" in front of induction centers. For myself, it is clear what civil disobedience will involve. I teach. I spend my professional life with American youth of draft age. And while I will not use the classroom for such purposes, I will make clear that from now on my concerns about Vietnam will be explicitly focused on counseling, aiding and abetting all students who declare that out of moral conviction they will not fight in Vietnam. I will "counsel, aid and abet" such students to find whatever level of moral protest is consonant with their consciences, and when for them this means refusing service in the armed forces, I will support them in that stand. In doing so, I am committing a Federal offense, for the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 specifically states that anyone who "knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces" opens himself to the same penalties as are visited upon the one he so counsels, aids and abets, namely up to five years in jail or up to $10,000 in fines, or both.

I will continue to do this until I am arrested. As long as I am not arrested, I will do it with increasing intensity, for I am no longer willing that 18- or 19-year-old boys should pay with their lives for the initially bumbling but now deliberate folly of our national leaders. Nor am I willing to support them in action that may lead them to jail, from a safe preserve of legal inviolability for myself. I must run the same risks as they, and therefore I break the law on their behalf, so that if they are arrested, I too must be arrested. If this means jail, I am willing to go with them, and perhaps we can continue there to think and learn and teach and reflect and emerge with a new set of priorities for American life. If, as is far more likely, this means merely public abuse or ridicule, then perhaps a minority of us can be disciplined, chastened and strengthened by that kind of adversity.

But whatever it means, the time has come when some of us can no longer afford the luxury of gentility or the luxury of holding "moderate" positions. The issue must be joined. Our country is committing crimes so monstrous that the only thing more monstrous would be continuing silence or inaction in the face of them. END

GROWTH OF DIRECT OVERSEAS FLIGHTS FROM DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star this afternoon has published an editorial on the encouraging growth of direct overseas flights from Dulles International Airport. The Star describes the anticipated 38-percent gain in such flights next year as "a welcome development," and all of us who are interested in seeing Dulles put to greater use agree.

I believe that Dulles should be recognized as a major international gateway. It has the modern facilities capable of handling the largest available aircraft, and, from a geographic point of view, it is the logical entry and exit point for overseas travelers from many parts of this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Coming of Age

The news that Dulles International Airport will be substantially increasing its direct overseas flights next year, helping travelers avoid the nightmare of stops at John F. Kennedy Airport in New York, is a welcome development.

JFK for too long has enjoyed a near-monopoly as a transit point for airline flights to Europe. The average takeoff and landing delay there is now about 20 minutes, and at peak traffic periods is much longer. Federal Aviation Agency officials say the average delay will double next year.

There is no earthly reason why Dulles, a magnificently designed facility, should not serve as an entry and exit point for many more international voyagers. The airport in fact is frequently used now on an emergency basis by Kennedy-bound planes that must refuel due to bad weather over New York.

According to published reports the number of overseas flights planned for the peak season next year at Dulles will show a 38 percent gain over the 1967 figure. At least one airline is also considering routing its overseas freight direct to Dulles to avoid the mess at Kennedy.

Just this month, airlines increased the total of non-stop and direct flights between Dulles and Europe from 34 to 40, and more will be added next April. It's a trend that ought to be encouraged. Not only will this result in greater comfort for international travelers but it will cut down the risk of air collisions over the saturated Kennedy area.

THE STAKE IN VIETNAM—AN ASIAN VIEW

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the November issue of Reader's Digest contains an interview by the noted journalist, Mr. Carl T. Rowan, with His Excellency Tan Sri Ong Yoke-Lin, one of the world's most distinguished diplomats and the Malaysian Ambassador to the United States. This article, entitled "What Is at Stake in Vietnam: An Asian View," offers a rare insight into the thinking of the pro-Western nations of Asia with regard to Vietnam. In the interview, the Ambassador makes it perfectly plain that in the eyes of our Asian allies our stand in Vietnam is essential to their continuing freedom. He also firmly asserts that the Vietnam war is not an American war but one being supported by many Asian nations. In answer to the question, "Just what is at stake in Vietnam?" the Ambassador replied:

> The independence of more than 200 million people in Southeast Asia; the rice bowl of the world; vast supplies of rubber, tin and oil; strategic control of critical sea lanes; the possibility of a wider war; and the integrity of a great nation, the United States—all are at stake. And much more—not the least of which is the simple desire of small, weak countries like mine to live free of harassment and aggression by the great powers, free of foreign coercion and subversion. That is what is at stake.

I commend this article to every Member of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What Is at Stake in Vietnam: An Asian View

(Tan Sri Ong Yoke-Lin, Malaysian Ambassador to the United States, interviewed by Carl T. Rowan)

(Note.— Tan Sri Ong Yoke-Lin was a top political leader in Malaya when it was still a British protectorate and a member of the mission to London that won Malaysian independence in 1957. Still a member of the Cabinet in Malaysia, he has also served as his nation's Ambassador to the United States since 1962.

(Carl T. Rowan, director of the U.S. Information Agency 1964–65, is today a widely syndicated columnist, also a radio and TV commentator.)

Q. Mr. Ambassador, the United States has almost 500,000 troops in Vietnam. We have suffered 13,000 killed and 80,000 wounded there. Is Vietnam becoming too much an American war?

A. No. The South Vietnamese have over 700,000 troops, and have suffered more than 70,000 military and civilian dead since 1961.

Many nations are aiding them. South Korea has sent some 45,000 troops. The Philippines, Australia, New Zealand and Thailand have all contributed troops. Other countries have supplied specialized training and material support. All of us in Asia have a lot at stake there.

Q. Critics hold that, except for the Korean troops, Asian contributions have been of a token nature—that we are fighting for a group of nations that won't fight for themselves. Why, for example, hasn't your country sent troops?

A. Because of our own serious problem of communist subversion. Though we won the 12-year war against them seven years ago, some 1500 armed, fanatical, hardcore communists still lurk along our northern border with Thailand and in the jungles of Sarawak. These terrorists, many of them trained in Indonesia during Sukarno's "Crush Malaysia" campaign, now get their orders from Communist China. Our small armed force is barely sufficient for our own defense.

Q. Malaysia, then, can provide only moral support?

A. We have given considerably more than moral support. As early as 1958, our prime minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman, saw that the communists would try to take South Vietnam through terrorism just as they were trying to take Malaysia, and he called upon the free world to help South Vietnam. Though hard-pressed ourselves, we began to train South Vietnamese in counter-insurgency techniques we had found successful. Several thousand officers have now completed this continuing program. And when we won our victory over the communists, in 1960, we gave most of our military equipment to South Vietnam.

Q. You won your war against the communists yourselves. Why can't the South Vietnamese?

A. There has been a far more massive infiltration of communist men and material into South Vietnam than there was in Malaysia. The South Vietnamese need more help.

Q. You believe that U.S. involvement is vital, then?

A. You recall the political manifesto which Lin Piao, the Communist Chinese Vice Premier and Minister of National Defense, expounded in 1965—that Asia, Africa and Latin America are the rural areas of the world, and that if you take the rural areas the cities eventually will fall. U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam under present circumstances would put Communist China well on the way to achieving Phase 1 of Lin Piao's master plan: domination of Asia. We in Malaysia, for example, would be in deep trouble. Not only would the armed bands of communists be encouraged, but the underground subversives would re-emerge.

Let's face it. Your country carries a terrible burden today because no other country in the world has the will and the power to stop Red China's expansionist march. Your stand has achieved more than most Americans seem to realize. You have given confidence and hope to millions of Asians who would otherwise have submitted to the communist juggernaut. In Indonesia which Sukarno had all but delivered to Peking, the army and the people rose up and crushed the communist coup attempt of 1965, later ousting Sukarno. I doubt they would have moved so confidently if your strong stand in Vietnam had not made it clear that you are not going to abandon Asia to communist tyranny.

Beyond this, Asians have been inspired toward economic and social coöperation as never before. They have formed the Asian Development Bank, created ASPAC (Asian and Pacific Council), reactivated the Association of Southeast Asia. All this has been made possible by the stabilizing presence—the security shield—of the U.S. military.

Q. Some Americans say that we have no vital interests so far from home, that we have no right to be there.

A. The United States has *every right* to be there, helping South Vietnam to repel aggression and meet the needs of her people. You also have a "selfish" interest. Red China has openly and brazenly declared her aggressive intentions. If you don't make a stand in Vietnam, you risk a much bigger war in years to come.

No fair-minded Asian believes that the United States has any ulterior economic or territorial motives. We are aware that, instead of keeping territories that you occupied in World War II, you returned them and spent vast amounts of money to rebuild them. You helped Japan to become one of the most prosperous countries of the World. You sent your young men to save Korea from communist domination. You willingly gave independence to the Philippines. This is a record that no amount of propaganda can distort.

Q. But some eminent critics say that in Vietnam the United States is opposing nationalism, not communism—that we are warring against the same kind of revolution that gained us our independence.

A. I know that it wasn't "nationalism" that caused communist terrorists to kill Malaysians for 12 years. It was an international communist conspiracy. A fanatical wing of these same conspirators is operating in Vietnam today.

Q. Critics have said that the United States will be hated in Asia for generations because it has sent soldiers to kill young Asians. What are the racial implications of this war?

A. In my country, the communist terrorists were mainly of Chinese origin—but so were 90 percent of the innocent and helpless Malaysians they assassinated. It was no race war; it was a conflict between murderers and a people who wished only to live in peace. Likewise in Vietnam. Asians recognize that this is just another of the many struggles of freedom against tyranny and coercion. Asian nations have themselves sent troops to Vietnam, remember. Race is not a factor.

Q. Some critics say that the Saigon government is a dictatorship, unworthy of support under a pretense of defending freedom and democracy . . .

A. You cannot ignore the fact that, for years, South Vietnam has been under vicious attack. What the South Vietnamese have is a war government. Even in a democratic country, the government necessarily takes on extra power during periods of national emergency. Some of your President's powers during World War II might be considered "dictatorial" when viewed from peacetime. South Vietnam must move toward democracy, but first it must have a period of peace—of freedom from aggression.

One more point about this: Don't forget that the Hanoi regime in North Vietnam is a dictatorship *beyond any doubt*. It is easy to criticize the harassed leaders in Saigon, but does any critic maintain that the group in Hanoi is preferable?

Q. Do you think a negotiated settlement in Vietnam is possible?

A. We should be very wary about any such proposal. The communists will come to the conference table only when they think that by doing so they can still take over South Vietnam. We have seen the work of the communists who went to Geneva to negotiate. Before the ink was dry on the agreement they signed in 1962, they started a campaign to subvert and take over the government of Laos from the neutralist premier Souvanna Phouma—one of the things they had pledged not to do.

In my country, when we had thoroughly whipped the communists both militarily and politically, there were no negotiations. Our government simply declared an end to "the emergency." It could well be that, if the American people show determination to last out the struggle in Vietnam, there will be a quiet, unannounced de-escalation, and eventually the war will fizzle out—but only after the communists are convinced that they have no hope of gaining their objectives.

Q. Mr. Ambassador, many Americans and some Asians fear that Communist China will enter the war and involve all Asia in a brutal conflict. Do you share this fear?

A. Before the United States bombed North Vietnam in 1965, the fear was widely expressed that such action would bring on Red Chinese intervention. But this has not happened. The Red Chinese leaders have been quite cautious.

Q. To sum up, just what is at stake in Vietnam?

A. The independence of more than 200 million people in Southeast Asia; the rice bowl of the world; vast supplies of rubber, tin and oil; strategic control of critical sea lanes; the possibility of a wider war; and the integrity of a great nation, the United States—all are at stake. And much more—not the least of which is the simple desire of small, weak countries like mine to live free of harassment and aggression by the great powers, free of foreign coercion and subversion. That is what is at stake.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2515) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

ESTATE TAX BILL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, for myself, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], I introduce a bill and ask that it be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2600) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the valuation of a decedent's interest in a closely held business for estate tax purposes, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. CARLSON and Mr. CURTIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the devastating impact of Federal estate taxes on the families of ranchers and farmers and some small businesses has become a problem of grave concern to the livestock industry. In recent years, an upward trend in the sales prices of farm and ranch properties, primarily caused by speculators investing in land, has produced higher and higher taxes at the death of the farmer or rancher. Often the heirs have little or no cash with which to pay these death taxes. This has already forced the liquidation of many family livestock operations, and could force the sale of countless other ranches and farms on the death of present owners.

The effect of this trend is to threaten the continuation of the traditional family ranch or farm which is passed on from one generation to the next. Small businesses involving real estate also are similarly affected.

In contrast to farms and ranches, the valuation of publicly traded stocks and securities generally reflects their earning power, and such stocks and securities can be sold on death without destroying a family business. Thus, decedents whose estates consist of farms or ranches or small businesses are discriminated against in comparison with those whose estates consist of marketable securities.

Along with the National Livestock Tax Committee, I have been exploring possible changes in the existing laws and regulations which might achieve estate tax equity for the livestock industry. The distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], has been making a similar personal study.

The prime reason for the upward trend in valuation is the Internal Revenue Service's interpretation of the requirement in the Federal estate tax regulations that the estate tax be imposed on the "market value" of the property held by the decedent at the time of his death. Today the price for which farm or grazing land might sell to speculators is out of all proportion to what it will earn for farm or grazing purposes. Unfortunately, however, many revenue agents refuse to give any consideration whatsoever to the earning capacity of a ranch or farm in determining its value for estate tax purposes. To the contrary, they rely only on inflated sales prices of similar farms which have been gobbled up by land speculators. Thus, the family which does not have substantial outside assets cannot pay the estate taxes. So, the property has to be sold and cannot be passed on to the next generation.

Congress should begin now to find a satisfactory solution to this problem. With the thought in mind that whatever we do would involve the passage of remedial legislation, together with the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], I have drafted a bill offering what I believe is a sound approach. In general, since other small businesses have a similar problem, it would apply in any case where a decedent owned an interest in a closely held business whether in proprietorship, partnership, or corporate form.

In such a case, the estate's representatives would have the option of having the decedent's interest in the business valued either at its market value, as at present, or the higher of the decedent's cost basis or a value based on the reasonable earning power of the business. In order to qualify for this option, my bill provides that the decedent must have been in the business for at least 10 years prior to his death, and his heirs would have to continue the business for at least 5 years after his death. In addition, this bill would provide that under the market value alternative all relevant factors should be considered in valuing a business interest, including the earning capacity of the business and the degree of control represented by the interest being valued.

I believe that this proposal represents a fair solution to the problem, and I hope the bill will be carefully and thoughtfully studied by the Treasury Department experts and others so that any shortcomings that may be found can be dealt with before I offer it as an amendment to an appropriate House-passed tax bill.

Mr. President, I am pleased now to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am happy to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] in regard to the introduction of this bill.

ESTATE TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILY BUSINESS

Mr. President, for the past several years, our Nation has seen a period of spectacular growth and expansion in our economy. Income and production have been booming.

One very important group within our society, however, has not shared this prosperity. I am speaking of the family-owned enterprise, whether it be a farm, ranch, or small main street business. The family farmer and the small businessman, while getting much lipservice, are now being discriminated against by our tax laws.

Specifically, I am talking about the Federal estate tax or what some refer to as the "death tax." Too often today, the "death tax" has meant the death of the family business; a death caused by tax discrimination.

On the one hand, we express alarm about the disappearance of the family farm, ranch or community business and the stability and proven worth of this kind of life. On the other hand, we place a discriminatory tax based on unrealistic, inflated land values and thereby make it virtually impossible for young people of today to carry on the family operation.

For over 200 years, the family farm has contributed strong and stable young men and women who formed the very backbone of our society. The family farm has given us plentiful production of food available at an ever decreasing share of our take-home pay. Today, the rest of the world looks to the success of the American farmer with envy, admiration, and hope. If these families are continually forced from rural America, where they lead productive and happy lives, we not only hasten the death of the traditional American farm but also speed up the mass migration to the cities where desperate conditions there already need our urgent attention.

The small, family-owned business has played an equally important role in building America. Such businesses provide the goods and services which we all expect and demand in our neighborhood homes, areas where the big corporations cannot serve because "it doesn't pay." The small businessman not only serves America but, in the eyes of many, he is America.

Yet with all of this lipservice and praise, there is continued discrimination against the family-owned enterprise.

My colleague, Senator HARRIS from Oklahoma, and I are today offering legislation to strike at one area of discrimination against the family-owned enterprise.

The prime problem centers on the requirement in the Federal estate tax regulations that the estate tax be imposed on the "fair market value" of the assets at the time of the owner's death. In the case of real estate, the fair market value is usually established by comparing land in the estate with prices recently paid for other land in the area.

More often than not, these prices are vastly inflated and are in no way comparable to the value of the decedent's ranch, farm, or business based on its ability to earn. The economic fact today is that ranch and farm land being sold is based on these inflated property values to speculators who may intend the land for purposes other than to produce food and fiber.

Unfortunately, even in light of this economic fact, no consideration is given to the earning capacity of the property in calculating estate taxes. Yet these taxes must be paid out of the earnings of the ranch, farm, or business unless the family has substantial outside interests or cash.

When shares of corporate stock in an estate are taxed, the earning power of the shares is generally considered the most important factor in determining value. It then becomes proper to argue that earning power should be considered in the valuation of a farm or ranch for estate tax purposes.

Let us take a case in point: Farmer Jones dies, leaving his 10,000-acre cattle ranch to his son. Assume the ranch is valued at $30 per acre, is paid for, and the cattle and supplies would sell at an auction for $150,000. Farmer Jones has no prior debts.

This ranch is now valued for estate tax purposes at $300,000. The personalty is valued at $150,000, bringing the total estate to $450,000. After the $60,000 exemption, Farmer Jones' taxable estate comes to $390,000. The estate would have to pay an astounding $110,500 in Federal estate taxes.

On the other hand, computing Farmer Jones' tax based upon the property's earning power is quite a different story. Jones had an average annual income of $7,500, a profit that is slightly above the average 1.5-percent value of his total earnings earned by most cattlemen. Taking a capitalization factor of 4½ percent increased value per year, Farmer

Jones' capitalized earning value comes to $165,000. With the $60,000 exemption, the taxable estate is now $105,000 and the estate tax would be a much more reasonable $22,200.

This same problem applies to the small businessman, who finds that high estate taxes make it impossible for the family business to be carried on from one generation to the next. The business is purchased by those who can pay the price, and what used to be a traditional and proud community service becomes a speculative investment for those who can afford it.

Mr. President, we must change these tax regulations that discriminate so blatantly against the family-owned enterprise. Up to now, ranchers, farmers, and small businessmen could only seek relief through lifetime planning and making sure they had enough liquid assets in case of emergency. These stopgap remedies do not offer any real guarantee and are available only to those who can afford to hire expensive tax consultant advice.

I believe this bill can bring some relief to the estate of small businessmen, ranchers, and farmers caught in the stranglehold of the estate or "death tax." The bill, simply put, would allow the estate's representatives to have the option of having the decedent's interest in the business valued at either its market value—the present system—or the higher of first, the decedent's cost basis; or, second, value based on the reasonable earning power of the business.

The bill additionally provides the decedent must have been in the business 10 years prior to his death and that his heirs would have to continue the business for at least 5 years after his death.

Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Oklahoma in expressing concern over this matter and am pleased to sponsor this proposal which I think represents a fair solution to the problem.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas. I am pleased that he and I are joint authors of this bill, which we today propose.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENTS NOS. 400 AND 401

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that amendments Nos. 400 and 401, which I have had inserted in the RECORD, intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080, the social security bill now pending in the Senate Finance Committee, continues to gain additional support.

Amendment No. 400 requires, in each State plan for welfare programs of various types, that the State provide for the recruitment, training, and effective use of paid subprofessional staff and employment of recipients to carry out the welfare program, and it also requires, in each State plan, for the recruitment, training, and effective use of social service volunteers for the same purpose.

That amendment has been endorsed by the National Association for Social Work and the National Association of Counties.

Amendment No. 401 is an amendment which directs that a study be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with recommendations to the Congress concerning the ways by which the welfare systems in each of the States may become activists on behalf of the welfare recipients in serving, assisting, and advising them in securing their full rights under welfare, housing, and other related laws.

That amendment has also been endorsed by the National Association of Social Work.

I have had previously inserted in the RECORD letters substantiating that support. In addition, both amendments have received the added cosponsorship of numerous Members of the Senate.

Today I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of both amendments at their next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A NEW LOOK AT MAKING AMERICA GROW

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last Friday, as Members of the Senate will recall, the Senate gave its approval to Senate Joint Resolution 64, the measure which I introduced to establish a special Presidential Commission on Balanced Economic Development. Prior to the passage of this measure, the Senate had already expressed its unlimited approval of the approach which I suggested by virtue of the fact that more than one-fifth of the membership of the Senate had joined as cosponsors.

Subsequently, our Senate Government Operations Committee, of which I am privileged to serve as the ranking minority member, brought out a unanimous report in support of the measure.

I would like to point out that an equally high degree of interest is developing in favor of this proposal in the House of Representatives, where some 22 Members are sponsors of the companion bill.

Prior to Senate passage, the Huntington Advertiser, a fine newspaper published in Huntington, W. Va., discussed the need for this development program. I want to quote a portion of that editorial. The Huntington Advertiser stated:

> If it is enacted and its purposes are effectively carried out, the resolution could become one of the most important pieces of legislation in many years.

I share the conviction of the Huntington Advertiser editor as to the importance of this measure.

If this country is to continue to forge ahead as a land of opportunity which provides success opportunities for its own citizens and hope for the free world, we cannot ignore the fact any longer that a good many of the rural and urban problems confronting us here at home find their origin in a common relationship of economic and population imbalances.

The approach we have been taking up to now, however, has been a piecemeal attack on these problems that we find both in rural America and in the urban areas. We discover some serious local problem and enact legislation to try to deal with it on an isolated basis, sometimes successfully so far as that particular local problem is concerned, but, more frequently, unsuccessfully, because the problems are wrapped up in interrelated situations in both urban and rural America.

The Advertiser editorial provides an excellent summation of the need for a Commission for Balanced Economic Development. I request permission to include it in the RECORD at this point because of the fact that this legislation is now in the House. After our favorable action of last Friday, it is now before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I might add, incidentally, that that committee is chaired by a distinguished Representative from the home State of that newspaper, Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS. I should like to add that both distinguished Senators from West Virginia are included as cosponsors of the legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, Oct. 27, 1967]

RESOLUTION FOR BALANCING U.S. GROWTH GAINS SUPPORT

A resolution to open the way for a study to find means for bringing about a better balance in national development is gaining support in both houses of Congress.

It has won the approval of the Senate Government Operations Committee and after the elimination of some difficulties regarding the language of the report, is expected to reach the floor this week.

The measure would authorize the President to appoint a 20-member bipartisan commission to study and recommend means of improving the balance in the nation's economic and population growth.

The report would have to be made within two years after the effectiveness date of the resolution.

The legislation was sponsored in the Senate by Sen. Karl E. Mundt, R-S.D., with about twoscore cosponsors, including Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va.

A companion resolution has also been reintroduced in the House of Representatives by Rep. Philip E. Ruppe, R–Mich., with 21 cosponsors, one of whom is Rep. Ken Hechler, Democrat of Huntington.

The House measure was referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee headed by Rep. Harley O. Staggers, D-W. Va.

If it is enacted and its purposes are effectively carried out, the resolution could become one of the most important pieces of legislation in many years.

The recommendations of the commission would be expected to present remedies both for the deterioration of rural areas and the growing congestion of the big cities.

The migration from farms and small towns to the cities has created critical problems. The number of migrants now is estimated at almost 600,000 a year. There is no indication that the trend will soon decline significantly without action to encourage people to stay in the rural areas.

In reintroducing his resolution, Rep. Ruppe said Census Bureau reports show that the average rate of population increase in the 38 largest metropolitan areas is about 2.06 per cent a year—more than 20 per cent in 10 years.

This, he said, compares with the 0.7 per cent average rate of increase outside metropolitan areas and the 1.9 per cent average rate of increase for all the 224 metropolitan areas identified by the Census Bureau in 1965.

"The result of this economic imbalance in the cities," he said, "has been substandard housing, polluted air, uncontrolled crime in the streets, congested highways, rundown schools, and growing discontent and upheaval among the already deprived minority groups. Economic imbalance in the countryside has resulted in declining economies, poverty-level incomes, limited job opportunities, and a forced exodus of the population into already congested areas."

The needs of the cities and the rural areas are already being attacked with separate programs, but Rep. Ruppe emphasized the major purpose of the resolution when he said, "The problem needs to be approached in its totality."

He summarized the commission's field of study as:

"A thorough analysis of geographic trends in the United States relating to economic development; the causative factors influencing trends; the implications in terms of distribution of population; the effect of governmental actions in shaping such trends; and the factors, both public and private, which influence the geographic location of industry and commerce."

Rep. Ruppe was followed in House discussion of the measure by Rep. John B. Anderson, R-Ill., and Rep. William D. Hathaway, D-Maine, both of whom strongly supported it. Rep. Hathaway also inserted a number of editorials and news stories on it in the Congressional Record.

Establishing the commission through the resolution would be only the first step toward finding remedies for the double problem that Rep. Ruppe called "a fast-approaching national crisis."

For several years The Advertiser has been advocating an attack on the problem through the appointment of a national planning agency that would make studies and recommendations for the location of federal bases, installations and contracts.

The agency would also make recommendations for the location of private business and industry in the most suitable areas.

Inducements to locate in the recommended areas could be offered through tax incentives.

A measure is pending in Congress now to authorize tax incentives for the location of enterprises in depressed areas. Among its cosponsors are Sen. Randolph and Sen. Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va.

The commission established by the resolution might find means of attacking the problem that would supplement the work of a national planning agency.

But certainly it should consider the advisability of locating new government bases and facilities in the most advantageous places for their operation, for the national defense and for their effect upon the economy.

And beyond that the study should take into consideration fundamental problems affecting not only the nation's growth but the welfare of its people, particularly its disadvantaged.

These problems include civil rights, welfare programs, educational opportunities, vocational training for adults as well as the young, pay scales and cultural attractions for the talented and educated in the towns and small cities.

The less strenuous life of the rural areas and smaller communities could be made more attractive also by the availability of regional airports and fast railway passenger service to and from the bigger cities for business or pleasure.

Also essential for the future welfare of the nation is the problem of dispersing the people for more adequate use of natural resources such as land and water and for more effective protection against nuclear attack.

Planning too long neglected on a national level while its benefits have been demonstrated in cities and areas is becoming increasingly important as the population grows and the complexities of modern life multiply.

While advancements in science are heading us toward the moon, we urgently need to rebuild a large part of our share of the earth.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I take the floor simply to encourage the House to move forward expeditiously, to hold early hearings, if time permits, before adjournment, to get this important piece of legislation passed and on the President's desk for signature before adjournment; and, if not, to prepare the ground, to get ready to consider it expeditiously when we convene in January, so this can be one of the first items of business to be considered.

Certainly, there are no problems of more serious concern to this country than why it is that while the cities, with too many people, are finding themselves upset by riots and upset by serious conditions of education, sanitation, and crime, at the same time people from the smaller communities of this country and from rural America are leaving the places of their birth and are going to the cities, searching for the opportunities about which they dream, but which they cannot find in the big metropolitan fleshpots of this country.

We need an overall look at all the related problems. We need to find ways to stop this influx into the cities by people who cannot be employed now in the big cities, and provide a magnet in rural America which will hold people there who belong there and encourage those who are disillusioned with the big cities to go out to the rural part of this country where they can once again achieve opportunity unlimited.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE OF ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8718) to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 871)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8718) to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses that the Senate recede from its amendments.

W. B. SPONG,
WAYNE MORSE,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DON FUQUA,
JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
THOS. ABERNETHY,
BASIL WHITENER,
ANCHER NELSEN,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation as to the end result of this conference. Additional revenue authorization for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1968 of $53.8 million is provided in this bill as agreed to by the conference.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a summary of the conference agreement.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF SENATE-HOUSE CONFERENCE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE BILL (H.R. 8718)—TOTAL ESTIMATED NEW REVENUE, $10 MILLION INCREASE IN ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT AUTHORIZATION, $43.8 MILLION INCREASE IN BORROWING AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968, AND SUBSEQUENT INCREASES

HOUSE VERSION	SENATE VERSION	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
TITLE I—AUTHORIZED ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT		
Increases same by $10 million (from $60 million to $70 million).	Provides Federal payment authorization shall be by formula, viz 25% of D.C. revenues from taxes.	Accepted House version.

SUMMARY OF SENATE-HOUSE CONFERENCE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE BILL (H.R. 8718)—TOTAL ESTIMATED NEW REVENUE, $10 MILLION INCREASE IN ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT AUTHORIZATION, $43.8 MILLION INCREASE IN BORROWING AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968, AND SUBSEQUENT INCREASES—Continued

HOUSE VERSION	SENATE VERSION	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
	TITLE II—AUTHORIZED BORROWING AUTHORITY	
Increases same by a formula—for 3 years—based on 6% debt service maximum of estimated general fund tax revenues and Federal payment to provide estimated ceiling of $333.8 in 1968, $363.9 (1969) and $392.3 (1970). **Present D.C. debt ceiling is $290 million ($200 million for general fund, $50 million for rapid transit, and $40 million for higher education).**	**Increases by same formula, but without the 3-year limitation.**	**Accepted House version.**
	TITLE III—D.C. GOVERNMENT HIRING PRACTICES	
	(Not before conference because Senate and House versions identical.) **Employment in D.C. Government—a new title to prohibit discrimination on grounds of residence, religion, race, color in recruiting and hiring of D.C. employees.**	

Mr. SPONG. In summary, title I provides an increase in the annual Federal payment authorization from the present $60 million to $70 million per year.

Likewise, title II provides an increase in the borrowing authorization which would make $43.8 million more available for capital construction for fiscal 1968, as the formula applies.

Title III, not before the conference because both the Senate and House bills were identical, directs the District of Columbia government not to exclude or give preference to residents of the District or any State in recruiting or hiring employees of the District government.

The overall purpose of this bill is to provide additional revenue urgently needed for financing District government activities that are supported from the District of Columbia general fund, including the cost of police, fire protection, education, health, welfare, courts, and other normal, general municipal government functions.

Your Senate conferees felt keenly that a formula approach for the Federal payment authorization should be adopted. Such would permit more orderly planning by the District government of this 15 percent of the District's annual budget and a more orderly utilization of the funds made available by this Federal payment. However, your Senate conferees conferred on three separate occasions with the conferees of the other body and were unsuccessful in our efforts.

In the interest of meeting our responsibilities to this body and to the Nation's Capital, we felt that a continuing deadlock would accomplish nothing constructive. Therefore, the Senate conferees receded on the Federal payment formula, agreeing to an increase of a flat $10 million fixed amount from the present $60 million annual Federal payment authorization to $70 million.

For the last two Congresses, the Senate has approved overwhelmingly the viewpoint that a formula method of establishing the level of the annual Federal payment authorization at 25 percent of District local tax revenues would be more equitable than the flat-sum approach. Under the formula, the amount of Federal payment would be tied directly to the level of local tax revenues.

Your Senate conferees are hopeful that the other body will in the next Congress consider an increase in the Federal payment authorization and bring that amount closer to what we believe to be a more equitable Federal share, as concurred in by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], whose knowledge of this matter as chairman of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee prompted him to remark on this floor on July 27, 1967, that the Federal payment should more appropriately be $80, $85, or $90 million.

Mr. President, additional expenditures, which may well come this year as a burden on the present budget, will in all probability include a request for some $5½ to $6 million for operating expenses to accept students at the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute, both authorized by the Congress 1 year ago and provided a $40 million capital construction authorization.

Pay increases for policemen and firemen are presently before the Congress, and administration sources have stated that teacher pay increases may well be proposed this year to bring the local school system pay level closer to that of the surrounding suburban school systems.

Mr. President, your Senate conferees agreed on a formula method for determining the maximum amount the District is authorized to borrow from the U.S. Treasury for general fund capital projects. The amount of revenue the District would be authorized to use for long-term debt retirement annually under the conference agreement would be limited to 6 percent of the sum of estimated annual general fund revenues from local taxes plus the Federal payment for the fiscal year involved.

The Senate version would have provided a continuing form of authorization over the years. The House-passed version, to which the Senate conferees receded, utilizes the same formula but limits it to a 3-year trial period, permitting the borrowing ceiling to remain at the 1970 fiscal year level unless changed by Congress.

The borrowing authorization formula, as adopted, has been estimated to increase the present $290 million borrowing authority to $333.8 million for fiscal year 1968, $363.9 million for 1969, and $392.3 million for 1970. Of this total amount, $50 million is earmarked for rail rapid transit construction only, and $40 million for construction purposes only for the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute.

Mr. President, the formula approach both to the annual Federal payment authorization and to the borrowing authority, as espoused by the Senate for several years now, has seen definite progress this year. One year ago, your Senate conferees on the District of Columbia revenue bill were unable to secure agreement of our counterparts in the other body on a formula approach for annual Federal payment or borrowing authority. This year, because the great advantages of the formula approach were pressed by this body and by supporters of this concept in the other body, we feel that definite headway has been made in reaching a more realistic and businesslike approach to the Federal participation in the expenses of operating this Federal Capital City and the unquestioned obligation that the Federal Government owes to the District of Columbia government. It must be remembered that some 53 percent of the Federal land area of this city is nontaxable because of its Federal status. Likewise, it should further be remembered that out of the District's $451 million budget this year, 85 cents of every dollar is paid for by local District of Columbia taxes or is a borrowing obligation against District of Columbia taxpayers.

Mr. President, your Senate conferees feel certain that this District of Columbia revenue bill will prove beneficial in permitting this city to move ahead and to provide a greater impetus to our reorganized government, and its official family to deal more effectively with the many problems at hand.

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2515) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 426

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under date of October 27, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] presented an amendment to the pending measure on behalf of himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. STENNIS, and myself.

I send that amendment (No. 426) to the desk for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Spong in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 19, change the comma to a period and strike the remainder of the sentence through the period in line 21, as follows: "or any federally owned property he may designate within the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit in Del Norte County, California."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am hopeful that no action will be taken on amendment No. 426 in the immediate future. I am engaged in a conference scheduled to meet at 1:30, and another scheduled to meet at 2:30. I am hopeful we can finish with those two conferences early in the afternoon, so that this amendment can be fully discussed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my able friend yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. First, I wish to say, as my able friend knows, that I am deeply grieved that a Senator of his stature and capability would join in such an amendment. But I am sure the authors of the bill will wish to argue for a reasonable period of time against the amendment, and then would be prepared to vote whenever the Senate desires. But as far as my friend from Louisiana is concerned, I would, of course, accommodate him with respect to his other responsibilities.

Does the Senator know whether any other amendments will be offered?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know of any.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Oregon has two amendments, I believe.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure my able friend would not object, then, in the interests of time, if there are other amendments, that his amendment be put aside.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not object to that.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is also fair to state that it is the desire of the minority leadership that final action on the pending bill not take place before tomorrow at or about the hour of 2:30.

I do not want to ask for a unanimous-consent agreement in that regard. I do not believe I should do so at this time. However, that fact should be spread on the Record. I believe it is correct.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—with the stipulation in mind regarding the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] that he must attend very important conference meetings—that after the opening remarks of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] and the distinguished ranking minority member, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], there be a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment and that there be a limitation of 1 hour on the bill, and that the vote on final passage take place at 2:30 p.m. Wednesday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would have to object to that request. I want to consult with other Senators who are cosponsoring the amendment.

I think the bill ought to be thoroughly discussed. It involves a future appropriation of $100 million, as authorized; and whether that amount of time will be sufficient, I do not know.

My amendment seeks to strike from the pending bill the authority to exchange federally owned lands for privately owned lands to constitute a park. It is a great departure from what we have done in the past.

I hope that the pending bill, together with the amendment, will be thoroughly discussed before we vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, with the exception of the pending amendment, which will be considered later today or possibly tomorrow afternoon, there be a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill, and that if at all possible, with the usual rules being waived, the vote take place at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Spong in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am in a position now to urge the majority leader to make a unanimous-consent request that we vote at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I know, but the acting minority leader must allow the majority leader a little leeway as a protection for the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand it, the amendment at the desk is the pending business and permission will be granted to set it aside if other amendments are offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the time limitation not start until after the opening statements of the two managers of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader make the unanimous-consent request in the usual form?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; indeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That after the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] conclude their opening statements, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 2515) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, except the pending amendment No. 426, offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] on which there is no limit, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader or his designee: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Provided further, That the Senate proceed to vote on the question of final passage of the said bill at 2:30 p.m. on Wednesday, November 1, 1967.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SPONG

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I compliment the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], who is presently presiding over the Senate, on the very capable manner in which he conducted the conference on the part of the Senate conferees, and on his handling of the District of Columbia revenue measure.

I think that his competency, of which I speak, was very much in evidence throughout his presentation of the revenue bill on the Senate floor, when the Senate originally considered the matter, and also in his presentation of the conference report today.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, I have naturally followed with great interest the developments during the conference between the Senate and the House on the revenue bill.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong] and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia [Mr. Bible] have, in view of the existing budget crisis, kept me informed of the developments. I believe that the Senate conferees did the very best they could in their effort to sustain the Senate position. I know that their task was very difficult. I am constrained to believe, without any question in my own mind, that, under the circumstances, the position finally taken by the Senate conferees in conference was the only position which could have been taken.

The District of Columbia government is faced with a financial crisis. It is of the utmost importance that the fiscal year 1968 appropriation bill be passed at the earliest possible date and placed on the President's desk for his signature. This fact, I think, was overriding in the decision of the Senate conferees to recede, as they did, in conference. I do not believe they had any alternative, under the circumstances.

So I have taken the floor at this time to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia and the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada, and other Senate conferees, on the determined fight that they made in the conference. While they did not succeed, as they had hoped to, in upholding the Senate position, I feel that the proposed Federal payment of $70 million is a considerable improvement over the present authorized payment of $60 million. I only hope that the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, of which I am the chairman, can now be successful in bringing about the enactment of an appropriation which will come up to the authorized amount of $70 million.

I thank the Senator from Virginia for the efforts he has made and for his able leadership in this matter. I say again that I think he has done a very good job. And so have his fellow conferees.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2515) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the bill S. 2515 will authorize creation of a Redwood National Park for the appreciation and enjoyment of this and future generations.

The Redwood National Park, preserving in their natural splendor the tallest of all living things, will be a unique addition to our national park system. Within the boundaries of the park proposed in S. 2515 are all of the most magnificent groves of redwood presently in private ownership. Also within the boundaries are three California State parks which contain some of the most impressive groves of redwood in existence.

In keeping with the highest purposes of our national park system, the Redwood National Park will offer abundant opportunities for a variety of recreational, educational, and scientific pursuits. Foremost is the redwood itself, displayed in profusion and variety from bottom land to ridgetop in a number of individual, untouched watersheds and climaxed in a grove of the tallest of the tall. Complementing the redwood groves will be crystal streams, quiet meadows, beautiful Fern Canyon, a herd of Roosevelt elk, and miles of unspoiled beaches defining the western perimeter of the park. Mr. President, this is an area worthy of addition to our national park system.

The proposal for creation of a Redwood National Park has been steeped in controversy. Perhaps no issue to come before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been the focus of such national attention and concern. Millions of Americans feel a very personal involvement in the Redwood Park issue. The many who have not seen and may never see these ancient specimens are awed and inspired by the knowledge of their existence. There has developed an insistent public demand that these giants of the forest be given the protection of the Nation.

In considering the proposed legislation, the committee has been conscious of the need for timely action. The remaining north coast redwoods outside of State parks are committed to cutting. While the redwood industry, for the most part, has acted with magnanimity in maintaining a moratorium on cutting within key areas advocated for park status, they cannot afford to stay the saw for long while we fail to make a decision. The committee has been conscious of the fact that until we achieve a resolution of this issue, a cloud of uncertainty hangs over local industry and local communities.

S. 2515 was introduced as a clean bill, incorporating the final results of deliberations in committee which attempted to fairly consider and weigh the competing and conflicting interests at stake. In my view, the bill approved in committee combines the best features of the several measures which were before the committee.

S. 1370, the administration bill, was introduced by the senior Senator from California and ranking minority member of the Interior Committee [Mr. KUCHEL] and was supported by the Save-the-Redwoods League. The bill proposed a park of close to 42,000 acres in the Mill Creek watershed of Del Norte County, including two State parks, plus a 1,600-acre separate unit comprising a corridor to and including the "tall trees" grove on Redwood Creek in Humboldt County.

S. 514, the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and supported by the Sierra Club and a number of other conservation organizations, proposed a 90,000-acre park in the Redwood Creek watershed of Humboldt County.

S. 1526, introduced by the junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and supported by a number of organizations representing industry and local communities, proposed a 25,000-acre park comprised primarily of three existing State parks.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends enactment of S. 2515, authorizing a Redwood National Park of not to exceed 64,000 acres exclusive of submerged lands. The park will be in two units, including the cream of the redwood country in both the Mill Creek and Redwood Creek drainages.

The north unit, in the Mill Creek watershed of Del Norte County, comprises 25,970 acres, of which 13,577 acres is old-growth redwood. Included in the north unit are the Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Coast Redwood State Parks, totaling 14,820 acres.

The south unit, in the Redwood Creek watershed of Humboldt County, comprises 35,684 acres of which 19,753 acres are old-growth redwood. Included in the south unit is the Prairie Creek Redwood State Park of 13,210 acres.

The committee-approved bill includes the best of both areas. I am pleased that the major conservation organizations advocating establishment of a park in one or the other watershed have now indicated their support for the park boundaries proposed in this bill. The committee bill preserves more old growth Redwood—some 13,000 acres more—than the administration bill. S. 2515 includes the three State parks recommended in the Murphy bill. However, the committee does not believe a national park can be created from the State parks alone. The addition of some 28,000 acres of private and Federal lands creates a Redwood National Park worthy of the name.

The committee does believe that the Redwood National Park will reach its ultimate fruition only when the Jed Smith, Del Norte Coast, and Prairie Creek State Parks are donated by the State of California and become part of the national park. Donation of the State parks is a matter for determination by the State of California, and the committee has not made this a condition precedent to the creation of a Redwood National Park. Should the State not act, the national park should, nonetheless, be created to assure preservation of the additional redwood groves. In such event, cooperative management agreements should be worked out with the State of California so that the National and State parks can coexist with the maximum shared contribution to the public interest.

The creation of a Redwood National Park requires the acquisition of a substantial acreage of privately owned lands now devoted to timber harvest. The committee is cognizant of the problems this creates in the disruption of industrial operations and impact on the local economy. These difficulties could be magnified by any undue delay in the acquisition process and could impede the establishment of the park.

With these problems in mind, the committee has approved language in the bill authorizing an exchange of lands within the northern redwood purchase unit which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture for privately owned lands within the park boundaries on a value-for-value basis. In approving this provision, the committee has stated specifically that a general policy of exchanging national forest lands for park acquisition is not proposed or advocated.

To the contrary, this provision is proposed as an honorable exception to a general policy, not the establishment of a new one. This provision must be strictly interpreted in the light of the unique circumstances affecting the Redwood National Park authorization. We face these alternatives: on the one hand, make a choice between establishing a Redwood National Park devoted to preserving the redwood or maintaining a northern redwood purchase unit devoted to harvesting the redwood; on the other hand, make a decision to both establish the Redwood National Park and also continue to sell redwood from the purchase unit on a public bid basis.

In this connection, I believe we have an obligation to examine and weigh the public purposes to which the purchase unit is devoted. The history and purposes of the purchase unit are summarized in a letter of April 27, 1967, from Mr. A. W. Greeley, Associate Chief of the Forest Service, which appears on page 204 of the printed record of the hearing conducted by the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee in April of this year.

Mr. Greeley states:

> In 1934 the National Forest Reservation Commission approved the acquisition of National Forest lands in the coast area of California. In 1935 it approved the establishment of specific purchase units—in Del Norte and Humboldt Counties and in Mendocino and Sonoma Counties. There were later designated the Northern and Southern Redwood Purchase Units, respectively. The present Northern Redwood National Forest Purchase Unit is a portion of the one originally approved in Del Norte and Humboldt Counties in the vicinity of the Klamath River. At that time purchase of about 130,000 acres in this area was contemplated. No lands were bought in the southern unit and it has been dropped from our records.
>
> The purpose of these purchase units very clearly was to promote sustained yield timber growing and utilization in the redwood forest areas, demonstrate conservative logging practices, and manage the lands under the multiple use programs which characterize the National Forests.

Mr. President, the lands actually acquired within the target of 130,000 acres mentioned by Mr. Greeley amount to some 14,500 acres. Further light is shed on the current status of the purchase unit in the report on redwoods of the American Forestry Association, dated February 25, 1965. I will quote from this report at this point but I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report headed "Coast Redwood Purchase Unit" appear in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **JACKSON**. Mr. President, here is what the American Forestry Association report says about the present status of the northern redwood purchase unit:

> Lack of funds, acquisition of sizable areas by large timber companies, and improved logging practices by private owners combined to put a stop to the acquisition program. This situation led the National Forest Reservation Commission in 1957 to drop the entire Southern Redwood Purchase Unit and to reduce the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit to a gross area of 147,180 acres, of which 36,184 acres is in Del Norte County and 90,996 acres in Humboldt County.
>
> With less than 10 percent of the reduced area in federal ownership, and with further substantial additions unlikely, the forest supervisors in charge of the unit recommended on November 1, 1963, that the gross area of the unit be decreased to the 32,409 acres north of the Klamath River, and that the area be known as the Redwood National Forest. This step would leave 931 acres in scattered tracts south of the Klamath River, which could be used as trading stock. The proposal was approved by the supervisors of Del Norte and Humboldt Counties and by the Stimpson Timber Company (the largest private owner in the unit) but has not been acted upon by the Forest Service.

Mr. President, the northern Redwood purchase unit involves a program conceived in depression days to help stabilize the local economy. The laudable objectives of the program were thwarted by World War II and made less important by a change in the pattern of operations in the industry. I think it is entirely within the purview of the Congress to determine whether retention of this activity should enjoy an overriding priority in light of the public purposes we are trying to achieve. Utilization of Federal lands within the purchase unit will lessen the cash appropriations required to establish the Redwood National Park, will expedite the land acquisition program necessary to establish the national park before redwood groves are cut within the park boundaries, and will help stabilize the local economy during the period of transition.

The committee has made clear in our report that we believe plans to increase the allowable cut on the Six Rivers National Forest in keeping with sound forest management practices should go forward. The additional allowable cut will more than offset any loss in opportunities for timber purchases through public bidding resulting from a change in the status of the northern redwood purchase unit.

Mr. President, under the terms of S. 2515, in contrast to other measures considered by the committee, the temporary economic impact of a reduction in lumbering operations is shared by more than one county and is therefore less on each county. Similarly, the impact is spread over more than one redwood lumber company. Because of the readjustment of the economic impact, the committee has eliminated the provision of the administration bill which called for economic adjustment payments to local governmental bodies.

The committee has also eliminated those provisions of the administration bill which called for a transfer of the Muir Woods National Monument and King Range lands to the State of California. The State of California has indicated interest in certain Federal properties, largely beach areas, which the State believes should be available for public use and enjoyment under the management of the State park system. The committee has made clear in our report that we believe negotiations should go forward between the responsible Federal and State authorities. This is in accordance with a national policy of reviewing Federal properties to determine where lands suitable for recreation purposes can be made available for public use.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate will create a Redwood National Park superior in location, natural beauty, and the proportion of old growth redwood preserved. The park described in this bill enjoys united support from public-spirited individuals and organizations that have long advocated a Redwood National Park.

Mr. President, before I conclude my remarks I wish to pay high tribute to the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. Kuchel], and the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. Bible]. The compromise bill, S. 2515, which is now before the Senate, is the result of the work of the ranking minority member of the committee and the able chairman of the subcommittee. Their work has made possible the legislation that is now before the Senate. We who serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs feel this is a good bill.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to approve S. 2515, as recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Exhibit 1

[From report on redwoods of the American Forestry Association, Feb. 25, 1965]

Coast Redwood Purchase Unit

Proposals for the acquisition by the Forest Service of coast redwood lands began early in 1934 with letters from private citizens and a recommendation by the Mendocino County Chamber of Commerce. The National Forest Reservation Commission responded promptly by approving in principle of the establishment of a redwood national forest with a tentative area of 200,000 acres. Regional Forester S. B. Show immediately issued a news release stating that the land would be handled as an economic unit for the production of timber, not as a park, but that provision would be made for recreation and that no timber would be cut in scenic strips along roads and streams; grazing would be maintained.

Some weeks later the Regional Forester reiterated these points in a letter to Governor Frank F. Merriam, with emphasis on the fact that the Forest Service would practice sustained yield forestry and would work out better methods of logging redwood than those currently in use by private owners. Assurance was given that recreation values would be fully developed and that roads would be constructed to make the land available for public use.

On September 14, 1934, the California Legislature, acting upon a special request from Governor Merriam, passed the following enabling act:

"The Legislature of the State of California hereby consents to the acquisition by the United States by purchase, gift or condemnation with adequate compensation of such lands in the State of California as in the opinion of the government of the United States may be needed for the establishment, consolidation and extension of National forests in this State under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1911."

It will be noted that the act applied to the entire state and not specifically to the coast redwood region. Three days later the supervisors of Humboldt County and Del Norte County, at separate meetings, approved plans for federal acquisition of redwood lands for a national forest. If this approval of the expansion of federal holdings now seems surprising, it must be remembered that the Great Depression had led many to regard private ownership of large holdings of mature timber that could not be harvested for many years as a liability rather than an asset. Some large landowners found it difficult even to pay their taxes.

On August 29, 1935, the National Forest Reservation Commission established a Southern Redwood Purchase Unit of 600,000 acres in Sonoma County and Mendocino County, and a Northern Redwood Purchase Unit of 863,000 acres in Humboldt County and Del Norte County. The total area of 863,000 acres was much larger than that first proposed.

The Forest Service obtained options on 63,000 acres in Del Norte County, which were to be acquired as funds became available. The first purchase of 4,336 acres was completed in 1939. Subsequent purchases brought the total to 14,491 acres (the present area) by 1945. The cost was $444,415.72, an average of $30.67 per acre, with most of the redwood bringing a stumpage price of about 50 cents per M board feet.

Lack of funds, acquisition of sizeable areas by large timber companies, and improved logging practices by private owners combined to put a stop to the acquisition program. This situation led the National Forest Reservation Commission in 1957 to drop the entire Southern Redwood Purchase Unit and to reduce the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit to a gross area of 147,180 acres, of which 36,184 acres is in Del Norte County and 90,996 acres in Humboldt County.

With less than 10 percent of the reduced area in federal ownership, and with further substantial additions unlikely, the forest supervisor in charge of the unit recommended on November 1, 1963, that the gross area of the unit be decreased to the 32,409 acres north of the Klamath River, and that the area be known as the Redwood National Forest. This step would leave 931 acres in scattered tracts south of the Klamath River, which could be used as trading stock. The proposal was approved by the supervisors of Del Norte and Humboldt counties and by the Simpson Timber Company (the largest private owner in the unit) but has not been acted upon by the Forest Service.

Practically all of the federal land in the present unit is classified as commercial forest land, of which 935 acres have been set aside as an experimental forest, and 491 acres are nonstocked. Timber volumes total 1,238 million board feet, of which about 60 percent is redwood and 40 percent Douglas-fir, with a scattering of other species.

Timber harvesting started on a small scale in 1954. The average annual cut during the 11 years ending June 30, 1964, has been about 19 million board feet. Payments to Del Norte County in lieu of taxes have totaled $1,083,407 during the last ten years—an average of about $108,341 per year.

Timber on the purchase unit is managed under a comprehensive and detailed plan, the primary objective of which is "conversion of the present over-mature forest to a regulated forest of proper age—class distribution and stocking which will support a sustained yield of forest products." The average allowable annual cut during the 30 years required for the conversion is estimated at 30 million board feet. Development of other multiple-use values is also sought, with emphasis on watershed protection and recreation. The latter has not yet reached a level requiring the development of camp sites.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

(At this point, Mr. HARTKE assumed the chair.)

Mr. KUCHEL. If, as I very much hope and believe it will, the Senate approves the pending legislation, much of the credit for that action will go to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I am grateful for his kind words. I do have an honest interest in the establishment by Congress of a Redwood National Park in the State from which I come. But I want Senators to know that there never would have been the opportunity now presented to the Senate to approve this kind of bill had it not been for the leadership of the Senator from Washington. I have been very glad to work with him and to work with the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and others, to bring about, at long last, a piece of legislation which not only bears the stamp of approval of the Senator's committee, but also has as its vigorous sponsors the Save the Redwoods League, the great Sierra Club, and others, all across the country, who are interested in the creation of a Redwood National Park.

The Senator's speech should be read by those who have not been able to listen to it. I think it spells out the indispensable necessity for speedy approval by the Senate of the bill which he has introduced.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I certainly want to thank my able colleague from California for his generous remarks, but I do want to emphasize the wonderful spirit of cooperation which has existed between the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], in working out this final solution.

We in the Senate understand that we would not be able to do many of these things without the assistance of others. This is especially true of our staff. We are fortunate in the committee to have had the outstanding staff assistance of Sterling Munro, my administrative assistant. He did special work on this particular compromise proposal. He was ably assisted and worked closely with Lew Reid, who is on the staff of the Senator from California and is his minority counsel on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; likewise, the staff director, Jerry Verkler, who participated actively in the formulation of a bill on which we hope to obtain Senate approval.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, 200 years ago there were 2 million acres of virgin redwoods stretching along the California coastline from Santa Cruz to the Oregon border. They were discovered by the expedition of Don Gaspar de Portola in 1769. Many of the *Sequoia sempervirens* are 500 years old. Some date back to the time of Christ. A few grow to nearly 400 feet in height.

In the two centuries since he discovered the great redwood forests, man has laid waste to all but about 300,000 acres of the ancient trees. Working over the past 50 years, the State of California and the Save the Redwoods League have preserved 50,000 acres of old-growth trees within State parks.

At the present rate of cutting, every single one of the primeval giants outside State parks will be cut within the next few decades. Long before that, the remaining untouched expanses of redwoods will be crisscrossed with logging roads and spotted with patches of cutting.

True, the redwoods regenerate. They grow again. But the second-growth forests will never be allowed to grow to the age of 100 years.

The redwoods are a national treasure which must be preserved. We, who are living when the last great primeval redwood forests are diminishing, have an obligation to preserve an area of national park stature where all Americans, for now and for the future, can experience the wonder of walking among these living remnants of past centuries.

Last year, and again this year, I introduced legislation to create such a park. Others have introduced bills to create a park of a different size or in different locations. This has been the most difficult, complex, and perplexing conservation legislation to come before our Senate Interior Committee during my tenure in the U.S. Senate.

Fortunately, the companies which own the land that we propose to make into a park have acted with high regard for the public interest. During the last year, they have tried to restrict their logging operations to areas where cutting would not be severely damaging to a park. They have not stayed completely outside the boundaries of the various park proposals, but they have—and I congratulate them for it—refrained from cutting which would jeopardize the opportunity for the American people to have a meaningful park.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has reported S. 2515. The chairman of our committee [Mr. JACKSON]—as I indicated to him earlier today—deserves the thanks of all Americans, and particularly those from my State of California, for bringing a redwood national park bill to the Senate floor. He has labored tirelessly for months, discussing, negotiating, and pondering, all with the unswerving goal of creating a Redwood National Park of majesty and distinction.

The chairman of the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee [Mr. BIBLE] also deserves great commendation and thanks for leading us through the fruitful hearings and constructive debate in committee that made it possible to present a bill to the Senate which, in my view, is a sound adjustment of the many conflicting views presented to the committee.

I am proud of the bill which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and I have introduced. It is superior to any of the other bills which were pending before our committee. It saves a truly significant number of the ancient and endangered trees. It spreads the impact of land acquisition over the tax base of two counties, rather than only one. It will preserve redwoods now owned by four major companies. It makes available federally owned commercial redwood timberland for exchanges with private companies, in order to assist the companies to stay in business and to reduce the number of Federal dollars which must be appropriated to purchase property for the park.

Three magnificent State parks are included within the boundaries of the proposed Redwood National Park. The goal of preserving redwoods for the future is well served by public ownership of these lands, whether it be State or Federal ownership. Should the State of California desire to transfer these State parks to the Federal Government, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept their donation. However, Federal acquisition of these State parks is not a condition precedent to the establishment of the Redwood National Park.

I am pleased to say that S. 2515 has healed a regrettable breach, which has existed in conservation ranks, over where the park should be.

Some questions have been raised about the size of the park authorized by S. 2515. Some people feel that a 64,000-acre park is too small. Others feel that it is too big. Mr. President, it is absolutely essential that the Senate pass this bill in order to continue the voluntary moratorium on cutting, pending enactment of the Redwood National Park legislation.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the other body, which will consider this legislation next spring is, in my view, a far better forum before which to test the wisdom of the size of the park which we propose in this bill, than is the floor of the Senate or the floor of the other body.

I am pleased to join with my friend the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] in recommending this bill to the Senate, and in urging its speedy passage so that it might move, with the blessing of the Senate, to the House of Representatives for action next year.

I think, because Senators who will not be present during every moment of the debate today will have an opportunity to read this RECORD before casting their votes tomorrow, I should like to add some additional comments now, including statements in support of this legislation from outstanding conservationists across the land.

Mr. President, the original proposal for a national redwoods park came from the Save-the-Redwoods League, a splendid conservation organization which has done so much to preserve the old-growth redwoods of California. It has now publicly urged support of the bill pending before us, and I ask consent that the text of the public statement by the Save-the-Redwoods League be incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. President, because of the preeminence of those who are officers and members of the council of the Save-the-Redwoods League, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the officers and of the council, as well as the objectives of the Save-the-Redwoods League which accompanied this news release, also be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

The Save-the-Redwoods League is of the opinion that the revised proposal for a Redwood National Park presented as a "compromise" by Senators Jackson, Kuchel and Bible on October 10 would provide for a commendable first step in the direction of realizing the recommendations of the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior for saving Redwoods.

Accordingly, the Board of Directors of the League, by unanimous vote on October 11 passed the following resolution of support:

"Historically the Save-the-Redwoods League for 48 years has advocated a Redwood National Park. On the basis of many years of study, the League, when asked by the National Park Service for its recommendation, indicated its support of the complete watershed of Mill Creek together with coastal and other lands as, in its opinion, the top priority for this purpose. The Administration plan followed along the lines of this recommendation.

"In December 1966, prior to the present session of Congress, the Board of Directors of the League agreed that Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park, as well as Lost Man, Little Lost Man and Skunk Cabbage Creeks in the Prairie Creek watershed are of National Park quality, and might well be added to the plan.

"Therefore, since the revised Senate Committee Bill provides for a commendable first step in the direction of realizing the recommendations of the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior as well as including other lands that the League considers of national park quality, we support this program for saving Redwoods. We hope for the ultimate rounding out of these areas within logical boundaries, either by government or private aid."

SAVE-THE-REDWOODS LEAGUE

OFFICERS

Ralph W. Chaney, *President*.
Richard M. Leonard, *Vice President*.
Robert G. Sproul, *Treasurer*.
Newton B. Drury, *Secretary*.
John B. Dewitt, *Assistant Secretary*.

COUNCIL

Horace M. Albright, Albert W. Atwood, John H. Baker, Mrs. Harmon C. Bell, Earl B. Birmingham, Harold C. Bryant, Selah Chamberlain, Jr., Ralph W. Chaney,[1] Pearl Chase, Allen L. Chickering, Jr.

Norman M. Christensen, Mrs. Arthur E. Connick, Charles F. Daly, Amos W. Elliott, Francis P. Farquhar,[1] Mrs. Marshal H. Fisher, Emanuel Fritz, John Jewett Garland, James P. Gilligan, T. A. Greig.

Melville Bell Grosvenor, D. Hanson Grubb, Falter A. Haas,[1] Charles C. Haines, Daryl P. Haskins, Arthur W. Hooper, Bruce S. Howard,[1] Charles P. Howard, Phelps Stokes Hunter, Roger Kent.

Alfred A. Knopf, Mrs. Joseph R. Knowland, Richard M. Leonard,[1] Martin Litton, Mrs. Norman B. Livermore, Harvey B. Lyon, Mrs. J. W. Mailliard, Jr., Mrs. Selby McCreery, Donald H. McLaughlin, R. A. L. Menzies.[1]

G. W. Merck, Lawrence C. Merriam, Robert C. Miller, Mrs. Dorothy Liebes Morin, Mrs. Elizabeth J. Morrison, Mrs. Alyce Moseley, Stuart O'Melveny, Fairfield Osborn, Mrs. Nathaniel A. Owings.

Herman Phleger, Nicholas Roosevelt, Mrs. Melvin E. Sawin, Robert G. Sproul,[1] Walter A. Starr, Mrs. William W. Stout, George Waldner, J. Roy Wittwer.

OBJECTS

1. *To rescue* from destruction representative areas of our primeval forests.
2. *To co-operate* with the California State Park Commission, the National Park Service, and other agencies, in establishing Redwood parks and other parks and reservations.
3. *To purchase* Redwood grooves by private subscription.
4. *To co-operate* with the California State Highway Commission, and other agencies in assuring the preservation of trees and roadside beauty along highways.
5. *To support* reforestation and conservation of our forest areas.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Sierra Club is an excellent conservation organization whose more than 50,000 members come from almost every State in the Union and beyond our borders. From the very beginning, it has been earnestly interested in congressional approval of a redwood national park. On October 30, the Sierra Club issued a news release supporting the redwood land exchange. That, of course, is the proposal in our bill, regrettably being attacked by the pending amendment.

In part, the news release of the Sierra Club states:

A spokesman for the Sierra Club said today that an exchange of Forest Service redwood lands is the key to financing an adequate Redwood National Park. "The simple truth is that no one really believes that Congress will provide the total financing for the $100 million park solely out of appropriations," declared Michael McCloskey, Conservation Director for the 56,000 member Sierra Club. "Only if more than half of the cost is met through land trades will we have a $100 million Redwood Park. If land exchanges are stripped from the bill, the ultimate effect will be to shrink the size of the park to a scraggly apology for failure."

I hope very much that Senators will heed the words of an able conservationist, the spokesman for the Sierra Club, which I have just read in part.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire release of the Sierra Club be put in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIERRA CLUB SUPPORTS REDWOOD LAND EXCHANGE

WASHINGTON.—A spokesman for the Sierra Club said today that an exchange of Forest Service redwood lands is the key to financing an adequate Redwood National Park. "The simple truth is that no one really believes that Congress will provide the total financing for the $100 million park solely out of appropriations," declared Michael McCloskey, Conservation Director for the 56,000 member Sierra Club. "Only if more than half of the cost is met through land trades will we have a $100 million Redwood Park. If land exchanges are stripped from the bill, the ultimate effect will be to shrink the size of the park to a scraggly apology for failure."

"Senator Thomas Kuchel and Senator Henry Jackson have worked too long putting together a viable Redwood park plan to have it undermined now," McCloskey said. "This is the time for all conservation groups truly interested in helping to achieve a worthwhile Redwood National Park to join in supporting the plan reported out of the Senate's Interior Committee. The Sierra Club has compromised a great deal in backing a 64,000 acre park, in place of the 90,000 acre one we wanted so badly. It is time for other groups to face realities too and lend a helping hand," McCloskey stated.

Some hunting groups have joined with the Forest Service in opposing the land exchange feature of the Committee's plan.

These groups, which usually oppose efforts to transfer forest lands to parks where hunting is not allowed, have charged that the exchanges would set a bad precedent. "Precedent is really not the issue," McCloskey replied. "If only land exchanges between the Forest Service and lumber companies were involved, there would be no controversy. The Forest Service makes such exchanges all the time. What excites the opposition of the Forest Service and the hunting groups is simply that the land the government gets will be turned over to another agency, the National Park Service. There is ample precedent for this. Thus, the issue is no more than that the Forest Service wants to hang on to what it has, regardless of the greater public need for parkland."

"We have no desire to see established National Forests bartered away," McCloskey said. "But there is no established National Forest in the case of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit. It is a remnant of a defunct program to purchase 60 times more land for a national forest. That purchase program failed long ago. All that is proposed is to re-allocate the residue of a defunct program to enable an important new one to succeed."

---

[1] *Directors*.

McCloskey pointed out that the redwoods in the Forest Service unit are not in any sense preserved. "The Forest Service plans to log these redwoods in any event. What we are really doing is to trade what will be future stumpland to obtain redwoods that we can save forever in a great national park. The Nation could obtain no better bargain," the club spokesman concluded.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, listen to the words of Dr. Edgar Wayburn, president of the Sierra Club:

> The key to the financing of the compromise bill of the Committee is use of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit which the Federal government now owns, on an exchange basis to acquire needed parkland. . . . This unit itself does not lend itself to park management. The Committee felt, and we agree, that it makes good sense to phase out this abortive redwood program to enable the National Park program to succeed. No adverse precedent is intended as these lands are not regular national forest lands and have never served their intended purpose.

That is precisely what the chairman of our committee said earlier—that the lands involved in the purchase unit are not part of an established national forest, Mr. President. Logging under contract with the Government has been carried on by private operators for over a decade on these lands. There ought not to be anything sacrosanct in the mind of any Senator with regard to this land. It was originally acquired by purchase, and now we propose to make it available to be utilized to acquire old-growth redwood suitable for park purposes.

Listen to the words of the Governor of California, Ronald Reagan:

> I highly commend the acceptance of the concept of including the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit, for the purpose of exchange with private land, in Redwood National Park legislation, S. 2515.

Mr. President, the Governor of California is interested in the problem of employment in our State. The Governor many months ago, in a statement to our committee, said that he approved of a national redwood park, but that he had certain things in mind that he wanted included in any legislation. One of those things was the purchase unit exchange.

Mr. President, if the purchase unit is used in partial compensation for the acquisition from private companies of sterling old-growth redwoods for park purposes, the property tax base in Del Norte County will not shrink; it will expand. The companies now operating in that area to be made a park will have an opportunity, by using some of the purchase unit land, to continue in business. Also, as the chairman has said, the amounts of dollars necessary to be appropriated from the public treasury to accomplish the objective of the national redwood park will be lessened.

Earlier our very able friend and fellow Senator from Montana, the distinguished junior Senator from that State [Mr. Metcalf] made a statement which I wish to place in the Record, because I think it is vitally important that Senators understand his position. The distinguished Senator from Montana is a recognized leader in conservation. This is what Senator Metcalf said:

> The purchase unit is the residue of a defunct program to purchase 860,000 acres for a redwood national forest. While this program authorized in the 1930's failed to be achieved, the unit remains the largest Federal property supporting redwood growth. Ironically, the Forest Service's management consists mainly of selling the huge trees to loggers and remitting the proceeds to the Federal treasury. If ever there was a program that might be dispensable, this is it. Yet the suggestion now is that it is sacrosanct.

Three cheers for the comment of the able Senator from Montana who, as I say, is one of the leaders in Congress in the effort for sound conservation.

I think it quite relevant to this debate for me to observe that the chairman of the California State Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Planning, and Public Works, has likewise endorsed this legislation; and I ask unanimous consent that portions of a statement from the office of Hon. Edward L. Z'berg endorsing our legislation be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Assemblyman Edwin L. Z'berg (D-Sacramento and Yolo Counties), Chairman of the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Planning, and Public Works, today praised the action of the United States Senate Recreation and Parks Subcommittee for their compromise plan recommending a redwoods national park in Humboldt and Del Norte Counties.
>
> Z'berg stated, "while details of the plan are yet to be received it would appear that the United States Senate Subcommittee's recommendation has attempted to bring together both the plans of the Sierra Club and the Save-the-Redwoods League, the two principal conservation organizations supporting a redwoods national park. Our Committee recently issued its report supporting a park in the prairie Creek-Redwood Creek area and I am extremely pleased that the Subcommittee did recommend 36,000 acres in Humboldt County, including in it Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park, and some 22,000 acres of private redwood acreage. While all concerned will obviously now go on to study the Subcommittee's recommendation, the important thing is that this is a significant step forward and can unite conservation support behind a single plan."
>
> * * * * *
>
> Z'berg particularly praised Senators Thomas Kuchel, Henry Jackson, and Lee Metcalf for their efforts in promoting the plan and hopes that the Senate leadership and the House leadership, including the efforts of Representative Jeffery Cohelan, can now be combined to move on a united front.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the people who live in the northern California counties of Del Norte and Humboldt are understandably concerned with continuing their employment rate at the highest possible figure. I have telegrams here from the city council of the city of Eureka, from the mayor of Crescent City speaking for the city council of the city of Crescent City, and from the president of the Rellim Redwood Co., located in Del Norte County, Mr. Harold A. Miller.

I read from the telegram sent by the city of Eureka:

> It is vital to the economy of Eureka and Humboldt County that Redwood purchase unit be left in S2515 for the exchange to private property and that the proposed increase in allowable cut in Six Rivers National Forest be permitted.

I read from the telegram sent by the mayor of Crescent City, the Honorable William G. Peepe, speaking for the city council of his community:

> Vital to Crescent City that purchase unit remain in SB2515 for exchange with private land in formation of Redwood National Park. Acceleration of 37 million 500 thousand extra annual cut in Six Rivers National Forest would greatly help local economy during formative years of park.

As to the telegram from Mr. Miller earnestly urging that the exchange remain in the bill, I simply observe that it represents the concern of private industry for the type of legislation we have introduced.

The executive vice president of the California Redwood Association, Mr. Philip T. Farnsworth, has sent the distinguished chairman of our committee and me a telegram under date of October 29, taking the same position.

I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the telegrams to which I have referred be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Eureka, Calif.,
October 27, 1967.

Senator Thomas Kuchel,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

It is vital to the economy of Eureka and Humboldt County that redwood purchase unit be left SB2515 for the exchange to private property and that the proposed increase in allowable cut in Six Rivers National Forest be permitted.

City of Eureka, Calif.,
Gilbert S. Trood,
Mayor.
Orvil R. Wilson,
Councilman.
Allan A. McVicar,
Council President.
Chesley N. Gaylord,
D.P. Councilman.
Wm. R. Hogarty,
Councilman.
Lawrence R. Dawson,
Councilman.

Crescent City, Calif.,
October 24, 1967.

Senator Henry Jackson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vital to Crescent City that purchase unit remain in SB2515 to exchange with private land in formation of Redwood National Park. Acceleration of 37 million 5 hundred thousand extra annual cut in Six Rivers National Forest would greatly help local economy during formative years of park.

William G. Peepe,
Mayor for the City Council of the City of Crescent City.

October 29.

Dear Senators Jackson and Kuchel: For your information, the redwood forest land owning companies whose lands would be taken under the Senate redwood national park legislation, all of whom are members of this association, and upon consultation with me strongly agree with the exchange concept in this particular instance. S. 2515 provides for the exchange of certain federal lands for certain private lands to be included in the park.

In this instance, exchange is essential to the maintenance of an important part of the region's economy.

Concurrent with the exchange and as an integral part of the companies' support for the exchange principles is the necessity to carry out the proposed increase in the annual allowable cut on the Six Rivers National Forest. This should be handled so as to provide the timber buying companies, who now receive a portion of their log supply from the Purchase Unit, with an alternate timber supply.

This wire is intended to respond to the exchange issue only and does not intend to endorse any National Park legislation.

PHILIP T. FARNSWORTH,
Executive Vice President,
California Redwood Association.

CRESCENT CITY, CALIF.,
October 12, 1967.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

For your information, the following wire was sent to W. Marvin Watson and Philip S. Hughes today:

"We are wiring you because of your particular interest in the establishment of a Redwood National Park. We wish to advise that the park bill as introduced by Senators Jackson, Kuchel, and Bible, while taking more private land we feel necessary, makes the availability of the northern purchase unit for exchange and will make it possible for us with a reasonable exchange to continue the $30 million dollar privately financed forest complex in Del Norte County, Calif. As you know we are the largest employer in the county, a depressed area, and with our complex completed our employment will be more than double.

"We hope you will make every effort to maintain the exchange provision in the bill so that we may continue the program. I can assure you without an exchange, our program must come to a prompt halt."

HAROLD A. MILLER,
President, Rellim Redwood Co.

Mr. KUCHEL. Surely it ought to be of interest to Senators to read what the free press in America feels with respect to the proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent that sundry editorials published in the newspapers of California and of other States be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the North Coast Outdoors, Oct. 20, 1967]

AN EDITORIAL

We are running the Senate Park Bill, and Map this issue. And it does indeed look like a compromise. In it are elements from Clausen's plan to include the seashore and connect existing parks in an effort to reduce the number of acres to be removed from tax rolls.

There is a recognition of the Sierra Club's desire to include the tall tree area in the Redwood Creek. The Administration's original park plan and the Save the Redwoods League's interest in the Mill Creek drainage was acknowledged. And the trade of lands from the Northern Purchase Unit recognized the necessity of the Rellim-Miller Company to Del Norte County's economic base.

This plan seems to have been designed after a study of our timber-based economy and yet provides a national redwood park of significance. Something that will be here long after we've run out of breath fighting about it. Something that will be here long after we've run out of breath—period.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 16, 1967]

REDWOOD COMPROMISE

Drawn-out efforts to create a Redwood National Park in California moved toward a happy solution in the United States Senate last week. The Senate Interior Committee selected the best features of two contending park plans and combined them into a proposed two-unit park of about 61,000 acres.

For more than a year, conservationists have been split between the Administration's 43,000-acre proposal for the Mill Creek area in Del Norte county, and the Sierra Club's 90,000-acre proposal for Humboldt county.

The compromise that emerged last week followed a somewhat similar concept suggested this summer by Representative Jeffrey Cohelan, Berkeley Democrat. It was worked out in the Senate Recreation and Parks subcommittee by Senators Thomas Kuchel (Rep.-Calif.) and Henry Jackson (Dem.-Wash.).

The new plan includes the California State Redwood Parks of Jedediah Smith, Prairie Creek and Del Norte Coast—in Del Norte and Humboldt counties. It will cost an estimated $99.8 million, compared with $64 million for the Mill Creek plan and $145 million for the 90,000-acre proposal. Significantly, the compromise, besides saving more old growth trees, will spread the impact over two counties and four timber companies instead of one county and one company.

The existing State parks could be federally administered without an outright transfer of title. And the proposal provides specifically that the Forest Service's 14,600-acre Northern Redwood Purchase Unit will be traded to private firms for their lands to help keep them in business.

The House of Representatives has not yet scheduled field hearings on any Redwood Park plan. But in view of the compromise developments last week, it is hoped that the House Interior Committee will now agree to forego field hearings, thus speeding final legislative action.

Because the moratorium on cutting these virgin redwoods by private companies is scheduled to expire at the end of this session of Congress, final action cannot be delayed.

The compromise proposal offers a practical way out of a protracted dispute. It is an encouraging step taken in the public interest and deserves wide support. Without the united backing of the various conservation organizations, it is unlikely that any Redwood Park plan can be approved.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 10, 1967]

A VICTORY FOR THE REDWOODS

The decision of the Senate Interior subcommittee to recommend creation of a two-unit national park to preserve a fraction of the nation's dwindling heritage of virgin redwoods is a major victory for the public interest.

Under the bipartisan leadership of Senators Jackson, Democrat of Washington, and Kuchel, Republican of California, the subcommittee has agree upon an intelligent compromise of the original Administration bill, which provided for a park in the Mill Creek area only, and the Metcalf-Cohelan bill, which provided for a larger and far superior park in the Redwood Creek Valley. This newspaper, as well as many conservationists, had supported the latter bill because the largest stands of ancient redwoods are in Redwood Creek Valley. Senator Metcalf, Democrat of Montana, and Representative Cohelan, Democrat of California, have performed an outstanding service by their tenacious fight for this area.

The compromise worked out by Senators Jackson and Kuchel saves the best of both plans and lays the basis for necessary expansion in the future. However, there remains an immediate danger under the new proposal, arising from the fact that a large portion of the watershed of Redwood Creek, southern unit of the proposed park, will still be outside Federal control. Its indiscriminate logging could lead to flooding and siltation, with serious damage resulting to the park area downstream. But pending a later decision by Congress to buy additional Redwood Creek acreage, private citizens could acquire land in this strategic watershed and contribute it to the park. The bill wisely provides that the existing state parks can be donated to the national park but offers none of the unprecedented concessions originally requested by the state of California.

Since the Senate is expected to act fairly soon on the pending compromise bill, the House Interior Committee could usefully hasten Congressional action by foregoing its proposed field hearings. With the moratorium on cutting by the private companies due to expire at the end of this session of Congress, definitive action is essential to save the redwoods now.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury, Oct. 11, 1967]

PARK PACT ACCEPTABLE

The Redwood National Park compromise bill now shaping in the Senate Interior Committee is probably the best that can be obtained under the circumstances. It should be accepted by all parties.

Essentially, the bill would create a 66,384-acre park from three existing state parks and surrounding lands. It would preserve some of the watersheds championed by the conservationist Sierra Club and some of the acreage contained in the so-called Kuchel plan.

In addition, it provides that private lumber companies now holding land within the proposed national park may swap that land for acreage now under jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service.

Finally, the proposal carries a $100 million pricetag, as compared with the estimated $60 million for the smaller Kuchel park; however, the total would be shaved considerably if lumber companies accepted the land swap and if private foundation funds were channeled into land purchase. The latter is considered an excellent possibility.

In point of fact, if the proposal is to be shepherded through an economy-minded Congress, great efforts will have to be made to keep total costs to a minimum. The Senate Interior Committee compromise bill offers the best chance of accomplishing this.

As Sen. Thomas H. Kuchel (R-Calif.), a moving force behind the efforts to preserve as many ancient redwoods as possible for posterity, expressed it:

"This plan provides for the maximum acquisition of old-growth redwoods. It would create a Redwood National Park—that's all it seeks to do and that's all it accomplishes."

That, however, is plenty.

The Sequoia Sempervirens, or Coast Redwoods, once extended from south of Monterey in an unbroken band to the Oregon border. They have been logged indiscriminately and unmercifully until only isolated patches of them remain.

The proposed Redwood National Park would preserve one of the last and largest of these Northern California patches in perpetuity. The several lumber companies owning strategic portions of this acreage have agreed to a moratorium on cutting while Congress debates the details of a Redwood National Park bill. These firms have shown an appreciation of the public interest, and they deserve not only a word of thanks but prompt action by Congress—so that their economic interests are not damaged unduly.

Take it all in all, the new compromise park bill offers something, though not everything, for everyone. It should meet most, if not all, of the objections raised to both earlier park plans.

Congress should push ahead with this bill as rapidly as possible.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 16, 1967]

The Lesson of the Redwoods

In approving a bill to establish a two-unit Redwood National Park the Senate Interior Committee has greatly enhanced the prospect of preserving these magnificent ancient trees from destruction.

But the committee also departed from usual practice by providing that the timber companies would be partially compensated by the exchange of their holdings for Federally owned land of similar value in a 14,000-acre tract now managed by the Forest Service. As Secretary of Agriculture Freeman pointed out in his memorandum to the committee, the saving to the Federal Government is purely nominal. However, an exchange of land reduces the cash outlay by the Government, and this is an important consideration in easing the bill through this economy-minded Congress.

These disputed acres have another and a larger significance. They were acquired by the Government between 1939 and 1945 at a cost of $444,000. Their value today is estimated at between $40 million and $60 million. In this comparatively brief time their value has increased by one hundredfold. The national park now going to cost $100 million could have been acquired in 1945 for a tiny fraction of that sum.

What has hapened so spectacularly in the redwoods is happening in varying degrees across the country. Land prices generally are rising 5 to 10 per cent a year. Specific parcels of land that have timber or minerals, or that lie along bodies of water or in scenic locations, are rising in price at a far faster rate.

If conservation projects are not to become astronomically expensive, action has to be taken now to save wilderness, open space and future park and recreation lands. The Nature Conservancy, a private foundation headquartered in Washington, D.C., works with private individuals in acquiring land now that may be needed by public agencies later. Congress needs to develop an over-all public policy on land acquisition. The future cannot be left to the mercy of the private speculator.

[From the Kansas City Times, Oct. 11, 1967]

At Last, Some Action on the Redwood Park

Favorable action in a Senate committee does not a Redwood National park create, but it's a start—a start too long delayed. As cleared by the interior and insular affairs committee and sent to the Senate floor, the bill is a compromise both in terms of the park's size and the money required to establish it.

Last spring and early summer, working under the deadline imposed by an imminent end to the timber companies' reluctant moratorium on cutting in the prospective park areas, Congress had before it two proposals. The first, favored by the administration, was for a 43,000-acre, 60-million-dollar preserve in California's Del Norte County. The Sierra club, backed by other conservation groups, was pitching for a park more than twice that size—90,000 acres farther south in Humboldt County, costing up to 200 million dollars.

The debate was characterized by a regrettable lack of give and take, and the result was inaction. Now, with the lumbermen having agreed to extend the grace period, Congress may have awakened to the urgency for action. The bill before the Senate calls for a park of 64,000 acres, costing 190 million dollars, with tracts in Humboldt and Del Norte Counties.

One major objection from California interests has been that creation of a park would destroy timber-based local economies in the areas affected. The current bill would authorize a trade of nearby federally-owned timberlands to companies that lose trees to the park—a provision opposed by some agencies as a bad precedent, but one apparently deemed necessary to silence the wounded cries of the Californians.

We doubt that the proposed legislation satisfies all parties completely. In all likelihood, the timber companies still feel aggrieved, the administration wishes the park weren't so costly and the Sierra club believes it is still too small. But the question from the standpoint of public interest is whether, in fact, an aesthetically significant stand of these irreplaceable forest giants will be preserved for future generations to enjoy at a price this generation can reasonably afford to pay. If the answer is found to be "yes," there can be no further excuse for dallying.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 20, 1967]

Agreement on Redwood Park Plan

To major conservation groups which had been at odds over the size and location of a proposed Redwood National Park announced yesterday they have united behind a new compromise plan.

The endorsements came from the Save-the-Redwoods League, which had backed the Administration's plan for a 43,000-acre park on Mill Creek in Del Norte county, and the Sierra Club, which had urged a 90,000-acre park on Redwood Creek in Humboldt county.

Directors of both organizations said they will back legislation for a two-unit, 62,000-acre park which is said to include "the best" of the two previously contending plans.

ESSENTIAL

United conservationist backing is considered essential to the creation of any redwood park The compromise plan has been approved by the Senate Interior Committee and now awaits floor action.

Both the Sierra Club and the Save-the-Redwoods League indicated they would prefer a larger park than that outlined in the compromise plan, and would support efforts—governmental or private—to enlarge the proposed park.

The compromise was rejected as over-large and unacceptable yesterday in a statement on behalf of the five timber companies which would be affected.

STATEMENT

A statement by the Redwood Industry Land Committee added, however, that the companies will "make every effort to withhold logging within the boundaries" of the proposed park until the issue is settled.

The affected companies are Arcata National Corporation, Georgia-Pacific Corporation, Miller Redwood company, Pacific Lumber company and Simpson Timber company.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 15, 1967]

The Compromise

What nature had spent over 2000 years creating, Senator Thomas J. Kuchel (R-Calif.) and many others did not want destroyed overnight by the lumberman's saw.

Last week he and Senator Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) came up with a compromise Redwoods National Park plan which, hopefully, would end the long and bitter fight between lumbermen and conservationists over size, location and cost of such a park.

Conservationists had demanded a 90,000-acre park costing between $150 and $200 million. The Administration had come up with a proposal for a 39,000-acre park costing about $50 million.

LAND TRADE

The Kuchel-Jackson compromise park would consist of 61,000 acres and by trading redwood land (14,491 acres) held by the Forest Service in Del Norte County for private timber lands in the new park area the cost would be held to about $60 million.

The 61,000 acres would include 36,000 acres in Humboldt county (Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park plus 22,000 acres of private land) and about 25,000 acres in Del Norte county (Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Redwoods State parks plus 10,600 acres of private land). It would also buy up a large chunk of the coast to link the two redwood areas into one big park.

It was a compromise that met California Governor Ronald Reagan's demands that private lumber interests get Federal land in exchange for their holdings so that the lumber-oriented northern counties would not become an economic disaster area.

Representatives of both the Sierra Club and Save-the-Redwoods League appeared favorably impressed by the compromise. But there remained one uncertainty in the deal: The Forest Service had long and valiantly fought against using its lands as "trading stamps" in deals such as this and Congress had always backed this policy.

HONORABLE EXCEPTION

But, reasoned Kuchel, this should be "an honorable exception" or the redwoods would be ruined forever.

At midweek the Senate Interior Committee quickly approved the compromise and the Senate was expected to act on it by November. Senator Jackson said he had been assured by House Interior Committee members they would take the measure under consideration in January—after previously having indicated they would stall maybe another half year.

Opposition, however, was far from dead. The Forest Service was openly unhappy, and that private lumber interests would try to have reduced the number of acres taken for the park was hinted by Governor Reagan.

Reagan, who had long appeared cool, even downright cold, toward tying up more redwoods in public parks, said he would ask the amount of private acreage taken be "substantially reduced" to prevent "serious damage to the lumber industry in the area."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], chairman of the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation, is unable to be present for the debate today. I wish to commend and thank the able chairman of our subcommittee for his devoted and skillful work in conducting the hearings and guiding the consideration of this measure. He devoted long hours to the task, and the bill reported by the committee reflects, in large measure, his personal contribution. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the senior Senator from Nevada in support of the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Bible

Mr. President, it has been my pleasure to serve as Chairman of the Parks and and Recreation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for a number of years. During this time. we have considered legislation affecting areas from one coastline to the other. Some of these acts have had a remarkable degree of unanimity, while others have been highly controversial. But each concerned areas which the Committee believed would best serve the Americans of today and tomorrow as units of our great National Park System.

Today we are considering a bill which would create a Redwood National Park. To say this proposal has been controversial would be an understatement. Depending upon whom you listen to, you are told that "the last redwood is being cut," or that "the redwood is not an endangered species."

I don't think either of these points is at issue here today.

Instead, we must consider just what is intended by the bill before us. The redwoods on the coast of California are unique in the world. The coastal redwoods are among the tallest living things to be found, with many specimen stretching higher than a thirty-story building. In the old-growth stands you may see trees over fourteen feet in diameter whose age may be anywhere from 1000 to 2000 years.

Some say there are adequate numbers of these magnificent trees preserved in the numerous state parks of California. Others believe that to properly protect and display the redwoods, we must have a national park of significant size; one in which there are complete watersheds and ample lands to accommodate great numbers of visitors without endangering the groves of redwood. The problem is further complicated by timber industries operating in the redwood forests which have just recently entered the final stage of their plan to partially harvest the old growth stands on their lands.

If a park of significant size is to be established, it must be soon. And if it is created, there is no doubt in my mind it will have some adverse effect on the industries using the trees as raw material.

So it should be quite evident the Committee was faced with a perplexing set of circumstances. Long months were spent considering alternatives. Different combinations of land ownerships were pieced together like jig-saw puzzles, taken apart and refitted, to arrive at the final recommendation. As a result, I believe that the park boundaries recommended represent the best combination which can be practically achieved.

To acquire the private lands needed to make up the park it appears we might spend more than we have ever considered for a unit of the National Park System. The estimated acquisition price is extremely high.

I have become increasingly concerned about the high cost of lands to be included in our parks and recreation areas. With other substantial burdens on our Nation's economic resources, I feel we must sometimes take unusual steps to achieve a desired goal. In the bill before us, we have taken a most unusual step by providing for lands in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit to be exchanged for timberlands within the park boundaries.

A third of a century ago, the decision was made to establish a Redwood National Forest, and the proper steps for creating purchase units were taken. But economic conditions changed. We moved from a deep depression to a war-stimulated economy, and finally to an era of continued prosperity and industrial growth. This is one reason why only 14,567 acres have been acquired of the original 860,000 acres in the two purchase units established. With the lumber industry firmly settled in the region, it is doubtful much additional progress can be expected toward creating a significant Redwood National Forest. Although we applaud the Forest Service in its management of this small unit, the Committee believes the greatest public benefit to be realized from this land is its exchange for private timberlands within the boundary of the park.

This also will have the secondary benefit of lessening the adverse impact on the local lumber industries, permitting them to operate for a longer period of time or on a larger scale than might otherwise be possible.

I have heard widely-conflicting Committee testimony on the value of this Northern Redwood Purchase Unit. I personally don't know what figure is accurate, but one thing is certain—use of the lands for exchange purposes could be significant in holding the ultimate price of a Redwood National Park far below the authorized purchase price.

I wish to express my appreciation for the many hours devoted to this legislation by the Senior Senator from California, Mr. Kuchel, and the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Jackson.

I believe the so-called "compromise bill" which has evolved is worthy, and I recommend it to you for passage.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, a typographical error appears in the last paragraph of page 3 of the report which accompanies S. 2515. The sentence as it appears in the report reads, in part, as follows:

> The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs met in executive session on August 10, 1967 * * *.

The date should be corrected to read: October 10, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield to the able junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement provides that when the opening statements have been made by the Senator from Washington and the Senator from California, the time on amendments shall be controlled, except that on the pending amendment there is no time limitation.

Mr. JACKSON. We are not speaking on the amendment; we are speaking on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for himself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is the pending question.

Mr. JACKSON. The amendment is now the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement on the bill.

I shall make a subsequent statement on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending. So long as the amendment is pending, the Senator may speak as long as he wishes to do so.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for his skill in developing a plan for a Redwood National Park whose boundaries have drawn such widespread support. All conservation groups known to me have indicated general support for the shape of the park that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is now proposing.

The committee's achievement in resolving wide disagreement—and I have been a part of that wide disagreement—over how boundaries should be drawn is a major one. But its success is also due to the willingness of conservation groups to "give some" with respect to some of their most cherished hopes. They have done so in a spirit of compromise to secure action on this urgent effort.

In backing the committee's bill, nevertheless, we should not lose sight of the conservation opportunities in the redwoods that these groups have brought to our attention. It was my privilege to sponsor a plan, along with 19 other Senators, for a 90,000-acre Redwood. National Park which many of these groups, led by the Sierra Club, recommended.

In regrouping now behind this 64,000-acre plan, let us realize what we are leaving to the lumbermen of what should have been saved. Most notable is the Emerald Mile, actually a 3-mile reach of magnificent redwood forest along Redwood Creek just upstream from the mouth of Bridge Creek. Here the trees stand in a procession at heights of 300 feet or more, with forest edges reminiscent of Bull Creek flat. No roads now enter this place. Only a handful of parties who run the river on spring freshets have seen what we are casting aside in this place.

Nowhere else do redwoods reach the elevations in such grandeur as they do along the slopes above Redwood Creek on the east below the Bald Hills Road. Here they rise to 2,500 feet in giant form, at the inner limit of the fog belt. The redwood expert knows he is seeing something special here. Most of these great slope forests are now being forgotten.

So also is the great hillmass of redwoods between Bridge Creek and Redwood Creek, and the scenic backdrop above Elam Creek and along MacArthur Creek. Tragically, in the 3 years since the National Park Service issued its report on the redwoods, much of the best of the North Fork of Lost Man Creek has already been lost. What we do not save in this bill will probably be lost to the saw within a very few years.

It was with this thought in mind that I attempted to persuade the committee to raise the ceiling on size from 64,000 to 70,000 acres. This small increase would be enough to rescue most of the threatened areas I have just mentioned. I believe that there is enough leeway within the cost estimates for the entire project to allow the increase to be made without raising the ceiling on appropriations.

I hope Congress will continue to explore the possibilities of extending this proposal to cover the magnificent areas of redwood forest in Redwood Creek, which are too good to lose. The opportunities we now have will never return.

It is easy for all of us here to become so engrossed with dollars, budgets, boundaries, and exchanges, that we tend to push into the background the real reason why we are today at a crucial point in a historic undertaking, creation of a redwood national park, a park commensurate with the character of these truly unique and awesome forests.

Last night I was reading an old account of one man's first visit to the redwoods. Morley Roberts told his story in "The Western Avernus: Toil and Travel in Further North America," first published in 1887:

> My road ran still through the redwoods, and if they were solemn and weird at night they were more beautiful in the daytime. Under them at times was thick brush, from which they rose like towers or great lighthouses from the breaking of little waves, and in other places they stood by themselves,

springing straight from the bare ground, or moss, or scanty turf. These had grown for so many centuries, and had such great life in them, they were so grand and solemn and king-like, that I felt they had personality. It seemed nothing short of murder to hew and saw them down for planks and post-making, for house-building, and shelter for little men, who lusted to destroy in an hour the slow, sweet growth of their unnumbered years. We come with our quick and furious flood of life to a quick conclusion, they, with the slow sap under bark and in the wood, rise imperceptibly to majesty, and fall at the end of their long term by overgrowth of summit and crown; they sink at last under the burden of natural honours, and mingle slowly in long decay with the soil in which they were rooted. But men come and destroy them, as barbarians in the pathetic, silent senate-house, and nature lies wounded and bleeding.

I came out on the banks of the Smith River again and was ferried over, and was asked no fee. I was astonished at the lack of greed, and the natural sweet kindliness of the man, a Charon fair and young, which are so rare in all countries, and alas! much too rare in America. I thanked him courteously, and he bowed and wished me well most knightlike, pushing back across the stream, and I passed again into the redwoods, climbing up through a sweet tangle of thick brush with the great god-trees rising from it, and then descended and came on a flat, more bare, with willow and birch, and no more redwoods. And I began to hear a faint roar, like a singing in my ears. But it grew and grew till I recognized the sound of the sea, the roar of breakers, the eternal ocean voice. It put new life into me; I walked faster, though I was faint, until I came where I could hear the separate roar of separate waves—distinct thunders. I sat under a tree by the roadside and lighted my pipe, and, to save myself from vain imaginings of possible things, I took my Virgil and again read part of the Sixth Book. And when I came to the middle I thought, "I am not yet out of Avernus, and who knows if I shall return to the lucid stars and lucid earth, for there is much to be passed through before my time is at hand."

When we are talking about conservation and the challenge of meeting the outdoor recreation demands of a growing nation, one man stands at the top in terms of accomplishment. I doubt that enough attention has ever been directed to the man and his work—the senior Senator from Nevada [Alan Bible]. During more than a decade in the U.S. Senate, Alan Bible has clearly established himself as a leading conservation figure. Certainly, his record in the area of parks and recreation is unmatched.

As chairman of the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee and, before that, the Public Lands Subcommittee, Senator Bible has been instrumental in passing legislation that has added no less than 47 new areas to the National Park System. And that record, I believe, is about to be greatly extended with the passage in the 90th Congress of bills creating two new landmark national parks—the Redwoods National Park bill we are considering today and the North Cascades National Park and related recreation and wilderness areas. This is a record unequaled by any other Senator in his position in the history of Congress. I submit it is a record that represents the greatest period of recreation development ever witnessed by our Nation.

Senator Bible's calm guiding hand was largely responsible for solving the complex problems that had thwarted progress on the Redwood National Park bill. It was the same effective capacity for overcoming obstacles that made his record of achievement possible.

Under Senator Bible's leadership we have seen the long-overdue resurgence of national recreation areas, national seashores, and national lakeshores designed to provide for the badly neglected recreation needs of those in crowded urban areas. We have seen two new national parks—Canyonlands and Guadalupe Mountains. And we have seen many historical parks and national monuments established. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a list of the National Park Service additions that have been authorized during Senator Bible's chairmanship of the responsible subcommittee up to this year.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

St. Thomas National Historical Site.
Christionsted National Historical Site.
Russell Cave National Monument.
Cape Cod National Seashore.
Fort Davis National Historical Site.
Fort Smith National Historical Site.
Piscataway Park.
Buck Island Reef National Monument.
Fort St. Marks National Historical Site.
Lincoln Boyhood National Monument.
Hamilton Grange National Monument.
Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace National Historical Site.
Sagamore Hill National Historical Site.
Frederick Douglas Home National Historical Site.
Point Reyes National Seashore.
Padre Island National Seashore.

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Ozark National Scenic Riverways.
Fort Bowie National Historical Site.
Fort Larned National Historical Site.
Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site.
Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historical Site.
Johnstown Flood National Historical Site.
John Muir National Historical Site.
Fire Island National Seashore.
Canyonlands National Park.
Ice Age National Scientific Reserve.

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Assateague Island National Seashore.
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.
Nez Perce National Historical Park.
Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area.
Cape Lookout National Seashore.
Chamizal Treaty National Monument.
Fort Union Trading Post National Historical Site.
George Rogers Clark National Historical Park.
San Juan Island National Historical Park.
Guadalupe Mountains National Park.
Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.
Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area.
Golden Spike National Historical Site.
Hubbell Trading Post National Historical Site.
Agate Fossil Beds National Monument.
Herbert Hoover National Monument.
Pecos National Monument.
Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument.
Ellis Island National Monument.
Roger Williams National Monument.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier today, I spoke of the great service the Senator from Montana performed in the discussions in committee which led up to this bill. The Senator is recognized as a leader in conservation. On the amendment now pending, the position that he has taken is one of tremendous strength for all of us who want a national redwood park, who recognize the need for Senate action now, and who oppose this amendment.

I simply wish to repeat, in the presence of the Senator from Montana, the feelings that I have and that I believe all people interested in this park have with respect to his high level of statesmanship in this controversy.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the committee, I wish to express my appreciation for the effective assistance of the able Senator from Montana in connection with the pending measure. The Senator from Montana has been active for many years as an advocate in promoting a redwood national park bill. As I recall, his interest dates back to the days when he was a student at Stanford University.

Mr. President, the Senator's forthright analysis of the so-called purchase unit matter has been stated as well as anyone could ask in defining the issues involved.

I say to the Members of the Senate that the able Senator from Montana has made our task much easier in bringing this bill to the floor of the Senate, and I commend him most highly for his help with respect to this important measure.

Mr. METCALF. I thank my chairman.

If I still have the floor, Mr. President, I wish to respond to the statements made by the Senator from California and the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I doubt whether any Member of the Senate has had more to do with opposition to land exchanges than I. I go back to the years when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, when Representative Ellsworth suggested that there be an omnibus program for land exchanges under which whenever a sustained yield area was taken for a Corps of Engineers project, a Bureau of Reclamation project, or a highway program, some of our national parks or our national forests would be exchanged. I vehemently opposed that proposal, and the House of Representatives voted it down.

I believe that the distinguished Senator from Vermont aided in preventing the addition of that amendment to the Senate bill.

But today we have a provision for a land exchange in the pending amendment, which is entirely different from what we were talking about back in the days when I opposed the Ellsworth proposal. I suggested in the House of Representatives that the Ellsworth bill should be defeated because it was a suggestion that we exchange trees for stumps. It was such a suggestion. Today, we have a better bill. The Government will receive trees in exchange for stumps. The land involved in this exchange is being logged. This area is in private operation at present. We are saying that we will receive a magnificent area within the confines of the park in exchange for an area that will be logged off, anyway. The Federal Government will get the better of the bargain.

In addition, we will be saving the economy of a small county in northern California. We will be helping them to have a tax base, which is important, and we will save some jobs.

Mr. President, I suggest that the pending amendment would not set a precedent at all. Every day, Members of Congress receive requests for endorsement of land exchanges between the Forest Service and railroads or other private owners, or between Government and State agencies.

For example, many persons are now writing to Senator MANSFIELD and me in support of a proposed land exchange between the Forest Service and the Northern Pacific Railroad, in order to add to the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Area. So long as it involves an exchange of one national forest area for another, no one complains. But if it involves an exchange of national forest land that goes into the Interior Department, then we have the National Forest Service coming up and objecting.

Originally, the Secretary of the Interior suggested to Congress that the Muir Woods be a part of the land exchange in this proposal. The Muir Woods, which is named after a great naturalist, John Muir——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Does the Senator mean that a Cabinet officer came to the Congress of the United States and recommended that the Muir Woods be traded off?

Mr. METCALF. Yes. And I made a speech about it. And when I suggested that this land exchange was not in the public interest, the distinguished Senator from California quoted that speech against me.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. To what Cabinet officer does the Senator refer?

Mr. METCALF. One of our best Cabinet officers.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Agriculture or Interior?

Mr. METCALF. One of our best—the Secretary of the Interior, Secretary Udall, a close friend of mine, the finest Secretary of the Interior, who has ever held that position.

Nevertheless, he suggested that the Muir Woods be part of this land exchange.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I assume that the distinguished Senator has been in the Muir Woods, one of the most beautiful spots in America.

Mr. METCALF. I said in committee that when I went into the service, having been drafted, and after I was given basic training, I received a 3-day pass and my wife and I went up into the Muir Woods. When I went to Stanford University, I used to go to the Muir Woods. I believe it is one of the greatest areas for spiritual satisfaction that I have ever been in.

I would vehemently oppose the abandonment of those woods so that loggers could come in with their chain saws and destroy the area.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the Senator. I went into the Muir Woods with Roger Kent, who, as Senators know, was in the Department of Defense under President Truman. It was his father, William Kent who named the Muir Woods in honor of that great naturalist. This happened in the early 1900's, some time before 1910. This area was set up as one of the first conservation areas in America.

His father, William Kent, is mentioned in the book about California Progressives and the founding of the Progressive movement in California, and in connection with the election of Gifford Pinchot as Governor of Pennsylvania. William Kent is credited by many persons as being the person who convinced Theodore Roosevelt that the conservation movement should be taken up. He had been a young man in Chicago. He went West, and was a great reform leader in California. He was one of the great conservationists in America, and he is credited with having great influence on Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, who are regarded as the fathers of the American conservationists movement.

Mr. METCALF. If we had listened to them in those days this bill would not be before us today.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes, if we had listened to William Kent, Gifford Pinchot, and Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. METCALF. But we have not and the keystone to that whole park is the land exchange. It is not significant as far as conservation goes for it is an exchange which goes on every day within the Forest Service. There was an exchange praised a day or so ago in the Washington Post in an editorial in connection with the Northern Cascades. It is the kind of exchange everyone can justify. If it is said to be setting a precedent, it is a good precedent, and it is the kind of precedent in which the Federal Government gets the better of the deal.

I have nothing but praise for the distinguished Senator from California, who sponsored the bill, and our chairman, who are giving us an opportunity for a significant national park which includes the big trees. I wish it were a little bigger, but that is what happens in the legislative process.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps I should not be taking part in this debate at all. I think my education is incomplete in that I have never been in the proposed Redwood park. I have been in Muir Woods. That is as near as I got. If the people of California want the national park there, I would be very much in favor of its establishment. However, I come from an area where I have seen the beneficial effects of the national forest and I cannot help but feel that we do not want to start a precedent that will spread to my part of the country; that is, trading off sections of the national forest for other desirable assets.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator wish to make a comment before I get started?

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The purchase unit that this bill proposes to exchange is not a part of an established national forest.

Mr. AIKEN. Possibly not in the strictest sense.

Mr. KUCHEL. This purchase unit was purchased between 1939 and 1945 by the United States from private owners, with the thought in mind that some 860,000 acres would be acquired from private owners and that the Federal Government would attempt to demonstrate the best way for redwood logging operations to proceed. But that plan collapsed. I want my friend, for whom I have No. 1 respect around here, as he knows, to know that this is not, never has been, and never will be a part of an established national forest.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator mean that the 14,500 acres are not now and never will be a part of the national forest?

Mr. KUCHEL. Are not now, and never has been.

Mr. AIKEN. Who administers it? The Forest Service administers it.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. As a further point of clarification I think that the able Senator from California stated it well. It is true that the Forest Service considered making a national forest. This proposal was turned down by the Forest Service. The Senator from Vermont must realize, as the Senator from California pointed out, that this was originally undertaken as a very large enterprise which started back in 1934 during the depression days. It was hoped they would be able to acquire this large acreage to which the Senator from California referred. They failed. Only a very small fractional part of the objective was achieved; 14,567 acres, to be precise.

I might say to my good friend from Vermont that we would not be arguing over this matter now if this particular acreage were in the hands of the Department of the Interior. This is nothing more or less than a good, old-fashioned, Washington, D.C., bureaucratic hassle. We are dealing with assets of the United States. This timber in the purchase unit is for logging. We are suggesting that that purpose continue by permitting an exchange. We are trying to create a national park. It seems to me it is just a matter of equity to make provisions along the lines we have provided for in the bill.

I wish to emphasize that if these lands were being administered by the Department of Interior there would not be a word said against it. It seems to me that Congress has some policymaking ability to see to it that assets of the Federal Government are properly managed and properly administered.

I wish to emphasize that point. This is nothing more than a fight between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. That began in 1908.

Mr. JACKSON. It has been going on for a long time. I think the Congress needs to step in, where it is in the public interest, to protect the assets of the United States. We should not allow the two departments to try to make this decision.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I may proceed, I think that perhaps my colleagues, if they are correct, should undertake to inform the American Forestry Association because I had a letter from them several days ago which stated as follows:

> MY DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: We are concerned about a provision in the Redwood National Park bill, S. 2515, to use national forest land in the Redwood Purchase Unit as payment in kind for private lands desired for park purposes.
>
> This Federal land was acquired by the Forest Service under the Weeks Act of March 1, 1911 for the practice of multiple use, sustained yield forestry. It is being managed efficiently for this purpose. Trading this land for other land to be used as a park will defeat the purpose for which national forests are established.
>
> The annual harvests of timber from the Redwood Purchase Unit supports ten small lumber companies and their employees. One-quarter of the receipts from timber sales, a substantial sum, goes to Del Norte County in lieu of taxes. This 25 percent fund exceeds the amount of taxes received from comparable land in private ownership.
>
> Therefore, it is clear that giving four large landowners this Forest Service land will not benefit the local economy. It merely aids four large companies at the expense of ten small companies.
>
> Neither will such an exchange improve the tax base of Del Norte County.
>
> Of even greater concern is the precedent to be established by such action. It will open the flood gates to demands by all sorts of special interests and land grabbers. Some of these already have appeared.
>
> Consequently, we urge you to delete all references to the Redwood Purchase Unit from S. 2515 and to preserve this tract for the purposes for which it was acquired.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> KENNETH B. POMEROY,
> *Chief Forester.*

Let me also quote from the individual views made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in the committee report:

> I am in full accord with the establishment of the Redwood National Park. I am deeply concerned, however, with the committee amendment to authorize the conveyance of national forest land in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit in exchange for lands to be acquired as a part of the park.
>
> The federally owned property in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit was made national forest land by the terms of the Weeks Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), under which it was acquired. It has always been and should continue to be treated just as all other national forest.

Mr. President, the reason I am concerned about the bill is that while the national forest is comparatively small in my State—about 250,000 acres—I have seen the good in the community and in the State which has come from it.

I have seen steadily increasing values not only of forest land but of the land around it which has been developed, too, by reason of proximity to the national forest.

I have seen development of recreation in the national forest, particularly in the skiing industry which, last year, it was estimated to bring about $75 million into my small State, to the owners and operators of the skiing areas—and probably much more to the people living around those areas.

I have seen the national forest develop as a refuge for wildlife—wild birds, mammals, and bears which have increased considerably. That might not be considered an asset in sheep country, but with us in Vermont, the black bear and other wildlife have been coming back and have found refuge in the national forest which runs up through the Green Mountains of my State.

I have seen developments in lumber operations. The income from standing timber sold has increased the income of the communities and of the State materially. The revenue derived from this income is being used to build roads and schools.

Thus, that is the reason I feel we would be shortsighted to trade off any part of the national forest, because just as sure as anything, if this gets by in one State, they will ask to do it in other States.

I have no doubt that today, if a promoter could get a part of the national forest which originally was purchased for a few dollars an acre, he could become rather wealthy as a result of such a deal.

Perhaps I should apologize to the Senator from California because I have not visited the Redwoods Park area in California, but I know what the national forest has done in my own State, and in the East generally. I do not want to start trading it off for other items regardless of how valuable they might be.

Of course, it is going to cost money to buy this park outright. The dollar, however, is not going to be very big in the future. Today we talk about how many pesos there are to the dollar—I believe it is 12—and until recently there were 2,700 cruzeiros to the dollar. But if inflation keeps increasing as it is increasing now, it will not be very long before we will be asking about how many dollars there are to the dollar.

Thus, this land will be a good buy, I would say, regardless of the fact that it would cost money now.

I want to add, once more, that the national forest has been extremely helpful in developing other communities, as well as those in my State, and for that reason I just do not want to make the initial start of trading off any parts of it.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. Senator, I am going to urge the Senator, who is a great conservationist and a great Senator, not to say that this 14,000-acre parcel is part of a national forest, because it is not.

I wish the Senator could see the fine redwoods in northern California. I have seen them. I want those trees, which stretch into the sky almost 400 feet, some of them centuries old, some of them thousands of years old, to be preserved.

And the path to the presentation of the bill has been a tortuous one.

There are people who want a park but disagree on where it should be.

There are people who want a park but do not want it to be too big.

There are people who want a park but say this one is not as large as it should be.

There have been all kinds of obstacles, wittingly or unwittingly placed in the path of this park legislation; but, here it is. Here it is, and it is justified.

I know that my friend from Vermont favors the acquisition or the setting aside of recreation areas for the American people in the future. I feel that he looks with favor on that concept, but I urge him not to vote for the amendment on the ground that we are talking of national forest land, for I tell him that that is not the fact.

I believe that the Senator from Vermont just read a letter from Mr. Kenneth Pomeroy.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I received it about 10 minutes ago.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me read what Mr. Pomeroy had to say in an article entitled "Redwoods and Parks," published in American Forests for May 1965:

> With less than 10 percent of the reduced area in federal ownership, and with further substantial additions unlikely, the forest supervisor in charge of the unit recommended on November 1, 1963, that the gross area of the unit be decreased to the 32,409 acres north of the Klamath River, and that the area be known as the Redwood National Forest. This step would leave 931 acres in scattered tracts south of the Klamath River, which could be used as trading stock. The proposal was approved by the supervisors of Del Norte and Humboldt counties and by the Simpson Timber Company (the largest private owner in the unit) but has not been acted upon by the Forest Service.

Nor has it been since. The Department of Agriculture has consistently and recently rejected the proposal to include this small and isolated tract in an established national forest. So I think we should not refer to this unit as part of a national forest, and I believe the public interest is best served by taking this 14,567-acre parcel, which has been used by private companies, under contract, for logging operations, and use that parcel to make possible the acquisition of magnificent trees for a park.

That is the best I can do, Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the views of the Senator from California. He always does what he thinks is best for his home State. I hope the people of California appreciate this and will soundly express their appreciation in November 1968. But there seems to be a difference of opinion, and being from a national forest area, I am still inclined to follow their policies.

I have in my hand another letter, just handed me, from the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he expresses his opposition to trading off these 15,000 acres for part of the cost of the redwood preserve. He said, "It would open the floodgates." Right now I do not want to open the floodgates to trading off any national forest lands.

I ask unanimous consent to have that letter to me from the Secretary printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 20, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: You will shortly be considering S. 2515, a new bill to establish a Redwood National Park. The Department of Agriculture actively supports the establishment of such a Park.

However, this Department vigorously and strongly objects to the feature of S. 2515 which would use National Forest land as trading stock to obtain land for the Park. This commandeering of the National Forest land in the Redwood Purchase Unit is not necessary in order for the Nation to have a Redwood Park.

Using National Forest land for trading stock in this important case endangers land administered by the Forest Service all over the country. It threatens the integrity of the National Forests, a principle of longstanding.

It would open the floodgates. Right now, and repeatedly in the past, there have been made demands in other parts of the country that National Forest lands be used to pay for parks, or for reservoirs, or for highway rights-of-way. Any and every instance of such a taking of National Forest land makes the later pressures that much harder to resist.

This is why past actions of Congress have resoundingly rejected use of National Forest land for this kind of trade-off.

There are other reasons for not appropriating these National Forest lands to pay for the Park:

1. Savings derived from trading off the National Forest land would be a small part of the total cost of the proposed Park. On an acre-for-acre basis, the value of the National Forest land in the Purchase Unit, estimated at $25 million, falls far short of the value of the old-growth groves proposed for inclusion in the Park. This is a very small sum to endanger a very basic principle of conservation.

2. The four main companies involved do not need the limited acreage of land that could be made available to them in order to continue operating for a significant number of years. The company that would experience the greatest impact could continue at its present rate of operation for 15 years or longer.

3. A move to make these companies partially whole would be at the cost of withdrawing supplies now used by smaller operators who buy the stumpage that would be transferred to the four larger, stronger companies. In recent years, 10 operators in the area have used the timber that this action would turn over to only four large companies. Thus, a trade-off of land would not create any new jobs. It would favor four large companies at the expense of 10 smaller ones.

A Redwood National Park is in the national interest. The USDA supports strongly that objective. But a raid on the National Forests and the establishment of a dangerous precedent in violation of longstanding, sound conservation principles is neither necessary nor wise.

Sincerely yours,
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have just had handed to me a telegram from another organization, which earnestly advocates increasing the size of the area.

In fact, I will go so far as to say that we have people in this country who would like to see it kept just as Columbus and Leif Ericson and Governor Bradford saw it for the first time, excepting, of course, for the property they own and live on.

I am reminded of something someone, whom my friend from California knew very well, said he did not want to own all the land in his State; he just wanted the land that adjoined his.

We have those in this country who are so esthetically inclined that they would not cut a tree anywhere, and we have those who are so monetarily inclined that they want to cut everything that would make a 2-by-4 stud. Between them we have to choose.

I am sure the Senator understands that, as Members of Congress, we first of all have to represent the areas from which we come, as well as the National Government. I believe I am representing the thoughts of many people in the East, and particularly in my part of the country, when I say we should not start trading off national forest areas. I do not see why we could not pay cash. I mean pay it over a period of time. The dollar is getting smaller every year. This property is not going to depreciate in value. In fact, barring a worldwide catastrophe, I cannot think of any real estate in the United States that is going to depreciate in value. It is going to increase in value. It has been increasing tremendously in the last 2 or 3 years. It seems to me there is not much time to lose in acquiring for the public what we will really need for public recreation and the public welfare.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I could not agree more wholeheartedly with the Senator from Vermont. I serve on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission. That is a commission, as Senators know, which buys land for conservation purposes from the Duck Stamp program. About half the duties we have are to upgrade our parcels and estimations, because land values continually increase.

I would like to have everybody concerned about my position on this bill go back and look into the debate on the Ellsworth bill.

I will say to my friend from Vermont that I do not believe we should buy railroad rights-of-way and highway rights-of-way and Bureau of Reclamation dams and Corps of Engineers dams by giving away the national forests of this country. No one has been more vehement in opposition to such a proposal than I. This is a proposal to exchange a rather isolated forest for a forest within the boundaries of a proposed national park. This is no different from what we do every day in authorizing the Forest Service to exchange national forest land for Northern Pacific land to have some boundaries taken care of.

Right now my colleague [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I are trying to organize some sort of land exchange so we can have some Northern Pacific land incorporated into a primitive or wilderness area in Montana by an exchange of national forest land.

As I have said many times, we cannot exchange stumps for trees as far as the Federal Government is concerned. This time we are exchanging trees. We are exchanging a stump area, a log-dump area, and we are getting trees back in a national park. As long as this Congress and this administration read into the bill each time the land exchange, then, as far as I am concerned, there is no danger that the fears of the Senator from Vermont will be realized, and that we will try to buy our highways and our Corps of Engineers' projects by trading off some of our natural resources.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am afraid I cannot agree that this bill provides an exchange of national forest land. It seems to me this is a sale of national forest land for dollars. The proposal is to use the dollars to buy other land for the redwood park.

Mr. President, when we make our appropriations, we make them for three purposes. The first is for the necessary expenses of Government, and we cannot avoid that. The next is as an investment for the acquisition of property, which will increase in value. The third purpose for which we appropriate funds in Congress is the "rathole." There has been an exaggerated emphasis on the "rathole" in the last few years, but I look upon the purchase of national forest land as an investment, because I have seen such land return very fine dividends on the initial cost.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] could not be present in the Chamber today. He has asked that I submit his statement so that his views supporting S. 2515 will be on record.

I appreciate his support. Particularly do I believe significant his endorsement of the committee's desire that no road or bridge be built in the scenic corridor of Redwood Creek. Our desire is that this portion of the park can be enjoyed in the quiet and solitude of the undisturbed primitive forest.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator RANDOLPH's statement appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REDWOOD CREEK CORRIDOR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. President, I commend the able senior Senator from California and his distinguished colleagues for their exhaustive study of this complex and controversial problem of preservation of the magnificent coast redwoods. Committee Report No. 641 stands as an example of their wisdom and diligence. I am of course impressed with the grandeur and magnificence of these incomparable trees; I am in complete agreement with my distinguished colleagues on the desirability of incorporating a vestige of this magnificence in our National Park system.

As Chairman of the Public Works Committee I have a particular interest in the road aspects of this legislation and the commentary on roads in the Committee Report. As outlined in the report: "The Acquisition of the lower Redwood Creek drainage and a scenic corridor down the creek will allow outdoorsmen to enjoy hiking or floating along more than 8 miles of the length of Redwood Creek."

The Committee Report goes on to say that "in authorizing the acquisition of a corridor southward along Redwood Creek to the tall trees unit and beyond, the committee intends to preserve the scenic and natural values now found along the miles of creek bank lined with virgin redwoods. The committee wishes to make clear its intention that no improved all-weather road should be built in the corridor and that no all-weather or permanent bridge spanning Redwood Creek should be built any farther than 2 miles from the confluence of Redwood Creek and Prairie Creek. The purpose of the committee including the lower Redwood Creek watershed and the Redwood Creek corridor would be frustrated by overdevelopment and intensive use."

I commend my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for their good judgment in determining that this corridor, which I understand is very precipitous, should remain unmarred by road and bridge construction and by the sights and sounds of motorized traffic. I assume the Committee intends that this corridor is to be enjoyed by those hikers and boaters who venture through by trail and by water trips on Redwood Creek.

The idea of providing a trail is certainly desirable, even though it may only be used by a small number of people. Certainly the idea of prohibiting roads is desirable as a means of providing opportunity for those to use the trail and creek to get away from mechanical means of transportation. To these ends I concur in the judgment of my distinguished colleagues.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the senior Senator from New Mexico to prevent a trade in national forest lands as part of the establishment of Redwood National Park. Due to the vision and foresight of the early pioneers in conservation in every State, this Nation has a headstart on dealing with the problems of preserving and promoting our national resources in the face of a burgeoning population.

I am proud that North Carolina is among the leaders in planning and research in conservation. I am proud also that she has contributed her share of those dedicated men who believe that every generation holds the land and resources in trust for the future. Early in this century, some wise men saw the threats to our economy and to our society of uncontrolled erosion, fires, destruction of wildlife, and poor land use. They foresaw the effect of vanishing forests on an increasingly urban society. And they sought to ward off the day when man would be unable to return to the beauties and comforts of nature for his recreation; when he would be unable to till his land because the topsoil was lost; when he no longer had pure water to drink.

The national forest system, in cooperation with the State systems, has played a substantial role in dispelling this grim threat to our national well-being. In North Carolina alone the national forest lands, including purchase units and experimental land, amount to 1,124,470 acres.

These lands, managed under multiple-purpose plans help provide watershed protection, recreation, and wildlife. In jobs and products yield they contribute to the economies of the States and counties in which they are located. In their natural beauty they promote the spiritual well-being of the residents of those areas and of those who drive many miles to partake of their beauty.

North Carolina has been bountifully blessed, I believe, above all States in this respect. The Charokee, Croatan, Nanatahala, Pisgah, and the Uwharrie National Forests, and the Nanatahala and Yadkin purchase units are breathtaking testimony to this truth.

As our cities expand, as our rural areas become congested, as our Nation grows, these forest lands are America's investment in the future. I see no compelling reason at this point in our history to start trading them off. Once the process is started, the movement will be difficult to control. The estimated saving on this one project will not be worth the cost to all our people.

In the primeval acreage of the Nanatahala National Forest stands a memorial to the poet, Joyce Kilmer, who understood so well what all of us today should remember. Men may pass all sorts of laws, but "only God can make a tree."

I believe Congress should not grant authority to trade redwood lands under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service for private lands; therefore, I support the Anderson amendment.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate the great service that has been performed by Senators Kuchel and Jackson in bringing before the full Senate a bill to create a Redwoods National Park. I know of no conservation matter which is of greater importance than the proper preservation of the magnificent redwoods in our country.

During the consideration of this bill by the full Interior Committee, I expressed certain reservation to my fellow committee members regarding the total cost of the legislation which is now before us. I made the point in committee which met with immediate approval of fellow committee members, that it would be extremely unwise for us to place an unrealistic estimate of costs in the present bill. To be unrealistic now with the authorization for appropriation section would only subject us to possible embarrassment and difficulty in the future.

I have been assured by members of the committee and their staff, who are much more knowledgeable on this question than I am, that the authorization-for-appropriation section in the present bill is a realistic figure and that if redwood legislation can be speedily passed by both Houses the total costs for land acquisition will not exceed the amount as stated in the bill.

On the other hand, since the Interior Committee reported the bill, interested persons have presented a somewhat different point of view than was taken by the Interior Committee in its final markup session. Mr. Robert Dehlendorf, the president of Arcata National Corp., has spoken to myself and my staff several times concerning the evaluation of the redwood properties encompassed by S. 2515. Mr. Dehlendorf has indicated that cursory evaluations of his company's property show that their value exceeds the amounts authorized by the Interior Committee.

Without presuming to make my judgment on these conflicting points of view and reiterating that I have no personal experience in the question of valuation which is before us, I simply ask that an outline provided by the Arcata National Corp. which states their interpretation of the cost implications of S. 2515 be printed in the Record at this point. My purpose in submitting this information is only to show that there is not unanimity regarding the values in this case.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COST IMPLICATIONS OF S. 2515, REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK BILL

I. TIMBER AND LAND ACQUISITION COSTS ARE HIGHER THAN SENATE COMMITTEE ESTIMATES

[In millions]

	Amount
(a) Senate Interior Committee estimates (sec. 6 of S. 2515)	$100
(b) Actual costs (based on actual timber inventories and actual current timber market values of 4 companies)	160
(c) Actual costs, plus additional costs resulting from cessation of operations by Arcata Redwood Co. (includes timber, land, and physical facilities of company)	206
If the purchase unit exchange of Forest Service lands is stricken from the Senate bill, this will force an additional company, Rellim Redwood Co., to cease operations:	
(d) The total cost of S. 2515 would then increase to	269

II. IMPACT OF S. 2515

	Total acreage	Old growth acreage included in total
(a) S. 2515 will add:		
From redwood industry	27,679	12,620
From other private holdings	5,310	285
Total	32,989	12,905
(b) To presently preserved lands:		
State redwood parks	107,458	59,000
Other Federal and State coast redwood forest lands	136,000	(1)
Total	243,458	[2] 59,000

---

[1] Not available.

[2] Minimum.

Mr. HANSEN. In dealing with costs of such magnitude it would appear to me to be advisable to set an authorization ceiling at the latest possible time before the President affixes his signature. I am aware that the Senate Interior Committee has wrestled with the extremely difficult problem of escalating land values for many years. It would be more realistic to leave the authorization open ended. The Government's experience would confirm the soundness of such a position.

With these reservations, I warmly support S. 2515 and congratulate once again the splendid work that has been done by its principal proponents.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, before stating my views in respect to the pending bill, S. 2215, I first wish to pay tribute to the committee chairman and the ranking minority member. As a member of the committee I appreciate fully the leadership they have again shown in steering this extremely complex and controversial conservation legislation through the legislative process. I share the pride of my colleagues and of all Americans in our unique and magnificent national park system. I, too, believe a redwood park will be a very appropriate and outstanding addition to the system. It is fitting that the American people have this park; they have strongly expressed their desire for it. In this instance, we are confronted with the problem of how to create a worthwhile redwood national park while at the same time doing everything possible to minimize problems for the local citizens. We have a corollary problem of avoiding waste of the taxpayers' dollars, especially so in these troubled times.

The central questions before us are how large a park is needed and what specific lands must be included to adequately represent the redwoods in the national park system? The administration feels that a 41,000-acre park would be adequate. The committee is suggesting 66,000 acres. Either size would be adequate.

But size is not so vexing a problem as is the question over which specific lands shall fall within the park. The committee report says:

> The Committee believes that no company which has a genuine interest in staying in the redwood timber business will be obliged to cease operations as a result of the enactment of S. 2515.

Yet, I have before me a copy of a letter from Mr. Robert O. Dehlendorf, II, president of Arcata National Corp., which very clearly states that the Arcata Redwood Co. division of his firm will be forced out of business, throwing several hundred men out of work. Let me just paraphrase the highlights of that letter.

First, he states that the mill facilities of the company would be physically isolated by park boundaries from all timber lands remaining in its ownership.

He also says that even if it had access to remaining timberlands, Arcata would be forced to employ very costly uphill logging techniques—three to four times more costly than at present. Economical downhill logging would be prohibited by park boundaries established under S. 2515.

Third, even if it had access to its remaining timberlands, the sharp reduction in acreage owned by the company would force it to operate its facilities at only 25 percent of capacity.

Fourth, under S. 2515, Arcata would lose all of the cutover and second growth timber lands it requires to support continuous, long-term operations under sound forest management practices.

Finally, he says that an alternative to continuing operations at 25 percent of capacity would be to operate the Arcata facilities at 100 percent of capacity for only 10 years, and then to cease operations. If this course of action were pursued, the impact on Arcata's operations would also be severe: Arcata's skilled employees would seek other employment knowing that the company's "life" is limited, and Arcata's wholesale distributors would turn to competitors who could assure them of continuous, long-term supply of lumber products.

We should all realize that the landowners will be paid for their property. But the wage earners dependent on this industry that will be cast adrift receive no compensation. Many have questioned if adequate consideration has been given to eliminating the 13,000-acre block in the Lost Man Creek and Redwood Creek areas. I have been assured that this would permit the Arcata Co. to continue in business. This action, they say, would reduce the cost of the park from the more than $200 million estimated by the companies to around $70 million. This cost could be halved by exchanging the northern redwood purchase unit lands for private lands taken into the park. The result would be a 50,000 acre park, which is 10,000 acres more than the administration said was adequate, but at a cost of only about a quarter of the authorization in S. 2515. Further, the very vexing questions—and potential high costs—of in lieu taxes and economic assistance for local people and communities would be avoided, for as I understand no companies would be forced out of business and the impact of local tax losses reduced. In short, we would be creating an outstanding redwood national park at a reasonable cost without adding further woes to an area already classed as depressed.

Now the question may properly arise: Would not this change take out the so-called tall trees area on Redwood Creek, which many people have favored including in a Redwood National Park? Reports indicate that the location of the world's tallest trees at this moment has not been definitely ascertained. Just last week in Eureka, Calif., Dr. Randolph Becking announced that a tree 18 feet taller than the currently accepted record holder lies outside the park boundaries proposed in S. 2515. In the interest of resolving this unsettled matter of the location of the world's tallest trees, I respectfully suggest that a survey should be undertaken by the Secretary of Interior to determine the location and height of a number of coast redwood trees which might, in fact, be the tallest. This study should be undertaken before we spend many millions of dollars for this particular piece of proposed national park.

I intend to vote for S. 2515. I do so because I think passage of this bill will do much to bring the Congress closer to agreement on authorization of the Redwood National Park. I trust, however, that Senator MURPHY's reservations and my reservations to S. 2515 will be considered by the House Interior Committee when it takes up the redwoods bill next session.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE SHOULD APPEAR BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today, Secretary of State Rusk appeared before the student body of Indiana University. Last night, he appeared in Columbus, Ind. In both instances he appeared to discuss the question of Vietnam.

On October 10, on the floor of the Senate, I raised the question as to why the Secretary of State has not met in public with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I said at that time that if he has been invited and does not wish to appear, the time for committee insistence is long overdue.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations appeared on the floor of the Senate at that time and gave a record of the requests for the appearance of the Secretary of State, and at no time during 1967 has the Secretary of State agreed or been willing to appear before the duly elected Members of the Senate and their representatives on the Foreign Relations Committee to discuss the vital issue of Vietnam.

On October 24, I repeated the entire question concerning the appearance of the Secretary of State, in view of the fact that on October 10 he had given a press conference in which he made a statement to the effect that he did not intend to appear before the klieg lights and answer questions to the Foreign Relations Committee. But the Secretary of State finds it appropriate to choose his own forum, to set up his own props, to turn on his own klieg lights, and to make any statements he wishes, without the opportunity of any Member of the Senate to question him, under our duly elective processes.

I believe that every American is interested in such an appearance. I believe that any parent or a prospective parent whose child will reach the age of 18 within the next 20 years, which is now the stated time it is anticipated that this war will last, will have a vital interest in what the Secretary of State has to say.

We use the USIA to make statements to the world that we are a democratic society. We complain about the fact that President Thieu and his Vice President, Air Force General Ky, will not confront the press and will not appear before the American press. Yet, we see the situation in America in which a member of the President's Cabinet, who is not an elected official, refuses to appear before the elected officials of his own country and refuses to appear before the body, the U.S. Senate, which under the Constitution has the responsibility of advising and consenting on the question of foreign affairs. Although in other democratic societies the Prime Minister is held to account in public session before the elected members of the parliament, this process has been ignored in this country.

I believe that the Committee on Foreign Relations should insist now that the Secretary of State should appear before them and answer in public session the questions which are on the minds of the American people and on the minds of the members of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Indiana has made this statement. I should like to have his attention for a moment. I completely agree with him.

I have already expressed myself to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as a member of that committee, along the same lines as stated by the Senator from Indiana.

I say to the American people that if the Secretary of State is allowed by the President of the United States to get by with this flouting of a legislative committee of Congress, we have taken another long stride down the road in this country toward government by executive supremacy. This is a challenge, in my judgment, to our constitutional system of three coordinate and coequal branches of government, with each branch having a check on the other two.

I speak most respectfully, but I say that in my judgment the President of the United States owes it to the American people to make clear to his Secretary of State that when a legislative committee requests that the Secretary come before that committee to report and to answer questions, he either should come or should send in his resignation.

In my judgment, it is not safe, in this Republic, to permit any member of the Cabinet to take the position that he can thwart and flout and defy a legislative committee of Congress. After all, we sit here as the checkers, so to speak, in behalf of the people, exercising the check-and-balance system against the executive branch of the Government.

The Secretary of State knows very well that when he appears before the Committee on Foreign Relations and any question is put to him that in his judgment should be answered in executive session because the question—unknown to the questioner, or known to the questioner—may involve the security of the Republic, all he need to do is say, "I want to say to the committee I'll be very glad to answer that question in executive session, because it involves certain matters that I think involve the security of the Republic, and therefore we should not make that information available to potential enemies." This has been done time and time again throughout the history of the Republic.

In my discussion of this matter before the Committee on Foreign Relations, I asked that a memorandum be prepared by the staff—and it will be prepared—to go back to World War II. In the midst of that war, the Secretary of State appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations time and time again to report, through the committee, to the people of this country in regard to the questions that the members of the committee submitted to the Secretary of State.

So far as I am concerned, this is a challenge to representative government that has been laid down by the Secretary of State. He happens to be an officer of the President of the United States, and therefore the American people are entitled to find out from the President whether he will stand by and permit a member of the Cabinet to flaunt what I consider to be the very basis of our system of representative government. Representative government does not mean government by executive supremacy. It does not mean that the Government be at the whim of the Secretary of State. The American people need to see to it that these checks are maintained in their own national interest.

If any Senator in a public hearing with the Secretary of State in any way violates his prerogatives, there will be other members of the committee to proceed at once to protect the public interest.

But the issue is simple as far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned: whether or not we have reached the point in this country where the representative of the executive branch of Government can, in effect, tell the Congress of the United States or a legislative committee of the Congress of the United States that there is a hot place to which it can go, although he does not engage in those semantics. There is no question about what we are being told by the Secretary of State.

In my judgment he should be either required by the President to come before the legislative committee in a public hearing to respond to the questions that the committee puts to him, or we should have a new Secretary of State. I believe we should have had a new Secretary of State a long time ago. If that had been the case, in my opinion we would not be involved in the way in which we are already involved.

All this Secretary of State is doing, in effect, is continuing the policies of a John Foster Dulles. Do not forget he was one of the associates of John Foster Dulles. History will record that what John Foster Dulles was seeking to do was to put us in a permanent military posture in Asia. That is where this mass retaliation policy came from. That Secretary of State wanted to involve us in the Indochina war.

With respect to all of this talk and State Department propaganda about containing China, we cannot contain China in the sense that the Secretary of State is talking about, because if you are going to contain China, according to the Rusk theory, you are going to contain her militarily.

I want to warn the American people before it is too late that we cannot police Asia or set ourselves up as the military policeman of Asia, for we will isolate the rest of the world against us. The rest of the world knows what it will lead to eventually: war with China. If she moves against us in Asia we will have to have the manpower to meet her in Asia, and you will not do it with nuclear bombing because that will not only endanger a nuclear war but also nuclear bombing in Asia will endanger hundreds of thousands and hundreds of thousands of Americans in the United States.

That is why I have pointed out on this floor that we had better talk to the physicists and nuclear scientists. If you drop a hydrogen bomb today on Peking, it is only a matter of not so many hours before that fallout hits the west coast, and some say it could go all the way to the Middle East, beyond Chicago, with the devastating loss of lives. That is my answer to the hydrogen bomb boys.

With respect to these super-hawks, who think what we should do, irrespective of the morality or immorality, is to bomb China, what are we thinking of? What has happened to us that we have developed this lack of responsibility?

I would think that, when these hawks walk into their churches on Sundays, their church pews would melt under them because of the course of action they are advocating with regard to the immoral course of action they urge us to follow in respect to the crisis in Vietnam.

I wish to thank the Senator from Indiana for laying it on the line again and making perfectly clear that we have to stand up and be counted in support of a continuation of our system of representative government. You do not have this system of representative government if you permit any Cabinet officer—and he is the only one that I know of—to take this position and to say to the Senate, "I will not appear in public hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations." He is willing to appear before press conferences. Of course, he is not subject there to the questioning of Senators. He is willing to appear where he thinks he can run the show.

He has always been dealt with courteously, and he should be dealt with courteously and with propriety before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I hope my President will make clear to the Secretary of State without further delay that, when the Committee on Foreign Relations asks him to come before it and testify in public, that is where he will be.

I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his eloquent statement.

The whole question here presented by the Secretary of State is a question of oversimplification on his part. He wants to oversimplify everything in the record. He has said that it is a matter of detail.

I think it is obvious from Secretary Rusk's record of the past, and his recent statements that he is afflicted with a kind of Sinophobia. It is obvious that he is structuring and shaping our policy with all its massive consequences in terms of his Sinophobia.

I grant that China is a problem for the United States, but it will take the best and most careful analysis and policy planning; not the easy psychological warfare that he is trying to hand out when he has his own klieg lights, and yet refuses to appear before the committee of which the Senator from Oregon is a member.

I ask that the Senator from Oregon transmit to the committee of which he is a member, and to the chairman, the urgency that the constitutional requirements of the Secretary of State, as the representative of the President, to appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations should be insisted upon forthwith.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Committee on Foreign Relations is already aware of the point of view that the Senator from Indiana has expressed.

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2515) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss now the pending bill before the Senate, the Redwood National Park bill. I wish to express, as a Senator from the Pacific Northwest, my very deep appreciation and thanks to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] for the introduction of this bill. I wish to say to both of them that I think it will become one of the legislative monuments, for your record in the Senate will remain known in American history for a long time to come because this is a sound conservation program in the best sense of the word conservation.

I rise only to associate myself with your objectives, and this is not the first time we have all stood together on sound conservation programs. I think what you are doing here will be remembered by future generations of American boys and girls as they are allowed to enjoy the great cathedral which you propose by this legislation to set up.

Therefore, I say, Mr. President, that I think this is long-overdue legislation which proposes to create a cathedral to the Lord out of one of His most magnificent wonders.

I regret that some segments of the timber industry oppose this vital bill. Coming from the State which leads America in the production of forest products, political discretion should dictate that I oppose this bill. I would not be true to my trust if I did not support this legislation. It has my full support with one exception—the exchange provision—which I shall discuss shortly.

I shall not detain the Senate long, but because of the importance of the forest products industry and forestry in Oregon, certain compelling facts of life need to be stated.

Since I have been in the Senate I have championed increased expenditures for access roads, stepped up reforestation and timber stand improvement, tree genetic research, forest insect and disease control actions, forest fire control, research and practical applications of aerial and helicopter logging, plus efforts to expand forest products research as an aid to increased forest utilization.

The forest has great commercial utility and we have an obligation to go into the forest on a sane and scientific basis to extract its crop of wood. I am proud of my constant support for sound commercial use of the forest resource.

But the forest has uses and values other than timber. Therefore, I have urged and supported activities to protect the clear water the forests nurture and yield, the wildlife and fish they produce, and the great recreation, wilderness and esthetic values our forests possess.

Foresters—and it is the Forest Service that has led, starting with Gifford Pinchot—foresters have devised two great concepts of conservation management—multiple use and sustained yield. Fifty years ago and even less, commercial timber men opposed these concepts. Today, more and more timber companies embrace them.

Our great public forests—the national forests and the other public forests such as the Interior Department's O. & C. lands in Oregon, have long been under sustained yield and multiple use.

There are some, however, who have urged stepping up the public forest's allowable cuts beyond the sustained yield presently obtainable at current levels of knowledge.

I think it is time, however, that we in the Congress who have established under law in our national forests these proven policies of sustained yield and multiple use, recognize what we have really licensed. We have licensed a policy of perpetual yield but this does not mean, in my State of Oregon for example, replacing the giant 400-year-old Douglas-fir that is 6 or 8 feet in diameter and over 200 feet tall with a tree of like size. No indeed—we are replacing these trees with young, fast-growing forests that will be harvested when the tree is 70 to 90 years old and maybe 20 inches in diameter.

The significance of this fact is that we are going to preserve—and I use that word advisedly—we are going to preserve the forest primeval, nature's forest—God's forest—only through the concept of publicly supported multiple use in the public's national forests or in our national parks.

It simply cannot be expected that the commercial timber companies can apply the concept of sustained yield on an economic basis to grow and maintain a 400-year-old Douglas-fir or an 800-year or 1,000-year-old redwood.

It is being done in the national forests only under the concept of multiple use—by setting land aside in wilderness, in natural areas, in research plots, or in scenic strips where these great old trees are kept under careful supervision.

With the public forests committed to sustained yield under shorter harvest cycles, any careful examination of the commercial private forests that are also under sustained yield will show that they to are on this same shorter commercial harvest basis.

I have been deluged with pronouncements that the private redwood forests are managed on the sustained yield principle, and perhaps they are, but I want to make it clear that the senior Senator from Oregon who supports sustained yield for public and private commercial forests knows just what it is.

Redwoods extend from a small volume in Curry County, Oreg., along the Pacific coast to just south of San Francisco. In a century they have been logged so extensively that they are threatened with extinction not as a species but as natural examples in their ecological community of one of the Lord's great gifts to man—the giant redwood forest.

For my part, I do not want to see these magnificent redwood trees cut for patio furniture.

The giant redwoods we preserve now are the only ones that will be preserved. Even if the entire redwood industry goes on a sustained yield program, and it is not, it will not be growing these legendary giants that our generation has inherited.

The case for this bill is overwhelming. We have so few tracts of primeval redwoods left. Its passage will in no real substantial way diminish the availability of prime timber-growing forest land which can be made to produce crop after crop of useful wood in 70- to 90-year cycles.

We do not have to gut the redwood forest, to bespoil the redwood forest land in California, in order to assure an adequate lumber supply for the future.

In my judgment, the committee has produced a bill with a reasonable acreage of prime old growth redwoods in a setting that will assure that both their esthetic and scientific values will be preserved for every generation that will follow. The committee has made a reasonable compromise of the commercial interest, the profit motive, and the public interest.

ONE AMENDMENT NEEDED

I support the amendment of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], which would strike out on lines 19 through 21 on page 3 the words: "or any federally owned property he may designate within the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit in Del Norte County, California."

For my part, I would prefer that the bill had no timberland exchange opportunities whatsoever in it. Exchanges of public timberland now under sustained yield management on lands under the Secretary of the Interior's jurisdiction are not planned if policy enunciations made earlier by the present Secretary of the Interior remain.

Let me digress here to say—which I shall point out in greater detail later—that we have had every reason to believe that the Bureau of the Budget was against land exchanges, and we have every reason to believe that the Secretary of the Interior has been on record against land exchanges in this area. I assume that the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of State do not speak without administration approval. In considering this bill, I do not think that we should make the mistake of underwriting land exchanges. It has been one of the most difficult, one of the hardest, and one of the toughest issues which has confronted us for years in the Senate in regard to the conservation of our natural resources.

I have been criticized in my State, from time to time, because I have stood adamantly against land exchanges, at least the kind of land exchanges which have been proposed to date. I am very wary, let me say, of the land exchange provision to which I have just referred on page 3 of the bill, and I hope that when the Anderson amendment comes before the Senate to strike the land exchange provision from the bill, it will receive a substantial majority vote in the Senate.

But if we do not adopt the Anderson amendment then the Secretary of the Interior, by inference, will have had weakened his policy of nonexchange in the sustained yield managed BLM forest lands in California and elsewhere. In California, according to "Public Land Statistics," the Bureau of Land Management has 465,000 acres of commercial forest land with a standing volume of 6.6 billion board feet of timber and an annual producing capacity of 66 million board feet of timber.

Mr. President, in my research in the preparation of this speech, I have prepared a table that sets forth the public domain forest land in California in comparison with the public domain forest land in other States.

The major States are: Alaska, California, Colorado, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon-eastern, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Oregon-western. The Oregon-western includes O. & C. land, Coos Bay, wagon-road lands, and public domain lands. The source of my material is public lands, USDI, BLM statistics.

The tables estimate the area of production capacity of forest woodland administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Acres	Standing volume (thousand board feet)	Annual producing capacity (thousand board feet)
Alaska	40,000,000	180,000,000	1,500,000
California	465,104	6,620,940	66,000
Colorado	603,530	2,097,000	14,850
Idaho	301,883	2,349,385	40,966
Minnesota	30,523	61,064	1,221
Montana	648,000	1,159,000	23,900
Nevada	50,000	250,000	2,500
New Mexico	76,748	218,732	2,302
Oregon (eastern)	153,140	623,371	10,363
Utah	634,500	1,900,000	6,000
Washington	103,930	687,000	6,600
Wyoming	429,990	1,125,000	22,700
Oregon (western)[1]	2,176,538	54,953,770	1,127,000

[1] Includes O. & C. lands, Coos Bay Wagon Road lands, and public domain lands.

Source: Public land statistics, U.S.D.I., BLM, table 65, "Estimated Area and Producing Capacity of Forest and Woodlands Administered by Bureau of Land Management."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to point out, and I think my colleagues will find the statistics interesting, that although California has 465,102 acres of public domain in forest land, Alaska has 40 million forest acres.

Colorado 603,530.

Idaho 301,883.

Montana, 648,000 acres.

Oregon, eastern—just the eastern part of my State—has 153,140 forested acres. The western part of my State has 2,176,538 forest acres, both O. & C. and public domain.

I think 52 percent of my State is owned by the Federal Government, which gives the Senate, I hope, some conception of how important the handling of the public domain is to the welfare of the people of my State.

Utah has 632,500 forested public domain acres.

The State of Washington has 103,930 forested public domain acres.

Wyoming has 429,990 acres.

So let the record show that the statistics in relation to the public domain forest lands are important not only to California, with its 465,102 acres, but to every other State. That is why I think we need to consider very carefully and review very carefully the provisions of this bill to see that we do not establish a precedent by authorizing a type of land exchange that, in my judgment, will prove to be a great detriment to the maintenance and future of a sustained yield program and a detriment to maintaining in the future a control over the forest lands of this country by the Govment for the benefit of all the people, from coast to coast.

I say this most respectfully. I say it with respect to the timberlands in my State. The Federal timberlands in my State are now owned by the people of my State. We happen to have a special responsibility of trusteeship in relation to them, but those lands are owned by the people of this country, the people in Maine as well as the people in Oregon. That is true of California. That is true of the redwoods. In fact, may I say that if one accepts the basic premise of my whole record of my years here in the Senate vis-a-vis this matter of protecting our natural resources, I repeat it again today, each generation is but the trustee of God's gift of these natural resources to our country. We have no right to despoil them, and we have no right to take the attitude that we own them in fee simple title in the sense that we can do anything we want to do with them.

I believe we labor under a mandate of future generations for hundreds of years to come and that if we are to keep our obligation to that mandate or that trusteeship, then we will not follow a course of action that will permit the gutting of these redwoods, despoiling them by cutting them down for profit dollars.

I hope there are things more valuable than dollars. I happen to think that the redwoods are much, much more valuable to future generations than any profit that powerful lumber companies want to make now, as they have brought pressure to bear on the Senate either in opposition to the Jackson-Kuchel bill, or in a proposal to modify the Jackson-Kuchel bill so that irreparable damage will be done to the trusteeship concept for which I have argued so many years in the Senate.

As I understand the policies of the Department of the Interior under classification and multiple use legislation applicable to the public domain, enacted by the Congress in 1964, the Secretary may not proceed to dispose of public land unless it is classified; after a proper public hearing is held; due regard is given to valid public views, and positive findings are made.

If I am incorrect as to the policy set forth by Congress and the policy of the Secretary of the Interior, then, in my judgment, legislative history ought to be made now that the language in the first part of this sentence does not diminish the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior to retain in public ownership timberland under sustained yield management.

Mr. President, do not forget what would happen under a land exchange program if you did not watch all the time. As we provide for a land exchange program, the land that is taken in by the private company is taken out of sustained yield. Do not forget, the public domain now is under sustained yield. Mr. President, you should be surprised by how many requests I get each year from lumber groups in my State trying to get me to go along either with a sale of public land or the exchange of private land for public land. Always, the land they want to exchange has been depleted. They want to get the timber land, for which, if the exchange were allowed, they would exchange a lot of cut-over land for a much smaller acreage of timber land. But what they are seeking is to get that timber land out from under sustained yield and make their profit killing now, mow it down, leave the hillside scarred, and increase our problems with respect to protection of our natural resources, create problems of erosion, and create problems of floods as a result of the removal of the trees so essential to holding back the water that is necessary in a river basin.

No, Mr. President, this is an old, old story. It involves exactly the same farseeing purposes of Gifford Pinchot, who was really the founding father of the whole development of the type of conservation I am pleading for once again on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. That is why I think it is so important that the Anderson amendment be adopted in opposition to the land-exchange provision of the bill which I have been arguing against for the last few minutes.

So far as I am concerned, I would prefer that we make it clear by adding to the Bureau of Land Management provision language which clearly indicates that the exchange must be in the broad public interest. That has been our policy up to now. It is one of the criteria. I do not believe it was eliminated from the language of the bill by design. I know the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] too well. I am only pointing out that the language I shall suggest eventually by way of an amendment—not at the present moment, but I am serving notice now—should meet the broad public interest criterion which is written into the Anderson amendment.

Turning to the language on page 3, lines 19 through 21, and line 25 on page 3 through line 3 on page 4, I would like to remind Senators that a controversy arose in my State in 1965 over the very idea of the Bureau of Land Management's possibly entertaining an exchange on some sustained yield public domain timberland in Oregon to aid in the creation of the Point Reyes National Seashore in California.

I shall not discuss the side issues and charges that were disseminated in my State. Suffice it to say that the fact that the Secretary of the Interior and his subordinates were even exploring the possibility of considering a change authorized by the Point Reyes law was sufficient to create a controversy in Oregon.

The underlying issue was that those Oregon public domain lands were and are under sustained-yield forest management. This policy has the support of the rank and file of the lumber industry, the men and women on every Main Street in Oregon, and the children in the schools of my State as they study conservation policy.

If these lands were traded at fair value in aid of creating a park, they would no longer be under sustained-yield management. The timber could be cut off and the land not restored to sustained-yield productivity. So no matter what the purpose, the people of my State want these public forest lands kept under sustained-yield management. The mills and communities that have grown to depend on these great public domain and O. & C. and national forest lands want the land well managed and the timber placed on the market for bidding under good forestry practices and under sound sustained yield principles. They have seen the private forests cut over and cut out. They know many private forest holdings sporting the Tree Farm sign are still under a liquidation cutting. They want the public forests to be a never-ending reservoir of wood flowing to the mills under sustained yield. Even more, they want the multiple benefits the sound conservation policies of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management have produced.

The committee report has done its best to argue that these 14,567 national forest acres in California are different and do not amount to much, and thus trading them to these companies is of small moment.

In my judgment, the committee report does not make its case when compared with the positions of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget.

Turning specifically to the northern redwood purchase unit, these national forest lands are capable of producing 20 million board feet annually—forever. In the past few years, over 10 separate sales were made to local lumbermen, and more than 30 timber operators bid on this timber.

If this timber is bartered away under the provisions of subsection 3(b), valuable public timber resources—belonging to all Americans—will be granted to a privileged few. This proposal will not create new jobs. While the privileged operators keep their men at work, other local operators will lose their long accustomed opportunity to bid on this timber, and the jobs it now supports. The end result, allowable cut from the national forests will be down 20 million feet.

Also, Del Norte County will lose an important source of income, which has produced an annual average of $150,000 to $200,000 in recent years for local government use.

And what worries me most is that this "payment-in-kind" would be an open invitation to those who would carve up our national forests and other Federal forests piece by piece for the sake of commercial exploitation.

I want to make it clear that I favor the Redwood National Park. The demand for recreation lands is growing more and more intense each year. New public recreation areas are going to be created to meet this demand. If we authorize exchange of the redwood purchase unit in aid of the redwood park, we expose all our public forests to grave danger as each new special Federal area is considered if it uses private land.

The trouble is, the demand for all the resources on the Federal force is increasing apace with recreation demand. The price we pay for a payment-in-kind is an inability to meet these increasing multiple-use demands. The national forests are multiple-use lands. Trading off the timberland of the northern redwood purchase unit is trading off watershed, wildlife habitat, and recreation land for a limited and special purpose—timber production.

In my judgment failure to adopt the Anderson amendment will provoke controversy that will attend every step of a proposed exchange. Demands will be made that the terms of appraisal be examined minutely. Protesting operators will show that they would provide just as many jobs, pay full value for the timber which would be cut under sustained yield; that the payments to the counties from this 14,567 acres of national forests will be beneficial.

First, on lines 19 through 21 the Secretary of Agriculture is deprived of any decision regarding the value or public interest aspect of exchanging these national forests land because the authority of the bill turns these lands over to the Secretary of the Interior for their disposal through exchange. The Secretary of the Interior may dispose of all or a part of these 14,567 acres and thus as soon as an exchange application is filed on the lands, all new timber sales must be stopped while the exchange is decided.

Even worse is the sentence starting on line 25 of page 3 through line 3, page 4 which reads:

> Through the exercise of his (the Secretary of the Interior's) exchange authority, the Secretary shall, to the extent possible, minimize economic dislocation and the disruption of the grantor's commercial operation.

Mr. President, I think this language sets new and untested standards for an exchange. Heretofore, on national forest exchanges the Secretary of Agriculture has had to make a finding that the granting of the Government lands and acquiring of the private lands was in the public interest. There, the public comes in for protection. This language junks these concepts, and introduces a new and I think very poor standard, directing the Secretary to be guided by minimizing "economic dislocations and disruption of the grantor's commercial operation."

No mention is made of the economic dislocation and disruption that will occur to those firms, including small operators, now dependent on the national forest timber harvested from these 14,567 acres.

As my fellow Senators know, I have been greatly concerned about these small operators over the years. Little town after little town in my State is dependent for its economic sustenance upon a small lumbermill that employs its manpower. Those small mills are constantly confronted with the problem of being outbid by the lumber giants.

So, some years ago, the Morse-Murray set-aside bill was passed by Congress. It has been used rather extensively in the State of Washington until recently.

Unfortunately, the regional officials of the Forest Service had not warmed up to it in the State of Oregon. Now there is great interest in it. In fact, the Forest Service, in recent weeks, has made clear that in one section of my State, they are going to set aside certain tracts, limited to the bidding of small mill operators.

Mr. President, this is all embedded in the general overall forest problem to which we ought to give some thought in the debate on this bill. I think it is very important that we keep in mind that in California, there are some small mill operators who are going to lose out, as far as their protection under a sustained yield program is concerned if we provide for a land exchange with the different type of criteria that, in my judgment, is involved in the language that is used in this bill.

I think one of the great benefits of the Anderson amendment is that, not as one of its indirect results but as one of its direct results, it will give the small mill operators in that area of California a protection to which they are entitled.

Most alarming is the sentence starting on line 25 of page 3 through line 3, page 4 which reads:

> Through the exercise of his (the Secretary of the Interior's) exchange authority, the Secretary shall, to the extent possible, minimize economic dislocation and the disruption of the grantor's commercial operation.

This language sets new and untested standards for an exchange. Heretofore on national forest exchanges the Secretary of Agriculture has had to make a finding that the granting of the Government lands and acquiring of the private lands was in the public interest. This language junks these concepts and introduces a new and very poor standard directing the Secretary to be guided by minimizing "economic dislocations and disruption of the grantors commercial operation."

No mention is made of the economic dislocation and disruption that will occur to those firms, including small operators, now dependent on the national forest timber harvested from these 14,567 acres.

This language puts a shotgun to the head of the Secretary of the Interior to make an exchange guided by the needs of the party acquiring the land. There is not one word about the public interest as a criterion.

If one examines the National Forest Exchange Act (16 U.S.C. 485) and the Bureau of Land Management exchange authority (43 U.S.C. 315g), he will see each starts out "When the public interest will be benefited."

This is too precious a provision to be set aside. The provisions in the bill in effect classify the national forest land for disposal. In the process they reach out and abrogate the policy governing other BLM forest lands managed by the Secretary of the Interior in California that may be sought for exchange under the redwood bill by setting up these new criteria. The language is so inclusive that in any exchange involving either forested or nonforested BLM land or any part of the 14,567 Forest Service acres, the proponent of any exchange can argue that the Secretary must be guided by the concept of minimizing the grantor's economic dislocation and disruption of his commercial operation.

So this is not restricted language with a limited impact. It sets a new and a very poor standard upon which the Secretary of the Interior will be directed to preside over the liquidation of 14,567 acres of sustained-yield national forest which was purchased with taxpayers' money. Even more, it reaches out to affect the equally valuable public domain land that became subject to exchange under the redwood bill.

In my view this is a provision which will be used in more than this single case. Even if it were used only once, it is so disastrous in its dimensions that it ought to be rejected on those grounds alone.

In every State where our priceless national forests or public lands are located, it will bring forth requests for exceptional treatment adverse to the public's interest and welfare.

I think a bad precedent is being created by this bill. I do not think we shall be able to escape this precedent once we have set it up. What we should be doing is discouraging land exchange and not setting up a precedent that will be looked up as a breakthrough and encouragement of land exchange.

When the wild rivers bill was before the Senate on its first trip, I strove to eliminate all exchange. The manager of the bill, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] did not agree fully with my proposal, but I did have his support for eliminating exchanges on the O. & C. lands in Oregon. I also had his support for the sustained yield in the public lands because in that bill there was still the regular classification concept for public lands which carried with it the Secretary's responsibility to find that the proposal, if it applied to public lands, was in the public interest. And likewise the national forest exchanges authorized therein had the regular public interest tests. In addition, under the wild rivers bill the exchanges were optional and not directed toward destruction of a national forest unit.

I think it is time for the Congress to circumscribe these exchange provisions in park bills. Actually, the first bill with such provisions was the 1962 Point Reyes Act. It has been included in some other new park authorizations but always reasonably well circumscribed.

Now we see the cancer of a bad idea spreading. We are told that this intrusion into the great national forest system is unique. Cancer still is considered unique, but devastating. I agree that the intrusion is unique and it is disastrous, too, for by its terms it sets standards so adverse to the public interest as to constitute a policy that would have been rejected even in the free and easy public land days of 1849—the year California became a State and the Department of the Interior was created.

I urge the bill be at least amended to strike the appropriate language in lines 19 through 21 on page 3, and the last sentence of section 3b starting on page 3 line 25 through page 4 line 3 and to circumscribe the exchange of BLM land under sustained yield by adding this clause in line 18 after the word "California": "except property needed for public use and management."

In fact, I suspect the entire bill would be improved and much less of a headache later to the Senators from California if all of section 3(b) were struck.

We ought not to fool ourselves for 1 minute with the dollar cost argument which is advanced in favor of these exchanges and especially exchanges to be made under the instructions this bill provides.

You show me a land sale made at auction or sealed bid and compare it with a negotiated sale and I will show you taxpayer dollars lost.

In addition, before we go further in exchanges based on the notion that they are a cheaper way to acquire land than outright purchase, we ought to have before us the cost records of the agencies on the administrative and appraisal costs to negotiate these exchanges. Also, we would need to add the overhead costs of the Department and GAO investigations that have occurred when some of these exchanges wind up in controversy. In my judgment an examination of the record would show that these exchanges are far more costly than use of arm's-length purchases.

So, for the part of the case that rests on economy, I think the burden of proof needs to be made that this will save taxpayers' dollars. The taxpayers own these land assets. These are part of the capital assets of the United States. They belong to all the taxpayers. So any method of commercial disposal which does not produce the top dollar and costs more to administer ought to be rejected on economy grounds.

I do not want to condemn all exchanges. The 1962 forest exchange law was designed to adjust land boundaries, to facilitate and improve public forest administration, to produce savings over time.

The insertion of the exchange provision as written into the final Point Reyes Act, I think, was a most unfortunate step. That language did not have the precision of that in the most recent wild rivers bill. It was bottomed on the fallacious premise that Interior's public domain managed by BLM was at least in part still to be disposed of on the choice of an applicant. No doubt some of it will be disposed of that way.

In this way we retain the basic public interest tests and the classification procedure. We also keep out of the pub'ic lands and forests those who seek lands already classified for and dedicated to a public program.

We hold these exchange provisions to disposable lands placed in this category under orderly procedures. So rather than broaden these exchange provisions to sweep in the national forests, we ought to reverse the procedure. We ought to use the land and water conservation fund. It was just betting underway in 1962.

We ought to appropriate the money. Last year Interior realized far more than anticipated from its sale of offshore gas and oil. We can allocate a block of this windfall to conservation and preservation.

I wish to digress for a moment to pay my high regard to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for a bill he has introduced, which is in the legislative hopper, so to speak, which would do exactly what I have just indicated. It would provide that funds from the sale of offshore gas and oil would go into the land and water conservation fund.

As the Senator from Washington knows, earlier this afternoon, thinking I had a bright idea, I contemplated adding to this bill an amendment which applied to the very principle involved in the Senator's bill. I am sure he knows—in fact, I made it clear to him—that if I had done that, I would have given him the full credit for the idea; because the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is the initiator, the originator, and the first proponent of this program.

When my proposal was submitted to the Senator from Washington and to the staff of the committee, as he knows, I agreed that it should not be added to this bill, but that I would make the statement, I am now making, setting forth my complete support and approval of the Senator's bill. I would much prefer to have it handled as a separate bill. My concern is that time may run out, and we may find ourselves, by the time this session concludes, not in a position to take action on the bill. But we can do so next time. I believe it is wise that we make the record this afternoon as to the applicability of the principle of the Senator's bill to the fund to which I have alluded.

I am not offering the amendment. I told the Senator I would not offer the amendment. I would rather wait and come to his assistance when he brings his bill, as an independent bill, to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

(At this point, Mr. HOLLINGS assumed the chair.)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the able senior Senator from Oregon for his helpful comments.

I hope that our committee, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, will be able to take action on this matter some time after the first of the year. I certainly shall welcome the support and the help of the Senator from Oregon when the matter comes up on the floor. I believe it is a wise approach to dealing with problems involving acquisition of lands for public use and enjoyment, and I would hope that we could get the bill through the Senate next year.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Senator will succeed. The Senator has an unanswerable case in support of his bill. I believe it is only a matter of time before the Senator's bill will be the law of the land.

Mr. President, there is no idle Federal

money. Whether we sell off the national forests, allocate offshore oil revenues, or appropriate dollars, the cost to the American people is just as real. What counts is whether we have devised a procedure that gets the most land for the best cost—paid a fair price to the landowners and received value for the taxpayer.

I believe the redwood park is of such necessity to the unborn generations that we have an obligation to act now. Is this Nation so poor that it cannot act well and wisely? The redwood park has national support and so do the national forests. We should not trade away the golden ring of conservation to buy the diamond.

The distinguished chairman of the Senate Interior Committee [Mr. JACKSON] in association with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], taking cognizance of the increasing need of funding important conservation programs, introduced S. 1401, which would provide the additional funds necessary for acquisition, without exchanges. This measure has the widespread support of all conservation organizations.

I urge that expeditious action be taken on S. 1401. It represents a far better method of handling land acquisitions than does the exchange procedure. The chairman of the Senate Interior Committee has my assurance of support and all possible assistance in bringing about passage of S. 1401.

As Senator JACKSON, Senator KUCHEL, and all other Senators know, the senior Senator from Oregon has worked very closely with various conservation groups in this country for many years.

One of the men among many I could mention is C. R. Gutermuth, known to most of us as "Pink" Gutermuth, one of the most able legislative representatives of the Wildlife Management Institute. He is the vice president of that institute.

The incomparable conservationist, the president of the group, Ira N. Gabrielson, for years and years has made representations to us in Congress in connection with conservation. To me, he is the Gifford Pinchot of our time because of what he has done through his dedicated public service over the years. He has carried on the ideal and the vision, in a very inspiring fashion, of Gifford Pinchot.

Gabrielson and Gutermuth and other conservation leaders in the country have been my leaders, as I have sought to carry out the major objectives of their conservation program. I have consulted with them in connection with this bill, and I have received a great deal of assistance from them.

I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter of October 25, 1967, signed by the vice president of Wildlife Management Institute, Mr. Gutermuth, to all State directors of the Wildlife Management Institute. Every Member of the Senate knows that this nationwide organization has served as a watcher over the degree to which Congress does or does not carry out the trusteeship obligation to which I have referred in my speech. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., October 25, 1967.

To All State Directors:

The U.S. Senate, on Tuesday, October 31, is scheduled to consider S. 2515, a proposal to authorize a new Redwood National Park in California.

The park that would be created is a satisfactory compromise of earlier proposals. It is acceptable to the vast majority of conservationists throughout the country.

S. 2515 offers a serious threat to wildlife and outdoor recreation opportunity over the nation, however, in that it would force the U.S. Forest Service to relinquish lands it administers in northern California in exchange for private timberlands that would be taken for the new park.

This is the same kind of a proposition that was advocated by the timber interests in the 1950's when they launched their ill-fated raids on the national forests. You will recall that the House Government Operations Committee held that trades of national forest lands in support of unrelated federal programs are not in the public interest. The full House of Representatives firmly rejected another national forest grab in a decisive floor vote.

Should that kind of a trade be authorized in connection with the Redwood Park bill, it will open the doors for similar raids in all states in which national forests and grasslands are located.

Senatorial leaders who want to prevent this kind of an undesirable precedent are planning a floor fight to delete the national forest trade provision in S. 2515. The interest of your agency and of the hunters and other recreationists in your state quite obviously is involved. Many conservationists already are telling their Senators that they support the Redwood National Park, but that they want Congress to authorize the purchase of lands that are needed rather than trading off national forest lands.

Time is short; floor action is expected next Tuesday, the 31st.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Vice-President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I never take credit that is due elsewhere, and I think it only fair to these conservationists to point out that the thesis of my speech this afternoon dealing with that part in opposition to the land exchange is the result of a great deal of help that I have received from conservationists such as Mr. Gutermuth, such as Spencer Smith, and I could go on and give the Senate a list of conservationists whose names are well known to every Senator.

Mr. President, Mr. Gutermuth supplied me with a list of questions and answers, and I shall not take the time now to read them. In view of the fact that the vote on the bill will not be until tomorrow, and in the interest of the time factor, and so that I do not hold the Senate in session unduly long, I shall ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the list of questions and answers that Mr. Gutermuth supplied me and which Senators will see provided the considerable amount of data that I used in my speech this afternoon.

I did not use the material until I studied it carefully and convinced myself that it will stand up against all analysis. I think this great conservation group has performed a very valuable service to the entire Senate in putting in question and answer form their data dealing with the subject matter of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the questions and answers may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with an October 20 letter addressed to Senator AIKEN by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, and a press release of the American Forestry Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The material, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

Question: What would be the effect on other timber operators if the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit is turned over to four companies?

Answer: The provision in S. 2515 which would use National Forest land as trading stock to obtain National Park land would help four companies which already have substantial supplies of private timber to support their operations. It would deprive some 20 struggling firms of a competitive chance to survive.

Over the past several years, 10 different timber companies have purchased sale offerings. In doing so, they bid against over 20 other firms. The companies buying this timber are those who own little private timber, if any. They bid on the National Forest timber to survive.

The National Forest land is providing a cut of 20 million board feet per year. This yield is offered for competitive sale in units of various size. It is fully utilized by a number of timber companies. It would provide favored treatment to four out of many companies and interfere with competitive processes.

Question: What is the Forest Service estimate of the value of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit?

Answer: There has been no comprehensive appraisal of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit which would be useful in considering its value as Federal trade-off property to help pay for the proposed park. Nor has there been a comprehensive appraisal of the private lands which must be acquired. It is entirely speculative that a significant savings would result from this feature of S. 2515.

Those who conceived this idea must have visualized that an acre of National Forest land would buy an acre of private land. This is far from the case. Considering the superlative quality of the old-growth redwood needed for the park, its heavy volumes per acre, and its location—all compared to the National Forest resource in the purchase unit, it is possible that four acres of the Federal property would be needed to offset one acre of the private. Thus the 14,000 acres in the unit would buy something less than 3,500 acres in the park. This is not precise, but realistic.

For this very small benefit as compared to the total cost of the park proposal, we would be breaking faith with one of the cornerstones of American conservation. By using National Forest lands as trading stock in this important case, we would be setting a precedent for the breakup of the National Forest System all over the country.

Question: Is the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit used for recreation or other nontimber purposes?

Answer: The Northern Redwood Purchase

Unit supports an important part of the recreation use of the Six Rivers National Forest. Last year the Purchase Unit recreation use amounted to over 71,000 visitor days. This was more than one-fifth of the total for the National Forest.

Approximately one-half of this use involved the rivers and streams for boating and fishing. This fishing use (20,000 visitor days last year) is particularly dependent upon land management which will assure protection of the watersheds.

The Purchase Unit is also a significant part of the game range of the National Forest. Last year, it supported about 5,000 visitor days of hunting, 3,000 of which were for hunting blacktail deer.

Question: Is there any difference between the Northern Redwood National Forest Purchase Unit and any other unit of the National Forest System?

Answer: The public lands in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit were bought by the United States under the Weeks Law of March 1, 1911, to promote the production of timber, the regulation of stream flow, and other National Forest purposes. The Weeks Law provides that lands purchased under its provisions shall be permanently reserved, held, and administered as National Forest lands. The Northern Redwood Purchase Unit lands are therefore identical with other National Forest lands so far as purposes of management and the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to administer is concerned. Section 11 of the Weeks Law permits the Secretary of Agriculture to place lands acquired under that Act into a National Forest when he considers this timely.

Lands within this Purchase Unit, as all other purchased National Forest lands, differ from National Forest lands reserved from the public domain in that they are not subject to location and entry under the mining law. Minerals may be extracted under lease or permit.

Question: Why did the Forest Service stop buying lands within the Redwood Purchase Unit?

Answer: Purchases were started in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit about 1939. Funds allotted for these purchases were limited by the need for land acquisitions to further consolidate previously established National Forest purchase areas in the Eastern United States. World War II intervened while the purchase program in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit was in the process of getting fully underway. Funds for the purchase of land for National Forests purposes became virtually nonexistent during and after the war until the fiscal year of 1947. Subsequent to 1947, appropriations limited to as little as $50,000 or $75,000 per year prevented renewed purchasing activity in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit.

Question: Why was the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit never made a part of the adjacent National Forest?

Answer: Addition of the unit to the Six Rivers National Forest would operate to distribute the 25 percent share of receipts derived from the purchased land to several counties, thus substantially decreasing the net financial contributions National Forest lands make to the Del Norte County Government. Discussions which led to local approval for establishment of the purchase unit considered possibilities for these lands to give greatly needed assistance to meeting the costs of the county government as well as assistance to the local economy. Management of the purchased lands for these purposes has therefore always been considered a particular obligation by the Forest Service.

There appeared to be no particular advantage in designating this relatively small unit as an individual National Forest, though this has been considered from time to time. A suggestion in 1965 by the County Supervisors of Del Norte County that it be established as the "Redwood National Forest" was not acted upon by the Department of Agriculture because by then there was public discussion of establishing a Redwood National Park in California. It was not thought desirable to confuse the issue by establishing a Redwood National Forest.

Question: Why is there such a big hassle when there is no net loss in Federal lands? As the Committee points out, we are merely determining that a set acreage of Federal redwoods should be used for park purposes rather than for timber production.

Answer: The real issue is whether we are willing to sacrifice national forest lands for *other* Federal purposes. The national forests are permanently reserved for special purposes—purposes fully as important as national park purposes. And these purposes have proved their worth. Timber production is, of course, one of these purposes.

If we allow this to happen here, we take the chance it will happen elsewhere in the future—likely for other unrelated purposes such as reservoir or highway construction.

The direct answer to the question is *precedent*. We must provide full and permanent protection to the integrity of our national forests.

Question: To what extent has the forest industry recognized the research done by the Forest Service in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit?

Answer: The Redwood Experimental Forest was activated over 25 years ago for the purpose of developing new knowledge to assist forest land managers in maintaining and improving the redwood timber type. After activation, the Simpson Logging Company entered into a cooperative agreement for facilitating the redwood research program. The studies have emphasized problems of redwood regeneration and cultural treatments of redwood stands. The results of these studies are made available to the forest industry as they become available. There is strong interest in the research. Industries in the area make wide and continuing use of the findings.

OCTOBER 20, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: You will shortly be considering S. 2515, a new bill to establish a Redwood National Park. The Department of Agriculture actively supports the establishment of such a Park.

However, this Department vigorously and strongly objects to the feature of S. 2515 which would use National Forest land as trading stock to obtain land for the Park. This commandeering of the National Forest land in the Redwood Purchase Unit is not necessary in order for the Nation to have a Redwood Park.

Using National Forest land for trading stock in this important case endangers land administered by the Forest Service all over the country. It threatens the integrity of the National Forests, a principle of long-standing.

It would open the floodgates. Right now, and repeatedly in the past, there have been made demands in other parts of the country that National Forest lands be used to pay for parks, or for reservoirs, or for highway rights-of-way. Any and every instance of such a taking of National Forest land makes the later pressures that much harder to resist.

This is why past actions of Congress have resoundingly rejected use of National Forest land for this kind of trade-off.

There are other reasons for not appropriating these National Forest lands to pay for the Park:

1. Savings derived from trading off the National Forest land would be a small part of the total cost of the proposed Park. On an acre-for-acre basis, the value of the National Forest land in the Purchase Unit, estimated at $25 million, falls far short of the value of the old-growth groves proposed for inclusion in the Park. This is a very small sum to endanger a very basic principle of conservation.

2. The four main companies involved do not need the limited acreage of land that could be made available to them in order to continue operating for a significant number of years. The company that would experience the greatest impact could continue at its present rate of operation for 15 years or longer.

3. A move to make these companies partially whole would be at the cost of withdrawing supplies now used by smaller operators who buy the stumpage that would be transferred to the four larger, stronger companies. In recent years, 10 operators in the area have used the timber that this action would turn over to only four large companies. Thus, a trade-off of land would not create any new jobs. It would favor four large companies at the expense of 10 smaller ones.

A Redwood National Park is in the national interest. The USDA supports strongly that objective. But a raid on the National Forests and the establishment of a dangerous precedent in violation of longstanding, sound conservation principles is neither necessary nor wise.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

[A press release from the American Forestry Association, Washington, D.C.]

PRECEDENT-BREAKING TRADEOFF OF NATIONAL FOREST LAND IN CALIFORNIA WOULD OPEN FLOOD GATES NATIONALLY FOR SPECIAL INTERESTS AND LAND GRABBERS, AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION SAYS—ALL MEMBERS OF CONGRESS URGED TO DELETE PROPOSALS NOT CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC INTEREST

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 27.—The American Forestry Association today called on all Members of Congress to oppose a trade-off of National Forest land in California as a part of a proposed Redwood National Park package that would, if adopted, "open the flood gates to demands by all sorts of special interest and land grabbers."

In a letter to Senator George D. Aiken, of Vermont, copies of which were sent to all Members of Congress, AFA Chief Forester Kenneth B. Pomeroy said lawmakers should delete proposals in S. 2515, the Redwood National Park Bill, to use National Forest land in the Redwoods Purchase Unit as payment in kind for private lands desired for park purposes.

This Federal land, Mr. Pomeroy said, was acquired by the Forest Service under the Weeks Act of March 1, 1911, for the practice of multiple use, sustained yield forestry. It is being managed efficiently for that purpose. Trading this land for other land to be used as a park will defeat the purpose for which national forests are established, he said.

The annual harvests of timber from the Redwood Purchase Unit supports ten small lumber companies and their employees, Pomeroy said. One-quarter of the receipts from timber sales, a substantial sum, goes to Del Norte County in lieu of taxes. This 25 percent fund exceeds the amount of taxes received from comparable land in private ownership.

"It is clear that giving four large landowners this Forest Service Land will not benefit the local economy," Pomeroy said. "It merely aids four large companies at the expenses of ten small companies. Neither will such an exchange improve the tax base of Del Norte County."

But the mail of members of Congress is already reflecting the greatest concern of all, Pomeroy said. That is the precedent-breaking nature of a proposal that would have ramifications for National Forest land far beyond the borders of California and could lead to other trade-offs and give-aways of National

Forest lands that have served as models of efficient forest management for multiple use.

The American Forestry Association has supported the national effort to establish a Redwood National Park but the association, and allied conservation organizations, contend that the trade-off principle now poses a direct threat to the public interest everywhere in the United States, as well as in California.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also have been influenced in my thinking in regard to the bill in respect to the suggestions I have offered in my speech and in relation to the amendments I shall offer tomorrow—which I hope will not be considered very controversial—by a whole group of conservation organizations, which on October 27, 1967, sent a wire to President Johnson which reads as follows:

October 27, 1967.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

We support a Redwoods National Park and are looking to you to uphold the outstanding conservation record of your administration as well as long established policy that national forest lands of this country not be used as trading stock in support of unrelated Federal programs. Specifically, we are opposed to provisions in the current Redwood National Park bill which would exchange national forest lands for private timber lands. We can see no purpose in subordinating the broad public interest to the pressures of some California interests.

American Forestry Association, Kenneth Pomeroy, Chief Forester; Boone and Crockett Club, John E. Rhea, Conservation Committee Chairman; Izaak Walton League of America, Joseph W. Penfold, Conservation Director; National Rifle Association of America, Frank C. Daniel, Secretary; National Wildlife Federation, Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Director; North American Wildlife Foundation, C. R. Gutermuth, Secretary; Sport Fishing Institute, Philip A. Douglas, Executive Secretary, Wildlife Management Institute, Ira N. Gabrielson, President.

There was issued on October 27 a press release, the first sentences of which read as follows:

Washington, D.C., October 27.—National conservation leaders today expressed grave concern about a provision of the Senate's bill to create a new Redwood National Park in California.

That provision calls for the forced trade of land administered by the U.S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture for private timber holdings that lie within the park. If this trade is pushed through the Congress, the conservation leaders say, it would be a precedent and constitute a serious threat to national forests and other public lands such as wildlife refuges and national grasslands throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire press release be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington, D.C., October 27.—National conservation leaders today expressed grave concern about a provision of the Senate's bill to create a new Redwood National Park in California.

That provision calls for the forced trade of land administered by the U.S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture for private timber holdings that lie within the park. If this trade is pushed through the Congress, the conservation leaders say, it would be a precedent and constitute a serious threat to national forests and other public lands such as wildlife refuges and national grasslands throughout the country.

The leaders expressed surprise that the trade is being recommended by the Senate Interior Committee. The Administration is firmly on record against trading national forest lands in support of unrelated federal programs.

The House of Representatives in a record vote in 1953 and at later dates soundly defeated moves that would have given private interests this kind of preferential treatment. In 1959, the House Government Operations Committee held that such trades would set a "dangerous precedent" and that the fee transfer of national forest timberlands under sustained-yield management to specified timber operators would simply benefit the grantee at the expense of other users.

The Senate Committee's bill contains the same situation that the House Committee found unacceptable in 1959. These fundamental principles of protecting the people's interest in national forests and other managed public lands is still valid today, the conservationists say.

Speaking for the President on this subject, the Bureau of the Budget stated in a letter of June 22, 1967, to the Chairman of the Senate Interior Committee: "The Administration will not consider the transfer of fee title of Forest Service land on a barter basis, or as compensation in kind. . . ."

On July 13, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall wrote to Senator Clinton P. Anderson (D-N.M.): "President Johnson asked me to reply to your letter about the Redwood National Park proposal in which you urged that we not trade off national forest lands in an effort to establish a Redwood National Park. . . ."

"The position of the Administration is firm against the transfer of national forest lands to the State of California or to private lumber interests as a part of the Redwood National Park transactions. We feel this general principle must be upheld always.

"It has been the long-standing position of the Government, and I know you are in agreement with this, that the national forests should be maintained intact and that when private timberlands are needed by the Federal Government in the public interest, payment should be in cash and not in kind. I agree with this principle and you need have no concern on this point insofar as the Administration is concerned."

The national conservation leaders expressed their support of Udall's statement of the Administration's position in his letter to Senator Anderson.

The conservationists said they also endorsed fully Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman's statement in a letter of October 20 sent to Senators: "Using national forest lands for trading stock in this important case endangers land administered by the Forest Service all over the country. It threatens the integrity of the national forests, a principle of long standing.

"It would open the flood gates. Right now, and repeatedly in the past, there have been made demands in other parts of the country that national forest lands be used to pay for parks, or for reservoirs, or for highway rights-of-way. Any and every instance of such a taking of national forest land makes the later pressures that much harder to resist.

"This is why past actions of Congress have resoundingly rejected use of national forest lands for this kind of trade-off."

The conservationists said they are in full support of Senator Anderson's announced amendment to the Redwood Park bill, due for Senate consideration early next week. It would delete reference to the national forest lands. They say most of the nation's conservationists want the Congress to appropriate the necessary funds to buy the new park instead of trading off national forest lands.

In his comments on the Senate Committee's bill, Anderson, one-time chairman of the Committee and a widely respected conservation legislator, described the forced forest trade as a "kind of robbing Peter to pay Paul." Except for the trade of national forest lands, the conservationists said the Senate Committee's Redwood Park bill is much superior to the smaller park recommended earlier this year by the Administration. The Committee's park would be located where the best virgin redwoods are, the conservationists pointed out, and would save more acres of the big trees than would the Administration's plan. The conservationists have regularly supported an even larger park than that proposed by the Senate Committee, but said that the compromise bill is acceptable except for the suggestion that national forest lands be used as trading stock for the new park.

Such a trade, they say, would make national forest and other managed public lands vulnerable to trading everywhere they occur.

American Forestry Association, Kenneth B. Pomeroy, Chief Forester; Izaak Walton League of America, Joseph W. Penfold, Conservation Director; National Wildlife Federation, Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Secretary; Sport Fishing Institute, Philip A. Douglas, Executive Secretary; Wildlife Management Institute, Ira N. Gabrielson, President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, here again the record is clear that I have in my speech today simply associated myself with the viewpoint of these conservation leaders in respect of the land exchange provisions of the bill. I think they are right and that is why I have made clear that I am going to support the Anderson amendment.

Mr. President, I have two more items. Under date of July 13, 1967, Secretary Udall wrote a letter to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] and I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, July 13, 1967.

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Anderson: President Johnson asked me to reply to your letter about the Redwood National Park proposal in which you urged that we not trade off National Forest lands in an effort to establish a Redwood National Park.

There have been extensive discussions between State officials and representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. The subject you raise has been thoroughly aired. The position of the Administration is firm against the transfer of National Forest lands to the State of California or to private lumber interests as part of the Redwood National Park transactions. We feel this general principle must be upheld always.

It has been the long-standing position of the Government, and I know you are in agreement with this, that the National Forests should be maintained intact and that when private timberlands are needed by the Federal Government in the public interest, payment should be in cash and not in kind. I agree with this principle and you need have no concern on this point insofar as the Administration is concerned.

In this connection, you may be interested in the letter of June 22, 1967 to Senator Jackson from the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget which discusses this question in some detail and makes clear the Administration's position.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the letter sets forth some views of the Secretary of Interior that I think very pertinent to the discussion of the issues that I have raised in my speech.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to the President, dated June 26, 1967, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES,
June 26, 1967.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Partly due to the Dodd matter, the Senate has been upset on our schedules, and I am very much afraid we are going to be delayed considerably in passing all the appropriations bills and other needed legislation. One of my worries has been that in the final windup before the July 4 holiday we will miss careful action on the proposal for a Redwood National Park.

I have gone over the suggestions on some of these redwood proposals, and I appreciate the fact that you have had excellent advice. I know that Laurance Rockefeller has helped, and he is one of the most dedicated conservationists that I know. However, I am not sure that the Sierra Club members in and around the San Francisco Bay area have been agreeable to the trading suggestions which have been made.

My particular worry is that trading might create some precedents which would be hard to overturn and which I believe are undesirable. Apparently the State of California would be asked to turn over to the Federal Government for the redwood forest some 30,000 acres in two existing state parks. It seems to me that we ought to count the cost and see if the State of California has asked for too much in the final transaction.

I feel that the turning over of 30,000 acres of state land now in existing state parks must be balanced by pay from the Federal Government to the state. This arrangement would give the state an opportunity to drive a hard bargain. Governor Reagan is alert to this possibility and may have requests to exchange forest land which possibly should not be traded.

I know you are familiar with this whole situation and have asked many people to see what is involved. But my attention has been called to the fact that Governor Reagan submitted to Congressman Aspinall on May 3 a letter which sets forth the price demanded by the State of California. The Governor's letter, plus subsequent conversations, make it very clear he considers trading to California the 14,500 acres in the national forest Northern Redwood Purchase Unit as an essential part of the state price.

My fear is that the people who are trying to save the redwoods and want to create a fine national park might agree to trade off these national forest lands as part of the price of getting national park support from the state. I think that such a trade might tend to become a precedent for other forest lands to be used to pay for other national parks. People might want to swap forest lands for highways, for reservoirs, or to pay off Indian claims, and it might cause serious embarrassment if such requests should be made and the trades completed.

If we can say now that we would not trade forest lands for parks of any kind, then I think that we will be safer and the national interest would be protected.

I am not trying to say that this is a new position. A reservoir trade-off proposal was seriously advanced as H.R. 4646 in the 83rd Congress. It was defeated on the floor of the House. But we can find numerous instances where owners have been asked by letter to be repaid in kind for land needed for highway purposes.

I am not sure if this letter covers exactly what I am thinking. My main worry is that if national parks are to be created, they should be financed from private gifts and public money, but not by trade.

This letter has not been written to criticize anybody. I refer to Governor Reagan only because he is the Governor of California and has a responsibility to his citizens. His letter of May 3, 1967 to Congressman Wayne Aspinall says:

"We have developed eight general principles that we in California submit for your consideration with the hope that they will be incorporated into any final plan for a Redwood National Park."

Then Governor Reagan very properly lists his eight general principles; the second which is:

"Exchange in fee title of state park lands to be incorporated into a national park for currently-owned federal lands suitable for park and recreational purposes in our state system."

The third principle is:

"Exchange in fee title of privately-owned timberlands for like kind of property accomplished through negotiation rather than condemnation. Where cash transactions are necessary, the payment period for private property taken should ideally be funded in the minimum number of years required for maximum tax advantage."

I only suggest to you that the new principle of exchange can be harmful, I think, and I would watch it very carefully.

In 1949 I suggested what is now known as the Anderson-Mansfield Act by which I wanted to preserve the forests and protect them in any way I could. I want to continue that protection, but I feel that we could give too great a payment on an exchange basis. If we want to obtain the redwoods by trade we could make bad trades and hence be involved in a worse situation than in establishing these parks.

Let the park people come in with a proposal to acquire, not a proposal to trade. We may have to shrink the boundaries of the park because purchases could be too high. But we will be better off shrinking the boundaries than to start trading forest land from the Federal Government to the State of California. At least that is my feeling, and I hope your excellent advisors and helpers will count carefully the entire cost of the program. It is my desire that trading federal forest lands to states will not be supported.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is nothing privileged about this letter. It has received wide public dissemination, but it should be a part of the legislative record of this debate. The letter sets forth some of Senator ANDERSON's views in regard to some of the issues I have raised in my speech this afternoon.

I highly commend the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for not only the record he has made in connection with the pending legislation, but also for the great record he has made over the years as a Member of the Senate in his various capacities, including serving as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which position is now so ably filled also by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

I want the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] to know that any views that I have expressed about the bill this afternoon have not expressed the slightest degree of criticism, direct or indirect, of their leadership in connection with this bill.

Quite to the contrary, we have differences of opinion to a degree as to how best to carry out the objectives that the Senator from Washington and the Senator from California have in mind in relation to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to say as I close, as I said in the beginning of my speech, that I have nothing but the highest commendation for their leadership on this subject matter. I hope that tomorrow, after they have had an opportunity to scan at least, and their staff to analyze the points of view I have expressed in this speech, we might be able to come to an understanding at least in connection with some of my suggestions and find them acceptable to take to conference.

I have explained to the majority leader that I prefer not to offer my proposals in amendment form tonight but to offer them tomorrow when other Members of the Senate will have had an opportunity to scan my remarks, if they care to.

Mr. President, I am about to yield the floor, unless the Senator from Washington or the Senator from California wish to make inquiry of me.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my able friend yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oregon knows my feelings for him, my respect for him, and my respect for his leadership in conservation. I also realize that I would be hard put to persuade my friend to change his mind on the amendment. But I do want to say this, in all sincerity. I have lived with the problem of fashioning this bill for the greater part of three years. As my colleague knows, there have been all sorts of cross-currents involved in trying to fashion it. Even among good, sound conservationists whom the Senator and I both respect, there were divergencies of view as to park location, park size, and the merits of park acquisition. Under the leadership of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Parks, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], we finally became convinced, with the aid of our excellent staff on both sides, majority and minority, that the best way to proceed would be to attempt to concentrate on the acquisition of superlative old growth virgin redwoods, and that we should meet the fears of potential unemployment in the areas where the park would be located, by using this purchase unit which has been logged and which is being logged by private operators to acquire private land for the park by exchange.

Mr. President, when I introduced the bill recommended by the Save the Redwoods League and endorsed by the administration, it had in it a provision for "in lieu" payments by the Secretary of the Interior to the county of Del Norte. Those "in lieu" payments were to continue a number of years in an effort to cushion the economic shock which it was alleged would come to Del Norte County if, of a sudden, the areas in private lumber company hands were to be taken over by the Government for cash.

As my able friend knows, there were those on the committee and those in the Senate who opposed the idea of "in lieu" payments. One of the reasons which prompted us to use the purchase unit was that it became easier to reject the "in lieu" payment provisions if damage to the industry could be minimized through exchanges. We also realized that in these times, no matter how worthy—and this is a worthy project—no matter how worthy a national park project might be, it would be difficult to persuade some of our colleagues that $100 million should be expended in this fashion. By using the purchase unit, we would minimize the direct cost.

For these and other reasons, we fashioned the pending bill. I say that, leading up to the one point I am going to make to my friend—and it may not make a difference, but I do want him to consider it—that the pending bill is endorsed by the Save the Redwoods League which sponsored the other bill and is endorsed by the Sierra Club which has, over the years, devoted itself to the cause of a Redwood National Park.

In that connection, I inserted in the RECORD earlier, but I am going to reread, the words of the distinguished president of the Sierra Club, Dr. Edgar Wayburn, of San Francisco, on this very point:

> The key to the financing of the compromise bill of the Committee is use of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit, which the Federal Government now owns, on an exchange basis to acquire needed parkland.
>
> The unit itself does not lend itself to park management. The Committee felt, and we agree, that it makes good sense to phase out this abortive redwood program to enable the National Park program to succeed. No adverse precedent is intended as these lands are not regular forest lands and have never served their intended purpose.

I only say this, in that connection, to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, that the quotation from the president of the Sierra Club accurately reflects the intentions of those of us who sincerely believe that this bill in its present form may be the last hope we have of saving the redwoods, which the Senator from Oregon has so eloquently described.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Senator from California to know that his viewpoint on any matter always receives my very careful consideration.

I know the point of view of the president of the Sierra Club. I have studied that point of view. I have ended up finding myself convinced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the other conservationist groups whom I have quoted from extensively this afternoon. I am going to vote for the bill, whatever its final form is. I seek only to do what I think would perfect the bill. There we have a difference of opinion on policy.

As I stated at some length this afternoon, and will only mention now in a broad brush stroke, I think that one of the things I do not like about this, without the protection I have pleaded for, is the taking out of the sustained yield timber that would result. I think it should be part of the sustained yield. I think that is part of the conservation program. If I am correct in my facts, and I do not specify it in great detail, but if I am correct in my facts, the result of the exchange would be to reduce the ownership of this tract into a very limited number of new owners, whereas at the present time a series of small companies have access to this Federal timber. To me, that is a very important matter. But I want to assure the Senator that before I come to the floor of the Senate tomorrow, I am going to reexamine the position he has taken. I do not want to give him any false encouragement because I have studied this at such depth that I think there is really a policy problem here to which I do not want to make an exception.

I know he believes that no precedent will be established. Too many times in the Senate I have seen a claim made that no precedent would be established, but that it then became a precedent. I am talking about past experience. It would always be brought up again.

All I can say, as of tonight, is that I appreciate, as usual, the Senator's courtesy and fairness in debate when he disagrees with somebody. It is so typical of the Senator from California. His view deserves exactly what I told him I would give it. I will reexamine it and meet with my advisers again, including conservation advisers, and then cast my vote. If I were to vote this minute, I would vote for the Anderson amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the acting majority leader [Mr. BYRD of West Virginia], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] came over to my desk and restated an understanding that he is willing to enter into.

I do not have the amendment in written form, may I say to the Parliamentarian, but in my argument I urged the public interest criterion be written into the bill on page 3, line 18.

The Senator from Washington said that if I offered that amendment tonight, it would be acted on. I want to cooperate and get out of the way all the business that we can tonight.

The amendment would be on line 18, of page 3, after the word "California", to insert "except property needed for public use and management."

If the Parliamentarian will write out that language, I will repeat it for him: "except property needed for public use and management."

I understand the clerk has the amendment. I ask that the amendment be stated. I am ready for action on it. I have no more to say about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is temporarily laid aside.

The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, line 18, after "California" to insert a comma and the following language: "except property needed for public use and management,".

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have conferred with the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. KUCHEL]. We both agree that the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Oregon would improve the bill. We are, therefore, pleased to accept the amendment as proposed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to thank both Senators very much. I offered it only because I thought it improved the bill and would be helpful to the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time under the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, section 2 of S. 2515 indicates that the boundaries of the park shall be as generally depicted on drawing No. NP-RED-7112, dated October 1967, on file in the National Park Service offices. While it can be said that the sentence in section 2 which gives the Secretary of the Interior power to revise the boundaries from time to time would authorize him to revise the boundaries to include up to 64,000 acres of private land, that is, to draw boundaries so as to exclude the State parks, it is clearly the intention of the committee that the power of the Secretary is only to make minor adjustments in the plan depicted in the previously mentioned drawing.

The committee report on S. 2515 states on page 24:

> The purpose of the authority given the Secretary to revise boundaries, is to make relatively minor adjustments where necessary or desirable from the standpoint of administration or land acquisition. The Secretary is not authorized to depart from the general boundaries described in the bill to make major acquisitions which would change the character of the Park or the emphasis the committee has placed on various watersheds.

If there was confusion regarding this matter, I am sure that the report and this discussion clarify it beyond dispute.

On another question, concern has been expressed that the park boundaries, as presently drawn, will deprive some companies of access to timber holdings on the edge of the park. It is not the intention of the committee—and I speak as the ranking minority member—or the sponsors of the bill that logging be prohibited in areas outside of the boundaries, and we urge that the Secretary of the Interior, in administering the park, make every effort, consistent with the principles of sound park management, to allow timber companies reasonable access through park lands so that they may engage in economical logging outside of the park. This may involve transportation of logs over park roads, but this can, I believe, be done in a manner and at a time which will not interfere with good park management practices.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the committee, and for the benefit of the legislative history of the matter referred to by the able ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. KUCHEL], I will say that his understanding with respect to these two matters as stated is correct.

CUTTING MORATORIUM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on September 7, 1966, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. JACKSON] and I were privileged to announce that four major redwood companies, owning land within the boundaries of various redwood park proposals, had agreed to a 1-year moratorium on cutting that would jeopardize the park proposals.

I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the communications from the companies to the committee, and my statement announcing the moratorium, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the communications and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAGAN & MASON,
Washington, D.C., September 8, 1966.
Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: I have been authorized to advise you, on behalf of the Miller Redwood Company, as follows:

Our logging plans call for a seasonal move of our operation from the low, drier areas during the summer months, to the higher hill and mountain areas that are well drained in the winter months. This move was scheduled to take place this year, as every year, when the rainy season starts. However, out of deference to the President of the United States, and to you as Chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate, and to Congressman Wayne Aspinall as Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, we will immediately cease cutting down trees in the area near the alleged park-type Redwoods on the flats which are adjacent to the Jedediah Smith State Park. This is the area that has been indicated to be vital to any consideration of a park proposal as contemplated by S. 2962.

This will involve, at no cost to the Government, moving our operation to steeper areas containing smaller and non park-like trees, with a substantial amount of Douglas fir timber. This mixture of species should supply enough timber this winter to both the sawmill and veneer plant to enable us to keep our employees working. It should be emphasized that this timber can in no way be construed as park-type caliber. Before we would return to the controversial area noted above, we agree we will consult with both you and Congressman Aspinall.

During this winter season we intend—and again at no cost to the Government—to be moving toward the areas that are outside of the so-called Administration-proposed boundaries.

We believe this program will give Congress more than a sufficient time to deliberate the establishment and location of a Redwood National Park without in any way endangering the alleged park potential of this area—a potential, of course, which we do not agree with.

It does appear from the above advices that we are authorized to submit that the Miller Redwood Company has again evidenced an attempt to be cooperative.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM F. RAGAN,
Counsel for Miller Redwood Co.

NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., September 7, 1966.
Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: The President of the Arcata Redwood Company at Arcata, California, phoned me to give you the following message immediately:

"The Arcata Redwood Company is not now logging in the Redwood Creek Watershed and is agreeable to holding off operations in the area for one year pending further study of park alternatives. We are willing to discuss with you and other officials conditions pertaining to our property. This does not mean we are endorsing currently proposed park legislation. We consider the present California State Park system outstanding when the additional superlative trees now reserved for park purposes by various timber companies are add.—Howard A. Libbey, President, Arcata Redwood Company, Arcata, California."

This communication may be used as you see fit.

Sincerely,
RALPH D. HODGES, Jr.,
Vice President, Government Relations.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1966.
Senator HENRY JACKSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

It has been the longstanding policy of Georgia-Pacific Corp. that the special interests of the Corporation, its employees and their families must be sacrificed if the national interest requires it. We earnestly believe however that this national interest must be clearly established before such a sacrifice is required. Under pending Redwood National Park proposals Georgia-Pacific Corp. could lose as much as 75 percent of its timber reserves in the redwood region. This loss would jeopardize our entire industrial complex in Humboldt County representing 1,500 jobs and annual payroll of $8 million.

Our opposition to the further acquisition of privately held timberlands for Redwood Park purposes is a matter of record with you and the Congress. All of the parklike groves are already preserved in existing parks or are voluntarily set aside by industry awaiting public acquisition. Existing Redwood Parks are largely unused and undeveloped. Most of our Redwood Creek holdings are commercial timberlands which are unsuitable for national park purposes.

Nevertheless we recognize that some people believe it is in the public interest to establish a National Redwood Park on our land and that they are concerned our harvesting operations might impair the alleged parklike quality of the land pending congressional action. We wish to let you know Georgia-Pacific Corp. is and always has been willing to work out any reasonable adjustment in our harvesting program on our redwood lands in order to minimize cutting in proposed Redwood Park areas. We believe a 1-year period would give everyone sufficient time to study carefully the needs for more Redwood Parks and the suitability or unsuitability of our land for such parks.

GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORP.,
GRAY EVANS,
Vice President.

SIMPSON TIMBER CO.,
Seattle, Wash., September 8, 1966.
Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Simpson Timber Company is responsible for 2,000 employees and their families in the Redwood Region of Northern California. We are also a partner in the Crown Simpson Pulp Mill at Eureka, Calif. which will begin operating in October, providing an additional 500 jobs in supply and manufacturing of pulp from sawmill and plywood leftovers.

Our consideration of park expansion affecting lands which provide employment for our people must at all times protect their welfare, the needs of our national and international customers and our community obligations.

We believe that the preservation of redwood trees deserving of park status has substantially been accomplished through the creation of California's excellent state park system. We believe, also, that a redwood national park which would encompass superlative stands of redwood trees now being reserved for park purposes could be created in a manner which would make—not take—jobs.

We believe that a thorough and objective Congressional study of national park alternatives and the economic requirements of timber-dependent communities in the Redwood Region is essential.

To help provide a satisfactory environment for such a study, Simpson is agreeable to immediately discussing with appropriate officials conditions and procedures under which we will continue to defer harvesting timber in superlative stands of redwood trees critical to areas seriously being considered for inclusion in the national park system.

We assure you of our continued cooperation in the interests of an equitable solution to redwood park problems.

Sincerely,
DAVE JAMES,
Vice President, Public Affairs.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL

The public interest of the American people is well served today and the cause of sound conservation has been advanced. We are a little nearer to the creation of a Redwood National Park because of the voluntary action of the lumber industry. Congress may proceed next January to consider Redwood Park legislation. Meanwhile, the giant and ancient trees in the proposed park sites are in no danger.

Miller Redwood Company has agreed to stop cutting the redwoods from along the south boundary of the Jedediah Smith State Park. It will simply carry on its logging operations in other parts of its properties, which is all we sought at this time. It has agreed that until Congress has had a reasonable time to act on Redwood National Park legislation, it will not cut in the prime areas of aged virgin redwoods. It will not shut down during this period; no one will be out of a job.

To their great credit, the redwood companies which operate in the area proposed by the Sierra Club for a park have announced that they will voluntarily, and at no cost to the American people, adjust their cutting operations so that the park value of the Redwood Creek watershed will not be defaced pending action on a Redwood National Park bill. These companies are Georgia Pacific Corporation, Simpson Timber Company, and Arcata Redwood Company.

In its telegram to me this morning, Georgia-Pacific Corporation stated:

"It has been the long-standing policy of Georgia Pacific Corporation that the special interests of the Corporation, its employees and their families must be sacrificed if the national interest requires it." I salute it.

Miller-Rellim apparently will cut about 100 acres of what it describes as "non-park quality" trees this winter, but it has agreed to consult with the National Park Service on the location of this cutting. It has also agreed to consult with the Chairmen of the House and Senate Interior Committees before moving back into the prime stands about which I have been concerned over recent months.

As the Chairman has indicated, we can look toward early passage of a Redwood National Park bill in the next session of Congress. Areas of disagreement still exist on where and how big the park should be. The Save-the-Redwoods League, the National Audubon Society, the California Division of the Izak Walton League, the National Geographic Society, Mr. Laurence Rockefeller, and other distinguished conservationists favor the bill which I introduced on President Johnson's recommendation. Governor Brown of California also favors this bill. The good people of the Sierra Club and other conservation organizations favor a vastly larger park located in a different area.

I believe the national interest requires a great Redwood National Park for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people. I also believe that the national interest requires the conservation organizations of this country to set aside their differences and to agree on a park site which will do justice to the majesty of these centuries old trees, while protecting the timber-based life and economy of the north coast region of my State of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, late this summer, the chairman and I wired the four companies to request an extension of the moratorium. The companies agreed. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram, in which the chairman and I joined and the responses which we received from the companies, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams ordered to be printed in the Record, are as follows:

Senate Interior Committee,
August 30, 1967.

G. Gray Evans,
Vice President Georgia-Pacific Corp., Portland, Oreg.:
Harold A. Miller,
President Miller-Rellim Lumber Co., Portland, Oreg.:
Starr W. Reed
Vice President, Simpson Timber Co., Seattle, Wash.:
Robert O. Dehlendorf II,
President, Arcata National Corp., Palo Alto, Calif.:

We expect the Senate to act on a Redwoods National Park bill before adjournment of the Congress this year. Therefore, we request the continued cooperation of your company in extending, for the balance of this session of the Congress, the expiration date of the understanding reached with you last year affecting lumber operations in areas involved in pending park bills. Your continued forbearance in the public interest will be appreciated by this committee.

Henry M. Jackson,
Chairman,
Thomas H. Kuchel,
Ranking Minority Member, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Portland, Oreg.,
September 1, 1967.

Senator Thomas H. Kuchel,
Senator Henry M. Jackson:
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your wire asking extension of the understanding which we proposed on Sept. 7 last year for certain redwood timberlands, let me say that the terms of the understanding are imposing a burden. Continuance of this is not in the interest of good forest management. We are aware of the complexities of the problem but had hoped that a year would be sufficient time to decide if a need for more than the 140,000 acres of already preserved redwood lands even exists. We remain convinced that the lands involved in the understanding are not of Redwood Park quality, but we shall abide by our understanding for another 60 days as a reasonable length of time. This does not mean that at the end of the period the timber involved would be harvested. It simply means that intelligent management calculated to maintain redwood forests forever on all the land would be put back into effect. As your consideration of the matter proceeds, I hope you will consult us prior to making final decisions if any of our lands are involved.

Georgia Pacific Corp.,
R. B. Pamplin,
President.

Arcata, Calif.,
August 31, 1967.

Hon. Thomas Kuchel,
Hon. Henry M. Jackson,
Chairman, Senate Interior Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

This is in reply to your wire received today about Redwood Park legislation. Your attention is directed to a letter sent you Sept. 8, 1966 by Dave James vice president public affairs of Simpson Timber Co. in which Simpson agreed to continue to defer harvesting timber in superlative stands of redwood trees critical to areas seriously being considered for inclusion in the national park system. You will also recall a map submitted to the committee showing our logging plans in the areas under consideration in the public interest and in the interest of helping the Congress reach a carefully reasoned solution to the park issue. Simpson will continue to cooperate with Congress by refraining from harvesting timber in the areas being seriously considered until Congress adjourns this session.

Sincerely,

Starr W. Reed,
Vice President, Timberlands Simpson Timber Co.

Palo Alto, Calif.,
September 1, 1967.

Hon. Henry M. Jackson,
Chairman,
Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
Ranking Minority Member, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your telegraphic request of August 30, 1967, that our Arcata Redwood Company Division continue to refrain from logging in areas involved in all pending alternative park bills, please be advised of the following. For the balance of the first session of the ninetieth Congress, Arcata Redwood will continue not to extend logging operations into that property which lies west of U.S. Highway 101 nor into the main watershed of Redwood Creek which is bounded on the east by the Bald Hills county road and on the west by the main channel of Redwood Creek. This agreement is not of course, subject to the following exception that, in conformance with sound logging practices and established procedure, logging crews may be moved into such areas to remove timber felled or endangered by wind or fire should either event occur during this period of time.

In complying with your request for continued cooperation, we do so in the trust that the Federal Government, State of California, and the Redwood industry will soon be able to arrive at an equitable solution—a solution that strikes a sensible balance in terms of the total public interest. Such solution should not be at the expense of the present and future perpetual operation of any single company, the economy of the area and the livelihood of the people who are directly or indirectly dependent upon the industry's survival. These people more than anyone else deserve and will welcome an early resolution of this problem that has left them in a state of continuing uncertainty and anxiety.

C. Davis Weyerhaeuser,
Chairman of the Board.
Robert O. Dehlendorf,
President, Arcata National Corp.

Miller Redwood Co.,
Crescent City, Calif., August 30, 1967.

Hon. Henry M. Jackson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Jackson: As our Counsel has advised you by separate correspondence, this company is agreeable to continue the moratorium set forth in its letter of September 8, 1966. We do so in an attempt to continue to have a spirit of cooperation, particularly in light of the fact that your Committee is moving toward a resolution of the problem.

We of course cannot remain indefinitely in a state of moratorium since, as I am sure you are aware, it is quite a hardship on the company. However, before making any move into the so-called "controversial" area we would certainly consult with you and with Chairman Aspinall of the House Committee.

We hope this is satisfactory.

Yours very truly,

Harold A. Miller,
President.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, within the last 2 weeks the companies made a further announcement with respect to the moratorium. I ask that the text of an October 18, 1967, telegram from Mr. Starr Reed be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

October 18, 1967.

Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senate,
Washington D.C.:

Am authorized as chairman of Redwood Industry Land Committee to advise on behalf of Arcata National, Georgia-Pacific, Miller Redwood, Pacific Lumber and Simpson Timber that the companies will individually make every effort to withhold logging within boundaries of new Senate redwood park proposal S. 2515 pending investigation of impact and Senate consideration urge your assistance in obtaining postponement of Senate floor consideration while impact on companies, employees and communities is evaluated. There is no question but that

S. 2515 will eliminate at least one company and seriously affect others.

STARR REED,
Simpson Timber Co., Seattle.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I think I can say our hope is that with Senate passage of S. 2515 these companies can refrain from any cutting within the boundaries described in S. 2515 pending House action on the legislation. I am pleased to announce that the Arcata National Corp., parent corporation of the Arcata Redwood Co., which owns 12,500 acres of land within the boundaries set forth in S. 2515, has informed the chairman and me that it will not perform any logging operations within the boundary described in S. 2515, prior to the end of the second session of the 90th Congress, next year.

The American people should be grateful that this company, while opposing S. 2515, does so with due respect for the legislative process and the public interest, rather than ruthlessly carving up forest lands within the park boundaries to frustrate congressional efforts to create a park.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ELLENDER TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of morning business on tomorrow, the able senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] be recognized to speak on his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PERMANENT INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MEET DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE ON NOVEMBER 1, 2, AND 3

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], I ask unanimous consent that permission be given for the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations to meet during the sessions of the Senate on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, November 1, 2, and 3. The meetings are to be held in connection with hearings on riots and criminal and civil disorders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-689, appoints the following Senators as delegates to the North Atlantic Assembly, to be held at Brussels, Belgium, on November 20-25, 1967: Senators SPARKMAN, JACKSON, BAYH, MCINTYRE, MONDALE, JAVITS, COOPER, MUNDT, and HANSEN, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey and MONTOYA, alternates.

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in a statement on the floor of the Senate on October 10, I referred to a memorandum inserted in the RECORD on October 5 by both the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. The memorandum was entitled "Free World Assistance to Vietnam as of October 1, 1967."

I remarked on October 10 that neither the Senator from Wyoming nor the Senator from Texas had mentioned the source of the memorandum. I have now received a copy of the same memorandum which was issued under a Department of State letterhead. Perhaps the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas felt that the information would have more credibility if it was not identified as having originated in the Department of State. I hope that this was not their reason, for it would be a sad commentary on the reputation of this great Government department. In any case, to complete the historical record, I request unanimous consent that the first paragraph of the memorandum entitled "Free World Assistance to Vietnam as of October 1, 1967," including the Department of State letterhead, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The first paragraph of the State Department memorandum begins by stating:

> Thirty-one nations besides the United States are assisting Vietnam under the Free World Assistance Program. Six other countries not considered part of the FWA Program and the United Nations also assist, and promises of help have come from three other nations.

This statement is not entirely correct. It is true that at some point in time the countries listed in the State Department memorandum were assisting Vietnam. But all of the 31 nations mentioned in the memorandum are not now assisting in Vietnam under the free world assistance program and all of the six other countries listed in the memorandum, not considered part of the free world assistance program, are also not now assisting in Vietnam.

Mr. President, the Department of State has provided information which contradicts its own assertions that 37 nations "are assisting Vietnam." On October 9, I wrote Secretary of State Rusk and asked him several questions relating to free world assistance. I ask unanimous consent that my letter of October 9 and the reply from Assistant Secretary William B. Macomber, Jr., dated October 16, together with its enclosures, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The questions I asked Secretary Rusk were designed to elicit information on trade with North Vietnam by countries also assisting South Vietnam; the years in which assistance to Vietnam has been provided by certain countries—countries whose assistance has been modest, totaling $26,000 or less; and the dollar value of the assistance provided in calendar year 1967 by 26 of the countries listed in the State Department memorandum.

The material provided in the enclosures to Assistant Secretary Macomber's letter of October 16 shows that while the State Department memorandum inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas lists Brazil, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Turkey, Uruguay and Venezuela as countries "assisting Vietnam under the free world assistance program," in fact these countries did provide assistance in 1964 or 1965 or 1966 but they have not given one single dollar in 1967. As for the "six other countries not considered part of the FWA program and the United Nations," Ireland, Pakistan and Norway are shown as having given assistance in 1965 but not since.

On the face of it, I would think it logical to conclude that, at least in some cases, the countries which have given aid in the past, but are no longer providing assistance, view the war with increasing reserve and obviously wish to disassociate themselves from it.

I have inserted in the RECORD before, on both May 25 and October 10, a letter from Assistant Secretary Macomber dated May 15, the enclosure to which showed the dollar value of assistance provided by 30 countries under the free world assistance program during the period June 1964 through December 1966. I noted, in my remarks on the floor on October 10, that the assistance provided by 13 of these 30 countries totalled $26,000 or less for the two and a half year period. In considering the assistance to Vietnam from the other 11 countries—the countries which have given more than $26,000—it seems to me that it is necessary to look at their assistance in a somewhat broader context.

In the first place, three of these 11 countries—Brazil, Liberia, Venezuela—have apparently given no assistance in 1967.

In the second place, in many cases, assistance to South Vietnam is far less than the amount of trade with North Vietnam. According to the statistics provided in the enclosures to Assistant Secretary Macomber's letter of October 16, Japan's total two-way trade with North Vietnam in the period 1964 through 1966 was about 20 times the amount of Japan's assistance to South Vietnam during the same period, Italy's trade with North Vietnam was more than 10 times Italy's assistance to South Vietnam, New Zealand's trade with North Vietnam was about eight times its assistance to South Vietnam, the Netherland's trade with North Vietnam was more than three times Dutch assistance to South Vietnam and the United Kingdom's trade with North Vietnam was almost twice the amount of British assistance to South Vietnam.

In the third place, and to me this is the most important and disturbing factor, in many cases the assistance being given to South Vietnam seems disproportionately small when compared to the money being earned from the war in Vietnam. For example, Japan has provided a total of $2,250,000 worth of assistance to Vietnam in the period June 1964 through December 1966, according to the State Department. But at the same time, Japanese exports to South Vietnam—and most of these exports were either purchases by the U.S. Government or by the South Vietnamese Government with U.S. funds—totaled $138 million in 1966, compared to $36 million in 1965. And I have seen statements in the press, which I understand are accurate, that Japanese economists believe that Japan's exports in fiscal year 1967 to the United States, South Vietnam and other Southeast Asian nations directly related to the conflict will total between $1.4 and $1.7 billion.

According to Assistant Secretary Macomber's letter of May 15, assistance to Vietnam from the Republic of China totalled $775,000 in the period June 1964 through December 1966. Yet the Republic of China's exports to South Vietnam in 1966 totalled $89 million, compared to $50 million in 1965, and in addition, according to the Government of the Republic of China, that country is making about $1 million a month from expenditures by American soldiers on rest and rehabilitation leaves.

Mr. President, these countries are not the only ones whose economies are profiting greatly because of the war in Vietnam. South Korea's earnings in South Vietnam as a result of the war—from remittances from Korean soldiers and civilians in South Vietnam, from construction and service contracts and from commodity procurement—totalled $59,540,000 in 1966 and $83,583,000 in the first 8 months of 1967.

And Singapore, which apparently is not providing any assistance to South Vietnam, saw its exports to South Vietnam increase to $85.5 million in 1966, from $37.4 million in 1965, and it is estimated that Singapore's exports to South Vietnam in 1967 will be on the order of $95 million. In fact, South Vietnam has now displaced the United Kingdom as Singapore's second largest customer.

Mr. President, I said in the Senate on October 10 that the old proverb that one cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear seemed to me particularly applicable to the Department of State's claims regarding free world assistance to Vietnam. The facts are that very few countries are supporting us in Vietnam in any meaningful way and that most Asian countries are profiting from the war while we, and, of course, the South Vietnamese, do the spending and dying.

Mr. President, the bulletin of the Department of State to which I have reference is, I believe, the kind of official Government information which is responsible for the answers to the questions asked in the Gallup poll of October 25 which appeared in the Washington Post, on page 14.

The question was:

> Do you think the Johnson Administration is or is not telling the public all it should know about the war?

Twenty-one percent answered: "Yes, the administration is telling the facts." Seventy percent replied: "No, the administration is not telling the facts." Nine percent had no opinion.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the effort of the State Department to create the impression that there is widespread support for the war, on the basis of the countries listed in the bulletin is very misleading, to put it mildly.

EXHIBIT 1

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1967

Thirty-one nations besides the United States are assisting Viet-Nam under the Free World Assistance Program. Six other countries not considered part of the FWA program and the United Nations also assist, and promises of help have come from three other nations. Five Asian countries now have almost 60,000 troops on the ground in Viet-Nam. A detailed listing by geographic area follows:

FAR EAST

Australia

Australia is providing a wide and substantial range of aid to Viet-Nam under the Colombo Plan and by direct bilateral assistance. Economic aid since 1964 is valued at more than $10 million.

Military aid consists of:

1. Approximately 5,750 combat troops including a brigade and support, and a squadron of 8 Canberra bombers. In addition, they provide naval assistance and a guided missile destroyer.
2. 100 combat advisors (primarily specialists in jungle warfare).
3. A 73-man air force unit at Vung Tau with six Australian caribou planes which fly daily logistical transport missions in support of Vietnamese military forces.

Economic and technical assistance includes:

1. Three surgical teams, totaling 37 personnel, in 3 provincial hospitals. These teams, in addition to performing major operations, have established a blood bank and are giving lessons in nursing.
2. A group of civil engineers working on water supply and road construction projects.
3. Three experts in dairy and crop practices and radio techniques.
4. Training of 130 Vietnamese in Australia.
5. In goods and materials: 1,250,000 textbooks in Vietnamese for rural schools; 3,300 tons of corrugated roofing for Vietnamese military dependents' housing; 6 large community windmills; 15,750 sets of hand tools; 400 radio sets and 2,400 loud-speakers; 16,000 blankets and 14,000 cases of condensed milk.
6. A 55 kilowatt broadcasting station at Ban Me Thuot.

The Australian Government decided on February 1 to increase its non-military aid to Viet-Nam during FY 1967 to $2 million. This will permit substantial enlargement of current medical and civic action programs and the undertaking of new projects such as providing equipment for refugee resettlement centers.

Republic of China

The Republic of China has provided:

1. An 80-man agricultural team.
2. An 18-man military psychological warfare team.
3. A 34-man electrical power mission under the leadership of Taipower.
4. A 16-man surgical team.

China has also provided training for more than 200 Vietnamese in Taiwan. In the way of goods and materials, they have provided 26 aluminum prefabricated warehouses, agricultural tools, seeds and fertilizers, 500,000 copies of mathematics textbooks and an electrical power substation.

Japan

Japan has provided over $55 million worth of economic assistance to Viet-Nam, chiefly through reparations. Japan has sent two medical teams, considerable amounts of medical goods (4,544 cases), 20,000 transistor radios and 25 ambulances. It has provided technical personnel and funds for the construction of a large power dam across the Da Nhim River and electrical transmission line. A new medical aid agreement ($1.1 million) was signed in June 1967.

Korea

Korea has sent approximately 48,800 troops including:

1. 2 combat divisions and 1 combat brigade.
2. A 130-man Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH).
3. 10 military instructors in Korean karate for training Vietnamese military in hand-to-hand combat.
4. A 2,200-man Task Force Unit composed of the following elements: 1 Army engineer battalion, 1 Headquarters group, 1 Army Transportation company, 1 Marine Corps Engineer company, 1 Infantry battalion, 1 LST and 2 LSM's, 1 Composite Support unit (communications, medical supplies, etc.).

Korean military medical personnel are providing some medical care to the local population in areas where ROK troops are stationed. In addition, 7 civilian medical teams totaling 118 doctors, nurses and support personnel are working in provincial health programs.

Laos

One million kip ($4,167) for flood relief in 1965 and a small cash donation for refugees in 1966.

Malaysia

Since 1963, Malaysia has trained over 2,000 Vietnamese military and police officers. Groups of 30–60 are regularly sent for about a month's training in counterinsurgency with Malayan Police Special Constabulary. Malaysia has previously provided substantial amounts of counterinsurgency materials, primarily military and police transport such as armored vehicles. Medicines and relief supplies have also been donated.

New Zealand

New Zealand has sent an artillery battery and an infantry company (approximately 350 men) and provided a 25-man army engineer detachment.

In *non-military aid,* New Zealand has sent a 15-man surgical team, and a professor in English language for the University of Saigon. A second 16-man medical team will be sent to Binh Dinh province. They are presently training 83 Vietnamese in New Zealand and have provided 7,500£ ($21,000) for equipment for a technical high school. They are also assisting by providing approximately $600,000 for a science building at the University of Saigon.

Philippines

The Philippine Government has sent a 2,000-man military engineering unit with security support personnel, a station hospital, and rural health and civic action teams.

In *non-military aid,* approximately 60 Philippine civic action personnel including military and civilian medical teams have been working in Viet-Nam for several years.

Thailand

Thailand has sent a total of approximately 2,200 men including a recently arrived combat brigade. A 150-man Thai naval group manning an LST and PGM patrol craft arrived in Viet-Nam in December 1966. A 35-man air force contingent has been flying operational transport missions for the Vietnamese forces. The Thais have also been providing jet training for Vietnamese pilots in Thailand.

In *non-military aid,* the Thais have provided rice for refugees and cement and zinc roofing materials. At the Manila Conference, the Thais offered the Vietnamese a $20 million rice credit. The Thais have also announced they will send a medical unit to Viet-Nam.

MIDDLE EAST

Greece

Greece has contributed $15,000 worth of medical supplies.

Iran

Iran has contributed 1,000 tons of petroleum products to Viet-Nam and has dispatched a 20-man medical team to Viet-Nam.

Turkey

Turkey has provided medicines and also offered to provide a substantial amount of cement.

EUROPE

Austria

Austria has offered to supply medical supplies, blankets, tents, through the Austrian Red Cross.

Belgium

Belgium has provided medicines and an ambulance and has given scholarships for 15 Vietnamese to study in Belgium.

Denmark

Denmark has provided medical supplies and has offered to train 12 Vietnamese nurses in Denmark.

Germany

Personnel in Viet-Nam:

A 3,000-ton hospital ship, the "helgoland" with 8 doctors, 30 other medical personnel and 145 beds is on duty in Viet-Nam.

Seven Germans, a director and six instructors, are teaching at the new Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc near Saigon. At Hue University there are five Germans: three physicians in the Medical School, a professor of music, a professor of German language, and one expert in forestry is working at the Department of Rural Affairs, Saigon.

Vietnamese in Germany: Forty Vietnamese are studying in Germany and the Germans have agreed to accept 30 more primarily for training as future instructors in the technical high school. A considerable number have previously been trained.

Goods and Materials: The Germans have provided the following credits:

(1) DM 15 million ($3.75 million) for import of German products such as machine tools, fertilizer, etc. The piastre funds generated go to the National Office of Agricultural Credit to aid farmers, particularly with loans;

(2) a credit of DM 50 million ($12.5 million) for development of the major industrial complex at An Hoan-Nong Son;

(3) a credit for DM 20 million ($5 million) for construction of an abattoir at Saigon-Cholon, and three coastal vessels;

(4) a credit of DM 500,000 ($125,000) for equipment at the Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc.

In April 1966, the Germans announced a gift of DM 17.5 million ($4.4 million) worth of pharmaceuticals, the first shipments of which have arrived. Also in the medical field, they have provided two mobile dental clinics and 30 ambulances for the Ministry of Health.

In June 1966, the Cabinet voted DM 25 million (US $6.25 million) for new aid to Viet-Nam including: 1) sending 25 experts to establish a refugee center; 2) building a home for wayward youths; 3) expansion of eight social centers and construction of a ninth, and 4) establishment of a training center for social workers. The Germans have also donated 260 tons of rice for refugee relief programs.

Italy

The Italians provided a 10-man surgical team and have offered science scholarships to 10 Vietnamese to study in Italy.

Luxembourg

Luxembourg has provided plasma and blood transfusion equipment.

The Netherlands

The Dutch have undertaken to build 5 tuberculosis centers in Saigon; sites for 3 have been selected. In August, the Netherlands announced a contribution of $355,000 for a 4-year UN project in social welfare, part of the $1 million they have earmarked for UN projects in Viet-Nam. In 1964, the Dutch gave antibiotics and 4 scholarships for Vietnamese. They previously provided a dredge.

Spain

Spain has sent a 12-man medical team to Viet-Nam and has provided 800 pounds of medicines, medical equipment and blankets.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has supplied economic aid valued at more than $2 million in the past three years. It has provided six civilians for the British Advisory Mission and a Professor of English at Hue University. Twenty-one Vietnamese are receiving training in the United Kingdom. A pediatric team of four British doctors and six nurses went to Viet-Nam in August, 1966.

In 1963–64, the United Kingdom provided the following goods and materials: Laboratory equipment for Saigon University; a typesetting machine for the Government Printing Office; a cobalt deep-ray therapy unit for the National Cancer Institute; various equipment for the faculties of Medicine, Science and Pharmacy at Saigon University, the Meteorologic Service and the Agricultural School at Saigon, and Atomic Research Establishment at Dalat and the Faculty of Education at Hue. In 1965–1966, British economic aid totalled $226,800 for roadbuilding equipment, diesel fishing boat engines, and portable anesthetic machines. Total aid in British FY 1967 was $515,200 and it is estimated $666,400 will be expended in FY 1968.

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina

Argentina is contributing 5,000 tons of wheat.

Brazil

Brazil has sent a substantial quantity of medical supplies which was carried to Viet-Nam by a Brazilian Air force plane and has also provided coffee.

Costa Rica

Costa Rica is contributing an ambulance for use in Viet-Nam.

Dominican Republic

Cement has been offered by the Dominican Republic for use in Viet-Nam.

Ecuador

Ecuador has sent medical supplies to Viet-Nam.

Guatemala

Guatemala has sent 15,000 doses of typhoid-paratyphoid serum for use in Viet-Nam.

Honduras

Honduras has contributed drugs and dry goods for refugees in Viet-Nam, flown there on a Honduras Air Force plane.

Uruguay

Uruguay has contributed $21,500 for relief supplies and medicines for Viet-Nam.

Venezuela

Venezuela has provided 500 tons of rice for refugee relief, and two civilian doctors are working in Viet-Nam.

AFRICA

Liberia

A contribution of $50,000 has been made by Liberia for the purchase of hospital equipment and other medical supplies for Viet-Nam.

Tunisia

Tunisia has made available 15 to 20 scholarships for Vietnamese.

NORTH AMERICA

Canada

Almost $6 million of development assistance to Viet-Nam has been provided by Canada.

1. Since 1964 Canada has supplied more than $4.5 million in economic aid. It increased its aid to South Viet-Nam this fiscal year allocating $1 million for medical assistance including providing ten 200-bed emergency hospital units. The first two units have arrived and have been installed at Phan Tiet and at Phu Tho near Saigon. A Canadian doctor and technician visited Viet-Nam in the fall to inspect potential sites. Canada has sent 650,000 doses of polio vaccine for Vietnamese school children and offered additional vaccines against polio, TB and smallpox. Consideration is being given to establishment of a children's rehabilitation center in Viet-Nam.

2. Since 1958, Canada has provided $850,000 worth of food aid for Viet-Nam. Funds generated by sales are used for capital construction projects in Viet-Nam.

3. A new science building for the medical faculty at the University of Hue is being built costing about $333,000, drawn from counterpart funds generated by sales of food supplied by Canada. Construction has passed the half-way mark.

4. The Canadians have also agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Hue University which will cost about $125,000.

5. Canada is printing half a million copies of a social sciences textbook for Vietnamese grade school children.

6. *Personnel in Viet-Nam:* A Canadian Supervisor has been at Quang Ngai supervising construction of a small TB Clinic which the Canadians are funding. The Canadians have sent two doctors and four nurses to staff the clinic. A professor of orthopedics is working at Cho Ray Hospital, Saigon, and there is a Canadian teacher at the University of Hue.

7. *Vietnamese in Canada:* 380 Colombo Plan trainees and a total of 463 trainees under all programs, including those sponsored by other agencies and third countries (as well as Colombo Plan), have been trained in Canada. There are currently 231 Vietnamese students in Canada.

OTHER ASSISTANCE

Six other nations whose help does not fall under the Free World Assistance Program have provided valuable assistance to Viet-Nam in economic and humanitarian fields.

France

Since 1956, France has contributed about $115 million in assistance to South Viet-Nam. Present aid is running at a rate of about $4 million per year, largely in the cultural field.

In 1965 France had nearly 500 persons serving in South Viet-Nam. Among them were 65 experts under France's program of economic and technical assistance, including 32 physicians, professors and other medical personnel. Under its cultural programs, 471 professors (350 French and 121 Vietnamese) were teaching at 9 French-teaching institutions, and 30 French professors are at Vietnamese institutions. France provided in 1965 for Vietnamese to study in France, 55 fellowships for technical training and 85 academic fellowships. These programs are continuing on a somewhat reduced scale.

France has provided low-interest credits of 100 million francs ($20 million) for financing imports of French equipment for Vietnamese industry, a grant of 500,000 francs ($100,000) for equipment for L'Ecole Nationale d'Ingenieurs des Arts Industriels.

In 1960 France extended a low-interest credit of 70 million francs ($14 million) to aid construction of the major coal and chemical complex at An Hoa Nong Son south of Da Nang which is underway. It also provides a low-interest, five-year credit of 60 million francs ($12 million) for construction of Viet-Nam's largest cement-producing complex with plants at Hatien and Thu Duc. In 1964, France provided a 930,000 francs ($186,000) grant for the installation of a training center for electrical technicians and in 1965 a gift of 1.25 million francs ($250,000) for teaching equipment, primarily in the medical field.

Ireland

The Irish people have contributed 1,000 pounds ($2,800) for Vietnamese flood victims through their Red Cross.

Israel

Israel made a gift of pharmaceutical supplies for flood victims and will train five Vietnamese in irrigation and animal husbandry.

Norway

Norway sent a contribution through the International Red Cross for flood victims in February 1965.

Pakistan

Pakistan made a financial contribution for assistance to flood victims and donated clothing for them.

Switzerland

The Swiss have provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. The Swiss Red Cross has sent an 11-man medical team through the International Committee of the Red Cross to work in a provincial hospital in the Central Highlands of South Viet-Nam.

U.N. aid to Vietnam

The United Nations and its specialized agencies are also making a significant contribution to the social and economic development of Viet-Nam. Under the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance of the UN Development Program, 15 technical assistance projects are scheduled for 1967 and 1968 at a cost of $724,475. These projects range across such varied fields as maternal and child health, labor administration, educational planning, telecommunications, meteorology and civil aviation. Among the participating agencies are ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, ICAO, ITU, WMO, and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the UN. In addition UNICEF has substantially expanded its health and child care programs with the 1967 program totalling $562,000, an increase over the 1966 level of $226,000.

Several major projects financed by the Special Fund of the UN Development Program are about to get underway. A National Technical Center (total international contribution approximately $1.5 million), with UNESCO is becoming operational. The Special Fund in January approved a Fisheries Development Project including exploratory and experimental fishing in the waters of the South China Sea, to be executed by FAO at a cost of $1.3 million. Also being negotiated is a Social Welfare Training Center to be executed by the Bureau of Social Affairs of the UN. ECAFE is pressing ahead with regional projects of benefit to the nations of the Mekong Basin and has undertaken surveys of irrigation, hydro-electric facilities and bridge construction projects in Viet-Nam.

EXHIBIT 2

OCTOBER 9, 1967.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, there has been considerable discussion in recent days on the floor of the Senate regarding assistance provided by other countries to the Government of South Vietnam. I would appreciate the answer, as soon as possible, to the following four questions:

1. What commitments has the United States Government made to, or what undertakings have been entered into with, the governments of South Korea, Thailand and the Philippines in connection with their provision of troops?

2. Which countries aiding South Vietnam under the Free World Assistance Program trade with North Vietnam and what has been the amount of such trade in each of the past three years?

3. In which calendar years has assistance to South Vietnam been provided by Austria, Denmark, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Norway, Pakistan, Tunisia, Turkey and Uruguay?

4. What is the dollar value of the assistance provided in calendar year 1967 to South Vietnam by Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Norway, Pakistan, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay and Venezuela?

Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 16, 1967.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of October 9 regarding assistance provided by other countries to the Government of South Viet-Nam.

With regard to your first question, the United States has not entered into any new security commitments with South Korea, Thailand, and the Philippines in connection with their provision of troops to South Viet-Nam. We are preparing and will send you shortly a classified summary of the support undertakings we have with these three countries.

The answers to your questions 2, 3, and 4 are provided in the enclosed tables.

I note that the list of countries under questions 3 and 4 comprises only the smaller contributors, and omits those nations which made the largest contributions. It is reasonable to expect that a small country, far distant from Viet-Nam, and with relatively limited resources such as Ecuador, Guatemala, and Honduras, would find that a small contribution was about all it could do in the circumstances. Nonetheless, the Department does attach significance to these contributions, modest as they may be, as an indication of support for the South Vietnamese people.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

(Enclosures: (1) Exports from Selected Countries to North Vietnam; (2) Imports by Selected Countries from North Vietnam; (3) Assistance to South Vietnam by Calendar Year; (4) Dollar Value of Assistance in Calendar Year 1967.)

EXPORTS FROM SELECTED COUNTRIES TO NORTH VIETNAM, 1964-66

[In thousands of dollars]

	1964	1965	1966
Argentina	606	------	------
Australia	------	300	2
Austria	------	1	(1)
Belgium-Luxembourg	2	1,685	515
Brazil	------	------	------
Canada	------	------	------
China	------	------	------
Costa Rica	------	------	------
Denmark	12	75	9
Dominican Republic	------	------	------
Ecuador	------	------	------
Germany	1,108	136	212
Greece	------	------	(2)
Guatemala	------	------	------
Honduras	------	----	------
Iran	------	------	------
Italy	1,274	633	399
Japan	3,372	3,853	5,649
Korea	------	------	------
Laos	(2)	(2)	(2)
Liberia	------	------	------
Malaysia	[3] 1,288	[3] 2,799	------
Netherlands	144	93	302
New Zealand	24	19	41
Philippines	------	------	------
Spain	------	2	------
Thailand	------	------	------
Tunisia	------	------	------
Turkey	------	------	(2)
United Kingdom	101	202	104
Uruguay	------	------	------
Venezuela	------	------	------

[1] Under $500.
[2] Not available.
[3] Includes Singapore in 1964 and 1965.

IMPORTS BY SELECTED COUNTRIES FROM NORTH VIETNAM, 1964-66

[In thousands of dollars]

	1964	1965	1966
Argentina	------	------	------
Australia	------	------	------
Austria	58	78	139
Belgium-Luxembourg	767	604	19
Brazil	------	------	------
Canada	------	------	------
China	------	------	------
Costa Rica	------	------	------
Denmark	10	------	------
Dominican Republic	------	------	------
Ecuador	------	------	------
Germany	236	215	147
Greece	------	------	(1)
Guatemala	------	------	------
Honduras	------	------	------
Iran	------	------	------
Italy	278	485	143
Japan	9,872	11,457	9,651
Korea	------	------	------
Laos	(1)	(1)	(1)
Liberia	------	------	------
Malaysia	[2] 1,434	[2] 1,859	179
Netherlands	1,312	573	112
New Zealand	------	------	(3)
Philippines	------	------	------
Spain	------	------	------
Thailand	------	------	7
Tunisia	1	------	------
Turkey	------	------	(1)
United Kingdom	165	333	255
Uruguay	------	------	------
Venezuela	------	3	3

[1] Not available.
[2] Includes Singapore in 1964 and 1965.
[3] Under $500.

ASSISTANCE TO SOUTH VIETNAM BY CALENDAR YEAR

	Year
Austria	Assistance offered.
Denmark	1964 and 1967.
Ecuador	1965.
Greece	1964.
Guatemala	1965.
Honduras	1967.
Ireland [1]	1965.
Laos	1965 and 1966.
Liberia	1966.
Luxembourg	1965.
Norway [1]	1965.
Pakistan [1]	1965.
Tunisia	1967.
Turkey	1964.
Uruguay	1966.

[1] Assistance is not considered part of the free world assistance program.

DOLLAR VALUE OF ASSISTANCE IN CALENDAR YEAR 1967

	Value
Argentina	$290,000 (in process).[1]
Austria[2]	
Belgium	$75,000 (scholarships).
Brazil	
Costa Rica	$7,000 (in process).
Denmark	$60,000 (training).
Dominican Republic	
Ecuador	
Greece	
Guatemala	
Honduras	$10,000.[3]
Iran	$80,000.[4]
Ireland[2]	
Israel[2]	(5).
Italy	$50,000 (scholarships).
Laos	
Luxembourg	
Malaysia	$50,000 (training).
Norway[2]	
Pakistan[2]	
Spain	(6).
Switzerland[2]	(7).
Tunisia	$48, 000 (scholarships).
Turkey	
Uruguay	
Venezuela	

[1] This contribution was included in the summary supplied in our letter of May 15, 1967. However, the commodities have not yet been delivered.

[2] Assistance is not considered part of the free world assistance program.

[3] This contribution was included in the summary supplied in our letter of May 15, 1967. However, the supplies were not delivered until March 1967.

[4] Estimated annual cost of medical team assigned to Vietnam.

[5] No estimate available of the cost of Vietnamese training scholarships.

[6] Estimated cost not available of the medical team assigned to Vietnam.

[7] Not available.

THE DEADLOCK EXISTING IN THE CONFERENCE ON THE FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on August 17, when the Senate passed the foreign aid authorization bill, I promised the Senate that I would do everything I could to hold the bill as the Senate passed it. I said:

> I could not have supported the bill if the Senate had not sustained the committee's work on it. I will let the bill languish in conference indefinitely if we cannot reach a satisfactory agreement on the major proposals.

Subsequently the House passed a bill on August 24. The Labor Day recess intervened and the conferees met for the first time on September 14. Since that date, the conferees have met 10 times.

There were 89 points of difference between the House and the Senate bills. The conferees have tentatively resolved 72 of those points. Of the 17 remaining differences, most have to do with the question of foreign military credit sales, and it is upon this issue that the conference apparently has deadlocked.

I therefore feel it my duty to report to the Senate on what has transpired and on what the situation is on that very controversial piece of legislation.

Over the years, the Congress has provided the administration, primarily the Department of Defense, with steadily broader authority to finance foreign credit sales of military equipment. About a year ago members of the Foreign Relations Committee began to be concerned over the manner in which this authority was being exercised. I believe the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] was the first to call it to the attention of the committee.

As a result of the Senator from Minnesota's concern, the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee made a study which was published in January 1967 under the title "Arms Sales and Foreign Policy." This study recommended that the United States "reappraise the adequacy of the present machinery of policy control and legislative oversight governing the sale of arms." It pointed out that over the past 4 years there has been a basic change in the composition of American military assistance. The sale of arms has now replaced the giving of arms as the predominant form of U.S. military assistance. While dramatic in character and of major importance in its implications for alliance relationships and for the problems of arms control in the developing regions of the world, the significance of this change has not been fully appreciated by the hierarchy of the American executive branch or the Congress. In Europe, American arms salesmanship has often been zealous to the point of irritation, and overpowering to the point of encouraging Europeans to compete more aggressively for the arms markets in the underdeveloped regions of the world. In some underdeveloped regions of the world—notably Latin America and the Middle East—where there are no significant balance-of-payment incentives, the United States, when faced with tough decisions as in Iran and Argentina, seems to be drifting into a policy of preemptive selling rather than the more difficult alternative of arms denial.

Subsequently the Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Subcommittee on Disarmament, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], held extensive hearings on the problem.

As a result of these hearings, there were revealed many abuses of the authority to sell military equipment on credit, and the Foreign Relations Committee in marking up the foreign aid bill voted to curtail that authority rather drastically. The committee was sustained by the Senate. The foreign aid bill as it passed the Senate repealed the authority of the Department of Defense to guarantee loans by the Export-Import Bank or private banks for the purchase of military equipment. It also provided for the liquidation, as of December 31, 1967, of the revolving fund which the Department of Defense has used to finance credit sales of military equipment to underdeveloped countries.

This is the issue upon which it appears that the foreign aid conference is deadlocked.

Although holding strong views about the matter, a majority of the Senate conferees have offered substantial concessions to the House.

First. The Senate conferees have offered to agree to the continuation of the guarantee authority to June 30, 1968, as contrasted with the Senate bill which would repeal the authority upon enactment. The House conferees insist upon continuation of the authority to June 30, 1969.

Second. Senate conferees have offered to agree to an overall limit on credit sales to developing countries of $175 million. This is more than halfway between the administration's original plans for such sales in the amount of $294.5 million, and the Senate's position that such sales ought not to be made at all except for cash or on short-term credit.

Third. The Senate conferees agreed to postpone liquidation of the revolving fund from December 31, 1967, to June 30, 1968.

Fourth. The Senate conferees offered to increase the authorization of appropriations for military assistance from $475 million in the Senate bill to $510 million, but this was rejected by the House conferees who insisted upon $585 million.

So, Mr. President, it appears that the foreign aid conference has deadlocked over these issues. There is talk that the House may pass an appropriation bill for foreign aid despite the fact that there is no authorization for it. If this happens, amendments will be offered in the Senate to bring the appropriation bill in line with the action of the Senate on the authorization bill, particularly with respect to military credit sales.

I do not intend to argue the matter further at this time. That can await Senate consideration of the appropriation bill if such a bill comes over from the House. However, I do think it my duty at this time to give the Senate a factual report on what has transpired in the conference committee. The Senate conferees have gone further than I and many of my colleagues would have liked in an effort to reach agreement. The proffered concessions on the part of the Senate have been to no avail.

I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the public interest would be better served by no foreign aid bill than by the bill which passed the House and which would allow—indeed encourage—a continuation of the policy of arming poor and underdeveloped countries.

By continuing the present authority of the Department of Defense to guarantee credit sales to underdeveloped countries we are saying to them, in effect: Even though you are so poor as a sovereign nation that you can't buy a jet squadron on commercial credit, we are ready and willing and able to get you easy government credit so you can do so—whether you need it or not." Continuation of this program means that the U.S. Government and the American people have no objection to becoming a cutrate, easy credit institution of the sale of sophisticated military supplies—much in the pattern of those domestic credit institutions which advertise a dollar down, and 25 cents a day for the rest of your life.

I do not think the United States should be in this position.

The Senate will have an opportunity to vote on this issue again if and when a foreign aid appropriation bill comes before it.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS AND INDIVIDUAL, MINORITY, OR SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be permitted until midnight to file reports, after the adjournment of the Senate today, together with any individual, minority, or supplemental views, if desired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHARLES HASLET, ABLE NEWSPAPERMAN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, today Charles C. Haslet will end a distinguished career of 43 years with the Associated Press.

A native of Wellington, Kans., for the last 30 years Charlie has effectively covered Capitol Hill for newspapers and radio and television stations of Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. Starting his career on the Wellington, Kans., Daily News, he joined the Associated Press in Chicago in 1924, and subsequently worked in the Tulsa and Oklahoma City bureaus.

Charlie's dedication and hard work, his always cheerful greeting as he called for news, will be missed by all of us who have known him over the years. On this, his last day before retirement from the Associated Press, it is an honor to extend to him our thanks for his years of responsible journalism and our best wishes for the future.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I want to remind Senators that on tomorrow, immediately following the disposition of morning business, the senior Senator from Louisiana will be recognized to speak on his amendment, and that the unanimous-consent agreement has already been entered to vote on final passage of the pending measure at 2:30 tomorrow. There will likely be rollcall votes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 31, 1967:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John Harold Fanning, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1972 (reappointment).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

L. B. J. Defeats Republicans in Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and New York Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, with just a year to go before the presidential election the Republicans are trying desperately to boost party morale by already claiming victory.

Unfortunately for them, the election will determine the winner—not their publicity releases. And while I hate to be a killjoy, I would urge the Republicans not to order their victory champagne before the final results are in.

Just last week, for example, polls conducted in Pennsylvania and New Hampshire revealed that President Johnson could defeat handily the top five Republican hopefuls.

The polls, conducted by an independent firm in Princeton, N.J., showed that in Pennsylvania, the President ran ahead of Richard Nixon, 51 to 37; ahead of Rockefeller 45 to 41; ahead of Romney, 48 to 35; ahead of Reagan, 51 to 33; and ahead of Percy, 50 to 29.

The sampling covered 657 persons throughout Pennsylvania.

In New Hampshire, the poll showed the President and Nixon running neck and neck, but Lyndon Johnson running ahead of Rockefeller, Romney, Reagan, and Percy.

In addition, an earlier poll covering New York State—conducted by this same firm—showed President Johnson easily defeating this same group of Republican rivals.

The Republicans want to claim victory in 1968 a year early. Now if only those polls would cooperate.

I think the polls will cooperate with the Republicans to the same degree that they have cooperated with the Johnson administration in passing needed legislation.

In other words, the Republicans do not have a chance.

Alexander Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that Wisconsin and the Nation received the news of Senator Alexander Wiley's death last week. The 24 years of his distinguished service in the Senate—longer than any other Wisconsin Senator in history—reflects the respect and reverence with which he was held by the citizens of Wisconsin.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee it was my periodic privilege to serve with Senator Wiley on various conference committees. While Senator Arthur Vanderburg was widely regarded as the outstanding exponent of bipartisan cooperation in international affairs, Senator Wiley epitomized that same philosophy in his work on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Over the years of his dedicated service on that committee Senator Wiley demonstrated an impartiality and fairness in his judgment of the issues—weighing each on its own merit and for the ultimate good of all Americans. He served his country and State well.

He was, in addition, a man motivated by strong religious principles, always honest, humble, and forthright in his dealings with all whatever their rank or station. The courage of his convictions was never underestimated.

I join with my many colleagues and with his countless friends and admires in expressing my personal sorrow over Senator Wiley's passing. Mrs. Zablocki joins me in extending heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Wiley and the Senator's children.

More Progress Needed in Air Pollution Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Clean Air Act, which we passed in 1963 and have since amended, was the beginning of a nationwide effort to combat the evils of air pollution. Unfortunately, we still have a long way to go before the war is won. Last December 12, Vice President HUMPHREY, in addressing the Third National Conference on Air Pollution, made it clear that the Johnson administration is extremely concerned about the need for further progress in this important area.

The Vice President told the conference:

> I said that there is a serious toll of human life involved. And there is. The nation that suffers the most is ours—from emphysema, for example, a disease associated directly with air pollution. Emphysema is the fastest-growing cause of death in this country today. Among American men the death rate from emphysema is almost ten times what it was in 1950. Each month 1,000 more workers are forced prematurely onto the Social Security rolls because of the crippling effects of this disease. Significantly, deaths from emphysema are twice as high in our cities as in our rural areas.
>
> Now, if there happens to be a relationship between the filthy air of the urban areas and the relatively clean air of the rural countryside, the coincidence only underscores what anybody with an eighth-grade education already knows. What a pity it is to think that we can build glistening towers, magnificent buildings, incredible designs for machines and devices, and yet we don't know how to control the smoke that comes out of a smockstack.
>
> Like emphysema, other major respiratory diseases—bronchitis, asthma, lung cancer, not to mention the common cold—are clearly lined with air pollution, even though the link is incompletely documented as yet. However, there seems to be a growing body of evidence that all of these disturbances of the lungs and throat are related indirectly to the atmosphere that surrounds us, the air we breathe.

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by Vice President Humphrey. We are indeed late in getting started and the problem is indeed immense. However, we in the House of Representatives will soon have an opportunity to substantially increase the resources available to combat air pollution. The Air Quality Act of 1967, an integral part of President Johnson's program to assure a safe and healthful environment for every American, has been favorably reported out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Our support of this important legislation will constitute another battle won in the war against polluted air. I strongly urge its passage.

The 100th Anniversary of Clinton Turn Verein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I revise and extend my remarks in the Record and include therein a speech I made at the 100th anniversary banquet of the Clinton Turn Verein, May 23, 1967.

This celebration, which was held in my hometown, was a very inspiring occasion to me, and it reawakened very happy memories of my early association with this great organization of friends and neighbors in my hometown, whose membership now embraces virtually every race, creed, and class and is devoted to wholesome family life, physical and moral fitness, and patriotic ideals of the brotherhood of man.

The speech follows:

Congressman Philip J. Philbin Addresses Clinton Turn Verein

My dear and distinguished friend, Judge Gould, whom I thank warmly for his very generous and eloquent personal references, and my friends, brothers and sisters of Turner Hall, this is indeed a great and memorable occasion. The 100th anniversary of the founding of our famous and beloved Turner Hall is a meaningful event in the history of Clinton, our state and our nation.

It has been my great honor to be here in this wonderful place to speak at the 75th anniversary, which was held before I became your Representative in the Congress, and later in May, 1957 when I spoke here at the 90th anniversary.

So you see, it is with special honor and pride that I am here tonight once again with distinguished guests, leaders of our community including our good friend, Chairman of the Board of Selectmen, Mr. Joseph Morano and the very great and distinguished President of the National Turners, Hon. George Jacquin and many other very esteemed gentlemen and ladies, officers and members of the Turners.

In the presence of dear cherished friends and fellow members, it is a very happy privilege to be with you to celebrate another Turner birthday, this time an outstanding one marking 100 years of unsurpassed, outstanding service to this community and glorious contributions to our country.

The Turn Verein is one of those exceptional organizations which the nation needs today probably more than ever before. It was founded in the early part of the last century by a dedicated, far-sighted and gifted gentleman named Frederick Jahn, a Clinton name by the way, which makes his honored name and memory stand out all the more in our minds, especially as we view and consider the many wonderful beneficial things that have been wrought here in this very place.

The rich German culture has been fused and blended with a superb brand of Americanism that in truth represents total service and loyalty to our great country.

The Turners were founded in this country in 1848 by the famous Frederick Hecker, one of the heroes of the German Revolution, to promote physical education, a most worthy and necessary goal that could be well emulated in this very day and age. But it has gone far beyond this end to include mental training, libraries, schools, journalism, civic contributions, charity and good works that stand out like a gleaming light of inspiration and leadership.

It is very interesting to note the original German slogans which our great Society followed and I am now referring to the Turners. They were Frisch, Frohm, Froh and Frei, which for the benefit of my Irish, Italian and Polish friends who are now found among our leaders, and to other non-Germans with us, simple mean Bold, Devout, Gay and Free.

These slogans are simple but they stand for fundamental principles of life and of government. They represent the will of our organization to stand up for its rights, and for the rights of free men, for our right to worship to God of our choice, for the right to be free of oppression and tyranny, and the right to enjoy some of the pleasures of music, comradeship and the gaiety and enjoyment of living in a free land.

Anything I might say by way of tribute to the founders of the Turners, and especially the founders of this Turn Hall, would be like carrying coals to Newcastle. Where could anyone find more understanding friends, better citizens, dedicated to town, state and country, honest, industrious, hard-working people, faithful fellow citizens, who in war and peace, by their words and their deeds gave expresson to their loyalty to this country and its institutions, which could never be exceeded by any other group.

It is inspiring to relate that during the Civil War, for example, over 51% of the total membership of the Turners were enlisted in the military service. The proud record will show that for the past 100 years in this town, whenever it was necessary for our citizens to rally to the cause of country, whether it was in terms of gallant patriotic contributions, commendable assumption of civic responsibility, the cause of civic virtue, neighborliness and friendship, the advancement of learning, the building of physical strength and the encouragement of all those things that go to make for the growth, development, betterment and strength of the nation, the Turners have played a leading role.

They have played this role across the board, not in any limited sense. They have furnished brilliant leadership in the promotion of many ideas and issues that have been written into our laws and made a part of the great American dream, a pattern of forward-looking philosophy, embracing progressive viewpoints and principles and unselfish public service and citizenship.

The Splendid Record of the J. P. Stevens & Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to know that the hearings on proposed amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, conducted by a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, have recently provided a forum to castigate the good name of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. My knowledge of this matter convinces me that the charges of unfair practices directed at J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. are unjustified and were completely refuted by Mr. Robert T. Stevens, president of the company, in his recent testimony before the subcommittee. I commend to the membership of the House the fine statement made before the subcommittee by Mr. Stevens, who is one of the Nation's outstanding citizens and businessmen.

It appears to me that the "crime" of which the Stevens Co. is accused is that its employees in every instance have failed to indicate a desire to join a labor union. Whenever they have voted, they have turned down the union emphatically in spite of an allout effort on the part of the Textile Union of America, with the backing of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO, and with vigorous assistance from the National Labor Relations Board, to make the Stevens Co., its prime target in an organizing drive on southern industry.

The Stevens Co., established in 1813, is one of this Nation's oldest firms and is the second largest textile manufacturing chain in America.

I have personal knowledge of the company's philosophy of employee relations as one of the Stevens' plants is now, and has been for more than 25 years, located in my home city of South Boston, Va. The company strives to maintain a progressive outlook, is eminently fair and just in its dealings and relations with its employees, and provides wages and benefits within the top level of the textile industry. It is unthinkable to believe that the charges which have been lodged against the Stevens Co., with respect to its employee relationship have any basis for credibility.

Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House on April 21, 1966, in my remarks concerning the decision of the National Labor Relations Board of March 22, 1966, charging unfair labor practices against the J. P. Stevens Co., I sought to point out the unbounded contributions the company has made to the growth of this country. I took vigorous exception to the manner in which the National Labor Relations Board is undertaking to punish this economically sound manufacturing concern and its employees, and I expressed the opinion that we should not sit idly by and witness this company being required to repent in sackcloth and ashes for a sin it did not commit. I commend the company and its legal counsel upon filing an appeal from the decision of the National Labor Relations Board, and am pleased to know of the company's intention to prosecute its appeal to the highest court of the land.

Mr. Speaker, my record in public life will show that I have always upheld the right of an individual to join or not join a union. I believe that voluntary membership in a union is the fundamental right of every American. The present case against the Stevens Co. is one in which a governmental agency seeks to force upon thousands of employees, who by their secret ballots have spoken out against the union, something they do not want. Such action will create discord in labor-management relations beyond recovery.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that it is a sad and shocking experience to observe the unfair treatment accorded the Stevens Co. in hearings before a congressional committee, and I hope the membership of the House will take time to read the statement of Mr. Robert P. Stevens presented to the subcommittee, and to which I have previously made reference.

Honor Lodge of B'nai B'rith Serves San Fernando Valley Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. CORMAN Mr. Speaker, one of the most successful projects in behalf of the youth of the San Fernando Valley, in my district in the Los Angeles area, is the Boys' Club of Pacoima and San Fernando, Inc.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the generous, civic minded efforts of the members of the Honor Lodge of B'nai B'rith, who conceived of and executed the Boys' Club project.

Honor Lodge of B'nai B'rith is an unusual organization. It consists of Jewish business and professional men who live in the San Fernando Valley, all of whom felt the need for a philanthropic organization, under the auspices of B'nai B'rith, which would be devoted to the welfare of the community as a whole rather than the welfare of any particular secular group.

When a representative of the Boys' Club of America, Inc., in late 1965 brought to the attention of Honor Lodge its feeling that the Pacoima-San Fernando area was potentially another Watts in terms of possible civil strife, and suggested that something be done immediately to alleviate the strained conditions, the Honor Lodge responded to the problem.

In December of 1966, the Honor Lodge formed the Boys' Club of Pacoima and San Fernando, Inc. Its original board members were Jerry Edelman, David Goldberg, Louis Sugarman, Bernard Shapiro, and Irvine Robbins. Mr. Robbins was then the president of Honor Lodge, and Mr. Shapiro was a former president of Honor Lodge, and between them they spearheaded the effort to find a location and set up a boys' club.

A small store front building on Van Nuys Boulevard in Pacoima was rented, on a month-to-month basis, because there was no guarantee of continued support for the project. However, the Boys' Club is still there, and it needs larger quarters. Ernest Dillard, a bright enterprising young man with roots in the community, was hired as supervisor. He is still with the project, and has done an outstanding job. The project started off with three VISTA volunteer workers. It now has one, and he is a very devoted and conscientious young man. The club now has approximately 180 boys as members, and with more money and better facilities, it could double or triple its membership.

The club provides recreational and educational facilities for the boys. Pingpong tables, pool tables, games, a basketball hoop, baseballs and mitts, and other sporting equipment are available to keep the boys busy and happy between the time school lets out and the time their parents return home from work. The club has books and art materials. Art classes are conducted. And, most important, Ernest Dillard counsels the boys with a great deal of depth and understanding.

The Boys' Club of Pacoima and San Fernando, Inc. has received $4,000 from the Boys' Club of America, Inc. as seed money, and the balance of the money, which runs aoout $16,000 or $17,000 a year, has come from the Honor Lodge. Members of the Honor Lodge have contributed athletic equipment for the boys, office equipment, and the thousand other things that are needed to run an organization.

The enthusiasm of the members of Honor Lodge for the Boys' Club is as strong today as it was when the club was formed, almost 2 years ago, and it is clear that they intend to continue their efforts to keep this worthwhile project going.

They, and all those who have devoted so much of themselves to this project are to be highly commended.

Carl Foreman, Film Industry Pioneer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American motion picture industry which not too many years ago bore the confining synonym of "Hollywood," has now become one of our greatest international enterprises, extending to every continent of the world. Hollywood is still there as its capitol, but men of great vision have broken the national and regional bounds to make American films a worldwide industry. Our influence and thoughts have been immeasureably broadened even beyond the understanding of our ideals which the motion picture itself carries to other nations. I want to call attention to one of the most vital figures in this broad internationalization of our motion picture interests. He is Mr. Carl Foreman, a writer, producer, and director of films, who pioneered the extension of our film industry to other continents. Fifteen years ago, Mr. Foreman went abroad to make movies in foreign locales. Authenticity of settings had a great deal to do with the tremendous resurgence of American films at a time when their demise was being predicted because of the growing competition of television. With headquarters in London, as well as in America, Mr. Foreman overcame the hurdle of being an outsider working in England and came to be accepted by the British film industry not as a competitor within their midst, but as one of the world's most respected workers in this visual art. This regard overcame national and competitive commercial considerations with the result that Mr. Foreman became the first American to be elected governor of the British Film Council. Jennie Lee, England's Minister of State for the Arts, appointed Mr. Foreman as the only American member on the national committee to study the need for a national film school. He is also the only American member of the British Experimental Film Board, and a member of the executive council of the British Film Production Association.

While we spend much time, effort and money on developing better economic and cultural understanding abroad, Mr. Foreman, as a single American, has contributed heavily to this solely through his own talent. Nor is he without honor in his own native country. Besides the Academy Award won for his screenplay for "Bridge on the River Kwai," he received Academy Award nominations for four other great movies, "Champion," "High Noon," "The Men," and "Guns of Navarone." It is well known that America gave the world the motion picture as its only original art medium. Within that medium, the western is its most uniquely American form. It was through the western that we first attracted the attention of the world in the film industry's infancy. Its popularity has never waned, but it reached a point some years ago when it had nothing new to say. Shortly before he left to establish himself in England, Mr. Foreman wrote and produced "High Noon" in Hollywood. It brought to the American western a new dimension and a fresh viewpoint of social consciousness. Its success here and abroad not only gave the western new directions, but added further international lustre to American frontier courage exemplified in our heritage of the West. True to his resolve for honesty and authenticity in settings, Mr. Foreman has now returned to this country to film another western, "Mackenna's Gold," his first film here since he left our shores 15 years ago. Mr. Foreman's return to his origins is welcomed not only by the American motion picture industry, but by our responsive leaders and citizens alike. We, too, add our welcome and our commendation to Mr. Foreman for the honors he has won abroad and the bright image he has created there of the creative American filmmaker.

New Reference Book on the Hungarian Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my pleasure to be visited by two distinguished Hungarians, Gen. Lajos Veres and Mr. Istvan Gereben. During their visit they presented to me a book which Mr. Gereben helped prepare, "The Hungarian Revolution in Perspective." This book is a collection of brief statements made by world leaders during and after the Hungarian revolution of 1956, and includes a series of detailed studies of the economic, historical, social, and political conditions and traditions which led to the revolution.

One of the virtues of this work is that it does not dwell upon the details of the revolution or the infamous tactics which were used to wrench victory from the hands of the valiant freedom fighters. Rather, it concentrates on placing this event in its proper place in the broad context of world history.

The first segment of the book is comprised of capsule opinions of many world leaders about the revolution. Men of such divergent views and positions as former Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Joseph Cardinal Ritter, Pope Pius XII, Jean-Paul Satre, former Premier Nikita Khrushchev, and Jomo Kenyatta are quoted in the opening pages of the book. Their conflicting, competing, and complementary views, many expressed quite some time after the fact of the revolution, form a most interesting mosaic.

Premier Khrushchev views the revolution and Russian intervention in it as one Socialist country coming to the aid of another in time of severe need. Former President Dwight Eisenhower on the other hand commented:

> The terror imposed on Hungary repudiates and negates almost every article in the Declaration of Human Rights. That these human rights have been so flagrantly repudiated is cause for worldwide mourning.

These two excerpts are typical of the views which are juxtaposed in the opening pages of this volume.

Following this introductory material is a series of carefully analytical essays which consider how the events of October of 1956 fit into the pattern of world history and what impact they have had on the subsequent pattern of that history. I believe that the casual reader of this book may well find the first of these essays to be among the most interesting.

In it Salvador de Madariaga, the widely respected European chronologer, details the social and political circumstances before, during, and after World War II which contributed to the descent of the Iron Curtain over Eastern Europe. From this he moves to a consideration of the international political factors which permitted the Soviet Union to act with impunity in reestablishing a Communist government in Hungary.

Hungarian readers or those persons with a particular involvement in the revolution and its consequences may be equally fascinated by the contribution of Louis Gogolak, one of Europe's preeminent authorities on Hungarian-Czech-Slovak history. His work carefully recounts Russian-Hungarian relations during this century, particularly since World War II.

As would be expected, Madariago, Gogolak, and the other authors share an obvious bias in favor of the freedom fighters and their fellow Hungarians. However, their analyses of the world situation are generally acute and reflect a studied effort to separate fact from opinion.

Perhaps because some time passed between the revolution and the writing of most of the works contained in this volume, this effort at objectivity is surprisingly successful.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues the contrasts between the lives of my two distinguished guests, General Veres and Mr. Istvan Gereben.

These two men represent the best of Hungary's past and the hope of its future.

General Veres, now 78 years old and living in England, is a much-decorated soldier, who in 1944 was designated by then head of state Horthy as "homo regius"—his successor in the event Horthy were killed. In October 1944, Veres was captured and sentenced to death but this sentence was later reduced to life imprisonment. By the war's end Veres was liberated and had assumed a prominent role in the underground opposition to Russian rule.

In 1947, General Veres was among several hundred members of the underground who were sentenced to prison for their activities. This prison sentence was also cut short, this time by Hungarian freedom fighters, who freed him during the 1956 revolution.

It is the heritage left by such outstanding Hungarians as General Veres that stimulates and motivates such younger men as Istvan Gereben, whom I have known for several years. Gereben, a young and prominent oceanographer and geophysist, is now an American citizen who left his native Hungary after actively participating in the 1956 revolution. He continues to work tirelessly to stimulate American concern for an understanding of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe.

Since arriving in Congress I have been continually concerned that the American people understand the oppression which the peoples of the captive nations must endure. Because of this concern I last year served as the chairman of the Board of the American Citizens Committee to Commerate the 10th Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution. This concern now prompts me to commend this book to my colleagues. I am sure each of you would find it to be a highly readable and valuable reference work.

Address by Senator Holland Before the 62d Annual Convention, Gulf Intra-Coastal Canal Association, Jacksonville, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very informative address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] at Jacksonville, Fla., on October 30, 1967, entitled "The Contribution of Manmade Navigation Projects."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONTRIBUTION OF MANMADE NAVIGATION PROJECTS

It is a great pleasure to me to welcome your Association, for its first convention in the Sunshine State of Florida—indeed its first convention east of the Mississippi.

I believe it most fitting that you selected the City of Jacksonville for this meeting as this will be the linking up point of the Gulf Intracoastal Canal by way of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal with the Atlantic Intercoastal Waterway which extends some 1456 miles from Trenton, New Jersey, to Miami. Within a few years, when the Intracoastal Waterway from St. Marks to Tampa Bay is completed, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, which now extends from Brownsville, Texas, to St. Marks on the West Coast—a distance of some 1115 miles—will be over 1400 miles long. The completion of the Cross State Barge Canal will save a distance of more than 600 miles and will eliminate the hazardous route around the Florida Keys and open up an intracoastal system from New Jersey to the Mexican border—a system of over 2500 miles of protected waterways. Here will be the point of connection of waterway systems which extend into 34 states.

I do not need to tell those present today that water transportation has played a vital role in our nation's development since the day of the earliest settlements along the East Coast.

And speaking of the East Coast, I would like to point out that you are less than 40 miles north of St. Augustine, the oldest city in the continental United States. It was established by Pedro Menendez d'Aviles, who landed there and took possession of Florida, September 8, 1565, in the name of King Philip II of Spain. He named the town San Augustin in honor of the Saint upon whose day the first fleet had sighted the Florida Coast.

Prior to the coming of Menendez, Jean Ribault and his French Huguenots, sailing the coast of Florida, came to the mouth of the St. Johns River which they named "May River" in commemoration of the day, May 1, 1562, when discovery was made. There they erected a stone column bearing the Arms of France, and later established Fort Caroline in honor of Charles IX of France, and set about the establishment of Protestant New France.

Somewhat earlier in 1512, Ponce de Leon, in search of the Fountain of Youth, first made land on Sunday, March 27, but did not set foot upon its shores until the 2nd of April at a spot believed to be a short distance north of St. Augustine. Having first come upon the coast on Palm Sunday, Pascua Florida, as it was called in Spanish, he gave to his supposed island the name "Florida". History also tells us that Ponce de Leon was the first to envision the possibility of a canal across the State of Florida and that some 300 years later this vision was rekindled by Andrew Jackson.

The foresight and leadership of such great Americans as Governor William P. Duval, and I include among them Clarence Holland, another Holland but unfortunately not related to me, and Roy Miller who played such a vital role in the building of the Intracoastal Canal since its inception on August 8, 1905, have aided materially in the conservation, preservation and development of our soil and water resources. Governor Duval, in addressing the Territorial Legislative Council of Florida in 1824 said:

"The bold and navigable rivers which run thro' our Territory will be more valuable than mines of gold."

The vision and the development of the Gulf Intracoastal Canal has very greatly exceeded expectations as the annual commerce carried on the Canal is approximately 15 times what it was forecast at the time the waterway was authorized some 40 years ago and it has achieved the phenomenal high ratio of benefits-to-cost of 26.0 to 1.

If you would picture a map before you, you would see that the Gulf Intracoastal Canal connects up with major developed river systems, such as the Mississippi and Alabama, and in addition the proposed or authorized development of the Trinity and Apalachicola Rivers. These, in turn, are linked with other major systems, such as the Ohio, Tennessee, Missouri, Arkansas, and Illinois and with the Intercoastal Canals. This great inland waterway system is of inestimable value to the continued growth of our nation. It helps to bring about the increase in the gross national product so necessary to maintain our ever-expanding population and keep our economy in balance.

In the early pioneer years of our country in the 1700's, the river was the American highway as there were few roads and no railroads. With the passing of time, the rivers no longer were the only arteries of commerce but became only a segment, a highly important segment, in an integrated national transportation system which is particularly adapted to moving large quantities in bulk at low cost.

The navigation benefits we enjoy from our water resources have increased as our water systems have moved from limited transportation usage to controlled usage. Likewise, by the employment of multi-purpose water development we have made possible the wise use and re-use of this priceless water resource.

This development has been a major factor in the transformation of our country from a wilderness to a nation of great national commerce and its continued virile growth. This continued expansion of the American economy requires continued emphasis on the development of our water resources and particularly in the field of navigation improvements.

Great credit goes to the Corps of Engineers in the development and control of this resource. In my opinion they have performed a most commendable job, and I might say that here in Jacksonville we have a District Engineer, Colonel Tabb, who has performed a great job, and we are indeed pleased that he is here.

We know, for it has been proven, during the development of our water resources in the some 140 odd years the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has carried forward our public works programs, that monies invested in these programs have been returned many fold. Just think of progress made since the steamship "Great Eastern", the famous "great iron ship", crossed the Atlantic in the 1890s when Portland, Maine, was the only American harbor that could receive her.

Yes, we have made great strides and as a result of the visions of great men—and great leaders—you have played a vastly important part in developing the most prosperous nation in the world, and the great efforts and enthusiastic support of groups and associations such as yours have played a major part in providing the means for such achievement by constantly urging the continued improvement and enlargement of our waterway systems.

This activity must be carried on most vigorously in the future in order that we may keep pace with our ever-expanding growth. The Bureau of the Census projects the population of our nation for 1977 at 232 million and for the year 2000 at 350 million—almost twice the population of 1960. This expansion in population, coupled with the projection of our gross national product which exceeded $700 billion last year and is estimated at about $1,000 billion, or one trillion dollars, in 1976 and at $2 trillion in the year 2000, which is about triple that of 1966.

These startling figures point up the necessity for continued improvement in all modes of transportation. Not only must our waterways be improved, but improvement of the railroads, the perennial objectors to waterway development and of the highways, also, must be accomplished.

As to the railroads, this becomes apparent when we compare the freight load carried by rail facilities during World War II which was about 745 billion ton-miles to an estimated requirement in 1976 of one trillion ton miles of freight haulage per year and by the year 2000 some two trillion ton-miles.

This ever-increasing demand for transportation of the production of physical goods, which increased from 1959 to 1964 by 17.6 percent, shows very clearly the need for constant improvement of rail facilities. The inability of the railroads to meet traffic demands is evidenced by the Interstate Commerce Commission reports that on some days in 1966 there was a shortage of 15,000 freight cars and I understand the backlog of orders placed for freight cars with the builders grew 66 percent in one year—May 1965 to May 1966.

To me, it is perfectly obvious that the projected demands will require vital steps in order to balance our transportation needs and it is apparent that the railroads will not be able to carry the projected traffic. Therefore, the only other mode of bulk transportation which can be substituted for or considered for relieving this demand is the great river systems and our inland waterways which are uniquely adaptable for the mass movement of bulk commodities at low cost. The use of such resources will aid in the creation of jobs for the estimated additional 25 million persons who will be added to our labor force by the year 1980.

The some 26,000 miles of improved waterways have brought with them industrial expansion along their routes involving more than 6000 plants which have provided jobs and payrolls, opened up new markets, stimulated general business activity and enlarged the public tax base, which is vitally important today when we are having great budgetary problems. And when we mention budgetary problems to a Member of Congress these days it brings on an immediate headache. This reminds me of a story of one friend asking another: "Are you saving any money since you started your budget system?" And his friend replied: "Sure, by the time we have balanced it up every evening it is too late to go anywhere." I wish that the budgetary problems of the Congress were that simple of solution.

These man-made waterways have stimulated greatly competition with the railroads and have resulted in reduced rail rates where such competition is present. This is readily apparent if comparison is made of rail rates between points where water transportation is available with those areas in which the railroads operate but do not compete with water transportation.

As our nation was being founded, writing in the Federalist, James Madison, John Jay and Alexander Hamilton all stressed the importance of federal improvement of transportation facilities. Madison was of the opinion that:

"Nothing which tends to facilitate the intercourse between States can be deemed unworthy of public care." (The Federalist, No. 42)

Madison further stated:

"Intercourse throughout the Union will be facilitated. . . . The communications between the western and the Atlantic districts and between various parts of each will be rendered more and more easy by the numerous canals with which the beneficience of nature has intersected our country and which art finds it so little difficult to connect and complete." (James Madison op. cit. No. 14).

These views, as expressed by James Madison, are even more relevant today than they were then and the pursuit of continued development of our waterways has now become an inherent part of our economy.

Along with many of my colleagues, I will continue, with the help of organizations such as yours, to seek necessary authorizations and appropriations to insure the full development of our water resources. We are now doing all we can, in the face of the strained current fiscal situation, attributable in great part to the Vietnam situation, to provide adequately for continued improvement of our waterways.

I am sure that you are all aware of the action now being taken by the Congress in regard to the Public Works Appropriations for fiscal year 1968. These appropriations do not provide all we would like, under the circumstances we have had to face up to. Being mindful of the need to continue vital projects as well as to make new starts, we have done the best possible. Senator Ellender of Louisiana has been our great and inspiring leader in this work. I might say that I would have liked to have seen additional funds provided for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal in order to insure its completion in 1974, now three years behind its original scheduled completion date. As many of you are probably aware, the Corps of Engineers indicated a capability of $20 million for the project for fiscal 1968. However, the budget recommendation was for $11.4 million and this figure will be in the final bill. Again, here is a case in point where additional funds can be justified, yet under our present burdensome fiscal condition some giving has to take place to provide for a needed, rounded-out, overall program.

I am not pleased nor am I unhappy about this for our field is just one of the many important programs for which our nation must provide. I do feel it is important that steps be taken to insure that once a project is funded for construction, the Engineers may adhere to their completion schedules and I hasten to say I do not blame the Engineers for delays in completion for in most cases such is the result of actions taken by higher authority in refusing to recommend the appropriation of adequate funds or in the withholding or deferment of the allocation of funds appropriated by the Congress.

One last point I would like to make with regard to the contribution of man-made navigation facilities:

Much is said, particularly by the various conservation groups—to the effect that the building of our waterways destroys the beauty of the areas where improvements are made. Let me say emphatically that I am deeply interested in the conservation movement and was instrumental in establishing the Everglades National Park which was begun when I was Governor and finally came into being after I came to the Senate. I shall continue to be an ardent conservationist. Certainly, there is something to say on this point—not only because of temporary construction scars, but likewise in contrast with the early days of the nation when inhabited areas were built in the wilderness, and later abandoned because of changing times and lack of transportation, the development of our inland waterways has brought with it the repopulation of many areas which now provide, as a result of water facilities, cheap rates of transportation. Those redeveloped areas and the industries which accompany them cannot have all the character of untouched nature. But I have also seen, as have many of you who have traversed the Inland Waterways, much beautiful scenery that heretofore was unseen and unenjoyed due to the difficulty in reaching it. Now millions may enjoy it. One such area which I shall mention—and there are many others—is the great dismal swamp in North Carolina— once second in size and inaccessibility to the Everglades. Here, besides us average citizens, skilled foresters, geologists, botanists and zoologists now find an ideal opportunity to observe nature at its best.

Anyone who has seen and enjoyed the indescribable beauties of manmade lakes in Tennessee, Missouri and Arkansas, and in many, many other places in our nation, will have to acknowledge that our program has helped to create beautiful scenery of incalculable value to America.

These great inland waterways which we shall continue to improve, in addition to their need for our industrial growth provide boundless recreational facilities for fisherman, sportsmen and boat enthusiasts. And speaking of both the pleasing and the economic side of life, the marinas and other facilities which have come into being for the enjoyment and pleasure of a great number of our citizens also provide a means of employment to many.

In closing I want to stress that many of my colleagues and I have long recognized that there is no physical asset more valuable to our nation than our water resources. The continued development of these resources is essential to our future. Their development adds to our national strength. Any attempt to restrict such improvement by establishing unrealistic criteria for the economic evaluation of waterway projects or the imposition of tolls or user charges, either by regulation or legislation, will be met head-on by those of us who believe that unrestricted use of our vast inland waterway system is essential to our national interest. Your friends in the Congress will fight all proposals of this nature.

But it is most important that your organization and the many other groups committed to the continued development of our inland waterways maintain a constant alert against such rash proposals. To date you have done a fine job, but this is no time for relaxation. Together we have strength and determination to defeat the constant efforts in certain quarters to impose unrealistic restrictions on waterway users. We must continue to mobilize our forces and stand at-the-ready to exert our united strength against these proposals which are definitely not in the national interest.

President Johnson Reaffirms the New Focus on Opportunity for Mexican Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Mexican American citizen of the United States was again the focus of opportunity by the American Government.

From all over the country, representatives of the Mexican American community, independent specialists, and government officials came together in El Paso, Tex., to discuss proposed solutions to Mexican American problems.

It was a fitting followup to the new focus on opportunity for Mexican Americans announced by President Johnson some months ago.

Indeed, the President himself came to El Paso to tell the gathering that although much had been accomplished by Spanish-speaking citizens during the last three decades, more had to be done.

He pledged the aid and assistance of Government in achieving those ends.

The President talked about progress being made in jobs, health, education, housing and civil rights.

He talked about the work of the new Interagency Committee on Mexican American Affairs.

And he cited the tens of thousands of Mexican Americans who had received job training during the last 3 years throughout the Southwest and West with Government help.

He talked of the 2 million children who had received the benefit of Project Headstart.

And he pledged continuing efforts to bring the Spanish-speaking resident of the Southwest up to the level of first-class citizenship.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the remarks of President Johnson made at the Mexican American Conference in El Paso, Tex., this past weekend:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE, EL PASO, TEX.

Mr. President and Mrs. Diaz Ordaz; Mr. Foreign Minister and Mrs. Carrillo Flores; Governor Connally; distinguished members of the Senate and House; distinguished Delegate to the United Nations, Dr. Garcia:

I am here on a mission that fills me with a great deal of pride and with deep satisfaction.

The Chamizal is now Mexican territory. The United States of America and United States of Mexico have solved a political problem of more than 100 years' standing.

So the fiesta that you are enjoying serves a dual purpose:

First, to celebrate the Chamizal, and

Second, to concentrate our attention on the achievement, and the concerns, of America's Mexican-American people.

This is the first time, to my knowledge, that the Federal Government of the United States has sent five of its top Cabinet officers across the land to search for new ways to fulfill the fundamental hopes of Spanish-speaking Americans—hopes and yearnings that they have for good education for their children, good jobs for their workers, good wages, good health, and good housing.

This is not much to ask, but we have a long way to go in order to get it.

This is home country for me, as you know.

When I talk with you about the problems and the potentials of the Mexican-American, I am talking about people I have known all of my life and care about deeply. These people are proud people. They are people who are older in history than the United States of America itself.

What a change there has been in your lives—in all our lives—since I was a poor schoolteacher in a Mexican-American school at Cotulla, Texas, 40 years ago. Most people in Texas then—Mexican-American included, lived on the farm and made their living in the fields.

Few Mexican-Americans had moved into better jobs, where they could offer their families a few of the comforts of life.

There has been a good deal of upward movement during these 40 years. It is encouraging, but it is not enough.

Tens of thousands of Spanish-speaking Americans entered professional and technical occupations during this period.

They became managers, executives, and proprietors.

They worked as key employees in some of the great new industries of the Southwest.

But for too many years your government paid too little heed to both the status and the hopes of the Mexican-American community.

For too many years Americans who were poor remained invisible.

But in the 1960's, we decided that an era of neglect must come to an end.

With the help of a great Congress, we wrote into law more measures to train, to educate, to heal, and to house more Americans than had ever been written in all of our history before.

We were abused, criticized, and condemned, but we wrote into law two landmark civil rights acts to guarantee that no American would be deprived of opportunity by the prejudice of other Americans.

We did all of this amidst a sea of controversy. That was to be expected. So far as I can determine, no President has ever done anything that is very worthwhile without controversy.

And I would much rather be controversial than complacent—or just critical. You will be hearing more about that in the days to come.

The effort and the controversy have been worth it. For the first time, we had the tools to work with each minority in a way that met its particular needs—that provided help, without regimentation or conformity.

For the Spanish-speaking citizen, there was a "New Focus on Opportunity."

He gained a powerful voice in the highest councils of government, the voice of a distinguished public servant who sits with the Cabinet committee and gives the Mexican-American community of our Nation able leadership—Vicente T. Ximenes.

I am very pleased to observe, from the Baltimore Sun front page this morning, that the distinguished Dr. Hector Garcia, the first Mexican-American to ever sit as a delegate to the United Nations, sat in the United Nations yesterday and made a speech in Spanish to that great body.

Yes, we have found programs that answered their special needs in language, education and economic development.

And those programs respected the rich and unique cultural traditions.

In the last four years, your Government has trained tens of thousands of Mexican-Americans in the Rio Grande Valley and throughout the Southwest, for useful and rewarding jobs.

And we have reached down into the smallest town and the largest city to do this.

And just as fundamental as jobs is education.

In four years we have passed 36 landmark education bills. We have tripled the money invested in these programs from $4 billion to more than $12 billion in education in this country in the last three years. We are doing three times as much today as we were doing three years ago.

These are not just statistics. They represent children being prepared to take part in America's prosperity and in America's future.

Let me tell you the story this afternoon of a young Mexican-American named Frank (Pancho) Mansera who came to visit me the other day in the White House.

Pancho got off to a rough start in life. He was sickly. His parents were poor. When he came into the Head Start program, he could hardly talk or walk, even though he was five years old.

But after medical treatment and the stimulus of people who cared about his education, Pancho moved ahead like the wind. He became cheerful. He was active, alert, healthier. He wanted to learn. He was a bright child. He just needed a chance. Head Start and the Government of the United States—through the Congress of the United States—gave him that start. And they are going to give other children that. We will be voting to give hundreds of thousands of other children that when we pass the Poverty Program—I hope in the next few days.

There are more than 2 million Pancho Manseras who have gotten a new educational head start already. There are millions more who need to.

And if I have my way, they will return to this country much more than they have received.

We are moving forward to set up additional community health centers for needy families.

In 41 different sections in our country now we have Neighborhood Health Centers that we didn't have just a few months ago. But we need more than 41.

We are ready to launch other Neighborhood Health Centers for San Luis, Colorado and Taos County, New Mexico. It could help more than 7,000 Spanish-speaking citizens in a remote area that has only two doctors and limited health facilities.

So we are moving forward. Nobody knows better than you how far we have to go.

Nobody can know, who has not experienced it, what it is like to be turned away at a personnel office because you have a strange accent. Nobody knows from the outside what it is like to have your children stumbling over words in a schoolbook, because a teacher hasn't taken the extra time to help them learn. Nobody can know, but those who have lived it, how a man wonders whether he will ever break free of the old cycle of just following the crops, and give his son a better chance.

A lesser people might have despaired. A lesser people might have given up a long time ago. But your people didn't give up. They believed they were full-fledged citizens of the greatest Nation on earth, even if others didn't always treat them as such.

It is a long way from the Cotulla schoolhouse to where I live now, but we have made progress and we are going to make more.

Today their time has come. With the help of their government—but far more importantly, by their own hard work and with high good humor—they are entering into their rightful heritage as Americans. They are contributing to their country's welfare here, and to their country's security abroad.

I can tell you that nothing I have seen since those days long ago when I left that classroom has given me greater happiness.

I hope that in my time of leadership that I have helped to make some of it happen. I know that in the time that remains, I am going to do all that one man can do to make the promise of these years multiply among the Mexican-American people. And you can be certain of that.

In the last 12 months, of the 129 Nations in the world, the President of the United States has conferred with more than 80 of the Heads of State. That is a record since the founding of this Government.

And there is another record—in all of those more than 80 meetings, none has been as pleasant, as successful, or as fruitful as the one just concluded with the distinguished leader of Mexico.

I want all of you to know his beautiful, gracious, enlightened wife, Mrs. Diaz Ordaz, the First Lady of Mexico.

And Mrs. Johnson.

The Senate had to adjourn today because we had the Majority Leader and most of the distinguished gentlemen on the plane—Senators coming down here with us. I would like to ask the Members of the Senate and the Members of the Congress, including all of our own delegation—Members of the House and Senator Yarborough—to please stand and take a hand.

I want to ask our distinguished Governor to please stand and take a hand—Governor Connally.

Now ladies and gentlemen, I want to present to you the great leader of a great people, a statesman, a man who understands the needs of not only his own people but the people of the world, a man who is providing international leadership—not only in this hemisphere, but throughout the world—because today in Afghanistan and Iran, in India and Pakistan, they are receiving the blessings of the laboratories that produced the Mexican wheat under the leadership of the great Nation the President represents—th Nation of Mexico. In the years to come, you will find—not only in this hemisphere, but throughout other lands—the mark of leadership of the Mexican people. No one will contribute more than His Excellency, the able, the cordial, the friendly good neighbor, Diaz Ordaz.